



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

יהוה



ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
M D C C C C X
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LECTURES
ON THE
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR
OF THE
SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

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



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

LECTURES
ON THE
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR
OF THE
SEMITIC LANGUAGES

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

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1890

[*All Rights reserved*]

PJ
3021
.W75
1890aa

Cambridge:

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



43,742

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

W. L.

b

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 : *Abl. der k. G. d. W.*, Bd. xxxv), and of Professor

Barth (*Die Nominalbildung in den Sem. Sprachen*, 1ste Hälfte, i., Leipzig 1889). On the other hand he doubtless intended to complete the subject of verbal inflexion, and I have therefore thought it right to make a few additions to the rough sketch of the derived forms of verbs whose third radical is *ʃ* or *ʃ'*, 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—Ĥimyaritic 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.	

CHAPTER V. THE VOWELS AND THEIR PERMUTATIONS PAGE 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 כִּי 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 (*it*) 136—Other feminine terminations 138—Cases 139—in Arabic and Ethiopic 140—Traces of case-endings in Hebrew 141—The nouns $\text{אִם, אִתּוֹ, אִתָּהּ}$ 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

<i>ya</i> 182—Other preformatives 183—3 sing. fem. 184—3 pl. masc. <i>ibid.</i> —3 pl. fem. 185—2 sing. m. and f. <i>ibid.</i> —2 pl. m. and f. 186—1 sing. and pl. 187—Dual <i>ibid.</i> —Accentuation 188.	
III. THE IMPERATIVE 188—Plural 189.	
IV. VARIATIONS OF IMPERFECT AND IMPERATIVE 191—Moods of the Imperfect in Arabic <i>ibid.</i> —in Hebrew: Jussive forms 192—Energetic forms 193—Moods of the Imperative 195.	
V. THE INFINITIVE 195.	
VI. THE PARTICIPIES 196—Passive participle 197.	
VII. DERIVED CONJUGATIONS. A. <i>First group</i> 198—1. The intensive and iterative stem 198—2. The conative stem 202—3. The factitive or causative stems 204—B. <i>Second group</i> , Reflexive stems 207—1. Reflexive of the simple stem <i>ibid.</i> —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. <i>Third group</i> (with characteristic syllable <i>na</i>) 215—1. Niph'al and its congeners <i>ibid.</i> —2. Ethiopic forms with preformative <i>an</i> 217—3. Nithpa"el 218—4. Arabic forms with infixed <i>n</i> <i>ibid.</i> —D. <i>Fourth group</i> , Reduplicated stems 218—1. Pi'l'el and its congeners <i>ibid.</i> —2. Pe'al'al 219—3. Pilp'el and its congeners 220—4. Arabic Conj. XII. <i>ibid.</i> —5. Forms of the type <i>katlaya</i> 221—E. <i>Passive Forms</i> 222—in Arabic <i>ibid.</i> —in Hebrew 223—in Aramaic 224.	
CHAPTER IX. THE IRREGULAR VERB	227
I. VERBS ױױ 227—in Arabic <i>ibid.</i> —in Hebrew and Syriac: simple stem 228—Derived conjugations 232.	
II. A. VERBS ױ״ AND ױ״ 234—1. Verbs with original <i>w</i> as first radical 235—Derived conjugations 239—2. Verbs with <i>y</i> as first radical 241.	
II. B. VERBS ױױ AND ױױ 242—Uncontracted verbs of this class <i>ibid.</i> —Contracted forms in Arabic 244—in the other dialects 245—Derived conjugations 251.	
II. C. VERBS ױױ AND ױױ 255—Perfect of the simple stem <i>ibid.</i> —Imperfect 263—Imperative 266—Infinitive 268—Participle 269—Derived conjugations 270.	
APPENDIX. Verbs with a radical ױ 277—A. <i>Verbs</i> ױ״ 278—B. <i>Verbs</i> ױױ 282—C. <i>Verbs</i> ױױ 283—History of radical ױ in Hebrew 284.	
ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS	286

100

100

100

100

100

CHAPTER I.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You understand, then, that there exists as yet no work which I can recommend to you as a complete text-book of Semitic Comparative Grammar; no treatise which we can confidently follow as a guide from the beginning of our course to its end. The French Orientalist Renan proposed to himself to write such a work; but he has not yet advanced beyond the introduction, the *Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques* [8vo, Paris, 1st ed. 1855]. The second part, the *Système Comparé*, has remained, and is now, I fear, likely to remain, a desideratum. Differing as I do from Renan, not merely in small details, but also in various matters of principle, I can still admire the industry and scholarship which are manifest in every page of the *Histoire Générale*; the justice of many of its views, and the clearness of its style and arrangement; and I therefore advise those of you who have not yet read it, to do so without delay, as a good introduction to the studies to which I now invite your 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*, 1ter Theil (Leipzig, 1879); and Bickell's *Grundriss der Hebräischen Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1869, 70), of which an English translation by Curtiss appeared at Leipzig in 1877 under the title of *Outlines of Hebrew Grammar*. To this little book I shall sometimes have occasion to refer, as I prefer it to Land's *Hebræusische 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, *Vergelijkende Geschiedenis van de Egyptische en Mesopotamische Godsdiensten* [8vo, Amsterdam, 1872], p. 20.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Similarly Sprenger in his *Alte Geogr. Arabiens* (Bern, 1875), p. 293: "All Semites are according to my conviction successive layers of Arabs. They deposited themselves layer upon layer; and who knows, for example, how many layers had preceded the Canaanites, whom we encounter at the very beginning of history?" "Alle Semiten sind nach meiner Ueberzeugung abgelagerte Araber. Sie lagerten sich Schichte auf Schichte, und wer weiss, die wie 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 religiös-mythologischen, weiter der linguistischen, nicht minder der allgemein geschichtlich-geographischen Verhältnisse, weist uns nach Arabien als den Ursitz des Semitismus" (p. 421).

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

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

in favour of the view that Central Arabia is the home of the Semitic race as a whole. Laying it down as a rule without exception that mountaineers never become inhabitants of the steppe and nomade shepherds, De Goeje rejects the notion that the Semites can have descended from the mountains of the Arrapachitis to become dwellers in the plains and swamps of Babylonia. On the other hand he shews how nomades are continually passing over into agriculturists with settled habitations; how villages and towns are gradually formed, with cultivated lands around them; and how the space needful for the pasturing nomade is thus gradually curtailed until the land becomes too narrow for him and he is forced to seek a home elsewhere. So it fared with Central Arabia. The result was that the nomade population was incessantly overstepping its bounds in every direction, and planting itself in Syria, Babylonia, 'Omān, or Yaman. Successive layers of emigrants would drive their predecessors in Syria and Babylonia farther northwards towards the borders of Kurdistān and Armenia, and thus the whole of Mesopotamia would be gradually semitised, and even portions of Africa would in course of time more or less completely share the same fate. This process, I may remark, has often been repeated in more recent, historical times, in which the Arab migration has overflowed the whole of Syria and Mesopotamia. In the earliest centuries of the Christian era, the wealthy city of Palmyra was ruled, I may say, by a company of Arab merchants. Three petty kingdoms, those of Ghassān, of the Tha'labites, and of al-Ḥīrah, divided between them the southern part of the Syrian steppe; and in the struggles between the Byzantine and Persian empires the Arabs of Mesopotamia had always to be reckoned with, and yielded a reluctant obedience to the one side or the other. De Goeje also lays stress upon the fine climate of Central Arabia and the splendid physical and mental development of the race; and, like Schrader, compares their language with those of the other Semites in the earliest stage at which we know them, drawing the inference that the speech of the Arabs is the nearest approximation that we can have to the primitive Semitic tongue. "En dat van alle Semietische talen het Arabisch het naast staat aan de moedertaal, waaruit zij 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 Nöldeke's remarks in *Enc. Brit.* xxi. 642. He himself suggests, "not as a definite theory but as a modest hypothesis," that the primitive seat of the Semites is to be sought in Africa, though he regards the Arabian theory as "not untenable." It may be observed that, if the Semites originally came from Africa, Arabia may yet be the centre from which they spread over other parts of Asia.]

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL SURVEY OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

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

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

sufficiently clear. Language is after all, as Whitney has remarked, the work of tradition ; we speak as we were taught by our fathers and mothers, who were in their turn trained by a preceding generation. This process of transmission is always, and necessarily, more or less imperfect. Hence language is always undergoing a process of modification, partaking of the nature both of decay and of growth. The less imperfect the transmission, the slighter will the modification obviously be. Now two circumstances above all others are favourable to the continuity and completeness of linguistic tradition: isolation is the one ; the possession of a literature is the other. If a race, speaking a single language, occupies a circumscribed territory, so long as that race is confined within those narrow limits, and thrown but little into contact with surrounding races, the forces which produce linguistic decay and growth are, if not entirely repressed, at least limited in their operation. Dialectic differences will probably arise, but they will be comparatively few and trifling. On the other hand, if the said race extends its territory largely, by conquest or colonisation, and is thrown into constant contact or collision with other races, the decay and growth of its speech proceeds with greatly accelerated rapidity ; and the language runs no small risk of being ultimately broken up into several languages, the speakers of which are no longer mutually intelligible. Here the possession of a literature steps in as a counteracting force, exercising a strong conservative influence. English, as is well known, has changed less since Shakespeare'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 Kor'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 Hammurabi, 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 \triangleright 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, \blacktriangle 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 *ir-ri-tiv* (𐎠𐎢𐎵). 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* (𐎶𐎶), or *kavā*, *ikun* (𐎠𐎫). 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 *vis.*, and pronounce "and" and "that is" and "namely." The Persians made more use of the same procedure in writing the Pahlavi character. Using a strange jumble of Semitic and Persian, they wrote *lmā* and *bsrā* [i.e. the Aramaic *lahmā*, "bread"; *hesrā*, "flesh"], but spoke *nān* and *gōsht*; they wrote *ab* and read *pit* ["father"], but *abitr* did duty for [the synonym] *pitār*.

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 Phoenician and Hebrew, and only in a somewhat less degree with Aramaic.

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

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

The Bible has made you familiar with the name of *Arām* (written אַרָם, constr. אֲרָם, for which we should rather have expected אָרָם, agreeably to the analogy of דְּבַר, דְּבַר). It speaks of אֲרָם דְּמִשְׁקֵן 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 סַעֲכָה, etc., all places situated in Syria. אַרַם נְהַרַיִם, "Aram of the two rivers," is usually supposed to mean *Mesopotamia*, but it is possible that the two rivers were not the Euphrates and Tigris, but the Euphrates and its chief affluent the Chabōras or Khābūr, which would limit the designation to the western half of what is generally understood by *Mesopotamia*. A part of this territory bore the name of אַרַם פְּרָן, which we may probably identify with the village of ٱرّان, 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 بֵּת אַרְמַיָּה [Beth Armāyē], or "the home of the Arameans." Now the Jews, as is well known, employed the word אַרְמִי (אַרְמִי) in the sense of "gentile," "heathen"; and under the influence of their usage, it was retained by the Syrian translators of the New Testament to express Ἕλληνες, ἔθνικοί, and similar words. But a term which was used in the Bible to designate "heathens" could no longer be borne by a Christian people. Hence the old name was modified into אַרְמַיָּה [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 Ἀσσυριοί, 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 سُوْرِيَا [Suryāyē]. See Noeldke 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. Turpic's Manual (1879) may be found convenient; but Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Biblisch-aramäischen* (Leipzig, 1884) is the best in its particular field. The best Samaritan grammars are those of Uhlemann (Leipzig, 1837), and Petermann (Berlin, 1873). That of Nicholls may also be mentioned.

Subordinate dialects of this second class are:—

(a) The Egyptian Aramaic, as exhibited, for example, in the stele of Saḳkāra, 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 Ḥaurān, Petra, and the Sinaitic Peninsula, as well as at Taimā and Madān Ṣāliḥ 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 Madān Ṣāliḥ, 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 Egypto-araméen*, Paris, 1861.]

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

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

⁷ [*Documents épigraphiques*, &c., 4^e Paris, 1884; now superseded for most of the inscriptions by Euting's *Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien*, 4^e 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 Hārithat IV. = A.D. 31. But Euting 1 (which was not in Doughty's collection) dates from the first year of this king, so that the series begins in B.C. 9. Again the inscription of the fourth year of Rab'el (Euting 28 = Doughty 19), which the academicians place in A.D. 79, is assigned by Euting with more probability to A.D. 75. The date of king Rab'el depends on the reading of the inscription of Dmēr, published by Sachau in *ZDMG.* xxxviii. (1884) p. 535.]

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 Mandæans or Gnostics (מַנְדַּאִיִּי), otherwise called Ṣābians (i.e. "Washers," from their frequent ablutions and washings, الصَّابِئُونَ, rad. צָבַע = צָבַע, 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*, יִקְטֹל; whereas in the eastern dialects—at least in Syriac—it is *nun*, נִקְטֹל. The usage of the Babylonian Talmūd and the Mandaitic appears to fluctuate between *n* and *l*, though *n* 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 (לְהַוִּין, לְהַוִּין, לְהַוִּין, or לְהַוִּין) הָוָא.

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:

ܐܘܢܝܢ ܒܫܡܐ ܝܒܩܝܫ ܐܫܡܝܢ
 ܐܘܢܝܢ ܒܫܡܐ ܝܒܩܝܫ ܐܫܡܝܢ

In the mountains of Diyār-Bakr and Kurdistān, northwards of Moṣul, from Māridīn and Midyād on the west as far as Urmiah or Urūmiah and Selmās (سَلْمَاس) on the east, other Aramaic dialects are still spoken by the Christian and Jewish populations, who, in the eastern districts at least, have a hard struggle for existence among the Muḥammadan Kurds. The eastern dialect—the grammar of which has been written first by the American Missionary Stoddard [London 1865], and afterwards more fully and accurately by Noeldeke¹—is usually called Modern Syriac or Neo-Syriac. This term is, however, erroneous, in so far as the said dialect, though a representative of the old Eastern Aramaic, is not directly descended from the more ancient language which we usually call Syriac, but from a lost sister tongue. Owing to the state of its verbal inflection, we cannot say for certain that the 3rd pers. sing. masc. Imperf. was formed with *n* instead of *y*, though this is highly probable, considering its relation to Syriac on the one side and Mandaitic on the other; but several points connect it more closely with the Mandaitic and the dialect of the Talmūd Bābli than with Syriac. For example, the infin. Pa“ēl in old Syriac is ܡܚܘܠܐ, but in modern Syriac it is ܡܚܘܠܐ (ܡܚܘܠܐ), which stand (as the usage of some subdialects shews) for ܡܚܘܠܐ, ܡܚܘܠܐ, and correspond very closely to Talmudic forms like ܡܚܘܠܐ, ܡܚܘܠܐ, and Mandaitic forms like ܡܚܘܠܐ, ܡܚܘܠܐ. In one respect there is a curious approximation to Hebrew, viz. in the existence of participles Pu“al and Hof“al, of which old Syriac has no trace, though we find the latter in Biblical Aramaic and perhaps in Palmyrene. When the modern Syrian says ܡܚܘܠܐ ܡܚܘܠܐ

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

² [*Gr. der neu-syrischen Sprache am Urmia-See und in Kurdistan*, Leipzig, 1869.]

parkin, "I will save," he uses a Pa"ēl participle active, with the loss of the initial *m*, **ܘܒܝܬ** *bit* being a contraction of **ܘܒܝܬܐ** [*it is* required that], and **ܘܦܫܘܬܐ** standing for **ܘܦܫܘܬܐܐ** [saving *be*, I]. But when he says **ܘܦܫܘܬܐܐ ܘܦܫܘܬܐܐ** *purkūt it*, "I have saved thee," he employs a Pu"al participle, **ܘܦܫܘܬܐܐ** being a contraction of **ܘܦܫܘܬܐܐܐ**, so that the literal meaning is "thou hast been saved by me." The original form **ܘܦܫܘܬܐܐܐ** is of course identical with the Hebrew **בְּפָרַשְׁתָּ**, **בְּפָרַשְׁתָּ**, **בְּפָרַשְׁתָּ**, and quite distinct from the old Syriac and Arabic passive participles **مُفْطَلٌ**, **مَفْطُلٌ**. 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 **אַרְאַ**, so these Canaanites called themselves by the common name of *Xvā*, i.e. **ܫܘܘܐ**. 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 Tŕir 'Abdŕn*, Gött. 1881; Socin, *Die neu-aram. Dialecte von Urmia bis Mosul*, 4^o Tüb. 1882 (cf. Nöldeke in *ZDMG.* xxxvi. 669 sqq.); Duval, *Les dialectes neo-araméens de Salamas*, Paris, 1883; Merx, *Neusyrisches Leseb.* 4to, Breslau, 1873; Guidi in *ZDMG.* xxxvii. 293 sqq.]

Ev. i. 10 (Fr. Hist. Gr. iii. 569)] that it was the name of a god or of a heroic ancestor. In the Old Testament it appears as a geographical term, under the form פְּנֵי [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 *Phœnician*. From the district of Sidon and Tyre the Phœnicians gradually spread, principally northwards, along the coast of Syria, occupying such places as Bērytos (Beirūt), Byblos (גִּבְלָה [Gabal, Ezek. xxvii.

9], *Botrys* (بَثْرُونَ, *Batrūn*), Tripolis, Simyra (Σίμυρα, *הַצִּמְרִי* ["the Zemarite," Gen. x. 18]), Arke (Ἄρκεη or τὰ Ἄρκα, *הָעַרְקִי* ["the Arkite," Gen. x. 17]), Sinnas (Σιννάς, *הַסִּינִי* ["the Sinite," Gen. x. 17]), Aradus (הָאַרְדִּי ["the Arvadite," Gen. x. 18], *رَوَاد*) and Antaradus (أَنْطَرَطُوس, *Tortosa*), Laodicea, and Amathe (חַמַּת [Hamath], *حَمَاة*), farther inland. With the extension of their domains by colonisation we are not now concerned. Suffice it to say that the Phœnicians 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 Phœnician colony at Marseilles before the Phœcean 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 Phœnician 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 (אֵילָת) 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 סוֹדֵר, as keen and energetic a trader as his kinsman the modern Jew.

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

Of the so-called Hittite empire, the chief seats of which were at Kadesh on the Orontes and subsequently at Karkēmīsh 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 חַת or חַתִּים 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 Karkēmīsh. 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-Mugair, ^{المقير})

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

in Babylonia, and had gone northwards to Harrān in Mesopotamia. Here a split took place among them. The family of Nahor remained in Mesopotamia; that of Terah, under the leadership of Abrām, marched south-westwards into Canaan. These strangers received the name of עֲבָרִים or עֲבָרִיִּים, most probably because they came מְעַבְרֵי הַנָּהָר, from across the great river Euphrates. This is what the LXX. intended when they rendered the words לְאַבְרָם הָעֶבְרִי (Gen. xiv. 13) by 'Αβραμ τῷ περάτῃ; and what Origen meant when he explained 'Εβραῖοι by περατικοί. Some of these strangers remained in the country, and in the end permanently occupied different portions of it on the East side of the Jordan and to the east and south of the Dead Sea; viz. the Children of Ammon, of Moab, and of Edom. Others of them, the Children of Ishmael, wandered away among the adjacent Arab tribes to the E. and S. E., and ultimately became inseparable and indistinguishable from them. Others still, the Children of Jacob, after dwelling for some considerable time in Palestine itself, moved southwards, and swelled the ranks of the Semitic immigrants into Egypt. After a sojourn in that country, which is variously estimated at from 215 to 430 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 אֲרָמֵי 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 nomadic Arameans, the tribes of Abram and Lot, having settled among a Canaanite population of a much higher order of civilisation, were soon constrained to disuse their mother tongue, the Aramaic, and to adopt the kindred language of the people among whom they had settled. To the advanced civilisation of the Hittites and Phoenicians the monuments of Egypt and the Old Testament itself bear ample testimony. We know for certain, thanks to the labours of such Egyptologists as the Vicomte de Rougé and Mr Goodwin, that in the time of Ramses II., that is, in the fifteenth century B.C., the Kheta of Kadesh were in possession of the art of writing and of a literature. And as for the Phoenicians, when Solomon desired to build his Temple to Jehovah, Hiram king of Tyre supplied the materials and the artisans; when Solomon sought to trade with South Arabia, it was again Hiram who manned the fleet of ships at Ezion-geber. That a small and less civilised tribe, such as the Hebrews in the time of Abram undoubtedly were, should have soon adopted the language of the more numerous and cultivated race among whom they took up their abode, has in itself nothing surprising, and is a fact not altogether unknown in history. In France and Spain, for example, the conquering German race soon gave up the use of its mother-tongue, which left but slight traces of the conquest upon the language of the conquered. The Norsemen invaded and took possession of a district in France, to which they gave their name; but the Normans invaded England as a French-speaking people, and were again in process of time merged among the English whom they conquered.

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

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

seventh century of our era that the nation acquired a really historical importance. It was under Muḥammad and his successors that the Arabs, maddened by religious enthusiasm, rushed forth from their deserts like a torrent; broke the Byzantine power on the banks of the Hieromax (Yarmūk); crushed the might of Persia on the day of al-Ḳādisiyah; 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 Vulgärdialectes von Ägypten* (1880). For the Syrian a useful book is the *Grammaire Arabe vulgaire* of Caussin de Perceval (fourth edition, 1858); and for the Algerian the *Éléments de la Langue Algérienne* of A. P. Pihan (1851). The Maltese has been treated by Vassalli, *Grammatica della lingua Maltese*, second edition, 1827; and by Gesenius in his *Versuch über die Maltesische Sprache* (Leipzig 1810).

2. The *South Arabian* or *Himyaritic* [also called Sabaeen] is one of the less known of the Semitic tongues. I use the term *Himyaritic* (حَمِير, حَمِيْرِيَّة, 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 (חַדְרַמְאוּת, 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 ገዕዝ: "migration" or "the emigrants," itself shews. Its territory is the mountainous region S.W. of Nubia, where its modern representatives still flourish. The most prominent of these are: on the north, the *Tigré*, spoken in the Dahlak islands, and on the mainland in Ṣamhar and by the Habab, Mensa, Bogos, and neighbouring tribes; in the centre, the *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 *Amharīna* 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 *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed. vol. xxiv. (1888), Prof. Müller looks with some favour on the view put forward by Halévy (*Ét. Sab.* p. 86), who takes the inscription Ḥiṣn Ghorāb, dated 640, to speak of the overthrow of Dhū Nuwās, and so fixes on 115 B.C. as the epoch of the Sabæan era. In that case the *five* dated inscriptions now known are to be ascribed to A.D. 270, 458, 467, 525, and 554 respectively. Cf. *C.I.S.*, IV. i. p. 18.]

in abundance from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, when the ancient Ge'ez had died out, but was still cultivated by the priesthood, like Latin by the learned of Europe or Hebrew in the Talmudic schools. The standard grammar of the ancient Ge'ez is that of Dillmann [Leipzig, 1857] which has superseded that of Ludolfus or Leuthof, an admirable work in its day. The 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 Fürst and Delitzsch on the one hand or of von Raumer and Raabe on the other. The temptation to identification is great, and too much weight has been attributed by the scholars mentioned, and even by men of higher reputation, to analogies that lie merely on the surface. The Semitic languages, like the Indo-European, belong to the inflective class; but this circumstance, as Whitney has remarked (*Language and the Study of Language*, 3rd ed., p. 300), by no means implies a genetic connexion or even descent from a common stock. The resemblance between the two families is, on the whole, not greater than we might reasonably expect to find in languages produced by human beings of nearly the same natural endowments under very similar circumstances of development. The probability of an ultimate connexion will of course seem greatest to those who believe in a common birthplace of the two races. If they both spread themselves abroad from a point near the Caspian Sea, or in Central Asia, original unity is not impossible. But if the Indo-Europeans rooted in Central

Asia, or, as some recent scholars (such as Penka in his *Origines Ariacae* [Teschen, 1883], and O. Schrader, in his *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte* [Jena, 1883]) have tried to prove, on the shores of the Baltic, whilst the Semites were autochthones in Central Arabia, the chances of original unity are reduced to a vanishing point. An ultimate relationship, if one exist at all, will only be discovered when we have solved the great mystery of the Semitic tongues, the 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, كتل), 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 *قتل* *katala* "he killed," *قتل* *kutila* "he was killed"; *قتل* *kattl* "the act of killing" or "of being killed"; *قتل* *kittl* "a killer," "an enemy"; *قتل* *kattil* "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 *kṛb* "come near," *ktl* "kill," *plg* "divide," which, as Bopp has justly remarked (*Vergl. Gr.*, 2^{te} Ausg., 1^{ter} 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, قَطَل, قَطَف, قَطَع, قَطَّ, قَدَّ, قَدَح, قَدَّ, قَتَل, قَتَّ, all of which convey the idea of "cutting" in some form or other.

Pl or *fl* are found in فَلَاح, فَلَاح, فَلَاح, فَلَاح, فَلَاح, all meaning "cleave" or "divide." *H, k* are the basis of فَحَق, فَحَق, فَحَق, of which the original signification is also "slit" or "cut." *Ph* or *fh* are the essential constituents of فَحَف, فَحَف, فَحَف, فَحَف, فَحَف, 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*; *pono* is a softening of *posno*, as we learn from its perfect and supine, and includes a suffix and a pronominal element. בָּעַר originally sounded *ba'ara*; *πῦρ* is stated to be a contraction of *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 Rougé, Ebers, and above all Brugsch, in the introduction to his *Hieroglyphic Dictionary*, have declared their belief in the descent of the Egyptian from the same stock as the Semitic languages. An examination of the Coptic alone readily suggests several considerations in support of this view. For example, there is the marvellous similarity, almost amounting to identity, of the personal pronouns, both separate and suffixed—a class of words which languages of radically different families are not apt to borrow from one another. "I" in Coptic is

ἀνοκ, ἀπακ.

"Thou" ἡτοκ, ἡτακ

"He" ἡσοϥ, etc.

"She" ἡσοϥ, etc.

"We" ἀνοκ, ἀπακ

"Ye" ἡσωτεκ, ἡτωτῆ, ἡτατῆ

"They" ἡσωοτ, ἡτοοτ, ἡτατ

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

"to me" πῆκ, πακ

"to us" πακ

"to thee," π. πακ

"to you" πωτεκ, πῆτεκ

f. πε

"to him" παϥ

"to them" πωοτ, πατ

"to her" παϥ

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

1, masc. **ⲟⲩⲁⲓ, ⲟⲩⲁ, ⲟⲩⲱⲧ**; fem. **ⲟⲩⲓ, ⲟⲩⲉⲓ, ⲟⲩⲱⲧ**

2, masc. **ⲥⲛⲁⲧ**, fem. **ⲥⲛⲧⲉ, ⲥⲛⲟⲩⲧ**

7, masc. **ⲮⲁⲮⲩ, ⲥⲁⲮⲩ**; fem. **ⲮⲁⲮⲩ, ⲥⲁⲮⲩⲉ**

8, masc. **Ⲯⲙⲛⲏ, Ⲯⲙⲟⲩⲏ**; fem. **Ⲯⲙⲛⲏ, Ⲯⲙⲟⲩⲏⲉ**.

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 **ⲕⲁⲣⲓ**. E.g.

sing. I. **ⲧ. ⲧⲱⲙ** *I am joining, adhering*; pl. I. **ⲧⲉⲛ. ⲧⲱⲙ**

2. m. **ⲕ. ⲧⲱⲙ, ⲭ. ⲧⲱⲙ** 2. **ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛ. ⲧⲱⲙ**
f. **ⲧⲉ. ⲧⲱⲙ**


3. m. **ⲙ. ⲧⲱⲙ** 3. **ⲥⲉ. ⲧⲱⲙ**
f. **ⲥ. ⲧⲱⲙ**

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

CHAPTER III.

SEMITIC WRITING.

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

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

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

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

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

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

that out of the twenty-two Phoenician letters, fifteen are beyond doubt directly derived from Egyptian models, whilst only one, the 'ayin, is clearly of Semitic invention. It may be that the "spoiling of the Egyptians" went so far; that the plundering Semites appropriated not only the idea of a written alphabet, but the very forms which the letters were to take. However, I cannot profess myself entirely convinced, not even by Mr Isaac Taylor's argumentation. If they did so, the Semites both remodelled and renamed their acquisitions. Out of the Egyptian eagle or vulture \curvearrowright they made the head and horns of an ox, \aleph , \aleph ; the throne, \beth , became the head and neck of a camel, \gimel , \beth ; the group of lotus plants growing out of the water, \daleth , a set of teeth, \vav , \vav ; 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 Uigür 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 Mēsha², \vav , king of Moab, which we may place about B.C. 890³. 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 \daleth (\bar{e}), \beth (\bar{u}) and \gimel (\bar{o}),

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

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

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

	Moab	Cyprus	Sidon
ג	⌋		∧
ד	△	△	∩
ו	⊥	⊥	∨
ה	⊐	⊐	⊐
ט	⊗	⊗	⊗
י	⌌	⌌	⌌
כ	⌋	⌋	⌋
ל	⌒	⌒	⌒
ם	⌐	⌐	⌐
ס	⌐	⌐	⌐
ק	⌐	⌐	⌐
ש	⌐	⌐	⌐
ת	x	†	⌐

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

¹ [Cf. the facsimile, *Palaographical Society*, and 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	⚡	⚡	ב	Ⓜ	Ⓜ
ב	Υ	⚡	ג	○	○
ג	⚡	⚡	ד	Ⓜ	⚡
ד	Ⓜ	Ⓜ	ה	Ⓜ	Ⓜ

Old seals and other gems, dating, say, from the seventh to the fourth century B.C., exhibit identical forms; and the same remark applies to two fragmentary inscriptions from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, discovered by M. Clermont-Ganneau and now deposited in the British Museum. This alphabet is still found, with slight modifications, upon the Maccabee and other Jewish coins; and is known to us in its latest shape as the *Samaritan* alphabet. It began, however, to be disused by the Jews even before the commencement of our era, and to be supplanted by a modified form of the Palmyrene character, the so-called *square* character, כְּתָב 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 Phoenician alphabet, is the undulating or wavy form of the letters *m* and *s/h*, 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 Ⓜ Ⓜ and Ⓜ, which become at a later time Ⓜ Ⓜ and Ⓜ Ⓜ. The letter *D* 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 𐤃 𐤄 𐤅 𐤆 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.
𐤃	𐤀	𐤃
𐤄	$\triangle \text{A}$	𐤄
𐤅	O	O
𐤆	A	𐤆

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

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

¹ [The inscriptions of aṣ-Ṣafā in the volcanic region S. E. of Damascus were first observed by Graham in 1857. Ten were published by Wetzstein (*Reisebericht*, Berl. 1860) more by De Vogüé in his *Syrie Centrale, Inscr. Sémit.* (4^e 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 (*Θαμουδιῶται*); hence the name Thamuditic. Euting's inscriptions have been deciphered by D. H. Müller (*Deutschr.* of the Vienna Acad. 1889). Twenty-six characters have been determined, and a twenty-seventh probably corresponds to the Arabic ظ "A sign for ظ 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 ح̣; whilst in Arabic ע has two representatives, ع and ع̣. Most scholars regard the sounds of ح and ع̣ 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 ع̣ seems certain from the fact that the LXX. expresses ע by γ (i.e. *gh*) in several proper names; e.g. עֵזָא, Γάζα, غَزَا; עֵטְרָה, Γομόρρα; צֵעֵר, Ζόγορα and Σηγώρ, زَغْر. Further, Χοδολλογυμόρ = פְּרִדְלֵעֵמֶר, corres-

ponding with an Elamitic *Kudur-Lāgamar* (a name formed like *Kudur-Mabūg* and *Kudur-nahundi* or *Kudur-nanhundi*); and Γαϊδάδ for עֵדָד, Genesis iv. 18, where the Massoretic text has (probably incorrectly) עֵדָד. On the contrary, ע is indicated in Greek merely by the *spiritus asper*, and even more frequently the *spiritus lenis*, with a vowel; or in the middle and at the end of a word by a vowel alone; as Ἠλί, עֵלִי; Ἐβραῖος, עֵבְרָי; Ἀμαλήκ, עֵמְלֵק; Συμεών, שִׁמְעֹן; Φαραώ, פִּרְעֹה; Γελβουέ, גֵּלְבָע. 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, Ἀλχάβορ, and in another Ἀβώρας [Ἀβόρρας, etc.]; חָרָן, حَرَّان, 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*, حَبَل, with חָבַל *act wickedly*, خَبَل *be corrupted, unsound, mad*; חָפַר *dig*, حَفَرَ, with חִפֵּר *be ashamed, bashful*, خَفِرَ; חָלַל *profane, desecrate*, حَلَّ, حَلَّ, حَلَّ, with חָלַל *bore, wound*, خَلَّ¹.

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

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

with entire disappearance of the \aleph , רָאָשׁ for רֹאָשׁ .—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 רָאָשׁ $ra's^{an}$ becomes רָאֵשׁ $rās$; דְּחִיבָה $dhīb^{an}$ becomes דְּחִיב $dhīb$; סוּלָה $su'l^{an}$ becomes סוּל $sūl$.

The usual spelling רָאֵשׁ , סוּל , is a compromise in writing between the ancient and the modern forms (רָאָשׁ , סוּלָה);

Hebrew, Syriac, and Assyrian, took nearly the same course. An original רָאָשׁ first became רָאֵשׁ $rāsh$ in Hebrew, as in the actual plural רָאֵשִׁים , and then רֹשׁ $rōsh$. We should have expected this form to be written רֹשׁ , but here the spelling has lagged behind the pronunciation, and the \aleph remains as a vestige of the original form. So also דְּחִיבָה $dhā'n^{an}$, "sheep," Hebrew originally דְּחִיבָה , then דְּחִיבָה , and finally דְּחִיבָה $ḥōn$. The corresponding Aramaic forms are דְּחִיב , רֹשׁ , for רָאָשׁ , and דְּחִיבָה , רֹשׁ , for דְּחִיבָה . In Assyrian I find cited such forms as $rēshu$ or $rīshu$, $ḥēnu$ or $ḥīnu$.—Initial \aleph is often dropped at the beginning of words, when pronounced with a short vowel; e.g. נֶחֱמָה for

נֶחֱמָה ; נֶחֱמָה , נֶחֱמָה , for נֶחֱמָה (Heb. נֶחֱמָה , נֶחֱמָה); נֶחֱמָה for נֶחֱמָה (Assyr. $nīshu$); נֶחֱמָה = נֶחֱמָה ; נֶחֱמָה = נֶחֱמָה ; נֶחֱמָה = נֶחֱמָה , but plur. נֶחֱמָה ; נֶחֱמָה $kīnsman$, from נֶחֱמָה .

Similarly in vulgar Arabic, أَحَد for أَحَد , أَكَل for أَكَل , أَحَد for أَحَد . *Per contra*, an initial \aleph with its vowel may be merely prosthetic, to lighten the pronunciation of an unpleasant combination of consonants, especially in foreign words; e.g. أَحَد for أَحَد ; أَحَد for أَحَد (Eth. ጠጠጠ : $mālm$, أَحَد); أَحَد , أَحَد ;

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

It would appear from this short survey of the gutturals, that they were exceedingly apt in the younger Semitic dialects to be confused with one another, and to disappear altogether. In Ethiopic MSS. there is usually no distinction observed between Ḳ, ḥ, ḳ, on the one side and Ḳ, Ḑ, on the other; modern Amharic pronounces them all as Ḳ 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 ṣ is very feeble, and ṣ scarcely heard at all; and in Mandaitic there is absolutely no distinction between Ṣ, ṣ, on the one hand and Ḥ, ḥ, on the other. The Talmūd too writes Ṣ for ṣ and Ḥ for ḥ in not a few words; e.g. א (with following *daghesh*) for עֵל; אָבָא (not אַבָּא) *wood*, for עָבָא, חֶבֶל, חָבֵל; גָּבֵהַ, חֶבֶל, חָבֶל; עוֹל for עוֹל, עוֹלָה; עֵל = עֵל = עֵל *neck*; עָבָא *willow*, עָרְבִים, עָרְבִים; אָרְבֶּלָה *sieve*, חֶבֶל, חָבֶל, חָבֶל (*cribrum, cribellum*); אָרְבֶּלָה *sieve*, אָרְבֶּלָה; אָרְבֶּלָה *sieve*, אָרְבֶּלָה, אָרְבֶּלָה. It is related that the Babylonian rabbi Haiyā was held guilty of blasphemy for pronouncing, in Isaiah viii. 17, הַכִּיּוֹתִי with ה instead of חַכִּיּוֹתִי with ח (פְּנִיּוֹ) *הַכִּיּוֹתִי לַיהוָה הַמִּסְתִּיר פְּנִיּוֹ* ¹. In Assyrian there is obviously no difference in sound between Ḳ ḥ 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," *tī'āmtu*, "sea," *dāru*, "eternity," *nāru*, "river"; *ussu*, "strong," *sēru* or *zīru*, "seed," *ishmī*, "he heard," *rīnu*, "thunder." Neither has ע any distinct sound or representative, as *usālu*, "gazelle," *āribu*, "raven."

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

² [*T.B. Meg.* 24 b.]

קָ has likewise sunk to the same level, e.g. *rāimu*, "loving," *rēmu*, "grace," *imēru* or *imīru*, "ass," *aptī*, "I opened," *rūku*, "distant, remote." But קָ has preserved its sound and is represented by a special sign; e.g. *khītu*, "sin," *khamilti*, "five," *akhu*, "brother," *amkhas*, "I destroyed," "defeated," *arkhu*, "month." In this case the comparison of the Assyrian may be important for Hebrew lexicography, as shewing us the distinction between קָ and קָ in this language. E.g., as Friedrich Delitzsch has pointed out in his little book *The Hebrew Language viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research* [London 1883], פָּתַח *פתח*, *to open*, Assy. *iptī*, "he opened," is quite different from פָּתַח *פתח*, *carving, engraving*, Assy. *iptakh*, "he carved." So too מָלַח *מלח*, *sailor*, is in Assy. *malākhū* or *mallākhū* (with ח), and has nothing to do with מָלַח *מלח*, "salt." It is said to be a word borrowed from the Accadian.

II. Advancing from the gutturals, we next encounter, in the order of the organs of speech, the so-called palatals, ק, כ, ג. These interchange freely with one another in the different dialects. E.g., in Hebrew itself the radicals גָּנַן and כָּנַן; סָגַר and סָכַר, also Syriac *ܣܚܪ* and *ܣܚܪ*; further *ܦܚܪ* and *ܦܚܪ*; קָשָׁה *קשה*, *almond tree*, *שִׁקְדָּה*, *שִׁקְדָּה*; קָשָׁה *קשה*, *truth*, *שִׁמְרָה*, but Mand. *שִׁמְרָה*; קָשָׁה *קשה*, *archer*, *שִׁמְרָה* and *שִׁמְרָה*. In Mandaitic the interchange of ק with ג is very frequent, under the influence of a neighbouring *כ* or *ג*; as גַּמְלָה [gaitā] = *שִׁמְרָה* *summer*, and so in the radicals גַּמְלָה, לָגַט, for קָטַל, קָטַן, קָטַם; לָקַט *break off (a branch)* = קָצַף (comp. קָצַף in Joel i. 7: *שָׁם יִפְּגֵי לְשִׁמְרָה וְתִיאֲנֹתֵי לְקָצֶפָה*). More rarely does ג exchange with *כ*; e.g. *נָבַע*, *נָבַע* and *נָבַע*; *נָבַע*, *נָבַע*.

أَبْهَت, and غَرِي be angry; جَلَبَةٌ and غَلَبَةٌ, outcry; جَدَفٌ and غَدَفٌ (dial.), row¹.

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, رَجُلٌ, جَبَلٌ. The Hebrew and Aramaic, however, modified its sound, when immediately preceded by a vowel (however slight), into one much resembling that of the Greek γ between two strong vowels, as ἄγαθός, or the Arabic غ. Indeed, when writing Arabic with Hebrew letters, the Jews generally use ג to represent غ. Modern Syriac gives unaspirated ܓ the sound of *dy* or *j* in a few roots, such as ܕܝܢܝܘܢ *dyāniū* or ܝܢܝܘܢ (*جَانِي*) "steal, carry off"; ܕܝܡܠܐ *dyūmla* or ܝܡܠܐ, "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 = وِشَّة. Similarly the old grammarian al-G'awālīkī mentions تَشْتَر as a faulty pronunciation of تَجْتَر, "it chews the cud¹."

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

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

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

ك is also softened dialectically into a sound like that of *ts* or *tsh*, sometimes of *dj* or *g*; as كَاتِب *ʿātib* or *ʿātib*, حَكِيم *ḥagīm*, كَامِل *gāmīl*.—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 *kēllū*. Perhaps this may help us to connect such a form as Ar. أَيَا *īyā*, with Eth. ነያ *kīyā*.

3. *p* in the older dialects is a *k* pronounced far back in the mouth, or rather, deep in the throat. In our English alphabet its lineal representative is *q*. In some Arabic dialects it takes the sound of *dsh* or *dz*, sometimes of *ch* or *t*; e.g. قَبْلَهُ *dshiblē* or *dziblē*, قَرِيب *dzarīb*, عَقِيل *ʿadzil*, قَائِد *tāʿid*, سِرَّة *sirṭa*. But its ordinary sound, throughout Arabia and Africa, is that of a hard *g*. This too is common in the modern forms of Ethiopic, whence *Magdalā* for *Makdalā*, ቆዳላ *tagābbala* for *taḳābbala*. In parts of Syria and Egypt, on the other hand, as well as in Amharic, *p* is apt to be converted into *ʿ*. A Syrian Christian says *ʿult*, *ʿaʿūl*, for قَوْل *qawl*, قَلَّت *qallat*; and a native of Shoa pronounces *taʿābbala* instead of *tagābbala* or *taḳābbala*. The Egyptian railway station Zagazig is written زازين *Zakāsik*, pronounced either *Zagāsīg* or *Zaʿāsīʿ*; the word حَقِيقِي *ḥaqīqī* becomes *ḥaʿīʿī*.

III. We next come to the dentals ܕ, ܛ, ܥ, which are common to all the old languages: e.g.

ܕܒܐ, ܕܒܐ: Ass. <i>dubbu</i> ,	ܕܒܐ,	ܕܒܐ;
ܕܝܕܐ, ܕܝܕܐ: Ass. <i>idu</i> (power),	ܕܝܕܐ,	ܕܝܕܐ;
ܕܢܚܐ, ܕܢܚܐ:	ܕܢܚܐ,	ܕܢܚܐ;
ܕܢܝܫܐ,	ܕܢܝܫܐ,	ܕܢܝܫܐ;

أَتَانٌ,	Ass. <i>atānu</i> ,	אתון,	אַתָּן;
طَلٌّ,	מט:	טל,	טל;
طَعَمٌ,	טוט:	טעם,	טעם;
حَطِيٌّ,	חטח:	Ass. <i>ikhti</i> ,	חטח, חטח.

Of these, ת and ט interchange freely, as קטל, صلا, but
 مُخَا, طَفِي, ضَعَلُو and קושט; ضَعَلُو and קושט; قَتَلَ, قَاتَلَ;
 and תעה, rarely טעה; חטף, טעף, and חתף. In
 modern Syriac ט for אט. ד often interchanges with ת, as
 in the Hebrew radicals תור and דור, Arabic تَار and دَار; חף
 and דף; in Mandaitic כארפא, "shoulder," for חפא,
 כדאב, as well as כדאב, חפא, "silence," שידקא; כנף;
 and חפא. More rarely does ד interchange with ט, as דבה
 and טבה; אטא, אטא, and טטא or טטא, Mand. אטאטא;
 טבה, "height, mountain," Sam. טב, Eth. ገብር; דבה,
 חפא and חפא, טטא and חפא. Of a possible interchange of ת
 with ד, I shall have something to say when we come to speak
 of the persons of the perfect in the verb. As another instance
 I may mention the substitution of *k* for *t* in some modern
 Syriac forms of the verb חט, "to come," e.g., particip. חט and
 חט (*tyā, ityā*), for חט and חט; imper. חט (*tyā*) for חט (*tyā*).

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

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

Thus far I have spoken chiefly of the pure *t*, *n*, *ḥ*, 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 *t*, *d*, *ḥ*, the old Arabic possesses a series of aspirated or lisped dentals, *th*, *dh*, *ḥh*. 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. *ḥḥḥ* *break*, *ḥḥḥ* *plough*, *ḥḥḥ*; *ḥḥḥ*; *ḥḥḥ*; *ḥḥḥ*; *ḥḥḥ*. The other Semites took a different course, modifying the lisped letter into a sibilant. In Phoenician and Hebrew

ث became *sh*, in Ethiopic and Assyrian ḥ s'; e.g. שׁוֹר, תּוֹר, ḥC: Ass. *sūr*; שָׁקַל, תָּקַל, ḥC: (*hang up*), Ass. *isḫul* (*hang up, weigh*); שׁוֹם, תּוֹם, ḥC: Ass. *sūmu*; שָׁרַח, חָרַח, ḥC: (*abundant crop*). Similarly ḏ became in all these languages *s*; e.g. שָׁבַח, זָבַח, ḥC: Ass. *szbu* (for *zibhu*); שָׁנַח, אָנַח, ḥC: Ass. *usnu*; שָׁחַח, אָחַח, ḥC: Finally, ḥ appears in the other languages as *š*, e.g. שָׁלַח, צָלַח, ḥC: Ass. *šalmu*, "dark"; שָׁלַח, צָלַח, ḥC: Ass. *šillu* and *šalūlu*; שָׁפַח, צָפַח, ḥC: Ass. *šupru*; שָׁפַח, צָפַח, ḥC: Of course, as every rule has its exceptions, these series are occasionally liable to disturbances. For instance שָׁפַח, צָפַח, ḥC: Ass. *šissī*, ought by rule to be in Aramaic שָׁפַח, צָפַח, ḥC: but the actual form is שָׁפַח, צָפַח, ḥC: the proximity of *p* having hardened the *š*.

Of the Aramaic dialects some have advanced to the Hebrew stage, at least in sporadic instances. In the great inscription of Taimā, for example, we find וי for וי, ון and its fem. ון for ון and ון; and the same forms occur in the Egyptian Aramaic inscriptions and papyri. In Mandaitic there are not only pronominal and adverbial forms of this kind, as הַאִיּוּן, fem. הַאִיּוּן (but הַאִיּוּן *this is*, and occasionally הַאִיּוּן); הַאִיּוּן = הַאִיּוּן *then*; הַאִיּוּן, as well as הַאִיּוּן, *how?* but also a few other words, as הַאִיּוּן or הַאִיּוּן, *male*, הַאִיּוּן or הַאִיּוּן, *offering* (but הַאִיּוּן *offerer*, הַאִיּוּן *altar*), הַאִיּוּן *beard*, and very strangely הַאִיּוּן as well as הַאִיּוּן, *palm tree*, and הַאִיּוּן as well as הַאִיּוּן, *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 ש = ש 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* *ketir*, *اتنين* *itnēn*, *شكّات* "beggar." More rarely it advances the *th* to a sibilant, *s*, as *sibit* = *سبت*, *bāhis* = *باحث* (argue, dispute), *khabbās* = *خبّاب* (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*, *تاب* *repent*¹ = *تاب* *return*. Similarly lisped *ḍ* seems to become in modern Arabic either *d* or *s*; e.g. *ḍib* = *ذئب*, *dahab* = *ذهب*, *adān* = *أذن*, *kidb* and *kisb* = *كذب*, *isn* = *أسن*, *sikr* = *سکر* (recitation), *samb* = *ذئب*. In like manner *ṭ* is pronounced either *ṭ* (ض) or *s*, e.g. *ʿadm* = *عظم*, *ḍill* = *ظل*, *ḍalma* = *ظلمة*, *sulm* = *ظلم*, *ḍuhr* = *ظهر*, *sahar* = *ظهر*, *ḥifz* = *حفظ*².

IV. The sibilants next engage our attention, viz. *ṣ*, *ḍ*, *ṣ̣* (*ṣ̣*, *ṣ̣*), and *ṣ̣̣*.

1. Pure *s* ṣ runs through all the Semitic languages, as *زرع*, *ṣr*, *ṣr*, Ass. *ṣru* or *stru*, "seed"; *عز*, *ṣḥḥ*: *ṣy*, *ḥṣ*, Ass. *issu*, "strong." But Eth. H, Heb. *ṣ*, and Ass. *s*, often correspond, as we have seen above, to Arab. *ḍ* and Aram. *ṣ*; as *ذئب*, *ṣṣ*, *ṣṣ*, *ḥḥ*: *hyaena*, *ṣṣ*.

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

² [The distinctive sound of *ṭ* is preserved in some parts of the Hijāz.]

As a rule, ש = ס = שׁ = שׂ; as

שׁוּר	سُور	שׂוּר:	סוּר
שׁוּר	سُر	שׁוּר:	סוּר

but there are exceptions [perhaps merely graphical], as

שׁוּר שׁוּר [for שׁוּר] but שׁוּר. שׁוּר.

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

(1)	שׁוּב	شَبَع	
	שׁוּב	شَاب	U. N. : Assyr. šubu (grey-haired)
	שׁוּב	شَمَك	„ šumzlu (-lu)
	שׁוּב	שׁוּב	
	שׁוּב	שׁוּב	
	שׁוּב	שׁוּב	„ irsu, ēršu
(2)	שׁוּב	שׁוּב	
	שׁוּב	שׁוּב	שׁוּב:
	שׁוּב	שׁוּב	שׁוּב:
	שׁוּב	שׁוּב	

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

לָשׁוֹן לָשׁוֹן לָשׁוֹן אֲרָא: Assyri. *lišānu*

רָאשׁ רָאשׁ רָאשׁ אֲרָא: „ *rāšu, rīšu*

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 ז, Arabic ف, Ethiopic ḥ, Assyrian s [š], of which I gave some examples above. Add:

שָׁלוֹם	שָׁלוֹם	שָׁלוֹם		<i>šalgu</i>
שָׁלוֹם	שָׁלוֹם	שָׁלוֹם	אֲרָא:	
שָׁלוֹם	שָׁלוֹם	שָׁלוֹם	אֲרָא:	<i>w'addiš</i>

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

ש is frequently changed into ש under the influence of a following ש, and in Arabic of a ש or ש; as שָׁלוֹם, שָׁלוֹם, שָׁלוֹם; especially in foreign words with *st*, as שָׁלוֹם or שָׁלוֹם.

Very curious is the change in Assyrian of *š* into *l* before a dental; e.g. *altur* or *aštur* (שָׁלוֹם), *maštitu* or *mallitu* (drink, שָׁלוֹם), *khamišti* or *khamilti* (five, שָׁלוֹם), *lubuštu* or *lubultu* (dress, שָׁלוֹם). It appears, however, to be thoroughly well established.

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

the verbal form **مُصَلَّ**, Heb. **הִפְעִיל**, Ar. **أَفْعَلَ**, Aram. **أَصَلَّ**; 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 Ḥimyaritic offers us a suffix form **שׁ**, pl. **שׁם**, as well as **וּ**, pl. **וּמָ**. The other Semitic languages have all the *h*-form, except the modern Mehri, which has, according to von Maltzan¹, masc. *he*, f. *se*, pl. *hēm*, f. *sēu*; as suffixes *he*, f. *es*, pl. *hum*, f. *senu*. Such cases as **سَلَكَ**, **هَلَكَ**, **هَلَكْ**, 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 **שׁ**, **ס**, **ז**; and we have also shown that it corresponds in Ethiopic, Phœnician, Hebrew, and Assyrian, to the Arabic **ظ**, which is represented in Aramaic by **ܣ**, **ܥ**. One or two additional examples may not be superfluous.

