LECTURES

ON THE

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR

OF THE

SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

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

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 elemen-
tary 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withdrawn from work by his last illness.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 manu-
script 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 modifi-
cation 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 occasion-
ally 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 observa-
tions. 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 under-
graduates; 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 doubt-
less 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 ו or י, with which the manu-
script ended, and also to supply, by way of appendix, a
short section on verbs one of whose radicals is an א.
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.

<div style="text-align: right">W. ROBERTSON SMITH.</div>

CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
    June, 1890.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

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 inti-
mately 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 con-
fidently 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 in-
dustry 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[1]. In connexion with our special course I would re-
commend 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 Hebrä-
ischen Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1869, 70), of which an English trans-
lation 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
Hebreeuwsche Grammatica (Amsterdam, 1869), of which there
is also an English translation by Reginald Lane Poole, *Prin-
ciples of Hebrew Grammar* (London, 1876). I would also men-
tion 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 con-
venient than scientific. It is not, however, easy to invent a

---

[1] [See also Nöldeke's article "Semitic Languages" in the ninth ed. of the
Encyclopaedia 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[1]. 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

---

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

various gigantic tribes as the primitive inhabitants of Palestine
(הַנּוֹלָדִים בָּאָרֶץ, I Chron. vii. 21), such as the Emīm, הָאֵמִים,
Nĕphīlīm, הַנְּפִילִים, Rĕphā'īm, הָרְפָאִים, 'Anākīm, הָעֲנָקִים,
Zūzīm, הַזּוּזִים, and Zamzummīm, וְזַמְזֻמִּים; the Ḥōrīm or Troglo-
dytes, 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 Thier-
reiche," 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 Jaihūn and Saihūn. 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 *Alte 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 vielte Schichte zum Beispiel die Kanaaniter, welche wir zu Anfang der Geschichte wahrnehmen, waren[1]?"

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

---

[1] [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 ex-
ception 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 Arrapa-
chitis to become dwellers in the plains and swamps of Babylonia.
On the other hand he shews how nomades are continually pass-
ing 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.   Suc-
cessive 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 over-
flooded 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-Ḥīrah, 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 over-
tuigend 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[1].

[1] [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 re-
marked, 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 im-
portant.   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 lan-
guages, the Babylonian and Assyrian, which have been pre-
served 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[1].· They are all written, unfortunately for us, in
a non-Semitic character, primitively hieroglyphic, and of pecu-
liar complexity, one of the varieties of the cuneiform type.   Into
a full description of these, and the history of their decipher-
ment, 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 syllabaric.   Such syllables as *ka, ki, ku,
ak, ik, uk,* are each expressed by a single sign, as well as sylla-
bles 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 num-
ber of the signs employed in writing are not syllables but ideo-
grams; not phonetic signs, but characters denoting an object or
idea.   Some of these ideograms have no phonetic value what-
ever; whilst others are both ideographic and have a phonetic

---

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

value as well.   For instance ▸▸▎ 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, ◂▵ 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 *irṣi-tiv* (אֶרְצִיּ).   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* (שָׁרַף), or *kavâ*, *ikvñ* (כָּוָה).   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.e.* and *viz.*, and pronounce "and" and "that is" and "namely."   The Persians made more use of the same procedure in writing the Pahlaví character.   Using a strange jumble of Semitic and Persian, they wrote *lhmâ* and *bsrâ* [i.e. the Aramaic *laḥmâ*, "bread"; *besrâ*, "flesh"], but spoke *nân* and *gôsht*; 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 compara-
tive purposes*, 1872; *An Elementary Grammar of the Assyrian
Language*, in "Archaic Classics," 1875 (2nd ed. 1877)[1]. The re-
searches 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 vocali-
sation of the Arabic and to the analogy of Sanskrit in the Indo-
European family[2]. 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," *šalašti*, שְׁלֹשׁ, ثَلَث; "manly," *zikaru*, זָכַר, ذَكَر.
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. אֲרַם, for which we should rather have
expected אֲרָם, agreeably to the analogy of דְּבַר, דְּבָר). It
speaks of אֲרָם דַּמֶּשֶׂק or "the Aram of Damascus," אֲרַם צוֹבָה,

---

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

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

אֲרַם מַעֲכָה, etc., all places situated in Syria. אֲרַם נַהֲרַיִם,
"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 פַּדַּן אֲרָם, which we
may probably identify with the village of فُدُنْ, called by the
Arab geographers فَدَان [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 ܒܹܝܬ ܐܲܪ̈ܡܵܝܹܐ
[Beth Armāyē], or "the home of the Arameans." Now the Jews,
as is well known, employed the word אַרְמָאי (אַרְמַי) 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, ἐθνικοί, 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 ܐܲܪ̈ܡܵܝܹܐ [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 ܣܘܼܪ̈ܝܵܝܹܐ [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[1]. 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 Yĕrūshalmī. 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-

---

[1] [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 Sakkāra, now in the Berlin Museum[1]; in the inscription preserved at Carpentras in France[2]; in the papyri Blacassiani, formerly in the collection of the Duc de Blacas, now in the British Museum[3]; and the papyrus of the Louvre edited by the Abbé Bargès[4]. 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[5], 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 Madāīn Ṣāliḥ or al-Ḥijr in North Arabia. The great inscription of Taimā[6] is of the Persian period and therefore some centuries anterior to the Christian era. The inscriptions discovered by Doughty at Madāīn Ṣāliḥ, and just published by the French Academy[7], date from B.C. 3 to

---

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

[2] [*Ibid.* Plate lxiv.]

[3] [*Ibid.* Plates xxv., xxvi.]

[4] [*Papyrus égypto-araméen*, Paris, 1862.]

[5] [*Revue Archéologique* 1878, 79, xxxvi. 93 *sqq.*, xxxvii. 21 *sqq.*]

[6] [Published by Nöldeke in *Sitzungsb. d. k. Pr. Acad. zu Berlin*, 10. July, 1884.]

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

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

(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[3].

(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

---

[1] [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'ēl (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'ēl depends on the reading of the inscription of Dmēr, published by Sachau in *ZDMG.* xxxviii. (1884) p. 535.]

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

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

are concerned, we know little or nothing. Of the latter, to which
Arab writers apply the name Nabathean (نَبَطِيّ or نَبَاطِيّ), 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 Mandeans or Gnostics (מאנדאייא), otherwise
called Ṣābians (i.e. "Washers," from their frequent ablutions and
washings, الصَّابِئُون, rad. צבא = צבע, or الْمُغْتَسِلَة) 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 inde-
fatigable 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 *yodh*, יִקְטֵל; whereas in
the eastern dialects—at least in Syriac—it is *nun*, ܢܶܩܛܽܘܠ. 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
(לְהֱוֵא) הֲוָא or לֶהֱוֵי, יְהֵוֵי לֶהֱוֵי, לְהֵוְיָן).

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:

ܐܚܡܢ ܚܡܦܐ. ܬܐܬܡܐ ܐܡܦܪ

أبونَح بِشما يِجقيش اِشمِح '

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 (سَلَماس) 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[2]—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 n 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 Bābli than with Syriac. For example, the infin. Pa"ēl in old Syriac is ܡܨܗܠܬܐ, but in modern Syriac it is

ܒܪܡܬܐ (ܚܕܘܬܐ), ܩܘܡܐ (ܦܪܘܩܐ), which stand (as the usage of some subdialects shews) for ܡܚܕܘܬܐ, ܡܦܪܘܩܐ, and correspond very closely to Talmudic forms like צַלּוֹיֵא, סִיוֹעֵי, שַׁבּוֹחֵי, and Mandaitic forms like קַאיוֹמיא, יַאקוֹריא, בַּארוֹכיא. 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 ܒܝܬ ܩܪܒ *bit*

---

[1] [See Ferrelle 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.]

[2] [*Gr. der neusyrischen Sprache am Urmia-See und in Kurdistan*, Leipz. 1868.]

parḳin, " I will save," he uses a Pa"ēl participle active, with the loss of the initial *m*, ܒܝ *bit* being a contraction of ܕܟܐ [*it is required that*], and ܦܝܩ standing for ܐܢܐ ܡܟܦܝܩ [*saving be I*]. But when he says ܠܟ ܦܘܪܩܬ *purḳit li*, " I have saved thee," he employs a Pu"al participle, ܦܘܪܩܬ being a contraction of ܡܟܦܘܪܩ ܐܢܐ, so that the literal meaning is " thou hast been saved by me." The original form ܡܟܦܘܪܩ is of course identical with the Hebrew מַחְדִּשׁ, מְבֹרָךְ, מְפֹרָשׁ, and quite distinct from the old Syriac and Arabic passive participles ܡܟܦܐܠܐ, ܡܩ݈ܬܠ. These Neo-Syriac dialects have been largely illustrated of late years by the publications of Socin and Prym, of Merx, and of Duval[1].

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 Běnē 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 אֲרָם, so these Canaanites called themselves by the common name of Χνᾶ, i.e. כְּנַע. Stephanus Byzantius says that Χνᾶ was an old name for Phoenicia; Sanchuniathon, [Philo Byblius, ap. Euseb. *Pr.*

[1] [Prym and Socin, *Der neu-aram. Dialect des Ṭûr 'Abdîn*, Gött. 1881 ; Socin, *Die neu-aram. Dialecte von Urmia bis Mosul*, 4° 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 geo-
graphical term, under the form כְּנַעַן [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 Bērỹtos (Beirūt), Byblos (גְּבַל [Gebal, Ezek. xxvii.

9], جَبَيْل), Botrys (بُتْرُون, Batrūn), Tripolis, Simyra (Σίμυρα,
הַצְּמָרִי ["the Zemarite," Gen. x. 18]), Arke ("Αρκη or τὰ "Αρκα,
הָעַרְקִי ["the Arkite," Gen. x. 17]), Sinnas (Σιννᾶς, הַסִּינִי ["the
Sinite," Gen. x. 17]), Aradus (הָאַרְוָדִי ["the Arvadite," Gen. x.

18], رَوَاد) and Antaradus (أنْطَرْطُوس, Tortosa), Laodicea, and
Amathe (חֲמָת [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[1]; and a large portion of Southern Spain
was in their hands.   From the port of Cadiz their ships sailed

---

[1] [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 (أَيْلَة) 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 סֹחֵר, 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 Phönicischen u. Hebräischen bestehenden Verwandtschaftsgrades," in *Morgenländische Forschungen*, Leipzig 1875 [1].

Of the so-called Hittite empire, the chief seats of which were at Kadesh on the Orontes and subsequently at Karkĕmīsh 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 בְּנֵי חֵת or חִתִּים 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 Karkĕmīsh. 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-Muġair, المقير)

---

[1] [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 Meso-
potamia. Here a split took place among them. The family of
Naḥor remained in Mesopotamia; that of Teraḥ, under the
leadership of Abrām, marched south-westwards into Canaan.
These strangers received the name of עִבְרִיִּים or עִבְרִים, most
probably because they came מֵעֵבֶר הַנָּהָר, from across the great
river Euphrates. This is what the LXX. intended when they
rendered the words לְאַבְרָם הָעִבְרִי (Gen. xiv. 13) by 'Αβρὰμ τῷ
περάτῃ; and what Origen meant when he explained 'Εβραῖοι 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[1],
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. March-
ing 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.

[1] [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 Dîbân (the ancient Dibon, דִּיבֹן) 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)[1].

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 Kasdîm 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 אֹבֵד "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

---

[1] [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.

   i. *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 Muhammad 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 Hicromax (Yarmūk); crushed the might of Persia on the day of al-Kādisíyah; 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 Muhammad's time the northern Arabs had only a literature of ballads, mostly handed down by oral tradition. With the promulgation of the Kor'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 Kor'ān and the Sunnah.

The Arabic language was thus peculiarly fortunate. Leading a life of comparative seclusion—not ground, like the Aramcans 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 Sanskrit, Arabic is at least the Lithuanian among the Semitic tongues. At this particular period too the dialect of the tribe of Koraish[1], which had already acquired a certain supremacy over the rest, was fixed by the Kor'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

---

[1] [The Koraish, 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 vicissi-
tudes 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 lan-
guage 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 Bedawīn; 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[1]). 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 Ægypten*
(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 Sabaean]
is one of the less known of the Semitic tongues. I use the term
Himyaritic (حِمْيَر, ܣܡܝܪܬܐ, Ὁμηρῖται) 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 (חצרמות, Gen. x. 26),
and Mahrah, spoke dialects of one tongue, and that these
dialects have their modern representatives in the Eḥkilī, also
called Ḥakilī or Ḳarāwī, and the Mehrī.

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

---

[1] [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[1]. None of the Himyaritic 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 Himyaritic
colony, as the word ግዕዝ : "migration" or "the emigrants," itself
shews. Its territory is the mountainous region S.W. of Nubia,
where its modern representatives still flourish. The most promi-
nent of these are: on the north, the *Tigré*, spoken in the Dahlak
islands, and on the mainland in Samhar and by the Habab,
Mensa, Bogos, and neighbouring tribes; in the centre, the *Tigriña*
[or *Tigrai*], 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 Sānā or Tānā, 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

---

[1] [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 over-
throw of Dhū Nuwās, and so fixes on 115 B.C. as the epoch of the Sabaean 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 Geʻez 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 Geʻez is that of Dillmann [Leipzig, 1857] which has superseded that of Ludolfus or Leuthof, an admirable work in its day. The Tigriña dialect has been handled by Praetorius, *Grammatik der Tigriña-Sprache* (Halle, 1871) [and Schreiber, *Man. de la langue Tigraï* (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 Prae-torius, *Die Amharische Sprache* (1879). [See also Guidi, *Gr. elm. della l. Amariña* (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 develop-ment. 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 *Sprachverglei-chung 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 triliterality of the roots. With a few exceptions, the most important of which are the pronouns, every Semitic root, as historically known to us, is triliteral; 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 *ktl* (قتل, קטל), 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 قَتَلَ *katala* "he killed," قُتِلَ *kutila* "he was killed"; قَتْل *katl* "the act of killing" or "of being killed"; قِتْل *kitl* "a killer," "an enemy"; قَاتِل *kātil* "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 pho-netic 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," *sthâ* "stand," *ad* "eat," *vid* "know," *grabh* "seize," are something wholly different in character from the Semitic roots *krb* "come near," *ktl* "kill," *plg* "divide," which, as Bopp has justly remarked (*Vergl. Gr.*, 2ᵗᵉ Ausg., 1ᵗᵉʳ Bd, p. 196), are un-pronounceable, 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 there-
fore variable. For example, *ḳt* or *ḳd* are common to the

series, قتم, قطل, قطف, قطع, قطا, قذ, قدم, قد, قذ, قتل, قت,
all of which convey the idea of "cutting" in some form or other.

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

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

نفخ, نفح, نفخ, فاخ, فاح, فخ, 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 triliterals; when we are able to
account for the position and to explain the function of each
variable constituent of the triliteral 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 *bǎnǎyǎ; pōno* 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 πύῖρ, which probably stands
for an original **pavar*, and comes from a radical *pu*, in Sanskṛit
"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 Sanskṛit 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 ⲁⲛⲟⲕ, ⲁⲛⲁⲕ.

"Thou" ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲕ, ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲕ
"He" ⲛ̅ⲑⲟϥ, etc.
"She" ⲛ̅ⲑⲟⲥ, etc.
"We" ⲁⲛⲟⲛ, ⲁⲛⲁⲛ
"Ye" ⲛ̅ⲑⲱⲧⲉⲛ, ⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̅, ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲧⲛ̅
"They" ⲛ̅ⲑⲱⲟⲩ, ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲟⲩ, ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲩ

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

"to me" ⲛⲏⲓ, ⲛⲁⲓ   "to us" ⲛⲁⲛ
"to thee," m. ⲛⲁⲕ   "to you" ⲛⲱⲧⲉⲛ, ⲛⲏⲧⲉⲛ
            f. ⲛⲉ
"to him" ⲛⲁϥ   "to them" ⲛⲱⲟⲩ, ⲛⲁⲩ
"to her" ⲛⲁⲥ

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

1, masc. ovai, ova, ovwt; fem. ovi, ovei, ovwt

2, masc. cnav, fem. cente, cnov†

7, masc. ஶaஶq, caஶq; fem. ஶaஶqi, caஶqe

8, masc. ஶмнn, ஶмovn; fem. ஶмнni, ஶмovne.

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 יִקְטֹל. E.g.

sing. 1.   †. twм *I am join-*   pl. 1. ten. twм
                ing, adhering;
        2. m. к. twм, х̇. twм   2. teten. twм
           f. te. twм
        3. m. q. twм   3. ce. twм
           f. c. twм

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*, λαλοι, begins with that sound; the picture of an *owl* the letter *m*, because the word *mūlag*, мотλαx, 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 de-terminative 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 re-modelled and renamed their acquisitions. Out of the Egyptian *eagle* or *vulture* ⩗ they made the head and horns of an ox, ⩗, אלף; the *throne*, ⟃, became the head and neck of a *camel*, ד, גמל; the group of lotus plants growing out of the water, ש, a *set of teeth*, W, שן; and so on[1].

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 Uïgūr 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‛, מישע, king of Moab, which we may place about B.C. 890[2]. Here we find already a carefully developed system of ortho-graphy and punctuation, which contrasts favourably with those of Phoenician inscriptions of later date by several centuries. Final vowels are expressed by the letters י (*i*), ו (*u*) and ה (*o*),

---

[1] Halévy, with whom Nöldeke inclines to agree, derives the Semitic alphabet from the hieroglyphs.

[2] [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 Ḳarḳar (Schrader, *Keilinschr. und A T.* 2nd ed. Giessen, 1883, pp. 199, 463) the stone of Mesha dates from about 850 B.C.]

e.g. אָבִי‎, בְּנֻתִי‎, עָשׂ‎, בְּבֵיתֹה‎, לֹה‎; 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 Ḥimyaritic, and the two dots of
the Ethiopic (:)[1]. Equally old, if not older, is the inscription on
the fragments of a bronze bowl discovered in Cyprus (*Corpus
Inscrr. Semitt.*, 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, Gĕbal, 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:—

Hebrew	Moab	Cyprus	Sidon
ג	٦		Λ
ד	⊿	Δ	٩
ז	⊥	‡	∿
ח	⊟	⊟	⊟
ט	⊗	⊕	⊎
י	⅂	⅂	∿
כ	ⴑ	ⴑ	ⴑ
ל	ⵏ	ⵏ	ⵏ
מ	ⷩ	ⷩ	ⷩ
ס	╪	╪	ⷩ
ק	ⵁ	ⵁ	ⵁ
ש	W	W	ⴜ
ת	X	✝	ⴗ

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

---

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

century B.C.[1] As compared with the Mēsha' alphabet, notable
varieties in the forms of single letters are :—

	Moab	Israel		Moab	Israel
א	⋜	Ƭ	ס	ꟽ	ꟿ
ו	Υ	ꟾ	ע	O	ⱺ
ז	⊏	↗	צ	ⱳ	⇶
ח	⊟	⊟	ק	φ	φ

Old seals and other gems, dating, say, from the seventh to the
fourth century B.C., exhibit identical forms; and the same re-
mark applies to two fragmentary inscriptions from the neigh-
bourhood 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 palaeo-
graphical 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 cen-
tury B.C. A sure mark of antiquity in this, as well as in the
Phoenician alphabet, is the undulating or wavy form of the
letters *m* and *sh*, 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 ꟽ ꟿ and w, which become at a
later time ꟽ ꟿ and ꟽ ꟿ. The letter ס too in the Moabite

---

[1] [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 ‡ ꞊, whereas later on it appears as ꟊ ꟊ ꟊ ꟊ 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.
ב	ꟼ	ꟼ
ר	◿ ᴀ	ꟼꟼ
ע	○	○
ר	ꟼ	ꟼ

To this class belong the Egyptian-Aramaic alphabet, the Nabathean (including the Sinaitic inscriptions), and the Syriac Estrangĕlā with all its more modern developments, comprising the Mandaitic on the one hand and the Kūfic and Naskhī Arabic on the other. The character of the Palmyrene 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)[1] 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

---

[1] [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. Sém.* (4° 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 (Θαμουδηνοί); 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 W into ‏שׁ‎ *sh* and ‏שׂ‎ *s*. The Arabs, who tried to distinguish the finer shades of sounds in writing, required no less than six additional letters; viz. ‏ث‎ ‏ذ‎ and ‏ظ‎, as lisping modifications of ‏ت‎ ‏د‎ and ‏ط‎; ‏ض‎ as a modification of ‏ص‎; and ‏خ‎ and ‏غ‎ as harder forms of ‏ح‎ and ‏ع‎. The order of the Syriac alphabet was retained by them in the numerical values of the letters, ‏ابجد هوز حطي كلمن سعفص قرشت 'اتخذ ضظغ)‎; but the ordinary sequence of the letters was very much altered, chiefly for the sake of bringing similar sounds or similar figures into juxta-position, e.g. ‏ب ت ث‎, ‏ج ح خ‎, etc. The Ethiopic alphabet has two letters fewer than the Arabic, or twenty-six in all, owing to the addition of ‏خ‎ ኀ and ‏ض‎ θ, which it has in common with the Arabic, and of two *p*s, the one of native origin ጰ *paiṭ*, the other borrowed from the Greek, ፐ *pa*, perhaps originally *psa*. The sequence of the letters differs both from the Hebrew and Arabic : ሀ ለ ሐ መ ሠ ረ ሰ ቀ በ ተ ኀ ነ አ ከ ወ ዐ ዘ የ ደ ገ ጠ ጰ ጸ ፀ ፈ ፐ.

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, ‏ث ذ ظ‎; and the letter ‏ض‎ (as distinguished from ‏ص‎), represent sounds of the proto-semitic tongue. I also think that the stronger gutturals ‏خ‎ and ‏غ‎, as distinguished from ‏ح‎ and ‏ع‎, belonged to that speech; and that it probably had three sibilants (besides ‏ز‎ *s* and ‏ص‎ *ṣ*), viz. *sh* (‏שׁ‎), *s* (‏שׂ‎), and *ś* = ‏ס‎, of which last sound I do not know the peculiar original nuance. De Lagarde[1] and others think that it was originally *ks* or *ksh*, which was gradually softened into *sh* and then into *s*.

[1] [Lagarde, *Symmicta* (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, ሐ ح and ኀ خ; whilst in Arabic ע has two representatives, ع and غ. Most scholars regard the sounds of ح and غ 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 غ seems certain from the fact that the LXX. expresses ע by γ (i.e. *gh*) in several proper names; e.g. עַזָּה, Γάζα, غَزَّةِ; עֲמֹרָה, Γομόρρα; צֹעַר, Ζόγορα and Σηγώρ, زُغَر. Further, Χοδολλογομόρ = כְּדָרְלָעֹמֶר, corres-

ponding with an Elamitic *Kudur-Lagamar* (a name formed like *Kudur-Mabûg* and *Kudur-nahundi* or *Kudur-nankundi*); and Γαιδάδ for עִירָד, Genesis iv. 18, where the Massoretic text has (probably incorrectly) עָירָד. On the contrary, ع 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 ῾Ηλί, עֵלִי; ᾽Εβραῖος, עִבְרִי; ᾽Αμαλήκ, עֲמָלֵק; Συμεών, שִׁמְעוֹן; Φαραώ, פַּרְעֹה; Γελβουέ, גִּלְבֹּעַ. It is not so easy to prove the existence of غ as distinct from ع 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 חָבוֹר is in one place Χαβώρας, الخابور, and in another ᾽Αβώρας [᾽Αβόρρας, etc.]; חָרָן, حرّان, becomes Χαρράν and Κάρραι; פֶּסַח is transliterated by πάσχα and φασέκ, الفصح. However, the comparison of the cognate languages, particularly Arabic and Assyrian, makes it exceedingly probable that the distinction of ع and غ once existed in Hebrew and Aramaic. Compare חָבַל *bind*, حَبَلَ, with חָבַל *act wickedly*, خَبِلَ *be corrupted, unsound, mad*; חָפַר *dig*, حَفَرَ, with חָפֵר *be ashamed, bashful*; خَفِرَ; חִלֵּל *profane, desecrate*, حَلَّ, حَلَّ, حَلَالٌ, with חִלֵּל *bore, wound*, خَلَّ [1].

1. 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

---

[1] [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.* (Leipz. 1886) p. 173 *sq.*]

write either with or without ‍ا, according to circumstances:
اُ اِ اَ, ‌٢ ‌٠ ‌١. 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 اَ from the long vowel ا *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 *Mappîk*; e.g. וַיָּבִיאֻ Gen. xliii.
26, Ezra viii. 18; תָּבִיאֻ Lev. xxiii. 17; לֹא רָאֻ Job xxxiii. 21 ;
but in some MSS., e.g. the codex Reuchlin, it is quite common.

א اَ, 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 : مَسْأَلَة, سَأَلَ ;أَمَّ ;أَلِفُ;
سُوْلٌ ,ذِئْبٌ ,رَأْسٌ ,يَأْلَفُ ;بَرَأَ ,شَيْءٌ ,سَوْءٌ .Compare in Hebrew,
יִרְאָה, מִשְׁאָלָה ,שָׁאַל ;אֹמֶן ,אִמִּי ,אָמַר; and with يَألَفُ such
cases as יָאֱרֹב Prov. xv. 9 (where others read יֶאֱרַב);וַיֶּאְסֹר
Gen. xlvi. 29; וַיֶּאְשַׁם Hosea xiii. 1; תֶּאְשַׁם Hosea xiv. 1 ;
מַאְפֵּלְיָה Jerem. ii. 31.—At the beginning of a syllable in the
middle of a word, if the preceding consonant have no vowel,
اَ is apt to be elided in Arabic, and its vowel transferred to the
preceding consonant; e.g. مَلْأَكٌ *mal'ak^un* becomes مَلَكٌ *malak*;
شَمْأَلٌ becomes شَمَالٌ ;يَرَئ becomes (יִרְאָה) يَرَائ .Compare
in Hebrew מַלְאָךְ, but מְלָאכָה for מַלְאֲכָה;לִקְרַאתִי for
שְׂמֹאל for שְׂמָאל, and that for שְׂמָאל, شَمَالٌ .This
is still more common in Aramaic; e.g. مَلَكٌ for مَلْأَكٌ, and

with entire disappearance of the א, ܡܚܠܠ for ܡܚܐܠܠ.—At the
end of a syllable in the middle of a word ٱ is very apt to pass
into a vowel-letter, and to be brought into conformity with
the preceding vowel. Thus رَأْسٌ *ra's^{un}* becomes رَاس *rās*;
ذِئْبٌ *dhi'b^{un}* becomes ذيب *dhīb*; مَؤُلٌ *su'l^{un}* becomes سول *sūl*.
The usual spelling سَؤُل, ذِئْب, is a compromise in writing
between the ancient and the modern forms (ذَأْب, سَأَل : ذيب,
سول). Hebrew, Syriac, and Assyrian, took nearly the same
course. An original רַאְשׁ first became רָאשׁ *rāsh* in Hebrew,
as in the actual plural רָאשִׁים, and then רֹאשׁ *rōsh*. We should
have expected this form to be written רוֹשׁ, but here the spelling
has lagged behind the pronunciation, and the א remains as a
vestige of the original form. So also ضَأْن *dha'n^{un}*, "sheep,"
Hebrew originally צַאְן, then צָאן, and finally צֹאן *ṣōn*. The
corresponding Aramaic forms are רֵישׁ, ܪܝܫ, for רָאשׁ, and עָן,
ܥܢ, for *dhān*. In Assyrian I find cited such forms as *rēshu* or
rīshu, *ṣēnu* or *ṣinu*.—Initial א is often dropped at the beginning
of words, when pronounced with a short vowel; e.g. נַחְנוּ for
אֲנַחְנוּ; חַד, ܚܕ, for (אַחַד, אֶחָד) (Heb. אֶחָד); אֵנָשׁ for אֱנָשׁ ܐܢܫ for
אָחוֹת = ܢܒܐ ; אַחֲרִית = ܢܒܐܠ ; אַחֵר = ܐܒܝܢܠ (Assyr. *nishu*);
plur. ܐܢܬܦܠ; אֵנֵשׁ ܐܢܫ *kinsman*, from אָח ܐܢܠ. Similarly in vul-
gar Arabic, خَد for أَحَدَ *ḥad* for أَخَذَ, أَكَل for كَل for أَكَلَ, حَد for أَحَدٌ. *Per contra*,
an initial א with its vowel may be merely prosthetic, to lighten
the pronunciation of an unpleasant combination of consonants,
especially in foreign words; e.g. אֶזְרוֹעַ for זְרוֹעַ, ذُكْلٌ, نِرَاع;
אֶתְמוֹל for תְּמוֹל (Eth. ተማልም: *t̆mālim*, ܐܒܦܟܠ); إِقْلِيم, κλίμα;

إهْلَا, ‎ܐܣܟܡܐ‎, σχῆμα; ‎ܐܣܦܘܓܐ‎, σπόγγος; ‎ܐܣܛܘܠܐ‎, أَتْنُوم στολή; أَسْطُول, στόλος.—At the end of a word this weak guttural is exceedingly apt to disappear altogether, particularly after a diphthong or a long vowel. Hence سَوْءٌ *sau'un* is vulgarly pronounced *sau* سَوْ, Heb. שָׁוְא; شَيْءٌ *shai'un* is vulgarly pronounced شَيْ *shai*: compare in Heb. גַּיְא, גַּיְ, constr. גֵּיְא, גֵּי; חֵטְא, with suff. חֶטְאוֹ. In some of these cases, assimilation of the א to the previous sound formed the intermediate stage. For example, نَبِيءٌ *nabī'un* became first نَبِيّ *nabīyun*[1], and then *nábī*, نَبِي. Hence, whilst the Hebrew holds fast נָבִיא (though with silent א), pl. נְבִיאִים, the Aramaic emphatic is נְבִיָּא, ‎ܢܒܝܐ‎, with double *y*, for נְבִיאָא, ‎ܢܒܝܐܐ‎. When preceded by a short vowel, the consonant *alif* is usually vocalised after the loss of its own proper vowel; e.g. קְרָא, قَرَأَ; ‎ܡܠܐ‎, مَلَأَ; مَلْءٌ مَلِيَ; ‎ܛܡܐ‎ طَمِيَ ‎ܛܡܐ‎.—In Aramaic indeed א 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 سَأَلَ, ‎ܫܐܠ‎; ‎ܡܠܐ‎ for ‎ܡܠܐ‎, מֵאָה, مِنَّة; ‎ܡܠܐ‎ for ‎ܡܠܐ‎, أَصْأَب for ‎ܐܙܐܒܠܐ‎ for ‎ܐܙܐܒܠܐ‎. In the middle of a word it may preserve its consonant power, especially when originally doubled, as ‎ܡܠܐ‎; but at the end of a word forms like ‎ܟܡܐ‎, خُطْءٌ, are very rare. In some cases assimilation takes place, especially in the Ettaf'al of the verb, as ‎ܐܬܬܚܒܫ‎ ‎ܐܠܐܬܚܒܫ‎ for ‎ܐܠܐܬܢܣܒ‎, ‎ܐܠܐܬܢܣܒ‎; for ‎ܐܠܐܬܢܣܒ‎. Similarly اِتَّجَرَ, ‎ܐܠܐܬܓܪ‎; اِتَّخَذَ, ‎ܐܠܐܬܚܕ‎ *nim*; ‎ܐܠܐܬܚܒܫ‎ for (from أَبَد).

[1] [Apparently a loanword from the Hebrew, through the Aramaic, in which the *hamsa* was already lost: Nöldeke, *Gesch. des Qorāns*, p. 1; Guidi, *Sede*, p. 36; Fränkel, *Fremdww.*, 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. اِ = הֵ; إِنْ, אֶ = הִנֵּה, הֵן; [[but conversely]] أَقْتَل, (اصمر) (where Syriac also رَفَّךְ = أَنَّكَ; (אֵיךְ) הֵיךְ for רָפַּךְ; הִקְטִיל = أَصْلَا; את-, لِ, in passives and reflexives = -הת.

In Arabic, especially in the vulgar dialects, اَ may interchange with و, as وَاحَد for أَخَذ, وَاكِل for آكِل, widn for أُذُن, wilf for اِلْف, رَوَّاس for رَأَاس; tarwīs, "introductory formula," for تَرْوِيس, and the verb رَوَّس for رَأَّس. Very rarely does it interchange with ي y, as in yasīr for أَسِير, malyān for مَلْآن. Parallels to this latter permutation in Syriac are أَلَفَ, אָלֶף = بِكّه; أَلَفَ; אֶרֶךְ = بِنُو.

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 נָהַר 'bow down', גְּהִין נְחַן (with ח) ܢ. Also with ו; e.g. נוּר and נהר be bright, shine, burn; בּוֹשׁ and ܒܗܬ, be ashamed; רוּץ and ܪܗܛ, run; דּוֹר and نَهَر; [perhaps also] כּוּן and כהן, whence כֹּהֵן and ܟܘܡܪܐ.—On a substitution of ה for a primitive initial שׁ, 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 ح and خ; as חָרַשׁ cut, plough, ܚܪܬ, حَرَت; חָרֵשׁ be deaf and dumb, ܚܪܫ, خَرَس.—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

sound of خ in all cases, going so far indeed as to harden نوسَ
into أبيض *rākhit*.

In old Arabic ح interchanged dialectically with ع، and خ with
غ; e.g. حَتّي and عَتّي; نَكَمْ and نَعَمْ; خَفير *protector, guard*, and
غفير. In the modern Arabic of Egypt, the substitution of ح for ع
seems to be common, when the ع is immediately followed by
another│consonant; as *semiḥt* = سَمِعْت, *maḥsare* = مَعْصَرَة,
mābiḥsh' = ما أبيع شيء. Hence we may be justified in com-
paring, for example, רָעֵב *be hungry*, رَغِبَ *desire, covet*, with ܪܓ݂ܢ:
be hungry; צָבַע *dip, dye*, صَبَغ, with ܨܒܥ: ; חָמַס *injure, oppress*,
ill use, حَمِس *be firm, strong, brave*, with ܚܡܨ: *oppress*, an inter-
mediate link being חָמֹוץ, חָמֵץ, *oppressor*.

Occasionally too ח corresponds to k-sounds; e.g. שֹׁחַד *bribe*,
ܫܘܚܕܐ، ܫܟܕ; بَحَث *search*, בָּקֵשׁ; ܩܨܪ: *be short*, קָצֵר; ܩܨܪ:
and ܩܨܪ: *row*, قَذَف (as well as غَدَف, جَذَف, جَدَف).

4. Hebrew and Syriac ע ordinarily represents Arabic ع and
غ; as עַיִן, ܚܝܢܐ, عَيِن; שָׁמַע, ܡܥܐ, سَمِع; but עַל, غَل;
עֲרָבִים *willows*, غَرَب; עֶרֶב *evening*, غَرَب; עֶלֶם، غَلَم, ܟܟܣܡܐ, *youth*, עֹלֵם
עֹרֵב *raven*, ܚܘܦ݂ܐ, غَرَب [*Populus Euphratica*]; غُرَاب، ܚܘܨܦ݂ܐ.
—Possible relations with ח (خ) I have already indicated.—It
is sometimes weakened into א, as in מְתָאֵב *abhorring* (Amos
vi. 8), compared with the ordinary form מְתָעֵב; and even passed
over entirely, as in בִּי *pr'ythee*, for בְּעִי, Syr. ܒܥܐ; בַּל for
בַּעַל. This tendency gains ground to an enormous extent in
the Aramean dialects, where we find such forms as מָרָא for

מוֹעֵנָא, and in the Punic or later Phoenician of Africa, where we find יָר for יַעַר *wood*, as הַחֹרֵשׁם שִׁיר (inscr. of Tugga), confirmed by S. Augustine on Ps. cxxiii.—Of the Aramaic substitution of ע for Arabic ف, Hebrew צ, 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 Ս, ሐ, ኀ, on the one side and አ, ዐ, on the other; modern Amharic pronounces them all as አ 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 ܗ is very feeble, and ܥ 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. ·אַ (with following *daghesh*) for עַל; אָבָא (not אַבָּא) *wood*,

for אָבָא עָבָא, ܟܘܼܚܛ, غَابَة; אַול for עֲזֵל, غَزَل *spin*; אוּנְקָא = عُنُق *neck*;

אַרְבָּא *willow*, עֲרָבִים, غَرَب; אַרְבְּלָא *sieve*, ܟܰܚܛ, غِرْبَال) *cribrum*,

cribellum[1]); הַרְדֵי *one another*, ܬܰ; ܟ̈ܰܪܕ̈ܘܠܬܐ *sieve*, ܡܚܣܠܐ,

ܡܢܚܠ. It is related that the Babylonian rabbi Ḥaiyā was held guilty of blasphemy for pronouncing, in Isaiah viii. 17, הִבֵּיתִי with ה instead of חִכֵּיתִי with ח (הַמַּסְתִּיר פָּנָיו לִיהוָֹה וְחִכֵּיתִי

מִבֵּית יַעֲקֹב)י.[2] 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," *ti'āmtu*, "sea," *dāru*, "eternity," *nāru*, "river"; *uzzu*, "strong," *zēru* or *zīru*, "seed," *ishmī*, "he heard," *rīmu*, "thunder." Neither has غ any distinct sound or representative, as *uzālu*, "gazelle," *āribu*, "raven."

---

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

[2] [*TB. Meg.* 24 b.]

חַ‎ has likewise sunk to the same level, e.g. *rāimu*, "loving," *rēmu*, "grace," *imēru* or *imīru*, "ass," *aptī*, "I opened," *rūķu*, "distant, remote." But חֲ‎ has preserved its sound and is represented by a special sign; e.g. *khītu*, "sin," *khamilti*, "five," *akhu*, "brother," *amkhaṣ*, "I destroyed," "defeated," *arkhu*, "month." In this case the comparison of the Assyrian may be important for Hebrew lexicography, as shewing us the distinction between חַ‎ and חֲ‎ in this language. E.g., as Friedrich Delitzsch has pointed out in his little book *The Hebrew Language viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research* [London 1883],

פָּתַח‎ نَتَح‎, *to open*, Assyr. *iptī*, "he opened," is quite different from פִּתּוּחַ‎ *carving, engraving*, Assyr. *iptakh*, "he carved." So too מַלָּח‎ مَلَّٰ‎, *sailor*, is in Assyr. *malākhu* or *mallākhu* (with خ‎), and has nothing to do with مِلْم‎ מָלַח‎ "salt." It is said to be a word borrowed from the Accadian.

II. Advancing from the gutturals, we next encounter, in the order of the organs of speech, the so-called palatals, ג, כ, ק. These interchange freely with one another in the different dialects. E.g., in Hebrew itself the radicals גנן and כנן; סגר and סכר, also Syriac ܣܓܪ. and ܣܟܪ; further כָּחַד and جَحَد; קשׁט, גְּעָה, ܓܟܠ and ܣܟܠ; שָׁקֵד *almond tree*, שְׁגִּדָּא ܠܘܙܐ, ܣܟܠ; צָדַק *truth*, ܩܘܫܬܐ, but Mand. ܩܘܫܛܐ; קֶשֶׁת *archer*, ܩܫܬܐ; and قَوْس. In Mandaitic the interchange of ק with ג is very frequent, under the influence of a neighbouring ܠ or ܝ; as גאימא [*gaiṭā*] = ܩܝܛܐ *summer*, and so in the radicals גמל, גטל, לנט, for קטל, קמן, לקט, קמן; גצף *break off* (*a branch*) = קצף (comp. קִצְפָה in Joel i. 7 : שָׂם גַּפְנִי לְשַׁמָּה וּתְאֵנָתִי לִקְצָפָה). More rarely does ג exchange with غ; e.g. נבע, נבא نَبَع and نَبَع; גָּרָה,

خَيِّب, and غَرِيَ *be angry*; جَلَبَة and غَلَبَة, *outcry*; جَدَفَ and غَدَفَ (dial.), *row*[1].

1. ‎ג‎ 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, رجُل, جبَل. The Hebrew and Aramean, 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 ἀγαθός, or the Arabic غ. Indeed, when writing Arabic with Hebrew letters, the Jews generally use ‎ג‎ to represent غ. Modern Syriac gives unaspirated ‎ܓ‎ the sound of *dy* or *j* in a few roots, such as ܕܝܢܝܘ *dyāniu* or *jāniu* (يَجِد) "steal, carry off"; ‎ܓܡܠܐ‎ *dyiimla* or *jiimla*, "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'awālīḳī mentions تَشْتَرّ as a faulty pronunciation of تَجْتَرّ, "it chews the cud[2]."

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

---

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

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

4—2

كش is also softened dialectically into a sound like that of *ts* or *tsh*, sometimes of *dj* or *g̱*; as كاتب *tᶜātib* or *tᶜātib*, حكيم *ḥagīm*, كامل *gāmil*.—In some Amharic words the old Ethiopic *k* has been aspirated, *kh*, and finally becomes *h*, e.g. *kŏna*, "to become," for *kŏna*, كان; *hūlū*, "all," for *kwĕllū*, كلّ. Perhaps this may help us to connect such a form as Ar. ايا, *īyā*, with Eth. ኪያ፡ *kīyā*.

3. ק 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 *dz*, sometimes of *ch* or *ts*; e.g. قبله *dshiblĕ* or *dziblĕ*, قريب *dzarīb*, عقيل *ʾadzīl*, قائد *tᶜāʾid*, سرقه *sirᶜa*. 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 *Makdalā*, መቅደላ፡, *tagábbala* for *takábbala*. In parts of Syria and Egypt, on the other hand, as well as in Amharic, ק is apt to be converted into א. A Syrian Christian says *ʾult, ʾaʾūl*, for أقولَ, قلتُ; and a native of Shoa pronounces *taʾábbala* instead of *tagábbala* or *takábbala*. The Egyptian railway station Zagazig is written زقازيق *Zakāsīk*, pronounced either *Zagāsīg* or *Zaʾāsīʾ*; the word حقيقي *ḥakīkī* becomes *ḥaʾīʾī*.

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

دُبّ, ደብ፡ Ass. *dubbu*,	דֹּב,	ܙܶܒ̇ܐ;
يَدّ, እደ፡ Ass. *idu* (power),	יָד,	ܐܝܺܕܳܐ;
تَحْتَ, ታሕት፡	תַּחַת,	ܠܚܶܣ;
تَيْس,	תַּיִשׁ,	ܬ̇ـܝܫܳܐ;

أَتَانٌ,   Ass. *atānu*, אָתוֹן, أَزْلٰ;

طَلّ, ܡܠ: ܡܠ, אֵל;

طَعَم, ܛܥܡ: ܛܥܡ ܠܚܡܐ, טַעַם, מֵעֶם;

خَطِيّ, אֲחָטֵא: Ass. *ikhti*, חָטָא, ܣܛܐ.

Of these, ח and ט interchange freely, as קְטַל, ܩܛܠ, but
ܠܚܐ, طَفَى, ܩܛܠ:; קָשֶׁת and ܩܫܬ; ܩܫܛ and ܩܣܛܐ; طَفَى, ܠܚܐ, ܩܛܠ:;
and תֵּעֶה, rarely מָעֶה; חָטַף, ܣܛܐ, خَطِفَ, and חָתַף. In
modern Syriac ܠܝܐ for ܐܠܝܐ. ד often interchanges with ת, as
in the Hebrew radicals תוֹר and דוֹר, Arabic تَارَ and دَارَ; תֵּף
and دَفّ; in Mandaitic כאדפא, "shoulder," for כָּתֵף, ܟܬܦܐ,
كَتِف; שׁירקא, "silence," ܫܬܩܐ; and even כראב, as well as
כתאב, ܟܬܒ. More rarely does ד interchange with ט, as דֻּבֵּה
and ܠܛܐ; אָטַד, أَلَد, and ܗܘܠܐ or ܗܘܠܐ, Mand. אטאמא;
טַבּוּר, "height, mountain," Sam. טבר, Eth. ደብር:; דְּבֵק,
ܕܒܩ and طَبِقَ, ܛܒܩ, ܡܢܩ:: Of a possible interchange of ת
with ד, I shall have something to say when we come to speak
of the persons of the perfect in the verb. As another instance
I may mention the substitution of *k* for *t* in some modern
Syriac forms of the verb ܐܬܐ, "to come," e.g., particip. ܟܐܬܐ and
ܐܟܐܬܐ (*tyīa, ityā*), for ܐܬܐ and ܐܬܐ; imper. ܟܐܬܐ (*tyā*) for ܐܬܐ (ܐܬܐ).

Of these three letters ד and ת undergo a slight modification
in Hebrew and Aramaic, when immediately preceded by a
vowel. In this position they receive a sound nearly approxi-
mating to *th* in *that* and *think* respectively; whence the Jews
in writing Arabic use ד for ذ and ת for ث. E.g. דְּבֵק, יְדְבַּק;

יִתְעָה, תָּעָה. 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 ת of the feminine gender in the noun and verb disappeared. The Arabic قَتَلَت became in Hebrew קָטְלָה; the Ethiopic ገነት፡ *gannat*, was written in Arabic جَنَّة *gannat͏ᵘⁿ*, and vulgarly pronounced first *gannat*, then *gannah*, and finally *ganna*, *janna*, exactly the Hebrew גַּנָּה, Syriac ܓܰܢܬܳܐ. This has gone much farther in the Aramaic dialects than in Arabic and Hebrew. E.g. in Syriac, ܡܰܠܟܘܿܬ for ܡܰܠܟܘܼܬܳܐ, מַלְכוּת; הָא דְנָא, הָא הֵן, for ܦܶܫܳܐ, ܗܳܘ, ܗܳܢܳܐ, ܡܶܟܳܐ, for ܡܶܟܳܐ, מְכַא, ܘ ܗ, for ܣܘܿ; בַּיִת; מָא דְנָא, מָא הֵן, ܐܰܝ ܕܢܳܐ for ܐܰܢܳܐ. In the Talmūd, בֵּי for בַּיִת; הָאי for הָדֵין (with the additional loss of the final *n*, as in בֵּי for בַּיִת; הַנֵּי, בֵּין for הַלֵּין), fem. הָדָא for הָא; מָא דֵין for מָא; and the like. In modern Syriac this aspirated *t* and *d* disappear regularly between two vowels: ܡܰܠܟܘܿܬܳܐ for ܡܰܠܟܘܼܬܳܐ, מַלְכוּתָא; ܣܘܼܣܳܘܳܐ for *sūsāwā'ê* (ܣܘܼܣܰܘܳܬܳܐ) for *sūsāwāthē* (old Syr. ܣܘܼܣܰܘܳܬܳܐ); ܬܠܳܬܝ *tlā'ī*, 30, for ܬܠܳܬܝܼܢ; ܕܺܝܝܼ *dīyī*, "mine," not for ܕܺܝܠܝ, as in old Syriac, but for the Talmūdic דִּידִי (from יַד); ܝܳܢܶܐ (*yāne*) "I know him," for ܝܳܕܰܥ ܐܢܳܐ ܠܶܗ (ܝܳܢܶܐ); "ignorance," for ܠܳܐ ܝܺܕܰܥܬܳܐ. Hence the fem. pron. ܗܳܝ (old Syr. ܗܳܝ) becomes first ܐܳܗ, and finally ܐܳ, with which compare the Talmūdic הָא above. I should remark that where ד and ת 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 (ﻋﻮﺩ ﺩﺡ) is a contraction for ﺩ ﺡﺪﺍ, but usually written ﺪﺡ; the imperative of ﺪﺡ, " to do," is written and pronounced ﺡﻤﻮ *vut*, for ﺡﺪﺠﺪ; ﻋﻜﺒﺎ is pronounced nearly as *minnit ishŏ*; the old Syriac ﻋﻜﻦ? ﺑﻬﻤﺎ is pronounced and actually written ﻋﻜﻦ? ﺑﻬﻤﺎ.—Lastly, I may mention that the hard ተ and ቀ 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 ነበረት፣ *nabarat* "she sat," compare Spanish *ser*, for *seer*, *sedere*); *ǐj* for እድ፣ *ǐd* "hand," *wallāj* for ወላዲ፣ *wallādī* "father."

Thus far I have spoken chiefly of the pure ד, ת, ט, 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 ت *t*, د *d*, ط *ţ*, the old Arabic possesses a series of aspirated or lisped dentals, ث *th*, ذ *dh*, ظ *ţh*.　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. نُبَّر *break*, ﻠﻬﺎ, ظُفْر; إِنُم, أَخَذَ; دَبَّح, وَصَد; سِبَا; حَرَثَ, *plough*, لَكَ; نَظَر, لَهُ.　The other Semites took a different course, modifying the lisped letter into a sibilant.　In Phoenician and Hebrew

ث became *sh*, in Ethiopic and Assyrian ሰ *s*[1]; e.g. شَور نُور, ሶር: Ass. *sûr*; شَقَل نَقَل, ሰቀለ: (*hang up*), Ass. *iskul* (hang up, weigh); ثُوم *garlic,* שׁוּם, ሰዉም: Ass. *sûmu*; حَرَث حَرَث, חָרַשׁ, ሐረሰ:; نُمَر, ሰምር: (*abundant crop*). Similarly ز became in all these languages *s*; e.g. ذِبح زَבַח, ዘብሐ: Ass. *zêbu* (for *zibhu*); أُنس, אֹזֶן, ዘነ: Ass. *uznu*; أَخَذ, אָחַז, ዘዘ:: Finally, ظ appears in the other languages as צ, *s*; e.g. ظُلمَة, צַלְמוּת, ጸልም: Ass. *salmu,* "dark"; ظِلّ, צֵל, ጸላል: Ass. *sillu* and *salûlu*; ظُفر, צִפֹּרֶן, ጸፍር: Ass. *supru*; نَظَר, נָצַר, ነጸረ:: Of course, as every rule has its exceptions, these series are occasionally liable to disturbances. For instance تنّاء *cucumber,* ቀስእ: קִשֻׁאִים, Ass. *kissî,* ought by rule to be in Aramaic קתיא; but the actual form is קְטַיָּא, قتّاء, the proximity of ק 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 די, זו and its fem. זא for זן and דא; 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 האזין, fem. האזא (but האדין *this is,* and occasionally האדא); هٰذا = האיזאך *then*; האיזן, as well as האידין, *how?* but also a few other words, as זאכרא or זיכרא, *male,* זאביא or זיביא, *offering* (but דאבא *offerer,* מאדבהא *altar*), ויקנא *beard,* and very strangely זיקלא as well as דיקלא, *palm tree,* and זמא as well as דמא, *blood.*

---

[1] [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 ث = 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. تُور *tōr,* "ox," كَتِير *ketīr,* اتنين *itnēn,* شَحَّات "beggar." More rarely it advances the *th* to a sibilant, *s,* as *sibit* = نُبَت, *bāḥis* = باحَث (argue, dispute), *khabbās* = خَبَّاث (scoundrel). The word حَدِيث in the sense of *narrative, story,* is pronounced in Egypt *ḥadīt,* but in the sense of "religious tradition," *ḥadīs.* Even in ancient Arabic we occasionally find *t* for *th,* as in تَابَ *repent* [1] = تَبَّر = تَبَّر *return.* Similarly lisped ذ seems to become in modern Arabic either *d* or *z* ; e.g. *dīb* = ذِئْب, *dahab* = ذَهَب, *adān* = أَذَان, *kidb* and *kizb* = كِذْب, *izn* = إِذْن, *zikr* = ذِكْر (recitation), *zamb* = ذَنْب. In like manner ظ is pronounced either *ḍ* (ض) or *z,* e.g. *'aḍm* = عَظْم, *ḍill* = ظِلّ, *ḍalma* = ظُلْمَة, *zulm* = ظُلْم, *ḍuhr* = ظُهْر, *zahar* = ظَهَر, *ḥifz* = حِفْظ [2].

IV. The sibilants next engage our attention, viz. ז, ס, שׁ (שׁ, שׂ), and צ.

1. Pure *s* ז runs through all the Semitic languages, as زَرَع, זֶרַע, ܙܪܥ, Ass. *stru* or *strn,* "seed" ; عَزّ, OHH: עֹז, ܚܣܝܢ, Ass. *issu,* "strong." But Eth. ኀ, Heb. ז, and Ass. *s,* often correspond, as we have seen above, to Arab. ذ and Aram. ܕ ; as ذَنْب, זְאֵב, *stbu,* ጽብ: *hyaena,* ܕܐܒܐ.

---

[1] [In this sense and form the word is a loanword from the Aramaic ܬܒ, see Fränkel, *Lehmww.* p. 83.]

[2] [The distinctive sound of ظ is preserved in some parts of the Ḥijāz.]

Not unfrequently ז interchanges with צ and ס; e.g. עֲלַץ,

زُخّ ,וְעֵיר ,צָעַר ,صَغَرَ ,וּזΒّא ;צְדָק ,صِدَق ;נָסַע ,نَزَعَ ;עָלַד ,עָלַס

and اكّ, vulg. Arabic *s'ghaiyar* and *sûghaiyar* (صَغِير زَغِير).

2. The Aramaic possesses two *s*-sounds, ܣ *s* and ܫ *sh*, to
which correspond Arabic س *s* and ش *sh*, Ethiopic ሰ and ሠ,
which latter are, however, confounded in modern times. The
Hebrew has also ס = ܣ, but splits ܫ into שׁ *sh* and שׂ *s*, the
latter of which approximates to ס, and is often confounded with
it; e.g. שׂעַר בַּעַס and בַּעַס; שׂרָפ and רָפַס; שִׂכְלוּת for סִכְלוּת
in Eccl. i. 17. Hence, by a further confusion of sounds, the
Ephraimite סִבֹּלֶת for שִׁבֹּלֶת (intermediate stage, שְׂבֹּלֶת).

The Assyrian appears also to have had two *s*-sounds, though
Assyriologists seem to differ on the question of their pronuncia-
tion. Haupt, for example, evidently distinguishes between an
Assyrian *s* = Hebrew שׂ, and an Assyrian *sh* = Hebrew שׁ, but
holds that these were gradually confounded, as in Ethiopic,
so that both came to be *s*. As for the Assyrian sound cor-
responding to the Hebrew ס, Haupt holds that it was *sh*. On
the contrary, Schrader and others seem to maintain that the
Hebrew ס is in Assyrian *s*, and that the other letter is *sh*, *š*.
See Schrader's article in the *Monatsberichte der Berliner Aka-
demie*, 5 March 1877; Hommel, *Zwei Jagdinschriften Asur-
banibal'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[1].

---

[1] [In Schrader's system of transcription *s* is the Assyrian consonant that corresponds
etymologically to Hebrew ס and *š* that which corresponds to Hebrew שׂ. Similarly
Delitzsch, *Ass. Gr.* p. 106, recognises an Assyrian *s* = Hebrew ס and an *š* which
etymologically considered is of threefold nature, viz. *š₁* = שׂ, س; *š₂* = שׁ, ث;
š₃ = שׁ, ش. 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 pronuncia-
tion 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, ܣ = س = ܢ = ס; as

ܣܗܪܐ	سَهَدَ	ܢܗܕ:	סָהֵד
ܐܣܪ	أَسَرَ	ܐܣܪ:	אָסַר

but there are exceptions [perhaps merely graphical], as

ܣܬܘܐ، ܣܬܐ. but [שׁתו for] סְתָו [for שׁתו] ܣܬܘ

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

(1)	שָׂבַע	ܣܒܥ	شَبِع	
	שָׂב	ܣܐܒ	شَاب	ܢܗ: Assyr. *šîbu* (grey-haired)
	שְׂמֹאל	ܣܡܠܐ	شَمَاك	„ *šumêlu* (-ilu)
	שָׂנֵא	ܣܢܐ	شَنِئ	
	שָׂרִיד	ܣܪܝܕܐ	شَرِيد	
	עָרַשׂ	ܥܪܣܐ	عرش	„ *irsu, êršu*
(2)	שִׁבְיָה	ܣܒܐ	سَبْي	
	שִׁבַּח	ܣܒܚ	سَبِّح	ܢܗܚ:
	שֶׂבַע	ܣܒܥ	سَبْع	ܢܗܥ:
	שׁוֹק	ܣܩܐ	سَاق	

לָשׁוֹן   ܠܫܢܐ   لِسَان   ܠܗܢ: Assyr. *lišānu*

רֹאשׁ   ܪܝܫ ܕܝܫ   رَأْس   ܪܗܢ: „   *rêšu, rîšu*

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

שְׁלָו but [as a loanword] ܡܟܠܬ (not سَلْوَي (شَلْوَي

שֶׁמֶשׁ but ܫܡܫܐ but شَمْس (not سَمْس, except in some modern
dialects), Assyrian *šamšu*.

There is another Hebrew שׂ, which corresponds to an Ara-
maic ܬ, Arabic ث, Ethiopic ሰ, Assyrian *s* [*š*], of which I gave
some examples above.   Add :

שְׁלָג   ثَلْج   ܬܠܓܐ   *šalgu*

חָרַשׁ   ܗܪܬ: حَرَث   ܚܪܬ

חָדַשׁ   ܗܕܬ: حَدَث   ܚܕܬ   *u'addiš*

שׁ and שׂ, as well as ס, may occasionally interchange with
צ, e.g. שָׂחַק, Eth. ሠሐቀ: or ፀሐቀ:, צָחַק; חָמֵשׁ, ܚܡܫܐ,
Eth. ማሕፀን: (womb), Talm. הִימְצָא and הִימְצָא (fat of the intes-
tines), Mand. הִימְצָא; שְׁוַע, צָוַח, صاح, ܨܘܚ:; קָפַץ, ܩܦܨܐ.

ס س is frequently changed into צ ص under the influence of
a following ט, and in Arabic of a خ غ ق or ر; as صَطَر, صَاخَر,
صَقْب ("young camel," "tent pole"), صَقْف; especially in foreign
words with *st*, as אֲצְטְלָא or אִסְטְלָא.

Very curious is the change in Assyrian of *š* into *l* before
a dental; e.g. *alṭur* or *ašṭur* (שׁטר), *maštītu* or *maltītu* (drink,
שׁתה), *khamišti* or *khamilti* (five, חמשׁ), *lubuštu* or *lubultu* (dress,
לבשׁ).   It appears, however, to be thoroughly well established.

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

the verbal form ܡܰܦܥܶܠ, Heb. הִפְעִיל, Ar. أَفْعَلَ, Aram. أَفْعَلَ;
and in the pronouns of the 3rd pers., Ass. *šu*, f. *ši*, pl. *šunu*,
f. *šina*; in the suffix forms *šu*, *ša*, pl. *šunu*, *šina*. The Ḥimya-
ritic offers us a suffix form שׁ, pl. שֵׁם, as well as הֻן, pl. הֻמֻ.
The other Semitic languages have all the *h*-form, except the
modern Mehrī, which has, according to von Maltzan[1], masc. *he*,
f. *sē*, pl. *hēm*, f. *sēn*; as suffixes *he*, f. *es*, pl. *hum*, f. *senu*. Such
cases as سَلَكَ, הָלַךְ, هَلَكَ, are very rare, and may either be
accidental or capable of some other explanation.

3. We have already seen that צ may be weakened into the
other sibilants שׁ, ס, ז; and we have also shown that it corres-
ponds in Ethiopic, Phoenician, Hebrew, and Assyrian, to the
Arabic ظ, which is represented in Aramaic by ט, ܛ. One or
two additional examples may not be superfluous.

צְבִי,	Assyr. *ṣabītu*,	ظَبْى	ܛܰܒܝܳܐ
צָהֳרַיִם		ظُهْر	ܛܰܗܪܳܐ
צָעַן *migrate* (Is. 33. 20)		ظَعَن	ܛܥܶܢ
טָעַן *load*		*travel*　*load*	*carry*.

ⵏⵓⵔ: 80%:

I now remark that צ in Hebrew may correspond

(*a*) To Arabic ص, Ethiopic ጸ, Assyrian *ṣ*, Aramaic ܥ; as

צָד	صَاد	*iṣūd*	ܨܰܝܕ
אֶצְבַּע	أَصْبَع	ጸንቦት: *ṣumbu* (for *ṣubbu* = *ṣubʿu*)	ܨܶܒܥܳܐ
בְּצָלִים	بَصَل	በሰል:	ܨܘܠܐ
נָצַב	نَصَب		ܢܨܒ

(*b*) To Arabic ض, Ethiopic ፀ, Assyrian *ṣ*, Aramaic ܥ; as

צָרָה, צַר	ضَرَّة	ፀር:	ܐܥܩܳܐ
צֶמֶר		ፀምር:	ܥܡܪܳܐ

צָק	ضَاق			خَص
צֹאן	ضَانٍ	*ṣēnu, ṣīnu*		خَنْا
	ضِرس	ϴᏟᴨ :		خِزْا
הִצִין	رِضّ			نّ
פִּצִין	نَضّ			ضّ
יָצָא		Ꮻϴλ :	*ūṣī* ("he escaped") part. *āṣū*	بِخْا
רָצָה	رَضِيَ		("satisfied")	نِخْا
בֵּיצָה	بَيضَة	*bīṣu*		جِحِبْا
אֶרֶץ	أَرض	*irṣitu* (*ēr-*)		اِنْخْا

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

צֶלַע	ضَلَع	*ṣilu* (for *ṣillu, ṣil'u*)	עַלְעָא	نَكْخْا
גֵּי הַצְּבֹעִים	ضَبَع		(אפא) אפעָא	أَصْخْا
	عرض		עֲרַע	إِنّ
	ضَعفّ			أَحصْا
צְפַרְדֵּעַ	ضَفدَع		עוּרְדְּעָן	اِةْزِنْخْا
עֵץ	عِضَة	Assyr. *iṣṣu*		אָע

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

צָמֵד	ضَمَد	ϴꟼᏚ :		رَمّ
נֹפֶץ	نَفَض	⁊ᏟᎡ : "to be scattered, flee" (with Ꝑ, not ϴ)		نَضّ

رَضَّ   רצץ

عَرَضَ

غَمَضَ

ضَرَعَ   Assyr. *siru*

ضَرَك

حَمَضَ   חמץ

صَرَفَ
ضِ   } with ص, not ض '
صيرَفي

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 אַרְקָא for אַרְעָא (Jerem. x. 11), Mand. אקנא for עָנָא, אקאמרא for עֲמְרָא. Occasionally the same thing happens in the case of a simple ע, as עְפָר, عَفَر, خَصَا, Mand. אפרא, but also אקאפרא, and even אנאפרא. At other times a נ appears upon the scene; e.g. ضَغَط "to press, squeeze," be oppressed, instead of ; فَعَك, Syriac Talm. גְחֵיךְ, for اسمى. 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. אֲחֵיךְ (not Af'el), עהכית, "I laughed"; but also חייך (חַיֵּךְ), and even דְחַךְ. Something similar occurs in Syriac with the word أَحَصَا, ضَعَف, whence are formed the secondary radicals and .

