

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_152769

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

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



Cambridge. DEIGHTON, BELLI AND CO.
LONDON. F. A. BROOKMAN.

LECTURES
ON THE
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR
OF THE
SEMITIC LANGUAGES

FROM THE PAPERS OF THE LATE
WILLIAM WRIGHT, LL.D.,
FELLOW OF ETRUSCAN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1890

[*All Rights reserved*]

Cambridge :

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SONS,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PREFACE.

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

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Syriac and Arabic in the Easter Term of 1877, and he continued to lecture on the subject at intervals till he was withdrawn from work by his last illness.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

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

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

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

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

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

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

W. ROBERTSON SMITH.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

June, 1890.

CONTENTS.

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

	PAGE
CHAPTER V. THE VOWELS AND THEIR PERMUTATIONS	75

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

CHAPTER VI. THE PRONOUNS	95

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

CHAPTER VII. THE NOUN	131

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

CHAPTER VIII. THE VERB	161

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

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

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

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

III. THE IMPERATIVE 188—Plural 189.

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

V. THE INFINITIVE 195.

VI. THE PARTICIPLES 196—Passive participle 197.

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

CHAPTER IX. THE IRREGULAR VERB 227

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

II. A. VERBS ׁ׃ׂ AND ׁ׃ׂ 234—1. Verbs with original *w* as first radical 235—Derived conjugations 239—2. Verbs with *y* as first radical 241.

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

II. C. VERBS ׁ׃ׂ AND ׁ׃ׂ 255—Perfect of the simple stem *ibid.*—Imperfect 263—Imperative 266—Infinitive 268—Participle 269—Derived conjugations 270.

APPENDIX. Verbs with a radical ׁ׃ׂ 277—A. *Verbs* ׁ׃ׂ 278—B. *Verbs* ׁ׃ׂ 282—C. *Verbs* ׁ׃ׂ 283—History of radical ׁ׃ׂ in Hebrew 284.

CHAPTER I.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You understand, then, that there exists as yet no work which I can recommend to you as a complete text-book of Semitic Comparative Grammar; no treatise which we can confidently follow as a guide from the beginning of our course to its end. The French Orientalist Renan proposed to himself to write such a work; but he has not yet advanced beyond the introduction, the *Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques* [8vo, Paris, 1st ed. 1855]. The second part, the *Système Comparé*, has remained, and is now, I fear, likely to remain, a desideratum. Differing as I do from Renan, not merely in small details, but also in various matters of principle, I can still admire the industry and scholarship which are manifest in every page of the *Histoire Générale*; the justice of many of its views, and the clearness of its style and arrangement; and I therefore advise those of you who have not yet read it, to do so without delay, as a good introduction to the studies to which I now invite your attention¹. In connexion with our special course I would recommend to you more particularly the Hebrew Grammar of Justus Olshausen, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache* (Brunswick, 1861); that of B. Stade, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik*, iter Theil (Leipzig, 1879); and Bickell's *Grundriss der Hebräischen Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1869, 70), of which an English translation by Curtiss appeared at Leipzig in 1877 under the title of *Outlines of Hebrew Grammar*. To this little book I shall sometimes have occasion to refer, as I prefer it to Land's *Hebræusche Grammatica* (Amsterdam, 1869), of which there is also an English translation by Reginald Lane Poole, *Principles of Hebrew Grammar* (London, 1876). I would also mention with commendation the latest or 22nd edition of Gesenius' *Hebräische Grammatik*, by Professor Kautzsch of Tübingen, as furnishing some useful hints; [24th ed. Leipzig, 1885].

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

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 civilisation¹. 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, *Vergelykende Geschiedenis van de Egyptische en Mesopotamische Godsdiensten* [8vo, Amsterdam, 1872], p. 20.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Similarly Sprenger in his *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 viele Schichte zum Beispiel die Kanaaniter, welche wir zu Anfang der Geschichte wahrnehmen, waren¹?"

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 religios-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. 1. (Berlin, 1869), p. 241 sq.]

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

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

Accepting this view of the cradle of the Semites,—assuming that they spread from Arabia as their centre,—how shall we depict to ourselves their dispersion over the Semitic territory? Let Schrader speak. He imagines the northern Semites—i.e., the Arameans, Babylonians and Canaanites—to have parted in a body from their brethren in the south, and to have settled in Babylonia, where they lived together for a long period. The Arameans would be the first to separate from the main body of emigrants; at a considerably later period the Canaanites; last of all the Assyrians. At the same time an emigration would be going on in a southerly direction. Leaving the northern Arabs in Central Arabia, these emigrants would settle on the southern coast of the peninsula, whence a band of them subsequently crossed the sea into Africa and pitched in Abyssinia¹.

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

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL SURVEY OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

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

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

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

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

We commence, then, our survey of the Semitic tongues with the *Northern* section, and herein with the *Eastern* group, which, as it happens, is the first to appear prominently in the field of history. This group comprises two very closely allied languages, the Babylonian and Assyrian, which have been preserved to us in numerous inscriptions, written in cuneiform or wedge-shaped characters. The earliest of these inscriptions go back beyond the time of the Babylonian king *Ḥammurabi*, who cannot, according to the best authorities, have flourished later than circa 1500 B.C.; and the latest come down to the beginning of the fourth century B.C., when the Persian monarch *Artaxerxes Mnemon* reigned¹. They are all written, unfortunately for us, in a non-Semitic character, primitively hieroglyphic, and of peculiar complexity, one of the varieties of the cuneiform type. Into a full description of these, and the history of their decipherment, so far as it has till now been accomplished, I cannot here enter. The Assyrian character, as I shall call it for shortness' sake, is not alphabetical, but syllabary. Such syllables as *ka*, *ki*, *ku*, *ak*, *ik*, *uk*, are each expressed by a single sign, as well as syllables of the form *kam*, *kim*, *sak*, *sik*. These latter compound syllables may, however, be also denoted by two signs, the one indicating a syllable which ends with a certain vowel, and the other a syllable which begins with the same vowel; e.g. *ka-am*, *si-ik*. Under these circumstances alone, the learning to read Assyrian texts with fluency would be no light task; but the difficulty is enormously enhanced by the fact that a great number of the signs employed in writing are not syllables but ideograms; not phonetic signs, but characters denoting an object or idea. Some of these ideograms have no phonetic value whatever; whilst others are both ideographic and have a phonetic

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 *irši-tiv* (אֶרֶץ). 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* (שָׂרַף), or *kavā*, *ikvū* (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 Pahlavī character. Using a strange jumble of Semitic and Persian, they wrote *llmā* and *bsrā* [i.e. the Aramaic *lahmā*, "bread"; *besrā*, "flesh"], but spoke *nān* and *gōsh*; they wrote *ab* and read *pī* ["father"], but *abit* did duty for [the synonym] *pitar*.

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

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

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

As I shall not often refer hereafter to the Assyrian tongue, I may take this opportunity of stating that, in regard to its vowels, the Assyrian seems to have preserved more than the Hebrew of that ancient simplicity which is so conspicuous in the Arabic. It appears to possess only the three radical vowel sounds *a, i, u*, a fact which need not surprise us, if we look to the written vocalisation of the Arabic and to the analogy of Sanskrit in the Indo-European family². In respect to its consonants, however, the Assyrian approaches more nearly to the lower level of the Phœnician and Hebrew, as contrasted with the higher level of the Arabic. This is especially obvious in regard to the sibilants, as "three," *šalašti*, שְׁלָשׁ, תְּלַת; "manly," *zikaru*, זִכָּר, זָכָר. Some salient and distinctive features in its grammar we may have occasion to notice from time to time; and I therefore only remark in conclusion that this eastern branch of the North Semitic languages has left no modern representative whatever.

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

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

אַרַם מְעַכָּה, etc., all places situated in Syria. אַרַם נְהָרַיִם, "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 פֶּדֶן אַרַם, which we may probably identify with the village of فِدْنًا, called by the Arab geographers فَدْدَان [Faddān], near Ḥarrān. *Arām* seems, therefore, not to be a geographical or political designation, but the ancient name of the race, which they brought with them in their wanderings from the banks of the lower Tigris, the district known in the time of the Sāsānians, and even later, as بَيْتُ أَرَمَیَّ [Beth Armāyē], or "the home of the Arameans." Now the Jews, as is well known, employed the word אֲרָמִי (אַרְמִי) in the sense of "gentile," "heathen"; and under the influence of their usage, it was retained by the Syrian translators of the New Testament to express Ἕλληνες, ἔθνικολ, 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 אֲרָמָיָא [Ārāmāyā]; but even this was gradually discarded and replaced by another, the Greek designation of "Syrians." This is merely an abbreviation of "Assyrians." At first the Greeks called all the subjects of the Assyrian empire Ἀσσύριοι, or more usually by the shorter form Σύριοι or Σύροι. Subsequently, as they became better acquainted with these regions, they used the fuller form Ἀσσυρία to designate the lands on the banks of the Tigris, whilst the shorter form Συρία served as the name of the western lands; and at last this term was adopted by the Arameans themselves, who as Christians applied to themselves the term سُرْيَايَا [Suryāyē]. See Noeldeke in *Hermes* for 1871, p. 443, and in *ZDMG.* xxv. 113.

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

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

Secondly, there are the dialects of Syria Proper and of Palestine, the region to the west of the Euphrates. These are usually spoken of by the absurd designation of *Chaldee*, which would properly mean something very different, as we have seen above. Leaving out of account two words in the book of Genesis (ch. xxxi. 47) and a verse in Jeremiah (ch. x. 11), the oldest literary monuments of this branch of Aramaic are certain passages in the book of Ezra (ch. iv. 8—vi. 18, vii. 12—26), going back to the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century B.C., which are, as Renan says, really specimens of the Aramaic of the time of Darius Hystaspis, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes Longimanus¹. About the Aramaic portions of the book of Daniel there is a doubt, for they are, according to the best foreign critics, of much later date, having been written by a Palestinian Jew in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, about 166 or 165 B.C. This point, however, is one which I am not called upon to settle, and I content myself with merely indicating the doubt. Then follow the Biblical Targūms, Onkelos, Jonathan, Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Yērūshalmī. Now, do not for a moment suppose that the Jews lost the use of Hebrew in the Babylonian captivity, and brought back with them into Palestine this so-called Chaldee. The Aramean dialect, which gradually got the upper hand since the fourth or fifth century B.C., did not come that long journey across the Syrian desert; it was *there*, on the spot; and it ended by taking possession of the field, side by side with the kindred dialect of the Samaritans, as exemplified in their Targūm of the Pentateuch, their festal services and hymns. For the grammati-

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-aramaischen* (Leipzig, 1884) is the best in its particular field. The best Samaritan grammars are those of Uhlemann (Leipzig, 1837), and Petermann (Berlin, 1873). That of Nicholls may also be mentioned.

Subordinate dialects of this second class are:—

(a) The Egyptian Aramaic, as exhibited, for example, in the stele of Saqqāra, now in the Berlin Museum¹; in the inscription preserved at Carpentras in France²; in the papyri Blacassiani, formerly in the collection of the Duc de Blacas, now in the British Museum³; and the papyrus of the Louvre edited by the Abbé Bargès⁴. 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 maintains⁵, 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 Madāin Šālīh or al-Ḥijr in North Arabia. The great inscription of Taimā⁶ is of the Persian period and therefore some centuries anterior to the Christian era. The inscriptions discovered by Doughty at Madāin Šālīh, and just published by the French Academy⁷, 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 Noldeke in *Sitzungsb. d. k. Pr. Acad. zu Berlin*, 10 July, 1884.]

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

A.D. 79¹. The Sinaitic inscriptions are certainly not of earlier date, whatever the Rev. Ch. Forster may have written to the contrary².

(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 sorts³.

(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 Iārithat IV. = A.D. 31. But Euting 1 (which was not in Doughty's collection) dates from the first year of this king, so that the series begins in B.C. 9. Again the inscription of the fourth year of Rab'el (Euting 28 = Doughty 19), which the academicians place in A.D. 79, is assigned by Euting with more probability to A.D. 75. The date of king Rab'el depends on the reading of the inscription of Dmēr, published by Sachau in *ZDMG.* xxxviii. (1884) p. 535.]

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 (نَبَاطِي or نَبْطِي), 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 (מַנְדַּאִיָא), otherwise called Ṣābians (i.e. "Washers," from their frequent ablutions and washings, الصَّابِنُونَ, rad. صَبَا = צבַע, or المَغْتَسِلَة) and, though very absurdly, St John's Christians. A miserable remnant of this race still lingers in Chūzistān [and near Baṣra], where they have been visited by Petermann and other recent travellers; but even their priests seem now to understand but little of their Aramaic dialect. Our MSS. of their religious works are all modern, the oldest in Europe being of the sixteenth century. The grammar of this dialect too has been written by the indefatigable Noeldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, Halle, 1875.

All these Aramean dialects may be divided into two classes, which are readily distinguishable by the form of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the Imperfect. In the western dialects—Biblical Aramaic, the Targūms, the Samaritan, the Egyptian Aramaic, the Nabathean, the Palmyrene, and the Christian dialect of Palestine—the prefix of this person is *yodh*, יָקַם; whereas in the eastern dialects—at least in Syriac—it is *nun*, נִמַּם. 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 (לְהוֹי, לְהוֹן, לְהוּי, or לְהוּא) הוּא.

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:

parkin, "I will save," he uses a Pa^{al} participle active, with the loss of the initial *m*, **ܚܒ** *bit* being a contraction of **ܚܒ** [it is required that], and **ܦܚܝܬ** standing for **ܦܚܝܬ** *ānā* [saving *be* I]. But when he says **ܚܒܝܬܐ** *purkit lī*, "I have saved thee," he employs a Pu^{al} participle, **ܚܒܝܬܐ** being a contraction of **ܚܒܝܬܐ** *ānā*, so that the literal meaning is "thou hast been saved by me." The original form **ܚܒܝܬܐ** is of course identical with the Hebrew **מִצַּרְתִּי**, **מִצַּרְתִּי**, **מִצַּרְתִּי**, and quite distinct from the old Syriac and Arabic passive participles **مَقْتَلٌ**, **مَقْتَلٌ**. These Neo-Syriac dialects have been largely illustrated of late years by the publications of Socin and Prym, of Merx, and of Duval¹.

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

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

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

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

¹ [Prym and Socin, *Der neu-aram. Dialect des Ṭūr 'Abdīn*, Gott. 1881; Socin, *Die neu-aram. Dialecte von Urmia bis Mosul*, 4^o Tub. 1882 (cf. Noldeke in *ZDMG.* xxxvi. 669 sqq.); Duval, *Les dialectes neo-araméens de Salamas*, Paris, 1883; Merx, *Neusyrisches Leseb.* 4to, Breslau, 1873; Guidi in *ZDMG.* xxxvii. 293 sqq.]

Ev. i. 10 (*Fr. Hist. Gr.* iii. 569)] that it was the name of a god or of a heroic ancestor. In the Old Testament it appears as a geographical term, under the form 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 Bērytos (Beirūt), Byblos (גִּבְלִי) [Gebal, Ezek. xxvii. 9], Botrys (בִּטְרוֹן, Batrūn), Tripolis, Simyra (Σίμυρα, הַצִּמְרִי ["the Zemarite," Gen. x. 18]), Arke ("Ἀρκη or τὰ Ἀρκα, הָעֲרֵקִי ["the Arkite," Gen. x. 17]), Sinnas (Σιννάς, הַסִּינִי ["the Sinite," Gen. x. 17]), Aradus (הָאַרְדִּי ["the Arvadite," Gen. x. 18], رَوَاد) and Antaradus (انطرطوس, Tortosa), Laodicea, and Amathe (חַמַּת [Hamath], حَمَّاء), 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 Marseilles¹; 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 Phocæan 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 (أيلة) 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 סֹחָר, as keen and energetic a trader as his kinsman the modern Jew.

All the languages of this Canaanitic group, it would seem, closely resembled what we call Hebrew; but the only one of them with which we are well acquainted is the Phoenician. It has been preserved to us in numerous inscriptions from all parts of the ancient world, varying in date from the seventh (or eighth) cent. to the first cent. B.C., or, if we include the Punic, to the second or third cent. of our era. The grammar which you should consult is that of Schröder [*Die Phönizische Sprache*, Halle, 1869], and you should also read Stade's treatise "Erneute Prüfung des zwischen dem Phönizischen u. Hebräischen bestehenden Verwandtschaftsgrades," in *Morgenlandische Forschungen*, Leipzig 1875¹.

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

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

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 Harrān in Mesopotamia. Here a split took place among them. The family of Naḥor remained in Mesopotamia; that of Terah, under the leadership of Abrām, marched south-westwards into Canaan. These strangers received the name of עֵבְרִים or עֵבְרִיִּים, 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 הָעֵבֶרִי (Gen. xiv. 13) by 'Αβράμ τῷ περάτῃ; and what Origen meant when he explained Ἑβραῖοι by περατικοί. Some of these strangers remained in the country, and in the end permanently occupied different portions of it on the East side of the Jordan and to the east and south of the Dead Sea; viz. the Children of Ammon, of Moab, and of Edom. Others of them, the Children of Ishmael, wandered away among the adjacent Arab tribes to the E. and S.E., and ultimately became inseparable and indistinguishable from them. Others still, the Children of Jacob, after dwelling for some considerable time in Palestine itself, moved southwards, and swelled the ranks of the Semitic immigrants into Egypt. After a sojourn in that country, which is variously estimated at from 215 to 430 years¹, the Children of Jacob fled or were expelled, and resumed a nomade life in the Sinaitic peninsula under the leadership of Moses. This event may be placed in the fifteenth or fourteenth cent. B.C., for the calculations of different scholars vary. Marching northwards they came once more to the borders of Palestine, and passing by their kinsmen of Edom and Moab, they fell upon the Amorites, who had succeeded in crushing Ammon and seriously crippling Moab. The Amorites went down before the fierce assault of Israel, for whom God fought (as the name betokens), and the land to the north of the Arnon was the reward of their prowess. From this vantage-ground they entered upon a long struggle with the Canaanites, which, after various vicissitudes, ended in the substantial triumph of the Israelites and the conquest of large portions of the Canaanite territory, in which they settled side by side with the conquered race.

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 Dībān (the ancient Dibon, דִּיבּוֹן) in the territory of Moab. This passed, after it had been broken and mutilated, into the hands of M. Clermont-Ganneau, then one of the officials of the French Consulate at Jerusalem, and is now deposited in the Louvre. This inscription belongs to the time of Mēsha', king of Moab, in the first quarter of the ninth century B.C., and gives an account of his wars with the Israelites and his domestic undertakings. The language is so similar to the Hebrew of the Old Testament that Prof. Roediger simply treated it as such in the last edition which he published of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (the twenty-first, 1872)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 Kasdim 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 אֲרָמִי אֲבִיר "a wandering," or "nomade, Aramean"; and that Jacob's relatives in Paddan Aram are always expressly called Arameans (Gen. xxv. 20, xxviii. 5, xxxi. 20, 24). I incline, therefore, to the second explanation, put forward by Schröder and other scholars, which is this: that

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.

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

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

The literary development of the race dates from the same period. Before Muḥammad's time the northern Arabs had only a literature of ballads, mostly handed down by oral tradition. With the promulgation of the Ḳor'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 Ḳor'ān and the Sunnah.

The Arabic language was thus peculiarly fortunate. Leading a life of comparative seclusion—not ground, like the Arameans and Canaanites, between the two grindstones of Assyria, Babylon, or Persia, on the one side, and Egypt on the other; nor, like the Phoenicians, thrown by commerce and colonisation into close contact with a dozen foreign nations—the Arabs had preserved, down to the sixth or seventh century of our era, far more of the ancient form and fashion of Semitic speech than any of their congeners. If not the Sanskrit, Arabic is at least the Lithuanian among the Semitic tongues. At this particular period too the dialect of the tribe of Ḳoraish¹, which had already acquired a certain supremacy over the rest, was fixed by the Ḳor'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 Ḳoraish, i.e. the branch of Kināna settled in and about Mecca, were the tribe of the prophet.]

of what is called "vulgar Arabic" are by no means so great as we might have expected after all the struggles and vicissitudes of the last twelve centuries. From the mouth of the Tigris, throughout Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine, Arabia proper, Egypt, and North Africa, as far as Morocco, the language is essentially one and the same—Arabic, sunk by the gradual decay of its inflection to the level at which we become acquainted with Aramaic and Hebrew. In its purest form it is probably to be heard among the 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, 1831¹). 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 Vulgardialectes von Ägypten* (1880). For the Syrian a useful book is the *Grammaire Arabe vulgaire* of Caussin de Perceval (fourth edition, 1858); and for the Algerian the *Éléments de la Langue Algérienne* of A. P. Pihan (1851). The Maltese has been treated by Vassalli, *Grammatica della lingua Maltese*, second edition, 1827; and by Gesenius in his *Versuch über die Maltesische Sprache* (Leipzig 1810).

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

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

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^o 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 357¹. None of the Ḥimyaritic monuments are likely to be later than the seventh century of our era. The grammar of these languages has not yet been formally compiled by any one orientalist, but we may soon expect a work on the subject from the competent hand of Prof. D. H. Müller of Vienna.

3. Crossing over into Africa, we encounter the Ge'ez or Ethiopic, the language of the Abyssinians, an ancient Ḥimyaritic colony, as the word ግዛ: "migration" or "the emigrants," itself shews. Its territory is the mountainous region S.W. of Nubia, where its modern representatives still flourish. The most prominent of these are: on the north, the *Tigré*, spoken in the Dahlak islands, and on the mainland in Ṣamhar and by the Habab, Mensa, Bogos, and neighbouring tribes; in the centre, the *Tigrīna* [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 Ṣānā or Ṭānā, as far as Gōjām. Of these three languages, the Tigré most resembles the old Ge'ez, whilst the Amharic has deviated furthest from it.

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

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

in abundance from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, when the ancient Ge'ez had died out, but was still cultivated by the priesthood, like Latin by the learned of Europe or Hebrew in the Talmudic schools. The standard grammar of the ancient Ge'ez is that of Dillmann [Leipzig, 1857] which has superseded that of Ludolfus or Leuthof, an admirable work in its day. The Tigrīña dialect has been handled by Praetorius, *Grammatik der Tigrīña-Sprache* (Halle, 1871) [and Schreiber, *Man. de la langue Tigrāi* (Vien. 1887)]. For the Amharic I may name the works of Isenberg (1842) and Massaja, *Lectiones grammaticales* (Paris, 1867); but the best book on the subject is that of Praetorius, *Die Amharische Sprache* (1879). [See also Guidi, *Gr. elem. 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 Furst and Delitzsch on the one hand or of von Raumer and Raabe on the other. The temptation to identification is great, and too much weight has been attributed by the scholars mentioned, and even by men of higher reputation, to analogies that lie merely on the surface. The Semitic languages, like the Indo-European, belong to the inflective class; but this circumstance, as Whitney has remarked (*Language and the Study of Language*, 3rd ed., p. 300), by no means implies a genetic connexion or even descent from a common stock. The resemblance between the two families is, on the whole, not greater than we might reasonably expect to find in languages produced by human beings of nearly the same natural endowments under very similar circumstances of development. The probability of an ultimate connexion will of course seem greatest to those who believe in a common birthplace of the two races. If they both spread themselves abroad from a point near the Caspian Sea, or in Central Asia, original unity is not impossible. But if the Indo-Europeans rooted in Central

Asia, or, as some recent scholars (such as Penka in his *Origines Ariacae* [Teschen, 1883], and O. Schrader, in his *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte* [Jena, 1883]) have tried to prove, on the shores of the Baltic, whilst the Semites were autochthones in Central Arabia, the chances of original unity are reduced to a vanishing point. An ultimate relationship, if one exist at all, will only be discovered when we have solved the great mystery of the Semitic tongues, the 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, كمل), for example, are the bones of a skeleton, which the vowels clothe with flesh and endow with life. These three consonants convey the idea of "kill." Add vowels, and you get such words as *qatala* قَتَلَ "he killed," *kutila* قُتِلَ "he was killed"; *qatl* قَتْل "the act of killing" or "of being killed"; *kill* قَاتِل "a killer," "an enemy"; *kātil* قَاتِل "killing." The use of prefixes, affixes, and even of infixes, is common to both families of languages; but the Indo-Europeans have nothing like this triconsonantal rule with its varying vocalisation as a means of grammatical inflexion. The Indo-European roots are not thus restricted in their nature; the radical vowels, although more liable to phonetic change than the consonants, are as essential a part of the root as these latter. A root may consist of a single vowel; of a vowel followed by one or more consonants; of one or more consonants followed by a vowel; of a vowel preceded and followed by a single consonant; and so on. The Sanskrit roots *i* "go," *sthā* "stand," *ad* "eat," *vid* "know," *grabh* "seize," are something wholly different in character from the Semitic roots *krb* "come near," *ktl* "kill," *plg* "divide," which, as Bopp has justly remarked (*Vergl. Gr.*, 2^{te} Ausg., 1^{er} Bd, p. 196), are unpronounceable, because, in giving them vowels, we make an advance to a special grammatical form. And yet here, if any-

where, will an ultimate connexion between these two families of languages be discovered. It cannot escape the observation of the student that a great many Semitic roots have two consonants in common, whilst the third seems less essential, and is therefore variable. For example, *kt* or *kd* are common to the series, قَطَم, قَطَلَ, قَطَعَ, قَطَّ, قَذَّ, قَدَح, قَدَّ, قَتَلَ, قَتَّ, all of which convey the idea of "cutting" in some form or other.

Pl or *fl* are found in فَلَاح, فَلَج, فَلَح, فَلَح, فَلَذ, فَلَع, فَلَق, all meaning "cleave" or "divide." *H*, *k* are the basis of حَقَرَ, حَقَا, حَقَق, of which the original signification is also "slit" or "cut." *Pl* or *fh* are the essential constituents of

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

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

As to the affinity of the Egyptian language with the Semitic stock, that is also a question which is as yet *sub judice*. Benfey, in his well-known work *Ueber das Verhältniss der ägyptischen Sprache zum semitischen Sprachstamm* (Leipzig 1844), sought to establish this affinity by various considerations, grammatical and lexicographical; and the conclusion to which he came was, that the Semites are only one branch of a great family, which includes not only the Egyptians but also all the other languages of Africa. His views have been combated by Pott, Renan, and other scholars; and certainly in this unrestricted form they seem to land us in almost Turanian absurdities. But with regard to the ancient Egyptian and the Coptic, Egyptologists seem gradually to be arriving at conclusions similar to those of Benfey. De Rouge, 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 ἀποκ, ἀπακ.

“Thou” ἡτοκ, ἡτακ

“He” ἡθοϥ, etc.

“She” ἡθοϥ, etc.

“We” ἀποκ, ἀπακ

“Ye” ἡωτεπ, ἡτωτῖ, ἡτατῖ

“They” ἡωωτ, ἡτοωτ, ἡτατ

The suffix pronouns I give as they appear in connexion with the preposition πα “to.”

“to me” κη, παλ-

“to us” παπ

“to thee,” m. πακ

“to you” κωτεп, κητεп

f. пе

“to him” παϥ

“to them” κωωт, пат

“to her” паϥ

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

1, masc. *отѧ, отѧ, отѧт*; fem. *отѧ, отѧѧ, отѧт*

2, masc. *спѧт*, fem. *септѧ, спотѧ*

7, masc. *шѧшѧ, сѧшѧ*; fem. *шѧшѧ, сѧшѧѧ*

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

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 *לִּקְיִל*. E.g.

sing. 1. *†. τωμ I am joining, adhering;* pl. 1. *тѧп. τωμ*

2. m. *κ. τωμ, χ. τωμ* 2. *тѧтѧп. τωμ*
f. *тѧ. τωμ*

3. m. *ϣ. τωμ* 3. *сѧ. τωμ*
f. *с. τωμ*

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

CHAPTER III.

SEMITIC WRITING.

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

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

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

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

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

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

that out of the twenty-two Phoenician letters, fifteen are beyond doubt directly derived from Egyptian models, whilst only one, the *'ayin*, is clearly of Semitic invention. It may be that the "spoiling of the Egyptians" went so far; that the plundering Semites appropriated not only the idea of a written alphabet, but the very forms which the letters were to take. However, I cannot profess myself entirely convinced, not even by Mr Isaac Taylor's argumentation. If they did so, the Semites both remodelled and renamed their acquisitions. Out of the Egyptian *eagle* or *vulture* 𐀀 they made the head and horns of an ox, 𐤀, 𐤁; the *throne*, 𐀁, became the head and neck of a *camel*, 𐤂, 𐤃; the group of lotus plants growing out of the water, 𐀂, a *set of teeth*, 𐤄, 𐤅; and so on¹.

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 Uġūr 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', 𐤌𐤍𐤔𐤁', king of Moab, which we may place about B.C. 890². Here we find already a carefully developed system, of orthography and punctuation, which contrasts favourably with those of Phoenician inscriptions of later date by several centuries. Final vowels are expressed by the letters 𐤀 (*i*), 𐤁 (*ū*) and 𐤂 (*ō*),

¹ Halévy, with whom Noldeke 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 Karkar (Schrader, *Keilinschr. und AT.* 2nd ed. Giessen, 1883, pp. 199, 463) the stone of Mesha dates from about 850 B.C.]

e.g. **לֵה, בְּנִיתָהּ, עָשׂוּ, בְּנִתִּי, אָבִי**; and the words are separated by a single point, which is also found in a few of the younger Phœnician inscriptions, and in Samaritan, and which we may compare with the line | of the Hīmyaritic, 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 Inscr. Semitt.*, i. pp. 22–26, and pl. iv). To the same class of alphabets as these inscriptions belong the various Phœnician monuments and coins of Tyre and Sidon, Gēbal, Cyprus, Athens, Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, Marseilles, Carthage and other parts of N. Africa, and Spain. The oldest of these date from the sixth or fifth century B.C., whilst of the youngest or Neopunic many are post-Christian. The difference between the earlier and later monuments in the form of certain letters is very marked. Observe these in particular:—

	Moab	Cyprus	Sidon
ג	𐤂		𐤁
ד	𐤃	𐤃	𐤃
ז	𐤅	𐤅	𐤅
ח	𐤆	𐤆	𐤆
ט	𐤇	𐤇	𐤇
י	𐤈	𐤈	𐤈
כ	𐤉	𐤉	𐤉
ל	𐤊	𐤊	𐤊
מ	𐤋	𐤋	𐤋
ס	𐤌	𐤌	𐤌
ק	𐤍	𐤍	𐤍
ש	𐤎	𐤎	𐤎
ת	𐤏	𐤏	𐤏

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	כ	ך	מ	מ	מ
ו	ו	ו	ע	ו	ו
ז	ז	ז	צ	ז	ז
ח	ח	ח	ק	ק	ק

Old seals and other gems, dating, say, from the seventh to the fourth century B.C., exhibit identical forms; and the same remark applies to two fragmentary inscriptions from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, discovered by M. Clermont-Ganneau and now deposited in the British Museum. This alphabet is still found, with slight modifications, upon the Maccabæe 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 מִרְבָּע. Some of the extant inscriptions of this type belong to the century preceding our era. For the first three or four centuries after Christ our materials, though not abundant, are sufficiently ample for palaeographical purposes.

The third of the Semitic alphabets is the Aramaic, our knowledge of which commences with some Assyrian weights, which go back as far as the seventh or eighth century before our era. There are also extant some gems and seals of nearly the same age. Among the inscriptions may be mentioned that recently discovered by Prof. Euting at Taimā, clearly belonging to the Persian period, say from the sixth to the fourth century B.C. A sure mark of antiquity in this, as well as in the Phœnician alphabet, is the undulating or wavy form of the letters *m* and *sk*, 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 מ מ and מ, which become at a later time מ מ and מ מ. The letter כ 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 𐤀 𐤁 , whereas later on it appears as 𐤅 𐤆 𐤇 𐤈 and the like. A peculiarity of the Aramean alphabet is that some of the letters have open heads, and thus contrast markedly with the closed heads of the Phoenician type. These are :—

	Phoen.	Aram.
𐤁	𐤀	𐤅
𐤆	𐤅 𐤆	𐤆 𐤇
𐤇	𐤇	𐤈
𐤈	𐤈	𐤉

To this class belong the Egyptian-Aramaic alphabet, the Nabathean (including the Sinaitic inscriptions), and the Syriac Eṣṭrangḫlā with all its more modern developments, comprising the Mandaic on the one hand and the Kūfic and Naskhī Arabic on the other. The character of the 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 Wetstein (*Reisebericht*, Berl. 1860) more by De Vogüé in his *Syrie Centrale, Inscr. Sem.* (4^o 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 (Θαμουδηνολ); 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."]]

CHAPTER IV.

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

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

I. We commence then with the gutturals, which are in Syriac and Hebrew four in number, א, ה, ח, and ע. In Arabic and Ethiopic ח has two representatives, ح and ه; 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. *g*/*h*) in several proper names; e.g. עֵזְרָא, Γάζα, غَزَّة; עֲמֹרָה, Γομόρρα; צֹעַר, Ζόγορα and Σηγώρ, زَعْر. Further, Χοδολλογομορ = עֲמֹרָה, corres-

ponding with an Elamitic *Kudur-Lagamar* (a name formed like *Kudur-Mabūg* and *Kudur-nahundi* or *Kudur-nanḥundi*); and Γαῖδαδ for עִירָד, Gensis iv. 18, where the Massoretic text has (probably incorrectly) עִירָד. On the contrary, ע is indicated in Greek merely by the *spiritus asper*, and even more frequently the *spiritus lenis*, with a vowel; or in the middle and at the end of a word by a vowel alone; as 'Ηλι, 'עלי; 'Εβραῖος, עֵבְרִי; 'Αμαλήκ, עֲמָלִיק; Συμεών, שִׁמְעוֹן; Φαραώ, פִּרְעוֹה; Γελβουέ, גִּלְבַּע. It is not so easy to prove the existence of ע as distinct from ח in Hebrew, because the Greeks had no precise equivalent for either sound, and expressed them by κ, χ and the soft breathing indifferently. Thus the name of the river חֲבֹר is in one place Χαβώρας, الْحَبَّار, and in another 'Αβώρας ['Αβόρρας, etc.]; חָרָן, 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 ח and ע once existed in Hebrew and Aramaic. Compare חֲבַל *bind*, حَبَلَ, with חָבַל *act wickedly*, خَبَلَ *be corrupted, unsound, mad*; חָפַר *dig*, حَفَرَ, with חִפֵּר *be ashamed, bashful, unsound, mad*; חָפַר *dig*, حَفَرَ, with חָלַל *be ashamed, bashful, unsound, mad*; חָלַל *profane, desecrate*, حَلَّ, حَلَّ, with חָלַל *bore, wound*, خَلَّ¹.

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 hebraisch-aram. Wörterbuchs zum A T.* (Leipz. 1886) p. 173 sq.]

write either with or without **ا**, according to circumstances:
ا ا ا, **ا ا ا**. This sign is nothing but the letter **ع** written small,
 to show that the *alif* is to be pronounced somewhat like an **ع**;
 which is also indicated by the name *hamza*, i.e. "compression,"
 viz. of the upper part of the windpipe. In this way the Arabs
 readily distinguish the consonant **ا** 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 *Mappik*; e.g. **וַיְבִיאוּ** Gen. xliii.
 26, Ezra viii. 18; **תְּבִיאוּ** Lev. xxiii. 17; **לֹא רָאוּ** Job xxxiii. 21;
 but in some MSS., e.g. the codex Reuchlin, it is quite common.

ا, as a consonant, may be found in Arabic and Hebrew
 at the beginning or the end of a syllable, and that either at
 the beginning, middle or end of a word: **مَسَالَة**, **سَال**; **أَم**, **أَلَف**;
سُول, **ذُنْب**, **رَأْس**, **يَأْلَف**; **بِرٌّ**, **شَيْءٌ**, **سَوْءٌ**. Compare in Hebrew,
יִרְאָה, **מִשְׁאָלָה**, **נִשְׂאָל**; **אָמֵן**, **אָמִי**, **אָמַר**
 cases as **וַיֹּאמֶר** Prov. xv. 9 (where others read **וַיִּתְּנֶה**);
 Gen. xli. 29; **וַיִּשְׁמַע** Hosea xiii. 1; **תִּשְׁמַע** Hosea xiv. 1;
מִתְפַּלֵּל Jerem. ii. 31.—At the beginning of a syllable in the
 middle of a word, if the preceding consonant have no vowel,
ا is apt to be elided in Arabic, and its vowel transferred to the
 preceding consonant; e.g. **مَلَأَ** *mal'ak* becomes **مَلَكَ** *malak*;
يَرِي (**يَرَاة**) becomes **يَرِي** **شَمَال** becomes **شَمَال**. Compare
 in Hebrew **מִלְאָךְ**, but **מִלְאָכָה** for **מִלְאָכָה**; **לְקִרְאָתִי** for
לְקִרְאָתִי, **שְׂמַאל** for **שְׂמַאל**, and that for **שְׂמַאל**. This
 is still more common in Aramaic; e.g. **מְלָאֲךָ** for **מְלָאֲךָ**, and

with entire disappearance of the א, ^{הממלל} for ^{הממלל}.—At the end of a syllable in the middle of a word א is very apt to pass into a vowel-letter, and to be brought into conformity with the preceding vowel. Thus ^{ראס} *ra's^u* becomes ^{ראס} *rās*; ^{דלוב} *dlu'b^u* becomes ^{דלוב} *dhīb*; ^{סול} *su'l^u* becomes ^{סול} *sal*. The usual spelling ^{דלוב}, ^{סול}, is a compromise in writing between the ancient and the modern forms (^{דלוב} : ^{סול}).

Hebrew, Syriac, and Assyrian, took nearly the same course. An original ^{ראש} first became ^{ראש} *rāsh* in Hebrew, as in the actual plural ^{ראשים}, and then ^{ראש} *rōsh*. We should have expected this form to be written ^{ראש}, but here the spelling has lagged behind the pronunciation, and the א remains as a vestige of the original form. So also ^{זאן} *zān^u*, “sheep,” Hebrew originally ^{צאן}, then ^{צאן}, and finally ^{צאן} *ṣōn*. The corresponding Aramaic forms are ^{ראש}, ^{ראש}, for ^{ראש}, and ^{ען}, ^{ען} for ^{ען}. In Assyrian I find cited such forms as *rāshu* or *rīshu*, *ṣēnu* or *ṣīnu*.—Initial א is often dropped at the beginning of words, when pronounced with a short vowel; e.g. ^{נחנח} for ^{נחנח}; ^{נחנח} for ^{נחנח}; ^{נחנח} for ^{נחנח} (Heb. ^{נחנח}, ^{נחנח}); ^{נחנח} for ^{נחנח} (Assyr. *nāshu*); ^{נחנח} = ^{נחנח}; ^{נחנח} = ^{נחנח}; ^{נחנח} = ^{נחנח}, but plur. ^{נחנח}; ^{נחנח} *kinsman*, from ^{נחנח}, ^{נחנח}. Similarly in vulgar Arabic, ^{حد} for ^{أحد}, ^{كل} for ^{أكل}, ^{حد} for ^{أحد}. *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. ^{نورع} for ^{نورع}; ^{نورع} for ^{نورع}; ^{نورع} for ^{نورع} (Eth. ^{ṯmālēm}, ^{ṯmālēm}); ^{نورع} for ^{نورع} (Eth. ^{ṯmālēm}, ^{ṯmālēm}).

اقْتَنُم, صَنَمَكَا; [مَخْمَكَا], σπόγγος; [مَخْمَكَا], σχήμα; [مَخْمَكَا],
 στολή; اسْطُول, اسْطُول, 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 سَوَّ saū^{un} is vulgarly pro-
 nounced sau سَو, Heb. שָׁי shai^{un}; שָׁי shai^{un} is vulgarly pronounced
 shai שַׁי: compare in Heb. גַּי, גַּי, constr. גַּי, גַּי, with
 suff. גַּי. In some of these cases, assimilation of the א to
 the previous sound formed the intermediate stage. For example,
 nabī^{un} nabī^{un} became first nabīyūn¹, and then nabī, nabī. Hence, whilst the Hebrew holds fast נבִיא (though with silent א),
 pl. נבִיאים, the Aramaic emphatic is נבִיא, נבִיא, with double
 y, for נבִיא, נבִיא. When preceded by a short vowel, the
 consonant *alif* is usually vocalised after the loss of its own
 proper vowel; e.g. קרא, قَرَأَ; مَلَأَ, مَلَأَ; مَلَأَ, مَلَأَ; طَمِئَ, طَمِئَ.
 —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 مَلَأَ for مَلَأَ, مَلَأَ, مَلَأَ; مَلَأَ for مَلَأَ, مَلَأَ, مَلَأَ;
 أَلِفَ for أَلِفَ; أَلِفَ for أَلِفَ. In the middle of a word
 it may preserve its consonant power, especially when originally
 doubled, as مَلَأَ; but at the end of a word forms like مَلَأَ,
 are very rare. In some cases assimilation takes place, especially
 in the Ettafal of the verb, as أَلِفَ for أَلِفَ, أَلِفَ;
 أَلِفَ for أَلِفَ. Similarly أَلِفَ, أَلِفَ; أَلِفَ, أَلِفَ;
 (from أَلِفَ).

¹ [Apparently a loanword from the Hebrew, through the Aramaic, in which the *hamza* was already lost: Nöldeke, *Gesch. des Qorāns*, p. 1; Guidi, *Sede*, p. 36; Fränkel, *Fremdwort*, 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. אֵל = הָ = אֵל; הָיָה = הָיָה; ([but conversely] אֶתְלָהּ for הָיָה; אֶתְלָהּ = אֶתְלָהּ (where Syriac also אֶתְלָהּ); אֶתְלָהּ = אֶתְלָהּ. אֶתְלָהּ, אֶתְלָהּ, in passives and reflexives = אֶתְלָהּ.

In Arabic, especially in the vulgar dialects, ا may interchange with و, as اأخذ for واأخذ, اأكل for واأكل, widn for أدن, wilf for ألف; رأس for رؤاس; tarwīs, “introductory formula,” for رأس, and the verb راس for رأس. Very rarely does it interchange with ي, as in yasīr for أسير, malyān for ملان. Parallels to this latter permutation in Syriac are אֶתְלָהּ = אֶתְלָהּ; אֶתְלָהּ = אֶתְלָהּ.

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 הָרָה *bow down*, חָרָה (with ח) חָרָה. Also with ו; e.g. נור and נהר *be bright, shine, burn*; בוש and חטל, *be ashamed*; רון and רון, *run*; דהר and דור, [perhaps also] כון and כהן, whence כהן and חָרָה.—On a substitution of ה for a primitive initial ש, I shall say something when we come to that letter.

3. Hebrew and Syriac ח we ought properly to distinguish, according to the Arabic and Assyrian, into ח and خ; as חָרָשׁ *cut, plough*, חָרָשׁ, חָרָשׁ *be deaf and dumb*, חָרָשׁ. —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

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

It would appear from this short survey of the gutturals, that they were exceedingly apt in the younger Semitic dialects to be confused with one another, and to disappear altogether. In Ethiopic MSS. there is usually no distinction observed between U, ח, ז, on the one side and א, O, on the other; modern Amharic pronounces them all as א at the beginning of a word, and slurs them over in the middle or at the end. Similar is the case of the Samaritan. In modern Syriac ס is very feeble, and ט scarcely heard at all; and in Mandaitic there is absolutely no distinction between א, ע, on the one hand and ה, ח, on the other. The Talmūd too writes א for ע and ה for ח in not a few words; e.g. א (with following *daghesch*) for עַל; אָבָא (not אַבָא) *wood*, for עָבָא, חָבָא; גָּבָהּ, חָבָא for עֲזָל, עֲזָל *spin*; אֲנָקָא = עֲנָק *neck*; אֲרָבָא *willow*, עֲרָבִים, גֵּרְבָל, חֲבָלָא *sieve*, גֵּרְבָל (cribrum, cribellum¹); חֲבָלָא *sieve*, חֲבָלָא *sieve*; חֲבָלָא *sieve*, חֲבָלָא *sieve*. It is related that the Babylonian rabbi Haiyā was held guilty of blasphemy for pronouncing, in Isaiah viii. 17, חֲבָתִי לִיהוָה חֲבָתִי פָנָיו with ח instead of חֲבָתִי with ח. 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,” *mūša’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,” *ārību*, “raven.”

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

² [TB. Meg. 24 b.]

جَدَفَ, and جَلَبَ, *be angry*; جَلَبَة and غَلَبَة, *outcry*; جَدَفَ and غَدَفَ (dial.), *row*¹.

1. ج is hard in Hebrew, Aramaic, Assyrian, and Ethiopic, like our *g* in *go, give, get*; in Arabic its sound varies, for the Syrians pronounce it soft, like *g* in *gem*, whereas in Egypt and parts of Arabia the hard sound is retained, جَبَل, رَجُل. The Hebrew and 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 ج to represent غ. Modern Syriac gives unaspirated ܝܝ the sound of *dy* or *j* in a few roots, such as ܕܝܢܝܐ *dyāniū* or *jāniū* (ܕܝܢܝܐ) “steal, carry off”; ܕܝܡܠܐ *dyūmla* or *jūmla*, “camel.” In a very few cases the Arabic soft *g* has been still further softened into *sh*; e.g., in Egypt the word *wishsh*, “face,” apparently = وَجَه. Similarly the old grammarian al-G’awālīkī mentions تَشْتَر as a faulty pronunciation of تَجْتَر, “it chews the cud.”

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

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

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

ك is also softened dialectically into a sound like that of *ts* or *tsh*, sometimes of *dj* or *ǧ*; as كَاتِب *t^{sh}ātīb* or *tātīb*, حَكِيم *haǧīm*, كَامِل *ǧāmil*.—In some Amharic words the old Ethiopic *k* has been aspirated, *kh*, and finally becomes *h*, e.g. *hōna*, “to become,” for *kōna*, كَان; *hūlū*, “all,” for *kwēllū*, كَلَّ. Perhaps this may help us to connect such a form as Ar. أَيَا, *īyā*, with Eth. ከያ, *kīyā*.

3. *ḡ* 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 *č*; e.g. قَبْلَه *dshiblē* or *dziblē*, قَرِيب *dzarīb*, عَقِيل *adzīl*, قَائِد *čā'id*, سِرْقَه *sirčā*. 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 *Maǧdalā*, ጠጋዕላ, *tagābbala* for *taǧābbala*. In parts of Syria and Egypt, on the other hand, as well as in Amharic, *ḡ* is apt to be converted into ḡ. A Syrian Christian says 'ult, 'a'ūl, for قُلْتُ, أَقُول; and a native of Shoa pronounces *ta'ābbala* instead of *tagābbala* or *taǧābbala*. The Egyptian railway station Zagazig is written زَغَازِيق *Zaǧāzīq*, pronounced either *Zagāzīg* or *Za'āzī'*; the word *ḡaḡīqī* حَقِيقِي becomes *ḡa'ī'ī*.

III. We next come to the dentals *ḡ, ḡ, ḡ*, which are common to all the old languages: e.g. > ت >

دَب, ḡ-ḡ: Ass. <i>dubbu</i> ,	ḡ,	دَب;
يد, ḡ-ḡ: Ass. <i>idu</i> (power),	ḡ,	دَب;
تَحَت, ḡḡḡ:	تَحَت,	دَب;
تيس, ḡḡ:	تيس,	دَب;

אָתָן,	Ass. <i>atānu</i> ,	אָתָן, אָתָן;
טָל, מל:		טָל, מל;
טָעַם, טָעַם:		טָעַם, טָעַם;
חָטִי, חָטִי:	Ass. <i>ikhti</i> ,	חָטִי, חָטִי.

Of these, ת and ט interchange freely, as קָטַל, סָמָל, but מָלַח, טָעַי; חָטַם and קָטַם; חָטַם and קָטַם; חָטַם and קָטַם; חָטַם and קָטַם. In modern Syriac מָלַח for חָטַח. ט often interchanges with ת, as in the Hebrew radicals תור and דור, Arabic تَار and دَار; חָטַם and חָטַם; חָטַם and חָטַם; חָטַם and חָטַם. More rarely does ט interchange with ת, as חָטַם and חָטַם; חָטַם and חָטַם; חָטַם and חָטַם. Of a possible interchange of ת with ט, 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 אָתָן, "to come," e.g., particip. חָבָא and חָבָא (*tyā, ityā*), for אָתָן and אָתָן; imper. חָבָא (*tyā*) for אָתָן (*ā*).

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

very little difference is perceptible between them, particularly at the end of words. For instance, the particle *bit*, which forms the future tense (ܒܝܬ) is a contraction for ܒܝܬ, but usually written ܒܝܬ; the imperative of ܠܥܠܡ, "to do," is written and pronounced ܠܥܠܡ *vut*, for ܠܥܠܡ; ܡܢܝܬ ܡܢܝܬ is pronounced nearly as *minnit ishō*; the old Syriac ܡܢܝܬ ܡܢܝܬ is pronounced and actually written ܡܢܝܬ ܡܢܝܬ.—Lastly, I may mention that the hard ܬ and ܕ 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 ܢܒܪܬ: *nabarāt* "she sat," compare Spanish *ser*, for *scer*, *sedcre*); ܥܝ for ܥܕ: *ēd* "hand," ܡܠܕ: *wallādī* "father."

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

Besides the simple dentals ܬ *t*, ܕ *d*, ܬ *t*, the old Arabic possesses a series of aspirated or lisped dentals, ܬ *th*, ܕ *dh*, ܬ *th*. 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. ܢܒܪ ܢܒܪ *break*, ܡܠܕ ܡܠܕ *plough*, ܡܠܕ ܡܠܕ *plough*, ܡܠܕ ܡܠܕ *plough*, ܡܠܕ ܡܠܕ *plough*. The other Semites took a different course, modifying the lisped letter into a sibilant. In Phœnician and Hebrew

ث became *sh*, in Ethiopic and Assyrian ⁵ث *s*¹; e.g. ⁵שׁוּר, ⁵שׁוּר; ⁵חָל: Ass. *sūr*; ⁵תָּקַל, ⁵תָּקַל, ⁵חָפַח: (*hang up*), Ass. *isḫul* (*hang up*, weigh); ⁵תֹּמַר *garlic*, ⁵תֹּמַר, ⁵חָמַם: Ass. *sūmu*; ⁵חָרַשׁ, ⁵חָרַשׁ, ⁵חָרַשׁ; ⁵תֹּמַר, ⁵חָמַם: (*abundant crop*). Similarly ⁵ז became in all these languages *z*; e.g. ⁵זֶבֶע, ⁵זֶבֶע, ⁵זֶבֶע: Ass. *zēbu* (for *zibḫu*); ⁵אֲזַן, ⁵אֲזַן: Ass. *uznu*; ⁵אָחַז, ⁵אָחַז, ⁵אָחַז: Finally, ⁵ז appears in the other languages as *z*, *z*; e.g. ⁵זָלְמוּת, ⁵זָלְמוּת: Ass. *šalmu*, “dark”; ⁵זָל, ⁵זָל, ⁵זָל: Ass. *šillu* and *šalūlu*; ⁵זָפַר, ⁵זָפַר, ⁵זָפַר: Ass. *šupru*; ⁵נָזַר, ⁵נָזַר, ⁵נָזַר: Of course, as every rule has its exceptions, these series are occasionally liable to disturbances. For instance ⁵תָּאָא *cucumber*, ⁵תָּאָא: קִשְׁשָׁאִים, Ass. *kissī*, ought by rule to be in Aramaic ⁵קִשְׁשָׁאִים; but the actual form is ⁵קִשְׁשָׁאִים, ⁵קִשְׁשָׁאִים, the proximity of ⁵ק 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 ⁵וִי for ⁵וִי, ⁵וִי and its fem. ⁵וִי for ⁵וִי and ⁵וִי; 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 ⁵הַאִיּוֹן, fem. ⁵הַאִיּוֹן (but ⁵הַאִיּוֹן *this is*, and occasionally ⁵הַאִיּוֹן); ⁵הַאִיּוֹן = ⁵הַאִיּוֹן *then*; ⁵הַאִיּוֹן, as well as ⁵הַאִיּוֹן, *how?* but also a few other words, as ⁵זַכְרָא or ⁵זַכְרָא, *male*, ⁵זַכְרָא or ⁵זַכְרָא, *offering* (but ⁵זַכְרָא *offerer*, ⁵מַאדְבָהָא *altar*), ⁵זַכְרָא *beard*, and very strangely ⁵זַכְרָא as well as ⁵זַכְרָא, *palm tree*, and ⁵זַכְרָא as well as ⁵זַכְרָא, *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 ⁵שׁ = ⁵שׁ 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. ^{تور} *tōr*, "ox," ^{كتير} *ketīr*, ^{اتنين} *itnēn*, ^{شحات} "beggar." More rarely it advances the *th* to a sibilant, *s*, as *sibit* = ^{ثبت} *bāḥis* = ^{باحث} (argue, dispute), *khabbās* = ^{خبث} (scoundrel). The word ^{حديث} 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 ^{تبر} = ^{تبر} *repent*¹ = ^{تاب} *return*. Similarly lisped ^ذ seems to become in modern Arabic either *d* or *z*; e.g. *dīb* = ^{ذئب} *dahab* = ^{ذهب} *adān* = ^{أذن} *kidb* and *kizb* = ^{كذب} *izn* = ^{أذن} *ziker* = ^{ذكر} (recitation), *zamb* = ^{ذنب}. In like manner ^ظ is pronounced either *d* (ض) or *z*, e.g. *ʿadm* = ^{عظم} *dill* = ^{ظل} *dalma* = ^{ظلمة} *zulm* = ^{ظلم} *ḍuhr* = ^{ظهر} *zahr* = ^{ظهر} *ḥifz* = ^{حفظ}².