צָבִי	Assyr. <i>šabitu</i> ,	ظَبِي	مُحَبَا
צָבִי		ظَهْر	مُסָן
צָעַן <i>migrate</i> (Is. 33. 20)	}	ظَعَن	مَنَح
צָעַן <i>load</i>		ظَعَن <i>travel</i>	مَنَح <i>load carry</i> .

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

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

צָד	صَاد	<i>išūd</i>	ሀ
צָבַע	أَصْبَحَ	ሀሀባሀት : <i>šumbu</i> (for <i>šubbu = šub'u</i>)	ܣܘܒܐ
בְּצָלִים	بَصَلَ	በሀሀ :	ሀሀሀ
בְּצָב	نَصَبَ		ሀሀ

(b) To Arabic **ض**, Ethiopic **ሀ**, Assyrian *š*, Aramaic **ܥ**; as

צָרָה , צָר	ضَرَّة	ሀሀ :	ሀሀሀ
צָפַר		ሀሀሀ :	ܥܘܦܪܐ

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

צָץ	צָץ		חַצ
צָצַן	צָצַן	šṣnu, ṣṣnu	חַצָּן
	פֶּרֶס	θCη :	חַצְפָּא
רָצַן	רָצַן		רָצַ
פָּצַן	פָּצַן		פָּצַ
יָצַא		⊖θλ : ūṣī ("he escaped") part. āṣū	יָצַא
רָצַה	רָצַה		רָצַח ("satisfied")
בִּיצָה	בִּיצָה	bīṣu	בִּיצָה
אָרֶץ	אָרֶץ	irṣitu (ēr-)	אָרֶץ

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

צָלַע	צָלַע	ṣilu (for ṣillu, ṣil'u)	עָלַע	אָלַע
בִּי הַצְלַעִים	בִּי הַצְלַעִים		אָפַע (אָפַע)	אָפַע
	עָרַע		עָרַע	אָרַע
	צָעַע			אָצַע
צָפַרְדַּע	צָפַרְדַּע		עָרְדַּע	אָרְדַּע
עָץ	עָץ	Assyr. ʿiṣṣu		אָע

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

צָמַד	צָמַד	θCθ :	רָצַד
נָפַץ	נָפַץ	ṣCṣ :	נָפַץ
		"to be scattered, flee" (with R, not θ)	

רצין	רִצַּן		רִצַּן
	عَرَض		عَرَضِي
	غَمَض		عَضِي
	ضَرَع	Assyr. <i>siru</i>	عَضِي
	ضَرَك		عَضِي
חמץ	חִמֵּץ		עִמֵּץ and עִמֵּץ
	صِرْف	} with ص, not ض ¹	عَضِي
	صِرْفِي		عَضِي

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 אֲרִיקָא for אֲרִיעָא (Jerem. x. 11), Mand. אֲקִנָא for אֲעִנָא, אֲקִמְרָא for אֲעִמְרָא. Occasionally the same thing happens in the case of a simple ע, as עֲפֵר, עֲפֵר, חֲפֵן, Mand. אֲפֵרָא, but also אֲקִמְרָא, and even אֲנִמְרָא. At other times a ך appears upon the scene; e.g. صَغَط "to press, squeeze," *be oppressed*, instead of اَحَد; ضَحِكَ, Syriac *חֲחִיךְ*, Talm. *חֲחִיךְ*, for *אֲחִיךְ*. 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. אֲחִיךְ (not Afel), עֲחִיכִית, "I laughed"; but also חֲחִיךְ (חֲחִיךְ), and even רִחֵךְ. Something similar occurs in Syriac with the word אֲחֵץ, whence are formed the secondary radicals חֲחֵץ and חֲחֵץ.

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

² [See however Fränkel, *Fremdw.*, p. 183.]

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

- (1) **צפר** "whistle, twitter," **صفر**, whence
צפוד, **צפיר**, **צפור**, **צפור**, Ass. *iṣṣūr* (for *iṣpūr*).
- (2) **צפר** "turn, return, twine, twist," **ضفر**, **ፀፈ**: whence
צפירה "turn, crown or garland."
- (3) **צפר** "leap, spring," **ضفر**, whence
צפיר "he goat," **צפירה**, **צפיר**.
- (4) **צפר**, **ظفر**, whence
צפרן "nail," **ظفر**, **፳፫**: Ass. *ṣupru*, **צפיר**.

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

- (5) **צפירא**, **צפירא**, "dawn" = **שפירא** 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*: **פרזל**, **פרזל**, Ass. *parzillu*, Ar. **فِرْزَل** *fetter*,
*forceps*¹.

פריקה, **פריקה**, **פריקה**

פריקה, **פריקה**, **פריקה**

פריקה, **פריקה**

פריקה, **פריקה**

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

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

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

زِنْت "pitch"¹; حَجَلًا for حَجَلًا; مُعْجَلًا for مُعْجَلًا; even when a vowel intervenes, as Mand. פַת for פֶת, פַתוּלָא for פֶתוּלָא.

2. *b* and *m*: פֶת, מַכֵּן.

أَصْلًا; זִמָּן or זִמָּן, Hוּזָא; זִמָּן.

The Arab grammarians mention such cases as بَكَّة for مَكَّة, مَا أَسْمَكْتَ for بِأَسْمَكْتَ; and the like. In Himyaritic בַן stands for בִּן, *who*, and בַן for בִּן, *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 Ḷ ḷ and Ṭ ṭ (or ḷṣ) are in native words usually modifications of an original *b*, sometimes of an *f*.

(1) נִבְּחָ, חִבְּחָ; יִבְּחָ, פִּבְּחָ;

חִחֶ: חֶחֶ; יִבְּכִי, בִּכִי

(2) יִפְּרָה, פִּפְּרָה;

פִּפְּדִי: פִּפְּדִי; פִּפְּדִי: פִּפְּדִי

In modern Syriac, I may remark, *f* is generally hardened into *p*, as فَلَاحًا *malpānā* for فَلَاحًا. 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. אֲרָגָמָן, Aram. אֲרָגָן; *surmēnu* or *survēnu*, "a sort of cypress," Aram. שִׁרְוִינָא, שִׁרְבִינָא, modern Arabic شَرْبِين; *arakh-šamnu* (*samnu*), "eighth month,"

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

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

(1) ל with נ, and vice versa: לחש and נחש; לשכה and נשכה; נשך, Aramaic נין and לין; נסון and לון; Talmud. נסם, רלין רני, לחמא for נחמא, לקם for נקם.

(2) ל with ר, and vice versa: ארמל, ארמל, ארמל; מעל, מעל, מעל, Ethiopic plur. : מעל, (for מעל); Mand. תארמירא for תארמירא, and כאלחא for כאלחא; חלצים, חלצים, Mand. ראלצא, but Aram. חרצא, חרצא.

(3) נ with ר, and vice versa: נר and רר; נמ and רמ; נר and רר; נמ and רמ.

(4) מ with נ; as מורנ *tribulum* (threshing-machine), נורج (Syriac נר "axe"); נחשולא and נחשולא. Especially at the end of words; e.g. נהנות, נהנות, Arab. نهم, نهم, نهم, نهم. So in the pronouns, أنتم, ان, ان, "if," אם; נסם, נשן; חפא, חפא, חפא, חפא. So in the plural terminations of the noun, Arab. نون, نون, Aram. נ, נ, Heb. נ; in the dual, Arab. ن, ن; Aram. נ, נ, Heb. נ.

Final ם and ן are apt to fall away:—

(1) In the *construct* state of nouns dual and plural.

(2) In the *absolute* plural of nouns, not only in Talmudic, Mandaitic, and modern Syriac, but also in Assyrian, where we have such plurals as *malki* "kings," *ili* "gods," *pagri* "bodics".¹

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

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

³ [Or also, according to Haupt and Delitzsch, *malki* etc.]

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

וּלְדָ	ⲬⲚ:	יְלֵד	יְלֵד	יְכַ
וְהָבַ	ⲬⲚ:	יְהַב	יְהַב, יְב	יְכַ and יְכַ
וַיֵּן	ⲬⲚ:	יֵן		
וְגֵל וְגֵר		יְגַ		
	ⲬⲚ:	יְגַ		יְכַ

The original initial *w* rarely appears in Hebrew and Aramaic, as וְלָד or וְלָד (if correct); [post-Biblical] וְדַי, וְדַח, וְדַל; [post-Biblical] וְדַי, וְדַח, וְדַל; and in some cases where it has been protected by a preceding consonant, as in the Hithpa^{al} forms הַתְּוַדַּע, הַתְּוַדַּח, הַתְּוַדַּח.

The fate of the initial *y* in Aramaic is worthy of further notice. In Biblical Aramaic and some other dialects we find *y*, as יְלֵד, יְתֵיב. In Syriac this letter is vocalised and becomes *f*, written in older times אַי, more recently *y* only, as יְכַ, יְכַ (whence יְכַ, יְכַ). Modern Syriac, however, simply drops the initial *y*; as יְכַ *stwd*, "sitting"; יְכַ, "they burned." Mandaitic follows the ancient Syriac in the P^{al} form of the verb and similar cases; as יְכַ = עַתְבִּית, יְכַ = עַתְבִּית or עַת = יְכַ, יְכַ = עַקְאֵרָא; but drops the *y* in the Ethpe^{al}, as יְכַ = עַתְהֵיב, יְכַ = עַתְלֵד.

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

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

“hand,” Eth. λp :; *arkhu*, “month,” כח , ܟܚܐ , ܟܚܐ ; *asib* “he dwells, dwelling,” ישב ; *asn*, “going out,” אצא ; *alidtu, alittu*, “bearing,” אלידת , والدة ; *akeru*, “costly,” יקר . Nor is this dislike of the sound of initial *y* or *w* confined to Assyrian. Even the Arabs were prone to change initial w and wi into u and i ; and the combination *warwā* is always modified at the beginning of a word into *'awā*. So in the Kor'an we find أَقْتَت for وَقَتَّت ; further, أَسَاد for وَسَاد , “cushion”; أَشَاح for وَشَاح , “belt”; أَوَاصِل for وَوَاصِل , plural of وَاصِلَةٌ , “connecting link, proximate cause”; أَرَاي for وَوَاي , plural of وَاقِيَةٌ , whether in the sense of “guard” or of “ounce.” Hence we see at once the connexion, on the one hand, between أَرَخ , “to date,” and Eth. ܟܚܐ : “month”; أَجِل “joint,” and وَصِل , where the *w* is original; and, on the other hand, between يَكْف and يَكْلِم , “learn”; يَمُر and يَمُر , “be long,” where the N claims the priority.

Of the disappearance of initial *w* in some verbal and nominal forms, I shall treat hereafter, when we come to the verbs “D” in the Hebrew Grammar.

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

Perf.	قَام	ܩܡ	ܩܡ	ܩܡ	for <i>kawama</i> ,
		ܩܡ	ܩܡ	ܩܡ	for <i>sayama</i> ;
Imperf.	يَقُوم	ܩܘܡ	ܩܘܡ	ܩܘܡ	for <i>yakwumu</i> ,
		ܩܘܡ	ܩܘܡ	ܩܘܡ	for <i>yasyimu</i> .

Compare also מָאֵת , מֵיִת , מַחֵה , for *mawita*; and طَالَ , for *ṭawla*, with בָּאֵשׁ and אֵשׁ , for בְּאֵשׁ and אֵשׁ . Uncontracted examples are, however, to be found; as عُور "be blind of one eye," حَوْل "squint," هَيْف "have a slender waist," بَوَّع , رَوَّح , رَوَّر , رَوَّع ; and the contraction does not take place when the 3rd radical is likewise a *w* or *y*, as رَوَّى , رَوَّه , رَوَّب ; رَوَّاه , رَوَّاه ; etc.

Medial *w* passes into *y* chiefly under the influence of an accompanying *i*, as صَمَمْتُ , صَمَمْتُ , "resurrection" (where the Arabic *i* has become a mere *shewa* in Syriac), for قَوَّامَةٌ . Instances like רָוּיָה , Aram. רָוָא , רָוָן , Arab. هَوَّى , are rare. In the Hebrew Pi"el and Aramaic Pa"el the change is more frequent; as קָיַם , קָיַם , קָיַם , קָיַם ; but examples to the contrary are not wanting, as עָוַר , "surround," עָוַר , עָוַר , עָוַר , עָוַר . As the original form is the Arabic *ḥawwama*, the change perhaps began with the 2nd *w*, which passed into *y*, *ḥawyama*; this worked upon the preceding *w*, so as to cause assimilation, *ḥayyama*; and hence arose the Aramaic form *ḥayyēm*, and finally the Hebrew *ḥayyēm*, 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 יִכְסִימוּ , יִכְסִימוּ , "they cover them." Its retention in such forms as שָׁלוּ , "be quiet," is rare; for even the Arabic, which tolerates حَلَو , requires رَضِيَ and سَلِيَ for رَضَو and سَلَو . In יָו , יָו , יָו , יָו , and the like, we should probably pronounce the final *ו* nearly as *ū*; as also in the forms with pronom. suffixes, like פִּיּוּ *piū* (for פִּיּוּ), or דְּבָרָיו *ḏbhārāū* (for דְּבָרָיו). This view derives some confirma-

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

לְשִׁבְנִידוּ עֶבֶד עֲזִידוּ i.e. לְשִׁבְנִי עֶבֶד עֲזִי

לְאֲבִידוּ עֶבֶד עֲזִידוּ i.e. לְאֲבִי עֶבֶד עֲזִי

In the perfect of the verb the Ethiopic alone retains the distinction of the final radicals, e.g. ተለወ: *taldwa*, "follow," በሐየ: *bakdya*, "weep." In the other languages the *w* has been changed into *y*, and the combination *aya* contracted into *d*. In Arabic the grammarians have introduced an arbitrary distinction, and write لآ for *talarwa* and بكي for *bakaya*, but the sound is the same in both cases, *tald*, *bakt*; and hence the Aramean has ܐܠܘܢ, ܐܠܘܢ, with ܐ, ܐ. In Hebrew a ה is substituted for this ܐ, ܐ, ܐ; but this does not warrant us in speaking of them as verbs לה. The only real verbs לה in Hebrew are such as ܠܗ, ܠܗ, in Syriac ܠܗܘܢ, ܠܗܘܢ, and the like. Upon the whole subject of the weak letters, and ܐ I shall find it necessary to enter into fuller details, when we come to the classes of verbs in which they appear as first, second and third radicals.

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

1. ה = *h* in all the languages; but also
 ה init. = Assyr. ܗ, Arab. ھ, Eth. 𐌒, Aram. ܗ, ܗ.
2. ז = *s* in all the languages; but also
 ז = Assyr. ܣ, Eth. 𐌆, Arab. ڤ, Aram. ܣ, ܣ.
3. 𐤎 = Aram. ܢ, ܢ, Eth. 𐌎, Arab. ڨ, Assyr. ܢ (as *iméru*);
 but also
 𐤎 = Aram. ܢ, ܢ, Eth. 𐌎, Arab. ڨ, Assyr. ܢ (*h*).

4. y init. = y in all the languages except Assyrian, where it is N ; but also
 y init. = Aram. y , Eth. O , Arab. و , Assy. N .
5. D = Aram. D , D , Eth. H , Arab. س , Assy. s (sk).
6. y = Aram. y , y , Eth. O , Arab. ع , Assy. N ; but also
 y = Aram. y , y , Eth. O , Arab. غ , Assy. N .
7. r = r in all the languages; but also
 r = Eth. R , Arab. ر , Aram. D , L , Assy. r ;
 r = Eth. O , Arab. ض , Aram. y , y , I , Assy. r ;
 r = Eth. O (R), Arab. ض , Aram. r , y , Assy. r .
8. D = Aram. D [D'], D , Eth. W , Arab. ث , Assy. d (s).
9. D = Aram. D , Eth. H , Arab. س , Assy. d (s); but also
 D = Eth. H , Arab. ث , Aram. D , L , Assy. d .

¹ [Biblical Aramaic and the oldest Aramaic monuments have $\text{D} = \text{D}$. In Palmyrene this D interchanges with D , e.g. D and D .]

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:

ă ā, ĩ ī, ŭ 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*.]

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 *ä* (in *hat, cap*), or it becomes *ä, e* (as in *Männer, pet*); whilst *ī* and *ii* are pronounced with their natural sounds, as in *pin* and *bull*, or nearly so. E.g. كَتَبْتَ *katabta*, مَرَكَبَ *markeb*, سَمَكَ *semek*, شَمَسَ *shems*, ذَكَرَ *dhiker*, كَلَّ *kull*. The sound of *ii* was also heard dialectically in old Arabic, as شِدَّةٌ *shidda*, رِدَّةٌ *riidda*, for *shidda, riidda*; سَيْقٌ *sīka*, قَيْلٌ *kīla*; and is found occasionally in the vulgar dialects, as *kīll* for *kull*; 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. سَمِينٌ *sēmīn*, جَلِيلٌ *jīllīl*, مَدِينَةٌ *mēdīneh*, مَبَارَكٌ *mībārāk*, of which the first two are sometimes vocalised *sēmīn, jīllīl*, 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?" أَسْوَدٌ *asūd* for أَسْوَدٌ "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. مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīthab*, مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīthab*, مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīthab*, مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīthab* for مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīthab*, مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīthab*, مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīthab* for مِثْهَبَةٌ *mīthab*; similarly, مُفْسِدَةٌ *mūfīdh* for مُفْسِدَةٌ *mūfīdh*, حُمُصٌ *humṣ* for حُمُصٌ *humṣ*.

Just as *ā* was thus modified into *ä* & *ī*, so did *ā* pass into *ē* and even into *ī*. A word like خَاتَمٌ or غَائِلٌ suffered no change; but the weaker sound in كِتَابٌ *kītāb*, رِكَابٌ *rikāb*, لَاقِنٌ *lāqīn*, underwent a modification into *kīṭeb, rikēb, lēqīn*, and among the Arabs of Africa and Spain into *ī*, so that لِسَانٌ *līsan* and بَابٌ *bāb* became *līstn* and *bīb*. Hence the Spanish names *Faen* and

Caniles are written by the Arabs **قنَالَش** and **جَيَان**. This is also the usual pronunciation in modern Maltese, as **نَاژل**, *naʒl*, **رَمَاد**, *ramād*, **نَاژل**, *naʒl*.

The diphthongs *ay* and *aw* retain their original sound after the guttural and emphatic letters, as **صَيْف** *ṣayf*, **خَوْف** *khauf*. Otherwise they are pronounced almost like *ē* and *ō*; e.g. **سَيْف** *seif* (almost *sēf*), **مَوْت** *mawt* (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 **اَوَّل** *awwal*, **طَيِّب** *ṭaiyib*, **سَيِّد** *seyyed*, **أَيُّو** *aiiwa*. Otherwise they are pronounced *θ* and *ʔ*, as **سَدَا** *sōdā*, **كُوس** *kos*, **خَوْف** *khauf*; **بَيضَاء** *biṣṣā*, **دَيْر** *deir*, **سَيْف** *seif*, **صَيْف** *ṣayf*.

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, *ā ī ū*;
3 long vowels, *ā ī ū*;
2 diphthongs, *ay aw*.

Short *ā* is liable in Hebrew to undergo changes analogous to those which it experiences in Arabic, that is to say to be modified into *ā* (אָ) and *ā* (אַ). Compare, for instance, **שְׁאֵלָתִי** with **שְׁאֵלָתְךָ** and **שְׁאֵלָתֵךְ**; **בְּתִי** with **בְּתִי**; **סֵפִים** with **סֵפִים**; **בְּנֵהְרָה** with **בְּנֵהְרָה**; **מִדְּבַח** with **מִדְּבַח**; **דְּמַעָה** with **דְּמַעָה**; **קְרִיָה** with **קְרִיָה**; **נְחֵמָה** with **נְחֵמָה**; **נְחֵמָה** with **נְחֵמָה**; **מְרַבֵּב** with **מְרַבֵּב**; **מְרַבֵּב** with **מְרַבֵּב** and fem.

נַעֲשֶׂתָהּ with נִגְלָה and fem. נִגְלִיתָהּ; יָד, יָדָה, with יָדְכֶם (יָדְכֶם); דָּם, דָּמָה, with דָּמְכֶם (דָּמְכֶם); דָּבָר, דָּבָרָה, for דָּבָר, דָּבָרָה, from דָּבָר (for *dābār*); רָדָה, רָדָהּ from רָדָה. 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: מְכַזְּבִים, מְכַזְּבִים, etc.; whilst at other times it is the Arabic which exhibits the weakening of the vowel, as Heb. צָדִיק, Arab. صَدِيق; Syr. نَجِيب, Arab. نَجِيب; 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 נָבֵר, נָפֵן and קָרָן, were originally pronounced נָבֵר, נָפֵן and קָרָן, might be inferred from the Arabic forms قَرْنٌ and جَفْنٌ, أَرْضٌ; it is rendered certain by the pausal forms קָרָן, נָפֵן, אֶרֶץ, and by the suffixed forms קָרָנוּ, נָפֵנִי, אֶרְצִי. Besides, we can cite the authority of the LXX., who write Ἀβελ for הָבֵל, Γασλων 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 *i*; as קָבֵר, קָבֵר, קָבֵרִי, Arab. قَبْر; שָׁמֶשׁ, שָׁמֶשׁ, Arab. شَمْس. In all such words the vowel of the 2nd syllable is merely supplementary, and has nothing to do with the original form, but merely lightens the pronunciation of the two final consonants. Again, as to the verbal form Piel, that קִפַּל stands for קָפַל is obvious from the following considerations.

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

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

(3) The *a* of the 2nd syllable is seen in the 2nd pers. sing. **קָטַלְתָּ** and analogous forms, as well as in numerous examples of the 3rd person, e.g. **יָשַׁר**, **חָזַק**, **בָּעֵשׂר**, **גָּדַל**, where the vocalisation depends partly upon the accentuation and partly upon other considerations. Sometimes the *a* of the 2nd syllable is modified into *ɛ*, as in **רָבַר**, **נָפַר**, **נָפַם**; and this weakening, combined with the influence of the *ɛ* in the 1st syllable, has led to the form with *ɛ*, **רָבַר**, **גָּדַל**. In the Hiphil, as we shall afterwards see, the process goes yet a step farther, *a* being changed into *i* by the successive steps *hakʔal*, *hikʔal*, *hikʔel*, *hikʔel*, *hikʔil*.

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

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

An original short *a* or *ɔ* has sometimes been modified in Hebrew into *ɛ*, which may appear in pausal forms as *ɛ*. This remark applies especially to the pronouns of the 2nd and 3rd pers. pl. and to the word **אַתֶּם**. For instance, **אַתֶּם** stands for 'antūm, as is shewn by the Arabic **أَنْتُمْ** and the Syriac **ܐܢܬܘܢ**. Similarly, the suffixes **כֶּם** and **חֶם** were originally *kūm* and *hūm*, as proved by the Arabic **كُمْ** and **هُمْ**, the latter of which becomes in certain cases **هُمْ**. The word **אַתֶּם** stands for **אַתֶּם** *ath*, as shewn by the

from יִרְדָּף ; צַפְרִים from צַפֵּר ; חֲצִי , with suffix חֲצִי , in pause חֲצִי , for hizî . More rarely still a fuller vowel is employed, as in קִרְשִׁים (also קִ) from קִרֵּשׁ , שְׂרָשִׁים from שְׂרָשׁ , אִהְלִים (and אִהָּ) from אִהֵּל . I call your attention to these last forms in particular, as Delitzsch and Baer have recently sought to revive the erroneous pronunciation *kaddāshim* and *shdrāshim*.

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, فُهِج , مُفِن , مُفِن , are weakened in exactly the same way as in Hebrew; but نُعْمَان , نُعْمَان , and صُلهَب follow different rules from נְשִׁמָה and קְטֹנִי .

The heightening or elevation of the three short vowels ä ɛ ɔ 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 heightned into á ; short ɛ into é ; and short ɔ or ø into ó . Bickell, following Olshausen, speaks of this heightening (§ 42, note 1) as being "merely a mechanical strengthening of the vowel through an a , which is placed before it, and which finds its complete analogy in the Indo-Germanic *guna* and the pronunciation of vowels in new high German and modern English¹." I am not quite sure that I understand this explanation; but it is at all events clear that Olshausen² and Bickell regard the heightned vowels á é ó as arising by contraction from $\text{ä} + \text{ä}$, $\text{ä} + \text{i}$, and $\text{ä} + \text{ü}$; 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 fellah says *mīn 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-raṣl*, "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* *ī* *ū*, without the addition of any other element.

Of the three vowels, *ī* and *ū* are almost always heightened in the tone-syllable; as יִקְנֶה for *sākn*, כֹּהֵן for *kāhīn*, יִדְבָּר for *yādābbār*, סִפֵּר for *sīfr*; כָּל for *kāll*, יָקום for *yākūm*, קָדַשׁ for *kādsh*. But *ā* often remains in the tone-syllable; as in דָּבַר, מִשְׁפָּט, נָחַל, בַּיִת, 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, לֵבַשׁ, קָטַל, דָּבַר. *ī* is also often heightened into *ē* in the open syllable before the tone, as לֵבַב for *libāb*, עֵנַב for *ʿēnab*. The second syllable before the tone is less frequently heightened; as in קָטַל and קָטַל, וְקָטַלְתָּ, הֵעֵבַרְתָּ (for הֵעֵבַרְתָּ), 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 *o*. 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 \bar{v} in בָּרַךְ and in יְגִלָּה . In the former instance, however, some confusion of sounds may actually arise. For instance, the plural of בַּיִת is written בַּיִתִּים , which must be read *bátim*, and not *bottim*, as is proved by Jewish tradition, by the accentuation, and by the evidence of the cognate Syriac form ܒܝܬܝܢ *bátin*. If *bottim* had been right, the Syriac form would certainly have been ܒܝܬܝܢ . Another example is afforded by רִזְיָלִי (Isaiah xxiv. 16), which, as I believe, is rightly read by Böttcher *rōzi-lī* (from a noun רִזְיָ), and not *rāzi-lī*.

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

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

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

¹ [The priority of \bar{a} in these cases is not now admitted.]

did *kātala* become קוּטַל (Poel); קוּטַל (participle); חֶמָר, חֶמֶר, etc. Exceptions to this rule are exceedingly rare. פְּתָב, פְּתָב, can scarcely be reckoned a pure Hebrew word; and פְּרָת, פְּרָת, is foreign to both languages [Assyrian *Purāt* (*Burat*), Accadian *Pura-nunu*, "the great river"]. מְעָרָה corresponds to the Arabic مَعْرَاة, but the Syriac form has *pathach*, מְעָרָה, and not מְעָרָה. The most conspicuous of apparent exceptions is that which is presented to us by the perfect of verbs עָע, as קָם, קָם, corresponding to the Arabic قَامَ, قَامَ. Next are adjectives of the form קָפַל, like עָיִל, טָפַח, צָיִד, אָפַר, פָּחַשׁ, עָיִל, טָפַח, צָיִד, אָפַר, if they really correspond to such Arabic words as صَيَّاحٌ, صَيَّاحٌ, طَبَّاحٌ, etc. This identification, however, is, as we shall afterwards see, somewhat doubtful; the Arabic forms just cited find their precise equivalents in such words as سَكَارٌ = جَبَّارٌ, جَبَّارٌ = جَبَّارٌ (in sense سَكَّيرٌ), קָפַל = قَفَّازٌ, יָפַר, and, with a rare retention of the original *pathach* in the first syllable, קָנָא = קָנָא. The Aramaic vowel corresponding to the Arabic *ā* and Hebrew *ō* is the *šēkāfā*, ֲ, pronounced by the eastern Syrians even at the present day *ā*, by the western *a* or *ō*, whence the latter represent it in writing by the Greek *omikron*, ֲ. Compare with the above cited words the Syriac forms ܦܢܘܐ, ܦܢܘܐ, ܦܢܘܐ, ܦܢܘܐ (with dissimilation); ܦܢܘܐ, ܦܢܘܐ. This vowel is sometimes weakened, both in Hebrew and Syriac, into *ū*; e.g. קָשׂוּא, קָשׂוּא, נְקִימוֹת, נְקִימוֹת, קָשׂוּא, קָשׂוּא, from a sing. קָשׂוּא, Arab. قَسَا, قَسَا, Arab. قَسَا, قَسَا, fem. قَسَا, pl. قَسَا; מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים, or מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים, for מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים, מְעוּנִים. As a parallel I may mention

that in some parts of Persia long \bar{a} is pronounced \bar{u} , e.g. $\bar{n}\bar{a}n$ $\bar{n}\bar{u}n$, for $n\bar{a}n$ or $n\bar{a}n$, "bread"; $\bar{b}i\bar{y}\bar{a}$ $\bar{b}i\bar{y}\bar{u}$, 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 *bān*, *stān*, whilst *moon* stands for *mōna*, which was in its turn preceded by a form *māna*. In the Hebrew words just cited you will observe that this weakening depends upon the removal of the tone to the following syllable; but in the Syriac words it seems to be due to the influence of the letter *n*. The Phœnicians appear to have gone beyond the Hebrews in this respect, pronouncing for instance *shūfēt* instead of שׁוּפֵט (*sufes*, $\bar{e}tis$), *rūfēt* for רׁוּפֵא , *shālūsh* (*salus*) for שְׁלֹשׁ , *rūsh* (*rus*) for רֹאשׁ , and in the plur. fem. *alōnūth* for אַלְוֹנוֹת . In a shut syllable such an \bar{u} might even be shortened into \bar{u} , \bar{o} ; thus נְחֻשְׁתִּי and נְחֻשְׁתֶּם from נְחֻשְׁתִּי and נְחֻשְׁתֶּם ; נְחֻשְׁתִּי from נְחֻשְׁתִּי ; נְחֻשְׁתֶּם from נְחֻשְׁתֶּם ; נְחֻשְׁתִּי from נְחֻשְׁתִּי ; נְחֻשְׁתֶּם from נְחֻשְׁתֶּם ; נְחֻשְׁתִּי from נְחֻשְׁתִּי ; נְחֻשְׁתֶּם from נְחֻשְׁתֶּם . 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 $\tau\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\mu\iota$, or the Arabic \bar{a} successively \bar{e} and \bar{i} . Thus the Arabic $\bar{r}\bar{a}s$ first became $\bar{r}\bar{e}s$, which the Hebrews modified into רֹאשׁ , *rōsh*, whilst the Arameans preferred רֵישׁ .

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{e} , this vowel is reheghtened by the accent into \bar{i} . Thus, יִבֵּן = יִבֵּן , but יִבֵּן and יִבֵּן = יִבֵּן .

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

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

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

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

I have already told you that their sound has been weakened in Arabic to that of *ē* and *ō*. Compare in other languages *θαῦμα* and *θῶμα*, *παιδῖον*, vulgar *παιδί*, *plaustrum* and *plostrum*, *causa* and *chosa*; German *Auge* and Dutch *oog*, German *Stein* and Dutch *steen*; etc. In North Africa, however, a further weakening has taken place into *ū* and *ī*. Thus *يَوْمٌ yawm* has gradually become first *yōm* and then *yūm*; *بَيْتٌ bayt*, first *bēt* and then *bīt*.

Now mark the same progression in the other Semitic languages.

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

In Hebrew *ay* and *aw* are of somewhat rare occurrence in a perfectly pure form; for example, ܐܝ, ܐܘ, ܐܝܢ, ܐܘܢ, ܐܝܢܐ, ܐܘܢܐ.

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

At the end of a word י= usually becomes ׀ or ׀. We find סִינֵי, שָׂרֵי, שָׂרֵי, and the like; but far more frequently ׀, as יִבְנֶה, שָׂרָה (in the construct state שָׂרָה), מְרַאָּה, יִגְלֶה, imper. גְּלֶה. The intermediate step is marked by the pronunciation of the LXX., Σιωᾶ, Σάρα, corresponding to the Arabic termination *ay* in مَنِيّ, رَمِيّ, *Minā, ramā*, which some pronounce with the 'imālah, *Minū, ramū*. In other cases, the *ā* element in the diphthong prevailed in Hebrew, and the termination became *ā*, ׀, as in גְּלָה. On these points I shall have more to say when I come to treat of the verbs לָהּ.

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 *ā* is rare: אָן, מֹות; but שָׂוא, like גֵּיא. The same supplementary vowel is found in the termination of the dual, יִם standing for יִם, Arabic *ayn*. At other times the *ā* sound in the diphthong predominates, yielding *ā* instead of *ay*. So מֵאָן, אָנָה, אָן, for אֵין, Arabic *ayn*; עֵינָם for עֵינֵם, רֵתֵין for רֵתֵן; בָּתִּים *bātīm* for בִּיתִים, from בִּית; the suffixed form דְּבָרַי, also written דְּבָרוּ, for דְּבָרַי. You will find a similar substitution of *ā* for *ai* in the older stages of our own language. The Gothic *ai* in *hails*, *hlāibs*, and *aigan*, became in Anglosaxon *hāl*, *hlāf*, and *āgan*, in English *whole*, *loaf* and *own*.

¹ If so, בֵּית follows the form of תוֹרִים, תוֹרֵין; זֵיתִים, זֵיתֵין; אֵילִים, אֵילֵין; לֵילִים, לֵילֵין; not that of שָׂרֵי, שָׂרֵין; עֵיר, עֵירֵין; תֵּשֵׁבִים, תֵּשֵׁבֵין; עֵין, עֵיןֵין, חֵילִים, חֵילֵין. Noeldeke however pronounces the word *bātīm*.

Generally speaking, however, *ay* and *aw* are modified as in vulgar Arabic into *ē* and *ō*, the *ē* being represented by עֵ, and sometimes by עִ, the *ō* by וּ. So in אֵי for אִי (with suffix, אֵי), אֵא for אִא (אֵ, אִ); in segolate nouns צוֹם, שׁוֹר, and in the construct state פִּית, מוֹת; in the Niphal and Hiphil of verbs פִּ, as נוֹלֵד for נוֹלֵד, הוֹלִיד for הוֹלִיד, הִיטֵב for הִיטֵב; and in several forms of verbs לָה, as גְּלִיתָ for גְּלִיתָ, הִגְלִיתָ for הִגְלִיתָ, הִגְלִינָה for הִגְלִינָה. This *ē* is frequently attenuated into *i*, and more rarely *ō* into *ū*. Thus גְּלִיתָ for גְּלִיתָ, גְּלִיתָ, as in the vulgar Arabic of North Africa رَمَيْت *r'mīt* for *r'mīt* (*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, كُفَيْفَاة for *kufaiḥah*, as the diminutive of كُفَّاء *kuffah*, "a basket." As examples of *ō* becoming *ū*, I may mention לוּ for לוּ, Arabic لُو; יוֹכַל for יוֹכַל, imperf. of יָכַל; and נוֹנִי, part. plur. Niphal of יָנָה, for נוֹנִי, נוֹנִי. Here again we find a parallel in the vulgar Arabic forms of the imperfect of verbs يُوَقِّف, يُوَصِّل, يُوَعِّد, for يُوَقِّف, يُوَصِّل.

يُوَعِّد.

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 حُنَّ, حُنَّ; in the construct plural مَكْتَب, where the Bibl. Aramaic, like the Hebrew, has עֵ; in the plural suffixed forms مَكْتَب, مَكْتَب, مَكْتَب (Ch. מַלְכֻדָּי); in the Aphel of verbs פִּ, as אֲמַת, אֲמַת (Ch. אֲמַת, אֲמַת); and in such words as the diminutives חֲמַל and חֲמַל (Ch. עֲרִימָא).

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

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

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

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

In the later Aramaic dialects there is a strong tendency to get rid of the diphthongs. Already in old Syriac we find אַבְּ, with short *ā*, for אַבְּ; חַסְנָא, for *lilyā*, *lilyā*, *lilyā*; and another example of the same kind is חַסְנָא (for חַסְנָא); but the modern Syrian says *ll* for חַסְנָא; *ikā* or *ikā* (חַסְנָא) for חַסְנָא; *ikh* (חַסְנָא) for חַסְנָא and חַסְנָא; and חַסְנָא, חַסְנָא; *bāthwā(th)ā*, "houses," חַסְנָא "our houses"; and even *tykkhūā*

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

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 eloh , Aram. אֱלֹהֵא , Arab. إِلَهِ , זְרוּעַ for zēro , Aram. זְרוּעָא , Arab. زُرْع ; תַּפְּחוֹת for tappūh , Arab. تَفَّاح ; רוּחַ for rūh , רוּחַ , רוּחַ ; מִשְׁלַחַת for mēshallēh , i.e. *mushallth*; רֵעַ for rē , rī . This sound is heard in the spoken Arabic of the present day, in such words as صَاحِب , رِيح , مَمْفُوك , سُطُوح , مَلِيح , but it is not, and never has been, written in this language or in Syriac, where we find only ܠܦܚܘܚܝܢܐ and the like.

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

(3) The auxiliary vowel ֵ , ֶ , ַ , in various nominal and verbal forms, which is very little stronger than no. 2. For example, in segolate nouns: פָּרָא , זָרַע , יָלַד , תָּחַת , נָעַר ; קָרַשׁ , נִצַּח , בֵּית , בַּיִת , פְּעֵל , קָרַשׁ , נִצַּח . The auxiliary is actually wanting in such words as קָרַשׁ , נִצַּח .

Of this supplementary vowel a far wider use is made in Aramaic. Thus in the Targums we find מְרִינְחָא for מְרִינְחָא, מְשִׁירִיחָא for מְשִׁירִיחָא; whilst in Syriac we may say מְרִינְחָא, מְשִׁירִיחָא, מְרִינְחָא and מְשִׁירִיחָא, for מְרִינְחָא, מְשִׁירִיחָא, מְרִינְחָא and מְשִׁירִיחָא; מְרִינְחָא and מְשִׁירִיחָא; מְרִינְחָא and מְשִׁירִיחָא, for מְרִינְחָא, מְשִׁירִיחָא, מְרִינְחָא and מְשִׁירִיחָא. In Mandaitic this insertion is very general, the vowel " being also occasionally employed, as הַיְכֹוּמְתָא and הַיְכֹוּמְתָא (הַיְכֹוּמְתָא, הַיְכֹוּמְתָא); in the conjugation Ethpe'el, the normal form is עַחְיַנְסִיב = עַחְיַב.

(6) Here, too, may find its place the *prothetic vowel*, which is prefixed to a word to facilitate the pronunciation of an initial consonant which has weakened or lost its original vowel. Compare in Greek χθές and ἐχθές, ἀσπαρῶ and σπαρῶ; Spanish *escudo*, *escuela*; French *espère*, *esprit*; Italian *con isciensa*, in *Ispagna*. In ancient Arabic this vowel is usually *ʾ* or *h*, as in the imperative اَفْرُقْ, اَجْلِسْ, اَقْتُلْ; in the verbal conjugations اِنْقَتَلَ, اَقْتَتَلَ, and اَسْتَقْتَلَ; in اِبْنٌ (for بَنِيٌّ), *son*, اِثْنَانٌ, *two*, اِسْمٌ or اِسْمٌ, *name*, etc. In the vulgar dialects examples are far more numerous; e.g. اَتَقَاتَلَ and اَتَقَاتَلَ, for تَقَاتَلَ and تَقَاتَلَ, اَمْبَارَكٌ for مَبَارَكٌ, etc. In Hebrew we find *ʾ*, *ʿ*, as in אָרְוַע for רְוַע, אָצְעָרָה for צְעָרָה, and perhaps a few more, such as אָשְׁפָר, אָתָן, אָחַמְלָא and אָחַמְלָא "measure." In אָשְׁפָר the prothetic *ʾ*, though pronounced by many of the Jews, has not been written. In Aramaic occur both *ʾ* and *h*. Already in Biblical Aramaic we have אָרְכָבָה "knee," in the Palestinian dialect אָרְכָבָה. In Syriac we find אָשְׁפָר for אָשְׁפָר, אָשְׁפָר for

[מַצְוֹת, מַצְוָה] and [מַצְוָה, מַצְוָה] for [מַצְוָה, מַצְוָה] for [מַצְוָה] "street,"
 [מַצְוָה] and [מַצְוָה] for [מַצְוָה] and [מַצְוָה, מַצְוָה] for [מַצְוָה] or [מַצְוָה], etc.
 In [מַצְוָה] the prosthetic vowel has been influenced by the
 original vowel of the ז , as shewn in the Arabic *رَقْعَةٌ*. In the
 later dialects of Aramaic, examples of the prosthetic vowels
 become more and more numerous.

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

מַצְוָה "melons" (מַצְוָה, מַצְוָה), מַצְוָה "blains" or "small
 blisters" (מַצְוָה "bubbles" of water), מַצְוָה "wings" of an
 army, מַצְוָה "fetters," מַצְוָה probably the same as *κάρταλος*,
κάρταλλος, which is also found in Arabic and Syriac; מַצְוָה
 a Persian coin, called by the Greeks *δαρεικός*¹; מַצְוָה "a nut,"

Arab. *جوز*, Syr. *ܐܘܢܐ* probably from the Persian *گوز* *gōz*; in Syriac
 [מַצְוָה] for [מַצְוָה] (Pers. *راز*), where the ז was doubtless once sounded,
drāsā; in later dialects מַצְוָה for מַצְוָה "blood," מַצְוָה "leaf," for
 מַצְוָה; Mand. עַשְׁמִיָּה for עַשְׁמִיָּה "heaven," אַמְמַתָּה for
 אַמְמַתָּה "heights," אַמְמַתָּה "wool," אַמְמַתָּה "dust," for the
 older חַמְמִיָּה and חַמְמִיָּה.

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

¹ [In a Phoenician inscription of 96 B.C., recently found at the Piræus, *דַּרְכַּנְנִים* and *דַּרְכַּנְנִים* seem to stand for *δραχμῶν*.]

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, ל, נ, מ, י and י. We shall notice each of them more particularly as occasion requires in our survey of the pronouns.

A. *The Personal Pronouns.*

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

Of the 1st pers. sing. the fullest form in actual use is the Arabic أنا - *iyā*, which is usually shortened, according to circumstances, into أنا *ya* or أنا *i*, as أنا نفسي , أنا نفسي , أنا نفسي . It is obviously identical with the Ethiopic P: *ya*, in ገርሰገር: *nafsēya*; and with the Assyrian *ya*, in *bit-ya* "my house." This latter,

I am told, becomes *i* and in certain cases *a*, as *biuti* "my daughter," *abiā* (for *abiya*), as well as *abi* and even *aba*, "my father"; with which last compare such Arabic forms as يَا بَنِي *ya'bna* 'amma, يَا رَبَّ *yā rabbā*. The Hebrew form is, as you all know, יְיָ, of which the *yūd*, though written, is no longer pronounced in Syriac: ܘܢܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ, ܘܢܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ. The intermediate step, no doubt, was the shortening of *i* into *ʃ*, which we find sometimes in old Arabic, especially in vocative forms like يَا رَبَّ, which in pause would be pronounced يَا رَبَّ *yā rabb*. The corresponding plural is in Arab. نٰ *nā*, sometimes shortened into *nā*; in Eth. ነ፡ *nā*, in Assyrian *nī* or *nū*, Heb. נִי, Aram. ܢܝ, Syr. ܢܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ, ܘܢܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ, ܘܢܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ. 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. ነ፡ *nī*, Assyrian *nī*, Heb. נִי, Aram. ܢܝ, Syr. ܢܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ *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. كِي *kī*. Identical with these are the Ethiopic ነ፡ *ka*, ነ፡ *kī*, and the Assyrian *ka*, *kī*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are ק and קִי, the latter generally abbreviated into ק. The Aramaic forms are ܩܐ for the masc. and ܩܝ for the fem., but the *yūd* has become silent, ܩܐܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ, ܩܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ; so that these forms are identical with those of the vulgar Arabic, masc. كَ *ak*, or *k*, fem. كِي *ek* or *kī*. The plurals were originally, as in Arabic, masc. كُم *kumū*, shortened into *kum*, fem. كُنَّ *kunna*; Ethiopic ነ፡ *kēmū* and ነ፡ *kēn*; Assyrian *kumū* or *kun*, of which the fem., according to analogy, should be *kina* or *kin*. The Hebrew forms are

כָּךְ for *him*, fem. כָּךְ, but for the latter the fuller כָּנָה or כָּנָה sometimes occurs. The Aramaic forms are כָּן, fem. כָּנָה, but כָּךְ 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. *hā*. The corresponding forms in Ethiopic are ሁ: *hū*, ህ: *hā*. In Hebrew the masc. is הוּ, but also הִי, ḥ, which is nearly identical with the vulgar Arabic *h*, pronounced *u* or *o*, as in *كُتَابٌ*, also written *كُتَاب*. The Hebrew fem. is הִי and הִי. In Aramaic the masc. is הוּ, fem. הִי. 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 ሁጦ: *hómū* and ሁጠ: *hón*. The Hebrew forms are, masc. הֵם and הֵן, or, with final vowel, הֵם; fem. הֵן (rarely הֵן) and הֵן, or, with final vowel, הֵן, הֵן, הֵן. In Aramaic we find הֵן, ḥ, and ḥ, but in the Aramaic of Ezra also הֵם. In contrast with these stand the Assyrian suffixes with initial *ḥ*; sing. masc. *ḥu*, fem. *ḥa*, plur. masc. *ḥunu* or *ḥun*, fem. *ḥina* or *ḥin*. A similar form is found in one of the Himyaritic dialects, where the sing. masc. is written ḥ or ḥ, pl. ḥḥ, whereas in the other we find ḥ and ḥ; and traces of it exist in the modern Mehri, in which according to Maltzan, the sing. masc. is *he*, fem. *es*, plur. masc. *lum*, 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>sīnu, humū</i>	} <i>humā</i>
	„ f. <i>sā, hā</i>	„ f.	<i>sīna, kunna</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 ^اان, ^اان, Hebrew הן, הנה, Syriac ܐܢܝܢ, and Ethiopic አን: in አንክሙ: *en'kīmū*, “en vobis = accipite.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

in Assyrian *anāku* (Haupt, *anakū*), in which the 2nd syllable must surely be long, as the corresponding Hebrew form is אֲנִי, in pause אָנִי. 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 *ānōkku*; 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 ⲁⲛⲟⲕ. The form *āku*, without the prefix *an*, is employed in Assyrian as an enclitic with the force of the substantive verb, e.g. *sarrāku* "I am king," *rabbāku* "I am great," *sikarāku* "I am manly"; thus corresponding to the use of אָנִי for אֲנִי in Syriac.

The corresponding plural form is still more remarkable: Assyrian *antni*, *ntni*, *ntnu* for *anilni*, *anahni*, Heb. אַנְהֵנוּ, Phoen. אַנְחֵנוּ. Here then ה of the singular has interchanged with ח (as in שַׁחַד, מַסְפֵּה, compared with שָׁכַד, חַטָּה compared with אַנְחֵנוּ), and the vowel has been shortened in the shut syllable. The last syllable of the word, נוּ, is probably shortened from נוֹנוּ, the plural form of אֲנִי, which we mentioned above. This plural אַנְחֵנוּ, abbreviated in Hebrew itself into אַנְחֵנוּ, is found, in some shape or other, in nearly all the Semitic dialects. Arabic: نَحْنُ, vulgar نَحْنُ *nehne*, *nehn*, أَحْنَا *ahnā* in Egypt *ihna*. Ethiopic: ከከነ: *nehna*, Tigré *nahna*, Tigrīna *nehnā*. Syriac, with an additional demonstrative *n* at the end, אַנְחֵנוּ, commonly אַנְחֵנוּ, which is shortened in pronunciation into *nan*, as in אַנְחֵנוּ. Also אַנְחֵנוּ, with prosthetic vowel, whence in modern Syriac אַנְחֵנוּ and אַנְחֵנוּ, but also *ākhnōkhun* אַנְחֵנוּ (with a curious assimilation to the pronoun of the 2nd pers. *ākhnōkhun* אַנְחֵנוּ). In Samaritan we also find the form אַנְחֵנוּ, whilst in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac, אַנְחֵנוּ,

and in the modern Syriac of Ma'lūla, ܐܢܗܝ *anah*, the final *n* has vanished. Jewish Aramaic forms are ܐܢܗܝ and ܐܢܗ; 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 ܐܢ and more commonly ܐܢܝ. Likewise in Assyrian, as above mentioned, *antni*, *ntni* or *ntuu*.

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 ܐܢܝ are very far-fetched; that ܐܢܝ can hardly be compounded with a demonstrative particle or interjection, '+(ܐ+ܢ), and ܐܢܝ with two words of that class '+(ܐ+ܢ)+(ܐ+ܢ). In reply I can only point to the history of the pronominal forms in other languages, for instance the Romance. Whence comes the French *ce*? In some cases it appears in the modern language as *cet*, for which the older form is *cest*. But *cest* is identical with the Italian *questo*, which springs from *eccu isto*, i.e. *eccum istum*, i.e. *ecce eum istum*! Even the English *I* is but the last remnant of *ich* or *ik*, *ego*, ܐܓܘ, ܐܓܘܘܢ, 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 *𐤀𐤊 𐤀𐤋* 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 ܐܢܝ, ܐܢܝ, ܐܢܝ, 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 τó.

The oldest form of this pronoun known to us in Semitic is the Arabic أَنْتَ *anta*, with its fem. أَنْتِ *anti*, dual أَنْتُمَا *antumā*, plur. masc. أَنْتُمْ *antumū*, shortened *antum*, and fem. أَنْتُنَّ *antumna*. The dual is found in Arabic only, and has disappeared from its vulgar dialects, in which the forms in use are *enta* or *ent* (Egypt. *inte*), *enti* or *enti* (Egypt. *inty*, *enty*), *entum* or *entū* (Egypt. *intū*). Almost identical with these are the Ethiopic ለነተ: *anta*, *anti*, *antēmū*, *antēn*, which appear in Tigré as *anta*, *anti*, *antūm*, and in Amharic as *anta*, *antyī* or *anty*, plur. *antū*. But in Tigrīña they have been displaced by the compound ነስሳክአ: *nəss'khā*, fem. *nəss'khī*, plur. *nəssātkūm*, *nəssātkēn*, by assimilation for *nəfs'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 אַתְּ, *attē* or *att*, also occurs, Num. xi. 15; Deut. v. 24, and in some other passages in the Kēthibh, e.g. Ps. vi. 4; Job i. 10; Eccles. vii. 22. Its fem. is אַתִּי, which occurs sometimes in the Kēthibh, viz. Judges xvii. 2; 1 Kings xiv. 2; 2 Kings iv. 16, 23, and viii. 1; Jerem. iv. 30; Ezek. xxxvi. 13; but it has been almost supplanted by the shorter אַתְּ, *attē* or *att*, in pause אַתְּ. The plur. masc. is אַתֶּם, with *š* for *š*; the fem. is אַתֶּנָּה, sometimes written אַתֶּנָּה and אַתֶּנָּה; 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, אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם מְצַדְדוֹת, and Isaiah xxxv. 1, אֲשֶׁר מְצַדְדוֹת, for אֲשֶׁר מְצַדְדוֹת).

