

GESENIUS'

HEBREW GRAMMAR

AS EDITED AND ENLARGED BY THE LATE

E. KAUTZSCH

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE

SECOND ENGLISH EDITON

REVISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TWENTY-EIGHTH GERMAN EDITON (1909)
BY

A. E. COWLEY

WITH A FACSIMILE OF THE SILOAM INSCRIPTION BY J. EUTING, AND A TABLE
OF ALPHABETS BY M. LIDZBARSKI

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E.C. 4

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI CAPETOWN IBADAN

Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University

¹Gesenius, F. W. (2003). *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar* (E. Kautzsch & S. A. E. Cowley, Ed.) (2d English ed.) (Page i). Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

ECOND ENGLISH EDITION 1910

REPRINTED LITHOGRAPHICALLY IN GREAT BRITAIN

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD, 1946, 1949, 1952, 1956

FROM CORRECTED SHEETS OF THE SECOND EDITION

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

THE translation of the twenty-sixth German edition of this grammar, originally prepared by the Rev. G. W. Collins and revised by me, was published in 1898. Since that date a twenty-seventh German edition has appeared; and Prof. Kautzsch was already engaged on a twenty-eighth in 1908 when the English translation was becoming exhausted. He sent me the sheets as they were printed off, and I began revising the former translation in order to produce it as soon as possible after the completion of the German. The whole of the English has been carefully compared with the new edition, and, it is hoped, improved in many points, while Prof. Kautzsch's own corrections and additions have of course been incorporated. As before, the plan and arrangement of the original have been strictly followed, so that the references for sections and paragraphs correspond exactly in German and English. Dr. Driver has again most generously given up time, in the midst of other engagements, to reading the sheets, and has made numerous suggestions. To him also are chiefly due the enlargement of the index of subjects, some expansions in the new index of Hebrew words, and some additions to the index of passages, whereby we hope to have made the book more serviceable to students. I have also to thank my young friend, Mr. Godfrey R. Driver, of Winchester College, for some welcome help in correcting proofs of the Hebrew index and the index of passages. בָּן חִכְמָה אֶבֶן. Many corrections have been sent to me by scholars who have used the former English edition, especially the Rev. W. E. Blomfield, the Rev. S. Holmes, Mr. P. Wilson, Prof. Witton Davies, Mr. G. H. Skipwith, and an unknown correspondent at West Croydon. These, as well as suggestions in reviews, have all been considered, and where possible, utilized. I am also much indebted to the Press-readers for the great care which they have bestowed on the work.

Finally, I must pay an affectionate tribute to the memory of Prof. Kautzsch, who died in the spring of this year, shortly after finishing the last sheets of the twenty-eighth edition. For more than thirty years he was indefatigable in improving the successive editions of the Grammar. The German translation of the Old Testament first published by him in 1894, with the co-operation of other scholars, under the title *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, and now (1910) in the third and much enlarged edition, is a valuable work which has been widely appreciated: the *Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, edited by him in 1900, is another important work: besides which he published his *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* in 1884, two useful brochures *Bibelwissenschaft und Religionsunterricht* in 1900, and *Die bleibende Bedeutung des Alten Testaments* in 1903, six popular lectures on *Die Poesie und die poetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* in 1902, his article 'Religion of Israel' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v. (1904), pp. 612–734, not to mention minor publications. His death is a serious loss to Biblical scholarship, while to me and to many others it is the loss of a

most kindly friend, remarkable alike for his simple piety and his enthusiasm for learning.

A. C.

MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD,

Sept. 1910.

FROM THE GERMAN PREFACE

THE present (twenty-eighth) edition of this Grammar,¹ like the former ones, takes account as far as possible of all important new publications on the subject, especially J. Barth's *Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Semitischen*, pt. i, Lpz. 1907; the important works of C. Brockelmann (for the titles see the heading of § 1; vol. i of the *Grundriss* was finished in 1908); P. Kahle's *Der masoretische Text des A Ts nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden*, Lpz. 1902 (giving on p. 51 ff. an outline of Hebrew accidence from a Babylonian MS. at Berlin); R. Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, Lpz. 1905 f., 2 vols. (discriminating between certain, probable, and proposed emendations; see § 3 g, end); Th. Nöldeke's *Beiträge zur semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, Strassburg, 1904; Ed. Sievers' *Metrische Studien* (for the titles of these striking works see § 2 r). The important work of J. W. Rothstein, *Grundzüge des hebr. Rhythmus*, &c. (see also § 2 r), unfortunately appeared too late to be used. The two large commentaries edited by Nowack and Marti have been recently completed; and in P. Haupt's Polychrome Bible (*SBOT.*), part ix (Kings) by Stade and Schwally was published in 1904.

For full reviews of the twenty-seventh edition, which of course have been considered as carefully as possible, I have to thank Max Margolis (in *Hebraica*, 1902, p. 159 ff.), Mayer Lambert (*REJ.* 1902, p. 307 ff.), and H. Oort (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1902, p. 373 ff.). For particular remarks and corrections I must thank Prof. J. Barth (Berlin), Dr. Gasser, pastor in Buchberg, Schaffhausen, B. Kirschner, of Charlottenburg, (contributions to the index of passages), Pastor Köhler, of Augst, Dr. Liebmann, of Kuczkow, Posen, Prof. Th. Nöldeke, of Strassburg, Pastor S. Preiswerk junior, of Bâle, Dr. Schwarz, of Leipzig, and Prof. B. Stade, of Giessen (died in 1906). Special mention must be made of the abundant help received from three old friends of this book, Prof. P. Haupt, of Baltimore, Prof. Knudtzon, of Kristiania, and Prof. H. Strack, of Berlin, and also, in connexion with the present edition, Prof. H.

¹ The first edition appeared at Halle in 1813 (202 pp. small 8vo); twelve more editions were published by W. Gesenius himself, the fourteenth to the twenty-first (1845–1872) by E. Rödiger, the twenty-second to the twenty-eighth (1878–1910) by E. Kautzsch. The first abridged edition appeared in 1896, the second at the same time as the present (twenty-eighth) large edition. The first edition of the 'Übungsbuch' (Exercises) to Gesenius-Kautzsch's Hebrew Grammar appeared in 1881, the sixth in 1908.

SBOT. *SBOT.* = Sacred Books of the Old Testament, ed. by P. Haupt. Lpz. and Baltimore, 1893 ff.

REJ. *REJ.* = Revue des Études Juives. Paris, 1880 ff.

Hyvernat, of the University of Washington, who has rendered great service especially in the correction and enlargement of the indexes. I take this opportunity of thanking them all again sincerely. And I am no less grateful also to my dear colleague Prof. C. Steuernagel for the unwearying care with which he has helped me from beginning to end in correcting the proof-sheets.

Among material changes introduced into this edition may be mentioned the abolition of the term *Šwā medium* (§ 10 d). In this I have adopted, not without hesitation, the views of Sievers. I find it, however, quite impossible to follow him in rejecting all distinctions of quantity in the vowels. It is no doubt possible that such matters may in the *spoken* language have worn a very different appearance, and especially that in the period of nearly a thousand years, over which the Old Testament writings extend, very great variations may have taken place. Our duty, however, is to represent the language in the form in which it has been handed down to us by the Masoretes; and that this form involves a distinction between unchangeable, tone-long, and short vowels, admits in my opinion of no doubt. The discussion of any earlier stage of development belongs not to Hebrew grammar but to comparative Semitic philology.

The same answer may be made to Beer's desire (*ThLZ.* 1904, col. 314 f.) for an 'historical Hebrew grammar describing the actual growth of the language on a basis of comparative philology, as it may still be traced within the narrow limits of the Old Testament'. Such material as is available for the purpose ought indeed to be honestly set forth in the new editions of Gesenius; but Beer seems to me to appraise such material much too highly when he refers to it as necessitating an 'historical grammar'. In my opinion these historical differences have for the most part been obliterated by the harmonizing activity of the Masoretes.

· · · · ·

E. KAUTZSCH.

HALLE,

July, 1909.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

Page 42, line 13 from below, *for note 1 read note 3.*

Page 63, § 15 p. [See also Wickes, *Prose Accentuation*, 130 f., 87 n. (who, however, regards the superlinear, Babylonian system as the earlier); and Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, 76, 78. In Ginsburg's *Hebrew Bible*, ed. 2 (1908), pp. 108 f., 267 f., the two systems of division are printed *in extenso*, in parallel columns—the 10 verses of the superlinear (Babylonian) system consisting (in Exodus) of v.^{2.3–6.7.8–11.12.13.14.15.16.}¹⁷ (as numbered in ordinary texts), and the 12 verses

of the sublinear (Palestinian) system, consisting of v.^{2-3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10.11.12.13-16.17}.—S. R. D.]

Page 65, note 1, for אָנָה read אָנָה (as § 105 a).

[Editions often vary in individual passages, as regards the accentuation of the first syllable: but in the 7 occurrences of אָנָה, and the 6 of אָנוּ, Baer, Ginsburg, and Kittel agree in having an accent on both syllables (as אָנָה) in Gn 50:17, Ex 32:31, Ps 116:16, and Metheg on the first syllable and an accent on the second syllable (as אָנוֹה) in 2 K 20:3=Is 38:3, Jon 1:14, 4:2, Ps 116:4, 118:25, 25, Dn 9:4, Ne 1:5, 11, except that in Ps 116:4 Ginsburg has אָנוֹה.—S. R. D.]

Page 79, § 22 s, before הַרְדִּיבָה insert exceptions to *b* are. After Jer 39:12 add Ps 52:5; and for Ez 9:6 read Ezr 9:6.

[So Baer (cf. his note on Jud 20:43; also on Jer 39:12, and several of the other passages in question): but Ginsburg only in 10 of the exceptions to *b*, and Jacob ben Hayyim and Kittel only in 5, viz. Jer 39:12, Pr 11:21, 15:1, Ps 52:5, Ezr 9:6.—S. R. D.]

Page 111, line 12, for הַהֲוֵה read הַהֲוֵה.

Page 123, § 45 e, add: cf. also מְהֻפֶּכֶת followed by אָה, Is 13:19, Am 4:11 (§ 115 d).

Page 175, § 67; . See B. Halper, ‘The Participial formations of the Geminate Verbs’ in *ZAW*. 1910, pp. 42 ff., 99 ff., 201 ff. (also dealing with the regular verb).

Page 177, at the end of § 67 g the following paragraph has been accidentally omitted:

Rem. According to the prevailing view, this strengthening of the first radical is merely intended to give the bi-literal stem at least a tri-literal appearance. (Possibly aided by the analogy of verbs פְּנַסְׁךְ, as P. Haupt has suggested to me in conversation.) But cf. Kautzsch, ‘Die sog. aramaisierenden Formen der Verba עַד im Hebr.’ in *Oriental. Studien zum 70. Geburtstag Th. Nöldekes*, 1906, p. 771 ff. It is there shown (1) that the sharpening of the 1st radical often serves to emphasize a particular meaning (cf. יִגְרֵר, but יִתְהַלֵּל, יִגְרֵר and יִתְהַלֵּל, and יִשְׁבֵב, יִשְׁבֵב and יִשְׁבֵב), and elsewhere no doubt to dissimilate the vowels (as יִגְרֵר, יִתְהַלֵּל, &c.); (2) that the sharpening of the 1st radical often appears to be occasioned by the nature of the first letter of the stem, especially when it is a sibilant. Whether the masoretic pronunciation is based on an early tradition, or the Masora has arbitrarily adopted aramaizing forms to attain the above objects, must be left undecided.

Page 193, the second and third paragraphs should have the marginal letters *d* and *e* respectively.

Page 200, § 72 z, line 2, *after* Est 2:18 *add* 4:14.

Page 232, § 84a s, *add* שָׁמֶן 2 S 13:20.

Page 236, § 85 c, *add* חַנְקָה Ezr 4:22.

Page 273, § 93 qq end, *add* מִזְרָחֹת שְׁלֵשִׁים, רַבּוּם, שְׁמָמָה Ex 20:5, Is 49:8,
La 1:16 (cf. König, ii. 109).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations have occasionally been used for works and periodicals frequently quoted:—

AJSL. = American Journal of Semitic Languages.

CIS. = Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.

Ed. Mant. = Biblia Hebraica ex recensione Sal. Norzi edidit Raphael Hayyim Basila,
Mantuae 1742–4.

Jabl. = Biblia Hebraica ex recensione D. E. Jablonski, Berolini, 1699.

JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review.

KAT.³ = Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, 3rd ed. by H. Zimmern and H.
Winckler, 2 vols., Berlin, 1902 f.

Lexicon = A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, based on the
Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius, by F. Brown, S. R. Driver,
and C. A. Britts, Oxford, 1906.

NB. = J. Barth, Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. Lpz. 1889–94.

NGGW. = Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.

OLZ. = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung. Vienna, 1898 ff.

PRE. = Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3rd ed. by A.
Hauck. Lpz. 1896 ff.

PSBA = Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology. London, 1879 ff.

REJ. = Revue des Études Juives. Paris, 1880 ff.

Sam. = The (Hebrew) Pentateuch of the Samaritans.

SBOT. = Sacred Books of the Old Testament, ed. by P. Haupt. Lpz. and Baltimore,
1893 ff.

ThLZ. = Theologische Literaturzeitung, ed. by E. Schürer. Lpz. 1876 ff.

VB. = Vorderasiatische Bibliothek, ed. by A. Jeremias and H. Winckler. Lpz. 1907
ff.

ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete, ed. by C. Bezold. Lpz.
1886 ff.

ZAW. = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen,
1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

ZDMG. = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff.,
since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

ZDPV. = Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins, Lpz. 1878 ff., since 1903 ed.
by C. Steuernagel.

HEBREW GRAMMAR

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. *The Semitic Languages in General.*

B. Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gramm.*, Lpz. 1879, § 2 ff.; E. König, *Hist.-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Spr.*, i. Lpz. 1881, § 3; H. Strack, *Einl. in das A.T.*, 6th ed., Munich, 1906, p. 231 ff. (a good bibliography of all the Semitic dialects); Th. Nöldeke, article ‘Semitic Languages’, in the 9th ed. of the *Encycl. Brit. (Dis semit. Sprachen)*, 2nd ed., Lpz. 1899), and *Beitr. zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb., 1904; W. Wright, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Cambr. 1890; H. Reckendorf, ‘Zur Karakteristik der sem. Sprachen,’ in the *Actes du X^{me} Congrès internat. des Orientalistes* (at Geneva in 1894), iii. 1 ff., Leiden, 1896; O. E. Lindberg, *Vergl. Gramm. der sem. Sprachen*, i A: *Konsonantismus*, Gothenburg, 1897; H. Zimmern, *Vergl. Gramm. der sem. Sprachen*, Berlin, 1898; E. König, *Hebräisch und Semitisch: Prolegomena und Grundlinien einer Gesch. der sem. Sprachen, &c.*, Berlin, 1901; C. Brockelmann, *Semitische Sprachwissenschaft*, Lpz. 1906, *Grundriss der vergl. Gramm. der sem. Sprachen*, vol. i (Laut- und Formenlehre), parts 1–5, Berlin, 1907 f. and his *Kurzgef. vergleichende Gramm. (Porta Ling. Or.)* Berlin, 1908.—The material contained in inscriptions has been in process of collection since 1881 in the Paris *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. To this the best introductions are M. Lidzbarski’s *Handbuch der Nordsem. Epigraphik*, Weimar, 1898, in 2 parts (text and plates), and his *Ephemeris zur sem. Epigraphik* (5 parts published), Giessen, 1900 f. [G. A. Cooke, *Handbook of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1903].

1. The Hebrew language is one branch of a great family of languages in Western Asia which was indigenous in Palestine, Phoenicia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Assyria, and Arabia, that is to say, in the countries extending from the Mediterranean to the other side of the Euphrates and Tigris, and from the mountains of Armenia to the southern coast of Arabia. In early times, however, it spread from Arabia over Abyssinia, and by means of Phoenician colonies over many islands and sea-boards of the Mediterranean, as for instance to the Carthaginian coast. No comprehensive designation is found in early times for the languages and nations of this family; the name *Semites* or *Semitic¹ languages* (based upon the fact that according to Gn 10:21 ff. almost all nations speaking these languages are descended from Shem) is, however, now generally accepted, and has accordingly been retained here.²

¹ First used by Sohlözer in Eichhorn’s *Repertorium für bibl. u. morgenl. Literatur*, 1781, p. 161.

² From Shem are derived (Gn 10:21 ff.) the Aramaean and Arab families as well as the Hebrews, but not the Canaanites (Phoenicians), who are traced back to Ham (vv. 6.15 ff.), although their language belongs decidedly to what is now called Semitic. The language of the Babylonians and Assyrians also was long ago shown to be Semitic, just as Aššur (Gn 10:22) is included among the sons of Shem.

2. The better known Semitic languages may be subdivided¹ as follows:—

I. The South Semitic or Arabic branch. To this belong, besides the classical literary language of the Arabs and the modern vulgar Arabic, the older southern Arabic preserved in the Sabaean inscriptions (less correctly called Himyaritic), and its offshoot, the Ge[□]ez or Ethiopic, in Abyssinia.

II. The Middle Semitic or Canaanitish branch. To this belongs the Hebrew of the Old Testament with its descendants, the New Hebrew, as found especially in the Mishna (see below, § 3 a), and Rabbinic; also Phoenician, with Punic (in Carthage and its colonies), and the various remains of Canaanitish dialects preserved in names of places and persons, and in the inscription of Mêša[□], king of Moab.

III. The North Semitic or Aramaic branch. The subdivisions of this are—(1) The Eastern Aramaic or Syriac, the literary language of the Christian Syrians. The religious books of the Mandaeans (Nasoreans, Sabians, also called the disciples of St. John) represent a very debased offshoot of this. A Jewish modification of Syriac is to be seen in the language of the Babylonian Talmud. (2) The Western or Palestinian Aramaic, incorrectly called also ‘Chaldee’.² This latter dialect is represented in the Old Testament by two words in Gn 31:47, by the verse Jer 10:11, and the sections Dn 2:4 to 7:28; Ezr 4:8 to 6:18, and 7:12–26, as well as by a number of non-Jewish inscriptions and Jewish papyri (see below, under m), but especially by a considerable section of Jewish literature (Targums, Palestinian Gemara, &c.). To the same branch belongs also the Samaritan, with its admixture of Hebrew forms, and, except for the rather Arabic colouring of the proper names, the idiom of the Nabataean inscriptions in the Sinaitic peninsula, in the East of Palestine, &c.

For further particulars about the remains of Western Aramaic (including those in the New Test., in the Palmyrene and Egyptian Aramaic inscriptions) see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, Lpz. 1884, p. 6 ff.

IV. The East Semitic branch, the language of the Assyrio-Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions, the third line of the Achaemenian inscriptions.

On the importance of Assyrian for Hebrew philology especially from a lexicographical point of view cf. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebr.-aram. Wörterbuchs zum A. T.*, Lpz. 1886; P. Haupt, ‘Assyrian Phonology, &c.,’ in *Hebraica*, Chicago, Jan. 1885, vol. i. 3; Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1906.

If the above division into four branches be reduced to two principal groups, No. I, as South Semitic, will be contrasted with the three North Semitic branches.¹

¹ For conjectures as to the gradual divergence of the dialects (first the Babylonian, then Canaanite, including Hebrew, lastly Aramaic and Arabic) from primitive Semitic, see Zimmern, *KAT.*³, ii. p. 644 ff.

² In a wider sense all Jewish Aramaic is sometimes called ‘Chaldee’.

¹ Hommel, *Grundriss der Geogr. und Gesch. des alten Orients*, Munich, 1904, p. 75 ff., prefers to distinguish them as Eastern and Western Semitic branches. Their geographical position, however, is of less importance than the genealogical relation of

All these languages stand to one another in much the same relation as those of the Germanic family (Gothic, Old Norse, Danish, Swedish; High and Low German in their earlier and later dialects), or as the Slavonic languages (Lithuanian, Lettish; Old Slavonic, Serbian, Russian; Polish, Bohemian). They are now either wholly extinct, as the Phoenician and Assyrian, or preserved only in a debased form, as Neo-Syriac among Syrian Christians and Jews in Mesopotamia and Kurdistan, Ethiopic (*Ge'ez*) in the later Abyssinian dialects (*Tigrē*, *Tigriña*, Amharic), and Hebrew among some modern Jews, except in so far as they attempt a purely literary reproduction of the language of the Old Testament. Arabic alone has not only occupied to this day its original abode in Arabia proper, but has also forced its way in all directions into the domain of other languages.

The Semitic family of languages is bounded on the East and North by another of still wider extent, which reaches from India to the western limits of Europe, and is called Indo-Germanic² since it comprises, in the most varied ramifications, the Indian (Sanskrit), Old and New Persian, Greek, Latin, Slavonic, as well as Gothic and the other Germanic languages. With the Old Egyptian language, of which Coptic is a descendant, as well as with the languages of north-western Africa, the Semitic had from the earliest times much in common, especially in grammatical structure; but on the other hand there are fundamental differences between them, especially from a lexicographical point of view; see Erman, ‘Das Verhältnis des Aegyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen,’ in the *ZDMG*. xlvi, 1892, p. 93 ff., and Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 3.

3. The *grammatical structure* of the Semitic family of languages, as compared with that of other languages, especially the Indo-Germanic, exhibits numerous peculiarities which collectively constitute its distinctive character, although many of them are found singly in other languages. These are—(a) among the consonants, which in fact form the substance of these languages, occur peculiar gutturals of different grades; the vowels are subject, within the same consonantal framework, to great changes in order to express various modifications of the same stem-meaning; (b) the word-stems are almost invariably trilateral, i.e. composed of three consonants; (c) the verb is restricted to two tense-forms, with a peculiarly regulated use; (d) the noun has only two genders (masc. and fem.); and peculiar expedients are adopted for the purpose of indicating the case-relations; (e) the oblique cases of the personal pronoun, as well as all the possessive pronouns and the pronominal object of the verb, are denoted by forms appended directly to the governing word (suffixes); (f) the almost complete absence of compounds both in the noun (with the exception of many proper names) and in the verb; (g) great simplicity in the expression of syntactical relations, e.g. the small number of particles, and the prevalence of simple co-ordination of clauses without periodic structure. Classical Arabic and Syriac, however, form a not unimportant exception as regards the last-mentioned point.

4. From a lexicographical point of view also the vocabulary of the Semites differs essentially from that of the Indo-Germanic languages, although there is apparently more agreement here than in the grammar. A considerable number of Semitic roots and stems agree in sound with synonyms in the Indo-Germanic family. But apart from

the various groups of dialects, as rightly pointed out by A. Jeremias in *Th.LZ.* 1906, col. 291.

² First by Klaproth in *Asia Polyglotta*, Paris, 1823; cf. Leo Meyer in *Nachrichten d. Gött. Gesellschaft*, 1901, p. 454.

ZDMG. *ZDMG.* = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

expressions actually borrowed (see below, under i), the real similarity may be reduced to imitative words (*onomatopoetica*), and to those in which one and the same idea is represented by similar sounds in consequence of a formative instinct common to the most varied families of language. Neither of these proves any *historic* or *generic* relation, for which an agreement in grammatical structure would also be necessary.

Comp. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Studien über indogermanisch-semitische Wurzelverwandtschaft*, Lpz. 1873; Nöldechen, *Semit. Glossen zu Fick und Curtius*, Magdeb. 1876 f.; McCurdy, *Aryo-Semitic Speech*, Andover, U.S.A., 1881. The phonetic relations have been thoroughly investigated by H. Möller in *Semitisch und Indogermanisch*, Teil i, *Konsonanten*, Copenhagen and Lpz. 1907, a work which has evoked considerable criticism.

As onomatopoetic words, or as stem-sounds of a similar character, we may compare, e.g. **לְקַחַת** λέχω, *lingo*, Skt. *lih*, Eng. *to lick*, Fr. *lécher*, Germ. *lecken*; **גָּלֵל** (cf. **אֲגָּל**, **גָּלֵשׁ**) κυλίω, *volvo*, Germ. *quellen*, *wallen*, Eng. *to well*; **חָרַט** חָרַת, χαράττω, Pers. *khāridān*, Ital. *grattare*, Fr. *gratter*, Eng. *to grate, to scratch*, Germ. *kratzen*; **בָּרַךְ** *frango*, Germ. *brechen*, &c.; Reuss, *Gesch. der hl. Schriften A.T.'s*, Braunschw. 1881, p. 38, draws attention moreover to the Semitic equivalents for *earth*, *six*, *seven*, *horn*, *to sound*, *to measure*, *to mix*, *to smell*, *to place*, *clear*, *to kneel*, *raven*, *goat*, *ox*, &c. An example of a somewhat different kind is *am*, *ham* (*sam*), *gam*, *kam*, in the sense of the German *samt*, *zusammen*, *together*; in Hebrew **םִמְנָא** (whence **הַמְּנָא** *people*, properly *assembly*), **מַעַן** (*with*) *samt*, **מַזְהָב** *also, moreover*, Arab. **عَمَّا** *to collect*; Pers. *ham*, *hamah* (*at the same time*); Skt. *samā* (*with*), Gk. **ἄμα** (*āmā*), ὁμός, ὁμοῦ (*ōmōs*, *ōmādōs*, and harder *koīvōs*, Lat. *cum*, *cumulus*, *cunctus*; with the corresponding sibilant Skt. *sam*, Gk. *σύν*, *ξύν*, *ξυνόσ=κοινός*, Goth. *sama*, Germ. *samt*, *sammeln*; but many of these instances are doubtful.

Essentially different from this internal connexion is the occurrence of the same words in different languages, where one language has borrowed directly from the other. Such *loan-words* are—

(a) In Hebrew: some names of objects which were originally indigenous in Babylonia and Assyria (see a comprehensive list of Assyrio-Babylonian loan-words in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Old Testament in Zimmern and Winckler, *KAT*³, ii. p. 648 ff.), in Egypt, Persia, or India, e.g. **רַיִם** (also in the plural) *river*, from Egyptian *yoor*, generally as the name of the Nile (late Egypt. *yaro*, Assyr. *yaruu*), although it is possible that a pure Semitic **אַיִם** has been confounded with the Egyptian name of the Nile (so Zimmern); **נְאָשָׂה** (Egyptian) *Nile-reed* (see Lieblein, ‘Mots égyptiens dans la Bible,’ in *PSBA*. 1898, p. 202 f.); **סְרִירָה** (in Zend *pairidaēza*, circumvallation=παράδεισος) *pleasure-garden, park*; **דָּרִיכָה** *daric*, Persian gold coin; **יִמְמָה** *peacocks*, perhaps from the Malabar *tōgai* or *tōghai*. Some of these words are also found in Greek, as **καρβάς** (Pers. *karbās*, Skt. *karpāsa*) *cotton*, **κάρπασος**, *carbasus*. On the other hand it is doubtful if **קֹוֶה** corresponds to the Greek *κῆπος*, *κῆπος*, Skt. *kapi*, *ape*.

(b) In Greek, &c.: some originally Semitic names of Asiatic products and articles of commerce, e.g. **בְּיַסְסָה** *byssus*; **לְבָנָה** λίβανος, λιβανωτός, *incense*; **כָּנָה** κάνη *canna*, *cane*; **קְמַעַת** κύμινον, *cumin*; **חַצְצָה** κασσία, *cassia*; **לְבָבָה** κάμηλος, *camelus*; **בְּזָבָבָה** δρραβών, *arrhabo*, *arrha*, *pledge*. Such transitions have perhaps been brought about chiefly by Phoenician trade. Cf. A. Müller, ‘Semitische Lehnworte im älteren Griechisch,’ in Bezzemberger’s *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indo-germ. Sprachen*, Göttingen, 1877, vol. i. p. 273 ff.; E. Ries. *Quae res et vocabula a gentibus semiticis in Graeciam pervencerint*,

KAT. *KAT*³ = Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, 3rd ed. by H. Zimmern and H. Winckler, 2 vols., Berlin, 1902 f.

PSBA. *PSBA* = Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. London, 1879 ff.

Breslau, 1890; Muss-Aruolt, ‘Semitic words in Greek and Latin,’ in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, xxiii. p. 35 ff.; H. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griech.*, Berlin, 1895; J. H. Bondi, *Dem hebr.-phöniz. Sprachzweige angehör. Lehnwörter in hieroglyph. u. hieratischen Texten*, Lpz. 1886.

5. No system of writing is ever so perfect as to be able (o reproduce the sounds of s language in all their various shades, and the *writing of the Semites* has one striking fundamental defect, viz. that only the consonants (which indeed form the substance of the language) are written as real letters,¹ whilst of the vowels only the longer are indicated by certain representative consonants (see below, § 7). It was only later that special small marks (points or strokes below or above the consonants) were invented to represent to the eye all the vowel-sounds (see § 8). These are, however, superfluous for the practised reader, and are therefore often wholly omitted in Semitic manuscripts and printed texts. Semitic writing, moreover, almost invariably proceeds from right to left.²

With the exception of the Assyrio-Babylonian (cuneiform), all varieties of Semitic writing, although differing widely in some respects, are derived from one and the same original alphabet, represented on extant monuments most faithfully by the characters used on the stele of Mêša□, king of Moab (see below, § 2 d), and in the *old Phoenician inscriptions*, of which the bronze howls from a temple of Baal (*CIS.* i. 22 ff. and Plate IV) are somewhat earlier than Mêša□. The old Hebrew writing, as it appears on the oldest monument, the Siloam inscription (see below, § 2 d), exhibits essentially the same character. The old Greek, and indirectly all European alphabets, are descended from the old Phoenician writing (see § 5 i).

See the Table of Alphabets at the beginning of the Grammar, which shows the relations of the older varieties of Semitic writing to one another and especially the origin of the present Hebrew characters from their primitive forms. For a more complete view, see Gesenius’ *Scripturae linguaeque Phoeniciae monumenta*, Lips. 1837, 4 to, pt. i. p. 15 ff., and pt. iii. tab. 1–5. From numerous monuments since discovered, our knowledge of the Semitic characters, especially the Phoenician, has become considerably enlarged and more accurate. Cf. the all but exhaustive bibliography (from 1615 to 1896) in Lidzbarski’s *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, i. p. 4 ff., and on the origin of the Semitic alphabet, *ibid.*, p. 173 ff., and *Ephemeris* (see the heading of § 1 a above), i. pp. 109 ff., 142, 261 ff., and his ‘Altsemitische Texte’, pt. i, *Kanaanäische Inschriften* (Moabite, Old-Hebrew, Phoenician, Punic), Giessen, 1907.—On the origin and development of the Hebrew characters and the best tables of alphabets, see § 5 a, last note, and especially § 5 e.

¹ ¹ So also originally the Ethiopic writing, which afterwards represented the vowels by small appendages to the consonants, or by some other change in their form. On the Assyrio-Babylonian cuneiform writing, which like-wise indicates the vowels, see the next note, ad fin.

² ² The Sabaean (Himyaritic) writing runs occasionally from left to right, and even alternately in both directions (*boustrophedon*), but as a rule from right to left. In Ethiopic writing the direction from left to right has become the rule; some few old inscriptions exhibit, however, the opposite direction. The cuneiform writing also runs from left to right, but this is undoubtedly borrowed from a non-Semitic people. Cf. § 5 d, note 3.

CIS. *CIS.* = Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.

6. As regards the relative *age* of the Semitic languages, the oldest literary remains of them are to be found in the Assyrio-Babylonian (cuneiform) inscriptions,¹ with which are to be classed the earliest Hebrew fragments occurring in the old Testament (see § 2).

The earliest non-Jewish *Aramaic* inscriptions known to us are that of זכְר king of Hamath (early eighth cent. B.C.), on which see Nöldeke, ZA. 1908, p. 376, and that found at Teima, in N. Arabia, in 1880, probably of the fifth cent. B.C., cf. E. Littmann in the *Monist*, xiv. 4 [and Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 195]. The monuments of Kalammus of Sam'al, in the reign of Shalmanezer II, 859–829 B.C. (cf. A. Šanda, *Die Aramäer*, Lpz. 1902, p. 26), and those found in 1888–1891 at Zenjîrlî in N. Syria, including the Hadad inscription of thirty-four lines (early eighth cent. B.C.) and the Panammu inscription (740 B.C.), are not in pure Aramaic. The Jewish-Aramaic writings begin about the time of Cyrus (cf. Ezra 6:3 ff.), specially important being the papyri from Assuan ed. by Sayce and Cowley, London, 1906 (and in a cheaper form by Staerk, Bonn, 1907), which are precisely dated from 471 to 411 B.C., and three others of 407 B.C. ed. by Sachau, Berlin, 1907.

Monuments of the *Arabic* branch first appear in the earliest centuries A.D. (Sabaean inscriptions, Ethiopic translation of the Bible in the fourth or fifth century, North-Arabic literature from the sixth century A.D.).

It is, however, another question which of these languages has adhered longest and most faithfully to the original character of the Semitic, and which consequently represents to us the earliest phase of its development. For the more or less rapid transformation of the sounds and forms of a language, as spoken by nations and races, is dependent on causes quite distinct from the growth of a literature, and the organic structure of a language is often considerably impaired even before it has developed a literature, especially by early contact with people of a different language. Thus in the Semitic group, the Aramaic dialects exhibit the earliest and greatest decay, next to them the Hebrew-Canaanitish, and in its own way the Assyrian. Arabic, owing to the seclusion of the desert tribes, was the longest to retain the original fullness and purity of the sounds and forms of words.¹ Even here, however, there appeared, through the

1¹ According to Hilprecht, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, i. p. 11 ff., the inscriptions found at Nippur embrace the period from about 4000 to 450 B.C.

ZA. ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete, ed. by C. Bezold. Lpz. 1886 ff.

1¹ Even now the language of some of the Bêdawi[□] is much purer and more archaic than that of the town Arabs. It must, however, be admitted that the former exalted estimate of the primitiveness of Arabic has been moderated in many respects by the most recent school of Semitic philology. Much apparently original is to be regarded with Nöldeke (*Die semit. Spr.*, p. 5 [=Encycl. Brit., ed. 9, art. SEMITIC LANGUAGES, p. 642]) only as a modification of the original. The assertion that the Arabs exhibit Semitic characteristics in their purest form, should, according to Nöldeke, be rather that ‘the inhabitants of the desert lands of Arabia, under the influence of the extraordinarily monotonous scenery and of a life continually the same amid continual change, have developed most exclusively some of the principal traits of the Semitic race’.

revolutionary influence of Islam, an ever-increasing decay, until Arabic at length reached the stage at which we find Hebrew in the Old Testament.

Hence the phenomenon, that in its grammatical structure the ancient Hebrew agrees more with the modern than with the ancient Arabic, and that the latter, although it only appears as a written language at a later period, has yet in many respects preserved a more complete structure and a more original vowel system than the other Semitic languages, cf. Nöldeke, 'Das klassische Arabisch und die arabischen Dialekte,' in *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 1 ff. It thus occupies amongst them a position similar to that which Sanskrit holds among the Indo-Germanic languages, or Gothic in the narrower circle of the Germanic. But even the toughest organism of a language often deteriorates, at least in single forms and derivatives, while on the contrary, in the midst of what is otherwise universal decay, there still remains here and there something original and archaic; and this is the case with the Semitic languages.

Fuller proof of the above statements belongs to the comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages. It follows, however, from what has been said: (1) that the Hebrew language, as found in the sacred literature of the Jews, has, in respect to its organic structure, already suffered more considerable losses than the Arabic, which appears much later on the historical horizon; (2) that, notwithstanding this fact, we cannot at once and in all points concede priority to the latter; (3) that it is a mistake to consider with some that the Aramaic, on account of its simplicity (which is only due to the decay of its organic structure), is the oldest form of Semitic speech.

§ 2. Sketch of the History of the Hebrew Language

See Gesenius, *Gesch. der hebr. Sprache u. Schrift*, Lpz. 1815, §§ 5–18; Th. Nöldeke's art., 'Sprache, hebräische,' in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, Bd. v, Lpz. 1875; F. Buhl, 'Hebräische Sprache,' in Hauck's *Realencycl. für prot. Theol. und Kirche*, vii (1899), p. 506 ff.; A. Cowley, 'Hebrew Language and Literature,' in the forthcoming ed. of the *Encycl. Brit.*; W. R. Smith in the *Encycl. Bibl.*, ii. London, 1901, p. 1984 ff.; A. Lukyn Williams, 'Hebrew,' in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, ii. p. 325 ff., Edinb. 1899.

1. The name *Hebrew Language* usually denotes the language of the sacred writings of the Israelites which form the canon of the *Old Testament*. It is also called *Ancient Hebrew* in contradistinction to the New Hebrew of Jewish writings of the post-biblical period (§ 3 a). The name Hebrew language (לְשׁוֹן עֲבָרִית γλῶσσα τῶν Ἐβραίων, Ἐβραϊστί) does not occur in the Old Testament itself. Instead of it we find in Is 19:18 the term *language of Canaan*,¹ and יהודית in the Jews' language 2 K 18:26, 28 (cf. Is 36:11, 13) Neh 13:24. In the last-cited passage it already agrees with the later (post-exilic) usage, which gradually extended the name *Jews*, *Jewish* to the whole nation, as in Haggai, Nehemiah, and the book of Esther.

The distinction between the names *Hebrew* (עֲבָרִים Εβραῖοι) and *Israelites* (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) is that the latter was rather a national name of honour, with also a religious significance, employed by the people themselves, while the former appears as the less significant name by which the nation was known amongst foreigners. Hence in the Old Testament *Hebrews* are only spoken of either when the name is employed by themselves as contrasted with foreigners (Gn 40:15, Ex 2:6 f. 3:18 &c., Jon 1:9) or when it is put in the mouth of those who are not

¹ That Hebrew in its present form was actually developed in Canaan appears from such facts as the use of *yām* (sea) for the west, *nègeb* (properly *dryness*, afterwards as a proper name for the south of Palestine) for the south.

Israelites ([Gn 39:14, 17](#) [41:12](#) &c.) or, finally, when it is used in opposition to other nations ([Gn 14:13](#) [43:32](#), [Ex 2:11, 13](#) [21:2](#)). In [1 S 13:3](#), [7](#) and [14:21](#) the text is clearly corrupt. In the Greek and Latin authors, as well as in Josephus, the name Ἐβραῖοι, Hebraei,² &c., alone occurs. Of the many explanations of the gentilic עָבֵר, the derivation from עָבֵר *a country on the other side* with the derivative suffix '-' ([§ 86 b](#)) appears to be the only one philologically possible. The name accordingly denoted the Israelites as being those who inhabited the □eber, i.e. the district on the other side of the Jordan (or according to others the Euphrates), and would therefore originally be only appropriate when used by the nations on this side of the Jordan or Euphrates. We must, then, suppose that after the crossing of the river in question it had been retained by the Abrahamidae as an old-established name, and within certain limits (see above) had become naturalized among them. In referring this name to the patronymic Eber, the Hebrew genealogists have assigned to it a much more comprehensive signification. For since in [Gn 10:21](#) ([Nu 24:24](#) does not apply) Shem is called the *father of all the children of Eber*, and to the latter there also belonged according to [Gn 11:14](#) ff. and [10:25](#) ff. Aramean and Arab races, the name, afterwards restricted in the form of the gentilic □bri' exclusively to the Israelites, must have originally included a considerably larger group of countries and nations. The etymological significance of the name must in that case not be insisted upon.¹

The term Ἐβραῖοι is first used, to denote the old Hebrew, in the prologue to Jesus the son of Sirach (about 130 B.C.), and in the New Testament, [Rv 9:11](#). On the other hand it serves in [Jn 5:2, 19:13, 17](#) perhaps also in [19:20](#) and [Rv 16:16](#) to denote what was then the (Aramaic) vernacular of Palestine as opposed to the Greek. The meaning of the expression Ἐβραῖς διάλεκτος in [Acts 21:40, 22:2](#), and [26:14](#) is doubtful (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 19 f.). Josephus also uses the term *Hebrew* both of the old Hebrew and of the Aramaic vernacular of his time.

The Hebrew language is first called the *sacred language* in the Jewish-Aramaic versions of the Old Testament, as being the language of the sacred books in opposition to the *lingua profana*, i.e. the Aramaic vulgar tongue.

2. With the exception of the Old Testament (and apart from the Phoenician inscriptions; see below, f–h), only very few remains of old Hebrew or old Canaanitish literature have been preserved. Of the latter—(1) an inscription, unfortunately much injured, of thirty-four lines, which was found in the ancient territory of the tribe of Reuben, about twelve miles to the east of the Dead Sea, among the ruins of the city of Dibôن (now Dîbân), inhabited in earlier times by the Gadites, afterwards by the Moabites. In it the Moabite king Mêša□ (about 850 B.C.) recounts his battles with Israel (cf. [2 K 3:4](#) ff.), his buildings, and other matters.² Of old Hebrew: (2) an

² ² The Graeco-Roman form of the name is not directly derived from the Hebrew עָבֵר, but from the Palestinian Aramaic □ebrāyā, ‘the Hebrew.’

¹ ¹ We may also leave out of account the linguistically possible identification of the □Ibriyyim with the □abiri who appear in the Tell-el-Amarna letters (about 1400 B.C.) as freebooters and mercenaries in Palestine and its neighbourhood.

² ² This monument, unique of its kind, was first seen in August, 1868, on the spot, by the German missionary F. A. Klein. It was afterwards broken into pieces by the Arabs, so that only an incomplete copy of the inscription could be made. Most of the fragments are now in the Louvre in Paris. For the history of the discovery and for the earlier literature relating to the stone, see Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, i. pp. 103 f., 415 f., and in the bibliography (under Me), p. 39 ff. The useful reproduction and translation of the inscription by Smend and Socin (Freiburg in Baden, 1886) was afterwards revised and improved by Nordlander, *Die Inschrift des*

inscription of six lines (probably of the eighth century B.C.¹) discovered in June, 1880, in the tunnel between the Virgin's Spring and the Pool of Siloam at Jerusalem; (3) about forty engraved seal-stones, some of them pre-exilic but bearing little except proper names²; (4) coins of the Maccabaean prince Simon (from 'the 2nd year of deliverance', 140 and 139 B.C.) and his successors,³ and the coinage of the revolts in the times of Vespasian and Hadrian.

3. In the whole series of the ancient Hebrew writings, as found in the Old Testament and also in non-biblical monuments (see above, d), the language (to judge from its consonantal formation) remains, as regards its general character, and apart from slight changes in form and differences of style (see k to w), at about the same stage of development. In this form, it may at an early time have been fixed as a literary language, and the fact that the books contained in the Old Testament were handed down as *sacred* writings, must have contributed to this constant uniformity.

Königs Mesa von Moab, Lpz. 1896; by Socin and Holzinger, 'Zur Mesainschrift' (*Berichte der K. Sächsischen Gesell. d. Wiss.*, Dec. 1897); and by Lidzbarski, 'Eine Nachprüfung der Mesainschrift' (*Ephemeris*, i. 1, p. 1 ff.; text in his *Altsemitischs Texte*, pt. 1, Giessen, 1907); J. Halévy, *Revue Sémitique*, 1900, pp. 236 ff., 289 ff., 1901, p. 297 ff.; M. J. Lagrange, *Revue biblique internationale*, 1901, p. 522 ff.; F. Prätorius in *ZDMG*. 1905, p. 33 ff., 1906, p. 402. Its genuineness was attacked by A. Löwy, *Die Echtheit der Moabit. Inschr. im Louvre* (Wien, 1903), and G. Jahn in *Das Buch Daniel*, Lpz. 1904, p. 122 ff. (also in *ZDMG*. 1905, p. 723 ff.), but without justification, as shown by E. König in *ZDMG*. 1905, pp. 233 ff. and 743 ff. [Cf. also Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford, 1890, p. lxxxv ff.; Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 1 ff.]

1¹ Of this inscription—unfortunately not dated, but linguistically and palaeographically very important—referring to the boring of the tunnel, a facsimile is given at the beginning of this grammar. See also Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, i. 105, 163, 439 (bibliography, p. 56 ff.; facsimile, vol. ii, plate xxi, 1); on the new drawing of it by Socin (*ZDPV*. xxii. p. 61 ff. and separately published at Freiburg i. B. 1899), see Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 53 ff. and 310 f. (text in *Altsemit. Texte*, p. 9 f.). Against the view of A. Fischer (*ZDMG*. 1902, p. 800 f.) that the six lines are the continuation of an inscription which was never executed, see Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, ii. 71. The inscription was removed in 1890, and broken into six or seven pieces in the process. It has since been well restored, and is now in the Imperial Museum at Constantinople. If, as can hardly be doubted, the name נְשָׁל (i.e. *emissio*) Is 8:6 refers to the discharge of water from the Virgin's Spring, through the tunnel (so Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. 594), then the latter, and consequently the inscription, was already in existence about 736 B.C. [Cf. Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 15 ff.]

2² M. A. Levy, *Siegel u. Gemmen, &c.*, Bresl. 1869, p. 33 ff.; Stade, *ZAW*. 1897, p. 501 ff. (four old-Semitic seals published in 1896); Lidzbarski, *Handbuch*, i. 169 f.; *Ephemeris*, i. 10 ff.; W. Nowack, *Lehrb. d. hebr. Archäol.* (Freib. 1894), i. 262 f.; I. Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäol.*² (Tübingen, 1907), pp. 80, 225 ff., which includes the beautiful seal inscribed לְשָׁמֵעַ עֲבֹד יְרֻבָּם from the castle-hill of Megiddo, found in 1904; [Cooke, p. 362].

3³ De Saulcy, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte*, Par. 1874; M. A. Levy, *Gesch. der jüd. Münzen*, Breslau, 1862; Madden, *The Coins of the Jews*, Lond. 1881; Reinach, *Les monnaies juives*, Paris, 1888.—Cf. the literature in Schörer's *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter J. C.*³, Lpz. 1901, i. p. 20 ff.; [Cooke, p. 352 ff.].

To this old Hebrew, the language of the Canaanitish or Phoenician⁴ stocks came the nearest of all the Semitic languages, as is evident partly from the many Canaanitish names of persons and places with a Hebrew form and meaning which occur in the Old Testament (e.g. קְרִיָת סָפֶר, מַלְכֵי־אַמָרָה, &c.; on ‘Canaanite glosses’¹ to Assyrian words in the cuneiform tablets of Tell-el-Amarna [about 1400 B.C.] cf. H. Winckler, ‘Die Thontafeln von Tellel-Amarna,’ in *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, vol. v, Berlin, 1896 f. [transcription and translation]; J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, Lpz. 1907 f.; H. Zimmern, *ZA*. 1891, p. 154 ff. and *KAT*³, p. 651 ff.), and partly from the numerous remains of the Phoenician and Punic languages.

The latter we find in their peculiar writing (*§ 1 k, l*) in a great number of inscriptions and on coins, copies of which have been collected by Gesenius, Judas, Bourgade, Davis, de Vogué, Levy, P. Schröder, v. Maltzan, Euting, but especially in Part I of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 ff. Among the inscriptions but few public documents are found, e.g. two lists of fees for sacrifices; by far the most are epitaphs or votive tablets. Of special importance is the inscription on the sarcophagus of King Eshmünazar of Sidon, found in 1855, now in the Louvre; see the bibliography in Lidzbarski, *Nordsem. Epigr.*, i. 23 ff.; on the inscription, i. 97 ff., 141 f., 417, ii. plate iv, 2; [Cooke, p. 30 ff.]. To these may be added isolated words in Greek and Latin authors, and the Punic texts in Plautus, *Poenulus* 5, 1–3 (best treated by Gildemeister in Ritschl’s edition of Plautus, Lips. 1884, tom. ii, fasc. 5). From the monuments we learn the native orthography, from the Greek and Latin transcriptions the pronunciation and vocalization; the two together give a tolerably distinct idea of the language and its relation to Hebrew.

Phoenician (Punic) words occurring in inscriptions are, e.g. בֵן son, אֲדֹם man, אֱלֹהִים God, מֶלֶךְ king, זְבּוּחַ sacrifice, בָּעֵל priest, שָׁמֶן sun, אָרֶץ land, יָם sea, מֶלֶךְ king, עַבְדָּה servant, בָּהָן sacrifice, בָּעֵל lord, שָׁמֶן sun, מֶלֶךְ king, אָבָן stone, כְּסֵף silver, מְצֻבָּה monument, מָקָם place, מְשֻׁכָּב bed, בָּרוּל iron, שָׁמֶן oil, עַת time, קְבָר grave, אָבָן stone, כָּל all, אֶחָד one, אֶתְוֹן two, שְׁלֹשֶׁה three, חַמְשָׁה four, שְׁשָׁה five, שְׁבַע six, שְׁזַבְעָה seven, שְׁעַר ten, שְׁעַר עַשְׂרֵה, אֶחָד עַשְׂרֵה, שְׁנַיִם two, שְׁלֹשֶׁה three, שְׁשָׁה four, שְׁבַע five, שְׁזַבְעָה six, שְׁזַבְעָה seven, שְׁעַר עַשְׂרֵה (=Hebr. היה) to be, שְׁמַע to hear, פָתָח to open, נָדַר to vow, בָרָךְ to bless, בָקַשׁ to seek, &c. Proper names: צִדְקָה Sidon, צַר Tyre, חָנוֹן Hanno, חַנְבָּעֵל Hannibal, &c. See the complete vocabulary in Lidzbarski, *Nordsem. Epigr.*, i. 204 ff.

Variations from Hebrew in Phoenician orthography and inflection are, e.g. the almost invariable omission of the vowel letters (*§ 7 b*), as בֵת for בֵּית house, קָל for קָוֵל voice, צִדְקָה for צִידְקָה priests, אֲלֹנָם for אֲלֹנִים gods; the fem., even in the absolute state, ending in תָ (ath) (*§ 80 b*) as well as וָ (ô), the relative שָׁאָתָה (Hebr. אִתָּה) yth; the וָ as o, e.g. מְעַקָּר (cf. מְעַקָּר LXX, Gn 22:24 מְוַקָּה). See the collection of the grammatical peculiarities in Gesenius, *Monuments Phoenicia*, p. 430 ff.; Paul Schröder, *Die phöniz. Sprache*, Halle, 1869; B. Stade, ‘Erneute Prüfung des zwischen dem Phönic. und Hebr. bestehenden Verwandtschaftsgrades,’ in the *Morgenländ. Forschungen*, Lpz. 1875, p. 169 ff.

⁴ Cf. inter alia : *aparu*, also □*aparu* (Assyr. *epru*, *ipru*)=עַפְרָה; □*ullu*=לְעַ (with hard עַ; cf. § 6 c, and Assyr. □*umri*=עַמְרִי, □*azzatu*=עַזְזָה); *iazkur*=רְאֵזְקָרָה, *zuru*□*u*=רוּעָה, *abadat*=אֲבָדָתָה, *ša*□*ri*=שְׁעָרָה, gate; *ba*□*nu*=בְּטַנְעָה, belly; *kilubi*=קְלֹובָה, net; □*aduk*=עַדְקָה (צִדְקָה), &c. [Cf. Böhl, *Die Sprache d. Amarnabriefe*, Lpz. 1909.]

4. As the Hebrew writing on monuments and coins mentioned in *d* consists only of consonants, so also the writers of the Old Testament books used merely the consonant-signs (§ 1 k), and even now the written scrolls of the Law used in the synagogues must not, according to ancient custom, contain anything more. The present pronunciation of this consonantal text, its vocalization and accentuation, rest on the tradition of the Jewish schools, as it was finally fixed by the system of punctuation (§ 7 h) introduced by Jewish scholars about the seventh century A.D.; cf. § 3 b.

An earlier stage in the development of the Canaanitish-Hebrew language, i.e. a form of it anterior to the written documents now extant, when it must have stood nearer to the common language of the united Semitic family, can still be discerned in its principal features:—(1) from many archaisms preserved in the traditional texts, especially in the names of persons and places dating from earlier times, as well as in isolated forms chiefly occurring in poetic style; (2) in general by an *a posteriori* conclusion from traditional forms, so far as according to the laws and analogies of phonetic change they clearly point to an older phase of the language; and (3) by comparison with the kindred languages, especially Arabic, in which this earlier stage of the language has been frequently preserved even down to later times (§ 1 m, n). In numerous instances in examining linguistic phenomena, the same—and consequently so much the more certain—result is attained by each of these three methods.

Although the systematic investigation of the linguistic development indicated above belongs to comparative Semitic philology, it is nevertheless indispensable for the scientific treatment of Hebrew to refer to the groundforms¹ so far as they can be ascertained and to compare the corresponding forms in Arabic. Even elementary grammar which treats of the forms of the language occurring in the Old Testament frequently requires, for their explanation, a reference to theseground-forms.

5. Even in the language of the Old Testament, notwithstanding its general uniformity, there is noticeable a certain progress from an earlier to a later stage. Two periods, though with some reservations, may be distinguished: the *first*, down to the end of the Babylonian exile; and the *second*, after the exile.

To the former belongs, apart from isolated traces of a later revision, the larger half of the Old Testament books, viz. (*a*) of the prose and historical writings, a large part of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; (*b*) of the poetical, perhaps a part of the Psalms and Proverbs; (*c*) the writings of the earlier prophets (apart from various later additions) in the following chronological order: Amos, Hosea, Isaiah I, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah (?), Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah II (ch. 40–55).

The beginning of this period, and consequently of Hebrew literature generally, is undoubtedly to be placed as early as the time of Moses, although the Pentateuch in its present form, in which very different strata may be still clearly recognized, is to be regarded as a gradual production of the centuries after Moses. Certain linguistic peculiarities of the Pentateuch, which it was once customary to regard as archaisms, such as the epicene use of

¹ Whether these can be described simply as ‘primitive Semitic’ is a question which may be left undecided here.

גֶּעָר boy, youth, for גֶּתֶת girl, and אַנְהָא for אִיָּה, are merely to be attributed to a later redactor; cf. § 17 c.

The linguistic character of the various strata of the Pentateuch has been examined by Ryssel, *De Elohistae Pentateuchici sermone*, Lpz. 1878; König, *De criticae sacrae argumento e linguae legibus repetito*, Lpz. 1879 (analysis of Gn 1–11); F. Giesebricht, ‘Der Sprachgebr. des hexateuchischen Elohisten,’ in *ZAW*. 1881, p. 177 ff., partly modified by Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xi. p. 201 ff.; Kräutlein, *Die sprachl. Verschiedenheiten in den Hexateuchquellen*, Lpz. 1908.—Abundant matter is afforded also by Holzinger, *Einleitung in den Hexateuct*, Freib. 1893; Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*⁸, Edinburgh, 1908; Strack, *Einleitung ins A. T.*⁶, Munich, 1906; König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, Bonn, 1893.

6. Even in the writings of this first period, which embraces about 600 years, we meet, as might be expected, with considerable differences in linguistic form and style, which are due partly to differences in the time and place of composition, and partly to the individuality and talent of the authors. Thus Isaiah, for example, writes quite differently from the later Jeremiah, but also differently from his contemporary Micah. Amongst the historical books of this period, the texts borrowed from earlier sources have a linguistic colouring perceptibly different from those derived from later sources, or passages which belong to the latest redactor himself. Yet the structure of the language, and, apart from isolated cases, even the vocabulary and phraseology, are on the whole the same, especially in the prose books.

But the *poetic language* is in many ways distinguished from prose, not only by a *rhythm* due to more strictly balanced (parallel) members and definite metres (see r), but also by peculiar *words* and *meanings*, *inflexions* and *syntactical constructions* which it uses in addition to those usual in prose. This distinction, however, does not go far as, for example, in Greek. Many of these poetic peculiarities occur in the kindred languages, especially in Aramaic, as the ordinary modes of expression, and probably are to be regarded largely as archaisms which poetry retained. Some perhaps, also, are embellishments which the Hebrew poets who knew Aramaic adopted into their language.¹

The prophets, at least the earlier, in language and rhythm are to be regarded almost entirely as poets, except that with them the sentences are often more extended, and the parallelism is less regular and balanced than is the case with the poets properly so called. The language of the later prophets, on the contrary, approaches nearer to prose.

On the *rhythm* of Hebrew poetry, see besides the Commentaries on the poetical books and Introductions to the O. T., J. Ley, *Grundzüge des Rhythmus, &c.*, Halle, 1875; *Leitfaden der Metrik der hebr. Poesie*, Halle, 1887; ‘Die metr. Beschaffenheit des B. Hiob,’ in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1895, iv, 1897, i; Grimme, ‘Abriss der bibl.-hebr. Metrik,’ *ZDMG*. 1896, p. 529 ff., 1897, p. 683 ff.; *Psalmenprobleme, &c.*, Freiburg (Switzerland), 1902 (on which see Beer in

ZAW. *ZAW*, = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

¹ That already in Isaiah’s time (second half of the eighth century B.C.) educated Hebrews, or at least officers of state, understood Aramaic, while the common people in Jerusalem did not, is evident from 2 K 18:26 (Is 36:11).

ThLZ. 1903, no. 11); ‘Gedanken über hebr. Metrik,’ in Altsehüler’s *Vierteljahrschrift*, i (1903), 1 ff.; Döller, *Rhythmus, Metrik u. Strophik in d. bibl.-hebr. Poesie*, Paderborn, 1899; Schloegl, *De re metrics veterum Hebraeorum disputatio*, Vindobonae, 1899 (on the same lines as Grimme); but especially Ed. Sievers, *Metrische Studien : i Studien zur hebr. Metrik*, pt. 1 *Untersuchungen*, pt. 2 *Textproben*, Lpz. 1901: ii *Die hebr. Genesis*, 1 *Texte*, 2 *Zur Quellenscheidung u. Textkritik*, Lpz. 1904 f.: iii *Samuel*, Lpz. 1907; *Amos metrisch bearbeitet* (with H. Guthe), Lpz. 1907; and his *Alttest. Miszellen* (1 *Is 24–27*, 2 Jena, 3 Deutero-Zecbariah, 4 Malachi, 5 Hoses, 6 Joel, 7 Obadiah, 8 Zephaniah, 9 Haggai, 10 Micah), Lpz. 1904–7.—As a guide to Sievers’ system (with some criticism of his principles) see Baumann, ‘Die Metrik u. das A.T.,’ in the *Theol. Rundschau*, viii (1905), 41 ff.; W. H. Cobb, *A criticism of systems of Hebrew Metre*, Oxford, 1905; Cornill, *Einleitung ins A.T.⁵*, Tübingen, 1905, p. 11 ff.; Rothstein, *Zeitschr. für d. ev. Rel.-Unterricht*, 1907, p. 188 ff. and his *Grundzige des hebr. Rhythmus*, Lpz. 1909 (also separately *Psalmtexte u. der Text des Hohen Liedes*, Lpz. 1909); W. R. Arnold, ‘The rhythms of the ancient Heb.,’ in *O.T. and Semitic Studies in memory of W. R. Harper*, i. 165 ff., Chicago, 1907, according to whom the number of syllables between the beats is only limited by the physiological possibilities of phonetics; C.v. Orelli, ‘Zur Metrik der alttest. Prophetenschriften,’ in his *Kommentar zu den kl. Propheten³*, p. 236 ff., Munich, 1908.—In full agreement with Sievers is Baethgen, *Psalmen³*, p. xxvi ff., Göttingen, 1904. [Cf. Budde in *DB.* iv. 3 ff.; Duhm in *EB.* iii. 3793 ff.]

Of all views of this matter, the only one generally accepted as sound was at first Ley’s and Budde’s discovery of the Qina- or Lamentation-Verse (*ZAW.* 1882, 5 ff.; 1891, 234 ff.; 1892, 31 ff.). On their predecessors, Lowth, de Wette, Ewald, see Löhr, *Klagelied²*, p. 9. This verse, called by Duhm ‘long verse’, by Sievers simply ‘five-syllabled’ (Fünfer), consists of two members, the second at least one beat shorter than the other. That a regular repetition of an equal number of syllables in *arsis* and *thesis* was observed by other poets, had been established by Ley, Duhm, Gunkel, Grimme, and others, especially Zimmern, who cites a Babylonian hymn in which the members are actually marked (*ZA.* x. 1 ff., xii. 382 ff.; cf. also Delitzsch, *Das babyl. Weltschöpfungsepos*, Lpz. 1896, pp. 60 ff.). Recently, however, E. Sievers, the recognized authority on metre in other branches of literature, has indicated, in the works mentioned above, a number of fresh facts and views, which have frequently been confirmed by the conclusions of Ley and others. The most important are as follows:—

Hebrew poetry, as distinguished from the quantitative Classical and Arabic and the syllabic Syriac verse, is *accentual*. The number of unstressed syllables between the beats (*ictus*) is, however, not arbitrary, but the scheme of the verse is based on an irregular anapaest which may undergo rhythmical modifications (e.g. resolving the ictus into two syllables, or lengthening the arsis so as to give a double accent) and contraction, e.g. of the first two syllables. The foot always concludes with the ictus, so that toneless endings, due to change of pronunciation or corruption of the text, are to be disregarded, although as a rule the ictus coincides with the Hebrew word-accent. The metrical scheme consists of combinations of feet in *series* (of 2, 3 or 4), and of these again in *periods*—double threes, very frequently, double fours in narrative, fives in Lamentations (see above) and very often elsewhere, and sevens. Sievers regards the last two metres as catalectic double threes and fours. Connected sections do not always maintain the same metre throughout, but often exhibit a mixture of metres.

It can no longer be doubted that in the analysis of purely poetical passages, this system often finds ready confirmation and leads to textual and literary results, such as the elimination of glosses. There are, however, various difficulties in carrying out the scheme consistently and extending it to the prophetical writings and still more to narrative: (1) not infrequently the required number of feet is only obtained by sacrificing the clearly marked parallelism, or the grammatical connexion (e.g. of the construct state with its genitive), and sometimes even by

means of doubtful emendations; (2) the whole system assumes a correct transmission of the text and its pronunciation, for neither of which is there the least guarantee. To sum up, our conclusion at present is that for poetry proper some assured and final results have been already obtained, and others may be expected, from the principles laid down by Sievers, although, considering the way in which the text has been transmitted, a *faultless* arrangement of metres cannot be expected. Convincing proof of the *consistent* use of the same metrical schemes in the prophets, and a *fortiori* in narrative, can hardly be brought forward.

The great work of D. H. Müller, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprüngl. Form* (2 vols., Vienna, 1896; cf. his *Strophenbau u. Respension*, ibid. 1898, and *Komposition u. Strophenbau*, ibid. 1907), is a study of the most important monuments of early Semitic poetry from the point of view of strophic structure and the use of the refrain, i.e. the repetition of the same or similar phrases or words in corresponding positions in different strophes.

The arrangement of certain poetical passages in verse-form required by early scribal rules (Ex 15:1–19; Dt 32:1–43; Ju 5; 1 S 2:1–10; 2 S 22, 23:1–7; Ps 18, 136; Pr. 31:10–31; 1 Ch 16:8–36; cf. also Jo 12:9–24; Ec 3:2–8; Est 9:7–10) has nothing to do with the question of metre in the above sense.

Words are used in poetry, for which others are customary in prose, e.g. אָנֹשׁ *man* = מְלֵאָה; אֶרֶץ *path* = קֶדֶם; מַלְאָה *word* = צִוָּה; צִוָּה *to see* = רָאָה; אֶתְּהָ *to come* = בָּוֹא.

To the poetic *meanings of words* belongs the use of certain poetic *epithets* as substantives; thus, for example, אֲבִיר (only in constr. st. אֲבִיר) *the strong one* for God; אֲבִיר *the strong one* for bull, horse; לְבָנָה *alba* for luna; אוֹרָב *enemy* for אָזְבָּן.

Of word-forms, we may note, e.g. the longer forms of prepositions of place (§ 103 n) עַלְיִי (§ 103 n) = עַלְיָה = עַלְיָה; the endings יְ, וְ in the noun (§ 90); the pronominal suffixes מוּ, מוּ, מוּ, מוּ, מוּ, מוּ, מוּ, מוּ (§ 58); the plural ending יְ for יְ (§ 87 e). To the *syntax* belongs the far more sparing use of the article, of the relative pronoun, of the accusative particle הָ; the construct state even before prepositions; the shortened imperfect with the same meaning as the ordinary form (§ 109 i); the wider governing power of prepositions; and in general a forcible brevity of expression.

7. The *second* period of the Hebrew language and literature, after the return from the exile until the Maccabees (about 160 B.C.), is chiefly distinguished by a constantly closer approximation of the language to the kindred western Aramaic dialect. This is due to the influence of the Aramaeans, who lived in close contact with the recent and thinly-populated colony in Jerusalem, and whose dialect was already of importance as being the official language of the western half of the Persian empire. Nevertheless the supplanting of Hebrew by Aramaic proceeded only very gradually. Writings intended for popular use, such as the Hebrew original of Jesus the son of Sirach and the book of Daniel, not only show that Hebrew about 170 B.C. was still in use as a literary language, but also that it was still at least understood by the people.¹ When it had finally ceased to exist as a living language, it was still preserved as the *language of*

¹ The extensive use of Hebrew in the popular religious literature which is partly preserved to us in the Midrašim, the Mišna, and the Liturgy, indicates, moreover, that Hebrew was widely understood much later than this. Cf. M. H. Segal, ‘Mišnaic Hebrew and its relations to Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic,’ in *JQR.*, 1908, p. 647 ff. (also separately).

the Schools—not to mention the numerous Hebraisms introduced into the Aramaic spoken by the Jews.

For particulars, see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, pp. 1–6. We may conveniently regard the relation of the languages which co-existed in this later period as similar to that of the High and Low German in North Germany, or to that of the High German and the common dialects in the south and in Switzerland. Even amongst the more educated, the common dialect prevails orally, whilst the High German serves essentially as the literary and cultured language, and is at least understood by all classes of the people. Wholly untenable is the notion, based on an erroneous interpretation of Neh 8:8, that the Jews immediately after the exile had completely forgotten the Hebrew language, and therefore needed a translation of the Holy Scriptures.

The Old Testament writings belonging to this second period, in all of which the Aramaic colouring appears in various degrees, are: certain parts of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, Ruth, the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther; the prophetical books of Haggai, Zechariah, Isaiah III (56–66), Malachi, Joel, Jonah, Daniel; of the poetical books, a large part of Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and most of the Psalms. As literary compositions, these books are sometimes far inferior to those of the first period, although work was still produced which in purity of language and aesthetic value falls little short of the writings of the golden age.

Later words (Aramaisms) are, e.g. אָחִוֹת declaration, אָנֵס compel, בֶּן son, גַּיר chalk, עַתָּה time, קָרַע raise up, סְזָה Pi. reproach, טָלַט Pi. roof over, שָׁמַךְ stray, רַכְבָּה rock, מְלַךְ advise, סָמֵךְ end, קָפֵל = חַקְלָה take, קָרַע break, אָגָשׁ be many, שָׁלַט rule, קָרַע be strong.— Later meanings are, e.g. אָמַר (to say) to command; עֲבָדָה (to answer) to being speaking.— Orthographical and grammatical peculiarities are, the frequent *scriptio plena* of ה and ו, e.g. קְרִיאָה¹ (elsewhere קְרִיאָה), even קְוֹדֶשׁ for קָדֵשׁ; the interchange of ה and ו final; the more frequent use of substantives in ה, ו, וְת, וְת, &c. Cf. Dav. Strauss, *Sprachl. Studien zu d. hebr. Sirachfragmenten*, Zürich, 1900, p. 19 ff.; for the Psalms Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 461 ff., and especially Giesebrécht in *ZAW*, 1881, p. 276 ff.; in general, Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im A. T.* (i, Lexikal. Teil), Halle, 1902.

But all the peculiarities of these later writers are not Aramaisms. Several do not occur in Aramaic and must have belonged at an earlier period to the Hebrew vernacular, especially it would seem in northern Palestine. There certain parts of Judges, amongst others, may have originated, as is indicated, e.g. by ו, a common form in Phoenician (as well as שׂ), for שְׁרָאֵל (§ 36), which afterwards recurs in Jonah, Lamentations, the Song of Songs, the later Psalms, and Ecclesiastes.

Rem. 1. Of dialectical varieties in the old Hebrew language, only one express mention occurs in the O. T. (*Ju 12:6*), according to which the Ephraimites in certain cases pronounced the ו as ס. (Cf. Marquart in *ZAW*, 1888, p. 151 ff.) Whether in Neh 13:24 by the *speech of Ashdod* a Hebrew, or a (wholly different) Philistine dialect is intended, cannot be determined. On the other hand, many peculiarities in the North Palestinian books (Judges and Hoses) are probably to be regarded as differences in dialect, and so also some anomalies in the Moabite inscription of Mêša□ (see above, d). On later developments see L. Metman, *Die hebr. Sprache, ihre Geschichte u. lexikal. Entwicklung seit Abschluss des Kanons u. ihr Bau in d. Gegenwart*, Jerusalem, 1906.

¹ קְרִיאָה in the Minor Prophets throughout (He 3:5, &c.) is due merely to a caprice of the Masoretes.

2. It is evident that, in the extant remains of old Hebrew literature,² the entire store of the ancient language is not preserved. The canonical books of the Old Testament formed certainly only a fraction of the whole Hebrew national literature.

§ 3. Grammatical Treatment of the Hebrew Language

Gesenius, *Gesch. der hebr. Sprache*, §§ 19–39; Oehler's article, 'Hebr. Sprache,' in Schmid's *Encycl. des ges. Erziehungs- u. Unterrichtswesens*, vol. iii. p. 346 ff. (in the 2nd ed. revised by Nestle, p. 314 ff.). Cf. also the literature cited above in the headings of §§ 1 and 2; also Böttcher, *Lehrb. der hebr. Spr.*, i. Lpz. 1866, p. 30 ff.; L. Geiger, *Das Studium der Hebr. Spr. in Deutschl. vom Ende des XV. bis zur Mitte des XVI. Jahrh.*, Breslau, 1870; B. Pick, 'The Study of the Hebrew Language among Jews and Christians,' in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1884, p. 450 ff., and 1885, p. 470 ff.; W. Bacher, article 'Grammar' in the *Jew. Encyclopaedia*, vol. vi, New York and London, 1904. Cf. also the note on *d*.

1. At the time when the old Hebrew language was gradually becoming extinct, and the formation of the O. T. canon was approaching completion, the Jews began to explain and critically revise their sacred text, and sometimes to translate it into the vernacular languages which in various countries had become current among them. The oldest *translation* is the Greek of the *Seventy* (more correctly *Seventy-two*) Interpreters (LXX), which was begun with the Pentateuch at Alexandria under Ptolemy Philadelphus, but only completed later. It was the work of various authors, some of whom had a living knowledge of the original, and was intended for the use of Greek-speaking Jews, especially in Alexandria. Somewhat later the Aramaic translations, or Targums (תַּרְגُוםִים i.e. *interpretations*), were formed by successive recensions made in Palestine and Babylonia. The *explanations*, derived in part from alleged tradition, refer almost exclusively to civil and ritual law and dogmatic theology, and are no more scientific in character than much of the textual tradition of that period. Both kinds of tradition are preserved in the *Talmud*, the first part of which, the *Mišna*, was finally brought to its present form towards the end of the second century; of the remainder, the *Gemāra*, one recension (the *Jerusalem* or *Palestinian Gem.*) about the middle of the fourth century, the other (the *Babylonian Gem.*) about the middle of the sixth century A.D. The *Mišna* forms the beginning of the New-Hebrew literature; the language of the *Gemaras* is for the most part Aramaic.

2. To the interval between the completion of the Talmud and the earliest grammatical writers, belong mainly the vocalization and accentuation of the hitherto unpointed text of the O.T., according to the pronunciation traditional in the Synagogues and Schools (§ 7 h, i), as well as the greater part of the collection of critical notes which bears the name of *Masōra* (מסורת, *traditio*?).¹ From this the text

2² According to the calculation of the Dutch scholar Leusden, the O.T. contains 5,642 different Hebrew and Aramaic words; according to rabbinical calculations, 79,856 altogether in the Pentateuch. Cf. also E. Nestle, *ZAW*. 1906, p. 283; H. Strack, *ZAW*. 1907, p. 69 ff.; Blau, 'Neue masoret. Studien,' in *JQR*. xvi. 357 ff., treats of the number of letters and words, and the ve sedivision in the O.T.

1¹ On the name *Masora* (or *Massora*, as e.g. E. König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 38 ff.; *Lehrgeb. d. hebr. Sprache*, ii. 358 ff.), and the great difficulty of satisfactorily explaining it, cf. De Lagarde, *Mitteilungen*, i. 91 ff. W. Bacher's derivation of the expression (in *JQR*. 1891, p. 785 ff.; so also C. Levias in the *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Cincinnati, 1904, p. 147 ff.) from Ez 20:37 (ברית הבָּרִית, מִסְרָה, i. e. מִזְרָה).

which has since been transmitted with rigid uniformity by the MSS., and is still the received text of the O.T., has obtained the name of the Masoretic Text.

E. F. K. Rosenmüller already (*Handbuch für d. Liter. der bibl. Kritik u. Exegese*, 1797, i. 247; *Vorrede zur Stereotyp-Ausg. des A. T.*, Lpz. 1834) maintained that our O. T. text was derived from Codices belonging to a single recension. J. G. Sommer (cf. Cornill, *ZAW*. 1892, p. 309), Olshausen (since 1853), and especially De Lagarde (*Proverbien*, 1863, p. 1 ff.), have even made it probable that the original Masoretic text was derived from a single standard manuscript. Cf., however, E. König in *Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss.*, 1887, p. 279 f., and especially his *Einleitung ins A. T.*, p. 88 ff. Moreover a great many facts, which will be noticed in their proper places, indicate that the Masora itself is by no means uniform but shows clear traces of different schools and opinions; cf. H. Strack in *Semitic Studies in memory of ... Kohut*, Berlin, 1897, p. 563 ff. An excellent foundation for the history of the Masora and the settlement of the masoretic tradition was laid by Joh. Buxtorf in his *Tiberias seu Commentarius Masorethicus*, first published at Basel in 1620 as an appendix to the Rabbinical Bible of 1618 f. For more recent work see Geiger, *Jüdische Ztschr.*, iii. 78 ff., followed by Harris in *JQR*. i. 128 ff., 243 ff.; S. Frensdorff. *Ochla W'ochla*, Hanover, 1864; and his *Massor. Wörterb.*, part i, Hanover and Lpz. 1876; and Ch. D. Ginsburg, *The Massora compiled from Manuscripts, &c.*, 3 vols., Lond. 1880 ff., and *Introduction to the Massoretico-critical edition of the Hebr. Bible*, Lond. 1897 (his text, reprinted from that of Jacob b. Ḥayyim [Venice, 1524–5] with variants from MSS. and the earliest editions, was published in 2 vols. at London in 1894, 2nd ed. 1906; a revised edition is in progress); H. Hyvernat, ‘La langue et le langage de la Massore’ (as a mixture of New-Hebrew and Aramaic), in the *Revue biblique*, Oct. 1903, p. 529 ff. and B: ‘Lexique massorétique,’ *ibid.*, Oct. 1904, p. 521 ff., 1905, p. 481 ff., and p. 515 ff. In the use of the Massora for the critical construction of the Text, useful work has been done especially by S. Baer, in the editions of the several books (only Exod.-Deut. have still to appear), edited from 1869 conjointly with Fr. Delitzsch, and since 1891 by Baer alone. Cf. also § 7 h.

The various readings of the Q^orê (see § 17) form one of the oldest and most important parts of the Masora. The punctuation of the Text, however, is not to be confounded with the compilation of the Masora. The former was settled at an earlier period, and is the result of a much more exhaustive labour than the Masora, which was not completed till a considerably later time.

3. It was not until about the beginning of the tenth century that the Jews, following the example of the Arabs, began their grammatical compilations. Of the numerous grammatical and lexicographical works of R. Saadaya,¹ beyond fragments in the commentary on the Sepher Yešira (ed. Mayer-Lambert, pp. 42, 47, 75, &c.), only the explanation in Arabic of the seventy (more correctly ninety) *hapax legomena* in the O. T. has been preserved. Written likewise in Arabic, but frequently translated into

being an equally legitimate form) is rightly rejected by König, l. c. The Correctness of the form **הַרְאֵת** (by the side of the equally well-attested form **הַרְאָת**) does not seem to us to be invalidated by his arguments, nor by Blau's proposal to read **סִזְרָתָה** (*JQR*. xii. 241). The remark of Levias (l.c.) deserves notice, that with the earlier Masoretes **מִסּוֹרָה** is equivalent to orthography, i.e. *plene-* and *defective* writing, and only later came to mean *traditio*.—G. Wildboer, in *ZAW*. 1909, p. 74, contends that as **מִסּרָה** to *hand on* is not found in the O.T., it must be a late denominative in this sense.

JQR. *JQR.* = Jewish Quarterly Review.

¹ On his independent attitude towards the Masoretic punctuation, see Delitzsch, *Comm. zu den Psalmen*⁴, p. 39.

Hebrew, were the still extant works of the grammarians R. Yehuda Hayyûg (also called Abu Zakarya Yaḥya, about the year 1000) and R. Yona (Ahu l-Walîd Merwân ibn Ḥanâḥ, about 1030). By the aid of these earlier labours, Abraham ben Ezra (commonly called Aben Ezra, ob. 1167) and R. David Qimhi (ob. c. 1235) especially gained a classical reputation by their Hebrew grammatical writings.

From these earliest grammarians are derived many principles of arrangement and technical terms, some of which are still retained, e.g. the naming of the conjugations and weak verbs according to the paradigm of פְּעֻלָּה, certain *voces memoriales*, as בְּגַדְכִּפְתָּה and the like.¹

4. The father of Hebrew philology among Christians was John Reuchlin (ob. 1522),² to whom Greek literature also is so much indebted. Like the grammarians who succeeded him, till the time of John Buxtorf the elder (ob. 1629), he still adhered almost entirely to Jewish tradition. From the middle of the seventeenth century the field of investigation gradually widened, and the study of the kindred languages, chiefly through the leaders of the Dutch school, Albert Schultens (ob. 1750) and N. W. Schroöder (ob. 1798), became offruitful service to Hebrew grammar.

5. In the nineteenth century³ the advances in Hebrew philology are especially connected with the names of W. Gesenius (born at Nordhausen, Feb. 3, 1786; from the year 1810 Professor at Halle, where he died Oct. 23, 1842), who above all things aimed at the comprehensive observation and lucid presentation of the actually occurring linguistic phenomena; H. Ewald (ob. 1875, at Göttingen; *Krit. Gramm. der Hebr. Spr.*, Lpz. 1827; *Ausführl. Lehrb. d. hebr. Spr.*, 8th ed., Gött. 1870), who chiefly aimed at referring linguistic forms to general laws and rationally explaining the latter; J. Olshausen (ob. 1882, at Berlin; *Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache*, Brunswick, 1861) who attempted a consistent explanation of the existing condition of the language, from the presupposed primitive Semitic forms, preserved according to him notably in old Arabic. F. Böttcher (*Ausführl. Lehrb. d. hebr. Spr.* ed. by F. Mühlau, 2 vols., Lpz. 1866–8) endeavoured to present an exhaustive synopsis of the linguistic phenomena, as well as to give an explanation of them from the sphere of Hebrew alone. B. Stade, on the other hand (*Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, pt. i. Lpz. 1879), adopted a

1¹ On the oldest Hebrew grammarians, see Strack and Siegfried, *Lehrb. d. neuhebr. Spr. u. Liter.*, Carlsr. 1884, p. 107 ff., and the prefaces to the Hebrew Lexicons of Gesenius and Fürst; Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm. im Talmud u. Midrasch*, Berlin, 1879; Baer and Strack, *Die Dikduke ha-t'amim des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher u. andere alte grammatisch-massorethische Lehrstücke*, Lpz. 1879, and P. Kahle's criticisms in *ZDMG*. lv. 170, n. 2; Ewald and Dukes, *Beiträge z. Gesch. der ältesten Auslegung u. Spracherklärung des A. T.*, Stuttg. 1844, 3 vols.; Hupfeld, *De rei grammaticae apud Judaeos initii antiquissimisque scriptoribus*, Hal. 1846; W. Bacher, 'Die Anfänge der hebr. Gr.' in *ZDMG*. 1895, 1 ff. and 335 ff.; and *Die hebr. Sprachwissenschaft vom 10. bis zum 16. Jahrh.*, Trier, 1892.

2² A strong impulse was naturally given to these studies by the introduction of printing—the Psalter in 1477, the Bologna Pentateuch in 1482, the Sencino O.T. complete in 1488: see the description of the twenty-four earliest editions (down to 1528) in Ginsburg's *Introduction*, p. 779 ff.

3³ Of the literature or the subject down to the year 1850, see a tolerably full account in Steinschneider's *Bibliogr. Handb. f. hebr. Sprachkunde*, Lpz. 1859.

strictly scientific method in endeavouring to reduce the systems of Ewald and Olshausen to a more fundamental unity. E. König¹ in his very thorough researches into the phonology and accidence starts generally from the position reached by the early Jewish grammarians (in his second part ‘with comparative reference to the Semitic languages in general’) and instead of adopting the usual dogmatic method, takes pains to re-open the discussion of disputed grammatical questions. The syntax König has ‘endeavoured to treat in several respects in such a way as to show its affinity to the common Semitic syntax’.—Among the works of Jewish scholars, special attention may be called to the grammar by S. D. Luzzatto written in Italian (Padua, 1853–69).

The chief requirements for one who is treating the grammar of an ancient language are—(1) that he should *observe* as fully and accurately as possible the existing linguistic phenomena and *describe* them, after showing their organic connexion (the empirical and historico-critical element); (2) that he should try to *explain* these facts, partly by comparing them with one another and by the analogy of the sister languages, partly from the general laws of philology (the logical element).

Such observation has more and more led to the belief that the original text of the O. T. has suffered to a much greater extent than former scholars were inclined to admit, in spite of the number of variants in parallel passages: Is 2:2 ff. = Mi 4:1 ff., Is 36–39 = 2 K 18:13–20¹⁹, Jer 52 = 2 K 24:18–25³⁰, 2 S 22 = Ps 18, Ps 14 = Ps 53, Ps 40:14 ff. = Ps 70, Ps 108 = Ps 57:8 ff. and 60:7 ff.. Cf. also the parallels between the Chronicles and the older historical books, and F. Vodel, *Die konsonant. Varianten in den doppelt überlief. poet. Stücken d. masoret. Textes*, Lpz. 1905. As to the extent and causes of the corruption of the Masoretic text, the newly discovered fragments of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus are very instructive; cf. Smend, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1906, p. 763.

The causes of *unintentional* corruption in the great majority of cases are:—Interchange of similar letters, which has sometimes taken place in the early ‘Phoenician’ writing; transposition or omission of single letters, words, or even whole sentences, which are then often added in the margin and thence brought back into the text in the wrong place; such omission is generally due to homoioteleuton (cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 171 ff.), i. e. the scribe’s eye wanders from the place to a subsequent word of the same or similar form. Other causes are dittography, i. e. erroneous repetition of letters, words, and even sentences; its opposite, haplography; and lastly wrong division of words (cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 158 ff.), since at a certain period in the transmission of the text the words were not separated.¹—*Intentional* changes are due to corrections for the sake of decency or of dogma, and to the insertion of glosses, some of them very early.

¹ ¹ *Historisch-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Sprache mit steter Beziehung auf Qimchi und die anderen Autoritäten*: I, ‘Lehre von der Schrift, der Aussprache, dem Pron. u. dem Verbum,’ Lpz. 1881; II. 1, ‘Abschluss der speziellen Formenlehre u. generelle Formenl.,’ 1895; ii. 2, ‘Historisch-kompar. Syntax d. hebr. Spr.,’ 1897.

¹ ¹ This *scriptio continua* is also found in Phoenician inscriptions. The inscription of Mêša□ always divides the words by a point (and so the Siloam inscription; see the facsimile at the beginning of this grammar), and frequently marks the close of a sentence by a stroke.

Advance in grammar is therefore closely dependent on progress in *textual criticism*. The systematic pursuit of the latter has only begun in recent years: cf. especially Doorninck on Ju 1–16, Leid. 1879; Wellhausen, *Text der Bb. Sam.*, Gött. 1871; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, Lpz. 1886; Klostermann, *Bb. Sam. u. d. Kön.*, Nördl. 1887; Driver, *Notes on the Hebr. text of the Books of Sam.*, Oxf. 1890; Klostermann, *Deuterojesaja*, Munich, 1893; Oort, *Textus hebr. emendationes*, Lugd. 1900; Burney on *Kings*, Oxf. 1903; the commentaries of Marti and Nowack; the *Internat. Crit. Comm.*; Kautzsch, *Die heil. Schriften des A.T.*², 1909–10. A critical edition of the O. T. with full textual notes, and indicating the different documents by colours, is being published in a handsome form by P. Haupt in *The Sacred Books of the Old Test.*, Lpz. and Baltimore, 1893 ff. (sixteen parts have appeared: Exod., Deut., Minor Prophets, and Megilloth are still to come); Kittel, *Biblia hebraica*², 1909, Masoretic text from Jacob b. Ḥayyîm (see c), with a valuable selection of variants from the versions, and emendations.

§ 4. Division and Arrangement of the Grammar.

The division and arrangement of Hebrew grammar follow the three constituent parts of every language, viz. (1) articulate *sounds* represented by *letters*, and united to form *syllables*, (2) *words*, and (3) *sentences*.

The first part (the elements) comprises accordingly the treatment of *sounds* and their representation in writing. It describes the nature and relations of the sounds of the language, teaches the pronunciation of the written signs (orthoepy), and the established mode of writing (orthography). It then treats of the sounds as combined in syllables and words, and specifies the laws and conditions under which this combination takes place.

The second part (etymology) treats of words in their character as parts of speech, and comprises: (1) the principles of the *formation of words*, or of the derivation of the different parts of speech from the roots or from one another; (2) the principles of *inflection*, i. e. of the various forms which the words assume according to their relation to other words and to the sentence.

The third part (syntax, or the arrangement of words): (1) shows how the word-formations and inflexions occurring in the language are used to express different shades of ideas, and how other ideas, for which the language has not coined any forms, are expressed by periphrasis; (2) states the laws according to which the parts of speech are combined in sentences (the principles of the sentence, or syntax in the stricter sense of the term).

²Gesenius, F. W. (2003). *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar* (E. Kautzsch & S. A. E. Cowley, Ed.) (2d English ed.) (Page 1). Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

FIRST PART

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OR THE SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

CHAPTER I

THE INDIVIDUAL SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

§ 5. *The Consonants: their Forms and Names.*

(Cf. the Table of Alphabets.)

Among the abundant literature on the subject, special attention is directed to: A. Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm.*, Berlin, 1879, p. 15 ff., on the names, forms, and pronunciation of the consonants in Talmud and Midrash; H. Strack, *Schreibkunst u. Schrift bei d. Hebräern*, PRE.³, Lpz. 1906, p. 766 ff.; Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäologie*², Tübingen, 1907, p. 172 ff.; Nowack, *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Archäol.*, Freiburg, 1894, i. 279 ff.; Lidzbarski, *Handbuch d. nordsem. Epigraphik*, Weimar, 1898, i. 173 ff.; also his art. ‘Hebrew Alphabet,’ in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, i, 1901, p. 439 ff. (cf. his *Ephemeris*, i. 316 ff.); and ‘Die Namen der Alphabet-buchstaben’, in *Ephemeris*, ii. 125 ff.; Kenyon, art. ‘Writing,’ in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv. Edinb. 1902, p. 944 ff.; Nöldeke, ‘Die semit. Buchstabennamen,’ in *Beitr. zur semit. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb. 1904, p. 124 ff.; F. Praetorius, *Ueber den Ursprung des kanaan. Alphabets*, Berlin, 1906; H. Grimme, ‘Zur Genesis des semit. Alphabets,’ in ZA. xx. 1907, p. 49 ff.; R. Stübe, *Grundlinien zu einer Entwicklungsgesch. d. Schrift*, Munich, 1907; Jermain, *In the path of the Alphabet*, Fort Wayne, 1907.—L. Blau, *Studien zum althebr. Buchwesen, &c.*, Strassb. 1902; and his ‘Ueber d. Einfluss d. althebr. Buch wesens auf d. Originale’, &c., in *Festschr. zu Ehren A. Berliners*, Frkf. 1903.

The best tables of alphabets are those of J. Euting in G. Bickell’s *Outlines of Heb. Gram.* transl. by S. I. Curtiss, Lpz. 1877; in Pt. vii of the *Oriental Series* of the Palaeographical Soc., London, 1882; and, the fullest of all, in Chwolson’s *Corpus inscr. Hebr.*, Petersburg, 1882; also Lidzbarski’s in the *Jewish Encycl.*, see above.

1. The Hebrew letters now in use, in which both the manuscripts of the O. T. are written and our editions of the Bible are printed, commonly called the *square character* (כְּתָב מִרְכָּבָע), also the *Assyrian character* (כְּ אַשְׁ-וֹרִי),¹ are not those originally employed.

PRE. PRE. = Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3rd ed. by A. Hauck. Lpz. 1896 ff.

ZA. ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete, ed. by C. Bezold. Lpz. 1886 ff.

¹ The name וְשָׂנָא (Assyria) is here used in the widest sense, to include the countries on the Mediterranean inhabited by Aramaeans; cf. Stade in ZAW. 1882, p. 292 f. On some other names for Old Hebrew writing, cf. G. Hoffmann, ibid. 1881, p. 334 ff.; Buhl, *Canon and Text of the O. T.* (transl. by J. Macpherson), Edinb. 1892, p. 200.

Old Hebrew (or *Old Canaanitish*²) writing, as it was used on public monuments in the beginning of the ninth and in the second half of the eighth century B.C., is to be seen in the inscription of Mêša¹, as well as in that of Siloam. The characters on the Maccabaean coins of the second century B.C., and also on ancient gems, still bear much resemblance to this (cf. § 2 d). With the Old Hebrew writing the Phoenician is nearly identical (see § 1 k, § 2 f, and the Table of Alphabets). From the analogy of the history of other kinds of writing, it may be assumed that out of and along with this monumental character, a less antique and in some ways more convenient, rounded style was early developed, for use on softer materials, skins, bark, papyrus, and the like. This the Samaritans retained after their separation from the Jews, while the Jews gradually¹ (between the sixth and the fourth century) exchanged it for an Aramaic character. From this gradually arose (from about the fourth to the middle of the third century) what is called the *square character*, which consequently bears great resemblance to the extant forms of Aramaic writing, such as the Egyptian-Aramaic, the Nabatean and especially the Palmyrene. Of Hebrew inscriptions in the older square character, that of Arâq al-Emîr (15 ½ miles north-east of the mouth of the Jordan) probably belongs to 183 B.C.²

The Jewish sarcophagus-inscriptions of the time of Christ, found in Jerusalem in 1905, almost without exception exhibit a pure square character. This altered little in the course of centuries, so that the age of a Hebrew MS. cannot easily be determined from the style of the writing. The oldest known biblical fragment is the Nash papyrus (found in 1902), containing the ten commandments and the beginning of Dt 6:4 f., of the end of the first or beginning of the second century A.D.; cf. N. Peters, *Die älteste Abschr. der 10 Gebote*, Freibg. i. B. 1905. Of actual MSS. of the Bible the oldest is probably one of 820–850 A.D. described by Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 469 ff., at the head of his sixty principal MSS.; next in age is the codex of Moses ben Asher at Cairo (897 A.D., cf. the art. ‘Scribes’ in the *Jew. Encycl.* xi and Gottheil in *JQR*. 1905, p. 32). The date (916 A.D.) of the Codex prophetarum Babylon. Petropol. (see § 8 g, note) is quite certain.—In the synagogue-rolls a distinction is drawn between the Tam-character (said to be so called from Rabbi Tam, grandson of R. Yišhāqī, in the twelfth century) with its straight strokes, square corners and ‘tittles’ (tāğîn), in German and Polish MSS., and the *foreign* character with rounded letters and tittles in Spanish MSS. See further E. König, *Einl. in das A. T.*, Bonn, 1893, p. 16 ff.

2. The Alphabet consists, like all Semitic alphabets, solely of consonants, twenty-two in number, some of which, however, have also a kind of vocalic power (§ 7 b). The following Table shows their form, names, pronunciation, and numerical value (see k):—

2² It is tacitly assumed here that this was the mother of *all* Semitic alphabets. In *ZDMG*. 1909, p. 189 ff., however, Prätorius has shown good grounds for believing that the South Semitic alphabet is derived not from the Mêša character, or from some kindred and hardly older script, but from some unknown and *much* earlier form of writing.

1¹ On the effect of the transitional mixture of earlier and later forms on the constitution of the text, see R. Kittel, *Ueber d. Notwendigk. d. Herausg. einer neuen hebr. Bibel*, Lpz. 1901, p. 20 ff.—L. Blau, ‘Wie lange stand die althebr. Schrift bei den Juden im Gebrauch?’ in *Kaufmanngedenkbuch*, Breslau, 1900, p. 44 ff.

2² Not 176, as formerly held. Driver and Lidzbarski now read עֲרָבִיה, correctly, not טַוְבִּיה.

JQR. JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review.

FORM.	NAME.	PRONOUNCIATION.	NUMERICAL VALUE.
א	Ālēph	<i>spiritus lenis</i>	1
ב	Bêth	<i>b</i> (<i>bh</i> , but see § 6 n)	2
ג	Gimel (Giml)	<i>g</i> (<i>gh</i> , " " ")	3
ד	Dâlêth	<i>d</i> (<i>dh</i> , " " ",)	4
ה	Hêth	<i>h</i>	5
ו	Wâw (Wâu)	<i>w</i> (<i>u</i>) ¹	6
ז	Zâyîn	<i>z</i> , as in English (softs)	7
ח	Hêth	<i>ħ</i> , a strong gutteral	8
ט	Têth	<i>t̄</i> , emphatic <i>t</i>	9
ׁ	Yôd	<i>y</i> (<i>i</i>) ¹	10
ׂ, final	Kaph	<i>k</i> (<i>kh</i> , but see § 6 n)	20
ׁ	Lâmèd	<i>l</i>	30
ׂ, final	Mêm	<i>m</i>	40
ׂ			
ׁ, final ׁ	Nûm	<i>n</i>	50
ׂ	Sâmêkh	<i>s</i>	60
ׁ	Áyiñ	`a peculiar gutteral (see below)	70
ׂ, final ׁ	Pê	<i>p</i> (<i>f</i> , see § 6 n)	80
ׁ			
ׁ, final ׁ	Sâdê	<i>ṣ</i> , emphatic <i>s</i>	90
ׁ			
ׁ	Qôf	<i>q</i> , a strong <i>k</i> ² formed at the back of the palate	100
ׁ	Rêš	<i>r</i>	200
ׁ	Śîn	<i>ś</i>	300
ׁ	Śîn ³	<i>ś</i> , pronounced <i>sh</i>	300
ׂ	Tâw (Tâu)	<i>t</i> (<i>th</i> , buy see § 6 n)	400

3. As the Table shows, five letters have a special form at the end of the word. They are called final letters, and were combined by the Jewish grammarians in the mnemonic word קָמְנֵה פָּהָס *Kamnêphâs*, or better, with A. Müller and Stade, קָמְנֵה פָּהָס i. e. *as the breaker in pieces*.¹ Of these, ׁ, ׁ, ׁ, ׁ, ׁ are distinguished from the common form by

¹ ¹ Philippi, ‘Die Aussprache der semit. Consonanten ׁ und ׁ’, in *ZDMG*. 1886, p. 639 ff., 1897, p. 66 ff., adduces reasons in detail for the opinion that ‘the Semitic ׁ and ׁ are certainly by usage consonants, although by nature they are vowels, viz. *u* and *i*, and consequently are consonantal vowels’; cf. § 8 m.

² ² As a representation of this sound the Latin *q* is very suitable, since it occupies in the alphabet the place of the Semitic ׁ (Greek κόπτα).

³ ³ Nestle (*Actes du onzième Congrès ... des Orientalistes*, 1897, iv. 113 ff.) has shown that the original order was ׁ, ׁ.

¹ ¹ In the Talmud, disregarding the alphabetical order, קָמְנֵה פָּהָס of *thy watcher*, i. e. *prophet*. See the discussions of this mnemonic word by Nestle, *ZAW*. 1907, p. 119 ff., König, Bacher (who would read קָמְנֵה פָּהָס = proceeding from *thy prophets*, Is 52:8),

the shaft being drawn straight down, while in the usual form it is bent round towards the left.² In the case of **ם** the letter is completely closed.

4. Hebrew is read and written from right to left.³ Words must not be divided at the end of the lines;⁴ but, in order that no empty space may be left, in MSS. and printed texts, certain letters suitable for the purpose are dilated at the end or in the middle of the line. In our printed texts these *literae dilatabiles* are the five following:

(mnemonic word **אַלְתֵּם** "haltēm). In some MSS. other letters suitable for the purpose are also employed in this way, as **נ**, **כ**, **ר**; cf. Strack in the *Theol. Lehrb.*, 1882, No. 22; Nestle, *ZAW*. 1906, p. 170 f.

Rem. 1. The forms of the letters originally represent the rude outlines of perceptible objects, the names of which, respectively, begin with the consonant represented (akrophony). Thus *Yôd*, in the earlier alphabets the rude picture of a hand, properly denotes *hand* (Heb. **ר**), but as a letter simply the sound ' (y), with which this word begins; *Ayiñ*, originally a circle, properly an *eye* (**ע** y), stands for the consonant y. In the Phoenician alphabet, especially, the resemblance of the forms to the objects denoted by the name is still for the most part recognizable (see the Table). In some letters (**ג**, **נ**, **ס**, **ט**, **ש**) the similarity is still preserved in the square character.

It is another question whether the present names are all original. They may be merely due to a later, and not always accurate, interpretation of the forms. Moreover, it is possible that in the period from about 1500 to 1000 B.C. the original forms underwent considerable change.

The usual explanation of the present names of the letters⁵ is: אָלָף ox, בֵּית house, גָּמָل camel (according to Lidzbarski, see below, perhaps originally גָּזָן axe or pick-axe), קֶלֶת door

Krauss, Marmorstein, ibid. p. 278 ff. All the twenty-two letters, together with the five final forms, occur in Zp 3:8.

2² Chwolson, *Corpus Inscr. Hebr.*, col. 68, rightly observes that the more original forms of these letters are preserved in the *literae finales*. Instances of them go back to the time of Christ.

3³ The same was originally the practice in Greek, which only adopted the opposite direction exclusively about 400 B.C. On the *boustrophēdon* writing (alternately in each direction) in early Greek, early Sabaean, and in the Safa-inscriptions of the first three centuries A.D., cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 116 f.

4⁴ This does not apply to early inscriptions or seals. Cf. Mêša, II. 1–5, 7, 8, &c., Siloam 2, 3, 5, where the division of words appears to be customary.

ZAW. *ZAW*, = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

5⁵ We possess Greek transcriptions of the Hebrew names, dating from the fifth century B.C. The LXX give them (in almost the same form as Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 10. 5) in La 1–4, as do also many Codices of the Vulgate (e.g. the Cod. Amiatinus) in ψψ 111, 112, 119, but with many variations from the customary forms, which rest on the traditional Jewish pronunciation. The forms *Deleth* (and *delth*), *Zai*, *Sen* (LXX also χσεν, cf. Hebr. תְּשִׁין tooth) are to be noticed, amongst others, for *Daleth*, *Zain*, *Šiּׁין*. Cf. the tables in Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 126 f. In his opinion (and so Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 134) the form and meaning of the names point to Phoenicia as the original home of the alphabet, since *alf*, *bêt*, *dalt*, *wāw*, *tāw*, *pei* = *pē*, *piּ*, mouth, and the vowel of פּוֹשֶׁה = *rōš*, head, are all Hebraeo-Phoenician.

(properly *folding door*; according to Lidzbarski, perhaps נָנָה *the female breast*), נַחַת *air-hole* (?), *lattice-window* (?), נְנִזֶּה *hook, nail*, נֵזֶב *weapon* (according to Nestle, comparing the Greek ξῆτα, rather than ὄλινος *olive-tree*), נַחֲת *fence, barrier* (but perhaps only differentiated from נ by the left-hand stroke), נַחַת *a winding* (?), according to others a *leather bottle* or a *snake* (but perhaps only differentiated from נ by a circle round it), נָזֶד *hand*, נָזֶב *bent hand*, נָזֶב *ox-goad*, מִזְבֵּחַ *water*, נַנְנָה *fish* (Lidzbarski, ‘perhaps originally שְׁנָה *snake*,’ as in Ethiopic), נָמָס *prop* (perhaps a modification of נ), עֵינָה *eye*, פָּה *(also פִּי) mouth*, נַצְבֵּה *fish-hook* (?), קְוֹף *eye of a needle*, according to others *back of the head* (Lidzb., ‘perhaps תְּשִׁבְעָה *bow*’), רַנְצָה *head*, נַנְנָה *tooth*, נָסָה *sign, cross*.

With regard to the origin of this alphabet, it may be taken as proved that it is not earlier (or very little earlier) than the fifteenth century B.C., since otherwise the el-Amarna tablets (§ 2 f) would not have been written exclusively in cuneiform.¹ It seems equally certain on various grounds, that it originated on Canaanitish soil. It is, however, still an open question whether the inventors of it borrowed

(a) From the Egyptian system—not, as was formerly supposed, by direct adoption of hieroglyphic signs (an explanation of twelve or thirteen characters was revived by J. Halévy in *Rev. Sémit.* 1901, p. 356 ff., 1902, p. 331 ff., and in the *Verhandlungen des xiii. ... Orient-Kongr. zu Hamb.*, Leiden, 1904, p. 199 ff.; but cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 261 ff.), or of hieratic characters derived from them (so E. de Rougé), but by the adoption of the *acrophonic* principle (see e) by which e.g. the hand, in Egyptian *tot*, represents the letter *t*, the lion = *laboi*, the letter *l*. This view still seems the most probable. It is now accepted by Lidzbarski (‘Der Ursprung d. nord- u. südsemit. Schrift’ in *Ephemeris*, i (1900), 109 ff., cf. pp. 134 and 261 ff.), though in his *Nordsem. Epigr.* (1898) p. 173 ff. he was still undecided.

(b) From the Babylonian (cuneiform) system. Wuttke’s and W. Deecke’s derivation of the old-Semitic alphabet from new-Assyrian cuneiform is impossible for chronological reasons. More recently Peters and Hommel have sought to derive it from the old-Babylonian, and Ball from the archaic Assyrian cuneiform. A vigorous discussion has been aroused by the theory of Frdr. Delitzsch (in *Die Entstehung des äl. Schriftsystems od. der Urspr. der Keilschriftzeichen dargest.*, Lpz. 1897; and with the same title ‘Ein Nachwort’, Lpz. 1898, preceded by a very clear outline of the theory) that the old-Semitic alphabet arose in Canaan under the influence both of the Egyptian system (whence the acrophonic principle) and of the old-Babylonian, whence the principle of the graphic representation of objects and ideas by means of simple, and mostly rectilinear, signs. He holds that the choice of the objects was probably (in about fifteen cases) influenced by the Babylonian system. The correspondence of names had all the more effect since, according to Zimmern (*ZDMG.* 1896, p. 667 ff.), out of twelve names which are certainly identical, eight appear in the same order in the Babylonian arrangement of signs. But it must first be shown that the present names of the ‘Phoenician’ letters really denote the original picture. The identity of the objects may perhaps be due simply to the choice of the commonest things (animals, implements, limbs) in both systems.

The derivation of the Semitic alphabet from the signs of the Zodiac and their names, first attempted by Seyffarth in 1834, has been revived by Winckler, who refers twelve fundamental sounds to the Babylonian Zodiac. Hommel connects the original alphabet with the moon and its phases, and certain constellations; cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 269 ff., and in complete agreement with him, Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäologie*², p. 173 ff. This theory is by no means convincing.

¹ In the excavations at Jericho in April, 1907, E. Sellin found a jar-handle with the Canaanite characters נִזְבֵּחַ which he dates (probably too early) about 1500 B.C..
ZDMG. *ZDMG.* = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

(c) From the hieroglyphic system of writing discovered in 1894 by A. J. Evans in inscriptions in Crete (esp. at Cnossus) and elsewhere. According to Kluge (1897) and others, this represents the ‘Mycenaean script’ used about 3000–1000^{b.c.}, and according to Fries (‘Die neuesten Forschungen über d. Urspr. des phöniz. Alph.’ in *ZDPV*. xxii. 118 ff.) really supplies the original forms of the Phoenician alphabet as brought to Palestine by the Philistines about 1100 B.C., but ‘the Phoenician-Canaanite-Hebrews gave to the Mycenaean signs names derived from the earlier cuneiform signs’. The hypothesis of Fries is thus connected with that of Delitzsch. But although the derivation of the Phoenician forms from ‘Mycenaean’ types appears in some cases very plausible, in others there are grave difficulties, and moreover the date, 1100 B.C., assigned for the introduction of the alphabet is clearly too late. [See Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, Oxf. 1909, p. 80 ff.]

(d) From a system, derived from Asia Minor, closely related to the Cypriote syllabary (Praetorius, *Der Urspr. des kanaan. Alphabets*, Berlin, 1906). On this theory the Canaanites transformed the syllabic into an apparently alphabetic writing. In reality, however, they merely retained a single sign for the various syllables, so that e.g. *p* is not really *q*, but *qa*, *qe*, *qi*, &c. Of the five Cypriote vowels also they retained only the star (in Cypriote = *a*) simplified into an *alef* (see alphabetical table) to express the vowels at the beginning of syllables, and *i* and *u* as Yod and Waw. Praetorius claims to explain about half the twenty-two Canaanite letters in this way, but there are various objections to his ingenious hypothesis.

2. As to the *order* of the letters, we possess early evidence in the alphabetic¹ poems: **Ps 9** (א–כ, cf. **Ps 10:1** ה, and vv^{12–17} פ–נ; cf. Gray in the *Expositor*, 1906, p. 233 ff., and Rosenthal, *ZAW*. 1896, p. 40, who shows that **Ps 9:3, 15, 17** כ, ל, נ, exactly fit in between פ, ט, ו, and that **Ps 10:1, 3, 5** therefore has the reverse order ה, ג, ו); also פפ 25 and 34 (both without a separate ו-verse and with ס repeated at the end²); 37, 111, 112, 119 (in which every eight verses begin with the same letter, each strophe, as discovered by D. H. Müller of Vienna, containing the eight leading words of **Ps 19:8** ff., *tôrâ, edîth*, &c.); **La 1–4** (in 2–4 ס before י³, in chap. 3 every three verses with the same initial, see Löhr, *ZAW*. 1904, p. 1 ff., in chap. 5 at any rate as many verses as letters in the alphabet); **Pr 24:1, 3, 5, 31:10–31** (in the LXX with ס before י³); also in **Na 1:2–10** Pastor Frohnmeier of Württemberg (ob. 1880) detected traces of an alphabetic arrangement, but the attempt of Gunkel, Bickell, Arnold (*ZAW*. 1901, p. 225 ff.), Happel (*Der Ps. Nah*, Würzb. 1900) to discover further traces, has not been successful. [Cf. Gray in *Expositor*, 1898, p. 207 ff.; Driver, in the Century Bible, *Nahum*, p. 26.]—Bickell, *Ztschr f. Kath. Theol.*, 1882, p. 319 ff., had already deduced from the versions the alphabetical character of **Eccl 51:13–30**, with the omission of the ו-verse and with ס¹ at the end. His conjectures have been brilliantly confirmed by the discovery of the Hebrew original, although the order from א to ה is partly disturbed or obscured. If ו before י is deleted, ten letters are in their right positions, and seven can be restored to their places with certainty. Cf.

ZDPV. ZDPV. = Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins, Lpz. 1878 ff., since 1903 ed. by C. Steuernagel.

1¹ On the supposed connexion of this artificial arrangement with magical formulae (‘the order of the letters was believed to have a sort of magic power’) cf. Löhr, *ZAW*. 1905, p. 173 ff., and *Klagelieder*², Gött. 1907, p. vii ff.

2² On this superfluous ס cf. Grimm, *Euphemistic liturgical appendices*, Lpz. 1901, p. 8 ff., and Nestle, *ZAW*. 1903, p. 340 f., who considers it an appendage to the Greek alphabet.

3³ [Perhaps also originally in Ps 34.] ס before י is probably due to a magic alphabet, see above, n. 1. According to Böhmer, *ZAW*. 1908, p. 53 ff., the combinations בָּא, דָּג, וָיָּה, &c., were used in magical texts; סָי was excluded, but by a rearrangement we get סָבָא and יָסָי.

1¹ See note 3 on p. 29.

N. Schloegl, *ZDMG*. 53, 669 ff.; C. Taylor in the appendix to Schechter and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, Cambr. 1899, p. lxxvi ff., and in the *Journ. of Philol.*, xxx (1906), p. 95 ff.; *JQR*. 1905, p. 238 ff.; Löhr, *ZAW*. 1905, p. 183 ff.; I. Lévy, *REJ*. 1907, p. 62 ff.

The sequence of the three softest labial, palatal, and dental sounds ב, ג, ד, and of the three liquids ה, ו, ז, indicates an attempt at classification. At the same time other considerations also appear to have had influence. Thus it is certainly not accidental, that two letters, representing a hand (*Yôd, Kaph*), as also two (if *Qôph* = back of the head) which represent the head, and in general several forms denoting objects naturally connected (*Mêm* and *Nûn*, *Ayîn* and *Pê*), stand next to one another.