IV. The sibilants next engage our attention, viz. ^ז, ^ד, ^ש (^ש, ^ש), and ^ז.

1. Pure *z* ^ז runs through all the Semitic languages, as ^{زرע}, ^{זרע}, ^{זרע}, Ass. *zēru* or *ztru*, "seed"; ^{עזר}, ^{עזר}, ^{עזר}, Ass. *izzu*, "strong." But Eth. ^ዘ, Heb. ^ז, and Ass. *z*, often correspond, as we have seen above, to Arab. ^ذ and Aram. ^ז; as ^{זאב}, *zību*, ^{חיה}: *hyaena*, ^{זאב}.

¹ [In this sense and form the word is a loanword from the Aramaic ^{ܕܚܝܬܐ} see Frankel, *Lehmann*. p. 83.]

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

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

שָׁבַע	سَجَدَ	הָלַל:	סָגַד
שָׁמַר	أَسْرَ	הָלַל:	אָסַר

but there are exceptions [perhaps merely graphical], as

שְׁתָּה, שְׁתָּה [for שְׁתָּה] but שְׁתָּה, שְׁתָּה.

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

(1)	שָׁבַע	שָׁבַע	שָׁבַע	
	שָׁבַע	שָׁבַע	שָׁבַע	Assyr. <i>šību</i> (grey-haired)
	שָׁמַל	שָׁמַל	שָׁמַל	„ <i>šumēlu</i> (-īlu)
	שָׁנָה	שָׁנָה	שָׁנָה	
	שָׁרִיד	שָׁרִיד	שָׁרִיד	
	שָׁרִשׁ	שָׁרִשׁ	שָׁרִשׁ	„ <i>irsu, ēršu</i>
(2)	שָׁבַח	שָׁבַח	שָׁבַח	
	שָׁבַח	שָׁבַח	שָׁבַח	הָלַל:
	שָׁבַע	שָׁבַע	שָׁבַע	הָלַל:
	שָׁבַח	שָׁבַח	שָׁבַח	

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

לָשׁוֹן לִשָּׁן אֲרָא: Assy. *lišānu*

רֹאשׁ רֵשׁ רֵשׁ רֵשׁ אֲרָא: „ *rēšu, rišu*

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

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

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

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

שָׁלַג שָׁלַג שָׁלַג *šalgu*

שָׁרַח שָׁרַח שָׁרַח אֲרָא:

שָׁדַח שָׁדַח שָׁדַח אֲרָא: *u'addiš*

ש and ש, as well as ש, may occasionally interchange with ש, e.g. שָׁחַק, Eth. ሠጠቀ: or ሠጠቀ:, שָׁחַק, שָׁחַק, שָׁחַק, Eth. ሠጠቀ: (womb), Talm. שָׁחַק and שָׁחַק (fat of the intestines), Mand. שָׁחַק, שָׁחַק, שָׁחַק, ሠጠቀ:; ሠጠቀ:.

ש is frequently changed into ש under the influence of a following ש, and in Arabic of a ص or ر; as صَخْر, صَخْر, صَخْر, صَخْر; especially in foreign words with *sz*, as אֲשַׁר or אֲשַׁר.

Very curious is the change in Assyrian of š into l before a dental; e.g. *alšur* or *aštur* (שָׁטַר), *maštītu* or *maltītu* (drink, שָׁתַה), *khamišti* or *khamilti* (five, חָמֵשׁ), *lubuštu* or *lubultu* (dress, לָבַשׁ). It appears, however, to be thoroughly well established.

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

the verbal form **מָנַל**, Heb. **הַפְעִיל**, Ar. **أَفْعَلَ**, Aram. **أَفْعَل**; and in the pronouns of the 3rd pers., Ass. *šū*, f. *ši*, pl. *šunu*, f. *šina*; in the suffix forms *šū*, *ša*, pl. *šunu*, *šina*. The Hīmyaritic offers us a suffix form **שׁוּ**, pl. **שִׁם**, as well as **הוּ**, pl. **המוּ**. The other Semitic languages have all the *h*-form, except the modern Mehri, which has, according to von Maltzan¹, masc. *he*, f. *sē*, pl. *hēm*, f. *sēn*; as suffixes *he*, f. *es*, pl. *hum*, f. *senu*. Such cases as **סָלַק**, **הִלָּךְ**, **הִלַּךְ**, are very rare, and may either be accidental or capable of some other explanation.

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

צָבִי	Assyr. <i>ṣabītu</i> ,	ظَبِي	مُحَا
צָדְרִים		ظُحْر	مُסְדָּן
צָעַן <i>migrate</i> (Is. 33. 20)	}	ظَعَنَ	مָحַ
בָּצַעַן <i>load</i>		<i>travel</i>	<i>load carry.</i>

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

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

צָד	صَاد	<i>iṣūd</i>	ṣ?
אֶצְבַּע	أَصْبَحَ	ḥḥḥḥḥ : <i>ṣumbu</i> (for <i>ṣubbu</i> = <i>ṣub'u</i>)	ṣḥḥḥ
בְּצָלִים	بَصَلَ	ḥḥḥ :	ṣḥḥḥ
נִצָּב	نَصَبَ		ṣḥḥ

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

צָרָה , צָר	ضَرَّة	θḥ :	ḥḥḥḥ
צָמַר		θḥḥ :	ḥḥḥḥ

¹ [ZDMG., vol. xxv. (1871) p. 200 sq.]

צָק	צָק		חַס
צָנָן	צָנָן	<i>ṣēnu, ṣīnu</i>	חָנָן
	צָרָס	ⲪⲘⲏ :	חָרַס
רָצִין	רָצִין		רָצִין
פָּצִין	פָּצִין		פָּצִין
יָצָא		ⲪⲘⲏ : <i>āṣē</i> ("he escaped") part. <i>āṣū</i>	יָצָא
רָצִי	רָצִי		רָצִי ("satisfied")
בִּיצָה	בִּיצָה	<i>bīṣu</i>	בִּיצָה
אַרְצִין	אַרְצִין	<i>irṣitu</i> (<i>ēr-</i>)	אַרְצִין

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

צָלַע	צָלַע	<i>ṣilu</i> (for <i>ṣillu, ṣil'u</i>)	עָלַע	לָלַע
יָיִ הַצָּלַעִים	צָלַע		אָפַע (אָפָא)	אָפַע
	עָרַע		עָרַע	יָרַע
	זָעַע			אָזַע
צָפַרְדֵּעַ	צָפַרְדֵּעַ		עָרְדַּע	אָזְדַּע
עֵץ	עֵץ	Assyr. <i>iṣṣu</i>		אָע

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

צָמַד	צָמַד	ⲪⲘⲏ :	רָמַד
נָפַץ	נָפַץ	ⲪⲘⲏ : "to be scattered, flee" (with <i>ṣ</i> , not <i>ṣ</i>)	נָפַץ

רָצַץ		רִץ
		חָצוּץ
עָרַץ		חָצַם
גְּמָץ		רָדַף
זָרַע	Assyr. <i>siru</i>	רָדַף
זָרַק		סָפַץ and סָפַל
חָמַץ		חָטְאָהוּ
صَرَفَ } صَيَّرَ }	with ص, not ر	مَكَّنْهُنَا صَدَّقْنَاهُنَّ

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 אֶרְקָא for אֶרְעָא (Jerem. x. 11), Mand. אַקנָא for עֶנָא, אַקאמְרָא for עֶמְרָא. Occasionally the same thing happens in the case of a simple ע, as עֶפְרָא, עֶפְרָא, Mand. אַפְרָא, but also אַקאפְרָא, and even אַנאפְרָא. At other times a ל appears upon the scene; e.g. صَغَطَ "to press, squeeze," اَلْحَدَّ *be oppressed*, instead of اَلْحَدَّ; ضَاكَّ, Syriac ܐܬܬܕܝܟ, Talm. גִּחִיךְ, for אִסְרִי. 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. אִחִיךְ (not Afel), עֵהכִית, "I laughed"; but also חִיךְ (חִיךְ), and even רִחִיךְ. Something similar occurs in Syriac with the word اَلْحَفَّ, whence are formed the secondary radicals اَلْحَفَّ and اَلْحَفَّ.

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

² [See however Frankel, *Fremdwort.*, 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," **صَفَر**, whence
צַפּוֹר, **צִפּוֹר**, **צַפֵּר**, **צִפֵּר**, **צַפֵּר**, **צִפֵּר**, Ass. *isṣūr* (for *iṣpūr*).
- (2) **צפר** "turn, return, twine, twist," **ضَفَر**, 𐤌𐤓: whence
צִפְרָה "turn, crown or garland."
- (3) **צפר** "leap, spring," **ضَفَر**, whence
צַפִּיר "he goat," **צִפְרָא**, **צִפּוֹ**.
- (4) **צפר**, **ظفر**, whence
צַפְרָן "nail," **ظَفَر**, 𐤌𐤓: Ass. *ṣupru*, **צִפּוֹ**.

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

- (5) **צַפְרָא**, **צִפּוֹ**, "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*: **פְּרוֹזֵל**, **פְּרוֹל**, Ass. *parzillu*, Ar. **فِرْزَل** *fetter*, *forceps*¹.

פְּרוֹל, **פְּרוֹל**, **פְּרוֹל**

פְּרוֹל, **פְּרוֹל**, **פְּרוֹל**

פְּרוֹל, **פְּרוֹל**

פְּרוֹל, **פְּרוֹל**

Particularly when the letter **ת** follows; as **פְּרוֹל** or **פְּרוֹל**,

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

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

زَفَتْ "pitch"¹; حֶחֶלְאָ for חֶחֶלְאָ; even when a vowel intervenes, as Mand. פֶּת for פֶּת, פֶּתוּלָא for פֶּתוּלָא.

2. *b* and *m*: מֶכֶן, בֶּחֶן.

אֶחָא: זִמָּן or זִמָּן, זִמָּן.

The Arab grammarians mention such cases as مَكَّة for مَكَّة, مَا أَسَمَك for مَا أَسَمَك; and the like. In Himyaritic בִּן stands for מִן, *who*, and בִּן for מִן, *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 ጸ *p* and ፒ *p* (or *ps*) are in native words usually modifications of an original *b*, sometimes of an *f*.

(1) חֶחֶלְאָ, חֶחֶלְאָ; יִבְכֶּה, יִבְכֶּה;

חֶחֶלְאָ: חֶחֶלְאָ; יִבְכֶּה, יִבְכֶּה;

(2) חֶחֶלְאָ, חֶחֶלְאָ;

חֶחֶלְאָ: חֶחֶלְאָ; יִבְכֶּה, יִבְכֶּה;

In modern Syriac, I may remark, *f* is generally hardened into *p*, as מַלְפָּנָא *malpānā* for מַלְפָּנָא. 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 *argamānu* or *argavānu*, "purple," Heb. אֶרְגָּמָן, Aram. אֶרְגָּמָן; *surmēnu* or *survēnu*, "a sort of cypress," Aram. שׁוּרְבִינָא, modern Arabic شَرْبِين; *arakh-šamnu* (*samnu*), "eighth month,"

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

or *šavnu* (*savnu*), Heb. מֶרְחָשׁוֹן. 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* (ו, ʋ). Examples of this are comparatively rare in the older dialects; e.g. חֶמְבָּל, כּוֹבָב, חֶמְבָּל, for כּוֹבָב; רִבְרִבִּין, רִבְרִבָּא, for רִבְרִבָּא, רִבְרִבָּא, רִבְרִבָּא, but Hiph. הוֹשִׁיט, אֶסְפֵּה, but Hiph. הוֹשִׁיט, אֶסְפֵּה. 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 ሰብላ: *sab'ä*; ነገረ: *navdra* and ነገረ: *nōra* (for *navra*, *naura*). But especially is it common in modern Syriac, where aspirated *b* is constantly treated as = ʋ, *w*, and often wholly disappears; e.g. ܐܝܢܐ *ʾēnā*, "time"; ܓܘܪܐ *gōrā*, "husband"; ܕܝܬܫܐ *dītshā*, "honey"; ܬܝܢܐ *tiñnā*, "straw"; ܡܠܐ for ܡܠܐ, *khulā*, "debt"; ܡܠܐ for ܡܠܐ, *khūyā*, "darkness"; ܡܠܐ for ܡܠܐ, *shūk*, "let alone," "pardon." The same remarks apply to *f*, in the few cases in which it is not hardened into *p*; e.g. ܢܫܐ *nōshā*, for ܢܫܐ; ܪܫܐ *rūshā*, "winnowing shovel," for ܪܫܐ.

A curious change in Arabic is that of ث *th* into *f*; e.g. ثُمَّ, "then," ثوم, "garlic," ثَرَج, "interstice" (between the crosshandles of a bucket), فَرَج, فَدَم, فَدَم, "stuttering, stammering"; فِدَام, فِدَام, "a cloth used as a strainer"; عَافُور, عَافُور, "calamity"; مَغْفُور and مَغْفُور, "sweet sap" or "gum" issuing from certain plants; جَدَف, جَدَف, "a tomb" (connected with جَدَف, "a stook"). Compare the substitution of *f* in Russian for the Greek *θ*; e.g. *Feodor* for *Theodore*, *Afinui* for *Athens*, 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. يَقْتُلْنَ, يَقْتُلْنَ; Heb. יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ; Syr. تَهْكُ, تَهْكُ; but in vulgar Arabic, and more commonly in Hebrew, יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ; and in Ethiopic, ይቃታሉ : ይቃታሉ :: So also in Assyrian we find the termination *ānu* or *āni*, as well as the shorter *ā*.

(4) In various other instances. For example, ם in the 2nd pers. plural perf. of the verb; קִטְּלוּהוּ compared with קִטְּלוּהֶם, vulg. Arab. قَتَلْتُوا for قَتَلْتُمْ. Again, Talmud. קָאִי or קָא, for מִיָּדִי; תִּיקוּם, נִיקוּם, תִּיקוּ or נִיקוּ; קָאִים, קָאִים; מִדְּעָם, מִדְּעָם, Mand. מִנְדָּא and מִנְדָּא.—ן in such Hebrew words as מְגִדּוֹן and מְגִדּוֹן; שְׂלִיָּה and שְׂלִיָּה for שְׂלִיָּוֹן, גִּלּוֹן, as proved by the adjectives שְׂלִיָּנִי, שְׂלִיָּנִי, etc. Much more frequently in the later dialects; as Talm. הָלִין for הָלִין, הָלִין for הָלִין, as Talm. הָלִין for הָלִין; מְאִדִּין and הָאִדִּין for מְאִי and הָאִי; וְסָכָה נִהְדּוֹן בִּיה for נִהְדּוּבִיה; אִמְאָרְתוֹן לִי for אִמְאָרְתוֹלִי; דְּאִינִין לְהוֹן (נִסְבֵּךְ חֶסֶד).

Initial *n*, when pronounced with the shortest vowel, is liable to be dropped in Hebrew and Aramaic, particularly in the imperative of verbs פֹּן (פֹּן, פֹּן, פֹּן), of which more hereafter. Initial *m* too, according to some scholars, is occasionally rejected in Hebrew, in the participle Pu'al, לָקַח, לָקַח; whence we can explain the modern Syriac form ܠܩܚܐ as standing for ܠܩܚܐ.

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

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.

וָלַד	ⲓⲗⲁ:	יָלַד	יָלִיד	ܝܠܝܕܐ
וָהֵב	ⲓⲗⲁ:	יָהֵב	יָהִב, יָב	ܝܠܝܕܐ and ܝܠܝܕܐ
וָיִן	ⲓⲗⲁ:	יָיִן		
וָגֵר		יָגֵר		
	ⲓⲗⲁ:	יָגֵר		ܝܠܝܕܐ

The original initial *w* rarely appears in Hebrew and Aramaic as וָלַד or וָלֵד (if correct); [post-Biblical] וָדִי, וָנוּחַ, וָסֵל, וָסֵל [Fpódov]; and in some cases where it has been protected by a preceding consonant, as in the Hithpa^{el} forms וָתַנּוּחַ, וָתַנּוּחַ, וָתַנּוּחַ.

The fate of the initial *y* in Aramaic is worthy of further notice. In Biblical Aramaic and some other dialects we find *y*, as יָתִיב, יָלִיד. In Syriac this letter is vocalised and becomes *ē*, written in older times אֵי, more recently *y* only, as ܝܠܝܕܐ, ܝܠܝܕܐ (whence ܝܠܝܕܐ, ܝܠܝܕܐ). Modern Syriac, however, simply drops the initial *y*; as ܝܠܝܕܐ *tiwā*, "sitting"; ܝܠܝܕܐ, "they burned." Mandaitic follows the ancient Syriac in the Pē'al form of the verb and similar cases; as ܝܠܝܕܐ = ܝܠܝܕܐ, ܝܠܝܕܐ = ܝܠܝܕܐ; but drops the *y* in the Ethpe'el, as ܝܠܝܕܐ = ܝܠܝܕܐ, ܝܠܝܕܐ = ܝܠܝܕܐ.

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

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

“hand,” Eth. $\lambda\text{ד}^{\text{ז}}$; *arkhu*, “month,” יָרַח , ܐܪܚܐ ; *asib* “he dwells, dwelling,” יָשַׁב ; *āṣū*, “going out,” יָצָא ; *ālidtu*; *ālittu*, “bearing,” יָלְדָה , ܐܠܕܬܐ ; *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 و *wu* and و *wi* into أ *u* and إ *i*; and the combination *warwā* is always modified at the beginning of a word into *ʾawā*. So in the Kōrʾān we find اَقْتَت *ʾaqtat* for وَقَتَّت ; further, اِسَاد for وَسَاد , “cushion”; اِشَاح for وَشَاح , “belt”; اَوَاصِل for وَوَاصِل , plural of وَاصِلَةٌ , “connecting link, proximate cause”; اَوَاق for وَوَاق , plural of وَاقِيَةٌ , whether in the sense of “guard” or of “ounce.” Hence we see at once the connexion, on the one hand, between اَرَخ , “to date,” and Eth. ܐܪܚܐ ; “month”; אֵצִיל “joint,” and וּסַל , where the *w* is original; and, on the other hand, between בִּלַּח and אֶלַח , “learn”; יָסַר and אָרַךְ , “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 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.	قَام	קָם	כָּמַד	for <i>ḵawama</i> ,
	שָׁמַד	שָׁם	שָׁמַד	for <i>sayama</i> ;
Imperf.	يَقُوم	יָקוּם	יָקוּמוּ	for <i>yakwumu</i> ,
	יָשִׁימוּ	יָשִׁימוּ	יָשִׁימוּ	for <i>yasyimu</i> .

Compare also מַת, מַת, מַת, for *mawita*; and טָל, for *ṭawula*, with בּוֹשׁ and אֹר, for בּוֹשׁ and אֹר. Uncontracted examples are, however, to be found; as עֹר “be blind of one eye,” נֶסוּ, רִוַח, חֹר, גִּוַע “squint,” הֵיפ “have a slender waist,” מַה; and the contraction does not take place when the 3rd radical is likewise a *w* or *y*, as רוּי, רוּה, רוּי; etc.

Medial *w* passes into *y* chiefly under the influence of an accompanying *i*, as صَمَلًا قِيَامَةً, “resurrection” (where the Arabic *i* has become a mere *shēvā* in Syriac), for قَوَامَةً. Instances like הָיָה, Aram. הָיָה, Arab. هَوِيَ, are rare. In the Hebrew Pi‘ēl and Aramaic Pa‘ēl the change is more frequent; as בָּיַת, בָּיַת, בָּיַת; but examples to the contrary are not wanting, as עָוֵר, “surround,” עָוֵר, עָוֵר, עָוֵר, עָוֵר. As the original form is the Arabic *ḵawwama*, the change perhaps began with the 2nd *w*, which passed into *y*, *ḵawyama*; this worked upon the preceding *w*, so as to cause assimilation, *ḵayyama*; and hence arose the Aramaic form *ḵayyēm*, and finally the Hebrew *ḵiyyēm*, 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 יְכַסֵּמוּ, “they cover them.” Its retention in such forms as נָשְׁלוּ, “be quiet,” is rare; for even the Arabic, which tolerates حَلَوْ, requires رَصِيَ and سَلَوْ and رَضَوْ. In נָשְׁלוּ, נָשְׁלוּ, נָשְׁלוּ, and the like, we should probably pronounce the final ן nearly as *ū*; as also in the forms with pronom. suffixes, like פִּיּוּ (פִּיּוּ), or דְּבָרָיו (דְּבָרָיו). This view derives some confirma-

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

לְשִׁבְנִיהוּ עֶבֶד עֲזִיָּהוּ i.e. לְשִׁבְנִי עֶבֶד עֲזִיָּהוּ

לְאַבְיָהוּ עֶבֶד עֲזִיָּהוּ i.e. לְאַבְיָי עֶבֶד עֲזִיָּהוּ

In the perfect of the verb the Ethiopic alone retains the distinction of the final radicals, e.g. ተለወ: *talāwa*, "follow," ለሰጠ: *bakāya*, "weep." In the other languages the *w* has been changed into *y*, and the combination *aya* contracted into *ā*. 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, *talā*, *bakā*; and hence the Aramean has ܬܠ, ܬܠܐ, with ܐ, ܐܬܐ. In Hebrew a ה is substituted for this א, תלה, בכה, תלה; but this does not warrant us in speaking of them as verbs לה. The only real verbs לה in Hebrew are such as נָתַן, תָּמַח, in Syriac ܬܡܚܐ, ܬܡܚܐ, and the like. Upon the whole subject of the weak letters, and ܝ 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. = Assy. א, Arab. ه, Eth. አ, Aram. א, י.
2. ז = z in all the languages; but also
ז = Assy. ז, Eth. ሀ, Arab. ز, Aram. ז, י.
3. ח = Aram. ח, ח, Eth. ሐ, Arab. ح, Assy. א (as *imēru*); but also
ח = Aram. ח, ח, Eth. ሐ, Arab. ح, Assy. *kh* (ḫ).

4. ' init. = *y* in all the languages except Assyrian, where it is **𐤅**; but also
 ' init. = Aram. ' , Eth. **ዐ**, Arab. **و**, Assy. **𐤅**.
5. **𐤃** = Aram. **𐤃**, **𐤆**, Eth. **ሰ**, Arab. **س**, Assy. *s* (*s/l*).
6. **𐤄** = Aram. **𐤄**, **𐤆**, Eth. **ዐ**, Arab. **ع**, Assy. **𐤅**; but also
𐤄 = Aram. **𐤄**, **𐤆**, Eth. **ዐ**, Arab. **غ**, Assy. **𐤅**.
7. **𐤅** = *ʃ* in all the languages; but also
𐤅 = Eth. **ሰ**, Arab. **ظ**, Aram. **ܥ**, **ܥ**, Assy. *ʃ*;
𐤅 = Eth. **θ**, Arab. **ض**, Aram. **𐤄**, **𐤆**, **𐤅**, Assy. *ʃ*;
𐤅 = Eth. **θ** (**ð**), Arab. **ض**, Aram. **𐤅**, **𐤆**, Assy. *ʃ*.
8. **𐤆** = Aram. **𐤆** [**𐤆'**], **𐤆**, Eth. **ሠ**, Arab. **ش**, Assy. **𐤆** (*ʃ*).
9. **𐤇** = Aram. **𐤇**, Eth. **ሰ**, Arab. **س**, Assy. **𐤆** (*ʃ*); but also
𐤇 = Eth. **ሰ**, Arab. **ث**, Aram. **ܬ**, **ܬ**, Assy. **𐤆**.

¹ [Biblical Aramaic and the oldest Aramaic monuments have **𐤆** = **𐤆'**. In Palmyrene this **𐤆** interchanges with **𐤃**, e.g. **𐤆𐤃𐤆** and **𐤃𐤆𐤆**.]

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-European¹, was at first very simple. There were only three primitive vowel-sounds, *a*, *i*, *u*, which might naturally be either short or long, thus giving rise to six vowels:

ā ā, ī ī, ū ū.

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

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

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 *ā ī ū* are capable of modification in sound, chiefly according to the nature of the consonants with which they are in juxtaposition.

In connexion with one of the gutturals, غ غ خ ح, or with the letter ر, *ā* retains its broad sound, as حَدّ *ḥadd*, خَمْر *khāmr*, لَعْب *lāb*, مَبْلَغ *mablagh*, رَبّ *rabb*, فَرَس *faras*; whilst with one of the emphatic or harsh consonants, ق ق ط ظ ض ص, it inclines to a duller, more obscure sound, somewhat like that of the broad Scotch *a* (*ā*) or the English *u* in *but*; e.g. بَقِيّ *bāḳiya*,

تَلَبّ *tālaba*, مَطَر *mātār*, ضَرَب *ḍaraba*, صَدْر *ṣadr* (*ṣu*), بَطْن *batn* (*bu*).

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

Turkish *y* or English *i* in *bird*, as عَلِم *‘elm*, سَحَر *sehr*, حَبْر *hebr*,

كَيْسَر *kyskr*, كَيْسَاة *kyssah*, طَبّ *tybb*, أَضْرَب *ydrīb*; whilst *ū* inclines to

ø, or with ح and ع to ö, as ظَفَر *ḍafr*, لَطْف *laṭofa*, لُطْف *lotf*,

حَسَن *hosn* or *hösn*, رَعَب *ro‘b*, عَمْر *ömr*, حَكِيّ *hökiya*. The same

influences operate upon the long vowels: as طَاهِر *tāḥir*, صَاحِب *ṣāḥib*,

حِيلَة *ṣahēāh*, صَاحِيح *ṣahīḥ*, نَظَّارَة *nāḍḍāra* (spectacles), وَاعِظ *wāḡib*;

طَوْر *tūr*, طِين *tīn*, كَيْلَة *kīle*.

Again, in connexion with the other consonants, whether in a shut or open syllable, *ā* takes a weaker sound, like that of the common English *ā* (in *hat*, *cap*), or it becomes *ä*, *e* (as in *Männer*, *pet*); whilst *i* and *ü* are pronounced with their natural sounds, as in *pin* and *bull*, or nearly so. E.g. كَتَبَتْ *katabta*, مَرَكَبَ *markeb*, سَمَكَ *semek*, شَمَسَ *shems*, ذَكَرَ *dhikr*, كَلَّ *kull*. The sound of *ü* was also heard dialectically in old Arabic, as شِيِدَّة *shiidda*, رِيِدَّة *riidda*, for *shüdda*, *rüdda*; سَيْقَ *sīka*, قَيْلَ *qūla*; and is found occasionally in the vulgar dialects, as *küll* for *küll*; in this latter case perhaps under the influence of the Turkish. In a short open syllable, followed by a long one, the short vowels are liable to be modified and reduced almost to the compass of the Hebrew *shēvā*; e.g. سَمِين *sēmīn*, جَلِيل *jēlīl*,

مَدِينَة *mēdīneh*, مَبَارَك *mūbārāk*, of which the first two are sometimes vocalised *sēmīn*, *jēlīl*, whilst the last is vulgarly pronounced *m'bārāk* or, with a prosthetic vowel, *ēmbārāk*. In modern dialects, e.g. that of Egypt, *a* becomes *i* even in a shut syllable, e.g. مَنْ *mīn*, for مَنْ "who?" أَسْوَدَ *aswad* for أَسْوَدَ "black," اِسْلَمَ *islama* for اِسْلَمَ "became a muslim," اِغْزَا *igza* for اِغْزَا "parts." It is also liable to be changed into *u*, under the influence of a proximate *b*, *f*, *m* or *w*, e.g. مِلْهَبَّة *mīlhabbe*, مِلْوَدَّة *mīlwedde* for مَحَبَّة *māhibba*, مَوَدَّة *mawadda*, غَوَارَ *ghawār* for جَوَارَ *jawār* female slaves; similarly, مُفْتَاح *muftāḥ* for مُفْتَح *mūftaḥ*, حُمَصَ *humṣa* for حَمَصَ *hamṣa*.

Just as *ā* was thus modified into *ä* & *ē*, so did *ā* pass into *ē* and even into *ī*. A word like خَاتَمَ or غَافَلَ suffered no change; but the weaker sound in كِتَابَ *kittāb*, رِكَابَ *rikāb*, لَاكِنَ *lākīn*, underwent a modification into *kittēb*, *rikēb*, *lēkīn*, and among the Arabs of Africa and Spain into *ī*, so that لِسَانَ *līsān* and بَابَ *bāb* became *līstn* and *bīb*. Hence the Spanish names *Jaen* and

Caniles are written by the Arabs جَيَّان and تَنَالَش. This is also the usual pronunciation in modern Maltese, as رَمَاد *r'mād*, نَزَل *nīzəl*.

The diphthongs *ay* and *aw* retain their original sound after the guttural and emphatic letters, as صَيْف *ṣayf*, خَوْف *khawf*. Otherwise they are pronounced almost like $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$; e.g. سَيْف *seif* (almost *sēf*), مَوْت *m^oot* (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 *ṭaiyib*, سَيِّد *seiyyed*, *aiwa* أَيُّوَة. Otherwise they are pronounced δ and ℓ , as *sōda* سَوْدَاء, صَيْف *ṣēf*, سَيْف *sēf*, دَيْر *dēr*, بَيْضَاء *bēḍa*, خَوْف *khōf*, قَوْس *qos*.

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

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

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

3 short vowels,	$\bar{a}$ $\bar{e}$ $\bar{i}$;
3 long vowels,	$\bar{ā}$ $\bar{ē}$ $\bar{ī}$;
2 diphthongs,	<i>ay aw</i> .

Short $\bar{a}$ is liable in Hebrew to undergo changes analogous to those which it experiences in Arabic, that is to say to be modified into $\bar{e}$ (◌ֶ) and $\bar{i}$ (◌ִ). Compare, for instance, שְׂאֵלָתִי with שְׂאֵלָתָם and שְׂאֵלָתֵיהֶם; בָּתִּי with בָּת; סֶפֶר with סֵפֶר; מְנַדְּרָה with מִדְּבַח; מְנַדְּרָה with מְנַדְּרָה; קִרְיָה with קִרְיָה; דְּמַעָּה with דְּמַעָּה; מְנַדְּרָה with מְנַדְּרָה; נְחִבָּאתָּ with נְחִבָּאתָּ; נְעִשָּׂה and fem. מְרַבֵּב with מְרַבֵּב; מְנַדְּרָה with מְנַדְּרָה.

נַעֲשֶׂתָהּ with נִגְלָה and fem. נִגְלָתָהּ; יָד, with יָדְכֶם (יִדְכֶם); דָּם, with דַּמְכֶם (דַּמְכֶם); דְּבָרִי, for דְּבָרִי, from דָּבָר (for *dābār*); הָרָה from הָרָה. 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: *مَضَجَلْ*, *مَضَجَلْ*, etc.; whilst at other times it is the Arabic which exhibits the weakening of the vowel, as Heb. צִדִּיק, Arab. صَدِيق; Syr. سَجِيح, Arab. سَكِير, Heb. and Syr. תְּלָמִיד, Arab. تَلْمِيز. 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 נָבֵר and by the perfect Piel of the verb. That words like קָרַן and נָפַן, אָרַן and קָרַן, were originally pronounced אָרַן and קָרַן, might be inferred from the Arabic forms قَرْنٌ and جَفْنٌ, أَرْضٌ; it is rendered certain by the pausal forms קָרַן, נָפַן, אָרַן, and by the suffixed forms קָרַנוּ, נָפַנִּי, אָרַצִּי. Besides, we can cite the authority of the LXX., who write Ἀβελ for הָבֵל, Γασίων Γαβέρ (1 Kings ix. 26) for עֲצִיּוֹן נָבֵר, and the like. In many other words of the same class the root-vowel has been farther modified into *z*; as קָבֵר, קָבֵר, קָבֵר, Arab. قَبْرٌ, شَمَشٌ, شَمَشٌ, شَمֶשֶׁד, Arab. شَمْسٌ. In all such words the vowel of the 2nd syllable is merely supplementary, and has nothing to do with the original form, but merely lightens the pronunciation of the two final consonants. Again, as to the verbal form Piel, that קָפַל stands for קָפַל is obvious from the following considerations.

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

(2) The *ā* of the 1st syllable appears in the Aramaic ܐܬܐ, and in Hebrew itself in the imperat. and imperfect קָטַל and יִקְטֹל.

(3) The *ā* of the 2nd syllable is seen in the 2nd pers. sing. קִטַּלְתָּ and analogous forms, as well as in numerous examples of the 3rd person, e.g. יָפַר, חִזַּק, בָּשַׁר, גָּדַל, where the vocalisation depends partly upon the accentuation and partly upon other considerations. Sometimes the *ā* of the 2nd syllable is modified into *ā*, as in נָפַס, נָפַר, רָבַר; and this weakening, combined with the influence of the *ā* in the 1st syllable, has led to the form with *ē*, גָּדַל, רָבַר. In the Hiphil, as we shall afterwards see, the process goes yet a step farther, *ā* being changed into *ī* by the successive steps *haktal*, *hiktal*, *hiktāl*, *hiktēl*, *hiktīl*.

On short *ā* we may content ourselves with noting that in Hebrew it is often modified in unaccented shut syllables into *ā* (־), as עֲנִילָךְ, חֲפָצִי (־); and that in western Syriac it usually appears as *ā* (ܐ), e.g. ܣܦܪܐ for ܣܦܪܐ, ܣܦܪܐ, ܣܦܪܐ.

As for short *ā*, it chiefly appears in Hebrew in a shut syllable with dagesh forte, as חָקִי, עָזוּ, and the verbal form קָטַל. In an unaccented shut or half-shut syllable it generally becomes *ā*, as קָדְשׁוֹ (for קָדְשׁוֹ, קָדְשׁוֹ); but also קָדְשׁוֹ, קָדְשׁוֹ. In Syriac this vowel is usually written *plene* with ܐ, as ܣܦܪܐ, but you must not therefore imagine it to be long in these and similar words.

An original short *ā* or *ā* has sometimes been modified in Hebrew into *ā*, 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 אַתָּה. For instance, אַתֶּם stands for *'āntūm*, as is shewn by the Arabic أَنْتُمْ and the Syriac ܐܢܬܐܡܐ. Similarly, the suffixes כֶּם and הֶם were originally *kām* and *hām*, as proved by the Arabic كَمْ and هَمْ, the latter of which becomes in certain cases هَمْ. The word אַתָּה stands for *āth*, as shewn by the

from יִרְדָּף; צַפְרִים from צַפֵּר; חֲצִי, with suffix חֲצִי, in pause חֲצִי, for *hatsi*. More rarely still a fuller vowel is employed, as in קִרְשִׁים (also קִרְשֵׁי) from קִרֵּשׁ, שְׂרָשִׁים from שְׂרֵשׁ, אֲהָלִים (and אֲהָ) from אָהַל. I call your attention to these last forms in particular, as Delitzsch and Baer have recently sought to revive the erroneous pronunciation *kēddāshim* and *shārāshim*.

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, صَلَحَ, صَلَحْنَا, are weakened in exactly the same way as in Hebrew; but تَعْمَلُ, نَعْمَلُ, and صَلَحْتَب follow different rules from נִשְׁמַח and קִטְלוּנִי.

The heightening or elevation of the three short vowels *ä* *ɛ* *ɨ* takes place in Hebrew, generally speaking, either in the tone-syllable of a word, or in the open syllable immediately preceding the tone. Short *ä* is heightened into *á*; short *ɛ* into *é*; and short *ɨ* or *ɔ* 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 *guma* and the pronunciation of vowels in new high German and modern English¹.” I am not quite sure that I understand this explanation; but it is at all events clear that Olshausen² and Bickell regard the heightened vowels *á* *é* *ó* as arising by contraction from *ä* + *ä*, *ä* + *i*, and *ä* + *ɨ*; 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 fellāh says *mēn hāda* ("who is this?"), but if you knock at his door, he calls out *mīn* ("who's there?"). You ask a shopkeeper *bi-kem er-raṭl*, "how much a pound?"; but if you use the first word only, you say *bi-kām* "how much?" If we consider, further, that the vowels *ī* and *ē*, *ō* and *ū*, 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 *ī* in *pin*, but rather inclines towards *ē*; we shall I think find little difficulty in believing that the heightened vowels *ā* (ֶ), *ē* (ֵ), *ō* (ֹ), may, as Noeldeke holds, have arisen in Hebrew from the short *ā* *ē* *ū*, without the addition of any other element.

Of the three vowels, *ī* and *ū* are almost always heightened in the tone-syllable; as זָקֵן for *zākīn*, בֹּהֵן for *kāhīn*, יָדִיבֵר for *yūdābbīr*, סִפֵּר for *sīfr*; כָּל for *kūll*, יָקָם for *yākūm*, קָדַשׁ for *kūdsh*. But *ā* often remains in the tone-syllable; as in דָּבַר, מִשְׁפָּט, נָחַל, בֵּית, קָטַל. In fact, *ā* chiefly appears in the closed tone-syllable of the absolute state of nouns, as in דָּבַר, מִשְׁפָּט; and in the open syllable before the tone, as in קָטַל, לָבַשׁ, קָטַן, דָּבַר. *ī* is also often heightened into *ē* in the open syllable before the tone, as לָבַב for *libāb*, עָנַב for *ʿanab*. The second syllable before the tone is less frequently heightened; as in קָטַלָּה and קָטַלָּהּ, וְקָטַלָּהּ, הָעֵבְרִית (for הָעֵבְרִית), אֲחֵלִים, etc.

It may have struck you as curious that, in many of the Hebrew words which I have lately cited, the short vowel *ō* and the heightened vowel *ā* should be represented to the eye by the same sign ֶ. This admits, however, of an easy explanation. Just as the pure *ā* of the Sanskrit is pronounced *ō* in Bengālī, so the heightened *ā* of the Hebrew gradually passed in the mouths of many of the Jews (not of all) into *ā*, and then into *ō*. Consequently the punctuators were fairly justified, from a certain point of view, in representing it and *ō* 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 נָבַר and in יִנְלָה. In the former instance, however, some confusion of sounds may actually arise. For instance, the plural of בֵּית is written בְּתִים, which must be read *bātīm*, and not *bottīm*, as is proved by Jewish tradition, by the accentuation, and by the evidence of the cognate Syriac form ܒܬܝܢ *bātīn*. If *bottīm* had been right, the Syriac form would certainly have been ܒܬܝܢ. Another example is afforded by רִיזִי (Isaiah xxiv. 16), which, as I believe, is rightly read by Bottcher *rōzī-lī* (from a noun רִיז), and not *rāzī-lī*.

In treating of this heightening of the vowels, I have taken no account of the Aramaic dialects, because in them it is neither so widely spread nor so readily perceived, owing to the defects of the vowel-system. I think, however, that the vowel of the tone-syllable in such verbal forms as ܢܚܝܢ, ܢܚܝܢ, ܢܚܝܢ, must have differed in sound from that of the first syllable almost, if not quite, as much as in the Hebrew יָתֵן. As for *o* in place of *ā*, it occurs, according to the eastern dialect of Syriac, in many verbal and nominal forms; for example, the imperfect and imperative ܢܚܝܢ *nēkṭōl* (*nikṭōl*), ܚܝܢ *ḥēṭōl*; and in the personal pronouns ܐܢܝܢ, ܐܢܝܢ, with the suffixes ܐܢܝܢ, ܐܢܝܢ, and the verbal form ܐܢܝܢ. In these latter cases, as we have seen above, the Hebrew has modified the original *ā* into *ā*, אָתָם, אָם, אָתָם, אָם. The western Syrians weakened this *o* again into *u*, saying ܐܢܝܢ, ܐܢܝܢ, but no doubt the quantity of this vowel much exceeded in length that of the original short *ā* in *nikṭōl*.

I now proceed to speak briefly of the long vowels, *ā*, *i*, *ū*.

Long *ā* has, we may say, almost disappeared from the Hebrew. Just as the long *ā* of the Sanskrit was modified in Greek into *η* and *ω*, so the long *ā* of the Arabic passed in Hebrew into *ō*. As *dadāmi* became δίδωμι, or *āmas*, ʾāmas¹, so

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

that in some parts of Persia long $\bar{a}$ is pronounced $\bar{u}$, e.g. نان $n\bar{u}n$, for $n\bar{a}n$ or $n\bar{a}n$, "bread"; بيا $biy\bar{u}$, for $biy\bar{a}$ or $biy\bar{a}$, "come."

But indeed I need go no farther than our own language, where such words as *bone*, *stone* represent an Old English $b\bar{a}n$, $st\bar{a}n$, whilst *moon* stands for $m\bar{ō}na$, which was in its turn preceded by a form $m\bar{ā}na$. In the Hebrew words just cited you will observe that this weakening depends upon the removal of the tone to the following syllable; but in the Syriac words it seems to be due to the influence of the letter n . The Phœnicians appear to have gone beyond the Hebrews in this respect, pronouncing for instance $shūfēl$ instead of שופט ($sufes$, $-ētis$), $rūfē$ for רופא, $shdlūsh$ ($salus$) for שלוש, $rūsh$ (rus) for ראש, and in the plur. fem. $alōnūth$ for אלונות. In a shut syllable such an $\bar{u}$ might even be shortened into $\bar{u}$, $\bar{u}$; thus נחשתם and נחשתי from נחשת, נחשתם; נחשתם, נחשתם; נחשתם, נחשתם. I may add that in a few cases, in Aramaic, long $\bar{a}$ has passed into $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{i}$, just as the Sanskrit $\bar{a}$ of *dadhāmi* became $\bar{e}$ in Greek $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$, or the Arabic $\bar{a}$ successively $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{i}$. Thus the Arabic $\bar{a}$ راس $r\bar{a}s$ first became راس $r\bar{a}s$, which the Hebrews modified into ראש, $r\bar{a}sh$, whilst the Arameans preferred ريش, ريش.

The long vowel $\bar{i}$ I may here dismiss with the remark that in the few cases where it has been shortened into $\bar{i}$, $\bar{i}$, this vowel is reheightened by the accent into $\bar{i}$. Thus, יבין = יבין, but יבין and יבין = יבין.

So also long $\bar{u}$ may in certain instances be shortened into $\bar{u}$, $\bar{u}$, and then this vowel be reheightened into $\bar{u}$; as יתוב = יתוב, but יתוב and יתוב = יתוב.

Whether long $\bar{u}$ can in Hebrew be differentiated into $\bar{o}$ seems a doubtful matter. ילוד seems to be identical in form with the

עֹלָה (חֹרָן); in the suffixed form דְּבָרִי; and when the letters ו and י are doubled, as פֶּן, דִּין ("cake"), or with suffixes גִּנָּה, חֵי, גִּנּוּם. More generally *ay* and *aw* are modified in various ways.

At the end of a word י= usually becomes ם or ם. We find סִנִּי, שָׂרִי, שָׂרִי, and the like; but far more frequently ם, as יִגְלָה, מִרְאָה, (שָׂרָה), imper. יִגְלָה. The intermediate step is marked by the pronunciation of the LXX., Σινᾶ, Σάρα, corresponding to the Arabic termination *in ʿay* in *مِنِي*, *رَمِي*, *Minā, ramā*, which some pronounce with the *ʾimālah*, *Minē, ramē*. In other cases, the *ā* element in the diphthong prevailed in Hebrew, and the termination became *ā*, ם, as in גִּלָּה. On these points I shall have more to say when I come to treat of the verbs לָה.

In the body of a word *ay* and *aw* exhibit several modifications. Sometimes a supplementary vowel is introduced, to lighten the pronunciation; as בֵּית for בִּית, מֹות for מִות. This latter form, in which the *ā* is heightened to *á* is rare: מֹות, אֹון, תֹּון; but שֹׂוא, like גִּיא. The same supplementary vowel is found in the termination of the dual, יִם standing for יִם, Arabic *ayin*. At other times the *ā* sound in the diphthong predominates, yielding *á* instead of *ay*. So מֹון, אֹון, מֹון, for מֹון, Arabic *ayin*; עֵינִים for עֵינִים, דִּתִּין for דִּתִּין; אֵין, Arabic *ayin*; בָּתִּים *bātīm* for עֵינִים, דִּתִּין; the suffixed form דְּבָרִי, also written דְּבָרִי, for דְּבָרִי. You will find a similar substitution of *á* for *ai* in the older stages of our own language. The Gothic *ai* in *hails*, *hlaihs*, and *aigan*, became in Anglosaxon *hāl*, *hlāf*, and *āgan*, in English *whole*, *loaf* and *own*.

¹ If so, בֵּית follows the form of תֹּור, תֹּורִים; זֹית, זֹיתִים; אֵיל, אֵילִים; לֵיל, לֵילִים; not that of שֹׂור, שֹׂורִים; עֵיר, עֵירִים; תֵּישׁ, תֵּישִׁים; חֵיל, חֵילִים; עֵון, חֵילִים; עֵון, חֵילִים. Noeldeke however pronounces the word *bātīm*.

Generally speaking, however, *ay* and *aw* are modified as in vulgar Arabic into $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$, the $\bar{e}$ being represented by יֵ, and sometimes by יָ, the $\bar{o}$ by וּ. So in אֵי for אִי (with suffix, אֵי), אֵו for אִו (אֵו, אִו); in segolate nouns צוֹם, שׁוֹר, and in the construct state מוֹת, בֵּית; in the Niphal and Hiphil of verbs פִּי, as נוֹלֵד for הוֹלֵד, הִיטֵב for הוֹלֵב, הִגְלִיתָ for הִגְלִיתָ, גְּלִיתָ for גְּלִיתָ, לָהּ, as תִּגְלִינָה for תִּגְלִינָה. This $\bar{e}$ is frequently attenuated into $\bar{i}$, and more rarely $\bar{o}$ into $\bar{u}$. Thus גְּלִיתָ for גְּלִיתָ, גְּלִיתָ, as in the vulgar Arabic of North Africa *r'mūt* for *r'mēt* (*ramaita*). Perhaps also the proper name אֲמִינֹן, instead of אֲמִינֹן (2 Sam. xiii. 20), if we regard it as a contemptuous diminutive, "that wretch of an Ammon." אֲמִינֹן would then stand for אֲמִינֹן i.e. 'umainān, just as, in vulgar Arabic, *k'fīfah* for *kufāifah*, as the diminutive of *kuffah*, "a basket." As examples of $\bar{o}$ becoming $\bar{u}$, I may mention לוּ for לוֹ, Arabic يُوْبَلْ; יוֹבֵל, imperf. of יָבֵל; and נוֹיִי, part. plur. Niphal of יָגֵה, for נוֹיִי, נוֹיִי. Here again we find a parallel in the vulgar Arabic forms of the imperfect of verbs يُوْقِفْ, يُوْصَلْ, يُوْعَدْ, for يُوْقِفْ, يُوْصَلْ, يُوْعَدْ.

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 חֲבֵל, חֲבֵל, חֲבֵל; in the construct plural מְחַבְּ, where the Bibl. Aramaic, like the Hebrew, has מְחַבְּ; in the plural suffixed forms מְחַבְּ, מְחַבְּ, מְחַבְּ (Ch. מְחַבְּ); in the Aphel of verbs אֲחֵב, as אֲחֵב, אֲחֵב, אֲחֵב (Ch. אֲחֵב); and in such words as the diminutives חֲבֵל and חֲבֵל (Ch. חֲבֵל).

At the end of a word we find forms similar to those of the Hebrew; e.g. with $\bar{e}$, ܠܝܠܐ , ܡܠܟܐ , ܡܠܟܐ ; with $\bar{a}$, ܠܝܠܐ .

In the body of a word, Syriac ay sometimes becomes $\bar{e}$, as in the construct ܠܡܠܟܐ , and in the duals ܠܡܠܟܐ , ܠܡܠܟܐ ; in Biblical Aramaic ܡܠܟܐ , but ܡܠܟܐ .

The $\bar{a}$ -sound predominates, for example, in Targumic ܡܠܟܐ (200) and ܡܠܟܐ [ܡܠܟܐ] (80, for ܡܠܟܐ , as well as ܡܠܟܐ); in the plural ܡܠܟܐ ; in the adverb ܐܬܝܐ , pronounced $\bar{a}kh$ (Ch. ܐܬܝܐ); in the plural suffixed forms of the Jewish Aramaic ܥܒܕܝܐ or ܥܒܕܝܐ , "thy servants," [Targumic] ܥܒܕܝܐ or [Biblical] ܥܒܕܝܐ [$\bar{e}b\bar{e}r\bar{i}$] "her servants," ܥܒܕܝܐ "our servants," as contrasted with ܥܒܕܝܐ and ܥܒܕܝܐ .

Further, $\bar{e}$ sinks into $\bar{a}$, according to the western pronunciation, in the simple forms of the segolates ܐܝܠܐ , ܐܝܠܐ ; also in the forms ܠܬܝܠܐ (construct), ܠܬܝܠܐ , ܠܬܝܠܐ ; in many forms of the 1st and 2nd pers. in the perf. of verbs ܐܠܐ , as perf. Peal ܐܠܐ (but Nestorian ܐܠܐ), Pael ܐܠܐ and ܐܠܐ , etc. Similarly, $\bar{o}$ sinks into $\bar{a}$, in ܐܠܐ "if" (= ܐܠܐ); and, at least according to the western pronunciation, in the simple state of the segolates ܐܠܐ , ܐܠܐ ("end").

In the later Aramaic dialects there is a strong tendency to get rid of the diphthongs. Already in old Syriac we find ܐܠܐ , $\bar{a}kh$, with short $\bar{a}$, for ܐܠܐ ; ܠܝܠܐ $\bar{a}$, for ܠܝܠܐ , ܠܝܠܐ (ܠܝܠܐ); and another example of the same kind is ܐܠܐ (for ܐܠܐ); but the modern Syrian says $\bar{a}t$ for ܠܐ ; $\bar{a}k\bar{a}$ or $\bar{a}k\bar{a}$ (ܠܐ) for ܠܐ ; $\bar{a}d$ (ܠܐ) for ܐܠܐ and ܐܠܐ ; ܠܐ and ܠܐ ; ܠܐ "our houses"; and even ܠܐ

for **חֶפְזָא**. So also, though to a less extent, in Mandaitic, where we find **לִית** as well as **לֵאִית** (**לִית**), and **קִרִית** for **כִּרִית** as well as **חֶפְזָא**.

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 **אֱלֹהֵי** for *ēloh*, Aram. **אֱלֹהָא**, **אֱלֹהִים**, Arab. **إِلَهِ**; **זֵרוֹעַ** for *zērōʿ*, Aram. **דְּרֵעָא**, **זֵרָא**, Arab. **ذِرَاع**; **תַּפְּזִיחַ** for *tappūh*, Arab. **تَفَّاح**; **מִשְׁלַחַ** for *mēšallāh*, i.e. *mushallāh*; **רוּחַ** for *rūh*, **רוּחַ**, **רוּחַ**; **מִשְׁלַחַ** for *mēšallāh*, i.e. *mushallāh*; **רֵעַ** for *rēʿ*, *rīʿ*. This sound is heard in the spoken Arabic of the present day, in such words as **صَاحِب**, **رِيح**, **مَمْفُوح**, **سُطُوح**, **سُطُوح**, but it is not, and never has been, written in this language or in Syriac, where we find only **חֶפְזָא** 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: **שְׁמַעְתָּ**, **שָׁכַחְתָּ**, **הִמְלַחְתָּ**, as well as **שָׁכַחְתָּ**, **לָקַחְתָּ**; **וַיַּחַדְךָ**, as compared with **וַיַּחַדְךָ**.

(3) The auxiliary vowel **ֵ**, **ֶ**, **ִ**, in various nominal and verbal forms, which is very little stronger than no. 2. For example, in segolate nouns: **נֶעַר**, **תַּחַת**, **יֶלֶד**, **זֶרַע**, **פָּרָא**, **סִפָּר**, **קִישׁ**, **פֶּעַל**, **מִוֶּת**, **בֵּית**, and in the dual termination **ִים**. The auxiliary is actually wanting in such words as **נֶרְדַּךְ**, **קִשְׁטְךָ**.

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, ד and ת, ש, כ, נ מ ל, י and ו. 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 *يَـ* *iyā*, which is usually shortened, according to circumstances, into *يَ* *ya* or *يَـ* *ī*, as *نَفْسِي*, *نَفْسِي*, *قَعَايَ*. It is obviously identical with the Ethiopic ϩ: *ya*, in ነፍሰሃ: *nafséya*; and with the Assyrian *ya*, in *bīt-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 *يَا بَنِيَّ* *yā’bna* ‘amma, *يَا رَبَّ* *yā rabbā*. The Hebrew form is, as you all know, אֲבִי, of which the *yūd*, though written, is no longer pronounced in Syriac: *ܡܠܚܒܐ*. The intermediate step, no doubt, was the shortening of *ī* into *ʾ*, which we find sometimes in old Arabic, especially in vocative forms like *يَا رَبَّ*, which in pause would be pronounced *yā rabb*. The corresponding plural is in Arab. *نَا* *nā*, sometimes shortened into *nā*; in Eth. *ኑ*: *nā*, in Assyrian *nī* or *nū*, Heb. *נִי*, Aram. *ܢܝ*, Syr. *ܢܝ*, as *ܡܠܚܒܐ*, *ܡܠܚܒܐ*. 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. *ኑ*: *nī*, Assyrian *nī*, Heb. *נִי*, Aram. *ܢܝ*, 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* *kā*, the fem. *كِ* *kī*. Identical with these are the Ethiopic *ክ*: *ka*, *ክ*: *kī*, and the Assyrian *ka*, *kī*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are *ךָ* and *כִּי*, the latter generally abbreviated into *ךִּ*. The Aramaic forms are *ܟܐ* for the masc. and *ܟܝ* for the fem., but the *yūd* has become silent, *ܟܐܒܐ*, *ܟܝܒܐ*; so that these forms are identical with those of the vulgar Arabic, masc. *كَ* *ak*, or *k*, fem. *كِ* *ek* or *kī*. The plurals were originally, as in Arabic, masc. *كُم* *kumū*, shortened into *kum*, fem. *كُنَّ* *kunna*; Ethiopic *ክሙ*: *kēmū* and *ክነ*: *kēn*; Assyrian *kunu* or *kun*, of which the fem., according to analogy, should be *kina* or *kin*. The Hebrew forms are

כָּם for *kūm*, fem. כֵּן, but for the latter the fuller כָּנָה or כִּנָּה sometimes occurs. The Aramaic forms are כֹּן, חֹן, fem. חֵן, but כָּם is also found in Biblical Aramaic (Ezra).