In Biblical Aramaic and the Targūms we find both the primitive and the assimilated forms, אַנְתָּהּ, אַנְתָּ, אַתָּ, fem. אַתָּ, plur. masc. אַנְתֶּן, אַתֶּן, fem. אַתֶּיךָ, אַתֶּיךָ. In Syriac the *n*, though written, is never pronounced, and the final *t* of the fem. sing. has also been dropped, אַתָּ, אַתָּ, אַתָּ, אַתָּ. The forms of the later dialects are in some cases such as we should naturally expect; e.g. Samaritan אַתָּה or אַתָּ, fem. אַתֶּיךָ, plur. אַתֶּיךָ, אַתֶּיךָ; Palestinian Syriac, אַתָּ, fem. אַתָּ, plur. אַתָּ and אַתָּ, אַתָּ. But in others there are points worthy of remark. For instance, in Mandaitic, instead of *n* and *t* being assimilated, a short *ā* is inserted between them, אַתָּא, plur. אַתָּא. Again, in the vulgar Syriac of Ma'lūla, we find אַח or אַח, with the plur. אַחְכֶּן or אַחְכֶּן, where *t* has been softened into *ty*, *ch*, as in *مدینچا* (مدينچا), *نارچا* (نارچا), *کاجبا* (کاجبا), *حکذا* (حکذا). The modern Nestorian or eastern forms are אַתָּ *at* or אַתֶּיךָ *attin*, the latter with a curious appendage; and not less strange are the plurals אַתָּכֶּן and אַתָּכֶּן, which can only be explained as having arisen under the influence of the 1st pers. אַתָּ or אַתָּ, whilst conversely the form of the 1st person אַתָּכֶּן must have owed its birth to this falsely formed אַתָּכֶּן.

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. *šē*, and the corresponding Syriac אַתָּ, fem. אַתָּ, 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 אַתָּ, fem. אַתָּ. Now some scholars believe that the *aleph* is a mere orthographic sign, like the Arabic *elif* in the 3rd pers. plur.

of the verb, *تَلَّرَا*, which is occasionally found even in Hebrew (*הַהֲלִכְוֹא* Josh. x. 24; *אָנוּא* 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. *וְאִמְרָנָם*) and the sarcophagus of Eshmūn'āzār, king of Sidon (masc. *אָדָם הָאָ* "that man," fem. *הַמְּלֻכָּת הָאָ* "this kingdom"). Had the original sounds been merely *hū* and *hī*, we should have found on such monuments *הוּ* and *הי*. I conclude, therefore, that the words must have sounded originally something like *hū-a* and *hī-a*, with the addition of a demonstrative *a* at the end. This will seem less improbable to you, when you are told that the modern Syrian forms from *וּ* *ū* and *וּ* *ū*, by the addition of *וּ* *ū*, another demonstrative *וּ* *ū* (*וּ* *ū*) *ū* *ū*, "that," "yonder." That Plautus heard the Phoenician word pronounced as *ly* 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 *וּ* *ū* for the fem. gender in Hebrew, because I do not believe in its existence. The distinction of the vowels in *וּ* *ū* and *וּ* *ū*, *sū* and *sī*, is just as primitive and essential as in *anta*, *anti* and *ka*, *ki*. I am aware that *וּ* *ū* takes the place of *וּ* *ū* in various passages of the Pentateuch; but in old Hebrew MSS. *וּ* and *וּ* are very much alike, and the Masorets have done well to regard *וּ* *ū* as nothing but a clerical error, and to substitute for it the correct *וּ* *ū*¹. The same pretended archaism may be found in the famous Babylonian codex of the Prophets published by Strack, e.g.

Hosea ii. 4, *וּ* *ū* (i.e. *וּ* *ū*), Joel iv. 1, *וּ* *ū* (i.e. *וּ* *ū*).

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, *Oud-roock*, 2nd ed. vol. i. (Leyden, 1887), § 16 and n. 7, who rightly refers the origin of the error to the old *scriptio defectiva* *וּ* *ū*, for *וּ* *ū* and *וּ* *ū* alike.]

increment at the end, and in consequence have suffered a slight curtailment at the beginning. The forms in actual use are 𐤒𐤋𐤕 : $wé'ētū$, fem. 𐤒𐤋𐤕 : $ye'ētī$, which have obviously lost an initial $hū$ and $hī$ on account of their having been lengthened by the syllable $tū$ and $tī$. I find the same increment in the Assyrian demonstrative $šuatū$, "this," fem. $šaatī$ or $šātī$ [Del. $šiatī$], and in another form in $šāšū$, fem. $šāšī$, $šāša$, as also in $lagā-šū$ (Del. $agāšu$), 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 $σήμες$; or the nominal terminations $τις$, $τιος$, $τια$, $τυνη$, passed into $σις$, $σιος$, $σια$, $συνη$ ($πέψις$, $πλούσιος$, $γερουσία$, $δικαιοσύνη$). Indeed it seems possible that $tū$ is the oldest form of the pronoun of the 3rd pers. in Semitic, of which $šū$ and $hū$ are successive weakenings.

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

	singular	plural	dual
Assyr. m.	šū	$šūnu$, $šūnu-tu$, $šūnut$	
f.	$šī$	$šīna$	
Arab. m.	هو (vulg. Eg. $hūwā$)	هم هم (Eg. hum and $huma$)	هما
f.	هي (vulg. Eg. $hiyā$)	هن	
Ethi. m.	𐤒𐤋𐤕 : $wé'ētū$	𐤋𐤓𐤏𐤕 : $ēmāntū$ or 𐤒𐤋𐤕𐤓 : $wé'ētómū$	
f.	𐤒𐤋𐤕 : $ye'ētī$	𐤋𐤓𐤏𐤕 : $ēmāntī$ or 𐤒𐤋𐤕𐤓 : $wé'ētōn$	
Heb. m.	הוּ (Ph. הָה)	הֵם, הֵנּוּ	
f.	הִיא (Ph. הָה)	הֵנָּה	
J. Ar. m.	הוּ	הֵמָּה, הֵנּוּ; הֵנּוּ	
f.	הִיא	הֵנָּה	

	singular	plural
Syr. m.	ܐܢܝ	ܐܢܝܢ
	f. ܐܢܝܬ	ܐܢܝܢܝܢ
Talm. m.	אֲנִי	אֲנֵינוּ
	f. אֲנִי	אֲנֵינוּ
Mand. m.	ܗܘ	ܗܝܢܘܢ
	f. ܗܘܐ	ܗܝܢܝܢ

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 ܐܢܝܢ , ܐܢܝܢܝܢ , vulgar Egypt. *hum, huma*, ܗܘܐ , ܗܝܢܘܢ , and ܗܝܢܝܢ , are really identical, the last being strengthened by an additional demonstrative element, as is also the case with ܐܢܝܢܝܢ and ܐܢܝܢܝܢ : The Talmudic forms אֲנִי and אֲנֵינוּ (for אֲנִי and אֲנֵינוּ) 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 ܐܢܝ and ܐܢܝܬ 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 Tigrifña, *uḥssü*, fem. *uḥssä*, plur. masc. *uḥssätöṃ*, fem. *uḥssätön*, for *uḥfsü*, etc.; and in Amharic, እርሱ : *ḥrsü*, fem. እርሷ : *ḥrsēwä*, plur. እርሳቸው : *ḥrsät yaw*, or with a further assimilation እሱ : *ḥssü*, etc., from ርእስ : *r'äs*, "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 הָרֵיָא, fem. הָרֵיָא, plur. הָרֵיָא (for הָרֵיָא). The word is often wrongly pointed הָרֵיָא, הָרֵיָא, whereby it is confounded with the Hebrew הָרֵיָא, הָרֵיָא, which is of a totally different origin, viz. by assimilation for הָרֵיָא. In Mandaitic the same word exists in the singular, הָרֵיָא, הָרֵיָא, without any corresponding plural. In Syriac the second *h* was elided, and the syllables *hā-ā*, *hā-ī*, contracted into *aw*, *hāy* or *hōy*, plur. *hānnūn*, *hānnēn* (for *hā-ān-hūn*, *hā-ān-hēn*). In the Palestinian dialect we also find the singular forms *aw*, *aw*; fem. *aw*, *aw*, but not the plural. In modern Syriac the corresponding words are *aw*, *ay*, often written and pronounced *ò*, *ó*, *ā*, *ā* and *ē*, with the plur. *āni* (from the old fem. *ānī*), shortened into *ān* and *ān*. From this is formed another pronoun by the addition of the particle *ā* at the end, to designate a more remote object; "that," "yonder," viz. *āw* (*āw*), *āw*, fem. *āw*, *āw*. The *n* which we have found in the plurals *hānnūn*, 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. <i>annu</i>	(fem. <i>annat</i>), (<i>annit</i>)
plur. masc. <i>annūtu</i>	fem. <i>annātu</i> , <i>annītu</i> ,

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

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

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

One of the simplest of these pronouns is the Arabic **ذَا**, fem. **أُولَاءَ**, **أُولِي**, plur. **أَلَاءَ** or **أَلِي**, often written *plene* **أُولِي**, **ذِي**, **ذِي**, **ذِي**, plur. **ذِي**, **ذِي**, **ذِي**. The corresponding forms in vulgar Arabic are *dā* or *dā*, fem. *dī*, plur. **دول** *daul* or *dōl*, *dōla*, *dōlī* (which seems to arise from a combination of the singular with the ancient plural). In Ethiopic we have the same word in the form **ዘ**: *zē*, fem. **ዛ**: *zā*, plur. **ለሉ**: *ellā*, fem. **ለሉ**: *ellā*. Its Hebrew equivalent is **זֶה**, fem. **זֹאת**, for *zāt*, shortened into **זֶה** and **זֹה**, plur. **אֵלֵּי** (1 Chron. xx. 8, generally with the art. **אֵלֵּי**), **אֵלֵּי**. The Phoenician forms are, as might be expected, very similar; viz. **ṣ** for both genders (perhaps with a difference of pronunciation, *zē*, *zū*); fem. also **ṣ**, in Plautus *syli*; plur. **ṣ**, in Plautus *ily*. The form **ṣ**, which also occurs in Phoenician, has been regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew **זֶה**; but the article in Phoenician is the same as in Hebrew, and **ṣ** does not take the article in Phoenician even when the preceding substantive is defined (**ṣ** and **ṣ**). I prefer therefore to consider the *aleph* in **ṣ** as merely prosthetic. The very curt form of the word **ṣ** might readily lead to such a vowel being prefixed; and we find some support for this idea in the modern Ethiopic or Tigrifia form **ለዘ**: fem. **ለዛ**:: In the later Hebrew of the Mishnah we have masc. **זֶה**, fem. **זֹה** (*zō* or *zū*), plur. **אֵלֵּי**. 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>ullītu</i> ¹ .

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

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

² [The feminines are not recognised by Delitzsch.]

Phoenician forms are ן and נן; and in certain Aramaic dialects (Egypto-Aram., Nabathcan) these words appear as נןן and נן. An Ethiopic form, with further demonstrative increment, is ዘኒቲ: *sēntū*, fem. ዛቲ: *sātī*, plur. ለኒቲ: *ellōntū*, fem. ለኒቲ: *ellāntū*.

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

dropped, *ā'a* has been contracted into *ā*. Dialectically the forms **אָב, אָב**, are also used, both from **אָב**.

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. **ךְ** or **כְּיָי**, fem. **כְּיָי**, plur. **כְּיָי**, which are formed from **כָּן**, **כָּן** and **כְּיָי**. The Palestinian dialect exhibits the plural in the form **כְּיָי**. By prefixing *hā* we arrive at the Talmudic **כְּיָי**, fem. **כְּיָי**, plur. **כְּיָי** or **כְּיָי**, and the Mandaitic **כְּיָי** (masc. and fem.), plur. **כְּיָי**, which are contractions for **כְּיָי**, **כְּיָי**, and **כְּיָי**. Here too the Syriac varieties **כְּיָי**, fem. **כְּיָי**, find their place; the former of which may perhaps be compounded with a form corresponding to the Mishnaic **כְּיָי**. As for **כְּיָי** (כְּיָי), which is always masc., it is probably not a mere variation of **כְּיָי**, but a different compound, viz. from **כְּיָי** and **כְּיָי**. In Arabic the corresponding pronoun is **ذَاكَ**, fem. **تَاكَ**, **تَيْكَ**, plur. **أُولَئِكَ** or **أُولَئِكَ**. The Arabs have, however, regarded the

suffixed **كَ** as being the pronoun of the 2nd person, and hence, though **ذَاكَ** is commonly used in speaking to two or more persons of both sexes, it is also permitted to use **ذَاكَ** in addressing a woman, **ذَاكَمَا** in speaking to two, and **ذَاكُمْ** or **ذَاكُمْ** in speaking to several, according to their sex. The vulgar forms, at least in North Africa, are **ذاك** *dāk*, fem. **ذيك** *dīk*, plur. **ذوك** *dūk*.

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

the form חִן : *zékî*, fem. לִיִּחִן : *enizékî*, plur. לִחִן : *elizékî*. Here the fem. is remarkable, but we shall speak of it when we come to the simple relative form לִיִּחִן : *enizékî*.

These pronouns again may be heightened by the accession of a fresh demonstrative syllable. Thus in Chaldee we find ܘܢܝܢܐ for both genders, with additional *n*. The Ethiopic presents us with a form with additional *ti*, viz. חִנְתִּי : *zékwtî* or חִנְתִּי : *zékîti*, fem. לִיִּחִתִּי : *entákîti*, plur. לִחִנְתִּי : *elizékwtî* or לִחִנְתִּי : *elizékîti*. The Arabic prefixes *hā* in the form هَٰذَا , fem. هَٰذِکَ , plur. هَٰؤُلَآئِکَ ; which are much used in the vulgar dialects, هَٰذَا *hādāk*, هَٰذِکَ *hādîk*, plur. هَٰؤُلَآئِکَ *hā'ulā'ik*, or in North Africa هَٰذِکَ *hādîk*. From *hādāk* seems to arise, by elision of the *d*, the form هَک *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 هَلِّیْنِکَ , هَلِّکُنَّ , هَلِّکُنَّ , هَلِّکُنَّ . Another strengthened form in old Arabic is ذَٰلِکَ , where the letter *l* has been inserted between ذَا and ک ; its fem. is تَٰلِکَ , by contraction for تَیْکَ . Peculiar to the Mandaitic is the word ܗܢܢܐܢܗܘܐ (masc. and fem.), plur. masc. ܗܢܢܐܢܗܘܐܢ , fem. ܗܢܢܐܢܗܘܐܢܝܢ . Here it seems tolerably clear that we have again the prefixes ܗܢ and ܝܢ , contracted into ܗܢܝܢ , and the suffixes of the 3rd person; but it is not so easy to say what is represented by the letters ܢܐܢ , unless we admit Noeldeke's suggestion that they are identical with ܢܐܢ , the Aramaic form of ܢܐܢ .

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

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

To designate a definite pronominal accusative, especially of a somewhat emphatic kind, we find in the Semitic languages a peculiar word joined with the pronominal suffixes. In Ethiopic this is ገሥ: *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 כּ into ה (of which I gave some examples in a former lecture), we obtain the Arabic dialectic form هيا. From this it is but a step

to the common Arabic ايا *iyā*, which is used precisely like its Ethiopic equivalent, and appears in Tigrifā in the contracted form of ለ: *i*, denoting *self*, as ለደ: *iyē*, ለገ: *ikhā*, ለቶ: *iyū*. In the other Semitic languages this word takes the feminine termination *at* or *t*, probably appended to it in order to bring out more strongly the abstract idea of *hoccitas* (if I may use such a word); and in these languages its range of use is considerably wider than in Arabic and Ethiopic. Hence we get, in the first place, the Phoenician אית, which was doubtless pronounced in the earlier stages of the language *iyāth* or *iyath*; for otherwise the *y* would not have been inserted in writing, as is almost invariably the case in the older inscriptions. In the inscriptions of later date, however, we find אַת, and Plautus heard the word pronounced *yth*. The Aramaic forms seem to be shortened from the Phoen., viz. Syr. ለ, Chald. ית, less correctly ית. These

are used not only as a sign of the definite accus., **כֹּחַ** **כֹּחְךָ**; but also as a substantive, signifying *self*, e. g. **וְכֹחֵךְ אֵתָּה** "he who knows himself," **כֹּחְךָ** "free-will"; and likewise in the Palestinian dialects and in Samaritan to form demonstratives, as in the phrases **בְּיִתָּה יוֹמָא** "on that same day," **בְּיִתָּה שְׁתָּא** "in that same year," **אֵתָּה אֵתָּה** "at that same time," **אֵתָּה אֵתָּה** "that man is a thief," **זֶה הַגֵּיץ לִי יִתְּרוֹן לֹא הַגֵּיץ לִי** "this is of use to me, those are not." In this way we may best explain the Mandaic demonstrative spoken of above, **הַאֲנַתָּה** (masc. and fem.), **הַאֲנַתָּין**, where **אֲתָ** is probably = **אֵתָּה**. Similarly in Hebrew *yāth* was further altered into *āth*, whence, by the usual change of *ā* into *ō*, resulted the common form *ōth*, **אֹת**. In close connection with a following word this *ōth* was shortened into *ōt*, just as from **נְחֹשֶׁת** and **שְׁלֹשֶׁת** we get **נְחֹשֶׁתִי** and **שְׁלֹשֶׁתִי**. Next, *ōt* was changed into *ōth* - **אֹתָ**, as in **אֹתָם** for *attim*; and finally this **אֹתָ** was heightened by the tone into **אֹתָה**. In later Hebrew, perhaps under the influence of the surrounding Aramaic dialects, **אֹתָה** came to be used, like **אֵתָה**, as a demonstrative: **יָשַׁב לוֹ אֹתוֹ**, **בְּאֹתָהּ שָׁעָה**, **בְּאֹתוֹ הַיּוֹם** "that one sat down," **זָכוֹר אֹתוֹ 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"), *siryā attūa* "my family" (ורע), *dināta attūa* "my laws" (דין), *bīta attūnu* "our house," *ša la iptallahū abīya wa attua* "who revere (פּלַח) not my father and me." Schrader also regards as cognate with *yāth* the words *yātī* and *āšī*, in such phrases as *yātī Nabūnahīd šusihanni*, "as for me, Nabunit, save (שִׁיב) thou me"; and again, *ša lā iplahū abūtīya u āšī lā isbatū 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* + *ti* or *šī*, i. e. *ya* for *yath*, *a* suffix of the 1st pers., and a further demonstrative *ti* or *šī*. Sayce, however, gives a differ-

ent explanation of both words, so that we are evidently on unsafe ground. Even the Hebrew אֵת has been explained in a manner different from that which I have just suggested to you, for some scholars have regarded it as a substantive, nearly equivalent in form and meaning to the Arabic ^{سِمَة} اَيْ "sign" or "mark," "form" or "body," thus identifying it with the word אֵת (for אֵת or אֵית), or else assuming a form אֵת or אֵיה, from the construct state of which (אֵית or אֵית) אֵת 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 הַלָּא "away," "beyond," and הַלֵּם "here," "hither." In Hebrew the *l* was assimilated to all following letters; and when the doubling wholly ceased to be audible, the loss of it was compensated by the heightening of the vowel into *ā* ַ, as in הָרֵר, הָעִיר, הָאִישׁ, on which and other modifications of the article see your Hebrew grammars. In Phoenician its form is the same as in Hebrew, but it is not so frequently used as in the latter language, e. g. מִשְׁכַּבּוֹ for מִשְׁכַּב הַזֶּה, הַשְּׁעָר הַזֶּה for הַשְּׁעָר וְ, הָאָדָם for הָאָדָם הַזֶּה, הַמַּמְלָכָה for הַמַּמְלָכָה הַזֶּה.

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* ت ث د ذ ر ز س ش), e. g. اَلْأَنسَانُ, اَلْجَبَلُ, اَلْمَدِينَةُ, but اَلتَّوْرُ (הַתּוֹרָה), (ص ض ط ظ ل ن), (הַיְנֻקָּה) اَلنَّهْرُ, (הַשְּׁמֶשׁ) اَلشَّمْسُ. 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*, אֶשְׁנָה'. Generally speaking, however, the initial *elif* is regarded as so weak in sound that it suffers elision whenever another word precedes, e. g. أَبُو الْمَلِكِ *abu 'l-maliki*, not *abū al-maliki*, فِي النَّاسِ *fi 'n-nāsi*, not *fi an-nāsi*, قَالَتِ الْمَرْأَةُ *kāla 'r-rajulu*, not *kāla ar-rajulu*, كَالَتِ الْمَرْأَةُ *kālati 'l-mar'atu*, not *kālat al-mar'atu*. Indeed it was at times dropped altogether and only the *l* sounded, and this is common at the present day, e. g. *lahmar* "red," *liswid* "black," *lashar*, the "Ashar" 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 גְּבֻרָא, גְּבֻרָא; סְפִינְתָא, סְפִינְתָא. With this we may compare the postpositive *en* and *et* of the Scandinavian tongues, derived from an older *inn* and *it* (e. g. Danish *Mand*, *Manden*; *Hus*, *Huset*), of which we shall have to make mention again hereafter. More to our present purpose, however, is the Hīmyaritic suffixed *n*, e. g. in מוֹנֵן "this monument" or "tablet," שְׁעָרָה | וּבְנָהוּ | בְּנוּ | מִרְתֵּם | דְּקִנְיֵי | אֶלְמָקָה | דְּדִרְן | מוֹנֵן | חֲמֻעָתָת | בֵּן | וְטָבֵן | עֲדָב | שְׁמַהֲעֵלִי | מִשְׁלָמֵן "this stone," מִשְׁלָמֵן | דְּקִנְיֵי | עֲתָתֵר | מִשְׁלָמֵן | מוֹנֵן and מִשְׁלָמֵן are apparently contractions of מוֹנְדָהּ and מִשְׁלָמָהּ, as seems to result from such forms as בֵּין | מַחְפְּרָנִיהֵן | "between these two towers" or "castles," אֲבַעַל | בֵּיתָנָהּ | "the lords of these two houses," בֵּיתָנָהּ "this house of ours" (where the ן is the suffix of the 1st pers. plur.³): Often the demonstrative pronoun דֵּן, fem. דֵּת, is prefixed to such words, as דֵּן מוֹנֵן.

¹ [This statement rests on a misconception: هَادِي السَّهْ stands for هَادِي السَّهْ. Nöld.]

² Other examples are: דֵּן סְטָרֵן, "this inscription"; דֵּן וְתָנ, "this idol"; דֵּן פְּתָח, "this door"; דֵּן מְבָנִין, "this building"; דֵּן צִלְמֵן, "this statue"; דֵּן וְאַבְלָנָהּ, "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 ך of the Biblical Aramaic, shortened in the Targums and in Syriac into ך, ך, ך. One or other of these forms appears in all the Aramaic dialects except the Egyptian and that of some ancient inscriptions, which have ך. The Mandaites say ך as well as ך, and the same form ܘܪ is occasionally found in Samaritan. I need only remark in addition that in Mandaitic ܘ is used in a few cases instead of the common ܘ, as ܘܘܢܝܕ ܘܘܢܘܢ "he who does good," ܘܘܢܝܕ ܘܘܢܘܢܐ "he who does evil" (where ܘܘܢܝܕ = ܘܘܢܝܕ); ܘܘܚܘܢܐ ܘܘܢܘܢܐܘܢ "spirit of our fathers." The word ܘ, 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 ܘ. In modern Syriac ܘ or ܘ is frequently employed for ܘ, as ܘܘܢܝܕ ܘܘܢܘܢܐ (for ܘܘܢܝܕ ܘܘܢܘܢܐ) "the Saviour of the world," ܘܘܢܝܕ ܘܘܢܘܢܐܘܢ (for ܘܘܢܝܕ ܘܘܢܘܢܐܘܢ) "forgiveness of sins," ܘܘܢܝܕ ܘܘܢܘܢܐܘܢܐ (for ܘܘܢܝܕ ܘܘܢܘܢܐܘܢܐ) "the passion of our Lord," *bārit ishū*, i. e. ܘܘܢܝܕ ܘܘܢܘܢܐܘܢܐ, "after Jesus."

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

In Ethiopic we find H: *sd*, with a fem. ܘܘܢܝܕ: *énta*, and a plur. *élla*, all bearing a striking resemblance to the corresponding

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

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

Hence, from a combination of these two words, with the insertion of the demonstrative letter *l* (as in ذَلِكَ), 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 إلي , 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 הַלְלוֹה , shortened into הַלּוֹ , just as الَّذِي is sometimes found in the form الذَّ . הַלּוֹ is used as fem. in 2 Kings iv. 25, הִנֵּה הַלּוֹ , and another form, הַלְלוֹה *hallésh*, also occurs as fem. in Ezekiel xxxvi. 35, $\text{הַאֲרֵץ הַלּוֹ הַנְּשֻׁמָּה}$. This last seems to be weakened from הַלּוֹה , and to exhibit this pronoun in even a purer form than הַלְלוֹה and الَّذِي .

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

The Hebrew word אֲשֶׁר, though familiar to us all, is difficult to analyse. Some, as for instance Fleischer, Mühlau and Sayce, following an older scholar named Tsepregi, regard אֲשֶׁר as the Hebrew representative of the Aramaic אַרְרֵי, אַרְרֵי, "place," in Syriac also "trace," "track," "footstep," as in אַרְרֵי (for *ba-athar*) "after," "behind," Arab. اَثْرٌ and اِثْرٌ, "trace," "track," "footstep," Eth. ለሠር:: 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 אֶשֶׁר: "Modo in tali vocabulo de etymo quaerendum est, אֲשֶׁר pr. *rectum* valuisse conjecerim ab אֶשֶׁר *rectus* fuit, deinde *recte, ita*, i. q. אֶן et Germ. *so*, idque in antiquiore lingua in pron. relat. abiisse. Cf. אֶת *ita*, et relativum אֶי, 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 אֶשֶׁל, and is compounded of two demonstratives, אֶש = ת, ר, ז and אֶל, plus the prosthetic אֶ. Finally, Friedrich Böttcher looks upon אֲשֶׁר as standing for אֶשֶׁל, and as made up of a merely prosthetic אֶ, and a word אֶשֶׁל, which he regards as an older form of the article אֶל (just as *su* seemed to be an older form of אֶת, or the verbal conj. אֶשֶׁל = אֶשֶׁל, אֶשֶׁל). As the matter at present stands, we have to choose, I think, between Fleischer's view on the one hand, and Ewald's or Böttcher's on the other; and, on the whole, I incline to the latter, in so far as I would seek the origin of the relative pronoun somewhere in the region of the demonstratives. For the

interchange of ל and ר, even in this region, compare the Syriac ܠܗܢܐ, "here," with the Chaldee ܠܗܢܐ. In Hebrew the longest form of the word is ܠܗܢܐ, but there are several shorter forms, without ܠ and usually with assimilation of the final ܠ or ܠ to the following letter; viz. ܠ, ܠ, ܠ, but also ܠ (in ܠܗܢܐ, Eccles. iii. 18, and according to one reading in ܠܗܢܐ for ܠܗܢܐ, Eccles. ii. 22). In Phoenician the word is written ܠܗܢܐ, but that the ܠ 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. ܠܗܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ. More frequent, however, are the shorter forms *as*, *es*, *ys*, *is*, and also *si*, *su*, which last correspond to the Hebrew ܠ; e. g. in the Poenulus, *assamar binam*, ܠܗܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ "what he says is friendly"; *ys siddobrim*, *thyfel yth chyl ys chon them liful*, i. e. (probably), ܠܗܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ, in Latin *eum fecisse aiunt, sibi quod faciundum fuit*; or, to quote another line, *yth alonim valonuth sicorathi simacom syth*, i. e. ܠܗܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ.

The use of the relative as a conjunction, and as a sign of the genitive relation between two substantives, belongs rather to the department of Syntax than of Etymology. These phenomena need cause you no surprise, if you reflect, on the one hand, that the Greek particle *ὅς* is only a case of the relative pronoun *ὅς*; and, on the other, that the Persian *izāfat* or connective vowel *i* in such constructions as ܠܗܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ *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 ܠܗܢܐ, fem. ܠܗܢܐ, plur. ܠܗܢܐ, combined with suffixes as follows: *zī d-ga*, *zī d-ka*, *zī a-hī*, *zī d-na*, *zī a-kēmū*, *zī a-hómū*, etc. Here we may perhaps discern the relative ܠ; *za*, in combination with the pronoun *kīyā*, or rather its Arabic form *iyā*, of which I

spoke in a former lecture. In Aramaic we meet with two forms, דִּי and דִּיל . The former is found in the Talmūd, e. g. $\text{אֲנִן בְּדִידָן וְאִינְהוּ בְּדִידְהוּ}$ "we (occupy ourselves) with our affairs, and they with theirs." This arises, as Luzzatto has suggested, from a combination of דִּי with יַד , "hand." It also occurs in modern Syriac in the forms ܕܝܝܝ , ܕܝܝܟܝ , ܕܝܝܢ , *dīyī*, *dīyukh*, *dīyan*, etc., with elision of the *d* between two vowels. The other form דִּיל , i. e. דִּי plus the prep. לְ , is found in Biblical Aramaic, e. g. Dan. ii. 20— $\text{דִּי הִכְמַתָּא וְגַבְרִתָּא דִּילָהּ דִּיא}$; and prevails in the Targūms and in Syriac¹. The equivalent שָׁל , from אֲשֶׁר לְ , occurs in later Hebrew, as well as in Phoenician. Already in Jonah i. 7 we read בְּשָׁלְמִי "for whose cause?" and in ver. 12, בְּשָׁלִי "for my sake"; and similarly in the Poenulus *ulic silli*, רוֹלְךְ שָׁלִי , "my guest" (lit. "wanderer"); *amma silli*, אִמָּא שָׁלִי , "my mother"; *bene silli*, בְּנֵי שָׁלִי , "my son." A fuller form seems to occur on a Tyrian signet ring, viz. $\text{לְבַעֲלִיתֶן אִשׁ יֵאלֵם אֲשַׁלְמֶלְקָתָּ רַצַּף}$ "(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 أَيُّ *ayy*, fem. أَيَّةٌ *ayyah*, fully inflected, meaning "who, which, what?" It governs a genitive, as أَيُّ أَرْضٍ or أَيَّةُ أَرْضٍ , "which land?" $\text{أَيُّ الرَّجُلَيْنِ}$ "which of the two men?" أَيُّهُمَا "which of them?" أَيُّ الرِّجَالِ

¹ Compare the African الذي ل = ذِيَال .

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

This word seems to me to have its ultimate source in the interrogative particle ^fא, Heb. אֵ. It is found in Ethiopic too in the sing. **ለይ**: *ay*, plur. **ለዖት**: *ayyāt*, for both genders; and in the modern Tigrīña it appears as **ለይን**: **ለዖን**: **ለዖን**: **ለዖን**: or **ለዖን**:, which are probably compounds of **ለይ**: and the Ethiopic interrogative ኑ:: In the other Semitic languages this word has more of an adverbial force, being prefixed to other words to convert them into interrogatives, and entering into the composition of a great many interrogative adverbs. In Hebrew, for example, it appears as **אֵ** (^fע for *ay*) in **הֵן אֵ**, "who, which?" **הֵן אֵ** "from which?" **מֵן אֵ** "wherefore, why?" But also as an independent word in the sense of "where?" with pronom. suffixes, **הֵן אֵ**, **יֵן אֵ**, **מֵן אֵ**; and in a longer form without suffix, **הֵן אֵ**. Of compound words the most ordinary examples are:

אֵן (for **הֵן אֵ**, Arabic ^{أين} أين) "where?" contracted **אֵן**, and as an accusative **הֵן אֵ** "whither?" **אֵן**, **הֵן אֵ**, and **הֵן אֵ**, "how?" **הֵן אֵ** "where? how?" Similar formations in Ethiopic are **ለይ**: "where?" and, with a shortening of **ለይ**: into **ለ**: **ይ**, **ለ**: **ይ**: *əfə*, "how? how!" reduplicated **ለ**: **ይ**: *əfəfə*, **ለ**: **ይ**: *əfəfə*, or **ለ**: **ይ**: *əfəfə*; and **ለ**: **ይ**: **ለ**: **ይ**: "how much? how many?" from **ለ**: **ይ**: *səfə*, which is properly a noun meaning "number," "quantity." In Aramaic we have two forms of this word, for just as the Arabic ^fأ is in Hebrew אֵ, so in Aramaic we find both **אֵ** and **אֵ**. The latter, **אֵ**, is the ordinary form in the Talmūd Bāblī and in the Syriac dialect of Palestine. For instance, in the Talmūd, **אֵן** **אֵ** or **אֵן** **אֵ**, fem. **אֵן** **אֵ** or **אֵן** **אֵ** "who?" "which?"; in Palestinian Syriac likewise **ܐܝܢ**, fem.

ā, "why?" In Egypt, *ənḥī*, *ənḥī*, *ənḥīm*, as *min ḥnḥī gīns*, "of what kind," but separately *ənḥī*, *ənḥī*, *ənḥīm*, "who?" "which?", where *ən* is probably for *ən* =

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

Tanwin, ^fمن أي هو, and so forth.]

וּסְמָן. Further, in the Talmūd, הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ or הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ "who," "which,"
 "what is—?" for הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ; הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ "how?" הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ "where?" אַהֲיִיא
 "in respect of which?" "in reference to which?" for עַל־דְּהִיא;
 לְהִיא "to which?" "whither?" for לְהִיא. In the Aramaic of the
 Targūms both forms occur; הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ and הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ "how?" הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ and
 הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ, fem. הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ and הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ, "who, which?" הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ and
 הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ, "where?" הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ and הַיִּי דְנָנּוּ, "how?" In Syriac we have only
 the forms with *aleph*, but in great abundance; for instance:
 אֲכַח (*akḥ*) "how," "as," with its derivatives אֲכַח "as," "like,"
 אֲכַח "together," "at once," אֲכַח "as one who," "as if,"
 אֲכַח, "as"; further, אֲכַח "where?" from אֲכַח "here"; אֲכַח,
 אֲכַח, "how?" for אֲכַח and אֲכַח; אֲכַח "whence?" for
 אֲכַח, "absc." for אֲכַח, "who?" with its fem. אֲכַח, and plur.
 אֲכַח for אֲכַח; and finally, with a shortening of אֲכַח into אֲכַח,
 אֲכַח "when?" in the Targūms אֲכַח and אֲכַח, from the
 Heb. מִתִּי, Arab. مَتِي. In modern Syriac there are similar
 forms, though of course more or less corrupted. Such are:
 אֲכַח or אֲכַח *ikā* or אֲכַח *ikā*, "where?" אֲכַח *edānā*, for אֲכַח,
 "when?" *iminē* or *immē*, "which of them?" אֲכַח or אֲכַח,
 in Talmudic אֲכַח; further, אֲכַח "who?" from אֲכַח and
 אֲכַח, with another form אֲכַח *imī*, which is, strictly speaking,
 derived from the old plural אֲכַח. In Mandaitic the same
 interrogative exists in אֲכַח *m'ud*, "whence?" which is also a
 Talmudic form, for אֲכַח or אֲכַח, i.e. מִן אֲכַח; אֲכַח *minnē lākḥ*,
 in the Talmud אֲכַח לך, *undenam tibi?* Also in אֲכַח or אֲכַח, *lē*,
 for אֲכַח, "whither?" אֲכַח *millē*, "whence?" אֲכַח or אֲכַח,
 "when?" אֲכַח and אֲכַח or אֲכַח, "where?" from אֲכַח,
 אֲכַח, אֲכַח, with suffix אֲכַח "where is—?" in which form the real inter-
 rogative has wholly disappeared, just as in the modern Syriac

כַּלְּ "where is he?" from אִכָּ "where?" Here too I should mention the Mandaic forms דַּאֲמַנִּיא and דַּאֲמַנּוּ, probably standing for דַּאֲמַנִּיא מְנַה and דַּאֲמַנּוּ מְנַה, e.g. דַּאֲמַנִּיא תִּדְהִילְפֹן "in which will ye cross over?" כּוֹרְסִיא דִּלִּיא דַּאֲמַנּוּ הוּ "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; ሙ: *mānū*, acc. ሙ: *māna*, "who?" and ሙት: *mēnt*, acc. ሙት: *mēnta*, "what?" The Himyar. form is also ሙ, but more usually ሙ, with the substitution of ሙ for ሙ. 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 *manuu* or *manu* and *man*, which last is identical with the Aramaic ሙ, ሙ. Hence arise in the Aramaic dialects, by the addition of the pronoun *hū*, such forms as Syriac مَنْه; Talmudic ሙ, fem. ሙ, for ሙ, ሙ; Mandaic ሙ; modern Syriac ሙ, ሙ, ሙ, 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 ሙ: "who?" and ሙት: *mēntāy*, rarely ሙት: and ሙት: "what?" This latter is compounded of ሙት: and the other interrogative ሙ: In Amharic the commonest forms are ሙ: "who?" and ሙ: "what," shortened from ሙት::

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

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

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

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

tracted in Mandaitic into **ܡܐ** in the word **ܡܐܢ** "why?" i.e. **ܡܐܢ** **ܥܠ** **ܡܐܢ** = **ܥܠ** **ܡܐܢ**. By adding **ܕܝܢ** to **ܡܐ** there arises in Talmudic the word **ܡܐ** "what?" in composition **ܡܐܢܐ** "wherefore?" "why?" = **ܥܠ** **ܡܐܢܐ**. In ancient Syriac the same combination of **ܡܐ** with **ܢܦܩ** and **ܕܝܢ** finally resulted in the contracted forms **ܡܢܐ** and **ܡܢ**, the latter of which was farther weakened into **ܡܢܐ**. Hence in combination with **ܩܕܝܫܐ** arose the form **ܡܢܐ** "what is it?" = **ܡܢܐ**. In modern Syriac this same *mā-dīn* has been contracted into **ܡܢܐ**, with a rather unusual weakening of the vowel in this dialect; and this is farther shortened into **ܡܢܐ**, **ܡܢܐ**, and even **ܡܢܐ**, as in **ܡܢܐ** "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 **مَا** **عَلَيْ** **مَا**, **مَا** **عَلَيْ** **مَا**, for **مَا** **عَلَيْ** **مَا**, for **مَا** **عَلَيْ** **مَا**. These last two words are still further abbreviated in poetry into **مَا** and **مَا**, which shows us the origin of the word **مَا** "how much?" standing for **مَا** or **مَا**. Syriac **ܡܐܢܐ**, Hebrew **מַה**. In Ethiopic this abbreviated *mā* is frequently appended to other interrogatives, with somewhat the same force as the Latin *nam*; e.g. **ላኒተ**: (*mānū-mā*) **ላኒተ**: "who art thou, pray?" **ላኒተ**: *mēnt-nū-mā*, **ላኒተ**: *ayīē-mā*, **ላኒተ**: *īfō-mā*, **ላኒተ**: *mā'zē-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*, *mannū-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 ጠ: *mī*. Similar words may be found in the modern dialects of Abyssinia. For instance, Tigrīña has ጠጠጠ: or ጠጠጠ: "whoever," "any one"; and in Amharic there occurs ጠጠጠ:, with the neuters ጠጠጠ: and ጠጠጠጠጠ:.

The indefinite *mā* is often attached in Arabic as an enclitic to another word, to give it a certain vagueness, as قَلِيلٌ مَّا "a small quantity"; اَعْطِنِي كِتَابًا مَّا "give me some book or other." At other times it conveys something of an intensifying force, as جِئْتَ لِمْرٍ مَّا "thou art come for some matter" (of importance); whence أَيُّ نَفْسٍ مَّا is often nearly equivalent to أَيُّ نَفْسٍ "what a youth!" "what a man!" Hence we obtain an easy explanation of such a word as the Chaldee ܡܕܝܥܘܡ "something," which is in reality a contraction of ܡܕܝܥܘܡܐ "scibile quid." All the other forms of this word are only more or less corrupted; e.g. Chald. ܡܕܝܥܘܡܐ (like ܡܕܝܥܘܡ for ܡܕܝܥܘܡ), Mand. ܡܝܢܪܐܢ, Syr. ܡܕܝܥܘܡܐ, Talmud. ܡܝܕܝܥܘܡܐ, modern Syriac ܡܝܕܝܥܘܡܐ. 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 ܡܕܝܥܘܡܐ, and in modern Syriac ܡܝܕܝܥܘܡܐ, whilst the Mandaic forms a new substantive ܡܝܢܪܐܢ, "a thing," plur. ܡܝܢܪܐܢܐ.

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

بِمَا رَحْمَةٍ مِنَ اللَّهِ "after a little," עֵמָּא קְלִיל "by God's mercy." The same is the case in Hebrew, only that מָה has in this case been modified into מוּ. Hence בְּמוֹשֶׁלָּךְ, Job ix. 30, *kērē*; בְּמוֹאפֶל, Ps. xi. 2; לְמוֹחֲרָב, Job xxvii. 14; and בְּמוֹאבֹן, Exod. xv. 5. So also before pronominal suffixes בְּמוֹנִי, בְּמוֹךְ, בְּמוֹרִי. Here the Ethiopic at once shows the old form in its *ḥ*: *kāma*, "as," "like," but with suffixes *ḥ* *ṣ* *ṣ*: *kamā-ya*, *kamā-ka*, *kamā-ḥī*, *kamā-ḥōmī*. 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 מוֹדְלָא and מוֹלָא, the former of which is certainly a mere error. מוֹלָא seems to me to be identical with the Arabic مَال, which is in reality a compound of مَا "what" and لِ "to," literally, "what belongs to one." In מוֹדְלָא the compound has been strengthened by the relative ד; that is to say מוֹדְלִי "my property," or מוֹדְלֵיה "his property," is really מוּ + ד + לִ, literally "that which is to me" or "to him."

E. *The Reflexive Pronouns.*

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

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

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

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

In other cases still, where it was positively necessary to make a distinction, recourse was had to a compound pronoun, such as $\eta\rho\iota\iota$, $\eta\mu\iota\iota$, $\sigma\upsilon\iota\iota$; 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. $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\mu\iota$ "my soul," for "myself."

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

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

or ብዓል: "lord, master," as ባዕለይ: ርእሱ: "I myself have seen," እኔህ: እኔ: ብዓለይ: ለይ: "behold, it is I myself." More rare is the use of ብዓልቤት: "master of the house," e.g. ወድረዓ: ብዓልቤታ: ተረረ: "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 ለህ: "flesh," "body." From ነፍሷ: are formed, as I said before, the personal pronouns ነከክ: *nessē-khā*, "thou," and ነሱ: *nessū* "he," as well as the reduplicated ነከክ: "one another," as ተባህሉ: ነከክተዎ: "they spoke to one another," or "among themselves." The word ብሔት: *solitudo*, is also used in the sense of *self*, apparently for any case; and similarly ሰብኝት: "humanity"; though these two may perhaps be restricted to the third person. In Amharic nearly the same words occur in their appropriate dialectic forms, viz. ባለቤት:, ራስ:, ነፍስ: and ሰውኝት:: From ራስ: has been derived the pronoun of the 3rd person, እርሱ:, farther contracted into እሱ: *essū*.

In Assyrian the common reflexive is *rāman*, which seems to stand for *rahman*, just as *ruk* for *rahuk*, קֹרַח. It is therefore equivalent to the Heb. קֹרַח, or rather קֹרַח, τὰ σπλάγχνα, and forms with suffixes *rāmaniya*, *rāmanika*, *ramanišu*, etc. One might have imagined this, after the analogy of the Hebrew, to be a plural in *ān*, against which the form *ramanišu*, with double *n*, would perhaps not have militated; but the form *ramnišu* 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 שֶׁנֶּפֶשׁ, though פְּנֵי, "face, presence," is also employed, e.g. Exod. xxxiii. 14, פְּנֵי יְלֹכֹו, 2 Sam. xvii. 11. עֶצְמוֹ, "bone," is used in the Bible in speaking of things only, as הָעֶצְמוֹת הַשֵּׁמַיִם, עֶצְמוֹת הָאָרֶץ; but in later Hebrew it is applied to persons, עֶצְמוֹתִי "for myself"; as are also הָעֶצְמוֹת "bone" and הַגִּבּוֹר "body," with which last you may compare the old German phrases *min lip*, *din lip*, for *ich* and *du*.

Among the Aramaic dialects there is some variety of usage.

In the Targūms נשׁ is common; in later writings נרם, which we also find in Samaritan and in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac. In Syriac נשׁ and נשׁ are the dominant words, נשׁ being very rare. In Mandaitic נשׁ is used; whilst נשׁ is found in Samaritan, in the forms קנום and קלום, and may possibly also occur in Phoenician¹. I regret my inability as yet to give any satisfactory etymology of this word. Modern Syriac still makes use of נשׁ *nōshā*, but far more frequently employs the word נשׁ which is merely the Persian جان *jān*, "soul"; as נשׁ כשׁ אשׁב נשׁ "who was making my way bitter to me," נשׁ "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 Gött. 1889) p. 37.]

CHAPTER VII.

THE NOUN.

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

I. *Gender.*

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

a former lecture, a corruption of *mant*, which is actually the fem. of מֵן, מִן, מֵן.

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

In this simple form of affixed *t* the fem. termination is rare in Arabic, as بְּנֵת "daughter," أُخْتُ "sister"; but common in Ethiopic, especially in adjectives and participles, as ለህቅ: *lähik*, "old," ለህቅት: *lähikēt*; ፍቅር: *fekür*, "beloved," ፍቅርት: *fikért*; ጸደቅ: *šaddék*, "just," ጸደቅት: *šaddékēt*; ጠየተጠየር: *mastamhêr*, "asking mercy," ጠየተጠየርት: *mastamhêrt*. We find it, however, in substantives too, as ነገሥ: *nəgūs*, "king," ነገሥት: *nəgést*, "queen"; ለንስት: *anést*, "woman"; ወለት: *waldtt*, "daughter," for ወለድት: In Hebrew the simple *t* is found in some cases where the masc. ends in a single consonant, as יִלְדָּת "bearing," Gen. xvi. 11, Judges xiii. 5, 7; לֵת "to bear," for לִידָת, 1 Sam. iv. 19; אַחַת "one," for אַחֲרָת; but more commonly a short supplementary vowel is inserted between the last two letters, resulting in the vocalisation \bar{v} , or, if there be a guttural at the end of the word, \bar{v} , and the like; thus, הַחֲמַת, לִדְת, יִלְדָּת, הַחֲמַת for הַחֲמַת, מְשַׁעֲנַת for מְשַׁעֲנַת, מִדְּעַת for מִדְּעַת, נְחֻשַׁת for נְחֻשַׁת or נְחֻשַׁת, מְאַבְּלָת for מְאַבְּלָת or מְאַבְּלָת.

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

⁵⁶جَدَّة "grandmother"; عَظِيمٌ "great," قَاتِلٌ "killing," تَانَّةٌ. In Ethiopic it is less frequent than *t*, though by no means uncommon; e.g. ርደት: "descent," ሰፍት: "garlic" (ሰፍ, ስፍ, ቦፍ), የቀት: "she-camel" (ሳንቴ), በረከት: *bardkat* "blessing" (ቦርካ, የቦርካ), ስጦት: "sin" (ሰጦት), ጭንቅት: "tent" (ጭንቅ, ጭንቅ). In Hebrew this termination is rare in the simple form of nouns; as examples take בְּרִיקָה (a precious stone), צַרְפַּת, דְּבַרְת, אֵילָת, גְּבַעַת, נְשֻׁמֹת, מַחְלָת (places), נְשֻׁמֹת, מַחְלָת (women); also with *kāmes*, הַקָּמָת "the pelican," בְּעֵלָת (a place), פֶּרֶת (Gen. xlix. 22), חַמָּאָת "sin," מְנָת for *manayat*, "portion"; also אַחֻוֹת, חַמּוֹת, for *ahawat*, *hamawat*. But we find it everywhere in the so-called construct state, and also before the pronominal suffixes, as נַחְלָתִי, נַחְלָת.

Now observe the history of these forms, from which you will perceive the absurdity of saying that the fem. termination in Hebrew is הַ, and that it becomes תַּ in the construct state. The reverse is the fact. The original form is the תַּ of the construct, and it becomes הַ. The Ethiopic presents us with the original form *t* or *at*. The Hebrew retained this termination in the construct state, before pronominal suffixes, and in a few other cases. But in the simple form of the noun the aspirated תַּ passed into aspirated הַ, and finally, when this *h* was dropped, nothing remained but the vowel, which was heightened in the open syllable into *ā*, הַ, as נַחְלָה¹. So also in Arabic; the original *t* is retained in أُخْتٌ, بِنْتُ, and in the Ḳor'ān in a few other words, e.g. Sūra xi. 76, رَحِمَتْ اللَّهَ; as also before suffixes, رَحِمْتَنِي, رَحِمْتَهُ. The next step was to the aspirated *h*, which

¹ Cf. what has been said above, p. 124, of the pronoun מֵ, מִן, מִן.

form is used by the Arabic poets in rhyme, as, for example, when ^{عذلة} العذلة (for ^{عذلة} العذلة) is rhymed with ^{ابله} ابله (for ^{ابله} ابله) and with ^{وله} وله (for ^{وله} وله); or ^{السلامة} السلامة (for ^{السلامة} السلامة) with ^{امامة} امامة (for ^{امامة} امامة). The last step is to drop the *h*, as is done in the vulgar pronunciation, ^{الرحمة} الرحمة, ^{السلامة} السلامة, ^{العذلة} العذلة. The spelling with the dotted *t* is merely a compromise of the grammarians between the old ^ت ت and the vulgar ^ه ه; if I write ^{سنة} سنة, I indicate at once the old pronunciation ^{سنت} سنت, ^{سنت} سنت, and the more recent ^{سنة} سنة, ^{سنة} سنة. If you ask for analogies in other languages for such changes as this of *at* into *ath*, then into *ah*, and finally into *d*, ^{ah} ah, 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. *civitatelem*). So also in French, in the verb, *il aime*, from *ille amât* (for *amavit*), but interrogatively *aime-t-il?* from *amât ille?* Indeed aspirated letters, in all positions, are apt to disappear entirely or else to leave no trace behind them save the mere aspiration. Compare the Talmudic ^{אהרן} אהרן for ^{אהרן} אהרן, and the modern Syriac ^{אוסין} אוסין for ^{אוסין} אוסין; 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," *nākat* "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, (אִמִּי אִמְעֵשְׁתָּרְת פְּהִינַת עֵשְׁתָּרְת רִבְתָּן הַמְּלִכָּת, or again וְשִׁכְבְּ אֲנִי בְּחַלְתָּן. We find however traces of a younger form in א θ, corresponding to the Hebrew הַ, very rarely in inscriptions, more frequently in the words handed down to us by classical authors; e. g. *κιννάμω*, Heb. קִנְדָּה, "cassia" or "cinnamon"; *nesso*, Heb. נֶצֶד, "flower"; *Dido*, either for נְדִידָה, according to the explanation of the *Etymol. Magnum* *πλανήτις*, or for יִרְדָּה; *Karqhedōn*, *Carthago*, corruption of קרת חרשא. 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: ܟܝܢܐ, ܕܝܢܐ, ܢܝܢܐ, ܫܝܢܐ.