The order, names, and numerical values of the letters have passed over from the Phoenicians to the Greeks, in whose alphabet the letters A to Y are borrowed from the Old Semitic. So also the Old Italic alphabets as well as the Roman, and consequently all alphabets derived either from this or from the Greek, are directly or indirectly dependent on the Phoenician.

3. a. In default of special arithmetical figures, the consonants were used also as numerical signs; cf. G. Gundermann, *Die Zahlzeichen*, Giessen, 1899, p. 6 f., and Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 106 ff. The earliest traces of this usage are, however, first found on the Maccabean coins (see above, § 2 d, end). These numerical letters were afterwards commonly employed, e.g. for marking the numbers of chapters and verses in the editions of the Bible. The units are denoted by נ–ט, the tens by י–צ, 100–400 by ק–ת, the numbers from 500–900 by נ (=400), with the addition of the remaining hundreds, e.g. קק 500. In compound numbers the greater precedes (on the right), thus טי 11, קכא 121. But 15 is expressed by טו 9+6, not טה (which is a form of the divine name, being the first two consonants of יהוה).² For a similar reason טו is also mostly written for 16, instead of ט, which in compound proper names, like יהואל, יהואל, also represents the name of God, e.g. יהואל.

The thousands are sometimes denoted by the units with two dots placed above, e.g. ט 1000.

b. The reckoning of the years in Jewish writings (generally *לייצירה after the creation*) follows either the *full chronology* (לפ' ג' or לפ' ג' קדוֹם), with the addition of the thousands, or the *abridged chronology* (לפ' קטוֹן), in which they are omitted. In the dates of the first thousand years after Christ, the Christian era is obtained by the addition of 240, in the second thousand years by the addition of 1240 (i. e. if the date falls between Jan. 1 and the Jewish new year; otherwise add 1239), the thousands of the Creation era being omitted.

4. Abbreviations of words are not found in the text of the O. T., but they occur on coins, and their use is extremely frequent amongst the later Jews.³ A point, or later an oblique stroke, serves as the sign of abridgement in old MSS. and editions, e.g. י' for פ', שׁרָאֵל for פֶלְנִי aliquis, ט' for קְבָר aliquid, ג' for וְגַם et complens, i. e. and so on. Also in the middle of what is apparently a word, such strokes indicate that it is an abbreviation or a *vox memorialis* (cf. e.g. § 15 d מ"ח). Two such strokes are employed, from § 41 d onward, to mark the different classes of weak verbs.—Note also ט or ט (also ה' ה) for הַתְנִהָה.

REJ. *REJ.* = Revue des Études Juives. Paris, 1880 ff.

² On the rise of this custom (ט having been originally used and afterwards ט), cf. Nestle in *ZAW*. 1884, p. 250, where a trace of this method of writing occurring as early as Origen is noted.

³ Cf. Jo. Buxtorf, *De abbreviaturis Hebr.*, Basel, 1613, &c.; Pietro Perreau.

5. Peculiarities in the tradition of the O. T. text, which are already mentioned in the Talmud, are—(1) The 15 *puncta extraordinaria*, about which the tradition (from Siphri on Nu 9:10 onwards) differs considerably, even as to their number; on particular consonants, Gn 16:5, 18:9, 19:33, 35, Nu 9:10; or on whole words, Gn 33:4, 37:12, Nu 3:39, 21:30, 29:15, Dt 29:28, 2 S 19:20, Is 44:9, Ez 41:20, 46:22, Ps 27:13,—all no doubt critical marks; cf. Strack, *Prolegomena Critica*, p. 88 ff.; L. Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, Strassburg, 1891, p. 6 ff., and *Einleitung in die hl. Schrift*, Budapest, 1894; Königsberger, *Juüd. Lit.-Blatt*, 1891, nos. 29–31, and *Aus Masorah u. Talmudkritik*, Berlin, 1892, p. 6 ff.; Mayer-Lambert, *REJ.* 30 (1895), no. 59; and especially Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 318 ff.; also on the ten points found in the Pentateuch, see Butin (Baltimore, 1906), who considers that they are as old as the Christian era and probably mark a letter, &c., to be deleted. (2) The *literae majusculae* (e.g. ב Gn 1:1, Lv 11:42 as the middle consonant of the Pentateuch, נ Nu 14:17), and *minusculae* (e.g. ה Gn 2:4). (3) The *literae suspensae* (Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 334 ff.) י Ju 18:30 (which points to the reading מִשְׁנָה for הַמִּשְׁנָה, ו Ps 80:14 (the middle of the Psalms¹) and Jb 38:13, 15. (4) The ‘mutilated’ *Wāw* in שָׁלוֹם Nu 25:12, and פ Ex 32:25 (בְּקֻמִּים), and Nu 7:2 (הַפְּקֻדִּים). (5) *Mém clausum* in Is 9:6, and *Mém apertum* in המְפֻרְצִים Neh 2:13. (6) *Nún inversum* before Nu 10:35, and after ver. 36, as also before Ps 107:23–28 and⁴⁰; according to Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 341 ff., a sort of bracket to indicate that the verses are out of place; cf. Krauss, *ZAW*. 1902, p. 57 ff., who regards the inverted *Nûns* as an imitation of the Greek obelus.

§ 6. Pronunciation and Division of Consonants.

P. Haupt, ‘Die Semit. Sprachlaute u. ihre Umschrift,’ in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie u. vergleich. semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, by Delitzsch and Haupt, i, Lpz. 1889, 249 ff.; E. Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i, Lpz. 1901, p. 14 ff.

1. An accurate knowledge of the original phonetic value of each consonant is of the greatest importance, since very many grammatical peculiarities and changes (§ 18 ff.) only become intelligible from the nature and pronunciation of the sounds. This knowledge is obtained partly from the pronunciation of the kindred dialects, especially the still living Arabic, partly by observing the affinity and interchange of sounds on Hebrew itself (§ 19), and partly from the tradition of the Jews.¹

The pronunciation of Hebrew by the modern German Jews, which partly resembles the Syriac and is generally called ‘Polish’, differs considerably from that of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews, which approaches nearer to the Arabic. The pronunciation of Hebrew by Christians follows the latter (after the example of Reuchlin), in almost all cases.

The oldest tradition is presented in the transcription of Hebrew names in Assyrian cuneiform; a later, but yet in its way very important system is seen in the manner in which the LXX transcribe Hebrew names with Greek letters.² As, however, corresponding signs for several sounds (ו, י, ئ, ؔ, ة) are wanting in the Greek alphabet, only an approximate

¹ According to Blau, *Studien zum althebr. Buchwesen*, Strassburg, 1902, p. 167, properly a large ي, called *tluyā* because *suspended* between the two halves of the Psalter, and then incorrectly taken for a *littera suspensa*.

¹ Cf. C. Meinhof, “Die Aussprache des Hebr.,” in *Neue Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Pädag.*, 1885, Bd. 132, p. 146 ff.; M. Schreiner, ‘Zur Gesch. der Ausspr. des Hebr.,’ in *ZAW*. 1886, p. 213 ff.

² Cf. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuag.*, Lpz. 1841, p. 90 ff.; C. Könneke, ‘Gymn.-Progr.,’ Stargard, 1885. On the transcription of eleven Psalms in a palimpsest fragment of the Hexapla at Milan, see Mercati, *Atti della R. Accad.*, xxxi, Turin, 1896. [Cf. Burkitt, *Fragments of ... Aquila*, Cambr. 1897, p. 13.]

representation was possible in these cases. The same applies to the Latin transcription of Hebrew words by Jerome, according to the Jewish pronunciation of his time.³

On the pronunciation of the modern Jews in North Africa, see Bargeès in the *Journ. Asiat.*, Nov. 1848; on that of the South Arabian Jews, J. Dérenbourg, *Manuel du lecteur, &c.* (from a Yemen MS. of the year 1390), Paris, 1871 (extrait 6 du *Journ. Asiat.* 1870).

2. With regard to the pronunciation of the several gutturals and sibilants, and of **ט** and **ר**, it may be remarked:—

I. Among the gutturals, the glottal stop **ף** is the lightest, corresponding to the *spiritus lenis* of the Greeks. It may stand either at the beginning or end of a syllable, e.g. **אָמָר** *āmár*, **שָׁאַם** *yāšám*. Even *before* a vowel **ף** is almost lost to our ear, like the *h* in *hour* and in the French *habit, homme*. *After* a vowel **ף** generally (and at the end of a word, always) coalesces with it, e.g. **קָרְךָ** *qārā* for an original *qārā*, Arab. *qārā*; see further, § 23 a, 27 g.

ח before a vowel corresponds exactly to our *h* (*spiritus asper*); after a vowel it is *either* a guttural (so always at the end of a syllable which is not final, e.g. **נָהָפֵךְ** *nāhpakh*; at the end of a word the consonantal **ח** has a point—*Mappiq*—in it, see § 14), *or* it stands inaudible at the end of a word, generally as a mere orthographic indication of a preceding vowel, e.g. **גָּלָה** *gālā*; cf. §§ 7 b and 75 a.

כ is related to **ף**, but is a much stronger guttural. Its strongest sound is a rattled, guttural *g*, cf. e.g. **גָּזָע**, LXX Γάζα, **גָּתָּמָע** Γόμορός; elsewhere, a weaker sound of the same kind, which the LXX reproduce by a *spiritus (lenis or asper)*, e.g. **יְלִיעָה** *Yel'ah*, **קָלָעָה** *Qala'ah*.⁴ In the mouth of the Arabs one hears in the former case a sort of guttural *r*, in the latter a sound peculiar to themselves formed in the back of the throat.—It is as incorrect to omit the **כ** entirely, in reading and transcribing words (**אֵלִי** *Eli*, **עֲמָלֵךְ** *Amalek*), as to pronounce it exactly like *g* or like a nasal *ng*. The stronger sound might be approximately transcribed by *gh* or '*g*'; but since in Hebrew the softer sound was the more common, it is sufficient to represent it by the sign , as **אַרְבָּע**.

צ is the strongest guttural sound, a deep guttural *ch*, as heard generally in Swiss German, somewhat as in the German *Achat, Macht, Sache, Docht, Zucht* (not as in *Licht, Knecht*), and similar to the Spanish *j*. Like **כ** it was, however, pronounced in many words feebly, in others strongly.

As regards **ר**, its pronunciation as a palatal (with a vibrating uvula) seems to have been the prevailing one. Hence in some respects it is also classed with the gutturals (§ 22 q r). On the *lingual r*, cf. o.

³ Numerous examples occur in *Hieronymi quaestiones hebraicae in libro geneseos*, edited by P. de Lagarde, Lpz. 1868; cf. the exhaustive and systematic discussion by Siegfried, ‘Die Aussprache des Hebr. bei Hieronymus,’ in *ZAW.* 1884, pp. 34–83.

⁴ It is, however, doubtful if the LXX always consciously aimed at reproducing the actual differences of sound.

2. The Hebrew language is unusually rich in sibilants. These have, at any rate in some cases, arisen from dentals which are retained as such in Aramaic and Arabic (see in the *Lexicon*, the letters *ת*, *צ* and *ש*).

שׁ and *שׂ* were originally represented (as is still the case in the unpointed texts) by only *one* form *שׁ*; but that the use of this one form to express two different sounds (at least in Hebrew) was due only to the poverty of the alphabet, is clear from the fact that they are differentiated in Arabic and Ethiopic (cf. Nöldeke in *Ztschr. f. wissensch. Theol.*, 1873, p. 121; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 133). In the Masoretic punctuation they were distinguished by means of the diacritical point as *שׁ* (*sh*) and *שׂ* (*s̄*).¹

The original difference between the sounds *שׁ* and *שׂ* sometimes marks a distinction in meaning, e.g. סַכַּר *to close*, שַׁכָּר *to hire*, שַׁכְלָה *to be foolish*, שַׁכְלָה *to be prudent, to be wise*. Syriac always represents both sounds by *س*, and in Hebrew also they are sometimes interchanged; as שַׁכָּר for *to hire*, *Ezr 4:5*; שַׁכְלוֹת for *folly*, *Ec 1:17*.

צ (transcribed *ζ* by the LXX) is a soft whizzing *s*, the French and English *z*, altogether different from the German *z* (*ts*).

3. *ט*, *ק*, and probably *ג* are pronounced with a strong articulation and with a compression of the larynx. The first two are thus essentially different from *נ* and *ל*, which correspond to our *t* and *k* and also are often aspirated (see below, *n*). *ג* is distinguished from every other *s* by its peculiar articulation, and in no way corresponds to the German *z* or *ts*; we transcribe it by *ȝ*, cf. G. Hüsing, ‘Zum Lautwerte des *ȝ*,’ in *OLZ*. x. 467 ff.

3. Six consonants, the weak and middle hard Palatals, Dentals, and Labials

(בְּגִדְכִּפְתָּה בְּגִדְכִּפְתָּה)

have a twofold pronunciation, (1) a harder sound, as mutes, like *k*, *p*, *t*, or initial *b*, *g* (hard), *d*; and (2) a softer sound as *spirantes*.¹ The harder sound is the original. It is retained at the beginning of syllables, when there is no vowel immediately preceding to influence the pronunciation, and is denoted by a point, *Dagesh lene* (§ 13), placed in the consonants, viz. בְּ *b*, גְּ *g*, דְּ *d*, קְּ *k*, פְּ *p*, תְּ *t*. The weaker pronunciation appears as soon as a vowel sound immediately precedes. It is occasionally denoted, esp. in MSS., by *Rāphè* (§ 14 e), but in printed texts usually by the mere absence of the *Dagesh*. In

Lexicon. *Lexicon* = A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius, by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Britts, Oxford, 1906.

1¹ The modern Samaritans, however, in reading their Hebrew Pentateuch pronounce *שׁ* invariably as *שׂ*.

2² The original value of *שׁ*, and its relation to the original value of *שׂ* and *שׁ*, is still undetermined, despite the valuable investigations of P. Haupt, *ZDMG*. 1880, p. 762 f.; D. H. Müller, ‘Zur Geschichte der semit. Zischlaute,’ in the *Verhandlungen des Wiener Orient. Congresses*, Vienna, 1888, Semitic section, p. 229 ff.; De Lagarde, ‘Samech,’ in the *NGGW*. 1891, no. 5, esp. p. 173; Aug. Müller, *ZAW*. 1891, p. 257 ff.; Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. 1893, p. 100 f.; E. Glaser, *Zwei Wiener Publicationen über Habaschisch-punische Dialekte in Südarabien*, Munich, 1902, pp. 19 ff.—On the phonetic value of *שׁ* see G. Hüsing, *OLZ*. 1907, p. 467 ff.

OLZ. *OLZ*. Orientalistische Literaturzeitung. Vienna, 1898 ff.

1¹ So at any rate at the time when the present punctuation arose.

the case of ב, כ, פ, ת, the two sounds are clearly distinguishable even to our ear as *b* and *v*, *k* and German (weak) *ch*, *p* and *ph*, *t* and *th* (in *thin*). The Greeks too express this twofold pronunciation by special characters: γ κ, ξ χ; φ π, θ φ; τ τ, θ θ. In the same way נ should be pronounced like the North German *g* in *Tage*, *Wagen*, and ר like *th* in *the*, as distinguished from נ and ר.

For more precise information on the cases in which the one or the other pronunciation takes place, see § 21. The modern Jews pronounce the aspirated ב as *v*, the aspirated ת as *s*, e.g. בַּר *rav* (or even *raf*), בִּין *bais*. The customary transcription (used also in this Grammar) of the spirants ב, כ, ת by *bh*, *kh*, *th* is only an unsatisfactory makeshift, since it may lead (esp. in the case of *bh* and *kh*) to an erroneous conception of the sounds as real aspirates, *b-h*, *k-h*.

4. According to their special character the consonants are divided into—

(a) <i>Gutturals</i>	ח ע א;
(b) <i>Palatals</i>	כ ק;
(c) <i>Dentals</i>	ט צ;
(d) <i>Labials</i>	ב פ;
(e) <i>Sibilants</i>	ש צ שׁ צׁ;
(f) <i>Sonants</i>	ג ר נ, ל ו, י.

In the case of ר its hardest pronunciation as a *palatal* (see above, g, end) is to be distinguished from its more unusual sound as a lingual, pronounced in the front of the mouth.

On the twofold pronunciation of *r* in Tiberias, cf. Delitzsch, *Physiol. und Musik*, Lpz. 1868, p. 10 ff.; Baer and Struck, *Dikduke ha-t'amim*, Lpz. 1879, p. 5, note *a*, and § 7 of the Hebrew text, as well as p. 82.

In accordance with E. Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i. 14, the following scheme of the Hebrew phonetic system is substituted for the table formerly given in this grammar:—

i. Throat sounds (Gutturals): א ה ע ח.

ii. Mouth-sounds:	w.	m.	e.	w.	m.
1. Mutes and Spirants:					
Palatal נ	כ	ק	כ	ג	כ
Dental ט	ת	צ	ט	ת	ת
Labial ב	פ	—	ב	פ	פ
2. Sibilants:	ץ צ צׁ צׁ	שׁ שׁ	צ	ץ	שׁ
3. Sonants:	וׁ וׁ וׁ	לׁ לׁ לׁ	נׁ נׁ נׁ	וׁ	לׁ

Rem. 1. The meaning of the letters at the top is, w. = weak, m. = middle hard, e. = emphatic. Consonants which are produced by the same organ of speech are called *homorganic* (e.g. נ and כ as palatals), consonants whose sound is of the same nature *homogeneous* (e.g. ו and ל as semi-vowels). On their homorganic character and homogeneity depends the possibility of interchange, whether within Hebrew itself or with the kindred

dialects. In such cases the soft sound generally interchanges with the soft, the hard with the hard, &c. (e.g. נ = נ, ת = ת, ט = ט). Further transitions are not, however, excluded, as e.g. the interchange of נ and פ (נ = פ = פ). Here it is of importance to observe whether the change takes place in an initial, medial, or final letter; since e.g. the change in a letter when medial does not always prove the possibility of the change when initial. That in certain cases the character of the consonantal sound also influences the preceding or following vowel will be noticed in the accident as the instances occur.

Rem. 2. Very probably in course of time certain nicer distinctions of pronunciation became more and more neglected and finally were lost. Thus e.g. the stronger י 'g, which was known to the LXX (see above, e), became in many cases altogether lost to the later Jews; by the Samaritans and Galileans י and נ were pronounced merely as נ, and so in Ethiopic, י like נ, נ like h, ו like s.

Rem. 3. The consonants which it is usual to describe especially as *weak*, are those which readily coalesce with a preceding vowel to form a long vowel, viz. א, ע, ו (as to נ, cf. § 23 k), or those which are most frequently affected by the changes described in § 19 b-l, as again א, ע, ו, and נ, and in certain cases נ and ל; finally the gutturals and נ for the reason given in § 22 b and 22 q.

§ 7. The Vowels in General, Vowel Letters and Vowel Signs.

1. The original vowels in Hebrew, as in the other Semitic tongues, are *a, i, u. E* and *o* always arise from an obscuring or contraction of these three pure sounds, viz. ē by modification from i or ā; short ö from ū; ê by contraction from ai (properly ay); and ô sometimes by modification (obscuring) from â, sometimes by contraction from au (properly aw).¹

In Arabic writing there are vowel signs only for *a, i, u*; the combined sounds *ay* and *aw* are therefore retained uncontracted and pronounced as diphthongs (*ai* and *au*), e.g. طוֹשׁ Arab. *sauṭ*, and מִיןְעָד Arab. *'ainain*. It was only in later Arabic that they became in pronunciation ê and ô, at least after weaker or softer consonants; cf. بַּיִן Arab. *bain*, בֵּן Arab. *yaum*, יוֹם. The same contraction appears also in other languages, e.g. in Greek and Latin (θαῦμα, Ionic θῶμα; *plastrum* = *polostrum*), in the French pronunciation of *ai* and *au*, and likewise in the German popular dialects (*Oge* for *Auge*, &c.). Similarly, the obscuring of the vowels plays a part in various languages (cf. e.g. the *a* in modern Persian, Swedish, English, &c.).¹

2. The partial expression of the vowels by certain consonants (נ, ע, ו; נ), which sufficed during the lifetime of the language, and for a still longer period afterwards (cf. § 1 k), must in the main have passed through the following stages²:

¹ In proper names the LXX often use the diphthongs αι and αυ where the Hebrew form has ē or ô. It is, however, very doubtful whether the αι and αυ of the LXX really represent the true pronunciation of Hebrew of that time; see the instructive statistics given by Kittel in Haupt's *SBOT.*, on 1 Ch 1:2, 20.

¹ In Sanskrit, in the Old Persian cuneiform, and in Ethiopic, short *a* alone of all the vowels is not represented, but the consonant by itself is pronounced with short *a*.

² Cf. especially Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, p. 34 ff.

(a) The need of a written indication of the vowel first made itself felt in cases where, after the rejection of a consonant, or of an entire syllable, a long vowel formed the final sound of the word. The first step in such a case was to retain the original final consonant, at least as a vowel letter, i. e. merely as an indication of a final vowel. In point of fact we find even in the Old Testament, as already in the *Mêša* inscription, a **נ** employed in this way (see below) as an indication of a final *o*. From this it was only a step to the employment of the same consonant to indicate also other vowels when final (thus, e.g. in the inflection of the verbs **לְלִי**, the vowels *ā*,³ *ē*, *e*). After the employment of **ו** as a vowel letter for *ō* and *ū*, and of **ו** for *ē* and *ī*, had been established (see below, e) these consonants were also employed—although not consistently—for the same vowels at the end of a word.

According to § 91 b and d, the suffix of the 3rd sing. masc. in the noun (as in the verb) was originally pronounced **הַ**. But in the places where this **הַ** with a preceding *a* is contracted into *ō* (after the rejection of the **הַ**), we find the **נ** still frequently retained as a vowel letter, e.g. **סֹתֶה עֵירָה Gn 49:11**, cf. § 91 e; so throughout the *Mêša* inscription **אֶרֶץ הַבַּתְהָרָה** (also **בַּתְהָרָה**), **לְבַתְהָרָה בְּנָה**; on the other hand already in the Siloam inscription **יְמָה גָּעוֹן**⁴ *Mêša*, 1.8 = *יְמָה his days* is unusual, as also 1. 20 if it is for *רָאשָׁיו his chiefs*. The verbal forms with **הַ** suffixed are to be read **לְבַתְהָרָה** (1. 6), **בְּנָה רָשָׁה** (1. 12f.) and **נוֹגֵרָשָׁה** (1. 19).

As an example of the original consonant being retained, we might also include the **ו** of the constr. state plur. masc. if its *ē* (according to § 89 d) is contracted from an original *ay*. Against this, however, it may be urged that the Phoenician inscriptions do not usually express this *ē*, nor any other final vowel.¹

(b) The employment of **ו** to denote *ō*, *ū*, and of **ו** to denote *ē*, *ī*, may have resulted from those cases in which a **ו** with a preceding *a* was contracted into *au* and further to *ō*, or with a preceding *u* coalesced into *ū*, and where **ו** with *a* has been contracted into *ai* and further to *ē*, or with a preceding *i* into *ī* (cf. § 24). In this case the previously existing consonants were retained as vowel letters and were further applied at the end of the word to denote the respective long vowels. Finally **ו** also will in the first instance have established itself as a vowel letter only where a consonantal **ו** with a preceding *a* had coalesced into *ā* or *ā*.

³ According to Stade, the employment of **נ** for *ā* probably took place first in the case of the locative accusatives which originally ended in **הַ**, as **אֶרֶץ הַבְּנָה קָדְשָׁה יְמָה**.

⁴ The form **רָעַ** contradicts the view of Oort, *Theol. Tijds.*, 1902, p. 374, that the above instances from the *Mêša*-inscription are to be read *benhu*, *bahn*, *lahu*, which were afterwards vocalized as *beno*, *bo*, *lo*.

¹ Thus there occurs, e.g. in Melit. 1, l. 3 **שְׁנֵי בָנִים** = **שְׁנֵבָן** *the two sons*; elsewhere for **כִּי** (but in the *Mêša*> and Siloam inscr.), **וְ** for **הַ** (the latter in the Siloam inscr.), **בְּנֵי** = **בְּנָה** (so *Mêša*) or **בְּנִיתִי**, &c. Cf. on the other hand in *Mêša*, **אֲנָכִי** = **אֲנָכָה** (unless it was actually pronounced *anôkh* by the Moabites!). As final *ā* is represented by **נ** and **ו** and final **ī** by **ו**, so final *ū* is almost everywhere expressed by **ו** in *Mêša*, and always in the Siloam inscription. It is indeed not impossible that Hebrew orthography also once passed through a period in which the final vowels were left always or sometimes undenoted, and that not a few strange forms in the present text of the Bible are to be explained from the fact that subsequently the vowel letters (especially **ו** and **ו**) were not added in all cases. So Chwolson, ‘Die Quiescentia **הַיִם** in der althebr. Orthogr.,’ in *Travaux du Congrès ... des Orientalistes*, Petersb. 1876; cf. numerous instances in Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 146 ff.

The orthography of the Siloam inscription corresponds almost exactly with the above assumptions. Here (as in the Mēša inscr.) we find all the long vowels, which have not arisen from original diphthongs, *without* vowel letters, thus שָׁבֵם, חָצֵבְמַן (or מִימָּן); אָמֵת, קָלְשָׁפָר, אָמֵתָא (from *mauṣa*), עֹזֶר (from *aud*); מִימָּן also, if it is to be read אִימָּן, is an instance of the retention of a ' which has coalesced with *i* into ī. Instances of the retention of an originally consonantal נ as a vowel letter are יִם, מַתְּהִים, מַתְּהִים, and קְרָא, as also רָאשִׁי. Otherwise final ā is always represented by ה: נְקֻבָּה, אֲמָה, וְרָה, קְנִיה, אֲמָה. To this מ alone would form an exception (cf. however the note on יּוֹם, § 96), instead of יוֹם (Arab. *yaum*) day, which one would expect. If the reading be correct, this is to be regarded as an argument that a consciousness of the origin of many long vowels was lost at an early period, so that (at least in the middle of the word) the vowel letters were omitted in places where they should stand, according to what has been stated above, and added where there was no case of contraction. This view is in a great measure confirmed by the orthography of the Mēša inscription. There we find, as might be expected, דִּיבָּן (= *Daibōn*, as the Δαιβών of the LXX proves), חָוָרְגָּן (*ô* from *au*), and וְאַשְׁבָּן = פִּתְּהָנִי (*ê* from *ai*), but also even הָוָשְׁעָנִי² instead of הָוָשָׁעָנִי (from *hauš-*), = וְאַשְׁבָּן = פִּתְּהָנִי four times, פִּתְּהָנִי once, for פִּתְּהָנִי (from *bait*); לִילָּה = אַנְּן or אַנְּן or אַנְּן.

(c) In the present state of Old Testament vocalization as it appears in the Masoretic text, the striving after a certain uniformity cannot be mistaken, in spite of the inconsistencies which have crept in. Thus the final long vowel is, with very few exceptions (cf. § 9 d, and the very doubtful cases in § 8 k), indicated by a vowel letter—and almost always by the same letter in certain nominal and verbal endings. In many cases the use of י to mark an ô or û, arising from contraction, and of ' for ê or ī, is by far the more common, while we seldom find an originally consonantal נ rejected, and the simple phonetic principle taking the place of the historical orthography. On the other hand the number of exceptions is very great. In many cases (as e.g. in the plural endings יִם and תִּי) the vowel letters are habitually employed to express long vowels which do not arise through contraction, and we even find short vowels indicated. The conclusion is, that if there ever was a period of Hebrew writing when the application of fixed laws to all cases was intended, either these laws were not consistently carried out in the further transmission of the text, or errors and confusion afterwards crept into it. Moreover much remained uncertain even in texts which were plentifully provided with vowel letters. For, although in most cases the context was a guide to the correct reading, yet there were also cases where, of the many possible ways of pronouncing a word, more than one appeared admissible.¹

3. When the language had died out, the ambiguity of such a writing must have been found continually more troublesome; and as there was thus a danger that the correct pronunciation might be finally lost, the vowel signs or vowel points were invented in order to fix it. By means of these points everything hitherto left uncertain was most accurately settled. It is true that there is no historical account of the date of this vocalization of the O. T. text, yet we may at least infer, from a comparison of other historical facts, that it was gradually developed by Jewish grammarians in the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. under the influence of different Schools, traces of

² הָוָשְׁעָנִי is the more strange since the name of king הָוָשָׁעָנִי is represented as *A-u si* in cuneiform as late as 728 B.C.

¹ Thus e.g. קְטָל can be read *qāṭal*, *qāṭāl*, *qāṭōl*, *q̄ṭōl*, *qōṭēl*, *qīṭēl*, *qāṭṭēl*, *quṭṭēl*, *qēṭēl*, and several of these forms have also different senses.

which have been preserved to the present time in various differences of tradition.² They mainly followed, though with independent regard to the peculiar nature of the Hebrew, the example and pattern of the older Syrian punctuation.¹

See Gesenius, *Gesch. d. hebr. Spr.*, p. 182 ff.; Hupfeld, in *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1830, pt. iii, who shows that neither Jerome nor the Talmud mentions vowel signs; Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm. im Talm. u. Midrasch*, p. 26 ff.; and B. Pick, in *Hebraica*, i. 3, p. 153 ff.; Abr. Geiger, ‘Zur Nakdanim-[Punctuators-]Literatur,’ in *Jüd. Ztschr. für Wissensch. u. Leben*, x. Breslau, 1872, p. 10 ff.; H. Strack, *Prolegomena critica in Vet. Test. Hebr.*, Lips. 1873; ‘ Beitrag zur Gesch. des hebr. Bibeltextes,’ in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1875, p. 736 ff., as also in the *Ztschr. f. die ges. luth. Theol. u. K.*, 1875, p. 619 ff.; ‘Massorah,’ in the *Protest. Real.-Enc.*³, xii. 393 ff. (a good outline); A. Merx, in the *Verhandlungen des Orientalistenkongresses zu Berlin*, i. Berlin, 1881, p. 164 ff. and p. 188 ff.; H. Graetz, ‘Die Anfänge der Vokalzeichen im Hebr.,’ in *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.*, 1881, pp. 348 ff. and 395 ff.; Hersmann, *Zur Gesch. des Streites über die Entstehung der hebr. Punktation*, Ruhrort, 1885; Harris, ‘The Rise ... of the Massorah,’ *JQR*, i. 1889, p. 128 ff. and p. 223 ff.; Mayer-Lambert, *REJ*, xxvi. 1893, p. 274 ff.; J. Bachrach, *Das Alter d. bibl. Vocalisation u. Accentuation*, 2 pts. Warsaw, 1897, and esp. Ginsburg, *Introd.* (see § 3 c), p. 287 ff.; Budde, ‘Zur Gesch. d. Tiberions, Vokalisation,’ in *Orient. Studien zu Ehren Th. Nöldekes*, i. 1906, 651 ff.; Bacher, ‘Diakrit. Zeichen in vormasoret. Zeit,’ in *ZAW*, 1907, p. 285; C. Levias, art. ‘Vocalization,’ in the *Jewish Encycl.*—On the hypothesis of the origin of punctuation in the Jewish schools for children, cf. J. Dérenbourg in the *Rev. Crit.*, xiii. 1879, no. 25.

4. To complete the historical vocalization of the consonantal text a phonetic system was devised, so exact as to show all vowel-changes occasioned by lengthening of words, by the tone, by gutturals, &c., which in other languages are seldom indicated in writing. The pronunciation followed is in the main that of the Palestinian Jews of about the sixth century A.D., as observed in the solemn reading of the sacred writings in synagogue and school, but based on a much older tradition. That the real pronunciation of early Hebrew is consistently preserved by this tradition, has recently been seriously questioned on good grounds, especially in view of the transcription of proper names in the LXX. Nevertheless in many cases, internal reasons, as well as the analogy of the kindred languages, testify in a high degree to the faithfulness of the

² ² The most important of these differences are, (a) those between the Orientals, i. e. the scholars of the Babylonian Schools, and the Occidentals, i. e. the scholars of Palestine (Tiberias, &c.); cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 197 ff.; (b) amongst the Occidentals, between Ben-Naphtali and Ben-Asher, who flourished in the first half of the tenth century at Tiberias; cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 241 ff. Both sets of variants are given by Baer in the appendices to his critical editions. Our printed editions present uniformly the text of Ben-Asher, with the exception of a few isolated readings of Ben-Naphtali, and of numerous later corruptions.

¹ ¹ See Geiger, ‘Massorah bei d. Syrern,’ in *ZDMG*. 1873, p. 148 ff.; J. P. Martin, *Hist. de la ponctuation ou de la Massore chez les Syriens*, Par. 1875; E. Nestle, in *ZDMG*. 1876, p. 525 ff.; Weingarten, *Die syr. Massora nach Bar Hebraeus*, Halle, 1887.

JQR. JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review.

REJ. REJ. = Revue des Études Juives. Paris, 1880 ff.

ZAW. ZAW. = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

tradition. At the same recension of the text, or soon after, the various other signs for reading (§§ 11–14, 16) were added, and the accents (§ 15).

§ 8. *The Vowel Signs in particular.*

P. Haupt, ‘The names of the Hebrew vowels,’ *JAOS*. xxii, and in the *Johns Hopkins Semitic Papers*, Newhaven, 1901, p. 7 ff.; C. Levias in the *Hebr. Union Coll. Annual*, Cincinnati, 1904, p. 138 ff.

Preliminary Remark.

The next two sections (§§ 8 and 9) have been severely criticized (Philippi, *ThLZ*. 1897, no. 2) for assigning a definite quantity to each of the several vowels, whereas in reality ֤, ֥, ֦ are merely signs for *a*, *e*, *o*: ‘whether these are long or short is not shown by the signs themselves but must be inferred from the rules for the pause which marks the breaks in continuous narrative, or from other circumstances.’ But in the twenty-fourth and subsequent German editions of this Grammar, in the last note on § 8 a [English ed. p. 38, note 4], it was stated: ‘it must be mentioned that the Masoretes are not concerned with any distinction between long and short vowels, or in general with any question of quantity. Their efforts are directed to fixing the received pronunciation as faithfully as possible, by means of writing. For a long time only שבעה מלכים seven kings were reckoned (*vox memor.* in Elias Levita ראי אלייער), *Sureq* and *Qibbuṣ* being counted as one vowel. The division of the vowels in respect of quantity is a later attempt at a scientific conception of the phonetic system, which was not invented but only represented by the Masoretes (Qimchi; *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenb. 136 a, distinguishes the five long as *mothers* from their five daughters).’

I have therefore long shared the opinion that ‘the vowel-system represented by the ordinary punctuation (of Tiberias) was primarily intended to mark only differences of quality’ (Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i. 17). There is, however, of course a further question how far these ‘later’ grammarians were mistaken in assigning a particular quantity to the vowels represented by particular signs. In Philippi’s opinion they were mistaken (excluding of course *i*, *ē*, *ō* when written *plene*) in a very great number of cases, since not only does ֤ stand, according to circumstances, for *ā* or *ă*, and ֥ for *ā̄* or *ă̄*, but also ֦ for *ē* or *ĕ*, and ֨ for *ō* or *ŏ*, e.g. קָבֵד and קָבְדָּה, out of pause *kābēd*, *qābōn* (form לִפְנֵי), but in pause *kābēd*, *qābōn*.

I readily admit, with regard to *Qameṣ* and *Səgol*, that the account formerly given in § 8 f. was open to misconstruction. With regard to *Sere* and *Holem*, however, I can only follow Philippi so long as his view does not conflict with the (to me inviolable) law of a long vowel in an open syllable before the tone and (except *Pathah*) in a final syllable with the tone. To me קָבֵד = *kābēd*, &c., is as impossible as e.g. עֲנָב = *ēnab* or בָּרָךְ = *bōrakh*, in spite of the analogy cited by Sievers (p. 18, note 1) that ‘in old German e.g. original *i* and *ü* often pass into *ē* and *ō* dialectically, while remaining in a closed syllable.

1. The full vowels (in contrast to the half-vowels or vowel trills, § 10 a–f), classified according to the three principal vowel sounds (§ 7 a), are as follows:—

First Class. A-sound.

A 1. ¹ *Qāmēṣ* denotes either *ā*, *â*, more strictly *å* (the obscure Swedish *å*) and *å*² as *רָאשִׁים* *rā’šim* (heads), or *å* (in future transcribed as *ō*), called *Qāmeṣ ḥāṭiph*, i. e. hurried Qameṣ. The latter occurs almost exclusively as a modification of *ū*; cf. c and § 9 u.

2. *Pathāḥ*, *ă*, *בָת* *bāth* (daughter).

Also 3. *S̄gōl*, an open *e*, *è* (*ă* or *ă*), as a modification of *ă*,¹ either in an untoned closed syllable, as in the first syllable of *מַדְקָה* *yādkhēm* (your hand) from *yādhēm*—or in a tone-syllable as in *סֵפֶר* *pēsaḥ*; cf. πάσχα, and on the really monosyllabic character of such formations, see § 28 e. But *S̄gōl* in an open tone-syllable with a following *,* as in *גָלֵןָה* *ḡlēnā* (cf. § 75 f), *יְדָקָה* *yādēkhā* (cf. § 91 i), is due to contraction from *ay*.

Second Class. I- and E-sounds.

- I* 1. *חִרְeq* with *yod*, almost always *i*, as *צָדִיק* *saddiq* (righteous).
2. *either i* (see below, i), as *צָדִיקִים* *saddiqim*, only orthographically different from *צָדִיקָם* (*צדיקם*),—or *i*, as *צָדָקָה* *sādqō* (his righteousness).
3. *שִׁרְ* or *שֵׁרֶה* with *yod=ē*, e.g. *בֵּיתָה* *bēthō* (his house).
- E* *either ē*, but rarely (see below, i), or *ē* as *שֵׁם* *shēm* (name).

¹ In early MSS. the sign for Qameṣ is a stroke with a point underneath, i.e. according to Nestle's discovery (*ZDMG*. 1892, p. 411 f.), Patha with *Holem*, the latter suggesting the obscure pronunciation of *Qameṣ* as *å*. Cf. also Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 609.

² Instead of the no doubt more accurate transcription *å* \square , *å* \square we have retained *ā*, *â* in this grammar, as being typographically simpler and not liable to any misunderstanding. For *Qameṣ ḥāṭiph*, in the previous German edition expressed by *å* \square , we have, after careful consideration, returned to *ō*. The use of the same sign *å* for *å* \square (*å* \square) and *å* \square , shows that the Massoretes did not intend to draw a sharp distinction between them. We must not, however, regard the Jewish grammarians as making a merely idle distinction between *Qāmeṣ rāḥāh*, or broad Qameṣ, and *Qāmeṣ hatūph*, or light Qameṣ. It is quite impossible that in the living language an *ā* lengthened from *ă*, as in *dābār*, should have been indistinguishable from e.g. the last vowel in *בִּשְׁבִּין* or the first in *מִשְׁבִּין*.—The notation *ā*, *ē*, *ō* expresses here the vowels essentially long, either naturally or by contraction; the notation *ă*, *ē*, *ō* those lengthened only by the tone, and therefore changeable; *ă*, *ē*, *ō* the short vowels. As regards the others, the distinction into *i* and *ī*, *ū* and *ū* is sufficient; see § 9.—The mark \square stands in the following pages over the tone-syllable, whenever this is not the last, as is usual, but the penultimate syllable of the word, e.g. *בְּשִׁבְעָה*.

¹ These *S̄gōls*, modified from *ă*, are very frequent in the language. The Babylonian punctuation (see § 8 g, note 3) has only one sign for it and tone-bearing Pathah.; see also Gaster, 'Die Unterschiedslosigkeit zwischen Pathach u. Segol,' in *ZAW*. 1894, p. 60 ff.

Sere can only be ē, in my opinion, in few cases, such as those mentioned in § 29 f.

4. - *S^egōl*, ā, a modification of ī, e.g. חָפְצִי *ḥāfṣi* (ground-form *ḥifṣ*); - וָשֵׁן *šān* (ground-form *šiñ*).

Third Class. U- and O-sounds.

1. וָשַׁׁרְעֵיֶךְ, usually ī, מות *mūth* (to die), rarely ū.
 - U* 2. - *Qibbūṣ*, either ū, e.g. סָלָם *sullām* (ladder): or ī, e.g. קָמַע *qūmā* (rise up), instead of the usual קָמַע.
 3. וְ and וְ - *Hōlēm*, ô and ə, קֹל *qōl* (voice), בָּרְבָּה *rōbh* (multitude). Often also a defective וְ for ô; rarely וְ for ə.
- O* On the question whether וְ under some circumstances represents ô, see § 93 r.
4. - On *Qāmēṣ hāṭiph=ō*, generally modified from ū, as חָקָק *ḥoq* (statute), see above, a.

The names of the vowels are mostly taken from the form and action of the mouth in producing the various sounds, as תְּחִנָּה *ṭchinah* opening; צְרִקָּה *ṭrīqah* a wide parting (of the mouth), also בְּרִקָּה (=i) breaking, parting (cf. the Arab. *kasr*); קְרִקָּה (also *ḥarq*) narrow opening; מְזֻלָּם *mezulam* closing, according to others fullness, i.e. of the mouth (also פְּוָם *pōm*¹ fullness of the mouth). צְמָקָה² also denotes a slighter, as קְבּוּץ *qubuz* and שְׂגָבָה *segabah* (also פְּוָם *pōm*) a firmer, compression or contraction of the mouth. *S^egōl* (סָגָול bunch of grapes) takes its name from its form. So שְׁלִשָּׁה *shelishah* (three points) is another name for *Qibbūṣ*.

Moreover the names were mostly so formed (but only later), that the sound of each vowel is heard in the first syllable (צְרִקָּה for צְרִקָּה, קְרִקָּה for קְרִקָּה, אֲרִקָּה for אֲרִקָּה); in order to carry this out consistently some even write *Sāgōl*, *Qomeṣ-hatiph*, *Qubbūṣ*.

2. As the above examples show, the vowel sign stands regularly *under* the consonant, *after* which it is to be pronounced, רָא *rā*, רָה *rā*, רָה *rē*, רָה *rū*, &c. The *Pathah* called *furtivum* (§ 22 f) alone forms an exception to this rule, being pronounced *before* the consonant, רָה *rū^aḥ* (wind, spirit). The *Hōlēm* (without wāw) stands on the left above the consonant; בָּרְבָּה *rōbh* (but בְּרָבָה = *lōbh*). If נְ, as a vowel letter, follows a consonant which is to be pronounced with ô, the point is placed over its right arm, thus אֲבָה, אֲבָה; but e.g. אֲבָה, since נ here begins a syllable.

¹ On the erroneous use of the term *melo pum*, only in Germany, for šūreq (hence also pronounced *melu pum* to indicate ī), see E. Nestle, *ZDMG*. 1904, p. 597 ff.; Bacher, *ibid.*, p. 799 ff., *Melopum*; Simonsen, *ibid.*, p. 807 ff.

² The usual spelling צְמָקָה and תְּחִנָּה takes the words certainly rightly as Hebrew substantives; according to De Lagarde (*Gött. gel. Anz.* 1886, p. 873, and so previously Luzzatto), צְמָקָה and תְּחִנָּה are rather Aram. participles, like *Dagesh*, &c., and consequently to be transliterated *Qaṣmēṣ* and *Pāthah*.

No dot is used for the Holem when *ō* (of course without *wāw*) is pronounced after *sn* or before *šīn*. Hence אַשׁ *sónē* (hating), אֲשָׁר *n̄'sō* (to bear), הַשְׁמֵד *mōs̄ē* (not הַשְׁמֵד); but שָׁמֵר *sh̄omēr* (a watchman). When *ō* precedes the *śin*, the dot is placed over its right arm, e.g. יִרְפֹּס *yirpōs* (he treads with the feet), אַיִם *hannōs̄eim* (those who carry).

In the sign *i*, the *i* may also be a consonant. The *i* is then either to be read *ōw* (necessarily so when a consonant otherwise without a vowel precedes, e.g. הַלְּ *lōwē*, lending) or *wō*, when a vowel already precedes the *i*, e.g. אַוָּן *awōn* (iniquity) for אַוָּן. In more exact printing, a distinction is at least made between *i wo* and *i* (i.e. either *ō* or, when another vowel follows the *wāw*, *ōw*³).

3

³ Since 1846 we have become acquainted with a system of vocalization different in many respects from the common method. The vowel signs, all except *i*, are there placed *above* the consonants, and differ almost throughout in form, and some even as regards the sound which they denote: tone-bearing *ă* and *î* in an unsharpened syllable toneless *ă* and *è*, and also *Haṭeph Pathah*; toneless *ě* and *Haṭeph S^eghôl*; and *Haṭeph Qameṣ*. Lastly in toneless syllables before *Dageš*, the accents differ less and stand in some cases under the line of the consonants. Besides this complicated system of the Codex Babylonicus (see below) and other MSS., there is a simpler one, used in Targums. It is still uncertain whether the latter is the foundation of the former (as Merx, *Chrest. Targ.* xi, and Bacher, *ZDMG*. 1895, p. 15 ff.), or is a later development of it among the Jews of South Arabia (as Praetorius, *ZDMG*. 1899, p. 181 ff.). For the older literature on this *Babylonian punctuation* (*קיד בבלין*), as it is called, see A. Harkavy and H. L. Strack, *Katalog der hebr. Bibelhandschr. der Kaiserl. öffentl. Bibliothek zu St. Petersb.*, St. Petersb. and Lpz., 1875, parts i and ii, p. 223 ff. A more thorough study of the system was made possible by H. Strack's facsimile edition of the *Prophetarum posteriorum codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (St. Petersb., 1876, la. fol.) of the year 916, which Firkowitsch discovered in 1839, in the synagogue at Tschufutkale in the Crimea. The MS. has been shown by Ginsburg (*Recueil des travaux rédigés en mémoire ... de Chwolson*, Berlin, 1899, p. 149, and *Introd.*, pp. 216 ff., 475 f.) to contain a recension of the Biblical text partly Babylonian and partly Palestinian; cf. also Barnstein, *The Targum of Onkelos to Genesis*, London, 1896, p. 6 f. Strack edited a fragment of it in *Hosea et Joel prophetae ad fidem cod. Babylon. Petrop.*, St. Petersb. 1875. Cf. also the publication by A. Merx, quoted above, § 7 h, and his *Chrestomathia Targumica*, Berlin, 1888; G. Margoliouth, in the *PSBA*. xv. 4, and M. Gaster, *ibid.*; P. Kahle, *Der masoret. Text des A. T. nach d. Überlief. der babyl. Juden*, Lpz. 1902, with the valuable review by Rahlfs in *GGA*. 1903, no. 5; Nestle, *ZDMG*. 1905, p. 719 (Babylonian v. According to the opinion formerly prevailing, this Babylonian punctuation exhibits the system which was developed in the Eastern schools, corresponding to and contemporaneous with the Western or Tiberian system, although a higher degree of originality, or approximation to the original of both systems of punctuation, was generally conceded to the latter. Recently, however, Wickes, *Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, Oxford, 1887, p. 142 ff, has endeavoured to show, from the accents, that the 'Babylonian' punctuation may certainly be *an* Oriental, but is by no means *the* Oriental system. It is rather to be regarded, according to him, as a later and not altogether successful attempt to modify, and thus to simplify, the system common to all the Schools in the East and West. Strack, *Wiss. Jahresb. der ZDMG*. 1879, p. 124, established the probability that the

3. The vowels of the first class are, with the exception of 'ָ' in the middle and הָ, אָ, הָ at the end of the word (§ 9 a-d, f), represented *only* by vowel signs, but the long vowels of the I- and U-class largely by vowel letters. The vowel sound to which the letter points is determined more precisely by the vowel sign standing before, above, or within it. Thus—

' may be combined with *Hirèq*, *Sérê*, *S'gôl* (ָ, ֵ, ֶ).

ׁ with *Šûrèq* and *Hôlém* (ׁ andׁ).¹

In Arabic the long *a* also is regularly expressed by a vowel letter, viz. *'Aléph* (אָ), so that in that language three vowel letters correspond to the three vowel classes. In Hebrew אָ is rarely used as a vowel letter; see § 9 b and § 23 g.

4. The omission of the vowel letters when writing *i*, *î*, *e*, *ô* is called *scriptio defectiva* in contrast to *scriptio plena*. קְוִיל, קְוִיּוֹת are written *plene*, קְלַח, קְמַט *defective*.

Cf. Bardowitz, *Studien zur Gesch. der Orthogr. im Althebr.*, 1894; Lidzbarski, *Ephem.*, i. 182, 275; Marmorstein, 'Midrasch der vollen u. defekt. Schreibung,' in *ZAW*, 1907, p. 33 ff.

So far as the choice of the full or defective mode of writing is concerned, there are certainly some cases in which only the one or the other is admissible. Thus the full form is necessary at the end of the word, for *û*, *ô*, *ô*, *i*, *î*, *e*, *ê*, as well as for *e* in הָ &c. (§ 9 f), also generally with *â*, *â* (cf. however § 9 d), e.g. קָלָב, קָלָבְּנִי, קָלָבְּנִי. (But the Masora requires in Jer 26:6, 44:8; Ezr 6:21; 2 Ch 32:13 גָוִי instead of Zp 2:9 גָוִי; [perhaps an error due to the followingׁ] for גָוִי; Is 40:31 קָרְבָּן [followed byׁ] for קָרְבָּן; Jer 38:11 בָלָוי for בָלָוי.) On the other hand the defective writing is common when the letter, which would have to be employed as a vowel letter, immediately precedes as a strong consonant, e.g. גּוֹיִם (*nations*) for גּוֹיִם, מְצֻוֹת (*commandments*) for מְצֻוֹת.

That much is here arbitrary (see § 7 g), follows from the fact that sometimes the same word is written very differently, e.g. Ez 16:60: קְרִימָהָתִי and also קְרִימָהָתִי Jer 23:4; cf. § 25 b. Only it may be observed,

vowels of the superlinear punctuation arose under *Arab* influence from the vowel letters אֵי (so previously Pinsker and Graetz), while the Tiberian system shows *Syrian* influence.

A third, widely different system (Palestinian), probably the basis of the other two, is described by A. Neubauer, *JQR*. vii. 1895, p. 361 ff., and Friedländer, *ibid.*, p. 564 ff., and *PSBA*. 1896, p. 86 ff.; C. Levias, *Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Lit.*, xv. p. 157 ff.; and esp. P. Kahle, *Beitr. zu der Gesch. der hebr. Punktation*, in *ZAW*. 1901, p. 273 ff. and in *Der masoret. Text des A. T.* (see above), chiefly dealing with the Berlin MS. Or. qu. 680, which contains a number of variants on the biblical text, and frequently agrees with the transcriptions of the LXX and Jerome.

¹ After the example of the Jewish grammarians the expression, 'the vowel letter rests (*quiesces*) in the vowel-sign,' has become customary. On the other hand, the vowel letters are also called by the grammarians, *matres lectionis* or *supports (fulcra)*.

(a) That the scriptio plena in two successive syllables was generally avoided; cf. e.g. **נְבִיא**, but נְבָאִים; **צְדִיק**, but **צְדִיקִים**; **קְלֹות**, **קְוָלָה**; **נְהֹשָׁעַ**.

(b) That in the later Books of the O. T. (and regularly in post-biblical Hebrew) the full form, in the earlier the defective, is more usual.

5. In the cognate dialects, when a vowel precedes a vowel-letter which is not kindred (heterogeneous), e.g. **וָיַּה**, **וָיַּר**, **וָיַּזְבֵּן**, **וָיַּזְבֵּן**, a diphthong (*au*, *ai*)² is formed if the heterogeneous vowel be *a*. This is also to be regarded as the Old Hebrew pronunciation, since it agrees with the vocalic character of **וָ** and **וְ** (§ 5 b, note 2). Thus such words as **וָיַּהֲבֵּךְ**, **וָיַּהֲבֵּךְ**, **וָעַשְׂתֵּי**, **וָעַשְׂתֵּי**, **וָחַיְתִּי**, **וָחַיְתִּי** are not to be pronounced according to the usual Jewish custom¹ as *vāv*, *hay*, *gōy*, *āsūy*, *gēv*, *bayith* (or even as *vaf*, &c.; cf. modern Greek *av af*, *ev ef* for *aū*, *eū*), but with the Italian Jews more like *wāu*, *hai*, &c. The sound of **וָיַּהֲבֵּךְ** is the same as **וָיַּהֲבֵּךְ**, i.e. almost like *āu*, so that **וָיַּהֲבֵּךְ** is often written defectively for **וָיַּהֲבֵּךְ**.

§ 9. Character of the several Vowels.

Numerous as are the vowel signs in Hebrew writing, they are yet not fully adequate to express all the various modifications of the vowel sounds, especially with respect to length and shortness. To understand this better a short explanation of the character and value of the several vowels is required, especially in regard to their length and shortness as well as to their changeableness (§§ 25, 27).

First Class. A-sound.

1. *Qameṣ*(**ָ**), when it represents a long *a*, is, by nature and origin, of two kinds:—

(1) The essentially long *ā* (in Arabic regularly written **ܰ**), which is not readily shortened and never wholly dropped (§ 25 c), e.g. **כְּתָבָה** *kethābh* (writing); very seldom with a following **א**, as **שְׁאָלָה** 2 S 12:1, 4 (see the examples in § 72 p).²

The writing of **מְאָרָק** Ho 10:14 for **מְאָרָק** would only be justifiable, if the *ā* of this form were to be explained as a contraction of *āā* cf. however § 72 a; **מְאָרָק** Neh 13:16 for **מְאָרָק** (*dāg*) is certainly incorrect.—The rarity of the *ā* in Hebrew arises from the fact that it has for the most part become an obtuse *ō*; see below, q.

(2) *ā*, lengthened only by position (i.e. tone-long or at all events lengthened under the influence of the tone, according to the laws for the formation of syllables, § 27 e–h), either in the tone-syllable itself (or in the secondary tone-syllable indicated by *Méthég*, see below), or just before or after it. This sound is invariably lengthened from an original *ă*,³ and is found in open syllables, i.e. syllables ending in a vowel (§ 26 b),

² Cf. T. C. Foote, *The diphthong ai in Hebrew* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars, June, 1903, p. 70 ff.).

¹ In MSS. **וָ** and **וְ**, in such combinations as **וָיַּהֲבֵּךְ**, **וְחַיְתִּי**, are even marked with **מְappi** (§ 14 a).

² Of a different kind are the cases in which **א** has lost its consonantal sound by coalescing with a preceding *a*, *a* § 23 a–d.

³ In Arabic this *ă* is always retained in an open syllable.

e.g. לְקָטֶל, קָטַל (Arab. *lākā*, *qātālā*, *yāqūmū*, *ăsīrū*), as well as in closed syllables, i.e. those ending in a consonant, as כּוֹכֵב (vulgar Arab. *yād*, *kaukāb*). In a closed syllable, however, it can only stand when this has the tone, רָכֶב, עֲזָל; whereas in an open syllable it is especially frequent *before* the tone, e.g. לְבָם, קָבָן, קָבֶר. Where the tone is moved forward or weakened (as happens most commonly in what is called the construct state of nouns, cf. § 89 a) the original short ā (*Pathah*) is retained in a closed syllable, while in an open syllable it becomes Še'wa (§ 27 i): כְּבָשׂ, constr. state סְבָשׂ (h̄ekhām); קְבָר, קְבָר (d̄bhār); קְטָל, קְטָל. For examples of the retention, in the secondary tone-syllable, of ā lengthened from ā, see § 93 xx.

In some terminations of the verb (אַ in the 2nd sing. masc. perf., אַיִל in the 2nd pl. fem. of the imperat., as well as in the 3rd and 2nd pl. fem. of the imperf.), in אַתָּךְ thou (masc.) and in the suffixes אַ and אַיִל, the final ā can stand even without a vowel letter. A הַ is, however, in these cases (except with אַ) frequently added as a vowel letter.

On אַ for ɔ̄ see below, f.

2. *Pathah*, or short ā, stands in Hebrew almost exclusively in a closed syllable with or without the tone (רָקֶב, עֲזָל). In places where it now appears to stand in an open syllable the syllable was originally closed, and a helping vowel (ā, i) has been inserted after the second radical merely to make the pronunciation easier, e.g. נְחָל (ground-form *nah̄l*), יְנָהֵט (Arab. *bait*), see § 28 d, and with regard to two cases of a different kind, § 25 g, h. Otherwise ā in an open syllable has almost without exception passed into ā (אַ), see above, c.

On the very frequent attenuation of ā to i, cf. below, h. On the rare, and only apparent union of *Pathah* with אַ (אַיִל), see § 23 d, end. On ā as a helping-vowel, § 22 f (*Pathah furtivum*), and § 28 e.

3. S^egôl (ě, è [ã]) by origin belongs sometimes to the second, but most frequently to the first vowel class (§ 27 o, p, u). It belongs to the first class when it is a modification of a (as the Germ. *Bad*, pl. *Büder*; Eng. *man*, pl. *men*), either in a toneless syllable, e.g. יְדָה (for *yadkhēm*), or with the tone, e.g. יְהָא from 'arṣ, קְדוּשָׁה (Arab. *qārn*, حَنْدَة) Arab. *qām̄h*. This S^egôl is often retained even in the strongest tone-syllable, at the end of a sentence or of an important clause (in pause), as לְאַמְלָאֵךְ, אַמְלָאֵךְ (mālākh, sādāq). As a rule, however, in such cases the *Pathah* which underlies the S^egôl is lengthened into *Qumeš*, e.g. יְהָא, יְהָא, קְדוּשָׁה. A S^egôl apparently lengthened from Še'wa, but in reality traceable to an original ā, stands in pausal forms, as פְּרִי (ground-form *pāry*), יְהִי (yāhy), &c. On the cases where a ' (originally consonantal) follows this S^egôl, see § 75 f, and § 91 k.

Second Class. I- and E-sounds.

4. The long ī is frequently even in the consonantal writing indicated by ' (a fully written *Hireq*, אַ); but a naturally long ī can be also written *defectively* (§ 8 i), e.g. צְדִיק, plur. צְדִיקִים; שְׁדִיק, plur. שְׁדִיקִים. Whether a *defectively*

written *Hireq* is long may be best known from the origin of the form; often also from the nature of the syllable (§ 26), or as in רָאָה from the *Metheg* attached to it (§ 16 f).

5. The *short Hireq* (always¹ written *defectively*) is especially frequent in sharpened syllables (קְפִילָה) and in toneless closed syllables (מִזְמֹרָה *psalm*); cf. however יַיְשָׁבָה in a closed tone-syllable, and even בְּנֵי פָּנָה, with a helping S^egôl, for *wayyiphn*. It has arisen very frequently by attenuation from ā, as in קְבָרִי from original *dābārē*, (ground-form *sādq*),² or else it is the original i, which in the tone-syllable had become ē, as in אֶלְקָנָה (*thy enemy*) from אֶלְכָּבָה (ground-form *'āyib*).³ It is sometimes a simple helping vowel, as in תְּהִתְּבָּא, § 28 e.

The earlier grammarians call every *Hireq* written *fully*, *Hireq magnum*; every one written *defectively*, *Hireq parvum*,—a misleading distinction, so far as quantity is concerned.

6. The longest ē (more rarely defective), e.g. עֲנֵי for Is 3:8; at the end of a word also טָן) is as a rule contracted from 'ay (ai), § 7 a, e.g. הַיְכָל (*palace*), Arab. and Syriac *haikal*.

7. The *Sere* without Yôdh mostly represents the tone-long ē, which, like the tone-long ā (see c), is very rarely retained except *in* and *before* the tone-syllable, and is always lengthened from an original i. It stands in an open syllable with or before the tone, e.g. סִפְרָה (ground-form *sîphr*) *book*, סִנְאָת (Arab. *siñāt*) *sleep*, or with Metheg (see § 16 d, f) in the secondary tone-syllable, e.g. לְתִי, אֱשָׁף *my request*, בְּלַכְה *let us go*. On the other hand in a closed syllable it is almost always with the tone, as בָּן *son*, אַלְמָם *dumb*.

Exceptions: (a) ē is sometimes retained in a toneless closed syllable, in monosyllabic words before Maqqeph, e.g. נְעָרָה Nu 35:18, as well as in the examples of *nāsōg* 'āḥōr mentioned in § 29 f (on the quantity cf. § 8 b 3 end); (b) in a toneless open final syllable, Sere likewise occurs in examples of the *nāsōg* 'āḥōr, as אֱצָב Ex 16:29; cf. Ju 9:39.

8. The S^egôl of the I(E)-class is most frequently an ē modified from original i, either replacing a tone-long ē which has lost the tone, e.g. תְּרִךְ from תְּרִיךְ (*give*), יְאַרְךְ (thy *creator*) from יְאַרְךְ, or in the case discussed in § 93 o, שְׂרִירָה, שְׂרִירָה from the ground-forms *hilq*, *izr*; cf. also § 64 f. S^egôl appears as a simple helping-vowel in cases such as סִפְרָה for *siphrah*, גַּלְגָּל for *yigl* (§ 28 e).

Third Class. U- and O-sounds.

9. For the U-sound there is—

1¹ At least according to the Masoretic orthography; cf. Wellhausen, *Text der Bb. Sam.*, p. 18, Rem.

2² Jerome (cf. Siegfried, ZAW. 1884, p. 77) in these cases often gives ā for i.

3³ Cf. the remarks of I. Guidi, 'La pronuncia del sérē,' in the Verhandl. des Hamburger Orient.-Kongr. of 1902, Leiden, 1904, p. 208 ff., on Italian e for Latin i, as in *fede* = fi dem, *pece* = pi cem.

(1) the *long ū*, either (a) written fully, י Šureq, e.g. גְבוֹל (boundary), or (b) defectively written צ Qibbûṣ, גְבּוֹן;

(2) the short *ū*, mostly represented by *Qibbûṣ*, in a toneless closed syllable and especially common in a sharpened syllable, in e.g. שְׁלֹחַ (table), סְכָה (booth).

Sometimes also *ū* in a sharpened syllable is written י, e.g. הָקֵה Ps 102:5, יְלִד Jb 5:7, כּוֹלֶם Jer. 31:34, עֲרוֹמִים מְשׂוּפָתוֹ Is 5:5, עֲרֹמִים Gn 2:25 for הָקֵה, &c.

For this *u* the LXX write *o*, e.g. ψυχή Ὁδολλάμ, from which, however, it only follows, that this *ū* was pronounced somewhat indistinctly. The LXX also express the sharp *Hireq* by ε, e.g. Ἄρ=Ἐμμήρ. The pronunciation of the *Qibbûṣ* like the German *ü*, which was formerly common, is incorrect, although the occasional pronunciation of the U-sounds as *ü* in the time of the punctators is attested, at least as regards Palestine¹; cf. the Turkish *buülbuül* for the Persian *bulbul*, and the pronunciation of the Arabic *dunyā* in Syria as *dünyā*.

10. The O-sound bears the same relation to U as the E does to I in the second class. It has four varieties:—

(1) The *ô* which is contracted from *aw* (=au), § 7 a, and accordingly is mostly written fully; י (*Holem plenum*), e.g. טֹשׁ (a whip), Arab. *sauṭ* (iniquity) from עֲנוּת. More rarely *defectively*, as בְּשָׂרֶב (thine ox) from שָׂוֹר Arab. *taur*.

(2) The long *ô* which arose in Hebrew at an early period, by a general process of obscuring, out of an original *â*,² while the latter has been retained in Arabic and Aramaic. It is usually written *fully* in the tone-syllable, *defectively* in the toneless, e.g. קְטַל Arab. *qâṭil*. Aram. *qâṭel*, אֲלֹהָה Arab. 'iâhâ, Aram. *lâh, plur. שְׁוֹקָה Aram. *sâq*; גְּבּוֹר (hero), Arab. *gâbbâr*; הְזִתָּם (seal), Arab. *ħâtâm*; רְמִזָּן (pomegranate), Arab. *rûmmân*; שְׁלֹטָן (dominion), Aram. *šâlîn* and שְׁלֹטָה Arab. *sûltân*; שְׁלוֹם (peace), Aram. סְלָמָה, Arab. *sâlâm*. Sometimes the form in *â* also occurs side by side with that in *ô* as שְׁרִין and שְׁרִיּוֹן (coat of mail; see however § 29 u). Cf. also § 68 b.

(3) The tone-long *ô* which is lengthened from an original *ū*, or from an *ô* arising from *ū*, by the tone, or in general according to the laws for the formation of syllables. It occurs not only in the tone-syllable, but also in an open syllable before the tone, e.g. שְׁקָד (ground-form *qud'*) *sanctuary*; בְּנֵךְ Ps 104:28, as well as (with *Metheg*) in the secondary tone-syllable; אֲלִילִם, פְּעָלוֹת, אֲלִילִים, פְּעָלוֹת. But the original *ô* (*ū*) is retained in a toneless closed syllable, whereas in a toneless open syllable it is weakened to *S̄wâ*. Cf. לְכָל (koל), يְקֻלָּם (kullâm); יְקֻלָּה and يְקֻלָּה, where original *ū* is weakened to *S̄wâ*: *yiq̄lū*, Arab. *yaqtūlū*. This tone-long *ô* is only as an exception written fully.

(4) צ *Qameṣ-hatuph* represents *ô* (properly *â*, cf. § 8 a, note 2) modified from *ū* and is therefore classed here. It stands in the same relation to *Holem* as the *S̄gôl* of the second class to *Sere*, כְּלִיל *kôl*, וְיִקְרָא *wayyâqôm*. On the distinction between this and *Qameṣ*, see below, u.

1 Cf. Delitzsch, *Physiologie u. Musik*, Lpz. 1868, p. 15 f.

2 Cf. above, b, end. On Jerome's transliteration of *o* for *â*, see *ZAW*. 1884, p. 75.

11. The following table gives a summary of the gradation of the three vowel-classes according to the quantity of the vowels:—

<i>First Class: A.</i>	<i>Second Class: I and E.</i>	<i>Third Class: U and O.</i>
original \bar{a} (Arabic \aleph).	\bar{e} , from original <i>ay</i> (<i>ai</i>). \bar{e} or \bar{e} long \bar{i} .	\bar{o} , from original <i>aw</i> (<i>au</i>). \bar{o} obscured from \bar{a} .
\bar{a} tone-long \bar{a} (from original \bar{a}) chiefly in the tone-syllable but also just before it.	\bar{e} tone-long \bar{e} (from i generally in the tone-syllable but also just before it).	\bar{o} tone-long \bar{o} (from original \bar{u} in the tone-syllable, otherwise in an open syllable).
\bar{a} (as a modification of \bar{a}) sometimes a tone-long \bar{e} , sometime \bar{e}	\bar{e} short i	\bar{o} , modified from \bar{u}
\bar{a} short \bar{a}	Utmost weakening to \bar{a} , \bar{e} , or \bar{e} .	short \bar{u} , especially in a sharpened syllable.
\bar{a} attenuated from \bar{a} ; see h .		Utmost weakening to \bar{a} , \bar{e} , \bar{o} , or \bar{e} .
Utmost weakening to \bar{a} , \bar{e} , \bar{e} .		

Rem. *On the distinction between Qameṣ and Qameṣ-hatuph.*¹

According to § 8 a, long \bar{a} or \bar{a}° (*Qameṣ*) and short \bar{o} or \bar{o}° (*Qameṣ-hatuph*) are in manuscripts and printed texts generally expressed by the same sign (ָ), e.g. $קָם$, $כָּל$. The beginner who does not yet know the grammatical origin of the words in question (which is of course the surest guide), may depend meanwhile on the following principal rules:—

1. *The sign ָ¹ is ḍ in a toneless closed syllable*, since such a syllable can have only a short vowel (§ 26 o). The above case occurs—

(a) When $\check{S}wā$ follows as a syllable-divider, as in $חִכְּבָה$ $hōkh-má$ (wisdom), $אַכְּלָה$ $’ōkh-lá$ (food). With *Metheg* ָ is \bar{a} (\bar{a}°) and according to the usual view stands in an open syllable with a following $\check{S}wā$ mobile, e.g. $אַקְּרָה$ $’ā-kh’lā$ (she ate); but cf. § 16 i.

¹ These statements, in order to be fully understood, must be studied in connexion with the theory of syllables (§ 26) and *Metheg* (§ 16 c–i).

¹ In the Babylonian punctuation (§ 8 g, note) \bar{a} and \bar{o} are carefully distinguished. So also in many MSS with the ordinary punctuation and in Baer’s editions of the text since 1880, in which ָ is used for \bar{o} as well as for ּ. Cf. Baer-Delitzsch, *Liber Jobi*, p. 43. But the identity of the two signs is certainly original, and the use of ָ for ּ is misleading.

(b) When a closed syllable is formed by *Dageš forte*, e.g. הָנַנְנִי *hōnnēni* (have mercy upon me); but מֵתָם (with *Metheg*, § 16 f ζ) *bāttim*.

(c) When the syllable in question loses the tone on account of a following *Maqqēph* (§ 16 a), e.g. כָלָה אֲדָם *kōl-hā-’adām* (all men).

In Ps 35:10 and Pr 19:7 *Maqqēph* with בָּל is replaced by a conjunctive accent (*Mer'kha*); so by *Darga*, Ju 19:5 with שָׁעֵד, and Ez 37:8 with נִקְרָם (so Baer after Qimhi; ed. Mant., Ginsburg, Kittel מִקְרָם).

(d) In a closed final syllable without the tone, e.g. וַיַּעֲמֹד *wayyāqōm* (and he stood up).—In the cases where ā or ā in the final syllable has become toneless through *Maqqēph* (§ 16 a) and yet remains, e.g. כַּתָּבְתָּה *kat-tābat-tāh* Est 4:8, פְּנַיְלִי *fen-p̄aylī* Gn 4:25, it has a *Metheg* in correct manuscripts and printed texts.

In cases like לְמַמָּה, the tone shows that ְ is to be read as ā.

2. The cases in which ְ appears to stand in an open syllable and yet is to be read as ō require special consideration. This is the case, (a) when *Hateph-Qameš* follows, e.g. וְעַוְלָה *wə’uwlāh* his work, or simple vocal Šwā, e.g. וְרָנוּ *wə’rānu* ox goad; בְּרָוֶה *bə’rāvəh* Jo 4:7; בְּאַרְהָה *bə’rah* (so ed. Mant., Ginsb.) preserve Ps 86:2, cf. 16:1 and the cases mentioned in § 48 i, n., and § 61 f, n.; other examples are Ob 11, Ju 14:15; *Hateph-Pathah* follows in לְמַשְׁחָה *lə’mashəh*? (so Ginsburg; Baer לְמַשְׁחָה?) 1 S 15:1, לְגַתְּבָה *lə’gat̄bəh* 24:11, and פְּגַתְּבָה *p̄ə’gat̄bəh*? (so Baer, Gn 32:18, others פְּגַתְּבָה *p̄ə’gat̄bəh* יִפְתַּח); (b) before another *Qameš* *haṭuph*, e.g. וְבָהְלִי *wə’bah-lī* Nu 23:7, see §67 o; (c) in the two plural forms קְשֻׁרִים *qə’shūrim* sanctuaries and פְּנַיְלִים *p̄ə’niylīm* roots (also written קְשֻׁרִים and פְּנַיְלִים). In all these cases the Jewish grammarians regard the *Metheg* accompanying the ְ as indicating a Qāmeš raḥab (broad Qameš) and therefore read the ְ as ā; thus pā-ºlō, dā-r̄bān, pā-ºkhā, qā-dāšim. But neither the origin of these forms, nor the analogous formations in Hebrew and in the cognate languages, nor the transcription of proper names in the LXX, allows us to regard this view as correct. It is just possible that Qameš is here used loosely for ā, as the equivalent of ō, on the analogy of וְעַלְוָה &c., § 93 q. As a matter of fact, however, we ought no doubt to divide and read pōº-lō (for p□-lō), pōº-khā, qōdā-šim.—Quite as inconceivable is it for *Metheg* to be a sign of the lengthening into ā in בָּרִירִיָּה *bā-’iriyāh* (Ex 11:8), although it is so in אָנָי *ānay* bā-ºni? (in the navy), since here the ā of the article appears under the ב.

§ 10. The Half Vowels and the Syllable Divider (Šwā).

1. Besides the full vowels, Hebrew has also a series of vowel sounds which may be called *half vowels* (Sievers, *Murmelvokale*). The punctuation makes use of these to represent extremely slight sounds which are to be regarded as remains of fuller and more distinct vowels from an earlier period of the language. They generally take the place of vowels originally short standing in *open syllables*. Such short vowels, though preserved in the kindred languages, are not tolerated by the present system of pointing in Hebrew, but either undergo a lengthening or are weakened to Šwā. Under some circumstances, however, the original short vowel may reappear.

To these belongs first of all the sign ְ, which indicates an extremely short, slight, and (as regards pronunciation) indeterminate vowel sound, something like an obscure

half ē (ং). It is called *Š̄wā*,¹ which may be either *simple Š̄wā* (*Š̄wā simplex*) as distinguished from the compound (see f), or *vocal Š̄wā* (*Š̄wā mobile*) as distinguished from *Š̄wā quiescens*, which is silent and stands as a mere syllable divider (see i) under the consonant which closes the syllable.

The vocal *Š̄wā* stands under a consonant which is closely united, as a kind of grace-note, with the following syllable, either (a) at the beginning of the word, as לְטַל (to kill), מְמֻלָּא *m̄mallē* (filling), or (b) in the middle of the word, as קֹוֶתֶלֶה *qō-ṭlā*, יִקְטָלֵוּ *yiq-ṭlū*.

In former editions of this Grammar *Š̄wā* was distinguished as *medium* when it followed a short vowel and therefore stood in a supposed ‘loosely closed’ or ‘wavering’ syllable, as in בְּנֵפֶל, מְלָכֵי. According to Sievers, *Metrisch Studien*, i. 22, this distinction must now be abandoned. These syllables are really closed, and the original vowel is not merely shortened, but entirely elided. The fact that a following B^egadk^ephath letter (§ 6 n) remains spirant instead of taking *Dageš lene*, is explained by Sievers on the ‘supposition that the change from hard to spirant is elder than the elision of the vowel, and that the prehistoric *malakai* became *malakhai* before being shortened to *malkhē*’. In cases like כְּסָאוּ (from כְּסָא), יִקְחָאֵוּ (from קְחָא) the dropping of the *Dageš forte* shows that the original vowel is completely lost.

The sound ē has been adopted as the normal transcription of simple *Š̄wā mobile*, although it is certain that it often became assimilated in sound to other vowels. The LXX express it by ε, or even by η, χερουβίμ, ἀλληλούια, more frequently by α, μωάλ, Σαμουήλ, but very frequently by assimilating its indeterminate sound to the following principal vowel, e.g. ε δέ Σόδομα, πάτηλον Σολομών (as well as Σαλωμών), αὐτός Σαβαώθ, αληθηναήλ.¹ A similar account of the pronunciation of *Š̄wā* is given by Jewish grammarians of the middle ages.²

How the *Š̄wā* sound has arisen through the vanishing of a full vowel is seen, e.g. in בָּרְכָה from *bärăkă*, as the word is still pronounced in Arabic. In that language the full short vowel regularly corresponds to the Hebrew *Š̄wā mobile*.

¹ On אֲבָשׁ, the older and certainly the only correct form (as in Ben Asher), see Bather, *ZDMG*. 1895, p. 18, note 3, who compares *Sewayya*, the name of the Syriac accentual sign of similar form □ (=Hebr. *Zaqeph*). The form אֲבָשׁ, customary in Spain since the time of Menaḥem b. Sarûq, is due to a supposed connexion with Aram. שָׁבַת *rest*, and hence would originally have denoted only *Š̄wā quiescens*, like the Arabic *sukūn* (*rest*). The derivation from הַשְׁבָּה (stem בָּשַׁבַּ, Levias, *American Journ. of Philol.*, xvi. 28 ff.) seems impossible.

¹ The same occurs frequently also in the Greek and Latin transcriptions of Phoenician words, e.g. אֲבָשׁ *Malaga*, גְּבוּלִים *gubulim* (Schröder, *Die phöniz. Spr.*, p. 139 ff.). Cf. the Latin augment in *momordi*, *pupugi*, with the Greek in τέτυφα, τετυμένος, and the old form *memordi*.

² See especially *Yehuda Hayyûg*, pp. 4 f. and 130 f. in Nutt’s edition (Lond. 1870), corresponding to p. 200 of the edition by Dukes (Stuttg. 1844); Ibn Ezra’s *Sahoth*, p. 3; Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache*, p. 68. The *Manuel du lecteur*, mentioned above, § 6 b, also contains express rules for the various ways of pronouncing *Š̄wā mobile*: so too the *Dikduks ha-ṭeamim*, ed. by Baer and Strack, Lpz. 1879, p. 12 ff. Cf. also Schreiner, *ZAW*. vi. 236 ff.

2. Connected with the *simple Šwâ mobile* is the *compound Šwâ* or *Hâṭeph* (*correptum*), i.e. a *Šwâ* the pronunciation of which is more accurately fixed by the addition of a short vowel. There are three *Šwâ*-sounds determined in this way, corresponding to the three vowel classes (§ 7 a):—

(a) *Hâṭeph-Páthâḥ*, e.g. מָוֵר *ḥmôr*, ass.

(b) *Hâṭeph-S̄gôl*), e.g. מֹר *emōr*, to say.

(c) *Hâṭeph-Qāmēṣ*, e.g. לִי *ḥli*, sickness.

These *Hâṭeph*s, or at least the first two, stand especially under the four guttural letters (§ 221), instead of a *simple Šwâ mobile*, since these letters by their nature require a more definite vowel than the indeterminate *simple Šwâ mobile*. Accordingly a guttural at the beginning of a syllable, where the *Šwâ* is necessarily vocal, can never have a mere *Šwâ simplex*.

On ^ן the shorter *Haṭef* as compared with ^ן cf. § 27 v.

Rem. A. Only ^ן and ^ן occur under letters which are not gutturals. *Hâṭeph-Pathâḥ* is found instead of *simple Šwâ* (especially *Šwâ mobile*), chiefly (a) under strengthened consonants, since this strengthening (commonly called doubling) causes a more distinct pronunciation of the *Šwâ mobile*, נְבָשׁ *nəbâš* branches, Zc 4:12. According to the rule given by Ben-Asher (which, however, appears to be unknown to good early MSS. and is therefore rejected by Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 466; cf. Foote, *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars*, June 1903, p. 71 f.), the *Hâṭeph* is necessary¹ when, in a strengthened medial consonant with *Šwâ* (consequently not in cases like נְדִי, &c.), preceded by a *Pathâḥ*, the sign of the strengthening (*Dageš forte*) has fallen away, e.g. הַלְלוּ *halîlô* praise ye! וְתִפְאַצֵּהוּ *wətip̄eṣṣehô* Ju 16:16; no less universally, where after a consonant with *Šwâ* the same consonant follows (to separate them more sharply, and hence with a *Metheg* always preceding), e.g. סֻכְּרִים *sukk̄rim* Ps 68:9; קָלְלָתָה *qallatâh* (ed. Mant. and Ginsb.) Gn 27:13 (but not without exceptions, e.g. חֲקָרִידָה *ḥak̄ridâh* Ju 5:15, Is 10:1; אלְלִי *el̄li* Jer 6:4, and so always הֲנַנִּי *haññî* behold me, הֲנָנוּ *haññû* behold us; on קָ before the suffix קָ, see § 20 b); also in certain forms under *Kaph* and *Rêš* after a long vowel and before the tone, e.g. תְּאַבֵּדָה *teab̄edâh* Gn 3:17; בְּרִכֵּי *ber̄ek̄iy* Ps 103:1; וְתִפְאַצֵּה *wetip̄eṣṣeh* 1 K 1:4 (but יְתִפְאַצֵּה *yetip̄eṣṣeh* Ps 72:17, cf. Jer 4:2, 1 Ch 29:20, because the tone is thrown back on to the ā). After ē *Šwâ* remains even before the tone, as בְּרִכֵּי &c.; but before Maqqef *אֶלְכָה-אֶלְכָה* Baer Ex 4:18, 2 S 15:7 Jer 40:15, but ed. Mant., Jabl., Ginsb. אֶלְלִי²; (b) under initial sibilants after י copulative, e.g. נְבָנָה *nəbânah* Gn 2:12; cf. Jer 48:20; וְסִחְרָר *wes̄her* Is 45:14; וְשִׁזְבָּה *wesh̄zvâh* Lv 25:34; וְשִׁזְבָּה *wesh̄zvâh* Gn 27:26; עֲמָשָׂה *’amashâh* Nu 23:18, Is 37:17, Dn 9:18, cf. Ju 5:12, 1 K 14:21, 2 K 9:17, Jb 14:1, Ec 9:7—to emphasize the vocal character of the *Šwâ*. For the same reason under the emphatic ט in הַוּטָלָה *haутâla* Jer 22:28; cf. Jb 33:25; after *Qôph* in יְקַרְתִּי (so Baer, but ed. Mant., Jabl., Ginsb.) Ez 23:41; וְקַרְבָּה *wek̄arbâh* Ps 55:22; cf. Jer. 32:9; under *Rêš* in בְּגַדָּה *bergâdâh* (ed. Mant. בְּגַדָּה). Gn 18:21; יְבִרְעָם *yeb̄ra’im* Ps 28:9; even under ת Eze 26:21; under כ Est 2:8; יְבִרְעָם *yeb̄ra’im* so Jabl., Ginsb., but ed. Mant. יְבִרְעָם Dt 24:13; (c) under sonants, sibilants or *Qôph* after i, e.g. אֶחָקָה *’eħaqâh* Gn 21:6, cf. 30:38 and Ez 21:28 (under ק); אֶמְרָות *’emrâot* Ps 12:7; תְּבִרְעָם *tebir̄ra’im* Jer 22:15; תְּבִרְעָם Jos 11:2;

¹ See Delitzsch, ‘Bemerkungen über masoretisch treue Darstellung des alttestam. Textes,’ in the *Ztschr. f. luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, vol. xxiv. 1863, p. 409 ff.

² On the uncertainty of the MSS. in some cases which come under a, see *Minhat shay* (the Masoretic comm. in ed. Mant.) on Gn 12:3 and Ju 7:6.

שׁ פָּמוֹת בְּ בַּ סְכָרֶךְ³ Ps 74:5, —for the same reason as the cases under *b*³; according to Baer also in S 30:28; Gn 32:18 after *o* (cf. § 9 v), as well as after *a* in הַקְשִׁיבָה Dn 9:19; הַבְּרִכָּה Gn 27:38; הַבְּצָרָעִים 2 K 7:8.

B. The *Hateph-Qameṣ* is less restricted to the gutturals than the first two, and stands more frequently for a simple *Šewâ mobile* when an original O-sound requires to be partly preserved, e.g. at the beginning, in רֵאֵי (ground-form *rōy*) *vision* (cf. § 93 z); 2 Ch 31:12, &c., *Q're* (*K'eth.* "Ammonitish women, 1 K 11:1 (sing. *u'moniyot*) ; יְרָאֵפָה Ez 35:6, from יְרָאֵד *his pate* (from קְרָקֵד) Nu 23:25, Jer 31:33, and elsewhere before suffixes, cf. § 60 a; קְרָקְדוֹ Is 18:4 *Q're*. Further, like נָ, it stands under consonants, which ought to have *Dagesh forte*, as in לְ (for קְרָקָה) Gn 2:23. In this example, as in לְהָ וְעַזְבָּן 1 K 13:7; וְעַזְבָּן 2 K 7:18; and קְרָאֵבְנָה Jer 22:20, the *Hateph-Qameṣ* is no doubt due to the influence of the following guttural as well as of the preceding U-sound. (Elsewhere indeed after נ in similar cases *Hateph-Pathah* is preferred, see above, b; but with קְרָקָה cf. also Is 9:3, 10:27, 14:25, where the U-sound must necessarily be admitted to have an influence on the *Šewâ* immediately following.) In עַזְבָּרָה (*û-ṭ'hōr*) Jb 17:9 it is also influenced by the following O-sound. In קְרָאֵס 1 S 28:8 *Q're*, the original form is סְסָס, where again the *o* represents an *o*. It is only through the influence of a following guttural that we can explain the forms נְקָרָה Est 2:14; נְבָרָה Pr 28:22; נְסָרָה Jer 49:7; אֲפָשָׁה Is 27:4; אֲשָׁמָה Dn 8:13; שְׁמָעָה Ps 39:13; בְּפָעָרָה 2 K 2:1 (Baer's ed. also in ver. 11); בְּקָרָבָה 2 Ch 34:12 (ed. Mant., Opitius, &c.). Finally in most of the examples which have been adduced, the influence of an emphatic sound (ק, ט, cf. also אַלְקָטָה Ru 2:2, 7), or of a sibilant is also to be taken into account.

3. The sign of the *simple Šewâ* נ serves also as a mere syllable divider. In this case it is disregarded in pronunciation and is called *Šewâ quiescens*. In the middle of a word it stands under every consonant which closes a syllable; at the end of words on the other hand it is omitted except in *final נ* (to distinguish it better from final נ), e.g. נָלָךְ *king*, and in the less frequent case, where a word ends with a mute after another vowelless consonant as in נְרָךְ *nard*, תָּתָּה *thou fem. (for 'ant)*, קְמָלָתָה *thou fem. hast killed*, קְנִישָׁה *and he watered*, וְיִשְׁבָּה *and he took captive*, אַלְמָשָׁתָה *drink thou not*; but נְיִרָא, נְיִרְאָה.¹

However, in the examples where a mute closes the syllable, the final *Šewâ* comes somewhat nearer to a vocal *Šewâ*, especially as in almost all the cases a weakening era final vowel has taken place, viz. אֲתָה *att'* from אֲתִי *att* (*anti*), קְמָלָתָה from קְמָלִי *att* (cf. in this form, the 2nd sing. fern. perf. Qal, even אֲתָה, after a vowel, Gn 16:8, Mi 4:10, &c., according to the readings of Baer), يִשְׁבָּה *yisb'* from يִשְׁבָּה, &c. The Arabic actually has a short vowel in analogous forms. In נְרָךְ borrowed from the Indian, as also in קְשָׁרָה (*qōśa*) Pr 22:21; and in קְנִישָׁה *ne addas* (for which we should expect תְּתִזְבְּחָה) Pr 30:6 the final mute of itself attracts a slight vowel sound.

Rem. The proper distinction between *simple Šewâ mobile* and *quiescens* depends on a correct understanding of the formation of syllables (§ 26). The beginner may observe for the present, that (1) *Šewâ* is always *mobile* (a) at the beginning of a word (except in שְׁמִינִי, שְׁמִינִי § 97 b, note); (b) under a consonant with *Dagesh forte*, e.g. גְּדִפָּה *gid-dəphū*; (c) after another *Šewâ*, e.g. יִקְרָא *yiqṭ'lū* (except at the end of the word, see above, i). (2) *Šewâ* is *quiescens* (a) at the end of a word, also in the נ; (b) before another *Šewâ*.

³ Ben-Asher requires נ for נ (even for *Šewâ quiescens*) generally before a guttural or נ; hence Baer reads in 2 S, 15:5 בְּקָרְבָּן, Ps 18:7 אֲנָשָׁוֹל, 49:15 לְבָנָה, 65:5 תְּבָנָה; 68:24 צְבָנָה; Pr 30:17 לְעָגָה; Jb 29:25 אֲבָנָה; cf. Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 12:7, note.

¹ On נְתָה as an ending of the 2nd sing. fem. perf. Qal of verbs לְהָ, see § 75 m.

§ 11. Other Signs which affect the Reading.

Very closely connected with the vowel points are the *reading-signs*, which were probably introduced at the same time. Besides the diacritical point over ו and ו , a point is placed *within* a consonant to show that it has a stronger sound. On the other hand a horizontal stroke (*Rāphè*) over a consonant is a sign that it has *not* the stronger sound. According to the different purposes for which it is used the point is either (1) *Dageš forte*, a sign of strengthening (§ 12); or (2) *Dageš lene*, a sign of the harder pronunciation of certain consonants (§ 13); or (3) *Mappiq*, a sign to bring out the full consonantal value of letters which otherwise serve as vowel letters (§ 7 b), especially in the case of n at the end of the word (§ 14 a). The *Rāphè*, which excludes the insertion of any of these points, has almost entirely gone out of use in our printed texts (§ 14 e).

§ 12. *Dageš in general,¹ and Dageš forte in particular.*

Cf. Graetz, ‘Die mannigfache Anwendung u. Bedeut. des Dagesch,’ in *Monatsschr. für Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judent.*, 1887, pp. 425 ff. and 473 ff.

1. *Dageš*, a point standing in the middle of a consonant,² denotes, according to § 11, (a) the *strengthening*³ of a consonant (*Dageš forte*), e.g. קְטַל *qitṭel* (§ 20); or (b) the *harder* pronunciation of the letters בָּגָדָכָת (*Dageš lene*). For a variety of the latter, now rarely used in our printed texts, see § 13 c.

The root שָׁגַן in Syriac means to *pierce through, to bore through* (with sharp iron); hence the name *Dageš* is commonly explained, solely with reference to its form, by *puncture, point*. But the names of all similar signs are derived rather from their grammatical significance. Accordingly שָׁגַן may in the Masora have the sense: *acuere (literam)*, i.e. to *sharpen* a letter, as well as to *harden* it, i.e. to pronounce it as hard and without aspiration. שָׁגָן *acuens (literam)* would then be a sign of sharpening and hardening (like *Mappiq* מַפִּיק *proferens*, as *signum prolationis*), for which purposes a *prick of the pen*, or *puncture*, was selected. The opposite of *Dageš* is רְפָה *soft*, § 14 e, and § 22 n.

2. In grammar *Dages forte*, the *sign of strengthening*, is the more important. It may be compared to the *sicilicus* of the Latins (*Luculsus* for *Lucullus*) or to the stroke over $m\square$ and $n\square$. In the unpointed text it is omitted, like the vowels and other reading signs.

1¹ Oort, *Theol. Tijdschr.* 1902, p. 376, maintains that ‘the Masoretes recognized no distinction between *Dageš lene* and *forte*. They used a *Dageš* where they considered that a letter had the sharp, not the soft or aspirated sound.’ This may be true; but the old-established distinction between the two kinds of *Dageš* is essential for the right understanding of the grammatical forms.

2² *Wāw* with *Dageš* (י) cannot in our printed texts be distinguished from a *wāw* pointed as *Sūrēq* (י); in the latter case the point should stand higher up. The י *u* is, however, easily to be recognized since it cannot take a vowel before or under it.

3³ Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, Lpz. 1879, pp. 44, 103, rightly insists on the expression *strengthened pronunciation* instead of the older term *doubling*, since the consonant in question is only written once. The common expression arises from the fact that in transcription a *strengthened* consonant can only be indicated by writing it as double.

For the different kinds of *Dageš forte*, see § 20.

§ 13. *Dageš lene*.

Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 114 ff.: Dagesh and Raphe.

1. *Dageš lene*, the sign of *hardening*, is in ordinary printed texts placed only within the בְּגִזְקָפָת letters (§ 6 n) as a sign that they should be pronounced with their original hard sound (without aspiration), e.g. מֶלֶךְ *mēlēkh*, but *mal-kō*; טֵפָר *tāphár*, but יִתְפַּר *yith-pōr*; שָׁתָּה *shāthā*, but *yiš-tē*.

2. The cases in which a *Dageš lene* is to be inserted are stated in § 21. It occurs almost exclusively at the beginning of words and syllables. In the middle of the word it can easily be distinguished from *Dageš forte*, since the latter always has a vowel before it, whereas *Dageš lene* never has; accordingly the *Dageš* in אֲפִי 'appi, רְבִים rabbim must be *forte*, but in יְגָדֵל *yigdal* it is *lene*.

A variety of the *Dageš lene* is used in many manuscripts, as well as in Baer's editions, though others (including Ginsburg in the first two cases, *Introd.*, pp. 121, 130, 603, 662) reject it together with the *Hatefs* discussed in § 10 g. It is inserted in consonants other than the *B^egadk^ephath* to call attention expressly to the beginning of a new syllable: (a) when the same consonant precedes in close connexion, e.g. בְּכָל־לְבִい Ps 9:2, where, owing to the *Dageš*, the coalescing of the two *Lameds* is avoided; (b) in cases like מְחַשֵּׁי Ps 62:8 = *mah-si* (not *māħ-si*); (c) according to some (including Baer; not in ed. Mant.) in לְאַל in the combination Dt 32:5, or לְאַל in Dt 1:6, 2:6 &c. (so always also in Ginsburg's text, except in Gn 38:9); see also § 20 e and g.—Delitzsch appropriately gives the name of *Dageš orthophonicum* to this variety of *Dageš* (*Bibl. Kommentar*, 1874, on Ps 94:12); cf. moreover Delitzsch, *Luth. Ztschr.*, 1863, p. 413; also his *Complutensische Varianten zu dem Alttest. Texte*, Lpz. 1878, p. 12##.

3. When *Dageš forte* is placed in a *B^egadk^ephath*, the strengthening necessarily excludes its aspiration, e.g. אֲנָפִי, from אֲנָפִי.

§ 14. *Mappiq* and *Raphè*.

1. *Mappiq*, like *Dageš*, also a point *within* the consonant, serves in the letters אַ הַ וַׁ יַׁ, as a sign that they are to be regarded as full consonants and not as vowel letters. In most editions of the text it is only used in the consonantal הַ at the end of words (since הַ can never be a vowel letter in the middle of a word), e.g. גַּבְּהָה *gābháh* (to be high), אַרְצָה arṣáh (her land) which has a consonantal ending (shortened from -hā), different from אַרְצָה árṣá (to the earth) which has a vowel ending.

Rem. 1. Without doubt such a *Hē* was distinctly aspirated like the Arabic *Hā* at the end of a syllable. There are, however, cases in which this הַ has lost its consonantal character (the *Mappiq* of course disappearing too), so that it remains only as a vowel letter; cf. § 91 e on the 3rd fem. sing.

The name מְפִיק means *proferens*, i.e. a sign which brings out the sound of the letter distinctly, as a consonant. The same sign was selected for this and for *Dageš*, since both are intended to indicate a hard, i.e. a strong, sound. Hence *Raphè* (see e) is the opposite of both.

2. In MSS. *Mappîq* is also found with **א**, **ב**, **ג**, to mark them expressly as consonants, e.g. **גּוֹי** (*gôy*), **קָאָו** (*qāw*, *qōu*), for which **ׁ** is also used, as **ׁשְׁׁבַׁע**, &c. For the various statements of the Masora (where these points are treated as *Dageš*), see Ginsburg, *The Massorah, letter א, § 5* (also *Introd.*, pp. 557, 609, 637, 770), and ‘The Dageshed Alephs in the Karlsruhe MS.’ (where these points are extremely frequent), in the *Verhandlungen des Berliner Orientalisten-Kongresses*, Berlin, i. 1881, p. 136 ff. The great differences in the statements found in the Masors point to different schools, one of which appears to have intended that every audible **א** should be pointed. In the printed editions the point occurs only four times with **א** (**א** or **ׁא**), **Gn 43:26**, **Lv 23:17**, **Ezr 8:18** and **Jb 33:21** (אֲ); where the point can be taken only as an orthophonetic sign, not with König as *Dageš forte*). Cf. Delitzsch, *Hiob*, 2nd ed., p. 439 ff.

2. *Râphè* (רָפֶּה i.e. weak, soft), a horizontal stroke over the letter, is the opposite of both kinds of *Dageš* and *Mappîq*, but especially of *Dageš lene*. In exact manuscripts every letter has either *Dageš lene* or *Râphè*, e.g. בְּגִדְכְּתָה **מֶלֶךְ** *mèlekh*, רְגִדְכְּתָה **פֶּרֶשׁ** *pêresh*. In modern editions (except Ginsburg’s 1st ed.) *Râphè* is used only when the absence of a *Dageš* or *Mappîq* requires to be expressly pointed out.

§ 15. *The Accents*.

On the ordinary accents (see below, *e*), cf. W. Heidenheim, מִשְׁׁפֵּטִי הַטּוּמִים [The Laws of the Accents], Rödelheim, 1808 (a compilation from older Jewish writers on the accents, with a commentary); W. Wickes (see also below), טעמי כ”א ספרים [The Accents of the Twenty-one Books], Oxford, 1887, an exhaustive investigation in English; J. M. Japhet, *Die Accente der hl. Schrift* (exclusive of the books אמת), ed. by Heinemann, Frankf. a. M. 1896; Prätorius, *Die Herkunft der hebr. Accente*, Berlin, 1901, and (in answer to Gregory’s criticism in the TLZ. 1901, no. 22) *Die Uebernahme der fruüh-mittelgriech. Neumen durch die Juden*, Berlin, 1902; P. Kahle, ‘Zur Gesch. der hebr. Accente,’ *ZDMG*. 55 (1901), 167 ff. (1, on the earliest Jewish lists of accents; 2, on the mutual relation of the various systems of accentuation; on p. 179 ff. he deals with the accents of the 3rd system, see above, § 8 g, note); Margolis, art. ‘Accents,’ in the *Jewish Encycl*, i (1901), 149 ff.; J. Adams, *Sermons in Accents*, London, 1906.—On the accents of the Books ט”ה (see below, *h*), S. Beer, תורת אמת [Accentual Laws of the Books ט”ה], Roödelheim, 1852, and his appendix to Delitzsch’s *Psalmencommentar*, vol. ii, Lpz. 1860, and in the 5th ed., 1894 (an epitome is given in Baer-Delitzsch’s *Liber Psalmorum hebr.*, Lpz. 1861, 1874, 1880); cf. also Delitzsch’s most instructive ‘Accentuologischer Commentar’ on **Psalms 1–3**, in his *Psalmencommentar* of 1874, as well as the numerous contributions to the accentual criticism of the text, &c., in the editions of Beer and Delitzsch, and in the commentaries of the latter; W. Wickes, טעמי אמת [Accents of the Poet. Books], Oxford, 1881; Mitchell, in the *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, 1891, p. 144 ff.; Beer and Strack, *Dikduke ha-t’amim*, p. 17 ff.

1. As Prätorius (see above) has convincingly shown, the majority of the Hebrew accents, especially, according to Kahle (see above), the ‘*Conjunctivi*’, were adopted by the Jews from the neums and punctuation-marks found in Greek gospel-books, and, like these, their primary purpose was to regulate minutely the public reading of the sacred text. The complete transformation and amplification of the system (in three different forms, see § 8 g, note), which soon caused the Jews to forget its real origin, is clearly connected with the gradual change from the speaking voice in public

reading to chanting or singing. The accents then served as a kind of musical notes.¹ Their value as such has, however, with the exception of a few traces, become lost in transmission. On the other hand, according to their original design they have also a twofold use which is still of the greatest importance for grammar (and syntax), viz. their value (*a*) as *marking the tone*, (*b*) as *marks of punctuation* to indicate the logical (syntactical) relation of single words to their immediate surroundings, and thus to the whole sentence.²

2. As a mark of the tone the accent stands almost invariably (but see below, e) with the syllable which has the principal tone in the word. This is usually the ultima, less frequently the penultima. Amongst the Jewish grammarians a word which has the tone on the ultima is called *Milra* (Aram. מִלְרָעַ i.e. accented below³), e.g. לְעֵקָב qāṭál; a word which has the tone on the penultima is *Milēl* (Aram. מִלְעָלָה, accented above), e.g. לְעֵקָב mēlēkh. Besides this, in many cases a *secondary tone* is indicated in the word by *Mēthēg* (cf. § 16). Examples such as נְעָמָךְ הַדָּבָר Is 50:8 (cf. 40:18, Ex 15:8, Jb 12:15, La 2:16) are regarded by the Jewish grammarians as even *paroxytone*.⁴

3. As marks of interpunctuation the accents are subdivided into those which *separate* (*Distinctivi* or *Domini*) and those which *connect* (*Conjunctivi* or *Servi*). Further a twofold system of accentuation is to be noted: (*a*) the common system found in twenty-one of the Books (the נ"כ i.e. twenty-one), and (*b*) that used in the first three Books of the *Hagiographa*, viz. Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, for which the *vox memor*, אֵין מִתְּאֵן, from the initial consonants of the names, תְּהִלִּים Psalms, מִשְׁלִים Proverbs, אִיּוֹב Job, or more correctly, according to their original sequence, תְּאֵם תְּאֵם (תְּאֵם twin), so that טְעֵמִי תְּאֵם means the accents (sing. טְעֵם) of these three Books. The latter system is not only richer and more complicated in itself, but also musically more significant than the ordinary accentuation.

The Common Accents.

Preliminary remark. The accents which are marked as *prepositive* stand to the right over or under the initial consonant of the word; those marked as *postpositive*, to the left over or under the last consonant. Consequently in both cases the tone-syllable must be ascertained independently of the accent (but cf. below, I).

DISJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (*Distinctivi* OR *Domini*).¹

¹ ¹ On the attempts of Christian scholars of the sixteenth century to express the Hebrew accents by musical notes, cf. Ortenberg, *ZDMG.*.. 1889, p. 534.

² ² At the same time it must not be forgotten that the value of the accent as a mark of punctuation is always relative; thus, e.g. *Athnāh* as regards the logical structure of the sentence may at one time indicate a very important break (as in Gn 1:4); at another, one which is almost imperceptible (as in Gn 1:1).

³ ³ ‘Above’ in this sense means what comes before, ‘below’ is what comes after; cf. Bacher, *ZAW.*.. 1907, p. 285 f.

⁴ ⁴ Cf. Delitzsch on Is 40:18.

¹ ¹ All the disjunctives occur in Is 39:2.—The earlier Jewish accentuologists already distinguish between אֲלָכִים Reges and רְתִים שְׂפָתִים servi. The division of the disjunctive accents into Imperatores, Reges, Duces, Comites, which became common amongst

1. (־ סילוֹק) Sillûq (*end*) always with the tone-syllable of the last word before Sôph pâsûq (:), the verse-divider, e.g. : זֶה אָתָה.
2. (־ אַתְּנָה Athnâh or אַתְּנָה אַתְּנָה Athnahtâ (*rest*), the principal divider within the verse.
- 3 a. (־) סְנוּלְתָא S^egôltâ, *postpositive*, marks the fourth or fifth subordinate division, counting backwards from Athnâh (e.g. Gn 1:7, 28).
- 3 b. (׀־) שָׁלֵשֶׁלֶת Šalšèleth (i.e. *chain*), as disjunctive, or Great Šalšèleth, distinguished by the following stroke² from the conjunctive in the poetic

Christian grammarians, originated in the *Scrutinium S. S. ex accentibus* of Sam. Bohlius, Rostock, 1636, and, as the source of manifold confusion, had better be given up. The order of the accents in respect to their disjunctive power is shown in general by the above classification, following Wickes. In respect to the height of tone (in chanting) 1, 2, 5, 4, 8, which were *low* and long sustained notes, are to be distinguished from the *high* notes (7, 3^a, 6, 13, 9), and the highest (3^b, 11, 12, 10); cf. Wickes, ט' כ"א p. 12 ff.—The name מִמְעִט (*later=accents in general*) was originally restricted to the disjunctives, see Kahle, 1. c., p. 169.

² This stroke is commonly confused with *Paseq*, which has the same form. But PaÆseµq (= *restraining, dividing*, also incorrectly called P^esiÆq) is neither an independent accent, nor a constituent part of other accents, but is used as a mark for various purposes; see the Masoretic lists at the end of Baer's editions, and Wickes, *Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, p. 120 ff., where PaÆseµq is divided into *distinctivum, emphaticum, homonymicum, and euphonicum*. The conjecture of Olshausen (*Lehrb.*, p. 86 f.), that Pâsēq served also to point out marginal glosses subsequently interpolated into the text, has been further developed by E. yon Ortenberg, 'Die Bedeutung des Paseq für Quellenscheidung in den BB. d. A. T.,' in *Progr. des Domgymn. zu Verden*, 1887, and in the article, 'Paseq u. Legarmeh,' in *ZAW.* 1887, p. 301 ff. (but see Wickes, *ibid.* 1888, p. 149 ff.; also E. Koönig, in the *Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben*, 1889, parts 5 and 6; Maas, in *Hebraica*, v. 121 ff., viii. 89 ff.). Praätorius, *ZDMG.* 1899, p 683 ff., pointed out that *Paseq* (which is pre-masoretic and quite distinct from *L^egarmēh*) besides being a divider (used especially for the sake of greater clearness) also served as a sign of abbreviation. For further treatment of *Paseq* see H. Grimme, 'Pasekstudien,' in the *Bibl. Ztschr.*, i. 337 ff., ii. 28 ff., and *Psalmenprobleme, &c.*, Freiburg (Switzerland), 1902, p. 173, where it is argued that *Paseq* indicates variants in a difficult sentence; J. Kennedy, *The Note-line in the Heb. Scriptures*, Edinb. 1903, with an index of all the occurrences of *Paseq*, p. 117 ff. According to Kennedy the 'note-line', of which he distinguishes sixteen different kinds, is intended to draw attention to some peculiarity in the text; it existed long before the Masoretes, and was no longer understood by them. See, however, the reviews of E. König, *Theol. stud. u. Krit.*, 1904, p. 448 ff., G. Beer, *TLZ.* 1905, no. 3, and esp. A. Klostermann, *Theol. Lit.-blatt*, 1904, no. 13, with whom Ginsburg agrees (*Verhandlungen des Hamb. Or.-kongresses von 1902*, Leiden, 1904, p. 210 ff.) in showing that the tradition with regard to the 479 or 480 uses of *Paseq* is by no means uniform. The purpose of *Paseq* is clearly recognizable in the five old rules: as a divider between identical letters at the end and beginning of two words; between identical or very similar words; between words which are absolutely

accentuation, is used for S^egôltā (seven times altogether) when this would stand at the head of the sentence; cf. Gn 19:16, &c.

4 a. (־) זָקֵף גָּדוֹל Zâqēph Ȏdôl, and

4 b. (־) זָקֵף קָטָן Zâqēph qâṭôn. The names refer to their musical character. As a disjunctive, Little Zâqēph is by nature stronger than Great Zâqēph; but if they stand together, the one which comes first is always the stronger.

5. (־) אַחֲרֶנֶת Tiphħā or אַחֲרִיָּה Tarħā, a subordinate disjunctive before Sillûq and Athnâḥ, but very often the principal disjunctive of the whole verse instead of Athnâḥ; always so when the verse consists of only two or three words (e.g. Is 2:13), but also in longer verses (Gn 3:21).

6. (־) רְבִיעַ R^ebhîa.

7. (־) אַקְרָא Zarqā, *postpositive*.

8 a. (U) אַפְשָׁתָה Pašṭā, *postpositive*,¹ and

8 b. (־) יְתִיבָה Y^ethîbh, *prepositive*, and thus different from M^ehuppākh. Y^ethîbh is used in place of Pašṭā when the latter would stand on a monosyllable or on a foretoned word, not preceded by a conjunctive accent.

9. (A□) תְּבִיר T^ebhîr.

10 a. (־) גְּרֵשׁ Gèreš or סְרֵשׁ Tères, and

10 b. (־) גְּרֵשׁ יִם G^er□šáyim² or Double Gèreš, used for Gèreš, when the tone rests on the ultima, and Azlā does not precede.

11 a. (־) פָּזֵר Pâzér, and

11 b. (־) פָּזֵר גָּדוֹל Pâzér gâdôl (Great Pâzér) or קָרְנֵי פָּרָה Qarnê phârâ (*cow-horns*), only used 16 times, for special emphasis.

12. (־) תְּלִישָׁה T^elišā g^edôlā or Great T^elisā, *prepositive*.

contradictory (as *God* and *evil-doer*); between words which are liable to be wrongly connected; and lastly, between heterogeneous terms, as ‘Eleazar the High Priest, and Joshua’. But the assumption Of a far-reaching critical importance in *Paseq* is at least doubtful.—Cf. also the important article by H. Fuchs, ‘*Pesiq ein Glossenzeichen*,’ in the *Vierteljahrsschrift f. Bibelkunde*, Aug. 1908, p. 1 ff. and p. 97 ff.

1¹ If the word in question has the tone on the penultima, Pašṭā is placed over it also, e.g. תְּמִימָה Gn 1:2; cf. below, 1

2² Wickes requires Geršáyim (גְּרֵשִׁים).

13. (לְגָמֶה) L^egarmēh, i.e. Mûnah (see below) with a following stroke.

CONJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (*Conjunctivi* OR *Servi*).

14. (מֻנָּה) Mûnah.

15. (מַהְפָּךְ) M^ehuppākh or (מַהְפָּקֵחַ) Mahpākh.

16 a. (מִירְכָּא) Mîr^ekhā, or (אַרְכָּא) Mîr^ekhā, and

16 b. (מִרְכָּה) Mîr^ekhā kh^ephûlā or Double Mîr^ekhā.

17. (דַּרְגָּה) Dargā.

18. (אַזְלָה) Azlā, when associated with Gereš (see above) also called Qadmā.

19. (קָטָנָה) T^elîshā q^etannā or Little T^elîshā, *postpositive*.

20. (גַּלְגָּל) Galgal or (יְרָהָה) Yerah̄.

[21. (מֵאַיְלָה) M^eayy^elā or (מֵאַיְלָה) Mây^elā, a variety of Tiphha, serves to mark the secondary tone in words which have Sillûq or Athnâh, or which are united by Maqqēph with a word so accentuated, e.g. וְאַתָּה בְּנֵי Gn 8:18.]

The Accents of the Books מ"ג.

Distinctivi.

1. (סילע) Sillûq (see above, I, 1).