---

[1] [This example is however disputed by G. Hoffmann, *ZDMG.*, xxxii. 762.]
[2] [See however Fränkel, *Fremdww.*, 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

عصفور صائر, צִפֶּר ܨܶܦܪܳܐ, צָפּוֹר, Ass. *iṣṣūr* (for *iṣpūr*).

(2)　צפר "turn, return, twine, twist," ضَفَرَ, θ௸: whence
צְפִירָה "turn, crown or garland."

(3)　צפר "leap, spring," ضَفَرَ, whence
צָפִיר "he goat," צְפִירָא ܨܶܦܪܳܐ.

(4)　צפר, ظفر, whence

צִפֹּרֶן "nail," ظُفُر, ๙௸: Ass. *ṣupru*, ܨܶܦܪܳܐ.

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

(5)　צַפְרָא ܨܰܦܪܳܐ, "dawn" = שַׁפְרָא from radical שפר.

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

1.　*b* and *p*: בַּרְזֶל ܦܰܪܙܠܳܐ, Ass. *parzillu*, Ar. فِرْزِلّ *fetter, forceps*[1].

ܦܶܩܥܳܐ, بَقْعَة, בִּקְעָה

[2]كبريت, ܟܶܒܪܺܝܬܳܐ, גָּפְרִית

ܐܳܒܳܪܳܐ, עֹפֶרֶת

ܦܽܘܡ, فَم, פֶּה‎‏פֶּן

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

---

[1] [This last according to Guidi, *Sede*, p. 18, Fränkel, p. 153, is a loanword from the Aramaic.]

[2] [Loanword from the Aramaic according to Fränkel, p. 153.]

زِفْت "pitch"[1]; حِـثِـجْأ for حِـثِـجْأ; لِـثِـجْأ for لِـثِـجْأ; even when a vowel intervenes, as Mand. פּת for בּת, פּתולא for בְּתוּלָא.

2. *b* and *m*: כַּחַ, ماكَس.

أصْنأ :Hواه, زَمَان or زَمَن, זְמֵן, אִמֵן.

The Arab grammarians mention such cases as بَكَّة for مَكَّة, مَا أَسْمَكَ for بَا أَسْمَكَ; and the like. In Ḥimyaritic בַ stands for מַ, *who*, and בַן for מַן, *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 ጰ *ḳ* and ፐ *p* (or *ps*) are in native words usually modifications of an original *b*, sometimes of an *f*.

(1) בָּכָה, יִבְכֶּה; חכֹא, نَجْلا;

ብካይ: ብከ; يَبْكِي بَكَي;

(2) פָּרָה, יִפְרֶה;

ፈደይ: ፈደ; يَغْدي نَدَي;

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

In Assyrian an original *m* passes into aspirated *b*, or *v*, as in *argamânu* or *argavânu*, "purple," Heb. אַרְגָּמָן, Aram. אַרְגְּוָן; *surmēnu* or *survēnu*, "a sort of cypress," Aram. שַׁרְבִּינָא שַׁרְוִינָא, modern Arabic شَرْبين; *arakh-šamnu* (*samnu*), "eighth month,"

---

[1] [The Arabic is a loanword, Fränkel p. 151.]

or *šavmu* (*savnu*), Heb. מַרְחֶשְׁוָן. These two letters, *m* and *v*, are not distinguished from each other in Assyrian writing.

The aspirated *b* and *p*, that is to say *v* and *f*, are liable to undergo a further change, viz. into *w* (ܘ, و). Examples of this are comparatively rare in the older dialects; e.g. כּוֹכָב, ܟܰܘܟܒܐ, רַבְרְבָנִין, רַבְרְבָא for רוֹרְבָא, ܪܰܘܪܒܐ, ܢܶܘܚܐ, כַּדְכֹּב for ܟܰܘܟܒ; פָּשַׂט, بَسَطَ, but Hiph. הוֹשִׁיט, ܐܰܘܫܛ. In some of the modern dialects, on the contrary, this change is common. We find it, for instance, in Amharic, e.g. ሰው: *saw*, "man," for ሰብእ: *sabĕ'*; ነውራ: *navâra* and ኖራ: *nŏra* (for *navra*, *naura*). But especially is it common in modern Syriac, where aspirated *b* is constantly treated as = ܘ, *w*, and often wholly disappears; e.g. ܙܰܘܢܐ *zŏnā*, "time"; ܓܰܘܪܐ *gŏrā*, "husband"; ܕܶܘܫܐ *diûshā*, "honey"; ܬܶܘܢܐ *tiûnā*, "straw"; ܚܰܘܠܐ for ܚܰܘܒܠܐ, *khûlā*, "debt"; ܚܶܘܝܐ for ܚܶܫܘܟܐ, *khûyā*, "darkness"; ܫܘܩ for ܫܒܘܩ, *shûk*, "let alone," "pardon." The same remarks apply to *f*, in the few cases in which it is not hardened into *p*; e.g. ܢܰܘܫܐ *nōshā*, for ܢܰܦܫܐ; ܪܰܘܫܬܐ *rûshtā*, "winnowing shovel," for ܪܰܦܫܐ.

A curious change in Arabic is that of ث *th* into *f*; e.g. فُمَّ, "then," ثُمَّ; فُومٌ, "garlic," ثُومٌ; فُرُغٌ, "interstice" (between the crosshandles of a bucket), ثَرْغٌ; فَدَمَ, "stuttering, stammering"; ثَدَمَ; فِدامٌ, "a cloth used as a strainer," ثِدامٌ; عافُورٌ, "calamity"; عاثُورٌ; مَغْفُورٌ and مَغْثُورٌ, "sweet sap" or "gum" issuing from certain plants; جَدَفٌ, "a tomb" (connected with גָּדִישׁ "a stook"). Compare the substitution of *f* in Russian for the Greek θ; e.g. *Feodor* for *Theodore*, *Afinui* for *Athens*, etc.

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

(1) ל with נ, and vice versâ: לחשׁ and נחשׁ; לשׁכָּה and
נשׁכָּה; נדָן, Aramaic נדַן and לדַן; להֵוֵא and נֵסֹו; Talmud.
וﬞﬦﬥﬡ for הלֵין, הני for לחמא, נהמא for נקם לקם for נקם.

(2) ל with ר, and vice versâ: أَرْمَلَة, ﬡﬣﬦﬥﬢﬡ, אלמָנָה;
ﬦﬣﬥﬡﬢ, سِلْسِلَة, שׁלשׁלֶת שׁרשׁרָה, Ethiopic plur. ሰናስል:,
(for ﬦﬥﬣﬡﬢ); Mand. תארמידא for ﬥﬦﬣﬡﬦﬢ, and כאלחא for
נשֵׁן, חלָצַיִם, Mand. האלצא, but Aram. חרצָא, כֻּהֹװﬡ.

(3) נ with ר, and vice versâ: נהַר and גהַר; טמַן and
וﬣﬥ; זרַח and ﬥﬦﬦﬡ.

(4) מ with נ; as מורג tribulum (threshing-machine), نَوْرَج
(Syriac نَهَا "axe"); נחשׁולָא and ﬦﬣﬦﬣﬢﬥﬡ. Especially at the
end of words; e.g. בָּמִים, בהַנוֹת בֹּהָן, Arab. إِبْهَام; بَطْم,
אם, "if," إِن, ٱّن. So in the pronouns, أَنْتُمْ,
דמֵשׁ, ﬦﬢﬥ; נסַם, So in the pronouns, أَنْتُمْ,
אתֶּם, but أَنْفُسٌ; חֹם, הֵם, כֻּמْ, כֹּם, בּוֹם, ﬣﬦﬡ. So in the
plural terminations of the noun, Arab. ـُونَ, ـِينَ, Aram. ـِﬦ,
Heb. ﬦ‍ַ; in the dual, Arab. ـَانِ, ـَيْنِ; Aram. ﬦﬣ, ـَﬥ,
Heb. ﬦﬦ‍ַ.

Final מ and נ 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 malkî "kings," ilî "gods," pagrî "bodies"[3].

---

[1] [But see Journ. of Phil. xiv. 115.]

[2] [Probably from a Persian word nidāna; Nöld. in G. G. A. 1884, p. 1022.]

[3] [Or also, according to Haupt and Delitzsch, malkê 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. يَقْتُلَنَ ,يَقْتُلُونَ; Heb. יִקְטְלוּן, יִקְטֹלְנָה (תִּ); Syr. ܢܩܛܠܘܢ, ܢܩܛܠ; but in vulgar Arabic, and more commonly in Hebrew, יִקְטְלוּ, يَقْتُلُوا; and in Ethiopic, ይቅትሉ ፡ ይቅትላ ፡፡ So also in Assyrian we find the termination *ūnu* or *ūni*, as well as the shorter *ū*.

(4) In various other instances. For example, ם in the 2nd pers. plural perf. of the verb; קְטַלְתּוּנ compared with קְטַלְתֶּם, vulg. Arab. قَتَلْتُوا for قَتَلْتُمْ. Again, Talmud. קָאי or קָא, for מִדֵּי מִדְּי; תִּקוּם, נִיקוּם for תִּיקוּם, fem. לֵיקוּ or נֵיקוּ; קָאֵים for מִידִּים, מִדְעָם, מִנְדַּעַם (מִינְרָא, מֵנְדַּע), Mand. מִינְדְּאָם and מִידִּים—(מִינְרָא) ן in such Hebrew words as שִׁילוֹן for שִׁילֹה and גִּילָה; מִגְדֹּן and מַגְדּוֹן; as proved by the adjectives גִּילָנִי, שִׁילֹנִי; etc. Much more frequently in the later dialects; as Talm. הָנִי for הָלֵין, בֵּי for בֵּין, מָאֲדִין and מָאֲדִין for הָאָרֶץ and הַאי and מַאי for הָאי; Mand. דְּאֵינִילוֹן for נֵידְרוֹן בֵּיה for נֵיהְדּוֹכֵיה; אַמַּארְתּוֹן לִי for אַמַּארְתּוּלִי; דְּאֵינֵין לַדֹן.

Initial *n*, when pronounced with the shortest vowel, is liable to be dropped in Hebrew and Aramaic, particularly in the imperative of verbs פ"ן (תֵּן, גַּשׁ, ܦܘܩ), of which more hereafter. Initial *m* too, according to some scholars, is occasionally rejected in Hebrew, in the participle Pu"al, יֻלַּד, לֻקַּח; whence we can explain the modern Syriac form ܡܣܘܣ ܠܒ as standing for ܡܬܚܘܠ ܐܢܐ ܠܒ.

Lastly, medial ܠ, ن, ר are exceedingly apt to be assimilated

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

(1) Assimilation: in verbs פ"ן; further, ܡܥܠܬܐ (ܡܥܢܠܬܐ), (ܓܠܓܠ) ܓܠܓܠ and ܝܚܠܝܠ (ܝܚܢܠܝܠ), cp. גְּלְגֵּל and נַלְגֵּל ܡܥܠܬܐ (ܡܥܢܠܬܐ); כרכר for ܟܪܟ, כְּבַּר, נַרְנָרוֹת; ܘܒ̈ܠܝ, גֻּלְגְּלָת ܝܥܢܙܡܥܠܬܐ; אֲמַתּוֹ for בְּנְתִּי for בַּתִּי; אַנְפַּיִם for אַפַּיִם; אַנְשָׁה for אִשָּׁה; אֲמַנְתּוֹ and ܡܕܝܢܬܐ, ܡܕܝܢܬܐ, ܝܚܒܐ, ܝܚܠܐ, ܙܒܢܐ (ܡܕܝܢܬܐ and ܡܕܝܢܬܐ). Forms like אִישׁ (rare pl. אִישִׁים, gen. אֲנָשִׁים), ܡܝܠܬܐ, ܝܚܒܝܠ, are easily explained, the long vowel being merely a compensation for the lost doubling.

(2) Dissimilation: מַנְדַּע, יִנְדַּע ; גִּבּוֹר, גִּבָּר ; ܢܕܥ, ܝܢܕܥ, for מַדַּע, יָדַע ; מִנְדָּה for מִדָּה (tribute); Mand. מינדאם, מִינְדָּא, for מַדַּע, יָדַע ; Mand. מידאם, מִידָא ; Mand. מינילתא, pl. מיניליא, for ܡܕܠܐ, מָדַּל, כַּרְסְיָא, כַּסֵּא ; ܙ ܕܡܫܩ ; דַּרְמְשֶׂק, דַּרְמְשֶׂק and דַּמֶּשֶׂק (interm. ܡܕܠܐ), كُرْسِيّ, ܟܘܪܣܝܐ.

VII. The weak letters י y and ו w 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 י y runs through all the dialects, though in comparatively few words; e.g.

ܝܒܫ	יְבֵשׁ	יָבֵשׁ	ፆበ:	يَبِسَ
ܝܘܡܐ	יוֹמָא	יוֹם	ፆጮ:	يَوم
	יְקַץ			يَقِظَ

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.

وَلَدَ   ወለደ፡   יֶלֶד יָלִד   יָלִיד   ܝܠܕ

وَهَبَ   ወሀበ፡   יָהַב יָהַב   יַב , יִיְהַב   ܝܗܒ and ܢܗܒ

وَسِنَ   ወዕነ፡   יָשֵׁן

وَجِلَ وَجِرَ   ﬗﬤ

ወረደ፡   יָרַד   ܝܪ݁ܕ

The original initial *w* rarely appears in Hebrew and Aramaic, as וְלָד or וָלָד (if correct); [post-Biblical] וָדִי וָּדָה; ﺁﻟﻮ , ﻣﻮﻟﺪ , ﻣﻮﺭﺩ [Ῥόδον]; and in some cases where it has been protected by a preceding consonant, as in the Hithpa‘êl forms הִתְוַדֵּעַ הִתְוַדָּה , הִתְוַכֵּחַ.

The fate of the initial ‹ in Aramaic is worthy of further notice. In Biblical Aramaic and some other dialects we find ‹, as יְתִיב יְלִיד. In Syriac this letter is vocalised and becomes *ī*, written in older times ܝܐ, more recently ‹ only, as ܝܠܕ אִלֶד (whence ܝܠܕܐ, ܝܠܝܕܐ). Modern Syriac, however, simply drops the initial ‹; as ܝܬܒܐ *tīwd*, "sitting"; ܝܩܕܘ, "they burned." Mandaitic follows the ancient Syriac in the Pĕʽal form of the verb and similar cases; as עתיב[1] = ܝܬܒ , עתבית = ܝܬܒܬ ; עית or עת = ܝܐ, עקארא = ܝܩܪܐ ; but drops the ‹ in the Ethpeʽêl, as עתהיב = ܐܬܝܬܒ , עתליד = ܐܬܝܠܕ.

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

---

[1] [y in Mandaitic is a mere vowel-letter and represents initial *e* or *i*.]

"hand," Eth. እዴ፡; *arkhu*, "month," יֶרַח, ܢܝܪܚܐ, ⵀⵛ⵰ ⵴፡; *âsib* "he dwells, dwelling," יֹשֵׁב; *âsñ*, "going out," יֹצֵא; *âlidtu, âlittu*, "bearing," יֹלֶדֶת, وَالِدَة; *akru*, "costly," יָקָר. Nor is this dislike of the sound of initial *y* or *w* confined to Assyrian. Even the Arabs were prone to change initial وُ *wu* and وِ *wi* into اُ *'u* and اِ *'i*; and the combination *wawâ* is always modified at the beginning of a word into *'awâ*. So in the Kor'ân we find أَقَّتَتْ for وَقَّتَتْ; further, إِسَادٌ for وِسَادٌ, "cushion"; إِشَاحٌ for وِشَاحٌ, "belt"; أَوَاصِلُ for وَوَاصِلُ, plural of وَاصِلَة, "connecting link, proximate cause"; أَوَاقٍ for وَوَاقٍ, plural of وَاقِيَة, whether in the sense of "guard" or of "ounce." Hence we see at once the connexion, on the one hand, between أَرَّخَ, "to date," and Eth. ⵀⵛ⵰፡ "month"; אֶצְאָיל "joint," and وَصْل, where the *w* is original; and, on the other hand, between ܝܟܟ and אָלַף, "learn"; يَنَمُ and אָרֵךְ, "be long," where the א 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 פ"ו 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.	قَامَ	ቆመ፡	קָם	ܩܡ	for *kawama*,
		ሠይመ፡	שָׂם	ܣܡ	for *sayama*;
Imperf.	يَقُومُ	ይቀውም፡	יָקוּם	ܢܩܘܡ	for *yakwumu*,
		ይሠይም፡	יָשִׂים	ܢܣܝܡ	for *yasyimu*.

Compare also مَاتَ, מֵת, ܡܝܬ, for *mawita*; and طَالَ, for *tawula*, with בּוֹשׁ and אוֹר, for בַּשׁ and אָוַר. Uncontracted examples are, however, to be found; as عَوِرَ "be blind of one eye," حَوَلَ, رֵוَا, "squint," هَيِفَ " have a slender waist," נָוַע, חָוַר, רוח, ܨܘ; and the contraction does not take place when the 3rd radical is likewise a *w* or *y*, as שָׁוָה, رَوِيَ, רוח, ܨܘ; ܡܘ; etc.

Medial *w* passes into *y* chiefly under the influence of an accompanying *i*, as تِيَامَة ܩܝܡܐ, "resurrection" (where the Arabic *i* has become a mere *shĕvā* in Syriac), for قَوَامَة. Instances like הָיָה, Aram. הֲוָא, ܗܘܐ, Arab. هَوَى, are rare. In the Hebrew Pi"ēl and Aramaic Pa"ēl the change is more frequent; as קֵם, חִיֵּב, ܩܢܬ, ܨܢܬ, ܐܢܬ; but examples to the contrary are not wanting, as עָד, "surround," עַוֵּת, עֲוֵת, ܙܘܢ, ܚܦ, ܐܦ, ܠܩܒ, ܐܦܝ. As the original form is the Arabic *kawwama*, the change perhaps began with the 2nd *w*, which passed into *y*, *kawyama*; this worked upon the preceding *w*, so as to cause assimilation, *kayyama*; and hence arose the Aramaic form *kayyĕm*, and finally the Hebrew *ḳiyyĕm*, 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 גָּלוּי, יְכַסְּיֻמוּ, "they cover them." Its retention in such forms as שָׁלֵו, "be quiet," is rare; for even the Arabic, which tolerates حَلَوَ, requires رَضِيَ and سَلِيَ for رَضَوَ and سَلَوَ. In שָׁלֵו, כִּסְלוּ, וָו, and the like, we should probably pronounce the final וֹ nearly as *ŭ*; as also in the forms with pronom. suffixes, like פִּיו *pĭu* (for פִּיהוּ), דִּבְרָיו or דְּבָרָו *dĕbhārăŭ* (for דִּבָרֵיהוּ). This view derives some confirma-

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

לְשִׁבְנִידְוּ עָבָד עָזִידְוּ i.e. לשבניו עבד עזיו

לַאֲבִידְוּ עָבָד עָזִידְוּ i.e. לאביו עבד עזיו

In the perfect of the verb the Ethiopic alone retains the distinction of the final radicals, e.g. ተለወ: *talǎwa*, "follow," በከየ: *bakǎya*, "weep." In the other languages the *w* has been changed into *y*, and the combination *aya* contracted into *â.* In Arabic the grammarians have introduced an arbitrary distinction, and write تَلَا for *talawa* and بَكَى for *bakaya*, but the sound is the same in both cases, *talâ, bakâ*; and hence the Aramean has בְּלָא, ܟܒ݂ܐ, with ו, א. In Hebrew a ה is substituted for this א, בָּכָה, תָּלָה; but this does not warrant us in speaking of them as verbs לׄ״ה. The only real verbs לׄ״ה in Hebrew are such as גָּבַהּ, תָּמַהּ, in Syriac ܦܨܚ, ܨܠܐ, and the like. Upon the whole subject of the weak letters و and ي 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. ה = *h* in all the languages ; but also

    ה init. = Assyr. א, Arab. ا, Eth. አ, Aram. א, ו.

2. ז = *z* in all the languages ; but also

    ז = Assyr. *z*, Eth. H, Arab. ذ, Aram. ד, ?.

3. ח = Aram. ח, ܚ, Eth. ሐ, Arab. ح, Assyr. א (as *imêru*); but also

    ח = Aram. ח, ܚ, Eth. ኅ, Arab. خ, Assyr. *kh* (*ẖ*).

4. י init. = *y* in all the languages except Assyrian, where it
      is א; but also

   י init. = Aram. י, Eth. Ⴍ, Arab. ﯼ, Assyr. א.

5. ס = Aram. ס, ﬤ, Eth. ﬣ, Arab. س, Assyr. *s* (*sh*).

6. ע = Aram. ע, ﬠ, Eth. Ⴍ, Arab. ع, Assyr. א; but also

   ע = Aram. ע, ﬠ, Eth. Ⴍ, Arab. غ, Assyr. א.

7. צ = ص in all the languages; but also

   צ = Eth. ፀ, Arab. ط, Aram. ﬢ, ﬞ, Assyr. ص;

   צ = Eth. θ, Arab. ض, Aram. ע, ﬠ, ﬞ, Assyr. ص;

   צ = Eth. θ (ፀ), Arab. ض, Aram. צ, ﬞ, Assyr. ص.

8. שׁ = Aram. ס [שׁ'], ﬤ, Eth. ሠ, Arab. ش, Assyr. š (*s*).

9. שׂ = Aram. ﬡ, Eth. ﬣ, Arab. س, Assyr. š (*s*); but also

   שׂ = Eth. ﬣ, Arab. ث, Aram. ﬠ, ﬞ, Assyr. š.

---

¹ [Biblical Aramaic and the oldest Aramaic monuments have שׂ = שׁ. In Palmyrene
this שׂ interchanges with ס, e.g. שׂיאן and סניאן.]

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[1], 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:

$$\breve{a}\ \bar{a}, \quad \breve{\imath}\ \bar{\imath}, \quad \breve{u}\ \bar{u}.$$

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

---

[1] [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 *ă ĭ ŭ* 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 خ, or with the letter ر, *ă* retains its broad sound, as حَدّ *ḥadd,* خمر *khămr,* لَعْب *lă'b,* مَبْلَغ *mablagh,* رَبّ *rabb,* فَرَس *faras;* whilst with one of the emphatic or harsh consonants, ص ض ط ظ ق, it inclines to a duller, more obscure sound, somewhat like that of the broad Scotch *a* (*â*) or the English *u* in *but;* e.g. بَقِيَ *băkiya,* طَلَبَ *tălaba,* مَطَر *mătĭr,* ضَرَبَ *ḍăraba,* صَدْر *sadr* (*su*), بَطْن *baṭn* (*bu*).

Also with *w,* as وَلَد *wălăd,* اوّل *auwal* (nearly *auwul*). Under the same circumstances *ĭ* has likewise a duller sound, with the gutturals, especially ع and ح, inclining more to *e* pronounced far back in the mouth, and with ص ض ط ظ ق to that of the deep Turkish *y* or English *i* in *bird,* as عِلْم *'ĭlm,* سِحر *sehr,* حِبر *ḥebr,* قِشْر *ḳyshr,* قِصّة *ḳyssah,* طِبّ *tybb,* اضْرِب *ydrib;* whilst *ŭ* inclines to *ŏ,* or with ح and ع to *ö,* as ظُفر *ḍŭfr,* لَطُف *laṭofa,* لُطْف *loṭf,* حُسْن *hosn* or *hösn,* رُعْب *ro'b,* عُمْر *'ömr,* حُكِيَ *hökiya.* The same influences operate upon the long vowels: as طَاهِر *tăhir,* صَاحِب *săhib,* نَظَّارَة *năḍḍăra* (spectacles), صَاحِيم *wăgib;* صَلَّاح *saḷḷăh,* حِيلة *hîle,* طِين *tîn,* طُور *tûr.*

Again, in connexion with the other consonants, whether in a shut or open syllable, *ă* takes a weaker sound, like that of the common English *ă* (in *hat*, *cap*), or it becomes *ä*, *e* (as in *Männer*, *pet*); whilst *ĭ* and *ŭ* are pronounced with their natural sounds, as in *pin* and *bull*, or nearly so. E.g. كَتَبْتَ *katabta*, مَرْكَبْ *markeb*, سَمَكْ *semek*, شَمْس *shems*, ذِكْر *dhikr*, كَلّ *kull*. The sound of *ŭ* was also heard dialectically in old Arabic, as شُدَّ *shŭdda*, رُدَّ *rŭdda*, for *shĭdda*, *rĭdda*; سِيق *sŭka*, قِيَل *kŭla*; and is found occasionally in the vulgar dialects, as *kŭll* for *kŭll*; 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 *shĕvā*; e.g. سَمِين *sĕmîn*, جَلِيل *jĕlîl*, مَدِينَة *mĕdîneh*, مُبَارَك *mŭbārăk*, of which the first two are sometimes vocalised *sĭmîn*, *jĭlîl*, whilst the last is vulgarly pronounced *m'bārăk* or, with a prosthetic vowel, *ĕmbārăk*. In modern dialects, e.g. that of Egypt, *a* becomes *i* even in a shut syllable, e.g. مِن, *mĭn*, for مَن "who?" اِسْوَد for اَسْوَد "black," اِسْلَم for اَسْلَم "became a muslim," *igzâ* for *agzâ* أَجْزَا "parts." It is also liable to be changed into *u*, under the influence of a proximate *b*, *f*, *m* or *w*, e.g. *mŭḥabbe*, *mŭwedde* for مَحَبَّة, مَوَدَّة, *guwâr* for جَوَار *female slaves*; similarly, *muftâḥ* for مِفْتاح, *Ḥumṣ* for حِمْص.

Just as *ă* was thus modified into *ä ĕ ĭ*, so did *ā* pass into *ē* and even into *î*. A word like خاتَم or غافِل suffered no change; but the weaker sound in كِتاب *kĭtâb*, رِكَاب *rĭkâb*, لَكِن *lākĭn*, underwent a modification into *kĭtēb*, *rikēb*, *lēkĭn*, and among the Arabs of Africa and Spain into *î*, so that لِسان *lĭsân* and باب *bâb* became *lisîn* and *bîb*. Hence the Spanish names *Jaen* and

Caniles are written by the Arabs جِيَّان and قَنَالَش. This is also

the usual pronunciation in modern Maltese, as نَازِل *rmíd*, رَمَاد

ntśl.

The diphthongs *ay* and *aw* retain their original sound after

the guttural and emphatic letters, as صَيْف *sayf*, خَوْف *khawf.*

Otherwise they are pronounced almost like *ē* and *ō*; e.g. سَيْف

seíf (almost *sēf*), مَوْت *m°ot* (almost *mōt*). In the spoken dialects

the original sounds *aw* and *ay* or *ey* are still heard, especially

when a *w* or *y* follows, as *awwal* أَوَّل, طَيِّب *taiyib*, سَيِّد *seiyed*,

aiwa أَيْوَ. Otherwise they are pronounced *ō* and *ē*, as *sôda* سَوْدَاء,

kos قَوْس, خَوْف *khôf*; بَيْضَاء *béḍa*, دَيْر *dér*, سَيْف *séf*, صَيْف *ṣéf*.

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 under-
standing 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, $\breve{a}$ $\breve{i}$ $\breve{u}$;
3 long vowels, $\bar{a}$ $\bar{i}$ $\bar{u}$;
2 diphthongs, ay aw.

Short $\breve{a}$ is liable in Hebrew to undergo changes analogous to
those which it experiences in Arabic, that is to say to be
modified into $\breve{e}$ ($\div$) and $\breve{i}$ ($\cdot$). Compare, for instance, שָׁאַלְתִּי

with סַפִּים; סַף with בַּתִּי; בַּת with שְׁאֶלְתָּם and שְׁאֶלְתִּידוּ; מַזְבֵּחַ with

מֶדְבַּח; דִּמְעָה with דֶּמְעָה; קַרְיָה with קְרִיָּה; מִנְהָרָה with

נֶחְבֵּאת with נֶחְבָּא; מֶרְכָּב with מַרְכָּב; and fem.

(for דָּבָר from דְּבָרֵי, for דִּבְרֵי ;(נֵסَكْم) דִּמְכֶם with נֵם, דַּם,

dābár); הָרָה from הַר. 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: مُرْخَبَا, مُرْخَبَها, etc.; whilst

at other times it is the Arabic which exhibits the weakening of

the vowel, as Heb. צַדִּיק, Arab. صَدِيق; Syr. مُنْبَحَما, مُنْبَص,

Arab. سَكِير, شَرِيب; Heb. and Syr. תַּלְמִיד, لَكَمِدَا, Arab.

تِلْمِيذ. 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 גֶּבֶר and by the perfect Piel of the verb. That words like

אֶרֶץ, גֶּפֶן and קֶרֶן, were originally pronounced אַרְץ, גַּפְן and

קַרְן, might be inferred from the Arabic forms أَرْض, جَفْن and

قَرْن; it is rendered certain by the pausal forms קָרֶן, גָּפֶן, אָרֶץ, and by

the suffixed forms אַרְצִי, גַּפְנִי, קַרְנוֹ. Besides, we can cite the

authority of the LXX., who write Ἄβελ for הֶבֶל, Γασιων Γαβέρ

(1 Kings ix. 26) for עֶצְיוֹן גֶּבֶר, and the like. In many other

words of the same class the root-vowel has been farther modified

into ĭ; as שְׁמֶשֶׁךָ, שֶׁמֶשׁ, שָׁמָשׁ, קִבְרִי, קֶבֶר, קָבָר, Arab. قَبْر; שֶׁמֶשׁ,

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 קִטֵּל

stands for קַטַּל is obvious from the following considerations.

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

(2) The *ă* of the 1st syllable appears in the Aramaic ܩܰܛܶܠ, and in Hebrew itself in the imperat. and imperfect קְטֹל and יִקְטֹל.

(3) The *ă* of the 2nd syllable is seen in the 2nd pers. sing. קְטַלְתָּ and analogous forms, as well as in numerous examples of the 3rd person, e.g. גָּדַל, יָסַד, חָזַק, בִּשַּׂר, where the vocalisation depends partly upon the accentuation and partly upon other considerations. Sometimes the *ă* of the 2nd syllable is modified into *ĕ*, as in דִּבַּר, כִּפֵּר, כִּבֵּם; and this weakening, combined with the influence of the *ĭ* in the 1st syllable, has led to the form with *ĕ*, דִּבֵּר גִּדֵּל. In the Hiphil, as we shall afterwards see, the process goes yet a step farther, *ă* being changed into *ĭ* by the successive steps *haktal, hiktal, hiktĕl, hiktĕl, hiktĭl.*

On short *ĭ* we may content ourselves with noting that in Hebrew it is often modified in unaccented shut syllables into *ĕ* (T), as חֶפְצִי, עֶגְלֵךְ; and that in western Syriac it usually appears as *ĕ* (=), e.g. ܣܶܦܪܳܐ, ܣܶܦܪܘܢ, ܣܶܦܪܶܗ for ܣܦܪ.

As for short *ŭ*, it chiefly appears in Hebrew in a shut syllable with dagesh forte, as חֻקִּי, עֻזּוֹ, and the verbal form קֻטַּל. In an unaccented shut or half-shut syllable it generally becomes *ŏ*, as קָדְשׁוֹ (for קֻדְשׁוֹ, ܩܘܕܫܳܐ), חָקְכֶם; but also גָּדְלוּ, קָדְשְׁכֶם. In Syriac this vowel is usually written *plene* with ܘ, as ܩܘܕܫܐ, ܦܘܫܳܩܐ, but you must not therefore imagine it to be long in these and similar words.

An original short *ŭ* or *ŏ* has sometimes been modified in Hebrew into *ĕ*, which may appear in pausal forms as *ē*. This remark applies especially to the pronouns of the 2nd and 3rd pers. pl. and to the word אֵת. For instance, אַתֶּם stands for 'ántŭm, as is shewn by the Arabic أنتُم and the Syriac ܐܰܢܬܘܢ. Similarly, the suffixes כֶּם and הֶם were originally kŭm and hŭm, as proved by the Arabic كُم and هُم, the latter of which becomes in certain cases هِم. The word אֵת stands for אֵת *ŏth*, as shewn by the

אֹתְהָם. and אֶתְהֶם, אוֹתְכֶם, אֶתְכֶם and אֹתוֹ, אֹתִי suffixed forms
The interchange in these cases between these two dull vowels *ŏ*
and *ĕ* will be less surprising to you, if you call to mind such

forms as חָצְנִי and חִצְנוֹ from חֹצֶן, i.e. *hŏṣn*, but Arabic حِضْن;

further, נְכֹחוֹ from נֹכַח; and the frequent interchange of *ĭ* and *ŭ*

in such words as רֹב, דֹּב, Syriac ܪܘܒ; دِبّ, تُفّاح and تِفّاح;

ظُفْر, Syriac ܛܦܪܐ, Syriac שֶׁרֶשׁ; إِوَزّ, אֱוָן, أَنْس; ظُفْر and

in modern Syriac, ܝܒܫܐ for ܝܒܫܐ, ܠܡܒܫܐ for ܝܒܫܐ, 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 צְדָקָה for *ṣădăkāh*,

Arab. صَدَقَة; מְדִינָה for *mă*, مَدِينَة; רְדָפוּנִי for *ră*, from רָדַף;

דְּבָרִים for *dă*, from דָּבָר; סְפָרִים for *sĭ*, from סֵפֶר; בְּקָרִים for

bĭ (*bŏ*), from בָּקָר; יְזַמְּרוּ for *yŭsammĭru*, as shewn by the
Arabic. As examples of the second case take: צִדְקַת י״

ṣĭd'kath for *ṣădăkăt*, from צְדָקָה; כַּנְפֵי רוּחַ *kăn'phē* for *kănăphē*,

from כָּנָף; דְּבַר for *dăbăr*, from דָּבָר; the verbal forms קְטָלָה and

קְטָלוּ; the plural participle קוֹטְלִים for *kătĭlĭm*, قَاتِلِين; כְּתָב for

kĭ, كِتَاب; זְרוֹעַ for *zĭ*, ذِرَاع. Sometimes this short vowel is
more distinctly indicated by one of the compound shĕvās;

thus: עֲבָדִים for *'ă*, from עָבָד (for *'ăbd*); עֲנָלִים for *'ĭ*, from עֵנֶל,

عِجْل; חֲרָשִׁים for *hŏ*, from חֹרֶשׁ; עֲנָבִים for *'ĭ*, from עֵנָב, عِنَب;

יֶֽרְדְּפֻךָ, אֶכְתֹּב for *hŭ*, from חֲדָשׁ, حَدَث; אֲכַתְּבֶנָּה from חֲדָשִׁים

from יְרֹדְּ; צִפֳּרִים from צִפֹּר; חֲצִי, with suffix חָצִיוֹ, in pause חֵצִי, for *ḥǐsi*. More rarely still a fuller vowel is employed, as in קְרָשִׁים (also קְ) from קֶרֶשׁ, שָׁרָשִׁים from שֹׁרֶשׁ, אֹהָלִים (and אֳהָ) from אֹהֶל. I call your attention to these last forms in particular, as Delitzsch and Baer have recently sought to revive the erroneous pronunciation *ḳǎdáshīm* and *shǎráshīm*.

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, ﻣﻬﻠﺐ, ﻣﻜﻨﺎ, ﻣﺮﻳﻨﺎ, are weakened in exactly the same way as in Hebrew; but ﻧﻤﻔﻚ, ﻧﻤﻜﻜﺎ, and ﻣﻬﻠﻜﺐ follow different rules from קְטַלוּני and נִשְׁמָה.

The heightening or elevation of the three short vowels *ǎ ǐ ǔ* takes place in Hebrew, generally speaking, either in the tone-syllable of a word, or in the open syllable immediately preceding the tone. Short *ǎ* is heightened into *á*; short *ǐ* into *é*; and short *ǔ* or *ǒ* into *ó*. Bickell, following Olshausen, speaks of this heightening (§ 42, note 1) as being "merely a mechanical strengthening of the vowel through an *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[1]." I am not quite sure that I understand this explanation; but it is at all events clear that Olshausen[2] and Bickell regard the heightened vowels *á é ó* as arising by contraction from *ǎ + ǎ*, *ǎ + i*, and *ǎ + ǔ*; 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

---

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

[2] [*Lehrb.* p. 110, § 57 a.]

more or less perceptible. The Egyptian fellâḥ says *mĭn hâda*
("who is this?"), but if you knock at his door, he calls out *mĭn*
("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
ĭ and *ĕ*, *ŏ* and *ŭ*, 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 *ĭ* in *pin*, but rather inclines
towards *ĕ*; we shall I think find little difficulty in believing that
the heightened vowels *â* (ָ), *ê* (ֵ), *ô* (ֹ), may, as Noeldeke
holds, have arisen in Hebrew from the short *ă ĭ ŭ*, without the
addition of any other element.

Of the three vowels, *ĭ* and *ŭ* are almost always heightened
in the tone-syllable; as זָקֵן for *săkĭn*, כֹּהֵן for *kăhĭn*, יְדַבֵּר for
yŭdăbbĭr, סֵפֶר for *sĭfr*; כֹּל for *kŭll*, יָקֻם for *yăkŭm*, קֹדֶשׁ for
kŭdsh. But *ă* often remains in the tone-syllable; as in דָּבָר,
קָטַל, בַּיִת, נַחַל; מִשְׁפָּט. In fact, *â* chiefly appears in the closed
tone-syllable of the absolute state of nouns, as in דָּבָר, מִשְׁפָּט;
and in the open syllable before the tone, as in קָטָן, לָבֵשׁ, קָטַל,
דָּבָר. *ĭ* is also often heightened into *ê* in the open syllable
before the tone, as in לֵבָב for *lĭbăb*, עֵנָב for عِنَب. The second
syllable before the tone is less frequently heightened; as in
אֹהָלִים, (הֶעֱבַרְתָּ), קְטָלָה and קְטָלָה (for הֶעֱבַרְתָּ, וְקָטַלְתָּ, יְקַטְּלוּ, etc.

It may have struck you as curious that, in many of the
Hebrew words which I have lately cited, the short vowel *ŏ* and
the heightened vowel *â* should be represented to the eye by the
same sign ָ. This admits, however, of an easy explanation.
Just as the pure *ă* of the Sanskrit is pronounced *ŏ* in Bengâlî, so
the heightened *â* of the Hebrew gradually passed in the mouths
of many of the Jews (not of all) into *â*, and then into *o*. Conse-
quently the punctuators were fairly justified, from a certain
point of view, in representing it and *ŏ* 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 ָ, which represents

vowels of such different quantities as ⸗ in גְּבַר and in יִגְלֶה.
In the former instance, however, some confusion of sounds may
actually arise. For instance, the plural of בַּיִת is written בָּתִּים,
which must be read *bâtîm*, and not *bottîm*, as is proved by
Jewish tradition, by the accentuation, and by the evidence of
the cognate Syriac form ܟ̈ܬܐ *bâtîn*. If *bottîm* had been right,
the Syriac form would certainly have been ܟ̈ܬܐ. Another
example is afforded by רָזִי־לִי (Isaiah xxiv. 16), which, as I
believe, is rightly read by Böttcher *rôzî-lî* (from a noun רָזִי), and
not *râzî-lî*.

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 ܢܩܛܠ, ܢܩܛܠ, ܢܩܛܠ,
must have differed in sound from that of the first syllable
almost, if not quite, as much as in the Hebrew יִתֵּן. As for *ô* in
place of *û*, it occurs, according to the eastern dialect of Syriac,
in many verbal and nominal forms; for example, the imperfect
and imperative ܢܩܛܠ *nektôl* (*niktûl*), ܩܛܠ *ktôl*; and in the
personal pronouns ܐܢܬܘܢ, ܐܢܬܘܢ, with the suffixes ܟܘܢ, ܗܘܢ, and
the verbal form ܩܛܠܘܢ. In these latter cases, as we have seen
above, the Hebrew has modified the original *û* into *ê*, אַתֶּם, כֶּם,
הֶם, קְטַלְתֶּם. The western Syrians weakened this *ô* again into
u, saying ܢܩܛܠ, ܐܢܬܘܢ, but no doubt the quantity of this vowel
much exceeded in length that of the original short *û* in *niktûl*.

I now proceed to speak briefly of the long vowels, *â, î, û*.

Long *â* has, we may say, almost disappeared from the
Hebrew. Just as the long *â* of the Sanskrit was modified in
Greek into η and ω, so the long *â* of the Arabic passed in
Hebrew into *ô*. As *dadâmi* became δίδωμι, or *âmas*, ὤμος[1], so

---

[1] [The priority of *â* in these cases is not now admitted.]

did *ḳâtala* become קוֹמֵל (Poel); *ḳâtîl^(un)*, קוֹמֵל (participle); حَمَّار,

חֲמוֹר; etc. Exceptions to this rule are exceedingly rare. כְּתָב,

كِتَاب, can scarcely be reckoned a pure Hebrew word; and פְּרָת,

نَرات, is foreign to both languages [Assyrian *Purât* (*Burat*),

Accadian *Pura-nunu*, "the great river"]. מְעָרָה corresponds to

the Arabic مَغَارَة, but the Syriac form has *pathach*, ܡܥܰܪܬܳܐ,

and not ܡܥܳܪܬܳܐ. The most conspicuous of apparent exceptions

is that which is presented to us by the perfect of verbs ע״ו,

as קָם, שָׂר, corresponding to the Arabic بَانَ, قَامَ. Next are

adjectives of the form קַטָּל, like צַיָּד, טַבָּח, עַוָּל, כַּחָשׁ, אַבָּר,

if they really correspond to such Arabic words as صَيَّاد, طَبَّاخ,

أَكَّار, 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 سَكَّار = שַׁכּוֹר, جَبَّار = גִּבּוֹר,

(in sense سَكِّير), تَفَّاز = קַפּוֹז, יָפּוֹר, and, with a rare retention of the

original *pathach* in the first syllable, קַנָּא = קַנּוֹא. The Aramaic

vowel corresponding to the Arabic *â* and Hebrew *ô* is the

zĕḳâfâ, �, pronounced by the eastern Syrians even at the

present day *â*, by the western *â* or *ô*, whence the latter

represent it in writing by the Greek *omikron*, ܿ. Compare

with the above cited words the Syriac forms ܙܢܳܪܐ; ܣܦܳܪܐ, ܩܰܛܳܠܐ;

ܝܶܬܩܰܛܠܳܐ, ܐܰܙܳܐ, ܚܰܣܺܝܢܳܐ, ܚܳܠܳܐ (with dissimilation); ܗܡܳܐ, ܩܳܡ.

This vowel is sometimes weakened, both in Hebrew and

Syriac, into *û*; e.g. קְשָׁאִים, נְקֻמּוֹת, נָקֻם, from a sing. קְשׁוּא,

Arab. ثِنَّا; תַּפּוּחַ, Arab. تُفَّاح; מָתוֹק, fem. מְתוּקָה, pl. מְתוּקִים;

מְעוֹן, מְעוֹנִים, מָעוֹן, מָנוּסִי, מָנוֹס; ܢܶܗܡܳܐ for ܢܶܗܡܽܢܳܐ or ܢܶܗܡܽܢܳܐ,

ܠܡܶܟܕܳܐ for ܠܡܶܟܕܽܢܳܐ, ܡܰܟ for ܡܰܟܽ. As a parallel I may mention

that in some parts of Persia long *ā* is pronounced *ū*, e.g. نان
nūn, for *nān* or *nân*, "bread"; بيا *biyū*, for *biyā* or *biyâ*, "come."
But indeed I need go no farther than our own language, where
such words as *bone*, *stone* represent an Old English *bân*, *stân*,
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 *shūfēt* instead of שֹׁפְטִם (sufes, -ētis), *rūfē* for רֹפֵא,
shâlūsh (salus) for שָׁלֹשׁ, *rūsh* (rus) for רֹאשׁ, and in the plur.
fem. *alōnūth* for אֵלֹנוֹת. In a shut syllable such an *ū* might
even be shortened into *ŭ*, *ŏ*; thus נְחֻשְׁתָּם and נְחֻשְׁתִּי from

נְחֹשֶׁת, نُحَاس; שְׁלָשְׁתָּם from שָׁלֹשֶׁת, ܠܟܐ, ܬܠܬܐ. 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 τίθημι,
or the Arabic *ā* successively *ē* and *ī*. Thus the Arabic رَأْس *rā's*
first became رَاس *rās*, which the Hebrews modified into רֹאשׁ,
rōsh, whilst the Arameans preferred רֵישָׁא, ܪܝܫܐ, رِيْس.

The long vowel *ī* I may here dismiss with the remark that
in the few cases where it has been shortened into *ĭ*, *ĕ*, this vowel
is reheightened by the accent into *ē*. Thus, يَبِين = יָבִין = יָבֵן, but יָבֵן
and وَيَبِن = וַיָּבֶן = יַבֵן.

So also long *ū* may in certain instances be shortened into
ŭ, *ŏ*, and then this vowel be reheightened into *ō*; as يَثُوب = יָשׁוּב = יָשֹׁב,
but יָשֹׁב and وَيَثِب = וַיָּשֶׁב = יַשֵׁב.

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

Syriac ܐܳܩܳܟܠ; and ܡܛܡ, with its construct plur. ܡܛܡܝ, may perhaps be only a variation upon ܡܛܡܢ, according to the form מַלְבּוּשׁ; 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 *ō* in many forms where *û* prevailed in the west. The vowel is represented by the letter ○; a point above this letter indicates the sound *ō*, beneath it the sound *û*. The Western Syrians, who use the Greek vowels, write ܘ, i.e. the Greek diphthong *ου*. Some of the principal forms in which the Eastern Syrians pronounced *ō* are the following: the pronominal forms ܐܢܬܘܢ, ܗܢܘܢ, ܗܘ, ܐܢܘܢ, ܐܢܬܘܢ, ܗܢܘܢ; the verbal forms ܢܩܛܠܘܢ, ܬܩܛܠܘܢ, ܩܛܠܘ; the nominal forms (ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܩܛܘܠܐ ܟܬܘܒܐ); and the diminutive terminations ܘܢܐ and ܘܢܐ (ܐܣܦܘܢܐ, ܨܦܘܢܐ, ܓܠܝܠܘܢܐ).

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 *ē* and *ō*. Compare in other languages θαῦμα and θῶμα, παιδίον, vulgar παιδί, *plaustrum* and *plostrum*, *causa* and *chose*; German *Auge* and Dutch *oog*, German *Stein* and Dutch *steen*; etc. In North Africa, however, a further weakening has taken place into *û* and *î*. Thus يَوْم *yawm* has gradually become first *yōm* and then *yūm*; بَيْت *bayt*, first *bēt* and then *bît*.

Now mark the same progression in the other Semitic languages.

In Assyrian I find that our authorities write *ûmu, bîtu, înu* (عين), *bîṣu* (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, גַּי, שַׁי, קַו, מֵימִינִים, צַו, שָׁלַוְתִּי,

עוֹלָה‎, חוֹרֶן‎ (חוران‎—); in the suffixed form דְּבָרַי‎; and when the letters ו and י are doubled, as דִּיֶּן‎, כַּוָּן‎ ("cake"), or with suffixes חַיַּי‎, גַּמָּם‎, גַּוְּךָ‎. More generally *ay* and *aw* are modified in various ways.

At the end of a word ־ַי usually becomes ־ַ or ־ֶ. We find שָׂרֵי‎, סִינַי‎, and the like; but far more frequently ־ֶ, as יִגְלֶה‎, יִבְנֶה‎, שָׂדֶה‎ (in the construct state שְׂדֵה‎), מַרְאֶה‎, imper. גְּלֵה‎. The intermediate step is marked by the pronunciation of the LXX., Σινᾶ, Σάρα, corresponding to the Arabic termination ى ‒ in رمى‎, مني‎, *Minā, ramā*, which some pronounce with the 'imālah, *Minē, ramē*. In other cases, the *ă* element in the diphthong prevailed in Hebrew, and the termination became *ā*, ־ָ, as in גָּלָה‎. On these points I shall have more to say when I come to treat of the verbs ל״ה‎.

In the body of a word *ay* and *aw* exhibit several modifications. Sometimes a supplementary vowel is introduced, to lighten the pronunciation; as בַּיִת‎ for בַּיְת‎, מָוֶת‎ for מָוְת‎. This latter form, in which the *ă* is heightened to *a* is rare: אָוֶן‎, מָוֶת‎, תָּוֶךְ‎; but שָׁוְא‎, like גֵּיְא‎. The same supplementary vowel is found in the termination of the dual, ־ַיִם standing for ־ַיְם, Arabic ‒َيْن. At other times the *ă* sound in the diphthong predominates, yielding *a* instead of *ay*. So אָן‎, אָנָה‎, מָאַן‎, for אַיִן‎, Arabic أَيْن‎; דֹּתָן‎ for דֹּתַיִן‎, עֵינָם‎ for עֵינַיִם‎; בָּתִּים‎ *bātīm* for בַּיְתִּים‎, from בַּיִת‎; the suffixed form דְּבָרָיו‎, also written דְּבָרָו‎, for דְּבָרֵיהוּ‎. You will find a similar substitution of *a* for *ai* in the older stages of our own language. The Gothic *ai* in *hails*, *hlaibs*, and *aigan*, became in Anglosaxon *hāl*, *hlāf*, and *āgan*, in English *whole, loaf* and *own*.

---

[1] If so, בַּיִת‎ follows the form of חוֹר‎, תּוֹרִים‎; זַיִת‎, זֵיתִים‎; אַיִל‎, אֵילִים‎; לַיִל‎, עֵינוֹת‎, עַיִן‎, חֲיָלִים‎, חַיִל‎; תְּלָשִׁים‎, תַּיִשׁ‎; עֲיָרִים‎, עַיִר‎; שְׁוָרִים‎, שׁוֹר‎ not that of; לֵילוֹת‎. Noeldeke however pronounces the word *bâttîm*.

Generally speaking, however, *ay* and *aw* are modified as in vulgar Arabic into *ê* and *ô*, the *ê* being represented by ־ֵי, and sometimes by ־ֵ, the *ô* by וֹ.　So in אֵי for אַי (with suffix, אֵינוֹ),

אוֹ for אַו (اَوْ, أَوْ); in segolate nouns צוֹם, שׁוֹר, and in the construct state בֵּית, מוֹת; in the Niphal and Hiphil of verbs פ"י, as נוֹלַד for נַוְלַד, הוֹלִיד for הַוְלִיד, הֵיטַב for הַיְטַב; and in several forms of verbs ל"ה, as גָּלִיתָ for גָּלַיְתָ, הִגְלִיתָ for הִגְלַיְתָ, תִּגְלֶינָה for תִּגְלַיְנָה.　This *ê* is frequently attenuated into *î*, and more rarely *ô* into *û*.　Thus גָּלִיתָ for גָּלֵיתָ, גָּלַיְתָ, as in the vulgar Arabic of North Africa رميت *r'mît* for *r'mêt* (*ramaita*).　Perhaps also the proper name אֲמִינוֹן, instead of אַמְנוֹן (2 Sam. xiii. 20), if we regard it as a contemptuous diminutive, "that wretch of an Amnon."　אֲמִינוֹן would then stand for אֲמֵינוֹן i.e. *'umainân*, just as, in vulgar Arabic, *k'fîfah* for *kufaifah*, as the diminutive of قُفّة *kuffah*, "a basket."　As examples of *ô* becoming *û*, I may mention לוּ for לוֹ, Arabic لَوْ; יוּכַל for יוֹכַל, יוּכַּל, imperf. of יָכַל; and נוֹנֵי, part. plur. Niphal of יָנֶה, for נוֹנֵי; נַוְנֵי.　Here again we find a parallel in the vulgar Arabic forms of the imperfect of verbs פ"ו, يُوصَل ,يوقف ,يوعَد for يُوصَل ,يوقف ,يوعد.

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 ܟܝܬܐ, ܟܣܦܐ; in the construct plural ܡܠܟܬ, where the Bibl. Aramaic, like the Hebrew, has ־ֵי; in the plural suffixed forms ܡܠܟܬ, ܡܠܟܬܗ, ܡܠܟܬܟܢ (Ch. מַלְכְּוֹהִי); in the Aphel of verbs פ"י, as ܐܘܠܕ, ܐܘܬܒ, ܐܘܟܡ (Ch. אוֹתֵב ,אוֹלֵד); and in such words as the diminutives ܛܠܝܡܐ and ܚܠܝܡܐ (Ch. עוֹלֵימָא).

At the end of a word we find forms similar to those of the Hebrew; e.g. with *ē*, ܢܣܝܠܐ ܚܣܝܢܐ ܚܣܢܐ ܡܕܢܐ ܢܣܟܐ; with *ā*, ܣܠܝܠܐ.

In the body of a word, Syriac *ay* sometimes becomes *ē*, as in the construct ܚܒܝܬ, and in the duals ܬܪܝܢ, ܡܐܬܝܢ, ܡܕܝܢܬܐ; in Biblical Aramaic תַּרְתֵּין, but מָאתַיִן.

The *ā*-sound predominates, for example, in Targumic מָאתָן (200) and תְּמָנֵן [תְּמָנַן] (80, for תְּמָנִין, ܬܡܢܝܢ, as well as תַּמְנֵין, ܠܬܡܢܝܢ); in the plural ܬܡܢܐ; in the adverb ܐܝܟ, pronounced *ākh* (Ch. הֵיךְ, אֵיךְ); in the plural suffixed forms of the Jewish Aramaic עַבְדָּךְ or עַבְדֵּיךְ, "thy servants," [Targumic] עַבְדָּא or [Biblical] עַבְדַיָּה [עַבְדֹהִי] *kĕri* עַבְדַיִךְ [עַבְדַּהּ] *kĕri* עַבְדָּנָא "our servants," as contrasted with עַבְדַּי, עַבְדֵּיכוֹן and עַבְדֵּיהוֹן.

Further, *ē* sinks into *i*, according to the western pronunciation, in the simple forms of the segolates ܓܒܝ, ܒܝܫܐ; also in the forms ܠܬܝܒ (construct), ܠܬܝܒܬܗܘܢ, ܠܬܝܒܬܗ, ܟܬܝܒܬܟܘܢ; in many forms of the 1st and 2nd pers. in the perf. of verbs ל״א, as perf. Peal ܓܠܝܬ (but Nestorian ܓܠܐܬ), Pael ܓܠܝܬ and ܓܠܝܬܐ, ܓܠܝܬܗ etc. Similarly, *ō* sinks into *ū*, in ܐܠܘ "if" (= ܠܘ + ܐܢ); and, at least according to the western pronunciation, in the simple state of the segolates ܣܘܡܐ, ܣܘܦ ("end").

In the later Aramaic dialects there is a strong tendency to get rid of the diphthongs. Already in old Syriac we find ܐܝܟ *ākh*, with short *ă*, for ܐܝܟ; ܠܠܝܐ *lilyā*, for *lēlyā, lailyā* (ܠܝܠܝܐ); and another example of the same kind is ܐܡܬܝ (for אֵי מָתַי); but the modern Syrian says *lit* for ܠܝܬ; *ika* or *ikă* (ܐܝܟܐ) for אֵיכָא; *ĭdh* (?ܐܝ) for אֵידֵין and אֵידָא, ܐܝܕܐ and ܐܝܢ; ܟܬܒܘܬܐ *bāthwā(th)ē*, "houses," ܟܬܒܬܢ "our houses"; and even *tyĕkhvā*

for ܟ݇ܦ݂ܟ݂ܒ݂. So also, though to a less extent, in Mandaitic, where we find לית as well as לאית (לַיִּת), and קרית for ܩܢܐ as well as ܩܢܝܐ.

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 ע ח ה; as אֱלוֹהַּ for *ĕlōh*, Aram. אֱלָהָא, ܐܲܠܵܗܵܐ, Arab. إِلاه; זְרוֹעַ for *zĕrō*, Aram. דְּרָעָא, ܕܪܵܥܵܐ, Arab. ذِرَاع; תַּפּוּחַ for *tappûḥ*, Arab. تُفّاح; רוּחַ for *rûḥ*, روح, ܪܘܼܚܵܐ; מֹחַ for *môḥ*, مُخ, מוֹחָא, ܡܘܿܚܵܐ; מְשַׁלֵּחַ for *mĕshalleḥ*, i.e. *mushalliḥ*; רֵעַ for *rē*, *rĕ*. This sound is heard in the spoken Arabic of the present day, in such words as صاحيم, ريح ,روح *mamfûkh*, منفوخ ,بطيخ *sutûkh*, سطوح ,مليح, but it is not, and never has been, written in this language or in Syriac, where we find only ܟܦ݂ܬܚܬܢ ܚܘܿܒ and the like.

(2) The auxiliary *pathach* which is sometimes inserted between ע or ח and ד or ת at the end of a word. It is so slight in sound as not even to effect the aspiration of the ד or ת. For example: שָׁמַעַתּ ,שָׁכַחַתּ ,הִמְלַחַתּ, as well as שָׁכַחְתּ ,לָקַחְתּ; וַיֵּחַדְּ for יָרַדְ ,וְיֵרַדְ ,יָפַת ,וַיִּפַת ,וְיֵחַדְּ, as compared with יָרַדְ ,וְיֵרַדְ ,יָפַת ,וַיִּפַת ,וְיֵחַדְּ.

(3) The auxiliary vowel ◌ֵ, ◌ָ, ◌ַ, in various nominal and verbal forms, which is very little stronger than no. 2. For example, in segolate nouns: נַעַר ,תַּחַת ,יֶלֶד ,זֶרַע ,פֶּרֶא ,סֵפֶר, נֵצַח ,קֹדֶשׁ ,פֹּעַל ,מָוֶת ,בַּיִת, and in the dual termination ◌ַיִם–. The auxiliary is actually wanting in such words as קֶשְׁט, נֵרְדְּ,

(also קְשָׁט), שָׂא, גִּיא, חֲטָא. And again, in the shortened
imperfect or jussive of verbs ל״ה: וַיֵּרֶב ,וַיֵּרְדְּ ,יֵגֶל ,וַתַּעַשׂ וַתֵּבְךְּ,
וַיֵּבְךְּ ,יֵשְׁטְ ,וַיֵּשְׁתְּ ,וַיֵּרְדְּ ,וַיִּפֶת; contrasted with יַחַר ,יֵרַע ,יִרָא
וַיֵּשֶׁב, וַיֵּשְׁקְ, and וַיִּרָא, where perhaps the final shĕvā may have
once been slightly moveable, *wayyiftĕ*, *wĕ-yĕrdĕ*, etc. A some-
what similar insertion of a short *ă* takes place in Mandaitic in
the word איאך for أبِ, and in the plural suffix of the 1st pers.
איאן for ـنا, as כּאפּאיאן *our hands*, עדראיאן *our hands*. Perhaps
also in the pronoun of the 2nd pers. masc. אנאתן, אנאת. The
vulgar Arabic has this auxiliary vowel, for example, in the
segolates, صِبُعْ, *subᵉh*, رُمُحْ, *rumᵉh*, سَطُحْ, *saṭᵉh*, نَسُخْ, *näsᵉkh*,
نَفُخْ *nafᵉkh*.

    (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 shĕvā*, conforms in character to the preceding
vowel. Thus: יֶעְמֹד and יֶחְזַק, for יַעְמֹד and יַחְזַק, of the form
יָחֳרָם, for יָחֳרִים and יַחֳרָם, for יָחֳרִים ,הָחֳרִים ,הָחֳרִים ;יִקְטֹל,
of the forms פָּעֳלוֹ ,נַעֳרוֹ, for נַעְרוֹ and יִקְטַל and הִקְטִיל ,יִקְטֹל,
פָּעֳלוֹ. Examples to the contrary are: אֲרַפֶּךְ ,יֹאשֶׁם ,יֹאמַר and
נָהְפַּךְ ,יַחְשֹׁב ,נֶחְבָּא ,יַעְשֶׂן ,תַּעֲלִים ,זַעְמִי ,מַעְטֹו.

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

with	יֶעְמֹד	compare	יַעַמְדוּ	for	יֶעְמְדוּ
„	יֶחְזַק	„	יַחַזְקוּ	„	יֶחְזְקוּ
„	וַיֶּאְסֹף	„	וַיַּאַסְפוּ	„	וַיֶּאְסְפוּ
„	נֶאְסַף	„	נֶאֶסְפוּ	„	נֶאְסְפוּ
„	נַעֲרוֹ	„	נַעַרְךָ	„	נַעְרְךָ
„	פָּעֳלוֹ	„	פָּעָלְךָ	„	פָּעְלְךָ

but on the contrary observe such forms as מַחְשְׁבוֹתַי ,וַיַּחְלְקוּ.