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

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

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

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

כַּדְלָלַת: *kadlat*, and the Syriac ܟܕܠܬܗ *kaldith*, but also by the following evidence derived from Hebrew itself. (1) The form with final *t* is actually found in Deut. xxxii. 36, אֲזַלְתָּ יָדְךָ (for אֲזַלְתָּ), Ezek. xlvi. 17, וְשָׁבַתְּ; possibly too Isaiah xxiii. 15, וְנִשְׁבַּחְתָּ צִדְדֵךָ (for וְנִשְׁבַּחְתָּ); as also in the whole class of verbs so-called, e.g. עָשַׂתָּ for עָשִׂיתָ, הִרְצַתָּ for הִרְצִיתָ, הִגְלַתָּ for הִגְלִיתָ. This is exactly the Arabic جَلَّتْ, by contraction for جَلَّتْ; and the uncontracted جَلَّتْ is actually found once in Hebrew in the pausal חָסִיָּה נִפְשִׁי, Ps. lvii. 2, whereas the ordinary pausal form is עֲשָׂתָּה. The ordinary non-pausal form עֲשָׂתָּה, גִּלְתָּה, etc., is a secondary formation, in which the fem. suffix is repeated in the form הַ, thus aiming at uniformity with the ordinary קִטְלָה. (2) The form with final *t* invariably occurs in connexion with pronominal suffixes; e.g. יִלְדְתִנִּי; or with assimilation יִלְדְתִנִּי, בָּאֲתִנִּי; אֲחֻזְתִּי, גִּמְלֹתֶיךָ, גִּנְבֹתֶם, אֲכַלְתֶּם; אֲהַבְתֶּךָ, רֵאֲתֶךָ.

The feminine termination הַ is occasionally written in Hebrew with א in place of ה, according to the usual practice in Aramaic; e.g. הִנָּא Isaiah xix. 17, קִרְחָא Ezek. xxvii. 31, שִׁנָּא Ps. cxxvii. 2, מִפְּרָא 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 ו, as in the noun הַוּוּרָה for הַוּוּרָה, Isaiah lix. 5, and in the verb לָנָה for לָנָה, Zechar. v. 4.

Besides the feminine termination in ت - or ت -, 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} šrī "good news," \bar{h} mī "a fever," \bar{d} ʿwī "a claim," \bar{r} ūyā "a vision"; of the latter, \bar{s} akrā "a desert," \bar{b} īdā "glory, pride." The one, viz. \bar{a} , forms the feminine of adjectives ending in $\bar{a}n$, as \bar{s} abān "sated, not hungry," f. \bar{s} abī; and of the form $\bar{a}fʿl$ used as a superlative, e. g. \bar{a} ṣṣṣr "the smallest," f. \bar{a} ṣṣṣrī. The other, $\bar{a}u$, forms the feminine of $\bar{a}fʿl$, when it is not a comparative or superlative, as \bar{a} ḥmā "red," \bar{a} ḥmā; \bar{a} ḥmā "foolish," \bar{a} ḥmā. These terminations seem to find their representatives in Ethiopic in nouns ending in \bar{a} , as \bar{h} lā: "building," \bar{d} lā: "joy," \bar{s} lā: "oath," \bar{o} lā: "wrong," \bar{s} lā: "temptation," \bar{g} lā: or \bar{q} lā: "toil," \bar{r} lā: "order, row"; and in \bar{z} , as \bar{w} lā: "beam, mast," \bar{h} lā: "army," \bar{q} lā: "moth," \bar{z} lā: "time," \bar{o} lā: "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 $\bar{a}i$ is represented in Syriac by the form $\bar{a}i$, as in \bar{h} lā, \bar{d} lā, \bar{s} lā, \bar{o} lā, 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} lā, of which the later form is \bar{s} lā, and the numeral \bar{e} lā, in the compounds \bar{a} ḥt \bar{e} lā, etc., which may stand for an original \bar{e} lā. Of the other ending $\bar{a}u$ I can find at present no certain trace in Aramaic and Hebrew, for Hebrew words in \bar{u} or \bar{u} , mostly proper names, seem, without exception, to have lost a final \bar{u} , \bar{u} and \bar{u} , for example, form the adjectives \bar{u} lā and \bar{u} lā. Since, however, in Arabic, we find

صَنَعَانِي derived from الصَّنَعَاءُ, بَهْرَانِي from the name of the tribe بَهْرَانِي from رَوْحَانِي, it may be that גִּלְהָ and שִׁלְהָ, 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 *katál*, which take in the feminine *katál*; e. g. ሰደሰ: "new," ሰደሰ:; ጠቢብ: "learned, wise," ጠቢብ:; ሀቢይ: "great," ሀቢይ:; ረሀብ: (for *rahīb*) "wide, spacious," ረሀብ:; ቀይሽ: (for *kayish*) "red," ቀይሽ:; Of this formation Ewald has discovered a trace in Arabic in حَصَانٌ "chaste," applied to a woman, as compared with حَصِينٌ "inaccessible, unapproachable"; and in رَزَانٌ "grave, staid," also used of a woman, whereas the masculine is رَزِينٌ.

II. *Numbers and Cases.*

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

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

In the *singular* number these three cases are distinguished in ancient Arabic, in the great majority of nouns, by three terminations, *n* for the subject or nominative, *t* for the object or accusative, and *j* 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	بَيْتٍ	بَيْتًا
جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةٍ	جَنَّةً

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	الْبَيْتِ	الْبَيْتَ
-----------	-----------	-----------

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

بَيْتُ يَوْسُفَ	بَيْتِ يَوْسُفَ	بَيْتَ يَوْسُفَ
بَيْتِهِ	بَيْتِهِ	بَيْتِهِ

In no other Semitic language has this inflexion been retained in such fullness and purity as in the ancient Arabic, the Arabic of the prae-Mohammedan poets and of the *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*, ^٤عمك, 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., ለፍቀረ፡ ብሉሳተ፡ "he loved a woman," ንጉሠ፡ ሊትዖላዖ፡ "the king of Ethiopia." In the case of proper names, the accusative termination is *ḳ*: *hd*, to which

form I shall call your attention more particularly hereafter; e.g. $\Phi P \zeta \Psi$: "Cain," $\text{L} \text{U} \text{L} \text{U}$: "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 lisan mat Aharri*, "in the language of the country of Phoenicia," without any case-sign in *lisan* and *mat*; *šar Babilu*, "king of Babel"; *malku banušun*, "the king their builder"; *šib 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., אֶרֶץ "to the ground," בְּיָתָהּ "homewards," "inwards," הַבְּיָתָהּ "into the house," הָעֵינָה "to the well," הָרָה "uphill," הַהָרָה "to the mountains," לְשֹׁכְתָהּ "to Shechem," שְׁכֵמָה "into a chamber," הַבְּמִתָּה "to the highplace," אֶרֶץ גִּשְׁן "chamber," בְּיָמָהּ פִּנְיָהּ. As real objective accusatives I may cite הִקְלָ אֶרֶץ וּבְלוֹן וְאֶרֶץ נִפְתָּלִי "he abased, etc." Isaiah viii. 23; מִי פָקַד עָלָיו אֶרֶץ הָאֵרֶץ "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 archaic 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 ן , in such phrases as חִיְתוֹ אֶרֶץ Gen. i. 24, בְּלִחְתוֹתָיִךְ Ps. l. 10, לְחִיְתוֹ אֶרֶץ Ps. lxxix. 2, בְּנֵי צַפֹּר "O son of Šippôr," Num. xxiii. 18, $\text{נָאֵם בְּלָעַם בְּנֵי בְעֹר}$ Num. xxiv. 3, 15, לְמַעַיְנו־מִים Ps. cxiv. 8. The purer form י I can discover only in a few compound nouns, e.g., אֲחֻמִּי , פְּנוֹאֵל , מְחוֹשָׁאֵל , and מְחוֹשֵׁלַח . The genitive termination is י , as in מְלֵאֲתַי Lament. i. 1, רַבְּתֵי עָם Ps. cx. 4, $\text{עַל־דְּבַרְתֵּי מְלֵכֵי־צָדֵק}$ Isaiah i. 21, בְּנֵי אֲחֻנֹּו (acc.) Gen. xlix. 11. It appears also in many compound proper names, as מְלֵכֵי־צָדֵק , גְּבַרְיָאֵל , 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 לְמַעַל and לְמַט are no doubt to be pronounced לְמַעְלָה and לְמַטְלָה , just as in Hebrew. In other cases the classical writers come to our aid. *Hannibal*, for instance, is חַנְיָבַעַל (genit.), but *Asdrubal* is עֲזַרְבַּעַל (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 أَخ "father-in-law"; in Arabic, أَب , أَخ , أَخ ; in Hebrew, אָב , אָח , חָם . These have all lost their third radical, which was a *w*, and which reappears in Arabic in the construct state thus:—

N.	أَبٌ	for	أَبٍ
G.	أَبِي	for	أَبِي
A.	أَبَا	for	أَبٍ

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

Let us now return once more to the Arabic, and examine its three flexional forms, h , t , d . 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 h , with which we are already acquainted in all the Semitic languages. In Ethiopic the full form ህ : is employed, as I already mentioned, to form the accusative of proper names. ቀዳህህ : etc. The gradual weakening of the h gives us such adverbial forms as $\lambda\text{f}\lambda$: af'd , or $\lambda\text{f}\lambda$: af'a , "out, outside" (*fords, foris*), ገጭረ : "at all, ever"; but ordinarily the particle is shortened to the utmost, and appears as final d . The Hebrew ד 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 h is more obscure; but we may possibly venture to see in it the pronominal element $h\text{h}$, as designating the subject. Finally, the genitive t , t , may perhaps be connected with the termination of the so-called relative adjectives in t (Arabic ت , vulgarly ت), 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 h , t , d 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. hn , tn , dn . E. g.

بَيْتٌ	بَيْتِ	بَيْتًا
جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةِ	جَنَّةًا

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

If we look around us for a similar appearance in the other Semitic languages, we find its counterpart in the *mtmation* 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 *mtmation* is found in the Hīmyaritic inscriptions of South Arabia in the form D for all three cases, its use nearly corresponding with that of the Arabic *ntnation*; e.g. שֶׁמֶשׁ עֵבֶדֶתְךָ ; שָׁנִי שְׁנָאִים ; אֲנִי אֲדָנִים , שֶׁמֶשׁ ; $\text{עֵבֶדֶתְךָ שְׁמִשׁ}$ but $\text{עֵבֶדֶתְךָ שְׁמִשׁ}$.

In Hebrew the *mtmation* seems to me to present itself in such words as אֲמָנָם or אֲמָנָם , חֲנָם , רִיקָם , which I consider as the accusatives of אֲמָן , חֵן and רִיק . יֹמָם is doubtful, as it may be connected with יִמְכֻמָּן rather than with יֹם . In Ethiopic we may perhaps find a trace of it in the word ገጠጠጠ , Heb. אֲתַמּוּל , אֲתַמּוּל .

Now what is the origin of these terminations *un*, *in*, *an*, and *um*, *im*, *am*? And are they identical, or different? These questions are hard to answer; but I incline on the whole to consider them as identical, and to derive them both from an appended, indefinite מָה , לָ . 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 , לָ 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 *ma* as an indefinite affix in Arabic in the so-called *ma al-ihāmīyah*, i. e. *ma* appended to an indefinite noun with a vague, often intensifying, force; e. g., *أَعْطِنَا كِتَابًا مَّا* "give us some book (or other)"; *قَلِيلٌ مَّا* "some (small) quantity"; *حَيْثُ لَأْتِيَنَّكَ مَّا* "thou art come for some matter (of importance)." Similar is the origin of the Aramaic word *מַיְדִי, מְזִמָּה, מִינְרָאם, מְדַעַם*, a contraction of *מְדַעַם מַיְדִי* "scibile quid." For the rest, how readily *ma* may be shortened into *ma* and *m* appears from such Arabic forms as *كَمْ* "how much?" *لَمْ يَمِ أَحْتِي مَ، عَلَي مَ*, shortened into *لَمْ، يَمْ*.

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. *ān*, G. *īn*, Acc. *ān*.

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

N. *āna*, G. *īna*, Acc. *āna*.

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

N. *ā*, G. *ī*, Acc. *ā*.

In the actual language, however, as known to us from the old poets and the Korān, 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 ሕዋድ: "alive," "living," ሕዋዮን:: ሐዲስ: "new," ሐዲሳን:: 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 ዕለሊ: ሠላሳ: እርባ: ኅጹሳ: 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, صِلْم); *hursāni*, "woods" (שׁוֹר); *šārāni*, "walls" (שׂר); *šarrāni*, "princes" (שׂר); whilst the numerals, 20, 30, etc., are 'isrā, šilāšā, irbā, ḥanšā.

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

The same choice was made by the Hebrews and Phoenicians. They discarded both the nom. *ām* and the accus. *ām*, retaining only the gen. *īm* in ordinary 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 $\text{ן}^{\text{—}}$, e.g., גבן. ארבען שח. המלכן. חמט הישן, etc.

this form in *t* is said to be not uncommon in Assyrian, as in *ilt*, "gods"; *malkt* or *malikt*, "kings"; *amt*, "days"; *pagrt*, "dead bodies"; with suffixes *karh̄ksu* "its towers"; *asri-šunu*, "their places." The full form in *tm* is rare and archaistic, as in the proper names *Ašur-rīš-iltm*, *Sumtrtm* and *Akkadtm*. Haupt finds traces of the form *ām*, representing the old accusative, in the Assyrian *šamāmu*, *šamāmi*, "heaven," *māmi*, "water," and the adverbial *akhāmīš*, "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 *ī*, 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. ܠܡܢܘܢܐ (*lampáda*), ܟܥܪܟܝܕܐ (*kerkida*), ܐܢܕܪܝܐܢܐ (*ándriána*), ܐܪܚܐܝܣ (*árchás*), etc. The Latin *accusative* too has supplied the ordinary nominal forms of the different Romance languages. In modern Persian the plural ان *an* is regarded by the best authorities as derived from an ancient *genitive* in *ām* (*aim*).

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

Sing.	N.	<i>atu</i> , <i>atun</i>	Plur.	<i>dtu</i> , <i>dtun</i>
	G.	<i>ati</i> , <i>atin</i>		<i>dti</i> , <i>dtin</i>
	Ac.	<i>ata</i> , <i>atan</i>		<i>dtā</i> , <i>dtān</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 *dt*, with its accusative and construct *dtā*. In Aramaic we find, as we should naturally

expect, the termination ת־ , Δ^e , *ath*, *oth*; in Hebrew, with the usual vowel-change, ת־ , which sinks in the later Phoenician into *úth*, as in Plautus's *yth alonim valonuth*. In Assyrian *átu*, *áti*, *áta*, are common; but there is also (if the grammarians may be trusted) a termination *út*, corresponding perhaps to the Hebrew and Phoenician *oth*, *úth*; and a third form in *tt* (or as Haupt pronounces it *ēt*), restricted to such words as have already weakened *at* into *it* in the singular. E.g., *ina šandti dannuti*, "in long (*lit.* strong) years"; *tabbanutu*, "buildings," from *tabbanu*; *'ibšiti*, "deeds," from *'ibšit* (עִבְשִׁית), according to Haupt *ēpšēti*; *išrēti* (*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. Böttcher has endeavoured to point out several in Hebrew; see his *Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, vol. i. p. 458–9. In Syriac we may perhaps refer to this class such words as ܨܘܒܝܢܐ from ܨܘܒܝܢܐ (Arabic قَرِيَّة , plur. قَرِي), and ܨܘܒܝܢܐ from ܨܘܒܝܢܐ (Arabic حِمَار , plur. حَمَر). 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 ܨܘܒܝܢܐ is a plural of ܨܘܒܝܢܐ , "helper," or ܨܘܒܝܢܐ of ܨܘܒܝܢܐ , "just"; but in reality these are nothing but the infinitives of ܨܘܒܝܢܐ and ܨܘܒܝܢܐ , meaning "help," and "justice," and may be applied alike to one or more, man or woman; for we can say ܨܘܒܝܢܐ , ܨܘܒܝܢܐ , and ܨܘܒܝܢܐ . Another plural of ܨܘܒܝܢܐ , viz. ܨܘܒܝܢܐ , is an example of the same sort, being really an intensive infinitive, to be compared with the Syriac ܨܘܒܝܢܐ , ܨܘܒܝܢܐ , etc.

In addition to the singular and plural, the Semitic languages

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

N. $\check{a} + \check{i}n = aun$
 G. $\check{a} + \check{i}n = ain$
 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 *ī*; whence the forms

N. *auni* G. *aini* Ac. *āni*.

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. *ā*.

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. *ā, āni*
 G. Ac. *ai, aini*.

In modern Arabic the first of these has now disappeared from ordinary use, leaving only the form *ain, ān*, for all the cases. In S. Arabian or Hīmyaritic the termination is also *ī*, as *צלמן ואבלנהן* (acc.), *ולביתנהן* "and their two houses (castles)," *מאתן אסרם* "two hundred warriors" (nom.), *צלמלנהן* "these two statues" (acc.). In Ethiopic scarcely a trace of the dual can be detected. In Assyrian Schrader gives as examples *idd*, "two hands"; *usud*, "two ears"; *šipa-ai* (for *šipā-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 *t* for *tm*.

The Aramaic form is מִן, with slight supplemental vowel, for מִן *ain*, corresponding to the ordinary Arabic oblique form مَيْنَ, مَيْنَ. This was contracted into מִן, as in מִתְּמָן for מִתְּמָיִן, “two hundred”; or into מִן, as in מִתְּמָיִן for מִתְּמָיִן, “two.” In Syriac it survives in only two or three words, in the form *nu*, viz. מִן, f. מִן, מִן, and מִן; further weakened into *in*, in מִן, f. מִן, “Mesopotamia,” (1 Kings xviii. 32), Heb. מִן, and even מִן = מִן; just as in Latin the sole representatives of the dual are the words *ambo*, *duo*, and *octo*. The Hebrew form is מִן, for מִן *ain*, with *m* for *n*, as in the plural; e.g., מִן, מִן, מִן; and often in proper names, as מִן, מִן, מִן. Rarer forms are the contracted מִן, as מִן (Josh. xv. 34), מִן (Ezek. xxv. 9, *kethibh*); and מִן in מִן, f. מִן. Further, מִן, contracted מִן; e.g. מִן, מִן, and מִן (Josh. xxi. 32). On the Moabite stone both forms appear, מִן and מִן; e.g. מִן, מִן, l. 15, but מִן, מִן, מִן, מִן.

And here I may intercalate the remark that the words מִן and מִן are not duals, but plurals, from obsolete singulars מִן and מִן. The original forms must have been *maym* and *shamaym*, which were contracted into *maym* and *shamaym*, just as in Arabic مَوِيَّت, مَوِيَّت, and مَوِيَّت, gradually pass into مَوِيَّت, مَوِيَّت, and مَوِيَّت. 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 שְׁמַיִם, the latter of which was pronounced in Phoenician *shamēm*, as in Plautus's *gune balsamem*, i.e., גַּנְאוֹנִי בעל שְׁמַיִם.

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

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

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

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

and of the plural,

Simple, N. <i>ana</i>	Construct, <i>ā</i>
G. Ac. <i>ina</i>	<i>ī</i>

In Assyrian in like manner the construct dual ended in *ā*, as *birka-ai* (for *birkā-ya*), "my knees"; the plural in *ī* [or *ē*], as *šarrī-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*; אֵי, אֵי, from יָדַיִם, מַלְכֵיִם; but from מַלְכֵיִם, מַלְכֵיִם, we should look for מַלְכֵיִם, מַלְכֵיִם, which however do not exist. The actually existing forms are מַלְכֵיִם, מַלְכֵיִם; 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 מַלְכֵיִם, מַלְכֵיִם, "my kings," for *malakai-ya*, corresponding with יָדַיִם, "my hands," for *yadai-ya*; and מַלְכֵיִם, מַלְכֵיִם, "his kings," corresponding with יָדַיִם, standing for *malakai-liš*, *yadai-liš*, and *malakan-liš*, *yadan-liš*, in which latter I descry a vestige of the long obsolete nominative dual in *anu*, construct *anu*.

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

(3) The so-called *status emphaticus* of the Aramaic; ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ "the man," ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ ; ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ "the city," ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ . 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 *hiinn* and *itt* or *hitt*. And just so the Aramean added to his noun in its simplest form the demonstrative *hā*, gradually weakened into *ā*. $\text{ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ} + \text{ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ}$ became ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ ; $\text{ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ} + \text{ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ}$. Other forms underwent greater alteration. $\text{ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ} + \text{ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ}$ was contracted into ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ (instead of ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ). ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ , on the other hand, is another example of the transference of a dual form to the plural, since it arises by assimilation from $\text{ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ} + \text{ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ}$. In Syriac and Mandaitic the termination ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ is shortened into ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ (*el*), though the full form is retained in some cases; for example, in Syriac, in the plural of many words derived from radicals ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ , and in a few other instances, such as ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ , "thousands." This contraction naturally commenced with a weakening of the final syllable into *el*, as in ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ for ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ , ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ as interjection for ܩܘܼܬܼܟܼ , 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 tanwin or nūnation. E. g.

2. كِتَابِكَ f. كِتَابِكَ, "thy book" (nom.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

أَبُوكِ or أَبِيك. But the final vowel of the fem. pronoun also disappears in most cases, and the difference of gender is marked by a transposition, as it were, of the final vowels; instead of كِتَابِكَ and كِتَابِكَ we have كِتَابِكَ *kitābak* and كِتَابِكَ *kitābik*. ✓

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

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

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 **מַלְכָּא**.

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

2nd pers. sing. masc. Arabic **مَلِكُكَ**, vulg. **مَلِكُكَ**. The Hebrew form is **מֶלֶכְךָ**, in pause **מֶלֶכְךָ**, with a trace of the original case-endings in the moveable *shēvā* and the *sēgōl*. The Aramaic forms are, Chald. **מַלְכְּךָ**, Syr. **מַלְכְּךָ**, with long *ā*, *ō*, whereas we should have expected *a* short. Probably *mal-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 **מֶלֶכְךָ**, e. g. **מֶלֶכְךָ**, 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, ܡܠܟܝ and ܡܠܟܝ . The Syrian writes ܡܠܟܝܟܝ , but does not pronounce the final *i*. The *i* 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 *nəgūsā-kī*, acc. *nəgūsā-kī*. Hebrew parallels are רַעְיֹתָי , Jerem. xi. 15; עֹלֵיבַי , Ps. ciii. 3.

3rd pers. sing. masc. Ar. ܡܠܟܗ , gen. ܡܠܟܗ ; vulg. ܡܠܟܗ .

The Hebrew forms very nearly resemble those of the vulgar Arabic, viz. ܡܠܟܗ , generally ܡܠܟܗ . These seem to find their origin in the old accus. *malka-hu*, with elision of the *h*, *malka-u*. Quite different is the Aramaic ܡܠܟܝܗ , as in ܡܠܟܝܗ , which I trace to the ancient genitive *malki-hu* or *malki-hi*. Parallel forms to this in Hebrew are לְמִינֵהוּ , Gen. i. 21; אֲרֵהוּ , Job xxv. 3. Instead of ܡܠܟܝܗ we occasionally find in Aramaic ܡܠܟܗ , the *h* having apparently become silent; and this form appears in the Phoen. suffix ܡܠܟܗ , more commonly written ܡܠܟܗ , as in ܡܠܟܗ and ܡܠܟܗ . Hebrew forms like אַבְיָו (*abhū*), פִּיּו (*pīu*), also spring from the old genitive, with elision of the *h*, for אַבְיָהוּ , פִּיָּהוּ , which likewise occur.

3rd pers. sing. fem. Ar. ܡܠܟܗܗ , vulg. ܡܠܟܗܗ . In Hebrew we have ܡܠܟܗܗ , as in אַבְיָהܗ , but more commonly ܡܠܟܗܗ , agreeing with the Aramaic ܡܠܟܗܗ (ܡܠܟܗܗ), ܡܠܟܗܗ , as in ܡܠܟܗܗ , ܡܠܟܗܗ , which we may derive from *malkā-āh*, for *malkā-hā*.

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

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

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

2nd pers. plur. fem. Ar. مَلِكُكُمْ, vulg. مَلِكُكُمْ. Hebr. מְלִכְכֶן, Aram. مَلِكُكُمْ, probably from the old accus. *malka-kumma*.

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

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

tōkha-hēnna. Contracted from this are the forms in נָהַ and נָהַ, as לְדַחְנָה, פְּלֹנָה, קַרְפָּנָה, לְבַדְנָה, לְבַדְהוֹן, חַלְפָּהוֹן, and לְפָן. Still shorter is the common הוֹן, as in לְבַדְהוֹן, חַלְפָּהוֹן, and לְפָן. The successive Hebrew forms appear then to have been *malka-hēnna*, *malka-hēn*, contracted *malkāl'na*, *malkána*, *malkán*. The Aramaic form מַלְחָסְמֵ 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 *ā* and *i*; as

Dual nom. عِبْدَايَ "my two servants," عِبْدَاكَ, etc.

gen. عِبْدِي, عِبْدِيكَ, etc.

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

gen. بَنِيهِ, بَنِيكَ, etc.

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

gen. بَنِيِي. 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," *ḵata-ai*, "my hands," for *šipā-ya*, *birkā-ya*,

ḵatā-ya, just as the Arab said يَدَايَ, 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. يَدَايَ), which became יָדַי; but קַוְבַלַיִם

for *ḵātīlīm* (Ar. قَاتِلِينَ, vulg. قَاتِلِينَ) should equally yield קַוְבַלַיִם

= Ar. **قَاتِلِي**. As a matter of fact, however, it is not so. The forms in use are **מַלְכֵי**, **קַוְלֵי**, 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. **مَلِكِي**, **يَدِي**. Heb. **מַלְכִי**, **יְדִי** stand for *yadai-ya* and *malakai-ya*; but the language has dropped the final vowel, and with it the doubling of the final *y*. Similarly in Aramaic, **מַלְכִי**, **מַלְכִי**.

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

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

native dual דַּבְרָוּהִי *dabarau-hu*, by elision of the *h*, *dabarau-u*, and then *dabarau*, דַּבְרוּ; just as the 1st pers. *dabarai-ya* became *dabarai*, דַּבְרֵי. Such at any rate must be the origin of the Aramaic forms מַלְכָּוְהִי, מַלְכָּחֲסֹב, the latter with silent ס, 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 בַּעֲנַל אִשׁ פְּרִנִי לִם, בְּשִׁמְע פֶּל-דַּבְרֵי, though we may perhaps also read קַרְנֵי and דַּבְרֵי, in closer accordance with the Hebrew forms.

3rd sing. fem. Arab. مَلَكِيَا, يَدِيَا; Heb. מַלְכֵיָהּ, יְדֵיהָ, for *yadai-hā, malakai-hā*. The corresponding Aramaic forms are, מַלְכָּהּ (rarely מַלְכֵיָהּ), Biblical, מַלְכֵיָהּ, מַלְכָּהּ; Syriac مَلْكَا, both standing for *malkai-hā*.

1st pers. plur. Arab. مَلَكَيْنَا, يَدَيْنَا. Heb. מַלְכֵינוּ, יְדֵינוּ, for *yadai-nū, malakai-nū*. Aramaic, מַלְכֵינָא (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. يَدَيْكُنَّ, Heb. יְדֵיכֶן, Aram. مَلْكَا. The fuller form כְּנָה is found in Hebrew in Ezekiel xiii. 20, כְּסֹתוֹתֵיכֶן ("pillows").

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

שְׁנֵימוּ, מְלִכֵיהֶם, יְדִיהֶם; and, on the other, the more poetic אֱלִיהֶֿמָּה, זְבָחֵימוּ. Archaistic is the form in Ezekiel xl. 16, מְלִכֵיהֶֿן, from אֵיל as an architectural term. The Aramaic forms are מְלִכֵיהֶֿן, מְלִכֵיהֶֿן. —The corresponding *fem.* is in Arab. מְלִכֵיהֶֿן; Heb. מְלִכֵיהֶֿן, יְדִיהֶֿן; Aram. מְלִכֵיהֶֿן, מְלִכֵיהֶֿן. Ezekiel indulges in the archaistic form גְּוִיֵּיהֶֿנָּה, 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: مְלִכֵיהֶֿם, مְלִכֵיהֶֿם, مְלִכֵיהֶֿם, מְלִכֵיהֶֿם. But the Hebrew almost invariably employs what is really an incorrect form. He does not say חֲקוֹתַי, חֲקוֹתֶיךָ, חֲקוֹתָיו, etc., but he adds to the plural חֲקוֹת the dual termination ם, borrowed from the masc., before appending the suffixes, and thus obtains the forms חֲקוֹתַי, חֲקוֹתֶיךָ, חֲקוֹתָיו. Almost the only exception is in the forms of the 3rd pers. plur., where we find חֲקוֹתָם as well as חֲקוֹתֵיהֶֿם.

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 تَبِعٌ "following," "a follower," بَطَلٌ "brave," حَسَنٌ "handsome"; in Hebrew, חָכֵם "wise," יָשָׁר "upright," רָשָׁע "wicked." The form *katil* may be exemplified in the one language by بَطِرٌ "proud," دَنَسٌ "dirty," عَاجِلٌ "quick"; in the other, by כָּבֵד "heavy," זָקֵן "old," טָמֵא "unclean." As instances of the form *katul* I will cite in Arabic نָطِنٌ "clever," يَقِظٌ "awake," حָذَرٌ "timid"; in Hebrew, יָגַר "afraid," קָטָן "small," גְּבוּהָ "high."

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

The heightening of the first vowel of *ḵatal* would yield the form *ḵātal*, which is of comparatively rare occurrence, as in طَابِع and خَاتَم, "a stamp," "a seal," Heb. חוֹתֵם, and in the participles of Hebrew verbs ל"ה, as חוֹה for חוֹי (i.e. ḵazai). The vowel of the second syllable has generally been weakened into *i*, thus rendering it indistinguishable from the heightening of *ḵatil*, viz. *ḵātil*. Hence, in the words just cited, the forms طَابِع, خَاتَم, as well as the great bulk of the participles of the form تَانِل, Heb. קוֹיֵל. 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 *ḵatāl*, *ḵattāl* and *ḵatāḥl*. (1) *Ḵatāl*, as in Arabic شَجَاع "brave," جَبَان "cowardly," كَهَام "blunt"; Heb. גָּדוֹל "great," עוֹשֵׁק "an oppressor," קְדוֹשׁ "holy." (2) *Ḵattāl*, as in Arabic رَحِيم "merciful," كَرِيم "noble," ثَقِيل "heavy"; جَرِيم "wounded," قَتِيل "slain," أَسِير "bound, a prisoner"; Heb. נְבִיא "a prophet," חַסִיד "gracious, pious"; אֶסֶר "bound, a prisoner," מְשִׁיחַ "anointed." (3) *Ḵatāḥl*, as in Arabic أَكُول "gluttonous," كَذُوب "lying," جَسُور "daring"; Heb. עָצוּם "strong," חָרוּץ "sharp," נְחוֹשׁ "brazen," and the ordinary participle passive קְטוּל.

The Aramaic furnishes us with an example of the heightening of *both* vowels in the form *ḵāttāl*, as נְטוּרָא; כְּחוּזָא; כְּחוּזָא; נְהֵזָא.

The doubling of the 2nd consonant appears in Hebrew in the common form *ḵattal*, intensive of *ḵatal*; e.g. טַבַּח "cook," טַבַּח "executioner," חַרֵּץ "cutter," קַנָּא "jealous," and with

weakening of the first vowel in the shut syllable אָבֵר “husbandman.” Also in the form *kattil*, intensive of *katil*, with weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* in the shut syllable and tone-lengthening of the 2nd into *z*, *kittil*, as נִבֵּן “humpbacked,” עִיֵר “blind,” פִּקְחָה “openeyed, seeing,” חִרְשֵׁה “deaf.”

The intensives of the first grade, *kattil*, *kattl*, and *kattal*, are all capable of being heightened in the same way, thus yielding the forms *kattil*, *kattl*, and *kattal*. (1) *Kattil* is very common in Arabic and Aramaic, e.g. مَمْوَنٌ, نَهْمًا, مُضْمًا, مَيَّادٌ, نَجَّارٌ, طَبَّاحٌ. In Hebrew we find קָנָא “jealous,” with *o* for *a*, but more usually the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened into *i*, e.g. יְסוֹר “one who reprehends” or “finds fault” (Job xl. 2 or xxxix. 32). (2) *Kattl* is very common in Hebrew and Aramaic, e.g. אֲבִיר “strong,” יָרִיֵק “just,” עֲלִיֵז “exulting,” “rejoicing,” עֲרִיֵץ “oppressor,” “tyrant,” אֲפִיר “bound”; מְבִיֵס “wise,” אֲזִיֵב “just,” מְבִיֵט “exact.” In Arabic the first vowel is weakened into *i*, e.g. مَسْكِيرٌ “drunken,” مَدِيْقٌ “very truthful,” عَرِيْفٌ “very fond of meddling.” (3) *Kattal*, as Heb. רַחוּם “merciful,” חַנּוּן “gracious,” עֲדוּלָה “deprived, bereft of young,” אֲלֹנָה “tame, domesticated, intimate”; Arab. قَدוּسٌ “very timid,” قَدِيمٌ “abiding, everlasting,” قَدוּسٌ “most holy.” In Arabic the vowel of the 1st syllable is sometimes assimilated to that of the 2nd, as قَدוּسٌ, قَدוּسٌ or قَدוּسٌ “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 *kattl*, *kittl*, *kull*, still retained in Arabic, e.g. أَرْضٌ “earth,” عَجَلٌ “calf,” أُنْسٌ “car.” They are also used as adjectives, e.g. صَعْبٌ “diffi-

cult," عَذْبٌ "sweet"; طِفْلٌ "small, young," حَلٍ "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. חֶזְזָא חֶזְזִי, חֶזְזָא חֶזְזִי. 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; סֵפֶר for סֵפֶר, with suffix סֵפְרָה; 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. גִּבְרַת הַמִּים P's. xviii. 26; בְּזֶרְעֶנָּה Num. xi. 7; נִטַּע שֵׁעֵלְשָׁעִיו Isa. v. 7; מִסְפָּרָה 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 *resh*.]

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

I. *The Perfect.*

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

تَقَلَّ, "being heavy" or "it was heavy." It is possible however that *ḵátala* may already be a contraction for *ḵátal-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 *ḵatdla* and *ḵélla*. (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. Hcb. קָטַלְתִּי, but קָטַלְתִּי *ḵ'áld-ni* = Arab. *ḵátala-ni*; Aram. *ḵ'áld*, but with suffix *ḵáld-n* for *ḵáld-ni*, *ḵátala-ni*.

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

transitive form is identical with the Arabic, קָטַל : *katála* = قَتَلَ . In the intransitive forms the vowels *i* and *u* were both weakened to *e*, and finally dropped, whence resulted such words as יָבֵשׁ : *yabsa*, "to be dry," יָדָבַח : "to be just," לָדַעַן : "to be satisfied with drink," פָּלַח : "to be near," exactly corresponding to rare Arabic forms like عَلِمَ for عَلِمَ , رَضِيَ for رَضِيَ , حَسَنَ for حَسَنَ , قَرَّبَ for قَرَّبَ . If the 2nd radical was a guttural, an assimilation of the first vowel to the 2nd took place, giving us the series *kátila*, *kétila*, *kétla*, e.g. אָחַז : "to pity," זָרַח : "to be hot," = سَاخَنَ رَحِمَ . Similar forms also exist in classical Arabic, e.g. شَهِدَ for شَهِدَ , نَهَبَ for نَهَبَ "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*, יָרָא "to be old," טָהַר "to be pure," כָּבַד "to be heavy," יָרָא "to fear"; with *u*, יָדָבַח "to be able," שָׁחַל "to be bereft," יָנַח "to be afraid." On the other hand, שָׁמַע , but שָׁמַעוּ , as in vulgar Arabic سَمِعَ for the classical سَمِعَ (سَمِعُوا); גָּבַר , but גָּבַרוּ ; דָּבַח , but דָּבַחוּ and דָּבַחוּ ; שָׁחַח , but שָׁחַחוּ ; נָדַל , but נָדַלוּ ; and many more. In Aramaic, verbs with *u* are nearly as rare as in Hebrew; e.g. דָּמַח "he slept"; דָּרַב "it was dried up, waste, desolate"; דָּבַח "he was bereft." In Syriac only one such seems to be certain, viz. صَفِه "to be shrivelled," as in Job vii. 5, صَفِهَ صَفِهَ ; Ps. cxviii. 120, صَفِهَ صَفِهَ . Another may perhaps be found in حَصَم , Nahum ii. 10, if that stand for حَصَم , in the phrase حَصَمَ

ܚܘܠܝܢ ܕܚܘܠܝܢ ܕܚܘܠܝܢ. Verbs of the form *kaṭila* are, on the contrary, very common in Aramaic; as ܫܘܠܟ, ܫܘܠܟ; ܩܪܒ, ܩܪܒ; ܩܪܒ, ܩܪܒ; ܩܪܒ, ܩܪܒ. 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. ܡܝܬܐ, except in its rather perplexing final vowel¹.

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

If we have rightly regarded *katāla*, 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 *katāla* is formed, as in the noun, by the addition of *t*. The Arabic has *kaṭlat*; the Ethiopic, *kaṭlat*, *yabṣat* for *yabṣat*, *mēhrat* for *mdhīrat*. In vulgar Arabic, e.g. in Egypt, we have the forms *katabet*, *fidlet*, *suktet*. In Aramaic the same form occurs, with the further weakening of the 1st vowel, in the now shut syllable, into *i*, viz. ܩܩܠܬ, ܩܩܠܬ, for *kaṭlat*, *kaṭlat*, *kaṭalat*. In Hebrew the usual form is *kaṭlā*, ܩܩܠܬ, 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 ܩܩܠܬ Deut. xxxii. 36, ܩܩܠܬ (for ܩܩܠܬ) Exod. v. 16, ܩܩܠܬ (for ܩܩܠܬ) Deut. xxxi. 29, ܩܩܠܬ Ezek. xlvi. 17, ܩܩܠܬ (for ܩܩܠܬ) Levit. xxv. 21; etc. (2) The termination *at* has always been retained before pronominal suffixes, in which case we find the forms ܩܩܠܬܐ, ܩܩܠܬܐ, 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 *mīti*, 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. נִדְרָא or נִדְרַע, "she vowed" (also נִדְרַעָא), שִׁמְעָא "she (Tanith) heard," for שִׁמְעָא, etc. I will only add that the final *t* disappears also in Mandaitic before enclitic ב and ל with suffixes, e.g. נִפְלֵאֵלָהּ, "she fell," for נִפְלֵאֵלְהָ, instead of נִפְלֵאֵלָת. So also in the dialect of the Talmūd Bablī, עִרְיָתָא "she fled," אִוְלָתָא "she went," side by side with לִיָּהּ, שְׁלַחָהּ לִיָּהּ, and in derived conjugations אִינְסִיבָא "she was married," לִיָּהּ אִינְסִיבָא "she was betrothed to him." In such Talmudic forms as הָוָא for הָוָת, and אָתָא אָחֵתִיָּהּ "his sister came" for אָתָת, we may perhaps discover a lingering trace of the original 3rd radical *yūd*.

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

¹ Arabic قَتَلُوا and قَتَلُوا, as in Hebrew occasionally קָטְלוּ, e.g. הִקְלִיבּוּ Josh. x. 24, אָבּוּא 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 *ʾn* is usually preceded by a *yūd*, for the insertion of which I find it hard to account; e.g. רְהִישִׁין, סְלִיקִין, נִפְאִקִין “they ran.” In the dialect of the Talmūd Babilī we find the same rejection of the termination *n*, but it seems to leave its mark in an assimilation of the vowel of the preceding syllable; thus, אֶסְדֵר “they have bound” or “banned,” for אֶסְדֵר; עֲבֹדֵר for עֲבֹדֵר; נִפְקֵר for נִפְקֵר.

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, *ʿn*. So in the Targūms there occur such words as אֶמְרָן “were made clear”; in Mandaitic, with inserted *yūd*, אֶתְנֵרָן “they understood,” רְגִזֵרָן “they were angry”; in Syriac, סְחָלָנָא for *ḵṭalān*. The Arabic exhibits the form *ḵatālna*, 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 *nagdrā*, *lābsā*, *mēhrā*; the J. Aram. קְטִלָא. The Syriac must of course have once had the form *ḵṭlāz*, but dropped the final vowel, whence we find in MSS. both סְחָלָא and סְחָלָא. In the Christian Palestinian dialect we find קְטִלָא, and so also in Samaritan; but the Mandaitic writes נִפְאִק, סְלִיק, like the Syriac. The older form with the final vowel *ā* appears in Syriac only before some of the pronominal suffixes, e.g. סְחָלָא “they have killed me,” סְחָלָא, סְחָלָא, corresponding with the Jewish Aramaic קְטִלָנִי, קְטִלָךְ, קְטִלָהּ.

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

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

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 كاتب , كاتب ; كاتب , كاتب ; كاتب , كاتب .

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*; *ḵāḏl*; and *ḵāḏl*, *ḵāḏlū*. The vulgar dialects of the Arabic vary, I believe, between *ḵátal* and *ḵatdl*. But in the intransitive forms the Ethiopic left the accent unshifted, and dropped the vowel of the middle syllable, *yábsa*, *sékhua*. 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. קָטְלָה and the plur. קָטְלוּ , which have now the accent on the last syllable. Had the accent originally fallen on that syllable in the verb, as it does in the noun, we should have had the forms קָטְלָה and קָטְלוּ , as in the noun we have חֻכְמָה from חָכֶם . 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. נִתְנָה , דְּבַקָה , יִכְלוּ ; 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 קָטְלָת and קָטְלוּ , e.g. אֵכְלָתָהּ , אֵכְלָהּ , and אֵכְלוּם ; just as in Ethiopic we have *nagarátō*, *nagarú-nī*, *nagaréwō*, and in Arabic itself *ḵataldt-hu*, *ḵatalú-hu*. The Aramaic 3rd pers. sing. fem.

¹ [See *ZDMG.* xxxii. 747.]

קטלה, ضحك, also favours this view, for the suppression of the 2nd vowel of the original *kaḥalat* must have been due to the accentuation of the 1st syllable, as in the modern Arabic of Egypt, *ḥatalet, widdet, kitret*. With suffixes the form approximates more to the Hebrew, e.g. קטלתיה, ضحكس; Mand.

לא כאלתאן "she has not devoured me," אנאלתה "she devoured him." The Mand. form with enclitics, e.g. נפאלאה "she fell," is almost identical with the Heb. אפלתה.

Passing on to the 2nd person, we find that the Semitic languages split into two divisions, the one exhibiting *t* as the characteristic letter of the pronominal ending, the other *k*. On the one side are the Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Assyrian; on the other, the Ethiopic, and most likely the Ḥimyaritic. At least we are told that the South Arabian of the present day says *kunk* for *kunt* "thou wast"; and the form with *k* for *t* is vouched for in other parts of Arabia'. 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, גלית for גלית "thou hast revealed," and in a dialect of Syria أنتو for أنتم or أنتم. It should further be noted that in the 2nd person no variation is made as to the verbal part of the word, for the purpose of indicating the sex and number of the person or persons addressed. The whole weight of these distinctions has to be borne by the pronominal part. It appeared perhaps to be a waste of energy to point out these differences in both parts, and if one was to be selected, the pronoun seemed to be the better adapted for the purpose.

The 2nd pers. sing. masc. is in classical Arabic قتلت, in

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

vulg. Arab. *katābt, misikt, kutūrt*. In Hebrew the final vowel is often indicated by the addition of the letter ה, קַטַּלְתָּהּ or קַטַּלְתָּהּ. The Ethiopic equivalent is *ḵatdka*. The other dialects, like the vulgar Arabic, have dropped the final vowel. Hence in Bibl. Aramaic קַטַּלְתָּ and קַטַּלְתָּ; in the Targūms קַטַּלְתָּ and קַטַּלְתָּ, in Syriac ܟܬܠܬܐ.

In Arabic and Ethiopic the accent naturally rests on the 2nd syllable, *ḵatdka, ḵatdka*; 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; קַטַּלְתָּ, קַטַּלְתָּנִי, but קַטַּלְתָּהּ or קַטַּלְתָּהּ, etc. Similarly in Jewish Aramaic, with suffixes, קַטַּלְתָּנִי, קַטַּלְתָּהּ, but in Syriac ܟܬܠܬܐܢܝ, ܟܬܠܬܐܢܝܢ, in Mand. ܫܒܘܩܬܐܢܝܢ, and in the Talmūd מְנַעַתָּהּ "hast hindered me," אֲדַכְּרֶתָּהּ "hast reminded me." I do not regard the vowel of the Ethiopic and Syriac forms as proving that the termination *ta* had originally a long vowel, *tā*, which is Noeldeke's view; on the contrary, I believe that the lengthening of the vowel is here due partly to the weight of the accent, but still more to an effort to distinguish this form from the almost identical one of the 3rd sing. fem., ܟܬܠܬܐ "she has killed me." Others would explain it as a contraction of the final vowel of *ta* with a supposed connective vowel *a*, as if ܟܬܠܬܐܢܝܢ 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 كَتَلْتِ, and the *i* is often lengthened before suffixes, كَسْرَتِيه or كَسْرَتِيه. The vulg. form of the present day is

قتلتی *katalti*. The corresponding Ethiopic form is *katalki*, written, according to the exigencies of the Geez syllabary, with long *i*, which passes before suffixes into *ɛ* or *ɛy*, as *nagarkɛ-ni*, *nagarkɛyō*, *nagarkɛyōmū*. 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. יִרְדְּתִי and שָׁכַבְתִּי, Ruth iii. 3, 4; לְפָדְתִּי 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, וְהִדְרַמְתִּי. Similarly before suffixes, קָטַלְתִּינִי, קָטַלְתִּיהוּ, etc. Forms like יִלְדְּתִנִּי, Jerem. ii. 27 (*Keth. ילדתני*), or וְהִבְאֵתוּ, 2 Sam. xiv. 10, are very rare. In Aramaic the same phenomena present themselves. In Jewish Aramaic we have קָטַלְתָּ side by side with קָטַלְתִּינִי; whilst the Syriac has preserved the older termination, at least in writing, ܩܬܠܬܐ, with suffixes ܩܬܠܬܐܝܢܝ, ܩܬܠܬܐܝܘܢܝ. Here again I regard the vowel of the syllable *ti* as being originally short, whilst Noeldeke regards it as long. To me the lengthening seems to be due to the shifting of the accent.

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

Generally however the final vowel is dropped, *antum*, قاتلتم; and the common form in the vulgar language is قاتلتموا with the loss of the final *m*. Parallel to these run the Ethiopic forms with *k*, viz. *katalkəmmū*, with suffixes *katalkəmmū-ni*, *katalkəmməvo*, *katalkəmməvōmū*. The corresponding form in the modern Tigré

and Tigrîna is *ḵatalḵūm* or *ḵatalātkūm*, which latter appears in Amharic as *ḵatalāchhū*, ቀተላህ: . In S. Arabia these forms with *ḵ* are heard at the present day, e.g. *سمعكم samītkum* (Halévy, *Études Sab.* p. 46). As *antum* becomes in Heb. אַתֶּם, so *ḵatdtum* 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 *تَلَّوْا*), 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 *ܟܬܠܬܘܢ*; in Mand. נצאבתון “ye planted.” In the latter dialect the final *n* disappears before enclitics, as נצאבתוליא “ye have planted me,” שאדארתוליא “ye have sent me”; and also before accusative suffixes, as נסאבתון “ye took me,” שאדארתון “ye sent me,” which is contrary to Syriac usage, but in accordance with Hebrew and Chaldee, where we find קְטַלְתִּי, קְטַלְתֶּם, beside קְטַלְתִּי, קְטַלְתֶּם. 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 *ḵatalatum* should be *ḵatalatunna*. 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, *ḵatalḵén*; the final vowel appears, however, in the form with suffixes *ḵatalḵénāhū* (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 *ḵatalḵā* (Dillmann, p. 274). The Hebrew form is almost identical with the Ethiopic, viz., קְטַלְתִּי. The existence of a longer form in *תָּנָה*, exemplified by הִשְׁלַכְתֶּנָּה, Amos iv. 3, is very doubtful; and no example with accus. suffixes occurs. The Aramaic forms are such as we might expect, *ܟܬܠܬܝܢ*, *ܟܬܠܬܝܢ*.

In Mandaitic however the feminine is a rarity, its place being mostly usurped by the masculine.

Proceeding to the 1st pers. sing., I would remind you that the root form of the pronoun of the 1st pers. we found to be *iya* or *t*, giving, in combination with the demonstrative *an*, the form *aniya* or *ant*. We found also that some of the Semitic languages inserted a second demonstrative, *ak*, whence the Assyrian *anāku*, 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 *katalkū*, which is also said to be the form in use in S. Arabia, كَتَّكَ, اَعْتَفَكَ, etc. (comp. Halévy, *Études Sabéennes*, p. 46). In the other Semitic languages we encounter an affix form with *t* instead of *k*, which demands explanation. It may be that *t* has interchanged with *k*, as in the 2nd person we find *ta* and *ka*; but more probably, I think, *tu* has been substituted for *ku* in the 1st person under the influence of the forms of the 2nd person. The solitary *katalku* gave way before the greater number of *t*-forms, and was gradually changed into *kataltu*, except, as we have seen, in Ethiopic (which was destitute of *t*-forms in the 2nd person).

While the Assyrian pronoun *anākū* (Haupt *anakū*) is indisputably older, in respect of its *d*, than the Hebrew *ānākht*, the latter would appear to have preserved the termination in a purer form. We may therefore fairly assume that the Arabic *kataltu* and the Ethiopic *katalkū* represent, in respect of the final vowel, a somewhat later stage than the corresponding Hebrew קָטַלְתִּי, with *vāv* conversive קָטַלְתִּי, with suffixes קָטַלְתִּיָּהּ or קָטַלְתִּיָּו, etc. Whether the *scriptio defectiva* in such forms as יָרַעַתְּ Job xlii. 2, בָּנִיתְּ 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 מִלְכְּתִי בִנְתִי, etc., and in one Phoen. inscr. we find בִּנְתִי (Umm 'Awāmid, *C.I.S.* nr. 7), though the usual spelling is בִּנְתִי. Plautus too has *corathi* for קִרְאֲתִי. In Aramaic the suffix sometimes

appears in full, especially in the case of verbs 3rd 'i, as קָטַלְתִּי, אֲמַנְתִּי; but more frequently the suffix has lost its vowel, the usual form being קָטַלְתָּ, אֲמַנְתָּ, 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, אֲמַנְתָּ; and the alteration of the vowel in the last syllable may be ascribed, either to the lingering influence of the lost termination *t*, or to an effort to differentiate this form from the 3rd pers. sing. fem. קָטַלְתָּ, אֲמַנְתָּ (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*, חֲבַדְתָּ, חֲבַדְתָּ. The older form *kaṭalt* appears with the accus. suffixes, אֲמַלְתָּ, אֲמַלְתָּ. The Mandaitic form is ordinarily the same as the Syriac, לִינְשִׁית, נִיפְקִית; but with the enclitics the *t* disappears, and we have the vocalisation *k'ṭalē* for *k'ṭalēth*, e.g. גִּטְמַרְיָהּ "I tied to him," סְלִיקִיבְהָ "I went up on it." In the Targūms we find the fully vocalised form אֲבַלְתִּי, דְּחִילְתִּי, etc., which is indeed older than the Biblical forms just cited. In the Talmūd Bābli both the forms which we have noted in the Mandaitic occur independently of enclitics; כְּבַשְׁתִּי "I subdued," שָׁמַעְתִּי "I heard," אֲרִגְשִׁית side by side with אֲמַרְי "I said," נִפְקִי "I went out," חֲזַאי "I have seen," קָרַאי "I called." The final vowel is merely tone-long, and hence can be shortened when the tone is thrown back, as הִקְיַמְתָּ, Dan. iii. 14; and with suffixes, as פְּרַעְתִּיהָ, אֲמַלְתָּ.

