

# Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages

פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي
פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي
פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي
פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي
פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي
פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي
פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي
פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي
פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي
פִּי	פִּי	فِي	فِي

If another פ follows in the word, then this Aramaic פ is commonly weakened into כ; e.g.

פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי

There are however some exceptions to this rule; e.g.

פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי
פִּי	פִּי	פִּי	פִּי

LECTURES  
ON THE  
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR  
OF THE  
SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,  
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,  
AVE MARIA LANE.



Cambridge: DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO.  
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

LECTURES  
ON THE  
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR  
OF THE  
SEMITIC LANGUAGES

FROM THE PAPERS OF THE LATE  
WILLIAM WRIGHT, LL.D.,  
PROFESSOR OF ARABIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

CAMBRIDGE  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1890

[*All Rights reserved*]

2

## PREFACE.

THE Lectures printed in this volume were composed and delivered for the instruction of students in the University of Cambridge, and with special reference to the Examination for the Semitic Languages Tripos.

It appears from the *Cambridge University Reporter* that Professor Wright began "a short course of elementary lectures" on the Comparative Grammar of Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic in the Easter Term of 1877, and he continued to lecture on the subject at intervals till he was withdrawn from work by his last illness. The manuscript from which this volume is printed represents the form which the Lectures ultimately assumed, after they had passed through repeated and sedulous revision. They were never redelivered without being retouched, and in parts rewritten; and the whole manuscript, except a few pages at the end, was so carefully prepared as to be practically ready to go to press. It was Professor Wright's intention that the lectures should one day be printed, and during his last illness he often spoke of this intention in such a way as to make it clear that he meant to publish them without any substantial modification or addition. It was not his design to produce a complete system of the Comparative Grammar of the

Semitic Languages or to give a complete account of all recent researches and discussions, but to do through the press for a wider circle of students what he had done by the oral delivery of the lectures for his Cambridge pupils.

Under these circumstances the task of editing the book for publication has been very simple. I have divided the text into chapters, for the convenience of the reader, but have printed it for the most part word for word as it stood in the manuscript. In a very few places I have removed repetitions or other slight inconcinnities of form, but in such cases I have been careful to introduce nothing of my own, and to limit myself to what would certainly have been done by the author's own hand if he had lived to see the book through the press. Occasionally I have thought it necessary to add a few words [within square brackets] to complete a reference or preclude a possible misconception, and I have also added a few notes where the statements in the text seemed to call for supplement or modification in view of facts or arguments which had not yet come under the writer's notice when the lectures were last revised. So long as his health allowed, Professor Wright closely followed all that was done in Semitic learning, and incorporated with his manuscript, from time to time, references to everything that he deemed important for the practical object of the lectures. But it was no part of his plan to give a complete view of the literature of the subject; as a rule he only referred to essays which he wished to encourage his hearers to read in connexion with the lectures. Bearing this in mind, I have been very sparing in the introduction of additional references

to books and papers ; but, on the other hand, I have borne in mind that every written lecture must occasionally be supplemented in delivery by unwritten remarks or explanations, and a few of the notes may be regarded as taking the place of such remarks. I have, for example, occasionally thought it necessary to warn the reader that certain words cited in the text are loan-words. In all questions of phonetics this is a point of importance, and I am informed by those who heard the lectures that Professor Wright was careful to distinguish loan-words as such in his teaching, in cases where the fact is not noted in his manuscript. A considerable number of the notes are due to the suggestion of the author's old and intimate friend Professor Nöldeke, of Strassburg, who has kindly read the lectures in proof, and the notes signed N. or Nöld. are directly taken from his observations. Some of these, which were not communicated to me till the book was in page, have been necessarily placed among the *Additional Notes and Corrections*, to which I desire to call the special attention of the reader.

It will be observed that the Lectures do not embrace any systematic discussion or classification of the forms of nouns in the Semitic languages ; nor can I find any indication that the author intended to add a section on this important and difficult subject. He seems to have regarded it as lying beyond the region that could be conveniently covered in a course of lectures to undergraduates ; and he did not live to read the recent works of his old and valued friend Professor de Lagarde (*Uebersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina*, Göttingen 1889 : *Abh. der k. G. d. W.*, Bd. xxxv), and of Professor

Barth (*Die Nominalbildung in den Sem. Sprachen*, 1ste Hälfte, i., Leipzig 1889). On the other hand he doubtless intended to complete the subject of verbal inflexion, and I have therefore thought it right to make a few additions to the rough sketch of the derived forms of verbs whose third radical is *l* or *'*, with which the manuscript ended, and also to supply, by way of appendix, a short section on verbs one of whose radicals is an *Ń*. Here also I have derived great advantage from Prof. Nöldeke's suggestions.

The printing of the volume, necessarily slow from the nature of the work, has been still further retarded by a prolonged illness, which fell upon me after the early sheets were printed off, and which would have caused still more delay had not Mr A. Ashley Bevan, of Trinity College, kindly undertaken to read the proofs during my enforced absence from Cambridge. I have to thank Mr Bevan not only for this service but for suggesting several useful notes.

W. ROBERTSON SMITH.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

*June, 1890.*



# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS. THE TERM SEMITIC. DIFFUSION AND ORIGINAL HOME OF THE SEMITES. . . . .	1
The subject 1—Founders of Semitic philology 2—Books recommended 3—Distribution of the Semitic races 4—Their original seat 5.	
CHAPTER II. GENERAL SURVEY OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES . . . . .	10
Northern and southern Semites 10—Northern dialects: Babylonian and Assyrian 12—Aramean group 14—Western and Eastern Aramaic 19—Modern Aramaic dialects <i>ibid.</i> —Canaanites 21—Phoenicians 22—Hittites 23—Hebrews <i>ibid.</i> —Moabites 25—Southern dialects: Arabic 26—Himyaritic 28—Ge'ez or Ethiopic 29—Relation of the Semitic languages to the Indo-European 30—to the Egyptian 33.	
CHAPTER III. SEMITIC WRITING . . . . .	35
Literature 35—Egyptian origin of the alphabet 36—Oldest monuments of Semitic writing 37—Old Hebrew alphabet of the Siloam inscription 38—Square character 39—Aramaic alphabet <i>ibid.</i> —Alphabets of the southern Semites 40—Inadequacy of the Semitic alphabets 41.	
CHAPTER IV. THE LETTERS OF THE SEMITIC ALPHABET AND THE CHANGES THEY UNDERGO . . . . .	42
The gutturals 42—The palatals 50—The dentals 52—Aspirated dentals 55—The sibilants 57—The labials 64—The liquids 67—The weak letters <i>w</i> and <i>y</i> 69—Table of permutations 73.	

	PAGE
CHAPTER V. THE VOWELS AND THEIR PERMUTATIONS . . . . .	75

The original vowel-system 75—Modifications of the vowels in Arabic 76—The short vowels in Hebrew and Aramaic 78—under the influence of the tone in Hebrew 81—The long vowels in Hebrew and Aramaic 84—The diphthongs 87—Supplementary vowels, especially in Hebrew 91—Prosthetic vowels 93.

CHAPTER VI. THE PRONOUNS . . . . .	95
------------------------------------	----

The personal pronouns: suffix forms 95—Separate forms: 1st person 98—2nd person 101—3rd person 103—The demonstrative pronouns 106—The sign of the definite pronominal accusative 112—The definite article 114—The relative pronouns 116—The Hebrew relative  $\text{וְכִי}$  118—Certain possessive pronouns 119—The interrogative pronouns 120—as indefinites 125—The reflexive pronouns 127—Expression of the reflexive by the aid of substantives 128.

CHAPTER VII. THE NOUN . . . . .	131
---------------------------------	-----

Gender 131—The fem. termination *t* (*at*, *ah*) 132—used adverbially 135—with increment (*et*) 136—Other feminine terminations 138—Cases 139—in Arabic and Ethiopic 140—Traces of case-endings in Hebrew 141—The nouns  $\text{כֵּן}$ ,  $\text{כִּן}$ ,  $\text{דִּן}$  142—Origin of the case-endings 143—Nunation 143—Mimation 144—Origin of these *ibid.*—The plural 145—The feminine plural 147—Broken plurals 148—The dual 149—Construct dual and plural 151—The feminine plural in Aramaic 152—The emphatic state *ibid.*—Pronominal suffixes to the noun 152.

CHAPTER VIII. THE VERB . . . . .	161
----------------------------------	-----

Nominal forms underlying the inflexion of the verb 161—Intensive forms 162—*Segholutes* 163.

I. THE PERFECT 165—Forms with characteristic *a*, *i*, *u* *ibid.*—Inflexion: 3 sing. fem. 167—3 pl. masc. 168—3 pl. fem. 169—Accentuation of 3rd pers. 170—2nd pers. 171—2 sing. masc. *ibid.*—2 sing. fem. 172—2 pl. masc. 173—2 pl. fem. 174—1 sing. 175—1 pl. 177—Dual *ibid.*—Later analogies to the formation of the Perfect 178.

II. THE IMPERFECT 179—3 sing. masc.: the preformative

*ya* 182—Other preformatives 183—3 sing. fem. 184—3 pl. masc. *ibid.*—3 pl. fem. 185—2 sing. m. and f. *ibid.*—2 pl. m. and f. 186—1 sing. and pl. 187—Dual *ibid.*—Accentuation 188.

III. THE IMPERATIVE 188—Plural 189.

IV. VARIATIONS OF IMPERFECT AND IMPERATIVE 191—Moods of the Imperfect in Arabic *ibid.*—in Hebrew: Jussive forms 192—Energetic forms 193—Moods of the Imperative 195.

V. THE INFINITIVE 195.

VI. THE PARTICIPLES 196—Passive participle 197.

VII. DERIVED CONJUGATIONS. A. *First group* 198—1. The intensive and iterative stem 198—2. The conative stem 202—3. The factitive or causative stems 204—B. *Second group*, Reflexive stems 207—1. Reflexive of the simple stem *ibid.*—2. Reflexive of the intensive 209—3. Reflexive of the conative 212—Infinitives of B. 2 and B. 3 213—4. Reflexive of the causative 214—C. *Third group* (with characteristic syllable *na*) 215—1. Niph'al and its congeners *ibid.*—2. Ethiopic forms with preformative *an* 217—3. Nithpa"el 218—4. Arabic forms with infixed *n* *ibid.*—D. *Fourth group*, Reduplicated stems 218—1. Pi'lel and its congeners *ibid.*—2. Pe'al'al 219—3. Pilpe'l and its congeners 220—4. Arabic Conj. XII. *ibid.*—5. Forms of the type *kallaya* 221—E. *Passive Forms* 222—in Arabic *ibid.*—in Hebrew 223—in Aramaic 224.

## CHAPTER IX. THE IRREGULAR VERB . . . . . 227

I. VERBS  $\gamma\gamma$  227—in Arabic *ibid.*—in Hebrew and Syriac: simple stem 228—Derived conjugations 232.

II. A. VERBS  $\gamma^{\text{D}}$  AND  $\gamma^{\text{D}}$  234—1. Verbs with original *w* as first radical 235—Derived conjugations 239—2. Verbs with *y* as first radical 241.

II. B. VERBS  $\gamma\gamma$  AND  $\gamma\gamma$  242—Uncontracted verbs of this class *ibid.*—Contracted forms in Arabic 244—in the other dialects 245—Derived conjugations 251.

II. C. VERBS  $\gamma^{\text{h}}$  AND  $\gamma^{\text{h}}$  255—Perfect of the simple stem *ibid.*—Imperfect 263—Imperative 266—Infinitive 268—Participle 269—Derived conjugations 270.

APPENDIX. Verbs with a radical  $\aleph$  277—A. *Verbs*  $\aleph^{\text{D}}$  278—B. *Verbs*  $\aleph^{\text{y}}$  282—C. *Verbs*  $\aleph^{\text{h}}$  283—History of radical  $\aleph$  in Hebrew 284.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS . . . . . 286

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS. THE TERM SEMITIC. DIFFUSION AND ORIGINAL HOME OF THE SEMITES.

IN commencing a course of Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, I feel it almost unnecessary to begin with an apology for my subject. The results which may be attained by the comparative treatment of an entire class, or even of a single group of languages, have been patent to all, since the time when men like Bopp, Pott and Schleicher, have investigated the connexion of the Indo-European languages; Jacob Grimm that of the Teutonic; and Diez that of the Romance. What has been done in these fields may yet be accomplished in another; and every attempt to illustrate the history and grammar of the Hebrew language in particular ought to be welcome to its students, even though the results should fail to be in exact conformity with preconceived notions and ancient prejudices.

To myself it is a matter of more importance to apologise for the meagreness of the outline which is all that I can pretend to offer. I have no great discoveries to announce, no new laws to enunciate. The field of our investigations is limited. Instead of ranging from the farthest limits of Hindūstān to the coasts of Ireland, and from the shores of Iceland to the isles of Greece, we are confined, I may say, to a small portion of Western Asia. Our position is that of the Teutonic or Romance philologist rather than that of the Indo-European. The languages with which we have to deal form a small group, which are as intimately connected with one another as old Norse, Gothic, old High German and old English, on the one hand; or as Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Provençal, French and Wallachian, on the

other. And not only this, but I propose to confine myself chiefly to three of these languages—Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic; and to consider these as they appear to us in the ancient forms of their literary monuments, and not, save incidentally, in the modern aspects of their spoken dialects.

You probably infer, then, that our path is a smooth one; that there is not much to investigate; not much room for inquiry or speculation. And yet this is far from being the case. On the contrary, it is surprising how relatively little progress the comparative philology of the Semitic languages has yet made; partly owing to the inherent difficulties of the subject, and partly to the imperfection of our knowledge on many preliminary points of importance.

A hundred years ago the Sanskrit language was barely known to Europeans by name; so recently as 1816 appeared Bopp's *Conjugations-System*, the first work of the great master and founder of the science of Comparative Grammar. And behold, the mustard seed has already grown into a great tree, and has yielded an ample and goodly crop of fruit.

Beside the results of Indo-European philology, those as yet attained by Semitic grammarians seem scant and dwarfish. Since the days of Reuchlin, who died in 1522, we Europeans have been engaged in the study of Hebrew and its sister-languages. The Dutchman De Dieu and the Swiss Hottinger, our own Edmund Castle and the Germans Buxtorf and Ludolf, Alting of Groningen and Danz of Jena, were among those who laid the foundations of our science; and they found worthy successors in the three great Dutch linguists, Schultens, Schroeder and Scheid. But yet the labours of these scholars were not far in advance of those of the classical philologists of their day, who speculated upon the obvious affinities of Latin and Greek, and their connexion with other languages, without being able to arrive at any satisfactory results; simply for want of the proper key wherewith to unlock this linguistic treasury. It was reserved for the men of our own day to take a decided step in advance. Thanks to the studies of a Gesenius and an Ewald, a Roediger and an Olshausen, a Dillmann and a Noeldeke, the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages is at last beginning to assume the proportions of a science; and we may therefore hope, before

many years are past, to see the results of their labours embodied in a work which shall not be inferior in fulness and accuracy, I will not say to those of Bopp and Schleicher, but rather to those of Grimm, of Diez, and of Curtius.

You understand, then, that there exists as yet no work which I can recommend to you as a complete text-book of Semitic Comparative Grammar; no treatise which we can confidently follow as a guide from the beginning of our course to its end. The French Orientalist Renan proposed to himself to write such a work; but he has not yet advanced beyond the introduction, the *Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques* [8vo, Paris, 1st ed. 1855]. The second part, the *Système Comparé*, has remained, and is now, I fear, likely to remain, a desideratum. Differing as I do from Renan, not merely in small details, but also in various matters of principle, I can still admire the industry and scholarship which are manifest in every page of the *Histoire Générale*; the justice of many of its views, and the clearness of its style and arrangement; and I therefore advise those of you who have not yet read it, to do so without delay, as a good introduction to the studies to which I now invite your attention<sup>1</sup>. In connexion with our special course I would recommend to you more particularly the Hebrew Grammar of Justus Olshausen, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache* (Brunswick, 1861); that of B. Stade, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik*, 1ter Theil (Leipzig, 1879); and Bickell's *Grundriss der Hebräischen Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1869, 70), of which an English translation by Curtiss appeared at Leipzig in 1877 under the title of *Outlines of Hebrew Grammar*. To this little book I shall sometimes have occasion to refer, as I prefer it to Land's *Hebræusche Grammatica* (Amsterdam, 1869), of which there is also an English translation by Reginald Lane Poole, *Principles of Hebrew Grammar* (London, 1876). I would also mention with commendation the latest or 22nd edition of Gesenius' *Hebräische Grammatik*, by Professor Kautzsch of Tübingen, as furnishing some useful hints; [24th ed. Leipzig, 1885].

The term *Semitic* is, as has been often observed, more convenient than scientific. It is not, however, easy to invent a

<sup>1</sup> [See also Nöldeke's article "Semitic Languages" in the ninth ed. of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xxi. (Edin. 1886).]

better; and it is, at any rate, no worse than "Hamitic," and much superior to "Japhetic" or "Turanian." The word is derived, as you are aware, from the tenth chapter of the Book of Genesis, in which the nations of the world, so far as known to the Jews, are divided into three sections, not, as it would seem, ethnographically, nor even geographically, but with reference to political history and civilisation<sup>1</sup>. Thus alone can we satisfactorily explain the mention of the Phoenicians and other Canaanites among the children of Ham. That the languages of Canaan were akin to the Hebrew, almost to identity, is certain; that their connexion with ancient Egyptian was a very remote one, is equally certain—many philologists would deny it altogether; but that Canaan and the Phoenicians were long subject to Egypt, and that they derived a great part of their civilisation from the Egyptians, are historical facts which do not admit of dispute.

The Semitic races occupy but a small portion of the earth's surface. They are known to us historically as the inhabitants of the south-western corner of Asia. Their territory is bounded on the north by Mount Taurus and the mountains of Armenia; on the east, by the mountains of Kurdistān and Khūzistān, and the Persian Gulf; on the south, by the Indian Ocean; and on the west, by the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. Early colonisation led them across the strait of Bāb el-Mandeb into the country which we call Abyssinia; and they also occupied, at an extremely remote period, various points on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea and even of the Atlantic Ocean, the trading ports of the energetic Phoenician race.

If you ask me whether the Semites were autochthones,—whether they were the original, primitive inhabitants of the Asiatic region above described,—I must beg of you to formulate the question differently.

It seems certain, on the evidence of ancient monuments, that the great basin of the Tigris and Euphrates was originally occupied by a non-Semitic people or peoples, of no mean civilisation, the inventors of the cuneiform system of writing. Hebrew tradition, as contained in the Old Testament, mentions

<sup>1</sup> See Tiele, *Vergelijkende Geschiedenis van de Egyptische en Mesopotamische Godsdiensten* [8vo, Amsterdam, 1872], p. 20.

various gigantic tribes as the primitive inhabitants of Palestine (הַנְּזֻלִים בְּאֶרֶץ, 1 Chron. vii. 21), such as the Emīm, הָאֵמִים, Nēphīlīm, הַנְּפִלִים, Rēphā'īm, הַרְפָּאִים, 'Anākīm, הָעֲנָקִים, Zūzīm, הַזּוּזִים, and Zamzummīm, הַזַּמְזוּמִים; the Hōrīm or Troglodytes, הַחֹרִים, and others; some of whom at least were probably non-Semitic.

It appears then that in certain parts of their territory the Semites were not autochthones, but a foreign conquering race. Was this the case with the whole Semitic region? Does the cradle of the Semites lie within the boundaries designated above, or outside of them? That is the shape which your question should take.

Here, on the very threshold of our inquiries, the opinions of the best modern authorities diverge widely, some maintaining (as I myself was formerly inclined to do) that the Semites were ancient immigrants from the North East; others that their home was in the South, whence they gradually overspread the whole of Syria and Mesopotamia by successive migrations in a northerly direction. In recent times the former view has been upheld, to mention only a very few names, by von Kremer, Guidi, and Hommel; the latter by Sayce, Sprenger, Schrader, and De Goeje.

It was in 1875 that von Kremer published in a German periodical called *Das Ausland* (nos. 1 and 2) two articles on "Semitische Culturentlehnungen aus dem Pflanzen- und Thierreiche," i.e. on plants and animals which the Semites obtained, with their names, from other races. His conclusions, so far as they interest us at the present moment, are briefly these. Before the formation of the different Semitic dialects, they had a name for the camel, which appears in all of them; whereas they have no names in common for the date-palm and its fruit, or for the ostrich. The one the Semites knew while they were as yet one people, dwelling together; the others they did not know. Now the region where there is neither date-palm nor ostrich, and yet where the camel has been known from the remotest antiquity, is the great central tableland of Asia, near the sources of the Oxus and Jaxartes, the Jaiḥūn and Saiḥūn. Von Kremer regards the



Semitic emigration from this region as having preceded the Aryan or Indo-European, perhaps under pressure from the latter race; and he holds that the Semites first settled in Mesopotamia and Babylonia, which he looks upon as the oldest centre of Semitic civilisation. "In der babylonisch-mesopotamischen Niederung, wo die Semiten sich angesammelt hatten, entstand das erste und älteste semitische Culturcentrum."

In 1879 the Italian orientalist Ignazio Guidi wrote a memoir upon the primitive seat of the Semitic peoples, "Della sede primitiva dei popoli Semitici," which appeared among the publications of the Reale Accademia dei Lincei. His line of argument is much the same as von Kremer's (whose articles appear to have been unknown to him). Comparing the words in the various Semitic languages which express the configurations of the earth's surface, the varieties of soil, the changes of the seasons and climate, the names of minerals, plants and animals, etc., Guidi arrives at nearly the same conclusions as von Kremer, viz. (1) that Babylonia was the first centre of Semitic life, "siamo sempre riportati alla Babilonide come centro degli antichissimi Semiti (p. 48)"; and (2) that these primitive Semites were immigrants from the lands to the S. and S.W. of the Caspian Sea, which he regards as "probabile punto di partenza degli antenati dei Semiti (p. 51)."

In the same year, 1879, Hommel wrote a paper on this subject, which I do not possess in its original shape. His conclusion, however, is nearly identical with that of von Kremer and Guidi, that lower Mesopotamia, and not Arabia, was the original seat of the Semites. You will find his views stated briefly, with some slight polemic against von Kremer, in his book *Die Namen der Säugethiere bei den Südsemitischen Völkern* [Leipzig, 1879], p. 406 sqq. Consult also his later work, *Die Semitischen Völker u. Sprachen*, 1883, especially p. 63.

Assuming for the moment the correctness of this view,—taking it for granted that the Semites first settled as one race in Mesopotamia and Babylonia,—how are we to depict to ourselves their dispersion over the territory which they subsequently occupied? Somewhat as follows:—

Having forced their way through the mountainous region of Kurdistān, and reached the Tigris, the Semites would cross it

and settle in the country between the Tigris and Euphrates. Thence they would gradually make their way southwards by two different lines, through what we call Syria and Babylonia. The one branch would extend its wanderings as far as Canaan; the other to the head of the Persian Gulf, where in process of time they would cast off a fresh swarm, which occupied Arabia and then crossed over into Africa. All this of course is supposed to happen in pre-historic times; as Guidi says, "tale parmi che possa essere stato il movimento preistorico di questi popoli."

Let us now consider the opposite view, which I am at present strongly inclined to adopt.

The plainest statement of it in English is that of Sayce in his *Assyrian Grammar* (1872), p. 13: "The Semitic traditions all point to Arabia as the original home of the race. It is the only part of the world which has remained exclusively Semite. The racial characteristics—intensity of faith, ferocity, exclusiveness, imagination—can best be explained by a desert origin."

Similarly Sprenger in his *Alle Geogr. Arabiens* (Bern, 1875), p. 293: "All Semites are according to my conviction successive layers of Arabs. They deposited themselves layer upon layer; and who knows, for example, how many layers had preceded the Canaanites, whom we encounter at the very beginning of history?" "Alle Semiten sind nach meiner Ueberzeugung abgelagerte Araber. Sie lagerten sich Schichte auf Schichte, und wer weiss, die wie viele Schichte zum Beispiel die Kanaaniter, welche wir zu Anfang der Geschichte wahrnehmen, waren!"

Schrader expresses views of the same nature in an article in the *ZDMG.* for 1873, vol. xxvii. pp. 397—424. After a long discussion of the religious, linguistic and historico-geographical relations of the different Semitic nations to one another, he arrives at the conclusion that Arabia is the home of these races: "Die Erwägung der religiös-mythologischen, weiter der linguistischen, nicht minder der allgemein geschichtlich-geographischen Verhältnisse, weist uns nach Arabien als den Ursitz des Semitismus" (p. 421).

Lastly, De Goeje in his academical address for 1882, *Het Vaderland der Semietische Volken*, has distinctly declared himself

<sup>1</sup> [The same view is already expressed and defended in Sprenger's *Leben und Lehre des Mohammad*, Bd. i. (Berlin, 1869), p. 241 sq.]

in favour of the view that Central Arabia is the home of the Semitic race as a whole. Laying it down as a rule without exception that mountaineers never become inhabitants of the steppe and nomade shepherds, De Goeje rejects the notion that the Semites can have descended from the mountains of the Arrapachitis to become dwellers in the plains and swamps of Babylonia. On the other hand he shews how nomades are continually passing over into agriculturists with settled habitations; how villages and towns are gradually formed, with cultivated lands around them; and how the space needful for the pasturing nomade is thus gradually curtailed until the land becomes too narrow for him and he is forced to seek a home elsewhere. So it fared with Central Arabia. The result was that the nomade population was incessantly overstepping its bounds in every direction, and planting itself in Syria, Babylonia, 'Omān, or Yaman. Successive layers of emigrants would drive their predecessors in Syria and Babylonia farther northwards towards the borders of Kurdistān and Armenia, and thus the whole of Mesopotamia would be gradually semitised, and even portions of Africa would in course of time more or less completely share the same fate. This process, I may remark, has often been repeated in more recent, historical times, in which the Arab migration has overflowed the whole of Syria and Mesopotamia. In the earliest centuries of the Christian era, the wealthy city of Palmyra was ruled, I may say, by a company of Arab merchants. Three petty kingdoms, those of Ghassān, of the Tha'labites, and of al-Hīrah, divided between them the southern part of the Syrian steppe; and in the struggles between the Byzantine and Persian empires the Arabs of Mesopotamia had always to be reckoned with, and yielded a reluctant obedience to the one side or the other. De Goeje also lays stress upon the fine climate of Central Arabia and the splendid physical and mental development of the race; and, like Schrader, compares their language with those of the other Semites in the earliest stage at which we know them, drawing the inference that the speech of the Arabs is the nearest approximation that we can have to the primitive Semitic tongue. "En dat van alle Semietische talen het Arabisch het naast staat aan de moedertaal, waaruit zij gesproten zijn, is overtuigend bewezen door hoogleeraar Schrader te Berlijn (p. 16)."

This view is of course diametrically opposed to that of Sayce, who claims for the Assyrian "the same position among the Semitic tongues that is held by Sanskrit in the Aryan family of speech." Which of these scholars is in the right we shall be better able to judge by and by. Meanwhile I will only say that I range myself on the Arabic side with Schrader and De Goeje.

Accepting this view of the cradle of the Semites,—assuming that they spread from Arabia as their centre,—how shall we depict to ourselves their dispersion over the Semitic territory? Let Schrader speak. He imagines the northern Semites—i.e., the Arameans, Babylonians and Canaanites—to have parted in a body from their brethren in the south, and to have settled in Babylonia, where they lived together for a long period. The Arameans would be the first to separate from the main body of emigrants; at a considerably later period the Canaanites; last of all the Assyrians. At the same time an emigration would be going on in a southerly direction. Leaving the northern Arabs in Central Arabia, these emigrants would settle on the southern coast of the peninsula, whence a band of them subsequently crossed the sea into Africa and pitched in Abyssinia<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> [On all these theories of the cradle of the Semitic race see also Nöldeke's remarks in *Enc. Brit.* xxi. 642. He himself suggests, "not as a definite theory but as a modest hypothesis," that the primitive seat of the Semites is to be sought in Africa, though he regards the Arabian theory as "not untenable." It may be observed that, if the Semites originally came from Africa, Arabia may yet be the centre from which they spread over other parts of Asia.]

## CHAPTER II.

### GENERAL SURVEY OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

I NOW proceed to give you a more detailed account of the several languages, or groups of languages, which constitute the Semitic family. I divide them broadly into the *northern* Semites and the *southern* Semites. By the former I understand the Arameans, the Canaanites and Hebrews, the Babylonians and Assyrians; by the latter, the northern Arabs, the southern Arabs or Himyarites, and the Ge'ez or Abyssinians. In the course of my description it may, perhaps, be better to follow a geographical than a historical arrangement; for this reason, that linguistic and political history are very different things; that one nation may have played its part in the world's history, and have disappeared from the stage, long before a kindred people has come prominently into notice; and yet, from a linguistic point of view, the language of the latter may exhibit their common speech in a more antique phase, and may prove in the hands of the comparative philologist a more efficient implement than that of the former. An example of what I mean is afforded us by the Icelandic, which among all the existing Teutonic dialects has retained the greatest number of original forms with the least alteration. Another and still better instance is the Lithuanian language. It is spoken by only a couple of millions of people (at most) on the borders of Prussia and Russia; its earliest written literary document dates from the middle of the sixteenth century; and yet it has preserved many of the forms of Indo-European speech in a less corrupted condition than any of its European congeners, aye, than any dialect of the entire family which is not at least two thousand years older.

The causes which produce results such as these are, probably, manifold; but some of them at any rate are, as it seems to me,

sufficiently clear. Language is after all, as Whitney has remarked, the work of tradition; we speak as we were taught by our fathers and mothers, who were in their turn trained by a preceding generation. This process of transmission is always, and necessarily, more or less imperfect. Hence language is always undergoing a process of modification, partaking of the nature both of decay and of growth. The less imperfect the transmission, the slighter will the modification obviously be. Now two circumstances above all others are favourable to the continuity and completeness of linguistic tradition: isolation is the one; the possession of a literature is the other. If a race, speaking a single language, occupies a circumscribed territory, so long as that race is confined within those narrow limits, and thrown but little into contact with surrounding races, the forces which produce linguistic decay and growth are, if not entirely repressed, at least limited in their operation. Dialectic differences will probably arise, but they will be comparatively few and trifling. On the other hand, if the said race extends its territory largely, by conquest or colonisation, and is thrown into constant contact or collision with other races, the decay and growth of its speech proceeds with greatly accelerated rapidity; and the language runs no small risk of being ultimately broken up into several languages, the speakers of which are no longer mutually intelligible. Here the possession of a literature steps in as a counteracting force, exercising a strong conservative influence. English, as is well known, has changed less since Shakespear's time than it did in the interval between him and Chaucer; and certainly much less since Chaucer's age than it did during the five preceding centuries. So too with Arabic. As long as the Arabs were confined within the limits of their peninsula, the variations of their speech were but small. We know indeed of dialectic differences, but they are neither numerous nor important. The words and names handed down to us from antiquity as Arabic,—whether in the cuneiform inscriptions, the Bible, or the writers of Greece and Rome,—are easily recognisable as such, unless when they have undergone corruption in the course of transmission. Since Muḥammad's time, however, the changes have been more rapid and numerous; and by this time the natives of Syria, Egypt, and Morocco, would perhaps have

been scarcely intelligible to one another, had it not been for the link of a common literature, commencing with the ancient poets and the *Ḳor'ān*. The existence of this link has greatly retarded the processes of growth and decay; and hence it happens that the Arabic of the present day is a far closer representative of the language as spoken, say, two thousand years ago, than modern Italian and French are of the Latin of the same period.

We commence, then, our survey of the Semitic tongues with the *Northern* section, and herein with the *Eastern* group, which, as it happens, is the first to appear prominently in the field of history. This group comprises two very closely allied languages, the Babylonian and Assyrian, which have been preserved to us in numerous inscriptions, written in cuneiform or wedge-shaped characters. The earliest of these inscriptions go back beyond the time of the Babylonian king *Ḥammurabi*, who cannot, according to the best authorities, have flourished later than circa 1500 B.C.; and the latest come down to the beginning of the fourth century B.C., when the Persian monarch *Artaxerxes Mnemon* reigned<sup>1</sup>. They are all written, unfortunately for us, in a non-Semitic character, primitively hieroglyphic, and of peculiar complexity, one of the varieties of the cuneiform type. Into a full description of these, and the history of their decipherment, so far as it has till now been accomplished, I cannot here enter. The Assyrian character, as I shall call it for shortness' sake, is not alphabetical, but syllabary. Such syllables as *ka, ki, ku, ak, ik, uk*, are each expressed by a single sign, as well as syllables of the form *kam, kim, sak, sik*. These latter compound syllables may, however, be also denoted by two signs, the one indicating a syllable which ends with a certain vowel, and the other a syllable which begins with the same vowel; e.g. *ka-am, si-ik*. Under these circumstances alone, the learning to read Assyrian texts with fluency would be no light task; but the difficulty is enormously enhanced by the fact that a great number of the signs employed in writing are not syllables but ideograms; not phonetic signs, but characters denoting an object or idea. Some of these ideograms have no phonetic value whatever; whilst others are both ideographic and have a phonetic

<sup>1</sup> [The Br. Mus. has an inscr. of Antiochus I., Soter, of the year 269 B.C.]

value as well. For instance  $\rightarrow$  | as a syllable sounds *an*, but as an ideogram it means "God," *ilu*, which is otherwise written phonetically with two signs, *i-lu*. One class of ideograms are mere determinatives, their object being solely to indicate the nature of the following group of signs; e.g. | before every name of a man,  $\rightarrow$  before most names of countries, etc.

How much perplexity is caused by the intermixture of these ideograms with the phonetic signs you can easily conceive; and that the Assyrians themselves found a difficulty herein is obvious from their use of what is called "the phonetic complement." This consists in the addition to an ideogram of one or two phonetic signs, indicating the termination of the word denoted by the ideogram. For example, a certain combination of wedges sounds KI; but as an ideogram it means "the earth." Consequently the phonetic complement *tiv* is added to it, to lead the reader to the correct pronunciation, which is not *ki-tiv*, but *irši-tiv* (𐎠𐎵𐎶). Two ideograms, the phonetic values of which are SU-AS, mean "I burned." Now in Assyrian the idea of "burning" is expressed by *sarap*, *isrup* (𐎶𐎶𐎶), or *kavā*, *ikvū* (𐎶𐎶𐎶). Consequently, when the 1st pers. sing. imperf. of the former verb is intended, the syllable *up* is added to the ideograms SU-AS, and the whole word, though written SU.AS.*up*, is pronounced *asrup*. We do something of this kind ourselves, but on a very limited scale, when we write LSD, and read "pounds, shillings and pence"; or write & and *i.c.* and *viz.*, and pronounce "and" and "that is" and "namely." The Persians made more use of the same procedure in writing the Pahlavi character. Using a strange jumble of Semitic and Persian, they wrote *lmā* and *bsrā* [i.e. the Aramaic *lahmā*, "bread"; *besrā*, "flesh"], but spoke *nān* and *gōsht*; they wrote *ab* and read *pit* ["father"], but *abitr* did duty for [the synonym] *pitar*.

To return to the Assyrian. A yet greater difficulty lies ahead of the decipherer than any of those already mentioned; for it seems to have been established that some at least both of the syllabic signs and of the ideograms are polyphonic, that is, have several different sounds and significations.

For further details and explanations I must refer you to the works of Ménant, Smith, Oppert, Sayce and Schrader, espe-



cially the treatise of the last-named scholar in the *ZDMG.*, vol. xxvi. pp. 1—392; Sayce, *An Assyrian Grammar for comparative purposes*, 1872; *An Elementary Grammar of the Assyrian Language*, in "Archaic Classics," 1875 (2nd ed. 1877)<sup>1</sup>. The researches of these and other writers, such as Rawlinson, Hincks and Norris, not to mention younger scholars, such as Delitzsch, Haupt and Hommel, have rendered it clear that the language of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires, as handed down to us in this particular variety of cuneiform writing, was a member of the North Semitic group, closely connected with Phoenician and Hebrew, and only in a somewhat less degree with Aramaic.

As I shall not often refer hereafter to the Assyrian tongue, I may take this opportunity of stating that, in regard to its vowels, the Assyrian seems to have preserved more than the Hebrew of that ancient simplicity which is so conspicuous in the Arabic. It appears to possess only the three radical vowel sounds *a, i, u*, a fact which need not surprise us, if we look to the written vocalisation of the Arabic and to the analogy of Sanskrit in the Indo-European family<sup>2</sup>. In respect to its consonants, however, the Assyrian approaches more nearly to the lower level of the Phoenician and Hebrew, as contrasted with the higher level of the Arabic. This is especially obvious in regard to the sibilants, as "three," *šalasti*, שַׁלֶּסְתִּי, ثَلَاثٌ; "manly," *zikaru*, זִכָּר, זָכָר. Some salient and distinctive features in its grammar we may have occasion to notice from time to time; and I therefore only remark in conclusion that this eastern branch of the North Semitic languages has left no modern representative whatever.

Proceeding northward and westward, we meet with the great *Aramean* or *central* group of the North Semitic dialects.

The Bible has made you familiar with the name of *Arām* (written אֲרָם, constr. אֲרָם, for which we should rather have expected אָרָם, agreeably to the analogy of דְּבַר, דְּבָר). It speaks of אֲרָם דַּמְשֶׁק or "the Aram of Damascus," אֲרָם צוֹנָה,

<sup>1</sup> [See also Lyon, *Assyrian Manual* (Chicago, 1886); Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.* (Berlin, 1889).]

<sup>2</sup> [But Haupt (*Amer. Journ. of Philol.* viii. (1887), p. 265 sqq.) and Delitzsch maintain the existence of *e* in Assyrian.]

אַרַם מְעַנָּה, etc., all places situated in Syria. אַרַם נְהַרַיִם, "Aram of the two rivers," is usually supposed to mean *Mesopotamia*, but it is possible that the two rivers were not the Euphrates and Tigris, but the Euphrates and its chief affluent the Chabōras or Khābūr, which would limit the designation to the western half of what is generally understood by Mesopotamia. A part of this territory bore the name of אַרַם פְּרִין, which we may probably identify with the village of فَرْدَان, called by the Arab geographers فَدْدَان [Faddān], near Ḥarrān. *Arām* seems, therefore, not to be a geographical or political designation, but the ancient name of the race, which they brought with them in their wanderings from the banks of the lower Tigris, the district known in the time of the Sāsānians, and even later, as بَيْتُ أَرْمَيْيَةَ [Beth Armāyē], or "the home of the Arameans." Now the Jews, as is well known, employed the word אַרְמִי (אַרְמִי) in the sense of "gentile," "heathen"; and under the influence of their usage, it was retained by the Syrian translators of the New Testament to express Ἕλληνες, ἔθνικοί, and similar words. But a term which was used in the Bible to designate "heathens" could no longer be borne by a Christian people. Hence the old name was modified into אַרְמַיָּא [Ārāmāyā]; but even this was gradually discarded and replaced by another, the Greek designation of "Syrians." This is merely an abbreviation of "Assyrians." At first the Greeks called all the subjects of the Assyrian empire Ἀσσύριοι, or more usually by the shorter form Σύριοι or Σύροι. Subsequently, as they became better acquainted with these regions, they used the fuller form Ἀσσυρία to designate the lands on the banks of the Tigris, whilst the shorter form Συρία served as the name of the western lands; and at last this term was adopted by the Arameans themselves, who as Christians applied to themselves the term سُرْيَايَا [Suryāyē]. See Noeldeke in *Hermes* for 1871, p. 443, and in *ZDMG.* xxv. 113.

From its northern settlements the Aramean race gradually extended itself over the whole of Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia; and its language is consequently known to us in various forms, attaining their literary development at different periods.

Firstly, there is the dialect of northern Mesopotamia, specifically of the district around Orhāi (Urhōi) or Edessa, which we commonly call Syriac. It is known to us as a literary language from about the second century after Christ down to the thirteenth or fourteenth. The best grammars of it for our purpose are those of Noeldeke [Leipzig, 1880] and Duval [Paris, 1881].

Secondly, there are the dialects of Syria Proper and of Palestine, the region to the west of the Euphrates. These are usually spoken of by the absurd designation of *Chaldee*, which would properly mean something very different, as we have seen above. Leaving out of account two words in the book of Genesis (ch. xxxi. 47) and a verse in Jeremiah (ch. x. 11), the oldest literary monuments of this branch of Aramaic are certain passages in the book of Ezra (ch. iv. 8—vi. 18, vii. 12—26), going back to the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century B.C., which are, as Renan says, really specimens of the Aramaic of the time of Darius Hystaspis, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes Longimanus<sup>1</sup>. About the Aramaic portions of the book of Daniel there is a doubt, for they are, according to the best foreign critics, of much later date, having been written by a Palestinian Jew in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, about 166 or 165 B.C. This point, however, is one which I am not called upon to settle, and I content myself with merely indicating the doubt. Then follow the Biblical Targūms, Onkelos, Jonathan, Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Yērūshalmī. Now, do not for a moment suppose that the Jews lost the use of Hebrew in the Babylonian captivity, and brought back with them into Palestine this so-called Chaldee. The Aramean dialect, which gradually got the upper hand since the fourth or fifth century B.C., did not come that long journey across the Syrian desert; it was *there*, on the spot; and it ended by taking possession of the field, side by side with the kindred dialect of the Samaritans, as exemplified in their Targūm of the Pentateuch, their festal services and hymns. For the grammati-

<sup>1</sup> [See however Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1887) vol. i. p. 502 sq., where the view is taken that the author of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah made extracts from an Aramaic work: this work may have been written in the Persian period, and it contained authentic history, but the documents it cites are not literally authentic. Upon this view the language of the Aramaic portions of Ezra is not so old as Renan supposes.]

cal study of the Biblical Aramaic I recommend to you the grammar of S. D. Luzzatto, *Elementi grammaticali del caldeo biblico e del dialetto talmudico-babilonese*, which has been translated into German by Krüger (Breslau 1873) and into English by Goldammer, rabbi at Cincinnati (New York, 1876). The works of Winer and Petermann may also be named. The former has been done into English by Riggs and by Longfield. Turpie's Manual (1879) may be found convenient; but Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Biblisch-aramäischen* (Leipzig, 1884) is the best in its particular field. The best Samaritan grammars are those of Uhlemann (Leipzig, 1837), and Petermann (Berlin, 1873). That of Nicholls may also be mentioned.

Subordinate dialects of this second class are:—

(a) The Egyptian Aramaic, as exhibited, for example, in the stele of Saqqāra, now in the Berlin Museum<sup>1</sup>; in the inscription preserved at Carpentras in France<sup>2</sup>; in the papyri Blacassiani, formerly in the collection of the Duc de Blacas, now in the British Museum<sup>3</sup>; and the papyrus of the Louvre edited by the Abbé Bargès<sup>4</sup>. The Berlin stele is dated in the fourth year of Xerxes, B.C. 482. The other monuments specified, and a few more of the same class, may perhaps be ascribed, as M. Clermont-Ganneau maintains<sup>5</sup>, to the periods of Persian sway in Egypt, B.C. 527 to 405 and B.C. 340 to 332; but it is possible that some of them at any rate may be of later date, the work of Jews dwelling in Egypt.

(b) The Nabathean dialect, or that of inscriptions found in Haurān, Petra, and the Sinaitic Peninsula, as well as at Taimā and Madān Šāliḥ or al-Ḥijr in North Arabia. The great inscription of Taimā<sup>6</sup> is of the Persian period and therefore some centuries anterior to the Christian era. The inscriptions discovered by Doughty at Madān Šāliḥ, and just published by the French Academy<sup>7</sup>, date from B.C. 3 to

<sup>1</sup> [Figured and published in the Palaeographical Society's *Oriental Series*, Plate lxiii.]

<sup>2</sup> [*Ibid.* Plate lxiv.]

<sup>3</sup> [*Ibid.* Plates xxv., xxvi.]

<sup>4</sup> [*Papyrus Egypto-araméen*, Paris, 1862.]

<sup>5</sup> [*Revue Archéologique* 1878, 79, xxxvi. 93 sqq., xxxvii. 21 sqq.]

<sup>6</sup> [Published by Nöldeke in *Sitzungsber. d. k. Pr. Acad. zu Berlin*, 10 July, 1884.]

<sup>7</sup> [*Documents épigraphiques*, &c., 4<sup>e</sup> Paris, 1884; now superseded for most of the inscriptions by Euting's *Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien*, 4<sup>e</sup> Berlin, 1885.]

A.D. 79<sup>1</sup>. The Sinaitic inscriptions are certainly not of earlier date, whatever the Rev. Ch. Forster may have written to the contrary<sup>2</sup>.

(c) The dialect of the inscriptions found at Tadmor or Palmyra, a large collection of which has been published by the Comte de Vogüé in his work *Syrie Centrale, Inscriptions Sémitiques*, 4to, Paris, 1868—77, on which Noeldeke has based his admirable article in the *ZDMG.*, vol. xxiv., p. 85. They range from 9 B.C. to the latter part of the third century of our era. Since De Vogüé's publication considerable additions have been made to our stock, notably one large bilingual inscription in three columns, containing a tariff of taxes and imposts on merchandise of various sorts<sup>3</sup>.

(d) The dialect spoken by the Christians of Palestine, the principal literary monument of which is a Lectionary, edited by the Count Miniscalchi-Erizzo under the misleading title of *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* [4to, Verona, 1861, 64], since there is nothing to connect it specially with Jerusalem. The remaining relics of this literature have been collected by Land in the fourth volume of his *Anecdota Syriaca* [4to, Lugd. Bat. 1875]. They comprise portions of the Old and New Testaments, hymns and fragments of theological writings. The grammar of this dialect has been written by Noeldeke in the *ZDMG.*, vol. xxii. p. 443. The extant MSS. of the lectionary belong to about the eleventh century, but as a spoken language this dialect was probably extinct several centuries before that time.

The third and last subdivision of the Aramean branch comprehends the dialects which occupied the Assyrian mountains and the plains of al-'Irāk. Of the former, so far as ancient times

<sup>1</sup> [These are the dates given by the French academicians. The inscription which they assign to B.C. 3 (Doughty 7 = Euting 12) is really, according to Euting's more perfect copy, of the fortieth year of Hārithat IV. = A.D. 31. But Euting 1 (which was not in Doughty's collection) dates from the first year of this king, so that the series begins in B.C. 9. Again the inscription of the fourth year of Rab'el (Euting 28 = Doughty 19), which the academicians place in A.D. 79, is assigned by Euting with more probability to A.D. 75. The date of king Rab'el depends on the reading of the inscription of Dmēr, published by Sachau in *ZDMG.* xxxviii. (1884) p. 535.]

<sup>2</sup> [Euting has copies of dated Sinaitic inscriptions of the 3rd Christian cent.]

<sup>3</sup> [Published by De Vogüé in *Journal Asiatique*, Ser. 8, t. i. ii. (1883). See also *ZDMG.* xxxvii. 562 *seq.*, and xlii. 370 *seq.*, where the literature is fully cited.]

are concerned, we know little or nothing. Of the latter, to which Arab writers apply the name Nabathean (نَبَاطِيّ or نَبْطِيّ), the older representative is the language of the Babylonian Talmūd (exclusive of certain portions, which are written in late Hebrew). Its more modern representative, which has only died out as a spoken language within the last few centuries, is the Mandaitic, the dialect of the Mandæans or Gnostics (מַנְדַּאִיִּים), otherwise called Ṣābians (i.e. "Washers," from their frequent ablutions and washings, الصَّابِنُونَ, rad. صَبَأ = صَبَع, or المَغْتَسِلَة) and, though very absurdly, St John's Christians. A miserable remnant of this race still lingers in Chūzistān [and near Baṣra], where they have been visited by Petermann and other recent travellers; but even their priests seem now to understand but little of their Aramaic dialect. Our MSS. of their religious works are all modern, the oldest in Europe being of the sixteenth century. The grammar of this dialect too has been written by the indefatigable Noeldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, Halle, 1875.

All these Aramean dialects may be divided into two classes, which are readily distinguishable by the form of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the Imperfect. In the western dialects—Biblical Aramaic, the Targūms, the Samaritan, the Egyptian Aramaic, the Nabathean, the Palmyrene, and the Christian dialect of Palestine—the prefix of this person is *yōdh*, יָדָה; whereas in the eastern dialects—at least in Syriac—it is *nūn*, نَصَل. The usage of the Babylonian Talmūd and the Mandaitic appears to fluctuate between *n* and *l*, though *nūn* preponderates in the latter. The form with *l* appears occasionally in Biblical Aramaic, and very rarely in the Targūms, but it is restricted to the verb (לְהַיִּין, לְהַיִּין, לְהַיִּין, לְהַיִּין).

Each of these two classes of Aramaic dialects has its modern representative. Around the village of Ma'lūlā, among the hills a short distance N.N.E. of Damascus, Syriac is still spoken, more by the women and children than by the men of the locality. The prefix of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. Imperf. is *yōdh*, and this dialect therefore represents the Western Aramaic. For instance:

ʾaṣḥūd qeṣṣā. tēḥrōf ʾimḥr  
 ʾabnāḥ bšmā yeqīš ʾašmāḥ

In the mountains of Diyār-Bakr and Kurdistān, northwards of Moṣul, from Māridīn and Midyād on the west as far as Urmiah or Urūmiah and Selmās (سَلْمَاس) on the east, other Aramaic dialects are still spoken by the Christian and Jewish populations, who, in the eastern districts at least, have a hard struggle for existence among the Muḥammadan Kurds. The eastern dialect—the grammar of which has been written first by the American Missionary Stoddard [London 1865], and afterwards more fully and accurately by Noeldeke<sup>1</sup>—is usually called Modern Syriac or Neo-Syriac. This term is, however, erroneous, in so far as the said dialect, though a representative of the old Eastern Aramaic, is not directly descended from the more ancient language which we usually call Syriac, but from a lost sister tongue. Owing to the state of its verbal inflection, we cannot say for certain that the 3rd pers. sing. masc. Imperf. was formed with *u* instead of *y*, though this is highly probable, considering its relation to Syriac on the one side and Mandaitic on the other; but several points connect it more closely with the Mandaitic and the dialect of the Talmūd Bāblī than with Syriac. For example, the infin. Pa“ēl in old Syriac is *ܡܚܘܕܐ*, but in modern Syriac it is *ܡܚܘܕܐ* (ܡܚܘܕܐ), which stand (as the usage of some subdialects shews) for *ܡܚܘܕܐ*, *ܡܚܘܕܐ*, and correspond very closely to Talmudic forms like *ܡܚܘܕܐ*, *ܡܚܘܕܐ*, and Mandaitic forms like *ܡܚܘܕܐ*, *ܡܚܘܕܐ*. In one respect there is a curious approximation to Hebrew, viz. in the existence of participles Pu“al and Hof“al, of which old Syriac has no trace, though we find the latter in Biblical Aramaic and perhaps in Palmyrene. When the modern Syrian says *ܡܚܘܕܐ* *bit*

<sup>1</sup> [See Ferrette in *Journ. R. As. Soc.* xx. (1863), p. 431 sqq., Nöldeke in *ZDMG.* xxi. 183 sqq., Huart in *Journal As.* Ser. 7, t. xii. (1878), p. 490 sqq., and Duval, *Ibid.* t. xiii. (1879), p. 456 sqq. Fuller information is promised by Prym and Socin.]

<sup>2</sup> [*Gr. der neusyrischen Sprache am Urmia-See und in Kurdistan*, Leipz. 1869.]

*parkin*, "I will save," he uses a Pa"ēl participle active, with the loss of the initial *m*, **ܘܒܝܬ** being a contraction of **ܘܒܝܬܐ** [it is required that], and **ܘܢܝܢܐ** standing for **ܘܢܝܢܐ** [saving *be*, I]. But when he says **ܘܢܝܢܐ ܘܒܝܬܐ** *purkit li*, "I have saved thee," he employs a Pu"al participle, **ܘܢܝܢܐ** being a contraction of **ܘܢܝܢܐ**, so that the literal meaning is "thou hast been saved by me." The original form **ܘܢܝܢܐ** is of course identical with the Hebrew **מַצִּיחַ, מְצַחֵךְ, מְצַחֵךְ, מְצַחֵךְ**, and quite distinct from the old Syriac and Arabic passive participles **مَقْتُلٌ, مَقْتُلٌ**. These Neo-Syriac dialects have been largely illustrated of late years by the publications of Socin and Prym, of Merx, and of Duval<sup>1</sup>.

I pass on from the Central or Aramaic to the next great division of the Semitic family, the *Western*, the members of which inhabited the narrow strip of land on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, from the mouth of the Orontes southwards.

Here we have two different, though kindred, layers of population to deal with.

(1) The *Canaanites*, under which term we include the Bēnē Hēth or Hittites, the Amorites, Jebusites, and some other tribes frequently mentioned in Scripture in close connexion with one another, and the Phoenicians of the seacoast. The Philistines, who occupied part of the south of Palestine and afterwards gave their name to the whole country, I purposely exclude for the present, as being *ἀλλόφυλοι*, of a yet uncertain race, though not improbably Semitic.

Just as the various Aramean tribes called themselves **אַרַם**, so these Canaanites called themselves by the common name of *Xvā*, i.e. **כְּנַעַן**. Stephanus Byzantius says that *Xvā* was an old name for Phoenicia; Sanchuniathon, [Philo Byblius, ap. Euseb. *Pr.*

<sup>1</sup> [Prym and Socin, *Der neu-aram. Dialect des Thir 'Abdin*, Gött. 1881; Socin, *Die neu-aram. Dialecte von Urmia bis Mosul*, 4<sup>o</sup> Tüb. 1882 (cf. Nöldeke in *ZDMG.* xxxvi. 669 sqq.); Duval, *Les dialectes neo-araméens de Salamas*, Paris, 1883; Merx, *Neusyrisches Leseb.* 4to, Breslau, 1873; Guidi in *ZDMG.* xxxvii. 293 sqq.]



*Ev. i. 10 (Fr. Hist. Gr. iii. 569)*] that it was the name of a god or of a heroic ancestor. In the Old Testament it appears as a geographical term, under the form פְּנֵעַן [which is taken to mean "lowland"]. Whether this territorial sense was the original one, may be doubted. Palestine, as a whole, is anything but a low, flat country; and the supposed contrast with אֲרָם is out of the question. It may be that the name was brought by these tribes, as a national designation, from their original home in lower Mesopotamia; or it may be that, as a national designation, it has some other source as yet unknown to us.

Of the different Canaanite races the only one that attained and maintained a great political importance was the *Phoenician*. From the district of Sidon and Tyre the Phoenicians gradually spread, principally northwards, along the coast of Syria, occupying such places as Bērytos (Beirūt), Byblos (גִּבְלָהּ [Gebal, Ezek. xxvii.

9), Botrys (בִּטְרוֹן, Batrūn), Tripolis, Simyra (Σίμυρα, הַצְמִירִי ["the Zemarite," Gen. x. 18]), Arke (Ἄρκεη or τὰ Ἄρκα, הָעֲרֵקִי ["the Arkite," Gen. x. 17]), Sinnas (Σιννάς, הַסִּינִי ["the Sinite," Gen. x. 17]), Aradus (הָאַרְדִּי ["the Arvadite," Gen. x. 18], رَوَاد) and Antaradus (انطرطوس, Tortosa), Laodicea, and Amathe (חַמַּת [Hamath], حَمَاة), farther inland. With the extension of their domains by colonisation we are not now concerned. Suffice it to say that the Phoenicians occupied, in whole or in part, many of the islands of the Mediterranean, such as Cyprus, Rhodes, Crete, Malta, Sicily, the Lipari isles, Sardinia, and the Balearic group. They had settlements in Egypt and throughout all northern Africa, where Carthage rose to be the dreaded rival of Rome. They set foot in Gaul at Massilia or Marseilles<sup>1</sup>; and a large portion of Southern Spain was in their hands. From the port of Cadiz their ships sailed

<sup>1</sup> [The evidence for the existence of a Phoenician colony at Marseilles before the Phocaean settlement is wholly archaeological and has broken down bit by bit. Last of all it has been shewn, since these lectures were written, that the famous Phoenician sacrificial tablet is of Carthaginian stone and must have been brought from Carthage; how or when can only be matter of conjecture. See *Corpus Inscr. Sem.* i. 217 sqq.]

southwards along the coast of Africa and northwards towards Britain; whilst from Elath ( $\text{אֵילַת}$ ) and Ezion-geber on the Red Sea they traded with S. Arabia and India, which they also reached by way of the Persian Gulf. In short, go where you will throughout the ancient world, you find the Phoenician  $\text{סוּרַר}$ , as keen and energetic a trader as his kinsman the modern Jew.

All the languages of this Canaanitic group, it would seem, closely resembled what we call Hebrew; but the only one of them with which we are well acquainted is the Phoenician. It has been preserved to us in numerous inscriptions from all parts of the ancient world, varying in date from the seventh (or eighth) cent. to the first cent. B.C., or, if we include the Punic, to the second or third cent. of our era. The grammar which you should consult is that of Schröder [*Die Phönizische Sprache*, Halle, 1869], and you should also read Stade's treatise "Erneute Prüfung des zwischen dem Phönizischen u. Hebräischen bestehenden Verwandtschaftsgrades," in *Morgenländische Forschungen*, Leipzig 1875<sup>1</sup>.

Of the so-called Hittite empire, the chief seats of which were at Kadesh on the Orontes and subsequently at Karkēmish on the Euphrates, I here say nothing; because it is doubtful whether the *Kheta* of the Egyptians and the *Khatti* of the Assyrians can really be identified with the  $\text{חַתִּים}$  or  $\text{בְּנֵי חַת}$  of the Book of Genesis. Ramses II., in the fifteenth cent. B.C., waged war with the Kheta and captured their city Kadesh; and the Khatti were always a bar in the way of the Assyrian kings down to the year 717 B.C., when Sargon succeeded in taking Karkēmish. This northern kingdom may be meant in such passages as 1 Kings x. 29, 2 Kings vii. 6, and 2 Sam. xxiv. 6; but scarcely in Gen. x. 15, xv. 20, and xxiii., or Deut. vii. 1, where we have clearly to deal with a strictly Canaanitic tribe.

(2) The Canaanites were already long masters of the land, when a body of strangers appeared among them. These immigrants had originally started from Ur Kasdīm, i.e. the city called in the Assyrian inscriptions *Uru* (now al-Muḡair,  $\text{المقير}$ )

<sup>1</sup> [A complete collection of Phoenician inscriptions will form the first part of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* undertaken by the French *Acad. des Inscr.* The first vol. has appeared, fol. Paris, 1881-87, with atlas of plates.]

in Babylonia, and had gone northwards to Ḥarrān in Mesopotamia. Here a split took place among them. The family of Naḥor remained in Mesopotamia; that of Terah, under the leadership of Abrām, marched south-westwards into Canaan. These strangers received the name of עֲבָרִים or עֲבָרִיִּים, most probably because they came מֵעֵבֶר הַיָּרְדֵּן, from across the great river Euphrates. This is what the LXX. intended when they rendered the words לְאַבְרָם הָעֵבֶרִי (Gen. xiv. 13) by Ἀβραῆμ τῷ περάτῃ; and what Origen meant when he explained Ἑβραῖοι by περατικοί. Some of these strangers remained in the country, and in the end permanently occupied different portions of it on the East side of the Jordan and to the east and south of the Dead Sea; viz. the Children of Ammon, of Moab, and of Edom. Others of them, the Children of Ishmael, wandered away among the adjacent Arab tribes to the E. and S. E., and ultimately became inseparable and indistinguishable from them. Others still, the Children of Jacob, after dwelling for some considerable time in Palestine itself, moved southwards, and swelled the ranks of the Semitic immigrants into Egypt. After a sojourn in that country, which is variously estimated at from 215 to 430 years<sup>1</sup>, the Children of Jacob fled or were expelled, and resumed a nomade life in the Sinaitic peninsula under the leadership of Moses. This event may be placed in the fifteenth or fourteenth cent. B.C., for the calculations of different scholars vary. Marching northwards they came once more to the borders of Palestine, and passing by their kinsmen of Edom and Moab, they fell upon the Amorites, who had succeeded in crushing Ammon and seriously crippling Moab. The Amorites went down before the fierce assault of Israel, for whom God fought (as the name betokens), and the land to the north of the Arnon was the reward of their prowess. From this vantage-ground they entered upon a long struggle with the Canaanites, which, after various vicissitudes, ended in the substantial triumph of the Israelites and the conquest of large portions of the Canaanite territory, in which they settled side by side with the conquered race.

<sup>1</sup> [See the commentaries on Exod. xii. 40.]

The language of the Hebrews is well known to us, its literature extending over a period of many ages, from the date of the earliest Biblical books down to the redaction of the Mishnah, about the end of the second century after Christ, when Hebrew had long ceased to be the language of ordinary life, and was only written and spoken in the schools. But the same cannot be said of the languages of Ammon, Moab and Edom, of which, till within the last few years, we knew no more than the Old Testament itself could teach us. However, in 1868, the German missionary Klein discovered a stone with a long inscription at Dībān (the ancient Dibon, דִּיבּוֹן) in the territory of Moab. This passed, after it had been broken and mutilated, into the hands of M. Clermont-Ganneau, then one of the officials of the French Consulate at Jerusalem, and is now deposited in the Louvre. This inscription belongs to the time of Mēsha', king of Moab, in the first quarter of the ninth century B.C., and gives an account of his wars with the Israelites and his domestic undertakings. The language is so similar to the Hebrew of the Old Testament that Prof. Roediger simply treated it as such in the last edition which he published of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (the twenty-first, 1872)<sup>1</sup>.

If, then, the difference between the Phoenicians on the one side, and the Hebrew and Moabite on the other, be so slight, how is this to be explained? In one or other of two ways. We might suppose, firstly, that the ancestors of the Hebrews, who wandered from Ur Kasdīm northwards in company with Arameans, were, though of the same stock, yet of a different family from these; and this circumstance might have led to their separation from the Arameans, and to their seeking a home among more closely allied peoples in Canaan. Against this view, however, it may be fairly urged that, in the Old Testament itself (Deut. xxvi. 5), Abram is spoken of as אֲרַמִּי אֲבִיר "a wandering," or "nomade, Aramean"; and that Jacob's relatives in Paddan Aram are always expressly called Arameans (Gen. xxv. 20, xxviii. 5, xxxi. 20, 24). I incline, therefore, to the second explanation, put forward by Schröder and other scholars, which is this: that

<sup>1</sup> [The latest edition of the "Moabite Stone" is that of Smend and Socin, Freiburg, 1886. In the same year a facsimile of a portion of the inscription with transliteration and translation was published by the Palaeographical Society (2nd Ser. pl. 43).]

these nomade Arameans, the tribes of Abram and Lot, having settled among a Canaanite population of a much higher order of civilisation, were soon constrained to disuse their mother tongue, the Aramaic, and to adopt the kindred language of the people among whom they had settled. To the advanced civilisation of the Hittites and Phoenicians the monuments of Egypt and the Old Testament itself bear ample testimony. We know for certain, thanks to the labours of such Egyptologists as the Vicomte de Rougé and Mr Goodwin, that in the time of Ramses II., that is, in the fifteenth century B.C., the Kheta of Kadesh were in possession of the art of writing and of a literature. And as for the Phoenicians, when Solomon desired to build his Temple to Jehovah, Hiram king of Tyre supplied the materials and the artisans; when Solomon sought to trade with South Arabia, it was again Hiram who manned the fleet of ships at Ezion-geber. That a small and less civilised tribe, such as the Hebrews in the time of Abram undoubtedly were, should have soon adopted the language of the more numerous and cultivated race among whom they took up their abode, has in itself nothing surprising, and is a fact not altogether unknown in history. In France and Spain, for example, the conquering German race soon gave up the use of its mother-tongue, which left but slight traces of the conquest upon the language of the conquered. The Norsemen invaded and took possession of a district in France, to which they gave their name; but the Normans invaded England as a French-speaking people, and were again in process of time merged among the English whom they conquered.

---

The last great section of the Semitic languages is the *Southern* or Arabian, which we may divide into three branches; viz. the North Arabian or Arabic, commonly so called; the South Arabian or Himyaritic; and the Ge'ez or Ethiopic.

1. *Arabic* is, in its historical career and literary development, one of the latest of the Semitic languages to rise into prominent notice. Though we read of wars between the Arabs and the Assyrians, the Romans, and the Persians, who were each acknowledged at different periods as liege lords of a considerable part of the Arabian Peninsula; yet it was not till the

seventh century of our era that the nation acquired a really historical importance. It was under Muḥammad and his successors that the Arabs, maddened by religious enthusiasm, rushed forth from their deserts like a torrent; broke the Byzantine power on the banks of the Hieromax (Yarmūk); crushed the might of Persia on the day of al-Ķādīstyah; and adding conquest to conquest, planted the standard of their Prophet, within a hundred years, upon the banks of the Indus in the east and of the Tagus in the west.

The literary development of the race dates from the same period. Before Muḥammad's time the northern Arabs had only a literature of ballads, mostly handed down by oral tradition. With the promulgation of the Ḷor'ān a new era commenced, and there are few, if any, nations of ancient and medieval Europe which can boast of a literature like the Arabic, especially in history, geography, philosophy, and other sciences, to say nothing of poetry, and of the peculiar systems of theology and law which depend upon the Ḷor'ān and the Sunnah.

The Arabic language was thus peculiarly fortunate. Leading a life of comparative seclusion—not ground, like the Arameans and Canaanites, between the two grindstones of Assyria, Babylon, or Persia, on the one side, and Egypt on the other; nor, like the Phoenicians, thrown by commerce and colonisation into close contact with a dozen foreign nations—the Arabs had preserved, down to the sixth or seventh century of our era, far more of the ancient form and fashion of Semitic speech than any of their congeners. If not the Sanskrīt, Arabic is at least the Lithuanian among the Semitic tongues. At this particular period too the dialect of the tribe of Ḷoraish<sup>1</sup>, which had already acquired a certain supremacy over the rest, was fixed by the Ḷor'ān as the future literary language of the whole nation. Had it not been for this circumstance, we might have known Arabic in the form of half a dozen languages, differing from one another almost as widely as the members of the Romance group or the modern languages of northern India. But its literature has in a great measure prevented this, and preserved the unity of the language, so that the dialectic divergences

<sup>1</sup> [The Ḷoraish, i.e. the branch of Kināna settled in and about Mecca, were the tribe of the prophet.]

of what is called "vulgar Arabic" are by no means so great as we might have expected after all the struggles and vicissitudes of the last twelve centuries. From the mouth of the Tigris, throughout Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine, Arabia proper, Egypt, and North Africa, as far as Morocco, the language is essentially one and the same—Arabic, sunk by the gradual decay of its inflection to the level at which we become acquainted with Aramaic and Hebrew. In its purest form it is probably to be heard among the Bedawin; in its most corrupt in the island of Malta. The standard grammar of the classical Arabic is that of Silvestre de Sacy (second edition, 2 vols. Paris, 1831<sup>1</sup>). Smaller works in various languages are numerous. For the modern dialects there is also an ample choice. For the Egyptian dialect none can compete with Spitta, *Grammatik des Arabischen Vulgärdialectes von Ägypten* (1880). For the Syrian a useful book is the *Grammaire Arabe vulgaire* of Caussin de Perceval (fourth edition, 1858); and for the Algerian the *Éléments de la Langue Algérienne* of A. P. Pihan (1851). The Maltese has been treated by Vassalli, *Grammatica della lingua Maltese*, second edition, 1827; and by Gesenius in his *Versuch über die Maltesische Sprache* (Leipzig 1810).

2. The *South Arabian* or *Himyaritic* [also called Sabaeans] is one of the less known of the Semitic tongues. I use the term Himyaritic (حَمِير, مَحَمِير, Ὁμηρίται) here, in its widest sense, to denote the language, or rather group of languages, whose territory extends along the south coast of Arabia, from the strait of Bāb-el-Mandeb on the west to the mouth of the Persian Gulf on the east. There seems to be little doubt that the three great provinces of al-Yemen, Ḥadramaut (حَضْرَمَوْت, Gen. x. 26), and Mahrah, spoke dialects of one tongue, and that these dialects have their modern representatives in the Eḥkili, also called Ḥakili or Ḳarāwī, and the Mehri.

The ancient Himyaritic is chiefly known to us through inscriptions, which have been found in great numbers, especially

<sup>1</sup> [The grammar of De Sacy is now difficult to procure, and the reader who desires to bring his knowledge down to date must take with it the notes of Fleischer, which form the first volume of his *Kleinere Schriften*, Leipzig, 1885. Students will therefore prefer the excellent grammar of the author of these lectures, 2nd ed. London, 1874.]

in the most accessible of the three provinces above named, that of al-Yemen. How far back they may go in point of time is uncertain. According to Mordtmann and D. H. Müller in their *Sabäische Denkmäler* (4° Vienna, 1883), p. 86, the era of the three dated inscriptions as yet known to us is, as guessed by Reinaud, the Seleucian. These inscriptions belong therefore to A.D. 261, 328, and 357<sup>1</sup>. None of the Ḥimyaritic monuments are likely to be later than the seventh century of our era. The grammar of these languages has not yet been formally compiled by any one orientalist, but we may soon expect a work on the subject from the competent hand of Prof. D. H. Müller of Vienna.

3. Crossing over into Africa, we encounter the Ge'ez or Ethiopic, the language of the Abyssinians, an ancient Ḥimyaritic colony, as the word ገዕዝ: "migration" or "the emigrants," itself shews. Its territory is the mountainous region S.W. of Nubia, where its modern representatives still flourish. The most prominent of these are: on the north, the *Tigré*, spoken in the Dahlak islands, and on the mainland in Ṣamhar and by the Habab, Mensa, Bogos, and neighbouring tribes; in the centre, the *Tigrīña* [or *Tigrāi*], which prevails in the districts of Dembeyā, Hama-sēn, Sarawē, Akala-guzai, and Agamē, around the ancient capital of Aksūm, and in the region of Walkait; and in the south, the *Amhariña* or *Amharic*, the language of Samēn and the districts around Gondar and the Lake Ṣānā or Ṭānā, as far as Gōjām. Of these three languages, the Tigré most resembles the old Ge'ez, whilst the Amharic has deviated furthest from it.

The oldest monuments of the Ethiopic literature are a few inscriptions, belonging to the first five or six centuries of our era. Next to these we must rank the translation of the Bible, executed probably at different times, during a space of several centuries from the fourth century onwards. The bulk of the literature is, however, modern, and consists of translations from the Coptic, and still more frequently from the Arabic, which were produced

<sup>1</sup> [In his article "Yemen" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th ed. vol. xxiv. (1888), Prof. Müller looks with some favour on the view put forward by Halévy (*Ét. Sab.* p. 86), who takes the inscription Ḥiṣn Ghorāb, dated 640, to speak of the overthrow of Dhū Nuwās, and so fixes on 115 B.C. as the epoch of the Sabæan era. In that case the *five* dated inscriptions now known are to be ascribed to A.D. 270, 458, 467, 525, and 554 respectively. Cf. *C.I.S.*, IV. i. p. 18.]



in abundance from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, when the ancient Ge'ez had died out, but was still cultivated by the priesthood, like Latin by the learned of Europe or Hebrew in the Talmudic schools. The standard grammar of the ancient Ge'ez is that of Dillmann [Leipzig, 1857] which has superseded that of Ludolfus or Leuthof, an admirable work in its day. The Tigrina dialect has been handled by Praetorius, *Grammatik der Tigrina-Sprache* (Halle, 1871) [and Schreiber, *Man. de la langue Tigrāi* (Vien. 1887)]. For the Amharic I may name the works of Isenberg (1842) and Massaja, *Lectiones grammaticales* (Paris, 1867); but the best book on the subject is that of Praetorius, *Die Amharische Sprache* (1879). [See also Guidi, *Gr. elrm. della l. Amarinā* (Rome, 1889)].

---

Having thus taken a rapid and necessarily imperfect survey of the Semitic languages, it may be well for us to spend a few minutes on an inquiry as to their connexion, real or imaginary, with the great contiguous families, more especially with the Indo-European and the Egyptian.

This is a question of great difficulty, and not to be settled in the crude and offhand manner of Fürst and Delitzsch on the one hand or of von Raumer and Raabe on the other. The temptation to identification is great, and too much weight has been attributed by the scholars mentioned, and even by men of higher reputation, to analogies that lie merely on the surface. The Semitic languages, like the Indo-European, belong to the inflective class; but this circumstance, as Whitney has remarked (*Language and the Study of Language*, 3rd ed., p. 300), by no means implies a genetic connexion or even descent from a common stock. The resemblance between the two families is, on the whole, not greater than we might reasonably expect to find in languages produced by human beings of nearly the same natural endowments under very similar circumstances of development. The probability of an ultimate connexion will of course seem greatest to those who believe in a common birthplace of the two races. If they both spread themselves abroad from a point near the Caspian Sea, or in Central Asia, original unity is not impossible. But if the Indo-Europeans rooted in Central

Asia, or, as some recent scholars (such as Penka in his *Origines Ariacae* [Teschen, 1883], and O. Schrader, in his *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte* [Jena, 1883]) have tried to prove, on the shores of the Baltic, whilst the Semites were autochthones in Central Arabia, the chances of original unity are reduced to a vanishing point. An ultimate relationship, if one exist at all, will only be discovered when we have solved the great mystery of the Semitic tongues, the trilaterality of the roots. With a few exceptions, the most important of which are the pronouns, every Semitic root, as historically known to us, is trilateral; it consists of three letters, neither more nor less, and these three are consonants. The vowels play only a secondary rôle. The consonants give the meaning of the word; the vowels express its modifications. The letters *kl* (کتل, قتل), for example, are the bones of a skeleton, which the vowels clothe with flesh and endow with life. These three consonants convey the idea of "kill." Add vowels, and you get such words as *qatala* "he killed," *qutila* "he was killed"; *qatl* "the act of killing" or "of being killed"; *qatil* "a killer," "an enemy"; *qatil* "killing." The use of prefixes, affixes, and even of infixes, is common to both families of languages; but the Indo-Europeans have nothing like this triconsonantal rule with its varying vocalisation as a means of grammatical inflexion. The Indo-European roots are not thus restricted in their nature; the radical vowels, although more liable to phonetic change than the consonants, are as essential a part of the root as these latter. A root may consist of a single vowel; of a vowel followed by one or more consonants; of one or more consonants followed by a vowel; of a vowel preceded and followed by a single consonant; and so on. The Sanskrit roots *i* "go," *sthā* "stand," *ad* "eat," *vid* "know," *grabh* "seize," are something wholly different in character from the Semitic roots *ḵrb* "come near," *ḵtl* "kill," *ḵlg* "divide," which, as Bopp has justly remarked (*Vergl. Gr.*, 2<sup>te</sup> Ausg., 1<sup>ter</sup> Bd, p. 196), are unpronounceable, because, in giving them vowels, we make an advance to a special grammatical form. And yet here, if any-

where, will an ultimate connexion between these two families of languages be discovered. It cannot escape the observation of the student that a great many Semitic roots have two consonants in common, whilst the third seems less essential, and is therefore variable. For example, *kt* or *kd* are common to the series, *قط, قطف, قطع, قَط, قَد, قدح, قَد, قتل, قت*, all of which convey the idea of "cutting" in some form or other.

*Pl* or *fl* are found in *فلح, فلج, فل, فلذ, فلخ, فلق, فلي, فلم*, all meaning "cleave" or "divide." *H, k* are the basis

of *חקר, חקה, חקק*, of which the original signification is also "slit" or "cut." *Ph* or *fh* are the essential constituents of

*נפח, נפח, נפח, נפח*, meaning "blow," "puff." When

Semitic philology has advanced so far as to have discovered the laws by which the original biliterals (assuming their separate existence) were converted into trilaterals; when we are able to account for the position and to explain the function of each variable constituent of the trilateral roots; then, and not till then, may we venture to think of comparing the primitive Indo-European and Semitic vocabularies. Meantime, to assert the identity of such a word as *בָּנָה* "he built" with *pono*, or of *בָּעַר* "he burned up" with *πῦρ*, is little better than sheer folly. And why? Because the comparison is not that of original forms, but of an original form (or what is very nearly so) with a comparatively late development. *בָּנָה* was originally *bānūyā*; *pono* is a softening of *posno*, as we learn from its perfect and supine, and includes a suffix and a pronominal element. *בָּעַר* originally sounded *ba'ara*; *πῦρ* is stated to be a contraction of *πύρις*, which probably stands for an original *\*pavar*, and comes from a radical *pu*, in Sanskrit "to be bright," "to purify," plus a derivative suffix. If such comparisons as these could be upheld, they would prove that Hebrew and Arabic were not merely connected with, but actually derived from Sanskrit or Greek or Latin. What has been written on this subject by Fürst and by the elder Delitzsch in his *Jesurun* (1838) is absolutely worthless; as are also the lucubrations of von Raumer and Raabe. The best that can be

said about it you will find in the younger Delitzsch's *Studien über Indogermanisch-Semitische Wurzelverwandtschaft* (Leipzig 1873) and in McCurdy's *Aryo-Semitic Speech* (1881).

As to the affinity of the Egyptian language with the Semitic stock, that is also a question which is as yet *sub judice*. Benfey, in his well-known work *Ueber das Verhältniss der ägyptischen Sprache zum semitischen Sprachstamm* (Leipzig 1844), sought to establish this affinity by various considerations, grammatical and lexicographical; and the conclusion to which he came was, that the Semites are only one branch of a great family, which includes not only the Egyptians but also all the other languages of Africa. His views have been combated by Pott, Renan, and other scholars; and certainly in this unrestricted form they seem to land us in almost Turanian absurdities. But with regard to the ancient Egyptian and the Coptic, Egyptologists seem gradually to be arriving at conclusions similar to those of Benfey. De Rougé, Ebers, and above all Brugsch, in the introduction to his *Hieroglyphic Dictionary*, have declared their belief in the descent of the Egyptian from the same stock as the Semitic languages. An examination of the Coptic alone readily suggests several considerations in support of this view. For example, there is the marvellous similarity, almost amounting to identity, of the personal pronouns, both separate and suffixed—a class of words which languages of radically different families are not apt to borrow from one another. "I" in Coptic is  
 ἄποκ, ἀπακ.

"Thou"	ἦτοκ, ἦτακ
"He"	ἦσοϥ, etc.
"She"	ἦσοϥ, etc.
"We"	ἄποκ, ἀπακ
"Ye"	ἦωτεπ, ἦτωτῖ, ἦτατῖ
"They"	ἦωωτ, ἦτοωτ, ἦτατ

The suffix pronouns I give as they appear in connexion with the preposition να "to."

"to me"	πνι, παι	"to us"	παπ
"to thee,"	m. πακ	"to you"	πωτεπ, πητεπ
	f. κε		
"to him"	παϥ	"to them"	πωωτ, πατ
"to her"	πας		

Again, there is the curious resemblance in the forms of some of the simplest numerals; e.g.

1, masc. *отал, ота, отат*; fem. *оти, отей, отот*

2, masc. *спат*, fem. *сенте, спот†*

7, masc. *шашу, сашу*; fem. *шашу, сашу*

8, masc. *шмнп, шмотп*; fem. *шмнп, шмотп*.

In the verb, the formation of the present tense presents a remarkable analogy to that of the Semitic imperfect or, as some still prefer to call it, future,—I mean the form *ⲗⲏⲣⲓ*. E.g.


sing. I.	†. <i>тѡм</i> <i>I am joining, adhering</i> ;	pl. I.	<i>тѣп. тѡм</i>
	2. m. <i>к. тѡм, ѡ. тѡм</i>	2.	<i>тѣтѣп. тѡм</i>
	f. <i>тѣ. тѡм</i>		
	3. m. <i>ѡ. тѡм</i>	3.	<i>сѣ. тѡм</i>
	f. <i>с. тѡм</i>		

Analogies like these seem to favour the idea of a genetic relationship between the Semitic languages and the Egyptian; or at least of a closer affinity than can be said to subsist between the Semitic and the Indo-European. To discover any connexion between the two latter, we must endeavour to work our way back to the very earliest stage of their history—to a period before Semitic really was Semitic; we must try to disintegrate the triliteral Semitic root; to extract from it the biliteral, which alone can be compared with the Indo-European radical. And if haply we succeed in this, it is apparently the utmost that we can hope for; their subsequent developments, the growth of their grammatical systems, are wholly distinct and discordant. But the connexion between the Semitic and the Egyptian languages seems to be of a somewhat nearer kind. It is true that we are met by the old difficulty with regard to the form of the Egyptian roots, the majority of which are monosyllabic, and certainly do not exhibit Semitic triliterality; but, on the other hand, we have not a few structural affinities, which may perhaps be thought sufficient to justify those linguists who hold that Egyptian is a relic of the earliest age of Semitism, of Semitic speech as it was before it passed into the peculiar form in which we may be said to know it historically.

## CHAPTER III.

### SEMITIC WRITING.

AFTER these preliminary investigations and surveys, there remains yet another subject on which it is desirable to say a few words before we address ourselves to the special object of these lectures, the comparative grammar of the Semitic languages. That subject is—the origin and history of Semitic writing. My account of this interesting topic must, however, be very brief and sketchy; the more so as I hope to treat it more fully in a subsequent course of lectures. Meantime I would refer those of you who seek further details to the treatise of the Vicomte de Rougé, *Mémoire sur l'origine égyptienne de l'alphabet phénicien*, 1874; to the work of Lenormant, *Essai sur la propagation de l'alphabet phénicien dans l'ancien monde*, of which the first part appeared in 1872, and two more have since been added, though the book must now unhappily remain unfinished; to the *Mélanges d'Archéologie orientale* of the Cte de Vogüé, 1868; and to Mr Isaac Taylor's excellent book *The Alphabet* [London, 1883], especially vol. i.

All writing—Chinese, Assyrian, Egyptian—was originally pictorial. The next stage was that of the ideogram. Each picture received a fixed, often symbolic, value, and was always used in the same way. In Egyptian the figure of a tongue meant “to speak”; two hands holding a shield and spear meant “to fight”; and so on. The third step—a great one—was to make a particular sign stand in all cases for one and the same syllabic sound; e.g., the figure of a mouth  for *ro*, the Egyptian for “mouth”; the figure of a hand for *tot*; the figure of an eye for *iri*. The last and greatest step was to divide the syllable into its component parts or letters, and to represent

each of these by a special figure. Here the ancient Egyptians happily lighted upon what has been called the "acrophonic" principle; that is to say, they designated each letter by the picture of an object, the name of which began with the sound which the letter was to represent. For example, the picture of a *lion*, would mean the letter *l*, because the word *labo*, λαβοι, begins with that sound; the picture of an *owl* the letter *m*, because the word *mūlag*, μουλαχ, begins with that sound; the picture of a *mouth* the letter *r*, because the word *ro*, ρο, begins with *r*.

To this stage the Egyptians attained at a very early period; but, like the inventors of the cuneiform characters, they did not avail themselves fully of their great discovery. On the contrary, they mixed up the two principles, the ideographic and the phonetic, in a manner that is extremely puzzling to the reader. To an Egyptian the figure of a *lion* might actually mean "a lion"; or it might, as an ideogram, be a symbolic sign, meaning "preeminence," "sovereignty"; or it might, as a mere letter, designate the sound *l*. To an Assyrian a certain combination of wedges might convey the idea of "the earth"; but phonetically it might express the syllable *ki*. Hence the mass of determinative signs of various kinds employed in writing by the Egyptians, Assyrians and Chinese.

Of course, in process of time, the picture gradually faded away. Details were neglected; a few bold strokes sufficed to depict the object intended; and, in the end, the form of the *letter* often bore little or no resemblance to the *thing* from which it was derived. The group of wedges, the hieratic or demotic character, and the modern Chinese sign, are, in most cases, wholly unlike any object in heaven or earth.