In the 3rd person we have again a variation of vowels according to gender. The Arabic forms are, masc. *hu* (with long vowel, though written defectively), which becomes *hi* when preceded by an *i*, as *abū-hu*, *abī-hi*; fem. *hi*. The corresponding forms in Ethiopic are ሁ: *hū*, ሁ: *hū*. In Hebrew the masc. is הוּ, but also הֵ, which is nearly identical with the vulgar Arabic *hu*, pronounced *u* or *o*, as in كُتَابٌ, also written كُتَاب. The Hebrew fem. is הִ and הִי. In Aramaic the masc. is הוּ, fem. הִ. The corresponding plurals in Arabic are, masc. *humū*, generally abbreviated *hum*, which may be changed by the influence of a preceding *i* into *himū* or *himī* and *him*; the fem. is *hunna* or *hinna*. The Ethiopic has ሁዎ: *hōmū* and ሁነ: *hōn*. The Hebrew forms are, masc. הֵם and הֵן, or, with final vowel, הֵמָּה; fem. הֵן (rarely הֵן) and הֵן, or, with final vowel, הֵנָּה, הֵנָּה, הֵנָּה. In Aramaic we find הוּן, חוּן and חוּן, but in the Aramaic of Ezra also הוּם. 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 Himyaritic dialects, where the sing. masc. is written ስጋ or ስ, pl. ስጋ, whereas in the other we find ስጋ and ስጋ; and traces of it exist in the modern Mehri, in which according to Maltzan, the sing. masc. is *he*, fem. *es*, plur. masc. *hum*, fem. *senn*.

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

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

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

From these suffixed pronouns *iya*, *ka* and *hū*, we obtain, by prefixing the demonstrative syllable *an* (אנ), the three pronouns *aniya*, *anka* and *anhū*. The syllable *an*,—itself a compound of א and נ,—we may regard as a sort of demonstrative particle or interjection, akin probably to the Arabic ^عان, ^هان, Hebrew ^הה, ^הנה, Syriac ^{ܐܢ}, and Ethiopic ^{እን}: in ^{እን}ክፍሉ: *en'kēmū*, “en vobis = accipite.”

The third of these pronouns, *anhū*, appears but rarely as an independent word. I would instance the Talmudic ^{איהו}, fem. ^{איהי}, possibly assimilated from ^{איהו}, ^{איהי}, with the first vowel weakened from *a* to *i*. At any rate, the plural forms, which are without assimilation, are ^{איהו}, ^{איהי}, for ^{איהון}, ^{איהין}. In Syriac too we find ^{ܐܢܗܘ}, ^{ܐܢܗܝ}, assimilated for ^{ܐܢܗܘܢ}, ^{ܐܢܗܝܢ}. Otherwise these forms are used as suffixes; for example, in Hebrew, ^{איהו}, as ^{יברכהו}, assimilated ^{בנו}, fem. ^{נה}; and also in the later Aramaic dialects, as Mand. ^{ינהון} or ^{ינן}, fem. ^{ינהין}, ^{ינין}; Talm. ^{ינהו}, ^{ינהי}.

The same is the case with the second of the above pronouns, *anka*, which appears in Hebrew only as a suffix, e.g. ^{אתקנה} (from ^{נתק}, Jerem. xxii. 24), usually with assimilation ^ת; in Mand. ^{ינכון}, fem. ^{ינכין}.

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-īya* 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, اُنْأ ^{اُنْأ} *anā*, with short *a* in both syllables, dialectically *ānā*, in pause *ānā* and *anāh*; Ethiopic likewise እን: *anā*; J. Aram. אָנָּא (אָנָּא Bibl.) or אָנָּא, Syriac ܐܢܐ *anā* or *enō*. Similarly in the younger dialects: Tigré እን: *anā*, Tigrīña እን: *anē* or እን: *ana*, Amharic እን: *enē*; Mand. ܐܢܐ, modern Syriac ܐܢܐ. As the proper plural of אֲנִי we may regard אֲנֵינוּ (Jerem. xlii. 6, *kəthībē*), to which, among the later dialects, the Amharic offers a parallel in the form *enā*. I may add that in Arabic, Ethiopic and Syriac this pronoun is liable to considerable mutilation. In Arabic we find اُنْ ^{اُنْ} *an*, and likewise in Ethiopic, when followed by the particle ሰ: *sa*, እሰ: *an-sa*. In Syriac the first syllable is liable to be elided under certain circumstances, whence arise such forms as ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, and finally, dropping the last vowel, ܐܢܐ. Hence in modern Syriac the verbal form of the present, 1st pers. sing. ܐܢܐ *I end*, ܐܢܐ *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 ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, "here," ܐܢܐ "thus, here, now," ܐܢܐ "that," ܐܢܐ "here," ܐܢܐ "how," etc. As the oldest form I venture to write *anākiya* or *anākī*, whence

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

The corresponding plural form is still more remarkable: Assyrian *antni*, *nēni*, *nēnu* for *anilni*, *anahni*, Heb. אֲנִי־הֵנוּ, Phoen. אַנְחֵנוּ. Here then ה of the singular has interchanged with ח (as in שְׁחַד, מַעֲבִיר, compared with שָׁדַד, חָבַד compared with אֲבִיחִים), and the vowel has been shortened in the shut syllable. The last syllable of the word, נִי, is probably shortened from אֲנִי, the plural form of אָנֹכִי, which we mentioned above. This plural אַנְחֵנוּ, abbreviated in Hebrew itself into נַחֲנוּ, is found, in some shape or other, in nearly all the Semitic dialects. Arabic: نَحْنُ, vulgar نَهْنَهْ, *nehnè*, *nehn*, أَحَنَّا *ahnā* in Egypt *ihna*. Ethiopic: ከነሁ: *nēhna*, Tigré *nahna*, Tigrīña *nēhna*. Syriac, with an additional demonstrative *n* at the end, أَنْسֵנֵ, commonly سِنֵ, which is shortened in pronunciation into *nan*, as in اِنْسِنֵ. Also اِنْسِنֵ, with prosthetic vowel, whence in modern Syriac اِنْسِنֵ and اِنْسِنֵ, but also *akhnōkhun* اِكْهَنُوكْهُنْ (with a curious assimilation to the pronoun of the 2nd pers. *akhtōkhun* اِكْهَتُوكْهُنْ). In Samaritan we also find the form אַנְחֵנוּ, whilst in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac, اِنْسِنֵ,

and in the modern Syriac of Ma'lūla, ܐܢܝܬܐ *anah*, the final *n* has vanished. Jewish Aramaic forms are ܐܢܚܢܐ and ܢܚܢܐ; but in several dialects the guttural has been elided, whence in the Talmud ܐܢ, in Samaritan ܐܢ, in Mandaitic ܐܢܝ (anēn for anān), and in Palestinian Syriac ܐܝ and more commonly ܐܝܝ. Likewise in Assyrian, as above mentioned, *anēni*, *nēni* or *nēnu*.

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 ܐܢܝ and ܐܢܢܝ are very far-fetched; that ܐܢܝ can hardly be compounded with a demonstrative particle or interjection, '+(ܢ+ܐ), and ܐܢܢܝ with two words of that class '+(ܢ+ܐ)+(ܢ+ܐ). 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 cum istum*! Even the English *I* is but the last remnant of *ich* or *ik*, *ego*, ܐܓܝܐ, ܐܓܝܐ, Sanskrit *aham*, all pointing to an original *agham* or *agam*, which has been supposed to be made up of three elements, *a* + *gha* (or *ga*) + *m*, the first of which is either the demonstrative root *a* "this," or else a mutilation of *ma*; whilst the second is a particle, identical with the Greek *γε*, and the third, in all probability, another demonstrative letter.

I pass on to the pronoun of the 2nd person in its independent form. Here the demonstrative syllable *an* is prefixed, not to the syllable *ka*, but to *ta*. Both these syllables are, it seems likely, also of a demonstrative character, and admit of being explained in one of two ways. Either (1) *ka* is a mere variety of *ta* (compare τὸς τίς 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 ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, 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 *antuma*, 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 አንተ: *anta*, *antī*, *antēmū*, *antēn*, which appear in Tigré as *anta*, *antī*, *antūm*, and in Amharic as *anta*, *antyī* or *anty*, plur. *antū*. But in Tigrīña they have been displaced by the compound ንክክ: *něss'khā*, fem. *něss'khī*, plur. *něssātkūm*, *něssātkēn*, by assimilation for *něfs'khā*, 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 אַתָּה; but the shorter אַת, *attē* or *att*, also occurs, Num. xi. 15; Deut. v. 24, and in some other passages in the Kēthībh, e.g. Ps. vi. 4; Job i. 10; Eccles. vii. 22. Its fem. is אַתִּי, which occurs sometimes in the Kēthībh, viz. Judges xvii. 2; 1 Kings xiv. 2; 2 Kings iv. 16, 23, and viii. 1; Jerem. iv. 30; Ezek. xxxvi. 13; but it has been almost supplanted by the shorter אַת, *attē* or *att*, in pause אַת. The plur. masc. is אַתֶּם, with *ē* for *ū*; the fem. is אַתֶּנָּה, sometimes written אַתְּנָה and אַתְּנָה; but the shorter אַתֶּן or אַתֶּן is found in Ezek. xxxiv. 31, and with assimilation of the *n* to a following *m*, in Ezek. xiii. 20, אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם מְצַדְדוֹת (observe Ezek. xxxiii. 26, יֵשׁוּעַ שֹׁמֵר מִדְבָּר, אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ תוֹעֲבָה for יֵשׁוּעַ). (יֵשׁוּעַ).

In Biblical Aramaic and the Targūms we find both the primitive and the assimilated forms, **אַתָּה**, **אַתָּה**, **אַתָּה**, fem. **אַתָּה**, plur. masc. **אַתְּמוֹן**, **אַתְּמוֹן**, fem. **אַתְּמִין**, **אַתְּמִין**. In Syriac the *u*, though written, is never pronounced, and the final *t* of the fem. sing. has also been dropped, **אַתָּה**, **אַתָּה**, **אַתָּה**. The forms of the later dialects are in some cases such as we should naturally expect; e.g. Samaritan **אתה** or **אתָּה**, fem. **אתי**, plur. **אתון**, **אתון**; Palestinian Syriac, **אתָּה**, fem. **אתָּה**, plur. **אתָּה** and **אתָּה**, **אתָּה**. But in others there are points worthy of remark. For instance, in Mandaitic, instead of *u* and *t* being assimilated, a short *ā* is inserted between them, **אנאת**, plur. **אנאתון**. Again, in the vulgar Syriac of Ma'lūla, we find **أَح** *ach* or **هَاح** *hach*, with the plur. **أَحْخُن** *achkhun* or **هَاحْخُن** *hachhun*, where *t* has been softened into *ty*, *ch*, as in **مدینچا** (مدینة), **دارچا** (دَارَة), **كاجبا** (كُوجَة). The modern Nestorian or eastern forms are **أَت** *at* or **أَتِ** *attin*, the latter with a curious appendage; and not less strange are the plurals **أَمْهَج** and **أَمْهَجَف**, which can only be explained as having arisen under the influence of the 1st pers. **أَمْب** or **أَمْبَب**, whilst conversely the form of the 1st person **أَمْهَجَف** must have owed its birth to this falsely formed **أَمْهَجَف**.

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 **ܫܝܬܐ**, fem. **ܫܝܬܐ**, 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 **הוא**, fem. **היא**. Now some scholars believe that the *aleph* is a mere orthographic sign, like the Arabic *elif* in the 3rd pers. plur.

of the verb, **נִתְּלוּ**, which is occasionally found even in Hebrew (**הֶהָלְכוּ** Josh. x. 24; **אָבוּ** 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. **וְיֹאמֶר גַּם הָא**) and the sarcophagus of Eshmūn'āzār, king of Sidon (masc. **אָדָם הָא** "that man," fem. **הַמַּמְלָכָה הָא** "this kingdom"). Had the original sounds been merely *hū* and *hī*, we should have found on such monuments **הוּ** and **הִי**. I conclude, therefore, that the words must have sounded originally something like *hū-a* and *hī-a*, with the addition of a demonstrative *a* at the end. This will seem less improbable to you, when you are told that the modern Syrian forms from **וָסָ** *ō* and **וָסָ** *ē*, by the addition of **וָסָ**, another demonstrative **וָסָ וָסָ** (**וָסָ וָסָ**) *ō'ā*, **וָסָ וָסָ** *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 **הוּא** for the fem. gender in Hebrew, because I do not believe in its existence. The distinction of the vowels in **הוּא** and **הִיא**, *sū* and *sī*, is just as primitive and essential as in *anta*, *anti* and *ka*, *ki*. I am aware that **הוּא** takes the place of **הִיא** 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 **הוּא** as nothing but a clerical error, and to substitute for it the correct **הִיא**¹. The same pretended archaism may be found in the famous Babylonian codex of the Prophets published by Strack, e.g. Hosea ii. 4, **הוּא** (i.e. **הוּא**), Joel iv. 1, **הִהוּא** (i.e. **הִהוּא**).

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

¹ [Cf. Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, 2nd ed. vol. 1. (Leyden, 1887), § 16 and n. 7, who rightly refers the origin of the error to the old *scriptio defectiva* **הא**, for **הוּא** and **הִיא** alike.]

increment at the end, and in consequence have suffered a slight curtailment at the beginning. The forms in actual use are **𐤗𐤋𐤕**: *wē'ētū*, fem. **𐤍𐤋𐤕**: *yē'ētī*, which have obviously lost an initial *hū* and *hī* on account of their having been lengthened by the syllable *tū* and *tī*. I find the same increment in the Assyrian demonstrative *šuatū*, "this," fem. *šaati* or *šātī* [Del. *šiatī*], and in another form in *šāšū*, fem. *šāšī*, *šāša*, as also in *hagā-šū* (Del. *agāsu*), 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), *τήτες* (this year) became *σήμερον* and *σήμετες*; 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 *sū* and *hū* are successive weakenings.

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

	singular	plural	dual
Assyr. m.	<i>šū</i>	<i>šūnu</i> , <i>šūnu-tu</i> , <i>šūnut</i>	
f.	<i>šī</i>	<i>šīna</i>	
Arab. m.	هو (vulg. Eg. <i>hūwa</i>)	هم (Eg. <i>hum</i> and <i>huma</i>)	هما
	<i>hūwa</i> هو		
f.	هي (vulg. Eg. <i>hīya</i>)	هن	
	<i>hīya</i> هي		
Eth. m.	𐤗𐤋𐤕 : <i>wē'ētū</i>	𐤋𐤍𐤕𐤕 : <i>ēmūntū</i> or 𐤗𐤋𐤕𐤍 : <i>wē'ētómū</i>	
f.	𐤍𐤋𐤕 : <i>yē'ētī</i>	𐤋𐤍𐤕𐤕 : <i>ēmāntū</i> or 𐤗𐤋𐤕𐤍 : <i>wē'ētón</i>	
Heb. m.	הוא (Ph. הא)	הם , הֵם	
f.	היא (Ph. הא)	הֵנָּה	
J. Ar. m.	הוא	הוּא , הוּמָא , הוּמָא	
f.	היא	הִיא	

	singular	plural
Syr. m.	ܐܢܝܐ	ܐܢܝܐܢܝܐ
f.	ܐܢܝܐ	ܐܢܝܐܢܝܐ
Talm. m.	אֲנִי	אֲנִיחֵ
f.	אֲנִי	אֲנִיחֵ
Mand. m.	ܐܢܝܐ	ܐܢܝܐܢܝܐ
f.	ܐܢܝܐ	ܐܢܝܐܢܝܐ

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 *هم*, *هم*, vulgar Egypt. *lum*, *luma*, *הם*, *הם*, and *המו*, *המון*, are really identical, the last being strengthened by an additional demonstrative element, as is also the case with *אֲנִי* and *אֲנִיחֵ*:: The Talmudic forms *אֲנִי* and *אֲנִיחֵ* (for *אֲנִיחֵ* and *אֲנִיחֵ*) 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 *ܐܢܝܐ* and *ܐܢܝܐ* 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, *něssū*, fem. *něssā*, plur. masc. *něssātōm*, fem. *něssātōn*, for *něfsū*, etc.; and in Amharic, *እርሱ*: *ērsū*, fem. *እርሷ*: *ērsēwā*, plur. *እርሳቸው*: *ērsātyaw*, or with a further assimilation *እሱ*: *ēssū*, etc., from *ርእስ*: *rēʾs*, “head.”

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

B. *The Demonstrative Pronouns.*

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

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

sing. masc. *annu* (fem. *annat*), (*annit*)

plur. masc. *annūtu* fem. *annātu*, *annītu*,

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

In vulgar Arabic of Egypt the forms corresponding to **הָהוּא**, **הָהִיא**, **הֵנָּהוּ**, are still used with the original interjectional force: *āhō*, "there he is," *āhī*, "there she is," *āhūm* or *āhōm*, "there they are."

A very large number of demonstrative pronouns have their source in the cognate letters *d* and *t*, in juxtaposition with which we often find *h*, *l* and *n*. You will remember that Aram. **ܕ** *d* = Arab. **ذ** *dh*, **ܬ** *t* = Eth. Heb. Assy. *z*; and that Aram. **ܬ** *t* = Arab. **ث** *th*, **ܫ** *sh* = Eth. **ሰ** *s*, Assy. **š**, Heb. **שׁ** *sh*.

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

sing. masc. <i>ullu</i>	fem. <i>ullat</i>
plur. masc. <i>ullūtu</i>	fem. <i>ullitū</i> ² .

By appending a demonstrative *u* to the masculine, we obtain the common J. Aram. form וְ, ^{וְ}, emphatic וְ, ^{וְ}, with its simple fem. וְ, ^{וְ}, and its plur. וְ. The corresponding

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

² [The feminines are not recognised by Delitzsch.]

Phoenician forms are **ן** and **נ**; and in certain Aramaic dialects (Egypto-Aram., Nabathean) these words appear as **נן** and **נ**. An Ethiopic form, with further demonstrative increment, is **ዘንቲ**: *zēntū*, fem. **ዘቲ**: *zātī*, plur. **እኩንቲ**: *ellōntū*, fem. **እኩንቲ**: *ellāntū*.

For the sake of still greater emphasis, *hā* is prefixed to these forms, giving in Arabic **هَذَا**, fem. **هَذِهِ** or **هَذِي**, plur. **هَآتَا**, **هَاتَا**, plur. **هَآلَا** or **هَالَا**; and vulgarly *hādā*, fem. *hādī*, plur. *hādānī*, 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 **הדין**, fem. **הדי** (or **עדא**), plur. **הדין** and **הלין** (less correctly pronounced **האלין** and **הלין**); and similarly in the Palestinian dialect **סדי** or **סדי**, fem. **סדי** (*hādē* for *hādā*), plur. **סדי**. In Mandaitic **ד** has generally taken the place of **ד**; **האדין**, fem. **האדי**, plur. **האדין**. **האדי** however occurs, as also the compound **האדינו** = Talmud. **הדין**, i.e. **הדין**. The ordinary Syriac forms are **סדי**, fem. **סדי**, plur. **סדי**. Of these, **סדי** stands for **הדין**, and **סדי** is weakened from **סדי**, which occurs in the combination **סדי** (for **סדי**). Shorter forms are **סדי**, for **הדין**, and **סדי**. Here too must be placed the Talmudic **הדין** or **הדין**, which latter is also found in Samaritan. Here **ד** has taken the place of **ד**, 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 **הדי**, fem. **הדי**, plur. **הדי** or **הדי**, as corruptions of **הדין**, **הדי**, and **הלין**. The modern Syriac words are very similar, viz. **āhā** or **ā**, plur. **annē**. **āhā** springs from the fem. **סדי**, the original aspirated *d* (*dh*) being represented, as in **הדין**, by an *h*; *h* having been gradually

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

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

The simplest of these is the J. Aram. ךֵּךְ or ךֵּיכִי , fem. ךֵּךְ , plur. אֵלֵךְ , which are formed from ךֵּן , ךֵּא and אֵלֵן . The Palestinian dialect exhibits the plural in the form סַלְכֵיךְ . By prefixing $h\bar{a}$ we arrive at the Talmudic הַאֵיךְ , fem. הַאֵךְ , plur. הַאֵיךְ or הַאֵיךְ , and the Mandaitic הַאֵךְ (masc. and fem.), plur. הַאֵיךְ , which are contractions for הַאֵיךְ , הַאֵיךְ , and הַאֵיךְ . Here too the Syriac varieties סַלְכֵיךְ , fem. סַלְכֵיךְ , find their place; the former of which may perhaps be compounded with a form corresponding to the Mishnaic אֵלֵךְ . As for סַלְכֵיךְ (סַלְכֵי), which is always masc., it is probably not a mere variation of סַלְכֵי , but a different compound, viz. from סַלְכֵי and כֵּי . In Arabic the corresponding pronoun is ذَإِكَ , fem. تَإِكَ , plur. أُولَئِكَ or أُولَئِكَ . The Arabs have, however, regarded the suffixed كَ as being the pronoun of the 2nd person, and hence, though ذَإِكَ is commonly used in speaking to two or more persons of both sexes, it is also permitted to use ذَإِكَ in addressing a woman, ذَإِكَمَا in speaking to two, and ذَإِكُمْ or ذَإِكُنَّ in speaking to several, according to their sex. The vulgar forms, at least in North Africa, are ذَإِكَ *dāk*, fem. ذَإِيكَ *dīk*, plur. ذَإِيكُم *dūk*. In Egypt we find, with the addition of $h\bar{a}$, the forms *dikhā* (masc. fem.) and *dukhā* (masc.); and these may be still further strengthened by appending the pronoun of the 3rd pers., masc. *dukhawwā*, masc. fem. *dikhaiya*, plur. masc. fem. *dukhamma*. The Ethiopic presents us with this augmented pronoun in

the form ܗܢ : *ṣēkū*, fem. ܗܢܬܐ : *ṣntēkū*, plur. ܗܢܐ : *ṣllēkū*. Here the fem. is remarkable, but we shall speak of it when we come to the simple relative form ܗܢܬ : *ēnta*.

These pronouns again may be heightened by the accession of a fresh demonstrative syllable. Thus in Chaldee we find ܗܢܬܐ for both genders, with additional *n*. The Ethiopic presents us with a form with additional *tñ*, viz. ܗܢܬܐ : *ṣēkwēṭū* or ܗܢܬܐ : *ṣēktū*, fem. ܗܢܬܐܬܐ : *ṣntāktū*, plur. ܗܢܬܐܬܐ : *ṣllēkwēṭū* or ܗܢܬܐܬܐ : *ṣllēktū*. The Arabic prefixes *hā* in the form هَٰذَا , fem. هَٰتَا , هَٰتَا , plur. هَٰؤُلَآئِكَ ; which are much used in the vulgar dialects, هَٰذَا *hādāḱ*, هَٰذِيكَ *hādīḱ*, plur. هَٰؤُلَآئِكَ *hā'ulā'ik*, or in North Africa هَٰذُوكَ *hādūḱ*. From *hādāḱ* seems to arise, by elision of the *d*, the form هَٰكَ *hak*, used by the Bedouins; just as هَٰذَا *hādā*, in combination with the article 'al, becomes *hal*, which is used for all numbers and genders, as هَٰلِكُنَّ , هَٰلِكُتَاب , هَٰلِكُتَاب . Another strengthened form in old Arabic is ذَٰلِكَ , where the letter *l* has been inserted between ذَا and كَ ; its fem. is تَٰلِكَ , by contraction for تَيْلِكَ . Peculiar to the Mandaic is the word ܗܢܐܢܐܬܐ (masc. and fem.), plur. masc. ܗܢܐܢܐܬܐܢ , fem. ܗܢܐܢܐܬܐܝܢ . Here it seems tolerably clear that we have again the prefixes ܗܢ and ܐܝܢ , contracted into ܗܢܐ , and the suffixes of the 3rd person; but it is not so easy to say what is represented by the letters ܐܢܐ , unless we admit Noeldeke's suggestion that they are identical with ܐܢܐ , the Aramaic form of ܐܢܐ .

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

אִידִי; doubtfully, I say, because it may also be explained, as I did above, by assimilation from אִינְהוּ, אִינְהִי. This latter view is countenanced by the plurals אִינְהוּ, אִינְהִי. The forms נִיהוּ and נִינְהוּ, representing the substantive verb, seem to be fresh compounds of the demonstrative *n* and אִידוּ, אִינְהוּ; e.g. מֵאִי נִיהוּ "what it is," אֲנָא נִיהוּ "it is I," צְדִיקֵי נִינְהוּ "they are perfectly righteous men." More certain examples of this formation with prefixed *ī* are אִידִי (for אִידִן), fem. אִידָא; and אִידִךְ, plur. אִינְךָ.

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 ኪሃ: *kīyā*, 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, *kīyā-ya*, *kīyā-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 هيا. From this it is but a step

to the common Arabic أيا *īyā*, which is used precisely like its Ethiopic equivalent, and appears in Tigrīña in the contracted form of ለ: *ī*, denoting *self*, as ለሮ: *īyē*, ለከ: *īkhā*, ለህ: *īyū*. 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 Phœnician אִית, which was doubtless pronounced in the earlier stages of the language *īyāth* or *īyath*; for otherwise the *y* would not have been inserted in writing, as is almost invariably the case in the older inscriptions. In the inscriptions of later date, however, we find אִת, and Plautus heard the word pronounced *yth*. The Aramaic forms seem to be shortened from the Phœn., viz. Syr. ላ, Chald. יִת, less correctly יִת. These

are used not only as a sign of the definite accus., **כִּנְעֵדָה בָּן**, **לְכִסְתָּן לִּי מִכְּבֵּל סוֹאֵן**; but also as a substantive, signifying *self*, e. g. **סֹאֵן יִכְנַעְלֵנִי חֲבִלָּס** "he who knows himself," **מִכְּבֵּלָה חֲבִלָּה** "free-will"; and likewise in the Palestinian dialects and in Samaritan to form demonstratives, as in the phrases **בִּיתָה יוֹמָא** "on that same day," **בִּיתָה שְׁתָּא** "in that same year," **לִּי וְלָהּ סֹאֵן** "at that same time," **סֹאֵן הָאִישׁ** "that man is a thief," **דִּין הַנִּינִי לִי יִתְהוֹן לֹא הַנִּינִי לִי** "this is of use to me, those are not." In this way we may best explain the Mandaitic demonstrative spoken of above, **הָאֲנָתָה** (masc. and fem.), **הָאֲנָתוֹן**, **הָאֲנָתִין**, where **אָת** is probably = **יָת**. Similarly 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 *ōt*, just as from **נָחֶשֶׁת** and **שָׁלַשֶׁת** we get **נָחֶשֶׁתִּי** and **שָׁלַשֶׁתִּי**. Next, *ōt* was changed into *ēth* **אֶת**, as in **אֶתְּם** for *attim*; and finally this **אֶת** was heightened by the tone into *ēth*, **אֵת**. In later Hebrew, perhaps under the influence of the surrounding Aramaic dialects, **אוֹת** came to be used, like **יָת**, as a demonstrative: **יָשָׁב לוֹ אוֹתוֹ**, **בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה**, **בְּאוֹתוֹ הַיּוֹם** "that one sat down," **זָכַר אוֹתוֹ הָאִישׁ לְטוֹב**. In Assyrian I find a word *attu*, which seems to be nearly connected with *yāth* and *ōth*, for example in such phrases as *attūa abūa* "my father" ("mon père à moi"), *zirya attūa* "my family" (זרע), *dīnāta attūa* "my laws" (דין), *bīta attūnu* "our house," *ša la iptallahū abīya wa attua* "who reverence (פִּלַּח) not my father and me." Schrader also regards as cognate with *yāth* the words *yātī* and *āšī*, in such phrases as *yātī Nabūnahīd šusibanni*, "as for me, Nabunit, save (שִׁיב) thou me"; and again, *ša lā iplahū abūtīya u āšī lā išbatū nīr sarrūtīya*, "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* + *tī* or *šī*, i. e. *ya* for *yath*, *a* suffix of the 1st pers., and a further demonstrative *tī* or *šī*. Sayce, however, gives a differ-

ent explanation of both words, so that we are evidently on unsafe ground. Even the Hebrew **אוֹת** 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 **آيَة** "sign" or "mark," "form" or "body," thus identifying it with the word **אוֹת** (for **אוֹת** or **אוֹתִית**), or else assuming a form **אוֹה** or **אוֹהִי**, from the construct state of which (**אוֹתִית** or **אוֹתִי**) **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 **הֲלָאָה** "away," "beyond," and **הֲלֵם** "here," "hither." In Hebrew the *l* was assimilated to all following letters; and when the doubling wholly ceased to be audible, the loss of it was compensated by the heightening of the vowel into *á* **הַ**, as in **הָאִישׁ**, **הָהָר**, **הָעִיר**, **הָרֹאשׁ**, on which and other modifications of the article see your Hebrew grammars. In Phœnician its form is the same as in Hebrew, but it is not so frequently used as in the latter language, e. g. **מִשְׁכְּבִי** for **הַמִּשְׁכְּבִי** **זוֹה**, **הַשְּׁעָרִי** **זוֹה** for **הַשְּׁעָרִי** **זוֹה**, **הָאָדָם** for **הָאָדָם** **זוֹה**, **הַמַּמְלָכָה** **זוֹה** for **הַמַּמְלָכָה** **זוֹה**.

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* **ث د ذ ر ز س ش** **التور**), e. g. **الْإِنْسَانُ**, **الْجَبَلُ**, **الْمَدِينَةُ**, but **الْأَنْثَى**, **الْشَّمْسُ** (the **النَّهَرُ**), **الْهَرَمُ**. In Egypt this assimilation is nowadays extended to **ج** and **ك**, as *eg-gazzār*, *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*, הַשָּׁנָה¹. Generally speaking, however, the initial *clif* 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 *kāla 'r-rajulu*, not *kāla ar-rajulu*, نَالَتْ الْمَرْأَةُ *kālāt 'l-mar'atu*, not *kālat al-mar'atu*. Indeed it was at times dropped altogether and only the *l* sounded, and this is common at the present day, e.g. *lahmar* "red," *liswid* "black," *lazhar*, 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 סְפִינְתָא, חַוָּא, נִבְרָא. 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 Himyaritic suffixed *n*, e.g. in מִזְבֵּחַ "this monument" or "tablet," שְׁעָרָה | וּבְנָהּ | בְּנוּ | מִרְתָּם | חֲקִנִּי | אֶלְמָקָה | דֶּהֲרִן | מִזְבֵּחַ | חֲמַעְתָּה | בֵּן | וְשִׁבְן | עֶרֶב | שְׁמֹהֲעֵלִי | מִשְׁלָמִן "this stone," or in מִשְׁלָמִן | מִזְבֵּחַ | עֶתְתֵּר | מִשְׁלָמִן | מִחְפְּרִיָּה | בֵּין | מִתְּנָהּ | אֲבַעַל | בֵּיתָהּ | בֵּיתָהּ "between these two towers" or "castles," "the lords of these two houses," "this house of ours" (where the *נ* is the suffix of the 1st pers. plur.²). Often the demonstrative pronoun דֵּן, fem. דֶּת, is prefixed to such words, as דֵּן מִזְבֵּחַ.

¹ [This statement rests on a misconception: هَازِي السَّنَةِ stands for هَازِي السَّنَةِ. Nöld.]

² Other examples are: דֵּן סִטְרִין, "this inscription"; דֵּן וְחִתִּין, "this idol"; דֵּן פֶּתַח, "this door"; דֵּן מִבְּנִין, "this building"; צִלְמִין, "this statue"; וְאַבְלָחָה, "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 דְּ of the Biblical Aramaic, shortened in the Targums and in Syriac into דְּ, ܕ. One or other of these forms appears in all the Aramaic dialects except the Egyptian and that of some ancient inscriptions, which have וי. The Mandaites say ܕܐ as well as ܕܠ, and the same form ܕܐ 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 ד, as טܐܒܝܕ טܐܒ "he who does good," טܐܒܝܕ טܐܢܐ "he who does evil" (where טܐܒܝܕ = דܐܒܝܕ); רܘܚܐ טܐܒܐܪܐܬܐܢ (דܐܒܝܕ); "spirit of our fathers." The word וי, 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 ד. In modern Syriac ܕܐ or ܕܠ is frequently employed for ܕ, as ܕܥܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ (for ܕܥܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ) "the Saviour of the world," ܕܥܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ (for ܕܥܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ) "the forgiveness of sins," ܕܥܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ (for ܕܥܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ) "the passion of our Lord," *bārit ʾishū*, i.e. ܕܥܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ, "after Jesus."

Identical with this דְּ or ד is the Arabic ذُو, generally employed in this one form for both genders and all numbers; as بئرِي ذُو حَفَرْت "he who said that came to me," أَتَانِي ذُو قَالَ ذَلِكَ "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. ܕ (𐩢), fem. ܕܐ, plur. ܕܐܐ or ܕܐܐܐ.

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

forms of the demonstratives. H: *šā* may be used, like ה' and ד', for both genders and numbers. The fem. לז: we must trace back to the demonstrative particle *en*, or the letter *n*, plus the fem. termination *z*; and the plur. לל: to the demonstrative letter *l*. In Hebrew occurs the cognate form לו, likewise invariable.

In Arabic and Hebrew the simple article אל, is sometimes employed as a relative; e.g. مِنَ الْقَوْمِ الرَّسُولِ اللَّهِ مِنْهُمْ "of the people of whom is the Apostle of God," for الَّذِينَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ مِنْهُمْ; Joshua x. 24, הַהֹלְכִים אִתּוֹ "who went with him"; 1 Sam. ix. 24, וְהַעֲלִיף אֶת-הַשֹּׁק וְהַעֲלִיף; 1 Chron. xxvi. 28, וְכָל הַהִקְדִּישׁ שְׁמוּאֵל.

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

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

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

Eth. **አሠር**:: In support of this view they appeal to analogies in other languages, e. g. the Chinese, where *so* means both "place" and "which," and to the vulgar use of *wo* in German, for example, "Der Mann, *wo* ich gesehen habe," instead of *welchen*, or again, "Der Fremde, *wo* du mit ihm gegessen hast," instead of "mit welchem du gegessen hast." Gesenius, in his immortal work, the *Thesaurus Linguae Hebraeae*, sought to connect **אֲשֶׁר** with the Hebrew radical **אִשֵּׁר**: "Modo in tali vocabulo de etymo quaerendum est, **אֲשֶׁר** pr. *rectum* valuisse conjecerim ab **אִשֵּׁר** *rectus fuit*, deinde *recte, ita*, i. q. **בֵּן** et Germ. *so*, idque in antiquiore lingua in pron. relat. abiisse. Cf. **כִּי** *ita*, et relativum **כִּי**, et contra Germ. *so*, i. e. propr. relat. fem. Simonis relationem ita exprimi censet, quod ad sequentia rectâ tendat." Ewald, whose opinions I would always mention with the respect due to so great a scholar,—Ewald's latest view seems to have been that **אֲשֶׁר** stands for **אִשֵּׁר**, and is compounded of two demonstratives, **ש** = **ת**, **ר**, **ו** and **ל**, plus the prosthetic **א**. Finally, Friedrich Böttcher looks upon **אֲשֶׁר** as standing for **אִשֵּׁל**, and as made up of a merely prosthetic **א**, and a word **שֵׁל**, 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. **הָקִטַּל** = **שָׁקִטַּל**, **אָקִטַּל**). 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 ܠܗ, "here," with the Chaldee ܠܗ. 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. שֶׁ, שְׁ, שֻׁ, but also שֵׁ (in שְׁהִם, Eccles. iii. 18, and according to one reading in שְׁהוּא for שְׁהוּא, Eccles. ii. 22). In Phoenician the word is written אש, but that the ש may originally have had a vowel is at least suggested by the transcription of words handed down to us by Latin and Greek authors, such as *Nesso esse sade* (capillus Veneris), i. e. נֶצֶה אֲשֶׁר שְׁהָ. More frequent, however, are the shorter forms *as*, *es*, *ys*, *is*, and also *si*, *su*, which last correspond to the Hebrew שֵׁ; e. g. in the Poenulus, *assamar binam*, אֲשָׁמֶר בְּנַעַם "what he says is friendly"; *ys siddobrim*, *thyfel yth chyl ys chon them liful*, i. e. (probably), אִישׁ שֶׁדְּבָרִים תִּפְעֵל אֶת-כָּל-אִשׁ-בֶּן תֵּם לִפְעֵל, in Latin *eum fecisse aiunt, sibi quod faciundum fuit*; or, to quote another line, *yth alonim valonuth siorathi simacom syth*, i. e. אֶת-אֲלוֹנִים וְאֲלוֹנוֹת שֶׁקִּרְאָתִי שֶׁמִּקּוֹם זֹאת.

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

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

spoke in a former lecture. In Aramaic we meet with two forms, *דִּיל* and *דִּיד*. The former is found in the Talmūd, e.g. *אֲנִן בְּדִידֵן וְאִיְהוּ בְּדִידֵהוּ* "we (occupy ourselves) with our affairs, and they with theirs." This arises, as Luzzatto has suggested, from a combination of *דִּי* with *יָד*, "hand." It also occurs in modern Syriac in the forms *دِي، ديس، دِيْ، dīyī, dīyukhī, 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 חֲכֻמָּתָא וּנְבוֹרָתָא דִּי־לֵיהּ הִיא*; and prevails in the Targūms and in Syriac¹. The equivalent *נֶשֶׁל*, from *אֲשֶׁר לְ*, occurs in later Hebrew, as well as in Phoenician. Already in Jonah i. 7 we read *בְּנֶשֶׁלִּי* "for whose cause?" and in ver. 12, *בְּנֶשֶׁלִּי* "for my sake"; and similarly in the Poenulus *ulic silli*, *דּוּלְךָ נֶשֶׁלִּי*, "my guest" (lit. "wanderer"); *amma silli*, *אִמָּא נֶשֶׁלִּי*, "my mother"; *bene silli*, *בְּנִי נֶשֶׁלִּי*, "my son." A fuller form seems to occur on a Tyrian signet ring, viz. *לְבַעֲלִיתֵן* "אֵשׁ אֵלִם אֲשֶׁלְמֶלְכָתָּה רַצָּה" "(belonging) to Ba'al-yathon, a priest (lit. a gods'-man) of Melkart Rsph."

D. *The Interrogative Pronouns.*

The first of these to which I would direct your attention is the Arabic *أَيّ* *ayy*, fem. *أَيَّة* *ayyah*, fully inflected, meaning "who, which, what?" It governs a genitive, as *أَيّ أَرْضٍ* or *أَيَّةُ أَرْضٍ* "which land?" *أَيّ الرجلين* "which of the two men?" *أَيّهما* "which of them?" *أَيّ الرجال*

¹ Compare the African *الدي ل = ذبال*.

² In vulgar Arabic it has become *شي*, or in combination with *شي* (thing) *شي*; *لي*

סמ. Further, in the Talmūd, הִי יִנּוּ or הִיִּנּוּ “who,” “which,” “what is—?” for הִיִּדִין הוּ; הִיִּדִין הוּ “where?” “how?” הִיִּדִין הוּ; “in respect of which?” “in reference to which?” for עַל-הִיִּדִין; לְ-הִיִּדִין “to which?” “whither?” for לְ-הִיִּדִין. In the Aramaic of the Targūms both forms occur; הִיִּדִין and הִיִּדִין “how?” הִיִּדִין and הִיִּדִין, fem. הִיִּדִין and הִיִּדִין, “who, which?” הִיִּדִין and הִיִּדִין, “where?” הִיִּדִין and הִיִּדִין, “how?” In Syriac we have only the forms with *aleph*, but in great abundance; for instance: אֲכַל (ākl) “how,” “as,” with its derivatives אֲכַל “as,” “like,” אֲכַל “together,” “at once,” אֲכַל “as one who,” “as if,” אֲכַל, “as”; further, אֲכַל “where?” from אֲכַל “here”; אֲכַל, “how?” for אֲכַל and אֲכַל; אֲכַל “whence?” for אֲכַל; אֲכַל for אֲכַל, “who?” with its fem. אֲכַל and plur. אֲכַל; and finally, with a shortening of אֲכַל into אֲכַל, אֲכַל; and finally, with a shortening of אֲכַל into אֲכַל, אֲכַל “when?” in the Targūms אֲכַל and אֲכַל, from the Heb. מִתִּי, Arab. مَتِي. In modern Syriac there are similar forms, though of course more or less corrupted. Such are: אֲכַל ikā or אֲכַל ikā, “where?” אֲכַל edānā, for אֲכַל, “when?” iminē or imnē, “which of them?” אֲכַל or אֲכַל, in Talmudic אֲכַל מִנִּיִּהוּ; further, אֲכַל “who?” from אֲכַל and אֲכַל, with another form אֲכַל emī, which is, strictly speaking, derived from the old plural אֲכַל. In Mandaitic the same interrogative exists in מִנָּא m’nā, “whence?” which is also a Talmudic form, for מִנָּא or מִנָּא, i.e. מִן אֵין minnē lākḥ, in the Talmud מִנָּא לָךְ, undenam tibi? Also in אֲכַל or אֲכַל, for אֲכַל, “whither?” מִלָּא millē, “whence?” עִמָּא or עִמָּא, “when?” עִמָּא and אֲכַל or אֲכַל, “where?” from אֲכַל, אֲכַל, with suffix אֲכַל “where is—?” in which form the real interrogative has wholly disappeared, just as in the modern Syriac

אֵלָּא "where is he?" from אֵלָּא *ikā*, "where?" Here too I should mention the Mandaitic forms האמניא and האמנו, probably standing for האני מנה and האני מנהון, 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; ሙን: *mānū*, acc. ሙን: *māna*, "who?" and ሙንተ: *mēnt*, acc. ሙንተ: *mēnta*, "what?" The Himyar. form is also ሙን, but more usually ሙን, with the substitution of 𐩦 for 𐩢. In Arabic we have ordinarily مَنْ *man* for persons, but a distinction of gender is made in the rare case of the word standing alone, when it is fully inflected, the masc. sing. being مَنْو *manū*, and the fem. مَنْه *manah* (with aspirated *h*, for مَنْت) and sometimes مَنْت *mant*. The Assyrian forms are said to be *mannu* or *manu* and *man*, which last is identical with the Aramaic ܡܢ, ܡܢܝ. Hence arise in the Aramaic dialects, by the addition of the pronoun *hū*, such forms as Syriac ܡܢܗ; Talmudic ܡܢܝ, fem. ܡܢܝ, for ܡܢ ܗܝ, ܡܢ ܗܝ; Mandaitic ܡܢܐ; modern Syriac ܡܢܝܬܐ, ܡܢܝܬܐ, ܡܢܝܬܐ, 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. Tigrīña ሙን: "who?" and ሙንተይ: *mēntāy*, rarely ሙንተ: and ለንተይ: "what?" This latter is compounded of ሙንተ: and the other interrogative ለይ:: In Amharic the commonest forms are ሙን: "who?" and ሙን: "what," shortened from ሙንተ::

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

in the latter, it is the natural weakening of *ā* in the shut syllable, and is pronounced in pause *mīn* مִין. 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. ለጸላጸ: "how pleasant!" ለደቦሊ: "how great is—!" ለመን: "how great?" "how much?" (from መን: "measure, quantity"). The Phoenician form of the personal interrogative seems also, from some phrases in the *Poculus*, to have been *mā*.

The neuter form *mā* is common to the Arabic, Hebrew, Phoenician, and the Aramaic dialects, مَا, מָה, מַה, مَا; and we also find abundant traces of it in Assyrian, as I shall show you presently. This form I would venture to explain, with Fr. Bottcher, 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*, מַה, *mah*, and finally disappear altogether in pronunciation, the vowel being lengthened in the now open syllable, מָה, *māh*. Compare the different stages of such words as أَنَف, أَنَف, أَنَف "anger" (Arab. أَنْف "nose"), or תֵּת, with suffix תֵּתִי, from תֵּת, תֵּת, תֵּת or תֵּת, תֵּת (for תֵּת); and the series of changes which produced the ordinary feminine termination of nouns הַ, אַ, out of the original *at*, viz. (1) *at*, (2) *ath*, תַּ, (3) *ah*, with aspirated *h* (found in Arabic in rhyme), and finally (4) *ā*, הַ, אַ. In this way too we are enabled to give an easy explanation of the *daghesh forte* which so constantly follows this word, and of the forms מַה, מָה, מֵה, as compared with those of the article הַ, הָ, הֵּ, from הֵּל.

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

tracted in Mandaitic into **מו** in the word **אמו** "why?" i.e. **על מאהו = אל מאהו**. By adding **דין** to **מא** there arises in Talmudic the word **מאי** "what?" in composition **אמאי** "wherefore?" "why?" = **על מאדין**. In ancient Syriac the same combination of **מא** with **דין** and **דין** finally resulted in the contracted forms **מֻנֵּ** and **מֻנֵּ**, the latter of which was farther weakened into **מֻנֵּ**. Hence in combination with **דין** arose the form **מֻנֵּ** "what is it?" = **סֻנֵּ**. In modern Syriac this same *mā-dēn* has been contracted into **ܡܕܢܒ**, with a rather unusual weakening of the vowel in this dialect; and this is farther shortened into **ܡܕܢ**, **ܡܕܢ**, and even **ܡܕ**, as in **ܡܕ ܡܕܢܐ** "what shall we do?"

With regard to the neutral **مَا** in Arabic, I may observe that it is not unfrequently shortened into **مَا** *mā*, especially in connection with prepositions, as **عَمَّ، اِلَيَّ، عَلَيَّ** for **عَنْ، مِمَّ، عَنْ**, for **لِمَ، بِمَ، فِيمَ، مِنْ**. These last two words are still further abbreviated in poetry into **لِمَ** and **بِمَ**, which shows us the origin of the word **كَمْ** "how much?" standing for **كَمْ** or **كَمَا**, Syriac **ܡܡܐ**, Hebrew **כִּמָּה**. In Ethiopic this abbreviated *mā* is frequently appended to other interrogatives, with somewhat the same force as the Latin *nam*; e.g. **ጠንቲ፡ (mānū-mā) ለከተ፡** "who art thou, pray?" **ጠንቲ፡ ጠንቲ፡ mēnt-nū-mā,** **እይቴ፡ aytē-mā,** **እፍ፡ ḫfō-mā,** **ጣእከ፡ mā'ḫē-nū-mā.**

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

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

The indefinite *mā* is often attached in Arabic as an enclitic to another word, to give it a certain vagueness, as قَلِيلٌ مَا "a small quantity"; اَعْطِنِي كِتَابًا مَا "give me some book or other." At other times it conveys something of an intensifying force, as جِئْتَ لِمَرٍّ مَا "thou art come for some matter" (of importance); whence أَيُّ فِتْيٍ مَا is often nearly equivalent to أَيُّ فِتْيٍ "what a youth!" "what a man!" Hence we obtain an easy explanation of such a word as the Chaldee מְדַע "something," which is in reality a contraction of מְדַע מָא "scibile quid." All the other forms of this word are only more or less corrupted; e.g. Chald. מְדַע (like מְדַע for מְדַע), Mand. מִנְרָא, Syr. مَدْعَا, Tal-mud. מִדְּי, modern Syriac مَدْعَب. 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 مَدْعَم and in modern Syriac مَدْعِب, whilst the Mandaitic forms a new substantive מִנְרָא, "a thing," plur. מִנְרִיא.

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 جَرَمٍ "without any offence," مِمَّا خَطِيئَاتِهِمْ "because of their sins,"

عَمَّا قَلِيلٍ “after a little,” بِمَا رَحْمَةٍ مِّنَ اللَّهِ “by God’s mercy.” The same is the case in Hebrew, only that מָה has in this case been modified into מוּ. Hence בְּמוֹ-שָׁלָן, Job ix. 30, *kērē*; בְּמוֹ-אֶפֶל, Ps. xi. 2; לְמוֹ-חָרָב, Job xxvii. 14; and בְּמוֹ-אֶבֶן, Exod. xv. 5. So also before pronominal suffixes בְּמוֹנִי, בְּמוֹךְ, בְּמוֹהוּ. Here the Ethiopic at once shows the old form in its ክ፡ *kāma*, “as,” “like,” but with suffixes ክ፡ሃ: *kamā-ya*, *kamā-ka*, *kamā-hū*, *kamā-hōmū*. You will, I think, find the same weakening of *mā* to *mō* in a word which appears in the Chaldee lexicons as מוֹדְלָא or מוֹלָא “wealth,” “property,” with the variants מִדְלָא and מוֹלָא, the former of which is certainly a mere error. מוֹלָא seems to me to be identical with the Arabic مَاْلٌ, which is in reality a compound of مَا “what” and ل “to,” literally, “what belongs to one.” In מוֹדְלָא the compound has been strengthened by the relative ד; that is to say מוֹדְלִי “my property,” or מוֹדְלֵיהּ “his property,” is really מוֹ + ד + לִי “my property,” or מוֹדְלֵיהּ, literally “that which is to me” or “to him.”

E. *The Reflexive Pronouns.*

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

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

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

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

In other cases still, where it was positively necessary to make a distinction, recourse was had to a compound pronoun, such as $\eta\rho\iota\iota$, $\iota\eta\kappa$, $\sigma\lambda\acute{\iota}$; 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 نَفْس "soul," plur. أَنْفُس , and عَيْن "eye, essence," plur. أَعْيَان ; but in the later stages of the language we also find رُوح "spirit," حَال "state," and دَات "essence"; e.g. تَجِبِي بِرُوحِكَ "thou wilt come thyself" (or "in person"), قَتَلَ حَالَهُ "he has killed himself," $\text{رَاحَ هُوَ بَدَاتِهِ}$ "he is gone himself" (or "in person").

In Ethiopic $\Lambda\Lambda$ is employed for the nominative in the forms $\Lambda\Lambda\rho$: *lalē-ya* or $\Lambda\Delta\rho$: *lalē-ya*, $\Lambda\Lambda\eta$: *lalē-ka*, $\Lambda\Lambda\iota$: *lalē-hū*, etc. This $\Lambda\Lambda$: Dillmann maintains to be nothing more than a reduplication of the demonstrative syllable *la*, which we have already found in so many pronominal forms. Praetorius has suggested another derivation, viz. from the verb $\Lambda\Lambda\rho$: "to separate," whence the Amharic $\Lambda\Lambda$: "another"; and for this no doubt analogies might be produced from other languages; but for the present I prefer to abide by Dillmann's view as the simpler. For other cases than the nominative the Ethiopic employs the word ረእሰ : "head," as ወን ትረሰረ ረእሰሰ : "whom dost thou make thyself (to be)?" ላዕላ ረእሰሰው : "against yourselves." ኛሩ is of comparatively rare occurrence in this sense, as ወመወ ኛሩ ለዋት : "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 ላዕላ :

or ብዓል: "lord, master," as ባዕለይ: ርእሹ: "I myself have seen," እኔህ: እኔ: ብዓለይ: ሊዩ: "behold, it is I myself." More rare is the use of ብዓልቤት: "master of the house," e.g. ወድሪዓ: ብዓልቤት: ተፈሪ: "for the earth brings forth fruit (of) itself." These two are generally used for the nominative, whilst for the other cases is commonly employed ርእሷ: "head"; less frequently ነፍሷ: "soul," and ሥጋ: "flesh," "body." From ነፍሷ: are formed, as I said before, the personal pronouns ነከከ: *nessē-khā*, "thou," and ነሁ: *nessū* "he," as well as the reduplicated ነከነከ: "one another," as ተባህሉ: ነከነላቶ: "they spoke to one another," or "among themselves." The word ብሐት: *solitudo*, is also used in the sense of *self*, apparently for any case; and similarly ሰብነት: "humanity"; though these two may perhaps be restricted to the third person. In Amharic nearly the same words occur in their appropriate dialectic forms, viz. ባለቤት: ራክ: ነፍስ: and ሰውነት:: From ራክ: has been derived the pronoun of the 3rd person, እርሱ: , farther contracted into እሱ: *ʾssū*.

In Assyrian the common reflexive is *rāman*, which seems to stand for *raḥman*, just as *ruk* for *raḥuk*, רֹחֶק. It is therefore equivalent to the Heb. רָחַק, 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 *ramanīšu*, 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 נִפְּץ, though פָּנִים, "face, presence," is also employed, e.g. Exod. xxxiii. 14, פָּנַי יִלְכּוּ, 2 Sam. xvii. 11. עָצָם, "bone," is used in the Bible in speaking of things only, as בְּעָצָם הַשָּׁמַיִם, בְּעָצָם הָאָרֶץ; but in later Hebrew it is applied to persons, לְעָצָמִי "for myself"; as are also גֶּרֶם "bone" and גּוֹף "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 נפש is common; in later writings נרם, which we also find in Samaritan and in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac. In Syriac نَفْسٌ and مَتَمَلٌ are the dominant words, مَتَمَلٌ being very rare. In Mandaitic נאפשא is used; whilst مَتَمَلٌ is found in Samaritan, in the forms קנום and קלום, and may possibly also occur in Phoenician¹. I regret my inability as yet to give any satisfactory etymology of this word. Modern Syriac still makes use of نَفْسٌ nōshā, but far more frequently employs the word نَفْسٌ, which is merely the Persian جان jān, "soul"; as בְּחַיָּהּ תִּסְוֶה אֶת־נַפְשִׁי לְחַיֵּי כָל־חַיָּה "who was making my way bitter to me," יִנְיֶהֱוֶה אֶת־נַפְשִׁי "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. Inschr.* (4^o Gott. 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 מִינְדָּאם "something," כּוּל ד "all that," and מַא ד or מַאֲהוּ ד "what," "whatever." Even the word מָלַךְ, מֶלֶךְ, מַלְכָּה, the nearest approach in the Semitic languages to a neuter, is only, as I tried to show you in

جَدَّة "grandmother"; عَظِيم "great," قَاتِل "killing," قَاتِلَة.