You will remark that in the first person, as in the second, the sex or number of the speaker or speakers is not marked in the verbal part of the word; whilst no variation was thought

necessary in the pronominal part, any more than in the actual pronoun אֲנִי or אָנֹכִי.

As to the plural, the original form of the pronom. affix was probably *nn*, from אֲנַחְנוּ or אֲנֵנוּ; 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 קָטַלְנוּדְוּ. The Arabic form is *ḡatalnā*, تَلَّنا, with long *ā*, which is however sometimes shortened in poetry, *ḡatalnā*. On the other hand, the Ethiopic has *ḡatalna*, with short *ā*, which is lengthened before suffixes: *nagdrna*, but *nagarnā-ka*, *nagarnā-kēmmū*. Similar is the Chaldee form קָטַלְנָא, with suffixes קָטַלְנָא, קָטַלְנָא, קָטַלְנָא. In Syriac *nā* is shortened into *n*, סְלַ, but the fuller termination appears with pronominal suffixes, as סְלַנְסַ, etc. The abbreviated form also prevails in the Talmūd Bābli, אֲנֵנוּ, אֲנֵנוּ. Frequently however the Syriac form is lengthened, by a repetition of the pronoun, into סְלַנְסַ (sometimes written סְלַ מְנֵ). This, in the weakened shape of נִין, is the usual termination in Mandaitic, e.g. נְפִאקְנִין; but with enclitics the older נָא is restored, e.g. נְפִאקְנָנְהָ "we went out therein," שְׂאֲדָרְנָאֵלֵין "we sent them." The accusative suffixes are added to the shorter form in *n*, as רְהִימְנָךְ "we loved thee," פְּתַחְנָהּ "we opened it."

I have reserved the *dual* for the last place in our view, because it occurs in only two or three of the Semitic languages, the Arabic and Hīmyaritic, and possibly the Assyrian. The rest,—Ethiopic, Hebrew, and Aramaic,—lost it in the verb before they reached the stage at which we become acquainted with them.

The Arabic forms are precisely such as we should expect, that is to say, almost identical with those of the noun and pronoun. The 3rd pers. masc. is *ḡdtald*, like the noun in *āni*, construct *d*, e.g. *raḡulāni*, *raḡuld*. Similarly in the feminine we find in Arabic *ḡatldat*, formed like *ḡannatāni*, *ḡannatd*, from *ḡannat*.

In Ḥimyaritic the final *ā* seems to have been weakened into *ʔ*. The pronoun **הָמָא** is written **הַמִּי** *humz*, and similarly in the verb **הִמְרִי**, **בְּנִי**, **עָהָרִי**, **הַחֲדָתִי** (**أَحَدَاتٍ**), fem. **שְׁמַתִּי** (**شَمَاتًا**), "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 *katdltumā*. 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, **فَلِحَان** for **أَنَا** **فَلِحَان**, "I am killing"; **فَحِنَان**, and even **فَحِنَان**, "I am seeking." In the Talmūd we find such words as **יָדַעְנָא** "I know," **אֵלֵינָא** "I am going." The Mandaite could say not only **לְאַיְטְנָא**, "I take," but also **לְאַיְטְנָאךְ**, "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 <i>parik</i> , "he comes to an end."
	f.	פָּרִיקָא <i>parikā</i> ¹ .
	2 p. m.	פָּרִיקִי <i>pariki</i> .
	f.	פָּרִיקִיא <i>parikā</i> .

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

	1 p. m.	فَرِحَ <i>parḥin.</i>
	f.	فَرِحْتَ <i>parḥān.</i>
plur.	3 p. c.	فَرِحُوا <i>parḥū.</i>
	2 p. c.	فَرِحْتُمْ <i>parḥtūn.</i>
	1 p. c.	فَرِحْتُ <i>parḥakkh (kikkh),</i>
		also فَرِحْتُ (فَرِحْتُ) + فَرِحْتُ.

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*, فَاكْتُلُ, 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 ደሰ: or ደህ:

Assyrian. The original shape of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. we may assume in this case to have been *yakdtilu*. In Ethiopic it appears under the normal form of *yəkdətəl*, and corresponds in its general use with the imperfect indicative of the Arabic; whereas the other form *yəngər* answers to the Arabic imperfect subjunctive and jussive. In Assyrian its form, according to Sayce, is *isdkinu* or *isdkin* [Delitzsch *išdkan*], the signification of which is "he makes" or "he will make"; whereas the form *iskun* takes, according to the same authority, the aoristic sense of "he made."

We need not at present dwell longer on this form *yəkdətəl*, because its prefixes and flexion are identical with those of the other form *yəktəl*, 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 *yaktulu*, with *a* 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, *yəktul*, *ylktul*, or *lktul*, *yimsik*, *yuskut*; thus giving us the same form which we find already in the Ethiopic *yəngər*, the Assyr. *iskun* (יִסְכַּן, "he placed" [Del. יִשְׁכַּן]) or *išbat* (יִצְבַּת, "he seized"), and the Hebrew יִכְבֵּד, יִפְקֹד. This too is the common form in the Aramaic dialects, e.g. Jewish Aram. יִלְבֵּשׁ, יִקְמַל, 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 יִדְרֹג, יִאֲסֹר or יִאֲסֹר; יִעֲבֹר, יִחַזֵּר; (2) from verbs ע"ע, as יִעֹן, יִטֵּב, which stand for *yasbub*, *ya'ssus*; and (3) from verbs ע"ו, as יִנַּחַח, יִקִּים, which stand for *yakwum*, *yamwul*. As we have often seen already, an original *pathach* may be gradually weakened into *segol* or *chirek*; but it is impossible that an original *chirek* should in such a case give rise to a *pathach*.

This person of the verb is identical in form, or nearly so, with a class of nouns in the older Semitic languages, which occur partly as proper names and partly as common nouns. Such are in Hebrew, יִצְחָק, יֵעֹקֵב; יָרִיב "adversary," יִצְדָּק "oil"; יִלְקוּט "bag," יִחְמֵר "kind of deer," יִשְׁוֶה "bittern" (?); in Arabic, يَنْبَعُ "the Helper," يَنْبَعُ "the Averter," يَنْبَعُ "green," يَنْبَعُ "jerboa," يَنْبَعُ "freshly cut branch," يَنْبَعُ and يَنْبَعُ "green," يَنْبَعُ "rapid river, horse, etc.," يَنْبَعُ and يَنْبَعُ "male vulture," يَنْبَعُ "queen bee," يَنْبَعُ "gazelle," يَنْبَعُ "lamb, kid," يَنْبَعُ "fountain," يَنْبَعُ "thickened honey," يَنْبَعُ "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 *ya*, used (exactly like ሃ, ሃ, ሃ) both as the relative and as a sign of the genitive case. Praetorius seems however to have made it tolerably certain that this *ya* is only a modification of the Ethiopic ሃ *sa*, which is still used in Harari, the intermediate link being *sha* ሃ in one of the Tigriña dialects. The change of sound is the same as in the Amharic ሃ, ሃ, derived through ሃ, ሃ, from an older ሃ, ሃ = 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 *ḵatala* and *ḵatalū* stand for *ḵatalya* and *ḵatalyū*. For this view I

can find no support whatever save in the Mandaitic plural which I mentioned in a previous lecture, viz. רגאויאן, fem. רגאויאן, 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 Mandaitic. I am compelled therefore to reject this view, though I cannot at present suggest any adequate explanation of the isolated Mandaitic forms just quoted.

I said before that there were some important exceptions to the formation of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. by *ya*. These I now proceed to enumerate.

Already in the Chaldee of the Old Testament we find the verb רָוֵא forming the 3rd pers. sing. masc. with ל instead of י; רָוֵא for רָוֵי in Ezra iv. 13, Dan. ii. 20, with the corresponding plur. masc. לָרוּן Dan. ii. 43, and fem. לָרוּיִן Dan. v. 17. The same form is common in the Talmūd Babil, and occurs also in Mandaitic, in both cases side by side with the forms with *n*; e.g. לִימָא "say," לִימָא לְכַתּוּב "bring"; לִימָא לִיקוּם "be like," לִימָא לִישְׁתְּרִיא "be dissolved." In Syriac the *n* alone is found, נִלְן, נִלְכַּם, נִלְחַם. On the whole subject see Mr Lowe's note in his *Fragment of the Talmud Babil P'sachim*. The identity of this *l* and *n* may perhaps be admitted; that either of them sprung from the *y* must be denied. De Goeje (in a review of Kautzsch's *Gr. des Biblisch-aramäischen*) supposes the form לָרוּא to be originally an infin. רָוֵא compounded with the prep. ל, "to be" taken in the sense of "is to be," "shall be"; and to this רָוֵא he finds a parallel in the form לְבִנֵיא, 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 אַל, הַל, and which appears in various pronouns and demonstrative

adverbs such as *הִלָּאָה*, *וְסָכֶּ*, *אֵלֶּיךָ*, *זֶלֶק*, *הִלָּוָה*, *אֵדִי*, *הִלָּבָה*, *הִלָּבָה*, *הִלָּבָה*, 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 *הֵן*, *הֵלֵךְ*; the pronominal base *an*, *אֵן*, *אֵן*, *הֵנָּה*, *הֵן*, etc.

The 3rd pers. sing. fem. has for its prefix *ta*, that is, no doubt, the same mark of the fem. gender which we find at the end of the word in the perfect *katalat*. The typical form is again the old Arabic *taktulu*, vulgarly *taktul*, *tektul*, *tiktul*, *timsik*, *tuskut*, which latter coincide with the Assyrian *taskun*, *tašbat*, and the Ethiopic *təngər*, *təlbās*. In Hebrew the *a* of the 1st syllable is ordinarily sunk to *i*, *תִּקְטַל*, *תִּכְבַּד*; but *ʾ* and *ʾ* are found in the same cases as in the masc., e.g. *תִּעֲבֹר*, *תִּתְעַבֵּר*, *תִּתְעַבֵּב*, *תִּתְעַבֵּב*; *תִּתְעַבֵּב*; *תִּתְעַבֵּב*. Similarly in Aramaic, *תִּקְטַל*, *תִּקְטַל*, *תִּקְטַל* (Mandaic).

Yaktulu being, as we have seen, essentially a nominal form, its plural is naturally obtained by the usual nominal inflexion, as in the perfect. The most ancient form is once more found in the Arabic *yaktulūna*, which is vulgarly shortened into *yaktūlū*, though *yaktulūn* is still heard. In Hebrew the fuller form *יִקְטַלְוּ* is not uncommon, as *יִקְטַלְוּ*, *יִקְטַלְוּ*, *יִקְטַלְוּ*, in pause *יִקְטַלְוּ*; but the shorter *יִקְטַלוּ* is far more frequent. The Ethiopic forms are *yəngərū*, *yəlbāsū*, with which correspond in accentuation the Hebrew pausal forms *יִפְלוּ*, *יִפְלוּ*, *יִפְלוּ*, etc.; and the vulgar Arabic (Egypt) *yik-tūlū*, *yimstikū*, *yuskūtū*. The Assyrian exhibits, as we might expect, the forms *iskunū*, *išbatū*. The old Aramaic dialects hold fast the final *n*, *נִקְטַלְוּ*, *נִקְטַלְוּ*. So also in Mandaic *נִלְיַמְוּ*, *נִלְיַמְוּ*; but before the enclitics the *n* disappears, *נִרְשִׁימוּבְכוּן*, *נִרְשִׁימוּבְכוּן* "register with you."

The feminine form corresponding to *yaktulāna* would naturally be *yaktulāna*. This is actually retained by the Aramaic dialects in the forms *נִרְיָמוּן*, *נִרְיָמוּן*, *נִרְיָמוּן*, Mand. *נִרְיָמוּן* "wink." In Ethiopic and Assyrian we find the same forms with the loss of the final *n*; Eth. *yəngērā*, *yəlbāsā*; Assyr. *iskunā*, *ışbatā*; and so also in Mandaitic, *נִרְיָמוּן*, *נִרְיָמוּן*, are more common than the fuller form in *נִרְיָמוּן*. The Arabic has contracted *yaktulāna* into *yaktūlīna*, after the analogy of *katālna* for *katalāna* in the perfect. The same form occurs in Hebrew; e.g. *יִחְמְנָה* Gen. xxx. 38, *וַיִּשְׂרְנָה* 1 Sam. vi. 12 (for *וַיִּשְׂרְנָה*), and *יַעֲמְדְנָה* Dan. viii. 22; but more commonly the Hebrew employs a form with prefixed *t*, after the analogy of the singular, and says *תִּקְטַלְנָה*, e.g. *תִּקְטַלְנָה*, *תִּעֲבְרְנָה*, *תִּלְבַּשְׁנָה*, *תִּשְׁכַּבְנָה*. The same form occurs dialectically in Arabic, even among the various readings of the *Ḳorān*, e.g. *سُورَةُ الْاٰنِ 3*, *يَنْظُرْنَ* for *تَنْظُرْنَ*. 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 *tdktulu*, which is the actual Arabic form; in the vulgar dialects, *taktul*, *təktul*, *tiktul*, *timsik*, *tuskut*. The Assyrian has retained the pure vowel in its *taskun*, *tašbat*; whilst the Ethiopic exhibits the weaker *təngər*, *təlbās*. The Hebrew offers exactly the same variations as the 3rd pers.; we find *תִּקְרַב*, *תִּזְכַּר*, *תִּחַל*; *תִּקְרַב*, *תִּזְכַּר*, *תִּחַל*; *תִּקְרַב*, *תִּזְכַּר*, *תִּחַל*; *תִּקְרַב*, *תִּזְכַּר*, *תִּחַל*. The Aramaic forms, *תִּקְטַלְנָה*, *תִּעֲבְרְנָה*, Mand. *תִּישְׁבֹּק*, *תִּירְגֹּא*, 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 *taktulīna*, which has survived in Hebrew in such forms as *תִּקְטַלְיָנָה* Ruth ii. 8, 21 *תִּעֲשִׂי* iii. 4; *תִּדְעִי* iii. 18. So also in Aramaic, *תִּקְטַלְיָנָה*,

تقتل. In other cases, the final *u* has altogether disappeared, as in the vulgar Arabic *تقتلي* *tiktūli*, *timskī*, *tuskūtī*; Assyrr. *taskunī*, *tašbatī*; Eth. *ṭngērī*, *ṭlbasī*; Heb. תִּזְכְּרִי, in pause תִּזְכְּרִי, תִּזְכְּרִי, תִּזְכְּרִי. 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 *تقتلون*. The final *u* is preserved in Hebrew in such words as תִּשְׁמְרוּן, תִּחַקְרוּן, תִּעֲמְדוּן; or with fuller vowels in pause, תִּשְׁמְרוּבּוֹן, תִּחַקְרוּבּוֹן, תִּעֲמְדוּבּוֹן. So also in Aramaic. תִּקְטְלוּן, *תִּקְטְלוּ*, Mand. תִּירִמוּן or more frequently תִּירִמוּן. In vulgar Arabic the final syllable has been rejected, leaving *تقتلوا* *tiktūlu*, *timskū*, *tuskūtū*; with which correspond the Assyrian *taskunū*, *tašbatū*, the Ethiopic *ṭngērū*, *ṭlbasū*, and the Hebrew תִּזְכְּרוּ, in pause, with fuller vowels, תִּזְכְּרוּבּוֹ, תִּזְכְּרוּבּוֹ; תִּזְכְּרוּבּוֹ, תִּזְכְּרוּבּוֹ. In Mandaitic too the *u* disappears before the enclitics, as in the 3rd person.

The fem. corresponding with *taktulūna* ought to be *taktulāna*; and this form is preserved, with the loss of only the final vowel, in the Aramaic *תִּקְטְלוּ*, *תִּקְטְלוּ*. In Mandaitic, however, it seems to have fallen into disuse. The Assyrian and Ethiopic exhibit forms with the loss of the final *u*; Assyrr. *taskunā*, *tašbatā*; Eth. *ṭngērā*, *ṭlbasā*. In Arabic *taktulāna* is contracted as I take it, after the same manner as the 3rd pers. fem., into *taktūlna*, a form which is lost in the vulgar dialects, but has been preserved in some examples in Hebrew, e.g. תִּקְטְמוּנָה, 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 **أَنْتَل** (vulg. *aktul, amsik, askut*), which appears in Assyrian, with the loss of the final vowel, as *askun, ašbat*. In Ethiopic the vowel is weakened, *əngēr, ɛlbas*; and so also in Aramaic, **ܐܢܬܐ**, **ܐܢܬܐ**, Mand. **עֲשׂוּב**. Similarly in Hebrew, **אֲשַׁבֵּר**, **אֲחַמֵּל**, **אֲעֲבֹר**, **אֲאַסֵּף**; but **אֲחֹן**, **אֲשׁוּב**, with the original *a*.

The corresponding plural takes its prefix *na* from **אֲנַחְנוּ**, **نَحْنُ**. In Arabic it is **نَقْتَل**, vulgarly *nektul, niktul, nimsik, nuskut*. In most of the other languages the vowel of the first syllable is weakened; e.g. Eth. *nəngēr, nəlbas*; Assyrian *niskun, nišbat*; Aram. **ܢܩܬܐ**, **ܢܩܬܐ**, Mand. **נִישׁוּב**. The Hebrew alone retains the original *a* with gutturals and in verbs **עָ** and **עִ**, e.g. **נִשְׁבַּר**, but **נִאַסֵּף**, **נִעֲבֹר**, **נִבֵּב**, **נִקָּח**.

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 **تَقْتُلَانِ**, to which the Assyrian inscriptions seem to offer no counterpart. The 2nd pers. is likewise **تَقْتُلَانِ**, which form serves for both genders, and is found in Arabic alone.

In conclusion, let me call your attention to the gradual shifting of the accent here, as in the perfect, at least in certain

¹ [Delitzsch regards these forms as plurals.]

forms. The original accentuation appears to me to be that of the classical Arabic, viz. on the first syllable of the 3rd pers. sing. *yáktulu*, in Eth. *yəngər*. In the lengthened forms of the 2nd sing. fem. and the 3rd and 2nd plur., the Ethiopic threw forward the accent one place, *ǝngərī*, *yəngərū -rā*, *ǝngərū -rā*, as compared with the corresponding Arabic *táktulī*, *yáktulū*, *táktulū*; and this accentuation we find in Hebrew in the so-called pausal forms, *יִמְשְׁלוּ*; *תִּשְׁמְעוּ*, *תִּחְשְׁבוּ*; *תִּלְכְּוּ*, *תִּלְכְּוּ*; *תִּלְכְּוּ*, *תִּלְכְּוּ*; *יִשְׁבוּ*, *יִשְׁבוּ*; and also in the vulgar Arabic *tiktūlī*, *timstki*, *tuskūtī*; *tiktūlū*, *timstki*, *tuskūtū*. Generally speaking, however, the Hebrew, like the Aramaic, shifts the accent to the last syllable, *תִּקְטֹלוּ*, *יִקְטֹלוּ*, *תִּקְטֹלוּ*. The forms ending in *ina*, *īna*, are already accented in Arabic on the penult, and the accent remains on the same syllable when it becomes final in Hebrew and Aramaic, *תִּקְטֹלוּ*, *יִקְטֹלוּ*; *تَكْتُلُوْكُمْ*. So also the Aramaic feminines in *ān*, *יִקְטֹלוּ*, *تَكْتُلُوْكُمْ*; whereas the Arabic forms *تَكْتُلُوْكُمْ*, *تَكْتُلُوْكُمْ*, 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 *ܟܬܘܠ*, *ܟܬܘܠ*; and the Hebrew *וְזַר*, *לְבַשׁ*, *תֵּן* (for *תֵּן*); in which latter the vowels *u* and *i* are heightened by the tone, as in the imperfect. The Ethiopic *uḡər*, *lḡbas*, 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*, *riḥiṣ*. The Arabic attained the same intonation by

means of a prosthetic *'alif*, with partial assimilation of its vowel to that of the 2nd syllable. Thus, for *k'tul*, the Arab wrote and spoke *'uktul*, أَقُلْ; for *g'lis*, 'iglis, اجلس; but for *fraḡ*, he said افرق, 'ifraḡ, not 'dfraḡ, because the vowel *a* appeared to him to be too heavy for a merely prosthetic syllable.

As the fem. of *k'tul* we should naturally expect *k'tulna*, after the analogy of *taḡtul*, *taktulna*, in the imperfect; but this full form has been nowhere preserved, except in such rare Syriac forms as ܩܬܘܠܢܐ or ܩܬܘܠܢܐ, e.g. ܩܬܘܠܢܐ, "remember thou me," ܩܬܘܠܢܐ, ܩܬܘܠܢܐ. As in the imperfect, so here, the final *n* has usually been dropped, e.g. Chald. ܩܬܘܠܐ; and then the *i* has disappeared also, as in the Syriac ܩܬܘܠܐ, ܩܬܘܠܐ; Mand. ܩܬܘܠܐ, ܩܬܘܠܐ. In the Talmūd the final *'* is retained, at any rate in writing, e.g. ܩܬܘܠܐ, ܩܬܘܠܐ. The Ethiopic form is *negēri*, *l'bdāsi*, with shifting of the accent, as we might expect. In the Assyrian forms *šukinī* or *šuknī*, *riḥiṣī* or *riḥiṣī*, *ṣabti*, the elision of the vowel seems to indicate that the accent remained on the first syllable. The classical Arabic too retains the accent on the prosthetic vowel, *'uktulī*, *'iglisī*; whereas in vulgar Arabic (Egypt) it is shifted, *uktulī*, *imstki*. In Hebrew the forms *k'tulī*, *k'tulī*, are found in pause, e.g. ܩܬܘܠܐ, ܩܬܘܠܐ; but also out of pause, according to the *k'tulbh*, in ܩܬܘܠܐ Judg. ix. 12. ܩܬܘܠܐ Sam. xxviii. 8. Out of pause, however, the word is commonly modelled somewhat after the form of segolate nouns, and becomes *kuṭlī*, *kaṭlī*; e.g. ܩܬܘܠܐ, ܩܬܘܠܐ; but the vowel of the first syllable is mostly weakened to *i*, or even, in certain cases, to *shēvā*; e.g. ܩܬܘܠܐ, ܩܬܘܠܐ.

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

as in the Chaldee קטל; and lastly the final *u* disappears, as in the perfect, leaving in Syriac the form **ܩܬܠܗ**, written in Mandaitic without the *w*, **ܦܪܘܫ**, **ܦܪܘܫ**. The Mandaitic however exhibits a few examples of the full termination *ūn*, or even, as in the perfect, *yūn*, e.g. **ܐܕܪܘܢܝܢ** (with prosthetic **א**), "lay waste." The final *ū* is also retained before the enclitics, e.g. **ܣܘܘܪܘܠܗ**, **ܫܒܝܩܘܠܗ**. In Talmudic the *u* is often retained, at any rate in writing, as **עבדו**, **כתבו**. If dropped, it seems in some cases to affect the vowel of the previous syllable, as **אִמַּר** (for **אִמְרו**) or the interjectional **אִשָּׂר** ("quick!"). The Ethiopic form is, as we might expect, *nəgērū*, *lǝbāsū*, with shifting of the accent; the Assyrian, *sukinū* or *suknū*, *rihišū* 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, *'uḳtulū*, *'iḡlisū*; but the vulgar dialect (Egypt) shifts it, *uḳtīlū*, *imstkū*. In Hebrew the forms *ḳṭūlū*, *ḳṭūlū*, appear in pause, as **זָכְרוּ**, **עֲבְדוּ**, **אֲכָלוּ**, **שָׁמְעוּ**, **אָהָבוּ**, **שָׁבוּ** (for **יִשָּׁבוּ**). Out of pause, the word is modelled somewhat after the form of segolate nouns, and becomes *ḳuṭlū*, *ḳaṭlū*, as **מִשְׁכְּנוֹ**, **רַחֲצוּ**, **וַעֲקֹדוּ**. Mostly, however, the vowel of the first syllable is weakened to *i*, or even, in certain cases, to *shēvā*; e.g. **זָכְרוּ**, **אֲכָלוּ**, **עֲבְדוּ**, **אִמְרוּ**; **קְרָאוּ**, **אִמְצוּ**, **בְּכוּ**, **רְאוּ**, compared with the pausal **בְּעִי**.

For the 2nd pers. plur. fem. the normal form ought to be *ḳṭulāna*, which appears in Syriac, with weakening of the vowel in the last syllable, as **ܩܬܠܬܝܢܐ**. If the *u* be dropped, the vowel disappears with it, leaving *ḳṭl*. But with suffixes the original *ā* is restored, as **ܩܬܠܬܝܢܐ**. Similarly, the Ethiopic forms are *nəgērā*, *lǝbāsā*; and the Assyrian, *sukinā* or *suknā*, *rihišā* or *riḥšā*, *ṣabtā*. The Arabic, on the contrary, follows the analogy of the imperfect. As *taḳtulāna* becomes *taḳtīlna*, so *ḳṭulāna* becomes **اَتَلُّنَا** *'uḳtīlna*. This too

is the Hebrew form, רָאִינָה, שְׁמַעְנָה, סַפְּרָנָה. In a couple of instances the final נָה (also written ן) is shortened into *n*, viz. שְׁמַעְנָ Gen. iv. 23, and קְרָאֵן Exod. ii. 20; which is in accordance with the vulgar pronunciation of a form like ^{ضربن}, as heard in Palestine by Robinson and Eli Smith, viz. *ḡurubn*.

The dual is to be found in ancient Arabic alone, and its form is analogous to that of the imperfect, viz., 'iḡtulā, for 'uḡtulāni, ḡtulāni. It serves for both genders, like the imperf. taḡtulāni.

IV. Variations of the Imperfect and Imperative.

I now proceed to notice sundry variations of the imperfect and imperative, which are used in the Semitic languages to express different shades of meaning, and which correspond in part to the several moods of the Indo-European tongues. As regards the imperfect, it has four such forms, serving as indicative, subjunctive, jussive (cohortative, optative), and energetic; whilst the imperative has two, the simple and the energetic.

It is in the old Arabic alone that these forms appear in full vigour, clearly distinguished by their terminations. The imperfect indicative ends in *n*, *yāḡtulu*; the subjunctive in *a*, *yāḡtula*. The jussive has ordinarily no vowel, *yāḡtul*, but seems originally to have ended in *i*; at least the poets use *yāḡtuli* in rime. Furthermore, the shorter terminations *ī*, *ū*, and *ā* are always substituted for the fuller *ina*, *ūna*, and *āni*, in the fem. sing., the masc. plur., and the dual; *idḡtuli*, *yāḡtuli*, *yāḡtulā*, not *taḡtulīna*, *yāḡtulūna*, *yāḡtulāni*. The province of each form is also distinctly marked out. The subjunctive is used in dependent clauses after certain conjunctions, such as ^{أَنَّ} "that," ^{كَيْ} "that," ^{لِ} "that, in order that," ^{حَتَّى} "until," and the like. The jussive serves as an imperative after ^{لَا} "not," as ^{لَا تَقْتُلْ} "do not kill," and after ^{لِ}, as ^{لِيَقْتُلْ} "let him kill" (commonly used in the 3rd pers. only). Preceded by ^{لَمْ} it designates the negative of the past, as ^{لَمْ يَقْتُلْ}, "he did not kill." It is also extensively employed in

two correlative conditional clauses, whether actually introduced by the conditional particle **إِنْ** "if," or not; e.g. **إِنْ تَعْجَلْ تَنْدَمَ** "if thou art hasty, thou wilt repent"; **مَنْ يَعْمَلْ سُوءًا يُجْزَ بِهِ** "he who doth evil, shall be recompensed for it."

In such languages as have lost the final vowels, these distinctions are of course no longer clearly obvious. The Aramaic, for example, we may at once dismiss from our observation. In Ethiopic a special form *yéndgēr* is employed for the imperfect indicative; whilst the ordinary *yēngēr* represents the subjunctive and jussive, e.g. **ለገዢህ: ብሔር: ይዕቀብጠ:** (*yē'kábka*) "may God preserve thee," **ለይገብ: ብርሃን:** "let there be light." Similarly, in Assyrian, if the grammarians may be implicitly trusted, the imperfect indicative is *išdkin*; whilst *iškun* has assumed an aoristic sense. Of this fact there appears to be no doubt. In the so-called precative, however, we see a form exactly corresponding to the Arabic jussive with **ل** and the Ethiopic with **ሰ**; e.g. 3rd pers. *liškun*, *liškunnū*, 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 **Qal** and Hiph'il of verbs **ע"ע** and **י"ע**, and in the various conjugations of verbs **ל"ל**; though there are equally clear cases in the **Qal** of some other classes, where the imperfect has *a* or *e* for its characteristic vowel. The form is used as an optative or an imperative, especially after the negative **לֹא**, or in the 3rd pers.; frequently too in correlative conditional clauses, as in Arabic; and lastly, with the so-called *vāv conversive*. On all these points see your Hebrew Grammar or Mr Driver's treatise on the tenses. Here I shall only seek to illustrate the different forms. If you compare **אֶל-תִּשְׁחַת** with **תִּשְׁחַת**, or **אֶל-יִמְּן** with **יִמְּן**, you perceive at once that you have before you two forms corre-

sponding exactly to the Arabic **يَقْتَل** and **يَقْتَلْ**. **תִּשְׁחִית** or **יִאָּמֵן** is, as I shall explain to you in a subsequent lecture, the equivalent of **يَقْتَل** with the loss of the final vowel; while **תִּשְׁחִית** or **יִאָּמֵן** answers to the shorter **يَقْتَلْ**, *i* being heightened into *ē* in the tone-syllable. With *vāu conversive* this *ē* may even become *ā*, if the accent be thrown back, as **יֹאסֵף** from **אִסְפָּה**. So also in verbs **ע"ע**, compare **יָחַן**, **יָסַב**, **יָעַז**, with **וַיַּחֵן**, **וַיַּסֵּב**, **וַיַּעַז**; Hiph'el, **יָגַן**, **יָפַר**, with **וַיִּדַק**, **וַיִּפֵּר**. In verbs **ע"ו** **יָקַם** with **יָקַם** and **וַיִּקָּם**; Hiph'el, **יָבִין** with **יָבַן** and **וַיִּבֵּן** with **יָסִיר** and **וַיִּסֵּר**. In verbs **ל"ה** the form is even more marked, if possible: **יִשְׁבֶּה** but **וַיִּשְׁבֵּה**, **יִרְאֶה** but **וַיִּרְאֶה**; with tone-lengthening, **יִשְׁטֶה**, **יִשְׁטֵה**; **יִבְכֶה**, **וַיִּבְכֵה**; **וַיִּדְדֶה**, **וַיִּדְדֵה**; with supplemental vowel, **יַחַד**, **יַחַד**, **יַחַד**, **יַחַד**. In Pi'el, **יִקְנֶה**, **יִצְנֶה**, but **יִרְדֶה**, **יִרְדֵה** but **וַיִּרְדֶה**, **וַיִּרְדֵה** but **וַיִּרְדֶה**, **וַיִּרְדֵה**; in Hiph'el, **יִפְתֶה** but **יִפְתֵה** but **וַיִּפְתֶה**, **וַיִּפְתֵה** but **וַיִּפְתֶה**; with supplemental vowel, **וַיִּגְלֶה**, **וַיִּחַר**, **וַיִּרְבֶה**, **וַיִּשְׁקֶה** but **וַיִּשְׁקֵה**; **וַיִּפְּן**.

Once more; there exists in Arabic, as I have already told you, an *energetic* or *cohortative* in two shapes, the one with the fuller ending *anna*, the other with the shorter *an*, **يَقْتَلَنَّ** and **يَقْتَلِنَنَّ**. 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**; **أَنْ**; **أَنْ**; **أَنْ**; **أَنْ**; and the like. I will not, however, pretend to decide as to the fuller form **يَقْتَلَنَّ**, whether it arises from an intensive doubling of the *n* of **يَقْتَلِنَنَّ**, or whether, as Stade thinks, it is compounded of **يَقْتَلِنَنَّ** and a particle, now lost in Arabic, equivalent in meaning to the Hebrew **נָא** and

Syriac ܢܐ. If the latter be the case, ^ءآتومن would be exactly equivalent to אָקִימָה נָא. Similar is the form in the inscriptions of S. Arabia, as in the tablet : **וּלִיקְמַעַן עַתְתֵּר דִּיתְכַרְנָה**.

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 energicum* or *demonstrativum* is a better term). This *n* is sometimes preserved, as יַעֲבֹרְנֶהוּ Jerem. v. 22, יֵצְרֹנְהוּ Deut. xxxii. 10, יִבְרַכְנֶהוּ Ps. lxxii. 5, אֶתְקַנְךָ Jerem. xxii. 24, יִבְרַכְנִי Ps. l. 23; but more usually assimilated, as יַחֲרֹנֶנּוּ, יַעֲזֹבְנָה, יַעֲזֹבְךָ, יִשְׁמַעְךָ. Similar forms are in constant use in the Aramaic dialects, though more widely in some than in others, and have even found their way into the perfect with plural suffixes in Mandaitic and Talmudic, as also perhaps in the Syriac form **לְגַאמִינְהוּ** = Mand. **لْغَامِينَهُ** = Mand. **لְגַאמִינֹן**, though **אֵנֶה** may here be the independent pronoun = **הַפּוֹן** or **הַפּוֹן** in Biblical Aramaic. In Phoenician this demonstrative *n* occurs also in the suffixes appended to nouns. (2) In the separate forms in ה־. In Arabic ^{اَنْتَلَا}اَنْتَلَا may also be written ^{اَنْتَلَا}اَنْتَلَا, and is pronounced in pause ^{اَنْتَلَا}’*antulā*. Hence is apparent its identity with the Hebrew אֶתְלָה. 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.: **אֶתְנַשֶּׂה**, **אֶתְנַשְׁרָה**, **אֶתְנַשְׂרָה**; **אֶתְנַשְׁרָה**, **אֶתְנַשְׂרָה**; in pause, with older accent, **אֶתְנַשְׂרָה**, **אֶתְנַשְׂרָה**; **אֶתְנַשְׂרָה**, **אֶתְנַשְׂרָה**; **אֶתְנַשְׂרָה**; **אֶתְנַשְׂרָה**. Very rare are examples in the other persons; e.g., in the 3rd, Ps. xx. 4, Is. v. 19, Ezek. xxiii. 20, Prov. i. 20, viii. 3, Job xi. 17 (where some take **הַתְּעַפָּה** for the 2nd pers. masc.). Of a weakened form in ה־ we have two instances; **יִרְשְׁנָה** Ps. xx. 4, and **וַאֲקַרְאָה** 1 Sam. xxviii. 15.

These same energetic forms are also used in the imperative, viz. in Arabic, ^{أَقْتُلْ} اَقْتُلْ and ^{أَقْتُلِي} اَقْتُلِي. In Hebrew the form in הַ- is restricted to the 2nd pers. sing. masc., but appears in two shapes. (1) With the older accentuation, קָטַלְהָ, קָטַלְהָ, from *k'tīlan*, *k'tīlan*; as פִּשְׁטָהּ and חָגְרָה Is. xxxii. 11, מְלוֹכָה Judg. ix. 8 (*Kethibh*), צְרוּפָה Ps. xxvi. 2 (*Do.*); יִרְשָׁהּ, רִגְנָהּ, שְׁמַעָהּ; with suffixes שְׁמַעְנָהּ, קְרָאנָהּ, חָגְנָהּ. (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. עֲזֹבָהּ, כְּרַתָּהּ, שְׁמַרָהּ, זַכְרָהּ; or with weakening of the vowel, עֲרַכָּהּ, מְכַרָּהּ, שְׁמַעָהּ, נִצְרָהּ. With weakening of הַ- into ה־ we find רַעָהּ in Prov. xxiv. 14, according to one reading, another being רַעָהּ.

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, ^{מְקַטְל} מְקַטְלָא. 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 ^{قَاتِل} قَاتِل *katl*, *kītl*, *kutl*, as ^{قَوْل} قَوْل, ^{ضَرْب} ضَرْب; ^{حِفْظ} حِفْظ; ^{نِكْر} نِكْر, ^{جَبْن} جَبْن; with their rarer feminines ^{قَاتِلَةٌ} قَاتِلَةٌ *katla*, *kītla*, *kutla*, as ^{رَحْمَةٌ} رَحْمَةٌ, ^{شُكْر} شُكْر; ^{حَمِيَّة} حَمِيَّة, ^{سَمْرَةٌ} سَمْرَةٌ. 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 קָטַלְתִּי, with their feminines קָטַלְתְּ or קָטַלְתְּהוּ, and קָטַלְתְּהוּ or קָטַלְתְּהוּ. Of these by far the most common is קָטַל, with suffixes קָטַלְתִּי and קָטַלְתְּ, etc. Of the rarer forms examples are: (1) שָׁכַב, שָׁפַל, חָסַר, שָׁלַח; with suffixes, שָׁכַבְתָּ Gen. xix. 33, בְּזַעַפּוֹ 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, בְּמַעְלָם Ezck. xx. 27, וְעַקְוָה Is. xxx. 19. (2) אָרְבָּה Deut. vii. 8, חָמְלָה Gen. xix. 16, יָרָאָה Is. xxix. 13; שָׁנְאָה Deut. i. 27. (3) עֲצָמָה Is. xlvi. 9, גְּבַרְהָ Zeph. iii. 11, קָרְבָּה Exod. xxxvi. 2, xl. 32, חָמְלָה Ezck. xvi. 5, חָמְצָה Hos. vii. 4.

The other Hebrew infinitive, the so-called infinitive absolute, has the form *kāṭōl*, as נָתַן, הָלֹךְ, יָצָא, יָדוּעַ, אָרֹר, בָּנָה, אָרֹר, בָּנָה, אָרֹר, יָדוּעַ, יָצָא, הָלֹךְ, נָתַן. Since *θ* in Hebrew ordinarily represents original *δ*, this form seems to be identical with the interjectional or imperative form *kāṭṭli* تَطَّال in Arabic. As in Hebrew שָׁמֹר means "keep, observe!" or זְכוֹר "remember!" so in Arabic نَزَّال means "come down!" تَرَكَ "let alone!"

VI. *The Participles.*

Of the active participle there would appear to have been originally three forms, corresponding to the three forms of the perfect, viz. *katal*, *katil*, and *katul*. The first of these, however, is actually known to us only as a verbal adjective, e.g. חָכֵם, חָרֵשׁ, יָשָׁר; unless we except the fem. הָרְרָה, constr. הִרְתָּ. The other two actually occur as participles: יָגוּר Jerem. xxii. 25, xxxix. 17 (the only example of this form), רָעֵב, מְלֵא, גָּרַל, יָשָׁן, etc. The place of *kāṭal* has been usurped by an intensive form *kāṭal*, of which we find clear traces in the verbs לָה, e.g. חוּזָה,

for *hōsai* חוֹזֵי (which actually occurs as a proper name); and in the usual feminine *kōfēleth*, for *kōfali*, as יִשְׁבֵּת, יִרְדֵּת, פִּרְחֵת, יִרְעֵת, in pause יִשְׁבֵּת, with suffixes יוֹלְדֵתְכֶם, יוֹלְדֵתְהוּ; as well as, I think, in such construct forms as אֲבָר Deut. xxxii. 28, נָטַע Ps. xciv. 9. Far more common however than *kāfal* is the form *kāfil*, which may be explained in one of two ways; either as a weakening of *kāfal* by change of *a* in the second syllable into *i*; or as an intensive of the intransitive *kāfil*, the use of which has been gradually extended so as to embrace all classes of verbs. Its oldest form is the Arabic *kāfil*, fem. *kātilat*, with which closely agree the Ethiopic *šādīk*, fem. *šādīkt*, and the Assyrian *sākin*, *āsib*, fem. *sākinat*, *āsibat*, as also the Aramaic קָטִיל, קָטִילָא, קָטִילָא, קָטִילָא. In the Biblical Aramaic this participle is pointed, at least in pause, קָטִיל, e.g. Dan. iv. 10, vi. 3, vii. 9, but also iii. 17, iv. 20, 34. In the same dialect the feminine and plurals have moveable *shēvā*, e.g. בְּטִילָא Ezr. iv. 24, פְּתִילָא Dan. v. 5, יִתְבִּין Ezr. iv. 17, סִלְקִין; whereas in Syriac the *shēvā* is silent, بَطِيْل, بَطِيْلَا, 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 *kātilūna*, *kātilatūna*. The Hebrew form naturally substitutes *š* for *ḥ* in the 1st syllable, and heightens the vowel of the tone-syllable into *e*, whence קוֹטֵל, fem. קוֹטֵלָה, in certain cases with fuller vowel בְּגִירָה, אֹכִילָה.

In regard to the passive participle, the Semitic languages diverge from one another more than is usual. Of the passive voice generally I shall treat at another opportunity. At present it must suffice to say that the participial form ordinarily employed in Arabic is *maḳtūl*, with the prefix *ma*, of which I shall have more to say when we come to the derived conjugations of the verb. The Hebrew form *kaḥūl*, קָטִיל, is very common in Ethiopic, but with the first vowel weakened, *kūl*, fem. *kūll*,

e.g. *ṣḥūf* "written," *'isūr* "bound," *mālu* "full," fem. *ṣḥēft*, *'isērt*, *māle'at*. 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 *ܕܫܡܘܬܐ*, *ܕܫܡܘܬܐ*, "beloved," *ܗܢܘܐ*, *ܗܢܘܐ*, "hated," *ܡܩܫܘܬܐ* "a thing stolen," *ܡܩܫܘܬܐ* "a thing heard, a rumour." In Aramaic however the form *ܩܝܝܠܐ*, *ܩܝܝܠܐ*, is preferred, which is identical with the Arabic adjective *ḳatīl*; e.g. *ܩܝܝܠܐ*, *ܩܝܝܠܐ*. Of another verbally inflected *ḳatīl* 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 *ḳatīl*, like *ܩܝܝܠܐ* or *ܩܝܝܠܐ*, becomes *ḳatīlā*, like *ܩܝܝܠܐ* or *ܩܝܝܠܐ*. Now as the nominal *ḳatīl* lies at the root of the verbal form *ḳatīlā*, so does the nominal *ḳatīl* at the root of the verbal *ḳatīlā*.

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

“to die in great numbers”; طَوَّفَ “to go round and round.” So in Ethiopic, ረሰዎ: *russdyn*, “to do”; ፈገገ: *faundwa*, “to send”; ጸወዐ: *ṣawwe*“a, “to call out” (where the vowel of the 2nd syllable is modified by the final guttural). In Hebrew the original form was, of course, *kattil*; but as in the noun we find אָכַר for אֶכֶר, so in the verb *kittil* for *kattil*, as גָּדַל, אָבַר, שָׁבַר, רָחַם, אָרַשׁ “betroth to oneself.” The *ā* of the 2nd syllable is sometimes weakened to *ā̄*, as in דָּבַר, כָּפַר, נָבַם (with which compare the change of *ā* into *ā̄* in נָבַר for גָּבַר); but far more usually into *ā̄*, more especially in pause, where it appears, owing to the force of the tone, as *ā̄* =. This change is probably owing to the influence of the vowel of the same syllable in the imperfect and imperative (קָטַל, יִקְטַל). In the first and 2nd persons the original short *ā* is dominant, דְּבַרְתִּי, דְּבַרְתָּם, דְּבַרְתָּ, דְּבַרְתְּ, דְּבַרְנִי. In the pausal forms of the 3rd pers. sing. fem., and the 3rd pers. plur., the weaker vowel predominates: לְקַטְּלָהּ, דְּבַרְוּ, though we also find קִבְּצָהּ, Micah i. 7. In the Aramaic dialects the weakened קָטַל, קָטַל, קָטַל prevails, except where a guttural, or the letter *r*, as 3rd radical, may have protected the original vowel; e.g. نَصَبٌ, نَصَبٌ.

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

guttural. Side by side with **שָׁמַח לְבִי**, Prov. xxvii. 11, we have **שָׁמַח נַפְשׁ עַבְדְּךָ**; and the pausal forms of the fem. and plur. are always **רַבְּרִי**, **רַבְּרוּ**, not **רַבְּרִי**, **רַבְּרוּ**.

The imperfect is formed and inflected on precisely the same principles as in the first or simple conjugation. The vowel of the preformatives was originally *a*, yielding the forms *yakáttilu*, *takáttilu*, etc. This pure vowel I find, however, only in the Ethiopic subjunctive of verbs 1st guttural, e.g. **የላሳደደረኛ**: *yaháddés*. Otherwise it is weakened into *e*, as *yəfásšəm*, **የፈረሰ**:. In Arabic this dull obscure vowel appears in the classical language as *ā*, e.g. **يَقْتَلُ**, **يَقْتَلُ**; 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, *yisaddak*, *yifattak*, but *yikallim*, *yirattib*. In Hebrew and Aramaic the preformative vowel is also *e*, **יְקַיֵּל**, **יְקַיֵּל**, save that in the 1st pers. sing. **אֶ** appears in Hebrew and **אֵ** in Aramaic, **אֶרְבֵּי**, **אֶרְבֵּי**. 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; *yəndəgər* for the indicative, *yəngər* for the subjunctive, corresponding in form at least to the Assyrian *išakin* and *iskun*. 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 *yəfásšəm* for the subjunctive, and had recourse for the indicative to the form *yəfəsšəm*, **የፈረሰ**:, 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 *kaitála* has been resorted to, which would naturally appear in Ethiopic as *kətála*.

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

מַקְוִיִּים: *makwūmūn*. The Hebrew and Aramaic weaken the vowel to *i*, מְרִיר, מֻסְקִי; and this dull vowel is represented in old Arabic and Assyrian by *u*, مَقْتَل, *muṣakkin*, in modern Arabic by *i*, as *mūfattaḥ*, *mūṣaddaḥ*, *mūkammiḥ*, *mū'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 קָפַל, *kappal*, from an original *kappall*. The weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* is a rarity, as קָפַר Levit. xiv. 43, Jerem. xlv. 21; נָשַׁל Deut. xxxii. 35'. Compare in the class of concretes such words as עָרַר, גָּבַן, from *gabbīn*, 'avvīr. The same form *kappal* serves for the infin. absolute (with weakening נָאֵץ 2 Sam. xii. 14); but with it occurs another, viz. קָפַל, e.g. קָנָא, יָפַר, רָפָא, בָּרַךְ. The corresponding concretes are exemplified by רְחוּק "chain," קָנָא "zealous, jealous," or, with weakening of the 1st vowel, מְלוּא, גְּבוּר, שְׂבוּר, יָפוּר (Job xl. 2 = xxxix. 32), קָפַח (قَفَّاح). These all spring from an original *kappal*, the intensive of קָפַל, תָּפַל. The Arabic infin. تَفَّال is therefore weakened from تَفَّال, as in كَذَاب, عَلَم, حَمَال, as compared with the concretes كَذَاب, عَلَم, حَمَال.—The forms with prefixed *i*, which are generally assigned to this conjugation, تَقْتَل, تَقْتِيل, تَقْتِيل, 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 קָפַל (קָפַלָה); whilst the Talmūd Babilī, the Mandaitic, and the modern Syriac, exhibit קָפַלִּי; e.g. Talm. B. שְׂבוּחֵי, קָפַלִּי.

¹ [Kautzsch-Ges. (15th 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.]

שִׁאבוּהִיא, אִסוּיִיא, נִאִסוּרִיא, בִּאִרוּכִיא, מַאֲסוּיִיא; צִלּוּיִיא, אִסּוּיִיא;
 mod. Syr. ܩܦܠܐ, ܩܦܠܐ. This ܩܦܠܐ is not easy to explain,
 but most likely, as Noeldeke thinks, it is connected with such
 Hebrew forms as שָׁבַל (plur. שְׁבָלִים, Is. xlix. 20) and שָׁלַח,
 plus the originally fem. termination *ai*, which we find in Syriac in
 ܠܡܚܒ, ܠܡܚܒ, etc. In all these dialects an *m* is occasionally
 prefixed, Targ. ܡܩܦܠܐ, Mand. ܡܦܐܩܘܪܝܐ, mod. Syr. ܡܚܦܠܐ,
 ܡܚܦܠܐ; and this is the ordinary form in old Syriac, but with a
 different termination, though also originally fem., viz. ܡܚܦܠܐ.
 The prefixing of the *m* may have been due to the influence
 of the participial forms, and of the infin. Pē'al, ܡܚܦܠܐ. — In
 Mandaitic and modern Syriac a fem. of ܩܦܠܐ is also in common
 use as a verbal noun or infinitive, viz. ܩܦܠܐ, as ܦܐܩܘܪܬܐ
 “order,” ܪܐܢܐܘܬܐ “provocation,” ܘܐܒܐܢܐܬܐ “selling,”
 ܘܐܘܪܐܘܬܐ “warning”; ܠܚܘܡܐ “completion,” ܘܚܘܡܐ “dcliverance.” The
 most nearly corresponding forms in Hebrew are represented by
 such words as ܩܦܠܐ “desiring,” ܩܦܠܐ “care,” ܩܦܠܐ “terror,”
 ܩܦܠܐ “cutting off (of rain), drought, distress,” ܩܦܠܐ “punish-
 ment,” ܩܦܠܐ “drought.” These are intensives of the form
 ܩܦܠܐ ܩܦܠܐ, found in old Syriac and still more abundantly in
 mod. Syriac, ܩܦܠܐ, ܩܦܠܐ; just as ܩܦܠܐ is the
 intensive of the Syr. and Mand. ܩܦܠܐ, ܩܦܠܐ, ܩܦܠܐ.

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. ܩܦܠܐ, ܩܦܠܐ: “bless”; ܩܦܠܐ
 “go to law”; ܩܦܠܐ “talk to”; ܩܦܠܐ, ܩܦܠܐ: “play the hypocrite.”