The Egyptians, in addition to the stiff pictorial hieroglyphs, had two sorts of more current or cursive characters, called the hieratic and the demotic. The former, used (as the name indicates) by the priests, was employed for sacred writings only; the latter, used by the people, served for all ordinary secular purposes. It was of the former that the inventors or adapters of the Semitic alphabet appear to have availed themselves. They used the forms which are found in papyri anterior to the eighteenth dynasty, belonging, roughly speaking, to the period between 2100 and 1500 B.C. De Rougé endeavours to show

that out of the twenty-two Phoenician letters, fifteen are beyond doubt directly derived from Egyptian models, whilst only one, the 'ayin, is clearly of Semitic invention. It may be that the "spoiling of the Egyptians" went so far; that the plundering Semites appropriated not only the idea of a written alphabet, but the very forms which the letters were to take. However, I cannot profess myself entirely convinced, not even by Mr Isaac Taylor's argumentation. If they did so, the Semites both remodelled and renamed their acquisitions. Out of the Egyptian eagle or vulture  $\curvearrowright$  they made the head and horns of an ox,  $\text{𐤀}$ ,  $\text{𐤁}$ ; the throne,  $\text{𐤂}$ , became the head and neck of a camel,  $\text{𐤃}$ ,  $\text{𐤄}$ ; the group of lotus plants growing out of the water,  $\text{𐤅}$ , a set of teeth,  $\text{𐤆}$ ,  $\text{𐤇}$ ; and so on<sup>1</sup>.

Deecke's attempt to derive the forms of the Semitic alphabet from the Assyrian, I must regard as an utter failure. You will find his views stated in an article in the *ZDMG.*, vol. xxxi. p. 102.

The remodelled Egyptian alphabet has been, in the hands of the Phoenicians and other Semites, the parent of nearly all the systems of writing used by the nations of Europe and Western Asia. The Greeks received it from the Phoenicians, and having again remodelled it, passed it on to the Etruscans, the Romans, and the Copts. The sacred books of the Persians are written with an alphabet of Aramaic origin. The Uigūr Tatars [and through them the Mongols] acknowledge a similar obligation. And even the Sanskrit alphabet, with all its Asiatic offshoots, has been traced to a South Semitic source.

The oldest monument of Semitic writing as yet discovered, with what we may call a certain date, is the inscription of Mēsha',  $\text{𐤌𐤍𐤏}$ , king of Moab, which we may place about B.C. 890<sup>2</sup>. Here we find already a carefully developed system of orthography and punctuation, which contrasts favourably with those of Phoenician inscriptions of later date by several centuries. Final vowels are expressed by the letters ' (ē), ı (ū) and 𐤍 (ō),

<sup>1</sup> Halévy, with whom Nöldeke inclines to agree, derives the Semitic alphabet from the hieroglyphs.

<sup>2</sup> [i.e. soon after the death of Ahab, which, according to the received chronology, took place 897 B.C. If, as is concluded from the Assyrian monuments, Ahab was alive in 854 and took part in the battle of Karkar (Schrader, *Keilinschr. und AT.* 2nd ed. Giessen, 1883, pp. 199, 463) the stone of Mesha dates from about 850 B.C.]



e.g. אָבִי, פְּנִיתִי, עֵשׂוֹ, לֵה, פְּבִיתוֹ; and the words are separated by a single point, which is also found in a few of the younger Phoenician inscriptions, and in Samaritan, and which we may compare with the line | of the Hımyaritic, and the two dots of the Ethiopic (:)<sup>1</sup>. Equally old, if not older, is the inscription on the fragments of a bronze bowl discovered in Cyprus (*Corpus Inscr. Semit.*, i. pp. 22–26, and pl. iv). To the same class of alphabets as these inscriptions belong the various Phoenician monuments and coins of Tyre and Sidon, Gēbal, Cyprus, Athens, Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, Marseilles, Carthage and other parts of N. Africa, and Spain. The oldest of these date from the sixth or fifth century B.C., whilst of the youngest or Neopunic many are post-Christian. The difference between the earlier and later monuments in the form of certain letters is very marked. Observe these in particular:—

	Moab	Cyprus	Sidon
ג	⌋		∧
ד	Δ	Δ	9
ז	⊥	⊥	∩
ה	⊠	⊠	⊠
ט	⊗	⊗	⊗
י	⌌	⌌	⌌
כ	⌋	⌋	⌋
ל	⌒	⌒	⌒
ם	⌍	⌍	⌍
ס	⌎	⌎	⌎
ק	⌏	⌏	⌏
שׁ	⌐	⌐	⌐
ת	x	†	⌑

The ancient Hebrew modification of the Semitic alphabet is now known to us in a document to which an approximate date can be assigned, viz. the Siloam inscription, of the seventh

<sup>1</sup> [Cf. the facsimile, *Palaeographical Society*, 2nd Series, pl. xliii. (1886).]

century B.C.<sup>1</sup> As compared with the Mēsha' alphabet, notable varieties in the forms of single letters are:—

	Moab	Israel		Moab	Israel
𐤀	𐤁	𐤂	𐤃	𐤄	𐤅
𐤆	𐤇	𐤈	𐤉	𐤊	𐤋
𐤌	𐤍	𐤎	𐤏	𐤐	𐤑
𐤒	𐤓	𐤔	𐤕	𐤖	𐤗

Old seals and other gems, dating, say, from the seventh to the fourth century B.C., exhibit identical forms; and the same remark applies to two fragmentary inscriptions from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, discovered by M. Clermont-Ganneau and now deposited in the British Museum. This alphabet is still found, with slight modifications, upon the Maccabee and other Jewish coins; and is known to us in its latest shape as the *Samaritan* alphabet. It began, however, to be disused by the Jews even before the commencement of our era, and to be supplanted by a modified form of the Palmyrene character, the so-called *square* character, כְּתָב מְרֻבָּע. Some of the extant inscriptions of this type belong to the century preceding our era. For the first three or four centuries after Christ our materials, though not abundant, are sufficiently ample for palaeographical purposes.

The third of the Semitic alphabets is the Aramaic, our knowledge of which commences with some Assyrian weights, which go back as far as the seventh or eighth century before our era. There are also extant some gems and seals of nearly the same age. Among the inscriptions may be mentioned that recently discovered by Prof. Euting at Taimā, clearly belonging to the Persian period, say from the sixth to the fourth century B.C. A sure mark of antiquity in this, as well as in the Phœnician alphabet, is the undulating or wavy form of the letters *m* and *s*, as contrasted with the later forms, which exhibit a cross-line. In the inscription of Mēsha', as well as in the Assyrian weights, we find 𐤌 𐤍 and 𐤎, which become at a later time 𐤏 𐤐 and 𐤑 𐤒. The letter 𐤃 too in the Moabite

<sup>1</sup> [Cf. the facsimile in the *Oriental Series* of the Palaeographical Society, Plate lxxxvii. (1882). "The inscription... may be ascribed to the reign of Hezekiah towards the year 700 B.C.": cf. 2 Kings xx. 20; 2 Chron. xxxii. 30.]

stele and the oldest Aramean seals has the forms  $\text{𐤀} \text{𐤁}$ , whereas later on it appears as  $\text{𐤁} \text{𐤂} \text{𐤃} \text{𐤄}$  and the like. A peculiarity of the Aramean alphabet is that some of the letters have open heads, and thus contrast markedly with the closed heads of the Phoenician type. These are:—

	Phoen.	Aram.
𐤁	𐤀	𐤁
𐤂	𐤃 𐤄	𐤅 𐤆
𐤇	𐤈	𐤉
𐤊	𐤋	𐤌

To this class belong the Egyptian-Aramaic alphabet, the Nabathean (including the Sinaitic inscriptions), and the Syriac Estrangēlā with all its more modern developments, comprising the Mandaic on the one hand and the Kūfic and Naskhī Arabic on the other. The character of the Palmyrenē inscriptions is very interesting, as coming nearest to the Jewish square character.

The alphabet used by the southern Semites, though ultimately sprung from the same stock as the Phoenician and Aramean alphabets, must have been separated from them at a very remote time, and have run its course under peculiar influences. The oldest inscriptions which we possess, whether from North or South Arabia, whether Thamūdite (aṣ-Ṣafā)<sup>1</sup> or Himyaritic or Ethiopic, are written, like all other Semitic writings, from right to left. Others, probably of later date, are written, to use a Greek word, *βουστροφηδόν*, "as the ox turns in ploughing," that is, like some Greek inscriptions, alternately from right to left and left to right. Finally the latter course

<sup>1</sup> [The inscriptions of aṣ-Ṣafā in the volcanic region S. E. of Damascus were first observed by Graham in 1857. Ten were published by Wetzstein (*Reisebericht*, Berl. 1860) more by De Vogüé in his *Syrie Centrale, Inscr. Scm.* (4<sup>e</sup> Paris, 1868-77); cf. Halévy's papers in *J. As.* 1877, 81, 82. Other inscriptions in the same character have been copied by Doughty and Euting in various parts of northern Arabia, especially in the region associated with the name of the ancient race of Thamūd (Θαμουδινοί); hence the name Thamuditic. Euting's inscriptions have been deciphered by D. H. Müller (*Denkschr.* of the Vienna Acad. 1889). Twenty-six characters have been determined, and a twenty-seventh probably corresponds to the Arabic ظ "A sign for ض probably existed but does not occur in known inscriptions."]

prevailed, and the Ethiopian, like the Greek, wrote from left to right, even as we do at the present day.

The Semitic alphabet, as framed by the Semites upon an Egyptian model, consisted of twenty-two letters, all consonants, which were faithfully retained by the Arameans. The Hebrews long subsequently added one to this number, by distinguishing  $\aleph$  into  $\aleph$  *sh* and  $\aleph$  *s*. The Arabs, who tried to distinguish the finer shades of sounds in writing, required no less than six additional letters; viz.  $\mathfrak{z}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$ , as lisping modifications of  $\mathfrak{z}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$ ;  $\mathfrak{z}$  as a modification of  $\mathfrak{z}$ ; and  $\mathfrak{z}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$  as harder forms of  $\mathfrak{z}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$ . The order of the Syriac alphabet was retained by them in the numerical values of the letters, (ابجد هوز حطي كمن سعنص قرشت ثخذ ضطغ); but the ordinary sequence of the letters was very much altered, chiefly for the sake of bringing similar sounds or similar figures into juxtaposition, e.g.  $\mathfrak{z}$ ,  $\mathfrak{z}$ ,  $\mathfrak{z}$ , etc. The Ethiopic alphabet has two letters fewer than the Arabic, or twenty-six in all, owing to the addition of  $\mathfrak{z}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$ , which it has in common with the Arabic, and of two *ps*, the one of native origin  $\mathfrak{z}$  *pait*, the other borrowed from the Greek,  $\mathfrak{z}$  *pa*, perhaps originally *psa*. The sequence of the letters differs both from the Hebrew and Arabic: U A h e W L r h n t z z l n O H P z z n m s s s s t.

From what I have just said you will see that I do not regard the ancient Semitic alphabets as adequately representing all the sounds of the Semitic languages. My belief is that the finer shades of utterance were disregarded, and that one sign was in several cases used to represent two cognate sounds. I believe that the lisped dentals of the Arabic,  $\mathfrak{z}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$ ; and the letter  $\mathfrak{z}$  (as distinguished from  $\mathfrak{z}$ ), represent sounds of the proto-semitic tongue. I also think that the stronger gutturals  $\mathfrak{z}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$ , as distinguished from  $\mathfrak{z}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$ , belonged to that speech; and that it probably had three sibilants (besides  $\mathfrak{z}$ ,  $\mathfrak{z}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$ ), viz. *sh* ( $\mathfrak{z}$ ), *s* ( $\mathfrak{z}$ ), and *f* =  $\mathfrak{z}$ , of which last sound I do not know the peculiar original nuance. De Lagarde<sup>1</sup> and others think that it was originally *ks* or *ksl*, which was gradually softened into *sh* and then into *s*.

<sup>1</sup> [Lagarde, *Symmieta* (Goettingen, 1877), p. 113 sq.]

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE LETTERS OF THE SEMITIC ALPHABET AND THE CHANGES THEY UNDERGO.

WE will now proceed to examine the letters of this alphabet in detail, and to ascertain, so far as is possible within our present narrow limits, what changes they undergo in the different Semitic languages, more especially in Arabic, Syriac, and Hebrew; so that we may be enabled to compare the words of these languages with one another, not by haphazard, but according to certain fixed rules. For this purpose it will be best to arrange the letters in groups, according to the vocal organs with which they are pronounced.

I. We commence then with the gutturals, which are in Syriac and Hebrew four in number, א, ה, ח, and ע. In Arabic and Ethiopic ח has two representatives, ح and ح; whilst in Arabic ע has two representatives, ع and ع. Most scholars regard the sounds of ح and ع as a later development in Arabic and Ethiopic; but with this view I am not disposed to agree. I believe, on the contrary, that these differences of sound existed from the earliest times, but that the inventors of the Semitic alphabet were not careful to distinguish in writing what seemed to them to be merely different shades of the same sound. That the Hebrew possessed the sound of ع seems certain from the fact that the LXX. expresses ע by γ (i.e. *gh*) in several proper names; e.g. אֶפְרַיִם, Γάζα, عَزْرَة; אֶבְרָהָם, Γομόρρα; אֶשְׂרָאֵל, Ζόγορα and Σηγώρ, عَزْرَة. Further, Χοδολλογυμόρ = אֶבְרָהָם אֶשְׂרָאֵל, corres-

ponding with an Elamitic *Kudur-Lāgamar* (a name formed like *Kudur-Mabūg* and *Kudur-nahundi* or *Kudur-nanhundi*); and Γαῖδάδ for עֵדָד, Genesis iv. 18, where the Massoretic text has (probably incorrectly) עֵדָד. On the contrary, ע is indicated in Greek merely by the *spiritus asper*, and even more frequently the *spiritus lenis*, with a vowel; or in the middle and at the end of a word by a vowel alone; as Ἑβραῖος, 'עֵבְרִי, Ἀμαλήκ, 'עַמְלֵק; Συμεών, שִׁמְעוֹן; Φαραώ, פְּרֹעֹה; Γελαβουέ, גְּלַבְעֹ. It is not so easy to prove the existence of ע as distinct from ח in Hebrew, because the Greeks had no precise equivalent for either sound, and expressed them by κ, χ and the soft breathing indifferently. Thus the name of the river חֲבֹר is in one place Χαβώρας, الْخَابُور, and in another Ἀβώρας [Ἀβόρρας, etc.]; حَرَّان, حَرَّان, becomes Χαρράν and Κάρραι; פָּסַח is transliterated by πάσχα and φασέκ, الْفِصْح. However, the comparison of the cognate languages, particularly Arabic and Assyrian, makes it exceedingly probable that the distinction of ח and ע once existed in Hebrew and Aramaic. Compare חֲבַל *bind*, حَبَل, with חָבַל *act wickedly*, خَبَل *be corrupted, unsound, mad*; חָפַר *dig*, حَفَرَ, with חִפַּר *be ashamed, bashful*, خَفَرَ; חָלַל *profane, desecrate*, حَلَّ, حَلَّ, حَلَّ, with חָלַל *bore, wound*, خَلَّ<sup>1</sup>.

i. Of these gutturals א is the weakest, indicating nothing more than that very slight, almost imperceptible, movement of the vocal organs, which the Greeks represent in writing, though only at the beginning of a word, by the *spiritus lenis*. The Arabs have a special sign for it, viz. the hamza, ء, which they

<sup>1</sup> [For the evidence to a similar effect from the Assyrian see p. 50, *infra*; also Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aram. Wörterbuchs zum A T.* (Leipzig, 1886) p. 173 29.]

write either with or without |, according to circumstances:

ا ا, ا ا. This sign is nothing but the letter ع written small, to show that the *alif* is to be pronounced somewhat like an ع; which is also indicated by the name *hamza*, i.e. "compression," viz. of the upper part of the windpipe. In this way the Arabs

readily distinguish the consonant | from the long vowel | ā, of which more hereafter. The only thing resembling the *hamza* in the Hebrew system of punctuation is the single point which appears in our Bibles in a very few cases, and is treated of in our Grammars under the head of *Mappik*; e.g. וַיְבִיֵאֵן Gen. xliii.

26, Ezra viii. 18; וַתְּבִיֵאֵן Lev. xxiii. 17; לֹא רָאָה Job xxxiii. 21; but in some MSS., e.g. the codex Reuchlin, it is quite common.

ا, as a consonant, may be found in Arabic and Hebrew at the beginning or the end of a syllable, and that either at

the beginning, middle or end of a word: مَسْأَلَةٌ, سَأَلَ, أَمَّ, أَلْفٌ;

سُؤْلٌ, ذُنْبٌ, رَأْسٌ, يَأْلَفُ, بَرٌّ, شَيْءٌ, سُوءٌ. Compare in Hebrew,

וַיֵּאָמֶר, וַיֵּאָהֱבֵן; and with يَأْلَفُ such cases as וַיֵּאָהֱבֵן Prov. xv. 9 (where others read וַיֵּאָהֱבֵן); וַיֵּאָמֶר Gen. xlvi. 29;

וַיֵּאָשֶׁם Hosea xiii. 1; וַיֵּאָשֶׁם Hosea xiv. 1;

וַיֵּאָפֶלֶה Jerem. ii. 31.—At the beginning of a syllable in the middle of a word, if the preceding consonant have no vowel,

ا is apt to be elided in Arabic, and its vowel transferred to the preceding consonant; e.g. مَلَأَ mal'ak becomes مَلَأَ malak;

يَرَى becomes يَرَى; يَرَى becomes يَرَى. Compare in Hebrew מְלֹאךָ, but מְלֹאכָה for מְלֹאכָה; לְקַרְאֹתִי

לְקַרְאֹתִי; לְקַרְאֹתִי for לְקַרְאֹתִי, and that for לְקַרְאֹתִי. This

is still more common in Aramaic; e.g. מְלֹאכָה for מְלֹאכָה, and

with entire disappearance of the  $\aleph$ ,  $\text{מִסְלָל}$  for  $\text{מִסְלָל}$ .—At the end of a syllable in the middle of a word א is very apt to pass into a vowel-letter, and to be brought into conformity with the preceding vowel. Thus  $\text{רָאֵשׁ}$  *ra's<sup>n</sup>* becomes  $\text{רָאֵס}$  *rās*;  $\text{דְּחִיב}$  *dhi'b<sup>n</sup>* becomes  $\text{דְּחִיב}$  *dhib*;  $\text{סוּל}$  *su'l<sup>n</sup>* becomes  $\text{סוּל}$  *sul*.

The usual spelling  $\text{דְּחִיב}$ ,  $\text{סוּל}$ , is a compromise in writing between the ancient and the modern forms ( $\text{דָּחַב}$ ,  $\text{סָל}$  :  $\text{דָּחַב}$ ,

$\text{סוּל}$ ). Hebrew, Syriac, and Assyrian, took nearly the same course. An original  $\text{רָאֵשׁ}$  first became  $\text{רָאֵשׁ}$  *rāsh* in Hebrew, as in the actual plural  $\text{רָאֵשִׁים}$ , and then  $\text{רֹשׁ}$  *rōsh*. We should have expected this form to be written  $\text{רֹשׁ}$ , but here the spelling has lagged behind the pronunciation, and the  $\aleph$  remains as a vestige of the original form. So also  $\text{דְּחִיב}$  *dha'n<sup>n</sup>*, "sheep," Hebrew originally  $\text{צֶאֱן}$ , then  $\text{צֶאֱן}$ , and finally  $\text{צֶאֱן}$  *ṣōn*. The corresponding Aramaic forms are  $\text{רִישׁ}$ ,  $\text{רִישׁ}$ , for  $\text{רָאֵשׁ}$ , and  $\text{עָן}$ ,  $\text{עָן}$ , for *dhān*. In Assyrian I find cited such forms as *rēshu* or *rīshu*, *ṣēnu* or *ṣīnu*.—Initial  $\aleph$  is often dropped at the beginning of words, when pronounced with a short vowel; e.g.  $\text{נִחַן}$  for  $\text{אִנַּחַן}$ ;  $\text{חָד}$ ,  $\text{חָד}$ , for  $\text{אִחַד}$  (Heb.  $\text{אִחָד}$ ,  $\text{אִחָד}$ );  $\text{אִנַּשׁ}$  for  $\text{אִנַּשׁ}$  (Assyr. *nīshu*);  $\text{אִחָר}$  =  $\text{אִחָר}$ ;  $\text{אִחָרִית}$  =  $\text{אִחָרִית}$ ;  $\text{אִחָזֵת}$  =  $\text{אִחָזֵת}$ , but plur.  $\text{אִתְּחָלֵן}$ ;  $\text{אִתְּחָלֵן}$  *kinsman*, from  $\text{אִתְּחָלֵן}$ . Similarly in vulgar Arabic,  $\text{أَحَد}$  for  $\text{أَحَد}$ ,  $\text{أَكَل}$  for  $\text{أَكَل}$ ,  $\text{أَحَد}$  for  $\text{أَحَد}$ . *Per contra*, an initial  $\aleph$  with its vowel may be merely prosthetic, to lighten the pronunciation of an unpleasant combination of consonants, especially in foreign words; e.g.  $\text{أَرَوَع}$  for  $\text{أَرَوَع}$ ;  $\text{أَمَلَم}$  for  $\text{أَمَلَم}$  (Eth.  $\text{ጠጠጠ}$ : *mālm*,  $\text{أَمَلَم}$ );  $\text{أَمَلَم}$ ,  $\text{أَمَلَم}$ .



اٰننوم, صٲمٲا; [هٲمٲا], σπόγγος; [هٲمٲا], σχήμα; اٲهٲا, στωλή; اسٲول, στόλας.—At the end of a word this weak guttural is exceedingly apt to disappear altogether, particularly after a diphthong or a long vowel. Hence سٲو san<sup>m</sup> is vulgarly pronounced san سٲو, Heb. שׂן; شى shai<sup>m</sup> is vulgarly pronounced shai: compare in Heb. שׂן, שׂן, constr. שׂן, שׂן; שׂן, with suff. שׂן. In some of these cases, assimilation of the *š* to the previous sound formed the intermediate stage. For example, nabi<sup>m</sup> became first nabiyun<sup>1</sup>, and then nabî, نَبِي. Hence, whilst the Hebrew holds fast נביא (though with silent *š*), pl. נביאים, the Aramaic emphatic is بٲيا, with double *y*, for بٲيا, نٲيا. When preceded by a short vowel, the consonant *š* is usually vocalised after the loss of its own proper vowel; e.g. بٲيا مٲي; بٲيا مٲي; مٲا; قٲا; قٲا. —In Aramaic indeed *š* rarely appears as a substantial consonant, and in all possible cases throws back its vowel on a preceding letter, which is either vowelless or has a very short vowel; as مٲا for مٲا; مٲا, مٲا; مٲا for مٲا; مٲا, نٲا; سٲا for سٲا; اٲا for اٲا; اٲا for اٲا. In the middle of a word it may preserve its consonant power, especially when originally doubled, as مٲا; but at the end of a word forms like مٲا, مٲا, are very rare. In some cases assimilation takes place, especially in the Ettafal of the verb, as اٲا for اٲا, اٲا for اٲا. Similarly اٲا, اٲا; اٲا, اٲا; اٲا, اٲا. (from *š*).

<sup>1</sup> [Apparently a loanword from the Hebrew, through the Aramaic, in which the *š* was already lost: Nöldeke, *Gesch. des Qurāns*, p. 1; Guidi, *Sede*, p. 36; Fränkel, *Fremdw.*, p. 232.]

א is prone to interchange with ה, particularly at the beginning of a word. Arabic and Aramaic have frequently א, where Hebrew has ה; e.g. אִם = הִם; אֵס = הֵס; ([but conversely] Hebrew has ה; e.g. הִיא = הֵיא, הִי = הֵי); אִתֵּל for הִתֵּל; אִתֵּל for הִתֵּל; אִתֵּל (where Syriac also אִתֵּל); אִתֵּל = אִתֵּל; אִתֵּל, אִתֵּל, in passives and reflexives = אִתֵּל - אִתֵּל.

In Arabic, especially in the vulgar dialects, א may interchange with و, as وَأَحَدٌ for أَحَدٌ, وَأَكِلٌ for أَكِلٌ, *widn* for أُدُنٌ, *wilf* for أَلْفٌ, رَأْسٌ for رَوَّاسٌ; *tarwis*, "introductory formula," for رَأْسٌ, and the verb رَوَّسٌ for رَأْسٌ. Very rarely does it interchange with ي, as in *yasir* for أُسِيرٌ, *malyān* for مَلَّانٌ. Parallels to this latter permutation in Syriac are أَلْفٌ = أَلْفٌ = أَلْفٌ; أَلْفٌ = أَلْفٌ.

2. ה does not require much remark after what has just been said of its interchange with א.—Occasionally it interchanges even in the ancient languages with ח, as הָרַחַב *bow down*, הָרַחַב (with ח) חָרַב. Also with ו; e.g. הָרַחַב and הָרַחַב *be bright, shine, burn*; הָרַחַב and הָרַחַב, *be ashamed*; הָרַחַב and הָרַחַב, *run*; הָרַחַב and הָרַחַב; [perhaps also] הָרַחַב and הָרַחַב, whence הָרַחַב and הָרַחַב.—On a substitution of ה for a primitive initial ש, I shall say something when we come to that letter.

3. Hebrew and Syriac ח we ought properly to distinguish, according to the Arabic and Assyrian, into ח and خ; as חָרַחַב *cut, plough*, חָרַחַב; חָרַחַב; חָרַחַב *be deaf and dumb*, חָרַחַב. —In the Aramean dialects there is a strong inclination to weaken its sound to that of ה. Only the modern Syriac of Urūmiah exhibits the contrary tendency, and uses the rougher



פּוֹעָנָא, and in the Punic or later Phoenician of Africa, where we find יר for יַעַר *wood*, as הַחֲרֹשֶׁם שִׁיר (inscr. of Tugga), confirmed by S. Augustine on Ps. cxxiii.—Of the Aramaic substitution of ע for Arabic ض, Hebrew פ, I shall speak hereafter.

It would appear from this short survey of the gutturals, that they were exceedingly apt in the younger Semitic dialects to be confused with one another, and to disappear altogether. In Ethiopic MSS. there is usually no distinction observed between U, ח, ז, on the one side and λ, O, on the other; modern Amharic pronounces them all as λ at the beginning of a word, and slurs them over in the middle or at the end. Similar is the case of the Samaritan. In modern Syriac ס is very feeble, and ש scarcely heard at all; and in Mandaitic there is absolutely no distinction between א, ע, on the one hand and ה, ח, on the other. The Talmūd too writes א for ע and ה for ח in not a few words; e.g. א (with following *daghesh*) for עַל; אָבָא (not אָבָא) *wood*,

for עָבָא, חֻבָּא, גָּבָא, אָזל for עֹזל, גְּזַל *spin*; אַנְקָא = عُنُق *neck*;

אַרְבָּא *willow*, עַרְבִים, גְּרָב, אַרְבֵּלָא *sieve*, חֻבְּלָא (cribrum,

*cribellum*); הַרְדִּי *one another*, תַּרְוָא; מַחְלָתָא *sieve*, מַחְלָלָא,

מַחְלָלָא. It is related that the Babylonian rabbi Haiyā was held guilty of blasphemy for pronouncing, in Isaiah viii. 17, הַכִּיּוֹתִי

with ה instead of הַכִּיּוֹתִי with ח (פְּנִיּוֹ) הַמַּסְתִּיר פְּנִיּוֹ).

In Assyrian there is obviously no difference in sound between א ה and ע, nor any way of distinguishing them

from one another in writing; e.g. *ilu*, "god," *ish'alū*, "they asked," *mūṣa'u*, "exit"; *la'abu*, "flame," *tī'āmtu*, "sea," *dāru*, "eternity," *nāru*, "river"; *ussu*, "strong," *sēru* or *sīru*, "seed," *ishmī*, "he heard," *rīmu*, "thunder." Neither has ע any distinct sound or representative, as *usālu*, "gazelle," *āribu*, "raven."

<sup>1</sup> [Lagarde, *Armenische Studien*, p. 65, No. 976; but see also Fränkel, *Aram. Fremdw. im Arab.* (Leiden 1886), p. 91.]

<sup>2</sup> [TB. Meg. 24 b.]



أَيْبُ and غَيْرِي *be angry*; جَلْبَة and غَلْبَة, *outcry*; جَدَف and غَدَف (dial.), *row*<sup>1</sup>.

1. ǰ is hard in Hebrew, Aramaic, Assyrian, and Ethiopic, like our *g* in *go, give, get*; in Arabic its sound varies, for the Syrians pronounce it soft, like *g* in *gem*, whereas in Egypt and parts of Arabia the hard sound is retained, جَبَل, رَجُل. The Hebrew and Aramaic, however, modified its sound, when immediately preceded by a vowel (however slight), into one much resembling that of the Greek γ between two strong vowels, as γυαθός, or the Arabic غ. Indeed, when writing Arabic with Hebrew letters, the Jews generally use ַ to represent غ. Modern Syriac gives unaspirated ܓ the sound of *dy* or *j* in a few roots, such as ܕܝܢܝܘ (دِينِي) *dyāniū* or *jāniū* “steal, carry off”; ܕܝܡܠܐ (دِيمْلَا) *dyūmla* or *jūmla*, “camel.” In a very few cases the Arabic soft *g* has been still further softened into *sh*; e.g., in Egypt the word *wishsh*, “face,” apparently = وَجْه. Similarly the old grammarian al-G’awālīkī mentions تَشْتَر as a faulty pronunciation of تَجْتَر, “it chews the cud.”

2. ǰ is also hard in Hebrew, Aramaic, Assyrian, Arabic and Ethiopic, like our *k*, as ܕܝܚܕ, ܕܝܚܕ, ܕܝܚܕ. The Hebrew and Aramaic modify its sound, after a vowel, into one closely resembling that of the Arabic ܟ, as ܕܝܚܕ, ܕܝܚܕ (but Arabic ܕܝܚܕ). Hence, when a Jew writes Arabic with Hebrew letters, he uses ַ for ܟ.—In modern Syriac unaspirated ܟ ܟ is said to have the sound of *ty* or *ch*, e.g., ܕܝܚܕ *tyalbā* or *chalbā*; ܕܝܚܕ *malyā* or *malchā*; ܕܝܚܕ *tyappā* or *chappā*.—In modern Arabic

<sup>1</sup> [These last seem to be loan-words, Fränkel, p. 227.]

<sup>2</sup> [*Livre des locutions vicieuses*, p. 145, in *Morgenl. Forschungen*, Leipz. 1875.]

ك is also softened dialectically into a sound like that of *ts* or *tsh*, sometimes of *dj* or *g*; as كَاتِبٌ *ʿātib* or *ʿātib*, حَكِيمٌ *ḥaḡim*, كَامِلٌ *ḡāmil*.—In some Amharic words the old Ethiopic *k* has been aspirated, *kh*, and finally becomes *h*, e.g. *hōna*, “to become,” for *kōna*, كَانٌ; *hūlū*, “all,” for *kwēllū*, كَلٌّ. Perhaps this may help us to connect such a form as Ar. أَيَا, *iyā*, with Eth. ጸያ: *kīyā*.

3. *p* in the older dialects is a *k* pronounced far back in the mouth, or rather, deep in the throat. In our English alphabet its lineal representative is *q*. In some Arabic dialects it takes the sound of *dsh* or *ds*, sometimes of *ch* or *t*; e.g. قَبِيلُهُ *dshibl* or *dsibl*, قَرِيبٌ *dzarib*, عَقِيلٌ *ʿadsil*, قَائِدٌ *tā'id*, سِرْقَةٌ *sirta*. But its ordinary sound, throughout Arabia and Africa, is that of a hard *g*. This too is common in the modern forms of Ethiopic, whence *Magdalā* for *Maḡdalā*, ጳጳሳ; *tagābbala* for *taḡābbala*. In parts of Syria and Egypt, on the other hand, as well as in Amharic, *p* is apt to be converted into *ḡ*. A Syrian Christian says 'ult, 'a'ul, for قَلْتُ, أَقُولُ; and a native of Shoa pronounces *ta'ābbala* instead of *tagābbala* or *taḡābbala*. The Egyptian railway station Zagazig is written زَغَزِيقٌ *Zaḡāsīḡ*, pronounced either *Zagāsīḡ* or *Za'āsī'*; the word *ḥaḡīḡī* حَقِيقِي becomes *ḥā'ī'ī*.

III. We next come to the dentals ד, ת, ט, which are common to all the old languages: e.g.

דָּב, דָּבָּ: Ass. <i>dubbu</i> ,	דָּב,	דָּבָּ;
יָד, יָדָּ: Ass. <i>idu</i> (power),	יָד,	יָדָּ;
תָּחַת, תָּחַתָּ:	תָּחַת,	תָּחַתָּ;
טָּיִשׁ,	טָּיִשׁ,	טָּיִשָּׁ;





תָּעָדָה, תָּעָדָה. The fate of such aspirated letters is usually to disappear gradually, especially when they stand between two vowels or at the end of a word. Final *d* is almost lost to the ear in a Spanish word like *ciudad*, whilst in the Italian *cività* it is gone even to the eye. So in French there is no trace of a *d* in *épée*, but the comparison of the Spanish *espada* and Italian *spada* reveals at once the history of the word. Similarly in the Semitic languages the final *t* of the feminine gender in the noun and verb disappeared. The Arabic <sup>تَلَّتْ</sup> became in Hebrew תָּלָה; the Ethiopic ገንገ: *gannat*, was written in Arabic <sup>جَنَّة</sup> *gannat<sup>um</sup>*, and vulgarly pronounced first *gannat*, then *gannah*, and finally *ganna*, *janna*, exactly the Hebrew גְּנָה, Syriac ܓܢܐ. This has gone much farther in the Aramaic dialects than in Arabic and Hebrew. E.g. in Syriac ܘܠܚܘܬܐ ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ; ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ; ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ; ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ. In the Talmūd, ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ (with the additional loss of the final *n*, as in ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ), fem. ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ; ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ; and the like. In modern Syriac this aspirated *t* and *d* disappear regularly between two vowels: ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ; ܘܠܚܘܬܐ for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ; *sūsāwā'ē* (ܘܠܚܘܬܐ) for *sūsāwāthē* (old Syr. ܘܠܚܘܬܐ); ܘܠܚܘܬܐ *uḥā*, 30, for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ; *diyā*, “mine,” not for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ, as in old Syriac, but for the Talmūdīc ܘܠܚܘܬܐ (from ܘܠܚܘܬܐ); ܘܠܚܘܬܐ (“I know him,” for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ); ܘܠܚܘܬܐ “ignorance,” for ܘܠܚܘܬܐ. Hence the fem. pron. ܘܠܚܘܬܐ (old Syr. ܘܠܚܘܬܐ) becomes first ܘܠܚܘܬܐ, and finally ܘܠܚܘܬܐ, with which compare the Talmūdīc ܘܠܚܘܬܐ above. I should remark that where ܘܠܚܘܬܐ and ܘܠܚܘܬܐ are retained in modern Syriac of Urumiah, their sound is hard, and

very little difference is perceptible between them, particularly at the end of words. For instance, the particle *bit*, which forms the future tense (ܒܝܬ ܒܝܬ) is a contraction for ܒܝܬܐ, but usually written ܒܝܬ; the imperative of ܗܘܘܐ, "to do," is written and pronounced ܘܘܬ *vut*, for ܘܘܬܐ; ܘܘܬܐ is pronounced nearly as *minnit ishō*; the old Syriac ܒܝܬܐ is pronounced and actually written ܒܝܬܐ.—Lastly, I may mention that the hard *t* and *l* of the ancient Ethiopic are changed in Amharic, in certain cases [where *y* or *i* follows], into *ty* or *ch*, and *dy* or *j*; e.g., in the 3rd pers. sing. fem. perf. of the verb *nabarach* "she was" (for ነበረች: *nabarat* "she sat," compare Spanish *ser*, for *seer*, *sedcre*); *čj* for *λl*: *čd* "hand," *wallāj* for *Ⲡⲗ*: *wallādī* "father."

Thus far I have spoken chiefly of the pure ܬ, ܢ, ܢ, which remain unchanged in all the old Semitic languages, and undergo comparatively slight alterations in the modern dialects, such changes depending mainly upon the aspiration of these letters in the older forms. Now, however, I must touch upon another set of modified dentals, which undergo in the old languages themselves a regular series of permutations.

Besides the simple dentals ܬ, ܢ, ܢ, the old Arabic possesses a series of aspirated or lisped dentals, ܬܐ, ܢܐ, ܢܐ. These formed, I have no doubt, part of the protosemitic stock of sounds, which has been preserved in Arabic alone. In the other Semitic languages they underwent various modifications.

The Arameans, as a rule, dropped the difficult lisped sound altogether, and fell back upon the simple dental; e.g. ܢܐܐ *break*, ܢܐܐ *plough*, ܢܐܐ; ܢܐܐ; ܢܐܐ; ܢܐܐ; ܢܐܐ. The other Semites took a different course, modifying the lisped letter into a sibilant. In Phœnician and Hebrew

ث became *sh*, in Ethiopic and Assyrian ḥ *s*<sup>1</sup>; e.g. שׁוּר, טוּר <sup>su</sup>; ḥC: Ass. *sūr*; ثَقَل, شَقَلَ, ḥḥḥ: (*hang up*), Ass. *isḫul* (*hang up, weigh*); ثوم <sup>su</sup> *garlic*, شام, ḥḥḥ: Ass. *sūmu*; حَرَت, חֲרַשׁ, ḥḥḥ: ḥḥḥ: (*abundant crop*). Similarly ḥ became in all these languages *s*; e.g. شَبَح, شَبَح, ḥḥḥ: Ass. *sēbu* (for *sibḥu*); اُنْس, ḥḥḥ: Ass. *usnu*; أَخَذَ, اَخَذ, ḥḥḥ: Finally, ظ appears in the other languages as *z*, *ḡ*; e.g. ظَلَمَ, צַלְמָה, ḡḡḡ: Ass. *ṣalmu*, "dark"; ظَلَّ, צַל, ḡḡḡ: Ass. *ṣillu* and *ṣalūlu*; ظَفَر, ḡḡḡ: Ass. *ṣupru*; نَظَرَ, نَظَر, ḡḡḡ: Of course, as every rule has its exceptions, these series are occasionally liable to disturbances. For instance قَبْأٌ *cucumber*, קְשִׁים: Ass. *ḫissī*, ought by rule to be in Aramaic קְשִׁי; but the actual form is קְשִׁי, קְשִׁי, the proximity of *q* having hardened the *t*.

Of the Aramaic dialects some have advanced to the Hebrew stage, at least in sporadic instances. In the great inscription of Taimā, for example, we find וי for וי, ון and its fem. ון for ון and ון; and the same forms occur in the Egyptian Aramaic inscriptions and papyri. In Mandaitic there are not only pronominal and adverbial forms of this kind, as האוּזין, fem. האוּזא (but האוּזיני *this is*, and occasionally האוּזא); האוּזין = האוּזין *then*; האוּזין, as well as האוּזין, *how?* but also a few other words, as זאכרא or זוכרא, *male*, זאכיא or זוכיא, *offering* (but זאכיא *offerer*, זאכיא *altar*), זאכיא *beard*, and very strangely זאכיא as well as זאכיא, *palm tree*, and זאכיא as well as זאכיא, *blood*.

<sup>1</sup> [Of the two forms of *s* which are distinguished in Assyrian writing, though they seem to have ultimately come to be pronounced alike, the one which corresponds to ט = שׁ is that which Schrader and Delitzsch represent by *š*, while Sayce and other English scholars render it by simple *s*. See below, p. 58.]

Among the modern dialects the Arabic alone calls for notice. Generally speaking, it has adopted the same course as the old Aramaic, i.e. it retrogrades by changing the lisped into the simple dental; e.g. *tūr* *tōr*, "ox," *كتير* *ketir*, *اتنين* *itnēn*, *شكات* "bcggar." More rarely it advances the *th* to a sibilant, *s*, as *sibit* = *سبت*, *bāhis* = *باحث* (argue, dispute), *khabbās* = *خباب* (scoundrel). The word *حديث* in the sense of *narrative, story*, is pronounced in Egypt *ḥadit*, but in the sense of "religious tradition," *ḥadis*. Even in ancient Arabic we occasionally find *t* for *th*, as in *تبر* = *تبر*, *تاب* *repent*<sup>1</sup> = *تاب* *return*. Similarly lisped *ḏ* seems to become in modern Arabic either *d* or *s*; e.g. *dīb* = *ذئب*, *dahab* = *ذهب*, *adān* = *أدان*, *kidb* and *kisb* = *كذب*, *ism* = *إسن*, *sikr* = *ذكر* (recitation), *samb* = *ذنب*. In like manner *ṣ* is pronounced either *ṣ* (ض) or *s*, e.g. *ʿadm* = *عظم*, *dill* = *ظل*, *dalma* = *ظلمة*, *sulm* = *ظلم*, *duhr* = *ظهر*, *sahar* = *ظهر*, *ḥifs* = *حفظ*<sup>2</sup>.

IV. The sibilants next engage our attention, viz. *š*, *ṣ*, *ṣ̣*, and *ṣ̣̣*.

1. Pure *s* † runs through all the Semitic languages, as *زرع*, *إرعا*, *أرعا*, Ass. *stru* or *stru*, "seed"; *عز*, *OHH: ʿn*, *حنا*, Ass. *issu*, "strong." But Eth. H, Heb. *š*, and Ass. *s*, often correspond, as we have seen above, to Arab. *ḏ* and Aram. *ḏ*; as *ذئب*, *إنا*, *stbu*, *חל-ני: hyaena*, *ذئبا*.

<sup>1</sup> [In this sense and form the word is a loanword from the Aramaic *ܫܘܬܐ*, see Fränkel, *Lehmann*. p. 83.]

<sup>2</sup> [The distinctive sound of *ṣ̣̣* is preserved in some parts of the Hijāz.]

Not unfrequently *š* interchanges with *ץ* and *ס*; e.g. עֲלֵץ, וֹחַ, וְעִיר, צִיעַר, מַעַר; אִנְצָא, צִרְק, מִדָּן; נָסַע, עָלָא, עֲלָם and אִחַ, vulg. Arabic *s'ghaiyar* and *šūghaiyar* (مغیر زغیر).

2. The Aramaic possesses two *s*-sounds, *ś* and *sh*, to which correspond Arabic *s* س and *sh* ش, Ethiopic *ś* and *W*, which latter are, however, confounded in modern times. The Hebrew has also *ś*=*ś*, but splits *ś* into *š* *ś* and *š* *s*, the latter of which approximates to *ś*, and is often confounded with it; e.g. פַּעַשׁ and פַּעַם; רַפֵּשׁ and רַפֵּם; שְׁכָלוֹת for סְכָלוֹת in Eccl. i. 17. Hence, by a further confusion of sounds, the Ephraimite סַבְלָת for שְׁבָלָת (intermediate stage, שְׁבַלָת).

The Assyrian appears also to have had two *s*-sounds, though Assyriologists seem to differ on the question of their pronunciation. Haupt, for example, evidently distinguishes between an Assyrian *s* = Hebrew *š*, and an Assyrian *sh* = Hebrew *š*, but holds that these were gradually confounded, as in Ethiopic, so that both came to be *s*. As for the Assyrian sound corresponding to the Hebrew *ś*, Haupt holds that it was *sh*. On the contrary, Schrader and others seem to maintain that the Hebrew *ś* is in Assyrian *s*, and that the other letter is *sh*, *š*. See Schrader's article in the *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 5 March 1877; Hommel, *Zwei Fagdinschriften Asurbanibal's*, 1879; and Haupt's "Beiträge zur assyrischen Lautlehre" in the *Nachrichten der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 25 April, 1883, especially p. 107, note 2<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> [In Schrader's system of transcription *s* is the Assyrian consonant that corresponds etymologically to Hebrew *ś* and *š* that which corresponds to Hebrew *š*. Similarly Delitzsch, *Ass. Gr.* p. 106, recognises an Assyrian *s* = Hebrew *ś* and an *š* which etymologically considered is of threefold nature, viz. *š*<sub>1</sub> = שׁ, *š*<sub>2</sub> = שׂ, *š*<sub>3</sub> = שׂ, שׂ. In many English books on the other hand, e.g. in those of Sayce, Schrader's *š* is written *s*, while his *s* is *š*. Prof. Wright abstains, it will be observed, from expressing any opinion of his own on the controverted question of the pronunciation of the sibilants, and his MS. presents variations which shew that he had not come to a final decision as to the best way of transcribing them. See above, p. 13, l. 19 where *s* in *sarap* is the consonant which Schrader and Delitzsch represent by *š*, and

As a rule,  $\text{ש} = \text{ס} = \text{שׁ} = \text{D}$ ; as

שׁ	שׁ	שׁ:	שׁ
שׁ	שׁ	שׁ:	שׁ

but there are exceptions [perhaps merely graphical], as

שׁוֹסֵס [for שׁוֹסֵס] but שׁוֹסֵס.

Hebrew שׁ, as a general rule, corresponds to Arabic ش; and vice versa, Arabic س corresponds to Hebrew שׁ. The Aramaic follows the Hebrew, writing of course שׁ for שׁ. E.g.

(1)	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	
	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ: Assy. šibu (grey-haired)
	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	" šumēlu (-lu)
	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	
	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	
	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	" irsu, ērsu
(2)	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	
	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ:
	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ:
	שׁ	שׁ	שׁ	

similarly p. 56, l. 2 sqq., whereas on p. 14, l. 23 š is used in Schrader's sense. Elsewhere he writes s with š above it, but on the whole he seems finally to have inclined to use š in Schrader's sense whenever it was desirable to indicate a distinction between the two forms of the sibilant. For the sake of uniformity this mode of transcription will be adopted in the following pages, without reference to variations in the MS., which would doubtless have been removed had Prof. Wright lived to see his work through the press.]

לָשׁוֹן    לִשָּׁנָא    לִשָּׁנָא    ḥānī:    Assy. *lišānu*

רִישׁ    רִישׁ    רִישׁ    ḥānī:    „ *rēšu, rīšu*

These rules are not, however, invariably observed. E.g.

שָׁלוֹם (not שָׁלוּי) [as a loanword] but שָׁלוּם

שָׁמֶשׁ (not שָׁמֶס) but שָׁמֶשׁ (not שָׁמֶס, except in some modern dialects), Assyrian *šamšu*.

There is another Hebrew ש, which corresponds to an Aramaic 𐤑, Arabic ث, Ethiopic ሰ, Assyrian 𐤑 [š], of which I gave some examples above. Add:

שָׁלַג    שָׁלַג    שָׁלַג    *šalgu*

שָׁחַט    שָׁחַט    שָׁחַט    ḥānī:

שָׁחַט    שָׁחַט    שָׁחַט    ḥānī:    *u'addiš*

ש and ש, as well as 𐤑, may occasionally interchange with 𐤑, e.g. שָׁחַק, Eth. ሠሐቀ: or ሠሐቀ:, שָׁחַק; שָׁחַט, Eth. ሠሐט: (womb), Talm. הַיִּמְצָא and הַיִּמְצָא (fat of the intestines), Mand. הַיִּמְצָא; שָׁחַט, שָׁחַט, ḥānī:; קָסָם, קָסָם.

𐤑 is frequently changed into 𐤑 under the influence of a following 𐤑, and in Arabic of a ق or غ or ر; as صَطْرٌ, صَاحِرٌ, صَافٍ; especially in foreign words with *st*, as אֲמִטְלָא or אֲמִטְלָא.

Very curious is the change in Assyrian of *š* into *l* before a dental; e.g. *ašur* or *ašur* (שָׁמֶר), *mašītu* or *malītu* (drink, שָׁתָה), *khamīsti* or *khamīti* (five, חָמֵשׁ), *lubuštu* or *lubultu* (dress, לָבַשׁ). It appears, however, to be thoroughly well established.

Lastly, it would seem that an initial *s* may in certain cases interchange with 𐤑, and later with 𐤑. This is most obvious in

the verbal form **مُصَلِّا**, Heb. **הַמְעִיל**, Ar. **أَمَلَ**, Aram. **أَصَلَا**; and in the pronouns of the 3rd pers., Ass. *šū*, f. *šī*, pl. *šunu*, f. *šina*; in the suffix forms *šū*, *ša*, pl. *šunu*, *šina*. The Ḥimyaritic offers us a suffix form **ሥ**, pl. **ሥ**, as well as **ሥ**, pl. **ሥ**. The other Semitic languages have all the *h*-form, except the modern Mehri, which has, according to von Maltzan<sup>1</sup>, masc. *he*, f. *sé*, pl. *hém*, f. *séu*; as suffixes *he*, f. *es*, pl. *hum*, f. *senu*. Such cases as **سَلَكَ**, **هَلَكَ**, **هَلَك**, are very rare, and may either be accidental or capable of some other explanation.

3. We have already seen that **ץ** may be weakened into the other sibilants **ש**, **ס**, **ז**; and we have also shown that it corresponds in Ethiopic, Phoenician, Hebrew, and Assyrian, to the Arabic **ظ**, which is represented in Aramaic by **ܣ**, **ܥ**. One or two additional examples may not be superfluous.

<b>צָבִי</b>	Assyr. <i>šabītu</i> ,	<b>ظَبِي</b>	<b>مُصَابًا</b>
<b>צָבִים</b>		<b>ظَهْر</b>	<b>مُסَدًا</b>
<b>צָעַן</b> <i>migrate</i> (Is. 33. 20)	}	<b>ظَعَن</b>	<b>مَنْح</b>
<b>צָעַן</b> <i>load</i>		<i>travel</i> <i>load</i>	<i>carry.</i>

I now remark that **ץ** in Hebrew may correspond

(a) To Arabic **ص**, Ethiopic **ሀ**, Assyrian **ṣ**, Aramaic **ܣ**; as

<b>צָד</b>	<b>صَاد</b>	<b>ሀ</b>	<b>ሀ</b>
<b>צָבַע</b>	<b>أَصْبَع</b>	<b>ሀ</b>	<b>ሀ</b>
<b>צָבָא</b>	<b>بَصَل</b>	<b>ሀ</b>	<b>ሀ</b>
<b>צָבַב</b>	<b>نَصَب</b>	<b>ሀ</b>	<b>ሀ</b>

(b) To Arabic **ض**, Ethiopic **ሀ**, Assyrian **ṣ**, Aramaic **ܣ**; as

<b>צָר</b>	<b>ضَرَّة</b>	<b>ሀ</b>	<b>ሀ</b>
<b>צָר</b>		<b>ሀ</b>	<b>ሀ</b>

<sup>1</sup> [ZDMG., vol. xxv. (1871) p. 200 sq.]



צַק	צַק		חַב
צִנָּן	צִנָּן	<i>šēnu, šīnu</i>	חִנָּן
רִצִּין	רִצִּין	θCη :	חִרְבָּן
רִצִּין	רִצִּין		רִצִּין
רִצִּין	רִצִּין		רִצִּין
רִצִּין	רִצִּין	⊙θλ :	רִצִּין
		<i>ūṣī ("he escaped")</i> part. <i>āšū</i>	
רִצִּין	רִצִּין		רִצִּין ("satisfied")
רִצִּין	רִצִּין	<i>biṣu</i>	רִצִּין
רִצִּין	רִצִּין	<i>irṣitu (ēr-)</i>	רִצִּין

If another *y* follows in the word, then this Aramaic *y* is commonly weakened into *n*; e.g.

צִלְע	צִלְע	<i>šilu</i> (for <i>šillu, šif'u</i> )	צִלְע	צִלְע
צִלְע	צִלְע		צִלְע	צִלְע
צִלְע	צִלְע		צִלְע	צִלְע
צִלְע	צִלְע		צִלְע	צִלְע
צִלְע	צִלְע		צִלְע	צִלְע
צִלְע	צִלְע	<i>Assyr. išsu</i>	צִלְע	צִלְע

There are however some exceptions to this rule; e.g.

צִלְע	צִלְע	θCθ :	צִלְע
צִלְע	צִלְע	θCθ :	צִלְע
		"to be scattered, flee"	
		(with <i>ṣ</i> , not <i>θ</i> )	

רצין	רַצִּין		רִצִּין
	עֲרִצִּין		עֲרִצִּין
	גִּמְצִין		גִּמְצִין
	צִרְעִין	Assyr. <i>siru</i>	צִרְעִין
	צִרְכִּין		צִרְכִּין
חמץ	חִמְצִין		חִמְצִין and חִמְצִין
	צִרְפִּין	} with <i>צ</i> , not <i>ר</i> <sup>1</sup>	צִרְפִּין
	צִרְפִּין		צִרְפִּין

In such cases some of the younger dialects seem to be, as it were, faintly conscious of their loss, and strive to make good the defect in different ways. Sometimes a ק, or the combination אק, takes the place of the ע; as in אֲרִקָא for אֲרִעָא (Jerem. x. 11), Mand. אֲקָנָא for אֲנָנָא, אֲקָמְרָא for אֲעִמְרָא. Occasionally the same thing happens in the case of a simple ע, as עֲפִר, עֲפִר, Mand. אֲפִרָא, but also אֲקָמְרָא, and even אֲנָמְרָא. At other times a ג appears upon the scene; e.g. <sup>ض</sup>صָطַר "to press, squeeze," <sup>ض</sup>صָطַר *be oppressed*, instead of <sup>ض</sup>صָطַר; <sup>ض</sup>صָطַר, Syriac <sup>ض</sup>صָطַר, Talm. <sup>ض</sup>צָחִיק, for <sup>ض</sup>צָחִיק. This last word, owing to the difficulty of its utterance, undergoes some curious modifications. The regular Aramaic form is found in Talmudic and Mandaitic, viz. <sup>ض</sup>צָחִיק (not Afel), עֲרִכִית, "I laughed"; but also <sup>ض</sup>צָחִיק (חִיק), and even <sup>ض</sup>צָחִיק. Something similar occurs in Syriac with the word <sup>ض</sup>צָחִיק, whence are formed the secondary radicals <sup>ض</sup>צָחִיק and <sup>ض</sup>צָחִיק.

<sup>1</sup> [This example is however disputed by G. Hoffmann, *ZDMG.*, xxxii. 762.]

<sup>2</sup> [See however Fränkel, *Fremdw.*, p. 183.]

Before going further let us examine by the light of these permutations the Hebrew radical צפר. You will find that it represents no less than four different radicals in Arabic and Ethiopic.

- (1) צפר "whistle, twitter," صَفَرَ, whence  
 צפוד, צפוד, צפוד, צפוד, Ass. *iššūr* (for *išpūr*).
- (2) צפר "turn, return, twine, twist," صَفَرَ, 𐤆𐤌: whence  
 צפירה "turn, crown or garland."
- (3) צפר "leap, spring," صَفَرَ, whence  
 צפיר "he goat," צפירא, צפירא.
- (4) צפר ظفر, whence  
 צפרן "nail," ظَفَرَ, 𐤆𐤌𐤍: Ass. *šupru*, 𐤆𐤌𐤍.

Perhaps we may add in Aramaic, by interchange of צ and ש,

- (5) צפרא 𐤆𐤌𐤒, "dawn" = שפרא from radical שפר.

V. The labials ב *b* and פ *p* interchange freely with one another; as also ב *b* and מ *m*.

1. *b* and *p*: פּוּקָל, פּוּקָל, Ass. *parzillu*, Ar. فِرْزَلٌ *fetter*,  
*forceps*<sup>1</sup>.  
 פּוּקָל, פּוּקָל, פּוּקָל  
 פּוּקָל, פּוּקָל  
 פּוּקָל, פּוּקָל  
 פּוּקָל, פּוּקָל

Particularly when the letter ת *t* follows; as פּוּקָל or פּוּקָל,

<sup>1</sup> [This last according to Guidi, *Sade*, p. 18, Fränkel, p. 153, is a loanword from the Aramaic.]

<sup>2</sup> [Loanword from the Aramaic according to Fränkel, p. 153.]

زِنَتْ "pitch"; حَبَّحَلَا for حَبَّحَلَا; حَبَّحَلَا for حَبَّحَلَا; even when a vowel intervenes, as Mand. פַת for פַת, פַתוּלָא for פַתוּלָא.

2. *b* and *m*: פַת, מַכֵּן.

أَحْنَا: أَحْنَا; زَمَانٌ or زَمَانٌ, زَمَانٌ.

The Arab grammarians mention such cases as بَكَّة for مَكَّة, مَا أَسَمَك for با أَسَمَك; and the like. In Hīmyaritic בַן stands for בַן, *who*, and בַן for בַן, *from*.

A slight aspiration of ב *b* and פ *p* modifies these sounds into *v* and *f*. Hebrew and Aramaic have both sounds, the latter after a vowel, and indicate the difference merely by points. Arabic and Ethiopic have only *b* and *f*; Assyrian only *b* and *p*. The sound of *p* is one of extreme difficulty to an Arab. The Ethiopic Ṣ *p* and Ṭ *p* (or *ps*) are in native words usually modifications of an original *b*, sometimes of an *f*.

(1) نَجَّحَا, حَبَّحَا; يَدَّحَا, بَدَّحَا;

חַח: חַח; יִבְכִי, בְכִי

(2) יִפְדָּה, פְּדָה;

פְּדִי: פְּדִי; נַדִּי, בַדִּי

In modern Syriac, I may remark, *f* is generally hardened into *p*, as מַלְחָנָא *malpānā* for מַלְחָנָא. The modern Ethiopic dialects, on the contrary, such as Tigrifā and Amharic, possess the aspirated *b*, or *v*.

In Assyrian an original *m* passes into aspirated *b*, or *v*, as in *argamānu* or *argavānu*, "purple," Heb. אֲרָגָמָן, Aram. אֲרָגָן; *surmēnu* or *survēnu*, "a sort of cypress," Aram. שַׁרְוִינָא, שַׁרְוִינָא, modern Arabic شَرْبِين; *arakh-samnu* (*samnu*), "eighth month,"

<sup>1</sup> [The Arabic is a loanword, Fränkel p. 151.]



VI. The liquids ל, נ, ר, and the letter ם, interchange freely.

(1) ל with נ, and vice versa: לחש and נחש; לשפה and נשפה; נון, Aramaic נון and לון; להוא and נסון; Talmud. סכסע, רגלין for רגני, לחמא for נחמא, לקט for נקט.

(2) ל with ר, and vice versa: ארמל, ארמל, ארמל; מעלא, : ארמל plur. : ארמל, Ethiopic plur. : ארמל, שרשלת, שרשלת; (for מכלא); Mand. תארמירא for ארמירא, and כאלחא for ניו, ורצא, but Mand. ראלצא, חלצים; כסון.

(3) נ with ר, and vice versa: נדר and רדר; טמן and רמן; ננד and רנד.

(4) ם with נ; as מורג tribulum (threshing-machine), נורג (Syriac נהא "axe"); מוספה and נחשלה. Especially at the end of words; e.g. ברוח, ברוח, Arab. أبهام, بطم, بجم, بجم, إن, إن, "if," אם, נסם, רשן; חפא, אנתם, רם, הם; חפ, פום, פם, כם; אנתם, but אנתם, So in the plural terminations of the noun, Arab. ون, ين, Aram. ܢܝܢ, Heb. ַי; in the dual, Arab. ٰين, ٰين; Aram. ܢܝܢ, Heb. ַי.

Final ם and ן are apt to fall away:—

- (1) In the *construct* state of nouns dual and plural.
- (2) In the *absolute* plural of nouns, not only in Talmudic, Mandaitic, and modern Syriac, but also in Assyrian, where we have such plurals as *malkī* "kings," *ilī* "gods," *pagrī* "bodics".<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [But see *Journ. of Phil.* xiv. 115.]

<sup>2</sup> [Probably from a Persian word *nidāna*; Nöld. in *G. G. A.* 1884, p. 1022.]

<sup>3</sup> [Or also, according to Haupt and Delitzsch, *malkī* etc.]

In Hebrew a few cases may perhaps be found, both in the plural and dual, but they are doubtful.

(3) In the 2nd and 3rd pers. plural imperfect masc. and fem. of the verb; e.g. Arab. يَقْتَلُونَ يَقْتَلْنَ; Heb. יִקְטְלוּ יִקְטְלנהּ; Syr. تصهفون تصهفن; but in vulgar Arabic, and more commonly in Hebrew, יִקְטְלוּ יִקְטְלוּ; and in Ethiopic, ተቀቲህ : ተቀቲህ :: So also in Assyrian we find the termination *ūnu* or *ūni*, as well as the shorter *n*.

(4) In various other instances. For example, ׀ in the 2nd pers. plural perf. of the verb; קָטַלְתֶּם compared with קָטַלְתֶּם, vulg. Arab. قَتَلْتُمْ for قَتَلْتُمْ. Again, Talmud. קָא or קָא, for קָאִים; לֵיקָ or לֵיקָ, fem. לֵיקָ, for לֵיקָם; מִיִּדֵי for מִיִּדֵים; מִיִּנְדָאָם and מִיִּנְדָאָם, Mand. מִיִּנְדָאָם and מִיִּנְדָאָם— in such Hebrew words as מְבַרְךָ and מְבַרְךָ; שִׁלְהָ and שִׁלְהָ for שִׁלְחָן, as proved by the adjectives שִׁלְחָנִי, שִׁלְחָנִי, etc. Much more frequently in the later dialects; as Talm. רֵגִי for רֵגִי, רֵגִי for רֵגִי; מְאַדִּין and מְאַדִּין for מְאַדִּין and מְאַדִּין; Mand. רֵאִינִילֹן for רֵאִינִין בֵּיהּ for נִיְהוּבִיהּ; אִמְאַרְתֹּן לִי for אִמְאַרְתֹּן לִי; רֵאִינִין לְדֹן (נִסְפֶּה צִס).

Initial *n*, when pronounced with the shortest vowel, is liable to be dropped in Hebrew and Aramaic, particularly in the imperative of verbs פִּן (פִּן, נִשׁ, הֶסֶם), of which more hereafter. Initial *m* too, according to some scholars, is occasionally rejected in Hebrew, in the participle Pu<sup>al</sup>, לָקַח, יוֹלֵד; whence we can explain the modern Syriac form ܚܒܘܣܘܟܘܢܐ as standing for ܚܒܘܣܘܟܘܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܚܒ.

Lastly, medial ܠ, ܢ, ܪ are exceedingly apt to be assimilated

to a following letter; and conversely ו and ך are frequently employed, especially in the younger dialects, for the purpose of dissimilating the component elements of a double consonant.

(1) Assimilation: in verbs פִּי; further, **מַחְלֵא** (מַחְלֵא), **מַחְלֵא** (מַחְלֵא); cp. **מַחְלֵא** and **מַחְלֵא**; כַּרְכַּר, **חֲצוּ**, **פָּפַר**; **מַחְלֵא**; **מַחְלֵא** for **מַחְלֵא**; **מַחְלֵא** for **מַחְלֵא**; **מַחְלֵא** and **מַחְלֵא** (לְחָלַל and לְחָלַל); **מַחְלֵא**, **מַחְלֵא**, **מַחְלֵא**; **מַחְלֵא**, **מַחְלֵא**, **מַחְלֵא** (rare pl. **מַחְלֵא**, gen. **מַחְלֵא**), **מַחְלֵא**, are easily explained, the long vowel being merely a compensation for the lost doubling.

(2) Dissimilation: **מַחְלֵא**, **מַחְלֵא**; **מַחְלֵא**, **מַחְלֵא** for **מַחְלֵא**; **מַחְלֵא** for **מַחְלֵא** (tribute); Mand. **מַחְלֵא**, for **מַחְלֵא**; **מַחְלֵא**, **מַחְלֵא**; Mand. **מַחְלֵא**, pl. **מַחְלֵא**, for **מַחְלֵא** (interm. **מַחְלֵא**); **מַחְלֵא** and **מַחְלֵא**; **מַחְלֵא**, **מַחְלֵא**, **מַחְלֵא**.

VII. The weak letters ך and ך would easily furnish me with material for more than one lecture, if I entered into a minute account of all their changes and vicissitudes. At present, however, I intend to dwell only upon a few points of primary importance.

Initial ך runs through all the dialects, though in comparatively few words; e.g.

יַבֵּשׁ	פּ-ח-ו:	יַבֵּשׁ	יַבֵּשׁ	יַבֵּשׁ
יָוֵם	פּ-ח-ו:	יָוֵם	יָוֵם	יָוֵם
יָקָץ		יָקָץ		



More usually an initial *w* in Arabic and Ethiopic has been changed into *y* in Hebrew and Aramaic. The priority of the *w* is proved by its reappearance in various derived forms of the verb and noun, as we shall see hereafter.

וּלְדָ	וּלְדָ:	יְלֵד	יְלֵד	יָכַ
וְהָבָ	וְהָבָ:	יְהַב	יְהַב, יָב	יָכַ and יָכַ
וְיָנָ	וְיָנָ:	יָנָ		
וְיָגַל וְיָגַר		יָגַר		
	וְיָגַר:	יָגַר		יָגַר

The original initial *w* rarely appears in Hebrew and Aramaic, as וּלְדָ or וְלָדָ (if correct); [post-Biblical] וְדָי, וְדָח, וְדָח; [פְּדָח, וְדָי]; [פְּדָח, וְדָי]; and in some cases where it has been protected by a preceding consonant, as in the Hithpa<sup>el</sup> forms וְהִתְדַע, וְהִתְדָה, וְהִתְדָה.

The fate of the initial *y* in Aramaic is worthy of further notice. In Biblical Aramaic and some other dialects we find *y*, as יְהַב, יְהַב. In Syriac this letter is vocalised and becomes *ʿ*, written in older times ʿ, more recently *y* only, as יָכַ, יָכַ (whence יָכַ, יָכַ). Modern Syriac, however, simply drops the initial *y*; as יָכַ *stwd*, "sitting"; יָכַ, "they burned." Mandaitic follows the ancient Syriac in the Pě'al form of the verb and similar cases; as יָכַ = עַתְיָב = יָכַ; עַתְיָב = יָכַ; עַתְיָב = יָכַ; עַתְיָב = יָכַ; but drops the *y* in the Ethpe<sup>el</sup>, as יָכַ = עַתְיָב, יָכַ = עַתְיָב.

In Assyrian the initial *y* of Hebrew and Aramaic is displaced, we are told, by *ʿ*. We find, for example, *ʿmu*, "day"; *idu*,

<sup>1</sup> [ *y* in Mandaitic is a mere vowel-letter and represents initial *ʿ* or *i*. ]

“hand,” Eth.  $\lambda\text{p}$ :; *arkhu*, “month,”  $\text{יָרַח}$ ,  $\text{ܡܢܫܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܘܥܘܪܝܢ}$ ; *āsib* “he dwells, dwelling,”  $\text{יָשַׁב}$ ; *āsū*, “going out,”  $\text{יָצָא}$ ; *alidtu*, *alittu*, “bearing,”  $\text{יָלְדָת}$ ,  $\text{ܘܐܠܕܬܐ}$ ; *akru*, “costly,”  $\text{יָקָר}$ . Nor is this dislike of the sound of initial *y* or *w* confined to Assyrian. Even the Arabs were prone to change initial *wu* and *wi* into *u* and *i*; and the combination *wawā* is always modified at the beginning of a word into *awā*. So in the Korān we find  $\text{اَقْتَت}$  for  $\text{وَقْتَت}$ ; further,  $\text{اَسَاد}$  for  $\text{وَسَاد}$ , “cushion”;  $\text{اِشَاح}$  for  $\text{وِشَاح}$ . “belt”;  $\text{اَوَاصِل}$  for  $\text{وَوَاصِل}$ , plural of  $\text{وَاَصْلَةٌ}$ , “connecting link, proximate cause”;  $\text{اَوَاقِي}$  for  $\text{وَوَاقِي}$ , plural of  $\text{وَاقِيَةٌ}$ , whether in the sense of “guard” or of “ounce.” Hence we see at once the connexion, on the one hand, between  $\text{اَرَخ}$ , “to date,” and Eth.  $\text{ܘܥܘܪܝܢ}$ : “month”;  $\text{אָצִיל}$  “joint,” and  $\text{וּמַל}$ , where the *w* is original; and, on the other hand, between  $\text{יִלְמַד}$  and  $\text{אֶלֶף}$ , “learn”;  $\text{יִמְרוּ}$  and  $\text{אָרְךָ}$ , “be long,” where the *n* claims the priority.

Of the disappearance of initial *w* in some verbal and nominal forms, I shall treat hereafter, when we come to the verbs  $\text{ו}^{\text{D}}$  in the Hebrew Grammar.

Medial *w* and *y* are chiefly liable to change under the influence of a preceding and following vowel, which lead to their vocalisation, and in some cases to their entire disappearance. E.g.

Perf.	$\text{قَام}$	$\text{ܩܡ}$	$\text{קָם}$	$\text{ܩܡܐ}$	for <i>kawama</i> ,
		$\text{ܩܡܐ}$	$\text{קָם}$	$\text{ܩܡܐ}$	for <i>sayama</i> ;
Imperf.	$\text{يَقُوم}$	$\text{ܩܘܡܐ}$	$\text{יְקוּם}$	$\text{ܩܘܡܐ}$	for <i>yakwumu</i> ,
		$\text{ܩܘܡܐ}$	$\text{יְשִׁימ}$	$\text{ܩܘܡܐ}$	for <i>yasyimu</i> .

Compare also *מַת*, *מַח*, *מַח*, for *mawita*; and *طَال*, for *tawula*, with *בָּאֵשׁ* and *אֵשׁ*, for *בָּאֵשׁ* and *אֵשׁ*. Uncontracted examples are, however, to be found; as *عور* "be blind of one eye,"

*נָסוּ*, *רוּחַ*, *חֹר*, *נָוַע*, "have a slender waist," *חֹל* "squint," *הֵיף*; and the contraction does not take place when the 3rd radical is likewise a *w* or *y*, as *רֹוּי*, *רֹוה*, *רֹוּי*; etc.

Medial *w* passes into *y* chiefly under the influence of an accompanying *i*, as *صَمَلًا* *تِبَاءَةً*, "resurrection" (where the Arabic *i* has become a mere *shēvā* in Syriac), for *تَوَامَةً*. Instances like *רֹוּה*, Aram. *רֹוּחַ*, *רֹוּחַ*, Arab. *هَوِي*, are rare. In the Hebrew *Pi'el* and Aramaic *Pa'el* the change is more frequent; as *קָיַם*, *קָיַם*, *קָיַם*, *קָיַם*; but examples to the contrary are not wanting, as *עָוַר*, "surround," *עָוַר*, *עָוַר*, *עָוַר*, *עָוַר*. As the original form is the Arabic *karwama*, the change perhaps began with the 2nd *w*, which passed into *y*, *karwyama*; this worked upon the preceding *w*, so as to cause assimilation, *kayyama*; and hence arose the Aramaic form *kayyem*, and finally the Hebrew *kayyem*, as we shall afterwards see in more detail.

Final *w*, when it appears at all as a consonant, is generally found in the shape of *y*; e.g. in Hebrew *נָלְוּ*, *נָלְוּ*, "they cover them." Its retention in such forms as *שָׁלוּ*, "be quiet," is rare; for even the Arabic, which tolerates *حَلَو*, requires *رَضِيَ* and *سَلِيَ* for *رَضَو* and *سَلَو*. In *נָלְוּ*, *נָלְוּ*, *נָלְוּ*, and the like, we should probably pronounce the final *ו* nearly as *#*; as also in the forms with pronom. suffixes, like *נָלְוּ* *פִּיּוֹ* (for *פִּיּוֹ*), *נָלְוּ* *דְּבָרָיו* (for *דְּבָרָיו*) *דְּבָרָיו* (for *דְּבָרָיו*). This view derives some confirma-

tion from ancient Hebrew seals, on which we read such inscriptions as :

לְשַׁבְּנִי עִבְדְּ עִיזָה i.e. לְשַׁבְּנִי עִבְדְּ עִיזָה

לְאַבְדֵּי עִבְדְּ עִיזָה i.e. לְאַבְדֵּי עִבְדְּ עִיזָה

In the perfect of the verb the Ethiopic alone retains the distinction of the final radicals, e.g.  $\text{ተለו}$ : *taldwa*, "follow,"  $\text{תקו}$ : *bakdya*, "weep." In the other languages the *w* has been changed into *y*, and the combination *aya* contracted into *d*. In Arabic the grammarians have introduced an arbitrary distinction, and write  $\text{تلا}$  for *talawa* and  $\text{بكى}$  for *bakaya*, but the sound is the same in both cases, *tald*, *bakd*; and hence the Aramean has  $\text{ܬܠ}$ ,  $\text{ܠܘܢ}$ , with  $\text{ܠ}$ ,  $\text{ܢ}$ . In Hebrew a  $\text{ה}$  is substituted for this  $\text{ܢ}$ ,  $\text{תלה}$ ,  $\text{תכה}$ ; but this does not warrant us in speaking of them as verbs  $\text{לה}$ . The only real verbs  $\text{לה}$  in Hebrew are such as  $\text{נבה}$ ,  $\text{תמה}$ , in Syriac  $\text{ܘܒܗ}$ ,  $\text{ܘܡܗ}$ , and the like. Upon the whole subject of the weak letters, and  $\text{י}$  I shall find it necessary to enter into fuller details, when we come to the classes of verbs in which they appear as first, second and third radicals.

Having thus gone through the various classes of letters in the Semitic alphabet, and enumerated the principal changes to which they are liable in the different Semitic languages, I will conclude this branch of my subject by briefly recapitulating those permutations which are of primary importance, any deviation from which must be regarded with a careful scrutiny before we accept the relationship of the words in question. In so doing, I shall follow the order of the Hebrew alphabet.

1.  $\text{ה} = h$  in all the languages; but also  
 $\text{ה}$  init. = Assy.  $\text{ܗ}$ , Arab.  $\text{ه}$ , Eth.  $\text{ሀ}$ , Aram.  $\text{ܗ}$ ,  $\text{}$ .
2.  $\text{ז} = s$  in all the languages; but also  
 $\text{ז} =$  Assy.  $\text{ܝ}$ , Eth.  $\text{ሀ}$ , Arab.  $\text{ذ}$ , Aram.  $\text{ܝ}$ ,  $\text{}$ .
3.  $\text{ח} =$  Aram.  $\text{ܫ}$ ,  $\text{ܘ}$ , Eth.  $\text{ሀ}$ , Arab.  $\text{ح}$ , Assy.  $\text{ܫ}$  (as *imtru*); but also  
 $\text{ח} =$  Aram.  $\text{ܫ}$ ,  $\text{ܘ}$ , Eth.  $\text{ሀ}$ , Arab.  $\text{ح}$ , Assy. *kh* (*h*).

4.  $\text{ʔ}$  init. =  $\gamma$  in all the languages except Assyrian, where it is  $\aleph$ ; but also  
 $\text{ʔ}$  init. = Aram.  $\text{ʔ}$ , Eth.  $\text{፬}$ , Arab.  $\text{ج}$ , Assy.  $\aleph$ .
5.  $\text{፬}$  = Aram.  $\text{፬}$ ,  $\text{𐤎}$ , Eth.  $\text{ሰ}$ , Arab.  $\text{س}$ , Assy.  $\text{ś}$  ( $\text{ś/k}$ ).
6.  $\text{፮}$  = Aram.  $\text{፮}$ ,  $\text{፮}$ , Eth.  $\text{ዐ}$ , Arab.  $\text{ع}$ , Assy.  $\aleph$ ; but also  
 $\text{፮}$  = Aram.  $\text{፮}$ ,  $\text{፮}$ , Eth.  $\text{ዐ}$ , Arab.  $\text{غ}$ , Assy.  $\aleph$ .
7.  $\text{፯}$  =  $\text{ś}$  in all the languages; but also  
 $\text{፯}$  = Eth.  $\text{ጸ}$ , Arab.  $\text{ظ}$ , Aram.  $\text{፯}$ ,  $\text{፯}$ , Assy.  $\text{ś}$ ;  
 $\text{፯}$  = Eth.  $\text{፬}$ , Arab.  $\text{ض}$ , Aram.  $\text{፯}$ ,  $\text{፯}$ , Assy.  $\text{ś}$ ;  
 $\text{፯}$  = Eth.  $\text{፬}$  ( $\text{ጸ}$ ), Arab.  $\text{ض}$ , Aram.  $\text{፯}$ ,  $\text{፯}$ , Assy.  $\text{ś}$ .
8.  $\text{፱}$  = Aram.  $\text{፱}$  [ $\text{፱}^1$ ],  $\text{𐤎}$ , Eth.  $\text{ሠ}$ , Arab.  $\text{ش}$ , Assy.  $\text{š}$  ( $\text{ś}$ ).
9.  $\text{፺}$  = Aram.  $\text{፺}$ , Eth.  $\text{ሰ}$ , Arab.  $\text{س}$ , Assy.  $\text{ś}$  ( $\text{ś}$ ); but also  
 $\text{፺}$  = Eth.  $\text{ሰ}$ , Arab.  $\text{ث}$ , Aram.  $\text{፺}$ ,  $\text{፺}$ , Assy.  $\text{ś}$ .

<sup>1</sup> [Biblical Aramaic and the oldest Aramaic monuments have  $\text{፱} = \text{፱}$ . In Palmyrene this  $\text{፱}$  interchanges with  $\text{፱}$ , e.g.  $\text{፺፱}$  and  $\text{፺፱}$ .]

## CHAPTER V.

### THE VOWELS AND THEIR PERMUTATIONS.

WE now go on to treat of the vowels and their permutations, a topic which I must, however, handle in a somewhat superficial manner; as time forbids me to enter into more than the most necessary details. In fact, a mere outline of the subject is all that I can pretend to lay before you. Your own reading and reflection must do the rest; and I recommend to you, at present, the Grammars of Olshausen, Bickell (translated by Curtiss), and Stade, as being, on the whole, the most suggestive and the best adapted to your present purpose.

The vowel-system of the Semitic languages, like that of the Indo-European<sup>1</sup>, was at first very simple. There were only three primitive vowel-sounds, *a*, *i*, *u*, which might naturally be either short or long, thus giving rise to six vowels:

*ā ā, ī ī, ū ū.*

Of real primitive diphthongs, like the Indo-European *ai* and *au*, we can hardly speak in Semitic; for a careful examination will, I think, shew us that in every case the second element in a Semitic *ai* or *au* was originally the consonant *y* or *w*. Still, it is convenient in this place to treat *ai* and *au* as being practically diphthongs, and I shall therefore so regard them, with the reservation already mentioned. It may perhaps be well to use in writing *ay* and *aw* instead of *ai* and *au*.

No one of the Semitic languages, however, is exactly restricted to this limited number of vowel-sounds, in the state in which we

<sup>1</sup> [This passage appears to have been written before the general acceptance, among comparative philologists, of the new doctrine of the Indo-European vowels which recognises primitive *e* and *o*.]

are acquainted with it, save perhaps the Assyrian, which seems to designate in writing only the six vowels above mentioned. The Arabic, it is true, also exhibits in writing only the same six vowels, but we know that the actual range of the spoken language is far wider; and probably the same held good in regard to the Assyrian, which is unfortunately, as a spoken tongue, wholly beyond our ken.

Beginning, then, with the Arabic, we find that the ancient *ā ī ū* are capable of modification in sound, chiefly according to the nature of the consonants with which they are in juxtaposition.

In connexion with one of the gutturals, ع غ ح, or with the letter ر, *ā* retains its broad sound, as هَادٍ *hadd*, خَمْرٌ *khāmr*, لَعْبٌ *lāb*, مَبْلَغٌ *mablagh*, رَبٌّ *rabb*, فَارَسٌ *faras*; whilst with one of the emphatic or harsh consonants, ق ط ظ ض ص, it inclines to a duller, more obscure sound, somewhat like that of the broad Scotch *a* (*ā*) or the English *u* in *but*; e.g. بَقِيَةٌ *bakiya*,

أَلَابَةٌ *alāba*, مَطْرٌ *maṭr*, دِرَابَةٌ *diraba*, سَدْرٌ *ṣadr* (*su*), بَطْنٌ *baṭn* (*bu*).

Also with *w*, as وَلَدٌ *walād*, أَوْلٌ *awwal* (nearly *awwul*). Under the same circumstances *ī* has likewise a duller sound, with the gutturals, especially ع and ح, inclining more to *e* pronounced far back in the mouth, and with ق ط ظ ض ص to that of the deep

Turkish *y* or English *i* in *bird*, as عَلِمٌ *‘ilm*, سِحْرٌ *sehr*, حَبْرٌ *hebr*,

كَيْسَرٌ *kyskr*, كَيْسَاكٌ *kysak*, طِبٌّ *tybb*, أَضْرِبٌ *ydrīb*; whilst *ū* inclines to

*ō*, or with ح and ع to *ö*, as دُفْرٌ *dūfr*, لَطْفٌ *laṭofa*, لُتْفٌ *lotf*,

حَسَنٌ *ḥosn* or *hösn*, رَعْبٌ *ro‘b*, عَمْرٌ *‘ömr*, حِكْيٌ *ḥökiya*. The same

influences operate upon the long vowels: as مَاحِبٌ *maḥir*, مَاحِبٌ *maḥib*,

نَظَّارَةٌ *nāḍḍāra* (spectacles), وَدْغِيْبٌ *wadgīb*; سَاحِلَةٌ *saḥlāḥ*, حَيْلَةٌ *ḥayla*,

أُتْرُوقٌ *atruq*, طِينٌ *ṭayn*.

Again, in connexion with the other consonants, whether in a shut or open syllable, *ā* takes a weaker sound, like that of the common English *ā* (in *hat, cap*), or it becomes *ä, e* (as in *Männer, pet*); whilst *ī* and *î* are pronounced with their natural sounds, as in *pin* and *bull*, or nearly so. E.g. كَتَبْتَ *katabta*, مَرْكَبَ *markeb*, سَمَكَ *semek*, شَمْسَ *shems*, ذَكَرَ *dhikr*, كَلَّ *kull*.

The sound of *î* was also heard dialectically in old Arabic, as شَدَّ *shidda*, رَدَّ *ridda*, for *shūdda, rūdda*; سَيْقَ *sīka*, قَيْلَ *kāla*; and is found occasionally in the vulgar dialects, as *kūll* for *kūll*; in this latter case perhaps under the influence of the Turkish. In a short open syllable, followed by a long one, the short vowels are liable to be modified and reduced almost to the compass of the Hebrew *shēvā*; e.g. سَمِينِ *smtn*, جَلِيلِ *jlll*,

مَدِينَةَ *mādīneh*, مَبَارَكَ *mībārāk*, of which the first two are sometimes vocalised *smtn, jlll*, whilst the last is vulgarly pronounced *m'bārāk* or, with a prosthetic vowel, *embārāk*. In modern dialects, e.g. that of Egypt, *a* becomes *i* even in a shut syllable, e.g. مِنْ *min*, for مَنْ "who?" أَسْوَدَ for أَسْوَدَ "black," اسْلَمَ *islam* for اسْلَمَ "became a muslim," اِغْزَا for اِغْزَا "parts." It is also liable to be changed into *u*, under the influence of a proximate *b, f, m* or *w*, e.g. مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīḥebbe*, مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīḥebbe* for مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīḥebbe*, مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīḥebbe* for مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīḥebbe*; similarly, مُسْتَهَبَةٌ *mustahb* for مُسْتَهَبَةٌ *mustahb*, حَمَصٌ *ḥumṣ* for حَمَصٌ *ḥumṣ*.

Just as *ā* was thus modified into *ä* & *ē*, so did *ā* pass into *ē* and even into *ī*. A word like خَاتَمَ or غَانَلَ suffered no change; but the weaker sound in كِتَابَ *kitāb*, رِكَابَ *rikāb*, لَأَكْنَ *lākn*, underwent a modification into *kītzb, rikzb, lēkn*, and among the Arabs of Africa and Spain into *ī*, so that لِسَانَ *līsān* and بَابَ *bāb* became *līstn* and *bīb*. Hence the Spanish names *Faen* and



*Caniles* are written by the Arabs جِيَان and تَنَالَش. This is also the usual pronunciation in modern Maltese, as نازل *na'zl*, رَمَاد *r'mtd*, *ntedl*.