2. (וְיֹרֶד) Ôlè w^eyôrēd, ¹ a stronger divider than

3. (אתנה) Athnâh (see above, I, 2). In shorter verses Athnâh suffices as principal distinctive; in longer verses Ôlè w^eyôrēd serves as such, and is then mostly followed by Athnâh as the principal disjunctive of the second half of the verse.

4. (רביה) R^ebhi^a gādôl (Great R^ebhi^a).

5. (רביה) R^ebhi^a mugrâš, i.e. R^ebhi^a with Gereš on the same word.

6. (גדולה) Great Šalsèleth (see above, I, 3 b).

¹ Wrongly called also Mîr^ekhā m^ehuppākh (*Mîr^ekhā mahpakhatum*), although the accent underneath is in no way connected with Mîr^ekhā; cf. Wickes, l. c., p. 14.

7. (־) **שִׁנָּוֶר** **Sinnôr** (*Zarqā*), as *postpositive*, is easily distinguished from **שִׁנָּוְרִת** similarly placed, which is not an independent accent, but stands only over an open syllable before a consonant which has Mêr^ekhā or Mahpâkh.

8. (־) R^ebhi[ׁ] qâtôن (Little R^ebhi[ׁ]) immediately before Ôlè w^eyôrēd.

9. (־) **דֵּהַי** D^ehî or **Tiphhâ**, *prepositive*, to the right underneath the initial consonant, e.g. **הַגּוֹי** (consequently it does not mark the tone-syllable).

10. (־) Pâzér (see above, I, 11 a).

11 a. (׀־) M^ehuppâkh l^egarmêh, i.e. Mahpâkh with a following stroke.

11 b. (׀־) Azlâ l^egarmêh, i.e. Azlâ with a following stroke.

Conjunctivi.

12. (־) Mêr^ekhâ (see above, I. 16 a).

13. (־) Mûnah (see above, I. 14).

14. (־) **עֲלֵי** Illûy or Mûnah superior.

15. (־) **תַּרְחָא** Tarhâ (under the tone-syllable, and thus easily distinguished from No. 9).

16. (־) Galgal or Yèrah (see above, I. 20).

17. (־) M^ehuppâkh or Mahpâkh (see above, I. 15).

18. (־) Azlâ (see above, I. 18).

19. (־) **שָׁלֵשֶׁת** q^etannâ (Little Šalšlèth). The last three are distinguished from the disjunctives of the same name by the absence of the stroke.

[20. (־) Sinnôrîth, see above under No. 7.]

REMARKS ON THE ACCENTS

As Signs of the Tone.

1. As in Greek and English (cf. εἰμί and εἶμι, *cómpact* and *compáct*) so also in Hebrew, words which are written with the same consonants are occasionally distinguished by the position of the tone, e.g. **בָּנָה** *banú* (they built), **בָּנוּ** *bánu* (in us); **קָם** *qáma* (she stood up), **קָמָה** *qamá* (standing up, *fem.*).

2. As a rule the accent stands on the tone-syllable, and properly on its initial consonant. In the case of prepositives and postpositives alone (see above, e) the tone-syllable must be ascertained independently of the accent. In many MSS. as well as in Baer's editions of the text, the postpositive sign in foretoned words stands also over the tone-syllable after the analogy of Paštā (see above, I. 8 a, note); e.g. בְּרָם יִשְׁכַּן Gn 19:4; so the prepositive sign in cases like נִקְיִן Gn 8:13.

As Signs of Punctuation.

3. In respect to this use of the accents, every verse is regarded as a period which closes with Sillūq, or in the figurative language of the grammarians, as a province (*ditio*) which is governed by the great distinctive at the end. According as the verse is long or short, i.e. the province great or small, there are several subordinate *Domini* of different grades, as governors of greater and smaller divisions. When possible, the subdivisions themselves are also split up into parts according to the law of dichotomy (see Wickes, *The Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, p. 29 ff.).—When two or more *equivalent* accents (Zâqēph, R^ebhiā) occur consecutively, the accent which precedes marks a greater division than the one which follows; cf. e.g. the Zâqēph, Gn 1^{20 a}.

4. In general a conjunctive (*Servus*) unites only such words as are closely connected in sense, e.g. a noun with a following genitive or a noun with an adjective. For the closest connexion between two or more words *Maqqēph* is added (§ 16 a).

5. The consecution of the several accents (especially the correspondence of disjunctives with their proper conjunctives) conforms in the most minute details to strict rules, for a further investigation of which we must refer to the above-mentioned works. Here, to avoid misunderstanding, we shall only notice the rule that in the accentuation of the books תְּהִימָּה, the R^ebhi^a *mugrāš* before *Sillūq*, and the D^eḥī before *Athnāḥī*, must be changed into conjunctives, unless at least two toneless syllables precede the principal disjunctive. For this purpose Š^ewâ *mobile* after Qameṣ, Sere, or Ḥolem (with Metheg) is to be regarded as forming a syllable. After Ôlē w^eyôrēd the Athnāḥī does not necessarily act as pausal (cf. Delitzsch on Ps 45:6). The condition of our ordinary texts is corrupt, and the system of accents can only be studied in correct editions [see Wickes' two treatises].

6. A double accentuation occurs in Gn 35:22, from וַיִּשְׁכַּב onward (where the later accentuation, intended for public reading, aims at uniting vv. 22 and 23 into *one*, so as to pass rapidly over the unpleasant statement in v. 22); and in the Decalogue, Ex 20:2 ff.; Dt 5:6 ff. Here also the later (mainly superlinear) accentuation which closes the first verse with עֲדִים (instead of פְנֵי) is adopted simply for the purposes of public reading, in order to reduce the original twelve verses (with sublinear accentuation) to ten, the number of the Commandments. Thus עֲדִים at the end of v. 2 has Silluq (to closethe verse) in the lower accentuation, but in the upper, which unites vv. 2–6 (the actual words of God) into a single period, only R^ebhi^a. Again פְנֵי, regarded as closing v. 3, is pointed פְנֵי (pausal Qameṣ with Silluq), but in the upper accentuation it is פְנֵי with Pathaḥ because not in pause. (Originally there may have been a third accentuation requiring עֲדִים and פְנֵי, and thus representing vv. 2 and 3 as the first commandment.) Further the upper accentuation unites vv. 8–11 into one period, while in vv. 12–15 the lower accentuation combines commandments 5–8 into one verse. Cf. Geiger, *Urschrift u. Übersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 373; Japhet, *op. cit.*, p. 158, and esp. K. J. Grimm, *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circ.* xix (May, 1900), no. 145.

§ 16. *Of Maqqēph and Mèthēg*

These are both closely connected with the accents.

1. Maqqēph (מֻקָּף i.e. *binder*) is a small horizontal stroke between the upper part of two words which so connects them that in respect of tone and pointing they are regarded as one, and therefore have only one accent. Two, three, or even four words may be connected in this way, e.g. פֶּלְדַּע שָׁב every man, every herb, Gn 1:29, אֲתִ-פֶּלְדַּע-אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ all that he had, Gn 25:5.

Certain monosyllabic prepositions and conjunctions, such as אֵלֶּה until, עַל upon, עַל-עַם with, אֵלֶּה ne, אִם if, whether, מִן from, פָּנָן lest, are almost always found with a following Maqqēph, provided they have not become independent forms by being combined with prefixes, e.g. מַעַל, in which case Maqqēph as a rule does not follow. Occasionally Maqqēph is replaced by a conjunctive accent (see above, § 9 u, 1 c), as, according to the Masora, in Dt 27:9, 2 S 20:23, Jer 25:30, 29:25, Ec 9:4 in the case of אֵלֶּה; Ps 47:5, 60:2, Pr 3:12 in the case of אֲתָּה, the objective particle. Longer words are, however, connected by Maqqēph with a following monosyllable, e.g. הַתְּהִלָּה Gn 6:9, נִיְהִיכָּה Gn 1:7; or two words of more than one syllable, e.g. שְׁבַע הָצָר seventeen, Gn 7:11. Cf. the Greek proclitics ἐν, ἐκ, εἰς, εἰ, ὡς, οὐ, which are *atonic*, and lean on the following word.

2. Mètheg (מְתֵג i.e. *a bridle*), a small perpendicular stroke under the consonant to the left of the vowel, indicates most frequently the secondary stress or counter-tone, as opposed to the principal tone marked by the accents. It serves, however, in other cases to point out that the vowel should not be hastily passed over in pronunciation, but should be allowed its full sound. Hence other names of Mètheg are *Ma^arīkh*, i.e. *lengthener*, and *Gayā*, i.e. *raising* of the voice, which is *Great Gayā* with long vowels, otherwise *Little Gayā*.¹

It is divided into: 1. The *light Mètheg*. This is subdivided again into (a) the ordinary Mètheg of the counter-tone, as a rule in the second (open) syllable before the tone, e.g. הַאֲתָּה מְתֵג (cf. also such cases as לְזָכָר); but also in the third when the second is closed, e.g. הַאֲרַבָּע יְמִים (also in such cases as בְּדַדְאַלְלָה), and when the third is not suitable for it, even in the fourth (open) syllable before the tone. This Mètheg may be repeated in the fourth syllable before the tone, when it already stands in the second, e.g. בְּעַתְּקָה מְתֵג. Finally it is always added to the vowel of an open ultima, which is joined by Maqqēph to a word beginning with a toneless syllable and so without Mètheg (e.g. בְּבָבָה, רְשָׁפֵידָה שָׁתָּה), or to a word beginning with Šwā before the tone-syllable, e.g. לְאָהָה, יְדָרָאָל, מְדָבָר, יְדָלָן, &c.; the object being to prevent the Šwā from becoming *quiescent*.

The ordinary *light Mètheg* is omitted with a movable וְ *copulative*, consequently we do not find וְגַנְנִים, &c. (nor even גַּנְנִי, &c., contrary to b, α; but בְּגַנְנָה, &c., according to b, β, cf. § 10 g. b).

(b) The *firm* or *indispensable Mètheg*. (α) With all long vowels (except in certain cases, וְ *copulative*, see above), which are followed by a Šwā *mobile* preceding the tone-syllable; e.g. אָוֹן, שָׁנוֹן, רָאוֹן, &c. (β) To emphasize a long vowel in a closed syllable immediately before Maqqēph, e.g. תְּלִיל Gn 4:25 (not šōth-li); hence also with כְּלִיל Ps 138:2, and חְתִמָּה Jb 41:26 (for כְּלִיל and חְתִמָּה; cf. also Jo 15:18, &c.). (γ) With Šere, which has become toneless

¹ Cf. as the source of this account of Mètheg, the exhaustive treatment by S. Baer, ‘Mètheg-Setzung nach ihren überlieferten Gesetzen,’ in A. Merx’s *Archiv für die wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. Test.*, Heft i, Halle, 1867, p. 56 ff., and Heft ii. 1868, p. 194 ff.; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke ha-ṭamim*, p. 30 ff.

through retraction of the tone, in order to prevent its being pronounced as *S^eghôl*, e.g. אָהַבְתִּי ^{תְּ}[Pr 12:1](#) (not *ôhēbh*). (δ) With all vowels before composite *Š^ewâ*, e.g. תְּמֻצָּאָקִים, &c. (except when the following consonant is strengthened, e.g. תְּבָקֵשׁ [Is 62:2](#), because the strengthening by *Dageš* excludes the retarding of the vowel by *Mèthēg*); so in the cases discussed in § 28 c, where a short vowel has taken the place of a *Haṭeph*, as אָמָעָן, &c. (ε) In the preformative syllable of all forms of the הָיָה *to be*, and הַחֲיָה *to live*, when *Š^ewâ quiescens* stands under the ה or ה, e.g. יְהִיְהִי, תְּיִהְיֶה (yih-yè, tiḥ-yè), &c., cf. § 63 q. (ζ) With the Qameṣ of the plural forms of הַבָּיִת *house* (thus יִםְמֻתְّבָּת bāttîm, cf. § 96 under בִּתְּהִת), and with הַבְּתִּיאָן¹ *prithee!* to guard against the pronunciation *bōttîm*, önnā.—Every kind of light *Mèthēg* may in certain circumstances be changed into a conjunctive accent, e.g. יִמְתְּחִתְּ 2 Ch 34:11, &c.

2. The *grave Mèthēg* (*Gayā* in the more limited sense) is especially employed in the following cases in order more distinctly to emphasize a short vowel or an initial *Š^ewâ*: (a) with the *Pathah* of the article or of the prefixes בְּ, כְּ, לְ, when followed by *Š^ewâ* under a consonant without *Dageš*, e.g. הַלְּסָנָה, הַלְּבָנָה, &c., but not before הָ (before which הָ also remains without *Mèthēg*, with the exception of הָיָה, הָזֶה, when they are followed by *Maqqēph*, or accented with *Pašṭā*), nor before the tone-syllable of a word, and neither before nor after the common *Mèthēg*; likewise not in words which are connected by a conjunctive accent with the following word; (b) with the interrogative הָ with *Pathah* (except when it precedes הָ, *Dageš forte* or the tone-syllable of the word), e.g. אָלָכָה. When a *Š^ewâ* follows the הָ and after the *Š^ewâ* there is an untoned syllable, Baer places the *Mèthēg* to the right of the *Pathah*, e.g. הָבָרְכָה [Gn 27:38](#) (but ed. Mant. and Ginsb. בָּהָ); (c) with the *Pathah* or *S^egol* of the article before a guttural (which cannot take *Dageš*), e.g. הָחִימָה, הָגִימָה.—The *Š^ewâ-Gayā* (,) is especially important in the accentuation of the מְאֹן, for purposes of musical recitation; it stands chiefly in words whose principal tone is marked by a disjunctive without a preceding conjunctive, e.g. הָנְחָתָה [Ps 1:3](#).

3. The *euphonic Gayā*, to ensure the distinct pronunciation of those consonants which in consequence of the loss of the tone, or because they close a syllable, might easily be neglected, e.g. הָנְשָׁבֵעַ [Gn 24:9](#); פְּנָה אָמָתְּ [Gn 28:2](#) (here to avoid a hiatus) or in such cases as רְפָתָה [Jb 33:4](#), &c.; תְּשַׁאֲתָה [Gn 1:11](#).

Mèthēg (especially in the cases mentioned in 1, b, a) is a guide to correct pronunciation, since it distinguishes ā from ö (except in the case noted in § 9 v, b) and ī from i; e.g. הָאָכְלָה ā-khlā (she has eaten), but הָאָכְלָה ökhla (food), since the - stands here in a toneless closed syllable, and must therefore be a short vowel; thus also רְאֵי yi-r̄'ū (they fear), but רְאֵי yirū (they see), שְׁנֵי sh̄nei (they sleep), but שְׁנֵי sh̄nei (they repeat). The Jewish grammarians, however, do not consider the syllables lengthened by *Mèthēg* as open. They regard the *Š^ewâ* as *quiescent* in cases like הָאָכְלָה, and belonging to the preceding vowel; cf. Baer, *Thorat Emeth*, p. 9, and in Merx's *Archiv*, i. p. 60, Rem. 1, and especially *Dikduke ha-ṭamim*, p. 13.

§ 17. Of the Q^erê and K^ethîbh. Masora marginalis and finalis

On Q^erê and K^ethîbh see Ginsburg, *Intr.*, p. 183 ff.]

¹ The common form is אָמְנָאָן, with an accent on both syllables, in which case, according to *Qimḥi*, the tone is always to be placed on the former. For the above mode of writing and position of the tone cf. Is 38:3, Jon 1:14, 4:2, Ps 116:4.

1. The margin of Biblical MSS. and editions exhibits variants of an early date (§ 3 c), called קְרִי² *to be read*, since, according to the opinion of the Jewish critics, they are to be preferred to the כתיב, i.e. what is *written* in the text, and are actually to be read instead of it.

On this account the vowels of the marginal reading (the *Q'ré*) are placed under the consonants of the text, and in order to understand both readings properly, the vowels in the text must be applied to the marginal reading, while for the reading of the text (the *K'thîbh*) its own vowels are to be used. Thus in Jer 42:6 אָנֹנוּ occurs in the text, in the margin קְרִי אָנֹנוּ. Read אָנֹנוּ *we* (or according to Jewish tradition אָנֹנוּ) in the text, in the margin אָנֹנוּ. A small circle or asterisk in the text always refers to the marginal reading.

2. Words or consonants which are to be passed over in reading, and are therefore left unpainted, are called כתיב וְלֹא קְרִי (*scriptum et non legendum*), e.g. את Jer 38:16, אם 39:12, ידך 51:3. Conversely, words not contained in the text, but required by the Masora (as indicated by the insertion of their vowels), are called קְרִי וְלֹא כתיב, e.g. זֶה S 8:3, Jer 31:38. See further Strack, *Prolegomena Critica*, p. 85; Dikduke ha-ṭamim, §§ 62, 64; Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 49 ff.

3. In the case of some very common words, which are *always* to be read otherwise than according to the *K'thîbh*, it has not been considered necessary to place the *Q'ré* in the margin, but its vowels are simply attached to the word in the text. This *Q'ré perpetuum* occurs in the Pentateuch in הָוֹא (Q'ré) wherever הָוֹא stands for the feminine (§ 32 l), and in נָעַר (K'thîbh, נָעַר, Q'ré נָעַר) always, except in Dt 22:19 (but the Sam. text always has נָעָרָה, הָיָה). The ordinary explanation of this supposed archaism, on the analogy of Greek ὁ παῖς and ἡ παῖς, our *child*, is inadequate, since there is no trace elsewhere of this epicene use; for נָעַר is rather a survival of a system of orthography in which a final vowel was written defectively, as in קְלֻפָּה; cf. § 2 n.—Other instances are: ישׁ שָׁבֵר (Q. ישׁ שָׁבֵר) Gn 30:18 &c., see the *Lexicon.*, and Baer and Delitzsch, *Genesis*, p. 84, and below, note to § 47 b; יְרוּשָׁלָם (Q. יְרוּשָׁלָם), properly יְהָוָה אֱלֹהִים (Q. יְהָוָה אֱלֹהִים; יְהָוָה the Lord), or (after אֲדֹנִי וְהִיא) (Q. אֲדֹנִי וְהִיא) properly יְהָוָה אֱלֹהִים (Q. יְהָוָה אֱלֹהִים; יְהָוָה Yahwè (cf. § 102 m, and § 135 q, note); on שְׁנִים, שְׁנִית, שְׁנִיתִי, see § 97 d, end).

4. The masoretic apparatus accompanying the biblical text is divided into (a) *Masora marginalis*, consisting of (α) *Masora (marginalis) magna* on the upper and lower margins of MSS.; (β) *Masora (marginalis) parva* between and on the right and left of the columns; (b) *Massora finalis* at the end of the several books, counting Samuel, Kings, Minor Prophets, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, each as one book. On all three varieties see especially Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 423 ff., and the appendices containing (p. 983 ff.) the masoretic treatise from the St. Petersburg MS. of A.D. 1009, and (p. 1000 ff.) specimens of the *Masora parva* and *magna* on two chapters.

² On the necessity of the punctuation קְרִי as passive participle (=legendum) instead of קְרִי Q'ri□, which was formerly common but is properly a past tense (=lectum est), see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 81, note.

Lexicon. *Lexicon* = A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius, by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Britts, Oxford, 1906.

In nearly all printed editions only the *Masora finalis* is found, indicating the number of verses, the middle point of the book, &c., and a scanty selection from the *Masora parva*. The following alphabetical list of technical expressions (some of them Aramaic) and abbreviations, may suffice with the help of the lexicon to elucidate the subject. Further details will be found in the appendix to Teilo's edition of the Hebrew O. T., p. 1222 ff.

בְּלֹא אָסְפַּחֲנָה letter. **אָתְּנָה** סֻפֶּר פִּסּוּק=Aṣ-pasq except. **אָמֵצָעָה** middle. in the formula without Athnah or Soph-pasq i.e. although no Athnah or Soph-pasq is written.

שְׁנָאֵךְ fem. הַשְׁנָאֵךְ marked with Dageš (or Mappiq). שְׁנָאֵךְ leaf, page.

צַעֲירָה fem. (Aram.) *small.*

חול profane, not sacred, e.g. נָאֵן Gn 19:2 because not referring to God. חווין except. חסר written defectively, also wanting as 'א'נ' aleph is omitted.

מִעְט *accent* (see ב); **מִיעַט** in Hiphil *to chant an accent*.

יתיר *superfluous.*

כִּי (Aram.) *total, as adv. in general.*

(Aram., from **לא** *אַיִת non est*)=the form *is not* found elsewhere.

מִלְבָר עַפּוֹת מִלְלָא מִלְלָה below=עַפּוֹת מִלְלָא מִלְלָה accurately corrected. full i.e. written plene. (§ 15 c). מִלְלָיִלְלָה מִלְלָא מִלְלָה separated, the name of the strangely formed Nûns before Ps 107:23 ff. (§ 5 n). מִקְרָא מִקְרָא that which is read, the name for all the O. T. scriptures. מִקְצָת part.

נֶה fem. נֶקֶה *quiescent*, i.e. not sounded. נַעֲלָם concealed, i.e. only retained orthographically. נְקֻודָה a point. נְקֻוד pointed.

סָכֹם = סְךִ' see σημεῖον, *sign*, esp. a mnemonic word or, frequently, sentence. סְךִ' total. סְפָסּוֹק = סְפַ' (§ 15 f).

עמוד עט *column* of a page.

פְּסָוק a masoretic verse. פֶּשׁוֹק a space, esp. in the phrase פֶּשׁוֹק בַּבְּאֵלֶּת a space within a verse, e.g. Gn 35:22; cf. H. Grätz, *Monatschrift für Gesch. u. Wiss. des Judentums*, 1878, p. 481 ff., and H. Strack, *ibid.* 1879, p. 26 ff.

קֹרֶא, **קָרְךָ**, see above, c. קַודֵם properly קָדוּם before. קִמְוֹץ fem. pointed with *Qames*. reader of the sacred text.

(**רֶבֶתִי**, **רֶבֶתָה**, **רֶבֶתָא**) (Aram., all fem. sing.) *large.*

word (consisting of more than one letter). תְּלִיָּה suspensa (§ 5 n, 3). (Aram.) two.

CHAPTER II

PECULIARITIES AND CHANGES OF LETTERS: THE SYLLABLE AND THE TONE

§ 18.

THE changes which take place in the forms of the various parts of speech, depend partly on the peculiar nature of certain classes of letters and the manner in which they affect the formation of syllables, partly on certain laws of the language in regard to syllables and the tone.

§ 19. *Changes of Consonants*

The changes which take place among consonants, owing to the formation of words, inflexion, euphony, or to influences connected with the progress of the language, are *commutation*, *assimilation*, *rejection*, *addition*, *transposition*, *softening*.

1. *Commutation*¹ may take place between consonants which are either *homorganic* or *homogeneous* (cf. § 6 q), e.g. עָלַס, עָלֵי, עָלְלִי to exult, לֹאָה, לֹהָה, Aram. אָעָלָה to be weary, צְהֻן and צְהֻנָּה to press, סָגַר and סָכַר to close, מָלַט and פָּלַט to escape. In process of time, and partly under the influence of Aramaic, the harder and rougher sounds especially were changed into the softer, e.g. קָהָצָה into קָהָשָׁה to laugh, עָלָקָה into עָלָקָה to reject, and the sibilants into the corresponding mutes: צ into צ, ש into שׁ, ג into גׁ. In many cases these mutes may be regarded as a return to an earlier stage of the pronunciation.

The interchange of consonants, however, belongs rather to the lexicographical treatment of stems² than to grammatical inflexion. To the latter belong the interchange (a) of נ and ו in *Hithpaēl* (§ 54 b); (b) of י and ו in verbs *primaे Yôd* (§ 69), יְלַלָּה, וְלַלָּה, &c.

2. *Assimilation* usually takes place when one consonant which closes a syllable passes over into another beginning the next syllable, and forms with it a strengthened letter, as *illustris* for *inlustris*, *affero* for *adfero*, συλλαμβάνω for συνλαμβάνω. In Hebrew this occurs,

(a) most frequently with נ, e.g. מִשְׁמָר (for *min-šām*) from *there*, מִזְׁמָר (for *min-zē*) from *this*, יִתְּנֵן (for *yintēn*) he gives. נ is not assimilated after the prefix ל, e.g. נְגַדֵּל, nor as a rule before gutturals (except sometimes before נ), nor when it is the third consonant of the stem, e.g. בְּנֵבֶשׂ (cf. however נְתַנֵּת for *nāthāntā*) except when another *Nun* follows, cf. § 44 o; nor in some isolated cases, as Dt 33:9, Is 29:1, 58:3, all in the principal pause; on בְּנֵבֶשׂ and בְּנֵבֶשׂ Ps 68:3, see § 51 k, and § 66 f.

1 Cf. Barth, *Etymologische Forschungen*, Lpz. 1893, p. 15 ff.
(‘Lautverschiebungen’).

2 See in the *Lexicon.*, the preliminary remarks on the several consonants.

(b) Less frequently and only in special cases with ל, ת, ד, e.g. יְקַח (for *yilqaḥ*) *he takes*; מִתְדַּבֵּר for *mithdabbēr*; יְתַפֵּן for *yithṭammā*; תִּתְהַנֵּן for *tithkōnēn*; אֲתָתְנֵשׁ for *attnēsh*; תִּתְהַחֵד for *atḥad*; but in 1 S 4:19 for לְתַתְהַלֵּת read probably לְלַתְהַלֵּת.

(c) In isolated cases with ה, ו, י, e.g. אֲתָתְנֵשׁ *prithee!* if from אֲתָתְנֵשׁ; ו and י mostly before sibilants in the verbal forms enumerated in § 71.

In all these cases, instead of the assimilated letter, a *Dagesh forte* appears in the following consonant. *Dagesh*, however, is omitted when the strengthened consonant would stand at the end of a word, since the strengthening would then be less audible (§ 20 l), e.g. נֶזֶן *nose* (from *anp*), תְּתִתְּ *to give* (from *tint*).

The cases are less frequent where a weak letter is lost in pronunciation,¹ and in place of it the preceding stronger sound is sharpened, i.e. takes *Dagesh*, e.g. קְטַל *tah* from קַטְלָל *tah* (§ 59 g). קְטַאָס for קַטְלָאָס (§ 66 e) is an Aramaism.

3. Complete *rejection* takes place only in the case of weaker consonants, especially the sonants נ and ל, the gutturals נ and ה, and the two half vowels ו and י. Such rejection takes place,

(a) at the beginning of a word (*aphaeresis*), when these weak consonants (א, י, ל, נ) are not supported by a full vowel, but have only Š^ewâ, e.g. בְּהָנוּ *we*, also בְּהָנוּ *we* also בְּהָנוּ *we* for בְּהָנָעַ; קְהָנָעַ for קְהָנָה; יְגָשָׁה for יְגָשָׁה; הְנָהָיָה for הְנָהָיָה Ez 2:10.

Aphaeresis of a weak consonant with a full vowel is supposed to occur in כְּ Ju 19:11 for כְּהָנָה 2 S 22:41 for כְּהָנָה; in יְשֹׁוּב for שֹׁוּב in יְשֹׁוּב Je 42:10; on כְּ Ez 17:5 for כְּהָנָה, and on מְהֻנָּה Ho 11:3 for מְהֻנָּה, see § 66 g, end. In reality, however, all these forms are to be regarded merely as old textual errors.

(b) In the middle of a word (*syncope*), when Š^ewâ precedes the weak consonant;² thus in the case of נ (see further § 23 b–f, and § 68 b–k), e.g. in מָוִים for מָאִים. As a rule in such cases, however, the נ is orthographically retained, e.g. לְקָרָאת for לְקָרָאת; Syncope occurs frequently in the case of ה, e.g. לְהַנְּהָרָה for לְהַנְּהָרָה (§ 23 k and § 35 n), לְקָטְלִיל for לְקָטְלִיל (§ 53 a).

Syncope of נ with Š^ewâ occurs in such cases as בְּאַדְנִי for בְּאַדְנִי (cf. § 102 m); נְאַעֲשֵׂר Zc 11:5.¹ On the cases in which נ is wholly omitted after the article, see § 35 d.

Finally, the elision of ו and י in verbs לְהַנְּהָרָה (§ 75 h) is an instance of syncope.—On the syncope of נ between two vowels, see § 23 k.

¹ Such a suppression of a letter is sometimes inaccurately called ‘backward assimilation’.

² Syncopate of a strong consonant (ב) occurs in בְּיִ prithes! if this stands for בְּעֵי (see Lexicon.), also in Am 8:8, K^ethi□bh for בְּלֵה וְנִשְׁקָה 9:5, and in Jos 19:3 for בְּלֵה וְנִשְׁקָה: (as in 15:29). Probably, however, בְּלֵה and וְנִשְׁקָה are only clerical errors, as is undoubtedly בְּאַדְרִיךְ Am 8:8 for בְּאַדְרִיךְ (9⁵).

¹ Frensdorff, *Ochla Wochla*, p. 97 f., gives a list of forty-eight words with quiescent נ.

(c) At the end of a word (*apocope*), e.g. גָּלַן pr. name of a city (cf. גִּילְנִי Gilonite); where נ though really rejected is orthographically retained, &c. On the apocope of נ and נ in verbs הָלַךְ, see § 24 g, and § 75 a.

Bolder changes (especially by violent apocope), took place in earlier periods of the language, notably the weakening of the feminine ending הָתֵּת *āth* to הָתֵּּת *ā*, see § 44 a, and § 80 f.

4. To avoid harshness in pronunciation a helping sound, Aleph prosthetic² with its vowel, is prefixed to some words, e.g. אַרְוֹעַ and עַרְוָעַ *arm* (cf. Ἀρέας, Ἐρέας; *spiritus*, French *esprit*).—A prosthetic נ occurs probably in עֲקָרָב *scorpion*; cf. Arab. *uṣfūr* bird (stem *safara*).

5. *Transposition*³ occurs only seldom in the grammar, e.g. הַתְּשִׁמְעָר for הַשְׁמִינָר (§ 54 b) for the sake of euphony; it is more frequent in the lexicon (כְּשֶׁבֶב and שְׁבֶב *lamb*, שְׁמַלְהָ and שְׁלַמְהָ *garment*), but is mostly confined to sibilants and sonants.

6. *Softening* occurs e.g. in כּוֹכֶב *star*, from *kaukahb=kawkab* for *kabkhab* (cf. Syriac *raurab=rabrab*); *תְּפִלְפִּות* *phylacteries* for *taphṭāphōth*; according to the common opinion, also in אִישׁ *man* from *ins*, cf. however § 96.

§ 20. *The Strengthening (Sharpening) of Consonants.*

1. The strengthening of a consonant, indicated by *Dageš forte*, is necessary and essential (*Dageš necessarium*)

(a) when the same consonant would be written twice in succession without an intermediate vowel or Šēwâ *mobile*; thus we have נָתַתְנָה for نָתַתָּה *nāthān-nū* and שָׁנַתְשָׁנָה for شَنَثَنَاهָ *shānān-hā*.

(b) in cases of assimilation (§ 19 b–f), e.g. יִתְּנִנָּה for *yintēn*.

In both these cases the *Dageš* is called *compensativum*.

(c) When it is characteristic of a grammatical form, e.g. לִמְצָא *he has learned*, לִמְצָא *he has taught* (*Dageš characteristicum*). In a wider sense this includes the cases in which a consonant is sharpened by *Dageš forte*, to preserve a preceding short vowel (which in an open syllable would have to be lengthened by § 26 e), e.g. גָּמְלִים *camels* for גְּמַלִּים; cf. § 93 ee and kk, § 93 pp.

This coalescing of two consonants as indicated above does not take place when the first has a vowel or Šēwâ *mobile*. In the latter case, according to the correct Masora, a compound Šēwâ should be used, preceded by *Metheg*, e.g. קְלֻלָּתָה, קְלֻלָּיִם, &c. (cf. §§ 10 g, 16 f). This pointing is not used before the suffix נְ, e.g. Gn 27:4, but the first נ has a vocal Šēwâ, otherwise the second נ would have *Dageš lene*. Also when the former of the two consonants

² This awkward term is at any rate as suitable as the name *Alef prostheticum* proposed by Nestle, *Marginalien u. Materialien*, Tübingen, 1893, p. 67 ff.

³ Cf. Barth, *Etymologische Studien*, Lpz. 1893, p. 1 ff.; Königsberger, in *Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1894, p. 451 ff.

has been already strengthened by *Dageš forte*, it can only have a *vocal Šēwâ*, and any further contraction is therefore impossible. This applies also to cases where *Dageš forte* has been omitted (see below, m, e.g. הַלְלוּ properly הַלְלָיו = *hal-ləlū*). The form נִיְהָן נִיְהָן Ps 9:14 (not חֲנֹנָן חֲנֹנָן) might be explained as imperat. Piēl=הַחֲנֹן; if it were imperat. *Qal* the non-contraction of the monosyllabic root would be as strange as it is in שָׁבֵש Jer 49:28, and in the imperf. יִשְׁרֹב Jer 5:6.

2. A consonant is sometimes strengthened merely for the sake of *euphony* (*Dageš euphonicum*), and the strengthening is then not so essential. This occurs¹—

(a) when two words are closely united in pronunciation by *Dageš forte conjunctivum*: (1) in the first letter of a monosyllable or of a word having the tone (or occasionally the counter-tone) on the first syllable,² when closely connected with the preceding word, if that word ends in a tone-bearing *Qameš* (הַ) with *Šēwâ mobile* preceding, or a tone-bearing הַ, —called *צְחִיק* (i.e. *compressed*) by the Jewish grammarians.

The term monosyllable here and in f (by § 28 e) includes Segholates like שָׁבֶב, שָׁבֶב, &c., as well as forms like לְפָרִי, מָשָׁבֶב, and even בְּנָעַן.

Some limit the use of the *D'ḥiq̄* to the closest connexion of a monosyllable with a following *B'gadk'phath*. However, it also applies to cases like לְכָה-אָת Nu 22:6; תְּקַהְיָא Gn 2:23; יְצַהְלָךְ Ps 91:11; and even with *Rēš*, עֲמָנָה-בָּבָר Pr 15:1; וְמָשָׁבֶב Gn 43:15. In all these examples the tone, were it not for the *Maqqēph*, would be on the ultima of the first word.

Rem. 1. When הַ this has *Maqqēph* after it, a *Dageš forte conj.* always follows, even if the next word is neither a monosyllable nor has the tone on the initial syllable; thus not only in מָוֶה Jer 23:6, but also in וְזָה-פְּרִיה Nu 13:27, 1 Ch 22:1. In הַגָּה אָת Gn 19:2 (where *Maqqēph* is represented by a conjunctive accent, § 9 u, 1 c, and § 16 b), the *S'ghôl* coincides with the secondary tone-syllable. On the origin of *Dag. f. conj.* after מה (for הָה) what?, see § 37 b, c.

2. Such cases as בְּנָעַן הַגָּה Ex 15:1, 21, the 2nd בְּנָעַן הַגָּה in ver. 11, בְּנָעַן הַלְתָה ver. 13, בְּנָעַן הַלְתָה ver. 16, do not belong here. In these the *Dageš* can only be intended for *Dag. lene*, see § 21 d.

(2) In the first letter of a monosyllable, or of a word with the tone on the first syllable after a closely connected *milēl* ending in הַ or הַ. Such a *Milēl* is called by the Jewish grammarians צְחִיק מְרֻחָה (Aram.=Heb. מְרֻחָה) *veniens e longinquo* (in respect of the tone). The attraction of the following tone-syllable by *Dageš forte conj.* is here also due to the exigencies of rhythm, e.g. בְּנָעַן שָׁבֶב Ps 68:19; Ps 118:25 (so ed. Mant., but Ginsburg and Kittel אָוֵל אָוֵל); Is 5:14; אָרְצָה הַרְחָחָה יְבָה שָׁבֶב Gn 11:31. The *Milēl* may, however, also be due to a subsequent retraction of the tone (*nāsōg aḥōr*, § 29 e), as in עַשְׂתָה פְּנֵי Gn 1:11.—The prefixes בָּ, לָ, וָ alone do

¹ Cf. Baer, ‘*De primarum vocabulorum literarum dagessatione*,’ in his *Liber Proverbiorum*, Lpz. 1880. pp. vii–xv; F. Prätorius, ‘*Über den Ursprung des Dag. f. conjunctivum*,’ in *ZAW*. 1883, p. 17 ff. (ascribed to an original assimilation of ה or ו).

² alone, although having the tone on the ultima, invariably takes the *Dageš forte conj.* when مشה with a conjunctive accent precedes, Ex 6:10, 29, 15:24, &c.

not take a Dageš in this case, except in לְקָרֶב, always, and לִלְיָה Ps 19:3. Such forms as Is בְּעַמְקָדָה יְחִיד Gn 21:23, בְּקָדָה מְגִבֵּן Jb 21:16, and even הַשְׁבָּעָה לְיִ 50:8 (i.e. the cases where the tone is thrown back from the ultima on to the syllable which otherwise would have *Metheg*), are likewise regarded as *milêl*. On the other hand, e.g. חֲרָה לְקָרֶב Gn 4:6, not לְקָרֶב since the first *ā* of חֲרָה could not have *Metheg*. When words are closely united by *Maqqēph* the same rules apply as above, except that in the first word *Metheg*, in the secondary tone, takes the place of the accent, cf. Gn עַשְׂתָּה הַפְּרִי 1:12; Gn 32:30, &c. Finally, the *Dageš* is used when the attracted word does not begin with the principal tone, but with a syllable having *Metheg*, וְיַרְשָׁה Ps 37:9; Is 44:21; Ex 25:29, provided that the second word does not begin with a *B^egadk^ephath* letter (hence e.g. Gn 2:4).

Rem. Such cases as קָנַע Dt 32:6, and שִׁבְעָה 32:15, and גַּעֲזָה (so Baer, but not ed. Mant., &c.) 1 S 1:13 are therefore anomalous; also, because beginning with a B^egadk^ephath, בְּאַלְמָם Ex 15:11 (cf. however above, e); בְּזָרְעָן Jos 8:28; בְּקָרְבָּהָא Ps 77:16; בְּיָהָרָב Jb 5:27.—It is doubtful whether we should include here those cases in which *Dageš forte* occurs after a word ending in a toneless *ū*, such as קְוֹמָצָא Gn 19:14, Ex 12:31; Ex 12:15 (רְאֵשׁ), Dt 2:24; also לְאֵ Gn 19:2, 1 S 8:19; לְזֵ Ju 18:19, Est 6:13 (where P. Haupt regards the *Dageš* as due to the enclitic character of the word); טְפָחָה Ho 8:10; דְּזֵ Jer 49:30; רְדוֹ 1 S 15:6. When we explained the *Dageš* in these examples not as conjunctive, but orthophonic (see above, § 13 c, and Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, 4th ed. on Ps 94:12 a), we especially had in view those cases in which the consonant with *Dageš* has a ſwā. The extension of the use of *Dageš* to consonants with a strong vowel, seems, however, to indicate that these are cases of the רְחִיקָה, אֲתִי מְרְחִיקָה, which was required by some Masoretes but not consistently inserted. On the other hand, the *Dageš forte* in ' after a preceding i (Ps 118:5, 18), and even after ū (Ps 94:12), is due to an attempt to preserve its consonantal power; see König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 54 b.

(b) When a consonant with Š̄wā is strengthened by *Dageš forte dirimēns* to make the Š̄wā more audible. In almost all cases the strengthening or sharpening can be easily explained from the character of the particular consonant, which is almost always a sonant, sibilant, or the emphatic *Qôph*; cf. Lv 25:5, Dt 32:32 (for עַבְדִּי); Gn 17:13 (with כָּלֹתָךְ Is 33:1 (where, however, however, is to be read); cf. Na 3:17, Jb 9:18, 17:2, Jo 1:17 (with נָ); Is 57:6 (with לְ); Ju 20:43,¹ 1 S 1:6 (with רַ); Gn 49:10, 17 (and so always in עֲקָבָה Ju 5:22, Ct 1:8 and עֲקָבָת Ps 77:20, 89:52); Ex 15:17, Dt 23:11, Ju 20:32, 1 S 28:10 (קָ)²; Ex 2:3, Is 58:3, Am 5:21, Ps 141:3, Pr 4:13 (צָ); Pr 27:25 (שָׁ); Is 5:28, Ps 37:15, Jer 51:56, Neh 4:7 (שָׁ). Also, with כ Ho 3:2; with ב Is 9:3, Jer 4:7; with נ 1 S 10:11. In many instances of this kind the influence of the following consonant is also observable.

(c) When a vowel is to be made specially emphatic, generally in the principal *pause*, by a *Dageš forte affectuosum* in the following consonant. Thus in a following sonant, Ju 5:7 (לְלִקְעָה), Jb 29:21 (יְיַחֲדָה), 22:12 (בְּמֵאָה); Ez 27:19 (in גְּ); in הָ Is 33:12, 41:17, Jer 51:58, perhaps also Jb 21:13 (יְתַהֲרֵה).

¹ The ordinary reading הַרְדִּישׁ הוּא, where 7 is without *Dageš*, is only intelligible if the 7 has *Dageš*.

² Also in Ps 45:10 read יְקִרְוָתָךְ with Baer and Ginsburg, following Ben Asher, and in Pr 30:17 (Ben Naphthali) לִקְהַת בֵּיכֶם and לִקְהַת בֵּיכֶן.

(d) When the sonants ל, מ are strengthened by *Dageš fortis firmativum* in the pronouns הַנֶּה, הַנְּתָנוּ, הַנְּתָנוּן, and in הַמְּה ? why? cf. also בַּמְּה, בַּמְּהָה, בַּמְּהָה, whereby? how much? (§ 102 k, l), to give greater firmness to the preceding tone-vowel.

3. Omission of the strengthening, or at least the loss of the *Dageš forte* occurs,

(a) almost always at the end of a word, since here a strengthened consonant cannot easily be sounded.¹ In such cases the preceding vowel is frequently lengthened (§ 27 d), e.g. רַבָּה *multitude*, from רַבְּ בָּעֵם; people, with a distinctive accent or after the article, עֲמָה, from עַמָּם; but e.g. גַּן *garden*, בָּתָה *daughter*, with the final consonant virtually sharpened. On the exceptions תְּךָ *thou* (fem.) and תְּנָךָ *thou* (fem.) *hast given* Ez 16:33, see § 10 k.

(b) Very frequently in certain consonants with Š'wâ *mobile*, since the absence of a strong vowel causes the strengthening to be less noticeable. This occurs principally in the case of ו and ו (on ו and ו after the article, see § 35 b; on ו after מְהָ, § 37 b); and in the sonants מ², נ² and ל²; also in the sibilants, especially when a guttural follows (but note Is 62:9: מִצְפֵּיו, as ed. Mant. and Ginsb. correctly read, while Baer has מִצְפֵּי with compensatory lengthening, and others even מִצְפֵּה; Gn 27:28, 39; מִשְׁלָשׁ 38:24 for ל, שְׁנַיִם 1 K 7:28; Ez 40:43 and נְשָׁק יִם 1 K 19:20 from ה, שְׁפָת יִם, קְהָדָם 1 K 7:28; ה, שְׁלֹבִים, מְשָׁבֶן 104:18; Jon 4:11; Ex 8:1 &c.);—and finally in the emphatic ק.³

מְגֻבָּרָתִם in גַּי Ju 8:2; מִבְצֵיר in בְּ Ez 32:30; נֶדֶחַ in Is 11:12 56:8, Ps 147:2 (*not* in Jer 49:36), supposing that it is the Participle Niphal of נֶדֶחַ; lastly, תִּתְחַזֵּק in Is 22:10. Examples, וַיַּהֲיֵה, עֹנְרִים (so always the preformative, in the *imperf.* of verbs), יָקֹחוּ, יָשְׁאֹו, כָּסָאִי, מְלָאוֹו, הַלְּוֹו, הַנְּנִי, לְמַנְצֵחַ, מְלַמֵּדְלַה, מְקֻלּוֹת, מְקַצֵּה, מְאַתָּה, &c. In correct MSS. the omission of the *Dagesh* is indicated by the *Raphé* stroke (§ 14) over the consonant. However, in these cases, we must assume at least a *virtual* strengthening of the consonant (*Dagesh forte implicitum*, see § 22 c, end).

(c) In the Gutturals, see § 22 b.

Rem. 1. Contrary to rule the strengthening is omitted (especially in the later Books), owing to the lengthening of the preceding short vowel, generally *hireq* (cf. *mīlē* for *mille*), e.g. חִתָּה *he makes them afraid*, for חִתָּה **Hb 2:17** (where, however, it is perhaps more correct to suppose, with König, a formation on the analogy of verbs יָצַא, and moreover to read חִתָּה נִזְקֹות with the LXX), יִזְקֹות **Is 50:11** for זִקְוֹת.

2. Very doubtful are the instances in which compensation for the strengthening is supposed to be made by the insertion of a following 1. Thus for [Is 23:11](#), read **מִצְרַיִם**.

¹ So in Latin *fel* (for *fell*), gen. *fellis*; *mel*, *mellis*; *os*, *ossis*. In Middle High German the doubling of consonants never takes place at the end of a word, but only in the middle (as in Old High German), e.g. *val* (*Fall*), gen. *valles*; *swam* (*Schwamm*, &c., Grimm, *Deutsche Gramm.*, 2nd ed., i. 383).

² *Dageš forte* is almost always omitted in נ when it is the prefix of the participle Piel or Pual, hence Ps 104:3 ה. מִקְרָה who layeth the beams, but הַמִּקְרָה the roof Ec 10:18 (cf. הַמְלָאָה the work, &c.).

³ According to some also in פָּעֵן Is 17:10; but see Baer on the passage.

(or קָבְנָה); and for תִּמְנָה קָבְנָה (see La 3:22), read תִּמְנָה קָבְנוּ. In Nu 23:13 קָבְנוּ is not an instance of compensation (see § 67 o, end).

§ 21. *The Aspiration of the Tenues.*¹

The harder sound of the six *B^egadk^ephath* letters, indicated by a *Dageš lene*, is to be regarded, according to the general analogy of languages, as their older and original pronunciation, from which the softer sound was weakened (§ 6 n and § 13). The original hard sound is maintained when the letter is initial, and after a consonant, but when it immediately follows a vowel or Š^ewā mobile it is softened and aspirated by their influence, e.g. פֶּרֶץ *pāraṣ*, יִפְרֹץ *yiphrōṣ*, כָּל *kōl*, לִכְלַל *lkhōl*. Hence the *B^egadk^ephath* take *Dageš lene*

(1) at the beginning of words: (a) without exception when the preceding word ends with a vowelless consonant, e.g. עַל־כֵן *al-kēn* (*therefore*), עַזְפֵן *ēspēn* (*fruit-tree*); (b) at the beginning of a section, e.g. בְּרִאשָׁית *Gn 1:1*, or at the beginning of a sentence, or even of a minor division of a sentence after a distinctive accent (§ 15 d), although the preceding word may end with a vowel. The distinctive accent in such a case prevents the vowel from influencing the following tenuis, e.g. וַיְהִי בָּאָשָׁר *and it was so, that when*, Ju 11:5 (but נִקְיָּין *Gn 1:7*).

Rem. 1. The vowel letters הַ, וַ, זַ, אַ, as such, naturally do not close a syllable. In close connexion they are therefore followed by the aspirated *B^egadk^ephath*, e.g. וַאֲבָה, וַעֲדָה, &c. On the other hand, syllables are closed by the consonantal נִ and מִ (except קָוִתָּה *Is 34:11*; שָׁלוּבָה *Ez 23:42*; אָדָנִיבָּס *Ps 68:18*), and by הַ with *Mappiq*; hence e.g. there is *Dageš lene* in עַלְיִם *piqim* and always after הַחֲנָן, since the *Q^rēre perpetuum* of this word (§ 17) assumes the reading אָדָנִי.

2. In a number of cases *Dageš lene* is inserted, although a vowel precedes in close connexion. This almost always occurs with the prefixes בְּ and בִּ in the combinations בְּפִ, בְּכִ, בְּבִ, בְּבַ (i.e. when a *B^egadk^ephath* with Š^ewā precedes the same or a kindred aspirate) and בְּמִ (see Baer, *L. Psalmorum*, 1880, p. 92, ² on *Ps 23:3*); cf. e.g. 1 S 25:1, Is 10:9, Ps 34:2, Jb 19:2; בְּגִ is uncertain; בְּכִ, בְּדִ, and according to David Qimhi do not take *Dageš*, nor בְּכִ, and according to the *Dikduke ha-ṭe'amim*, p. 30. Sometimes the *B^egadk^ephath* letters, even with a full vowel, take *Dageš* before aspirant (and even before הַ in הַחֲנָן, בְּ 1 K 12:32); cf. the instances mentioned above, § 20 e (mostly *tenues* before אַ). In all these cases the object is to prevent too great an accumulation of aspirates. The LXX, on the other hand, almost always represent the בְּ and בִּ, even at the beginning of a syllable, by χ and φ; Χερούβ, Χαλδαῖοι, Φαρφάρ, &c.—The forms בְּדִ (after יִמְשַׁתְּ) Is 54:12, and בְּלִיכְלַל (after יִתְהַלֵּל) Jer 20:9 are doubly anomalous.

(2) In the middle of words after Š^ewā *quiescens*, i.e. at the beginning of a syllable immediately after a vowelless consonant, e.g. יִרְפָּא *yirpā* (*he heals*), קָטְלָתָם *ye have killed*; but after Š^ewā *mobile*, e.g. רְפָאָתָךְ *rēphāt'ekh* (*heal thou*), בְּזָהָה *she was heavy*.

¹ Cf. Delitzsch, *Ztschr. f. luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1878, p. 585 ff.

² Also *L. Proverbiorum*, 1880, Praef. p. ix; and *Dikduke ha-ṭe'amim*, p. 30 (in German in König's *Lehrgeb.*, i. p. 62).

¹ The exceptions יְקַחְתָּאֵל Jos 15:38 (see *Minḥat shay*, on this passage), 2 K 14:7, and יְקַדְּעֵם Jos 15:56 may perhaps be due to the character of the בְּ.

On קְטַלְתָּךְ, קְנִישָׁךְ and similar forms, see § 10 i.

Whether Š^ewâ be vocal and consequently causes the aspiration of a following *tenuis*, depends upon the origin of the particular form. It is almost always vocal

(a) When it has arisen from the weakening of a strong vowel, e.g. רְפֵעַ pursue ye (not רְפֵא) from מְלָכִי (not מְלָכִי), because originally *mālākhē*, but from the ground-form *malk*.

(b) With the נ of the pronominal suffixes of the 2nd pers. נְנוּ, נְכָם, נְכָמָה, since Š^ewâ mobile is characteristic of these forms (see § 58 f; § 91 b).

Rem. Forms like קְתַלְתָּךְ thou (fem.) *hast sent*, in which we should expect an aspirated ה after the vowel, cf. קְנִישָׁךְ Ex 18:9, have arisen from קְתַלְתָּךְ, קְנִישָׁךְ, &c.; Pathah being here simply a helping vowel has no influence on the tenuis; cf. § 28 e.

§ 22. Peculiarities of the Gutturals.

The four gutturals נ, ה, ע, א, in consequence of their peculiar pronunciation, have special characteristics, but א, as the weakest of these sounds, and sometimes also ע (which elsewhere as one of the harder gutturals is the opposite of א), differ in several respects from the stronger ה and ע.

1. They do not admit of *Dageš forte*, since, in consequence of a gradual weakening of the pronunciation (see below, note 2), the strengthening of the gutturals was hardly audible to the Masoretes. But a distinction must be drawn between (a) the complete omission of the strengthening, and (b) the mere *echo* of it, commonly called *half doubling*, but better, *virtual strengthening*.

In the former case, the short vowel before the guttural would stand in an open syllable, and must accordingly be lengthened or modified.² For a distinction must again be drawn between the full lengthening of *Pathah* into *Qameṣ*—mostly before א (always under the ע of the article, see § 35), as a rule also before ע, less frequently before ה, and least often before נ—and the modification of *Pathah* to *S'ghôl*, mostly before a guttural with *Qameṣ*. In the other case (*virtual strengthening*) the *Dageš* is still omitted, but the strengthening is nevertheless regarded as having taken place, and the preceding vowel therefore remains short. This *virtual strengthening* occurs most frequently with נ, usually with ה, less frequently with ע, and very seldom with א. Examples of (a) תְּהִנְתֵּר (for *yihhabhe*); also תְּהִנְתֵּר (see more fully on the pointing of the article before ע in § 35).—Of (b) מְחוֹת (from *minhūt*), עֲבָר (from *habar*), גְּזָר (from *zahr*), &c.—In all these cases of virtual strengthening the *Dageš forte* is to be regarded at least as implied (hence called *Dageš forte implicitum*, *occultum*, or *delitescens*).

2. They prefer before them, and sometimes after them (cf. ה), a short A-sound, because this vowel is organically the nearest akin to the gutturals. Hence

2 Cf. *terra* and the French *terre*, the German *Rolle* and the French *rôle*; German *drollig* and French *drôle*. The omission of the strengthening shows a deterioration of the language. Arabic still admits of the strengthening of gutturals in all cases.

(a) before a guttural, *Pathah* readily (and always before ה, ח, ו closing a syllable) takes the place of another short vowel or of a rhythmically long ē or ō, e.g. זְבַח sacrifice, not zēbēh; עַמְשֵׁ report, not šēmē. This is more especially so when a was the original vowel of the form, or is otherwise admissible. Thus in the Imperat. and Imperf. Qal of guttural verbs, חָלַח send thou, יִשְׁלֹחַ he will send (not yišlōh); Perf. Piel חָלַשׁ (but in Pausa חָלַשׁ); דַּיְחַםְתִּ he will desire (not yiḥmōd); חָנַן and he rested (not wayyānōh); עַרְתָּ a youth. In such cases as אֲשָׁרְתִּ, קָרְאַ, בָּשָׁרְתִּ, the א has no consonantal value, and is only retained orthographically (see § 23 a).

(b) After a heterogeneous long vowel, i.e. after all except *Qameṣ*, the hard gutturals¹ (consequently not א), when standing at the end of the word, require the insertion of a rapidly uttered ā (*Pathah furtivum*) between themselves and the vowel. This *Pathah* is placed under the guttural, but sounded before it. It is thus merely an orthographic indication not to neglect the guttural sound in pronunciation, e.g. רֻוָּחַ, נֹעַ, הַשְׁלִיחַ, גְּבוּךְ, רַעַ, (when consonantal ה is final it necessarily takes *Mappiq*), but e.g. רַוְחַי, &c., since here the rapidly uttered ā is no longer heard.

I^ach for *ich*, &c., in some Swiss dialects of German, is analogous; a *furtive Pathah* is here involuntarily intruded before the deep guttural sound. In Arabic the same may be heard in such words as *mesiāh*, although it is not expressed in writing. The LXX (and Jerome, cf. ZAW. iv. 79) write ε, sometimes α, instead of *furtive Pathah*, e.g. ἡ Νῶε, Ιεδδούα (also Ἰαδδού).

Rem. 1. The guttural may also have an influence upon the *following* vowel, especially in Segholate forms, e.g. נָעֵר (not *naer*) a youth, פָּעֵל (not *pōel*) deed. The only exceptions are בְּקָרָם, לְקָרָם, בְּקָרָן, אֲקָרָן.

2. Where in the present form of the language an i, whether original or attenuated from *Pathah*, would stand before or after a guttural in the first syllable of a word, a S^eghol as being between ā and i is frequently used instead, e.g. יְחִיפָּשׁ (also יְאִזְרִי, יְאִדְרִי, יְהִגְגָּ), יְחִילִי, &c.

On the other hand, the slighter and sharper *Hireq* is retained even under gutturals when the following consonant is sharpened by *Dageš forte*, e.g. הַלְּהָ, הַלְּהָה, הַלְּהָה; but when this sharpening is removed, S^eghol is again apt to appear, e.g. הַזְּיוּן, הַגְּזִין constr. הַזְּיוּן, הַגְּזִין constr.

3. Instead of *simple Šwâ mobile*, the gutturals take without exception a compound Šwâ, e.g. שְׁבָטָה, אֲקָטָלָה, אֲנָמָרָה, &c.

¹ Prätorius, *Ueber den rückweich. Accent im Hebr.*, Halle, 1897, p. 17, &c., remarks that *Pathah furtivum* has not arisen merely under the influence of the guttural, but is due to a duplication of the accented syllable, so that e.g. יְצִוֵּה would also be pronounced *yasi'bh*, *yaṣi'dh* although the short intermediate vowel was not so noticeable as before a guttural.

ZAW. ZAW, = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

4. When a guttural with *quiescent Šwâ* happens to close a syllable in the middle of a word, the strongly closed syllable (with *quiescent Šwâ*) may remain; necessarily so with **ח**, **ע**, and **נ** at the end of the tone-syllable, e.g. **שְׁלַח**, **שְׁלָא**, **יְדַעַת**, but also *before* the tone (see examples under i), even with **א**.

But in the syllable before the tone and further back, the closed syllable is generally opened artificially by a *Hateph* (as being suited to the guttural) taking the place of the *quiescent Šwâ*, and in particular that *Hateph* which repeats the sound of the preceding vowel, e.g. **יְחִישֵׁב** (also **יְחִישֶׁבּ**); **זְקִינֵׁק** (also **זְקִינֶׁק**); **עֲלֹוֶה** **פְּ** **pō̄lō** (for **pō̄lō**). But when, owing to a flexional change, the strong vowel following the *Hateph* is weakened into *Šwâ mobile*, then instead of the *Hateph* its fall vowel is written, e.g. **עֲמָדוֹת** (**עֲמָדוֹת**), **עֲרָמוֹת** (**עֲרָמוֹת**), **עֲלָכָה** **עֲלָכָה** (**עֲלָכָה**). The original forms, according to § 28 c, were *yam'dhû*, *ner'mû*, *pō̄lōkhā*. Hence **עֲדָוָת**, **עֲמָדוֹת**, &c., are really only different orthographic forms of **עֲמָדוֹת**, **עֲמָדוֹת**, &c., and would be better transcribed by *ya'm'dhû*, &c.

Rem. 1. On the use of simple or compound *Šwâ* in guttural verbs, see further §§ 62–65.

2. Respecting the choice between the three *Hatephs*, it may be remarked:

(a) **ח**, **ה**, **ע** at the beginning of a syllable prefer **א**, but **א** prefers **א**, e.g. **הַמֹּאֲרֵךְ** *ass*, **גַּרְגַּר** *to kill*, **אָמַר** *to say*; when farther from the tone syllable, however, the **א** even under **א** changes into the lighter **א**, e.g. **אָלִיכָם** (*poetic for אֶלְכָם*) *to*, but **אָכְלִי** **אָלִיכָם** *to eat*, but **אָכְלִי** (*"khôl*, toneless on account of Maqqēph). Cf. § 27 w. The 1st pers. sing. imperf. Piēl regularly has **א**. Likewise **א** is naturally found under **א** in cases where the *Hateph* arises from a weakening of an original **א** (e.g. **אָרִי** *lion*, ground-form **ary**), and **א** if there be a weakening of an original **u** (e.g. **אָנָי** *a fleet*, **אָנָגָן** *affliction*, cf. § 93 q, z).

(b) In the middle of a word after a long vowel, a *Hateph-Pathah* takes the place of a *simple Šwâ mobile*, e.g. **אָנָה** **עָלָה** (*see § 63 p*); but if a short vowel precedes, the choice of the *Hateph* is generally regulated by it, e.g. *Perf. Hiph.* **עָמֵיד** (*see above, i*), *Infin.* **עָמֵיד** (*regular form עָמֵיד*); *Perf. Hoph.* **עָמַד**, **עָמַד** (*regular form עָמַד*); but cf. **שְׁחָדוֹת** **שְׁחָדוֹת** Jb 6:22 (*§ 64 a*).

5. The **ר**, which in sound approximates to the gutturals (§ 6 g), shares with the gutturals proper their first, and to a certain extent their second, peculiarity, viz.

(a) The exclusion of the strengthening, instead of which the preceding vowel is almost always lengthened, e.g. **בָּרְךָ** *he has blessed* for *birrakh*, **בָּרְךָ** *to bless* for *barrēkh*.

(b) The preference for **א** as a preceding vowel, e.g. **וַיַּרְא** *and he saw* (*from וְיָרָא*); **וַיַּרְא** both for **וַיַּרְא** *and he turned back*, and for **וַיַּרְא** *and he caused to turn back*.

The exceptions to **א** are *mōrrâth*, Pr 14:10; **קְבַת** **שְׁרָךְ** and **שְׁרָךְ** **שְׁוֹרְרֶךְ**, Ez 16:4 (cf. Pr 3:8); **אֲשֶׁר** **אֲשֶׁר** Ct 5:2; **הַקְעָמָה** 1 S 1:6; **הַרְאִיקָם** 1 S 10:24, 17:25, 2 K 6:32; exceptions to **ב** are **הַרְיִיבָה** Ju 20:43 (cf. § 20 h); **אֲרִיךְ** 1 S 23:28, 2 S 18:16; also on account of **דִּחְקָה** (*§ 20 c*), Pr 15:1, 20:22, 2 Ch 26:10; and on account of **מְרֹחִיק** (*§ 20 f*) 1 S 15:6, Jer 39:12, Ps 52:5, Hb 3:13, Pr 11:21, Jb 39:9, Ezr 9:6. A kind of virtual strengthening (after **ב** for **בְּ**) is found in **מְרֹגְגָה** Is 14:3. In Samaritan and Arabic this strengthening has been retained throughout, and the LXX write e.g. Σάρρα for **שָׂרָה**.

§ 23. The Feebleness of the Gutturals *a* and *h*.

1. The **א**, a light and scarcely audible guttural breathing, as a rule entirely loses its slight consonantal power whenever it stands without a vowel at the end of a syllable. It then remains (like the German *h* in *roh*, *geh*, *nahte*) merely as a sign of the preceding long vowel, e.g. הָזִיא מְלִיאָה, (but when a syllable is added with an introductory vowel, according to *b* below, we have, e.g. הָזִיא נִי, since the א then stands at the beginning of the syllable, not مְלִיאָנִי), cf., however, § 74 a), חֹזִיאָנִי (for *māṣatā*), שָׁנָא נִירָא, &c. (§ 19 l), and even in אַשְׁר קָרָא (see above, § 22 e), the א only retains an orthographic significance.

2. On the other hand, א is in general retained as a strong consonant whenever it begins a syllable, e.g. אָמֵר, אָסֵג, or when it is protected by a *Hateph* after a short syllable, e.g. לְאָכֶל, and finally, when it stands in a closed syllable with quiescent Šwâ after a preceding S'ghôl or *Pathah*, e.g. נָאָדָר, יְאָסָר *nādār*, *yāsār*. Even in such cases the consonantal power of א may be entirely lost, viz.

(a) when it would stand with a long vowel in the middle of a word after Šwâ mobile. The long vowel is then occasionally thrown back into the place of the Šwâ, and the א is only retained orthographically, as an indication of the etymology, e.g. רְאִשִּׁים heads (for *rāšîm*), בְּאַתָּה two hundred (for *mēṭhāyim*), Ez 25:6 for בְּזַמָּן Neh 6:8 for בְּזַמָּן; בְּקַרְבָּן Jb 31:7, Dn 1:4 for פָּאָרָה Is 10:33; חֲטָאת Jb 1 S 14:33 for חֲטָאת (cf. § 74 h, and § 75 oo); so always חֲטָאת or חֲטָאת Nu 34:14, from רְאִיבָנִי; 1 K 14:16, Mi 1:5, &c., for חֲטָאת. Sometimes a still more violent suppression of the א occurs at the beginning of a syllable, which then causes a further change in the preceding syllable, e.g. מְלָאָכָה work for מְלָאָכה (as in the Babylonian punctuation), שְׁמָמָאָל for יְשֻׁמְעָאָל (see § 102 m), שְׁמָמָאָל or שְׁמָמָאָל the left hand, ground form *simâl*.

(b) When it originally closed a syllable. In these cases א is generally (by § 22 m) pronounced with a *Hateph*, תְּ or תָּ. The preceding short vowel is, however, sometimes lengthened and retains the following א only orthographically, e.g. Nu 11:25 for נִי אָצֵל Nu 11:25 for לְאָלָהִים for לְאָלָהִים; but the contraction does not take place in לְאָלִיל תְּ Is 10:11. The short vowel is retained, although the consonantal power of א is entirely lost, in גַּדְנִי, &c. (see § 102 m), Is 41:25, Ez 28:16 for גַּדְנָךְ; cf. Dt 24:10, 1 K 11:39, Is 10:13.

Instead of this א which has lost its consonantal value, one of the vowel letters וּ and יּ is often written according to the nature of the sound, the former with ô and the latter with î, e.g. בְּרִימָה buffalo for רְאִימָה. At the end of the word הַ also is written for אָ, he fills for יְמִילָה Jb 8:21 (see below, I).

3. When א is only preserved orthographically or as an indication of the etymology (quiescent), it is sometimes entirely dropped (cf. § 19 k), e.g. יְצַחֵץ Jb 1:21 for יְצַחֵץ; וְפָזֵר נִי; וְנִירְפָּאוּ Nu 11:11; וְתָקֵעַ 2 S 20:9; וְתָקֵעַ Jer 8:11 for תָּקֵעַ Nu 11:11; וְתָקֵעַ 2 S 22:40, but תָּקֵעַ Ps 18:40; Gn 25:24 for תָּקֵעַ; וְתָקֵעַ 31:39, for אֲתָקֵעַ; חֲבָר תְּאַנְהָה 1 S 1:17 for תְּאַנְהָה; Ps 22:22 for רְאִים; שְׁאָלָה 1 Ch 11:39 for רְאִים; שְׁאָרִית 1 Ch 12:38 for שְׁאָרִית; שְׁאָרִית 2 K 19:25 and so 2 S 23:37;

K^ethibh for **אָזֶה** (cf. Is 37:26); **לְפָנֶיךָ** Jb 29:6 for **אַזְמָחָךְ**.¹ In 1 K 5:25 (for **מִכְּאָזֶן**) the strengthening of the following consonant by Dageš compensates for the loss of the **א**; in **סֵתֶר** Ez 20:37, if for **סֵאָתֶר** (but read **מִסְרָר**, with Cornill), the preceding vowel is lengthened; cf. above, c. On **אָמֵר** for **אָמַר**, see § 68 g.

Rem. 1. In Aramaic the **א** is much weaker and more liable to change than in Hebrew. In literary Arabic, on the other hand, it is almost always a firm consonant. According to Arabic orthography, **א** serves also to indicate long *a*, whereas in Hebrew it very rarely occurs as a mere vowel letter after Qameṣ; as in **אָמַת** Ho 10:14 for **מָקַם** *he rose up*; **רֹאשׁ** Pr 10:4, 13:23 for **רֹאשׁ** *poor*; but in 2 S 11:1 the *K^ethibh* **הַמְּלָאִכִּים** *the messengers*, is the true reading; cf. § 7 b.

2. In some cases at the beginning of a word, the **א**, instead of a compound *Šuā*, takes the corresponding full vowel, e.g. **אָזָר** *girdle* for **אָזָרָא**; cf. § 84 a, q, and the analogous cases in § 52 n, § 63 p, § 76 d, § 93 r (אֲנָלִים).

3. An **א** is sometimes added at the end of the word to a final *î*, *i*, or *ô*, e.g. **הַלְכָה** for **הַלְכָה** for **הַלְכָה** (before **א!**!), Is 28:12. These examples, however, are not so much instances of ‘Arabic orthography’, as early scribal errors, as in **יְשֻׁוָּא** Je 10:5 for **יְשֻׁוָּא**; and in **נְשִׂיאָה** Ps 139:20 for **נְשִׂיאָה**. Cf. also **חַדְשָׁה** Ec 11:13 (§ 75 s) for **חַדְשָׁה** *pure*; **לֹא** for **לֹא**; **אֲפָוָה** for **אֲפָוָה** for **אֲפָוָה** *if*; **וְ** for **וְ** *then* (*enclitic*); **רְבָה** for **רְבָה** *myriad*, Neh 7:66, 71. On **הַיָּה** and **הִיא** see § 32 k.

4. The **ה** is stronger and firmer than the **א**, and never loses its consonantal sound (i.e. *quiesces*) in the middle of a word¹ except in the cases noted below, in which it is completely elided by syncope. On the other hand, at the end of a word it is always a mere vowel letter, unless expressly marked by *Mappiq* as a strong consonant (§ 14 a). Yet at times the consonantal sound of **ה** at the end of a word is lost, and its place is taken by a simple **ה** or more correctly **הָ**, with *Rāphē* as an indication of its non-consonantal character, e.g. **הָתָּה** to *her* for **הָהָה**, Zc 5:11, &c. (cf. § 103 g, and §§ 58 g, 91 e); cf. also **הָהָה** for **הָהָה** (from **הָהָה**) in proper names like **יְרָמִים**, &c.—Finally, in very many cases a complete elision of the consonantal **ה** takes place by *syncope*: (a) when its vowel is thrown back to the place of a preceding *Šwâ mobile* (see above, c, with **א**), e.g. **קָרְבָּה** for **קָרְבָּה** (the **ה** of the article being syncopated as it almost always is); **בְּנִינִיהם** for **בְּנִינִיהם** [but see § 35 n], **יְהֹוֹנָה** for **יְהֹוֹנָה**; perhaps also **בְּנִינִיהם** for **בְּנִינִיהם** Ez 27:32. (b) By contraction of the vowels preceding and following the **ה**, e.g. **סְוִסָּה** (also written **סְוִסָּה**) from *súsahu* (*a+u=ô*).—A violent suppression of **ה** together with its vowel occurs in **בָּם** (from **בָּהָם**), &c.

Rem. In connexion with *ô* and *e*, a **ה** which only marks the vowel ending is occasionally changed into **ו** or **וּ** (e.g. **הָרָאָה**=**הָרָאָה** Ho 6:9), and with any vowel into **א** in the later or Aramaic orthography, but especially with *ā*, e.g. **אָגָשָׁה** *sleep*, Ps 127:2 for **אָגָשָׁה**; **אָשָׁשָׁה** Jer 23:39 for **אָשָׁשָׁה**, &c. Thus it is evident that final **ה** as a vowel letter has only an orthographical importance.

§ 24. Changes of the Weak Letters **וּ** and **אָ**.

¹ In Jer 22:23, **נִתְנַחַת** is unquestionably a corruption of **נִתְנַחַת** for **נִתְנַחַת**.

¹ Only apparent exceptions are such *proper names* as **פְּרַחַצְׂרָאָל**, **עֲשָׂהָאָל**, which are compounded of two words and hence are sometimes even divided. Cf. forms like **חַזְאָל** for **חַזְאָהָאָל**. Another exception is **יְפַהְפִּיהָ**, the reading of many MSS. for the artificially divided form **יְפַהְ-פִּיהָ** in the printed texts, Je 46:20.

Philippi, *Die Aussprache der semit. Konsonanten und ֿ* (mentioned above, § 5 b, note 1), a thorough investigation of their phonetic value as consonantal, i.e. non-syllabic, vowel-sounds, not palatal or labial fricatives; cf. also E. Sievers, *Metriche Studien*, i. 15.

ׁ and ׂ are, as consonants, so weak, and approach so nearly to the corresponding vowels *u* and *i*, that under certain conditions they very readily merge into them. This fact is especially important in the formation of those weak stems, in which a ׁ or ׂ occurs as one of the three radical consonants (§ 69 ff., § 85, § 93).

1. The cases in which ׁ and ׂ lose their consonantal power, i.e. merge into a vowel, belong almost exclusively to the middle and end of words; at the beginning they remain as consonants.¹

The instances may be classified under two heads:

(a) When either ׁ or ׂ with *quiescent Šewâ* stands at the end of a syllable immediately after a *homogeneous* vowel (*u* or *i*). It then merges in the homogeneous vowel, or more accurately it assumes its vowel-character (ׁ as *u*, ׂ as *i*), and is then contracted with the preceding vowel into *one* vowel, necessarily long, but is mostly retained orthographically as a (quiescent) vowel letter. Thus הַשְׁבָּע for *huwšab*; יִקְרָא for *yiqqaṣ*, so also at the end of the word, e.g. עֲבָרִיָּה *a Hebrew*, properly *ibriy*, fem. pl. עֲבָרִים (and עֲבָרִת) Jb 41:25 for עֲשֹׂוֹת 1 S 25:18 *Kethibh*). On the other hand, if the preceding vowel is heterogeneous, ׁ and ׂ are retained as full consonants (on the pronunciation see § 8 m), e.g. מֵשֵׁלָן *quiet*, מֵשֵׁן *the month of May*, גּוֹי *nation*, גּוֹלָא *revealed*. But with a preceding ׁ the ׁ and ׂ are mostly contracted into ׁ and ׂ (see below, f), and at the end of a word they are sometimes rejected (see below, g).

Complete syncope of ׁ before ׁ occurs in אֵי *island* for עֵין; עֵינִי *ruins* for עֵינִי *watering* Jb 37:11 for כֵּן; [כֵּי] *burning* Is 3:24 for כֵּי, cf. §§ 84a c, e, 93 y].

Thus an initial ׁ after the prefixes בֶּ, בַּ, בָּ, לֶ, לַ, which would then be pronounced with ׁ (see § 28 a), and also almost always after בֶּ (see § 102 b), coalesces with the ׁ to ׁ, e.g. מִצְרַיִם *in Judah* (for בְּיַהוָּה, בְּיַהוָּה, בְּיַהוָּה) and Judah, מִצְרַיִם *as the Nile*, לְיַהוָּה *for Judah*, מִצְרַיִם *from the hands of*.

(b) When ׁ and ׂ without a vowel would stand at the end of the word after *quiescent Šewâ*, they are either wholly rejected and only orthographically replaced by ה (e.g. כָּה from *bikhy*, as well as the regularly formed בְּכִי *weeping*; cf. § 93 x) or become again vowel letters. In the latter case ׂ becomes a homogeneous *Hireq*, and also attracts to itself the tone, whilst the preceding vowel becomes *Šewâ* (e.g. פָּרִי from *piry*, properly *pariy*); ׁ is changed sometimes into a toneless *u* (e.g. תָּהִי from *tuhw*).

¹ Or as consonantal vowels (see above), and are then transcribed by P. Haupt, Philippi, and others, as *u*□, *i*□, following the practice of Indogermanic philologists. ׁ for ׁ and ׂ alone is a standing exception, see § 26. 1 and § 104 e. On ׁ=i at the beginning of a word, cf. § 47 b, note. According to § 19 a, end, *initial ׁ* in Hebrew almost always becomes ׂ; always in verbs originally פְּזַבֵּחַ, § 69 a. Apart from a few proper names, *initial ׁ* occurs only in נְזַבֵּחַ *hook*, וְלַדֵּךְ *child* Gn 11:30, 2 S 6:23 *Kethibh* [elsewhere נְלַדְּךְ], and the doubtful נְזַבְּךְ Pr 21:8.

Rem. In Syriac, where the weak letters more readily become vowel sounds, a simple *i* may stand even at the beginning of words instead of *ו* or *וֹ*. The LXX also, in accordance with this, write Ιουδά for יְהוּדָה, Ισαάκ for אַיָּזָק. Hence may be explained the *Syriac usage* in Hebrew of drawing back the vowel *i* to the preceding consonant, which properly had a simple vocal Š^ewâ, e.g. (according to the reading of Ben-Naphtali¹) יְלִילָה (so Jer 25:36 for יְלִילָה) (so Baer), קְרִירָן (so Ec 2:13 for קִירָן, cf. also the examples in § 20 h, note 2; even יְחִילָה (so Jb 29:21) (in some editions) for חִילָה). According to Qimḥî (see § 47 b) יְקִטָּל was pronounced as *iqtōl*, and therefore the 1st peps. was pointed לְאַקְטָּל to avoid confusion. In fact the Babylonian punctuation always has *i* for *a* in the 1st pers.

2. With regard to the *choice* of the long vowel, in which *ו* and *וֹ* quiesce after such vocalization and contraction, the following rules may be laid down:

- (a) With a short *homogeneous* vowel *ו* and *וֹ* are contracted into the corresponding long vowel (*û* or *i*), see above, b.
- (b) With short *ă* they form the diphthongs *ô* and *ê* according to § 7 a, e.g. מִיטִּיב from שִׁבְעָה, וּשְׁבֵעָה; מִיטִּיב from יְשִׁיבָה, &c.²

Rem. The rejection of the half vowels *ו* and *וֹ* (see above, b) occurs especially at the end of words after a heterogeneous vowel (*ă*), if according to the nature of the form the contraction appears impossible. So especially in verbs לְהַגְלִיל, e.g. originally הַגְלִילָה(¹=גְלִילָה), since *ă* after the rejection of the *ו* stands in an open syllable, and consequently must be lengthened to *ā*. The *ה* is simply an orthographic sign of the long vowel. So also הַשְׁלָאָל for šālaw.¹ On the origin of *הַגְלִילָה*, see § 75 e; on מְקֻדָּשָׁה as perf. and part. of קָדָם, see § 72 b and g; on יְלִילָה, &c., from ולְדָה, see § 69 b.—On the weakening of *ו* and *וֹ* to *ă*, see § 93 x.

§ 25. Unchangeable Vowels.

What vowels in Hebrew are unchangeable, i.e. are not liable to attenuation (to Š^ewâ), modification, lengthening, or shortening, can be known with certainty only from the nature of the grammatical forms, and in some cases by comparison with Arabic (cf. § 1 m). This hems good especially of the *essentially* long vowels, i.e. those long by *nature* or *contraction*, as distinguished from those which are only lengthened *rhythmically*, i.e. on account of the special laws which in Hebrew regulate the tone and the formation of syllables. The latter, when a change takes place in the position of the tone or in the division of syllables, readily become short again, or are reduced to a mere vocal Š^ewâ.

¹ According to Abulwalid, Ben-Naphtali regarded the *Yodh* in *all* such cases as a vowel letter.

² Instances in which no contraction takes place after *ă* are, 1 Ch 12:2; מִימִינִים Ho 7:12 (but cf. § 70 b); Ps 5:9 *Q'reh*, the locatives בְּיִתְהָבָה, בְּיִתְהָבָה, &c.—On the suffix יְכִי־ for יְכִי־ see § 91 l.—Sometimes both forms are found, as עֲזָלָה and עֲזָלָה; cf. חַי living, constr. state חַי. Analogous is the contraction of מְמֻתָּה (ground-form *mawt*) death, constr. state מְמֻתָּה (ground-form *ayn* [ain]) eye, constr. עֵין.

¹ The Arabic, in such cases, often writes etymologically גָلָה, but pronounces *galā*. So the LXX Σινᾶ, Vulg. *Sina*; cf. Nestle, ZAW. 1905, p. 362 f. But even in Arabic شَلَّا is written for شَلَّو and pronounced *salā*.

1. The essentially long and consequently, as a rule (but cf. § 26 p, § 27 n, o), unchangeable vowels of the *second* and *third* class, *i*, *ē*, *û*, *ō*, can often be recognized by means of the vowel letters which accompany them (יִ, יֵ, יַ, יָ); e.g. יִתְּפִיבּ *he does well*, חַיְבָל *palace*, גַּבּוֹל *boundary*, קֹוֶל *voice*. The *defective* writing (§ 8 i) is indeed common enough, e.g. גַּבּוֹל for קֹוֶל; יִתְּפִיבּ and יִתְּפִיבּ for גַּבּוֹל; but this is merely an orthographic licence and has no influence on the quantity of the vowel; the *û* in גַּבּוֹל is just as necessarily long, as in גַּבּוֹל.

As an exception, a merely tone-long vowel of both these classes is sometimes written *fully*, e.g. יִקְטּוֹל for יִקְטּוֹל.

2. The essentially or naturally long *â* (*Qameš impure*),² unless it has become *ô* (cf. § 9 q), has as a rule in Hebrew no representative among the consonants, while in Arabic it is regularly indicated by ئ; on the few instances of this kind in Hebrew, cf. § 9 b, § 23 g. The naturally long *â* and the merely tone-long *ā* therefore can only be distinguished by an accurate knowledge of the forms.

3. Short vowels in closed syllables (§ 26 b), which are not final, are as a rule unchangeable, e.g. מִלְבָשׁ *garment*, מִזְבֵּחַ *wilderness*, מְמֻלָּכָה *kingdom*; similarly, short vowels in sharpened syllables, i.e. before *Dagesh forte*, e.g. גִּנְבֵּבָה *thief*.

4. Finally, those long vowels are unchangeable which, owing to the omission of the strengthening in a guttural or ר, have arisen by lengthening from the corresponding short vowels, and now stand in an open syllable, e.g. מֵאֵן for *mī'ēn*; בְּרֵךְ for *burrakh*.

§ 26. Syllable-formation¹ and its Influence on the Quantity of Vowels.

Apart from the unchangeable vowels (§ 25), the use of short or long vowels, i.e. their lengthening, shortening, or change into vocal Šwâ, depends on the *theory of syllable-formation*. The initial and final syllables especially require consideration.

1. The *initial* syllable. A syllable regularly begins with a consonant, or, in the case of initial י and ו (cf. note on § 5 b), a consonantal vowel.² The copula is a standing exception to this rule. According to the Tiberian pronunciation נ and is resolved into the corresponding vowel י before Šwâ, and the labials, e.g. וְלָקֵךְ, וְקָבֵר; the Babylonian punctuation in the latter cases writes נ, i.e. נ before a full vowel.

2. The *final* syllable. A syllable may end—

² By *vocales impurae* the older grammarians meant vowels properly followed by a vowel letter. Thus קְחַבּ *kethâbh* was regarded as merely by a licence for קְחַאַבּ, &c.

¹ Cf. C. H. Toy, ‘The Syllable in Hebrew,’ *Amer. Journal of Philol.*, 1884, p. 494 ff.; H. Strack, ‘The Syllables in the Hebrew Language,’ *Hebraica*, Oct. 1884, p. 73 ff.

² We are not taking account here of the few cases in which initial *Yodh* is represented as simple *i*, by being written י or ئ, see § 24 e, and especially § 47 b, note; nor of certain other cases in which ئ with an initial vowel has only a graphic purpose, though it is indispensable in an unpointed text.

(a) With a vowel, and is then called an *open* or *simple* syllable, e.g. in לְקַטָּה where the first and last are open. See below, e.

(b) With *one* consonant, and is then called a *simple closed* or *compound* syllable, as the second in לְבָבּ קַטָּל. See below, o, p. Such are also the syllables ending in a strengthened consonant, as the first in קַטָּל qat-tel. See below, q.

(c) With *two* consonants, a *doubly closed* syllable, as קַטָּשׁ qošt. Cf. below, r, and § i-l.

3. *Open* or *simple* syllables have a long vowel, whether they have the tone as in בָּךְ in *thee*, לֹךְ he goes, or are toneless as in עֲטָבּ a bunch of grapes.³ A long vowel (Qameš, less frequently Ṣere) is especially common in an open syllable before the tone (pretonic vowel), e.g. לְבָבּ בָּקָטּ וּמָלֵךְ. ¹

Short vowels in *open* syllables occur:

(a) In apparently dissyllabic words formed by means of a helping vowel from monosyllables, as בָּרְךִּי brook, בָּתְּהִירְךִּי house, בָּרְךִּי let him increase, from naḥl, bayt, yirb; cf. also בָּרְךִּי the ending of the dual (§ 88). But see § 28 e.

(b) In the verbal suffix of the 1st pers. sing. (נִ - me), e.g. נִטְלָנֵי (Arab. qāṭalāni). The uncommon form נִ - , however (Gn 30:6, cf. § 59f), proves that the tone-bearing *Pathaḥ* produces a sharpening of the following sonant, and thus virtually stands in a closed syllable,

³ ³ In opposition to this fundamental law in Hebrew (a *long* vowel in an *open* syllable), the original short vowel is found always in Arabic, and sometimes in the other Semitic languages, except of course in the case of *naturally* long vowels. The above examples are pronounced in Arabia bīkā, qāṭalā, iṇnāb. Although it is certain therefore that in Hebrew also, at an earlier period, *short* vowels were pronounced in open syllables, it may still be doubted whether the present pronunciation is due *merely* to an artificial practice followed in the solemn recitation of the O. T. text. On this hypothesis we should have still to explain, e.g. the undoubtedly very old lengthening of i and u in an open syllable into ē and ō.

¹ ¹ That these pretonic vowels are really *long* is shown by Brockelmann, ZA. xiv. 343 f., from the transcription of Hebrew proper names in the Nestorian (Syriac) punctuation, and e.g. from the Arabic Ibrāhīm=אַبְرָהָם. He regards their lengthening in the syllable before the tone as a means adopted by the Masoretes to preserve the pronunciation of the traditional vowels. This explanation of the pretonic vowels as due to a precaution against their disappearing, is certainly right; as to whether the precaution can be ascribed to the Masoretes, see the previous note. For the pretonic vowel the Arabic regularly has a short vowel (*lāhūm*, *yāqūm*, &c.), the Aramaic simply a vocal Šwā (לְהֻןּ, יְקֻםּ, לְבָבּ, קַטָּל); and even in Hebrew, when the tone is thrown forward the pretonic vowel almost always becomes Šwā, see § 27. It would, however, be incorrect to assume from this that the pretonic vowel has taken the place of Šwā only on account of the following tone-syllable. It always arises from an original short vowel, since such a vowel is mostly lengthened in an open syllable before the tone, but when the tone is moved forward it becomes Šwā.

even when the *Nun* is not expressly written with *Dageš*. In cases like יְנַחֲנָה (§ 102 m) *Pathaḥ* is retained in the counter-tone after the \aleph has become quiescent.

(c) Sometimes before the toneless ה־ *local* (§ 90 c), e.g. מִדְבָּרֶה *towards the wilderness*; only, however, in the constr. state (1 K 19:15), since the toneless suffix ה־ does not affect the character of the form (especially when rapidly pronounced in close connexion); otherwise it is מִדְבָּרֶה.

In all these cases the short vowel is also supported by the tone, either the principal tone of the word, or (as in *h*) by the secondary tone in the constr. st., or by the counter-tone with *Metheg*, as in יָמֵן above, *g*; cf. the effect of the *arsis* on the short vowel in classical prosody.

(e) In forms like יְחִזְקָה *yāḥāz^e-qu* (they are strong), עֲלֹךְ *pōō l^ekhā* (thy deed). These again are cases of the subsequent opening of closed syllables (hence, e.g. יְחִזְקָה also occurs); עֲלֹךְ is properly *pōl^ekhā*; cf. generally § 22 m, end, and § 28 c.

Such eases as **אֲחִים** (§ 96), **הַחַת** (§ 67 w) do not come under this head, since they all have *ă* in a virtually sharpened syllable; nor does the tone-bearing *S'ghôl* in suffixes (e.g. **בְּנָכֶת**), nor *S'ghôl* for *ă* before a guttural with *Qameṣ* (§ 22 c). On **בְּשִׁים** and **קְשִׁים**, see § 9 v.

4. The independent syllables with a firm vowel which have been described above, are frequently preceded by a single consonant with vocal Š^ewâ, simple or compound. Such a consonant with vocal Š^ewâ never has the value of an independent syllable, but rather attaches itself so closely to the following syllable that it forms practically one syllable with it, e.g. לְחֵי (cheek) לְחֵי; בְּלִרְבָּו (sickness) בְּלִרְבָּו yilim^edhû. This concerns especially the prefixes ל, ב, כ, בְ. See § 102.

The Š^ewâ *mobile* is no doubt in all such cases weakened from an original full vowel (e.g. יָקְלָעַ Arab. *yaqtūlū*, בֵּקָע Arab. *bikā*, &c.); from this, however, it cannot be inferred that the Masoretes regarded it as forming a kind of *open* syllable, for this would be even more directly opposed to their fundamental law (viz. that a long vowel should stand in an open syllable), than are the exceptions cited above, *f–k*. Even the use of Metheg with Š^ewâ in special cases (see § 16 f) is no proof of such a view on the part of the Masoretes.

5. Closed syllables ending with one consonant, when without the tone, necessarily have *short vowels*, whether at the beginning or at the end of words,¹ e.g. מלְכָה queen, הבְּשָׁר understanding, חַכְמָה wisdom, וַיַּסֶּר and he turned back, וַיִּקְםֶנּוּ (wayyāqōm).

¹ In exceptions such as פָּנָלִי Gn 4:25 (where *šāt* is required by the character of the form, although the closed syllable has lost the tone owing to the following Maqqeph),

A *tone-bearing* closed syllable may have either a long or short vowel, but if the latter, it must as a rule be either Pathah or S^eghôl.² The tone-bearing closed penultima admits, of the *long* vowels, only the tone-long ā, ē, ō, not the longest i, ī, ē, ô, ū; of the *short* vowels, only ā, ē, not i, ū, ō (but on i and ū, see § 29 g). Thus יִקְרָא (3rd pl. masc. Imperf. Hiph.) but תְּקַנֵּת לְנָה 3rd pl. fem., and קו מַזְמָן (and pl. masc. Imperat. Qal) but נַחַת מַנְחָה fem.

6. A special kind of closed syllables are the *sharpened*, i.e. those which end in the same (strengthened) consonant with which the following syllable begins, e.g. אֶמְמִי, קֶלְלוּ kūl-lō. If without the tone, they have, like the rest, short vowels; but, if bearing the tone, either short vowels as הֶבֶת, קֶלֶב, or long, as הֶמֶת, קֶלֶל.

On the omission of the strengthening of a consonant at the end of a word, see § 201.

7. Syllables ending with *two* consonants occur only at the end of words, and have most naturally short vowels, נְלָטָה, וְיִשְׁבָּה; but sometimes *Sere*, as גְּרָךְ, וְיִבְּשָׁה, or *Holem*, טְשִׁפְתָּה. Cf., however, § 10 i. Usually the harshness of pronunciation is avoided by the use of a helping vowel (§ 28 e).

§ 27. *The Change of the Vowels, especially as regards Quantity.*

The changes in sound through which the Hebrew language passed, before it assumed the form in which we know it from the Masoretic text of the O. T. (see § 2 k), have especially affected its vowel system. A precise knowledge of these vowel changes, which is indispensable for the understanding of most of the present forms of the language, is derived partly from the phenomena which the language itself presents in the laws of derivation and inflexion, partly from the comparison of the kindred dialects, principally the Arabic. By these two methods, we arrive at the following facts as regards Hebrew:

1. That in an open syllable the language has frequently retained only a half-vowel (*S̄wâ mobile*), where there originally stood a full short vowel, e.g. עֲגָלָת (ground-form āgālat) *a waggon*, אֲדָקָה (groundform s̄adāqāt) *righteousness*, קְטָלָו (Arab. qātālū), יְקָטָלָו (Arab. jūqattilū).

2. That vowels originally short have in the tone-syllable, as also in the open syllable preceding it, been generally changed into the corresponding tone-long vowels, ā into ā, i into ī, ū into ū (see 9, a–e, k, r). If, however, the tone be shifted or weakened, these tone-long vowels mostly revert to their original shortness, or, occasionally, are still further shortened, or reduced to mere *S̄wâ mobile*, or, finally, are entirely lost through a change in the division of syllables; e.g. מְטָר (Arab. māṭār) *rain*, when in close dependence on a following genitive in the *construct state*),

Metheg is used to guard against a wrong pronunciation; similarly ī is sometimes retained before Maqqeph, e.g. מְמַתְּהֵג Gn 2:13; מְעַמְּדֵה Gn 2:16.

² See § 9 e, f. i □ occurs thus only in the particles אָם, עָמָן; but these usually (always) are rendered toneless by a following Maqqeph. Cf. also such forms as וְיִשְׁבָּה § 26 r and § 75 q.

becomes מַטְרָה (Arab. *aqiš*) heel, dual עֲקֵב יִם, dual *construct* (with attenuation of the original ā of the first syllable to i) עֲקֵבִי (on the ּ, see § 20 h); יָקְטָל (Arab. *yāqtūl*), plur. يَقْتُلُونَ (Arab. *yāqtūlū*). For instances of complete loss, as in פָּסֶפֶת, cf. § 93 m.

According to § 26, the following details of vowel-change must be observed:

1. The original, or a kindred short vowel reappears—

(a) When a closed syllable loses the tone (§ 26 o). Thus, יָד hand, but יְדֵי Yahwe; בָּן son, but בֵּן the son of the king; כָּלָל the whole, but כָּלָלָה the whole of the people; so also when a tone-bearing closed syllable loses the tone on taking a suffix, e.g. אָבִי enemy, but אָבִיךָ thy enemy; finally, when the tone recedes, וְיִקְרָא, but וְיִקְרָא (wayyāqōm); but וְלֹא.

(b) To the same category belong cases like קָדְשָׁה book, but סָפֶר my book; קָדְשָׁה holiness, but קָדְשִׁי my holiness. In spite of the helping vowel, סָפֶר and קָדְשָׁה are really closed syllables with a tone-long vowel; when the syllable loses the tone, the original i or ū (properly ū) reappears.

The same is true of syllables with a virtually sharpened final consonant: the lengthening of original i to ē and ū to ū takes place only in a tone-bearing syllable; in a toneless syllable the i or ū (or ū) remains, e.g. אֶמֶת mother, but אֶמֶת my mother; חָקָק law, plur. עֲקָקִים; but עֲזָקָה strength, עֲזָקָה (and עֲזָקָה) my strength.

2. The lengthening of the short vowel to the corresponding long, takes place—

(a) When a closed syllable becomes open by its final consonant being transferred to a suffix beginning with a vowel, or in general to the following syllable, e.g. קָטַל he has killed him; סָוִסָּת primarily from סָוִסָּת. Similarly ā mostly becomes ā even before a suffix beginning with Šwâ mobile; e.g. קָטַל, לְקָטַל from סָוִסָּת, תָּקָטַל from סָוִסָּת.

(b) When a syllable has become open by complete loss of the strengthening of its final consonant (a guttural or *Rēš*), e.g. בִּירְךָ for *birrakh*, see § 22 c. Cf. also § 20 n.

(c) When a weak consonant (ח, נ, י) following the short vowel quiesces in this vowel, according to § 23 a, c, d, § 24 f, e.g. אַחֲנָה for אַחֲנָה, where the ח, losing its consonantal value, loses also the power of closing the syllable, and the open syllable requires a long vowel.

(d) Very frequently through the influence of the *pause*, i.e. the principal tone in the last word of a sentence or clause (§ 29 k). Sometimes also through the influence of the article (§ 35 o).

3. When a word increases at the end and the tone is consequently moved forward, or when, in the *construct state* (see § 89), or otherwise in close connexion with the following word, its tone is weakened, in such cases a full vowel (short or tone-long) may, by a change in the division of syllables, be weakened to Šwâ mobile, or even be entirely lost, so that its place is taken by the mere syllable-divider (Šwâ quiescens). Examples of the first case are, שֵׁם name, pl. שָׁוֹתֶה, but מֵשֵׁם my name, שָׁוֹתֶם their

names, constr. st. קְבָר word; constr. st. צִדְקָה righteousness; constr. st. צִדְקַת; an example of the second case is, constr. st. בְּרָכָה blessing; constr. st. בְּרָכַת. Whether the vowel is retained or becomes Š^ewâ (ם, מֵ, but שֵׁם, שֵׁמֵי), and which of the two disappears in two consecutive syllables, depends upon the character of the form in question. In general the rule is that only those vowels which stand in an open syllable can become Š^ewâ.

Thus the change into Š^ewâ takes place in—

(a) The ā and ē of the first syllable, especially in the inflexion of nouns, e.g. קְבָר word, plur. קְבָרִים, great, fem. קְבָרִתִּי heart, my heart; but also in the verb, קְרַבְתִּי she will return, plur. קְרַבְתִּים, and so always, when the originally short vowel of the prefixes of the Imperfect comes to stand in an open syllable which is not pretonic. On the other hand, an ā lengthened from ā before the tone is retained in the *Perfect consecutive* of Qal even in the secondary tone, e.g. נִזְקָן, טַלְפָת; cf. § 49 i.

(b) The short, or merely tone-long, vowels *a*, *e*, *o* of the ultima, especially in verbal forms, e.g. קָטָל, fem. קָטָלה, יִקְטָלֶו, יִקְטָלָה; but note also יִלְקֹטֶן, תִּקְבְּקִין, &c., according to § 47 m and o. The helping vowels are either entirely omitted, e.g. מֶלֶךְ king (ground-form *malk*), e.g. מֶלֶכִי my king; or, under the influence of a guttural, are weakened to Ḥateph, e.g. עַבְרָו boy, עַבְרָו his boy. If the tone remains unmoved, the vowel also is retained, notwithstanding the lengthening of the word, e.g. יִקְטָלֶו pausal-form for יִקְטָלָו.

Where the tone moves forward two places, the former of the two vowels of a dissyllabic word may be shortened, and the second changed into Š^ewâ. Cf. קְבָר word; in the plur. קְבָרִים; with heavy suffix מְקֻרְבָּה their words. On the attenuation of the ā to ī, see further, s. t.

Rem. 1. An ô arising from *aw=au*, or by an obscuring of ā (see § 9 b), sometimes becomes ū, when the tone is moved forward, e.g. נְקוּם וְעַמְּקָם (see Paradigm *Perf. Niph.* of קומ); flight, fem. אֲנָנוּסָה with suffix, אֲנָנוּסָה. The not uncommon use of ī in a sharpened syllable, as in Ez 20:18 (for בְּקָרִי, cf. also the examples in § 9 o), is to be regarded as an orthographic licence, although sometimes in such cases ū may really have been intended by the *K^ethibh*.

Of the vowels of the U-class, ū and tone-long ō stand in a tone-bearing closed final syllable, and ö in a toneless syllable, e.g. יְקַוֵּם he will arise, יְקַוֵּם jussive, let him arise, מְקֻרְבָּה and he arose. The only instance of ū in an ultima which has lost the tone is מְרַגְּלָה Ex 16:20 (see § 67 n). Similarly, of vowels of the I-class, ē, ī, and ē stand in a tone-bearing closed final syllable, and ē in a toneless syllable, e.g. יְקַרְבָּה he will raise, יְקַרְבָּה let him raise, מְקֻרְבָּה and he raised. The only instance of ī in an ultima which has lost the tone is וְרַצְחָה Ju 9:53 (see § 67 p).

2. In the place of a *Pathaḥ* we not infrequently find (according to § 9 f) a *S^eghōl* (ē, ē) as a modification of ā:

(a) In a closed antepenultima, e.g. in the proper names אַבִּיכָר and אַבִּיכָּר, where LXX Αβι- = אַבִּיכָּר, which is certainly the better reading, cf. Ulmer, *Die semit. Eigennamen*, 1901, p. 12: or

in a closed penultima, e.g. יָדְךָ, but also יָדְכֶם your hand, for *yad^əkhem*. In all these cases the character of the surrounding consonants (see § 6 q) has no doubt had an influence.

(b) Regularly before a guttural with *Qameṣ* or *Hateph Qameṣ*, where the strengthening has been dropped, provided that a lengthening of the *Pathaḥ* into *Qameṣ* be not necessary, e.g. אֶחָיו his brothers, for 'aħāw; בַּשְׂרֵב false, for kaħās; פַּחַד governor, constr. st. פַּחַת; כַּחֲם coal; הַחַי the living (with the article, הַ for הַ); Nu 23:19, &c., and so always before הַ and חַ, as הַחֲדֹשִׁים the months, see § 35 k. Before הַ and יַ S^eghōl generally stands only in the second syllable before the tone, e.g. הַכְּרִים the mountains; הַזְוֹן the guilt; immediately before the tone *Pathaḥ* is lengthened into a (pretonic) *Qameṣ*, e.g. הַהָרָה Nu 8:7. Before the weak consonants נ and ר (cf. § 22 c, q), the lengthening of the *Pathaḥ* into *Qameṣ* almost always takes place, e.g. הָאָבָב the father, pl. הָאָבוֹת; הָרָאֵב the head, pl. הָרָאֵשִׁים. Exceptions, הַרָּה towards the mountain, Gn 14:10, in the tone-syllable, for hárrā; הַרְיָה (pr. name) for יְהִי, בְּרִיָּה. On הַ as a form of the interrogative הָ (הָ), see § 100 n; on הַמָּה for מַה (מָה), § 37 e, f. Finally, אַכְלָנָה Ex 33:3 also comes partly under this head, in consequence of the loss of the strengthening, for אַכְלָנָה, and יְחִזְקָאֵל Ezekiel for יְחִזְקָאֵל = חִזְקָאֵל, God strengthens.

(c) As a modification of the original *Pathah* in the first class of the segholate forms (§ 93 g), when a helping vowel (§ 28 e) is inserted after the second consonant. Thus the ground-form *kalb* (*dog*), after receiving a helping *S'eghôl*, is modified into לְבָב (also in modern Arabic pronounced *kelb*),¹ *yarḥ* (*month*), with a helping *Pathah*, נַרְחֵב. The same phenomenon appears also in the formation of verbs, in cases like לְגַזֵּב (jussive of the Hiphîl of נַלְגֵּב), with a helping *S'eghôl*, for *yagl*.

3. The attenuation of *ă* to *i̥* is very common in a toneless closed syllable.

(a) In a firmly closed syllable, מִזְוֹ his incasure, for מִזּוֹ (in a sharpened syllable); I have begotten thee, from יָלַלְתִּי with the suffix קָם; cf. Lv 11:44, Ez 38:23, and § 44 d. Especially is this the case in a large number of segholates from the ground-form *qaṭṭ*, when combined with singular suffixes, e.g. צַדְקִי my righteousness, for *Sadqi*.¹

(b) In a loosely-closed syllable, i.e. one followed by an aspirated *Begadk^ephath*, as דְמָכַת your blood, for דְמָכָם, and so commonly in the *st. constr. plur.* of segholates from the ground-form *qaṭṭ*, e.g. בְגָדִי from בְגָד (ground-form *bagd*) a garment. In most cases of this kind the attenuation is easily intelligible from the nature of the surrounding consonants. It is evident from a comparison of the dialects, that the attenuation was consistently carried out in a very large number of noun and verb-forms in Hebrew, as will be shown in the proper places.¹

4. *S^eghôl* arises, in addition to the cases mentioned in *o* and *p*, also from the weakening of *ā* of the final syllable in the isolated cases (נַחֲלָה for נַחֲלָה) in 1 S 28:15 (? see § 48 d), Ps 20:4 (?), Is 59:5, Pr 24:14 (see § 48 l); for examples of Locative forms in נַחֲלָה see § 90 i end.

1¹ So the LXX write Μελγισεδέκ for לְקָמֵלְכִיָּז.

¹ Analogous to this attenuation of *ă* to *i* is the Lat. *tango, attingo; laxus, prolixus*; to the transition of *ă* to *ě* (see above, a), the Lat. *carpo, decerpo; spargo, conspergo*.

5. Among the *Hataeph*-sounds ² is shorter and lighter than ³, and consequently the vowel group ² is shorter than ³; e.g. אֶדוֹם *Edom*, but יְאָדָם (*Edomite*), shortened at the beginning because the tone is thrown forward; מֵתָה (*mèth*) *truth*, וְמֵתָה (*his truth*); מַלְלָה (*malalah*) *hidden*, pl. מַלְלִים (*malalim*) *but also conversely עֲבָרָתִי (*abarathiy*) but עֲשָׂתָה (*asatay*) cf. § 63 f, 3.*

6. To the chapter on vowel changes belongs lastly the *dissimilation* of vowels, i.e. the change of one vowel into another entirely heterogeneous, in order to prevent two similar, or closely related vowels, from following one another in the same word.² Hence for לֹלָא *lôlô* (unless). Cf. also בְּחַדְשָׁה from נְכֻחָה; רְאַשְׁׁוֹן from רְאַשׁׁוֹן; עַיְרָם from עַיְרָם; בְּנֵי חַיְזָן from בְּנֵי רְאַשְׁׁוֹן; רְאַשְׁׁוֹן from עַיְרָם; most probably also יְלָדָה *offspring*, קְפָדָה *porcupine*, for קְפָדָה, see § 68 c, note.—On the proper names יְהֹוָה and יְשָׁעָה, which were formerly explained in the same way, see now Praetorius, *ZDMG*. 1905, p. 341 f.

§ 28. The Rise of New Vowels and Syllables.

1. According to § 26 m a half-syllable, i.e. a consonant with Š^ewâ mobile (always weakened from a short vowel), can only occur in close dependence on a full syllable. If another half-syllable with simple Š^ewâ follows, the first takes a full short vowel again.³ This vowel is almost always *Hireq*. In most cases it is probably an attenuation of an original ā, and never a mere helping vowel. In some instances analogy may have led to the choice of the i. Thus, according to § 102 d, the prefixes בְּ, בָּ, לְ before a consonant with Š^ewâ mobile become בְּ, בָּ, לְ, e.g. בְּפִרִי, בְּפִרִי; before יְ they are pointed as in בְּיְהֹרָה (from *bi-yeh^edûā*, according to § 24 c); so too with *Wāw copulative*, e.g. וְיְהֹרָה for וְיְ attenuated from וְיְ. The first half-syllable, after the restoration of the short vowel, sometimes combines with the second to form a firmly closed syllable, e.g. לְנִפְלֵל Nu 14:3 for *lin^ephôl*, and so almost always in the infin. constr. after לְ (§ 45 g); in isolated cases also with בְּ, as בְּקַפְרֵר Jer 17:2.

2. If a guttural with *Hataeph* follows, the original ā of the prefixes is retained before *Hataeph Pathah*, but before *Hataeph S^eghol* or *Hataeph Qameṣ* it is modified to the short vowel contained in the *Hataeph*. Thus arise the vowel groups בְּ, בָּ, בְּ, בָּ, בְּ, בָּ, אֲנִי, אֲנִי and I, אֲשֶׁר, אֲשֶׁר as, בְּאַכְלֵי, בְּאַכְלֵי to eat, בְּאַלְמֵד, בְּאַלְמֵד in sickness. On the Metheg with every such short vowel, see § 16 f, δ. Sometimes here also a fully closed syllable is formed. In such a case, the prefix takes the short vowel, which would have belonged to the suppressed *Hataeph*, e.g. בְּאַתְּ בְּאַתְּ for לְחַתְּ Is 47:14 for לְחַתְּ (see § 67 cc); רְאַסְרֵךְ but also רְאַסְרֵךְ; and even עְצֵר Jb 4:2, cf. Gn 32:16. So always in the Infin. and Imperat. Qal of the verbs הַיְהָ to be and הַיְהָ to live, e.g. לְהַיְהָ to be, וְהַיְהָ and be ye; even with עַתָּה, as הַיְהָתָה, on which cf. § 102 b; but הַיְהָתָה and be, הַיְהָתָה and live, have ē instead of i under the prefix. For the Metheg, cf. § 16 f, ε.

3. When a *Hataeph* in the middle of a word, owing to flexional changes, would stand before a vocal Š^ewâ, it is changed into the short vowel, with which it is compounded. This applies especially to cases in which the *Hataeph* stands under a

² Cf. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semit. Spr.*, p. xxix; A. Müller, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1892, p. 177 f., and Nestle, *ibid.*, p. 573 f.

ZDMG. ZDMG. = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

³ Except וְand, which generally becomes וְ before a simple Š^ewâ, cf. § 104 c.

guttural instead of quiescent Š^ewâ, as an echo of the preceding short vowel, e.g. יְעַמֵּד for *he will stand* (for יָעַם), but plur. יְעַמְּדוּ for *ya'm^edhû*, and יְנַהֲפֵךְ for *nēh^aph^ekhû* (*they have turned themselves*), לְעַמְּךָ thy work, cf. § 26 k. The syllables are to be divided *yāă-m^edhû*, and the second ā is to be regarded exactly as the helping *Pathah* in עַ, &c.¹

4. At the end of words, syllables occur which close with two consonants (§ 10 i, § 26 r), but only when the latter of the two is an emphatic consonant (ט, ק) or a tenuis (viz. ב, ד, ג, ת²), e.g. יִשְׁלַח let him turn aside, קָרַב and he caused to drink, רָאַת thou (fem.) hast said, נִבְךָ and he wept, נִירַךְ and let him have dominion, נִשְׁבַּח and he took captive.

This harsh ending is elsewhere avoided by the Masora,³ which inserts between the two final consonants a helping vowel, usually Š^eghôl, but with medial or final gutturals a *Pathah*,¹ and after ' a *Hireq*, e.g. וַיַּגְּלֹل and he revealed, for *wayyigl*; יְרַב let it multiply, for *yirb*; שְׁקָדָל holiness, ground-form *qudš*; בְּנַת brook, ground-form *nahl*; תְּשִׁלְחָנָה thou hast sent; בְּבַיִת house, ground-form *bayt*. These helping vowels are, however, to be regarded as exactly like *furtive Pathah* (§ 22 f, g); they do not alter the monosyllabic character of the forms, and they disappear before formative suffixes, e.g. קָדְשָׁה my holiness, בְּיִתָּה home-ward.

5. On the rise of a full vowel in place of a simple Š^ewâ, under the influence of the pause, see § 29 m; on initial § for §, see § 23 h.

§ 29. The Tone, its Changes and the Pause.

1. The principal tone rests, according to the Masoretic accentuation (cf. § 15 c), as a rule on the final syllable, e.g. קָרְרֹן, קָרְרָם, קָרְרָתָה—in the last five examples on the formative additions to the stem. Less frequently it rests on the penultima, as in לִילָה night, קָטָלָתָה death; but a closed penultima can only have the tone if the ultima is open (e.g. מָנָה, לְכָנָה, קָטָלָתָה), whilst a closed ultima can as a

¹ In Ju 16:13 read אֶרְגִּי not (with Opitius, Hahn and others) חָרְגִּי.