In Hebrew its use is likewise restricted. It appears in this language under the shape of *kāṭēl*, for *kāṭal*, and is most common in verbs ע"ע, e.g. פֹּדַר "cleave," חוּלַל "pierce, wound," חוּנַן "show mercy," סוּבַב "surround," הוּלַל "befool," רוּצַן "crush to bits." In the ordinary trilateral verb examples are rare, but certain; e.g. שׁוּפַט (Job ix. 15, מְשַׁפֵּט = مَسْحَكِمِي), לֹאֲשֵׁן (Ps. ci. 5, מְלֹאֲשֵׁן בְּפִתְרֵי רֵעֵדוֹ, סוּעַר (Hos. xiii. 3, יְסוּעַר "blows away"), שׁוּרַשׁ "to take root," וְהִנּוּ "conceiving and uttering," Is. lix. 13. In Aramaic this form can hardly be said to occur, save in Biblical Aramaic, where we find מְסוּבְּלִין "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 *kīṭāl*, of which the grammarians quote one or two examples, as *صِرَابٌ* and *تِبْنَالٌ*. Usually, however, it has been shortened into *تَنَالٌ*, though some compensated for the loss of the long vowel by doubling the middle radical, *مِرَاءٌ*, *تَنَالٌ*, which must however have led to confusion with the infinitive of the intensive. The Hebrew infinitives הִנּוּ and הִנּוּ hold fast the original vowel *ā*, and would be represented in Arabic by some such words as *هَاجَاءٌ* and *قَاتَالٌ*, which do not actually exist.

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

sound with this קוּמַל. I mean the form קַטַלַל, originally *kaḫalāl*, *kaḫlāl*, when derived from verbs עָץ; e.g. פּוֹנֵן for פּוֹנֵן, עוֹרֵר for עוֹרֵר, and the like. Here too we find an active participle without prefixed *m*, שׁוֹרֵר, "that lie in wait for me," Ps. v. 9, and elsewhere.

3. The factitive or causative conjugation of the verb seems originally to have been marked by a prefixed *tu*, *taḫāḫala*, contracted *taḫāḫala*. Of this formation verbal examples are exceedingly rare in any dialect. הַרְגֵלְתִי, Hos. xi. 3, seems certain; perhaps also תַּרְגַּם, תַּרְגָּם, תַּרְגָּם, if connected, as seems probable, with the Assyrian root *ragāmu* "to speak," whence *rigmu*, "a word" (Delitzsch). For תַּרְגָּה (Jer. xii. 5, xxii. 15) another explanation is possible. But in verbal nouns of the infinitive class it is exceedingly common, though in our Arabic grammars these are all ascribed to the intensive form, with which, strictly speaking, they have nothing to do. I mean the infinitives تَقْتِيلٌ and تَقْتَلَةٌ, تَقْتَالٌ and تَقْتُولٌ, with their Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents, such as Aram. and late Heb. תַּרְבִּית, תַּרְבִּית, תַּרְבִּית "shroud," תַּרְבִּית "wrapper," תַּרְבִּית "model," תַּרְבִּית "interest," תַּרְבִּית "benefit," תַּרְבִּית "guidance"; Syr. ܬܪܒܝܬܐ, ܬܪܒܝܬܐ, ܬܪܒܝܬܐ "exchange," ܬܪܒܝܬܐ, ܬܪܒܝܬܐ, ܬܪܒܝܬܐ.—This form with *t* appears to have had a sister form with prefixed *s* or *sh*. In Arabic this latter occurs in rare instances like سَلَبٌ "dash to the ground," سَلَقِي "throw down flat on the back" (whence the trilateral سَلَقَ), and سَلَفَ "swallow," as well as in the exceedingly common reflexive اسْتَقْتَلَ, of which, as well as of the corresponding Ethiopic forms we shall speak in a subsequent lecture. The Hīmyaritic exhibits the *s* in one of its dialects, סַקְנִי, סַחֲרַת. In Amharic the

preformative ה, *sa*, more frequently לה, *as*, is an ordinary causative prefix, e.g. חוּלַל: "be honoured," אֲחַלְלֶנּוּ: "honour." In Assyrian such forms as *ušaškin*, "set up," *ušaṣriš*, "spread out," *ušašbit*, "let seize," seem to be common. In Biblical Hebrew, on the other hand, the prefix ש is found only in the derivative nouns שְׂלֵהֶבֶת "flame," [from Aram. שְׂלֵהֵב "kindle"], שְׂקֵעוֹרוֹת (Levit. xiv. 37), "hollows, depressions," (rad. קֶעַר), and שְׂבִיל "snail," (rad. בָּל "moisten," בָּל). In the Aramaic dialects, on the contrary, there are numerous examples of it, such as מְפַח, מְפַכּ, מְחַכּ, מְחַכּ, מְחַכּ, מְחַכּ, מְחַכּ, מְחַכּ; מְפַח. The form with ט is far more rare, e.g. מְפַח, מְפַח, מְפַח; Syr. מְפַח, מְפַח, מְפַח (rad. מְפַח); Mand. מְפַח, מְפַח, מְפַח "smooth."—This initial *s* underwent, however, in most cases, a further change into *h*. Hence some rare Arabic forms like هَات "give," هَارَق "pour out," هَارَى "wish," هَارَح "let rest," (for هَات, imperative of هَاتِي, from هَاتِي "come"). This *h* does not occur in Ethiopic or Assyrian, but we find it in one of the Himyaritic dialects, הקני, החדת. In Biblical Aramaic it is common, in the forms הקטל, הקטל; and may also be found in the Targūms, at least in verbs פ"ץ and פ"ץ. In Mandaitic there are likewise a few instances, e.g. האוליל "cry out, lament"; האשיט "despise"; האנפיק "lead out," and האנסיק "let ascend," as well as אפיק and אסיק. In Syriac it is unknown¹; but it is the usual form in Hebrew. Here the original was *haktal*, with *a* in both syllables. For the first syllable this is proved (1) by the vowel of the imperative and imperfect, and (2) by the forms of verbs פ"ץ, where הושיב, הושיב, can only

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

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

arise from הוֹרִישׁ, הוֹשִׁיב. For the second syllable the *a* is established (1) by the vowel of the 1st and 2nd persons, הַקְטִילְתָּ, הַקְטִילְתִּי, etc., and (2) by the form הַגְלֵה for הַגְלִי, in verbs לִיץ or לִיץ. The vowel of the first syllable was however mostly weakened into *i*, and that of the second into *ī*. In the second syllable we should naturally expect = *ē*, but the language has in this case gone a step further and sunk *ē* into *ī*. Hence the normal הַקְטִיל, with its fem. הַקְטִילָה and plur. הַקְטִילוּ. The rest of the paradigm does not call for much remark. The imperfect יִקְטִיל is a contraction for יִדְקִטֵּל, of which fuller form examples occur in Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. The normal *ē* is retained in Hebrew in the jussive יִקְטַל, the infinitive absolute הַקְטַל, and the imperative הַקְטֵל and הַקְטִלְנָה (הָאֲזִנָּה in Gen. iv. 23); but the long *ī* appears in the heavier forms of the imperfect יִקְטִיל, the energetic יִקְטִילְנֹו, הַקְטִילָה, the imperative הַקְטִילִי, הַקְטִילוּ, and the participle מְקַטֵּל. The infinitive construct varies between הַקְטִיל and הַקְטַל, though the former is much more common. A form like הַשְׁמִיר, Deut. vii. 24, xxviii. 48, is a rarity¹.

The last step in the history of the factitive or causative is the weakening of the initial *h* into the spiritus lenis. In Phoenician the perfect is written with initial *h*, but was probably pronounced *ihʔil*. Examples from the inscriptions are יִמְנָא "he set up," and יִקְדִישׁ "he consecrated." This weakening is almost universal in Arabic, where the form is written أَتَلَّ *ʔtalla*. In Ethiopic too it is exceedingly common; and the prefix 'a is used in this language to form causatives not merely from *katdla*, but also from *kattdla*, and even from *kātdla*; as ጠጽጽ: "come," ለጠጽጽ: "bring"; ጠረ: "go," ለጠረ: "make to go"; ሠነዖ: *sannāya*, "be beautiful," ለሠነዖ: *ʾasannāya*, "make beautiful"; ለጸጸጸ:

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

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

“make one finish”; $\lambda\lambda\phi\tau$: “condole with one.” In Tigrifta and Amharic too it is in ordinary use. In Hebrew it is very rare (אֲנִלְתִּי “I have defiled,” Is. lxiii. 3; אֲשַׁבֵּי , infin., Jerem. xxv. 3); but in the Aramaic dialects it is the almost universal form, ܐܘܫܠܐ . In one instance in Syr. the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened to *e*, viz. ܐܘܫܠܐ , as compared with ܐܘܫܠܐ , ܐܘܫܠܐ ,—like the vulg. Arab. اسلم mentioned above. With regard to the initial *a*, I may remark that it disappears after preformatives; e.g. in Arabic, يقتل , part. مقتل ; in Ethiopic, from $\lambda\lambda\gamma\zeta$: “make speak,” $\rho\gamma\gamma\zeta$: *yāndgēr* and $\rho\gamma\gamma\zeta$: *yāngēr*; Syr. ܐܘܫܠܐ , ܘܫܠܐ . The vulgar Arabic of Egypt has weakened the vowel of the 1st syllable to *i*, as *yikhibir* (يخبير), *yimhil* (يمهل). 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 ܐܘܫܠܐ , ܐܘܫܠܐ , corresponding very nearly to the Arabic أنتال ; Talm. Babli and Mandaitic, ܐܘܫܠܐ , as ܐܘܫܠܐ , ܐܘܫܠܐ ; ܐܘܫܠܐ “kneel,” ܐܘܫܠܐ “condemn”; with prefixed *m*, ܐܘܫܠܐ “go,” ܐܘܫܠܐ “bring”; Syriac, always with *m*, ܐܘܫܠܐ .

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 *taḫḫtala*. Of this

we have two varieties in Ethiopic, ተከረኒ: *takaddna*, and ተከረኒ: *takádna*, "cover oneself, be covered"; ተዐቀብ: and ተዐቅብ: "guard oneself, abstain, beware, be guarded"; ተወለደ: "be born"; ተለኘ: "be taken"; ተመመ: 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, אֲתַקַּל, more commonly, with weakening of the last vowel, אֲתַקַּל, אֲתַקַּל. In Syriac and Mandaitic we also find a supplementary vowel in frequent use, عَتِيقِطِل, اَلِصَهْل. The Biblical Aram. has the spiritus asper instead of the lenis, הֲתַקַּל, e.g. הֲתַרְחִצוּ Dan. iii. 28. In Hebrew this form is of very rare occurrence indeed. A possible example, without any prosthetic, may be תַּתְּרַה, of which the imperf. תַּתְּרַה occurs in Jerem. xii. 5, and the participle מַתְּרַה in xxii. 15. If so, this form is next of kin to the Syr. اَلِصَب. More certain is a derivative from the rad. פָּקַד, with the prosthetic spiritus asper, viz. הֲתַפְּקַד "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 اَتَتَل, standing for تَتَل, offers us the curious feature of a transposition of the preformative to the place after the first radical, تَتَل for تَتَل. This began no doubt with the verbs which commenced with a sibilant, as in Syr. اَلِصَحْب, اَلِصَحْب; اَلِصَحْب, اَلِصَحْب; and was gradually extended to all alike. The Arabic parallel to הֲתַפְּקַד is therefore اِنْتَقَد "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 הֲלַחַח, from the rad. לַחַם, in the

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

sense of the Heb. נָלַחַם "fight," Arab. اَلْتَحَمَ "join oneself to, adhere to," "rage" (of a battle). It is also found in Assyrian, as *istakan* "he made," *iftikid* "he committed" or "entrusted"; and in Himyaritic, without any prosthetic *alif*, e.g. סָטַר from סָטַר, סָטַל from סָטַל, נָטַר from נָטַר. It would appear that forms without transposition of the *t*, as well as forms corresponding to those of classical Arabic, exist in the modern dialect of Egypt. At least Spitta distinguishes carefully verbs of the form *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 *ithabas*, *itkasar*, *itmisik*, *itfihim*; whereas the transposed *ifta'al* is more usually reflexive than passive, as *it'amad*, *intaḡar*, *iṡtalah*, *iṡtama'* ("be heard" and "obey").

2. The reflexive of the intensive and iterative is naturally *taḡattala*. This form presents itself in Arabic, تَغَطَّلَ, and in Ethiopic, ተጸደሰ: *taḡaddtsa*, "be hallowed," ተጸደዐ: *tafaṡṡma*, "be finished," ተለዘዘ: *ta'assāsa*, "obey," ተፈለዘ: *tafassēha*, "rejoice" (because of the 3rd guttural). It would gradually be corrupted into اِتَّغَطَّلَ *itḡattala*, 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," اَزِين "adorn oneself," اِسْمَع "hear, listen," اِصْعَد "ascend," اِصْدَق "give alms," اِطِير "regard as an evil omen." In this way اِتَّنَفَسَ would become اِتَّنَفَسَ, and so in vulg. Arabic اِتَّعَلَّقَ *it'allaq*, "be suspended," اِتَّنَظَّفَ *itnaddaf*, "be cleansed," or with weakening of the 3rd vowel, اِتَّعَمَّ, *it'ammim*, "put on a turban." Here we have the origin of the Aramaic אֲתַקְפַל, Syr. ܐܬܩܦܠ, in Bibl. Aram. ܐܬܩܦܠ, as ܐܬܩܦܠ Ezra vii. 15,

v. 17, Dan. iv. 12, 20, 30, etc.; with weakening of the last vowel, הִוּדְמַנְתָּן, Dan. ii. 9 (*Kēzē*); as well as of the Hebrew form הִתְקַטַּל or הִתְקַטַּל. The assimilation of which I spoke above as occurring even in classical Arabic, is common in most of the dialects. In Arabic a word like *أدثر* makes in its imperfect *يدثر* for *يتدثر*. Just so in Ethiopic, from verbs with initial dentals and sibilants, we have in this and in the preceding conjugation, such forms as *ይጠጥጥ*: from *ተጠጥጥ*: “be dipped, baptized”; *ይጸጸን*: from *ተጸጸን*: “be covered, buried”; *ይሰበሰ*: from *ተሰበሰ*: “be broken”; *ይጻጻፍ*: from *ተጻጻፍ*: “be written”; *ይዘከር*: from *ተዘከር*: “remember”; *ይጸደቅ*: from *ተጸደቅ*: “pretend to be righteous.” In Tigrifā this assimilation extends to all verbs, *ይገደፍ*: “it will be forgiven,” from *ተገደፍ*; *ይሰለስ*: “he returns,” from *ተሰለሰ*; *ይፈጸመ*: “it will be finished,” from *ተፈጸመ*; *ይቅበል*: “he receives,” from *ተቅበል*:. Indeed the doubling caused by the assimilation of the preformative seems to have been gradually dropped in pronunciation, and these words are now pronounced *yēgdaf*, *yēmēlas*, *yēḥḥam*, *yēḥḥbal*. Hence Hebrew forms like הִתְקַטַּל, הִתְפַּתַּח, הִתְבַּעַי, are at once explained, as well as the similar הִכּוּנָן. In Mandaitic and the Talmūd this assimilation is as common in both conjugations as in Tigrifā. E.g. in Mandaitic, not merely *עֲדָגָא* “were heaped up” (*עֲתָרְגָא*), *עֲטָמָא* “were stopped up” (*עֲתָמָא*), but also *מִיִּפְתָּא* “opened” (*מִתְפַּתַּח*), *מִיִּגְטִיל* “killed” (*מִתְבַּעַי*), *עֲנָמָא* “was fulfilled,” *עֲכָנָא* “was collected,” (*מִתְקַטַּל*); *מִכְאֲלָא* “crowned”; in the Talmūd, *מִיִּבְעֵי*, *מִיִּגְנִיב*, *מִיִּקְטִיל*, *מִיִּפְלְגִי* for *מִתְפַּלְגִין*, *מִיִּכְפָּא* “cover thyself” (fem.), and apparently with suppression of the doubling, *אִיעֶסַק* “he gave himself the trouble,” *אִיעֶלְמָא* “she hid herself,” *אִיעֶתֵרִי* “I am become

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

Yet again, the Ithpēl and Ithpa'al forms have a peculiarity common to them in several of the dialects. This is, that when the first radical is a sibilant, the preformative is transposed and appears in the 2nd place, as is always the case with the Arabic **افعل**. Frequently too the **א** is changed into a **ב** or a **ג**, according to the character of the initial consonant of the root. So in Hebrew, **הַשְׁתַּיִם**, **הַשְׁתַּיִם**, **הַשְׁתַּיִם**, but **הַשְׁתַּיִם**. So in Syriac, **ܐܘܫܘܡܝܢ**, **ܐܘܫܘܡܝܢ**, but **ܐܘܫܘܡܝܢ**, **ܐܘܫܘܡܝܢ**. So in Arabic, in the conj. **اصطبغ**, **زاد** from **ازداد**, **زجر** from **ازدجر**, **افتعل** from **اضطر**, **صبغ** from **ضرب**. 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 **نَار** Lane gives **انار**; from **ثرد**, **اثرد** and **اثرد**, "crumble bread"; from **انفرع** and **انفرع**, "cut the front teeth"; from **اندرع**, **اندرع**, "put on mail"; from **ادلج**, **ادلج**, "journey by night"; from **ذخر** and **اذخر** and **اذكر**, rather than **اذخر** and **اذكر**, but from **ذبح** and **اظفر** and **اطعن**, **ظلم** or **اطلم** from **ظلم**; **اذري** and **اذبح**, **ذري** from **ظفر** and **ظعن**. With initial **ص** and **ض** this assimilation is far less common, as **اصبغ**, **اضرب**, **اصبح**; and with **س** and **ز** it is very rare, as **ازان**, **اسمع**. Bearing these facts in mind, we are, I think, justified in saying that a Hebrew form

like הִזְנֵנִי (Is. i. 16) is assimilated from הִזְנֵנִי , just as the similar הִשְׁלֹמֵם (Eccles. vii. 16) stands for הִשְׁלֹמֵם , with backward assimilation. Similarly in Syriac, نَلَّزْنَا for نَلَّزْنَا , نَلَّزْنَا for نَلَّزْنَا , نَلَّزْنَا for نَلَّزْنَا . Here and there we find exceptions to

the rule of transposition. In Aramaic the verb اَض exhibits the forms يُضِض (in Euting's *Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien*, no. 11) and يُضِض 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 اَتَتَل and تَتَل , the third member of this group requires but little notice. It is the reflexive and reciprocal of katāla , viz. takātala , which is the ordinary Arabic form, as تَرَامِي "to throw oneself down," تَمَارَض "to pretend to be sick," تَقَاتَلُوا "they fought with one another." So in Ethiopic, ተላጸዖ ; or ተላፀዖ ; "to shave oneself," ተሀሀላ ; "to show oneself gentle to another, pardon," ተፋለጡ ; "they parted from one another," ተሀቀዖ ; "he was tortured, afflicted." But تَقَاتَل gradually became اَتَقَاتَل , and hence such forms in classical Arabic as اَتَايَعَ "rush headlong," اَتَانَل "be heavy and troublesome," اَدَارَأ "repel one another," اَسَاتَط . In the vulgar Arabic of Egypt the vowel of the 3rd syllable is weakened to *i* or to *shēva*, as itkāmīl , i'ārik "struggled with," i'ārādū , itnāsābū . In Biblical Aramaic occurs the form הִשְׁלֹמֵם , Dan. iv. 16. In Hebrew we may regard הִזְנֵנִי "stagger to and fro, toss itself," Jer. xxv. 16, xlvi. 7, 8; and הִשְׁלֹמֵם , Is. lii. 5, for הִשְׁלֹמֵם , "blasphemed," as examples from the ordinary trilateral verb. From verbs ע"ע I may mention הִתְעַלַּל "perpetrate,

accomplish," Ps. cxli. 4; הִתְפַּוֵּר Is. xxiv. 19; הִתְרוֹצֵץ Gen. xxv. 22; הִתְקַוֶּשׁ Zeph. ii. 1; and הִתְהוֹלֵל. And here I will notice in passing one curious Hebrew form, though it does not belong to the conjugation תִּתַּל, but to תִּתַּל. From the radical שׁוּט is derived the Pi'lēl שׁוּטוּט, "wander about," and from this the Prophet Jeremiah has formed the Hithpa'lēl הִתְשׁוּטוּט, in the imperat. plur. fem. הִתְשׁוּטוּטְנָה, 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, הִתְשׁוּטוּטְנָה.

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 *kātala*, *kāttala*, and *kātala*. 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 تَتَال, for تَتَال, though but little used, so we look here for a corresponding formation. This actually occurs in the rare تَتَال, with assimilation of the preformative vowel. Examples تَتَامَل, تَتَكَلَّم, تَتَمَلَّق, تَتَنَقَّم; to which we may add such concretes as تَلْقَام "glutton," تَلْقَاع "foolish chatterer," تَكْذَاب "mendacious," and the like. A great many Hebrew and Aramaic words with prefixed *t*, especially of the form تَتَل, belong by their signification to this conjugation, and not to the causative or factitive تَتَل. Such are in Syriac, ܬܬܠܘܢܐ, ܬܬܘܡܘܢܐ, ܬܬܘܥܘܢܐ, ܬܬܘܥܘܢܐ; in Hebrew, תְּחַנֵּן, "entreaty, prayer," תְּפִלָּה "prayer," תְּעֻלָּמָה "secret," תְּעֻנָּנִים from תְּעֻנָּה, תְּאֻדָּה from תְּאֻדָּה, תְּגַרָּה from תְּגַרָּה, etc. The Arabic however generally uses another form of the infinitive,

which is common to the 5th and 6th conjugations, viz. ⁵تَقَاتَلٌ and ⁵تَقَاتَلٌ, with *u* in the 3rd syllable. These seem to be closely connected with such Hebrew and Aramaic forms as שָׁלוּם, שְׁלוּחִים, שְׁלוּלִים, Bibl. Aram. אִשְׁתָּרַר "rebellion," Mand. עַתְלָא בְרִשְׁיָא, Talmud. אִימְנוּעֵי, for אִיחְמוּנְעֵי, "withdraw from, abstain from." ⁵تَقَاتَلٌ is almost exactly represented by the Hebrew concretes תִּבְלָל "having a white spot on the eye," תִּאֲשַׁר "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 ¹⁰اِسْتَسَلَّمَ "to give oneself up," ¹⁰اِسْتَقَامَ "to hold oneself upright, stand upright," ¹⁰اِسْتَخْلَفَ "select one as a deputy for oneself," ¹⁰اِسْتَفْرَ "ask pardon for oneself," ¹⁰اِسْتَكَلَّ "deem something lawful" (for oneself to do). It is exceedingly common, and is derived, as I explained to you before, from the form *saḫtala*, by the prefixing of the syllable *tu*. This form *tasaxtala* became *itsaxtala*, and then, by the same transposition as is usual in Hebrew and Aramaic, *istaxtala*. Hence its identity with the Aramaic אִשְׁתַּקְטַל from שְׁקַטַל. It is found in Hīmyaritic or S. Arabian, without a prosthetic letter, *satafal* from *safal*, as סַתְפַל, סַתְפִי. It also occurs in Assyrian; as *uštīšib-šināt*, "I have set them" or "made them dwell," for *uštīšib* [or *uštīšib*], from אִשַׁב = אִשַׁב; *altabušu*, "I did," for *aštabušu*, from עִבַשׁ (Haupt *epēšu*). In Ethiopic we had, you may remember, three forms of the causative, 'aḫtāla, 'aḫattāla, and 'aḫātāla; and so also we have three forms of the reflexive, 'astaxatāla or 'astaxattāla, 'astaxattāla and 'astaxātāla; e.g. ለስተረፈሰ:

“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,” $\lambda\eta\tau\delta\lambda\omega\tau$: “rejoice”; $\lambda\eta\tau\text{-}\text{q}\eta\text{-}\eta$: “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 أَتَلَّ *'aktala* forms in the Aramaic dialects a reflexive and passive by prefixing the syllable *eth*, as in the Palmyrene tariff לְתַעֵלְתִּי , מְתַעֵלְתִּי , from לָעַל , לָעַל . In Samaritan, Syriac and Mandaitic the assimilation of the *t* with the following *alif* takes place, e.g. תְּשַׁלְּתִי (תְּשַׁלְּתִי , “be found”), תְּשַׁלְּתִי (תְּשַׁלְּתִי , “be finished”), תְּשַׁלְּתִי (תְּשַׁלְּתִי), תְּשַׁלְּתִי (תְּשַׁלְּתִי), תְּשַׁלְּתִי (תְּשַׁלְּתִי), תְּשַׁלְּתִי (תְּשַׁלְּתִי), תְּשַׁלְּתִי (תְּשַׁלְּתִי).

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 *na-katala* became first *na-katala*, and then, with prosthetic vowel, *in-katala*, انْقَلَبَ ; as انْشَقَّ “to split itself, open” (of a flower); انْزَمَ “to let oneself be put to flight, to flee”; انْقَادَ “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 يَنْقَلِبُ ; the Hebrew, יִנְקַלֵּב for יִנְקַלֵּב , with constant assimilation of the preformative to the 1st radical. The Arabic imperative

is **اَنْقَتَل**, the Hebrew **הִקְטִיל**, with the usual substitution of ה for א in these preformative syllables. The Arabic infinitive is **اَنْقَتَل**; the corresponding Hebrew form is **הִקְטִיל** (with *ō* for *ā*), as **הִנָּחֵן**, **הִאָּכַל**, beside which we have another form for the construct infinitive, viz. **הִקְטִיל**, as **הִלָּחַם**, **הִפְתִּיחַ**, **הִעֵיז**. 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 *nakaṭāl* into *nakṭāl*, which was gradually weakened into *niḳṭāl*. The original vowel of the 1st syllable is established by such words as **נָחַטָּא**, **נָעֵשָׂה**, **נָעֵלָה**, **נָוֵלַד** (for **נִוֵּלַד**), **נָסַב** (for **נִסְבַּב**), **נָסוּג** (for *nāsāg*, from **נָסַג**); whilst **נָחַטָּה**, **נָעֵשְׂתָה**, exhibit an intermediate state. The infinitive absolute is now **נִקְטֵל**, for *nakṭāl*, as **נָעֵתוֹר**, **נָהֲפֵךְ** [where the original vowel of the first syllable is protected by the guttural following], **נִקְרָא**, **נִלָּחַם**. The Arabic participle, formed after the analogy of the imperfect, with prefixed *m*, is **مَنْقَتِلٌ**. The Hebrew, on the contrary, has no prefix, but exhibits the same form as the perfect, with a slight difference in the vowel of the 2nd syllable. As **חָכַם** is differentiated from **חָכַם**, so is *nakṭāl*, *niḳṭāl*, from *nakṭāl*, *niḳṭāl*; e.g. **נָעֵרַץ**, **נָחַטָּם**, **נָאֹזַר** and **נָאֹזַר**, **נָוֵלַד**, **נָבְהַל**. We shall have occasion to notice a similar participial formation hereafter in the form *kuffāl*, as **אָכַל** "eaten," **יָוֵלַד** "born," **לָקַח** "taken." In a very few instances we seem to find an imperative after the form *niḳṭāl* or *niḳṭél*, viz. **נִקְבְּצוּ**, in pause **נִקְבְּצוּ**, Is. xliiii. 9; Joel iv. 11; **נָלוּז** 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 **נִתַּן**, and also **נָעַנְשׁ** [ש], probably **נָעַנְשׁ**.

In Assyrian Schrader gives such examples as *innabit* (נבב), "he fled," *innamir* (נמ), "was seen," *iššakin*, "was set up" or "restored," *iššibir*, "was broken," *ibbanî*, "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 ሁከከ, with initial *h*.

2. Of the actual Niph'al of the Arabic and Hebrew there is no trace in Ethiopic, but a cognate form is preserved in the prefix *an*, which we find in quadrilaterals, more especially reduplicated verbs of the form *kaḵala*, the Hebrew *Pilpəl*. 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: እንሰሰዐ: "to walk about," እንፈረዐጸ: "to leap, dance," እንጉድጉድ: "to thunder"; እንገለገ: "to come together, assemble"; እንቀዕደዐ: properly "to lean forward, prostrate oneself," but generally used in the sense of "lift up the eyes *or* heart in prayer"; እንኩርኩረ: "roll" (intrans. or trans.); እንቀቀለ: "totter" and "shake"; እንጠልዐ: "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 ነጉድጉድ: "thunder," ነጠርጢር: "rolling, a whirlwind," ነቀቀለ: "shaking," gave rise to the notion that the prefixed እ might be identical with the causative or factitive prefix እ. Hence, according to him, the occasional change of meaning, and the formation in a few cases of a passive with ተ, e.g. ተእንኩርኩረ: "to be rolled," ተእንጠልዐ: "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 *ittanasafal*], 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 נִפָּר Deut. xxi. 8, for נִתְּפַר, "be atoned for, forgiven," and נִסְרָו Ezek. xxiii. 48, for נִתְּפָרוּ, "let themselves be warned." In post-biblical Hebrew it is common, and has usurped the place of the perfect Hithpa"el, as נִשְׁתַּפֵּשׁ, נִסְתַּבֵּל, נִדְרָמָן, נִפְמָא; and is then extended to other formations, as נִשְׁתַּעַבַר, נִתְּרָגַם, נִתְּאֻלְמָה, "she is become a widow."

4. Lastly we may reckon here the third conjugation of the quadriliteral verb in Arabic, where the letter *u* is inserted after the 2nd radical; as اِبْرَشَقُ "to open" (of a flower), "to bloom"; اِحْرَنْجَمُ "to be gathered together in a mass or crowd"; اسَلَنْقِي "to lie on one's back"; اِنْعَنْجَرُ "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'lél*, *P'ra'al*, and *Pilpél*.

1. Starting from the root *katála*, the simplest form of such a reduplication is the repetition of the 3rd radical, *katalála*. But *katalála* would naturally become *kaflál*, which would be weakened in Aramaic into *kaflél*, and in Hebrew into *kiflél*. Aramaic examples are not numerous; e.g. עֲרַבַב "mix up, confuse"; חֻבַב "crumble," חֻבַב "separate," חֻבַב "practise, reduce to slavery," with its passive חֻבַב; חֻבַב "irritate," and חֻבַב "to become fierce"; חֻבַב "to be intelligent, sensible." In Hebrew this form has taken the place of Pi"el in verbs ע"ו, as נִדְרָו (better from נִדַר than from נִדַר), כֻּנַן, עוֹרַר, etc., and

forms a reflexive and passive with prefixed *ta*, **הִתְפַּעֵל**. In other classes of verbs it is rare, but we can refer to it **שָׁמַן** "to be quiet, still," Jerem. xxx. 10; Job iii. 18; **רָעַנְן** in the fem. **רָעַנְנָה** Job xv. 33; further, with passive pronunciation, **אִמְלַל** "to be withered, wither away, mourn"; and from verbs **לָה**, **נִאֲוָה**, contracted **נִאֲוָה** "to be seemly, beautiful"; **מִטְחַוֵּי קֶשֶׁת**, from **טַחַוָה** "to shoot," and the reflexive **הִשְׁתַּחַוָה**, from **שָׁחָה**. As to the Arabic development of the original *katalala*, it generally took the following course; *katalala* became *k̄atalala*, *ik̄atalala*, and finally *ik̄talla*. This form *ik̄talla* appears in the Arabic paradigm as the 9th conj. of the verb, with the cognate *ik̄talla* as the 11th; e.g. **أَزْوَرَّ** and **أَزْوَرَّ** "turn away," **أَرَبَّتْ** and **أَرَبَّتْ** "be scattered," **أَرَقَدَّ** "run quickly," **أَشَعَانُ** "be dishevelled"; and constantly of colours and defects, as **أَعْوَجَّ**, **أَعْوَجَّ**, "be crooked"; **أَحْوَلَّ**, **أَحْوَلَّ**, "squint"; **أَصْفَرَّ**, **أَصْفَرَّ**, "be yellow"; **أَبْيَضَّ**, **أَبْيَضَّ**, "be white." The uncontracted form *ik̄talla* survives only in some examples from verbs 3rd rad. **و** or **ي**; as **أَرَعَوِي** "to abstain, refrain"; **أَحَوَوِي** "to become brownish," with its byform **أَحَوَوِي**; **أَجْوَوِي** "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, **أَقْتَنَلَّ** for **أَقْتَنَلَّ**; as **أَحْلَنَكَ** "be jet black" (**حَلِكَ**), **أَعْلَنَكَ** "be long and thick" (of the hair), **أَعْنَسَسَ** "have a hump in front" (**عَسَسَ**).

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

I find a few similar forms in Syriac from verbs final o and d ; e.g. ܐܠܡܐܘܣܝܒ "to boast or brag"; ܐܠܦܢܗܝܒ "to lie down, be hidden, be blamed"; ܐܠܠܗܝܡܝܒ "become young, be smeared over." In Hebrew it can hardly be said to exist, unless we take count of הַצֹּפֵר "to blow the trumpet" (מְהַצֵּפֵרִים), from הַצֹּפֵרָה . But the form is doubtful, the ḥzr being מְהַצֵּרִים ; and even if we assume it to be correct, הַצֹּפֵר might stand for הַצֵּפֵר , as יַעֲרֹד in Is. xv. 5, if correct, stands for יַעֲרֹד .

5. The reduplication of the form ḡatalala or ḡatlala seems in some cases to have been softened into ḡatlaya , which would be represented in Arabic by ḡatlā تَتَلَّى , and in Aramaic by ܡܢܒܠܝ . Such words are in Mandaitic ܢܐܡܢܝܐ "to bewail," ܢܐܡܢܝܐ "to make an alien, estrange"; in Syr. ܘܚܝܒ "terrify," ܘܚܝܒ "estrangle," ܘܚܝܒ "be deprived of, fail, perish," ܘܚܝܒ "expose," ܘܚܝܒ "deport," with their passives. In Arabic a passive of this form is found in the 15th conj. of the verb, اِنْعَلَى , with h inserted after the 2nd rad.; as اِحْبَنْطَى "to be swollen or inflated" (حَبَطَ), اِعْلَدَى "be stout and strong" (عَلَدَ "be hard"). Curiously enough, a few verbs of this form in Arabic have a transitive sense, e.g. اَسْرَدَى "to overcome" (سَرَدَى "strong, brave"), اَغْرَدَى "to assail, overcome"; and, still more strangely, the only Mandaitic parallel, ܘܘܪܐܡܢܝܐ , "to be shaken," is derived from an active ܘܪܐܡܢܝܐ , which however does not occur in the extant literaturc.

E. *The Passive Forms.*

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

In Arabic nearly all the conjugations are capable of forming, and actually form, passives by means of internal modification of the vowels of the active voice. There are of course exceptions, which will readily suggest themselves to you. For instance, a verb like **صَلَحَ** "to be good *or* right," **فَرِحَ** "to be glad," or **ثَقَلَ** "to be heavy," cannot have a passive; nor one like **أَسْوَدَ**, "to be black." The vowel-change in the passive voice consists, generally speaking, in the substitution of duller sounds for the clearer ones of the active, the vowel *u* almost always playing a prominent part.

In the other Semitic languages the use of these real passives is far less frequent. In Hebrew the largest survival is found; much less in Aramaic. In Ethiopic they have, to all appearance, utterly vanished. In Assyrian Sayce states that "a passive formed by means of the obscure vowel *u*" exists for Pa"ēl, Shaph'ēl, Aph'ēl, and Istaph'al; but I do not find that he is supported by Schrader or Oppert. From my own knowledge I cannot speak¹.

1. In Arabic the following are the principal passives :

	Perfect.		Imperfect.	
(1)	<i>ḥatala</i>	<i>ḥutīla</i>	<i>yaḥtulu</i>	<i>yuchṭalu</i>
(2)	<i>ḥattala</i>	<i>ḥuttīla</i>	<i>yuchattīlu</i>	<i>yuchattalu</i>
(3)	<i>ḥāṭala</i>	<i>ḥhūṭīla</i>	<i>yuchhūṭīlu</i>	<i>yuchhūṭalu</i>
(4)	<i>'aḥtala</i>	<i>'uḥtīla</i>	<i>yuchṭīlu</i>	<i>yuchṭalu</i>
(5)	<i>taḥattala</i>	<i>tuchuttīla</i>	<i>yataḥattalu</i>	<i>yutachattalu</i>
(6)	<i>taḥāṭala</i>	<i>tuchhūṭīla</i>	<i>yataḥhūṭīlu</i>	<i>yutachhūṭalu</i>
[(7)	<i>inḥatala</i>	<i>unḥutīla</i>	<i>yanḥatīlu</i>	<i>yunḥatalu</i>]
(8)	<i>ikhatala</i>	<i>ukhutīla</i>	<i>yaḥtatīlu</i>	<i>yuchṭatalu</i>
(10)	<i>istahatala</i>	<i>ustuhūṭīla</i>	<i>yastahūṭīlu</i>	<i>yustahūṭalu</i>

¹ [According to Delitzsch, p. 249, the permansives II. 1 and III. 1 (Pa"ēl and Shaph'ēl) may be used either in active or passive sense, but without difference of form.]

2. In Hebrew the formation is similar, but not identical, the vowel *a* predominating throughout in the second syllable. The passives in use are:—

(a) Intensive and iterative, *kuttal*, *kottal*, imperf. *yēkuttal*. The infin. absolute has the form קָטַל, as קָטַל, Gen. xi. 15. The participle appears in two shapes, the one with prefixed *m*, *mūkuttāl*; the other without it, as אָכַל, יָדָל, לָקַח, הִלָּלָה, 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 *kuttāl*; but the corresponding form in Aramaic is a verbal noun from the active Pa“ēl, e.g. יַמְנָא “theft,” וַיִּשְׁטָן “warning,” מְכַסְּא “finishing”; whilst the Arabic *kuttāl* is now the plural of the active participle of the simple verb *katāla*, as *katīl* “a murderer,” *kuttāl* “murderers.” So again, the Hebrew participle אָכַל stands for *’ukkāl*, a sing. masc.; whereas the corresponding form in Arabic is another plural of the active participle of the simple *katāla*, as *shāgid*, “worshipper,” *suggād*, “worshippers.”

(b) The form expressive of effort, *kōtal*, imperf. *yēkōtal*, as יִשְׁרָשׁוּ, Job xxxi. 8.

(c) The causative or factitive, *hoktal*, *huktal*, imperf. *yoktal*.

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

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

(e) *Hothkattal*, in הִטְפַּאֲהוּ, Deut. xxiv. 4; הִרְשְׁנָה, for הִרְשְׁנָה, Is. xxxiv. 6; הִרְשְׁנָה 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 اَنْتَقَدْرُوا with הִתְפַּקְדוּ, or تَتَبَّتْ with הִרְשְׁנָה.

(f) A curious form is presented to us in the Hebrew נָנְאֵלָה, Is. lix. 3; Lament. iv. 14. This is generally explained as a passive of Niph'al, נִנְאָלָה, 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 נָנְאֵלָה as = *انفعلوا*; if the latter, I can produce a parallel from the vulgar Arabic of Egypt, viz. *انصيح* "it is lost, forfeited" (Spitta, *Contes Arabes*, p. 9, l. 10), from *ضيع* "to lose, forfeit." Here again perhaps the Massoretic punctuation may be erroneous (נָנְאֵלָה?).

(g) *Kuflal*, in אִמְלַל.

(h) *Kolkal*, in כִּלְכֵל, 1 Kings xx. 27, and חֲשַׁעְשַׁעוּ, 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 *kuffil*, 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, יְהִיב Dan. vii. 4, 6, כְּתִיב Ezra v. 7, קָטִיל Dan. v. 30, רָשִׁים Dan. v. 24, שָׁלַם Ezra v. 16; 3rd fem. בְּטִילַת Ezra iv. 24, יְהִיבַת Dan. vii. 27, נְטִילַת Dan. vii. 4, פְּרִיסַת Dan. v. 28, קָטִילַת Dan. vii. 11; 2nd sing. masc. תְּקַלְתָּא Dan. v. 27; 3rd plur. masc. יְהִיבוּ Ezra v. 15, כְּפָתוּ Dan. iii. 21, טָרִיטוּ Dan. vii. 4, פְּתִיחוּ Dan. vii. 10. The distinction of form is clearer in the case of verbs לִיא, where the

perfect passive is גָּלִי Dan. ii. 19, גָּלִי Dan. ii. 30, קָרִי Ezra iv. 18, 23; plur. רְמִיז Dan. iii. 21, vii. 9; whereas the form of the participle Pē'el is בָּנָה , מָנָא , קָרִי , שָׂרָא , plur. שָׂרִין . Similarly in the Palmyrene tariff, גְּבִי = Arab. جَبِيَ ; see Sachau in *ZDMG.* xxxvii. pp. 564—5.

(b) The passive of *Hiph'el*, viz. *Hoph'al*, in Biblical Aramaic and the Palmyrene dialect, viz. הִנְחַח Dan. v. 20, הִזְכַּר Dan. vii. 11, הִסֵּק Dan. vi. 24, הִעֵל Dan. v. 13, plur. הִעֵלוּ Dan. v. 15; fem. sing. הִקְיַמְת Ezra iv. 15, הִוְסַפְת Dan. iv. 33, הִתְקַנַּת (not נַת) Dan. vii. 4 (cf. أَتَيْمَت); 1st pers. הִתְקַנַּת (not נַת) Dan. iv. 33.

Very peculiar are the forms הִיִּתִיז Dan. vi. 18, and הִיִּתִיז Dan. iii. 13, the vocalisation of the 1st syllable of which is as yet unexplained. Similarly in the Palmyrene tariff, אֲשַׂר (from שָׂר), e.g. $\text{אֲשַׂר לְאַגּוּרָא}$ (ומרי אשר לאגורא); imperfect יִכְתַּב , e.g. $\text{יִכְתַּב מְדַעַם דִּי לֹא מְסַפֵּק}$; part. מְסַפֵּק , e.g. $\text{מְסַפֵּק מְדַעַם דִּי מִן עִידָא וִיהוּא מְבַטֵּל לְאַרְכּוּנְיָא דִּי הָוֵן בּוּבֵן}$; מְבַטֵּל ; $\text{מְבַטֵּל מְדַעַם דִּי מִן תְּחוּמָא אֹו מְפַק}$, for מְפַק , e.g. $\text{מְפַק מְדַעַם דִּי מִן תְּחוּמָא אֹו מְפַק}$; מְפַק .

(c) The passive of *Pi'el*, viz. *Pu'al*, in the Palmyrene tariff, יִזְבֵּן , e.g. $\text{יִזְבֵּן לְמִשְׁכַּא אֲפִרִין}$ (ומן כל) משך די יתאעל או יזבן למשכא אפרין.

(d) The passive participles of *Pa'el*, *Aph'el* and *Shaph'el*, formed exactly as in Arabic. Thus in Biblical Aramaic מְהַלֵּךְ , מְמַלֵּל , but מְכַפְתִּין "bound," Dan. iii. 23, 24, from מְכַפַּת ; מְסַתְרָא "hidden things," Dan. ii. 22, from מְסַתֵּר ; מְהַחְצֵפָה Dan. v. 19, and מְהַחְצֵפָה Ezra iv. 15, but מְהַחְצֵפָה Dan. ii. 15, or מְחַצֵּפָה Dan. iii. 22, from מְהַחְצֵף , מְחַצֵּף . Also from *Pō'al*, מְסוּבְלִין "set up, erected," Ezra vi. 3, from מְסוּבֵל .

Exactly so in Syriac, *מְבָרַךְ*, *מְבָרַכְתָּ*; *מְבָרַח*, *מְבָרַחָה*; *מְבָרַחְתָּ*, *מְבָרַחְתָּה*; and in Mandaitic, *מְבָרַךְ* "blessing," *מְבָרַכְתָּ* "blessed"; *מְבָרַח* "covering," *מְבָרַחָה* "covered"; *מְבָרַחְתָּ* "teaching," *מְבָרַחְתָּה* "taught," *מְבָרַחְתָּ* "bringing out," *מְבָרַחְתָּה* "brought out." The corresponding Arabic forms are *مَقْتَل*, *مَقْتَلٌ*; *مَقَاتِل*, *مَقَاتِلٌ*; *مَقَاتِلٌ*, *مَقَاتِلٌ*.

(e) The existence of passive participles of Pa"ēl and Aph'ēl after the *Hebrew* formation is not certain in Mandaitic, but Noeldedeke gives for the Pa"ēl the possible instances of *מְבָרַח*, "the highlands," for *מְבָרַחָה*, and *מְבָרַחְתָּ*, a name of Paradise, lit. "the taken away of righteousness," i.e. "the (land) of righteousness that has been taken away," = *מְבָרַחְתָּה*. On the other hand, the existence of Pu"al and Hoph'al participles in modern Syriac seems tolerably certain. For example, in Pu"al, *صَبَّحْتُكَ* "I have healed thee," is literally *صَبَّحْتُكَ* "thou hast been healed by me," the fem. being *صَبَّحْتُكِ*, for *صَبَّحْتُكِ*. So also in Pu"al, *سُبِّحْتُ*, *sūbinnē*, for *سُبِّحْتُ*, for *سُبِّحْتُ*; in Hoph'al, *صَبَّحْتُ* "raised up," *صَبَّحْتُ* "exalted"; with weakening of the vowel in the 2nd syllable.

CHAPTER IX.

THE IRREGULAR VERBS.

I NOW proceed, with the Hebrew Grammar in hand, to explain to you the principal forms of the Irregular Verbs, comparing them, as before, with the corresponding forms in Arabic and Syriac, and more rarely in other dialects.

I. Verbs *y'y* or *Geminate Verbs*.

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

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

(a) If all three radicals have vowels, the 2nd radical loses its vowel, and unites with the 3rd, so as to form a double letter. Hence سَبَّ, "to cause," becomes سَبَّ; مَسَسَ "to touch," مَسَسَ; حَبَّبَ "to become dear" (to one), حَبَّبَ. The original form may be retained in poetry, for the sake of the metre, as فَضُّوا for فَضُّوا, "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," دَمَّمَ "to be ugly." Vulg. Arab., *madd*, 'add, *zann*.

(b) If the first radical has no vowel, and the 2nd and 3rd have, then the 2nd radical throws back its vowel on the 1st, and unites with the 3rd, so as to form a double letter. Hence **يَسْبَبُ** becomes **يَسْبَسْ**; **يَمَسُّ**, **يَمَسَسْ**; **يَفِرُّ**, **يَفِرَّرْ**. The original forms may be used by poetic license, as **يَكَلُّ** for **يَكَلَّلْ**. Vulg. Arab., *yeççumun*, *ye'idd*, *yişahih*.

(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 **يَسْبَبْ**, and the imperative **أَسْبَبْ**; but both are usually contracted, with the help of a supplementary vowel, into **يَسْبِ** and **سَبِّ**. Vulg. Arab., *çumun*, '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 **רָדַד**, **סָבַב**, and **כָּבַב**.

Kal. Here the uncontracted forms are relatively far more common in Hebrew than in Arabic, as **סָבַב**, **סָרַר**, **חָנַן**, **חָלַל**, fem. **נָדְדָה**, plur. **נָדְדוּ**, **שָׁחַחוּ**, **סָבְבוּ**, **סָבְבוּ**. The contracted 3rd sing. masc. **סָבַ** and **כָּבַ** stand for *sabb* and *bazz*, and these for *sabba* and *bazza*, *sababa* and *bazaza*, like **רָדַד** for **רָדַד**. Add a suffix, and the doubling immediately becomes audible, **קָבַבְתִּי**, **חָנַנְתִּי** for *ḵabba-lu*; Aram. **קָבַבְתִּי**; like Arabic **رَدَدْتَنِي**. In the same way in the 3rd pers. plur. **סָבְבוּ**, **תָּמְמוּ**, J. Aram. **רָדְדוּ**, Syr. **رَدَدُوا** for *sababū*, *tamamū*, *daḵaḵū*, 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 רָפְּנוּ, רָפְּנוּ. The real existence of forms like רָפְּנוּ, Gen. xlix. 23, and רָפְּנוּ, Job xxiv. 24, is somewhat doubtful; but if genuine, they would find their analogy in the Arabic forms of praise and blame, بَعِدَ for بَعَدَ, حَبَّبَ for حَبَّ, حَسَّنَ for حَسَنَ, and بَعَدَ for بَعَدَ. In the 3rd p. fem. sing., Syr. حَبَّ stands for *bazzath* (Bibl. Aram. נָרַת, עָלַת, Mand. פִּאסֵאת, שִׁאֲרֵאת, אֲלֵאת), *bazasat*; and similarly סָבָה for *sabbath*, *sababat*, as رَدَّتْ for رَدَّتْ. The primitive accent is often retained, as in מָרָה, חָתָה, but may be shifted, as in וְרָפְּנוּ, 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; בְּזוֹנֵנוּ, 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 رَدَّتْ for رَدَدْتَ, ظَلَّتْ or ظَلَّتْ for ظَلَلْتَ, مَسَّتْ for مَسَسَتْ. So in Aramaic, حَوَّلَف, حَوَّلَف, حَوَّلَف, for *basasta*, *basastu*, *basastuan*. So in Hebrew, תָּמַנְנוּ for *tamamnu*, Num. xvii. 28. The 1st pers. sing., however, in Aramaic, is רִיקַת, Mand. פִּאסִית, אֲלִית, מֵאֲכִית, Syr. חָבִי for *bazzēth*, *bazzit*, *bazasti*. 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 *و* and *ي*, as رَدَدْتُ, رَدَدْتُ. 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 רָדַדְתָ would become (through the impossible *raddta*) *raddaita*, and this is the ordinary form at the present day, *raddait*, *raddét*, and in Algiers *raddtt*. We have seen, however, that the diphthong *ai* passed in some cases into *a*; for instance, Arab. أَيْنَ , Heb. אֵן , אָנָה ; בָּתִּים , from בַּיִת , בֵּית ; דְּבָרָיו or דְּבָרוֹ , from דְּבַרְיָו ; and in Arabic itself سَابَّة for سَابِيَّة , dimin. of دَابَّة . Hence out of رَدِيَّت sprang the form رَدَات , the dialectical existence of which is vouched for by the grammarians; and hence the Hebrew סַבְּתֵי , חַגְתֵם , וּמֹת , for *sabbati*, *sababti*. Of course the Hebrew *ð* 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 *raddaita* is a known dialectical variety of *raddaita*.

The infinitive construct in Hebrew exhibits two forms: uncontracted, לְחַנְּכֶם , לְסַבֵּב , far more rarely with *a*, לְחַנְּנָה , Is. xxx. 18, Ps. cii. 14; and contracted, חַנֵּן , סַבֵּב , far more rarely with *a*, רַר , Is. xlv. 1, שָׂדֶה , Jerem. v. 26. These are, of course, nothing but segolates of the same form as the Arabic رَد , رَدَا .

The Arabic imperative presents to us, as I explained above, the forms $\text{رَدِّ$ (رَدِّ), $\text{رَدِّ$. These are exactly equivalent to the Hebrew רַד , רַדְם , רַדְל , perhaps also רַדְל , Ps. cxix. 22; in Aramaic, רַדַּק , Mand. רַדַּק "wash," רַדַּר "dwell"; Syr. رَدِّ , رَدِّ (from رَدِّ). An example of the uncontracted form is שָׂדֶה , Jerem. xlix. 28, corresponding to an Arabic رَدِّ for رَدِّ .