The diphthongs *ay* and *aw* retain their original sound after the guttural and emphatic letters, as صَيْف *sayf*, خَوْف *khauf*. Otherwise they are pronounced almost like *e* and *o*; e.g. سَيْف *seif* (almost *sef*), مَوْت *m'ot* (almost *möt*). In the spoken dialects the original sounds *aw* and *ay* or *ey* are still heard, especially when a *w* or *y* follows, as *awwal* أول *aiyib* طَيِّب, *seyed* سَيِّد, *aiwa* أَيُّو. Otherwise they are pronounced *o* and *e*, as *söda* سَوْدَاء, *kos* قَوْس, *khöf* خَوْف; *böda* بَيْضَاء, *dör* دَيْر, *seif* سَيْف, *seif* صَيْف.

You see then that the Arabic, instead of being limited to the six primitive vowels and two diphthongs, has in reality as wide a range of vowel-sounds as the Hebrew.

On the Hebrew and Aramaic we must dwell at greater length, because in these languages the vowels have undergone considerable modifications, and it is important for an understanding of many grammatical forms that we should be able to trace them back to their original sounds, in doing which the Arabic, ancient and modern, will be of signal service to us.

We start then in Hebrew from the same position as before :

- |                 |                              |
|-----------------|------------------------------|
| 3 short vowels, | <i>a</i> <i>i</i> <i>ü</i> ; |
| 3 long vowels,  | <i>ā</i> <i>ī</i> <i>ū</i> ; |
| 2 diphthongs,   | <i>ay</i> <i>aw</i> .        |

Short *a* is liable in Hebrew to undergo changes analogous to those which it experiences in Arabic, that is to say to be modified into *ä* (א) and *ä* (א). Compare, for instance, שְׁאֵלָתִי with שְׁאֵלָתָם and שְׁאֵלָתֵינוּ; בָּתִּי with בָּתִּי; סָף with סָפִים; בְּנֵי־רָדָה with מְדִבְּחֵי; מְעַה with דְּמַעָה; קָרִיָה with קָרִיָה; נְעֻשָׁה with נְחֻפָּאתָ; מְרַכֵּב with מְרַכֵּב; מְנַהֵר with מְנַהֵר.

נַעֲשֶׂתָהּ with נִגְלָה and fem. נִגְלָתָהּ; יָד, with יָדְכֶם (יִדְכֶם); דָּם, with דָּמְכֶם (דָּמְכֶם); דָּבַר, for דָּבַר, from דָּבַר (for *dābār*); דָּרָה from דָּר. These examples are taken, you will observe, almost exclusively from shut syllables, or half-shut syllables before the tone. In such cases the Syriac often ranges itself on the side of the Arabic: *مَكْنُحًا*, *مَكْنُحًا*, etc.; whilst at other times it is the Arabic which exhibits the weakening of the vowel, as Heb. צָדִיק, Arab. صَدِيق; Syr. نَجِيصًا, Arab. نَجِيص; Heb. and Syr. תְּלָמִיד, Arab. تَلْمِيذ. This change has spread extensively in the later dialects, as compared with the classical Syriac and Arabic. In Hebrew two conspicuous cases are exemplified by segolate nouns of the form *נִבְרָ* and by the perfect Piel of the verb. That words like *קָרָן*, *נִפְן*, and *אָרָץ*, were originally pronounced *קָרָן*, *נִפְן*, and *אָרָץ*, might be inferred from the Arabic forms *قَرْن* and *جَفْن*, *أَرْض*; it is rendered certain by the pausal forms *קָרָן*, *נִפְן*, *אָרָץ*, and by the suffixed forms *קָרְנוּ*, *נִפְנִי*, *אָרְצִי*. Besides, we can cite the authority of the LXX., who write Ἀβελ for *הַבֵּל*, Γασλων Γαβέπ (1 Kings ix. 26) for *עֶצְיוֹן נִבְרָ*, and the like. In many other words of the same class the root-vowel has been farther modified into *z*; as *קָבַר*, *קָבַר*, *קָבַר*, Arab. قَبْر; *שָׁמֶשׁ*, *שָׁמֶשׁ*, *שָׁמֶשׁ*, Arab. شَمْس. In all such words the vowel of the 2nd syllable is merely supplementary, and has nothing to do with the original form, but merely lightens the pronunciation of the two final consonants. Again, as to the verbal form Piel, that *קָפַל* stands for *קָפַל* is obvious from the following considerations.

(1) The Arabic form is *كَتَل* *kattala*, with a *fetha* in each syllable.

(2) The *a* of the 1st syllable appears in the Aramaic **ܐܘܠܐ**, and in Hebrew itself in the imperat. and imperfect **קָפַל** and **יִקְפֹּל**.

(3) The *a* of the 2nd syllable is seen in the 2nd pers. sing. **קִפַּלְתָּ** and analogous forms, as well as in numerous examples of the 3rd person, e.g. **יָפַד**, **הִזִּק**, **בִּישַׁר**, **גָּדַל**, where the vocalisation depends partly upon the accentuation and partly upon other considerations. Sometimes the *a* of the 2nd syllable is modified into *ɛ*, as in **דָּבַר**, **נָפַר**, **כָּפַם**; and this weakening, combined with the influence of the *ɛ* in the 1st syllable, has led to the form with *ɛ*, **דָּבַר**, **גָּדַל**. In the Hiphil, as we shall afterwards see, the process goes yet a step farther, *a* being changed into *i* by the successive steps *hak̄tal*, *hik̄tal*, *hik̄təl̄*, *hik̄tél̄*, *hik̄tīl̄*.

On short *ɛ* we may content ourselves with noting that in Hebrew it is often modified in unaccented shut syllables into *ɛ̄* (◌◌), as **עֲנִיָּה**, **חֲפִצָּי** (◌◌); and that in western Syriac it usually appears

as *ɛ̄* (◌◌), e.g. **ܣܦܪܐ** for **ܣܦܪܐ**, **ܣܦܪܐ**, **ܣܦܪܐ**.

As for short *a*, it chiefly appears in Hebrew in a shut syllable with dagesh forte, as **חָקִי**, **עָז**, and the verbal form **קָפַל**.

In an unaccented shut or half-shut syllable it generally becomes

*ɔ*, as **קָדְשׁוֹ** (for **קָדְשׁוֹ**, **קָדְשׁוֹ**); but also **קָדְשׁוֹ**.

In Syriac this vowel is usually written *plene* with **ܘ**, as **ܘܣܦܪܐ**, **ܘܣܦܪܐ**, but you must not therefore imagine it to be long in these and similar words.

An original short *ā* or *ɔ* has sometimes been modified in Hebrew into *ɛ̄*, which may appear in pausal forms as *ɛ̄*. This remark applies especially to the pronouns of the 2nd and 3rd pers. pl. and to the word **אַתָּה**. For instance, **אַתָּם** stands for *ʾantūm*,

as is shewn by the Arabic **أَنْتُمْ** and the Syriac **ܐܢܬܘܢ**. Similarly, the suffixes **כֶּם** and **חֶם** were originally *kūm* and *hūm*, as proved

by the Arabic **كَمْ** and **هَمْ**, the latter of which becomes in certain cases **هَمْ**. The word **אַתָּה** stands for *ʾith*, as shewn by the

suffixed forms אֶתְּךָ, אֶתְּךָ, אֶתְּךָ and אֶתְּךָ, אֶתְּךָ, אֶתְּךָ.

The interchange in these cases between these two dull vowels *ʾ* and *ʾ* will be less surprising to you, if you call to mind such

forms as אֶתְּךָ and אֶתְּךָ from אֶתְּךָ, i.e. *hōsn*, but Arabic حَسَنَ;

further, נָכַח from נָכַח; and the frequent interchange of *ʾ* and *ʾ*

in such words as دَبَّ: تَصَبَّأَن and دَبَّ: تَصَبَّأَن, Syriac ܕܒܐ:

ܕܒܐ, Syriac ܕܒܐ: ܕܒܐ, ܕܒܐ: ܕܒܐ, Syriac ܕܒܐ:

ܕܒܐ, etc.

Let me next call your attention to a set of phenomena which are common in Hebrew to all three short vowels: a weakening and a heightening.

The utmost weakening or (as Bickell calls it) volatilizing of these vowels takes place in Hebrew more especially in the 2nd open syllable before the tone, but also (though less frequently) in the open syllable immediately preceding the tone. As examples of the first case, I may give צִדְקָה for *šaddākhā*,

Arab. مَدَنَةٌ; מְדִינָה for *mā*, مَدِينَةٌ; רִדְפוֹנִי for *rā*, from רִדַּף;

דְּבָרִים for *dā*, from דָּבַר; סִפְרִים for *sī*, from סִפַּר;

בְּרִים for *bī* (*bō*), from בָּקַר; יוֹסַמְמִירוּ for *yūsammīru*, as shewn by the

Arabic. As examples of the second case take: צִדְקָתָא

šid'kath for šaddākt, from צִדְקָה; כְּנָפֵי רוּחַ kānāphē for kānāphē,

from כְּנָף; דְּבַר for dābār, from דָּבַר; the verbal forms קָמְלָה and

קָמְלוּ; the plural participle קוֹטְלִים for kātīlīm, קָטַל; קָטַל for

*kā*, كَتَاب; וְרוּעַ for *ś*, نُرَاع. Sometimes this short vowel is

more distinctly indicated by one of the compound shēvās;

thus: עֲבָדִים for *ʾ*, from עָבַד (for *ʾabd*); עֲנָלִים for *ʾ*, from עָנַל,

עָנַל; עֲנָבִים for *ʾ*, from עָנַב; עֲנָבִים; עָנַב; עָנַב; עָנַב;

יְרַדְפָּךְ, אֶתְּךָ from אֶתְּךָ; חֲדָשׁ, חֲדָשׁ; חֲדָשׁ; חֲדָשׁ;

יְרַדְפָּךְ, אֶתְּךָ from אֶתְּךָ; חֲדָשׁ, חֲדָשׁ; חֲדָשׁ; חֲדָשׁ;

from  $\text{יִרְדָּף}$ ;  $\text{צִפְרִים}$  from  $\text{צִפֹּר}$ ;  $\text{חֲצִי}$ , with suffix  $\text{חֲצִי}$ , in pause  $\text{חֲצִי}$ , for  $\text{חֲצִי}$ . More rarely still a fuller vowel is employed, as in  $\text{קָרְשִׁים}$  (also  $\text{קָרְשִׁים}$ ) from  $\text{קָרַשׁ}$ ,  $\text{שִׁרְשִׁים}$  from  $\text{שִׁרַשׁ}$ ,  $\text{אֲהָלִים}$  (and  $\text{אָהָל}$ ) from  $\text{אָהַל}$ . I call your attention to these last forms in particular, as Delitzsch and Baer have recently sought to revive the erroneous pronunciation *kaddáshim* and *sháráshim*.

The Aramaic, I may remark in passing, shares the tendency of the Hebrew to weaken or volatilize its short vowels, though it often proceeds by different rules. For instance,  $\text{صَهِجِي}$ ,  $\text{صَهِجِنَا}$ , are weakened in exactly the same way as in Hebrew; but  $\text{نَعْمَانَا}$ ,  $\text{نَعْمَانَا}$ , and  $\text{صَهِجَانَا}$  follow different rules from  $\text{נִשְׁמַר}$  and  $\text{קִטְלוֹנִי}$ .

The heightening or elevation of the three short vowels  $\text{ä}$   $\text{ɛ}$   $\text{ɨ}$  takes place in Hebrew, generally speaking, either in the tone-syllable of a word, or in the open syllable immediately preceding the tone. Short  $\text{ä}$  is heightened into  $\text{á}$ ; short  $\text{ɛ}$  into  $\text{é}$ ; and short  $\text{ɨ}$  or  $\text{ɔ}$  into  $\text{ó}$ . Bickell, following Olshausen, speaks of this heightening (§ 42, note 1) as being "merely a mechanical strengthening of the vowel through an  $\text{a}$ , which is placed before it, and which finds its complete analogy in the Indo-Germanic *guna* and the pronunciation of vowels in new high German and modern English<sup>1</sup>." I am not quite sure that I understand this explanation; but it is at all events clear that Olshausen<sup>2</sup> and Bickell regard the heightened vowels  $\text{á}$   $\text{é}$   $\text{ó}$  as arising by contraction from  $\text{ä} + \text{ä}$ ,  $\text{ɛ} + \text{i}$ , and  $\text{ɨ} + \text{i}$ ; and they believe this heightening to have been produced by the solemn reading or chanting of the Scriptures, and not to have existed in the language of ordinary life. As to the latter proposition, I myself believe that the slow and solemn recitation of the Scriptures in the synagogue has exercised a considerable effect upon the punctuation as exhibited to us in the Masoretic text of our Bible; but, on the other hand, I feel sure that even in the speech of everyday life such differences at least as exist between the pausal and the common forms of words must have been

<sup>1</sup> With this compare his explanatory observation at p. 140 [of the Eng. Tr.].

<sup>2</sup> [*Lehrb.* p. 110, § 57 a.]

more or less perceptible. The Egyptian fellah says *mēn hādā* ("who is this?"), but if you knock at his door, he calls out *mīn* ("who's there?"). You ask a shopkeeper *bi-kem er-raṭl*, "how much a pound?"; but if you use the first word only, you say *bi-kām* "how much?" If we consider, further, that the vowels *ɿ* and *ʔ*, *ø* and *ʰ*, frequently interchange in Hebrew, without our being able to assign any satisfactory reason; and that even in Arabic the sound of *kesr* is not, according to the best authorities, so sharp and distinct as that of our *ɿ* in *pin*, but rather inclines towards *ʔ*; we shall I think find little difficulty in believing that the heightened vowels *ā* (◌ā), *ē* (◌ē), *ō* (◌ō), may, as Noeldeke holds, have arisen in Hebrew from the short *ā* *ɿ* *ʰ*, without the addition of any other element.

Of the three vowels, *ɿ* and *ʰ* are almost always heightened in the tone-syllable; as וְקָן for *sāḳān*, כָּהֵן for *kāhēn*, יָדָבָר for *yādābbār*, סִפָּר for *sīḥār*; כָּל for *kāll*, יָקָם for *yāḳām*, קָרָשׁ for *kārāsh*. But *ā* often remains in the tone-syllable; as in דָּבָר, מִשְׁפָּחָה; נָחַל, בַּיִת, קָטַל. In fact, *ā* chiefly appears in the closed tone-syllable of the absolute state of nouns, as in דָּבָר, מִשְׁפָּחָה; and in the open syllable before the tone, as in קָטַל, לָבַשׁ, קָטַל. *ɿ* is also often heightened into *ē* in the open syllable before the tone, as לָבַב for *libāb*, עָנַב for *ʿānab*. The second syllable before the tone is less frequently heightened; as in קָטַל and קָטַל, וְקָטַלְתָּ, וְקָטַרְתָּ (for וְקָטַרְתָּ), אָחִים, etc.

It may have struck you as curious that, in many of the Hebrew words which I have lately cited, the short vowel *ø* and the heightened vowel *ā* should be represented to the eye by the same sign ◌ā. This admits, however, of an easy explanation. Just as the pure *ā* of the Sanskrit is pronounced *ø* in Bengālī, so the heightened *ā* of the Hebrew gradually passed in the mouths of many of the Jews (not of all) into *ā*, and then into *o*. Consequently the punctuators were fairly justified, from a certain point of view, in representing it and *ø* by the same sign, even though there was a difference in the quantity of the two vowels. The same thing happened in the case of ◌ā, which represents

vowels of such different quantities as  $\bar{v}$  in  $\text{בָּנָה}$  and in  $\text{יְנִיחָה}$ . In the former instance, however, some confusion of sounds may actually arise. For instance, the plural of  $\text{בַּיִת}$  is written  $\text{בַּיִתִּים}$ , which must be read *bātim*, and not *bottim*, as is proved by Jewish tradition, by the accentuation, and by the evidence of the cognate Syriac form  $\text{ܒܝܬܝܢ}$  *bātin*. If *bottim* had been right, the Syriac form would certainly have been  $\text{ܒܝܬܝܢ}$ . Another example is afforded by  $\text{רָזִי-לִי}$  (Isaiah xxiv. 16), which, as I believe, is rightly read by Böttcher *rōzi-lī* (from a noun  $\text{רָזִי}$ ), and not *rāzi-lī*.

In treating of this heightening of the vowels, I have taken no account of the Aramaic dialects, because in them it is neither so widely spread nor so readily perceived, owing to the defects of the vowel-system. I think, however, that the vowel of the tone-syllable in such verbal forms as  $\text{نَصَلْ}$ ,  $\text{نَحْضْ}$ ,  $\text{نَضْ}$ , must have differed in sound from that of the first syllable almost, if not quite, as much as in the Hebrew  $\text{יָתַן}$ . As for  $\delta$  in place of  $\bar{u}$ , it occurs, according to the eastern dialect of Syriac, in many verbal and nominal forms; for example, the imperfect and imperative  $\text{ܢܚܝܠ}$  *nəḫīl* (*nīḫīl*),  $\text{ܚܝܠ}$  *ḫīl*; and in the personal pronouns  $\text{ܐܢܝܢ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܢܝ}$ , with the suffixes  $\text{ܘܢܝܢ}$ , and the verbal form  $\text{ܘܢܝܢ}$ . In these latter cases, as we have seen above, the Hebrew has modified the original  $\bar{u}$  into  $\bar{e}$ ,  $\text{אָנִי}$ ,  $\text{אָנִי}$ ,  $\text{אָנִי}$ . The western Syrians weakened this  $\delta$  again into  $u$ , saying  $\text{ܘܢܝܢ}$ , but no doubt the quantity of this vowel much exceeded in length that of the original short  $\bar{u}$  in *nīḫīl*.

I now proceed to speak briefly of the long vowels,  $\bar{a}$ ,  $\bar{i}$ ,  $\bar{u}$ .

Long  $\bar{a}$  has, we may say, almost disappeared from the Hebrew. Just as the long  $\bar{a}$  of the Sanskrit was modified in Greek into  $\eta$  and  $\omega$ , so the long  $\bar{a}$  of the Arabic passed in Hebrew into  $\bar{o}$ . As *dadāmi* became  $\delta\delta\omega\mu\iota$ , or *āmas*,  $\omega\mu\bar{o}s$ <sup>1</sup>, so

<sup>1</sup> [The priority of  $\bar{a}$  in these cases is not now admitted.]

did *kātala* become קוּטַל (Poel); *kāllim*, קוּטַל (participle); חֶמָר, חֶמֶר; etc. Exceptions to this rule are exceedingly rare. פְּתָב, פְּתָב, can scarcely be reckoned a pure Hebrew word; and פְּרָת, פְּרָת, is foreign to both languages [Assyrian *Purāt* (*Burat*), Accadian *Pura-numu*, "the great river"]. מְעֶרָה corresponds to the Arabic مَعَارَة, but the Syriac form has *pathach*, مְעַרְא, and not מְעַרְא. The most conspicuous of apparent exceptions is that which is presented to us by the perfect of verbs ע'ע, as שָׂר, קָם, corresponding to the Arabic بَانَ, قَامَ. Next are adjectives of the form קָפַל, like צִיד, מְבַח, עֵנֵל, אֶבֶר, פְּחֶשׁ, עֵנֵל, מְבַח, צִיד, קָפַל, if they really correspond to such Arabic words as صَيَاد, طَبَاح, أَكَار, etc. This identification, however, is, as we shall afterwards see, somewhat doubtful; the Arabic forms just cited find their precise equivalents in such words as סָכָר = שְׂכָר, جَبَّار = גְּבֹר (in sense סְכִיר), קָפַח = قَفَّار, and, with a rare retention of the original *pathach* in the first syllable, קָנָא = קְנֹא. The Aramaic vowel corresponding to the Arabic *ā* and Hebrew *ō* is the *šikāfā*, א, pronounced by the eastern Syrians even at the present day *ā*, by the western *a* or *ō*, whence the latter represent it in writing by the Greek *omikron*, ο. Compare with the above cited words the Syriac forms ܫܟܝܘܢܐ, ܫܟܝܘܢܐ; ܩܫܘܝܐ, ܩܫܘܝܐ (with dissimilation); ܩܫܘܝܐ, ܩܫܘܝܐ.

This vowel is sometimes weakened, both in Hebrew and Syriac, into *ū*; e.g. קָשׁוּיִם; נְקֻמוֹת; נְקוּמָה, from a sing. קָשׁוּי. Arab. قَشَا; قَشَا, Arab. قَشَا; قَشَا, fem. مְتَوּקָה, pl. مְتَوּקִים; مְעוּנִים, مְעוּנִים, مְעוּנִים, مְעוּנִים, for מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים. As a parallel I may mention



that in some parts of Persia long *ā* is pronounced *ū*, e.g. نَان *nān*, for *nān* or *nān*, "bread"; بِيَا *biyū*, for *biyā* or *biyā*, "come."

But indeed I need go no farther than our own language, where such words as *bone*, *stone* represent an Old English *bān*, *stān*, whilst *moon* stands for *mōna*, which was in its turn preceded by a form *māna*. In the Hebrew words just cited you will observe that this weakening depends upon the removal of the tone to the following syllable; but in the Syriac words it seems to be due to the influence of the letter *n*. The Phœnicians appear to have gone beyond the Hebrews in this respect, pronouncing for instance *shūfēl* instead of שׁוּפֵם (*sufes*, -*ctis*), *rūfēl* for רׁוּפֵא (*shālūsh* (*salus*) for שְׁלוּשׁ, *rūsh* (*rus*) for רֹאשׁ, and in the plur. fem. *alōnūth* for אֱלֹנוֹת. In a shut syllable such an *ū* might even be shortened into *ū*, *ū*; thus נְחֻשָׁתֵם and נְחֻשָׁתֵי from נְחֻשָׁתֵם, נְחֻשָׁתֵי; נְחֻשָׁתֵם, נְחֻשָׁתֵי. I may add that in a few cases, in Aramaic, long *ā* has passed into *ē* and *ī*, just as the Sanskrit *ā* of *dadhāmi* became *ē* in Greek *δαδάμι*, or the Arabic *ā* successively *ē* and *ī*. Thus the Arabic رَأَس *rās* first became رَاس *rās*, which the Hebrews modified into רֹאשׁ, *rōsh*, whilst the Arameans preferred رِيشָא, *rīshā*.

The long vowel *ī* I may here dismiss with the remark that in the few cases where it has been shortened into *ī*, *ī*, this vowel is reheightened by the accent into *ī*. Thus, יְבִין = יִבִּין, but יְבִין and יְבִין = יִבִּין.

So also long *ū* may in certain instances be shortened into *ū*, *ū*, and then this vowel be reheightened into *ū*; as יְשׁוּב = יִשׁוּב, but יְשׁוּב and יְשׁוּב = יִשׁוּב.

Whether long *ū* can in Hebrew be differentiated into *ū* seems a doubtful matter. יְלוּר seems to be identical in form with the

Syriac ܘܢܐܘܢ; and ܘܢܐܘܢ, with its construct plur. ܘܢܐܘܢܐ, may perhaps be only a variation upon ܘܢܐܘܢ, according to the form ܘܢܐܘܢܐ; but both words admit of other explanations. In Aramaic, however, a distinction of this sort existed, and actually forms one of the main distinctions in pronunciation between the eastern and western dialects of Syriac. The modern Syrians still retain *ø* in many forms where *û* prevailed in the west. The vowel is represented by the letter  $\circ$ ; a point above this letter indicates the sound *ø*, beneath it the sound *û*. The Western Syrians, who use the Greek vowels, write  $\alpha$ , i.e. the Greek diphthong *ou*. Some of the principal forms in which the Eastern Syrians pronounced *ø* are the following: the pronominal forms ܐܘܢܐ, ܐܘܢܐ, ܐܘܢܐ, ܐܘܢܐ; the verbal forms ܐܘܢܐ, ܐܘܢܐ; the nominal forms ܐܘܢܐ (ܐܘܢܐ, ܐܘܢܐ); and the diminutive terminations ܐܘܢܐ and ܐܘܢܐ (ܐܘܢܐ, ܐܘܢܐ).

We next enter upon the examination of the so-called diphthongs *ay* (*ai*) and *aw* (*au*).

I have already told you that their sound has been weakened in Arabic to that of *ê* and *è*. Compare in other languages *θαῦμα* and *θῶμα*, *παῖδιον*, vulgar *παῖδι*, *plaustrum* and *plostrum*, *causa* and *chöse*; German *Auge* and Dutch *oog*, German *Stein* and Dutch *steen*; etc. In North Africa, however, a further weakening has taken place into *û* and *i*. Thus *يَوْم* *yawum* has gradually become first *yôm* and then *yûm*; *بَيْت* *bayt*, first *bêt* and then *bît*.

Now mark the same progression in the other Semitic languages.

In Assyrian I find that our authorities write *šumu*, *bītu*, *īnu* (عين), *bīsu* (egg) without apparently the slightest trace of the older forms, which must necessarily have preceded them.

In Hebrew *ay* and *aw* are of somewhat rare occurrence in a perfectly pure form; for example, ܘܢܐܘܢ, ܘܢܐܘܢ, ܘܢܐܘܢ, ܘܢܐܘܢ.

עֹלָה (حوران); in the suffixed form דְּבָרַי; and when the letters ו and י are doubled, as פֶּן, דִּין ("cake"), or with suffixes גָּנָה, גָּנָה, חַי. More generally *ay* and *aw* are modified in various ways.

At the end of a word י= usually becomes ׀ or ׀. We find סיני, שָׂרִי, שָׂרִי, and the like; but far more frequently ׀, as יִגְלָה, מְרָאָה, (in the construct state שָׂרָה), imper. גְּלָה. The intermediate step is marked by the pronunciation of the LXX., Σινᾶ, Σάρα, corresponding to the Arabic termination *in* مِني, رمي, *Minā, ramā*, which some pronounce with the 'imālah, *Mīnā, ramā*. In other cases, the *ā* element in the diphthong prevailed in Hebrew, and the termination became *ā*, ׀, as in גְּלָה. On these points I shall have more to say when I come to treat of the verbs לָה.

In the body of a word *ay* and *aw* exhibit several modifications. Sometimes a supplementary vowel is introduced, to lighten the pronunciation; as בֵּית for בִּית, מֶטָה for מִטָה. This latter form, in which the *ā* is heightened to *ā* is rare: אֵן, מֶטָה; but שָׂא, like גֵּיא. The same supplementary vowel is found in the termination of the dual, יִם standing for יִם, Arabic *ayn*. At other times the *ā* sound in the diphthong predominates, yielding *ā* instead of *ay*. So מֵאן, אֵנָה, אֵן, for מֵאן, Arabic *āyīn* for *ayīn*; עֵינַם for עֵינִים; בָּתִּים *bātīm* for *ayīnīm*; דָּתִן for דָּתִן; אֵן, Arabic *āyīn*, from בֵּית; the suffixed form דְּבָרַי, also written דְּבָרוּ, for דְּבָרַי. You will find a similar substitution of *ā* for *ai* in the older stages of our own language. The Gothic *ai* in *hails*, *hlaihs*, and *aigan*, became in Anglosaxon *hāl*, *hlāf*, and *āgan*, in English *whole*, *loaf* and *own*.

<sup>1</sup> If so, גֵּית follows the form of תֹּר, תֹּרִים; גֵּית, גֵּיתִים; אֵל, אֵלִים; לָל, לָלִים; not that of שָׂר, שָׂרִים; עֵר, עֵרִים; פֵּישׁ, פֵּישִׁים; חֵל, חֵלִים; עֵן, עֵנִים; גֵּיתִים. Noeldeke however pronounces the word *bātīm*.

Generally speaking, however, *ay* and *aw* are modified as in vulgar Arabic into *ē* and *ō*, the *ē* being represented by יׁ, and sometimes by י׃, the *ō* by ם. So in אׁ for אׁ (with suffix, אׁ), אׁ for אׁ (אׁ, אׁ); in segolate nouns צׁם, שׁור, and in the construct state בׁית, מׁות; in the Niphal and Hiphil of verbs פׁ, as נׁלד for נׁלד, הׁלד for הׁלד, הׁיטב for הׁיטב; and in several forms of verbs לׁה, as גׁלית for גׁלית, הׁגלית for הׁגלית, הׁגלינה for הׁגלינה. This *ē* is frequently attenuated into *i*, and more rarely *ō* into *ū*. Thus גׁלית for גׁלית, גׁלית, as in the vulgar Arabic of North Africa رمت *r'mit* for *r'mēt* (*ramaita*). Perhaps also the proper name אמניון, instead of אמנן (2 Sam. xiii. 20), if we regard it as a contemptuous diminutive, "that wretch of an Amnon." אמניון would then stand for אמניון i.e. *'umainān*, just as, in vulgar Arabic, كُفَيْفَة for *kufaiḥah*, as the diminutive of كُفَّة *kuffah*, "a basket." As examples of *ō* becoming *ū*, I may mention לו for לו, Arabic لُو; יׁכל for יׁכל; יׁכל, imperf. of יׁכל; and נׁני, part. plur. Niphal of יׁנה, for נׁני; נׁני. Here again we find a parallel in the vulgar Arabic forms of the imperfect of verbs يُوَصِّلُ, يُوَقِّفُ, يُوَعِدُ, for يُوَصِّلُ, يُوَقِّفُ, يُوَعِدُ.

In Aramaic the position of matters is on the whole, *mutatis mutandis*, much the same as in Hebrew. In Syriac the original diphthongs appear, however, more frequently than in Hebrew; for example in the emphatic form of the segolates חַנְּא, חַנְּא; in the construct plural מְכַפְּ, where the Bibl. Aramaic, like the Hebrew, has מְכַפְּ; in the plural suffixed forms מְכַפְּ, מְכַפְּ, מְכַפְּ (Ch. מְכַפְּ); in the Aphel of verbs פׁ, as אַמְ, אַמְ, אַמְ (Ch. אַמְ, אַמְ); and in such words as the diminutives חַמְּ and חַמְּ (Ch. חַמְּ).

At the end of a word we find forms similar to those of the Hebrew; e.g. with *z*, חֲמַנָּן חֲמַנָּן חֲמַנָּן; with *ā*, חֲמַנָּן.

In the body of a word, Syriac *ay* sometimes becomes *z*, as in the construct חֲמַנָּן, and in the duals חֲמַנָּן, חֲמַנָּן; in Biblical Aramaic חֲמַנָּן, but חֲמַנָּן.

The *ā*-sound predominates, for example, in Targumatic חֲמַנָּן (200) and חֲמַנָּן [חֲמַנָּן] (80, for חֲמַנָּן, as well as חֲמַנָּן, חֲמַנָּן); in the plural חֲמַנָּן; in the adverb אֲבָר, pronounced *ākk* (Ch. אֲבָר, אֲבָר); in the plural suffixed forms of the Jewish Aramaic חֲמַנָּן or חֲמַנָּן, "thy servants," [Targumatic] חֲמַנָּן or [Biblical] חֲמַנָּן [חֲמַנָּן] "her servants," חֲמַנָּן "our servants," as contrasted with חֲמַנָּן and חֲמַנָּן.

Further, *z* sinks into *z*, according to the western pronunciation, in the simple forms of the segolates חֲמַנָּן; also in the forms חֲמַנָּן (construct), חֲמַנָּן, חֲמַנָּן; in many forms of the 1st and 2nd pers. in the perf. of verbs חֲמַנָּן, as perf. Peal חֲמַנָּן (but Nestorian חֲמַנָּן), Pael חֲמַנָּן and חֲמַנָּן, etc. Similarly, *ā* sinks into *ā*, in חֲמַנָּן "if" (= חֲמַנָּן); and, at least according to the western pronunciation, in the simple state of the segolates חֲמַנָּן ("end").

In the later Aramaic dialects there is a strong tendency to get rid of the diphthongs. Already in old Syriac we find אֲבָר, with short *ā*, for אֲבָר; חֲמַנָּן, for חֲמַנָּן, חֲמַנָּן; and another example of the same kind is חֲמַנָּן (for חֲמַנָּן); but the modern Syrian says *kk* for חֲמַנָּן; חֲמַנָּן or חֲמַנָּן (חֲמַנָּן) for חֲמַנָּן; חֲמַנָּן (חֲמַנָּן) for חֲמַנָּן and חֲמַנָּן, חֲמַנָּן and חֲמַנָּן; חֲמַנָּן, "houses," חֲמַנָּן "our houses"; and even חֲמַנָּן

for **כְּחֻבָּ**. So also, though to a less extent, in Mandaitic, where we find **לִית** as well as **לֵאִיית** (**לִית**), and **קְרִית** for **מְאֵ** as well as **מְאֵ**.

I will now say a few words on the different classes of supplementary vowels, especially in Hebrew. These, as is indicated by the term which I have just employed, do not belong to the original vocalisation of the word, but have been introduced at subsequent periods, to make the pronunciation of it easier by facilitating the utterance of a harsh consonant or of a combination of consonants.

(1) The so-called *furtive pathach*, which is inserted between a long or heightened vowel and the final gutturals **ה** **ח** **ה**; as **אֱלֹהֵי** for *eloh*, Aram. **אֱלֹהֵא**, **אֱלֹהֵא**, Arab. **إِلَهٍ** for *serō*, Aram. **רְדֵעָא**, **רְדֵעָא**, Arab. **رَدَعٍ**; **תַּפְּחָא** for *tappūh*, Arab. **تَفَّاحٍ**; **מְשַׁלְּלֵי** for *mēshallēh*, i.e. *mushallāh*; **רֹחַ** for *rūh*, **רוּחַ**; **רֵעַ** for *rē*, *rī*. This sound is heard in the spoken Arabic of the present day, in such words as **صَاحِبٍ**, **رِيحٍ**, **رُوحٍ**, **مَمْفُوحٍ**, **بَطِيحٍ**, **سُطْحٍ**, **مَلِيحٍ**, and never has been, written in this language or in Syriac, where we find only **لَقَطَقْتَنِي** **حَسَد** and the like.

(2) The auxiliary *pathach* which is sometimes inserted between **ע** or **ח** and **ך** or **ת** at the end of a word. It is so slight in sound as not even to effect the aspiration of the **ך** or **ת**. For example: **שְׂמֵעַתְּ**, **שְׂכַחַתְּ**, **הַמְלַחַתְּ**, as well as **שְׂכַחַתְּ**, **לְקַחַתְּ**; **יִרְדְּ**, **יִרְדְּ**, **יִפְתְּ**, **יִפְתְּ**, as compared with **יִרְדְּ** for **יִרְדְּ**.

(3) The auxiliary vowel **ֵ**, **ֶ**, **ִ**, in various nominal and verbal forms, which is very little stronger than no. 2. For example, in segolate nouns: **נָעַר**, **תַּחַתְּ**, **יֶלֶדְּ**, **זָרַעְּ**, **פָּרָא**, **סִפְרָא**, **מִנְיָא**, **פְּעֵל**, **קָרַשׁ**, **נִצַּח**, and in the dual termination **ֵי**. The auxiliary is actually wanting in such words as **נָרַדְּ**, **קָשַׁטְּ**.

(also קָשַׁם), חָטָא, גִּיָּא, שִׂיָּא. And again, in the shortened imperfect or jussive of verbs לִיהַ : וּדְרַבְּ, וּדְרַף, וּנְל, וּתְכַל, וּתְעַשׂ, וּבְכַד, יִשְׁט, וּיִשְׁתַּח, וּוּרַד, וּיִפַּת; יִחַר, יִרַע, יִרָא, וּיִשְׁכַּח, וּיִשְׁכַּח, and וּיִרָא, where perhaps the final shēvā may have once been slightly moveable, *wayyifitē, wē-yērdē*, etc. A somewhat similar insertion of a short *ä* takes place in Mandaitic in the word וּיִאֲךַ for וּיִאֲכַ, and in the plural suffix of the 1st pers. וּיִאֲנַ for וּיִאֲנַ, as כַּאֲפַאֲיָאן our hands, עַדֲאֲיָאן our hands. Perhaps also in the pronoun of the 2nd pers. masc. אַנְאָת, אַנְאָתוֹן. The vulgar Arabic has this auxiliary vowel, for example, in the segolates, صَبَحَ, *subḥ*, رَمَحَ, *rumḥ*, سَطَحَ, *saṭḥ*, نَسَحَ, *näsḥ*, نَفَسَ, *nafḥ*.

(4) A guttural letter at the end of a toneless syllable often takes a very short vowel, when an ordinary consonant would remain vowelless. This vowel, which is represented in writing by a *compound shēvā*, conforms in character to the preceding vowel. Thus: יַעֲמַד and יַחֲזֹק, for יַעֲמַד and יַחֲזֹק, of the form יַחֲזֹק; יַחֲרִים and יַחֲרִים, for יַחֲרִים and יַחֲרִים; יַקְטִיל and יַקְטִיל, for יַקְטִיל and יַקְטִיל. Examples to the contrary are: יַאֲכַר, יַאֲשֵׁם, יַאֲרַף, and יַעֲשֵׂן, יַחֲשַׁב, יַחֲבֵא, יַעֲשֵׂן, יַעֲשֵׂן, יַעֲשֵׂן, יַעֲשֵׂן.

(5) The compound shēvā spoken of under no. 4 frequently becomes a *full short vowel*, when the guttural is followed by a consonant with the shortest vowel (*shēvā mobile*). Thus

with	יַעֲמַד	compare	יַעֲמַדוֹ	for	יַעֲמַדוֹ
"	יַחֲזֹק	"	יַחֲזֹקוֹ	"	יַחֲזֹקוֹ
"	וַיַּאֲכַר	"	וַיַּאֲכַרוּ	"	וַיַּאֲכַרוּ
"	נִאֲכַר	"	נִאֲכַרוּ	"	נִאֲכַרוּ
"	נַעֲרוֹ	"	נַעֲרוֹ	"	נַעֲרוֹ
"	פַּעֲלוֹ	"	פַּעֲלוֹ	"	פַּעֲלוֹ

but on the contrary observe such forms as יַחֲזֹקוֹ, יַחֲזֹקוֹ.

Of this supplementary vowel a far wider use is made in Aramaic. Thus in the Targums we find  $\text{מְרִינְחָא}$  for  $\text{מְרִינְחָא}$ ,  $\text{מְשִׁירִיתָא}$  for  $\text{מְשִׁירִיתָא}$ ; whilst in Syriac we may say  $\text{مُحْيِنُنَا}$ ,  $\text{مُحْيِنُنَا}$ ,  $\text{نُحْنَفُنَا}$  and  $\text{فُحْصُنُنَا}$ , for  $\text{مُحْيِنُنَا}$ ,  $\text{نُحْنَفُنَا}$ ,  $\text{نُحْنَفُنَا}$ ,  $\text{نُحْنَفُنَا}$  and  $\text{فُحْصُنُنَا}$ ,  $\text{نُحْنَفُنَا}$ ,  $\text{نُحْنَفُنَا}$ ,  $\text{نُحْنَفُنَا}$  and  $\text{فُحْصُنُنَا}$  for  $\text{نُحْنَفُنَا}$ ,  $\text{نُحْنَفُنَا}$  and  $\text{فُحْصُنُنَا}$ . In Mandaitic this insertion is very general, the vowel *u* being also occasionally employed, as  $\text{הוֹכּוֹמַתָא}$  and  $\text{הוֹכּוֹמַתָא}$  ( $\text{הוֹכּוֹמָא}$ ,  $\text{הוֹכּוֹמָא}$ ),  $\text{נִיְצִיבְתָא}$  and  $\text{נִיְצִיבְתָא}$  ( $\text{נִיְצָבָא}$ ); in the conjugation Ethpe'el, the normal form is  $\text{עַחְיַסְבָּ}$  =  $\text{עַחְיַסְבָּ}$ .

(6) Here, too, may find its place the *prothetic vowel*, which is prefixed to a word to facilitate the pronunciation of an initial consonant which has weakened or lost its original vowel. Compare in Greek  $\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\alpha\lambda\pi\omega$  and  $\sigma\alpha\lambda\pi\omega$ ; Spanish *escudo*, *escuela*; French *espère*, *esprit*; Italian *con isciienza*, *in Ispagna*. In ancient Arabic this vowel is usually  $\aleph$  or  $\eta$ , as in the imperative  $\text{أَقْرُقِ}$ ,  $\text{أَجْلِسْ}$ ,  $\text{أَقْتُلْ}$ ; in the verbal conjugations  $\text{أَقْتُلُ}$ ,  $\text{أَقْتَلْتُ}$ , and  $\text{أَسْتَقْتُلُ}$ ; in  $\text{أَبْنٌ}$  (for  $\text{بَنْيٌ}$ ), *son*,  $\text{أَتْنَانٌ}$ , *two*,  $\text{أَسْمٌ}$  or  $\text{أَسْمٌ}$ , *name*, etc. In the vulgar dialects examples are far more numerous; e.g.  $\text{أَقَاتَلْ}$  and  $\text{أَقَاتَلْ}$ , for  $\text{تَقَاتَلْ}$  and  $\text{تَقَاتَلْ}$ ,

$\text{أَمْبَارَكْ}$  for  $\text{مَبَارَكْ}$ , etc. In Hebrew we find  $\aleph$ ,  $\text{א}$ , as in  $\text{אָרָוּעַ}$  for  $\text{רָוּעַ}$ ,  $\text{אָצְעָרָה}$  for  $\text{צְעָרָה}$ , and perhaps a few more, such as  $\text{אָחֻמּוֹל}$  and  $\text{אָחֻמּוֹל}$ ,  $\text{אָתֻנָּן}$ ,  $\text{אָשֻׁפָּר}$  "measure." In  $\text{שְׁתִּים}$  the prothetic  $\aleph$ , though pronounced by many of the Jews, has not been written. In Aramaic occur both  $\text{א}$  and  $\text{א}$ . Already in Biblical Aramaic we have  $\text{אָרְכַבְהָ}$  "knee," in the Palestinian dialect  $\text{אַחְסַחְהָ}$ . In Syriac we find  $\text{אַسְכְּ}$  for  $\text{سك}$ ,  $\text{אַسְفַحְהָ}$  for  $\text{سفع}$ .



[מַצְלָה, מַצְלָה, מַצְלָה] for [מַצְלָה, מַצְלָה, מַצְלָה] "street,"  
 [מַצְלָה] and [מַצְלָה] for [מַצְלָה] and [מַצְלָה], [מַצְלָה] for [מַצְלָה] or [מַצְלָה], etc.  
 In [מַצְלָה] the prosthetic vowel has been influenced by the  
 original vowel of the  $\dot{\text{z}}$ , as shewn in the Arabic <sup>لُحْمٌ</sup>لَحْمٌ. In the  
 later dialects of Aramaic, examples of the prosthetic vowels  
 become more and more numerous.

(7) Different from this vowel is the likewise very short  
 vowel which is occasionally prefixed in Hebrew and Aramaic to  
 words beginning with a consonant and a full vowel. This  
 addition may sometimes find its explanation in the harshness of  
 the initial consonant, as when it is ק, ט, or even ר; but in other  
 cases even this reason is wanting. Examples in Hebrew are:

אֲנֵבִיחִים "melons" (بَطِيخٌ, صِهْحَا), אֲבַעְבָּעִת "blains" or "small

blisters" (صَحْقَعِيْنٌ "bubbles" of water), אֲנַפִּים "wings" of an

army, אֲזֻקִים "fetters," אֲנַרְטָלִים probably the same as *καρταλος*,

*καρταλλος*, which is also found in Arabic and Syriac; אֲדַרְכָּן

a Persian coin, called by the Greeks *δρακίος*<sup>1</sup>; אֲנָו "a nut,"

Arab. حَوْر, Syr. ܐܘܘܢܐ, probably from the Persian گوز *guz*; in Syriac

ܐܘܘܢܐ for ܐܘܢܐ (Pers. راز), where the ܐ was doubtless once sounded,

*ārasā*; in later dialects אֲדַם for דַם "blood," אֲטַפָּה "leaf," for

טַפָּה; Mand. עֲשׂוּמִיָּה for שׂוּמִיָּה "heaven," אֲרַמְתָּה for

רַמְתָּה "heights," אֲקַמְרָה "wool," אֲקַמְרָה "dust," for the

older ܐܘܘܢܐ and ܐܘܢܐ.

This concludes what I have to say for the present upon the  
 consonants and vowels of the languages with which we are  
 dealing—Arabic, Hebrew and Syriac. I now proceed to treat  
 of the different parts of speech, beginning with the pronouns.

<sup>1</sup> [In a Phoenician inscription of 96 B.C., recently found at the Piræus, ܐܘܘܢܐ and ܐܘܢܐ seem to stand for *δραχμαί*.]

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE PRONOUNS.

HERE let me call your attention, in the first place, to certain elements which enter into the formation of a great many of the pronouns, as well as of the demonstrative and other particles, of the Semitic languages. I can give these elements no better general or common name than that of *demonstrative* letters or syllables. Their origin and precise original force are in most cases unknown to me; or, at all events, I can only make such guesses at them as it is hardly worth while to lay before you just now, when you have need rather of facts than of speculations. The principal of these demonstrative letters, so far as regards the pronouns, are: א and ה, ו and ת, ש, כ, ל, מ, נ, י and י. We shall notice each of them more particularly as occasion requires in our survey of the pronouns.

#### A. *The Personal Pronouns.*

In treating of the personal pronouns I shall begin, for reasons which will afterwards become apparent, with the suffixed forms which we find appended to substantives in the singular.

Of the 1st pers. sing. the fullest form in actual use is the Arabic *أنا* - *ana*, which is usually shortened, according to circum-

stances, into *أنا* *ya* or *أنا* *i*, as *أنا نفسي*, *أنا نفسي*. It is

obviously identical with the Ethiopic *P*: *ya*, in *ሰናይ*: *nafstya*; and with the Assyrian *ya*, in *bit-ya* "my house." This latter,

I am told, becomes  $i$  and in certain cases  $a$ , as *bintī* “my daughter,” *abiā* (for *abiya*), as well as *abi* and even *aba*, “my father”; with which last compare such Arabic forms as  $\text{يَابْنِ اَمِّ}$  *ya’bna ‘amma*,  $\text{يَا رَبًّا}$  *yā rabbā*. The Hebrew form is, as you all know,  $\text{אב}$ , of which the *yūd*, though written, is no longer pronounced in Syriac:  $\text{ܘܕܐܒܝܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܘܕܐܒܝܐܘܠܐܕܝܢܐ}$ . The intermediate step, no doubt, was the shortening of  $i$  into  $\gamma$ , which we find sometimes in old Arabic, especially in vocative forms like  $\text{يَا رَبِّ}$ , which in pause would be pronounced  $\text{يَا رَبِّ}$  *yā rabb*. The corresponding plural is in Arab.  $\text{أب}$  *ab*, sometimes shortened into *ab*; in Eth.  $\text{ኃ}$ : *ab*, in Assyrian *ab* or *ab*, Heb.  $\text{אב}$ , Aram.  $\text{ܐܒ}$ , Syr.  $\text{ܐܒ}$ , as  $\text{ܐܒܝܐܘܠܐܕܝܢܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܒܝܐܘܠܐܕܝܢܐ}$ . These plural forms serve also to designate the accusative after a verb, and we have here evidently the same  $n$  that appears in the suffix of the accusative sing., viz. Arab.  $\text{نِي}$  *niya* or *ni*, Eth.  $\text{ኃ}$ : *ni*, Assyrian *ni*, Heb.  $\text{נִי}$ , Aram.  $\text{ܢܝ}$ , Syr.  $\text{ܢܝ}$  (*n* (the *yūd* being suppressed).

In the 2nd person we find a necessary distinction of gender introduced by the differentiation of the final vowel; the masc. form was originally, as in Arabic,  $\text{كَ}$  *kā*, the fem.  $\text{كِي}$  *kī*. Identical with these are the Ethiopic  $\text{ኃ}$ : *ka*,  $\text{ኄ}$ : *kī*, and the Assyrian *ka*, *kī*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are  $\text{כ}$  and  $\text{כִּי}$ , the latter generally abbreviated into  $\text{כ}$ . The Aramaic forms are  $\text{ܟܝܘܪ}$  for the masc. and  $\text{ܟܝܘܪܝܐ}$  for the fem., but the *yūd* has become silent,  $\text{ܟܠܘܪܝܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܟܠܘܪܝܐܘܠܐܕܝܢܐ}$ ; so that these forms are identical with those of the vulgar Arabic, masc.  $\text{كَ}$  *ak*, or *k*, fem. *ek* or *kī*. The plurals were originally, as in Arabic, masc.  $\text{كُم}$  *kumū*, shortened into *kum*, fem. *kunna*; Ethiopic  $\text{ኃ}$ : *kēn* and  $\text{ኄ}$ : *kēn*; Assyrian *kunū* or *kun*, of which the fem., according to analogy, should be *kina* or *kin*. The Hebrew forms are

כָּם for *kām*, fem. כָּן, but for the latter the fuller כָּנָה or כְּנָה sometimes occurs. The Aramaic forms are כָּן, fem. כָּנָה, but כָּם is also found in Biblical Aramaic (Ezra).

In the 3rd person we have again a variation of vowels according to gender. The Arabic forms are, masc. *hu* (with long vowel, though written defectively), which becomes *hi* when preceded by an *i*, as *abū-hu*, *abī-hi*; fem. *hi*. The corresponding forms in Ethiopic are *hu*: *hū*, *hi*: *hā*. In Hebrew the masc. is *hu*, but also *hu*, *hu*, which is nearly identical with the vulgar Arabic *hu*, pronounced *u* or *o*, as in *kuṭāb*, also written *kuṭūb*. The Hebrew fem. is *hi* and *hi*. In Aramaic the masc. is *hu*, fem. *hi*. The corresponding plurals in Arabic are, masc. *humū*, generally abbreviated *hum*, which may be changed by the influence of a preceding *i* into *himū* or *himī* and *him*; the fem. is *hinna* or *hinna*. The Ethiopic has *humū* and *hinna*. The Hebrew forms are, masc. *hem* and *hem*, or, with final vowel, *hem*; fem. *hen* (rarely *hen*) and *hen*, or, with final vowel, *hen*, *hen*, *hen*. In Aramaic we find *hem* and *hem*, but in the Aramaic of Ezra also *hem*. In contrast with these stand the Assyrian suffixes with initial *h*; sing. masc. *hu*, fem. *ha*, plur. masc. *hunu* or *hun*, fem. *hina* or *hin*. A similar form is found in one of the Himyaritic dialects, where the sing. masc. is written *hu* or *hu*, pl. *hum*, whereas in the other we find *hu* and *hu*; and traces of it exist in the modern Mehri, in which according to Maltzan, the sing. masc. is *he*, fem. *es*, plur. masc. *hum*, fem. *senn*.

From a comparison of these various forms we may fairly assume the oldest shape of the suffixed pronouns actually known to us to be:

1st sing.	<i>iya</i>	plur.	<i>nā</i>	dual (only in Arabic)
2nd	„ m. <i>ka</i>	„	m. <i>kumū</i>	} <i>kumā</i>
	„ f. <i>ki</i>	„	f. <i>kunna</i>	
3rd	„ m. <i>sū, hū</i>	„	m. <i>sūnu, humū</i>	} <i>humā</i>
	„ f. <i>sā, hā</i>	„	f. <i>sīna, hunna</i>	

I have put *sū* and *hū* together in order to lay before you two alternatives; viz. (1) *hū* may be identical with *sū*, initial *s* having passed into *h*, just as in Sanskrit compared with Persian, or Greek compared with Latin; or (2) *sū* and *hū* may spring from different demonstrative letters *s* and *h*, a point to which we shall have to recur hereafter.

From these suffixed pronouns *iya*, *ka* and *hū*, we obtain, by prefixing the demonstrative syllable *an* (אן), the three pronouns *aniya*, *anka* and *anhū*. The syllable *an*,—itself a compound of א and נ,—we may regard as a sort of demonstrative particle or interjection, akin probably to the Arabic <sup>ا</sup>ان, <sup>ا</sup>ان, Hebrew <sup>ה</sup>ה, <sup>ה</sup>ה, Syriac <sup>ا</sup>ا, and Ethiopic <sup>ላ</sup>ላ: in <sup>ላ</sup>ላ፡፡: *en'kēmū*, “en vobis = accipite.”

The third of these pronouns, *anhū*, appears but rarely as an independent word. I would instance the Talmudic <sup>א</sup>איה, fem. <sup>א</sup>איה, possibly assimilated from <sup>א</sup>איה, <sup>א</sup>איה, with the first vowel weakened from *a* to *i*. At any rate, the plural forms, which are without assimilation, are <sup>א</sup>איה, <sup>א</sup>איה, for <sup>א</sup>איה, <sup>א</sup>איה. In Syriac too we find <sup>ا</sup>ا, <sup>ا</sup>ا, assimilated for <sup>ا</sup>ا, <sup>ا</sup>ا. Otherwise these forms are used as suffixes; for example, in Hebrew, <sup>א</sup>איה, as <sup>א</sup>איה, assimilated <sup>א</sup>איה, fem. <sup>א</sup>איה; and also in the later Aramaic dialects, as Mand. <sup>א</sup>איה or <sup>א</sup>איה, fem. <sup>א</sup>איה; Talm. <sup>א</sup>איה, <sup>א</sup>איה.

The same is the case with the second of the above pronouns, *anka*, which appears in Hebrew only as a suffix, e.g. <sup>א</sup>איה (from <sup>א</sup>איה, Jerem. xxii. 24), usually with assimilation <sup>א</sup>איה; in Mand. <sup>א</sup>איה, fem. <sup>א</sup>איה.

The first of these three forms, *aniya*, is found, however, with slight modifications in most of the Semitic languages. What its

origin may be, I can hardly pretend to explain, unless we connect it with a demonstrative root *i*, "this," also found in the Indo-European languages, in which case *an-iya* would literally mean *behold this one* or *this one here*, as a designation of the speaker. This would still, however, leave the final element *ya* or *a* unaccounted for.

In Hebrew the form *aniya* appears almost intact in אֲנִי, in pause, with fuller vowel, אֲנִי. In the other languages the older form is more or less obscured: Arabic, اُنْ اُنْ, with short *a* in both syllables, dialectically *ānā*, in pause *ānā* and *ānāh*; Ethiopic likewise እን: *ānā*; J. Aram. אֲנִי (אֲנִי Bibl.) or אֲנִי, Syriac ܐܢܝ *ənā* or *ənō*. Similarly in the younger dialects: Tigré እን: *anā*, Tigrīña እን: *anē* or እን: *anā*, Amharic እን: *ənā*; Mand. אֲנִי, modern Syriac ܐܢܝ. As the proper plural of אֲנִי we may regard אֲנֵינוּ (Jerem. xlii. 6, *kēthibh*), to which, among the later dialects, the Amharic offers a parallel in the form *ənā*. I may add that in Arabic, Ethiopic and Syriac this pronoun is liable to considerable mutilation. In Arabic we find اُنْ *an*, and likewise in Ethiopic, when followed by the particle *sa*: እን: *an-sa*. In Syriac the first syllable is liable to be elided under certain circumstances, whence arise such forms as ܐܢܝܐ, ܐܢܝܐ, ܐܢܝܐ, and finally, dropping the last vowel, ܐܢܝܐ. Hence in modern Syriac the verbal form of the present, 1st pers. sing. ܐܢܝܐ *I end*, ܐܢܝܐ *I repair*.

There is, however, another form of the pronoun of the 1st pers. sing., which we must endeavour to explain, namely that which is found in Assyrian, Hebrew and Phoenician. Here the first demonstrative basis, *an*, has been strengthened by the addition of a second, *ak* or *āk*, which I take to be compounded of *ḥ* and *ḳ*, and to be akin to such words as אֲכָ, ܐܚܐ, "here," הֵנָּה "thus, here, now," הַיּ "that," הֵנָּה "here," הֵנָּה "how," etc. As the oldest form I venture to write *anākiya* or *anāki*, whence

in Assyrian *anāku* (Haupt, *anakū*), in which the 2nd syllable must surely be long, as the corresponding Hebrew form is אָנֹכִי, in pause אָנֹכִי. The Hebrew has preserved the vowel of the last syllable in a purer state than the Assyrian. On the Moabite stone it appears as אַנְך, probably pronounced *ánōkh*; whilst in Phoenician inscriptions we also find אַנְך, which in the ears of Plautus sounded like *anēch*. I may remind you in passing that the Egyptian pronoun was also *anek*, *cnek*, and the Coptic אⲛⲟⲕ. The form *āku*, without the prefix *an*, is employed in Assyrian as an enclitic with the force of the substantive verb, e.g. *sarrāku* "I am king," *rabbāku* "I am great," *sikarāku* "I am manly"; thus corresponding to the use of אֲנִי for אֲנִי in Syriac.

The corresponding plural form is still more remarkable: Assyr. *antni*, *ntni*, *ntnu* for *anihni*, *anahni*, Heb. אֲנַחְנִי, Phoen. אַנְחַן. Here then ח of the singular has interchanged with ת (as in אֲחַד, אֲחַדִּים, compared with אֲחַד, אֲחַדִּים compared with אֲחַדִּים), and the vowel has been shortened in the shut syllable. The last syllable of the word, חִי, is probably shortened from אֲנַחְנִי, the plural form of אֲנִי, which we mentioned above. This plural אֲנַחְנִי, abbreviated in Hebrew itself into אַחְנִי, is found, in some shape or other, in nearly all the Semitic dialects. Arabic: نَحْنُ, vulgar نَحْنُ *nehne*, *nehn*, أَيْنَا *ahnā* in Egypt *ihna*. Ethiopic: ኢክኑ: *nehna*, Tigré *nahna*, Tigrīṣṭa *nehnā*. Syriac, with an additional demonstrative *n* at the end, אֲנַחְנֵנָּה, commonly אֲנַחְנֵנָּה, which is shortened in pronunciation into *nan*, as in אֲנַחְנֵנָּה. Also אֲנַחְנֵנָּה, with prosthetic vowel, whence in modern Syriac אֲנַחְנֵנָּה and אֲנַחְנֵנָּה, but also *āklenōkhun* (with a curious assimilation to the pronoun of the 2nd pers. *ākhtōkhun*). In Samaritan we also find the form אַחְחַן, whilst in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac, אַחְחַן,

and in the modern Syriac of Ma'lūla, ܐܢܝܗ *anah*, the final *n* has vanished. Jewish Aramaic forms are ܐܢܝܢܐ and ܢܝܢܐ; but in several dialects the guttural has been elided, whence in the Talmud ܐܢܝ, in Samaritan ܐܢܝ, in Mandaitic ܐܢܝ (*anēn* for *anān*), and in Palestinian Syriac ܐܝ and more commonly ܐܝܝ. Likewise in Assyrian, as above mentioned, *antni*, *ntni* or *ntnu*.

On reviewing what I have said about the pronoun of the 1st pers. sing., you may think that much of it is very precarious and doubtful; in particular that the derivations which I have ventured to suggest of the forms ܐܢܝܢܐ and ܢܝܢܐ are very far-fetched; that ܐܢܝ can hardly be compounded with a demonstrative particle or interjection, '+(ܓ+ܢ), and ܐܢܝܢܐ with two words of that class '+(ܓ+ܢ)+(ܓ+ܢ). In reply I can only point to the history of the pronominal forms in other languages, for instance the Romance. Whence comes the French *ce*? In some cases it appears in the modern language as *cel*, for which the older form is *cest*. But *cest* is identical with the Italian *questo*, which springs from *eccu isto*, i.e. *eccum istum*, i.e. *ecce eum istum*! Even the English *I* is but the last remnant of *ich* or *ik*, *ego*, ܐܝܘܐ, ܐܝܘܐ, Sanskrit *aham*, all pointing to an original *agham* or *agam*, which has been supposed to be made up of three elements, *a* + *gha* (or *ga*) + *m*, the first of which is either the demonstrative root *a* "this," or else a mutilation of *ma*; whilst the second is a particle, identical with the Greek *γε*, and the third, in all probability, another demonstrative letter.

I pass on to the pronoun of the 2nd person in its independent form. Here the demonstrative syllable *an* is prefixed, not to the syllable *ka*, but to *ta*. Both these syllables are, it seems likely, also of a demonstrative character, and admit of being explained in one of two ways. Either (1) *ka* is a mere variety of *ta* (compare τὸς τῆ with Sanskrit *nā-ki-s* "nemo," *ki-m* "what?" *quis*, *quid*); or (2) they spring from different demonstrative letters, *k* and *t*. The one of these we have already mentioned as lying at the root of ܟܢܐ, ܟܢܐ, ܟܢܐ, and similar words; whilst the other gives birth to various forms, of some of which we shall have to treat presently. If so, the pronoun of the 2nd person designates the individual spoken



to as a "this" or "here," in contradistinction to the more remote "that" or "there" of the 3rd person. In the Indo-European languages the same element seems to lie at the root of both pronouns, for Sanskrit *tvam*, i.e. *tu-am*, "thou," differs only in its vowel from *ta*, the base of the demonstrative pronoun *ta*, in Greek τό.

The oldest form of this pronoun known to us in Semitic is the Arabic أنت *anta*, with its fem. أنت *anti*, dual أنتما *antuma*, plur. masc. انتم *antumū*, shortened *antum*, and fem. انتن *antunna*. The dual is found in Arabic only, and has disappeared from its vulgar dialects, in which the forms in use are *enta* or *ent* (Egypt. *inte*), *enti* or *enti* (Egypt. *inty*, *enty*), *entum* or *entū* (Egypt. *intū*). Almost identical with these are the Ethiopic ለነተ: *anta*, *anti*, *antēmū*, *antēn*, which appear in Tigré as *auta*, *auti*, *autūm*, and in Amharic as *anta*, *antyi* or *anty*, plur. *antū*. But in Tigrīña they have been displaced by the compound ነክክ: *nəss'kkhā*, fem. *nəss'kkhī*, plur. *nəss'atkūm*, *nəss'atkēn*, by assimilation for *nəfs'kkhā*, etc.

In Assyrian and Hebrew *nt* have been assimilated into *tt*. The Assyrian forms are *attā*, *atti*, plur. masc. *attūnu*, (fem., according to analogy, *attina*). In Hebrew the masc. sing. is אתה, in pause אתה or אתה; but the shorter את, *attē* or *att*, also occurs, Num. xi. 15; Deut. v. 24, and in some other passages in the Kēthībh, e.g. Ps. vi. 4; Job i. 10; Eccles. vii. 22. Its fem. is אתי, which occurs sometimes in the Kēthībh, viz. Judges xvii. 2; 1 Kings xiv. 2; 2 Kings iv. 16, 23, and viii. 1; Jerem. iv. 30; Ezek. xxxvi. 13; but it has been almost supplanted by the shorter את, *attē* or *att*, in pause את. The plur. masc. is אתם, with *ē* for *ū*; the fem. is אתנה, sometimes written אתנה and אתנה; but the shorter אתן or אתן is found in Ezek. xxxiv. 31, and with assimilation of the *n* to a following *m*, in Ezek. xiii. 20, אשר אתם מצדרות (observe Ezek. xxxiii. 26, עשיתן תועבה for עשיתם, and Isaiah xxxv. 1, ישלום מרבר for יששן).

In Biblical Aramaic and the Targūms we find both the primitive and the assimilated forms,  $\text{אַתָּה}$ ,  $\text{אַתָּת}$ ,  $\text{אַתָּ}$ , fem.  $\text{אַתָּ}$ , plur. masc.  $\text{אַתָּתָּן}$ ,  $\text{אַתָּתָּן}$ , fem.  $\text{אַתָּתָּיִן}$ ,  $\text{אַתָּתָּיִן}$ . In Syriac the *n*, though written, is never pronounced, and the final *t* of the fem. sing. has also been dropped,  $\text{אַתָּ}$ ,  $\text{אַתָּ}$ ,  $\text{אַתָּ}$ . The forms of the later dialects are in some cases such as we should naturally expect; e.g. Samaritan  $\text{אתה}$  or  $\text{את}$ , fem.  $\text{אתי}$ , plur.  $\text{אתון}$ ,  $\text{אתין}$ ; Palestinian Syriac,  $\text{ל}$ , fem.  $\text{ל}$ , plur.  $\text{ל}$  and  $\text{ל}$ . But in others there are points worthy of remark. For instance, in Mandaitic, instead of *n* and *t* being assimilated, a short *a* is inserted between them,  $\text{אתא}$ , plur.  $\text{אתון}$ . Again, in the vulgar Syriac of Ma'lūla, we find  $\text{أح}$  or  $\text{هح}$  *hach*, with the plur.  $\text{أحخن}$  *achkhun* or  $\text{هحجن}$  *hachjun*, where *t* has been softened into *ty*, *ch*, as in  $\text{مدینحہ}$  (مدینة),  $\text{نارحہ}$  (نار),  $\text{کاجحہ}$  (کاجبا). The modern Nestorian or eastern forms are  $\text{أت}$  or  $\text{أتین}$  *attin*, the latter with a curious appendage; and not less strange are the plurals  $\text{أمتحہ}$  and  $\text{أمتحہ}$ , which can only be explained as having arisen under the influence of the 1st pers.  $\text{أمتحہ}$  or  $\text{أمتحہ}$ , whilst conversely the form of the 1st person  $\text{أمتحہ}$  must have owed its birth to this falsely formed  $\text{أمتحہ}$ .

The separate pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons have, as we have seen, received a demonstrative increment at the beginning; with the pronoun of the 3rd pers. the reverse apparently is the case. The Assyrian *šū*, fem. *šū*, and the corresponding Syriac  $\text{ش}$ , fem.  $\text{ش}$ , may perhaps never have had any such increment; but it is, I think, otherwise with the Hebrew and Arabic singulars. In Hebrew these forms, with the ancient and necessary difference of vowels, are  $\text{הוא}$ , fem.  $\text{היא}$ . Now some scholars believe that the *aleph* is a mere orthographic sign, like the Arabic *elif* in the 3rd pers. plur.

of the verb, **תָּלְוּ**, which is occasionally found even in Hebrew (**הַהֲלִכְוָה** Josh. x. 24; **אָנוּה** Isaiah xxviii. 12). In this view I can hardly concur, because the words are written with this *aleph* in the oldest documents we possess, such as the Moabite stone (masc. **וְיִאמֵר גַּם הָהָא**) and the sarcophagus of Eshmün'āzār, king of Sidon (masc. **אָדָם הָהָא** "that man," fem. **הַמַּמְלָכָה הָהָא** "this kingdom"). Had the original sounds been merely *hū* and *hī*, we should have found on such monuments **הוּ** and **הי**. I conclude, therefore, that the words must have sounded originally something like *hū-a* and *hī-a*, with the addition of a demonstrative *a* at the end. This will seem less improbable to you, when you are told that the modern Syrian forms from **וְסָ** *ō* and **וְסָ** *ē*, by the addition of **וְסָ**, another demonstrative **וְסָ וְסָ** (**וְסָוְסָ**) *ō'ā*, **וְסָ וְסָ** *ē'ā*, "that," "yonder." That Plautus heard the Phoenician word pronounced as *hy* only proves that the Carthaginians, like the Jews, had gradually let this additional sound drop, although they retained the symbol of it in writing.

I have said nothing to you as yet of the use of **וְוָה** for the fem. gender in Hebrew, because I do not believe in its existence. The distinction of the vowels in **וְוָה** and **וְוָה**, *sū* and *sē*, is just as primitive and essential as in *anta*, *anti* and *ka*, *ki*. I am aware that **וְוָה** takes the place of **וְוָה** in various passages of the Pentateuch; but in old Hebrew MSS. **ו** and **ו** are very much alike, and the Masorets have done well to regard **וְוָה** as nothing but a clerical error, and to substitute for it the correct **וְוָה**. The same pretended archaism may be found in the famous Babylonian codex of the Prophets published by Strack, e.g. Hosea ii. 4, **וְוָה** (i.e. **וְוָה**), Joel iv. 1, **וְוָה** (i.e. **וְוָה**).

To proceed. The same primitive difference of the vowels and the same affixed syllable are to be found in Arabic, although slightly obscured, since *hū-'a* and *hī-'a* have become *hūwa* **هو** and *hīya* **هي**. In Ethiopic these words have received a further

<sup>1</sup> [Cf. Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, 2nd ed. vol. i. (Leyden, 1887), § 16 and n. 7, who rightly refers the origin of the error to the old *scriptio defectiva* **וְוָה**, for **וְוָה** and **וְוָה** alike.]

increment at the end, and in consequence have suffered a slight curtailment at the beginning. The forms in actual use are  $\text{𐤒𐤋𐤕}$ :  $wē'ētū$ , fem.  $\text{𐤒𐤋𐤕}$ :  $yē'ētī$ , which have obviously lost an initial  $hū$  and  $hī$  on account of their having been lengthened by the syllable  $tū$  and  $tī$ . I find the same increment in the Assyrian demonstrative  $šuatū$ , "this," fem.  $šaatī$  or  $šātī$  [Del.  $šiatī$ ], and in another form in  $šāšū$ , fem.  $šāšī$ ,  $šāša$ , as also in  $lagā-šū$  (Del.  $agāšū$ ), which last is found mainly in inscriptions of the Persian period.  $Šū$  seems to be only a weakening of  $tū$ , just as in Greek the pronoun  $tu$ , Doric  $τύ$ , became  $σύ$ ; or  $τῆμερον$  (to-day),  $τῆτες$  (this year) became  $σήμερον$  and  $σῆτες$ ; or the nominal terminations  $τις$ ,  $τιος$ ,  $τια$ ,  $τυνη$ , passed into  $σις$ ,  $σιος$ ,  $σια$ ,  $συνη$  ( $πέψις$ ,  $πλούσιος$ ,  $γερουσία$ ,  $δικαιοσύνη$ ). Indeed it seems possible that  $tū$  is the oldest form of the pronoun of the 3rd pers. in Semitic, of which  $šū$  and  $hū$  are successive weakenings.

We have then the following forms of the pronoun of the 3rd person.

	singular	plural	dual
Assyr. m.	$šū$	$šūnu$ , $šūnu-tu$ , $šūnut$	
f.	$šī$	$šīna$	
Arab. m.	هو (vulg. Eg. $hūwā$ )	هم (Eg. $hum$ and $huma$ )	هما
f.	هي (vulg. Eg. $hīyā$ )	هن	
Ethi. m.	$\text{𐤒𐤋𐤕}$ : $wē'ētū$	$\text{𐤋𐤓𐤏𐤕}$ : $ēmāntū$ or $\text{𐤒𐤋𐤕𐤓}$ : $wē'ētōmū$	
f.	$\text{𐤒𐤋𐤕}$ : $yē'ētī$	$\text{𐤋𐤓𐤏𐤕}$ : $ēmāntī$ or $\text{𐤒𐤋𐤕𐤓}$ : $wē'ētōn$	
Hcb. m.	$\text{𐤏𐤁}$ (Ph. $\text{𐤏𐤁}$ )	$\text{𐤏𐤁}$ , $\text{𐤏𐤁}$	
f.	$\text{𐤏𐤁}$ (Ph. $\text{𐤏𐤁}$ )	$\text{𐤏𐤁}$	
J. Ar. m.	$\text{𐤏𐤁}$	$\text{𐤏𐤁}$ , $\text{𐤏𐤁}$ ; $\text{𐤏𐤁}$	
f.	$\text{𐤏𐤁}$	$\text{𐤏𐤁}$	

	singular	plural
Syr. m.	ܐܘܬܐ	ܐܘܬܐܢ
	f. ܐܘܬܐ	ܐܘܬܐܢܐ
Talm. m.	אִירָהּ	אִירְהוּ
	f. אִירָהּי	אִירְהוּי
Mand. m.	ܘܘܐ	ܘܘܢܘܢ
	f. ܘܘܐܘܐ	ܘܘܢܘܢܘܢܐ

After what I have already said, in this and former lectures, very few of these forms call for any further remark. I need only add, I think, that  $\text{ܐܘܬܐܢ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܘܬܐܢܐ}$ , vulgar Egypt. *hum, huma*,  $\text{ܘܘܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܘܘܐܘܐ}$ , and  $\text{ܘܘܢܘܢ}$ ,  $\text{ܘܘܢܘܢܐ}$ , are really identical, the last being strengthened by an additional demonstrative element, as is also the case with  $\text{ܘܘܢܘܢܐ}$  and  $\text{ܘܘܢܘܢܐܐ}$ :: The Talmudic forms  $\text{אִירָהּ}$  and  $\text{אִירָהּי}$  (for  $\text{אִירְהוּ}$  and  $\text{אִירְהוּי}$ ) shew us that the double *u* of the Chaldee, Syriac and Mandaitic is an assimilation of *uh*, the syllable *in, en, hen* being, as I formerly stated, an interjectional or demonstrative element prefixed to the pronoun. The simple  $\text{ܐܘܬܐ}$  and  $\text{ܐܘܬܐܐ}$  of the old Syriac have entirely disappeared in the modern language; and in the modern dialects of Ethiopia the place of this pronoun has been usurped by later compounds. Thus in Tigrīña, *něssü*, fem. *něssā*, plur. masc. *něssätōm*, fem. *něssätōn*, for *něfsü*, etc.; and in Amharic,  $\text{እርሱ}$ : *ěrsü*, fem.  $\text{እርሱዋ}$ : *ěrsěwā*, plur.  $\text{እርሱቸው}$ : *ěrsätyaw*, or with a further assimilation  $\text{እሱ}$ : *ěssü*, etc., from  $\text{ርእስ}$ : *rě's*, "head."

On the formation of the plurals of the personal pronouns, I shall make some additional remarks when I come to treat of that subject in relation to the noun and verb. Meantime I pass on to the other classes of pronouns.

### B. The Demonstrative Pronouns.

From the pronoun of the 3rd person, by prefixing the demonstrative particle or interjection *hā*, in vulgar Arabic *ā*, we get the compound pronoun *hā-hū*. This appears in the

Talmūd as רְהוּא, fem. רְהוּיָא, plur. רְהוּוּ (for רְהוּוּוּן). The word is often wrongly pointed רְהוּא, רְהוּיָא, whereby it is confounded with the Hebrew רְהוּא, רְהוּיָא, which is of a totally different origin, viz. by assimilation for רְהוּוּוּא. In Mandaitic the same word exists in the singular, רְהוּוּ, רְהוּוּע, without any corresponding plural. In Syriac the second *h* was elided, and the syllables *hū-n*, *hā-i*, contracted into *ō* *haw*, *ō* *hāy* or *hōy*, plur. *ō* *hānnūn*, *ō* *hānnēn* (for *hā-ān-hūn*, *hā-ān-hēn*). In the Palestinian dialect we also find the singular forms *ō* *ō*, *ō* *ō*; fem. *ō* *ō*, *ō* *ō*, but not the plural. In modern Syriac the corresponding words are *ō* *aw*, *ō* *ay*, often written and pronounced *ō*, *ō*, *ō*, *ō*, *ō* and *ō*, with the plur. *ō* *āni* (from the old fem. *ō* *ō*), shortened into *ō* *ān* and *ō* *ān*. From this is formed another pronoun by the addition of the particle *ō* at the end, to designate a more remote object; "that," "yonder," viz. *ō* *ō* (*ō* *ō*), *ō* *ā*, fem. *ō* *ō*, *ō* *ā*. The *u* which we have found in the plurals *ō* *ō*, etc., seems to appear in the singular in the Assyrian *annu*, "this," whether we regard it as merely = *an* + *hū*, or as = *ā* + *in* + *hū*. The forms given by the grammarians are:

sing. masc. *annu* (fem. *annat*), (*annit*)  
 plur. masc. *annūtu* fem. *annātu*, *annītu*,

with another plural form, perhaps of both genders, *annī* or *annē*.

In vulgar Arabic of Egypt the forms corresponding to רְהוּא, רְהוּיָא, רְהוּוּ, are still used with the original interjectional force: *āhū*, "there he is," *āhī*, "there she is," *āhūm* or *āhōm*, "there they are."

A very large number of demonstrative pronouns have their source in the cognate letters *d* and *t*, in juxtaposition with which we often find *k*, *l* and *n*. You will remember that Aram. *ד* *d* = Arab. *د* *dh*, *ט* = Eth. Heb. Assy. *s*; and that Aram. *ת* *t* = Arab. *ت* *th*, *פ* = Eth. *ח*: *s*, Assy. *š*, Heb. *ש* *sh*.

One of the simplest of these pronouns is the Arabic **ذَا**, fem. **ذِي**, plur. **ذِي**, **ذِي**, **ذِي**, plur. **أُولَئِكَ** or **أُولَئِكَ**, often written *plene* **أُولَئِكَ**, **أُولَئِكَ**. The corresponding forms in vulgar Arabic are *dā* or *dī*, fem. *dī*, plur. **دُول** *dawl* or *dōl*, *dōla*, *dōlī* (which seems to arise from a combination of the singular with the ancient plural). In Ethiopic we have the same word in the form **ዘ**: *zē*, fem. **ዛ**: *zā*, plur. **እሱ**: *ellū*, fem. **እሱ**: *ellū*. Its Hebrew equivalent is **זֶה**, fem. **זֵה**, for *zēt*, shortened into **זֶה** and **זֵה**, plur. **אֵלֶּה** (1 Chron. xx. 8, generally with the art. **אֵלֶּה**), **אֵלֶּה**. The Phoenician forms are, as might be expected, very similar; viz. **ṣ** for both genders (perhaps with a difference of pronunciation, *zē*, *zū*); fem. also **ṣ**, in Plautus *syth*; plur. **ṣ**, in Plautus *ily*. The form **ṣ**, which also occurs in Phoenician, has been regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew **זֶה**; but the article in Phoenician is the same as in Hebrew, and **ṣ** does not take the article in Phoenician even when the preceding substantive is defined (**ṣ** **ṣ** and **ṣ** **ṣ**). I prefer therefore to consider the **ṣ** in **ṣ** as merely prosthetic. The very curt form of the word **ṣ** might readily lead to such a vowel being prefixed; and we find some support for this idea in the modern Ethiopic or Tigrifia form **እሱ**: fem. **እሱ**:: In the later Hebrew of the Mishnah we have masc. **זֶה**, fem. **זֵה** (*zō* or *zū*), plur. **אֵלֶּה**. In Assyrian it is curious to find the form with *l* in the singular as well as the plur.;

sing. masc. <i>ullu</i>	fem. <i>ullat</i>
plur. masc. <i>ullūtu</i>	fem. <i>ullitū</i> <sup>1</sup> .

By appending a demonstrative *u* to the masculine, we obtain the common J. Aram. form **זֶה**, **זֵה**, emphatic **זֶה**, **זֵה**, with its simple fem. **זֵה**, **זֵה**, and its plur. **אֵלֶּה**. The corresponding

<sup>1</sup> [The latter only in the Pentateuch, where it is probably to be viewed as a mere *scriptio defectiva* (**אֵלֶּה**) as in Phoenician. Cf. Kuenen *ut supra*. In any case **אֵלֶּה** is younger than **אֵלֶּה**, final **ה** being readily lost in Hebrew, as in **עָר** = **עָרָה**.]

<sup>2</sup> [The feminines are not recognised by Delitzsch.]

Phoenician forms are ן and נן; and in certain Aramaic dialects (Egypto-Aram., Nabathean) these words appear as נןן and נן. An Ethiopic form, with further demonstrative increment, is ዘኒቲ: *sēntī*, fem. ዘቲ: *sātī*, plur. እሉነቲ: *ellōntī*, fem. እሉነቲ: *ellāntī*.

For the sake of still greater emphasis, *hā* is prefixed to these forms, giving in Arabic هَذَا, fem. هَذِهِ or هَاتِي, هَاتَا, plur. هَؤُلَاءِ or هَؤُلَاءِ; and vulgarly *hādā*, fem. *hādī*, plur. *hādawl*, and in Africa *hādūm*. In Egypt, with somewhat of the original interjectional force, *ādī*, "this here." The corresponding Aramaic words vary considerably in form according to the dialects. In the Targūms and the Talmūd we find הָרִין, fem. הָרָא (or עָרָא), plur. הָרִין and הָרִין (less correctly pronounced הָרִין and הָרִין); and similarly in the Palestinian dialect עָרָא or עָרָא, fem. עָרָא ( *hādī* for *hādā* ), plur. עָרָא. In Mandaitic ך is generally taken the place of ד; הָרִין, fem. הָרִין, plur. הָרִין however occurs, as also the compound הָרִין = Talmud. הָרִין, i.e. הָרִין. The ordinary Syriac forms are הָרִין, fem. הָרִין, plur. הָרִין. Of these, הָרִין stands for הָרִין, and הָרִין is weakened from הָרִין, which occurs in the combination הָרִין (for הָרִין). Shorter forms are הָרִין, for הָרִין, and הָרִין. Here too must be placed the Talmudic הָרִין or הָרִין, which latter is also found in Samaritan. Here נ has taken the place of ה, whilst the aspirated ד *dh* is represented only by the aspiration *h*. This gradual elision of the *d*, combined with the ordinary dropping of the final *n*, enables us to explain the common Talmudic forms הָרִין, fem. הָרִין, plur. הָרִין or הָרִין, as corruptions of הָרִין, הָרִין, and הָרִין. The modern Syriac words are very similar, viz. הָרִין *āhā* or *ā*, plur. הָרִין *annē*. הָרִין springs from the fem. הָרִין, the original aspirated *d* (*dh*) being represented, as in הָרִין, by an *h*; *h* having been gradually



dropped,  $\bar{a}'\bar{a}$  has been contracted into  $\bar{a}$ . Dialectically the forms  $\bar{a}$ ,  $\bar{a}'$ , are also used, both from  $\bar{a}$ .

Now if to these series of pronouns we append the letter  $\bar{y}$ , we obtain another series, generally designating more distant objects.

The simplest of these is the J. Aram.  $\bar{y}$  or  $\bar{y}'$ , fem.  $\bar{y}$ , plur.  $\bar{y}'$ , which are formed from  $\bar{y}$ ,  $\bar{y}'$  and  $\bar{y}'$ . The Palestinian dialect exhibits the plural in the form  $\bar{y}'$ . By prefixing  $h\bar{a}$  we arrive at the Talmudic  $\bar{y}'$ , fem.  $\bar{y}'$ , plur.  $\bar{y}'$  or  $\bar{y}'$ , and the Mandaitic  $\bar{y}'$  (masc. and fem.), plur.  $\bar{y}'$ , which are contractions for  $\bar{y}'$ ,  $\bar{y}'$ , and  $\bar{y}'$ . Here too the Syriac varieties  $\bar{y}'$ , fem.  $\bar{y}'$ , find their place; the former of which may perhaps be compounded with a form corresponding to the Mishnaic  $\bar{y}'$ . As for  $\bar{y}'$  ( $\bar{y}'$ ), which is always masc., it is probably not a mere variation of  $\bar{y}'$ , but a different compound, viz. from  $\bar{y}'$  and  $\bar{y}'$ . In Arabic the corresponding pronoun is  $\bar{y}'$ , fem.  $\bar{y}'$ , plur.  $\bar{y}'$  or  $\bar{y}'$ . The Arabs have, however, regarded the suffixed  $\bar{y}'$  as being the pronoun of the 2nd person, and hence, though  $\bar{y}'$  is commonly used in speaking to two or more persons of both sexes, it is also permitted to use  $\bar{y}'$  in addressing a woman,  $\bar{y}'$  in speaking to two, and  $\bar{y}'$  or  $\bar{y}'$  in speaking to several, according to their sex. The vulgar forms, at least in North Africa, are  $\bar{y}'$  *dāk*, fem.  $\bar{y}'$  *dīk*, plur.  $\bar{y}'$  *dūk*.

In Egypt we find, with the addition of  $h\bar{a}$ , the forms *dikhā* (masc. fem.) and *dukhā* (masc.); and these may be still further strengthened by appending the pronoun of the 3rd pers., masc. *dukhawwā*, masc. fem. *dikhaiya*, plur. masc. fem. *dukhamma*. The Ethiopic presents us with this augmented pronoun in

the form חַיִּי: *sékéh*, fem. לִיִּיתִי: *entékéh*, plur. לִיִּי: *ellékéh*. Here the fem. is remarkable, but we shall speak of it when we come to the simple relative form לִיִּי: *énta*.