Of this supplementary vowel a far wider use is made in Aramaic. Thus in the Targums we find מְדִינְחָא for מַדְנְחָא,

מַשִׁירְיָיתָא for מַשְׁרִיתָא; whilst in Syriac we may say ܡܐܕܢܐ,

ܡܐܕܢܐ, for ܡܐܟܘܣܢܐ, ܐܘܙܓܐ, ܙܢܟܐ, ܡܚܙܝܬܐ, ܡܚܙܝܬܐ; ܬܘܕܦܬ, and ܐܘܙܓܐ, ܙܢܟܐ, ܡܚܙܝܬܐ, ܡܚܙܝܬܐ

ܐܘܠܗܓ, ܙܘܣܟܒ; ܡܚܙܘܙܐ, for ܬܘܕܦܬ, ܐܘܠܗܓ and ܙܘܣܟܒ

and ܡܚܙܘܙܐ. In Mandaitic this insertion is very general, the vowel *u* being also occasionally employed, as הוכומתא and

(אﬦכﬧﬣ) ניציבתא and ניצובתא (חכמה, שגמﬡ), היכומתא; in the conjugation Ethpe'ēl, the normal form is עתינסיב = ܐܬܢܣܒ.

(6) Here, too, may find its place the *prosthetic 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 χθές and ἐχθές, ἀσπαίρω and σπαίρω; Spanish *escudo, escuela*; French *espère, esprit*; Italian *con iscienza, in Ispagna*. In ancient Arabic this vowel is usually *ĭ* or *ŭ*, as in the imperative اقْتُل, اجْلِس, افْرَق; in the verbal conjugations

اثْنَانِ, *two*, (بَنَيْ for) ابْنٌ, *son*, in ابْنٌ; اسْتَقْتَلَ and اتْنَتَلَ, انْقَتَلَ, اسْم or اسْم, *name*, etc. In the vulgar dialects examples are far

more numerous; e.g. تَقَاتَلَ and تَقَنَّلَ, for اتْقَاتَلَ and اتْقَنَّلَ,

مُبَارَكْ for امْبَارَكْ, etc. In Hebrew we find *ĭ*, ◌ֵ, as in אֶזְרוֹעַ for זְרוֹעַ, אֶצְעָדָה for צְעָדָה, and perhaps a few more, such as אֶשְׁפָּר "measure." In שְׁתַּיִם the pros- אֶתְנַן, אֶתְמוֹל and תְּמוֹל

thetic א, though pronounced by many of the Jews, has not been

written. In Aramaic occur both אָ and אְ. Already in Biblical Aramaic we have אַרְכֻּבָּה "knee," in the Palestinian dialect

ܐܘܟܘܡܐ. In Syriac we find ܐܣܬ for ܣܬ, ܐܣܦܩܝܕܐ for

ܣܘܩܐ, ܐܣܘܩܐ and ܣܘܩܐ, for ܐܣܩܐ, ܣܩܐ, ܐܣܩܐ for ܣܩܐ "street," ܣܒܝ or ܐܣܒܝ, ܣܒܝ, ܐܣܒܝ for ܣܒܐ and ܣܒܐ for ܐܣܒܝ and ܐܣܒܝ, etc. In ܐܩܪܘܒܐ the prosthetic vowel has been influenced by the original vowel of the ܪ, as shewn in the Arabic عَقْرَب. 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:

אֲבַטִּיחִים "melons" (بَطِيخ, ܒܛܝܚܐ), אֲבַעְבֻּעֹת "blains" or "small blisters" (ܒܘܥܒܥܝܬܐ "bubbles" of water), אֲגַפִּים "wings" of an army, אֲזִקִּים "fetters," אֲגַרְטָלִים probably the same as κάρταλος, κάρταλλος, which is also found in Arabic and Syriac; אֲדַרְכֹּן a Persian coin, called by the Greeks δαρεικός[1]; אֱגוֹז "a nut," Arab. جَوْز, Syr. ܓܘܙܐ, probably from the Persian گوز gôz; in Syriac ܐܪܘܙܐ for ܪܘܙܐ (Pers. راز), where the ܐ was doubtless once sounded, ărăsā; in later dialects אֲדָם for דָּם "blood," אֲטַרְפָּא "leaf," for טַרְפָּא; Mand. עֲשׁוּמִיא for שׁוּמִיא "heaven," אֲרַאמָאתא for ראמאתא "heights," אֲקָאמְרָא "wool," אֲקָאפְרָא "dust," for the older ܥܡܪܐ and ܥܦܪܐ.

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.

---

[1] [In a Phoenician inscription of 96 B.C., recently found at the Piraeus, דרכנם and דרכמנם 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, ר and ת, ש, כ, ל מ נ, ו 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 ﻱ - *iya*, which is usually shortened, according to circumstances, into ﻱ *ya* or ﻱ- *i*, as ﻗَﻔَﺎﻱَ ,ﻧَﻔْﺴِﻲ ,ﻧَـﻔْـﺴِﻲَ. It is obviously identical with the Ethiopic ይ: *ya*, in ነፍስየ: *nafséya*; and with the Assyrian *ya*, in *bît-ya* "my house." This latter,

I am told, becomes *ī* and in certain cases *a*, as *bintī* "my daughter," *abūa* (for *abūya*), as well as *abī* and even *aba*, "my father"; with which last compare such Arabic forms as يَـابْنَ عَمَّ *ya'bna 'amma*, يَا رَبَّا *yā rabbā*. The Hebrew form is, as you all know, ‏ֽי‎, of which the *yūd*, though written, is no longer pronounced in Syriac: ܡܰܠܟܝ‎, ‏מַלְכִּי‎. The intermediate step, no doubt, was the shortening of *ī* into *ĭ*, which we find sometimes in old Arabic, especially in vocative forms like يا رَبِ, which in pause would be pronounced يا رَبْ *yā rabb*. The corresponding plural is in Arab. نا *nā*, sometimes shortened into *nŭ*; in Eth. ነ: *nă*, in Assyrian *nī* or *nū*, Heb. ‏נוּ‎, Aram. ‏נָא‎, Syr. *n*, as ‏מַלְכֵּנוּ‎, ‏מַלְכָּנָא‎, ܡܰܠܟܲܢ. 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. نِي *niya* or *nī*, Eth. ፈ: *nī*, Assyr. *nī*, Heb. ‏נִי‎, Aram. ‏נִי‎, Syr. 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, كَ *kă*, the fem. كِ *kĭ*. Identical with these are the Ethiopic ከ: *ka*, ኪ: *kī*, and the Assyrian *ka*, *kī*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are ‏ךָ‎ and ‏כִי‎, the latter generally abbreviated into ‏ךְ‎. The Aramaic forms are ‏ךְ‎ مو for the masc. and ‏כִי‎ ܟܝ for the fem., but the *yūd* has become silent, ܡܰܠܟܟܘܢ, ܡܰܠܟܟܝ; so that these forms are identical with those of the vulgar Arabic, masc. ـَكْ *ak*, or *k*, fem. *ek* or *kī*. The plurals were originally, as in Arabic, masc. كُم *kumū*, shortened into *kum*, fem. *kŭnna*; Ethiopic ከሙ: *kĕmū* and ከን: *kĕn*; Assyrian *kunū* or *kun*, of which the fem., according to analogy, should be *kina* or *kin*. The Hebrew forms are

כֶם for *kŭm*, fem. כֶן, but for the latter the fuller כֶּנֶה or כֶּנֶּה sometimes occurs. The Aramaic forms are כּוֹן כֹּן, fem. ـَــ, but כֹם 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 *abī-hu*, *abī-hi*; fem. ‌. The corresponding forms in Ethiopic are ሁ፡ *hū*, ሃ፡ *hā*. In Hebrew the masc. is הוּ, but also ‍ה‌ـ, וֹ, which is nearly identical with the vulgar Arabic ‌, pronounced *u* or *o*, as in كَتَابُه, also written كتابو. The Hebrew fem. is הָ and ה‍ָ. In Aramaic the masc. is ה‍ָ ‌ה‌, fem. ה‍ָ ‌וֹ‌. The corresponding plurals in Arabic are, masc. ‌هم‌ *humū*, generally abbreviated *hum*, which may be changed by the influence of a preceding *i* into *himū* or *himī* and *him*; the fem. is ‌هن‌ *hunna* or *hinna*. The Ethiopic has ሆሙ፡ *hŏmū* and ሆን፡ *hŏn*. The Hebrew forms are, masc. הָם and ם‍ָ, or, with final vowel, מוֹ‍ָ; fem. הָן (rarely הֵן) and ן‍ָ, or, with final vowel, נָה‍ָ, נָּה‍ָ, נָה‍ָ. In Aramaic we find הון, ‌هن‌ and ‌هـ‌, but in the Aramaic of Ezra also הוֹם הֹם. In contrast with these stand the Assyrian suffixes with initial *š*; sing. masc. *šu*, fem. *ša*, plur. masc. *šunu* or *šun*, fem. *šina* or *šin*. A similar form is found in one of the Ḥimyaritic dialects, where the sing. masc. is written סוֹ or ס, pl. סם, whereas in the other we find הו and הם; and traces of it exist in the modern Mehrī, 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.	*iya*	plur.	*nā*	dual (only in Arabic)
2nd „	m. *ka*	„	m. *kumū*	} *kumā*
„	f. *ki*	„	f. *kunna*	
3rd „	m. *sū, hū*	„	m. *sūnu, humū*	} *humā*
„	f. *sā, hā*	„	f. *sīna, hunna*	

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* (אֲן), the three pronouns *aniya*, *anka* and *anhū*. The syllable *an*,—itself a compound of א and ן,—we may regard as a sort of demonstrative particle or interjection, akin probably to the Arabic اِنّ, اَنّ, Hebrew הֵן, הִנֵּה, Syriac ܐܶܢ, and Ethiopic ልል፡ in ልልክሙ፡ *ën'kĕmū*, "en vobis = accipite."

The third of these pronouns, *anhū*, appears but rarely as an independent word. I would instance the Talmudic אִיהוּ, fem. אִיהִי, possibly assimilated from אִינְהִי, אִינְהוּ, with the first vowel weakened from *a* to *i*. At any rate, the plural forms, which are without assimilation, are אִינְהִי, אִינְהוּ, for אִינְהוֹן, אִינְהִין. In Syriac too we find ܐܶܢܘܿܢ, ܐܶܢܶܝܢ, assimilated for ܐܶܢܗܘܿܢ, ܐܶܢܗܶܝܢ. Otherwise these forms are used as suffixes; for example, in Hebrew, נֽרוּ ־ְ, as יְבָרֲכֶנֽרוּ, assimilated נּוּ ־ֶ, fem. נָּה ־ֶ; and also in the later Aramaic dialects, as Mand. יַנרוּן or יַנוּן, fem. יַנהִין; Talm. יַנהֵי, יַנהוּ, יַנִין, יַנהִין.

The same is the case with the second of the above pronouns, *anka*, which appears in Hebrew only as a suffix, e.g. אֶתְּקֶנְךָ (from נתק, Jerem. xxii. 24), usually with assimilation ךָ ־ְ; in Mand. יַנכוּן, fem. יַנכִין.

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, אָנִי. In the other languages the

older form is more or less obscured: Arabic, اَنَا *ănă*, with short *a* in both syllables, dialectically *ănă*, in pause *ănā* and *ănăh*; Ethiopic likewise አነ: *ănă*; J. Aram. אֲנָא (אֲנָה Bibl.) or אֲנָא,

Syriac اَنَا *ĕnă* or *ĕnō*. Similarly in the younger dialects: Tigré አነ: *ană*, Tigriña አነ: *ané* or አነ: *anä*, Amharic እነ: *ĕnē*; Mand. אֲנָא, modern Syriac اَنَا. As the proper plural of אֲנִי we may regard אֲנוּ (Jerem. xlii. 6, *kĕthībh*), to which, among the later dialects, the Amharic offers a parallel in the form *ĕnă*. I may add that in Arabic, Ethiopic and Syriac this pronoun is liable to considerable mutilation. In Arabic we find اَن *an*, and likewise in Ethiopic, when followed by the particle ሰ: *sa*, አንሰ: *an-sa*. In Syriac the first syllable is liable to be elided under certain circumstances, whence arise such forms as ܐܢܐ ܚܕܢ, ܚܕܢܐ, ܚܕܢܐ, and finally, dropping the last vowel, ܚܕܢ. Hence in modern Syriac the verbal form of the present, 1st pers. sing.

ܩܘܡ *I end*, بنِي *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 א and ך, and to be akin to such words as כָּא, כֹּ, "here," כֹּה "thus, here, now," כִּי "that," הָכָא "here," אֵיכָה "how," etc. As the oldest form I venture to write *anākiya* or *anākī*, whence

in Assyrian *anâku* (Haupt, *anakû*), 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 אנך, probably pronounced *ânôkh*; whilst in Phoenician inscriptions we also find אנך, which in the ears of Plautus sounded like *anŏch*. I may remind you in passing that the Egyptian pronoun was also *anek, enek*, and the Coptic ⲁⲛⲟⲕ. The form *âku*, without the prefix *an*, is employed in Assyrian as an enclitic with the force of the substantive verb, e.g. *sarrâku* "I am king," *rabbâku* "I am great," *zikarâku* "I am manly"; thus corresponding to the use of אֲנָ for אֲנָ in Syriac.

The corresponding plural form is still more remarkable: Assyr. *anĥni, nĥni, nĥnu* for *aniĥni, anaĥni*, Heb. אֲנַחְנוּ, Phoen. אנחן. Here then נ of the singular has interchanged with ח (as in שְׁחַר, ܡܣܒܪ̈ܐ, compared with شكد, ܟܗܒܕܐ compared with אֲבַטִּיחִים), and the vowel has been shortened in the shut syllable. The last syllable of the word, נוּ, is probably shortened from אֲנוּ, the plural form of אֲנִי, which we mentioned above. This plural אֲנַחְנוּ, abbreviated in Hebrew itself into נַחְנוּ, is found, in some shape or other, in nearly all the Semitic dialects. Arabic: نَحْنُ, vulgar نَحَنْ *neĥnĕ, neĥn*, أَحْنَا *aĥnâ* in Egypt *iĥna*. Ethiopic: ንሕነ ː *nĕĥna*, Tigré *naĥna*, Tigriña *nĕĥnâ*. Syriac, with an additional demonstrative *n* at the end, ܐܢܚܢܢ, commonly ܚܢܢ, which is shortened in pronunciation into *nan*, as in ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ. Also ܐܚܢܢ, with prosthetic vowel, whence in modern Syriac ܐܚܢܝ and ܐܚܠܒ, but also *âkhnôkhun* ܐܚܢܘܟܘܢ (with a curious assimilation to the pronoun of the 2nd pers. *âkhtôkhun* ܐܚܬܘܟܘܢ). In Samaritan we also find the form אנחנן, whilst in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac, ܐܢܚ,

and in the modern Syriac of Maʿlūla, ܐܢܚ anaḥ, the final *n* has vanished. Jewish Aramaic forms are אֲנַחְנָא and נַחְנָא; but in several dialects the guttural has been elided, whence in the Talmud אֲנַן, in Samaritan אֲנַן, in Mandaitic אנין (*anēn* for *anān*), and in Palestinian Syriac ܐܢ and more commonly ܐܢܚ. Likewise in Assyrian, as above mentioned, *anini*, *nini* or *ninu*.

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 אֲנִי and אָנֹכִי are very far-fetched; that אֲנִי can hardly be compounded with a demonstrative particle or interjection, ᵃ + (נ + א), and אָנֹכִי with two words of that class ᵃ + (כ + א) + (נ + א). 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 *cet*, 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*, ἐγώ, ἐγών, 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 τίς τί 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 כֹּ, כֹּה, כִּי, 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 *tat*, in Greek τό.

The oldest form of this pronoun known to us in Semitic is the Arabic أَنْتَ *anta*, with its fem. أَنْتِ *anti*, dual أَنْتُمَا, plur. masc. أَنْتُمْ *antumū*, shortened *antum*, and fem. أَنْتُنَّ *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 *entī* (Egypt. *inty, enty*), *entum* or *entū* (Egypt. *intū*). Almost identical with these are the Ethiopic አንት: *anta, antī, antĕmū, antĕn*, which appear in Tigré as *anta, antī, antūm*, and in Amharic as *anta, antyī* or *anty*, plur. *antū*. But in Tigriña they have been displaced by the compound ንስኻ: *nĕssᵉkhā*, fem. *nĕssᵉkhī*, plur. *nĕssātkūm, nĕssātkĕn*, by assimilation for *nĕfsᵉkhā*, etc.

In Assyrian and Hebrew *nt* have been assimilated into *tt*. The Assyrian forms are *attā, attī*, plur. masc. *attūnu*, (fem., according to analogy, *attīna*). In Hebrew the masc. sing. is אַתָּה, in pause אַתָּה or אָתָּה; but the shorter אַתְּ, *attĕ* or *att*, also occurs, Num. xi. 15; Deut. v. 24, and in some other passages in the Kĕthîbh, e.g. Ps. vi. 4; Job i. 10; Eccles. vii. 22. Its fem. is אַתִּי, which occurs sometimes in the Kĕthîbh, 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 אַתְּ, *attĕ* or *att*, in pause אָתְּ. The plur. masc. is אַתֶּם, with *ĕ* for *ŭ*; the fem. is אַתֵּנָה, sometimes written אַתֵּנָה and אַתֵּנָּה; but the shorter אַתֵּן or אַתֶּן is found in Ezek. xxxiv. 31, and with assimilation of the *n* to a following *m*, in Ezek. xiii. 20, אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם מְצֹדְדוֹת (observe Ezek. xxxiii. 26, עֲשִׂיתֶן תּוֹעֵבָה for עֲשִׂיתֶם, and Isaiah xxxv. 1, יְשֻׂשׂוּם מִדְבָּר for יְשֻׂשׂוּן).

In Biblical Aramaic and the Targūms we find both the primitive and the assimilated forms, אַנְתָּה, אַנְתְּ, אַתְּ, אַנְתְּ, fem. אַתְּ, plur. masc. אַנְתּוּן, אַתּוּן, fem. אַנְתֵּין, אַתֵּין. In Syriac the *n*, though written, is never pronounced, and the final *t* of the fem. sing. has also been dropped, ܐܰܢ̱ܬ݁, ܐܰܢ̱ܬ݁, ܐܰܢ̱ܬ݁, ܐܰܢ̱ܬ݁. The forms of the later dialects are in some cases such as we should naturally expect; e.g. Samaritan אתה or אַתְ, fem. אתי, plur. אתון, אתין; Palestinian Syriac, ܐܢ݇ܬ, fem. ܐܢ݇ܬܝ, plur. ܐܢ݇ܬܘܢ and ܐܢ݇ܬܝܢ, ܐܢ݇ܬܝܢ. But in others there are points worthy of remark. For instance, in Mandaitic, instead of *n* and *t* being assimilated, a short *ă* is inserted between them, אנאת, plur. אנאתון. Again, in the vulgar Syriac of Ma'lūla, we find اَچ *ach* or هِچ *hach*, with the plur. اَچخُن *achkhun* or هَچِن *hachun*, where *t* has been softened into *ty, ch*, as in كاچبا (ܟܳܬ݂ܒ݂ܐ), نارچا (ܢܳܪܬ݁ܐ), مدينچا (ܡܕ݂ܺܝܢܬ݁ܐ), (ܚܰܕ݂ܬ݁ܐ). The modern Nestorian or eastern forms are ܐܰܬ݁ *at* or ܐܰܬ݁ܝܢ *attin*, the latter with a curious appendage; and not less strange are the plurals ܐܰܢ݇ܬܘܢ and ܐܰܢ݇ܬܘܢ, which can only be explained as having arisen under the influence of the 1st pers. اَسب or اَسب, whilst conversely the form of the 1st person اَسنچن must have owed its birth to this falsely formed ܐܰܢ݇ܚܢܢ.

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. *šī*, and the corresponding Syriac ܗܽܘ, fem. ܗܺܝ, 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 הוּא, fem. הִיא. Now some scholars believe that the *aleph* is a mere orthographic sign, like the Arabic *elif* in the 3rd pers. plur.

of the verb, تَنَلُوا, which is occasionally found even in Hebrew (הֲרִלְכוּא Josh. x. 24; אָבוֹא 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. ויאמר גם הא) and the sarcophagus of Eshmūn'āzār, king of Sidon (masc. ארם הא "that man," fem. הממלכת הא "this kingdom"). Had the original sounds been merely *hū* and *hī*, we should have found on such monuments הו and הי. I conclude, therefore, that the words must have sounded origi- nally 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 ܘܗ *ō* and ܝܗ *ē*, by the addition of ܐܢ, another demonstrative ܐܢܘܗ (ܐܢܘܗ) *ō'ā*, ܐܢ ܝܗ *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 הוא for the fem. gender in Hebrew, because I do not believe in its existence. The distinction of the vowels in הוא and היא, *sū* and *sī*, is just as primitive and essential as in *anta, anti* and *ka, ki.* I am aware that הוא takes the place of היא in various passages of the Pentateuch; but in old Hebrew MSS. ו and י are very much alike, and the Masorets have done well to regard הוא as nothing but a clerical error, and to substitute for it the correct היא[1]. The same pretended archaism may be found in the famous Babylonian codex of the Prophets published by Strack, e.g. Hosea ii. 4, הוא (i.e. הוא), Joel iv. 1, ההוא (i.e. ההוא).

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 *hŭwa* هُوَ and *hĭya* هِيَ. In Ethiopic these words have received a further

---

[1] [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* הא, for הוא and היא alike.]

increment at the end, and in consequence have suffered a slight curtailment at the beginning. The forms in actual use are ዐእቱ: *wǝʾétū*, fem. ይእቲ: *yǝʾétī*, 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 *šâšū*, fem. *šâšī*, *šâša*, as also in *hagâ-šū* (Del. *agâšu*), 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 τήμερον (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.	هُوَ (vulg. Eg. *hūwä* هو)	هُم هِم (Eg. *hum* and *huma*)	هُمَا
f.	هِي (vulg. Eg. *hīyä* هي)	هُنَّ	
Eth. m.	ዐእቱ: *wǝʾétū*	እሙንቱ: *ǝmūntū* or ዐእቶሙ: *wǝʾétómū*	
f.	ይእቲ: *yǝʾétī*	እማንቱ: *ǝmāntū* or ዐእቶን: *wǝʾétón*	
Heb. m.	הוּא (Ph. הא)	הֵם, הֵמָּה	
f.	הִיא (Ph. הא)	הֵנָּה	
J. Ar. m.	הוּא	אִנּוּן; הִמּוֹן, הִמּוֹ	
f.	הִיא	אִנִּין	

	singular	plural
Syr. m.	ܗܽܘ	ܐܶܢܽܘܢ ܗܶܢܽܘܢ
f.	ܗܺܝ	ܐܶܢܶܝܢ ܗܶܢܶܝܢ
Talm. m.	אִידוּ	אִינְהוּ
f.	אִיהִי	אִינְהִי
Mand. m.	הו	הינון
f.	הע	הינין

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 هُمْ, هُمَ, vulgar Egypt. *hum, huma,* הֵמָּה, הֵם, and הֵמּוֹ, הֵמּוֹן, are really identical, the last being strengthened by an additional demonstrative element, as is also the case with አሙንቱ: and አማንቱ:: The Talmudic forms אִינְהוּ and אִינְהִי (for אִינְהוֹן and אִינְהֵין) shew us that the double *n* of the Chaldee, Syriac and Mandaitic is an assimilation of *nh*, the syllable *in, en, hen* being, as I formerly stated, an interjectional or demonstrative element prefixed to the pronoun. The simple ܗܽܘ and ܗܺܝ 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 Tigriña, *nĕssū,* fem. *nĕssā,* plur. masc. *nĕssātōm,* fem. *nĕssātōn,* for *nĕfsū,* etc.; and in Amharic, እርሱ: *ĕrsū,* fem. እርሷ: *ĕrsĕwā,* plur. እርሳቸው: *ĕrsātyaw,* or with a further assimilation እሱ: *ĕssū,* etc., from ርእስ: *rĕ'ĕs,* "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 *hâ,* in vulgar Arabic *â,* we get the compound pronoun *hā-hū.* This appears in the

Talmūd as הַרְדָּא, fem. הָהִיא, plur. הָנְדֹן (for הָאִנְדֹן). The
word is often wrongly pointed הַרְדָא, הַהִיא, whereby it is
confounded with the Hebrew הַהִיא, הַהוּא, which is of a totally
different origin, viz. by assimilation for הַלְדָּא. In Mandaitic
the same word exists in the singular, האהו, האהע, without any
corresponding plural. In Syriac the second *h* was elided, and
the syllables *hă-n, hă-ĭ,* contracted into ܗܘ *haw,* ܗܝ *hăy* or *hŏy,*
plur. ܗܢܘܢ *hănnūn,* ܗܢܝܢ *hănnĕn* (for *hă-ĕn-hūn, hă-ĕn-hĕn*).
In the Palestinian dialect we also find the singular forms ܗܘܢ,
ܗܘ; fem. ܗܝܢ, ܗܝ, but not the plural. In modern Syriac
the corresponding words are ܗܘ *aw,* ܗܝ *ay,* often written and
pronounced ܐܘ, ܐܘ, ܐܝ, *ŏ* and *ĕ,* with the plur. ܐܢܝ *ănĭ* (from
the old fem. ܗܢܝܢ), shortened into ܐܢ *ăn* and ܐܢ *an.* From this
is formed another pronoun by the addition of the particle
ܗܘ at the end, to designate a more remote object; "that,"
"yonder," viz. ܗܘ ܗܘܢ (ܗܘ ܗܘܢ), *ŏ'ŏ,* fem. ܗܘ ܗܝ, *ĕ'ŏ.* The *n*
which we have found in the plurals הָנְדֹן, ܗܢܘܢ, etc., seems to
appear in the singular in the Assyrian *annu,* "this," whether
we regard it as merely = *an + hū,* or as = *ă + 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, *annĭ* or *annĕ.*

　　In vulgar Arabic of Egypt the forms corresponding to
הַרְדָּא, הָהִיא, הָנְדֹן, are still used with the original interjectional
force: *ăhŏ́,* "there he is," *ăhĭ́,* "there she is," *ăhŭ́m* or *ăhŏ́m,*
"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. ذ *dh,* צ = Eth. Heb. Assyr. *z*; and that Aram. ת *t* =
Arab. ث *th,* פ = Eth. ሰ: *s,* Assyr. *š,* Heb. שׁ *sh.*

One of the simplest of these pronouns is the Arabic ذَا, fem.

ذِي, نَّه, تَا, plur. أُلَى or أُلَّا, often written *plene* ,أُوْلَاءِ ,أُولَى.
The corresponding forms in vulgar Arabic are *dā* or *dē*, fem. *dī*,
plur. دول *daul* 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 ዝ: *zĕ*, fem. ዛ: *zâ*,
plur. እሉ: *ĕllú*, fem. እላ: *ĕllá*. Its Hebrew equivalent is זֶה,
fem. זֹאת, for *zât*, shortened into זֹה and זוֹ, plur. אֵל (1 Chron.
xx. 8, generally with the art. הָאֵל'), אֵלֶּה. The Phoenician
forms are, as might be expected, very similar; viz. ז for both
genders (perhaps with a difference of pronunciation, *zĕ*, *zū*);
fem. also זת, in Plautus *syth*; plur. אל, in Plautus *ily*. The
form אז, which also occurs in Phoenician, has been regarded as
equivalent to the Hebrew הַזֶּה; but the article in Phoenician
is the same as in Hebrew, and ז does not take the article in
Phoenician even when the preceding substantive is defined
(הַשַּׁעַר ז and מִשְׁכָּב ז). I prefer therefore to consider the *aleph*
in אז as merely prosthetic. The very curt form of the word ז
might readily lead to such a vowel being prefixed; and we find
some support for this idea in the modern Ethiopic or Tigriña
form እዚ: fem. እዛ:: In the later Hebrew of the Mishnah we
have masc. זֶה, fem. זוֹ (*zŏ* or *zū*), plur. אֵלּוּ. In Assyrian it is
curious to find the form with *l* in the singular as well as the
plur.;

sing. masc. *ullu*	fem. *ullat*
plur. masc. *ullûtu*	fem. *ullîtu*[2].

By appending a demonstrative *n* to the masculine, we obtain
the common J. Aram. form דֵּן, דֵּין, emphatic דְּנָה, דְּנָא, with its
simple fem. דָּה, דָּא, and its plur. אִלֵּין. The corresponding

---

[1] [The latter only in the Pentateuch, where it is probably to be viewed as a mere
scriptio defectiva (הָאֵל) as in Phoenician. Cf. Kuenen *ut supra*. In any case הָאֵל
is younger than הָאֵלֶּה, final הָ﹍ being readily lost in Hebrew, as in רֵעַ=רֵעֶה.]

[2] [The feminines are not recognised by Delitzsch.]

Phoenician forms are זן and אז; and in certain Aramaic dialects (Egypto-Aram., Nabathean) these words appear as זנא and אז. An Ethiopic form, with further demonstrative increment, is ዝ�ንቱ፡ *zǝntū*, fem. ዛቲ፡ *zātī*, plur. እሎንቱ፡ *ellōntū*, fem. እላንቱ፡ *ellāntū*.

For the sake of still greater emphasis, *hā* is prefixed to these forms, giving in Arabic هٰذَا, fem. هٰذِهِ or هٰذِي, هَاتِي, هَاتَا, plur. هٰؤُلَاءِ or هٰؤُلَا; and vulgarly *hādā*, fem. *hādī*, plur. *hādaul*, 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 הָדֵין, fem. הָדָא (or עָדָא), plur. הָאֵלִין and הָלֵין (less correctly pronounced הַאֵלִין and הֵלֵין); and similarly in the Palestinian dialect ܗܿܕܶܝܢ or ܗܿܕܶܝܢ, fem. הֹדָא (*hādē* for *hādā*), plur. ܗܳܠܶܝܢ. In Mandaitic ן has generally taken the place of ד; האזין, fem. האזא, plur. האלין. האדא however occurs, as also the compound האדינו = Talmud. הדינו, i.e. הדין הו. The ordinary Syriac forms are ܗܳܢܳܐ, fem. ܗܳܕܶܐ, plur. ܗܳܠܶܝܢ. Of these, ܗܳܢܳܐ stands for הָדְנָא, and ܗܳܢ is weakened from ܗܳܕܶܝܢ, which occurs in the combination ܗܳܕܶܝܢ‌ܗܘܿ (for ܗܳܕܶܝܢ‌ܗܘܿ). Shorter forms are ܗܳܢ, for הָדֵן, and ܗܳܢ. Here too must be placed the Talmudic הָהֵן or אָהֵן, which latter is also found in Samaritan. Here א 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 הָאִי, fem. הָא, plur. הָנֵי or הַנֵי, as corruptions of הָדֵין, הָדָא, and הָלֵין. The modern Syriac words are very similar, viz. ܗܳܢܳܐ *āhā* or ܗܳܐ *ā*, plur. ܐܰܢܶܐ *annē*. ܗܳܢܳܐ springs from the fem. ܗܳܕܶܐ, the original aspirated *d* (*dh*) being represented, as in אָהֵן, by an *h*; *h* having been gradually

dropped, *ā'ā* has been contracted into *ā*. Dialectically the forms

آب, بآ, are also used, both from הֲדֵן.

Now if to these series of pronouns we append the letter ךְ,
we obtain another series, generally designating more distant
objects.

The simplest of these is the J. Aram. דֵּךְ or דֵּיכִי, fem. דָךְ,
plur. אִלֵּךְ, which are formed from דֵּן, דָא and אִלֵּין. The
Palestinian dialect exhibits the plural in the form ܗ݁ܠܝܢ.
By prefixing *hā* we arrive at the Talmudic הָדֵיךְ, fem. הָךְ, plur.
הַנֵּךְ or הַנַּךְ, and the Mandaitic האך (masc. and fem.), plur.
האניך, which are contractions for הדינך, הראך, and הלינך.
Here too the Syriac varieties ܗ݁ܢܘܢ, fem. ܗ݁ܢܝܢ, find their
place; the former of which may perhaps be compounded with a
form corresponding to the Mishnaic אִלּוּ. As for (הנון) ܗܢܘܢ,
which is always masc., it is probably not a mere variation of
ܗ݁ܢܘܢ, but a different compound, viz. from ܗܢ and ܡ.
In Arabic the corresponding pronoun is ذَاكَ, fem. تَاكَ, تِيكَ,
plur. أُولَاكَ or أُولَائِكَ. The Arabs have, however, regarded the
suffixed كَ as being the pronoun of the 2nd person, and hence,
though ذَاكَ is commonly used in speaking to two or more per-
sons of both sexes, it is also permitted to use ذَاكِ in addressing
a woman, ذَاكُمَا in speaking to two, and ذَاكُمْ or ذَاكُنَّ in speaking
to several, according to their sex. The vulgar forms, at least in
North Africa, are ذَاك *dāk*, fem. ذيك *dīk*, plur. ذوك *dūk*.
In Egypt we find, with the addition of *hā*, the forms *dikhā*
(masc. fem.) and *dukhā* (masc.); and these may be still further
strengthened by appending the pronoun of the 3rd pers., masc.
dukhauwā, masc. fem. *dikhaiya*, plur. masc. fem. *dukhamma*.
The Ethiopic presents us with this augmented pronoun in

the form ዝኩ፡ *zĕkú*, fem. እንትኩ፡ *ĕntĕkú*, plur. እልኩ፡ *ĕllĕkú*.
Here the fem. is remarkable, but we shall speak of it when
we come to the simple relative form እለ፡ *ĕnta*.

These pronouns again may be heightened by the accession
of a fresh demonstrative syllable. Thus in Chaldee we find
דִּכֵּן for both genders, with additional *n*. The Ethiopic presents
us with a form with additional *ñ*, viz. ዝኩቱ፡ *zĕkwĕtú* or ዝኩቱ፡
zĕktú, fem. እንትኩቱ፡ *ĕntākú*, plur. እልኩቱ፡ *ĕllĕkwĕtú* or እልኩቱ፡
ĕllĕktú. The Arabic prefixes *hā* in the form هَاذَاكَ, fem. هَاتَاكَ,

هَاتِيكَ, plur. هَآؤُلَائِكَ; which are much used in the vulgar

dialects, هَذاك *hādāk*, هَذِيك *hādīk*, plur. هُولَائِك *hā'ulā'ik*, or in

North Africa هَذُوك *hādūk*. From *hādāk* seems to arise, by

elision of the *d*, the form هَكَ *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 هَلْبِنْتْ, هَلْكِتَاب,

هَلْكِلَاب, هَالرَّجَل, هَالشَّيخ. Another strengthened form in old

Arabic is ذٰلِكَ, where the letter *l* has been inserted between

ذَا and كَ; its fem. is تِلْكَ, by contraction for تِيلِكَ. Peculiar
to the Mandaitic is the word האנאתה (masc. and fem.), plur.
masc. האנאתון, fem. האנאתין. Here it seems tolerably clear
that we have again the prefixes הא and אין, contracted into
האן, and the suffixes of the 3rd person; but it is not so easy to
say what is represented by the letters את, unless we admit
Noeldeke's suggestion that they are identical with יָת, the
Aramaic form of את.

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

אִיהִי; doubtfully, I say, because it may also be explained, as I did above, by assimilation from אִינְהִי, אִינְהוּ. This latter view is countenanced by the plurals אִינְהֵי, אִינְהוֹ. The forms נִירוּ and נִינְהוּ, representing the substantive verb, seem to be fresh compounds of the demonstrative *n* and אִירוּ, אִינְהוֹ; e.g. מַא נִירוּ "what it is," אֲנָא נִירוּ "it is I," צַדִּיקֵי גְּמוּרֵי נִינְהוּ "they are perfectly righteous men." More certain examples of this formation with prefixed *i* are אִידֵי (for אִידָן), fem. אִידָא; and אִידָךְ, plur. אִינַּךְ.

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: *kǐyā́*, 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, *kǐyā́-ya*, *kǐyā́-ka*, etc. By the weakening of כ into ה (of which I gave some examples in a former lecture), we obtain the Arabic dialectic form هِيَّا. From this it is but a step to the common Arabic إِيَّا *ǐyā*, which is used precisely like its Ethiopic equivalent, and appears in Tigriña in the contracted form of ኢ: *i*, denoting *self*, as ኢየ: *ǐyē*, ኢኻ: *ǐkhā*, ኢዩ: *ǐyū*. 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 *ǐyāth* or *ǐyath*; for otherwise the י 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 את, and Plautus heard the word pronounced *yth*. The Aramaic forms seem to be shortened from the Phoen., viz. Syr. ܝܬ, Chald. יָת, less correctly יַת. These

are used not only as a sign of the definite accus., ܟܪ ܣܒܪܟܕ
ܐܕܐ ܣܟ ܛܟܣܐ ܟ ܠܐܟܐ; but also as a substantive, signify-
ing *self*, e. g. ܗܢ ܘ݁ܗ ܢܟܐܕܘܢ؟ ܟܢܐܗ "he who knows himself,"
ܐܢܐܠ ܗܠܦܗ̈ ܡܟܝܓܐܟ "free-will"; and likewise in the Palestinian dia-
lects and in Samaritan to form demonstratives, as in the phrases
יוֹמָא בְּיָתֵהּ "on that same day," שַׁתָּא בְּיָתֵהּ "in that same
year," ܗܢܘ ܙܒܢܐ ܣܗ ܒܗ ܗܘ "at that same time." ܣܠܐ ܗ݁ܘ ܓܢܒ ܗܘ
"that man is a thief," לִי הָגֵין לָא יָתְהוֹן לִי הָגֵין דֵּין "this is of
use to me, those are not." In this way we may best explain the
Mandaitic demonstrative spoken of above, האנאתה (masc. and
fem.), האנאתין, האנאתון, where את is probably = יָת. Simi-
larly in Hebrew *yāth* was further altered into *āth*, whence, by the
usual change of *ā* into *ō*, resulted the common form *ōth*, אוֹת.
In close connection with a following word this *ōth* was shortened
into *ŏth*, just as from נְחֹשֶׁת and שְׁלֹשֶׁת we get נְחֻשְׁתִּי and
שְׁלָשְׁתָּם. Next, *ŏth* was changed into *ăth* אֶת־, as in אַתֶּם for
attŭm; and finally this אֶת־ was heightened by the tone into *ēth*,
אֵת. In later Hebrew, perhaps under the influence of the sur-
rounding Aramaic dialects, אוֹת came to be used, like יָת, as a
demonstrative: בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה, בְּאוֹתוֹ הַיּוֹם אוֹתוֹ לוֹ יֵשַׁב "that
one sat down," לְמוֹב הָאִישׁ אוֹתוֹ זְכוֹר. In Assyrian I find a
word *attu*, which seems to be nearly connected with *yāth* and
ōth, for example in such phrases as *attûa abûa* "my father"
("mon père à moi"), *sirya attûa* "my family" (זרע), *dînāta
attûa* "my laws" (דין), *bîta attûnu* "our house," *ša la iptallahû
abīya wa attua* "who revere (פלח) not my father and me."
Schrader also regards as cognate with *yāth* the words *yātī* and
āšī, in such phrases as *yātī Nabûnahīd šusibanni*, "as for me,
Nabunit, save (שׁיזב) thou me"; and again, *ša lā iplahû abûtīya
u āšī lā iṣbatū nīr sarrûtīya*, "who did not fear my fathers,
and, as regards me, did not take up the yoke of my rule."
These words *yātī* and *āšī* he explains as made up of *ya* +
a + *ti* or *ši*, i.e. *ya* for *yath*, *a* suffix of the 1st pers., and
a further demonstrative *ti* or *ši*. Sayce, however, gives a differ-

ent explanation of both words, so that we are evidently on unsafe ground. Even the Hebrew אֵת 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 اٰيَة "sign" or "mark," "form" or "body," thus identifying it with the word אוֹת (for אָוְת or אָוְיֵת), or else assuming a form אָוָה or אָיָה, from the construct state of which (אָוַת or אָיַת) אוֹת 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 הָלְאָה " away," " beyond," and הֲלֹם " 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 *â* ָ, as in הָרֹאשׁ, הָאִישׁ, הָהָר, הָעִיר, 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. משכב ז האדם for אדם הא, השער הזה for השער ז, דמשכב הזה for המשכב ז, המלכת ההיא for המלכת הא, ההוא.

The Arabs ordinarily weakened the initial ה to א, but restricted the assimilation of the final *l* to a following dental, sibilant or liquid (the so-called *solar letters* ش س ز ر ذ د ث ت , ز (ص ض ط ظ ل ن) .e.g. الإنْسَان, الْجَبَل, الْمَدِينَة, but الثَّوْر (הַשּׁוֹר), الشَّمْس (הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ), النَّهَر (הַנָּהָר). In Egypt this assimilation is nowadays extended to ج and ك, as *eg-gassār, eg-gum'a* " Friday," *ek-kull, ek-kenīse* " 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 *fī an-nāsi*, قَالَ الرَّجُلُ *ḳāla 'r-rajulu*, not *ḳāla ar-rajulu*, قَالَتِ الْمَرْأَةُ *ḳālati 'l-mar'atu*, not *ḳālat 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. *laḥmar* "red," *liswid* "black," *lashar*, the "*Azhar*" 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 גַּבְרָא, ܐ‍‍ ; סְפִינְתָּא, ܣܦܝܢܬܐ. 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 Ḥimyaritic suffixed *n*, e.g. in מונרן "this monument" or "tablet," שֶׂעֶדָלה | וכנהו | בנו | מרתדם | הקניו | אַלְמְקה | הדרן | מונרן | or in משלמן "this stone," חמעתת | בן | וֹטֹבן | עדב | שמהעלי | הקני | עתתר | משלמן. The words מונרן and משלמן are apparently contractions of מונרהן and משלמהן, as seems to result from such forms as בין | מחפדניהן | "between these two towers" or "castles," אבעל | ביתנהן | "the lords of these two houses," ביתנהן "this house of ours" (where the נ is the suffix of the 1st pers. plur.[2]). Often the demonstrative pronoun הן, fem. הת, is prefixed to such words, as הן מונרן.

---

[2] Other examples are: הן סטרן, "this inscription"; הן ותנן, "this idol"; הן פתחן, "this door"; הן מבנין, "this building"; צלמן, "this statue"; ואבלנהן, "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 דִּי of the Biblical Aramaic, shortened in the Targums and in Syriac into דְּ, ? *dĕ*. One or other of these forms appears in all the Aramaic dialects except the Egyptian and that of some ancient inscriptions, which have זִי. The Mandaites say *ĕd* as well as *dĕ*, and the same form Ნᾼ is occasionally found in Samaritan. I need only remark in addition that in Mandaitic ט is used in a few cases instead of the common דּ, as טאביד טאב "he who does good," טאביד סניא "he who does evil" (where דִּי־עֲבֵד = טאביד); רוחא טאבאדראתאן "spirit of our fathers." The word זי, 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 דּ. In modern Syriac ܠ or ܠܿ is frequently employed for ?, as ܦܘܿܫܝܼܕ ܦܢܝܼܐ (for ܦܪܘܩܗ ܕܢܝܐ) "the Saviour of the world," ܦܘܿܟܝܐ ܣܐܝܼܒܝܼܕ (for ܡܚܣܝܐ ܕܣܒ̈ܐ) "forgiveness of sins," ܒܢܝܼܕܗ ܕܡܟܢ (for ܒܝܼܗܐ ܕܡܟܢ) "the passion of our Lord," *bārit īshū*, i.e. ܟܠܐܵܘܘܗ ܕܝܼܣܦܘ, "after Jesus."

Identical with this דִּי or דְּ is the Arabic نُو, generally employed in this one form for both genders and all numbers; as بِئْرِي نُو حَفَرْتُ "he who said that came to me," أَتَانِي نُو قَالَ ذٰلِكَ "my well which I dug." The use of this word is, however, only dialectic. In S. Arabia the Ḥimyaritic furnishes us with similar forms: masc. דּ (ⵀ), fem. דּת, plur. אלי or אל.

In Ethiopic we find Ħː *ză*, with a fem. ኢንታː *ĕnta*, and a plur. *ĕlla*, all bearing a striking resemblance to the corresponding

forms of the demonstratives. H: *sd* may be used, like ד and

نُو, for both genders and numbers. The fem. אֵלֶּה: we must
trace back to the demonstrative particle *en*, or the letter *n*, *plus*
the fem. termination *t*; and the plur. אֵל: to the demonstrative let-
ter *l*. In Hebrew occurs the cognate form אֵל, likewise invariable.

In Arabic and Hebrew the simple article اَلْ, הָ, is sometimes

employed as a relative; e.g. مِنَ الْقَوْمِ الرَّسُولُ اللّٰهِ مِنْهُمْ "of the

people of whom is the Apostle of God," for اَلَّذِينَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ مِنْهُمْ;
Joshua x. 24, הַהֹלְכוּא אִתּוֹ "who went with him"; 1 Sam. ix. 24,
וְכֹל הַהִקְדִּישׁ שְׁמוּאֵל; 1 Chron. xxvi. 28, אֶת־הַשׁוֹק וְהֶעָלֶיהָ.

Hence, from a combination of these two words, with the
insertion of the demonstrative letter *l* (as in ذٰلِكَ), arises the

ordinary Arabic relative اَلَّذِي, with its fem. اَلَّتِي, for the full
inflection of which see the Arabic grammar. Its form in the

vulgar dialects is اَلَّي *ellī*, in Maltese even shortened into لِي *li*,
for all the genders and numbers. Identical with اَلَّذِي in form,
though not exactly in meaning, is the Hebrew demonstrative

הַלָּזֶה, shortened into הַלָּז, just as اَلَّذِي is sometimes found in

the form اَلّٰذ. הַלָּז is used as fem. in 2 Kings iv. 25,
הַשּׁוּנַמִּית הַלָּז, and another form, הַלָּזוּ *hallēzū*, also occurs as
fem. in Ezekiel xxxvi. 35, הָאָרֶץ הַלֵּזוּ הַנְּשַׁמָּה. This last seems
to be weakened from הַלָּזוּ, and to exhibit this pronoun in even
a purer form than הַלָּזֶה and اَلَّذِي.

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-šu*.

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 אֲתַר, ﺃﺛﺮ, "place," in Syriac also "trace," "track," "footstep," as in ܐܬܪ (for *ba-athar*) "after," "behind," Arab. ﺃﺛﺮ and ﺇﺛﺮ, "trace," "track," "footstep," Eth. አሰር:: 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 אָשַׁר: "Modo in tali vocabulo de etymo quaerendum est, אֲשֶׁר pr. *rectum* valuisse conjecerim ab אָשַׁר *rectus fuit*, deinde *recte*, *ita*, i. q. כֵּן et Germ. *so*, idque in antiquiore lingua in pron. relat. abiisse. Cf. כֹּה *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, שׁ = ת, ד, ז and ל, *plus* the prosthetic אֲ. Finally, Friedrich Böttcher looks upon אֲשֶׁר as standing for אֲשֶׁל, and as made up of a merely prosthetic אֲ, 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. הִקְטֵל = שֶׁקְטֵל, אֲקְטֵל). 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
הָרְכָא, "here," with the Chaldee הָרְכָא.   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. שַׁ, שֶׁ, שָׁ, but also שְׁ (in שְׁהֶם־, Eccles.
iii. 18, and according to one reading in שֶׁהוּא for שֶׁהוּא, Eccles.
ii. 22).   In Phoenician the word is written אש, but that the שׁ
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. נֵצָה
אֵשׁ שָׂדֶה.   More frequent, however, are the shorter forms *as,
es, ys, is*, and also *si, su*, which last correspond to the Hebrew
שְׁ; e.g. in the Poenulus, *assamar binam*, אֲשֶׁאמַר בְּנַעַם " what
he says is friendly"; *ys siddobrim, thyfel yth chyl ys chon them
liful*, i. e. (probably), אִישׁ שֶׁדְּבָרִים תִּפְעַל אֶת־כָּל־אֵשׁ־בֹּן תַּם לְפֹעַל,
in Latin *eum fecisse aiunt, sibi quod faciundum fuit;* or, to quote
another line, *yth alonim valonuth sicorathi simacom syth*, i. e.
אֶת־אֱלוֹנִים וַאֲלוֹנוֹת שֶׁקְּרָאתִי שֶׁמָּקוֹם 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 ὡς is only a case of the relative pronoun ὅς;
and, on the other, that the Persian *iẓâfat* or connective vowel *i*
in such constructions as نامِ پدرِ من *nâm-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
ዚአ፡, fem. እንታአ፡, plur. እለአ፡, combined with suffixes as fol-
lows: *zî'a-ya, zî'a-ka, zî'a-hû, zî'a-na, zî'a-kêmû, zî'a-hômû*, etc.
Here we may perhaps discern the relative ዘ፡ *za*, in combination
with the pronoun *kîyâ*, or rather its Arabic form *îyâ*, of which I

spoke in a former lecture. In Aramaic we meet with two forms, דִּיד and דִּיל. The former is found in the Talmūd, e. g. אֲנַן בְּדִידָן וְאִינְהוּ בְּדִידְהוֹ "we (occupy ourselves) with our affairs, and they with theirs." This arises, as Luzzatto has suggested, from a combination of דִּי with יַד, "hand." It also occurs in modern Syriac in the forms ܕ‎ܝ‎ܒ‎, ܕܝܘܟ, ܕܝܝ, *dīyī*, *dīyukh*, *dīyan*, etc., with elision of the *d* between two vowels. The other form דִּיל, i. e. דִּי plus the prep. לְ, is found in Biblical Aramaic, e. g. Dan. ii. 20—דִּי חָכְמְתָא וּגְבוּרְתָּא דִּי־לֵהּ הִיא; and prevails in the Targūms and in Syriac[1]. The equivalent שֶׁל, from אֲשֶׁר לְ, occurs in later Hebrew, as well as in Phoenician. Already in Jonah i. 7 we read בְּשֶׁלְמִי "for whose cause?" and in ver. 12, בְּשֶׁלִּי "for my sake"; and similarly in the Poenulus *ulic silli*, הוֹלֵךְ שֶׁלִּי, "my guest" (lit. "wanderer"); *amma silli*, אִמָּא שֶׁלִּי, "my mother"; *bene silli*, בְּנֵי שֶׁלִּי, "my son." A fuller form seems to occur on a Tyrian signet ring, viz. לְבַעַלְיָתֹן אִשׁ אֵלִם אֲשַׁלְמַלְקַרְתְּ רצף "(belonging) to Ba'al-yathon, a priest (lit. a gods'-man) of Melḳart Rṣph."

D. *The Interrogative Pronouns.*

The first of these to which I would direct your attention is the Arabic أيّ *ayy*, fem. أيّة *ayyah*, fully inflected, meaning "who, which, what?" It governs a genitive, as أيّ أرض or أيّة أرض, "which land?" أيّ الرّجلين "which of the two men?" أيّ الرّجال "which of the men?" أيّم، أيّهما "which of them[2]?"

---

[1] Compare the African نيال = الّذي ل.

[2] In vulgar Arabic it has become é, or in combination with شي (thing) ésh; لي

This word seems to me to have its ultimate source in the inter-
rogative particle اَ, Heb. הֲ. It is found in Ethiopic too in the
sing. አይ፡ *áy*, plur. አያት፡ *ayyắt*, for both genders; and in the
modern Tigriña it appears as እይ፡ እየ፡ እዮ፡ አዮ፡ or አዬ፡,
which are probably compounds of አይ፡ and the Ethiopic inter-
rogative ሁ፡፡ 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 composi-
tion of a great many interrogative adverbs. In Hebrew, for
example, it appears as אֵי (*ē* for *ay*) in אֵי זֶה, "who, which?"
אֵי מִזֶּה "from which?" אֵי לָזֹאת "wherefore, why?" But also
as an independent word in the sense of "where?" with pronom.
suffixes, אַיָּם, אַיּוֹ, אַיֶּכָּה; and in a longer form without suffix,
אַיֵּה. Of compound words the most ordinary examples are:

אַיִן (for אַיִן, Arabic اَيْنَ) "where?" contracted אָן, and as an
accusative אָנָה "whither?" אֵיכָה, אֵיךְ, and אֵיכָכָה, "how?"
אֵיפֹה "where? how?" Similar formations in Ethiopic are
አይቴ፡ "where?" and, with a shortening of አይ፡ into እ፡ *ĕ*, እፎ፡
ĕfṓ, "how? how!" reduplicated እፎፎ፡ *ĕfōfō*, እፋፎ፡ *ĕfāfō*, or
እፋፎ፡ *ĕfāfō*; and እስፍንቱ፡ "how much? how many?" from
ኍፍን፡ *sĕfn*, which is properly a noun meaning "number,"
"quantity." In Aramaic we have two forms of this word,
for just as the Arabic اَ is in Hebrew הֲ, so in Aramaic we find
both אֵי and הֵי. The latter, הֵי, is the ordinary form in the
Talmūd Bābli and in the Syriac dialect of Palestine. For
instance, in the Talmūd, הֵיי דֵין or הֵידֵין, fem. הֵיידָא or הֵידָא
"who?" "which?"; in Palestinian Syriac likewise ܗܝܕܝܢ, fem.

lĕ, "why?" In Egypt, *ĕnhū, ĕnhī, ĕnhĭm*, as *min ĕnhū gins*, "of what kind," but
separately *ĕnhū, ĕnhī, ĕnhĭm*, "who?" "which?", where *en* is probably for *ĕn* =
اَيْنَ. [So Spitta, p. 80. But Nöldeke explains the *n* as a remnant of the old
Tanwīn, مِنْ أَيٍّ هُوَ, and so forth.]

סו. Further, in the Talmūd, הֵי דְנוּ or הַיְדְנוּ "who," "which,"
"what is—?" for הוּ הַיְדִין ;הַיְכָה "how?" הֵיכָה "where?" אַהֵיָּא
"in respect of which?" "in reference to which?" for עַל־הַיָּא;
לְהַיָּא "to which?" "whither?" for לְהַיָּא. In the Aramaic of the
Targūms both forms occur; הֵיךְ אֵיךְ and הֵיךְ "how?" אֵידֵין and
הַיְדֵין, fem. אֵידָא and הַיְדָא, "who, which?" אִיכָא and הֵיכָא,
"where?" אִיכְדֵין and הֵיכְדֵין, "how?" In Syriac we have only
the forms with *aleph*, but in great abundance; for instance:
ܐܝܟ (*âkh*) "how," "as," with its derivatives ܐܝܟܢ "as," "like,"
ܐܟܚܕ "together," "at once," ܐܟܡܢ "as one who," "as if,"
ܐܟܡܐ "as"; further, ܐܝܟܐ "where?" from ܟܐ "here"; ܐܡܐ,
"how?" for ܐܡܢ and ܐܡܢܐ; ܐܡܟܐ "whence?" for
ܟܐ ܡܢ; ܐܝܢܐ for ܐܝܡܢ, "who?" with its fem. ܐܝܕܐ, and plur.
ܐܝܠܝܢ for אִלֵּין; and finally, with a shortening of ܐ into ܐ,
ܐܡܬܝ "when?" in the Targūms אֵימָתַי and אֵימַת, from the
Heb. מָתַי, Arab. مَتَى. In modern Syriac there are similar
forms, though of course more or less corrupted. Such are:
ܐܝܟܐ *îkâ* or ܐܟܐ *ikâ*, "where?" ܐܝ ܟܡܐ *êdânâ*, for אֵי עִדָּנָא,
"when?" *imînê* or *imnê*, "which of them?" ܐܝ ܡܢܗ or ܐܝܡܢܗ,
in Talmudic הַי מִנַּיְהוּ; further, ܐܝ "who?" from אֵי דְנָא and
אֵי דָא, with another form ܐܝܢܝ *ênî*, which is, strictly speaking,
derived from the old plural ܐܝܠܝܢ. In Mandaitic the same
interrogative exists in מנא *m'nâ*, "whence?" which is also a
Talmudic form, for מַנָּא or מַנָּן, i.e. מִן אֵין; מִן לָאךְ סִינִי *minnê lâkh*,
in the Talmud מנא לך, *undenam tibi?* Also in לִיָא or לֵע, *lê*,
for לְאֵי, "whither?" מִילְיָא *millê*, "whence?" עמאת or לעמאת
"when?" עכא and אבא or האבא, "where?" from הַיְכָא, אִיכָּא,
with suffix כָּארֵנ "where is—?" in which form the real inter-
rogative has wholly disappeared, just as in the modern Syriac

אֵן כֹּ "where is he?" from אֵן כֹּ *ika*, "where?" Here too I should mention the Mandaitic forms האמניא and האמנו, probably standing for הַאי מֶנָּה and הַאי מִנְּהוֹן, e.g. בהאמניא תיהילפון "in which will ye cross over?" כורסיא דיליא האמנו הו "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; መኑ: *mānū*, acc. መነ: *māna*, "who?" and መንት: *mĕnt*, acc. መንተ: *mĕnta*, "what?" The Himyar. form is also מֹ, but more usually בֹן, with the substitution of בֹ for מֹ. In Arabic we have ordinarily مَن *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 مَنو *manū*, and the fem. مَنَه *manah* (with aspirated *h*, for مَنَت) and sometimes مَنَت *mant*. The Assyrian forms are said to be *mannu* or *manu* and *man*, which last is identical with the Aramaic מֵן, مَن. Hence arise in the Aramaic dialects, by the addition of the pronoun *hū*, such forms as Syriac مَنُو; Talmudic מַנּוּ, fem. מַנִּי, for מַן הִי, מַן הוּ; Mandaitic מאנו; modern Syriac مَنُو, مَنُو, مَنُو, 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. Tigriña መን: "who?" and መንታይ: *mĕntāy*, rarely መንት: and እንታይ: "what?" This latter is compounded of መንት: and the other interrogative እይ:: In Amharic the commonest forms are ማን: "who?" and ምን: "what," shortened from መንት::

Vulgar Arabic forms of مَن are مِن and مُن. 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 *ă* in the shut
syllable, and is pronounced in pause *mīn* مِيـن. 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.
ሚአዕም: "how pleasant!" ሚፆኀ: "how great is—!" ሚዐጢ፤:
"how great?" "how much?" (from ዐጢ፤: "measure, quantity").
The Phoenician form of the personal interrogative seems also,
from some phrases in the *Poenulus*, to have been *mī*.

The neuter form *mā* is common to the Arabic, Hebrew, Phoe-
nician, and the Aramaic dialects, مَا, מֶה, מָא, מֹא; 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
matt; 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*, מֵה, *mah*, and finally
disappear altogether in pronunciation, the vowel being length-
ened in the now open syllable, מָה, *māh*. Compare the different

stages of such words as אַנְף, אַף, אַף "anger" (Arab. أَنْف
"nose"), or תֵּת, with suffix תִּתִּי, from תֵּת, תֵּת, תִּנְת or תִּנְת,
תִּנְת (for נְתֶנֶת); and the series of changes which produced the
ordinary feminine termination of nouns ה ָ, א ָ, out of the
original *at*, viz. (1) *at*, (2) *ath*, ת ְ, (3) *ah*, with aspirated *h*
(found in Arabic in rhyme), and finally (4) *ā*, ה ָ, א ָ·. 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 מֶה־, מֶה, מֶה, as compared with those of the article
הַ, הָ, הֶ·, from הַל.

From מָא by the addition of הֻ we obtain in Talmudic and
Mandaitic the forms מָרוּ, מָארוּ, "what is it?" מָאהוּ is con-

tracted in Mandaitic into מַן in the word אמן "why?" i.e.
עַל מָאהוּ=אל מָאהוּ. By adding דֵין to מָא there arises in
Talmudic the word מָאי "what?" in composition אַמַּאי "where-
fore?" "why?" = עַל מָאדֵין. In ancient Syriac the same com-
bination of מָא with דְּנָא and דֵין finally resulted in the
contracted forms ܡܳܢܳܐ and ܡܰܢ, the latter of which was farther
weakened into ܡܰܢ. Hence in combination with הֻו arose the
form ܡܳܢܰܘ "what is it?" = ܡܳܢܳܐ ܗܽܘ. In modern Syriac this
same mâ-dîn has been contracted into ܡܰܘܕܝ, with a rather
unusual weakening of the vowel in this dialect; and this is farther
shortened into ܡܰܘܕܝ, ܡܰܘܕܝ, and even ܡܰܘ, as in ܡܰܘ ܟ݁ܳܐܶܪ
"what shall we do?"

With regard to the neutral مَا in Arabic, I may observe that
it is not unfrequently shortened into مَ mä, especially in con-
nection with prepositions, as عَلَيمَ ,إِلَيمَ ,عَمَّ for عَمْ ,عَنمَ ,مِمَّ, for
مِنمَ ,فِيمَ ,بِمَ ,لِمَ. These last two words are still further
abbreviated in poetry into بِمُ and لِمُ, which shows us the origin
of the word كَمْ "how much?" standing for كَمَ or كَمَا, Syriac
ܟܡܳܐ, Hebrew כַּמָּה. In Ethiopic this abbreviated mä is fre-
quently appended to other interrogatives, with somewhat the
same force as the Latin nam; e.g. መኑመ፡ (mânû-mä) አንት፡
"who art thou, pray?" ምንትኑመ፡ mênt-nû-mä, አይቴመ፡ aytê-mä,
እፎመ፡ êfô-mä, ማእዜኑመ፡ mā'êzê-nû-mä.