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

יִמְסוּ, יִפְרֹ, יִדְּ. The first of these is reproduced exactly in the Hebrew יִסְבּוּ for *yasubb*, *yasubbu*, *yasubbu*, with suffix יִסְבְּנִי, plural, יִסְבּוּ for *yasubbū*, *yasubbūma*. This *ō* has rarely been weakened into *ī*, but we find examples in יִרְוֹן Is. xlii. 4, יִרְוֹן Prov. xxix. 6, יִשְׂאֵר Ps. xci. 6. These may not improbably have been influenced by the imperfect of verbs ע"ו, as in Mand., where נִימוּךְ (from מֵאֵךְ) is identical with נִיקוּם from קָאם, and conversely נִירְאָר "dwells," נִינְאָר "commits adultery," cannot be distinguished from נִירְאָם "be hot," תִּירְאָג "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 יִמַר, for *yinrar*, *yamrar*. So יִרְע, יִרְע, and a few more. In 1 Kings i. 1 the form is pointed יִחַם instead of יִחַם. The reason of this deviation from the form with *a* in the first syllable probably was that יִמַר, יִרְע, too closely resembled in their vocalisation that of the *perfect*. Indeed יִמַר, יִרְע, and יִרַר, rightly appear as verbal roots in our lexicons. This has not however prevented the substitution of the form יִוְמוּ for יִוְמוּ in Gen. xi. 6, because the singular must actually have been יִוֹם, not יִוֹם. In the fem. plur. תִּסְבְּנִי, תִּסְבְּנִי, the diphthong *ai* has again been inserted to facilitate the pronunciation of the contracted forms, which stand respectively for *tasubbua* and *tašlilna*, the intermediate steps being *tasubbua*, *tašillna*, then *tasubbaina*, *tašillaina*.

The Aramaic dialects go their own way in the formation of the imperfect and infinitive. They throw back the lost doubling of the 2nd and 3rd radicals upon the 1st. Hence יִדְּ, יִדְּ, נִבְּ, נִבְּ, for *yidukḳ*, *nēbuzs*, etc., from *yadukḳu*, *nabuzsu*; and in the infinitive, מִדְּ, מִדְּ, for *midḳaḳ*, *mēbas*. The

Hebrew also has this form in such words as יָקַד, יָדַמוּ, יָדַם; יָקַדוּ, יָקַדוּ; יָהֲמוּ, יָהֲמוּ; יָהֲמוּ, יָהֲמוּ, Jerem. xix. 3, for תִּצְלַחְנָה; and so forth.

The participle active has in Hebrew the uncontracted form חֹנֵן, חֹנֵן, חֹנֵן, whereas in Arabic the contraction is prevalent, حَالٌّ, حَالٌّ, and the uncontracted حَالٌّ occurs as a rare poetic license. In vulg. Arab. however the uncontracted حَاجِجٌ 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 חָוּן, חָוּן, like חָוּן, but the fem. sing. and the plurals are regular, חָוּן, חָוּן, חָוּן, for 'alilat, 'aliltu, 'aliltu. In Bibl. Aram. we find the uncontracted plur. עֲלִילִין, Dan. iv. 5, v. 8, as *Kēlībbl*, the *Kēlīb* being עֲלִין, as also in Samarit. עֲלִילָה, עֲלִילָה.

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*, *naqall*, from *nasbab*, *nahrar*, *naqlal*. Curiously enough, however, we find here the intransitive vowels of the *Kal* also used in the 2nd syllable; e.g. נָמַס, נָקַל, נָרַץ; and so in the fem., נָשַׁמָּה, but נָסַפָּה; and in the plur., נָסַבוּ, נָשַׁמוּ, but also נָבַחוּ, נָגְלוּ. This seems due to the resemblance of נָסַב to the ordinary *Kal* נָגַשׁ, whence the same variations that were admissible in the one came in course of time to be thought allowable in the other. Others think that the *o* 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 נָשַׁמָּה, Jerem. xxx. 16 (*Kēlībbl*), if we derive it from נָשַׁמָּה = נָשַׁמָּה, the sing. being נָשַׁמָּה for נָשַׁמָּה.

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

doubling and inflects exactly like the *Kal* of נָגַשׁ, for the same reason as the first three; e.g. נָבְקָה, נָסְכָה, נָגְלוּ. A fifth form resembles the ordinary Niph'al in the vowel of the first syllable, as נָחַר, נָחַת, נָחַל, and gives the plur. נָחְרוּ, נָחְלוּ; participp. נֹאָרִים, נֹחְמִים. This seems to be a secondary formation from נָגַשׁ, נָחַר, נָחַת, נָחַל, after the fashion of Niph'al נָגַשׁ from *Kal* נָגַשׁ.—Of the 2nd person examples are very rare; but we find נִמְלַחְתָּם side by side with נִמְלַחְתֶּם and נִחַלְתָּ.—Similarly in the first person we have נִקְלָוְתִי with the plur. נִשְׁדָּנוּ, Micah ii. 4, where the supplementary vowel *o* has been weakened into *a*.—For the sake of comparison with the above I need only mention the Arabic forms *ingarara* for *انجر*; 2nd pers. *انجرت*, uncontracted.—In the imperfect, the ordinary form is *yissabb*, by assimilation and contraction for *yansabib*; as *יגל*, *יפד*, *יזח*. The uncontracted form occurs in *יִלְכַּב*, Job xi. 12. The corresponding plural naturally exhibits the double letter, *yimradh*, *yispanh*, contracted for *yansabibh(ua)*, *yannadidh(ua)*. Such words as *ירוע*, Prov. xi. 15, xiii. 20, and *הִרְוִין*, Ezek. xxix. 7, follow the analogy of verbs ע"ו. In Arabic, for the sake of comparison, take *yanjir* for *ينجر*, plur. *ينجرون*.

Hiph'el. In the perfect the Arabic form is *ajjar* for *اجر*, 2nd pers. *ajjart*. Contractions like *ahsast* and *ahsist*, for *ahsast*, are very rare in the classical language. The Hebrew follows the form *hiktal* or *hiktal* instead of *haktal*; e.g. *הִרְק*, *הִקַּל*, *הִסַּב*, *הִחַל*, which stand for *hēdakk*, *hēsēbb*, etc., by contraction for *hidkak*, *hisbēb*. The uncontracted form in its latest stage appears in *הִרְנִין*, *הִיִּלִּיל*, which never undergo contraction (also in Syriac *ܐܢܐ*, Mand. *האוליל*), and in the participle

מְשֻׁמִּים, Ezek. iii. 15. The fem. sing. and plur. actually exhibit the doubling הַחֲלָה, הַחֲלוּ, הַחֲלוּ, הַחֲלוּ. The 2nd pers. usually has the form הִרְעִיתָם, (הַחֲלוּתָ), הִרְעִיתָה. The original 1st pers. *haktalti* occurs in all its purity in וְהִחַתְתִּי, Jerem. xlix. 37; and a modification of the 2nd pers. in הִתְלַחְתָּ and וְהִפְרַחְתָּ, for *hitlallta* and *hiphrarta*.—In the imperfect the Arabic form is يَجْرِرُ for يَجْرِبُ. The Hebrew preserves a purer vowel in the 1st syllable, יִסַּב for *yāsēbb*, contracted from *yasbēb* for *yasbibu*, יִגַּן, יִפַּר; 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 נָצַב, יִדַּק, אָבַן, הִדַּק, אָבַן, הִנְעַל, הָעַל, הִדַּק. To these correspond such Hebrew imperfects as יַחַל, יִתֵּם, יִסַּב. 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 וַיִּסְבּוּ, the latter by וַיִּכְתּוּ, Deut. i. 44.

The passive is in Arabic أُجِرُّ for أُجِرُّ, 2nd pers. أُجِرَّتَ, impf. يُجْرَرُ for يُجْرَبُ. The Hebrew form הוּסַב stands for *husbab*, but has been influenced by the corresponding form of verbs הוּחַל, הוּחַל, fem. הוּחַדָּה. In the imperfect we find a treble formation, as in the Hiph'il, there being forms (1) like יוּדַק, in pause for יוּדַק, resembling יִסַּב; (2) like יוּכַת, plur. יוּכַתוּ, resembling יִסַּב, plur. יִסְבּוּ; and (3) like הוּכַבוּ, Job xxiv. 24; יוּחַקוּ, in pause for יוּחַקוּ, Job xix. 23, resembling the Aramaic יוּדַק and יוּדַקוּ.

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

Of these the former, פ"ץ, 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}, ^{وَعَدَ}, ^{وَعِظَ}, ^{وَدَّ}. Similarly in Ethiopic, ^{ወረደ}: ^{ወረሰ}: ^{ወረደ}: ^{ወሰለ}: ^{ወሰዖ}. The only example that I remember in Ethiopic of the change of *w* into *y* is in ^{ለደደሰ}: "to make known," the causative of an unused ^{ደደሰ}: Heb. ^{יָדַע}. The corresponding Arabic verb is ^{وَدَعَ} "to put, place, store up, deposit"; what we "know" is that which we have "placed" or "stored up" in the mind for use¹. In Hebrew the initial *w* almost invariably passes into *y*, unless protected by a preceding consonant; hence ^{יָדַע}, ^{יָעַץ}, ^{יָעַד}, ^{יָלַד}, ^{יָצָא}, ^{יָרַד}, ^{יָרַשׁ}, ^{יָנַע}, ^{יָנַר}. The same remark applies to the Aramaic; e.g. in Biblical Aramaic, ^{יָדַע}, ^{יָהַב}, further ^{יָקַר}, ^{יָקַר}, ^{יָקַר}, ^{יָרַת}. But the later Aramaic dialects vocalise this ^י, and turn it into a simple vowel *i*. Hence in Syriac ^{ܝܢܟܘܢ}, ^{ܝܢܝܘܢ}, ^{ܝܢܝܘܢ}, ^{ܝܢܝܘܢ}, which are commonly written in the oldest MSS. with prefixed *aleph*, ^{ܝܢܟܘܢ}, etc.; and in Mandaitic ^{ܝܢܟܘܢ}, ^{ܝܢܝܘܢ}, etc. The verb ^{יָהַב}, Mand. ^{ܝܢܝܘܢ}, also occurs in Syriac as ^{ܝܢܝܘܢ}, but the more common form is ^{ܝܢܝܘܢ}, which appears in the Talmūd Yĕrūshalmī as ^{ܝܢ}, in which form the *h* is elided and its vowel

¹ [The explanation of ^{יָדַע}, "know," from the Arabic ^{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 Sabæan, and perhaps in Assyrian (see Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gramm.* p. 308). The verb therefore is now generally taken to be true ^י. Even in Arabic, as Nöldeke observes, there is a trace of a root ^{يَدَع} distinct from ^{وَدَعَ} (^{اَيَدَع}). The forms with ^י after a prefix (^{הוֹדִיעַ}, ^{הוֹדִיעַ} etc.) are to be explained in the same way as ^{ܝܢܝܘܢ}, *infra*, p. 242.]

יָהֵם, יָאֵג. Thirdly, the vowel of the first syllable may be weakened into *i*, and give us the forms *يَهَم*, *يَاغ*.

Lastly, the vulgar forms of the present day are *يُوقَف*, *يُوصَل*, *يُزِن*, *يَلَد*, *يَعِد*, *يَقِف*, *يَصَل*, instead of *يُوزِن*, *يُولد*, *يُوعَد*. We also find at the present day in Egypt the forms *ytkaʃ*, *ytka*, *ytʃal*, and *yakif*, *yakʃ*, but they are comparatively rare.

Let us glance now at Hebrew. Here one form of the imperfect is represented by *יִקַּר*, *יִרַע*, *יִשָּׁב*, *יִרַד*, *תִּלְד*, apparently identical with the normal Arabic *يُرَد*, *تَلَد*. The *a* was weakened as usual into *i*, and then lengthened before the tone into *ē*, *תִּלְד*, *יִרַד*, for *tilid*, *yirid*. A form like *יִקַּר* is against Arabic rule; and forms like *יִרְעֵנָה*, *יִרְעֵנָה*, show that the *ʃrē* 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 *יִרַע*, *יִרַד*, *תִּלְד*, from *יִרְעֵנָה*, *יִרְדֵּנָה*, according to the dialectical Arabic *يُرَاع*, *يُرَاد*. Another form of the Hebrew imperfect is represented by *יִרְשָׁן* (as well as *יִקַּר*).

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

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

¹ [But comp. p. 180.]

tical Arabic *يَا جَلَّ*, *يَا جَعَّ*; and that *ā* was weakened into *ē* (for which we have abundant analogies), whence the Eastern forms *نَاجَل*, *نَاجَل*. Others think, however, that this form arose by assimilation of the verbs *ف* and *ف*, such as *نَاجَل*, *نَاجَل*.

The Western Syrians weakened the *ē* still further into *ī*, *نَاجَل*, *نَاجَل*, as in the verbs *ف*. In Mandaitic the first syllable has *ī*, probably *ē*, as *עראב*, "I give," *ניקאר* or *ניקוד*; *ניקוד* and *תידול*, from *ערל* = *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 *ፀቅር*; or *ፀቀር*: "hew, cut out," *ፀገር*: "pelt, stone"; but the usual ones are *ቅር*; or *ቀር*;, *ገር*; or *ገር*;, *ረረ*;, *ሀሀ*;, *ባላ*:: In Arabic, all verbs that lose the *w* in the imperfect, also drop it in the imperative; hence *عَد*, *رَد*, *رَد*, *رَد*. In those that retain the *w*, it is necessarily changed, on account of the prosthetic vowel, into a letter of prolongation; *اِجَل* for *اوجَل* from

وَضَو for *اَوْضَو* from *وَضَو*. The vulgar form of the present day in Egypt is *akaf*, *akaf*, *akaf*, *akaf*, *akaf*; more rarely *akaf*, *akaf*, or *kif*.

In Hebrew the forms waver somewhat: *שָׁב*, *יָרַד*, *צָא*, *יָדַע*; but perhaps *יָרַד* (Judg. v. 13). On the other hand, *יָרַד*, *יָרַד*, *יָרַד* (Deut. xxxiii. 23) but also *יָרַשׁ* and *יָרַשׁ*, 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 *سَو* from *سَو*, *سَو* from *سَو*, and *سَو* from *سَو*. 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. ⁵اَدَّةٌ as well as ⁵وَالَّةٌ and ⁵وَالَّةٌ or ⁵الَّةٌ; ⁵رِنَّةٌ, as well as ⁵وَرِنٌ or ⁵أَرِنٌ; ⁵عِدَّةٌ, as well as ⁵وَعْدٌ; ⁵عِظَّةٌ, as well as ⁵عِظٌ. Precisely corresponding infinitives in Hebrew, as ⁵לָדָה, ⁵רָעָה; generally however, ⁵לָדַת, ⁵רָדַת, ⁵רָשַׁת, ⁵שָׁבַת, ⁵צָאָת (for ⁵צָאָת), for *lidat*, etc. In ⁵רָעַת the *pathachs* are due to the guttural, as in ⁵שָׁעָה, ⁵זָעָה. The masculine form ⁵רָעַ in Job is a rarity, and equally so the contracted feminine ⁵לַת in 1 Sam. iv. 19. Examples of the fuller form are ⁵יָרָא, ⁵יָסַר, ⁵יָרַד (Ps. xxx. 4), ⁵יָצַק. The Ethiopic supplies us with many substantives of this class, but not infinitives, as ሰ.ደ.ገ: ር.ደ.ገ: ሰ.ገ.ገ: ፀ.ገ.ገ:: In Aramaic there are likewise a few, e.g. ⁵עֵטָא, Dan. ii. 14; ⁵פְּבָלָא, ⁵פְּבָלָא; ⁵חֲבָלָא is probably to be regarded as borrowed from the Hebrew ⁵עָרָה.

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

In the same way, in the reflexive and passive *Niphal*, the Hebrew נִקְטַל stands for נִקְלַד, according to the form נִקְטַל, whereas יִקְלַד is by assimilation from יִנְקַד, corresponding to an Arabic يَنْوَلِدُ from اَنْوَلِدُ. Such forms, though not uncommon in the modern language, are not deemed classical.

The reflexive conjugations formed with the prefix *ta* require a little more attention.

The simplest is the Aramaic *Ethpe'el*. Of this the oldest shape is to be discerned in the Ethiopic ተወለደ: "be born," ተሰለፀ: "be given." In Syriac it always appears with vocalised *y*, [ܝܢܟܡ, ܝܢܠܕ] for 'eth-*y*-lēdh, and that from 'eth-*w*-lēdh, [ܝܢܠܕܬ]. In Mandaitic however the vowelless *yodh* is dropped, giving עתהיב, עתהיב; but "she was given" is עתהיבא, as in Syr. [ܝܢܠܕܬܐ]. The corresponding conjugation in Arabic is, as you may remember, the 8th, *ifta'ala*, اِتَّقَلَ for تَقَلَّ. This should give us اَوْتَقَلَّ, اَوْتَقَلَّ; but these impossible forms necessarily become اَيْتَقَلَّ, اَيْتَقَلَّ, اَيْتَقَلَّ, the existence of which is admitted, although the assimilation of *wt* into *tt* is greatly preferred: اَتَقَلَّ, اَتَقَلَّ, اَتَقَلَّ. The imperf. of the former is يَتَقَلَّ, يَتَقَلَّ; of the latter يَتَقَلَّ, يَتَقَلَّ. 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," تَكَنَّ "rely on," اَتَلَجَّ "insert," اَتَمَّ "suspect." In Syriac ܝܢܠܕܬܐ is an example of this sort¹.

¹ [Prof. Wright's ms. cites also ܝܢܠܕܬܐ, late Heb. יָנַדַּד, which some scholars

On the reflexive of the Hebrew *Pi'el*, viz. *Hithpa'al*, in Syr. [לְזַחַל], I will merely remark that the prefixed syllable sometimes preserves the initial *w* from passing into *y*. So in הִתְנַדָּה, הִתְנַדָּח, הִתְנַדָּע; whence in post-biblical Hebrew the substantives נִדָּה and נִדָּח. The Syriac [לְזַחַל] is hardly a parallel, because in that language we have the Pa'al סֻחַ and the noun מֻחַ.

The tendency to assimilate the *w* to the following letter, which we saw in the Arabic 8th conj. اَنْدَّ, appears in the other dialects in some other forms. In Hebrew, for instance, יָצַע = וָצַע assimilates in Hiph'il and Hoph'al, הִצִּיעַ, הֻצַּע. The same is the case with הִצִּיג and הֻצַּג; and with the rad. יָצַת, impf. יָצַת, Niph. נָצַת, Hiph. הִצִּיַת. In other instances the assimilation is merely sporadic, as in יָצַק, יָפַר, and even הִקְלַת (inf. Hoph'al). In Aramaic instances of a similar kind are יָפַל from יָתַב = יָבַל, Dan. vii. 26 [Compl., Norzi, Baer], from יָתַב; Syr. נָדַכ, נָדַכ, from נָדַכ, whence in Bibl. Aram. יָנַדַע, with dissimilation of *dd* into *nd*.

2. The verbs which are really פ"י are very few in number in the Semitic languages, and call for but little notice. In Hebrew there are only seven or eight altogether; יָנַס, יָנַשׁ, not used in Kal; יָבַשׁ, יָבַס; יָטַב, יָבַס; יָנַק; יָנַץ; יָנַץ, not used in perf. Kal; יָנַץ; and the Hiph'ls הִיבִיל and יָנַץ connect with יָנַץ; יָנַץ: so still Mühlau and Volck, 11th ed., 1890. But יָנַץ like the Syriac נָצַע seems rather to be a denominative from נָצַע, *elkaba* (so Nöldeke; cf. Fränkel, *Lehrw.* p. 273), and therefore quite distinct from יָנַץ, יָנַץ.]

הַיָּמִין. יָצַר is doubtful, and may be פֿ"ץ; at least the Niph'al is נִיצַר, Is. xliii. 10. The imperfects are יִצַּב, יִיבֹשׁ, יִיבֹשׁ, יִיבֹשׁ, according to the Arabic form يَبْسُ for يَبَسُّ; but instances of assimilation occur, as יִבֹּשׁ (1 Kings iii. 15), יִשָּׁר (1 Sam. vi. 12), יָצַר. The Hiph'il is הִיטִיב for הִיטִיב, הִינִיק, הִינִיק, הִינִיק, הִינִיק, הִינִיק, but the original diphthong is retained in הִישָּׁר, Prov. iv. 25, P's. v. 9 (Kĕrē). In two cases the form הוֹשִׁיר seems to be used, falsely conforming to verbs פֿ"ץ, viz. Ps. v. 9 (Kĕthĭbh) and Is. xlv. 2 (Kĕthĭbh). The same has happened with הוֹבִישׁ, Syr. اَوْصَف; and with the Niph'al נִוּאֵשׁ. The Niph'al of יָצַר is likewise, as we have seen, נִיצַר (Is. liii. 10), and its Hoph'al יוֹצַר (Is. liv. 17). The latter form would be quite *en règle* from a verb פֿ"ץ, because in Arabic too اَيْبَسَ would become in the passive اُوْبِسَ, for اُيْبِسَ, the ي conforming to the preceding vowel. In Syriac اَوْصَف and اَوْصَف are the only words that exhibit the radical y, and the latter of these has a second form اَوْصَف, which seems to have carried the day in Mandaitic, if we may judge by the word מוֹנְקָא "foster, guardian," for מוֹנְקָא. The Mand. equivalent of اَوْصَف is also הוֹאִלִּיל. In the 8th conj. of the Arabic the same assimilation takes place as in verbs פֿ"ץ, e.g. اَتَقَنَّ, اَتَسَّرَ, اَتَبَسَّ.

II. B. *Verbs of which the middle radical is w or y.*

In treating of these verbs, ע"ו and ע"י in Hebrew Grammar, we must, at the outset, distinguish carefully between verbs that never undergo contraction, and those which, according to my view, are generally or always contracted. To the former class, for example, belong in Arabic many verbs of the form فَعَلَ, as سَوَّلَ "to be flaccid" or "pendu-

lous," **חֹרַר** "to be very white and black" (of the eye), **עֹרַר** "to be one-eyed," **חֹלַל** "to squint," **סִידַד** "to have the disease called **סִידַד**" (of a camel), **עִידַד** "to be tender and flexible"; in Hebrew, **חָוַר** "be white," **נָוַע** "expire," **צָוַח** "cry out," **רָוַח** "be airy and wide," **אָוַיב** "be hostile to," **עָוַיב** "be weary"; in Syriac, **עֹוַ** "be white," **עֹוַ** "leap," **עֹוַ** "rejoice"; and in all three languages verbs that are also **ל'ו** or **ל'ו**, as **רֹוַי**, **רֹוַה**, **רֹוַב**; **הֹוַי**, **הֹוַה**, **הֹוַב**. What principle guided the Semitic languages in the contraction or non-contraction of verbs **ע'ו** and **ע'ו**, I am unable to state. I do not know why **חֹפַר** became **חָפַר**, and **מֹוַת**, **מָוַת**, whilst **חֹוַל** and **עֹוַר** remained uncontracted; neither can I tell you why the Hebrew says **צָוַח**, while the Arab changed his **صَاح** into **صَدِیح**.

The uncontracted verbs **ע'ו** and **ע'ו** 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, Noeldcke 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'ו**, 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'ו** 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 **كَلِمٌ** and **كَلِمٌ** are not true **كَلِمٌ** verbs but shortened Hiph'îls from roots **كَلِمٌ**]. 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 **كَلِمٌ**, **كَلِمٌ** and **كَلِمٌ**, 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 **كَلِمٌ** becomes **كَلِمٌ**, **كَلِمٌ** becomes **كَلِمٌ**, **كَلِمٌ** becomes **كَلِمٌ**. If, however, the first radical has *u* and the second *i*, the latter vowel, as being the clearer, generally predominates, so that **كَلِمٌ** becomes **كَلِمٌ**; although some of the Arabs contracted the form more regularly into **كَلِمٌ**, whilst others gave the long vowel the intermediate sound of *ü*, *küllä*.

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

uscless prosthetic *alif*; أَقَوْلٌ becomes أَقَوْلٌ, أَقَلٌ, قَلٌ; or perhaps we may rather say that it never required the prosthetic *alif*, for the original قَوْلٌ would naturally become قَوْلٌ and then قَلٌ.

(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 تَوَمَّتْ becomes, not تَمَّتْ, but تَمَّتْ, through the influence of the *و*, and سَيَّرَتْ becomes سَرَّتْ, through the influence of the *ي*; but خَوَّفَتْ becomes خَفَّتْ, not خَفَّتْ or خَفَّتْ, 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; طَوَّلَتْ can become nothing but طَلَّتْ, and هَيَّبَتْ nothing but هَبَّتْ.

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 قَامٌ stands, as we have seen, for قَوْمٌ, خَافٌ for خَوَّفٌ, طَالَ for طَوَّلٌ. The corresponding Ethiopic forms ሩጸ: “run,” ቀለ: “conquer,” ሰረ: “go,” በለ: “come,” ሀሮ: “set,” ጫጠ: “turn,” are not identical with the Arabic, for the Arabic long *a* does not ordinarily become *ḍ* or *ḷ* in Ethiopic. The Ethiopic forms have been obtained by simple rejection of the vowel of the second radical, and subsequent change of the resulting diphthongs *au*, *ai*, into *ḍ*, *ḷ*. Thus *rawaša*, *sayama*, became *rauša*, *sayma*, and then *rôša*, *séma*. These vowels are retained throughout the whole inflexion of the perfect, ሩጸት: ሩጸከ: ሀሮት: ሀሮከ: 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 *ḍ* in Hebrew, we should have expected

קָוַם to yield *kām* as the equivalent of قَامَ *kāma*, 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 כָּם 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 *kawam* into *kām*, 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 مَوْت into مَات, and طَوَّل into طَالَ; but the Hebrew attached more weight to the vowels as characteristic of the intransitive form, and spoke not *miti*, but יָת *mēth* (for *mit*, from *mawit*); not *bāsh* or 'ār, but בָּשָׁשׁ *bāsh* and אָרָר 'ār (for *bush* and 'ur, from *bawush*, 'awur). These forms resemble those of the Arabic 2d pers. حَوِّفْتَ, مَوِّتْتَ, for طَلَّتْ, خَفَّتْ, مِتَّ, حَوِّفْتُ, مَوِّتْتُ. In Aramaic the ordinary form is precisely what we should expect, with long *ā* corresponding to the Arabic *ā*; e.g. קָם, שָׁם, חָם, חָם; Mand. קָאם, פָּאשׁ "remain"; but סָכַם, Mand. סָיָת, corresponding to Heb. יָת. The 3rd pers. sing. fem. is in Arabic سَارَتْ, طَالَتْ, خَافَتْ, مَاتَتْ, قَامَتْ. The Heb. קָמָה, קָמָה, קָמָה, קָמָה, with the tone ordinarily on the 1st syllable, are derived directly from the forms of the masc. קָם, יָת, בָּשָׁשׁ; but we also find וְשָׁבַת, with older termination, Ezek. xlvi. 17. The Aramaic forms are סָפַת, 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 **קָמָ** in Hos. x. 14 may seem to indicate.

ضَمَّ، ضَمَّ، ضَمَّ؛ Mand. קאמאח, נאראח. Similarly in the 3rd pers. plur., سَارُوا, خَافُوا, مَاتُوا, قَامُوا, corresponding to Aramaic, שָׁמוּ, Dan. iii. 12, קָמוּ, Ezra v. 2; Syr. ضَمَّ، ضَمَّ، ضَمَّ؛ Mand. קאמבה, פאשובה (without ו), in the fuller form קאמיון, פאשיון. The Heb. בָּשָׂו, מָתוּ, חָפוּ, 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 طَلَّتْ، مِتَّ، خِفَّتْ، قَمَّتْ, or from a verb medial

هَبَّتْ، سَرَّتْ، ي. 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*: خَوْنَتَ = خِفَّتْ، قَوْمَتَ = قَمَّتْ، هَيْبَتَ = هَبَّتْ، سَيْرَتَ = سَرَّتْ، طَوْلَتَ = طَلَّتْ، مَوْتَ = مِتَّ.

In Hebrew the form is בָּרַחְתִּי, סָרַחְתִּי, שָׁמַחְתִּי, בָּנַחְתִּי, קָמַחְתִּי, with short *a*, and *kāmeṣ* (*ā*) appears only in pause, קָמַחְתִּי, Micha vii. 8, סָרַחְתִּי, Ps. cxix. 102, שָׁמַחְתִּי, Jerem. xxxiii. 25. Before Kimḥi's time, however, even the ordinary forms used to be pointed with *kāmeṣ*, קָמַחְתִּי, שָׁמַחְתִּי, at least when the accent was *mil'el*. From מַחְתִּי we have, unexpectedly, מִתְנַחְתִּי (we should have expected מִתְנַחְתִּי), and in pause מִתְנַחְתִּי, Gen. xix. 19, but also מִתְנַחְתִּי. From verbs with *ḥ* we get בָּשַׁחְתִּי, בָּשַׁחְתִּי (for *bushit*, *bushiti*, *bushni*). On the other hand, the long vowel is steadily preserved in the Aramaic, not merely in the 1st pers., שָׁמַחְתִּי Ezra vi. 12, Syr. ضَمَّ، ضَمَّ، Mand. קאמית, נאמית; but also

in the same way.—In Hebrew the preformatives have usually retained the original vowel *a*, as יָבוֹא, יָשִׁים, יָקוּם, corresponding exactly to the three Arabic forms, since יָבוֹא was originally *yabā'u*; other examples may be the very doubtful יָרוּן, Gen. vi. 3, and יָקוּט, Job viii. 14. The only instance of the weakening of the preformative to *i* is יִבְּשׁ, for *yabwashu*, *yabāsh*, *yibāsh*, *yēbbāsh*. The jussives of יִצְמַח, יִכָּחַף, יִשְׁרַץ are in Arabic يَضْمَحُ, يَكْشِفُ, and to these correspond in Hebrew יִצְמַח, יִכָּחַף, יִשְׁרַץ, still farther shortened with *vāv* conversive into יִצְמַח, יִכָּחַף, יִשְׁרַץ. If however the last radical be ר or a guttural, then *ā* is substituted for *o* or *e*, as יִצְמַח, יִכָּחַף, יִשְׁרַץ; except יִצְמַח, יִכָּחַף. In the 3rd pers. plur. fem. we should expect, after the analogy of the Arabic يَضْمَحْنَ, يَكْشِفْنَ, יִצְמַחְנָה, and this actually occurs in תִּשְׁבְּנָה, Exod. xvi. 55, (for *tabāna*, *tabwa'na*), תִּשְׁבְּנָה; but more frequently this form is assimilated to that of verbs ע"ע, and a diphthongal ' inserted, with consequent restoration of the long vowel, תִּשְׁבְּנָה, תִּשְׁבְּנָה. The Aramaic forms of the imperfect are just what we should naturally expect, viz. נִשְׁמַח, נִשְׁמַח. There is however another form in use, viz. Syr. נִשְׁמַח, Mand. and Talmud. נִקוּם. In Syriac I can scarcely remember any but singular forms, נִשְׁמַח, נִשְׁמַח, though נִשְׁמַח is quoted¹; but in Mand. the plural is נִמִּיתוּן, f. נִמִּיתוּן, etc., while in the verb קוּם the vowel of the 2nd syllable is rejected, נִקְמָא, f. נִקְמָא. These Mandaitic forms coincide with those from verbs ע"ע in the same dialect, as תִּירִיגוּן from רִגַּג, נִנְזוּן "sprinkle," from נָזַז, and the Syriac variation must be traced to a similar assimilation of ע"ע

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

to ע"ע. The verb **יָמַרְתָּ**, **יָמַרְתָּ**, **יָמַרְתָּ** has in all the dialects **יָמַרְתָּ**, **יָמַרְתָּ**, like **יָבַל** from **יָבַל**, or **נָחַת** from **נָחַת**. In Mandaitic we find a future in *a*, **נִדְאָר**, **נִדְאָר**, "dwell," by assimilation to the class ע"ע.

The infinitive construct in Hebrew has the simple form **קָוַם**, for **קָוַם**, as in the regular verb **קָטַל** for **קָטַל**. The form **בָּוֵא**, **בָּוֵשׁ**, probably springs from a long *a*, **בָּא'**, *'ar, bāsh*, for *barwa'*, *'awar, barwash*.—In the infinitive absolute on the contrary, **מָוַת**, **שׁוּב**, **סוּר**, are contractions of *sawār, shawwāb, mawwāth*.—The Aramaic infinitive is **מָקַם**, Syr. **ܡܚܘܡܐ**, for **ܡܚܘܡܐ**; the same variation occurs as in the imperfect, especially in Mandaitic and Talmudic, i.e. **מִדְאָן**, **מִדְאָן**, Talm. **מִקָּמ**, **מִימַת**, **מִימַת**; but the emphatic form of **מִקָּמ** in Mandaitic is **מִקָּמַא**, as if from a verb ע"ע.

The original form of the participle active must have been **سَائِرٌ**, **سَائِرٌ**; but in the contracted verbs the **و** at the beginning of the syllable was changed into *hamsa*, **تَائِمٌ**, and the verbs mediae **ي** followed this analogy, **سَائِرٌ**. These forms are liable to a rare contraction into **سَارٌ**, **قَامٌ** as **شَائِكٌ** for **شَائِكٌ** "armed," **هَارٌ** for **هَائِرٌ** "feeble," **طَائِفٌ** for **طَائِفٌ** "going about," **سَائِسٌ** for **سَائِسٌ** "decayed" (a tooth), **مَائِهٌ** for **مَائِهٌ** "cowardly." To this corresponds the rare Hebrew form **לוֹט**, Is. xxv. 7, **בוֹסִים**, Zach. x. 5, **קוֹמִים**, 2 Kings xvi. 7, for *lūt, bōs, kōm*. The more usual form is however analogous to that of the perf., viz. **נָר**, **נָרָה**, fem. **נָרָה**, **רָץ**, sometimes written with **א**, as **לָאָם**, Judg. iv. 21, **שָׂאָמִים**, Ezek. xxviii. 24, 26, **שָׂאָמוֹת**, Ezek. xvi. 57, **רָאִישׁ**, 2 Sam. xii. 1, 4, Prov. x. 4 (compare the perf. **קָאָם**, Hos. x. 14). This form

seems to me to be best explained as arising from a nominal *kaṭal*, i.e. *ṣawḏm, rawḏs, barud'*, contracted after the analogy of the perfect into *ṣam, ras, ba'*. In the same way in intrans. verbs, with *ē* and *ō* in the second syllable, e.g. מַת for מוֹת (*marūt, mit*), לִץ for לוֹץ (*lawlṣ, liṣ*), בּוֹש for בּוֹש (*bawūsh, bush*), according to the Heb. יָנַר, בְּבַר, or the Arabic adjectives يَقْطُ, حَذِرُ. In Aramaic similar phenomena recur. In Bibl. Aram. the form is קָאֵם Dan. ii. 31, plur. in *K'thibh* קָאֵיִן, קָאֵרִין, קָאֵעִין, emph. קָאֵמִיא, constr. קָאֵרִי. The *K'irē* usually substitutes ' for א in these plur. forms, קָאֵיִן, קָאֵרִי. In Syriac only the singular is written with ܐ, pronounced however, we are told, *kyēm*. The fem. and plurals are invariably with *yūd*, ܘܘܕܐ, ܘܘܕܐܝܢ. In Mandaitic the ' is written in the sing. masc. too, קָאֵיִם, קָאֵיִת, fem. קָאֵיִמָא.—The passive participle of the Hebrew is exemplified by מוֹלָה, סוֹגָה, fem. לוֹטָה, for *marūhl, sawālg, l'wāḥāh*. In Aramaic the corresponding form is ܘܘܠܐ, ܘܘܠܐܝܢ, Mand. ܘܘܠܐܝܢ, "depicted," כִּיל "measured," for *ṣyṭm, l'wāḥ*, etc.

I shall now proceed to the derived conjugations of these verbs, and go through them as rapidly as possible.

1. *Pi'el*. The uncontracted verbs form their Pi'el quite regularly; e.g. עוֹרֵר, עוֹרֵר, "to blind of one eye," עוֹרֵר "bend," עוֹרֵר "leap in numbers." The contracted ones too exhibit the normal form, that is to say, the weak letter, being strengthened by doubling, undergoes no change or only a slight one. In Arabic, for example, we have عَيْنٌ, دَيْلٌ, صَوْرٌ, قَوْمٌ; in Ge'ez ሰወጸ: "inspect," "visit," ጸወጸ: "cry out"; in Heb. עוֹרֵר "surround," Ps. cxix. 61; Aram. ܘܘܪܐ, ܘܘܪܐ, Syr. ܘܘܪܐ, ܘܘܪܐ; Mand. ܘܘܪܐ. But more frequently the middle consonant appears as a *y*, the origin of which I explain thus.

In a form like *kaucēm*, the initial of the second syllable was changed in Hebrew and Aramaic into *y*, *kaucēm* (comp. **כָּיַעַם**, **כָּיַעַם**; **כָּיַעַם**, **כָּיַעַם**), whence, by assimilation of the preceding letter, *kaiyēm*, and finally *kaiyyēm*. So in Aram. **כָּיַעַם**, **כָּיַעַם**, etc. In Hebrew forms like **כָּיַעַם**, **כָּיַעַם**, **כָּיַעַם**, etc. belong to the later stage of the language. In place of Pⁱ“ēl the Hebrew frequently exhibits another formation, viz. *Pēlzl*, of which the older form was *Pa‘lal*, as **כָּיַעַם**, **כָּיַעַם**, **כָּיַעַם**, etc., for *kaumam*, *raumam*, etc.

2. *Hiplāl* and *Hoplāl*. The contracted Arabic form is **أَبَانَ**, **أَبَانَ**, for **أَبَانَ**, **أَبَانَ**. To this correspond in Ge‘ez **ለሐረ**, **ለሐረ**, which seem to be taken directly from the simple forms **ረሐ**, **ሐረ**, **ሐረ**. Some verbs however exhibit a short *a* in the 2nd syllable, which before a final guttural may become *ʔ*; e.g. **ለቀሎ**: ‘*aqāma*’; **ለረሎ**: ‘*andma*’, as well as **ለረሎ**; **ለሐሐ**: ‘*aḏka*’, “hem in,” as well as **ለሐሐ**; **ለረሐ**: ‘*andha*’ or **ለረሐ**: ‘*andha*’, “lengthen”; **ለሐሐ**: ‘*abē’a*’ “bring or put in”; **ለሐሐ**: ‘*abēha*’, “permit.” Such words seem to be really derived from the old form ‘*akwāma*’, ‘*awāma*’, ‘*abwē’a*’, etc.; perhaps with doubling of the first letter by way of compensation, as in **הַפִּיחַ**, **הַפִּיחַ**.—The Hebrew form **הַפִּיחַ** stands far below the Arabic and Ge‘ez. The original *hakwāma* must have already passed through the stages of *hakwām*, *hikwām*, *hikwām*, *hikīm*, before it could become *hēkīm*. The 2nd pers. of the Hebrew is likewise far removed from the purity of the Arabic **أَتَمَّتْ**, for **أَتَمَّتْ**, **أَتَمَّتْ**. The purer form does indeed occur in such cases as **הַבְּאֵתָם**, **הַבְּאֵתָם**, **הַבְּאֵתָם**, plur. **הַבְּאֵתָם**; but commonly an assimilation to verbs **ע**“*y*” is effected by the insertion of *θ*, for original *ʔ*, in which case the vowel of the preformative is usually *ā*, sometimes *ʔ*, and the vowel of the radical syllable sometimes *ē* instead of *ī*; as **הַבְּאֵתָתָם**, **הַבְּאֵתָתָם**, **הַבְּאֵתָתָם**, plur. **הַבְּאֵתָתָם**; and in the plur. **הַבְּאֵתָתָם**, **הַבְּאֵתָתָם**, **הַבְּאֵתָתָם**, plur. **הַבְּאֵתָתָם**.

הַבִּינֹתֶם, הַבִּיאֹתֶם, הַשִּׁבְתֶּם. The Aramaic perfect is in the Old Testament הִקִּים, וְהִקִּים, הִתִּיב; 2nd sing. הִקִּמְתָּ, 1st sing. הִקִּמַּתְתָּ, 3rd plur. הִקִּימוּ; in Syr. اَوَصَمَ, اَوَلَّيْتُ; in Mand. ארים, אקים. In this last dialect the 1st pers. seems often to be identical in form with that of verbs ע"ע, c.g. האשטית, אקמית "I despised," but ארימית, אדיקית.—The imperfect is in Arabic اَقِمُّ for يَقُومُ, with the jussive يَقُمْ and imperative اَقِم. In Ge'ez the imperfect indicative is ለጸፀር፡ ለጸፀድ፡, the subjunctive ለጸር፡ ለጸድ፡, imperative ለጸር፡ ለጸድ፡. But verbs of the form ለቆ፡ ለብለ፡ have in the subjunctive ለቆ፡ *yaḥkām*, ለብለ፡, imperative ለቆ፡ ለብለ፡. In Hebrew יְקִים stands for *ya-hakwim*, *yaḥwim*; the jussive is יְקַם, the vowel of which is still further shortened with *ḥ* *conversive* into וְיְקַם. In Aramaic the corresponding form is יְקִים, נִבְסַם; but in Syriac the form نَبِصَم, participle مَوَصِم, is admissible, and this is the only one found in Mandaitic, c.g. מאקים, מארים, נארים. These are all assimilated to verbs ע"ע, as appears from the plur. מאקמילון as compared with מאהיקילון, "afflicting them."—The passive of this conjugation in Arabic is اَقِيمَ for اَقُومَ. In Hebrew the original *luḥwama* would naturally become *luḥama*, *luḥam*, but the form in actual use has been entirely assimilated to that of verbs הִשָּׁב, הִקֵּם, הִפָּס. In Syriac we have only the passive participle مَوَصَم, for *muḥwam*, *muḥam*; but in Biblical Aramaic there is the remarkable survival הִקִּמַתְתָּ Dan. vii. 4, wrongly pointed הִקִּמַתְתָּ in verse 5.

3. Of the reflexive conjugations with prefixed *ta*, I will only notice the *Ethpsttl*, corresponding to the 8th conjugation of the Arabic. In Arabic the form is, of course, اَتَجَنَّزَ, contracted for

اجتوز; but the uncontracted form is used in many verbs either by itself or along with the other; e.g. اجتاروا or اجتوروا. In Ge'ez the corresponding forms are ተሰጠ: "be agitated," ተሰጠ. The Aramaic of the Bible exhibits יתשם, יתשמן, יתשם, but also יתזון. The one form, יתשם, comes directly from the original *tasayama*, *tasāma*. The doubling of the *t* may be an attempt to compensate for the radical which has disappeared by contraction, and so to give the word something of the outward form of the normal התקטל; or it may be merely imitated from the *Ethtafal* (*Ittafal*). The other form, יתזון, has no doubt arisen by assimilation to the *Ethtafal* or reflex of *Af'el*, the two being completely confounded in Syriac. E.g. יתזון is *Ethpe'el* of ܐܢܝܢܐ or ܐܢܝܢܐ of ܐܢܝܢܐ; but ܐܢܝܢܐ, ܐܢܝܢܐ, ܐܢܝܢܐ are *Ethtafals* from ܐܢܝܢܐ. In Mandaic however the two conjugations can be readily distinguished; ניתלפון is *Ethpe'el* from ܠܘܦ; ניתארם, *Ethtafal* from ܠܘܡ. I find however עתגיהית "I was quieted," which seems to be *Ethpe'el*, whereas ܐܢܝܢܐ must be regarded as *Ethtafal*.

4. The last form to which I shall direct your attention is the reflexive and passive *Nipl'al*. The Arabic form may be exemplified by اِنْدَسَ, اِنْدَسَ, for اِنْدَسَ, اِنْدَسَ, imperf. يَنْدَسُ. In Hebrew נדש was originally *naddsh*, contracted from *nadwash*, as in the Arabic 4th conj. اِنْدَسَ from اِنْدَسَ; and so fem. נִדְּשָׁה, plur. נִדְּשָׁו. One verb, נִעוּר, 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. נִפְצוּתם, נִקְצוּתם, with *θ*; 1st pers. sing. נִסְנְתִי, נִסְנְתִי, with sinking of *θ* to *h*. The infinitives have the form

הַפּוֹחַ, הַפּוֹל. The vowel *o* (for *a*) is sunk to *o* in הַרְדֵּשׁ (Isaiah xxv. 10); and the preformative is absorbed in לֵאמֹר (Job xxxiii. 30), if the reading be correct. The imperative is exemplified by רְבוֹן for *hinkān* (*hinkawin*), הַרְפֵּז, הַרְפִּז, the last with irregular doubling of the *m*. The imperfect is, for example, יִכּוֹן for *yinkān*, from *yankawin*, יַעֲוֶה, יַעֲוֶה; יִפְגֵּן, יִרְפֵּן, with irregular doubling of the *m*.

Of the frequent and close resemblances in form between verbs ע"ן and ע"ע we have already had many examples. I may add to these such Hiph'ls as הִפְיִן, with its Hoph'al הִפְיִן, and הִפְיִן, which latter differs only in form from הִפְיִן; 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 נִפְוֹל for *namāl* (*namwal*), Gen. xvii. 26, participle נִפְוֹלִים, Gen. xxxiv. 22, for *namālīm* (*namwalīm*).

II. C. Verbs of which the 3rd radical is w or y.

We now proceed to the large and important class of verbs in which the weak letter occupies the third place in the root. In our Hebrew Grammars these are generally called verbs ל"ה, but as the ה is merely a vowel-letter, I prefer speaking of them as verbs ל' or 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: *taltwa*, "follow"; በጠየ: *baktya*, "weep"; ለከየ: *hkywa*, "live"; ዐ-ብየ: *'dbya*, "be large"; ርከየ: *rkya*, "see." The solitary instance that I remember of contraction is in a form corresponding to Heb. Pi"el, viz. ሀሎ: *hallō*, for ሀለወ: *halltwa* ["he was"], which are both in use. The final vowel was obviously dropped in this exceedingly common word, and the resulting diphthong *aw* then naturally passed into *o*.—In Arabic the final *w* appears as such only

in verbs of the form **فَعَلَ**, as **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 **رَضَو**, **سَلِيَ** "be comforted or consoled," for **سَلَو**, **حَيِيَ** for **حَيَو**. These forms, be it observed, are all uncontracted (with the exception of **حَلِيَ**, 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. *Tálawá* and *bákaya* drop their final vowel, but the resulting diphthongal terminations *aw* and *ay* both pass in Arabic into *á*, *állá*, *bákká*. For distinction's sake the grammarians bid us write **لَا** with *alif*, when the final radical is *w*, and **بَكِّي** with *y*, when the final radical is *y*, but the sound is one and the same.

In Hebrew the tendency of the **l** to pass into **l'** has almost obliterated the differences between verbs **לָ"ן** and **לָ"י**. The radical **שָׁלוּ** alone has preserved the final *w* in such forms as **שָׁלוּהוּ**, Job iii. 25, and, which is more remarkable, in an adjective of the form **נָעַל**, viz. **שָׁלוּ** or **שָׁלִיו**, Job xvi. 12, xxi. 23, Jerem. xlix. 31 (written **שָׁלִיו**). Neither do intransitive verbs of the form **فَعَلَ** seem to occur in Hebrew, so that we have only verbs

of the form *فَعَلَ* to deal with. These follow exactly the same course as in Arabic; the final vowel was dropped, and the resulting diphthongal terminations passed into *A*, which the Hebrews expressed by the vowel-letter ה. In this way the original *taldwa*, *bakdyā*, became *taldw*, *talā*; *bakdy*, *bakā*; and were written תַּלְדָּה "hang," בָּכָה "weep."

In Aramaic the intransitive forms are not very common, e.g., in Syriac, *ܫܠܬܝܐ*, *ܫܠܬܘܐ*, which stand for *shaltya*, *shaltwa*, and *hadtya*, *hadtwa*. So in Mandaitic, *ܥܡܝܠܝܐ* "he swore to me." The transitives have undergone the same contraction as in Hebrew, only that the termination is here usually expressed by *ܐ*, and the door thereby opened for further confusion, as in vulgar Arabic, with the entirely different verbs *لأ*, like *مَلَأَ*, *مَلَأَ*. The words *ܬܠܘܐ*, *ܒܚܘܐ* stand for *taldwa*, *bakdyā*; whereas *ܠܘܐ*, *ܡܠܘܐ*, were originally *laṭd'a*, *mald'a*. Similarly in Mandaitic *ܚܘܐ* "saw," *ܫܚܘܐ* "drank," *ܒܘܐ* "sought for" (for *ܒܘܥܘܐ*). In the Bibl. Aram. *ܐ* and *ܗ* are used indifferently.

One verb in Aramaic constantly takes prosthetic aleph, viz. *ܐܫܬܝܐ* 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*: *taldwat*, *ተለወተ*: *bakdyat*. (The contracted *ሀለ*: *hallō* [*infra*, p. 271] admits of a contracted *ሀለት*: *hallōt*, for *ሀለወተ*: *halltawat*.) In Arabic and Aramaic the intransitives are regular in formation, *رَضِيََتْ*, *خَزَيْتِ*, *حَلَوَتْ*; Syr. *ܫܠܝܘܐ*, for *shaliyat*, *shaliwat*; Mand. *ܡܝܫܝܘܬܐ* "arrived," *ܡܝܫܝܘܬܐ* "became dense or firm"; vulgar Arabic of Egypt, *mishiyet* "she went," from *mishl*, or more commonly *mishyet*, *bikyet*, *nisyet*, *ridyet*. In the Targûms the punctuation is *ܫܠܝܘܬܐ*, *ܫܠܝܘܬܐ*, but this I consider doubtful. But the transitives undergo contraction: *galḏwat* or *galḏyat* 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**, **ܚܘܬ**; in Mand. as **ܚܘܬܐ** (for **ܚܘܬܐ**); in the Talmûd as **הָוַת**, **הָוַת**, or more commonly **הוואי**, **הואי**, **אתאי**, where the *i* must be a trace either of the lost radical or of the evanishing final soft *t*, which wholly disappears in Mandaitic before enclitics, as **עמאלה**, "she swore to him." In Arabic the same contraction takes place, but the Arab has a certain dislike to a long vowel in a shut syllable, and has consequently shortened *at* into *at*, **جَلَّتْ**, **رَمَّتْ**, for **جَلَّاتْ**, **رَمَّاتْ**, and these for **جَلَّيْتُ** or **جَلَّوْتُ** and **رَمَّيْتُ**. 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. **הָסִיָּהּ**, Ps. lvii. 2. More frequently, however, the Hebrew takes the same course as the Arabic, and contracts the original *galdyat* into *galdt*, whence with suffix-pronouns in sundry derived conjugations, **צִוְוֵנִי**, Ruth iii. 6, **כָּלְלֵנִי**, Zach. v. 4, **הִטְוֵנִי**, Prov. vii. 21. But in pause the vowel is slightly lengthened, **עֲשָׂנִי** Job xxxiii. 4, **רֵאֲוֵנִי** Job xlii. 5, **חִיְתֵנִי**, Ps. xcix. 50, **כִּפְתֵנִי** Ps. xlv. 16; and so also in the separate form **עֲשָׂתָהּ** Lev. xxv. 21, **הִיָּתָהּ** 2 Kings ix. 37 *kehtthl*, Siloam inscription l. 3, and from derived conjugations **הִרְצָתָהּ**, Lev. xxvi. 34, **הִלָּאָתָהּ** (in pause), Ezck. xxiv. 12, **הִנְגָּלָתָהּ**, Jerem. xiii. 19. Far more frequently, however, the Hebrew uses separately the form **עֲשָׂתָהּ**, **רֵאֲוֵתָהּ**, in pause **עֲשָׂתָהּ**, **רֵאֲוֵתָהּ**. Herein there is no great mystery. The language had got accustomed to the form **קָטְלָהּ**, and as the old **עֲשָׂתָהּ** (for **עֲשִׂיתָהּ**) 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 הִנְאִתְאֵלְהָ, "it pleased him," גִּלְאִתְאֵלְכֹן, "she revealed to you," אִתְאִתְאֵלְן, "she came to them." Here הִנְאִתְאֵ etc. stand for הִנְאִתְאֵ etc., the final *t* having disappeared as in the ordinary נִפְלְאֵלְהָ or נִפְלְאֵלְהָ, "she fell," compared with the separate נִפְלְאֵת.