These pronouns again may be heightened by the accession of a fresh demonstrative syllable. Thus in Chaldee we find ܢܝܢ for both genders, with additional *n*. The Ethiopic presents us with a form with additional *in*, viz. חַיִּי־נִי: *sékewéti* or חַיִּי־נִי: *sékéti*, fem. לִיִּי־נִי: *entákéti*, plur. לִיִּי־נִי: *ellékewéti* or לִיִּי־נִי: *ellékéti*. The Arabic prefixes *hā* in the form هَذَا, fem. هَاتَا, هَاتِيك, plur. هَآوَلَائِكَ; which are much used in the vulgar dialects, هَذَا *hādāk*, هَذِيك *hādīk*, plur. هَآوَلَائِكَ *hā'ulā'ik*, or in North Africa هَذِيك *hādīk*. From *hādāk* seems to arise, by elision of the *d*, the form هَاك *hak*, used by the Bedouins; just as هَذَا *hādā*, in combination with the article 'al, becomes *hal*, which is used for all numbers and genders, as هَلْبِنْت, هَلِكْتَاب, هَلْبِنْت, هَالشَّيْخ, هَالرَّجُل, هَالكَلَاب. Another strengthened form in old Arabic is ذَلِك, where the letter *l* has been inserted between ذَا and ك; its fem. is تَلِك, by contraction for تِلِك. Peculiar to the Mandaitic is the word ܘܢܝܢܢܐ (masc. and fem.), plur. masc. ܘܢܝܢܢܐ, fem. ܘܢܝܢܢܐ. Here it seems tolerably clear that we have again the prefixes ܢܝܢ and ܢܝܢ, contracted into ܢܝܢ, and the suffixes of the 3rd person; but it is not so easy to say what is represented by the letters ܢܝܢ, unless we admit Noeldeke's suggestion that they are identical with ܢܝܢ, the Aramaic form of ܢܝܢ.

Finally, under this head, we have a few demonstratives that are formed by means of the prefix 'N. Here I mention first, though somewhat doubtfully, the Talmudic pronoun ܘܢܝܢܢܐ, fem.

אִידִי; doubtfully, I say, because it may also be explained, as I did above, by assimilation from אִינְרוּ, אִינְרִי. This latter view is countenanced by the plurals אִינְהוּ, אִינְהִי. The forms נִירוּ and נִינְרוּ, representing the substantive verb, seem to be fresh compounds of the demonstrative *n* and אִירוּ, אִינְהוּ; e.g. מַאי נִירוּ "what it is," אֲנָא נִירוּ "it is I," צְדִיקֵי נִינְהוּ "they are perfectly righteous men." More certain examples of this formation with prefixed *i* are אִירִי (for אִירָן), fem. אִירָא; and אִירָךְ, plur. אִירָךְ.

To designate a definite pronominal accusative, especially of a somewhat emphatic kind, we find in the Semitic languages a peculiar word joined with the pronominal suffixes. In Ethiopic this is ኪያ: *kīyá*, a word regarding the origin of which various conjectures have been hazarded, but which I am inclined to think finds its source in the demonstrative *k*, to which we have so often referred. From this are formed, with the usual pronominal suffixes, *kīyá-ya*, *kīyá-ka*, etc. By the weakening of כּ into ה (of which I gave some examples in a former lecture), we obtain the Arabic dialectic form هيا. From this it is but a step to the common Arabic ايا *iyā*, which is used precisely like its Ethiopic equivalent, and appears in Tigrifia in the contracted form of ا: *i*, denoting *self*, as اة: *iyē*, اة: *ikhā*, اة: *iyū*. In the other Semitic languages this word takes the feminine termination *at* or *t*, probably appended to it in order to bring out more strongly the abstract idea of *hoccitas* (if I may use such a word); and in these languages its range of use is considerably wider than in Arabic and Ethiopic. Hence we get, in the first place, the Phoenician אית, which was doubtless pronounced in the earlier stages of the language *iyāth* or *iyath*; for otherwise the *y* would not have been inserted in writing, as is almost invariably the case in the older inscriptions. In the inscriptions of later date, however, we find אית, and Plautus heard the word pronounced *yth*. The Aramaic forms seem to be shortened from the Phoen., viz. Syr. ا, Chald. ית, less correctly ית. These

are used not only as a sign of the definite accus., **כִּי** **כִּי** **כִּי**; but also as a substantive, signifying *self*, e. g. **כִּי** **כִּי** **כִּי** "he who knows himself," **כִּי** **כִּי** "free-will"; and likewise in the Palestinian dialects and in Samaritan to form demonstratives, as in the phrases **כִּי** **כִּי** "on that same day," **כִּי** **כִּי** "in that same year," **כִּי** **כִּי** "at that same time," **כִּי** **כִּי** "that man is a thief," **כִּי** **כִּי** "this is of use to me, those are not." In this way we may best explain the Mandaic demonstrative spoken of above, **כִּי** (masc. and fem.), **כִּי**, where **כִּי** is probably = **כִּי**. Similarly in Hebrew *yāth* was further altered into *āth*, whence, by the usual change of *a* into *o*, resulted the common form *ōth*, **כִּי**. In close connection with a following word this *ōth* was shortened into *oth*, just as from **כִּי** and **כִּי** we get **כִּי** and **כִּי**. Next, *ōth* was changed into *eth*, **כִּי**, as in **כִּי** for *attim*; and finally this **כִּי** was heightened by the tone into *ēth*, **כִּי**. In later Hebrew, perhaps under the influence of the surrounding Aramaic dialects, **כִּי** came to be used, like **כִּי**, as a demonstrative: **כִּי** **כִּי**, **כִּי** **כִּי** "that one sat down," **כִּי** **כִּי**. In Assyrian I find a word *attu*, which seems to be nearly connected with *yāth* and *ōth*, for example in such phrases as *attūa abūa* "my father" ("mon père à moi"), *siryā attūa* "my family" (ורע), *dināta attūa* "my laws" (דין), *bīta attūnu* "our house," *ša la iptallahū abīya wa attua* "who revere (פּלַח) not my father and me." Schrader also regards as cognate with *yāth* the words *yāti* and *āsi*, in such phrases as *yāti Nabūnahid šusihanni*, "as for me, Nabunit, save (שׁוּב) thou me"; and again, *ša lā iplahū abūtīya u āsi lā isbatū nir sarrūtīya*, "who did not fear my fathers, and, as regards me, did not take up the yoke of my rule." These words *yāti* and *āsi* he explains as made up of *ya* + *a* + *ti* or *si*, i. e. *ya* for *yath*, *a* suffix of the 1st pers., and a further demonstrative *ti* or *si*. Sayce, however, gives a differ-

ent explanation of both words, so that we are evidently on unsafe ground. Even the Hebrew אֹת has been explained in a manner different from that which I have just suggested to you, for some scholars have regarded it as a substantive, nearly equivalent in form and meaning to the Arabic <sup>س</sup>اِيَّة "sign" or "mark," "form" or "body," thus identifying it with the word אֹת (for אֹת or אֹת), or else assuming a form אֹת or אֹת, from the construct state of which (אֹת or אֹת) אֹת might be derived by contraction.

Before quitting the demonstrative pronouns, I will say a few words regarding the definite article, which really belongs to this class of words. Its original form was, in all probability, הַל, a compound of *hā* and *l*, nearly in the sense of the Latin *ille*, connected with the adverbs הַלְאָה "away," "beyond," and הַלֵּם "here," "hither." In Hebrew the *l* was assimilated to all following letters; and when the doubling wholly ceased to be audible, the loss of it was compensated by the heightening of the vowel into *á* ַ, as in הָרֵאשׁ, הָרֵר, הָעִיר, הָרֵאשׁ, on which and other modifications of the article see your Hebrew grammars. In Phoenician its form is the same as in Hebrew, but it is not so frequently used as in the latter language, e. g. מִשְׁכַּבּוֹ for הַמִּשְׁכַּבּוֹ הַזֶּה, רִמְשֵׁכְבּוֹ הַזֶּה for הַרְשַׁעֲרֵי הַזֶּה, הָאָדָם for הָאָדָם הַזֶּה, הַהוּא for הַמַּמְלָכָה הַזֵּה.

The Arabs ordinarily weakened the initial הַ to הַ, but restricted the assimilation of the final *l* to a following dental, sibilant or liquid (the so-called *solar letters* ت ث د ذ ر ز س ش). e. g. اَلْاِنْسَانُ, اَللِّجَبَلُ, اَلْمَدِيْنَةُ, but اَلتَّوْرُ (הַתּוֹרָה), (הַנְּהָר) اَلنَّهْرُ, (הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ) اَلشَّمْسُ. In Egypt this assimilation is nowadays extended to ج and ك, as *eg-gassār*, *eg-gum'a* "Friday," *ek-kull*, *ek-kenise* "church." The letter *l*, however, though assimilated in pronunciation, is always written. The Arabian Bedouins are still said to retain the old pronunciation *hal*, saying

*has-sanah* instead of *as-sanah*, הַשָּׁנָה. Generally speaking, however, the initial *elif* is regarded as so weak in sound that it suffers elision whenever another word precedes, e. g. أَبُو الْمَلِكِ *abu 'l-maliki*, not *abū al-maliki*, فِي النَّاسِ *fi 'n-nāsi*, not *fi an-nāsi*, قَالَ الرَّجُلُ *kāla 'r-rajulu*, not *kāla ar-rajulu*, قَالَتِ الْمَرْأَةُ *kālati 'l-mar'atu*, not *kālat al-mar'atu*. Indeed it was at times dropped altogether and only the *l* sounded, and this is common at the present day, e. g. *lahmar* "red," *liswid* "black," *lashar*, the "Ashlar" mosque, *letnēn* "the two."

In Ethiopic there is no definite article, and the same appears to be the case in Assyrian. The Aramaic dialects labour under the same deficiency, but make up for it by appending to the noun the demonstrative *hā* or *ā*, which appears in writing as an *aleph*; thus בְּבַרְאָה; בְּבַרְאָה; בְּבַרְאָה. With this we may compare the postpositive *en* and *et* of the Scandinavian tongues, derived from an older *inn* and *it* (e. g. Danish *Mand, Manden*; *Hus, Huset*), of which we shall have to make mention again hereafter. More to our present purpose, however, is the Hīmyaritic suffixed *n*, e. g. in מוֹנֵדָן "this monument" or "tablet," שְׁעָרָה | וּבְנָהוּ | בְּנֹו | מִרְתָּם | רִקְנֵי | אֵלְמָקָה | דְּרֹן | מוֹנֵדָן | חֲמֻעָתָה | בֵּן | וְשִׁבְן | עֹדֵב | שְׁמֵהֶעֱלִי | מִשְׁלָמָן "this stonc," חֲמֻעָתָה | בֵּן | וְשִׁבְן | עֹדֵב | שְׁמֵהֶעֱלִי | מִשְׁלָמָן. The words מוֹנֵדָן and מִשְׁלָמָן are apparently contractions of מוֹנֵדָהָן and מִשְׁלָמָהָן, as seems to result from such forms as מִחֲפָרְנֵיהָן | בֵּין | "between these two towers" or "castles," אֲבַעְלָהן | בֵּיתָנְהָן | "the lords of these two houses," בֵּיתָנְהָן "this house of ours" (where the נ is the suffix of the 1st pers. plur.). Often the demonstrative pronoun דָּן, fem. דָּת, is prefixed to such words, as דָּן מוֹנֵדָן.

<sup>1</sup> [This statement rests on a misconception: هَادِي السَّيْه stands for هَادِي السَّيْه. Nöld.]

<sup>2</sup> Other examples are: דָּן סִטְרָן, "this inscription"; דָּן וְחָנ, "this idol"; דָּן מַתָּח, "this door"; דָּן מְבַנֵּן, "this building"; דָּן צִלְמָן, "this statue"; דָּן וְאֲבַלְנָהן, "and these two camels."

C. *The Relative Pronouns.*

The relative in its simplest form is, it may be said, identical with the demonstrative pronoun. As the Germans use *der* instead of *welcher*, and we English *that* instead of *who*, so did the Semites employ closely cognate or identical words as demonstratives and relatives.

The simplest of the relative forms is the ךַּ of the Biblical Aramaic, shortened in the Targums and in Syriac into ך, ך̄, ך̄̄. One or other of these forms appears in all the Aramaic dialects except the Egyptian and that of some ancient inscriptions, which have ך̄. The Mandaites say ך̄̄ as well as ך̄̄̄, and the same form ܕܐ is occasionally found in Samaritan. I need only remark in addition that in Mandaitic ܕ is used in a few cases instead of the common ܕ, as ܕܐܢܝܢ ܕܐܝܒܝܢ "he who does good," ܕܐܢܝܢ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ "he who does evil" (where ܕܐܢܝܢ = ܕܐܝܠܝܢ); ܕܐܝܚܘܢ ܕܐܝܘܢܐܢ "spirit of our fathers." The word ך̄̄̄, which is mentioned by Gesenius and others as the Mandaitic form of the relative, has no existence, being merely a false reading of the somewhat abbreviated character of the word ܕ. In modern Syriac ܕܐ or ܕܐ̄ is frequently employed for ܕ, as ܕܐܝܘܢܐܢ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ (for ܕܐܝܠܝܢ) "the Saviour of the world," ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ (for ܕܐܝܠܝܢ) "forgiveness of sins," ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ (for ܕܐܝܠܝܢ) "the passion of our Lord," *bārit islū*, i. e. ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ, "after Jesus."

Identical with this ܕܐ or ܕܐ̄ is the Arabic ܕܐ, generally employed in this one form for both genders and all numbers; as ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ "he who said that came to me," ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ "my well which I dug." The use of this word is, however, only dialectic. In S. Arabia the Himyaritic furnishes us with similar forms: masc. ܕܐ (|=), fem. ܕܐܐ, plur. ܕܐܐܐ or ܕܐܐܐܐ.

In Ethiopic we find H: *sd*, with a fem. ܕܐܐ: *ēnta*, and a plur. *ēlla*, all bearing a striking resemblance to the corresponding

forms of the demonstratives. H: *sd* may be used, like  $\text{וְ}$  and  $\text{נֹר}$ , for both genders and numbers. The fem.  $\text{לָזָה}$ : we must trace back to the demonstrative particle *en*, or the letter *n*, plus the fem. termination *z*; and the plur.  $\text{לָזֶה}$ : to the demonstrative letter *l*. In Hebrew occurs the cognate form  $\text{וְזֶה}$ , likewise invariable.

In Arabic and Hebrew the simple article  $\text{الْ}$ ,  $\text{הַ}$ , is sometimes employed as a relative; e.g.  $\text{مِنَ الْقَوْمِ الرَّسُولِ الَّذِي مِنْهُمُ}$  "of the people of whom is the Apostle of God," for  $\text{الَّذِينَ رَسَلَهُ اللَّهُ مِنْهُمْ}$ ; Joshua x. 24,  $\text{הַהֹלְכִים אִתּוֹ}$  "who went with him"; 1 Sam. ix. 24,  $\text{אֶת־הַשֹּׁק וְהַעֲלִיָּה}$ ; 1 Chron. xxvi. 28,  $\text{וְכָל־הַהֹקְדִישׁ שְׂמוּאֵל}$ .

Hence, from a combination of these two words, with the insertion of the demonstrative letter *l* (as in  $\text{ذَلِكَ}$ ), arises the ordinary Arabic relative  $\text{الَّذِي}$ , with its fem.  $\text{الَّتِي}$ , for the full inflection of which see the Arabic grammar. Its form in the vulgar dialects is  $\text{إِلِي}$  *elli*, in Maltese even shortened into  $\text{لي}$  *li*, for all the genders and numbers. Identical with  $\text{الَّذِي}$  in form, though not exactly in meaning, is the Hebrew demonstrative  $\text{הַלֵּזֶה}$ , shortened into  $\text{הַלֵּזֶה}$ , just as  $\text{الَّذِي}$  is sometimes found in the form  $\text{الَّذ}$ .  $\text{הַלֵּזֶה}$  is used as fem. in 2 Kings iv. 25,  $\text{הִנֵּה הַלֵּזֶה}$ , and another form,  $\text{הַלֵּזֶה}$  *hallēzēh*, also occurs as fem. in Ezekiel xxxvi. 35,  $\text{הַבְּרִיחַ הַלֵּזֶה הַנִּשְׁמָה}$ . This last seems to be weakened from  $\text{הַלֵּזֶה}$ , and to exhibit this pronoun in even a purer form than  $\text{הַלֵּזֶה}$  and  $\text{الَّذِي}$ .

The relative pronoun in Assyrian is *ša* or *šā*, which admits of no variation, but is evidently connected with the simple pronoun *šū*, "he," and the demonstrative *ša-su*.



The Hebrew word **אֲשֶׁר**, though familiar to us all, is difficult to analyse. Some, as for instance Fleischer, Mühlau and Sayce, following an older scholar named Tsepregi, regard **אֲשֶׁר** as the Hebrew representative of the Aramaic **אֲשֶׁר**, **ܐܫܪ**, "place," in Syriac also "trace," "track," "footstep," as in **ܘܫܘܪܐ** (for *ba-athar*) "after," "behind," Arab. **اثر** and **اثر**, "trace," "track," "footstep,"

Eth. **አሠር**: In support of this view they appeal to analogies in other languages, e. g. the Chinese, where *so* means both "place" and "which," and to the vulgar use of *wo* in German, for example, "Der Mann, *wo* ich gesehen habe," instead of *welchen*, or again, "Der Fremde, *wo* du mit ihm gegessen hast," instead of "mit welchem du gegessen hast." Gesenius, in his immortal work, the *Thesaurus Linguae Hebraeae*, sought to connect **אֲשֶׁר** with the Hebrew radical **אֲשֶׁר**: "Modo in tali vocabulo de etymo quaerendum est, **אֲשֶׁר** pr. *rectum* valuisse conjecerim ab **אֲשֶׁר** *rectus fuit*, deinde *recte, ita*, i. q. **כִּי** et Germ. *so*, idque in antiquiore lingua in pron. relat. abiisse. Cf. **כִּי** *ita*, et relativum **כִּי**, et contra Germ. *so*, i. e. propr. relat. fem. Simonis relationem *ita* exprimi censet, quod ad sequentia *rectâ* tendat." Ewald, whose opinions I would always mention with the respect due to so great a scholar,—Ewald's latest view seems to have been that **אֲשֶׁר** stands for **אֲשֶׁל**, and is compounded of two demonstratives, **ש** = **ת**, **ד**, **ו** and **ל**, plus the prosthetic **א**. Finally, Friedrich Böttcher looks upon **אֲשֶׁר** as standing for **אֲשֶׁל**, and as made up of a merely prosthetic **א**, and a word **שֶׁל**, which he regards as an older form of the article **הַל** (just as *su* seemed to be an older form of **הוּא**, or the verbal conj. **הַקֵּטַל** = **שֶׁקֵטַל**, **אֲקֵטַל**). As the matter at present stands, we have to choose, I think, between Fleischer's view on the one hand, and Ewald's or Böttcher's on the other; and, on the whole, I incline to the latter, in so far as I would seek the origin of the relative pronoun somewhere in the region of the demonstratives. For the

interchange of ל and ר, even in this region, compare the Syriac ܠܗܢܐ, "here," with the Chaldee ܠܗܢܐ. In Hebrew the longest form of the word is אֲשֶׁר, but there are several shorter forms, without א and usually with assimilation of the final *r* or *l* to the following letter; viz. ש, ש, ש, but also ש (in שְׁהָם, Eccles. iii. 18, and according to one reading in שְׁהָא for שְׁהָא, Eccles. ii. 22). In Phoenician the word is written אש, but that the ש may originally have had a vowel is at least suggested by the transcription of words handed down to us by Latin and Greek authors, such as *Nesso esse sade* (capillus Veneris), i. e. נֶסֶדָּה אֲשֶׁר שְׁהָא. More frequent, however, are the shorter forms *as*, *es*, *ys*, *is*, and also *si*, *su*, which last correspond to the Hebrew ש; e. g. in the *Poenulus*, *assamar binam*, אֲשַׁמֶּר בְּנַעַם "what he says is friendly"; *ys siddobrim*, *thyfel yth chyl ys chon them liful*, i. e. (probably), אִישׁ שְׁדֹבְרִים תִּפְעֵל אֶת-כָּל-אִשׁ בֶּן תָּם לִפְעֵל, in Latin *eum fecisse aiunt, sibi quod faciundum fuit*; or, to quote another line, *yth alonim valonuth sicorathi simacom syth*, i. e. אֶת-אֲלוֹנִים וְאֲלוֹנוֹת שִׁקְרָאֲתִי שְׁמַקּוֹם זֹאת.

The use of the relative as a conjunction, and as a sign of the genitive relation between two substantives, belongs rather to the department of Syntax than of Etymology. These phenomena need cause you no surprise, if you reflect, on the one hand, that the Greek particle *ὅς* is only a case of the relative pronoun *ὅς*; and, on the other, that the Persian *izāfat* or connective vowel *i* in such constructions as *نام پدر من* *nām-i pidar-i man*, "the name of my father," is merely a corruption of what was the relative pronoun in the older stages of the language.

I may therefore conclude my remarks on the relative by referring briefly to certain *possessive* pronouns, which are formed from it in several of the Semitic languages. In Ethiopic we find *Hλ*:, fem. *λነተλ*:, plur. *λλλ*:, combined with suffixes as follows: *sī'd-ya*, *sī'd-ka*, *sī'a-hī*, *sī'd-na*, *sī'a-kémū*, *sī'a-hómū*, etc. Here we may perhaps discern the relative *H*: *za*, in combination with the pronoun *kīyā*, or rather its Arabic form *īyā*, of which I

spoke in a former lecture. In Aramaic we meet with two forms,  $\text{דִּיר}$  and  $\text{דִּיל}$ . The former is found in the Talmūd, e.g.  $\text{אֲנִן בְּדִירָן וְאֵינָהוּ בְּדִירָהוּ}$  "we (occupy ourselves) with our affairs, and they with theirs." This arises, as Luzzatto has suggested, from a combination of  $\text{דִּי}$  with  $\text{יָד}$ , "hand." It also occurs in modern Syriac in the forms  $\text{ܕܝܝܢܝܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܕܝܝܢܝܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܕܝܝܢܝܐ}$ , *diyyi*, *diyukh*, *diyan*, etc., with elision of the *d* between two vowels. The other form  $\text{דִּיל}$ , i. e.  $\text{דִּי}$  plus the prep.  $\text{לֵי}$ , is found in Biblical Aramaic, e.g. Dan. ii. 20— $\text{דִּי חֲכֻמָּתָא וְגַבְרִיתָא דִּילָהּ דִּיא}$ ; and prevails in the Targūms and in Syriac<sup>1</sup>. The equivalent  $\text{שָׁל}$ , from  $\text{אֲשֶׁר לֵי}$ , occurs in later Hebrew, as well as in Phoenician. Already in Jonah i. 7 we read  $\text{בְּשָׁלְמִי}$  "for whose cause?" and in ver. 12,  $\text{בְּשָׁלִי}$  "for my sake"; and similarly in the Poenulus *ulic silli*,  $\text{רְוֹלָךְ שָׁלִי}$ , "my guest" (lit. "wanderer"); *amma silli*,  $\text{אִמָּא שָׁלִי}$ , "my mother"; *bene silli*,  $\text{בְּנֵי שָׁלִי}$ , "my son." A fuller form seems to occur on a Tyrian signet ring, viz.  $\text{לְבַעַלְיָתֹן אִשׁ אֱלֹם אֲשֶׁלְמֶלְכָרְתָּ רַצָּף}$  "(belonging) to Ba'al-yathon, a priest (lit. a gods'-man) of Melkart Rsph."

#### D. The Interrogative Pronouns.

The first of these to which I would direct your attention is the Arabic  $\text{أَي}$  *ayy*, fem.  $\text{أَيَّة}$  *ayyah*, fully inflected, meaning "who, which, what?" It governs a genitive, as  $\text{أَي أَرْضٍ}$  or  $\text{أَيَّة أَرْضٍ}$ , "which land?"  $\text{أَي الرَّجُلَيْنِ}$  "which of the two men?"  $\text{أَيُّهُمَا}$  "which of them?"

<sup>1</sup> Compare the African  $\text{الذي ل}$  =  $\text{ذِيَال}$ .

<sup>2</sup> In vulgar Arabic it has become  $\text{أَي}$ , or in combination with  $\text{شَيْ}$  (thing)  $\text{أَي شَيْ}$ ;

This word seems to me to have its ultimate source in the interrogative particle <sup>f</sup>א, Heb. אֵ. It is found in Ethiopic too in the sing. אደ: *dy*, plur. אደት: *ayyāt*, for both genders; and in the modern Tigrifta it appears as אደን: אደን: אደን: אደን: or אደን:, which are probably compounds of אደ: and the Ethiopic interrogative ኑ:: In the other Semitic languages this word has more of an adverbial force, being prefixed to other words to convert them into interrogatives, and entering into the composition of a great many interrogative adverbs. In Hebrew, for example, it appears as אֵ (ע for ay) in הֵ אֵ, "who, which?" הֵ מֵ אֵ "from which?" הֵ לָּ אֵ "wherefore, why?" But also as an independent word in the sense of "where?" with pronom. suffixes, הֵכֶּנָּה, הֵי, הֵמָּה; and in a longer form without suffix, הֵאָּ. Of compound words the most ordinary examples are:

הֵאָּ (for הֵי, Arabic أين) "where?" contracted הֵאָּ, and as an accusative הֵנָּה "whither?" הֵכֶּנָּה, הֵכֶּנָּה, and הֵכֶּנָּה, "how?" הֵפֶּה "where? how?" Similar formations in Ethiopic are אደተ: "where?" and, with a shortening of אደ: into א: ε, אፎ: εፍፊ, "how? how!" reduplicated אፎፎ: εፍፍፍ, אፎፍፍ: εፍፍፍ, or אፎፍፍ: εፍፍፍ; and אፎፍፍ: "how much? how many?" from ስፍፍ: *səfn*, which is properly a noun meaning "number," "quantity." In Aramaic we have two forms of this word, for just as the Arabic <sup>f</sup>أ is in Hebrew אֵ, so in Aramaic we find both אֵ and אֵי. The latter, אֵי, is the ordinary form in the Talmūd Bābli and in the Syriac dialect of Palestine. For instance, in the Talmūd, אֵי הֵי or אֵי הֵי, fem. אֵי הֵי or אֵי הֵי "who?" "which?"; in Palestinian Syriac likewise ܐܝܢܝܘܢ, fem.

ܐܝܢܝܘܢ, "why?" In Egypt, *enhā, enhī, enhim*, as *min enhā gins*, "of what kind," but separately *enhā, enhī, enhim*, "who?" "which?"; where *en* is probably for *en* = <sup>f</sup>א.

أين. [So Spitta, p. 80. But Nöldeke explains the *n* as a remnant of the old

Tanwin, <sup>f</sup>أين هو, and so forth.]

וסמ. Further, in the Talmūd, הַיִּרְנָו or הַיִּרְנָו "who," "which," "what is—?" for הַיִּרְדִּין הוּא; הַיִּרְדִּין הוּא "how?" הַיִּרְדִּין הוּא "where?" הַיִּרְדִּין הוּא; "in respect of which?" "in reference to which?" for עַל־הַיִּרְדִּין; "to which?" "whither?" for לַיִּרְדִּין. In the Aramaic of the Targūms both forms occur; הַיִּרְדִּין and הַיִּרְדִּין "how?" הַיִּרְדִּין and הַיִּרְדִּין, fem. הַיִּרְדִּין and הַיִּרְדִּין, "who, which?" הַיִּרְדִּין and הַיִּרְדִּין, "where?" הַיִּרְדִּין and הַיִּרְדִּין, "how?" In Syriac we have only the forms with *aleph*, but in great abundance; for instance: אֲכַח (*akkh*) "how," "as," with its derivatives אֲכַח "as," "like," אֲכַח "together," "at once," אֲכַח "as one who," "as if," אֲכַח, "as"; further, אֲכַח "where?" from כַּח "here"; אֲכַח, אֲכַח, "how?" for אֲכַח and אֲכַח; אֲכַח "whence?" for אֲכַח; אֲכַח for אֲכַח, "who?" with its fem. אֲכַח, and plur. אֲכַח for אֲכַח; and finally, with a shortening of אֲכַח into אֲכַח, אֲכַח "when?" in the Targūms אֲכַח and אֲכַח, from the Heb. אֲכַח, Arab. مَتَى. In modern Syriac there are similar forms, though of course more or less corrupted. Such are: אֲכַח or אֲכַח *ikā*, "where?" אֲכַח *zānā*, for אֲכַח, "when?" אֲכַח or אֲכַח, "which of them?" אֲכַח or אֲכַח, in Talmudic אֲכַח מִיִּיְדֵי; further, אֲכַח "who?" from אֲכַח and אֲכַח, with another form אֲכַח *eni*, which is, strictly speaking, derived from the old plural אֲכַח. In Mandaic the same interrogative exists in אֲכַח *m'na*, "whence?" which is also a Talmudic form, for אֲכַח or אֲכַח, i.e. מִן אֲכַח; מִיִּנְיִל אֲכַח, in the Talmud אֲכַח לְךָ, *undenam tibi?* Also in אֲכַח or אֲכַח, *le*, for אֲכַח, "whither?" אֲכַח מִיִּלְיָא *millā*, "whence?" אֲכַח or אֲכַח, "when?" אֲכַח and אֲכַח or אֲכַח, "where?" from אֲכַח, הַיִּרְדִּין, אֲכַח, "where is—?" in which form the real interrogative has wholly disappeared, just as in the modern Syriac

כַּן "where is he?" from אֵיכָּן *ikā*, "where?" Here too I should mention the Mandaitic forms האַמְנִיא and האַמְנו, probably standing for הַאִי מְנִיָּה and הַאִי מְנִהוֹן, e.g. הַאִי מְנִהוֹן "in which will ye cross over?" הַאִי מְנִהוֹן הַאִי מְנִהוֹן "which (of them) is my throne?"

Another interrogative pronoun in the Semitic languages is that which is characterised by the initial letter *m*. Its oldest forms appear to me to be *man* for the masc., and *mant* for the fem.; but in practice *man* is used as the interrogation for persons of both sexes, "who?" whilst *mant* is employed in speaking of things, "what?"

In Ethiopic we actually find these oldest forms in use; ጠን: *mdnū*, acc. ጠን: *mdna*, "who?" and ጠንተ: *mēnt*, acc. ጠንተ: *mēnta*, "what?" The Himyar. form is also ጠ, but more usually ጠ, with the substitution of ጠ for ጠ. In Arabic we have ordinarily مَنْ *man* for persons, but a distinction of gender is made in the rare case of the word standing alone, when it is fully inflected, the masc. sing. being مَنْو *manū*, and the fem. مَنْه *manah* (with aspirated *h*, for مَنْت) and sometimes مَنْت *mant*. The Assyrian forms are said to be *mannu* or *manu* and *man*, which last is identical with the Aramaic ጠ, ጠ. Hence arise in the Aramaic dialects, by the addition of the pronoun *hū*, such forms as Syriac مَنْه; Talmudic ጠ, fem. ጠ, for ጠ, ጠ; Mandaitic ጠ; modern Syriac مَنْب, مَنْب, مَنْب, which is strictly speaking derived from the old feminine. The forms in the vulgar dialects of Abyssinia are not dissimilar to those of the ancient Ethiopic, viz. Tigrifā ጠ: "who?" and ጠንተ: *mēntāy*, rarely ጠንተ: and ጠንተ: "what?" This latter is compounded of ጠንተ: and the other interrogative ጠ:: In Amharic the commonest forms are ጠ: "who?" and ጠ: "what," shortened from ጠንተ::

Vulgar Arabic forms of مَنْ are مَنْ and مَنْ. The change of vowel in the former case is due to the influence of the labial *m*;

in the latter, it is the natural weakening of *ā* in the shut syllable, and is pronounced in pause *mīn* مِين. From a form resembling this last must have arisen, by the rejection of the final *n*, the Hebrew מִי "who?" It is also found in Ethiopic, but as a neuter, "what?" or else as an adverb "how!" e.g. ጢላደጦ: "how pleasant!" ጢዖቦ: "how great is—!" ጢጦጠን: "how great?" "how much?" (from ጦጠን: "measure, quantity"). The Phoenician form of the personal interrogative seems also, from some phrases in the *Poenulus*, to have been *mt*.

The neuter form *mā* is common to the Arabic, Hebrew, Phoenician, and the Aramaic dialects, מָ, מַה, מַּה, مَا; and we also find abundant traces of it in Assyrian, as I shall show you presently. This form I would venture to explain, with Fr. Böttcher, as follows. The original *mant* became by assimilation *mat*; the doubling was gradually dropped, because hardly audible, at the end of the word, leaving *mat*. This would gradually lead to the aspiration of the final *t*, *math*. The aspirated letter would first pass into *h*, מה, *mah*, and finally disappear altogether in pronunciation, the vowel being lengthened in the now open syllable, מה, *māh*. Compare the different stages of such words as אַנְה, אַה, אַה "anger" (Arab. اَنْف "nose"), or תַּתְּ, with suffix תַּתְּי, from תַּתְּ, תַּתְּ, תַּנְּתְּ or תַּנְּתְּ, תַּנְּתְּ (for תַּנְּתְּ); and the series of changes which produced the ordinary feminine termination of nouns הַ, אַ, out of the original *at*, viz. (1) *at*, (2) *ath*, תַּ. (3) *ah*, with aspirated *h* (found in Arabic in rhyme), and finally (4) *ā*, הַ, אַ. In this way too we are enabled to give an easy explanation of the *daghesh forte* which so constantly follows this word, and of the forms מַה, מַה, מַה, as compared with those of the article הַ, הַ, הַ, from הַ.

From מַה by the addition of הַ we obtain in Talmudic and Mandaitic the forms מַהוּ, מאוּ, "what is it?" מאוּ is con-

tracted in Mandaitic into **ܡܘ** in the word **ܡܘܢ** "why?" i.e. **ܡܘܢ** = **ܡܘܢܐ** = **ܡܘܢܐ**. By adding **ܘܢ** to **ܡܘܢ** there arises in Talmudic the word **ܡܘܢܐ** "what?" in composition **ܡܘܢܐ** "wherefore?" "why?" = **ܡܘܢܐ**. In ancient Syriac the same combination of **ܡܘܢ** with **ܘܢܐ** and **ܘܢ** finally resulted in the contracted forms **ܡܘܢܐ** and **ܡܘܢܐ**, the latter of which was farther weakened into **ܡܘܢܐ**. Hence in combination with **ܘܢܐ** arose the form **ܡܘܢܐ** "what is it?" = **ܡܘܢܐ**. In modern Syriac this same *mā-dēn* has been contracted into **ܡܘܢܐ**, with a rather unusual weakening of the vowel in this dialect; and this is farther shortened into **ܡܘܢܐ**, **ܡܘܢܐ**, and even **ܡܘܢܐ**, as in **ܡܘܢܐ** "what shall we do?"

With regard to the neutral **ܡܐ** in Arabic, I may observe that it is not unfrequently shortened into **ܡܐ** *mā*, especially in connection with prepositions, as **ܡܐ** *ma* for **ܡܐ** *ma*, **ܡܐ** *ma* for **ܡܐ** *ma*, **ܡܐ** *ma* for **ܡܐ** *ma*. These last two words are still further abbreviated in poetry into **ܡܐ** and **ܡܐ**, which shows us the origin of the word **ܡܐ** "how much?" standing for **ܡܐ** or **ܡܐ**, Syriac **ܡܐ**, Hebrew **ܡܐ**. In Ethiopic this abbreviated *mā* is frequently appended to other interrogatives, with somewhat the same force as the Latin *nam*; e.g. **ܡܐ** *mānū-mā* **ܡܐ** *mānū-mā* "who art thou, pray?" **ܡܐ** *mānt-nū-mā*, **ܡܐ** *aylē-mā*, **ܡܐ** *ēfō-mā*, **ܡܐ** *mā'ēsē-nū-mā*.

That these interrogative pronouns should pass into indefinites, with the sense of "who, whoever, what, whatever," is only what might be naturally expected, and the consideration of this point belongs rather to comparative syntax than to our present subject. Sundry forms must, however, for the sake of completeness, be noticed here. And firstly, the Assyrian words *mannū-ma*, *mann-d-ma*, *man-man*, by assimilation *mamman*, and



*man-mā*, "whoever," "any one"; *mimma*, "whatever." Of these, *manman* or *maniman* is merely a reduplication of *man*; *manúma*, *mandma*, and *manma*, are formed by the addition of *ma* to *mannu* or *man*; and *mimma* arises from a neuter *mi*, like the Ethiopic ጣ: *mī*. Similar words may be found in the modern dialects of Abyssinia. For instance, Tigriña has ጣጣጣ: or ጣጣጣ: "whoever," "any one"; and in Amharic there occurs ጣጣጣ:, with the neuters ጣጣጣ: and ጣጣጣጣጣ::

The indefinite *mā* is often attached in Arabic as an enclitic to another word, to give it a certain vagueness, as قَلِيلٌ مَّا "a small quantity"; اَعْطِنِي كِتَابًا مَّا "give me some book or other." At other times it conveys something of an intensifying force, as جِئْتَ لِمْرٍ مَّا "thou art come for some matter" (of importance); whence أَيُّ نَتِي مَّا is often nearly equivalent to أَيُّ نَتِي "what a youth!" "what a man!" Hence we obtain an easy explanation of such a word as the Chaldee ܡܪܥܡ "something," which is in reality a contraction of ܡܪܥܡܢܐ "scibile quid." All the other forms of this word are only more or less corrupted; e.g. Chald. ܡܪܥܡܢܐ (like ܡܪܥܡܢܐ for ܡܪܥܡܢܐ), Mand. ܡܝܢܪܐܡ, Syr. ܡܪܥܡܢܐ, Talmud. ܡܝܪܝ, modern Syriac ܡܝܪܝܐ. In later times the word began to be treated in some of the dialects as a simple substantive, and to form a plural; e.g. in old Syriac ܡܪܥܡܢܐ, and in modern Syriac ܡܝܪܝܐ, whilst the Mandaitic forms a new substantive ܡܝܢܪܐ, "a thing," plur. ܡܝܢܪܝܐ.

To return to the Arabic مَّا: we also find it used, especially with prepositions, without its apparently adding anything to the sense; e.g. مِنْ غَيْرِ مَّا جَرِمَ "in every year," مِمَّا خَطِيئَاتِهِمْ "without any offence," "because of their sins,"

عَمَّا قَلِيلٍ "after a little," بِمَا رَحْمَةً مِنَ اللَّهِ "by God's mercy."

The same is the case in Hebrew, only that מָה has in this case been modified into מו. Hence בְּמוֹ-שְׁלֹגַ, Job ix. 30, *kerē*; בְּמוֹ-אֶפֶל, Ps. xi. 2; לְמוֹ-הָרֵב, Job xxvii. 14; and בְּמוֹ-אֶבֶן, Exod. xv. 5. So also before pronominal suffixes כְּמוֹנִי, כְּמוֹךָ, כְּמוֹדוֹ.

Here the Ethiopic at once shows the old form in its ስጦ: *kāma*, "as," "like," but with suffixes ስጦሃ: *kamā-ya*, *kamā-ka*, *kamā-hū*, *kamā-hōmī*. You will, I think, find the same weakening of *mā* to *mō* in a word which appears in the Chaldee lexicons as מוּדְלָא or מוּלָא "wealth," "property," with the variants מִדְלָא and מוּלָא, the former of which is certainly a mere error. מוּלָא seems to me to be identical with the Arabic

مَالٌ, which is in reality a compound of مَا "what" and لٌ "to," literally, "what belongs to one." In מוּדְלָא the compound has been strengthened by the relative דְּ; that is to say מוּדְלִי "my property," or מוּדְלֵיהּ "his property," is really מוּדְלִי + דְּ + לֵיהּ or מוּדְלֵיהּ, literally "that which is to me" or "to him."

### E. *The Reflexive Pronouns.*

Finally, it may be as well to say a few words regarding the mode of expressing the reflex pronouns in the Semitic languages, though this pertains rather to the subject of comparative syntax than to our present topic.

In some cases, as you are aware, the reflex idea is conveyed by means of a peculiar form of the verb, for instance in Hebrew the Niph'al or Hithpa'el.

In other cases, the ordinary pronouns of the 3rd person have to do duty for the reflex pronouns as well; e.g. וַיִּקַּח אֶת-שְׁנֵי נַעֲרָיו אִתּוֹ, where we also say "he took two of his young men with *him*," whilst the German more accurately expresses it by "und er nahm zween (zwei) seiner Knechte mit

*sich*." I may remark, however, in passing, that even in German, so late as Luther's time, *ihm*, *ihr*, and *ihnen*, could be employed for *sich*, just as *sein* and *ihr* serve at the present day both for *suus* and *eius* or *eorum*.

In other cases still, where it was positively necessary to make a distinction, recourse was had to a compound pronoun, such as  $\eta, \rho, \iota, \iota, \sigma, \delta$ ; or—and this is the point to which I more particularly wish to direct your attention just now,—a substantive, most frequently one expressing some part of the human frame, was employed with the appropriate pronominal suffix, e.g.  $\psi, \delta, \iota$  "my soul," for "myself."

In Arabic the words frequently used for this purpose are  $\text{نفس}$  "soul," plur.  $\text{انفس}$ , and  $\text{عين}$  "eye, essence," plur.  $\text{اعيان}$ ; but in the later stages of the language we also find  $\text{روح}$  "spirit,"  $\text{حَال}$  "state," and  $\text{ذات}$  "essence"; e.g.  $\text{تَجِي بِرُوحِكَ}$  "thou wilt come thyself" (or "in person"),  $\text{قَتَلَ حَالَهُ}$  "he has killed himself,"  $\text{رَاحَ هُوَ بِذَاتِهِ}$  "he is gone himself" (or "in person").

In Ethiopic  $\Lambda\Lambda$ : is employed for the nominative in the forms  $\Lambda\Lambda, \rho$ : *lali-ya* or  $\Lambda\Delta\rho$ : *lali'-ya*,  $\Lambda\Lambda, \eta$ : *lali-ka*,  $\Lambda\Lambda, \iota$ : *lali-hi*, etc. This  $\Lambda\Lambda$ : Dillmann maintains to be nothing more than a reduplication of the demonstrative syllable *la*, which we have already found in so many pronominal forms. Praetorius has suggested another derivation, viz. from the verb  $\Lambda\Lambda\rho$ : "to separate," whence the Amharic  $\Lambda\Lambda$ : "another"; and for this no doubt analogies might be produced from other languages; but for the present I prefer to abide by Dillmann's view as the simpler. For other cases than the nominative the Ethiopic employs the word  $\text{ርእስ}$ : "head," as  $\text{ወገ፡ ትረሲ፡ ርእስከ}$ : "whom dost thou make thyself (to be)?"  $\text{ላዕለ፡ ርእስከኛ}$ : "against yourselves."  $\text{ኛርእስ}$  is of comparatively rare occurrence in this sense, as  $\text{ወገኑ፡ ኛርእስ፡ ለጥጥ፡}$  "he gave himself up to death." In the vulgar dialects, Tigrifā and Amharic, there seems to be a still greater variety of expression. In Tigrifā we find  $\text{ሳዕል}$ :

or ብዓል: "lord, master," as ባዕሉይ: ርእሱ: "I myself have seen," እኔ: እኔ: ብዓሉይ: ለይ: "behold, it is I myself." More rare is the use of ብዓልቤት: "master of the house," e.g. መድረግ: ብዓልቤታ: ተፈሪ: "for the earth brings forth fruit (of) itself." These two are generally used for the nominative, whilst for the other cases is commonly employed ርእሷ: "head"; less frequently ነፍሷ: "soul," and ለኃ: "flesh," "body." From ነፍሷ: are formed, as I said before, the personal pronouns ነህ: *nessē-khā*, "thou," and ነሁ: *nessū* "he," as well as the reduplicated ነህነህ: "one another," as ተባህሉ: ነህነህተሙ: "they spoke to one another," or "among themselves." The word ብሕቱ: *solitudo*, is also used in the sense of *self*, apparently for any case; and similarly ሰብነት: "humanity"; though these two may perhaps be restricted to the third person. In Amharic nearly the same words occur in their appropriate dialectic forms, viz. ባህነት:, ራህ:, ነህነ: and ሰውነት:: From ራህ: has been derived the pronoun of the 3rd person, እሱ:, farther contracted into እሱ: *essū*.

In Assyrian the common reflexive is *rāman*, which seems to stand for *rahman*, just as *ruk* for *rahuk*, רוק. It is therefore equivalent to the Heb. ׀ך, or rather ׀ך, τὰ σπλάγχνα, and forms with suffixes *rāmanīya*, *rāmanīka*, *ramanīsu*, etc. One might have imagined this, after the analogy of the Hebrew, to be a plural in *ān*, against which the form *ramanīsu*, with double *n*, would perhaps not have militated; but the form *ramnīsu* seems to show that the vowel of the second syllable, even though accented, was short, and might in some cases be elided.

In Biblical Hebrew the most usual word as a reflexive is שׁנפ, though ׀פ, "face, presence," is also employed, e.g. Exod. xxxiii. 14, ילכני ׀פ, 2 Sam. xvii. 11. עצ, "bone," is used in the Bible in speaking of things only, as ׀שׁמי ׀עצ, ׀עצ; הָיָה ׀יָוֹם; but in later Hebrew it is applied to persons, ׀עצ ל "for myself"; as are also רג "bone" and תג "body," with which last you may compare the old German phrases *mīn īp*, *ān īp*, for *ich* and *du*.

Among the Aramaic dialects there is some variety of usage.

In the Targūms נשׁ is common; in later writings נר, which we also find in Samaritan and in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac. In Syriac נשׁ and נשׁ are the dominant words, נשׁ being very rare. In Mandaitic נשׁ is used; whilst נשׁ is found in Samaritan, in the forms קנום and קלום, and may possibly also occur in Phoenician<sup>1</sup>. I regret my inability as yet to give any satisfactory etymology of this word. Modern Syriac still makes use of נשׁ *nōshā*, but far more frequently employs the word נשׁ, which is merely the Persian جان *jān*, "soul"; as נשׁ כשׁ אשׁב נשׁא לחיב "who was making my way bitter to me," נשׁ נשׁ "to shake himself."

<sup>1</sup> [Viz., in the inscription of Eshmūn'āzār, *C. I. S.*, No. 3, l. 4, 20. Cf. G. Hoffmann, *Ueber einige Phoen. Inschr.* (4<sup>o</sup> Gött. 1889) p. 37.]

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE NOUN.

FROM the pronoun we naturally proceed to the *Noun*, in treating of which it will be most convenient for our present practical purpose to speak first of the distinction of gender, and then of the distinctions of number and case. With respect to gender and number, it may be desirable to consider the verbal forms to a slight extent along with the nominal, because there is in the Semitic languages a close resemblance in the flexion of the noun and verb, for which we look in vain in the Indo-European languages.

#### I. *Gender.*

The vivid imagination of the Semite conceived all objects, even those that are apparently lifeless, as endowed with life and personality. Hence for him there are but *two genders*, as there exist in nature but two sexes. All that we are accustomed to look upon as indifferent and neuter, was of necessity classed by him as either masculine or feminine, though the latter predominated, as we may see from the formation of abstract nouns, from the employment of the fem. as the impersonal form of the verb, and from other phenomena in Semitic speech. The Mandaite only pushes this use to its utmost limit, when he construes as fem. such words and expressions as מִינְרָאם "something," כּוֹל דַּ "all that," and מַא דַּ or מַארו דַּ "what," "whatever."

Even the word מַ, מָּא, מָּה, the nearest approach in the Semitic languages to a neuter, is only, as I tried to show you in

a former lecture, a corruption of *mant*, which is actually the fem. of <sup>م</sup>مِن, <sup>م</sup>مِن, <sup>م</sup>مِ.

There are, of course, a great many cases in which the Semitic languages, as well as others, do not mark the difference of gender by any difference of termination, both in respect of living and of inanimate objects. <sup>א</sup>א “mother,” <sup>א</sup>אָ “ewe,” <sup>ע</sup>עַי “eye,” <sup>ע</sup>עִיר “city,” are not designated as fem. by any external mark. But in the greater number of cases it was found convenient, if not absolutely necessary, to indicate the fem. gender by an external sign; and for this purpose the letter *t* was commonly employed as an affix.

In this simple form of affixed *t* the fem. termination is rare in Arabic, as <sup>ب</sup>بنت “daughter,” <sup>أ</sup>أخت “sister”; but common in Ethiopic, especially in adjectives and participles, as <sup>ለ</sup>ለህቅ: *lähkë*, “old,” <sup>ለ</sup>ለህቅት: *lähkëti*; <sup>ፍ</sup>ፍቅር: *fëkür*, “beloved,” <sup>ፍ</sup>ፍቅርት: *fëkërti*; <sup>ጸ</sup>ጸደቅ: *šādäqë*, “just,” <sup>ጸ</sup>ጸደቅት: *šādäqëti*; <sup>መ</sup>መስጠጤ: *mastamhür*, “asking mercy,” <sup>መ</sup>መስጠጤት: *mastamhërti*. We find it, however, in substantives too, as <sup>ን</sup>ንጉሠ: *nëgüs*, “king,” <sup>ን</sup>ንጉሠት: *nëgësti*, “queen”; <sup>እ</sup>እንስት: *anësti*, “woman”; <sup>ወ</sup>ወለት: *walditi*, “daughter,” for <sup>ወ</sup>ወለት:: In Hebrew the simple *t* is found in some cases where the masc. ends in a single consonant, as <sup>י</sup>ילדת “bearing,” Gen. xvi. 11, Judges xiii. 5, 7; <sup>ל</sup>לת “to bear,” for <sup>ל</sup>לדת, 1 Sam. iv. 19; <sup>א</sup>אחת “one,” for <sup>א</sup>אחת; but more commonly a short supplementary vowel is inserted between the last two letters, resulting in the vocalisation <sup>ַ</sup>ַ, or, if there be a guttural at the end of the word, <sup>ֶ</sup>ֶ, and the like; thus, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת, <sup>ח</sup>חַמַּת for <sup>ח</sup>חמַת.

Instead of the simple *t*, however, we more usually find *at*, with a connective short *a*. This is by far the most common form in Arabic, as <sup>ا</sup>امرأه “man,” <sup>ا</sup>امرأه “woman”; <sup>ج</sup>جد “grandfather,”

جَدَّةٌ "grandmother"; عَظِيمٌ "great," عَظِيمَةٌ; قَاتِلٌ "killing," قَاتِلَةٌ.

In Ethiopic it is less frequent than *t*, though by no means uncommon; e.g. ርደት: "descent," ሰጦት: "garlic" (ሰጦም, ሰጦጦም), ናቀት: "she-camel" (ሳቀት), ስጦት: *bardkat* "blessing"

(ጥቅም), ስጦት: "sin" (ጥቅም), ስጦት: "tent" (ጥቅም).

In Hebrew this termination is rare in the simple form of nouns; as examples take בְּרִיקָה (a precious stone), צִרְפֵּת, דְּבָרָה, אֵילָה, נְבִיעַת (places), מְחִילָה, בְּשֻׁמָּה (women); also with *kāmes*, הַקָּאָה "the pelican," בְּעֵלָה (a place), פֶּרֶת (Gen. xlix. 22), חַמָּאָה "sin," מַנָּה for *manayat*, "portion"; also אַחֻוֹת, חַמָּוֹת, for *ahawat*, *hamawat*. But we find it everywhere in the so-called construct state, and also before the pronominal suffixes, as נְחִלָּהּ, נְחִלָּתִי.

Now observe the history of these forms, from which you will perceive the absurdity of saying that the fem. termination in Hebrew is הַ, and that it becomes תַּ in the construct state.

The reverse is the fact. The original form is the תַּ of the construct, and it becomes הַ. The Ethiopic presents us with the

original form *t* or *at*. The Hebrew retained this termination in the construct state, before pronominal suffixes, and in a few other

cases. But in the simple form of the noun the aspirated תַּ passed into aspirated הַ, and finally, when this *h* was dropped, nothing remained but the vowel, which was heightened in the open syllable into *d*, הַ, as נְחִלָּהּ. So also in Arabic; the

original *t* is retained in بِنْتٌ, أُخْتٌ, and in the Kor'ān in a few

other words, e.g. Sūra xi. 76, رَحْمَتُ اللَّهِ; as also before suffixes,

رَحْمَتِي, رَحْمَتِي. The next step was to the aspirated *h*, which

<sup>1</sup> Cf. what has been said above, p. 124, of the pronoun *ta*, *na*, *ma*.



form is used by the Arabic poets in rhyme, as, for example, when <sup>عَدْلُهُ</sup> (for <sup>الْعَدْلَةُ</sup>) is rhymed with <sup>أَيْلُهُ</sup> (for <sup>الْأَيْلَةُ</sup>) and with <sup>وَلَّهُ</sup> (for <sup>وَلَّهُ</sup>); or <sup>السَّلَامَةُ</sup> (for <sup>السَّلَامَةُ</sup>) with <sup>أَمَامُهُ</sup> (for <sup>أَمَامُهُ</sup>). The last step is to drop the *h*, as is done in the vulgar pronunciation, <sup>الرَّحْمَةُ</sup>, <sup>السَّلَامَةُ</sup>, <sup>الْعَدْلَةُ</sup>. The spelling with the dotted *ḥ* is merely a compromise of the grammarians between the old <sup>ت</sup> and the vulgar <sup>ت</sup>; if I write <sup>سَنَةٌ</sup>, I indicate at once the old pronunciation <sup>سَنَتْ</sup>, <sup>سَنَاتٌ</sup>, and the more recent <sup>سَنَةٌ</sup>. If you ask for analogies in other languages for such changes as this of *at* into <sup>אֶת</sup>, *ath*, then into <sup>אֶת</sup>, *ah*, and finally into *d*, <sup>אֶת</sup>, I can give you several. The final aspirated *d* of the Spaniard, for example in the word *ciudad*, has a very faint sound to an English ear, and the consonant has altogether vanished in the corresponding Italian *città* for *civitat* (i.e. *civitatem*). So also in French, in the verb, *il aime*, from *ille amat* (for *amavit*), but interrogatively *aime-t-il?* from *amat ille?* Indeed aspirated letters, in all positions, are apt to disappear entirely or else to leave no trace behind them save the mere aspiration. Compare the Talmudic <sup>אֶתְּ</sup> for <sup>אֶתְּ</sup>, and the modern Syriac <sup>אֶתְּ</sup> for <sup>אֶתְּ</sup>; or, to go a little farther afield, consider the Armenian *hayr* and the Irish *athir*, both the regular equivalents in these languages of the Latin *pater*. In *hayr* an aspirated *p* remains as *h*, and an aspirated *t* has vanished (as in *père*); in *athir* an aspirated *p* has vanished, whilst an aspirated *t* remains only in writing, for the word is actually pronounced *ahir*.

Having thus, by the help of Arabic, Ethiopic and Hebrew, established the fact that the principal fem. termination in these languages is *t* or *at*, let us trace this form in the remaining Semitic tongues.

In Assyrian we find such forms as *bint* "daughter," *ihit* "one" (for *ihidit*), and the like, with simple *t*; but the usual

shape of this affix is *at*, weakened into *it*, e. g. *šarrat* "princess," *malikat* "queen," *nākat* "she-camel," *šanat* "year," *āšibat* "inhabiting" (יִשְׁבֵּת), *bilat* or *bilit* "mistress, lady," *riš'at* or *riš'it* "wickedness," *iršit* "earth."

In Phoenician the noun ends in ת, whether it be in the simple or the construct state, as in the usual dedication of the Carthaginian *ex voto* tablets לרבת לתנת, "to the goddess Tanith," or in the words from the sarcophagus of king Eshmunazar, וְאִמִּי אִמְעִשְׁתָּרְתָּ כְּהַנֵּת עִשְׁתָּרְתָּ רַבְתָּן הַמְּלִכָּת, or again וְשָׁכַב אֲנִי בְּחֵלֶת וְ. We find however traces of a younger form in א δ, corresponding to the Hebrew הַ, very rarely in inscriptions, more frequently in the words handed down to us by classical authors; e. g. *κιστώ*, Heb. קָרְה, "cassia" or "cinnamon"; *nesso*, Heb. נִצָּה, "flower"; *Dido*, either for נִדְיָה, according to the explanation of the *Etymol. Magnum* *πλανήτις*, or for נִדְיָה; Καρχηδών, *Carthago*, corruption of קַרְתַּ חַדְשָׁא. In the Aramaic dialects the forms run exactly parallel to the Hebrew; e. g. in Syriac the construct state ends in *ath*; the *t* is retained in the emphatic form and before suffixes; but it disappears in the simple form of the noun, and is represented in writing by an *aleph*. Thus: ܩܪܗܐ, ܩܪܗܐ, ܩܪܗܐ, ܩܪܗܐ.

Here I may be allowed to remark that this original fem. in *t* has been retained in another instance in several of the Semitic languages, viz. as an adverb. Examples are: Hebrew, רַבַּת, Ps. lxx. 10, cxx. 6, cxxiii. 4; Aramaic, טָוֹת "fasting," Dan. vi. 19; Syriac, ܕܚܘܒܐ, ܕܚܘܒܐ; ܢܝܒܐ "alive," ܦܠܢܐ "well," ܕܘܒܐ "naked," ܕܘܒܐ "gratis, for nothing"; ܕܘܒܐ "last," ܕܘܒܐ or ܕܘܒܐ "first," where *ith* is merely, as Noeldeke has remarked, a weakening of the older *yath*; ܕܘܒܐܢܐ "carnally," ܕܘܒܐܢܐ "spiritually," from ܕܘܒܐܢܐ and ܕܘܒܐܢܐ; ܕܘܒܐܢܐ "like a wild

beast," from **בְּתַמְלִינָא**; and hence, in Syriac and the Palestinian dialect, as an adverbial termination, even where an adjective in **־וּ**, **־וּ**, is not in use, as **בְּיַנְיָא** "well," **בְּיַנְיָא** "gently," **בְּיַנְיָא** "truly." Such adverbs, being really feminine adjectives in the old form of the *status absolutus*, may be construed with a preposition, as **בְּיַנְיָא** "in Greek," **בְּיַנְיָא** "in Syriac"; and still more freely in Mandaitic, **בְּיַנְיָא** "in haste," **בְּיַנְיָא** "gently." Sometimes the abstract termination **וּת** is used in the same way in both languages, as **לְבַנְיָא** "a second time, again," **לְבַנְיָא** "a third time"; in the dialect of Palestine, **לְבַנְיָא** "rightly, well"; in Mandaitic **רַאבּוּת** "grandly"; and among the later Jews **יַאֲת**, **מְבּוּת**.

I may next remark that this fem. in **ת** has in some cases received a curious increment in Mandaitic and the Talmudic dialect. Here namely we find some feminine adjectives ending in **תִּי**, Mand. **תִּיא**, instead of **תא**. The correct pronunciation of this termination is held by Noeldeke to be most probably **תִּי**.

With the Hebrew **רַפְתִּי** in Lament. i. 1, **הָעִיר רַפְתִּי עִם**, it can have nothing to do; that form is to be classed with **יּוֹם וְגַבְתִּי**, **אֲסִירִי לְגַפְנֵי עִירָה**, etc., which I shall try to explain when we speak of the cases. Examples of this fem. in **תִּי** from the Talmud and Targūms are: **אֶצְבְּעִיהָ זוּמְרָתִי** "his little finger," **אֲנִיפְתִּי**, **חֲזוֹרָתִי**, **מִלְּקָתָא אַחְרֵיתִי**, **שְׁתָּא חֲרָתִי**, **רַאדִּיתִיא** "small," **רַאבּוּתִיא**, **רַאבּוּתִיא** "new," **בְּיַנְיָא** "another," **הוּאֲרִיתִיא** "white," **בְּיַנְיָא** "heavy," **הַאֲתִיקִיתִיא** "ancient," **שְׂאֲמִירִיתִיא** "beautiful," etc.

I would now call your attention to the parallel form in the flexion of the verb, viz. the 3rd pers. sing. fem. of the perfect, in Hebrew **קָטְלָהּ**. Here too the original termination was *at*, as is proved not only by the Arabic **كَتَلَتْ** *katalat*, the Ethiopic

כַּתְּלַת: *katlat*, and the Syriac  $\text{ܕܠܬܐ}$  *kətlāth*, but also by the following evidence derived from Hebrew itself. (1) The form with final *t* is actually found in Deut. xxxii. 36, אֲזַלְתָּ יָדְךָ (for אֲזַלְתָּ), Ezek. xlvi. 17, וְשַׁבְתָּ; possibly too Isaiah xxiii. 15, וְנִשְׁבַּחְתָּ צִיר (for וְנִשְׁבַּחְתָּ); as also in the whole class of verbs הִגַּלְתָּ so-called, e. g. עָשַׂתָּ for עָשִׂיתָ, הִרְצַתָּ for הִרְצִיתָ, הִגַּלְתָּ for הִגַּלִּיתָ. This is exactly the Arabic جَلَّتْ, by contraction for جَلَّتِ; and the uncontracted جَلَّتِ is actually found once in Hebrew in the pausal חֲסִיָּה נִפְשִׁי, Ps. lvii. 2, whereas the ordinary pausal form is עֲשֶׂתָּה. The ordinary non-pausal form עֲשֶׂתָּה, גַּלְתָּה, etc., is a secondary formation, in which the fem. suffix is repeated in the form הַ, thus aiming at uniformity with the ordinary קָטַלְתָּ. (2) The form with final *t* invariably occurs in connexion with pronominal suffixes; e. g. יִלְדְתִנִּי; גַּמְלֶתְךָ, or with assimilation יִלְדְתֵנִי; אֲחֻזְתֵּנוּ; בְּאֲתֵנִי; יִלְדְתֶךָ; גַּנְבְתֵם; אֲכַלְתֶם; אֲרַבְתֶךָ; רָאִתְךָ. Into this subject I shall have to enter more fully in treating of the verb; here it must suffice to have thus indicated the identity of the fem. termination in the singular noun and in the 3rd pers. sing. of the perfect tense.

The feminine termination הַ is occasionally written in Hebrew with נ in place of ה, according to the usual practice in Aramaic; e. g. חֲנָנָא Isaiah xix. 17, קָרְחָא Ezek. xxvii. 31, שִׁנָּא Ps. cxxvii. 2, מְטָרָא Lament. iii. 12; and even in the verb, נִבְרָחָא Ezek. xxxi. 5. We also find the vowel of this syllable weakened, though very rarely, into ם, as in the noun הַזְּוָרָה for הַזְּוָרָה, Isaiah lix. 5, and in the verb לָנָה for לָנָה, Zechar. v. 4.

Besides the feminine termination in ت - or ة -, the Arabic

language possesses two others, viz.  $\bar{a}$  \_ ي and  $\bar{a}$  \_ آ, both, as it would seem, originally of abstract signification. Examples of the former are  $\bar{b}$  شري "good news,"  $\bar{h}$  حمي "a fever,"  $\bar{d}$  دعوي "a claim,"  $\bar{r}$  روياء "a vision"; of the latter,  $\bar{s}$  صكراء or  $\bar{b}$  بيدااء "a desert,"  $\bar{k}$  كبرياء "glory, pride." The one, viz.  $\bar{a}$  \_ ي, forms the feminine of adjectives ending in  $\bar{a}$  \_ ان, as  $\bar{s}$  شبعان "sated, not hungry," f.  $\bar{s}$  شبعي; and of the form  $\bar{a}$  \_ افعل used as a superlative, e. g.  $\bar{a}$  اصغر "the smallest," f.  $\bar{a}$  الصغري. The other,  $\bar{a}$  \_ آ, forms the feminine of  $\bar{a}$  \_ افعل, when it is not a comparative or superlative, as  $\bar{a}$  احمر "red,"  $\bar{a}$  حمراء;  $\bar{a}$  احمق "foolish,"  $\bar{a}$  حمقاء. These terminations seem to find their representatives in Ethiopic in nouns ending in  $\bar{a}$ , as  $\bar{b}$  ቤንዳ: "building,"  $\bar{g}$  ገልገል: "joy,"  $\bar{t}$  ጥላ: "oath,"  $\bar{w}$  ሀላግ: "wrong,"  $\bar{t}$  ጥገራ: "temptation,"  $\bar{t}$  ጸጣ: or  $\bar{t}$  ጸጣ: "toil,"  $\bar{r}$  ጸታ: "order, row"; and in  $\bar{z}$ , as  $\bar{w}$  ሠርፑ: "beam, mast,"  $\bar{a}$  ሰርፑ: "army,"  $\bar{m}$  ጻፍ: "moth,"  $\bar{t}$  ጊዜ: "time,"  $\bar{t}$  ሰድጫ: "appointed time." The rules of gender are, however, very loosely observed in Ethiopic, and most of the words just cited may also be construed as masculine.

The Arabic termination  $\bar{a}$  \_ ي is represented in Syriac by the form *ai*, as in  $\bar{h}$  هُكِب,  $\bar{h}$  هُكَيْب,  $\bar{h}$  هُكَيْب,  $\bar{h}$  هُكَيْب,  $\bar{h}$  هُكَيْب, and a few more. In Hebrew this termination can hardly be said to exist, unless we reckon as examples of it the proper name  $\bar{s}$  שרי, of which the later form is  $\bar{s}$  שרה, and the numeral  $\bar{s}$  עשרה, in the compounds  $\bar{s}$  אֶחָד עֶשְׂרֵה, etc., which may stand for an original  $\bar{s}$  עשרי. Of the other ending  $\bar{a}$  \_ آ I can find at present no certain trace in Aramaic and Hebrew, for Hebrew words in  $\bar{h}$  or  $\bar{h}$  \_ , mostly proper names, seem, without exception, to have lost a final *n*,  $\bar{h}$  \_ ון.  $\bar{s}$  גִּלְדָּה and  $\bar{s}$  שִׁלְדָּה, for example, form the adjectives  $\bar{s}$  גִּלְדָּנִי and  $\bar{s}$  שִׁלְדָּנִי. Since, however, in Arabic, we find

صَنَعَانِي derived from الصَّنَعَاءُ, بَهْرَانِي from the name of the tribe بَهْرَانِي, رَوْحَانِي from رَوْحَاءُ, it may be that גִּלְדָּה and נְשִׁילָה, as well as the Moabite קְרָחָה, represent an original *Gaild'u*, *Shaild'u*, and *Karhd'u*.

Finally, I may say a few words regarding a curious feminine form in Ethiopic, which consists entirely in an internal change of vowels. This is found in adjectives of the form *katál*, which take in the feminine *katál*; e. g. ሐደስ: "new," ሐደስ; (ጠብ-ብ: "learned, wise," ጠብ-ብ; ሀገራ: "great," ሀገራ; ርኩብ: (for *rahīb*) "wide, spacious," ርኩብ; ቀይሕ: (for *kayih*) "red," ቀይሕ:: Of this formation Ewald has discovered a trace in Arabic in حَصَان "chaste," applied to a woman, as compared with حَصِين "inaccessible, unapproachable"; and in رَزَان "grave, staid," also used of a woman, whereas the masculine is رَزِين.

## II. Numbers and Cases.

In treating of the *Numbers* and *Cases* of nouns in the Semitic languages I shall begin with the latter, for reasons which will become apparent as we proceed.

Of what we are accustomed to call *cases*—those varieties of termination which express the relations to one another of a noun and verb or of two nouns—the Semitic languages possess but three: the *casus rectus*, nominative or subject, and two *casus obliqui*, the one indicating the accusative or direct object, and also serving in a variety of ways as a *casus adverbialis*, the other corresponding most closely to the Indo-European genitive.

In the *singular* number these three cases are distinguished in ancient Arabic, in the great majority of nouns, by three terminations, *n* for the subject or nominative, *h* for the object or accusative, and *t* for the genitive, as we may appropriately

designate the second oblique form. In certain classes of nouns, however, the accusative has at an early period supplanted the genitive, so that these have only two terminations, *ā* for the nominative, and *ā* for the accusative and genitive. Examples of the triptote declension:—

بَيْتٌ	بَيْتٌ	بَيْتٌ
جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةٌ

The usage of the Arabic restricts these simple terminations to the definite and construct states of the noun. The noun must be defined by the article,

الْبَيْتُ	الْبَيْتُ	الْبَيْتُ;
-----------	-----------	------------

or it must be followed by a genitive, which is also a species of definition,

بَيْتُ يُوْسُفَ	بَيْتُ يُوْسُفَ	بَيْتُ يُوْسُفَ
بَيْتِهِ	بَيْتِهِ	بَيْتِهِ

In no other Semitic language has this inflexion been retained in such fullness and purity as in the ancient Arabic, the Arabic of the prae-Mohammedan poets and of the *Kor'ān*. In the modern language, as spoken at the present day, the case-terminations are either confounded with one another or entirely lost. In the Sinaitic peninsula, for example, one hears '*ammuk*, عَمُّكَ, which is really the nominative, used for all three cases.

In Ethiopic we can distinguish only one of these cases by an external mark; the accusative, with the termination *ā*. The vowel-endings of the nominative and genitive have disappeared; and the accusative *ā* takes the place of the others in the construct state, without any regard to the real case of the governing noun. E.g., ለጥፋረ፡ ብሉሊሳተ: "he loved a woman," ነገሠ፡ ሊትዮጲያ: "the king of Ethiopia." In the case of proper names, the accusative termination is *ū*; *hā*, to which

form I shall call your attention more particularly hereafter; e.g.  $\text{פְּרִלְיָ}$ : "Cain,"  $\text{יְהוּדָה}$ : "Judah."

In Assyrian, so far as I can understand the statements of the grammarians, these terminations are, as a general rule, appended to the noun when it is not in the construct state, but apparently without any regard to the actual relation of case. Thus, according to Schrader, the Assyrian writes *ina listn mat Aharri*, "in the language of the country of Phoenicia," without any case-sign in *listn* and *mat*; *šar Babbli*, "king of Babel"; *malku banušun*, "the king their builder"; *ššib libbišun*, "dwelling in their midst"; *'iribu ša šanši* or *'irib šanši*, "the setting of the sun"; *Dariyavus šarri*, "Darius the king." Here, therefore, the state of matters seems to be much the same as in modern Arabic; the case-endings, when employed, are used without any strict regard to their proper signification.

In Hebrew traces of all three terminations may be found. The accusative indeed is not uncommon, particularly in its adverbial sense, indicating direction or motion towards. E.g.,  $\text{אֶרֶץ}$  "to the ground,"  $\text{בֵּיתָהּ}$  "homewards," "inwards,"  $\text{הַבֵּיתָהּ}$  "into the house,"  $\text{הַעֵינָה}$  "to the well,"  $\text{הָרָה}$  "uphill,"  $\text{הַרְרָה}$  "to the mountains,"  $\text{שֶׁכֶּמָּה}$  "to Shechem,"  $\text{לְשֶׁכֶּתָּהּ}$  "into a chamber,"  $\text{בְּאֶרֶה שָׁבַע}$ ,  $\text{אֶרֶץ נָשָׁן}$  "to the highplace,"  $\text{יָמָה שׁוֹף}$ ,  $\text{בֵּיתָהּ יוֹסֵף}$ . As real objective accusatives I may cite  $\text{הִקֵּל אֶרֶץ וּבָלוֹן וְאֶרֶץ נִפְתָּלִי}$  "he abased, etc." Isaiah viii. 23;  $\text{מִי פָקַד עָלָיו אֶרֶץ}$  "who hath committed to his charge the earth?" Job xxxiv. 13. Here you may remark that the vowel *a* is expressed in writing by the letter ה. This does not, however, justify us in speaking of a "ה locale," as if the ה were anything more than the mere indication of the final vowel.

The terminations of the nominative and genitive are far rarer, and seem indeed to be used now and then only as archaistic forms, just as our poets occasionally indulge in such archaisms as *yode*, *whilom*, *yclept*, *ywis*, and the like. We need not therefore expect them to be employed with more regard to



grammatical accuracy than in Assyrian or in modern Arabic. The nominative termination is **ו**, in such phrases as **חֵיתוֹ אֶרֶץ** Gen. i. 24, **כָּל־חֵיתוֹ־יָעַר** Ps. l. 10, **לְחֵיתוֹ־אֶרֶץ** Ps. lxxix. 2, **בְּנוֹ צִפּוֹר** "O son of Šippōr," Num. xxiii. 18, **נָאֵם בְּלָעָם בְּנוֹ בְּעוֹר** Num. xxiv. 3, 15, **לְמַעַיְנו־מִים** Ps. cxiv. 8. The purer form **י** I can discover only in a few compound nouns, e.g., **אֲחוּמִי**, **פְּנוּיָל**, **מְתוּשָׁלַח**, and **מְתוּשָׁאֵל**. The genitive termination is **י**, as in **מְלֵאֲתִי** Lament. i. 1, **רַבְתִּי עִם** Ps. cx. 4, **עַל־דְּבַרְתִּי מְלִכֵי־צָדֵק** Isaiah i. 21, **בְּנֵי אֲתָנוּ** (acc.) Gen. xlix. 11. It appears also in many compound proper names, as **גְּבַרְיָאֵל**, **מְלִכֵי־צָדֵק**, **עוֹרִיָאֵל**, **חַנִּיָאֵל**.

All these three forms, no doubt, existed likewise in the Phœnician language, though the defective orthography of the monuments does not enable us to recognise them. In the inscription of Eshmûn'azar, for example [*C. I. S.*, No. 3, l. 11, 12], the words **לְמַמ** and **לְמַעַל** are no doubt to be pronounced **לְמַמָּה** and **לְמַעְלָה**, just as in Hebrew. In other cases the classical writers come to our aid. *Hannibal*, for instance, is **חַנְיָבַעַל** (genit.), but *Asdrubal* is **עוֹרֻבַעַל** (nomin.).

In Syriac we look in vain for any trace of these case-endings, save in two or three nouns regarding which I may be allowed to say a few words. I mean the words **أَب** "father," **أَخ** "brother," and **أَخْل** "father-in-law"; in Arabic, **أَب**, **أَخ**, **أَخْل**; in Hebrew, **אָב**, **אָח**, **חָם**. These have all lost their third radical, which was a *w*, and which reappears in Arabic in the construct state thus:—

N.	أَبُو	for	أَبُو
G.	أَبِي	for	أَبِي
A.	أَبَا	for	أَبُو

Of these three forms the Ethiopic has preserved before pronominal suffixes the nom.  $\lambda\beta\text{:}$ , as  $\lambda\beta\text{-}\eta$ : "thy father," and the accus.  $\lambda\beta\text{:}$ , as  $\lambda\beta\eta$ : "thy father," though  $\lambda\beta\text{-}\eta$ : is also used for the accusative. The Hebrew has chosen the genitive for all its three cases,  $\text{אָבִי}$  "father of —,"  $\text{אָבִיךָ}$ ; whereas the Syriac has

preferred the nom.,  $\text{ܐܒܝ}$ , and similarly  $\text{ܐܢܝܡܝ}$  and  $\text{ܐܢܝܡܝܗܘܢ}$ .

Let us now return once more to the Arabic, and examine its three flexional forms, *ā*, *ī*, *ū*. What may the origin of these be? With regard to the accusative the answer seems to be tolerably certain. It is a pronominal element, of a demonstrative nature, appended to the object noun to indicate the direction of the action of the governing verb. It is in fact nothing but the demonstrative *hā*, with which we are already acquainted in all the Semitic languages. In Ethiopic the full form  $\Psi$ : is employed, as I already mentioned, to form the accusative of proper names.  $\Phi\rho\lambda\Psi$ : etc. The gradual weakening of the *h* gives us such adverbial forms as  $\lambda\alpha\lambda$ : *af'ā*, or  $\lambda\alpha\lambda$ : *af'a*, "out, outside" (*forās, foris*),  $\eta\omega\omega$ : "at all, ever"; but ordinarily the particle is shortened to the utmost, and appears as final *ā*. The Hebrew  $\text{אֵל}$  preserves somewhat of the original lengthening of the vowel, for a primitive short *ā* would certainly have disappeared *in toto*.

The origin of the nominative *ā* is more obscure; but we may possibly venture to see in it the pronominal element *hā*, as designating the subject. Finally, the genitive *ī*,  $\text{אֵי}$ , may perhaps be connected with the termination of the so-called

relative adjectives in  $\text{אֵי}$  (Arabic  $\text{عِي}$ , vulgarly  $\text{ي}$ ), the origin of which is, however, not yet clear to me.

I said at the commencement of this discussion that the use of the singular terminations *ā*, *ī*, *ū* in Arabic was restricted to the defined noun, whether the definition was by the article or by a following genitive. I now remark that the undefined noun is inflected with the same terminations *plus* the sound of *n*, viz. *ān, īn, ūn*. E. g.

$\text{بَيْت}$	$\text{بَيْت}$	$\text{بَيْتًا}$
$\text{جَنَّة}$	$\text{جَنَّة}$	$\text{جَنَّة}$

In the accus. form <sup>بَيْتًا</sup> the letter 'alif may perhaps serve to mark the pausal pronunciation, *baith*, or it may be a mere indication of the *a*-sound, to distinguish this case more clearly in writing from the other two. This addition of the *n*-sound in Arabic is technically called the *tanwin* or "nunation," from the name of the letter *nūn*.

If we look around us for a similar appearance in the other Semitic languages, we find its counterpart in the *ntmation* of the Assyrian, which is not, however, according to the grammarians, restricted to the undefined noun, but also irregularly used with that which is defined. The forms are usually written *uv*, *iv*, *av*, but as *v* and *m* are not distinguished in writing, we are justified by analogy in pronouncing them *um*, *im*, *am*.

The same *ntmation* is found in the Himyaritic inscriptions of South Arabia in the form **Ⲅ** for all three cases, its use nearly corresponding with that of the Arabic *ntmation*; e.g., **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**; **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**; **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**; **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**, but **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**.

In Hebrew the *ntmation* seems to me to present itself in such words as **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** or **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**, **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**, **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**, which I consider as the accusatives of **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**, **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** and **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**. **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** is doubtful, as it may be connected with **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** rather than with **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**. In Ethiopic we may perhaps find a trace of it in the word **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**, Heb. **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**, **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**.

Now what is the origin of these terminations *un*, *in*, *an*, and *um*, *im*, *am*? And are they identical, or different? These questions are hard to answer; but I incline on the whole to consider them as identical, and to derive them both from an appended, indefinite **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**, **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**. That *n* and *m* readily interchange is known to us; and it is quite conceivable that some of the Semitic languages may have substituted *n* for original *m* in certain grammatical forms, whilst others carried out the change through the whole of them. That the word **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ**, **Ⲅⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙⲙ** might have been used at

an early period in the way suggested, can only be inferred from the recurrence of the phenomenon at a later period. History is apt to repeat itself, especially linguistic history. Now we find this use of **مَا** as an indefinite affix in Arabic in the so-called **مَا** <sup>صحة</sup> **مَا**, i. e. **مَا** appended to an indefinite noun with a vague, often intensifying, force; e. g., **أَعْطِنَا كِتَابًا مَا** "give us some book (or other)"; **قَلِيلٌ مَا** "some (small) quantity"; **جِيءَ لِيَوْمًا مَا** "thou art come for some matter (of importance)." Similar is the origin of the Aramaic word **מַרְעָם, מִנְרָאם, מְרָעָם**, a contraction of **מָרַעַץ מָה** "scibile quid." For the rest, how readily **مَا** may be shortened into **mā** and **m** appears from such Arabic forms as **كَمْ** "how much?" **وَلَمْ يَمِمْ، حَتَّى مِ، عَلَي مِ** shortened into **لَمْ، يَمِمْ.**

We have thus far established the following scheme of inflexion by cases in the Semitic languages for the *singular* number.

	Arabic	Assyr., Hīmyar., Hebrew
N.	<i>u, un</i>	<i>u, um</i>
G.	<i>i, in</i>	<i>i, im</i>
Acc.	<i>a, an</i>	<i>a, am</i>

Let us next examine the formation of the *plural*.

To express the idea of plurality in the inflexion of the noun the Semitic languages had recourse to the simple expedient of lengthening the vowel-ending of the singular. The lengthening of the sound, the dwelling upon the utterance, sufficed to convey the idea of indefinite number. Consequently in Arabic the undefined plural of masculine nouns must originally have been—

N. *ūn*, G. *īn*, Acc. *ān*.

But as the Arabs seem to have objected to terminate a long syllable with a consonant (save in pause), a short final vowel was added, giving the forms—

N. *āna*, G. *īna*, Acc. *āna*.

These forms were also employed in the plural when defined by the article; but in the construct state, as we should naturally expect, the final vowels of the singular were merely lengthened—

N. *ā*, G. *ī*, Acc. *ā*.

In the actual language, however, as known to us from the old poets and the *Ḳor'ān*, the accusative *ā*, *āna*, has become obsolete, so that we have in real use only two cases—

N. *ā*, *āna*; G. Acc. *ī*, *īna*.

The vulgar dialects of the present day have gone yet one step farther, and have discarded the nominative from ordinary use, retaining only the form *īn*. In Ethiopic, on the contrary, the accusative *ān* has supplanted the other cases, and forms the ordinary plural of adjectives and participles; as ሕዋ፡ “alive,” “living,” ሕዋን፡፡ ሐደስ፡ “new,” ሐደሳን፡፡ ክሠት፡ “revealed,” “manifest,” ክሠተን፡፡ Forgetful however of the real origin of this form, the language forms for itself an accusative and a construct state by appending to it the vowel *ā*, as in the singular; and the real construct plural in *ā* is found only in the numerals for 20, 30, etc., which are ሰሠረ፡ ሠላሳ፡ እርብዓ፡ ንጦሳ፡ etc. In all this the Assyrian runs curiously parallel to the Ethiopic. According to Schrader, the plural in *ān* appears in the forms *ānu*, *āni*, *āna*, with an appended vowel (obviously borrowed from the singular); as *šalmānu*, “statues” (שַׁלְמָנִים); *hursāni*, “woods” (חֻרְשָׁנִים); *šārāni*, “walls” (שָׂרָנִים); *šarrāni*, “princes” (שָׂרָנִים); whilst the numerals, 20, 30, etc., are *‘išrā*, *šilašā*, *irbā*, *ḥanšā*.

The Aramaic dialects make use, not of the accusative, but of the other oblique form, the genitive, for their plural. Hence we find the forms  $\text{ן}^{\text{—}}$  in the Biblical Aramaic,  $\text{ן}^{\text{—}}$  in Syriac, and in Mandaitic both  $\text{ן}^{\text{—}}$  and  $\text{ן}^{\text{—}}$  (*ī*).

The same choice was made by the Hebrews and Phoenicians. They discarded both the nom. *ām* and the accus. *ām*, retaining only the gen. *īm* in ordinary use<sup>1</sup>. In later stages of the language the *m* was dropped, a form of which there are two or three doubtful examples in the Bible; but curiously enough

<sup>1</sup> But the Moabites took the form  $\text{ן}^{\text{—}}$ , e.g., גַּבְרִין אַרְבַּעַן שָׁתַּי הַמַּלְכִין. etc.

this form in *t* is said to be not uncommon in Assyrian, as in *ilt*, "gods"; *malkt* or *malikt*, "kings"; *amt*, "days"; *pagrt*, "dead bodies"; with suffixes *karhlsu* "its towers"; *ašri-šunu*, "their places." The full form in *tm* is rare and archaistic, as in the proper names *Ašur-rš-iltm*, *Sumtrtm* and *Akkadtm*. Haupt finds traces of the form *ām*, representing the old accusative, in the Assyrian *šamāmu*, *šamāmi*, "heaven," *māmi*, "water," and the adverbial *akhāmiš*, "with one another, mutually (*lit.* like brothers)." It seems probable, as he suggests, that the plural *ān* is only a later form of this *ām*. And indeed he goes so far as to deny the existence of the termination *i*, which he pronounces *z*, and considers to be only a deflection of *ā*, from *ān*, *ām*.