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 com-
pleteness, be noticed here. And firstly, the Assyrian words
mannú-ma, mannâ-ma, man-man, by assimilation *mamman,* and

man-mā, "whoever," "any one"; *mimma*, "whatever." Of these, *manman* or *mamman* 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 መ፡ *mī*. Similar words may be found in the modern dialects of Abyssinia. For instance, Tigriña has መኖም፡ or መኝም፡ "whoever," "any one"; and in Amharic there occurs ማንም፡, with the neuters ምንም፡ and ምንምን፡፡

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"; أَعْطِنِي كِتَابًا مَّا " give me some book or other." At other times it conveys something of an intensifying force, as جِئْتَ لِأَمْرٍ مَّا " thou art come for some matter" (of importance); whence فَتًى مَّا is often nearly equivalent to أَيُّ فَتًى " what a youth !" "what a man !" Hence we obtain an easy explanation of such a word as the Chaldee מִדַּעַם "something," which is in reality a contraction of מִדַּע מָא " *scibile quid*." All the other forms of this word are only more or less corrupted; e. g. Chald. מִנְדְּעַם (like מַנְדַּע for מַדַּע), Mand. מינדאם, Syr. ܡܶܕܶܡ, Talmud. מִידִי, modern Syriac ܡܶܕܶܡ. 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 ܡܶܕܡܶܐ, and in modern Syriac ܡܶܕܡܳܢܶܐ, whilst the Mandaitic forms a new substantive מינדא, "a thing," plur. מינדיא.

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

عَمَّا قَلِيل "after a little," بِمَا رَحْمَةٍ مِنَ اللّٰه "by God's mercy."
The same is the case in Hebrew, only that מָה has in this case
been modified into מוֹ. Hence בְּמוֹ־שֶׁלֶג, Job ix. 30, kĕrî;
בְּמוֹ־אֹפֶל, Ps. xi. 2; לְמוֹ־חָרֶב, Job xxvii. 14; and כְּמוֹ־אֶבֶן,
Exod. xv. 5. So also before pronominal suffixes כָּמוֹנִי, כָּמוֹךָ,
כָּמוֹהוּ. Here the Ethiopic at once shows the old form in its
ከመ፡ *kâma*, "as," "like," but with suffixes ከማየ፡ *kamâ-ya, kamâ-ka,*
kamâ-hî, kamâ-hômû. You will, I think, find the same weak-
ening of *mâ* to *mô* in a word which appears in the Chaldee
lexicons as מוֹדְלָא or מוֹלָא "wealth," "property," with the
variants מִידְלָא and מוֹלָא, the former of which is certainly a
mere error. מוֹלָא seems to me to be identical with the Arabic

مَالٌ, which is in reality a compound of مَا "what" and لِ "to,"
literally, "what belongs to one." In מוֹדְלָא the compound has
been strengthened by the relative דְ; that is to say מוֹדְלִי
"my property," or מוֹדְלֵיהּ "his property," is really מוֹ + דְ + לִי
or לֵיהּ, 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 נְעָרָיו 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 ሊ.ዖሁ꞉, ልኣ፡, ሰዕ; 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. נַפְשִׁי "my soul," for "myself."

In Arabic the words frequently used for this purpose are نفس "soul," plur. أنفس, and عين "eye, essence," plur. أعيان; but in the later stages of the language we also find روح "spirit," حَال "state," and ذَات "essence"; e.g. تَجِي بِرُوحَك "thou wilt come thyself" (or "in person"), قَتَل حَالَه "he has killed himself," رَاح هُو بِذَاتِه "he is gone himself" (or "in person").

In Ethiopic ለለ꞉ is employed for the nominative in the forms ለሊ.ዖ꞉ *lalĭ-ya* or ለልዖ꞉ *lalĕ-ya*, ለሊ.ከ꞉ *lalī-ka*, ለሊ.ሁ꞉ *lalī-hŭ*, etc. This ለለ꞉ 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 ሌለዖ꞉ "to separate," whence the Amharic ሌላ꞉ "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 ርእስ꞉ "head," as መነ꞉ ትሬሲ꞉ ርእሰከ꞉ "whom dost thou make thyself (to be)?" ለዕለ꞉ ርእስክሙ꞉ "against yourselves." ነፍስ꞉ is of comparatively rare occurrence in this sense, as መጠወ꞉ ነፍሰ꞉ ለሞት꞉ "he gave himself up to death." In the vulgar dialects, Tigriña and Amharic, there seems to be a still greater variety of expression. In Tigriña we find ባዕል꞉

or በዓል: "lord, master," as ንዕሊዩ: ርእኩ: "I myself have seen,"
እኔሆ: እኔ: በዓሊዩ: ለደ: "behold, it is I myself." More rare is
the use of በዓለቤት: "master of the house," e.g. ምድርሰ:
በዓለቤት: ትፈሪ: "for the earth brings forth fruit (of) itself."
These two are generally used for the nominative, whilst for the
other cases is commonly employed ርእስ: "head"; less frequently
ነፍስ: "soul," and ሥጋ: "flesh," "body." From ነፍስ: are formed,
as I said before, the personal pronouns ነስሕ: *nessǎ-khā*, "thou,"
and ነሱ: *nessū* "he," as well as the reduplicated ነስነስ: "one
another," as ተናገሩ: ነስነቶሙ: "they spoke to one another,"
or "among themselves." The word ብሕት: *solitudo*, is also
used in the sense of *self*, apparently for any case; and similarly
ሰብእት: "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. ባለቤት:, ራስ:, ነፍስ:
and ሰውነት:: From ራስ: has been derived the pronoun of the
3rd person, እርሱ:, farther contracted into እሱ: *ǎssū*.

In Assyrian the common reflexive is *rāman*, which seems to
stand for *raḥman*, just as *ruk* for *raḥuk*, רָחוֹק. It is therefore
equivalent to the Heb. רָחָם, or rather רַחֲמִים, τὰ σπλάγχνα,
and forms with suffixes *rāmanīya, rāmanīka, ramanīšu*, etc. One
might have imagined this, after the analogy of the Hebrew, to
be a plural in *ān*, against which the form *ramannīšu*, with double
n, would perhaps not have militated; but the form *ramnīšu*
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
נֶפֶשׁ, though פָּנִים, "face, presence," is also employed, e.g. Exod.
xxxiii. 14, פָּנַי יֵלְכוּ, 2 Sam. xvii. 11. עֶצֶם, "bone," is used in
the Bible in speaking of things only, as בְּעֶצֶם, בְּעֶצֶם הַשָּׁמַיִם
הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה; but in later Hebrew it is applied to persons, לְעַצְמִי
"for myself"; as are also גֶּרֶם "bone" and גּוּף "body," with
which last you may compare the old German phrases *mīn līp*,
dīn līp, for *ich* and *du*.

Among the Aramaic dialects there is some variety of usage.

In the Targūms נַפְשׁ is common; in later writings גֻּרְם, which
we also find in Samaritan and in the Palestinian dialect of
Syriac. In Syriac ܢܰܦܫ and ܩܢܘܡܐ are the dominant words,
ܓܪܡ being very rare. In Mandaitic אנאשא is used; whilst
ܩܢܘܡܐ is found in Samaritan, in the forms קְנוֹם and קְלוֹם,
and may possibly also occur in Phoenician[1]. I regret my inability
as yet to give any satisfactory etymology of this word. Modern
Syriac still makes use of ܢܰܦܫ *nōshā*, but far more frequently
employs the word ܓܰܢ, which is merely the Persian جان *jān*,
"soul"; as ܘܚܡ ܬܗܐ ܟܢ ܐܘܐܣܒ ܡܪܝܐ ܟܢܝܒ "who was
making my way bitter to me," ܟܝܢܩܣܗ ܚܣܗ ܢܦܫܗ "to shake
himself."

---

[1] [Viz., in the inscription of Eshmūn‘āzār, *C.I.S.*, No. 3, l. 4, 20. Cf. G.
Hoffmann, *Ueber einige Phoen. Inschrr.* (4° 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 מינדאם "something," כול ד "all that," and מא ד or מאדו ד "what," "whatever." Even the word ﻟَ, מָא, מָה, 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 مَن, מֶן, מִי.

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. אֵם "mother," רָחֵל "ewe,"
עַיִן "eye," 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 بِنْت "daughter," أُخْت "sister"; but common in
Ethiopic, especially in adjectives and participles, as ልህቅ፡ *lĕhĭḳ*,
"old," ልህቅት፡ *lĕhĭḳt*; ፍቁር፡ *fĕḳŭr*, "beloved," ፍቅርት፡ *fĕḳĕrt*;
ጻድቅ፡ *ṣâdĕḳ*, "just," ጻድቅት፡ *ṣâdĕḳt*; መስተምሕር፡ *mastâmhĕr*,
"asking mercy," መስተምሕርት፡ *mastamhĕrt*. We find it, however,
in substantives too, as ንጉሥ፡ *nĕgūs*, "king," ንግሥት፡ *nĕgĕst*,
"queen"; አንስት፡ *anĕst*, "woman"; ወለት፡ *walâtt*, "daughter,"
for ወለድት። In Hebrew the simple *t* is found in some cases
where the masc. ends in a single consonant, as יֹלֵדְתְּ "bearing,"
Gen. xvi. 11, Judges xiii. 5, 7; לַת "to bear," for לֶדֶת, 1 Sam.
iv. 19; אַחַת "one," for אַחַדְתְּ; but more commonly a short
supplementary vowel is inserted between the last two letters,
resulting in the vocalisation ֶ֫ת, or, if there be a guttural at the
end of the word, ַ֫ת, and the like; thus, חֹתֶמֶת, לָדֶת, יֹלֶדֶת,
for חֹתַמְתְּ, מֹדַעַת for מֹדַעְתְּ, מִשְׁעֶנֶת for מִשְׁעַנְתְּ, נְחֹשֶׁת for
נְחֹשְׁתְּ or נְחֻשְׁתְּ, מַאֲכֶלֶת for מַאֲכַלְתְּ or מַאֲכֹלְתְּ.

Instead of the simple *t*, however, we more usually find *at*,
with a connective short *ă*. This is by far the most common
form in Arabic, as اِمْرُؤٌ "man," اِمْرَأَة "woman"; جَدٌّ "grandfather,"

قَاتِلَةٌ "killing," قَاتِلٌ ; عَظِيمَةٌ "great," عَظِيمٌ ; جَدَّةٌ "grandmother"; In Ethiopic it is less frequent than *t*, though by no means uncommon; e.g. ወረደት፡ "descent," ሳውምት፡ "garlic" (שׁוּם, ثُوم, ܟܘܼܡܵܐ), ገመለት፡ "she-camel" (نَاقَة), በረከት፡ *barâkat* "blessing" (בְּרָכָה, بَرَكَة), ኀጢአት፡ "sin" (خَطِيئَة), መዕለት፡ "tent" (مَظَلَّة, ܡܛܲܠܬܵܐ). In Hebrew this termination is rare in the simple form of nouns; as examples take בָּרֶקֶת (a precious stone), מָחֲלַת, בָּשְׂמַת (women); צָרְפַת, דִּבְרַת, אַיֶלֶת, גִּבְעַת (places), also with *kâmes*, הַקָּאָת "the pelican," בַּעֲלָת (a place), פְּרָת (Gen. xlix. 22), חַטָּאת "sin," מְנָת for *manayat*, "portion"; also אֲחוֹת, חָמוֹת, for *ahawat*, *hamawat*. But we find it everywhere in the so-called construct state, and also before the pronominal suffixes, as נַחֲלַת, נַחֲלָתִי.

Now observe the history of these forms, from which you will perceive the absurdity of saying that the fem. termination in Hebrew is ◌ָה, and that it becomes ◌ַת in the construct state. The reverse is the fact. The original form is the ◌ַת of the construct, and it becomes ◌ָה. 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 ת passed into aspirated ה, and finally, when this *h* was dropped, nothing remained but the vowel, which was heightened in the open syllable into *â*, ◌ָה, as נַהֲלָה[1]. So also in Arabic; the original *t* is retained in أُخْت , بِنْت , and in the Ḳor'ân in a few other words, e.g. Sûra xi. 76, رَحْمَتُ ٱللّٰهِ; as also before suffixes, رَحْمَتِي , رَحْمَتُهُ . The next step was to the aspirated *h*, which

---

[1] Cf. what has been said above, p. 124, of the pronoun مَا, מָא, מה.

form is used by the Arabic poets in rhyme, as, for example, when العَذلَة (for العَذلَة) is rhymed with اِبلَه (for اِبلَه) and with وولَه (for وولَه); or السَّلامَة (for السَّلامَة) with اَمامَه (for اَمامَة). The last step is to drop the *h*, as is done in the vulgar pronunciation, الرَّحمَه, السلامَه, العَذلَه. The spelling with the dotted ة is merely a compromise of the grammarians between the old ت ــ and the vulgar ه ـ; if I write سَنَة, I indicate at once the old pronunciation سَنَت, שָׁנַת, and the more recent سَنَه, שָׁנָה. If you ask for analogies in other languages for such changes as this of *at* into הַ֫ـ, *ath*, then into הָ֫ـ, *ah*, and finally into *â*, הָ֫ـ, 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 *civitad* (i.e. *civitatem*). So also in French, in the verb, *il aima*, from *ille amât* (for *amavit*), but interrogatively *aima-t-il?* from *amât 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 אַהֲן for הֲרֵן, and the modern Syriac ܐܘܗܐ for הֲרָא, ܗܘܢ; 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," *iḫit* "one" (for *iḫidt*), and the like, with simple *t*; but the usual

shape of this affix is *at*, weakened into *it*, e. g. *šarrat* "princess," *malikat* "queen," *nâkat* "she-camel," *šanat* "year," *âšibat* "inhabiting" (יֹשֶׁבֶת), *bilat* or *bilit* "mistress, lady," *riš'at* or *riš'it* "wickedness," *irṣit* "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, וְאָמִי אֵמֲעַשְׁתֹּרֶת כֹּהֲנַת עַשְׁתֹּרֶת רַבָּתֶן הַמִּלְכַּת, or again וְשֹׁכֵב אָנֹךְ בְּחִלַּת זְ. We find however traces of a younger form in א *â*, corresponding to the Hebrew הָ‐, very rarely in inscriptions, more frequently in the words handed down to us by classical authors; e. g. κιττώ, Heb. קִדָּה, "cassia" or "cinnamon"; *nesso*, Heb. נִצָּה, "flower"; *Dido*, either for נְדִירָא, according to the explanation of the *Etymol. Magnum* πλανῆτις, or for יְדִירָא; Καρχηδών, *Carthago*, corruption of קרת חדשא. 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: ܠܝܼ̈ܬ, ܐܝܼ̈ܬ, ܐܝܼ̈ܬ, ܗܘ̈ܬ.

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. lxv. 10, cxx. 6, cxxiii. 4; Aramaic, צְוָת "fasting," Dan. vi. 19; Syriac, ܐܰܟ̈ܝ, ܦܳܐ̈ܝ; ܢܰܝ̈ܬ "alive," ܦܳܐ̈ܬ "well," ܚܪܝܼ̈ܬ "naked," ܡܰܓܳ̈ܢ "gratis, for nothing"; ܐܰܣܪ̈ܝ "last," ܩܰܕ̈ܡܝ or ܩܰܕ̈ܡ "first," where *ith* is merely, as Noeldeke has remarked, a weakening of the older *yath*; ܦܰܓܪܳ̈ܢܝ "carnally," ܪܘܼܚܳ̈ܢܝ "spiritually," from ܦܰܓܪܳ̈ܢܐ and ܪܘܼܚܳ̈ܢܐ; ܢܡܪ̈ܢܝ "like a wild

beast," from ܢܷܣܛܴܠܷܢܴܐ; and hence, in Syriac and the Pales-
tinian dialect, as an adverbial termination, even where an adjec-
tive in ـــَ, ـْـٰ, is not in use, as ܛܴܒܳܐܝܬ "well," ܢܝܼܚܳܐܝܬ
"gently," ܫܰܪܝܼܪܳܐܝܬ "truly." Such adverbs, being really feminine
adjectives in the old form of the *status absolutus*, may be con-
strued with a preposition, as ܝܰܘܢܳܐܝܬ "in Greek," ܣܘܼܪܝܳܐܝܬ
"in Syriac"; and still more freely in Mandaitic, בסארהבאיית
"in haste," בניהאיית "gently." Sometimes the abstract termi-
nation תֽ is used in the same way in both languages, as ܙܒܢܬܐ
"a second time, again," ܬܠܝܼܬܳܝܘܼܬ "a third time"; in the dialect
of Palestine, ܫܰܦܝܼܪ "rightly, well"; in Mandaitic ראבות "grandly";
and among the later Jews מָבוּת, יָאוּת.

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

With the Hebrew רַבָּתִי in Lament. i. 1, הָעִיר רַבָּתִי עָם, it can
have nothing to do; that form is to be classed with גְּנֻבְתִי יוֹם,
אֹסְרִי לַגֶּפֶן עִירֹה, etc., which I shall try to explain when we
speak of the cases. Examples of this fem. in תִי from the
Talmud and Targūms are: אֶצְבְּעֵיהּ זוּטַרְתִי "his little finger,"
שַׁתָּא חֲדַתִּי "the new year," מִילְתָא אַחֲרִיתִי, חִוּוֹרְתִי, אוּכַּמְתִי,
רַבְּתִי. So in Mandaitic, צטארתיא, ראבתיא "small,"
"new," הורינתיא "another," היואררתיא "white," כאדירתיא
"heavy," האתיקתיא "ancient," שאפירתיא "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 קָטְלָה. Here too the original termination was *at*, as is
proved not only by the Arabic قَتَلَتْ *ḳatalat*, the Ethiopic

ቀተለት: *katálat*, and the Syriac ܩܶܛܠܰܬ *ḳĕṭláth*, but also by the following evidence derived from Hebrew itself. (1) The form with final *t* is actually found in Deut. xxxii. 36, אָזְלַת יָד (for אָזְלָה), Ezek. xlvi. 17, וְשָׁבַת; possibly too Isaiah xxiii. 15, וְנִשְׁכַּחַת צֹר (for וְנִשְׁכְּחָה)); as also in the whole class of verbs לַ״ה so-called, e. g. גָּלַת for עָשָׂת, הִרְצִיַת, עָשִׂיַת, הִרְצָת for עָשָׂת הַגְלִיַת. This is exactly the Arabic جَلَتْ, by contraction for جَلَيَتْ; and the uncontracted גָּלְיָה is actually found once in Hebrew in the pausal חָסָיָה נַפְשִׁי, Ps. lvii. 2, whereas the ordinary pausal form is עָשָׂתָה. The ordinary non-pausal form גָּלְתָה, עָשְׂתָה, etc., is a secondary formation, in which the fem. suffix is repeated in the form ה_ָ, thus aiming at uniformity with the ordinary קָטְלָה. (2) The form with final *t* invariably occurs in connexion with pronominal suffixes; e. g. יְלָדְתְנִי; יְלָדְתְךָ, or with assimilation בָּאַתְנוּ; אֲחָזַתָה, יְלָדַתוּ, גְמָלַתְהוּ. גְנָבְתַם, אֲכָלָתַם; אֲהַבְתְךָ, רְאָתְךָ. 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 ה_ָ is occasionally written in Hebrew with א in place of ה, according to the usual practice in Aramaic; e. g. חָנָא Isaiah xix. 17, קָרְחָא Ezek. xxvii. 31, שָׁנָא Ps. cxxvii. 2, מַטְרָא Lament. iii. 12; and even in the verb, גָּבְהָא Ezek. xxxi. 5. We also find the vowel of this syllable weakened, though very rarely, into ָ_, as in the noun הַוּרָה for הַוּרָה, Isaiah lix. 5, and in the verb לָנָה for לָנָה, Zechar. v. 4.

Besides the feminine termination in تـ — or ة —, the Arabic

language possesses two others, viz. ـَـي *ā* and ـَـآ, *āu*, both, as it would seem, originally of abstract signification. Examples of the former are بُشْرَى "good news," حُمَّى "a fever," دَعْوَى "a claim," رُؤْيَا "a vision"; of the latter, صَحْرَآء or بَيْدَآء "a desert," كِبْرِيَآء "glory, pride." The one, viz. ـَـي *ā*, forms the feminine of adjectives ending in ـَـان, as شَبْعَان "sated, not hungry," f. شَبْعَى; and of the form أَفْعَل used as a superlative, e. g. الأَصْغَر "the smallest," f. الصُّغْرَى. The other, ـَـآء, forms the feminine of أَفْعَل, when it is not a comparative or superlative, as حَمْقَآء. "foolish," أَحْمَق; حَمْرَآء "red," أَحْمَر. These terminations seem to find their representatives in Ethiopic in nouns ending in *ā*, as ሕንጻ: "building," ፍሥሓ: "joy," መሐላ: "oath," ዐመፃ: "wrong," መንሱ: "temptation," ፃማ: or ጻማ: "toil," ሥርዓ: "order, row"; and in *ē*, as ውቅሬ: "beam, mast," ሰቅሬ: "army," ብብ: "moth," ጊዜ: "time," ዕራዓ: "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 ـَـي is represented in Syriac by the form *ai*, as in ܡܠܟܰܝ, ܩܒܶܠܢܰܝ, ܐܶܫܬܰܝ, ܩܰܘܡܰܝ, ܙܟܰܝ, and a few more. In Hebrew this termination can hardly be said to exist, unless we reckon as examples of it the proper name שָׂרַי, of which the later form is שָׂרָה, and the numeral עֶשְׂרֵה, in the compounds אַחַת עֶשְׂרֵה, etc., which may stand for an original עֶשְׂרַי. Of the other ending ـَـآء I can find at present no certain trace in Aramaic and Hebrew, for Hebrew words in וֹ or ה֖־, mostly proper names, seem, without exception, to have lost a final *n*, וֹן. גִּלֹה and שִׁילֹה, for example, form the adjectives גִּילֹנִי and שִׁילֹנִי. Since, however, in Arabic, we find

صَنْعَانِي derived from اَلصَّنْعَآءُ, بَهْرَانِي from the name of the

tribe بَهْرَآءُ, رُوحَانِي from رُوحَآءُ, it may be that גִּלֹּה and שִׁילֹה,

as well as the Moabite קִרחֹה, represent an original *Gailâ'u,*
Shailâ'u, and *Karhâ'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 *katîl,* which
take in the feminine *katâl;* e.g. ሐዲስ፡ "new," ሐዳስ፡; ጠቢብ፡
"learned, wise," ጠባብ፡; ዐቢይ፡ "great," ዐባይ፡; ርሒብ፡ (for *rahîb*)
"wide, spacious," ረሓብ፡; ቀይሕ፡ (for *kayîh*) "red," ቀያሕ፡:: Of
this formation Ewald has discovered a trace in Arabic in حَصَان

"chaste," applied to a woman, as compared with حَصِين "inac-

cessible, 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 adver-
bialis,* 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 termi-
nations, *ŭ* for the subject or nominative, *ă* for the object or
accusative, and *ĭ* 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, *ŭ* for the nominative, and *ă* for the accusative and genitive.   Examples of the triptote declension :—

$$\text{بَيْتَ} \qquad \text{بَيْتٍ} \qquad \text{بَيْتٌ}$$

$$\text{جَنَّةَ} \qquad \text{جَنَّةٍ} \qquad \text{جَنَّةٌ}$$

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,

$$\text{الْبَيْتَ} \qquad \text{الْبَيْتِ} \qquad \text{;الْبَيْتُ}$$

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

$$\text{بَيْتَ يُوسُفَ} \qquad \text{بَيْتِ يُوسُفَ} \qquad \text{بَيْتُ يُوسُفَ}$$

$$\text{بَيْتَهُ} \qquad \text{بَيْتِهِ} \qquad \text{بَيْتُهُ}$$

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 Ḳor'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*, عَمَّك, 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 *ă*.   The vowel-endings of the nominative and genitive have disappeared ; and the accusative *ă* takes the place of the others in the construct state, without any regard to the real case of the governing noun.   E.g., አፍቀረ፡ ብእሲተ፡ "he loved a woman," ንጉሠ፡ ኢትዮጵያ፡ "the king of Ethiopia."   In the case of proper names, the accusative termination is ሃ፡ *hă*, to which

form I shall call your attention more particularly hereafter; e.g. 𐤒𐤉𐤍: "Cain," 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤃𐤄: "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 lisân mât Aharri*, "in the language of the country of Phoenicia," without any case-sign in *lisân* and *mât*; *šar Babîlu*, "king of Babel"; *malku bânušun*, "the king their builder"; *âšib 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.,

אַרְצָה "to the ground," בַּיְתָה "homewards," "inwards," הַבַּיְתָה "into the house," הָעַיְנָה "to the well," הָרָה "uphill," הָהָרָה "to the mountains," שְׁכֶמָה "to Shechem," לִשְׁכָּתָה "into a chamber," הַבָּמָתָה "to the highplace," בְּאֵרָה שֶׁבַע, אַרְצָה גֹּשֶׁן, יָמָּה סוּף, בֵּיתָה יוֹסֵף. As real objective accusatives I may cite הֵקַל אַרְצָה זְבֻלוּן וְאַרְצָה נַפְתָּלִי "he abased, etc." Isaiah viii. 23; מִי פָּקַד עָלָיו אָרְצָה "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 וֹ, in such phrases as וְחַיְתוֹ־אֶרֶץ Gen. i. 24, כָּל־חַיְתוֹ־יָעַר Ps. l. 10, לְחַיְתוֹ־אֶרֶץ Ps. lxxix. 2, בְּנוֹ צִפֹּר "O son of Ṣippôr," Num. xxiii. 18, נְאֻם בִּלְעָם בְּנוֹ בְעֹר Num. xxiv. 3, 15, לְמַעְיְנוֹ־מָיִם Ps. cxiv. 8. The purer form וּ I can discover only in a few compound nouns, e. g., פְּנוּאֵל, אֲרוּמַי, מְתוּשָׁאֵל, and מְתוּשֶׁלַח. The genitive termination is יִ־, as in מְלֵאֲתִי Lament. i. 1, רַבָּתִי עָם עַל־דִּבְרָתִי מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק Ps. cx. 4, בְּנִי אֲתֹנוֹ (acc.) Gen. xlix. 11. It appears מִשְׁפָּט Isaiah i. 21, also in many compound proper names, as גַּבְרִיאֵל, מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק, עֲזְרִיאֵל, חֲנִיאֵל.

All these three forms, no doubt, existed likewise in the Phoenician 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 למם and למעל are no doubt to be pronounced לְמַּטָּה and לְמַעְלָה, just as in Hebrew. In other cases the classical writers come to our aid. *Hannibal*, for instance, is חַנִּיבַעַל (genit.), but *Asdrubal* is עַזְרוּבַעַל (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 ܐܒ "father," ܐܚ "brother," and ܚܡ "father-in-law"; in Arabic, أَب, أَخ, حَم; 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	أَبُو
A.	أَبَا	for	أَبُو

Of these three forms the Ethiopic has preserved before prono-
minal suffixes the nom. አቡከ፡, as አቡከ፡ "thy father," and the
accus. አባ፡, as አባከ፡ "thy father," though አቡከ፡ is also used for
the accusative.　The Hebrew has chosen the genitive for all its
three cases, אֲבִי "father of —," אָבִיךָ; whereas the Syriac has

preferred the nom., ܐܚܽܘܗܝ, and similarly ܐܢܬܽܘܢ and ܗܶܢܽܘܢ.

Let us now return once more to the Arabic, and examine its
three flexional forms, *ŭ*, *ĭ*, *ă*. 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
hâ, with which we are already acquainted in all the Semitic lan-
guages.　In Ethiopic the full form ሃ፡ is employed, as I already
mentioned, to form the accusative of proper names. ቅዱሳሃ፡ etc.
The gradual weakening of the *h* gives us such adverbial forms as
አፍአ፡ *af'â*, or አፍአ፡ *af'a*, "out, outside" (*fords, foris*), ግሙሬ፡
"at all, ever"; but ordinarily the particle is shortened to the
utmost, and appears as final *ă*.　The Hebrew הָ‍ָ preserves
somewhat of the original lengthening of the vowel, for a primi-
tive short *ă* would certainly have disappeared *in toto*.

The origin of the nominative *ŭ* is more obscure; but we may
possibly venture to see in it the pronominal element *hŭ*, as
designating the subject.　Finally, the genitive *ĭ*, *ִ‍י*, may
perhaps be connected with the termination of the so-called

relative adjectives in *ִ‍י* (Arabic ـِيّ, vulgarly ـِي), 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 *ŭ*, *ĭ*, *ă* 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.
ŭn, *ĭn*, *ăn*. E. g.

بَيْتٌ	بَيْتٍ	بَيْتًا
جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةٍ	جَنَّةً

In the accus. form بَيْتًا the letter '*alif* may perhaps serve to mark the pausal pronunciation, *baitâ*, 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 *tanwîn* or " nunation," from the name of the letter *nûn*.

If we look around us for a similar appearance in the other Semitic languages, we find its counterpart in the *mîmation* 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 *mîmation* is found in the Ḥimyaritic inscriptions of South Arabia in the form מ for all three cases, its use nearly corresponding with that of the Arabic *nûnation*; e. g., שמשם شَمْس, אדנם أَنْس, שנאם שمئ, שانئ; כלבתם كَلْبَة, עגלתם عِجْلَة; עבד עבדם but עבד שמשם עبد شَمْس.

In Hebrew the *mîmation* seems to me to present itself in such words as אָמְנָם or אָמְנָם, חִנָּם, רֵיקָם, which I consider as the accusatives of אֹמֶן, חֵן and רֵיק. יוֹמָם is doubtful, as it may be connected with يَوْمَ rather than with יוֹם. In Ethiopic we may perhaps find a trace of it in the word ትማልም:, Heb. תְּמוֹל, אֶתְמוֹל.

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 מָה, مَا. 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 מָה, مَا 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 الْإِبْهَامِيَّة, 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 مَّا "some (small) quantity"; جِئْتَ لِأَمْرٍ مَّا "thou art come for some matter (of importance)." Similar is the origin of the Aramaic word מִדִּי, פֿמֿד, מִינדָּאם, מִדְּעֵם, a contraction of מִדְּע מָה "scibile quid." For the rest, how readily مَا may be shortened into *mă* and *m* appears from such Arabic forms as كَمَ "how much?" عَلَى مَ ,حَتَّى مَ ,بِمَ ,لِمَ shortened into لِمْ ,بِمْ.

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

	Arabic	Assyr., Himyar., Hebrew
N.	*u, un*	*u, um*
G.	*i, in*	*i, im*
Acc.	*a, an*	*a, am*

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 un-defined plural of masculine nouns must originally have been—

N. *ûn,*   G. *în,*   Acc. *ân.*

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. *ûna,*   G. *îna,*   Acc. *âna.*

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. *û*,　　　G. *î*,　　Acc. *â*.

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

N. *û*, *ûna*;　　　G. Acc. *î*, *îna*.

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 *în*. In Ethiopic, on the contrary, the accusative *ân* has supplanted the other cases, and forms the ordinary plural of adjectives and participles; as ሕያው። "alive," "living," ሕያዋን፡፡ ሐዲስ። "new," ሐዲሳን፡፡ ኅሡት። "revealed," "manifest," ኅሡታን፡፡ 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 *â*, as in the singular; and the real construct plural in *â* is found only in the numerals for 20, 30, etc., which are ዕሥራ። ሠላሳ። አርብዓ። ኃምሳ። etc. In all this the Assyrian runs curiously parallel to the Ethiopic. According to Schrader, the plural in *ân* appears in the forms *ânu*, *âni*, *âna*, with an appended vowel (obviously borrowed from the singular); as *ṣalmânu*, "statues" (צְלָם, صَنَم); *ḥursâni*, "woods" (חֹרֶשׁ); *šûrâni*, "walls" (שׁוּר); *šarrâni*, "princes" (שַׂר); whilst the numerals, 20, 30, etc., are *'iŝrâ*, *ŝilaŝâ*, *irbâ*, *ḥanŝâ*.

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 יִ֖ין in the Biblical Aramaic, ܝܢ in Syriac, and in Mandaitic both יִן and אִיֵן (*î*).

The same choice was made by the Hebrews and Phoenicians. They discarded both the nom. *ûm* and the accus. *âm*, retaining only the gen. *îm* in ordinary use[1]. 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

---

[1] But the Moabites took the form יִן, e.g., גֹבֵן, אַרְבַּע שֵׁת, הַמֶּלֶךְ, חֹמֹת הַיְשִׁרִן, etc.

this form in *i* is said to be not uncommon in Assyrian, as in *ilí*, "gods"; *malkí* or *malikí*, "kings"; *ûmí*, "days"; *pagrí*, "dead bodies"; with suffixes *karhîšu* "its towers"; *ašri-šunu*, "their places." The full form in *îm* is rare and archaistic, as in the proper names *Ašur-rîš-ilîm*, *Sumîrîm* and *Akkadîm*. Haupt finds traces of the form *âm*, representing the old accusative, in the Assyrian *šamâmu*, *šamâmi*, "heaven," *mâmi*, "water," and the adverbial *akhâmiš*, "with one another, mutually (*lit.* like brothers)." It seems probable, as he suggests, that the plural *ân* is only a later form of this *âm*. And indeed he goes so far as to deny the existence of the termination *î*, which he pronounces *ê*, and considers to be only a deflection of *â*, from *ân*, *âm*.

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. ܟܡܦܐܕܐ (λαμπάδα), ܩܪܩܡܐ (κερκίδα), ܐܢܕܪܝܢܛܐ (ἀνδριάντα), ܐܪܟܣ (ἀρχάς), etc. The Latin *accusative* too has supplied the ordinary nominal forms of the different Romance languages. In modern Persian the plural ان *ân* is regarded by the best authorities as derived from an ancient *genitive* in *âm* (*ânm*).

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 *ăt*, which accordingly became *ât*, and took the case-endings as the singular.

Sing.	N.	*atu, atun*	Plur.	*âtu, âtun*
	G.	*ati, atin*		*âti, âtin*
	Ac.	*ata, atan*		*âta, âtan.*

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 *ât*, with its accusative and construct *âta*. In Aramaic we find, as we should naturally

expect, the termination ن, ܐܬ, *áth*, *óth*; in Hebrew, with the usual vowel-change, ות, which sinks in the later Phoenician into *úth*, as in Plautus's *yth alonim valonuth*. In Assyrian *átu*, *áti*, *áta*, are common; but there is also (if the grammarians may be trusted) a termination *át*, corresponding perhaps to the Hebrew and Phoenician *óth*, *úth*; and a third form in *ît* (or as Haupt pronounces it *ēt*), restricted to such words as have already weakened *at* into *it* in the singular. E.g., *ina šanáti dannáti*, "in long (*lit.* strong) years"; *tabbanútu*, "buildings," from *tabbanu*; *'ibšíti*, "deeds," from *'ibšit* (עֲבִשֶׁת), according to Haupt *ēpšēti*; *išríti* (*ešrēti*) "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 Himyaritic 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 ܩܘܪܝܐ from ܩܪܝܬܐ (Arabic قَرْيَة, plur. قُرًى), and ܚܡܪܐ from ܚܡܪܐ (Arabic حِمَار, plur. حُمُر). 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 نَصْر is a plural of نَاصِر, "helper," or عَدْل of عَادِل, "just"; but in reality these are nothing but the infinitives of نَصَر and عَدَل, meaning "help," and "justice," and may be applied alike to one or more, man or woman; for we can say اِمْرَأَة عَدْل, رَجُل عَدْل, and قَوْم عَدْل. Another plural of قَاتِل, viz. قَتَّال, is an example of the same sort, being really an intensive infinitive, to be compared with the Syriac ܢܨܘܦܐ, ܩܘܕܫܐ, ܩܘܡܟܡܐ, 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 *ă*. Hence result the forms—

> N.   *ă* + *ŭn* = *aun*
> G.   *ă* + *ĭn* = *ain*
> Ac. *ă* + *ăn* = *ăn*.

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 *ĭ*; whence the forms

> N. *auni*   G. *aini*   Ac. *ăni*.

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. *ă*.

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. *ă*, *ăni*
> G. Ac. *ai*, *aini*.

In modern Arabic the first of these has now disappeared from ordinary use, leaving only the form *ain*, *ên*, for all the cases. In S. Arabian or Himyaritic the termination is also ן, as צלמן ואבלנהן (acc.), ולביתנהן "and their two houses (castles)," מאתן אסרם "two hundred warriors" (nom.), צמלנהן "these two statues" (acc.). In Ethiopic scarcely a trace of the dual can be detected. In Assyrian Schrader gives as examples *idă*, "two hands"; *uznă*, "two ears"; *šipa-ai* (for *šipă-ya*), "my feet"; *birka-ai*, "my knees"; *ḳata-ai*, "my hands." Here the final *n* seems to have been cast off, according to the analogy of the plural in *î* for *îm*.

The Aramaic form is יִ‑ֽן, with slight supplemental vowel, for
יִ‑ן *ain*, corresponding to the ordinary Arabic oblique form
ـَيْنِ, ـَيْنٍ. This was contracted into ‑ָן, as in מָאתָן for
מָאתַיִן, "two hundred"; or into ‑ִין, as in תְּרֵין for תְּרַיִן, "two."
In Syriac it survives in only two or three words, in the form *ên*,
viz. ܬ̈ܪܝܢ, f. ܬ̈ܪܬܝܢ, ܡܐܬܝܢ, and ܡܟܘ̈ܢܐ; further weakened into
in, in ܒܝܬ ܢܗ̈ܪܝܢ ܕܘܠܐ ܕ̈ܟܠܐ, "Mesopotamia," ܐܣܪ
(1 Kings xviii. 32), Heb. כְּבֵית סָאתַיִם זָרַע, and even ـَيْنِ =
אַפַּיִם = ـَيْنِ, יָדַיִם; just as in Latin the sole representatives of
the dual are the words *ambo*, *duo*, and *octo*. The Hebrew form
is ‑ַיִם, for ‑ַיִם *aim*, with *m* for *n*, as in the plural; e.g., יוֹמַיִם,
אַלְפַּיִם, מָאתַיִם, כִּכְּרַיִם, שְׁנָתַיִם; and often in proper names, as
בֵּית דִּבְלָתַיִם, עֵין עֶגְלַיִם, קִרְיָתַיִם, דֹּתָנַיִם, חֲפָרַיִם, הָעֵינַיִם. Rarer
forms are the contracted ‑ֵם, as הָעֵינָם (Josh. xv. 34), קִרְיָתְמָה
(Ezek. xxv. 9, *kethîbh*); and ‑ֵים in שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר, f. שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה.
Further, ‑ַיְן, contracted ‑ָן; e.g. דֹּתָן, דֹּתַיְן, and קַרְתָּן (Josh.
xxi. 32). On the Moabite stone both forms appear, ם and ן;
e.g., קריתן, בית דבלתן, (הצהרים) הצהרם, l. 15, but מאתן, בית דבלתן,
חורנן.

And here I may intercalate the remark that the words מַיִם
and שָׁמַיִם are not duals, but plurals, from obsolete singulars מֵי
and שְׁמֵי. The original forms must have been *mayim* and *sha-*
mayim, which were contracted into *maym* and *shamaym*, just as
in Arabic هَوَيْنَ, لَيِّن, مَوِّيت, خَيِّير, and هَوَيْنَ, gradually pass into
خَيْر, لَيْن, مَيِّت, and هَيْن. 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 מַיִם and שָׁמַיִם, the latter of which was pronounced in Phoenician *shamêm*, as in Plautus's *gune balsamem*, i.e., גָּאוּנִי בְעֵל שמים.

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., יַ־, ـَـ.

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

Simple,	N. *âni*,	Construct,	*â*
	G. Ac. *aini*		*ai*

and of the plural,

Simple,	N. *ûna*	Construct,	*û*
	G. Ac. *îna*		*î.*

In Assyrian in like manner the construct dual ended in *â*, as *birka-ai* (for *birkâ-ya*), "my knees"; the plural in *î* [or *ê*], as *šarrî-šunu*, "their kings." Consequently we should expect the Hebrew and Aramaic dual to have the construct form *ai*, *ê*, but the plural in both languages *î*; יְדֵיהֶם, ܝ̈ܕܝܗܘܢ, from יָדַיִם, ܝ̈ܕܐ; but from מְלָכִים, ܡ̈ܠܟܐ, we should look for מַלְכֵיהֶם, ܡ̈ܠܟܝܗܘܢ, which however do not exist. The actually existing forms are מַלְכֵיהֶם, ܡ̈ܠܟܝܗܘܢ; 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 מְלָכַי, ܡ̈ܠܟܝ, "my kings," for *malakai-ya*, corresponding with יָדַי, "my hands," for *yadai-ya*; and מְלָכָיו, מַלְכּוֹהִי, ܡ̈ܠܟܘܗܝ, "his kings," corresponding with יָדָיו, אֲי<ܝ̈ܕܘܗܝ>, standing for *malakai-hû, yadai-hû*, and *malakau-hû, yadau-hû*, in which latter I descry a vestige of the long obsolete nominative dual in *aun*, construct *au*.

(2) The form ‎ָ‎|, ‎ܶ‎, used as the simple plural of feminine nouns in Aramaic; e.g., ‎ܟ̈ܬܳܒܳܐ‎, ‎ܡܕܺܝܢ̈ܳܬ‎, as contrasted with the construct ‎ܟ̈ܬܳܒܰܬ‎, ‎ܡܕܺܝܢ̈ܳܬ‎, which correspond with the Arabic plural in *ât* and the Hebrew in *ôth*. This form in *ân*, *ôn*, which also plays an important rôle in the verbal inflection, I regard as a variation of the masculine *ûn*, under the influence of the ordinary fem. *ât*. 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; גַּבְרָא "the man," גֻּבְרַיָּא; מְדִינְתָּא "the city," מְדִינָתָא. 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 *hinn* and *itt* or *hitt*. And just so the Aramean added to his noun in its simplest form the demonstrative *hâ*, gradually weakened into *â*. גְּבַר + הָא became גַּבְרָא; מְדִינַת + הָא, מְדִינְתָא. Other forms underwent greater alteration. מְדִינַת + הָא was contracted into מְדִינָתָא (instead of מְדִינְתָּא). גֻּבְרַיָּא, on the other hand, is another example of the transference of a dual form to the plural, since it arises by assimilation from גֻּבְרֵי + הָא. In Syriac and Mandaitic the termination ‎ַ‎יָּא is shortened into ‎ܶ‎, ‎ܰ‎י (*ê*), though the full form is retained in some cases; for example, in Syriac, in the plural of many words derived from radicals ל״א, and in a few other instances, such as ‎ܐܰܠ̈ܦܶܐ‎, "thousands." This contraction naturally commenced with a weakening of the final syllable into *ê*, as in וֹסֵן for הָא הֲדָא, הָא as interjection for הָא, 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.   كِتَابَكَ f. كِتَابُكَ , " thy book " (nom.)

كِتَابَكِ f. كِتَابَكَ , " thy book " (acc.)

كِتَابِكِ f. كِتَابِكَ , " of thy book " (gen.)

3.   كِتَابَهَا f. كِتَابُهُ , " his, her book " (nom.)

كِتَابَهَا f. كِتَابَهُ , " his, her book " (acc.)

كِتَابِهَا f. كِتَابِهِ , " 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 أَبُوَ ; " 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

كِتَابَكَ and كِتَابِكِ we have كِتَابَكْ *kitābak* and كِتَابِكْ *kitābik*.

The 3rd pers. sing. masc. is properly *kitāb-hu*, كِتَابُهُ , but this is almost always written and pronounced كِتَابُهْ *kitābuh* or *kitāboh*,

or else كِتابُو *kitābō*. The fem. is كِتابُها *kitāb-hā*, more commonly

with shortening of the vowel, *kitab-hă*. From أَبٌ the corre-

sponding forms would be أَبُوهُ *abūh* and أَبُوها *abū-hă*. The

plurals are كِتابُنا, كِتابُكُم and كِتابُهِم; the fem. forms كِتابُكُنَّ and

كِتابُهِنَّ being very rarely used. The long vowel is either shortened

in pronunciation, *kitab-nā*, *kitab-hum*, or a slight vowel (*shĕvā*)

is interposed, *kitābŭkum*. Should the noun end in two conso-

nants, as عَبْد *'abd*, this *shĕvā* is necessarily inserted, *'abdăhā* or

'abdĭhā, *'abdŭkum*, *'abdŭhum*, *'abdĭnā*.

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, מֶלֶךְ, corresponding

to the Arabic مَلَك, مَلِك, and the Aramaic مَلْكَ‍.

1st pers. sing. in old Arabic مَلِكِي or مَلِكِيَ, vulg. مَلِكِي;

Hebrew מַלְכִּי; Chald. also מַלְכִּי, Syr. مَلْكَ‍, dropping the

final vowel.

2nd pers. sing. masc. Arabic مَلَكَكَ, vulg. مَلَكَكْ. The

Hebrew form is מַלְכְּךָ, in pause מַלְכֶּךָ, with a trace of the

original case-endings in the moveable *shĕvā* and the *sĕgōl*. The

Aramaic forms are, Chald. מַלְכָּךְ, Syr. مَلْكَ‍, with long *ā*, *ō*,

whereas we should have expected *a* short. Probably *mal-kākh*

stands for *malkă-ăkh*, and that for *malka-ka*, the old accusative

with suffix.

2nd pers. sing. fem. Arabic مَلَكَكِ, vulg. مَلَكَكْ. In Hebrew

the usual form is ךְ ֵ, e.g. מַלְכֵּךְ, 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, כִּ֫י and ךְ. The Syrian writes مَلْكَخِب, but does not pronounce the final *i*. The *ĕ* 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 *nĕgūsĕ́-kĭ*, acc. *nĕgūsá-kĭ*. Hebrew parallels are רֵעָתֵ֫כִי, Jerem. xi. 15; עוֹנֵ֫כִי, Ps. ciii. 3.

3rd pers. sing. masc. Ar. مَلَكُهُ, gen. مَلَكِهِ; vulg. مَلَكُه, مَلَكَه. The Hebrew forms very nearly resemble those of the vulgar Arabic, viz. מַלְכֹּה, generally מַלְכּוֹ. These seem to find their origin in the old accus. *malka-hu*, with elision of the *h*, *malka-u*. Quite different is the Aramaic הֵ, as in مَلْكَخِ, which I trace to the ancient genitive *malki-hu* or *malki-hi*. Parallel forms to this in Hebrew are לְמִינֵ֫הוּ, Gen. i. 21; אוֹרֵ֫הוּ, Job xxv. 3. Instead of הֵ we occasionally find in Aramaic אֵ, the *h* having apparently become silent; and this form appears in the Phoen. suffix א, more commonly written י, as in קְלָא and בְּנֵי. Hebrew forms like אָבִיו (*abhīu*), פִּיו (*pīu*), also spring from the old genitive, with elision of the *h*, for אָבִיהוּ, פִּיהוּ, which likewise occur.

3rd pers. sing. fem. Ar. مَلَكُهَا, vulg. مَلَكَهَا. In Hebrew we have הָ, as in אָבִיהָ, but more commonly הֵ, agreeing with the Aramaic הֵ (הַ), هَ, as in מַלְכָּה, مَلْكَخْ, which we may derive from *malkā-ah*, for *malkā-hā*.

1st pers. plur. Ar. مَلَكُنَا, vulg. مَلَكَنَا. In Hebrew מַלְכֵּ֫נוּ, from the old genitive *malki-nū*. The rare forms with נוּ, such as קִימָ֫נוּ "our adversary," Job xxii. 20, מֹרָעַתֵּ֫נוּ, Ruth iii. 2, may perhaps represent the old accus. *malka-nū*. They stand

therefore nearer to the Aramaic מַלְכָּנָא‎ ‑֟, as (וּכ) מַלְכָּנָא‎,

ܡܲܠܟܵܢ. The Jewish Aramaic form has a tone-long vowel in
the penult owing to the accent, (as in the Ethiopic *nĕgūsá-na*).
The Syriac has lost the final vowel of the pronoun, under the
influence of the same accentuation (compare ܟܬܲܒ for ܟܬܲܒܢ,
ܟܬܲܒ אֲנָ.

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

     2nd pers. plur. fem. Ar. مَلِكُكُنَّ, vulg. مَلِكْكُنَّ. Hebr. מַלְכְּכֶן‎,
Aram. ܡܲܠܟ݂ܟ݂ܹܝܢ, probably from the old accus. *malka-kunna*.

     3rd pers. plur. masc. Ar. مَلِكُهُمْ, مَلِكَهُمْ, مَلِكِهِمْ; vulg.
مَلِكُهُمْ. In Hebrew the simplest form of the suffix is *hĕm* for
hum, as in פִּירָם, אֲבִירָם‎, 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 כֻּלָּהֶם‎, 2 Sam. xxiii. 6, in
pause for *kulla-hḗm*; whence, by elision of the *h* and contraction,
arises the common כֻּלָּם‎. A still fuller form is represented by
the suffixes מוֹ ‑֟, מוֹ, as in פִּימוֹ, פְּרִימוֹ, עָזְמוֹ, חֶלְבָּמוֹ, con-
tracted from *hĕlba-hŭmū*, etc. מַלְכָּם‎ stands therefore for original
malka-humū. The Aramaic forms need no further explanation,
ܡܲܠܟ݂ܟ݂ܘܿܢ, etc.

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

tókha-hĕnna. Contracted from this are the forms in נָה‎ֿ and

נָה‎ֿ, as קְרֹבָּנָה, לְבַתָּנָה, כֻּלָּנָה, בָּאְנָה, לִדְתָּנָה. Still shorter

is the common הֶן, as in חֶלְקַּתְהֶן, לְבַדְהֶן, and ן‎ֿ, as in לְבֶּן.

The successive Hebrew forms appear then to have been *malka-
hĕnna, malka-hĕn*, contracted *malkáhᵉna, malkána, malkán*. The
Aramaic form ܡܲܠܟܵܬܗܘܿܢ 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 *û* and *î*;
as

    Dual nom. عَبْدَايَ "my two servants," عَبْدَاكَ, etc.

        gen. عَبْدَيَّ ,عَبْدَيكَ, etc.

    Plur. nom. بَنُوَّ "his sons," بَنُوكَ, etc.

        gen. بَنِيهِ ,بَنِيكَ, etc.

But "my sons" is expressed by بَنِيَّ for both nom. بَنُوِيَ and

gen. بَنِيِيَ. 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. *šepâa*],
birka-ai "my knees," *kata-ai*, "my hands," for *šipā-ya, birkā-ya,
katā-ya*, just as the Arab said رِجلاَيَ, رُكَبْتَايَ، يَدَايَ; 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. יָדַיִם for

yadaim (Arab. يَدَيْنِ, vulg. يَدَيْنْ) would naturally give in the

construct form *yadai* (Ar. يَدَيْ), which became יְדֵי; but קֹטְלִים

for *ḳâtilîm* (Ar. قَاتِلِينَ, vulg. قَاتِلِينْ) should equally yield קֹטְלֵי

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

1st pers. sing. Arab. مَلَكَيَّ، يَدَيَّ. Heb. יָדַי, מְלָכַי 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, מַלְכַּי, ܡܠܟܬ݂ܝ.

2nd pers. sing. Arab. مَلَكَيْكَ، يَدَيْكَ. Heb. יָדֶיךָ and יָדַיִךְ for *yadai-ka* and *yadai-ki*, shortened *yadai-k*, מְלָכֶיךָ for *malakai-ka*. The fuller form of the fem. also occurs, e.g. חַיְיֵכִי and נְעוּרָיְכִי in Ps. ciii., for חַיַּיִךְ and נְעוּרָיִךְ. This leads us to the Syriac forms ܡܠܟܬܟܝ and ܡܠܟܬܟ, with silent *yûd*. In Biblical Aramaic the diphthong has been weakened into *â*, just as in Hebrew אַיִן became אָן, or in Aramaic itself מָאתַיִן became מָאתָן. Hence the masc. מלכיך, for *malkai-ka*, is according to the *k'rē* to be pronounced מַלְכָּךְ; whereas the fem. is usually pointed מַלְכַּיִךְ [in the Targums], though מַלְכֵּךְ is also found.

3rd pers. sing. masc. Arab. مَلَكَيْهِ، يَدَيْهِ (for *s*). In Hebrew the fullest form is גִּבּוֹרֵיהוּ, עֵינֵיהוּ, יָדֵיהוּ, for *yadai-hu*, etc., with weakening of *ai* to *ê*. The more common form, however, is יָדָיו, מְלָכָיו, with elision of the *h* and weakening of *ai* to *â*. We also find a form without *yud*, as דִּבְרָן; and the question arises whether this is identical with דִּבְרִין, or not. If identical, then דִּבְרָן is only incorrectly written, according to ear, for דִּבְרִין. But it may also be that דִּבְרָן stands for the old nomi-

native dual דְּבָרַוְהִי *dabarau-hu*, by elision of the *h*, *dabarau-u*,
and then *dabarau*, דְּבָרַו ; just as the 1st pers. *dabarai-ya* became
dabarai, דְּבָרַי. Such at any rate must be the origin of the
Aramaic forms מַלְכַּוְהִי, ܡܲܠܟܵܘܗܝ, the latter with silent ܗܝ,
for *malkau-hu*. The form מַלְכַּוֹ, with elision of the ה, also
occurs; and this appears to be the Phoenician form in such
phrases as בְּעֵנֶל אֵשׁ מַרְנִי לֵם, כְּ שָׁמֵעַ כָּל־דִּבָרַי, though we may
perhaps also read דְּבָרַי and מַרְנִי, in closer accordance with
the Hebrew forms.

3rd sing. fem. Arab. مَلَكَيْهَا, يَدَيْهَا; Heb. יָדֶיהָ, מַלְכֶיהָ, for
yadai-hā, malakai-hā. The corresponding Aramaic forms are,
מַלְכְּהָא (rarely מַלְכַּיְהָא), Biblical, מַלְכֶּיהָ, *k'rî* מַלְכַּהּ; Syriac
ܡܲܠܟܹܝܗ̇, both standing for *malkai-hā*.

1st pers. plur. Arab. مَلَكَيْنَا, يَدَيْنَا. Heb. יָדֵינוּ, מַלְכֵינוּ,
for *yadai-nū, malakai-nū*. Aramaic, מַלְכַּיְנָא (*k'rî*, מַלְכַּנָא),
ܡܲܠܟܹܝܢ, for *malkai-nā*.

2nd pers. plur. masc. Arab. مَلَكَيْكُمْ, يَدَيْكُمْ. Heb. יְדֵיכֶם,
מַלְכֵיכֶם, for *yadai-kum, malakai-kum*. Aramaic ܡܲܠܟܲܝܟܘܿܢ,
מַלְכֵּיכֹן.—The corresponding *fem.* forms are: Arab. يَدَيْكُنَّ,
Heb. יְדֵיכֶן, Aram. ܡܲܠܟܲܝܟܹܝܢ. The fuller form כֵנָה is found
in Hebrew in Ezekiel xiii. 20, כְּסָתוֹתֵיכֶנָה ("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

מַלְכֵיהֶם, יְדֵיהֶם; and, on the other, the more poetic שְׁנֵימוֹ,

אֲלֵיהֶמָּה וְכָחֵימוֹ. Archaistic is the form in Ezekiel xl. 16,

from אַיִל as an architectural term. The Aramaic forms are

מַלְכַּיהֹן, מֵלְכֵּיהֹן.—The corresponding *fem.* is in Arab.

מַלְכֵּיהֶן. ; Heb. יְדֵיהֶן, מַלְכֵּיהֶן; Aram. מֵלְכֵּיהֶן, יְדַיְהֶן

Ezekiel indulges in the archaistic form גְּוִיתֵיהֶנָה, 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, جَنَّاتِي، جَنَّاتِكَ، جَنَّاتِهِ، جَنَّاتِهِمْ. So also the Syrian:

מֵתְנָתֶה, מֵתְנָתֶהֹ, מֵתְנָתֹהֹ, מֵתְנָתֵה. But the Hebrew
almost invariably employs what is really an incorrect form.
He does not say חֻקֹּתִי, חֻקֹּתְךָ, חֻקֹּתוֹ, etc., but he adds to
the plural חֻקֹּת the dual termination *ê*, borrowed from the
masc., before appending the suffixes, and thus obtains the
forms חֻקֹּתַי, חֻקֹּתֶיךָ, חֻקֹּתָיו. Almost the only exception is in
the forms of the 3rd pers. plur., where we find חֻקֹּתָם as well as
חֻקֹּתֵיהֶם.

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 *ḳatal*, *ḳatil* and *ḳatul*, especially as concrete substantives and as adjectives. It is in the latter function that we notice them here. Examples of the form *ḳatal* in Arabic are تَبِع "following," "a follower," بَطَل "brave," حَسَن "handsome"; in Hebrew, חָכָם "wise," יָשָׁר "upright," רָשָׁע "wicked." The form *ḳatil* may be exemplified in the one language by بَطِر "proud," دَنِس "dirty," عَجِل "quick"; in the other, by כָּבֵד "heavy," זָקֵן "old," טָמֵא "unclean." As instances of the form *ḳatul* I will cite in Arabic فَطُن "clever," يَقُظ "awake," حَذُر "timid"; in Hebrew, יָגֹר "afraid," קָטֹן "small," גָּבֹהַּ "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 *ḳatal* would yield the form *ḳâtal*, which is of comparatively rare occurrence, as in طَابِع and خَاتَم, "a stamp," "a seal," Heb. חוֹתָם, and in the participles of Hebrew verbs ל״ה, as חֹזֶה for חֹזַי (i.e. *ḥâzai*). The vowel of the second syllable has generally been weakened into *i*, thus rendering it indistinguishable from the heightening of *ḳatil*, viz. *ḳâtil*. Hence, in the words just cited, the forms طَابِع, خَاتَم, as well as the great bulk of the participles of the form قَاتِل, 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 *ḳatâl*, *ḳatîl* and *ḳatûl*. (1) *Ḳatâl*, as in Arabic شُجَاع "brave," جَبَان "cowardly," كَهَام "blunt"; Heb. גָּדוֹל "great," עָשׁוֹק "an oppressor," קָדוֹשׁ "holy." (2) *Ḳatîl*, as in Arabic رَحِيم "merciful," كَرِيم "noble," ثَقِيل "heavy"; جَرِيح "wounded," قَتِيل "slain," أَسِير "bound, a prisoner"; Heb. נָבִיא "a prophet," חָסִיד "gracious, pious"; אָסִיר "bound, a prisoner," מָשִׁיחַ "anointed." (3) *Ḳatûl*, as in Arabic أَكُول "gluttonous," كَذُوب "lying," جَسُور "daring"; Heb. עָצוּם "strong," חָרוּץ "sharp," נָחוּשׁ "brazen," and the ordinary participle passive קָטוּל.

The Aramaic furnishes us with an example of the heightening of *both* vowels in the form *ḳâtôl*, as נָטוֹרָא, כָּרוֹזָא כֹּ֫סוֹן; نَهُوَاُ.

The doubling of the 2nd consonant appears in Hebrew in the common form *ḳattâl*, intensive of *ḳatal*; e.g. גַּנָּב "thief," טַבָּח "cook," "executioner," חָרָשׁ "cutter," קַנָּא "jealous," and with

weakening of the first vowel in the shut syllable אִכָּר "hus-
bandman." Also in the form *kattil*, intensive of *katil*, with
weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* in the shut syllable and tone-
lengthening of the 2nd into *ē*, *kittēl*, as גִּבֵּן "humpbacked," עִוֵּר
"blind," פִּקֵּחַ "openeyed, seeing," חֵרֵשׁ "deaf."

The intensives of the first grade, *katĭl*, *katĭl*, and *katŭl*, are
all capable of being heightened in the same way, thus yielding
the forms *kattāl*, *kattīl*, and *kattūl*. (1) *Kattāl* is very common
in Arabic and Aramaic, e.g. رَمَّا نُبَّهَا لَطُصْبَا , صَيَّاد , نَجَّار , طَبَّاخ.
In Hebrew we find קַנּוֹא "jealous," with *ō* for *ā*, but more
usually the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened into *i*, e.g.
גִּבּוֹר = נُبَّصُوا , جَبَّار , שִׁכּוֹר "drunken," יִסּוֹר "one who repre-
hends" or "finds fault" (Job xl. 2 or xxxix. 32). (2) *Kattīl* is
very common in Hebrew and Aramaic, e.g. אַבִּיר "strong," צַדִּיק
"just," עַלִּיז "exulting," "rejoicing," עָרִיץ "oppressor," "tyrant,"
אַסִּיר "bound"; نُحِّصَد "wise," أَنِّس "just," نُكِّمَد "exact."
In Arabic the first vowel is weakened into *i*, e.g. سِكِّير "drunken,"
صِدِّيق "very truthful," عِرِّيض "very fond of meddling." (3)
Kattūl, as Heb. רַחוּם "merciful," חַנּוּן "gracious," שַׁכּוּל "de-
prived, bereft of young," אַלּוּף "tame, domesticated, intimate";
Arab. فَرُوق "very timid," قَيُّوم "abiding, everlasting," قَدُّوس
"most holy." In Arabic the vowel of the 1st syllable is some-
times assimilated to that of the 2nd, as سُبُّوح , قُدُّوس or سَبُّوح
"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 *katl*, *kitl*,
kutl, still retained in Arabic, e.g. أَرْض "earth," عِجْل "calf,"
أُذْن "ear." They are also used as adjectives, e.g. صَعْب "diffi-

cult," عَذُبَ "sweet"; طَفُلَ "small, young," جِلَّ "large, coarse";

صَلُبَ "hard," حَلُوَ "sweet," مَرَّ "bitter." The corresponding Aramaic forms are *ḳ'tal, ḳ'til, ḳ'tul,* with transposition of the vowels, which however resume their normal place in the emphatic state, e.g. ܟܬܒܐ ܣܦܪ, ܟܬܒܐ ܣܦܪ ܩܛܠ ܩܛܠܐ. The ordinary Hebrew forms are identical with the Arabic, for the 2nd vowel in Hebrew is merely supplementary, and disappears before a suffix; e.g. אֶרֶץ for אַרְץ, with suffix אַרְצוֹ; סֵפֶר for סִפְר, with suffix סִפְרְךָ; אֹזֶן for אֻזְן or אָזְן, with suffix אָזְנִי. But the Aramaic forms are also found in our Hebrew text, though more sparingly, in the construct state; e.g. גְּבַר תָּמִים Ps. xviii. 26; כַּזֶּרַע־גַּד Num. xi. 7; נְטַע שַׁעֲשׁוּעָיו Isa. v. 7; מִסְחַר כָּסֶף 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[2].