In Ethiopic it is less frequent than *t*, though by no means uncommon; e.g. ርደት: "descent," ሰፍት: "garlic" (ሰፍ, ሰፍት), ነቀት: "she-camel" (ነቀ, ነቀት), በረከት: *barakat* "blessing" (በረከ, በረከት), ጸጸት: "tent" (ጸጸ, ጸጸት).

In Hebrew this termination is rare in the simple form of nouns; as examples take בִּרְקֶת (a precious stone), צִרְפֶּת (places), מַחֲלֵת (women); also with *kāmes*, הַקֶּאֶת "the pelican," בַּעֲלָת (a place), פֶּרֶת (Gen. xlix. 22), הַמֶּאֶת "sin," מִנֶּת for *manayat*, "portion"; also אַחֲוֹת, חֲמוֹת, for *ahawat*, *hamawat*. But we find it everywhere in the so-called construct state, and also before the pronominal suffixes, as נַחֲלֵתִי, נַחֲלֵת.

Now observe the history of these forms, from which you will perceive the absurdity of saying that the fem. termination in Hebrew is הַ, and that it becomes תְּ in the construct state. The reverse is the fact. The original form is the תְּ of the construct, and it becomes הַ. The Ethiopic presents us with the original form *t* or *at*. The Hebrew retained this termination in the construct state, before pronominal suffixes, and in a few other cases. But in the simple form of the noun the aspirated 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 *ā*, הַ, as נַחֲלָה¹. So also in Arabic; the original *t* is retained in بِنْتُ, أُخْتُ, and in the Kōr'ān in a few other words, e.g. Sūra xi. 76, رَحِمَتْ آلَ اللَّهِ; as also before suffixes, رَحِمَتِي, رَحِمَتَهُ. The next step was to the aspirated *h*, which

¹ Cf. what has been said above, p. 124, of the pronoun מֶה, מָה, מַה.

form is used by the Arabic poets in rhyme, as, for example, when ^{عَدْلُهُ} (for ^{الْعَدْلَةُ}) is rhymed with ^{أَيْلُهُ} (for ^{الْأَيْلَةُ}) and with ^{وَلَّهُ} (for ^{وَلَّهُ}); or ^{السَّلَامُهُ} (for ^{السَّلَامَةُ}) with ^{أَمَامُهُ} (for ^{أَمَامَةُ}). The last step is to drop the *h*, as is done in the vulgar pronunciation, ^{الْعَدْلُ}, ^{السَّلَامُ}, ^{الرَّحْمَةُ}. The spelling with the dotted *ṣ* is merely a compromise of the grammarians between the old ^ت and the vulgar ^ه; if I write ^{سَنَة}, I indicate at once the old pronunciation ^{سَنَت}, ^{شَنَت}, and the more recent ^{سَنَه}, ^{شَنَه}. If you ask for analogies in other languages for such changes as this of *at* into ^ا, *ath*, then into ^ا, *ah*, and finally into *á*, ^ا, I can give you several. The final aspirated *d* of the Spaniard, for example in the word *ciudad*, has a very faint sound to an English ear, and the consonant has altogether vanished in the corresponding Italian *città* for *civitat* (i.e. *civitatem*). So also in French, in the verb, *il aime*, from *ille amāt* (for *amavit*), but interrogatively *aime-t-il?* from *amāt 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 ^{אֵי} for ^{אֵי}, and the modern Syriac ^{ܐܝܬܐ} for ^{ܐܝܬܐ}; or, to go a little farther afield, consider the Armenian *hayr* and the Irish *athir*, both the regular equivalents in these languages of the Latin *pater*. In *hayr* an aspirated *p* remains as *h*, and an aspirated *t* has vanished (as in *père*); in *athir* an aspirated *p* has vanished, whilst an aspirated *t* remains only in writing, for the word is actually pronounced *ahir*.

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

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

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

In Phoenician the noun ends in ת, whether it be in the simple or the construct state, as in the usual dedication of the Carthaginian *ex voto* tablets לרבת לתנת, "to the goddess Tanith," or in the words from the sarcophagus of king Eshmunazar, וְאִמִּי אִמְעֶשֶׁתָּרַת כְּהֵנַת עֶשֶׁתָּרַת רַבָּתָן הַמְלִכָּה, or again וְשִׁכְבָּךְ אָנֹכְךָ בְּחֵלֶתִי. We find however traces of a younger form in א *δ*, corresponding to the Hebrew תָּ, very rarely in inscriptions, more frequently in the words handed down to us by classical authors; e. g. *κιννάμω*, Heb. קִנְיָה, "cassia" or "cinnamon"; *nesso*, Heb. נֶצֶחַ, "flower"; *Dido*, either for נִידִיָּה, according to the explanation of the *Etymol. Magnum* *πλανήτις*, or for יִדִּיָּה; *Karχηδών*, *Carthago*, corruption of קֶרֶת חֲרָשָׁה. 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: חַיֵּי, חַיֵּי, חַיֵּי, חַיֵּי.

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, רַבָּת, Ps. lxx. 10, cxx. 6, cxxiii. 4; Aramaic, טוֹת "fasting," Dan. vi. 19; Syriac, חַיֵּי, חַיֵּי, חַיֵּי "alive," חַיֵּי "well," חַיֵּי "naked," חַיֵּי "gratis, for nothing"; חַיֵּי "last," חַיֵּי or חַיֵּי "first," where *ith* is merely, as Noeldeke has remarked, a weakening of the older *yath*; חַיֵּי "carnally," חַיֵּי "spiritually," from חַיֵּי and חַיֵּי; חַיֵּי "like a wild

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

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

With the Hebrew **ܐܢܐ** in Lament. i. 1, **ܐܢܐ**, it can have nothing to do; that form is to be classed with **ܐܢܐ**, **ܐܢܐ**, etc., which I shall try to explain when we speak of the cases. Examples of this fem. in **ܐܢܐ** from the Talmud and Targūms are: **ܐܢܐ** "his little finger," **ܐܢܐ**, **ܐܢܐ**, etc., which I shall try to explain when we speak of the cases. Examples of this fem. in **ܐܢܐ** from the Talmud and Targūms are: **ܐܢܐ** "the new year," **ܐܢܐ**, **ܐܢܐ**. So in Mandaitic, **ܐܢܐ** "small," **ܐܢܐ** "new," **ܐܢܐ** "another," **ܐܢܐ** "white," **ܐܢܐ** "heavy," **ܐܢܐ** "ancient," **ܐܢܐ** "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 **ܐܢܐ**. Here too the original termination was *at*, as is proved not only by the Arabic **ܐܢܐ** *katalat*, the Ethiopic

כַּתְּלַת: *katdlat*, and the Syriac ܕܠܬܬܐ *kəṭlāth*, but also by the following evidence derived from Hebrew itself. (1) The form with final *t* is actually found in Deut. xxxii. 36, אֲזַלְתָּ (for אֲזַלְתָּ), Ezek. xlvi. 17, וְשַׁבְתָּ; possibly too Isaiah xxiii. 15, וְנִשְׁפַּחְתָּ (for וְנִשְׁפַּחְתָּ); as also in the whole class of verbs so-called, e.g. עָשִׂיתָ for עָשִׂיתָ, הִרְצִיתָ for הִרְצִיתָ, הִגִּלְתָּ for הִגִּלְתָּ. This is exactly the Arabic جَلَّتْ, by contraction for جَلَيْتَ; and the uncontracted גִּלִּיתָ is actually found once in Hebrew in the pausal חֲסִיָּה נִפְשִׁי, Ps. lvii. 2, whereas the ordinary pausal form is עֲשֵׂתָּה. The ordinary non-pausal form עָשִׂיתָ, גִּלִּיתָ, etc., is a secondary formation, in which the fem. suffix is repeated in the form ה־, thus aiming at uniformity with the ordinary קִטְלָה. (2) The form with final *t* invariably occurs in connexion with pronominal suffixes; e.g. יִלְדְּתִנִּי; יִלְדְּתֶךָ, or with assimilation יִלְדְּתִנוּ, יִלְדְּתֶיךָ, יִלְדְּתֵנוּ, יִלְדְּתֵיךָ. 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, מִטָּרָא Lament. iii. 12; and even in the verb, גִּבְהָא Ezek. xxxi. 5. We also find the vowel of this syllable weakened, though very rarely, into ם, as in the noun הַזֹּזָה for הַזֹּזָה, Isaiah lix. 5, and in the verb לָנָה for לָנָה, Zechar. v. 4.

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

language possesses two others, viz. $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{a}u$, both, as it would seem, originally of abstract signification. Examples of the former are $\bar{b}\bar{s}\bar{r}\bar{i}$ "good news," $\bar{h}\bar{m}\bar{i}$ "a fever," $\bar{d}\bar{u}\bar{o}\bar{i}$ "a claim," $\bar{r}\bar{o}\bar{i}\bar{a}$ "a vision"; of the latter, $\bar{s}\bar{a}\bar{k}\bar{r}\bar{a}$ or $\bar{b}\bar{i}\bar{d}\bar{a}$ "a desert," $\bar{k}\bar{b}\bar{r}\bar{i}\bar{a}$ "glory, pride." The one, viz. $\bar{a}$, forms the feminine of adjectives ending in $\bar{a}n$, as $\bar{s}\bar{b}\bar{e}\bar{a}n$ "sated, not hungry," f. $\bar{s}\bar{b}\bar{e}\bar{i}$; and of the form $\bar{a}\bar{f}\bar{e}\bar{l}$ used as a superlative, e.g. $\bar{a}\bar{l}\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{f}\bar{e}\bar{r}$ "the smallest," f. $\bar{a}\bar{l}\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{f}\bar{e}\bar{r}\bar{i}$. The other, $\bar{a}u$, forms the feminine of $\bar{a}\bar{f}\bar{e}\bar{l}$, when it is not a comparative or superlative, as $\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{m}\bar{r}$ "red," $\bar{h}\bar{m}\bar{r}\bar{a}$; $\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{m}\bar{t}$ "foolish," $\bar{h}\bar{m}\bar{t}\bar{a}$. These terminations seem to find their representatives in Ethiopic in nouns ending in $\bar{a}$, as $\bar{h}\bar{n}\bar{g}$: "building," $\bar{d}\bar{a}\bar{w}\bar{h}$: "joy," $\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{a}$: "oath," $\bar{o}\bar{a}\bar{q}$: "wrong," $\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{z}$: "temptation," $\bar{g}\bar{a}$: or $\bar{q}\bar{a}$: "toil," $\bar{g}\bar{t}$: "order, row"; and in $\bar{e}$, as $\bar{w}\bar{c}\bar{p}$: "beam, mast," $\bar{h}\bar{c}\bar{p}$: "army," $\bar{q}\bar{q}$: "moth," $\bar{q}\bar{h}$: "time," $\bar{o}\bar{p}\bar{a}$: "appointed time." The rules of gender are, however, very loosely observed in Ethiopic, and most of the words just cited may also be construed as masculine.

The Arabic termination $\bar{a}$ is represented in Syriac by the form ai , as in $\bar{h}\bar{d}\bar{a}\bar{b}$, $\bar{h}\bar{e}\bar{m}\bar{b}$, $\bar{h}\bar{e}\bar{f}\bar{b}$, $\bar{h}\bar{e}\bar{g}\bar{b}$, $\bar{h}\bar{e}\bar{h}\bar{b}$, and a few more. In Hebrew this termination can hardly be said to exist, unless we reckon as examples of it the proper name $\bar{s}\bar{h}\bar{r}\bar{i}$, of which the later form is $\bar{s}\bar{h}\bar{r}\bar{a}$, and the numeral $\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{r}\bar{a}$, in the compounds $\bar{a}\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{t}$ $\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{r}\bar{a}$, etc., which may stand for an original $\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{r}\bar{i}$. Of the other ending $\bar{a}u$ I can find at present no certain trace in Aramaic and Hebrew, for Hebrew words in $\bar{i}$ or $\bar{e}$, mostly proper names, seem, without exception, to have lost a final u , $\bar{o}\bar{n}$. $\bar{g}\bar{l}\bar{a}$ and $\bar{s}\bar{i}\bar{l}\bar{a}$, for example, form the adjectives $\bar{g}\bar{i}\bar{l}\bar{a}\bar{i}$ and $\bar{s}\bar{i}\bar{l}\bar{a}\bar{i}$. Since, however, in Arabic, we find

صَنَاعِي derived from الصَّنَاعَة, بَهْرَانِي from the name of the tribe بَهْرَانِي, رَوَّحَانِي from رَوَّحَاء, it may be that גִּלְדָּה and שַׁיִלְדָּה, as well as the Moabite קָרְחָה, represent an original *Gaild'u*, *Shaild'u*, and *Karhd'u*.

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

II. *Numbers and Cases.*

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

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

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

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

بَيْتٌ	بَيْتٌ	بَيْتٌ
جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةٌ

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

الْبَيْتُ	الْبَيْتُ	الْبَيْتُ;

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

بَيْتُ يَوْسُفَ	بَيْتُ يَوْسُفَ	بَيْتُ يَوْسُفَ
بَيْتُهُ	بَيْتُهُ	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*, عَمَّكُ, which is really the nominative, used for all three cases.

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

form I shall call your attention more particularly hereafter; e.g. **פֶּלֶץ**: "Cain," **יְהוּדָה**: "Judah."

In Assyrian, so far as I can understand the statements of the grammarians, these terminations are, as a general rule, appended to the noun when it is not in the construct state, but apparently without any regard to the actual relation of case. Thus, according to Schrader, the Assyrian writes *ina lisān māt Aḥarri*, "in the language of the country of Phoenicia," without any case-sign in *lisān* and *māt*; *šar Babilu*, "king of Babel"; *malku bānušun*, "the king their builder"; *āšib 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., **הָאֲרֶצָה** "to the ground," **בֵּיתָהּ** "homewards," "inwards," **הַבֵּיתָהּ** "into the house," **הָעֵינָהּ** "to the well," **הָרָהּ** "uphill," **הָהָרָהּ** "to the mountains," **לְשֹׁכֶתָהּ** "to Shechem," **בְּחֶמֶתָהּ** "into a chamber," **הַבִּמְתָּהּ** "to the highplace," **גִּשְׁן** **אֶרֶץ** **שֶׁבַע**, **בְּאֶרֶץ** **שֶׁבַע**, **אֶרֶץ** **גִּשְׁן** "to the highplace," **הַבִּמְתָּהּ** "to the highplace," **יָמָה** **סוּף**, **בֵּיתָהּ** **יוֹסֵף**. As real objective accusatives I may cite **הִקֵּל אֶרֶץ וּבִלּוֹן וְאֶרֶץ נַפְתָּלִי** "he abased, etc." Isaiah viii. 23; **מִי פָקַד עָלָיו אֶרֶץ** "who hath committed to his charge the earth?" Job xxxiv. 13. Here you may remark that the vowel *a* is expressed in writing by the letter ה. This does not, however, justify us in speaking of a "ה locale," as if the ה were anything more than the mere indication of the final vowel.

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

grammatical accuracy than in Assyrian or in modern Arabic. The nominative termination is **ו**, in such phrases as **וְחִיתוֹ-אַרְצָן** Gen. i. 24, **כָּל-חִיתוֹ-יָעַר** Ps. l. 10, **לְחִיתוֹ-אַרְצָן** Ps. lxxix. 2, **בְּנוֹ צֶפֶר** "O son of Šippôr," Num. xxiii. 18, **נָאֵם בְּלָעָם בְּנוֹ בְּעֵר** Num. xxiv. 3, 15, **לְמַעֲיְנוֹ-מִים** Ps. cxiv. 8. The purer form **ו** I can discover only in a few compound nouns, e.g., **אָחוּמִי**, **פְּנוֹאֵל**, **מְתוּשָׁלַח**, and **מְתוּשָׁאֵל**. The genitive termination is **י**, as in **מְלֵאֲתִי** Lam. i. 1, **רַבְתִּי עִם** Ps. cx. 4, **עַל-דְּבַרְתִּי מֶלְכִי-צָדֵק** Isaiah i. 21, **בְּנִי אֲתָנוּ** (acc.) Gen. xlix. 11. It appears also in many compound proper names, as **גְּבַרְיָאֵל**, **מֶלְכִי-צָדֵק**, **עֲזַרְיָאֵל**, **חַנְיָאֵל**.

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

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

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

Of these three forms the Ethiopic has preserved before pronominal suffixes the nom. እቡ:, as እቡከ: "thy father," and the accus. እባ:, as እባከ: "thy father," though እቡከ: is also used for the accusative. The Hebrew has chosen the genitive for all its three cases, אָבִי "father of —," אֶבְרָא; whereas the Syriac has preferred the nom., ܐܒܝܐ, and similarly ܐܒܝܐ and ܐܒܝܐ.

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

The origin of the nominative *il* is more obscure; but we may possibly venture to see in it the pronominal element *hū*, as designating the subject. Finally, the genitive *iz*, '—, may perhaps be connected with the termination of the so-called relative adjectives in '— (Arabic ⁵—, vulgarly ⁵—), 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 *il*, *iz*, *id* 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. *in*, *izn*, *ān*. E. g.

بَيْتٌ	بَيْتٌ	بَيْتَانِ
جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّتَانِ

In the accus. form ^{baïtâ} **بَيْتًا** the letter 'alif may perhaps serve to mark the pausal pronunciation, *baïtâ*, 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 *nîl*.

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 Hîmyaritic inscriptions of South Arabia in the form **ם** for all three cases, its use nearly corresponding with that of the Arabic *nîl*ation; e.g., **שִׁמְשֵׁם** **עֵבְלָתָם**, **כְּלָבָתָם**; **שָׁנִי נִשְׁנָא**, **אֲנִי אֲדָנִי**, **שִׁמְשֵׁם**; **עֵבְדִּי שִׁמְשֵׁם**, but **עֵבְדִּי שִׁמְשֵׁם**.

In Hebrew the *mîmation* seems to me to present itself in such words as **אֲמָנָם** or **אֲמָנָם**, **חָנָם**, **רִיקָם**, which I consider as the accusatives of **אֲמֵן**, **חֵן** and **רִיק**. **יֹמָם** is doubtful, as it may be connected with **יֹמָמָא** rather than with **יֹם**. In Ethiopic we may perhaps find a trace of it in the word **ተጠጠረ**, Heb. **תַּתְּמֹל**, **תַּתְּמֹל**.

Now what is the origin of these terminations *um*, *im*, *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**, **מָה**. 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**, **מָה** 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 *صَلْبَةُ مَا*, i. e. مَا appended to an indefinite noun with a vague, often intensifying, force; e. g., *أَعْطِنَا كِتَابًا مَا* "give us some book (or other)"; *قَلِيلٌ مَا* "some (small) quantity"; *جِئْتُ لَأَمْرٍ مَا* "thou art come for some matter (of importance)." Similar is the origin of the Aramaic word *מִיָּדִי, מִכְּסֵּל, מִיִּנְדָּאם, מִדְּעָם*, a contraction of *מִדְּעָ מָה* "scibile quid." For the rest, how readily مَا may be shortened into *mā* and *m* appears from such Arabic forms as *كَمْ* "how much?" *لَمْ, بِمَ, حَتَّى مَ, عَلَي مَ* shortened into *لِمَ, بِمَ*.

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

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

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

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

N. *ūn*, G. *īn*, Acc. *ān*.

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

N. *ūna*, G. *īna*, Acc. *āna*.

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

N. *ā*, G. *ī*, Acc. *ā*.

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

N. *ā*, *āna*; G. Acc. *ī*, *īna*.

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

The Aramaic dialects make use, not of the accusative, but of the other oblique form, the genitive, for their plural. Hence we find the forms *īn* in the Biblical Aramaic, *ēn* in Syriac, and in Mandaitic both *īn* and *ēn* (*ē*).

The same choice was made by the Hebrews and Phoenicians. They discarded both the nom. *ām* and the accus. *ām*, retaining only the gen. *īm* in ordinary use¹. 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 *īn*, e.g., *המלכן שח*, *ארבען שח*, *גברן*, *חמט היערן*, etc.

this form in *î* is said to be not uncommon in Assyrian, as in *ilî*, "gods"; *malkî* or *malikî*, "kings"; *âmî*, "days"; *pagrî*, "dead bodies"; with suffixes *karhîšû* "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 *ām*, representing the old accusative, in the Assyrian *šamāmu*, *šamāmi*, "heaven," *māmi*, "water," and the adverbial *akhāmîš*, "with one another, mutually (*lit.* like brothers)." It seems probable, as he suggests, that the plural *ān* is only a later form of this *ām*. And indeed he goes so far as to deny the existence of the termination *i*, which he pronounces *ġ*, and considers to be only a deflection of *ā*, from *ān*, *ām*.

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

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

Sing.	N. <i>atu</i> , <i>atun</i>	Plur.	<i>ātu</i> , <i>ātun</i>
	G. <i>atî</i> , <i>atîn</i>		<i>âtî</i> , <i>âtîn</i>
	Ac. <i>ata</i> , <i>atan</i>		<i>âta</i> , <i>âtan</i> .

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

expect, the termination נֶֿת , Δ^e , $\hat{a}th$, $\hat{o}th$; in Hebrew, with the usual vowel-change, נִת , which sinks in the later Phoenician into $\hat{n}th$, as in Plautus's *yth alonim valonuth*. In Assyrian $\hat{a}tu$, $\hat{a}ti$, $\hat{a}ta$, are common; but there is also (if the grammarians may be trusted) a termination $\hat{n}t$, corresponding perhaps to the Hebrew and Phoenician $\hat{o}th$, $\hat{n}th$; and a third form in $\hat{n}t$ (or as Haupt pronounces it $\hat{e}t$), restricted to such words as have already weakened at into it in the singular. E.g., *ina šanāti dannāti*, "in long (*lit.* strong) years"; *tabbanātu*, "buildings," from *tabbanu*; *ibššti*, "deeds," from *ibšit* (עֲבֹשֶׁת), according to Haupt *ēpšētī*; *išrīti* (*ēsrēti*) "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 Ḥimyaritic and Ethiopic. In the northern dialects examples are either wanting or of rare occurrence. Bottcher 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 ܨܒܬܐ from ܨܒܬܐ (Arabic قَرْيَة , plur. قَرِي), and ܨܡܬܐ from ܨܡܬܐ (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 ܢܨܪ is a plural of ܢܥܣܪ , "helper," or ܥܕܠ of ܥܕܠܐ , "just"; but in reality these are nothing but the infinitives of ܢܨܪ and ܥܕܠ , meaning "help," and "justice," and may be applied alike to one or more, man or woman; for we can say ܕܥܕܠܐ ܕܥܕܠܐ , ܕܥܕܠܐ ܕܥܕܠܐ , and ܕܥܕܠܐ ܕܥܕܠܐ . Another plural of ܩܬܠ , viz. ܩܬܠܐ , is an example of the same sort, being really an intensive infinitive, to be compared with the Syriac ܩܬܠܐ , ܩܬܠܐ , 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 *ä*. Hence result the forms—

N. $\check{a} + \check{a}n = aun$

G. $\check{a} + \check{a}n = ain$

Ac. $\check{a} + \check{a}n = \check{a}n$.

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 *ä*; whence the forms

N. *auni* G. *aini* Ac. *äni*.

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. *ä*.

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. *ä, äni*

G. Ac. *ai, aini*.

In modern Arabic the first of these has now disappeared from ordinary use, leaving only the form *ain, en*, for all the cases. In S. Arabian or Hımyaritic the termination is also *ן*, as *עלמן ואבלנהן* (acc.), *ולביתנהן* “and their two houses (castles),” *מאתן אסדם* “two hundred warriors” (nom.), *עמלנהן* “these two statues” (acc.). In Ethiopic scarcely a trace of the dual can be detected. In Assyrian Schrader gives as examples *iddä*, “two hands”; *uszûä*, “two ears”; *šipa-ai* (for *šipä-ya*), “my feet”; *birka-ai*, “my knees”; *kata-ai*, “my hands.” Here the final *n* seems to have been cast off, according to the analogy of the plural in *î* for *im*.

The Aramaic form is אִין, with slight supplemental vowel, for אִין *ain*, corresponding to the ordinary Arabic oblique form اَيْنَ, اَيْنَ. This was contracted into אִן, as in מֵאָתָן for מֵאִין, “two hundred”; or into אִין, as in תֵּרִין for תֵּרִין, “two.” In Syriac it survives in only two or three words, in the form *ên*, viz. ܐܢܝܢ, f. ܐܢܝܢ, ܐܢܝܢ, and ܐܢܝܢ; further weakened into *in*, in ܐܢܝܢ, ܐܢܝܢ, “Mesopotamia,” ܐܢܝܢ (1 Kings xviii. 32), ‘Heb. כְּבִית סְאִתִּים זָרַע, and even אִתֵּי = אִתֵּי, אִתֵּי = אִתֵּי; just as in Latin the sole representatives of the dual are the words *ambo*, *duo*, and *octo*. The Hebrew form is אִין, for אִין *aim*, with *m* for *n*, as in the plural; e.g., יוֹמִים, שָׁנִים, כְּבִיתִים, מֵאִתִּים, אֶלְפִים; and often in proper names, as בֵּית דְּבָלִים, עֵין עַגְלִים, קִרְיָתִים, חֲרָדִים, חֲפָרִים, הָעֵינִים. Rarer forms are the contracted אִן, as הָעֵינִים (Josh. xv. 34), קִרְיָתָם (Ezek. xxv. 9, *kethlbbh*); and אִן in שָׁנִים עֶשְׂרֵה, f. שָׁנִים עֶשְׂרֵה. Further, אִין, contracted אִן; e.g., דָּתִין, דָּתִין, and קִרְתִּין (Josh. xxi. 32). On the Moabite stone both forms appear, אִן and אִן; e.g., בֵּית דְּבָלִת, מֵאָתָן, 1. 15, but חֲרָדִין.

And here I may intercalate the remark that the words מֵים and שָׁמַיִם are not duals, but plurals, from obsolete singulars מֵי and שָׁמַי. The original forms must have been *maylīm* and *shamaym*, which were contracted into *maym* and *shamaym*, just as in Arabic هَوَيْنَ, مَوِيَّتَ، لَيَيْنَ، خَدِيرَ, gradually pass into هَوَيْنَ، مَوِيَّتَ، لَيَيْنَ، خَدِيرَ. But since forms like *maym* and *shamaym* were intolerable to the ear of the later Hebrews, a short vowel was inserted to lighten the pronunciation, resulting

in the forms מִים and שְׁמִים, the latter of which was pronounced in Phoenician *shamém*, as in Plautus's *gune balsamem*, i.e., גֻּנֵי בַעַל שְׁמִים.

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

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

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

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

and of the plural,

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

In Assyrian in like manner the construct dual ended in *ā*, as *birka-ai* (for *birka-ya*), "my knees"; the plural in *ī* [or *ē*], as *šarri-šunu*, "their kings." Consequently we should expect the Hebrew and Aramaic dual to have the construct form *ai*, *ē*, but the plural in both languages *ī*; יְדֵיהֶם, יְדֵיהֶם, from יָדִים, יָדִים; but from מַלְכֵיהֶם, מַלְכֵיהֶם, we should look for מַלְכֵיהֶם, מַלְכֵיהֶם, which however do not exist. The actually existing forms are מַלְכֵיהֶם, מַלְכֵיהֶם; 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 מַלְכֵי, מַלְכֵי, "my kings," for *malakai-ya*, corresponding with יָדֵי, "my hands," for *yadai-ya*; and מַלְכֵיהֶם, מַלְכֵיהֶם, "his kings," corresponding with יְדֵיהֶם, יְדֵיהֶם, standing for *malakai-hū*, *yadai-hū*, and *malakau-hū*, *yadau-hū*, in which latter I descry a vestige of the long obsolete nominative dual in *aun*, construct *au*.

(2) The form ܐܢܝܢ , ܐܢܝܢ , used as the simple plural of feminine nouns in Aramaic; e.g., ܩܕܝܫܝܢ , ܡܕܝܢܝܢ , as contrasted with the construct ܩܕܝܫܝܢ , ܡܕܝܢܝܢ , which correspond with the Arabic plural in *āt* and the Hebrew in *ōth*. This form in *ān*, *ōn*, which also plays an important rôle in the verbal inflection, I regard as a variation of the masculine *ān*, under the influence of the ordinary fem. *āt*. 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; ܕܢܒܪܐ "the man," ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ ; ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ "the city," ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ . 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 *hā*, gradually weakened into *ā*. $\text{ܕܢܒܪܐ} + \text{ܕܢܒܪܐ}$ became ܕܢܒܪܐ ; $\text{ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ} + \text{ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ}$. Other forms underwent greater alteration. $\text{ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ} + \text{ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ}$ was contracted into ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ (instead of ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ). ܕܢܒܪܐ , on the other hand, is another example of the transference of a dual form to the plural, since it arises by assimilation from $\text{ܕܢܒܪܐ} + \text{ܕܢܒܪܐ}$. In Syriac and Mandaitic the termination ܐܝܢ is shortened into ܐܝܢ (*ē*), though the full form is retained in some cases; for example, in Syriac, in the plural of many words derived from radicals ܐܠܐ , and in a few other instances, such as ܐܠܐܝܢ , "thousands." This contraction naturally commenced with a weakening of the final syllable into *ē*, as in ܐܠܐܝܢ for ܐܠܐܝܢ , ܐܠܐܝܢ as interjection for ܐܠܐܝܢ , 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. كِتَابُكَ f. كِتَابِكَ, "thy book" (nom.)

كِتَابُكَ f. كِتَابِكَ, "thy book" (acc.)

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

3. كِتَابُهَا f. كِتَابِهَا, "his, her book" (nom.)

كِتَابُهَا f. كِتَابِهَا, "his, her book" (acc.)

كِتَابُهَا f. كِتَابِهَا, "of his, her book" (gen.)

and so on. Only the suffix of the 1st pers. sing. absorbs the vowels of the case-endings, so that "my book," "of my book," is كِتَابِي or كِتَابِي in all the three cases.

The forms of the spoken Arabic of the present day are such as we should naturally expect, when we take into account the loss of the case-terminations and other final vowels. "My book" is كِتَابِي, "my father" أَبِي or أَبَوِي; "thy father" is أَبُوكَ, fem.

أَبُوكِي 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 كِتَابُكَ and كِتَابِكَ we have كِتَابُكَ *kitābak* and كِتَابِكِ *kitābik*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

the two vowels in *malkā-ik*. In Aramaic two forms are found, כִּי and כִּי. The Syrian writes مَلَكَيْك, but does not pronounce the final *i*. The *ē* 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 *negūsē-kī*, acc. *negūsā-kī*. Hebrew parallels are רָעֵהְכִי, Jerem. xi. 15; עֲוֹנֵי, Ps. ciii. 3.

3rd pers. sing. masc. Ar. مَلِكُهُ, gen. مَلِكِهِ; vulg. مَلِكُو. The Hebrew forms very nearly resemble those of the vulgar Arabic, viz. מַלְכָּה, generally מַלְכּוּ. These seem to find their origin in the old accus. *malka-hu*, with elision of the *h*, *malka-u*. Quite different is the Aramaic כִּי, as in מַלְכִּי, which I trace to the ancient genitive *malki-lu* or *malki-li*. Parallel forms to this in Hebrew are לְמִינֵהוּ, Gen. i. 21; אוֹרֵהוּ, Job xxv. 3. Instead of כִּי we occasionally find in Aramaic אִי, the *h* having apparently become silent; and this form appears in the Phoen. suffix אִי, more commonly written י, as in קִלְיִי and פִּנְיִי. Hebrew forms like אֲבִיו (*abhū*), פִּיו (*pū*), also spring from the old genitive, with elision of the *h*, for אֲבִיהוּ, פִּיהוּ, which likewise occur.

3rd pers. sing. fem. Ar. مَلِكُهَا, vulg. مَلِكْهَا. In Hebrew we have הָ, as in אֲבִיהָ, but more commonly הַ, agreeing with the Aramaic הַ (הָ =), הַ, as in מַלְכָּהּ, מַלְכֶּחָּ, which we may derive from *malkā-āh*, for *malkā-hā*.

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

therefore nearer to the Aramaic נָאֵ, as מְלִכְנָא (פ), מְלִכְנָא. The Jewish Aramaic form has a tone-long vowel in the penult owing to the accent, (as in the Ethiopic *negūsá-na*). The Syriac has lost the final vowel of the pronoun, under the influence of the same accentuation (compare חֲנִי for חֲנִיָּא, חֲנִיָּא אָבָא).

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

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

3rd pers. plur. masc. Ar. مَلِكِهِمْ, مَلِكِهِمْ; vulg. مَلِكِهِمْ, مَلِكِهِمْ. In Hebrew the simplest form of the suffix is *hēm* for *hum*, as in פִּיהֶם, אֲבִיהֶם, 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 כָּלָהֶם, 2 Sam. xxiii. 6, in pause for *kulla-hēm*; whence, by elision of the *h* and contraction, arises the common כָּלָם. A still fuller form is represented by the suffixes מוֹ, מוֹ, as in חֲלָבָמוּ, עֲזוֹמוּ, פְּרִימוּ, פִּימוּ, contracted from *hēlba-hēmū*, etc. מְלִכְכֶּם stands therefore for original *malka-humū*. The Aramaic forms need no further explanation, מְלִכְכֶּנָא, etc.

3rd pers. plur. fem. Ar. مَلِكُنَّ, مَلِكُنَّ, vulg. مَلِكُنَّ. Here again the oldest Hebrew form is the rare כָּלָהֶנָּה; as in לְכָל־הָנָה, 1 Kings vii. 37, בְּתוֹכָהֶנָּה, Ezek. xvi. 53, for *kulla-hēnna* and

tôkha-hēnna. Contracted from this are the forms in נָה־ and נָה־, as לְרִתָּנָה, פְּאֻנָה, פְּלֻנָה, לְבִדְנָה, קִרְפָּנָה. Still shorter is the common הָ, as in לְבִדְהָ, חִלְבְּהָ, and ׀, as in לְפָן. The successive Hebrew forms appear then to have been *malka-hēnna*, *malka-hēn*, contracted *malkāhēna*, *malkāna*, *malkān*. The Aramaic form מַלְכָּחְסֵי calls for no further remark.

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

Dual nom. عَبْدَايَ “my two servants,” عَبْدَاكَ, etc.

gen. عَبْدَيْكَ, عَبْدَيْكَ, etc.

Plur. nom. بَنُوهُ “his sons,” بَنُوكَ, etc.

gen. بَنِيكَ, بَنِيكَ, etc.

But “my sons” is expressed by بَنِي for both nom. بَنُوِي and

gen. بَنِي. In Hebrew and Aramaic this difference between

the dual and plur. has disappeared; because, as it seems to me, the dual terminations in the suffixes have wholly supplanted the plural. The Assyrian said *šipa-ai* “my two feet” [Del. *šepāa*], *birka-ai* “my knees,” *kata-ai*, “my hands,” for *šipā-ya*, *birkā-ya*,

katā-ya, just as the Arab said رِجْلَايَ, رِجْلَايَ; 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. יָדַי for

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

construct form *yadai* (Ar. يَدَيَّ), which became יָדַי; but קְטִילַיִם

for *kātilīm* (Ar. قَاتِلِينَ, vulg. قَاتِلِينَ) should equally yield קְטִילַיִם.

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

1st pers. sing. Arab. *مَلَكِي، يَدِي*. Heb. *מִלְכִּי, יָדִי* 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, *מַלְכִּי, מְכַזְּבִי*.

2nd pers. sing. Arab. *مَلِكِيكَ، يَدِيكَ*. Heb. *יָדֶיךָ* and *מִלְכֶיךָ* for *yadai-ka* and *yadai-ki*, shortened *yadai-k*, *מַלְכֶיךָ* for *malakai-ka*. The fuller form of the fem. also occurs, e.g. *חַיִּיכִי* and *נְעוּרֶיכִי* in Ps. ciii., for *חַיִּיךָ* and *נְעוּרֶיךָ*. This leads us to the Syriac forms *مَكْضَبْ* and *مَكْضَبِي*, with silent *yūd*. In Biblical Aramaic the diphthong has been weakened into *ā*, just as in Hebrew *אֵין* became *אָן*, or in Aramaic itself *מֵאתַין* became *מֵאתָן*. Hence the masc. *מַלְכִּיךָ*, for *malkai-ka*, is according to the *k'rē* to be pronounced *מַלְכֶיךָ*; whereas the fem. is usually pointed *מַלְכִּיכִי* [in the Targums], though *מַלְכֶיכִי* is also found.

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

native dual דַּבָּרָוּהַ *dabarau-hu*, by elision of the *h*, *dabarau-u*, and then *dabarau*, דַּבָּרוּ; just as the 1st pers. *dabarai-ya* became *dabarai*, דַּבְּרִי. Such at any rate must be the origin of the Aramaic forms מַלְכוּהַ, מַלְכֻסָּה, the latter with silent סָה, for *malkau-hu*. The form מַלְכוּי, with elision of the ה, also occurs; and this appears to be the Phoenician form in such phrases as בְּעֶנְלֵ אִשׁ קַרְנִי לֵם, כִּי שָׁמַע כָּל דַּבְּרֵי, though we may perhaps also read קַרְנִי and דַּבְּרֵי, in closer accordance with the Hebrew forms.

3rd sing. fem. Arab. مَلَكِيَا, يَدِيَا; Heb. מַלְכִּיהָ, יְדִיהָ, for *yadai-hā*, *malakai-hā*. The corresponding Aramaic forms are, מַלְכָּהָ (rarely מַלְכִּיהָ), Biblical, מַלְכִּיהָ, *k'rē*, מַלְכָּהָ; Syriac مَلَكَيْتِ, both standing for *malkai-hā*.

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

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

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

יְדִיהֶם, מְלִכֵּיהֶם; and, on the other, the more poetic שְׁנֵימֹ, אֱלִיהֶמָּה. Archaistic is the form in Ezekiel xl. 16, זְבַחֵימֹ, from אֵיל as an architectural term. The Aramaic forms are מְלִכֵּיהֶן, מְלִכֵּיהֶן.—The corresponding *fem.* is in Arab. يَدِيَّهِنَّ; Heb. יְדִיהֶן, מְלִכֵּיהֶן; Aram. מְלִכֵּיהֶן, מְלִכֵּיהֶן. Ezekiel indulges in the archaistic form גְּוִיֹּתֶיהֶן, ch. i. 11.

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

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 *katal*, *katil* and *katul*, especially as concrete substantives and as adjectives. It is in the latter function that we notice them here.

Examples of the form *katal* in Arabic are تَبِعَ "following," "a follower," بَطَلَ "brave," حَسَنَ "handsome"; in Hebrew, חָכֵם "wise," יָשָׁר "upright," רָשָׁע "wicked." The form *katil* may be exemplified in the one language by بَطِرَ "proud," دَنَسَ "dirty," عَاجَلَ "quick"; in the other, by כָּבֵד "heavy," זָקֵן "old," טָמֵא "unclean." As instances of the form *katul* I will cite in Arabic نָظַقَ "clever," يَقُظَ "awake," حָذَرَ "timid"; in Hebrew, יָזַח "afraid," קָטַן "small," גָּבַהַ "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 *katal* would yield the form *kâtal*, which is of comparatively rare occurrence, as in طَابَعَ and خَاتَمَ, "a stamp," "a seal," Heb. חוֹתֵם, and in the participles of Hebrew verbs ל"ה, as חוֹה for חוֹי (i.e. *hâsai*). The vowel of the second syllable has generally been weakened into *i*, thus rendering it indistinguishable from the heightening of *katil*, viz. *kâtil*. Hence, in the words just cited, the forms طَابَعَ, خَاتَمَ, as well as the great bulk of the participles of the form قَاتِلٌ, Heb. קוֹטֵל. Here the lengthening of the first vowel seems to express the continuity or duration of the action.

The heightening of the 2nd vowel yields us the common intensives of the form *kâtâl*, *kâtîl* and *kâtîl*. (1) *Kâtâl*, as in Arabic شَجَاعٌ "brave," جَبَانٌ "cowardly," كَهَامٌ "blunt"; Heb. גָּדוֹל "great," עוֹשֵׁק "an oppressor," קדוֹשׁ "holy." (2) *Kâtîl*, as in Arabic رَحِيمٌ "merciful," كَرِيمٌ "noble," ثَقِيلٌ "heavy"; Heb. גָּרִיִם "wounded," قָטִילٌ "slain," אֲסִירٌ "bound, a prisoner"; Heb. נְבִיא "a prophet," חָסִיד "gracious, pious"; אֲסִיר "bound, a prisoner," מְשִׁיחַ "anointed." (3) *Kâtîl*, as in Arabic أَكُولٌ "gluttonous," كَذَّابٌ "lying," جَسُورٌ "daring"; Heb. עָצוּם "strong," חָרוּץ "sharp," נְחוּשׁ "brazen," and the ordinary participle passive קטול.

The Aramaic furnishes us with an example of the heightening of *both* vowels in the form *kâtâtâl*, as כְּחוֹא, כְּחוֹא; כְּחוֹא, נְחוֹא.

The doubling of the 2nd consonant appears in Hebrew in the common form *kattal*, intensive of *katal*; e.g. גָּנַב "thief," טָבַח "cook," "executioner," חָרַשׁ "cutter," קָנָא "jealous," and with

weakening of the first vowel in the shut syllable אָכָר "husbandman." Also in the form *ḵattil*, intensive of *ḵatil*, with weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* in the shut syllable and tone-lengthening of the 2nd into *ē*, *ḵittēl*, as נִבֵּן "humpbacked," עִוֵּר "blind," פִּקְחָה "openeyed, seeing," חֵרֵשׁ "deaf."

The intensives of the first grade, *ḵatāl*, *ḵattl*, and *ḵathl*, are all capable of being heightened in the same way, thus yielding the forms *ḵattāl*, *ḵattīl*, and *ḵatthl*. (1) *Ḵattāl* is very common in Arabic and Aramaic, e.g. نَبِيْءٌ, مُضْمِلٌ, صَيَّادٌ, نَجَّارٌ, طَبَّاحٌ. In Hebrew we find קְנֹא "jealous," with *ō* for *ā*, but more usually the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened into *i*, e.g. יְפֹר "one who reprehends" or "finds fault" (Job xl. 2 or xxxix. 32). (2) *Ḵattl* is very common in Hebrew and Aramaic, e.g. צַדִּיק "strong," עֹרֵיץ "oppressor," "tyrant," עֲלִיז "exulting," "rejoicing," אִפִּיר "bound"; מְדַבֵּר "wise," אִזֵּב "just," מְדַבֵּר "exact." In Arabic the first vowel is weakened into *i*, e.g. سَكِرَ "drunken,"

صَدِيقٌ "very truthful," عَرِيفٌ "very fond of meddling." (3) *Ḵatthl*, as Heb. רַחוּם "merciful," חַנוּן "gracious," נֶשְׁבֹּל "deprived, bereft of young," אֶלּוּף "tame, domesticated, intimate"; Arab. قَدُوسٌ "very timid," قَيּוֹם "abiding, everlasting," قَدُوسٌ "most holy." In Arabic the vowel of the 1st syllable is sometimes assimilated to that of the 2nd, as قَدُوسٌ or سَبُوحٌ "all pure" or "all glorious."

Another important class of nouns in the Semitic languages is the so-called *Segolates*, of which the normal form is *ḵatl*, *ḵittl*, *ḵutl*, still retained in Arabic, e.g. أَرْضٌ "earth," عَجَلٌ "calf," أُنْثَى "car." They are also used as adjectives, e.g. صَعْبٌ "diffi-

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

صَلْبٌ "hard," حَلْوٌ "sweet," مَرٌّ "bitter." The corresponding Aramaic forms are *k'tal*, *k'til*, *k'tul*, with transposition of the vowels, which however resume their normal place in the emphatic state, e.g. חֲמֻלָּהּ חֲמֻלָּהּ חֲמֻלָּהּ. 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 אֶרֶץ, with suffix אֶרְצוֹ; סֶפֶר for סֶפֶר, with suffix סֶפְרָה; אֶזֶן for אֶזֶן or אֶזֶן, with suffix אֶזְנִי. But the Aramaic forms are also found in our Hebrew text, though more sparingly, in the construct state; e.g. גִּבֹּר תַּמִּים Ps. xviii. 26; כּוֹרֵעַ-גִּד Num. xi. 7; נִמְעֵ נִשְׁעֵשׁוּעָיו Isa. v. 7; מִפְּחַד כֶּסֶף 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 state¹.

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

² [Cf. Noldeke'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, *ḡātala*, *ḡātīla*, *ḡātūla*, precisely corresponding to the three nominal or adjectival forms mentioned above. The form *ḡātala* is, generally speaking, transitive; whilst *ḡātīla* and *ḡātūla* 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, *ḡātala* would be an ancient adjective signifying "killing," or, as a verbal form, "he killed"; حَرَن would signify "sorrowing" or "he sorrowed";

ثَقَل, "being heavy" or "it was heavy." It is possible however that *ḡātala* may already be a contraction for *ḡatal-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 *ḡatīla* and *ḡitīla*. (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 קָטַלְנִי *ḡ'ṭālā-nī* = Arab. *ḡātala-nī*; Aram. קָטַל מְלֵא *ḡ'ṭal*, but with suffix מְלֵאֵנִי *ḡ'ṭālā-n* for *ḡ'ṭālā-nī*, *ḡātala-nī*.

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," فَضَّل *fiḡḡil*, "it was over and above," كَثَّرَ *kitir*, *kutur*, "it was much," سَكَتَ *sikit*, *sukut*, "he was silent." The existence of the same forms in the other Semitic languages can easily be proved. In Ethiopic the

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

ܚܬܬܐ ܐܢܝܢ ܕܩܪܝܢܐ. Verbs of the form *kaṭila* are, on the contrary, very common in Aramaic; as ܡܠܝܩ, ܡܠܝܩܐ;

ܕܩܪܝܢܐ. 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 *mīti*, "he is dead," which would correspond to the Heb. מֵת, Syr. ܡܬܐ, except in its rather perplexing final vowel¹.

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

If we have rightly regarded *kaṭala*, 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 *kaṭala* is formed, as in the noun, by the addition of *t*. The Arabic has *kaṭalat*; the Ethiopic, *kaṭālat*, *yābsat* for *yābisat*, *mēḥrat* for *māhirat*. 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. ܩܬܠܐ, ܩܬܠܐ, for *kaṭlat*, *kaṭlat*, *kaṭalat*. In Hebrew the usual form is *kāṭlā*, ܩܬܠܐ, 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 facts². (1) The termination *at* actually occurs, e.g. in ܐܘܠܬܐ Deut. xxxii. 36, ܩܬܠܐ (for ܩܬܠܐ) Exod. v. 16, ܩܬܠܐ (for ܩܬܠܐ) Deut. xxxi. 29, ܩܬܠܐ Ezek. xlvi. 17, ܩܬܠܐ (for ܩܬܠܐ) Levit. xxv. 21; etc. (2) The termination *at* has always been retained before pronominal suffixes, in which case we find the forms ܩܬܠܐܗܘ, ܩܬܠܐܗܘ, 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 *mīt*, and recognises a permansive form *kaṭil* 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. יִטְנָא (prob. יִטְנָא) in a Cyprian inscr. of B.C. 254 [C.I.S. 93]; in Carthag. inscr. נִרְרָא or נִרְרֵע, “she vowed” (also נִרְרֵעָא “she (Tanith) heard,” for שִׁמְעָא, etc. I will only add that the final *t* disappears also in Mandaitic before enclitic ב and ל with suffixes, e.g. נִפְלָאֵלָה, “she fell,” for נִפְלָאֵלָתָה, instead of נִפְלָאֵת. So also in the dialect of the Talmūd Babilī, עִרְיָקָת, “she fled,” אִמְרָה לִיה, “she went,” side by side with אִמְרָה לִיה, and in derived conjugations אִינְסִיבָא “she was married,” אִינְסִיבָהּ לִיה “she was betrothed to him.” In such Talmudic forms as הָוִי for הָוָה, and אִתְּתִיָּהּ “his sister came” for אִתְּתִי, we may perhaps discover a lingering trace of the original 3rd radical *yūd*.

If we be right in regarding *ḡatala*, 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 *ḡatalūna* as the oldest form of the 3rd pers. plur. masc., which is still preserved to us in יִרְעִין Deut. viii. 3, 16, and perhaps in צָקִין “poured forth” Isa. xxvi. 16; as also in the Aramaic forms קְטַלִין, صَحْلَق, and the Assyrian *katlūni*, side by side with *katlū*. Usually, however, the final *n* has been dropped, as in the construct state of the noun; whence we obtain the ordinary Arabic *ḡatalū*¹, the Ethiopic *ḡatalū*, *lābsū*, *mēḡurū*; the Heb. קָטְלוּ; and the Aramaic קְטַלוּ. In the Aramaic dialects the process of corruption has gone yet farther. The Syriac pronounces *kʿtal*, and hence we find in old MSS. صَحْلَق as well as the more accurate صَحْلَق. In Mandaitic too the ordinary form is סְגִיד, נִפְאָק, though the termination *n* is sometimes restored before enclitics, as נִצְאִבֻלָךְ

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

“they planted for thee.” I may add that in Mandaitic the full form in *ūn* is usually preceded by a *yūd*, for the insertion of which I find it hard to account; e.g. רהיטיון, סליקיון, נפאקיון “they ran.” In the dialect of the Talmūd Bablī we find the same rejection of the termination *ū*, but it seems to leave its mark in an assimilation of the vowel of the preceding syllable; thus, אסור “they have bound” or “banned,” for אסרו; עביר “they have sinned,” for עבדו; נפקו “they have departed,” for נפקו.

The feminine of *ḵatalāna* we should naturally expect, in accordance with the nominal flexion, to be *ḵatalāna*; and though this form has entirely disappeared in Hebrew, it exists in the other languages. In the Aramaic dialects we find the final *n* retained, in the termination *ān*, or, with a weakening of the vowel, *ēn*. So in the Targūms there occur such words as אמרן, אתגדרן “were made clear”; in Mandaitic, with inserted *yūd*, רגאזיאן “they were angry”; in Syriac, מלכ for *ḵʿtalān*. The Arabic exhibits the form *ḵatalna*, which I cannot as yet make up my mind to regard as anything else than a strong contraction of *ḵatalāna*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 *nagārā*, *lābsā*, *mēhrā*; the J. Aram. קטלא. The Syriac must of course have once had the form *ḵʿtālā*, but dropped the final vowel, whence we find in MSS. both מלכ and מל. In the Christian Palestinian dialect we find קטלי, and so also in Samaritan; but the Mandaitic writes נפאק, סליק, like the Syriac. The older form with the final vowel *ā* appears in Syriac only before some of the pronominal suffixes, e.g. قتلني “they have killed me,” قتلني, قتلني, corresponding with the Jewish Aramaic קטלני, קטלני, קטלני.

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 Noldeke (*ZDMG.* xxxviii. 412) who regards the Arabic *ḵatalna* as formed on the analogy of the corresponding imperfect form *yaḵtulna*.]

have gone on the assumption that the original forms are *ḵatalūna* and *ḵatalāna*. I must tell you however that this is altogether denied by such scholars as Noeldeke and G. Hoffmann¹, who maintain the originals to be *ḵatalū* and *ḵatalā*, and explain the forms in *ūn* and *ān* or *ēn* as later pronominal additions, comparing in particular the vulg. Arab. *katabum* for *katabū*, i.e. *katabū* + *hum* (see Noeldeke in *ZDMG.* xxxviii. p. 410), or else as analogical formations to 𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤀, 𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤀; 𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤀, 𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤀; 𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤀, 𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤀.

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

The original accentuation of the 3rd pers. I believe to have been that of the old Arabic, *ḵátala*, *ḵátalat*, *ḵátalū*. The Ethiopic, Hebrew and Aramaic carried the accent onward to the next syllable, thus obtaining the forms *ḵatdla*, *ḵatdlat*, *ḵatdlū*; *ḵāḏál*; and *ḵṯál*, *ḵṯálū*. The vulgar dialects of the Arabic vary, I believe, between *ḵátal* and *ḵatál*. But in the intransitive forms the Ethiopic left the accent unshifted, and dropped the vowel of the middle syllable, *yábsa*, *sékkhna*. That the Hebrew accentuation too was once the same as in the old Arabic is clear, as it seems to me, from the vocalisation in particular of the fem.

קָטַלָּהּ and the plur. קָטַלְוּ, 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 קָטַלָּהּ and קָטַלְוּ, 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. נִתְּנָה, דִּבְּקָה, יִבְּלוּ; and it is only when pronom. suffixes are appended, and the tone is consequently thrown forwards towards the end of the word, that we get in Hebrew the forms קָטַלְתָּ and קָטַלְוּ, e.g. אֶבְלַתְּהוּ, אֶבְלַתְּהוּ, and אֶבְלָיוֹם; just as in Ethiopic we have *nagarátō*, *nagarú-nī*, *nagaréwō*, and in Arabic itself *ḵatalát-hu*, *ḵatalú-hu*. The Aramaic 3rd pers. sing. fem.

¹ [See *ZDMG.* xlii. 747.]

קַטְלַת, ^{قَتَلَتْ}, also favours this view, for the suppression of the 2nd vowel of the original *kaṭalat* must have been due to the accentuation of the 1st syllable, as in the modern Arabic of Egypt, *kātalet*, *wilidet*, *kútrret*. With suffixes the form approximates more to the Hebrew, e.g. קַטְלֶיהָ, ^{قَتَلَهَا}; Mand.

נפאלתהּ, ^{نَفَالَتْهَا} “she has not devoured me,” אנאלתהּ, ^{اَنَالَتْهَا} “she devoured him.” The Mand. form with enclitics, e.g. נפאללהּ, ^{نَفَالَتْهَا} “she fell,” is almost identical with the Heb. אֶכְלָתִיו, ^{اَكَلَتْهُ}.