² With a final ה, the only example is סְפֻתָּה Pr 30:6, where several MSS. and printed editions incorrectly have ה without *Dagesh*. Instead of this masoretic caprice we should no doubt read סְפֻתָּה.

³ An analogy to this practice of the Masora is found among the modern Beduin, who pronounce such a helping vowel before *h*, *h*, *h*, *g*; cf. Spitta, *Gramm. des arab.* *Vulgärdialektes von Aegypten*, Lpz. 1880, § 43 d.

¹ On the apparent exceptions אֲשָׁלָךְ, &c., cf. § 22 e; other instances in which א has entirely lost its consonantal value, and is only retained orthographically, are אֲשָׁר sin, אֲנָצָה valley (also נָצָה), אֲנָשָׁה vanity (Jb 15:31 *K^ethi* אֲנָשָׁה).

² In this form (§ 65 g) the *Dagesh lene* remains in the final *Tâw*, although a vowel precedes, in order to point out that the helping *Pathah* is not to be regarded as a really full vowel, but merely as an orthographic indication of a very slight sound, to ensure the correct pronunciation. An analogous case is יְהָדָה *yihăd* from יְהָנָה (§ 75 r).

rule only be without the tone if the penultima is open, e.g. מְקַנֵּן, מְקַנֵּן; see also below, e.

A kind of counter-tone or secondary stress, as opposed to the principal tone, is marked by *Metheg* (§ 16 c). Words which are closely united by *Maqqeph* with the following word (§ 16 a) can at the most have only a secondary tone.

2. The original tone of a word, however, frequently shifts its place in consequence either of changes in the word itself, or of its close connexion with other words. If the word is increased at the end, the tone is moved forward (*descendit*) one or two places according to the length of the addition, e.g. קְבָרִיךְ מָ; קְבָרִים; קְבָרַת word, plur. your words; קְדֻשָּׁה holy thing, plur. קְדֻשָּׁתָּה הוּא לְפָנֶיךָ, קְדֻשָּׁה יְמִינְךָ קְדֻשָּׁה וְקְדֻשָּׁתְּךָ. On the consequent vowel-changes, see § 27 d, i–m.

3. On the other hand, the original tone is shifted from the ultima to the penultima (*ascendit*):

(a) In many forms of the Imperfect, under the influence of a prefixed *Wāw consecutive* (י see § 49 c–e), e.g. י אָמַר *he will say*, וַיֹּאמֶר *and he said*; יְלַךְ *he will go*, וַיְלַךְ *and he went*. Cf. also § 51 n on the impf. Niphal, and § 65 g, end, on the impf. Piel; on these forms in Pause, when the *consec.* does not take effect, see below, p.

(b) For rhythmical reasons (as often in other languages), when a monosyllable, or a word with the tone on the first syllable, follows a word with the tone on the ultima, in order to avoid the concurrence of two tone-syllables¹. This rhythmical retraction of the tone, however (נִסְגָ אַחֲרָן *receding*, as it is called by the Jewish grammarians), is only admissible according to *a*, above, provided that the penultima, which now receives the tone, is an open syllable (with a long vowel; but see *g*), whilst the ultima, which loses the tone, must be either an open syllable with a long vowel, e.g. קָרָא לִיְהָ Gn 1:5, 4:17, 27:25, Ex 16:29, Ps 5:11, 104:14, Dn 11:13, or a closed syllable with a short vowel, e.g. בָנָם, בָנָם Gn 3:19, Jb 3:3, 22:28.² The *grave* suffixes –תָם, –תָמָם, –תָמָן are exceptions, as they never lose the tone. Moreover a fair number of instances occur in which the above conditions are fulfilled, but the tone is not retracted, e.g. esp. with יְהִי, and before ו; cf. Qimḥi, *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenberg (Lyck, 1862), p. 4^b, line 13 ff.

¹ Even Hebrew *prose* proceeds, according to the accentuation, in a kind of iambic rhythm. That this was intended by the marking of the tone, can be seen from the use of Metheg.—Jos. Wijnkoop in *Darche hannesigah sive leges de accentus Hebraicae linguae ascensione*, Ludg. Bat. 1881, endeavours to explain, on euphonic and syntactical grounds, the numerous cases in which the usual retraction of the tone does not occur, e.g. יְבָרֶךְ הָשֵׁךְ Is 45:7, where the object probably is to avoid a kind of hiatus; but cf. also Am 4:13. Prätorius, *Ueber den ruickweich. Accent im Hebr.*, Halle, 1897, has fully discussed the *nasog 'ahor*.

² The reading עֲזֵי יִם (so even Opitius and Hahn) Ez 16:7 for עֲזֵי מִם is rightly described by Baer as ‘error turpie’.—That an unchangeable vowel in a closed final syllable cannot lose the tone is shown by Prätorius from the duplication of the accent (see above, § 22 f.).

Although *Sere* can remain in a closed ultima which has lost the tone, it is perhaps not to be regarded in this case (see § 8 b) as a long vowel. At any rate it then always has, in correct editions, a retarding *Methog*, no doubt in order to prevent its being pronounced as *S'ghôl*, e.g. לְבָעֵר יְהוָה Nu 24:22; cf. Nu 17:23, Ju 20:2, Is 66:3, Jer 23:29, Ez 22:25, Ps 37:7, and even with a following *furtive Pathâh* Pr 1:19, 11:26, &c., although there is no question here of two successive tone-syllables. In other cases the shortening into *S'ghôl* does take place, e.g. הַזְּלִם פֶּעֶם who smiteth the anvil, Is 41:7, for אֲתָּה שָׁמָר הַזְּלִם פֶּעֶם 1 K 16:24.—The retraction of the tone even occurs when a half-syllable with a Š^ewâ mobile precedes the original tone-syllable, e.g. מְטַעַנְתִּי חַבְבָּא נָמָנוֹ לִי Ps 31:5; יְזַקְיִי בָּוָר Ps 28:1; as also when the tone-syllable of the second word is preceded by a half-syllable, e.g. עַשְׂתָּה פָּרִי Gn 1:11 (on the *Dag. f.*, cf. § 20 f); לְפָתָח לְבָקָר Gn 15:7 (cf. § 20 c).

According to the above, it must be regarded as anomalous when the Masora throws back the tone of a closed ultima upon a *virtually sharpened* syllable with a short vowel, e.g. אֲחָר פָּן § 101 a; וְקַחְשֵׁב Po Jb 8:18, cf. Lv 5:22, Ho 9:2; לְצַדְקָה בָּנוּ Gn 39:14, 17; whereas it elsewhere allows a closed penultima to bear the tone only when the ultima is open. Still more anomalous is the placing of the tone on a *really sharpened* syllable, when the ultima is closed, as in לְקַמְּלָה 2 S 23:1; בְּכַר שׂוֹעֵץ Jb 34:19; cf. also קַמְּלָה Gn 4:24, with *Metheg* of the secondary tone. We should read either סַקְנָה, or, with Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 167, Ginsb., Kittel, after Bomb., קַמְּלָה. Other abnormal forms are וְקַזְקֵקְבָּשׁ Ex 4:4 (for similar instances see § 15 c, end) and וְקַיְיִשְׁמָם Dt 10:5.

(c) In *pause*, see i–v.

The meeting of two tone-syllables (see e, f) is avoided also by connecting the words with Maqqeph, in which case the first word entirely loses the tone, e.g. וְקַרְבָּשׁ מְקַרְבָּשׁ and he wrote there, Jos 8:32.

4. Very important changes of the tone and of the vowels are effected by the *pause*. By this term is meant the strong stress laid on the tone-syllable in the last word of a sentence (verse) or clause. It is marked by a great *distinctive accent*, *Sillûq*, *Athnâh*, and in the accentuation of the books תְּהִלָּה, *Olè w' yôrêd* (§ 15 h). Apart from these principal pauses (*the great pause*), there are often pausal changes (*the lesser pause*) with the lesser distinctives, especially *S'golta*, *Zaqeph qaṭon*, *R^ebhi*, and even with *Pašta*, *Tiphâha*, *Gereš*, and (Pr 30:4) *Pazer*.¹ The changes are as follows:

¹ In most cases, probably on account of a following guttural or (at the end of a sentence) י (cf. e.g. Ex 21:31, Jer 3:9 [but Ginsb. חַחָנָה], Ru 4:4, Ec 11:6 [but Ginsb. יְכַשֵּׁר]; before י Jer 17:11) [see also § 29 w]. אַתָּה טַפְשָׁה 1 S 7:17, אַתָּה Is 65:17, Pr 25:3, where ā has *munah*, are very irregular, but the lengthening here is probably only to avoid the cacophony *sphâ*־*t̄et*. In the same way חַצְצָה Ez 17:15 (with *Mahpakh* before ה) and מִקְרָב Ez 37:8 (with *Darga* before מ) are to be explained. The four instances of אַנְיִי for אֲנִי apparently require a different explanation; see § 32 c.—The theory of Olshausen and others that the phenomena of the *pause* are due *entirely* to liturgical considerations, i.e. that it is ‘a convenient way of developing the musical value of the final accents by means of fuller forms’ in liturgical reading (Sievers,

(a) When the tone-syllable naturally has a short vowel, it as a rule becomes tone-long in *pause*, e.g. קָטַל לְקָטַל, מִם לְמִם; אֶת לְאֶת. An ā which has been modified to *S'ghôl* usually becomes ā in *pause*, e.g. שָׁרֵךְ (ground-form *qašr*) in *pause* שָׁרֵךְ 2 K 11:14; אֶרְצָה אֶרְצָה Jer 22:29; also in 2 K 4:31 read קָשֵׁב with ed. Mant., &c. (Baer קָשֵׁב).— *דבר* becomes in *pause* קָשֵׁב.

Sometimes, however, the distinct and sharper ā is intentionally retained in *pause*, especially if the following consonant is strengthened, e.g. יְבָחַת Jb 4:20, or ought to be strengthened, e.g. תְּבָחַת 2 S 12:3, זְבָחַת Is 8:1, &c.; but also in other cases as נְתָנָת Gn 27:2, because from נְתָנוּ, cf. below, q; וְהַקְרָבָתְנוּ 2 Ch 29:19 (so Baer, but Ginsb. הַקְרָבָת, ed. Mant. הַקְרָבָת); and regularly in the numeral ארבע *four*, Lv 11:20, &c. In the accentuation of the three poetical books (§ 15 d) the use of *Pathâh* with *Athnâh* is due to the inferior pausal force of *Athnâh*, especially after *Ôlè w'yored* (§ 15 o); cf. Ps 100:8, Pr 30:9, and Qimhi, *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenberg, p. 5^b, line 4 from below. Compare the list of instances of pausal ā and ē in the appendices to Baer's editions.

(b) When a full vowel in a tone-bearing final syllable has lost the tone before an afformative, and has become *vocal Š'wâ*, it is restored in *pause* as tone-vowel, and, if short, is lengthened, e.g. לְקָטָל, *fem.* קָטָלָה (*qāṭelâh*), in *pause* קָטָלָה; שְׁמָעָן (*shm'ān*), in *pause* שְׁמָעָן (from sing. שְׁמָעָה); לְקָטָלָו (*qāṭelâw*); לְאָהָה (*qāṭelâh*). The fuller endings of the Imperfect וְ and זְ (§ 47 m and o) alone retain the tone even when the original vowel is restored. In segholate forms, like פְּרִי, לְחִי (ground-form *laḥy*, *pary*), the original ā returns, though under the form of a tone-bearing *S'ghôl*, thus פְּרִי, לְחִי; original i becomes ē, e.g. חֲצִי, in *pause* חֲצִי; original ö (ü) becomes ō (ü) (ground-form *ħuly*), in *pause* חֲלִי (93 x, y, z).

On the analogy of such forms as יְהִי, &c., the shortened Imperfects and יְחִי become in *pause* יְחִי, יְחִי, because in the full forms יְחִי he will be, and he will live, the i is attenuated from an original ā. Similarly שְׁכָם *shoulder*, in *pause* שְׁכָם (ground-form *šakhm*), and the pron. אָנִי I, in *pause* אָנִי; cf. also the restoration of the original ā as ē before the suffix תְּךָ thy, thee, e.g. תְּכָרְךָ thy word, in *pause* תְּכָרְךָ; יְשֻׁמְרָךְ he guards thee, in *pause* יְשֻׁמְרָךְ; but after the prepositions בְּ, אֶת (אֶת) the suffix תְּךָ in *pause* becomes תְּךָ, e.g. אֶפְךָ לְךָ, בְּךָ.

(c) This tendency to draw back the tone in *pause* to the *penultima* appears also in such cases as אָנֹכִי I, in *pause* אָנֹכִי thou, in *pause* אָתָּה (but in the three poetically accented books also אָתָּה, since in those books *Athnâh*, especially after *Ôlè*

Metr. Studien, i. 236, also explains pausal forms like יְקָטְלָו, קָטְלָה as ‘late formations of the grammarians’) is contradicted by the fact that similar phenomena are still to be observed in modern vulgar Arabic, where they can only be attributed to rhythmical reasons of a general character.

¹ Such a pausal syllable is sometimes further emphasized by strengthening the following consonant, see § 20 i.

w^eyôrēd, has only the force of a *Zaqeph*; hence also יְמַלֵּא נָזֶה Pr 24:4 instead of יְמַלֵּא נָזֶה²; הַתָּה עַ now, הַתָּה עַ; and in other sporadic instances, like כָּל וְלוּ Ps 37:20 for כָּל וְלוּ; but in 1 S 12:25 תִּפְטֹפְטוּ with Baer and Ginsb., is to be preferred to the reading of ed. Mant., &c.

(d) Conversely all forms of imperfects consecutive, whose final syllable, when not in *pause*, loses the tone and is pronounced with a short vowel, take, when in *pause*, the tone on the ultima with a tone-long vowel, e.g. וְיָמַת *and he died*, in *pause*.

Of other effects of the *pause* we have still to mention, (1) the transition of an ē (lengthened from i) to the more distinct ā (see above, I), e.g. תְּמֻנָה for תְּמֻנָה Is 18:5 (cf. § 67 v; § 72 dd); קְמֻלָה Is 33:9; אֲצַלָה 1 Ch 8:38 (beside אֲצַל [, see v. 37. Cf. אֲלָבָד, אֲלָבָד Is 7:6 (אֲלָבָד Ezr 4:7); שְׁלָמָה Jer 22:14; סְפִיר Ob 20; וְיִגְפְּשָׂה Ex 31:17; וְיִגְפְּשָׂה 2 S 12:15 (below, § 51 m)—S. R. D.]); הַפְּרָץ Gn 17:14; הַפְּצָרָה 1 S 15:23; הַרְחָקָה Ps 40:18; הַרְחָקָה Jb 13:21, mostly before liquids or sibilants (but also בְּיַד Is 42:22, and without the *pause* בְּיַד La 3:48). So also גַּלְעָד (shortened from גַּלְעָד) becomes in *pause* גַּלְעָד Ju 19:20. On *S^eghôl* in *pause* instead of *Sere*, el. § 52 n, 60 d, and especially § 75 n, on וְיָהָה Pr 4:4 and 7:2.

(2) The transition from ā to ē in the ultima; so always in the formula לְעוֹלָם וְעוֹד (for עַד) *for ever and ever*.

(3) The pausal *Qameṣ* (according to § 54 k, lengthened from original ā) in *Hithpaēl* (but not in *Piel*) for *Sere*, e.g. תְּהִלָּתָה Jb 18:8 for תְּהִלָּתָה. But pausal forms like בְּתָרְבָּה, בְּתָרְבָּה (in the *absol. st.* בְּתָרְבָּה, בְּתָרְבָּה) go back to a secondary form of the *abs. st.* בְּתָרְבָּה, בְּתָרְבָּה.

(4) The restoration of a final *Yodh* which has been dropped from the stem, together with the preceding vowel, e.g. אַתְּ בָּעֵת Is 21:12, for אַתְּ בָּעֵת, the latter also without the *pause* Is 56:9, 12; cf. Jb 12:6, and the same occurrence even in the word *before* the *pause* Dt 32:37, Is 21:12.

(5) The transition from ô or ö to ā in *pause*: as הַאֲלָמָּה Is 7:11, if it be a locative of אלָמָה, and not rather imperat. Qal of אַלְמָה Gn 43:14 for לְתַתִּי שָׁבָע Gn 49:3; וְשָׁבָע Gn 49:27; perhaps also שְׁרִין 1 K 22:34, Is 59:17, and מְלַחֵם Is 28:17, cf. 2 K 21:13. On the other hand the regular pausal form צְפָנָה (ordinary imperfect צְפָנָה) corresponds to a perfect צְפָנָה (see § 47 h).

(6) When a *Pathâh* both precedes and follows a virtually strengthened guttural, the second becomes ā in *pause*, and the first *S^eghôl*, according to § 22 c and § 27 q, e.g. אַחֲי my brothers, in *pause* אַחֲי. Similarly in cases where an original *Pathâh* after a guttural has been attenuated to i out of *pause*, and then lengthened to ē with the tone (cf. § 54 k), e.g. תְּחִנָּה מְתַנָּה Dt 32:36; cf. Nu 8:7, 23:19, Ez 5:13, Ps 135:14.—On pausal *Sere*, for *S^eghôl*, in infin., imperat., and imperf. of verbs לְהַיְהָ, see § 75 hh.

[Other instances of the full vowel in lesser pause, where the voice would naturally rest on the word, are Gn 15:14, יְעַבְּדוּ Is 8:15, 40:24, Ho 4:12, 8:7, Dn 9:15, and very often in such cases.]

² Ps 45:6, cf. also יְמַלֵּא נָזֶה Ps 40:15, is to be explained in the same way, but not הַמְּלִיטִים Zc 2:11, where, on the analogy of הַשְׁמִיטָה Je 9:3, we should expect הַמְּלִיטִים.

SECOND PART

ETYMOLOGY, OR THE PARTS OF SPEECH

§ 30. *Stems and Roots¹: Biliteral, Trilateral, and Quadrilateral.*

1. Stems in Hebrew, as in the other Semitic languages, have this peculiarity, that by far the majority of them consist of three consonants. On these the meaning essentially depends, while the various modifications of the idea are expressed rather by changes in the vowels, e.g. קַמָּע (קַמְעַ or קַמְעָה; the 3rd pers. sing. perf. does not occur) *it was deep*, קַמְעָה *deep*, קַמְעָה *depth*, קַמְעָה *a valley, plain*. Such a stem may be either a verb or a noun, and the language commonly exhibits both together, e.g. יָרַע *he has sown*, עֵדָה *seed*; חָכָם *he was wise*, חָכָם *a wise man*. For practical purposes, however, it has long been the custom to regard as the stein the 3rd pers. sing. Perf. *Qal* (see § 43), since it is one of the simplest forms of the verb, without any formative additions. Not only are the other forms of the verb referred to this stem, but also the noun-forms, and the large number of particles derived from nouns; e.g. קָדוֹשׁ *he was holy*, קָדוֹשׁ *holiness*, קָדוֹשׁ *holy*.

Sometimes the language, as we have it, exhibits only the verbal stem without any corresponding noun-form, e.g. קָרַע *to stone*, בָּהַקְתָּ *to bray*; and on the other hand, the noun sometimes exists without the corresponding verb, e.g. אֶבֶן *stone*, אֶגֶּת *south*. Since, however, the nominal or verbal stems, which are not now found in Hebrew, generally occur in one or more of the other Semitic dialects, it may be assumed, as a rule, that Hebrew, when a living language, also possessed them. Thus, in Arabic, the verbal stem *ăbūnā* (*to become compact, hard*) corresponds to אֶבֶן, and the Aramaic verb *n^egab* (*to be dry*) to אֶגֶּת.

Rem. 1. The Jewish grammarians call the stem (i.e. the 3rd pers. sing. Perf. *Qal*) שְׂרֵשׁ *root*. Hence it became customary among Christian grammarians to call the stem *radix*, and its three consonants *litterae radicales*, in contradistinction to the *litterae serviles* or *formative letters*. On the correct use of the term *root*, see [g](#).

2. Others regard the three stem-consonants as a *root*, in the sense that, considered as *vowelless* and unpronounceable, it represents the common foundation of the verbal and nominal stems developed from it, just as in the vegetable world, from which the figure is borrowed, stems grow from the hidden root, e.g.

Root: מלִךְ, the indeterminate idea of *ruling*.
Verb-stem, מָלַךְ *he has reigned*. Noun-stem, מלֵךְ *king*.

For the historical investigation of the language, however, this hypothesis of unpronounceable roots, with indeterminate meaning, is fruitless. Moreover, the term *root*, as

¹ On the questions discussed here compare the bibliography at the head of § 79.

it is generally understood by philologists, cannot be applied to the Semitic triliteral stem (see f).¹

3. The 3rd sing. Perf. Qal, which, according to the above, is usually regarded, both lexicographically and grammatically, as the ground-form, is generally in Hebrew a dissyllable, e.g. לִפְקָד. The monosyllabic forms have only arisen by contraction (according to the traditional explanation) from stems which had a weak letter (ו or י) for their middle consonant, e.g. מַפֵּא from *qāwām*; or from stems whose second and third consonants are identical, e.g. לְפָרָר and פָּרָר (but see below, §§ 67, 72). The dissyllabic forms have themselves no doubt arisen, through a loss of the final vowel, from trisyllables, e.g. לִפְתָּלָה from *qātālā*, as it is in literary Arabic.

2. The law of the triliteral stem is so strictly observed in the formation of verbs and nouns in Hebrew (and in the Semitic languages generally), that the language has sometimes adopted artificial methods to preserve at least an appearance of trilateralism in monosyllabic stems, e.g. בְּתָה for the inf. constr. of verbs פִּי; cf. § 69 b. Conversely such nouns, as אֲבָן *father*, אֲמָן *mother*, אֲחָน *brother*, which were formerly all regarded as original monosyllabic forms (*nomina primitiva*), may, in some cases at least, have arisen from mutilation of a triliteral stem.

On the other hand, a large number of triliteral stems really point to a biliteral base, which may be properly called a *root* (*radix primaria, bilitteralis*), since it forms the starting-point for several triliteral modifications of the same fundamental idea. Though in themselves unpronounceable, these roots are usually pronounced with ā between the two consonants, and are represented in writing by the sign □, e.g. □ as the root of כֹּר, כְּרָה, כֹּור, כְּרָא. The reduction of a stem to the underlying root may generally be accomplished with certainty when the stem exhibits one weak consonant with two strong ones, or when the second and third consonants are identical. Thus e.g. the stems קַבְּחָה, קַבְּחָה, קַבְּחָה, קַבְּחָה may all be traced to the idea of *striking, breaking*, and the root common to them all is evidently the two strong consonants דָּך (dakh). Very frequently, however, the development of the root into a stem is effected by the addition of a strong consonant, especially, it seems, a sibilant, liquid or guttural.¹ Finally, further modifications of the same root are produced when either a consonant of the root, or the letter which has been added, changes by phonetic laws into a kindred letter (see the examples below). Usually such a change of sound is accompanied by a modification of meaning.

Examples: from the root קַבְּחָה (no doubt *onomatopoetic*, i.e. imitating the sound), which represents the fundamental idea of *carving off, cutting in pieces*, are derived directly: קַצְקָה and קַצְחָה *to cut, to cut off*; the latter also metaph. *to decide, to judge* (whence קַצְחָה, Arab. *qāḍī*, a *judge*); also בַּקְבָּבָה *to cut off, to shear*, קַצְקָה *to tear, to break*, עַזְקָה *to cut into*, עַזְרָה *to cut off, to reap*. With a dental instead of the sibilant, טַקְקָה, קַטְקָה, whence בַּטְקָה *to cut in pieces, to destroy*, בַּטְקָה *to cut down, to kill*, פַּטְקָה *to tear off, to pluck off*. With the initial letter softened, the root becomes סַבְּבָה, whence סַבְּבָה *to cut off*, and סַבְּבָה *to shave*; cf. also נַכְנָה *Syr. to slay (sacrifice), to kill*. With the greatest softening to תַּבְּבָה and דַּבְּבָה *to cut off, to shear*; הַבְּבָה *to hew stone*; גַּבְּבָה.

¹ Cf. Philippi, ‘Der Grundstamm des starken Verbums,’ in *Morgenländische Forschungen*, Leipzig. 1875, pp. 69–106.

¹ That all triliteral stems are derived from biliterals (as König, *Lehrg.* ii. 1, 370; M. Lambert in *Studies in honour of A. Kohut*, Berl. 1897, p. 354 ff.) cannot be definitely proved.

גַּדְרָה, גַּדְרָה, גַּזְעָל, גַּזְעָל to cut off, to tear off, eat up; similarly גַּדְדָּר to cut into, גַּדְעָה to cut off; cf. also גַּדְעָה, גַּדְעָה. Allied to this root also is the series of stems which instead of a palatal begin with a guttural (ח), e.g. חַדֵּד to split, cut; cf. also חַדְלָה, חַדְקָה, and further חַזָּה, חַזָּה, חַזָּה, חַטָּב, חַזָּה, חַזָּה, חַצְבָּה, חַצְבָּה, חַסְמָה, חַסְמָה in the *Lexicon*.

The root המ expresses the sound of *humming*, which is made with the mouth closed (μύω); hence המם, המם, המם, המם (אָמָם) Arab. *hámhamá*, to buzz, to hum, to snarl, &c.

As developments from the root רע cf. the stems רַעַד, רַעַל, רַעַם, רַעַע, רַעַע, רַעַע. Not less numerous are the developments of the root בר (פָּר) and many others.²

Closer investigation of the subject suggests the following observations:

(a) These roots are mere *abstractions* from stems in actual use, and are themselves not used. They represent rather the hidden germs (*semina*) of the stems which appear in the language. Yet these stems are sometimes so short as to consist simply of the elements of the root itself, e.g. פָּמָם to be finished, קָלָل light. The ascertaining of the root and its meaning, although in many ways very difficult and hazardous, is of great lexicographical importance. It is a wholly different and much contested question whether there ever was a period in the development of the Semitic languages when purely *bilateral* roots, either isolated and invariable or combined with inflexions, served for the communication of thought. In such a case it would have to be admitted, that the language at first expressed extremely few elementary ideas, which were only gradually extended by additions to denote more delicate shades of meaning. At all events this process of transformation would belong to a period of the language which is entirely outside our range. At the most only the gradual multiplication of *stems* by means of phonetic change (see below) can be historically proved.

(b) Many of these monosyllabic words are clearly imitations of sounds, and sometimes coincide with roots of a similar meaning in the Indo-Germanic family of languages (§ 1 h). Of other roots there is definite evidence that Semitic linguistic consciousness regarded them as onomatopoetic, whilst the Indo-Germanic instinct fails to recognize in them any imitation of sound.

(c) Stems with the harder, stronger consonants are in general (§ 6 r) to be regarded as the older, from which a number of later stems probably arose through softening of the consonants; cf. פָּזָר and בָּזָר and צָהָק, צָהָק and שָׁחָק, שָׁחָק and צָעָק, צָעָק and עָלָק, עָלָק and רָקָק, רָקָק and רָלָס, רָלָס and רָכָךְ, רָכָךְ and תְּנָהָה, תְּנָהָה. Finally in many cases the harder and softer stems may have been in use together from the first, thus often distinguishing, by a kind of sound-painting, the intensive action from the less intensive; see above צָקָר to cut, גֹּזֶן to shear, &c.

(d) When two consonants are united to form a root they are usually either both emphatic or both middle-hard or both soft, e.g. גִּזְגִּז, גִּזְגִּז never גִּזְגִּז, גִּזְגִּז, גִּזְגִּז, גִּזְגִּז, גִּזְגִּז. Within (trilateral) stems the first and second consonants are never identical. The apparent exceptions are either

Lexicon. *Lexicon* = A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius, by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Britts, Oxford, 1906.

² Cf. the interesting examination of the Semitic roots QR, KR, XR, by P. Haupt in the *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, xxiii (1907), p. 241 ff.

due to reduplication of the root, e.g. חַדְדָה (Ps 42:5, Is 38:15), Arabic أَلَّدَ, or result from other causes, cf. e.g. בִּבְהָ in the *Lexicon*. The first and third consonants are very seldom identical except in what are called concave stems (with middle י or י), e.g. צוֹזֵן, נוֹזֵן; note, however, בָּגָן, בָּתָן, שָׁרָשֶׁן, שָׁמֶשֶׁן, and on עַלְעַל Jb 39:30 see § 55 f. The second and third consonants on the other hand are very frequently identical, see § 67.¹

(e) The softening mentioned under *l* is sometimes so great that strong consonants, especially in the middle of the stem, actually pass into vowels: cf. § 19 o, and § 55 f. Cf. Lv 16:8 ff. if it is for צְלִזְלִזְלָל.

(f) Some of the cases in which triliteral stems cannot with certainty be traced back to a biliteral root, may be due to a combination of two roots—a simple method of forming expressions to correspond to more complex ideas.

3. Stems of *four*, or even (in the case of nouns) of *five* consonants² are secondary formations. They arise from an extension of the triliteral stem: (a) by addition of a fourth stem-consonant; (b) in some cases perhaps by composition and contraction of two triliteral stems, by which means even *quinquilaterals* are produced. Stems which have arisen from reduplication of the biliteral root, or from the mere repetition of one or two of the three original stem-consonants, e.g. כָּלֵב from קָלֵב, כִּיל or כָּל from סָחָר, are usually not regarded as *quadrilaterals* or *quinquilaterals*, but as *conjugational forms* (§ 55); so also the few words which are formed with the prefix שׁ, as شְׁלָה בְּתָה from לְהַבָּה, correspond to the Aramaic conjugation Šaphēl, شَلَّهَ بَهَّ.

Rem. on (a). The letters *r* and *l*, especially, are inserted between the first and second radicals, e.g. כְּרָסֶם = שְׁרָבִיט to eat up; שְׁבָט = בְּטַש sceptre (this insertion of an *r* is especially frequent in Aramaic); הַלְּלָעָפָה hot wind from עַזְּפָה to be hot. Cf. Aram. עַרְגָּל to roll, expanded from עַזְּלָל (conjugation *Paēl*, corresponding to the Hebrew *Piel*). In Latin there is a similar expansion of *fid*, *scid*, *tud*, *jug* into *findo*, *scindo*, *tundo*, *jungo*. At the end of words the commonest expansion is by means of ל and נ, e.g. גַּרְזָן axe, כַּרְמָל garden-land (from רַם), גַּבְעָל corolla (אַבְבָּעָל cup); cf. § 85, xi.

Rem. on (b). Forms such as חַבְצָה אֲפֻרְקָע frog, צְלָמָנָה shadow of death,¹ were long regarded as compounds, though the explanation of them all was uncertain. Many words of this class, which earlier scholars attempted to explain from Hebrew sources, have since proved to be *loan-words* (§ 1 i), and consequently need no longer be taken into account.

4. A special class of formations, distinct from the fully developed stems of three or four consonants, are (a) the *Interjections* (§ 105), which, as being direct imitations of natural sounds, are independent of the ordinary formative laws; (b) the *Pronouns*. Whether these are to be regarded as the mutilated remains of early developed stems, or as relics of a period of language when the formation of stems followed different

Lexicon. *Lexicon* = A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius, by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Britts, Oxford, 1906.

1¹ Consonants which are not found together in roots and stems are called *incompatible*. They are chiefly consonants belonging to the same class, e.g. כָּק, גָּכָ, בָּקָ, תָּטָ, בָּף, מָף, זָד, צָזָ, זָזָ, אָצָ, חָעָ, &c., or in the reverse order.

1¹ So expressly Nöldeke in *ZAW* 1897, p. 183 ff.; but most probably it is to be read צְלָמוֹת darkness from the stem צָלָם [Arab. *zalima*, to be dark].

laws, must remain undecided. At all events, the many peculiarities of their formation² require special treatment (§ 32 ff.). On the other hand, most of the particles (adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions) seem to have arisen in Hebrew from fully developed stems, although in many instances, in consequence of extreme shortening, the underlying stem is no longer recognizable (see § 99 ff.).

§ 31. Grammatical Structure.

P. Dörwald, ‘Die Formenbildungsgesetze des Hebr.’ (*Hilfsbuch für Lehrer des Hebr.*), Berlin, 1897, is recommended for occasional reference.

1. The formation of the parts of speech from the stems (derivation), and their inflexion, are effected in two ways: (a) internally by changes in the stem itself, particularly in its vowels; (b) externally by the addition of formative syllables before or after it. The expression of grammatical relations (e.g. the comparative degree and some case-relations in Hebrew) periphrastically by means of separate words belongs, not to etymology, but to syntax.

The external method (b) of formation, by affixing formative syllables, which occurs e.g. in Egyptian, appears on the whole to be the more ancient. Yet other families of language, and particularly the Semitic, at a very early period had recourse also to the internal method, and during their youthful vigour widely developed their power of forming derivatives. But the continuous decay of this power in the later periods of language made syntactical circumlocution more and more necessary. The same process may be seen also e.g. in Greek (including modern Greek), and in Latin with its Romance offshoots.

2. Both methods of formation exist together in Hebrew. The internal mode of formation by means of vowel changes is tolerably extensive (קָטֵל, קָטַל, קָטִיל; לְקָטֵל, לְקָטַל, &c.). This is accompanied in numerous cases by external formation also (הַקָּטֵל, הַקָּטַל, הַקָּטִיל, נְקָטֵל, נְקָטַל, &c.), and even these formative additions again are subject to internal change, e.g. הַקָּטֵל, הַקָּטַל. The addition of formative syllables occurs, as in almost all languages, chiefly in the formation of the persons of the verb, where the meaning of the affixed syllables is for the most part still perfectly clear (see §§ 44, 47). It is also employed to distinguish gender and number in the verb and noun. Of case-endings, on the contrary, only scanty traces remain in Hebrew (see § 90).

CHAPTER I

THE PRONOUN.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 98 ff.; *Grundriss*, i. 296 ff. L. Reinisch, ‘Das persönl. Fürwort u. die Verbalflexion in den chamito-semit. Sprachen’ (*Wiener Akad. der Wiss.*, 1909).

§ 32. The Personal Pronoun. The Separate Pronoun.

² Cf. Hupfeld, ‘System der semitischen Demonstrativbildung,’ in the *Ztschr. f. d. Kunde des Morgenl.*, vol. ii. pp. 124 ff., 427 ff.

1. The personal pronoun (as well as the pronoun generally) belongs to the oldest and simplest elements of the language (§ 30 s). It must be discussed *before* the verb, since it plays an important part in verbal inflexion (§§ 44, 47).

2. The independent principal forms of the personal pronoun serve (like the Gk. ἐγώ, σύ, Lat. *ego, tu*, and their plurals) almost exclusively to emphasize the nominative-subject (see, however, § 135 d). They are as follows:

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1st Person, Common. I. �ָאַבְכִּי �ָאַבְכִּי; �ָאַנְיִי, in pause נָאַנְיִי	we. �ָאַנְנֵי in pause נָאַנְנֵי (אָנוּ) נָאַנְנֵי, in pause נָאַנְנֵי
2nd Person, Masc. <i>thou</i> . �ָאַתְּךָ (תְּךָ), in pause תְּךָ תְּךָ אַ or תְּךָ אַ	ye. m. נָאַתְּךָ
2nd Person, Fem. <i>thou</i> תְּךָ אַ in pause תְּךָ	אַתְּתָּךָ (תְּךָ אַ); אַתְּתָּךָ (תְּךָ אַ)
3rd Person, Masc. <i>he (it)</i> הָאָה 3rd Person, Fem. <i>she (it)</i> הָאָה	they. ם. הָאָה (הָאָה) הָאָה after prefixes הָאָה, הָאָה

The forms enclosed in parentheses are the less common. A table of these pronouns with their shortened forms (*pronominal suffixes*) is given in Paradigm A at the end of this Grammar.

REMARKS.

First Person.

1. The form נָאַבְכִּי is less frequent than נָאַנְיִי.¹ The former occurs in Phoenician, Moabite, and Assyrian, but in no other of the kindred dialects; from the latter the suffixes are derived (§ 33). The ô most probably results from an obscuring of an original â (cf. Aram. אֲנָא, Arab. 'ána). The pausal form נָאַנְיִי occurs not only with small disjunctive accents, but even with conjunctives; so always in נִי אַנְיִי as *I live!* also Is 49:18 with Munah, Ps 119:125 with Merkha

¹ On the prevalence of נָאַבְכִּי in the earlier Books compare the statistics collected by Giesebrecht in *ZAW*, 1881, p. 251 ff., partly contested by Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, 1882, vol. xi. p. 222 ff. (but cf. his *Introduction*, ed. 6, p. 135, line 1 f.), but thoroughly established by König in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1893, pp. 464 ff. and 478, and in his *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 168, &c. In some of the latest books this is not found at all, and hardly at all in the Talmud. [For details see the *Lexicon.*, s. v. נָאַנְיִי.]

¹ In Phoenician and Moabite (inscription of Mêša, line 1) it is written אֲנָא, without the final כִּי. In Punic it was pronounced *anec* (Plaut. *Poen.* 5, 1, 8) or *anech* (5, 2, 35). Cf. Schröder, *Phöniz. Sprache*, p. 143. In Assyrian the corresponding form is *anaku*, in old Egyptian *anek*, Coptic *anok, nok*.

(which, however, has been altered from D^eḥî), and twice in **Mal 1:6**. In all these cases there is manifestly a disagreement between the vocalization already established and the special laws regulating the system of accentuation.

2. The formation of the plural, in this and the other persons, exhibits a certain analogy with that of the noun, while at the same time (like the pronouns of other languages) it is characterized by many differences and peculiarities. The short form אַנוּ (אָנוּ) from which the suffix is derived occurs only in **Jer 42:6** K^ethibh. The form אֲנָה (cf. § 19 h) only in **Ex 16:7, 8**, **Nu 32:32**, **La 3:42**; אֲנָה in pause, **Gn 42:11**; in Arabic *nāḥnu* is the regular form. In the Mišna אֲנָה (אָנוּ) has altogether supplanted the longer forms.

3. The pronoun of the 1st person only is, as a rule in languages, of the *common gender*, because the person who is present and speaking needs no further indication of gender, as does the 2nd person, who is addressed (in Greek, Latin, English, &c., this distinction is also lacking), and still more the 3rd person who is absent.

Second Person.

4. The forms of the 2nd person אַתָּה, אַתְּ, אַתָּם, אַתְּתָּ, נִתְּהָ, &c., are contracted from 'antā, &c. The kindred languages have retained the *n* before the *t*, e.g. Arab. 'ánā, fem. 'ánti, thou; pl. 'ántum, fem. 'antúnna, ye. In Syriac אַנְתָּי, fem. אַנְתִּי are written, but both are pronounced 'at. In Western Aramaic אַנְתָּא is usual for both genders.

אַתָּא (without *n*) occurs five times, e.g. **Ps 6:4**, always as K^ethibh, with אַתָּא as Q^erē. In three places אַתָּא appears as a masculine, **Nu 11:15**, **Dt 5:24**, **Ez 28:14**.

The feminine form was originally אַתָּי as in Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic. This form is found seven times as K^ethibh (**Ju 17:2**, **1 K 14:2**, **2 K 4:16, 23**, **8:1**, **Jer 4:30**, **Ez 36:13**) and appears also in the corresponding personal ending of verbs (see § 44 f), especially, and necessarily, before suffixes, as יִנְתַּלֵּת יִנְתַּלְתָּ, § 59 a [c]; cf. also ī as the ending of the 2nd fem. sing. of the imperative and imperfect. The final ī was, however, gradually dropped in pronunciation, just as in Syriac (see above, f) it was eventually only written, not pronounced. The ' therefore finally disappeared (cf. § 10 k), and hence the Masoretes, even in these seven passages, have pointed the word in the text as אַתָּא to indicate the Q^erē אַתָּא (see § 17). The same final ' - appears in the rare (Aramaic) forms of the suffix § 58, 91).

5. The plurals מְנֻהָּא (with the second vowel assimilated to the fem. form) and אֲנָהָן (אֲנָהָן), with the tone on the ultima, only partially correspond to the assumed ground-forms *antumū*, fem. *antinnā*, Arab. āntūm (Aram. אֲנָתָוֹן אֲנָתָ�) and āntūnā (Aram. אֲנָתָ� אֲנָתָ�). The form אֲנָהָן is found only in **Ez 34:31** (so Qimḥi expressly, others אֲנָהָא); אֲנָהָה (for which some MSS. have אֲנָהָה) only four times, viz. **Gn 31:6**, **Ez 13:11, 20, 34:17**; in 13:20 מְנֻהָּא (before a *n*) is even used as feminine.

Third Person.

6. (a) In הַיָּא and הַיָּא (hū and hi) the אָ (corresponding to the *Elif of prolongation* in Arabic, cf. § 23 i) might be regarded only as an orthographic addition closing the final long vowel, as

in לְאָ, נָקִיא, &c. The נ is, however, always written in the case of the separate pronouns,¹ and only as a toneless suffix (§ 33 a) does הָא appear as הָ, while הַיָּא becomes הַ. In Arabic (as in Syriac) they are written هٰ and هيٰ but pronounced *hūwā* and *hiyā*, and in Vulgar Arabic even *hūwwa* and *hiyya*. This Arabic pronunciation alone would not indeed be decisive, since the vowel complement might have arisen from the more consonantal pronunciation of the א and ئ; but the Ethiopic *we^etū* (= *hua-tū*) for הָא, *ye^eti* (= *hia-ti*) for הַיָּא (cf. also the Assyrian *ya-u-a* for הָא) show that the נ was original and indicated an original vocalic termination of the two words. According to Philippi (*ZDMG*. xxviii. 175 and xxix. 371 ff.) הָא arose from a primitive Semitic *ha-va*, הַיָּא from *ha-ya*.

(b) The form הָא also stands in the consonantal text (*K^ethibh*) of the Pentateuch² (with the exception of eleven places) for the *fem.* הַיָּא. In all such cases the Masora, by the punctuation הָא, has indicated the *Q^rē* (perpetuum, see § 17). The old explanation regarded this phenomenon as an archaism which was incorrectly removed by the Masoretes. This assumption is, however, clearly untenable, if we consider (1) that no other Semitic language is without the quite indispensable distinction of gender in the separate pronoun of the 3rd pers.; (2) that this distinction does occur eleven times in the Pentateuch, and that in Gn 20:5, 38:25, Nu 5:13, 14 הָא and הַיָּא are found close to one another; (3) that outside the Pentateuch the distinction is found in the oldest documents, so that the הַיָּא cannot be regarded as having been subsequently adopted from the Aramaic; (4) that those parts of the book of Joshua which certainly formed a constituent part of the original sources of the Pentateuch, know nothing of this epicene use of אָהָ. Consequently there only remains the hypothesis, that the writing of אָהָ for הַיָּא rests on an orthographical peculiarity which in some recension of the Pentateuch-text was almost consistently followed, but was afterwards very properly rejected by the Masoretes. The orthography was, however, peculiar to the Pentateuch-text alone, since it is unnecessary to follow the Masora in writing נָחָת for אָהָ in 1 K 17:15, Is 30:33, Jb 31:11, or אָהָ for הַיָּא in Ps 73:16, Ec 5:8, 1 Ch 29:16. The Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch has the correct form in the *K^ethibh* throughout. Levy's explanation of this strange practice of the Masoretes is evidently right, viz. that originally נָחָת was written for both forms (see k, note), and was almost everywhere, irrespective of gender, expanded into אָהָ. On the whole question see Driver, *Leviticus* (in Haupt's Bible), p. 25 f. In the text Driver always reads נָחָת.

7. The plural forms מְנֻהָה (הָנָה) and מְנֻהָה (after *prefixes* תְּנָה, תְּנָה) are of doubtful origin, but מְנֻהָה have probably been assimilated to מְנֻהָה which goes back to a form *hinnā*. In Western Aram. המְנוֹן, הנְנוֹן (אֲנוֹן), Syr. *henūn* (*enūn*), Arab. *hūmū* (archaic form of *hum*), and Ethiop. *hōmū*, an ô or ô is appended, which in Hebrew seems to reappear in the poetical suffixes מוֹ, מוֹן, מוֹן (§ 91 l, 3).

In some passages הָנָה stands for the feminine (Zc 5:10, Ct 6:8, Ru 1:22; cf. the use of the suffix of the 3rd masc. for the 3rd fem., § 135 o and § 145 t). For the quite anomalous מְנֻדָּעָה² K 9:18 read מְנֻדָּעָה (Jb 32:12).

8. The pronouns of the 3rd person may refer to *things* as well as persons. On their meaning as *demonstratives* see § 136.

¹ In the inscription of King Mêša (see § 2 d), lines 6 and 27, we find נָחָת for אָהָ, and in the inscription of Ešmunazar, line 22, for הַיָּא, but in the Zenjirli inscriptions (see § 1 m) both נָחָת and הָא occur (Hadad i, l. 29).

ZDMG. *ZDMG.* = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

² Also in twelve places in the Babylonian Codex (Prophets) of 916 A.D.; cf. Baer, *Ezechiel*, p. 108 f.; Buhl, *Canon and Text of the O. T.* (Edinb. 1892), p. 240.

§ 33. Pronominal Suffixes.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 100 f.; *Grundriss*, i. 306 ff. J. Barth, ‘Beiträge zur Suffixlehre des Nerdsemit.,’ in the *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, 1901, p. 193 ff.

1. The independent principal forms of the personal pronoun (the *separate pronoun*), given in the preceding section, express only the nominative.¹ The accusative and genitive are expressed by forms, usually shorter, joined to the end of verbs, nouns, and particles (*pronominal suffixes* or simply *suffixes*); e.g. הָו (toneless) and הִ (from *āhū*) *eum* and *eius*, הָיוּתְךָ I have killed him (also קָטַלְתִּי *him*), הָיוּתְךָ or (with *āhū* contracted into *ō*) אָוָרְךָ thou hast killed him; also אָוָרְךָ (also *lux eius*).

The same method is employed in all the other Semitic languages, as well as in the Egyptian, Persian, Finnish, Tartar, and others; in Greek, Latin, and German we find only slight traces of the kind, e.g. German, *er gab's* for *er gab es*; Greek, πατήρ μου for πατήρ οὐρανοῦ; Latin, *eccum, eccos*, &c., in Plautus and Terence for *ecce eum, ecce eos*.

2. The case which these suffixes represent is—

(a) When joined to verbs, the accusative (cf., however, § 117 x), e.g. קָטַלְתָּךְ I have killed *him*.

(b) When affixed to substantives, the genitive (like πατήρ μου, *pater eius*). They then serve as *possessive pronouns*, e.g. אָבִי (*ābh-i*) my father, סֹיסָו his horse, which may be either *equus eius* or *equus suus*.

(c) When joined to particles, either the genitive or accusative, according as the particles originally expressed the idea of a noun or a verb, e.g. בֵּיןִי, literally *interstitium mei*, between me (cf. *mea causa*); but הָנָנִי behold me, *ecce me*.

(d) Where, according to the Indo-Germanic case-system, the dative or ablative of the pronoun is required, the suffixes in Hebrew are joined to prepositions expressing those cases (ן sign of the dative, בְ in, מְ from, § 102), e.g. לְ to him (*ei*) and to himself (*sibi*), בְּ in him, מְ from (usually בְּ מְ from me).

3. The suffixes of the 2nd person (ךְ, &c.) are all formed with a *k*-sound, not, like the *separate pronouns* of the 2nd person, with a *t*-sound.

So in all the Semitic languages, in Ethiopic even in the verbal form (*qatalka, thou hast killed*=Hebr. קָטַלְתָּךְ).

4. The *suffix of the verb* (the accusative) and the *suffix of the noun* (the genitive) coincide in most forms, but some differ, e.g. מְנִי me, מְנִי my.

Paradigm A at the end of the Grammar gives a table of all the forms of the *separate pronoun* and the *suffixes*; a fuller treatment of the *verbal suffix* and the mode of attaching it to the verb will be found in § 58 ff., of the *noun-suffix* in § 91, of the prepositions with suffixes in § 103, of adverbs with suffixes § 100 o.

¹ On apparent exceptions see § 135 d.

§ 34. *The Demonstrative Pronoun.*

Sing. <i>this</i> m. f.	הַזֶּה ¹ זָהָר ²	Plur. com. <i>these</i> אֵלֶּה (rarely אֵלְלֶה)
-------------------------------	---	---

Rem. 1. The feminine form **זָהָר** has undoubtedly arisen from **אתָה**, by obscuring of an original *â* to *ô* (for **אִי** = **הִזֶּה** cf. the Arab. *hâ-dâ*, *this*, masc.; for **ת** as the feminine ending, § 80), and the forms **תְּזִהֵר**, **זְהִיר**, both of which are rare,³ are shortened from **תְּאִתְּהָ**. In Ps 132:12 **וְ** is used as a *relative*, cf. **וְ** below. In Jer 26:6, *Kethibh*, **הַזְּהָה** (with the article and the demonstrative termination **הָה**) is found for **תְּאִתְּהָ**. The forms **אֲלֹהָה** and **אֲלָהָה** are the plurals of **הִזֶּה** and **זְהִיר** by usage, though not etymologically. The form **אֲלָהָה** occurs only in the Pentateuch (but not in the Samaritan text), Gn 19:8, 25, 26:3, 4, &c. (8 times), always with the article, **הַאֲלָהָה** [as well as **אֲלֹהָהָה** frequently], and in 1 Ch 20:8 without the article [cf. Driver on Dt 4:42].⁴ Both the singular and the plural may refer to things as well as persons.

2. In combination with prepositions to denote the oblique case we find **לְזֶה** *to this* (cf. for **לְ**, § 102 g), **לְזָהָר** *to this* (fem.), **לְזָהָרָה** *to these*; **אֶתְּזֶה** *hunc*, **אֶתְּזָהָרָה** *hanc*, **אֶתְּזָהָרָה** *hos*, also without **אֶתְּ**, even *before* the verb Ps 75:8, &c. Note also **מִזְהִירָה** *huius* (1 K 21:2), &c.

2. The secondary form **וְ** occurs only in poetic style, and mostly for the relative, like our *that* for *who* [see *Lexicon.*, s. v.]. Like **שָׁנָה** (§ 36), it serves for all numbers and genders.

Rem. 1. This pronoun takes the article (**הַזֶּה**, **הַזָּהָר**, **הַאֲלָהָה**) according to the same rule as adjectives, see § 126 u; e.g. **יְהִי אֵשׁ הַזֶּה** *this man*, but **זֶה אֲשֶׁר** *זה this is the man*.

2. Rarer secondary forms, with strengthened demonstrative force, are **הַזְּהָה** Gn 24:65, 37:19; **וְהַלְּה** *sem. Ez 36:35*; and shortened **הַלְּה**, sometimes *masc.*, as in Ju 6:20, 1 S 17:26, 2 K 23:17, Zc 2:8, Dn 8:16, sometimes *fem.*, **2 K 4:25**: cf. 1 S 14:1 [and 20:19 LXX; see Commentaries and Kittel].

3. The personal pronouns of the 3rd person also often have a demonstrative sense, see § 136.

¹ In many languages the demonstratives begin with a *d*-sound (hence called the *demonstrative sound*) which, however, sometimes interchanges with a sibilant. Cf. Aram. **זֶה**, **זָהָר** *masc.*, **זֶה**, **זָהָר** *fem.* (this); Sansk. *sa*, *sā*, *tat*; Gothic *sa*, *sō*, *thata*; Germ. *da*, *der*, *die*, *das*; and Eng. *the*, *this*, *that*, &c. Cf. J. Barth, ‘Zum semit. Demonstr. *d*,’ in *ZDMG*. 59, 159 ff., and 633 ff.; *Sprachwiss. Untersuchungen zum Semit.*, Lpz. 1907, p. 30 ff. [See the *Lexicon.*, s. v. **הַזֶּה**, and Aram. **אֵת**, **וְ**.]

² That **זָהָר** may stand for the feminine, cannot be proved either from Ju 16:28 or from the certainly corrupt passage in Jos 2:17.

³ **זְהִיר** 2 K 6:19, and in seven other places; **וְ** only in Hos 7:16, Ps 132:12.

⁴ According to Kuenen (cf. above, § 2 n) and Driver, on Lev 18:27 in Haupt’s Bible, this **אֲלָהָה** is due to an error of the punctuators. It goes back to a time when the vowel of the second syllable was not yet indicated by a vowel letter, and later copyists wrongly omitted the addition of the **ה**. In Phoenician also it was written **אֲלָהָה**, but pronounced *ily* according to Plautus, *Poen*, v, 1, 9.

§ 35. *The Article.*

J. Barth, 'Der heb. u. der aram. Artikel,' in *Sprachwiss. Untersuch. zum Semit.*, Lpz. 1907, p. 47 ff.

1. The article, which is by nature a kind of demonstrative pronoun, never appears in Hebrew as an independent word, but always in closest connexion with the word which is defined by it. It usually takes the form הַ, with *ă* and a strengthening of the next consonant, e.g. הַשֶּׁמֶן *the sun*, הַיָּאֵר *the river*, הַלְוִיִּם *the Levites* (according to § 20 m for הַיָּאֵר, הַלְוִיִּם).

Rem. With regard to the *Dageš* in י after the article, the rule is, that it is inserted when a ה or ו follows the י e.g. *הַיְהוּדִים* the Jews (La 4:3 *Q're* is an exception), but *הַיּוֹסֵד*, &c. *Dageš forte* also stands after the article in the prefix י in certain nouns and in the participles *Piel* and *Pual* (see § 52 c) before ה, ו and ר, except when the guttural (or ר) has under it a short vowel in a sharpened syllable; thus *הַקָּוֹמָה* Ez 22:5, *הַעֲרָה* the cave, *Ps 37:1* (cf. Jb 38:40, 1 Ch 4:41); but הַמְּלֻךְ Ps 104:3 (Ec 4:15, 2 Ch 23:12; before ו Ps 103:4); הַמְּשֻׁקֶּה Is 23:12; הַמְּגַלִּים Jos 6:22. Before letters other than gutturals this י remains without *Dageš*, according to § 20 m.

2. When the article stands before a guttural, which (according to § 22 b) cannot properly be strengthened, the following cases arise, according to the character of the guttural (cf. § 27 q).

(1) In the case of the weakest guttural, **א**, and also with **ר** (§ 22 c and q), the strengthening is altogether omitted. Consequently, the *Pathaḥ* of the article (since it stands in an open syllable) is always lengthened to *Qameṣ*, e.g. **הָאָבֶר** *the father*, **הָאַחֲרֶר** *the other*, **הָאִישׁ** *the man*, **הָאֹורֶת** *the light*, **הָאִםֶּת** *the foot*, **הָרָאשָׁה** *the head*, **הָרָשָׁעָה** *the wicked*.

So also **הַשְׁפּוֹת** Neh 3:13, because syncopated from **הַאֲשֶׁר** (cf. verse 14 and Baer on the passage); **הַאַזְקִים** (as in Nu 11:4, Ju 9:41, 2 S 23:33, with the **א** orthographically retained), for **הַאֲזָ'ת** Jer 40:4 (cf. verse 1); **הַסּוּרִים**; **הַאֲסָ'ת**, 2 Ch 22:5 for **הַאֲרֵ'ת** (cf. 2 K 8:28).

(2) In the case of the other gutturals either the virtual strengthening takes place (§ 22 c)—especially with the stronger sounds \bar{n} and $\bar{\eta}$, less often with \bar{v} —or the strengthening is wholly omitted. In the former case, the *Pathah* of the article remains, because the syllable is still regarded as closed; in the second case, the *Pathah* is either modified to *S'ghol* or fully lengthened to *Oames*. That is to say:—

A. When the guttural has any other vowel than *ā* (‑) or *ō* (‑), then

(1) before the stronger sounds ה and ה the article regularly remains ה; e.g. הַחֶזֶקְמָה that, הַחַדְשָׁה the month, הַחֶזֶקְמָה the force, הַחֶזֶקְמָה the wisdom. Before א, ā occurs only in Gn 6:19 [not elsewhere], הַחֲרִיטִים Is 3:22, הַחֲנָנִים Is 17:8 [not elsewhere]; before ה, always in הַחֶם, הַחֶם.

(2) before **ו** the *Pathaḥ* is generally lengthened to *Qameṣ*, e.g. **עֵין** *the eye*, **שָׁבֵךְ** *the city*, **עֲבָדִים** *the servant*, plur. **לְעַגְלִים**; **בְּעַכְדִּים** 1 K 12:32; also in Gn 10:17 **בְּבָדְךָ** *the better reading*. Exceptions are **בְּעֹזֶף רָתָה** Ex 15:10, **בְּעֹרִים** 2 S 5:6, 8, Is 42:18, **בְּעַדְךָ** Ex 24:2; **בְּעַשְׂק** Ez 22:7, **בְּעַזְבִּים** Pr 2:13 and **בְּעַרְכִּים** Pr 2:17, **בְּעַזְנִים** 1 S 16:7, Ec 11:7; but **לְעַיְנִים** Gn 3:6, Pr 10:26. Cf. Baer on Is 42:18.

B. When the guttural has *ā* (ָ) then

(1) immediately before a tone-bearing **ה** or **ו** the article is always **ה**, otherwise it is **הָ**; e.g. **הָעָם** *the people*, **הָרָן** *the mountain*, **הָעֵין** (in pause) *the eye*, **הָרָה** *towards the mountain*; but (according to § 22 c) **הָרִים**, **הָרִיּוֹת** *the mountains*, **הָעֹנוֹת** *the iniquity*.

(2) before **הָ** the article is invariably **הָ** without regard to the tone; e.g. **הָחָכָם** *the wise man*, **הָחָגָה** *the festival*.

C. When the guttural has *ā* the article is **הָ** before **הָ** e.g. **הָמָתִישִׁים** *the months*; **הָרְבָות** *in the waste places* (without the article **בְּהָרְבָות**) Ez 33:27, Ez 36:35, 38, cf. 2 Ch 27:4; but **הָ** before **וּ**, as **הָשְׁאָלָמִים** *the sheaves* Ru 2:15.

The gender and number of the noun have no influence on the form of the article.

Rem. 1. The original form of the Hebrew (and the Phoenician) article **הָ** is generally considered to have been **הָלָل**, the **ל** of which (owing to the proclitic nature of the article) has been invariably assimilated to the following consonant, as in **יְלָקָה** from *yilqaḥ*, § 19 d. This view was supported by the form of the Arabic article **ال** (pronounced *hal* by some modern Beduin), the **ل** of which is also assimilated at least before all letters like *s* and *t* and before *l*, *n*, and *r*, e.g. *'al-Qur'an* but *'as-sānā* (Beduin *has-sana*)=Hebr. **הָשָׁנָה** *the year*. But Barth (*Amer. Journ. of Sem. Laug.*, 1896, p. 7 ff.), following Hupfeld and Stade, has shown that the Hebrew article is to be connected rather with the original Semitic demonstrative *hā*, ¹ cf. Arab. *hāda*, Aram. *hādēn*, &c. The sharpening of the following consonant is to be explained exactly like the sharpening after **וּ** consecutive (§ 49 f; cf. also cases like **בְּפַהָה**, **כְּפַהָה**, &c., § 102 k), from the close connexion of the *ha* with the following word, and the sharpening necessarily involved the shortening of the vowel.²

The Arabic article is supposed to occur in the Old Testament in **אַלְמָגִים** 1 K 10:11, 12 (also **אַלְגּוֹנִים** 2 Ch 2:7, 9:10, 11), *sandal-wood* (?), and in **אַלְגָבִישׁ** *hail, ice*=*gibbīsh* (Arab. *ǵibbs*) Ez 13:11, 13, 38:22, but this explanation can hardly be correct. On the other hand, in the proper name **אַלְמֹתָה** Gn 10:26 the first syllable is probably **אַל** *God*, as suggested by D. H. Müller (see Lexicon, s. v.) and Nöldeke, *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.*, 1882, p. 1186. **אַלְקּוּם** Pr 30:31, commonly explained as=Arab. *al-qāum*, the militia, is also quite uncertain.

¹ An original form *han*, proposed by Ungnad, ‘Der hebr. Art.,’ in *OLZ*. x (1907), col. 210 f., and *ZDMG*. 1908, p. 80 ff., is open to grave objections.

² In the Lihyanitic inscriptions collected by Euting (ed. by D. H. Müller in *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Arabien*, Wien, 1889) the article is **הָ**, and also in a North Arabian dialect, according to E. Littmann, *Safa-inschriften*, p. 2, Rem., and p. 34.

2. When the prefixes בָּ, לָ, כָּ (§ 102) come before the article, the הַ is elided, and its vowel is thrown back to the prefix, in the place of the Š^ewâ (§ 19 k, and § 23 k), e.g. יְמִינֵּךְ in the heaven for בְּהָשָׁמִים (so Ps 36:6); לְעַם for לְהָעַם to the people, כְּבָדָה in the months; also in Is 41:2, read עַפְרֵה כְּ instead of the impossible עַפְרֵה כָּ. Exceptions to this rule occur almost exclusively in the later Books: Ez 40:25, 47:22, Ec 8:1, Dn 8:16, Neh 9:19, 12:33, 2 Ch 10:7, 25:10, 29:27; cf., however, 1 S 13:21, 2 S 21:20. Elsewhere, e.g. 2 K 7:12, the Masora requires the elision in the *Q^erê*. A distinction in meaning is observed between בְּהַזְּמָן about this time (Gn 39:11, 1 S 9:13, &c.) and בְּכָלֶל first of all (Gn 25:31, &c.). After the copula וְ (and) elision of the הַ does not take place, e.g. וְעַמְּךָ.

3. The words אָרֶץ earth, הַר mountain, אֹתֶל feast, עַם people, פָּז bull, always appear after the article with a long vowel (as in pause); אָרֶץ אָתֶל, הַר הָתֶל, אֹתֶל הָתֶל, הַפָּז הָפָז; cf. also אֲרוֹן ark (so in the absol. st. in 2 K 12:10, 2 Ch 24:8, but to be read אַרְוֹן), with the article always הָאֲרוֹן.

§ 36. The Relative Pronoun.

The relative pronoun (cf. § 138) is usually the indeclinable אֲשֶׁר (who, which, &c.), originally a demonstrative pronoun; see further §§ 138 and 155. In the later books, especially Eccles. and the late Psalms, also Lam. (4 times), Jon. (1⁷), Chron. (twice), Ezra (once),—and always in the Canticle (cf. also Ju 7:12, 8:26, 2 K 6:11), אֲשֶׁר is used instead; more rarely אֲשֶׁר Ju 5:7, Ct 1:7 (Jb 19:29?); once אֲשֶׁר before אֲלֹהִים Ju 6:17 (elsewhere אֲשֶׁר before a guttural), before הַ even אֲשֶׁר Ec 3:18, and according to some (e.g. Qimḥi) also in Ec 2:22.³ [See Lexicon, s. v.]

§ 37. The Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns.

1. The interrogative pronoun is מי who? (of persons, even before plurals, Gn 33:5, Is 60:8, 2 K 18:35, and sometimes also of things Gn 33:8, Ju 13:17, Mi 1:5; cf. also בְּהַמִּי whose daughter? Gn 24:23; לְמִי to whom? אֲתַתְּמִי whom?)—מה, מָה (see b) what? (of things).—אֲיָחִיד which? what?

The form אֲיָחִיד, אֲיָה, &c. (followed by *Dageš forte conjunct.*: even in הָאֲיָחִיד, **Hb 2:1**, &c., against § 20 m) may be explained (like the art. הָאֲיָחִיד, § 35 l, and אֲיָה in the *imperf. consec.*) from the rapid utterance of the interrogative in connexion with the following word. Most probably, however, the *Dageš forte* is rather due to the assimilation of an originally audible הַ (אֲיָה, as Olshausen), which goes back through the intermediate forms *math*, *mat* to an original *mant*: so W. Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, Cambridge, 1890, p. 124, partly following Böttcher, *Hebräische Grammatik*, § 261. A ground-form *mant* would most easily explain אֲיָה (what?), used in Ex 16:15 in explanation of אֲיָה manna, while אֲיָה is the regular Aramaic for who. Socin calls attention to the Arabic *mah* (in pause with an audible *h*: *Mufassal*, 193, 8). Observe further that—

(a) In the closest connexion, by means of *Maqqeph*, אֲיָה takes a following *Dageš* (§ 20 d), e.g. אֲיָה־תְּךָ what is it to thee? and even in one word, as אֲיָה מְלֹאת what is it to you? Is 3:15; cf. Ex 4:2, Mal 1:13, and even before a guttural, אֲיָה מְלֹאת Ez 8:6 *Kethibh*.

³ The full form אֲשֶׁר does not occur in Phoenician, but only אֲשֶׁר (= אֲשֶׁר?), pronounced *asse, esse* (also *as, es, is, ys, us*), or—especially in the later Punic and in the *Poenulus* of Plautus—אֲשֶׁר (sa, si, sy, su). Also in New Hebrew אֲשֶׁר has become the common form. Cf. Schröder, *Phön. Sprache*, p. 162 ff. and below, § 155; also Bergsträsser, ‘Das hebr. Präfix אֲשֶׁר,’ in *ZAW*. 1909, p. 40 ff.

(b) Before gutturals in close connexion, by means of *Maqqeph* or (e.g. Ju 14:18, 1 S 20:1) a conjunctive accent, either הָנָה is used with a virtual strengthening of the guttural (§ 22 c), so especially before נ, and, in Gn 31:36, Jb 21:21, before ר—or the doubling is wholly emitted. In the latter case either (cf. § 35 e–k) אָ is fully lengthened to *Qames* (so always before the נ of the article, except in Ec 2:12; also before הָנָה, הָנָה, and so נ (Hb 2:18), נ (2 S 18:22, 2 K 8:14), נ (Gn 31:22, 2 K 8:13), or modified to *Sghôl*, especially before י, ו, and generally before ר. The omission of the strengthening also takes place as a rule with ה, ו, י, when they have not *Qames*, and then the form is either הָנָה or הָנָה, the latter especially before נ or י, if *Maqqeph* follows.

The longer forms הָנָה and הָנָה are also used (הָנָה even before letters which are not gutturals) when not connected by *Maqqeph* but only by a *conjunctive accent*. As a rule הָנָה is then used, but sometimes הָנָה when at a greater distance from the principal tone of the sentence, Is 1:5, Ps 4:3. (On הָנָה in the combinations הָנָהָנָה, הָנָהָנָה, and even הָנָהָלָה, 1 S 1:8, cf. § 102 k and l.)

(c) In the principal pause הָנָה is used without exception; also as a rule with the smaller *disjunctives*, and almost always before gutturals (הָנָה only in very few cases). On the other hand, הָנָה more often stands before letters which are not gutturals, when at a greater distance from the principal tone of the sentence, e.g. 1 S 4:6, 15:14, 2 K 1:7, Hag 1:9 (see Köhler on the passage), Ps 10:13, Jb 7:21; cf., however, Pr 31:2, and Delitzsch on the passage.

2. On יְנָה and הָנָה as indefinite pronouns in the sense of *quicunque, quodcunque*, and as relatives, *is qui, id quod, &c.*, see § 137 c.

CHAPTER II

THE VERB

§ 38. General View

Verbal stems are either original or derived. They are usually divided into—

(a) Verbal stems proper (*primitive verbs*), which exhibit the stem without any addition, e.g. הַלְלָה *he has reigned*.

(b) *Verbal derivatives*, i.e. *secondary verbal stems*, derived from the pure stem (letter a), e.g. שְׁמִינִי *to sanctify*, שְׁמִינִי הַמִּינִי *to sanctify oneself*, from קָדוֹשׁ *to be holy*. These are usually called *conjugations* (§ 39).

(c) *Denominatives*,¹ i.e. verbs derived from nouns (like the Latin *causari*, *praedari*, and Eng. *to skin, to stone*), or even from particles (see d, end) either in a primitive or derivative form, e.g. הַלְלָה, *Qal* and Pi'el, *to pitch a tent*, from הַלְלָה *tent*; שְׁרִישׁ and שְׁרִישׁ *to take root*, and שְׁרִישׁ *to root out*, from שְׁרִישׁ *root* (§ 52 h).

This does not exclude the possibility that, for nouns, from which denominative verbs are derived, the corresponding (original) verbal stem may still be found either in Hebrew or in the dialects. The meaning, however, is sufficient to show that the denominatives have come from the noun, not from the verbal stem, e.g. לְבָנָה *a brick* (verbal stem לְבָנָה *to be white*), denomin.

¹ Cf. W. J. Gerber, *Die hebr. Verbs denom., insbes. im theolog. Sprachgebr.* des A. T., Lpz. 1896.

לְבָנָה to make bricks; נַי a fish (verbal stem נִיָּה to be prolific), denomin. נִגְמָן to fish; חֶרְבָּה to winter (from חֵרֶב autumn, winter, stem חָרֵב to pluck); קַיִם to pass the summer (from קַיִם summer, stem קִים to be hot).

On ‘Semitic verbs derived from particles’ see P. Haupt in the *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, xxii (1906), 257 ff.

§ 39. *Ground-form and Derived Stems*

Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 119 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 504 ff.

1. The 3rd sing. masc. of the *Perfect* in the form of the pure stem (i.e. in *Qal*, see e) is generally regarded, lexicographically and grammatically, as the ground-form of the verb (§ 30 a), e.g. לְמַתַּק he has killed, כַּבֵּד he was heavy, נַטֵּח he was little.² From this form the other persons of the *Perfect* are derived, and the *Participle* also is connected with it. לְטַק or לְמַטַּק, like the Imperative and Infinitive construct in sound, may also be regarded as an alternative ground-form, with which the Imperfect (see § 47) is connected.

In verbs יְנַע (i.e. with י for their second radical) the stem-form, given both in Lexicon and Grammar, is not the 3rd sing. masc. Perfect (consisting of two consonants), but the form with medial י, which appears in the Imperative and Infinitive; e.g. שׁוֹב to return (3rd pers. perf. בָּשָׁבָע): the same is the case in most stems with medial י, e.g. יְנַז to judge.

2. From the pure stem, or *Qal*, the derivative stems are formed according to an unvarying analogy, in which the idea of the stem assumes the most varied shades of meaning, according to the changes in its form (intensive, frequentative, privative, causative, reflexive, reciprocal; some of them with corresponding passive forms), e.g. לְמַדְעַת to learn, לְמַעַת to teach; שָׁכַב to lie, הַשְּׁפִיבָה to lay; טַפְחַת to judge, טַפְחַתָּה to contend. In other languages such formations are regarded as new or *derivative* verbs, e.g. Germ. fallen (to fall), fällen (to fell); trinken (to drink), tränken (to drench); Lat. lactere (to suck, Germ. saugen), lactare (to suckle, Germ. säugen); iacere (to throw), iacere (to lie down); γίνομαι, γεννάω. In Hebrew, however, these formations are incomparably more regular and systematic than (e.g.) in Greek, Latin, or English; and, since the time of Reuchlin, they have usually been called *conjugations* of the primitive form (among the Jewish grammarians בְּנִיּוֹת, i.e. *formations*, or more correctly *species*), and are always treated together in the grammar and lexicon.¹

3. The changes in the primitive form consist either in internal modification by means of vowel-change and strengthening of the middle consonant (לְקֻטָּל, קֻטָּל; קֻטָּל; cf. to lie, to lay; to fall, to fell), or in the repetition of one or two of the stem-consonants (לְקֻטָּלְל, קֻטָּלְל; קֻטָּלְלָה), or finally in the introduction of formative additions (לְקֻטָּלְה, הַקֻּטָּלְה), which may also be accompanied by internal change (הַקֻּטָּלְה). Cf. § 31 b.

In Aramaic the formation of the conjugations is effected more by formative additions than by vowel-change. The vocalic distinctions have mostly become obsolete, so that, e.g. the

² For the sake of brevity, however, the meaning in Hebrew-English Lexicons is usually given in the Infinitive, e.g. לְמַתַּק to learn, properly he has learnt.

¹ The term *Conjugation* thus has an entirely different meaning in Hebrew and Greek or Latin grammar.

reflexives with the prefix **הָתְ**, **אָתְ**, **אָתָּה** have entirely usurped the place of the passives. On the other hand, Arabic has preserved great wealth in both methods of formation, while Hebrew in this, as in other respects, holds the middle place (§ 1 m).

4. Grammarians differ as to the *number* and *arrangement* of these conjugations. The common practice, however, of calling them by the old grammatical terms, prevents any misunderstanding. The simple form is called *Qal* (**קַل** *light*, because it has no formative additions); the others (כַּבדִים *heavy*, being weighted, as it were, with the strengthening of consonants or with formative additions) take their names from the paradigm of **פָעַל** *he has done*,¹ which was used in the earliest Jewish grammatical works. Several of these have passives which are distinguished from their actives by more obscure vowels. The common conjugations (including *Qal* and the passives) are the seven following, but very few verbs exhibit them all:

	<i>Active.</i>	<i>Passive.</i>
1. Qal	לְפֹטֵל <i>to kill.</i>	(Cf. § 52 e.)
2. Niph'al	לְפֹטֵל <i>to kill oneself</i> (rarely passive).	
3. Pi'el	לְפֹטֵל <i>to kill many, to massacre.</i>	4. Pu'al לְפֹטֵל.
5. Hiph'il	לְפֹטִיל <i>to cause to kill.</i>	6. Hoph'al לְפֹטִיל.
7. Hithpa'el	לְפֹטֵל <i>to kill oneself.</i>	[Very rare, Hothpa'al לְפֹטֵל.]

There are besides several less frequent conjugations, some of which, however, are more common in the kindred languages, and even in Hebrew (in the weak verb) regularly take the place of the usual conjugations (§ 55).

In Arabic there is a greater variety of conjugations, and their arrangement is more appropriate. According to the Arabic method, the Hebrew conjugations would stand thus: 1. *Qal*; 2. *Pi'el* and *Pu'al*; 3. *Po'T* and *Po'al* (see § 55 b); 4. *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*; 5. *Hithpa'el* and *Hothpa'al*; 6. *Hithpô'el* (see § 55 b); 7. *Niph'al*; 8. *Hithpa'el* (see § 54 I); 9. *Pi'lêl* (see § 55 d). A more satisfactory division would be into three classes: (1) The intensive *Pi'el* with the derived and analogous forms *Pu'al* and *Hithpa'el*. (2) The causative *Hiph'il* with its passive *Hoph'al*, and the analogous forms (*Saph'el* and *Tiph'el*). (3) The reflexive or passive *Niph'al*.

¹ This paradigm was borrowed from the Arabic grammarians, and, according to Bacher, probably first adopted throughout by Abulwalid. It was, however, unsuitable on account of the guttural, and was, therefore, usually exchanged in later times for פְּקַד, after the example of Moses Qimhi. This verb has the advantage, that all its conjugations are actually found in the Old Testament. On the other hand, it has the disadvantage of indistinctness in the pronunciation of some of its forms, e.g. פְּקַדְתִּי, פְּקַדְתֶּךָ. The paradigm of לְפֹטֵל, commonly used since the time of Danz, avoids this defect, and is especially adapted for the comparative treatment of the Semitic dialects, inasmuch as it is found with slight change (Arab. and Ethiop. קַתְל) in all of them. It is true that in Hebrew it occurs only three times in *Qal*, and even then only in poetic style (Ps 139:19, Jb 13:15, 24:14); yet it is worth retaining as a model which has been sanctioned by usage. More serious is the defect, that a number of forms of the paradigm of לְפֹטֵל leave the beginner in doubt as to whether or not there should be a *Dageš* in the *B'gadk'phath* letters, and consequently as to the correct division of the syllables.

§ 40. Tenses. Moods. Flexion

A. Ungnad, 'Die gegenseitigen Beziehungen der Verbalformen im Grundstamm des semit. Verbs,' in *ZDMG.* 59 (1905), 766 ff., and his 'Zum hebr. Verbalsystem,' in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* ed. by Fr. Delitzsch and P. Haupt, 1907, p. 55 ff.

1. While the Hebrew verb, owing to these derivative forms or conjugations, possesses a certain richness and copiousness, it is, on the other hand, poor in the matter of *tenses* and *moods*. The verb has only two *tense-forms* (*Perfect* and *Imperfect*, see the note on § 47 a), besides an *Imperative* (but only in the active), two *Infinitives* and a *Participle*. All relations of time, absolute and relative, are expressed either by these forms (hence a certain diversity in their meaning, § 106 ff.) or by syntactical combinations. Of moods properly so called (besides the *Imperfect Indicative* and *Imperative*), only the *Jussive* and *Optative* are sometimes indicated by express modifications of the *Imperfect-form* (§ 48).

2. The *inflection* of the *Perfect*, *Imperfect*, and *Imperative* as to persons, differs from that of the Western languages in having, to a great extent, distinct forms for the two genders, which correspond to the different forms of the *personal pronoun*. *It is from the union of the pronoun with the verbal stem that the personal inflexions of these tenses arise.*

The following table will serve for the beginner as a provisional scheme of the formative syllables (*afformatives* and *preformatives*) of the two *tenses*. The three stem-consonants of the strong verb are denoted by dots. Cf. § 44 ff. and the Paradigms.

PERFECT					
<i>Singular.</i>			<i>Plural.</i>		
3. <i>m.</i>	.	.	3.	<i>c.</i>	.
3. <i>f.</i>	תְּ
2. <i>m.</i>	תָּ
2. <i>f.</i>	תְּ
1. <i>c.</i>	תִּ	.	1.	<i>c.</i>	.
IMPERFECT					
<i>Singular.</i>			<i>Plural.</i>		
3. <i>m.</i>	.	.	3.	<i>m.</i>	.
3. <i>f.</i>	.	.	3.	<i>f.</i>	תְּ
2. <i>m.</i>	.	.	2.	<i>m.</i>	.
2. <i>f.</i>	תְּ	.	2.	<i>f.</i>	תְּ
1. <i>c.</i>	.	.	1.	<i>c.</i>	.

§ 41. Variations from the Ordinary Form of the Strong Verb.

The same laws which are normally exhibited in stems with strong (unchangeable) consonants, hold good for all other verbs. Deviations from the model of the strong verb are only modifications due to the special character or weakness of certain consonants, viz. :—

(a) When one of the stem-consonants (or *radicals*) is a guttural. In this case, however, the variations only occur in the vocalization (according to § 22), not in the consonants. The *guttural verbs* (§§ 62–65) are, therefore, only a variety of the *strong verb*.

(b) When a stem-consonant (*radical*) disappears by assimilation (§ 19 b–f), or when the stem originally, consisted of only two consonants (*verbs* ז"פ, ע"ע, and ז"ע, as שָׁבַע, קָוִם, קָלַב, §§ 66, 67, 72).

(c) When one of the stem-consonants (*radicals*) is a weak letter. In this case, through aphaeresis, elision, &c., of the weak consonant, various important deviations from the regular form occur. Cf. § 68 ff. for these verbs, such as גָּלַה, מָצָא, יָשַׁב.

Taking the old paradigm פְּעַל as a model, it is usual, following the example of the Jewish grammarians, to call the first radical of any stem פ, the second ע, and the third ל. Hence the expressions, *verb* א"פ for a verb whose first radical is פ (prima radicis [sc. literae] א); ז"ע for mediae radicis ע; ע"ע for a verb whose second radical is repeated to form a third.

The Strong Verb.

§ 42.

As the formation of the strong verb is the model also for the weak verb, a statement of the general formative laws should precede the treatment of special cases.

Paradigm B, together with the Table of the personal preformatives and afformatives given in § 40 c, offers a complete survey of the normal forms. A full explanation of them is given in the following sections (§§ 43–55), where each point is elucidated on its first occurrence; thus e.g. the inflexion of the Perfect, the Imperfect and its modifications, will be found under Qal, &c.

THE PURE STEM, OR QAL.

§ 43. *Its Form and Meaning.*

The common form of the 3rd sing. masc. of the *Perfect Qal* is לְפִזְבֵּחַ, with ā (Pathah) in the second syllable, especially in *transitive* verbs (but see § 44 c). There is also a form with ē (Sere, originally i), and another with ō (Holem, originally u) in the second syllable, both of which, however, have almost always an *intransitive*¹ meaning, and serve to express states and qualities, e.g. כָּבֵד to be heavy, נָטֵף to be small.

In Paradigm B a verb *middle a*, a verb *middle ē*, and a verb *middle ō* are accordingly given side by side. The second example כָּבֵד is chosen as showing, at the same time, when the *Dageš lene* is to be inserted or omitted.

¹ But cf. such instances as Jer 48:5. In Arabic also, transitive verbs are found with middle i□, corresponding to Hebrew verbs with ē in the second syllable. Hence P. Haupt (*Proc. Amer. Or. Soc.*, 1894, p. ci f.) prefers to distinguish them as *verba voluntaria* (actions which depend on the will of the subject) and *involuntaria* (actions or states independent of the will of the subject).

Rem. 1. The vowel of the second syllable is the principal vowel, and hence on it depends the distinction between the transitive and intransitive meaning. The *Qameṣ* of the first syllable is lengthened from an original ā (cf. Arabic *qātālā*), but it can be retained in Hebrew only immediately before the tone, or at the most (with an open ultima) in the counter-tone with *Metheg*; otherwise, like all the pretonic vowels (ā, ē), it becomes Š^ewā, e.g. מִתְּפַלֵּק 2nd plur. masc. In the Aramaic dialects the vowel of the first syllable is always reduced to Š^ewā, as לְפָק=Hebr. לְפָק. The intransitive forms in Arabic are *qātiłā*, *qātiłā*; in Hebrew (after the rejection of the final vowel) i being in the tone-syllable has been regularly lengthened to ē, and ū to ō.

2. Examples of *denominatives* in *Qal* are: מִטְּפַר *to cover with pitch*, from מִטְּפָר *pitch*; מִלְּאַמְּדָה *to salt*, from לְאַמְּדָה *salt*; שְׂבָר (usually *Hiph.*) *to buy or sell corn*, from בָּר שֶׁבֶר *corn*; see above, § 38 c.

§ 44. Flexion of the Perfect of Qal.¹

1. The formation of the persons of the Perfect is effected by the addition of certain forms of the personal pronoun, and marks of the 3rd fem. sing. and 3rd pl. (as *affirmatives*) to the *end* of the verbal-stem, which contains the idea of a predicate, and may be regarded, in meaning if not in form, as a *Participle* or *verbal adjective*. For the 3rd pers. sing. masc. *Perfect*, the pronominal or subject idea inherent in the finite verb is sufficient: thus, קָטַל *he has killed*, קָטַלְתָּ *thou hast killed* (as it were, *killing thou*, or *a killer thou*), a killer wast thou=אֲתָּה קָטַל; he was fearing, יָרָא אֲתָּה תָּמַם; ye were fearing=יָרָא אַתָּהֶם. The ending of the 1st pers. plur. (נוּ) is also certainly connected with the termination of אָנוּ, אָנוּ חָנוּ we (§ 32 b, d). The affirmative of the 1st pers. sing. (יָהִי) is to be referred, by an interchange of כ and ה (cf. § 33 f), to that form of the pronoun which also underlies אָנוּ, כִּי I.² In the *third* person הָיָה (originally הָיָה, cf. below, f) is the mark of the feminine, as in a great number of nouns (§ 80 c), and וְ is the termination of the plural; cf., for the latter, the termination of the 3rd and 2nd pers. plur. Imperf. ָעַנָּה in Arabic and ָעַנָּה (often also ָעַנָּה) in Hebrew, also ָעַנָּה (in the construct state ָעַנָּה) as the plural termination of masc. nouns in literary Arabic.

2. The characteristic *Pathaḥ* of the second syllable becomes Š^ewā before an affirmative beginning with a vowel, where it would otherwise stand in an open syllable (as הָלַח, הָלַחֲךָ; but in *pause* הָלַחֲךָ). Before an affirmative beginning with a consonant the *Pathaḥ* remains, whether in the tone-syllable (הָלַחֲךָ, הָלַחֲךָ, הָלַחֲךָ; in *pause* הָלַחֲךָ &c.) or *before* it. In the latter case, however, the *Qameṣ* of the first syllable, being no longer a pretonic vowel, becomes vocal Š^ewā; as מִתְּפַלֵּק, מִתְּפַלֵּק, cf. § 27 i and § 43 b. On the retention of ā with *Metheg* of the counter-tone in the *Perf. consecutive*, cf. § 49 i.

Rem. 1. Verbs *middle ē* in Hebrew (as in Ethiopic, but not in Arabic or Aramaic) generally change the *E*-sound in their inflexion into *Pathaḥ* (frequently so even in the 3rd sing. masc. Perf.). This tendency to assimilate to the more common verbs *middle a* may also

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, ‘Die Endungen des Perfects’ (*Untersuchungen zur semit. Gramm.* ii.), in *ZDMG*. vol. 38, p. 407 ff., and more fully in *Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb. 1904, p. 15 ff.

² According to Nöldeke, *l.c.*, p. 419, the original Semitic termination of the 1st sing. Perf. was most probably *kū*; cf. the Ethiopic *qatalku*, Arabic *qataltu*.

be explained from the laws of vocalization of the tone-bearing closed penultima, which does not readily admit of *Sere*, and never of *Hireq*, of which the *Sere* is a lengthening (cf. § 26 p). On the other hand, *Sere* is retained in an open syllable; regularly so in the weak stems אָלֶל (§ 74 g), before suffixes (§ 59 i), and in the pausal forms of the strong stem in an open tone-syllable, e.g. קָרַב it cleaveth, Jb 29:10 (not קָרַב, cf. 2 S 1:23, Jb 41:15; even (contrary to § 29 q) in a *closed* pausal syllable, e.g. שְׁכֹן, Dt 33:12 (out of pause שְׁכֹן, Is 32:16); but לִקְמָד Is 33:9, &c., according to § 29 q).

2. In some weak stems *middle a*, the *Pathah* under the second radical sometimes, in a closed toneless syllable, becomes ֤, and, in one example, ֥. Thus from יִרְשֶׁתְהָ and thou shalt possess it, Dt 17:14; מִרְשָׁתְמָמָה Dt 19:1; וְרָשָׁתְמָמָה Dt 4:1, and frequently; from יִלְכֵד to bring forth, to beget; לִקְתֵּת Ps 2:7 (cf. Nu 11:12, Jer 2:27, 15:10); from פְוִישָׁה וְפָשָׁתְמָמָה Mal 3:20; from אָלְתִּי I have asked him, 1 S 1:20 (Ju 13:6), and three times אָלְתִּי שְׁאָלָתִי 1 S 12:13, 25:5, Jb 21:29. Qimhi already suggests the explanation, that the i (e) of these forms of אָלָל and שְׁאָלָל is the original vowel, since along with אָלָל and שְׁאָלָל are also found אָלָשָׁה and שְׁאָשָׁה (see the Lexicon). The possibility of this explanation cannot be denied (especially in the case of שְׁאָלָל, see § 69 s); the i in these forms might, however, equally well have arisen from an attenuation of ā (§ 27 s), such as must in any case be assumed in the other instances. Moreover, it is worthy of notice that in all the above cases the i is favoured by the character of the following consonant (a sibilant or dental), and in most of them also by the tendency towards assimilation of the vowels (cf. § 54 k and § 64 f).

3. In verbs *middle o*, the *Holem* is retained in the tone-syllable, e.g. תְּמַלֵּא thou didst tremble; לָכַל in pause for לָכַל they were able; but in a toneless closed syllable the original short vowel appears in the form of a *Qameš haṭuph*; יִלְמַד I have prevailed against him, Ps 13:5; יִלְמַד (see § 49 h) then shalt thou be able, Ex 18:23; in a toneless open syllable it becomes vocal Š̄wā, e.g. יִכְלַה.

4. Rarer forms¹ are: *Sing. 3rd fem.* in הָאָתָה (as in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Aramaic), e.g. אָזְלָתָה it is gone, Dt 32:36; נָגָשָׁתָה Is 23:15 (in the Aramaic form, for נָגָשָׁה); from a verb עָזַב, חָזַב, cf. § 72 o. This original feminine ending -ath is regularly retained before suffixes, see § 59 a; and similarly in stems הָלָל, either in the form āth (which is frequent also in stems אָלָל § 74 g), or with the *Pathah* weakened to vocal Š̄wā before the pleonastic ending הָאָתָה, e.g. לְמַה אָתָה, § 75 i. In Ez 31:5 the Aramaic form אָתָה occurs instead of הָאָתָה.

2nd *masc.* הָתָה for הָאָתָה (differing only orthographically), e.g. בָּגְדָתָה thou hast dealt treacherously, Mal 2:14; cf. 1 S 15:3, Gn 3:12 (נָתָה which is twice as common as הָתָה, cf. § 66 h); Gn 21:23, 2 S 2:26, 2 K 9:3, Is 2:6, Ps 56:9 (so also in *Hiphil*; 2 K 9:7, Is 37:23, Ps 60:4).

2nd *fem.* has sometimes a Yodh at the end, as in הָלְכָתִי thou wentest, Jer 31:21; cf. 2:33, 3:4, 5, 4:19 (but read the ptcp. הָעֲשָׂה, with the LXX, instead of the 2nd fem.),⁴⁶¹¹, and so commonly in Jeremiah, and Ez (16¹⁸, &c.); see also Mi 4¹³, Ru 3:3, 4. כְּתִי הָלְכָתִי, &c., is really

¹ Many of these forms, which are uncommon in Hebrew, are usual in the other Semitic dialects, and may, therefore, be called Aramaisms (Syriasm) or Arabisms. They must not, however, be regarded as cases of borrowing, but as a return to original forms.

intended, for the vowel signs in the text belong to the marginal reading קְלִיבָתָה (without י¹) as in the corresponding pronoun אַתָּה § 32 h. The ordinary form has rejected the final *i*, but it regularly reappears when pronominal suffixes are added (§ 59 a, c).

1st pers. *comm.* sometimes without Yodh, as פָּתָח Ps 140:13, Jb 42:2, 1 K 8:48, Ez 16:59 (all in K^ethībh), Ps 16:2, without a Q^erē; in 2 K 18:20 also אָמֵת רָתֶה is really intended, as appears from Is 36:5. The Q^erē requires the ordinary form, to which the vowels of the text properly belong, whilst the K^ethībh is probably to be regarded as the remains of an earlier orthography, which omitted vowel-letters even at the end of the word.

וָתַּחַת as the termination of the 2nd *plur. m.* for וָתַּחַת Ez 33:26, might just possibly be due to the following ה (cf., for an analogous case, Mi 3:12, § 87 e), but is probably a copyist's error. Plur. 2nd *fem.* in וָתַּחַת- (according to others וָתַּחַת-) Am 4:3, but the reading is very doubtful; since ה follows, it is perhaps merely due to dittography; cf., however, וָתַּחַת § 32 i.

3rd *plur. comm.* has three times the very strange termination עֲנָן²; Dt 8:3, 16 (both before נ, and hence, no doubt, if the text is correct, to avoid a hiatus), and in the still more doubtful form עֲנָנָא Is 26:16; on ע in the Imperf. see § 47 m; on the affixed נ in Jos 10:24, Is 28:12, see § 23 i.

It is very doubtful whether, as in most Semitic languages (see § 47 c, note), the 3rd *fem. plur.* in Hebrew was originally distinguished from the 3rd *masc. plur.* by the termination ה, as in Biblical Aramaic. Nöldeke (*ZDMG*. 38 [1884], p. 411) referred doubtfully to the textual readings in Dt 21:7, Jos 15:4, 18:12, 14, 19, Jer 2:15, 22:6, where the Masora uniformly inserts the termination *û*, and to Gn 48:10 in the Samaritan Pentateuch, Gn 49:22, 1 S 4:15, Ps 18:35, Neh 13:10. In his *Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 19, however, he observes that the construction of a fem. plural with the 3rd sing. fem. is not unexampled, and also that ה is often found as a mistake for י. On the other hand Mayer Lambert (*Une série de Qeré ketib*, Paris, 1891, p. 6 ff.) explains all these K^ethībh, as well as Ps 73:2, Jer 50:6 (?), and (against Nöldeke) 1 K 22:49 (where ה is undoubtedly the article belonging to the next word), Jb 16:16 (where the *masc.* פְּנֵי requires the marginal reading), also Jer 48:41, 51:56, Ez 26:2, Ps 68:14, as remains of the 3rd *fem. plur.* in ה. The form was abandoned as being indistinguishable from the (later) form of the 3rd *fem. sing.*, but tended to be retained in the perfect of verbs הִיְהָ, as *K^ethībh* six times in the above examples.

5. The afformatives וָתַּחַת, (וָתַּחַת), וָתַּחַת, וָתַּחַת are generally toneless, and the forms with these inflexions are consequently *Milēl* (וָתַּחַת, &c.); with all the other afformatives they are *Milra* (§ 15 c). The place of the tone may, however, be shifted: (a) by the *pause* (§ 29 i–v), whenever a vowel which has become vocal Š^ewâ under the second stem-consonant is restored by the *pause*; as הָתַּחַת for הָתַּחַת (for הָתַּחַת), and בָּתַּחַת for בָּתַּחַת (for בָּתַּחַת); (b) in certain cases after wāw *consecutive* of the *Perfect* (see § 49 h).

¹ Where the Masora apparently regards the יִ as the termination of the 2nd *sing. fem.*, e.g. in Jer 2:20 (twice), Mi 4:13, it has rather taken the form as 1st *pers. sing.* (cf. Stade, *Gramm.*, p. 253); so in Ju 5:7, where אַתָּה וְקָרְבָּנָה, on account of verse 12, must either have originally been intended as 2nd *sing. fem.*, or is due to an erroneous pronunciation of the form קָרְבָּנָה as אַתָּה וְקָרְבָּנָה instead of 3rd *sing. fem.* קָרְבָּנָה (as LXX).

² That these examples can hardly be referred to a primitive Semitic ending *ûn* in the 3rd plur. Perf., has been shown by Nöldeke in *ZDMG*. vol. 38, p. 409 ff.; cf. also *ZDMG*. vol. 32, p. 757 f., where G. Hoffmann proves that the terminations in *Nûn* of the 3rd plur. in Aramaic, formerly adduced by us, are secondary forms. [See also Driver, *Heb. Tenses*³, p. 6 *note.*]

6. Contraction of a final **נ** with the **נ** of the afformative occurs e.g. in כִּרְתִּי [Hag 2:5](#), &c.; cf. [Is 14:20](#), &c., in the *Perf. Poel*; [Dt 4:25](#) in the *Hiphil* of חָשַׁשׁ; [Is 21:2](#), &c., in the *Hiphil* of שָׁבֵב. Contraction of a final **נ** with the afformative **נוּ** occurs in נִתְּנָהּ [Gn 34:16](#); in *Niph.* [Ezr 9:7](#), cf. [2 Ch 14:10](#); in *Hiph.* [2 Ch 29:19](#); with the afformative **הָנָהּ** in the *Imperfect Qal* [Ez 17:23](#); *Piel* [Ps 71:23](#), where with Baer and Ginsburg **הָנָהּ** is to be read, according to others תְּרֻבָּהּ **הָנָהּ** (cf. in *Polel* [קָרַבְנָהּ](#) [Ez 32:16](#)), but certainly not תְּרֻבָּהּ **הָנָהּ** with the Mantua ed., Opitius and Hahn; with **הָנָהּ** in the *Imperat. Hiph.* [Gn 4:23](#), [Is 32:9](#).

§ 45. The Infinitive.

F. Prätorius, ‘Ueber den sog. Inf. absol. des Hebr.’, in [ZDMG](#). 1902, p. 546 ff.

1. The Infinitive is represented in Hebrew by two forms, a shorter and a longer; both are, however, strictly speaking, independent nouns (*verbal substantives*). The shorter form, the *Infinitive construct* (in Qal לְטַלֵּ, ¹ sometimes incorrectly طَلَلْ), is used in very various ways, sometimes in connexion with pronominal suffixes, or governing a substantive in the genitive, or with an accusative of the object (§ 115), sometimes in connexion with prepositions (לְטַלֵּל *to kill*, § 114 f), and sometimes in dependence upon substantives as genitive, or upon verbs as accusative of the object. On the other hand, the use of the longer form, the *Infinitive absolute* (in Qal לְטַלִּיל, sometimes also لְטַלֵּ, obscured from original *qāṭāl*), is restricted to those cases in which it emphasizes the abstract verbal idea, without regard to the subject or object of the action. It stands most frequently as an adverbial accusative with a finite verb of the same stem (§ 113 h-s).¹

The flexibility and versatility of the Infin. constr. and the rigidity and inflexibility of the Infin. absol. are reflected in their vocalization. The latter has unchangeable vowels, while the *ō* of the Infin. constr. may be lost. For לְטַלֵּ, according to § 84a, e, goes back to the ground-form *qūṭāl*.

Other forms of the Infin. constr. Qal of the strong verb are—

(a) לְקַלֵּ, e.g. שָׁכַבְנָהּ *to lie*, [Gn 34:7](#); פְּלַלְנָהּ *to sink*, [Ec 12:4](#); especially with verbs which have *ă* in the second syllable of the Imperf.: hence sometimes also with those, whose second or third radical is a guttural (frequently besides the ordinary form). All the examples (except شָׁכַבְנָהּ, see above) occur in the closest connexion with the following word, or with suffixes (see § 61 c). In [Ez 21:33](#) the Masora seems to treat לְטַלֵּבְנָהּ (verse 20, in *pause* חֲבַטְלָהּ) as an Infinitive=לְטַלְבָנָהּ; probably לְטַלֵּבְנָהּ should be read.

(b) הַקְּלָלָהּ and, attenuated from it, הַקְּלָלָהּ; הַקְּלָלָהּ and הַקְּלָלָהּ (which are feminine forms² of קְלָלָהּ and לְקַלֵּ, mostly from intransitive verbs, and sometimes found along with forms having no feminine ending in use), e.g. הַמְּשַׁאֲלָהּ *to be guilty*, [Lv 5:26](#), בְּהַאֲהָןָהּ *to love*, אַהֲנָהּ *to hate*; לִירָאָהּ,

¹ Cf. the analogous forms of the noun, § 93 t.

¹ The terms *absolute* and *construct* are of course not to be understood as implying that the Infin. constr. לְטַלֵּ forms the *construct state* (see § 89) of the Infin. absol. (طَلَلْ ground-form *qāṭāl*). In the Paradigms the *Inf. constr.*, as the principal form, is placed before the other, under the name of Infinitive simply.

² According to the remark of Elias Levita on Qimḥī’s *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenb., 14 a, these feminine forms occur almost exclusively in connexion with the preposition לְ.

often in Dt., *to fear*; זָקֵנָה to be old; קָרַאָה to meet (in לְקֹרֶאת § 19 k); לְרֹבֶעָה to lie down, Lv 20:16; הַשְׁמִמָּה to anoint, Ex 29:29; לְרֹחֶץ to wash, Ex 30:18, &c.; לְאַנְטָפָה (also a subst.= uncleanness, like אַנְטָפָה) to be unclean, Lv 15:32; לְקָרְבָּה to approach, Ex 36:2, &c.; cf. Lv 12:4, 5, Dt 11:22, Is 30:19, Ez 21:16, Hag 1:6; also קָדָשָׁה to be far off, Ez 8:6; הַחֲנָה to pity, Ez 16:5; cf. Ho 7:4. On the other hand in הַמְּאַנְתָּה Gn 19:16, the original ā has been modified to ē; cf. חֲזָקָה Is 8:11, &c.

(c) In the Aramaic manner (לְקֹטָל) but cf. also Arab. *maqtal*) there occur as *Infin. Qal*: מְשֻׁלָּוחַ to send, Est 9:19; אַרְקָמָה to call and עַפְעָמָה to depart, Nu 10:2 (Dt 10:11); קְחָמָה to take, 2 Ch 19:7, &c.; אַשְׁשָׁמָה to carry, Nu 4:24, &c. (cf. even אַנְשָׁוָת Ez 17:9); also with a feminine ending מְעַלָּה to go up, Ezra 7:9, &c.; cf. for these forms (almost all very late) Ryssel, *De Elohistae Pentateuchici sermone*, p. 50, and Strack on Nu 4:24. Cf. also מְהֻפְכָּה followed by אַת, Is 13:19, Am 4:11, (§ 115 d).

(d) תַּחַת יְבַשְׁתָּה in קְטַבְתָּה Gn 8:7; תַּחַת יְבַשְׁתָּה Nu 14:16; probably also תַּחַת שְׁבָתָה Ex 31:5, 35:33.

2. A kind of *Gerund* is formed by the *Infin. constr.* with the preposition לְ; as לְקֹטָל ad interficiendum, לְנַפְלָל ad cadendum (see § 28 a).

The blending of the לְ with the *Infin. constr.* into a single grammatical form seems to be indicated by the firmly closed syllable, cf. לְשָׁכֵב Gn 34:7; לְנַפְלָל Ps 118:13, with *Dageš lene* in the פ=lin-pōl; hence, also *liq-tōl*, &c.; but בְּנֵפֶל bin^ephōl, Jb 4:13; לְכַנְפָל 2 S 3:34. Exceptions Nu 4:23, 8:24; לְנַתְוֹשׁ וְלַנְתֹוֹן Jer 1:10, 18:7, 31:28; לְשַׂדְוֹת Jer 47:4; לְצַבּוֹת Jer 11:19, &c., Ps 37:14; לְבִדּוֹת 2 Ch 34:10; according to some also בְּנֵבֶב Nu 21:4 and לְכַבְשָׁת 2 Ch 28:10 (Baer לְבַבָּשָׁת); on the other hand בְּנֵבֶב Gn 35:22; קְנֵפֶר Jer 17:2. For the meaningless לְרִיּוֹשׁ Ezr 10:16 read רִישׁ.

§ 46. *The Imperative.*

1. The ground-forms of the Imperative, לְקֹטָל (properly *q^etūl*, which is for an original *qu^etūl*), and קֹטָל (see below, c), the same in pronunciation as the forms of the *Infin. constr.* (§ 45), are also the basis for the formation of the Imperfect (§ 47).¹ They represent the *second person*, and have both fem. and plur. forms. The third person is supplied by the Imperfect in the Jussive (§ 109 b); and even the second person must always be expressed by the Jussive, if it be used with a negative, e.g. לֹא לְקֹטָל *ne occidas* (not לְאַל-קֹטָל). The passives have no Imperative, but it occurs in the reflexives, as Niphal and Hithpaēl.²

2. The Afformatives of the *2nd sing. fem.* and the *2nd plur. masc.* and *fem.* are identical in every case with those of the Imperfect (§ 47 c). In the same way, the Imperative of the *2nd sing. masc.*, in common with the Imperfect, admits of the lengthening by the נָן *paragogicum* (§ 48 i), as, on the other hand, there are certain shortened forms of this person analogous to the Jussive (§ 48. 5).

Rem. 1. Instead of the form לְקֹטָל (sometimes also *plene*, e.g. פְּנַמּוֹר Ec 12:13; before *Maqqeph* לְקֹטָל with *Qameš haṭuph*), those verbs which have an *a* in the final syllable of the

¹ The *Infin. absol.*, like the Greek *Infin.*, is also sometimes used for the Imperative (§ 113 bb). Cf. in general, Koch, *Der semitische Inf.* (Schaffhausen, 1874).

² In *Hophal* an Imperative is found only twice (Ez 32:19, Jer. 49:8), and closely approximating in meaning to the reflexive.

Imperf. (i.e. especially verbs middle ē) make their Imperative of the form קְפַל לִבְשׁ, e.g. *dress!* (Perf. קָפַל and לִבְשׁ *lie down!* in *pause* בְּשָׁבֵב 1 S 3:5, 6, 9).

2. The first syllable of the sing. fem. and plur. masc. are usually to be pronounced with Š̄wā mobile (*qiṭṭli*, *qiṭṭlū*, and so *קְפַל*, &c., without *Dageš lene*, and even *קְפַל* with *Metheg*, Ex 12:21; but cf. אֲסֻפִי *Jer 10:17*, and with the same phonetic combination חֲשֶׁפִי *Is 47:2*; see analogous cases in § 93 m); less frequently we find an ḥ instead of the i, e.g. קְלִכִי *rule*, Ju 9:10; קְרֹמִים *draw*, Ez 32:20; חֲרָבוֹ *Jer 2:12* (cf. בְּרִי *Is 44:27*); on קְרֹמִים 1 S 28:8 *Q̄rē*, קְרֹמִים 22:20 (cf. 1 K 13:7), see § 10 h. This ḥ arises (see above, a) from a singular ground-form *quṭṭil*, not from a retraction of the original ū of the second syllable. We must abandon the view that the forms with i in the first syllable (cf. also עֲבָרִי, מְכָרִי, חָגָרִי, אֲמָרִי) arise from a weakening of the characteristic vowel ḥ. They, or at least some of them, must rather be regarded with Barth (*ZDMG*, 1889, p. 182) as analogous to the original i-imperfects. See further analogies in §§ 47 i and 48 i; 61 b, 63 n.

The *pausal* form of the 2nd plur. masc. is קְרֹמִים 1 K 3:26; from *שְׁמַע*, *שְׁמַעַנְה*, &c.; similarly the 2nd sing. fem. in *pause* is עֲבָרִי *Is 23:12*; even without the *pause* Ju 9:10, 12, *K̄th.*; קְרֹמִים 1 S 28:8, *K̄th.* (cf. with this also אֲמָלֹכה, &c., § 48 i); from שְׁמַחַת חֵי, שְׁמַה Jo 2:21.

3. In the 2nd plur. fem. עֲמָן occurs once, in Gn 4:23 (for עֲמָנָה) with loss of the ה and insertion of a helping vowel, unless it is simply to be pointed עֲמָן. Also instead of the abnormal קְרֹאָן *Ex 2:20* (for קְרֹאָה) we should perhaps read as in Ru 1:20 (cf. אָנָן 1:9 and קְרֹאָן 1:12).

On the examples of a 2nd plur. fem. in עֲמָן, Is 32:11, see § 48 i.

§ 47. *The Imperfect and its Inflexion.*

1. The persons of the Imperfect,¹ in contradistinction to those of the Perfect, are formed by placing abbreviated forms of the personal pronoun (preformatives) before

¹ On the use of the Semitic Perfect and Imperfect cf. 106 ff. and the literature cited in § 106. For our present purpose the following account will suffice:—The name *Imperfect* is here used in direct contrast to the Perfect, and is to be taken in a wider sense than in Latin and Greek grammar. The Hebrew (Semitic) *Perf.* denotes in general that which is *concluded*, *completed*, and *past*, that which has happened and has come into effect; but at the same time, also that which is *represented* as accomplished, even though it be continued into present time or even be actually still future. The *Imperf.* denotes, on the other hand, the *beginning*, the *unfinished*, and the *continuing*, that which is just happening, which is conceived as in process of coming to pass, and hence, also, that which is yet future; likewise also that which occurs repeatedly or in a continuous sequence in the past (Latin *Imperf.*). It follows from the above that the once common designation of the *Imperf.* as a *Future* emphasizes only *one* side of its meaning. In fact, the use of Indo-Germanic tense-names for the Semitic tenses, which was adopted by the Syrians under the influence of the Greek grammarians, and after their example by the Arabs, and finally by Jewish scholars, has involved many misconceptions. The Indo-Germanic scheme of three periods of time (past, present, and future) is entirely foreign to the Semitic tense-idea, which regards an occurrence only from the point of view of Completed or incomplete

the stem, or rather before the abstract form of the stem (לְתַקֵּן). As, however, the tone is retained on the characteristic vowel of the Stem-form, or even (as in the 2nd sing. fem. and the 3rd and 2nd plur. masc.) passes over to the afformatives, the preformatives of the Imperfect appear in a much more abbreviated form than the afformatives of the Perfect, only *one* consonant (י, ה, נ, ג) remaining in each form. But as this preformative combined with the stem-form was not always sufficient to express at the same time differences both of gender and number, the distinction had to be farther indicated, in several cases, by special *afformatives*. Cf. the table, § 40 c.

2. The derivation and meaning, both of the preformatives and the afformatives, can still, in most cases, be recognized.

In the *first* pers. לְתַקֵּן, plur. אֲתָקִינָה, plur. לְתַקְתָּאָנָה is probably connected with אָתִי, and ג with חָנוּ; here no indication of gender or number by a special ending was necessary. As regards the vocalization, the Arabic points to the ground-forms *aq̄tūl* and *nāq̄tūl*: the *i* of the 1st plur. is, therefore, as in the other preformatives, attenuated from *a*. The *Sghōl* of the 1st sing. is probably to be explained by the preference of the נ for this sound (cf. § 22 o, but also § 51 p); according to Qimḥi, it arises from an endeavour to avoid the similarity of sound between לְתַקֵּן (which is the Babylonian punctuation) and לְתַקְתָּאָנָה, which, according to this view, was likewise pronounced *iqtōl*.¹

The preformative נ of the *second* persons (לְתַקֵּנָה, ground-form *tāq̄tūl*, &c.) is, without doubt, connected with the נ of הָתָקָה, מָתָקָה, &c., and the *afformative* יְ of the 2nd fem. sing. תַּקְתִּילִי with the *i* of the original feminine form אָתִי (see § 32 h). The *afformative* יְ of the 2nd masc. plur. תַּקְתִּילָוּ (in its more complete form, יְנָה, see m) is the sign of the plural, as in the 3rd pers., and also in the Perfect (§ 44 a). In the Imperfect, however, it is restricted in both persons to the masculine,² while the *afformative* יְנָה (also יְ) of the 3rd and 2nd plur. fem. is probably connected with הָנָה *eae* and הָנָה *vos* (fem.).

action.—In the formation of the two tenses the chief distinction is that in the Perfect the verbal stem precedes and the indication of the person is added afterwards for precision, while in the Imperf. the subject, from which the action proceeds or about which a condition is predicated, is expressed by a prefixed pronoun.