---

[1] [The absolute state and construct of nouns of this class usually appear with ◌ֶ instead of ◌ֵ except before gutturals or *rîsh.*]

[2] [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, *ḳátala, ḳátila, ḳátula,* precisely corresponding to the three nominal or adjectival forms mentioned above. The form *ḳátala* is, generally speaking, transitive; whilst *ḳátila* and *ḳátula* 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, *ḳátala* would be an ancient adjective signifying "killing," or, as a verbal form, "he killed"; حَزِن would signify "sorrowing" or "he sorrowed";

ثَقُل, "being heavy" or "it was heavy." It is possible however that *ḳatala* may already be a contraction for *ḳatal-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 *ḳatála* and *ḳétla.* (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. קָטַל, but קְטָלַנִי *ḳ'tálá-nî* = Arab. *ḳatala-nî;* Aram. ܩܛܰܠ *ḳ'ṭal,* but with suffix ܩܰܛܠܰܢ *ḳaṭlá-n* for *ḳaṭlá-nî, ḳaṭala-nî.*

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," فِضِل *fiḍil,* "it was over and above," كِتِر *kitir, kutur,* "it was much," سِكِت *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, ፈተለ: *ḳatála* = قَتَلَ. In the intransitive forms the vowels *i* and *u* were both weakened to *ĕ*, and finally dropped, whence resulted such words as የብሰ: *yabsa*, "to be dry," ጸደቀ: "to be just," ረወየ: "to be satisfied with drink," ቀርበ: "to be near," exactly corresponding to rare Arabic forms like عَلَمَ for عَلِمَ، رَضَيَ for رَضِيَ، حَسَنَ for حَسُنَ، قَرُبَ for قَرَبَ. If the 2nd radical was a guttural, an assimilation of the first vowel to the 2nd took place, giving us the series *ḳátĕla*, *ḳétĕla*, *ḳétla*, e.g. መሐረ: "to pity," ነዳድ: "to be hot," = رَحِمَ سَخُنَ. Similar forms also exist in classical Arabic, e.g. نَهِبَ for نَهَبَ، شَهِدَ for شَهَدَ "to be dazzled with the sight of gold," بِئِسَ or بِؤُسَ، نَعِمَ or نَعَمَ. 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*, זָקֵן "to be old," טָהֵר "to be pure," כָּבֵד "to be heavy," יָרֵא "to fear"; with *u*, יָכֹל "to be able," שָׁכֹל "to be bereft," יָגֹר "to be afraid." On the other hand, שָׁמַע, but שָׁמְעוּ, as in vulgar Arabic سَمَع for the classical سَمِعَ (שָׁמֵעַ); גָּבַר, but גָּדַל, but שְׁכַבְתָּנִי; שָׁכַח, but דָּבַק, but דָּבְקָה and דָּבְקוּ; גָּבְרוּ; גְּדַלְנִי; and many more. In Aramaic, verbs with *u* are nearly as rare as in Hebrew; e.g. דְּמֹךְ "he slept"; חֲרֹב "it was dried up, waste, desolate"; תְּכֹל "he was bereft." In Syriac only one such seems to be certain, viz. ܩܡܛ "to be shrivelled," as in Job vii. 5, ܦܪܬ̈ܝ ܩܡܛ ܘܐܬܡܣܝ; Ps. cxviii. 120, ܩܡܛ ܟܣܪܝ. Another may perhaps be found in ܐܒܟܘ, Nahum ii. 10, if that stand for ܐܬܒܟܬ, in the phrase ܘܐܒܟ

ܪܳܡܝܰܐ ܦܰܘܡܶܢ݁ ܐܣܪ. ܐܟܡܰܐ ܟܠܰܐܣܩ. Verbs of the form *ḳaṭila*

are, on the contrary, very common in Aramaic; as ܡܟܣ, ܣܶܪܰܩ;

ܪܘܦܰܪ; ܣܦܰܬ, ܝܬܶܒ; ܩܪܶܒ, ܟܪܶܒ. 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 *mîti*, "he is dead," which would correspond to the
Heb. מֵת, Syr. ܡܟܶܒ, except in its rather perplexing final vowel[1].

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

If we have rightly regarded *ḳatala*, 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 *ḳatala* is
formed, as in the noun, by the addition of *t*. The Arabic has
ḳátalat; the Ethiopic, *ḳatálat*, *yábsat* for *yábisat*, *méḥrat* for
máḥirat. 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. קְטֵלַת, ܩܶܛܠܰܬ, for *ḳaṭlat*, *ḳaf'lat*, *ḳaṭalat*. In Hebrew

the usual form is *ḳáṭlā*, קָטְלָה, 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[2]. (1) The termination *at*
actually occurs, e.g. in אָזְלַת Deut. xxxii. 36, חָטָאת (for חָטְאַת)

Exod. v. 16, קָרָאת (for קָרְאַת) Deut. xxxi. 29, שָׁבַת Ezek. xlvi.

17, עָשָׂת (for עָשִׂית) Levit. xxv. 21; etc. (2) The termination

at has always been retained before pronominal suffixes, in which

case we find the forms אֲהֵבְתָּךְ, אֲהַבְתַּתְהוּ, גְּמָלַתְהוּ, and the like.
The difference of vocalisation depends upon the difference of
accentuation, a point on which I shall offer a few remarks by

---

[1] [Delitzsch writes *mêt*, and recognises a permansive form *ḳaṭil* 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.]

[2] [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 Phoenician, e.g. יּמֹנָא (prob. יִמְנָא) in a Cyprian inscr. of B.C. 254 [*C.I.S.* 93]; in Carthag. inscrr. נדרא or נדרע, "she vowed" (also נדרעא), שמע "she (Tanith) heard," for שמעא, etc. I will only add that the final *t* disappears also in Mandaitic before enclitic בֿ and לֿ with suffixes, e.g. נפאלאלה, "she fell," for נפאלאתלה, instead of נִיפְלָאת. So also in the dialect of the Talmūd Bablī, עֲרִיקַת "she fled," אֲזַלַת "she went," side by side with אמרה ליה, שלחה ליה, and in derived conjugations אִינְּסִיבָא "she was married," אִיקַּדַּשָׁה לֵיה "she was betrothed to him." In such Talmudic forms as הֲוָאי for הֲוַת, and אֲתָאי אֲחָתֵיה "his sister came" for אֲתָת, we may perhaps discover a lingering trace of the original 3rd radical *yūd*.

If we be right in regarding *ḳatala*, 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 *ḳatalūna* as the oldest form of the 3rd pers. plur. masc., which is still preserved to us in יְדָעוּן Deut. viii. 3, 16, and perhaps in צָקוּן "poured forth" Isa. xxvi. 16; as also in the Aramaic forms קְטַלוּן, ܩܰܛܶܠܘܢ, and the Assyrian *ḳatlūni*, side by side with *ḳatlū*. Usually, however, the final *n* has been dropped, as in the construct state of the noun; whence we obtain the ordinary Arabic *ḳátalū*[1], the Ethiopic *ḳatálū, lábsū, mêḥrū*; the Heb. קָטְלוּ; and the Aramaic קְטַלוּ. In the Aramaic dialects the process of corruption has gone yet farther. The Syriac pronounces *ḳ'ṭal*, and hence we find in old MSS. ܩܰܛܠܘ as well as the more accurate ܩܰܛܶܠܘ. In Mandaitic too the ordinary form is סַגִיר, נפאק, though the termination *ū* is sometimes restored before enclitics, as נצאבולאך

---

[1] Arabic قَتَلُوا and قَتْلُوا, as in Hebrew occasionally קְטָלוּא, e.g. הָקְלְכוּא Josh. x. 24, אָבוּא 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 *ûn* is usually preceded by a *yûd*, for the insertion of which I find it hard to account; e.g. רהיטיון ,סליקיון, נפאקיון "they ran." In the dialect of the Talmūd Bablī we find the same rejection of the termination *û*, but it seems to leave its mark in an assimilation of the vowel of the preceding syllable; thus, אֲסוּר "they have bound" or "banned," for אֲסַרוּ; עֲבוּד for עֲבַדוּ; נְפַק for נְפַקוּ.

The feminine of *katalûna* we should naturally expect, in accordance with the nominal flexion, to be *katalâna*; 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 *ân*, or, with a weakening of the vowel, *ên*. So in the Targūms there occur such words as אֲמַרן, אִתְנַהַרן "were made clear"; in Mandaitic, with inserted *yûd*, פראשיאן "they understood," רגאזיאן "they were angry"; in Syriac, ܩܛܠܝܢ for *ḳ'ṭalân*. The Arabic exhibits the form *katâlna*, which I cannot as yet make up my mind to regard as anything else than a strong contraction of *katalâna*[1]. 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 *nagdrâ, lâbsâ, mêhrâ*; the J. Aram. קְטַלָא. The Syriac must of course have once had the form *ḳ'ṭâlî*, but dropped the final vowel, whence we find in MSS. both ܩܛܠܬ and ܩܛܠܝ. In the Christian Palestinian dialect we find קְטַלִי, and so also in Samaritan; but the Mandaitic writes סליק, נפאק, like the Syriac. The older form with the final vowel *â* appears in Syriac only before some of the pronominal suffixes, e.g. ܩܛܠܝܢܝ "they have killed me," ܩܛܠܟ, ܩܛܠܘܗܝ, corresponding with the Jewish Aramaic קְטַלוּנִי, קְטַלוּךְ, קְטַלוּהִי.

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

---

[1] [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 *katalna* as formed on the analogy of the corresponding imperfect form *yaḳtulna*.]

have gone on the assumption that the original forms are *kata-lūna* and *katalāna*. I must tell you however that this is alto-gether denied by such scholars as Noeldeke and G. Hoffmann[1], who maintain the originals to be *katalū* and *katalā*, 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 Noeldcke in *ZDMG.* xxxviii. p. 410), or else as analogical formations to ܩܛܠܘ, ܩܛܠܝܢ; ܩܛܠܝܢ, ܩܛܠܝ; ܩܛܠ, ܗܘ; ܗܝ, ܗܢܘܢ.

Here I will make, as promised, a few remarks on the accen-tuation of certain of these verbal forms and the changes in voca-lisation which result therefrom.

The original accentuation of the 3rd pers. I believe to have been that of the old Arabic, *kátala, kátalat, kátalū*. The Ethio-pic, Hebrew and Aramaic carried the accent onward to the next syllable, thus obtaining the forms *katála, katálat, katálū*; *kāṭál*; and *ḳṭál, ḳṭálū*. The vulgar dialects of the Arabic vary, I believe, between *kátal* and *katál*. But in the intransitive forms the Ethiopic left the accent unshifted, and dropped the vowel of the middle syllable, *yábsa, séklma*. That the Hebrew accentua-tion 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. קָטְלָה and the plur. קָטְלוּ, 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 קְטָלָה and קְטָלוּ, as in the noun we have חֲכָמָה from חָכָם. 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. יָכְלוּ, דְּבָקָה, נָתָנָה; and it is only when pronom. suffixes are appended, and the tone is consequently thrown forwards to-wards ·the end of the word, that we get in Hebrew the forms קְטָלַת and קְטָלוּ, e.g. אֲכָלָהוּ, אֲכָלַתְהוּ, and אֲכָלוּם; just as in Ethiopic we have *nagardtō, nagarū-ni, nagarēwō*, and in Arabic itself *kataldt-hu, katalū-hu*. The Aramaic 3rd pers. sing. fem.

─────────────
[1] [See *ZDMG.* xxxii. 747.]

קְטֵלַת, ܩܶܛܠܰܬ, also favours this view, for the suppression of the 2nd vowel of the original *ḳaṭalat* must have been due to the accentuation of the 1st syllable, as in the modern Arabic of Egypt, *ḳátalet, wíldet, kútret*. With suffixes the form approximates more to the Hebrew, e.g. קְטַלְתֵּהּ, ܩܶܛܠܰܬܶܗ; Mand. לא כאלתאן "she has not devoured me," אכאלתה "she devoured him." The Mand. form with enclitics, e.g. נפאלאלה "she fell," is almost identical with the Heb. אֲכָלַתְהוּ.

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 كَنْك *kunk* for كَنْت *kunt* "thou wast"; and the form with ك for ت is vouched for in other parts of Arabia[1]. 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, גליך for גְּלֵית "thou hast revealed," and in a dialect of Syria أنكو for أنتو or أنتم. 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

---

[1] 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, קְטַלְתָּ or קְטַלְתָּה. The Ethiopic equivalent is *katálka*. The other dialects, like the vulgar Arabic, have dropped the final vowel. Hence in Bibl. Aramaic קְטַלְתְּ and קְטַלְתָּ; in the Targūms קְטַלְתָּא and קְטַלְתְּ, in Syriac ܩܛܠܬ.

In Arabic and Ethiopic the accent naturally rests on the 2nd syllable, *katálta, katálka*; but when an accus. suffix is added, the Ethiopic throws forward the tone, *katalká-ni, 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; וְקָטַלְתָּ, קְטַלְתַּנִי, but קְטַלְתָּרוּ or קְטַלְתּוֹ, etc. Similarly in Jewish Ara-maic, with suffixes, קְטַלְתַּנִי, קְטַלְתַּה, but in Syriac ܩܛܠܬܢ, ܩܛܠܬܘܗܝ; in Mand. שבאקתאן, and in the Talmūd מִנַּעְתַּן "hast hindered me," אַדְכַּרְתַּן "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, *tá*, 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., ܩܛܠܬܢ "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 ܩܛܠܬܢ 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, كَسَرْتِهِ or كَسَرْتِيهِ. The vulg. form of the present day is

تَلْتِ *kataltî*. The corresponding Ethiopic form is *katâlkî*, written, according to the exigencies of the Geez syllabary, with long *î*, which passes before suffixes into *ě* or *ěy*, as *nagarkě-nî*, *nagarkěyŏ*, *nagarkěyŏmû*. In Hebrew the ordinary form is קְטַלְתְּ with the loss of the final vowel; but קְטַלְתִּי is sufficiently common, though usually altered by the Massorites into קְטַלְתִּי; e.g. דִּבַּרְתִּי and יָרַדְתִּי שָׁכַבְתִּי, Ruth iii. 3, 4; לָמַדְתִּי Jerem. ii. 33; Jerem. iii. 5. Sometimes the full form seems to have been left through a misunderstanding; e.g. Jerem. ii. 20, where שָׁבַרְתִּי and נִתַּקְתִּי seem to be 2nd pers. sing. fem. rather than 1st pers.; so also Micah iv. 13, וַהֲרִמֹתִי. Similarly before suffixes, קְטַלְתִּיהוּ or קְטַלְתִּיו, קְטַלְתִּינִי, etc. Forms like יְלִדְתְּנוּ, Jerem. ii. 27 (*Kěth.* ילדתני), or וַהֲבֵאתוֹ, 2 Sam. xiv. 10, are very rare. In Aramaic the same phenomena present themselves. In Jewish Aramaic we have קְטַלְתְּ side by side with קְטַלְתִּינִי; whilst the Syriac has preserved the older termination, at least in writing, ܩܛܠܬܝ, with suffixes ܩܛܠܬܝܢܝ, ܩܛܠܬܝܘܗܝ. 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 *antumû*; and consequently we expect in the verb for the 2nd pers. plur. masc. the form *katâltumû*, which actually occurs in Arabic poetry and before suffixes, قَتَلْتُمُونِي, قَتَلْتُمُ. Generally however the final vowel is dropped, *antum*, قَتَلْتُمْ; and the common form in the vulgar language is قَتَلْتُوا with the loss of the final *m*. Parallel to these run the Ethiopic forms with *k*, viz. *katalkěmmû*, with suffixes *katalkěmmû-nî*, *katalkěmměvŏ*, *katalkěmměvŏmû*. The corresponding form in the modern Tigré

and Tigriña is *ḳatalkūm* or *ḳatalātkūm*, which latter appears
in Amharic as *ḳatalāchhū*, ФТ\ТЏ:. In S. Arabia these forms
with *k* are heard at the present day, e.g. سمعکم *samiʿkum*
(Halévy, *Études Sab.* p. 46). As *antum* becomes in Heb. אַתֶּם,
so *ḳatáltum* appears in the shape of קְטַלְתֶּם, the accent being
thrown forward upon the pronoun, as in Ethiopic. The original
vowel appears however, in the rather rare form קְטַלְתּוּ (corre-
sponding 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
ܩܛܠܬܘܢ; in Mand. נצאבתן "ye planted." In the latter dialect
the final *n* disappears before enclitics, as נצאבתוליא "ye have
planted me," שאראןתוליא "ye have sent me"; and also before
accusative suffixes, as נסאבתן "ye took me," שאראןתן "ye
sent me," which is contrary to Syriac usage, but in accordance
with Hebrew and Chaldee, where we find קְטַלְתּוּנָא, קְטַלְתּוּנִי,
beside קְטַלְתּוּנַן, קְטַלְתּוּנָה. In the Talmūd such forms as
סְפִיתוּ, בְּעִיתוּ, 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 *ḳataltum* should be *ḳataltunna*.
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, *ḳatalkĕn*; the final vowel
appears, however, in the form with suffixes *ḳatalkĕnāhū* (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
ḳatalkā (Dillmann, p. 274). The Hebrew form is almost iden-
tical with the Ethiopic, viz., קְטַלְתֶּן. The existence of a longer
form in תֶּנָה, exemplified by הִשְׁלַכְתֶּנָה, Amos iv. 3, is very
doubtful; and no example with accus. suffixes occurs. The
Aramaic forms are such as we might expect, קְטַלְתֵּין, ܩܛܠܬܝܢ.

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 *î*, giving, in combination with the demonstrative *an*, the form *aniya* or *anî*. We found also that some of the Semitic languages inserted a second demonstrative, *ak*, whence the Assyrian *anâku*, the Hebrew אָנֹכִי, the Moabite אנך, and the Phoenician אנכי and אנך *anech*. It is this latter form that has given rise to the verbal affix in the Ethiopic *katalkû*, which is also said to be the form in use in S. Arabia, كَنْكَ, اعتْنَفَكَ, 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 *anâkû* (Haupt *anakû*) is indisputably older, in respect of its *â*, than the Hebrew *ânôkhî*, the latter would appear to have preserved the termination in a purer form. We may therefore fairly assume that the Arabic *katáltu* and the Ethiopic *katálkû* represent, in respect of the final vowel, a somewhat later stage than the corresponding Hebrew קָטַלְתִּי, with vâv conversive וְקָטַלְתִּי, with suffixes קְטַלְתִּיהוּ or קְטַלְתִּיו, etc. Whether the *scriptio defectiva* in such forms as יָדַעְתְּ Job xlii. 2, בָּנִיתְ 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 בנתי, מלכתי, etc., and in one Phoen. inscr. we find בנתי (Umm 'Awâmid, *C.I.S.* nr. 7), though the usual spelling is בנת. Plautus too has *corathi* for קראתי. In Aramaic the suffix sometimes

appears in full, especially in the case of verbs 3rd ʼ, as קְנִיתִי,
אַסְגִּיתִי; but more frequently the suffix has lost its vowel, the
usual form being קִטְלֵת, ܩܶܛܠܶܬ, which stands for *ḳaṭlat*, by
transposition from *ḳaṭalt*, which is the form used in vulg. Arab.,
ḳatalt, misikt, kuturt. The transposition probably took place to
distinguish it from the 2nd pers. קְטַלְתְּ, ܩܛܶܠܬ; and the altera-
tion of the vowel in the last syllable may be ascribed, either to
the lingering influence of the lost termination *t*, or to an effort to
differentiate this form from the 3rd pers. sing. fem. קִטְלַת, ܩܶܛܠܰܬ
(for *ḳaṭlat*, out of *ḳaṭalat*). Remark however a difference between
the Biblical Aramaic and the Syriac. The former has *movable
shĕwā*, עֲבְדֵת Dan. iii. 15, vi. 25, קִרְבֵּת Dan. vii. 16; the latter
silent shĕwā, ܢܶܚܬ, ܩܶܛܠܬ. The older form *ḳaṭalt* appears with
the accus. suffixes, ܩܛܰܠܬܳܗ, ܩܛܰܠܬܳܢܝ. The Mandaitic form is
ordinarily the same as the Syriac, ליגמית, ניפקית; but with the
enclitics the *t* disappears, and we have the vocalisation *ḳ'ṭalē* for
ḳ'ṭalēth, e.g. נמארילה "I tied to him," סליקיבה "I went up on
it." In the Targūms we find the fully vocalised form אֲכָלִית,
דְּחֵילִית, 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; כְּבָשִׁית
"I subdued," שְׁמָעִית "I heard," אַרְגִּישִׁית side by side with אֲמַרִי
"I said," נְפֵקִי "I went out," חֲזָאִי "I have seen," קְרָאִי "I
called." The final vowel is merely tone-long, and hence can be
shortened when the tone is thrown back, as הֲקֵימָת, Dan. iii. 14;
and with suffixes, as פְּרַעְתֵּיהּ, ܩܛܰܠܬܶܗ.

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 אָנֹכִי or אֲנִי, אֵן.

As to the plural, the original form of the pronom. affix was probably *nů*, from אֲנַחְנוּ or אֲנוּ; but it underwent various modifications in the several languages, as we shall presently see.

The Hebrew has preserved the old form in קְטַלְנוּ, with suffix קְטַלְנוּהוּ. The Arabic form is *katalnâ*, قَتَلْنَا, with long *â*, which is however sometimes shortened in poetry, *katalnă*. On the other hand, the Ethiopic has *katalna*, with short *ă*, which is lengthened before suffixes: *nagărna*, but *nagarnâ-ka*, *nagarnâ-kĕmmû*. Similar is the Chaldee form קְטַלְנָא, with suffixes קְטַלְנָךְ, קְטַלְנָכוֹן. In Syriac *nă* is shortened into *n*, ܩܛܠܢ, but the fuller termination appears with pronominal suffixes, as ܩܛܠܢܳܝܗܝ, etc. The abbreviated form also prevails in the Talmūd Bāblī, אֲמַרְן, אַשְׁכַּחְן. Frequently however the Syriac form is lengthened, by a repetition of the pronoun, into ܩܛܠܢܰܢ (sometimes written ܩܛܠ ܢܢ). This, in the weakened shape of נָן, is the usual termination in Mandaitic, e.g. נפאקנין, סהירנין; but with enclitics the older נא is restored, e.g. נפאקנאבה "we went out therein," שאדארנאלון "we sent them." The accusative suffixes are added to the shorter form in *n*, as רהימנאך "we loved thee," פתאהנה "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 Himyaritic, 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 *kătală*, like the noun in *ăni*, construct *ă*, e.g. *ragulăni*, *ragulă*. Similarly in the feminine we find in Arabic *kătălată*, formed like *gannatăni*, *gannată*, from *gannat*.

In Ḥimyaritic the final *a* seems to have been weakened into *ĕ*.

The pronoun هُمَا is written רֹמִי *humē*, and similarly in the verb

עֲהֹרִי, בְּנִי, עֲהֹרִי, הַחֲדַתִי (أَحَدنَا), fem. שֵׁמַתִּי (shēmatē, شابِنَا),
"they two set up." The dual of the pronoun of the 2nd person being in Arabic *anṭumā*, the corresponding form of the perfect is naturally *ḳatáltumā*. 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, ܩܳܛܶܠܢܳܐ for ܐܢܳܐ ܩܳܛܶܠ, "I am killing"; ܒܳܥܶܢܳܐ, and even ܒܳܥܶܢ, "I am seeking." In the Talmūd we find such words as יָדַעְנָא "I know," אָזְלִינָא "I am going." The Mandaite could say not only לְאַגֵּיטְנָא, "I take," but also לְאַגֵּיטְנָאךְ, "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.   ܦܳܪܶܩ *párik*, "he comes to an end."

         f.   ܦܳܪܩܳܐ *parkā*[1].

2 p. m.   ܦܳܪܩܶܬ *parkit*.

         f.   ܦܳܪܩܰܬ *parkat*.

[1] [The *a* is shortened in the closed syllable *par*.]

1 p. m.   ﻗﺼﺮﻚ *parḳin.*

f.   ﻗﺼﺮﻚ *parḳán.*

plur. 3 p. c.   ﻗﺼﺮﺒ *parḳl.*

2 p. c.   ﻗﺼﺮﺒﺘﻥ *parḳtiôn.*

1 p. c.   ﻗﺼﺮﺪﺨ *parḳákh (ḳikh),*

also ﻗﺼﺮﻴ (ﻗﺼﺮﺒ+ﺍﻨﻲ).

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 pre-cedence 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 *yaḳtul,* יִקְטֹל, 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 ይኽ: or ይሁ:

"this," and ‮P‬ " who, which," but of these Praetorius has attempted a different explanation in his Amharic Grammar, as we shall see hereafter.

A third difference between the two states lies in the variety of the vocalisation of the 2nd syllable; and herein we descry another effort of the language to mark the contrast in their signification. Given in Arabic the perfect with *a* in the 2nd syllable, then the corresponding imperfect has either *u* or *i*; *ḳátala* has *yaḳtulu*, but *ǵálasa, yaǵlisu*. So in Hebrew, יִפְקֹד‎, but יִתֵּן‎; in Syriac, ‮نحلۊم‬, but ‮نۊتّ‬. But if the perfect has *i* in the 2nd syllable, the vowel of the imperfect is usually *a*; e.g. Arab., *fáriḳa, yáfraḳu*; Heb. כָּבֵד, יִכְבַּד‎; Syr. ‮رحم‬, ‮نرحم‬. If the 2nd, and still more frequently if the 3rd radical be guttural, ا ء ح ع the favorite vowel is *a*, as نَتَحَ، يَفْتَحُ; يَسْاَبَ، سَاَبَ; يَذْهَبَ، ذَهَبَ; يَدْفَعُ، دَفَعَ; and similarly in Hebrew and Syriac[1]. If the perfect has *u* in the 2nd syllable, this vowel is ordinarily retained in Arabic in the imperfect, as *tháḳula, yáthḳulu*; but in Hebrew and Syriac the few verbs of this form seem to take *a*, as יוּכַל, יֻכַל‎ [if this is not Hof'al]; יִקְטַן, קָטֹן; שָׁפֵל, יִשְׁפַּל; ‮محم‬, ‮نحم‬. Exceptions to these rules are comparatively rare; occasionally, for example, we find the perfect in *i* connected with an imperfect in *u*, e.g. שָׁכֵן‎, יִשְׁכֹּן; נָבֵל, יִבּוֹל; ‮محم، نحمحم‬; ‮صم، نحلۊم‬; ‮بنثہ‬, and even נֵשְׁמַ, מֵת, יָמוּת, מֵגֵא, ‮لحۊہ‬, and even ‮مت، أَمُوتَ‬.

The Semitic languages seem in their earliest stage to have formed imperfects from two nominal roots. The one of these was *ḳatil*, which we found above as one of the forms of the perfect; the other the shorter *ḳ'tal, ḳ'til, ḳ'tul*. The former has survived in only two of these languages, both of which have preserved to us many archaisms, the Ethiopic and the

---

[1] [In Syriac the influence of the guttural is less marked; indeed most transitive verbs 3rd gutt. have the imperfect in *o*.]

Assyrian. The original shape of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. we may assume in this case to have been *yaḳâtilu*. In Ethiopic it appears under the normal form of *yĕḳâtĕl*, and corresponds in its general use with the imperfect indicative of the Arabic; whereas the other form *yĕngĕr* answers to the Arabic imperfect subjunctive and jussive. In Assyrian its form, according to Sayce, is *isâkinu* or *isâkin* [Delitzsch *išâkan*], 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 *yĕḳâtĕl*, because its prefixes and flexion are identical with those of the other form *yĕḳtĕl*, 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 *yâḳtulu*, with *ă* as the vowel of the prefix and a final *ŭ*. This we may accept as the archetype. The vulgar dialects drop the final vowel and weaken that of the first syllable, *yĕḳtul*, *yĭḳtul*, or *ĭḳtul*, *yimsik*, *yuskut*; thus giving us the same form which we find already in the Ethiopic *yĕngĕr*, the Assyr. *iskun* (יסכן, "he placed" [Del. (יְשֻׁכַן]) or *iṣbat* (יצבת, "he seized"), and the Hebrew יִפְקֹד, יִכְבַּד. This too is the common form in the Aramaic dialects, e.g. Jewish Aram. יִקְטֹל, יִלְבַּשׁ, 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 יֶאֱסֹר or יַאֲסֹר, יַהֲרֹג, יַעֲבֹר, יֶחֱגֹּר; (2) from verbs ע״ע, as יָסֹב, יָעֹז, which stand for *yasbub*, *ya'zuz*; and (3) from verbs ע״ו, as יָקוּם, יָנוּחַ, which stand for *yaḳwum*, *yanwuḥ*. 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, יִצְחָק, יַעֲקֹב; יָרִיב "adversary," יִצְהָר "oil"; יַלְקוּט "bag," יַחְמוּר "kind of deer," יַנְשׁוּף "bittern" (?); in Arabic, يَغُوثٌ "the Helper," يَعُوقُ "the Averter," يَثْرِبُ, يَنْبَعُ, يَخْضُونٌ "male bustard," يَحْبُورٌ "oryx," يَحْمُورٌ; يَعْلَى, يَحْيَى "freshly cut branch," يَخْضُورٌ and يَخْضِيرٌ "green," يَرْبُوعٌ "jerboa," يَرْخُومٌ and يَرْخُمٌ "male vulture," يَعْبُوبٌ "rapid river, horse, etc.," يَنْبُوعٌ "queen bee," يَعْفُورٌ "gazelle," يَعْمُورٌ "lamb, kid," يَعْسُوبٌ "fountain," يَعْقِيدٌ "thickened honey," يَعْضِيدٌ "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 የ *ya*, used (exactly like זֶה, ־ֶ, שֶׁ) 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 ዘ *za*, which is still used in Hararī, the intermediate link being *sha* ዠ in one of the Tigriña dialects. The change of sound is the same as in the Amharic ያህ:, ያሽ:, derived through ያዝ:, ዣሽ:, from an older ዚኽ, ዚነ = ذَاكَ. 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 *ḳátala* and *ḳátalū* stand for *ḳatalya* and *ḳatalyū*. For this view I

can find no support whatever save in the Mandaitic plural which I mentioned in a previous lecture, viz. רְנָאיִין, fem. רְנָאיִאן, instead of רְנָאן. 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 הֲוָא forming the 3rd pers. sing. masc. with ל instead of י; לֶהֱוֵא for יְהֱוֵא in Ezra iv. 13, Dan. ii. 20, with the corresponding plur. masc לֶהֱוֹן Dan. ii. 43, and fem. לֶהֶוְיָן Dan. v. 17. The same form is common in the Talmūd Bablī, and occurs also in Mandaitic, in both cases side by side with the forms with *n*; e.g. לֵימָא "say," לְמֵיתֵי, לְמִכְתּוּב "bring"; לִירְמִיא, לִיקוּם "be like," לִישְׁתָּרִיא "be dissolved." In Syriac the *n* alone is found, ܢܣܓܘܢ, ܢܠܟܘܢ, ܢܩܘܡ, ܢܗܘܐ. On the whole subject see Mr Lowe's note in his *Fragment of the Talmud Bablī Pĕsachim.* 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 לֶהֱוֵא to be originally an infin. הֲוֵא compounded with the prep. לְ, "to be" taken in the sense of "is to be," "shall be"; and to this הֲוֵא he finds a parallel in the form לְבֵנֵא, 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 اَلْ, הַל, and which appears in various pronouns and demonstrative

adverbs such as הַלָּזֶה ,אֵלֶּה ,אֵלָּין ,هٰكَـٰ ,הַלָּזֶה ,אָלֶה ,ذٰلِكَ ,الَّذِي ,

הָלְכָה ,هَلُمَّ ,هُنَالك, etc. The *n*, if it be anything more than
a mere variation of the *l*, may also be explained from the de-
monstrative *n*, which appears for instance in זֶן, אَלُوَ:, the pro-
nominal base *an*, הֵן ,הַנֵּה ,أَنَّ ,أِنَّ, 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 *katalat*. The typical form is again
the old Arabic تَقْتُلُ *taktulu*, vulgarly *taktul, tektul, tiktul, timsik,
tuskut*, which latter coincide with the Assyrian *taskun, tasbat*,
and the Ethiopic *těngěr, těllbas*. In Hebrew the *a* of the 1st
syllable is ordinarily sunk to *i*, תִּקְטֹל, תִּכְבַּד; but *ĕ* and *ă* are
found in the same cases as in the masc., e.g. תֶּאֱרֹב ,תֶּעֱבֹר,
תִּקְטֹל. Similarly in Aramaic, תָּקוּם; תָּעֹז; תַּחְשֹׁב ,תַּעֲנֹב,
תירנאן ,ܢܶܣܓܘܢ (Mandaitic).

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 *yaktulûna*, which is vulgarly shortened into *yaktúlú*,
though *yaktulûn* is still heard. In Hebrew the fuller form
יִקְטְלוּן is not uncommon, as יַעֲשׂוּן ,יְקוּמוּן ,יַהַרְגוּן ,יִדְרְכוּן, in
pause יִבְכָּיוּן ,יַחְפָּצוּן ,יִקְצֹרוּן; but the shorter יִקְטְלוּ is far more
frequent. The Ethiopic forms are *yěngěrú, yělbdsú*, with which
correspond in accentuation the Hebrew pausal forms יִפֹּלוּ,
יִשְׁכָּבוּ ,יֶחְדָּלוּ ,יַעֲבֹרוּ, etc.; and the vulgar Arabic (Egypt) *yik-
túlú, yimsíkú, yuskútú*. The Assyrian exhibits, as we might
expect, the forms *iskunú, iṣbatú*. The old Aramaic dialects hold
fast the final *n*, יִקְטְלוּן ,לְהֵן ,ܢܶܣܓܘܢ. So also in Mandaitic
נישיתלון ,נילינטון "plant"; but before the enclitics the *n* disap-
pears, נירשימובכון ,נישביקולאך "register with you."

The feminine form corresponding to *yaḳtulūna* would naturally be *yaḳtulāna*. This is actually retained by the Aramaic dialects in the forms קְטַלָן, לְהַוְיָן, نَسْهَكَ, Mand. נירימאן "wink." In Ethiopic and Assyrian we find the same forms with the loss of the final *n*; Eth. *yĕngĕrā*, *yĕlbĕsā*; Assyr. *iskunā*, *iṣbatā*; and so also in Mandaitic, ניסינגרא, נירימאן, are more common than the fuller form in אן. The Arabic has contracted *yaḳtulāna* into *yaḳtúlna*, after the analogy of *ḳatálna* for *ḳatalána* in the perfect. The same form occurs in Hebrew; e.g. יֶחֱמַנָה Gen. xxx. 38, יֶעֱמֹדְנָה I Sam. vi. 12 (for וַיִּשַּׁרְנָה), and Dan. viii. 22; but more commonly the Hebrew employs a form with prefixed *t*, after the analogy of the singular, and says תֵּשַׁבְןָ. The same form תִּלְבַּשְׁןָ, תַּעֲבֹרְנָה, תִּפֹּלְנָה, e.g. תִּקְטֹלְנָה, occurs dialectically in Arabic, even among the various readings of the Ḳor'ān, e.g. Sūr. xlii. 3, تَنْفَطِرْنَ for يَنْفَطِرْنَ. In the vulgar Arabic dialects the fem. seems to have vanished entirely.

The 2nd 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 *táḳtulu*, which is the actual Arabic form; in the vulgar dialects, *taḳtul*, *tĕḳtul*, *tiḳtul*, *timsik*, *tuskut*. The Assyrian has retained the pure vowel in its *taskun*, *taṣbat*; whilst the Ethiopic exhibits the weaker *tĕngĕr*, *tĕlbas*. The Hebrew offers exactly the same variations as the 3rd pers.; we find תִּקְרַב, תִּזְכֹּר, but תִּקּוֹם; תָּחֹג; תַּחְמֹל, תַּהֲרֹג, תַּעֲבֹר, תֶּאֱסֹף. The Aramaic forms, תִּקְטֵל, ܬܶܩܛܘܠ, Mand. תירגאז, תישבוק, call for no remark.

The 2nd pers. sing. fem. is differentiated from the masc. not by any change in the pronominal prefix, but by the addition of the termination *īna*, the origin of which seems quite obscure. The normal form is again the Arabic تَقْتُلِينَ, *taḳtulīna*, which has survived in Hebrew in such forms as תִּדְבָּקִין Ruth ii. 8, 21 תַּעֲשִׂין iii. 4; תֵּרְדִין iii. 18. So also in Aramaic, תִּקְטְלִין,

ܠܡܐܒܝ. In other cases, the final _n_ has altogether disappeared, as in the vulgar Arabic تقتلي _tiktúlí, timsíkí, tuskútí_; Assyr. _taskuní, taṣbatí_; Eth. _tĕngĕrí, tĕlbásí_; Heb. תִּזְכְּרִי, in pause תִּירָאִי, תִּלְבָּשִׁי, תִּשְׁקְטִי. In Mandaitic this fem. form seems to have gone out of use. In what I have said I regard _ína_ as being the original termination of this person, and _í_ as a shortening thereof. Other scholars take _í_ to be the original termination, and consider _ín, ína_ to be a later formation after the analogy of the plur. _ún, úna_.

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 تقتلون. The final _n_ is preserved in Hebrew in such words as תִּשְׁמְרוּן, תַּחְקְרוּן, תַּעַמְדוּן; or with fuller vowels in pause, תֶּאֱרָבוּן, תִּשְׁכְּבוּן, תֶּעֱבֹדוּן. So also in Aramaic. תִּקְטְלוּן, ܠܡܐܒܠܝܢ, Mand. תירמון or more frequently תירימון. In vulgar Arabic the final syllable has been rejected, leaving تقتلوا _tiktúlu, timsíkú, tuskútú_; with which correspond the Assyrian _taskunú, taṣbatú_, the Ethiopic _tĕngĕrú, tĕlbású_, and the Hebrew תִּזְכְּרוּ, תֶּעֱזֹבוּ, תֶּחְמְלוּ, תַּעַזְבוּ; in pause, with fuller vowels, תִּשְׁמֹרוּ, תִּזְבָּחוּ, תֶּאֱרָבוּ, תֶּאֱשֹׁמוּ. In Mandaitic too the _n_ disappears before the enclitics, as in the 3rd person.

The fem. corresponding with _taktulúna_ ought to be _taktulána_; and this form is preserved, with the loss of only the final vowel, in the Aramaic תִּקְטְלָן, ܠܡܐܒܠܝ. In Mandaitic, however, it seems to have fallen into disuse. The Assyrian and Ethiopic exhibit forms with the loss of the final _n_; Assyr. _taskuná, taṣbatá_; Eth. _tĕngĕrá, tĕlbásá_. In Arabic _taktulána_ is contracted as I take it, after the same manner as the 3rd pers. fem., into _taktúlna_, a form which is lost in the vulgar dialects, but has been preserved in some examples in Hebrew, e.g. תִּקְסַמְנָה, Ezek. xiii. 23, תִּשָּׂאִינָה, Ezek. xxiii. 49, and a very few more.

An example like תִּרְאֻנִי, 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, אֲנִ, اَنَا. In Arabic it is اَقْتُل (vulg. *aktul, amsik, askut*), which appears in Assyrian, with the loss of the final vowel, as *askun, aṣbat*. In Ethiopic the vowel is weakened, *ĕngĕr, ĕlbas*; and so also in Aramaic, اصقڤلا אֶקְטֹל, Mand. עשבוק. Similarly in Hebrew, אֶעֱבֹר, אֶחֱמֹל, אֶשְׁמֹר, אֶאֱסֹף; but אֶשׁוּב, אֶחַן, with the original *a*.

The corresponding plural takes its prefix *na* from אֲנַחְנוּ, נַחְנוּ, نَـحْـنُ. In Arabic it is نَقْتُل, vulgarly *nĕktul, niktul, nimsik, nuskut*. In most of the other languages the vowel of the first syllable is weakened; e.g. Eth. *nĕngĕr, nĕlbas*; Assyr. *niskun, niṣbat*; Aram. نصقڤلا נִקְטֹל, Mand. נישבוק. The Hebrew alone retains the original *a* with gutturals and in verbs ע״ע and ע״וּ, e.g. נָקוּם, נָסֹב, נַעֲבֹר, but נֵאָסֹף, נִשְׁמֹר.

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, iṣbatā*, with the loss of the final syllable[1]. 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

---

[1] [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. *yáḳtulu*, in Eth. *yĕngĕr*. In the lengthened forms of the 2nd sing. fem. and the 3rd and 2nd plur., the Ethiopic threw forward the accent one place, *tĕngĕrī, yĕngĕrū -rā, tĕngĕrū -rā*, as compared with the corresponding Arabic *táḳtulī, yáḳtulū, táḳtulū*; and this accentuation we find in Hebrew in the so-called pausal forms, יִמְשָׁלוּ, תִּתֵּנוּ; תִּשְׁמָעוּ, תַּחְשֹׁבוּ; תַּלֹּכִי, תִּלְבָּשִׁי, תַּעֲבֹרוּ; יֵשֵׁבוּ, יֶחְדְּלוּ; and also in the vulgar Arabic *tiktúlī, timsíkī, tuskútī; tiktúlū, timsíkū, tuskútū*. Generally speaking, however, the Hebrew, like the Aramaic, shifts the accent to the last syllable, תִּקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ, תִּקְטְלִי, יִקְטֹל. The forms ending in *īna*, *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, תִּקְטְלִין, יִקְטְלוּן; نَصْهَكُمْ. So also the Aramaic feminines in *ān*, יִקְטְלָן, نَصْهَكْ; whereas the Arabic forms تَقْتُلْنَ, يَقْتُلْنَ, 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 *ḳ'tul, ḳ'tal* and *ḳ'til*. Nearest to this postulated original stand the Aramaic forms مَقْفَلا, حَصِم, اَصْ; and the Hebrew זְכֹר, לְבַשׁ, תֵּן (for נְתֵן); in which latter the vowels *u* and *i* are heightened by the tone, as in the imperfect. The Ethiopic *nĕgĕr, lĕbas*, 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, ṣabat, riḳiṣ*. 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 *ķ'tul*, the Arab wrote and spoke *'uķtul*, اقْتُل ; for *ǵ'lis*, *'iǵlis*, اجْلِس ; but for *frak*, he said افْرَق , *'ifrak*, not *'dfrak*, because the vowel *a* appeared to him to be too heavy for a merely prosthetic syllable.

As the fem. of *ķ'tul* we should naturally expect *ķ'tulīna*, after the analogy of *taķtul, taķtulīna*, in the imperfect; but this full form has been nowhere preserved, except in such rare Syriac forms as ܣܐܩܛܠܝܢ or ܣܐܩܛܠܝܢ, e.g. ܐܕ݂ܟ݁ܪܝܢܝ, "remember thou me," ܐ݁ܕ݂ܟ݁ܪܝܢܝ, ܗܘܝ݈ܢܝܢ, ܟ݁ܬ݂ܒ݂ܝܢܝ. As in the imperfect, so here, the final *n* has usually been dropped, e.g. Chald. קְטֻלִי ; and then the *ī* has disappeared also, as in the Syriac ܣܐܩܛܠ, إقْتُل ; Mand. בהאר סנוד. In the Talmūd the final ' is retained, at any rate in writing, e.g. תברי, שׁקוֹלִי, וּילִי. The Ethiopic form is *nǐgǐrī, lǐbǎsī*, with shifting of the accent, as we might expect. In the Assyrian forms *šukinī* or *šuknī, riḥiṣī* or *riḥṣī, ṣabtī*, 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, *'uķtulī, 'iǵlisī*; whereas in vulgar Arabic (Egypt) it is shifted, *uktulī, imsǐkī*. In Hebrew the forms *ķ'ṭulī, ķ'ṭlī*, are found in pause, e.g. תֵּנִי, וּשְׂמָחִי, עֲבֹרִי ; but also out of pause, according to the *ķ'thībh*, in מַלֹכִי Judg. ix. 12, קְסוֹמִי 1 Sam. xxviii. 8. Out of pause, however, the word is commonly modelled somewhat after the form of segolate nouns, and becomes *ķuṭ'lī, ķaṭ'lī*; e.g. רְחַקִי, וַעֲקִי, קָרְחִי, עֲלִי, מָלְכִי ; but the vowel of the first syllable is mostly weakened to *i*, or even, in certain cases, to *shěvā* ; e.g. עֲשִׂי, רְאִי, שְׂמָחִי, לִבְשִׁי, עֲבְרִי, עָמְרִי.

The plural of *ķ'tul* we should naturally expect, after the analogy of the imperfect, to be *ķ'tulūna*; and this form is actually found in Syriac, ܣܐܩܛܠܘ. Usually, however, the *n* is dropped,

as in the Chaldee קְטֻלִי; and lastly the final *u* disappears, as
in the perfect, leaving in Syriac the form ܐܶܟܽܘܠ ܩܛܽܘܠܘ. ,
written in Mandaitic without the *w*, פרוש, בהאר. The Man-
daitic however exhibits a few examples of the full termination
ûn, or even, as in the perfect, *yûn*, e.g. ארובין (with prosthetic
א), "lay waste." The final *û* is also retained before the enclitics,
e.g. סגודולה, שביקולה. In Talmudic the *u* is often retained,
at any rate in writing, as עבודו, כתבו. If dropped, it seems in
some cases to affect the vowel of the previous syllable, as אימור
(for אִמְרֻן) or the interjectional אֲשֵׁוּר ("quick!"). The Ethiopic
form is, as we might expect, *negěrū, lěbásū*, with shifting of the
accent; the Assyrian, *sukinū* or *suknū, riḥiṣū* 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, *'úktulū, 'íglisū*; but the vulgar dialect
(Egypt) shifts it, *uktúlū, imslkū*. In Hebrew the forms *ḳ'ṭúlū*,
ḳ'ṭálū, appear in pause, as זְכֹרוּ, עֲבֹדוּ, אֱכֹלוּ, שִׁמְעוּ, אֱהָבוּ,
שֵׁבוּ (for יֵשֵׁבוּ). Out of pause, the word is modelled somewhat
after the form of segolate nouns, and becomes *ḳuṭlū, ḳaṭlū*, as
מָשְׁכוּ, זַעֲקִי, רַחֲצוּ. Mostly, however, the vowel of the first
syllable is weakened to *i*, or even, in certain cases, to *shěvā*; e.g.
זִכְרוּ, אִכְלוּ, עִבְדוּ, אִסְפוּ; אִמְצוּ, קִרְאוּ; רְאוּ, בְּכוּ, compared
with the pausal בְּעָיוּ.

For the 2nd pers. plur. fem. the normal form ought to be
ḳ'tulāna, which appears in Syriac, with weakening of the vowel
in the last syllable, as ܩܛܽܘܠܶܝܢ. If the *u* be dropped, the
vowel disappears with it, leaving ܩܛܶܠܶܝܢ *ḳ'ṭôl*. But with
suffixes the original *â* is restored, as ܩܛܽܘܠܳܬܶܗ, ܩܛܽܘܠܳܢܶܟ.
Similarly, the Ethiopic forms are *negěrā, lěbásā*; and the Assy-
rian, *sukinā* or *suknā, riḥiṣā* or *riḥṣā, ṣabtā*. The Arabic, on the
contrary, follows the analogy of the imperfect. As *taktulāna*
becomes *taktúlna*, so *ḳ'tulāna* becomes اقتُلن *'uktúlna*. This too

is the Hebrew form, רְאֶינָה, שְׁמַעְנָה, סְפֹרְנָה. In a couple of instances the final נָה (also written ָן) is shortened into *n*, viz. שְׁמַעַן Gen. iv. 23, and קְרֶאָן Exod. ii. 20; which is in accordance with the vulgar pronunciation of a form like ضَرِبْن, 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., *'úḳtulā*, for *'uḳtulāni*, *ḳ'tulāni*. It serves for both genders, like the imperf. *taḳtulāni*.

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 *u*, *yáḳtulu*; the subjunctive in *a*, *yáḳtula*. The jussive has ordinarily no vowel, *yáḳtul*, but seems originally to have ended in *i*; at least the poets use *yáḳtuli* in rime. Furthermore, the shorter terminations *ī*, *ū*, and *ā* are always substituted for the fuller *īna*, *ūna*, and *āni*, in the fem. sing., the masc. plur., and the dual; *táḳtulī*, *yáḳtulū*, *yáḳtulā*, not *taḳtulīna*, *yaḳtulūna*, *yaḳtulāni*. The province of each form is also distinctly marked out. The subjunctive is used in dependent clauses after certain conjunctions, such as أَنْ "that," كَيْ "that," لِ "that, in order that," حَتَّى "until," and the like. The jussive serves as an imperative after لَا "not," as لَا تَقْتُلْ "do not kill," and after لِ, as لِيَقْتُلْ "let him kill" (commonly used in the 3rd pers. only). Preceded by لَمْ it designates the negative of the past, as لَمْ يَقْتُلْ, "he did not kill." It is also extensively employed in

two correlative conditional clauses, whether actually introduced by the conditional particle اِنْ " if," or not; e.g. اِنْ تَعْجَلْ تَنْدَمْ "if thou art hasty, thou wilt repent"; مَنْ يَعْمَلْ سُوءًا يَجْزَ 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 *yĕndgĕr* is employed for the imperfect indicative; whilst the ordinary *yĕngĕr* represents the subjunctive and jussive, e.g. ኦግዚአ: ብሔር: ይዕቀብካ: (*yĕ'ḳdbka*) "may God preserve thee," ለይኩን: ብርሃን: "let there be light." Similarly, in Assyrian, if the grammarians may be implicitly trusted, the imperfect indicative is *išákin*; 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 لِ and the Ethiopic with ለ:; e.g. 3rd pers. *liškun*, *liškunû*, 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 ע״ע and ע״ו, and in the various conjugations of verbs ל״ה; though there are equally clear cases in the Ḳal of some other classes, where the imperfect has *a* or *ĕ* 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 *vâv 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־תַּשְׁחֵת with תַּשְׁחִית, or אַל־יֵאָמֵן with יֵאָמִין, you perceive at once that you have before you two forms corre-

sponding exactly to the Arabic يَقْتُل and يَقْتَل. תַּשְׁחִית or

יַאֲמִין is, as I shall explain to you in a subsequent lecture, the

equivalent of يَقْتِل with the loss of the final vowel; while

תַּשְׁחֵת or יַאֲמֵן answers to the shorter יַּקְתֵּל, *i* being heightened

into *ē* in the tone-syllable. With *vāv conversive* this *ē* may even

become *ǎ*, if the accent be thrown back, as וַיּוֹסֶף from יוֹסֵף.

So also in verbs ע"ע, compare יָעֹז, יָסֹב, יָחֹן, with וַיָּסַב, וַיָּחָן,

וַתָּעָז; Hiph'îl יָפֵר, יָגֵן, with וַיָּדֶק, וַיָּפַר. In verbs ע"ו, יָקוּם

with יָקֶם and וַיָּקֶם; Hiph'îl, יָבִין with יָבֵן and וַיָּבֶן, יָסִיר with

יָסֵר and וַיָּסַר. In verbs ל"ה the form is even more marked, if

possible : יִשְׁבֶּה but וַיֵּשֶׁב, יִרְאֶה but וַיִּרְא; with tone-lengthening,

יִשְׁטֶה, יֵשְׁט; יִבְכֶּה, וַיֵּבְךְּ; וַיֵּרְדְ, וַיִּשְׁתְּ; with supplemental

vowel, יֵחַדְ, יֵחַר, יִגֶל, יֵרָא, יַעַשׂ, יַעַל. In Pi"ēl, יְצַוֶּה, יְקַוֶּה, but

יֵרְדְ, but יְרַדֶּה יֵרְךְ; in Hiph'îl, יַפְתֶּה but פַּתְּ, וַיַּכֶּס; יְצַו, יְקַו, וַיַּגֵל, וַיֵּגֶל,

וַיֵּחַר, וַיֵּחַר, וַיֵּרְב; with supplemental vowel, יַשְׁקֶה but וַיַּשְׁקְ;

וַיִּפֶן.

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*, يَقْتُلَنَّ and يَقْتُلَنْ.

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 demonstra-

tives, such as דֵּן; הֵן, הֵנָּה, הַן; إِنَّ, أَنَّ; and the like. I will not,

however, pretend to decide as to the fuller form يَقْتُلَنَّ, whether

it arises from an intensive doubling of the *n* of يَقْتُلَنْ, or whether,

as Stade thinks, it is compounded of يَقْتُلَنْ and a particle, now

lost in Arabic, equivalent in meaning to the Hebrew נָא and

Syriac ܢܶ. If the latter be the case, اقومن would be exactly
equivalent to אָקֽוּמָה נָּא. Similar is the form in the inscriptions
of S. Arabia, as in the tablet: וליקמען 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 nûn* (Kautzsch's *nûn energicum*
or *demonstrativum* is a better term). This *n* is sometimes pre-
served, as יִבְרְכַנְהוּ Jerem. v. 22, יִצְּרֶנְהוּ Deut. xxxii. 10,
יְעַבְרֶנְהוּ Ps. lxxii. 5, אֶתְּקֶנְךָ Jerem. xxii. 24, יְכַבְּדֶנְנִי Ps. l. 23 ; but more
usually assimilated, as יִשְׁמָעֶךָ, יְעַזָבֶךָ, יְעַזְבֶנָּה, יַחְקְרֶנּוּ. 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 ܐܶܢܽܘܢ ܩܰܛܠܶ = Mand. לנאטינון
or לנאטינון, though ܐܶܢܽܘܢ may here be the independent pronoun
= הִמּוֹ or הִמּוֹן in Biblical Aramaic. In Phoenician this demon-
strative *n* occurs also in the suffixes appended to nouns. (2) In
the separate forms in ־ָה. In Arabic اقتل may also be written
اقتلا, and is pronounced in pause اقتلا *'áḳtulā*. Hence is apparent
its identity with the Hebrew אֶקְטְלָה. 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.: אֶחְבְּשָׁה,
אֶצְרָה, אֶפְּלָה, נַעַבְדָךְ, אֶעֶזְבָה ; נַעַבְרָה, אֶעְבְּרָה ; in pause, with
older accent, אֶשְׁאָלָה ; אֶצֹּרָה, אֶפֹּלָה, נַחְקֹרָה, אֶעֱבֹרָה, אֶשְׁמֹרָה,
אֶתֵּנָה, אֶתְּנָה ; אִישָׁנָה. 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 תֵּעָפָה for the 2nd pers.
masc.). Of a weakened form in ־ָה we have two instances;
יִדְעֶשָׁנָה Ps. xx. 4, and וָאֶקְרָאָה 1 Sam. xxviii. 15.

These same energetic forms are also used in the imperative,
viz. in Arabic, اُقْتُلَنَّ and اُقْتُلَنْ. In Hebrew the form in ־ָה is
restricted to the 2nd pers. sing. masc., but appears in two shapes.
(1) With the older accentuation, קְטָלָה, קְטֹלָה, from *k'tŭlan*,
k'tŭlan; as פִּשְׁטָה and חֲגֹרָה Is. xxxii. 11, מְלֹוכֹה Judg. ix. 8
(*K'thîbh*), צֽרוּפֹה Ps. xxvi. 2 (*Do.*); שְׁמָעָה, רְגְזָה, יָרְשָׁה; with
suffixes תְּנֶנָּה, קְרָאֶנָּה, שְׁמָעֵנָּה. (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. כָּרְתָּה, עָזְבָה,
שָׁמְרָה, זָכְרָה; or with weakening of the vowel, מִכְרָה, עֶרְבָה,
שָׁמְעָה, נִצְרָה. With weakening of ־ָה into ־ֶה we find רְעֵה in
Prov. xxiv. 14, according to one reading, another being רְעֵה.

V. *The Infinitive.*

The *infinitive* of the Semitic languages is in reality nothing
but a verbal noun, varying in form according to various modi-
fying 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, *nagĭr* and *nagĭrôt*; in
Aramaic but one, מַקְטַל, ܡܩܛܠ. The Hebrew has likewise
two infinitives, one of which, however, appears under several dif-
ferent forms.

Among the commonest infinitives in Arabic are the simple
segolates قَتْل *katl*, *kitl*, *kutl*, as جَبَن; ذِكْر, حِفْظ; قَوْل, ضَرْب;
شُكْر; with their rarer feminines قَتْلَة *katla*, *kitla*, *kutla*, as رَحْمَة,
سَمَرَة, حِمْيَة. To these—or still more closely to their Aramaic
equivalents [the nominal forms] *k'tăl*, *k'tĭl*, *k'tŭl*—correspond the

forms of the ordinary Hebrew infinitive construct, קְטַל and קְטֹל,
with their feminines קִטְלָה or קַטְלָה, and קָטְלָה or קִטְלָה. Of
these by far the most common is קְטֹל, with suffixes קָטְלִי and
קָטְלְנִי, קָטְלְךָ or קָטְלֶךָ, קָטְלוֹ, etc. Of the rarer forms examples
are: (1) שָׁכַב, שָׁפַל, חֲסַר, שָׁלַח; with suffixes, שָׁכְבָהּ Gen. xix. 33,
בַּוְעפוֹ 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, בְּמַעֲלָם Ezek. xx. 27, זַעֲקֵךְ Is. xxx. 19.
(2) אַהֲבָה Deut. vii. 8, חֶמְלָה Gen. xix. 16, יִרְאָה Is. xxix. 13;
שִׂנְאָה Deut. i. 27. (3) עָצְמָה Is. xlvii. 9, גָּבְהָה Zeph. iii. 11,
קָרְבָה Exod. xxxvi. 2, xl. 32, חֶמְלָה Ezek. xvi. 5, חֶמְצָה Hos.
vii. 4.

The other Hebrew infinitive, the so-called infinitive abso-
lute, has the form *ḳāṭôl*, as בָּנֹה, אָרוֹר, יָדוֹעַ, יָצוֹא, הָלוֹךְ, נָתֹן,
גָּעוֹ. Since *ô* in Hebrew ordinarily represents original *â*, this
form seems to be identical with the interjectional or imperative
form *ḳatâli* قَتَال in Arabic. As in Hebrew שָׁמוֹר means " keep,
observe!" or זְכוֹר " remember!" so in Arabic نَزَالِ means "come
down!" تَرَاكِ " 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. *ḳatal*, *ḳatil*, and *ḳatul*. The first of these, however,
is actually known to us only as a verbal adjective, e.g. חָכָם,
חָדָשׁ, יָשָׁר; unless we except the fem. הָרָה, constr. הֲרַת. The
other two actually occur as participles: יָגוֹר Jerem. xxii. 25,
xxxix. 17 (the only example of this form), רָעֵב, מָלֵא; גָּדֵל, יָשֵׁן,
etc. The place of *ḳaṭal* has been usurped by an intensive form
ḳâṭal, of which we find clear traces in the verbs ל"ה, e.g. חוֹזֶה,

for *ḥôṣai* חֹזִי (which actually occurs as a proper name); and in the usual feminine *ḳôṭéleth*, for *ḳôṭalt*, as בֹּרַחַת, יָרְדָת, יֹשֶׁבֶת, יֹדַעַת, in pause יֹשֵׁבֶת, with suffixes יֹלַדְתְּבֶם, יֹלַדְתּוֹ; as well as, I think, in such construct forms as אֹבֵד Deut. xxxii. 28, נֹטֵעַ Ps. xciv. 9. Far more common however than *ḳâṭal* is the form *ḳâṭil*, which may be explained in one of two ways; either as a weakening of *ḳâṭal* by change of *a* in the second syllable into *i*; or as an intensive of the intransitive *ḳaṭil*, the use of which has been gradually extended so as to embrace all classes of verbs. Its oldest form is the Arabic *ḳâṭil*, fem. *ḳâṭilat*, with which closely agree the Ethiopic *ṣâdᵉḳ*, fem. *ṣâdᵉḳt*, and the Assyrian *sâkin*, *âsib*, fem. *sâkinat*, *âsibat*, as also the Aramaic קָטֵל, קָטְלָא, ܩܳܛܠ, ܩܳܛܠܐ. In the Biblical Aramaic this participle is pointed, at least in pause, קָטֵל, 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 *shᵉvâ*, e.g. בָּטְלָא Ezr. iv. 24, כָּתְבָה Dan. v. 5, יָתְבִין Ezr. iv. 17, סָלְקָן; whereas in Syriac the *shᵉvâ* is silent, ܢܳܟܒܝܢ, ܟܳܬܒܐ, 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 shĕvā is of course the older form, coinciding with the moveable shĕvā of the Hebrew, and the full vowel *i* of the Arabic *ḳâtilûna*, *ḳâtilatᵘⁿ*. The Hebrew form naturally substitutes *ô* for *â* in the 1st syllable, and heightens the vowel of the tone-syllable into *ê*, whence קוֹטֵל, fem. קוֹטְלָה, in certain cases with fuller vowel בֹּגֵרָה, אֹכֵלָה.