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 ^{كُنْتُ} *kunk* for ^{كُنْتَ} *kunt* “thou wast”; and the form with ^ل for ^ت is vouched for in other parts of Arabia¹. It is hard to say which is the more ancient form, if either. More probably the two existed side by side from remote antiquity, as we find in all of these languages the separate form with *t*, *anta*, etc., as well as the accus. and genit. suffixes with *k*. In quite modern times the *k* appears where we should not have expected it, as in the Samaritan hymns, גִּלִּית for גִּלִּית, ^{גִּלִּית} “thou hast revealed,” and in a dialect of Syria ^{أَنْتُمْ} *אֲנֻ* for ^{أَنْتُمْ} *אֲנֻ* or ^{أَنْتُمْ} *אֲנֻ*. 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 ^{تَنْتَ} *تَنْتَ*, in

¹ See Noeldeke, *ZDMG.* xxxviii. 413; Halévy, *Études Sabéennes*, p. 46.

vulg. Arab. *katábt, mislkt, kutírt*. In Hebrew the final vowel is often indicated by the addition of the letter ה, קְטִילָהּ or קְטִילָהָ. The Ethiopic equivalent is *ḵatálka*. The other dialects, like the vulgar Arabic, have dropped the final vowel. Hence in Bibl. Aramaic קְטִילָהּ and קְטִילָהָ; in the Targūms קְטִילָהָ and קְטִילָהּ, in Syriac ܡܠܬܐ.

In Arabic and Ethiopic the accent naturally rests on the 2nd syllable, *ḵatálta, ḵatálka*; but when an accus. suffix is added, the Ethiopic throws forward the tone, *ḵatalká-nī, ḵatalká-na*, and lengthens the vowel before the uncontracted forms of the suffixes of the 3rd pers., *ḵatalkā-hū* or *ḵatalkó, ḵatalkāhā*, etc. In Hebrew the tone is thrown forward not only with pronom. suffixes, but also when the so-called vāv conversive precedes; וְקְטִילָהּ, קְטִילָהּ, but קְטִילָהּוּ or קְטִילָהּוּ, etc. Similarly in Jewish Aramaic, with suffixes, קְטִילָהּ, קְטִילָהָ, but in Syriac ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܠܬܐ, in Mand. ܫܒܢܐܩܬܐܢ, and in the Talmūd מְנַעַתָּן “hast hindered me,” אֲדַפְּרָתִי “hast reminded me.” I do not regard the vowel of the Ethiopic and Syriac forms as proving that the termination *ta* had originally a long vowel, *tā*, which is Noeldeke’s view; on the contrary, I believe that the lengthening of the vowel is here due partly to the weight of the accent, but still more to an effort to distinguish this form from the almost identical one of the 3rd sing. fem., ܡܠܬܐ “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 ܡܠܬܐ stood for *ḵataltā-anī*.

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 *ḵatalti*, which is actually the case. The Arabic has قَتَلْتَ, and the *i* is often lengthened before suffixes, كَسَرْتِي or كَسَرْتِيه. The vulg. form of the present day is

قتلتی *ḳatalṭī*. The corresponding Ethiopic form is *ḳatālkī*, written, according to the exigencies of the Geez syllabary, with long *ī*, which passes before suffixes into *ē* or *ey*, as *nagarkē-nī*, *nagarkēyō*, *nagarkēyōmū*. In Hebrew the ordinary form is קָטַלְתָּ with the loss of the final vowel; but קָטַלְתִּי is sufficiently common, though usually altered by the Massorites into קָטַלְתִּי; e.g. יָרַדְתִּי and שָׁכַבְתִּי, Ruth iii. 3, 4; לָמַדְתִּי Jerem. ii. 33; דִּבַּרְתִּי Jerem. iii. 5. Sometimes the full form seems to have been left through a misunderstanding; e.g. Jerem. ii. 20, where שָׁבַרְתִּי and נִתְקַתִּי seem to be 2nd pers. sing. fem. rather than 1st pers.; so also Micah iv. 13, וְהִחַרְמְתִּי. Similarly before suffixes, יָלַדְתִּנִּי, Jerem. ii. 27 (*Kēth*. יָלַדְתִּנִּי), or וְהִבֵּאתִנִּי, 2 Sam. xiv. 10, are very rare. In Aramaic the same phenomena present themselves. In Jewish Aramaic we have קָטַלְתָּ side by side with קָטַלְתִּנִּי; whilst the Syriac has preserved the older termination, at least in writing, ܩܬܠܬܐ, with suffixes ܩܬܠܬܐܝܢܝܐ. Here again I regard the vowel of the syllable *ti* as being originally short, whilst Noeldcke regards it as long. To me the lengthening seems to be due to the shifting of the accent.

The plural of *anta*, as you may remember, we found to be in its oldest form *antumū*; and consequently we expect in the verb for the 2nd pers. plur. masc. the form *ḳatāltumū*, which actually occurs in Arabic poetry and before suffixes, قَتَلْتُمُونِي, قَتَلْتُمْ.

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. *ḳatalkēmmū*, with suffixes *ḳatalkēmmū-nī*, *ḳatalkēmmēvō*, *ḳatalkēmmēvōmū*. The corresponding form in the modern Tigré

and Tigrīna is *ḡatalkūm* or *ḡatalātkūm*, which latter appears in Amharic as *ḡatalāchlū*, ቀተለሁ. In S. Arabia these forms with *k* are heard at the present day, e.g. *سمعكم samī'kum* (Halévy, *Études Sab.* p. 46). As *antum* becomes in Heb. אַתֶּם, so *ḡatdltum* 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 קְטַלְתִּי (corresponding to the vulgar Arabic قَتَلْتُ), 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 مְطַלְתִּי; in Mand. נְצַאבְתִּי “ye planted.” In the latter dialect the final *n* disappears before enclitics, as נְצַאבְתִּילִי “ye have planted me,” שְׂאֲדַאבְתִּילִי “ye have sent me”; and also before accusative suffixes, as נְסַאבְתִּי “ye took me,” שְׂאֲדַאבְתִּי “ye sent me,” which is contrary to Syriac usage, but in accordance with Hebrew and Chaldec, where we find קְטַלְתִּינִי, קְטַלְתִּינָה, beside קְטַלְתִּינוּ, קְטַלְתִּינוֹן. In the Talmūd such forms as בְּעִיתִי, סְפִיתִי, 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 *ḡataltum* should be *ḡataltunna*. 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, *ḡatalkēn*; the final vowel appears, however, in the form with suffixes *ḡatalkēnāhū* (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 *ḡatalkā* (Dillmann, p. 274). The Hebrew form is almost identical with the Ethiopic, viz., קְטַלְתִּי. The existence of a longer form in חָתַנָּה, exemplified by הִשְׁלַחְתִּנָּה, Amos iv. 3, is very doubtful; and no example with accus. suffixes occurs. The Aramaic forms are such as we might expect, מְטַלְתִּי, קְטַלְתִּי.

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 *anākū*, the Hebrew אֲנִי, the Moabite אֲנִי, and the Phoenician אֲנִי and אֲנִי *anech*. It is this latter form that has given rise to the verbal affix in the Ethiopic *ḵatalkū*, which is also said to be the form in use in S. Arabia, اَعْتَفَرَ, كَذَكَ, 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 *ḵatalku* gave way before the greater number of *t*-forms, and was gradually changed into *ḵataltu*, except, as we have seen, in Ethiopic (which was destitute of *t*-forms in the 2nd person).

While the Assyrian pronoun *anākū* (Haupt *anakū*) is indisputably older, in respect of its *ā*, than the Hebrew *ānōkhî*, the latter would appear to have preserved the termination in a purer form. We may therefore fairly assume that the Arabic *ḵatāltu* and the Ethiopic *ḵatālkū* represent, in respect of the final vowel, a somewhat later stage than the corresponding Hebrew קְטַלְתִּי, with *vāv* conversive וְקְטַלְתִּי, with suffixes קְטַלְתִּיָּהוּ or קְטַלְתִּיָּי, etc. Whether the *scriptio defectiva* in such forms as יָדַעְתָּ Job xlii. 2, בָּנִיתָ 1 Kings viii. 48, is merely accidental, or really indicates a tendency to dull the final vowel or to drop it altogether, it is hard to say. The Moabite and Phoenician forms were doubtless identical with the Hebrew. King Mesha' writes מַלְכִּי, בְּנִתִּי, etc., and in one Phoen. inscr. we find בְּנִתִּי (Umm 'Awāmid, *C.I.S.* nr. 7), though the usual spelling is בְּנִת. Plautus too has *corathi* for קְרַאתִי. In Aramaic the suffix sometimes

appears in full, especially in the case of verbs 3rd 'i, as קָנִיתִי, אִסְגִּיתִי; but more frequently the suffix has lost its vowel, the usual form being קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ, which stands for *kaṭlat*, by transposition from *kaṭalt*, which is the form used in vulg. Arab., *kaṭalt*, *misikt*, *kuturt*. The transposition probably took place to distinguish it from the 2nd pers. קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ; and the alteration of the vowel in the last syllable may be ascribed, either to the lingering influence of the lost termination *l*, or to an effort to differentiate this form from the 3rd pers. sing. fem. קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ (for *kaṭlat*, out of *kaṭalat*). Remark however a difference between the Biblical Aramaic and the Syriac. The former has *movable shēwā*, עֲבַדְתָּ Dan. iii. 15, vi. 25, קָרַבְתָּ Dan. vii. 16; the latter silent *shēwā*, עֲבַדְתָּ, קָרַבְתָּ. The older form *kaṭalt* appears with the accus. suffixes, מִלְּהֶאֱלֹהִים, מִלְּהֶאֱלֹהִים. The Mandaitic form is ordinarily the same as the Syriac, לִיגִנִּית, נִיפְקִית; but with the enclitics the *t* disappears, and we have the vocalisation *k'ṭalē* for *k'ṭalēth*, e.g. גִּטְאִירִלָּהּ "I tied to him," סִלִּיקִיבָּהּ "I went up on it." In the Targūms we find the fully vocalised form אֲבָלִית, רִחִילִית, 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; כִּבְשִׁית "I subdued," שָׁמַעִית "I heard," אֶרְגִּישִׁית side by side with אֶמַרִי "I said," נִפְקִי "I went out," חֲוֵי "I have seen," קֵרֵא "I called." The final vowel is merely tone-long, and hence can be shortened when the tone is thrown back, as הִקִּימָתָּ, Dan. iii. 14; and with suffixes, as פִּרְעֵתִיָּהּ, מִלְּהֶאֱלֹהִים.

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 אָנָּה, אָנִי.

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

The Hebrew has preserved the old form in קָטַלְנוּ, with suffix קָטַלְנוּהוּ. The Arabic form is *katalnā*, قَتَلْنَا, with long *ā*, which is however sometimes shortened in poetry, *katalnā*. On the other hand, the Ethiopic has *katalna*, with short *ā*, which is lengthened before suffixes: *nagárna*, but *nagarnā-ka*, *nagarnā-kēmmū*. Similar is the Chaldee form קָטַלְנָא, with suffixes קָטַלְנָבּוֹן, קָטַלְנָדָךְ. In Syriac *nā* is shortened into *n*, מְלֵךְ, but the fuller termination appears with pronominal suffixes, as מְלֵכִי, etc. The abbreviated form also prevails in the Talmūd Bābli, אֲשַׁכְּחִין, אֲמַרְן. Frequently however the Syriac form is lengthened, by a repetition of the pronoun, into מְלֵכֵי (sometimes written מְלֵכֵי מֵ). This, in the weakened shape of נִין, is the usual termination in Mandaitic, e.g. נִפְאֲקִנִין, נִפְאֲקִנָּבָה; but with enclitics the older נָא is restored, e.g. "we went out therein," שָׂאֲדָרְנָאֲלוֹן "we sent them." The accusative suffixes are added to the shorter form in *n*, as רַהֲמָנָךְ "we loved thee," פִּתְחָהּנָה "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 Ḥimyaritic, 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 *kátalā*, like the noun in *āni*, construct *ā*, e.g. *raḡulāni*, *raḡulā*. Similarly in the feminine we find in Arabic *kātđlatā*, formed like *ḡannatāni*, *ḡannatā*, from *ḡannat*.

In Ḥimyaritic the final *ā* seems to have been weakened into *ē*. The pronoun **هَما** is written **המי** *humē*, and similarly in the verb **שָׁמְתָי** (שָׁמַתָּ), fem. **שָׁמְתִי** (*shēmatē*, שָׁמַתָּ), "they two set up." The dual of the pronoun of the 2nd person being in Arabic *antumā*, the corresponding form of the perfect is naturally *ḡatāltumā*. 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, **فُكِّلِنَا** for **فُكِّلْنَا**, "I am killing"; **فُكِّلْنَا**, and even **فُكِّلْنَا**, "I am seeking." In the Talmūd we find such words as **יָדְעִינָא** "I know," **אֹלִינָא** "I am going." The Mandaite could say not only **לֹאֲגִיטְנָא**, "I take," but also **לֹאֲגִיטְנָאךְ**, "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. **פָּרִיק** *parik*, "he comes to an end."

f. **פָּרְקָא** *parkā*¹.

2 p. m. **פָּרִיקְתָּ** *parkit*.

f. **פָּרְקַתְּ** *parkat*.

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

1 p. m.	فَصِيحَ	<i>parkin.</i>
f.	فَصِيحُ	<i>parkân.</i>
plur. 3 p. c.	فَصِيحِب	<i>parkî.</i>
2 p. c.	فَصِيحَانِ	<i>parkîttôn.</i>
1 p. c.	فَصِيحِي	<i>parkâkh (kîkh),</i>
	also	فَصِيحِي + (إِنِّي) + فَصِيحِي.

II. *The Imperfect.*

Having thus discussed the various forms of the perfect state of the verb, I proceed to the consideration of the imperfect.

Here the first thing that strikes us is the different collocation of the parts which go to the constitution of the verbal form. In the perfect the verbal element preceded, and was followed by the pronominal element. The action, as completed, seemed apparently to be more prominent than the agent. In the imperfect, on the contrary, the pronominal element takes precedence of the verbal; the agent seems to be more conspicuous in relation to the still unfinished act. The whole arrangement may of course be, as some have thought, merely accidental; but if we are to seek a reason for it, that just given seems to be the most natural.

Another point of difference between the two verbal states is that the 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the perfect appears to be destitute of any pronominal affix, whereas the corresponding person of the imperfect* is furnished with a peculiar pronominal prefix. The reason of this probably also lies in the greater prominence of the pronominal element in the imperfect state. It may of course be said, with Dietrich and Stade, that the 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the imperfect is a noun of the form *yaktul*, **يَكْتُلُ**, 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 **ይህ**: or **ይህ**:

Assyrian. The original shape of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. we may assume in this case to have been *yakdtilu*. In Ethiopic it appears under the normal form of *yĕkātēl*, and corresponds in its general use with the imperfect indicative of the Arabic; whereas the other form *yēngēr* answers to the Arabic imperfect subjunctive and jussive. In Assyrian its form, according to Sayce, is *isákinu* or *isákin* [Delitzsch *išákan*], 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 *yĕkātēl*, because its prefixes and flexion are identical with those of the other form *yĕktūl*, 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 *yáktulu*, with *ā* as the vowel of the prefix and a final *ū*. This we may accept as the archetype. The vulgar dialects drop the final vowel and weaken that of the first syllable, *yéktul*, *yíktul*, or *íktul*, *yimsik*, *yuskut*; thus giving us the same form which we find already in the Ethiopic *yēngēr*, the Assyrian *iskun* (יִסְכַּן, "he placed" [Del. יִשְׁכַּן]) or *išbat* (יִצְבַּת, "he seized"), and the Hebrew יִכְבֵּד, יִפְקֹד. This too is the common form in the Aramaic dialects, e.g. Jewish Aram. יִלְבֵּשׁ, יִקְטֹל, with some important exceptions, which we shall specify presently.

That the vowel of the preformative was originally *a* in Hebrew as well as in Arabic we may infer: (1) from verbs of which the first letter is a guttural, as יִהְיֶה, יִאָמַר or יִאָמַר, יִהְיֶה; (2) from verbs ע"ע, as יִעֲבֹר, יִעֲבֹר; (3) from verbs ע"ו, as יִנִּיחַ, יִקְוּם, which stand for *yakwum*, *yanwuh*. As we have often seen already, an original *pathach* may be gradually weakened into *segol* or *chirek*; but it is impossible that an original *chirek* should in such a case give rise to a *pathach*.

This person of the verb is identical in form, or nearly so, with a class of nouns in the older Semitic languages, which occur partly as proper names and partly as common nouns. Such are in Hebrew, יֵצֶקֶב, יֵצֶחֶק; יָרִיב "adversary," יֵצֶדֶר "oil"; יֶלְקוּט "bag," יֶחְמוּד "kind of deer," יֶנְשׁוּף "bittern" (?); in Arabic, يَغُوث "the Helper," يَعُوقُ "the Averter," يَثْرِبُ, يَنْبَعُ, يَخْضُودُ "oryx," يَكْبُورُ "male bustard," يَخْضُرُ "freshly cut branch," يَخْضِرُ and يَخْضُورُ "green," يَرْبُوع "jerboa," يَرْحُومُ and يَرْحَمُ "male vulture," يَعْجُوبُ "rapid river, horse, etc.," يَعْجُوبُ "queen bee," يَعْجُورُ "gazelle," يَعْجُورُ "lamb, kid," يَنْبُوع "fountain," يَعْجِيدُ "thickened honey," يَعْصِيدُ "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 *pa*, used (exactly like ሁ, ሁኒ, ሁኒኒ) both as the relative and as a sign of the genitive case. Praetorius seems however to have made it tolerably certain that this *pa* is only a modification of the Ethiopic *ha*, which is still used in Harari, the intermediate link being *sha* ስ in one of the Tigriña dialects. The change of sound is the same as in the Amharic ሁ, ሁኒ, derived through ሁኒ, ስኒ, from an older ሁኒ, ሁኒ = 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 *ḵátala* and *ḵátalū* stand for *ḵatalya* and *ḵatalyū*. For this view I

can find no support whatever save in the Mandaïtic plural which I mentioned in a previous lecture, viz. רגאזיאן, fem. רגאזיאן, instead of רגאן. 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 Mandaïtic. I am compelled therefore to reject this view, though I cannot at present suggest any adequate explanation of the isolated Mandaïtic 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 הוּא forming the 3rd pers. sing. masc. with ל instead of י; לְהוּא for יְהוּא in Ezra iv. 13, Dan. ii. 20, with the corresponding plur. masc. לְהוּן Dan. ii. 43, and fem. לְהוּיָן Dan. v. 17. The same form is common in the Talmūd Bablī, and occurs also in Mandaïtic, in both cases side by side with the forms with *u*; e.g. לִימָא “say,” לִימָא “bring”; לִימָא “be like,” לִימָא “be dissolved.” In Syriac the *u* alone is found, ܠܗܘܐ, ܠܗܘܢ, ܠܗܘܝܢ. On the whole subject see Mr Lowe's note in his *Fragment of the Talmud Bablī Pēsachim*. The identity of this *l* and *u* 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-aramaischen*) supposes the form לְהוּא to be originally an infin. הוּא compounded with the prep. ל, “to be” taken in the sense of “is to be,” “shall be”; and to this הוּא he finds a parallel in the form לְבִנָא, 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 אֵל, הֵל, and which appears in various pronouns and demonstrative

adverbs such as *הִלָּאָה, וְסָכֶּה, אֵלֵין, יֵאָדָה, זֶלֶק, הִלָּחָה, אֲדִי*, etc. The *n*, if it be anything more than a mere variation of the *l*, may also be explained from the demonstrative *n*, which appears for instance in *זֶן, הִלָּח*, the nominal base *an*, *הִנֵּה, הֵן, אֵן, אִן*, etc.

The 3rd pers. sing. fem. has for its prefix *ta*, that is, no doubt, the same mark of the fem. gender which we find at the end of the word in the perfect *ḵatalat*. The typical form is again the old Arabic *تَقْتُلُ taqtulu*, vulgarly *taqtul, teḵtul, tiktul, timsik, tuskut*, which latter coincide with the Assyrian *taskun, tašbat*, and the Ethiopic *tēngər, tēlbas*. In Hebrew the *a* of the 1st syllable is ordinarily sunk to *i*, *תִּקְטֹל, תִּכְבֹּד*; but *ʾ* and *ā* are found in the same cases as in the masc., e.g. *תִּעֲבֹד, תִּתְאַרֵב*, *תִּתְעַנֵּב, תִּתְחַשֵּׁב*; *תִּתְעַנֵּב, תִּתְחַשֵּׁב*; *תִּתְעַנֵּב, תִּתְחַשֵּׁב*. Similarly in Aramaic, *תִּקְטֹל*, *תִּרְנֹא* (Mandaïtic).

Yaqtulu 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 *yaqtulūna*, which is vulgarly shortened into *yaqtūlū*, though *yaqtulūn* is still heard. In Hebrew the fuller form *יִקְטֹלוּ* is not uncommon, as *יִרְכְּבוּ, יִדְרְגוּ, יִקְוִמוּ, יַעֲשֻׂנוּ*, in pause *יִקְטֹלוּ*; but the shorter *יִקְטֹלוּ* is far more frequent. The Ethiopic forms are *yēngǧērū, yēlḅāsū*, with which correspond in accentuation the Hebrew pausal forms *יִפְּלוּ, יִשְׁכְּבוּ, יִחָדְלוּ*, etc.; and the vulgar Arabic (Egypt) *yik-tilū, yimsikū, yuskūtū*. The Assyrian exhibits, as we might expect, the forms *iskunū, iṣbatū*. The old Aramaic dialects hold fast the final *n*, *יִקְטֹלוּ, יִלְחוּ, נִמְחֲלֵךְ*. So also in Mandaïtic *נִישִׁתְלוּ, נִישִׁתְלוּ*, “plant”; but before the enclitics the *n* disappears, *נִישִׁתְלוּכֹן, נִישִׁתְלוּכֹן* “register with you.”

The feminine form corresponding to *yaktulūna* would naturally be *yaktulāna*. This is actually retained by the Aramaic dialects in the forms *יִקְטֹלָן*, *לְהִינָן*, *נִכְחָן*, Mand. *נִרִימוּזָן* "wink." In Ethiopic and Assyrian we find the same forms with the loss of the final *n*; Eth. *yəngērā*, *yəlbāsā*; Assy. *iskunā*, *išbatā*; and so also in Mandaitic, *נִרִימוּזָא*, *נִיסיגְדָא*, are more common than the fuller form in *אָן*. The Arabic has contracted *yaktulāna* into *yaktūlna*, after the analogy of *ḡatālna* for *ḡatalāna* in the perfect. The same form occurs in Hebrew; e.g. *יִחְמְנָה* Gen. xxx. 38, *וַיִּשְׁרְנָה* 1 Sam. vi. 12 (for *וַיִּשְׁרְנָה*), and *יַעֲמֻדְנָה* Dan. viii. 22; but more commonly the Hebrew employs a form with prefixed *t*, after the analogy of the singular, and says *תִּקְטֹלְנָה*, e.g. *תִּשְׁכֹּן*, *תִּלְבַּשְׁנָה*, *תַּעֲבֹדְנָה*, *תִּפְלֹגְנָה*, *תִּקְטֹלְנָה*. The same form occurs dialectically in Arabic, even among the various readings of the Kor'ān, e.g. Sūr. xlii. 3, *يَتَغَطَّرْنَ* for *يَتَغَطَّرْنَ*. 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 *tāktulu*, which is the actual Arabic form; in the vulgar dialects, *taḡtul*, *tēḡtul*, *tiḡtul*, *timsik*, *tuskut*. The Assyrian has retained the pure vowel in its *taskun*, *tašbat*; whilst the Ethiopic exhibits the weaker *təngēr*, *təlbās*. The Hebrew offers exactly the same variations as the 3rd pers.; we find *תִּקְרֶב*, *תִּזְכֹּר*, but *תִּקְרַב*, *תִּזְכֹּר*, *תִּחַמֵּל*, *תִּהַרֵג*, *תִּעֲבֹר*, *תִּאָסֵף*. The Aramaic forms, *תִּקְטֹל*, *לְחִינָא*, Mand. *תִּישְׁבֹּק*, *תִּירְגָּאז*, 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 *ina*, the origin of which seems quite obscure.

The normal form is again the Arabic *taḡtulīna*, which has survived in Hebrew in such forms as *תִּדְבְּקִינִי* Ruth ii. 8, 21 *תִּעֲשִׂי* iii. 4; *תִּדְעִי* iii. 18. So also in Aramaic, *תִּקְטֹלִין*,

٢٥٦. In other cases, the final *n* has altogether disappeared, as in the vulgar Arabic ^{نَقَتْلِي} *tiktúli*, *timsíkī*, *tuskúti*; Assy. *taskunī*, *tašbatī*; Eth. *təngērī*, *təlbāsī*; Heb. תִּזְכְּרִי, in pause תִּשְׁקָמִי, תִּלְבָּשִׁי, תִּירָאִי. In Mandaitic this fem. form seems to have gone out of use. In what I have said I regard *ina* as being the original termination of this person, and *ī* as a shortening thereof. Other scholars take *ī* to be the original termination, and consider *in*, *ina* to be a later formation after the analogy of the plur. *ūn*, *ūna*.

The formation of the plural in the 2nd pers. is identical with that in the 3rd. The normal form in the masc. is, as usual, the Arabic ^{تَقْتُلُونَ} *tiktúlūn*. The final *n* is preserved in Hebrew in such words as תִּשְׁמְרוּן, תִּחְקְרוּן; or with fuller vowels in pause, תִּשְׁמְרוּן, תִּשְׁכְּבוּן, תִּתְקַטְלוּן. So also in Aramaic. תִּתְקַטְלוּן, ٢٥٦, Mand. תִּירִימוּן or more frequently תִּירִימוּן. In vulgar Arabic the final syllable has been rejected, leaving ^{تَقْتُلُوا} *tiktúlu*, *timsíkū*, *tuskútū*; with which correspond the Assyrian *taskunū*, *tašbatū*, the Ethiopic *təngērū*, *təlbāsū*, and the Hebrew תִּזְכְּרוּ, תִּשְׁמְרוּ; in pause, with fuller vowels, תִּשְׁמְרוּ, תִּתְקַטְלוּ, תִּשְׁכְּבוּ. In Mandaitic too the *n* disappears before the enclitics, as in the 3rd person.

The fem. corresponding with *taktulūna* ought to be *taktulāna*; and this form is preserved, with the loss of only the final vowel, in the Aramaic ٢٥٦, תִּתְקַטְלָא. In Mandaitic, however, it seems to have fallen into disuse. The Assyrian and Ethiopic exhibit forms with the loss of the final *n*; Assy. *taskunā*, *tašbatā*; Eth. *təngērā*, *təlbāsā*. In Arabic *taktulāna* is contracted as I take it, after the same manner as the 3rd pers. fem., into *taktúluna*, a form which is lost in the vulgar dialects, but has been preserved in some examples in Hebrew, e.g. תִּקְסַמְנָה, Ezek. xiii. 23, תִּשְׁאִינָה, Ezek. xxiii. 49, and a very few more.

An example like **הִרְאֵנִי**, 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. **אֲ** is apparently derived from the corresponding pronoun **אֲנִי**, **أَنَا**. In Arabic it is **أَتْلُ** (vulg. *aktul*, *amsik*, *askut*), which appears in Assyrian, with the loss of the final vowel, as *askun*, *ašbat*. In Ethiopic the vowel is weakened, *əngər*, *əlbas*; and so also in Aramaic, **אֶקְטַל**, **אֶשְׁבֵּט**, Mand. **עֶשְׁבֹּק**. Similarly in Hebrew, **אֶשְׁמַר**, **אֶחְמַל**, **אֶעֱבֹר**, **אֶאֱכֹף**; but **אֶחֱזֶנּוּ**, **אֶשׁוּב**, with the original *a*.

The corresponding plural takes its prefix *na* from **אֲנַחְנוּ**, **נַחְנוּ**, **نَحْنُ**. In Arabic it is **نَعْتَلُ**, vulgarly *nektul*, *niktul*, *nimsik*, *nuskut*. In most of the other languages the vowel of the first syllable is weakened; e.g. Eth. *nəngər*, *nəlbas*; Assy. *niskun*, *nišbat*; Aram. **נֶקְטַל**, **נֶשְׁבֵּט**, Mand. **נִשְׁבֹּק**. The Hebrew alone retains the original *a* with gutturals and in verbs **עָ** and **ע״**, e.g. **נֶשְׁמַר**, but **נֶאֱכֹף**, **נֶעֱבֹר**, **נֶקֹּם**.

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*, *išbatā*, with the loss of the final syllable¹. The corresponding fem. in Arabic is **تَعْتَلَانِ**, 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. *yáktulu*, in Eth. *yəngēr*. In the lengthened forms of the 2nd sing. fem. and the 3rd and 2nd plur., the Ethiopic threw forward the accent one place, *təngērī*, *yəngērū -rā*, *təngērū -rā*, as compared with the corresponding Arabic *táktulī*, *yáktulū*, *táktulū*; and this accentuation we find in Hebrew in the so-called pausal forms, תַּעֲבֹרִי, תִּלְבְּשִׁי, תִּלְכִּי; תִּשְׁמְעוּ, תִּחֲשְׁבוּ; יִמְשְׁלוּ, יִחַדְלוּ; יִשְׁבּוּ; and also in the vulgar Arabic *tiktulī*, *timstikī*, *tuskūtī*; *tiḡtūlū*, *timstikū*, *tuskūtū*. Generally speaking, however, the Hebrew, like the Aramaic, shifts the accent to the last syllable, יִקְטַל, יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ. The forms ending in *ina*, *āna*, are already accented in Arabic on the penult, and the accent remains on the same syllable when it becomes final in Hebrew and Aramaic, יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ. So also the Aramaic feminines in *ān*, יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ; whereas the Arabic forms يَتَقَتَّلْنَ, يَتَقَتَّلْنَ, 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 *k'tul*, *k'tal* and *k'til*. Nearest to this postulated original stand the Aramaic forms ܕܠܬܐ, ܕܠܬܐ; and the Hebrew זָכַר, לָבַשׁ, חָשַׁב (for נָתַן); in which latter the vowels *u* and *i* are heightened by the tone, as in the imperfect. The Ethiopic *nəgēr*, *ləbas*, show by the accent that more weight was given to the first syllable than in Aramaic and Hebrew; and the same appears to have been the case in Assyrian, where we find the vowel of the first syllable assimilated to that of the second, *šukun*, *šabat*, *riliš*. The Arabic attained the same intonation by

as in the Chaldee קטלו; and lastly the final *u* disappears, as in the perfect, leaving in Syriac the form ܩܬܠܐ, written in Mandaitic without the *w*, פרוש, בהאר. The Mandaitic however exhibits a few examples of the full termination *ūn*, or even, as in the perfect, *yūn*, e.g. אהרוביון (with prosthetic א), "lay waste." The final *ū* is also retained before the enclitics, e.g. סגודולה, שניקולה. In Talmudic the *u* is often retained, at any rate in writing, as כתבו, עבדו. If dropped, it seems in some cases to affect the vowel of the previous syllable, as אמור (for אימרו) or the interjectional אשור ("quick!"). The Ethiopic form is, as we might expect, *nǧǧērū*, *lǧbāsū*, 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, *'uḳtūlū*, *'iǧlisū*; but the vulgar dialect (Egypt) shifts it, *uḳtūlū*, *imsikū*. In Hebrew the forms *ḳ'tūlū*, *ḳ'tlū*, appear in pause, as אָהָבוּ, שָׁמְעוּ, אָכְלוּ, עָבְדוּ, זָכְרוּ (for יִשְׁבּוּ). Out of pause, the word is modelled somewhat after the form of segolate nouns, and becomes *ḳuṭlū*, *ḳaṭlū*, as מִשְׁכּוֹ, רַחֲצוּ, זַעֲקוּ. Mostly, however, the vowel of the first syllable is weakened to *i*, or even, in certain cases, to *shēvā*; e.g. זָכְרוּ, אָכְלוּ, עָבְדוּ, אָסְפוּ, אָמְצוּ, קָרְאוּ, אָמְצוּ, בָּנוּ, רָאוּ, compared with the pausal בָּעִי.

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 ܩܬܠܐܢܐ. If the *u* be dropped, the vowel disappears with it, leaving *ḳ'tōl*. But with suffixes the original *ā* is restored, as ܩܬܠܐܢܐ. Similarly, the Ethiopic forms are *nǧǧērā*, *lǧbāsā*; and the Assyrian, *sukinā* or *suknā*, *riḥiṣā* or *riḥsā*, *ṣabtā*. The Arabic, on the contrary, follows the analogy of the imperfect. As *taḳtūlāna* becomes *taḳtūlna*, so *ḳ'tulāna* becomes اُتْلُنَا 'uktūlna. This too

is the Hebrew form, רִאִינָה, שִׁמְעֵנָה, סִפְרֵנָה. In a couple of instances the final נָה (also written נִי) is shortened into *n*, viz. שִׁמְעֵן Gen. iv. 23, and קִרְאֵן Exod. ii. 20; which is in accordance with the vulgar pronunciation of a form like ضَرِبْنَ, 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., 'uḳtulā, for 'uḳtulāni, ḳtulāni. 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*, yāḳtulu; the subjunctive in *a*, yāḳtula. The jussive has ordinarily no vowel, yāḳtul, but seems originally to have ended in *i*; at least the poets use yāḳtuli in rime. Furthermore, the shorter terminations *ī*, *ū*, and *ā* are always substituted for the fuller *īna*, *ūna*, and *āni*, in the fem. sing., the masc. plur., and the dual; taḳtulī, yāḳtulū, yāḳtulā, not taḳtulīna, yāḳtulūna, yāḳtulāni. The province of each form is also distinctly marked out. The subjunctive is used in dependent clauses after certain conjunctions, such as اِنَّ "that," كَيْ "that," لِ "that, in order that," حَتَّى "until," and the like. The jussive serves as an imperative after لا "not," as لا تَقْتُل "do not kill," and after لِ, as لِيَقْتُل "let him kill" (commonly used in the 3rd pers. only). Preceded by لَمْ it designates the negative of the past, as لَمْ يَقْتُل "he did not kill." It is also extensively employed in

two correlative conditional clauses, whether actually introduced by the conditional particle **אִן** "if," or not; e.g. **אִן תַּעֲבֹל תִּנְדָּם** "if thou art hasty, thou wilt repent"; **מִן יַעֲמַל שׁוּא יִכְזֹּב בֶּה** "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 *yěnáǵəŕ* is employed for the imperfect indicative; whilst the ordinary *yěngəŕ* represents the subjunctive and jussive, e.g. **እግዚአብሔር ይዕቅብክ** (*yě'kábbka*) "may God preserve thee," **ለይከ-ነ ብረሃነ** "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 precativē, however, we see a form exactly corresponding to the Arabic jussive with **ج** and the Ethiopic with **ለ**; e.g. 3rd pers. *liškun*, *liškunū*, 2nd pers. *lutaškun*, 1st pers. *luškun*.

In Hebrew there is a somewhat closer correspondence to the fullness of the Arabic. If we can no longer distinguish the subjunctive from the indicative, we can at any rate clearly discern the jussive, and perceive that it had originally the same form as in Arabic. This takes place most easily in the Hiph'il of the regular verb, in the **קל** and Hiph'il of verbs **ע"ע** and **ע"ע**, and in the various conjugations of verbs **ל"ה**; though there are equally clear cases in the **קל** of some other classes, where the imperfect has *a* or *ē* 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 *vāv conversivē*. On all these points see your Hebrew Grammar or Mr Driver's treatise on the tenses. Here I shall only seek to illustrate the different forms. If you compare **אַל-תִּשְׁחַת** with **תִּשְׁחַת**, or **אַל-יִאָמֵן** with **יִאָמֵן**, you perceive at once that you have before you two forms corre-

sponding exactly to the Arabic ^{يَقْتُلُ} and ^{يَقْتُلْ}. תַּשְׁחִית or יִמְחִי is, as I shall explain to you in a subsequent lecture, the equivalent of ^{يَقْتُلْ} with the loss of the final vowel; while תַּשְׁחִית or יִמְחִי answers to the shorter ^{يَقْتُلْ}, *i* being heightened into *ē* in the tone-syllable. With *vāu conversive* this *ē* may even become *ǣ*, if the accent be thrown back, as יוֹסֵף from יוֹסֵף. So also in verbs ע"ע, compare יָחַן, יָסַב, יָעַז, with יוֹסֵב, יוֹחֵן, יוֹסֵב, יוֹחֵן. In verbs ע"י, יָפַר, יָדַק, with יוֹפֵר, יוֹדֵק. In verbs ע"י, יָסַר, יוֹסֵר, with יָסַר and יוֹסֵר. In verbs ל"ה the form is even more marked, if possible: יִשְׁבֶּה but יוֹשֵׁב, יִרְאֶה but יוֹרֵא; with tone-lengthening, יִשְׁמֶה but יוֹשֵׁם, יִבְכֶּה but יוֹבֵךְ, יִעֲשֶׂה but יוֹעֲשֵׂה. In Pī'āl, יִצְוֶה but יוֹכִיחַ, יִגְלֶה but יוֹגֵל, יִרְאֶה but יוֹרֵא, יִשְׁקֶה but יוֹשֵׁק, with supplemental vowel, יִשְׁמֶה but יוֹשֵׁם, יִבְכֶּה but יוֹבֵךְ, יִעֲשֶׂה but יוֹעֲשֵׂה. In Pī'āl, יִצְוֶה but יוֹכִיחַ, יִגְלֶה but יוֹגֵל, יִרְאֶה but יוֹרֵא, יִשְׁקֶה but יוֹשֵׁק, with supplemental vowel, יִשְׁמֶה but יוֹשֵׁם, יִבְכֶּה but יוֹבֵךְ, יִעֲשֶׂה but יוֹעֲשֵׂה.

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*, ^{يَقْتُلُنَّ} and ^{يَقْتُلْنَ}. If we seek after the origin of this termination, we shall perhaps discover it in that demonstrative *n*, which we have already found as a component part of so many pronouns and other demonstratives, such as ^{أَنْ} and the like. I will not, however, pretend to decide as to the fuller form ^{يَقْتُلُنَّ}, whether it arises from an intensive doubling of the *n* of ^{يَقْتُلْنَ}, or whether, as Stade thinks, it is compounded of ^{يَقْتُلْنَ} and a particle, now lost in Arabic, equivalent in meaning to the Hebrew נָא and

Syriac **ܒ**. If the latter be the case, **ܐܩܘܡܢ** would be exactly equivalent to **ܐܩܘܡܐ ܢܐ**. Similar is the form in the inscriptions

of S. Arabia, as in the tablet: וְלִיקְמֶעַן עֵתֶתֶר דִּיתְבְּרָנָה.

These forms, or at any rate the shorter one of the two, have left distinct traces in Hebrew in two ways. (1) In all those forms of the imperfect with pronominal suffixes, where our grammars speak of an *epenthetic nūn* (Kautzsch's *nūn energeticum* or *demonstrativum* is a better term). This *n* is sometimes preserved, as יֵעָבְרָהּ Jerem. v. 22, יֵצְרָהּ Deut. xxxii. 10, יִבְרַכְנָהּ Ps. lxxii. 5, יִכְבְּדֵנִי Jerem. xxii. 24, יִכְבְּדֵנִי Ps. l. 23; but more usually assimilated, as יִשְׁמְעֶךָ, יִעֲזֹבֶךָ, יִעֲזֹבֶנָּה, יִחַקְרֵנוּ. 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 لְגַאמִינָהוּ = Mand. ܠܓܡܝܢܗܘܢ or لְגַאמִינוּ, though ܠܢ may here be the independent pronoun = הֵמוֹ or הֵמוֹן in Biblical Aramaic. In Phoenician this demonstrative *n* occurs also in the suffixes appended to nouns. (2) In the separate forms in הָ. In Arabic اقتل may also be written اقتلا , and is pronounced in pause اقتلا 'aqtulā. Hence is apparent its identity with the Hebrew אֶקְטֹל. 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.: אֶחַפֵּשׂ, אֶחַפְּרוּ, אֶעֱבֹר, אֶעֱבֹרוּ, אֶעֱזֹב, אֶעֱזֹבוּ, אֶפְלֹא, אֶפְלֹאוּ, in pause, with older accent, אֶשְׁמְרָה, אֶשְׁמְרָה, אֶחַקְרָה, אֶחַקְרָה, אֶעֱזֹבָה, אֶעֱזֹבָה, אֶשְׁמְרָה, אֶשְׁמְרָה. Very rare are examples in the other persons; e.g., in the 3rd, Ps. xx. 4, Is. v. 19, Ezek. xxiii. 20, Prov. i. 10, viii. 3, Job xi. 17 (where some take תַּעֲפֹה for the 2nd pers. masc.). Of a weakened form in הָ we have two instances; יִרְשָׁהּ Ps. xx. 4, and וְאֶקְרָאָהּ 1 Sam. xxviii. 15.

These same energetic forms are also used in the imperative, viz. in Arabic, ^{أَقْتُلْ} and ^{أَقْتُلِي}. In Hebrew the form in הַ is restricted to the 2nd pers. sing. masc., but appears in two shapes. (1) With the older accentuation, קְטֹלָה, קְטֹלָה, from *k'ttilan*, *k'ttalan*; as פִּשְׁטָה and חֲגָרָה Is. xxxii. 11, מְלוֹכָה Judg. ix. 8 (*Kethib*), צְרוּפָה Ps. xxvi. 2 (*Do.*); שְׁמָעָה, רְגֹזָה, יִרְשָׁה; with suffixes שְׁמַעְנָה, קְרָאנָה, תִּנְנָה. (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. עֲוֹכָה, פָּרְתָה, שְׁמְרָה, וִזְכָּרָה; or with weakening of the vowel, עֲרֵכָה, מְכָרָה, נִצָּרָה, שְׁמָעָה. With weakening of הַ into ה־ we find דְּעָה in Prov. xxiv. 14, according to one reading, another being דַּעָה.

V. *The Infinitive.*

The *infinitive* of the Semitic languages is in reality nothing but a verbal noun, varying in form according to various modifying influences. In Arabic the grammarians enumerate some forty of these forms in the first conjugation only, though perhaps not more than a dozen or so of these are in common use. In the other languages the number is much smaller. In Ethiopic there are in the first conjugation only two, *nagīr* and *nagīrōt*; in Aramaic but one, מְקַטֵּל, מְחַלֵּל. The Hebrew has likewise two infinitives, one of which, however, appears under several different forms.

Among the commonest infinitives in Arabic are the simple segolates جَبْنَ; ذَكَرَ, حَفِظَ; قَوْلَ, ضَرَبَ, as قَتَلَ *katl*, *kittl*, *kutl*, with their rarer feminines قَتَلَتْ *katla*, *kittla*, *kutla*, as رَحِمَتْ, شَكَرَ; سَمَرَتْ, حَمِيَتْ. To these—or still more closely to their Aramaic equivalents [the nominal forms] *k'tal*, *k'til*, *k'tul*—correspond the

forms of the ordinary Hebrew infinitive construct, קָטַל and קָטֹל, with their feminines קָטְלָה or קָטֹלָה, and קָטְלָה or קָטֹלָה. Of these by far the most common is קָטַל, with suffixes קָטַלְי and קָטַלְיָ, קָטַלְךָ or קָטַלְךָ, קָטַלוּ, etc. Of the rarer forms examples are: (1) שָׁלַח, חָסַר, נִשְׁפַּל, שָׁכַב; with suffixes, נִשְׁכַּבְּהָ Gen. xix. 33, בָּזַעְפוּ 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, בִּמְעַלְם Ezek. xx. 27, זָעַקְךָ Is. xxx. 19. (2) אָהַבְהָ Deut. vii. 8, חָמְלָה Gen. xix. 16, יָרָאָה Is. xxix. 13; שָׁנְאָה Deut. i. 27. (3) עֲצָמָה Is. xlvii. 9, גָּבַהָ Zeph. iii. 11, קָרְבָּה Exod. xxxvi. 2, xl. 32, חָמְלָה Ezek. xvi. 5, חָמְצָה Hos. vii. 4.

The other Hebrew infinitive, the so-called infinitive absolute, has the form *kātōl*, as נָתַן, הָלֹךְ, יָצִיא, יָרוּעַ, אָרָר, בָּנָה, אָרָר, יָרוּעַ, יָצִיא, הָלֹךְ, נָתַן. Since *ō* in Hebrew ordinarily represents original *a*, this form seems to be identical with the interjectional or imperative form *kātālī* فَتَال in Arabic. As in Hebrew נִשְׁמֹר means "keep, observe!" or זָכוֹר "remember!" so in Arabic نَزَالَ means "come down!" or تَرَاكْ "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. *katal*, *katil*, and *katul*. The first of these, however, is actually known to us only as a verbal adjective, e.g. חָכָם, חָרַשׁ, יִשָּׂר; unless we except the fem. הָרַת, constr. הָרַת. The other two actually occur as participles: יָגוֹר Jerem. xxii. 25, xxxix. 17 (the only example of this form), יָשָׁן, מָלָא, נָדַל, רָעַב, etc. The place of *katal* has been usurped by an intensive form *kātāl*, of which we find clear traces in the verbs חָוָה, לָהּ, e.g. חָוָה,

for *hōsai* חוֹזִי (which actually occurs as a proper name); and in the usual feminine *ḵōtēleth*, for *ḵōtalt*, as יִשָּׁבֶת, יִרְדָּת, בְּרַחַת, in pause יִשְׁבֶּת, with suffixes יוֹלְדֵתְכֶם, יוֹלְדֵתוֹ; as well as, I think, in such construct forms as אֲבִיר Deut. xxxii. 28, נָמַע Ps. xciv. 9. Far more common however than *ḵātal* is the form *ḵātil*, which may be explained in one of two ways; either as a weakening of *ḵātal* by change of *a* in the second syllable into *i*; or as an intensive of the intransitive *ḵaṭil*, the use of which has been gradually extended so as to embrace all classes of verbs. Its oldest form is the Arabic *ḵātil*, fem. *ḵātilat*, with which closely agree the Ethiopic *ṣādēk*, fem. *sādēkt*, and the Assyrian *sākin*, *āsib*, fem. *sākinat*, *āsibat*, as also the Aramaic קָטַל, קָטְלָה, שׁוּבָה, שׁוּבָה. In the Biblical Aramaic this participle is pointed, at least in pause, קָטַל, c.g. Dan. iv. 10, vi. 3, vii. 9, but also iii. 17, iv. 20, 34. In the same dialect the feminine and plurals have moveable *shēvā*, c.g. בְּטָלָה Ezr. iv. 24, כְּתָבָה Dan. v. 5, יִתְבִּין Ezr. iv. 17, מְלָקָן; whereas in Syriac the *shēvā* is silent, بَطَلَ, بَطَلَا, whence it comes that in later Jewish Aramaic [and in some Hebrew Bibles] we often find *pathach* in the first syllable, though incorrectly. The moveable *shēvā* is of course the older form, coinciding with the moveable *shēvā* of the Hebrew, and the full vowel *i* of the Arabic *ḵātilūna*, *ḵātilatun*. The Hebrew form naturally substitutes *ō* for *ā* in the 1st syllable, and heightens the vowel of the tone-syllable into *ē*, whence קָטַל, fem. קָטְלָה, in certain cases with fuller vowel בְּנָדָה, אֹכְלָה.

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 *maḵtūl*, 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 *ḵaṭūl*, קָטוּל, is very common in Ethiopic, but with the first vowel weakened, *ḵēṭūl*, fem. *ḵēṭēlt*,

e.g. *šḥūf* "written," *'šūr* "bound," *mīlū* "full," fem. *šḥēft*, *'šērt*, *mīlē'tt*. The Arabic form *فَعُول* is also sometimes used in a passive sense, e.g. *رَكُوبَةٌ* "a she camel for riding," *حَلُوبَةٌ* "a she camel for milking." In Syriac too there are a few examples of this kind, as *ܡܠܝܬܐ*, *ܡܠܝܬܐ*, "beloved," *ܡܠܝܬܐ*, *ܡܠܝܬܐ*, "hated," *ܡܠܝܬܐ* "a thing stolen," *ܡܠܝܬܐ* "a thing heard, a rumour." In Aramaic however the form *ܡܠܝܬܐ*, *ܡܠܝܬܐ*, is preferred, which is identical with the Arabic adjective *kaṭīl*; e.g. *ܡܠܝܬܐ*, *ܡܠܝܬܐ*. Of another verbally inflected *kaṭīl* 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 *kaṭāl*, like *ܡܠܝܬܐ* or *ܡܠܝܬܐ*, becomes *kaṭtāl*, like *ܡܠܝܬܐ* or *ܡܠܝܬܐ*. Now as the nominal *kaṭāl* lies at the root of the verbal form *kaṭtālā*, so does the nominal *kaṭtāl* at the root of the verbal *kaṭtālā*.

The Arabic, as usual, exhibits this form in its primitive integrity, *kaṭtala*; *فَتَّلَ* "to kill many, to massacre"; *كَسَرَ* "to break into many pieces"; *بَكَى* "to weep much" or "constantly"; *مَوَتْ*

“to die in great numbers”; طَوَّفَ “to go round and round.” So in Ethiopic, ረሰዖ: *rassáya*, “to do”; ረሰወ: *fannáwa*, “to send”; ረሰዐ: *šauwé’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, *kattál*; but as in the noun we find אָכַר for אֶכֶר, so in the verb *kittál* for *kattál*, as נָדַל, אָכַר, שָׁכַר, רָחַם, אִירַשׁ “betroth to oneself.” The *ā* of the 2nd syllable is sometimes weakened to *ā̄*, as in דָּכַר, כָּפַר, נָפַם (with which compare the change of *ā* into *ē* in גָּבַר for גִּבֹּר); but far more usually into *ē*, more especially in pause, where it appears, owing to the force of the tone, as *ē̄*. This change is probably owing to the influence of the vowel of the same syllable in the imperfect and imperative (קָטַל, יִקְטֹל). In the first and 2nd persons the original short *ā* is dominant, דִּבַּרְתִּי, דִּבַּרְתָּ, דִּבַּרְתָּם, דִּבַּרְתֶּם, דִּבַּרְנוּ. In the pausal forms of the 3rd pers. sing. fem., and the 3rd pers. plur., the weaker vowel predominates: לִקְטָהּ, גִּדְּלָהּ, שָׁבְרוּ, though we also find קִבְצָה, Micah i. 7. In the Aramaic dialects the weakened קָטַל, קָטַל, קָטַל prevails, except where a guttural, or the letter *ʿ*, as 3rd radical, may have protected the original vowel; e.g. קָטַל, קָטַל.

Glancing at the imperative, imperfect, and participle, we observe that in all the Semitic languages the vowels of the root-syllables are *a* in the first and *i* in the second, *kattil*. So the imperative in Arabic, قَتِّلْ *kattil*; in Ethiopic, ረሰመ: *fássēm*; in Hebrew, דָּבַר, בָּקַשׁ; in Syriac, ܕܒܪܐ, ܒܩܫܐ. The nominal form *kattil*, intensified to *kattil*, lies at the root of the verbal form. Hence it appears that the use of *ā* in the case of radicals 3rd guttural, like שָׁכַח, שָׁמַח, בָּלַע, is due, not to the retention of the original vowel under the protection of the guttural, but to a later change of *ē*, *ē̄*, into *ā* under the influence of that

guttural. Side by side with שִׁמַּח לְבִי, Prov. xxvii. 11, we have שִׁמַּח נַפֶּשׁ עֲבָדָךְ; and the pausal forms of the fem. and plur. are always רִבְּרוּ, רִבְּרוּ, not רִבְּרִי, רִבְּרוּ.

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 *ā*, yielding the forms *yakāttīlu*, *taḳāttīlu*, etc. This pure vowel I find, however, only in the Ethiopic subjunctive of verbs 1st guttural, e.g. የሐድሰ: *yahāddēs*. Otherwise it is weakened into *ä*, as *yēfaṣṣēm*, ይፈፍሱ: . In Arabic this dull obscure vowel appears in the classical language as *ā*, e.g. يَفْتَل, يَفْتَل; 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, *yīṣaddak*, *yīfattaḥ*, but *yikallim*, *yirattib*. In Hebrew and Aramaic the preformative vowel is also *ä*, יִקְטֹל, יִקְטֹל, save that in the 1st pers. sing. ִ appears in Hebrew and ִ in Aramaic, יִקְטֹל, יִקְטֹל. 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; *yēnāgēr* for the indicative, *yēngēr* for the subjunctive, corresponding in form at least to the Assyrian *išākin* 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 *yēfaṣṣēm* for the subjunctive, and had recourse for the indicative to the form *yēfēṣēm*, ይፈፍሱ:, 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 *ḳaitāla* has been resorted to, which would naturally appear in Ethiopic as *ḳētdāla*.

The active participle follows exactly the same vocalisation. Its preformative in Ethiopic is *ma*, e.g. ሙሙ: *ma'ammēz*,

מַכְוָּנֶנֶן: *makwānnēn*. The Hebrew and Aramaic weaken the vowel to *ē*, מְדַבֵּר, מְחַלֵּל; and this dull vowel is represented in old Arabic and Assyrian by *u*, مَقْتَل, *muṣakkin*, in modern Arabic by *ē*, as *mēfattaḥ*, *mēṣaddaḥ*, *mēkanmil*, *mē'allim*.