¹ Cf. § 24 e. In favour of the above view of Qimḥi may be urged the phonetic orthography שָׁבֵב (in Pr 18:24 שָׁבֵב), 2 S 14:19 (unless, with Perles, שָׁבֵב is to be read), Mi 6:10, for שָׁבֵב, and 1 Ch 2:13 for יְשִׁיבָה (as verse 12). Also הָאַזְבָּה Mi 6:11 is probably for יְשִׁיבָה Is 10:12 for אַגְחָמָה; דְּאַזְבָּה = קְאַזְבָּה Is 51:19 for אַפְקָדָה, חַיְזָה = קְחַיְזָה; and conversely יְשִׁיבָרָה is for אַשְׁכָּרָה. Similarly, יְשִׁיבָה-אַשְׁכָּרָה is probably for אַשְׁכָּרָה or אַשְׁבָּה; in 2 S 23:8 is, according to the LXX, an error for يְשִׁבָּתָה=אַשְׁבָּתָה. In Assyrian also the simple *i* corresponds to the Hebrew יְ as the preformative of the Impf. Qal.

² This is also the proper gender of the plural syllable *û*, *ûn*. In Hebrew, indeed, it is used in the 3rd plur. *Perfect* for both genders, but in the kindred languages even there only for the masculine, e.g. in Syriac *q̄tálū*, *q̄tálūn*, with the feminine form *q̄tálēn*, in Western Aram. *q̄tálū*, fem. *q̄tálā*; in Arab. *qātálū*, fem. *qātálnā*, Eth. *qātálū*, *qātálā*.

The preformatives of the *third* persons (ו in the masc. יִקְרָא, ground-form *yāqtūl*, plur. יִקְרָאִים, ground-form *yāqtūlū*; ו in the fem. לִקְרָא, plur. קְרָאִתּוֹת) have not yet met with any satisfactory explanation. With ו might most obviously be compared the original feminine ending ו of nouns, and of the 3rd fem. sing. perfect. For the afformatives ו (ו) and וְ (וְ), see c.

3. The characteristic vowel of the second syllable becomes Š^ēwā before tone-bearing afformatives which begin with a vowel, but is retained (as being in the tone-syllable) before the toneless afformative וְ. Thus: תְּקַטֵּל וְ, תְּקַטֵּלְוּ (but in *pause* תְּקַטֵּל וְ, תְּקַטֵּלְוּ &c.), לְנָה תְּקַטֵּלְוּ.

Rem. 1. The ō of the second syllable (as in the inf. constr. and imperat.), being lengthened from an original ī in the tone-syllable, is only tone-long (§ 9 r). Hence it follows that: (a) it is incorrectly, although somewhat frequently, written *plene*; (b) before *Maqqeph* the short vowel appears as *Qameš haṭuph*, e.g. וַיְכַתֵּב שָׁם and he wrote there, Jos 8:32 (but cf. also Ex 21:37, Jos 18:20); (c) it becomes Š^ēwā before the tone-bearing afformatives וְ and וְ (see above, e; but Jerome still heard e.g. *iezbuleni* for וַיְזַבְּלֶנִי; cf. ZAW. iv. 83).

Quite anomalous are the three examples which, instead of a shortening to Š^ēwā, exhibit a long ū: מִשְׁפָּטוֹתָה Ex 18:26, immediately before the principal pause, but according to Qimḥi (ed. Rittenb. p.18^b), ed. Mant., Ginsb., Kittel against the other editions, with the tone on the ultima; likewise לְאַתְּ עֲבוֹרִי מֻנָּה Ru 2:8; מִשְׁמָרָה (in principal pause) Pr 14:3. In the first two cases perhaps וַיְשַׁפֵּט וְרִי and וַיְשַׁפֵּט (for וְשַׁפֵּט, &c.) are intended, in virtue of a retrogressive effect of the pause; in Pr 14:3 תְּשֻׁמְרוּם is to be read, with August Müller.

2. The ō of the second syllable is to be found almost exclusively with transitive verbs middle *a*, like קָטַל. Intransitives *middle a* and *e* almost always take ā (*Pathaḥ*)¹ in the impf., e.g. יַרְבֵּץ, יַרְבֵּץ, רַבֵּץ to couch, יַשְׁכֵּב, יַשְׁכֵּב to lie down (לִמְדָה, לִמְדָה, לִמְדָה to learn is also originally intransitive = to accustom oneself); יַגְדֵּל, גַּדֵּל to become great (but cf. שָׁכַן and שָׁכַן to dwell and to inhabit, בָּבֵל imperf. יַבְּלֵל to wither); also from verbs *middle ō*, as תַּקְהַל to be small, the imperf. has the form יַקְהַל.

Sometimes both forms occur together; those with ō having a transitive, and those with ā an intransitive meaning, e.g. רַקֵּצְרַקְצָר he cuts off, יַקְצֵר he is cut off, i.e. is short; שְׁלִילַי impf. ō, to overcome, Ex 17:13; impf. ā, to be overcome, Jb 14:10. More rarely both forms are used without any distinction, e.g. נַשְׁבֵּשׁ and נַשְׁבֵּשׁ he bites, יַחְזֵקְקַחְקָחְ he is inclined (but only the latter with a transitive meaning=he bends, in Jb 40:17). On the *a* of the impf. of verbs middle and third guttural, cf. § 64 b; § 65 b. In some verbs first guttural (§ 63 n), עַעַעַע (§ 67 p), פַּיְיַיְיַי (§ 69 b), and פַּאַאַא (§ 68 c), and in תְּנִינָה for *yintēn* from תְּנִין to give, instead of ā or ō a movable Šere (originally i) is found in the second syllable. A trace of these *i*-imperfects² in the ordinary strong verb is probably to be found in וְנִטְמֵנָה 2 K 7:8, since טְמֵנָה otherwise only occurs in Qal. We call these three forms of the imperfect after their characteristic vowel impf. *o*, impf. *a*, impf. *e*.

ZAW. ZAW, = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

¹ This ā is, however, by no means restricted to intransitive *strong* verbs; apart from verbs third guttural (§ 65 b), it is to be found in נַפְיַי and עַעַע, and in many verbs אַפְיַי and פַּי (§§ 69–71).

² Cf. Barth, ‘Das *i*-Imperfekt im Nordsemitischen,’ ZDMG. 1889, p. 177 ff.

3. For the *3rd sing. fem.* לְתַקְטַּק (=*tiq-tōl*), Baer requires in **1 S 25:20** תַּפְגֵּשׁ (but read with ed. Mant., &c. שָׂגָגֶת). For the *2nd sing. fem.* לְתַקְתַּק the form is found in **Is 57:8**, **Jer 3:5**, **Ez 22:4**, **23:32**, in every case after the regular form; but cf. also **Ez 26:14**. In **Is 17:10**, where the 2nd fem. precedes and follows, probably תַּזְרִעַן וּבָנָה is to be read with Marti for תַּזְרִעַן וּבָנָה.—For the *3rd plur. fem.* תַּקְטַּק we find in **Jer 49:11**, in pause חֲבַט הַנָּה (for חֲבַט הַנָּה), and thrice (as if to distinguish it from the 2nd pers.) the form לַנָּה יְקַטֵּל with the preformative י (as always in Western Aram., Arab, Eth., and Assyr.), in **Gn 30:38**, **1 S 6:12**, **Dn 8:22**. On the other hand, לַנָּה appears in some cases to be incorrectly used even for the fem. of the 3rd pers. or for the masc. of the 2nd pers. *sing.* as **Ju 5:26** (where, however, perhaps בָּה is to be read), and **Ob 13**, for 2nd sing. masc., according to Olshausen a corruption of בָּה; in **Pr 1:20**, **8:3** for בָּה read בָּנָה as in **Jb 39:23**; in **Ex 1:10** read תַּקְרְאֵנָה with the Samaritan.—In **Is 27:11**, **28:3**, as also in **Jb 17:16** (if we read תַּזְבִּית with LXX for the 2nd תַּקְוֹתִי), it is equally possible to explain the form as a plural. This small number of examples hardly justifies our finding in the above-mentioned passages the remains of an emphatic form of the Impf., analogous to the Arab. *Modus energicus I*, with the termination *ānnā*.

For הָנָה we frequently find, especially in the Pentateuch and mostly after *wāw consecutive*, simply יְנָה, e.g. **Gn 19:33**, **36**, **37:7**, **Ex 1:18**, **19**, **15:20**, **Nu 25:2**, **Ez 3:20**, **16:55**; in Arab. always *nā*. According to Elias Levita פָּלָב שָׁנָה (2 S 13:18) is the only example of this kind in the strong verb. The form וְתַּקְבִּחַנָּה (so also Qimḥi and ed. Mant.; but Baer, Ginsb. וְתַּקְבִּיכָּה) for וְתַּקְבִּיבָּה they were high, **Ez 16:50**, is irregular, with יְ inserted after the manner of verbs עָשָׂה, עָשָׂה, § 67 d; § 72 i; according to Olshausen it is an error caused by the following form.

4. Instead of the plural forms in י there are, especially in the older books, over 300 forms¹ with the fuller ending וָן (with *Nūn paragogicum*), always bearing the tone; cf. § 29 m and § 44 l; on its retention before suffixes, see § 60 e; also defectively Ex 21:18, 22:8, &c. This usually expresses marked emphasis, and consequently occurs most commonly at the end of sentences (in the principal pause), in which case also the (pausal) vowel of the second syllable is generally retained. Thus there arise full-sounding forms such as יְלַקְתָּוָן they collect, Ps 104:28; יְמַצְתָּוָן they tremble, Ex 15:14; יְשֻׁמְעָנָה ye shall hear, Dt 1:17; cf. Ex 34:13, with Zaqeph qaṭon, Athnah, and Silluq; Jos 24:15, with Segolta; Is 13:8 and 17:13 with Zaqeph qaṭon, 17:12 with Athnah and Silluq, 41:5 after *wāw consec.* Without the pause, e.g. Ps 11:2 יְרַכְוּן קְשַׁתְּ שָׁתְּ, cf. 4:3, Gn 18:28, 29, 30 ff., 44:1, Nu 32:23, Jos 4:6 (יְשָׁלֹון); Is 8:12, 1 S 9:13, Ru 2:9 (יְקַצְרֹונָה); Ju 11:18 after *wāw consec.*

Some of these examples may be partly due to euphonic reasons, e.g. certainly **Ex 17:2**, **Nu 16:29**, **32:20**, **1 S 9:13**, **1 K 9:6**, and often, to avoid a hiatus before נ or ו. It was, however, the pause especially which exerted an influence on the restoration of this older and fuller termination (cf. § 159 c, note), as is manifest from **Is 26:11**: בְּלִי... יְהִזְרֵז וְיַבְשֵׁשׁ they see not; may they see and become ashamed. All this applies also to the corresponding forms in the Imperfect of the derived conjugations.¹ In Aramaic and Arabic this earlier וָן (old Arabic *ūnā*) is the regular termination; but in some dialects of vulgar Arabic it has also become *ū*.

¹ [See details in F. Böttcher, *Lehrb.*, § 930; and cf. Driver on 1 S 2:15.]

¹ It is to be observed that the Chronicles often omit the *Nūn*, where it is found in the parallel passage in the Books of Kings; cf. 1 K 8:38, 43 with 2 Ch 6:29, 33; 1 K 12:24, 2 K 11:5 with 2 Ch 11:4, 23:4.

With an affixed נ we find (in the imperf. Niphal) נִשְׁׁבַּע Jer 10:5, evidently an error for נִשְׁׁבָּע, caused by the preceding נִשְׁׁזָּב.—In נִשְׁׁזָּב Is 35:1, since נ follows, the נ is no doubt only due to dittography.

5. Corresponding to the use of נ for נ there occurs in the 2nd sing. fem., although much less frequently, the fuller ending נִנְּ (as in Aram. and Arab.; old Arab. *iñā*), also always with the tone, for נִנְּ, generally again in the principal pause, and almost in all cases with retention of the vowel of the penultima; thus נִנְּבָּרְאָ Ru 2:8, 21, cf. 3:4, 18, 1 S 1:14 (תִּשְׁׁבְּרָא), Jer 31:22, Is 45:10.

6. On the reappearance in pause of the *ō* which had become ſwā in the forms פְּקֻדֵּלִי, &c., see above, e; similarly, the imperfects with ā restore this vowel in pause and at the same time lengthen it (as a tone-vowel) to ī, hence, e.g. נִגְּדָה לֹ, נִגְּדָה לִ. This influence of the pause extends even to the forms without afformatives, e.g. נִגְּדָל, in pause נִגְּדָל. But the fuller forms in *ūn* and *iñ* have the tone always on the ultima, since the vowels *ū* and *i* in a closed final syllable never allow of the retraction of the tone.

7. On the numerous instances of passive forms in the imperfect, mostly treated as Hophal, see § 53 u.

§ 48. Shortening and Lengthening of the Imperfect and Imperative. The Jussive and Cohortative.

1. Certain modifications which take place in the form of the imperfect, and express invariably, or nearly so, a distinct shade of meaning, serve to some extent as a compensation for the want of special forms for the *Tempora relativa* and for certain moods of the verb.

2. Along with the usual form of the imperfect, there exists also a lengthened form of it (the *cohortative*), and a shortened form (the *jussive*).² The former occurs (with few exceptions) only in the 1st person, while the latter is mostly found in the 2nd and 3rd persons, and less frequently in the 1st person. The laws of the tone, however, and of the formation of syllables in Hebrew, not infrequently precluded the indication of the jussive by an actual shortening of the form; consequently it often—and, in the imperfect forms with afformatives, always—coincides with the ordinary imperfect (*indicative*) form.

In classical Arabic the difference is almost always evident. That language distinguishes, besides the indicative *yāqtūlū*, (a) a subjunctive, *yāqtūlā*; (b) a jussive, *yāqtūl*; (c) a double ‘energetic’ mood of the impf., *yāqtūlānnā* and *yāqtūlān*, in pause *yāqtūlā*, the last form thus corresponding to the Hebrew cohortative.

3. The characteristic of the cohortative form is an ā (נִנְּ) affixed to the 1st pers. sing. or plur., e.g. נִנְּלָא from לְטָא.¹ It occurs in almost all conjugations and classes of the strong and weak verb (except of course in the passives), and this final נִנְּ has

² The perfect has only one form, since it cannot be used, like the imperfect, to express mood-relations (see § 106 p).

¹ Probably this ā goes back to the syllable *an*, which in Arabic (see above, Rem. to b) is used for the formation of the ‘energetic’ mood, and in Hebrew (see the footnote to § 58 i) often stands before suffixes.

the tone wherever the afformatives **ו** and **וּ** would have it. As before these endings, so also before the **הַ** cohortative, the movable vowel of the last syllable of the verbal form becomes **שָׁewâ**, e.g. in Qal **הַשְׁמַרְתִּי** *I will observe*, in Piel **נְשַׁבֵּךְ** *let us break asunder*, Ps 2:3; on **הַטְּבֹשְׁתִּי** Is 18:4 **Q^erē** (cf. also 27:4, Ezr 8:25, &c.), see § 10 h; with the *K^ethibh* of these passages, compare the analogous cases **יְשֻׁפּוּתִי**, &c., § 47 g.—On the other hand, an unchangeable vowel in the final syllable is retained as tone-vowel before the **הַ**, as (e.g.) in Hiph. **הַזְּבֵחַ** *I will praise*. In pause (as before *u* and *i*), the vowel which became **שָׁwâ** is restored as tone-vowel; thus for the cohortative **הַשְׁמַרְתִּי** the pausal form is **רָהַשְׁמַרְתִּי** Ps 59:10; cf. Gn 18:21, Is 41:26.

The change of **הַ** into the obtuse **הָ** seems to occur in 1 S 28:15, unless, with Nestle, we are to assume a conflate reading, **אָקָרְתָּ** and **אָקָרְתָּהָ**; and with the 3rd pers. Ps 20:4, in a syllable sharpened by a following *Dages forte conjunct.*; cf. similar cases of the change of **הַ** into the obtuse **הָ** in *l* and in §§ 73 d, 80 i, 90 i. In Ps 20:4, however, **הָנָשְׁתִּים**—with suffix—is probably intended. An **הָ** cohort. is also found with the 3rd pers. in Is 5:19 (twice); Ez 23:20, and again in verse 16 according to the **Q^erē**, but in both these cases without any effect on the meaning. Probably another instance occurs in Jb 11:17, although there **פָּהָעָתָה** might also, with Qimhi, be regarded as 2nd masc. For the doubly irregular form **תָּבָאָתָה** Dt 33:16 (explained by Olshausen and König as a scribal error, due to a confusion with **תָּבוֹאָתָה** in verse 14), read **תָּבָאָתָה**. For **תָּבָאָתָה** Jb 22:21 the noun **תָּבוֹאָתָה** *thine increase*, might be meant, but the Masora has evidently intended an imperfect with the ending *ath*, instead of **הָ**, before the suffix, on the analogy of the 3rd sing. fem. perfect, see § 59 a; on **וְתָבָאָתָה** 1 S 25:34, see § 76 h.

The *cohortative* expresses the direction of the will to an action and thus denotes especially self-encouragement (in the 1st plur. an exhortation to others at the same time), a resolution or a wish, as an *optative*, &c., see § 108.

4. The general characteristic of the *jussive* form of the imperfect is rapidity of pronunciation, combined with a tendency to retract the tone from the final syllable, in order by that means to express the urgency of the command in the very first syllable. This tendency has, in certain forms, even caused a material shortening of the termination of the word, so that the expression of the command appears to be concentrated on a single syllable. In other cases, however, the jussive is simply marked by a shortening of the vowel of the second syllable, without its losing the tone, and very frequently (see above, b) the nature of the form does not admit of any alteration. It is not impossible, however, that even in such cases the jussive in the living language was distinguished from the indicative by a change in the place of the tone.

In the strong verb the jussive differs in *form* from the indicative only in *Hiphil* (juss. **נִקְרַיְלָה**, ind. **נִקְרַיְלָ**), and similarly in the weak verb, wherever the imperfect indicative has *i* in the second syllable, e.g. from **יִשְׁבֶּה** impf. *Hiph.* **יְשִׁיבָה**, juss. **יְשִׁיבָה**; from **יִמְתַּחֲתָה** and **יִמְתַּחֲתָה**; also in *Qal* of the verbs **יִעַשְׂתָה** and **יִעַשְׂתָה**, as **מְתַחֲתָה**, ind. **מְתַחֲתָה**; in all conjugations of verbs **הִלְאָה**, so that the rejection (*apocope*) of the ending **הָ** in *Qal* and *Hiph.* gives rise to monosyllabic forms, with or without a helping vowel under the second radical, e.g. *Qal* ind. **יִגְלַה**, juss. **גַּלְהָ**; *Hiph.* ind. **יְגַלְהָ**, juss. **גַּלְהָ**; and in the *Piel* **וְגַלְתָה**.

from the indic. יִצְהָ (called apocopated imperfects). But almost all¹ the plural forms of the jussive coincide with those of the indicative, except that the jussive excludes the fuller ending וּ. Neither do the forms of the 2nd sing. fem., as פְקַטְתִּי לִילִי, תְגַלֵּי, &c., admit of any change in the jussive, nor any forms, whether singular or plural, to which suffixes are attached, e.g. חֲמִיתִ נִי as ind. Jer 38:15, as jussive Jer 41:8.

The meaning of the jussive is similar to that of the cohortative, except that in the jussive the command or wish is limited almost exclusively to the and or 3rd pers. On special uses of the jussive, e.g. in hypothetical sentences (even in the 1st pers.), see § 109 h.

5. The imperative, in accordance with its other points of connexion with the imperfect in form and meaning, admits of a similar lengthening (by הַ, Arab. *imper. energicus*, with the ending -*ānnā* or -*ān*, in pause -*ā*) and shortening. Thus in *Qal* of the strong verb, the lengthened form of רְשֹׁמֶר guard is שֹׁמֶרֶת² (*šōm'rā*, cf. קְפַלִּי, § 46 d); בְּזֻבָּה שֻׂבָּה, עַזְבָּה, שְׁמַעַת hear, in lesser pause שְׁמַעַת עַזְבָּה Jer 49:11; שְׁכַבָּה, שְׁכַבָּה lie down; שְׁמַעַת, עַמְעַת, שְׁמַעַת hear, in lesser pause שְׁמַעַת עַמְעַת Dn 9:19; in Niphal הַשְׁבָּעָה Gn 21:23. Cf., however, also מְקַרְבָּה sell, Gn 25:31, notwithstanding the impf. יְמַכְּרָבָה; יְמַכְּרָבָה Jb 33:5 (cf. עַרְכָּה Jer 46:3), but impf. יְעַרְכָּבָה; אַסְפָּה collect, Nu 11:16 (for אַסְפָּא cf. § 63 l and the plural אַסְפָּא), but 2nd masc. אַסְפָּה Ps 141:3. Barth (see above, § 47 i note) finds in these forms a trace of old imperfcts in *i*, cf. § 63 n. On the other hand, קְרַבָּה Ps 69:19 (also Imperat. Lv 9:7, &c.), but impf. יְקַרְבָּב. Without הַ, we have the form לֹךְ go, Nu 23:13, Ju 19:13, 2 Ch 25:17. The form קְטַל in pause becomes לֹהֶה קְטַל, the form קְטַל becomes לֹהֶה קְטַל, e.g. יְלַשְּׁה לֹהֶה קְטַל Dt 33:23. But also without the pause we find אַלְזַכְתָּה Ju 9:8 *K^eth.* and Ps 26:2 *K^eth.*, on which see § 46 e. On the other hand, עַזְבָּה וְרַה, עַזְבָּה, רַה Is 32:11 are to be explained as aramaizing forms of the and plur. fem.; also for v. 11 read חַרְדָּוּ דָה, and for v. 12 read סְפִּים דָה.

The shortened imperative is found only in verbs הַלְּ, e.g. in *Piel* גַּלְהָ from גַּלְלָה. The shade of meaning conveyed by the imperatives with הַ is not always so perceptible as in the cohortative forms of the imperfect, but the longer form is frequently emphatic, e.g. קְוּם rise up, קְוּמָה up! תְּנַהֵּן give, תְּנַהֵּן give up!

Rem. The form קְעָה for קְעָה, best attested in Pr 24:14 (where it is taken by the Masora as imperat., not as infin., קְעָה) is evidently due to the influence of the הַ which follows it in close connexion (so Strack, on the analogy of Jb 31:2); for other examples of this change of *a* to S^eghol, see above, under d, § 73 d, and § 80 i. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether Ju 9:29 (from רַבָּה) is intended for רַבָּה, and not rather for the common form of the imperative *Piel* רַבָּה. In favour of the former explanation it may be urged that the imperative הַאֲזָה (from אֲזִין) follows immediately after; in favour of the latter, that the ending הַ, with imperatives of verbs הַלְּ, is not found elsewhere, and also that here no guttural follows (as in Pr 24:14).

¹ Only in 1st plur. do we find a few shortened forms, as נְשָׁאָר 1 S 14:36, parallel with cohortatives; and נְרַבְּנָה Is 41:23 *K^eth.*

² On the reading שְׁמַרְתָּה (i.e. *šām'ra*, according to the Jewish grammarians), required by the Masora in Ps 86:2, 119:167 (cf. also Is 38:14, and מְרַבִּי Ps 16:1), see § 9 v; on מלוכה, Ju 9:8 *K^eth.*, see § 46 e.

§ 49. *The Perfect and Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive.*

1. The use of the two tense-forms, as is shown more fully in the Syntax (§§ 106, 107, cf. above, § 47, note on *a*), is by no means restricted to the expression of the past or future. One of the most striking peculiarities in the Hebrew *consecution* of tenses¹ is the phenomenon that, in representing a series of past events, only the first verb stands in the perfect, and the narration is continued in the imperfect. Conversely, the representation of a series of future events begins with the imperfect, and is continued in the perfect. Thus in 2 K 20:1, *In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death* (perf.), *and Isaiah ... came* (imperf.) *to him, and said* (imperf.) *to him, &c.* On the other hand, Is 7:17, *the Lord shall bring* (imperf.) *upon thee ... days, &c., 7:18, and it shall come to pass* (perf.) *(וְהִי) in that day ...*

This progress in the sequence of time, is regularly indicated by a pregnant *and* (called *wāw consecutive*¹), which in itself is really only a variety of the ordinary *wāw copulative*, but which sometimes (in the imperf.) appears with a different vocalization. Further, the tenses connected by *wāw consecutive* sometimes undergo a change in the tone and consequently are liable also to other variations.

2. The *wāw consecutive* of the *imperfect* is (*a*) pronounced with *Pathaḥ* and a *Dageš forte* in the next letter, as לְטַקֵּן and *he killed*; before ו of the 1st pers. sing. (according to § 22 c) with *Qameṣ*, as לְטַקָּאַנְתִּי and *I killed*. Exceptions are, Ez 16:10 according to the *Dikduke ha-ṭamim*, § 71; also אֶמְתַּת הַזֶּה 2 S 1:10 according to Qimḥi; but in Ju 6:9 אֶגְרַשְׁתִּי should be read according to Baer, and 'אַנְתִּי in both places in Ju 20:6. *Dageš forte* is always omitted in the preformative ו, in accordance with § 20 m.

(*b*) When a shortening of the imperfect form is possible (cf. § 48 g), it takes effect, as a rule (but cf. § 51 n), after *wāw consec.*, e.g. in Hiphil נִזְקַל (§ 53 n). The tendency

¹ The other Semitic languages do not exhibit this peculiarity, excepting the Phoenician, the most closely related to Hebrew, and of course the Moabitish dialect of the *Mēša* inscription, which is practically identical with Old Hebrew. It also appears in the inscription of זְכָר of Hamāth (cf. Noöldeke, ZA. 1908, p. 379) where we find וְאָשַׁאָדִי and *I lifted up my hand*, וְיִעֲנֵנִי and *and he answered me*, after a perfect of narration.

¹ This name best expresses the prevailing syntactical relation, for by *wāw consecutive* an action is always represented as the direct, or at least temporal consequence of a preceding action. Moreover, it is clear from the above examples, that the *wāw consecutive* can only be thus used in immediate conjunction with the verb. As soon as *wāw*, owing to an insertion (e.g. a negative), is separated from the verb, the imperfect follows instead of the perfect *consecutive*, the perfect instead of the imperfect *consecutive*. The fact that whole Books (Lev., Num., Josh., Jud., Sam., 2 Kings, Ezek., Ruth, Esth., Neh., 2 Chron.) begin with the imperfect *consecutive*, and others (Exod., 1 Kings, Ezra) with *wāw copulative*, is taken as a sign of their close connexion with the historical Books now or originally preceding them. Cf., on the other hand, the independent beginning of Job and Daniel. It is a merely superficial description to call the *wāw consecutive* by the old-fashioned name *wāw conversive*, on the ground that it always converts the meaning of the respective tenses into its opposite, i.e. according to the old view, the future into the preterite, and vice versa.

to retract the tone from the final syllable is even stronger after *wāw consec.* than in the jussive. The throwing back of the tone on to the penultima (conditional upon its being an open syllable with a long vowel, § 29 a), further involves the greatest possible shortening of the vowel of the ultima, since the vowel then comes to stand in a toneless closed syllable, e.g. קָם, juss. מִקָּם, with *wāw consec.* וְקָם and he arose (§ 67 n and x, § 68 d, § 69 p, § 71, § 72 t and aa, § 73 e).¹

In the *first* pers. sing. alone the retraction of the tone and even the reducing of the long vowel in the final syllable (*u* to *o*, *i* to *e*, and then to *ɔ* and *ɛ*) are not usual,² at least according to the Masoretic punctuation, and the apocope in verbs הַלְׁ occurs more rarely; e.g. always אָקוֹם (or מְאָקוֹם, a merely orthographic difference) *and I arose; Hiph.* מְאָקִים (but generally written מְאָקָם, implying the pronunciation *wāāqem*, as מְאָקָם implies *wāāqōm*); נְאָרָה and *I saw*, more frequently than אָרָה, § 75 t. On the other hand, the form with final הַ is often used in the 1st pers. both sing. and plur., especially in the later books, e.g. תְּשִׁלְחָה, and *I sent*, Gn 32:6, 41:11, 43:21, Nu 8:19 (הַתִּשְׁלַח, as in Ju 6:9, 1 S 2:28, and often, probably a sort of compensation for the lost *n*); Ju 6:10, 12:3, 2 S 22:24, Ps 3:6, 7:5, 90:10, 119:55, Jb 1:15 ff., 19:20, Ez 7:28, 8:25, 9:3, Neh 2:13, 5:7, 8, 13, 6:11, 13:7–11, 21 f., &c.—Sometimes, as in Ps 3:6, with a certain emphasis of expression, and probably often, as in Ju 10:12, נְאָוֶשׁ יִשְׁהָ before אָ, for euphonic reasons. In Is 8:2 נְעָזָה may have been originally intended; in Ps 73:16 נְאָזָח and in Jb 30:26 נְאָזֵח. In Ez 3:3 read נְאָכְלָה or נְאָכְלָתָה.

This ·וְ is in meaning a strengthened *wāw copulative*, and resembles in pronunciation the form which is retained in Arabic as the ordinary copula (*wā*).³ The close connexion of this *wā* with the following consonant, caused the latter in Hebrew to take *Dagesh*, especially as אָ could not have been retained in an open syllable. Cf. לְנָה בְּנָה בְּנָה (for הַנָּה), where the prepositions בְּ and לְ, and the particle נָ, are closely connected with הַ in the same way (§ 102 k).

The retraction of the tone also occurs in such combinations, as in הַנָּה לְ (for הַנָּה לְנָה § 102 l).—The identity of many *consecutive* forms with jussives of the same conjugation must not mislead us into supposing an intimate relation between the moods. In the consecutive forms the shortening of the vowel (and the retraction of the tone) seems rather to be occasioned solely by the strengthening of the preformative syllable, while in the jussives the shortening (and retraction) belongs to the character of the form.

3. The counterpart of *wāw consecutive* of the *imperfect* is *wāw consecutive* of the *perfect*, by means of which perfects are placed as the sequels in the future to preceding actions or events regarded as incomplete at the time of speaking, and therefore in the imperfect, imperative, or even participle. This *wāw* is in form an ordinary *wāw copulative*, and therefore shares its various vocalization (וְ, וְ, וְ, as 2 K

¹ The plural forms in וְ also occur less frequently after *wāw consecutive*; cf., however, Ju 8:1, 11:18, Am 6:3, Ez 44:8, Dt 4:11, 5:20. The 2nd fem. sing. in וְ never occurs after *wāw consecutive*.

² In the 1st plur. (וְעָמִיד) Neh 4:3 is the only instance in which the vowel remains unreduced (cf. וְנִשְׁׁוּב, i.e. וְנִשְׁׁוּב, 4:9 *K'eth.*; *Q'rethē* בְּשִׁׁבְעָת). On the treatment of the tone in the imperfect, imperative, and infinitive *Niphal*, see § 51 n.

³ In usage the Hebrew *wāw* does duty for the Arabic *fā* (*wāw apodosis*, see § 143 d) as well as *wā*.

7:4, and 1); e.g. וְהִיא, after an imperfect, &c., *and so it happens = and it will happen*. It has, however, the effect, in certain verbal forms, of shifting the tone from the penultima, generally on to the ultima, e.g. הָלַךְ I went, consecutive form וְהָלַךְ יֵלֶךְ I will go, Ju 1:3, where it is co-ordinated with another *perfect consecutive*, which again is the consecutive to an *imperative*. See further on this usage in § 112.

As innumerable examples show, the *Qameṣ* of the first syllable is retained in the strong perf. consec. Qal, as formerly before the tone, so now in the secondary tone, and therefore necessarily takes *Metheg*. On the other hand, the *ō* of the second syllable in verbs *middle ō* upon losing the tone necessarily becomes *ō*, e.g. וְכָלַח Ex 18:23.

The shifting forward of the tone after the *wāw consecutive* of the *perfect* is, however, not consistently carried out. It is omitted—(a) always in the 1st pers. pl., e.g. וַיְשִׁבּוּ Gn 34:16; (b) regularly in Hiphil before the afformatives הָנָה and הָנָה, see § 53 r; and (c) in many cases in verbs אָלַח and אָלַח, almost always in the 1st sing. of אָלַח (Jer 29:14), and in הָלַח if the vowel of the 2nd syllable is i, Ex 17:6, 26:4, 6, 7, 10 ff., Ju 6:26, &c., except In Qal (only Lv 24:5, before אָ) and the 2nd sing. masc. of Hiphil-forms before אָ, Nu 20:8, Dt 20:13, 1 S 15:3, 2 K 13:17; similarly in Piēl before אָ, Ex 25:24, Jer 27:4. On the other hand the tone is generally moved forward if the second syllable has ē (in אָלַח Gn 27:10 &c., in הָלַח Ex 40:4, Jer 33:6, Ez 32:7); but cf. also Lv 19:14, 32 and frequently, always before the counter-tone, Jo 4:21, Ps 19:14.¹ With ā in the penultima the form is וְקָרָא אָתָּה Is 14:4, and probably also וְקָרָא אָתָּה Jer 2:2, 3:12, 1 S 10:2 with little Tēlīšā, a postpositive accent.

But before a following אָ the ultima mostly bears the tone on phonetic grounds, e.g. וְבָאָתָּה Gn 6:18, Ex 3:18, Zc 6:10 (by the side of וְבָאָתָּה), &c. (cf., however, וְקָרָא אָתָּה, before אָ, Gn 17:19, Jer 7:27, Ex 36:29); Ju 6:16, cf. Ex 25:11, Lv 24:5 (but also Lv 25:21). Likewise, before הָ, Am 8:9, and עָ, e.g. Gn 26:10, 27:12, Lv 26:25 (cf., however, וְקָרָא אָתָּה עָלָיו, Ez 38:21); on verbs עָעָד, see § 67 k and § ee.

(d) The tone always keeps its place when such a perfect stands in *pause*, e.g. וְשָׁבַע Dt 6:11, 11:15; וְאָמַת Is 14:4, Ju 4:8; sometimes even in the lesser pause, as Dt 2:28, Ez 3:26, 1 S 29:8 (where see Driver), with *Zaqeph qaṭon*; and frequently also immediately *before* a tone-syllable (according to § 29 e), as in הָנָה בְּ וְיִשְׁבַּתְהָ בְּ Dt 17:14, Ez 14:13, 17:22, Am 1:4, 7, 10, 12—but also הָנָה בְּ Dt 21:11, 23:14, 24:19, 1 K 8:46.

§ 50. *The Participle.*

1. Qal has both an active participle, called *Pōēl* from its form (פֹּעֶל), and a passive, *Pāūl* (פָּעָל).¹

Pāūl is generally regarded as a survival of a passive of Qal, which still exists throughout in Arabic, but has been lost in Hebrew (see, however, § 52 e), just as in Aramaic the passives of Piēl and Hiphil are lost, except in the participles. But instances of the form *quttāl* are better

¹ The irregularity in the tone of these perfects manifestly results from following conflicting theories, not that of Ben Asher alone.

¹ The constr. st. נִמְּנָם in the formula נִמְּנָם יְהוָה, *the word* (properly the *whispering*) of the Lord, &c., is always written defectively.

regarded as remnants of the passive participle Qal (see § 52 s), so that פְּעִיל must be considered as an original verbal noun; cf. Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 173 ff.

2. In the intransitive verbs *mid. e* and *mid. o*, the form of the participle active of Qal coincides in form with the 3rd sing. of the perfect, e.g. גָּורֵי שָׁן sleeping, from גָּורֵי (only orthographically different from the perf. גָּרַג) fearing; cf. the formation of the participle in *Niphil*, § 51 a. On the other hand, the participle of verbs *mid. a* takes the form קְפָלֶל (so even from the *transitive* אָנַשְׁׂה to hate, part. אָנַשְׁׂה). The ô of these forms has arisen through an obscuring of the ā, and is therefore unchangeable, cf. § 9 q. The form קְפָלֶל (with a changeable *Qameṣ* in both syllables), which would correspond to the forms יִשְׁן and רָגַג, is only in use as a noun, cf. § 84a f. The formation of the participle in *Piel*, *Hiphil*, and *Hithpaēl* follows a different method.

3. Participles form their feminine (הַלְּטִיל or לְתִיל) and their plural like other nouns (§ 80 e, § 84a r, s, § 94).

Rem. 1. From the above it follows, that the ā of the form יִשְׁן is lengthened from ā, and consequently changeable (e.g. *fem.* הַלְּטִיל); and that the ô of קְפָלֶל on the other hand is obscured from an unchangeable ā.² In Arabic the verbal adjective of the form *qātil* corresponds to the form *qāṭel*, and the part. *qāṭul* to *qōṭel*. In both cases, therefore, the ē of the second syllable is lengthened from i, and is consequently changeable (e.g. קְפָלֶל, plur. קְפָלִים; constr. pl. כְּפָלִי).

תֹּמִיק Ps 16:5, instead of the form *qōṭel*, is an anomaly; it is possible, however, that תֹּמִיק (incorrectly written fully) is intended (cf. סְבִיב 2 K 8:21), or even the *imperfect Hiphil* of מִקְרָא. The form קְפָלֶל in Is 29:14, 38:5 appears to stand for קְפָלֶל, but most probably the Masora here (as certainly in יְזִקְרָא Ec 1:18) intends the 3rd sing. imperf. Hiph., for which the better form would be אֲוֹבֵל; יְזִקְרָא 1 Ch 27:30, being a proper name and a foreign word, need not be considered.—אֲכָד (constr. state of אֲכָד), with ā in the second syllable, occurs in Dt 32:28 (cf. moreover, § 65 d). On הַוְלֵם Is 41:7 (for הַוְלֵם), see § 29 f.

2. A form like the pass. ptc. *Pāūl*, but not to be confused with it, is sometimes found from *intransitive verbs*, to denote an inherent quality, e.g. אָמֵן faithful; אָנוֹשָׁה desperate, Jer 15:18, &c.; בְּטֻחוֹת trustful, Is 26:3, Ps 112:7; עֲצֹום strong; שְׁכֹור drunken, Is 51:21; and even from transitive verbs, אָחֹת handling, Ct 3:8; נְכֹור mindful, Ps 103:14; יִדּוֹעַ knowing, Is 53:3; cf. § 84a m.

VERBA DERIVATIVA, OR DERIVED CONJUGATIONS.

§ 51. Niphal.¹

1. The essential characteristic of this conjugation consists in a prefix² to the stem. This exists in two forms: (a) the (probably original) prepositive *nā*, as in the Hebrew perfect and participle, although in the strong verb the ā is always attenuated to i: נְקָפֵל.

² Cf. Völlers, ‘Das *QaÆtil-partizipium*,’ in ZA. 1903, p. 312 ff.

¹ Cf. A. Rieder, *De linguae Hebr. verbis, quae vocantur derivata nifal et hitpael*, Gumbinnen (Progr. des Gymn.), 1884, a list of all the strong Niphal forms (81) and Hithpaēl forms (36) in the Old Testament; and especially M. Lambert, ‘L’emploi du Nifal en Hébreu,’ REJ. 41, 196 ff.

² See Philippi in ZDMG. 1886, p. 650, and Barth, ibid. 1894, p. 8 f.

for original *nā-qāṭāl*, participle נִקְטוֹל, infinitive absolute sometimes נִקְטוֹל; (b) the (later) proclitic *in* (as in all the forms of the corresponding Arabic conjugation VII. *inqāṭālā*), found in the imperfect נִקְטוֹל for *yinqāṭēl*, in the imperative and infinitive construct, with a secondary ה added, נִקְטוֹל (for *hinqāṭēl*), and in the infinitive absolute נִקְטוֹל. The inflexion of *Niphal* is perfectly analogous to that of *Qal*.

The features of *Niphal* are accordingly in the perfect and participle the prefixed *Nūn*, in the imperative, infinitive, and imperfect, the *Dageš* in the first radical. These characteristics hold good also for the weak verb. In the case of an initial guttural, which, according to § 22 b, cannot take *Dageš forte*, the emission of the strengthening invariably causes the lengthening of the preceding vowel (see § 63 h).

2. As regards its meaning, *Niphal* bears some resemblance to the Greek *middle voice*, in being—(a) primarily *reflexive* of *Qal*, e.g. נָלַץ to thrust oneself (*against*), נָשַׁם to take heed to oneself, φυλάσσεσθαι, נָסַת to hide oneself, נָאַל to redeem oneself, cf. also נָעַן, נָעַן to answer for oneself. Equally characteristic of *Niphal* is its frequent use to express emotions which react upon the mind; נָחַם to trouble oneself, נָאַנְהַן to sigh (*to bemoan oneself*, cf. ὀδύρεσθαι, *lamentari, contristari*); as well as to express actions which the subject allows to happen to himself, or to have an effect upon himself (*Niphal tolerativum*), e.g. נָשַׁב to search, to inquire, Niph. to allow oneself to be inquired of, Is 65:1, Ez 14:3, &c.; so the Niph. of נָצַח to find, נָרַג to warn, to correct, Jer 6:8, 31:18, &c.

(b) It expresses *reciprocal* or mutual action, e.g. נָבַר to speak, Niph. to speak to one another; נָפַשְׁׁוּ to judge, Niph. to go to law with one another; נָעַזְׁעַזְׁוּ to counsel, Niph. to take counsel, cf. the *middle* and *deponent* verbs βουλεύεσθαι (ψυχί), μάξεσθαι (νοῦ), altercari, luctari (נָאַזְׁעַזְׁוּ to strive with one another) proeliari.

(c) It has also, like *Hithpaēl* (§ 54 f) and the Greek *middle*, the meaning of the active, with the addition of *to oneself (sibi)*, *for oneself*, e.g. נָאַל to ask (something) for oneself (1 S 20:6, 28, Neh 13:6), cf. αἴτοῦμαί σε τοῦτο, ἐδύσασθαι χιτωσνα to put out on (oneself) a tunic.

(d) In consequence of a looseness of thought at an early period of the language, *Niphal* comes finally in many cases to represent the *passive*¹ of *Qal*, e.g. נָלַד to bear, Niph. to be born; נָכַר to bury, Niph. to be buried. In cases where *Qal* is intransitive in meaning, or is not used, *Niphal* appears also as the passive of *Piel* and *Hiphił*, e.g. נָכַד to be in honour, *Piel* to honour, Niph. to be honoured (as well as Pual נָכַבְּ); נָהַר Piēl to conceal, Hiph. to destroy, Niph. passive of either. In such cases *Niphal* may again coincide in meaning with *Qal* (נָלַד Qal and Niph. to be ill) and even take an accusative.

¹ Cf. Halfmann, *Beiträge zur Syntax der hebraäischen Sprache*, I. Stuück, Wittenb., 1888, 2. St. 1892 (Gymn.-Programm), statistics of the *Niphal* (Pual, Hophal, and qāṭūl) forms at different periods of the language, for the purpose of ascertaining the meaning of *Niph.* and its relation to the passive; the selection of periods is, however, very questionable from the standpoint of literary criticism.

Examples of denominatives are, נִזְכָּר *to be born a male*, Ex 34:19 (from זָכָר; but probably should here be read); נִלְבֵּב *cordatum fieri*, Jb 11:12 (from לִבְבָּר *cor*); doubtless also נִבְנָה *to obtain children*, Gn 16:2, 30:3.

The older grammarians were decidedly wrong in representing *Niphil* simply as the *passive* of *Qal*; for *Niphil* has (as the frequent use of its imperat. shows), in no respect the character of the other passives, and in Arabic a special conjugation (*inqātālā*) corresponds to it with a passive of its own. Moreover, the forms mentioned in § 52 e point to a differently formed passive of *Qal*.—The form נִאַלְיָוָן Is 59:3, La 4:14, is not to be regarded as a passive of *Niphil*, but with Koönig and Cheyne as a *forma mixta*, in the sense that the punctuators intended to combine two optional readings, נִאַלְיָוָן, perf. *Niph.*, and אַלְיָוָן, perf. *Pual* [cf. also Wright, *Compar. Gramm.*, p. 224]. Although the passive use of *Niphil* was introduced at an early period, and became tolerably common, it is nevertheless quite secondary to the reflexive use.

Rem. 1 The *infin. absol.* נִקְטוֹל is connected in form with the perfect, to which it bears the same relation as קִטְטוֹל to קִטְל in *Qal*, the ô in the second syllable being obscured from an original â. Examples are, נִכְסָף Gn 31:30; נִלְחָם Ju 11:25; נִשְׁאָל S 20:6, 28, all in connexion with the perfect.

Examples of the form לְהַקְרֵב (in connexion with imperfects) are, הַנְּתַת Jer 32:4; הַאֲכַל Lv 7:18; once אַקְרֵב Ez 14:3, where, perhaps, the subsequent אַקְרֵב has led to the substitution of אַ for הַ.—Moreover, the form נִקְרֵב is not infrequently used also for the *infin. absol.*,² e.g. Ex 22:3, Nu 15:31, Dt 4:26, 1 K 20:39. On the other hand, קְהֻנָּה should simply be read for the wholly abnormal נְהֻנָּה Ps 68:3 (commonly explained as being intended to correspond in sound with the subsequent תְּהֻנָּה but probably a ‘*forma mixta*’, combining the readings קְהֻנָּה and נְהֻנָּה).

Elision of the ה after prepositions is required by the Masora in פֶּהֶם, פֶּהֶם, שְׁלֵוֹן Pr. 24:17 (for פֶּהֶם), Ez 26:15 and פֶּתַח La 2:11; also in verbs לְהַעֲנֹת Ex 10:3 (with final וָ); 34:24, Dt 31:11, Is 1:12 (לְרֹאות); in verbs עַזְבָּר Jb 33:30 (לְאוֹר). It is, however, extremely doubtful whether the *infin. Qal* of the *K'thîbh* is not rather intended in all these examples; it certainly is so in La 2:11, cf. Ps 61:3.

2. Instead of the *Sere* in the ultima of the imperfect, *Pathâh* often occurs in pause, e.g. נִזְמָם Gn 21:8; cf. Ex 31:17, 2 S 12:15 (with final וָ); 17:23 (with קָ); Jon 1:5 (with אָ); see § 29 q. In the 2nd and 3rd plur. fem. *Pathâh* predominates, e.g. תְּצִבְנָה Is 65:17; *Sere* occurs only in נִנְהָת Ru 1:13, from נָנָה, and hence, with loss of the doubling, for נִנְהָת; cf. even נִנְהָת Is 60:4.—With *Nûn paragogicum* (see § 47 m) in the 2nd and 3rd plur. masc. are found, נִנְהָת, נִנְהָת, &c., in pause נִנְהָת, נִנְהָת, &c.; but Jb 19:24 (cf. 24:24) נִנְהָת, נִנְהָת, &c.

3. When the imperfect, the infinitive (in ē), or the imperative is followed in close connexion by a monosyllable, or by a word with the tone on the first syllable, the tone is, as a rule (but cf. נִיאָבָק Gn 32:25), shifted back from the ultima to the penultima, while the ultima, which thus loses the tone, takes *S'ghôl* instead of *Sere*; e.g. יְמַלְּךָ Ez 33:12; גַּיְעַר לוֹן Gn 25:21; in the imperative, 13:9.—So always הַשְׁמַר לְךָ (since לְךָ counts as one syllable) Gn 24:6, &c., cf. 1 S 19:2; and even with *Pathâh* in the ultima, צְרַב אֶרְצָה Jb 18:4 (but cf. גַּיְעַר).

² But, like לְהַקְרֵב, only in connexion with imperfects, except Jer 7:9. Barth is therefore right in describing (*Nominalbildung*, p. 74) both forms as later analogous formations (in addition to the original Semitic נִקְרֵב), intended to assimilate the infinitive to the imperfect which it strengthens.

2 S 21:14). Although in isolated cases (e.g. Gn 32:25, Ezr 8:23) the tone is not thrown back, in spite of a tone-syllable following, the retraction has become usual in certain forms, even when the next word begins with a toneless syllable; especially after *consec.*, e.g. Gn 7:23; Nu 21:1 and frequently, Nu 25:3; and always so in the imperative Ex 23:21, Jb 36:21, and (before Metheg of the counter-tone) Dt 24:8, 2 K 6:9. On the avoidance of pausal-forms in the imperative (Am 2:12 with *Silluq*, Zc 2:11 with *Athnāḥ*), and imperfect (Pr 24:4, &c.), see § 29 o, and note; on the other hand, always הַמְלָטָה, הַמְלָטָה, &c.

In the *imperative*, בָּצֹו, for the initial נִקְבְּצָו, with the rejection of the initial נ, occurs in Is 43:9, and in Joel 4:11 in *pause* נִקְבְּצֵו (cf. גָּלוּוּ Jer 50:5); but in these examples either the reading or the explanation is doubtful. The 2nd sing. imperat. of נִשְׁבַּעֲנָה is always (with הַ- *paragogicum*) בָּשַׁעַת לִי (*həsh̄-baš̄at li* *swear to me*, Gn 21:23, &c. (also Gn 47:31, 1 S 30:15).

4. For the 1st sing. of the *imperfect*, the form אַקְרָבָל is as frequent as אַקְרָבָשׁ, e.g. I shall be inquired of, Ez 14:3; עֲשֵׂא I will swear, Gn 21:24; cf. 16:2, Nu 23:15, Ez 20:36, and so always in the cohortative, e.g. אַקְרָבָה I will avenge me, Is 1:24; cf. 1 S 12:7, Ez 26:2, and in the impf. Niph. of פִּירָא (§ 69 t). The Babylonian punctuation admits only ī under the preformative of the 1st person.

§ 52. Pi□el and Pu□al.

1. The *characteristic* of this conjugation consists in the strengthening of the middle radical. From the simple stem *qaṭal* (cf. § 43 b) the form קְטַל (cf. the Arabic conj. II. *qāttālā*) would naturally follow as the *perfect* of the active (*Pi□al*). The *Pathah* of the first syllable is, however, with one exception (see m), always attenuated to ī in the *perfect*. In the second syllable, ā has been retained in the majority of cases, so that the conjugation should more correctly be called *Pi□al*; but very frequently¹ this ā also is attenuated to ī, which is then regularly lengthened to ē, under the influence of the tone. Cf. in Aram. طَلَل; but in Biblical Aramaic almost always طَلَل. On the three cases in which ā before a final ר or ס has passed into *S'ghōl*, see below, l.—Hence, for the 3rd sing. masc. *perfect*, there arise forms like אַבְדָּל, אַמְדָּל, אַשְׁרָל, אַשְׁרָשׁ, &c.—Before afformatives beginning with a consonant, however, ā is always retained, thus תְּקַלְתָּם, קְלַנְתָּנוּ, קְלַטְתָּם, &c. In the *infinitives* (*absol.* לְתַקְלִל, obscured from *qaṭṭal*; *constr.* טַקְלָה), *imperfect* (לְתַקְלִי), *imperative* (לְתַקְלֵה), and *participle* (לְתַקְלִפָּה) the original ā of the first syllable reappears throughout. The vocal Š'wā of the preformatives is weakened from a short vowel; cf. the Arabic imperfect *yūqātīl*, participle *mūqātīl*.

The *passive* (*Pu□al*) is distinguished by the obscure vowel ū, or very rarely ō, in the first syllable, and ō (in pause ā) always in the second. In Arabic, also, the passives are formed throughout with ū in the first syllable. The inflexion of both these conjugations is analogous to that of *Qal*.

Rem. 1. The preformative הַ, which in the remaining conjugations also is the prefix of the participle, is probably connected with the interrogative or indefinite (cf. § 37) pronoun מַן quis? quicunque (fem. i.e. neuter, מה); cf. § 85 e.

¹ So in all verbs which end in *Nün*, and in almost all which end in *Lamed* (Olsh. p. 538). Barth is probably right in supposing (*ZDMG*. 1894, p. 1 ff.) that the vowels of the strengthened perfects have been influenced by the *imperfect*.

2. The Dageš *forte*, which according to the above is characteristic of the whole of *Pi-ēl* and *Pu-āl*, is often omitted (independently of verbs *middle guttural*, § 64 d) when the middle radical has Š̄wâ under it (cf. § 20 m), e.g. קָרַחֲשׁ for הִלְלָשׁ Ez 17:17; הוּא בְּקָשׁוּ 2 Ch 15:15 (but in the *imperative* always בְּקָשׁוּ 1 S 28:7, &c.), and so always in הֵלֶל *praise*. The vocal character of the Š̄wâ under the *litera dagessanda* is sometimes in such cases (according to § 10 h) expressly emphasized by its taking the form of a *Hateph*, as in לְקָרַח Gn 2:23, with ה owing to the influence of the preceding *u*, cf. פְּעַלְוָה פָּעַל, &c.; Gn 9:14, Ju 16:16. In the *imperfect* and *participle* the Š̄wâ under the preformatives (*Hateph-Pathah* under ו in the *1st sing. imperfect*) serves at the same time as a characteristic of both conjugations (Gn 26:14 f.).

3. According to the convincing suggestion of Boëttcher² (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, § 904 ff. and § 1022), many supposed perfects of *Pu-āl* are in reality passives of Qal. He reckons as such all those *perfects*, of which the *Pi-ēl* (which ought to express the corresponding active) is either not found at all, or only (as in the case of יָלַד) with a different meaning, and which form their *imperfect* from another conjugation, generally Niph'āl. Such *perfects* are the *quṭṭal* form of the stems אָבֵל (*imperfect* תְּאַבֵּל Is 1:20), שָׁפֵךְ, עָבֵד, לְקָח, יָצַר, טָרַף, עָזֵב, נָפַח, בָּרַת, חָצַב, זָנָה, בָּזָה, עָזָב, רָאָה, עָשָׂה, and of verbs with middle ר (hence with ū of the first syllable lengthened to ō), הָרְגָה, הָרְגָה Jb 3:3 [זָרָה, see § 67 m], מְרֻט, טְרִיף, זְרַק, קְרָא, שְׁרִיף; also the infinitives absolute הָרֹגֶת Is 59:13. In these cases there is no need to assume any error on the part of the punctuators; the sharpening of the second radical may have taken place in order to retain the characteristic ū of the first syllable (cf. Arab. *qūtilā* as passive of *qātālā*), and the a of the second syllable is in accordance with the vocalization of all the other passives (see § 39 f). Cf. § 52 s and § 53 u.

2. The fundamental idea of *Pi-ēl*, to which all the various shades of meaning in this conjugation may be referred, is to *busy oneself eagerly* with the action indicated by the stem. This intensifying of the idea of the stem, which is outwardly expressed by the strengthening of the second radical, appears in individual cases as—(a) a *strengthening* and *repetition* of the action (cf. the *intensive* and *iterative* nouns with the middle radical strengthened, § 84b),¹ e.g. קָהַץ to laugh, Pi-ēl to jest, to make sport (to laugh repeatedly); לְאַשֵּׁשׁ to ask, Pi-ēl to beg; hence when an action has reference to *many*, e.g. קָבַר to bury (a person) Gn 23:4, Pi-ēl to bury (many) 1 K 11:15, and often so in Syr. and Arab. Other varieties of the *intensive* and *iterative* meaning are, e.g. חַתָּה to open, Pi-ēl to loose; סְפִיר to count, Pi-ēl to recount: [cf. רְפָא, הַלְּקָנָה, חַשְׁבָּנָה, תְּפִשָּׁה; מְאַהֲבָה, מְאַרְצָה].

The eager pursuit of an action may also consist in *urging* and *causing* others to do the same. Hence *Pi-ēl* has also—(b) a *causative* sense (like *Hiph'ił*), e.g. לְמַדְתָּן to learn, Pi-ēl to teach. It may often be turned by such phrases as *to permit to*, *to declare* or

² As Mayer Lambert observes, the same view was already expressed by Ibn Ġanāḥ (see above, § 3 d) in the *Kitāb el-luma*, p. 161. Cf. especially Barth, ‘Das passive Qal und seine Participien,’ in the *Festschrift zum Jubilaüm Hildesheimer* (Berlin, 1890), p. 145 ff.

¹ Analogous examples, in which the strengthening of a letter has likewise an *intensive* force, are such German words as *reichen*, *recken* (Eng. to reach, to rack); *streichen* (stringo), *strecken*: cf. *Strich* (a stroke), *Strecke* (a stretch); *wacker* from *wachen*; others, in which it has the *causative* sense, are *stechen*, *stecken*; *wachen* (watch), *wecken* (wake); τέλλω to bring to an end (cf. the stem τέλω to end, in τέλος, τελέω); γεννάω to beget, from the stem γένω to come into being (cf. γένος).

hold as (the declarative Pi'ēl), to help to, e.g. חִיָּה to cause to live, צְדָקָה to declare innocent, יַלְדָה to help in child-bearing.

(c) *Denominatives* (see § 38 b) are frequently formed in this conjugation, and generally express a being occupied with the object expressed by the noun, either to form or to make use of it, e.g. קָנוּ to make a nest, to nest (from קֹן), עָפֵר to throw dust, to dust (from עָפָר), עֲטַנָּה to gather the clouds together (from עָטָן), שָׁלַשׁ to divide in three parts, or to do a thing for the third time (from שָׁלַשׁ); probably also דְּבָרָה to speak, from בָּרָךְ a word. Or again, the denominative may express taking away, injuring, &c., the object denoted by the noun (*privative Pi'ēl*, cf. our to skin, to behead, to bone), e.g. שָׁרֵשׁ, from שׁ to root out, to extirpate, זָבֵב prop. to injure the tail (זָבֵב), hence to rout the rear of an army, to attack it; לְבָבָה to ravish the heart; נְשָׁדֵד to remove the ashes (נְשָׁדֵד), אַחֲנָה to free from sin (אַחֲנָה), עַצְמָה to break any one's bones (עַצְמָה); cf., in the same sense, כְּרָם from רָם); סָעֵף to lop the boughs, Is 10:33 (from סָעֵיף a bough). Some words are clearly denominatives, although the noun from which they are derived is no longer found, e.g. לְקַלֵּס to stone, to pelt with stones (also used in this sense in *Qal*), and to remove stones (from a field), to clear away stones; cf. our to stone, used also in the sense of taking out the stones from fruit.

The meaning of the *passive* (*Pu'al*) follows naturally from the above, e.g. בְּקַשׁ Pi'ēl to seek, *Pu'al* to be sought.

In *Pi'ēl* the literal, concrete meaning of the verb has sometimes been retained, when *Qal* has acquired a figurative sense, e.g. נָגַל, Pi'ēl to uncover, *Qal* to reveal, also to emigrate, i.e. to make the land bare.

Also with an intransitive sense *Pi'ēl* occurs as an intensive form, but only in poetic language, e.g. תַּהַנֵּה in *Pi'ēl* to be broken in pieces, *Jer 51:56*; פַּתַּח to tremble, *Is 51:13*, *Pr 28:14*; רָהָה to be drunken, *Is 34:5, 7*; [טֻמָּה to be few, *Ec 12:3*]; but in *Is 48:8, 60:11* instead of the *Pi'ēl* of the Niph'āl is certainly to be read, with Cheyne.

Rem. 1. The (more frequent) form of the perfect with *Pathah* in the second syllable appears especially before *Maqqeph* (*Ec 9:15, 12:9*) and in the middle of sentences in continuous discourse, but at the end of the sentence (in *pause*) the form with *Sere* is more common. Cf. קָדַל *Is 49:21* with קָדַל *Jos 4:14, Est 3:1*; טָלַל *Ez 33:5* with טָלַל *Ec 9:15*; צָרַ 2 *K 8:16* with צָרַ *Ps 129:4*; but Qameš never appears in this pausal form. The 3rd sing. fem. in *pause* is always of the form קָטַת, except אָזֶה קָטַת *Mi 1:7*; the 3rd plur. always as לוּ קָטַת; the 2nd and 1st sing. and 1st plur. of course as קָטַת, קָטַת, קָטַת (but always קָטַת, קָטַת, קָטַת), נָשַׁת. In the 3rd sing. perf. דְּבָרָה to speak, כְּפָרָה to pardon, and כְּבָסָה to wash clothes (also *Gn 49:11*) take *S'ghōl*, but become in *pause* קָבָסָה (2 S 19:25); the pausal form of כְּפָרָה does not occur.

Pathah in the first syllable (as in Aramaic and Arabic) occurs only once, *Gn 41:51*, נִשְׁנָנִי, he made me forget, to emphasize more clearly the play on the name נָשָׁה.

2. In the *imperfect* (and *jussive* Ju 16:25), *infinitive*, and *imperative* *Pi'ēl* (as also in *Hithpa'ēl*) the *Sere* in the final syllable, when followed by *Maqqeph*, is usually shortened into *S'ghōl*, e.g. יְבַקֵּשׁ-לּוּ he seeks for himself, *Is 40:20*; קְרַבְתִּי sanctify unto me, *Ex 13:2*. Pausal-forms with *S'ghōl* instead of *Sere*, as יְרַכֵּת Ho 2:6 (cf. *Ex 32:6* in the infinitive, and *Gn 21:9* in the participle), owe their origin to some particular school of Masoretes, and

are wrongly accepted by Baer; cf. the analogous cases in § 75 n and hh. If the final syllable of the *imperfect* Pi'el has Pathah (before a guttural or ר), it remains even in *pause*; cf. § 29 s and 65 e. In the 1st sing. imperfect the *e*-sound occurs in two words for *Hateph-Pathah*, under the preformative אַ Ez 26:33, Ez 5:12, 12:14 and עֲרָם אַ Zc 7:14 (in accordance with § 23 h).—Before the full plural ending וְ (see § 47 m) the *Sere* is retained in *pause*, e.g. נִתְקַבֵּר Ps 58:2 (but Gn 32:20 נִתְקַבֵּר), cf. 2 K 6:19, Dt 12:3; so before *Silluq* Ps 58:3, Jb 21:11 and even before *Zaqeph qatōn* Dt 7:5. Instead of לְנָה טְקַנָּה, forms like לְנָה טְקַנָּה are also found, e.g. Is 3:16, 13:18, in both cases before a sibilant and in *pause*. Also פְלֹג Ps 55:10 occurs as the 2nd sing. imperative (probably an intentional imitation of the sound of the preceding בְלֹע) and קְרֻב (for *qarrabh*) Ez 37:17.

3. The *infinite absolute* of Pi'el has sometimes the special form לְטַה given in the paradigm, e.g. סְכַרְתָּ castigando, Ps 118:18; cf. Ex 21:19, 1 K 19:10 (from a verb אָלָל); Ps 40:2 (from a verb הָלָל); but much more frequently the form of the *infinitive construct* (לְפִתְחָה) is used instead. The latter has also, in exceptional cases, the form לְקַפְּלָה (with ā attenuated to i as in the *perfect*), e.g. in 1 Ch 8:8 חָלַשׁ; perhaps also (if not a substantive) קְפַר Jer 44:21; and for the sake of assonance even for *infinitive absolute* in 2 S 12:14 (תְּאַזֵּן נָאַזֵּן). On the other hand, שְׂמָךְ Dt 32:35 and דְּבָרָר Jer 5:13 are better regarded as substantives, while דְּבָרָר Ex 6:28, Nu 3:1, Dt 4:15 (in each case after תְּיֻמָּה), Ho 1:2 (after תְּהִלָּה), in all of which places it is considered by König (after Qimhi) to be *infinitive construct*, is really perfect of Pi'el.

The infinitive construct Pi'el, with the *fem.* ending (cf. § 45 d), occurs in יְנַה Lv 26:18; זְרַבָּה Ps 147:1; with ה of the *fem.* before a suffix צְרַתְּךָ Ez 16:52. On the verbal nouns after the form of the Aram. inf. *Pa'il* (הַלְּפָקָד), see § 84b e.

Instead of the abnormal מְפִירְיוֹן (so Baer, Is 62:9) as ptcp. Pi'el, read 'מְפִירְיָה' with ed. Mant. and Ginsburg.

4. In Pu'al ō is sometimes found instead of ū in the initial syllable, e.g. מְאַדָּם dyed red, Ex 25:5, &c., Na 2:4, cf. 3:7 הַלְּבָשָׁה; Ez 16:4, Ps 72:20, 80:11. According to Baer's reading also in תְּרַצְּחָה Ps 62:4, and so also Ben Ašer, but Ben Naphtali תְּרַצְּחָה. It is merely an orthographic licence when ū is written fully, e.g. יְלִי Ju 18:29.

5. As *infinitive absolute*, of Pu'al we find בְּגַגְגָה Gn 40:15.—No instance of the *inf. constr.* occurs in the strong verb in Pu'al; from הַלְּה with suffix עֲבֹתוֹ Ps 132:1.

6. A few examples occur of the *participle* Pu'al without the preformative (ה), e.g. אֲכֵל Ex 3:2; יְיַלֵּד Ju 13:8; לְקַח 2 K 2:10; סְעַרָה Is 54:11. These *participles* are distinguished from the *perfect* (as in Niph'al) by the ā of the final syllable. For other examples, see Is 30:24, Ec 9:12 (where יְזַבְּשֵׁה, according to § 20 n, stands for 'זַבְּשֵׁה = יְזַבְּשֵׁה'); but, according to the Masora, not Ez 26:17, since הַלְּה הַלְּה as Mil'el can only be the *perfect*. The rejection of the ה may be favoured by an initial מ, as in Is 18:2, 7 (but also קְרַבְתָּ); Pr 25:19 (where, however, read מְזַעַּת); so also in the participle Pi'el אֲנָזֵן Ex 7:27, 9:2 (always after מ, but cf. also הַפְּאָנִים Jer 13:10, where, however, אֲנָזֵן הַמְּאָנִים is to be read, with Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 264 f.) and מְהֻרָּה Zp 1:14 (and Is 8:1, 3?). Notice, however, Barth's suggestion (*Nominalbildung*, p. 273) that, as the active of forms like אֲכֵל only occurs in Qal, they are perfect participles of former *passives* of Qal (see e), and in Jer 13:10, 23:32, perfect participles of Pi'el.—On אֲרַבָּע Ez 45:2, see § 65 d.

§ 53. Hiph'il and Hoph'al.

1. The characteristic of the active (*Hiph'îl*) is a prefixed ה (on its origin see § 55 i) in the perfect ה (with the ā attenuated to ī, as in *Pi'ēl*), which forms a closed syllable with the first consonant of the stem. The second syllable of the perfect had also originally an ā; cf. the Arabic conj. IV. 'aqṭālā, and in Hebrew the return of the *Pathah* in the 2nd and 1st pers. הַקְטִיל, &c. After the attenuation of this ā to ī, it ought by rule to have been lengthened to ē in the tone-syllable, as in Aramaic אֲקֹטֵל, beside הָקֹטֵל in Biblical Aramaic. Instead of this, however, it is always replaced in the strong verb by ī¹, but sometimes written defectively ; cf. § 9 g. Similarly in the infinitive construct הָקֹטִיל, and in the imperfect and participle יָקֹטִיל and טָקֹטִיל, which are syncopated from הָקֹטֶל, and יָקֹטֶל; § 23 k. The corresponding Arabic forms (*juqtil* and *muqtil*) point to an original ī in the second syllable of these forms. In Hebrew the regular lengthening of this ī to ē appears in the strong verb at least in the *jussive* and in the *imperfect consecutive* (see n), as also in the *imperative* of the 2nd sing. masc. (see m); on הָקֹטֶל לְנָה, cf. § 26 p. On the return of the original ā in the second syllable of the *Imperat.*, *Jussive*, &c, under the influence of a guttural, cf. § 65 f.

In the *passive* (*Hoph'âl*) the preformative is pronounced with an obscure vowel, whilst the second syllable has ā (in pause ā), as its characteristic, thus:—*Perf.* הָקֹטֵל or הָקֹטֶל, *Imperf.* יָקֹטֶל (syncopated from הָקֹטֶל or יָקֹטֶל) or טָקֹטֶל (from מְהֹקְטֵל); but the *infinitive absolute* has the form הָקֹטֶל.

Thus the characteristics of both conjugations are the ה preformative in the *perfect*, *imperative*, and *infinitive*; in the *imperfect* and *participle* *Hiph'îl*, *Pathah* under the preformatives, in the *Hoph'âl* ö or ü.

2. The *meaning* of *Hiph'îl* is primarily, and even more frequently than in *Pi'ēl* (§ 52 g), *causative* of *Qal*, e.g. אָשָׂא to go forth, *Hiph.* to bring forth, to lead forth, to draw forth; שָׁקָר to be holy, *Hiph.* to sanctify. Under the *causative* is also included (as in *Pi'ēl*) the *declarative* sense, e.g. הָצִיד to pronounce just; הָרִישׁ to make one an evil doer (to pronounce guilty); cf. שָׁקָע, in *Hiph'îl*, Jb 9:20, to represent as perverse. If *Qal* has already a transitive meaning, *Hiph'îl* then takes two accusatives (see § 117 cc). In some verbs, *Pi'ēl* and *Hiph'îl* occur side by side in the same sense, e.g. אָבַד periit, *Pi'ēl* and *Hiph'îl*, perdidit; as a rule, however, only one of these two conjugations is in use, or else they differ from one another in meaning, e.g. בָּבֶד gravem esse, *Pi'ēl* to honour, *Hiph'îl* to bring to honour, also to make heavy. Verbs which are intransitive in *Qal* simply become transitive in *Hiph'îl*, e.g. נִפְתַּח to bow oneself, *Hiph.* to bow, to bend.

Among the ideas expressed by the *causative* and *transitive* are included, moreover, according to the *Hebrew* point of view (and that of the Semitic languages in general, especially Arabic), a series of actions and ideas, which we have to express by periphrasis, in order to understand their being represented by the *Hiph'îl*-form. To these *inwardly transitive* or *intensive* *Hiph'îls* belong: (a) *Hiph'îl* stems which express the obtaining or receiving of a

¹ This ī□ may have been transferred originally from the imperfects of verbs וְעַ, as a convenient means of distinction between the indicative and jussive, to the *imperfect* of the strong verb and afterwards to the whole of *Hiph'îl*; so Stade, Philippi, Praetorius, *ZAW*. 1883, p. 52 f.

concrete or abstract quality. (In the following examples the *Qal* stems are given, for the sake of brevity, with the addition of the meaning which—often together with other meanings—belongs to the *Hiph'il*.) Thus אָהַל, *זָהָר, יְפַע, צֹוֹז*, *to be bright, to shine* (to give forth brightness); opposed to חִשּׁק, *to become dark*; אֶמְצָא, *גָּבֵר*, *חֹזֶק*, *to be strong* (to develop strength), עַטְפָּה, *to be weak*; אֲרֹךְ, *to be long* (to acquire length); גָּבָהּ, *to be high*; הַוָּם, *to be in tumult*, זַעַק, *to cry out*, רֹעֶה, *to make a noise, to exult*; חַלְפָּה, *to sprout* (to put forth shoots), cf. פָּרָה, *to bloom*, שָׁוֹק, עַדְף, *to overflow*; סְכַת, *צָמָת*, *to be silent* (*silentium facere*, Pliny); מַתְקָה, *חַשָּׁה*, *חַרְשָׁה*, *to be sweet*; צָלָה, *to have success*; שְׁפֵל, *to be low*; אָדָם, *to become red*, לְבָן, *to become white*.

(b) Stems which express in *Hiph'îl* the entering into a certain condition and, further, the being in the same: אָמַן to become firm, to trust in; בָּאֵשׁ to become stinking; זֹר to become boiling, to boil over; חִלָּה to become ill; הַסֵּר to come to want; חֶרְחָה to become hot; יִבְשֶׂה to become dry, to become ashamed; יִתְהַגֵּד to attain superiority; סָכַן to become familiar; קוֹץ עֹור to become awake; קָשָׁה to become hard; רָגַע, טְקַפֵּה to become quiet (to keep quiet); שָׁמַם to be astonished. The *Hiph'îl* forms of some verbs of motion constitute a variety of this class: נִגְשֵׁה to draw near; קָרַב to come near; רָחַק to withdraw far off (all these three are besides used as causatives); קָדַם to come before.

(c) Stems which express action in some particular direction: חָלַק *to err*; חָלַט *to flatter* (to act smoothly); יְתַבֵּל *to act well, to do good*; סָכַל *to act foolishly*, שָׁכַל *to act wisely*; עָרַם *to act craftily*; צָנָע *to act submissively*; רָשָׁע, רָעַ *to act wickedly, godlessly*; תָּבַחַת *to act corruptly, abominably*; שָׁלָם *to act peacefully, to be at peace, to be submissive*.

Further, there are in *Hiph'il* a considerable number of *denominatives* which express the bringing out, the producing of a thing, and so are properly regarded as causatives, e.g. **אָצַר** to set over the treasury, Neh 13:13 (unless אָצַח, צְנַח is to be read, as in Neh 7:2); **בִּכְרָה** to bring forth a firstborn; **גַּשֵּׁם** to cause to rain; **זָרָע** to produce seed; **יָמַן** (*Hiph'il* יָמַנְתִּי) to go to the right, cf. **הַשְׂמַאל** to go to the left; **פָּרָס** to get or to have hoofs; **קָרֵן** to get or to have horns; **שְׁכַל** to produce abortion; **שָׁלֹג** to become snow-white; **שָׁמַן** to grow fat; **רָשַׁךְ** to put forth roots, &c.; so also according to the ordinary acceptation **וְיָמַרְתֶּן** Is 19:6, they have become stinking, from **אָמַח** stinking or stench, with retention of the **א** prosthetic, § 19 m (but see below, p.).

Of a different kind are the *denominatives* from: אָזַן (scarcely *to prick up the ears*, but) *to act with the ears, to hear*; cf. לְשֹׁן *to move the tongue, to slander*, and the German *äugeln* (to make eyes), *füsseln, näseln, schwänzeln*; שְׁבַר *to sell corn*; שְׁכַם *to set out early* (to lead the back [of the camel, &c.]?); opposed to קָרֵב.

3. The meaning of *Hoph' al* is (a) primarily that of a *passive* of *Hiph'il*, e.g. הַשְׁלִיךְ or *proiecit* or הַשְׁלָךְ or *projectus est*; (b) sometimes equivalent to a *passive* of *Qal*, as נָקַם to avenge, *Hoph.* to be avenged (but see below, u).

Rem. 1. The *i'* of the 3rd sing. masc. perf. *Hiph'ił* remains, without exception, in the 3rd fem. (in the tone-syllable). That it was, however, only lengthened from a short vowel, and consequently is changeable, is proved by the forms of the *imperative* and *imperfect* where *ē* (or, under the influence of gutturals, *ă*) takes its place. In an open syllable the *i'* is retained almost throughout; only in very isolated instances has it been weakened to *S'wā* (see **n** and **o**).

¹ The same ideas are also paraphrased by the verb **נָפַשׁ** (*to make*), e.g. *to make fat*, for, to produce fat upon his body, Jb 15:27; *to make fruit*, *to make branches*, for, to put forth, to yield, Jb 14:9, Ho 8:7, cf. the Lat. *corpus*, *robur*, *sobolem*, *divitias facere*, and the Ital. *far corpo*, *far forze*, *far frutto*.

2. The *infinitive absolute* commonly has *Sere* without *Yodh*, e.g. הַקְרִישׁ Ju 17:3; less frequently it takes יְ, e.g. הַשְׁמִיד Am 9:8; cf. Dt 15:14, Is 59:4, Jer 3:15, 23:32, 44:25, Jb 34:35, Ec 10:10. With נ instead of ה (probably a mere scribal error, not an Aramaism) we find אֲשֶׁר Jer 25:3. Rare exceptions, where the form with *Sere* stands for the *infinitive construct*, are, e.g. Dt 32:8 (Sam; בְּהַנֵּיל; read perhaps בְּהַנְּהָל), Jer 44:19, 25, Pr 25:2, Jb 13:3 (?); on the other hand, for לְעֹשֵׂר Dt 26:12 (which looks like an infinitive Hiph'îl with elision of the ה, for עֹשֵׂר) the right reading is simply לְעֹשֵׂר, since elsewhere the Pi'êl alone occurs with the meaning *to tithe*; for בְּעֹשֵׂר Neh 10:39 perhaps the inf. Qal (בְּעֹשֵׂר) was intended, as in 1 S 8:15, 17 (=*to take the tithe*). At the same time it is doubtful whether the present punctuation does not arise from a conflation of two different readings, the Qal and the Pi'êl.

Instead of the ordinary form of the *infinitive construct* הַקְרִיטִיל sometimes occurs, e.g. הַשְׁמִיד *to destroy*, Dt 7:24, 28:48; cf. Lv 14:46, Jos 11:14, Jer 50:34, 51:33 and הַקְצֹות for הַקְצֹת Lv 14:43 from קָצַח; scarcely, however, Lv 7:35 (see § 155 1), 2 S 22:1 (Ps 18:1), 1 K 11:16 (after וְ), and in the passages so explained by König (i. 276) where הַשְׁאִיר appears after prepositions¹; [cf. Driver on Dt 3:3, 4:15, 7:24, 28:55].

With ā in the second syllable there occurs הַזְּרָכָם Ez 21:29 (cf. the substantival infin. ר 1 S 15:23).—In the Aram. manner הַקְצָר is found in Ez 24:26 (as a construct form) for the *infinitive Hiph'îl* (cf. the *infinitive Hithpa'el*, Dn 11:23). On the elision of the ה after prefixes, see q.

3. In the *imperative* the ī is retained throughout in the open syllable, according to i, and consequently also before suffixes (see § 61 g) and הַ paragogic, e.g. הַקְשִׁיבָה attend to, Ps 118:25, as in ed. Mant., Jabl.; Baer, not אֲשִׁיעָה as Ginsb. and Kittel; with the tone at the end only הַאֲלִיקָה ibid. v. 25^b. On the other hand, in the 2nd sing. masc. the original ī (cf. Arabic 'aqtiū) is lengthened to ē, e.g. הַשְׁפַּט make fat, and becomes Se'ghôl before *Maqqeph*, e.g. הַסְּפִינָה Jb 22:21.—The form הַקְטִיל for הַקְטָל appears anomalously a few times: Ps 94:1, Is 43:8, Jer 17:18 (cf. § 69 v and § 72 y); elsewhere the Masora has preferred the punctuation הַקְטִיל, e.g. 2 K 8:6; cf. Ps 142:5.—In La 5:1 הַבְּיִתָּה is required by the *Q're* for הבִּיט.

4. In the *imperfect Hiph'îl* the shorter form with *Sere* prevails for the jussive in the 3rd masc. and fem. and 2nd masc. sing., e.g. אֲלֹתְתָּגֵל make not great, Ob 12; בְּכַרְתָּ let Him cut off! Ps 12:4; even incorrectly תְּבַרְתָּ Ex 19:3 and תְּבַרְתָּ Ec 10:20; cf. also בְּבַרְתָּ Ex 22:4, where the jussive form is to be explained according to § 109 h, and אֲרָרָתָה Jb 39:26 before the principal pause. Similarly, after ו consec., e.g. וַיְבָרֵל and He divided, Gn 1:4. On the other hand, ī is almost always retained in the 1st sing., e.g. וְאַתָּה Am 2:9 (but generally without ו, as Ez 39:23 f., &c.); cf. § 49 e and § 74 l, but also § 72 aa; in 1st plur. only in Neh 4:3; in the 3rd sing. Ps 105:28. With ā in the principal pause וְתוֹחר Ru 2:14, and in the lesser pause, Gn 49:4; before a sibilant (see § 29 q) וְגַשְׁתָּ Ju 6:19; in the lesser pause וְנִקְרָבָה La 3:5. Before *Maqqeph* the *Sere* becomes S'ghôl, e.g. וְנִזְקַרְבָּה Ju 19:4. In the plural again, and before suffixes, ī remains in the forms תְּמֻלֵּת, תְּמֻלֵּת, even in the jussive and after ו consecutive, e.g. וְיִרְבֶּה Ju 18:22. The only exceptions, where the ī is weakened to Šwâ, are וְנִזְקְרָנוּ Jer 9:2; 1 S 14:22, 31:2, 1 Ch 10:2; וְעַבְרָה Jer 11:15; אֲזַחְתָּ Neh 13:13, if it is *Hiph'îl* of אָצַח, but probably אֲזַחְתָּה is to be read, as in 7:2; perhaps also תְּהַכְּרוּ Jb 19:3 (according to others, *imperfect Qal*). The same weakening occurs also in the imperfect in 3rd and and masc. sing. before suffixes, 1 S 17:25, 1 K 20:33, Ps 65:10, and in Jb 9:20, unless the form be Pi'êl=וְיִצְשְׁנָן, since the *Hiph'îl* is not found elsewhere. It is hardly likely that in these isolated examples we have a trace of

¹ As to the doubtfulness, on general grounds, of this form of the Inf. Hiph., see Robertson Smith in the *Journ. of Philol.*, xvi. p. 72 f.

the ground-form, *yaqtil*, or an Aramaism. More probably they are due partly to a misunderstanding of the defective writing, which is found, by a purely orthographic licence, in numerous other cases (even in 3rd sing. מִשְׁלָל Is 44:28), and partly are intended, as *formae mixtae*, to combine the forms of *Qal* and *Hiph'îl*. Instead of the firmly closed syllable, the Masora requires in Gn 1:11 תַּשְׁאֵת, with euphonic Ga'ya (see § 16 h).

5. In the *participle*, מִצְׁאֵת Ps 135:7 appears to be traceable to the ground-form, *maqtîl*; yet the Šere may also possibly be explained by the retraction of the tone. The Masora appears to require the weakening of the vowel to Šwâ (see above, n) in מִקְׁלִים Zc 3:7 (probably, however, מִקְׁלִים should be read), also in מִזְׁרִים 2 Ch 28:23 (but as מ precedes, and accordingly dittography may well have taken place, the participle Qal is probably to be read in both places; the reading of the text is perhaps again intended to combine *Qal* and *Hiph'îl*, see above, n), and in the Q'rem 1 Ch 15:24 &c. (where the K'thîbh מִחְׁצָרִים is better).—The fem. is ordinarily pointed as מִזְׁבֶּחֶת Nu 5:15, מִשְׁגַּת Lv 14:21; in pause מִשְׁבָּת, לְתָה Pr 19:14.

6. In the *perfect* there occur occasionally such forms as קָרְבָּן 1 S 25:7; cf. Gn 41:28, 2 K 17:11, Jer 29:1, Mi 6:3, Jb 16:7; with the original ā in the first syllable וְהָרְאִיתִי I have stained, Is 63:3, א stands at the beginning instead of ה, cf. above, k, on אֲשֶׁר. On the other hand, אָגָן יְהוָה Is 19:6 (see above, g) is a mere error of the scribe, who had the Aramaic form in mind and corrected it by prefixing ה.

7. In the *imperfect* and *participle* the characteristic n is regularly elided after the preformatives, thus נִקְׁמִיל, נִקְׁמִיל; but it is retained in the *infinitive* after prepositions, e.g. לְקֹמִיל. The exceptions are in the imperfect, הַשׁוֹעֵר He will save for יְשֻׁעָה 1 S 17:47, Ps 116:6 (in pause); יְהִיר He will praise for יְהִיר Neh 11:17, Ps 28:7, 45:18 (cf. the proper name יְהִינֵּל Jer 37:3, for which 38:1 [and Ps 81:6]; יְהִילָּו, § 70 d) Is 52:5, יְהִתְהַלֵּל Jer 9:4, יְהִתְהַלֵּל Jb 13:9] and הַקְּרָעָות Ez 46:22; in the *infinitive* (where, however, as in *Niph'al*, § 511, the *infinitive Qal* is generally to be read) Is 29:15 for לְסַפֵּר; Nu 5:22; לְצַבּוֹת and לְנַפְלֵל; לְהַסְּפִיר (§ 511); 2 S 19:19; לְקַלֵּק Jer 37:12; לְתַחְיָה Ec 5:5; (doubly anomalous for לְלַבְּבֵן Dn 11:35; לְשָׁמַע Ps 26:7; לְאַדִּיב 1 S 2:33; לְשָׁמֵר Is 23:11; לְלַשְׁבִּית Am 8:4 (certainly corrupt); for בְּעִיר Ps 73:20 (but in the city is probably meant); לְבַיִת Jer 39:7 (2 Ch 31:10); Is 3:8, Ps 78:17; לְמִרְאֵת Dt 1:33; cf. further, from verbs נְהַזֵּק Ex 13:21; נְכַלֵּת (see, however, § 20 h) Is 33:1; נְחַזֵּק Dt 1:33; cf. further, from verbs נְהַזֵּק Nu 5:22, Jer 27:20; on Dt 26:12 and Neh 10:39, see above, k; for הַזְּהֹהָת Pr 31:3 read לְמַחְזָה or לְמַחְזָה?

8. With regard to the tone it is to be observed that the afformatives וְ and הַ in Hiph'îl have not the tone, even in the *perfect* with *waw consecutive* (except in Ex 26:33 before הַ, Lv 15:29 before וְ, to avoid a hiatus); but the plural ending וּ (see § 47 m) always has the tone, e.g. Dt 1:17.

9. The passive (Hoph'al) has ū instead of Qameš haṭuph in the first syllable (הַטְּלֵל), in the strong verb less frequently in the perfect and infinitive, but generally in the participle, through the influence of the initial מ (but cf. מְשַׁבֵּב Ez 32:32 (beside נְשַׁבֵּב 32:19); מְשַׁלֵּךְ 2 S 20:21 (beside נְשַׁלֵּךְ Is 14:19) נְמַלֵּת Ez 16:4; in the participle).

¹ Most probably, however, הַמְּלֵה (perfect Pi'el) is to be read, and the א is only an indication of the change of the *perfect* into the *imperfect*, as also previously, by a change of punctuation, וְאַדְרָכֶם and וְיַיְצֵא (instead of וְאַדְרָכֶם and וְיַיְצֵא) are made future instead of past. Jewish exegesis applied these Edomoracles to the Roman (i.e. Christian) empire. So G. Moore in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1887, col. 292.

Hoph. without elision of the ה: אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂו Ez 46:22; on the other hand, verbs פְּנַז always have ְנַז (in a sharpened syllable): לְנַז, נַז (cf. § 9 n).

10. The *infinitive absolute* has in *Hoph'äl* (as in *Hiph'îl*) *Sere* in the last syllable, e.g. בְּחִתָּה and הַמְלָכָה Ez 16:4; הַגָּד Jos 9:24. An *infinitive construct* does not occur in the strong verb.

11. With regard to the *imperative Hoph'äl*, see above, § 46 a, note.

12. According to Böttcher (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, § 906) and Barth (see above, § 52 e) a number of supposed imperfects *Hoph'äl* are, in fact, imperfects of the passive of *Qal*. As in the case of the perfects passive of *Qal* (see above, § 52 e) the question is again of verbs of which neither the corresponding causative (i.e. here the *Hiph'îl*), nor the other tense of the same conjugation (i.e. here the perfect *Hoph'äl*) is found; so with בְּקַר (for בְּקַרְתָּ, cf. *yuqtâlū* as imperfect *Qal* in Arabic) and בְּקַרְתָּ, from בְּקַרְתָּ and בְּקַרְתָּ; בְּקַרְתָּ from בְּקַרְתָּ (cf. § 66 g); יְוָאֵר Nu 22:6 from אָרַר; בְּקַרְתָּ from בְּקַרְתָּ; יְיַשְׁׁר Ho 10:14 (cf. Is 33:1) from שְׁׁרָשָׁר; Barth adds the verbs פְּנַז Ez 19:12 from נַחַטְתָּ; צְמַח Lev 11:35 from צַחַטְתָּ; the verbs עַזְבָּה קָרְבָּה Jb 19:23 from קָרְבָּה; וַיְבַּצְעָה &c. from בְּתַחַת; the verb עַזְבָּה יְיַעַשְׁׁר from יְיַעַשְׁׁר, חִילָּה and שְׁׁשָׁבָה. On יְשַׁׁם &c., § 73 f. In point of fact it would be very strange, especially in the case of בְּקַרְתָּ and בְּקַרְתָּ, that of these frequently used verbs, amongst all the forms of *Hiph'îl* and *Hoph'äl*, only the *imperfect Hoph'äl* should have been preserved. A passive of *Qal* is also indicated in the Tellel-Amarna letters, according to Knudtzon, by a number of imperfect forms, which are undoubtedly due to Canaanite influence, cf. *Beitr. zur Assyriologie*, iv. 410.

§ 54. *Hithpa'ēl*.

1. The *Hithpa'ēl*¹ is connected with *Pi'ēl*, being formed by prefixing to the *Pi'ēl*-stem (*qattēl*, *qattal*) the syllable הַתָּ (Western Aramaic הַתָּ, but in Biblical Aramaic הַתָּ; Syr. 'et²). Like the preformative נָ (הָ) of *Niph'äl*, הַתָּ has also a reflexive force.

2. The נ of the prefix in this conjugation, as also in *Hothpa'äl* (see h), *Hithpōēl*, *Hithpa'ēl* and *Hithpalpel* (§ 55), under certain circumstances, suffers the following changes:

(a) When the stem begins with one of the harder sibilants ס, צ, or ש, the נ and the sibilant change places (cf. on this *metathesis*, § 19 n), and at the same time the נ after a צ becomes the corresponding emphatic ט: thus הַשְׁפֵּר to take heed to oneself, for הַשְׁפֵּר; הַתְּשִׁמֵּר to become burdensome, for הַתְּסִיבֵּל; הַצְּדִיק to justify oneself, from צְדָקָה. The only exception is in Jer 49:3, וְהַתְּשֻׁוֹט טָנוֹה, to avoid the cacophony of three successive t-sounds.

(b) When the stem begins with a *d*- or *t*-sound (ת, ט), the נ of the preformative is assimilated to it (§ 19 d), e.g. מְדֻבֵּר speaking, conversing; אֲמֻדָּה to be crushed, to purify oneself, אֲמַטָּה to defile oneself, מְמַתָּקָה to act uprightly. (An exception occurs in Ju 19:22.) The assimilation of the נ occurs also with נ and צ, e.g. הַנְּבָא to prophesy, as well as הַתְּנִבָּא (cf. Nu 24:7, Ez 5:13, Dn 11:14); הַכְּפִיר Nu 21:27 (cf. Is 54:14, Ps 59:5); הַפְּרִיר Pr 26:26; with ש Ec 7:16 with ר Is 33:10.

¹ A. Stein, *Der Stamm des Hithpael im Hebr.* pt. 1, Schwerin, 1893, gives alphabetical statistics of the 1151 forms.

² So also in Hebrew אֲתַתְּבָר 2 Ch 20:35; cf. Ps 76:6 (אֲשֶׁתְּזַלְלָה).

Rem. Metathesis would likewise be expected, as in the cases under *b*, when *ת* and *ר* come together, as well as a change of *ת* to *תְ*. Instead of this, in the only instance of the kind (*הַזְכֵּר* Is 1:16) the *ת* is assimilated to the *ר*, —unless indeed *הַזְכֵּר*, *imperative Niph'äl* of *זָכָר*, is intended.

3. As in form, so also in meaning, *Hithpa'el* is primarily (*a*) *reflexive* of *Piel*, e.g. *הַתְּאַזֵּר* *to gird oneself*, *שְׁמַדְנֵה* *to sanctify oneself*. Although in these examples the intensive meaning is not distinctly marked, it is so in other cases, e.g. *הַקְנִים* *to how oneself revengeful* (*Niph.* simply *to take revenge*), and in the numerous instances where the *Hithpa'el* expresses *to make oneself* that which is predicated by the stem, *to conduct oneself* as such, *to show oneself*, *to imagine oneself*, *to affect* to be of a certain character. E.g. *הַתְּבַלֵּל* *to make oneself great*, *to act proudly*; *הַתְּחִכֵּם* *to show oneself wise*, *crafty*; *הַתְּחִילָה* *to pretend to be ill*; *הַעֲשֵׂר* *to make*, i.e. *to feign oneself rich*; Nu 16:13, *to make oneself a prince*; *הַחֲנִיבָא* 1 S 18:10, *to act in an excited manner like a prophet*, *to rave*. The meaning of *Hithpa'el* sometimes coincides with that of *Qal*, both forms being in use together, e.g. *אָבַל* *to mourn*, in *Qal* only in poetic style, in *Hithpa'el* in prose. On the accusative after *Hithpa'el* (regarded as a transitive verb), see § 117 w.

(*b*) It expresses *reciprocal* action, like *Niph'äl*, § 51 d, e.g. *הַתְּרַאֶה* *to look upon one another*, Gn 42:1; cf. Ps 41:8; —but

(*c*) It more often indicates an action less directly affecting the subject, and describes it as performed *with regard to* or *for oneself*, in one's own special interest (cf. *Niph'äl*, § 51 e). *Hithpa'el* in such cases readily takes an accusative, e.g. *הַתְּפַרֵּק* Ex 32:3 and *הַתְּנַצֵּל* Ex 33:6 *to tear off from oneself*, *טַשְׁפֵּשׁ exuit sibi (vestem)*, *הַתְּפַתֵּח* *solvit sibi (vincula)*; *הַצִּיד* Jos 9:12, *to take (something) as one's provision*; without an accusative, *הַתְּהַלֵּךְ* *to walk about for oneself* (*ambulare*); *הַתְּפִלֵּל* *sibi intercedere* (see Delitzsch on Is 1:15); *הַתְּקַהֵה* *to draw a line for oneself*, Job 13:27; on Is 14:2, see § 57, note.

(*d*) Only seldom is it *passive*, e.g. *לֹא תִּהְלֵל* Pr 31:30 *she shall be praised*; *הַשְׁפַּחַח* *to be defiled*, Dt 24:4; *infinitive סְבִבָּס* *to be washed*, Lv 13:55, 56; *שָׁבַת* (for *שָׁבַת*, the *בָּה* being treated as if it were the afformative of the *fem. plur.*) *it is made fat*, Is 34:6. On *קָדוֹם*, *קָדוֹם*, see 1.

Denominatives with a reflexive meaning are *הַתִּינְחַד* *to embrace Judaism*, from *יְהִוָּה* (*יהוָה יְהִוָּה*) *Judah*; *הַצִּיטָּר* *to provision oneself for a journey*, from *צִירָה* *provision for a journey* (see § 72 m).

Rem. 1. As in *Pi'el*, so in *Hithpa'el*, the perfect very frequently (in stems ending in *ג*, *ק*, *מ*, *נ*) has retained the original *Pathaḥ* in the final syllable (while in the ordinary form it is attenuated, as in *Pi'el*, to *i* and then lengthened to *ē*), e.g. *הַתְּאַגֵּן* Dt 4:21, &c.; cf. 2 Ch 13:7, 15:8; with *י consecutive* Is 8:21; so also in the imperfect and imperative, e.g. *מִתְחִיכֵם* Ec 7:16; cf. Dt 9:8, 18, 1 S 3:10, 2 S 10:12, 1 K 11:9, Is 55:2, 58:14, 64:11, Ps 55:2; *הַתְּחִזֵּק* 1 K 20:22, Ps 37:4, Est 5:10; *קָרְאַתְּקָרְבָּן* 1 S 13:12.—In Lv 11:44, 20:7 and Ez 38:23, *i* takes the place of *ă* in the final syllable of the stem before *וּ* (cf. § 44 d), and in the last passage before *ל*. In the *perfect*, *imperfect* (with the exception of Ec 7:16), and *imperative* of *Hithpa'el* (as well as of *Hithpo'el*, *Hithpa'lēl*, *Hithpalpēl*, § 55) the original *ă* always returns in *pause* as *Qameṣ*, e.g.

הַתְּאֵר Ps 93:1; יִתְּאֵל Ez 7:27; יִתְּהַלֵּךְ Jb 18:8; יִתְּלַפֵּשׁ 38:30; יִתְּהַלֵּךְ Jos 3:5; cf. Jb 33:5 and § 74 b.—The *ā* also appears before the fuller ending *וֹ* in the plural of the imperfect (cf. § 47 m) in Ps 12:9, Jb 9⁶, 16:10.—Like the *Pi־ēl* לְנָהּ הַתְּקִדְשָׁהּ (§ 52 n), forms occur in *Hithpa־ēl* like תְּהִלְלָה Zc 6:7; cf. Am 8:13, and so in *Hithpo־ēl*, Jer 49:3, Am 9:13; with *ē* only in La 4:1.—In the Aramaic manner an *infinitive Hithpa־ēl* occurs in Dn 11:23 (cf. the *Hiph־il* inf. הַשְׁעָרוֹת in Ez 24:26).

2. As instances of the *reflexive* הַתְּקִדְלֵל (connected with *Pi־ēl*) a few reflexive forms of the verb קָדַשׁ (*to examine*) are also probably to be reckoned. Instead of a *Pathaḥ* in a sharpened syllable after the first radical, these take *Qameṣ* in an open syllable, e.g. קָדוֹם Ju 20:15, 17, *imperfect* קָדַשׁ 20:15, 21:9. The corresponding passive form קָדוֹם קָדַשׁ also occurs four times, Nu 1:47, 2:33, 26:62, 1 K 20:27. According to others, these forms are rather reflexives of *Qal*, in the sense of *to present oneself for review, to be reviewed*, like the Aramaic *Ithpe־ēl* (Western Aramaic طَّلَّكَنْ, Syr. طَّلَّكَنْ) and the Ethiopic *taqat’la*, Arab. *iqtatala*, the last with the *t* always placed after the first radical (cf. above, b); but they are more correctly explained, with König, as *Hithpa־ēl* forms, the doubling of the *ק* being abnormally omitted.—Such a reflexive of *Qal*, with the *ה* transposed, occurs in הלְחָם (on the analogy of O.T. Hebrew to be pronounced הלְחָם) in the inscription of the Moabite king *Mēša*, with the meaning of the O.T. *Niph־al* מָלַחַת *to fight, to wage war*: see the inscription, lines 11, 15, 19, and 32; in the first two places in the *imperfect* with *wāw consecutive* אַלְמָלַחַת, גַּן; in line 19 in the *infinitive* with suffix, בְּהַלְתָּהּ, חַם הַבְּ in his fighting against me.

§ 55. Less Common Conjugations.

Of the less common conjugations (§ 39 g) some may be classed with *Pi־ēl*, others with *Hiph־il*. To the former belong those which arise from the lengthening of the vowel or the repetition of one or even two radicals, in fact, from an internal modification or development of the stem; to the latter belong those which are formed by prefixing a consonant, like the *נ* of *Hiph־il*. Amongst the conjugations analogous to *Pi־ēl* are included the *passive* forms distinguished by their vowels, as well as the reflexives with the prefix הַ, on the analogy of *Hithpa־ēl*.

The following conjugations are related to *Pi־ēl*, as regards their inflexion and partly in their meaning:

1. *Pō־ēl* קָוֶל, passive *Pō־al* קָוֶל, reflexive *Hithpō־ēl* הַקָּוֶל, corresponding to the Arabic conj. III. *qātālā*, pass. *qūṭilā*, and conj. VI. reflexive *tāqātālā*; *imperfect* קָוֶל, *participle* קָוֶל, *imperfect passive* קָוֶל &c. Hence it appears that in Hebrew the *ō* of the first syllable is in all the forms obscured from *ā*, while the passive form is distinguished simply by the *a*-sound in the second syllable. In the strong verb these conjugations are rather rare. Examples: *participle* פָּנִים mine adversary, who would contend with me, Jb 9:15; פָּנִים (denominative from שׂוֹן the tongue) slandering (as if intent on injuring with the tongue) Ps 101:5 *Keth.* (The *Qré* requires *mēlošni* as Na 1:3 זְרֻמוּ; זְרֻמוּ they have poured out, Ps 77:18 (if not rather *Pu־al*); יְזַעֲנִי I have appointed, 1 S 21:3 (unless הָזַעֲנִי should be read); יְסַעְעַד Ho 13:3; שְׂרַשׁ to take root, passive שְׂרַשׁ, denominative from שְׂרַשׁ root (but שְׂרַשׁ to root out); in *Hithpō־ēl* הַשְׁעַזְזָזָה they shall be moved, Jer 25:16; imperf. 46:8; from a verb לְשַׁׁחַט Is 10:13. The *participle* אַזְכָּר מְשַׁׁחַט Is 52:5 is probably a *forma mixta* combining the readings שְׁוַׁשְׁחַט אַזְכָּר and אַזְכָּר מְשַׁׁחַט.

Po־ēl proper (as distinguished from the corresponding conjugations of verbs עַזְזֵל § 671 and עַזְזֵל § 72 m, which take the place of the ordinary causative *Pi־ēl*) expresses an aim or

endeavour to perform the action, especially with hostile intent, and is hence called, by Ewald, the stem expressing *aim* (*Zielstamm*), *endeavour* (*Suche-stamm*) or *attack* (*Angriffs-stamm*); cf. the examples given above from Jb 9:15, Ps 101:5, and צִוֵּי 1 S 18:9 *Q're* (probably for צִוְּעֵי, cf. § 52 s; § 55 f: *seeking to cast an evil eye*).

With קֹטֶל is connected the formation of quadrilaterals by the insertion of a consonant between the first and second radicals (§ 30 p, § 56).

2. *Pa[□]lēl*, generally with the *ă* attenuated to *ī=Pi[□]lēl*¹ (*Pi[□]lal*), and קְשֻׁלָּל; the *ē* in the final syllable also arises from *ī*, and this again from *ă*; passive *Pu[□]lal* קְשֻׁלָּל, reflexive *Hithpa[□]lēl* הִתְקֻשְׁלָל, like the Arabic conjugations IX. *iqtāllā* and XI. *iqtāllā*, the former used of permanent, the latter of accidental or changing conditions, e.g. of colours; cf. שָׁבֵן to be at rest, שָׁנֵן to be green, passive אַמְלֵל to be withered, all of them found only in the *perfect* and with no corresponding *Qal* form. (For the barbarous form נִזְמַת וְנִזְמַת Ps 88:17 read צְמַת וְצְמַת; for נִגְלַל Ez 28:23, which has manifestly arisen only from confusion with the following חִלְל (פִּלְלָה). These forms are more common in verbs עַי, where they take the place of *Pi[□]ēl* and *Hithpa[□]ēl* (§ 72 m). Cf. also § 75 kk.

3. $P^e \square al \square al$: with repetition of the last two radicals, used of movements repeated in quick succession; e.g. סַחֲרֵר *to go about quickly, to palpitate (of the heart)* Ps 38:11, from סַחַר *to go about; passive חַמְרָם* *to be in a ferment, to be heated, to be red,* Jb 16:16, La 1:20, 2:11. Probably this is also the explanation of חַצּוֹצֶר (denom. from חַצּוֹר *a trumpet*, but only in the participle, 1 Ch 15:24 &c. *K^eth.*) for אַצְּרֵץ, by absorption of the first ר, lengthening of ā in the open syllable, and subsequent obscuring of ā to ḥ. On the other hand, for the meaningless אַהֲבָו הַבָּי Ho 4:18 (which could only be referred to this conjugation if it stood for אַהֲבָו read אַהֲבָו, and for the equally meaningless יִתְפִּיכְתָּ Ps 45:3 read יִתְפִּיכְתָּ) In both these cases a scribal error (*dittography*) has been perpetuated by the punctuation, which did not venture to alter the *K^ethibh.* On the employment of $P^e \square al \square al$ in the formation of nouns, cf. § 84b n. Closely related to this form is—

4. *Pilpēl* (pass. *Pōlpal*), with a strengthening of the two essential radicals in stems עַגְלָל, and עַגְלָל, e.g. גָּלַל to roll, from גָּלַל; reflexive הַתָּגַלְגֵּל to roll oneself down; passive כָּלַבְלָל; cf. also אַטְפָּה (so Baer and Ginsb. after Qimhi; others אַטְפָּה) Is 14:23, and with ā in both syllables owing to the influence of ר from קְרֹךְ from קָרְךָ (cf. however, in the parallel passage, Jer 48:45 זְקָדָק) and Is 22:5, in the participle; שְׁבִשָּׁגַּג Is 17:11 to hedge in, acc. to others make to grow. Probably to this form also belongs לְעַלְעָלָשׂ, the emended reading of Jb 39:30 instead of the impossible עַלְעָשׂ; also אֲהַסְפָּא Is 27:8, if that form is to be referred to an infinitive אַסְפָּא; perhaps also אַשְׁפָּא Ez 39:2 for אַשְׁאָשׂ. This form also commonly expresses rapidly repeated movement, which all languages incline to indicate by a repetition of the sound,¹ e.g. צְפַצְּפָנָה to chirp; cf. in the Lexicon the nouns derived from צָרָר, עַזְבָּן, and צָלָל.

As *Hithpalpel* we find יִשְׁקֹעַ Na 2:5; וַיַּמְרָא Est 4:4; Dn 8:7, 11:11. Of the same form is אָזֶה Is 38:15, if contracted from the root יָזַר or יָזַר (וְ or יְ), and also יִתְמַהֵּן (tarry ye, Is 29:9 (but read probably הַתְמַהֵּן), (in pause) Gn 19:16, &c., if it is to be derived from מהָן, and not *Hithpalpel* from מהָה.

¹ Cf. Wolfensohn, 'The Pi \square lel in Hebrew,' *Amer. Journ. of Or. Studies*, xxvii (1907), p. 303 ff.

¹ Cf. Lat. *tinnio*, *tintinno*, our *tick-tack*, *ding-dong*, and the German *wirrwarr*, *klingklang*. The repetition of the radical in verbs үүү also produces this effect; as in لکّ to lick, حکّ to pound, حفّ to trip along. The same thing is expressed also by diminutive forms, as in Latin by the termination -illo, e.g. *cantillo*, in German by -eln, -ern, e.g. *flimmern*, *trillern*, *tröpfeln*, to trickle.

Only examples more or less doubtful can be adduced of—

5. *Tiphəēl* (properly *Taphəēl*²): תִּפְהַל, with ת prefixed, cf. תָּרַגֵּל to teach to walk, to lead (denominative from תָּרַגֵּל a foot?) *Ho* 11:3; from a stem לָגַל, the imperfect לָגַלְתָּ to contend with, *Jer* 12:5; participle, 22:15 (from חָרַה to be hot, eager). Similarly in Aramaic, פְּרַגָּם to interpret, whence also in Hebrew the passive participle מְחַרְגָּם *Ezr* 4:7.

6. *Šaphəēl*: שָׁפֶל, frequent in Syriac, e.g. from לְהַב to flame; whence in Hebrew שָׁפֵל flame. Perhaps of the same form is שָׁבְלוֹל a snail (unless it be from the stem שָׁבֵל), and שָׁעֲרוֹת hollow stakes, cf. § 85, No. 50. This conjugation is perhaps the original of *Hiphəīl*, in which case the ה, by a phonetic change which may be exemplified elsewhere, is weakened from a sibilant.

*

* *

Forms of which only isolated examples occur are:—

7. *קְשֻׁלָּת*, *passive* קְשֻׁלָּה; as מִקְשָׁפָס peeled off, like scales, *Ex* 16:14, from קָשַׁשׁ to peel, to scale.

8. *קְרֻעָה*, in קְרֻעָה a rain-storm, from קָרַע.

9. *נְתַקְפָּל* (regularly in Mishnic Hebrew³) a form compounded of *Niphəal* and *Hithpaəel*; as נְתַקְפָּר that they may be taught, *Ez* 23:48; נְכַפֵּר probably an error for נְכַפֵּר to be forgiven, *Dt* 21:8. On נְשַׁתְּוָה *Pr* 27:15, see § 75 x.

§ 56. Quadrilaterals.

On the origin of these altogether secondary formations cf. § 30 p. While quadrilateral nouns are tolerably numerous, only the following examples of the verb occur:

(a) On the analogy of *Piəēl*: כְּרָסָה, imperfect יְכָרַסֵּה he doth ravage it, *Ps* 80:14 from בָּסָם. Passive כְּרָסָה to grow fresh again, *Jb* 33:25. Participle אַכְרָבֵל girt, clothed (cf. Aramaic קְבָל to bind), *1 Ch* 15:27. It is usual also to include among the quadrilaterals *Jb* 26:9, as a perfect of Aramaic form with *Pathah* not attenuated. It is more correctly, however, regarded, with Delitzsch, as the infinitive absolute of a *Piəēl* formation, from פָּרַשׂ to spread out, with euphonic change of the first שׂ to שׁ, and the second to תׁ. Moreover, the reading פָּרַשׂ also is very well attested, and is adopted by Beer in the text of Job; cf. the Rem. on p. 48 of his edition.

(b) On the analogy of *Hiphəīl*: הַשְׁמָאֵיל, by syncope השְׁמָאֵיל to turn to the left (denom. from שָׁמַם *Al*) *Gn* 13:9, *Is* 30:21, &c. On אַזְּבָן יְהֹוָה cf. § 53 p.

STRONG VERB WITH PRONOMINAL SUFFIXES.¹

² The existence of a *Taphəēl* is contested on good grounds by Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 279.

³ [See Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, Oxf. 1909, p. 30 ff.]

§ 57.

The accusative of the personal pronoun, depending on an active verb,² may be expressed (1) by a separate word, **תָּא** the accusative sign (before a suffix **תָּא**, **תְּאָ**) with the pronominal suffix, e.g. **קָטַל אֲתָּו** *he has killed him*; or (2) by a mere suffix, **הָוּ** or **קָטַלּוּ** *he has killed him*. The latter is the usual method (§ 33), and we are here concerned with it alone.³ Neither of these methods, however, is employed when the accusative of the pronoun is *reflexive*. In that case a reflexive verb is used, viz. Niph[□]al or Hithpa[□]el (§§ 51 and 54), e.g. **הִתְקַדֵּשׁ** *he sanctified himself*, not **קָדַשׁ**, which could only mean *he sanctified him*.⁴

Two points must be specially considered here: the form of the suffix itself (§ 58), and the form which the verb takes when suffixes are added to it (§§ 59–61).