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 *maḳtûl*, 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 *ḳaṭûl*, קָטוּל, is very common in Ethiopic, but with the first vowel weakened, *ḳᵉtûl*, fem. *ḳᵉtᵉlt*,

e.g. *sĕhŭf* "written," *'ĕsŭr* "bound," *mĕlŭ* "full," fem. *sĕhĕft*, *'ĕsĕrt*, *mĕlĕ't*. The Arabic form فَعُول is also sometimes used in a passive sense, e.g. رَكُوبَة "a she camel for riding," حَلُوبَة "a she camel for milking." In Syriac too there are a few examples of this kind, as ܪܚܝܡܐ, ܪܚܝܡܬܐ, "beloved," ܣܢܝܐܐ, ܣܢܝܬܐ, "hated," ܓܢܝܒܬܐ "a thing stolen," ܫܡܝܥܬܐ "a thing heard, a rumour." In Aramaic however the form ܩܛܝܠ, ܣܡܝܟܐ, is preferred, which is identical with the Arabic adjective *katīl*; e.g. أَسِير, جَرِيح, قَتِيل. Of another verbally inflected *kĕtil* 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 *katăl*, like חָכָם or רָשָׁע, becomes *kattăl*, like גִּבֹּר or צַדִּיק. Now as the nominal *katăl* lies at the root of the verbal form *katălă*, so does the nominal *kattăl* at the root of the verbal *kattălă*.

The Arabic, as usual, exhibits this form in its primitive integrity, *kăttala*; قَتَّلَ "to kill many, to massacre"; كَسَّرَ "to break into many pieces"; بَكَّى "to weep much" or "constantly"; مَوَّتَ

"to die in great numbers"; طُوِّفَ "to go round and round." So in Ethiopic, ረሰይ፡ *rassáya*, "to do"; ፈነወ፡ *fannáwa*, "to send"; ጸነዐ፡ *ṣanwe'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, *kaṭṭál*; but as in the noun we find אִכָּר for אַכָּר, so in the verb *kiṭṭál* for *kaṭṭál*, as רִחַם, שִׁבַּר, אִבַּד, גִּדַּל, אֵרַשׂ "betroth to oneself." The *á* of the 2nd syllable is some-times weakened to *ĕ* ⁻, as in דִּבֶּר, כִּפֶּר, כִּבֶּס (with which com-pare the change of *á* into *ĕ* in גֶּבֶר for גַּבַּר); but far more usually into *ĭ*, more especially in pause, where it appears, owing to the force of the tone, as *ī* ⁻. This change is probably owing to the influence of the vowel of the same syllable in the imper-fect and imperative (קַטֵּל, יְקַטֵּל). In the first and 2nd persons the original short *á* is dominant, דִּבַּרְתִּי, דִּבַּרְתָּ, דִּבַּרְתְּ, דִּבַּרְתֶּם, דִּבַּרְנוּ. In the pausal forms of the 3rd pers. sing. fem., and the 3rd pers. plur., the weaker vowel predominates: לְקֵטָה, גֻּדְּלָה, שִׁבְּרוּ, דִּבְּרוּ, though we also find קִבְּצָה, Micah i. 7. In the Aramaic dialects the weakened ܩܰܛܶܠ, קַטֵּל, קַטֵּל prevails, except where a guttural, or the letter *r*, as 3rd radical, may have protected the original vowel; e.g. زَكَّ, زَكَّـب.

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, *kaṭṭil*. So the imperative in Arabic, قَتِّل *kaṭṭil*; in Ethiopic, ፈስም፡ *fassĕm*; in Hebrew, דַּבֵּר, בַּקֵּשׁ; in Syriac, أنتَل, ܟܰܫܶܠ. The nominal form *kaṭíl*, intensified to *kaṭṭíl*, lies at the root of the verbal form. Hence it appears that the use of *á* in the case of radicals 3rd guttural, like בִּלַּע, שִׂמַּח, زَكَّـب, زَكَّ, is due, not to the re-tention of the original vowel under the protection of the guttural, but to a later change of *ĭ*, *ĕ*, into *á* under the influence of that

guttural. Side by side with שָׂמֵחַ לִבִּי, Prov. xxvii. 11, we have שַׂמֵּחַ נֶפֶשׁ עַבְדֶּךָ; and the pausal forms of the fem. and plur. are always דִּבָּרוּ, דִּבֵּרוּ, not דִּבָּרִי, דִּבֵּרִי.

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 *ă*, yielding the forms *yaḳăṭṭilu*, *taḳăṭṭilu*, etc. This pure vowel I find, however, only in the Ethiopic subjunctive of verbs 1st guttural, e.g. የሕድድስ፡ *yaḥădĕdĕs*. Otherwise it is weakened into *ĕ*, as *yĕfassĕm*, ይፈጽም፡. In Arabic this dull obscure vowel appears in the classical language as *ŭ*, e.g. يَقْتُل, تَقْتُل; 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, *yiṣaddaḳ*, *yifattaḥ*, but *yikallim*, *yirattib*. In Hebrew and Aramaic the preformative vowel is also *ĕ*, יְקַטֵּל, ܢܩܰܛܶܠ, save that in the 1st pers. sing. ◌ֱ appears in Hebrew and ◌ֶ in Aramaic, אֲדַבֵּר, ܐܶܩܰܛܶܠ. 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; *yĕnădgĕr* for the indicative, *yĕngĕr* for the subjunctive, corresponding in form at least to the Assyrian *išăkin* and *iškun*. 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 *yĕfassĕm* for the subjunctive, and had recourse for the indicative to the form *yĕfēsĕm*, ይፈጽም፡, 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 *ḳaităla* has been resorted to, which would naturally appear in Ethiopic as *ḳētăla*.

The active participle follows exactly the same vocalisation. Its preformative in Ethiopic is *ma*, e.g. መዐምምስ፡ *ma'dmmĕs*,

ܡܟܘ̈ܕܢܢ: *makwdnn̆n*. The Hebrew and Aramaic weaken the vowel to *ĕ*, מְדַבֵּר, مَكْصْهَا; and this dull vowel is represented in old Arabic and Assyrian by *u*, مُقَتِّل, *mušakkin*, in modern Arabic by *ĕ*, as *mĭfattaḥ, mĭṣaddaḳ, mĭkammil, mĭʿallim*.

The infinitive of this conj. also calls for a few remarks. Beginning with the Hebrew, we find the ordinary or construct infin. to be קַטֵּל, *ḳaṭṭēl*, from an original *ḳaṭṭĭl*. The weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* is a rarity, as חִטֵּא Levit. xiv. 43, קִטֵּר Jerem. xliv. 21; שַׁלֵּם Deut. xxxii. 35[1]. Compare in the class of concretes such words as גִּבֵּן, עִוֵּר, from *gabbĭn, 'avvĭr*. The same form *ḳaṭṭēl* serves for the infin. absolute (with weakening נַאֵץ 2 Sam. xii. 14); but with it occurs another, viz. קַטּוֹל, e.g. בָּרוּךְ, רַפֹּא יֵרָפֵא, קַנֹּא. The corresponding concretes are exemplified by רַתּוֹק "chain," קַנּוֹא "zealous, jealous," or, with weakening of the 1st vowel, מִלֹּא, גִּבּוֹר, שִׁכּוֹר, יִסּוֹר (Job xl. 2 = xxxix. 32), קִפֹּא (تَفَّازَ). These all spring from an original *ḳaṭṭŭl*, the intensive of קְטוֹל, تَتَال. The Arabic infin. تَتَّال is therefore weakened from تَتَّال, as in حِمَّال, عِلَّم, كِذَّاب, as compared with the concretes حَمَّال, عَلَّم, كَذَّاب.—The forms with prefixed *t*, which are generally assigned to this conjugation, تَقْتُلَة, تَقْتِيل, تَقْتَال, 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 קַטָּלָא (קַטָּלָה); whilst the Talmūd Bablī, the Mandaitic, and the modern Syriac, exhibit קַטּוֹלֵי; e.g. Talm. B. שַׁבּוֹחֵי,

---

[1] [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. נַאֵץ seems to be influenced by the sound of the following word אֹיְבֵי.]

שָׁאבוהיָא, אסיְיא, נאטוריא, בארוכיא, Mand. ; צלוִֹיי, אסֹוֵיי,

mod. Syr. ܢܡ̈ܙܳܐ, ܦܘ̈ܨܐ . This קַטֹּולֵי is not easy to explain,

but most likely, as Noeldeke thinks, it is connected with such

Hebrew forms as שַׁכּוּל (plur. שַׁכֻּלִים, Is. xlix. 20) and שַׁלּוֹם,

plus the originally fem. termination *ai*, which we find in Syriac in

ܠܡܚܢ̈ܐ, ܒ̈ܢܐ, etc. In all these dialects an *m* is occasionally

prefixed, Targ. מְקַטְּלָא, Mand. מפאקודיא, mod. Syr. ܡܢܨܨܐ,

ܡܢܦܨܐ; and this is the ordinary form in old Syriac, but with a

different termination, though also originally fem., viz. ܡܟܦܠܬܐ.

The prefixing of the *m* may have been due to the influence

of the participial forms, and of the infin. Pĕ‘al, ܡܟܬܠ.—In

Mandaitic and modern Syriac a fem. of קַטֹּולָא is also in common

use as a verbal noun or infinitive, viz. *kaṭṭâltâ*, as פאקארתא

"order," ראגאזותא "provocation," זאבאנתא "selling,"

"warning"; ܠܡܟܦܠܬܐ "completion," ܦܘܨܐ "deliverance." The

most nearly corresponding forms in Hebrew are represented by

such words as בַּקָּשָׁה "desiring," בַּקָּרָה "care," בַּלָּדָה "terror,"

בַּצָּרָה "cutting off (of rain), drought, distress," בַּקֹּרֶת "punish-

ment," בַּצֹּרֶת "drought." These are intensives of the form

ܟܬܠܬܐ *kĕṭâltâ*, found in old Syriac and still more abundantly in

mod. Syriac, ܡܚܣ̈ܐ, ܣܢܩܬܐ, ܣ̈ܢܝܐ; just as קַטְּלָא is the

intensive of the Syr. and Mand. קְטָלָא, ܣܟܠܐ, ܣܦܚܬܐ, ܗܘܢܐ.

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, *kâtala* instead of *ḳátala*. It is in general use in Arabic
only, but examples occur in Ethiopic too, the form being
identical in both languages, viz. حاكَم, بَارَك, ባረከ: "bless";
كالَم "talk to"; نافَق, ተናፈቀ: "go to law"; "play the hypocrite."

In Hebrew its use is likewise restricted. It appears in this language under the shape of *ḳōṭēl*, for *ḳāṭál*, and is most common in verbs ע"ע, e.g. פּוֹרֵר "cleave," חוֹלֵל "pierce, wound," חוֹנֵן "show mercy," סוֹבֵב "surround," הוֹלֵל "befool," רוֹצֵץ "crush to bits." In the ordinary triliteral verb examples are rare, but certain; e.g. שׁוֹפֵט (Job ix. 15, מִשְׁפָּטִי = مَحَاكِمِي), לֹחֵשׁ (Ps. ci. 5, מְלוֹשְׁנִי בַסֵּתֶר רֵעֵהוּ), סוֹעֵר (Hos. xiii. 3, יְסוֹעֵר "blows away"), שׁוֹרֵשׁ "to take root," הֹרוֹ וְהֹגוֹ "conceiving and uttering," Is. lix. 13. In Aramaic this form can hardly be said to occur, save in Biblical Aramaic, where we find מְסוֹבְלִין "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 قِيتَال *ḳītāl*, of which the grammarians quote one or two examples, as ضِرَاب and قِيتَال. Usually, however, it has been shortened into قِتَال, though some compensated for the loss of the long vowel by doubling the middle radical, مِرَّاة, قِتَّال, which must however have led to confusion with the infinitive of the intensive. The Hebrew infinitives הֹרוֹ and הֹגוֹ hold fast the original vowel *ā*, and would be represented in Arabic by some such words as قَاتَال and هَاجَاة, 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 עוֹיֵן 1 Sam. xviii. 9 (*Kĕthîbh* עון), for the corresponding Arabic verb is عَايَن. 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 קוֹטֵל. I mean the form קְטַלֵל, originally *kaṭalál*, *kaṭlál*, when derived from verbs ע"ע; e.g. כּוֹנֵן for כַּוְנֵן, עוֹרֵר for עַוְרֵר, and the like. Here too we find an active participle without prefixed *m*, שׁוֹרְרָי, "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, takátala*, contracted *táktala*. Of this formation verbal examples are exceedingly rare in any dialect. תִּרְגַּלְתִּי, Hos. xi. 3, seems certain; perhaps also ܬܪܓܶܡ, ترجم, תִּרְגֵּם, ⲧⲙⲓⲱⲕ:, if connected, as seems probable, with the Assyrian root *ragámu* "to speak," whence *rigmu*, "a word" (Delitzsch). For תַּחֲרֶה (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 تَقْتِيل and تَقْتَلَة, تَقْتَال and تَقْتُل, with their Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents, such as Aram. and late Heb. תַּרְבִּית "interest," תַּכְרִיךְ "shroud," "wrapper," תַּבְנִית "model," תַּלְמִיד, "interest," תַּגְמוּל "benefit," תַּחְבּוּלוֹת "guidance"; Syr. ܬܶܓܪ݂ܳܐ, ܬܰܚܠܽܘܦܳܐ, ܬܽܘܟܶܒܬܳܐ, ܬܶܫܡܶܫܬܳܐ "exchange," ܬܶܫܡܶܫܬܳܐ.—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 سَقْلَب "dash to the ground," سَلْقَى "throw down flat on the back" (whence the triliteral سَلْقَى), and سَلْعَف "swallow," as well as in the exceedingly common reflexive اِسْتَقْتَلَ, of which, as well as of the corresponding Ethiopic forms we shall speak in a subsequent lecture. The Himyaritic exhibits the *s* in one of its dialects, סחרת, סכני. In Amharic the

preformative ḥ, *sa*, more frequently אֵהּ, *as*, is an ordinary causative prefix, e.g. חֲלֵ: "be honoured," אֵהּחֲלֵ: "honour." In Assyrian such forms as *usaškin*, "set up," *usapriš*, "spread out," *usasbit*, "let seize," seem to be common. In Biblical Hebrew, on the other hand, the prefix שׁ is found only in the derivative nouns שַׁלְהֶבֶת "flame," [from Aram. שַׁלְהֵב "kindle"], שְׁקַעֲרוּרֹת (Levit. xiv. 37), "hollows, depressions," (rad. קער), and שַׁבְּלוּל "snail," (rad. בלל "moisten," بَلَّ). In the Aramaic dialects, on the contrary, there are numerous examples of it, such as ܫܲܟ݂ܠܸܠ, ܫܵܘܬ݁, ܫܲܘܙܸܒ݂, ܫܲܚܠܸܦ, ܫܲܥܒܸܕ݂, ܫܲܟ݂ܠܸܠ, ܫܲܘܬܸܒ݂. The form with ס is far more rare, e.g. סְרְהֵב, סַקְבֵּל; Syr. ܣܲܪܗܸܒ݂, ܣܲܥܡܸܠ, ܣܲܡܟ݂ܶܠܐ (rad. ܐܟܠ); Mand. סַארהֵיב, סַאסְקֵיל "smooth."—This initial *s* underwent, however, in most cases, a further change into *h*. Hence some rare Arabic forms like هَرَاقَ "pour out," هَرَاقَ "wish," هَرَاقَ "let rest," هَاتِ "give" (for آتِ, imperative of آتَى, from أَتَى "come"). This *h* does not occur in Ethiopic or Assyrian, but we find it in one of the Himyaritic dialects, הַחֲרַת, הַקֲנִי. In Biblical Aramaic it is common, in the forms הַקְטֵל, הַקְטֵל; and may also be found in the Targūms, at least in verbs פ"י and פ"ן. In Mandaitic there are likewise a few instances, e.g. הַאוּלִיל "cry out, lament"; הַאֲשִׁיט "despise"; הַאֲנְפִּיק "lead out," and הַאֲסִיק "let ascend," as well as אַפִּיק and אַסִיק. In Syriac it is unknown[2]; but it is the usual form in Hebrew. Here the original was *haḳṭal*, 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"י, where הוֹשִׁיב, הוֹרִישׁ, can only

---

[1] שכלל and שׁוּב appear to be of Assyrian origin.   N.]

[2] [The solitary form ܣܲܡܟ݂ܶܠ, was regarded by Prof. Wright as a loan-word from the Hebrew.]

arise from הַוְרִישׁ ,הַוְשִׁיב. For the second syllable the *a* is established (1) by the vowel of the 1st and 2nd persons, הִקְטַלְתָּ, הִקְטַלְתִּי, etc., and (2) by the form הִגְלָה for הִגְלִי, in verbs ל"י or ל"ו. The vowel of the first syllable was however mostly weakened into *i*, and that of the second into *ī*. 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 הִקְטִיל, with its fem. הִקְטִילָה and plur. הִקְטִילוּ. The rest of the paradigm does not call for much remark. The imperfect יַקְטִיל is a contraction for יְהַקְטִיל, of which fuller form examples occur in Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. The normal *ē* is retained in Hebrew in the jussive יַקְטֵל, the infinitive absolute הַקְטֵל, and the imperative הַקְטֵל and הַקְטֵלְנָה (הַאֲזֵנָה in Gen. iv. 23); but the long *ī* appears in the heavier forms of the imperfect יַקְטִיל, the energetic יַקְטִילֶנּוּ ,הַקְטִילָה, the imperative הַקְטִילוּ ,הַקְטִילִי, and the participle מַקְטִיל. The infinitive construct varies between הַקְטִיל and הַקְטֵל, though the former is much more common. A form like הִשְׁמִיד, Deut. vii. 24, xxviii. 48, is a rarity[1].

The last step in the history of the factitive or causative is the weakening of the initial *h* into the spiritus lenis. In Phoenician the perfect is written with initial י, but was probably pronounced *ikṭīl*. Examples from the inscriptions are יסָא "he set up," and יקרשׁ "he consecrated." This weakening is almost universal in Arabic, where the form is written اَقـتَـلَ *'aḳtala*[2]. In Ethiopic too it is exceedingly common; and the prefix '*a* is used in this language to form causatives not merely from *ḳatála*, but also from *ḳattála*, and even from *ḳâtála*; as መጽአ: "come," አመጽአ: "bring"; ሐረ: "go," አሐረ: "make to go"; ሠነየ: *sannáya*, "be beautiful," አሠነየ: *'asannáya*, "make beautiful"; አደሠወ:

---

[1] [Indeed, the genuineness of such forms is doubtful; see *Journ. of Phil.* xvi. 72.]

[2] In vulgar Arabic one hears *islam* for *aslam*, "he has become a Muslim," but this is a rare exception.

"make one finish"; ኣለፎሰ: "condole with one." In Tigriña and Amharic too it is in ordinary use. In Hebrew it is very rare (אֶגְאָלְתִּי "I have defiled," Is. lxiii. 3; אַשִּׁמֵּים, infin., Jerem. xxv. 3); but in the Aramaic dialects it is the almost universal form, ܐܘܣܦܠ. In one instance in Syr. the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened to ĕ, viz. ܐܡܟܚ, as compared with אַשְׁכַּח, הַשְׁכַּח,—like the vulg. Arab. اِسلَم mentioned above. With regard to the initial *a*, I may remark that it disappears after preformatives; e.g. in Arabic, يَقْتِل, part. مَقْتِل; in Ethiopic, from ኣንገረ: "make speak," ያንድግር: *yăndgĕr* and ያንግር: *yăngĕr*; Syr. ܢܣܦܠ, ܡܣܦܠ. The vulgar Arabic of Egypt has weakened the vowel of the 1st syllable to *i*, as *yikhbir* (يخبِر), *yimhil* (يمهِل). In the Aramaic dialects, the infinitive of Aph'ēl exhibits nearly the same varieties as that of Pa"ēl. The Biblical and Targumic form is הַקְטָלָה, אַקְטָלָא, corresponding very nearly to the Arabic اِقتَال; Talm. Bablī and Mandaitic, אַקְטוֹלֵי, as אַרְבוכִיא; אַחוֵּי, אַפּוֹקֵי "kneel," אַגְזוריא "condemn"; with prefixed *m*, מַאסְגוֹיִיא "go," מַאיתויִיא "bring"; Syriac, always with *m*, ܡܣܦܠܟܘ.

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 *takdtala*. Of this

we have two varieties in Ethiopic, ተከደነ፡ *takaddna*, and ተከደነ፡
takddna, "cover oneself, be covered"; ተዐቅበ፡ and ተዐቅበ፡ "guard
oneself, abstain, beware, be guarded"; ተወልደ፡ "be born"; ተአኅዘ፡
"be taken"; ተመዐዐ፡ or ተመዐ፡ "be angry." In course of time
the prefixed *ta* would lose its vowel, and take a prosthetic vowel
instead, becoming firstly *t'*, and then *'it* or *'ith*. Hence the Ara-
maic form, אֶתְקְטֵל, more commonly, with weakening of the last

vowel, אִתְקְטִיל, אִתְקְטֵל. In Syriac and Mandaitic we also find

a supplementary vowel in frequent use, ܥܬܝܩܛܝܠ, ‏ܐܬܩܛܠ. The

Biblical Aram. has the spiritus asper instead of the lenis, הִתְקְטֵל,

e.g. הִתְרְחִצוּ Dan. iii. 28. In Hebrew this form is of very rare
occurrence indeed. A possible example, without any prosthetic,
may be תִּחֲרֶה, of which the imperf. תִּתְחֲרֶה occurs in Jerem.
xii. 5, and the participle מְתַחֲרֶה in xxii. 15. If so, this form is
next of kin to the Syr. ‏ܐܬܚܪܝ. More certain is a derivative
from the rad. פקד, with the prosthetic spiritus asper, viz. הִתְפָּקַד
"to be numbered, mustered," e.g. Judges xx. 15, 17, xxi. 9,
which is written without *daghesh* and with *ḳāmeṣ* wherever it
occurs[1]. The Arabic form اِقْتَتَلَ, standing for تَتَتَلَ, offers us
the curious feature of a transposition of the preformative to the
place after the first radical, تَتَتَلَ for تَقْتَلَ. This began no
doubt with the verbs which commenced with a sibilant, as in
Syr. ‏ܐܨܛܒܐ, ‏ܐܣܬܟܡ; ‏ܐܙܕܗܪ, ‏ܐܙܕܩܦ; ‏ܐܫܬܡܥ, ‏ܐܫܬܒܚ; and
was gradually extended to all alike. The Arabic parallel to
הִתְפָּקַד is therefore اِنْتَقَدَ "to search for, inspect." Curiously
enough the same transposition seems to have existed in Moabi-
tic; at least in the inscription of king Mēshaʻ we find four times
(ll. 11, 15, 19, 32) a form הלתחם, from the rad. לחם, in the

---

[1] The pronunciation as a passive הָתְפָּקְדוּ, Num. i. 47, ii. 33, xxvi. 62; 1 Kings
xx. 27, is probably due to a misunderstanding of the Massoretes.

sense of the Heb. נִלְחַם "fight," Arab. اِلْتَحَمَ "join oneself to, adhere to," "rage" (of a battle). It is also found in Assyrian, as *ištakan* "he made," *iftlkid* "he committed" or "entrusted"; and in Ḥimyaritic, without any prosthetic *alif*, e.g. סֹתמר from סֹמר, סֹתאל from סֹאל, נתדֹר from נדֹר. 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 *itfaʻal* or *itfiʻil* from the corresponding forms of the intensive with double radical. According to him *itfaʻal* or *itfiʻil* is usually passive of Conj. I, as *ithabas, itkasar, itmisik, itfihim*; whereas the transposed *iftaʻal* is more usually reflexive than passive, as *iʻtamad, intaẓar, iṣṭalaḥ, isṭamaʻ* ("be heard" and "obey").

2.　The reflexive of the intensive and iterative is naturally *takáttala*. This form presents itself in Arabic, تَقَتَّلَ, and in Ethiopic, ተቀደሰ፡ *takaddása*, "be hallowed," ተፈጸመ፡ *tafaṣṣáma*, "be finished," ተአዘዘ፡ *taʻazzáza*, "obey," ተፈሥሐ፡ *tafassǐḥa*, "rejoice" (because of the 3rd guttural). It would gradually be corrupted into اِتَّقَتَّلَ *itkáttala*, of which we find examples even in classical Arabic, especially when the verb begins with a dental or sibilant, when assimilation takes place, as اِدَّثَّرَ "wrap oneself up in a garment," اِزَّيَّنَ "adorn oneself," اِسَّمَّعَ "hear, listen," اِصَّعَّدَ "ascend," اِصَّدَّقَ "give alms," اِطَّيَّرَ "regard as an evil omen." In this way تَنَفَّس would become اِتَّنَفَّس, and so in vulg. Arabic اِتَّعَلَّق *itʻallak*, "be suspended," اِتَّنَظَّف *itnaddaf*, "be cleansed," or with weakening of the 3rd vowel, اِتَّعَمَّم *itʻammim*, "put on a turban." Here we have the origin of the Aramaic אֶתְקַטַּל, Syr. ܐܶܬܩܰܛܰܠ, in Bibl. Aram. הִתְקַטַּל, as הִתְנַדְּבוּ Ezra vii. 15,

v. 17, Dan. iv. 12, 20, 30, etc.; with weakening of the last vowel,
הִזְדְּמִנְתּוּן, Dan. ii. 9 (*Kĕrî*); as well as of the Hebrew form
הִתְקַטֵּל or הִתְקַטַּל. 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 اِدَّثَّر makes in its imperfect
يَدَّثَّر for يَتَدَثَّر. Just so in Ethiopic, from verbs with initial
dentals and sibilants, we have in this and in the preceding con-
jugation, such forms as ይጠመቅ፧ from ተጠመቀ፧ "be dipped, bap-
tized"; ይደፈን፧ from ተደፈን፧ "be covered, buried"; ይሰበር፧ from
ተሰበረ፧ "be broken"; ይጽሐፍ፧ from ተጽሕፈ፧ "be written"; ይዘከር፧
from ተዘከረ፧ "remember"; ይጸደቅ፧ from ተጸደቀ፧ "pretend to be
righteous." In Tigriña this assimilation extends to all verbs,
ይግደፍ፧ "it will be forgiven," from ተግደፈ፧, ይመልስ፧ "he returns,"
from ተመለስ፧, ይፍጸም፧ "it will be finished," from ተፈጸመ፧,
ይቅበል፧ "he receives," from ተቀበለ፦ Indeed the doubling
caused by the assimilation of the preformative seems to have
been gradually dropped in pronunciation, and these words are
now pronounced *yĕgĕdaf, yĕmĕlas, yĕfĭsam, yĕkĭbal*. Hence He-
brew forms like הַנַּבָּא, הִטַּהֵר, הִדַּכָּא, are at once explained, as
well as the similar הִכּוֹנֵן. In Mandaitic and the Talmûd this
assimilation is as common in both conjugations as in Tigriña.
E.g. in Mandaitic, not merely עֲדַגְאַר "were heaped up" (עתדגאר),
עֲטַאמַאם "were stopped up" (עתטאמאם), but also מִיפֵּתַא
"opened" (מתפתח), מִיבִיא "wanted" (מתבּעי), מִיגְטִיל "killed"
(מיתקטל); עֲנַאמַאר "was fulfilled," עֲכַאנַאש "was collected,"
מִיכַאלַאל "crowned"; in the Talmûd, מִיבְּעֵי, מִיגְּנִיב, מִיקְטִיל,
מִיפַּלְגִּי for אִיכַּסַאי, מִיתְפַלְגִין, "cover thyself" (fem.), and appa-
rently with suppression of the doubling, אִיעֲסַק "he gave himself
the trouble," אִיעֲלְמַא "she hid herself," אִיעַתְרִי "I am become

rich." Similar phenomena occur in Samaritan; and even in Hebrew we have at least one similar instance in the word אֲרִיאֵם,
Is. xxxiii. 10.

Yet again, the Ithpĕʿēl and Ithpaʿʿal 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 افْتَعَل. Frequently too the ת is changed into a ט or a ד, according-ing to the character of the initial consonant of the root. So in Hebrew, הִשְׁתַּמֵּר, הִסְתַּבֵּל, but הִצְטַדֵּק. So in Syriac, إمحصُ,

إِزْدَهَنَ, إِزْدَهَجَ, إِزْدَرَع, but إمحكمد, إمحجمد. So in Arabic, in the conj. افْتَعَل, اِزْدَجَر from زَجَر, اِزْدَاد from زَاد, اِصْطَبَغ

from صَبَغ, اِضْطَرَّ from ضَرَّ. In Arabic the assimilation of the two letters is the rule when the first radical is ث, د, ذ, or ظ, and it may take place either backwards or forwards; thus from ثَأَرَ Lane gives اِثَّأَرَ; from ثَرَدَ, اِتَّرَدَ and اِثَّرَدَ, "crumble bread";

from ثَرَعَ, اِدَّرَعَ, اِتَّغَرَ and اِثَّغَرَ, "cut the front teeth"; from دَخَرَ "put on mail"; from دَلَجَ, اِدَّلَجَ, "journey by night"; from ذَكَرَ and اِدَّكَرَ and اِدَّخَرَ, rather than اِذْدَكَرَ and اِذْدَخَرَ, but from ذَبَحَ and

ظَلَمَ and اِظَّلَمَ from ظَلَمَ, اِظَّلَمَ or اِطَّلَمَ; اِنَّرَي and اِذَّبَحَ, ذَرَي and

from ظَفِرَ and ظَعَنَ. With initial ص and ض this assimilation is far less common, as اِضَّجَعَ, اِضَّرَبَ, اِصَّبَرَ, اِصَّلَمَ; and with س

and ز it is very rare, as اِسَّمَعَ, اِزَّانَ. Bearing these facts in mind, we are, I think, justified in saying that a Hebrew form

14—2

like הֻזַּכּוּ (Is. i. 16) is assimilated from הִזְדַּכּוּ, just as the similar
תִּשְׁתּוֹמֵם (Eccles. vii. 16) stands for תִּשְׁתּוֹמֵם, with backward as-
similation. Similarly in Syriac, ܢܶܬܛܰܠܶܡ for ܢܶܬܕܰܠܶܡ, ܐܶܬܛܰܪܰܦ for
ܐܶܬܕܰܪܰܦ, ܢܶܬܕܰܠܶܡ for ܢܶܬܕܰܠܶܡ. Here and there we find exceptions to
the rule of transposition. In Aramaic the verb اكْتَبَ exhibits
the forms יִתְוֶכַּן (in Euting's *Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien*,
no. 11) and מִתְוַבְּנָא 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 اِفْتَعَلَ and
تَفَعَّلَ, the third member of this group requires but little notice.
It is the reflexive and reciprocal of *ḳátala*, viz. *taḳátala*, which is
the ordinary Arabic form, as تَرَامَى "to throw oneself down,"
تَمَارَضَ "to pretend to be sick," تَقَاتَلُوا "they fought with one
another." So in Ethiopic, ተላጸየ or ተላፀየ "to shave oneself,"
ተሣሀለ "to show oneself gentle to another, pardon," ተፈለጡ
"they parted from one another," ተሰቀየ "he was tortured,
afflicted." But تَقَاتَلَ gradually became اِتَّقَاتَلَ, and hence such
forms in classical Arabic as اِتَّايَعَ "rush headlong," اِتَّاقَلَ " be
heavy and troublesome," اِدَّارَأَ "repel one another," اِسَّاقَطَ.
In the vulgar Arabic of Egypt the vowel of the 3rd syllable is
weakened to *i* or to *shĕva*, as *itkámil, it'árik* "struggled with,"
it'árạḍū, itnásábū. In Biblical Aramaic occurs the form אֶשְׁתּוֹמֵם,
Dan. iv. 16. In Hebrew we may regard הִתְגֹּעֲשׁ "stagger to
and fro, toss itself," Jer. xxv. 16, xlvi. 7, 8; and מִגֹּאָל, Is. lii. 5,
for מִתְגֹּאָל, "blasphemed," as examples from the ordinary tri-
literal verb. From verbs ע"ע I may mention הִתְעוֹלֵל "perpetrate,

accomplish," Ps. cxli. 4; הִתְפּוֹרֵר Is. xxiv. 19; הִתְרוֹצֵץ Gen.
xxv. 22; הִתְקוֹשֵׁשׁ Zeph. ii. 1; and הִתְרוֹלֵל. And here I will
notice in passing one curious Hebrew form, though it does not
belong to the conjugation تَقَاتَلَ, but to تَقَتَّلَ. From the
radical שׁוּט is derived the Pi'lēl שׁוֹטֵט, "wander about," and
from this the Prophet Jeremiah has formed the Hithpa'lēl
הִתְשׁוֹטֵט, in the imperat. plur. fem. הִתְשׁוֹטַטְנָה, 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 pro-
bably was to avoid the sequence of three t's, הִשְׁתּוֹטַטְנָה.

With regard to the moods and tenses of these three conju-
gations, there is but little to add to what has already been said
regarding the simple ḳátala, ḳáttala, and ḳâtala. 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 تِنّال, for تَنَّال, though but little
used, so we look here for a corresponding formation. This
actually occurs in the rare تِقتّال, with assimilation of the
preformative vowel. Examples تِحِمّال, تِكلّام, تِملّاك, تِنقّام;
to which we may add such concretes as تِلقّام "glutton,"
"foolish chatterer," تِكذّاب "mendacious," and the like. A great
many Hebrew and Aramaic words with prefixed t, especially of
the form تِقتِلة, belong by their signification to this conjugation,
and not to the causative or factitive تَقتِل. Such are in Syriac,
ܬܶܫܒ̈ܚܳܬܳܐ, ܬܶܕܡ̈ܪܳܬܳܐ, ܬܶܫܦ̈ܳܬܳܐ, ܬܶܫܒ̈ܚܳܬܳܐ; in Hebrew, תְּחִנָּה,
"entreaty, prayer," תְּפִלָּה "prayer," תַּעֲלוּמָה "secret," תַּעֲנוּגִים
from הִתְעַנֵּג, תַּאֲוָה from הִתְאַוָּה, תִּגְרָה from הִתְגָּרָה, etc. The
Arabic however generally uses another form of the infinitive,

which is common to the 5th and 6th conjugations, viz. تَقْتُل

and تَقَاتُل, with *u* in the 3rd syllable. These seem to be
closely connected with such Hebrew and Aramaic forms as
שִׁלּוּם, שִׁלּוּחִים, שִׁכּוּלִים, Bibl. Aram. אֶשְׁתַּדּוּר "rebellion,"
Mand. עתלאבושׁיא, Talmud. אִימְּנוֹעֵי, for אִיתְמְנוֹעֵי, "withdraw
from, abstain from." تَقْتُل is almost exactly represented by the
Hebrew concretes תְּבַלְּל "having a white spot on the eye,"
תְּאַשּׁוּר "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 *Ettaf'al* of the
Aramaic.

In Arabic the 10th conjugation is the reflexive or middle
voice of the 4th; as اِسْتَسْلَم "to give oneself up," اِسْتَقَام "to
hold oneself upright, stand upright," اِسْتَخْلَف "select one as a
deputy for oneself," اِسْتَغْفَر "ask pardon for oneself," اِسْتَحَلّ
"deem something lawful" (for oneself to do). It is exceedingly
common, and is derived, as I explained to you before, from the
form *saktala*, by the prefixing of the syllable *ta*. This form
tasaktala became *itsaktala*, and then, by the same transposition
as is usual in Hebrew and Aramaic, *istáktala*. Hence its identity
with the Aramaic אֶשְׁתַּקְטֵל from שַׁקְטֵל. It is found in
Ḥimyaritic or S. Arabian, without a prosthetic letter, *sataf'al*
from *saf'al*, as סתופי, סתמלא. It also occurs in Assyrian; as
ultišib-šinât, "I have set them" or "made them dwell," for
uštišib [or *uštěšib*], from יָשַׁב = אשׁב; *altabušu*, "I did," for
aštabušu, from עבשׁ (Haupt *epêšu*). In Ethiopic we had, you
may remember, three forms of the causative, *'aktála*, *'akattála*,
and *'akātála*; and so also we have three forms of the reflexive,
'astakatála or *'astaktála*, *'astakattála* and *'astakātála*; e.g. አስተጋብአ፡

"to draw breath, be refreshed," ኣኅተንፈ፡ "to entreat," ኣኅተኣኅቀ፡
"to ill-treat"; ኣኅተዐገሠ፡ "be patient," ኣኅተፈሠሐ፡ "rejoice";
ኣኅተማሰለ፡ "compare with one another," ኣኅተጋብኣ፡ "collect."
On its inflexion it is unnecessary to make any remarks, as it
runs parallel to that of *'iḳtatala*. The other causative form

اَقْتَلَ *'aḳtala* forms in the Aramaic dialects a reflexive and
passive by prefixing the syllable *eth*, as in the Palmyrene tariff
יתאעל, מתאעלין, from ܐܟܠ, ܐܟܠ. In Samaritan, Syriac and
Mandaitic the assimilation of the *t* with the following *alif* takes
place, e.g. אֶתְּכַּם (אֶתְּשְׁכַח, "be found"), אתסכם (אֶתְּכַּם)
"be finished"), ܐܬ݁ܟ݁ܠܰ (ܢܨܡ), ܐܬ݁ܠܳܠ݂ܐ (ܟ݁ܕ݂), ܐܬ݁ܠܝ݂ܒ݁ (ܠܟ݁),
עתאנזאר, עתאשפאל, עתאאפראש (ܨܒܬ), ܐܬ݁ܟ݁ܠ݂ܒ݁.

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-ḳatala.

In Arabic this *naḳátala* became first *nĭḳátala*, and then, with
prosthetic vowel, *inḳatala*, اِنْقَتَلَ; as اِنْشَقَّ " to split itself, open "
(of a flower); اِنْهَزَمَ " to let oneself be put to flight, to flee"; اِنْقَادَ
" to let oneself be led, to be docile *or* submissive"; اِنْكَسَرَ " to be
broken"; اِنْقَطَعَ " 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
يَنْقَتِلُ; the Hebrew, יִקָּטֵל for יִנְקָטֵל, with constant assimilation
of the preformative to the 1st radical.   The Arabic imperative

is اِنْقَتَلَ, the Hebrew הִקָּטֵל, with the usual substitution of ה for

א in these preformative syllables. The Arabic infinitive is

اِنْقِتَال; the corresponding Hebrew form is הִקָּטֹל (with *ō* for *ā*),

as הֵאָכֵל, הִנָּתֹן, beside which we have another form for the con-

struct infinitive, viz. הִקָּטֵל, as הֵעָזֵר, הִפָּתֵחַ, הִלָּחֵם. 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 *nakaṭál* into *nakṭál*,

which was gradually weakened into *nikṭál*. The original vowel

of the 1st syllable is established by such words as נֶחְבֵּאת,

נֶעֶשָׂה, נֶעֲלָה, נוֹלַד (for נִוְלַד), נָסַב (for נִסְבַּב), נָסוֹג (for *nāsāg*,

from נִסְוַג); whilst נֶעֶשְׂתָה, נֶחְבָּא, exhibit an intermediate state.

The infinitive absolute is now נִקְטֹל, for *nakṭál*, as נֶהְפֹּךְ, נַעְתּוֹר

[where the original vowel of the first syllable is protected by

the guttural following], נִקְרֹא, נִלְחֹם. The Arabic participle,

formed after the analogy of the imperfect, with prefixed *m*, is

مُنْقَتِل. 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 חָכָם is differentiated

from חָכַם, so is *nakṭál*, *nikṭál*, from *nakṭál*, *nikṭál*; e.g. נֶעֱרָץ,

נִבְהָל, נוֹלָד, נֶאֱזָר and נָאֱזַר, נָאוֹר, נֶחְתָּם. We shall have occasion

to notice a similar participial formation hereafter in the form

kuṭṭál, as אָכָל "eaten," יֻלַּד "born," לֻקָּח "taken." In a

very few instances we seem to find an imperative after the

form *nikṭál* or *nikṭél*, viz. נִקְבְּצוּ, in pause נִקְבָּצוּ, Is. xliii. 9;

Joel iv. 11; נִלְווּ Jerem. l. 5. The Hebrew form of the Niph‘al

seems to extend to Phoenician and Assyrian. In Phoeni-

cian we find נתן as the perf. Niph‘al of יתן "to give," which we

pronounce either נִתַּן or נִתֵּן, and also [נ]ענ[ש], probably נֶעֱנַשׁ.

In Assyrian Schrader gives such examples as *innabit* (נבת), "he fled," *innamir* (נמר), "was seen," *iššakin*, "was set up" or "restored," *iššibir*, "was broken," *ibbanû*, "were created." The imperative of *iššakin* is given as *naškin*, and the participle *muššakin*; the one resembling the rare Hebrew form נִכְבָּץ (mentioned above), and the other the common Arabic form مُنْقَتِل.

In Ḥimyaritic Halévy gives as an example the word הנרמש, 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 quadriliterals, more especially reduplicated verbs of the form *ḳalḳala*, 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: አንሶሰወ፡ "to walk about," አንፈርዐፀ፡ "to leap, dance," አንጐደጐደ፡ "to thunder"; አንገለገ፡ "to come together, assemble"; አንቆዐወ፡ properly "to lean forward, prostrate oneself," but generally used in the sense of "lift up the eyes *or* heart in prayer"; አንኰርኰረ፡ "roll" (intrans. or trans.); አንቀልቀለ፡ "totter" and "shake"; አንጠባ0፡ "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 ነጐድጓድ፡ "thunder," ነኰርኰር፡ "rolling, a whirlwind," ነቀልቀል፡ "shaking," gave rise to the notion that the prefixed አ might be identical with the causative or factitive prefix አ. Hence, according to him, the occasional change of meaning, and the formation in a few cases of a passive with ተ, e.g. ተንኰርኰረ፡ "to be rolled," ተንጠባ0፡ "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[1].

---

[1] [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 נִכַּפֵּר Deut. xxi. 8, for נִתְכַּפֵּר, "be atoned for, forgiven," and נִוָּסְרוּ Ezek. xxiii. 48, for נִתְוַסְּרוּ, "let themselves be warned." In post-bib-lical Hebrew it is common, and has usurped the place of the perfect Hithpa"ēl, as נִטַּמֵּא, נִזְדַּמֵּן, נִסְתַּבֵּל, נִשְׁתַּמֵּשׁ; and is then extended to other formations, as נִתְאַלְמְנָה, נִתַּרְגֵּם, נִשְׁתַּעְבֵּד, "she is become a widow."

4. Lastly we may reckon here the third conjugation of the quadriliteral verb in Arabic, where the letter *n* is inserted after the 2nd radical; as اِبْرَنْشَقَ "to open" (of a flower), "to bloom"; اِحْرَنْجَمَ "to be gathered together in a mass *or* crowd"; اِسْلَنْقَى "to lie on one's back"; اِثْعَنْجَرَ "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*, *Pĕʿalʿal*, and *Pilpēl*.

1. Starting from the root *ḳatala*, the simplest form of such a reduplication is the repetition of the 3rd radical, *ḳatalala*. But *ḳatalala* would naturally become *ḳaṭlál*, which would be weak-ened in Aramaic into *ḳaṭlēl*, and in Hebrew into *ḳiṭlēl*. Aramaic examples are not numerous; e.g. עַרְבֵּב "mix up, confuse"; ܨܽܘܪܨܶܡ "crumble," ܦܽܪܢܰܙ "separate," ܚܰܨܢܰܪ "practise, reduce to slavery," with its passive]ܶ݁ܬܚܰܨܢܰܪ; ܟܰܕܢܶܪ "irritate," and]ܶ݁ܬܚܰܕ "to become fierce";]ܶ݁ܣܬܰܟܰܠ "to be intelligent, sensible." In Hebrew this form has taken the place of Pi"ēl in verbs ע"ע, as נוֹדֵד (better from נוּד than from נָדַד), כּוֹנֵן, עוֹרֵר, etc., and

forms a reflexive and passive with prefixed *ta*, הִתְפַּעְלֵל. In other classes of verbs it is rare, but we can refer to it שַׁאֲנַן "to be quiet, still," Jerem. xxx. 10; Job iii. 18; רַעֲנַן in the fem. רַעֲנַנָּה Job xv. 33; further, with passive pronunciation, אֻמְלָל "to be withered, wither away, mourn"; and from verbs ל״ה, נָאוָה, contracted נָאֶה "to be seemly, beautiful"; מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵי־קָשֶׁת, from שָׁחָה "to shoot," and the reflexive הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, from שָׁחָה. As to the Arabic development of the original *ḳatalala*, it generally took the following course; *ḳatalala* became *ḳĕtalala*, *iḳtalala*, and finally *iḳtalla*. This form *iḳtalla* appears in the Arabic paradigm as the 9th conj. of the verb, with the cognate *iḳtālla* as the 11th; e.g. اِزْوَرَّ and اِزْوَارَّ "turn away," اِرْبَدَّ and اِرْبَادَّ "be scattered," اِرْقَدَّ "run quickly," اِشْعَانَّ "be dishevelled"; and constantly of colours and defects, as اِعْوَجَّ ,اِعْوَاجَّ, "be crooked"; اِبْيَضَّ ,اِبْيَاضَّ "be yellow"; اِصْفَرَّ ,اِصْفَارَّ "squint"; اِحْوَلَّ ,اِحْوَالَّ "be white." The uncontracted form *iḳtalala* survives only in some examples from verbs 3rd rad. ي or و; as اِرْعَوَى "to abstain, refrain"; اِحْوَوَى "to become brownish," with its byform اِجْنَوَى ;اِحْوَاوَى "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, اِقْعَنْلَلَ for اِحْلَنْكَكَ "be jet black" (حَلِكَ), اِعْلَنْكَكَ "be long and thick" (of the hair), اِقْعَنْسَسَ "have a hump in front" (قَعِسَ).

2. A stronger form of the reduplication consists in the repetition of two radicals, the 2nd and 3rd. Hence the form

ḳataltala, appearing occasionally in Aramaic and Hebrew as *ḳĕṭalṭăl*; e.g. סְחַרְחַר "to beat violently" (of the heart), Ps. xxxviii. 11; חֳמַרְמָר "to be red" with weeping, "to be agitated or troubled." Similar cases are Ps. xlv. 3, יָפְיָפִיתָ, which should probably be read יְפֵיפִיתָ; and אֲהֵבוּ הֵבוּ, Hos. iv. 18, probably in the first instance a mere clerical error for אֲהַבְהֲבוּ, from אָהֵב. Aramaic examples in derived conjugations are ܐܶܣܬܰܟܡܰܟ "to dream," ܐܶܣܬܰܥܰܝܝܰܢ "to imagine."

3. The form *ḳalḳala*, Aram. *ḳalḳēl*, Heb. *ḳilḳēl*, is often produced by the repetition of an imitative syllable. E.g. خَشْخَشَ "to make things rattle or rustle," وَسْوَسَ "to whisper," حَمْحَمَ "to neigh," غَرْغَرَ "to gargle," צִפְצֵף "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, ܦܰܩܦܶܩ, ܙܳܥܙܰܥ, ܐܰܟܠܶܢ; ܨܰܠܦܶܟ, ܨܳܐܨܶܬ, ܬܰܠܬܶܢܢ, ܨܰܘܨܰܘ; with their reflexives; in Hebrew, שִׁעֲשַׁע "gladden, take delight in," קִרְקֵל, גִּלְגֵּל, מְטַלְטֵל, מְזַעְזֵעַ, כִּלְכֵּל "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 فَعَوْعَلَ, which became in Arabic اِفْعَوْعَلَ, as اِحْدَوْدَبَ "be arched or curved, hump-backed" (حَدِبَ), اِعْصَوْصَبَ "be gathered together" (عَصَبَ) اِحْلَوْلَكَ "be jet black" (حَلِكَ) اِحْلَوْلَى "be sweet" (حَلُوَ), اِعْرَوْرَى "ride on a horse barebacked" (عَرِيَ).

I find a few similar forms in Syriac from verbs final ο and ـ;
e.g. إِسْتُنَوِّب "to boast or brag"; إِلَـٰنُوِب "to lie down, be
hidden, be blamed"; إِلَـٰكَمِب "become young, be smeared
over." In Hebrew it can hardly be said to exist, unless we
take count of חֲצוֹצֵר "to blow the trumpet" (מְחַצֹּצְרִים), from
חֲצֹצְרָה. But the form is doubtful, the *kĕrî* being מַחְצְרִים;
and even if we assume it to be correct, חֲצוֹצֵר might stand for
חֲצֹרְצֵר, as יְעֹעֵר in Is. xv. 5, if correct, stands for יְעַרְעֵר.

5. The reduplication of the form *katalala* or *katlala* seems
in some cases to have been softened into *katlaya*, which would be
represented in Arabic by *katlā* قَتْلَى, and in Aramaic by קַטְלִי.
Such words are in Mandaitic נַאבְרִיא "to bewail," נַאמַבִיא "to
make an alien, estrange"; in Syr. ܟܠܗܒ "terrify," نَحِب "es-
trange," بَهِرَت "be deprived of, fail, perish," ضَهَقَب "expose,"
ܝܠܗܒ "deport," with their passives. In Arabic a passive of
this form is found in the 15th conj. of the verb, اِفْعَنْلَى, with *n*
inserted after the 2nd rad.; as اِحْبَنْطَى "to be swollen *or* in-
flated" (حَبِطَ, اِعْلَنْدَى " be stout and strong" (عَلِدَ " be hard").
Curiously enough, a few verbs of this form in Arabic have a
transitive sense, e.g. اِسْرَنْدَى "to overcome" (سَرَنْدَى " strong,
brave"), اِغْرَنْدَى "to assail, overcome"; and, still more strangely,
the only Mandaitic parallel, עֻזדראמבִיא, "to be shaken," is
derived from an active ראמבִיא, which however does not occur
in the extant literature.

E. *The Passive Forms.*

Lastly, in this enumeration of the verbal forms or con-
jugations, 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 صَلُحَ " to be good *or* right," فَرِحَ " to be glad," or ثَقُلَ
" to be heavy," cannot have a passive; nor one like اِسْوَادَّ ,اِسْوَدَّ,
" 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[1].

1. In Arabic the following are the principal passives:

	Perfect.		Imperfect.	
(1)	*ḳatala*	*ḳutila*	*yaḳtulu*	*yuḳtalu*
(2)	*ḳattala*	*ḳuttila*	*yuḳattilu*	*yuḳattalu*
(3)	*ḳâtala*	*ḳûtila*	*yuḳâtilu*	*yuḳâtalu*
(4)	*'aḳtala*	*'uḳtila*	*yuḳtilu*	*yuḳtalu*
(5)	*taḳattala*	*tuḳuttila*	*yataḳattalu*	*yutaḳattalu*
(6)	*taḳâtala*	*tuḳûtila*	*yataḳâtalu*	*yutaḳâtalu*
[(7)	*inḳatala*	*unḳutila*	*yanḳatilu*	*yunḳatalu*]
(8)	*iḳtatala*	*uḳtutila*	*yaḳtatilu*	*yuḳtatalu*
(10)	*istaḳtala*	*ustuḳtila*	*yastaḳtilu*	*yustaḳtalu*

[1] [According to Delitzsch, p. 249, the permansives II. 1 and III. 1 (Pa"el and
Shaph'el) 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, *ḳuṭṭal*, *ḳoṭṭal*, imperf. *yĕḳuṭṭal*. The infin. absolute has the form קֻטֹּל, as גֻּנֹּב, Gen. xl. 15. The participle appears in two shapes, the one with prefixed *m*, *mĕḳuṭṭāl*; the other without it, as הֻלְּלָה, לֻקַּח, יֻלַּד, אֻכָּל, 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 קֻטֹּל stands for *ḳuṭṭāl*; but the corresponding form in Aramaic is a verbal noun from the active Pa"ēl, e.g. ܓ݁ܰܢܳܒ݂ܳܐ "theft," ܙܽܘܗܳܪܳܐ "warning," ܫܽܘܡܠܳܝܳܐ "finishing"; whilst the Arabic *ḳuṭṭāl* is now the plural of the active participle of the simple verb *ḳatala*, as *ḳātil*ᵘⁿ, a "murderer," *ḳuttāl*ᵘⁿ, "murderers." So again, the Hebrew participle אֻכָּל stands for *'ukkāl*, a sing. masc.; whereas the corresponding form in Arabic is another plural of the active participle of the simple *ḳatala*, as *sāǵid*, "worshipper," *suǵǵad*, "worshippers."

(*b*) The form expressive of effort, *ḳōṭal*, imperf. *yĕḳōṭal*, as יְשֹׁרָשׁוּ, Job xxxi. 8.

(*c*) The causative or factitive, *hoḳṭal*, *huḳṭal*, imperf. *yoḳṭal*. Other forms are comparatively rare, but I may mention :—

(*d*) *Hothḳatal*, in the form הָתְפָּקְדוּ, Num. i. 47, ii. 33, xxvi. 62 ; 1 Kings xx. 27 ; instead of הִתְפָּקְדוּ.

(*e*) *Hothḳaṭṭal*, in הֻטַּמָּאָה, Deut. xxiv. 4 ; הֻדַּשְׁנָה, for הֻדְּשְׁנָה, Is. xxxiv. 6 ; הֻכַּבֵּס 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 اُنْتُقِدُوا with הָתְפָּקְדוּ, or تُنُبِّئَتْ with הֻדַּשְׁנָה.

(*f*) A curious form is presented to us in the Hebrew נִגְאֲלוּ, Is. lix. 3; Lament. iv. 14. This is generally explained as a passive of Niph'al, נִגְאָלָה, Zeph. iii. 1. I should rather be inclined to regard it as a quasi-Niph'al formation from the Pi"el גֵּאֵל, Pu"al גֹּאַל. If you adopt the former view, you must regard נִגְאֲלוּ as = اِنْفَعَلُوا; if the latter, I can produce a parallel from the vulgar Arabic of Egypt, viz. اِنْضَيَّع "it is lost, forfeited" (Spitta, *Contes Arabes*, p. 9, l. 10), from ضَيَّع "to lose, forfeit." Here again perhaps the Massoretic punctuation may be erroneous (נְגֶאֲלוּ?).

(*g*) *Kuṭlal*, in אֻמְלַל.

(*h*) *Kolḳal*, in כַּלְכְּלוּ, 1 Kings xx. 27, and תְּשָׁעֳשָׁעוּ, Is. lxvi. 12.

3. Of the Aramaic passive the chief traces are the following.

(*a*) The passive of *Pĕʻal*, in a form which appears at first to be that of the passive participle *Pĕʻîl*, 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 *ḳuṭîl*, 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 shĕvā: טְרִיד Dan. iv. 30, יְהִיב Dan. vii. 4, 6, כְּתִיב Ezra v. 7, קְטִיל Dan. v. 30, רְשִׁים Dan. v. 24, שְׁלֵם Ezra v. 16; 3rd fem. בְּטֵלַת Ezra iv. 24, יְהִיבַת Dan. vii. 27, נְמִילַת Dan. vii. 4, פְּרִיסַת Dan. v. 28, קְטִילַת Dan. vii. 11; 2nd sing. masc. תְּקֵלְתָּא Dan. v. 27; 3rd plur. masc. יְהִיבוּ Ezra v. 15, כְּפִתוּ Dan. iii. 21, רְמִיו 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 גְּלִי Dan. ii. 19, גְּלִי Dan. ii. 30, קְרִי Ezra iv.
18, 23; plur. רְמִיו Dan. iii. 21, vii. 9; whereas the form of the
participle Pĕʿîl is בְּנֵה, מְנָא, קְרֵי, שְׂרֵא, plur. שָׁרַיִן. Similarly
in the Palmyrene tariff, נבי = Arab. جَبِيّ; see Sachau in
ZDMG. xxxvii. pp. 564—5.

(*b*) The passive of *Hiphʿîl*, viz. *Hophʿal*, in Biblical Aramaic
and the Palmyrene dialect, viz. הֻנְחַת Dan. v. 20, הוּבַד Dan.
vii. 11, הֻפַּק Dan. vi. 24, הֻעַל Dan. v. 13, plur. הֻעַלּוּ Dan. v. 15;
fem. sing. הֶחָרְבַת Ezra iv. 15, הֻסְפַּת לִי Dan. iv. 33, הֻקִּימַת
Dan. vii. 4 (cf. أُقِيمَت); 1st pers. הָתְקְנֵת (not נַת_) Dan. iv. 33.

Very peculiar are the forms הֵיתָיִו Dan. vi. 18, and הֵיתָיִו
Dan. iii. 13, the vocalisation of the 1st syllable of which is as
yet unexplained. Similarly in the Palmyrene tariff, אֲשֵׁר (from
שׁר), e.g. ומדי אשר לאגורא; imperfect יִכְתֵּב, e.g. ויכתב
מרעם די לא, e.g. מֻפַּק .part; למרעם מרעמא מכסה די מן עידא
ויהוא מבטל לארכונַיָא די הַוֵן בוזן, e.g. מֻבְטַל; מסק בנמוסא
מרי יהוא מ[תאעל] בר מן תחומא או מֻפַּק, for מָאפַק; זבן
מאפק.

(*c*) The passive of *Piʿʿêl*, viz. *Puʿʿal*, in the Palmyrene tariff,
ומן כל] משך די יתאעל או יובן למשכא אפרִין, e.g. יְזַבַּן.

(*d*) The passive participles of *Paʿʿêl*, *Aphʿêl* and *Shaphʿêl*,
formed exactly as in Arabic. Thus in Biblical Aramaic מְהַלֵּךְ,
מְמַלֵּל, but מְכַפְּתִין "bound," Dan. iii. 23, 24, from מְכַפַּת;
מַשְׁפֵּל; מְסַתַּר "hidden things," Dan. ii. 22, from מִסְתָּרָתָא
Dan. v. 19, and מְהַנְזְקַת מַלְכִּין Ezra iv. 15, but מְהַחְצְפָה Dan.
ii. 15, or מַחְצְפָה Dan. iii. 22, from מְהַחְצַף, מַחְצַף. Also from
Pĕʿal, מְסוֹבְלִין "set up, erected," Ezra vi. 3, from מְסוֹבַל.

Exactly so in Syriac, ܡܲܟ݂ܕ݁ܚ, ܡܲܟ݂ܕ݁ܚܵܐ, ܡܲܟ݂ܕ݁ܚ; ܡܲܟ݂ܕ݁ܚ, ܡܲܟ݂ܕ݁ܚ, ܡܲܟ݂ܕ݁ܚ; and in Mandaitic, מבארך "blessing," מבארך "blessed"; מכאסיא "covering," מכאסא "covered"; מאפאן "teaching," מאפראש "taught," מאפיק "bringing out," "brought out." The corresponding Arabic forms are مَقْتَل,

مَقْتَل, مَقَاتِل; مُقَتَّل, مَقْتَل; مُقَتَّل.

(*e*) The existence of passive participles of Pa"ēl and Aph'ēl after the *Hebrew* formation is not certain in Mandaitic, but Noeldeke gives for the Pa"ēl the possible instances of מוליא, "the highlands," for מְעֻלְּיָא, and משניא כושטא, a name of Paradise, lit. "the taken away of righteousness," i.e. "the (land) of righteousness that has been taken away," = מְשֻׁנָּה. On the other hand, the existence of Pu"al and Hoph'al participles in modern Syriac seems tolerably certain. For example, in Pu"al, ܚܘܣܝܬܟ "I have healed thee," is literally ܐܢܐ ܟ ܡܚܘܣܝܬ "thou hast been healed by me," the fem. being ܚܘܣܝܬܐ ܟ, for ܡܚܘܣܝܬܐ, for ܡܚܘܣܝܬܟ. So also in Pu"al, ܘܩܒܝܠ, *sūbinnē*, for ܟ ܗ, for ܟ ܗ ܡܩܘܒܠ; in Hoph'al, ܡܩܘܣܡ "raised up," for ܟ ܗ "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* ע״ע *or Geminate Verbs.*

I begin with the verbs ע״ע, 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 سَبَبَ, "to cause," becomes سَبَّ; مَسَسَ; "to touch,"

مَسَّ; حَبِبَ "to become dear" (to one), حَبَّ. The original form may be retained in poetry, for the sake of the metre, as ضَنِنُوا for ضَنُّوا, "they are stingy"; and in some verbs of the

forms فَعِلَ and فَعَلَ the contraction does not take place, as مَكِكَ "to be knock-kneed," لَحِحَ "to be sore" (of the eyes), لَبِبَ "to be wise," دَمَمَ "to be ugly." Vulg. Arab., *madd, 'add, ṣann.*

(*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 يَسْبُبُ becomes يَسُبُّ. The original forms يَمْسَسُ, يَمَسُّ, يَفْرِرُ, يَفِرُّ may be used by poetic license, as يَحْلِلُ for يَحِلُّ. Vulg. Arab., *yeẓunn, yeʾidd, yiṣaḥḥ.*

(*c*) If the 3rd radical is vowelless, no contraction, generally speaking, takes place. The forms in ordinary use are سَبَبْتُ, حَبِبْتُ, مَسِسْتُ.

(*d*) Forms that might by rule remain uncontracted are sometimes contracted in different ways. For example, the jussive of سَبَّ is يَسْبُبْ, and the imperative أُسْبُبْ; but both are usually contracted, with the help of a supplementary vowel, into يَسُبَّ and سُبَّ. Vulg. Arab., *ẓunn, ʾidd.*

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 رَنّ, סַב, and ضَّا.