The infinitive of this conj. also calls for a few remarks. Beginning with the Hebrew, we find the ordinary or construct infin. to be קָטַל, *kaṭṭēl*, from an original *kaṭṭil*. The weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* is a rarity, as חִלַּץ Levit. xiv. 43, קָטַר Jerem. xlv. 21; שָׁלַם Deut. xxxii. 35¹. Compare in the class of concretes such words as גָּבַן, עָוַר, from *gabbin*, 'avvtr. The same form *kaṭṭēl* serves for the infin. absolute (with weakening נָאֵץ 2 Sam. xii. 14); but with it occurs another, viz. קָטַל, e.g. קָנָא, יָסַר, רָפָא, בָּרַךְ. The corresponding concretes are exemplified by רְתוּק "chain," קָנָא "zealous, jealous," or, with weakening of the 1st vowel, מְלוּא, גְּבוּר, שְׂבוּר, יָסוּר (Job xl. 2 = xxxix. 32), קָפַז (قَفَازَة). These all spring from an original *kaṭṭal*, the intensive of קָטַל. The Arabic infin. قَتَلَ is therefore weakened from قَتَلَ, as in كَذَابٌ, عَلَامٌ, as compared with the concretes كَذَابٌ, عَلَامٌ, حَمَالٌ.—The forms with prefixed *t*, which are generally assigned to this conjugation, تَعَال, تَغْتِيل, تَقْتِل, 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 קָטַל (קָטַלָה); whilst the Talmūd Bablī, the Mandaic, and the modern Syriac, exhibit קָטַל; e.g. Talm. B. שְׂבוּרָי,

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. נָאֵץ seems to be influenced by the sound of the following word נָאֵץ.]

אִפְּוּי, צִלְוּי; Mand. בארונא, נאטוריא, אסוּיא, שאבוהיא; mod. Syr. ܨܠܘܐ, ܨܢܘܐ. This ܨܬܘܐ is not easy to explain, but most likely, as Noeldeke thinks, it is connected with such Hebrew forms as שָׁבוּל (plur. שְׁבָלִים, Is. xlix. 20) and שָׁלוּם, plus the originally fem. termination *ai*, which we find in Syriac ܠܥܨܒܐ, ܠܥܨܒܐ, etc. In all these dialects an *m* is occasionally prefixed, Targ. ܡܡܬܠܐ, Mand. ܡܡܦܐܩܘܪܝܐ, mod. Syr. ܡܡܨܦܐ; and this is the ordinary form in old Syriac, but with a different termination, though also originally fem., viz. ܡܡܨܦܐ. The prefixing of the *m* may have been due to the influence of the participial forms, and of the infin. ܡܡܨܦܐ. — In Mandaitic and modern Syriac a fem. of ܨܬܘܐ is also in common use as a verbal noun or infinitive, viz. ܡܡܨܦܐ, as ܡܡܨܦܐ ܡܡܨܦܐ “order,” ܡܡܨܦܐ ܡܡܨܦܐ “provocation,” ܡܡܨܦܐ ܡܡܨܦܐ “selling,” ܡܡܨܦܐ ܡܡܨܦܐ “warning”; ܡܡܨܦܐ “completion,” ܡܡܨܦܐ “deliverance.” The most nearly corresponding forms in Hebrew are represented by such words as ܡܡܨܦܐ “desiring,” ܡܡܨܦܐ “care,” ܡܡܨܦܐ “terror,” ܡܡܨܦܐ “cutting off (of rain), drought, distress,” ܡܡܨܦܐ “punishment,” ܡܡܨܦܐ “drought.” These are intensives of the form ܡܡܨܦܐ ܡܡܨܦܐ, found in old Syriac and still more abundantly in mod. Syriac, ܡܡܨܦܐ, ܡܡܨܦܐ; just as ܨܬܘܐ is the intensive of the Syr. and Mand. ܨܬܘܐ, ܨܬܘܐ, ܨܬܘܐ.

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, *kātala* instead of *katala*. It is in general use in Arabic only, but examples occur in Ethiopic too, the form being identical in both languages, viz. ܡܡܨܦܐ, ܡܡܨܦܐ: “bless”; ܡܡܨܦܐ, ܡܡܨܦܐ: “go to law”; ܡܡܨܦܐ, ܡܡܨܦܐ: “talk to”; ܡܡܨܦܐ, ܡܡܨܦܐ: “play the hypocrite.”

In Hebrew its use is likewise restricted. It appears in this language under the shape of *kōtēl*, for *kātāl*, and is most common in verbs ע"ע, e.g. פִּוֶּר "cleave," חוּלַל "pierce, wound," חוּנַן "show mercy," סוּבַב "surround," דוּלַל "befool," רוּצֵץ "crush to bits." In the ordinary triliteral verb examples are rare, but certain; e.g. שׁוּפֵט (Job ix. 15, מְשַׁכְמִי = *ṣāḥakmī*), לִשֵּׁן (Ps. ci. 5, מְלוֹשְׁנִי בִפְתָר יַעֲדוּ, סוּעַר (Hos. xiii. 3, יְסוּעַר "blows away"), שׁוֹרֵשׁ "to take root," הָרָז וְהָגָז "conceiving and uttering," Is. lix. 13. In Aramaic this form can hardly be said to occur, save in Biblical Aramaic, where we find מְסוּבְלִין "set up," Ezra vi. 3. The inflexion runs entirely parallel to that of the intensive form, and therefore requires no special elucidation. I will merely remark as to the Arabic infinitive that the original form is *kītāl*, قِيَتَال, of which the grammarians quote one or two examples, as قِيَتَال and صِيَرَاب. Usually, however, it has been shortened into فَتَال, though some compensated for the loss of the long vowel by doubling the middle radical, مَرَّاءَ, فَتَّال, which must however have led to confusion with the infinitive of the intensive. The Hebrew infinitives הָרָז and הָגָז hold fast the original vowel *ā*, and would be represented in Arabic by some such words as هَاجَأَ and قَاتَل.

As to the participle I would remark that an example without prefixed *m* seems to offer itself in the word עוֹיִן 1 Sam. xviii. 9

(*Kethibh* עוֹיִן), for the corresponding Arabic verb is عَايَنَ. 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

“make one finish”; $\lambda\lambda\phi\eta$: “condole with one.” In Tigrīna and Amharic too it is in ordinary use. In Hebrew it is very rare (אֲנִי־לִתִּי “I have defiled,” Is. lxiii. 3; אֲשַׁכֵּי , infin., Jerem. xxv. 3); but in the Aramaic dialects it is the almost universal form, ܐܠܡܐ . In one instance in Syr. the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened to ϵ , viz. ܐܠܡܐ , as compared with ܐܠܡܐ , ܐܠܡܐ ,—like the vulg. Arab. اسلم mentioned above. With regard to the initial α , I may remark that it disappears after preformatives; e.g. in Arabic, يَقْتُل , part. مَقْتُل , in Ethiopic, from $\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda$: “make speak,” ዖጎጎር : *yāndǝǝr* and ዖጎጎር : *yāngǝr*; Syr. ܐܠܡܐ , ܐܠܡܐ . The vulgar Arabic of Egypt has weakened the vowel of the 1st syllable to i , as *yikhhbir* (يُخْبِر), *yimhil* (يَمِيل). 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 ܐܡܬܠܐ , ܐܡܬܠܐ , corresponding very nearly to the Arabic اَتَمَّل , Talm. Babli and Mandaitic, ܐܡܬܠܐ , as ܐܡܬܠܐ , ܐܡܬܠܐ ; ܐܡܬܠܐ “kneel,” ܐܡܬܠܐ “condemn”; with prefixed m , ܡܐܡܬܠܐ “go,” ܡܐܡܬܠܐ “bring”; Syriac, always with m , ܡܐܡܬܠܐ .

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 *takātala*. Of this

we have two varieties in Ethiopic, ተአደነ: *takadāna*, and ተአደነ: *takādna*, "cover oneself, be covered"; ተዐቀበ: and ተዐቅበ: "guard oneself, abstain, beware, be guarded"; ተወልደ: "be born"; ተላካዘ: "be taken"; ተመሰ: or ተመ: "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 Aramaic form, אֶתְקַטֵּל, more commonly, with weakening of the last vowel, אֶתְקַטֵּל, אֶתְקַטֵּל. In Syriac and Mandaitic we also find a supplementary vowel in frequent use, عَتِיקَتِيل, عَتِיקَتِيل. The Biblical Aram. has the spiritus asper instead of the lenis, הֶתְקַטֵּל, e.g. הֶתְרַחֲצוּ Dan. iii. 28. In Hebrew this form is of very rare occurrence indeed. A possible example, without any prosthetic, may be הִתְחַרְהָ, of which the imperf. הִתְחַרְהָ occurs in Jerem. xii. 5, and the participle מִתְחַרְהָ in xxii. 15. If so, this form is next of kin to the Syr. اِتَّكَب. More certain is a derivative from the rad. פָּקַד, with the prosthetic spiritus asper, viz. הִתְפַּקֵּד "to be numbered, mustered," e.g. Judges xx. 15, 17, xxi. 9, which is written without *daghesh* and with *kāmeṣ* wherever it occurs¹. The Arabic form اِتَّقَلَّ, standing for قَتَلَّ, offers us the curious feature of a transposition of the preformative to the place after the first radical, قَتَلَّ for قَتَلَّ. This began no doubt with the verbs which commenced with a sibilant, as in Syr. اِصْطَبَّ, اِصْطَبَّ; اِصْطَبَّ, اِصْطَبَّ; and was gradually extended to all alike. The Arabic parallel to הִתְפַּקֵּד is therefore اِفْتَقَدَّ "to search for, inspect." Curiously enough the same transposition seems to have existed in Moabitic; at least in the inscription of king Mēsha' we find four times (ll. 11, 15, 19, 32) a form הִלְחַחַם, from the rad. לחם, in the

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

sense of the Heb. נָלַחַם "fight," Arab. اَلْتَحَمَ "join oneself to, adhere to," "rage" (of a battle). It is also found in Assyrian, as *ištakan* "he made," *iftikid* "he committed" or "entrusted"; and in Hīmyaritic, without any prosthetic *alif*, e.g. כָּתַר from כָּטַר, כָּתַל from כָּאֵל, נָתַר from נָדַר. 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 *itfa'al* or *itfi'il* from the corresponding forms of the intensive with double radical. According to him *itfa'al* or *itfi'il* is usually passive of Conj. I, as *itḥabas*, *itkasar*, *itmisik*, *itfilim*; whereas the transposed *ifta'al* is more usually reflexive than passive, as *itamad*, *intaṣar*, *iṣṭalah*, *iṣṭama* ("be heard" and "obey").

2. The reflexive of the intensive and iterative is naturally *taḳāttala*. This form presents itself in Arabic, تَقَاتَّلَ, and in Ethiopic, ተቀደሰ: *taḳaddsa*, "be hallowed," ተፈጸመ: *tafaṣṣama*, "be finished," ተላላዘ: *ta'azzāza*, "obey," ተፈላገዘ: *tafaṣṣəḥa*, "rejoice" (because of the 3rd guttural). It would gradually be corrupted into اِتَعَلَّلَ *itəḳāttala*, of which we find examples even in classical Arabic, especially when the verb begins with a dental or sibilant, when assimilation takes place, as اِدْتَرَّ "wrap oneself up in a garment," اِزِين "adorn oneself," اِصْمَع "hear, listen," اِصْعَد "ascend," اِصْدَق "give alms," اِطْيِر "regard as an evil omen." In this way اِتَنَفَسَ would become اِتَنَفَسَ, and so in vulg. Arabic اِتَعَلَّقَ *it'allaq*, "be suspended," اِتَنَظَّفَ *itnaḍḍaf*, "be cleansed," or with weakening of the 3rd vowel, اِتَعَمَّم "put on a turban." Here we have the origin of the Aramaic אִתְקַטַּל, Syr. ܐܬܬܩܬܠ, in Bibl. Aram. ܐܬܬܩܬܠ, as ܐܬܬܩܬܠ Ezra vii. 15,

v. 17, Dan. iv. 12, 20, 30, etc.; with weakening of the last vowel, הוֹדַמְנָתוֹן, Dan. ii. 9 (*Kēre*); as well as of the Hebrew form הִתְקַטַּל or הִתְקַטֵּל. 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 اَدْرَ makes in its imperfect يَدْرَر for يَتَدَرَّر. Just so in Ethiopic, from verbs with initial dentals and sibilants, we have in this and in the preceding conjugation, such forms as ይጠጥቅ: from ተጠጥቀ: “be dipped, baptized”; ይደፈን: from ተደፋን: “be covered, buried”; ይሰበር: from ተሰበረ: “be broken”; ይጻሐፍ: from ተጻሐፈ: “be written”; ይዘከር: from ተዘከረ: “remember”; ይጸድቅ: from ተጸደቀ: “pretend to be righteous.” In Tigrifña this assimilation extends to all verbs, ይገደፋ: “it will be forgiven,” from ተገደፋ:, ይመለስ: “he returns,” from ተመለሰ:, ይፈጸመ: “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 *yǝgǝdʷaf*, *yǝmǝlʷas*, *yǝfǝʃʷam*, *yǝkǝbʷal*. Hence Hebrew forms like הִדְבַּחַ, הִפְחִיחַ, הִנְבִּיאַ, are at once explained, as well as the similar הִכְנִיחַ. In Mandaitic and the Talmūd this assimilation is as common in both conjugations as in Tigrifña. E.g. in Mandaitic, not merely עֲדָנָא “were heaped up” (עֲתִדָנָא), עֲמָמָא “were stopped up” (עֲתִמָמָא), but also מִפְתָּא “killed” (מִתְפְּעִי), מִיבִיא “wanted” (מִתְפְּתַח), עֲנָמָא “was fulfilled,” עֲכָנָא “was collected,” מִכְלָא “crowned”; in the Talmūd, מִקְטִיל, מִיגְנִיב, מִיבְּעִי, מִכְלָא “cover thyself” (fem.), and apparently with suppression of the doubling, אִיעֶסַק “he gave himself the trouble,” אִיעֲלָמָא “she hid herself,” אִיעֲתָרִי “I am become

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

Yet again, the Ithpč'el and Ithpa'al forms have a peculiarity common to them in several of the dialects. This is, that when the first radical is a sibilant, the preformative is transposed and appears in the 2nd place, as is always the case with the Arabic **افْتَعَلَ**. Frequently too the **ת** is changed into a **ט** or a **ד**, according to the character of the initial consonant of the root. So in Hebrew, **הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה**, **הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה**, but **הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה**. So in Syriac, **ܐܬܬܚܥܐ**, **ܐܬܬܚܥܐ**, but **ܐܬܬܚܥܐ**, **ܐܬܬܚܥܐ**. So in Arabic, in the conj. **اصْطَبَحَ**, **زَادَ** from **ازداد**, **زحر** from **ازدجر**, **افْتَعَلَ** from **اضطر**, **صَبَحَ** 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 **ثَارَ** Lane gives **اِثَّارَ**; from **اِثَّرَ** and **اِثَّرَ**, "crumble bread"; from **اِثَّرَ** and **اِثَّرَ**, "cut the front teeth"; from **اِثَّرَ** and **اِثَّرَ**, "put on mail"; from **اِثَّرَ** and **اِثَّرَ**, "journey by night"; from **اِثَّرَ** and **اِثَّرَ**, rather than **اِثَّرَ** and **اِثَّرَ**, but from **اِثَّرَ** and **اِثَّرَ**, **اِثَّرَ** or **اِثَّرَ** from **اِثَّرَ** and **اِثَّرَ**, **اِثَّرَ** and **اِثَّرَ**. With initial **ص** and **ض** this assimilation is far less common, as **اِصْبَحَ**, **اِصْبَحَ**, **اِصْبَحَ**; and with **س** and **ز** it is very rare, as **اِزَانَ**, **اِصْبَحَ**. Bearing these facts in mind, we are, I think, justified in saying that a Hebrew form

like הִזְכִּיר (Is. i. 16) is assimilated from הִזְכִּיר, just as the similar תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה (Eccles. vii. 16) stands for תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה, with backward assimilation. Similarly in Syriac, ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ for ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ, ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ for ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ. Here and there we find exceptions to the rule of transposition. In Aramaic the verb ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ exhibits the forms ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ (in Euting's *Nabataische Inschriften aus Arabien*, no. 11) and ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ 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 ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ and ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ, the third member of this group requires but little notice. It is the reflexive and reciprocal of *ḥātala*, viz. *taḥātala*, which is the ordinary Arabic form, as ترامي "to throw oneself down," تمارض "to pretend to be sick," تقاتلوا "they fought with one another." So in Ethiopic, ተሰሰ: or ተሰፀ: "to shave oneself," ተሰሰ: "to show oneself gentle to another, pardon," ተሰሰ: "they parted from one another," ተሰሰ: "he was tortured, afflicted." But ተባብረ gradually became ተባብረ, and hence such forms in classical Arabic as اتابع "rush headlong," اتأكل "be heavy and troublesome," اذارأ "repel one another," اسأطأ. In the vulgar Arabic of Egypt the vowel of the 3rd syllable is weakened to *i* or to *shēva*, as *itkāmīl*, *it'ārik* "struggled with," *it'ārādū*, *itnāsābū*. In Biblical Aramaic occurs the form ܬܫܬܚܝܬܐ, Dan. iv. 16. In Hebrew we may regard הִתְעַצֵּשׁ "stagger to and fro, toss itself," Jer. xxv. 16, xlv. 7, 8; and מִנְּאִין, Is. lii. 5, for מִתְנַאֵץ, "blasphemed," as examples from the ordinary triliteral verb. From verbs ע"ע I may mention הִתְעַלֵּל "perpetrate,

accomplish," Ps. cxli. 4; הַתְּפִלָּה Is. xxiv. 19; הַתְּרִיצִין Gen. xxv. 22; הַתְּקַוֶּשׁ Zeph. ii. 1; and הַתְּהוֹלֵל. And here I will notice in passing one curious Hebrew form, though it does not belong to the conjugation תִּפְּתַל, but to תִּתְּקַל. From the radical שׁוּט is derived the Pi'lél שׁוּטִיט, "wander about," and from this the Prophet Jeremiah has formed the Hithpa'lél הַתְּשׁוּטִיט, in the imperat. plur. fem. הַתְּשׁוּטִיטֵנָה, Jer. xlix. 3. It is the solitary instance that I know in Hebrew of the ת not being transposed with an initial sibilant; and the reason probably was to avoid the sequence of three *t*'s, הַתְּשׁוּטִיטֵנָה.

With regard to the moods and tenses of these three conjugations, there is but little to add to what has already been said regarding the simple *kátala*, *káttala*, and *kátala*. I will therefore merely make a remark upon the infinitives of the fifth and sixth conjugations in Arabic. As in the frequentative and iterative we found the form فَتَال, for تَتَال, though but little used, so we look here for a corresponding formation. This actually occurs in the rare تَتْتَال, with assimilation of the preformative vowel. Examples تَتَمَلَّق, تَتَكَلَّم, تَتَحَمَّل; to which we may add such concretes as تَلْقَاع "glutton," تَلْقَاع "foolish chatterer," تَكْذَاب "mendacious," and the like. A great many Hebrew and Aramaic words with prefixed *t*, especially of the form تَتْتَل, belong by their signification to this conjugation, and not to the causative or factitive تَتَل. Such are in Syriac, ܬܬܠܬܐ, ܬܬܦܠܬܐ, ܬܬܠܥܬܐ; in Hebrew, תְּתַל, תְּתַפֵּל, תְּתַלַּח, "entreaty, prayer," תְּתַלַּח "prayer," תְּתַלְּמוּ "secret," תְּתַנְּנוּ from תַּאֲנוּ, תְּתַנְּנוּ from תַּאֲנוּ, etc. The Arabic however generally uses another form of the infinitive,

which is common to the 5th and 6th conjugations, viz. ^{5 3 3}تَقْتَل and ^{5 3 3}تَقَاتَل, with *u* in the 3rd syllable. These seem to be closely connected with such Hebrew and Aramaic forms as ^{5 3 3}שָׁלוּם, ^{5 3 3}שְׁלוּחִים, ^{5 3 3}שְׁנוּלִים, Bibl. Aram. ^{5 3 3}אַשְׁתָּדוּר “rebellion,” Mand. ^{5 3 3}עַתְלֵאבְּוּשִׁיא, Talmud. ^{5 3 3}אַיְמְנוּעִי, for ^{5 3 3}אַיְתְּמְנוּעִי, “withdraw from, abstain from.” ^{5 3 3}תִּקְלֵל is almost exactly represented by the Hebrew concretes ^{5 3 3}תֵּבֵלָל “having a white spot on the eye,” ^{5 3 3}תֵּאֲשֹׁר “a kind of pine” or similar growing tree.

4. I pass on now to the last member of this group, the reflexive of the factitive or causative, which is represented by the 10th conjugation of the Arabic verb and the *Ettafal* of the Aramaic.

In Arabic the 10th conjugation is the reflexive or middle voice of the 4th; as ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَسْلَمَ “to give oneself up,” ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَقَامَ “to hold oneself upright, stand upright,” ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَخْلَفَ “select one as a deputy for oneself,” ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَغْفَرَ “ask pardon for oneself,” ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَحَلَّ “deem something lawful” (for oneself to do). It is exceedingly common, and is derived, as I explained to you before, from the form *saḳtala*, by the prefixing of the syllable *ta*. This form *tasakṭala* became *itsakṭala*, and then, by the same transposition as is usual in Hebrew and Aramaic, *istakṭala*. Hence its identity with the Aramaic ^{5 3 3}אַשְׁתַּקְטַל from ^{5 3 3}שָׁקַטַל. It is found in Ḥimyaritic or S. Arabian, without a prosthetic letter, *satafal* from *safal*, as ^{5 3 3}סַתְּמַלָּא, ^{5 3 3}סַתְּוִפִּי. It also occurs in Assyrian; as *ultšib-šināt*, “I have set them” or “made them dwell,” for *uštšib* [or *uštššib*], from ^{5 3 3}אַשַׁב = ^{5 3 3}יָשַׁב; *altabušu*, “I did,” for *aštabušu*, from ^{5 3 3}עָבַשׁ (Haupt *epēšu*). In Ethiopic we had, you may remember, three forms of the causative, ^{5 3 3}ʾaḳtāla, ^{5 3 3}ʾaḳattāla, and ^{5 3 3}ʾaḳātāla; and so also we have three forms of the reflexive, ^{5 3 3}ʾastakṭāla or ^{5 3 3}ʾastakṭāla, ^{5 3 3}ʾastakattāla and ^{5 3 3}ʾastakātāla; e.g. ለስተፈሰሰ:

“to draw breath, be refreshed,” $\lambda\eta\tau\text{-}\eta\phi\text{-}\theta$: “to entreat,” $\lambda\eta\tau\lambda\eta\rho$: “to ill-treat”; $\lambda\eta\tau\theta\gamma\omega$: “be patient,” $\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\lambda\omega\eta$: “rejoice”; $\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\eta\alpha$: “compare with one another,” $\lambda\eta\tau\gamma\text{-}\eta\lambda$: “collect.” On its inflexion it is unnecessary to make any remarks, as it runs parallel to that of *iktatala*. The other causative form اقتل *ʾaqtala* forms in the Aramaic dialects a reflexive and passive by prefixing the syllable *eth*, as in the Palmyrene tariff מתאעלין , יתאעל , from על , על . In Samaritan, Syriac and Mandaitic the assimilation of the *t* with the following *alif* takes place, e.g. אתשקע (אתשקה , “be found”), אתסנכ (אתסנכ , “be finished”), עללל (על), עללל (על), עללל (על), עללל (על).

C. Third Group.

Of the next group of derived conjugations the characteristic syllable is *na*.

1. The most prominent member of this group is a reflexive and passive of the simple form of the verb, in its original shape *na-katala*.

In Arabic this *naḵātala* became first *nāḵātala*, and then, with prosthetic vowel, *inḵātala*, انقتل ; as انشق “to split itself, open” (of a flower); انهزم “to let oneself be put to flight, to flee”; انقاد “to let oneself be led, to be docile or submissive”; انكسر “to be broken”; انقطع “to be cut off, to come to an end.” In Hebrew the imperfect and imperative and two infinitives follow the same mode of formation as in Arabic. The Arabic imperfect is ينقتل ; the Hebrew, יִנְקַח for יִנְקַח , with constant assimilation of the preformative to the 1st radical. The Arabic imperative

is **اَنْتَلَّ**, the Hebrew **הִקְטִיל**, with the usual substitution of **ה** for **א** in these preformative syllables. The Arabic infinitive is **اَنْتَلَّ**; the corresponding Hebrew form is **הִקְטִיל** (with *ō* for *ā*), as **הִאָּכַל**, **הִנָּחֵן**, beside which we have another form for the construct infinitive, viz. **הִקְטִיל**, as **הִקְלַחַם**, **הִפְתַּח**, **הִעְזֹר**. 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 *naḳatāl* into *naḳtāl*, which was gradually weakened into *niḳtāl*. The original vowel of the 1st syllable is established by such words as **נִחְבְּאתָ**, **נַעֲשָׂה**, **נִלְדָּ** (for **נִלְדָּה**), **נָסַב** (for **נִסְבַּב**), **נָסַג** (for *nāsāg*, from **נָסַג**); whilst **נַעֲשֶׂתָה**, **נִחְבְּאָה**, exhibit an intermediate state. The infinitive absolute is now **נִקְטֹל**, for *naḳtāl*, as **נַעֲתוֹר**, **נִהַפֵּךְ** [where the original vowel of the first syllable is protected by the guttural following], **נִקְרָא**, **נִלְחַם**. The Arabic participle, formed after the analogy of the imperfect, with prefixed *m*, is **مَنْتَلَّ**. 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 **הִכָּם** is differentiated from **הִכָּם**, so is *naḳtāl*, *niḳtāl*, from *naḳtāl*, *niḳtāl*; e.g. **נִעֲרֵץ**, **נִחְתָּם**, **נִאָּזַר** and **נִאָּזַר**, **נִלְדָּה**, **נִבְהַל**. We shall have occasion to notice a similar participial formation hereafter in the form *ḳuttāl*, as **אָכַל** “eaten,” **יֻלְדָּ** “born,” **לָקַח** “taken.” In a very few instances we seem to find an imperative after the form *niḳtāl* or *niḳtāl*, viz. **נִקְבְּצוּ**, in pause **נִקְבְּצוּ**, Is. xliii. 9; Joel iv. 11; **נָלוּ** Jerem. l. 5. The Hebrew form of the Niph'al seems to extend to Phoenician and Assyrian. In Phoenician we find **נתן** as the perf. Niph'al of **יתן** “to give,” which we pronounce either **נָתַן** or **נָתַן**, and also **נעניש** [ש], probably **נעניש**.

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

In Ḥimyaritic Halévy gives as an example the word הנחפּשׁ, 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 *kalkala*, the Hebrew *Pilpēl*. The meaning of this formation in Ethiopic is not however so fixed as in Arabic and Hebrew. It generally implies motion, sometimes reflexive and reciprocal action; but sometimes too it is transitive, and admits of a passive being formed from it. Examples: ለእኩሳወ: "to walk about," ለእፈረዐ፡ "to leap, dance," ለእንደጉዳ: "to thunder"; ለእንገለገ: "to come together, assemble"; ለእንቀዕደወ: properly "to lean forward, prostrate oneself," but generally used in the sense of "lift up the eyes *or* heart in prayer"; ለእንብርኩረ: "roll" (intrans. or trans.); ለእንቀፋፋ: "totter" and "shake"; ለእንጠልዐ: "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 ነጉደጊድ: "thunder," ነጉርጊር: "rolling, a whirlwind," ነፋፋ: "shaking," gave rise to the notion that the prefixed ለ might be identical with the causative or factitive prefix ለ. Hence, according to him, the occasional change of meaning, and the formation in a few cases of a passive with ተ, e.g. ተነጉርኩረ: "to be rolled," ተነጠልዐ: "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 transitive¹.

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 נִכְפַּר Deut. xxi. 8, for נִתְכַּפַּר, "be atoned for, forgiven," and נִסְרַן Ezek. xxiii. 48, for נִתְסַרַן, "let themselves be warned." In post-biblical Hebrew it is common, and has usurped the place of the perfect Hithpa"*el*, as נִשְׁתַּמֵּשׁ, נִסְתַּבֵּל, נִזְדַּמֵּן, נִשְׁמַמָּה; and is then extended to other formations, as נִשְׁתַּעַבַּד, נִתְרַגַּם, נִתְאַלְמַנָּה "she is become a widow."

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

D. Fourth Group.

I will next speak briefly of a group of *reduplicated* forms. This reduplication is of different kinds, but always takes place at the end of the root, not at the beginning. The chief varieties are, to use the Hebrew terms, *Pi'lēl*, *Pē'al'al*, and *Pilpēl*.

1. Starting from the root *ḵatala*, the simplest form of such a reduplication is the repetition of the 3rd radical, *ḵatalala*. But *ḵatalala* would naturally become *ḵatldl*, which would be weakened in Aramaic into *ḵatlēl*, and in Hebrew into *ḵitlēl*. Aramaic examples are not numerous; e.g. עָרַבַב "mix up, confuse"; חָבַב "crumble," חָבַבַב "separate," חָבַבַב "practise, reduce to slavery," with its passive חָבַבַב; חָבַבַב "irritate," and חָבַבַב "to become fierce"; חָבַבַב "to be intelligent, sensible." In Hebrew this form has taken the place of Pi"*el* in verbs ע"י, as נִדְרָה (better from נִדַּר than from נִדַּר), נִדְרָה, נִדְרָה, etc., and

forms a reflexive and passive with prefixed *tu*, הִתְפַּעֵל. In other classes of verbs it is rare, but we can refer to it שָׁאֵן "to be quiet, still," Jerem. xxx. 10; Job iii. 18; רָעֵן in the fem. רָעֲנָה Job xv. 33; further, with passive pronunciation, אָמַל "to be withered, wither away, mourn"; and from verbs לָה, מִטְחִי-קֶשֶׁת, contracted נָאָה "to be seemly, beautiful"; מִטְחֶה, from טָחָה "to shoot," and the reflexive הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה, from שָׁחָה. As to the Arabic development of the original *katalala*, it generally took the following course; *katalala* became *kʿtalala*, *iktalala*, and finally *iktalla*. This form *iktalla* appears in the Arabic paradigm as the 9th conj. of the verb, with the cognate *iktalla* as the 11th; e.g. اِزْوَار and اِزْوَر "turn away," اِرْبَث and اِرْبَث "be scattered," اِرْقَد "run quickly," اِشْعَان "be dishevelled"; and constantly of colours and defects, as اِعْوَج, اِعْوَج "be crooked"; اِحْوَل, اِحْوَل "squint"; اِصْفَر, اِصْفَر "be yellow"; اِبْيَض, اِبْيَض "be white." The uncontracted form *iktalala* survives only in some examples from verbs 3rd rad. و or ي; as اِرْعَوِي "to abstain, refrain"; اِحْوَوِي "to become brownish," with its byform اِحْوَاوِي, اِحْذَوِي "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, اِقْتَنَلَ for قَتَنَلَ; as اِحْلَنَكَ "be jet black" (حَلَكَ), اِعْلَنَكَ "be long and thick" (of the hair), اِقْعَنَسَس "have a hump in front" (قَعَس).

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

ḵataltala, appearing occasionally in Aramaic and Hebrew as *ḵəṭaltāl*; e.g. סַחַרְחַר "to beat violently" (of the heart), Ps. xxxviii. 11; חִמְרִמֵּר "to be red" with weeping, "to be agitated or troubled." Similar cases are Ps. xlv. 3, יִפְּפִית, which should probably be read יִפְּפִית; and אָהָבוּ הֵבוּ, Hos. iv. 18, probably in the first instance a mere clerical error for אָהָבוּ הֵבוּ, from אָהָב. Aramaic examples in derived conjugations are ܠܡܕܡܕܡܕ "to dream," ܠܡܕܢܝܢ "to imagine."

3. The form *ḵalkāla*, Aram. *ḵalkēl*, Heb. *ḵilkēl*, is often produced by the repetition of an imitative syllable. E.g. خَشَخَش "to make things rattle or rustle," وَسَّسَ "to whisper," حَمَّاحَمَّ "to neigh," غَرَّغَر "to gargle," צִפְצִף "to chirp." Very frequently it is formed in Aramaic and Hebrew from verbs ע"ע and ו"ו by repeating the two chief letters of the root; e.g. in Aramaic, ܠܚܠܠ, ܠܫܠܠ, ܠܫܠܠ, ܠܫܠܠ; with their reflexives; in Hebrew, גִּלְגֵּל, קִלְקֵל, שִׁשֵּׁשׁ "gladden, take delight in," בִּלְבֵּל, מוֹעֵזֵז, מַמְלִיל "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 فَعَوَّل, which became in Arabic اِفْعَوَّل, as اِحْدَوْدَب "be arched or curved, hump-backed" (حَدَب), اِعْصَوَّصَب "be gathered together" (عَصَب), اِحْلَوَّل "be jet black" (حَلَك), اِعْرَوَّر "be sweet" (حَلَو), اِعْرَوَّر "ride on a horse barebacked" (عَرَب).

I find a few similar forms in Syriac from verbs final **o** and **u**; e.g. **ܐܠܝܫܐܝܒ** "to boast or brag"; **ܐܠܝܢܝܒ** "to lie down, be hidden, be blamed"; **ܐܠܡܝܬܐܒ** "become young, be smeared over." In Hebrew it can hardly be said to exist, unless we take count of **הַצֹּאֵר** "to blow the trumpet" (**מַחְצֵרִים**), from **הַצֹּרֶה**. But the form is doubtful, the *kəṛē* being **מַחְצֵרִים**; and even if we assume it to be correct, **הַצֹּאֵר** might stand for **הַצֹּרֵר**, as **יַעְרֵרוּ** in Is. xv. 5, if correct, stands for **יַעְרֵרוּ**.

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 **كَتَلَى**, and in Aramaic by **ܩܬܠܝ**. Such words are in Mandaitic **ܢܐܡܒܝܐ** "to bewail," **ܢܐܡܒܝܐ** "to make an alien, estrange"; in Syr. **ܬܠܝܐ** "terrify," **ܬܠܝܐ** "es-
trange," **ܬܠܝܐ** "be deprived of, fail, perish," **ܬܠܝܐ** "expose," **ܬܠܝܐ** "deport," with their passives. In Arabic a passive of this form is found in the 15th conj. of the verb, **اُتَعَلَّى**, with *n* inserted after the 2nd rad.; as **اُحْبَنَی** "to be swollen or inflated" (**حَبَطَ**), **اُعْلَدَی** "be stout and strong" (**عَلَدَ** "be hard"). Curiously enough, a few verbs of this form in Arabic have a transitive sense, e.g. **اَسْرَدَی** "to overcome" (**سَرَدَی** "strong, brave"), **اَغْرَدَی** "to assail, overcome"; and, still more strangely, the only Mandaitic parallel, **ܥܘܪܐܡܒܝܐ**, "to be shaken," is derived from an active **ܘܪܐܡܒܝܐ**, which however does not occur in the extant literature.

E. *The Passive Forms.*

Lastly, in this enumeration of the verbal forms or conjugations, I would call your attention to the real passives, as distinguished from the reflexives and effectives, which so often discharge the functions of passives.

In Arabic nearly all the conjugations are capable of forming, and actually form, passives by means of internal modification of the vowels of the active voice. There are of course exceptions, which will readily suggest themselves to you. For instance, a verb like صَلَحَ "to be good *or* right," فَرِحَ "to be glad," or ثَقَلَ "to be heavy," cannot have a passive; nor one like اَسْوَدَّ, "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'el, Shaph'el, Aph'el, and Istaph'al; but I do not find that he is supported by Schrader or Oppert. From my own knowledge I cannot speak¹.

1. In Arabic the following are the principal passives :

Perfect.		Imperfect.	
(1) <i>ḵatala</i>	<i>ḵutīla</i>	<i>yāḵtulu</i>	<i>yukṭalu</i>
(2) <i>ḵattala</i>	<i>ḵuttila</i>	<i>yukṭatīlu</i>	<i>yukṭattalu</i>
(3) <i>ḵātala</i>	<i>ḵūtīla</i>	<i>yukṭatīlu</i>	<i>yukṭātalu</i>
(4) <i>'aḵtala</i>	<i>'uḵtīla</i>	<i>yukṭīlu</i>	<i>yukṭalu</i>
(5) <i>taḵattala</i>	<i>tuḵuttila</i>	<i>yataḵattalu</i>	<i>yutataḵattalu</i>
(6) <i>taḵātala</i>	<i>tuḵūtīla</i>	<i>yataḵātalu</i>	<i>yutataḵātalu</i>
[(7) <i>inḵatala</i>	<i>unḵutīla</i>	<i>yankatīlu</i>	<i>yunkātalu</i>]
(8) <i>iḵtatala</i>	<i>uḵtutīla</i>	<i>yāḵtatīlu</i>	<i>yukṭātalu</i>
(10) <i>istāḵtala</i>	<i>ustuḵtīla</i>	<i>yastāḵtīlu</i>	<i>yustāḵtalu</i>

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, *kuṭṭal*, *koṭṭal*, imperf. *yēkuṭṭal*. The infin. absolute has the form קָטַל, as קָטַל, Gen. xl. 15. The participle appears in two shapes, the one with prefixed *m*, *mēkuṭṭāl*; the other without it, as הַקָּטָל, יוֹלֵד, אָכַל, 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 קָטַל stands for *kuṭṭāl*; but the corresponding form in Aramaic is a verbal noun from the active Pa“ēl, c.g. אֲסֻפָּא “theft,” וְסֻפְרָא “warning,” מְסַמְפָּא “finishing”; whilst the Arabic *kuṭṭāl* is now the plural of the active participle of the simple verb *ḵatala*, as *ḵātil*“, a “murderer,” *kuṭṭāl*“, “murderers.” So again, the Hebrew participle אָכַל stands for *’ukkāl*, a sing. masc.; whereas the corresponding form in Arabic is another plural of the active participle of the simple *ḵatala*, as *sāgīd*, “worshipper,” *suggāid*, “worshippers.”

(b) The form expressive of effort, *koṭal*, imperf. *yēkoṭal*, as יִשְׁרָשֵׁוּ, Job xxxi. 8.

(c) The causative or factitive, *hoḵtal*, *luḵtal*, imperf. *yokṭal*.

Other forms are comparatively rare, but I may mention:—

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

(e) *Hothḵaṭṭal*, in הִטְפַּחְתָּ, Deut. xxiv. 4; הִרְשַׁנָּה, for הִרְשַׁנָּה, Is. xxxiv. 6; הִנְפַּס 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 اَتَفَدَّرَا with هִתְפַּקְרוּ, or تَتَبَعْتُ with הִרְשַׁנָּה.

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

(g) *Kuṭlal*, in אֶמְלֵל.

(h) *Kolkal*, in כֹּלְכָלוּ, 1 Kings xx. 27, and תִּשְׁעֵשְׁעוּ, Is. lxvi. 12.

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

(a) The passive of *Pi'al*, in a form which appears at first to be that of the passive participle *Pi'el*, and is accordingly generally so treated, even by Kautzsch. In my opinion, however, the verbal flexion of this form forbids us to regard it as a participle, and Noeldeke is right in adopting the other view. The form was originally *kuṭil*, but the weight of the accent produced a lengthening of the vowel of the 2nd syllable, whilst that of the 1st syllable was weakened in the regular verb to simple shēvā: טָרִיד Dan. iv. 30, יָהִיב Dan. vii. 4, 6, בָּתִּיב Ezra v. 7, קָטִיל Dan. v. 30, רָשִׁים Dan. v. 24, שָׁלַם Ezra v. 16; 3rd fem. בָּטִילָת Ezra iv. 24, יָהִיבָת Dan. vii. 27, נָטִילָת Dan. vii. 4, פָּרִיסָת Dan. v. 28, קָטִילָת Dan. vii. 11; 2nd sing. masc. תִּקְלָתָא Dan. v. 27; 3rd plur. masc. יָהִיבוּ Ezra v. 15, בָּפְתוּ Dan. iii. 21, מָרִיטוּ Dan. vii. 4, פָּתִיחוּ Dan. vii. 10. The distinction of form is clearer in the case of verbs ל"א, where the

perfect passive is גָּלִי Dan. ii. 19, גָּלִי Dan. ii. 30, קָרִי Ezra iv. 18, 23; plur. רָמִיו Dan. iii. 21, vii. 9; whereas the form of the participle Pē'īl is בָּנֶה, מְנֵה, קָרִי, שָׂרָה, plur. שָׂרִין. Similarly in the Palmyrene tariff, נְבִי = Arab. جَبِي; see Sachau in *ZDMG.* xxxvii. pp. 564—5.

(b) The passive of *Hiph'īl*, viz. *Hoph'al*, in Biblical Aramaic and the Palmyrene dialect, viz. הִנַּחַת Dan. v. 20, הוֹבֵד Dan. vii. 11, הִפֵּק Dan. vi. 24, הָעֵל Dan. v. 13, plur. הָעֵלוּ Dan. v. 15, fem. sing. הִחְרַבְתָּ Ezra iv. 15, הוֹסַפְתָּ לִּי Dan. iv. 33, הִקְיַמְתָּ Dan. vii. 4 (cf. أَتَيْمَتْ); 1st pers. הִתְקַנַּת (not נָתַתְּ) Dan. iv. 33.

Very peculiar are the forms הִיִּתִּית Dan. vi. 18, and הִיִּתִּיו Dan. iii. 13, the vocalisation of the 1st syllable of which is as yet unexplained. Similarly in the Palmyrene tariff, אֲשֵׁר (from שָׁר), e.g. וּמְרִי אֲשֵׁר לְאַגּוּרָא; imperfect יִכְתֵּב, e.g. וּיִכְתֵּב מִדְּעָם דִּי לֹא מִפֶּסֶק; part. מִפֶּסֶק, e.g. וִיהוּא מְבַטֵּל לְאַרְכּוֹנִיָּא דִּי הֶוֹן בּוֹבֵן, e.g. מְבַטֵּל; מִסַּק בְּנִמוּסָא מְרִי יְהוּא מִ[תְּאַעֵּל] בֵּר מִן תַּחּוּמָא אוּ מִפֶּסֶק, e.g. מִפֶּסֶק, for מִאֲפֶק; זִבְן מִאֲפֶק.

(c) The passive of *Pi'īl*, viz. *Pu'al*, in the Palmyrene tariff, יוֹפֵן, e.g. מִשְׁךְ דִּי יִתְאַעֵל אוּ יוֹבֵן לְמִשְׁכָּא אֲפָרִין.

(d) The passive participles of *Pa'īl*, *Aph'īl* and *Shaph'īl*, formed exactly as in Arabic. Thus in Biblical Aramaic מְחַלֵּךְ, מְמַלֵּל, but מְכַפֵּתִין “bound,” Dan. iii. 23, 24, from מְכַפֵּת; מְשַׁפֵּל “hidden things,” Dan. ii. 22, from מְסַתֵּר; מְהַחְצֵפָה Dan. v. 19, and מְהַנְזִקַת מְלִכִין Ezra iv. 15, but מְהַחְצֵפָה Dan. ii. 15, or מְחַצֵּף, מְהַחְצֵף. Also from מְסוֹבֵל “set up, erected,” Ezra vi. 3, from מְסוֹבֵל.

Exactly so in Syriac, **ܡܠܬܬܐ**, **ܡܠܬܐ**; **ܡܠܬܐ**, **ܡܠܬܐ**; **ܡܠܬܐ**, **ܡܠܬܐ**; and in Mandaitic, **ܡܢܐܪܝܚ** "blessing," **ܡܢܐܪܝܚ** "blessed"; **ܡܢܐܪܝܚ** "covering," **ܡܢܐܪܝܚ** "covered"; **ܡܢܐܪܝܚ** "teaching," **ܡܢܐܪܝܚ** "taught," **ܡܢܐܪܝܚ** "bringing out," **ܡܢܐܪܝܚ** "brought out." The corresponding Arabic forms are **مَمْلَأَ**, **مَمْلَأَ**, **مَمْلَأَ**, **مَمْلَأَ**.

(c) The existence of passive participles of Pa'ʿl and Aph'el after the *Hebrew* formation is not certain in Mandaitic, but Noeldcke gives for the Pa'ʿl the possible instances of **ܡܠܝܐ**, "the highlands," for **ܡܠܝܐ**, and **ܡܫܘܢܝܐ ܕܫܡܝܐ**, a name of Paradise, lit. "the taken away of righteousness," i.e. "the (land) of righteousness that has been taken away," = **ܡܫܘܢܝܐ**. On the other hand, the existence of Pu'al and Hoph'al participles in modern Syriac seems tolerably certain. For example, in Pu'al, **ܚܒܝܬܐ ܕܝܐܠܗܝܬܐ** "I have healed thee," is literally **ܚܒܝܬܐ ܕܝܐܠܗܝܬܐ** "thou hast been healed by me," the fem. being **ܚܒܝܬܐ ܕܝܐܠܗܝܬܐ**, for **ܚܒܝܬܐ ܕܝܐܠܗܝܬܐ**. So also in Pu'al, **ܐܘܒܝܢܐ**, *zūbinnē*, for **ܐܘܒܝܢܐ**, for **ܐܘܒܝܢܐ**; in Hoph'al, **ܡܪܝܬܐ** "raised up," **ܡܪܝܬܐ** "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.

1. Verbs *y'y* or *Geminate Verbs*.

I begin with the verbs *y'y*, or, as they are called in Arabic Grammars, the *doubled* or *geminate verbs* or the *solid verbs*. The peculiarity here is the contraction of the trisyllabic root into a disyllable by the rejection of the vowel of the second radical or some other modification.

In classical Arabic the rules of contraction are few and simple.

(a) If all three radicals have vowels, the 2nd radical loses its vowel, and unites with the 3rd, so as to form a double letter. Hence سَبَّ, "to cause," becomes سَبَّ; مَسَسَ "to touch," مَسَسَ; حَبَّ "to become dear" (to one), حَبَّ. The original form may be retained in poetry, for the sake of the metre, as ضَضُّوا for ضَضُّوا, "they are stingy"; and in some verbs of the forms فَعَّلَ and فَعَّلَ the contraction does not take place, as صَكَكَ "to be knock-kneed," لَحِجَحَ "to be sore" (of the eyes), لَبَّبَ "to be wise," دَمَمَ "to be ugly." Vulg. Arab., *madd*, *'add*, *ẓann*.

(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 ^{يَسْبِبُ} becomes ^{يَسْبُ}; ^{يَمَسُ}, ^{يَمَسَسُ}; ^{يَغْرِ}, ^{يَغْرِغِرُ}. The original forms may be used by poetic license, as ^{يَكَلُّ} for ^{يَكَلُّ}. Vulg. Arab., *yeẓunn*, *ye'idd*, *yiṣaḥḥ*.

(c) If the 3rd radical is vowelless, no contraction, generally speaking, takes place. The forms in ordinary use are ^{سَبَبْتُ}, ^{حَبَبْتُ}, ^{مَسَسْتُ}.

(d) Forms that might by rule remain uncontracted are sometimes contracted in different ways. For example, the jussive of ^{سَبَّ} is ^{يَسْبِبُ}, and the imperative ^{أَسْبِبْ}; but both are usually contracted, with the help of a supplementary vowel, into ^{يَسْبُ} and ^{سَبْ}. Vulg. Arab., *ẓunn*, 'idd.

Bearing these rules in mind, we may proceed to compare the Arabic forms with those of the Hebrew and Syriac, using chiefly as our paradigms ^{רָד}, ^{סַב}, and ^{בָּז}.

Kal. Here the uncontracted forms are relatively far more common in Hebrew than in Arabic, as ^{חָלַל}, ^{חָנַן}, ^{סָרַר}, ^{סָבַב}, fem. ^{נִדְרָה}, plur. ^{נִדְרוֹ}, ^{נִשְׁחַחוּ}, ^{סָבְבוּ}, ^{סָבְבוּ}. The contracted 3rd sing. masc. ^{סַב} and ^{בָּז} stand for *sabb* and *bazz*, and these for *sabba* and *bazza*, *sababa* and *bazaza*, like ^{רָד} for ^{רָדַד}. Add a suffix, and the doubling immediately becomes audible, ^{קָבַה}, ^{חֲנִנִי}, for *kabba-lu*; Aram. ^{זַבְב}; like Arabic ^{رَدَدَنِي}. In the same way in the 3rd pers. plur. ^{סָבּוּ}, ^{תָּמּוּ}, J. Aram. ^{דַּקְנוּ}, Syr. ^{نَمَّ}, for *sababū*, *tamamū*, *daḳaḳū*, as in Arabic ^{رَدَدُوا} 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 רָפוּ, רָפוּ. The real existence of forms like רָפוּ, Gen. xlix. 23, and רָמוּ, Job xxiv. 24, is somewhat doubtful; but if genuine, they would find their analogy in the Arabic forms of praise and blame, حَبَّ for حَبَّبَ, حَسَنَ for حَسَّنَ, and بَعَدَ for بَعَّدَ. In the 3rd p. fem. sing., Syr. حָلַ stands for *bassath* (Bibl. Aram. נָרַת, עָלַת, Mand. שאראת, פאסאת), *basasat*; and similarly סָבַה, for *sabbath*, *sababat*, as רָדַת for רָדַדַת. The primitive accent is often retained, as in מָרָה, חָתָה, but may be shifted, as in וּרְפָה, Is. vi. 12. In the 1st and 2nd persons, the normal form is the uncontracted Arabic رَدَدْنَا, رَدَدْتَ, رَدَدْتَ, which we find in Hebrew only in the forms וּמְמַתִּי, Zech. viii. 14, 15; בְּזוֹנוֹ, Deut. ii. 35. But these forms may be altered in two ways even in Arabic. Firstly, the 2nd radical may be dropped, and its vowel go with it, or it may be transferred to the 1st radical; as رָדַת for رָדַדַת, ظَلَّت or ظَلَّت for ظَلَّلَتْ, عِستَ for عِستَ. So in Aramaic حָנַ, حָنַف, حָنַ, for *basasta*, *basastôn*, *basasnan*. So in Hebrew תַּמְנִי for *tamannû*, Num. xvii. 28. The 1st pers. sing., however, in Aramaic, is דִּיקַת, Mand. פֶּאסִית, מאכית, אֵלִית, Syr. חָבַ for *bassêth*, *bassit*, *basasti*. Secondly, the 3rd radical may coalesce in the usual way with the second, and to make the doubling audible a vowel-sound may be inserted after it. This vowel-sound seems to have been that of the diphthong *au* or *ai*, which was favoured by the corresponding forms of the verbs 3rd ر and ي, as رَمِيتَ, نَدَوْتُ. 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 رَدَّتْ would become (through the impossible *raddta*) *raddaita*, and this is the ordinary form at the present day, *raddait*, *raddēt*, and in Algiers *raddīt*. We have seen, however, that the diphthong *ai* passed in some cases into *a*; for instance, Arab. أَيْنَ, Heb. אֵינָה; בָּתִּים, from בֵּית, בֵּית or בְּבֵית, from בְּבֵיתָה; and in Arabic itself دَابَّةٌ for دَوِيَّةٌ, dimin. of دَابَّة. Hence out of رَدِيتْ sprang the form رَدَات, the dialectical existence of which is vouched for by the grammarians; and hence the Hebrew סַבְּתִי, חַנְּתָם, וַמֹּת, for *sabbāti*, *sababtī*. Of course the Hebrew *ō* 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 *raddāta* is a known dialectical variety of *raddaita*.

The infinitive construct in Hebrew exhibits two forms: uncontracted, לְחַנְּנָם, far more rarely with *a*, לְחַנְּבָם, Is. xxx. 18, לְחַנְּנָה, Ps. cii. 14; and contracted, חַנְּבָה, חַנְּבָה, far more rarely with *a*, חַנְּבָה, Is. xlv. 1, חַנְּבָה, Jerem. v. 26. These are, of course, nothing but segolates of the same form as the Arabic رَدَّ, رَدَّ.

The Arabic imperative presents to us, as I explained above, the forms رَدِّ, رَدِّ, رَدِّ. These are exactly equivalent to the Hebrew חַנְּבָה, חַנְּבָה, perhaps also חַנְּבָה, Ps. cxix. 22; in Aramaic, חַנְּבָה, Mand. חַנְּבָה “wash,” חַנְּבָה “dwell”; Syr. حَسِّنْ, حَسِّنْ (from حَسِّنْ, حَسِّنْ). An example of the uncontracted form is חַנְּבָה, Jerem. xlix. 28, corresponding to an Arabic ارْدُدُوا for رَدُّوا.

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

יִמְסּוּ, יִפְרּוּ, יִבְרּוּ. The first of these is reproduced exactly in the Hebrew יִסְבּוּ for *yasubb*, *yasubbu*, *yasubbu*, with suffix יִסְבְּנִי, plural, יִסְבּוּ for *yasubbū*, *yasubbūna*. This *ō* has rarely been weakened into *ā*, but we find examples in יִרְוִן Is. xlii. 4, יִרְוִן Prov. xxix. 6, יִשׁוּר Ps. xci. 6. These may not improbably have been influenced by the imperfect of verbs ע"ו, as in Mand., where נִמּוּךְ (from מִאֲךְ) is identical with נִקּוּם from קִאם, and conversely נִדְאָר "dwells," נִגְאָר "commits adultery," cannot be distinguished from נִהָאם "be hot," תִּירָאנ "desirest." In intransitives like the Arabic يَمْسُ, مَسَّ, where the characteristic vowel of the imperfect is *a*, the Hebrew no longer maintains the ancient *yakṭal*, but employs the more recent *yikṭal*. Thus the imperfect of מַר is not יִמַר but יִמְר, for *yimrar*, *yamrar*. So יִרְע, יִרְך, and a few more. In 1 Kings i. i the form is pointed יַחַם instead of יָחַם. The reason of this deviation from the form with *a* in the first syllable probably was that יִמְר, יִרְך, יִרְע, too closely resembled in their vocalisation that of the *perfect*. Indeed יִמַר, יִרְך, and יִרְר, rightly appear as verbal roots in our lexicons. This has not however prevented the substitution of the form יִמְרוּ for יִמְרוּ in Gen. xi. 6, because the singular must actually have been יִמַר, not יִמַם. In the fem. plur. תִּסְבְּנִי, תִּסְבְּנִי, the diphthong *au* has again been inserted to facilitate the pronunciation of the contracted forms, which stand respectively for *tashubna* and *tashlilna*, 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 נִבְסּוּ, נִבְסּוּ, נִבְסּוּ, for *yidukḳ*, *neḅuzz*, etc., from *yadukḳu*, *nabuzzu*; and in the infinitive, מִדְּקַח, מִבְּסַח, for *midḳaḳ*, *mēbsaz*. The

Hebrew also has this form in such words as יָקַד, יָדְמוּ, יָדַם; יָקְדוּ, יָתְמוּ, יָתְמוּ, Jerem. xix. 3, for תִּצְלֶלְנָה; and so forth.