You must not suppose that there is anything singular in this apparently capricious choice of a single case-ending to take the place of all its fellows, in the later stages of a language. It is precisely what has happened elsewhere than on Semitic ground. I need hardly remind you that Greek nouns appear in Syriac mostly in the *accusative*, simply because that was the one form with which the Syrians were familiar in the mouths of the Greeks; e.g.  $\text{ܠܐܡܘܢܐ}$  (*lampanāda*),  $\text{ܟܥܪܟܝܕܐ}$  (*kerkidā*),  $\text{ܐܢܕܪܝܐܢܬܐ}$  (*andriānta*),  $\text{ܐܪܚܘܨܐ}$  (*arxās*), etc. The Latin *accusative* too has supplied the ordinary nominal forms of the different Romance languages. In modern Persian the plural  $\text{ان}$  *an* is regarded by the best authorities as derived from an ancient *genitive* in *ām* (*āim*).

Turning to the plural of *feminine* nouns, we find the same principle in force, only applied in a different way. The weight of utterance was thrown in this case not upon the case-endings, but upon the feminine termination *āt*, which accordingly became *āt*, and took the case-endings as the singular.

Sing. N.	<i>atu, atun</i>	Plur.	<i>ātu, ātun</i>
G.	<i>ati, atin</i>		<i>āti, ātin</i>
Ac.	<i>ata, atan</i>		<i>āta, ātan.</i>

In Arabic these forms are all in common use, except the accusative plural, which has disappeared even in the oldest stages of the language. The Ethiopic has *āt*, with its accusative and construct *āta*. In Aramaic we find, as we should naturally

expect, the termination  $\text{N}_\text{—}$ ,  $\Delta^\circ$ ,  $\text{dth}$ ,  $\text{dth}$ ; in Hebrew, with the usual vowel-change,  $\text{N}_\text{—}$ , which sinks in the later Phœnician into  $\text{dth}$ , as in Plautus's *yth alonim valouuth*. In Assyrian  $\text{dtu}$ ,  $\text{dti}$ ,  $\text{dta}$ , are common; but there is also (if the grammarians may be trusted) a termination  $\text{dt}$ , corresponding perhaps to the Hebrew and Phœnician  $\text{dth}$ ,  $\text{dth}$ ; and a third form in  $\text{tt}$  (or as Haupt pronounces it  $\text{t}$ ), restricted to such words as have already weakened  $\text{at}$  into  $\text{it}$  in the singular. E.g., *ina šandti dannđti*, "in long (*lit.* strong) years"; *tabbanđtu*, "buildings," from *tabbanu*; *ibđđti*, "deeds," from *ibđđit* ( $\text{עבדשית}$ ), according to Haupt *epđđti*; *iđđiti* (*đđđiti*) "temples."

Of the so-called *broken plurals* of the Arabic I cannot speak at any length in this place. You will find these various forms enumerated in any Arabic Grammar, and many of them occur likewise in Ĥimyaritic and Ethiopic. In the northern dialects examples are either wanting or of rare occurrence. Böttcher has endeavoured to point out several in Hebrew; see his *Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, vol. i. p. 458–9. In Syriac we may perhaps refer to this class such words as  $\text{ܘܚܘܒܝܢ}$  from  $\text{ܘܚܘܒܝܢ}$  (Arabic  $\text{قَرِيْبَة}$ , plur.  $\text{قَرِيْب}$ ), and  $\text{ܘܚܘܒܝܢ}$  from  $\text{ܘܚܘܒܝܢ}$  (Arabic  $\text{حَمْر}$ , plur.  $\text{حَمْر}$ ). These so-called broken plurals are, however, in all probability without exception, singular abstract forms, which gradually came to be used in a concrete and collective sense, and hence pass for plurals. We are told, for example, that  $\text{نَصْر}$  is a plural of  $\text{نَاصِر}$ , "helper," or  $\text{عَدْل}$  of  $\text{عَادِل}$ , "just"; but in reality these are nothing but the infinitives of  $\text{نَصْر}$  and  $\text{عَدْل}$ , meaning "help," and "justice," and may be applied alike to one or more, man or woman; for we can say  $\text{رَجُلٌ عَدْلٌ}$ ,  $\text{اِمْرَاةٌ عَدْلٌ}$ , and  $\text{قَوْمٌ عَدْلٌ}$ . Another plural of  $\text{قَاتِل}$ , viz.  $\text{قَاتَال}$ , is an example of the same sort, being really an intensive infinitive, to be compared with the Syriac  $\text{ܘܚܘܒܝܢ}$ ,  $\text{ܘܚܘܒܝܢ}$ , etc.

In addition to the singular and plural, the Semitic languages

employed from their earliest period a third form to designate a pair or two of any objects. The principle of formation of this *dual* would naturally resemble that of the plural; that is to say, the vowel of the singular would be lengthened in some way, so as to indicate the increase of number. But as the simple lengthening was appropriated to the plural, in the case of the dual recourse was had to the heightening of the singular terminations by the insertion of a short *ā*. Hence result the forms—

N.  $\bar{a} + \bar{u}n = aun$

G.  $\bar{a} + \bar{u}n = ain$

Ac.  $\bar{a} + \bar{u}n = an.$

For the same reason as in the plural, the Arabs added here also a final vowel; but on account of the greater weight of the dual endings, or perhaps merely for the sake of variety, they selected in this case the weaker vowel *i*; whence the forms

N. *auni*      G. *aini*      Ac. *ani*.

These forms were used, like the corresponding plurals, when the noun was defined by the article; but in the construct state the syllable *ni* is of course absent, and we have merely the vowel-endings

N. *au*      G. *ai*      Ac. *a*.

Of these terminations the nominative must have fallen into disuse at a very early period, and its place was usurped by the accus.; so that we actually meet in Arabic only the two forms

N. *a, ani*  
G. Ac. *ai, aini*.

In modern Arabic the first of these has now disappeared from ordinary use, leaving only the form *ain, en*, for all the cases. In S. Arabian or Hîmyaritic the termination is also ן, as *צלמן ואבלנהן* (acc.), *ולביתנהן* "and their two houses (castles)," *מאתן אדם* "two hundred warriors" (nom.), *צלמנהן* "these two statues" (acc.). In Ethiopic scarcely a trace of the dual can be detected. In Assyrian Schrader gives as examples *idd*, "two hands"; *usud*, "two ears"; *šipa-ai* (for *šipt-ya*), "my feet"; *birka-ai*, "my knees"; *ḵata-ai*, "my hands." Here the final *u* seems to have been cast off, according to the analogy of the plural in *t* for *im*.



The Aramaic form is  $\text{אָיִן}$ , with slight supplemental vowel, for  $\text{אִיִן}$  *ain*, corresponding to the ordinary Arabic oblique form  $\text{أَيْنَ}$ . This was contracted into  $\text{אֵי}$ , as in  $\text{מֵאָתָן}$  for  $\text{מֵאִתָּן}$ , "two hundred"; or into  $\text{אִי}$ , as in  $\text{הֵרִין}$  for  $\text{הִרִין}$ , "two." In Syriac it survives in only two or three words, in the form *ai*, viz.  $\text{ܐܝܢܐ}$ , f.  $\text{ܐܝܢܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܡܘܠܐܝܢܐ}$ , and  $\text{ܦܫܬܐܝܢܐ}$ ; further weakened into *in*, in  $\text{ܐܝܢܐܢܐ}$   $\text{ܩܘܢܐܢܐ}$ , "Mesopotamia," (1 Kings xviii. 32), Heb.  $\text{בְּבַיִת סְאִתִּים יָרַע}$ , and even  $\text{אֵיִם} = \text{יָדַיִם}$  =  $\text{אֵצְטֵי}$  =  $\text{אֵצְטֵי}$ ; just as in Latin the sole representatives of the dual are the words *ambo*, *duo*, and *octo*. The Hebrew form is  $\text{אִיִּם}$ , for  $\text{אִיִּם}$  *aim*, with *m* for *n*, as in the plural; e.g.,  $\text{יָמַיִם}$ ,  $\text{שְׁנַיִם}$ ,  $\text{בְּנַיִם}$ ,  $\text{מֵאִתִּים}$ ,  $\text{אֲלַפִּים}$ ; and often in proper names, as  $\text{בֵּית דְּבָלַתִּים}$ ,  $\text{עֵין עַגְלִים}$ ,  $\text{קְרִיתִים}$ ,  $\text{חֹרְנִים}$ ,  $\text{חַפְרִים}$ ,  $\text{הָעֵינִים}$ . Rarer forms are the contracted  $\text{אֵי}$ , as  $\text{קְרִיתָמָה}$ , (Josh. xv. 34),  $\text{קְרִיתָמָה}$  (Ezek. xxv. 9, *kethlbk*); and  $\text{אִי}$  in  $\text{שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר}$ , f.  $\text{עֶשְׂרֵה}$ . Further,  $\text{אִי}$ , contracted  $\text{אֵי}$ ; e.g.  $\text{דָּתָן}$ ,  $\text{דָּתָן}$ , and  $\text{קָרְתָן}$  (Josh. xxi. 32). On the Moabite stone both forms appear,  $\text{אֵי}$  and  $\text{אִי}$ ; e.g.,  $\text{קְרִיתָן}$ ,  $\text{בֵּית דְּבָלַתָן}$ ,  $\text{מֵאָתָן}$ , l. 15, but  $\text{הַצְּהָרִים}$  (הַצְּהָרִים), l. 15, but  $\text{קְרִיתָן}$ ,  $\text{בֵּית דְּבָלַתָן}$ ,  $\text{מֵאָתָן}$ ,  $\text{חֹרְנָן}$ .

And here I may intercalate the remark that the words  $\text{אִיִּם}$  and  $\text{שְׁמַיִם}$  are not duals, but plurals, from obsolete singulars  $\text{אִי}$  and  $\text{שָׁמַי}$ . The original forms must have been *mayim* and *shamayim*, which were contracted into *maym* and *shamaym*, just as in Arabic  $\text{مَوِيْت}$ ,  $\text{لَيْيْن}$ ,  $\text{خَيْبِير}$ ,  $\text{هَوَيْن}$ , gradually pass into  $\text{مَيْت}$ ,  $\text{لَيْن}$ ,  $\text{خَيْر}$ . But since forms like *maym* and *shamaym* were intolerable to the ear of the later Hebrews, a short vowel was inserted to lighten the pronunciation, resulting

in the forms מִים and שְׁמִים, the latter of which was pronounced in Phoenician *shamēm*, as in Plautus's *gune balsamem*, i.e., גִּאוֹנִי בעל שְׁמִים.

I shall conclude this survey of the declension of the noun with a few remarks on some forms which we have not as yet noticed.

(1) The construct state of the dual and plural in Hebrew and Aramaic, viz., אֵי, אֵי.

In Arabic the forms of the dual in actual use are, as we have seen,

Simple, N. <i>āni</i> ,	Construct, <i>ā</i>
G. Ac. <i>aini</i>	<i>ai</i>

and of the plural,

Simple, N. <i>āna</i>	Construct, <i>ā</i>
G. Ac. <i>āna</i>	<i>ā</i>

In Assyrian in like manner the construct dual ended in *ā*, as *birka-ai* (for *birka-ya*, "my knees"; the plural in *ā* [or *ē*], as *šarrt-šunu*, "their kings." Consequently we should expect the Hebrew and Aramaic dual to have the construct form *ai*, *ē*, but the plural in both languages *ā*; יְרֵיהֶם, יְרֵיהֶם, from יְרֵים, יְרֵים; but from מְלָכֵים, מְלָכֵים, we should look for מְלָכֵיהֶם, מְלָכֵיהֶם, which however do not exist. The actually existing forms are מְלָכֵיהֶם, מְלָכֵיהֶם; and these can, I think, be explained only on the supposition that the dual forms have supplanted those of the plural number. I find additional evidence for this notion in the forms מְלָכֵי, מְלָכֵי, "my kings," for *malakai-ya*, corresponding with יָדַי, "my hands," for *yadai-ya*; and מְלָכָיו, מְלָכָיו, מְלָכָיו, "his kings," corresponding with יָדָיו, standing for *malakai-lāh*, *yadai-lāh*, and *malakau-lāh*, *yadau-lāh*, in which latter I descry a vestige of the long obsolete nominative dual in *am*, construct *au*.

(2) The form  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗ}$ ,  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ , used as the simple plural of feminine nouns in Aramaic; e.g.,  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ , as contrasted with the construct  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ , which correspond with the Arabic plural in *at* and the Hebrew in *oth*. This form in *an*, *on*, which also plays an important rôle in the verbal inflection, I regard as a variation of the masculine *an*, under the influence of the ordinary fem. *at*. The language felt the want of an additional feminine termination in the plural, and framed it from existing material after the analogy of an established form.

(3) The so-called *status emphaticus* of the Aramaic;  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$  "the man,"  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ ;  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$  "the city,"  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ . The essence of this form is the postposition of a demonstrative particle. The Swedes and Danes say *mand-en*, "the man," *hus-et*, "the house," where *en* and *et* are corruptions of *inn* or *him* and *itt* or *hitt*. And just so the Aramean added to his noun in its simplest form the demonstrative *had*, gradually weakened into *â*.  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ} + \text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$  became  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ ;  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ} + \text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ . Other forms underwent greater alteration.  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ} + \text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$  was contracted into  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$  (instead of  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ ).  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ , on the other hand, is another example of the transference of a dual form to the plural, since it arises by assimilation from  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ} + \text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ . In Syriac and Mandaitic the termination  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$  is shortened into  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$  ( $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ ), though the full form is retained in some cases; for example, in Syriac, in the plural of many words derived from radicals  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ , and in a few other instances, such as  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ , "thousands." This contraction naturally commenced with a weakening of the final syllable into *ê*, as in  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$  for  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$  as interjection for  $\text{ܩܘܝܢܝܗܐ}$ , and the like.

Having thus treated briefly of the personal pronouns and of the noun, I must next speak of the pronouns as they appear when appended to nouns substantive in the form of genitive

suffixes. In doing so I shall confine myself chiefly to Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic, as represented by Biblical Aramaic, the Targūms and the old Syriac.

In classical Arabic these suffixes are appended to the different cases of the noun in the construct form, i. e. without the tanwīn or nūnation. E. g.

2. كِتَابِكَ f. كِتَابِكَ, "thy book" (nom.)  
 كِتَابِكَ f. كِتَابِكَ, "thy book" (acc.)  
 كِتَابِكَ f. كِتَابِكَ, "of thy book" (gen.)
3. كِتَابِهَا f. كِتَابِهَا, "his, her book" (nom.)  
 كِتَابِهَا f. كِتَابِهَا, "his, her book" (acc.)  
 كِتَابِهَا f. كِتَابِهَا, "of his, her book" (gen.)

and so on. Only the suffix of the 1st pers. sing. absorbs the vowels of the case-endings, so that "my book," "of my book," is

كِتَابِي or كِتَابِي in all the three cases.

The forms of the spoken Arabic of the present day are such as we should naturally expect, when we take into account the loss of the case-terminations and other final vowels. "My book"

is كِتَابِي, "my father" أَبِي or أَبِي; "thy father" is أَبُوكَ, fem.

أَبُوكِ or أَبُوكِ. But the final vowel of the fem. pronoun also

disappears in most cases, and the difference of gender is marked by a transposition, as it were, of the final vowels; instead of

كِتَابِكَ and كِتَابِكَ we have كِتَابِكَ *kitābak* and كِتَابِكَ *kitābik*. ✓

The 3rd pers. sing. masc. is properly كِتَابُهُ, but this is

almost always written and pronounced كِتَابُهُ *kitābuh* or *kitāboh*,

or else *كِتَابٍ* *kitābō*. The fem. is *كِتَابِهَا* *kitāb-hā*, more commonly with shortening of the vowel, *kitāb-hā*. From *أَب* the corresponding forms would be *أَبُو* *abūh* and *أَبُوهَا* *abū-hā*. The plurals are *كِتَابِنَا*, *كِتَابِكُمْ*, and *كِتَابِهِمْ*; the fem. forms *كِتَابِنَا* and *كِتَابِنَا* being very rarely used. The long vowel is either shortened in pronunciation, *kitāb-nā*, *kitāb-hum*, or a slight vowel (*shēvā*) is interposed, *kitābūkum*. Should the noun end in two consonants, as *عَبْد* 'abd, this *shēvā* is necessarily inserted, 'abdāhā or 'abdihā, 'abdūkum, 'abdūhum, 'abdūnā.

Let us now take a Hebrew and Aramaic noun with its suffixes, and examine them by the light we receive from the Arabic, ancient and modern. For example, *מַלְכִּי*, corresponding to the Arabic *مَلِكٌ*, *مَلِكٌ*, and the Aramaic *מַלְכִּי*.

1st pers. sing. in old Arabic *مَلِكِي* or *مَلِكِي*, vulg. *مَلِكِي*; Hebrew *מַלְכִּי*; Chald. also *מַלְכִּי*, Syr. *מַלְכִּי*, dropping the final vowel.

2nd pers. sing. masc. Arabic *مَلِكُكَ*, vulg. *مَلِكُكَ*. The Hebrew form is *מַלְכְּךָ*, in pause *מַלְכֶּךָ*, with a trace of the original case-endings in the moveable *shēvā* and the *sēgōl*. The Aramaic forms are, Chald. *מַלְכְּךָ*, Syr. *מַלְכְּךָ*, with long *ā*, *ō*, whereas we should have expected *a* short. Probably *mal-kākū* stands for *malkā-ākū*, and that for *malka-ka*, the old accusative with suffix.

2nd pers. sing. fem. Arabic *مَلِكُكِ*, vulg. *مَلِكُكِ*. In Hebrew the usual form is *מַלְכֶּךָ*, e.g. *מַלְכֶּךָ*, which may be either merely tone-lengthening of *malk-ik*, or may spring from the coalition of

the two vowels in *malkā-ik*. In Aramaic two forms are found, כִּי and קִי. The Syrian writes مَلَكِي, but does not pronounce the final *i*. The *z* in these forms is apparently tone-lengthening of the old genitive termination, *maliki-ki*, which must have received the accent, like the corresponding Ethiopic forms *nəgnsē-ki*, acc. *nəgnsd-ki*. Hebrew parallels are רָעוּתִי, Jerem. xi. 15; עֲוֹנִי, Ps. ciii. 3.

3rd pers. sing. masc. Ar. مَلِكٌ, gen. مَلِكَةٍ; vulg. مَلِكُو, مَلِكِو.

The Hebrew forms very nearly resemble those of the vulgar Arabic, viz. מַלְכָּה, generally מַלְכּוּ. These seem to find their origin in the old accus. *malka-hu*, with elision of the *h*, *malka-u*. Quite different is the Aramaic קִי, as in מַלְכֻס, which I trace to the ancient genitive *malki-hu* or *malki-hi*. Parallel forms to this in Hebrew are לְמִינֵהוּ, Gen. i. 21; אֲוֵרָהוּ, Job xxv. 3. Instead of קִי we occasionally find in Aramaic כִּי, the *h* having apparently become silent; and this form appears in the Phoen. suffix כִּי, more commonly written י, as in קִלִּי and פִּנִּי. Hebrew forms like אֲבִי (abī), פִּי (pī), also spring from the old genitive, with elision of the *h*, for אֲבִיהוּ, פִּיהוּ, which likewise occur.

3rd pers. sing. fem. Ar. مَلِكَةٌ, vulg. مَلِكَةٍ. In Hebrew we have קִי, as in אֲבִיהָ, but more commonly קִי, agreeing with the Aramaic קִי (קִי=), וִי, as in מַלְכָּהּ, מַלְכֻסָּהּ, which we may derive from *malkā-āh*, for *malkā-hā*.

1st pers. plur. Ar. مَلَكْنَا, vulg. مَلِكْنَا. In Hebrew מַלְכֵּנוּ, from the old genitive *malki-nū*. The rare forms with וֵנוּ, such as קִימְנוּ "our adversary," Job xxii. 20, מַדְעֵתָנוּ, Ruth iii. 2, may perhaps represent the old accus. *malka-nū*. They stand

therefore nearer to the Aramaic מְלִכְךָ, מְלִכְךָ, as מְלִכְךָ (אֲנִי), מְלִכְךָ. The Jewish Aramaic form has a tone-long vowel in the penult owing to the accent, (as in the Ethiopic *nəgūs-d-na*). The Syriac has lost the final vowel of the pronoun, under the influence of the same accentuation (compare חֲנִינָא for חֲנִינָא, חֲנָא אֲנָא).

*2nd pers. plur. masc.* Ar. مَلِكِكُمْ, vulg. مَلِكِكُمْ. Hebr. מְלִכְכֶם, probably from the old accus. *malka-kum*; Aramaic similarly מְלִכְכֶם, with a purer form of the suffix.

*2nd pers. plur. fem.* Ar. مَلِكِكُنَّ, vulg. مَلِكِكُنَّ. Hebr. מְלִכְכֶנּוּ, Aram. מְלִכְכֶנּוּ, probably from the old accus. *malka-kunna*.

*3rd pers. plur. masc.* Ar. مَلِكِهِمْ, مَلِكِهِمْ; vulg. مَلِكِهِمْ. In Hebrew the simplest form of the suffix is *hēm* for *hum*, as in מְלִכֵהוּם, מְלִכֵהוּם, really old genitives. Most of the forms in use, however, are to be explained from an old accus., such as I descry in the rare form מְלִכֵהוּם, 2 Sam. xxiii. 6, in pause for *kulla-hēm*; whence, by elision of the *h* and contraction, arises the common מְלִכֵהוּם. A still fuller form is represented by the suffixes מְלִכֵהוּם, מְלִכֵהוּם, as in מְלִכֵהוּם, מְלִכֵהוּם, מְלִכֵהוּם, מְלִכֵהוּם, contracted from *hēlba-hēmū*, etc. מְלִכֵהוּם stands therefore for original *malka-humū*. The Aramaic forms need no further explanation, מְלִכֵהוּם, etc.

*3rd pers. plur. fem.* Ar. مَلِكِهِنَّ, مَلِكِهِنَّ, vulg. مَلِكِهِنَّ. Here again the oldest Hebrew form is the rare מְלִכֵהֶנּוּ; as in מְלִכֵהֶנּוּ, 1 Kings vii. 37, מְלִכֵהֶנּוּ, Ezek. xvi. 53, for *kulla-hēmna* and

*idkha-henna*. Contracted from this are the forms in  $\text{נָה}^{\text{׃}}$  and  $\text{נָה}^{\text{׃}}$ , as  $\text{לְדַתְנָה}$ ,  $\text{פְּאֲנָה}$ ,  $\text{פְּלָנָה}$ ,  $\text{לְבִדְנָה}$ ,  $\text{קִרְפְּנָה}$ . Still shorter is the common  $\text{הָן}$ , as in  $\text{לְבִדְהָן}$ ,  $\text{חֻלְבְּהָן}$ , and  $\text{׀}^{\text{׃}}$ , as in  $\text{לְבָן}$ . The successive Hebrew forms appear then to have been *malka-henna*, *malka-hēn*, contracted *malkākna*, *malkāna*, *malkān*. The Aramaic form  $\text{מַלְכָּתְנָא}$  calls for no further remark.

In the dual number the Arabic appends the suffixes to the construct forms in *ā* and *ai*; in the plural, to those in *ū* and *i*; as

Dual nom.  $\text{عَبْدَايَ}$  "my two servants,"  $\text{عَبْدَاكَ}$ , etc.

gen.  $\text{عَبْدِي}$ ,  $\text{عَبْدِيكَ}$ , etc.

Plur. nom.  $\text{بَنُوهُ}$  "his sons,"  $\text{بَنُوكَ}$ , etc.

gen.  $\text{بَنِيهِ}$ ,  $\text{بَنِيكَ}$ , etc.

But "my sons" is expressed by  $\text{بَنِي}$  for both nom.  $\text{بَنُوِي}$  and

gen.  $\text{بَنِي}$ . In Hebrew and Aramaic this difference between

the dual and plur. has disappeared; because, as it seems to me, the dual terminations in the suffixes have wholly supplanted the plural. The Assyrian said *šipa-ai* "my two feet" [Del. *špāa*], *birka-ai* "my knees," *kata-ai*, "my hands," for *špā-ya*, *birkā-ya*, *katā-ya*, just as the Arab said  $\text{يَدَايَ}$ ,  $\text{رِجْلَيْيَ}$ ,  $\text{رِجْلَيْيَ}$ ; but the

Assyrian had also the plural forms *šarrī-šunu* [*šarrē-šunu*], "their kings," *ašrī-šunu* [*ašrē-šunu*], "their places." The Hebrew on the other hand used only one form for both numbers.  $\text{יָרִים}$  for

*yadaim* (Arab.  $\text{يَدَيْنِ}$ , vulg.  $\text{يَدَيْنِ}$ ) would naturally give in the

construct form *yadai* (Ar.  $\text{يَدَي}$ ), which became  $\text{יָרִי}$ ; but  $\text{קַוְטַלִּים}$

for *katillim* (Ar.  $\text{قَاتِلِينَ}$ , vulg.  $\text{قَاتِلِينَ}$ ) should equally yield  $\text{קַוְטַלִּי}$



= Ar. **قَاتِلِي**. As a matter of fact, however, it is not so. The forms in use are **מַלְכַי**, **קוֹנְסְלַי**, which I maintain to be strictly speaking duals, standing for *kātilai* and *malakai*. Herewith all the forms of the Hebrew and Aramaic become intelligible.

*1st pers. sing.* Arab. **مَلِكِي**, **يَدِي**. Heb. **מַלְכִי**, **יְדִי** stand for *yadai-ya* and *malakai-ya*; but the language has dropped the final vowel, and with it the doubling of the final *y*. Similarly in Aramaic, **מַלְכִי**, **מַלְכַפְּ**.

*2nd pers. sing.* Arab. **مَلِكِيكَ**, **يَدِيكَ**. Heb. **יְדִיךָ** and **מַלְכִיךָ** for *yadai-ka* and *yadai-ki*, shortened *yadai-k*, **מַלְכִיךָ** for *malakai-ka*. The fuller form of the fem. also occurs, e.g. **חַיִּיכִי** and **נְעוּרֵיכִי** in Ps. ciii., for **חַיִּיךָ** and **נְעוּרֵיךָ**. This leads us to the Syriac forms **מַלְכַפְּ** and **מַלְכַפְּ**, with silent *yūd*. In Biblical Aramaic the diphthong has been weakened into *ā*, just as in Hebrew **אֵן** became **אָן**, or in Aramaic itself **מֵאֲתָן** became **מֵאָתָן**. Hence the masc. **מַלְכִיךָ**, for *malkai-ka*, is according to the *k'rē* to be pronounced **מַלְכַפְּךָ**; whereas the fem. is usually pointed **מַלְכִיךָ** [in the Targums], though **מַלְכַפְּךָ** is also found.

*3rd pers. sing. masc.* Arab. **مَلِكِيهِ**, **يَدِيهِ** (for *ē*). In Hebrew the fullest form is **יְדֵיהֶוָה**, **עֵינָיו**, **גְּבוּרָתוֹ**, for *yadai-hu*, etc., with weakening of *ai* to *ē*. The more common form, however, is **יְדָיו**, **מַלְכָּיו**, with elision of the *h* and weakening of *ai* to *ā*. We also find a form without *yūd*, as **דְּבָרוֹ**; and the question arises whether this is identical with **דְּבָרָיו**, or not. If identical, then **דְּבָרוֹ** is only incorrectly written, according to ear, for **דְּבָרָיו**. But it may also be that **דְּבָרוֹ** stands for the old nomi-

native dual דַּבְּרָוּהִי *dabarau-hu*, by elision of the *h*, *dabarau-u*, and then *dabarau*, דַּבְּרוּ; just as the 1st pers. *dabarai-ya* became *dabarai*, דַּבְּרִי. Such at any rate must be the origin of the Aramaic forms מַלְכָּוְהִי, מַלְכָּסָס, the latter with silent ס, for *malkau-hu*. The form מַלְכוֹי, with elision of the ה, also occurs; and this appears to be the Phoenician form in such phrases as בַּעֲנַלְ אִשׁ קַרְנֵי לֵם, בְּ שִׁמְעַ כְּלִדְבְּרֵי, though we may perhaps also read דַּבְּרֵי and קַרְנֵי, in closer accordance with the Hebrew forms.

3rd sing. fem. Arab. مَلَكَيْهَا, يَدَيْهَا; Heb. מַלְכֵיהָ, יְדֵיהָ, for *yadai-hā, malakai-hā*. The corresponding Aramaic forms are, מַלְכֵיהָ (rarely מַלְכֵיהָ), Biblical, מַלְכֵיהָ, מַלְכֵיהָ; Syriac مَلَكَيْهَا, both standing for *malkai-hā*.

1st pers. plur. Arab. مَلَكَيْنَا, يَدَيْنَا. Heb. מַלְכֵינוּ, יְדֵינוּ, for *yadai-nū, malakai-nū*. Aramaic, מַלְכֵינָא (מַלְכֵינָא), Syriac مَلَكَيْنَا, for *malkai-nā*.

2nd pers. plur. masc. Arab. مَلَكَيْكُمْ, يَدَيْكُمْ. Heb. יְדֵיכֶם, מַלְכֵיכֶם, for *yadai-kum, malakai-kum*. Aramaic מַלְכֵיכֶם, מַלְכֵיכֶם.—The corresponding fem. forms are: Arab. يَدَيْكُمْ, Heb. יְדֵיכֶן, Aram. مَلَكَيْكُمْ. The fuller form כְּנָה is found in Hebrew in Ezekiel xiii. 20, כְּסִתּוֹתֵיכֶן (‘‘pillows’’).

3rd pers. plur. masc. Arab. مَلَكَيْهِمْ, يَدَيْهِمْ, shortened from مَلَكَيْهِمْ, يَدَيْهِمْ. In Hebrew the oldest form was of course *yadai-humū, malakai-humū*. Hence, on the one hand, the ordinary

שְׁנֵימָו, and, on the other, the more poetic מְלִיכָהֶם, יְדִיהֶם, אֱלִיהֶמָּה, Ezekiel xl. 16, אֱלִימָו, from אֵיל as an architectural term. The Aramaic forms are מְלִיכָהוֹן, מְלִיכָתֶסָּה.—The corresponding *fem.* is in Arab. מְלִיכָהוֹן, מְלִיכָתֶסָּה; Heb. יְדִיהֶן, מְלִיכָתֶהֶן; יְדֵיהֶן, מְלִיכָתֶהֶן, Ezekiel indulges in the archaistic form גְּוִיחֵיהֶנָּה, ch. i. 11.

As to the forms of feminine nouns with pronominal suffixes, I would merely call your attention at this time to one point in which Hebrew differs most markedly from Arabic and Syriac. The Arab adds the simple suffixes to the plural substantive, for example, جَنَاتِهِمْ, جَنَاتِهِ, جَنَاتِكَ, جَنَاتِي. So also the Syriac: מְלִיכָתֶסָּה, מְלִיכָתֶסָּה, מְלִיכָתֶסָּה, מְלִיכָתֶסָּה. But the Hebrew almost invariably employs what is really an incorrect form. He does not say חֲקוֹתָיו, חֲקוֹתֶיךָ, חֲקוֹתַי, etc., but he adds to the plural חֲקוֹת the dual termination *z*, borrowed from the masc., before appending the suffixes, and thus obtains the forms חֲקוֹתָיו, חֲקוֹתֶיךָ, חֲקוֹתַי. Almost the only exception is in the forms of the 3rd pers. plur., where we find חֲקוֹתָם as well as חֲקוֹתֵיהֶם.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE VERB.

I NEXT proceed to treat of the *Verb*, in doing which I must direct your attention first, for reasons which will gradually become apparent, to certain *nominal* forms, partly adjectives and partly substantives.

Among the commonest nominal forms in the Semitic languages are those which I may represent by the types *ḵatal*, *ḵatil* and *ḵatul*, especially as concrete substantives and as adjectives. It is in the latter function that we notice them here.

Examples of the form *ḵatal* in Arabic are تَبَعَ "following," "a follower," بَطَّلَ "brave," حَسَنَ "handsome"; in Hebrew, חָכֵם "wise," יָשָׁר "upright," רָשָׁע "wicked." The form *ḵatil* may be exemplified in the one language by بَطْرٌ "proud," دَنَسٌ "dirty,"

عَجִילٌ "quick"; in the other, by כִּבֵּד "heavy," זָקֵן "old," טִמֵּא "unclean." As instances of the form *ḵatul* I will cite in Arabic فَطِنٌ "clever," يَقِظٌ "awake," حָזֵן "timid"; in Hebrew, יָזַר "afraid," קָטַן "small," גְּבוּהָ "high."

In seeking to modify these simple forms, so as to make them express greater extension or greater energy, the Semites adopted one of two methods; they either *lengthened a vowel*, or they *doubled a consonant*. The former process might affect either the first or second vowel; the latter affected chiefly the middle consonant.

The heightening of the first vowel of *ḵatal* would yield the form *ḵātal*, which is of comparatively rare occurrence, as in طَابِعٌ and خَاتَمٌ, "a stamp," "a seal," Heb. חוֹתֶם, and in the participles of Hebrew verbs לָוָה, as חוֹהָה for חוֹוֵי (i.e. ḥāzai). The vowel of the second syllable has generally been weakened into *i*, thus rendering it indistinguishable from the heightening of *ḵatil*, viz. *ḵātil*. Hence, in the words just cited, the forms طَابِعٌ, خَاتَمٌ, as well as the great bulk of the participles of the form قَاتِلٌ, Heb. קוֹטֵל. Here the lengthening of the first vowel seems to express the continuity or duration of the action.

The heightening of the 2nd vowel yields us the common intensives of the form *ḵatdl*, *ḵattl* and *ḵatll*. (1) *Ḵatdl*, as in Arabic شَجَاعٌ "brave," جَبَانٌ "cowardly," كَهَامٌ "blunt"; Heb. גָּדוֹל "great," לְשׁוֹן "an oppressor," קְדוֹשׁ "holy." (2) *Ḵattl*, as in Arabic رَحِيمٌ "merciful," كَرِيمٌ "noble," ثَقِيلٌ "heavy"; Heb. جَرِيحٌ "wounded," قَتِيلٌ "slain," أَسِيرٌ "bound, a prisoner"; Heb. נְבִיא "a prophet," חָסִיד "gracious, pious"; אָסִיר "bound, a prisoner," מְשִׁיחַ "anointed." (3) *Ḵatll*, as in Arabic أَكُولٌ "gluttonous," كَذُوبٌ "lying," جَسُورٌ "daring"; Heb. עָצוּם "strong," חָרוּץ "sharp," נְחוֹשׁ "brazen," and the ordinary participle passive קְטוּל.

The Aramaic furnishes us with an example of the heightening of *both* vowels in the form *ḵātdl*, as נְמוּרָא; חֲסִיּוֹן; בְּרוּחָא, נְהַדְוָא.

The doubling of the 2nd consonant appears in Hebrew in the common form *ḵattal*, intensive of *ḵatal*; e.g. מִבְּחַ "thief," גִּנְבַח "cook," "executioner," חַרְטָשׁ "cutter," קַנְיָא "jealous," and with

weakening of the first vowel in the shut syllable אָנֵךְ "husbandman." Also in the form *ḵattil*, intensive of *ḵatil*, with weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* in the shut syllable and tonelengthening of the 2nd into *z*, *ḵittēl*, as גָּבֵן "humpbacked," עֵיִר "blind," פָּקַח "openeyed, seeing," חֵרֵשׁ "deaf."

The intensives of the first grade, *ḵattl*, *ḵattl*, and *ḵattl*, are all capable of being heightened in the same way, thus yielding the forms *ḵattll*, *ḵattll*, and *ḵattll*. (1) *Ḵattll* is very common

in Arabic and Aramaic, e.g. <sup>طَبَّاحٌ</sup>, <sup>نَجَّارٌ</sup>, <sup>مَيَّادٌ</sup>, <sup>مُضَمَّنٌ</sup>, <sup>مُتَمِّدٌ</sup>.

In Hebrew we find קָנֵא "jealous," with *o* for *a*, but more usually the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened into *i*, e.g.

יָפֹר "one who reprehends" or "finds fault" (Job xl. 2 or xxxix. 32). (2) *Ḵattll* is very common in Hebrew and Aramaic, e.g. אֲבִיר "strong," צַדִּיק "just,"

עֲלִיז "exulting," "rejoicing," עֲרִיץ "oppressor," "tyrant,"

אֲסִיר "bound"; נְצִיב "wise," אֲדִיב "just," אֲדִיב "exact."

In Arabic the first vowel is weakened into *i*, e.g. <sup>سَكِرٌ</sup> "drunken,"

<sup>صَدِيقٌ</sup> "very truthful," <sup>عَرِيفٌ</sup> "very fond of meddling." (3)

*Ḵattll*, as Heb. רַחֻם "merciful," חַנּוּן "gracious," שְׁבוּל "deprived, bereft of young," אֶלּוּף "tame, domesticated, intimate";

Arab. <sup>فَرُوقٌ</sup> "very timid," <sup>قَدِيمٌ</sup> "abiding, everlasting," <sup>قَدُوسٌ</sup> "most holy." In Arabic the vowel of the 1st syllable is some-

times assimilated to that of the 2nd, as <sup>سَبُوحٌ</sup>, <sup>قَدُوسٌ</sup>, or <sup>سَبُوحٌ</sup> "all pure" or "all glorious."

Another important class of nouns in the Semitic languages is the so-called *Segolates*, of which the normal form is *ḵatl*, *ḵitl*,

*ḵutl*, still retained in Arabic, e.g. <sup>أَرْضٌ</sup> "earth," <sup>عَاجِلٌ</sup> "calf,"

<sup>أَنْسٌ</sup> "car." They are also used as adjectives, e.g. <sup>صَعْبٌ</sup> "diffi-

cult," عَذْبٌ "sweet"; طِفْلٌ "small, young," جَلٌّ "large, coarse";

صَلْبٌ "hard," حَلْوٌ "sweet," مَرٌّ "bitter." The corresponding Aramaic forms are *k'tal*, *k'til*, *k'tul*, with transposition of the vowels, which however resume their normal place in the emphatic state, e.g. חֶזְקָא חֶזְקָא חֶזְקָא. The ordinary Hebrew forms are identical with the Arabic, for the 2d vowel in Hebrew is merely supplementary, and disappears before a suffix; e.g. אֶרֶץ for אֶרֶץ, with suffix אֶרְצוֹ; סֵפֶר for סֵפֶר, with suffix סִפְרָה; אֵן for אֵן or אֵן, with suffix אֵנִי. But the Aramaic forms are also found in our Hebrew text, though more sparingly, in the construct state; e.g. גִּבֹר חַמִּים Ps. xviii. 26; בְּרַעְדָּר Num. xi. 7; נִמַע שֶׁעֲשִׂעִיו Isa. v. 7; כִּסְתָר נִסְתָּר Prov. iii. 14; and the like.

I have dwelt for a little while on these classes of nouns, because I believe that they really lie at the root of the inflection of the verb in the Semitic languages. In one of the most recent Hebrew Grammars, that of Prof. Bernh. Stade (1879), you will find plainly stated, what I have long believed, that the verbal forms of the Semites are really nominal forms, mostly in combination with pronouns. Each person of the verb is, so to say, a sentence, consisting of a noun and a pronoun, which has gradually been contracted or shrivelled up into a single word. The same view was enunciated some years before by Philippi, in an article on the Semitic verb in the volume entitled *Morgenländische Forschungen*, 1875, and by Sayce in the *JRAS.* 1877 and in his lectures on Assyrian Grammar.

With this idea in our minds, let us submit the different forms of the Semitic verb to a careful analysis, selecting for the purpose the first or simplest form, and commencing, according to ancient custom, with the perfect state<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> [The absolute state and construct of nouns of this class usually appear with ־ instead of ־ except before gutturals or *resh*.]

<sup>2</sup> [Cf. Nöldeke's article "Die Endungen des Perfects" in *ZDMG.* vol. xxxviii (1884), p. 407 sqq.]

I. *The Perfect.*

In Arabic, the 3rd pers. sing. masc. exhibits three forms, *ḵátala*, *ḵátila*, *ḵátula*, precisely corresponding to the three nominal or adjectival forms mentioned above. The form *ḵátala* is, generally speaking, transitive; whilst *ḵátila* and *ḵátula* are intransitive, the latter being the stronger form of the two. Here then we are face to face with the oldest and simplest form of this state and person; and here we at once encounter one of our greatest difficulties, the explanation of the final vowel *a*. On the whole I am inclined, after careful consideration, to acquiesce for the present in Stade's view, that we have here a simple noun, without any pronominal affix, and that the final *a* is really the oldest termination of the Semitic noun. If so, *ḵátala* would be an ancient adjective signifying "killing," or, as a verbal form, "he killed"; حَزِنَ would signify "sorrowing" or "he sorrowed";

ثَقَلَ, "being heavy" or "it was heavy." It is possible however that *ḵátala* may already be a contraction for *ḵatal-ya*, with the pronominal element *ya* postfixed, like *ta*, *na*, etc. That the final vowel existed anterior to the separation of the Semitic stock, is apparent from the following considerations. (1) The Ethiopic has also the forms *ḵatála* and *ḵéila*. (2) The Hebrew and Aramaic, which (like the vulgar Arabic) drop the final vowel under ordinary circumstances, retain it when a pronominal suffix follows; e.g. Heb. קָטַלְתָּ, but קָטַלְתָּנִי *ḵátála-ni* = Arab. *ḵátala-ni*; Aram. ḵátal, but with suffix ḵatála-n for *ḵatála-ni*, *ḵátala-ni*.

The Arabic has, as we have seen, three forms of the perfect state, distinguished by the vowels *a*, *i*, *u*. The same distinctions are maintained, to a greater or less extent, in the modern dialects, e.g. in Egypt, *katab*, "he wrote," فَضَّلَ *fidil*, "it was over and above," كَثُرَ *kitir*, *kutur*, "it was much," سَكَتَ *sikit*, *sukut*, "he was silent." The existence of the same forms in the other Semitic languages can easily be proved. In Ethiopic the



transitive form is identical with the Arabic,  $\Phi\tau\Lambda$ : *katála* =  $\text{تَلَّ}$ . In the intransitive forms the vowels *i* and *u* were both weakened to *e*, and finally dropped, whence resulted such words as  $\rho\text{-}\tau\text{-}\Lambda$ : *yabsa*, "to be dry,"  $\text{X}\text{-}\text{X}\text{-}\Phi$ : "to be just,"  $\text{Z}\text{-}\text{O}\text{-}\rho$ : "to be satisfied with drink,"  $\Phi\text{-}\text{C}\text{-}\Lambda$ : "to be near," exactly corresponding to rare Arabic forms like  $\text{عَلَم}$  for  $\text{عَلِم}$ ,  $\text{رَضِيَ}$  for  $\text{رَضِيَ}$ ,  $\text{حَسَن}$  for  $\text{حَسَن}$ ,  $\text{قَرَب}$  for  $\text{قَرَّب}$ . If the 2nd radical was a guttural, an assimilation of the first vowel to the 2nd took place, giving us the series *kátala*, *kéala*, *kéala*, e.g.  $\text{L}\text{-}\text{H}\text{-}\text{L}$ : "to pity,"  $\text{H}\text{-}\text{L}\text{-}\text{H}$ : "to be hot," =  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{X}\text{-}\text{N}$  *رحم*. Similar forms also exist in classical Arabic, e.g.  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{H}\text{-}\text{D}$  for  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{H}\text{-}\text{D}$ ,  $\text{N}\text{-}\text{H}\text{-}\text{B}$  for  $\text{N}\text{-}\text{H}\text{-}\text{B}$  "to be dazzled with the sight of gold,"  $\text{N}\text{-}\text{E}\text{-}\text{M}$  or  $\text{N}\text{-}\text{E}\text{-}\text{M}$ ,  $\text{B}\text{-}\text{N}\text{-}\text{S}$  or  $\text{B}\text{-}\text{N}\text{-}\text{S}$ . In Hebrew we find in like manner all three vowels, although the forms in *i* and *u* are disappearing, as in vulgar Arabic. For example, with *i*,  $\text{I}\text{-}\text{Q}\text{-}\text{N}$  "to be old,"  $\text{T}\text{-}\text{R}$  "to be pure,"  $\text{P}\text{-}\text{B}$  "to be heavy,"  $\text{Y}\text{-}\text{R}$  "to fear"; with *u*,  $\text{Y}\text{-}\text{L}$  "to be able,"  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{L}$  "to be bereft,"  $\text{Y}\text{-}\text{R}$  "to be afraid." On the other hand,  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{M}\text{-}\text{E}$ , but  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{M}\text{-}\text{E}$ , as in vulgar Arabic  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{M}\text{-}\text{E}$  for the classical  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{M}\text{-}\text{E}$  ( $\text{S}\text{-}\text{M}\text{-}\text{E}$ );  $\text{G}\text{-}\text{B}$ , but  $\text{G}\text{-}\text{B}$ ,  $\text{D}\text{-}\text{B}$ , but  $\text{D}\text{-}\text{B}$  and  $\text{D}\text{-}\text{B}$ ;  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{B}$ , but  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{B}$ ;  $\text{G}\text{-}\text{L}$ , but  $\text{G}\text{-}\text{L}$ ; and many more. In Aramaic, verbs with *u* are nearly as rare as in Hebrew; e.g.  $\text{D}\text{-}\text{M}\text{-}\text{D}$  "he slept";  $\text{H}\text{-}\text{R}\text{-}\text{O}$  "it was dried up, waste, desolate";  $\text{H}\text{-}\text{B}\text{-}\text{L}$  "he was bereft." In Syriac only one such seems to be certain, viz.  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{H}\text{-}\text{E}$  "to be shrivelled," as in Job vii. 5,  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{H}\text{-}\text{E}$ ; Ps. cxviii. 120,  $\text{S}\text{-}\text{H}\text{-}\text{E}$ . Another may perhaps be found in  $\text{H}\text{-}\text{S}\text{-}\text{L}$ , Nahum ii. 10, if that stand for  $\text{H}\text{-}\text{S}\text{-}\text{L}$ , in the phrase  $\text{H}\text{-}\text{S}\text{-}\text{L}$ .

ܠܗܘܢ ܕܢܘܨܘܢܐ. Verbs of the form *kaṣila* are, on the contrary, very common in Aramaic; as ܠܗܘܢ, ܠܗܘܢ; ܠܗܘܢ, ܠܗܘܢ. Regarding Assyrian I find it difficult to say anything, owing to the conflict among the grammarians as to the real nature of certain forms. Schrader quotes a word *mti*, "he is dead," which would correspond to the Heb. מָת, Syr. ܡܬܐ, except in its rather perplexing final vowel<sup>1</sup>.

I proceed to the 3rd pers. sing. fem.

If we have rightly regarded *katala*, etc., as being originally nouns, without any pronominal affix, we should naturally expect the existence of a feminine formed in the same way as in the noun. And this is actually the case. The fem. of *katala* is formed, as in the noun, by the addition of *t*. The Arabic has *katalat*; the Ethiopic, *katlat*, *yabsat* for *yabisat*, *mēhrat* for *māhīrat*. In vulgar Arabic, e.g. in Egypt, we have the forms *katabet*, *fidlet*, *suktet*. In Aramaic the same form occurs, with the further weakening of the 1st vowel, in the now shut syllable, into *i*, viz. ܩܩܠܬ, ܩܩܠܬ, for *kaflat*, *kaflat*, *kaflat*. In Hebrew the usual form is ܩܩܠܐ, ܩܩܠܐ, with the same termination *ā* as in the noun; but as in the one case so in the other, *ā* is only a weakened form of *at*, the successive steps being *at*, *ath*, *ah*, *ā*. The proof lies in the following facts<sup>2</sup>. (1) The termination *at* actually occurs, e.g. in ܐܘܠܬ Deut. xxxii. 36, ܩܩܬܐ (for ܩܩܬܐ) Exod. v. 16, ܩܩܬܐ (for ܩܩܬܐ) Deut. xxxi. 29, ܩܩܬܐ Ezek. xlvi. 17, ܩܩܬܐ (for ܩܩܬܐ) Levit. xxv. 21; etc. (2) The termination *at* has always been retained before pronominal suffixes, in which case we find the forms ܩܩܬܐܗܘܢ, ܩܩܬܐܗܘܢ, and the like. The difference of vocalisation depends upon the difference of accentuation, a point on which I shall offer a few remarks by

<sup>1</sup> [Delitzsch writes *mti*, and recognises a permansive form *kaṣil* as common to most verbal themes, to express the idea of prolonged or completed activity as well as that of a permanent state or affection; *Ass. Gr.* p. 235, sq.]

<sup>2</sup> [Cf. p. 133, supra.]

and by, after we have treated of the 3rd pers. plur. masc. and fem. The final *t* is also lost in Phœnician, e.g. יִטְנָא (prob. יִטְנָא) in a Cyprian inscr. of B.C. 254 [C.I.S. 93]; in Carthag. inscr. נִדְרָא or נִדְרַע, "she vowed" (also נִדְרַעָא, שִׁמְעָא "she (Tanith) heard," for שִׁמְעָא, etc. I will only add that the final *t* disappears also in Mandaitic before enclitic ב and ל with suffixes, e.g. נִפְלֵאֲלָהָה, "she fell," for נִפְלֵאֲלָהָה, instead of נִפְלֵאֲלָהָה. So also in the dialect of the Talmūd Babli, עֲרִיקָתָהּ "she fled," אִוְלָתָהּ "she went," side by side with לֵיהּ, שְׁלַחָהּ לֵיהּ, and in derived conjugations אִינְסִיבָהּ "she was married," אִינְקִדְשָׁהּ לֵיהּ "she was betrothed to him." In such Talmudic forms as הָיָא לֵיהּ, and הָיָא אֶחָתִיהּ "his sister came" for הָיָא, we may perhaps discover a lingering trace of the original 3rd radical *yūd*.

If we be right in regarding *ḵatala*, etc., as originally nouns without pronom. affix, we shall again expect to find their plural agreeing in form with that of the nouns. This is also really the case. We shall not be far wrong in assuming *ḵatalīna* as the oldest form of the 3rd pers. plur. masc., which is still preserved to us in יִדְעוּן Deut. viii. 3, 16, and perhaps in צָקוּן "poured forth" Isa. xxvi. 16; as also in the Aramaic forms קַטְלוּן, and the Assyrian *katlīni*, side by side with *katlū*. Usually, however, the final *n* has been dropped, as in the construct state of the noun; whence we obtain the ordinary Arabic *ḵatalū*<sup>1</sup>, the Ethiopic *ḵatalū*, *lābsū*, *mēhrū*; the Heb. קָטְלוּ; and the Aramaic קַטְלוּ. In the Aramaic dialects the process of corruption has gone yet farther. The Syriac pronounces *ḵʿal*, and hence we find in old MSS. صَلا as well as the more accurate صَلا. In Mandaitic too the ordinary form is סגיד, נפאק, though the termination *ū* is sometimes restored before enclitics, as נצאבולאך

<sup>1</sup> Arabic قَتَلُوا and قَتَلُوا, as in Hebrew occasionally קָטְלוּ, e.g. Josh. x. 24, מָנוּ Isa. xxviii. 12, if the text be correct. Sayce makes a strange blunder in considering the quiescent *alif* of the Arabic to be a trace of the original *n*.

“they planted for thee.” I may add that in Mandaitic the full form in *ūn* is usually preceded by a *yūd*, for the insertion of which I find it hard to account; e.g. רְדִיטִיּוֹן, סְלִיקִיּוֹן, נִפְאִקִיּוֹן “they ran.” In the dialect of the Talmūd Babilī we find the same rejection of the termination *ū*, but it seems to leave its mark in an assimilation of the vowel of the preceding syllable; thus, אֶסְדָּר “they have bound” or “banned,” for אֶסְדָּרָּ; עֲבָדָּר for עֲבָדָּרָּ; נִפְקָּו for נִפְקָּוָּ.

The feminine of *ḵatalūna* we should naturally expect, in accordance with the nominal flexion, to be *ḵatalāna*; and though this form has entirely disappeared in Hebrew, it exists in the other languages. In the Aramaic dialects we find the final *n* retained, in the termination *ān*, or, with a weakening of the vowel, *ēn*. So in the Targūms there occur such words as אֶסְדָּרָּ, אֶתְנָרָּ “were made clear”; in Mandaitic, with inserted *yūd*, פְּרִאשִׂיאָּ “they understood,” רְגִאזִיאָּ “they were angry”; in Syriac, מְלָלָּ for *ḵʾalān*. The Arabic exhibits the form *ḵatdlna*, which I cannot as yet make up my mind to regard as anything else than a strong contraction of *ḵatalāna*<sup>1</sup>. It has almost gone out of use in the vulgar dialects. Several of the ancient Semitic languages, however, reject the final *n*. The Ethiopic is *nagdrā*, *lābsā*, *mēḥrā*; the J. Aram. קְטָלָּ. The Syriac must of course have once had the form *ḵʾdlz*, but dropped the final vowel, whence we find in MSS. both מְלָלָּ and מְלָלָּ. In the Christian Palestinian dialect we find קְטָלִי, and so also in Samaritan; but the Mandaitic writes נִפְאִק, סְלִיק, like the Syriac. The older form with the final vowel *ā* appears in Syriac only before some of the pronominal suffixes, e.g. قَتَلْتَنِي “they have killed me,” قَتَلْتَنِي, قَتَلْتَنِي, corresponding with the Jewish Aramaic קְטָלְנִי, קְטָלְנִי, קְטָלְנִי.

In what I have said of the 3rd pers. plur. masc. and fem. I

<sup>1</sup> [It would seem from a deletion in the MS., that Prof. Wright had hesitated between this view and that of Nöldeke (*ZDMG.* xxxviii. 412) who regards the Arabic *ḵatalna* as formed on the analogy of the corresponding imperfect form *yakūlūna*.]

have gone on the assumption that the original forms are *ḵatalūna* and *ḵatalāna*. I must tell you however that this is altogether denied by such scholars as Noeldeke and G. Hoffmann<sup>1</sup>, who maintain the originals to be *ḵatalū* and *ḵatalā*, and explain the forms in *ūn* and *ān* or *ēn* as later pronominal additions, comparing in particular the vulg. Arab. *katabum* for *katabū*, i.e. *katabū* + *hum* (see Noeldeke in *ZDMG.* xxxviii. p. 410), or else as analogical formations to  $\text{كٲٲٲٲ}$ ,  $\text{كٲٲٲٲ}$ ;  $\text{كٲٲٲ}$ ,  $\text{كٲٲ}$ ;  $\text{كٲٲ}$ ,  $\text{كٲ}$ .

Here I will make, as promised, a few remarks on the accentuation of certain of these verbal forms and the changes in vocalisation which result therefrom.

The original accentuation of the 3rd pers. I believe to have been that of the old Arabic, *ḵátala*, *ḵátalat*, *ḵátalū*. The Ethiopic, Hebrew and Aramaic carried the accent onward to the next syllable, thus obtaining the forms *ḵatdla*, *ḵatdlat*, *ḵatdlū*; *ḵāḵál*; and *ḵáḵál*, *ḵáḵálū*. The vulgar dialects of the Arabic vary, I believe, between *ḵátal* and *ḵatál*. But in the intransitive forms the Ethiopic left the accent unshifted, and dropped the vowel of the middle syllable, *yábsa*, *séḵluu*. That the Hebrew accentuation too was once the same as in the old Arabic is clear, as it seems to me, from the vocalisation in particular of the fem.

$\text{קטלה}$  and the plur.  $\text{קטלו}$ , which have now the accent on the last syllable. Had the accent originally fallen on that syllable in the verb, as it does in the noun, we should have had the forms  $\text{קטלה}$  and  $\text{קטלו}$ , as in the noun we have  $\text{חכמה}$  from  $\text{חכם}$ . But this is not the case. On the contrary, we find the Ethiopic accentuation of the 2nd syllable in the so-called pausal forms, e.g.  $\text{נְתַנְה}$ ,  $\text{רְבִּיקָה}$ ,  $\text{יִכְלו}$ ; and it is only when pronom. suffixes are appended, and the tone is consequently thrown forwards towards the end of the word, that we get in Hebrew the forms  $\text{קטלת}$  and  $\text{קטלו}$ , e.g.  $\text{אֶכְלֶתְהוּ}$ ,  $\text{אֶכְלֶהוּ}$ , and  $\text{אֶכְלוּם}$ ; just as in Ethiopic we have *nagarátō*, *nagarū-nī*, *nagarēwō*, and in Arabic itself *ḵatalát-hu*, *ḵatalū-hu*. The Aramaic 3rd pers. sing. fem.

<sup>1</sup> [See *ZDMG.* xxxii. 747.]

קָטַלְתָּ, ضَمَكْتَ, also favours this view, for the suppression of the 2nd vowel of the original *kaṭalat* must have been due to the accentuation of the 1st syllable, as in the modern Arabic of Egypt, *kaṭalet*, *wildet*, *kūtret*. With suffixes the form approximates more to the Hebrew, e.g. קָטַלְתָּהּ, ضَمَكْتِهَا; Mand.

לֹא נִאֲלַתְנָא "she has not devoured me," אֲנִיאֲלַתְנָא "she devoured him." The Mand. form with enclitics, e.g. נִפְּאֲלַתְנָא "she fell," is almost identical with the Heb. אֲנִיאֲלַתְנָא.

Passing on to the 2nd person, we find that the Semitic languages split into two divisions, the one exhibiting *t* as the characteristic letter of the pronominal ending, the other *k*. On the one side are the Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Assyrian; on the other, the Ethiopic, and most likely the Ḥimyaritic. At least we are told that the South Arabian of the present day says *kunk* for *kunt* "thou wast"; and the form with *k* for *t* is vouched for in other parts of Arabia<sup>1</sup>. It is hard to say which is the more ancient form, if either. More probably the two existed side by side from remote antiquity, as we find in all of these languages the separate form with *t*, *anta*, etc., as well as the accus. and genit. suffixes with *k*. In quite modern times the *k* appears where we should not have expected it, as in the Samaritan hymns, גִּלִּית for גִּלִּית "thou hast revealed," and in a dialect of Syria أَنْتَو for أَنْتَو or أَنْتَم. It should further be noted that in the 2nd person no variation is made as to the verbal part of the word, for the purpose of indicating the sex and number of the person or persons addressed. The whole weight of these distinctions has to be borne by the pronominal part. It appeared perhaps to be a waste of energy to point out these differences in both parts, and if one was to be selected, the pronoun seemed to be the better adapted for the purpose.

The 2nd pers. sing. masc. is in classical Arabic قَتَلْتَ, in

<sup>1</sup> See Noeldeke, *ZDMG.* xxxviii. 413; Halévy, *Études Sabéennes*, p. 46.

vulg. Arab. *katdbt, mislkt, kutúrt*. In Hebrew the final vowel is often indicated by the addition of the letter ה, קטלתָה or קטלתָהּ. The Ethiopic equivalent is *katdka*. The other dialects, like the vulgar Arabic, have dropped the final vowel. Hence in Bibl. Aramaic קטלתָה and קטלתָהּ; in the Targūms קטלתָהּ and קטלתָהּ, in Syriac ܟܬܠܬܐ.

In Arabic and Ethiopic the accent naturally rests on the 2nd syllable, *katdta, katdka*; but when an accus. suffix is added, the Ethiopic throws forward the tone, *katalká-nī, katalká-na*, and lengthens the vowel before the uncontracted forms of the suffixes of the 3rd pers., *katalkā-hū* or *katalkó, katalkāhā*, etc. In Hebrew the tone is thrown forward not only with pronom. suffixes, but also when the so-called *vāv* conversive precedes; וקטלתָהּ, קטלתָהּנִי, but קטלתָהּרוּ or קטלתָהּוּ, etc. Similarly in Jewish Aramaic, with suffixes, קטלתָהּנִי, קטלתָהּ, but in Syriac ܟܬܠܬܐܢܝ, ܟܬܠܬܐܢܝܘܢ, in Mand. ܫܒܢܐܩܬܐܢ, and in the Talmūd ܫܒܢܐܩܬܐܢ "hast hindered me," אֲדַרְבַּרְתָּן "hast reminded me." I do not regard the vowel of the Ethiopic and Syriac forms as proving that the termination *ta* had originally a long vowel, *tā*, which is Noeldeke's view; on the contrary, I believe that the lengthening of the vowel is here due partly to the weight of the accent, but still more to an effort to distinguish this form from the almost identical one of the 3rd sing. fem., ܟܬܠܬܐ "she has killed me." Others would explain it as a contraction of the final vowel of *ta* with a supposed connective vowel *a*, as if ܟܬܠܬܐܐܢܝ stood for *katalta-ani*.

To the masc. form of the 2nd pers. *anta* corresponds the fem. *anti*; and hence we should expect to find the 2nd pers. sing. fem. of the verb the form *katalti*, which is actually the case. The Arabic has قَتَلْتِ, and the *i* is often lengthened before suffixes, كَسْرَتِيه or كَسْرَتِيه. The vulg. form of the present day is

تتلي *katali*. The corresponding Ethiopic form is *katalki*, written, according to the exigencies of the Geez syllabary, with long *i*, which passes before suffixes into *ɛ* or *ɛy*, as *nagarké-ni*, *nagarkéyō*, *nagarkéyómū*. In Hebrew the ordinary form is קטלת with the loss of the final vowel; but קטלתי is sufficiently common, though usually altered by the Massorites into קטלת; e.g. ירדתי and שכבתי, Ruth iii. 3, 4; למדתי Jerem. ii. 33; דברתי Jerem. iii. 5. Sometimes the full form seems to have been left through a misunderstanding; e.g. Jerem. ii. 20, where שברתי and נתקתי seem to be 2nd pers. sing. fem. rather than 1st pers.; so also Micah iv. 13, והדרמתי. Similarly before suffixes, קטלתיהו, קטלתיו, etc. Forms like ילדתנו, Jerem. ii. 27 (*Kath. ילדתי*), or והבאתו, 2 Sam. xiv. 10, are very rare. In Aramaic the same phenomena present themselves. In Jewish Aramaic we have קטלת side by side with קטלתני; whilst the Syriac has preserved the older termination, at least in writing, ܩܬܠܬܐ, with suffixes ܩܬܠܬܐܝܢܐ, ܩܬܠܬܐܡܐ. Here again I regard the vowel of the syllable *ti* as being originally short, whilst Noeldeke regards it as long. To me the lengthening seems to be due to the shifting of the accent.

The plural of *anta*, as you may remember, we found to be in its oldest form *antumū*; and consequently we expect in the verb for the 2nd pers. plur. masc. the form *katallumū*, which actually

occurs in Arabic poetry and before suffixes, <sup>تتلموني</sup>تتلم، <sup>تتلمون</sup>تتلمون.

Generally however the final vowel is dropped, *antum*, <sup>تتلمون</sup>تتلم; and

the common form in the vulgar language is <sup>تتلمون</sup>تتلمون with the loss of the final *m*. Parallel to these run the Ethiopic forms with *k*, viz. *katalkēmū*, with suffixes *katalkēmū-ni*, *katalkēmūyō*, *katalkēmūyómū*. The corresponding form in the modern Tigré



and Tigrīna is *katalkūm* or *katalātkūm*, which latter appears in Amharic as *katalāchhū*, ቀተላህ: . In S. Arabia these forms with *k* are heard at the present day, e.g. *سمعكم sami'ukum* (Halévy, *Études Sab.* p. 46). As *antum* becomes in Heb. אַתָּם, so *kataltum* appears in the shape of קַטְלְתֶם, the accent being thrown forward upon the pronoun, as in Ethiopic. The original vowel appears however, in the rather rare form קַטְלְתֻוּ (corresponding to the vulgar Arabic قَتَلْتُوا), used in connexion with accusative suffixes (Num. xx. 5, xxi. 5, Zech. vii. 5). In Aramaic *n* takes the place of *m* in pronoun and verb. Thus in Syriac ܩܬܠܬܘܢ; in Mand. נצאבתון “ye planted.” In the latter dialect the final *n* disappears before enclitics, as נצאבתוליא “ye have planted me,” שאדארתוליא “ye have sent me”; and also before accusative suffixes, as נסאבתון “ye took me,” שאדארתון “ye sent me,” which is contrary to Syriac usage, but in accordance with Hebrew and Chaldee, where we find קַטְלְתֶנִּי, קַטְלְתֶנָּה, beside קַטְלְתֶנִּי, קַטְלְתֶנָּה. In the Talmūd such forms as קַטְלְתִּי, כַּפִּיתִי, occur even without suffixes, as in vulgar Arabic.

The feminine of *antumū* we found to be in its fullest form *antunna*, whence the fem. of *kataltum* should be *kataltunna*. This actually occurs in old Arabic, though it has disappeared from the vulgar dialects. The Ethiopic form is analogous to the Arabic, but has lost the final syllable, *katalkēn*; the final vowel appears, however, in the form with suffixes *katalkēnāhū* (Cornill, *das Buch der weisen Philosophen*, p. 51). But, on the other hand, the form is also liable to a further mutilation before suffixes into *katalkā* (Dillmann, p. 274). The Hebrew form is almost identical with the Ethiopic, viz., קַטְלְתֶן. The existence of a longer form in קַטְלְתֶנָּה, exemplified by הִשְׁלַחְתֶּנָּה, Amos iv. 3, is very doubtful; and no example with accus. suffixes occurs. The Aramaic forms are such as we might expect, ܩܬܠܬܝܢ, ܩܬܠܬܝܢܐ.

In Mandaitic however the feminine is a rarity, its place being mostly usurped by the masculine.

Proceeding to the 1st pers. sing., I would remind you that the root form of the pronoun of the 1st pers. we found to be *iya* or *t*, giving, in combination with the demonstrative *an*, the form *aniya* or *aut*. We found also that some of the Semitic languages inserted a second demonstrative, *ak*, whence the Assyrian *anākū*, the Hebrew אֲנֹכִי, the Moabite אֲנִי, and the Phoenician אֲנִי and אֲנֵכִי. It is this latter form that has given rise to the verbal affix in the Ethiopic *katalkū*, which is also said to be the form in use in S. Arabia, كَاتَلَكَ, اَعْتَفَرَكَ, etc. (comp. Halévy, *Études Sabéennes*, p. 46). In the other Semitic languages we encounter an affix form with *t* instead of *k*, which demands explanation. It may be that *t* has interchanged with *k*, as in the 2nd person we find *ta* and *ka*; but more probably, I think, *tu* has been substituted for *ku* in the 1st person under the influence of the forms of the 2nd person. The solitary *katalku* gave way before the greater number of *t*-forms, and was gradually changed into *kataltu*, except, as we have seen, in Ethiopic (which was destitute of *t*-forms in the 2nd person).

While the Assyrian pronoun *anākū* (Haupt *anakū*) is indisputably older, in respect of its *d*, than the Hebrew *andekht*, the latter would appear to have preserved the termination in a purer form. We may therefore fairly assume that the Arabic *kataltu* and the Ethiopic *katalkū* represent, in respect of the final vowel, a somewhat later stage than the corresponding Hebrew קָטַלְתִּי, with *vāv* conversive וְקָטַלְתִּי, with suffixes קָטַלְתִּיהוּ or קָטַלְתִּיו, etc. Whether the *scriptio defectiva* in such forms as יָדַעְתָּ Job xlii. 2, בָּנִיתָ 1 Kings viii. 48, is merely accidental, or really indicates a tendency to dull the final vowel or to drop it altogether, it is hard to say. The Moabite and Phoenician forms were doubtless identical with the Hebrew. King Mesha' writes מַלְכָתִי, בַּנְתִּי, etc., and in one Phoen. inscr. we find בַּנְתִּי (Umm 'Awāmid, *C.I.S.* nr. 7), though the usual spelling is בַּנְתִּי. Plautus too has *corathi* for קָרַאתִי. In Aramaic the suffix sometimes

appears in full, especially in the case of verbs 3rd  $\text{ʔ}$ , as  $\text{קָנִיתִי}$ ,  $\text{אֲדַגִּיתִי}$ ; but more frequently the suffix has lost its vowel, the usual form being  $\text{קָטַלְת}$ ,  $\text{שָׁחַטְת}$ , which stands for *kaṭlat*, by transposition from *kaṭalt*, which is the form used in vulg. Arab., *kaṭalt*, *misikt*, *kuturt*. The transposition probably took place to distinguish it from the 2nd pers.  $\text{קָטַלְתָּ}$ ,  $\text{שָׁחַטְתָּ}$ ; and the alteration of the vowel in the last syllable may be ascribed, either to the lingering influence of the lost termination  $\text{t}$ , or to an effort to differentiate this form from the 3rd pers. sing. fem.  $\text{קָטַלְתָּ}$ ,  $\text{שָׁחַטְתָּ}$  (for *kaṭlat*, out of *kaṭalat*). Remark however a difference between the Biblical Aramaic and the Syriac. The former has *movable shēwā*,  $\text{עֲבֹדְתָּ}$  Dan. iii. 15, vi. 25,  $\text{קָרַבְתָּ}$  Dan. vii. 16; the latter silent *shēwā*,  $\text{עֲבֹדְתָ}$ ,  $\text{קָרַבְתָ}$ . The older form *kaṭalt* appears with the accus. suffixes,  $\text{שָׁחַטְתָּס}$ ,  $\text{קָטַלְתָּס}$ . The Mandaitic form is ordinarily the same as the Syriac,  $\text{נִיפְקִית}$ ,  $\text{לִיגְשִׁית}$ ; but with the enclitics the  $\text{t}$  disappears, and we have the vocalisation  $\text{קָטַלְתֵּ}$  for  $\text{קָטַלְתֵּת}$ , e.g.  $\text{נִמְאִירְלֵה}$  "I tied to him,"  $\text{סְלִיקִיבֵה}$  "I went up on it." In the Targūms we find the fully vocalised form  $\text{אֲבָלִית}$ ,  $\text{דְּחִילִית}$ , etc., which is indeed older than the Biblical forms just cited. In the Talmūd Bāblī both the forms which we have noted in the Mandaitic occur independently of enclitics;  $\text{כְּבָשִׁית}$  "I subdued,"  $\text{שָׁמְעִית}$  "I heard,"  $\text{אֲרִיגִישִׁית}$  side by side with  $\text{אֲמַרִי}$  "I said,"  $\text{נִפְקִי}$  "I went out,"  $\text{חֹזִאי}$  "I have seen,"  $\text{קָרִאי}$  "I called." The final vowel is merely tone-long, and hence can be shortened when the tone is thrown back, as  $\text{הִקְיַמְתָּ}$ , Dan. iii. 14; and with suffixes, as  $\text{פָּרַעְתִּיהָס}$ ,  $\text{שָׁחַטְתִּיהָס}$ .

You will remark that in the first person, as in the second, the sex or number of the speaker or speakers is not marked in the verbal part of the word; whilst no variation was thought

necessary in the pronominal part, any more than in the actual pronoun **אֲנִי** or **אָנָּה**.

As to the plural, the original form of the pronom. affix was probably *an*, from **אֲנֵנוּ** or **אֲנֵי**; but it underwent various modifications in the several languages, as we shall presently see.

The Hebrew has preserved the old form in **קָטַלְנוּ**, with suffix

**קָטַלְנוּהוּ**. The Arabic form is *katalnā*, **كَتَلْنَا**, with long *a*, which is however sometimes shortened in poetry, *katalnā*. On the other hand, the Ethiopic has *katalna*, with short *a*, which is lengthened before suffixes: *nagdrna*, but *nagarnā-ka*, *nagarnā-kēmmū*. Similar is the Chaldec form **קָטַלְנָא**, with suffixes

**קָטַלְנָאֵךְ**, **קָטַלְנָאֵךְוּ**. In Syriac *nā* is shortened into *n*, **ܣܠܚ**, but the fuller termination appears with pronominal suffixes, as **ܣܠܚܢܝܣܘܫ**, etc. The abbreviated form also prevails in the Talmūd Bāblī, **אֲנֵנוּ**, **אֲנֵי**. Frequently however the Syriac

form is lengthened, by a repetition of the pronoun, into **ܣܠܚܢܝܣܘܫ** (sometimes written **ܣܠܚܢܝܣܘܫ**). This, in the weakened shape of **ܢܝܢ**, is the usual termination in Mandaitic, e.g. **ܢܦܐܩܢܝܢ**, **ܢܦܐܩܢܝܢ**; but with enclitics the older **ܢܐ** is restored, e.g. **ܢܦܐܩܢܝܢܐ** "we went out therein," **ܫܐܪܕܢܐܠܘܢ** "we sent them." The accusative suffixes are added to the shorter form in *n*, as **ܪܗܝܡܢܐܚ** "we loved thee," **ܦܬܐܪܢܐ** "we opened it."

I have reserved the *dual* for the last place in our view, because it occurs in only two or three of the Semitic languages, the Arabic and Hīmyaritic, and possibly the Assyrian. The rest,—Ethiopic, Hebrew, and Aramaic,—lost it in the verb before they reached the stage at which we become acquainted with them.

The Arabic forms are precisely such as we should expect, that is to say, almost identical with those of the noun and pronoun. The 3rd pers. masc. is *kātālā*, like the noun in *āni*, construct *ā*, e.g. *ragūlāni*, *ragūlā*. Similarly in the feminine we find in Arabic *kātālātā*, formed like *gannatāni*, *gannatā*, from *gannat*.

In Ḥimyaritic the final *d* seems to have been weakened into *z*. The pronoun **هُمَا** is written **הַמִּי** *humē*, and similarly in the verb **הָמַרְי** (שָׁמַתָּ), fem. **שָׁמַתִּי** (*shēmatē*, שָׁמַתָּ), "they two set up." The dual of the pronoun of the 2nd person being in Arabic *antumā*, the corresponding form of the perfect is naturally *ḵatdltumā*. The 1st person, as in the case of the pronoun, has no dual.

Herewith I finish my survey of the perfect state of the verb. You may remember that I regarded it, in most of its forms, as made up of a nominal and a pronominal element; as being in fact a sentence which gradually shrivelled up and contracted into a word. Only the 3rd pers. seemed to be a noun without any pronominal adjunct. Perhaps you are inclined to demur to this view, on the ground of intrinsic improbability. If so, I would remind you that history is apt to repeat itself, and nowhere more so than in language. The formation of the Romance tongues out of Latin, or of the modern Indian dialects out of Sanskrit, illustrates many points in the early history of the Indo-European group. And so the later formations of the Semitic dialects may help us largely to understand the older ones. The ancient Syrian pronounced, and sometimes wrote, **فَلَانًا** for **أَنَا** *fulānā*, "I am killing"; **فَلَانًا**, and even **فَلَانًا**, "I am seeking." In the Talmūd we find such words as **דַּעִינָא** "I know," **אֹלִינָא** "I am going." The Mandaite could say not only **לֵאנִימָנָא**, "I take," but also **לֵאנִימָנָךְ**, "I take thee." But above all the modern Syrian forms his present tense solely in this way. Where can you find a more complete parallel to the formation of the Hebrew perfect, as I have explained it, than in the Nestorian present, according to the following paradigm?

sing.	3 p. m.	<b>פָּרִיק</b> <i>parik</i> , "he comes to an end."
	f.	<b>פָּרְקָא</b> <i>parḵā</i> <sup>1</sup> .
	2 p. m.	<b>פָּרִיקְתָּ</b> <i>parḵit</i> .
	f.	<b>פָּרְקַתְּ</b> <i>parḵat</i> .

<sup>1</sup> [The *d* is shortened in the closed syllable *par*.]

1 p. m.	فَرِيحٌ	<i>parkin.</i>
f.	فَرِيحًا	<i>parkān.</i>
plur. 3 p. c.	فَرِيحًا	<i>parkl.</i>
2 p. c.	فَرِيحَاتًا	<i>parklātān.</i>
1 p. c.	فَرِيحِي	<i>parkdkh (kīkkh),</i>
	also فَرِيحِي (سَبِي) + فَرِيحِي.	

## II. *The Imperfect.*

Having thus discussed the various forms of the perfect state of the verb, I proceed to the consideration of the imperfect.

Here the first thing that strikes us is the different collocation of the parts which go to the constitution of the verbal form. In the perfect the verbal element preceded, and was followed by the pronominal element. The action, as completed, seemed apparently to be more prominent than the agent. In the imperfect, on the contrary, the pronominal element takes precedence of the verbal; the agent seems to be more conspicuous in relation to the still unfinished act. The whole arrangement may of course be, as some have thought, merely accidental; but if we are to seek a reason for it, that just given seems to be the most natural.

Another point of difference between the two verbal states is that the 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the perfect appears to be destitute of any pronominal affix, whereas the corresponding person of the imperfect is furnished with a peculiar pronominal prefix. The reason of this probably also lies in the greater prominence of the pronominal element in the imperfect state. It may of course be said, with Dietrich and Stade, that the 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the imperfect is a noun of the form *yaktul*, فَرِيحِي, etc., without any pronominal element. But surely the preformative *ya* demands some explanation; and if so, what explanation is more probable than that it is pronominal in its nature? Rödiger connected it with the Amharic ደኸ: or ደህ:



Assyrian. The original shape of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. we may assume in this case to have been *yakdtilu*. In Ethiopic it appears under the normal form of *yēkdātēl*, and corresponds in its general use with the imperfect indicative of the Arabic; whereas the other form *yēngēr* answers to the Arabic imperfect subjunctive and jussive. In Assyrian its form, according to Sayce, is *isdkinu* or *isdkin* [Delitzsch *išdkan*], the signification of which is "he makes" or "he will make"; whereas the form *iskun* takes, according to the same authority, the aoristic sense of "he made."

We need not at present dwell longer on this form *yēkdātēl*, because its prefixes and flexion are identical with those of the other form *yēkdātēl*, which is common to all the Semitic languages, and therefore better adapted for the purpose of a comparative survey.

Of the different moods,—subjunctive, jussive, and energetic or cohortative,—we will not treat just now, but confine our attention for the present exclusively to the indicative mood.

The 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the imperfect indicative is in classical Arabic *yakṭulu*, with *ā* as the vowel of the prefix and a final *ū*. This we may accept as the archetype. The vulgar dialects drop the final vowel and weaken that of the first syllable, *yēktul*, *yēktul*, or *iktul*, *yimsik*, *yuskut*; thus giving us the same form which we find already in the Ethiopic *yēngēr*, the Assyr. *iskun* (יִסְכַּן, "he placed" [Del. יִשְׁכַּן]) or *išbat* (יִצְבַּת, "he seized"), and the Hebrew יִכְבֵּד, יִפְקֹד. This too is the common form in the Aramaic dialects, e.g. Jewish Aram. יִלְבֵּשׁ, יִקְטֹל, with some important exceptions, which we shall specify presently.

That the vowel of the preformative was originally *a* in Hebrew as well as in Arabic we may infer: (1) from verbs of which the first letter is a guttural, as יִהְיֶה, יִאָסֵר, or יִאָסֵר; יִהְיֶה, יִעֲבֹר; (2) from verbs ע"ע, as יִעֲזֹב, יִסָּב, which stand for *yasbub*, *ya'sus*; and (3) from verbs ע"ו, as יִנְוַח, יִקְוֹם, which stand for *yakwum*, *yanwuh*. As we have often seen already, an original *pathach* may be gradually weakened into *segol* or *chirek*; but it is impossible that an original *chirek* should in such a case give rise to a *pathach*.



This person of the verb is identical in form, or nearly so, with a class of nouns in the older Semitic languages, which occur partly as proper names and partly as common nouns. Such are in Hebrew, יֶצֶקֶד, יֶצֶדֶק; "adversary," יָדָר "oil"; יֶלְקוּם "bag," יְחַמֵּר "kind of deer," יֶשׁוּף "bittern" (?); in Arabic, يَنْبَع "the Helper," يَعْوَق "the Averter," يَنْبَع "يَنْبَع," يَنْبَع "yَنْبَع" "oryx," يَكْبُور "male bustard," يَخْضُود "freshly cut branch," يَخْضِر and يَخْضِر "green," يَرْبُوع "jerboa," يَرْحَم and يَرْحَم "male vulture," يَعْذُوب "rapid river, horse, etc.," يَنْبُوع "queen bee," يَعْفُور "gazelle," يَعْمُور "lamb, kid," يَعْقِد "fountain," يَعْقِد "thickened honey," يَعْصِد "a kind of plant."

From all these cases it seems perfectly clear that the prefix *ya* must signify "one who, he who, that which"; but we do not find in the older Semitic languages any pronoun of this signification at all resembling *ya* in sound. In Amharic, one of the modern dialects sprung from the Ge'ez or Ethiopic, we find, it is true, a pronoun *ρ ya*, used (exactly like ገ, ገ, ገ) both as the relative and as a sign of the genitive case. Praetorius seems however to have made it tolerably certain that this *ya* is only a modification of the Ethiopic ገ *sa*, which is still used in Harari, the intermediate link being *sha* ገ in one of the Tigriña dialects. The change of sound is the same as in the Amharic ገገ, ገገ, derived through ገገ, ገገ, from an older ገገ, ገገ = ذَاك. This comparison therefore fails us. Neither does it seem likely that this *ya* can stand for *wa*, as an abbreviation of *huwa*; because, though initial *w* passes into *y* in Hebrew and Aramaic, the same change does not take place in Arabic and Ethiopic. I am obliged therefore to confess my ignorance of the derivation of this prefix.

Here I may add that some scholars have sought this same pronoun *ya* as a suffix in the perfect. According to them *ḫatala* and *ḫatalū* stand for *ḫatalya* and *ḫatalyū*. For this view I

can find no support whatever save in the Mandaitic plural which I mentioned in a previous lecture, viz. רנאזין, fem. רנאזיין, instead of רנא. It seems to me, however, very unlikely (1) that the *y* should have been simply elided, without leaving behind any trace of its existence; and (2) that, if it had wholly disappeared in Arabic, Ethiopic, Hebrew, and the older Aramaic, it should have been preserved in the comparatively late Mandaitic. I am compelled therefore to reject this view, though I cannot at present suggest any adequate explanation of the isolated Mandaitic forms just quoted.

I said before that there were some important exceptions to the formation of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. by *ya*. These I now proceed to enumerate.

Already in the Chaldee of the Old Testament we find the verb רוא forming the 3rd pers. sing. masc. with ל instead of י; לרוא for רוא in Ezra iv. 13, Dan. ii. 20, with the corresponding plur. masc לרואן Dan. ii. 43, and fem. לרואין Dan. v. 17. The same form is common in the Talmūd Babilī, and occurs also in Mandaitic, in both cases side by side with the forms with *n*; e.g. לרוא "say," לרוא "bring"; לרוא "be like," לרוא "be dissolved." In Syriac the *n* alone is found, נרוא, נרוא, נרוא. On the whole subject see Mr Lowe's note in his *Fragment of the Talmud Babilī P̄sachim*. The identity of this *l* and *n* may perhaps be admitted; that either of them sprung from the *y* must be denied. De Goeje (in a review of Kautzsch's *Gr. des Biblisch-aramäischen*) supposes the form לרוא to be originally an infin. רוא compounded with the prep. ל, "to be" taken in the sense of "is to be," "shall be"; and to this רוא he finds a parallel in the form לרוא, Ezra v. 3, 13. To me it seems that the origin of the *l* may rather be sought in the demonstrative *l*, which is the essential element of the article אל, הל, and which appears in various pronouns and demonstrative

adverbs such as הִלְאָה, וְסָכָה, אֵלַיִן, יֵאָדָה, זֶלֶק, הִלְאָה, אֲדֵי, הִלְאָה, etc. The *n*, if it be anything more than a mere variation of the *l*, may also be explained from the demonstrative *n*, which appears for instance in הַן, הַלֵּל, the pronominal base *an*, אֵן, אֵן, אֵן, אֵן, etc.