Kal. Here the uncontracted forms are relatively far more common in Hebrew than in Arabic, as סָבַב, סָרַר, חָנַן, חָלַל, fem. נָדְדָה, plur. סָבְבוּ‎, שָׁחֲחוּ‎, נָדְדוּ‎, סְבַבְתִּי‎. The contracted 3rd sing. masc. סַב and ضَّا stand for *sabb* and *baẓẓ*, and these for *sabba* and *baẓẓa*, *sababa* and *baẓaẓa*, like رَنّ for رَنَنَ. Add a suffix, and the doubling immediately becomes audible, חַגֵּנִי, קַבֹּה for *ḳabba-hu*; Aram. اُحٌدَّ; like Arabic رَدَّنِي. In the same way in the 3rd pers. plur. סַבּוּ, תַּמּוּ, J. Aram. דַּקּוּ, Syr. رُحٌّ, for *sababū, tamamū, daḳaḳū,* as in Arabic رَدُّوا for 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

זַכּוּ, רַכּוּ.   The real existence of forms like רֻּבּוּ, Gen. xlix. 23,

and רֻמּוּ, Job xxiv. 24, is somewhat doubtful; but if genuine,
they would find their analogy in the Arabic forms of praise and

blame, حَبَّ for حَبُبَ, حَسُنَ for حَسُنَ, and بَعُدَ for بَعُدَ.   In

the 3rd p. fem. sing., Syr. בַּזַּת stands for *bazzath* (Bibl. Aram.
נַדַּת, עַלַּת, Mand. פאסאת, שאראת, (אלאת), *bazazat*; and simi-

larly סַבָּה, for *sabbath*, *sababat*, as رَدَّت for رَدَدَت.   The pri-

mitive accent is often retained, as in מָרָה, חַתָּה, but may be

shifted, as in וְרַבָּה, Is. vi. 12.   In the 1st and 2nd persons, the

normal form is the uncontracted Arabic رَدَدَت, رَدَدَت, رَدَدَنَا,

which we find in Hebrew only in the forms זַמֹּתִי, Zech. viii. 14,

15; בַּזֹּנוּ, 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 radi-

cal; as مِسْتَ for ظَلِلْتَ, ظَلْتَ or ظَلْتَ for رَدَدَت, رَدَت for

مِسْسْتَ.   So in Aramaic בַּזְתְּ, בַּזְתּוּן, בַּזְנַן, for *bazasta*, *bazas-

tôn*, *bazaznan*.   So in Hebrew, תַּמְנוּ for *tamamnû*, Num. xvii.
28.   The 1st pers. sing., however, in Aramaic, is דַּקֵּת, Mand.

פאסית, מאכית, אלית, Syr. בַּזֵּת for *bazzêth*, *bazzit*, *bazazti*.
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 corre-

sponding forms of the verbs 3rd و and ي, as نَدَوْتَ, رَمَيْتَ.
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 رَدَدْتَ would become (through the impossible *raddta*) *raddaita*, and this is the ordinary form at the present day, *raddait, raddêt,* and in Algiers *raddît*. We have seen, however, that the diphthong *ai* passed in some cases into *â*; for instance, Arab. أَيْنَ, Heb. אָן, אָנָה; בָּתִּים, from בַּיִת, בֵּיْت; דְּבָרָיו or דְּבָרָו, from דְּבָרֵיהוּ; and in Arabic itself دَوَابَّ for دُوَيْبَّة, dimin. of دَابَّة. Hence out of رَدَيْتَ sprang the form رَدَاتَ, the dialectical existence of which is vouched for by the grammarians; and hence the Hebrew סַבֹּתִי, חַגֹּתֶם, זַמֹּתִי, for *sabbâti, sababtî.* Of course the Hebrew *ô* in these forms might be as readily derived from an original *au,* but we have no evidence of the existence of a form *raddauta,* whereas *raddâta* is a known dialectical variety of *raddaita.*

The infinitive construct in Hebrew exhibits two forms: un-contracted, גֹּז, לִסְבֹּב, far more rarely with *a,* לַחֲנַנְכֶם, Is. xxx. 18, לְחֶנְנָהּ, Ps. cii. 14; and contracted, לֹג, חֹג, סֹב, far more rarely with *a,* רַד, Is. xlv. 1, שַׁךְ, Jerem. v. 26. These are, of course, nothing but segolates of the same form as the Arabic رَدّ, رِدّ.

The Arabic imperative presents to us, as I explained above, the forms رُدَّ (رِدَّ, رَدَّ), مَسَّ. These are exactly equivalent to the Hebrew גֹּל, דֹּם, סֹב, perhaps also גַּל, Ps. cxix. 22; in Aramaic, דֹּק, Mand. הוֹף "wash," דָּאר "dwell"; Syr. فُوح, نِسَّ, فِنّ (from نَفِّ, فِنّ). An example of the uncontracted form is שְׁדֹדוּ, Jerem. xlix. 28, corresponding to an Arabic اُرْدُدُوا for رُدُّوا.

The Arabic imperfect has, as I explained to you, the forms

يَمَسُّ ,يَفِرُّ ,يَرُدُّ. The first of these is reproduced exactly in the Hebrew יָסֹב for *yasubb, yasubbu, yasbubu*, with suffix יְסֻבֵּנִי, plural, יָסֹבּוּ for *yasubbū, yasubbūna*. This *ŏ* has rarely been weakened into *ŭ*, but we find examples in יָרוּן Is. xlii. 4, יָרֻץ Prov. xxix. 6, יָשׁוּד Ps. xci. 6. These may not improbably have been influenced by the imperfect of verbs ע״ו, as in Mand., where נִימוֹך (from מָאך) is identical with נִיקוֹם from קָאם, and conversely נִידָאר "dwells," נִינָאר "commits adultery," cannot be distinguished from נִיהָאם "be hot," תִּירְאָג "desirest." In intransitives like the Arabic مَسَّ , يَمَسُّ, where the characteristic vowel of the imperfect is *a*, the Hebrew no longer maintains the ancient *yaktal*, but employs the more recent *yiktal*. Thus the imperfect of מַר is not יָמַר but יִמַר, for *yimrar, yamrar*. So יֵרַע ,יֵרַךְ, and a few more. In 1 Kings i. 1 the form is pointed יִחַם instead of יֵחַם. The reason of this deviation from the form with *a* in the first syllable probably was that יָמַר ,יָרַךְ, יָרַע, too closely resembled in their vocalisation that of the *perfect*. Indeed יָמַר, יָרַךְ, and יָרַד, rightly appear as verbal roots in our lexicons. This has not however prevented the substitution of the form יָזְמוּ for יִזְמּוּ in Gen. xi. 6, because the singular must actually have been יָזֹם, not יִזַם. In the fem. plur. תִּצְלֶינָה ,תְּסֻבֶּינָה, the diphthong *ai* has again been inserted to facilitate the pronunciation of the contracted forms, which stand respectively for *tasbubna* and *taslilna*, the intermediate steps being *tasubbna, tasillna*, then *tasubbaina, tasillaina*.

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 يدُقّ نَدُقّ, ܢܶܒ݁ܽܘܙ ,ܢܶܕ݁ܽܘܩ, نَبُزّ ,نَفِرّ, for *yidukk, nĕbuzz*, etc., from *yadukku, nabuzzu*; and in the infinitive, מְדַּק, فَكّ, for *midkak, mebzaz*. The

Hebrew also has this form in such words as יִדְּמוּ ,יִדֹּם; יִקַּד,

יִקְּדוּ; יִתֹּם ,יִתְּמוּ; תִּצְלַלְנָה, Jerem. xix. 3, for תִּצְלַלְנָה; and so
forth.

The participle active has in Hebrew the uncontracted form
חוֹנֵג, חֹנֵן, גָּזַז, whereas in Arabic the contraction is prevalent,

حَالٌ ,حَاجٌ, and the uncontracted خَالِلٌ occurs as a rare poetic

license. In vulg. Arab. however the uncontracted حَاجِبٌ 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 ܟܳܐܶܠ ,ܟܳܐܠ, like ܩܳܐܶܡ, but the fem. sing.
and the plurals are regular, ܟܳܠܳܐ, ܟܳܠܟܶ̈ܐ, ܟܳܠܝ̈ܢ, for 'âlilat, 'âlilîn,
'âlilân[1]. In Bibl. Aram. we find the uncontracted plur. עָלֲלִין,
Dan. iv. 5, v. 8, as Kĕthîbh, the Kĕrê being עָלִּין, as also in
Samarit. עֲלַל, עֲלָלָה[2].

Let us now glance rapidly at the derived conjugations.

Niphʿal. Here the chief peculiarity in Hebrew is the pure
vowel of the 1st syllable, נָקַל ,נָחַר ,נָסַב, for *nasabb, naḥarr,*
naḳall, from *nasbab, naḥrar, naḳlal.* Curiously enough, however,
we find here the intransitive vowels of the *Kal* also used in the
2nd syllable; e.g. נָמֵס ,נָקֵל ,נָרֹץ; and so in the fem., נָשַׁמָּה,
but נָסַבָּה; and in the plur., נָשַׁמּוּ ,נָסַבּוּ, but also נָבֹזּוּ ,נָגֹלּוּ.
This seems due to the resemblance of נָסַב to the ordinary *Kal*
נָגַשׁ, 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 *ŏ* forms are due to the influence of verbs
ע״ו. There is a fourth form, which altogether gives up the

---

[1] A possible instance of this Aramaic form in Hebrew is שְׁאֲסַיִךְ, Jerem. xxx. 16
(*Kĕthîbh*), if we derive it from שָׁסַם=שָׁסָה, the sing. being שֹׁאֵם for שֹׁסֵם.

[2] [עֲלַל occurs also in Palmyrene; in Palestinian Syriac both עֲלַל and חֲשַׁשׁ
"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. נָזֹלּוּ, נִבְקָה, נָסַבָּה. A fifth form
resembles the ordinary Niph'al in the vowel of the first syllable,
as נָחַר, נָחַת, נָחַל, and gives the plur. נָחֲרוּ; participp.
נֶחֱמִים, נְאָרִים. This seems to be a secondary formation from
נָחַר, נָחַת, נָחַל, after the fashion of Niph'al נִגַּשׁ from Kal נָגַשׁ
— Of the 2nd person examples are very rare; but we find
נְמַקֹּתֶם side by side with נְמַלְתֶּם and נַחֲלְתְּ.—Similarly in the
first person we have נְקַלֹּתִי, with the plur. נָשַׁדֻּנוּ, Micah ii. 4,
where the supplementary vowel *ŏ* has been weakened into *ŭ*.—
For the sake of comparison with the above I need only mention
the Arabic forms اِنْجَرَّ for *ingarara*; 2nd pers. اِنْجَرَرْتَ, uncon-
tracted.—In the imperfect, the ordinary form is יִסַּב, for *yissabb*,
by assimilation and contraction for *yansabib*; as יִגַּל, יִמַּר, יֵחַם.
The uncontracted form occurs in יִלְבַּב, Job xi. 12. The corre-
sponding plural naturally exhibits the double letter, יִמַּדּוּ, יִסַּבּוּ,
contracted for *yansabibû(na)*, *yamnadidû(na)*. Such words as
יָרֹעַ, Prov. xi. 15, xiii. 20, and תָּרוּץ, Ezek. xxix. 7, follow the
analogy of verbs ע״וּ. In Arabic, for the sake of comparison,
take يَنْجَرَّ for يَنْجَرِرَ, plur. يَنْجَرُّونَ.

Hiph'îl. In the perfect the Arabic form is أَجَرَّ for أَجْرَرَ, 2nd
pers. أَجْرَرْتَ. Contractions like أَحَسَّتَ and أَحْسَيْتَ, for
أَحْسَسْتَ, are very rare in the classical language. The Hebrew
follows the form *hiḳṭal* or *hiḳṭîl* instead of *haḳṭal*; e.g. הֲדַק,
הֵחֵל, הֵסַב, הֵקַל, which stand for *hĭdaḳḳ, hēsĭbb*, etc., by con-
traction for *hidḳaḳ, hisbēb*. The uncontracted form in its latest
stage appears in הֵילִיל, הִרְנִין, which never undergo contraction
(also in Syriac ܐܘܠܠܝ, Mand. האאוליל), and in the participle

מַשְׁמִים, Ezek. iii. 15. The fem. sing. and plur. actually exhibit

the doubling הֶחֱלָה, הֵחֵלוּ, הֵקַלוּ, הֵתַמּוּ, הֵרֵעוּ, הֵפֵרוּ. The

2nd pers. usually has the form הֲרֵעֹתָ (הַחִלּוֹתָ), הֲרֵעֹתָם. The

original 1st pers. *haktalti* occurs in all its purity in וְהַחְתַּתִּי,

Jerem. xlix. 37; and a modification of the 2nd pers. in הֲתִלּתָ

and וַהֲפֵרֹתָה, for *hithlalta* and *hiphrarta*.—In the imperfect the

Arabic form is يَكِرّ for يَكِرِر. The Hebrew preserves a purer

vowel in the 1st syllable, יָסֵב for *yāsēbb*, contracted from *yasbēb*

for *yasbibu*, יָגֵן, יָפֵר; plur. יָחֵלוּ for *yaḥlilū(na)*.

In the Aramaic dialects the doubling is thrown back upon
the 1st radical, as in the imperfect Pě‘al, whence arise the forms

נֵֿס, יַדֵּק, impf. אִכֹֿו, הַדְקֵן for הַרְקֵן, הַגְעֵל or הַגְעֵל, הַעֵל, הַדֵּק. To

these correspond such Hebrew imperfects as יָחֵל, יֵתֵם, יֵסֵב.
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 וַיִּסֹּבּוּ, the latter

by וַיַּכְּתוּ, Deut. i. 44.

The passive is in Arabic أُجِرّ for أُجْرِرَ, 2nd pers. أُجْرِرْتَ,

impf. يُكَرّ for يُكْرَرُ. The Hebrew form הוּסַב stands for *hus-*
bab, but has been influenced by the corresponding form of verbs

ע"ו, הוּקַם; e.g. הוּתַל, הוּחַל, fem. הוּחֲדָה. In the imperfect

we find a treble formation, as in the Hiph'îl, there being forms
(1) like יוּדַק, in pause for יוּדָק, resembling יָסַב; (2) like יֻכַּת,

plur. יֻכַּתּוּ, resembling יֵסַב, plur. יֵסַבּוּ; and (3) like הֻמְכּוּ, Job

xxiv. 24; יֻחָקּוּ, in pause for יֵחָקּוּ, Job xix. 23, resembling the

Aramaic הַדֵּק and יְדִּקּוּן·

II. A. *Verbs of which the 1st radical is w or y.*

Of these the former, פ"ו, 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, وَلَدَ, وَعَدَ, وَعَظَ, وَدَعَ. وَجَرَ, وَجَلَ, وَجِعَ. Similarly in Ethiopic, ወኅለ፡ ወረሰ፡ ወደየ፡ ወለደ፡ ወፀየ፡. The only example that I remember in Ethiopic of the change of *w* into *y* is in አየደዐ፡ "to make known," the causative of an unused የደዐ፡ Heb. יָדַע. The corresponding Arabic verb is وَدَعَ "to put, place, store up, deposit"; what we "know" is that which we have "placed" or "stored up" in the mind for use[1]. In Hebrew the initial *w* almost invariably passes into *y*, unless protected by a preceding consonant; hence יָדַע, יָעֵץ, יָעֵד, יָלַד, יָצָא, יָרַד, יָרֵשׁ, יָנַע, יָגֹר. The same remark applies to the Aramaic; e.g. in Biblical Aramaic, יְדַע, יְהַב, further יְלַד, יְקַד, יְקַר, יְרַת. But the later Aramaic dialects vocalise this י and turn it into a simple vowel *i*. Hence in Syriac ܝܟܠ, ܝܠܕ, ܝܠܦ, ܝܩܪ, ܝܨܦ, which are commonly written in the oldest MSS. with prefixed *aleph*, ܐܝܠܕ, ܐܝܠܦ, etc.; and in Mandaitic עתאר, עקיר, עתיב, עקאר or עקיר. The verb יְהַב, Mand. עהאב, also occurs in Syriac as ܝܗܒ, but the more common form is ܢܬܠ, which appears in the Talmūd Yĕrūshalmī as יַב, in which form the ה is elided and its vowel

---

[1] [The explanation of יר״ע, "know," from the Arabic وَدَع is due to Schultens but has not found general acceptance. The first radical of the verb "to know" is י not only in Hebrew, Aramaic and Ethiopic, but also in Sabaean, and perhaps in Assyrian (see Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gramm.* p. 308). The verb therefore is now generally taken to be true פ״י. Even in Arabic, as Nöldeke observes, there is a trace of a root يَدَع distinct from وَدَع (أَيْدَع). The forms with ו after a prefix (נוֹדַע, הוֹדִיעַ etc.) are to be explained in the same way as הוֹבִישׁ, ܐܘܣܦ, *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, אשַׁב for יָשַׁב, אֵצָא for יָצָא, אַרַד for יָרַד. There is nothing antecedently improbable in this change of sound, since in Syriac we find these sounds confounded in ܒܝܼܡ compared with ܐܝܼܣܪ, ܒܝܼܟ compared with ܟܠܝܼ, whilst in Arabic we have أَرْخ from ΦΛΛ: יָרַח. 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 وَحِيَ for أَحِيَ, وَقْتَ for أَقْتَ, وِسَادَة for إِسَادَة, وِشَاح for أَشَاح (but not وَقْتَ for أَقْتَ).

In the imperfect indicative of the first form the Ethiopic retains the w, ይወልድ: ይወርስ:, with the exception of ይሁብ: (= ይውሁብ:) from ወሀበ: (by transposition for ይውሀብ:). In the subjunctive the w is occasionally retained, as in ይውግር: "throw, pelt," ይውቅሥ: or ይውቀሥ: "argue, go to law," ይውስድ: "lead, carry," ይውግእ: "butt"; but ordinarily the ወ is rejected, and the subjunctive appears as ይስድ: or ይሰድ: ይለድ: ይርስ: ይግር: ይሁብ: ይግእ:: 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. وَرِثَ ،يَعِدُ ،وَعَدَ ،يَلِدُ ،وَلَدَ ،يَرِثُ. But the و is retained يَهَبُ ،وَهَبَ ،يَقَعُ ،وَقَعَ ،يَسَعُ ،وَسِعَ ،يَرِثُ when the characteristic vowel is u, and generally when it is a; e.g. يُوبُو ،وُبُو ؛(يُودَدُ for) يُودُ ،وُدَّ ؛يُوجَعُ ،وُجِعَ ؛يُوجَرُ ،وُجِرَ "have murrain"; يُوضُو ،وَضُو "be clean and fair." There are, however, some interesting dialectical varieties, which I must notice. Firstly, initial و passes into y, yielding the forms يِيَم ،يِيَجَعُ ،يِيَجَلُ "make mistake." Next, the sound of the a in this diphthong prevails over the other element, and the forms pass into يَاجَلُ,

يَاجَع, يَاهَم. Thirdly, the vowel of the first syllable may be weakened into *i*, and give us the forms بِيَجَل, بِيَجَع, بِيهَم.

Lastly, the vulgar forms of the present day are يَوصَل, يَوقَف, We also يَزِن, يَلِد, يَعِد, يَقِف, يَصِل, instead of يَعِد, يَولِد, يَوزِن, find at the present day in Egypt the forms *yikaf, yika', yisal*, and *yakif, yaki'*, but they are comparatively rare.

Let us glance now at Hebrew. Here one form of the imperfect is represented by יֵקַר, יֵדַע, יֵשֵׁב, יֵרֵד, תֵּלֵד, apparently identical with the normal Arabic يَرِث, تَلِد. The *a* was weakened as usual into *i*, and then lengthened before the tone into *ê*, תֵּלֵד, יֵרֵד, for *tilid, yirid.* A form like יֵקַר is against Arabic rule; and forms like יֵדְעֵם, יֵדְעֵנּוּ, show that the *sĕrê* 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 יֵֽדַע, יֵירֵד, תֵּלֵד, from יֵירַע, תֵּילֵד, יֵירֵד, according to the dialectical Arabic بِيَجَل, يَيَجَع. Another form of the Hebrew imperfect is represented by יֵרַשׁ, יֵקַר (as well as יֵקַר), יֵישֵׁן. Here we have, no doubt, the dialectical Arabic بِيَجَل, بِيَجَع. The original *a* of the 1st syllable became *i*, and this worked the change of *w* into *y*. In one word, יֵכַל, the imperfect יוּכַל resembles in form the vulgar Arabic يَوصَل. We may consider it as the last weakening of an original יֵוֹכַל, יוּכַל.[1]

Passing on to the Aramaic dialects, we find in Syriac the imperfect written with an *ālaph*, ܢܐܠܕ, ܢܐܪܬ. It seems to me that the original pronunciation was *nâladh, nârath*, as in the dialec-

---

[1] [But comp. p. 180.]

tical Arabic يَاجَع, يَاجَل; and that *ā* was weakened into *ē* (for which we have abundant analogies), whence the Eastern forms نِوْبَ, نِوْلِدْ. Others think, however, that this form arose by assimilation of the verbs פ"ע and פ"א, such as נֶוְחֲתָא, נֶוְמַר. The Western Syrians weakened the *ē* still further into *i*, نِبْك, نِوْلِدْ, as in the verbs פ"א נَוْמَر. In Mandaitic the first syllable has י, probably *i*, as ניתאב עהאב, "I give," ניקאר ניקוד or ניקוד; עדול תידול and תידול, from ילד עדל = 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 ወቀር: or ወቅር: "hew, cut out," ወገር: "pelt, stone"; but the usual ones are ቀር: or ቅር:, ገር: or ገር:, ልደ:, ህብ:, ፀአ:: In Arabic, all verbs that lose the و in the imperfect, also drop it in the imperative; hence هَبْ, رِثْ, رِدْ, قَعْ, عِدْ. In those that retain the و, it is necessarily changed, on account of the prosthetic vowel, into a letter of prolongation; اِيجَل for اُوجَل from وَجِل; اُوضُو for وَضُو. The vulgar form of the present day in Egypt is *ûkaf, ûṣal, ûkaʿ, ûzin, ûlid*; more rarely *tkaf, tkaʿ, tṣal,* or *kif*.

In Hebrew the forms waver somewhat: דַּע, צֵא, רֵד, שֵׁב; but perhaps יְרֵד (Judg. v. 13). On the other hand, יְרֵה, יְרָא, יְרְשָׁה (Deut. xxxiii. 23) but also רֵשׁ and רָשׁ, and even יְצַק as well as צַק "pour." In Syriac, on the contrary, the initial letter is retained in the imperative, with the exception of הַב from נֶסַב, זֶל from אֶזַל, and תֶל from יֶהַב. In Mandaitic the form is not common in the extant literature. Noeldeke gives no

examples but עָתִיב and תִיב " sit"; הָאֵב "give," with the curious variations אָהוֹב עֲהוֹב, and before enclitics with ל, in the singular, הֲבָא and אַרְבָא, plur. הֲבוּ and אַרְבוּ.

In Arabic, the verbs which drop the initial و 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. وَلِدَة as well as وَلِد and وِلَادَة or الوِلَادَة; وِرْثَة, as well as وَرَث or إِرْث أَرِثَ; عِدَة, as well as وَعَد; عِظَة, as well as وَعَظ. Precisely corresponding infinitives in Hebrew, as לֵדָה, דֵּעָה; generally however, צֵאת, שֶׁבֶת, רֶדֶת, לָדֶת, רֶשֶׁת (for צָאֶת), for *lidat*, etc. In דַּעַת the *pathachs* are due to the guttural, as in وَدَعَة, ضَعَة. The masculine form רֵעַ in Job is a rarity, and equally so the contracted feminine לַת in I Sam. iv. 19. Examples of the fuller form are יְרֹד, יְסֹר, יְרֹא (Ps. xxx. 4), יְצָק. The Ethiopic supplies us with many substantives of this class, but not infinitives, as ልደት፡ ርደት፡ ዕሰት፡ ፀአት፡። In Aramaic there are likewise a few, e.g. עֲטָא, Dan. ii. 14; ܐܠܒܘ, ܐܟܣܘ̈ܬ ܐܠܒܪ; ܙܡܠܐ is probably to be regarded as borrowed from the Hebrew עֶרָה.

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 ו is sufficient guarantee that the verb originally began with this letter; an original י must have yielded הֵילִיד. The Arabic and Ethiopic have preserved for us the purer form أَوْلَد, አዎለደ፡, in Syriac ܐܘܠܕ, ܐܘܡܒ, ܐܘܡܒ. In the passive *Hoph'al*, the weak consonant is vocalised, הוּשַׁב for הֻשַּׁב, as in Arabic أُولِد for أُولِد.

In the same way, in the reflexive and passive *Niph'al*, the Hebrew נוֹלַד stands for נַוְלַד, according to the form נִקְטַל, whereas יִוָּלֵד is by assimilation from יִנְוָלֵד, corresponding to an Arabic يَنْوَلِدُ from اِنْوَلَدَ. 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'ēl*. Of this the oldest shape is to be discerned in the Ethiopic ተወልደ፡ "be born," ተወህበ፡ "be given." In Syria it always appears with vocalised *y*, ܐܬܝܠܕ for 'eth-y-lēdh, and that from 'eth-w-lēdh, ܐܬܘܠܕ. In Mandaitic however the vowelless *yodh* is dropped, giving עתהיב, מיתליד; but "she was given" is עתיאהבאת, as in Syr. ܐܬܝܗܒܬ. The corresponding conjugation in Arabic is, as you may remember, the 8th, *ifta'ala*, اِتَّقَتَل for تَفَتَّل. This should give us اوتفق, اوتكل; but these impossible forms necessarily become ايتكل, ايتفق, ايتعد, ايتصل, the existence of which is admitted, although the assimilation of *wt* into *tt* is greatly preferred: اتكل, اتفق, اتعد, اتصل. The imperf. of the former is يتّكل, يتّفق, يتّعد; of the latter يأتكل, يأتفق, يأتعد. So usual has this assimilation become that many secondary roots beginning with *t* have been formed from this conjugation; e.g. تَلَدَ "to be born in one's house, be hereditary"; تَسِعَ "be wide," تَقَى "fear God," تَكَنَ "rely on," اتَّلَمَ "insert," اتَّهَمَ "suspect." In Syria ܬܟܠ is an example of this sort[1].

---

[1] [Prof. Wright's MS. cites also ܬܘܒ, late Heb. תָּב, which some scholars

On the reflexive of the Hebrew *Piʿʿēl*, viz. *Hithpaʿʿal*, in Syr. ܐܬܦܥܠܝ, I will merely remark that the prefixed syllable some-times preserves the initial *w* from passing into *y*. So in הִתְוַדָּה, הִתְוַכַּח, הִתְוַדַּע; whence in post-biblical Hebrew the substan-tives וִדּוּי and וִכּוּחַ. The Syriac ܐܬܘܕܝ is hardly a parallel, be-cause in that language we have the Paʿʿēl ܘܕܝ and the noun ܘܕܝܐ.

The tendency to assimilate the *w* to the following letter, which we saw in the Arabic 8th conj. اتّلد, appears in the other dialects in some other forms. In Hebrew, for instance, יצע = وضع assimilates in Hiphʿil and Hophʿal, הִצִּיעַ, הֻצַּע. The same is the case with הִצִּיג and הֻצַּג; and with the rad. יצת, impf. יִצַּת, Niph. נִצַּת, Hiph. הִצִּית. In other instances the assimila-tion is merely sporadic, as in יִסֹּר, יִצֹּק, and even הֻקְּדַת (inf. Hophʿal). In Aramaic instances of a similar kind are יִכַּל from יְכַל = יְכֵל, יִתֵּב, Dan. vii. 26 [Compl., Norzi, Baer], from יְתֵב; Syr. ܬܒ, ܢܬܒ, from ܝܬܒ, ܝܕܥ, whence in Bibl. Aram. יִנְדַּע, 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; יאֵשׁ, يَئِسَ, not used in Kal; יבֵשׁ, يَبِسَ; יטב, not used in the perf. Kal; يَئِسَ; יקַץ, يَقِظَ, not used in perf. Kal; ישַׁר; and the Hiphʿils הֵילִיל and connect with أتقن; يَتقن: so still Mühlau and Volck, 11th ed., 1890. But يقن like the Syriac ܝܩܢ seems rather to be a denominative from ܐܝܩܘܢܐ, *eikóva* (so Nöldeke; cf. Fränkel, *Lehnww.* p. 273), and therefore quite distinct from חקק, [يقن, ܝܩܢ].

יָצַר הֵימִן‎ is doubtful, and may be פ"ו‎; at least the Niph'al is נוֹצַר‎, Is. xliii. 10.   The imperfects are יִיקַץ‎, יִינַק‎, יִיטַב‎, יִיבַשׁ‎, יִישַׁר‎, according to the Arabic form بِيَاسٌ for يَيْأَسُ; but instances of assimilation occur, as יִקַּץ‎ (1 Kings iii. 15), יִשַּׁר‎ (1 Sam. vi. 12), יִצַּר‎.   The Hiph'il is הֵיטִיב‎, הֵיטִיב‎, הֵינִיק‎, הֵילִיל‎, הֵימִן‎, but the original diphthong is retained in הֵישִׁיר‎, Prov. iv. 25, Ps. v. 9 (Kĕrē).   In two cases the form הוֹשִׁיר‎ seems to be used, falsely conforming to verbs פ"ו‎, viz. Ps. v. 9 (Kĕthîbh) and Is. xlv. 2 (Kĕthîbh).   The same has happened with הוֹבִישׁ‎, Syr. ܐܘܒܶܫ‎; and with the Niph'al נוֹאָשׁ‎.   The Niph'al of יָצַר‎ is likewise, as we have seen, נוֹצַר‎ (Is. liii. 10), and its Hoph'al יוּצַר‎ (Is. liv. 17).   The latter form would be quite *en règle* from a verb פ"ו‎, because in Arabic too أَيْبَسَ would become in the passive أُوبِسَ, for أَيْبِسَ, the ي conforming to the preceding vowel.   In Syriac ܐܝܠܶܠ‎ and ܐܝܬܶܒ‎ are the only words that exhibit the radical *y*, and the latter of these has a second form ܐܘܬܶܒ‎, which seems to have carried the day in Mandaitic, if we may judge by the word מוּנקָא‎ "foster, guardian," for מָאונקָא‎. The Mand. equivalent of ܐܝܠܶܠ‎ is also הַאוֹלִיל‎.   In the 8th conj. of the Arabic the same assimilation takes place as in verbs פ"ו‎, e.g. اِتَّقَنَ, اِتَّسَرَ, اِتَّبَسَ.

II. B. *Verbs of which the middle radical is* w *or* y.

In treating of these verbs, ע"ו‎ and ע"י‎ 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 فَعِلَ, as سَوِلَ "to be flaccid" or "pendu-

lous," حَوَرَ " to be very white and black" (of the eye), عَوِرَ " to be one-eyed," حَوِلَ " to squint," صَيِدَ " to have the disease called صَيَدٌ (of a camel), غَيِدَ " to be tender and flexible"; in Hebrew, חָוַר " be white," גָּוַע " expire," צָוַח " cry out," רָוַח " be airy and wide," אָיַב " be hostile to," עָיֵף " be weary"; in Syriac, ܚܘܰܪ " be white," ܕܘܰܨ " leap," ܕܘܰܨ " rejoice"; and in all three languages verbs that are also ל"וֹ or ל"י, as רָוָה ,רָוִי ,رَوِي ;هَوِي ,فَسَ ,הָיָה, ܗܘܳܐ. What principle guided the Semitic languages in the contraction or non-contraction of verbs ע"וֹ and ע"י, I am unable to state. I do not know why خَوِفَ became خَافَ, and مَاتَ ,مَوِتَ, whilst حَوِلَ and عَوِرَ remained uncontracted; neither can I tell you why the Hebrew says צָוַח, while the Arab changed his صَيِمَ into صَاحَ[1].

The uncontracted verbs ע"וֹ and ע"י 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, Noeldeke 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"וֹ, for says he (p. 109) "these roots never had a consonant ו 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"י in Hebrew has been

---

[1] [With the exception of verbs which have י as their third radical (e.g. לוה, لوي), all those verbs in which middle ו or י 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
שִׂים and בִּין are not true ע״וּ verbs but shortened Hiph'ils from
roots ע״ע]. To this article I refer you for all necessary informa-
tion on the subject.

If you consult the Arab grammarians, they will tell you that
such words as قَامَ, خَانَ and 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 *ă* 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 *ā*. Hence قَوَلَ becomes قَالَ,
طَوَلَ becomes طَالَ, خَوَنَ becomes خَانَ. If, however, the first
radical has *u* and the second *i*, the latter vowel, as being the
clearer, generally predominates, so that قَوِلَ becomes قِيلَ;
although some of the Arabs contracted the form more regularly
into قُولَ, whilst others gave the long vowel the intermediate
sound of *ü*, *ḳüla*.

(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 يَقْوُلُ becomes
يَقُولُ, يَخْوَفُ يَخَافُ, يَقْوُلُ يَقَالُ, أَقْوَمَ أَقَامَ, يَقْوِمُ يَقِيمُ.
Should the final radical under any circumstances lose its vowel,
then the preceding long vowel must be shortened. The jussive
يَقُولُ becomes يَقْلُ, يَخَافُ يَخَفُ, يَقَالُ يَقَلُ, يَقِيمُ يَقِمُ, أَقَامَتْ
أَقَمَتْ, يَقِيمَنَ يَقِمَنَ. A further consequence of these changes
is that the imperative of the 1st conjugation drops the now

useless prosthetic *alif*; أَقْوَلْ becomes قَلْ, أَقَلْ, أَقْوَلْ; or perhaps
we may rather say that it never required the prosthetic *alif*, for
the original قَوَلْ would naturally become قَوْلْ and then قَلْ.

(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 قَوَمْتُ
becomes, not قَمْتَ, but قُمْتَ, through the influence of the و,
and سَيَرْتُ becomes سِرْتُ, through the influence of the ي; but
خَوِفْتُ becomes خِفْتَ, not خَفْتَ or خُفْتَ, through the
influence of the vowel *i*, which is characteristic of the intransi-
tive form. Where these influences are combined, their operation
is of course the more certain; طُوِلَتْ can become nothing but
طُلْتَ, and هَيِبْتَ nothing but هِبْتَ.

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 قَامَ stands, as we have seen, for قَوَمَ, خَافَ for
خَوِفَ, طَالَ for طُوَلَ. The corresponding Ethiopic forms ፍፈ:
"run," ፆኢ: "conquer," ሖረ: "go," በኢ: "come," ሀይመ: "set," ጓጠ:
"turn," are not identical with the Arabic, for the Arabic long
â does not ordinarily become *ô* or *ê* in Ethiopic. The Ethiopic
forms have been obtained by simple rejection of the vowel of
the second radical, and subsequent change of the resulting diph-
thongs *au*, *ai*, into *ô*, *ê*. Thus *rawaṣa*, *sayama*, became *rauṣa*,
sayma, and then *rôṣa*, *sêma*. These vowels are retained through-
out the whole inflexion of the perfect, ፍፈት: ፍፈን: ሀይመት:
ሀይመን: etc. The Hebrew form of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. is
still more peculiar, and indeed very hard to explain. As Arabic
long *â* regularly becomes *ô* in Hebrew, we should have expected

קוּם to yield *ḳôm* as the equivalent of قَامَ *ḳâma*, and not *ḳâm*. How then is this form *ḳâm*, קָם, from *ḳâm*, to be explained? Assimilation to the class ע"ע can scarcely have been in operation, for קָם is always carefully distinguished from סַב in its punctuation, and besides the fem. and plur. are קָמָה, קָמוּ, not קַמָּה, קַמּוּ. 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 *ḳawam* into *ḳam*, and then derived the other persons from this shortened form as a base[1]. 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 مَوِتَ into مَاتَ, and طَوِلَ into طَالَ; but the Hebrew attached more weight to the vowels as characteristic of the intransitive form, and spoke not *mâth*, but מֵת *mêth* (for *mit*, from *mawit*); not *bâsh* or *ôr*, but בּושׁ *bôsh* and אוֹר *ôr* (for *bush* and *'ur*, from *bawush*, *'awur*). These forms resemble those of the Arabic 2nd pers. خِفْتَ ,مِتَّ ,طَلْتَ, for خَوِفْتَ ,مَوِتَّ, طَوِلْتَ. In Aramaic the ordinary form is precisely what we should expect, with long *â* corresponding to the Arabic *â*; e.g. קָם שָׂם, ܩܳܡ ,ܣܳܡ; Mand. קאם פֿאשׁ "remain"; but ܡܺܝܬ, Mand. מית, corresponding to Heb. מֵת. The 3rd pers. sing. fem. is in Arabic قَامَتْ ,مَاتَتْ ,خَافَتْ ,طَالَتْ, سَارَتْ. The Heb. בּושָׁה, מֵתָה, בָּאָה, קָמָה, with the tone ordinarily on the 1st syllable, are derived directly from the forms of the masc. בּושׁ, מֵת, קָם; but we also find וְשָׁבַת, with older termination, Ezek. xlvi. 17. The Aramaic forms are קָמַת, Dan. iv. 30; Syr.

[1] It may be, however, that the sound of the vowel was even still somewhat longer than that of *â*, something between it and *â*, as the spelling קָאם in Hos. x. 14 may seem to indicate.

ܩܡ̈ܬ, ܩܡ̈ܬܐ, ܩܡ̈ܬܐ; Mand. קאמאת, נאדאת. Similarly in the 3rd pers. plur., سَارُوا, قَامُوا, مَاتُوا, خَانُوا, طَالُوا, corresponding to Aramaic, שָׂמוּ, Dan. iii. 12, קָמוּ, Ezra v. 2; Syr. ܩܡܘ, ܩܡ̈ܘܗܝ, ܩܡ̈ܘܢ; Mand. קאמבה, פאשובה (without וֹ), in the fuller form פאשיון, קאמין. The Heb. בֹּשׁ, מֵתוּ, פָרוּ, קָמוּ, אֹרוּ, 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 طُلْتَ, مُتَّ, خِفْتَ, قُمْتَ, or from a verb medial ي, سِرْتَ, هِبْتَ. 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*: قُمْتَ = قَوَمْتَ, خِفْتَ = خَوِفْتَ, مُتَّ = مَوُتَّ, طُلْتَ = طَوُلْتَ, سِرْتَ = سَيَرْتَ, هِبْتَ = هَيِبْتَ.

In Hebrew the form is נֻֽרְתִּי, סַרְתֶּם, שַֽׁמְתֶּם, בַּֽנְתָּה, קַֽמְתְּ, with short *ă*, and *kāmes* (*ā*) appears only in pause, קָֽמְתִּי, Micha vii. 8, סָֽרְתִּי, Ps. cxix. 102, שָֽׁמְתִּי, Jerem. xxxiii. 25. Before Kimhi's time, however, even the ordinary forms used to be pointed with *kāmes*, שָֽׁמְתָּ, קָֽמְתָּ, at least when the accent was *mil'êl*. From מֵת we have, unexpectedly, מַתָּה, מַֽתְנוּ (we should have expected מֵתָה, מֵֽתְנוּ), and in pause וָמַֽתִּי, Gen. xix. 19, but also וַֽיָּמָֽתְנוּ. From verbs with *ô* we get בֹּשְׁנוּ, בֹּשְׁתִּי, בֹּשְׁתָּ (for *busht*, *bushti*, *bushnû*). On the other hand, the long vowel is steadily preserved in the Aramaic, not merely in the 1st pers., שָׂמֵת Ezra vi. 12, Syr. ܩܡ̈ܬ, ܩܡ̈ܬ, Mand. קאמית, נאמית; but also

in the second, שַׁמַּֽעַת Dan. iii. 10, Syr. ܐܰܠܶܦܬ, ܫܰܡܥܬ, Mand. הַאכֵּת = ܟܶܒܐ, לאפֵת = ܟܰܒܐ "didst teach."

Passing on to the imperative, we find the Arabic forms to be such as قُمْ, خَفْ, سِرْ. But the plurals are قُومُوا, خَافُوا, سِيرُوا; fem. قُومِي, خَافِي, سِيرِي. In vulgar Arabic the shortening of the sing. forms is neglected, قُلْ *ḳûl*, بِيعْ *bîʿ*; unless an accus. suffix or an enclitic prep. follows, as *shîl-nî* "carry me," *ḳul-lî, ḳul-lûhum*. In Geʿez the corresponding forms are ኁም፡, ሑር፡ or ሕር፡, ግስ፡, ሢም፡, exactly like the Heb. בֹּא; קוּם, קֻמוּ, בֹּאוּ; גִּיל; שִׂים, בֹּשִׁי, בֹּשׁוּ. In Hebrew קוּם stands for קוֹם; but בֹּא was originally *bâ'*, for בָּוָא, בַּוְא; בֹּשׁוּ *bâshû*, for *bĕwashû*; אוֹרִי *'ârî*, for *'âwarî*. In Geʿez the form ሕር፡ is difficult to explain; perhaps we may regard it as an example of the change of *â* into *ô*, and as therefore standing for *ḥôr*; if so, then the other form ሑር፡ is only a weakening of the original ሕር፡, brought about by the influence of the common form ኁም፡. In Aramaic we find nothing unusual; Bibl. קוּמִי Dan. vii. 5, שִׂימוּ Ezra iv. 21; Syr. ܫܺܡܬ, ܩܽܘܡܝ; Mand. תּוּב קוּם, but also סוּם. The verb مَاتَ, مَت מֵת, ܡܶܬܬ, has مِتَّ, מֵת, ܡܺܝܬ, Mand. מוּת; and in Mand. there is one example with *a*, viz. דָּאר "dwell," by assimilation to the class עy"ע.

For the imperfect indicative the Arabic has the three forms يَقُومُ, يَخَافُ, يَسِيرُ, standing respectively for يَقُومُ, يَخَافُ, يَسِيرُ. The peculiar Geʿez indicative may be exemplified by such words as ይቤውን፡, ይሐውር፡, ይቤውእ፡, ይሤይም፡. It is only the forms of the subjunctive that we can compare with the Arabic indicative. Here then we have ይቄድ፡, ይቆም፡, ይብእ፡, ይሢም፡. The verb ሕር፡ "to go," has the same double formation as in the imperative, viz. ይሕር፡ as well as ይሑር፡, which we must explain

in the same way.—In Hebrew the preformatives have usually retained the original vowel *a*, as יָשִׂים, יָבוֹא, יָקוּם, corresponding exactly to the three Arabic forms, since יָבוֹא was originally *yabá'u*; other examples may be the very doubtful יִרְדֹן, Gen. vi. 3, and יָקֹם, Job viii. 14. The only instance of the weakening of the preformative to *i* is יֵבֹשׁ, for *yabwashu, yabásh, yibásh, yebósh*. The jussives of يَقُومُ, يَخَافُ, يَسِيرُ are in Arabic يَقُمْ, يَخَفْ, يَسِرْ, and to these correspond in Hebrew יָשֵׁם, תָּרֹם, יָקֹם, still farther shortened with vâv conversive into וַתָּרֶם, וַיָּקָם, וַיָּנֶל, וַיָּשֶׂם. If however the last radical be ר or a guttural, then *ă* is substituted for *ŏ* or *ĕ*, as וַיִּזְרַח, וַיָּסַר, וַיָּנַח, וַיָּנַע; except וַיָּנֶר, וַתָּנֶר. In the 3rd pers. plur. fem. we should expect, after the analogy of the Arabic يَسِرْنَ, يَخَفْنَ, يَقُمْنَ, a Hebrew form תִּקֹמְנָה, and this actually occurs in תִּשֹׁבְן, Exod. xvi. 55, תָּבֹאן (for *tabána, tabwa'na*), תְּגֵלֶנָה; but more frequently this form is assimilated to that of verbs עֹ״י, and a diphthongal ־ֶיְ inserted, with consequent restoration of the long vowel, תִּשֹׁבֶינָה, תְּמוּטֶינָה. The Aramaic forms of the imperfect are just what we should naturally expect, viz. יָקוּם, ܢܩܘܡ ,ܢܚܘܪ. There is however another form in use, viz. Syr. ܢܩܘܡ, Mand. and Talmud. נִיקוּם. In Syriac I can scarcely remember any but singular forms, ܢܩܘܡ, ܬܩܘܡ, though نَقْمُكْ is quoted[1]; but in Mand. the plural is נידינון, נימיתא, f. נימיתון, etc., while in the verb קום the vowel of the 2nd syllable is rejected, ניקמון, f. ניקמא. These Mandaitic forms coincide with those from verbs עֹ״y in the same dialect, as תירינון from רגג, נינזון "sprinkle," from נזז, and the Syriac variation must be traced to a similar assimilation of עֹ״י

---

[1] نَقْمُكْ is demanded by the metre in Ephr. Syr., iii. 316 A.—N.]

to ע"ע. The verb مَاتَ ,מֵת ,ܡܟܼܬܼ has in all the dialects يَمُوتُ,

יָמוּת, ܢܦܼܠ, like יִבֹּל from נָבֹל, or نَصِمَت from مَت. In

Mandaitic we find a future in *a*, נידאר, עדאר, "dwell," by

assimilation to the class ע"ע.

The infinitive construct in Hebrew has the simple form קוֹם,

for קוֹם, as in the regular verb קְטֹל for קְטֹל. The form בּוֹא,

אוֹר ,בּוֹשׁ, probably springs from a long *â*, *bâ'*, *'âr*, *bâsh*, for

bawa', *'awar*, *bawash*.—In the infinitive absolute on the contrary,

מוֹר ,שׁוֹב ,מוֹת, are contractions of *sawâr*, *shawâb*, *mawâth*.—The

Aramaic infinitive is מְקָם, Syr. ܡܩܡ, for ܡܩܡ; the same

variation occurs as in the imperfect, especially in Mandaitic and

Talmudic, i.e. ܡܩܡ, מידאן, מיקאם, Talm. מיקם, מימת, מידן;

but the emphatic form of מיקאם in Mandaitic is מיקמא, as if

from a verb ע"ע.

The original form of the participle active must have been

قَاوِم, سَايِر; but in the contracted verbs the و at the beginning of

the syllable was changed into *hamza*, قَائِم, and the verbs mediae

ي followed this analogy, سَائِر. These forms are liable to a

rare contraction into سَارُ ,قَامُ as شَاكُّ for شَائِكُ "armed," هَارُّ

for هَائِرُ "feeble," طَاسُّ for طَائِسُ "going about," سَاسُ for سَائِسُ

"decayed" (a tooth), مَاه الفؤاد for مَائِه "cowardly." To this corre-

sponds the rare Hebrew form לוֹט, Is. xxv. 7, בּוֹסִים, Zach. x. 5,

קוֹמִים, 2 Kings xvi. 7, for *lât*, *bâs*, *kâm*. The more usual form is

however analogous to that of the perf., viz. בָּא, fem. בָּאָה, זָר,

צָם ,רָן, sometimes written with א, as לָאם, Judg. iv. 21, שָׁאטִים

Ezek. xxviii. 24, 26, שָׁאטוֹת, Ezek. xvi. 57, רָאשׁ, 2 Sam. xii. 1, 4,

Prov. x. 4 (compare the perf. קָאם, Hos. x. 14). This form

seems to me to be best explained as arising from a nominal *ḳaṭal*, i.e. *ṣawdm, rawḍṣ, bawḍ'*, contracted after the analogy of the perfect into *ṣam, raṣ, baʿ*. In the same way in intrans. verbs, with *ē* and *ō* in the second syllable, e.g. מֵת for מָוֶת (*mawǐt, mit*), לִץ for לָוִץ (*lawǐṣ, liṣ*), בּוֹשׁ for בָּוִשׁ (*bawǐsh, bush*), according to the Heb. כָּבֵד, יָנֹר, or the Arabic adjectives حَذِرٌ, يَقِظٌ. In Aramaic similar phenomena recur. In Bibl. Aram. the form is קָאֵם Dan. ii. 31, plur. in *Keṯîbh* זָאֲעִין, דָּאֲרִין, דָּאֲנִין, emph. קָאֲמַיָּא, constr. דָּאֲרֵי. The *Ḳerē* usually substitutes י for א in these plur. forms, דָּיְרִי, זָיְעִין, דָּיְנִין. In Syriac only the singular is written with ܐ, ܩܳܐܶܡ, pronounced however, we are told, *ḳāyěm*. The fem. and plurals are invariably with *yūd*, ܩܳܝܡܳܐ, ܩܳܝܡܰܝ, ܩܳܝܡܺܝܢ. In Mandaitic the י is written in the sing. masc. too, קאים, מאית, fem. קאימא.—The passive participle of the Hebrew is exemplified by מוּל, סוּג, fem. לוּטָה, for *mawǔl, sawǔg, lǔwǐṭāh*. In Aramaic the corresponding form is שִׂים, ܣܺܝܡ, Mand. ציר, "depicted," כיל "measured," for *sǐym, lǐwǐṭ*, etc.

I shall now proceed to the derived conjugations of these verbs, and go through them as rapidly as possible.

1. *Piʿēl.* The uncontracted verbs form their Piʿēl quite regularly; e.g. عَوَّرَ, עַוֵּר, ܥܰܘܰܪ, "to blind of one eye," עִוֵּת "bend," قَفَّزَ "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 عَيَّنَ, ذَيَّلَ, صَوَّرَ, قَوَّمَ; in Geʿez ሐወጸ፡ "inspect," "visit," ጸወዐ፡ "cry out"; in Heb. עֹדֵד "surround," Ps. cxix. 61; Aram. זַוֵּג, זַוֵּד, כַּוֵּן, Syr. ܪܰܘܶܙ, ܐܰܘܶܙ, ܩܰܘܶܡ, ܚܰܘܶܒ, ܐܰܘܶܙ; Mand. זאויד. But more frequently the middle consonant appears as a *y*, the origin of which I explain thus.

In a form like *ḳauwĕm*, the initial of the second syllable was changed in Hebrew and Aramaic into *y*, *ḳauyēm* (comp. דִּין,

הָיָה, הֲוָא, هَوِيَ; نَوَاة), whence, by assimilation of the preceding letter, *ḳaiyĕm*, and finally *ḳiyyĕm*. So in Aram. קָם, ܩ݂ܡ,

חַיֵּב, ܢ݂ܬ, أَنِس, etc. In Hebrew forms like קֵים, חַיֵּב, belong to the later stage of the language. In place of Pi"ēl the Hebrew frequently exhibits another formation, viz. *Pĭlēl*, of which the older form was *Pa'lal*, as בּוֹסֵם, עוֹרֵר, רוֹמֵם, קוֹמֵם, etc., for *ḳaumam*, *raumam*, etc.

2. *Hiph'îl* and *Hoph'al*. The contracted Arabic form is أَبِينَ, أَقْوَمَ, for أَبَانَ, أَقَامَ. To this correspond in Ge'ez ኣቆም:, ኣብኣ:, ኣኅየ:, which seem to be taken directly from the simple forms ቆም:, ብኣ:, ኅየ:. Some verbs however exhibit a short *a* in the 2nd syllable, which before a final guttural may become *ĕ*; e.g. ኣቀመ: *'aḳáma*; ኣነመ: *'andma*, as well as ኣየመ:; ኣጠቀ: *'aṭáḳa*, "hem in," as well as ኣጥወቀ:; ኣነኀ: *'andḫa* or ኣነኀ: *'anĕḫa*, "lengthen"; ኣብኣ: *'abĕ'a* "bring or put in"; ኣብኀ: *'abĕḫa*, "permit." Such words seem to be really derived from the old form *'aḳwáma*, *'anwáma*, *'abwĕ'a*, etc.; perhaps with doubling of the first letter by way of compensation, as in הֵפִית, הֵנִיחַ.—The Hebrew form הֵקִים stands far below the Arabic and Ge'ez. The original *haḳwáma* must have already passed through the stages of *haḳwâm*, *hiḳwâm*, *hiḳwîm*, *hiḳîm*, before it could become *hēḳîm*. The 2nd pers. of the Hebrew is likewise far removed from the purity of the Arabic أَقَمْتَ, for أَقَمْتَ, أَقْوَمْتَ. The purer form does indeed occur in such cases as הֲמִתֶּם, הֵבֵאתָ, הֵמַתָּה, הֵנַפֵתָּ, plur. הֲבֵאתֶם, הֲמִתֶּם; but commonly an assimilation to verbs ע"ע is effected by the insertion of *ô*, for original *â*, in which case the vowel of the preformative is usually *ă*, sometimes *ĕ*, and the vowel of the radical syllable sometimes *ĕ* instead of *î*; as וַהֲסִירֹת, הֲבִיאֹתָ, הֲרִימֹתָ, הָעִירֹתָ; and in the plur. הֲפִצֹתֶם, וַהֲקֵמֹתָ, הָעֵדֹתָה, הֲשִׁיבוֹתָ, הֲבִישֹׁת,

הֲשֵׁבֹתָם ,הֲבִיאֹתָם ,הֲבִינֹתָם. The Aramaic perfect is in the Old Testament הֲתִיב ,וַהֲקִים ,הֲקִים; 2nd sing. הֲקֵימְתָ, 1st sing. הֲקֵימֵת, 3rd plur. הֲקִימוּ; in Syr. ܐܩܺܝܡܶܬ, ܐܩܺܝܡ; in Mand. אקים ,ארים. In this last dialect the 1st pers. seems often to be identical in form with that of verbs ע"ע, e.g. האשטית ,אקמית "I despised," but ארימית ,אדיקית.—The imperfect is in Arabic يَقِيمُ for يَقْوُمُ, with the jussive يَقِمْ and imperative أَقِمْ. In Ge'ez the imperfect indicative is ያቀውም፡ ያቀይይ፡, the subjunctive ያቀም፡ ያቀይ፡, imperative አቀም፡ አቀይ፡. But verbs of the form አቀመ፡ አብአ፡ have in the subjunctive ያቅም፡ yáḳĭm, ያብእ፡, imperative አቅም፡ አብእ፡. In Hebrew יָקִים stands for ya-haḵwim, yaḵwim; the jussive is יָקֵם, the vowel of which is still further shortened with ו *conversive* into וַיָּקֶם. In Aramaic the corresponding form is יְקִים ,ܢܩܺܝܡ; but in Syriac the form ܢܩܺܝܡ, participle ܡܩܺܝܡ, is admissible, and this is the only one found in Mandaitic, e.g. מאקים, מארים, נארים. These are all assimilated to verbs ע"ע, as appears from the plur. מאקמילון as compared with מאהיקילון, "afflicting them."—The passive of this conjugation in Arabic is أُقِيمَ for أُقْوَمُ. In Hebrew the original *huḵwáma* would naturally become *luḵáma, luḵắm*, but the form in actual use has been entirely assimilated to that of verbs פ"י, הוּקַם ,הוּשַׁב. In Syriac we have only the passive participle ܡܩܳܡ, for *muḵwam, muḵắm*; but in Biblical Aramaic there is the remarkable survival הֲקִימַת Dan. vii. 4, wrongly pointed הֲקֵמַת in verse 5.

3. Of the reflexive conjugations with prefixed *ta*, I will only notice the *Ethpě̆'ĕl*, corresponding to the 8th conjugation of the Arabic. In Arabic the form is, of course, اِجْتَازَ, contracted for

اِجْتَوَزَ; but the uncontracted form is used in many verbs either

by itself or along with the other; e.g. اِجْتَوَرُوا or اِجْتَارُوا, اِعْتَوَرَا.

In Geʿez the corresponding forms are ተዋሥአ: "be agitated,"

ተውሥዐ:. The Aramaic of the Bible exhibits יִתְשַׁם, יִתְּשְׁמוּן,

מִתְּשַׁם, but also יִתָּוִין. The one form, הִתְּשַׁם, comes directly

from the original *tasayama, tasâma*. The doubling of the *t*

may be an attempt to compensate for the radical which has dis-

appeared by contraction, and so to give the word something of

the outward form of the normal הִתְקַמֵּל; or it may be merely imi-

tated from the *Ethtafʿal (Ittafʿal)*. The other form, הִתָּוִין, has no

doubt arisen by assimilation to the *Ethtafʿal* or reflex of *Afʿel*, the

two being completely confounded in Syriac. E.g. הִתָּוִין is *Eth-*

peʿel of זָן, ܐܶܬ݁ܬ݁ܙܺܝܢ or ܐܶܬ݁ܬ݁ܙܺܝܢ of ܙܳܢ; but ܐܶܬ݁ܬ݁ܙܺܝܢ, ܐܶܬ݁ܬ݁ܺܝܒ݂,

ܐܶܬ݁ܬ݁ܺܝܚܶܬ݂ are *Ethtafʿals* from ܐܺܝܚܶܬ݂, ܐܺܝܒ݂, ܐܺܝܚܶܬ݂. In Mandaitic

however the two conjugations can be readily distinguished;

ניתליפון is *Ethpeʿel* from לוף; ניתאראם, *Ethtafʿal* from רום. I

find however עתניהית "I was quieted," which seems to be *Eth-*

peʿel, whereas ܐܶܬ݁ܬ݁ܺܝܚܶܬ݂ must be regarded as *Ethtafʿal*.

4. The last form to which I shall direct your attention is
the reflexive and passive *Niphʿal*. The Arabic form may be

exemplified by اِنْقَادَ, اِنْدَاسَ, for اِنْقَوَدَ, اِنْدَوَسَ, imperf. يَنْقَادُ,

يَنْدَاسُ. In Hebrew נָדוֹשׁ was originally *nadûsh*, contracted

from *nadwash*, as in the Arabic 4th conj. أَقَامَ from أَقْوَمَ; and so

fem. נָפוֹצָה, plur. נָפֹצוּ. One verb, נֵעוֹר, exhibits the weaken-

ing 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. נְפֻצוֹתֶם, נְקֻטֹּתֶם, with *ô*; 1st pers. sing. נְסֻבּוֹתִי, נְפֻצּוֹתִי,

נְבֻנּוֹתִי, with sinking of *ô* to *û*. The infinitives have the form

הַמּוֹל, הַטּוֹחַ.   The vowel *ô* (for *â*) is sunk to *û* in הַרוּס (Isaiah xxv. 10); and the preformative is absorbed in לָאוֹר (Job xxxiii. 30), if the reading be correct.   The imperative is exemplified by הָכֵן for *hinkân* (*hinkawin*), הַרֹמּוּ, הַמֵּלִי, the last with irregular doubling of the *m*.   The imperfect is, for example, יָכֹן for *yinkân*, from *yankawin*, יָרֹמּוּ, יָסֹנּוּ; יֵעוֹר, יָנֹוּעַ, with irregular doubling of the *m*.

Of the frequent and close resemblances in form between verbs עו and עי we have already had many examples. I may add to these such Hiph'îls as הֵפִין, with its Hoph'al הֻפַן, and הֵפִית, which latter differs only in form from הֵמִית; whereas in some other cases the difference perhaps extends to the meaning as well, as הֵנִיחַ "cause to rest" and הִנִּיחַ "lay down." Similar is the Niph'al נָמֹול for *namâl* (*namwal*), Gen. xvii. 26, participle נְמֹלִים, Gen. xxxiv. 22, for *namâlîm* (*namwalîm*).

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 לו or לי, according to circumstances. Verbs ל"ה, strictly so called, are such as גָּבַהּ, which pertain to a quite different class, *verba tertiae 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.: ተለወ፡ *taldwa*, "follow"; በከየ፡ *bakáya*, "weep"; ሐይወ፡ *ḥáywa*, "live"; ዐብየ፡ *'ábya*, "be large"; ርእየ፡ *rĕ'ya*, "see." The solitary instance that I remember of contraction is in a form corresponding to Heb. Pi"êl, viz. ሀሎ፡ *halló*, for ሀለወ፡ *halláwa* ["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 *ô*.—In Arabic the final *w* appears as such only

in verbs of the form فَعُلَ, as سَرُوَ "to be noble," حَلُوَ "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 فَعِلَ, if it ever occurred, would be indistinguishable from فَعِلَ, as خَزِيَ "be ashamed," رَوِيَ "be sated with drink." Not only so, however, but verbs third و of the form فَعِلَ are indistinguishable from verbs third ي, because the influence of the vowel *kesr* necessarily changes و into ي, as رَضِيَ "be pleased with," for رَضِوَ, سَلِيَ "be comforted *or* consoled," for سَلِوَ, حَيِيَ for حَيِوَ. These forms, be it observed, are all uncontracted (with the exception of حَيِيَ, which a false analogy has shortened into حَيَّ); but in the most common form of all, فَعَلَ, the contraction, of which we found but a trace in Ethiopic, has become customary. *Tálawa* and *bákaya* drop their final vowel, but the resulting diphthongal terminations *aw* and *ay* both pass in Arabic into *á*, *tálá*, *báká*. For distinction's sake the grammarians bid us write تَلَا with *alif*, when the final radical is *w*, and بَكَى 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 לׄ״ו and לׄ״י. The radical שׁלו alone has preserved the final *w* in such forms as שַׁלְוָתִי, Job iii. 25, and, which is more remarkable, in an adjective of the form فَعِلٌ, viz. שָׁלֵו or שַׁלֵיו, Job xvi. 12, xxi. 23, Jerem. xlix. 31 (written שַׁלְיו). Neither do intransitive verbs of the form فَعَلَ seem to occur in Hebrew, so that we have only verbs

of the form نَعَلَ to deal with. These follow exactly the same course as in Arabic; the final vowel was dropped, and the resulting diphthongal termination passed into *á*, which the Hebrews expressed by the vowel-letter ה. In this way the original *taláwa*, *bakáya*, became *taláw, talá*; *bakáy, baká*; and were written תָּלָה "hang," בָּכָה "weep."