The participle active has in Hebrew the uncontracted form חוֹנֵן, חוֹנֵן, whereas in Arabic the contraction is prevalent, حَالٍ, حَالٍ, and the uncontracted حَالٍ occurs as a rare poetic license. In vulg. Arab. however the uncontracted حَاجِج is common in the masc. sing., whereas in the fem. sing. and in the plur. masc. and fem. the contracted form is more usual. In Syriac the form has been influenced by that of verbs ע"ו. The sing. masc. is therefore כָּלוּ, כָּלוּ, like כָּלוּ, but the fem. sing. and the plurals are regular, כָּלוּ, כָּלוּ, כָּלוּ, for 'ālilat, 'āliltū, 'āliltān'. In Bibl. Aram. we find the uncontracted plur. עָלְלִין, Dan. iv. 5, v. 8, as Kēthūbbh, the Kērrē being עָלִין, as also in Samarit. עָלְלָה, עָלְלָה.

Let us now glance rapidly at the derived conjugations.

Niphal. Here the chief peculiarity in Hebrew is the pure vowel of the 1st syllable, נָסַב, נָחַר, נָקַל, for *nasabb*, *naharr*, *naḳall*, from *nasbab*, *nahrar*, *naḳlal*. Curiously enough, however, we find here the intransitive vowels of the *Kal* also used in the 2nd syllable; e.g. נָמַם, נָקַל, נָרַץ; and so in the fem., נִשְׁמָה, נִשְׁמָה; and in the plur., נִשְׁמָו, נִסְבּוּ, but also נִסְבּוּ; and in the plur., נִשְׁמָו, נִסְבּוּ, but also נִסְבּוּ. This seems due to the resemblance of נָסַב to the ordinary *Kal* נָשַׁב, whence the same variations that were admissible in the one came in course of time to be thought allowable in the other. Others think that the *ō* 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 נִשְׁאָסִיר, Jerem. xxx. 16 (Kēthūbbh), if we derive it from נִשְׁסָה = נִשְׁסָה, the sing. being נִשְׁסָה for נִשְׁסָה.

² עָלְל occurs also in Palmyrene; in Palestinian Syriac both עָלְל and עָלְל "suffering" are found: the former word makes its plural עָלְלִין.]

doubling and inflects exactly like the *Kal* of נָגַשׁ, for the same reason as the first three; e.g. נָגַשׁ, נִגְשָׁה, נִגְשָׁה. A fifth form resembles the ordinary Niph'al in the vowel of the first syllable, as נָחַר, נָחַת, נָחַל, and gives the plur. נִחְרוּ, נִחְלוּ; participp. נִחְרִים, נִחְלִים. This seems to be a secondary formation from נָגַשׁ, after the fashion of Niph'al נָגַשׁ from *Kal* נָגַשׁ. — Of the 2nd person examples are very rare; but we find נִמְלִיךְ side by side with נִמְלִיכֶם and נִחְלִיךְ. — Similarly in the first person we have נִקְלוֹתִי, with the plur. נִשְׁדָּנוּ, Micah ii. 4, where the supplementary vowel *ô* has been weakened into *û*. — For the sake of comparison with the above I need only mention the Arabic forms اِنْجَرَّ for *ingarara*; 2nd pers. اِنْجَرَرْتَ, uncontracted. — In the imperfect, the ordinary form is يَسْبُ, for *yissabb*, by assimilation and contraction for *yansabib*; as يَسْبُ, يَسْبُ. The uncontracted form occurs in يَلْبَسُ, Job xi. 12. The corresponding plural naturally exhibits the double letter, يَسْبُونَ, contracted for *yansabibû(na)*, *yanmadidû(na)*. Such words as يَرِيعُ, Prov. xi. 15, xiii. 20, and תִּרְוֶיךָ, Ezek. xxix. 7, follow the analogy of verbs עָוָה. In Arabic, for the sake of comparison, take يَنْجَرُّ for يَنْجَرُّ, plur. يَنْجَرُونَ.

Hiph'il. In the perfect the Arabic form is اَجَرَّ for اَجَرَّ, 2nd pers. اَجَرَرْتَ. Contractions like اَحْسَيْتَ and اَحْسَيْتَ, for اَحْسَيْتَ, are very rare in the classical language. The Hebrew follows the form *hiḳtal* or *hiḳtêl* instead of *haḳtal*; e.g. הִיךְ, הִחַל, הִסב, הִקל, which stand for *hēdaḳḳ*, *hūsēbb*, etc., by contraction for *hidḳaḳ*, *hisbēb*. The uncontracted form in its latest stage appears in הִחִלִּיל, הִרְנִין, which never undergo contraction (also in Syriac ܠܐܝܠ, Mand. ܠܐܝܠܝܠ), and in the participle

מִשְׁמִים, Ezek. iii. 15. The fem. sing. and plur. actually exhibit the doubling הִפְּרוּ, הִרְעוּ, הִתְמוּ, הִקְלוּ, הִחֲלוּ, הִחֲלָה. The 2nd pers. usually has the form הִרְעֶתָם, (הִחֲלוֹתָ), הִרְעֵתָה. The original 1st pers. *hakaltti* occurs in all its purity in וְהִחַתֵּיתִי, Jerem. xlix. 37; and a modification of the 2nd pers. in הִתְלֵתָ and וְהִפְרֵתָ, for *hitlalta* and *hiphrarta*.—In the imperfect the Arabic form is يَجْرُ for يَجْرُر. The Hebrew preserves a purer vowel in the 1st syllable, יִסֵּב for *yāsēbb*, contracted from *yasbēb* for *yasbibu*, יִפֹּר, יִגֵּן; plur. יַחֲלוּ for *yahlilū(na)*.

In the Aramaic dialects the doubling is thrown back upon the 1st radical, as in the imperfect Pē'al, whence arise the forms נָחַו, יִדַּק, impf. אָחַו, הִדַּק, for אָחַו, הִנְעַל, הָעַל, הִדַּק. To these correspond such Hebrew imperfects as יַחֲלֵ, יִתֵּם, יִסֵּב. 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 וַיִּפְּנוּ, the latter by וַיִּכְתּוּ, Deut. i. 44.

The passive is in Arabic أَجْرُ for أَجْرَر, 2nd pers. أَجْرَرْتَ, impf. يَجْرُرُ for يَجْرُر. The Hebrew form הוֹסֵב stands for *husbab*, but has been influenced by the corresponding form of verbs הוֹחֵל, הוֹתֵל, fem. הוֹחֵדָה. In the imperfect we find a treble formation, as in the Hiph'il, there being forms (1) like יוֹדַק, in pause for יוֹדֵק, resembling יִסֵּב; (2) like יִכְתּוּ, plur. יִכְתּוּ, resembling יִסֵּב, plur. יִסְּבוּ; and (3) like הִמְכּוּ, Job xxiv. 24; יִחְקוּ, in pause for יִחְקוּ, Job xix. 23, resembling the Aramaic הִדַּק and יִדַּקוּ.

II. A. Verbs of which the 1st radical is w or y.

Of these the former, פִּי, are by far the more common in the

Semitic languages. The number of verbs first *y* in Arabic and Ethiopic is very small indeed ; in Hebrew and Syriac it appears to be larger, but this phenomenon is due to a peculiar change which verbs first *w* undergo in these two languages.

1. The normal form of verbs first *w* in the perfect of the first or simple form is that of the Arabic, ^{وَدَعَ}وَدَعَ, ^{وَعَدَ}وَعَدَ, ^{وَعָظَ}وَعָظَ, ^{وَدَّعَ}وَدَّعَ. Similarly in Ethiopic, ^{ወሰደ}ወሰደ: ^{ወረደ}ወረደ: ^{ወረደ}ወረደ: ^{ወሰለ}ወሰለ: ^{ወሰደ}ወሰደ. The only example that I remember in Ethiopic of the change of *w* into *y* is in ^{እደደደ}እደደደ: "to make known," the causative of an unused ^{ደደደ}ደደደ: Heb. ^{יָדַע}יָדַע. The corresponding Arabic verb is ^{وَدَعَ}وَدَعَ "to put, place, store up, deposit"; what we "know" is that which we have "placed" or "stored up" in the mind for use¹. In Hebrew the initial *w* almost invariably passes into *y*, unless protected by a preceding consonant; hence ^{יָדַע}יָדַע, ^{יָעַן}יָעַן, ^{יָעַד}יָעַד, ^{יָלַד}יָלַד, ^{יָצָא}יָצָא, ^{יָרַד}יָרַד, ^{יָרַשׁ}יָרַשׁ, ^{יָנַע}יָנַע, ^{יָגַר}יָגַר. The same remark applies to the Aramaic; e.g. in Biblical Aramaic, ^{יָדַע}יָדַע, further ^{יָקַר}יָקַר, ^{יָלַד}יָלַד, ^{יָקַר}יָקַר, ^{יָרַד}יָרַד. But the later Aramaic dialects vocalise this ^{יָ}יָ, and turn it into a simple vowel *ī*. Hence in Syriac ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, which are commonly written in the oldest MSS. with prefixed *aleph*, ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, etc.; and in Mandaitic ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ or ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ. The verb ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, Mand. ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, also occurs in Syriac as ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, but the more common form is ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, which appears in the Talmūd Yērūshalmī as ^{ܝܬܝܢܐ}ܝܬܝܢܐ, in which form the *h* is elided and its vowel

¹ [The explanation of ^{יָדַע}יָדַע, "know," from the Arabic ^{وَدَعَ}وَدَعَ 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 Sabaeen, and perhaps in Assyrian (see Delitzsch, *Assy. Gramm.* p. 308). The verb therefore is now generally taken to be true ^{פ'}פ'. Even in Arabic, as Noldeke observes, there is a

trace of a root ^{يَدَع}يَدَع distinct from ^{يَدَع}يَدَع (^{يَدَع}يَدَع). The forms with ^י after a prefix (^{הוֹדִיעַ}הוֹדִיעַ etc.) are to be explained in the same way as ^{הוֹבִישׁ}הוֹבִישׁ, *infra*, p. 242.]

יָאֵהֶם, יָאֵג. Thirdly, the vowel of the first syllable may be weakened into *i*, and give us the forms يَإِجَل, يَإِجَع, يَإِجَم.

Lastly, the vulgar forms of the present day are يُوَف, يُوَص, يَزِن, يَلِد, يَعِد, يَقِف, يَصَل, instead of يُوَد, يُوَزِن, يُوَعِد. We also find at the present day in Egypt the forms *yīkaf*, *yīka'*, *yīsal*, and *yakīf*, *yakī'*, but they are comparatively rare.

Let us glance now at Hebrew. Here one form of the imperfect is represented by יִקַּר, יִדַּע, יִשָּׁב, יִרַד, תִּלַּד, apparently identical with the normal Arabic يَرِد, تَلِد. The *a* was weakened as usual into *i*, and then lengthened before the tone into *ē*, תִּלַּד, יִרַד, for *tilid*, *yirid*. A form like יִקַּר is against Arabic rule;

and forms like יִדַּעַנּוּ, יִרַעַנּוּ, show that the *ṣrê* 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 יִדַּע, יִרַד, from יִדַּעַ, יִרַדַּע, according to the dialectical Arabic يَإِجَل, يَإِجَع. Another form of the Hebrew imperfect is represented by יִרַשׁ, יִקַּר (as well as יִקַּר).

Here we have, no doubt, the dialectical Arabic يَإِجَل, يَإِجَع. The original *a* of the 1st syllable became *i*, and this worked the change of *w* into *y*. In one word, יִבַּל, the imperfect יוֹבַל resembles in form the vulgar Arabic يُوَصَل. We may consider it as the last weakening of an original יוֹבַל, יוֹבַל.

Passing on to the Aramaic dialects, we find in Syriac the imperfect written with an *ālah*, נֹאֵל, נֹאֵל. It seems to me that the original pronunciation was *nāladh*, *nārath*, as in the dialect-

¹ [But comp. p. 180.]

tical Arabic *يَا جَع*, *يَا جَل*; and that *ā* was weakened into *ē* (for which we have abundant analogies), whence the Eastern forms *بَنَج*, *بَنَجَل*. Others think, however, that this form arose by assimilation of the verbs *ف"ف* and *ف"ن*, such as *بَنَص*, *بَنَصَل*.

The Western Syrians weakened the *ē* still further into *ġ*, *بَنَج*, *بَنَجَل*, as in the verbs *ف"ف* *بَنَص*. In Mandaitic the first syllable has *ī*, probably *z̄*, as *עראב*, "I give," *ניקאר*, *ניקאר* or *ניקור*; *עדול* and *תידול*, from *עדר* - *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 *ፀቕር*: or *ፀቀር*: "hew, cut out," *ፀገር*: "pelt, stone"; but the usual ones are *ቕር*: or *ቀር*:, *ገር*: or *ገር*:, *ፈር*:, *ሀር*:, *ባር*:. In Arabic, all verbs that lose the *w* in the imperfect, also drop it in the imperative; hence *هَب*, *قَع*, *رَد*, *رَث*, *عَد*. In those that retain the *w*, it is necessarily changed, on account of the prosthetic vowel, into a letter of prolongation; *أَوَجَل* for *أَيَجَل* from

أَوْجَل for *أَوْضَو* from *أَوْضَو*. The vulgar form of the present day in Egypt is *ḥkaf*, *ḥṣal*, *ḥkaf*, *ḥsin*, *ḥlid*; more rarely *ḥkaf*, *ḥṣal*, or *kif*.

In Hebrew the forms waver somewhat: *יָצַא*, *יָרַד*, *יָשַׁב*; but perhaps *יָרַד* (Judg. v. 13) On the other hand, *יָרַח*, *יָרַח*, *יָרַח* (Deut. xxxiii. 23) but also *יָרַח* and *יָרַח*, and even *יָצַק* as well as *יָצַק* "pour." In Syriac, on the contrary, the initial letter is retained in the imperative, with the exception of *س* from *سَمَس*, *س* from *سَمَس*, and *س* from *سَمَس*. In Mandaitic the form is not common in the extant literature. Noeldeke gives no

examples but עָתִיב and תִּיב “sit”; הָאֵב “give,” with the curious variations עָהוּב, אָהוּב, and before enclitics with ל, in the singular, הָבָא and אָהָבָא, plur. הָבוּ and אָהָבוּ.

In Arabic, the verbs which drop the initial *h* in the imperfect and imperative usually lose it also in one of the commonest forms of the infinitive, taking, as a sort of compensation, the feminine termination; e.g. ⁵لَدَّ as well as ⁵وَلَدَ and ⁵وَلَدَةً or ⁵الْدَّة; ⁵رَنَ, as well as ⁵وَرَنَ or ⁵أَرَنَ; ⁵عَدَدَ, as well as ⁵وَعَدَ, ⁵عِظَةً, as well as ⁵وَعِظَ. Precisely corresponding infinitives in Hebrew, as ⁵לָדָה, ⁵רָדָה; generally however, ⁵לָדַת, ⁵רָדַת, ⁵רָשַׁת, ⁵נִשְׁבַּת, ⁵צָאָת (for ⁵צִאָת), for *lidat*, etc. In ⁵רָעַת the *pathachs* are due to the guttural, as in ⁵רָעָה, ⁵רָעָה. The masculine form ⁵רָע in Job is a rarity, and equally so the contracted feminine ⁵רָעָה in 1 Sam. iv. 19. Examples of the fuller form are ⁵רָעָה, ⁵רָעָה (Ps. xxx. 4), ⁵רָעָה. The Ethiopic supplies us with many substantives of this class, but not infinitives, as ሰጥ፡ ሰጥ፡ ሰጥ፡ ሰጥ፡. In Aramaic there are likewise a few, e.g. ⁵עָטָא, Dan. ii. 14; ⁵עָטָא, ⁵עָטָא; ⁵עָטָא is probably to be regarded as borrowed from the Hebrew ⁵עָדָה.

Passing on to the derived conjugations, I would first direct your notice to the transitive or causative *Hiph'il*, in Hebrew הוֹלִיד. The presence of the *h* is sufficient guarantee that the verb originally began with this letter; an original *h* must have yielded הוֹלִיד. The Arabic and Ethiopic have preserved for us the purer form ⁵أَوَلَدَ, ለፀፀፂፂፂ, in Syriac ⁵أَوَلَدَ, ለፀፀፂፂፂ. In the passive *Hoph'al*, the weak consonant is vocalised, הוֹשֵׁב for ⁵הוֹשֵׁב, as in Arabic ⁵أَوَلَدَ for ⁵أَوَلَدَ.

In the same way, in the reflexive and passive *Niphal*, the Hebrew נִזְלַד stands for נִזְלַד, according to the form נִקְטַל, whereas יִזְלַד is by assimilation from יִנְזַל, corresponding to an Arabic يَنْزِلُ from انْزَلَ. 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'él*. Of this the oldest shape is to be discerned in the Ethiopic ተወለደ: "be born," ተወለ: "be given." In Syriac it always appears with vocalised *y*, ܬܝܠܕ, for 'eth-*y*-lêdh, and that from 'eth-*w*-lêdh, ܬܝܠܕܬ. In Mandaitic however the vowelless *yodh* is dropped, giving ܬܝܠܕ, עתהיב; but "she was given" is ܬܝܠܕܬ, as in Syr. ܬܝܠܕܬ. The corresponding conjugation in Arabic is, as you may remember, the 8th, اِفْتَلَّ for تَفَعَّل. This should give us اَوْتَفَّقَ, اَوْتَكَّل; but these impossible forms necessarily become اِيتَفَّقَ, اِيتَكَّل, the existence of which is admitted, although the assimilation of *wt* into *tt* is greatly preferred: اِتَفَّقَ, اِتَعَدَّ, اِتَصَلَ. The imperf. of the former is اِتَفَّقَ, اِتَعَدَّ, اِتَصَلَ; of the latter اِتَفَّقَ, اِتَعَدَّ, اِتَصَلَ. So usual has this assimilation become that many secondary roots beginning with *t* have been formed from this conjugation; e.g. تَلَدَّ "to be born in one's house, be hereditary"; تَسَعَ "be wide," تَقِيَ "fear God," تَكِيَ "rely on," اَتَلَجَّ "insert," اَتَمَّ "suspect." In Syriac ܬܝܠܕ is an example of this sort¹.

¹ [Prof. Wright's MS. cites also ܬܝܠܕ, late Heb. ܬܝܠܕ, which some scholars

On the reflexive of the Hebrew *Pi'el*, viz. *Hithpa'al*, in Syr. ܦܠܐ, I will merely remark that the prefixed syllable sometimes preserves the initial *w* from passing into *y*. So in התְּוֹדָה, התְּנוּכָה, התְּנוּדָה; whence in post-biblical Hebrew the substantives וְדוּי and וְנוּחַ. The Syriac ܦܠܐ is hardly a parallel, because in that language we have the Pa'el ܦܠܐ and the noun ܦܠܐ.

The tendency to assimilate the *w* to the following letter, which we saw in the Arabic 8th conj. ٱتَّلا, appears in the other dialects in some other forms. In Hebrew, for instance, יצע = ٱצע assimilates in Hiph'il and Hoph'al, הציע, הציע. The same is the case with הצין and הצין; and with the rad. יצת, impf. יצת, Niph. נצת, Hiph. הצית. In other instances the assimilation is merely sporadic, as in יצר, יסר, and even הִלֵּד (inf. Hoph'al). In Aramaic instances of a similar kind are יכל from יכל = יכל, יתב, Dan. vii. 26 [Compl., Norzi, Baer], from יתב; Syr. ܦܠܐ, from ܦܠܐ, whence in Bibl. Aram. ܦܠܐ, with dissimilation of *dd* into *nd*.

2. The verbs which are really פִּי are very few in number in the Semitic languages, and call for but little notice. In Hebrew there are only seven or eight altogether; יָכַס, יָאֵשׁ, not used in Kal; יָקַץ, יָנַק, not used in the perf. Kal; יָבַשׁ, יָבַשׁ, not used in the perf. Kal; יָשַׁר, and הִלִּיל connect with ٱقن; ٱقن; so still Muhlau and Volck, 11th ed., 1890. But ٱقن like the Syriac ܦܠܐ seems rather to be a denominative from ܦܠܐ, *elkóna* (so Noldeke; cf. Frankel, *Lehnw.* p. 273), and therefore quite distinct from ܦܠܐ. ܦܠܐ.

lous," حَوْرَ "to be very white and black" (of the eye), عَوْرَ "to be one-eyed," حَوَلَ "to squint," صَدَ "to have the disease called صَدَّ" (of a camel), غَدَ "to be tender and flexible"; in Hebrew, חוּר "be white," גוּע "expire," צוּח "cry out," רוּח "be airy and wide," אִיב "be hostile to," עִיף "be weary"; in Syriac, مَعْدُ "be white," مَعْدُ "leap," زَمَّ "rejoice"; and in all three languages verbs that are also לו' or לו', as رَوِيَ, رُوِّح, رُوِّب; هَوِيَ, رُوِّح, رُوِّب. What principle guided the Semitic languages in the contraction or non-contraction of verbs ע' and ע', I am unable to state. I do not know why خَوِف became خَاف, and مَوَت, مات, whilst حَوَلَ and عَوْر remained uncontracted; neither can I tell you why the Hebrew says צוּח, while the Arab changed his صَدَ into صَاح¹.

The uncontracted verbs ע' and ע' we may pass over altogether, as their inflexion is exactly like that of the regular verb. It is only the contracted ones that require our attention. And here I may remark that some grammarians of note, among them Aug. Müller, 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', for says he (p. 109) "these roots never had a consonant י in the second place." For my own part, I prefer the older view, which is held by the Arab grammarians themselves, and for which I think we shall discover many good reasons as we go along.

The question of the existence of verbs ע' in Hebrew has been

¹ [With the exception of verbs which have י as their third radical (e.g. לוּח, לוּי), all those verbs in which middle י 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 שִׁים and בִּין are not true ע"י verbs but shortened Hiph'ls from roots ע"י]. To this article I refer you for all necessary information on the subject.

If you consult the Arab grammarians, they will tell you that such words as قَامَ, خَافَ 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 *a* and the other two any of the three vowels, then the vowel of the second syllable is rejected, and the second radical is changed into long *a*. Hence قَوْلَ becomes قَالَ, خَوْفَ becomes خَافَ, طَوْلَ becomes طَالَ. If, however, the first radical has *u* and the second *i*, the latter vowel, as being the clearer, generally predominates, so that قَوْلَ 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*, *kûla*.

(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 يَقُولَ becomes يَقِيْمُ يَقِيْمُ, اَقَامَ اَقِيْمُ, يَقَالُ يَقِيْمُ, يَقَالُ يَقِيْمُ, يَقَالُ يَقِيْمُ. Should the final radical under any circumstances lose its vowel, then the preceding long vowel must be shortened. The jussive اَقَامْتَ becomes اَقَامْتَ, يَقِيْمُ يَقِيْمُ, يَقِيْمُ يَقِيْمُ. A further consequence of these changes is that the imperative of the 1st conjugation drops the now

useless prosthetic *alif*; ^{אָ}אָוֹל becomes ^{אָ}אָוֹל, ^{אָ}אָל, ^{אָ}אָל; or perhaps we may rather say that it never required the prosthetic *alif*, for the original ^{אָ}אָוֹל would naturally become ^{אָ}אָוֹל and then ^{אָ}אָל.

(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 ^{אָ}אָוֹת becomes, not ^{אָ}אָוֹת, but ^{אָ}אָוֹת, through the influence of the *ו*, and ^{אָ}אָוֹת becomes ^{אָ}אָוֹת, through the influence of the *י*; but ^{אָ}אָוֹת becomes ^{אָ}אָוֹת, not ^{אָ}אָוֹת or ^{אָ}אָוֹת, through the influence of the vowel *i*, which is characteristic of the intransitive form. Where these influences are combined, their operation is of course the more certain; ^{אָ}אָוֹת can become nothing but ^{אָ}אָוֹת, and ^{אָ}אָוֹת nothing but ^{אָ}אָוֹת.

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 ^{אָ}אָוֹת stands, as we have seen, for ^{אָ}אָוֹת, ^{אָ}אָוֹת for ^{אָ}אָוֹת. The corresponding Ethiopic forms ^{אָ}אָוֹת: ^{אָ}אָוֹת: ^{אָ}אָוֹת: ^{אָ}אָוֹת: etc. The Hebrew form of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. is still more peculiar, and indeed very hard to explain. As Arabic long *a* regularly becomes *ā* in Hebrew, we should have expected

קָוַם to yield *kôm* as the equivalent of *kâma*, and not *kām*. How then is this form *kām*, קָם, from *kām*, to be explained? Assimilation to the class ע"ע can scarcely have been in operation, for קָם is always carefully distinguished from קָם in its punctuation, and besides the fem. and plur. are קָמָה, קָמוּ, not

קָמָה, קָמוּ. 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 *karwam* into *kam*, and then derived the other persons from this shortened form as a base¹. 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 *مَوْتُ* into *مَاتَ*, and *طَوَّلَ* into *طَالَ*; but the Hebrew attached more weight to the vowels as characteristic of the intransitive form, and spoke not *māth*, but *mēth* (for *mit*, from *marvit*); not *bāsh* or *'ār*, but *bōsh* and *'ôr* (for *bush* and *'ur*, from *barwsh*, *'arwur*). These forms resemble those of the Arabic 2d pers. *خَوَّنْتَ*, *مَوَّنْتَ*, *طَوَّلْتَ*, *خَفَّفْتَ*, *مَتَّ*, for

طَوَّلْتُ. In Aramaic the ordinary form is precisely what we should expect, with long *ā* corresponding to the Arabic *ā*; e.g. קָם, *פָּאשׁ*, קָאם, *שָׁם*, *חָמַם*; Mand. *פָּאשׁ*, קָאם, "remain"; but *פָּאשׁ*, Mand. *מִית*, corresponding to Heb. *מִית*. The 3rd pers. sing.

fem. is in Arabic *سَارَتْ*, *طَالَتْ*, *خَانَتْ*, *مَاتَتْ*, *قَامَتْ*. The Heb. *קָמָה*, *בָּשָׂה*, *מָתָה*, *פָּאָה*, with the tone ordinarily on the 1st syllable, are derived directly from the forms of the masc. קָם, *בָּשׁ*, *מִית*; but we also find *וְשָׁבַת*, with older termination, Ezek. xlv. 17. The Aramaic forms are *כָּפַת*, Dan. iv. 30; Syr.

¹ It may be, however, that the sound of the vowel was even still somewhat longer than that of *ā*, something between it and *ā*, as the spelling קָאם in Hos. x. 14 may seem to indicate.

מַמְלָא, מַמְלָא, מַמְלָא; Mand. קאמאט, נאדאט. Similarly in the 3rd pers. plur., סָאָרוּ, פָּאָלוּ, חָאָוּ, מָאָוּ, פָּאָמוּ, corresponding to Aramaic, שָׁמוּ, Dan. iii. 12, קָמוּ, Ezra v. 2; Syr. مَمْلَأَ, مَمْلَأَ; Mand. קאמבֿה, פאשובֿה (without ו), in the fuller form קאמיון, פאשיון. The Heb. בָּשׂוּ, יָמְנוּ, קָמוּ, 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 طَلْتَ, مَتَّ, خَفْتَ, قَمَّتْ, or from a verb medial

هَبَّتْ, سَرَّتْ. 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*: خَوَفْتَ = خَفْتَ, قَوَّعْتَ = قَمَّتْ, هَيَّيْتُ = هَبَّتْ, سَيَّرْتُ = سَرَّتْ, طَوَّلْتُ = طَلْتُ, مَوَّوْتُ = مَتَّ.

In Hebrew the form is בָּרַתִּי, סָרַתִּי, שָׁמַתִּי, בָּנַתִּי, קָמַתִּי, with short *ā*, and *kāmeš* (*ā*) appears only in pause, קָמַתִּי, Micha vii. 8, סָרַתִּי, Ps. cxix. 102, שָׁמַתִּי, Jerem. xxxiii. 25. Before Kimḥi's time, however, even the ordinary forms used to be pointed with *kāmeš*, קָמַתִּי, שָׁמַתִּי, at least when the accent was *mil'el*. From מַת we have, unexpectedly, מִתְנוּ, מִתָּה (we should have expected מִתְנוּ, מִתָּה), and in pause וּמַתִּי, Gen. xix. 19, but also וּמַתְנוּ. From verbs with *ō* we get בָּשְׁתִּי, בָּשְׁתִּי, בָּשְׁנוּ (for *busht*, *bushti*, *bushnū*). On the other hand, the long vowel is steadily preserved in the Aramaic, not merely in the 1st pers., שָׁמַתִּי, Ezra vi. 12, Syr. مَمْلَأَ, مَمْلَأَ, Mand. קאמית, נאמית; but also

in the same way.—In Hebrew the preformatives have usually retained the original vowel *a*, as יָשִׁים, יָבוֹא, יָקוּם, corresponding exactly to the three Arabic forms, since יָבוֹא was originally *yabā'u*; other examples may be the very doubtful יָדוֹן, Gen. vi. 3, and יָקוּם, Job viii. 14. The only instance of the weakening of the preformative to *i* is יִבּוֹשׁ, for *yabwaslu*, *yabāsh*, *yibāsh*, *yēbōsh*. The jussives of יִסֵּר, יִכַּף, יִגְוֹם are in Arabic يَقْم, يَسِّر, and to these correspond in Hebrew יִשֵּׁם, יִתֵּרם, יִקֵּם, יִסֵּר, יִכַּף, and to these correspond in Hebrew יִתֵּרם, יִקֵּם, still farther shortened with vāv conversive into יִתְּרֵם, יִקְּרֵם, יִגְּוֹם. If however the last radical be ר or a guttural, then *ā* is substituted for *ō* or *ē*, as יִרְחַ, יִרְסַ, יִנְחַ, יִנְעַ; except יִגְּרַ, יִתְּגַר. In the 3rd pers. plur. fem. we should expect, after the analogy of the Arabic يَسِرْنَ, يَكْفِنَ, يَقْمْنَ, a Hebrew form תִּבְּנֵנָה, and this actually occurs in תִּשְׁבְּנֵנָה, Exod. xvi. 55, תִּבְּנֵנָה; but more frequently this form is assimilated to that of verbs ע"ע, and a diphthongal י inserted, with consequent restoration of the long vowel, תִּשְׁבְּנֵנָה, תִּמוּטֵנָה. The Aramaic forms of the imperfect are just what we should naturally expect, viz. נִסְמַס, נִסְמַס, יִקֹּם. There is however another form in use, viz. Syr. נִסְמַס, Mand. and Talmud. נִיקוּם. In Syriac I can scarcely remember any but singular forms, נִסְמַס, נִסְמַס, though نَقْمُ is quoted¹; but in Mand. the plural is נִמִּיתוֹן, f. נִמִּיתָא, נִדִּינוֹן, etc., while in the verb קוּם the vowel of the 2nd syllable is rejected, נִיקְמָא, f. נִיקְמָא. These Mandaïtic forms coincide with those from verbs ע"ע in the same dialect, as נִזְנוֹן from רָגַג "sprinkle," from נָזַז, and the Syriac variation must be traced to a similar assimilation of ע"י

¹ [نَقْمُ is demanded by the metre in Ephr. Syr., iii. 316 A.—N.]

to ע"ע. The verb מָתַ, מָתַ, מָתַ has in all the dialects יָמֹת, יָמֹת, like יָבֵל from יָבֵל, or יָמֹת from יָמֹת. In Mandaitic we find a future in *a*, עֲדָאָר, נִדָּאָר, "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 קָמַל for קָמַל. The form בּוֹא, probably springs from a long *ā*, *bā'*, 'ār, *bāsh*, for *barwa*, 'arwar, *barwash*.—In the infinitive absolute on the contrary, מוֹת, שׁוֹב, are contractions of *sawār*, *sharwāb*, *marwāth*.—The Aramaic infinitive is מְקַם, Syr. مَقَمًا, for مَقَمًا; the same variation occurs as in the imperfect, especially in Mandaitic and Talmudic i.e. מִקָּאם, מִדָּאן, מִקָּאם, Talm. מִימַת, מִימַת, מִדָּאן; but the emphatic form of מִקָּאם in Mandaitic is מִקָּמַא, as if from a verb ע"ע.

The original form of the participle active must have been سَائِر, قَائِم; 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 سَار, قَام as شَائِك for شَائِك "armed," هَار for هَائِك "feeble," طَائِف for طَائِف "going about," سَائِس for سَائِس "decayed" (a tooth), مَائِدَة for مَائِدَة "cowardly." To this corresponds the rare Hebrew form לוֹט, ls. xxv. 7, בּוֹטִים, Zach. x. 5, קוֹמִים, 2 Kings xvi. 7, for לוֹט, בּוֹט, קוֹמ. The more usual form is however analogous to that of the perf., viz. בָּא, fem. בָּאָה, זָר, sometimes written with א, as לָאֵט, Judg. iv. 21, נְשָׂאִים, Ezek. xxviii. 24, 26, נְשָׂאִים, Ezek. xvi. 57, רָאֵשׁ, 2 Sam. xii. 1, 4, Prov. x. 4 (compare the perf. קָאם, Hos. x. 14). This form

IX.]

VERBS 'עו AND 'ע.

251

In a form like *ḵauwēm*, the initial of the second syllable was changed in Hebrew and Aramaic into *y*, *ḵauyēm* (comp. *הָיוּ*, *דָּוָה* *הוּי*, *הָיוּ*, *הָיָה*), whence, by assimilation of the preceding letter, *ḵaiyēm*, and finally *ḵiyyēm*. So in Aram. *כַּיִם*, *כַּיִם*, *כַּיִם*, etc. In Hebrew forms like *קַיִם*, *קַיִם*, *קַיִם*, etc. In Hebrew forms like *קַיִם*, *קַיִם*, *קַיִם*, etc. belong to the later stage of the language. In place of Pi'el the Hebrew frequently exhibits another formation, viz. *Pîlêl*, of which the older form was *Pa'lal*, as *בּוֹסֵם*, *עוֹרֵר*, *רוֹמֵם*, *קוֹמֵם*, etc., for *ḵaumam*, *raumam*, etc.

2. *Hipl'il* and *Hopl'al*. The contracted Arabic form is *أَبِين*, *أَبَان*, *أَقَام*, for *أَبِين*, *أَبَان*. To this correspond in Ge'ez *አፋፈ*, *አከፈ*, *አከፈ*, which seem to be taken directly from the simple forms *ḶḶ*, *ḶḶ*, *ḶḶ*. Some verbs however exhibit a short *a* in the 2nd syllable, which before a final guttural may become *ē*; e.g. *አቀፍ*: '*aḳáma*'; *አፈፍ*: '*anáma*', as well as *አፈፍ*: '*aḳáma*'; *አፈፍ*: '*anáma*' or *አፈፍ*: '*anáma*', "lengthen"; *አፈፍ*: '*abē'a*' "bring or put in"; *አፈፍ*: '*abē'a*', "permit." Such words seem to be really derived from the old form '*aḳáwáma*', '*awáwáma*', '*abwē'a*', etc.; perhaps with doubling of the first letter by way of compensation, as in *הַפִּית*, *הַפִּית*.—The Hebrew form *הַפִּית* stands far below the Arabic and Ge'ez. The original *ḵaḳwáma* must have already passed through the stages of *ḵaḳwám*, *ḵiḳwám*, *ḵiḳwám*, *ḵiḳím*, before it could become *ḵēḳím*. The 2nd pers. of the Hebrew is likewise far removed from the purity of the Arabic *أَقَمْتَ*, for *أَقَمْتَ*, *أَقَمْتَ*. The purer form does indeed occur in such cases as *הַפִּית*, *הַפִּית*, *הַפִּית*, plur. *הַפִּית*, *הַפִּית*; but commonly an assimilation to verbs *ע"ע* is effected by the insertion of *ē*, for original *ā*, in which case the vowel of the preformative is usually *ā*, sometimes *ē*, and the vowel of the radical syllable sometimes *ē* instead of *ī*; as *הַפִּית*, *הַפִּית*, *הַפִּית*, and in the plur. *הַפִּית*, *הַפִּית*.

اجْتَوَزَ; but the uncontracted form is used in many verbs either

by itself or along with the other; e.g. اجْتَوَرُوا or اجْتَارُوا.

In Ge'ez the corresponding forms are ተሰፀኑ: "be agitated," ተሰፀኑ. The Aramaic of the Bible exhibits יִתְשַׁמּוּ, יִתְשַׁם, but also יִתְיוּן. The one form, יִתְשַׁם, comes directly from the original *tasayama*, *tasâma*. The doubling of the *t* may be an attempt to compensate for the radical which has disappeared by contraction, and so to give the word something of the outward form of the normal יִתְקַטֵּל; or it may be merely imitated from the *Ethtaf'al* (*Ittaf'al*). The other form, יִתְיוּן, has no doubt arisen by assimilation to the *Ethtaf'al* or reflex of *Af'el*, the two being completely confounded in Syriac. E.g. יִתְיוּן is *Ethpe'el* of יִן, יִתְשַׁם or יִתְשַׁם of שָׁם; but יִתְשַׁם, יִתְשַׁם are *Ethtaf'als* from יִתְשַׁם, יִתְשַׁם. In Mandaitic however the two conjugations can be readily distinguished; יִתְלַפּוּן is *Ethpe'el* from לָפַן; יִתְלַפּוּן, *Ethtaf'al* from לָפַן. I find however יִתְנַהֵי "I was quieted," which seems to be *Ethpe'el*, whereas יִתְנַהֵי must be regarded as *Ethtaf'al*.

4. The last form to which I shall direct your attention is the reflexive and passive *Niph'al*. The Arabic form may be exemplified by اِنْدَاسَ, اِنْدَاسَ, for اِنْقَدَ, اِنْقَدَ, imperf. يَنْقَدُ. In Hebrew נִדָּשׁ was originally *nadâsh*, contracted from *nadwash*, as in the Arabic 4th conj. اِقَامَ from اَقَامَ; and so fem. נִפְדָּה, plur. נִפְדָּו. One verb, נִעָוַר, exhibits the weakening of *a* to *i* in the preformative. The 1st and 2nd persons are assimilated to verbs ע"ע by the insertion of a vowel; viz. 2nd plur. נִקְטַתֶּם, נִקְטַתֶּם, with *ô*; 1st pers. sing. נִסְוִנִּי, נִסְוִנִּי, with sinking of *ô* to *u*. The infinitives have the form

הַמּוֹל. The vowel *ô* (for *â*) is sunk to *â* in הַדִּישׁ (Isaiah xxv. 10); and the preformative is absorbed in לָאוֹר (Job xxxiii. 30), if the reading be correct. The imperative is exemplified by הָבוּ for *hinkân* (*hinkawin*), הָרְמוּ, הַפְּלוּ, the last with irregular doubling of the *m*. The imperfect is, for example, יָבוֹן for *yinkân*, from *yankawin*, יַעֲוֶה; יַרְמוּ, יַפְּלוּ, with irregular doubling of the *m*. •

Of the frequent and close resemblances in form between verbs ע"ו and ע"ע we have already had many examples. I may add to these such Hiph'als as הַפִּיג, with its Hoph'al הִפַּג, and הִפִּית, which latter differs only in form from הִסִּית; whereas in some other cases the difference perhaps extends to the meaning as well, as הִנִּיחַ "cause to rest" and הִנִּיחַ "lay down." Similar is the Niph'al נִמּוֹל for *namâl* (*namwal*), Gen. xvii. 26, participle נִמְלִים, 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 ו"י or ו"י, according to circumstances. Verbs ל"ה, strictly so called, are such as נָבַה, which pertain to a quite different class, *verba tertiæ gutturalis*.

In the *first conjugation*, the fullest form of the verbs of this class has been preserved in Ethiopic, where no contraction takes place in the perfect 3rd pers. sing. masc.: ተለወ: *talâwa*, "follow"; በከዋ: *bakâya*, "weep"; ሐይወ: *hâywa*, "live"; ዐለዋ: *âbya*, "be large"; ርዥሃ: *rê'ya*, "sec." The solitary instance that I remember of contraction is in a form corresponding to Heb. Pi'el, viz. ሀለ: *hallô*, for ሀለወ: *hallâwa* ["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 *فَعَلَ*, as *سَرَوَ* “to be noble,” *حَلَوَ* “to be sweet.” In verbs third *ي* such a form would be impossible; the final *ي* would at once influence the vowel *u* so as to change it into *i*, and the form *فَعَلِ*, if it ever occurred, would be indistinguishable from *فَعِلَ*, as *خَزِيَ* “be ashamed,” *رَوِيَ* “be sated with drink.” Not only so, however, but verbs third *و* of the form *فَعَل* are indistinguishable from verbs third *ي*, because the influence of the vowel *kesr* necessarily changes *و* into *ي*, as *رَضِيَ* “be pleased with,” for *رَضَوَ*, *سَلِيَ* “be comforted or consoled,” for *سَلَوَ*, *حَيَوَ* for *حَيِيَ*, *سَلَو*. 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. *Tálarwa* and *bákaya* drop their final vowel, but the resulting diphthongal terminations *aw* and *ay* both pass in Arabic into *â*, *tálâ*, *bákâ*. For distinction's sake the grammarians bid us write *تَلَا* with *alif*, when the final radical is *w*, and *بَكِيَ* with *y*, when the final radical is *y*, but the sound is one and the same.

In Hebrew the tendency of the *â* to pass into *î* has almost obliterated the differences between verbs *לָו* and *לִי*. The radical *שָׁלַח* alone has preserved the final *w* in such forms as *שָׁלַחְתִּי*, Job iii. 25, and, which is more remarkable, in an adjective of the form *פָּעַל*, viz. *שָׁלַח* or *שָׁלַי*, Job xvi. 12, xxi. 23, Jerem. xlix. 31 (written *שָׁלַי*). Neither do intransitive verbs of the form *فَعَلَ* seem to occur in Hebrew, so that we have only verbs

of the form **נַעַל** to deal with. These follow exactly the same course as in Arabic; the final vowel was dropped, and the resulting diphthongal terminations passed into *ā*, which the Hebrews expressed by the vowel-letter ה. In this way the original *talāwa*, *bakāya*, became *talāw*, *talā*; *bakāy*, *bakā*; and were written תַּלָּה "hang," בָּכָה "weep."

In Aramaic the intransitive forms are not very common, e.g., in Syriac, **ܫܠܝܬܐ**, **ܫܠܝܬܐ**, which stand for *shaliya*, *shaltwa*, and *hadlya*, *hadtwa*. So in Mandaitic, **ܥܡܝܠܝܐ** "he swore to me." The transitives have undergone the same contraction as in Hebrew, only that the termination is here usually expressed by **ܐ**, and the door thereby opened for further confusion, as in vulgar Arabic, with the entirely different verbs **ܬܠܐ**, like **ܬܠܐ**, **ܬܠܐ**. The words **ܬܠܐ**, **ܬܠܐ** stand for *talāwa*, *bakāya*; whereas **ܬܠܐ**, **ܬܠܐ**, were originally *ḥatā'a*, *malā'a*. Similarly in Mandaitic **ܚܘܐ** "saw," **ܫܬܐ** "drank," **ܒܐ** "sought for" (for **ܒܥܐ**). In the Bibl. Aram. **ܐ** and **ܗ** are used indifferently.

One verb in Aramaic constantly takes prosthetic aleph, viz. **ܐܫܬܐ** Dan. v. 3, 4, **ܐܫܬܐ**, for **ܫܬܐ**. I mention this for the sake of calling attention to the same phenomenon in vulgar Arabic (Spitta, p. 232), e.g. *ihkā* "he narrated," *isḳā* "he gave water," *irmā* "he threw or pelted."

The 3rd pers. sing. fem. must of course originally have been, as in Ethiopic, **ተለወተ**: *talāwat*, **በከየተ**: *bakāyat*. (The contracted **ሀላ**: *hallō* [*infra*, p. 271] admits of a contracted **ሀላ**: *hallōt*, for **ሀለወተ**: *hallāwat*.) In Arabic and Aramaic the intransitives are regular in formation, **ܫܠܝܬܐ**, **ܫܠܝܬܐ**; Syr. **ܫܠܝܬܐ**, for *shaliyat*, *shaliwat*; Mand. **ܡܝܫܝܐܬ** "arrived," **ܡܝܫܝܐܬ** "became dense or firm"; vulgar Arabic of Egypt, *mishiyet* "she went," from *mishit*, or more commonly *mishyet*, *bikyet*, *nisyet*, *ridyet*. In the Targûms the punctuation is **ܡܝܫܝܐܬ**, **ܡܝܫܝܐܬ**, but this I consider doubtful. But the transitives undergo contraction: *galāwat* or *galāyat* becomes in Aramaic *galāt*, which appears in

Biblical Aramaic as **מָטַת**, **הָוַת**, **רָבַת**, **עָדַת**; the form with *pathach*, though equally common, seems to be less correct, e.g. **הָוַת**, **מָחַת**, **מָטַת**, **עָנַת**; in Syr. as **ܡܬܬ**, **ܚܬܬ**; in Mand. as **ܡܬܬ**, **ܚܬܬ** (for **ܡܬܬ**); in the Talmûd as **הָוַת**, **הָוַת**, or more commonly **הוּא**, **הוּא**, **הוּא**, where the **ו** must be a trace either of the lost radical or of the evanishing final soft *t*, which wholly disappears in Mandaitic before enclitics, as **ܥܡܬܐܠܗ**, "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 *ât* into *at*, **جَلَّتْ**, **رَمَتْ**, for **جَلَّاتْ**, **رَمَّاتْ**, and these for **جَلَّيتْ** or **جَلَّوتْ** and **رَمَّيتْ**. In Hebrew, according to the analogy of **קָטְלָהּ** for **קָטְלָתָהּ**, we should expect the 3rd pers. sing. fem. to be **גָּלְיָהּ** (for **גָּלְיָתָהּ**), and this form is actually once found, with the older accentuation in pause, viz. **חֲסִיָּהּ**, 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, **צִוִּיתִי**, Ruth iii. 6, **בָּלִיתִי**, Zach. v. 4, **הִטִּיתִי**, Prov. vii. 21. But in pause the vowel is slightly lengthened, **עָשִׂיתִי** Job xxxiii. 4, **רָאִיתִי** Job xlii. 5, **חִיִּיתִי**, Ps. xcix. 50, **בִּפְתִּיתִי** Ps. xlv. 16; and so also in the separate form **עָשִׂיתָ** Lev. xxv. 21, **הִיתָ** 2 Kings ix. 37 *kéthibh*, Siloam inscription l. 3, and from derived conjugations **הִרְצָתָהּ**, Lev. xxvi. 34, **הִלָּאתָהּ** (in pause), Ezek. xxiv. 12, **הִגָּלְתָהּ**, Jerem. xiii. 19. Far more frequently, however, the Hebrew uses separately the form **עָשִׂיתָהּ**, **רָאִיתָהּ**, in pause **עָשִׂיתָהּ**, **רָאִיתָהּ**. Herein there is no great mystery. The language had got accustomed to the form **קָטְלָהּ**, and as the old **עָשִׂיתָ** (for **עָשִׂיתָהּ**) 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 loveST*, with a double pronominal termination, to distinguish this form externally from *he loves* or *loveth*. It is curious, however, to observe the Mandaite using a similar form when he connects the verb with an enclitic, as הִנָּאתָלָה, "it pleased him," גִּלָּאתָלָכֹן, "she revealed to you," אִתָּאתָלָן, "she came to them." Here הִנָּאתָ etc. stand for הִנָּאתָתָ etc., the final *t* having disappeared as in the ordinary הִנָּאלָה or נִפִּילָה, "she fell," compared with the separate נִפִּילָתָ.

On the 3rd pers. dual, which occurs only in Arabic, I will merely remark that the masc. form is uncontracted, نَدَوَا, 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 رَمَتَ, the dual was naturally taken from this form, as was قَتَلَتَا from قَتَلَتَ.

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. requires a little more explanation. Reverting to the Ethiopic, we find in use the uncontracted ተለዉ: *taláwū*, ባለዮ: *bakáyū*, ላለዮ: *‘ábyū*; to which correspond in Hebrew the pausal חָלָיו, Deut. xxxii. 37, נָפְלָיו, Num. xxiv. 6, דָּהָיו, Is. xxi. 14, Jerem. xii. 9; and so too probably, though out of pause, Ps. lxxiii. 2, נָטְיוֹ רַגְלִי (for נָטִי *kēthīb*), and Prov. xxvi. 7, [where some copies read] דָּלְיוֹ שָׁקִים מִפֶּפֶחַ (for [the Massoretic] דָּלְיוֹ = דָּלָיו). More usually, however, contraction takes place in Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic. In Arabic the form varies according to the characteristic vowel; حَلَّوْا becomes حَلُّوا رَضُوا and خَزَيُوا also become رَضُوا and

خَزُوا; but a preceding *fatha* produces a diphthong, غَزُوا for غَزَوُوا, رَمُوا for رَمَيُوا. The vulgar forms in Egypt are *ramā* from *ramā*, but *mishiyā* or *mishyū* from *mishī* "go," *bikyū*, *nisyū*, *ridyū*. In Aramaic we may also remark a difference between the intransitive and the transitive forms: مَجِب makes مَجِبْ, shortened into مَجِب, but يَلِي makes يَلِ, contracted, after dropping the final *n*, into يَلِ, *gēldāw* for *gēldā'n*. The corresponding form in Biblical Aramaic texts is usually read with *ō* for *an*, رָמוּ, שָׁנוּ, עָנוּ, הָיוּ, מָסוּ; but also אֲשַׁתִּי Dan. v. 3, 4. In the later Jewish writings I find such forms as בָּנוּ, גָּלוּ, and אֲשַׁתִּי. In Syriac the original *gēldā'n* is used with suffixes, as حُذِّبْتُ or حُذِّبْتُ, "they sought me." In our Jewish Aramaic texts the punctuation is exemplified by שְׁנוּהִי Dan. v. 6, in later texts רָמוּנִי, רָמוּהִי. In Mandaitic the usual form is הוּן, בּוּן (for בעוּן), but the *n* is sometimes dropped, רָמוּ, צָבוּ, בָּנוּ; this latter form is always used with enclitics, אַתּוּלִיךְ, צַבּוּבִיא. With suffixes the shorter form is employed, e.g. הוּן "saw me," בּוּן "sought me"; but the fuller form with *'* often occurs, as הוּיוּן "saw me," עֲנִינוּן, שִׁיבִינוּן. In Hebrew the prevalent form is identical with that of the vulgar Arabic. The normal גָּלָיו (for *galayū*) has been contracted into גָּלוּ.

The corresponding fem. in Ethiopic is *talāwā*, *bakāyā*, 'ābyā. In Aramaic the yet fuller form with 'final *n*' is preserved, e.g. Chald. קָרְאָן, הוּן (for הוּאָן); Syr. تَرَبَّ, قُتِبَّ; but far more common are the shortened مَنِيَا, مَنِيَا, مَنِيَا. With suffixes, however, the Syriac exhibits the purer forms intact, تَكْنَبْتُ, تَكْنَبْتُ. In Mandaitic this form is rare, but Noeldeke gives as examples עֲקִנִיא and עֲקִנִיא, which are probably to be read *ekē* and *eknē* or *k'nē*, for تَكْنَبْتُ.

and ܩܬܠ. The Arabic, as you may remember, has adopted the form ܩܬܠ instead of the original *katalāna*; whence in this class of verbs we meet, according to the vowel of the 2nd syllable, with the forms ܠܠܘܢ, ܠܠܝܢ, ܠܠܝܢ, ܠܠܝܢ. The form ܠܠܝܢ stands for ܠܠܝܢ and ܠܠܝܢ for ܠܠܝܢ.

In the 2nd pers. sing. masc. the Ethiopic exhibits the oldest form ܬܠܘܬ: *taláwka*, ܬܠܘܬ: *bakáyka*, ܬܠܘܬ: *'abayka*, from ܬܠܘܬ: The contracted form too is common in verbs 3rd *w*, as ܬܠܘܬ: ܬܠܘܬ:, much rarer in those 3rd *y*, as ܬܠܘܬ: Verbs 3rd *y*, of which the 2nd radical is a guttural, weaken the diphthong still further into *l*, as ܬܠܘܬ: *r'élka*, ܬܠܘܬ: *r'élka*, from ܬܠܘܬ: and ܬܠܘܬ: In classical Arabic the forms are precisely what we should expect from analogy: ܠܠܘܢ makes ܠܠܘܬ and ܠܠܝܢ, ܠܠܝܢ and ܠܠܝܢ; but ܠܠܘܬ and ܠܠܝܢ make ܠܠܘܬ and ܠܠܝܢ.

In the modern dialects these words may be pronounced nearly as *l'lot* and *r'mét*, which are weakened in the dialect of N. Africa to *l* and *l*, ܠܠܘܬ *gh'zât* and *r'mît*. Spitta gives the Egyptian forms as *sakét* and *mishît*. In the Aramaic dialects there is a considerable variety. The Biblical Aramaic of Daniel exhibits ܠܠܘܬ ii. 41, 43, 45, iv. 17, ܠܠܘܬ ii. 31, 34, and ܠܠܝܢ iv. 19 (*kéthibh*, where I do not understand the Massoretic alteration into ܠܠܝܢ, (in some MSS. even ܠܠܝܢ, with incomprehensible ܠܠܝܢ or ܠܠܝܢ) Dan. iv. 27, all with soft *t*, which I do not find it easy to explain; in later books we find ܠܠܝܢ as well as ܠܠܝܢ, but in the plural the weaker form ܠܠܝܢ has prevailed, e.g. ܠܠܝܢ Dan. ii. 8. Intransitive verbs of the form ܠܠܝܢ have of course ܠܠܝܢ, ܠܠܝܢ. In Syriac only the form ܠܠܝܢ is used; and from the intransitive ܠܠܝܢ, ܠܠܝܢ, ܠܠܝܢ likewise

with hard *t*, by way of distinction from the 1st pers. **מִבְּיָד**. The Mandaitic appears to have weakened the original vowels most, for though the plural exhibits the diphthong **קראיתון**, **הואיתון**, more frequently than the weaker **קריתון**, **עיתון** (*ē* or *ī*?), yet in the singular we find only **קרית**, **הוית**, **בית** (for **בעית**). Lastly in Hebrew the weakest form of all has prevailed; **בְּנִיתָם**, **בְּנִיתָ**, stand for *banēthā*, *b'nēthēm*, and these for *bandyta*, *banaytūm*.