§ 58. *The Pronominal Suffixes of the Verb.*

Cf. the statistics collected by H. Petri, *Das Verbum mit Suffixen im Hebr.*, part ii, in the **ביבאים ראנשנימ**, Leipzig, 1890. W. Diehl, *Das Pronomen pers. suff. ... des Hebr.*, Giessen, 1895. J. Barth, ‘Beitäge zur Suffixlehre des Nordsem.,’ *AJSL*, xvii (1901), p. 205 f. Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, i. 159 f.; *Grundriss*, p. 638 ff.

1. The *pronominal suffixes* appended to the verb express the accusative of the *personal pronoun*. They are the following:—

	A.	B.		C.
	<i>To a form ending in a Vowel.</i>	<i>To a form in the Perf. ending in a Consonant.</i>		<i>To a form in the Imperf. ending in a Consonant.</i>
Sing.	1. com. נִ -	נִ - (in pause נִ -)	נִ -	me.
	2. m. נֶ -	נֶ - (in pause נֶ -)	נֶ -, also נֶ -	thee.
	f. נַ -	נַ - , rarely נַ -	נַ -	
	3. m. הַ - , הָ -	הַ - , הָ - (הָ -)	הָ -	him.
	f. הֶ -	הֶ -	הֶ -	her.
Plur.	1. com נָ -	נָ -	נָ -	us.
	2. m. נְמָ -	נְמָ -	נְמָ -	you (vos).

¹ This subject of the verbal suffixes is treated here in connexion with the strong verb, in order that both the forms of the suffixes and the general laws which regulate their union with verbal forms may be clearly seen. The rules which relate to the union of the suffixes with weak verbs will be given under the several classes of those verbs.

² An accusative suffix occurs with *Niph[□]al* in Ps 109:3 (since **בְּנָם** is used in the sense of *to attack*), and according to some, in Is 44:21; with *Hithpa[□]el* Is 14:2 (*הִתְנַחַל* (*to appropriate somebody to oneself as a possession*); cf. above, § 54 f, and § 117 w.).

³ On the cases where **תָּא** is necessary, see § 117 e.

⁴ The exceptions in Jer 7:19, Ez 34:2, 8, 10 are only apparent. In all these instances the sharp antithesis between **מְנֻעָן** (*themselves*) and another object could only be expressed by retaining the same verb; also in Ex 5:19 **מְנֻעָן** after an active verb serves to emphasize the idea of *themselves*.

f. ¹				
3. m.	םַעֲשֵׂה ¹	םַעֲשֵׂה	(from מְעַשֵּׂה, מְעַשָּׂה)	םַעֲשֵׂה	(from מְעַשֵּׂה) eos.
poet.	מוֹעֵד	מוֹעֵד	מוֹעֵד	מוֹעֵד	
f.	עַתָּה	עַתָּה, עַתָּה ¹		eas.

2. That these suffixes are connected with the corresponding *forms of the personal pronoun* (§ 32) is for the most part self-evident, and only a few of them require elucidation.

The suffixes נִי, נִי, הָנִי, הָנִי (and הָנִי, when a long vowel in an open syllable precedes) never have the tone, which always rests on the preceding syllable; on the other hand, מַעֲשֵׂה and מְעַשֵּׂה always take the tone.

In the 3rd pers. masc. הָנִי, by contraction of *a* and *u* after the rejection of the weak *n*, frequently gives rise to *ô* (§ 23 k), ordinarily written *i*, much less frequently הָנִי (see § 7 c). In the *feminine*, the suffix הָנִי should be pronounced with a preceding *a* (cf. below, f, note), as הָנִי or הָנִי, on the analogy of *āhū*; instead of הָנִי, however, it was simply pronounced הָנִי, with the rejection of the final vowel, and with *Mappiq*, since the *n* is consonantal; but the weakening to הָנִי is also found, see below, g.

3. The variety of the suffix-forms is occasioned chiefly by the fact that they are modified differently according to the form and tense of the verb to which they are attached. For almost every suffix three forms may be distinguished:

(a) One beginning with a consonant, as נִמְמָה, נִמְמָה, נִמְמָה (only after *i*), &c. These are attached to verbal forms which end with a vowel, e.g. יְקֻפָּלְתִּי; וְנִי, קְלִילְתִּי, for which by absorption of the *n* we also get קְלִילְתִּי, pronounced *q'ṭaltiū*; cf. § 8 m.

(b) A second and third with what are called *connecting vowels*¹ (נִי, נִי, נִי), used with verbal forms ending with a consonant (for exceptions, see § 59 g and § 60 e).

¹ According to Diehl (see above), p. 61, מַעֲשֵׂה occurs only once with the perfect (see § 59 e), 7 times with the imperfect, but never in pre-exilic passages, whereas the accus. מְעַשֵּׂה occurs 40 times in Jer. and 36 times in Ezek.—םְעַשֵּׂה occurs only once as a *verbal suffix* (Dt 32:26, unless, with Kahan, *Infinitive u. Participien*, p. 13, מְעַשֵּׂה from פְּאַתְּה אֶתְּהַמְּעַשֵּׂה

is to be read), while the forms עַתָּה (2nd f. pl.) and עַתָּה and עַתָּה (3rd f. pl.), added by Qimḥi, never occur.

¹ We have kept the term *connecting vowel*, although it is rather a superficial description, and moreover these vowels are of various origin. The connective *a* is most probably the remains of the old verbal termination, like the *i* in the 2nd pers. fem. sing. יְהִי. Observe e.g. the Hebrew form *q'ṭal-anī* in connexion with the Arabic *qatala-nī*, contrasted with Hebrew *q'ṭalat-nī* and Arabic *qatalat-nī*. König accordingly prefers the expression ‘vocalic ending of the stem’, instead of ‘connecting syllable’. The connective *ē*, aŒ–, as Prätorius (*ZDMG*. 55, 267 ff.) and Barth (ibid. p. 205 f.) show by reference to the Syriac connective *ai* in the imperf. of the strong verb, is originally due to the analogy of verbs לְהַנִּי = מְהַנִּי from *m'haṇī* (from *m'haṇī*), in which the final *ē* was used as a connecting vowel first of the imperat., then of the impf. (besides many forms with *a*, § 60 d), and of the infin. and participle.

This *connecting vowel* is *a* with the forms of the perfect, e.g. קָרְבַּלְנוּ, קָרְבַּלְנִי (on קָרְבַּלְ, the ordinary form of the 3rd masc. perf. with the 2nd fem. suffix, cf. below, g); and *e* (less frequently *a*) with the forms of the imperfect and imperative, e.g. יְקַרְבֵּהוּ, מְיַלְאֵךְ; also with the infinitive and participles, when these do not take noun-suffixes (cf. § 61 a and h). The form *i* also belongs to the suffixes of the perfect, since it has arisen from *eh* (cf., however, § 60 d). With קָרְבַּ, the connecting sound is only a vocal *S̄wā*, which has arisen from an original short vowel, thus קָרְבַּ, e.g. קָרְבַּ, or when the final consonant of the verb is a guttural, קָרְבַּ, e.g. קָרְבַּ. In *pause*, the original short vowel (*ă*) reappears as *S̄ghōl* with the tone קָרְבַּ (also קָרְבַּ, see g). On the appending of suffixes to the final וּ of the imperfect (§ 47 m), see § 60 e.

Rem. 1. As *rare* forms may be mentioned *sing.* 2nd pers. *masc.* קָה־ [Gn 27:7, 1 K 18:44, &c.], in *pause* also קָה־ (see below, i); *fem.* קָי, קָי, קָי [Ps 103:4, 137:6]. Instead of the form קָה־, which is usual even in the perfect (e.g. Ju 4:20, Ez 27:26), קָה־ occurs as *fem.* Is 60:9 (as *masc.* Dt 6:17, 28:45, Is 30:19, 55:5 always in *pause*); with *Munah* Is 54:6, Jer 23:37.—In the 3rd *masc.* ה־ Ex 32:25, Nu 23:8; in the 3rd *fem.* ה־ without *Mappiq* (cf. § 91 e) Ex 2:3, Jer 44:19; Am 1:11, with retraction of the tone before a following tone-syllable, but read certainly שָׁמָר־ קָה־.—The forms מוֹ־ מוֹ־ מוֹ־ occur 23 times, all in poetry¹ (except Ex 23:31) [viz. with the perfect Ex 15:10, 23:31, Ps 73:6; with the imperfect Ex 15:5 (מוֹ for מוֹ), 15:7, 9, 9, 12, 15, 17, 17, Ps 2:5, 21:10, 13, 22:5, 45:17, 80:6, 140:10; with the imperative Ps 5:11, 59:12, 12, 83:12]. On the age of these forms, see § 91 13; on וְ and וְ as suffixes of the 3rd *fem. plur.* of the imperfect, § 60 d.—In Gn 48:9 נָגַע־קָה־ (cf. נָגַע־שָׁמָר־ 1 Ch 14:11 according to Baer), ס־ has lost the tone before *Maqqeph* and so is shortened to ס־.—In Ez 44:8 וְמִשְׁמִינִי is probably only an error for וְמִשְׁמִינָה.

2. From a comparison of these verbal suffixes with the noun-suffixes (§ 91) we find that (a) there is a greater variety of forms amongst the verbal than amongst the noun-suffixes, the forms and relations of the verb itself being more various;—(b) the verbal suffix, where it differs from that of the noun, is longer; cf. e.g. נִי, נִי, נִי, נִי (*me*) with מִי, מִי (*my*). The reason is that the pronominal object is less closely connected with the verb than the possessive pronoun (the genitive) is with the noun; consequently the former can also be expressed by a separate word (את in אֲתִי, &c.).

4. A verbal form with a suffix gains additional strength, and sometimes intentional emphasis, when, instead of the mere connecting vowel, a special connecting-syllable² (*ăn*)³ is inserted between the suffix and the verbal stem. Since, however, this syllable

¹ Thus in Ps 2 מוֹ־ occurs five times [four times attached to a noun or preposition, §§ 91 f, 103 c], and ס־ only twice.

² It is, however, a question whether, instead of a connecting syllable, we should not assume a special verbal form, analogous to the Arabic *energetic mood* (see 1, at the end) and probably also appearing in the Hebrew cohortative (see the footnote on § 48 c).—As M. Lambert has shown in *REJ.* 1903, p. 178 ff. ('De l'emploi des suffixes pronominaux ...'), the suffixes of the 3rd pers. with the impf. without *waw* in prose are ס־ and הָס־ ס־, but with *waw consec.* הָס־ and ס־ or ה־; with the jussive in the 2nd and 3rd pers. always ס־, הָס־ ס־, the 1st pers. more often ס־ than ס־, and always הָס־ ס־.

³ According to Barth 'n-haltige Suffixe' in *Sprachwiss. Untersuchungen*, Lpz. 1907, p. 1 ff., the connecting element, as in Aramaic, was originally *in*, which in Hebrew became *en* in a closed tone-syllable.

always has the tone, the *ă* is invariably (except in the 1st pers. sing.) modified to tone-bearing *S^eghōl*. This is called the *Nûn energicum*⁴ (less suitably *demonstrativum* or *epentheticum*), and occurs principally (see, however, Dt 32:10 *bis*) in pausal forms of the imperfect, e.g. בָּרוּךְ יְהִי he will bless him (Ps. 72:15, cf. Jer 5:22), נָתַן יְהִי אֶת־נֵתֶן Jer 22:24; בָּרוּךְ יְהִי כְּבָרְכוּ he will honour me (Ps 50:23) is unusual; rarely in the perfect, Dt 24:13 נָתַן יְהִי כְּבָרְכוּ. On examples like יְהִי נָתַן Gn 30:6, cf. § 26 g, § 59 f. In far the greatest number of cases, however, this *Nûn* is assimilated to the following consonant (נ, כ), or the latter is lost in pronunciation (so נ), and the *Nûn* consequently sharpened. Hence we get the following series of suffix-forms:—

1st pers. יְהִי (even in pause, Jb 7:14, &c.), יְהִי (for יְהִי נָתַן, יְהִי כְּבָרְכוּ).

2nd pers. נָתַן (Jer 22:24 in pause נָתַן) and, only orthographically different,

נָתַן (Is 10:24, Pr 2:11 in *pause*).

3rd pers. נָתַן (for נָתַן נָתַן),¹ fem. נָתַן for נָתַן.

[1st pers. plur. נָתַן (for נָתַן נָתַן), see the Rem.]

In the other persons *Nûn* energetic does not occur.

Rem. The uncontracted forms with *Nûn* are rare, and occur only in poetic or elevated style (Ex 15:2, Dt 32:10 [*bis*], Jer 5:22, 22:24); they are never found in the 3rd *fem. sing.* and 1st *plur.* On the other hand, the contracted forms are tolerably frequent, even in prose. An example of נָתַן as 1st *plur.* occurs perhaps in Jb 31:15 [but read נָתַן and cf. § 72 cc], hardly in Ho 12:5; cf. נָתַן behold us, Gn 44:16, 50:18, Nu 14:40 for נָתַנוּ (instead of נָתְנוּ; see § 20 m).—In Ez 4:12 the Masora requires נָתַן עֲצָרָה, without Dageš in the *Nûn*.

That the forms with *Nûn energicum* are intended to give greater emphasis to the verbal form is seen from their special frequency in *pause*. Apart from the verb, however, *Nûn energicum* occurs also in the union of suffixes with certain particles (§ 100 o).

This *Nûn* is frequent in Western Aramaic. In Arabic the corresponding forms are the two *energetic moods* (see § 48 b) ending in *an* and *anna*, which are used in connexion with suffixes (e.g. *yaqtulan-ka* or *yaqtulanna-ka*) as well as without them.

§ 59. The Perfect with Pronominal Suffixes.

1. The endings (*affirmatives*) of the perfect occasionally vary somewhat from the ordinary form, when connected with pronominal suffixes; viz.:—

(a) In the 3rd *sing. fem.* the original feminine ending נָתַן or נָתַתְּ is used for נָתַן.

⁴ So König, *Lehrgeb.*, i. p. 226.

¹ On נָתַן = נָתַתְּ Nu 23:13, see § 67 o.

(b) In the 2nd sing. masc. besides **תְּ** we find **תִּ**, to which the connecting vowel is directly attached, but the only clear instances of this are with **נִיּוּן**.²

(c) In the 2nd sing. fem. **תְּ**, the original form of **תִּ**, appears; cf. **קָטַלְתִּי**, § 32 f; § 44 g. This form can be distinguished from the 1st pers. only by the context.

(d) 2nd plur. masc. **תְּ** for **תִּ**. The only examples are Nu 20:5, 21:5, Zc 7:5. The fem. **קָטְלָנוּן** never occurs with suffixes; probably it had the same form as the masculine.

We exhibit first the forms of the perfect *Hiphil*, as used in connexion with suffixes, since here no further changes take place in the stem itself, except as regards the tone (see c).

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3. m. הַקְטִילֵל	3. c. הַקְטִילֵלוּן
3. f. הַקְטִילֵת	
2. m. הַקְטִילָתָה , הַקְטִילָתָה	2. m. הַקְטִילָתוֹ
2. f. הַקְטִילָתָה , הַקְטִילָתָה	
1. c. הַקְטִילֵתי	1. c. הַקְטִילֵנוּן

The beginner should first practise connecting the suffixes with these *Hiphil* forms and then go on to unite them to the *Perfect Qal* (see d).

2. The addition of the suffix generally causes the tone to be thrown forward towards the end of the word, since it would otherwise fall, in some cases, on the ante-penultima; with the *heavy* suffixes (see e) the tone is even transferred to the suffix itself. Considerations of tone, especially in the Perfect *Qal*, occasion certain vowel changes: (a) the *Qameṣ* of the first syllable, no longer standing *before* the tone, always becomes vocal *Šewâ*; (b) the original *Pathaḥ* of the second syllable, which in the 3rd sing. fem. and 3rd plur. had become *Šewâ*, reappears before the suffix, and, in an open syllable before the tone, is lengthened to *Qameṣ*; similarly original *i* (as in the 3rd sing. masc. *without* a suffix) is lengthened to *ē*, e.g. **אֶחָד** 1 S 18:22, Pr 19:7.

The forms of the perfect of *Qal* consequently appear as follows:—

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3. m. קָטַל	3. c. קָטְלָנוּן
3. f. קָטְלָתָה (קָטְלָתָה , see g)	
2. m. קָטְלָתָה (קָטְלָתָה , see h)	2. m. קָטְלָתוֹ
2. f. קָטְלָתָה (קָטְלָתָה , see h)	
1. c. קָטְלָתִי	1. c. קָטְלָנוּן

The connexion of these forms with all the suffixes is shown in *Paradigm C*. It will be seen there also, how the *Sere* in the Perfect *Piel* changes sometimes into *Sghôl*, and sometimes into *vocal Šewâ*.

2² On the *ă* as an original element of the verbal form, see § 58 f, note.

Rem. 1. The suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd pers. plur. כְם and הֵם, since they end in a consonant and also always have the tone, are distinguished as *heavy* suffixes (*suffixa gravia*) from the rest, which are called *light* suffixes. Compare the connexion of these (and of the corresponding feminine forms כָנֶה and הֵנֶה) with the *noun*, § 91. With a perfect כְם alone occurs, Ps 118:26. The form קָטַל which is usually given as the connective form of the 3rd sing. masc. before כְם and כָנֶה is only formed by analogy, and is without example in the O.T.

2. In the 3rd sing. masc. הִכְפַּלְתָּה (especially in verbs לְהִכְפַּלְתָּה; in the strong verb only in *Jer 20:15* in *Pi-ēl*) is mostly contracted to קְפַלָּה, according to § 23 k; likewise in the 2nd sing. masc. הִכְפַּלְתָּה.—As a suffix of the 1st sing. נִכְפַּלְתָּה to קְפַלְתָּה.—As a suffix of the 3rd sing. masc. perf. Qal of verbs לְהִכְפַּלְתָּה, not only in *pause* (as פְּנֵי Ps 118:5; נֵי קְפַלָּה Pr 8:22 with *D^ehi*), but even with a conjunctive accent, as הִכְפַּלְתָּה נֵי 1 S 28:15 (where, however, the reading פְּנֵי נֵי is also found). With a sharpened נֵי Gn 30:6; יְקַרְבֵּי נֵי Ps 118:18.

3. The 3rd sing. fem. תְּכַלְתָּה (= קְפַלְתָּה) has the twofold peculiarity that (a) the ending *ath* always takes the tone,¹ and consequently is joined to those suffixes which form a syllable of themselves (נִי, הִי, כִּי, נֵי, הֵי), without a connecting vowel, contrary to the general rule, § 58 f; (b) before the other suffixes the connecting vowel is indeed employed, but the tone is drawn back to the *penultima*, so that they are pronounced with shortened vowels, viz. נִכְפַּלְתָּה, סִכְפַּלְתָּה, e.g. תְּכַלְתָּה she loves thee, *Ru 4:15*, cf. Is 47:10; גִּנְבַּתָּה she has stolen them, *Gn 31:32*; שִׁרְשַׁתָּה it burns them, Is 47:14, Jos 2:6, Ho 2:14, Ps 48:7. For תְּכַלְתָּה, תְּכַנְתָּה &c., in *pause* is found, *Jer 8:21*, Ps 69:10, and תְּכַלְתָּה Ct 8:5; and also without the *pause* for the sake of the assonance חֲבַלְתָּה, she was in travail with thee, ibid. The form קְפַלְתָּה (e.g. *Ru 4:15*) has arisen, through the loss of the ה and the consequent sharpening of the ת (as in נִכְפַּלְתָּה and נֵהָה for נִכְפַּלְתָּה and נֵהָה, cf. § 58 i), from the form קְפַלְתָּה, which is also found even in *pause* (וְאַתְּתָּה 1 S 18:28; elsewhere it takes in *pause* the form תְּהִמְתָּה Is 59:16); so קְפַלְתָּה from קְפַלְתָּה; cf. 1 S 1:6, Is 34:17, *Jer 49:24*, *Ru 3:6*; in *pause* Ez 14:15, always, on the authority of *Qimḥi*, without *Mappiq* in the נ, which is consequently always a more vowel-letter.

4. In the 2nd sing. masc. the form קְפַלְתָּה is mostly used, and the suffixes have, therefore, no connecting vowel, e.g. נִכְפַּלְתָּה נִכְרַצְתָּה thou hast cast us off, thou hast broken us down, Ps 60:3; but with the suff. of the 1st sing. the form קְפַלְתָּה נִי is used, e.g. Ps 139:1; in *pause*, however, with *Qameṣ*, e.g. זָקֵפְתָּה נִי Ps 22:2; Ju 1:15 (with *Zaqeph qaṭon*); but cf. also Ps 17:3 with *Mer^ekha*.—In the 2nd sing. fem. תְּהִמְתָּה— is also written defectively, e.g. 1 S 19:17, Ju 11:35, *Jer 15:10*, Ct 4:9. Occasionally the suffix is appended to the ordinary form תְּהִ, viz. נִכְפַּלְתָּה thou (fem.) dost adjure us, Ct 5:9, Jos 2:17, 20; cf. *Jer 2:27*, and, quite abnormally, with *Sere* נִכְפַּלְתָּה thou (fem.) didst let us down, Jos 2:18, where הַוְרַזְתָּה נִי would be expected. In Is 8:11 נִי is probably intended as an *imperfect*.

5. In verbs *middle ē*, the ē remains even before suffixes (see above, c), e.g. תְּהִמְתָּה אַתְּתָּה Dt 15:16, 1 S 18:28, cf. 18:22; וְהִבְטַחְתָּה Jb 37:24. From a verb *middle ḥ* there occurs יְכַלְתָּה I have prevailed against him, Ps 13:5, from יְכַל with ḥ instead of ḥ in a syllable which has lost the tone (§ 44 e).

¹ □ Ct 8:5 is an exception. כְם would probably even here have the tone (see e); but no example of the kind occurs in the O.T. In Is 51:2 the *imperfect* is used instead of the *perfect* with a suffix.

§ 60. Imperfect with Pronominal Suffixes.

In those forms of the *imperfect* Qal, which have no afformatives, the vowel *ō* of the second syllable mostly becomes *-* (simple Šwâ *mobile*), sometimes *-*; thus in the principal *pause*, Nu 35:20, Is 27:3, 62:2, Jer 31:33, Ez 35:6, Ho 10:10; before the principal *pause*, Ps 119:33; before a secondary *pause*, Ez 17:23; even before a conjunctive accent, Jos 23:5. Before *ךְם*, however, it is shortened to *Qameš haṭuph*, e.g. יִשְׁמַרְךָ (but in *pause* יִשְׁמַרְךָ or יִשְׁמַרְךָ; with *Nün energicum*, see §58 i), יִשְׁמַרְכֶּם, &c. Instead of *תְּקַטֵּל*, the form *תְּקַטְּלִי*¹ is used for the 2nd and 3rd *fem. plur.* before suffixes in three places: Jer 2:19, Jb 19:15, Ct 1:6.

Rem. 1. יִתְבָּרְךָ Ps 94:20 is an anomalous form for יִתְבָּרְךָ (cf. the analogous יִחְנַן §67 n) and (so Baer; others שָׁבֵךְ) Gn 32:18 for יִתְבָּרְךָ. To the same category as يִתְבָּרְךָ belong also, according to the usual explanation, עֲבָדָם, מְעַבְּדָם (from עֲבֹד), Ex 20:5, 23:24, Dt 5:9, and עֲבָד Dt 13:3. As a matter of fact, the explanation of these forms as imperfects of *Qal* appears to be required by the last of these passages; yet why has the retraction of the *ō* taken place only in these examples (beside numerous forms like עֲבָד נִי)? Could the Masora in the two Decalogues and in Ex 23:24 (on the analogy of which Dt 13:3 was then wrongly pointed) have intended an imperfect *Hophal* with the suffix, meaning *thou shalt not allow thyself to be brought to worship them?*

Verbs which have *a* in the second syllable of the *imperfect*, and imperative, *Qal* (to which class especially *verba tertiae* and *mediae gutturalis* belong, § 64 and § 65) do *not*, as a rule, change the *Pathah* of the *imperfect* (nor of the imperative, see § 61 g) into Šwâ before suffixes; but the *Pathah*, coming to stand in an open syllable before the tone, is lengthened to *Qameš*, e.g. גַּזְלְתָּם Jb 29:14, 1 Ch 3:5; Jos 8:3, הַזְרָאָלָה וְהַזְרָאָלָה; but קְרָאָז Jer 23:6, is probably a *forma mixta* combining the readings יִקְרָאָז and יִקְרָאָז, cf. § 74 e.

2. Not infrequently suffixes with the connecting vowel *a* are also found with the *imperfect*, e.g. תְּדַבֵּךְ Gn 19:19, cf. 29:32, Ex 33:20, Nu 22:33, 1 K 2:24 *Q'reh*, Is 56:3, Jb 9:18; also יְגַדֵּל Gn 27:19, 31, Jb 7:14, 9:34, 13:21 (in principal *pause*); וְיִכְרַת Gn 37:33, cf. 16:7, 2 S 11:27, Is 26:5, Jb 28:27, 1 Ch 20:2; וְיִכְרַת Is 63:16 (manifestly owing to the influence of the preceding נו); Ex 29:30, cf. 2:17, Nu 21:30, Dt 7:15, Ps 74:8; even אֲמִילָם 118:10–12; נְיֻשֵּׁין Ex 2:17, and חִיתָה Hb 2:17 (where, however, the ancient versions read קְחִיתָה); even יְרַקְפּוּ (*ō* from *āhu*) Ho 8:3; cf. Ex 22:29, Jos 2:4 (but read וְתַחֲפִגְנָם); 1 S 18:1 *K'th.*, 21:14 (where, however, the text is corrupt); 2 S 14:6 (where read with the old versions יְרַקְפּוּ); Jer 23:6 (see § 74 e), Ps 35:8, Ec 4:12.—On pausal Šghôl for *Sere* in מ Gn 48:9 and אֲבָרְכָם וְתַאֲלִצְתָּה so Baer, but ed. Mant., Ginsb. Ju 16:16, see § 29 q.

3. Suffixes are also appended in twelve passages to the plural forms in *viz.*, תְּדַקְּאָנוּנִי, will ye break me in pieces? Jb 19:2; רְתַתְּנִי, (here necessarily with a connecting vowel) Is 60:7, 10; Pr 5:22 (i but probably corrupt); elsewhere always without a connecting vowel; נְנִיחַנְתָּה with two other examples Pr 1:28, 8:17, Ho 5:15; cf. וְתַהֲנֵה Ps 63:4, 91:12; נְנִיחַנְתָּה Jer 5:22; וְנִנְחַנְתָּה Jer 2:24, all in principal pause. [See Böttcher, *Lehrb.*, § 1047 f.]

¹ This form is also found as feminine without a suffix, in Jer 49:11, Ez 37:7. In the latter passage וְתַקְרִבְנִי is probably to be regarded, with König, as a clumsy correction of the original וְתַקְרִבְנִי, intended to suggest the reading בְּנָה, to agree with the usual gender of מִזְמָה.

4. In *Pi*[□]*ēl*, *Pō*[□]*ēl*, and *Po*[□]*lēl*, the *Sere* of the final syllable, like the *ō* in Qal, becomes vocal *š̄wā*; but before the suffixes *ךְ* and *כְּ* it is shortened to *S̄ghōl*, e.g. יְקַבֵּץ Dt 30:4, Ps 34:12, Is 51:2. With a final guttural, however, *ךְּשָׁלֶחֶן* Gn 32:27; also in Pr 4:8, where with Qimḥi *ךְּתַּבְּכָה* is to be read. *ē* is retained in the tone-syllable; an analogous case in *Hiph*[□]*ił* is *ךְּתַּבְּכָה* Dt 32:7. Less frequently *Sere* is sharpened to *Hireq*, e.g. אֲנִמְצָא Jb 16:5, cf. Ex 31:13, Is 1:15, 52:12; so in *Po*[□]*lēl*, Is 25:1, Ps 30:2, 37:34, 145:1, and probably also in *Qal* אֲסַפֵּר 1 S 15:6; cf. § 68 h.

5. In *Hiph*[□]*ił* the *i* remains, e.g. תְּלַבֵּישׁ נִי Jb 10:11 (after *wāw consecutive* it is often written defectively, e.g. נִילַבְּשָׁם Gn 3:21 and often); but cf. above, f, Dt 32:7. Forms like פְּעֹשָׂרְךָ thou enrichest it, Ps 65:10, 1 S 17:25, are rare. Cf. § 53 n.

6. Instead of the suffix of the 3rd plur. fem. (ג), the suffix of the 3rd plur. masc. (ם) is affixed to the afformative נ, to avoid a confusion with the personal ending וּ; cf. נִימְלָאִים Gn 26:15 (previously also with a perf. סִמְמָה); Gn 26:18, 33:13, Ex 2:17 (where נִוְשָׁעַן occurs immediately after); 39:18, 20, 1 S 6:10 (where also בְּנֵיכֶם is for בְּנֵיכָן, a neglect of gender which can only be explained by § 135 o).—For נִהְרָגָן Zc 11:5 read perhaps נִהְרָגָן with M. Lambert.

§ 61. Infinitive, Imperative and Participle with Pronominal Suffixes.

1. The *infinitive construct* of an *active verb* may be construed with an accusative, and therefore can also take a *verbal suffix*, i.e. the *accusative* of the personal pronoun. The only undoubted instances of the kind, however, in the O. T. are infinitives with the verbal suffix of the 1st pers. sing., e.g. לִזְרַשׁ נִי to inquire of me, Jer 37:7. As a rule the infinitive (as a *noun*) takes *noun-suffixes* (in the *genitive*, which may be either subjective or objective, cf. § 115 c), e.g. עַבְרִי my passing by; מֶלֶךְ his reigning, see § 115 a and e. The infinitive *Qal*, then, usually has the form *qōtl*, retaining the original short vowel under the first radical (on the probable ground-form *qūṭil*, see § 46 a). The resulting syllable as a rule allows a following B^egadk^ephath to be spirant, e.g. בְּכַחְתוּ in his writing, Jer 45:1; cf., however, Gn 19:21; נִגְפּוּ (so ed. Mant.; others נִגְפּוּ) Ex 12:27; עֲזֵבֵי 1 Ch 4:10; before נְ and כְּ also the syllable is completely closed, e.g. בְּאָסְפֵן Ex 23:16, Lv 23:39 (but in pause לִהְרָגָן, נִהְרָגָן Gn 27:42), unless the vowel be retained in the second syllable; see d. With the form קְטַל generally, compare the closely allied nouns of the form קְטַל (before a suffix קְטַלְיָה or קְטַלְתָּה), § 84a a; § 93 q.

Rem. 1. The infin. of verbs which have *ō* in the last syllable of the *imperfect* of *Qal*, sometimes takes the form *qiṭl* before suffixes, e.g. אָמַרְתּוּ בְּבָגְדָו Ex 21:8; Am 2:6 (but אָמַרְתּה Ex 21:8) 2 S 1:10 (but נִבְלָו 1 S 29:3), לְשֻׁטָּנוּ שְׁבָרִי Lv 26:26, Ez 30:18 &c. According to Barth (see above, § 47 i with the note) these forms with *i* in the first syllable point to former *i*-imperfects.

Infinitives of the form קְטַל (§ 45 c) in verbs middle or third guttural (but cf. also שְׁבָרָה Gn 19:33, 35—elsewhere שְׁבָרָה and שְׁבָרָה) before suffixes sometimes take the form *qaṭl*, as in עַפּוּ Jon 1:15 (and, with the syllable loosely closed. רְקַעַן מְחַקֵּן Ju 13:25, פְּעַמּוֹ Ez 25:6; sometimes *qiṭl*, with the *a* attenuated to *i*, especially in verbs third guttural; as בְּלַעַי, בְּטַחַן, פְּגַעַן, בְּקַעַן—Contrary to § 58 f נִי (1 Ch 12:17) and נִוְ (Ex 14:11) are sometimes found with the *infinitive* instead of נִי and נִוְ. On רְדוֹפִי my following Ps 38:21 (but *Q're* רְדוֹפִי), cf. the analogous examples in § 46 e.

2. With the suffixes **ךְ** and **כְ**, contrary to the analogy of the corresponding nouns, forms occur like **אָכַלְךָ thy eating**, Gn 2:17; **אָקְרַבָּם** Gn 3:5; **עֲמֹדְךָ** (others **עֲמֹדְךָךְ**) Ob¹¹, i.e. with *ō* shortened in the same way as in the *imperfect*, see § 60. But the analogy of the nouns is followed in such forms as **קָרְבָּם your harvesting**, Lv 19:9, 23:22 (with retention of the original *ū*), and **בָּמְשָׁקָבָם** (read *mōdōs'khēm*) **your despising**, Is 30:12; cf. Dt 20:2; on **בָּמְשָׁקָבָם** Gn 32:20 (for **עֲמֹדְךָךְ**), see § 74 h.—Very unusual are the infinitive suffixes of the 2nd sing. masc. with **נ energicum** (on the analogy of suffixes with the *imperfect*, § 58 i), as **יִסְפַּךְ** Dt 4:36, cf. 23:5, Jb 33:32, all in principal pause.

Examples of the *infinitive Niph'al* with suffixes are, **הַשְׁמַדְךָ** Ex 14:18; **הַבְּנֵי** Dt 28:20 (in pause, **הַבְּנֵי** verse 24); **הַשְׁפֹּטְךָ** Ps 37:33; **הַכְּרַכְמָם** Ez 21:29; **הַשְׁמַדְךָ** Dt 7:23. In the *infinitive of Pi'al* (as also in the *imperfect*, see § 60 f) the *ē* before the suff. **ךְ** **כְ** becomes *S'ghôl*, e.g. **דְּבַרְךָ** Ex 4:10, and with a sharpening to **יְשַׁבְּכָם** Is 1:15 (see § 60 f). In the *infinitive Pô'al*, **בְּוֹשְׁכָם** occurs (with *a* for *ē* or *i'* Am 5:11, but probably **בְּוֹסְכָם**, with Wellhausen, is the right reading; the correction **o** has crept into the text alongside of the *corrigendum* **v**.

2. The leading form of the *imperative Qal* before *suffixes* (**קְלִיל**) is due probably (see § 46 d) to the retention of the original short vowel of the first syllable (ground-form *qūtūl*). In the *imperative* also *ō* is not followed by *Dageš lene*, e.g. **קְתֻבֶּם** *kōthbēm* (not *kōthbēm*), &c.¹ As in the *imperfect* (§ 60 d) and *infinitive* (see above, c), so also in the *imperative*, suffixes are found united to the stem by an *a*-sound; e.g. **קְתֻבֵּנִי** Is 30:8; cf. 2 S 12:28.—The forms **קְטַלְיוֹ**, **קְטַלְוֹ**, which are not exhibited in Paradigm C, undergo no change. Instead of **לְנָהָה**, the masc. form (**קְטַלְוֹי**) is used, as in the *imperfect*.

In verbs which form the *imperative* with *a*, like **שְׁלַח** (to which class belong especially verbs *middle* and *third guttural*, §§ 64 and 65), this *a* retains its place when pronominal suffixes are added, but, since it then stands in an open syllable, is, as a matter of course, lengthened to *Qameṣ* (just as in *imperfects Qal* in a, § 60 c), e.g. **בְּצַעַם** *send me*, Is 6:8; **בְּחַנֵּנִי** Ps 26:2; **בְּרַגְעַמָּנוּ** Ps 50:15, **וְנִי** Gn 23:8. In Am 9:1, **בְּצַעַם** (*so ed. Mant., Baer, Ginsb.*, instead of the ordinary reading **בְּצַעַם**) is to be explained, with Margolis, *AJSL*. xix, p. 45 ff., from an original **בְּצַעְמוֹ**, as **בְּרַגְעַתָּם** Am 9:4 from original **בְּרַגְעָתָה**.—In the *imperative Hiph'il*, the form used in conjunction with suffixes is not the 2nd sing. *masc.* **הַקְטִיל**, but **קְטִיל** (with *i'* on account of the open syllable, cf. § 60 g), e.g. **הַקְרִיב** *present it*, Mal 1:8.

3. Like the infinitives, the participles can also be united with either verbal or noun-suffixes; see § 116 f. In both cases the vowel of the participles is shortened or becomes *S'wâ* before the suffix, as in the corresponding noun-forms, e.g. from the form **רְצִפוֹ**, **רְצִפִּי**: **קְטִיל**, &c.; but before *S'wâ mobile* (**שְׁמַרְנִי**, &c., or with the original *i'*, **אַיְלִנִי** Ex 23:4, &c., **אַסְפִּנִי** 2 K 22:20 (coinciding in form with the 1st sing. *imperfect Qal*, 1 S 15:6; cf. § 68 h); with a middle guttural (**אַלְכִי**, **אַלְכִּי**, &c.; with a third guttural, **אַלְשִׁילִי** Is 43:1, but **לְתַקְלִי** Jer 28:16, cf. § 65 d. The form **מְקִטְלִי**, with suffix **מְקִטְלָם**; before *S'wâ* sometimes like **מְלִאָדָךְ** Is 48:17, **מְנַחְמָכָם** 51:12, sometimes like

¹ **שְׁמַרְנִי** *sām'rēni* required by the Masora in Ps 16:1 (also **שְׁמַרְהָנִי** Ps 86:2, 119:167; cf. Is 38:14 and **דְּקָרְנִי** Ob¹¹), belongs to the disputed cases discussed in § 9 v and § 48 i note.

כָּלְהַ מִאֲסֶפֶת 52:12. In Is 47:10 רֹאֵנִי is irregular for רֹאֵנִי instead of the meaningless בְּקָלְקָם קָלָל וְנִי Jer 15:10 read בְּקָלְקָם קָלָל וְנִי.

Also unusual (see above, d) with participles are the suffixes of the 2nd sing. masc. with *energeticum*, as עֲנוּנָה Jb 5:1; cf. Dt 8:5, 12:14, 28.

§ 62. Verbs with Gutturals.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 584 ff.

Verbs which have a guttural for one of the three radicals differ in their inflexion from the ordinary strong verb, according to the general rules in § 22. These differences do not affect the consonantal part of the stem, and it is, therefore, more correct to regard the guttural verbs as a subdivision of the strong verb. At the most, only the entire omission of the strengthening in some of the verbs *middle guttural* (as well as in the *imperfect Niph^רal* of verbs *first guttural*) can be regarded as a real weakness (§§ 63 h, 64 e). On the other hand, some original elements have been preserved in guttural stems, which have degenerated in the ordinary strong verb; e.g. the *ā* of the initial syllable in the *imperfect Qal*, as in יְחַם־, which elsewhere is attenuated to *i*, *l*, *t*.—In guttural verbs *א* and *ה* are only taken into consideration when they are actual consonants, and not vowel-letters like the *א* in some verbs פְּאַיִל (§ 68), in a few אַעֲזָב (§ 73 g), and in most אַלְמָנָה (§ 74). In all these cases, however, the *א* was at least originally a full consonant, while the *ה* in verbs לְהַזְמָנָה was never anything but a vowel letter, cf. § 75. The really consonantal *ה* at the end of the word is marked by *Mappiq*.—Verbs containing a *ר* also, according to § 22 q, 22 r, share some of the peculiarities of the guttural verbs. For more convenient treatment, the cases will be distinguished, according as the guttural is the first, second, or third radical. (Cf. the Paradigms D, E, F, in which only those conjugations are omitted which are wholly regular.)

§ 63. Verbs First Guttural, e.g. עֲמַד to stand.

In this class the deviations from the ordinary strong verb may be referred to the following cases:—

1. Instead of a *simple Š^ewâ mobile*, the initial guttural takes a *compound Š^ewâ* (*Hateph*, § 10 f, § 22 l). Thus the *infinitives* לְאַכְלָה to eat, and the *perfects*, 2nd plur. masc. עֲמַדְתָּם, עֲמַדְתָּם from עֲמַדָּה to be inclined, correspond to the forms לְטַקְתָּקָה and עֲמַדְתָּקָה; also אַכְלָוּ to eat, and so always with initial *ל* before a suffix for an original *ā*, according to § 22 o.

2. When a preformative is placed before an initial guttural, either the two may form a closed syllable, or the vowel of the preformative is repeated as a *Hateph* under the guttural. If the vowel of the preformative was originally *a*, two methods of formation may again be distinguished, according as this *a* remains or passes into S^eghôl.

Examples: (a) of firmly closed syllables after the original vowel of the preformative (always with *ō* in the second syllable, except וְתַעֲבֵב Ez 23:5, הַעֲלֵה &c. from עֲבָה to adorn oneself, and הַתְּפִיעֵי; but cf. e): דְּעַקְבָּה, יְהַשְּׁקָה, יְהַמְּלָה, יְהַמְּלָה Jer 9:3

(probably to distinguish it from the name בָּצָק, just as in Jer 10:19, &c., the participle fem. Niph[□]al of נְחַלָּה is to distinguish it from נְחַלָּה, &c., and so generally in the *imperfect Qal* of stems beginning with ח, although sometimes parallel forms exist, which repeat the ā as a *Hateph*, e.g. בָּצָק, &c. The same form appears also in the *imperfect Hiph[□]il*, &c. Very rarely the original ā is retained in a closed syllable under the preformative נ of the *perfect Niph[□]al*: נְחַבֵּת Gn 31:27; cf. 1 S 19:2, Jos 2:16; also the *infinitive absolute* נְחַתּוּם Est 8:8, נְעַתּוֹר 1 Ch 5:20, and the *participle fem.* נְחַלָּה (see above), *plur.* נְחַלּוֹת Pr 27:6. In these forms the original ā is commonly kept under the preformative and is followed by *Hateph-Pathah*; thus in the *perfect* of some verbs חָלָה, e.g. שָׂבַע, &c.; in the *infinitive absolute*, נְכֻפּוֹר Est 9:1; in the *participle* צְרָבָה, Ps 89:8, &c.

(b) Of the corresponding *Hateph* after the original vowel: יְחִבּשָׁה (but יְחִבּשָׁ Jb 5:18 in pause), יְחִלּוּמָה, and so almost always with ע and often with ח in the *imperfects* of *Qal* and *Hiph[□]il*; in *Hoph[□]al*, שְׁמַד, חְמַד; but cf. also יְחִבּבָא Is 42:22, יְחִלּוּל Ez 16:4.

The ā of the preformative before a guttural almost always (§ 22 i, cf. § 27 p) becomes *S^ēghōl* (cf., however, q). This *S^ēghōl* again appears sometimes

(c) in a closed syllable, e.g. שְׁמַד, יְחִסּוֹד, יְחִסּוֹד, יְחִסּוֹד, always with ā in the second syllable, corresponding to the imperfects of verbs עָשָׂה, with original ī in the first and ā in the second syllable, § 67 n, and also to the imperfects of verbs עָזָה, § 72 h; but cf. also דְּבָרֶךָ, יְאָסָר, and הַדְּבָרֶךָ; in *Niph.*, e.g. נְחַלּוֹ; in *Hiph.* הְעַלִים, הְחִסּוֹר 2 K 4:7 &c.: sometimes

(d) followed by *Hateph-S^ēghōl*, e.g. יְעַרְבָּה in *imperfect Qal*; הְיִשְׁשָׁה in *Hiph[□]il*; שְׁמַיָּה in *Niph[□]al*.

Rem. With regard to the above examples the following points may also be noted: (1) The forms with a firmly closed syllable (called the hard combination) frequently occur in the same verb with forms containing a loosely closed syllable (the soft combination). (2) In the 1st sing. *imperfect Qal* the preformative נ invariably takes *S^ēghōl*, whether in a firmly or loosely closed syllable, e.g. אֲחִיבָה (with the cohortative אֲחִיבָה), אֲחִיבָה (in pause), &c. In Jb 32:17 must unquestionably be *Hiph[□]il*, since elsewhere the pointing is always עֲנָה. Cohortatives like נְחַרְגָּה Gn 27:41 and אֲחַלָּה Jb 16:6, are explained by the next remark. (3) The shifting of the tone towards the end frequently causes the *Pathah* of the preformative to change into *S^ēghōl*, and vice versa, e.g. בְּעַשְׂתָה, but בְּעַשְׂתָה, 3rd sing. fem.; אֲסָר, but אֲסָר, but with wāw consecutive עֲמִיד, וְעַמִּיד, &c.; so יְנִיחָרָה Gn 8:3 the plur. of יְנִיחָרָה, cf. Gn 11:8; and thus generally a change of the stronger *Hateph-S^ēghōl* group (ְּ-ְּ) into the lighter *Hateph-Pathah* group takes place whenever the tone is moved one place toward the end (cf. § 27 v).

3. When in forms like דְּעַמְּדָה, the vowel of the final syllabl becomes a *vocal Š^ēwā* in consequence of the addition of an afformative (וְ, יְ, הְ) or suffix, the *compound Š^ēwā* of the guttural is changed into the corresponding short vowel, e.g. דְּעַמְּדוּ (ya-□a-m^e-dhū as an equivalent for ya-□-m^e-dhū); she is forsaken. But even in these forms the hard combination frequently occurs, e.g. הְקֻלָּוּ they take as a pledge (cf. in the sing. לְקֻלָּה, also לְקֻלָּה); they are strong. Cf. m and, in general, § 22 m, § 28 c.

4. In the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect Niph^וal*, where the first radical should by rule be strengthened (**הַקְטִיל**, **יִקְטִיל**), the strengthening is always omitted, and the vowel of the preformative lengthened to **Sere**; **עָמֵד** for **yi^{וּ}āmēd**,¹ &c. Cf. § 22 c—For **עָשָׂה** Ex 25:31 (according to Dillmann, to prevent the pronunciation **עָשָׂה**, which the LXX and Samaritan follow) read **עָשָׂה**.

REMARKS

On Qal.

1. In verbs נְפָא the *infinitive construct* and *imperative* take **Haṭeph-S^וghōl** in the first syllable (according to § 22 o), e.g. **גַּדְלָךְ** *gird thou*, Jb 38:3; **אֶחֱבָּךְ** *love thou*, Ho 3:1; **זַחֲזִירָךְ** *seize thou*, Ex 4:4 (on this **אֶפְנָה** *bake ye*, Ex 16:23, see § 76 d); **אֶאָכֶל** *to eat*; infinitive with a prefix נְאָכֵל Is 5:24; נְאָכֵל בְּ Ec 3:8. Sometimes, however, **Haṭeph-Pathah** is found as well, e.g. *infinitive* נְאָכֵל 1 K 6:6; נְאָשֵׁר Nu 26:10 (before a suffix נְאָכֵל אֶאָכֵל אֶאָכֵל אֶאָכֵל § 61 d); cf. Dt 7:20, 12:23, Ez 25:8, Ps 102:5, Pr 25:7 (**לְאָמַר**, Jb 34:18, always in close connexion with the following word. With a firmly closed syllable after **ל** cf. Is 30:2; **לְעֹשֵׂר** Jos 2:2 f. (on Is 2:20, cf. § 84b n); **לְקַחְתָּה** Is 30:14, Hag 2:16; **בְּלְקַשְׁ** Ex 31:4, &c.; **לְעֹשֵׂר** 2 S 18:3 **Q^וrē**, but also **בְּעֹשֵׂר** 1 Ch 15:26.

לְקַדְלִתִי Ju 9:9, 11, 13 is altogether anomalous, and only a few authorities give **קַדְלִתִי** (Hiph^וil), adopted by Moore in Haupt's Bible. According to Qimḥi, Olshausen, and others, the Masora intended a *perfect Hoph^וal* with syncope of the preformative after the נ interrogative = **לְתִי**, or (according to Olshausen) with the omission of the נ interrogative. But since the *Hiph^וil* and *Hoph^וal* of **קַדְלִיל** nowhere occur, it is difficult to believe that such was the intention of the Masora. We should expect the *perfect Qal*, **קַדְלִתִי**. But the *Qameṣ* under the נ, falling between the tone and counter-tone, was naturally less emphasized than in נ, without the נ interrogative. Consequently it was weakened, not to simple **S^וwā**, but to נ, in order to represent the sound of the *Qameṣ* (likewise pronounced as **ā**) at least in a shortened form. The **S^וghōl** of the נ interrogative is explained, in any case, from § 100 n (cf. the similar pointing of the article, e.g. in **מַקְדִּשִׁים**, קַדְשִׁים, § 35 k). For the accusative after **קַדְלִיל**, instead of the usual **ן**, Jb 3:17 affords sufficient evidence.

Also in the other forms of the *imperative* the guttural not infrequently influences the vowel, causing a change of **i** (on this **i** cf. § 48 i) into **S^וghōl**, e.g. **אַסְפֵּה** *gather thou*, Nu 11:16; **עֲרַכָּה** *set in order*, Jb 33:5; **חַשְׁפֵּי** *strip off*, Is 47:2 (on this irregular *Dageš* cf. § 46 d), especially when the second radical is also a guttural, e.g. **הַבּוֹא**, Am 5:15, Ps 31:24; cf. Zc 8:19; **זַעֲמָה** Ct 2:15; cf. also in verbs **הַלְּאֵה**, **עַנְנֵה** *sing ye*, Nu 21:17, Ps 147:7 (compared with **עַנוּ** *answer ye*, 1 S 12:3) and **אַלְיָה** Jo 1:8.—**Pathah** occurs in **חַבְלֵל** *hold him in pledge*, Pr 20:16, and probably also in **Ps 9:14** (נִיְמָנִי).—As a pausal form for **חַרְבִּי** (cf. the plur. Jer 2:12) we find in Is 44:27 **חַרְבָּי** (cf. the *imperf.* חַרְבָּי) with the **o** repeated in the form of a **Haṭeph-Qameṣ**. For other examples of this kind, see § 10 h and § 46 e.

2. The pronunciation (mentioned above, No. 2) of the imperfects in **ă** with **S^וghōl** under the preformative in a firmly closed syllable (e.g. **יִקְרָא**) regularly gives way to the soft combination in verbs which are at the same time **הַלְּ**, e.g. **יִקְרָא**, **יִקְרָא**, &c. (but cf. **יִקְרָא** &c., **יִקְרָא** Pr 6:27, **הַעֲשֵׂה** ed. Mant., Ex 3:20). Even in the strong verb **וַיִּזְקַח** is found along with **יִזְקַח**. Cf. also **וַיִּצְבַּע** Ez 23:5; **וַיִּצְבַּע** Gn 27:36 (so Ben-Asher; but Ben-Naphtali עַקְבָּי); **וַיִּלְקַח** Neh

¹ 1 Jb 19:7 (so even the Mantua ed.) is altogether abnormal: read **עֲנָה**, **אֲנָה**, with Baer, Ginsb.

9:22, and so always in the *imperfect Qal* of שׂוֹר with suffixes, Gn 49:25, &c.—**תַּאֲבֹו** Pr 1:22 is to be explained from the endeavour to avoid too great an accumulation of short sounds by the insertion of a long vowel, but it is a question whether we should not simply read **תַּאֲבֹו** with Haupt in his Bible, *Proverbs*, p. 34, 1. 44 ff.; cf. the analogous instances under *p*, and such nouns as **אָבָּא**, § 93 t.—On תְּבִרְךָ Ps 94:20 for תְּקִרְבָּם (according to Qimhi, and others, rather *Pu \square al*) cf. § 60 b.

מִלְאָמֵן Ps 58:5 and יְשַׁעַרְמָה to deal subtilly, 1 S 23:22, Pr 15:5, 19:25, may be explained with Barth (*ZDMG*. 1889, p. 179) as *i*-imperfects (see above, § 47 i),—the latter for the purpose of distinction from the causative יְשַׁעֲרִים Ps 83:4.—Instead of the unintelligible form וַיַּחֲקָם (so ed. Mant.; Baer and Ginsb. as in 24:3) 1 Ch 23:6 and וַיַּחֲקָם 24:3 (partly analogous to דַּמְצַדְּמָה § 60 b) the Qal יְנִיחַלְמָה is to be read. The form רַדְמָה Ps 7:6 which is, according to Qimhi (in *Mikhlol*; but in his Lexicon he explains it as *Hithpa \square el*), a composite form of *Qal* (רַדְמָה) and *Pi \square el* (רַדְמָה), can only be understood as a development of רַדְמָה (cf. § 64 h on צְחַק, and § 69 x on לְבָקָר Ex 9:23, Ps 73:9). Pathā has taken the place of *Hateph-Pathah*, but as a mere helping-vowel (as in קְעַמְשָׁה § 28 e, note 2) and without preventing the closing of the syllable. It is much simpler, however, to take it as a *forma mixta*, combining the readings רַדְמָה (impf. Qal) and רַדְמָה (impf. Pi \square el).

On Hiph \square il and Hoph \square al.

3. The above-mentioned (f, 3) change of הַ to הֶ occurs in the *perfect Hiph \square il*, especially when *wāw consecutive* precedes, and the tone is in consequence thrown forward upon the affirmative, e.g. הַעֲמָדָה, but הֶעֱמָדָה Nu 3:6, 8:13, 27:19; but הַעֲבָרָת Jer 15:14, Ez 20:37; even in the 3rd sing. הַעֲזִין Ps 77:2.—On the contrary הַ occurs instead of הֶ in the *imperative Hiph \square il*, Jer 49:8, 30; and in the *infinitive* Jer 31:32. The preformative עַתָּה in *Hiph \square il* always takes *a* in a closed syllable: Ex 8:4 הַעֲתָה יְרוֹא; verse 5 אַעֲתָה יְרֹא; also verse 25 and Jb 22:27.

4. In the *perfect Hiph \square il* הַ is sometimes changed into הֶ, and in *Hoph \square al* הַ into הֶ (cf. § 23 h); הַ Jos 7:7, הֶ Ju 6:28, 2 Ch 20:34, Na 2:8, always before הֶ, and hence evidently with the intention of strengthening the countertone-syllable (הֶ or הַ) before the guttural. On a further case of this kind (הַמְּשָׁנֵת) see § 64 c. Something similar occurs in the formation of segholate nouns of the form *qōṭl*; cf. § 93 q, and (on אַמְנָן &c. for אַמְנוֹן) § 84a q.—In the imperfect consecutive הַחֲזָק בָּו the tone is thrown back on to the first syllable. On the *Hoph \square al* הַעֲבָדָם Ex 20:5, &c., see § 60 b.

הַנִּיה and הַנִּיה.

5. In the verbs הַנִּיה to be, and הַנִּיה to live, the guttural hardly ever affects the addition of preformatives; thus *imperfect Qal* הַנִּיה, הַנִּיה, *Niph \square al* הַנִּיה, הַנִּיה; but in the *perfect Hiph \square il* הַנִּיה, הַנִּיה (2nd plur. מִנִּיה, הַנִּיה Jos 2:13, and even without *wāw consecutive*, Ju 8:19). Initial ה always has *Hateph-S'ghol* instead of *vocal Š'wā*; הַנִּיה, הַנִּיה, מִנִּיה 1 S 25:7, הַנִּיה (except הַנִּיה be thou! fem. Gn 24:60). The 2nd sing. fem. *imperative* of הַנִּיה live thou, Ez 16:6; the infinitive, with suffix, מִנִּיה Jos 5:8. After the prefixes נִ, כִּ, בִּ, לִ, אִ (=גִּ) both ה and נ retain the *simple Š'wā* (§ 28 b) and the prefix takes *i*, as elsewhere before strong consonants with *Š'wā*; hence in the *perfect Qal* הַנִּיה, הַנִּיה,

imperative בְּקַיּוֹת, לִקְיָוֹת &c. (cf. §16 f, ε). The only exception is the 2nd sing. *masc.* of the *imperative* after *wāw*; נִקֵּה Gn 12:2, &c., נִקֵּה Gn 20:7.

§ 64. Verbs Middle Guttural, e.g. טַהַשׁ to slaughter.

The slight deviations from the ordinary inflexion are confined chiefly to the following¹:—

1. When the guttural would stand at the beginning of a syllable with simple Š^ewa, it necessarily takes a *Hateph*, and almost always *Hateph-Pathah*, e.g. *perfect* שָׂבֵעַ, *imperfect* שָׂבַעֲוָי, *imperative* Niph[□]al שָׂבַעֲ, שָׂבַעַ. In the *imperative Qal*, before the afformatives *i* and *u*, the original *Pathah* is retained in the first syllable, and is followed by *Hateph-Pathah*, thus, עַקְבֵּי, עַקְבָּי, &c.; in אַחֲרֵי the preference of the *a* for Š^eghōl (but cf. also אַחֲרָיו Jer 13:21) has caused the change from *ă* to *ē*; in יְדֵי, שְׂבָעַ Jb 6:22, even *i* remains before a *hard* guttural.

So in the *infinitive Qal fem.*, e.g. בְּאֶהֱבָה to love, בְּאֶהֱבָה to pine; and in the *infinitive* with a suffix לְקַנְתָּה Is 9:6; the doubtful form שְׂבָעַ Ho 5:2, is better explained as *infinitive Pi[□]el* (= שְׂבָעַ).

2. Since the preference of the gutturals for the *a*-sound has less influence on the following than on the preceding vowel, not only is *Holem* retained after the middle guttural in the *infinitive Qal* עַחֲשָׁ (with the fem. ending and retraction and shortening of the *o* רְחַצָּה and *u* רְחַמָּה cf. § 45 b), but generally also the *Sere* in the *imperfect Niph[□]al* and *Pi[□]el*, e.g. יְלַחֵם he fights, מְנַחֵּה he comforts, and even the more feeble Š^eghōl after *wāw consecutive* in such forms as וְנִילְחַם וְתַפְעַע Gn 41:8 (cf., however, גְּנִיעַנְךָ 1 K 12:6, &c.). But in the *imperative* and *imperfect Qal*, the final syllable, through the influence of the guttural, mostly takes *Pathah*, even in transitive verbs, e.g. שְׂבָעַת, שְׂבָעַת, שְׂבָעַת; יְבַחר, בְּבַחר, בְּבַחר; with *suffixes* (according to § 60 c), *imperative* יְגַאֲלוּ הוּא נְגַאֲלָה, *imperfect* יְגַאֲלוּ הוּא נְגַאֲלָה.

With *ō* in the *imperative Qal*, the only instances are לְעַזְבָּן 2 S 13:17; זְחַרְעַל Ex 4:4, 2 S 2:21, *fem.* זְחַרְעַזְיָה Ru 3:15 (with the unusual repetition of the lost *ō* as *Hateph-Qameṣ*, 2nd plur. *masc.* in *pause* זְחַרְעַזְיָה Neh 7:3; without the *pause* זְחַרְעַזְיָה Ct 2:15); סְעַד Ju 19:8.² Finally זְעַמְהָה for זְעַמְהָה, Nu 23:7, is an example of the same kind, see § 63 p. Just as rare are the imperfects in *ō* of verbs *middle guttural*, as זְנַחֲרֵל, זְנַחֲרֵל Lv 5:15, Nu 5:27 (but גְּנַעַל 2 Ch 26:16); cf. וְתַשְׁחַק Ez 16:33; תַּפְעַלְלִי Jb 35:6. Also in the *perfect Pi[□]el*, *Pathah* occurs somewhat more frequently than in the strong verb, e.g. נְנַחֵם to comfort (cf., however, כְּנַחַד, כְּנַחַד, כְּנַחַד); but *a* and *u* always have *ē* in 3rd sing.—On the *infinitive* with *suffixes*, cf. § 61 b.

3. In *Pi[□]el*, *Pu[□]al*, and *Hithpa[□]el*, the *Dageš forte* being inadmissible in the middle radical, the preceding vowel, especially before ה, ה and ו, nevertheless,

¹ *Hoph[□]al*, which is not exhibited in the paradigm, follows the analogy of *Qal*; *Hiph[□]i[□]l* is regular.

² Also Ju 19:5 (where *Qimḥi* would read s^e□ād), read s^e□ōd, and on the use of the conjunctive accent (here *Darga*) as a substitute for *Metheg*, at. § 9 u (c) and § 16 b.

generally remains short, and the guttural is consequently to be regarded as, at least, *virtually strengthened*, cf. §22 c; e.g. *Pi*[□]*ēl* בְּהִלָּו, Jos 14:1, יְבָרֶךְ קַשְׁתָּו, 1 K 14:10, בְּנֵגָג, Ex 10:13 (cf., however, אָחָר Gn 34:19; בְּנֵה לְתָה Ex 15:13, but in the *imperfect* and *participle* נְיָהָל, &c.; in verbs לְהִזְמָה, e.g. *Hithpa*[□]*ēl* שָׂבַע, *Pu*[□]*al* בְּרַצְנָה (but cf. Ps 36:13 from קְשָׁה, also the unusual position of the tone in בְּהִנְנָה¹ Ez 21:18, and in the *perfect* *Hithpa*[□]*ēl* הַתְּרַחַת צְפִי Jb 9:30); *Hithpa*[□]*ēl* *perfect* and *imperative* הַתְּרַחַר, &c.; in *pause* (see §§ 22 c, 27 q, 29 v, 54 k) הַתְּמַחַם Nu 8:7, 2 Ch 30:18; יְתַמַּם Nu 23:19, &c.

The complete omission of the strengthening, and a consequent lengthening of the preceding vowel, occurs invariably only with בְּקַת (Ez 16:4 is an exception; פְּרַתָּה is an exception; בְּרַקָּה also occurs, Ju 6:28), e.g. בְּרַק (in *pause* בְּרַק), *imperfect* יְבָרֶךְ, *Pu*[□]*al* בְּרַכְתָּה. Before אָ it occurs regularly in the stems רָאָה, בָּאָשָׁה, פָּאָר, מָאָן, שָׁאָל, פָּאָר, and in the *Hithpa*[□]*ēl* of נָאָר, נָאָר, נָאָר, and נָאָר; on the other hand, אָ is *virtually strengthened* in the *perfects*, נְאָר (once in the *imperfect*, Jer 29:23) to commit adultery, נְאָר to despise (in the *participle*, Nu 14:23, Is 60:14, Jer 23:17; according to Baer, but not ed. Mant., or Ginsb., even in the *imperfect* נְאָר Ps 74:10), נְאָר to abhor La 2:7 (also נְאָר Ps 89:40) and שָׁאָל Ps 109:10; moreover, in the *infinitive* שְׁאָר Ec 2:20, according to the best reading. On the *Mappiq* in the *Pu*[□]*al* יְאָר Jb 33:21, cf. § 14 d.

Rem. 1. In the verb שָׁאָל to ask, to beg, some forms of the *perfect Qal* appear to be based upon a secondary form *middle e*, which is *Sere* when the vowel of the אָ stands in an open syllable, cf. קָשָׁא Gn 32:18, Ju 4:20; וְנִי שָׁאָל Ps 137:3; but in a closed syllable, even without a suffix, סָאָלָשׁ 1 S 12:13, 25:5, Jb 21:29; יְהָוָה אָשָׁא Ju 13:6, 1 S 1:20. Cf., however, similar cases of attenuation of an original ā, § 69 s, and especially § 44 d. In the first three examples, if explained on that analogy, the i attenuated from ā would have been lengthened to ē (before the tone); in the next three i would have been modified to ē. Also in the *Hiphil-form* הָשָׁאָלָתָה 1 S 1:28 the אָ is merely attenuated from אָ.

2. In *Pi*[□]*ēl* and *Hithpa*[□]*ēl* the lengthening of the vowel before the guttural causes the tone to be thrown back upon the penultima, and consequently the *Sere* of the ultima to be shortened to *S'ghōl*. Thus (a) before monosyllables, according to § 29 e, e.g. שְׁמָךְ רָתָה to minister there, Dt 17:12, even in the case of a guttural which is *virtually strengthened*, Gn 39:14, Jb 8:18 (see § 29 g). (b) after wāw consecutive, e.g. כִּי בָּרָךְ and he blessed, Gn 1:22 and frequently, וְשָׁנָה and he drove out, Ex 10:11, וְתַחַת אֹם Dn 2:1.

3. The following are a few rarer anomalies; in the *imperfect Qal* קָשָׁא, Gn 21:6 (elsewhere קָשָׁא, &c., in *pause* קָשָׁא, cf. § 10 g (c) and § 63 n); in the *perfect Pi*[□]*ēl* בָּרָךְ Ju 5:28 (perhaps primarily for בָּרָךְ, according to Gn 34:19 בָּרָךְ אָדָם would be expected), and similarly תְּנִינָה Ps 51:7 for תְּנִינָה; in the *imperative Pi*[□]*ēl* קָרְבָּה Ez 37:17 (cf. above, § 52 n); finally, in the *imperative Hiphil* הַתְּרַחַק Jb 13:21 and הַמְּעַזֵּד Ps 69:24, in both cases probably influenced by the closing consonant, and by the preference for *Patha* in *pause* (according to § 29 q); without the pause הַתְּרַחַק Pr 4:24, &c.; but also הַתְּרַחַק Jo 4:11.

4. As *infinitive Hithpa*[□]*ēl* with a suffix we find סְמִתְחָק Ezr 8:1, &c., with a firmly closed syllable, also the *participle* מְתִתְחָקִים Neh 7:64; Baer, however, reads in all these cases, on good authority, סְמִתְחָקָה הַתְּמַחַם &c.—The quite meaningless *K'thibh* אֲשָׁא נָגָן Ez 9:8 (for which the

¹ בְּהִנְנָה is explained by Abulwali□d as the 3rd pers. *perfect Pu*[□]*al*, but by Qimhi as a noun.

Q^erē requires the equally unintelligible פָּשָׁאָר (part. *Niph.*) evidently combines two different readings, viz. פָּשָׁאָר (*imperf. consec.*); cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, i. p. 266 f.—In הוּא בְּנֵשֶׁאָר Is 44:13 (also in the same verse) an *imperfect Pōēl* appears to be intended by the Masora with an irregular shortening of the *ō* for אָר; cf. § 55 b פָּלַשְׁנִי Ps 101:5 *Q^erē*; on the other hand *Qimḥi*, with whom Delitzsch agrees, explains the form as *Piēl*, with an irregular פָּ for פָּ, as in the reading פָּלַקְתָּה Ru 2:2, 7; cf. § 10 h.

5. A few examples in which פָּ, as middle radical, entirely loses its consonantal value and quiesces in a vowel, will be found in § 73 g.

§ 65. Verbs Third Guttural, e.g. פָּלַשׁ to send.¹

1. According to § 22 d, when the last syllable has a vowel incompatible with the guttural (i.e. *not* an *a*-sound), two possibilities present themselves, viz. either the regular vowel *remains*, and the guttural then takes *furtive Pathah*, or *Pathah* (in pause *Qameṣ*) takes its place. More particularly it is to be remarked that—

(a) The unchangeable vowels יְ, נְ, וְ (§ 25 b) are always retained, even under such circumstances; hence *inf. abs.* *Qal* פָּלֹעַ, *part. pass.* פָּלֹעַ, *Hiph.* הָפְלִיעַ, *imperf.* הָפְלִיעַ, *part.* הָפְלִיעַ. So also the less firm *ō* in the *inf. constr.* חָפַלְתָּ is almost always retained: cf., however, חָלַשׁ, in close connexion with a substantive, Is 58:9, and גָּוֹעַ Nu 20:3. Examples of the *infinitive* with suffixes are בְּבָרְתָּ Gn 35:1; בְּפָגָעָ Nu 35:19; לְרָבָעָ Lv 18:23, &c.

(b) The *imperfect* and *imperative* *Qal* almost always have אָ in the second syllable, sometimes, no doubt, due simply to the influence of the guttural (for a tone-long *ō*, originally *ū*), but sometimes as being the original vowel, thus יָשַׁלְחָ, יָשַׁלְחָ, &c.; with suffixes נִיְשַׁלְחָ נִיְשַׁלְחָ, see § 60 c.

Exceptions, in the *imperfect* אָסְלִיחַ Jer 5:7, *Keth.* (חָלָא *Q^erē*); in the *imperative* בְּבָרְתָּ Gn 43:16. On such cases as אָפְשַׁעַת Is 27:4, cf. § 10 h.

(c) Where *Sere* would be the regular vowel of the final syllable, both forms (with ē^a and אָ) are sometimes in use; the choice of one or the other is decided by the special circumstances of the tone, i.e.:—

Rem. 1. In the *absolute state* of the *participle Qal*, *Piēl* and *Hithpaēl*, the forms חָלַשׁ (with suff. חָלַחַ, שָׁ, but חָלַחַ, שָׁ, פָּ) and מִשְׁלַחַ (with suff. מִשְׁלַחַ, שָׁ) are used exclusively; except in verbs עַל where we find, in close connexion, also עַל Ps 94:9, רַע Is 51:15, Jer 31:35, רַק Is 42:5, 44:24, רַזְקַנְתָּ Ps 136:6, עַד שָׁ Lv 11:7, all with the tone on the last syllable.—The part. *Puēl* is אָרְבָּע Ez 45:2 according to the best authorities (Kittel אָרְבָּע).

2. Similarly, in the *imperf.* and *inf.* *Niphēl*, and in the *perf. inf.* and *imperf.* *Piēl* the (probably more original) form with אָ commonly occurs in the body of the sentence, and the fuller form with ē^a in *pause* (and even with the lesser distinctives, e.g. with *D^ehi* Ps 86:4 in the *imperative Piēl*; with *Tiphha* 1 K 12:32 in the *infinitive Piēl*; Jer 4:31 *imperfect Hithpaēl*; Jer 16:6 *imperfect Niphēl*), cf. e.g. יָרַע Nu 27:4, with יָרַע 36:3, בָּעַנְיָשׁ Dt 1:34, even with retraction of the tone in the *inf. abs.* *Niphēl* בָּעַנְיָשׁ Nu 30:3 (elsewhere בָּעַנְיָשׁ Jer

¹ Verbs לְהַ in which the ה is *consonantal* obviously belong also to this class, e.g. גָּבַהּ to be high, תָּמַטּ to be astonished, מָהָה (only in *Hithpalpel*) to delay.

7:9, 12:16 twice, in each case without the pause); **Hb 3:9**, with עֲבֹדֵךְ Ez 13:11; **בַּלְעַד** to devour **Hb 1:13**, **Nu 4:20** with עַל La 2:8; for *infinitive Hithpaēl*, cf. **Is 28:20**. The *infinitive absolute Piēl* has the from חָשַׁש Dt 22:7, 1 K 11:22; the *infinitive construct*, on the other hand, when without the pause is always as חָשַׁש except חָשַׁש Ex 10:4.—**בַּבְּחַד** **Hb 1:16** has ē, though not in *pause*, and even נִזְבַּח 2 K 16:4, 2 Ch 28:4; but a in *pause* in the *imperative Niphāl* אָמַן Ez 21:11; *jussive Piēl* תָּאַחֲרָה Ps 40:18; cf. § 52 n. An example of ā in the *imperative Piēl* under the influence of a final ר is תָּתַר Jb 36:2, in the *imperfect Niphāl* נִצְחָה Nu 17:13, &c.—In נִפְרַח Jb 14:9 (cf. Ps 92:14, Pr 14:11), Barth (see above, § 63 n) finds an *i-imperfect* of *Qal*, since the intransitive meaning is only found in *Qal*.

3. In the 2nd *sing. masc.* of the *imperative*, and in the forms of the *jussive* and *imperfect consecutive* of *Hiphil* which end in gutturals, a alone occurs, e.g. יְבַטַּח prosper thou, let him make to trust, מַתָּאַחֲרָה and he made to grow (so in *Hithpalpel* נִמְתַּחֲרָה, &c., **Hb 2:3**); even in *pause* וְיִתְאַלְּחֶנְךָ 1 Ch 29:23, and, with the best authorities, וְיִזְכְּרֶנָּךְ 1 Ch 12:17; שְׂעִיר Is 35:4 is perhaps to be emended into וְיִשְׂעִיר (=עִיר).—In the *infinitive absolute Sere* remains, e.g. תָּגַבֵּה to make high; as *infinitive construct* חָסַח also occurs in close connexion (**Jb 6:26**); on הַשְׁעָרָה as *infinitive construct* (1 S 25:26, 33), cf. § 53 k.

2. When the guttural with *quiescent Šewâ* stands at the end of a syllable, the ordinary strong form remains when not connected with suffixes, e.g. שְׁלַחְתִּי, שְׁלַחְתְּךָ. But in the 2nd *sing. fem. perfect* a *helping-Pathaḥ* takes the place of the Šewâ, שְׁבַחְתְּךָ Jer, 13:25 (§ 28 e); also in, 1 K 14:3, שְׁבַחְתְּךָ is to be read, not לְקַחְתְּךָ.

Rem. The soft combination with *compound Šewâ* occurs only in the 1st *plur. perfect* with suffixes, since in these forms the tone is thrown one place farther forward, e.g. יְדַעְתִּים we know thee, **Ho 8:2** (cf. **Gn 26:29**, **Ps 44:18**, **132:6**). Before the *suffixes* כְּ and מְ, the guttural must have כּ, e.g. שְׁלַחְתִּיכּ I will send thee, 1 S 16:1; שְׁלַחְתִּיכּ Gn 31:27; שְׁמַנְתִּיכּ Jer 18:2.

On the weak verbs אָלַי, see especially § 74.

The Weak Verb.¹

§ 66. Verbs *Primae Radicalis Nūn* (יְנָה), e.g. שָׁגַן to approach

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 138 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 595 ff.

The weakness of initial נ consists chiefly in its suffering *aphaeresis* in the *infinitive construct* and *imperative* in some of these verbs (cf. § 19 h). On the other hand, the *assimilation* of the נ (see below) cannot properly be regarded as weakness, since the trilateral character of the stem is still preserved by the strengthening of the second consonant. The special points to be noticed are—

1. The *aphaeresis* of the Nūn (a) in the *infinitive construct*. This occurs only (though not necessarily) in those verbs which have a in the second syllable of the *imperfect*. Thus from the stem שָׁגַן, *imperfect* שָׁגַן, *infinitive* properly שָׁגַן, but always

¹ Cf. the summary, § 41.

lengthened by the feminine termination **תְּ** to the segholate form **תְּשִׁבַּתְּ**²; with *suffix* **גָּנְבֵּתְּ** Gn 33:3; with the concurrence of a guttural **עֲנָהָעַ** *to touch*, imperfect **עֲנָהָעַ**, infinitive **תְּעַנְּהָעַ** (also **עֲנָהָעַ**, see below); **עֲטַבְּ** *to plant*, infinitive **תְּעַטְּבָהָעַ** (also **עֲטַבְּתָהָעַ**, see below); on the verb **נְתַבְּ** *to give*, see especially h and i. On the other hand, *aphaeresis* does not take place in verbs which have *ō* in the *imperfect*, e.g. **יְפַלֵּלְ** *to fall*, imperfect **יְפַלֵּלְ**, infinitive **תְּפַלֵּלְ**, with *suffix* **נְפַלְּוֹ**, also **לְנְפַלְּרָ**; cf., moreover, **עֲנָמָעַ** **לְנָמָעַ** Gn 20:6, &c., Ex 19:12 (even **עֲנָמָעַ** **לְנָמָעַ** Jb 6:7; cf. Jer 1:10); with *suffix* **בְּנָשָׂאָהָעַ** Lv 15:23. Also **לְנָטָעַ** Is 51:16 (but **תְּעַטְּבָהָעַ** Ec 3:2); with *suffix* **בְּנָשָׂאָהָעַ** Ps 28:2 (elsewhere **שָׁאָהָעַ**, cf. § 74 i and § 76 b), **לְנָקָדָהָעַ** 2 S 20:9.

(b) In the *imperative*. Here the *Nūn* is always dropped in verbs with *a* in the *imperfect*, e.g. **שָׁגַגְ**, *imperative* **שָׁגַגְ** (more frequently with *paragogic a*, **שָׁגַגְהָ**; before *Maqqeph* also **שָׁגַגְ** Gn 19:9), *plur.* **שָׁגַגְ**, &c. Parallel with these there are the curious forms with *ō*, **שָׁגַגְ** Ru 2:14 (with *retarding Metheg* in the second syllable, and also *nasog ahor*, according to § 29 e, before **תְּלִמְ**) and **שָׁגַגְ** Jos 3:9 (before **הָנָהָ**), 1 S 14:38 (before **מְלִיכָהָ**) and 2 Ch 29:31; in all these cases without the *pause*. With *Nūn* retained, as if in a strong verb, **נְהַגְ** *drive*, 2 K 4:24 (*imperfect* **גִּנְהַגְ**, without assimilation of the *Nūn*), **שְׁמַנְיָהָ** 2 K 19:29, Is 37:30, Jer 29:5, 28; cf. also the verbs **הַלְּ**, which are at the same time **יְלִפְ**; **הַנְּ** Ez 32:18, **נְחַחָהָ** Ex 32:34, **נְטַהָהָ** Ex 8:1, &c.; the verb **אַלְ**, **נְשַׁאָהָ** Ps 10:12 (usually **אַשְׁ**); cf. § 76 b. But, as in the infinitive, the *aphaeresis* never takes place in verbs which have *ō* in the *imperfect*, e.g. **לְנְצַחְרָ**, **תְּנְצַחְרָ**, &c.

2. When, through the addition of a *preformative*, *Nūn* stands at the end of a syllable, it is readily assimilated to the second radical (§ 19 c); thus in the *imperfect Qal*,¹ e.g. **יְפַלֵּלְ** for *yinpōl*, *he will fall*; **שְׁגַגְ** for *yingaš*; **נְתַבְּלָהָ** for *yintēn*, *he will give* (on this single example of an *imperfect* with original *i* in the second syllable, cf. h)²; also in the *perfect Niphal* **שְׁנָגָהָ** for *ningaš*; throughout *Hiphil* (**שִׁגְגָהָ**, &c.) and *Hophal* (which in these verbs always has *Qibbus*, in a sharpened syllable, cf. § 9 n) **שְׁנָגָהָ**.

The other forms are all quite regular, e.g. the *perfect*, *infinitive absolute* and *participle Qal*, all *Piēl*, *Puēl*, &c.

In Paradigm H, only those conjugations are given which differ from the regular form.

The *characteristic* of these verbs in all forms with a preformative is *Dageš* following it in the second radical. Such forms, however, are also found in certain verbs **יְפַ** (§ 71), and even in verbs **עַזְ** (§ 67). The *infinitive* **תְּשִׁבַּתְּ** and the *imperative* **שָׁגַגְ**, also **שָׁגַגְ** (Gn 19:9) and **תְּנַבְּ**, resemble the corresponding forms of verbs **יְפַ** (§ 69).—On **תְּקַבְּ**, **תְּקַבְּ**, and **תְּקַבְּ**, from **תְּקַבְּ** *to take*, see g.—In **מְקֻומָהָ** (*imperfect Niphal* of **קוֹם**), and in similar forms of verbs **עַזְ** (§ 72), the full writing of the *ō* indicates, as a rule, that they are not to be regarded as *imperfects Qal* of **מְקֻומָהָ**,

2²The law allowing the addition of the feminine termination to the unlengthened form, instead of a lengthening of the vowel, is suitably called by Barth ‘the law of compensation’ (*Nominalbildung*, p. xiii).

1¹Cf. Mayer Lambert, ‘Le futur qal des verbes **יְפַ**, **יְפַ**, **אַלְ**’, in the *REJ.* xxvii, 136 ff.

2²An *imperfect* in *a* (**שָׁגַגְ**) is given in the Paradigm, simply because it is the actual form in use in this verb.

&c.—Also קָרַא (Ps 139:8) is not to be derived from קָרֵךְ, but stands for קָרַע (with a sharpening of the ס as compensation for the loss of the י), from קָלַק to ascend, see § 19 f, and Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 44. Similarly the *Hiphil*-forms הִקְרִיב Ez 39:9, יִשְׁלַח Is 44:15, and the *Niphil* נִשְׁלַח Ps 78:21 are most probably from a stem קָלַק, not קָרַע.

Rem. 1. The instances are comparatively few in which the forms retain their *Nün* before a firm consonant, e.g. בָּטָר, imperfect בָּטַר Jer 3:5 (elsewhere בָּטַר); also from נָצֶר the pausal form is always נָצֵר (without the pause נָצַר Pt 20:28); similarly in Is 29:1, 58:3, Ps 61:8, 68:3 (where, however, נָצֶר is intended), 140:2, 5, Pr 2:11, Jb 40:24, the retention of the *Nün* is always connected with the pause. In *Niphil* this never occurs (except in the irregular *inf.* נָתַק Ps 68:3, cf. § 51 k), in *Hiphil* and *Hophal* very seldom; e.g. לְנָתַק Ez 22:20, Ju 20:31; for Nu 5:22 read לְנָפֶל, according to § 53 q. On the other hand, the *Nün* is regularly retained in all verbs, of which the Second radical is a guttural, e.g. יִתְהַלֵּל he will possess, although there are rare cases like יִתְהַתֵּחַ (also יִתְהַתֵּחַ) he will descend, Jer 21:13 (even תִּתְהַתֵּחַ Pr 17:10; without apparent reason accented as Milēl), plur. תְּהַתְּ Jb 21:13 (cf. § 20 i; the Masora, however, probably regards תְּהַתְּ and תְּהַתְּ as imperfect *Niphil* from תְּהַתְּ); *Niphil* נָתַם for מָתַם he has grieved.

2. The ל of חַקְלָה to take is treated like the *Nün* of verbs פְּנַז (§ 19 d). Hence imperfect *Qal* חַקְלָה, cohortative (§ 20 m) חַקְלָאָ, imperative חַקְלָה, in pause and before suffixes חַקְלָה (on Gn 48:9, see § 61 g), paragogic form חַקְלָה קָחַי, &c. (but cf. also לְקַחְלָה Ex 29:1, Ez 37:16, Pr 20:16, 1 K 17:11, perhaps a mistake for לְקָחַי, cf. LXX and Lucian); infinitive construct חַקְלָה חַקְלָה (once חַקְלָה 2 K 12:9, cf. § 93 h); with ל, חַקְלָה לְקַחְלָה; with suffix קָחַתְּ Hophal (cf., however, § 53 u) imperfect חַקְלָה; *Niphil*, however, is always חַקְלָה גָּלַלְתָּ Ez 17:5. The meaningless form חַקְלָה Ez 17:5 is a mistake; for the equally meaningless נָקְלָה Ho 11:3 read נָקְלָה.

3. The verb נָתַן to give, mentioned above in d, is the only example of a verb with imperfect in ē (נָתַן for yintēn; נָתַן¹ only in Ju 16:5, elsewhere before *Maqqeph* נָתַן, &c.), and a corresponding imperative נָתֵן or (very frequently) נָתַהּ (but in Ps 8:2 the very strange reading נָתַהּ is no doubt simply meant by the Masora to suggest נָתַהּ); before *Maqqeph* נָתַנְתָּ, fem. נָתַנְתָּ, &c. Moreover, this very common verb has the peculiarity that its final *Nün*, as a weak nasal, is also assimilated; נָתַתְּ for nāth̄nti, נָתַתְּ or, very frequently, נָתַתְּ, with a kind of orthographic compensation for the assimilated *Nün* (cf. § 44 g); *Niphil* perfect נָתַתְּ Lv 26:25, Ezr 9:7.

In the *infinitive construct Qal* the ground-form *tint* is not lengthened to *tēneth* (as תְּשַׁתְּ), but contracted to *titt*, which is then correctly lengthened to תְּתִתְּ, with the omission of *Dageš forte* in the final consonant, see § 20 l; but with suffixes תְּתִתְּ, תְּתִתְּ, &c.; before *Maqqeph* with the prefix לְ, לְתִתְּ, e.g. Ex 5:21, and even when closely connected by other means, e.g. Gn 15:7. However, the strong formation of the *infinitive construct* also occurs in נָתַנְתָּ Nu 20:21 and נָתַנְתָּ Gn 38:9; cf. § 69 m, note 2. On the other hand, for תְּתִתְּ 1 K 6:19 read either תְּתִתְּ or simply תְּתִתְּ, just as the *Q'reh*, 1 K 17:14, requires תְּתִתְּ for תְּתִתְּ.

In other stems, the נ is retained as the third radical, e.g. זְקַנְתִּי נְשַׁבְתִּי cf. § 19 c and § 44 o. On the entirely anomalous aphaeresis of the *Nün* with a strong vowel in תְּתִתְּ (for נָתַתְּ 2 S 22:41, cf. § 19 i.—On the passive imperfect נָתַתְּ, cf. § 53 u.

§ 67. Verbs עַיִל, e.g. בְּבִיאַת to surround.

¹P. Haupt on Ju 16:5 in his Bible, compares the form of the Assyrian imperfect *iddan* or *ittan* (besides *inádin*, *inámdin*) from *nadānu* = נתן. But could this one passage be the only trace left in Hebrew of an imperf. in *a* from נתן?

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 155 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 632 ff. B. Harper, ‘The Participial formations of the Geminate Verbs’ in *ZAW*. 1910, pp. 42 ff., 99 ff., 201 ff. (also dealing with the regular verb).

1. A large number of Semitic stems have verbal forms with only two radicals, as well as forms in which the stem has been made trilateral by a *repetition of the second radical*, hence called verbs ע"ע. Forms with two radicals were formerly explained as being due to contraction from original forms with three radicals. It is more correct to regard them as representing the original stem (with two radicals), and the forms with the second radical repeated as subsequently developed from the monosyllabic stem.¹ The appearance of a general contraction of trilateral stems is due to the fact that in biliteral forms the second radical regularly receives *Dageš forte* before afformatives, except in the cases noted in § 22 b and q. This points, however, not to an actual doubling, but merely to a strengthening of the consonant, giving more body to the monosyllabic stem, and making it approximate more to the character of trilateral forms.

The development of biliteral to trilateral stems (ע"ע) generally takes place in the 3rd sing. masc. and fem. and 3rd plur. perfect Qal of transitive verbs, or at any rate of verbs expressing an activity, e.g. סְבַב, בְּכָה, סְבַב, בְּנָן: Gn 33:5 (but with suffix חֲנֵן, ver. 11); sometimes with an evident distinction between transitive and intransitive forms, as צָרַר to make strait, צָרָא to be in a strait; see further details, including the exceptions, in aa. The development of the stem takes place (a) necessarily whenever the strengthening of the 2nd radical is required by the character of the form (e.g. חָלֵל, צָצַצֵּ), and (b) as a rule, whenever the 2nd radical is followed or preceded by an essentially long vowel, as, in Qal, סְבֹובָ, סְבֹובָ, in Pôl and Pôal, טָבָב, סְבָבָ, סְבָבָ.

2. The biliteral stem always (except in *Hiphîl* and the *imperfect Niphâl*, see below) takes the vowel which would have been required between the *second* and *third* radical of the ordinary strong form, or which stood in the ground-form, since that vowel is characteristic of the form (§ 43 b), e.g. מִתְפַּלֵּל answering to מִתְפַּלֵּל to the ground-form *qăṭălat*, מִתְפַּלֵּל to the ground-form *qăṭălu*; infinitive, בְּקַטֵּל to בְּקַטֵּל.

3. The insertion of *Dageš forte* (mentioned under a), for the purpose of strengthening the second radical, never takes place (see § 20 l) in the final consonant of the word, e.g. מִתְפַּלֵּל, בְּקַטֵּל, not מִתְפַּלֵּל, בְּקַטֵּל; but it appears again on the addition of afformatives or suffixes, e.g. סְבָבָ, סְבָבָ, סְבָבָ, &c.

4. When the afformative begins with a consonant (נ, ת), and hence the strongly pronounced second radical would properly come at the end of a closed syllable, a *separating vowel* is inserted between the stem-syllable and the afformative. In the *perfect* this vowel is ה, in the *imperative* and *imperfect* וְ, e.g. סְבָבָ, סְבָבָ, imperf.

¹ So (partly following Ewald and Boëtcher) A. Müller, *ZDMG*. xxxiii. p. 698 ff.; Stade, *Lehrbuch*, § 385 b, c; Nöldeke, and more recently Wellhausen, ‘Ueber einige Arten schwacher Verba im Hebr.’ (*Skizzen u. Vorarb.* vi. 250 ff.). Against Böttcher see M. Lambert, *REJ*. xxxv. 330 ff., and Brockelmann, as above.

תְּסַבֵּב יְנָה (for *sabb-tā*, *sabb-nū*, *tasōbb-nā*). The artificial opening of the syllable by this means is merely intended to make the strengthening of the second radical audible.¹

The *perfect* יְנָה (for וְנָה) Nu 17:28, Ps 64:7 (Jer 44:18 יְנָה, with *Silluq*), owing to omission of the separating vowel, approximates, if the text is right, to the form of verbs עֲזָב (cf. נָמָק קָר from קָרְם).

5. Since the preformatives of the *imperfect Qal*, of the *perfect Niph[□]al*, and of *Hiph[□]ił* and *Hoph[□]al* throughout, before a monosyllabic stem form an open syllable, they take a *long* vowel before the tone (according to § 27 e), e.g. *imperfect Hiph[□]ił* יְסֵב for *yā-sēb*, *imperative* הַסֵּב for *yā-sēb*, &c. Where the preformatives in the strong verb have *i*, either the original *ă* (from which the *i* was attenuated) is retained and lengthened, e.g. בְּסִי in *imperfect Qal* for *yā-sōb*, or the *i* itself is lengthened to *ē*, e.g. בְּסֵב in *perfect Hiph[□]ił* for *hi-sēb* (see further under h). The vowel thus lengthened can be maintained, however, only before the tone (except the *ū* of the *Hoph[□]al*, בְּסֵב for *hū-sāb*); when the tone is thrown forward it becomes Šwā, according to § 27 k (under א and ה compound Šwā), e.g. בְּסֵב, but תְּסַבֵּב; *imperfect Hiph[□]ił* תְּסַבֵּב, but תְּסַבֵּב; *perfect* תְּסַבֵּב, &c.

Besides the ordinary form of the imperfects, there is another (common in *Aramaic*), in which the *imperfect Qal* is pronounced בְּבִיסֵב or יְסֵב, the *first* radical, not the second, being strengthened by *Dageš forte*, cf. מְשִׁיב Gn 9:8, דְּגִינִיק Gn 24:26; with *a* in the second syllable, גְּר Lv 11:7, יְקִיל Is 17:4, חְשִׁיבָה Is 2:9, &c., יְדִמְתָּא Am 5:13 and frequently, כְּפִיר Dt 9:21, &c., בְּסִב (turn intrans.) 1 S 5:8, &c., נְיִקְבָּב Lv 24:11, מְתִת Ez 47:12, &c., יְחִים (with *Dageš forte implicitum*) 1 K 1:1; in the plural, מְתִתְנִית Nu 14:35, &c. (in pause מְתִתְנִית Ps 102:28); perhaps also יְמִנְךָ (unless these forms are rather to be referred to *Niph[□]al*, like מְתִתְנִית 1 S 2:9; לְיִמְךָ Jb 24:24); with suffix תְּקִבְבָּנָה occurs (cf. § 10 h) in Nu 23:25; *Imperfect Hiph[□]ił* מְתִתְנִית, *Hoph[□]al* יְבִתָּה, &c. The vowel of the preformative (which before *Dageš* is, of course, short) follows the analogy of the ordinary strong form (cf. also *u* and *y*). The same method is then extended to forms with afformatives or suffixes, so that even before these additions the second radical is not strengthened, e.g. יְקִיד Gn 43:28, &c., for נִיקְד and they bowed the head; נִיבְתָּה and they beat down, Dt 1:44 (from נִבְתָּה Dt 32:8; יְקִמוּ וְנִתְפְּחוּ בְּתִתְמָנוּ); Ex 15:16, Jb 29:21 (cf., however, Ju 18:23, 1 S 5:8, יְבִעְתָּה Jer 46:5, Jb 4:20). To the same class of apparently strong formations belongs תְּצִלְנָה (without the separating vowel, for תְּצִלְנָה, cf. 1 S 3:11 and below, p) they shall tingle, 2 K 21:12, Jer 19:3.—On the various forms of the *Niph[□]al*, see under t.

Rem. According to the prevailing view, this strengthening of the first radical is merely intended to give the bi-literal stem at least a tri-literal appearance. (Possibly aided by the analogy of verbs פְּנָה, as P. Haupt has suggested to me in conversation.) But cf. Kautzsch, ‘Die sog. aramaisierenden Formen der Verba עַי im Hebr.’ in *Oriental. Studien zum 70. Geburtstag Th. Nöldekes*, 1906, p. 771 ff. It is there shown (1) that the sharpening of the 1st radical often serves to emphasize a particular meaning (cf. יְמִנְךָ but יְמִינְךָ, יְמִילְךָ and יְמִילְךָ).

¹ Of all the explanations of these separating vowels the most satisfactory is that of Rödiger, who, both for the *perfect* and *imperfect* (Ewald and Stade, for the *imperfect* at least), points to the analogy of verbs נְנִיחָה. We must, however, regard נְנִיחָה as formed on the analogy not of נְנִיחָה, but (with P. Haupt) of a form נְלֹאָתָה (= *gālautā*, cf. Arab. *gazauta*), while תְּסַבֵּב follows the analogy of תְּגִילִינָה. [See also Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, 229 f.]

and **יִשְׁבַ** (and **שָׁמָם** and **יִשְׁמַם**), and elsewhere no doubt to dissimilate the vowels (as **יִקְלֵל**, **יִגְרֵר** never &c.): (2) that the sharpening of the 1st radical often appears to be occasioned by the nature of the first letter of the stem, especially when it is a sibilant. Whether the masoretic pronunciation is based on an early tradition, or the Masora has arbitrarily adopted aramaizing forms to attain the above objects, must be left undecided.

6. The original vowel is retained, see f, (a) in the preformative of the *imperfect Qal* בְּסַבֵּךְ for *yā-sōb* (cf. §§ 47 b, 63 b, and for verbs § 72); (b) in the *perfect Niph^וal נִסְבָּה* for *nā-sāb* (§ 51 a); (c) in *Hoph^וal הִסְבָּה*, with irregular lengthening (no doubt on the analogy of verbs פִּזְבַּח) for *hōsāb* from *hū-sab*, imperfect יִזְבֵּחַ from *yū-sab*, &c.

On the other hand, an already attenuated vowel (*i*) underlies the intransitive *imperfects Qal* with *ă* in the second syllable (probably for the sake of dissimilating the two vowels), e.g. יִמְרֵךְ for *yī-mār* (see p); and in the preformative of *Hiph^וal הִסְבָּה* from *hi-sēb* (ground-form הִסְבָּה, § 53 a), as well as of the participle מִסְבָּה (ground-form מִסְבָּה), on the analogy of the perfect. In the second syllable of the Perf. the underlying vowel is *i*, attenuated from an original *ă*, which in the strong verb is abnormally lengthened to *ī* (§ 53 a). The lengthened from *ī* is, of course, only tone-long, and hence when without the tone and before *Dagesh forte* we have e.g. וְתַּהֲסֵבְנָה. On the retention of the original *ă* in the second syllable, cf. v.

7. The *tone*, as a general rule, tends to keep to the stem-syllable, and does not (as in the strong verb) pass to the afformatives הַ, וְ, וִ, and הֶ, וֶ (2nd sing. fem. *imperfect*); e.g. 3rd sing. fem. *perfect* הַתְּפִתְחָה, in *pause* הַתְּפִתְחָה; with רְ and gutturals הַתְּרִמְמָה (for רִמְמָה), פְּתִילְתְּ, Ps 44:26; on the other hand, with *wāw consecutive* וְתַּרְבֵּה Is 6:12 (but וְתַּהֲסֵבְנָה Ex 1:16). In the 3rd plur. *perfect* the tone-syllable varies; along with לְ we also find קְלְוִי, קְלְוִי, קְלְוִי, Is 59:12, שְׁחָדְוִי, &c.; but in *pause* always מְתְּחִלְתָּה, מְתְּחִלְתָּה, &c. The tone likewise remains on the stem-syllable in the *imperfect Qal* in בְּיִתְחַדְּשָׁה; *perfect Hiph^וal הִתְחַדְּשָׁה*; *imperfect Hiph^וal הִתְחַדְּשֵׁה*; *perfect Hiph^וal הִתְחַדְּשָׁה*; *imperfect Hiph^וal הִתְחַדְּשֵׁה*; *perfect Hiph^וal הִתְחַדְּשָׁה*; *imperfect Hiph^וal הִתְחַדְּשֵׁה*; *perfect Hiph^וal הִתְחַדְּשָׁה*. In the forms with separating vowels, the tone is moved forward to these vowels (or to the final syllable, cf. ee), e.g. סְבִבְנָה, וְתַּהֲסֵבְנָה, &c.; except before the endings מְתְּנָה and תְּנָה in the *perfect*, which always bear the tone. This shifting of the tone naturally causes the shortening of the merely tone-long vowels ē and ō to i and ū (or o, see n), hence וְתַּהֲסֵבְנָה from סְבִבְנָה, and וְתַּהֲסֵבְנָה from סְבִבְנָה; on cases in which the vowel of the preformative becomes Š^וwā, see above, f

8. In several verbs עַזְעַז, instead of *Pi^וel*, *Pu^וal* and *Hithpa^וel*, the less frequent conjugation *Pō^וel*, with its passive and reflexive, occurs (most probably on the analogy of the corresponding forms of verbs עַזְעַז, cf. § 72 m), generally with the same meaning,¹ e.g. עֹזֶל to ill-treat, passive עֹזֶל, reflexive (from עֹזֶל; cf. the *Hithpō^וel* from עַזְעַז and פְּרַד Is 24:19 f.); in a few verbs also *Pilpēl* (§ 55 f) is found, e.g. גָּלַגְלֵל to roll, *Hithpalpēl* הִתְגַּלְגֵּל to roll oneself (from גָּלַגְלֵל); imperative with suffix חֲלַלְתָּה exalt her, Pr 4:8; עַשְׂעַדְתָּה to comfort, to delight in; passive עַשְׂעַדְתָּה to be caressed (from עַשְׂעַדְתָּה). These forms cannot appear in a biliteral form any more than *Pi^וel*,

¹ Sometimes both *Pi^וel* and *Pō^וel* are formed from the same stem, though with a difference of meaning, e.g. רָצַץ to break in pieces, רָצַץ to oppress; חָנוּן to make pleasing, חָנוּן to have pity; סְבִבָּה to turn, to change, סְבִבָּה to go round, to encompass.

Pu□al, and *Hithpa□ēl*; cf. עֲזָעִים (Is 19:14) and קְנַקּו (Is 18:2, 7).—For תְּחִבָּר 2 S 22:27 read, according to Ps 18:27, תְּחִבָּר.

REMARKS

On Qal.

1. In the *perfect*, isolated examples are found with *ō* in the first syllable, which it is customary to refer to trilateral stems with middle *ō* (like יָכַל, § 43 a); viz. רַא they are exalted, Jb 24:24 to רַמֵּם they shot, Gn 49:23 to Is 1:6 to יָרַר. But this explanation is very doubtful: יָרַר especially is rather to be classed among the passives of Qal mentioned in § 52 e.

2. *Imperfets Qal* with *ō* in the second syllable keep the original *a* in the preformative, but lengthen it to *ā*, as being in an open syllable, hence יָרַע, יָמַד, יָרַע (trans. he breaks in pieces, but עָרָע intrans.= he is evil); imperfects with *ă* have, in the preformative, an *ē*, lengthened from *i*. See the examples below, under p, § 63 c and e, § 72 h, and specially Barth in *ZDMG*. 1894, p. 5 f.

The *Holém* of the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect* (בְּסֶבֶב) is only tone-long, and therefore, as a rule, is written defectively (with a few exceptions, chiefly in the later orthography, e.g. צֹר bind up, Is 8:16; גָּזָל Ps 37:5; זָוָם ver. 7; לְבָזָז to plunder, Est 3:13, 8:11). When this *ō* loses the tone, it becomes in the final syllable *ō*, in a sharpened syllable *ū*, or not infrequently even *ō* (see above, k). Examples of *ō* are: (a) in a toneless final syllable, i.e. before *Maqqeph* or in the *imperfect consecutive*, רָנוֹן (rōn) to rejoice, Jb 38:7; Ju 11:18 (once even with *ū* in a toneless final syllable, נָשָׂא Ex 16:20); on the other hand, in the *plur.* בָּנוּ, fem. בָּנוּתָה; (b) before a tone-bearing *afformative* or *suffix*, e.g. *imperative 2nd sing. fem.* נָאֵן pity me; נָאֵן Jer 50:26; נָאֵן Pr 11:3 Q^ērē; הָנָאֵן Ex 12:14 (for the defective writing, cf. Jb 40:22). In Gn 43:29, Is 30:19 (for נָאֵן) this *ō* is thrown back to the preformative.

On the 2nd plur. fem. imperat. נָאֵן make yourselves naked Is 32:11, cf. the analogous forms in § 48 i.-Quite abnormal is the *infinitive absolute* Is 24:19 (as follows, probably only a case of dittography for רָה, cf. Nu 23:25 and שָׁלָל Ru 2:16); so also are the *imperatives* אָרְהָלֵי Nu 22:11, 17, and אָרְהָלֵי 22:6, 23:7, with ה paragogic. We should expect אָרְהָה, בָּהָה. If these forms are to be read *qōballi*, *ōralli*, they would be analogous to such cases as מְלָאֵב רָה (§ 90 i), the addition of the *paragogic* ה causing no change in the form of the word (קְבָר like above). If, however, as Jewish tradition requires, they are to be read *qāballi*, *āralli*, then in both cases the *Qameṣ* must be explained, with Stade, as the equivalent of *ō* (קְבָר, &c.; cf. § 9 v). Still more surprising is קְבָנו curse him, Nu 23:13, for קְבָר נָוָה or קְבָר נָוָה.¹

3. Examples with *Patha* in the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect* are בְּרַם (in לְבַרְמָם to prove them, Ec 3:18); רָד Is 45:1; שָׁגַם in their error, Gn 6:3 (so ed. Mant., but there is also good authority for בְּשָׁגַם, from שָׁגַם = אָשָׁגַם and שָׁגַם also; so Baer and Ginsburg). Also גָּל take away, Ps 119:22; and the *imperfects* חַם it is hot, Dt 19:6, &c. (on the ē of the preformative cf. n); יָמַר it is bitter, Is 24:9; יָצַר it is straitened; בְּרַךְ it is soft, Is 7:4; שָׁמַר it is

¹ For נָוָה as suffix of the 3rd person a parallel might be found in יָשַׁנוּ, § 100 o, and probably also in the *Nün* of the Phoenician suffix נָמָה: cf. Barth, *ZDMG*. xli. p. 643, and the note on § 100 o.

desolate, Ez 12:19 (in *pause* מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה Gn 47:19); וַתֵּהֶנֶּה לְshe was despised, Gn 16:4 (but elsewhere in the *impf. consec.* with the tone on the penultima, e.g. Gn 32:8, &c.; נִרְעָא Gn 21:11, &c., cf. Ez 19:7); in the 1st sing. *imperfect* מִתְּאִיר² Ps 19:14, abnormally written fully for מִתְּאִיר, unless מִתְּאִיר is to be read, as in some MSS., on the analogy of the 3rd sing. מִתְּהִלָּה.—In the *impf. Qal* of שָׁלֵל the reading of Hb 2:8 varies between Baer, Ginsb.) and יִשְׁלַׁוּ (ed. Mant., *Jabl.*).—The following forms are to be explained with Barth (*ZDMG*. xlili, p. 178) as imperfects Qal with original *i* in the second syllable, there being no instances of their Hiphîl in the same sense: גָּלַן Gn 29:10; יָגַן Is 31:5, &c.; נִשְׁקָר Ex 40:21, Ps 91:4, &c.; perhaps also תְּצַלֵּנָה 1 S 3:11 and יְהִלָּה Job 31:26, &c.; in accordance with this last form, הַלְּוֹבָד (Job 29:3) would also be an *infinitive Qal*, not Hiphîl (for הַלְּוֹבָד, בָּד), as formerly explained below, under **w**. Finally the very peculiar form רַזְעָתָה Ju 9:53 may probably be added to the list.

Imperfects, with an original *u* in the second syllable, are also found with this *u* lengthened to *ü* (instead of *ō*), e.g. נָרְוָן, if the text is correct, in Pr 29:6; יְשָׁרָוד Ps 91:6 (unless it be simply an imperfect from שׁוֹר *to be powerful, to prevail*); יְרֻזָּעָם (if from צָרָעָה) Is 42:4, &c. (also defectively אָרְזָעָם Ps 18:30; but in Ec 12:6, according to Baer, יְרֻזָּעָם); תְּמַמָּה Ez 24:11 (on the sharpening of the *n* cf. **g** above).³

A similar analogy with verbs עַי is soon in the infinitives לְבָדָק (for בָּדַק Ec 9:1; Pr 8:27 (cf. בָּדַק Pr 8:29) for בָּדַק, and in the *imperfect* שְׁבָדָק Gn 27:21. (The forms in Ps 77:10, שְׁמָנוֹת Ez 36:3, שְׁמָנוֹת Ps 77:11, formerly treated here as infinitives from עַי stems, are rather to be referred to לְהַ stems, with Barth, *Wurzeluntersuchungen*, Lpz. 1902, p. 21.) On other similar cases, see below, under **ee**. For examples of the *aramaizing imperfect*, see above, **g**.

4. In the *participle*, the aramaizing form יְשָׁבָד for יְשָׁבָד occurs in *K'thîbh*, Jer 30:16 (the *Q'ré* indicates a *participle* from שָׁבָד); רְעַשָּׂה Pr 25:19 appears to be a contraction from רְעַשָּׂה, *part. fem. = breaking in pieces*.

On Niphîl.

5. Besides the ordinary form of the *perfect* נִסְבָּה with *Pathâh* (in *pause* נִסְבָּה) and the *participle* נִסְבָּה with *Qameš* in the second syllable, there is also another with *Sere*, and a third with *Holem*, e.g. *perfect* סְמָנוּת it melts, Ez 21:12, 22:15; נִסְבָּה (for נִסְבָּה) Ez 26:2; *part.* סְמָנוּת molten, 1 S 15:9, Na 2:11; נִסְבָּה it is a light thing, 2 K 20:10, Is 49:6 (*perf.* חַלְלָה); with *ō*, e.g. נִסְבָּה they are rolled together, Is 34:4; cf. 63:19, 64:2, Am 3:11, Na 1:12, Ec 12:6b. In the *imperfect* with *ō* in the second syllable, on the analogy of verbs עַי (from which König would also explain the *perfects* with *ō*), we find נִסְבָּה thou shalt be brought to silence, Jer 48:2 (unless this form should be referred to *Qal* with Qimhi, Olshausen, König); יְרֻזָּעָם he suffers hurt, Pr 11:15, 13:20; נִסְבָּה (for *tirrōt*) Ez 29:7; with ē in the second syllable נִסְבָּה she profanes herself, Lv 21:9, but נִסְבָּה Ez 22:26, and לְנִסְבָּה Is 48:11, תְּנִסְבָּה Is 7:8, &c. For *infinitives*, cf. סְמָנוּת to melt, Ps 68:3 (as *inf. constr.*; 2 S 17:10 as *inf. absol.*); again, with compensatory lengthening in the first syllable, נִסְבָּה Ez 20:9, 14:22, but with suffix הַנִּסְבָּה Lv 21:4; also to be

² Also in Ez 6:6, instead of נִשְׁמָנָה, which could only come from נִשְׁמָנָה, is intended, and נִשְׁמָנָה in the same verse is probably only an error for נִשְׁמָנָה.

Jabl. *Jabl.* = *Biblia Hebraica ex recensione D. E. Jablonski, Berolini, 1699.*

³ According to Stade, *Grammatik*, § 95, Rem., the pronunciation with *ü*, since it also appears in Neo-Punic [and in Western Syriac, see Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.*, § 48], was that of everyday life.

plundered, and **הַבּוֹק** *to be emptied*, Is 24:3; in the *imperative*, only **הִכְרֵא** *be ye clean*, Is 52:11. On **הָרַג** *get you up*, Nu 17:10, and the corresponding *imperf.* **יָרַג** *make* Ez 10:17, &c., cf. dd.

Examples of the *perfect Niph^hal* with sharpening of the initial syllable are, נִמְלָא it is profaned, Ez 22:16, 25:3 (from נִמְלֵךְ); נִמְרָא (from נִמְרַח) Ps 69:4, 102:4 (also נִמְרָא Jer 6:29); נִמְתָּח fractus est (from נִמְתַּח) Mal 2:5; cf. with this in the *participle*, נִמְמִים (for *nīħħāmîm*) Is 57:5, and נִמְרִים Mal 3:9; in the *imperative* and *infinitive Niph^hal* such a virtual strengthening of the guttural after preformatives never occurs.—The occurrence of *u* instead of *ô* as a separating vowel in the *perfect* נִשְׁׂרָא Mic 2:4 is abnormal.

On Hiphil and Hophal.