In Aramaic the intransitive forms are not very common, e.g., in Syriac, ܡܟܠܝ, ܫܠܘ, which stand for *shalíya, shallwa*, and *hadíya, hadíwa*. So in Mandaitic, עמיליא "he swore to me." The transitives have undergone the same contraction as in Hebrew, only that the termination is here usually expressed by א ן, and the door thereby opened for further confusion, as in vulgar Arabic, with the entirely different verbs לא"א, like ܠܐ, ܡܠܐ. The words ܬܠܐ, ܒܟܐ stand for *taláwa, bakáya*; whereas ܚܛܐ, ܡܠܐ, were originally *hatá'a, malá'a*. Similarly in Mandaitic הזא "saw," שתא "drank," בא "sought for" (for בעא). In the Bibl. Aram. א and ה are used indifferently.

One verb in Aramaic constantly takes prosthetic aleph, viz. אֶשְׁתִּי Dan. v. 3, 4, ܐܫܬܝ, for ܫܬܝ. I mention this for the sake of calling attention to the same phenomenon in vulgar Arabic (Spitta, p. 232), e.g. *ihká* "he narrated," *iská* "he gave water," *irmá* "he threw or pelted."

The 3rd pers. sing. fem. must of course originally have been, as in Ethiopic, ተለወት፡ *taláwat*, በከየት፡ *bakáyat*. (The contracted ሀሎ፡ *halló* [*infra*, p. 271] admits of a contracted ሀሎት፡ *hallót*, for ሀለወት፡ *halláwat*.) In Arabic and Aramaic the intransitives are regular in formation, رَضِيَت, خَزِيَت, حَلَوَت; Syr. ܡܟܠܝܐ, for *shaliyat, shaliwat*; Mand. מיטיאת "arrived," מימיאת "became dense *or* firm"; vulgar Arabic of Egypt, *mishiyet* "she went," from *mishí*, or more commonly *mishyet, bikyet, nisyet, ridyet*. In the Targûms the punctuation is סְנִיאַת, סְנִיַת, but this I consider doubtful. But the transitives undergo contraction: *galáwat* or *galáyat* becomes in Aramaic *galát*, which appears in

Biblical Aramaic as עֲדָת, רְבָת, הֲוָת, מְטָת; the form with
pathach, though equally common, seems to be less correct, e.g.
עֲנָת, מְחַת, מְטַת, הֲוַת; in Syr. as ܚܛ, ܥܠ; in Mand. as
באת הזאת (for ܚܛ); in the Talmûd as הֲוָת, חֲזָת, or more
commonly אתאי, הואי, חזאי, where the ' 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 *át* into *at*, جَلَتْ,
رَمَتْ, for جَلَتْ, رَمَاتْ, and these for جَلَيَتْ or جَلَوَتْ and
رَمَيَتْ. In Hebrew, according to the analogy of קְטָלָה for
קְטָלַת, 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. חָסָיָה, Ps. lvii. 2. More frequently,
however, the Hebrew takes the same course as the Arabic, and
contracts the original *galáyat* into *galát*, whence with suffix-
pronouns in sundry derived conjugations, צִוַּתּוּ, Ruth iii. 6,
כִּלַּתּוּ, Zach. v. 4, הִסַּתּוּ, Prov. vii. 21. But in pause the vowel is
slightly lengthened, עָשָׂתְנִי Job xxxiii. 4, רָאָתְךָ Job xlii. 5,
חִיְּתְנִי, Ps. xcix. 50, כִּסָּתְנִי Ps. xliv. 16; and so also in the
separate form עָשָׂת Lev. xxv. 21, הָיְת 2 Kings ix. 37 *kĕthîbh*,
Siloam inscription l. 3, and from derived conjugations הִרְצָת,
Lev. xxvi. 34, הֶלְאָת (in pause), Ezek. xxiv. 12, הִגְלָת, Jerem.
xiii. 19. Far more frequently, however, the Hebrew uses sepa-
rately the form עָשְׂתָה, רָאֲתָה, in pause רָאָתָה, עָשָׂתָה. Herein
there is no great mystery. The language had got accustomed
to the form קְטָלָה, and as the old עָשָׂת (for עָשְׂיַת) was no
longer perspicuous and intelligible, the usual termination הָ

was once more appended to it. We ourselves do much the same thing when we say *thou love*ST, 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," נגלאתאלכן, "she revealed to you," אתאתאלן, "she came to them." Here הנאתא etc. stand for הנאתאת etc., the final *t* having disappeared as in the ordinary נפילאלה or נפאלאלה, "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, رَمَيَا، رَضِيَا. حَلَوَا ; whereas the fem. is directly derived from the contracted singular. The form in use is رَمَتَا، جَلَتَا, not, as we should have expected, رَمَاتَا، جَلَاتَا, though these latter are said to occur dialectically. The ear having once got accustomed to رَمَتْ, the dual was naturally taken from this form, as was قَتَلْنَا from قَتَلَتْ.

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. requires a little more explanation. Reverting to the Ethiopic, we find in use the uncontracted ተለው: *talǎwū*, በከድየ: *bakdyñ*, ዐብየ: *'ǎbyñ* ; to which correspond in Hebrew the pausal חָסָיוּ, Deut. xxxii. 37, נָטָיוּ, Num. xxiv. 6, הֶתָיוּ, Is. xxi. 14, Jerem. xii. 9; and so too probably, though out of pause, Ps. lxxiii. 2, נָטָיוּ רַגְלָי (for נטוי *kĕthîbh*), and Prov. xxvi. 7, [where some copies read] דְּלָיוּ שֹׁקַיִם מִפִּסֵּחַ (for [the Massoretic] דַּלְיוּ = דָּלוּ = דְּלָיוּ). More usually, however, contraction takes place in Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic. In Arabic the form varies according to the characteristic vowel; حَلَوُوا becomes حَلَوْا ; رَضَوُوا and خَزِيُوا also become خَزُوا and رَضُوا

17—2

خَزَوُوا; but a preceding *fatḥa* produces a diphthong, غَزَوُوا for

غَزَووا, رَمَوُوا for رَمَيوا. The vulgar forms in Egypt are *ramû*

from *ramā*, but *mishiyû* or *mishyû* from *mishī* "go," *bikyû*,

nisyû, riḍyu. In Aramaic we may also remark a difference

between the intransitive and the transitive forms: ܡܟܝܢ makes

ܡܟܝܢ, shortened into ܡܟܝܢ, but ܓܠܐ makes ܓܠܐܘܢ, con-

tracted, after dropping the final *n*, into ܓܠܐܘ *gĕlăw* for *gĕlă'ũ*.

The corresponding form in Biblical Aramaic texts is usually read

with *ô* for *au*, מְטוֹ, הֲווֹ, עֲנוֹ, שְׁנוֹ, רְמוֹ; but also אֶשְׁתִּיו Dan.

v. 3, 4. In the later Jewish writings I find such forms as בְּכוֹ,

גְּלוֹ, and אֶשְׁתִּיאוֹ. In Syriac the original *gĕlă'ũ* is used with

suffixes, as ܒܥܐܘܢܝ or ܒܥܐܘܢܝ, "they sought me." In our

Jewish Aramaic texts the punctuation is exemplified by שְׁנוֹהִי

Dan. v. 6, in later texts רְמוֹנִי, רְמוֹהִי. In Mandaitic the usual

form is בֵן, שתון, אתון, הוון (for בְעון), but the *n* is sometimes

dropped, בנו, צבו, רמו; this latter form is always used with

enclitics, אתוליך, צבוביא. With suffixes the shorter form is

employed, e.g. הוון "saw me," בֵן "sought me"; but the fuller

form with י often occurs, as היון "saw me," שיבין, עניין. In

Hebrew the prevalent form is identical with that of the vulgar

Arabic. The normal גָּלְיוּ (for *galayū*) has been contracted into

גָּלוּ.

The corresponding fem. in Ethiopic is *taldwā, bakăyā, 'ăbyā*.

In Aramaic the yet fuller form with final *n* is preserved, e.g.

Chald. הֲוָן, קְרָאָן (for הֲוָאָן); Syr. ܗܘܝ, ܢܬܝ; but far

more common are the shortened גְּלָאָה, סְנְיָאָה, ܗܘܝ, ܢܬܝ.

With suffixes, however, the Syriac exhibits the purer forms

intact, ܢܬܟܣܝܢ, ܬܟܣܝܢ. In Mandaitic this form is rare,

but Noeldeke gives as examples עהויא and עקניא or קניא,

which are probably to be read *ehzĕ* and *eknĕ* or *k'nĕ*, for ܢܒܢܐ

and قَتَـلَ. The Arabic, as you may remember, has adopted

the form قَتَلَ instead of the original *katalána*; whence in this

class of verbs we meet, according to the vowel of the 2nd

syllable, with the forms حَلَوَ ‚رَضِيَ ‚رَمَيَ ‚نَدَوَ. The form

رَضِيَ stands for رَضُوَ ‚and حَلَوَ for حَلُوَ.

In the 2nd pers. sing. masc. the Ethiopic exhibits the oldest

form ተሰዐብከ: *taláwka*, በከይከ: *bakáyka*, ዐበይከ: *'abáyka*, from

ዐበየ:: The contracted form too is common in verbs 3rd *w*, as

ተኰን: ሐፀን:, much rarer in those 3rd *y*, as ኀፈን:: Verbs 3rd

y, of which the 2nd radical is a guttural, weaken the diphthong

still further into *i*, as ርእከ: *rĕ'íka*, ርኢከ: *rĕ'íka*, from ርአየ:

and ርኦየ:: In classical Arabic the forms are precisely what we

should expect from analogy: حَلَوَ and رَضِيَ; حَلَوَت makes حَلَوَ

رَمَيَت and تَلَوَت make رَمَيَ and تَلَا but نَلَا and خَزِيَت and رَضِيَت.

In the modern dialects these words may be pronounced nearly

as *t'lôt* and *r'mét*, which are weakened in the dialect of N. Africa

to *lî* and *ti*, غزوت *gh'zht* and *r'mlt*. Spitta gives the Egyptian

forms as *sakêt* and *mishtt*. In the Aramaic dialects there is a

considerable variety. The Biblical Aramaic of Daniel exhibits

חֲזֵית ii. 41, 43, 45, iv. 17, הֲוֵית ii. 31, 34, and רְבִית iv. 19

(*kĕthîbh*, where I do not understand the Massoretic alteration

into רְבַת), בְּנַיְתַהּ (in some MSS. even בְּנַיְתָהּ, with incompre-

hensible ⳯ or ⳯) Dan. iv. 27, all with soft *t*, which I do not find

it easy to explain; in later books we find גְּלִיתָ as well as גְּלֵיתָ,

but in the plural the weaker form גְּלֵיתוּן has prevailed, e.g.

חֲזֵיתוּן Dan. ii. 8. Intransitive verbs of the form סְנִי have of

course סְנִיתָ, סְנִיתוּן. In Syriac only the form ܐܠܨܠ, ܐܠܨܠܬ

is used; and from the intransitive ܕܡܟ, ܕܡܟܬ, ܕܡܟܬ likewise

with hard *t*, by way of distinction from the 1st pers. ‏ـمـيـﺖ‎.
The Mandaitic appears to have weakened the original vowels
most, for though the plural exhibits the diphthong ‏קראיתן‎,
‏הואיתן‎, more frequently than the weaker ‏עתיתן‎, ‏קריתן‎ (*ē* or
ī?), yet in the singular we find only ‏בית‎, ‏הוית‎, ‏קרית‎ (for
‏בעית‎). Lastly in Hebrew the weakest form of all has pre-
vailed; ‏בָּנִית‎, ‏בְּנִיתָם‎, stand for *banétha*, *b'néthém*, and these for
bandyta, *banaytúm*.

The 1st pers. sing. and plur. deviate but little from the ana-
logy of the 2nd. In Gĕ'ĕz and Arabic the forms, apart from the
pronominal affix, are identical; and in the vulgar dialects the
forms are *sakét*, *sakénâ*, *mishît*, *mishînâ*. In Hebrew too ‏עָשִׂיתִי‎,
‏עָשִׂינוּ‎, are the exact counterparts in vocalisation of ‏עָשִׂית‎,
standing for *'asdytĕ*, *'asdynâ*. The one form ‏שָׁלֵוְתִּי‎ is remark-
able 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 ‏הֲוֵית‎, ‏חֲזֵית‎,
‏רְמֵינָא‎, ‏בְּעֵינָא‎, with *ē* for *ai*; the weaker ‏צְבִית‎ occurs in Dan
vii. 19; intrans. verbs have naturally the vowel *ĭ*, ‏סְגִינָא‎, ‏סְגִית‎.
Similarly in Syriac, in the singular, ‏ﺭﻣﻴـﺚ‎ *rĕmîth* (eastern) or
‏ﺭﻣﻴـﺚ‎ *rĕmîth* (western); but the plural retains the older diph-
thong ‏ﺭﻣﻲ‎ or ‏ﺭﻣﻴـﻦ‎. Intransitives have always *ĭ*, ‏ـﻤـﻴـﺖ‎,
‏ـﻤـﻲ‎ or ‏ـﻤـﻴـﻦ‎. In Mandaitic the usual form is ‏הוית‎, ‏קרית‎,
‏בית‎ (for ‏בעית‎), but whether with *ē* or *ī* is uncertain. The plural
has not only the weaker form ‏בין‎, ‏אתין‎, ‏הטין‎, but also the
stronger diphthongal ‏מטאינין‎, ‏קראינין‎, ‏הטאינין‎. Before encli-
tics the plural exhibits both forms, ‏קרינאלה‎, ‏הזאינאלה‎. The
singular in the same position has only the weak form, but in two
varieties. Firstly, the final ‏ת‎ may be rejected, as ‏הדיבה‎, ‏קרילה‎;
or, secondly, the original termination of the 1st person may be
restored, ‏שריתיבה‎, ‏קריתילה‎, "I dwelt in it." In the Talmūd

the ordinary form of the 1st pers. sing. has also lost the final *t*, as

אתאי " I came," בעאי " I asked," לָךְ קְרָאִי לָךְ תְּנָאִי " 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 סְגִיתִי, גְּלֵיתִי, אֲתִיתִי.

Passing on to the *imperfect*, I will first invite your attention to the forms in Gĕ'ĕz of the indic. and subj. In the indic. the original forms must have been *yĕtdlĕwu, yĕbdkĕyu*; but the final short vowels were dropped, yielding *yĕtdlĕw, yĕbdkĕy*; and the contraction took place, giving as the actual forms in use *yĕtdlû, yĕbdkî, yĕwĕᵘt*, ይወ፡ : 3 sing. f. *tĕtalĕwî, tĕbakĕyî*; 3 pl. m. *yĕtalĕwû, yĕbakĕyû*. In the subj., which corresponds with the ordinary imperf. of the other Semitic languages, the fuller *yĕtlĕw, yĕbkĕy*, were contracted into *yĕtlî, yĕbkî*; 3 sing. f. *tĕtlĕwî, tĕbkĕyî*; 3 pl. m. *yĕtlĕwû, yĕbkĕyû*. The forms with *a* in the 2nd syllable may be exemplified by *yĕftaw, yĕᶜbay*, which become *yĕftau, yĕᶜbai*; the former may be further vocalised into *yĕftô*.

The form of the Arabic imperfect is, as you remember, identical with that of the Ethiopic subjunctive; Ar. *yáktulu* = Eth. *yĕktĕl*. We therefore obtain in the imperf. indic. the forms *yátluwu, yábkiyu, yardayu*. The rejection of the final short vowels reduces these to *yátluw, yábkiy, yárday*, which then become *yátlî* يَتْلُو, *yárdâ* يَرْضَى, يَبْكِي *yábkî*. 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 *yátluwa* يَتْلُوَ, and *yábkiya* يَبْكِيَ; whereas the combination *aya* becomes first *ay* and then *â*, يَرْضَى *yárdâ*, which is therefore indistinguishable from the indic. The corresponding vulgar forms are *yimshî* and *yirdâ*. 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 يَرْضُى, يَبْكِي, يَتْلُو, which would necessarily become *yátlî*, *yábkî, yárdâ*, and thus coincide with the indicative. To obviate

this, the language shortened the final vowels, and the result was the forms *yátlu* يَتْل, *yábki* يَبْك, *yarḍa* يَرْضَ.

These Arabic forms in their turn cast much light on the corresponding ones in Hebrew. If we regard the word יִגְלֶה by itself, we might readily suppose that the final vowel *ĕ* was merely a dulling or obscuration of an older *û*; that *yiglĕ* stood for *yiglû*, just as פֶּה *pĕ* stands for *pû*, Ar. فُو, or זֶה *zĕ* for *zû*, Ar. ذُو. Were this the case, יִגְלֶה would correspond letter for letter to the Ar. *yaglû*, يَجْلُو. Other circumstances, however, militate against this explanation. For instance, if يَجْلُو = יִגְלֶה, then the 3rd pl. fem. ought to be תִּגְלֹנָה = يَجْلُونَ, for *yagluwna*, whereas the form in use is תִּגְלֶינָה. And how about يَبْكِي = יִבְכֶּה, and

יִחְיֶה = يَحْيِي *yahyâ*? 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 *yarḍâ* for *yarḍay*, for the *alif maksûra* of the Arabic is represented in Hebrew by the termination ‎ֶה. In the jussive this vowel would naturally be shortened to the utmost, whence such words are וַיֵּרֶד, וַיֵּבְךְּ, וַיֵּשְׁבְּ, וַיִּרְא. 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 יִרְא, יִשְׁע, יִחְד, יִבְן, יִגְל, יַעְשׂ, were unpronounce-able by the Hebrew organs, and a supplementary or furtive vowel had to be introduced to facilitate their utterance. Hence such forms as יִרְא, יִשְׁע, יִחְד, יִבְן, יִגְל, יַעַשׂ (with hard ר), . In חָיָה and הָיָה, the jussives יְחִי and יְהִי became יְחִי and יְהִי,

just like the similar nominal forms בְּכִי, עֲנִי, for עֱנִי, בְּכִי. A
trace of the original *a* of the first syllable remains, both in verb
and noun, in the pausal forms בֶּכִי, יֶחִי, יֶהִי, for the original
בֶּכִי, יָחִי, יֶהִי.

In Aramaic the same form is dominant as in Hebrew, the
imperfect being usually of the forms יִבְנֵה or יִבְנֵא, نبنا, Mand.
ניקריא. Very remarkable is לֶהֱוֵה or לֶהֱוֵא in Ezra and Daniel,
with the plur. masc. לֶהֱוֹן and fem. לֶהֶוְיָן. The verb הֲסֹא has
also in Syriac a shorter form נסֹא for the common נַהֱסֹא, and in
Mand. Noeldeke gives ניהיא or ליהיא as well as ניהויא or
לירויא. Similar varieties occur in Samaritan, יהי, and in Tal-
mudic, לירוי and נהי. In Syriac too the verb حيا, "to live,"
contracts its imperf. into נחא or נחא (for نحسا), but in Mand.
this does not seem to be the case (ניהייא).

The contractions which the augmented persons of the imper-
fect undergo, I will illustrate by the 2nd pers. sing. fem. and the
3rd pers. plural.

In Ethiopic no contraction takes place: the 2nd pers. sing.
fem. is *tĭtalĕwî, tĭbakĕyî*; *tĭtlĕwî, tĭbkĕyî, tĭftdwî*; the 3rd pers.
plur. masc. *yĭtalĕwû, f. -wâ, yĭbakĕyû -yâ; yĭtlĕwû -wâ, yĭbkĕyû
-yâ, yᵉʳbâyû -yâ.*

In the other dialects these forms are more or less contracted.

In Arabic the 2nd pers. sing. fem. is, for example, تَجْلِينَ
from جَلَا, تَرْمِينَ from رَمَى. In the former case, تَجْلِينَ stands
for *tagluwîna*; in the latter, تَرْمِينَ stands for *tarmiyîna*. A verb
like رَضِيَ gives the form تَرْضَيْنَ, for *tarḍayîna*. The vulgar forms
are *timshî, tirḍî*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are תַּעֲשִׂין,
תַּעֲשִׂי, תִּרְהֲמִי, תִּבְכִּי, תִּרְאִי, תִּהְיִי. Here תַּעֲשִׂין stands for

ta'saȋn, tibkȋ for *tabkayȋ*, etc.   The Syriac has the advantage
over the Hebrew in having the vowel *é* instead of the weaker *ȋ*,
ܠܬܒܟ݂ܝܢ for *tabkaytu.*

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. in Arabic has the forms يَجْلُونَ,
يَرْضَوْن يَرْمُون.   The first of these is contracted from *yagluwûna,*
the second from *yarmiyûna,* the third from *yarḍayûna.*   The
vulgar forms are *yimshû, yirḍû.*   The corresponding Hebrew
form occurs not unfrequently in its uncontracted shape, יֶאֱתָיוּן,

יִשְׁתָּיוּן, יִבְכָּיוּן, יֶחֱזָיוּן ; without final *n,* יֶאֱתָיוּ, יִשְׁלָיוּ ; with a
weaker vowel in the 2nd syllable, יִרְבָּיֻן Deut. viii. 13, יִרְוָיֻן Ps.
xxxvi. 9.   These stand for *yabkayûna, yarbayûna,* etc.   More
frequently, however, a still further change takes place : יִרְבָּיֻן
becomes יִרְבֻּן.   Hence יַעֲשׂוּ, יַעֲשֹׂ ; יֶהֱגּוּ, יַהְגוּ, יֶחֱזוּ ; יִבְכּוּ, יִרְאוּ.

In Syriac the masc. form is ܢܪܡܘܢ *nĕrmôn,* according to the
Eastern pronunciation, for *narmayûn ;* the Westerns weaken the
vowel of the 2nd syllable to *û, nĕrmûn,* ܢܪܡܘܢ.   The correspond-
ing Mand. form is written ניהון, ניקרון ; with an enclitic,
נירמובה ; and in Biblical Chaldee we also find יִשְׁתּוֹן, יִבְנוֹן,
לֵהֱוֺן.

The 3rd pers. plur. fem. in Arabic is يَرْضَيْنَ, يَرْمِينَ, يَجْلُونَ ;
the first of which, according to the norm يَقْتُلْنَ, stands for *yag-
luwna,* the second for *yarmiyna,* the third for *yarḍayna.*   The
corresponding Hebrew form is תִּבְכֶּינָה, תִּחֱזֶינָה, תֶּעֱשֶׂינָה, for
ta'sayna, taḥzayna, tabkayna.   The Aramaic preserves here an
older shape than the other dialects, and does not contract.   In
Jewish Aramaic we have לֶהֱוֶיָן, יִגְלְיָן Dan. v. 16 ; in Syriac
ܢܪܡܝܢ ; in Mand. ניבעיאן or ניבייאן (ܢܒܟܝܢ), corresponding
very closely to the Ethiopic subjunctive *yĕbkĕyâ,* for *yĕbkĕyân.*

Passing on to the imperative, we find the minimum of con-
traction in the Ethiopic where the masc. sing. is *tĕlû* (for *tĕlĕw*),

f. *tĕlĕwî*, pl. m. *tĕlĕwû*; *bĕkî* (for *bĕkĕy*), f. *bĕkĕyî*, pl. m. *bĕkĕyû*; *'ĕbai* (for *'ĕbay*), f. *'ĕbdyî*, pl. m. *'ĕbdyû*; *fĕtau* or *fĕtô* (for *fĕtaw*), f. *fĕtĕwî*, pl. m. *fĕtĕwû*. In Arabic the 3rd radical has altogether disappeared, as in the jussive, and only a vowel remains: أَجِلْ *uglu* for *ugluw*, اِرْمِ *irmi* for *irmiy*, اِرْضَ *irḍa* for *irḍay* or *irḍā*. The vulgar forms have the long vowels, *imshî*, *irḍâ*. The different persons undergo contraction precisely as in the imperfect. For instance the feminines of the above words are أَجِلِي *uglî* for *ugluwî*, اِرْمِي *irmî* for *irmiyî*, and اِرْضَي *irḍay* for *irḍayî*; their plurals masc., أَجِلُوا *uglû* for *ugluwû*, اِرْمُوا *irmû* for *irmiyû*, and اِرْضَوا *irḍau* for *irḍayû*. The vulgar forms are: fem. *imshî*, *irḍî*; plur. *imshû*, *irḍû*. 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, הֱיֵה, עֲלֵה, רְאֵה, גְּלֵה, for *gĕlai*, etc. This lengthening is sometimes found in the imperfect, especially in pause and with a jussive sense; as יֵרֶא Gen. xli. 33, יַעֲשֶׂה Is. lxiv. 3, אַל־תִּהְיֵה Jerem. xvii. 17. The sing. fem. is רְאִי, עֲשִׂי, גְּלִי, for *gil'yî*, and that for *gĕlayî*. The plur. masc. is found in the oldest form *kĕṭâlû* in such words as אֱתָיוּ and בְּעָיוּ; but far more common are words like הֱיוּ, עֲשׂוּ, בְּכוּ, רְאוּ, for *bikh'yû*, etc. The corresponding fem. is exemplified by רְאֶינָה, Cant. iii. 11, for *rĕ'ayna*, in Arabic رَيْنَ *raina*. In Syriac we find a very few imperatives with the original diphthong in the 2nd syllable, e.g. ܐܶܣܚܰܒ, ܢܶܒܟܶܐ, ܣܰܚܶܒ; and in the Targūms the punctuation with *e* occurs, ܓܠܝ; but generally speaking, in Aramaic the sound of *î* prevails. So in Dan. ii. 4, חֱיִי; in Syr. ܢܶܚܶܐ, ܢܚܶܒ, ܢܚܶܒ; in Mand. קריא, הויא. The fem. and plurals retain more of the ancient forms than in Hebrew.

Thus the fem. sing. in Syriac is ܪܡܟܼ ; in Mand. קרא׳, הוא׳, and in the Talmūd חדא׳ "rejoice," גבא׳ "get thyself paid." Hence it appears that the fem. form גל׳ in the Targūms is to be read גְּלִי (and not גְּלִי, as indeed we might infer from the variant גְּלָא (for גְּלָאִי). The plural masc. in Syriac is ܪܡܰܘ, for *rĕmā'ū*, and that for *rĕma'ūn* ܪܡܰܐܘܢ. The Mand. exhibits the contraction הרון, הוון, הרון; the Bibl. Aram. the still greater one of הֲוֹו, אֲתוֹ.

The corresponding fem. in Syriac is ܪܡܝܶܢ *rĕmāyĕn*, for *rĕmāyān*, to which answer the Jewish Aram. רְמָאָה or רְמָן, and the Mand. אתיאן, in Syr. ܐܬܝ̈.

With regard to the infinitive I will merely remark that the Hebrew form עָשֹׂו, הָיוֹ, בְּנֹה, גְּלֹה, has lost its 3rd radical. Originally these were words of same form as the Arabic infinitive خِفَاءٌ, بِنَاءٌ, بُكَاءٌ, 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 *â* passed as usual into *ô*. The other infinitive עֲשׂוֹת, בְּנוֹת, גְּלוֹת, stands for *galâth, banâth*, by contraction for *galawat, banayat*; just as in Arabic صَلَاة stands for صَلَوَة, حَيَاة for حَيَوَة, نَتَاة for نَتَيَة. The Aramaic infinitive with prefixed *m* varies slightly in form in the several dialects. In Bibl. Aramaic we have מֶחֱזֵא, מִגְלֵא, מִבְנֵא, with suff. כְּמִצְבְּיֵה, as contrasted with the Syriac ܡܶܚܙܳܐ, ܡܶܪܡܳܐ, ܡܶܠܳܐ, with suff. ܡܶܚܙܝܶܗ. In the form ܡܶܠܳܐ I see the influence of verbs ל״א, as well as in the imperatives of Pa'ʿēl, Aph'ʿēl, etc. In Mand. both forms seem to occur, מיהדיא, מיבניא, as well as מיסנא, מירבא; and so also in the Talmūd מֶחֱזֵי, מִבְעֵי, מִטְעֵי, as well as מִיגְבָּא "to get paid." There also occurs in Bibl. Aram. the form לְמִבְנְיָה Ezra v. 9, like מִבְזְיָא in Targ. Prov. xxv. 27 and

מַשְׁתְּיָא in Targ. Esther v. 14. The form לְבְנֵא or לִבְנֵא in Ezra v. 3, 13, is probably corrupt; in any case it must be meant for an infin. Pe'al and not Hithpe'ēl.

The Arabic participle active has the same form as in the regular verb, but contracted; رَامٍ, جَالٍ, رَام, رَاضٍ for رَامِيٌ, جَالِيٌ, fem. جَالِيَة, etc. The vulgar form is *bâkî, mâshî, râḍî*, fem. *bâkiye* or *bakye* (with short *a*), etc. The Aramaic has preserved an older form *ḳâṭal*, instead of the prevalent *ḳâṭil*; e.g. in Biblical Aramaic עָנֵה, שָׁתֵה, plur. שָׁתַיִן, בָּנַיִן, fem. דָּמְיָה, plur. שָׁנַיִן; in Syriac ܫܳܐܶܠ ܫܳܠܐ ܫܳܠܐ fem. ܫܳܠܬܐ; and in Mandaitic בָּאייא, הָאויא. The form כֻּנֵ, בָּנַיִן, for *bânayin*, is analogous to the Hebrew plurals שָׁמַיִם, מַיִם, for *mayim* and *shamayim*, and is probably due to an effort to preserve the consonant power of the *yôd* unimpaired. Similar to the Aramaic is the Hebrew form, which appears in its integrity in the proper name חֹוַי; but ordinarily *ai* has passed into *ē*, and we get the form רֹעֶה, חֹזֶה, construct רֹעֵה, חֹזֵה, like שָׂרֵי, שָׂרָה, שָׂרֶה. The corresponding fem. is exemplified by זֹנָה, רֹעָה, פֹּרָת, which stand for *pârayat, rô'ayat, zônayat*. The fem. עֹטְיָה, Cant. i. 7, is like the Aramaic דָּמְיָה, or it may rather be taken as = Arabic جَالِيَة, with *i* in the 2nd syllable; if so, the other form צֹפִיָּה, פֹּרִיָּה, הֹמִיָּה, בֹּכִיָּה, is only a slight variation, with emphatic utterance of the 3rd radical.

The passive participle of the Hebrew presents the regular form *ḳâṭûl*, בָּנוּי, עָשׂוּי, fem. בְּנוּיָה, עֲשׂוּיָה, with ' at the end, whether the third radical be really ' or ו. The final radical is sometimes rejected, עָשׂוּ, צָפוּ, which some derive from עָשׂוּי, צָפוּי, others from עָשׂוּ, צָפוּ. The original *w* reappears in the two plurals *kĕthîbh* עֲשֻׂוות, 1 Sam. xxv. 18, and נְטֻוות, Is. iii. 16.

In Esther ii. 9 הָרְאֻיוֹת seems to be a mistake for הָרְאֻיוֹת, which is found in some MSS. and editions. The corresponding Aramaic participle has the form שְׁרֵא, מְנֵא, חֲזֵה, בְּנֵה; Syr. ܚܙܐ, Mand. הזיא; the plur. is שָׁרֵין Dan. iii. 25, in Syr. ܚܙܝܢ, ܚܙ̈ܝܢ; the fem. שַׁרְיָא, ܚܙܝܐ. The form would seem then to be that of adjectives like ܣܢܝܐ ܣܢܐ, ܕܡܟܐ (or ܕܡܟܐ), ܕܡܟܐ; ܙܡܟ̈ܝܐ, ܙܡܟܐ; ܚܕ̈ܝܐ ܚܕܐ; which spring from an original *katal* or *katil*, like بَطَل "brave," حَسَن "handsome," جَذِل "glad," دَنِس "dirty." The nearest Arabic equivalent would be شَجٍ "in grief," رَدٍ "perishing," for رَدِيٌّ, شَاجِيٌّ, 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 בְּנֵה would stand for *banay*, plur. בְּנֵין for *banayîn*, fem. בַּנְיָא for *banaya, banayat*. Lastly, the Arabic passive participle has the form *maktûl*, and therefore appears in these verbs as مَجْلُو, مَرْمِي, مَرْمِيّ, مَرْضِي. In the case of مَرْضِيّ, مَرْمِيّ, مَرْضِيّ, the influence of the final *y* has sufficed to transform the original *û* of مَرْمُوي, مَرْضُوي, into *î*. The vulgar forms may be exemplified by مَهْدِيّ *mahdíy*[un], which has become *máhdî*, fem. *mahdíye*, plur. *mahdiyîn*.

In treating of the derived conjugations I can be somewhat more brief[1].

In the intensive or Pi"ēl the Ethiopic form alone is pure in the third person of the perfect: ሐለወ: *hallāwa*, "watch,"

---

[1] [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.]

ሐለየ: *halláya*, "meditate," ሐሰወ: *hassáwa*, "lie," ሰነየ: *sannáya*,
"be beautiful," ሀለወ: *halláwa* "become, be," contracted ሀሎ
halló[1]. The Arabic exhibits ي for و in the 3rd pers. sing., not
only here, but throughout all the derived conjugations; جَلَّى
for *gallaya*, whence plur. masc. جَلَّوْا for *gallayû*, fem. جَلَّيْنَ.
The vulgar form of the plur. masc. would be *gallû*. In Hebrew
we find similar forms prevailing, viz. גִּלָּה for *gallaya*, גִּלּוּ for
gallayû [Niph'al נִגְלָה plur. נִגְלוּ, 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. אַתָּה from הֲוֵיתִי, הַגְלִי [Haph'el רַבִּי, מַנִּי,
etc.], Syr. ܐܳܒ݂ܶܕ݂, ܨܒ݂ܳܐ, Mand. אסיא, שאניא for *mannaya*, etc.,
[and so throughout the other derived conjugations]. The length-
ening of the final vowel by the complete vocalisation of the
radical *y* has affected the form of the 3rd plur. masc., which
is now שְׁרִיו, שַׁנִּיו; Syr. ܨܒ݂ܰܘ, ܨܒ݂ܺܝܘ; the Mand. however
gives us שאנון, מאמן for *shannayûna*. Of the 3rd plur. fem.
there are no examples in Biblical Aramaic. The Syriac form is
ܨܒ݂ܰܝ, shortened from ܨܒ݂ܺܝ from an original *rabbayân(a)*;
Mand. [Aph'el] אסניא, אוריבן = ܨܒ݂ܺܝ .ܨܒ݂ܰܝ—The 3rd sing.
fem. of the Arabic is جَلَّتْ for *gallayat*, which appears in
Hebrew (before suffixes) as *gillath*, e.g. כִּלַּתּוּ צִוַּתָה, or, with
slight tone-lengthening of the vowel כִּפָּתְנִי, חִיָּתְנִי. The ordi-
nary form in Hebrew of course is כִּלְּתָה, כִּפְתָה, with double
termination. The Aramaic inflects regularly, ܐܶܒ݂ܕ݂ܰܬ݂ for *rabbayat*,
Mand. שאריאת, שאניאת. The Targûms give, it is true, the
forms גַּלְיַת, גַּלִּיאַת, but this punctuation seems as doubtful as

---

[1] [And so in the other derived conjugations *dûlawa*, *dûtaya*, *tafûtwa*, *tahûrya*,
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 diph-
thong in Arabic, جَلَّيْتَ *gallaita* for *gallayta*, of which the
vulgar form would be *gillêt*. In Hebrew the vowel is weakened
to *î*, גָּלִיתָ, כָּסִּיתָ, fem. נָלִית, plur. masc. עֲוִיתֶם, כִּלִּיתֶם,
but the older *ê* is sometimes retained in the first pers., e.g.
צִוִּיתִי[1]. In Biblical
Aramaic the only form that occurs is מַנִּיתְ, Dan. iii. 12. Syriac
distinguishes the second person ܐܫܟܚܬ (plur. ܐܫܟܚܬܘܢ) by giving
it hard *t*, while the first person is ܐܫܟܚܬ with soft *t*[2]. 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. מטית, שאנית, זאבית, we
cannot tell; probably not, as the Targums seem to make the
difference in the vowels, גְּלֵית fem. גְּלֵית, but גְּלֵיתִי,
supposing the punctuation to be correct[3].

In Ethiopic the form of the subjunctive mood of the imper-
fect is ይፈኑ፡ *yĕfánnû*, ይሀሉ፡ *yahállû*, ይሰሊ፡ *yĕsallî*, ይሀሊ፡
yahallî for -*nĕw*, -*lĕy*. The corresponding indicative, 3rd pers.
sing., in Arabic is يَنْجَلِي by regular contraction for يَنْجَلِيُ,

[1] [In the other derived conjugations the older *ê* occurs also in the second person.
In the Niph'al it is commoner than *î*, and in the perfects of Po"el and Hoph'al
ê is never thinned to *î* before consonantal affixes.]

[2] [So in all the derived conjugations, as in the intransitive form of Pe'al; *supra*,
p. 261 *sq.*]

[3] [This distinction is not uniformly carried out in the printed texts: e.g., in the
first person, the Bomberg editions have צָלִיתִי Ps. xxx. 3 (Nebiensis צְלִיתִי), אַחֲזִיתָךְ
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 אֵיתִי Gen. xxxi. 39, Deut. xxvi. 10 (where the edition of Sabbioneta,
according to Berliner, has אֵיתִי, but Compl. agrees with Bomb.), אִתְגְּלִיתִי 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 Targums.]

according to the norm يَقْتَل, the preceding *kesr* changing every *w* into *y*. We are therefore surprised to find in Hebrew יִגְלֶה 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: יְגֻלֶּה for *yagullay*, Ar. يُجَلَّى;

יֻגְלֶה for *yahuglay*, Ar. يُجْلَى; whence, I imagine, it spread to the *Pi''el*, [*Hiph'îl*]. and *Niph'al*, giving יְגַלֶּה instead of יְגַלִּי, Ar. يُجَلِّي [יַגְלֶה instead of יַגְלִי, Ar. يُجْلِي], and יִגָּלֶה instead of יִגָּלִי, Ar. يَنْجَلِي. As regards the plural of the imperfect we find in Hebrew examples of uncontracted forms, תִּדְמְיוּן, Is. xl. 18, תְּדַמְּיוּנִי, ibid. ver. 25, ch. xlvi. 5, יְכַסְיֻמוּ, Exod. xv. 5; but the ordinary form is יְגַלּוּ, Arabic يُجَلُّونَ, *yugallûna*, for *yugalliyûna*. A similarly uncontracted participle is the Pu''al מְמֻחָיִם in Isa. xxv. 6. The shortened or jussive form of the Imperfect is in Arabic يُجَلِّ, to which correspond closely the Hebrew יְצַו, Deut. xxviii. 8, וַיְצַו, תְּעַר, Ps. cxli. 8[2].

The Aramaic form of the Imperfect differs from the Hebrew,

---

[1] [In like manner יִתְגַּלֶּה corresponds to يَنْجَلِي.]

[2] [Similarly in the Hiph'îl the forms without a helping vowel תֵּפֶן, וַיִּשְׁק, וַיְּרָא, correspond to the Arabic يُجْلِ, while the forms with a helping vowel like וַיַּעַל, יַגֶל stand for *yagl*, *ya'l*, as, in the case of nouns, מֶלֶךְ, נַעַר stand for *malk*, *na'r*. In the Hithpa''el the Jussive is וַיִּתְגַּל for *yithgall*, pl. יִתְכַּסּוּ, in pause וַיִּתְחָל, 2 Sam. xiii. 6, and so without pause תִּתְגָּר, Deut. ii. 9, 19 (under the influence of the virtually doubled guttural), also יִתְאָו. The Pi''êl הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה has Jussive יִשְׁתַּחוּ for יִשְׁתַּחְוֶן.]

being in Biblical Aramaic יְמַחָא ,יְבַלֵּא, often written with ֵ‍י

in the Targūms; [and this *ṣērī* runs through all the conjuga-

tions], while *seghol* appears in the termination only a very few

times in pause, as אַחֲוֵה, Dan. ii. 24, נְחַוֵּה, Dan. ii. 4,—a doubt-

ful punctuation. The plural is יְבַעֵן ,יְשַׁנּוֹן. The Syriac and

Mandaitic forms are nearly identical, viz. نِحْفَا, pl. نِحْفُون;

נִישָׁאנַון ,נִידְאלוּן, pl. נִידָאלִיא ,נִישָׁאנִיא. In Biblical Aramaic

the final *ṣērī* is however shortened with suffixes into *ī,* יְחַוִּנַּי,

Dan. v. 7, and יְחַוִּנַּהּ, Dan. ii. 11, which might raise a doubt

whether אָ‍ ֵ, ֵ‍י arises out of *ai,* as in Hebrew, or out of *i.* I

prefer the former view because of the plural יְשַׁנּוֹן, and because

the participle is מְצַלֵּא, Dan. vi. 11, with the plural מְצַלַּיִן, Ezra

vi. 10, Syr. مُصَلَّا, مُصَلِّيْن, which could only arise out of

mĕṣallayīn not *mĕṣalliyīn.* The striving after unity of termina-

tion in the same part of the different verbal forms has here been

pushed to its utmost.

The Imperative has in Ethiopic the form ፈኑ: *fánnû,* ጸሊ:

ṣálli for *fannĕw, ṣalliy;* fem. ፈኒዊ: *fannĕwi,* ጸልዪ: *ṣalléyi;* plur.

masc. ፈኑዉ: *fannĕwû,* ጸልዩ: *ṣalléyû.* In Arabic the correspond-

ing form has a short vowel in the singular, جَلِ for *galliy,* but

the feminine is جَلِي for *galliyī,* and the plural masc. جَلُوا for

galliyū. Identical herewith is the shorter Hebrew form צַו, מַן,

Ps. lxi. 8, גַּל, Ps. cxix. 18, 22, מַן, Dan. i. 12, for *ṣauwi* etc. The

longer and commoner form צַוֵּה, קַוֵּה, has arisen under the

combined influence of the Qal גְּלֵה and the normal קַטֵּל.—In

the Aramaic dialects similar forms prevail. The Bibl. Aram.

yields the form מֶנִּי for מַנִּי, Ezr. vii. 25. In the Targūms you

will find both גַּלִּי and גְּלִי, but the former is probably correct.

So in Mand. וְאַכִיא, הַאדִיא; in the Talmūd שַׁנִי " change,"

"remove," in Samaritan מלי, in modern Syriac ܡܣܟ, ܡܣܟ, *sâpi* for *sappi*. In ancient Syriac alone do we encounter a different form ܡܣܟ, which is probably owing to the influence of verbs ל״א, which would naturally have this vowel[1]. The fem. in Syriac is ܓܠܝܬ, in the Targūms גַּלְיָא for גַּלְיָא; the plur. m. in Syriac is ܓܠܝܢ, in the Targūms גַּלְין, Mand. דאכון, כאסון; the plur. fem. in Syriac ܓܠܝܢ for *gallâyân*, in the Targūms גַּלְיָן.

The Infinitive is remarkable for the variety of its forms. In Arabic the preference is given to the form تَقْتِلَة, the real origin of which I explained to you before [*supra*, p. 204]; thus تَسْلِيَة, تَعْزِيَة, which become in vulgar Arabic, under the influence of the accent, *taslîye*, *ta'zîye*, *tarbîye*. In Hebrew the usual form of the inf. abs. is כַּלֹּה, קַוֹּה, according to the norm קַטֵּל [and similarly Hiph. הַגְלֵה, Hoph. הָגְלֵה on the norm הָקְטֵל, הַקְטֵל], but קַוֹּה occurs in Ps. xl. 2, which was originally

---

[1] [As in the infinitive Pe'al ܩܛܠ; see p. 268, *supra*. An original *gallay* (with *a* in the last syllable, according to the principle of effort after uniformity of termination explained in the text) would give *gallê*, *gallî*, but an original *malla'* (from ܡܠܐ = ܡܠܐ) might naturally become *mallâ*. Now, in Syriac, verbs ל״א (with a very few exceptions in the intensive stem, such as ܚܒܠ and ܡܠܐ) have become entirely fused with verbs ל״י and ל״ו, 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 (ܓܠܝ, ܓܠܝ, ܓܠܝ) the ל״א form may be supposed to have prevailed. The imperative Ethpe'el on the other hand has the unweakened termination *ay* ܓܠܝ, in Eastern Syriac ܓܠܝ *ethgal*, with transposition of the vowel and double silent ܝ. Duval, p. 193, thinks that the imperatives in *â*, to which must be added a single Pe'al form, ܬܐ "come," are relics of the energetic form in *an*, *â*; cf. p. 195 *supra*.]

18—2

ḳauwâ, corresponding to the Arabic form (with weakened vowel) *kittâl*. The inf. const. is כַּלּוֹת, חַיּוֹת, גַּלּוֹת, formed as an intensive from the *Kal* גְּלוֹת etc.; originally therefore *gallâth*. In Aramaic the different dialects vary considerably. The Targums have גַּלָּאָה [with suf. 'נַלָּיוּת; Aph‘el in Biblical Aramaic הַשְׁנָיָה, הַחֲוָיָה, Targumic אַגְלָאָה and so forth], the Talmūd Babli אַסּוּיֵי, צַלּוּיֵי, Mand. אַסּוּיָא, נַאסּוּיָא, which form sometimes occurs in the later Targūms, e. g. רַצּוּיֵי. In these dialects forms with prefixed *m* sometimes occur, e. g. Mand. מִישַׁאנוּיָא; and the same prefix appears in the Syriac forms ܡܰܫܰܟܶܢܬܳܐ constr. ܡܰܫܰܟܶܢܬܳ, [Aph‘ēl ܡܰܫܰܟܶܢܬ 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 مُجَلٍّ for *mugalliy⁴⁴*, the passive مُجَلًّى for *mugallay⁴⁴*. Here all is clear and distinct, as also in Hebrew מְגַלֶּה, מְגֻלָּה. 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. מְגַלֵּא, מְגַלֵּי, ܡܰܓܠܶܐ is, it is true, sufficiently distinct from the passive מְגַלֵּי, ܡܰܓܠܶܐ, 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. مُجَلٍّ and the passive مُجَلًّى, the Hebrew active מַגְלֶה and the passive מֻגְלֶה are clearly distinguished, but in Syriac the active ܡܰܓܠܶܐ and the passive ܡܰܓܠܶܐ assume identical forms with inflexional additions, ܡܰܓܠܶܝܢ, ܡܰܓܠܶܝܢ etc.]

[Appendix. Verbs of which one radical is an א.

Here we must distinguish, in general, between forms in which the א retains its original force as a guttural consonant (*hamza*) and forms in which the א 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 א 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 و or ي among their radicals.

In Ethiopic verbs a radical א 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 بوس for باس,

يبوس for يباس , يوثر for يائر 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 Mohammed the people of the Ḥijāz retained the guttural force of *hamza* less firmly than many other tribes, and to the influence of the Ḥijāzī pronunciation may be ascribed such readings in the Ḳorʼân as مومن , ياتي for *yaʼtî, muʼmin*[1]. In modern Arabic the

---

[1] In all cases where radical ا is represented by و, ي or simple ا 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 Ḳorʼân, which was first written down in the Ḥijāz, and without ا or other diacritical points. But as regards ⌐

weakening of *hamza* has gone much further, so that, for example,
verbs *tertiae hamzatae* are entirely merged in verbs *tertiae* ي.
The extreme is reached in the Aramaic dialects, where conso-
nantal א 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 א much more fully than the Massoretic
tradition admits. (See below, p. 284.)   Of the details a brief
sketch will suffice.

A.   *Verbs* א"פ.   In the perfect of the simple stem א is
initial, and retains its guttural force, so that the inflexion is
essentially regular.   In Syriac initial ܐ demands a full vowel
instead of a mere vocal *shĕvâ*, and in the perfect this vowel is
commonly *e*, ܐܡܰܪ, with the same thinning of the original *a* as in
the fem. ܐܡܪܰܬ, ܩܶܛܠܰܬ.   But in some verbs the Eastern Syrians
have the older and stronger pronunciation ܐܰܟ݂ܠ, ܐܰܠܐ, ܐܟ݂ܡܪ, ܐܟ݂ܠ [1].
In Mandaitic also the vowel of the first syllable is generally *a*,
אמאר, and so too in the fem. we have אמראת, אולאת as well
as עמראת, עולאת.   In Biblical Aramaic the vowel appears to
be shorter, אֲמַר, אֱזַל [2].   In Syriac a few verbs assume in the
perfect the form of verbs ע"י, ܐܒܟ݂, ܒܟ݂ܝ, ܒܝ, ܒܗܬ.

In the imperfect the Arabic has يَاكُل, يَاكُلُ, to which such

Hebrew forms as יֹאמַר, תֹּאמַר closely correspond. But in Heb.,
where the א retains its guttural force, the pronunciation is usually
facilitated by the insertion of a *hateph* or a short vowel, יֶאְסֹף,
יֶאֱהַב, 2 fem. תֶּאֶסְפִי etc. By this means the radical א may
remain consonantal even in the first person, אֶאֱסֹף, whereas in

Arabic اٰكُلُ necessarily becomes اٰكُلُ *ákulu*, 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 *yákul, yámur* is the rule.
Similarly Hebrew אָפָה, אָמַר, אָכַל, אָבָה, אָבַד form the imper-
fects יֹאכַל, יֹאפֶה, יֹאבַד etc.; *yô*- standing as usual for *yá*-.
The first persons are written אֹבַד 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
Mêsha' also writes וָאֹמַר, "and I said," l. 24, וָאֹחֵזָה l. 11, 20,
but וַיֹּאמֶר l. 6, 14. The *ê* of the second radical, which becomes
a, ĕ in current discourse or with retracted accent, וַיֹּאכַל, יֹאבַד,
וַיֹּאמֶר, extends through all these verbs, and similarly אָחַז
makes יֹאחֵז and וַיֹּאחֶז; תֹּאסֹף, יֶאֱסֹף, אָסַף, תֶּאֱסֹף and וַיֹּסֶף
(with omission of the א). In all these cases the broader prefix
seems to have thinned the *u, ô* of the second radical to *ĭ, ĕ*,
a vowel which the Hebrew imperfect usually avoids. Similar
forms from stative verbs with imperfect *a* are וָאֹהַב, Mal. i. 2,
וַיֹּחַר (for וַיֹּאחַר), 2 Sam. xx. 5, *Kĕrî*; but beside these we find
also אֱהַב, Prov. viii. 17, וַיֵּאֱחַר, Gen. xxxii. 5, and probably
וַיֵּחַר, 2 Sam. xx. 5 *Kĕthîbh*, with similar forms from אתה and
אול. Those from the two last verbs may be mere Aramaisms;
the others seem to be genuine Hebrew forms and may be com-
pared with the dialectic Arabic تِيقَم from أُقُم.

In the Aramaic imperfect (and inf.) the contraction into *ê*
(for *â, a'*, as in the particle לְ = נָא, *na'*) is universal; Jewish Ar.

יֵאמַר, יֹאכַל, inf. מֵאמַר etc., Syr. ܒܐܟܠܐ, ܡܐܟܠܐ. But in verbs imperfect *a* the West Syrians further thin *ê* to *î*; thus بَأْكُل, مَأْكُل are in the East *némar*, *mékul*, but in the West *nîmar*, *mîmar*.

The Arabic imperative is necessarily اِيسِرْ not اِئْسِرْ, اِوْمَلْ not اِوْمَلْ[1]. Three verbs commonly reject the first radical, أَمَرَ, أَخَذَ, أَكَلَ, making كُلْ, مَرْ, خُذْ, whence in vulgar Arabic we even find the perfects *ḫad* and *kal*. So from أَتَى we have اِيتِ and تِ, in pause تِ. A similar apocope takes place in Syriac in the imperatives ܬܐ "come" and ܙܶܠ "go"[2]. 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 *ô* but *e* before *a*, ܐܟܘܠ, ܐܟܘܠܝ—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 *ḥateph* commonly takes the place of a full vowel; yet we find in the Targums such forms as אֲכוֹל, אֲמַר, and even in Hebrew the plurals אֱסֹפוּ and אֱתָיוּ. In the passive participle the Syriac has ܐ, but in Dan. iii. 22 we have אֲזֵה.

In the reflexive of the simple stem the Arabic اِيتَمَرَ, imperfect يَأْتَمِرُ, perf. pass. أُوتُمِرَ, requires no explanation. But the verb أَخَذَ makes اِتَّخَذَ, and so also we find اِتَّزَرَ as well as اِتَّجَرَ.اِيتَزَرَ.

[1] But وَكَلَ, وَخَذَ, but وَمَرَ, and so forth. So also وَأَمَرَ as well as أَمَرَ but فَأْمُرْ, وَأْمُلْ.

[2] Talm. B. תָּא, זִיל; but in Bibl. Aram. אֲזַל, Ezra v. 15 (in the Targums אֱזִיל, Numb. xxii. 35, Compl., Bomb.); אֱתוֹ, Dan. iii. 26 (in the Targums אֱתָא, אֱתָא).

as well as اِيْتَجَرَ, and more rarely a few other cases of the same kind. Similarly in Aramaic ܐܶܬܚܰܪ, אִתְּחַד with sporadic cases of the same kind in other verbs. The ordinary Syriac reflexive is ܐܶܬ݂ܟ݁ܶܠ, fem. ܐܶܬܐܰܟ݂ܠܰܬ, by the general rule of Syriac that ܐ 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 ܐ in Syriac also mostly surrenders its vowel and is elided after prefixes with a vanishing vowel: imperf. ܢܰܟ݁ܶܠ for *n'akkel* (1st person ܐܰܟ݁ܶܠ) part. ܡܟ݂ܰܟ݁ܶܠ etc. Similar forms are found, though less consistently, in Jewish Aramaic and occasionally in Hebrew, וַתַּזְרֵנִי, 2 Sam. xxii. 40, for וַתְּאַזְּרֵנִי, Ps. xviii. 40, מַלֵּף, 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 פ״י, except in the two verbs הֵימִן, ܗܰܝܡܶܢ and הַיְתִי, אֵיתִי, Palmyrene אתי, De Vog. 15, l. 4, ܐܰܝܬ݁ܺܝ, where the א becomes י; compare the Hebrew imper. Hiph. הֵתָיוּ, Jer. xii. 9, and the part. מַזִין "giving ear," Prov. xvii. 4. The Hebrew forms are generally regular, but in a few cases we find the contraction of אֲ‍ into ô, as אוֹכִיל, Hosea xi. 4, and so in the Niph'al נֹאחֲזוּ, Numb. xxxii. 30, or even into â, וַיֵּאָצֶל, Numb. xi. 25, וַיֹּרֶב, 1 Sam. xv. 5. The passage of א into ו, 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 تَآمَرُوا "they deliberated together," and so too initial 'd sometimes becomes *wd* in stem III., وَاكَلَ for آكَلَ. In modern Egyptian Arabic we even find *wakkil* for أَكَّلَ, perf. of اكل II.

B. *Verbs* פ״א. In Ethiopic, Arabic and Hebrew the forms are generally strong throughout; and strong forms are also common in Eastern Syriac[1]. 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 سَال، سِلْتَ، يَسْأَل, or more frequently, with elision, يَسَل. Similarly the common يَرَى for يَرْأَي "he will see," and a few others. In Western Syriac the elision of ܐ 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 ܐܟ݂ܰܠ (E. Syr. ܐܟ݂ܰܠ), imperf. ܢܶܐܟ݂ܰܠ, pl. ܢܶܐܟ݂ܠܽܘܢ (E. Syr. ܢܶܐܟ݂ܰܠ, pl. ܢܶܐܟ݂ܠܽܘܢ, where the subscript line denotes a kind of vocal *shĕva*), Ethpe'el ܐܶܬ݂ܰܐܟ݂ܶܠ (E. Syr. ܐܶܬ݂ܰܐܟ݂ܶܠ), 1st pers. ܐܶܬ݂ܰܐܟ݂ܠܶܬ݂, and so forth. When the first or third radical is an aspirate we sometimes find forms like ܐܶܟ݂ܰܕ݂, ܢܶܟ݂ܽܘܠ, where the hardening of the aspirate represents an older doubling, presumably due to assimilation of the ܐ. In Biblical Aramaic the א maintains itself, as in E. Syriac, and so apparently in the Targums. In the latter א may pass into י when it is doubled, e.g. שַׁיֵּר (שִׁיֵּר) Pa"el of שְׁאַר. So too many Syrians pronounced ܐܶܟ݂ܰܕ݂ as *bayesh*, and the verb ܒܶܐܫ forms the Pa"el ܒܰܐܶܫ; but in the latter case it is the form of the Pĕ'al that is secondary. The transition of verbs פ״א to hollow verbs, of which we have found some examples in Arabic, prevails within the Aramaic field in

---

[1] See for the Syriac Nestle in *Beitr. zur 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 ܐ to be pronounced). All Syriac verbs of this class are stative in form. In Hebrew the only cases of contraction are זֵאבִים pl. of the Pi'lēl זַאֲזֵן (if this is not rather an old Niph'al from אזן) and possibly יָנֵאץ, Eccles. xii. 5.

Mandaitic. A transition to פ״א sometimes occurs in Syriac,
e.g. اَخْضَعَ, لَوَعَ (from لَوَى), نَلَهَت, Ps. xli. 2 ; but most
forms of this kind are only graphical errors.

C. *Verbs* ל״א. Here the tendency of the languages, completely
carried out in vulgar Arabic, and almost completely in Aramaic,
is to entire assimilation with verbs ל״י. In the intensive stem
of a very few Syriac verbs a final ו, though it is no longer
actually pronounced, retained its guttural force to so late a date
that the forms are still صَبِّ, اصْطَبِّ, لَفَّ (with *a* for *e* in the
last syllable under the influence of the guttural), and are com-
monly inflected regularly, except that the ו throws back its
vowel in forms like 3rd pl. perf. صَبِّوْ etc. In Hebrew alone do
the ל״א form a distinct class of weak verbs, the א retaining its
consonantal force whenever it has a vowel, מְצָאֵי, יִמְצְאוּ, מְצָאָה,
or even a vocal *shĕva*, אִמְצְאָךְ, 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 *â*, מָצָא, stative מָלֵא, imperf. יִמְצָא
(for *yimṣa'*, with characteristic *a* before the guttural), Niph'al
נִמְצָא, יִמָּצֵא, Hiph. הִמְצִיא etc. In the perfect of the simple
stem the normal vowel is also retained in syllables not final
מָלְאָה, מָצְאָת, but the other perfects in such cases uniformly
take *ê* נִמְצֵאת, הִמְצֵאת etc. A similar law of uniformity pre-
vails in all imperfects (so far as the few examples allow us to
judge), but here the vowel is *sĕghol*; תִּמְצֶאןָה, תִּמָּצֶאנָה etc.
So also the imper. of the simple stem מְצָאן; 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 *ê* of the perfect and the
sĕghol of the imperfect alike represent an older *a'*, and it seems
most likely that the deflection to *ê*, *è*, has been produced under

the influence of verbs ל״ע. 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 Mēshaʻ 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 ויאמר, מאתן (Heb. מָאתַיִם), 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 Phoenician 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 Phoenician 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 אאמר, where the

second א 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 (מאתים, מוצא, ראש,
against Moabite and Phoenician רש). The conclusion is inevit-
able that when Hebrew first came to be written to an extent
sufficient to give a tolerably fixed orthography, radical א 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.
3 m.	ḥbs	3.	ḥbsw
3 f.	ḥbsti'		
2 m.	ḥbsti'	2 c.	ḥbstīnī
1.	ḥbskwi' (cf. Aeth. -kū)	1.	ḥbswïn

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 Minaean 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 Liḥyânite. 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^{mn}* by elision of ן would be *shamal^{mn}*, not *shamâl^{mn}*. The latter therefore must be derived from a secondary form *sham'âl^{mn}*; 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 ע in any one of the three cases adduced. In מתאב the change of ע to א has been deliberately introduced to change the sense" [Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebers.* p. 349], "בל is Babylonian, and that בי stands for בעי is improbable." There are, however, other probable examples of the occasional weakening of ע in Hebrew, notably פתאם side by side with פֶּתַע. Such readings as נשקה for נִשְׁקְעָה, Amos viii. 8, *Kethîbh*, לְמוֹ for לְעַמוֹ, Ps. xxviii. 8 (LXX. τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ), are probably due to a pronunciation in which ע 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 ج 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 ج is hard in Nejd, and soft (*g* in *gem*) in the Ḥijâz (Mecca, Ṭâif).

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 *ṣ*. All three appear distinct in Hebrew as שׂ, שׁ and ס respectively; but in later times the sounds of שׁ and ס 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*) שׁ has been absorbed in ס (ܣ); in Arabic, on the contrary, the primitive sound represented by Hebrew שׁ remains distinct (as ش), while the other two old sounds (שׂ, ס) 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 لا 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 Ḳor'ān. These scribes, he believes, made a distinction in pronunciation between اـ and ىـ; we know indeed that many Ḳor'ān teachers pronounced ىـ with *Imāla*. See *Geschichte des Qorāns*, p. 252 *sqq.*

P. 94, l. 14. For ܠܐܟܣܘܣܐ read ܠܐܟܣܘܣܐ.

P. 100, l. 17. Prof. Nöldeke remarks that to connect שַׁחַר with شَكّ appears to be inadmissible, since to do so involves *two* irregularities (Hebrew שׁ should correspond to Arabic س), and that ܟܘܬܐ is a mere transcription of the Arabic بطيخ. The genuine Syriac form is ܦܛܝܚܐ.   ?

THE END.

V530-17