The 3rd pers. sing. fem. has for its prefix *ta*, that is, no doubt, the same mark of the fem. gender which we find at the end of the word in the perfect *ḵatalat*. The typical form is again the old Arabic *taḵtulu*, vulgarly *taḵtul*, *teḵtul*, *tiktul*, *timsik*, *tuskut*, which latter coincide with the Assyrian *taskun*, *tasbat*, and the Ethiopic *təngər*, *təlbās*. In Hebrew the *a* of the 1st syllable is ordinarily sunk to *i*, תִּקְטַל, תִּכְבֵּד; but *ʾ* and *ʾ* are found in the same cases as in the masc., e.g. תִּעֲבֹר, תִּמְאֹב; תִּעֲבֹר, תִּמְאֹב; תִּעֲבֹר, תִּמְאֹב. Similarly in Aramaic, תִּקְטַל, תִּקְטַל, תִּקְטַל (Mandaic).

*Yaktulu* being, as we have seen, essentially a nominal form, its plural is naturally obtained by the usual nominal inflexion, as in the perfect. The most ancient form is once more found in the Arabic *yaktulūna*, which is vulgarly shortened into *yaktūlū*, though *yaktulūn* is still heard. In Hebrew the fuller form יִקְטְלוּ is not uncommon, as יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ, in pause יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ; but the shorter יִקְטְלוּ is far more frequent. The Ethiopic forms are *yəngərū*, *yəlbāsū*, with which correspond in accentuation the Hebrew pausal forms יִפְלוּ, יִפְלוּ, יִפְלוּ, etc.; and the vulgar Arabic (Egypt) *yik-tūlū*, *yimsikū*, *yuskūtū*. The Assyrian exhibits, as we might expect, the forms *iskunū*, *išbatū*. The old Aramaic dialects hold fast the final *n*, יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ. So also in Mandaic נִישִׁיתְלוּ, נִישִׁיתְלוּ, "plant"; but before the enclitics the *n* disappears, נִישִׁימוּבְכוּ, נִישִׁימוּבְכוּ, "register with you."

The feminine form corresponding to *yaktulūna* would naturally be *yaktulāna*. This is actually retained by the Aramaic dialects in the forms *נְהָךְ*, *לְהַיִּין*, *יְקַטְרִין*, Mand. *נִרְיִמֻזֵּאן* "wink." In Ethiopic and Assyrian we find the same forms with the loss of the final *n*; Eth. *y'ngērā*, *y'lbāsā*; Assy. *iskunā*, *išbatā*; and so also in Mandaitic, *נִרְיִמֻזֵּא*, *נִסִּינְרֵא*, are more common than the fuller form in *אן*. The Arabic has contracted *yaktulāna* into *yaktūlna*, after the analogy of *katāna* for *katalāna* in the perfect. The same form occurs in Hebrew; e.g. *יְחַמְּנָה* Gen. xxx. 38, *וַיִּשְׂרְנָה* 1 Sam. vi. 12 (for *וַיִּשְׂרְנָה*), and *יַעֲמִדְנָה* Dan. viii. 22; but more commonly the Hebrew employs a form with prefixed *t*, after the analogy of the singular, and says *תְּקַטְלֶנָּה*, e.g. *תְּחַפְּלֶנָּה*, *תְּעַבְרֶנָּה*, *תְּחַלְּשֶׁנָּה*, *תְּשַׁבֵּן*. The same form occurs dialectically in Arabic, even among the various readings of the Korān, e.g. Sūr. xlii. 3, *تَنْظُرُنَ* for *يَنْظُرُنَ*. In the vulgar Arabic dialects the fem. seems to have vanished entirely.

The 2d pers. is formed by prefixing to the verbal element the syllable *ta*, being, as we have already seen, the essential base of the pronoun *anta*. Hence we get in the sing. masc. the normal *taktulu*, which is the actual Arabic form; in the vulgar dialects, *taktul*, *tāktul*, *tiktul*, *timsik*, *tuskut*. The Assyrian has retained the pure vowel in its *taskun*, *tasbat*; whilst the Ethiopic exhibits the weaker *t'ngēr*, *t'lbās*. The Hebrew offers exactly the same variations as the 3rd pers.; we find *תְּקַרְב*, *תְּזַכֵּר*, *תְּחַלְּשֶׁ*, *תְּעַבְר*, *תְּחַמְּסֶ*, but *תְּקַטְל*, *תְּחַמְּל*, Mand. *תִּירְנֵאן*, *תִּישְׁבֹּק*, call for no remark.

The 2d pers. sing. fem. is differentiated from the masc. not by any change in the pronominal prefix, but by the addition of the termination *ina*, the origin of which seems quite obscure.

The normal form is again the Arabic *taktulīna*, which has survived in Hebrew in such forms as *תְּדַבְּקִין* Ruth ii. 8, 21 *תְּעַשִּׂין* iii. 4; *תְּדַעִין* iii. 18. So also in Aramaic, *תְּקַטְלִין*,

لصهلب. In other cases, the final *u* has altogether disappeared, as in the vulgar Arabic <sup>تقتل</sup> *tiktūli*, *timskī*, *tuskūtī*; Assyri. *taskunī*, *tašbatī*; Eth. *ṭngēṭrī*, *ṭlbāsī*; Heb. תּוֹכְרִי, in pause תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי. In Mandaitic this fem. form seems to have gone out of use. In what I have said I regard *ina* as being the original termination of this person, and *i* as a shortening thereof. Other scholars take *i* to be the original termination, and consider *in*, *ina* to be a later formation after the analogy of the plur. *ūn*, *ūna*.

The formation of the plural in the 2nd pers. is identical with that in the 3rd. The normal form in the masc. is, as usual, the Arabic <sup>تقتلون</sup> *tiktūn*. The final *u* is preserved in Hebrew in such words as תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי; or with fuller vowels in pause, תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי. So also in Aramaic. תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי, <sup>לصهلب</sup> Mand. תּוֹכְרִי or more frequently תּוֹכְרִי. In vulgar Arabic the final syllable has been rejected, leaving <sup>تقتلوا</sup> *tiktūlu*, *timskū*, *tuskūtū*; with which correspond the Assyrian *taskunū*, *tašbatū*, the Ethiopic *ṭngēṭrū*, *ṭlbāsū*, and the Hebrew תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי; in pause, with fuller vowels, תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי, תּוֹכְרִי. In Mandaitic too the *u* disappears before the enclitics, as in the 3rd person.

The fem. corresponding with *taktulūna* ought to be *taktulāna*; and this form is preserved, with the loss of only the final vowel, in the Aramaic <sup>لصهلب</sup> תּוֹכְרִי. In Mandaitic, however, it seems to have fallen into disuse. The Assyrian and Ethiopic exhibit forms with the loss of the final *u*; Assyri. *taskunā*, *tašbatā*; Eth. *ṭngēṭrā*, *ṭlbāsā*. In Arabic *taktulāna* is contracted as I take it, after the same manner as the 3rd pers. fem., into *taktūlna*, a form which is lost in the vulgar dialects, but has been preserved in some examples in Hebrew, e.g. תּוֹכְרִי, Ezek. xiii. 23, תּוֹכְרִי, Ezek. xxiii. 49, and a very few more.

An example like **הִנְאִי**, Song of Songs i. 6, shows that here, as well as in other cases, in Hebrew the masc. was gradually supplanting the fem.

The prefix of the 1st pers. sing. **א** is apparently derived from the corresponding pronoun **אֲנִי**, **أَنَا**. In Arabic it is **أَنْتَل** (vulg. *aktul, amsik, askut*), which appears in Assyrian, with the loss of the final vowel, as *askun, asbat*. In Ethiopic the vowel is weakened, *əngər, əlbas*; and so also in Aramaic, **אֲנִי**, **אֲנִי**, **אֲנִי**, **אֲנִי**, **אֲנִי**, **אֲנִי**. Similarly in Hebrew, **אֲנִי**, **אֲנִי**, **אֲנִי**; but **אֲנִי**, with the original *a*.

The corresponding plural takes its prefix *na* from **אֲנֵנוּ**, **أَنْتَل**. In Arabic it is **نَفْتَل**, vulgarly *nektul, niqtul, nimsik, nuskut*. In most of the other languages the vowel of the first syllable is weakened; e.g. Eth. *nəngər, nəlbas*; Assy. *niskun, nišbat*; Aram. **נִקְטַל**, **נִקְטַל**, **נִקְטַל**. The Hebrew alone retains the original *a* with gutturals and in verbs **עָ** and **עָ**, e.g. **נִשְׁכַּר**, but **נִשְׁכַּר**, **נִשְׁכַּר**.

The *dual* number is found, as in the perfect, only in old Arabic and Assyrian; and only in the 3rd and 2nd persons, not in the first. The 3rd pers. masc. in Arabic is **يَقْتُلَانِ**, with the same termination as in the perfect and in substantives. It is represented in Assyrian, according to Sayce, by the form *iskunā, isbatā*, with the loss of the final syllable<sup>1</sup>. The corresponding fem. in Arabic is **تَقْتُلَانِ**, to which the Assyrian inscriptions seem to offer no counterpart. The 2nd pers. is likewise **تَقْتُلَانِ**, which form serves for both genders, and is found in Arabic alone.

In conclusion, let me call your attention to the gradual shifting of the accent here, as in the perfect, at least in certain

<sup>1</sup> [Delitzsch regards these forms as plurals.]

forms. The original accentuation appears to me to be that of the classical Arabic, viz. on the first syllable of the 3rd pers. sing. *yáktulu*, in Eth. *yəngər*. In the lengthened forms of the 2nd sing. fem. and the 3rd and 2nd plur., the Ethiopic threw forward the accent one place, *təngərī*, *yəngərū -rā*, *təngərū -rā*, as compared with the corresponding Arabic *táktulī*, *yáktulū*, *táktulū*; and this accentuation we find in Hebrew in the so-called pausal forms, תַּעֲבֹדוּי, תִּלְבְּשׁוּי, תִּלְכּוּי; תַּחֲשְׁבוּ, תַּחֲשְׁבוּ, תַּחֲשְׁבוּ; יִשְׁבּוּ, יִשְׁבּוּ, יִשְׁבּוּ; and also in the vulgar Arabic *tiktūlī*, *timskī*, *tuskūtī*; *tiktūlū*, *timskū*, *tuskūtū*. Generally speaking, however, the Hebrew, like the Aramaic, shifts the accent to the last syllable, יִקְטַל, יִקְטַל, יִקְטַל. The forms ending in *ina*, *ūna*, are already accented in Arabic on the penult, and the accent remains on the same syllable when it becomes final in Hebrew and Aramaic, יִקְטַלְיָן, יִקְטַלְיָן; تَصْهَكْ. So also the Aramaic feminines in *ān*, יִקְטַלְיָן, تَصْهَكْ; whereas the Arabic forms <sup>يَقْتُلُ</sup> <sup>يَقْتُلُ</sup> *يقتل*, *يقتل*, with the corresponding Hebrew ones, are accented on the penult.

### III. *The Imperative.*

Passing on to the imperative mood, I would point out to you its perfect identity in the masc. sing. with the nominal form that constitutes the base of the Arabic imperfect. With substantially the same vowels as in the imperfect, the original forms are *ḵtul*, *ḵtal* and *ḵtil*. Nearest to this postulated original stand the Aramaic forms <sup>ܫܘܦܠ</sup> <sup>ܫܘܦܠ</sup> *ܫܘܦܠ*, *ܫܘܦܠ*; and the Hebrew <sup>וְזַר</sup> <sup>וְזַר</sup> *וְזַר*, *וְזַר* (for *וְזַר*); in which latter the vowels *u* and *i* are heightened by the tone, as in the imperfect. The Ethiopic *nəgər*, *ləbas*, show by the accent that more weight was given to the first syllable than in Aramaic and Hebrew; and the same appears to have been the case in Assyrian, where we find the vowel of the first syllable assimilated to that of the second, *šukun*, *šabat*, *rihiš*. The Arabic attained the same intonation by

means of a prosthetic *'alif*, with partial assimilation of its vowel to that of the 2nd syllable. Thus, for *k'tul*, the Arab wrote and spoke *'uktul*, أَتَقَلْ; for *g'lis*, *'lglis*, اجْلِسْ; but for *fraḡ*, he said *'afraḡ*, أَفْرُقْ, not *'dfraḡ*, because the vowel *a* appeared to him to be too heavy for a merely prosthetic syllable.

As the fem. of *k'tul* we should naturally expect *k'tulna*, after the analogy of *taktul*, *taktulina*, in the imperfect; but this full form has been nowhere preserved, except in such rare Syriac forms as ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ or ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ, e.g. ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ,

"remember thou me," ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ ܕܚܘܒܝܢܐ.

As in the imperfect, so here, the final *n* has usually been dropped, e.g. Chald. ܩܬܘܠܝ; and then the *i* has disappeared also, as in the

Syriac ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ; Mand. ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ. In the Talmūd

the final *'* is retained, at any rate in writing, e.g. ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ, ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ. The Ethiopic form is *nəgēri*, *lḥdāsī*, with shifting of the accent, as we might expect. In the Assyrian forms *šukini* or *šukni*, *riḥiṣī* or *riḥiṣī*, *šabiī*, the elision of the vowel seems to indicate that the accent remained on the first syllable. The classical Arabic too retains the accent on the prosthetic vowel, *'uktulī*, *'lglisī*; whereas in vulgar Arabic (Egypt) it is shifted, *uktulī*, *imstki*. In Hebrew the forms *k'tulī*, *k'talī*, are found in pause, e.g. ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ, ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ; but also out of pause, according

to the *k'thbbh*, in מְלוּכִי Judg. ix. 12, קְסוּמִי 1 Sam. xxviii. 8. Out of pause, however, the word is commonly modelled somewhat after the form of segolate nouns, and becomes *kuḥlī*, *kaḥlī*; e.g.

ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ, ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ; but the vowel of the first syllable is mostly weakened to *i*, or even, in certain cases, to *shēvā*; e.g. ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ, ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ, ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ, ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ.

The plural of *k'tul* we should naturally expect, after the analogy of the imperfect, to be *k'tulina*; and this form is actually found in Syriac, ܩܬܘܠܝܢܐ. Usually, however, the *n* is dropped,



as in the Chaldee קָטַל; and lastly the final *u* disappears, as in the perfect, leaving in Syriac the form *ܘܟܬܘܠܢܐ*, written in Mandaitic without the *w*, *ܒܪܐܪ ܦܪܘܫ*. The Mandaitic however exhibits a few examples of the full termination *in*, or even, as in the perfect, *yūn*, e.g. *ܐܪܪܘܢܝܢ* (with prosthetic *א*), "lay waste." The final *ū* is also retained before the enclitics, e.g. *ܫܒܝܩܘܠܗ ܫܢܘܪܘܠܗ*. In Talmudic the *u* is often retained, at any rate in writing, as *ܥܒܘܪܘ*, *ܟܬܒܘ*. If dropped, it seems in some cases to affect the vowel of the previous syllable, as *ܐܝܡܘܪ* (for *ܐܝܡܘܪܘ*) or the interjectional *ܐܝܫܘܪ* ("quick!"). The Ethiopic form is, as we might expect, *negēru, lḥāsū*, with shifting of the accent; the Assyrian, *sukinū* or *suknū, riḥišū* or *riḥsū, ṣabtū*, were perhaps accentuated on the first syllable, as the elision of the vowel seems to indicate. The old Arabic retains the accent on the prosthetic syllable, *'uḳtūlū, 'ḡlisū*; but the vulgar dialect (Egypt) shifts it, *uḳtūlū, imslkū*. In Hebrew the forms *קָטַלְוּ*, *קָטַלְוּ*, appear in pause, as *וְכָרְוּ*, *עֲבָדְוּ*, *אֲכָלְוּ*, *שָׁמְעוּ*, *אָהָבוּ*, *שָׁבוּ* (for *יִשָּׁבוּ*). Out of pause, the word is modelled somewhat after the form of segolate nouns, and becomes *kuṭlū, kaṭlū*, as *מִשְׁכְּנוּ*, *וְעָקְוּ*, *רָחֲצוּ*. Mostly, however, the vowel of the first syllable is weakened to *i*, or even, in certain cases, to *shēvā*; e.g. *וְכָרְוּ*, *אֲכָלְוּ*, *עֲבָדְוּ*, *אֲסַפּוּ*; *אֲמַצּוּ*, *קִרְאוּ*, *רְאוּ*, *בְּכוּ*, compared with the pausal *בְּעֵיךְ*.

For the 2d pers. plur. fem. the normal form ought to be *ḳtulāna*, which appears in Syriac, with weakening of the vowel in the last syllable, as *ܘܟܬܘܠܢܐ*. If the *u* be dropped, the vowel disappears with it, leaving *ḳtul*. But with suffixes the original *l* is restored, as *ܩܬܘܠܢܐ ܩܬܘܠܢܐ*. Similarly, the Ethiopic forms are *negēra, lḥāsā*; and the Assyrian, *sukinā* or *suknā, riḥišā* or *riḥsā, ṣabtā*. The Arabic, on the contrary, follows the analogy of the imperfect. As *taḳtulāna* becomes *taḳtūlna*, so *ḳtulāna* becomes *uḳtūlna*. This too

is the Hebrew form, קָרְאֵנָה, שְׁמַעְנָה, סַפְּרָנָה. In a couple of instances the final נָה (also written ן) is shortened into *n*, viz. שְׁמַעֲנִי Gen. iv. 23, and קְרֵאֲנִי Exod. ii. 20; which is in accordance with the vulgar pronunciation of a form like <sup>ضرب</sup>ضرب, as heard in Palestine by Robinson and Eli Smith, viz. *ḍurubn*.

The dual is to be found in ancient Arabic alone, and its form is analogous to that of the imperfect, viz., 'iḳtulā, for 'uḳtulāni, ḳtulanī. It serves for both genders, like the imperf. taḳtulanī.

#### IV. Variations of the Imperfect and Imperative.

I now proceed to notice sundry variations of the imperfect and imperative, which are used in the Semitic languages to express different shades of meaning, and which correspond in part to the several moods of the Indo-European tongues. As regards the imperfect, it has four such forms, serving as indicative, subjunctive, jussive (cohortative, optative), and energetic; whilst the imperative has two, the simple and the energetic.

It is in the old Arabic alone that these forms appear in full vigour, clearly distinguished by their terminations. The imperfect indicative ends in *n*, *yāḳtulu*; the subjunctive in *a*, *yāḳtula*. The jussive has ordinarily no vowel, *yāḳtul*, but seems originally to have ended in *i*; at least the poets use *yāḳtuli* in rime. Furthermore, the shorter terminations *i*, *ū*, and *ā* are always substituted for the fuller *ina*, *ūna*, and *āni*, in the fem. sing., the masc. plur., and the dual; *taḳtuli*, *yāḳtuli*, *yāḳtulā*, not *taḳtulina*, *yāḳtulūna*, *yāḳtulāni*. The province of each form is also distinctly marked out. The subjunctive is used in dependent clauses after certain conjunctions, such as <sup>أَنَّ</sup>“that,” <sup>كَيْ</sup>“that,” <sup>لِ</sup>“that, in order that,” <sup>حَتَّى</sup>“until,” and the like. The jussive serves as an imperative after <sup>لَا</sup>“not,” as <sup>لَا تَقْتُلْ</sup>“do not kill,” and after <sup>لِ</sup>, as <sup>لِيَقْتُلْ</sup>“let him kill” (commonly used in the 3rd pers. only). Preceded by <sup>لَمْ</sup> it designates the negative of the past, as <sup>لَمْ يَقْتُلْ</sup>“he did not kill.” It is also extensively employed in

two correlative conditional clauses, whether actually introduced by the conditional particle **إِنْ** "if," or not; e.g. **إِنْ تَعْجَلْ تَنْدَمَ** "if thou art hasty, thou wilt repent"; **مَنْ يَعْمَلْ سُوءًا يُعْجَزْ بِهِ** "he who doth evil, shall be recompensed for it."

In such languages as have lost the final vowels, these distinctions are of course no longer clearly obvious. The Aramaic, for example, we may at once dismiss from our observation. In Ethiopic a special form *yēndgēr* is employed for the imperfect indicative; whilst the ordinary *yēngēr* represents the subjunctive and jussive, e.g. **ለገዢ፡ ብሐር፡ ይዕቀብ፡** (*yē'kabbka*) "may God preserve thee," **ለደን፡ ብረሃነ፡** "let there be light." Similarly, in Assyrian, if the grammarians may be implicitly trusted, the imperfect indicative is *išdkin*; whilst *iškun* has assumed an aoristic sense. Of this fact there appears to be no doubt. In the so-called precative, however, we see a form exactly corresponding to the Arabic jussive with **ل** and the Ethiopic with **ሰ**; e.g. 3rd pers. *liškun*, *liškunū*, 2nd pers. *lutaškun*, 1st pers. *luškun*.

In Hebrew there is a somewhat closer correspondence to the fullness of the Arabic. If we can no longer distinguish the subjunctive from the indicative, we can at any rate clearly discern the jussive, and perceive that it had originally the same form as in Arabic. This takes place most easily in the Hiph'il of the regular verb, in the **Ḳal** and Hiph'il of verbs **פָּעַל** and **יָעַל**, and in the various conjugations of verbs **לָהּ**; though there are equally clear cases in the **Ḳal** of some other classes, where the imperfect has *a* or *e* for its characteristic vowel. The form is used as an optative or an imperative, especially after the negative **אַל**, or in the 3rd pers.; frequently too in correlative conditional clauses, as in Arabic; and lastly, with the so-called *udu conversive*. On all these points see your Hebrew Grammar or Mr Driver's treatise on the tenses. Here I shall only seek to illustrate the different forms. If you compare **אַל-תִּשְׁחַת** with **תִּשְׁחַת**, or **אַל-יִדַּן** with **יִדַּן**, you perceive at once that you have before you two forms corre-

sponding exactly to the Arabic  $\text{يَقْتَل}$  and  $\text{يَقْتُل}$ .  $\text{תִּשְׁחִית}$  or  $\text{יִאֲמִין}$  is, as I shall explain to you in a subsequent lecture, the equivalent of  $\text{يَقْتُل}$  with the loss of the final vowel; while  $\text{תִּשְׁחַת}$  or  $\text{יִאֲמֵן}$  answers to the shorter  $\text{يَقْتُل}$ ,  $i$  being heightened into  $\bar{e}$  in the tone-syllable. With *vāv conversive* this  $\bar{e}$  may even become  $\bar{z}$ , if the accent be thrown back, as  $\text{יִאֲסֵף}$  from  $\text{אִסְפָּה}$ . So also in verbs  $\text{ע"ע}$ , compare  $\text{יָחַן}$ ,  $\text{יָסַב}$ ,  $\text{יָעַז}$ , with  $\text{וַיָּחַן}$ ,  $\text{וַיָּסַב}$ ,  $\text{וַיָּעַז}$ ; Hiph'il  $\text{יָגַן}$ ,  $\text{יָפַר}$ , with  $\text{וַיָּגַן}$ ,  $\text{וַיָּפַר}$ . In verbs  $\text{ע"י}$   $\text{יָקַם}$  with  $\text{יָקַם}$  and  $\text{וַיָּקַם}$ ; Hiph'il,  $\text{יָבִין}$  with  $\text{יָבַן}$  and  $\text{וַיָּבִין}$  with  $\text{יָסַר}$  and  $\text{וַיָּסַר}$ . In verbs  $\text{ל"ה}$  the form is even more marked, if possible:  $\text{יִשְׁבֵּה}$  but  $\text{וַיִּשְׁבֵּה}$ ,  $\text{יִרְאֶה}$  but  $\text{וַיִּרְאֶה}$ ; with tone-lengthening,  $\text{יִשְׁטֵה}$ ,  $\text{יִשְׁטֵה}$ ;  $\text{יִבְכֶה}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּבְכֶה}$ ;  $\text{וַיִּרְדֵּה}$ ; with supplemental vowel,  $\text{יַעַל}$ ,  $\text{יַעַל}$ ,  $\text{יַעַשׂ}$ ,  $\text{יַרְא}$ ,  $\text{יַגַּל}$ ,  $\text{יַחַר}$ ,  $\text{יַחַד}$ , but  $\text{יִקְנֶה}$ ,  $\text{יִצְוֶה}$ ,  $\text{יִרְדֶּה}$  but  $\text{וַיִּרְדֶּה}$  but  $\text{וַיִּרְדֶּה}$ ,  $\text{יִגַּל}$  but  $\text{וַיִּגַּל}$ ; in Hiph'il,  $\text{יִפְתֶּה}$  but  $\text{וַיִּפְתֶּה}$  but  $\text{וַיִּפְתֶּה}$ ,  $\text{יִגַּל}$  but  $\text{וַיִּגַּל}$ ; with supplemental vowel,  $\text{יַרְב}$ ,  $\text{יַחַר}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּגַּל}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּפְּן}$ .

Once more; there exists in Arabic, as I have already told you, an *energetic* or *cohortative* in two shapes, the one with the fuller ending *anna*, the other with the shorter *an*,  $\text{يَقْتُلَنَّ}$  and  $\text{يَقْتُلُنَّ}$ . If we seek after the origin of this termination, we shall perhaps discover it in that demonstrative *n*, which we have already found as a component part of so many pronouns and other demonstratives, such as  $\text{أَنْ}$ ;  $\text{إِنْ}$ ,  $\text{هَذَا}$ ,  $\text{هَذَا}$ ; and the like. I will not, however, pretend to decide as to the fuller form  $\text{يَقْتُلَنَّ}$ , whether it arises from an intensive doubling of the *n* of  $\text{يَقْتُلُنَّ}$ , or whether, as Stade thinks, it is compounded of  $\text{يَقْتُلُنَّ}$  and a particle, now lost in Arabic, equivalent in meaning to the Hebrew  $\text{נָא}$  and

Syriac ܢܐ. If the latter be the case, <sup>ء</sup>اقومن would be exactly equivalent to אָקוּמָה נָא. Similar is the form in the inscriptions of S. Arabia, as in the tablet : ולקמען עתתר דיתברנה.

These forms, or at any rate the shorter one of the two, have left distinct traces in Hebrew in two ways. (1) In all those forms of the imperfect with pronominal suffixes, where our grammars speak of an *epenthetic nūn* (Kautzsch's *nūn energeticum* or *demonstrativum* is a better term). This *n* is sometimes preserved, as יִעֲבֹרְנֶהוּ Jerem. v. 22, יִצְרְרֶהוּ Deut. xxxii. 10, יִבְרַכְנֶהוּ Ps. lxxii. 5, אֲתִקְנֶךָ Jerem. xxii. 24, יִכְפְּרֶנִּי Ps. l. 23; but more usually assimilated, as יִחַקְרְנֶוּ, יִעֲזֹבְנָה, יִעֲזֹבְךָ, יִשְׁמַעְךָ. Similar forms are in constant use in the Aramaic dialects, though more widely in some than in others, and have even found their way into the perfect with plural suffixes in Mandaitic and Talmudic, as also perhaps in the Syriac form <sup>ܢܐ</sup>ܠܘܡܝܢܗܘܢ = Mand. לְגַאמִינֶהוּ or לְגַאמִינֶן, though <sup>ܢܐ</sup>ܠܘܡܝܢܗܘܢ may here be the independent pronoun = הַמּוֹ or הַמּוֹן in Biblical Aramaic. In Phoenician this demonstrative *n* occurs also in the suffixes appended to nouns. (2) In the separate forms in הַ. In Arabic <sup>ء</sup>اقتل may also be written <sup>ء</sup>اقتل and is pronounced in pause <sup>ء</sup>اقتلā 'aktulā. Hence is apparent its identity with the Hebrew אֲקַטְלָה. Observe, however, that whilst the form is fully inflected in Arabic, its use is almost restricted in Hebrew to the first person sing. and plur. : אֲחַבְּשָׁה, אֲחַבְּשׁוּ, אֲעַבְּרָה, אֲעַבְּרֶה; נִעְבְּרָה, נִעְבְּרֶה; אֲעֹבֵב, אֲעֹבֵבְךָ, אֲעֹבֵבְךָ; in pause, with older accent, אֲשַׁמְרָה, אֲשַׁמְרֶה, אֲשַׁמְרֶה, אֲשַׁמְרֶה; אֲעֹבֵבְךָ, אֲעֹבֵבְךָ, אֲעֹבֵבְךָ. Very rare are examples in the other persons; e.g., in the 3rd, Ps. xx. 4, Is. v. 19, Ezek. xxiii. 20, Prov. i. 20, viii. 3, Job xi. 17 (where some take תַּעֲפֶה for the 2nd pers. masc.). Of a weakened form in הַ we have two instances; יִדְּשְׁנָה Ps. xx. 4, and וְאֲקַרְאָה I Sam. xxviii. 15.

These same energetic forms are also used in the imperative, viz. in Arabic, <sup>مات</sup> اَمِتْ and <sup>مات</sup> اَمِتْ. In Hebrew the form in הַ is restricted to the 2nd pers. sing. masc., but appears in two shapes.

(1) With the older accentuation, קַטֹּלָה, קַטְּלָה, from *kʿtulan*, *kʿtulan*; as פִּשְׁטָה and הִגְרָה Is. xxxii. 11, מְלוֹכָה Judg. ix. 8 (*Kethibh*), צְרוּפָה P's. xxvi. 2 (*Do*); שְׂמַעַח, רְנוּה, יִרְשָׁה; with suffixes שְׂמַעְנָה, קְרָאנָה, הִנְנָה. (2) More frequently the form is adapted to that of the augmented persons of the imperative, and the accent shifted to the last syllable; e.g. עֲזֹבָה, בְּרָתָה, שְׂמַרָה, וְכָרָה; or with weakening of the vowel, מְכַרָה, עֲרַכָה, נְצַרָה, שְׂמַעָה. With weakening of הַ into הֶ we find רְעָה in Prov. xxiv. 14, according to one reading, another being רְעָה.

### V. *The Infinitive.*

The *infinitive* of the Semitic languages is in reality nothing but a verbal noun, varying in form according to various modifying influences. In Arabic the grammarians enumerate some forty of these forms in the first conjugation only, though perhaps not more than a dozen or so of these are in common use. In the other languages the number is much smaller. In Ethiopic there are in the first conjugation only two, *nagir* and *nagirôt*; in Aramaic but one, *מְקַטֵּל*, *מְקַטְּלָה*. The Hebrew has likewise two infinitives, one of which, however, appears under several different forms.

Among the commonest infinitives in Arabic are the simple segolates جَبْنٌ, ذِكْرٌ, حِفْظٌ, قَوْلٌ, ضَرْبٌ, as *katl*, *kittl*, *kutl*, as *katla*, *killa*, *kutla*, as رَحْمَةٌ, شُكْرٌ; with their rarer feminines قَتْلَةٌ, كَتْلَةٌ, كُتْلَةٌ, as سَمْرَةٌ, حَمِيَّةٌ. To these—or still more closely to their Aramaic equivalents [the nominal forms] *kʿtal*, *kʿtil*, *kʿtul*—correspond the

forms of the ordinary Hebrew infinitive construct, קָטַל and קָטַלְתִּי, with their feminines קָטַלְתְּ or קָטַלְתְּהוּ, and קָטַלְתְּהוּ or קָטַלְתְּהוּ. Of these by far the most common is קָטַל, with suffixes קָטַלְתִּי and קָטַלְתְּהוּ or קָטַלְתְּהוּ, etc. Of the rarer forms examples are: (1) *שָׁכַב*, *שָׁפַל*, *חָסַר*, *שָׁלַח*; with suffixes, *שָׁכַבְתָּ* Gen. xix. 33, *בְּזַעַפּוֹ* 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, *בְּמַעְלָם* Ezek. xx. 27, *וְעַקְדָּה* Is. xxx. 19. (2) *אָרְבָּה* Deut. vii. 8, *חָמְלָה* Gen. xix. 16, *יָרָאָה* Is. xxix. 13; *שָׁנְאָה* Deut. i. 27. (3) *עָצְמָה* Is. xlvi. 9, *גָּבְהָהּ* Zeph. iii. 11, *קָרְבָּה* Exod. xxxvi. 2, xl. 32, *חָמְלָה* Ezek. xvi. 5, *חָמְצָה* Hos. vii. 4.

The other Hebrew infinitive, the so-called infinitive absolute, has the form *kāṭōl*, as *נָתַן*, *הָלֹךְ*, *יָצָא*, *יָרַע*, *אָרַר*, *בָּנָה*, *אָרַר*, *יָרַע*, *יָצָא*, *הָלֹךְ*, *נָתַן*. Since *ḥ* in Hebrew ordinarily represents original *h*, this form seems to be identical with the interjectional or imperative form *kaṭṭli* *تَال* in Arabic. As in Hebrew *שָׁמֹר* means "keep, observe!" or *זָכוֹר* "remember!" so in Arabic *نَزَّال* means "come down!" or *تَرَكَ* "let alone!"

## VI. *The Participles.*

Of the active participle there would appear to have been originally three forms, corresponding to the three forms of the perfect, viz. *kaṭal*, *kaṭil*, and *kaṭul*. The first of these, however, is actually known to us only as a verbal adjective, e.g. *חָכַם*, *חָכַם*; unless we except the fem. *חָכְמָה*, constr. *חָכְמָה*. The other two actually occur as participles: *יָגוֹר* Jerem. xxii. 25, xxxix. 17 (the only example of this form), *יָשָׁן*, *מָלָא*, *גָּדַל*, *רָעַב*, etc. The place of *kaṭal* has been usurped by an intensive form *kaṭṭal*, of which we find clear traces in the verbs *לָה*, e.g. *חָזָה*,

for *hōsai* חוֹסֵי (which actually occurs as a proper name); and in the usual feminine *kōšēleth*, for *kōšalt*, as יִרְדַת, יִשְׁבַת, בְּרַחַת, יִרְדַת, in pause יִשְׁבַת, with suffixes יוֹלְדֶתְכֶם, יוֹלְדֶתִי; as well as, I think, in such construct forms as אֲבָר Deut. xxxii. 28, נָטַע Ps. xciv. 9. Far more common however than *kōšal* is the form *kōšil*, which may be explained in one of two ways; either as a weakening of *kōšal* by change of *a* in the second syllable into *i*; or as an intensive of the intransitive *kašil*, the use of which has been gradually extended so as to embrace all classes of verbs. Its oldest form is the Arabic *kāšil*, fem. *kāšilat*, with which closely agree the Ethiopic *šādīk*, fem. *šādīkt*, and the Assyrian *sākin*, *āsib*, fem. *sākinat*, *āsibat*, as also the Aramaic קָטַל, קָטְלָא, סְחָל, סְחָלָא. In the Biblical Aramaic this participle is pointed, at least in pause, קָטַל, e.g. Dan. iv. 10, vi. 3, vii. 9, but also iii. 17, iv. 20, 34. In the same dialect the feminine and plurals have moveable *shēvā*, e.g. בְּטָלָא Ezr. iv. 24, כְּתָבָה Dan. v. 5, יִתְבִּין Ezr. iv. 17, סְלִקָן; whereas in Syriac the *shēvā* is silent, بَطْلٌ, سَحْلٌ, whence it comes that in later Jewish Aramaic [and in some Hebrew Bibles] we often find *pathach* in the first syllable, though incorrectly. The moveable *shēvā* is of course the older form, coinciding with the moveable *shēvā* of the Hebrew, and the full vowel *i* of the Arabic *kāšilūna*, *kāšilatūna*. The Hebrew form naturally substitutes *š* for *š* in the 1st syllable, and heightens the vowel of the tone-syllable into *ē*, whence קוֹטַל, fem. קוֹטְלָה, in certain cases with fuller vowel בְּגִרָה, אוֹכְלָה.

In regard to the passive participle, the Semitic languages diverge from one another more than is usual. Of the passive voice generally I shall treat at another opportunity. At present it must suffice to say that the participial form ordinarily employed in Arabic is *maḳtūl*, with the prefix *ma*, of which I shall have more to say when we come to the derived conjugations of the verb. The Hebrew form *kašūl*, קָטוּל, is very common in Ethiopic, but with the first vowel weakened, *kāšūl*, fem. *kāšūlt*,



e.g. *ṣḥūf* "written," *'isūr* "bound," *mīlū* "full," fem. *ṣḥēft*, *'isērt*, *mīlēt*. The Arabic form *فعل* is also sometimes used in a passive sense, e.g. *رَكوبَةٌ* "a she camel for riding," *حَلَبَةٌ* "a she camel for milking." In Syriac too there are a few examples of this kind, as *ܢܫܡܘܬܐ*, *ܢܫܡܘܬܐ*, "beloved," *ܗܢܘܬܐ*, *ܗܢܘܬܐ*, "hated," *ܫܡܘܬܐ* "a thing stolen," *ܡܫܡܘܬܐ* "a thing heard, a rumour." In Aramaic however the form *ܩܝܒܐ*, *ܩܝܒܐ*, is preferred, which is identical with the Arabic adjective *kaṭīl*; e.g. *ܩܝܒܐ*, *ܩܝܒܐ*. Of another verbally inflected *ḳṭīl* in Aramaic I shall attempt an explanation when we come to the passive voice.

## VII. *The Derived Conjugations.*

### A. *First Group.*

I next proceed to speak briefly of the more important of the derived conjugations.

These are divisible into groups, the members of which closely resemble one another in their inflexion. The first group consists of three: (a) an intensive and iterative or frequentative; (b) a form expressive of effort, with an implied idea of reciprocal effort; and (c) a factitive or causative.

1. The first of these, the intensive and iterative, finds its expression in the doubling of the second consonant of the root. You may remember that intensive nouns are formed in the same way; that a word of the form *ḳāṭal*, like *ܩܬܠ* or *ܩܬܠܐ*, becomes *ḳāṭṭal*, like *ܩܬܠܐ* or *ܩܬܠܐ*. Now as the nominal *ḳāṭal* lies at the root of the verbal form *ḳāṭalā*, so does the nominal *ḳāṭṭal* at the root of the verbal *ḳāṭṭalā*.

The Arabic, as usual, exhibits this form in its primitive integrity, *ḳāṭṭala*; *قَتَلَ* "to kill many, to massacre"; *كَسَرَ* "to break into many pieces"; *بَكَى* "to weep much" or "constantly"; *مَوَتْ*

“to die in great numbers”; طَوَّفَ “to go round and round.” So in Ethiopic, ረሰዎ: *russaya*, “to do”; ፈገገ: *faundwa*, “to send”; ጸገገ: *ṣawwe“a*, “to call out” (where the vowel of the 2nd syllable is modified by the final guttural). In Hebrew the original form was, of course, *kattil*; but as in the noun we find אָפַר for אֶפֶר, so in the verb *kittil* for *kattil*, as שָׁפַר, אָפַר, גָּדַל, רָחַם, שָׁפַר, אָפַר, גָּדַל, רָחַם, “betroth to oneself.” The *ä* of the 2nd syllable is sometimes weakened to *ɛ*, as in דָּפַר, נָפַר, פָּבַם (with which compare the change of *ä* into *ɛ* in גָּבַר for נָבַר); but far more usually into *ɪ*, more especially in pause, where it appears, owing to the force of the tone, as *ɪ* =. This change is probably owing to the influence of the vowel of the same syllable in the imperfect and imperative (קָטַל, יִקְטֹל). In the first and 2nd persons the original short *ä* is dominant, דִּפְרַתִּי, דִּפְרַתְּם, דִּפְרַתְּךָ, דִּפְרַתְּךָ, דִּפְרַתְּךָ. In the pausal forms of the 3rd pers. sing. fem., and the 3rd pers. plur., the weaker vowel predominates: לִקְטָה, גִּדְלָה, לִקְטָה, גִּדְלָה, though we also find קָבְצָה, Micah i. 7. In the Aramaic dialects the weakened קָטַל, קָטַל, קָטַל prevails, except where a guttural, or the letter *r*, as 3rd radical, may have protected the original vowel; e.g. קָטַד, קָטַד.

Glancing at the imperative, imperfect, and participle, we observe that in all the Semitic languages the vowels of the root-syllables are *a* in the first and *i* in the second, *kattil*. So the imperative in Arabic, كَاتِلْ *kattil*; in Ethiopic, ፈገገ: *faṣṣem*; in Hebrew, פָּקַד, פָּקַד; in Syriac, كَفِد, كَفِد. The nominal form *kattil*, intensified to *kattil*, lies at the root of the verbal form. Hence it appears that the use of *ä* in the case of radicals 3rd guttural, like שָׁפַח, שָׁפַח, קָטַד, קָטַד, is due, not to the retention of the original vowel under the protection of the guttural, but to a later change of *ɪ*, *ɛ*, into *ä* under the influence of that

guttural. Side by side with **שָׁמַח לְבִי**, Prov. xxvii. 11, we have **שָׁמַח נַפְשׁ עַבְדְּךָ**; and the pausal forms of the fem. and plur. are always **רַבְּרָה, רַבְּרָה**, not **רַבְּרִי, רַבְּרִי**.

The imperfect is formed and inflected on precisely the same principles as in the first or simple conjugation. The vowel of the preformatives was originally *a*, yielding the forms *yakáttílu*, *takáttílu*, etc. This pure vowel I find, however, only in the Ethiopic subjunctive of verbs 1st guttural, e.g. **የላከህኛ**: *yaháddés*. Otherwise it is weakened into *e*, as *yěfásšém*, **የፈረሁ**. In Arabic this dull obscure vowel appears in the classical language as *ā*, e.g. **يَقْتُلُ, يَقْتُلُ**; and the same is the case in Assyrian, where we have the forms *yušakkin*, *tušakkin*, etc. In vulgar Arabic Spitta gives the preformative the vowel *i*, whilst the vowel of the final syllable varies according to the nature of the last radical, *yīšaddak*, *yīfattak*, but *yīkallim*, *yīrattib*. In Hebrew and Aramaic the preformative vowel is also *e*, **יָצַל, יָצַל**, save that in the 1st pers. sing. **אֶצַּל** appears in Hebrew and **אֶצַּל** in Aramaic, **אֶצַּל, אֶצַּל**. As, in the 1st conj., the Ethiopic exhibits two varieties of the imperfect, one serving for the indicative, the other for the subjunctive and jussive, so here in the 2nd conj. In the 1st conj., however, the distinction was easily made, and effected by a mere change of the vocalisation; *yěndǝǝr* for the indicative, *yěngǝǝr* for the subjunctive, corresponding in form at least to the Assyrian *šákin* and *škun*. But here, in the 2nd conj., some further change is necessary, because of the double letter, which renders any mere vowel change almost impossible without entirely destroying the normal form. The Ethiopic therefore retained the normal *yěfásšém* for the subjunctive, and had recourse for the indicative to the form *yěfǝǝém*, **የፈረሁ**, the origin of which is not perfectly clear. That the doubling of the 2nd radical has been dropped is certain; and therefore it seems most likely that the form *káitála* has been resorted to, which would naturally appear in Ethiopic as *kǝtála*.

The active participle follows exactly the same vocalisation. Its preformative in Ethiopic is *ma*, e.g. **መጠሙ**: *ma'ámmǝg*,

מִקְטָלִים: *mikwātūmūn*. The Hebrew and Aramaic weaken the vowel to *i*, מִקְטָר, מִקְטָלָה; and this dull vowel is represented in old Arabic and Assyrian by *u*, مَقْتَلٌ, *mušakkin*, in modern Arabic by *i*, as *mīšfattaḥ*, *mīšaddak*, *mīšakammil*, *mīš'allim*.

The infinitive of this conj. also calls for a few remarks. Beginning with the Hebrew, we find the ordinary or construct infin. to be קָטַל, *kattēl*, from an original *kattll*. The weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* is a rarity, as קָטַר Levit. xiv. 43, קָטַר Jerem. xlv. 21; שָׁלַם Deut. xxxii. 35<sup>1</sup>. Compare in the class of concretes such words as עָרַר, גָּבַן, from *gabbn*, 'avvtr. The same form *kattēl* serves for the infin. absolute (with weakening נָאץ 2 Sam. xii. 14); but with it occurs another, viz. קָטַל, e.g. קָטַל, יָפַר, רָפָא, בָּרַךְ. The corresponding concretes are exemplified by רְחוּק "chain," קְנֹזָא "zealous, jealous," or, with weakening of the 1st vowel, מְלֹזָא, גְּבוּר, שְׂבוּר, יְפוּר (Job xl. 2 = xxxix. 32), קָפוּח (قَفَاوَة). These all spring from an original *kattll*, the intensive of قَتَلَ. The Arabic infin. قَتَلَ is therefore weakened from قَتَلَ, as in كَذَابٌ, عِلْمٌ, حِمَالٌ, as compared with the concretes كَذَابٌ, عِلْمٌ, حِمَالٌ.—The forms with prefixed *i*, which are generally assigned to this conjugation, تَقْتَلُ, تَقْتِيلٌ, تَقْتِيلَةٌ, we shall explain elsewhere.—In Aramaic the forms of the infinitive diverge somewhat from one another. The Aramaic of the Bible and the Targūms generally has the form קָטַלָה (קָטַלָה); whilst the Talmūd Babilī, the Mandaitic, and the modern Syriac, exhibit קָטַוְלִי; e.g. Talm. B. שְׂבוּרִי,

<sup>1</sup> [Kautzsch-Ges. (25th ed., p. 143) recognises only two certain examples of the infinitive const. with *i* in the first syllable, viz. Lev. xiv. 43 and 1 Chron. viii. 8, and in both the text is open to question; see *Journ. of Phil.* xvi. 72. In 2 Sam. xii. 14 the inf. abs. נָאץ seems to be influenced by the sound of the following word נָאץֶה.]

שִׁבּוּחַ, אֲסוּיָא, נִאֲסוּרִיא, בִּאֲרוּכִיא, מַאֲסוּרִיא; צִלּוּי, אֲסוּיָא; mod. Syr. ܨܒܚܐ, ܨܒܚܐ. This ܨܒܚܐ is not easy to explain, but most likely, as Noeldeke thinks, it is connected with such Hebrew forms as שָׁבַח (plur. שִׁבְחִים, Is. xlix. 20) and שָׁלוּם, plus the originally fem. termination *ai*, which we find in Syriac in ܠܡܨܒܐ, ܠܢܘܒ, etc. In all these dialects an *m* is occasionally prefixed, Targ. ܡܫܒܚܐ, Mand. ܡܦܐܡܘܪܝܐ, mod. Syr. ܡܨܒܘܐ; and this is the ordinary form in old Syriac, but with a different termination, though also originally fem., viz. ܡܨܒܘܬܐ. The prefixing of the *m* may have been due to the influence of the participial forms, and of the infin. Pē'al, ܡܨܒܘܬܐ. — In Mandaic and modern Syriac a fem. of ܨܒܚܐ is also in common use as a verbal noun or infinitive, viz. ܕܫܒܚܐ, as ܦܐܡܪܬܐ "order," ܪܐܢܐܘܬܐ "provocation," ܘܐܒܐܢܬܐ "selling," ܘܐܪܐܪܬܐ "warning"; ܠܨܒܘܬܐ "completion," ܨܒܚܐ "deliverance." The most nearly corresponding forms in Hebrew are represented by such words as ܒִּקְשָׁה "desiring," ܒִּקְרָה "care," ܒִּלְדָּה "terror," ܒִּצְרָה "cutting off (of rain), drought, distress," ܒִּקְרָת "punishment," ܒִּצְרָת "drought." These are intensives of the form ܨܒܚܐ ܕܫܒܚܐ, found in old Syriac and still more abundantly in mod. Syriac, ܡܨܒܘܬܐ, ܡܨܒܘܬܐ; just as ܨܒܚܐ is the intensive of the Syr. and Mand. ܨܒܚܐ, ܨܒܚܐ, ܨܒܚܐ.

2. The second verbal form in this group is that which expresses an effort, with the implied idea of a counter-effort. Its expression lies in the lengthening of the vowel of the first syllable, *ḵātala* instead of *ḵatala*. It is in general use in Arabic only, but examples occur in Ethiopic too, the form being identical in both languages, viz. ܒָּאַרַךְ, ܒָּאַרַךְ: "bless"; ܠܗܘܚܒܐ "go to law"; ܠܗܘܚܒܐ "talk to"; ܠܗܘܚܒܐ, ܠܗܘܚܒܐ: "play the hypocrite."

In Hebrew its use is likewise restricted. It appears in this language under the shape of *kōfēl*, for *kāfēl*, and is most common in verbs ע"ע, e.g. פָּרַר "cleave," חוּלַל "pierce, wound," חוּן "show mercy," סוּבַב "surround," הוּלַל "befool," רוּצַץ "crush to bits." In the ordinary triliteral verb examples are rare, but certain; e.g. שׁוּפַט (Job ix. 15, مَسْحَكِمِي = مَسْحَكِمِي), לָשַׁן (Ps. ci. 5, מְלֹשְׁנֵי בַּתְּחַר רִיעוּדוּ), סוּעַר (Hos. xiii. 3, יְסוּעַר "blows away"), שׁוּרַשׁ "to take root," רוּ וְהוּ "conceiving and uttering," Is. lix. 13. In Aramaic this form can hardly be said to occur, save in Biblical Aramaic, where we find מְסוּבְלִין "set up," Ezra vi. 3. The inflexion runs entirely parallel to that of the intensive form, and therefore requires no special elucidation. I will merely remark as to the Arabic infinitive that the original form is تَيْتَالٌ *tītal*, of which the grammarians quote one or two examples, as صَيْرَابٌ and تَيْتَالٌ. Usually, however, it has been shortened into تَتَالٌ, though some compensated for the loss of the long vowel by doubling the middle radical, مَرَاءٌ تَتَالٌ, which must however have led to confusion with the infinitive of the intensive. The Hebrew infinitives רוּ וְהוּ and רוּ וְהוּ hold fast the original vowel *ā*, and would be represented in Arabic by some such words as قَاتَالٌ and هَاجَأٌ, which do not actually exist.

As to the participle I would remark that an example without prefixed *m* seems to offer itself in the word עוּן 1 Sam. xviii. 9 (*Kūthibh* עוּן), for the corresponding Arabic verb is عَابَى. We shall have occasion hereafter to notice other participial forms in Hebrew and modern Syriac without prefixed *m*.

And here I may call your attention in passing to another verbal form in Hebrew, which is in some cases identical in

sound with this קָטַל. I mean the form קָטַלָּל, originally *kaṭalál, kaṭlál*, when derived from verbs עָץ; e.g. פָּוְנָן for פָּוֵן, עוֹרָר for עוֹר, and the like. Here too we find an active participle without prefixed *u*, שׁוֹרְרִי, "that lie in wait for me," Ps. v. 9, and elsewhere.

3. The factitive or causative conjugation of the verb seems originally to have been marked by a prefixed *ta*, *taḫátala*, contracted *táḫala*. Of this formation verbal examples are exceedingly rare in any dialect. תַּרְבֵּלְתִי, Hos. xi. 3, seems certain; perhaps also תַּרְבֵּם, תַּרְבֵּם, תַּרְבֵּם, if connected, as seems probable, with the Assyrian root *ragamu* "to speak," whence *rigmu*, "a word" (Delitzsch). For תַּתְרַה (Jer. xii. 5, xxii. 15) another explanation is possible. But in verbal nouns of the infinitive class it is exceedingly common, though in our Arabic grammars these are all ascribed to the intensive form, with which, strictly speaking, they have nothing to do. I mean the infinitives تَقْتِيلُ and تَقْتَلُ and تَقْتَالُ and تَقْتُولُ, with their Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents, such as Aram. and late Heb. תַּרְבֵּיִת, תַּרְבֵּיִת, תַּרְבֵּיִת "shroud," "wrapper," תַּבְנִית "model," תַּרְבִּית "interest," תַּנְבִּיל "benefit," תַּחְבִּילוֹת "guidance"; Syr. ܬܪܒܝܬܐ, ܬܪܒܝܬܐ, ܬܪܒܝܬܐ, ܬܪܒܝܬܐ, ܬܪܒܝܬܐ.—This form with *t* appears to have had a sister form with prefixed *s* or *sh*. In Arabic this latter occurs in rare instances like سَقَلَّ "dash to the ground," سَلَقِي "throw down flat on the back" (whence the trilateral سَلَقَ), and سَلَعَفَ "swallow," as well as in the exceedingly common reflexive اسْتَقْتَلَّ, of which, as well as of the corresponding Ethiopic forms we shall speak in a subsequent lecture. The Hīmyaritic exhibits the *s* in one of its dialects, סַקְנִי, סַחְרַת. In Amharic the

preformative *h*, *sa*, more frequently *ah*, *as*, is an ordinary causative prefix, e.g. *חנל*: "be honoured," *חנל*: "honour." In Assyrian such forms as *ušaškin*, "set up," *ušašpriš*, "spread out," *ušašbit*, "let seize," seem to be common. In Biblical Hebrew, on the other hand, the prefix *ש* is found only in the derivative nouns *שלהבת* "flame," [from Aram. *שלהב* "kindle"], *שקעוררות* (Levit. xiv. 37), "hollows, depressions," (rad. *קער*), and *שבלול* "snail," (rad. *בלל* "moisten," *בל*). In the Aramaic dialects, on the contrary, there are numerous examples of it, such as *שבלל*, *שפפ*, *שפפ*, *שפפ*, *שפפ*, *שפפ*, *שפפ*, *שפפ*. The form with *ס* is far more rare, e.g. *סקבל*, *סרהב*; Syr. *סמס*, *סמס*, *סמס* (rad. *ספ*); Mand. *סמרהב*, *סמרהב* "smooth."—This initial *s* underwent, however, in most cases, a further change into *h*. Hence some rare Arabic forms like *هراح* "let rest," *هراذ* "wish," *هراق* "pour out," *هات* "give" (for *آت*, imperative of *أتي*, from *أتي* "come"). This *h* does not occur in Ethiopic or Assyrian, but we find it in one of the Hīmyaritic dialects, *הקני*, *ההרת*. In Biblical Aramaic it is common, in the forms *הקטל*, *הקטל*; and may also be found in the Targūms, at least in verbs *פ* and *פ*. In Mandaitic there are likewise a few instances, e.g. *האוליל* "cry out, lament"; *האשיט* "despise"; *האנפיק* "lead out," and *האנסיק* "let ascend," as well as *אפיק* and *אסיק*. In Syriac it is unknown; but it is the usual form in Hebrew. Here the original was *hakṭal*, with *a* in both syllables. For the first syllable this is proved (1) by the vowel of the imperative and imperfect, and (2) by the forms of verbs *פ*, where *הושיב*, *הושיב*, can only

<sup>1</sup> *שבלל* and *שויב* appear to be of Assyrian origin. N.]

<sup>2</sup> [The military form *וספ*, was regarded by Prof. Wright as a loan-word from the Hebrew.]



arise from הוֹשִׁיב, הוֹרִישׁ. For the second syllable the *a* is established (1) by the vowel of the 1st and 2nd persons, הַקְטִילְתָּ, הַקְטִילְתִּי, etc., and (2) by the form הַנְּלֵה for הַנְּלִי, in verbs לִי or לִי. The vowel of the first syllable was however mostly weakened into *i*, and that of the second into *ē*. In the second syllable we should naturally expect = *ē*, but the language has in this case gone a step further and sunk *ē* into *ī*. Hence the normal הַקְטִיל, with its fem. הַקְטִילָה and plur. הַקְטִילוּ. The rest of the paradigm does not call for much remark. The imperfect יִקְטִיל is a contraction for יִהַקְטִיל, of which fuller form examples occur in Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. The normal *ē* is retained in Hebrew in the jussive יִקְטַל, the infinitive absolute הַקְטִיל, and the imperative הַקְטִיל and הַקְטִילְנָה (הַאֲוִנָה in Gen. iv. 23); but the long *ī* appears in the heavier forms of the imperfect יִקְטִיל, the energetic יִקְטִילְנִי, הַקְטִילְנָה, the imperative הַקְטִילִי, הַקְטִילוּ, and the participle מְקַטֵּל. The infinitive construct varies between הַקְטִיל and הַקְטִיל, though the former is much more common. A form like הַשְׁמִיד, Deut. vii. 24, xxviii. 48, is a rarity<sup>1</sup>.

The last step in the history of the factitive or causative is the weakening of the initial *h* into the spiritus lenis. In Phœnician the perfect is written with initial *ʿ*, but was probably pronounced *ikʿīl*. Examples from the inscriptions are יִצְנָא "he set up," and יִקְדֵּשׁ "he consecrated." This weakening is almost universal in Arabic, where the form is written أَكْتَل *akʿtala*<sup>2</sup>. In Ethiopic too it is exceedingly common; and the prefix 'a is used in this language to form causatives not merely from *katála*, but also from *kattála*, and even from *kātála*; as ጠጽጸ: "come," ለጠጽጸ: "bring"; ሰረ: "go," ለሰረ: "make to go"; ሠነዖ: *sannāya*, "be beautiful," ለሠነዖ: 'asannāya, "make beautiful"; ለጸጸጸ:

<sup>1</sup> [Indeed, the genuineness of such forms is doubtful; see *Journ. of Phil.* xvi. 71.]

<sup>2</sup> In vulgar Arabic one hears *islam* for *astam*, "he has become a Muslim," but this is a rare exception.

“make one finish”;  $\lambda\lambda\phi\theta$ : “condole with one.” In Tigrifta and Amharic too it is in ordinary use. In Hebrew it is very rare ( $\text{אֲנִלְתִּי}$  “I have defiled,” Is. lxiii. 3;  $\text{אֲשַׁבֵּי}$ , infin., Jerem. xxv. 3); but in the Aramaic dialects it is the almost universal form,  $\text{أَصَل}$ . In one instance in Syr. the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened to  $\epsilon$ , viz.  $\text{أَصَب}$ , as compared with  $\text{أَصَب}$ ,  $\text{أَصَب}$ ,—like the vulg. Arab.  $\text{إِسْم}$  mentioned above. With regard to the initial  $a$ , I may remark that it disappears after preformatives; e.g. in Arabic,  $\text{يَقْتَل}$ , part.  $\text{مَقْتَل}$ ; in Ethiopic, from  $\lambda\lambda\eta\zeta$ : “make speak,”  $\rho\eta\eta\zeta$ :  $y\acute{a}ndg\acute{e}r$  and  $\rho\eta\eta\zeta$ :  $y\acute{a}ng\acute{e}r$ ; Syr.  $\text{أَصَل}$ ,  $\text{أَصَل}$ . The vulgar Arabic of Egypt has weakened the vowel of the 1st syllable to  $i$ , as  $yikhibir$  ( $\text{يَخْبِر}$ ),  $yimhil$  ( $\text{يَمِيل}$ ). In the Aramaic dialects, the infinitive of Aph’el exhibits nearly the same varieties as that of Pa’el. The Biblical and Targumic form is  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$ ,  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$ , corresponding very nearly to the Arabic  $\text{أَتَل}$ ; Talm. Babil and Mandaitic,  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$ , as  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$ ;  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$ ;  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$  “knecl,”  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$  “condemn”; with prefixed  $m$ ,  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$  “go,”  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$  “bring”; Syriac, always with  $m$ ,  $\text{أَصَل}$ .

### B. Second Group.

The 2nd group of derived conjugations consists of four members, serving originally as reflexives and reciprocals of the previous four, but often also as passives. The sign which is common to the whole of them is the prefixed syllable  $ta$ . This, whatever may have been its primitive form and derivation, must originally have been quite different from the causative prefix  $ta$ , of which we spoke above.

1. The reflexive of the first conjugation is  $ta\acute{k}dtala$ . Of this

we have two varieties in Ethiopic, ተገደኝ: *takadāna*, and ተገደኝ: *takādna*, "cover oneself, be covered"; ተጠቀሰ: and ተጠቅሰ: "guard oneself, abstain, beware, be guarded"; ተጠልደ: "be born"; ተለካዘ: "be taken"; ተጠፀፀ: or ተጠፀ: "be angry." In course of time the prefixed *ta* would lose its vowel, and take a prosthetic vowel instead, becoming firstly *tʰ*, and then *'it* or *'itʰ*. Hence the Aramaic form, אֲתַקְמַל, more commonly, with weakening of the last vowel, אֲתַקְמַל, אֲתַקְמַל. In Syriac and Mandaitic we also find a supplementary vowel in frequent use, عَتِיקْمِل, اِتْمَل. The Biblical Aram. has the spiritus asper instead of the lenis, הֲתַקְמַל, e.g. הֲתַרְחֲצוּ Dan. iii. 28. In Hebrew this form is of very rare occurrence indeed. A possible example, without any prosthetic, may be תַּרְחַץ, of which the imperf. תַּתְּרַחֵץ occurs in Jerem. xii. 5, and the participle מִתְּרַחֵץ in xxii. 15. If so, this form is next of kin to the Syr. اِتْمَل. More certain is a derivative from the rad. פָּקַד, with the prosthetic spiritus asper, viz. הֲתַפְקֵד "to be numbered, mustered," e.g. Judges xx. 15, 17, xxi. 9, which is written without *daghesh* and with *hāmes* wherever it occurs<sup>1</sup>. The Arabic form اِتْمَل, standing for تَتَمَل, offers us the curious feature of a transposition of the preformative to the place after the first radical, تَتَمَل for تَمَل. This began no doubt with the verbs which commenced with a sibilant, as in Syr. اِتْمَل, اِتْمَل; اِتْمَل, اِتْمَل; and was gradually extended to all alike. The Arabic parallel to הֲתַפְקֵד is therefore اِتْمَل "to search for, inspect." Curiously enough the same transposition seems to have existed in Moabitic; at least in the inscription of king Mēsha' we find four times (ll. 11, 15, 19, 32) a form הֲלַתְחַם, from the rad. לַחַם, in the

<sup>1</sup> The pronunciation as a passive הֲתַפְקֵד, Num. i. 47, ii. 33, xxvi. 62; 1 Kings xx. 27, is probably due to a misunderstanding of the Massoretes.

sense of the Heb. נָלַחַם "fight," Arab. اَلتَّحَمَ "join oneself to, adhere to," "rage" (of a battle). It is also found in Assyrian, as *istakan* "he made," *iftkid* "he committed" or "entrusted"; and in Himyaritic, without any prosthetic *alif*, e.g. סָטַר from סָטַר, סָטַל from סָטַל, נָטַר from נָטַר. It would appear that forms without transposition of the *t*, as well as forms corresponding to those of classical Arabic, exist in the modern dialect of Egypt. At least Spitta distinguishes carefully verbs of the form *ifsa'al* or *ifsi'il* from the corresponding forms of the intensive with double radical. According to him *ifsa'al* or *ifsi'il* is usually passive of Conj. I, as *itabas*, *itkasar*, *itmisik*, *itfihim*; whereas the transposed *ifsa'al* is more usually reflexive than passive, as *itamad*, *intazar*, *isfalak*, *istama'* ("be heard" and "obey").

2. The reflexive of the intensive and iterative is naturally *takattala*. This form presents itself in Arabic, تَكْتَلِّ, and in Ethiopic, ተቀደደ: *takaddsa*, "be hallowed," ተቀጸደ: *tafaṣṣama*, "be finished," ተለዘዘ: *ta'azzaza*, "obey," ተቋረጸ: *tafassḥa*, "rejoice" (because of the 3rd guttural). It would gradually be corrupted into *itkattala*, of which we find examples even in classical Arabic, especially when the verb begins with a dental or sibilant, when assimilation takes place, as اَدْتَر "wrap oneself up in a garment," اَزِين "adorn oneself," اَسْمِع "hear, listen," اَصْعِد "ascend," اَصْدُق "give alms," اَطِير "regard as an evil omen." In this way تَنْفَس would become اَنْفَس, and so in vulg. Arabic اِنْعَلَى *it'allak*, "be suspended," اِنْتَضَف *itnadḍaf*, "be cleansed," or with weakening of the 3rd vowel, اَتَمَم, *it'ammim*, "put on a turban." Here we have the origin of the Aramaic אֲתַקְמַל, Syr. ܐܬܩܡܠ, in Bibl. Aram. ܐܬܩܡܠ, as ܐܬܩܡܠ Ezra vii. 15,

v. 17, Dan. iv. 12, 20, 30, etc.; with weakening of the last vowel, הוֹדֵמְנָנִין, Dan. ii. 9 (*Kēzē*); as well as of the Hebrew form הִתְקַטַּל or הִתְקַטְּל. The assimilation of which I spoke above as occurring even in classical Arabic, is common in most of the dialects. In Arabic a word like *اُدْر* makes in its imperfect *يُدْتَر* for *يَتَدْتَر*. Just so in Ethiopic, from verbs with initial dentals and sibilants, we have in this and in the preceding conjugation, such forms as *ደጠጐጐ*: from *ተጠጐጐ*: “be dipped, baptized”; *ደደጎ*: from *ተደጎ*: “be covered, buried”; *ደሰሰ*: from *ተሰሰ*: “be broken”; *ደጸጐጐ*: from *ተጸጐጐ*: “be written”; *ደዘጐጐ*: from *ተዘጐጐ*: “remember”; *ደጸደጐ*: from *ተጸደጐ*: “pretend to be righteous.” In Tigrifā this assimilation extends to all verbs, *ደገደጐ*: “it will be forgiven,” from *ተገደጐ*; *ደሶሰ*: “he returns,” from *ተሶሰ*; *ደፋጐጐ*: “it will be finished,” from *ተፋጐጐ*; *ደቕሰ*: “he receives,” from *ተቀሰ*:. Indeed the doubling caused by the assimilation of the preformative seems to have been gradually dropped in pronunciation, and these words are now pronounced *yēgdaf*, *yēmēlas*, *yēššam*, *yēkēbal*. Hence Hebrew forms like *הִדְבָּהּ*, *הִטְהַר*, *הִגְבֵּהּ*, are at once explained, as well as the similar *הִכְוִינִי*. In Mandaitic and the Talmūd this assimilation is as common in both conjugations as in Tigrifā. E.g. in Mandaitic, not merely *עֲדָנָר* “were heaped up” (*עֲתֻנָּר*), *עֲמָמָם* “were stopped up” (*עֲתֻמָּמָם*), but also *מִפְתָּה* “opened” (*מִתְפַּתַּח*), *מִיבִיָּה* “wanted” (*מִתְבַּעֵי*), *מִיגְמִיל* “killed” (*מִיתְקַטַּל*); *עֲנָמָר* “was fulfilled,” *עֲכָנָשׁ* “was collected,” *מִיכָלָל* “crowned”; in the Talmūd, *מִיבְעֵי*, *מִיגְנִיב*, *מִיקְטִיל*, *מִיפְלְגֵי* for *מִיתְפַּלְגִין*, *מִיתְבַּפְּאֵי* “cover thyself” (fem.), and apparently with suppression of the doubling, *אִיעַסַק* “he gave himself the trouble,” *אִיעַלְמָה* “she hid herself,” *אִיעַתֵרִי* “I am become

rich." Similar phenomena occur in Samaritan; and even in Hebrew we have at least one similar instance in the word **אִרְמִם**, Is. xxxiii. 10.

Yet again, the Ithpē'el and Ithpa'al forms have a peculiarity common to them in several of the dialects. This is, that when the first radical is a sibilant, the preformative is transposed and appears in the 2nd place, as is always the case with the Arabic **افعل**. Frequently too the **ת** is changed into a **ט** or a **ך**, according to the character of the initial consonant of the root. So in Hebrew, **הַשְׁתַּמֵּךְ**, **הַשְׁתַּמֵּר**, **הַשְׁתַּמֵּל**, but **הַשְׁתַּמֵּךְ**. So in Syriac, **ܐܘܫܬܡܢܘܢܐ**, **ܐܘܫܬܡܢܘܢܐ**, but **ܐܘܫܬܡܢܘܢܐ**. So in Arabic, in the conj. **افعل** from **زجر** **ازداد** from **زاد** **اصطبغ** from **صبر** **اضطر** from **صبر**. In Arabic the assimilation of the two letters is the rule when the first radical is **س**, **ذ**, **د**, or **ظ**, and it may take place either backwards or forwards; thus from **نار** Lane gives **انار**; from **اترد** and **اترد** "crumble bread"; from **انغر** and **انغر** "cut the front teeth"; from **ادرع** **درع**, "put on mail"; from **ادلج** **دلج**, "journey by night"; from **ذبح** and **اذكر** and **اذكر**, rather than **اذخر** and **اذكر**, but from **اذبح** and **اذفر** and **اظعن** **ظلم** from **اظلم** or **اظلم**; **اذري** and **اذبح** **ذري** and **اظفر** from **ظفر** and **ظفر**. With initial **ص** and **ض** this assimilation is far less common, as **اصبح** **اضرب** **اصبر** **اصلح**; and with **س** and **ز** it is very rare, as **ازان** **اسمع**. Bearing these facts in mind, we are, I think, justified in saying that a Hebrew form

like הִרְבֵּי (Is. i. 16) is assimilated from הִרְבִּי, just as the similar הִשְׁלִימִם (Eccles. vii. 16) stands for הִשְׁלִימִם, with backward assimilation. Similarly in Syriac, نَلَلْنَا for نَلَلْنَا, نَلَلْنَا for نَلَلْنَا, نَلَلْنَا for نَلَلْنَا. Here and there we find exceptions to

the rule of transposition. In Aramaic the verb اَضَ exhibits the forms اِتَوَبِن (in Euting's *Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien*, no. 11) and اِتَوَبِن in the great Tariff of Palmyra (*Journ. Asiat.* 1883, Aug. Sept., p. 165), A.D. 137 (last year of Hadrian). The solitary Hebrew example will be spoken of below (p. 213).

3. After all that I have said about the forms اَتَتَّل and تَقَتَّل, the third member of this group requires but little notice. It is the reflexive and reciprocal of *katāla*, viz. *taḵātala*, which is the ordinary Arabic form, as تَرَامِي "to throw oneself down," تَمَارَض "to pretend to be sick," تَقَاتَلُوا "they fought with one another." So in Ethiopic, ተላላዖ: or ተላላዖ: "to shave oneself," ተላላላ: "to show oneself gentle to another, pardon," ተላላላ: "they parted from one another," ተላላዖ: "he was tortured, afflicted." But اَتَقَاتَلَ gradually became اَتَقَاتَلَ, and hence such forms in classical Arabic as اَتَاع "rush headlong," اَتَقَلَ "be heavy and troublesome," اَدَارَا "repel one another," اَسَاتَط. In the vulgar Arabic of Egypt the vowel of the 3rd syllable is weakened to *i* or to *shēva*, as *itkāmīl*, *it'ārik* "struggled with," *it'ārdāḡū*, *itnāsābū*. In Biblical Aramaic occurs the form אִשְׁתַּחֲוִי, Dan. iv. 16. In Hebrew we may regard הִתְעַלֵּשׁ "stagger to and fro, toss itself," Jer. xxv. 16, xli. 7, 8; and מִתְנַאֵץ, Is. lii. 5, for מִתְנַאֵץ, "blasphemed," as examples from the ordinary triliteral verb. From verbs ע"ע I may mention הִתְעַלֵּל "perpetrate,

accomplish," Ps. cxli. 4; הִתְפַּוֵּר Is. xxiv. 19; הִתְרוֹצֵץ Gen. xxv. 22; הִתְקוּשׁ Zeph. ii. 1; and הִתְרוֹלֵל. And here I will notice in passing one curious Hebrew form, though it does not belong to the conjugation תִּתְּלַל, but to תִּתְּלַל. From the radical שׁוּט is derived the Pi'lél שׁוּטוּט, "wander about," and from this the Prophet Jeremiah has formed the Hithpa'lél הִתְשׁוּטוּט, in the imperat. plur. fem. הִתְשׁוּטוּטֶנָּה, Jer. xlix. 3. It is the solitary instance that I know in Hebrew of the ת not being transposed with an initial sibilant; and the reason probably was to avoid the sequence of three *t*'s, הִתְשׁוּטוּטֶנָּה.

With regard to the moods and tenses of these three conjugations, there is but little to add to what has already been said regarding the simple *kátala*, *káttala*, and *kátala*. I will therefore merely make a remark upon the infinitives of the fifth and sixth conjugations in Arabic. As in the frequentative and iterative we found the form تَتَّالٌ, for تَتَّالٌ, though but little used, so we look here for a corresponding formation. This actually occurs in the rare تَتَّقَالٌ, with assimilation of the preformative vowel. Examples تَتَّقَالٌ, تَتَّقَالٌ, تَتَّقَالٌ; to which we may add such concretes as تَتَّقَالٌ "glutton," تَتَّقَالٌ "foolish chatterer," تَتَّقَالٌ "mendacious," and the like. A great many Hebrew and Aramaic words with prefixed *t*, especially of the form תִּתְּלַל, belong by their signification to this conjugation, and not to the causative or factitive תִּתְּלַל. Such are in Syriac, ܬܘܬܠܘܢ, ܬܘܬܠܘܢ, ܬܘܬܠܘܢ, ܬܘܬܠܘܢ; in Hebrew, תִּתְּלַל, "entreaty, prayer," תִּתְּלַל "secret," תִּתְּלַל from תִּתְּלַל, etc. The Arabic however generally uses another form of the infinitive,



which is common to the 5th and 6th conjugations, viz. <sup>5 4</sup>تَقَاتَل and <sup>5 4</sup>تَقَاتَل, with *u* in the 3rd syllable. These seem to be closely connected with such Hebrew and Aramaic forms as <sup>5 4</sup>שָׁלוּם, <sup>5 4</sup>שָׁלוּחִים, <sup>5 4</sup>שָׁבוּלִים, Bibl. Aram. <sup>5 4</sup>אִשְׁתָּדָר "rebellion," Mand. <sup>5 4</sup>עַתְלֵאבְרֵשִׁיא, Talmud. <sup>5 4</sup>אִימְנוּעִי, for <sup>5 4</sup>אִיחְמוּנְעִי, "withdraw from, abstain from." <sup>5 4</sup>תִּקְטַל is almost exactly represented by the Hebrew concretes <sup>5 4</sup>תִּבְלַל "having a white spot on the eye," <sup>5 4</sup>הַנֵּאֲשָׁר "a kind of pine" or similar growing tree.

4. I pass on now to the last member of this group, the reflexive of the factitive or causative, which is represented by the 10th conjugation of the Arabic verb and the *Ettafal* of the Aramaic.

In Arabic the 10th conjugation is the reflexive or middle voice of the 4th; as <sup>5 4</sup>اِسْتَسَلَّمَ "to give oneself up," <sup>5 4</sup>اِسْتَقَامَ "to hold oneself upright, stand upright," <sup>5 4</sup>اِسْتَخَلَفَ "select one as a deputy for oneself," <sup>5 4</sup>اِسْتَغْفَرَ "ask pardon for oneself," <sup>5 4</sup>اِسْتَحَلَّ "deem something lawful" (for oneself to do). It is exceedingly common, and is derived, as I explained to you before, from the form *sakṭala*, by the prefixing of the syllable *ta*. This form *tasakṭala* became *itsakṭala*, and then, by the same transposition as is usual in Hebrew and Aramaic, *istakṭala*. Hence its identity with the Aramaic <sup>5 4</sup>אִשְׁתַּקְטַל from <sup>5 4</sup>שָׁקַטַל. It is found in Himyaritic or S. Arabian, without a prosthetic letter, *satafal* from *saf'al*, as <sup>5 4</sup>סַתּוּפִי, <sup>5 4</sup>סַתּוּמֵלָא. It also occurs in Assyrian; as *ultšib-šīnāt*, "I have set them" or "made them dwell," for *uštšib* [or *uštššib*], from <sup>5 4</sup>אִשַּׁב = <sup>5 4</sup>יִשַּׁב; *altabušu*, "I did," for *aštabušu*, from <sup>5 4</sup>עַבַּשׁ (Haupt *epēšu*). In Ethiopic we had, you may remember, three forms of the causative, *'aḳṭāla*, *'aḳāṭṭāla*, and *'aḳātāla*; and so also we have three forms of the reflexive, *'astakāṭāla* or *'astakṭāla*, *'astakāṭṭāla* and *'astakātāla*; e.g. <sup>5 4</sup>ለከተረፈከ:

“to draw breath, be refreshed,”  $\lambda\eta\tau\text{-}\eta\phi\text{-}\sigma$ : “to entreat,”  $\lambda\eta\tau\lambda\eta\rho$ : “to ill-treat”;  $\lambda\eta\tau\sigma\tilde{\omega}$ : “be patient,”  $\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\tilde{\omega}\rho$ : “rejoice”;  $\lambda\eta\tau\sigma\eta\sigma$ : “compare with one another,”  $\lambda\eta\tau\gamma\text{-}\eta\lambda$ : “collect.” On its inflexion it is unnecessary to make any remarks, as it runs parallel to that of *ik̄tatala*. The other causative form  $\text{أَتَلَّ}$  *aktala* forms in the Aramaic dialects a reflexive and passive by prefixing the syllable *eth*, as in the Palmyrene tariff  $\text{תַּאֲעֵל}$ ,  $\text{תַּאֲעֵלִין}$ ,  $\text{תַּאֲעֵלִין}$ , from  $\text{עָל}$ ,  $\text{עָלָא}$ . In Samaritan, Syriac and Mandaitic the assimilation of the *t* with the following *alif* takes place, e.g.  $\text{תַּאֲשַׁקַע}$  ( $\text{תַּשַׁקַע}$ , “be found”),  $\text{תַּאֲתַסַּם}$  ( $\text{תַּתַּסַּם}$ , “be finished”),  $\text{תַּאֲלַלַּף}$  ( $\text{תַּלַּף}$ ),  $\text{תַּאֲלַלַּף}$  ( $\text{לַלַּף}$ ),  $\text{תַּאֲנַזַּר}$  ( $\text{תַּנַּזַּר}$ ),  $\text{תַּאֲשַׁפַּל}$  ( $\text{תַּשַׁפַּל}$ ),  $\text{תַּאֲנַזַּר}$  ( $\text{תַּנַּזַּר}$ ).

### C. Third Group.

Of the next group of derived conjugations the characteristic syllable is *na*.

1. The most prominent member of this group is a reflexive and passive of the simple form of the verb, in its original shape *na-katala*.

In Arabic this *naḳdtala* became first *nḳdtala*, and then, with prosthetic vowel, *inḳatala*,  $\text{انْقَطَلَ}$ ; as  $\text{انْشَقَّ}$  “to split itself, open” (of a flower);  $\text{انْهَزَم}$  “to let oneself be put to flight, to flee”;  $\text{انْقَاد}$  “to let oneself be led, to be docile or submissive”;  $\text{انكسر}$  “to be broken”;  $\text{انقطع}$  “to be cut off, to come to an end.” In Hebrew the imperfect and imperative and two infinitives follow the same mode of formation as in Arabic. The Arabic imperfect is  $\text{يَنْقَلِب}$ ; the Hebrew,  $\text{יִנְקִיב}$  for  $\text{יִנְקִיב}$ , with constant assimilation of the preformative to the 1st radical. The Arabic imperative

is **اِنْتَلَّ**, the Hebrew **הִקְטִיל**, with the usual substitution of ה for א in these preformative syllables. The Arabic infinitive is **اِنْتَلَّ**; the corresponding Hebrew form is **הִקְטִיל** (with *ō* for *ā*), as **הִתְנַחֵם**, **הִאָּכַל**, beside which we have another form for the construct infinitive, viz. **הִקְטִיל**, as **הִלָּחַם**, **הִפְתִּיחַ**, **הִעְיִיר**. But in the formation of the perfect, the participle, and one form of the infinitive absolute, the Hebrew has taken a different line. In the perfect the Hebrew contracted the primitive *nakāṭal* into *nakṭal*, which was gradually weakened into *nikṭal*. The original vowel of the 1st syllable is established by such words as **נִחְבְּאתָ**, **נִעְשָׂה**, **נִעְלָה**, **נִוֵּלַד** (for **נִוְלַד**), **נָסַב** (for **נָסַבַּב**) (for *nāsāg*, from **נָסַג**); whilst **נִחְבְּאתָ**, **נִעְשָׂתָה**, exhibit an intermediate state. The infinitive absolute is now **נִקְטַל**, for *nakṭāl*, as **נִהַפְּךָ**, **נִעֲתוֹר** [where the original vowel of the first syllable is protected by the guttural following], **נִלָּחַם**, **נִקְרָא**. The Arabic participle, formed after the analogy of the imperfect, with prefixed *m*, is **مَنْتَلٌ**. The Hebrew, on the contrary, has no prefix, but exhibits the same form as the perfect, with a slight difference in the vowel of the 2nd syllable. As **חָכַם** is differentiated from **חָכְם**, so is **נִקְטַל**, **נִקְטָל**, from **נִקְטַל**, **נִקְטָל**; e.g. **נִעְרַץ**, **נִתְחַם**, **נִתְחָם** and **נִאֲוֵר** and **נִאֲוָר**, **נִוֵּלַד**, **נִבְהַל**. We shall have occasion to notice a similar participial formation hereafter in the form **كُتِفَالٌ**, as **אָכַל** "eaten," **יֻלַּד** "born," **לָקַח** "taken." In a very few instances we seem to find an imperative after the form **nikṭal** or **nikṭel**, viz. **נִקְבְּצוּ**, in pause **נִקְבְּצוּ**, Is. xliii. 9; Joel iv. 11; **נָלוּ** Jerem. l. 5. The Hebrew form of the Niph'al seems to extend to Phoenician and Assyrian. In Phoenician we find **נתן** as the perf. Niph'al of **יתן** "to give," which we pronounce either **נתן** or **נתין**, and also **נעניש** [נעניש], probably **נעניש**.

In Assyrian Schrader gives such examples as *innabit* (נבב), "he fled," *innamir* (נבב), "was seen," *iššakin*, "was set up" or "restored," *iššibir*, "was broken," *ibbanū*, "were created." The imperative of *iššakin* is given as *naškin*, and the participle *muššakin*; the one resembling the rare Hebrew form  $\text{יִשְׁכַּן}$  (mentioned above), and the other the common Arabic form  $\text{مُنْقَل}$ .

In Hımyaritic Halévy gives as an example the word  $\text{ሠዕንገ}$ , with initial *h*.

2. Of the actual Niph'al of the Arabic and Hebrew there is no trace in Ethiopic, but a cognate form is preserved in the prefix *an*, which we find in quadrilaterals, more especially reduplicated verbs of the form *kalkala*, the Hebrew *Pilpēl*. The meaning of this formation in Ethiopic is not however so fixed as in Arabic and Hebrew. It generally implies motion, sometimes reflexive and reciprocal action; but sometimes too it is transitive, and admits of a passive being formed from it. Examples:  $\text{እንሱሰ}$ : "to walk about,"  $\text{እንፈርዕ}$ : "to leap, dance,"  $\text{እንጉደጉደ}$ : "to thunder";  $\text{እንገለገ}$ : "to come together, assemble";  $\text{እንቀደደ}$ : properly "to lean forward, prostrate oneself," but generally used in the sense of "lift up the eyes *or* heart in prayer";  $\text{እንሱርሱር}$ : "roll" (intrans. or trans.);  $\text{እንቀልቀል}$ : "totter" and "shake";  $\text{እንሰልዕ}$ : "to spread out" as a veil, which is only transitive. Dillmann explains this curious phenomenon on the supposition that the nominal forms with initial *na*, like  $\text{ነጉደጉደ}$ : "thunder,"  $\text{ነሱርሱር}$ : "rolling, a whirlwind,"  $\text{ነቀልቀል}$ : "shaking," gave rise to the notion that the prefixed  $\text{እ}$  might be identical with the causative or factitive prefix  $\text{እ}$ . Hence, according to him, the occasional change of meaning, and the formation in a few cases of a passive with  $\text{ተ}$ , e.g.  $\text{ተንሱርሱር}$ : "to be rolled,"  $\text{ተንሰልዕ}$ : "to be spread out." This view may perhaps be correct; I am not in a position to affirm or deny it. It may however be well to inform you that the Assyrian grammarians speak of forms like *iftana*"*al* and *istanaf'al* [Del. *iftaneal* and *ittanafal*], in which an *n* is inserted, and yet the meaning of all the examples cited by Schrader is said to be transitive<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> [Those cited by Delitzsch, p. 233, are mostly intransitive or reflexive.]