On the 3rd pers. dual, which occurs only in Arabic, I will merely remark that the masc. form is uncontracted, نَدَوَا, حَلَّوْا رَضِيََا رَمِيَا; whereas the fem. is directly derived from the contracted singular. The form in use is جَلَّتَا, رَمَّتَا, not, as we should have expected, جَلَّتَا, رَمَّتَا, though these latter are said to occur dialectically. The ear having once got accustomed to رَمَّتْ, the dual was naturally taken from this form, as was تَلَّتْ from تَلَّتْ.

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. requires a little more explanation. Reverting to the Ethiopic, we find in use the uncontracted ተለዉ: *taldwū*, ባላሉ: *bakdyū*, ሰብሉ: *'dbyū*; to which correspond in Hebrew the pausal הָלְיוּ, Deut. xxxii. 37, נָפְטְיוּ, Num. xxiv. 6, הִתְיָיו, Is. xxi. 14, Jerem. xii. 9; and so too probably, though out of pause, Ps. lxxiii. 2, נָטְיוּ רְגְלֵי (for נָטְיוּ *kaṭhibh*), and Prov. xxvi. 7, [where some copies read] הָלְיוּ שִׁקִּים מִפִּסָּח (for [the Massoretic] הָלְיוּ = הָלְיוּ). More usually, however, contraction takes place in Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic. In Arabic the form varies according to the characteristic vowel; حَلَّوْا becomes حَلَّوْا رَضِيَوا and حَزَبُوا also become رَضُوا and

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

In the 2nd pers. sing. masc. the Ethiopic exhibits the oldest form ܩܢܒܝܢ: *talduka*, ܩܢܒܝܢ: *bakdyka*, ܩܢܒܝܢ: *abayka*, from ܩܢܒܝܢ: The contracted form too is common in verbs 3rd *w*, as ܩܢܒܝܢ: ܩܢܒܝܢ:, much rarer in those 3rd *y*, as ܩܢܒܝܢ: Verbs 3rd *y*, of which the 2nd radical is a guttural, weaken the diphthong still further into *t*, as ܩܢܒܝܢ: *r'ika*, ܩܢܒܝܢ: *r'ika*, from ܩܢܒܝܢ: and ܩܢܒܝܢ: In classical Arabic the forms are precisely what we should expect from analogy: ܩܢܒܝܢ makes ܩܢܒܝܢ; ܩܢܒܝܢ and ܩܢܒܝܢ, ܩܢܒܝܢ and ܩܢܒܝܢ; but ܩܢܒܝܢ and ܩܢܒܝܢ make ܩܢܒܝܢ and ܩܢܒܝܢ.

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

with hard *l*, by way of distinction from the 1st pers. **ܡܥܝܢܐ**. The Mandaitic appears to have weakened the original vowels most, for though the plural exhibits the diphthong **ܩܪܝܝܬܢ**, **ܕܪܝܝܬܢ**, more frequently than the weaker **ܩܪܝܬܢ**, **ܕܪܝܬܢ** (*é* or *l?*), yet in the singular we find only **ܩܪܝܬ**, **ܗܝܬ**, **ܒܝܬ** (for **ܒܝܬܐ**). Lastly in Hebrew the weakest form of all has prevailed; **בְּנִיתָם**, **בְּנִיתָ**, stand for *banētha*, *bnēthēm*, and these for *bandyta*, *banaytūm*.

The 1st pers. sing. and plur. deviate but little from the analogy of the 2nd. In Gē'ez and Arabic the forms, apart from the pronominal affix, are identical; and in the vulgar dialects the forms are *saklī*, *saklū*, *mishkīl*, *mishkū*. In Hebrew too **עָשִׂיתִי**, **עָשִׂינוּ**, are the exact counterparts in vocalisation of **עָשִׂיתָ**, **עָשִׂינוּ**, standing for *'asdyll*, *'asdynū*. The one form **עָשִׂיתִי** is remarkable as corresponding exactly with the Arabic **سَلَّتَ**.

The Aramaic forms we must notice with a little more detail. The book of Daniel and the Targūms offer us **ܗܝܬ**, **ܗܘܝܬ**, **ܕܡܝܢܐ**, **ܕܡܝܢܐ**, with *ē* for *ai*; the weaker **ܘܒܝܬܐ** occurs in Dan. vii. 19; intrans. verbs have naturally the vowel *l*, **ܫܢܝܢܐ**, **ܫܢܝܢܐ**. Similarly in Syriac, in the singular, **ܪܝܡܬܗ** (*rēmth* (eastern) or *ܪܝܡܬܗ* (*rēmth* (western)); but the plural retains the older diphthong **ܪܝܡܬܗ** or **ܪܝܡܬܗ**. Intransitives have always *l*, **ܡܪܝܬܐ**, **ܡܪܝܬܐ** or **ܡܪܝܬܐ**. In Mandaitic the usual form is **ܩܪܝܬ**, **ܗܝܬ**, **ܒܝܬ** (for **ܒܝܬܐ**), but whether with *l* or *l* is uncertain. The plural has not only the weaker form **ܕܡܝܢܐ**, **ܕܡܝܢܐ**, but also the stronger diphthongal **ܕܡܝܢܐ**, **ܕܡܝܢܐ**. Before enclitics the plural exhibits both forms, **ܩܪܝܢܐܠܗ**, **ܗܘܐܝܢܐܠܗ**. The singular in the same position has only the weak form, but in two varieties. Firstly, the final *t* may be rejected, as **ܩܪܝܠܗ**; or, secondly, the original termination of the 1st person may be restored, **ܩܪܝܬܝܠܗ**, **ܫܪܝܬܝܒܗ**, "I dwelt in it." In the Talmūd

the ordinary form of the 1st pers. sing. has also lost the final *t*, as אָתָא "I came," בִּעָא "I asked," לָךְ קָרָא לָךְ הִנָּא "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 סָנִיתִי, נָלִיתִי, אָתִיתִי.

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 *yǝtǝlǝw*, *yǝbakǝy*; but the final short vowels were dropped, yielding *yǝtǝlǝw*, *yǝbakǝy*; and the contraction took place, giving as the actual forms in use *yǝtǝlǝ*, *yǝbakǝt*, *yǝwǝt*, 𐩧𐩣𐩪: 3 sing. f. *tǝtalǝwt*, *tǝbakǝyt*; 3 pl. m. *yǝtalǝwǝ*, *yǝbakǝyǝ*. In the subj., which corresponds with the ordinary imperf. of the other Semitic languages, the fuller *yǝtǝlǝw*, *yǝbakǝy*, were contracted into *yǝlǝ*, *yǝbakǝt*; 3 sing. f. *tǝlǝwt*, *tǝbakǝyt*; 3 pl. m. *yǝlǝwǝ*, *yǝbakǝyǝ*. The forms with *a* in the 2nd syllable may be exemplified by *yǝftaw*, *yǝbay*, which become *yǝftaw*, *yǝbai*; the former may be further vocalised into *yǝftǝ*.

The form of the Arabic imperfect is, as you remember, identical with that of the Ethiopic subjunctive; Ar. *yǝktulu* = Eth. *yǝktǝl*. We therefore obtain in the imperf. indic. the forms *yǝtluw*, *yǝbbkiy*, *yǝrday*. The rejection of the final short vowels reduces these to *yǝtluw*, *yǝbbkiy*, *yǝrday*, which then become *yǝtlǝ* *يَتَلَوْ*, *yǝbbkt* *يَبْكِي*, *yǝrdǝ* *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 *yǝtluwa* *يَتَلَوْ*, and *yǝbbkiya* *يَبْكِي*; whereas the combination *aya* becomes first *ay* and then *ǝ*, *yǝrdǝ* *يَرْضِي*, which is therefore indistinguishable from the indic. The corresponding vulgar forms are *yimsht* and *yirdǝ*. The 3rd Arabic form, the jussive, is marked in the regular verb by the absence of any final vowel, *يَقْتَلْ*. Hence in verbs 3rd *و* and *ي* the original form must have been *يَتَلَوْ*, *يَبْكِي*, *يَرْضِي*, which would necessarily become *yǝtlǝ*, *yǝbbkt*, *yǝrdǝ*, and thus coincide with the indicative. To obviate

this, the language shortened the final vowels, and the result was the forms *yállu* يَلُّو, *yábbki* يَبِّكِي, *yarda* يَرِّضَ.

These Arabic forms in their turn cast much light on the corresponding ones in Hebrew. If we regard the word יגלה by itself, we might readily suppose that the final vowel *á* was merely a dulling or obscuration of an older *ú*; that *yiglá* stood for *yigláú*, just as פרה פֶּה stands for פֹּה, Ar. فَو, or זר זֶר for זֹר, Ar. ذَر. Were this the case, יגלה would correspond letter for letter to the Ar.

yagláú, יגלו. Other circumstances, however, militate against this explanation. For instance, if יגלה = יגלו, then the 3rd pl.

fem. ought to be הגלונה = יגלונן, for *yaglutunna*, whereas the form in use is הגלונה. And how about יבכי = יבכה, and

יחיה = יחיי *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 يرضي *yardá* for

yarday, for the *alif makṣūra* of the Arabic is represented in Hebrew by the termination הַ. In the jussive this vowel would

naturally be shortened to the utmost, whence such words are ירד, יבך, וישב, וירא. 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 ירא, ישע, יחד, יבן, יגל, יעש were unpronounceable by the Hebrew organs, and a supplementary or furtive vowel had to be introduced to facilitate their utterance. Hence

such forms as ירא, ישע, יחד, יבן, יגל, יעש. In

יחיה and יחיה, the jussives יחי and יחי became יחי and יחי,

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

In Aramaic the same form is dominant as in Hebrew, the imperfect being usually of the forms יִבְנֶה or יִבְנֶא, Mand. נִבְנֶא. Very remarkable is לְהוּא or לְהוּה in Ezra and Daniel, with the plur. masc. לְהוּן and fem. לְהוּיָן. The verb סָסֹן has also in Syriac a shorter form סָסֹן for the common נִסְסֹן, and in Mand. Noeldeke gives נִהוּא or לִהוּא as well as נִהוּיא or לִהוּיא. Similar varieties occur in Samaritan, יָהִי, and in Talmudic, לִהוּי and נָהִי. In Syriac too the verb מִבְּלָ, "to live," contracts its imperf. into יִנְבָּ or יִנְבָּ (for יִנְבָּ), but in Mand. this does not seem to be the case (נִהוּיא).

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

In Ethiopic no contraction takes place: the 2d pers. sing. fem. is *t'atalawt, t'abaklyt*; *t'atlawt, t'abaklyt, t'afdawt*; the 3d pers. plur. masc. *y'atalawst, f. -awt, y'abaklyst -ay*; *y'atlawst -awt, y'abaklyst -ay*.

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

In Arabic the 2d pers. sing. fem. is, for example, تَجَلِّينَ from رَعَى. In the former case, تَجَلِّينَ stands for *tagluwtna*; in the latter, تَرْمِينَ stands for *tarmiynna*. A verb like رَضِيَ gives the form تَرْضِينَ, for *tardaytna*. The vulgar forms are *timsht, tirdt*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are תַּעֲשִׂין, תַּעֲשִׂי, תַּעֲשִׂי, תַּעֲשִׂי, תַּעֲשִׂי. Here תַּעֲשִׂין stands for

ta'saytn, tibkt for *tabkayt*, etc. The Syriac has the advantage over the Hebrew in having the vowel *ē* instead of the weaker *i*,

ܬܒܟܝܬ for *tabkaytn*.

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. in Arabic has the forms يَجْلُونَ, يَرْضُونَ, يَرْمُونَ. The first of these is contracted from *yagluwāna*, the second from *yarmiynāna*, the third from *yardayāna*. The vulgar forms are *yimshū*, *yirdū*. The corresponding Hebrew form occurs not unfrequently in its uncontracted shape, יִאָחֲזוּ, יִשְׁלְחוּ, יִאָחֲזוּ; without final *n*, יִאָחֲזוּ, יִשְׁלְחוּ; with a weaker vowel in the 2nd syllable, יִרְבִּינָה Deut. viii. 13, יִרְוּ Ps. xxxvi. 9. These stand for *yabkayāna*, *yarbayāna*, etc. More frequently, however, a still further change takes place: יִרְבִּינָה becomes יִרְבִּין. Hence יִרְבִּין, יִעֲשֶׂה, יִרְבִּין; יִרְבִּין, יִרְבִּין; יִרְבִּין, יִרְבִּין; יִרְבִּין, יִרְבִּין. In Syriac the masc. form is ܢܪܡܘܢ *nərmōn*, according to the Eastern pronunciation, for *narmayān*; the Westerns weaken the vowel of the 2nd syllable to *ū*, *nərmūn*, ܢܪܡܘܢ. The corresponding Mand. form is written ܢܝܩܪܘܢ, ܢܝܩܪܘܢ; with an enclitic, ܢܝܩܪܘܢܐ; and in Biblical Chaldee we also find ܢܝܩܪܘܢ, ܢܝܩܪܘܢ.

The 3rd pers. plur. fem. in Arabic is يَرْضِينَ, يَجْلُونَ; the first of which, according to the norm يَقْتُلْنَ, stands for *yagluwāna*, the second for *yarmiynāna*, the third for *yardayāna*. The corresponding Hebrew form is תִּבְכְּינָה, תִּחְזִינָה, תִּעֲשֶׂינָה, 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 ܢܝܩܪܘܢ, ܢܝܩܪܘܢ Dan. v. 16; in Syriac ܢܝܩܪܘܢ; in Mand. ܢܝܩܪܘܢ or ܢܝܩܪܘܢ, corresponding very closely to the Ethiopic subjunctive *yəbbəkēyā*, for *yəbbəkēyāna*.

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

f. *lélawt*, pl. m. *lélawt*; *békt* (for *békky*), f. *békéyt*, pl. m. *békéyt*; 'dbai (for 'dbay), f. 'dbéyt, pl. m. 'dbéyt; *fétaw* or *fétib* (for *fétaw*), f. *fétawt*, pl. m. *fétawt*. In Arabic the 3rd radical has altogether

disappeared, as in the jussive, and only a vowel remains: أَجَلْ *uglu* for *ugluw*, اِرْمِ *irmi* for *irmiy*, اِرْضِ *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 أُجَلِّي *ugli* for *ugluwt*, اِرْمِي *irmit* for *irmiyt*, and اِرْضِي *irḍay* for *irḍayt*; their

plurals masc., اُجَلُّوا *uglā* for *ugluwt*, اِرْمُوا *irmit* for *irmiyt*, and اِرْضُوا *irḍau* for *irḍayt*. The vulgar forms are: fem. *imshī*, *irḍt*;

plur. *imshā*, *irḍā*. 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, הִיָּה, עִלָּה, רִאָּה, גִּלָּה, for *gēlai*, etc. This lengthening is sometimes found in the imperfect, especially in pause and with a jussive sense; as יִרָא

Gen. xli. 33, יַעֲשֶׂה Is. lxiv. 3, אֶל-תְּהִיָּה Jerem. xvii. 17. The

sing. fem. is גִּלִּי, עֲשִׂי, רִאִי, for *gil'it*, and that for *gēlayt*. The

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

אֲרָוּי and בְּעָוִי; but far more common are words like הָיוּ, עָשׂוּ,

רָאוּ, for *biklīyā*, etc. The corresponding fem. is exemplified

by רִאִיָּה, Cant. iii. 11, for *re'ayna*, in Arabic رَيْنَ *raina*. In

Syriac we find a very few imperatives with the original diphthong in the 2nd syllable, e.g. يَصْبُ, يَحْبُ, اِحْلَابُ; and in the

Targūms the punctuation with *l* occurs, גִּלִּי; but generally

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

חָיִי; in Syr. حَيِّ, حَيِّ, حَيِّ; in Mand. קריא, הוּיָה. The

fem. and plurals retain more of the ancient forms than in Hebrew.

Thus the fem. sing. in Syriac is **זָכַב**; in Mand. **קראי, הוואי**, and in the Talmūd **חראי** "rejoice," **גבאי** "get thyself paid." Hence it appears that the fem. form **גלי** in the Targūms is to be read **גְּלִי** (and not **גְּלִי**, as indeed we might infer from the variant **גְּלִיא** (for **גְּלִיא**). The plural masc. in Syriac is **זָכְבוּ**, for *rēmd'ū*, and that for *rēmd'ūn* **זָכְבוּן**. The Mand. exhibits the contraction **הוון, הרון**; the Bibl. Aram. the still greater one of **הוון, הרון**. The corresponding fem. in Syriac is **זָכְבִּי** *rēmd'eyn*, for *rēmd'yān*, to which answer the Jewish Aram. **רָמְן, רָמְנָה** or **רָמְן**, and the Mand. **אתיאן**, in Syr. **لَتِي**.

With regard to the infinitive I will merely remark that the Hebrew form **עָשׂוּ, הָיוּ, פָּנָה, גָּלָה**, has lost its 3rd radical. Originally these were words of same form as the Arabic infinitive **بَكَأَ, بِنَاءَ, خَفَاءَ**, where the 3rd rad. **و** or **ي** appears as a *hamza*. In Hebrew however the *hamza* fell away after the loss of the final vowels, and the preceding *ā* passed as usual into *ō*. The other infinitive **עָשׂוּ, פָּנָה, גָּלָה**, stands for *galāth, banāth*, by contraction for *galawat, banayat*; just as in Arabic **مَلَّ** stands for **مَلَّوْة, مَلَّوْة** for **مَلَّوْة, مَلَّوْة**. The Aramaic infinitive with prefixed *m* varies slightly in form in the several dialects. In Bibl. Aramaic we have **מְבַנֵּא, מְבַלֵּא, מְחַוֵּא**, with suff. **מְבַנֵּיָה, מְבַלֵּיָה, מְחַוֵּיָה**, as contrasted with the Syriac **فَعْلًا, فَعْلًا**, with suff. **فَعْلَيْس**. In the form **فَعْلًا** I see the influence of verbs **لֵא**, as well as in the imperatives of Pa'ēl, Aph'ēl, etc. In Mand. both forms seem to occur, **מִיבְנֵא, מִיבְנֵא**, as well as **מִיבְנֵא, מִיבְנֵא**; and so also in the Talmūd **מְבַנֵּי, מְבַנֵּי**, as well as **מִיבְנֵא** "to get paid." There also occurs in Bibl. Aram. the form **מְבַנֵּיָה** Ezra v. 9, like **מְבַנֵּיָה** in Targ. Prov. xxv. 27 and

In Esther ii. 9 **הַרְאִיֹּת** seems to be a mistake for **הַרְאִיֹּת**, which is found in some MSS. and editions. The corresponding Aramaic participle has the form **בְּנִה**, **חֹזֶה**, **מְנִיא**, **שָׂרָא**; Syr. **ܫܪܝܐ**, Mand. **ܫܪܝܐ**; the plur. is **ܫܪܝܢ** Dan. iii. 25, in Syr. **ܫܪܝܢ**; the fem. **ܫܪܝܢܐ**, **ܫܪܝܢܐ**. The form would seem then to be that of adjectives like **مُهْطَلًا**, **مُهْطَلًا**; **مُهْطَلًا** (or **مُهْطَلًا**), **مُهْطَلًا**; which spring from an original *katil* or *katil*, like **بَطَلٌ** "brave," **حَسَنٌ** "handsome," **جَدَلٌ** "glad," **دَسٌ** "dirty." The nearest Arabic equivalent would be **شَجٌّ** "in grief," **رَدٌ** "perishing," for **شَاجِي**, **رَدِي**, but either the Aramaic words had *a* in the second syllable, or the termination was influenced by that of the active participle. On this supposition **בְּנִה** would stand for *banay*, plur. **בְּנִי** for *banayin*, fem. **בְּנִיָּא** for *banaya*, *banayat*. Lastly, the Arabic passive participle has the form *maktil*, and therefore appears in these verbs as **مَرْمُوي**, **مَرْمُوي**. In the case of **مَرْمُوي**, the influence of the final *y* has sufficed to transform the original *l* of **مَرْمُوي**, into *l*. The vulgar forms may be exemplified by **مَهْدِي** *mahdīy*, which has become *māhdī*, fem. *mahdīye*, plur. *mahdīyīn*.

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**: *halldwa*, "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.]

חֲחַפּ: *halldya*, "meditate," חֲחַפּוּ: *hassdwa*, "lie," וּ זְפּוּ: *sannadya*, "be beautiful," וּ חַפּוּ: *halltwa* "become, be," contracted וּ חַפּוּ *hallt*¹. The Arabic exhibits ي for و in the 3rd pers. sing., not only here, but throughout all the derived conjugations; جَلِيَ for *gallaya*, whence plur. masc. جَلَوْا for *gallayn*, fem. جَلَيْنَ. The vulgar form of the plur. masc. would be *gallt*. In Hebrew we find similar forms prevailing, viz. גָּלָה for *gallaya*, גָּלוּ for *gallayn* [Niph'al גָּלָה plur. גָּלוּ, and so forth]. In Aramaic the vowel of the first syllable has been retained intact, but that of the second has been weakened to the utmost, the resulting form being in Bibl. Aram. מְנִי, רְבִי [Haph'el מְנִי, רְבִי from מְנִי, רְבִי, etc.], Syr. مَنِي, رَبِي, Mand. מַנְיָ, שַׁנְיָ for *mannaya*, etc., [and so throughout the other derived conjugations]. The lengthening of the final vowel by the complete vocalisation of the radical *y* has affected the form of the 3rd plur. masc., which is now שְׁנִי, שְׁרִי; Syr. مَنِي, رَبِي; the Mand. however gives us שַׁנְיָ, שַׁרְיָ for *shannayhna*. Of the 3rd plur. fem. there are no examples in Biblical Aramaic. The Syriac form is مَنِي, shortened from مَنِي from an original *rabbaydn(a)*; Mand. [Aph'el] מַנְיָ, אֲדִיבִי = אֲדִיבִי = אֲדִיבִי.—The 3rd sing. fem. of the Arabic is جَلَتْ for *gallayat*, which appears in Hebrew (before suffixes) as *gillath*, e.g. גִּלַּתְךָ, or, with slight tone-lengthening of the vowel גִּלַּתְנִי. The ordinary form in Hebrew of course is גִּלַּתְךָ, גִּלַּתְךָ, with double termination. The Aramaic inflects regularly, מְנִי for *rabbayat*, Mand. שַׁנְיָ, שַׁרְיָ. The Targūms give, it is true, the forms גִּלַּתְךָ, גִּלַּתְךָ, but this punctuation seems as doubtful as

¹ [And so in the other derived conjugations *dlawa*, *dstaya*, *tafdtwa*, *tahdrya*, etc.; so that the whole inflexion of the perfects is the same as in the strong verb.]

in the 1st conjugation. The 2nd pers. always retains the diphthong in Arabic, جَلَيْتَ *gallaita* for *gallayta*, of which the vulgar form would be *gillét*. In Hebrew the vowel is weakened to *é*, צוֹיֵת, פְּסוֹיֵת, fem. גְּלִיֵת, plur. masc. פְּלִיֵתָם, עוֹיֵתָם, but the older *é* is sometimes retained in the first pers., e.g. נִקְסִי, קָצִי, גְּלִי and נִקְסִי, קָצִי, גְּלִי and נִקְסִי, קָצִי, גְּלִי. In Biblical Aramaic the only form that occurs is מְנִיֵת, Dan. iii. 12. Syriac distinguishes the second person *أَضَلَّ* (plur. *أَضَلُّوا*) by giving it hard *t*, while the first person is *أَضَلُّ* with soft *t*¹. 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, ממת, we cannot tell; probably not, as the Targūms seem to make the difference in the vowels, גְּלִיֵת fem. גְּלִיֵת, but גְּלִיֵת, גְּלִיֵת, supposing the punctuation to be correct².

In Ethiopic the form of the subjunctive mood of the imperfect is ደረኒ: *yēfannū*, የሀሉ: *yahallū*, ደደለ: *yēšallū*, የሐለ: *yahallū* for *-nēw*, *-lēy*. The corresponding indicative, 3rd pers. sing., in Arabic is يَجَلِي by regular contraction for يَجَلِي,

¹ [In the other derived conjugations the older *é* occurs also in the second person. In the Niph'al it is commoner than *t*, and in the perfects of Po'el and Hoph'al *é* is never thinned to *f* 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 צָלִיֵת 1's. xxx. 3 (Nebiensis) צָלִיֵתָם Deut. xxxiv. 4 (where the same pronunciation is indicated by means of the Babylonian vowels in the ms. of the Brit. Mus. used by Merx, *Chrest. Targ.* p. 54), side by side with צָלִיֵתָם Gen. xxxi. 39, Deut. xxvi. 10 (where the edition of Sabbioneta, according to Berliner, has צָלִיֵתָם, but Compl. agrees with Bomb.), אִתְּנִיֵתָם 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 يَقْتَل, the preceding *kesr* changing every *w* into *y*. We are therefore surprised to find in Hebrew יְגַלָּה instead of יְגַלֵּי. I can only explain this by supposing that it is due to an effort at uniformity. We found reason to suppose that the *a*-form prevailed in the first conjugation; and it is in its proper place in the passives: יְגַלָּה for *yagullay*, Ar. يَجَلِّي; יְגַלָּה for *yahuglay*, Ar. يَجَلِّي; whence, I imagine, it spread to the *Pi'el*, [*Hiph'il*]. and *Niph'al*, giving יְגַלָּה instead of יְגַלֵּי, Ar. يَجَلِّي [instead of יְגַלֵּי, Ar. يَجَلِّي], and יְגַלָּה instead of יְגַלֵּי, Ar. يَنْجَلِي. As regards the plural of the imperfect we find in Hebrew examples of uncontracted forms, תְּרַמְיוּן, Is. xl. 18, תְּרַמְיוּנֵי, *ibid.* ver. 25, ch. xlvi. 5, יְבַסְיוּ, Exod. xv. 5; but the ordinary form is יְגַלֵּוּ, Arabic يَجَالُونَ, *yugallūna*, for *yugalliyyūna*. A similarly uncontracted participle is the Pu'al מְגַלֵּי in Isa. xxv. 6. The shortened or jussive form of the Imperfect is in Arabic يَجَلِّ, to which correspond closely the Hebrew יַצוּ, Deut. xxviii. 8, יַצוּ, יַצוּ, Ps. cxli. 8^o.

The Aramaic form of the Imperfect differs from the Hebrew,

¹ [In like manner יְגַלָּה corresponds to يَنْجَلِي.]

² [Similarly in the Hiph'il the forms without a helping vowel יְגַלָּה, יְגַלָּה, יְגַלָּה correspond to the Arabic يَجَلِّ, while the forms with a helping vowel like יְגַלֵּוּ, יְגַלֵּוּ, stand for *yagl*, *ya'l*, as, in the case of nouns, מַלְאָךְ, מַלְאָךְ stand for *malak*, *na'r*. In the Hithpa'el the Jussive is יְגַלֵּוּ for *yithgall*, pl. יְגַלֵּוּ, in pause יְגַלֵּוּ, 2 Sam. xiii. 6, and so without pause יְגַלֵּוּ, Deut. ii. 9, 19 (under the influence of the virtually doubled guttural), also יְגַלֵּוּ. The Pi'el יְגַלָּה has Jussive יְגַלָּה for יְגַלָּה.]

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 **אֲחִיָּה**, Dan. ii. 24, **נְחִיָּה**, Dan. ii. 4,—a doubtful punctuation. The plural is **יְבַעֲוּ**, **יְשַׁנּוּ**. The Syriac and Mandaic forms are nearly identical, viz. **نُضَفْ**, pl. **نُضَفْ**; **נִישְׁאָנִי**, pl. **נִישְׁאָנִין**. In Biblical Aramaic the final *ṣērē* is however shortened with suffixes into **יְחַנְנִי**, Dan. v. 7, and **יְחַנְנִיה**, Dan. ii. 11, which might raise a doubt whether א=, י= arises out of *ai*, as in Hebrew, or out of *i*. I prefer the former view because of the plural **יְשַׁנּוּ**, and because the participle is **מְצַלֵּא**, Dan. vi. 11, with the plural **מְצַלֵּינ**, Ezra vi. 10, Syr. **صَلَّيْ**, **صَلَّيْ**, which could only arise out of *məṣallaytn* not *məṣalliytn*. The striving after unity of termination in the same part of the different verbal forms has here been pushed to its utmost.

The Imperative has in Ethiopic the form **ፈሎ**: *fannā*, **ፈሎ**: *ṣállt* for *fannēw*, *ṣallēy*; fem. **ፈሎ**: *fannēw*, **ፈሎ**: *ṣallēyt*; plur. masc. **ፈሎ**: *fannēw*, **ፈሎ**: *ṣallēy*. 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**, **צו**, Ps. lxi. 8, **צו**, Ps. cxix. 18, 22, **צו**, Dan. i. 12, for *ṣawwi* etc. The longer and commoner form **צוה**, **צוה**, has arisen under the combined influence of the Qal **צוה** and the normal **קטל**.—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 **נְלִי** and **נְלִי**, but the former is probably correct. So in Mand. **וּאֲנִי**, **וּאֲנִי**; in the Talmūd **שַׁנִּי** “change,”

“remove,” in Samaritan **סלי**, in modern Syriac **سُفِّبْ**, **سُفِّبْ**, *sāpfi* for *sappfi*. In ancient Syriac alone do we encounter a different form **سُفِّبْ**, which is probably owing to the influence of verbs **لָּ**, which would naturally have this vowel¹. The fem. in Syriac is **سُفِّبْ**, in the Targūms **סֻפֵּב** for **סֻפֵּב**; the plur. m. in Syriac is **سُفِّبْ**, in the Targūms **סֻפֵּב**, Mand. **סֻפֵּב**, **סֻפֵּב**; the plur. fem. in Syriac **سُفِّبْ** for *galldyān*, in the Targūms **סֻפֵּב**.

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

¹ [As in the infinitive Pe'al **سُفِّبْ**; see p. 268, *supra*. An original *gullay* (with *a* in the last syllable, according to the principle of effort after uniformity of termination explained in the text) would give *gallé*, *gallf*, but an original *malla'* (from **مَلَأَ** = **مَلَأَ**) might naturally become *malla*. Now, in Syriac, verbs **لָּ** (with a very few exceptions in the intensive stem, such as **سُفِّبْ** and **سُفِّبْ**) have become entirely fused with verbs **لָּ** and **لִּי**, 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 (**سُفِّبْ**, **سُفِّبْ**, **سُفِّبْ**) the **لָּ** form may be supposed to have prevailed. The imperative Ethpe'el on the other hand has the unweakened termination **سُفِّبْ**, in Eastern Syriac **سُفِّبْ** *athgal*, with transposition of the vowel and double silent **ب**. Duval, p. 193. thinks that the imperatives in *a*, to which must be added a single Pe'al form, **سُفِّبْ** “come,” are relics of the energetic form in *an*, *a*; cf. p. 195 *supra*.]

ḵawwā, corresponding to the Arabic form (with weakened vowel) *kittā*. The inf. const. is גָּלוּת, חִיּוּת, גְּלוּת, 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. גְּלוּתָא; Aph'el in Biblical Aramaic הַשְׁנִיָּה, הַחַוְיָה, Targumic אַגְלָאָה and so forth], the Talmūd Bābli אַסְוִי, אַסְוִי, Mand. אַסְוִי, אַסְוִי, which form sometimes occurs in the later Targūms, e.g. אַסְוִי. In these dialects forms with prefixed *m* sometimes occur, e.g. Mand. מִישְׁאֲנִיָּה; and the same prefix appears in the Syriac forms מְגַלְתֵּה constr. מְגַלְתֵּה, [Aph'el מְגַלְתֵּה 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, מְגַלֵּה. 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, מְגַלֵּה, מְגַלֵּה is, it is true, sufficiently distinct from the passive מְגַלֵּה, מְגַלֵּה, 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 מְגַלֵּה are clearly distinguished, but in Syriac the active مְגַלְתֵּה and the passive مְגַלְתֵּה assume identical forms with inflexional additions, مְגַלְתֵּה, مְגַלְתֵּה etc.]

[*Appendix. Verbs of which one radical is an Ḥ.*

Here we must distinguish, in general, between forms in which the **Ḥ** retains its original force as a guttural consonant (*hamza*) and forms in which the **Ḥ** is weakened or disappears, according to the principles laid down above, pp. 44 *sqq.* In the former case there is no irregularity, properly so called, though the **Ḥ** exerts the usual influence of a guttural on neighbouring vowels; in the latter case weak forms arise, some of which can be at once explained by the general rules at pp. 44 *sqq.*, while others involve also the operation of the law of analogy, and the influence of weak verbs of the class that have a } or ' among their radicals.

In Ethiopic verbs a radical **Ḥ** is throughout treated as a guttural. Similarly in Arabic verbs a radical *hamza* commonly remains consonantal in all positions (except where two *hamzas* come together in the same syllable) and the inflexion is essentially regular, though a certain tendency to soften the guttural pronunciation in the direction of و or ي, under the influence of an *u* or *i* immediately preceding or following the *hamza*, is indicated by the orthographic rules which bid us write ^ـباس for ^ـباس, ^ـيوثر for ^ـيوثر, ^ـيباس for ^ـيباس 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 **Ḥor'an** as ^ـياتي, ^ـمؤمن for *ya'ti*, *mu'min*¹. In modern Arabic the

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

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

A. *Verbs ܠ'D*. In the perfect of the simple stem ܠ is initial, and retains its guttural force, so that the inflexion is essentially regular. In Syriac initial ܠ demands a full vowel instead of a mere vocal *shêva*, and in the perfect this vowel is commonly *e*, אֶפֶס, with the same thinning of the original *a* as in the fem. فَهَسَتْ, اَمَّطَتْ. But in some verbs the Eastern Syrians have the older and stronger pronunciation اَكَمَ, اَلَا, اَلَا, اَلَا. In Mandaic also the vowel of the first syllable is generally *a*, اَمَار, and so too in the fem. we have اَمَارَات, اَمَارَات as well as اَمَارَات, اَمَارَات. In Biblical Aramaic the vowel appears to be shorter, اَمַר, اَمַר. In Syriac a few verbs assume in the perfect the form of verbs ܘ, اِبَّج, اِبَّج, اِبَّج, اِبَّج.

In the imperfect the Arabic has يَأْكُل, يَأْكُل, 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 ܘ 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 اَكَمَ, for عرض = عرض. The Western Syrians write اَكَمَ, and even اَكَمَ, the ܘ before ܘ being pronounced by them as ܠ.

² A fuller vowel, ܘ, ܘ, 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 ܘ, ܘ instead of a *hatephs*, 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 **אָכַר**, **תָּאָמַר** closely correspond. But in Heb., where the א retains its guttural force, the pronunciation is usually facilitated by the insertion of a *hatoph* or a short vowel, **אָכַף**, **אָכַב**, 2 fem. **תָּאָכַפִּי** etc. By this means the radical א may remain consonantal even in the first person, **אָכַפְּאָ**, whereas in

Arabic **أَكَل** necessarily becomes **أَكَل** *akulu*, because two hamzas cannot be pronounced in one syllable. The same contraction sometimes appears in old Arabic in the other persons, and in modern Arabic the pronunciation *yakul*, *yamur* is the rule. Similarly Hebrew **אָכַר**, **אָכַה**, **אָכַל**, **אָמַר**, **אָפַה** form the imperfects **יֵאָכַר**, **יֵאָפַה**, **יֵאָכַל** etc.; *ya-* standing as usual for *ya-*. The first persons are written **אָכַר** 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 *ē* of the second radical, which becomes *a*, *ē* in current discourse or with retracted accent, **יֵאָכַר**, **יֵאָכַל**, **יֵאָמַר**, extends through all these verbs, and similarly **אָחַז** makes **יֵאָחַז** and **יֵאָחוּ**; **אָסַף**, **יֵאָסַף**, **תָּאָסַף** and **יֵאָסַף** (with omission of the א). In all these cases the broader prefix seems to have thinned the *u*, *o* of the second radical to *ē*, *ē*, a vowel which the Hebrew imperfect usually avoids. Similar forms from stative verbs with imperfect *a* are **וְאָרַב**, Mal. i. 2, **וְיֵחָדַר** (for **וְיֵאָחַדַר**), 2 Sam. xx. 5, *Kēlāḏ*; but beside these we find also **יֵאָרַב**, Prov. viii. 17, **וְיֵאָחַר**, Gen. xxxii. 5, and probably **וְיֵחָדַר**, 2 Sam. xx. 5 *Kēlāḏh*, with similar forms from **אָתַה** and **אָוַל**. Those from the two last verbs may be mere Aramaisms; the others seem to be genuine Hebrew forms and may be compared with the dialectic Arabic **أَتَمَّ** from **أَتَمَّ**.

In the Aramaic imperfect (and inf.) the contraction into *ē* (for *a*, *a'*, as in the particle **נָא** = **נָא'**, *na'*) is universal; Jewish Ar.

אִמַּר, אִכַּל, inf. מֵאִמַּר etc., Syr. ܐܘܡܪ, ܐܘܟܠ. But in verbs imperfect *a* the West Syrians further thin *l* to *ʕ*; thus ܐܘܡܪ, ܐܘܟܠ are in the East *uamar*, *uamal*, but in the West *umar*, *umal*.

The Arabic imperative is necessarily **اِئْسِرْ** not **اِيسِرْ** not **اِوَمَلْ** not **اِوَمَلْ**. Three verbs commonly reject the first radical, **اَمَرَ**, **اَخَذَ**, **اَكَلَ**, making **مَرَ**, **خَذَ**, **اَكَلَ**, whence in vulgar Arabic we even find the perfects *had* and *kal*. So from **اَتَى** we have **اَيْتِ** and **تِ**, in pause **تِ**. A similar apocope takes place in Syriac in the imperatives ܐܘܠ "come" and ܐܘܠ "go".¹ Apart from these anomalous forms the only point to be noted about the Syriac imperative is that the full vowel necessarily assumed by the initial ܐ is *a* before *ʃ* but *e* before *a*, ܐܘܟܠ, ܐܘܡܪ—a distinction which does not appear to be carried out in the other dialects of Aramaic. In Biblical Aramaic and Targumic, as in Hebrew, a *hateph* commonly takes the place of a full vowel; yet we find in the Targums such forms as ܐܘܡܪ, ܐܘܟܠ, and even in Hebrew the plurals ܐܘܡܪ and ܐܘܟܠ. In the passive participle the Syriac has ܐܘܡܪ, but in Dan. iii. 22 we have ܐܘܡܪ.

In the reflexive of the simple stem the Arabic **اَيْتَرَ**, imperfect **يَاتِرُ**, perf. pass. **اَوْتَرَ**, requires no explanation. But the verb **اَتَجَرَ** makes **اَتَخَذَ**, and so also we find **اَتَرَرُ** as well as **اَيْتَرَ**.

¹ But **اَمَلْ** and **اَمَلْ** and so forth. So also **اَمَرَ** as well as **مَرَ**, but **اَخَذَ** and **اَكَلَ**.

² Talm. B. ܐܘܟܠ, ܐܘܟܠ; but in Bibl. Aram. ܐܘܟܠ, Ezra v. 15 (in the Targums ܐܘܟܠ, Numb. xxii. 35, Compl., Bomb.); ܐܘܟܠ, Dan. iii. 26 (in the Targums ܐܘܟܠ, ܐܘܟܠ).

as well as **אֵינְתַבֵּר**, and more rarely a few other cases of the same kind. Similarly in Aramaic **אֵינְתַבֵּר**, **אֵינְתַבֵּר** with sporadic cases of the same kind in other verbs. The ordinary Syriac reflexive is **אֵינְתַבֵּר**, fem. **אֵינְתַבֵּר**, by the general rule of Syriac that | gives up its vowel to a vowelless consonant and disappears in pronunciation. In the Targums this elision seems not to take place and the forms are regular. In the intensive stem the | in Syriac also mostly surrenders its vowel and is elided after prefixes with a vanishing vowel: imperf. **נִבְּלָא** for *n'akkal* (1st person **אֵבְּלָא**) part. **בְּלָלָא** etc. Similar forms are found, though less consistently, in Jewish Aramaic and occasionally in Hebrew, **וַתִּתְּוֹרְנִי**, 2 Sam. xxii. 40, for **וַתִּתְּוֹרְנִי**, Ps. xviii. 40, **מִלְּפִי**, Job xxxv. 11, and so forth. In Aramaic the extensive stem (Aph'el and Shaph'el with their reflexives) passes wholly over into the forms of verbs פ"ו, except in the two verbs **הִימֵן**, **וְסִפֵּף** and **הִיחִי**, **אֵיחִי**, Palmyrene **אֵחִי**, De Vog. 15, l. 4, **أَحَب**, where the א becomes י; compare the Hebrew imper. Hiph. **הִחִי**, Jer. xii. 9, and the part. **מִוִּין** "giving ear," Prov. xvii. 4. The Hebrew forms are generally regular, but in a few cases we find the contraction of אַ into א, as **אֶכֶל**, Hosea xi. 4, and so in the Niph'al **נִאֶחַז**, Numb. xxxii. 30, or even into א, **וַיֵּאָצֵל**, Numb. xi. 25, **וַיִּרְב**, 1 Sam. xv. 5. The passage of א into א, 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'el* often becomes *awel*, **تَوَامَرُوا** for **تَاَمَرُوا** "they deliberated together," and so too initial 'el sometimes becomes *wel* in stem III., **وَأَكَل** for **أَكَل**. In modern Egyptian Arabic we even find *wakkil* for **أَكَل**, pcrf. of **أَكَل** II.

B. *Verbs* א"י. In Ethiopic, Arabic and Hebrew the forms are generally strong throughout; and strong forms are also common in Eastern 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 **سأل** "ask," from which we have such forms as **سأل**, **سأل**, **سأل**, or more frequently, with elision, **يسأل**. Similarly the common **يرى** for **يراي** "he will see," and a few others. In Western Syriac the elision of א 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 **פאל** (E. Syr. **פאל**), imperf. **נעאל**, pl. **נעאלם** (E. Syr. **נעאל**, pl. **נעאלם**, where the subscript line denotes a kind of vocal *sheva*), Ethpe'el **אמאל** (E. Syr. **אמאל**), 1st pers. **אמאל**, and so forth. When the first or third radical is an aspirate we sometimes find forms like **נצاف**, **נצاف**, where the hardening of the aspirate represents an older doubling, presumably due to assimilation of the א. In Biblical Aramaic the א maintains itself, as in E. Syriac, and so apparently in the Targums. In the latter א may pass into א when it is doubled, e.g. **שייר** (שייר) Pa"el of **שייר**. So too many Syrians pronounced **כאפ** as *buyesh*, and the verb **כאפ** forms the Pa"el **כאפ**; but in the latter case it is the form of the P'el that is secondary. The transition of verbs א"י to hollow verbs, of which we have found some examples in Arabic, prevails within the Aramaic field in

¹ See for the Syriac Nestle in *Beitr. zur Assyriologie*, i. 153 sqq. (where however in Nöldeke's judgment the case is overstated, and insufficient weight is given to the numerous instances in which the ancient Nestorian Massora (of A.D. 899) forbids the א to be pronounced). All Syriac verbs of this class are stative in form. In Hebrew the only cases of contraction are **און** pl. of the P'el **און** (if this is not rather an old Niph'al from **און**) and possibly **און**, Eccles. xii. 5.

Mandaic. A transition to \aleph^{D} sometimes occurs in Syriac, c.g. ܐܠܘܦ , ܐܠܘܦܝܢ (from ܐܠܘܦ), ܢܐܘܦܝܢ , Ps. xli. 2; but most forms of this kind are only graphical errors.

C. *Verbs* \aleph^{L} . Here the tendency of the languages, completely carried out in vulgar Arabic, and almost completely in Aramaic, is to entire assimilation with verbs \aleph^{L} . 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 ܘܠܐ , ܘܠܐܘܐ , ܘܠܐܘܐܘܐ (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. ܘܠܐܘܐ etc. In Hebrew alone do the \aleph^{L} form a distinct class of weak verbs, the \aleph retaining its consonantal force whenever it has a vowel, ܘܠܐܘܐ , ܘܠܐܘܐܘܐ , ܘܠܐܘܐܘܐܘܐ , or even a vocal *shewa*, ܘܠܐܘܐܘܐܘܐܘܐ , 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*, ܘܠܐܘܐ , stative ܘܠܐܘܐ , imperf. ܘܠܐܘܐ (for *yimsa'*, with characteristic *a* before the guttural), Niph'al ܘܠܐܘܐ , ܘܠܐܘܐ , Hiph. ܘܠܐܘܐ etc. In the perfect of the simple stem the normal vowel is also retained in syllables not final ܘܠܐܘܐ , ܘܠܐܘܐ , but the other perfects in such cases uniformly take *ē* ܘܠܐܘܐ , ܘܠܐܘܐ 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 *sigħol*; ܘܠܐܘܐ , ܘܠܐܘܐ etc. So also the imper. of the simple stem ܘܠܐܘܐ ; 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 *ē* of the perfect and the *sigħol* of the imperfect alike represent an older *a*, and it seems most likely that the deflection to *ē*, *ē*, has been produced under

the influence of verbs וְיָ . 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 stela of Mēsha' we have רש, "head," רית, "gazingstock," ואמר "and I said," all with omission of a radical א which was already lost in pronunciation. But on the other hand we have מאתן, ויאמר (Heb. מֵאֲתַיִם), צאן "sheep." The last example is particularly noticeable in contrast with רש; for while the spelling מאתן might conceivably be aided by the singular מאת (l. 20) there was nothing to help the retention of the א in צאן unless it was actually sounded when this spelling was chosen. So again when the Phœnician writes בנת "I built" (*C. I. S.* 3, l. 4) but קראת "I called" (*Id.* 1, l. 7) we are certainly not justified by the rules of Phœnician spelling in taking the א to be merely the sign of the vowel *a*. When we pass from inscriptions to the Biblical texts we are met by the difficulty that the spelling has undergone later revision, especially by the insertion of vowel letters in cases where these were not used in old times. But א is not a mere *mater lectionis*; the rule that prevails is that א is inserted wherever it is etymologically justified, whether it is sounded or not, and the exceptions to this rule are merely sporadic, except in such cases as אמר for אומר, where the

second **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 (**אֲרַשׁ, מִצָּא, מֵאֲרִים**), 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 Strassmeier has published in *Zeitschr. f. Assyr.* vol. iii. (1888) p. 129 *sqq.* One of these (p. 135) of the year 80 B.C. is, as Mr E. A. W. Budge kindly informs me, the latest example of the Assyrian writing of which we have certain knowledge.
- P. 17. The Aramaic inscriptions will form the second part of the great Paris Corpus. The first fasciculus, edited by M. de Vogüé, has appeared (Paris, 1889).
- P. 20, l. 10. For 1865 read 1855.
- Ibid.*, *footnote* 1. Further information about the dialect of Ma'lulā is given by Mr F. J. Bliss in the *Qu. Statement of the Pal. Expl. Fund*, April, 1890, p. 74 *sqq.*
- P. 25, *footnote*. The text of the inscription, in Hebrew square characters, with translation and notes, is given in Prof. Driver's *Notes on . . . Samuel* (Oxf. 1890), p. lxxxv *sqq.*
- P. 29, *footnote*. A substantial addition to our stock of dated Himyaritic inscriptions is promised by E. Glaser from the epigraphic collections formed during his journeys in S. Arabia.
- P. 34. In *Zeitschr. f. aegypt. Spr. u. Alterthumsk.* 1889, p. 81, Erman has indicated the existence in Egyptian of a tense precisely corresponding to the Semitic Perfect. (Nöld.) The forms of the singular and plural are as follows—

SING.		PLUR.	
3 m.	ḥbs	3.	ḥbsw
3 f.	ḥbsti'		
2 m.	ḥbsti'	2 c.	ḥbstini
1.	ḥbskwi' (cf. Aeth. -kū)	1.	ḥbswin

- P. 35. For the history of Semitic, and especially of Hebrew, writing the student will do well to consult the introduction to Prof. Driver's *Notes on . . . Samuel*, Oxf. 1890 (with facsimiles).
- P. 40, *footnote*. It should be stated that the quotation at the close of this note is from Prof. Müller's article "Yemen" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. His paper in the Vienna *Denkschriften*, which had not reached England when the note was printed, deals with the Minacan inscriptions of Euting's collection, of which the dialect and character are S. Arabian, and with one group of inscriptions of N. Arabian type, which, on the ground of their contents, are called Lihyānite. A large number of inscriptions, provisionally classed together as Proto-Arabic, are reserved for future publication. Thus it is not yet possible to say anything definitive about the history of the old Arabian alphabets; the materials already published have given rise to lively controversy.
- P. 44, l. 24. Prof. Nöldeke observes that the form derived from *sham'al*^m by elision of ^ʾ would be *shamal*^m, not *shamāl*^m. The latter therefore must be derived from a secondary form *sham'āl*^m; cf. the Hebrew and Aramaic forms.
- P. 48, l. 15. See p. 51, *footnote* 1.
- P. 48, l. 21. Prof. Nöldeke "cannot recognise the weakening or loss of *y* in any one of the three cases adduced. In פתאם the change of *y* to *ʿ* 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 *y* in Hebrew, notably פתאם side by side with פתע. Such readings as נשקעה for נשקה, Amos viii. 8, *Kethibh*, למו for לעמו, Ps. xxviii. 8 (LXX. τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ), are probably due to a pronunciation in which *y* was not sounded; but to ascribe this vicious pronunciation to the original writers is not justifiable; the readings in question are presumably errors of later scribes.
- P. 51, l. 5. "In many parts of Syria *ç* seems to be pronounced like the French *j*"—(Nöld.). In upper Egypt one sometimes hears a pronunciation intermediate between English hard and soft *g*, but nearly approaching the latter. In Arabia *ç* is hard in Nejd, and soft (*g* in *gem*) in the Hijāz (Mecca, 'Iāif).

**This book is a preservation photocopy.
It was produced on Hammermill Laser Print natural white,
a 60 # book weight acid-free archival paper
which meets the requirements of
ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (permanence of paper)**

Preservation photocopying and binding

by

**Acme Bookbinding
Charlestown, Massachusetts**



1995