6. The second syllable in *Hiphil* sometimes has *Pathaḥ* instead of *Sere*, especially under the influence of ר and the gutturals, e.g. *perfect* הִמְרָה *he made bitter*, הַשְׁחָה *he bowed*, הַפְרָר *he hath broken*, Gn 17:14, in *pause*, cf. § 29 q; otherwise הַפְרָר, *plur.* Is 24:5. In Ps 33:10, Ez 17:19, cf. Ps 89:34, and in Ho 8:4 (perhaps also in Hab 2:17, but cf. § 20 n) there is an assimilation to the corresponding forms of verbs יְצַר, see z. Also הַצָּר Dt 28:52, הַתֹּו (in *pause*) Is 18:5; *inf.* רְלֵבֶב *to cleanse*, Jer 4:11, in *pause*. But also with other consonants, e.g. הַזְקָק 2 K 23:15; הַזְקָק Is 8:23; *plur.* הַנְּגָג Jb 23:16; *plur.* הַסְבָּב 1 S 5:9, 10 (and so usually in the 3rd *plur. perf.*, except before ר and gutturals, e.g. הַבְּשָׂר); *imper.* הַשְׁמַר *besmear*, Is 6:10; *plur.* הַשְׁמַר *be astonished*, Jb 21:5; *imperfect* תְּפַר עֲלֵךְ *Thou dost afflict*; *part.* מִצְלָה (on ē in the first syllable, see under i) *shadowing*, Ez 31:3 (but מִסְכֵּךְ Ju 3:24 is assimilated to the form of verbs יְעַמֵּךְ, unless, with Moore, we simply read מִסְכֵּךְ, or, with incorrect spelling, מִסְכֵּךְ. So in the *imperative* הַמִּשְׁבֵּךְ Ju 16:26 Q^re, and in the *infinitive* הַמִּשְׁבֵּךְ is 33:1).

The *ē* of the second syllable, when without the tone, may become *ĕ*, e.g. Gn 31:7 (see also x). It is unusual (cf. § 53 k) to find the *ē* written fully as in the *infinitive Zc 11:10*. Instead of *Hateph-Pathaḥ a Hateph-S'ghôl* is found under the preformative in 2 S 19:44, and a *Pathaḥ* occurs before *ח* (with a virtual sharpening of the *נ*) in such forms as Is 9:3; cf. Gn 11:6, Dt 2:31, 3:24, 1 S 22:15, Est 6:13—in all these cases before *ח*.—On בְּהַלֵּי Jb 29:3, see above, p: on וְהַחֲתָה Jer 49:37, see below, dd.

7. In the *imperfect consecutive* of verbs whose second radical is a guttural, *ă* is retained (§ 22 d) in the second syllable instead of *ě*, e.g. נִיְעָר 1 K 16:25: so also with ר, as נִצְחָר 2 Ch 28:20, Dt 2:9—but cf. also נִפְרָא Neh 4:9.

8. Aramaizing forms (but cf. Rem. § 67 g) in *Hiphil* and *Hophal* are, וַיָּסֶב Ex 13:18, &c.; cf. Ju. 18:23; אַל-תִּתְעַר Ex 23:21, but read מְרֵה from וַיְקַרְתָּ Dt 1:44 (cf. Nu 14:45), but יָשַׁב Ju 18:23, 1 S 5:8, 2 Ch 29:6; אַחֲלָל profanabo, Ez 39:7; תִּפְנַט Jb 22:3; without elision of the ה (cf. § 53 q), נִיהְתֶּל 1 K 18:27, but Jer 9:4; נִיהְתֶּל לוֹ Jb 13:9; with *i* in the second syllable יִשְׁמַר Jer 49:20, 50:45; cf. Nu 21:30; in the *perfect* הַזִּי לְוַקָּה La 1:8. In *Hophal*, הַמְּכֻן they are brought low, Jb 24:21; יִנְחַת he is smitten, Is 24:12 (plur. יִנְחַטוּ Jer 46:5, Mi 1:7); in pause, יִנְחַת Jb 19:23, but also יִנְחַת Jb 4:20 (so Baer, Ginsb., but ed. Mant., Jabl. וְנִכְתָּה); with ő in the initial syllable, הַנְּשִׁבָּה (infinitive with suffix = הַנְּשִׁבָּה, cf. § 91 e) Lv 26:34 f., cf. 2 Ch 36:21; בְּהַשְׁמָה, with irregular syncope for בְּהַשְׁמָה, Lv 26:43.

In General.

9. Verbs עַע are most closely related as regards inflexion to verbs עַז (§ 72). The form of verbs עַע is generally the shorter (cf. e.g. הָסֵב, יְקִים and הָקִים); in a few cases, however, the two classes exactly coincide, e.g. in the *imperfect Qal* and *Hiph̄il* with *wāw consecutive*, in *Hoph̄al* and in the less common conjugations (see above, 1).

10. The developed forms (with three radicals), as mentioned in *a*, are especially frequent in the 3rd *sing. masc.* and *fem.*, and the 3rd *plur. perf. Qal* (i.e. in forms without an afformative or with an afformative beginning with a vowel) of transitive verbs, or verbs, at any rate, expressing action, e.g. סָבַב, סָבַב, סָבַב (but before a suffix also, as well as סָבַב וְנִי, סָבַב וְנִי &c.); Sometimes the contracted, *as well as* the uncontracted form, is found, e.g. בָּזָבָז to plunder, plur. בָּזָבָז; in other parts, only בָּזָבָז Dt 2:35, as well as בָּזָבָז Dt 3:7 זָבָז מְתִיב Zc 8:14, 15 and זָבָז תִּזְבַּח Jer 4:28. Other examples of biliteral forms in 2nd *sing. masc.* are Dt 25:12, Pr 30:32; in 1st *sing.*, Jos 5:9. A part from Qal the only example of a developed form is זָהָה Jer 49:37.

On the other hand, the biliteral forms are the more common in the 3rd *sing.* and *plur.* of perfects which are *intransitive*, and express a state; cf. קָרְא Dt 9:21 (Ex 32:20 קָרְא; elsewhere always a transitive verb); קָרְתָּה, fem. קָרְתָּה מָרְתָּה, fem. מָרְתָּה (for *marrā*); אֶצְרָה, fem. אֶצְרָה תָּחָתָה, fem. תָּחָתָה &c.; plur. תָּחָתָה תָּחָתָה &c. (but on the tone, cf. ee below). Exception, שָׁשָׁה Ps 6:8.

The intransitive but developed perfects נָכַר דָּוֹן, נָדַה, חָלֵל, קָרְאַי (also קָרְאַי in *pause* נָכַר דָּוֹן, נָדַה, חָלֵל), קָרְאַי (also קָרְאַי in *pause* Ps 31:11), almost all have, as Mayer Lambert observes, at least an active, not a stative meaning. Trilateral forms of the *infinitive* after לְ are found in Nu 21:4; לְשָׁדוֹד Jer 47:4; Gn 31:19 (also לְגַזְזָר Gn 38:13); cf. also לְחַמֵּם Is 47:14, in *subordinate pause*, for suffix לְ; with suffix לְחַמְמָם Is 30:18, and, from the same form בְּגַזְזָר, with retraction and modification of the vowel, לְחַמְמָה Ps 102:14; also לְחַמְמָה Is 60:14, 1 S 25:2, Is 10:18, בְּעַזְזָז Pr 8:28, בְּאֶזְרָוד Pr 26:8.—*Imperative* לְשָׁדָד Jer 49:28 (cf. § 20 b, and ibid. also on בְּ Ps 9:14); in the *imperfect*, לְזֹה Na 3:7 (Ps 68:13; cf. Gn 31:40) from נְדָד; the strong form here, after the assimilation of the *Nün*, was unavoidable. On the other hand, יְשַׂדְּדָם Jer 5:6 is anomalous for יְשַׂדְּדָם (Pr 11:3 Q̄rē; the eastern school read the Pōēl in the *Kethibh*); the strengthening of the second radical has been afterwards resolved by the insertion of a *vocal Šwā*. Cf. also בְּעַדְעָן Am 5:15 (elsewhere בְּעַדְעָן). In *Niph̄al*, the trilateral form יְלַבְּבָב is found, Jb 11:12; in *Hiph̄il*, all the forms of רַנֵּן, thus *imperative* הָרַנֵּן, *imperfect* תְּרַנֵּן; *infinitive* הַשְׁמָמָם Mi 6:13; *participle* מְשֻׁמָּם Ez 3:15. That the developed (trilateral) forms possess a certain emphasis is seen from their frequent use in *pause*, as in Ps 118:11 after a biliteral form סָבַב וְנִי גַּם־סָבַב וְנִי).

11. The above-mentioned (see g) neglect of the strengthening in aramaizing forms, such as יְקִמָּה and the like, occurs elsewhere tolerably often; in the *perfect Qal* תְּמִימָנוּ for תְּמִימָנוּ Nu 17:28 (Jer 44:18; cf. above, e); *imperfect* תְּמִימָה בְּבָבָה 1 S 14:36 (הָבָבָה parag. without any influence on the form, cf. o); even with the firm vowel reduced to *vocal Šwā*; Gn 11:7 for בְּבָבָה Gn 11:7 (cohortative from בְּבָבָה); for תְּמִימָה ibid. ver. 6, *they purpose*; following the analogy of verbs אֲמִימָה עֲמִימָה (see above, r); from *intransitive imperfects Qal*, אֲרִי Is 49:19 (plur. masc. Jb 18:7); also Neh 2:3; also תְּמִימָה תְּמִימָה Ez 6:6 (for which read תְּמִימָה תְּמִימָה=שְׁמִימָה) might be explained in the same way.—*Perfect Niph̄al* תְּמִימָה for תְּמִימָה Ez 41:7; לְיָזָר Ju 5:5 for לְיָזָר Gn 17:11 (as if from מְלִיל not to circumcise), cf. Is 19:3, Jer 8:14; *imperfect* תְּמִימָה Zc 14:12; *participle* מְמִימָם, cf. u. So also 1 S 13:11, Gn 9:19 (cf. Is 33:3), are perfects

Niph[□]al from פְּצָע (= פִּיצָּע), not *Qal* from פְּצָע.—In *Hiph[□]il* הַתְּפִלֵּן (for הַתְּפִלָּה) Ju 16:10 (2 S 15:34); הַעֲנָה for הַעֲנָה Pr 7:13 (cf. Ct 6:11, 7:13).

No less irregular is the suppression of the vowel of the stem-syllable in לְהַפְּרִכָּם Lv 26:15.—On the perfect קִלְיָן Pr 26:7, cf. § 75 u.

12. Cases in which the tone is thrown forward on the afformatives (see k) are (a) in the *perfect*, the 1st *sing.* regularly (but cf. יְהִיא בְּאֶצֶר תִּי Jer 10:18 before לְקֹדֶם) after 1 *consec.*, Ex 33:19, 22, 2 K 19:34, &c., also Is 44:16 (before עַחֲזָה תִּי before ר); Ps 92:11 (but the text is certainly corrupt; see the Lexicon), 116:6, perhaps also Jb 19:17, יְהִיא תִּי (though in this passage, and in Ps 17:3, the form might be an *infinitive* in ôth; see Delitzsch on Jb 19:17); in the 2nd *sing.* הַקְּצָצָה תִּי (before אַךְ Dt 25:12; in the 3rd *plural*, רַבּוּ multi sunt, Ps 3:2, 104:24, Jer 5:6, 1 S 25:10; they are soft, Ps 55:22 קָלְלוּ they are swift, Jer 4:13, Hb 1:8; יְמִימָה they are pure, Jb 15:15, 25:5, La 4:7; וְחַשְׁבָּה they did bow, Hb 3:6; יְחַרְבָּה they are burned, Is 24:6. A by-form of שְׁתוֹן (יְשֻׁתּוֹן, cf. § 72 dd) is וְחַשְׁבָּה Ps 49:15, 73:9.

(b) In the *imperative* (a command in an emphatic tone) רְבּוּ sing, Is 54:1, Zp 3:14, Zc 2:14; רְבּוּ Is 44:23, 49:13, Jer 31:7 (but רְבּוּ lament, La 2:19), יְהִיא keep (thy feasts), Na 2:1, Jer 7:29; הַעֲזָה (= עַזָּה) before אַךְ, Ps 68:29. On the retention of the short vowels ū (ô) and i before *Dageš forte*, in place of the tone-long ô and ē, see above, k; on the change of the vowel of the preformative into Š^w□, when it no longer stands before the tone, see g.

THE WEAKEST VERBS (*Verba Quiescentia*).

§ 68. Verbs נְאָכֵל e.g. נְאָכֵל to eat.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 140 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 589 ff.

So far as נ retains its full consonantal value as a guttural, these verbs share all the peculiarities of verbs *primaे gutturalis*, mentioned in § 63. They are, however, to be treated as *weak verbs*, when the נ loses its value as a consonant, and coalesces with the preceding vowel (originally short) to form one long syllable. This takes place only in the following very common verbs and forms, as if through phonetic decay:—

1. In the *imperfect Qal*, five verbs (viz. נְאָכֵל to perish, נְאָכֵה to be willing, נְאָכֵל to eat, נְאָמֵן to say, נְאָפֵה to bake) regularly make the נ quiesce in a long ô, e.g. נְאָכֵל.¹ In a few others the ordinary (strong) form is also in use, as נְאָמֵן (18 times) and נְאָמֵן (3 times) he takes hold; נְאָסֵף, also נְאָסֵף, he collects. This ô has primarily arisen from an obscuring of ô (§ 9 q), and the â from נְאָ, the weak consonant נ coalescing with â to â; cf. § 23 a.

In the second syllable ô (for original ū) never appears, but either ē² or ā; and in pause almost always ē, even before the tone-bearing heavy afformative נְאָ, e.g. נְאָכֵל.

¹ So in the modern vulgar Arabic of South Palestine, *yakul* (he eats) becomes *yôkul*.

² On this ē (originally i^w) as a dissimilation from ô (originally ū), cf. § 27 w, and F. Philippi, in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, xiv. 178. The latter rightly observes that the existence of an original ū in the *imperfect* of נְאָכֵל is

Dt 18:1, without the pause, יִאֱכַלְוּ Dt 4:28. In the 3rd *sing. masc.* and 1st *sing.* of אָמַר, however, ā is always retained in pause, אָמֵר and יִאֱמֹר; but in the 2nd *masc.* תְּאָמַר K 5:20, in the 3rd *fem.* תְּאָמַר Pr 1:21; in the *plural* תְּאָמְרוּ Jer 5:2, Ps 145:6, 11, תְּאָמְרוּ Jer 23:38, with S^g*olta*; cf. also לְכָל תְּאָמַר 1 S 1:7, &c. But with conjunctive accents in the body of the sentence, ā (as being a lighter vowel) is used, e.g. תְּאָבֶד Ps 9:19, but in *pause* תְּאָבֶד Ps 1:6; cf. a similar interchange of ē and ā in § 65 c. The 3rd *fem. plur. impf.* always has the form תְּאָכְלָנָה Zc 11:9.

When the tone moves back, the final syllable of the *imperfects* of אָכַל and אָכְלָנָה, with a conjunctive accent, also always takes *Pathah*, e.g. נִיְאָכַל יּוֹם Jb 3:3, יִאָכַל and he did eat; in אָמַר the loss of the tone from the final syllable only occurs in the form with *wāw consecutive* (but never in the 1st *sing.*); נִיְאָכַל, and then the final syllable, if without the *pause*, always takes S^g*hol*, נִיְאָמַר and he said (except נִיְאָמַר לְזִוְּנָה Pr 7:13).

In *pause*, however, the *imperfect consecutive* (except the 1st pers. of אָכַל, see below) always has the form נִיְאָכְלָו, יִאָכְלָו (but *plur.* always נִיְאָכְלָו, נִיְאָמְרָו); נִיְאָמַר, נִיְאָכְלָו, נִיְאָמְרָו, נִיְאָכְלָו, נִיְאָמְרָו in the poetic portion of the book of Job, as 3:2, 4:1, &c., but not in 32:6, in the middle of the verse. The weak *imperfect* of אָחָז is always אָחָז and אָחָז, but in the 1st *sing.*, according to § 49 e, גַּזְעָאָחָז Ju 20:6; cf. גַּזְעָאָחָז Gn. 3:12, 13 in *pause*.—אָבָה and אָפָה are, at the same time, verbs לְאָבָה, hence *imperfect* יִאָבָה (§ 75 c).

Before *light* suffixes the vowel of the second syllable becomes vocal Šewâ, as יִאָכְלָם, but תְּאָכְלָת. —In a few cases, instead of the ô in the first syllable an ē is found, which is due to contraction from the group אָחָז (or אָחָז) in place of אָחָז; e.g. תְּאָחָז it shall come, Mi 4:8, from אָחָז (from אָחָז); אָחָב (for אָחָז) I love, Pr 8:17, also (four times) אָחָב Mal 1:2, &c., with suffixes אָחָב הָוָה Ho 11:1, 14:5, &c. (but only in 1st *sing.*, otherwise אָחָב, אָחָב, &c., from אָחָב); נִיְאָחָב and I stayed, Gn 32:5. The *infinitive construct* of אָמַר with לְ is always לְאָמְרָנִי dicendo, for לְאָמְרָנִי.—According to Barth (*ZDMG*, 1889, p. 179) Nu 11:25 is to be regarded as an *imperfect Qal*, without the obscuring of אָחָז to ô, not as *imperfect Hiphil*, since אָצַל elsewhere occurs only in the *perfect Qal* and *Niphil*; on the original i in the second syllable, see above, § 67 p. For תְּאָקַלְתָּנוּ Jb 20:26 we should simply emend תְּאָקַלְתָּנוּ; the view that it is *imperfect Pôlēl* (which nowhere else occurs) can, as regards the change of ô to ö, be supported only by the very doubtful analogies of Ps 62:4 (see § 52 q) and Ps 101:5 Q^erē (see § 55 b), while the view that it is Pi^lēl (תְּאָקַלְתָּנוּ=תְּאָקַלְתָּנוּ) rests on no analogy whatever. It would be more admissible to suppose that תְּאָקַלְתָּנוּ stands for תְּאָקַלְתָּנוּ, Pu^lal (cf. אָקַלְתָּנוּ for אָקַלְתָּנוּ, § 27 q); but no reason has been discovered for this departure from the natural punctuation תְּאָקַלְתָּנוּ.

2. In the 1st *pers. sing. imperfect*, where two אָ's would ordinarily come together, the second (which is radical) is regularly dropped (§ 23 f), as אָמַר¹ (for אָמַר אָ), &c.,

indicated by the form of the *imperative* אָכְלָל, the Arabic *yakul* and the Aramaic יִאָכְלָל, as well as by the fact that אָחָז and אָסָס are found along with אָחָז and אָסָס.

1¹ The regularity of this orthography indicates that the contraction of אָחָז to ā in this 1st *pers.* occurred at a time when in the 3rd and 2nd persons the אָ was still audible as a consonant (which accordingly was almost always retained in writing). Nöldeke

and even *plene* אָזְמַר Neh 2:7, &c., אָזְמַרְה Ps 42:10. In the other cases, also, where the נ is ordinarily regarded as *quiescing* in ô or ê, it is only retained orthographically, and on etymological grounds. Hence the possibility of its being dropped in the following cases:—

Always in the contracted forms of נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה, as נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה for נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה Ps 104:29; נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה 2 S 6:1 (but for נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה Jb 27:19 read נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה with the LXX); cf. also in the 1st pers. Mi 4:6 and נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה 1 S 15:6, which is apparently (from the *Metheg* with the i), intended for an *imperfect Hiphil*: instead of it, however, read, with the Mantua edition, נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה (with i, according to § 60 f). But נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה Ex 5:7 (for נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה), נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה 1 S 18:29 (for נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה), and נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה Jb 27:19 (see above) are due to a mistake, since all three forms must be derived from the stem נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה. Furthermore, נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה Ps 139:20 (where certainly נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה is to be read); נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה Pr 1:10 (cf. § 75 hh); נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה 1 S 28:24; Ez 42:5; תְּמַרְאָה 2 S 19:14; תְּמַרְאָה 2 S 20:9; וְלֹא תְּמַרְאָה thou gaddest about (from אֶזְלָה), Jer 2:36; תְּמַרְאָה Dt 33:21 (for נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה), according to other readings (on the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 75 p) נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה or נִסְתַּחֲשָׁנָה.

Paradigm I shows the weak forms of the *imperfect Qal*, and merely indicates the other conjugations, which are regular.

Rem. 1. In the derived conjugations only isolated weak forms occur: *Perfect Niphal* נִאֵתָה Nu 32:30, Jos 22:9; *Hiphil* נִאֵלָה Nu 11:25 (but the statement in verse 17 is therefore Qal); equally doubtful is the punctuation of נִבְּבָה (for נִבְּבָה?) and he laid wait, 1 S 15:5, and יִשְׁמַן I listen, Jb 32:11 (on the analogy of verbs עִשְׂרָה); cf. also אָזְלָה (ô from â) I give to eat, Hos 11:4; אָבֵדָה (ô from â) I will destroy, Jer 46:8; נִיּוֹשָׁר 2 S 20:5 *Q're* (for נִיּוֹשָׁר); the *K'tibh* appears to require the *Pi'el*, נִיּוֹשָׁר, from יִחְרָר=ニイヒラ, from יִחְרָר as a secondary form of אָזְלָה; but נִיּוֹשָׁר=ニイシラ as *imperfect Qal* is not impossible. On נִאֵתָה Neh 13:13, cf. § 53 n.—*Infinitive* לְהַכְּלִיל (=לְאַכְּלִיל unless it is rather *infin. Hiph.* from פָּול); *Participle* מִזְרָעָה giveth ear, Pr 17:4 (clearly by false analogy of verbs עִזָּה, for עִזָּה); *Imperative* יִבְּרַךְ bring (from נִאֵתָה) Jer 12:9. (On the same form used for the *perfect* in Is 21:14, cf. § 76 d.)

2. In the *Pi'el* the נ is sometimes elided (like ה in יִקְרָא, يَقْرَأ, thus (as in Aramaic and Samaritan) *teaching*, for נִאֵלָה Jb 35:11; נִלְלָה (if not a mere scribal error) for נִאֵלָה Is 13:20; נִתְנַתָּה thou hast girded me, 2 S 22:40, for נִתְנַתָּה as Ps 18:40; נִאֵלְךָנָה Ez 28:16; cf. § 23 c.)

§ 69. Verbs פְּ. First Class, or Verbs originally פְּ, e.g. בַּיִשְׁבַּע to dwell.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 141 f.; *Grundriss*, p. 596 ff.

Verbs which at present begin with Yôdh when without preformatives are divided into two classes according to their origin and consequent inflexion: (a) Verbs which (as still in Arabic and Ethiopic) originally began with *Wāw*, e.g. לְלַבְּ to give birth to, Arab. and Eth. *wālādā*. In consequence of a phonetic change which prevails also with few exceptions in the noun, this *Wāw* in Hebrew and Aramaic always becomes a Yôdh, at least when it is the initial consonant; but after preformatives it either reappears, or is again changed into Yôdh, or, lastly, is altogether elided; (b) Verbs which (as in Arabic) originally began with Yôdh (called *Verba cum Iod originario*, see § 70). A few verbs again (some with original Yôdh, and some with original *Wāw*)

(ZDMG. xxxii. 593) infers this from the fact that also in Arabic the 3rd and 2nd persons are still written *yākūlū*, *tākūlū*, but the 1st pers. *ākūlū*, not *ākūlū*.

form a special class, which in certain forms assimilates the *Wāw* or *Yâdh* to the following consonant on the analogy of the *Nûn* in verbs נָפַת (see § 71).

With regard to verbs פַּי (i.e. פַּי with original *Wāw*) it is to be noticed that—

1. In the *imperfect*, *imperative* and *infinitive construct Qal* there is a twofold inflexion, according as the *Wāw* is wholly rejected or only changed into *Yôdh*. The complete rejection (or *elision*) takes place regularly in eight verbs (see h) in the following manner:

A. *Imperfect* יִשְׁבַּע, with an unchangeable¹ *Sere* in the first syllable and original *i* in the second, which in the tone-syllable (according to § 27 c) becomes *ē* (thus יִלְאָם, יִרְדֵּן, יִצְאָה; יִלְכֵד, see x), or, under the influence of a guttural, with *ă* in the second (עִקָּע, יִקְרָא, יִתְּהַלֵּךְ).

The tone-long ē of the second syllable is of course liable to be shortened or to become Šwâ, e.g. שָׁבַע, וָיְשַׁבַּע, &c.; in the same way ā becomes Šwâ in such cases as עָלָה, &c., but is lengthened to *Qameš* in pause (וַיִּזְהֶב) and before suffixes (וְלָאֵם).

B. Imperative **ئى** with *aphaeresis* of the *Wāw* and with tone-long *ē*, from *i*, as in the *imperfect*.

C. *Infinitive* נְבָאַת from original *sibh*, by addition of the feminine ending (נ) lengthened to a *segholate* form; as in verbs גְּפָאַת (cf. § 66 b) this lengthening affords a certain compensation for loss of the initial consonant.

Rem. Since the infinitives לְעָה, לְקָה (see below, m) point to a ground-form *di[□]at, lidat*, we must, with Philippi (*ZDMG*. xxxii. 42) and Barth (ibid. xli. 606), assign to בַּתְּשׁ, &c., the ground-form *šibt* (which, therefore, reappears in בַּתְּשׁ, &c.); the apparent ground-form *šabt* rests upon the law that the *i* of the stem-syllable is changed into *a* whenever the syllable becomes doubly closed by the addition of the vowelless feminine ending.

In more than half the number of verbs וָה the original *Wāw* in the above-mentioned forms gives place to *Yōdh*, which, unless it suffers aphaeresis (see f), appears:—

in the *imperatives* קְרַב, יָרֶשׁ, and *infinitives* אִסְךֵּר, יָרֶא, as a strong consonant, but

in the *imperfect* יִירְשֶׁה̄, properly *yiyrăš*, merges with the preceding *i* into *ī*.

¹ The *e* of the first syllable is really *ê*, not tone-long *ē*, since it is retained not merely before the tone, and in the counter-tone (e.g. יְיַהּ עָם Ho 14:10), but also in אֶלְעָנָה Ex 33:13, 17. It is no objection to this view that the *scriptio plena* of this *ê* occurs (with the exception of קְרֻב Ps 72:14, elsewhere pointed קְרֻבָּה) only in Mi 1:8 and Ez 35:9 *K^eth.*; in Ps 138:6 the Masora prefers to point עִירָנָה.—Of the various explanations of the *ê* the most satisfactory is that of Philippi (*ZDMG*. xl. p. 653) that an original *yālīd*, for example (see above), became *yilid* by assimilation of the vowel of the first syllable to that of the second; this then became *yēlēd* instead of *yēlēd*, in an attempt to raise the word again in this way (by writing *ê* instead of *ē*) to a trilateral form.

In the second syllable *imperfects* of this form regularly have *ă*.

(a) That the latter forms are derived from verbs with an original *Wāw* (not *Yōdh*) is shown partly by the inflexion of these verbs in *Niph^וal*, *Hiph^וil*, and *Hoph^וal* (where the original *Wāw* reappears throughout), and partly by the Arabic, in which verbs يَد likewise exhibit a twofold formation; cf. *wālādā*, imperf. *yāliḍu*, with elision of the *Wāw*, and *wāgilā*, *yauḡalu*, with retention of the *Wāw*.

(c) On רְדָה Ju 19:11 for שׁוֹב יְרֵד Jer 42:10 for the *infinitive absolute*, cf. § 19 i.—But יְרַד Ju 5:13 (twice) is not intended by the Masora either as *perfect* (for רְדָה, which really should be restored) or as *imperative* of יְרַד, but as an apocopated *imperfect Piñel* from רְדָה (=יְרַדֶּה) (*to have dominion*).

(d) The eight verbs,¹ of which the initial consonant in the above-mentioned forms always suffers elision or aphaeresis, are לְקַרֵּב *to bring forth*, נָשַׂבֵּעַ *to go forth*, נִשְׁבַּעַ *to sit, to dwell*, יָרַדְתִּי *to descend*, also לָקַרְתִּי *to go* (cf. below, x); and with ā in the second syllable of the imperfect, יָדַעַתְּ *to know*, יָמַרְתִּי *to be united*, עֲקַרְתִּי *to be dislocated*. Examples of the other formation (שָׁנַׁתְּ, &c.) are יָצַפְתִּי *to be wearied*, יָצַעְתִּי *to counsel*, יָשַׁןְתִּי *to sleep*, יִירְאֶתְּ *(imperfect יִירְאֶה, imperative אַרְאֵ) to fear*.

2. The original *Wāw* is retained as a firm consonant: (a) in the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect Niph^{וּ}al*, being protected by the strengthening, e.g. *הַנְשֵׁב*, *יָנוֹשֶׁב*, which are consequently strong forms like *הַקְטִיל*; (b) in the *Hithpa^{וּ}el* of some verbs, e.g. *יִקְרֹב* from *הַתְּנוֹחַה*, *יַכְחֹדֵשׁ* from *הַתְּנוֹעַה*; otherwise a radical *Wāw* at the beginning of a word is now found only in a few nouns, e.g. *וְלָדָעַ* *offspring* from *לְדֹעַ* *to bear*. At the end of a syllable *Wāw* with the homogeneous vowel *ū* coalesces into *ū*; so throughout *Hoph^{וּ}al*, e.g. *הוֹשֵׁב* for *hūwšabh*; but with a preceding *a* the *Wāw* is contracted into *ô* (i); so in the *perfect* and *participle Niph^{וּ}al* and throughout *Hiph^{וּ}il*, e.g. *נוֹשֵׁב* from an original *nāwšābh*, *הוֹשִׁיב* from an original *hāwšibh*.

The first radical always appears as *Yôdh* in the *perfect* and *participle Qal*, נִשְׁבַּר, &c., even when י precedes, e.g. וַיִּשְׁבַּת, נִשְׁבָּת, according to § 24 b), also throughout *Pi*ּēl and *Pu*ּal, e.g. יִחַל to wait, יִלְדַּךְ to be born, and in the *imperfect* and *participle* יִתְחַלֵּן, יִתְعַזֵּן known (from יָדָע), and, as a rule, also in *Hithpa*ּel, e.g. הַתִּילֶךְ, הַתִּצְבֶּא (as against הַתִּזְדֹּעַ, הַתִּיחַשׁ, &c., with *Waw*).

¹ A ninth יִסַּף *to add*, is also to be included. In the *Mēša*-inscription, l. 21, the infinitive is written לְסַפֵּת (cf. יִסְפֵּת, l. 29); hence read in Is 30:1 (Nu 32:14, Dt 29:18) סָפֹת. The 2nd plur. masc. imperative Is 29:1, Jer 7:21 corresponds to שָׁבּוּ; thus in proof of a supposed סָפֵה *addere*, there remains only אָסֵף Dt 32:23, for which, according to 2 S 12:8, read אָסֵפָה.

The beginner may recognize verbs פִי in the *imperfect Qal* partly by the *Sere* under the preformatives; in *Niph[□]al* and *Hiph[□]il* by the *Wāw* (ו, י) before the second radical. (The defective writing, as in הַיְד, is rare.) Verbs פִי have forms like בָתֵשׁ (בָתֵשׁ), in common with verbs פִי. Similarly *Hoph[□]al* has the same form as in verbs עַע and עַע.

Rem. 1. The *infinitive Qal* of the weaker form (בָתֵשׁ, ground-form *sibt*, cf. above, c) with suffixes is pointed as רְשַׁתְנִי¹, שְׁבַתִּי (the strong form only in לִרְשַׁתְנִי Ju 14:15). The masculine form is very rare, e.g. עַד to know, Jb 32:6, 10, as also the feminine ending הַתִּ, e.g. הַתְצַדֵּק² Ex 2:4; Is 37:3 (2 K 19:3); Jer 13:21, Ho 9:11; רְדֵה, מְלֵא to descend, Gn 46:3, where the change of the ē into vocal Š^{wā} is to be explained, with König, from its position between the principal and secondary tone. From עַד, under the influence of the guttural, תִּ is formed, with *suff.*, &c.; but from צָאת, יָרַד there occurs in Ps 30:4 in Q^{rē} מִירְדֵּי (the *K^eth.* requires מִירְדֵּי) a very remarkable case of the strong form (for רְדֵה). For לְתִה 1 S 4:19 (generally explained as a case of assimilation of תִּ to תִּ in the supposed ground-form *ladt*; according to Mayer Lambert pausal of לְתִה=lidt, see above, c) read simply לְתִה.

Examples of the strong form of the *infinitive* are אֶרְאֶנְךָ to fear, Jos 22:25, with preposition לִי Is 51:16 (but 2 Ch 31:7 according to Ben Naphtali לִי, where the י is only retained orthographically, but is really assimilated to the ו; the reading of Ben Asher, לִיְסֹד, accepted by Baer, is meaningless); Ec 5:11; לִישֹׁן 1 S 18:29 is irregular, but probably לִרְאָן (for אֶרְאָן) is intended. With *suff.* Jb 38:4, cf. Ju 14:15, Ezr 3:12; with נ fem. לִתְכִּי to be able, Nu 14:16. On בְשַׁת which is likewise usually referred to this class, cf. the note on § 70 a.

2. The *imperative Qal* frequently has the lengthening by הַתִּ, e.g. שְׁבַתָּה sit thou, Gn 11:3, 4 even addressed to several persons (Gn 29:21 הַתִּבְנֵה before ו to avoid the hiatus); fem. Ru 3:15, Milra[□] on the analogy of the plural וְתִּבְנֵי (once in Jb 6:22 הַבִּי before the tone-syllable; but cf. Dt 32:3), whilst, on the analogy of other *imperatives Qal* of verbs הַבִּי, הַבִּי, פִי would be expected.—On צְבָא Pr 24:14, cf. § 48 l.

3. The *imperfect* with ו elided takes ā in the second syllable, besides the cases mentioned above (under f), also in צְבָד Jer 13:17 (cf. La 3:48) and in the pausal form לְלִי Jb 27:21, &c. (from לְלִי, see x); on יְקַד Is 10:16 see above, f. The ā in the second syllable, when followed by the afformative בְנֵה (בְנֵה &c.), is in accordance with the law mentioned above (under c), by which ā takes the place of ī in a doubly closed syllable. Forms with ē in the second syllable shorten the ē to Š^{ghōl}, when the tone is drawn back (before a tone-syllable or after wāw consecutive), e.g. שְׁבַתְּנִי Gn 44:33; וְשְׁבַתְּנִי R^d; but ē is retained in an open syllable, even with Mil[□]el-tone, in צְבָא Ex 16:29, Ju 9:39, in both cases with *nasog ahor*, § 29 e. The *pausal* is either of the form וְיִשְׁבְּנָא Ru 4:1 or וְיִשְׁבְּנָא Ps 18:10; the 1st pers. sing., whether in or out of pause, is וְאָלַד, וְאָלַד &c., except וְאָלַד Jb 19:10, see x.—For עַיְיַה Ps 138:6 (cf. the note above, on b and the analogous cases in § 70 d) עַיְיַה is intended.

1¹ Ps 23:6 can hardly be intended for an *infin.* with suffix from יִשְׁבָּה, but rather for a *perf. consec.* from שִׁבָּה; but read גַּי שְׁבַתִּי.

2² The infinitives קְעָה and רְדֵה belong to the source marked E (Dillmann's B) in the modern criticism of the Pentateuch. The same document also has נְתִה to give, for תִּתְהַ; קְמַת to go, for כָתַה; and עֲשָׂה to make, for עַשְׂתָה. See Dillmann, *Die BB. Num., Deut., Jos.*, p. 618.

The *imperfect* of the form יִרְשֶׁ is frequently (especially before afformatives) written defectively, in which case the *i* can always be recognized as a long vowel by the *Metheg* (see § 16 f), e.g. וְעַפּוֹ Is 40:30, וְגַעֲזָה Is 65:23; and so always רְאֵי they fear, as distinguished from אָרְאֵוּ they see (*imperf.* *Qal* of רָאַה).—On נְיִשְׁמָה Gn 50:26, 24:33 *K^eth*, and יִסְׁקַנְהָ Ex 30:32, see § 73 f.

From יָכַל to prevail, to be able, the *imperfect Qal* is יִכְלֶ, which can only have arisen through a depression of the vowel from יְכָל (ground-form *yaukhāl=yawkhāl*), to distinguish it, according to Qimḥi, from אָכָל, just as, according to § 47 b, לְקַטְּן is differentiated from לְקַטְּלָה. Cf. the Arabic *yauruu* (*yōruu*) from *warua*, *yaugālu* (*yōgālu*) from *waǵila*, as also the vulgar Arabic (among towns-people) *yūṣal*, &c., from *waṣala*. Others regard יִכְלֶ as an *imperfect Hophal* (he is enabled=he can), always used instead of the *imperfect Qal*; cf., however, § 53 u.—לְ occurs in Jer 3:5 as 2nd sing. fem. for וְתוֹךְ, according to König because the 2nd fem. had been sufficiently indicated previously.—Further רְהָ or רְ is to be regarded with M. Lambert (*REJ.* xxxvii, no. 73) as *impf. Qal* (not *Hiphil*) of יַרְתָּה to throw, shoot (the supposed *impf. Qal* נְגַרְתָּ Nu 21:30 is critically very doubtful). This is shown especially by the passages in which the *impf. Qal* is immediately preceded by the *imperat. Qal* (2 K 13:17) or *infin. Qal* (Ps 64:5), or is followed by the *participle Qal* (2 Ch 35:23; but in 2 S 11:24 by the *participle Hiphil*).

4. The attenuation of ā to i in the *perfect* (in a toneless, closed syllable) which is discussed in § 44 d (cf. § 64 f) occurs in verbs פְּזַר in a few forms of נְדַע Nu 11:12, Jer 2:27, Ps 2:7, &c. (always after ז), as well as of שְׁרֵב, e.g. יְשֻׁבָּם, &c., Dt 4:1, 8:1, 17:14, 19:1, 26:1, 31:3 (always after י for נ). In both cases the attenuation might be explained from the tendency to assimilate the vowels, especially if the initial ש was pronounced, as in Syriac, like i (§ 47 b). In the case of שְׁנָה, however, a secondary form יְרִישָׁה (cf. § 44 d) is probably to be assumed, since in Arabic also the verb is *wāriša*. The forms נְרִישָׁה Ez 36:12 and נְרִישָׁה Ps 69:36, &c., are most simply explained from the return of this i.

5. As an exception, the *imperfect Niphal* sometimes has a i instead of the ְ, e.g. וְיַהְלֵל and he stayed, Gn 8:12 (unless the *Piel* or נְיַהְלֵל, as in ver. 10, is to be read), cf. Ex 19:13; 1 S 13:8 *K^ethibh*.—The first person always has the form אֲנִישָׁב, not אֲנִישָׁבָה, cf. § 51 p.—In the *participle* the plural נְגִיִּים (from נְגַהָּ, with depression of ô to ă, cf. § 27 n) is found in Zp 3:18; cf. La 1:4. While in these cases some doubt may be felt as to the correctness of the Masoretic pointing, much more is this so in the perfect נְלִידָה null^o*dhû*, 1 Ch 3:5, 20:8, for נְלִידָה which appears to be required by the wāw in the initial syllable.

6. In the *imperfect Piel* elision of the first radical (י) sometimes takes place after wāw consec. (as in the case of נ, § 68 k), e.g. וְיִגְנַה for וְיִגְנַה and he has grieved, La 3:33, וְיִלְכַּד for וְיִלְכַּד and they have cast, verse 53, from לְכַד, which may also be a true verb פִּי (on the other hand, in יְלִיכָּל they have east lots, Jo 4:3, Ob 11, Na 3:10, a *perfect Qal* of יְלִיכָּה is required by the context; but as this, being a *transitive* perfect, ought to have the form יְלִיכָּה according to § 67 a, perhaps we should read יְלִיכָּה). So from a verb פִּשְׁבַּע, of the second class, וְיִשְׁבַּע הָיָה for וְיִשְׁבַּע הָיָה and he made it dry, Na 1:4; cf. רְמַם נְשִׁבַּע 2 Ch 32:30 *Q^erē* (the *K^eth.* points either to *Piel* רְמַם or *Hiphil* נְשִׁבַּע).

7. The *imperative Hiphil*, instead of the usual form הַוְשֵׁב, sometimes has i in the second syllable; הַוְשֵׁיעַ Is 43:8; הַוְפִּיעַ Ps 94:1 (before ה, hence probably a mere mistake for הַוְפִּעה). On the uncertainty of the tone in הַוְשִׁיעָה see § 53 m. When closed by a guttural the second syllable generally has ā, as in הַוְעַדְעָה, הַוְשַׁעְעָה, cf. also הַקְּרַבְתָּה Pr 25:17 (as in the *infin. constr.* הַוְכָח Jb

6:26; see § 65 f). On the other hand, *i* always appears when the syllable is open, thus הָוֹשֵׁבְהָ, and so also before suffixes (§ 61 g). Gn 8:17 *Q^erē* (*K^eth.* אַתָּה, see § 70 b) is irregular.—The *jussive* and the *imperfect consecutive Hiph^ol* when the tone is drawn back take *S^eghōl* in the second syllable, as in *Qal*, e.g. הִרְאֶה that he may increase, Pr 1:5, before הַלְּקָה; cf. Ex 10:28 and Dt 3:26 after אלְךָ וְיָסַף (Pr 30:6 is anomalous); in *pause*, however, also הָוֹסֵף as *jussive*, Jb 40:32 (usual *jussive* in *pause* יִשְׁבֶּה, &c., which occurs even without the pause after wāw *consecutive*, Gn 47:11, Jos 24:3, 2 S 8:4, &c.). With a final guttural עֲזָרָה and יְמָנָה (*jussive*) and וְיָכָה (*imperative*) with a final ר in *pause* רְמָתָה Ru 2:14: on סְעָם וְיִשְׁעָם Is 35:4, cf. § 65 f).—On forms like יְהֹוֹשִׁיעַ, see § 53 q.

In *Hoph^oal* ô stands instead of o, in הַזְׁעָן (for הַזְׁעָע) Lv 4:23, 28, הַגְּהָה 2 S 20:13, and perhaps in יְזָעָה (for יְזָרָה Pr 11:25; but cf. Delitzsch on the passage).—*Ptcp.* Is 12:5 *Q^ere* (חַזְקָה *K^eth*).—An *infinitive Hoph^oal* with feminine ending occurs in הַלְּקָה Gn 40:20, for בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל cf. above, t, on בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל at the end.

8. The verb הַלְּקָה *to go*, also belongs in some respects to the פֿ class, since it forms (as if from הַלְּקָה) *imperfect consecutive* הַלְּקָה, with wāw *consecutive* הַלְּקָה (in *pause* נִילְקָה Gn 24:61, &c.), 1st sing. הַלְּקָה (but in Jb 19:10 אַלְקָה); *infinitive construct* הַלְּקָה with suff. (S^eghōl under the influence of the following palatal, as in גַּכְיָה, cf. also גַּגְיָה); *imperative* הַלְּקָה, in the lengthened form הַלְּקָה (as an interjection referring even to a *feminine*, Gn 19:32, or a *plural*, Gn 31:44) and הַלְּקָה (Nu 23:13, Ju 19:13, 2 Ch 25:17); *Hiph.* (also in Ex 2:9 הַוְלִיקָה 2nd *sem. imperative* is to be read for הַלְּקָה, which probably arose merely through confusion with the following הַלְּקָה); *imperfect* הַוְלִיקָה, but in the 1st sing. of the *imperfect consecutive* always הַאֲוְלִיקָה Lv 26:13, Am 2:10, &c. Rarely, and almost exclusively late or in poetry, the regular inflexions of הַלְּקָה are also found: *imperf.* הַלְּקָה (Ps 58:9, &c.; but הַלְּקָה Ex 9:23, Ps 73:9; cf. § 64 a and h); אֲהַלְקָה Jb 16:22, also Mēšā^o inscription, line 14, אֲהַלְקָה (Ex 3:19, Nu 22:13 f.16, Ec 6:8, 9); *imperative plur.* הַלְּכוּ Jer 51:50. On the other hand, the *perfect Qal* is always הַלְּקָה, *participle* הַלְּקָה, *infinitive absolute* הַלְּקָה, *Niph^oal* הַלְּקָה, *Pi^oel* הַלְּקָה, *Hithpa^oel* הַהַלְּקָה, so that הַ never rears unmistakably as the first radical. The usual explanation of the above forms is nevertheless based on a supposed obsolete *halikh*. It is, however, more correct to regard the apparent פֿ forms of הַלְּקָה with Praetorius (ZAW. ii. 310 ff.) as originating with the *Hiph^ol*, of which the ground-form *hahlikh* became *halikh*, and this again, on the analogy of the *imperfect Qal* of verbs פֿ, *holikh*. This *holikh* being referred to a supposed *haulikh* (properly *hawlikh*) gave rise to new formations after the manner of verbs פֿ.

§ 70. Verbs פֿ. Second Class, or Verbs properly פֿ, e.g. בְּנֵי-בְּנֵי to be good. Paradigm L.

Brockelmann, Semit. Sprachwiss., p. 143 ff.; Grundriss, p. 603 ff.

Verbs properly פֿ differ from verbs פֿ in the following points:

1. In *Qal* the initial Yôdh never suffers aphaeresis or elision; hence the *infinitive* has the form בְּשָׁבֵד² the *imperfect* בְּשָׁבֵד, יִתְבָּשֵׁב, יִתְבָּשֵׁת (in *pause* בְּשָׁבֵד), also written בְּשָׁבֵד, &c.;

¹ Cf. above, m, note 2.

ZAW. ZAW. = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

² This may be inferred from בְּבִשְׁת (Is 27:11, which with its fem. בְּבִשְׁת Gn 8:7, is the only example of an *infinitive construct Qal* of these verbs. No example of the

and so always with a tone-bearing *ă* in the second syllable, even after *wāw consec.*, e.g. זִקְנֵי, except זִקְרָא Gn 9:24, and Gn 2:7, 19, unless זִקְרָא is to be included among verbs (cf. נוֹצֵר פ"ז Is 43:10).

2. In *Hiphil* the original form is regularly contracted to **הִטֵּב** (rarely written **יִשְׁרָאֵל**) and the uncontracted form is **יִשְׁרָאֵל**. Instances of the uncontracted form are Pr 4:25, according to Barth (see above, § 67 p), an example of an *i-imperfect* of *Qal*, since the *Hiphil* is otherwise always *causative*; **הַשְׁרָאֵל** (*imperative*) Ps 5:9 *Q'reh* (the *Keth.* requires **הוֹשֶׁר** according to the form of verbs **פִּזְרָאֵל**; cf. Is 45:2, **אוֹשֵׁר** *Keth.*, *Q'reh*), cf. Gn 8:17 *Q'reh*; 1 Ch 12:2, to be explained as a denominative from **אִישָׁם** Ho 7:12 (§ 24 f, note), but perhaps the punctuation here is only intended to suggest another reading **אִיסְרָם**; **יִמְצָא**.

Rem. 1. The only verbs of this kind are: יִבְּרַךְ *to be good* (only in the *imperfect Qal* and in *Hiphil*; in the *perfect Qal*, a verb טֹוב עַזָּעַ, is used instead), יִנְקַח *to suck*, יִקְרַב *to awake*, *to form* (but see above, a), יִלְלֶה only in *Hiphil* הַיְלֵל *to bewail*, יִשְׁרֵךְ *to be straight, right*, also יִבְשֵׂש (Arabic *yabišā*) *to be dry* (but *Hiphil* הַבְּשֵׂש 2 S 19:6, on the analogy of verbs פַּעַם; on Is 30:5, cf. § 72 x), and the *Hiphil* הַיְמִינֵּל (denominative from יְמִין), infin. לְהַמִּינָה 2 S 14:19 *to go to the right*.

2. In some examples of the *imperfect Hiphil* □*i* the preformative has been subsequently added to the contracted form: יְיַעֲשֵׂה **Jb 24:21**; יְיַלֵּיל **Is 15:2, 3, 16:7**; אִזְלֵיל **Jer 48:31**; plur. **יְיָלִוּ**, **יְיָלִים** **Ho 7:14**, cf. **Is 65:14**. Qimḥi and others explain the above forms from a phonetic interchange of *Yodh* and *He*, arising from the unsyncopated forms יְהַלֵּיל, &c. (cf. **Is 52:5**). It is, perhaps, more correct to suppose that the regular forms (יְיַלֵּיל, יְיַעֲשֵׂה) were originally intended, but that in the later pronunciation the syllable was broken up in order to restore artificially the preformative which had become merged in the first radical.

Isolated anomalies are: *perfect Hiph* הִלֵּל Ez 36:11 with separating vowel (for on the analogy of verbs; *imperfect* יְיַצֵּב for יִצְבֶּה 1 K 1:47; *imperfect Qal* for וְתַנְקֵחַ he takes (תָּנַקֵּב Na 3:8; *imperfect Hiph* הִלֵּא Ex 2:9, either an error for וְתַנְקֵחַ, or an irregular shortening of the first syllable, caused by the forward movement of the tone. Similarly, the *Hiph* הִקְרִיץ (from קֹוץ) is always used instead of הַקְרִיצָה from קָרַץ; hence also הַקְרִיצָה, *imperat.* וְיַבְשֵׁה—On הַקְרִיצָה Na 1:4, see § 69 u).

§ 71. Verbs "וְ. Third Class, or Verbs with Yôdh assimilated.

In some verbs פְּיַ, the *Yôdh* (or the original *Wâw*) does not quiesce in the preceding vowel, but is regarded as a full consonant, and, like *Nûn*,¹ is assimilated to the following consonant. These forms, therefore, belong properly to the class of strong verbs. Assimilation invariably takes place in צָעַ (prop. צָעֵן) *to spread under*; *Hiph*[□]*il*, *Hoph*[□]*al*, *הצָאַת*; יִצְחַת, *to burn*, imperfect יִצְחַת, *Niph*[□]*al*, נִצְחַת, *Hiph*[□]*il* (in Is 27:4 also אֲצַחַת) is to be read with König; in 2 S 14:30 the Masora has rightly emended the *K'ethibh* וְהַצִּיתִתְהָ, which could only be the 1st sing. perf. of a verb פְּיַ, to

imperative Qal is found: consequently the forms נִמְלָא, &c. (in Paradigm L of the earlier editions of this Grammar), are only inferred from the *imperfect*.

¹ These verbs, like verbs **עָזַב** (cf. above, note on § 67 g), may perhaps have been influenced by the analogy of verbs **נָזַב**.

the imperative וְהִצְבֵּת וְהַצְבָּת in agreement with the context and all the early versions); גִּזְבֹּן, *Hiph^לil* הַצִּיבָּן *to place*, *Hoph^לal* אַצְבָּן; and probably also in the forms ordinarily derived from נִצְבֵּב, viz. נִצְבֵּב (*Niph^לal*), הַצִּיבָּב, גִּזְבָּב; at any rate a stem יִצְבֶּב is implied by the *Hithpa^לel* הַתִּצְבְּבָה; instead of the anomalous וְתִצְבֵּב Ex 2:4 read with the Samaritan וְתִצְבֵּב. Besides the common form we find once קְצַבְתִּי in Is 44:3 (from קִצְבָּה *pour*) with a *transitive* meaning, beside קְצַבְתִּי *intransitive*, 1 K 22:35. Elsewhere the *imperfect consecutive* has the form קְצַבְתִּי Gn 28:18, 35:14, &c., cf. § 69 f, where also other forms of קִצְבָּה are given; וְיִצְרֶר and צִרְבָּה (Is 44:12, 49:8, Jer 1:5 *Q^erē*), from יִצְרֶר *to form*, are, however, used in the same sense. Cf. also אֲסֹרֶם Ho 10:10; וְנִישַׁרְתִּי (for according to § 47 k) 1 S 6:12; לִפְתַּח 2 Ch 31:7 (cf. § 69 n) and Is 28:16. This assimilation is found always with sibilants (most frequently with צ) except in the case of גִּזְקָה 1 K 3:15 (so ed. Mant., Ginsb., Kittel; but *Jabl.*, Baer גִּזְקָה) and in לִזְתָּה Gn 40:20, Ez 16:5 (cf. הַוְלָתָה verse 4), *infinitive Hoph^לal* of לִזְתָּה (cf. § 69 t).

§ 72. Verbs יְעַזְבֵּן (vulgo יְעַזְבֵּן), e.g. מִקְרָב to rise up. Paradigm M.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 144 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 605 ff.

1. According to § 67 a large number of monosyllabic stems were brought into agreement with the trilateral form by a strengthening, or repetition, of the second radical, i.e. of the *consonantal* element in the stem. In another large class of stems the same object has been attained by strengthening the *vocalic* element. The ground-form used for these verbs is not, as in other cases (§ 39 a), the 3rd sing. *mast. perfect*, but always the *infinitive construct* form (§ 39 b), the ָu of which is characteristic also of the *imperative* and of the *imperfect indicative Qal*. These stems are consequently termed verbs יְעַזְבֵּן or more correctly (see below) יְעַזְבָּן.¹

Jabl. *Jabl.* = *Biblia Hebraica ex recensione D. E. Jablonski, Berolini, 1699.*

¹ The term יְעַזְבֵּן was consequent on the view that the *Wāw* (or ָu in the case of verbs יְעַזְבֵּן) in these stems was originally consonantal. This view seemed especially to be supported by the return of the *Wāw* in *Pi^לel* (עַזְבֵל, the ָu usually passing into ָu as in קִים, cf. Arabic *qáwwámā*), and by certain forms of the *absolute state* of the nouns of such stems, e.g. מִתְּעַזְבָּה death, compared with מִתְּמַתָּה to die. Hence in explaining the verbal forms a supposed stem *qawam* (in verbs יְעַזְבֵּן e.g. šayat) was always assumed, and קִום was referred to an original *yaqwūm*, the *infinitive absolute* בְּקִום to original *qawōm*, the *participle passive* קִום to original *qawūm*. It must, however, be admitted: (1) that forms like עַזְבָּן, קִים (see m) are only to be found in the latest books, and are hence evidently secondary as compared with the pure Hebrew forms קִום, &c.; (2) that to refer the verbal forms invariably to the stem קִום, leads in many cases to phonetic combinations which are essentially improbable, whereas the assumption of original *middle-vowel* stems renders a simple and natural explanation almost always possible. These יְעַזְבֵּן stems are therefore to be rigidly distinguished from the real יְעַזְבָּן stems of the strong forms, such as פְּרַעַע, קְנוּעַ, &c. (see below, gg).—As early as the eleventh century the right view with regard to יְעַזְבָּן stems was taken by Samuel Hannagid (cf. Bacher, *Leben und Werke des AbulwaléEd*, p. 16); recently by Böttcher (*Lehrbuch*, § 1112), and (also as to יְעַזְבָּן stems) especially by Müller, Stade, and Wellhausen (see above, § 67 a, note). On the other hand, the old view of ָu and ָu as consonants has been recently revived by Philippi, Barth, M. Lambert, and especially Brockelmann (op. cit.).

2. As in the case of verbs עַז, the monosyllabic stem of verbs עָז generally takes the vowel which would have been required in the *second* syllable of the ordinary strong form, or which belonged to the ground-form, since this is essentially characteristic of the verbal form (§ 43 b; § 67 b). However, it is to be remarked: (a) that the vowel, short in itself, becomes of necessity long in an open syllable as well as in a tone-bearing closed *ultima* (except in *Hophal*, see d), e.g. 3rd sing. *mast. perf.* מָקַם, *fem.* מָקַת, *plur.* מָקָת, but in a closed *penultima* מָקָת, &c.¹; (b) that in the forms as we now have them the lengthening of the original short vowel sometimes takes place irregularly. Cf. f.

Intransitive verbs *middle e* in the *perfect Qal* have the form מֵת *he is dead*; verbs *middle o* have the form אָזֵר *he shone*, בָּשֵׂר *he was ashamed*, מָבוֹב *he was good*.² Cf. n-r.

3. In the *imperfect Qal*, *perfect Niphal*, and throughout *Hiphil* and *Hophal* the short vowel of the preformatives in an open syllable before the tone is changed into the corresponding tone-long vowel. In *Qal* and *Niphal* the original ā is the basis of the form and not the ī attenuated from ā (§ 67 h; but cf. also h below, on שְׁבֹועַ), hence קִיּוּם, for *yāqūm*; נִקּוּם for *nāqōm*; on the other hand, in the *perfect Hiphil* הִקְיָם for *hiqūm*; *participle* קִיּוּם (on the Šere cf. z); *perfect Hophal* הִקְמָה for *hūqam*.

A vowel thus lengthened before the tone is naturally changeable and becomes *vocal Šewâ* when the tone is moved forward, e.g. יְמִיתֵּנָה *he will kill him*; so also in the 3rd *plur. imperfect Qal* with *Nün paragogic*; וְיִמְתַּחֲדֵה (without *Nün*). The wholly abnormal *scriptio plena* of ē in קִיּוּם, תִּקְיָם (beside קִיּוּם in the same verse) should, with König, be emended to קִיְמָה; the incorrect repetition of the interrogative necessarily led to the pointing of the form as *perfect* instead of *imperfect*.—But in *Hophal* the ū is retained throughout as an unchangeable vowel, when it has been introduced by an abnormal lengthening for the tone-long ō (as in the *Hophal* of verbs עַז).

4. The cases of unusual vowel lengthening mentioned in b are: *imperfect Qal* קִיּוּם (also in Arabic *yāqūmu*), but *jussive* with normal lengthening (§ 48 g), מִקְיָם, with retraction of the tone מִקְיָם (yāqōm), מִקְיָם (in *pause* מִקְיָם); *imperative* קִיּוּם, with normal lengthening of the ū in the 2nd *plur. fem.* קִיְמָה, since, according to § 26 p, the ū cannot be retained in a closed penultima; *infinitive construct* קִיּוּם. In *Hiphil* the original ī is naturally lengthened to ī (הִקְיָם), *imperfect* קִיּוּם, *jussive* מִקְיָם, with retraction

¹ ² In Aramaic, however, always מָקַת; also in Hebrew grammars before Qimḥi מָקַת, מָקַת, מָקַת, &c., are found, but in our editions of the Bible this occurs only in *pause*, e.g. מָקַת Mi 7:8, מָקַת 2 K 7:3, 4.

² According to Stade (*Grammatik*, § 385 e and f) the e in מֵת is of the nature of a diphthong (from ai, which arose from the union of the vowel ī, the sign of the intransitive, with the ā of the root), and likewise the o in אָזֵר, &c. (from au). But ō (from au) could not, by § 26 p, remain in a closed penultima (בָּשָׂר, &c.); consequently the o of these forms can only be tone-long, i.e. due to lengthening of an original ū, and similarly the ē of מֵת to lengthening of an original ī. This is confirmed by the fact that the ō in אָזֵר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, 3rd *plur. perfect*, nearly always (the instances are 11 to 2), written defectively. Forms like אָזֵר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, &c., are therefore due to orthographic licence.

of the tone םְקַבֵּל , םְקָבִיל); on the transference of this i to the *Hiphil* of the strong verb, cf. § 53 a.

The following forms require special consideration: the *participle Qal* מִקָּן is to be traced to the ground-form with *â* unobscured, Arab. *qâtil*, § 9 q, and § 50 b. On this analogy the form would be *qâim*,¹ which after absorption of the *i* became מִקָּן, owing to the predominating character of the *â*. The unchangeableness of the *â* (*plur.* מִקְנִים, *constr.* מִקָּן, &c.) favours this explanation.

In the *imperfect Qal*, besides the forms with original *ü* (now *â*) there are also forms with original *ă*. This *ă* was lengthened to *ā*, and then further obscured to *ô*; hence especially **בָּאֵם** (*yib'ōm*), **בָּיִבְאָה** (*yib'āh*), &c., from the *perfect* **בָּאַ** *he has come*. In the *imperfects* **יָאֹר** (*yā'ōr*) (but cf. **רָנָה** *rānah* 1 S 14:27) and **יָבֹשׁ** (*yābōsh*) from the *intransitive perfects* **אָוֶר** (*ā'ōr*), **בָּשָׁת** (*bāshat*) (see above, c), most probably also in **תָּאִזְעָה** (*tā'azah*) 2 K 12:9, **נָאֹתָה** (*nā'ōtah*) Gn 34:15 from an unused *אָוָת* *to consent*, and perhaps in **מָקָם** (*māqām*) 1 S 4:5, &c., as in the cases noticed in § 63 e and especially § 67 n, the *ē* of the preformative is lengthened from *i* (which is attenuated from original *ă*) and thus *yī-bāš* became *yī-bāš*, and finally *yē-bōš*. Finally the *Niph.* **נָקָם** (*nā-qām*), *imperfect* **מָקָם** (*māqām*) from *yiqqām*, originally (§ 51 m) *yinqām*, arises in the same way from the obscuring of *ā* lengthened from *ă*.

5. In the *perfect Niph^וal* and *Hiph^וił* a *וֹ* is inserted before the afformatives beginning with a consonant in the 1st and 2nd persons, and '־ָ' regularly (but see Rem.) in the *imperfect Qal*, sometimes also in the *imperfect Hiph^וił* (as in **תְּבִיאֵנָה Lv 7:30**, cf. **תְּהִיאֵנָה Mi 2:12**), before the termination of **נוּ**. As in verbs **עַיָּע** (§ 67 d and note) these *separating vowels* serve as an artificial opening of the preceding syllable, in order to preserve the long vowel; in the *perfect Hiph^וił*, however, before the *וֹ*, instead of the *i* an *e* is somewhat often found² (as a normal lengthening of the original *i*), especially after *wāw consecutive*, Dt 4:39, 30:1, as well as before the afformatives **מְנֻהָה** and **נְנֻהָה** or before suffixes, Dt 22:2, 1 S 6:8, 1 K 8:34, Ez 34:4. For in all these cases the tone is removed from the *וֹ* to the following syllable, and this forward movement of the tone produces at the same time a weakening of the *i* to *e*; thus **הַקִּים וּתְ** (or **הַקִּים וּתְ**, Ex 19:23, cf. x), but **מְנֻהָה עַל-נֻהָה קְרִ'קְרִ'** (cf., however, **וּהַקִּם נְנוּהָ Mi 5:4**). In the same way in the 1st pers. sing. of the *perfect Niph^וal*, the *o* before the separating vowel is always modified to *û* ('**וּקְוּם וּתְ**); cf. v. In the *imperfect Qal* and *Hiph^וił* the separating vowel '־ָ' always bears the tone (**וּקְוּמָתְ יְנָה**).

Without the separating vowel and consequently with the tone-long \bar{o} and \bar{e} instead of \hat{u} and \hat{i} we find in *imperfect Qal* (see § 76 g) תְּשִׁיבֵנִה Ez 16:55 (also תְּבָנֶה in the same verse); תְּיִשְׁבַּנְהָ 1 S 7:14 (cf. Ez 35:9 *Q'reh*; on the *K'thibh* cf. above, note on § 69 b); תְּרַאֲנָה 1 S 14:27, from (K'thibh וְתַرְאָנָה *and they saw*, see § 75 w); in *Hiphil*, e.g. רָבָנָה the פְתָח.

¹ So in Arabic, prop. *qâi* \square *m*, since the two vowels are kept apart by the insertion of an *š*, cf. Aram. **שָׁקַ**; but also contracted, as *šâk*, *hâr*, for *šâi* \square *k*, &c. (cf. Wright's *Gramm. of the Arabic Language*, 2nd ed. vol. i. p. 164).

2² 1 S 6:7 (cf. 2 Ch 6:25) could only be an orthographic licence for; perhaps, however, וְהַשְׁבִּיבָם was originally intended.

Ex 20:25, also **בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** Jb 31:21; **וְתַלְתִּי** Jer 22:26; with a separating vowel, e.g. **בָּזָא** Lv. 7:30 from **בָּזָא** S^eghól without **י** occurs in the *imperfect Qal* in **תִּמְוֹת נָה** Ez 13:19, Zc 1:17; and in *Hiphil* Mi 2:12: the Dageš in the *Nün* is, with Baer, to be rejected in all three cases according to the best authorities. Wholly abnormal is **פֶּקֶד יִמְנָה** Jer 44:25, probably an erroneous transposition of **יִמְנָה** (for **פֶּקֶד יִמְנָה**), unless it originates from an incorrect spelling **פֶּקֶד יִמְנָה** or **פֶּקֶד יִמְנָה**.

6. The tone, as in verbs יְמַלֵּךְ (cf. § 67 k), is also generally retained on the stem-syllable in verbs יְמַלֵּךְ before the afformatives הָיָה, הִנֵּה; thus בָּנָה 2 K 19:21, probably for the sake of rhythmical uniformity with the following לְעָגָה; after *wāw consecutive* וְשָׁבָה Is 23:17); קָמוּ (but also קָם, cf. Is 28:7, 29:9, Na 3:18, Ps 76:6, Pr 5:6, La 4:18; וְרֹצֶחֶן 1 S 8:11; so especially before a following א, cf. § 49 l, Nu 13:32; וְנָעַד Is 19:1; before ע, Ps 131:1, Pr 30:13, La 4:14); יְקַרְבֵּן, but before a suffix or with *Nün paragogic* וְיַסְכֵּן 2 Ch 28:15; יְקַרְבֵּם Dt 33:11, &c.

7. The formation of the conjugations *Pi* \square *ēl*, *Pu* \square *al*, and *Hithpa* \square *ēl* is, strictly speaking, excluded by the nature of verbs ע"ז. It is only in the latest books that we begin to find a few secondary formations, probably borrowed from Aramaic, on the analogy of verbs ע"ז (with consonantal נ, see below, gg); e.g. the *Pi* \square *ēl* עָזַע to surround, only in Ps 119:61; and with change of נ to י, Est 9:31, קִימֵץ Est 9:27, *impf.* עָזַע, קִימֵץ Ps 119:106, *infin.* קִימֵץ Ez 13:6, Ru 4:7 &c., Est 9:21 &c., *imperat.* קִימֵץ נִי Ps 119:28; וְחִכְתָּם Dn 1:10 from חָבֶב to be guilty. The *Hithpa* \square *ēl* Jos 9:12, which belongs to the older language, is probably a denominative from יָצַא. On the other hand the otherwise less common conjugation *Pōlēl* (see § 55 c), with its passive and reflexive, is usually employed in the sense of *Pi* \square *ēl* and as a substitute for it, e.g. רֹצַם מוות to set up from קומם; מותה to slaughter, 1 S 14:13, 17:51, 2 S 1:9, from קומם; רֹצַם to exalt, passive רֹצַם, from רום; reflexive הַתְעַרְרֵר to stir up oneself (cf. Jb 17:8 in pause) from עור; reciprocal הַתְבִשֵּׁשְׁ to be ashamed before one another, Gn 2:25. The conjugation *Pilpēl* (§ 55 f), on the analogy of verbs ע"ז, is less common, e.g. טַלְטֵל to hurl away from קְרַקְרָה, כְּנַלְלָה to contain from פְּלַכְלָה; טויל to destroy from קויל.

REMARKS

On Qal.

1. Of verbs *middle e* and *o*, in which, as in the strong verb, the *perfect* and *participle* have the same form (§ 50.2), the following are the only examples: מַתָּה *he is dead, fem.* מַתָּה, 2nd masc. הַמְתָּה (cf. § 44 g; § 66 h); 1st sing. מִתְּהִי (even in *pause*, Gn 19:19); plur. מִתְּהוּ, 1st pers. אָזֵר; בְּשׁוֹ, בְּשָׁנוּ, בְּשָׁתִי, בְּשָׁתָה; בְּשָׁתְּנוּ, in *pause* מִתְּנָנוּ, in *it has shone, plur.* בְּשָׁתְּנוּ. *Participles* מַתָּה *a dead man* (plur. בְּשָׁתִים, מַתִּים); מַתָּה *ashamed*, Ez 32:30. For נִתְּנָה Is 27:11 read נִתְּנָה, or, with LXX, γενέται.

Isolated anomalies in the *perfect* are: וְשַׁבָּה (with the original ending of the *fem.* for נִשְׁבָּה) Ez 46:17 (see § 44 f); אֲצֹקָה Is 26:16 (see § 44 l).—In בְּנֵי S 25:8 (for בְּזֵאוֹן) the נ has been dropped contrary to custom. In בְּאֵל Jer 27:18 (instead of בְּאֵלֶּה) the Masora seems to point

to the *imperfect* יְבָאֵי which is what would be expected; as *Yôdh* precedes, it is perhaps simply a scribal error.

The form מִקְמָה occurs (cf. § 9 b) with נ in the *perfect*, אָמַם **Ho 10:14**, also in the *participles* לֹאַט softy, **Ju 4:21**, שָׁאַל poor, **2 S 12:1, 4**, **Pr 10:4**, plur. 13:23; מִתְעַשֵּׂש doing despite unto (unless שָׁאַל is to be read, from a stem טָאַש whence טָאַש Ez 25:15, 36:5), **Ez 28:24, 26**; fem. 16:57; also in **Zc 14:10** רְאַמְתָּה is to be read with Ben-Naphtali for הָרְאַמְתָּה. On the analogy of participles of verbs *middle ò* (like בּוֹשִׁים, see above) occurs קְמִים 2 **K 16:7** and even with a transitive meaning לֹוֹט occultans, **Is 25:7**; **Zc 10:5**.—*Participle passive*, מִוּל circumcised; but סָוֶג a backslider, **Pr 14:14**, and put aside, **Is 49:21** (cf. **Jer 17:13** Q^{rē}), are verbal adjectives of the form qāṭūl (§ 50 f), not passive participles. For חַשְׁמָה hastening, **Nu 32:17**, read שְׁזַבְּיָה as in **Ex 13:18**; for שְׁזַבְּיָה **Mi 2:8** read שְׁזַבְּיָה.

2. Imperfects in ָ almost always have the corresponding *imperative* and *infinitive construct* in ָ, as קְוּם, *imperative* and *infinitive* קְוֻם (also defectively written קְוָם); but יְדֹוּשׁ he threshes (*infin.* דֹוָשׁ), has *imperative* דֹוָשׁ (fem.), **Mi 4:13**; יְמֹוּט infinitive (Ps 38:17, 46:3); cf. נְנַחַת (also נְנַחַת **Nu 11:25** and נְנַחַת elsewhere) with the *imperfects* יְנַחַת and נְנַחַת **Is 7:2** (with the *imperfects* יְנַחַת and נְנַחַת); **Is 30:2**; שְׁוּבָה **Jos 2:16**; רְוָם **Ez 10:17** (verse 16). **Rom**

Where the *imperfect* (always intransitive in meaning) has ô the *imperative* and *infinitive* also have it; thus *imperfect* יְבֹזָא, *infin.* יְבָא¹, or בֹּזָא; יְבָא¹; **2 S 2:32**, גְּזָר¹; בְּגָר¹; בְּגָרָא, &c.—**Jb 8:14** (if it be a verb at all and not rather a substantive) is formed on the analogy of verbs עָעַד, since the *imperfect* of קָוָט appears as אָקָוָט in **Ps 95:10**. On the other hand יְקַשֵּׁן (as if from קָשֵׁן, on the analogy of בְּבָאָה, &c.) occurs as *imperfect* of שְׁקַשְׁפָּה (פָּפָה). The *imperfect* יְדֹזֵן, with ô, **Gn 6:3**, probably in the sense of to rule, has no corresponding *perfect*, and is perhaps intentionally differentiated from the common verb יְדִין to judge (from עָדֵן, עָדֵין). Or can יְדֹזֵן be a *jussive* after לְאָתָה (cf. § 109 d)? Similarly לְאָתָה might be taken as a case of a *jussive* after לְאָתָה, with irregular *scriptio plena* (as in **Ju 16:30**), in **Dt 7:16, 13:9, 19:13, 21, 25:12**, **Ez 5:11, 7:4, 9, 8:18, 9:10**. But perhaps in all these cases was originally intended, as in **Is 13:18**, **Jer 21:7**, while cases like סְחַדְתִּי **Ps 72:13** are to be explained as in § 109 k.—The *infinitive absolute* always has ô, e.g. קְוֻם יְקַר וּמְזִמְרָה **Jer 44:29**.

3. In the *imperative* with afformatives (קְוָמָה, קְוָמִי) the tone is on the stem syllable (cf., however, **Ju 5:12** intentionally varied from עָוֵר יְעֵר, **Zc 13:7** and **Is 51:9** beside **Zc 9:9**; **Is 21:2**, **Ps 116:7**, likewise for rhythmical reasons). So also the lengthened form, as שְׁוָה יְשָׁה Jer 3:12, **Ps 7:8**, and verse 7. But if an נ follows in close connexion, the lengthened *imperative* usually has the form קְוָעָה, &c., ¹ in order to avoid a hiatus, e.g. **Ju 4:18**, **Ps 82:8**; hence also before הָהָן, Q^{rē} perpetuum (§ 17 c), e.g. **Ps 3:8, 7:7** קְוָעָה (cf., however, in the same verse עָוֵר and in **Jer 40:5**, שְׁבָה before נָה), and so even before רָהָב **Ps 43:1, 74:22**, &c. (רְיָבָה).

4. In the *jussive*, besides the form מִקְרָם (see above, f), also occurs (as subjunctive, **Ec 12:4**; גְּסָוג **Ps 80:19** may also, with Delitzsch, be regarded as a voluntative), incorrectly written *plene*, and מִקְרָם (Gn 27:31; cf. **Ju 6:18**, **Pr 9:4, 16**), which, however, is only orthographically different from מִקְרָם (cf. **Jer 46:6**). In the *imperfect consecutive* (מִקְרָם, in pause מִקְרָם, see above, f) if there be a guttural or ר in the last syllable, ă often takes the place of ô, e.g. נִנְחָה and he

¹ In 1 **K 14:12** בְּבָאָה before a genitive), the text is evidently corrupt: read with Klostermann after the LXX בְּבָאָה.

¹ Cf. Delitzsch's commentary on **Ps 3:8**.

rested; וְנִעַן and it was moved; וְנִסַּרְתָּ and he turned aside, Ju 4:18, Ru 4:1 (distinguished only by the sense from *Hiphil* וְנִסַּרְתָּ and he removed, Gn 8:13); וְנִצְרָא Ex 21:4, 2 K 5:23, 17:5 (but also וְנִצְרָא from both נִזְרָא to sojourn, and נִזְרָא to fear); וְנִעַשׂ (to be distinguished from וְנִשְׁבָּא and he flew, Is 6:6) and he was weary, Ju 4:21, 1 S 14:28, 31, 2 S 21:15, but probably in all these cases וְנִיעַשׂ for וְנִיְשָׁרֵף is intended. For וְתַלְוָשׁ 2 S 13:8 *Keth.*, the Qere rightly requires שְׁלַוְתָּה. On the other hand, in an open syllable always וְנִיסְרָא וְנִזְרָא, &c. On נִקְוּם (נִקְוָם), see § 49 e.

Examples of the full plural ending וְנִ are given with the tone (see above, I) are וְנִתְמַמָּת Gn 3:3, 4; וְנִנְוֹס Ps 104:7; יְרֻוָץ וְנִ Jo 2:4, 7, 9.

On Niph'al.

5. The form of the 1st sing. perf. נִקְוּם וְתִי, which frequently occurs (נִסְתָּרְתִּי, cf. also the ptcp. plur. נִכְוָקִים, Ex 14:3), serves as a model for the 2nd sing. נִקְוּמָת וְתִּי, and the 1st plur. נִקְוּמוֹת given in the paradigm, although no instances of these forms are found; but of the 2nd plur. the only examples found have ô (not â), viz. נִפְגַּזְתֶּם ye have been scattered, Ez 11:17, 20:34, 41, and נִנְקַטְתֶּם and ye shall loathe yourselves, Ez 20:43, 36:31.—To the i' (instead of ā) of the preformative may be traced the perfect Zc 2:17 (analogous to the perfect and participle נִמְלָאֵל, see below, ee), imperfect יִשְׁעַר for yi^רōr.—The infinitive construct נִדְוָשׁ occurs in Is 25:10; in לְאֹזֶר Jb 33:30, the Masora assumes the elision of the ה (for אֹזֶר?); but probably לְאֹזֶר (Qal) is intended (see § 51 l).—Is 14:31, נִסְתָּרְתִּי Is 59:13 are to be regarded as infinitives absolute.

On Hiph'il, Hoph'al, and Pi'elēl.

6. Examples of the perfect without a separating vowel (see above, k), are: הַבְּתָה, הַמְּתָה (from מְתָה) for *hemáth-tā* (cf. § 20 a); הַבְּתָה 1st plur. perfect *Hiphil* הַבְּתָה from פְּנֵן 2 Ch 29:19, even מְמַתָּה (§ 27 s) Nu 17:6, &c.; cf. 1 S 17:35, 2 S 13:28, also הַמְּתָה, Ex 1:16, and הַמְּתָה Ho 2:5; but elsewhere, with wāw consecutive הַמְּתָה, Is 14:30; cf. הַמְּלָתָה Jer 16:13, and הַמְּתָה Ex 29:24, &c.—In these cases the ē of the first syllable is retained in the secondary tone; elsewhere in the second syllable before the tone it becomes ֤ (1 Ch 15:12, &c.) or more frequently ֤, and in the syllable before the antepenultima it is necessarily ֤ (e.g. יְמַתָּה Gn 6:18). Before a suffix in the 3rd sing. mase. (except Gn 40:13) and fem., and in the 3rd plur., the vowel of the initial syllable is *Hateph-Sghôl*, in the other persons always *Hateph-Pathâh* (König); on תְּזַבְּחַת 2 K 9:2, Ps 89:44, cf. Ex 19:23, Nu 31:28, Dt 4:39, 22:2, 27:2, 30:1, Ez 34:4, and above, i. The 3rd fem. perf. *Hiph.* הַמְּתָה 1 K 21:25 is quite abnormal for סְוִתָּה יְתָה from סְוִתָּה or סְוִתָּה.

As in verbs עַז with ה for their first radical (§ 67 w), all the forms of עַז Ex 19:23 (where against the rule given under i we find הַמְּתָה, הַעֲזָה with ē instead of i), Dt 8:19, Neh 9:34, Jer 42:19, and עַז Is 41:25, 45:13, take Pathâh in these conjugations instead of ֤. The irregular הַזְּבַחַת Zc 10:6 has evidently arisen from a combination of two different readings, viz. הַזְּבַחַת (from שָׁבֵב) and בְּזַבְבָּתִים (from שָׁבֵב): the latter is to be preferred.—On הַבְּשִׁתָּה and הַזְּבַחַת as a (metaplastic) perfect *Hiphil* of שָׁבֵב, cf. § 78 b.

7. In the imperative, besides the short form קְרַב (on בְּקַרְבָּה Is 42:22 with Silluq, cf. § 29 q; but in Ez 21:35 for קְרַבְבָּה read the infinitive קְרַבְבָּה) the lengthened form קְרַבְבָּה is also found. With

suffix נִי, הַקִּימֵם, &c. The *imperative* הַבְּרִיא Jer 17:18 is irregular (for Gn 43:16); perhaps (as in 1 S 20:40; cf. 2 K 8:6) is intended, or it was originally הַבְּרִיא.

In the *infinitive*, elision of the ה occurs in לְבִיא Jer 39:7, 2 Ch 31:10 (for לְהַבִּיא); the fem. is added in לְהַנְּפָה Is 30:28; cf. Est 2:18, 4:14 and the analogous *infinitive Haphel* in biblical Aramaic, Dn 5:20.—As *infinitive absolute* הַכִּין occurs in Ez 7:14 (perh. also Jos 4:3, Jer 10:23).—The *participles* have ē, on the analogy of the *perfect*, as the vowel of the preformative, like verbs עַז (§ 67 i). On מְבִיא 2 S 5:2, &c. (in *K'thibh*), see § 74 k.

On the shortened forms of the *imperfect* (טָמֵן, וָיָמֶן, but always אֲנִיבָה); in the *jussive* also with retraction of the tone שָׁב 1 K 2:20) see above, f. With a guttural or ר the last syllable generally has *Pathah* (as in *Qal*), e.g. עָד and he testified, 2 K 17:13; יְרַח let him smell, 1 S 26:19; וְרָה Gn 8:21; וְנָסַר and he took away, Gn 8:13. The 1st sing. of the *imperfect consecutive* commonly has the form יְבָשָׁא Neh 2:20, or, more often, defectively וְבָשָׁא 1 K 2:42, less frequently the form שָׁב Jos 14:7.—For סְמָךְ Zp 1:2 (after רְסָא) and in verse 3, read סְמָךְ from סָמָךְ, on the analogy of מְעָד § 68 g; similarly in Jer 8:13 instead of אֲסִיפָה.

In the *imperfect Pôlêl* the tone is moved backwards before a following tonesyllable, but without a shortening of the vowel of the final syllable; e.g. קְחַת לְלֹז Pr 14:34; בְּקָד וְמְמֻזָּז Jb 35:14; cf. Pr 25:23, and acc. to Baer וְתַחַת בְּגַת וְתַחַת Ps 139:20 (ed. Mant., Ginsb. וְתַחַת), always in principal pause; on the *Metheg* with *Sere*, cf. § 16 f. —As *Pôlal* cf. רְעַשׂ Is 16:10.

As *participle Hophel* הַמְוַשֵּׁב occurs in close connexion, Gn 43:12; cf. § 65 d.

Peculiar contracted forms of *Pôlêl* (unless they are transitives in *Qal*) are יְנַצְּעַנְה Jb 31:15, נְמַנְּנָה Is 64:6 for נִמְנָנָה (§ 58 k), and יְעַרְעַנְה or יְעַרְעַנְה for יְעַרְעַנְה (§ 58 k); also קְרַר מְמֻמָּתָה Jb 17:4, for רְמֻמָּתָה. —In Is 15:5 רְעַז appears to have arisen from the *Pilpel* רְעַז, the ā after the loss of the ר having been lengthened to ā, which has then been obscured to ô. —For the strange form תְּקַוְּנָה Ps 139:21, which cannot (according to § 52 s) be explained as a *participle* with the מ omitted, read בְּמַתָּקָה.

In General.

8. The verbs עַז are primarily related to the verbs עַז (§ 67), which were also originally biliteral, so that it is especially necessary in analysing them to pay attention to the differences between the inflexion of the two classes. Several forms are exactly the same in both, e.g. *imperfect Qal* and *Hiphel* with wāw *consecutive*, the whole of *Hophel*, the *Piell* of verbs עַז, and the *Pôlêl* of verbs עַז; see § 67 z. Owing to this close relation, verbs עַז sometimes have forms which follow the analogy of verbs עַז, e.g. *perfect Qal* בָּז he has despised (from בָּז, as if from זָב Zc 4:10; *perfect Niphel* בָּז Jer 48:11 (for בָּזָר from בָּז, as if from בָּז)). The same explanation equally applies to הַנְּקָזָה Jb 10:1 for נְקָזָה (cf. § 67 dd) = קְזָז from קְזָז, and נְקָז Ez 6:9 (for נְקָז); Ez 10:17 and verse 15; הַדְּמוֹז (imperative) Nu 17:10; אַדְּמִי Mi 2:6; *Hiphel* perfect הַתְּמִימָה Is 18:5 for תְּמִימָה (cf. § 29 q), which is for תְּמִימָה from תְּמִימָה. On the other hand the *imperfects* מְרַא Ez 48:14 (unless it be intended for מְרַא, cf. Ps 15:4) and יְפַרְּחַ Hb 2:3, are to be regarded according to § 109 i, simply as rhythmically shortened forms of מְרַא and יְפַרְּחַ.

9. In common with verbs עַז (§ 67 g) verbs עַז sometimes have in *Niphel* and *Hiphel* the quasi-Aramaic formation, by which, instead of the long vowel under the preformative,

they take a short vowel with *Dages forte* in the following consonant; this variety is frequently found even along with the ordinary form, e.g. *הַסִּתְתָּה to incite*, imperfect *יִסְתַּתְתָּה* (also *הַסִּתְתָּה*, *הַסִּתְתָּה*); imperfect *יִפְרַגֵּה to remove* (from *סֹג*), also *Hophal גַּפְתָּה* Is 59:14 (on קְמָה cf. § 29 g); sometimes with a difference of meaning, as in *הַגִּיחַה to cause to rest*,¹ but (*imperfect* *הַגִּיחַה*, *consecutive* Gn 39:16; *imperative* *חַנֵּחַ plur.* *הַחֲנַה to set down*; for *וְהַחֲנַה* (Baer, Ginsburg) Zc 5:11 (which at any rate could only be explained as an isolated passive of *Hiphil*) on the analogy of the biblical Aramaic *הַקִּימַת* Dn 7:4) we should probably read *וְהַגִּיחַה* with Klostermann after the LXX. In Dn 8:11 the *Kethibh* is intended for a *perfect* *Hiphil*. There is also a distinction in meaning between *יָלַין to spend the night, to remain*, and *יָלַן Ex 16:7 Q'reh (Kethibh *תָּלָן*; conversely, verse 2 *Kethibh יָלַנוּ*, *Q'reh יָלַן*), participle *מָלֵן Ex 16:8, Nu 14:27, 17:20, to be stubborn, obstinate*: in the latter sense from the form *יָלַן* only *יָלַן* is found, Ex 17:3. Other examples are *Niphal בָּמֹלֶךְ he was circumcised*, Gn 17:26 f.; participle 34:22 (from *מָלַךְ*, not *בָּמְלָךְ*); *גָּעוֹר he is waked up*, Zc 2:17 (see above, v); *Hiphil* *הַזְּילֵה La 1:8; יָלַז Pr 4:21.**

Perhaps the same explanation applies to some forms of verbs *first guttural* with *Dages forte implicitum*, which others derive differently or would emend, e.g. *שָׁבַת* for *שָׁבַת וְשָׁבַת* *and she hastened* (from *חָשַׁב*) Jb 31:5; *עָטָה* (another reading is *עָטָה*) (14³² *Q'reh*) from *עָטַת* or *עָטַה* *to fly at anything*. Both, as far as the form is concerned, would be correct *apocopated imperfects* from *חָשַׁבְתָּה* and *עָטַתָּה* (ל"ה), but these stems only occur with a wholly different meaning.

10. Verbs with a consonantal *Waw* for their second radical, are inflected throughout like the strong form, provided the first or third radical is not a weak letter, e.g. *קָנָר imperfect קָנָר to be white*; *עָזַב imperfect עָזַב to expire*; *רָחַח to be wide*; *צָוָה to cry*; *Pi'el עָזַל imperfect יָעַזֵּל to act wickedly*; *עָזַב to bend*, *Hithpa'el הַתְּعַזֵּב to bend oneself*; and this is especially the case with verbs which are at the same time *לְיָה*, e.g. *צָוָה Pi'el צָוָה to command*, *קָנָה to wait*, *תָּרַ�ה to drink*, *Pi'el רָהַר (on אָרַב גָּר Is 16:9, see § 75 dd)* and *Hiphil* *הַרְבֵּה to give to drink, &c.*

§ 73. Verbs middle i (vulgo "ע"), e.g. *כִּין* to discern. Paradigm N.

1. These verbs agree, as regards their structure, exactly with verbs "ע", and in contrast to them may be termed "ע", or more correctly, *ayin-i* verbs, from the characteristic vowel of the *impf.*, *imper.*, and *infin. constr.* This distinction is justified in so far as it refers to a difference in the pronunciation of the *imperfect* and its kindred forms, the *imperative* and *infin. constr.*—the "ע" verbs having *ü* lengthened from original *ü* and "ע" having *i* lengthened from original *i*. In other respects verbs "ע" simply belong to the class of really monosyllabic stems, which, by a strengthening of their *vocalic* element, have been assimilated to the trilateral form¹ (§ 67 a). In the *perfect Qal* the monosyllabic stem, as in "ע", has *ā* lengthened from *ă*, thus: *הָשַׁבַּת he has set*; *infinitive* *הַשְׁבַּת*, *infinitive absolute* *שְׁבָת*, *imperative* *הַשְׁבַּת*, *imperfect* *הַשְׁבַּת*, *jussive* *הַשְׁבַּת* (§ 48 g), *imperfect consecutive* *הַשְׁבַּת*.—The *perfect Qal* of some verbs used to be treated as having a double set of forms, a regular series, and others like *Hiphil*

¹ As the passive of this *Hiphil* we should expect the *Hophal* *הַמִּנְחָה*, which is, no doubt, to be read for *הַמִּנְחָה* in La 5:5.

¹ That verbs "ע" and "ע" are developed from biliteral roots at a period before the differentiation of the Semitic languages is admitted even by Nöldeke (*Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassburg, 1904, p. 34 ff.), although he contests the view that בִּינְתִּי and רִיבְתִּי are to be referred to *Hiphil* with the preformative dropped.

without the preformative, e.g. Dn 10:1; בֵּין תִּי Dn 9:2, also Ps 139:2; רַב וְתָה Ps 139:2; בְּנֵת thou strivest, Jb 33:13, also רַב בְּתָה La 3:58. The above *perfects* (רַב בְּנֵי, &c.) might no doubt be taken as forms *middle ē* (properly *i*), the *i* of which has been lengthened to *i'* (like the *ü* lengthened to *ü* in the *imperfect Qal* of קָם). It is more probable, however, that they are really shortened forms of *Hiphil*. This is supported by the fact that, especially in the case of בְּנֵי, the shortened forms are few and probably all late, while the corresponding unshortened forms with the same meaning are very numerous, e.g. *perfect* בְּנֵי (but only in Dn 10:1); בְּנֵי הַבְּנִים, *infinitive abs.* only in Pr 23:1), *imperative* הַבְּנִים (only in Dn 9:23 immediately before וְבֵין, also בְּנֵי הַבְּנִים three times, and in Ps 5:2), *participle*¹ מַבְּנִים. Elsewhere *Hiphil*-forms are in use along with actual *Qal*-forms with the same meaning, thus: רַב (also מַרְבֵּים) placing (but only in Jb 4:20, which, with the critically untenable קָשָׁם Ez 21:21, is the only instance of in *Hiphil*, שָׁוֹם *breaking forth* Ju 20:33, with *infinitive Qal* הַשְׁׁוֹם they rushed forth Ju 20:37, with שָׁתֵּי הַמְצִיא *glancing*, also in *perfect* אָצַּב; he spat out, with *imperat. Qal* קְיוּחַ. As *passives* we find a few apparent *imperfects Hophal*, which are really (according to § 53 u) *imperfects passive of Qal*, e.g. Is 66:8 from חַיל to turn round, יָוֹשֵׁר from שִׁיר to sing, שִׁית from שִׁית to set.

2. The above-mentioned *Hiphil*-forms might equally well be derived from verbs עַזְעַזְעַז; and the influence of the analogy of verbs עַזְעַזְעַז is distinctly seen in the *Niphal* נַבְזֵן (ground-form *nabān*), *Pōlēl* בְּנֵן, and *Hithpōlēl* הַהְבֹּזֵן. The very close relation existing between verbs עַזְעַז and עַזְעַז is evident also from the fact that from some stems both forms occur side by side in *Qal*, thus from חַיל to turn round, *imperative* also Mi 4:10; שִׁים to place, *infinitive construct* commonly שְׁוֹם (2 S 14:7 שְׁוֹם *Q're*), *imperfect* שִׁים, but Ex 4:11 שְׁוֹם. In other verbs one form is, at any rate, the more common, e.g. גַּל to exult (only Pr 23:24 *K'thīb*); from לְוֹן (perhaps denominative from לְלִיל to spend the night, only in Gn 24:23; but the *imperative* is always לְלִין, &c.—Of verbs עַזְעַז the most common are רַב to strive, צִדְקַה to judge, שִׁיטַה to rejoice; cf. also *perfect* בְּלִי (middle *Yōdh* in Arabic) to comprehend, to measure, Is 40:12; עַיטַּה (as in Arabic and Syriac) to rush upon, and the denominative *perfect* צִדְקַה (from צִדְקָה to pass the summer, Is 18:6. On the other hand, וְצִדְגָּם and they shall fish them, Jer 16:16, generally explained as *perfect Qal*, denominative from גַּד fish, probably represents a denominative *Piel*; וְצִדְגָּם.

Corresponding to verbs properly עַזְעַז mentioned in § 72 gg, there are certain verbs עַזְעַז with consonantal *Yōdh*, as אֶיְבֶּה to hate, צִעְפֶּה to faint, הַבְּהִיה to become, to be, הַחְיִיה to live.

Rem. 1. In the *perfect Qal* 3rd fem. sing. וְלִנְהָה occurs once, Zc 5:4, for גַּל נָה, with the weakening of the toneless *ā* to *ē* (as in the fem. *participle* זְוֻרָה Is 59:5); cf. the analogous examples in § 48 1 and § 80 i.—2nd sing. masc. הַשְּׁתָּה Ps 90:8, *Q're* (before *u*; cf. § 72 s); 1st

¹ Since Ps 139:2 might be intended for בְּנֵת, there remains really no form of בְּנֵי which must necessarily be explained as a *Qal*, except the *ptcp. plur.* Jer 49:7. Nevertheless it is highly probable that all the above instances of *Hiphil*-forms, parallel with *Qal*-forms of the same meaning, are merely due to a secondary formation from the *imperfects Qal*, יְבִין, יְשִׁים, &c., which were wrongly regarded as *imperfects Hiphil*: so Barth, *ZDMG*. xlivi. p. 190 f., and *Nominalbildung*, p. 119 f.

sing. once יָשַׁע **Ps** 73:28, *milra*□, without any apparent reason; 1st *plur.* וְלֹא Ju 19:13 for *lán-nû*. The lengthened *imperative* has the tone on the ultima before gutturals, **Ps** 35:1; see further, § 72 s.—Examples of the *infinitive absolute* are: רִיב הַיּוֹה **Ps** 35:1; שׁוֹמֵם **Jer** 42:15; תְּשַׁׁפֵּן **Is** 22:7. On the other hand, דִּיבְּרַתְּךָ (for **רְבָּתְּךָ**) **Jer** 50:34, בְּנֵי קָבִין **Pr** 23:1; חֹל הַחִיל **Ez** 30:16 *K^eth.*, are irregular and perhaps due to incorrect *scriptio plena*; for the last the *Q^erē* requires חֹלְךָ, but read חֹלֶךָ; cf. § 113 x.

2. The *shortened imperfect* usually has the form יָשַׁם, יָשַׁם, יָשַׁם; more rarely, with the tone moved back, e.g. Ju 6:31, cf. Ex 23:1, 1 S 9:20. So with *wāw consecutive* וְשָׁם and *he placed*, וְבָנָם and *he perceived*; with a middle guttural וְעַתְּבָקָם 1 S 25:14 (see § 72 ee); with **ר** as 3rd radical, וְשָׁרָתְּלָן Ju 5:1. As jussive of **ר** **לְתָלֵן** is found in Ju 19:20 (in *pause*) and Jb 17:2, for **לְתָלֵן**.—For *Q^erē* אֲלִפְרָוּב **Pr** 3:30 *Keth.* (*Q^erēb*) read תְּרָבָּה.

3. As *participle active Qal* לְזַנְנָה *spending the night*, occurs once, Neh 13:21; *participle passive* מִשְׁמָר Nu 24:21, 1 S 9:24, Ob⁴; *feminine* שָׁמְמָה 2 S 13:32, in the *Q^erē*, even according to the reading of the Oriental schools (see p. 38, note 2): the *K^ethibh* has שָׁמְמָה. A *passive* of *Qal* (cf. above, § 52 e and s, and § 53 u) from שִׁים may perhaps be seen in נִיְשָׁם Gn 50:26 (also Gn 24:33 *K^ethibh*, וְיִשְׁמָר; the Samaritan in both places has וְיִוְשָׁם), and also in יִסְפַּר Ex 30:32, Samaritan וְסָפָר. Against the explanation of סְמִינָה as a *Hoph*□*al-form* from סִינָה, Barth (*Jubelschrift ... Hildesheimer*, Berlin, 1890, p. 151) rightly urges that the only example of a *Hiph*□*il* of סִינָה is the doubtful נִסְפָּר, which is probably an *i*-imperfect of *Qal*.—The explanation of סְמִינָה, &c., as a *passive* of *Qal* arising from *yiyasam*, &c. = *yuysam* (so Barth, ibid., note 1), is certainly also unconvincing, so that the correctness of the traditional reading is open to question.

* * * * *

4. In verbs נְצִיָּה the נ always retains its consonantal value; these stems are, therefore, to be regarded as verbs *middle Guttural* (§ 64). An exception is גְּנִזְתָּה Ec 12:5 if it be *imperfect Hiph*□*il* of גְּנִזָּה (for גְּנִזָּה); but if the form has really been correctly transmitted, it should rather be referred to גְּנִזָּה, and regarded as incorrectly written for גְּנִזָּה. On נְאוּי (from נְאוּי, אֹנוֹי), which was formerly treated here as נְעִי, see now § 75 x.

§ 74. Verbs נְצִיָּה, e.g. נְצִיָּה to find. Paradigm O.

The נ in these verbs, as in verbs נְפִיָּה, is treated in some cases as a consonant, i.e. as a guttural, in others as having no consonantal value (as a quiescent or vowel letter), viz.:

1. In those forms which terminate with the נ, the final syllable always has the regular vowels, if long, e.g. מְצִיאָה, מְצִיאָה, מְצִיאָה, i.e. the נ simply quiesces in the

2² The most important of these differences are, (a) those between the Orientals, i. e. the scholars of the Babylonian Schools, and the Occidentals, i. e. the scholars of Palestine (Tiberias, &c.); cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 197 ff.; (b) amongst the Occidentals, between Ben-Naphtali and Ben-Asher, who flourished in the first half of the tenth century at Tiberias; cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 241 ff. Both sets of variants are given by Baer in the appendices to his critical editions. Our printed editions present uniformly the text of Ben-Asher, with the exception of a few isolated readings of Ben-Naphtali, and of numerous later corruptions.

long vowel, without the latter suffering any change whatever. It is just possible that after the altogether heterogeneous vowel *î* the *ă* may originally have preserved a certain consonantal value. On the other hand, if the final *ă* quiesces in a preceding *ă* (as in the *perfect*, *imperfect*, and *imperative Qal*, in the *perfect Niph^ăal*, and in *Pu^ăal* and *Hoph^ăal*) this *ă* is necessarily lengthened to *ā*, by § 27 g, as standing in an open syllable; e.g. נִצְחָן, נִצְחָנוּ, &c.

The *imperfect* and *imperative Qal* invariably have *ā* in the final syllable, on the analogy of verbs *tertiae gutturalis*; cf., however, § 76 e.—In the *imperfect Hithpa^ăel* *ā* occurs in the final syllable not only (according to § 54 k) in the principal pause (*Nu 31:23*), or immediately before it (*Jb 10:16*), or with the lesser disjunctives (*Lv 21:1, 4*, *Nu 19:13, 20*), but even out of pause with *Mer^ăkha*, *Nu 6:7*, and even before *Maqqeph* in *Nu 19:12*.

2. When *ă* stands at the end of a syllable before an afformative beginning with a consonant (ה, נ), it likewise quiesces with the preceding vowel; thus in the *perfect Qal* (and *Hoph^ăal*, see below) quiescing with *ă* it regularly becomes *Qumeṣ* (הַנְּצָחָן for הַנְּצָחָנָה, &c.); but in the *perfect* of all the other active and reflexive conjugations, so far as they occur, it is preceded by *S^ăere* (הַנְּצָחָנוּ, &c.), and in the *imperative* and *imperfect* by *S^ăghōl*, *אַתְּנָצָחָה*, *אַתְּנָצָחָנוּ*.

(a) The *S^ăghōl* of these forms of the *imperfect* and *imperative* might be considered as a modification, and at the same time a lengthening of an original *ă* (see § 8 a). In the same way the *ē* of the *perfect* forms in *Pi^ăel*, *Hithpa^ăel*, and *Hiph^ăil* might be traced to an original *i* (as in other cases the *ē* and *i* in the final syllable of the 3rd sing. *muse. perfect* of these conjugations), although this *i* may have only been attenuated from an original *ă*. According to another, and probably the correct explanation, however, both the *Sere* and the *S^ăghōl* are due to the analogy of verbs הָלַל (§ 75 f) in consequence of the close relation between the two classes, cf. § 75 nn.—No form of this kind occurs in *Pu^ăal*; in the *perfect Hoph^ăal* only the 2nd *masc. sing.* הָלַל *Ez 40:4*, lengthened according to rule.

(b) Before suffixes attached by a connecting vowel (e.g. יִקְרָאֵנִי) the *ă* retains its consonantal value; so before הַ and בַּ, e.g. אֲנָצָחָנָה Ct 8:1; הַבְּכָרָאֲנָצָחָנָה Ez 28:13 (cf. § 65 h), not אֲנָצָחָנָה, &c., since these suffixes, by § 58 f, are likewise attached to the verb-form by a connecting vowel in the form of Š^ăwâ *mobile*.—As *infinitive Qal* with suffix notice הַקְרָאָמָנָה Ez 25:6; *participle* with suffix הַקְרָאָמָנָה Is 43:1; *infinitive Pi^ăel* בְּאַתְּנָצָחָנוּ. —The doubly anomalous form אוֹיְקְרָאָה Jer 23:6 (for יִקְרָאֵה or יִקְרָאֵנָה) is perhaps a *forma mixta* combining the readings יִקְרָאֵה and יִקְרָאֵנָה.

3. When *ă* begins a syllable (consequently before afformatives which consist of or begin with a vowel, as well as before suffixes) it is necessarily a firm consonant, and the form then follows the analogy of the strong verb, e.g. הַאֲנָצָחָה *māṣ^ăā*, אֲנָצָחָה, &c. (in *pause* הַאֲנָצָחָה, אֲנָצָחָה).

REMARKS.

1. Verbs *middle e*, like אָלַל *to be full*, retain the *Sere* also in the other persons of the *perfect*, e.g. אָלַל אָתֵי (*Est 7:5* has אָלַל owing to its transitive use; for יִרְאָתֶם *Jos 4:24* read with Ewald סְמִינָה). Instead of הָאֲנָצָחָה the form קְרָאתָה *she names*, on the analogy of the הָלַל-forms noticed in § 75 m, occurs in *Is 7:14* (from אָתֵת, cf. § 44 f), and with a different meaning (*it befalls*) in *Dt 31:29*, *Jer 44:23*, in both places before *ă*, and hence, probably, to avoid a hiatus

(on the other hand, וְקַרְבָּאתְךָ Ex 5:16, could only be the and *sing. masc.*; the text which is evidently corrupt should probably be emended to קָרְבָּאתְךָ לְעֵף וְקַרְבָּאתְךָ with the LXX); in *Niph[□]al* קָרְבָּאתְךָ Ps 118:23; in *Hoph[□]al* קָרְבָּאתְךָ Gn 33:11.—The 2nd *fem. sing.* is written קָרְבָּאתְךָ by Baer, Gen 16:11, &c., according to early MSS.

2. The *infin. Qal* occurs sometimes on the analogy of verbs קָרְבָּה (לְהִלְוֹת, &c., see § 75 nn) in the feminine form; so always אֶת מְלָא to fill (as distinguished from אֶל fullness), Lv 8:33, 12:4, 6, 25:30, Jer 29:10, Ez 5:2, also written אֶת מְלָא אֶת Jer 25:12, Jb 20:22, &c., and likewise Est 1:5. Cf. further, תְּקַרְבָּתְךָ Ju 8:1; שְׁנָאתְךָ Pr 8:13; before suffixes, Ez 33:12, and likewise in *Niph. Zc* 13:4; also in *Pi[□]el* אֶת קְפִילָה Ex 31:5, 35:33, or קְפִילָה Dn 9:2, &c. *K^ethibh*; with suffix 2 S 21:2.—On the (aramaizing) *infinitives* אֲשָׁר and אֲשָׁר, see § 45 e; on קָרְבָּאתְךָ obviam, § 19 k.—בְּמַעַן אֲשָׁר when ye find, Gn 32:20, stands, according to § 93 q, for בְּמַעַן אֲשָׁר. The tone of the lengthened *imperative* רְפָא ה Ps 41:5 as *Mil[□]ra* (before אֲשָׁר) is to be explained on rhythmical grounds; cf. the analogous cases in § 72 s.—The and *fem. plur. imperative* in Ru 1:9 has, according to *Qimhi*, the form אֲשָׁר אֲשָׁר and in verse 20 קָרְבָּתְךָ; on the other hand, the Mantua edition and Ginsburg, on good authority, read קָרְבָּתְךָ אֲשָׁר.

3. The *participle fem.* is commonly contracted, e.g. מְאַתְּךָ (for מְאַתְּךָה) 2 S 18:22, cf. Est 2:15; so *Niph[□]al* נְקַלְלָה Dt 30:11, Zc 5:7 (but תְּאַתְּשָׁה Is 30:25), and *Hoph[□]al*, Gn 38:25; less frequent forms are מְאַתְּךָ Ct 8:10; תְּאַתְּשָׁה 1 K 10:22 (cf. § 76 b, תְּאַתְּשָׁה beside תְּשָׁאַתְּךָ as *infinitive construct* from אֲשָׁר) and without אֲ (see k) תְּאַתְּשָׁה (from אֲשָׁר) Dt 28:57. In the forms חַטָּאתְךָ sining, 1 S 14:33, cf. Ps 99:6; אֲתָם בְּקַרְבָּתְךָ feigning them, Neh 6:8, the אֲ is elided, and is only retained orthographically (§ 23 c) after the retraction of its vowel; see the analogous cases in § 75 oo.—On the *plur. masc. ptcp. Niph.* cf. § 93 oo.

4. Frequently an אֲ which is quiescent is omitted in writing (§ 23 f): (a) in the middle of the word, e.g. נְבָבָה 1 S 25:8; תְּבָבָה Nu 11:11, cf. Jb 1:21; תְּבָבָה Ju 4:19, cf. Jb 32:18. In the *imperfect* תְּבָבָה Jer 9:17, Zc 5:9, Ru 1:14 (but the same form occurs with *Yôdh* pleonastic after the manner of verbs לְהִלְוֹת in Ez 23:49, according to the common reading; cf. § 76 b and Jer 50:20); in *Pi[□]el* אֲתָה נְבָבָה (after elision of the אֲ, cf. § 75 oo) Gn 31:39; and also in *Niph[□]al* נְמַתְּמַתְּ Lv 11:43; cf. Jos 2:16. (b) at the end of the word; וַיְבָבָו 1 K 12:12 *K^ethibh*; *Hiph[□]ił* אֲתָה נְבָבָה 2 K 13:6, cf. Is 53:10; אֲתָה נְבָבָה for אֲתָה נְבָבָה the *perfect Hiph[□]ił* formed after the manner of verbs אֲתָה; in the *imperfect Hiph[□]ił* אֲתָה נְבָבָה Ps 55:16 *K^ethibh*; אֲתָה נְבָבָה Ps 141:5; אֲתָם בְּקַרְבָּתְךָ 1 K 21:19, Mi 1:15; in the *infinitive*, Jer 32:35; in the *participle*, 2 S 5:2, 1 K 21:21, Jer 19:15, 39:16, all in *K^ethibh* (אֲתָה, always before אֲ, hence perhaps only a scribal error).

5. In the *jussive*, *imperfect consecutive*, and *imperative Hiph[□]ił* a number of cases occur with ī in the final syllable; cf. אֲשָׁר Is 36:14 (in the parallel passages 2 K 18:29, 2 Ch 32:15 אֲשָׁר); Neh 8:2 (before עַ); אֲשָׁר 2 K 21:11 (cf. 1 K 16:2, 21:22); וְקַרְבָּאתְךָ 2 K 6:29; וְקַרְבָּאתְךָ Dt 4:20, 2 K 11:12, Ps 78:16, 105:43; *imperative* קָרְבָּאתְךָ Jer 17:18; Is 43:8 (in both cases before עַ). If the tradition be correct (which at least in the defectively written forms appears very doubtful) the retention of the ī is to be attributed to the open syllable; while in the closed syllable of the 3rd *sing. masc.* and *fem.*, and the 2nd *sing. masc.* after וְ consecutive, the ī is always reduced to ē. In the examples before וְ considerations of euphony may also have had some influence (cf. § 75 hh).—In Ez 40:3, Baer reads with the Western school גִּיבְעָה, while the Orientals read in the *K^ethibh* גִּיבְעָה, and in the *Q^erē* גִּיבְעָה.

On the transition of verbs לְהִלְוֹת to forms of לְהִלְוֹת see § 75 nn.

§ 75. Verbs נְרָאַל, e.g. נְרָאַל to reveal. Paradigm P.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 149 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 618 ff.—G. R. Berry, ‘Original Waw in הַלְׁ verbs’ in *AJSL*. xx. 256 f.

These verbs, like the verbs פָּי (§§ 69, 70), belong to two different classes, viz. those originally לְז and those originally לְז¹, which in Arabic, and even more in Ethiopic, are still clearly distinguished. In Hebrew, instead of the original ז or ז at the end of the word, a ה always appears (except in the *ptcp. pass. Qal*) as a purely orthographic indication of a final vowel (§ 23 k); hence both classes are called הַלְׁ verbs, e.g. גָּלַה for גָּלִי *he has revealed*; הַשֵּׁלָה for שָׁלַח he has rested. By far the greater number of these verbs are, however, treated as originally לְז; only isolated forms occur of verbs לְז.

הַשְׁלָה *to be at rest* may be recognized as originally זל, in the forms in which the *Wāw* appears as a strong consonant, cf. 1st sing. perfect *Qal* וְשָׁלַח Jb 3:26, the participle וְשָׁלַח and the derivative *rest*; on the other hand the *imperfect* is זְשָׁלַח. (with *Yôdh*). In עֲנָה (Arab. عن) *to answer*, and עֲנָה² (Arab. عن) *to be afflicted*, are to be seen two verbs originally distinct, which have been assimilated in Hebrew (see the Lexicon, s. v. עֲנָה).