3. Another member of this group is the Hebrew *Nithpa*"*el*, chiefly post-biblical. The Biblical examples are נִכְפַּר Deut. xxi. 8, for נִתְכַפַּר, "be atoned for, forgiven," and נִסְרַד Ezek. xxiii. 48, for נִתְוַסְרַד, "let themselves be warned." In post-biblical Hebrew it is common, and has usurped the place of the perfect Hithpa"ēl, as נִשְׁתַּמֵּשׁ, נִסְתַּבֵּל, נִזְדַּמֵּן, נִטְמַא; and is then extended to other formations, as נִשְׁתַּעַבַּד, נִתְרַגַּם, נִתְאַלְמַנָּה "she is become a widow."

4. Lastly we may reckon here the third conjugation of the quadriliteral verb in Arabic, where the letter *u* is inserted after the 2nd radical; as اِبْرَشَقُ "to open" (of a flower), "to bloom"; اِحْرَنْجَمُ "to be gathered together in a mass or crowd"; اسْلَنْقِي "to lie on one's back"; اِئْتَنْجَرُ "to flow."

#### D. Fourth Group.

I will next speak briefly of a group of *reduplicated* forms. This reduplication is of different kinds, but always takes place at the end of the root, not at the beginning. The chief varieties are, to use the Hebrew terms, *Pi'lēl*, *Pē'al'al*, and *Pilpēl*.

1. Starting from the root *ḵatala*, the simplest form of such a reduplication is the repetition of the 3rd radical, *ḵatalala*. But *ḵatalala* would naturally become *ḵaṣṣlāl*, which would be weakened in Aramaic into *ḵaṣṣlāl*, and in Hebrew into *ḵiṣṣlāl*. Aramaic examples are not numerous; e.g. עֲרַבְבַּ "mix up, confuse"; חֻצַּר "crumble," חֻצַּרְבַּ "separate," חֻצַּרְבַּ "practise, reduce to slavery," with its passive חֻצַּרְבַּ; חֻצַּרְבַּ "irritate," and חֻצַּרְבַּ "to become fierce"; חֻצַּרְבַּ "to be intelligent, sensible." In Hebrew this form has taken the place of Pi"ēl in verbs עָוַר, as עוֹרֵר (better from עוֹר than from עוֹר), עוֹרֵר, כּוֹנֵן, etc., and

forms a reflexive and passive with prefixed *ta*, הִתְפַּעֵל. In other classes of verbs it is rare, but we can refer to it שָׁאֵן "to be quiet, still," Jerem. xxx. 10; Job iii. 18; רָעַן in the fem.

רָעַנָה Job xv. 33; further, with passive pronunciation, אִמַּלַל "to be withered, wither away, mourn"; and from verbs לָה, נָאָה, contracted נֶאָה "to be seemly, beautiful"; מִטְחַן־קֶשֶׁת, from מָחָה "to shoot," and the reflexive הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, from שָׁחָה.

As to the Arabic development of the original *katalala*, it generally took the following course; *katalala* became *k̄atalala*, *iktalala*, and finally *iktalla*. This form *iktalla* appears in the Arabic paradigm as the 9th conj. of the verb, with the cognate *iktalla* as the 11th; e.g. اَزْوَرَّ and اَزْوَارٌ "turn away," اَرَبَّتْ and اَرِبَاتٌ "be scattered," اَرَقَدَّ "run quickly," اَشْعَانٌ "be dishevelled"; and con-

stantly of colours and defects, as اِعْوَجَّ, اِعْوَجٌ, "be crooked";

اِحْوَلَّ, اِحْوَالٌ, "squint"; اِصْفَرَّ, اِصْفَارٌ, "be yellow"; اِبْيَضَّ, اِبْيَاضٌ, "be white." The uncontracted form *iktalala* survives only in

some examples from verbs 3rd rad. و or ي; as اِرْعَوِيَ "to abstain, refrain"; اِحْوَوِيَ "to become brownish," with its byform

اِحْوَاوِيَ; اِحْوَوِيَ "to stand on tiptoe." A kind of reflexive or passive, with *n* inserted after the 2nd rad., may perhaps be discerned in the rare 14th conj. of the Arabic verb, اِقْتَنَلَّ for

اِقْتَنَلَّ; as اِحْلَاكَكَ "be jet black" (حَلِكَ), اِعْلَنَكَ "be long and thick" (of the hair), اِعْنَسَسَ "have a hump in front"

(عَسَسَ).

2. A stronger form of the reduplication consists in the repetition of two radicals, the 2nd and 3rd. Hence the form

*kataltala*, appearing occasionally in Aramaic and Hebrew as *kəṭaltəl*; e.g. סָחָרְחָר "to beat violently" (of the heart), Ps. xxxviii. 11; הִמְרַמֵּר "to be red" with weeping, "to be agitated or troubled." Similar cases are Ps. xlv. 3, יִפְּיִית, which should probably be read יִפְּיִית; and אָהֲבוּ הִבּוּ, Hos. iv. 18, probably in the first instance a mere clerical error for אָהֲבוּ הִבּוּ, from אָהַב. Aramaic examples in derived conjugations are ܠܣܟܡܟܡܗ "to dream," ܐܘܡܢܐܘܢ "to imagine."

3. The form *kaḵkala*, Aram. *kaḵkəl*, Heb. *kaḵkəl*, is often produced by the repetition of an imitative syllable. E.g. חֶשֶׁחֶשֶׁח "to make things rattle or rustle," וִסְוִס "to whisper," חִמְחִמ "to neigh," גֶּרְגֵר "to gargle," צִפְצִפ "to chirp." Very frequently it is formed in Aramaic and Hebrew from verbs ע"ע and ע"ו by repeating the two chief letters of the root; e.g. in Aramaic, ܠܡܚܝܡ, ܠܫܝܒ, ܠܪܘܦ, ܠܚܘܘܠ, ܠܚܘܘܠܗܘܢ, ܠܡܫܚܘܠܗܘܢ, ܠܡܫܚܘܠܗܘܢ, ܠܡܫܚܘܠܗܘܢ; with their reflexives; in Hebrew, ܠܫܚܚܝܠ, ܠܫܚܚܝܠ, ܠܫܚܚܝܠ "gladden, take delight in," ܠܫܚܚܝܠ, ܠܫܚܚܝܠ, ܠܫܚܚܝܠ "casting"; with their reflexives and passives.

4. Under this head I will next mention what is called in the Arabic Grammars the 12th conjugation of the verb, wherein the second radical is repeated, but separated from its fellow by the introduction of the diphthong *au*. The original form was ܠܚܘܘܠ, which became in Arabic ܠܚܘܘܠ, as اِحدوَدَب "be arched or curved, hump-backed" (اِحْدَبَ), اِعْصَمَب "be gathered together" (عَصَبَ), اِحْلَوِي, (احْلِكَ) "be jet black" (احْلَوِكَ), (احْلَوِ) "be sweet" (احْلَوِ), اِعْرَوِي "ride on a horse barebacked" (اعْرَوِي).

I find a few similar forms in Syriac from verbs final  $\text{o}$  and  $\text{d}$ ; e.g.  $\text{ܐܠܝܫܘܒ}$  "to boast or brag";  $\text{ܐܠܝܢܝܒ}$  "to lie down, be hidden, be blamed";  $\text{ܐܠܝܚܡܝܒ}$  "become young, be smeared over." In Hebrew it can hardly be said to exist, unless we take count of  $\text{ܠܘܥܘܒ}$  "to blow the trumpet" ( $\text{ܠܘܥܘܒܝܡ}$ ), from  $\text{ܠܘܥܘܒܐ}$ . But the form is doubtful, the  $\text{ܠܘܥܘܒ}$  being  $\text{ܠܘܥܘܒܝܡ}$ ; and even if we assume it to be correct,  $\text{ܠܘܥܘܒ}$  might stand for  $\text{ܠܘܥܘܒܐ}$ , as  $\text{ܠܘܥܘܒܐ}$  in Is. xv. 5, if correct, stands for  $\text{ܠܘܥܘܒܐ}$ .

5. The reduplication of the form  $\text{katalala}$  or  $\text{katlala}$  seems in some cases to have been softened into  $\text{katalaya}$ , which would be represented in Arabic by  $\text{katalā}$   $\text{ܩܬܠܝ}$ , and in Aramaic by  $\text{ܩܬܠܝ}$ . Such words are in Mandaitic  $\text{ܢܐܡܒܝܐ}$  "to bewail,"  $\text{ܢܐܡܒܝܐ}$  "to make an alien, estrange"; in Syr.  $\text{ܬܚܝܒ}$  "terrify,"  $\text{ܬܚܝܒ}$  "estrangle,"  $\text{ܬܚܝܒ}$  "be deprived of, fail, perish,"  $\text{ܬܚܝܒ}$  "expose,"  $\text{ܬܚܝܒ}$  "deport," with their passives. In Arabic a passive of this form is found in the 15th conj. of the verb,  $\text{أَعْنَلِي}$ , with  $\text{ن}$  inserted after the 2nd rad.; as  $\text{أَحْبَنْطِي}$  "to be swollen or inflated" ( $\text{حَبِطَ}$ ),  $\text{أَعْلَدِي}$  "be stout and strong" ( $\text{عَلَدَ}$  "be hard"). Curiously enough, a few verbs of this form in Arabic have a transitive sense, e.g.  $\text{أَسْرَدِي}$  "to overcome" ( $\text{سَرَدِي}$  "strong, brave"),  $\text{أَغْرَدِي}$  "to assail, overcome"; and, still more strangely, the only Mandaitic parallel,  $\text{ܘܘܪܐܡܒܝܐ}$ , "to be shaken," is derived from an active  $\text{ܘܘܪܐܡܒܝܐ}$ , which however does not occur in the extant literature.



E. *The Passive Forms.*

Lastly, in this enumeration of the verbal forms or conjugations, I would call your attention to the real passives, as distinguished from the reflexives and effectives, which so often discharge the functions of passives.

In Arabic nearly all the conjugations are capable of forming, and actually form, passives by means of internal modification of the vowels of the active voice. There are of course exceptions, which will readily suggest themselves to you. For instance, a verb like *صَلَحَ* "to be good *or* right," *فَرِحَ* "to be glad," or *ثَقَلَ* "to be heavy," cannot have a passive; nor one like *أَسْوَدَ*, "to be black." The vowel-change in the passive voice consists, generally speaking, in the substitution of duller sounds for the clearer ones of the active, the vowel *u* almost always playing a prominent part.

In the other Semitic languages the use of these real passives is far less frequent. In Hebrew the largest survival is found; much less in Aramaic. In Ethiopic they have, to all appearance, utterly vanished. In Assyrian Sayce states that "a passive formed by means of the obscure vowel *u*" exists for Pa'ēl, Shaph'ēl, Aph'ēl, and Istaph'al; but I do not find that he is supported by Schrader or Oppert. From my own knowledge I cannot speak<sup>1</sup>.

1. In Arabic the following are the principal passives :

	Perfect.		Imperfect.	
(1)	<i>ḵatala</i>	<i>ḵutīla</i>	<i>yaktulu</i>	<i>yukṭalu</i>
(2)	<i>ḵattala</i>	<i>ḵuttīla</i>	<i>yukattilu</i>	<i>yukattalu</i>
(3)	<i>ḵāṭala</i>	<i>ḵūtīla</i>	<i>yukāṭilu</i>	<i>yukāṭalu</i>
(4)	<i>'aḵtala</i>	<i>'uḵtīla</i>	<i>yukṭīlu</i>	<i>yukṭalu</i>
(5)	<i>taḵattala</i>	<i>tukuttīla</i>	<i>yataḵattalu</i>	<i>yutataḵattalu</i>
(6)	<i>taḵāṭala</i>	<i>tukāṭīla</i>	<i>yataḵāṭalu</i>	<i>yutataḵāṭalu</i>
[(7)	<i>inḵatala</i>	<i>unḵutīla</i>	<i>yankatīlu</i>	<i>yunkatalu</i> ]
(8)	<i>ikṭatala</i>	<i>ukṭutīla</i>	<i>yaktatīlu</i>	<i>yukṭatalu</i>
(10)	<i>istaḵtala</i>	<i>ustukṭīla</i>	<i>yastakṭīlu</i>	<i>yustakṭalu</i>

<sup>1</sup> [According to Delitzsch, p. 249, the permansives II. 1 and III. 1 (Pa'ēl and Shaph'ēl) may be used either in active or passive sense, but without difference of form.]

2. In Hebrew the formation is similar, but not identical, the vowel *a* predominating throughout in the second syllable. The passives in use are:—

(a) Intensive and iterative, *kuffal*, *kottal*, imperf. *yekuffal*. The infin. absolute has the form קָפַל, as קָנַב, Gen. xl. 15. The participle appears in two shapes, the one with prefixed *m*, *mikuffāl*; the other without it, as אָכַל, יוֹלַד, לָקַח, הִלְלָה, Ezek. xxvi. 17. And here it is curious to remark in what different ways the several Semitic languages have made use of the materials at their disposal. The Hebrew infinitive קָפַל stands for *kuffāl*; but the corresponding form in Aramaic is a verbal noun from the active Pa“ēl, e.g. אֲמַנְחָא “theft,” אֲוַסְנָן “warning,” מְכַמְמָא “finishing”; whilst the Arabic *kuffāl* is now the plural of the active participle of the simple verb *katāla*, as *kātil*“, a “murderer,” *kuffāl*“, “murderers.” So again, the Hebrew participle אָכַל stands for *’ukkāl*, a sing. masc.; whereas the corresponding form in Arabic is another plural of the active participle of the simple *katāla*, as *sāgīd*, “worshipper,” *suggād*, “worshippers.”

(b) The form expressive of effort, *kōḏal*, imperf. *yekōḏal*, as יִשְׁרָשֵׁן, Job xxxi. 8.

(c) The causative or factitive, *hoktal*, *huktal*, imperf. *yoktal*.

Other forms are comparatively rare, but I may mention:—

(d) *Hothkatal*, in the form הִתְפַּקְדוּ, Num. i. 47, ii. 33, xxvi. 62; 1 Kings xx. 27; instead of הִתְפַּקְדוּ.

(e) *Hothkuffal*, in the form הִתְפַּאֲחָה, Deut. xxiv. 4; הִרְשָׁנָה, for הִרְשָׁנָה, Is. xxxiv. 6; הִתְפַּאֲחָה infinitive, Levit. xiii. 55, 56.

In these two cases, if correctly pointed, observe that the Hebrew changes only the vowel of the preformative syllable; whereas in Arabic it is the vowel of the first radical syllable that is modified, and that of the preformative is assimilated to it.

Compare اَتَقَدَّرُوا with هִתְפַּקְדוּ, or تَتَبَّتْ with הִרְשָׁנָה.

(f) A curious form is presented to us in the Hebrew נִנְאֵל, Is. lix. 3; Lament. iv. 14. This is generally explained as a passive of Niph'al, נִנְאֵלָה, Zeph. iii. 1. I should rather be inclined to regard it as a quasi-Niph'al formation from the Pi'el נִיאַל, Pu'al נִיאַל. If you adopt the former view, you must regard נִנְאֵל as = انْفَعَلَا; if the latter, I can produce a parallel from the vulgar Arabic of Egypt, viz. انصيح "it is lost, forfeited"

(Spitta, *Contes Arabes*, p. 9, l. 10), from ضيع "to lose, forfeit." Here again perhaps the Massoretic punctuation may be erroneous (נִנְאֵלָה).

(g) *Kuflal*, in אִמְלַל.

(h) *Kolkal*, in כִּלְכַל, 1 Kings xx. 27, and תִּשְׁעֶשְׁעוּ, Is. lxvi. 12.

3. Of the Aramaic passive the chief traces are the following.

(a) The passive of *Pi'al*, in a form which appears at first to be that of the passive participle *Pi'el*, and is accordingly generally so treated, even by Kautzsch. In my opinion, however, the verbal flexion of this form forbids us to regard it as a participle, and Noeldeke is right in adopting the other view. The form was originally *kuflil*, but the weight of the accent produced a lengthening of the vowel of the 2nd syllable, whilst that of the 1st syllable was weakened in the regular verb to simple shēvā: מָרִיד Dan. iv. 30, יְהִיב Dan. vii. 4, 6, כְּתִיב Ezra v. 7, קָמִיל Dan. v. 30, רָשִׁים Dan. v. 24, שָׁלַם Ezra v. 16; 3rd fem. בְּמִלַּת Ezra iv. 24, יְהִיבַת Dan. vii. 27, נְמִילַת Dan. vii. 4, פְּרִיסַת Dan. v. 28, קָמִילַת Dan. vii. 11; 2nd sing. masc. תִּקְלַתָּ Dan. v. 27; 3rd plur. masc. יְהִיבוּ Ezra v. 15, נְפְתוּ Dan. iii. 21, מְרִיטוּ Dan. vii. 4, פְּתִיחוּ Dan. vii. 10. The distinction of form is clearer in the case of verbs ל"א, where the

perfect passive is  $\text{גָּלַי}$  Dan. ii. 19,  $\text{גָּלַי}$  Dan. ii. 30,  $\text{קָרַי}$  Ezra iv. 18, 23; plur.  $\text{רָמְיו}$  Dan. iii. 21, vii. 9; whereas the form of the participle Pē'il is  $\text{בָּנֶה}$ ,  $\text{מָנֵה}$ ,  $\text{קָרַי}$ ,  $\text{שָׂרַה}$ , plur.  $\text{שָׂרִין}$ . Similarly in the Palmyrene tariff,  $\text{גְּבַי}$  = Arab.  $\text{جَبِي}$ ; see Sachau in *ZDMG.* xxxvii. pp. 564—5.

(b) The passive of *Hiph'il*, viz. *Hoph'al*, in Biblical Aramaic and the Palmyrene dialect, viz.  $\text{הִנְחַח}$  Dan. v. 20,  $\text{הִנְבַּד}$  Dan. vii. 11,  $\text{הִפֵּס}$  Dan. vi. 24,  $\text{הִעֵל}$  Dan. v. 13, plur.  $\text{הִעֵלוּ}$  Dan. v. 15; fem. sing.  $\text{הִתְרַבַּח}$  Ezra iv. 15,  $\text{הִוְסַפַּח}$  Dan. iv. 33,  $\text{הִקְיַחַח}$  Dan. vii. 4 (cf.  $\text{أَيَمَّت}$ ); 1st pers.  $\text{הִתְקַנַּח}$  (not  $\text{נַח}$ ) Dan. iv. 33.

Very peculiar are the forms  $\text{הִתְיַחַח}$  Dan. vi. 18, and  $\text{הִתְיַחַח}$  Dan. iii. 13, the vocalisation of the 1st syllable of which is as yet unexplained. Similarly in the Palmyrene tariff,  $\text{אִשַּׁר}$  (from  $\text{שָׂר}$ ), e.g.  $\text{אִשַּׁר לְאַגּוּרַא}$ ; imperfect  $\text{יִכְתַּב}$ , e.g.  $\text{וִיכְתַּב מְרַעַם דִּי לֹא מִפִּסַּק}$ ; part.  $\text{מִפִּסַּק}$ , e.g.  $\text{מִפִּסַּק מְרַעַם דִּי מִן עִירַא וִידוּא מְבַטַּל לְאַרְכוּנְיַא דִּי הִנֵּן כּוּבַן}$ , e.g.  $\text{מְבַטַּל}$ ;  $\text{מִסַּק בְּנִמּוּסַא מְרַי יְהוּא מִן תְּחוּמַא אֹא}$ , e.g.  $\text{מִפִּסַּק}$ , for  $\text{מִפִּסַּק}$ ;  $\text{זִבְנַן מִפִּסַּק}$ .

(c) The passive of *Pi'al*, viz. *Pu'al*, in the Palmyrene tariff,  $\text{יִזְבַּן}$ , e.g.  $\text{יִזְבַּן לְמִשְׁכַּא אִפְרִין}$ .

(d) The passive participles of *Pa'al*, *Aph'el* and *Shaph'el*, formed exactly as in Arabic. Thus in Biblical Aramaic  $\text{מְהַלֵּךְ}$ ,  $\text{מְמַלֵּל}$ , but  $\text{מְכַפְּתִין}$  "bound," Dan. iii. 23, 24, from  $\text{מְכַפַּח}$ ;  $\text{מְסַתְרַתָּא}$  "hidden things," Dan. ii. 22, from  $\text{מְסַתֵּר}$ ; Dan. v. 19, and  $\text{מְהַנְזִיקַת מַלְכִין}$  Ezra iv. 15, but  $\text{מְהַחְצֵפָה}$  Dan. ii. 15, or  $\text{מְחַצֵּפָה}$  Dan. iii. 22, from  $\text{מְהַחְצֵף}$ ,  $\text{מְחַצֵּף}$ . Also from *Pu'al*,  $\text{מְסוּבְלִין}$  "set up, erected," Ezra vi. 3, from  $\text{מְסוּבַל}$ .

Exactly so in Syriac, מַלְבֵּט, מַלְבֵּט; מַלְבֵּט, מַלְבֵּט; מַלְבֵּט, מַלְבֵּט; and in Mandaitic, מְבֵּרַךְ "blessing," מְבֵּרַךְ "blessed"; מְכַסֵּי "covering," מְכַסֵּי "covered"; מְפָרִישׁ "teaching," מְפָרִישׁ "taught," מְפָרִיק "bringing out," מְפָרִיק "brought out." The corresponding Arabic forms are مَقْتَل, مَقْتَل; مَقَاتِل, مَقَاتِل; مَقَاتِل, مَقَاتِل; مَقْتَل, مَقْتَل.

(e) The existence of passive participles of Pa"el and Aph'el after the *Hebrew* formation is not certain in Mandaitic, but Noeldeke gives for the Pa"el the possible instances of מְרִיבָא, "the highlands," for מְרִיבָא, and מְשַׁנְיָא כְּרִשְׁמָא, a name of Paradise, lit. "the taken away of righteousness," i. e. "the (land) of righteousness that has been taken away," = מְשַׁנְיָא. On the other hand, the existence of Pu'al and Hoph'al participles in modern Syriac seems tolerably certain. For example, in Pu'al, חֲבִיבְיָא חֲבִיבְיָא "I have healed thee," is literally חֲבִיבְיָא חֲבִיבְיָא "thou hast been healed by me," the fem. being חֲבִיבְיָא חֲבִיבְיָא, for חֲבִיבְיָא חֲבִיבְיָא. So also in Pu'al, חֲבִיבְיָא, *sūbinnē*, for חֲבִיבְיָא חֲבִיבְיָא, for חֲבִיבְיָא חֲבִיבְיָא; in Hoph'al, חֲבִיבְיָא "raised up," חֲבִיבְיָא "exalted"; with weakening of the vowel in the 2nd syllable.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE IRREGULAR VERBS.

I NOW proceed, with the Hebrew Grammar in hand, to explain to you the principal forms of the Irregular Verbs, comparing them, as before, with the corresponding forms in Arabic and Syriac, and more rarely in other dialects.

#### I. Verbs $y'y$ or Geminate Verbs.

I begin with the verbs  $y'y$ , or, as they are called in Arabic Grammars, the *doubled* or *geminate verbs* or the *solid verbs*. The peculiarity here is the contraction of the trisyllabic root into a disyllable by the rejection of the vowel of the second radical or some other modification.

In classical Arabic the rules of contraction are few and simple.

(a) If all three radicals have vowels, the 2nd radical loses its vowel, and unites with the 3rd, so as to form a double letter.

Hence سَبَب, "to cause," becomes سَبَّ; مَسَس "to touch,"

مَسَّ; حَبَّب "to become dear" (to one), حَبَّب. The original form may be retained in poetry, for the sake of the metre, as

ضَنُّوا for ضَنُّوا, "they are stingy"; and in some verbs of the

forms فَعَّلَ and فَعَّلَ the contraction does not take place, as صَكَكَ

"to be knock-kneed," لَحَّحَ "to be sore" (of the eyes), لَبَّبَ "to

be wise," دَمَّمَ "to be ugly." Vulg. Arab., *madd*, 'add, *zann*.

(b) If the first radical has no vowel, and the 2nd and 3rd have, then the 2nd radical throws back its vowel on the 1st, and unites with the 3rd, so as to form a double letter. Hence <sup>سَبَّ</sup>يسب becomes <sup>يسَّب</sup>يسَّب; <sup>يَمَس</sup>يمس, <sup>يَمَسَس</sup>يمَسَس; <sup>يَقِر</sup>يقِر, <sup>يَقِرَّر</sup>يَقِرَّر. The original forms may be used by poetic license, as <sup>يَحَلَل</sup>يَحَلَل for <sup>يَحَل</sup>يَحَل. Vulg. Arab., *yczunni, ye'idd, yiṣahli*.

(c) If the 3rd radical is vowelless, no contraction, generally speaking, takes place. The forms in ordinary use are <sup>سَبَّ</sup>سَبَّ, <sup>حَبَّ</sup>حَبَّ, <sup>مَسَّت</sup>مَسَّت, <sup>حَبَّبَت</sup>حَبَّبَت.

(d) Forms that might by rule remain uncontracted are sometimes contracted in different ways. For example, the jussive of <sup>سَبَّ</sup>سَبَّ is <sup>يسَّب</sup>يسَّب, and the imperative <sup>اسَّب</sup>اسَّب; but both are usually contracted, with the help of a supplementary vowel, into <sup>يسب</sup>يسب and <sup>سب</sup>سب. Vulg. Arab., *zunni, 'idd*.

Bearing these rules in mind, we may proceed to compare the Arabic forms with those of the Hebrew and Syriac, using chiefly as our paradigms <sup>רָד</sup>רָד, <sup>סַב</sup>סַב, and <sup>בָּז</sup>בָּז.

*Kal.* Here the uncontracted forms are relatively far more common in Hebrew than in Arabic, as <sup>סַבַּב</sup>סַבַּב, <sup>סַבַּר</sup>סַבַּר, <sup>חַבַּב</sup>חַבַּב, <sup>חַבַּל</sup>חַבַּל, fem. <sup>נַדְדָה</sup>נַדְדָה, plur. <sup>נַדְדוּ</sup>נַדְדוּ, <sup>סַבְבּוּ</sup>סַבְבּוּ, <sup>שַׁחַחוּ</sup>שַׁחַחוּ, <sup>סַבְבּוּ</sup>סַבְבּוּ. The contracted 3rd sing. masc. <sup>סַב</sup>סַב and <sup>בָּז</sup>בָּז stand for *sabb* and *bazz*, and these for *sabba* and *bazza*, *sababa* and *bazaza*, like <sup>רָד</sup>רָד for <sup>רָדָד</sup>רָדָד. Add a suffix, and the doubling immediately becomes audible, <sup>קַבְבָה</sup>קַבְבָה, <sup>חַבְבִי</sup>חַבְבִי for *ḳabba-lu*; Aram. <sup>זַבְב</sup>זַבְב; like Arabic <sup>رَدَدِي</sup>رَدَدِي. In the same way in the 3rd pers. plur. <sup>סַבְבּוּ</sup>סַבְבּוּ, <sup>תַמְמוּ</sup>תַמְמוּ, J. Aram. <sup>דַקְקוּ</sup>דַקְקוּ, Syr. <sup>זַבְבּוּ</sup>זַבְבּוּ, for *sababū*, *tamamū*, *daḳaḳū*, as in Arabic <sup>رَدَدُوا</sup>رَدَدُوا for <sup>رَدَدُوا</sup>رَدَدُوا. The retention of the tone on the 1st syllable is in accordance with

the primitive accent, but it is often shifted to the last syllable, as רָבְנוּ, נִבְנוּ. The real existence of forms like רָבְנוּ, Gen. xlix. 23, and רָבְנוּ, Job xxiv. 24, is somewhat doubtful; but if genuine, they would find their analogy in the Arabic forms of praise and blame, بَعَدَ for بَعِدَ, حَسَّنَ for حَسَبَ, and حَبَّ for حَبَّ. In the 3rd p. fem. sing., Syr. حَبَّلَ stands for *bassath* (Bibl. Aram. נָרַת, עָלַת, Mand. שאראת, פאסאת), *basazat*; and similarly סָבַה, for *sabbath, sababat*, as רָדַת for רָדַת. The primitive accent is often retained, as in מָרָה, חָתָה, but may be shifted, as in וְרָבָה, Is. vi. 12. In the 1st and 2nd persons, the normal form is the uncontracted Arabic رَدَدْنَا, رَدَدْتَ, رَدَدْتِ, which we find in Hebrew only in the forms וְרָבְנוּ, Zech. viii. 14, 15; וְרָבְנוּ, Deut. ii. 35. But these forms may be altered in two ways even in Arabic. Firstly, the 2nd radical may be dropped, and its vowel go with it, or it may be transferred to the 1st radical; as رָدַת for رَدَدْتِ, ظَلَّتْ or ظَلَّتْ for ظَلَلْتِ, مَسَّتْ for مَسَسَتْ. So in Aramaic حَوَّلَ, حَوَّلَف, حَوَّلَف, for *basasta, basastôn, basastan*. So in Hebrew תָּמַנְנוּ for *tamannû*, Num. xvii. 28. The 1st pers. sing., however, in Aramaic, is רָבַת, Mand. פאסית, מאכית, אלית, Syr. حَبَّلَ for *bassêth, bassit, basasti*. Secondly, the 3rd radical may coalesce in the usual way with the second, and to make the doubling audible a vowel-sound may be inserted after it. This vowel-sound seems to have been that of the diphthong *au* or *ai*, which was favoured by the corresponding forms of the verbs 3rd ر and ي, as رَمَيْتَ, نَدَوْتِ. More probably however it was *ai*, which is far more frequent in the language than *au*, occurring alone for instance in all the



derived conjugations. Hence  $\text{رَدَّتْ}$  would become (through the impossible *raddta*) *raddaita*, and this is the ordinary form at the present day, *raddait*, *raddét*, and in Algiers *radditt*. We have seen, however, that the diphthong *ai* passed in some cases into *i*; for instance, Arab.  $\text{أَيْنَ}$ , Heb.  $\text{אֵינָה, אֵינָן}$ ; from  $\text{בֵּית}$ ,  $\text{בְּיָתָיו}$  or  $\text{בְּבָרְיו}$ , from  $\text{בְּבָרְיָהוּ}$ ; and in Arabic itself  $\text{دَابَّة}$  for  $\text{دَوْبِيَّة}$ , dimin. of  $\text{دَابَّة}$ . Hence out of  $\text{رَدَّتْ}$  sprang the form  $\text{رَدَات}$ , the dialectical existence of which is vouched for by the grammarians; and hence the Hebrew  $\text{סַבְּתִי, חַגְּתֶם, וַמּוֹת}$ , for *sabbati*, *sababti*. Of course the Hebrew *š* in these forms might be as readily derived from an original *au*, but we have no evidence of the existence of a form *raddanta*, whereas *raddaita* is a known dialectical variety of *raddaita*.

The infinitive construct in Hebrew exhibits two forms: uncontracted,  $\text{לְחַנְּכֶם, לְסַבֵּב}$ , far more rarely with *a*,  $\text{לְחַנְּנָה}$ , Is. xxx. 18,  $\text{לְחַנְּנָה}$ , Ps. cii. 14; and contracted,  $\text{חַנֵּן, חַנֵּן}$ , far more rarely with *a*,  $\text{חַנֵּן}$ , Is. xlv. 1,  $\text{חַנֵּן}$ , Jerem. v. 26. These are, of course, nothing but segolates of the same form as the Arabic  $\text{وَد, وَد}$ .

The Arabic imperative presents to us, as I explained above, the forms  $\text{مَسِّ, فِرِّ, اِرِّ}$ . These are exactly equivalent to the Hebrew  $\text{מַסֵּב, מַסֵּב}$ , perhaps also  $\text{מַסֵּב}$ , Ps. cxix. 22; in Aramaic,  $\text{מַסֵּב}$ , Mand.  $\text{מַסֵּב}$  "wash,"  $\text{מַסֵּב}$  "dwell"; Syr.  $\text{مَسَّ, مَسَّ}$  (from  $\text{مَسَّ, مَسَّ}$ ). An example of the uncontracted form is  $\text{مَسَّ}$ , Jerem. xlix. 28, corresponding to an Arabic  $\text{مَسَّ}$  for  $\text{مَسَّ}$ .

The Arabic imperfect has, as I explained to you, the forms

يَمْسُ يَمْسُ يَمْسُ. The first of these is reproduced exactly in the

Hebrew יָסַב for *yasubb, yasubbu, yasubbu*, with suffix יִסְבֵּנִי,

plural יִסְבְּנוּ for *yasubbū, yasubbūna*. This *ō* has rarely been

weakened into *ū*, but we find examples in יָרִיז Is. xlii. 4, יָרִיזוּ

Prov. xxix. 6, יִשְׂאוּ Ps. xci. 6. These may not improbably have

been influenced by the imperfect of verbs עָוָה, as in Mand.,

where נִימוך (from מָאך) is identical with נִיקוּם from קָאם, and

conversely נִירָא "dwells," נִינָא "commits adultery," cannot

be distinguished from נִירָאם "be hot," תִּירָאג "desirest." In

intransitives like the Arabic يَمْسُ يَمْسُ, where the character-

istic vowel of the imperfect is *a*, the Hebrew no longer maintains

the ancient *yakḥal*, but employs the more recent *yikḥal*. Thus

the imperfect of מָר is not יִמַר but יִמַר, for *yimrar, yamrar*.

So יִרַע, יִרַע, and a few more. In 1 Kings i. 1 the form is

pointed יַחַם instead of יַחַם. The reason of this deviation from

the form with *a* in the first syllable probably was that יִרַע, יִרַע,

too closely resembled in their vocalisation that of the

*perfect*. Indeed יִמַר, יִרַע, and יִרַע, rightly appear as verbal

roots in our lexicons. This has not however prevented the sub-

stitution of the form יִזְמוּ for יִזְמוּ in Gen. xi. 6, because the sin-

gular must actually have been יִזְמוּ, not יִזְמוּ. In the fem. plur.

תִּסְבְּנֶינָה, תִּסְבְּנֶינָה, the diphthong *ai* has again been inserted to

facilitate the pronunciation of the contracted forms, which stand

respectively for *tasubbua* and *tašlilua*, the intermediate steps

being *tasubbua*, *tašillua*, then *tasubbaina*, *tašillaina*.

The Aramaic dialects go their own way in the formation of

the imperfect and infinitive. They throw back the lost doubling

of the 2nd and 3rd radicals upon the 1st. Hence יִדְקוּ, יִדְקוּ,

יִדְקוּ, יִדְקוּ, for *yidukḥ, ʾēbuzs*, etc., from *yadukḥu, nabuzsu*;

and in the infinitive, מִדְקָא, מִדְקָא, for *midḥaḥ, mebsas*. The

Hebrew also has this form in such words as יָקַד, יָדַמוּ, יָדַם; יָקַדוּ; יָתַמוּ; יָתַמוּ, תַּעֲלֵלְנָה, Jerem. xix. 3, for תַּעֲלֵלְנָה; and so forth.

The participle active has in Hebrew the uncontracted form גִּזּוּ, חוּגַג, חֲזַנְג, whereas in Arabic the contraction is prevalent, حَاجٍ, حَاجٌ, and the uncontracted حَالٌّ occurs as a rare poetic license. In vulg. Arab. however the uncontracted حَاجِج is common in the masc. sing., whereas in the fem. sing. and in the plur. masc. and fem. the contracted form is more usual. In Syriac the form has been influenced by that of verbs ע"ו. The sing. masc. is therefore כָּוַן, כָּוַל, like כָּוַס, but the fem. sing. and the plurals are regular, כָּוַל, כָּוַס, כָּוַת, for 'alilat, 'aliltu, 'alilan'. In Bibl. Aram. we find the uncontracted plur. עֲלִילִין, Dan. iv. 5, v. 8, as *Kethibh*, the *Kerē* being עֲלִין, as also in Samarit. עֲלִלָה, עֲלִל.

Let us now glance rapidly at the derived conjugations.

*Nipl'al.* Here the chief peculiarity in Hebrew is the pure vowel of the 1st syllable, נָסַב, נָחַר, נָקַל, for *nasabb, naharr, naḳall*, from *nasab, nahrar, naḳlal*. Curiously enough, however, we find here the intransitive vowels of the *Kal* also used in the 2nd syllable; e.g. נָמַם, נָרַץ, נָקַל; and so in the fem., נִשְׁמָה, but נִסְבָּה; and in the plur., נִשְׁמָו, נִסְבוּ, but also נִבְּוּ, נִגְּלוּ. This seems due to the resemblance of נָסַב to the ordinary *Kal* נָשַׁב, whence the same variations that were admissible in the one came in course of time to be thought allowable in the other. Others think that the *ḡ* forms are due to the influence of verbs ע"ו. There is a fourth form, which altogether gives up the

<sup>1</sup> A possible instance of this Aramaic form in Hebrew is שָׁאֲסִיד, Jerem. xxx. 16 (*Kethibh*), if we derive it from שָׁסַח = שָׁסַח, the sing. being שָׁסַח for שָׁסַח.

<sup>2</sup> עֲלִין occurs also in Palmyrene; in Palestinian Syriac both עֲלִל and עֲלִין "suffering" are found: the former word makes its plural [עֲלִין.]

doubling and inflects exactly like the *Kal* of נָגַשׁ, for the same reason as the first three; e.g. נָגַשׁ, נִבְקָה, נִסְכָּה. A fifth form resembles the ordinary Niph'al in the vowel of the first syllable, as נָחַר, נָחַת, נָחַל, and gives the plur. נִחְרוּ, נִחְלוּ; participp. נִחְרִים, נִחְתִּים. This seems to be a secondary formation from נָגַשׁ, after the fashion of Niph'al נָגַשׁ from *Kal* נָגַשׁ.—Of the 2nd person examples are very rare; but we find נִמְלַתֶם side by side with נְמַלְתֶּם and נִחַלְתֶּם.—Similarly in the first person we have נִקְלוֹתִי, with the plur. נִשְׁדַּנּוּ, Micah ii. 4, where the supplementary vowel *o* has been weakened into *u*.—For the sake of comparison with the above I need only mention the Arabic forms انجَرَّ for *ingarara*; 2nd pers. اِنجَرَرْتَ, uncontracted.—In the imperfect, the ordinary form is يَسَبُّ, for *yissabb*, by assimilation and contraction for *yansabib*; as يَسُبُّ, يَسَبُّ. The uncontracted form occurs in يَلْبَبُ, Job xi. 12. The corresponding plural naturally exhibits the double letter, يَسَبُّو, contracted for *yansabibū(na)*, *yanmadidū(na)*. Such words as יִרְועֶ, Prov. xi. 15, xiii. 20, and תִּירוֹץ, Ezek. xxix. 7, follow the analogy of verbs עָוָה. In Arabic, for the sake of comparison, take يَنجَرُّ for يَنجَرُّ, plur. يَنجَرُونَ.

*Hiph'il.* In the perfect the Arabic form is أَجَرَ for أَجَرَ, 2nd pers. أَجَرْت. Contractions like أَحَسَّتْ and أَحَسَّتْ, for أَحَسَّتْ, are very rare in the classical language. The Hebrew follows the form *hiktal* or *hiktēl* instead of *haktal*; e.g. הִדְקַ, הִסְבַּ, הִחַל, which stand for *hēdakk*, *hēsēbb*, etc., by contraction for *hidkək*, *hisēbēb*. The uncontracted form in its latest stage appears in הִדְקַנּוּ, הִיִּלְוּ, which never undergo contraction (also in Syriac ܢܘܠܐ, Mand. ܢܘܠܐ), and in the participle

מִשְׁשִׁים, Ezek. iii. 15. The fem. sing. and plur. actually exhibit the doubling הַחֲלָה, הַחֲלוּ, הַקָּלוּ, הַתַּמּוּ, הַרְעוּ, הַפְּרוּ. The 2nd pers. usually has the form הִרְעִיתָ, הִחֲלוֹתָ. The original 1st pers. *haktalti* occurs in all its purity in הִתְחַמֵּתִי, Jerem. xlix. 37; and a modification of the 2nd pers. in הִתְחַלֵּתְּ and הִתְפַּרְתְּ, for *hitlalta* and *hipharta*.—In the imperfect the Arabic form is يَجْرُ for يَجْرِر. The Hebrew preserves a purer vowel in the 1st syllable, יָסַב for *yāsēbb*, contracted from *yasbēb* for *yasbibu*, יָפַר; plur. יַחֲלוּ for *yahlilū(na)*.

In the Aramaic dialects the doubling is thrown back upon the 1st radical, as in the imperfect Pē'al, whence arise the forms הִדַּק, הִעֵל or הִנְעֵל, הִאָּזַב, for הִדַּקַּק, הִאָּזַב, impf. יִדַּק. To these correspond such Hebrew imperfects as יַחַל, יַחֵם, יַפֵּב. The plural however has two formations, one of which retains the doubling of the 2nd radical, whilst the other is purely Aramaic in dropping it. The former is exemplified by וַיַּפְּבוּ, the latter by וַיִּבְתּוּ, Deut. i. 44.

The passive is in Arabic أُجِرَّ for أُجِر, 2nd pers. أُجِرَّت, impf. يُجَرُّ for يُجَرِّ. The Hebrew form הוֹסַב stands for *husbab*, but has been influenced by the corresponding form of verbs הוֹקַם, e.g. הוֹחֵל, הוֹחֵל, fem. הוֹחֵדָה. In the imperfect we find a treble formation, as in the Hiph'il, there being forms (1) like יוֹדַק, in pause for יוֹדַק, resembling יָסַב; (2) like יִבְתּוּ, plur. יִבְתּוּ, resembling יַפֵּב, plur. יַפְּבוּ; and (3) like הוֹמַכּוּ, Job xxiv. 24; יוֹחֵקוּ, in pause for יוֹחֵקוּ, Job xix. 23, resembling the Aramaic הִדַּק and הִדַּקִּין.

## II. A. Verbs of which the 1st radical is w or y.

Of these the former, פִּי, are by far the more common in the

Semitic languages. The number of verbs first *y* in Arabic and Ethiopic is very small indeed; in Hebrew and Syriac it appears to be larger, but this phenomenon is due to a peculiar change which verbs first *w* undergo in these two languages.

1. The normal form of verbs first *w* in the perfect of the first or simple form is that of the Arabic, <sup>وَدَعَ</sup>, <sup>وَعَدَ</sup>, <sup>وَعَضَّ</sup>, <sup>وَدَّ</sup>. <sup>وَجَعَ</sup>, <sup>وَجَلَ</sup>, <sup>وَجِرَ</sup>. Similarly in Ethiopic, ገለገለ። ገለገለ። ገለገለ። ገለገለ። ገለገለ።. The only example that I remember in Ethiopic of the change of *w* into *y* is in ለይደቦ: "to make known," the causative of an unused የደቦ: Heb. יָדַע. The corresponding Arabic verb is <sup>وَدَعَ</sup> "to put, place, store up, deposit"; what we "know" is that which we have "placed" or "stored up" in the mind for use<sup>1</sup>. In Hebrew the initial *w* almost invariably passes into *y*, unless protected by a preceding consonant; hence יָדַע, יָעַן, יָעַד, יָלַד, יָנַח, יָנַח, יָנַח, יָנַח, יָנַח. The same remark applies to the Aramaic; e.g. in Biblical Aramaic, יָדַע, יָדַע, further יָלַד, יָקַד, יָקַד, יָקַד. But the later Aramaic dialects vocalise this י, and turn it into a simple vowel *i*. Hence in Syriac יָדַע, יָדַע, יָדַע, which are commonly written in the oldest MSS. with prefixed *aleph*, אִדַּע, אִדַּע, etc.; and in Mandaitic עתיד, עקיד or עקיד, עתיד. The verb יָדַע, Mand. עתיד, also occurs in Syriac as אִדַּע, but the more common form is אִדַּע, which appears in the Talmūd Yērūshalmī as יָדַע, in which form the ה is elided and its vowel

<sup>1</sup> [The explanation of יָדַע, "know," from the Arabic <sup>وَدَعَ</sup> is due to Schultens but has not found general acceptance. The first radical of the verb "to know" is <sup>ו</sup> not only in Hebrew, Aramaic and Ethiopic, but also in Sabaeen, and perhaps in Assyrian (see Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gramm.* p. 308). The verb therefore is now generally taken to be true <sup>ו</sup>. Even in Arabic, as Nöldeke observes, there is a trace of a root יָדַע distinct from <sup>وَدَعَ</sup> (أيدع). The forms with <sup>ו</sup> after a prefix (הוֹדַע, הוֹדַע, etc.) are to be explained in the same way as אִדַּע, הוֹדַע, *infra*, p. 242.]

thrown back on the initial letter. The Assyrian exhibits a further modification of the ground-form, since, according to the grammarians, the initial syllable is written with **א**, **אשנ** for **שנ**, **אצא** for **צא**, **ארר** for **רר**. There is nothing antecedently improbable in this change of sound, since in Syriac we find these sounds confounded in **במר** compared with **במר**, **בכ** compared with **בכ**, whilst in Arabic we have **أرخ** from **ارخ**: **يرخ**. In Arabic every initial **و** may be pronounced with hamza, if accompanied by the vowel *i* or *u* (but not *a*); e.g. one may say **وحي** for **أحي**, **وقت** for **أقت**, **وسادة** for **أسادة**, **وشاح** for **أشاح** (but not **أقت** for **وقت**).

In the imperfect indicative of the first form the Ethiopic retains the *w*, **ወፍድ**: **ወርከ**:, with the exception of **ወብ**:- (= **ወፀብ**:-) from **ወበ**:- (by transposition for **ወፀብ**:-). In the subjunctive the *w* is occasionally retained, as in **ወገር**: “throw, pelt,” **ወቅላ**: or **ወቀላ**: “argue, go to law,” **ወከድ**: “lead, carry,” **ወገላ**: “butt”; but ordinarily the **ወ** is rejected, and the subjunctive appears as **ከድ**: or **ሰድ**: **ሰድ**: **ገር**: **ሀብ**: **ባላ**:: This rejection of the initial *w* is the rule in Arabic with all verbs which have *i* as the characteristic vowel of the imperfect, and with a few that have *a*; e.g. **ورث**: **يعد**: **وعد**: **يولد**: **ولد**:

**يهب**: **وهب**: **يوقع**: **وقع**: **يوسع**: **وسع**: **يرث**: But the **و** is retained when the characteristic vowel is *u*, and generally when it is *a*;

e.g. **يؤبو**: **وبو**: (for **يؤد**:); **يؤد**: **ود**: **يؤجع**: **وجع**: **يؤجر**: **وجر**:

**يؤوض**: **وضو**: **يؤوض**: **وضو**: “be clean and fair.” There are, however, some interesting dialectical varieties, which I must notice. Firstly,

initial **و** passes into **y**, yielding the forms **يبيج**: **بيج**: **يبيجل**: “make mistake.” Next, the sound of the *a* in this diphthong prevails over the other element, and the forms pass into **ياجل**:

יָהֶם, יָאֶחַ. Thirdly, the vowel of the first syllable may be weakened into *i*, and give us the forms יִיָּחַ, יִיָּכַל.

Lastly, the vulgar forms of the present day are יוֹתֵף, יוֹסֵף, instead of יִתֵּן, יִלְדֵּ, יִעַד, יִקַּף, יִסַּל, instead of יוֹעַד, יוֹזֵן, יוֹלֵד, יוֹסֵף. We also find at the present day in Egypt the forms *yfkaʃ*, *yfka'*, *yfʃal*, and *yakif*, *yakʔ*, but they are comparatively rare.

Let us glance now at Hebrew. Here one form of the imperfect is represented by יִרַד, יִשַׁב, יִרַע, יִקַּר, apparently identical with the normal Arabic يَرِدُ, تَلِدُ. The *a* was weakened as usual into *i*, and then lengthened before the tone into *ē*, תִּירַד, תִּירַד, for *tilid*, *yirid*. A form like יִקַּר is against Arabic rule; and forms like יִרַעֵנוּ, יִרַעֵנוּ, show that the *šrē* was retained in the 2nd syllable before the tone, which has led some to think that it might have a diphthongal origin. They would derive יִרַד, יִרַע, יִקַּר, from תִּירַד, תִּירַע, according to the dialectical Arabic يِيَجُّ, يِيَكُلُّ. Another form of the Hebrew imperfect is represented by יִרַשׁ, יִקַּר (as well as יִקַּר).

Here we have, no doubt, the dialectical Arabic يِيَجُّ, يِيَكُلُّ. The original *a* of the 1st syllable became *i*, and this worked the change of *w* into *y*. In one word, יִכַּל, the imperfect יִכַּל resembles in form the vulgar Arabic يُوֹסַל. We may consider it as the last weakening of an original יִכַּל, יִכַּל.

Passing on to the Aramaic dialects, we find in Syriac the imperfect written with an *ā* *alph*, נִאֲלַ, נִאֲרַ. It seems to me that the original pronunciation was *nāladh*, *nārath*, as in the dialect-

<sup>1</sup> [But comp. p. 180.]



tical Arabic  $\text{يَا جَل}$ ,  $\text{يَا جَع}$ ; and that  $\bar{a}$  was weakened into  $\bar{e}$  (for which we have abundant analogies), whence the Eastern forms  $\text{نَاجِل}$ ,  $\text{نَاجِل}$ . Others think, however, that this form arose by assimilation of the verbs  $\text{نَاف}$  and  $\text{نَاف}$ , such as  $\text{نَافِه}$ ,  $\text{نَافِه}$ .

The Western Syrians weakened the  $\ell$  still further into  $\ell$ ,  $\text{نَاجِل}$ ,  $\text{نَاجِل}$ , as in the verbs  $\text{نَافِه}$ . In Mandaitic the first syllable has  $\bar{i}$ , probably  $\bar{e}$ , as  $\text{עראב}$ , "I give,"  $\text{ניקאר}$ ,  $\text{ניקאר}$  or  $\text{ניקוד}$ ;  $\text{עודול}$  and  $\text{תודול}$ , from  $\text{עודל}$  =  $\text{ילד}$ . These forms with  $u$  in the second syllable are remarkable.

Let us next examine the imperative mood.

In Ethiopic, where the initial  $w$  is lost in the subjunctive, it also disappears in the imperative. We occasionally find such forms as  $\text{ፀቅር}$ ; or  $\text{ፀቅር}$ : "hew, cut out,"  $\text{ፀገር}$ : "pelt, stone"; but the usual ones are  $\text{ቅር}$ ; or  $\text{ቅር}$ ;  $\text{ገር}$ ; or  $\text{ገር}$ ;  $\text{ረር}$ ;  $\text{ሀር}$ ;  $\text{ፀር}$ ;  $\text{ፀር}$ : In Arabic, all verbs that lose the  $w$  in the imperfect, also drop it in the imperative; hence  $\text{هَب}$ ,  $\text{قَع}$ ,  $\text{رَد}$ ,  $\text{رَث}$ ,  $\text{عَد}$ . In those that retain the  $w$ , it is necessarily changed, on account of the prosthetic vowel, into a letter of prolongation;  $\text{اوجَل}$  for  $\text{ايجَل}$  from

$\text{اوضو}$  for  $\text{اوضو}$  from  $\text{وضو}$ . The vulgar form of the present day in Egypt is  $\text{akaf}$ ,  $\text{akaf}$ ,  $\text{akaf}$ ,  $\text{akaf}$ ,  $\text{akaf}$ ; more rarely  $\text{akaf}$ ,  $\text{akaf}$ ,  $\text{akaf}$ , or  $\text{akaf}$ .

In Hebrew the forms waver somewhat:  $\text{שַׁב}$ ,  $\text{יָר}$ ,  $\text{צָא}$ ,  $\text{יָדַע}$ ; but perhaps  $\text{יָר}$  (Judg. v. 13). On the other hand,  $\text{יָרָא}$ ,  $\text{יָרָה}$ ,  $\text{יָרָה}$  (Deut. xxxiii. 23) but also  $\text{יָרַשׁ}$  and  $\text{יָרַשׁ}$ , and even  $\text{יָצַק}$  as well as  $\text{יָצַק}$  "pour." In Syriac, on the contrary, the initial letter is retained in the imperative, with the exception of  $\text{ṣ}$  from  $\text{ṣ}$  from  $\text{ṣ}$ ,  $\text{ṣ}$  from  $\text{ṣ}$ , and  $\text{ṣ}$  from  $\text{ṣ}$ . In Mandaitic the form is not common in the extant literature. Noeldeke gives no

examples but עָתִיב and תִּיב "sit"; הָאֵב "give," with the curious variations עָהוּב, אָהוּב, and before enclitics with לְ, in the singular, הֵבָא and אָהֵבָא, plur. הֵבּוּ and אָהֵבּוּ.

In Arabic, the verbs which drop the initial *h*, in the imperfect and imperative usually lose it also in one of the commonest forms of the infinitive, taking, as a sort of compensation, the feminine termination; e.g. *أَدَى* as well as *وَأَدَى* and *وَأَدَى* or *الْأَدَى*; *رَدَى*, as well as *وَرَدَى* or *أَرَدَى*; *عَدَى*, as well as *وَعَدَى*; *عَطَى*, as well as *وَعَطَى*. Precisely corresponding infinitives in Hebrew, as *לָדָה*, *רָעָה*; generally however, *לָדַת*, *רָדַת*, *רָשַׁת*, *שָׁבַת*, *צָאָה* (for *צָאָת*), for *lidat*, etc. In *רָעַת* the *pathachs* are due to the guttural, as in *سَعَى*, *ضَعَى*. The masculine form *רָעַ* in Job is a rarity, and equally so the contracted feminine *לָת* in 1 Sam. iv. 19. Examples of the fuller form are *יָרָא*, *יָסַר*, *יָרַד* (Ps. xxx. 4), *יָצַק*. The Ethiopic supplies us with many substantives of this class, but not infinitives, as ልደት: ርደት: ሰለት: ፀለት:: In Aramaic there are likewise a few, e.g. *עָטָא*, Dan. ii. 14; *فَعَلَان*, *نَمَصَلَان*; *حَزَان* is probably to be regarded as borrowed from the Hebrew *עָרָה*.

Passing on to the derived conjugations, I would first direct your notice to the transitive or causative *Hiph'il*, in Hebrew *הוֹלִיד*. The presence of the *h* is sufficient guarantee that the verb originally began with this letter; an original *h* must have yielded *הוֹלִיד*. The Arabic and Ethiopic have preserved for us the purer form *أَوْلَدَ*, ሰለደ: in Syriac *أَوْلَدَ*, *أَوْلَدَ*. In the passive *Hoph'al*, the weak consonant is vocalised, *הוּשַׁב* for *הוּשַׁב*, as in Arabic *أُوْلِدَ* for *أَوْلَدَ*.

In the same way, in the reflexive and passive *Niphal*, the Hebrew נִגְלַד stands for נִגְלַד, according to the form נִקְטַל, whereas יִגְלַד is by assimilation from יִגְלַד, corresponding to an Arabic يَنْوَلِد from أَنْوَلِد. Such forms, though not uncommon in the modern language, are not deemed classical.

The reflexive conjugations formed with the prefix *ta* require a little more attention.

The simplest is the Aramaic *Ethpe'el*. Of this the oldest shape is to be discerned in the Ethiopic ተወለደ: "be born," ተወለ: "be given." In Syriac it always appears with vocalised *y*, [ܝܬܝܡܝܢ] for 'ethi-*y*-tēdh, and that from 'ethi-*w*-tēdh, [ܝܬܝܡܝܢܬ]. In Mandaitic however the vowelless *yodh* is dropped, giving עתהיב; מיתליד, עתהיב; but "she was given" is עתהיב, as in Syr. [ܝܬܝܡܝܢܬ]. The corresponding conjugation in Arabic is, as you may remember, the 8th, *ifta'ala*, اِفْتَلَّ for تَفَلَّل. This should give us اَوْتَفَّق, اَوْتَفَّق; but these impossible forms necessarily become اِيتَفَّق, اِيتَفَّق, اِيتَفَّق, the existence of which is admitted, although the assimilation of *wt* into *tt* is greatly preferred: اِتَفَّق, اِتَفَّق, اِتَفَّق. The imperf. of the former is يَاتَفَّق, يَاتَفَّق; of the latter يَتَفَّق, يَتَفَّق. So usual has this assimilation become that many secondary roots beginning with *t* have been formed from this conjugation; e.g. تَلَد "to be born in one's house, be hereditary"; تَسَع "be wide," تَقِيَ "fear God," تَكَنَّ "rely on," اَتَلَجَّ "insert," اَتَمَّ "suspect." In Syriac ܠܘܘܐ is an example of this sort<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> [Prof. Wright's MS. cites also ܠܘܘܐ, late Heb. ܠܘܘܐ, which some scholars

On the reflexive of the Hebrew *Pi'el*, viz. *Hithpa'al*, in Syr. ܐܘܘܠܐ, I will merely remark that the prefixed syllable sometimes preserves the initial *w* from passing into *y*. So in התְּוֹדָה, התְּוֹכַח, התְּוֹדַע; whence in post-biblical Hebrew the substantives וְדוּחַ and וְדוּחָה. The Syriac ܐܘܘܠܐ is hardly a parallel, because in that language we have the Pa'al ܘܘܠܐ and the noun ܘܘܠܐܘܢܐ.

The tendency to assimilate the *w* to the following letter, which we saw in the Arabic 8th conj. ٱٓنلَدَ, appears in the other dialects in some other forms. In Hebrew, for instance, יִצַע = יִצַע assimilates in Hiph'il and Hoph'al, הִצִיעַ, הִצַע. The same is the case with הִצִיג and הִצַג; and with the rad. יִצַת, impf. יִצַת, Niph. נִצַת, Hiph. הִצִית. In other instances the assimilation is merely sporadic, as in יִפַר, יִצַק, and even הִקְרַת (inf. Hoph'al). In Aramaic instances of a similar kind are יִכַל from יִכַל = יִכַל, יִתַב, Dan. vii. 26 [Compl., Norzi, Baer], from יִתַב; Syr. ܘܘܠܐܘܢܐ, from ܘܘܠܐܘܢܐ, whence in Bibl. Aram. ܘܘܠܐܘܢܐ, with dissimilation of *dd* into *nd*.

2. The verbs which are really פ"י are very few in number in the Semitic languages, and call for but little notice. In Hebrew there are only seven or eight altogether; יִתַס, יִתַס, not used in Kal; יִתַס, יִתַס; יִתַב, not used in the perf. Kal; יִתַב, יִתַב; יִתַב, not used in perf. Kal; יִתַב; and the Hiph'als הִיחִיל and connect with יִתַב; יִתַב: so still Mühlau and Volck, 11th ed., 1890. But יִתַב

like the Syriac ܘܘܠܐܘܢܐ seems rather to be a denominative from ܘܘܠܐܘܢܐ, *elcōna* (so Nöldeke; cf. Fränkel, *Lehrw.* p. 273), and therefore quite distinct from ܘܘܠܐܘܢܐ,

[יִתַב, יִתַב.]

הִימִין. יצר is doubtful, and may be פ"ץ; at least the Niph'al is נִצָּר, Is. xliii. 10. The imperfects are יִצַּב, יִינַק, יִיקַץ, according to the Arabic form يَبْسُ for يَأْسُ; but instances of assimilation occur, as יִקַּץ (1 Kings iii. 15), יִשָּׂר (1 Sam. vi. 12), יצר. The Hiph'il is הִיטִיב for הִיטִיב, הִינִיק, הִלִּיל, הִימִין, but the original diphthong is retained in הִשָּׂר, Prov. iv. 25, Ps. v. 9 (Kěřē). In two cases the form הוֹשִׁיר seems to be used, falsely conforming to verbs פ"ץ, viz. Ps. v. 9 (Kěthibh) and Is. xlv. 2 (Kěthibh). The same has happened with הוֹבִישׁ, Syr. أَوْصَف; and with the Niph'al נִוֵּאֵשׁ. The Niph'al of יצר is likewise, as we have seen, נִצָּר (Is. liii. 10), and its Hoph'al יוֹצָר (Is. liv. 17). The latter form would be quite *en règle* from a verb פ"ץ, because in Arabic too أَيْبَسَ would become in the passive أُوْبِسَ, for أُيْبِسَ, the ي conforming to the preceding vowel. In Syriac ܐܘܒܫܐ and ܐܘܒܫܐ are the only words that exhibit the radical *y*, and the latter of these has a second form ܐܘܒܫܐ, which seems to have carried the day in Mandaitic, if we may judge by the word מוֹנְקָא "foster, guardian," for מוֹנְקָא. The Mand. equivalent of ܐܘܒܫܐ is also ܐܘܒܫܐ. In the 8th conj. of the Arabic the same assimilation takes place as in verbs פ"ץ, e.g. ܐܘܒܫܐ, ܐܘܒܫܐ, ܐܘܒܫܐ.

## II. B. *Verbs of which the middle radical is w or y.*

In treating of these verbs, ע"י and ע"ץ in Hebrew Grammar, we must, at the outset, distinguish carefully between verbs that never undergo contraction, and those which, according to my view, are generally or always contracted. To the former class, for example, belong in Arabic many verbs of the form فَعَلَ, as سَوَلَ "to be flaccid" or "pendu-

lous," חֹרַר "to be very white and black" (of the eye), עֹרַר "to be one-eyed," חוּלַל "to squint," סִידַד "to have the disease called סִידַד" (of a camel), גִּידַד "to be tender and flexible"; in Hebrew, חוּרַר "be white," נָוַע "expire," צוּחַ "cry out," רָוַח "be airy and wide," אָיַב "be hostile to," עָיַף "be weary"; in Syriac, מְוַח "be white," מְוַח "leap," נְסוּ "rejoice"; and in all three languages verbs that are also לוּ' or לוּ', as רוּי, רוּחַ, רוּי; הוּי, הוּי, הוּי. What principle guided the Semitic languages in the contraction or non-contraction of verbs ע' and ע', I am unable to state. I do not know why חוּרַר became חָרַר, and מוּרַר, מוּרַר, whilst חוּלַל and עוּרַר remained uncontracted; neither can I tell you why the Hebrew says צוּחַ, while the Arab changed his صَاح into صَاح'.

The uncontracted verbs ע' and ע' we may pass over altogether, as their inflexion is exactly like that of the regular verb. It is only the contracted ones that require our attention. And here I may remark that some grammarians of note, among them Aug. Müller, Noeldke and Stade, regard this class as actual specimens of biliteral roots. Stade, for example, calls them *mittelvocalig*, "having a vowel in the middle," and denies altogether the correctness of the term ע', for says he (p. 109) "these roots never had a consonant ך in the second place." For my own part, I prefer the older view, which is held by the Arab grammarians themselves, and for which I think we shall discover many good reasons as we go along.

The question of the existence of verbs ע' in Hebrew has been

<sup>1</sup> [With the exception of verbs which have ך as their third radical (e.g. לוּח, לוּי), all those verbs in which middle ך or ך' is treated as a consonant, appear to be denominatives and to have been formed at a relatively late period.—N.]

finally settled by Noeldeke in the *ZDMG.* xxxvii. p. 525, in the affirmative [as against the view of Ewald that such forms as  $\text{خَف}$  and  $\text{قَالَ}$  are not true "ع" verbs but shortened Hiph'als from roots "ع"]. To this article I refer you for all necessary information on the subject.

If you consult the Arab grammarians, they will tell you that such words as  $\text{قَام}$ ,  $\text{خَانَ}$  and  $\text{طَالَ}$ , had originally a *و*, in the second place, which has generally been vocalised; whence it comes that its place is occupied by a long vowel, which must under certain circumstances be shortened. The rules for these processes are few and simple.

(1) If three open syllables follow one another in succession the first of which has short *a* and the other two any of the three vowels, then the vowel of the second syllable is rejected, and the second radical is changed into long *a*. Hence  $\text{قَوْل}$  becomes  $\text{قَالَ}$ ,  $\text{خَوْف}$  becomes  $\text{خَانَ}$ ,  $\text{طَوْل}$  becomes  $\text{طَالَ}$ . If, however, the first radical has *u* and the second *i*, the latter vowel, as being the clearer, generally predominates, so that  $\text{قَوْل}$  becomes  $\text{قَيْل}$ ; although some of the Arabs contracted the form more regularly into  $\text{قَوْل}$ , whilst others gave the long vowel the intermediate sound of *ü*, *kūla*.

(2) If the 1st radical be vowelless, and the 2nd and 3rd radicals have vowels, then the vowel of the second is thrown back upon the 1st, and the *و* or *ي* becomes the corresponding letter of prolongation or long vowel. Hence  $\text{يَقُول}$  becomes  $\text{يَقِيم}$ ,  $\text{يَقُول}$  becomes  $\text{يَقِيم}$ ,  $\text{يَقُول}$  becomes  $\text{يَقِيم}$ ,  $\text{يَقُول}$  becomes  $\text{يَقِيم}$ . Should the final radical under any circumstances lose its vowel, then the preceding long vowel must be shortened. The jussive  $\text{يَقُول}$  becomes  $\text{يَقُل}$ ,  $\text{يَقُول}$  becomes  $\text{يَقُل}$ ,  $\text{يَقُول}$  becomes  $\text{يَقُل}$ . A further consequence of these changes is that the imperative of the 1st conjugation drops the now

useless prosthetic *alif*; أَتَوَّل becomes أَتَوَّل, أَتَوَّل, أَتَوَّل; or perhaps we may rather say that it never required the prosthetic *alif*, for the original قَوْل would naturally become قَوْل and then قَل.

(3) In the perfect of the 1st conjugation, when the first radical has *a* and the third is vowelless, contraction takes place, but the vowel of the first radical is affected either by the consonant or the vowel of the middle syllable. Hence قَوِّمَت becomes, not قَمَّت, but قَمَّت, through the influence of the و, and سَدَّت becomes سَرَّت, through the influence of the ي; but خَوِّفَت becomes خَفَّت, not خَفَّت or خَفَّت, through the influence of the vowel *i*, which is characteristic of the intransitive form. Where these influences are combined, their operation is of course the more certain; طَوَّلَت can become nothing but طَلَّت, and هَيَّبَت nothing but هَبَّت.

So much for the Arabic rules. Let us next study the forms of the Ethiopic, Hebrew and Syriac paradigms as compared with those of the Arabic.

The Arabic خَاف, قَام stands, as we have seen, for قَوْم, خَاف for خَوْف, طَالَ for طَوْل. The corresponding Ethiopic forms ርጸ: ርጸገ: ርጸገገ: ርጸገገገ: ርጸገገገገ: etc. The Hebrew form of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. is still more peculiar, and indeed very hard to explain. As Arabic long *a* regularly becomes *ā* in Hebrew, we should have expected



קָוַם to yield *ḵōm* as the equivalent of *تَامَ ḵāma*, and not *ḵām*. How then is this form *ḵām*, קָם, from *ḵām*, to be explained? Assimilation to the class *ע"ע* can scarcely have been in operation, for קָם is always carefully distinguished from קָם in its punctuation, and besides the fem. and plur. are קָמָה, קָמֵי, not קָמָה, קָמֵי. It would seem as if, in this case, the Hebrew, attaching more weight than the Arab did to the characteristic vowel of the form, had shortened the original *ḵawam* into *ḵam*, and then derived the other persons from this shortened form as a base<sup>1</sup>. Similarly, the Hebrew differs from the Arabic in the turn which it gives to verbs with *u* and *i* in the second syllable. The Arab changes *مَرَت* into *مَات*, and *طَوَّل* into *طَالَ*; but the Hebrew attached more weight to the vowels as characteristic of the intransitive form, and spoke not *madli*, but *מֵת meth* (for *mit*, from *mawit*); not *bāsh* or *'ār*, but *בָּשׁ bāsh* and *אֹר 'ār* (for *bush* and *'ur*, from *bawush*, *'awur*). These forms resemble those of the Arabic 2nd pers. *مَرَّت*, *خَفَّت*, *طَلَّت*, for *مَرَّت*, *خَوَّفَت*, *طَوَّلَت*. In Aramaic the ordinary form is precisely what we should expect, with long *ā* corresponding to the Arabic *ā*; e.g. קָם, שָׁם, שָׁם; Mand. קָם, פָּאש "remain"; but *سَمَّ*, Mand. מֵת, corresponding to Heb. *מֵת*. The 3rd pers. sing. fem. is in Arabic *سَارَتْ*, *طَالَتْ*, *خَافَتْ*, *مَاتَتْ*, *قَامَتْ*. The Heb. *קָמָה*, *בָּשָׂה*, *מָתָה*, *בָּשָׂה*, with the tone ordinarily on the 1st syllable, are derived directly from the forms of the masc. קָם, *מֵת*, *בָּשׁ*; but we also find *וְשָׁבַת*, with older termination, Ezek. xlvi. 17. The Aramaic forms are *סָפַת*, Dan. iv. 30; Syr.

<sup>1</sup> It may be, however, that the sound of the vowel was even still somewhat longer than that of *ā*, something between it and *ā*, as the spelling *QMP* in Hos. x. 14 may seem to indicate.

صَفَا, صَفَا, صَفَا; Mand. קאמאת, נאדאת. Similarly in the 3rd pers. plur., مَارُوا, طَالُوا, خَانُوا, مَاتُوا, قَامُوا, corresponding to Aramaic, שָׁמוּ, Dan. iii. 12, קָמוּ, Ezra v. 2; Syr. صَمَمَ, صَمَمَ; Mand. קאמבה, פאשבה (without ו), in the fuller form קאמיון, פאשיון. The Heb. מָתוּ, קָמוּ, בָּשׂוּ, מָתוּ, מָתוּ, with the tone usually on the 1st syllable, are derived directly from the corresponding singulars, קָם, etc.

In the 2nd pers. sing. and its analogous forms we find a still greater variety among the dialects. In Arabic the 2nd pers. sing. masc. is طَلَّتْ, مِتْ, خَفَتْ, قَمَتْ, or from a verb medial

يَهَيْتُ سِرْتُ, هَيْتُ سِرْتُ. Here the vowels *u* and *i* are due respectively either to the influence of the last radical و or ي, or of the characteristic vowel *u* or *i*: قَمَتْ = قَوْمَتْ, خَفَتْ = خَوَفَتْ, هَيْتُ = هَيْبَتْ, سِرْتُ = سَدِرْتُ, طَلَّتْ = طَوَلَّتْ, مِتْ = مَوْتٌ.

In Hebrew the form is קָמַתְּ, פָּנַתְּ, שָׁמַתְּ, סָרַתְּ, with short *a*, and *kāmes* (*ā*) appears only in pause, קָמַתִּי, Micha vii. 8, סָרַתִּי, Ps. cxix. 102, שָׁמַתִּי, Jerem. xxxiii. 25. Before Kimḥi's time, however, even the ordinary forms used to be pointed with *kāmes*, קָמַתְּ, שָׁמַתְּ, at least when the accent was *mil'el*. From מַת we have, unexpectedly, מָתַנוּ (we should have expected מָתַנוּ), and in pause וּמַתִּי, Gen. xix. 19, but also וּמַתְנוּ. From verbs with *θ* we get בָּשַׁתְּ, בָּשַׁתִּי, בָּשַׁנוּ (for *bisht*, *bushiti*, *bushnū*). On the other hand, the long vowel is steadily preserved in the Aramaic, not merely in the 1st pers., שָׁמַתְּ, Ezra vi. 12, Syr. صَمَمْتُ, صَمَمْتُ, Mand. קאמית, נאמית; but also

in the second, **שָׁמַתְּ** Dan. iii. 10, Syr. **صَمَدًا، صَمَدًا**, Mand. **האנתך = חָבַלְתְּ, לאנתך = לְכַבַּלְתְּ** "didst teach."

Passing on to the imperative, we find the Arabic forms to be such as **سِرَّ، خَفَّ، قَمَّ**. But the plurals are **سَيِّرُوا، خَانُوا، قَوْمُوا**; fem. **سَيِّرِي، خَانِي، قَوْمِي**. In vulgar Arabic the shortening of the sing. forms is neglected, **كُلُّ، بِيْع** *kuḷ, biʿ*; unless an accus. suffix or an enclitic prep. follows, as *shil-nī* "carry me," *kuḷ-ll, kuḷ-lilum*. In Ge'ez the corresponding forms are **ኑሙ፣ ሰር፣** or **ሰር፣ ሰለ፣ ሀሁሙ፣** exactly like the Heb. **קָמוּ, קָמוּ; בָּאוּ, בָּאוּ; בָּשָׂוּ, בָּשָׂוּ; נִיַּל, שָׂים; בָּשָׂו, בָּשָׂו; אַרְי, אַרְי**; *'ārī, for 'āwārī*. In Ge'ez the form **ሰር፣** is difficult to explain; perhaps we may regard it as an example of the change of *d* into *ḍ*, and as therefore standing for *ḥār*; if so, then the other form **ሰር፣** is only a weakening of the original **ሰር፣**, brought about by the influence of the common form **ፈሙ፣**. In Aramaic we find nothing unusual; Bibl. **קָמוּ** Dan. vii. 5, **שָׂמוּ** Ezra iv. 21; Syr. **صَمَدًا، صَمَدًا**; Mand. **קָמוּ, תָּנוּב**, but also **סָמוּ**. The verb **מָתַתְּ**, **מָתַתְּ**, has **מָתַתְּ, מָתַתְּ, מָתַתְּ**, Mand. **מות, מות**; and in Mand. there is one example with *a*, viz. **גָּאָר** "dwell," by assimilation to the class *y"y*.

For the imperfect indicative the Arabic has the three forms **يَسِيرُ، يَخْوَفُ، يَقومُ**, standing respectively for **يسير، يخوف، يقوم**. The peculiar Ge'ez indicative may be exemplified by such words as **ይሰውን፣ የሰውን፣ ይሰውል፣ ይሠይሙ፣**. It is only the forms of the subjunctive that we can compare with the Arabic indicative. Here then we have **ይረዱ፣ ይዑድ፣ ይሰሉ፣ ይሀሁሙ፣**. The verb **ሰር፣** "to go," has the same double formation as in the imperative, viz. **ይሰር፣** as well as **ይሰር፣**, which we must explain

in the same way.—In Hebrew the preformatives have usually retained the original vowel *a*, as יָקוּם, יָבֹוא, יָשִׁים, corresponding exactly to the three Arabic forms, since יָבֹוא was originally *yabū'a*; other examples may be the very doubtful יִדְוֹן, Gen. vi. 3, and יָקוּט, Job viii. 14. The only instance of the weakening of the preformative to *i* is יִבֹּאֵשׁ, for *yabwashu*, *yabdsh*, *yibdash*, *yēbdsht*. The jussives of יִקְוֹם, יִכְאֹף, יִסְרֹם are in Arabic يَقْمُ, يَسْرُ, and to these correspond in Hebrew יָקָם, יָתָרָם, יָשָׁם, still farther shortened with vāv conversive into וְיָקָם, וְיָתָרָם, וְיָשָׁם. If however the last radical be ר or a guttural, then *ā* is substituted for *ā* or *ā*, as וְיָנַע, וְיָנַח, וְיָסַר, וְיָרַח; except וְיָנַר, וְיָתַר. In the 3rd pers. plur. fem. we should expect, after the analogy of the Arabic يَسْرَنَّ, يَكْفَنَنَّ, يَقْمَنَّ, a Hebrew form תְּבַאֵנָה, and this actually occurs in תְּשַׁבְּנָה, Exod. xvi. 55, תְּבַאֵנָה (for *tabāna*, *tabwā'na*); but more frequently this form is assimilated to that of verbs ע"ע, and a diphthongal י inserted, with consequent restoration of the long vowel, תְּשַׁבְּינָה. The Aramaic forms of the imperfect are just what we should naturally expect, viz. נִשְׁמַל, נִשְׁמַל, יִקְוֹם. There is however another form in use, viz. Syr. نَقْمَم, Mand. and Talmud. נִקְוֹם. In Syriac I can scarcely remember any but singular forms, نَقْمَم, نَقْمَم, though نَقْمَم is quoted<sup>1</sup>; but in Mand. the plural is נִמִּיתוּן, f. נִמִּיתוּ, נִדִּינוּ, etc., while in the verb קוּם the vowel of the 2nd syllable is rejected, נִקְמָא, f. נִקְמוּ. These Mandaitic forms coincide with those from verbs ע"ע in the same dialect, as תִּירִינוּן from רָגַג, נִנְוּן "sprinkle," from נָוַו, and the Syriac variation must be traced to a similar assimilation of ע"ע

<sup>1</sup> [نَقْمَم is demanded by the metre in Ephr. Syr., iii. 316 A.—N.]

to ע"ע. The verb **יָמַרְתָּ**, **יָמַרְתָּ**, **יָמַרְתָּ**, has in all the dialects **יָמַרְתָּ**, **יָמַרְתָּ**, **יָמַרְתָּ**, like **יָבַל** from **יָבַל**, or **יָבַלְתָּ** from **יָבַל**. In Mandaitic we find a future in *a*, **יָדַרְתָּ**, **יָדַרְתָּ**, "dwell," by assimilation to the class ע"ע.

The infinitive construct in Hebrew has the simple form **קָוַם**, for **קָוַם**, as in the regular verb **קָטַל** for **קָטַל**. The form **בָּוֹא**, **אָוַר**, **בָּוֹשׁ**, probably springs from a long *a*, *ba'*, 'Ar, *bāsh*, for *barwa'*, 'awar, *barwash*.—In the infinitive absolute on the contrary, **מָוַת**, **נָשׁוּב**, **מָוַר**, are contractions of *sawār*, *shawāb*, *marwāth*.—The Aramaic infinitive is **מָקַם**, Syr. **מָכַמַ**, for **מָכַמַ**; the same variation occurs as in the imperfect, especially in Mandaitic and Talmudic, i.e. **מִיָּמַת**, **מִיָּמַת**, **מִיָּמַת**, Talm. **מִיָּמַת**, **מִיָּמַת**, **מִיָּמַת**; but the emphatic form of **מִיָּמַת** in Mandaitic is **מִיָּמַת**, as if from a verb ע"ע.

The original form of the participle active must have been **سَائِرٌ**, **سَائِرٌ**; but in the contracted verbs the *w* at the beginning of the syllable was changed into *hamsa*, **سَائِرٌ**, and the verbs mediae *y* followed this analogy, **سَائِرٌ**. These forms are liable to a rare contraction into **سَارٌ**, **سَارٌ** as **سَائِرٌ** for **سَائِرٌ** "armed," **سَائِرٌ** for **سَائِرٌ** "feeble," **سَائِرٌ** for **سَائِرٌ** "going about," **سَائِرٌ** for **سَائِرٌ** "decayed" (a tooth), **سَائِرٌ** for **سَائِرٌ** "cowardly." To this corresponds the rare Hebrew form **לָוַם**, Is. xxv. 7, **בְּלוֹמִים**, Zach. x. 5, **קְלוֹמִים**, 2 Kings xvi. 7, for *lūf*, *bāls*, *kām*. The more usual form is however analogous to that of the perf., viz. **בָּא**, fem. **בָּאָה**, **וָר**, **וָרָה**, sometimes written with *h*, as **וָרָה**, Judg. iv. 21, **וָרָה**, Ezek. xxviii. 24, 26, **וָרָה**, Ezek. xvi. 57, **וָרָה**, 2 Sam. xii. 1, 4, Prov. x. 4 (compare the perf. **וָרָה**, Hos. x. 14). This form

seems to me to be best explained as arising from a nominal *kaṭal*, i.e. *ṣawdm, rawdš, bawd'*, contracted after the analogy of the perfect into *ṣam, raš, ba'*. In the same way in intrans. verbs, with *š* and *š* in the second syllable, e.g. מַת for מִית (*marwt, mit*), לֵץ for לִיץ (*lawlš, liš*), בּוֹשׁ for בּוֹשֵׁשׁ (*bawušh, bušh*), according to the Heb. יָגַר, כִּבֵּד, or the Arabic adjectives يَقْطُ, حَذِرٌ. In Aramaic similar phenomena recur. In Bibl. Aram. the form is קָאם Dan. ii. 31, plur. in *Kṯlibh* קָאָמִין, קָאָמִין, קָאָמִין, emph. קָאָמִין, constr. קָאָמִין. The *Kṯrē* usually substitutes ' for Ṣ in these plur. forms, קָאָמִין, קָאָמִין, קָאָמִין. In Syriac only the singular is written with ܐ, ܦܘܠܐ, pronounced however, we are told, *kaṭyēm*. The fem. and plurals are invariably with *yūd*, ܦܘܠܐ, ܦܘܠܐ. In Mandaic the ' is written in the sing. masc. too, קָאָמִין, קָאָמִין, fem. קָאָמִין.—The passive participle of the Hebrew is exemplified by מוֹלַח, מוֹלַח, fem. מוֹלַחַת, for *marwll, sawlhg, l'wllh'āl*. In Aramaic the corresponding form is ܦܘܠܐ, Mand. ܦܘܠܐ, "depicted," כִּיל "measured," for *šylym, l'wllš*, etc.

I shall now proceed to the derived conjugations of these verbs, and go through them as rapidly as possible.

1. *Pi'el*. The uncontracted verbs form their *Pi'el* quite regularly; e.g. עוּר, עוּר, "to blind of one eye," עוּר "bend," ܦܘܠܐ "leap in numbers." The contracted ones too exhibit the normal form, that is to say, the weak letter, being strengthened by doubling, undergoes no change or only a slight one. In Arabic, for example, we have عَيْنَ، دَيْلَ، صَوْرَ، قَوْمَ; in Ge'ez ሰወረ: "inspect," "visit," ሰወረ: "cry out"; in Heb. עוּר "surround," Ps. cxix. 61; Aram. ܦܘܠܐ, ܦܘܠܐ, Syr. ܦܘܠܐ, ܦܘܠܐ, ܦܘܠܐ; Mand. ܦܘܠܐ, ܦܘܠܐ. But more frequently the middle consonant appears as a *γ*, the origin of which I explain thus.

In a form like *kaucōm*, the initial of the second syllable was changed in Hebrew and Aramaic into *y*, *kauyēm* (comp. רָיוּ, נָרָא; הָרָה, הָרָא, הָרָי, הָרָי), whence, by assimilation of the preceding letter, *kaiyēm*, and finally *kīyyēm*. So in Aram. כָּיַם, כָּיַם, חָיַב, חָיַב, חָיַב, חָיַב, חָיַב, חָיַב, etc. In Hebrew forms like קָיַם, חָיַב, חָיַב, belong to the later stage of the language. In place of Pi<sup>u</sup>l the Hebrew frequently exhibits another formation, viz. Pi<sup>l</sup>l, of which the older form was Pa<sup>l</sup>l, as קוּמַם, רוּמַם, עוּרַר, בּוּסַם, etc., for *kaumam*, *raumam*, etc.