The 1st pers. sing. and plur. deviate but little from the analogy of the 2nd. In Gē'ēz and Arabic the forms, apart from the pronominal affix, are identical; and in the vulgar dialects the forms are *saḳēt*, *saḳēnā*, *mishīt*, *mishēnā*. In Hebrew too **עֲשִׂיתִי**, **עֲשִׂינוּ**, are the exact counterparts in vocalisation of **עֲשִׂיתָ**, standing for *'asdytī*, *'asdyntū*. The one form **שָׁלוֹתִי** is remarkable as corresponding exactly with the Arabic **سَلَوْتُ**.

The Aramaic forms we must notice with a little more detail. The book of Daniel and the Targūms offer us **הוֹיִת**, **חַוִּית**, **רְמִינָא**, **בְּעִינָא**, with *ē* for *ai*; the weaker **צְבִית** occurs in Dan. vii. 19; intrans. verbs have naturally the vowel *ī*, **סְגִינָא**, **סְגִית**. Similarly in Syriac, in the singular, **רֻמְתָּ** *rēmēth* (eastern) or **רֻמְתָּ** *rēmīth* (western); but the plural retains the older diphthong **רֻמְתֵּי** or **רֻמְתֵּי**. Intransitives have always *ī*, **מְבַבְתָּ**, **מְבַבְתֵּי** or **מְבַבְתֵּי**. In Mandaitic the usual form is **קרית**, **הוית**, **בית** (for **בעית**), but whether with *ē* or *ī* is uncertain. The plural has not only the weaker form **בין**, **אתין**, **המין**, but also the stronger diphthongal **מטאנין**, **קראנין**, **המאנין**. Before enclitics the plural exhibits both forms, **קרִינאלָה**, **הואִינאלָה**. The singular in the same position has only the weak form, but in two varieties. Firstly, the final **ת** may be rejected, as **הרִיבָה**, **קרִילָה**; or, secondly, the original termination of the 1st person may be restored, **קרִיתִיבָה**, **שרִיתִיבָה**, "I dwelt in it." In the Talmūd

the ordinary form of the 1st pers. sing. has also lost the final *t*, as אָתָּא "I came," בָּעֵא "I asked," לָךְ קָרָא לִךְ תִּנְאִי "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 סִנֵּיתִי, נִלֵּיתִי, אִתֵּיתִי.

Passing on to the *imperfect*, I will first invite your attention to the forms in Gē'ez of the indic. and subj. In the indic. the original forms must have been *yəṭaləw*, *yəbəkčy*; but the final short vowels were dropped, yielding *yəṭaləw*, *yəbəkčy*; and the contraction took place, giving as the actual forms in use *yəṭālḥ*, *yəbākḥ*, *yəwḥ*, 209: 3 sing. f. *təṭaləwḥ*, *təbəkčyḥ*; 3 pl. m. *yəṭaləwḥ*, *yəbəkčyḥ*. In the subj., which corresponds with the ordinary imperf. of the other Semitic languages, the fuller *yəṭləw*, *yəbəkčy*, were contracted into *yəṭlḥ*, *yəbəkḥ*; 3 sing. f. *təṭləwḥ*, *təbəkčyḥ*; 3 pl. m. *yəṭləwḥ*, *yəbəkčyḥ*. The forms with *a* in the 2nd syllable may be exemplified by *yəṭṭaw*, *yəḥbay*, which become *yəṭṭau*, *yəḥbai*; the former may be further vocalised into *yəṭṭō*.

The form of the Arabic imperfect is, as you remember, identical with that of the Ethiopic subjunctive; Ar. *yāktulu* = Eth. *yəktlḥ*. We therefore obtain in the imperf. indic. the forms *yātluw*, *yābkiy*, *yārḍay*. The rejection of the final short vowels reduces these to *yātluw*, *yābkiy*, *yārḍay*, which then become *yātlḥ* *يَتْلُو*, *yābkiḥ* *يَبْكِي*, *yārḍā* *يَرْضِي*. 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 *yātluwa* *يَتْلُو*, and *yābkiya* *يَبْكِي*; whereas the combination *aya* becomes first *ay* and then *ā*, *yārḍā* *يَرْضِي*, which is therefore indistinguishable from the indic. The corresponding vulgar forms are *yimshḥ* and *yirḍā*. The 3rd Arabic form, the jussive, is marked in the regular verb by the absence of any final vowel, *يَقْتُلْ*. Hence in verbs 3rd *و* and *ي* the original form must have been *يَتْلُو*, *يَبْكِي*, *يَرْضِي*, which would necessarily become *yātlḥ*, *yābkiḥ*, *yārḍā*, and thus coincide with the indicative. To obviate

this, the language shortened the final vowels, and the result was the forms *yátlh* יָתַל, *yábki* יָבַק, *yardā* יָרַד.

These Arabic forms in their turn cast much light on the corresponding ones in Hebrew. If we regard the word יָגַל by itself, we might readily suppose that the final vowel *ǵ* was merely a dulling or obscurization of an older *ǵ*; that *yiglé* stood for *yiglǵ*, just as פָּה stands for *pǵ*, Ar. فَوْ, or יָד for *ǵd*, Ar. ذُو. Were this the case, יָגַל would correspond letter for letter to the Ar. *yaglǵ*, יָגַל. Other circumstances, however, militate against this explanation. For instance, if יָגַל = יָגַל, then the 3rd pl. fem. ought to be תִּגְלֶנָּה = תִּגְלֶנָּה, for *yagluwna*, whereas the form in use is תִּגְלֶנָּה. And how about יָבַק = יָבַק, and

יָחַד = יָחַד *yahyá*? 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 يَرَضِي *yardā* for *yarday*, for the *alif makṣūra* 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 יָרַד, יָבַק, יָגַל. 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 יָרַד, יָשַׁע, יָחַד, יָבַק, יָגַל, יָעַשׂ, were unpronounceable by the Hebrew organs, and a supplementary or furtive vowel had to be introduced to facilitate their utterance. Hence such forms as יָרַד, יָשַׁע, יָחַד, יָבַק, יָגַל, יָעַשׂ. In יָחַד and יָחַד, the jussives יָחַד and יָחַד became יָחַד and יָחַד,

just like the similar nominal forms עָנִי, פָּכִי, for עָנִי, פָּכִי. A trace of the original *a* of the first syllable remains, both in verb and noun, in the pausal forms יָחִי, יָחִי, פָּכִי, for the original יָחִי, יָחִי, פָּכִי.

In Aramaic the same form is dominant as in Hebrew, the imperfect being usually of the forms יִבְנֶה or יִבְנֶא, נִחְנֶה, Mand. נִקְרִיא. Very remarkable is לִהְיֶה or לִהְיֶה in Ezra and Daniel, with the plur. masc. לִהְיוּ and fem. לִהְיוּ. The verb סָבֹן has also in Syriac a shorter form סָבֹן for the common נִסְבֹן, and in Mand. Noeldcke gives נִהִיא or לִהִיא as well as נִהִיא or לִהִיא. Similar varieties occur in Samaritan, יָחִי, and in Talmudic, לִהְיוּ and נָהִי. In Syriac too the verb سَبَا, "to live," contracts its imperf. into نَبَا or يَبَا (for نَسَبَا), but in Mand. this does not seem to be the case (نִהִיא).

The contractions which the augmented persons of the imperfect undergo, I will illustrate by the 2nd pers. sing. fem. and the 3rd pers. plural.

In Ethiopic no contraction takes place: the 2nd pers. sing. fem. is *tētalēwā*, *tēbakēyā*; *tētlēwā*, *tēbkēyā*, *tēftāwā*; the 3rd pers. plur. masc. *yētalēwā*, f. -wā, *yēbakēyā* -yā; *yētlēwā* -wā, *yēbkēyā* -yā, *yēbāyā* -yā.

In the other dialects these forms are more or less contracted.

In Arabic the 2nd pers. sing. fem. is, for example, تَجْلِيْنَ from تَجْلِيْنَ تَرْمِيْنَ from رَمَى. In the former case, تَجْلِيْنَ stands for *tagluwīna*; in the latter, تَرْمِيْنَ stands for *tarmiyīna*. A verb like رَضِيَ gives the form تَرْضِيْنَ, for *tardayīna*. The vulgar forms are *timshī*, *tirdī*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are תַּעֲשֶׂינָה, תַּעֲשֶׂינָה, תַּרְמִי, תַּרְמִי, תַּרְמִי, תַּרְמִי. Here תַּעֲשֶׂינָה stands for

ta'saytn, tibkt for *tabkayt*, etc. The Syriac has the advantage over the Hebrew in having the vowel *é* instead of the weaker *ê*, *ܬܚܒܐ* for *tabkaytn*.

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. in Arabic has the forms *يَجْلُونَ*, *يَجْلُون*, *يَجْلُون*. The first of these is contracted from *yagluwūna*, the second from *yarmiynā*, the third from *yardayūna*. The vulgar forms are *yimshū*, *yirdū*. The corresponding Hebrew form occurs not unfrequently in its uncontracted shape, *יִחְיוּ*, *יִחְיוּ*; without final *n*, *יִחְיוּ*, *יִחְיוּ*; with a weaker vowel in the 2nd syllable, *יִחְיוּ*. Deut. viii. 13, *יִחְיוּ* Ps. xxxvi. 9. These stand for *yabkayūna*, *yarbayūna*, etc. More frequently, however, a still further change takes place: *יִחְיוּ* becomes *יִחְיוּ*. Hence *יִחְיוּ*, *יִחְיוּ*; *יִחְיוּ*, *יִחְיוּ*. In Syriac the masc. form is *ܢܝܪܡܢܐ* *nērmôn*, according to the Eastern pronunciation, for *narmayūn*; the Westerns weaken the vowel of the 2nd syllable to *û*, *nērmûn*, *ܢܝܪܡܢܐ*. The corresponding Mand. form is written *ܢܝܪܡܢܐ*; with an enclitic, *ܢܝܪܡܢܐ*; and in Biblical Chaldee we also find *ܢܝܪܡܢܐ*.

The 3rd pers. plur. fem. in Arabic is *يَرْضَيْنَ*, *يَرْضَيْنَ*; the first of which, according to the norm *يَقْتُلْنَ*, stands for *yagluwna*, the second for *yarmiyna*, the third for *yardayna*. The corresponding Hebrew form is *תַּחְיוּנָה*, *תַּחְיוּנָה*, for *ta'sayna*, *tahsayna*, *tabkayna*. The Aramaic preserves here an older shape than the other dialects, and does not contract. In Jewish Aramaic we have *ܠܚܝܢ*, *ܠܚܝܢ* Dan. v. 16; in Syriac *ܢܝܪܡܢܐ*; in Mand. *ܢܝܒܝܐܢ* or *ܢܝܒܝܐܢ*, corresponding very closely to the Ethiopic subjunctive *yēbkeṣyān*, for *yēbkeṣyān*.

Passing on to the imperative, we find the minimum of contraction in the Ethiopic where the masc. sing. is *tēlē* (for *tēlēw*),

f. *ʔelʔwʔ*, pl. m. *ʔelʔwʔ*; *bʔkʔ* (for *bʔkʔy*), f. *bʔkʔyʔ*, pl. m. *bʔkʔyʔ*; *ʔbai* (for *ʔbay*), f. *ʔbʔyʔ*, pl. m. *ʔbʔyʔ*; *fʔtau* or *fʔtʔ* (for *fʔtauw*), f. *fʔtʔwʔ*, pl. m. *fʔtʔwʔ*. In Arabic the 3rd radical has altogether

disappeared, as in the jussive, and only a vowel remains: *أجل*

uglu for *ugluw*, *أرم* *irmi* for *irmiy*, *أرض* *irḍa* for *irḍay* or *irḍā*.

The vulgar forms have the long vowels, *imshī*, *irḍā*. The different persons undergo contraction precisely as in the imperfect.

For instance the feminines of the above words are *أجلى* *uglī* for

ugluwī, *أرمي* *irmi* for *irmiyī*, and *أرضي* *irḍay* for *irḍayī*; their

plurals masc., *أجلا* *uglū* for *ugluwū*, *أرموا* *irmiū* for *irmiyū*, and

أرضوا *irḍau* for *irḍayū*. The vulgar forms are: fem. *imshī*, *irḍī*;

plur. *imshū*, *irḍū*. 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, *גלה*, *ראה*, *עלה*, *היה*,

for *gʔlai*, etc. This lengthening is sometimes found in the im-

perfect, especially in pause and with a jussive sense; as *ראה*

Gen. xli. 33, *יעשה* Is. lxiv. 3, *אלהיה* Jerem. xvii. 17. The

sing. fem. is *גלי*, *עשי*, *ראי*, for *gilʔy*, and that for *gʔlayī*. The

plur. masc. is found in the oldest form *kʔḏlū* in such words as

אתי and *בְּעִי*; but far more common are words like *היו*, *עשו*,

ראו, *בכו*, for *bikhʔyū*, etc. The corresponding fem. is exempli-

fied by *ראינה*, Cant. iii. 11, for *rʔayna*, in Arabic *رَيْن*, *raina*. In

Syriac we find a very few imperatives with the original diph-

thong in the 2nd syllable, e.g. *يُحِب*, *يُحِب*; and in the

Targūms the punctuation with *ʔ* occurs, *גלי*; but generally

speaking, in Aramaic the sound of *ʔ* prevails. So in Dan. ii. 4,

חיי; in Syr. *ܚܝܝܬܝܢ*; in Mand. *קריא*. The fem. and plurals retain more of the ancient forms than in Hebrew.

Thus the fem. sing. in Syriac is **ܕܡܠܬ** ; in Mand. **קראי**, **הואי**, and in the Talmūd **הראי** “rejoice,” **גבאי** “get thyself paid.” Hence it appears that the fem. form **גלי** in the Targūms is to be read **גְּלִי** (and not **גָּלִי**, as indeed we might infer from the variant **גְּלִא** (for **גְּלִאי**). The plural masc. in Syriac is **ܕܡܠܬܐ**, for *rēmā’ū*, and that for *rēmā’ūn* **ܕܡܠܬܐܢ**. The Mand. exhibits the contraction **הוון**, **הרון**; the Bibl. Aram. the still greater one of **הוּו**, **הוּוּ**. The corresponding fem. in Syriac is **ܕܡܠܬܝܬܐ** *rēmā’yēn*, for *rēmā-yēn*, to which answer the Jewish Aram. **רמאנה** or **רמן**, and the Mand. **אתיאן**, in Syr. **ܐܬܝܐܢ**.

With regard to the infinitive I will merely remark that the Hebrew form **עָשׂוּ**, **הָיוּ**, **בָּנָה**, **גָּלָה**, has lost its 3rd radical. Originally these were words of same form as the Arabic infinitive **عَاشَ**, **هَيَّأَ**, **بَنَى**, **خَفَّأَ**, where the 3rd rad. **ي** or **و** appears as a *hamza*. In Hebrew however the *hamza* fell away after the loss of the final vowels, and the preceding *ā* passed as usual into *ō*. The other infinitive **עָשׂוֹת**, **בָּנוֹת**, **גָּלוֹת**, stands for *galāth*, *banāth*, by contraction for *galāwat*, *banayat*; just as in Arabic **صَلَاةٌ** stands for **صَلَوَةٌ**, **حَيَاةٌ** for **حَيَوَةٌ**, **فَتَاةٌ** for **فَتَيَةٌ**. The Aramaic infinitive with prefixed *m* varies slightly in form in the several dialects. In Bibl. Aramaic we have **מְבִנָּה**, **מְגִלָּה**, **מְחִיָּה**, with suff. **מְבַנְיָה**, as contrasted with the Syriac **ܡܠܬܐܢ**, with suff. **ܡܠܬܝܐܢ**. In the form **ܡܠܬܝܐܢ** I see the influence of verbs **לִי**, as well as in the imperatives of Pa’ēl, Aph’ēl, etc. In Mand. both forms seem to occur, **מִבְּנִיָּה**, **מִבְּנִיָּה**, as well as **מִסְּנָה**, **מִרְבָּה**; and so also in the Talmūd **מִבְּנִי**, **מִבְּנִי**, as well as **מִבְּנִיָּה** “to get paid.” There also occurs in Bibl. Aram. the form **מִבְּנִיָּה** Ezra v. 9, like **מִבְּנִיָּה** in Targ. Prov. xxv. 27 and

מִשְׁתַּיָּא in Targ. Esther v. 14. The form לִבְנָא or לְבִנָּא in Ezra v. 3, 13, is probably corrupt; in any case it must be meant for an infin. Pe'al and not Hithpe'el.

The Arabic participle active has the same form as in the regular verb, but contracted; رَامِي, جَالِي, for رَامٍ, جَالٍ; رَامِي, fem. جَالِيَّة, etc. The vulgar form is *bākīl*, *māslī*, *rādī*, fem. *bākīye* or *bakye* (with short *a*), etc. The Aramaic has preserved an older form *kātāl*, instead of the prevalent *kātīl*; e.g. in Biblical Aramaic שְׁתִּין, עֲנִה, plur. שְׁתִּין, fem. רְמִיָּה, plur. שְׁנִין; in Syriac ܪܡܝܬܐ, fem. ܪܡܝܬܐ; and in Mandaitic ܪܡܝܐ, ܪܡܝܐ. The form ܪܡܝܐ, for *bānayn*, is analogous to the Hebrew plurals מְיָם, שְׁמַיִם, for *maym* and *shamaym*, and is probably due to an effort to preserve the consonant power of the *yōd* unimpaired. Similar to the Aramaic is the Hebrew form, which appears in its integrity in the proper name חֲוִי; but ordinarily *ai* has passed into *ʾ*, and we get the form חֲוָה, רְעָה, construct חֲוָה, רְעָה, like שְׂרָה, שְׂרָה, שְׂרָה. The corresponding fem. is exemplified by פְּרָת, רְעָה, זֹנָה, which stand for *pārayat*, *rā'ayat*, *sānayat*. The fem. עֲמִיָּה, Cant. i. 7, is like the Aramaic רְמִיָּה, or it may rather be taken as = Arabic جَالِيَّة, with *i* in the 2nd syllable; if so, the other form ܪܡܝܐ, ܪܡܝܐ, ܪܡܝܐ, is only a slight variation, with emphatic utterance of the 3rd radical.

The passive participle of the Hebrew presents the regular form *kātīl*, בְּנוֹי, עֲשׂוֹי, fem. בְּנוּיָה, עֲשׂוּיָה, with *y* at the end, whether the third radical be really *y* or *l*. The final radical is sometimes rejected, ܪܡܝܐ, ܪܡܝܐ, which some derive from עֲשׂוֹי, ܪܡܝܐ, others from עֲשׂוֹי, ܪܡܝܐ. The original *w* reappears in the two plurals ܪܡܝܐ, עֲשׂוֹי, 1 Sam. xxv. 18, and נְטוּי, Is. iii. 16.

In Esther ii. 9 **הִרְאִיּוֹת** seems to be a mistake for **הִרְאִיּוֹת**, which is found in some MSS. and editions. The corresponding Aramaic participle has the form **בְּנָה**, **חָזָה**, **מָנָה**, **שָׂרָה**; Syr. **ܡܢܐ**, Mand. **ܪܘܝܐ**; the plur. is **ܫܪܝܢ** Dan. iii. 25, in Syr. **ܡܬܒܝܢ**; the fem. **ܫܪܝܢܐ**, **ܫܪܝܢܐ**. The form would seem then to be that of adjectives like **ܡܚܠܐ**; **ܡܚܠܐ**; **ܡܚܠܐ** (or **ܡܚܠܐ**); **ܡܚܠܐ**; which spring from an original *katal* or *katil*, like **ܒܬܠܐ** "brave," **ܚܫܐ** "handsome," **ܓܕܠܐ** "glad," **ܕܢܝܐ** "dirty." The nearest Arabic equivalent would be **ܫܪܝܢܐ** "in grief," **ܪܕܐ** "perishing," for **ܫܪܝܢܐ**, **ܪܕܐ**, 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 **ܒְּנָה** would stand for *banay*, plur. **ܒְּנִין** for *banayn*, fem. **ܒְּנִיܐ** for *banaya*, *banayat*. Lastly, the Arabic passive participle has the form *makṭūl*, and therefore appears in these verbs as **ܡܚܬܠܐ**, **ܡܚܬܠܐ**, **ܡܚܬܠܐ**. In the case of **ܡܪܝܝܐ**, **ܡܪܝܝܐ**, the influence of the final *y* has sufficed to transform the original *l* of **ܡܪܝܝܐ**, **ܡܪܝܝܐ**, into *l*. The vulgar forms may be exemplified by **ܡܪܝܝܐ**, **ܡܪܝܝܐ**, which has become *māhdī*, fem. *māhdīye*, plur. *māhdīyēn*. In treating of the derived conjugations I can be somewhat more brief¹.

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.]

חֲלֹפ: *hallāya*, "meditate," חֲסֹד: *hassāwa*, "lie," וִזְר: *sanndya*, "be beautiful," וִלֹד: *hallāwa* "become, be," contracted וִלֹ *hallō*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. جَلَّوْ for *gallayā*, fem. جَلَّيْنَ. The vulgar form of the plur. masc. would be *gallā*. In Hebrew we find similar forms prevailing, viz. גָּלָה for *gallaya*, גָּלּוּ for *gallayā* [Niph'al גָּלְגָּה plur. גָּלְלוּ, and so forth]. In Aramaic the vowel of the first syllable has been retained intact, but that of the second has been weakened to the utmost, the resulting form being in Bibl. Aram. רִבִּי, מְנִי [Haph'el הִגְלִי, הִיְתִי from אָתָה, etc.], Syr. رُفِ, رُفِ, Mand. שאניא, אסיא for *mannaya*, etc., [and so throughout the other derived conjugations]. The lengthening of the final vowel by the complete vocalisation of the radical *y* has affected the form of the 3rd plur. masc., which is now שָׁנּוּ, שָׁרּוּ; Syr. رُفِ, رُفِ; the Mand. however gives us שָׁנּוּ, שָׁרּוּ for *shannayāna*. Of the 3rd plur. fem. there are no examples in Biblical Aramaic. The Syriac form is رُفِ, shortened from رُفِ from an original *rabbayān(a)*; Mand. [Aph'el] אוריבון, אסניא = رُفِ. —The 3rd sing. fem. of the Arabic is جَلَّتْ for *gallayat*, which appears in Hebrew (before suffixes) as *gillath*, e.g. בְּלָתוּ, צוֹתָהּ, or, with slight tone-lengthening^o of the vowel בְּלָתִי, צוֹתִי. The ordinary form in Hebrew of course is בְּלָתָהּ, צוֹתָהּ, with double termination. The Aramaic inflects regularly, رُفِ for *rabbayat*, Mand. שאריאת, שאניאת. The Targūms give, it is true, the forms גְּלִיאת, גְּלִית, but this punctuation seems as doubtful as

¹ [And so in the other derived conjugations *ātlawa*, *āstaya*, *tafātwa*, *taḥārya*, etc.; so that the whole inflexion of the perfects is the same as in the strong verb.]

in the 1st conjugation. The 2nd pers. always retains the diphthong in Arabic, جَلَيْتَ *gallaita* for *gallayta*, of which the vulgar form would be *gillét*. In Hebrew the vowel is weakened to *i*, צוֹיֵת, כָּפִיֵת, fem. גָּלִית, plur. masc. עוֹיֵתָם, כָּלִיֵתָם, but the older *e* is sometimes retained in the first pers., e.g. נָקִיִּי, קָנִיִּי, גָּלִיִּי and צוֹיִי, גָּלִיִּי and צוֹיִי¹. In Biblical Aramaic the only form that occurs is מְנִיֵּי, Dan. iii. 12. Syriac distinguishes the second person رُبَّعْ (plur. رُبَّعْ) by giving it hard *t*, while the first person is رُبَّعْ 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. זאכית, שאנית, ממית, we cannot tell; probably not, as the Targūms seem to make the difference in the vowels, גָּלִית fem. גָּלִית, but גָּלִית, גָּלִית, supposing the punctuation to be correct³.

In Ethiopic the form of the subjunctive mood of the imperfect is ይፈላፍሉ: *yəḥánná*, የሀላላ: *yahállá*, ይፈላፍሉ: *yəḥállá*, የሀላ: *yahállá* for *-nəw*, *-ləy*. The corresponding indicative, 3rd pers. sing., in Arabic is يَجَلِي by regular contraction for يَجَلِي,

¹ [In the other derived conjugations the older *e* occurs also in the second person. In the Niph'al it is commoner than *i*, and in the perfects of Po'el and Hoph'al *e* is never thinned to *i* 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 צָלִיתִי, אֲחִיתִי Deut. xxxiv. 4 (where the same pronunciation is indicated by means of the Babylonian vowels in the ms. of the Brit. Mus. used by Meix, *Chrest. Targ.* p. 54), side by side with אֲחִיתִי Gen. xxxi. 39, Deut. xvi. 10 (where the edition of Sabbioneta, according to Berliner, has אֲחִיתִי, but Compl. agrees with Bomb.), אֲחִיתִי Ezek. xvi. 3. These examples shew how precarious are the rules formulated in ordinary "Chaldee" grammars, which for the most part are not even based on the fundamental editions of the Targūms]

according to the norm יִקְטֹל, the preceding *kesr* changing every *w* into *y*. We are therefore surprised to find in Hebrew יִגְלֵ instead of יִגְלֵ. I can only explain this by supposing that it is due to an effort at uniformity. We found reason to suppose that the *α*-form prevailed in the first conjugation; and it is in its proper place in the passives: יִגְלֵ for *yagullay*, Ar. يَجْلِي; יִגְלֵ for *yahuglay*, Ar. يَجْلِي¹; whence, I imagine, it spread to the *Pi'el*, [*Hiph'il*], and *Niph'al*, giving יִגְלֵ instead of יִגְלֵ, Ar. يَجْلِي instead of יִגְלֵ, Ar. يَجْلِي, and יִגְלֵ instead of יִגְלֵ, Ar. يَنْجَلِي. As regards the plural of the imperfect we find in Hebrew examples of uncontracted forms, תִּגְלִימוֹן, Is. xl. 18, תִּגְלִימוֹנִי, *ibid.* ver. 25, ch. xlv. 5, יִגְלִימוֹ, Exod. xv. 5; but the ordinary form is יִגְלֵ, Arabic يَجْلُونَ, *yugallūna*, for *yugalliyūna*. A similarly uncontracted participle is the Pu'al מִמְחִיָּם in Isa. xxv. 6. The shortened or jussive form of the Imperfect is in Arabic يَجْلِ, to which correspond closely the Hebrew יִצוּ, Deut. xxviii. 8, תִּעַר, Ps. cxli. 8².

The Aramaic form of the Imperfect differs from the Hebrew,

¹ [In like manner יִגְלֵ corresponds to يَنْجَلِي.]

² [Similarly in the Hiph'il the forms without a helping vowel יִפֹּא, יִשָּׁא, יִנָּא correspond to the Arabic يَجْلِ, while the forms with a helping vowel like יִגְלֵ, יִגְלֵ stand for *yagl*, *ya'l*, as, in the case of nouns, מַלְאָךְ, נַעַר stand for *malak*, *na'ar*. In the Hithpa'el the Jussive is יִתְגַּל for *yithgall*, pl. יִתְגַּסּוּ, in pause וַיִּתְגַּל, 2 Sam. xiii. 6, and so without pause תִּתְגַּר, Deut. ii. 9, 19 (under the influence of the virtually doubled guttural), also יִתְגַּר. The Pi'el הִשְׁתַּחֲוּהוּ has Jussive יִשְׁתַּחֲוּהוּ for יִשְׁתַּחֲוּהוּ.]

being in Biblical Aramaic **יִמְחָא**, **יְבַלֵּא**, often written with **י־** in the Targūms; [and this *ṣērē* runs through all the conjugations], while *seghol* appears in the termination only a very few times in pause, as **אֲחִיהָ**, Dan. ii. 24, **נְחִיהָ**, Dan. ii. 4,—a doubtful punctuation. The plural is **יִשְׁנֹן**, **יִבְעֹן**. The Syriac and Mandaitic forms are nearly identical, viz. **ܢܒܥܐ**, pl. **ܢܒܥܝܐ**; **ܢܝܫܐܢܝܐ**, **ܢܝܫܐܢܝܐ**, pl. **ܢܝܫܐܢܝܐ**. In Biblical Aramaic the final *ṣērē* is however shortened with suffixes into *z*, **יְחִינֵי**, Dan. v. 7, and **יְחִינֵה**, Dan. ii. 11, which might raise a doubt whether **י־**, **י־** arises out of *ai*, as in Hebrew, or out of *i*. I prefer the former view because of the plural **יִשְׁנֹן**, and because the participle is **מַצִּילָא**, Dan. vi. 11, with the plural **מַצִּילַיִן**, Ezra vi. 10, Syr. **ܡܥܝܠܝܢ**, **ܡܥܝܠܝܢ**, which could only arise out of *mēṣallayīn* not *mēṣalliyīn*. The striving after unity of termination in the same part of the different verbal forms has here been pushed to its utmost.

The Imperative has in Ethiopic the form **ፈላ**: *fānnā*, **ፈላ**: *ṣāllā* for *fannāw*, *ṣallāy*; fem. **ፈላ**: *fannāwē*, **ፈላ**: *ṣallāyē*; plur. masc. **ፈላ**: *fannāwā*, **ፈላ**: *ṣallāyā*. In Arabic the corresponding form has a short vowel in the singular, **جَلِّ** for *galliy*, but the feminine is **جَلِّي** for *galliyt*, and the plural masc. **جَلُّوا** for *galliyā*. Identical herewith is the shorter Hebrew form **צו**, **מן**, Ps. lxi. 8, **גַּל**, Ps. cxix. 18, 22, **נִם**, Dan. i. 12, for *ṣauwi* etc. The longer and commoner form **צוה**, **קוה**, has arisen under the combined influence of the Qal **גַּלָּה** and the normal **קָטַל**.—In the Aramaic dialects similar forms prevail. The Bibl. Aram. yields the form **מְנִי** for **מְנִי**, Ezr. vii. 25. In the Targūms you will find both **גַּלִּי** and **גַּלִּי**, but the former is probably correct. So in Mand. **זאכיא**, **דאדיא**; in the Talmūd **שני** “change,”

“remove,” in Samaritan מִלִּי, in modern Syriac ܡܠܝܬܐ, *sāpī* for *sappī*. In ancient Syriac alone do we encounter a different form ܡܠܝܬܐ, which is probably owing to the influence of verbs ܡܠܝܬܐ, which would naturally have this vowel¹. The fem. in Syriac is ܡܠܝܬܐ, in the Targūms ܡܠܝܬܐ for ܡܠܝܬܐ; the plur. m. in Syriac is ܡܠܝܬܐ, in the Targūms ܡܠܝܬܐ, Mand. ܡܠܝܬܐ, ܡܠܝܬܐ; the plur. fem. in Syriac ܡܠܝܬܐ for *gallâyân*, in the Targūms ܡܠܝܬܐ.

The Infinitive is remarkable for the variety of its forms. In Arabic the preference is given to the form ܡܠܝܬܐ, the real origin of which I explained to you before [*supra*, p. 204]; thus ܡܠܝܬܐ, ܡܠܝܬܐ, which become in vulgar Arabic, under the influence of the accent, *taslīye*, *taʿslīye*, *tarbīye*. In Hebrew the usual form of the inf. abs. is ܡܠܝܬܐ, ܡܠܝܬܐ, according to the norm ܡܠܝܬܐ [and similarly Hiph. ܡܠܝܬܐ, Hoph. ܡܠܝܬܐ on the norm ܡܠܝܬܐ, ܡܠܝܬܐ], but ܡܠܝܬܐ occurs in Ps. xl. 2, which was originally

¹ [As in the infinitive Pe'al ܡܠܝܬܐ; 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*, *gallf*, but an original *malla* (from ܡܠܝܬܐ = ܡܠܝܬܐ) might naturally become *mallâ*. Now, in Syriac, verbs ܡܠܝܬܐ (with a very few exceptions in the intensive stem, such as ܡܠܝܬܐ and ܡܠܝܬܐ) have become entirely fused with verbs ܡܠܝܬܐ and ܡܠܝܬܐ, 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 (ܡܠܝܬܐ, ܡܠܝܬܐ, ܡܠܝܬܐ) the ܡܠܝܬܐ form may be supposed to have prevailed. The imperative Ethpe'el on the other hand has the unweakened termination *ay* ܡܠܝܬܐ, in Eastern Syriac ܡܠܝܬܐ *ethgal*, with transposition of the vowel and double silent ܡܠܝܬܐ. Duval, p. 193, thinks that the imperatives in ܡܠܝܬܐ, to which must be added a single Pe'al form, ܡܠܝܬܐ “come,” are relics of the energetic form in *an*, *ā*; cf. p. 195 *supra*.]

ḵawwā, corresponding to the Arabic form (with weakened vowel) *kittāl*. The inf. const. is גָּלוּת, חִיּוּת, בָּלוּת, formed as an intensive from the *Kal* גָּלוּת etc.; originally therefore *gallāth*. In Aramaic the different dialects vary considerably. The Targūms have גָּלָאָה [with suf. גָּלְיוּת; Aph'el in Biblical Aramaic הִשְׁנִיָּה, Targumic אִגְלָאָה and so forth], the Talmūd Babilī אִסְוִי, צִלְוִי, Mand. אִסְוִיָּא, נִאִסְוִיָּא, which form sometimes occurs in the later Targūms, e.g. רִצְוִי. In these dialects forms with prefixed *m* sometimes occur, e.g. Mand. מִישְׁאִנְוִיָּא; and the same prefix appears in the Syriac forms مَكْنَهْ constr. مَكْنَهْ, [Aph'el مَكْنَهْ 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 مَجَلٌّ for *mugalliy^m*, the passive مَجْلِيٌّ for *mugallay^m*. Here all is clear and distinct, as also in Hebrew מְגַלֵּה, 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. מְגַלֵּה, מְגֻלָּה, מְגַלֵּה is, it is true, sufficiently distinct from the passive מְגֻלָּה, מְגֻלָּה, 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. مَجَلٌّ and the passive مَجْلِيٌّ, the Hebrew active מְגַלֵּה and the passive מְגֻלָּה are clearly distinguished, but in Syriac the active مَكْنَهْ and the passive مَكْنَهْ assume identical forms with inflexional additions, مَكْنَهْ, مَكْنَهْ etc.]

[Appendix. Verbs of which one radical is an ʾ.

Here we must distinguish, in general, between forms in which the ʾ retains its original force as a guttural consonant (*hamza*) and forms in which the ʾ 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 ʾ 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 ʾ or ʾ among their radicals.

In Ethiopic verbs a radical ʾ 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 بَاسٌ for بَاسٌ,

يَاسٌ for يَاسٌ, يَاسٌ for يَاسٌ, يَاسٌ for يَاسٌ etc. For the details of these rules it is sufficient to refer to the Arabic Grammar. Further weakenings of a radical *hamza*, involving the entire disappearance of the consonant or its conversion into *w* or *y*, occur in old Arabic in certain parts of very common verbs, or, sporadically, under the influence of metrical necessity. It is recorded that in the time of Moḥammed the people of the Ḥijāz retained the guttural force of *hamza* less firmly than many other tribes, and to the influence of the Ḥijāzī pronunciation may be ascribed such readings in the Korʾān as يَاسٌ, مَوسٍ for *yāʾti*, *muʾmin*¹. In modern Arabic the

¹ In all cases where radical ʾ is represented by و, ي or simple ʾ the consonants, taken by themselves, indicate a pronunciation in which the radical has ceased to be heard as a guttural; and this is very intelligible if we remember that the laws of Arabic orthography are mainly based on the text of the Korʾān, which was first written down in the Ḥijāz, and without ʾ or other diacritical points. But as regards

weakening of *hamza* has gone much further, so that, for example, verbs *tertiæ hamzatae* are entirely merged in verbs *tertiæ* י. The extreme is reached in the Aramaic dialects, where consonantal **ʕ** 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 **ʕ** much more fully than the Massoretic tradition admits. (See below, p. 284.)^f Of the details a brief sketch will suffice.

A. *Verbs ʕ''*. In the perfect of the simple stem **ʕ** is initial, and retains its guttural force, so that the inflexion is essentially regular. In Syriac initial **ʕ** demands a full vowel instead of a mere vocal *shewa*, and in the perfect this vowel is commonly *e*, ʕܐܢܐ, with the same thinning of the original *a* as in the fem. ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ. But in some verbs the Eastern Syrians have the older and stronger pronunciation ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ. In Mandaitic also the vowel of the first syllable is generally *a*, ܐܢܐ, and so too in the fem. we have ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ as well as ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ. In Biblical Aramaic the vowel appears to be shorter, ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ.² In Syriac a few verbs assume in the perfect the form of verbs ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ.

In the imperfect the Arabic has ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, to which such

the pronunciation of the text the influence of the *Hijāz* was limited, and most readers preserved something of the guttural sound in very many cases where there was nothing to indicate this in the consonantal text. The insertion of the sign *ʕ* is therefore a sort of corrective, warning the careful reader to retain, in spite of the consonants, at least a trace of the original guttural.

¹ So too ܐܢܐ, for ܐܢܐ = ܐܢܐ. The Western Syrians write ܐܢܐ, and even ܐܢܐ, the *ʕ* before *ʕ* being pronounced by them as *ʕ*.

² A fuller vowel, **ʕ**, **ʕ**, is given in MSS. and early editions of the Targums and even in some copies of the Bible; but these forms, and others to be mentioned below, with **ʕ**, **ʕ** instead of a *hateph*, are now explained as due to transcription from MSS. with Assyrian punctuation in which there were no distinctive signs for the *hatephs*.

Hebrew forms as תִּאֶמֶר, יֹאמֶר closely correspond. But in Heb., where the א retains its guttural force, the pronunciation is usually facilitated by the insertion of a *hatephi* or a short vowel, יֹאמֶף, יֹאֶהֱב, 2 fem. תִּאֶמְפִּי etc. By this means the radical א may remain consonantal even in the first person, אֶאֱמָר, whereas in

Arabic أَكَلٌ necessarily becomes أَكَلٌ *ākulu*, 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 *yākul*, *yāmur* is the rule. Similarly Hebrew אֶבֶר, אֶבֶה, אֶכֶל, אֶמֶר, אֶפֶה form the imperfects יֹאבֶר, יֹאפֶה, יֹאכֶל etc.; *yô-* standing as usual for *yâ-*. The first persons are written אֶבֶר etc. with a single א, which probably indicates that the contraction began, as in Arabic, with the part in which two hamzas came together. King Mēsha' also writes ואמר, "and I said," l. 24, ואחזה l. 11, 20, but ויאמר l. 6, 14. The *ê* of the second radical, which becomes *a*, *ê* in current discourse or with retracted accent, יֹאבֶר, יֹאכֶל, יֹאמֶר, extends through all these verbs, and similarly אחז makes יֹאחֶז and יֹאחֶזו; אָסַף, יֹאסֶף, תִּאֶסֶף and יֹאסֶף (with omission of the א). In all these cases the broader prefix seems to have thinned the *u*, *ô* of the second radical to *î*, *ê*, a vowel which the Hebrew imperfect usually avoids. Similar forms from stative verbs with imperfect *a* are וְאֶהֱב, Mal. i. 2, וְיֹהֶר (for וְיֹאחֶר), 2 Sam. xx. 5, *Kêrê*; but beside these we find also וְאֶהֱב, Prov. viii. 17, וְאֹחֶר, Gen. xxxii. 5, and probably וְיֹהֶר, 2 Sam. xx. 5 *Kêthêhê*, with similar forms from אָתַר and אָזַל. Those from the two last verbs may be mere Aramaisms; the others seem to be genuine Hebrew forms and may be compared with the dialectic Arabic أَثِمَ from تَيْثَمَ.

In the Aramaic imperfect (and inf.) the contraction into *ê* (for *â*, *a'*, as in the particle נָא = נָא, *na'*) is universal; Jewish Ar.

ܡܢܐܠ, ܡܢܐܠ, inf. ܡܢܐܠ etc., Syr. ܡܢܐܠ. But in verbs imperfect *a* the West Syrians further thin *e* to *i*; thus ܡܢܐܠ, ܡܢܐܠ are in the East *nēmar*, *mēmar*, but in the West *nīmar*, *mīmar*.

The Arabic imperative is necessarily ٱٓمْرُ not ٱٓمْرُ not ٱٓمْرُ. Three verbs commonly reject the first radical, ٱٓمْرُ, ٱٓمْرُ, ٱٓمْرُ¹. ٱٓمْرُ, ٱٓمْرُ, ٱٓمْرُ, whence in vulgar Arabic we even find the perfects *had* and *kal*. So from ٱٓمْرُ we have ٱٓمْرُ and ٱٓمْرُ, in pause ٱٓمْرُ. A similar apocope takes place in Syriac in the imperatives ܡܢܐܠ “come” and ܡܢܐܠ “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 ܡ is *a* before *o* but *e* before *a*, ܡܢܐܠ, ܡܢܐܠ—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 *hataphi* commonly takes the place of a full vowel; yet we find in the Targums such forms as ܡܢܐܠ, ܡܢܐܠ, and even in Hebrew the plurals ܡܢܐܠ and ܡܢܐܠ. In the passive participle the Syriac has ܡܢܐܠ, but in Dan. iii. 22 we have ܡܢܐܠ.

In the reflexive of the simple stem the Arabic ٱٓمْرُ, imperative ٱٓمْرُ, perf. pass. ٱٓمْرُ, requires no explanation. But the verb ٱٓمْرُ makes ٱٓمْرُ, and so also we find ٱٓمْرُ as well as ٱٓمْرُ.

¹ But ٱٓمْرُ and ٱٓمْرُ, and so forth. So also ٱٓمْرُ as well as ٱٓمْرُ, but ٱٓمْرُ, ٱٓمْرُ.

² Talm. B. ܡܢܐܠ; but in Bibl. Aram. ܡܢܐܠ, Ezra v. 15 (in the Targums ܡܢܐܠ, Numb. xxii. 35, Compl., Bomb.); ܡܢܐܠ, Dan. iii. 26 (in the Targums ܡܢܐܠ, ܡܢܐܠ).

as well as *אֵיתַגֵּר*, and more rarely a few other cases of the same kind. Similarly in Aramaic *אֵתְגַר*, *אֵתְגַר* with sporadic cases of the same kind in other verbs. The ordinary Syriac reflexive is *אֵתְגַר*, fem. *אֵתְגַרְתִּי*, by the general rule of Syriac that א 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 א in Syriac also mostly surrenders its vowel and is elided after prefixes with a vanishing vowel: imperf. *נִאֲכַל* for *n'akkal* (1st person part. *מִאֲכַל* etc. Similar forms are found, though less consistently, in Jewish Aramaic and occasionally in Hebrew, *וַתִּתְּנִי*, 2 Sam. xxii. 40, for *וַתִּתְּנִי*, Ps. xviii. 40, *מִלֵּךְ*, 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 *פִּי*, except in the two verbs *הִימֵן* and *וַסְפֵּךְ* and *הִימֵן*, *אֵתְנִי*, Palmyrene *אֵתְנִי*, De Vog. 15, l. 4, *אֵתְנִי*, where the א becomes י; compare the Hebrew imper. Hiph. *הִתְּנִי*, Jer. xii. 9, and the part. *מִתְּנִי* "giving ear," Prov. xvii. 4. The Hebrew forms are generally regular, but in a few cases we find the contraction of אֵת into *et*, as *אֵתְנִי*, Hosca xi. 4, and so in the Niph'al *נִתְּנִי*, Numb. xxxii. 30, or even into *et*, *וַיִּתְּנִי*, Numb. xi. 25, *וַיִּתְּנִי*, 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'a* often becomes *aw'a*, *تَوَامَرُوا* for *تَامَرُوا* "they deliberated together," and so too initial *'a* sometimes becomes *wa* in stem III., *وَأَكَل* for *أَكَل*. In modern Egyptian Arabic we even find *wakkil* for *أَكَل*, perf. of *أَكَل* II.

B. *Verbs* א"ע. In Ethiopic, Arabic and Hebrew the forms are generally strong throughout; and strong forms are also common in Eastern Syriac¹. 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}, ^{سَلَّتْ}, ^{سَلَّ}, or more frequently, with elision, ^{يَسَلْ}. Similarly the common ^{يَرَى} for ^{يَرِي} "he will see," and a few others. In Western Syriac the elision of ^ا 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 ^{فَالَا} (E. Syr. ^{فَالَا}), imperf. ^{تَفَالَا}, pl. ^{تَفَالِم} (E. Syr. ^{تَفَالَا}, pl. ^{تَفَالِم}, where the subscript line denotes a kind of vocal *shēva*), Ethpe'el ^{أَفَالَا} (E. Syr. ^{أَفَالَا}), 1st pers. ^{أَفَالَانَا}, and so forth. When the first or third radical is an aspirate we sometimes find forms like ^{تَفَالَا}, ^{تَفَالَا}, where the hardening of the aspirate represents an older doubling, presumably due to assimilation of the ^ا. In Biblical Aramaic the א maintains itself, as in E. Syriac, and so apparently in the Targums. In the latter א may pass into ' when it is doubled, e.g. ^{שִׁיר} (שִׁיר) Pa"el of ^{שָׁרַר}. So too many Syrians pronounced ^{בַּיֶּשֶׁל} as *bayeshl*, and the verb ^{בָּא} forms the Pa"el ^{בִּיַּעַל}; but in the latter case it is the form of the Pē'al that is secondary. The transition of verbs א"ע 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 Noldeke'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 ^א to be pronounced). All Syriac verbs of this class are stative in form. In Hebrew the only cases of contraction are ^{נָאֵר} pl. of the Pi'el ^{נָאֵר} (if this is not rather an old Niph'al from ^{נָאֵר}) and possibly ^{נָאֵר}, Eccles. xii. 5.

Mandaïtic. A transition to **א''** sometimes occurs in Syriac, e.g. **ܐܠܗܐ**, **ܐܠܗܐ** (from **ܐܠܗ**), Ps. xli. 2; but most forms of this kind are only graphical errors.

C. *Verbs א''*. Here the tendency of the languages, completely carried out in vulgar Arabic, and almost completely in Aramaic, is to entire assimilation with verbs **א'**. In the intensive stem of a very few Syriac verbs a final **ܐ**, though it is no longer actually pronounced, retained its guttural force to so late a date that the forms are still **ܐܠܗܐ**, **ܐܠܗܐ**, **ܐܠܗܐ** (with *a* for *e* in the last syllable under the influence of the guttural), and are commonly inflected regularly, except that the **ܐ** throws back its vowel in forms like 3rd pl. perf. **ܐܠܗܐ** etc. In Hebrew alone do the **א''** form a distinct class of weak verbs, the **א** retaining its consonantal force whenever it has a vowel, **יִמְצְאוּ**, **יִמְצְאוּ**, **יִמְצְאוּ**, or even a vocal *shēva*, **אִמְצְאוּ**, but being absorbed into the previous vowel when it closes a syllable. In a final syllable this absorption produces no change in the quality of the vowel, though it lengthens *a* to *ā*, **מִצָּא**, stative **מִצָּא**, imperf. **יִמְצָא** (for *yimṣā'*, with characteristic *a* before the guttural), Niph'al **נִמְצָא**, **יִמְצָא**, Hiph. **הִמְצָא** etc. In the perfect of the simple stem the normal vowel is also retained in syllables not final **מִצָּא**, **מִצָּא**, but the other perfects in such cases uniformly take *e* **נִמְצָא**, **הִמְצָא** etc. A similar law of uniformity prevails in all imperfects (so far as the few examples allow us to judge), but here the vowel is *seghol*; **תִּמְצָא**, **תִּמְצָא** etc. So also the imper. of the simple stem **מִצָּא**; 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 *e* of the perfect and the *seghol* of the imperfect alike represent an older *a'*, and it seems most likely that the deflection to *e*, *è*, has been produced under

the influence of verbs ג'ר'. The two classes of verbs often run into one another, as may be seen from the lists of mixed forms in any Hebrew Grammar.

In what has been said above as to the treatment of radical א in Hebrew we have had to do with the stage of the language represented by the Massoretic pronunciation; but before we leave the subject it will be well to glance at the reasons, already alluded to on p. 278, for concluding that traces of a more primitive pronunciation are preserved in the spelling of the consonantal text. It is not doubtful that when Hebrew and the neighbouring Canaanite dialects were first committed to writing, spelling went by sound and not by etymology, so that א would not be written unless it was actually heard as a guttural. Let us first apply this consideration to ancient inscriptions, in which we are sure that we have the actual orthography of the first writers, untouched by subsequent correction. On the stele of Mēsha' we have רש, "head," רית, "gazingstock," ואמר "and I said," all with omission of a radical א which was already lost in pronunciation. But on the other hand we have מאתן, ויאמר (Heb. מֵאֲתַן), צאן "sheep." The last example is particularly noticeable in contrast with רש; for while the spelling מאתן might conceivably be aided by the singular מאת (l. 20) there was nothing to help the retention of the א in צאן unless it was actually sounded when this spelling was chosen. So again when the Phœnician writes בנת "I built" (C. I. S. 3, l. 4) but קראת "I called" (Ib. 1, l. 7) we are certainly not justified by the rules of Phœnician spelling in taking the א to be merely the sign of the vowel *a*. When we pass from inscriptions to the Biblical texts we are met by the difficulty that the spelling has undergone later revision, especially by the insertion of vowel letters in cases where these were not used in old times. But א is not a mere *mater lectionis*; the rule that prevails is that א is inserted wherever it is etymologically justified, whether it is sounded or not, and the exceptions to this rule are merely sporadic, except in such cases as אמר for אֱמַר, 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 (ראש, מוצא, מאתים) against Moabite and Phoenician (רש). The conclusion is inevitable that when Hebrew first came to be written to an extent sufficient to give a tolerably fixed orthography, radical 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 Strassmeyer has published in *Zeitschr. f. Assyrl.* 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'lûlâ is given by Mr F. J. Bliss in the *Qu. Statement of the Pal. Expl. Fund*, April, 1890, p. 74 *sqq.*
- P. 25, *footnote*. The text of the inscription, in Hebrew square characters, with translation and notes, is given in Prof. Driver's *Notes on . . . Samuel* (Oxf. 1890), p. lxxxv *sqq.*
- P. 29, *footnote*. A substantial addition to our stock of dated Himyaritic inscriptions is promised by E. Glaser from the epigraphic collections formed during his journeys in S. Arabia.
- P. 34. In *Zeitschr. f. aegypt. Spr. u. Alterthumsk.* 1889, p. 81, Erman has indicated the existence in Egyptian of a tense precisely corresponding to the Semitic Perfect. (Nöld.) The forms of the singular and plural are as follows—

SING.		PLUR.	
3m.	ḥbs	3.	ḥbsw
3f.	ḥbsti'		
2m.	ḥbsti'	2c.	ḥbstini
1.	ḥbskwi' (cf. Aeth. -kū)	1.	ḥbswin

- P. 35. For the history of Semitic, and especially of Hebrew, writing the student will do well to consult the introduction to Prof. Driver's *Notes on . . . Samuel*, Oxf. 1890 (with facsimiles).
- P. 40, *footnote*. It should be stated that the quotation at the close of this note is from Prof. Muller'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 Lihyānite. A large number of inscriptions, provisionally classed together as Proto-Arabic, are reserved for future publication. Thus it is not yet possible to say anything definitive about the history of the old Arabian alphabets; the materials already published have given rise to lively controversy.
- P. 44, l. 24. Prof. Noldeke observes that the form derived from *sham'al*^u by elision of ^ʔ would be *shamal*^u, not *shamāl*^u. The latter therefore must be derived from a secondary form *sham'āl*^u, 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 פתע. Such readings as נשקה for נשקעה, Amos viii. 8, *Kethibh*, למו for לעמו, 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 **ح** 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 **ح** is hard in Nejd, and soft (*g* in *gem*) in the Hijāz (Mecca, Ṭāif).

- 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 *z* and *ṣ*. All three appear distinct in Hebrew as שׁ, שׂ and ש׃ respectively; but in later times the sounds of שׂ and ש׃ were so much alike that the one was sometimes written for the other. In Syriac (but not in the oldest Aramaic; see p. 74 *footnote*) שׂ has been absorbed in ש׃ (ܫܐ); in Arabic, on the contrary, the primitive sound represented by Hebrew שׂ remains distinct (as ش), while the other two old sounds (שׁ, ש׃) are both represented by س. For an attempt to work out the history of the Semitic sibilants see D. H. Muller, *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. Noldeke observes that the distinction between تلا and بكي cannot be regarded as the invention of the grammarians, inasmuch as it was carefully observed by the writers of the oldest copies of the Korān. These scribes, he believes, made a distinction in pronunciation between أ and ع; we know indeed that many Korān teachers pronounced ع with *Imāla*. See *Geschichte des Qorāns*, p. 252 *sqq.*
- P. 94, l. 14. For ܠܚܝܬܐ read ܠܚܝܬܐ.
- P. 100, l. 17. Prof. Noldeke remarks that to connect ܢܫܚܐ with ܫܚܐ appears to be inadmissible, since to do so involves *two* irregularities (Hebrew שׂ should correspond to Arabic س), and that ܠܚܝܬܐ is a mere transcription of the Arabic بطيخ. The genuine Syriac form is ܠܚܝܬܐ.

THE END.