2. *Hipt'il* and *Hopt'al*. The contracted Arabic form is <sup>أَقَامَ</sup> <sup>أَبَانَ</sup>, for <sup>أَقَامَ</sup> <sup>أَبَانَ</sup>. To this correspond in Ge'ez ለርጸ፡, ለሐረ፡, ለሁደ፡, which seem to be taken directly from the simple forms ርጸ፡, ሐረ፡, ሁደ፡. Some verbs however exhibit a short *a* in the 2nd syllable, which before a final guttural may become *ʔ*; e.g. ለቀጦ፡ 'akāma; ለሰጦ፡ 'andma, as well as ለሰጦ፡; ለጠቀ፡ 'atāka, "hem in," as well as ለጥወቀ፡; ለነ፡ 'andha or ለነ፡ 'andha, "lengthen"; ለብለ፡ 'abē'a "bring or put in"; ለብለ፡ 'abē'a, "permit." Such words seem to be really derived from the old form 'akwāma, 'awāma, 'abwē'a, etc.; perhaps with doubling of the first letter by way of compensation, as in הָפִיחַ, הָפִיחַ.—The Hebrew form הָקִים stands far below the Arabic and Ge'ez. The original *hakwāma* must have already passed through the stages of *hakwām*, *hikwām*, *hikwīm*, *hikīm*, before it could become *hēkīm*. The 2nd pers. of the Hebrew is likewise far removed from the purity of the Arabic <sup>أَقَامْتَ</sup>, for <sup>أَقَامْتَ</sup>, <sup>أَقَامْتَ</sup>. The purer form does indeed occur in such cases as הִנַּחְתָּ, הִנַּחְתָּ, הִנַּחְתָּ, הִנַּחְתָּ, plur. הִנַּחְתֶּם, הִנַּחְתֶּם; but commonly an assimilation to verbs ע"ע is effected by the insertion of *h*, for original *ʔ*, in which case the vowel of the preformative is usually *a*, sometimes *ʔ*, and the vowel of the radical syllable sometimes *ʔ* instead of *i*; as הָעִירָתָה, הָרִימוּתָה, הָבִיאתָה, הָעִירָתָה, הָעִירָתָה, הָעִירָתָה; and in the plur. הָפַצְתֶּם,

הַשְׁבַּתָּם, הַבִּיאָתָם, הַבִּנְיָוֹתָם. The Aramaic perfect is in the Old Testament הִקִּים, וְהִקִּים, הִתִּיב; 2nd sing. הִקִּימָתָּ, 1st sing. הִקִּימָתָּ, 3rd plur. הִקִּימוּ; in Syr. ܐܘܩܡܐ; in Mand. ܐܘܩܡܐ. In this last dialect the 1st pers. seems often to be identical in form with that of verbs ע"ע, c.g. ܐܘܩܡܐ, ܐܘܩܡܐ "I despised," but ܐܘܩܡܐ, ܐܘܩܡܐ.—The imperfect is in Arabic ܐܘܩܡܐ for ܐܘܩܡܐ, with the jussive ܐܘܩܡܐ and imperative ܐܘܩܡܐ. In Ge'ez the imperfect indicative is ܐܘܩܡܐ: ܐܘܩܡܐ:, the subjunctive ܐܘܩܥ: ܐܘܩܥ:, imperative ܐܘܩܥ: ܐܘܩܥ:. But verbs of the form ܐܘܩܥ: ܐܘܩܥ: have in the subjunctive ܐܘܩܥ: ܐܘܩܥ:, ܐܘܩܥ:, imperative ܐܘܩܥ: ܐܘܩܥ:. In Hebrew יְקִים stands for *ya-hakwim, yakwim*; the jussive is יְקִים, the vowel of which is still further shortened with *ḥ* *conversive* into יְקִים. In Aramaic the corresponding form is יְקִים, ܐܘܩܡܐ; but in Syriac the form ܐܘܩܡܐ, participle ܐܘܩܡܐ, is admissible, and this is the only one found in Mandaitic, c.g. ܐܘܩܡܐ, ܐܘܩܡܐ. These are all assimilated to verbs ע"ע, as appears from the plur. ܐܘܩܡܐ as compared with ܐܘܩܡܐ, "afflicting them."—The passive of this conjugation in Arabic is ܐܘܩܡܐ for ܐܘܩܡܐ. In Hebrew the original *hukwama* would naturally become *hukāma, hukam*, but the form in actual use has been entirely assimilated to that of verbs ܐܘܩܥ, הִקִּים, הִקִּים. In Syriac we have only the passive participle ܐܘܩܡܐ, for *muḥwam, muḥam*; but in Biblical Aramaic there is the remarkable survival הִקִּימָתָּ Dan. vii. 4, wrongly pointed ܐܘܩܡܐ in verse 5.

3. Of the reflexive conjugations with prefixed *ta*, I will only notice the *Ethiopl.*, corresponding to the 8th conjugation of the Arabic. In Arabic the form is, of course, ܐܘܩܡܐ, contracted for



اجتوز; but the uncontracted form is used in many verbs either by itself or along with the other; e.g. اجتوروا or اجتورا. In Ge'ez the corresponding forms are ተሰዐ: "be agitated," ተሰዐ. The Aramaic of the Bible exhibits יתשם, יתשמן, מתשם, but also יתזין. The one form, התשם, comes directly from the original *tasayama*, *tasama*. The doubling of the *t* may be an attempt to compensate for the radical which has disappeared by contraction, and so to give the word something of the outward form of the normal התקטל; or it may be merely imitated from the *Ethtaf'al* (*Ittaf'al*). The other form, התזין, has no doubt arisen by assimilation to the *Ethtaf'al* or reflex of *Af'el*, the two being completely confounded in Syriac. E.g. התזין is *Ethpe'el* of זין, [לשמע] or [לשמע] of שמע; but [לחב] , [לחב] , [לחב] are *Ethtaf'als* from [לחב] , [לחב] , [לחב] . In Mandaitic however the two conjugations can be readily distinguished; ניתלפון is *Ethpe'el* from לוף; ניתאראם, *Ethtaf'al* from רום. I find however עתניהית "I was quieted," which seems to be *Ethpe'el*, whereas [לשמע] must be regarded as *Ethtaf'al*.

4. The last form to which I shall direct your attention is the reflexive and passive *Niph'al*. The Arabic form may be exemplified by اِنْدَسَ , اِنْدَسَ , for اِنْدَسَ , اِنْدَسَ , imperf. يَنْدَسُ . In Hebrew נדש was originally *naddash*, contracted from *nadwash*, as in the Arabic 4th conj. اِنْدَسَ from اِنْدَسَ ; and so fem. נפוצה , plur. נפוצו . One verb, נעזר , exhibits the weakening of *a* to *i* in the preformative. The 1st and 2nd persons are assimilated to verbs ע"ע by the insertion of a vowel; viz. 2nd plur. נפוצתם , נקטתם , with *o*; 1st pers. sing. נפונתי , נפונתי , with sinking of *o* to *a*. The infinitives have the form

הַפּוֹחַ, הַפּוֹל. The vowel *o* (for *a*) is sunk to *a* in הַרְדֵּשׁ (Isaiah xxv. 10); and the preformative is absorbed in לֵאמֹר (Job xxxiii. 30), if the reading be correct. The imperative is exemplified by הִכְנֹן for *hinkān* (*hinkawin*), הַפְּלוּ, הַרְפֵּנוּ, the last with irregular doubling of the *m*. The imperfect is, for example, יִכְּנֹן for *yinkān*, from *yankawin*, יַעֲוֹר, יִפְּנוּ; יִרְפֵּנוּ, יִפְּנוּ, with irregular doubling of the *m*.

Of the frequent and close resemblances in form between verbs ע"ו and ע"ע we have already had many examples. I may add to these such Hiph'als as הִפְּיֵנוּ, with its Hoph'al הִפְּנֵנוּ, and הִפְּיֵנוּ, which latter differs only in form from הִפְּיֵנוּ; whereas in some other cases the difference perhaps extends to the meaning as well, as הִנְיֵחַ "cause to rest" and הִנְיֵחַ "lay down." Similar is the Niph'al נִפְּוֹל for *namāl* (*namwal*), Gen. xvii. 26, participle נִפְּוֹלִים, Gen. xxxiv. 22, for *namālīm* (*namwalīm*).

## II. C. Verbs of which the 3rd radical is w or y.

We now proceed to the large and important class of verbs in which the weak letter occupies the third place in the root. In our Hebrew Grammars these are generally called verbs ל"ה, but as the ה is merely a vowel-letter, I prefer speaking of them as verbs ל"י or ל"י, according to circumstances. Verbs ל"ה, strictly so called, are such as הִבְּיֵנוּ, which pertain to a quite different class, *verba tertiæ gutturalis*.

In the *first conjugation*, the fullest form of the verbs of this class has been preserved in Ethiopic, where no contraction takes place in the perfect 3rd pers. sing. masc.: ተለገዐ: *taldwa*, "follow"; በገዐ: *baktya*, "weep"; ለገዐ: *hadywa*, "live"; ዕለገዐ: 'abya, "be large"; ረገዐ: *re'ya*, "see." The solitary instance that I remember of contraction is in a form corresponding to Heb. Pi'el, viz. ሀለገዐ: *hallō*, for ሀለገዐ: *halltdwa* ["he was"], which are both in use. The final vowel was obviously dropped in this exceedingly common word, and the resulting diphthong *aw* then naturally passed into *o*.—In Arabic the final *w* appears as such only

in verbs of the form **فَعَلَ**, as **سَرَوُ** "to be noble," **حَلَوُ** "to be sweet." In verbs third **ي** such a form would be impossible; the final **ي** would at once influence the vowel *u* so as to change it into *i*, and the form **فَعَلِ**, if it ever occurred, would be indistinguishable from **فَعِلَ**, as **حَزِي** "be ashamed," **رَوِي** "be sated with drink." Not only so, however, but verbs third **و** of the form **فَعَل** are indistinguishable from verbs third **ي**, because the influence of the vowel *kasr* necessarily changes **و** into **ي**, as **رَضِي** "be pleased with," for **رَضُو**, **سَلِي** "be comforted or consoled," for **سَلُو**, **حَمِي** for **حَمِي**. These forms, be it observed, are all uncontracted (with the exception of **حَمِي**, which a false analogy has shortened into **حَمِي**); but in the most common form of all, **فَعَل**, the contraction, of which we found but a trace in Ethiopic, has become customary. *Tdlawa* and *bakaya* drop their final vowel, but the resulting diphthongal terminations *aw* and *ay* both pass in Arabic into *a*, *āla*, *bakā*. For distinction's sake the grammarians bid us write **لَا** with *alif*, when the final radical is *w*, and **بَكِي** with *y*, when the final radical is *y*, but the sound is one and the same.

In Hebrew the tendency of the **ו** to pass into **י** has almost obliterated the differences between verbs **לָו** and **לָי**. The radical **וּלָו** alone has preserved the final *w* in such forms as **וּלָוּתוֹ**, Job iii. 25, and, which is more remarkable, in an adjective of the form **נָעַל**, viz. **וּלָו** or **וּלָי**, Job xvi. 12, xxi. 23, Jerem. xlix. 31 (written **וּלָי**). Neither do intransitive verbs of the form **נָעַל** seem to occur in Hebrew, so that we have only verbs

of the form *فعل* to deal with. These follow exactly the same course as in Arabic; the final vowel was dropped, and the resulting diphthongal terminations passed into *l*, which the Hebrews expressed by the vowel-letter ה. In this way the original *taldwa*, *bakdya*, became *taldw*, *talá*; *bakdy*, *baká*; and were written תַּלְדָּה "hang," בָּכָה "weep."

In Aramaic the intransitive forms are not very common, e.g., in Syriac, *ܫܠܝܬܐ*, *ܫܠܝܬܘܐ*, which stand for *shallya*, *shallwa*, and *hadtya*, *hadtwa*. So in Mandaitic, *ܥܡܝܠܝܐ* "he swore to me." The transitives have undergone the same contraction as in Hebrew, only that the termination is here usually expressed by *l* א, and the door thereby opened for further confusion, as in vulgar Arabic, with the entirely different verbs *لأ*, like *سكنا*, *سكلا*. The words *لأ*, *سكلا* stand for *taldwa*, *bakdya*; whereas *سكنا*, *سكلا*, were originally *had'a*, *mald'a*. Similarly in Mandaitic *ܚܘܢܐ* "saw," *ܫܘܚܢܐ* "drank," *ܢܐ* "sought for" (for *ܢܘܢܐ*). In the Bibl. Aram. א and ה are used indifferently.

One verb in Aramaic constantly takes prosthetic aleph, viz. *ܐܫܝܬ* Dan. v. 3, 4, *ܐܫܝܬ*, for *ܫܝܬ*. I mention this for the sake of calling attention to the same phenomenon in vulgar Arabic (Spitta, p. 232), e.g. *ihkã* "he narrated," *iskã* "he gave water," *irmã* "he threw or pelted."

The 3rd pers. sing. fem. must of course originally have been, as in Ethiopic, *ተለወተ*: *taldwat*, *በአዋተ*: *bakdyat*. (The contracted *ሀላተ*: *halló* [*infra*, p. 271] admits of a contracted *ሀላተ*: *hallót*, for *ሀለወተ*: *halldwat*.) In Arabic and Aramaic the intransitives are regular in formation, *حَلَوْتُ*, *خَرَيْتُ*, *رَضَيْتُ*; Syr. *ܦܠܝܬܐ*, for *shaliyat*, *shaliwat*; Mand. *ܡܝܫܝܐܬ* "arrived," *ܡܝܫܝܐܬ* "became dense or firm"; vulgar Arabic of Egypt, *mishiyet* "she went," from *mishit*, or more commonly *mishyet*, *bikyet*, *nisyet*, *ridyet*. In the Targûms the punctuation is *ܫܢܝܝܬ*, *ܫܢܝܝܬ*, but this I consider doubtful. But the transitives undergo contraction: *galdwat* or *galdyat* becomes in Aramaic *galát*, which appears in

Biblical Aramaic as **מָטַת**, **הָוַת**, **רָבַת**, **עָרַת**; the form with *pathach*, though equally common, seems to be less correct, e.g. **רָוַת**, **מָחַת**, **מָטַת**, **עָנַת**; in Syr. as **ܡܬܐ**, **ܚܘܐ**; in Mand. as **הוּאָת** (for **ܚܘܐ**); in the Talmûd as **הוּת**, **הוּת**, or more commonly **הוּאִי**, **הוּאִי**, **הוּאִי**, where the *י* must be a trace either of the lost radical or of the evanishing final soft *t*, which wholly disappears in Mandaitic before enclitics, as **עמאלה**, "she swore to him." In Arabic the same contraction takes place, but the Arab has a certain dislike to a long vowel in a shut syllable, and has consequently shortened *at* into *at*, **جَلَّتْ**, **رَمَّتْ**, for **جَلَّاتٌ**, **رَمَّاتٌ**, and these for **جَلَّيْتُ** or **جَلَّوْتُ** and **رَمَّيْتُ**. In Hebrew, according to the analogy of **קָמְלָה** for **קָמְלַת**, we should expect the 3rd pers. sing. fem. to be **גָּלְיָה** (for **גָּלְיַת**), and this form is actually once found, with the older accentuation in pause, viz. **הַסִּיָּה**, Ps. lvii. 2. More frequently, however, the Hebrew takes the same course as the Arabic, and contracts the original *galdyat* into *galdt*, whence with suffix-pronouns in sundry derived conjugations, **צָוַתִּי**, Ruth iii. 6, **כָּלְתִּי**, Zach. v. 4, **הִטַּתִּי**, Prov. vii. 21. But in pause the vowel is slightly lengthened, **עֲשָׂתִּי** Job xxxiii. 4, **רָאִתִּי** Job xlii. 5, **הִיָּתִי**, Ps. xcix. 50, **כִּפְתַּתִּי** Ps. xlv. 16; and so also in the separate form **עֲשָׂת** Lev. xxv. 21, **הִיַת** 2 Kings ix. 37 *kishbbl*, Siloam inscription l. 3, and from derived conjugations **הִרְצַת**, Lev. xxvi. 34, **הִלְאִת** (in pause), Ezek. xxiv. 12, **הִגְלַת**, Jerem. xiii. 19. Far more frequently, however, the Hebrew uses separately the form **עֲשָׂתָה**, **רָאִתָה**, in pause **עֲשָׂתָה**, **רָאִתָה**. Herein there is no great mystery. The language had got accustomed to the form **קָמְלָה**, and as the old **עֲשָׂת** (for **עֲשִׂיַת**) was no longer perspicuous and intelligible, the usual termination **הַ**

was once more appended to it. We ourselves do much the same thing when we say *thou lovest*, with a double pronominal termination, to distinguish this form externally from *he loves* or *loveth*. It is curious, however, to observe the Mandaite using a similar form when he connects the verb with an enclitic, as

הנאתאלה, "it pleased him," גלאתאלכון, "she revealed to you," אתאתאלון, "she came to them." Here הנאתא etc. stand for הנאתאת etc., the final *t* having disappeared as in the ordinary נפאלאלה or נפילאלה, "she fell," compared with the separate ניפלאת.

On the 3rd pers. dual, which occurs only in Arabic, I will merely remark that the masc. form is uncontracted, نَدَوَا, حَلَّوْا رَضِيََا; whereas the fem. is directly derived from the contracted singular. The form in use is رَمَتَا, جَلَّتَا, not, as we should have expected, رَمَاتَا, جَلَاتَا, though these latter are said to occur dialectically. The ear having once got accustomed to رَمَتٌ, the dual was naturally taken from this form, as was قَتَلَتْ from قَتَلَتْ.

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. requires a little more explanation. Reverting to the Ethiopic, we find in use the uncontracted ተለዉ: *taldwū*, ባሐሩ: *bakdyū*, ዕ-ላሁ: *'abyū*; to which correspond in Hebrew the pausal הָסִיּוּ, Deut. xxxii. 37, נָטִיּוּ, Num. xxiv. 6, הִתִּיּוּ, Is. xxi. 14, Jerem. xii. 9; and so too probably, though out of pause, Ps. lxxiii. 2, נָטִיּוּ רַגְלֵי (for *kyshshb*), and Prov. xxvi. 7, [where some copies read] הָלִיּוּ שִׁקִּים מִפֶּסַח (for [the Massoretic] הָלִיּוּ = הָלִיּוּ). More usually, however, contraction takes place in Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic. In Arabic the form varies according to the characteristic vowel; حَلَّوْا becomes حَلَّوْا رَضِيَُوا and حَزَبُوا also become رَضُوا and



and ܩܩܒ. The Arabic, as you may remember, has adopted the form ܩܩܒ instead of the original *katalāna*; whence in this class of verbs we meet, according to the vowel of the 2nd syllable, with the forms ܩܩܒ, ܩܩܒ, ܩܩܒ. The form ܩܩܒ stands for ܩܩܒ, and ܩܩܒ for ܩܩܒ.

In the 2nd pers. sing. masc. the Ethiopic exhibits the oldest form ܩܩܒ: *tultwka*, ܩܩܒ: *bakdyka*, ܩܩܒ: *abayka*, from ܩܩܒ: The contracted form too is common in verbs 3rd *w*, as ܩܩܒ: ܩܩܒ:, much rarer in those 3rd *y*, as ܩܩܒ: Verbs 3rd *y*, of which the 2nd radical is a guttural, weaken the diphthong still further into *t*, as ܩܩܒ: *r'ika*, ܩܩܒ: *r'ika*, from ܩܩܒ: and ܩܩܒ: In classical Arabic the forms are precisely what we should expect from analogy: ܩܩܒ makes ܩܩܒ and ܩܩܒ, ܩܩܒ and ܩܩܒ; but ܩܩܒ and ܩܩܒ make ܩܩܒ and ܩܩܒ. In the modern dialects these words may be pronounced nearly as *t'lot* and *r'met*, which are weakened in the dialect of N. Africa to *l* and *t*, ܩܩܒ *gh'zht* and *r'mt*. Spitta gives the Egyptian forms as *sakét* and *mishlt*. In the Aramaic dialects there is a considerable variety. The Biblical Aramaic of Daniel exhibits ܩܩܒ ii. 41, 43, 45, iv. 17, ܩܩܒ ii. 31, 34, and ܩܩܒ iv. 19 (*kéthibh*, where I do not understand the Massoretic alteration into ܩܩܒ), ܩܩܒ (in some MSS. even ܩܩܒ, with incomprehensible ܩܩܒ or ܩܩܒ) Dan. iv. 27, all with soft *t*, which I do not find it easy to explain; in later books we find ܩܩܒ as well as ܩܩܒ, but in the plural the weaker form ܩܩܒ has prevailed, e.g. ܩܩܒ Dan. ii. 8. Intransitive verbs of the form ܩܩܒ have of course ܩܩܒ, ܩܩܒ. In Syriac only the form ܩܩܒ is used; and from the intransitive ܩܩܒ, ܩܩܒ, ܩܩܒ likewise



with hard *t*, by way of distinction from the 1st pers. **מִבְּיָדָא**. The Mandaic appears to have weakened the original vowels most, for though the plural exhibits the diphthong **קְרֵאִיתוּן**, **דְּרֵאִיתוּן**, more frequently than the weaker **קְרִיתוּן**, **עִתִּיתוּן** (*ē* or *i*?), yet in the singular we find only **קְרִית**, **הוּיִת**, **בִּית** (for **בְּעִית**). Lastly in Hebrew the weakest form of all has prevailed; **בְּנִיתָם**, **בְּנִיתָ**, stand for *banētha*, *b'ulthēm*, and these for *bandyta*, *banaytīm*.

The 1st pers. sing. and plur. deviate but little from the analogy of the 2nd. In G'ēz and Arabic the forms, apart from the pronominal affix, are identical; and in the vulgar dialects the forms are *sakēt*, *sakētud*, *mishēt*, *mishētud*. In Hebrew too **עָשִׂיתִי**, **עָשִׂינוּ**, are the exact counterparts in vocalisation of **עָשִׂיתָ**, standing for 'asdytī, 'asdyntū. The one form **שָׁלוּתִי** is remarkable as corresponding exactly with the Arabic **سَلَوْتُ**.

The Aramaic forms we must notice with a little more detail. The book of Daniel and the Targūms offer us **הוּיִת**, **הוּיִת**, **רְמִינָא**, **בְּעִינָא**, with *ē* for *ai*; the weaker **צְבִית** occurs in Dan. vii. 19; intrans. verbs have naturally the vowel *i*, **סְנִינָא**, **סְנִינָא**. Similarly in Syriac, in the singular, **רֵמְלִתְה** (*rēmliṯh* (eastern) or **רֵמְלִתְה** (*rēmliṯh* (western)); but the plural retains the older diphthong **רֵמְלִתְה** or **רֵמְלִתְה**. Intransitives have always *i*, **מְרִבְתָא**, **מְרִבְתָא**. In Mandaic the usual form is **קְרִית**, **הוּיִת**, **בִּית** (for **בְּעִית**), but whether with *ē* or *i* is uncertain. The plural has not only the weaker form **דְּמִינָא**, **בִּין**, **אֲתִין**, **דְּמִינָא**, but also the stronger diphthongal **מְמִינָא**, **קְרֵאִינָא**, **דְּמִינָא**. Before enclitics the plural exhibits both forms, **קְרֵאִינָא**, **הוּאִינָא**. The singular in the same position has only the weak form, but in two varieties. Firstly, the final **ת** may be rejected, as **קְרִילָה**; or, secondly, the original termination of the 1st person may be restored, **קְרִיתִילָה**, **שְׂרִיתִיבָה**, "I dwelt in it." In the Talmūd

the ordinary form of the 1st pers. sing. has also lost the final *t*, as אָתָּא "I came," כָּעָא "I asked," לָךְ קָרָא לְךָ הִנְנִיא "for thee have I read (the Scriptures), for thee have I repeated" (the Mishnah); but the fuller form is found occasionally both in it and in the Targūms, as אָתָּיתִי, נִלְיָתִי, אָתָּיתִי.

Passing on to the *imperfect*, I will first invite your attention to the forms in Gē'ez of the indic. and subj. In the indic. the original forms must have been *yǝtdlǝwu*, *yǝbdkǝyu*; but the final short vowels were dropped, yielding *yǝtdlǝw*, *yǝbdkǝy*; and the contraction took place, giving as the actual forms in use *yǝtdlǝ*, *yǝbdkǝt*, *yǝwǝt*, 𐩧𐩣𐩪: 3 sing. f. *tǝtalǝwt*, *tǝbakǝyt*; 3 pl. m. *yǝtalǝwǝ*, *yǝbakǝyǝ*. In the subj., which corresponds with the ordinary imperf. of the other Semitic languages, the fuller *yǝtlǝw*, *yǝbdkǝy*, were contracted into *yǝtlǝ*, *yǝbkt*; 3 sing. f. *tǝtlǝwt*, *tǝbktǝyt*; 3 pl. m. *yǝtlǝwǝ*, *yǝbktǝyǝ*. The forms with *a* in the 2nd syllable may be exemplified by *yǝstaw*, *yǝbay*, which become *yǝstau*, *yǝbai*; the former may be further vocalised into *yǝfǝt*.

The form of the Arabic imperfect is, as you remember, identical with that of the Ethiopic subjunctive; Ar. *yǝktulu* = Eth. *yǝktǝl*. We therefore obtain in the imperf. indic. the forms *yǝtluw*, *yǝbkiyu*, *yǝrdayu*. The rejection of the final short vowels reduces these to *yǝtluw*, *yǝbkiy*, *yǝrday*, which then become *yǝtlǝ* *يَتَلَو*, *yǝbkt* *يَبْكِي*, *yǝrdǝ* *يَرْدِي*. The subjunctive differs from the indic. only in its final vowel *a*, instead of *u*; but as the combinations *uwa* and *iya* do not undergo contraction, the forms in use are *yǝtluwa* *يَتَلَو*, and *yǝbkiya* *يَبْكِي*; whereas the combination *aya* becomes first *ay* and then *ǝ*, *yǝrdǝ* *يَرْدِي*, which is therefore indistinguishable from the indic. The corresponding vulgar forms are *yimshǝt* and *yirǝt*. The 3rd Arabic form, the jussive, is marked in the regular verb by the absence of any final vowel, *يَقْتُل*. Hence in verbs 3rd *و* and *ي* the original form must have been *يَتَلَو*, *يَبْكِي*, *يَرْدِي*, which would necessarily become *yǝtlǝ*, *yǝbkt*, *yǝrdǝ*, and thus coincide with the indicative. To obviate

this, the language shortened the final vowels, and the result was the forms *yātlu* يَتَلُّ, *yabki* يَبْكِي, *yarda* يَرَضُّ.

These Arabic forms in their turn cast much light on the corresponding ones in Hebrew. If we regard the word יְגַלֵּה by itself, we might readily suppose that the final vowel *ē* was merely a dulling or obscuration of an older *ū*; that *yiglē* stood for *yiglū*, just as אֶל פָּה stands for אֵל, Ar. *fō*, or אֶל נֶה for אֵל, Ar. *ḏō*. Were this the case, יְגַלֵּה would correspond letter for letter to the Ar.

יְגַלֵּה, יִגְלוּ. Other circumstances, however, militate against this explanation. For instance, if יְגַלֵּה = יִגְלוּ, then the 3rd pl. fem. ought to be הִגְלוּנָה = יִגְלוֹנָה, for *yagluwna*, whereas the form in use is הִגְלוּנָה. And how about יְבַכֶּה = יִבְכִי, and

יְחַיֶּה = יִחַיֵּה *yahyā*? It would seem therefore that in verbs of this class the vowel *a* gained the upper hand in Hebrew as the characteristic vowel of the 2nd syllable; and final *w* everywhere gave place to *y*; so that the oldest Hebrew forms were *yaglay*, *yabkay*, most nearly resembling the Arabic يَرْضَى *yardā* for *yarday*, for the *alif maqṣūra* of the Arabic is represented in Hebrew by the termination הַ. In the jussive this vowel would naturally be shortened to the utmost, whence such words are יִרֵא, וְיִשָּׁב, וְיִבְךְ, וְיִרְד. In course of time, however, as the final letter became absolutely vowelless, a difficulty would be experienced in the utterance of the two consecutive consonants.

Words like יִרֵא, יִשָּׁע, יִחַד, יִבֵן, יִגַל, יִעַש, were unpronounceable by the Hebrew organs, and a supplementary or furtive vowel had to be introduced to facilitate their utterance. Hence such forms as יִרֵא, יִשָּׁע, יִחַד (with hard ד) יִבֵן, יִגַל, יִעַש. In יְחַיֶּה and הִחַי, the jussives יְחִי and הִחִי became יְחִי and הִחִי,

just like the similar nominal forms עֲנִי, פְּכִי, for עֲנִי, פְּכִי. A trace of the original *a* of the first syllable remains, both in verb and noun, in the pausal forms יְחִי, יְחִי, פְּכִי, for the original פְּכִי, יְחִי, יְחִי.

In Aramaic the same form is dominant as in Hebrew, the imperfect being usually of the forms יִבְנֶה or יִבְנֵא, Mand. נִבְנָא. Very remarkable is לְהוּיָא or לְהוּיָא in Ezra and Daniel, with the plur. masc. לְהוּיָא and fem. לְהוּיָא. The verb סָבֹל has also in Syriac a shorter form סָבֹל for the common נִסְבֹּל, and in Mand. Noeldeke gives נִהוּיָא or לְהוּיָא as well as נִהוּיָא or לְהוּיָא. Similar varieties occur in Samaritan, יְחִי, and in Talmudic, לְהוּיָא and נְהִי. In Syriac too the verb סִבְּלָא, "to live," contracts its imperf. into תִּנְבָּא or בִּנְבָּא (for תִּסְבָּא), but in Mand. this does not seem to be the case (נִהוּיָא).

The contractions which the augmented persons of the imperfect undergo, I will illustrate by the 2nd pers. sing. fem. and the 3rd pers. plural.

In Æthiopic no contraction takes place: the 2nd pers. sing. fem. is *tälälwät, t'bakéyt; t'äléwät, t'bbéyät, t'fädwät*; the 3rd pers. plur. masc. *y'älälwät, f. -wät, y'bakéyät -yät; y'äléwät -wät, y'bbéyät -yät, y'ädéyät -yät.*

In the other dialects these forms are more or less contracted.

In Arabic the 2nd pers. sing. fem. is, for example, تَجَلِّينَ from جَلَّ from رَمَى. In the former case, تَجَلِّينَ stands for *tagluwīna*; in the latter, تَرْمِينَ stands for *tarmiynā*. A verb like رَضِيَ gives the form تَرْضَيْنَ, for *tardayna*. The vulgar forms are *timsūt, tirdt*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are תַּעֲשִׂין, תַּעֲשִׂי, תַּרְמִי, תַּרְמִי, תַּרְמִי, תַּרְמִי. Here תַּעֲשִׂין stands for

*ta'saytn*, *tibkt* for *tabkayt*, etc. The Syriac has the advantage over the Hebrew in having the vowel *é* instead of the weaker *é*, *لَحَضَ* for *tabkaytn*.

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. in Arabic has the forms *يَجْلُونَ*, *يِرْضُونَ*. The first of these is contracted from *yagluwūna*, the second from *yarmiyūna*, the third from *yardayūna*. The vulgar forms are *yimshū*, *yirdū*. The corresponding Hebrew form occurs not unfrequently in its uncontracted shape, *יִאֲתוּן*, *יִשְׁלִי*, *יִאֲתוּ*; without final *n*, *יִחֲזוּ*, *יִבְכּוּ*; with a weaker vowel in the 2nd syllable, *יִרְבּוּ* Deut. viii. 13, *יִרְוּ* Ps. xxxvi. 9. These stand for *yabkayūna*, *yarbayūna*, etc. More frequently, however, a still further change takes place: *יִרְבּוּ* becomes *יִרְבוּ*. Hence *יִרְבוּ*, *יִעֲשׂוּ*, *יִרְגּוּ*; *יִחֲזוּ*, *יִבְכוּ*; *יִרְאוּ*. In Syriac the masc. form is *ܢܡܪܘܢܢ* *ܢܡܪܘܢ*, according to the Eastern pronunciation, for *narmayūn*; the Westerns weaken the vowel of the 2nd syllable to *ú*, *nərmūn*, *ܢܡܪܘܢ*. The corresponding Mand. form is written *ܢܝܩܪܘܢ*, *ܢܝܗܘܘܢ*; with an enclitic, *ܢܝܪܡܘܒܗ*; and in Biblical Chaldee we also find *ܝܫܬܘܢ*, *ܝܒܢܘܢ*, *ܝܪܘܢ*.

The 3rd pers. plur. fem. in Arabic is *يَجْلُونَ*, *يِرْضِينَ*; the first of which, according to the norm *يَقْتُلْنَ*, stands for *yagluwna*, the second for *yarmiyna*, the third for *yardayna*. The corresponding Hebrew form is *תִּבְכּוּנָה*, *תִּחֲזִינָה*, *תִּעֲשִׂינָה*, for *ta'sayna*, *tahzayna*, *tabkayna*. The Aramaic preserves here an older shape than the other dialects, and does not contract. In Jewish Aramaic we have *יִגְלִין*, *יִרְזִין* Dan. v. 16; in Syriac *ܢܡܪܘܢܢ*; in Mand. *ܢܝܒܝܝܢ* or *ܢܝܒܝܝܢ* (*ܢܡܪܘܢܢ*), corresponding very closely to the Ethiopic subjunctive *yəbbkəyān*, for *yəbbkəyān*.

Passing on to the imperative, we find the minimum of contraction in the Ethiopic where the masc. sing. is *ṭṭā* (for *ṭṭāw*),

f. *šlšwt*, pl. m. *šlšwš*; *bēkt* (for *bēkty*), f. *bēktyt*, pl. m. *bēktyš*; *'šbai* (for *'šbay*), f. *'šbtyt*, pl. m. *'šbtyš*; *šštau* or *šštš* (for *šštauw*), f. *šštdwt*, pl. m. *šštdwš*. In Arabic the 3rd radical has altogether

disappeared, as in the jussive, and only a vowel remains: *أَجَلْ* *uglu* for *ugluw*, *أِرْمِ* *irmi* for *irmiy*, *أِرْضْ* *irda* for *irday* or *irdā*.

The vulgar forms have the long vowels, *imshī*, *irdā*. The different persons undergo contraction precisely as in the imperfect.

For instance the feminines of the above words are *أَجَلِي* *ugli* for

*ugluwt*, *أِرْمِي* *irmt* for *irmiyt*, and *أِرْضِي* *irday* for *irdayt*; their

plurals masc., *أَجَلُوا* *uglū* for *ugluwš*, *أِرْمُوا* *irmtū* for *irmiyš*, and

*أِرْضُوا* *irdau* for *irdayš*. The vulgar forms are: fem. *imshī*, *irdī*;

plur. *imshū*, *irdū*. In Hebrew the termination of the imperat. sing. masc. is substantially the same as that of the imperfect, but

with a slight lengthening of the vowel, *גַּלֵּה*, *רֵאֵה*, *עֵלֵה*, *הִיֵּה*,

for *gēlai*, etc. This lengthening is sometimes found in the imperfect, especially in pause and with a jussive sense; as *יֵרֵא*

Gen. xli. 33, *יַעֲשֶׂה* Is. lxiv. 3, *אֶל-תְּהִיֵּה* Jerem. xvii. 17. The

sing. fem. is *גִּלִּי*, *עֵשִׂי*, *רֵאִי*, for *gil'yi*, and that for *gēlayt*. The

plur. masc. is found in the oldest form *kāšālū* in such words as

*אָתִינוּ* and *בְּעֵינֵינוּ*; but far more common are words like *הָיוּ*, *עֵשִׂי*,

*רֵאוּ*, *בְּכוּ*, for *bikl'yū*, etc. The corresponding fem. is exemplified

by *רֵאֵנָה*, Cant. iii. 11, for *rē'ayna*, in Arabic *رَيْن* *raina*. In

Syriac we find a very few imperatives with the original diphthong in the 2nd syllable, e.g. *بُكِبْ*, *بُكِبْ*, *بُكِبْ*; and in the

Targūms the punctuation with *l* occurs, *גַּלִּי*; but generally speaking, in Aramaic the sound of *l* prevails. So in Dan. ii. 4,

*חַיִּי*; in Syr. *سَبَبْ*, *سَبَبْ*, *سَبَبْ*; in Mand. *קריא*, *הזיא*. The fem. and plurals retain more of the ancient forms than in Hebrew.

Thus the fem. sing. in Syriac is **ܘܢܩܒ**; in Mand. **קראי, הואי**, and in the Talmūd **קראי** "rejoice," **גבאי** "get thyself paid." Hence it appears that the fem. form **גלי** in the Targūms is to be read **גְּלִי** (and not **גָּלִי**, as indeed we might infer from the variant **גְּלֵא** (for **גְּלֵאי**). The plural masc. in Syriac is **ܘܢܩܒܘ**, for *rēmā'ū*, and that for *rēmā'ūn* **ܘܢܩܒܘܢ**. The Mand. exhibits the contraction **הוון, הרוון**; the Bibl. Aram. the still greater one of **הוּו, אַתוּו**. The corresponding fem. in Syriac is **ܘܢܩܒܝܢ** *rēmāyēn*, for *rēmāyān*, to which answer the Jewish Aram. **רְמַאנָה** or **רְמַן**, and the Mand. **אתיאן**, in Syr. **ܘܢܩܒܝܢ**.

With regard to the infinitive I will merely remark that the Hebrew form **גָּלָה, פָּנָה, הָיוּ, עָשׂוּ**, has lost its 3rd radical. Originally these were words of same form as the Arabic infinitive **بَغَاةٌ, بِنَاةٌ, خَفَاةٌ**, where the 3rd rad. **و** or **ي** appears as a *hamza*. In Hebrew however the *hamza* fell away after the loss of the final vowels, and the preceding *ā* passed as usual into *ō*. The other infinitive **גָּלוּת, בָּנוּת, עָשׂוּת**, stands for *galāth, banāth, by* contraction for *galawat, banayat*; just as in Arabic **صَلَاةٌ** stands for **صَلَوَاتٌ, حَيَاةٌ** for **حَيَوَاتٌ, فِتْيَةٌ** for **فِتْيَانَةٌ**. The Aramaic infinitive with prefixed *m* varies slightly in form in the several dialects. In Bibl. Aramaic we have **מְבַנֵּי, מְבַלֵּי, מְחַוֵּי**, with suff. **בְּמַצְבֵּי**, as contrasted with the Syriac **ܘܢܩܒܝܢ**, with suff. **ܘܢܩܒܝܢ**. In the form **ܘܢܩܒܝܢ** I see the influence of verbs **ܘܢܩܒܝܢ**, as well as in the imperatives of Pa'ēl, Aph'ēl, etc. In Mand. both forms seem to occur, **מִבְּנֵי, מִבְּהֵי**, as well as **מִסְּנֵי, מִרְּבֵי**; and so also in the Talmūd **מְבַעֵי, מְבַעֵי, מְחַוֵּי**, as well as **מִבְּנֵי** "to get paid." There also occurs in Bibl. Aram. the form **מְבַנֵּי** Ezra v. 9, like **מְבַנֵּי** in Targ. Prov. xxv. 27 and

מִשְׁתַּיִן in Targ. Esther v. 14. The form לִבְנֵי or לִבְנָא in Ezra v. 3, 13, is probably corrupt; in any case it must be meant for an infin. Pe'al and not Hithpe'el.

The Arabic participle active has the same form as in the regular verb, but contracted; رَامٍ, رَامٍ, رَامٍ, for رَامِيَّ, رَامِيَّ, رَامِيَّ, fem. رَامِيَّةً, etc. The vulgar form is *baḳt*, *mdslit*, *rdāt*, fem. *baḳiye* or *baḳye* (with short *a*), etc. The Aramaic has preserved an older form *kdal*, instead of the prevalent *kdil*; e.g. in Biblical Aramaic עָנָה, שָׁתָה, plur. פְּנִין, שְׁתִּין, fem. דְּמִיָּה, plur. שְׁנִין; in Syriac ܩܘܠܝܢܝܬܝܢ, fem. ܩܘܠܝܢܝܬܝܢ; and in Mandaitic באיין, הראזיין. The form פְּנִין, ܩܘܠܝܢܝܬܝܢ, for *bdnaytn*, is analogous to the Hebrew plurals מַיִם, שָׁמַיִם, for *maytm* and *shamayim*, and is probably due to an effort to preserve the consonant power of the *yōd* unimpaired. Similar to the Aramaic is the Hebrew form, which appears in its integrity in the proper name חוּזִי; but ordinarily *ai* has passed into *z*, and we get the form חוּזָה, רְעָה, construct חוּזָה, רְעָה, like שָׂרָה, שָׂרָה, שָׂרָה. The corresponding fem. is exemplified by פָּרָת, רְעָה, זֹנָה, which stand for *pārayat*, *rā'ayat*, *sdnayat*. The fem. עֲמִיָּה, Cant. i. 7, is like the Aramaic דְּמִיָּה, or it may rather be taken as = Arabic جَالِيَّةً, with *i* in the 2nd syllable; if so, the other form לְמִיָּה, פְּרִיָּה, רְמִיָּה, פְּנִיָּה, is only a slight variation, with emphatic utterance of the 3rd radical.

The passive participle of the Hebrew presents the regular form *kāṭil*, פְּנוּי, עֲשׂוּי, fem. פְּנוּיָה, עֲשׂוּיָה, with *i* at the end, whether the third radical be really *i* or *l*. The final radical is sometimes rejected, עָפּוּ, צָפּוּ, which some derive from עֲשׂוּי, עָפּוּ, others from עֲשׂוּי, צָפּוּ. The original *w* reappears in the two plurals כְּלִיבִיּוֹת, נְמִיבִיּוֹת, 1 Sam. xxv. 18, and נְמִיבִיּוֹת, Is. iii. 16.



In Esther ii. 9 **הַרְאִיּוֹת** seems to be a mistake for **הַרְאִיּוֹת**, which is found in some MSS. and editions. The corresponding Aramaic participle has the form **בְּנִה**, **חֹזֶה**, **מְנִיא**, **שָׂרִיא**; Syr. **ܘܢܝܐ**, Mand. **ܗܘܝܐ**; the plur. is **ܫܪܝܢ** Dan. iii. 25, in Syr. **ܗܘܝܢ**; the fem. **ܫܪܝܢܐ**, **ܫܪܝܢܐ**. The form would seem then to be that of adjectives like **مُضَلَّ**, **مُهْطَلَّ**; **مُضَلَّ** (or **مُضَلَّ**), **مُضَلَّ**; **مُضَلَّ**, **مُضَلَّ**; which spring from an original *katāl* or *katil*, like **بَطْلٌ** "brave," **حَسَنٌ** "handsome," **جَدَلٌ** "glad," **دَنَسٌ** "dirty." The nearest Arabic equivalent would be **شَجِيحٌ** "in grief," **رَدِيحٌ** "perishing," for **شَجِيحٌ**, **رَدِيحٌ**, but either the Aramaic words had *a* in the second syllable, or the termination was influenced by that of the active participle. On this supposition **בְּנִה** would stand for *banay*, plur. **בְּנִי** for *banayln*, fem. **בְּנִי** for *banaya*, *banayat*. Lastly, the Arabic passive participle has the form *maḥtāl*, and therefore appears in these verbs as **مَرْصِي**, **مَرْصِي**. In the case of **مَرْصِي**, **مَرْصِي**, the influence of the final *y* has sufficed to transform the original *ḥ* of **مَرْصِي**, into *ḥ*. The vulgar forms may be exemplified by **مَهْدِي** *mahdīy*<sup>m</sup>, which has become *māhdī*, fem. *māhdīye*, plur. *māhdīyln*.

In treating of the derived conjugations I can be somewhat more brief<sup>1</sup>.

In the intensive or Pi"ēl the Ethiopic form alone is pure in the third person of the perfect: **ሐለገው**: *hallāwa*, "watch,"

<sup>1</sup> [Of the sketch of the derived conjugations of these verbs there is, among Prof. Wright's papers, only a rough draft in pencil, not going beyond the intensive or Pi"ēl. There are indications in the MS. that the writer intended to add, in a separate paragraph, some remarks on the other derived conjugations; but, as these are for the most part constructed on exactly the same model as the Pi"ēl, it has seemed sufficient to refer to them from time to time, in the course of the discussion of the intensive, by foot-notes or insertions within square brackets.]

חלפ: *hallāya*, "meditate," חלפ: *hassāwa*, "lie," ו יפ: *sannāya*, "be beautiful," ופ: *hallāwa* "become, be," contracted ופ *hallā*<sup>1</sup>. The Arabic exhibits ی for ו in the 3rd pers. sing., not only here, but throughout all the derived conjugations; جَلِيَ for *gallaya*, whence plur. masc. جَلَوْا for *gallayā*, fem. جَلَيْنَ. The vulgar form of the plur. masc. would be *gallā*. In Hebrew we find similar forms prevailing, viz. גָּלָה for *gallaya*, גָּלָו for *gallayā* [Niph'al גָּלְלוּ plur. גָּלְלוּ, and so forth]. In Aramaic the vowel of the first syllable has been retained intact, but that of the second has been weakened to the utmost, the resulting form being in Bibl. Aram. מְנִי רְבִי, רְבִי מְנִי [Haph'el מְנִי רְבִי, רְבִי מְנִי from מְנִי, etc.], Syr. مَنِي, مَنِي, Mand. מְנִי, מְנִי for *mannaya*, etc., [and so throughout the other derived conjugations]. The lengthening of the final vowel by the complete vocalisation of the radical *y* has affected the form of the 3rd plur. masc., which is now שְׁנִי, שְׁנִי; Syr. مَنِي, مَنِي; the Mand. however gives us מְנִי, מְנִי for *shannayāna*. Of the 3rd plur. fem. there are no examples in Biblical Aramaic. The Syriac form is مَنِي, shortened from مَنِي from an original *rabbayān(a)*; Mand. [Aph'el] מְנִי, מְנִי = مَنِي.—The 3rd sing. fem. of the Arabic is جَلَتْ for *gallayat*, which appears in Hebrew (before suffixes) as *gillath*, e.g. גִּלְתִּי, צִנְתִּי, or, with slight tone-lengthening of the vowel גִּלְתִּי. The ordinary form in Hebrew of course is כִּפְתָּה, כִּפְתָּה, with double termination. The Aramaic inflects regularly, مَنِي for *rabbayat*, Mand. מְנִי, מְנִי. The Targūms give, it is true, the forms מְנִי, מְנִי, but this punctuation seems as doubtful as

<sup>1</sup> [And so in the other derived conjugations *dāwa*, *dāya*, *tafāwa*, *tafāya*, etc.; so that the whole inflexion of the perfects is the same as in the strong verb.]

in the 1st conjugation. The 2nd pers. always retains the diphthong in Arabic, جَلَيْتَ *gallaita* for *gallayta*, of which the vulgar form would be *gillét*. In Hebrew the vowel is weakened to *é*, צוֹיֶת, כְּפִיֶת, fem. נְלִיֶת, plur. masc. כְּבִלֵיֶתם, עוֹיֵתם, but the older *é* is sometimes retained in the first pers., e.g. נְקִיִּי, קְצִיִּי, נְלִיִּי and נְלִיִּי, צוֹיִי and צוֹיִי. In Biblical Aramaic the only form that occurs is מְנִיֶת, Dan. iii. 12. Syriac distinguishes the second person *نُضِبَ* (plur. *نُضِبُوا*) by giving it hard *t*, while the first person is *نُضِبِ* with soft *t*<sup>1</sup>. The former word was originally *rabbaita*, the latter *rabbaiti*, and so the reason for the different treatment of the two cases lies merely in the wish to differentiate the later forms. Whether the same rule applies to the Mand. זאכית, שאנית, מטית, we cannot tell; probably not, as the Targūms seem to make the difference in the vowels, נְלִיֶת fem. נְלִיֶת, but נְלִיֶת, נְלִיֶת, supposing the punctuation to be correct<sup>2</sup>.

In Ethiopic the form of the subjunctive mood of the imperfect is ደረረ: ሃላላላላ, የሀላላላ: ሃላላላ, ደረረ: ሃላላላ, የሀላላላ: ሃላላላ for *-nēw*, *-lēy*. The corresponding indicative, 3rd pers. sing., in Arabic is يَجَلِي by regular contraction for يَجَلِي,

<sup>1</sup> [In the other derived conjugations the older *é* occurs also in the second person. In the Niph'al it is commoner than *t*, and in the perfects of Po'el and Hoph'al *é* is never thinned to *t* before consonantal affixes.]

<sup>2</sup> [So in all the derived conjugations, as in the intransitive form of Pe'al; *supra*, p. 261 sq.]

<sup>3</sup> [This distinction is not uniformly carried out in the printed texts; e.g., in the first person, the Bomberg editions have צִלִּיתִי Ps. xxx. 3 (Nebiensis צִלִּיתִי, אֲחִיִּי Deut. xxxiv. 4 (where the same pronunciation is indicated by means of the Babylonian vowels in the ms. of the Brit. Mus. used by Merx, *Chrest. Targ.* p. 54), side by side with אֲחִיִּי Gen. xxxi. 39, Deut. xxvi. 10 (where the edition of Sabbioneta, according to Berliner, has אֲחִיִּי, but Compl. agrees with Bomb.), אֲחִיִּי Ezek. xvi. 3. These examples shew how precarious are the rules formulated in ordinary "Chaldee" grammars, which for the most part are not even based on the fundamental editions of the Targūms.]

according to the norm يَقْتَلُ, the preceding *kasr* changing every *w* into *y*. We are therefore surprised to find in Hebrew יִגְלָה instead of יִגְלִי. I can only explain this by supposing that it is due to an effort at uniformity. We found reason to suppose that the *a*-form prevailed in the first conjugation; and it is in its proper place in the passives: יִגְלָה for *yagullay*, Ar. يَجَلِّي; יִגְלָה for *yahuglay*, Ar. يَجَلِّي<sup>1</sup>; whence, I imagine, it spread to the *Pi'el*, [*Hiph'il*], and *Niph'al*, giving יִגְלָה instead of יִגְלִי, Ar. يَجَلِّي [יִגְלָה] instead of יִגְלִי, Ar. يَجَلِّي, and יִגְלָה instead of יִגְלִי, Ar. يَجَلِّي. As regards the plural of the imperfect we find in Hebrew examples of uncontracted forms, תִּדְרְמוּן, Is. xl. 18, תִּדְרְמוּנֵי, *ibid.* ver. 25, ch. xlvi. 5, יִבְסִמוּ, Exod. xv. 5; but the ordinary form is יִגְלוּ, Arabic يَجْلُونَ, *yugallūna*, for *yugalliyūna*. A similarly uncontracted participle is the Pu'al מִמְחִים in Isa. xxv. 6. The shortened or jussive form of the Imperfect is in Arabic يَجَلِّ, to which correspond closely the Hebrew יִצוּ, Deut. xxviii. 8, תִּצְוּ, תִּצְוֶה, Ps. cxli. 8<sup>2</sup>.

The Aramaic form of the Imperfect differs from the Hebrew,

<sup>1</sup> [In like manner תִּגְלָה corresponds to يَتَجَلِّي.]

<sup>2</sup> [Similarly in the *Hiph'il* the forms without a helping vowel יִצַּח, יִצַּק, יִצַּח correspond to the Arabic يَجَلِّ, while the forms with a helping vowel like יִצְחַל, יִצְחַק stand for *yagħ, ya'ħ, as*, in the case of nouns, מִלְכָּךְ, נַעַר stand for *malik, na'ar*. In the *Hithpa'el* the Jussive is יִתְחַלְלֵךְ for *yithgall*, pl. יִתְחַלְלוּ, in pause יִתְחַלְלוּ, 2 Sam. xiii. 6, and so without pause תִּתְחַלְלֶךְ, Deut. ii. 9, 19 (under the influence of the virtually doubled guttural), also יִתְחַלְלוּ. The *Pi'el* הִשְׁתַּחֲוּהוּ has Jussive יִשְׁתַּחֲוּהוּ for *ishthachūhu*.]

being in Biblical Aramaic **יְמַחָא**, **יְבַלֵּא**, often written with י= in the Targūms; [and this *šērē* runs through all the conjugations], while *seghol* appears in the termination only a very few times in pause, as **אֲחֻוּהָ**, Dan. ii. 24, **נִרְחֻהָ**, Dan. ii. 4,—a doubtful punctuation. The plural is **יְבַעֲוּ**, **יְשַׁנְוּ**. The Syriac and Mandaic forms are nearly identical, viz. **نَبْضًا**, pl. **نَبْضَف**; **נִירְאֵינָא**, **נִישַׁאנֵינָא**, pl. **נִירְאֵלָוּ**, **נִישַׁאנֵוּ**. In Biblical Aramaic the final *šērē* is however shortened with suffixes into **יְרַחֲנֵי**, Dan. v. 7, and **יְרַחֲנֵהָ**, Dan. ii. 11, which might raise a doubt whether א=, י= arises out of *ai*, as in Hebrew, or out of *i*. I prefer the former view because of the plural **יְשַׁנְוּ**, and because the participle is **מְצַלֵּא**, Dan. vi. 11, with the plural **מְצַלֵּינָוּ**, Ezra vi. 10, Syr. **صَوَّجِب**, **صَوَّجِلَا**, which could only arise out of *mēšallaytn* not *mēšalliytn*. The striving after unity of termination in the same part of the different verbal forms has here been pushed to its utmost.

The Imperative has in Ethiopic the form **ፈሎ**: *fānūh*, **ፈለ**: *šāllū* for *fannēw*, *šallēy*; fem. **ፈሎዮ**: *fannēwōt*, **ፈለዮ**: *šallēyt*; plur. masc. **ፈሎው**: *fannēwōt*, **ፈለው**: *šallēyōt*. In Arabic the corresponding form has a short vowel in the singular, **جَلِّ** for *galliy*, but the feminine is **جَلِّي** for *galliyt*, and the plural masc. **جَلُّوا** for *galliyōt*. Identical herewith is the shorter Hebrew form **צוּ**, **צוּן**, Ps. lxi. 8, **צוּל**, Ps. cxix. 18, 22, **צוּם**, Dan. i. 12, for *šawwi* etc. The longer and commoner form **צוּהָ**, **צוּהָה**, has arisen under the combined influence of the Qal **צוּהָ** and the normal **קַיִמַל**.—In the Aramaic dialects similar forms prevail. The Bibl. Aram. yields the form **מְנֵי** for **מְנֵי**, Ezr. vii. 25. In the Targūms you will find both **נְגַלֵּי** and **נְגַלֵּי**, but the former is probably correct. So in Mand. **זאכניא**, **דארכניא**; in the Talmūd **שני** “change,”

"remove," in Samaritan  $\text{לָּ}$ , in modern Syriac  $\text{فُفَّ}$ ,  $\text{فُفَّ}$ ,  $\text{sāpī}$  for  $\text{sappī}$ . In ancient Syriac alone do we encounter a different form  $\text{لָּ}$ , which is probably owing to the influence of verbs  $\text{לָּ}$ , which would naturally have this vowel<sup>1</sup>. The fem. in Syriac is  $\text{لָּ}$ , in the Targūms  $\text{לָּ}$  for  $\text{לָּ}$ ; the plur. m. in Syriac is  $\text{לָּ}$ , in the Targūms  $\text{לָּ}$ , Mand.  $\text{כאסון}$ ,  $\text{דאכון}$ ; the plur. fem. in Syriac  $\text{לָּ}$  for  $\text{gallydn}$ , in the Targūms  $\text{לָּ}$ .

The Infinitive is remarkable for the variety of its forms. In Arabic the preference is given to the form  $\text{تَقَدَّ}$ , the real origin of which I explained to you before [*supra*, p. 204]; thus  $\text{تَسْلِيَةٌ}$ ,  $\text{تَعَزِيَةٌ}$ , which become in vulgar Arabic, under the influence of the accent,  $\text{taslīye}$ ,  $\text{ta'sīye}$ ,  $\text{tarbīye}$ . In Hebrew the usual form of the inf. abs. is  $\text{קָה}$ ,  $\text{בָּלָה}$ , according to the norm  $\text{קָטַל}$  [and similarly Hiph.  $\text{הִגִּילָה}$ , Hoph.  $\text{הִגִּילָה}$  on the norm  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$ ,  $\text{הִקְטִיל}$ ], but  $\text{קָה}$  occurs in Ps. xl. 2, which was originally

<sup>1</sup> [As in the infinitive Pe'al  $\text{فُفَّ}$ ; see p. 268, *supra*. An original *gally* (with *a* in the last syllable, according to the principle of effort after uniformity of termination explained in the text) would give *gall'*, *gall'*, but an original *malla'* (from  $\text{مَلَّ}$  =  $\text{مَلَّ}$ ) might naturally become *malla*. Now, in Syriac, verbs  $\text{لָּ}$  (with a very few exceptions in the intensive stem, such as  $\text{فُفَّ}$  and  $\text{فُفَّ}$ ) have become entirely fused with verbs  $\text{لָּ}$  and  $\text{لָּ}$ , and in the main it is the latter class of verbs that have prevailed to determine the form of the verbal inflexions. But in the inf. Pe'al and also in the imperatives Pa'el, Aph'el and Ethpa'al ( $\text{لָּ}$ ,  $\text{لָּ}$ ,  $\text{لָּ}$ ) the  $\text{لָּ}$  form may be supposed to have prevailed. The imperative Ethpe'el on the other hand has the unweakened termination *ay*  $\text{لָּ}$ , in Eastern Syriac  $\text{لָּ}$  *athgal*, with transposition of the vowel and double silent  $\text{ب}$ . Duval, p. 193. thinks that the imperatives in *ā*, to which must be added a single Pe'al form,  $\text{لָּ}$  "come," are relics of the energetic form in *an*, *ā*; cf. p. 195 *supra*.]

*ḡawwā*, corresponding to the Arabic form (with weakened vowel) *ḡittā*. The inf. const. is גָּלוּת, חִיּוּת, בְּלוּת, formed as an intensive from the *Kal* גָּלוּת etc.; originally therefore *ḡallāth*. In Aramaic the different dialects vary considerably. The Targūms have גָּלָאָה [with suf. גְּלִיּוּת]; Aph'el in Biblical Aramaic רִשְׁנָיָה, Targumic רִשְׁנָאָה and so forth], the Talmūd Babli אֲסִיּוּי, אֲסִיּוּי, Mand. אֲסִיּוּי, אֲסִיּוּי, which form sometimes occurs in the later Targūms, e.g. רִצְיִי. In these dialects forms with prefixed *m* sometimes occur, e.g. Mand. מִישְׁאֲנִיּוּי; and the same prefix appears in the Syriac forms مَكْنَنُه constr. مَكْنَنُكُم, [Aph'el مَكْنَنُه and so forth, which, apart from the initial *m*, are of the same type as the Biblical and Targumic forms].

The active participle is in Arabic مَجَلِّ for *mugalliy*<sup>m</sup>, the passive مَجَلِّي for *mugallay*<sup>m</sup>. Here all is clear and distinct, as also in Hebrew מְגַלֵּה, מְגַלָּה. But in Aramaic a considerable amount of confusion has been introduced by the unlucky assimilation of active and passive forms. Thus the absolute singular masc. مَجَلِّ, مَجَلِّي, مَجَلِّ is, it is true, sufficiently distinct from the passive مَجَلِّي, مَجَلِّ, but all the other forms are hopelessly confounded, and can only be distinguished with the help of the context. [Similarly in the causative stem the Arabic active part. مَجَلِّ and the passive مَجَلِّي, the Hebrew active מְגַלֵּה and the passive מְגַלָּה are clearly distinguished, but in Syriac the active مَكْنَنُ and the passive مَكْنَنُ assume identical forms with inflexional additions, مَكْنَنُكُم, مَكْنَنُكُم etc.]

[*Appendix. Verbs of which one radical is an Ḥ.*

Here we must distinguish, in general, between forms in which the **Ḥ** retains its original force as a guttural consonant (*hamza*) and forms in which the **Ḥ** is weakened or disappears, according to the principles laid down above, pp. 44 *sqq.* In the former case there is no irregularity, properly so called, though the **Ḥ** exerts the usual influence of a guttural on neighbouring vowels; in the latter case weak forms arise, some of which can be at once explained by the general rules at pp. 44 *sqq.*, while others involve also the operation of the law of analogy, and the influence of weak verbs of the class that have a } or ' among their radicals.

In Ethiopic verbs a radical **Ḥ** is throughout treated as a guttural. Similarly in Arabic verbs a radical *hamza* commonly remains consonantal in all positions (except where two *hamzas* come together in the same syllable) and the inflexion is essentially regular, though a certain tendency to soften the guttural pronunciation in the direction of و or ي, under the influence of an *u* or *i* immediately preceding or following the *hamza*, is indicated by the orthographic rules which bid us write

باس<sup>١</sup> for بوس<sup>١</sup>,  
 يائثر<sup>١</sup> for يائثر<sup>١</sup>, يائس<sup>١</sup> for يئوس<sup>١</sup> etc. For the details of these rules it is sufficient to refer to the Arabic Grammar. Further weakenings of a radical *hamza*, involving the entire disappearance of the consonant or its conversion into *w* or *y*, occur in old Arabic in certain parts of very common verbs, or, sporadically, under the influence of metrical necessity. It is recorded that in the time of Moḥammed the people of the Ḥijāz retained the guttural force of *hamza* less firmly than many other tribes, and to the influence of the Ḥijāzi pronunciation may be ascribed such readings in the

Ḥor'an as ياتي<sup>١</sup>, مومين<sup>١</sup> for *ya'ti*, *mu'min*<sup>1</sup>. In modern Arabic the

<sup>1</sup> In all cases where radical Ḥ is represented by و<sup>١</sup>, ي<sup>١</sup> or simple ʾ the consonants, taken by themselves, indicate a pronunciation in which the radical has ceased to be heard as a guttural; and this is very intelligible if we remember that the laws of Arabic orthography are mainly based on the text of the Ḥor'an, which was first written down in the Ḥijāz, and without ʾ or other diacritical points. But as regards



weakening of *hamsa* has gone much further, so that, for example, verbs *tertiæ hamsatæ* are entirely merged in verbs *tertiæ* **י**. The extreme is reached in the Aramaic dialects, where consonantal **ח** is maintained only as an initial or between two full vowels. The Hebrew holds a middle position between the Arabic and the Aramaic, but there is reason to think that at the time when the oldest Biblical Books were written it retained the consonantal force of **ח** much more fully than the Massoretic tradition admits. (See below, p. 284.) Of the details a brief sketch will suffice.

A. *Verbs ח"ב*. In the perfect of the simple stem **ח** is initial, and retains its guttural force, so that the inflexion is essentially regular. In Syriac initial **ח** demands a full vowel instead of a mere vocal *shewâ*, and in the perfect this vowel is commonly *e*, אָפֵּן, with the same thinning of the original *a* as in the fem. אָפֵּן, אָפֵּן. But in some verbs the Eastern Syrians have the older and stronger pronunciation אָפֵּן, אָפֵּן, אָפֵּן. In Mandaitic also the vowel of the first syllable is generally *a*, אַמַּר, and so too in the fem. we have אַמַּר, אַמַּר as well as אַמַּר, אַמַּר. In Biblical Aramaic the vowel appears to be shorter, אַמַּר, אַמַּר. In Syriac a few verbs assume in the perfect the form of verbs אָפֵּן, אָפֵּן, אָפֵּן, אָפֵּן.

In the imperfect the Arabic has يَأْكُلُ, يَأْكُلُ, to which such

the pronunciation of the text the influence of the *Ḥijāz* was limited, and most readers preserved something of the guttural sound in very many cases where there was nothing to indicate this in the consonantal text. The insertion of the sign <sup>2</sup> is therefore a sort of corrective, warning the careful reader to retain, in spite of the consonants, at least a trace of the original guttural.

<sup>1</sup> So too אָפֵּן, for עָרַץ = *عرض*. The Western Syrians write אָפֵּן, and even אָפֵּן, the **א** before **ע** being pronounced by them as **ח**.

<sup>2</sup> A fuller vowel, **ח**, **ח**, is given in mss. and early editions of the Targums and even in some copies of the Bible; but these forms, and others to be mentioned below, with **ח**, **ח** instead of a *hateph*, are now explained as due to transcription from mss. with Assyrian punctuation in which there were no distinctive signs for the *hatephs*.

Hebrew forms as **אָמַר**, **תִּאמַר** closely correspond. But in Heb., where the **א** retains its guttural force, the pronunciation is usually facilitated by the insertion of a *hatephi* or a short vowel, **אָמַרְתִּי**, **אָמַרְתָּ**, 2 fem. **תִּאמְרִי** etc. By this means the radical **א** may remain consonantal even in the first person, **אָמַרְתִּי**, whereas in

Arabic **أَكَل** necessarily becomes **أَكَلُ** *akulu*, because two hamzas cannot be pronounced in one syllable. The same contraction sometimes appears in old Arabic in the other persons, and in modern Arabic the pronunciation *yakul*, *yamur* is the rule. Similarly Hebrew **אָמַרְתָּ**, **אָמַרְתִּי**, **אָמַרְתִּי** form the imperfects **אָמַרְתָּ**, **אָמַרְתִּי** etc.; *ay*-standing as usual for *ya*-. The first persons are written **אָמַרְתִּי** etc. with a single **א**, which probably indicates that the contraction began, as in Arabic, with the part in which two hamzas came together. King Mēsha' also writes **ואמר**, "and I said," l. 24, (אָמַרְתָּ) l. 11, 20, but **ואמר** l. 6, 14. The *ʿ* of the second radical, which becomes *a*, *ʿ* in current discourse or with retracted accent, **אָמַרְתָּ**, **אָמַרְתִּי**, **אָמַרְתִּי**, extends through all these verbs, and similarly **אָמַרְתָּ** makes **אָמַרְתָּ** and **אָמַרְתִּי**; **אָמַרְתָּ**, **אָמַרְתִּי** and **אָמַרְתָּ** (with omission of the **א**). In all these cases the broader prefix seems to have thinned the *u*, *o* of the second radical to *i*, *e*, a vowel which the Hebrew imperfect usually avoids. Similar forms from stative verbs with imperfect *a* are **אָמַרְתָּ**, Mal. i. 2, **אָמַרְתָּ** (for **אָמַרְתָּ**), 2 Sam. xx. 5, *Kēzē*; but beside these we find also **אָמַרְתָּ**, Prov. viii. 17, **אָמַרְתָּ**, Gen. xxxii. 5, and probably **אָמַרְתָּ**, 2 Sam. xx. 5 *Kēthibl*, with similar forms from **אָמַרְתָּ** and **אָמַרְתָּ**. Those from the two last verbs may be mere Aramaisms; the others seem to be genuine Hebrew forms and may be compared with the dialectic Arabic **أَتَمَّ** from **أَتَمَّ**.

In the Aramaic imperfect (and inf.) the contraction into *ʿ* (for *a*, *a'*, as in the particle **אָ** = **אָ**, *na'*) is universal; Jewish Ar.

יֵאמַר, יֵאָכֵל, inf. יֵאָמַר etc., Syr. ܘܢܝܡܪ, ܘܢܝܚܠ. But in verbs imperfect *a* the West Syrians further thin *l* to *t*; thus ܘܢܝܡܪ, ܘܢܝܚܠ are in the East *ne'mar*, *me'mar*, but in the West *ntmar*, *mtmar*.

The Arabic imperative is necessarily **اِيسِرْ** not **اِئْسِرْ** not **اِوَمَلْ** not **اِوَمَلْ**. Three verbs commonly reject the first radical, **اَمْرٌ**, **اَخَذَ**, **اَكَلَ**, making **مَرٌ**, **خَذَ**, **اَكَلَ**, whence in vulgar Arabic we even find the perfects *had* and *kal*. So from **اَتَى** we have **اَيْت** and **ت**, in pause **تِ**. A similar apocope takes place in Syriac in the imperatives ܘܠ "come" and ܘܟܘ "go".<sup>1</sup> Apart from these anomalous forms the only point to be noted about the Syriac imperative is that the full vowel necessarily assumed by the initial **ܐ** is *a* before *ð* but *e* before *a*, ܘܢܝܡܪ, ܘܢܝܚܠ—a distinction which does not appear to be carried out in the other dialects of Aramaic. In Biblical Aramaic and Targumic, as in Hebrew, a *hateph* commonly takes the place of a full vowel; yet we find in the Targums such forms as **אֵימַר**, **אֵיכֹל**, and even in Hebrew the plurals **אֵמְרוּ** and **אֵכְלוּ**. In the passive participle the Syriac has **ܘܢܝܡܪ**, but in Dan. iii. 22 we have **אֵימַר**.

In the reflexive of the simple stem the Arabic **اِيتَرَّ**, imperfect **يَاتِرُّ**, perf. pass. **اَوْتِرَّ**, requires no explanation. But the verb **اَخَذَ** makes **اِتَّخَذَ**, and so also we find **اِتَّرَّ** as well as **اَيْتَرَّ**

<sup>1</sup> But **اَمَلٌ** and **اَمَلٌ** and so forth. So also **اَمَرٌ** as well as **مَرٌ**, but **وَكَلٌ** and **وَكَلٌ**.

<sup>2</sup> Talm. B. **אָמַר**, **אָכַל**; but in Bibl. Aram. **אֵמַר**, Ezra v. 15 (in the Targums **אֵמַר**, Numb. xxii. 35, Compl., Bomb.); **אֵכֹל**, Dan. iii. 26 (in the Targums **אֵכֹל**, **אֵכֹל**).

as well as **اَيْتَجَر**, and more rarely a few other cases of the same kind. Similarly in Aramaic **אִתְחַד**, **אִתְחַדְתִּי** with sporadic cases of the same kind in other verbs. The ordinary Syriac reflexive is **אִתְחַד**, fem. **אִתְחַדְתִּי**, by the general rule of Syriac that | gives up its vowel to a vowelless consonant and disappears in pronunciation. In the Targums this elision seems not to take place and the forms are regular. In the intensive stem the | in Syriac also mostly surrenders its vowel and is elided after prefixes with a vanishing vowel: imperf. **אִתְחַד** for *n'akkal* (1st person **אִתְחַד**) part. **אִתְחַדְתִּי** etc. Similar forms are found, though less consistently, in Jewish Aramaic and occasionally in Hebrew, **וַתְחַדְתִּי**, 2 Sam. xxii. 40, for **וַתְחַדְתִּי**, Ps. xviii. 40, **מִלְחָמָה**, Job xxxv. 11, and so forth. In Aramaic the extensive stem (Aph'el and Shaph'el with their reflexives) passes wholly over into the forms of verbs **פָּ**, except in the two verbs **הִימַן**, **הִסְפֵּן** and **הִימַן**, **הִסְפֵּן**, Palmyrene **אִתְחַד**, De Vog. 15, l. 4, **אִתְחַד**, where the א becomes י; compare the Hebrew imper. Hiph. **הִתְחַדְתִּי**, Jer. xii. 9, and the part. **מִיָּן** "giving ear," Prov. xvii. 4. The Hebrew forms are generally regular, but in a few cases we find the contraction of אִתְ into *d*, as **אִתְחַד**, Hosea xi. 4, and so in the Niph'al **נִתְחַדְתִּי**, Numb. xxxii. 30, or even into *d*, **נִתְחַדְתִּי**, Numb. xi. 25, **נִתְחַדְתִּי**, 1 Sam. xv. 5. The passage of אִתְ into |, which plays so large a part in Syriac, is sometimes found also in the Arabic verb, but in a different connexion and mainly in the later language. Thus *a'd* often becomes *awd*, **تَوَامَرُوا** for **تَأَمَرُوا** "they deliberated together," and so too initial *'d* sometimes becomes *wal* in stem III., **وَأَكَل** for **أَكَل**. In modern Egyptian Arabic we even find *wakkil* for **أَكَل**, perf. of **أَكَل** II.

B. *Verbs* א"י. In Ethiopic, Arabic and Hebrew the forms are generally strong throughout; and strong forms are also common in Eastern Syriac<sup>1</sup>. But in Arabic these verbs are sometimes assimilated to hollow verbs, or, when the hamza begins a syllable and is preceded by a vowelless consonant, it is elided and throws back its vowel on the consonant before it. This happens mainly with the verb سَأَلَ "ask," from which we have such forms as سَأَلَ, سَأَلْتِ, سَأَلْتِ, or more frequently, with elision, يَسَلُّ. Similarly the common يَرَى for يَرَى "he will see," and a few others. In Western Syriac the elision of ʾ is the rule, whether at the beginning or end of a syllable, unless it stands between two full vowels; but the otiant letter is generally allowed to remain in writing; thus perf. Peal ܦܠܐ (E. Syr. ܦܠܐ), imperf. ܦܥܠܐ, pl. ܦܥܠܘܢ (E. Syr. ܦܥܠܐ, pl. ܦܥܠܘܢ, where the subscript line denotes a kind of vocal *shewa*), Ethpe'el ܦܥܠܐܘܠܐ (E. Syr. ܦܥܠܐܘܠܐ), 1st pers. ܦܥܠܐܘܠܐ, and so forth. When the first or third radical is an aspirate we sometimes find forms like ܦܥܠܐܘܠܐ, where the hardening of the aspirate represents an older doubling, presumably due to assimilation of the ʾ. In Biblical Aramaic the א maintains itself, as in E. Syriac, and so apparently in the Targums. In the latter א may pass into ʾ when it is doubled, e.g. ܦܥܠܐܘܠܐ (ܦܥܠܐ) Pa"el of ܦܥܠܐ. So too many Syrians pronounced ܦܥܠܐ as *bayeshi*, and the verb ܦܥܠܐ forms the Pa"el ܦܥܠܐ; but in the latter case it is the form of the P'el that is secondary. The transition of verbs א"י to hollow verbs, of which we have found some examples in Arabic, prevails within the Aramaic field in

<sup>1</sup> See for the Syriac Nestle in *Beitr. sur Assyriologie*, i. 153 sqq. (where however in Nöldeke's judgment the case is overstated, and insufficient weight is given to the numerous instances in which the ancient Nestorian Massora (of A.D. 899) forbids the ʾ to be pronounced). All Syriac verbs of this class are stative in form. In Hebrew the only cases of contraction are ܦܥܠܐ pl. of the Pi'el ܦܥܠܐ (if this is not rather an old Niph'al from ܦܥܠܐ) and possibly ܦܥܠܐ, Eccles. xii. 5.

Mandaïtic. A transition to N<sup>o</sup>D sometimes occurs in Syriac, e.g. ܐܠܘܢܘܬܐ, ܐܠܘܢܐ (from ܡܠܐ), ܢܘܠܝܬ, Ps. xli. 2; but most forms of this kind are only graphical errors.

C. *Verbs* N<sup>o</sup>L. Here the tendency of the languages, completely carried out in vulgar Arabic, and almost completely in Aramaic, is to entire assimilation with verbs N<sup>o</sup>L. In the intensive stem of a very few Syriac verbs a final ܠ, though it is no longer actually pronounced, retained its guttural force to so late a date that the forms are still ܚܘܠܐ, ܐܠܘܢܐ, ܠܘܠܐ (with *a* for *e* in the last syllable under the influence of the guttural), and are commonly inflected regularly, except that the ܠ throws back its vowel in forms like 3rd pl. perf. ܚܘܠܘ etc. In Hebrew alone do the N<sup>o</sup>L form a distinct class of weak verbs, the N retaining its consonantal force whenever it has a vowel, ܡܘܨܐ, ܡܘܨܐ, ܝܡܘܨܐ, ܝܡܘܨܐ, or even a vocal *shewa*, ܡܘܨܐ, but being absorbed into the previous vowel when it closes a syllable. In a final syllable this absorption produces no change in the quality of the vowel, though it lengthens *a* to *ā*, ܡܘܨܐ, stative ܡܘܨܐ, imperf. ܡܘܨܐ (for *yimsa'*, with characteristic *a* before the guttural), Niph'al ܡܘܨܐ, ܡܘܨܐ, Hiph. ܡܘܨܐ etc. In the perfect of the simple stem the normal vowel is also retained in syllables not final ܡܘܨܐ, ܡܘܨܐ, but the other perfects in such cases uniformly take *ā* ܡܘܨܐ, ܡܘܨܐ etc. A similar law of uniformity prevails in all imperfects (so far as the few examples allow us to judge), but here the vowel is *sigʰol*; ܡܘܨܐ, ܡܘܨܐ etc. So also the imper. of the simple stem ܡܘܨܐ; in the derived stems there are no examples of the imperative with consonantal affix. If we compare these forms with the corresponding parts of verbs third guttural we see that the *ā* of the perfect and the *sigʰol* of the imperfect alike represent an older *a'*, and it seems most likely that the deflection to *i*, *e*, has been produced under

the influence of verbs ג'ו'. The two classes of verbs often run into one another, as may be seen from the lists of mixed forms in any Hebrew Grammar.

In what has been said above as to the treatment of radical א in Hebrew we have had to do with the stage of the language represented by the Massoretic pronunciation; but before we leave the subject it will be well to glance at the reasons, already alluded to on p. 278, for concluding that traces of a more primitive pronunciation are preserved in the spelling of the consonantal text. It is not doubtful that when Hebrew and the neighbouring Canaanite dialects were first committed to writing, spelling went by sound and not by etymology, so that א would not be written unless it was actually heard as a guttural. Let us first apply this consideration to ancient inscriptions, in which we are sure that we have the actual orthography of the first writers, untouched by subsequent correction. On the stele of Mēsha' we have רש, "head," רית, "gazingstock," ואמר "and I said," all with omission of a radical א which was already lost in pronunciation. But on the other hand we have מאתן, "ויאמר" (Heb. מֵאֲתַיִם), צאן "sheep." The last example is particularly noticeable in contrast with רש; for while the spelling מאתן might conceivably be aided by the singular מאת (l. 20) there was nothing to help the retention of the א in צאן unless it was actually sounded when this spelling was chosen. So again when the Phœnician writes בנת "I built" (*C. I. S.* 3, l. 4) but קראת "I called" (*Ib.* 1, l. 7) we are certainly not justified by the rules of Phœnician spelling in taking the א to be merely the sign of the vowel *a*. When we pass from inscriptions to the Biblical texts we are met by the difficulty that the spelling has undergone later revision, especially by the insertion of vowel letters in cases where these were not used in old times. But א is not a mere *mater lectionis*; the rule that prevails is that א is inserted wherever it is etymologically justified, whether it is sounded or not, and the exceptions to this rule are merely sporadic, except in such cases as אמר for אומר, where the

second **Ḥ** must have lost its sound in very ancient times. It is incredible that any systematic correction of the orthography, by the lights that the later Hebrew scribes possessed, could have given us a system so correct etymologically as the Old Testament displays; and the same degree of correctness already appears on a small scale in the Siloam inscription (ראש, מוצא, פאתים) against Moabite and Phoenician (רש). The conclusion is inevitable that when Hebrew first came to be written to an extent sufficient to give a tolerably fixed orthography, radical **Ḥ** still retained in most cases its guttural sound.]



## ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS.

- P. 3, l. 35. Since this was printed Prof. Kautzsch, now of Halle, has brought out the 25th edition of Gesenius' *Heb. Gr.* (Leipzig, 1889) with considerable additions and improvements.
- P. 7, l. 35. For 421 read 420.
- P. 12, *footnote*. Still later are the cursive tablets of the Arsacid period, some of which Strassmeier has published in *Zeitschr. f. Assyr.* vol. iii. (1888) p. 129 *sqq.* One of these (p. 135) of the year 80 B.C. is, as Mr E. A. W. Budge kindly informs me, the latest example of the Assyrian writing of which we have certain knowledge.
- P. 17. The Aramaic inscriptions will form the second part of the great Paris Corpus. The first fasciculus, edited by M. de Vogüé, has appeared (Paris, 1889).
- P. 20, l. 10. For 1865 read 1855.
- Ibid.*, *footnote* 1. Further information about the dialect of Ma'lūlā is given by Mr F. J. Bliss in the *Qu. Statement of the Pal. Expl. Fund*, April, 1890, p. 74 *sqq.*
- P. 25, *footnote*. The text of the inscription, in Hebrew square characters, with translation and notes, is given in Prof. Driver's *Notes on . . . Samuel* (Oxf. 1890), p. lxxxv *sqq.*
- P. 29, *footnote*. A substantial addition to our stock of dated Himyaritic inscriptions is promised by E. Glaser from the epigraphic collections formed during his journeys in S. Arabia.
- P. 34. In *Zeitschr. f. aegypt. Spr. u. Alterthumsk.* 1889, p. 81, Erman has indicated the existence in Egyptian of a tense precisely corresponding to the Semitic Perfect. (Nöld.) The forms of the singular and plural are as follows—

SING.		PLUR.	
3m.	ḥbs	3.	ḥbsw
3f.	ḥbsti'		
2m.	ḥbsti'	2c.	ḥbstini
1.	ḥbskwi' (cf. Aeth. -kū)	1.	ḥbswin

- P. 35. For the history of Semitic, and especially of Hebrew, writing the student will do well to consult the introduction to Prof. Driver's *Notes on . . . Samuel*, Oxf. 1890 (with facsimiles).
- P. 40, *footnote*. It should be stated that the quotation at the close of this note is from Prof. Müller's article "Yemen" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. His paper in the Vienna *Denkschriften*, which had not reached England when the note was printed, deals with the Minacan inscriptions of Euting's collection, of which the dialect and character are S. Arabian, and with one group of inscriptions of N. Arabian type, which, on the ground of their contents, are called Lihyānite. A large number of inscriptions, provisionally classed together as Proto-Arabic, are reserved for future publication. Thus it is not yet possible to say anything definitive about the history of the old Arabian alphabets; the materials already published have given rise to lively controversy.
- P. 44, l. 24. Prof. Nöldeke observes that the form derived from *sham'al*<sup>m</sup> by elision of <sup>ʾ</sup> would be *shamal*<sup>m</sup>, not *shamāl*<sup>m</sup>. The latter therefore must be derived from a secondary form *sham'āl*<sup>m</sup>; cf. the Hebrew and Aramaic forms.
- P. 48, l. 15. See p. 51, *footnote* 1.
- P. 48, l. 21. Prof. Nöldeke "cannot recognise the weakening or loss of *y* in any one of the three cases adduced. In מִתְנַבֵּא the change of *y* to *ʾ* has been deliberately introduced to change the sense" [Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebers.* p. 349], "בִּלְבַּל is Babylonian, and that בִּי stands for בְּיִ is improbable." There are, however, other probable examples of the occasional weakening of *y* in Hebrew, notably פִּתְּעָא side by side with פִּתְּעָ. Such readings as נִשְׁקָעָה for נִשְׁקָעָה, Amos viii. 8, *Kethibh*, לָמוּ for לָעֲמוּ, Ps. xxviii. 8 (LXX. τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ), are probably due to a pronunciation in which *y* was not sounded; but to ascribe this vicious pronunciation to the original writers is not justifiable; the readings in question are presumably errors of later scribes.
- P. 51, l. 5. "In many parts of Syria *ç* seems to be pronounced like the French *j*"—(Nöld.). In upper Egypt one sometimes hears a pronunciation intermediate between English hard and soft *g*, but nearly approaching the latter. In Arabia *ç* is hard in Nejd, and soft (*g* in *gem*) in the Hijāz (Mecca, 'Āif).

- P. 58, l. 4. This paragraph and those that follow it should be read in the light of p. 41, where the author takes it to be probable that the proto-Semitic had three sibilants besides *s* and *š*. All three appear distinct in Hebrew as שׁ, שׂ and ש׃ respectively; but in later times the sounds of שׂ and ש׃ were so much alike that the one was sometimes written for the other. In Syriac (but not in the oldest Aramaic; see p. 74 *footnote*) שׂ has been absorbed in ש׃ (ܫ); in Arabic, on the contrary, the primitive sound represented by Hebrew שׂ remains distinct (as ش), while the other two old sounds (שׁ, ש׃) are both represented by س. For an attempt to work out the history of the Semitic sibilants see D. H. Müller, *Zur Gesch. d. Sem. Zischlaute*, Vienna, 1888 (from the *Abhandlungen* of the 7th International Congress of Orientalists, Sem. Sect., p. 229 *sqq.*).
- P. 73, l. 9 *sqq.*; and p. 256, l. 16. Prof. Nöldeke observes that the distinction between تلا and بكي cannot be regarded as the invention of the grammarians, inasmuch as it was carefully observed by the writers of the oldest copies of the Kor'an. These scribes, he believes, made a distinction in pronunciation between أ and ع; we know indeed that many Kor'an teachers pronounced ع with *Imāla*. See *Geschichte des Qorāns*, p. 252 *sqq.*
- P. 94, l. 14. For ܫܫܫܫܫܫ read ܫܫܫܫܫܫ.
- P. 100, l. 17. Prof. Nöldeke remarks that to connect ܫܫܫܫܫܫ with ܫܫܫܫܫܫ appears to be inadmissible, since to do so involves *two* irregularities (Hebrew שׂ should correspond to Arabic س), and that ܫܫܫܫܫܫ is a mere transcription of the Arabic بطيخ. The genuine Syriac form is ܫܫܫܫܫܫ.

THE END.