Of quite a different class are those verbs of which the third radical is a *consonantal h* (distinguished by *Mappiq*). These are inflected throughout like verbs *tertiae gutturalis*. Cf. §65 note on the heading.

The grammatical structure of verbs הַלְׁ (see Paradigm *P*) is based on the following laws:—

1. In all forms in which the original *Yôdh* or *Wāw* would stand at the end of the word, it is dropped (cf. § 24 g) and ה takes its place as an orthographic indication of the preceding long vowel. Such an indication would have been indispensable, on practical grounds, in the still unvocalized consonantal text. But even after the addition of the vowel signs, the orthographic rule remained, with insignificant exceptions (see § 8 k, and ā in תְּקֻנָּה, &c.), that a final vowel must be indicated by a vowel letter. In verbs הַלְׁ the ה which is here employed as a vowel letter is preceded by the same vowel in the same part of the verb throughout all the conjugations. Thus the endings are—

ה - in all perfects, גָּלַה, גָּלַת, &c.

ה - in all imperfects and participles, גָּלַה, גָּלַת, &c.

ה - in all imperatives, גָּלַה, גָּלַת, &c.

AJSL. *AJSL*. = American Journal of Semitic Languages.

1 According to Wellheusen, ‘Ueber einige Arten schwächer Verbs’ in his *Skizzen*, vi. p. 255 ff., the הַלְׁ verbs, apart from some true זל and some probable זל, are to be regarded as originally biliteral. To compensate for their arrested development they lengthened the vowel after the 2nd radical, as the זע verbs did after the 1st radical. But although there is much to be said for this view, it fails to explain pausal forms like הַיְהָ (see u). It seems impossible that these should all be *late* formations.

2 In the Mêša inscription, line 5, וַיַּעֲנֵנוּ and *he oppressed* occurs as 3rd sing. masc. *imperfect Piēl*, and in line 6, אָעַנְנוּ *I will oppress* as 1st sing.

נִ - in the infinitive absolute (נִלְיָה, &c.), except in *Hiphil* וַיַּעֲשֵׂה, *Hophal*, and generally also *Piel*, see aa and ff.

The *participle passive Qal* alone forms an exception, the original י (or ו, see v) reappearing at the end, נִלְיָה; and so also some derived nouns (§ 84a c, ε, &c.).

The *infinitive construct* always has the ending נִי (with נ feminine); *Qal* גָּלוֹת, *Piel* גָּלוֹת, &c.; for exceptions, see n and y.

These forms may be explained as follows:—in the *perfect Qal* נִלְיָה stands, according to the above, for נִלְיָה, and, similarly, in *Niphal*, *Pual*, and *Hophal*. The *Piel* and *Hithpael* may be based on the forms נִקְטֶל, נִקְטָל (§ 52 l; and § 54 k), and *Hiphil* וַיַּעֲשֵׂה on the form נִקְטָל, on the analogy of the ā in the second syllable of the Arabic وَاجْتَالَة (§ 53 a). Perhaps, however, the finalā of these conjugations simply follows the analogy of the other conjugations.

The explanation of the final tone-bearing נִי of the *imperfect* is still a matter of dispute. As to the various treatments of it, see Barth, *Nominalbildung*, i. p. xxx ff, with § 136, Rem., and *ZDMG*. xliv. 695 f., against Philippi's objections in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, 1890, p. 356 f.; also *ZDMG*. li. 244, where Barth appeals to the rule that, in the period before the differentiation of the North Semitic dialects, final iy becomes ִ (constr. נִי), not i; M. Lambert, *Journ. Asiat.* 1893, p. 285; Prätorius, *ZDMG*. lv. 365. The most probable explanation now seems to be, first, that the uniform pronunciation of all imperfects and participles with *Sghôl* in the last syllable merely follows the analogy of the *impf. Qal*, and secondly, that the *Sghôl* of the *impf. Qal* does perhaps ultimately represent a contraction of the original termination י (= ai), although elsewhere (e.g. in the *imperative* of נִלְיָה) ai is usually contracted to ē.

2. When the original *Yôdh* stands at the end of the syllable before an afformative beginning with a consonant (נ, נ) there arises (a) in the *perfects*, primarily the diphthong ai (ִי). In the middle of the word this ought always to be contracted to ē (ִ), but this ē is only found consistently in the passive conjugations, whilst regularly in *Qal*, and frequently in the other active and reflexive conjugations (especially in *Piel*), it appears as i (cf. x, z, ee). This i, however, in the *perf. Qal* is not to be explained as a weakening of an original ē, but as the original vowel of the *intransitive* form. It then became usual also in the *transitive* forms of *Qal* (and in some other conjugations on this analogy), whereas e.g. in Syriac the two kinds of forms are still carefully distinguished.—(b) In the *imperfects* and *imperatives*, יִ with the tone always appears before the afformative נִהְיָה. On the most probable explanation of this יִ, see above, e.

Summary. Accordingly before afformatives beginning with a consonant the principal vowel is—

In the perfect *Qal* i, e.g. לִיְתָה;

In the perfects of the other active and reflexive conjugations, sometimes ē, sometimes i, גִּילִיתָה and גִּילִיתָה; נִלְיָתָה and נִלְיָתָה;

In the perfects passive always *ē*, e.g. *גָּלַת יְהִי*;

In the imperfects and imperatives always *וְיִנֶּה*, e.g. *תִּגְלַל יִנֶּה*.

The diphthongal forms have been systematically retained in Arabic and Ethiopic; only as an exception and in the popular language is the diphthong contracted. In Aramaic the contracted forms predominate, yet the Syriac, for example, has in *Qal* 2nd pers. sing. *g^elait* (but 1st pers. sing. *גָּלִית*), and so too the Western Aramaic *גָּלִית*, but also *גָּלִית*.

3. Before the vocalic afformatives (וְיִנֶּה, וְיִתְהִיא, וְיִתְהִיא) the *Yôdh* is usually dropped altogether, e.g. *גָּלֵל* (ground-form *gălyû*), *תִּתְגַּלֵּל*, *participle fem.* *תִּתְגַּלֵּלָה*, *plur. masc.* *תִּתְגַּלְלִים*; yet the old full forms also not infrequently occur, especially in *pause*, see u. The elision of the *Yôdh* takes place regularly before *suffixes*, e.g. *תִּתְגַּלֵּלְךָ* (see ll).

4. In the 3rd sing. fem. *perfect*, the original feminine ending *תְּ* was appended to the stem; hence, after elision of the *Yôdh*, arose properly forms like *תִּגְלֵת*, with *ā*, in the final syllable with the tone. This form, however, has been but rarely preserved (see below, m). The analogy of the other forms had so much influence, that the common ending *תְּ* was added pleonastically to the ending *תְּ*. Before the *תְּ* the vowel of the ending *תְּ*, which thus loses the tone, becomes *S̄wâ*, and thus there arise such forms as *תִּתְגַּלְתָּה*, *תִּתְגַּלְתָּהָה*, &c. (but in *pause* *תִּתְגַּלְלָה*, &c.).

For similar cases see § 70 d; § 91 m.

5. Finally, a strongly-marked peculiarity of verbs *לֹא* is the rejection of the ending *תְּ* in forming the *jussive* and the *imperfect consecutive*. This shortening occurs in all the conjugations, and sometimes also involves further changes in the vocalization (see o, y, bb, gg). Similarly, in some conjugations a *shortened imperative* (cf. § 48 k) is formed by *apocope* of the final *תְּ* (see cc, gg).

6. The ordinary form of the *imperfect* with the ending *תְּ* serves in verbs *לֹא* to express the cohortative also (§ 48 c); cf. Gn 1:26, 2:18, 2 Ch 25:17, &c. With a final *תְּ* there occur only: in *Qal*, *אֲשֶׁר יְהִי* Ps 119:117, *תְּמֻמָּה* Ps 77:4; and in *Hithpa□el* *בְּנִשְׁתָּה* Is 41:23 (with *Tiphha*, therefore in lesser pause).

REMARKS.

On Qal.

1. The older form of the *fem.* of the 3rd *sing. perf.* *תִּגְלֵת*, mentioned above, under i (cf. § 74 g), is preserved in *תִּשְׁתַּחַט* (before נ) Lv 25:21 (cf. 2 K 9:37 *K^ethibh*)¹; likewise in *Hiph□el* *תִּתְגַּלֵּל* (before נ) Lv 26:34; *תִּתְגַּלֵּל* Ez 24:12; and in *Hoph□al* *תִּתְגַּלֵּל* (before י) Jer 13:19.—The 2nd *sing. fem.* is also written *תִּתְגַּלְתָּ*; thus in the *textus receptus* 2 S 14:2, and always in Baer's editions (since 1872), as in most other verbs; *תִּתְגַּלְתָּה* and *תִּתְגַּלְתָּהָה* Is 57:8; *תִּתְגַּלְתָּהָה* Jer 2:23, Ez 16:48, &c. (so 1 K 17:13 from אֱלֹהִים). In the 3rd pers. plur. the tone, instead of keeping its usual place (*תִּתְגַּלְלָה*, &c.), is retracted in Ps 37:20, לֹא, both on account of the *pause* and also in

¹ In the Siloam inscription also (see above, § 2 d), line 3, *הִתְגַּלֵּת* may be read quite as well as [ה]תִּתְגַּלֵּת.

rhythrical antithesis to the preceding קָלְלִי (according to Delitzsch for the sake of the assonance with שָׁבֵע); and in **Jb 24:1** זַחַת.—On the tone of the *perfect consecutive* see § 49 k.

2. The *infin. absol.* frequently has i (probably a survival of the older orthography) for הַ־, e.g. יְהִי Gn 18:18; שְׁמֹעֲדֵר Jer 4:18, &c., Ez 31:11; נְגַנֵּב 2 S 24:24; אָזֶן Gn 26:28, Is 6:9 (cf. 1 S 6:12), &c., beside הַ־. The form תְּהִוֵּת Is 22:13 (beside תְּהִוָּה in the same verse) appears to have been chosen on account of its similarity in sound to טְהִוָּה; so in Is 42:20 Q̄rē and Ho 10:4, אֲלִילָה (unless it is a substantive, *oaths*) and כְּדִין; cf. also שְׁרוֹתָה Hv 3:13.—Conversely, instead of the *infinitive construct* לְלִוְתָה such forms are occasionally found as גַּלְהָ or גַּלְוָה, cf. Gn 48:11; הַנְּגַנֵּב Pr 16:16; שְׁנָה Gn 50:20, Ps 101:3, also שְׁמָעָה Gn 31:28 (cf. Pr 31:4), and even with the *suffix* הַ־ the very remarkable form הַשְׁמָעָה Ex 18:18.²—The feminine form הַ־ (for תְּאַנְּהָ) Ez 28:17, analogous to nouns like אֲנָה, אֲנָה, is strange, but הַ־ as *infin. Ez 21:15* is quite inexplicable.—The forms הַ־ and הַ־ Is 59:13 are perhaps to be regarded with Barth, *Nominalbildung*, § 51 a, as *infinitives absolute* of the *passive* of *Qal* (see above, § 53 u), not of *Pōēl*.—The 2nd sing. masc. imperative הַ־ occurs in the principal pause in Pr 4:4 and 7:2; but probably these forms are simply to be attributed to a Masoretic school, which in general marked the difference between certain forms by the use of ē for ē, and conversely ē for ē; cf. the analogous examples in § 52 n, and especially § 75 hh, also Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 17, 2, Rem. 1.—On the reading וְרָא יָנָה Ct 3:11 (for וְרָא יָנָה, on the analogy of the reading אָנָה אָנָה, &c., § 74 h), see Baer's note on the passage.

3. The *shortening* of the *imperfect* (see above, k, and the note on hh) occasions in *Qal* the following changes:

(a) As a rule the first radical takes a helping *S̄ghōl*, or, if the second radical is a guttural, a helping *Pathaḥ* (according to § 28 e). Thus נִגְלַל for נִגְלָל; וַיִּגְלַל and he despised, Gn 25:34; and he built; וַיִּמְחַק וַיִּמְחַק he looks; וַיִּמְשַׁבֵּךְ and he destroyed, Gn 7:23.

(b) The i of the preformative is then sometimes lengthened to ē, e.g. אָרֵי he sees. This, however, mostly happens only after the preformative הַ, whilst after הַ the homogeneous i remains, e.g. פָּנֵי (but פָּנָה), בָּרֵךְ (but בָּרָךְ), וָתֵּפֵךְ (but וָתָפֵךְ); with middle guttural וָתֵּבֵת, וָתֵּבֵת Jb 17:7 (from בָּבֵת). The unusual position of the tone in וָתֵּבֵת Zc 9:5, וָתֵּבֵת Mi 7:10 (so Baer and Ginsb.; ed. Mant. וָתֵּבֵת, וָתֵּבֵת, &c.) is best explained (except in וָתֵּבֵת Gn 41:33, before הַ) on the analogy of הָקֵם, &c., § 72 s, as due to the following הַ. But cf. also hh

(c) The helping vowel is elsewhere not used under the circumstances mentioned in § 28 d; נִשְׁבַּע Nu 21:1, Jer 41:10, cf. נִשְׁבַּע Jb 31:27; on the other hand, with i lengthened into ē (see p) נִשְׁבַּע, נִירַךְ, נִבְכֵךְ, נִשְׁבַּע. The form אָרֵי he sees, occurs parallel with אָנְרַךְ and he saw (but 3rd fem. always אָנְתָה), the latter with the original *Pathaḥ* on account of the following רַ, and identical with the 3rd sing. masc. of the *imperf. consec.* *Hiph'il*, 2 K 11:4.

(d) Examples of verbs *primaे gutturalis* (§ 63), and at the same time הָלֵל, are שְׁמַעַי, in pause שְׁמַעַי and he made, from הָשַׁבֵּעַ; שְׁמַעַי and he answered, from שְׁמַנְהָה (always identical with the corresponding forms in *Hiph'il*), שְׁמַעַי and he divided, from חָזָה. On some similar forms of פְּנַנְהָ see § 76 d.—In the following cases the initial (hard) guttural does not affect the form: וְחָרַב

² All these infinitives construct in ḥ, in the Pentateuch, belong to the document called E; cf. § 69 m, second note.

and he was wroth, וַיְהִי and he encamped (3rd plur. וַיְהִי, קָנָה) (with *Dageš lene* and *Šwā*) let it rejoice, Jb 3:6; cf. Ex 18:9.—On נִזְבֵּן, נִזְבֵּן, נִזְבֵּן (לֹא as well as פֶּן), &c., see § 76 b, c, f.

(e) The verbs הָיָה to be, and הַחֲיָה to live, of which the shortened imperfects ought to be *yihy* and *yihy*, change these forms to יָהִי and יְחִי, the second *Yôdh* being resolved into *i* at the end of the word; but in pause (§ 29 n) חָיָה, חַיְהָ, with the original *ă* modified to *S'ghôl* with the tone (cf. also nouns like בָּכִי for *bakhy*, in pause בָּכַי; עָנִי for 'ony, &c., § 84a c, and § 93 x). For שָׁמֵחַ, however, in Dt 32:18, since no verb שָׁמַח exists, we must read either שָׁמֵחַ, or better שָׁמַחַ (Samaritan תְּשַׁמַּח), as imperfect *Qal* of שָׁמַח to forget.—Analogous to יָהִי from הָיָה, there occurs once, from the noun הָנָה to be, the form יְהַוֵּה for יְהִי he will be, Ec 11:3, but no doubt הָוֵה is the right reading.

The full forms (without apocope of the ה, cf. § 49 c) not infrequently occur after *wâw consecutive*, especially in the 1st pers. and in the later books, e.g. וְאָרָאתִי and I saw, twenty times, and Jos 7:21 in *K'ethibh*, but never in the Pentateuch (אָרָאתִי fifteen times, of which three are in the Pent.); also in the 3rd pers. וְיָרָאתִי Ez 18:28, Jb 42:16 *Q're*; וְעָשָׂה and he made, four times (but עָשָׂה over 200 times); cf. also Ju 19:2 (וְעָתָה); 1 K 10:29 (וְעַלְהָ); Dt 1:16 (אָצַבָּה), and Gn 24:48. So also occasionally for the *jussive*, cf. Gn 1:9, 41:34, Jer 28:6.—For the well attested, but meaningless וְיָרָאתִי Jb 6:21 (doubtless caused by the following וְתִירָא), read ye see, with Ginsburg.

4. The original ' sometimes appears even before afformatives beginning with a vowel (cf. above, h and l), especially in and before the *pause*, and before the full plural ending יְנָן, or where for any reason an emphasis rests on the word. *Perfect* הָיָה Ps 57:2, יְהִי Dt 32:37, cf. Ps 73:2 *Q're*; *imperative* בְּעֵד יְהִי Is 21:12. *Imperfect* יְאָהָה Jb 16:22, 30:14 (without the *pause*, Ps 68:32); יְשַׁלֵּחַ Ps 122:6, Jb 12:6, cf. Ps 77:4; יְגַבֵּן Dt 8:13; Ps 36:9: more frequently like יְשַׁקְּפִין Ps 78:44; Is 17:12, 21:12, 26:11, 31:3, 33:7, 41:5, Ps 36:8, 39:7, 83:3; before a suffix, Jb 3:25. Also in Pr 26:7 יְלִין, as *perf. Qal* from קָלַה, was perhaps originally intended, but hardly יְלִין probably points to לִוְיָה from קָלַל as the right reading, since the sense requires an intransitive verb. Cf. further, v, x, dd, gg.

5. The *participle active* (cf. Völlers, ‘Das Qaâtil-Partizipium,’ ZA, 1903, p. 312 ff., and on the participles of הַלְּ, *ibid.*, p. 316 ff.), besides feminine forms like הַלְּעָנָה Ju 20:31, &c., אָהָרָה Pr 20:12, has also a feminine which retains the 3rd radical ' viz. בְּבָנָה (= בְּבָנִיה) weeping, La 1:16; תְּמֻתָּה tumultuous, Is 22:2 (plur. Pr 1:21); אָזְפִּיהָ spying, Pr 31:27, פְּרִיה fruitful, Ps 128:3, plur. תְּמִתּוֹת the things that are to come, Is 41:23. With the ordinary strong inflexion ' appears in עִזִּים Ct 1:7, but perhaps there also עִזִּים was intended, unless it should be עִזִּים a wanderer. For עִזִּים Is 47:10, רְאִזְמָנִי is to be read.—On הַעֲשָׂה 1 K 20:40 for הַעֲשָׂה, cf. § 116 g, note.—In the *participle passive* the 3rd radical still sometimes appears as ו (§ 24 b), cf. עֲשָׂה made, Jb 41:25, אֲשָׂה Jb 15:22, contracted from עֲשָׂה, עֲשָׂה; and before a formative ending, it even has its consonantal sound, הַעֲשָׂה (read הַעֲשָׂה) 2 K 23:4; עֲשָׂה (read "sûwôth) 1 S 25:18 *K'ethibh*, נְעַשְׂה (read n'qûwôth) Is 3:16 *K'ethibh*. The shortening of the *ain* in רְאִזְמָנִות Est 2:9 is irregular.

6. The defective writing is rare in such forms as קָנֵת חִי 2 S 15:33; בְּנֵת חִי 1 K 8:44, cf. 1 K 9:3; וְתִרְלֵת נָה Ex 2:16 (cf. Jer 18:21, 48:6, 1 Ch 7:15, Jb 17:5, &c.), and the pronunciation

תְּרָא יְנֵה Mi 7:10, cf. Ju 5:29 (unless they are *sing.* with *suff.* of the 3rd *sing. fem.*). Both cases are probably to be explained according to § 20 i.

On Niph'āl.

7. Here the forms with '־' in the 1st and 2nd *pers. sing.* of the *perfect* predominate '־' only in Gn 24:8); on the other hand in the 1st *plur.*, always '־', as נִגְלַל יְנֵו 1 S 14:8. No examples of the 2nd *plur.* occur.—With '־' retained in *pause* Nu 24:6; once with an initial guttural כְּתֹב Ct 1:6 for כְּתֹב, probably arising from the ordinary strong form *nīħru*, but the harshness of ה immediately followed by ר is avoided by pronouncing the ה with *Hateph-Pathah*.—In the 3rd *sing. fem.* וְאַתָּה Pr 27:15 (in *pause* for וְאַתָּה) and וְנַחֲנָה may be transposed for euphonic reasons; but probably we should simply read וְנַחֲנָה.—Among Niph'āl forms of לְה must be classed, with Buxtorf and others (cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xxx. 185), בְּאַתָּה from אַתָּה, not Pi'el of נָאָה; hence, according to § 23 d, נָאָה *they are beautiful* (for אַתָּה Is 52:7, Ct 1:10; but in Ps 93:5, where Baer requires בְּאַתָּה, read אַתָּה with ed. Mant., Ginsb.).

8. The *apocope* of the *imperfect* causes no further changes beyond the rejection of the ה, e.g. יָגַל from middle guttural, however, a form occurs with the *Qameš* shortened to *Pathah*, viz. הַמְּ (for המְ) Ps 109:13, as in verbs עַע; but in *pause* הַמְּ verse 14. Cf. bb.—The *infinitive absolute* אֲלֹאת emphasizing an *infinitive construct*, 2 S 6:20, is very extraordinary; probably it is a subsequent correction of an erroneous repetition of ה. The ה. galoth occurs in Ju 13:21, 1 S 3:21 for הַרְאָה הַלְּ; cf. above, n.—On the *infinitive Niph'āl* with the ה elided, see § 51 l.—The irregular צְלָו Ez 36:3 has probably arisen from a combination of the readings צְלָו (*Qal*) and צְלָו (*Niph'āl*). Similarly the solecism נִמְמָה 1 S 15:9 might be due to a combination of the *participle fem. Niph'āl* (נִמְמָה, cf. נִמְמָה) with the *Hoph'āl* (נִמְמָה); but it is more correct, with Wellhausen, to explain the מ from a confusion with נִמְמָה and to read, in fact, נִמְמָה וְנִמְמָה סֶת (= שׂוֹשִׁית).

On Pi'ēl, Pō'ēl, Pu'āl, and Hithpa'ēl.

9. In the 1st and 2nd persons of the *perfect Pi'ēl* the second syllable in most of the instances has '־' on the analogy of *Qal* (see f), as קְנוּ יְתִי, קְנוּ יְתִי; always so in the first *plur.*, and before *suffixes*, e.g. יְנֵו 37:26, יְכַפֵּת Ps 44:20. The form with '־' is found only in the 1st *sing.* (e.g. Jo 4:21; Is 5:4, 8:17 along with the form with i). On the tone of the *perf. consec. Pi'ēl* of הַהְ, see § 49 k.—*Hithpa'ēl* has (besides '־' Jer 17:16) as a rule '־' (Pr 24:10, 1 K 2:26, Jer 50:24). On the other hand, *Pu'āl* always has '־', e.g. יְתִי, יְתִי Ps 139:15.—A 1st *sing. perfect Pō'ēl* תְּשִׁוָּשָׁת (= שׂוֹשִׁית) occurs in Is 10:13.

10. The *infinitive absolute Pi'ēl* takes the form בְּכָלָה (like בְּכָלָה, the more frequent form even in the strong verb, see § 52 o); with ô only in Ps 40:2 בְּכָלָה; with ôth Hb 3:13 שְׁרוֹת (cf. above, n). On the ה. ז. and ה. ר. *infinitives absolute* of the passive of *Qal*, not of *Pō'ēl*, see above, n.—As *infinitive construct* חֲפֵי occurs in *Pi'ēl*, Ho 6:9 (only orthographically different from חֲפֵה, if the text is correct); לְכָלָה Dn 9:24 (on the ל see rr); עַד-כָּלָה 2 Ch 24:10, 31:1, for which in 2 K 13:17, 19, Ezr 9:14 עַד-כָּלָה with *infin. abs.*; in *Pu'āl* עַזְבָּת Ps 132:1.

11. The apocopated *imperfect* must (according to § 20 l) lose the *Dagesh forte* of the second radical, hence וַיִּצְרַא and he commanded, (for תִּתְחַרְּה=t'arrè) Ps 141:8; cf. Gn 24:20; even in the principal pause אַל-תִּתְגַּנֵּל Pr 25:9; *Hithpa'ēl* וַיִּתְגַּלֵּן and he uncovered himself, Gn 9:21; Pr 22:24; cf. Ps 37:1, 7, 8. With the lengthening of *Pathah* to *Qameš*, וַיִּתְמַרֵּךְ and he made marks, 1 S 21:14 (but read with Thenius וַיִּתְמַרֵּךְ, and instead of the meaningless וַיִּשְׁבַּן ibid. read וַיִּשְׁבַּן). In *Hithpa'ēl* אַל-תִּתְגַּנֵּר, in close connexion, Dt 2:9, 19; עַמְּשָׁת Is 41:10; according to

Qimhi also **Ps 45:12, Pr 23:3, 6, 24:1, 1 Ch 11:17**, whilst Baer and Ginsburg read with the best authorities **תְּהִאָו** (but cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, i. 597). —On **אֲחֹזֶק Jb 15:17** (for **אֲחֹזֶק**) cf. § 20 m; on **אַכְלֵךְ Ex 33:3**, see § 27 q; on **יַרְד Ju 5:13**, see § 69 g. Finally, on **קְלִיעַ**, which is referred to *Pi'el* by some, as a supposed *imperative*, see above, u.

12. Examples of apocopated *imperatives* in *Pi'ēl* and *Hithpa'ēl* are: אַזְכֵר also אָזְכָה command thou, גַּל open thou, Ps 119:18, 22; נַעֲמֵד prepare thou, Ps 61:8; נַעֲמֵה prove thou, Dn 1:12; לְנַעֲמֵה feign thyself sick, 2 S 13:5; cf. Dt 2:24.—On רְבָה Ju 9:29, cf. § 48 I.—In Ps 137:7 עַרְוֵי rase it, is found twice instead of עַרְוִי (for 'arrû) for rhythmical reasons (cf., however, וַיַּעֲרֹה in the *imperfect*, 2 Ch 24:11).

13. Examples of forms in which the *Yôdh* is retained are the *imperfects* תְּקַנֵּיָוּן Is 40:18, cf. verse 25 and 46:5; *they cover them*, Ex 15:5; *participle* *Pu' al* מִתְחַדֵּה Is 25:6; for אֲרֹי נֶגֶג Is 16:9 (from רֹוחַ יְהֹוָה) read with Margolis.

On Hiph'îl and Hoph'al.

14. The 3rd sing.*perfect* *Hiph'îl* sometimes has *S'ghôl* in the first syllable instead of *i* (§ 53 p), especially in **הָגַלְתָּה** (but *perfect consecutive* **וְהָגַלְתָּה** 2 K 24:14), **רָאָה**, **בָּאָה**; also with suffixes, e.g. **נִגְלָם** 1 Ch 8:7; **הָלָא בֵּי** Jb 16:7; **וְנִפְקָה** Ex 21:8. The *S'ghôl* also occurs in the 1st sing., e.g. **דָּלָאת יְהִי** Mi 6:3. On **וְהָרְאִיתִי** Na 3:5, cf. § 53 p. The forms with *ê* in the second syllable (also written defectively, as **וְהָפְתָה** Jer 21:6) are found throughout in the 1st sing. (except Pr 5:13), rarely in the 2nd sing. *masc.*, and never in the 1st plur. In the other persons they are about equally common with *i*, except in the 2nd plur., where *i* predominates. Before suffixes the forms with *i* predominate throughout; cf., however, *ê* in Ex 4:12, Mi 6:3, Pr 4:11. On the tone of the *perf. consec. Hiph.* of **הָלָל**, see § 49 k. In *Hoph'al* only **וְ** occurs in the 2nd syllable.

15. In the *infinitive Hiph'il* of **רָבַת** *to be abundant*, besides the *construct* **הָרְבָות** we find the *absolute* **הָרְבָה** taking the place of the common form **הָרְבָה**, which had come to be used invariably (but König calls attention to its use as *infinitive construct* in **Ez 21:20**) as an adverb, in the sense of *much*; in **2 S 14:11** the *Q'reh* requires for the *K'thibh* **הָרְבִיתָה**, an evident scribal error for **הָרְבָה**. Cf. **Gn 41:49, 22:17, Dt 28:63**; the pointing **הָרְבָה** **Jer 42:2** probably arises from regarding this form as a noun.—On the **הָמְרוֹת** **Jb 17:2** (with *Dageš f. dirimens*) see § 20 h.—In **2 K 3:24** **תֵּן** (before **נ**) is probably *infinitive absolute*, used in order to avoid the hiatus, cf. § 113 x, and on a similar case in *Qal*, see above, n.—On the *infinitives* with elision of the **נ**, cf. § 53 q.

16. The shortened imperfect *Hiph'îl* either takes no helping vowel, as יָפַת let him enlarge, Gn 9:27; יְנַצֵּחַ he shall subdue, Is 41:2; וַיִּשְׁׁמַע and he watered, Gn 29:10, &c.; יְנַרְאֶה and he showed, 2 K 11:4 (see § 28 d): or else has a helping vowel, as בָּגָל (for בָּגָל, see § 27 r), e.g. 2 K 18:11; בָּקָר Ps 105:24; וְרַב Ez 5:6; וְרַב 2 Ch 33:9; i.e. probably בָּרַב Jos 24:3 *K^ethibh* (וְאַרְבָּה Q^{rē}).—Examples of verbs *first guttural*: נְאַעֲלֵל Nu 23:2, נְאַעֲלֵל, &c., which can be distinguished as *Hiph'îl* from the similar forms in *Qal* only by the sense.—The *apocopated imperative* *Hiph'îl* always (except in verbs פְּנַח, e.g. הַנַּח, § 76 c) has a helping vowel, *S^ghôl* or *Pathah*, e.g. בְּרַב increase thou (for *harb*, הַרְבָּה) Ps 51:4 Q^{rē}, also Ju 20:38; where, however, it cannot be explained the text stands; בְּרַב let alone (for *harb*, הַרְבָּה) Dt 9:14, &c.; עַל הַרְבָּה the *harb*, הַרְבָּה, Dt 9:14.

¹ In Nu 34:7 f., according to verse 10, תְּהִלָּתָה (=תְּהִלָּתָה) is intended to be read for תְּהִלָּה (imperfect Pi 'el from הַלֵּךְ).

(for **עֲלֵה**, Ex 8:1, 33:12; but for **עַשְׂנָה** Ps 39:14, which could only be *imperative Hiph'il* of **עַזְבָּשׁ** (=smear over, as in Is 6:10), read with Baethgen **עַזְבָּשׁ** look away.—The *imperfect Hiph'il* with *Yôdh* retained occurs only in **תִּזְבַּח** Jb 19:2, from **זְבַח**. Cf. **עַ**.

In General.

17. In Aramaic the *imperfect* and *participle* of all the conjugations terminate in נְ or יְ. The Hebrew *infinitives*, *imperatives*, and *imperfects* in נָ, less frequently נְ or יָ, may be due to imitation of these forms. On the *infinitive construct* *Pi'el*, see above, aa; *imperative Qal* הַנֵּא Jb 37:6 (in the sense of *fall*); *imperfect* יְנִא let him look out, Gn 41:33 (but see above, p); *לְעֻשָׂה* he will do, Is 64:3; *אֲלֹתָתֶךָ* consent thou not, Pr 1:10; *אֲלֹתָתֶךָ* do thou not, 2 S 13:12 (the same form in Gn 26:29, Jos 7:9, Jer 40:16 *Q'reh*) (so Baer and Ginsburg, after cod. Hillel, &c.) I will be, Jer 31:1; *אֲלֹתָתֶךָ* Jos 9:24; *תְּגִלָּה* Dn 1:13. Cf. also in *Niph'al* יְמַצֵּה Lv 5:9; תְּבִנָה (according to Qimhi) Nu 21:27; in *Pi'el* תְּגִלָּה Lv 18:7, 8, 12–17, 20:19, in each case לְ אֲמַגְלָה beside נְגַלָּה (Baer נְגַפָּה) Na 1:3; אֲרָה Ez 5:12 (with *Zaqeph*; Baer אֲרָה). The fact, however, that a great number of these forms occur in *pause* and represent at the same time a *jussive* or *voluntative* (Jos 7:9), suggests the view that the *Sere* is used merely to increase the emphasis of the pausal form, and at the same time to make a distinction in sound between the *jussive* or *voluntative* and the ordinary *imperfect*.¹ Elsewhere (Gn 26:29, Lv 5:9, Jer 40:16, Dn 1:13; according to Baer also Mi 7:10, Zc 9:5) the pronunciation with ē is probably intended to soften the hiatus caused by a following נ or י; cf. the analogous cases above, § 741.

The ending יְנִי-שָׁם appears to stand for הַנִּי in the *imperfect Qal* וַתַּגְנִי-שָׁם and there hath she played the harlot, Jer 3:6; perhaps, however, the 2nd sing. fem. is intended, or it may have been introduced into the text of Jeremiah from Ez 16:15, &c. Still more strange is it in the *imperfect Hiph'il* אֲלֹתָה מִתְּחִילָה Jer 18:23; but the *Mil'el*-tone probably points to מִתְּחִילָה as the correct reading (cf. Neh 13:14). The יְנִי stands for הַנִּי in the *perfect Hiph'il* הַנִּי-חָלֵל he made sick, Is 53:10, which is probably for חָלֵל הַחֲלִיל from חָלֵל, a secondary form of חֶלֶב; see rr. The plur. הַמְּסִין (Baer) הַמְּסִין they made to melt, Jos 14:8, is a purely Aramaic form.

18. In two verbs the rare conjugation *Pa'lēl* or its reflexive (§ 55 d) occurs: מַטְבִּחֵנִים *archers*, Gn 21:16 (from *הַקָּפֵעַ*); but most frequently in *הַקָּפֵעַ* *to bend*, *Pa'lēl* שְׁמַרְתָּךְ *not in use*, whence reflexive קָרְבָּנָה *to bow oneself, to prostrate oneself*, 2nd pers. in תִּתְּהַנֵּא and 1st pers. in תִּתְּהַנֵּא, imperfect קָרְבָּנָה, consecutive 3rd sing. masc. וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ *cho* for *wayyištaḥw* (analogous to the noun-forms, like שְׁחָנוֹ *cho* for *sahw*); 3rd plur. וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ.—Instead of the aramaizing *infinitive* with suffix בְּהַשְׁתָּחֻוֹתִים 2 K 5:18 read with König בְּהַשְׁתָּחַוֹתִים; in Ez 8:16 מִשְׁתָּחַוֹתִים is still more certainly a scribal error for חֲוִימִים.

19. Before *suffixes* in all forms ending in ַ, a connecting vowel is employed instead of the ַ and the connecting vowel which precedes it (§ 58 f), e.g. Gn 24:27; in *pause* 1 K 2:30, &c., even with lesser disjunctives, Ps 118:5, Pr 8:22, or with a conjunctive accent, 1 S 28:15 (but Baer), Jb 30:19; cf. § 59 h; ָנָךְ, in *pause* עֲנָךְ, Is 30:19 (and even when not in *pause* Jer 23:37) or like Dt 32:6; עֲנָם, עֲנָה יְמִינָךְ Gn 28:3; cf. also *imperfect*, עֲנָה הָיָה Hiph. עֲנָה, □ עֲלָךְ, הָפֵנָה בְּנֵי עֲנָה.

¹ Possibly these examples (like the eases of *S'ghol* in *pause*, see n) represent the view of a particular Masoretic school, which was intended to be consistently carried out.

Only very seldom does the *imperat.* or *impf.* end in ‘־’ before suffixes, e.g. Dt 32:26; Ps 140:10 *Q^rê*; *הַפְעֵל יִנְצֹה* *smite me*, 1 K 20:35, 37; cf. Hb 3:2, Is 38:16. Even in these examples a return to the original ending *ay* might be assumed; but perhaps they are merely due to a less correct *plene* writing. In the 3rd sing. perf. fem. the older form *גָּלוּתָה* (see i) is always used before a *suffix*, e.g. Zc 5:4; in *pause* עַשׂ תְּנִי (for *כְּלַתְּהוּ*) Jb 33:4; רָתַק 42:5.

The Relation between Verbs לְהַ and אֶלְּ.

20. The close relation existing between verbs נָלַךְ and נָלַכְתִּי is shown in Hebrew by the fact that the verbs of one class often borrow forms from the other, especially in the later writers and the poets.

21. Thus there are forms of verbs אָלַח—

(a) Which have adopted the vowels of verbs נָלַח, e.g. *perfect Qal* *I have refrained*, Ps 119:101; *participle* נָלַח (אֲלֵה) *sinning*, Ec 2:26, 8:12, 9:2, 18; cf. Is 65:20; Ec 7:26; נָשַׁל lending, 1 S 22:2; *Pi'el perfect* נָלַל *he has filled*, Jer 51:34; cf. 1 K 9:11, Am 4:2 (where, however, the *perfect Niph.* is perhaps intended), Ps 89:11, 143:3; *Rip̄ אֶתְּנוֹ I heal*, 2 K 2:21; cf. Jer 51:9; *imperfect* יָגַע נָפְלָתָה (like נָגְלָתָה) *it was wonderful*, 2 S 1:26; *Hiph'il perfect* הָפַלָּתָה Dt 28:59; *not* הָפַקְבָּתָה (cf. above, 2 S 1:26) *she hid*, Jos 6:17. On the other hand, forms like 1 S 14:33, חָטָאים Ps 99:6, קְרָפָאוּ Ez 47:8, קְרָפָאנִי, according to the correct reading, Jb 19:2 (cf. Gn 31:39 אֲחַת בָּה), and יְרָאוּ imperative plur. masc. from יְרָא Jos 24:14, 1 S 12:24, Ps 34:10, are due to the elision of the ה, see § 74 i. On קְשָׁוֹא Jer 10:5 and גְּשָׁא Ps 139:20, see § 23 i.

(b) Forms in הַ, but keeping their לְ vowels, e.g. *imperfect Qal* אָרֶפֶה Jer 3:22; *imperative Rāpha'* heal thou, Ps 60:4; *Niph'al*; נִחְבֵּה Jer 49:10 (which must evidently be a *perfect*; read with Ewald the *infinitive absolute* נִחְבֵּה as in verse 23), and *הִחְבֹּה* to hide oneself, 1 K 22:25, cf. Jer 19:11; *Pi'el imperfect* מִלְלָה, he will fill, Jb 8:21.

(c) Forms entirely of a הַלְאָ character, e.g. *perfect Qal* וְאַמְתָה and when thou art athirst, *Ru 2:9*, cf. *2 S 3:8*; קָלּוּ they shut up, *1 S 6:10*; cf. *25:33*; מָלִוּ they are full, *Ez 28:16*, cf. *39:26*; *infinitive* הַטּוּ (see above, n) to sin, *Gn 20:6* (on the מְלִאת see above, § 74 h); *imperative sing. fem.* הַבִּי Is 26:20; *imperfect* תְּרַפֵּי נָהָה יְכַלֵּה (for יְקַלֵּא) he will keep back, *Gn 23:6*; they heal, *Jb 5:18*; *participle* בּוֹעֲתָה *Pr 12:18*; *fem.* יְצָאָה Ec 10:5; *plur.* צְבָתָה Is 29:7; *participle passive* נְשֻׁי Ps 32:1; *Niph'al* נְגַנְּתָה Jer 51:9; בְּנָבָת thou hast prophesied, *Jer 26:9* (cf. *Ps 139:14*, *Jb 18:3*); *imperfect* פָּוֹ 2 K 2:22 (*infinitive* Jer 19:11); *Pi'el imperfect* נִירְפָּו Jer 8:11, cf. *Gn 31:39*; *Hiph'il* מְקֻנָה Ez 8:3; *Hithpa'el* הַתְּנַבֵּה 1 S 10:6; *infinitive* הַתְּנַבּוֹת 1 S 10:13. For the *K^ethibh* להשות 2 K 19:25, Jablonski and others require as *Q're* the form קְנַשְׁתָות (so Is 37:26); the *K^ethibh* would have to be read לְנַשְׁתָות, with elision of the נ and retraction of the vowel.

22. On the other hand, there are forms of verbs הַל, which wholly or in part follow the analogy of verbs לְאָנֹה, e.g. in their consonants אָנֹה *he comes*, Is 21:12; בָּרָא 2 S 12:17 (*textus receptus* Ez 43:27; וְרָצָתִי Jb 8:11; יִשְׁגַּג La 4:1; וְחָלָא 2 Ch 16:12; אֲנָה Ex 1:10, Lv 10:19; Dt 28:66 (cf. Ho 11:7); נִקְרָא 2 S 1:6; שְׁבָא 2 S 1:6) (נִקְרָא *infin. absol.* Niph'al beside נִקְרָא 2 K 25:29; יִשְׁגַּג Jer 38:4; Ec 8:1: in their vowels, אָנָה נָו Jer 3:22; Dn 10:14; תְּכִלָּה 1 K 17:14: in both, יִקְרָא Gn 49:1; cf. 42:4, Is 51:19; תְּלָאוּם 2 S 21:12 Q're; לִירֹא 2 Ch 26:15 (cf. 2 S 11:24 *K'thlibh*); מְרָאָה (participle fem. Qal) Zp 3:1; Ho 13:15; La 4:2.—For אָוֹת (so Baer, Ez 17:6, cf. 31:8), which can only be intended for פְּרָאֹות (so Ez 31:5, &c. *participle fem. plur.* from פָּרָה=פָּרָא, read פְּאֹרֶת=פְּאֹרֶא, according to Ez 31:5, &c.)

§ 76. Verbs Doubly Weak.

1. In a tolerably large number of verbs two radicals are weak letters, and are consequently affected by one or other of the anomalies already described. In cases where two anomalies might occur, usage must teach whether one, or both, or neither of them, takes effect.

Thus e.g. from נִנְצָד *to flee*, the *imperfect* is יַדּוֹ in **Na 3:7** and יַקְרֵב in **Gn 31:40** (on the analogy of verbs פְּנִים); *Hiph'il* הַנְּצָד (like a verb עַמְּדָה), but the *imperfect Hoph'al* again יַקְרֵב (as פְּנִים).

2. The following are examples of difficult forms, which are derived from doubly weak verbs:

(a) Verbs פְּנִים and לְאַתָּה (cf. § 66 and § 74), e.g. נְשַׁפֵּר *to bear*, imperative נְשַׁפֵּר (Ps 10:12 אֲשַׁפֵּר), of which נְשַׁפֵּר Ps 4:7 is probably only an orthographic variation); *infinitive construct* נְשַׁפֵּר (for נְשַׁפֵּר; see the analogous noun-formations in § 93 t), also נְשַׁבֵּר Is 1:14, 18:3; Gn 4:13 אֲשַׁבֵּר; Ps 89:10 אֲשַׁבֵּר (perhaps only a scribal error); after the *prefix* ל always לְשַׁתְּ (otherwise the contracted form only occurs in תְּשַׁבֵּח Jb 41:17, with rejection of the א); *imperfect* הַנְּשַׁבֵּר for נְשַׁבֵּר Ru 1:14; wholly irregular are יְנַהֵּר Ez 23:49 (so Baer after Qimhi; *textus receptus*, and also the Mantua ed., and Ginsburg, אַתָּה שְׁאַתָּה אַתָּה) and נְשַׁבֵּר 2 S 19:43 as *infinitive absolute Niph'al* (on the analogy of the *infinitive construct Qal*?); but most probably נְשַׁבֵּר אַתָּה is to be read, with Driver.

(b) Verbs פְּנִים and לְהַזְּהָבָה (cf. § 66 and § 75), as נְבַעַת *to bow*, *to incline*, נְכַבָּה *to smite*. Hence *imperfect Qal* נְבַעַת, *apocopated* טַבַּע (Gn 26:25 טַבַּע) and he bowed; יְנַזֵּן (so, probably, also Is 63:3 for יְנַזֵּן) 2 K 9:33 and he sprinkled (from נְזֵב); *perfect Hiph'il* הַנְּכַבָּה he smote, *imperfect* יְכַבָּה, *apocopated* נְכַבָּה (even with Athnah 2 K 15:16; but also ten times נְכַבָּה, נְכַבָּה Dt 2:33; so also Lv 8:11, 30; אַלְתָּה Ps 141:4 (cf. Jb 23:11); *imperative* נְכַבָּה, *apocopated* הַנְּכַבָּה smite thou (like תְּכַבָּה *incline*, with נְהָבָה), *infinitive* הַכְּבָה, *participle* מְכַבָּה; *Hoph'al* הַנְּכַבָּה, *participle* מְכַבָּה.

(c) Verbs פְּאַתָּה and לְהַזְּהָבָה (cf. § 68 and § 75), as אַתָּה *to be willing*, אַפְּהָה *to bake*, אַתָּה *to come*. E.g. *imperfect Qal* יְאַתָּה, plur. יְאַתָּה, אַתָּה, אַתָּה (cf. § 68 h) Dt 33:21 for נְאַתָּה (= נְאַתָּה); *imperfect apocopated* Is 41:25 for נְאַתָּה; *imperative* יְאַתָּה Is 21:12, 56:9, 12 (cf. אַפְּהָה bake ye, Ex 16:23) for יְאַתָּה יְאַתָּה (§ 23 h; § 75 u); *Hiph'il* יְאַתָּה הַנְּאַתָּה for יְאַתָּה (Is 21:14); *imperfect apocopated* יְאַלְתָּה and he adjured, 1 S 14:24, properly יְאַלְתָּה (הַאֲלָתָה) from נְאַתָּה, whence נְאַלְתָּה, and, with the obscuring to ô, יְאַלְתָּה; instead of the simple *apocode* (לְאַלְתָּה) the א which had already become quiescent, is made audible again by the helping *S'ghôl* (unless perhaps there is a confusion with the *imperfect consecutive Hiph'il* of אַלְתָּה).

(d) Verbs פְּיַי and לְאַתָּה (cf. § 69, § 70, and § 74), as אַתָּה *to go forth*, *imperative* אַתָּה go forth, with הַהָּאַתָּה *paragogic* הַהָּאַתָּה Ju 9:29 in principal pause for נְאַתָּה; 2nd fem. plur. נְאַתָּה Ct 3:11; *infinitive* נְאַתָּה; *Hiph'il* הַנְּאַתָּה to bring forth.—אַנְגָּרָה to fear, *imperfect* יְאַנְגָּרָה and נְאַנְגָּרָה (or נְיַגָּרָה), *imperative* אַנְגָּרָה; *imperfect Niph'al* נְגַרְתָּה Ps 130:4, *participle* נְגַרְתָּה.

(e) Verbs פְּיַי and לְהַזְּהָבָה (cf. § 69, § 70, and § 75), e.g. יְזַהֵּב *to throw*, *Hiph'il* הַזְּהָבָה to confess, to praise, and יְזַהֵּב *to throw* (both properly verbs פְּנִים), and יְזַהֵּב *to be beautiful*. *Infinitive* יְזַהֵּב; *imperative* יְזַהֵּב; *imperfect consecutive* יְזַהֵּב Ez 31:7 (cf. also 16:13); with *suffixes* וְגַרְבָּם we have shot at them (from נְגַרְבָּה) Nu 21:30; perhaps, however, it should be read with the LXX וְגַרְבָּם and their race (also in the very corrupt passage Ps 74:8 נְגַרְבָּם is probably a *substantive*, and not the *imperfect Qal* with suffix from נְגַרְבָּה); *Pi'el*; וְגַדְוּ for וְגַדְוּ (§ 69 u). *Hiph'il* הַזְּהָבָה, הַזְּהָבָה;

infinitive absolute 2 Ch 7:3); *imperfect* יָרַח, cf. אלְתָנָה (Jer 22:3; apocopated יָרַח 2 K 13:17.

(f) Verbs עָלָה and אָלָה, particularly בָּאֵת, בָּאֵת or בָּאֵת בָּאֵת (Gn 16:8, 2 S 14:3, Mi 4:10; cf. § 75 m), once נָאֵת for נָאֵת בָּאֵת 1 S 25:8; for אָלָה בָּאֵת Jer 27:18, which is apparently the *perfect*, read אָלָה. In the *imperfect Qal* the separating vowel occurs אָלָה instead of the more common אָלָה, cf. also Gn 30:38) only in Jer 9:16, Ps 45:16, and 1 S 10:7 *K^ethibh*.

For the reading וְאָתָה 1 S 25:34 Q^erē evidently combines the two readings וְאָתָה and וְאָתָה; cf. Nestle, *ZAW*. xiv. 319), read אָתָה; on the impossible forms Dt 33:16 and Jb 22:21 cf. § 48 d.—In the *perfect Hiphil* הָבִיאָת and (only before a suffix) הָבִיאָת; the latter form is also certainly intended in Nu 14:31, where the Masora requires הָבִיאָת, cf. 2 K 9:2, 19:25, Is 43:23) Jer 25:13, Ct 3:4. Before suffixes the ē of the first syllable in the 3rd sing. always becomes *Hateph-Sghōl*, e.g. הָבִיאָת; elsewhere invariably *Hateph-Pathah*, e.g. הָבִיאָת or הָבִיאָת. On the other hand, ē is retained in the secondary tone in the *perfect consecutive* when without suffixes, e.g. הָבִיאָת. Cf. moreover, הָבִיאָת in Opitius and Hahn is altogether incorrect), Pr 25:16, from קִיא; but קִיא spue ye, Jer 25:27 (perhaps only a mistake for קִיאוֹ), is not to be referred to קִיא but to a secondary stem קִיה. In the *imperfect Qal* קִיה is found once, Lv 18:25, besides קִיה (analogous to קִיא).—On אָבִי (for אָבִי, יְנִי, מְבִי, אָבִי, see § 74 k.

(g) The form חַיִּים to live, in the *perfect Qal*, besides the ordinary development to חַיה (fem. חַיִּה), is also treated as a verb עָלָה, and then becomes חַי in the 3rd pers. *perfect*, in *pause* חַי, and with wāw *consecutive* חַי Gn 3:22, and frequently. In Lv 25:36 the contracted form חַי is perhaps st. *constr.* of חַיה life, but in any case read חַי *perfect consecutive* as in verse 35. The form חַי occurs in Ex 1:16 in *pause* for חַי (3rd fem.) with *Dageš* omitted in the ' on account of the pausal lengthening of ā to ā.

§ 77. Relation of the Weak Verbs to one another.

The close relation which exists between some classes of the weak verbs (e.g. between פָּאֵת and פָּאֵת, לְאֵת and לְאֵת, עָלָה and עָלָה, עָלָה and עָלָה) appears not only in their similarity or identity of inflexion, or their mutual interchange of certain forms, but especially from the fact that frequently the same root (*radix bilittera*, see § 30 g) recurs in various weak stems of similar meaning. The meaning accordingly is inherent in the two constant root-consonants, while the third consonant □, which is weak (and the particular class of weak verbs with it), does not establish any difference in the meaning. Thus from the root קַד there occur with the same meaning קַדְךָ, קַדְךָ, קַדְךָ to strike, to crush; and from the root נַד there are נַדְךָ, נַדְךָ, נַדְךָ to flee.

In this manner the following classes are related in form and meaning:

1. Verbs עָלָה and עָלָה in which the first and third consonants are the same in both, as being essential to the meaning; e.g. מַוְךָ and מַכְךָ to become poor; מַוְשֵׁחַ and שְׂשֵׁחַ to feel; נַדְךָ and נַדְךָ to flee.

2. Verbs פְּצַבֵּי and פְּצַבָּה and פְּצַבְּנָה to place, שְׁקֹדֶן and שְׁקֹדֶס (yāqōs) to lay snares. Moreover, stems belonging to the classes mentioned in 1 (especially יְמִיעָה) are frequently related also to verbs פְּטַבֵּי and פְּטַבָּה, e.g. פְּגַוֵּר and פְּטַבְּנָה to fear; פְּטַבָּה and פְּטַבָּה to be good; פְּפַחַד and פְּפַחַד to blow; פְּפַגֵּעַ and פְּפַגְּזָה to dash to pieces. Verbs אַפְּנִים are less frequently connected with these classes, e.g. אַפְּנִים and דְּוַשֵּׁנָה to thresh, &c.

3. Verbs לְהַנִּיחַ and לְהַקְרָבַ (in which the first two consonants form the real body of the stem) are sometimes related to each other, and sometimes to the above classes. To each other, in אֲכַלֵּה and קָרַבְנָה to crush, קָרַבְתָּה and פָּרַחַת to meet (cf. § 75 nn); to verbs of the other classes, in הַצְּעַדְתָּ and מַצְּעַדְתָּ to suck, קָרַחַת and דַּוְחַת to thrust, &c.

4. Verbs עָנָה and לְעָנָה, on which cf. Grimm, *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, 1903, p. 196; e.g. and קָלַל and קָלַה and קָלַל to sigh, קָמַת and קָמַם to be quiet, קָנַן and קָנַה to incline, קָרַב and קָרַב to despise, שָׁגַג and שָׁגַג to err, קָרַח and קָרַח to bend down, סָסַס and סָסַס to plunder.

5. Verbs פָּהוֹל and עַזְּה (New Hebrew; in O. T. only מִיל (Mil) (Is 1:22) to circumcise, נְהַר and מְהַר to exchange, נָור אֲנוֹרָה a light) and מָור to shine; cf. also לְקָטִים secret arts, Ex 7:11 with לְט secret, from לֹט.

§ 78. Verba Defectiva.

It often happens, when two kindred weak verbs are in use with the same meaning, that both are *defective*, i.e. do not occur in all the forms. Since, however, those tenses and forms which are not in use in the one verb are generally supplied by the other, they mutually complete one another, and thus form together, as it were, an entire verb, as in Greek ἔρχομαι, aor. ἤλθον, fut. ἐλεύσομαι, and in Latin *fero*, *tuli*, *latum*, *ferre*, &c., but with this difference, that in Hebrew the roots of these verbs are almost always closely related.

The most common verbs of this kind are—

הַבָּשׂ, הַבִּישׁ וְתַּחֲבֵשׁ (inferred from **הַבִּישׁ עַל**), but also as if from **בָּשָׁ**, on the analogy of verbs פְּשַׁׁע; also in **Is 30:5** the *Q^ré* requires הַבִּישׁ, where the *K^ethibb* has בָּאַשׁ from **בָּאַשׁ**.

טוֹב *to be good. Perfect בָּטַח; but imperfect יִיטַח, and Hiph.* יִטְבֶּה from **הַטִּיב**. ^ת (but cf. K 10:30).

גָּורֵר *to be afraid. Imperfect* גָּזֹר (from גָּור).

וְיָקַם to awake, only in the *imperf.* זָקַם; for the *perfect*, the *Hiph'il* הִקַּם is used (from קִים).

נִפְצֵץ *Pi'el*. **נִפְזַּר** *Niph'al*. **פָּזָר** *Imperative* (from **פֹזֶן**). **הַפְּזִיר** *Reflexive Hiph'il* (from **פֹזֶן**). **פָּזָץ** *Jb 16:12*.

(*Qal* in post-biblical Hebrew, in Aramaic and Arabic) to place, whence (possibly) *Niph' al* and *Hiph'* (see above, § 71); but *Hithpa' el*.

הַקְרִבָּה to drink, used in *Qal*; but in *Hiph.* **הַקְרִבֵּה** to give to drink, from a *Qal* **הַקְרִבָּה** which is not used in Hebrew.

On הַלְךָ (ילך) *to go*, see above, § 69 x.

Rem. 1. To the same category belong also, to a certain extent, those cases where the *tenses* or *moods* not in use in one conjugation, are supplied by forms having the same meaning in other conjugations of the same verb. Thus:

רֹאֵס *to add*. The *infinitive* (but cf. § 69 h, note) and *imperfect*, unused in *Qal*, are supplied by the *Hiph'il* הַסִּירָה, יָסִיר (on יָסִיר as *imperfect indicative*, see § 109 d, cf. also § 109 i).

כָּשַׁל *to stumble*. *Perfect* from *Qal*, *imperfect* from *Niph'al*.

נָגַשׂ *to approach*, unused in *perf. Qal*, instead of which *Niph'al* שָׁגַן is used; but *imperfect* שָׁגַן, *imperative* שָׁגַן, and *infinitive* תָּשַׁגֵּן from *Qal* only are in use.

נָחַת *to lead*. *Perfect* usually נָחַת in *Qal*, so *imperative* נָחַת, but *imperfect* and *infinitive* always in *Hiph'il*.

נָתַךְ *to be poured out*. *Perfect Niph'al* נָתַךְ with *imperfect Qal* נָתַךְ, but the *perfect Qal* and *imperfect Niph'al* are not in use.

2. The early grammarians often speak of *mixed forms* (*formae mixtae*), i.e. forms which unite the supposed character and meaning of two different tenses, genders, or conjugations. Most of the examples adduced are at once set aside by accurate grammatical analysis; some others appear to have arisen from misapprehension and inaccuracy, especially from erroneous views of unusual *plene* forms. Others, again, are either merely wrong readings or represent an intentional conflation of two different readings.

CHAPTER III

THE NOUN

§ 79. General View.

For the literature, see De Lagarde, *Uebersicht über die im Aram., Arab. und Hebr. übliche Bildung der Nomina*, Göttingen, 1889; Index and Additions, 1891; J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, first half, *Simple nouns*, Leipzig, 1889; second half, *Nouns with external additions*, 1891; second edition, with indices of words and subjects, 1894; E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude, &c.*, ii. 1, Leipzig, 1895, see above, § 3 f.—Of these three important works the first two especially have given rise to various articles. In support of De Lagarde: Hommel in *ZDMG*. xliv, p. 535 ff. (against De Lagarde and Hommel: Barth, *ibid.*, p. 679 ff.), and dealing with the Index, *ZDMG*. xlv, p. 340 ff.—Against Barth (though with many points of agreement): Philippi in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, 1890, p. 344 ff. (answered by Barth in *ZDMG*. xliv, p. 692 ff.), and *ZDMG*. xlvi, p. 149 ff. (answered again by Barth, *ibid.*, xlviii, p. 10 ff.), also in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii (1892), p. 359 ff. ‘Die semitische Verbal- und Nominalbildung,’ and lastly, in *ZDMG*. xlix, p. 187 ff.—Cf. also A. Müller, ‘Semitische Nomina. Bemerkungen zu de Lagarde und Barth,’ *ZDMG*. xlv, p. 221 ff.—The main points at issue in the works of De Lagarde and Barth are indicated below, § 83 d.—Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 104 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 329 ff.

1. Since, according to § 30 a, most word-stems are developed into verbal stems as well as into noun-stems, it has become customary (especially in the Lexicon) to refer the noun to the most simple ground-form of the verbal formation, viz. the 3rd *pers. sing. perfect Qal*, and, as it were, to derive it from that form. This is usual, not only in those noun-stems which can be directly connected with a corresponding verbal stem (*Nomina veralia* or *derivativa*, § 83 ff.), but also with *Nomina primitiva*, i.e. those of which no verbal stem is now found in Hebrew (see § 82), as well as finally with *Nomina denominativa*, which have evidently been derived from other nouns (§ 86).

The adjective agrees in form entirely with the substantive. On the formation of adjectival ideas by giving to abstracts a concrete sense, see § 83 c.

2. A special inflexion of the noun to express the various cases does not exist in Hebrew; only a few ancient and almost extinct traces of case-endings have survived (§ 90). The syntactical relation of a noun can therefore in general only be inferred from its position in the sentence, or from its being joined to prepositions. In either case, the form of the noun undergoes no change (except for the *construct state*, § 89), and the representation of case-relations belongs therefore almost exclusively to the syntax (§ 117 ff.). The comparative and superlative of adjectives also can be expressed only by a syntactical combination (§ 133). On the other hand, several changes in the forms of nouns are occasioned by the additions of the plural, dual, and feminine terminations, as well as of the pronominal suffixes, and also by the close connexion of two nouns, by means of the *construct state*.¹

§ 80. *The Indication of Gender in Nouns.*

Brockelmann; *Grundriss*, p. 404 ff.; ‘Ueber die Femininendung *at, ah, ā*’ in *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 106 f.; *Grundriss*, pp. 105, 405 ff.; ‘Die Femininendung *T* im Semit.’ (*Sitzung d. orient.-sprachwiss. Sektion d. schlesischen Gesellschaft*, Feb. 26, 1903); against him J. Barth, *ZDMG*, 1903, p. 628 ff.; Brockelmann’s reply, *ibid.*, p. 795 ff.; and Barth again, *ibid.*, p. 798 ff.

1. The Hebrew, like all Semitic languages, recognizes only two genders in the noun, a *masculine* and a *feminine*. Inanimate objects and abstract ideas, which other languages sometimes indicate by the *neuter*, are regarded in Hebrew either as masculine or feminine, more often the latter (see the Syntax, § 122 q).

2. The *masculine*, as being the more common and important gender, has no special indication.

Feminine nouns are also without an indication of gender when the meaning of the word naturally denotes a feminine, as בָּתִי mother, תַּרְסֵא a she-ass, תַּרְסֵה a she-goat, לְבָנִי an ewe (cf. § 122 b). As a rule, however, the *feminine* had originally the ending נֶ, as in the 3rd *sing. perfect* of verbs (§ 44 a). This נֶ, however, is regularly retained in Hebrew only in close connexion with a following genitive or suffix (cf. § 89 e and § 91 o), except where the form has arisen through the addition of a simple נֶ² (see

¹ To speak of these changes as a declension of the Hebrew noun, as is usually done, is accordingly incorrect.

² In Mal 1:14 הַמְשֻׁנָּה (so e. g. ed. Mant.) would stand for הַמְשֻׁנָּה, the ptcp. fem. Hophal; but הַמְשֻׁנָּה (so Baer and Ginsb.) is also supported by good authority.

below, d). Otherwise, the feminine ending of the independent form (the *absolute state*, § 89 a) is—

(a) Most commonly a tone-bearing הָ, e. g. סֹסֶה *equus*, equa. Of nouns ending in הָ, like עַבְרִיהָ, the feminine (by § 24 b) is עַבְרִיהָ, cf. § 86 h. As in the 3rd sing. *perf.* (הָלַחֲתָ, &c.), this הָ seems to have arisen by the rejection of the final חָ, and the lengthening of the אָ in the open syllable, whereupon the הָ was added as an orthographic indication of the final long vowel: cf. the exactly similar origin of such forms as גָּלָה for גָּלֵי, § 75 c. It must, however, be noticed that in Arabic (see m and note) the pausal form of *at* is *ah*, of which a trace may be preserved in the Hebrew הָ.

(b) Simple חָ with nouns ending in a vowel, e. g. יְהוּדִית *Jewess*. The same ending חָ is very frequently added to stems ending in a consonant, but only (except before suffixes) by means of a helping vowel, which, as a rule, is *S'ghol*, but after gutturals *Pathah*, e. g. קְטַלְתָּ, *killing*; before suffixes, e. g. קְטַלְתִּי, according to the rule given in § 69 c, cf. also § 84a s; מְזֻעָה *an acquaintance*, *fem.* מְזֻעָה. The forms which arise in this way follow in every respect the analogy of the *segholate* forms (§ 94 f). The forms which have been developed by means of a helping vowel are retained even in the connective form (*construct state*); except יְלָקָת (for יְלָקָת, which is used elsewhere) Gn 16:11, Ju 13:5, 7; cf. Jer 22:23 and 51:13 *Q'reh*, also 1 K 1:15, *participle fem. Pi-ēl*, properly *me-šāratt* = מְשֻׁרָתָה; also בְּבָעָתָה (participle fem. *Pi-ēl* with suffix) arises from the form מְבָעָתָה which was developed into מְבָעָתָה.

Rem. 1. The fem. form in חָ is in general less frequent, and occurs almost exclusively when the form in הָ is also in use. It is only in the participles and infinitives that it is the commoner, e. g. חָמָת more common than קָלָה, קָלָה than לָקָת.

2. Rarer feminine endings are—(a) חָ with the tone, e. g. תְּרֵקָה *emerald*, Ez 28:13 (also Ex 28:17); חָשָׁפָע *a company*, 2 K 9:17, unless the reading is wrong; more frequently in proper names, especially of places among the Canaanites or Phoenicians (in whose language חָחָ was the usual fem. ending, § 2 d) and other neighbouring tribes,¹ e. g. תְּרֵפָה *Zarephath*, תְּגִיבָּה *Gibeath*, תְּקִירָה *Kiriath*, תְּאִילָה *Ailana* in Idumea; אַחֲרָה Gn 26:26: on the reading אַחֲרָה cf. g. Cf., moreover, אַגְּנָת Ps 61:1 (prob. originally חַיָּת *life*); תְּחִיָּה חַיָּה 74^{19a}; פָּגָת La 2:18; [רְבָת *much*, in Ps 65:10, 120:6, 123:4, 129:1, 2, is a form borrowed from the Aramaic (Syriac rabbath) in which the original *t* of the *fem.* is often retained to form *adverbs*, see Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 135.]

(b) חָ, which likewise occurs in some names of places, e. g. תְּלֵקָה בְּעַלְתָּה, as well as in the masc. proper name גִּלְעָד 1 S 17:4, &c. (in 17:23, and 21:10, ed. Mant. has גִּלְעָד), and in the fem. proper name תְּמַעַת; otherwise, almost only in poetry, viz. זָמְרָת Ex 15:2, Is 12:2, Ps 118:14 (really for זָמְרָת *my song*; the absorption of the *i*, however, can scarcely have ‘taken place in the Aramaic manner’, as suggested by Duhm on Is 12:2, nor is it due merely to the following יְוָדָה, but is intended ‘to facilitate the absorption of הָיָה’; so Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 277 f.);

¹ In the list of Palestinian towns taken by Pharaoh Shoshenq, the feminine town-names all end in *t*. Cf. also the Mēša inscription, line 3, הבְּמִתְהָזָאת *this high place*; line 26, הַמְּסִלָּתָה *the highway* [see also Driver, *Tenses*, § 181, note].

heritage, Ps 16:6 (either again for נַחֲלָתִי *my heritage*, or for נַחֲלָתְהָ, cf. § 90 g, as probably also עֹזרָתֶךָ *help*, Ps 60:13, 108:13 for עֹזֶר תָּה). These forms are possibly survivals from a period when even final vowels were not supported by a vowel-letter. Cf. also פֵּרֶת *fecunda (a fruitful tree)* Gn 49:22; יְמֻרָתָה *abundance*, Jer 48:36 (before ו; but in Is 15:7 יְמֻרָה); שְׁנָתָה *sleep (for שְׁנָה)* Ps 132:4; and (unless the ת is radical) in prose תְּאֵנָתָק *pelican* (which reading is also preferable, in Is 34:11, to the form קְאֵנָתָק), also מְמֻרָתָה ¹ תְּמֻרָתָה Jer 45:25 Q^re is no doubt intended to indicate the reading תְּמֻרָתָה, parallel to מְשׁוּשָׁתָה; cf. above, on זְמֻרָתָה, &c.

(c) נַחַת, the Aramaic orthography for נַחַת, chiefly in the later writers; נַרְאָת *loathing*, Nu 11:20; נַחַת *a terror*, Is 19:17; נַשְׁמָן *sleep*, Ps 127:2; נַבְיָה *a lioness*, Ez 19:2 (unless נַבְיָה is intended); נַמְרָא *a mark*, La 3:12; cf. also נַשְׁמָד *threshing (participle Qal from דִּשְׁמַד)* Jer 50:11; נַמְרָא *bitter*, Ru 1:20. On the other hand, according to the western Masora, נַרְחָה *baldness* is to be read in Ez 27:31; see Baer on the passage.

(d) נַחַת, an obtuse form of נַחַת (§ 27 u), only in the later writers for נַחֲתָה *the armenian* Is 59:5 (unless it is again a *forma mixta* combining the *active ptcp. masc.* נַחֲתָה and the *passive ptcp. fem.* נַחֲתָה); cf. לְנַחַת for נַחַת Zc 5:4; נַחַת 1 K 2:36, 42 (§ 90 i, and § 48 d).

(e) נַחַת - without the tone, e. g. נַחַת Dt 14:17 [Lv 11:18 חַמֵּר בְּעֵרֶת]; an oven heated, Ho 7:4; cf. Ez. 40:19, 2 K 15:29, 16:18. In all those examples the usual tone-bearing נַחַת is perhaps intended, but the Punctuators, who considered the feminine ending inappropriate, produced a kind of locative form (see § 90 c) by the retraction of the tone. [In 2 K 16:18, Is 24:19, Ez 21:31 (note in each case the following נ), and in Jb 42:13, Ho 7:4, the text is probably in error.]

(f) נַחַת, as an old feminine termination, preserved also in Syriac (*ai*; see examples in Nöldeke's *Syrische Gram.*, § 83), in Arabic and (contracted to ē) in Ethiopic, very probably occurs in the proper name סַרְאֵי Sarai, cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xl. 183, and xlvi. 484; also שְׁשָׁרָה ten (*fem.*) undoubtedly arises from an original נַחַת; so Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 138; König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 427.

3. It is wholly incorrect to regard the *vowel-ending* נַחַת² as the original termination of the feminine, and the *consonantal* ending נַחַת as derived from it. The Ethiopic still has the נַ throughout, so too the Assyrian (*at, it*); in Phoenician also the feminines end for the most part in נַ, which is pronounced *at* in the words found in Greek and Latin authors; less frequently in נָ (see Gesenius, *Monum. Phoen.*, pp. 439, 440; Schröder, *Phön. Sprache*, p. 169 ff.). The ancient Arabic has the obtuse ending (*ah*) almost exclusively in *pause*; in modern Arabic the relation between the two endings is very much as in Hebrew.

§ 81. Derivation of Nouns.

¹ In 1 S 20:27 also, where the Masora (see Baer on Jos 5:11) for some unknown reason requires נַחֲרָתָה, read with ed. Mant., Jablonski, Opitius, and Ginsburg, נַחֲרָתָה.

² In this ending the נַ h can only be considered consonantal in the sense that the נַ was originally aspirated, and afterwards 'the mute נַ was dropped before h, just as the old Persian *mithra* became in modern Persian *mehr*'; so Socin, who also points to the Arabic pausal form in *ah*, and observes that among some of the modern Beduin an *h* is still heard as a fem. ending, cf. Socin, *Diwan aus Centralarabien*, iii. 98, ed. by H. Stumme, Lpz. 1901. In Hebrew this consonantal termination was entirely abandoned, at any rate in later times.

Nouns are by their derivation either *primitive*, i.e. cannot be referred to any verbal stem at present extant (see § 82), such as בָּאֵב *father*, מִתְּאֵם *mother* (but see both words in the Lexicon; according to Stade and others אָב, אָמֵם, &c., are children's words and terms of endearment, and so really primitive nouns), or *derivative*, i.e. either *Derivativa veralia* (§§ 83–5), e. g. רֶם *high*, רֶמֶת *high place*, מַרְגֹּוּת *height*, from רָם *to be high*, or less frequently *Derivativa denominativa* (§ 86), e. g. מַרְגּוֹלָה *the place at the feet*, from רֶגֶל *foot*.

Rem. 1. The earlier grammarians consider the verb alone as stem, and therefore *all* nouns as verbals, dividing them into (a) *Formae nudae*, i.e. such as have only the *three* (or two) radicals, and (b) *Formae auctae*, such as have formative letters or syllables added at the beginning or end, e. g. מְלֻכָּה, מְלֻכּוֹת. The formative letters used for this purpose are יְנִתְּנָה, אֲמִתְּנָה¹, and the treatment of nouns formerly followed this order.

According to the view of *roots* and *stems* presented in § 30 d, nouns (other than *denominatives*) are derived not from the verbal stem, but either from the (abstract) root or from the still undefined stem. In the following pages, however, the arrangement according to the verbal stem is retained as being simpler for the beginner. Cf. § 79 a.

2. *Compound nouns as appellatives* are very rare in Hebrew, e. g. בְּלִי עַל *worthlessness, baseness*. On the other hand, they very frequently occur as proper names, e. g. גְּבִרִיאֵל (*man of God*), יְהֹוָיִקְרָם (*Yahwe raises up*), יְהֹוֹנָנָן (*Yahwe gave*), &c.²

§ 82. Primitive Nouns.

The number of *primitive* nouns in the sense used in § 81 is small, since nouns, which in other languages are represented as independent noun-stems, can easily be traced back in Hebrew to the verbal idea, e. g. names of animals and natural objects, as שֵׁעִיר *he-goat* (prop. shaggy, from שֵׁעֶר), שְׁעִיר *barley* (prop. prickly, also from שֵׁעֶר), חֵסִידָה *stork* (prop. pia, sc. avis), זְהָב *gold* (from זְהַב *to shine, to be yellow*). Thus there remain only a few nouns, e. g. several names of members of the body in men or beasts, to which a corresponding verbal stem cannot be assigned at all, or at any rate only indirectly (from other Semitic dialects), as קְן *horn*, עֵין *eye*.

§ 83. Verbal Nouns in General.

1. In Hebrew, as in Greek and Latin, the *verbal nouns* are connected in form and meaning primarily with certain forms of the verb, especially the participles and infinitives, which are themselves, even in their ordinary form, frequently used precisely like nouns, e. g. אִיּוֹן *enemy*, יְعַנְּתָן *to know, knowledge*. Still oftener, however,

¹ From this *vox memorialis* the *nomina aucta* are also called by the older grammarians *nomina heemantica*.

² G. Rammelt (*Über die zusammengesetzten Nomina im Hebr.*, Halle, 1883, and Leipzig, 1884) recognizes as appellatives only צְפָרְעָנָם (cf. below, § 85 w) and נְזִתְּתָן (the latter certainly incorrectly [see, however, Nöldeke, *ZATW* 1897, p. 183 ff.]). In p. 8 ff. the author gives a list of 'logical compounds', i.e. new terms formed by composition with the negatives מְבִלִּי, בְּלִי, לֹא.

certain forms of the infinitive and participle, which are seldom or never found as such in the strong verb, though in use in the weak verb and in the kindred dialects, came to be commonly used for the verbal noun; e. g. the participial form קְפִילָה, the infinitives of the (Aramaic) form מְקַפֵּלָה (as a *noun* also מְקַפֵּלָה), further לְתַחַת קְפִילָה, קְפִילָה, קְפִילָה (§ 45 d), &c. Others (as the Arabic shows) are properly intensive forms of the participle.

2. As regards their meaning, it follows from the nature of the case that nouns which have the form of the infinitive regularly denote the *action* or *state*, with other closely related ideas, and are therefore mostly *abstract*; while the participial nouns, on the contrary, denote for the most part the *subject* of the action or state, and are therefore *concrete*. Moreover, it is to be noticed, that a particular meaning is attached to many of the special forms of derivative nouns, although it does not appear equally in them all.

Rem. It need not appear strange, when we consider the analogy of other languages, that a noun which in form is properly *abstract* afterwards acquired a *concrete* sense, and vice versa. So in English, we say *his acquaintance*, for the persons with whom he is *acquainted*; the *Godhead* for *God* himself; in Hebrew מִזְעָן *acquaintance* and *an acquaintance*.

The inner connexion in thought between Semitic noun-forms and the corresponding verbal forms is investigated in the works of De Lagarde and Barth (see the titles at the head of § 79) on very different lines, but with many points of agreement. De Lagarde starts from the fact that language consists of sentences. A sentence which consists of only *one* word is called a verb, and anything which serves as a complement to it is a noun. The oldest form of the sentence is the imperative. Closely related to it are three kinds of sentences of the nature of verbal forms, differing according as the property of the particular object of sense is to be represented as invariable (form *qatula*), or as liable to change (form *qatila*), or, finally, as a circumstance which takes place before our eyes (form *qatala*). Like the imperative, these three forms of sentences have also been transformed into nouns, by means of certain phonetic changes,—especially by the omission of the final vowels and the addition of different terminations to the last consonant of the stem. But just as the forms of the verbal sentence undergo numerous modifications (in the tenses, moods, and conjugations), so also do the nouns, sometimes by assimilation of the unessential to the characteristic vowel (*qutul*, *qitil*), sometimes by the lengthening of the characteristic vowel (*qatul*, *qatil*, *qatal*), or else through the displacement of the accent and the consequent reduction of the noun to a monosyllabic form (*qatl*, *qutl*, *qitl*), or, finally, by their being formed from the derived stems (or conjugations), e. g. *qattal*, *qattâl*; *qutil*, *qittâl*, &c. Further modifications arise from the use of the various imperfect and infinitive forms, and also from the employment of the prefix *m*. Lastly, *denominalia* are formed from *deverbalia* by appending certain suffixes.

De Lagarde does not, however, claim to be able to show in the case of each particular noun the sense it conveyed in primitive times; the origin of a number of nouns can now no longer be detected. In those, however, which are clearly derived from verbs, the original meaning is chiefly determined by the characteristic vowel.

Barth's system is based on the thesis that 'all Semitic nouns, adjectives, and participles are derived from either the perfect or the imperfect stem'. Thus, e. g. קְטוֹלָה is the infinitive of the perfect stem, לְטַקְלָה the infinitive of the imperfect stem, שְׁכָבָה infinitive of יְשַׁכְּבָה, &c. In dissyllabic noun-forms the second vowel is always alone characteristic and essential, the first vowel unessential, and therefore variable. Further modifications of the simple form are effected by strengthening (sharpening) the second or third consonant, by lengthening the characteristic vowel (instead of which, however, the feminine termination may also be used),

or by ‘metaplasms’, i.e. by the use of noun-forms derived from one of the two intransitive stems for the other, e. g. *qutl* for *qitl*, and vice versa.

In nouns of the perfect stem, the vowels *i* and *u* indicate intransitive formations, the vowel *a* a transitive sense. In nouns of the imperfect stem on the contrary, *u* and *i*, being characteristic vowels, indicate a transitive and *a* an intransitive sense: for *yaqtūlū* is imperfect of the transitive perfect *qatala*, and *yaqtūlū* imperfect of the intransitive perfects *qatila* and *qatula*, &c. This explains how nouns, apparently identical in form, may yet in sense belong to different classes: a *qutl*-form from a *u*-imperfect has a transitive meaning, but the same form from a *u*-perfect has an intransitive meaning. This double system of perfect and imperfect forms runs through the whole scheme of noun-formation, not only the forms connected with the conjugations, but also the forms with prefixes and suffixes.

Against the whole theory it has been urged that it postulates for the development of the language a much too abstract mechanism, and further, that the meanings of words as we find them may in many cases be due to a modification of the original sense. But though many of the details (e. g. the alleged unessential character of the vowel of the first syllable) remain doubtful, yet the agreement between the characteristic vowel of certain noun formations and that of the perfect or imperfect stem, is supported by such a number of uncontested instances, that there can be no doubt as to a systematic, intimate connexion between the two. At the same time it must be admitted that De Lagarde has put forward many important and suggestive points, and both scholars agree in laying stress on *one* characteristic vowel as indicative of the meaning.

§ 84a. Nouns derived from the Simple Stem.

Preliminary remark.—From the statement made above, § 83 d, it follows that an external similarity between forms is no proof of their similar origin, and, vice versa, external difference does not exclude the possibility of their being closely related both in origin and meaning.

Nouns with One Vowel, originally Short.

R. Růžička, ‘Beiträge zur Erklärung der nomina segolata,’ in *Sitz.-ber. d. böhmischen Ges. d. Wiss.*, Prag, 1904.

1. Nouns with one of the three short vowels after the first radical: *present* ground-form *qātl*, *qiṭl*, *quṭl*.

The supposition of *monosyllabic* ground-forms appeared to be required by the character of forms now existing in Hebrew, as well as in Arabic, &c. But there are strong reasons for believing that at least a large proportion of these forms go back to original dissyllabic bases with a short vowel in each syllable. When formative additions were made, the vowel of the 2nd syllable was dropped, i.e. before case-endings in Assyrian and early Arabic, and before pronominal suffixes in Hebrew. From the forms thus produced, the bases *qaṭl*, *qiṭl*, *quṭl* have been assumed, although they never appear in Hebrew except in the singular and then in connexion with suffixes.

In support of this view of a large number of original dissyllabic bases, we must not, however, appeal to the S^eghôl or Pathâḥ under the 2nd consonant of the existing developed forms, רָאַתְּ, עָרַבְּ, &c. These are in no sense survivals or modifications of an original full vowel in the 2nd syllable, but are mere helping-vowels (§ 28 e) to make the monosyllabic

forms pronounceable,¹ and consequently disappear when no longer needed. Under certain circumstances even (e. g. in պվր) they are not used at all. Actual proofs of such original toneless full vowels in the 2nd syllable of existing Segholates are—

1. Forms like Arab. *mélik*, for which rarely *malk*, corresponding to the Hebrew ground-form; cf. De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, p. 72 ff.
 2. In Hebrew גָּדִיר, יָרִיךְ, בָּדֵד, תָּמֵר, בָּקָר, קָרֵב, &c., the connective forms of which latter can only come from ground-forms *gādiř*, *yārič*, *kāriđ*, *kātič*.
 3. The forms treated under *e*, which are in many ways related to the Segholates proper, in so far as they are to be referred to original dissyllabic bases.
 4. The plurals of Hebrew Segholates, since, with very rare exceptions, they take *Qameš* under the 2nd radical before the termination יֶם, יֶתֶן, fem. יֶזֶת, of the *absolute state*, as אַלְכִים, אַלְכָות, סִפְרִים, מִלְכָות, &c. This *Qameš* (see note 1 on § 26 e) can only be due to a lengthening of an original short vowel in the 2nd syllable, and hence it would seem as though the vowel were always ā. This is impossible from what has been said, especially under 1 and 2. Hence the explanation of the consistent occurrence of *Qameš* in the plurals of all Segholates can only be that the regularly formed plurals (i.e. from singulars with original ā in the 2nd syllable) became the models for all the others, and ultimately even for some really monosyllabic forms.²

(a) From the strong stem the above three ground-forms are further developed to לְקָלַק³, קָלַק, קָלַל (cf. § 27 r and in § 93 the explanations of Paradigm I, *a–c*); without a helping vowel (§ 28 d) קָשָׁתָה *truth*. If the second or third radical be a guttural, a helping *Pathah* takes the place of the helping *S'ghol*, according to § 22 d, e. g. רָעֵץ *seed*, נָצֵחַ *eternity*, פָּעֵל *work*; but with middle ה or ח, note לְקָם *bread*, בְּקָמָה *womb*, אֲקָלָה *tent*, בְּקָמָה *thumb*; so with final אֲקָלָה *a wild ass*, &c.; with a middle guttural also the modification of the principal

¹ According to Delitzsch (*Assyr. Gram.*, p. 157 f.) the same is true in Assyrian of the corresponding *qaṭṭl*-forms. Without case-endings they are *kalab*, *šamas*, *aban* (= לָבֶב, שָׁמָשׁ, אָבָן), with case-endings *kalbu*, *šamsu*, *abnu*. On the other hand, acc. to Sievers, *Metrik*, i. 261, Hebrew ground-forms probably have a twofold origin: they are shortened according to Hebrew rules partly from old absolute forms like *kálbu*, *sífru*, *qudšu*, and partly from old construct-forms like the Assyrian types *kalab*, *sifir*, *quduš*.

² On the other hand, Ungnad, ZA. 1903, p. 333 ff., rejecting all previous explanations, maintains that the *a* in *m^elākhi m*, *m^elākhōth* is inserted merely to facilitate the pronunciation. From *qaṭli m* arose *qaṭlim*, then *qaṭali m* and finally *q^etāli m*. See, however, Nöldeke, 'Zur semit. Pluralendung,' ZA. 1904, p. 68 ff., who points out that the Semitic nouns *fa l*, *fi l*, *fu l* with their corresponding feminines *fa la*, &c., on assuming the plural termination commonly take an *a* before the 3rd radical, but that no satisfactory account can be given for it. M. Margolis, 'The plural of Segolates' (*Proc. of the Philol. Assoc. of the Pacific Coast*, San Francisco, 1903, p. 4 ff.), and S. Brooks, *Vestiges of the broken plural in Hebrew*, Dublin, 1883, explain *m^elākhi m* as a *pluralis fractus*.

³ It is worthy of notice that St. Jerome also (cf. Siegfried, ZAW. iv. 76) frequently represents the vowel of the first syllable by *a*, e. g. *gader*, *aben*, *ader*, *areb*, for גָּדֵר, אָבֵן, אָדֵר, אָרֵב, but *cedem*, *secel*, *deber*, &c., for קְדֵם, שְׁכֵל, דְּבֵר, &c.

vowel *ă* to *è* does not occur, e. g. *רַחֲם* *רַחֲמָה* (*exceptions, again*, *again*, *רַחֲם* *רַחֲמָה*). On the inflexion, cf. § 93, Paradigm I, *a–f*, and the explanations. In *אַתְּ* *sin*, the *א* has wholly lost its consonantal value.

Examples of feminines: *מַלְכָה* (*directly from the ground-form *malk*, king*), *סִתְרָה* *a covering* (*also סִתְרָה* *food* (*also אַכְלָה*)), *פָתָה* *a morsel*, *עָם* *people* (*so, when in close connexion with the next word; unconnected מָעֵד; with article מֵעָם, לְעָם, &c.*); *רַבָּה* *much*, but *רַבָּה* *great, numerous* (*in close connexion also רַבָּה*); *רָעָה* *evil*, with the article in close connexion *רָעָה*, unconnected *רָעָה*; with the *ă* always lengthened to *ā*, *מְיֻחָדָה* *sea*; fem. *חַיָּה* *life*, and with attenuation of the *ă* to *i*, *מְזֻמָּה* *measure*; from the ground-form *qīṭṭ*, *מְמֹתָה* *mother*; fem. *גְּזַחַת* *a shearing*; from the ground-form *qūṭṭ*, *מְמֹתָה* *statute*, fem. *מְמֹתָה*. (*γ*) from stems *נָעֵם* (*Paradigm I, g* and *i*); *מוֹתָה* *death* (*from *má-ut*, the *u* passing into the corresponding consonant, as in middle*) or contracted *יּוֹם* *day*, *שָׁוֹטֶה* *whip*; fem. *עֲוֹלָה* *perverseness* (*also contracted עֲוֹלָה*); from the ground-form *qūṭṭ*, *צָוָה* *a rock*; fem. *סְוָפָה* *a storm*. (*δ*) from stems *נָעֵם* (*Paradigm I, h*); *מְגַדֵּלָה* *an olive-tree* (*with a helping *Hireq* instead of a helping *Sghōl**) from *zá-it*, the *i* passing into the corresponding consonant; or contracted *מְבָרָקָה* *bosom*, *מְבָרָקָה* *host*; fem. *בְּיַנְהָה* *grey hair*; from the ground-form *qīṭṭ*, *מְדִינָה* *judgement*; fem. *בְּיַנְהָה* *understanding*. (*ε*) from stems *נָהָלָה* (*Paradigm I, k*); partly forms such as *בְּנָהָה* *weeping*, *בְּנָהָה* *murmuring*, *בְּנָהָה* *a present*, *בְּנָהָה* *the end*, partly such as *בְּנָהָה* *a lion* (*ground-form *bāky*, *āry**); cf. also the forms from stems originally *נָהָלָה*, *בְּנָהָה* *swimming* (*ground-form *sāḥw**); fem. *שְׁלָמָה* *rest*, *שְׁלָמָה* *exaltation*; from stems *אֲלָהָה*, *בְּנָהָה* *a fat tail*, and with attenuation of *ă* to *i*, *שְׁבִיָּה* *captivity*, also *שְׁבִיָּה*, formed no doubt directly from the masc. *שְׁבִי* with the fem. termination *הָה*; from the ground-form *qīṭṭ*, *צְבָה* (*from *hiṣy**); fem. *עֲרָה* *joy*, *עֲרָה* *and עֲרָה* *nakedness*; from the ground-form *qūṭṭ*, *חוֹתָה* (*from *bōhw**) *waste*, *חוֹתָה* *emptiness*; *כְּלִי*, for *כְּלִי*, *bucket*; fem. *אַנְיָה* *a ship* (*directly from *āni* a fleet*).

The masculines as well as the feminines of these *segholate* forms may have either an *abstract* or a *concrete* meaning. In the form *קְטַלָּה* the *passive* or at any rate the *abstract* meaning is by far the more common (e. g. *בְּנָהָה* *youthfulness*, abstract of *boy*; *בְּנָהָה* *food*, &c.).¹

2. Nouns with one of the three short vowels under the second radical (present ground-form *q'ṭal*, *q'ṭil*, *q'ṭil*), e. g. *בְּבִשְׁתָה* *honey*, *בְּנִיָּה* *sickness*, *בְּתִתְרָה* *terror*; and so always with middle *אַ*, *בְּאַ* *a well*, *בְּאַ* *a wolf*, *בְּאַ* *stench*. In reality these forms, like the segholates mentioned in No. 1 (see above, *a*), are, probably, for the most part to be referred to original *dissyllabic* forms, but the tone has been shifted from its original place (the penultima) on to the ultima. Thus *dibás* (*originally *dibaš**) as ground-form of *בְּבִשְׁתָה* is supported both by the Hebrew *בְּבִשְׁתִּי* (*with suffix of the first person*), and by the Arabic *dibs*, the principal form; *biir* (*according to Philippi with assimilation of the vowel of the second syllable to that of the first*) as ground-

¹ M. Lambert also (*REJ.* 1896, p. 18 ff.), from statistics of the Segholates, arrives at the conclusion that the *qaṭṭ*-form is especially used for concretes (in nouns without gutturals he reckons twenty concretes as against two abstracts), and the *qṭṭ*-form, and less strictly the *qṭṭ*, for abstracts.

form of בָּאֵר is attested by the Arabic *bir*; for שָׁבַע (Arabic *bus*) similarly a ground-form *buiúš* may be inferred, just as a ground-form *qūṭil* underlies the infinitives of the form לְמַטֵּק.¹

Nouns with an original Short Vowel in both Syllables.

3. The ground-form *qăṭal*, fem. *qăṭalat*, developed in Hebrew to קָטָל (§ 93, Paradigm II, *a, b*) and קָטָלָה (§§ 94, 95, Paradigm II, *a, b*), mostly forms intransitive adjectives, as חָכָם *wise*, שָׁבָע *new*, יָשָׁר *upright*; but also substantives, as קָבָר *a word*, and even abstracts, as מִשְׁפָּט *guilt*, רָעַב *hunger*, עֲבָדָה ² *satiety*; in the fem. frequently abstract, as צְדָקָה *righteousness*; with an initial guttural אֶרְזָה *earth*.—Of the same formation from verbs עָזַב *alone*, עָנָן *cloud*, passive חָלַל *pierced*.—In verbs לִיְהָ a final *Yôdh* is almost always rejected, and the ā of the second syllable lengthened to ē. Thus שָׂדֵי *field*, after rejection of the ī and addition of ה as a vowel-letter, becomes שָׂדָה (cf. § 93, Paradigm II, *f*); fem. e. g. שָׂנָה *year*; cf. § 95, Paradigm II, *c*. From a verb לִיעַ the strong form עָנוֹ *afflicted* occurs.

4. The ground-form *qăṭil*, fem. *qăṭilat*, developed to קָטֵל (§ 93, Paradigm II, *c–e*) and קָטָלָה, is frequently used as participle of verbs middle *e* (§ 50 *b*), and hence mostly with an intransitive meaning; cf. זָקָן *old*, *an old man*; בָּבֶן *heavy*; fem. קָטָלָה and אַפְּלָה *cattle*, חָשָׁכָה *darkness*.—From verbs פְּיִי: irregularly, קְלִיּוֹתָיו *the branches of it*, Jer 11:16, &c., generally referred to a sing. קְלִילָה (*stem* דְלָה), and קְלִילָה Ho 14:1 *their women with child* (from הָרָה, *st. constr.* קְלִילָה, plur. st. *absol.* and constr. קְלִילָותָה).—From a verb לְוַיְלָה with consonantal Waw: שְׁלִילָה *at ease*, incorrectly written *plene* שְׁלִילָוֹ Jb 21:23.

5. The ground-form *qăṭul*, developed to לְקָטָל (also written קָטָל), generally forms adjectives, e. g. אִיְמָד *terrible*, בָּרְדָּה *piebald*, מַתְוקָה *sweet*, עֲבָדָה *interwoven*, עָגָלָה *round*, קָטָם *deep*, עָזָה *hilly*, גָּדָה *golden*; נָקָטָה *small*, only in sing. masc., with a parallel form קָטָן of the class treated under *f*, fem. קָטָנה, plur. קָטָנִים. These forms are not to be confounded with those in No. III, from the ground-form *qăṭal*.—Fem. קָבוֹדָה *glorious*, עֲבָדָה *delicate*, קָטָלָה *weak*, with sharpening of the third radical, in order to keep the original ū short, and similarly in the plurals עֲגָלִים, בָּרְדִּים, מַתְוקִים, אִסְפִּים *stores*, &c.

6. The ground-form *qiṭal* develops to קָטָל (cf. § 93, Paradigm II, Rem. 1), e.g. לְבָבָה *heart*, עֲנָבָה *a bunch of grapes*, שָׁבָר *strong drink*; from a verb הָלַל, probably of this class is בָּעָה, generally contracted to בָּעָה *friend*, ground-form *ri'ay*: the full form is preserved in רָעַה הוּא *his friend*, for רָעַה יְהוּ.

Nouns with an original Short Vowel in the First and a Long Vowel in the Second Syllable.

7. The ground-form *qăṭal* in Hebrew always develops to the form לְקָטָל, the ā becoming an obscure ô. The fact that this form is also written לְקָטָה must not lead to the confusion of these forms with those mentioned in No. 5, from the ground-form *qăṭal*.¹ Moreover the *qaṭol*-class

¹ On this theory cf. Stade, *Hebräische Grammatik*, § 199 *b*; De Lagarde, *Übersicht*, p. 57 f.; A. Müller, *ZDMG*. xlv, p. 226, and especially Philippi, *ZDMG*. xlix, p. 208.

² In St. Jerome's time these forms were still pronounced *sadaca* (צָדָקָה), *saaca* (צָאָקָה), *nabala* (נָבָלָה), &c., see Siegfried, *ZAW*. iv. 79. Moreover, the numerous abstracts of this form (e. g. even קָצָה *a splintering*, צָוָה *a crying*, &c.) are undoubtedly to be regarded (with Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 87) as feminines of infinitives of the form *qăṭal*, the lengthening of the second syllable being balanced, as in other cases, by the addition of the feminine termination.

¹ In Na 1:3 only the *Q'reh* requires גָּדוֹלָה (in the constr. state) for the *K'ethi* □ *bh*.

includes forms of various origin, and therefore of various meaning, as (a) intransitive adjectives like קָדוֹל *great*, fem. קָדוֹלהּ *holy*, the short vowel becoming Š^ewâ, whereas in &c., before the tone it is lengthened to ā; (b) the *infinitives absolute* of the form קְטוֹל (§ 45 a) as representing the abstract idea of the verb, and abstract substantives like קְבּוֹד *honour*, שְׁלוֹם *peace* (Arab. *sâlâm*); (c) substantives and adjectives in an active sense, as קְחֹזֶן *assayer* (of metals,.) קְמֹזֵעַ *an oppressor*, קְמֹזֵעַ *oppressing*; in the feminine נָגָדָה, בְּנָגָדָה *treacherous* Jer 3:7, 10, the irregular retention of the ā in the third syllable from the end is no doubt to be explained, with Brockelmann, from Aramaic influence, the punctuator having in mind the Aramaic nomen agentis *qâṭôl*.

8. The ground-form *qâṭîl* develops to קְטִיל (cf. § 93, Paradigm IV, *a* and *b*). Here also forms of various origin and meaning are to be distinguished: (a) adjectives used substantivally with a passive meaning to denote duration in a state, as אָסֵר *a prisoner*, מִשְׁמָרָה *an anointed one*. These proper *qâṭîl*-forms are parallel to the purely passive *qaṭîl*-forms (see **m**), but others are due to a strengthening of original *qaṭîl*-forms. These are either (b) intransitive in meaning, as אָעֵיר *small*, and, from לִי stems, נָקֵר *pure*, עָנֵי *poor* (see § 93 *vv*), or (c) active, as נָבֵיא *a speaker* (prophet), פָּקִיד *an overseer*.—Of a different kind again (according to Do Lagarde, infinitives) are (d) forms like אָסֵף *the ingathering*, בָּצֵיר *vintage*, חֲרִישׁ *ploughing time*, קָצֵיר *harvest*. On *qâṭîl* forms with a kindred meaning, cf. § 84b *f*.

9. The ground-form *qâṭîl* develops to קְטוֹל. As in the *qaṭîl* and *qaṭîl*-forms (see **k** and **l**), so here forms of various kinds are to be distinguished: (a) *qaṭîl*-forms proper, with passive meaning, especially all the passive participles of Qal; fem. e.g. בְּתוֹלָה *virgin* (properly *secluded*). On the other hand, by strengthening an original *qaṭîl*-form we get (b) certain stative adjectives (§ 50 *f*), as אָנוֹשׁ *incurable*, עָזֶזֶם *strong*, עָרוֹם *subtil*, or even transitive, as אָתֵה *holding*; (c) active substantives, as קָוֵשׁ *a fowler*. Further, some of the forms mentioned in § 84b *g* belong to this class; see above, the remark on **l**.

10. The ground-form *qiṭâl* or *quṭâl*² in Hebrew changes the *i* to vocal Š^ewâ, and develops to קְטִיל (cf. § 93, Paradigm IV, *c*) or קְטוֹל, with ā obscured to ô (as above, **k**). Cf. אָשָׁר *remnant*, קָרֵר *honour*, בְּקָרָב *book* (Arab. *kitâb*), בְּקָרָב *war* (the last three probably loan-words from the Aramaic); of the other form, קְלָם *a dream*, קָמָר *an ass* (Arab. *hîmâr*), אָלֹהָה *God* (Arab. *'îlâh*); with \aleph prosthetic (§ 19 *m*), אָזְרוֹעַ *arm* (twice: usually עִזּוּעַ); fem. בְּשׂוֹרָה *good news* (Arab. *bišârât*); בְּשֻׂרָה *service*, בְּתֻרָה *tattooing*.

11. The ground-form *qiṭâl* seems to occur e.g. in Hebrew אָלִיל *foolish*, בְּרִיל *vanity*, אָלִיל *lead*, בְּרִיל *a fool*, קָזֵיר *a swine* (the prop. name חַזֵּיר points to the ground-form *qiṭâl*, cf. Arab. *hînzîr*).

12. The ground-form *qiṭâl* or *quṭâl*, Hebr. קְטוֹל, e.g. גָּבוֹל *a boundary*, לְבוֹשׁ *a garment*; fem. גָּבוֹרָה *strength*, גָּבוֹרָה *faithfulness*.

Rem. When the forms *q^eṭîl* and *q^eṭol* begin with \aleph , they almost invariably take in the singular a *Sere* under the \aleph instead of the ordinary *Hateph-S^eghôl*; cf. אָבּוֹס *a crib*, אָתּוֹן *thread*, אָמוֹן *faithful*, אָזּוֹב *hyssop*, אָזּוֹר *a waist-band*, אָסּוֹר *a bond*, אָפּוֹד *an 'ephod'*; cf. § 23 *h*, and the analogous cases of *Sere* for *Hateph-S^eghôl* in verbal forms § 52 *n*, § 63 *p*, § 76 *d*.

² On the *fu'âl*-forms (regarded by Wellhausen as original diminutives) see Nöldeke, *Beitragé* (Strassb. 1904), p. 30 ff. He includes among them נְעָרָת *tow*, and טְהִרָּה *hemorrhoids*.

Nouns with a Long Vocal in the First Syllable and originally a Short Vowel in the Second Syllable.

13. The ground-form *qāṭāl*, in Hebrew, always changes the *ā* into an obscure *ō*, קֹטֶל (קְטַל), e.g. עֲוָלָם (§ 93, Paradigm III, *a*), Arab. 'ālām, *eternity; חֹתֶם* (Arab. ḥātām) *a seal* (according to Barth a loan-word of Egyptian origin), fem. חֹתֶמֶת (from ḥātāmt); עֲוָלָעַ worm (unless from a stem וָלָעַ, like תְּוַיֵּשֶׁב from שָׁבַע; see the analogous cases in § 85 *b*). On the participles *Qal* of verbs הָלַל (§ 93, Paradigm III, *c*), cf. § 75 *e*; on the feminines of the participles *Qal*, which are formed with the termination *n*, see below, *s*.

Rem. Of a different kind (probably from a ground-form *qauṭāl*) are such forms as אֲוָגָן (or אֲוָגָן Ez 10:9 in the same verse) *a wheel*; גָּזָל *a young bird*, דָּגָן *wax*, &c.

14. The ground-form *qāṭīl* also becomes in Hebrew almost invariably קֹטֵל (קְטִיל). Besides *participles active masc. Qal* this class includes also feminines of the form קְלִתָּה, if their ground-form *qōṭalt* (§ 69 *c*) goes back to an original *qāṭilt*. The substantives of this form, such as כְּהֵن *priest* (Arab. kāhiñ), were also originally participles *Qal*. The fem. of the substantives has ē (lengthened from *i*) retained before the tone, e.g. קְדֵדָה *a woman in travail* (cf. also בְּגָדָה *the treacherous woman*, Jer 3:8; הָלֵךְ *her that halteth*, Mi 4:6 f., Zp 3:19; חָלֵב *a buckler*, Ps 91:4); the participles as a rule have the form קָדֵדָה, &c., the original *i* having become S^{wā}; however, the form with *Sere* occurs also in the latter, Is 29:6, 8, 34:9, Ps 68:26, 118:16 (all in principal pause; in subordinate pause 2 S 13:20, Is 33:14; with a conjunctive accent, Ct 1:6). Cf. הָמֵץ־בָּשָׂר 2 S 13:20

15. The ground-form *qūṭāl*, Hebrew קֹטֶל (as יִוְבֶּל river, Jer 17:8) or עֲוָגֶל *a pipe*, commonly עֲגֶב, and to be so read, with Baer, also in Ps 150:4, not עֲגָב.

Nouns with a Long Vowel in each Syllable

16. קִיטּוֹל, e.g. קִיטּוֹר *smoke*. The few forms of this kind are probably derived from the ground-form *qiṭāl* (*qiṭṭāl* ?), i.e. the original *ā* has become an obscure *ō*.

§ 84b. Formation of Nouns from the Intensive Stem.

This includes all forms which have arisen, either through the doubling of the middle radical, or the repetition of one or of two consonants of the simple stem.

Nouns with the Middle Consonant sharpened.

As in the corresponding verbal stems (cf. § 52 *f*), so also in some noun-formation of this class, the Dageš in the second radical expresses an intensification of the idea of the stem, either emphasizing the energy of the action or relation, or else indicating a longer continuance of the relation or state. Other nouns of this character are evidently only by-forms of the nouns derived from the simple stem, which were treated in the last section: cf. the instances adduced under *f* and *g*, and Barth, *Nominalbildung*, Introd., p. x.

17. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl* is mostly lengthened in Hebrew to קֹטְל; cf. אַיִל *a stag*, fem. אַיִילָה, constr. st. נִלְאָה (from 'āyyālt); cf. also the fem. (originating from *Qal*) לְבָהָה *a flame* (according to § 27 *q* for lāhhābhā), בָּרָהָה *dry land* (for ḥarrābhā), קְרָהָה *and קְרָהָה a burning fever*, נְשָׁבָה *and נְשָׁבָה dry land*, תְּחִלָּה *צְבָבָה a seal-ring*, חְמָרָה *חְמָרָה consumption*. Adjectives of this class ('intensified participles of the active verb', Barth, *ibid.*, § 33) are אַפְּלָה *sinful*, חָנָה *wont to gore*,

אֲנָזֵן *jealous*, בְּקַהַל (for *kaḥhaš*, by § 22 c) *lying*. *Nomina opificum* also, curiously enough, are so treated in Hebrew (at least in the *constr. state* of the sing.), although the corresponding Arabic form *qāttāl* points to an original (unchangeable) *ā* in the second syllable; cf. בְּגַב *a thief*, גִּזְעָן *a judge* (*constr. st.* גִּזְעָן Ps 68:6), טְבַח *a cook*, חַרְשָׁן (for *ḥarrāš*) *artificer* (*constr. st.* חַרְשָׁן, but *plur. constr.* פְּרַשְׁׁן, חַרְשָׁן); פְּרַשְׁׁן *horseman* (for *parrāš*), *const. st.* פְּרַשְׁׁן Ez 26:10.

18. The ground-form *qīṭṭāl* appears in הָצָה *dry*, אָגָג *haughty* (the *i* being lengthened to *ē* according to § 22 c), if these forms go back to original *ṣīḥḥāy*, *grī’āy*. On the analogy, however, of the adjectives denoting defects (see d below), we should rather expect a ground-form *qīṭṭāl*; moreover, *iwwalt*, ground-form of the fem. אָוֶן *foolishness*, goes back to an original *iwwilt*, see § 69 c.

19. The ground-form *qūṭṭāl* and *qūṭṭūl*; cf. the fem. בְּמִתְחָדָה *spelt*, בְּמִתְחָדָה *coat*.

20. The ground-form *qāṭṭīl*; from the intensive stem, the infinitives *Pi’el* of the form קְטִיל.

21. The ground-form *qīṭṭīl*, in Hebrew lengthened to קְטִיל. Of this form are a considerable number of adjectives which denote a bodily or mental fault or defect. Cf. אָפֵר *disabled*, אָלֵם *dumb*, גָּבֵן *hump-backed*, עִירָר *blind*, שָׁמֵר *deaf* (for *ḥirrēš*), חַרְמָה *lame*, קָרְמָה *bald*, שָׁקָע *perverse*; פְּנַח *open-eyed* follows the same analogy.

22. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, cf. the remarks in b above, on the *nomina opificum*; moreover, to this class belong infinitives *Pi’el* of the Aramaic form בְּקֻרָה *a searching out*; בְּקֻשָּׁה *a request*; with middle guttural (see § 22 c) אָצָה *contumely*; but cf. also נָאָצָה *comfort* Ez 35:12, with full lengthening of the original *ā* before אָ; בְּחַנָּה *comfort*. From the attenuation of the *ā* of this form to *i*, arises undoubtedly:

23. The ground-form *qīṭṭāl*, e.g. אָפֵר *husbandman* (Arab. ’akkār).

24. The ground-form *qīṭṭōl*, most probably only a variety of the form *qāṭṭāl* with the *ā* attenuated to *i* (as in No. 23), and the *ā* obscured to *ō* (as in *n* and *r*); cf. גְּבֹור *hero* (Arab. *gābbār*), יְסֹור *caviller*, צְפֹור *(piper or chirper)* a bird, שְׁכֹור *drunkard*. On the other hand, לְלוֹד *born* probably arises from *yullōd*, an old participle passive of *Qal*, the *ū* being dissimilated in the sharpened syllable before *ō*: so Barth, *ibid.*, p. 41 f.

25. The ground-form *qāṭṭīl*, קְטִיל, almost exclusively of persons, who possess some quality in an intensive manner, e.g. אָבִיר *strong*, צְדִיק *righteous*, בְּרִיחָה *fugitive* (for *barri’āh*), עָרִיז *violent* (for *’arriṣ*).

That some of these are only by-forms of the *qāṭṭīl*-class (see above, remark on a), appears from the *constr. st.* פְּרִיזָה *ravenous*, Is 35:9 (but always), and according to Barth (*ibid.*, 35 a) also from the *constr. st.* אָבִיר (but also אָבִיר 1 S 21:8) of אָבִיר. However, the form אָבִיר, as a name of God, may be intentionally differentiated from אָבִיר, a poetic term for the bull.

In the same way *prisoner*, סְרִיס *eunuch* (*constr. st.* always סְרִים, plur. סְרִים, *constr. st.* Gn 40:7, but in the book of Esther always סְרִיס, סְרִיסוֹן, סְרִיסי, סְרִיסי, &c.), and עֲתִיק *weaned*, may be regarded as by-forms of the *qāṭṭīl*-class with passive meaning, see § 84a l.

26. The ground-form *qāṭṭūl*, קְטֻול, e.g. חָנוּן *gracious*, רָחוּם *compassionate* (with virtual strengthening of the ח), חָרוּץ *diligent* (for *ḥarrūṣ*), probably, again, to a large extent by-forms of the *qāṭṭīl*-class, § 84a m. The same applies to substantives like אָשָׁר *a step* (in אָשָׁר, as

well as אָשָׁר, &c.), עַמּוֹד pillar; fem. חֻבְרָה a stripe (also בְּטַחֲוֹת security: cf. Barth, *ibid.*, § 84).

27. The ground-form *qăṭṭōl*; besides the infinitives absolute *Pi'el* of the form לְקַטֵּל, also קָנוֹא jealous (as well as קָנָא, an obscured form of *qăṭṭāl*, see e).

28. The ground-form *qăṭṭūl*, קָטוֹל, e.g. אַפִּי a coating of metal, שְׁלָוָם requital, שְׁקִי drink, עַזְוָה detestable thing; with concrete meaning לְמוֹד a disciple, עָזָז strong; frequently in the plural in an abstract sense, as גְּדוּפִים reproach, מְלָאִים filling (the induction of a priest), גְּמִים consolations, compassion, שְׁבָלִים bereavement, שְׁלָחִים dismissal, שְׁפָרִים observance.

Nouns with the Third Consonant repeated.

29. The ground-form *qăṭṭāl*, e.g. שָׁאַנְנָה quiet, fem. שָׁאַנְנָה (with sharpening of the second *Nün*, in order to keep the preceding vowel short); רְעַנְנִים green, plur.

30. The ground-form *qăṭṭāl*, in Hebrew קָטָל; of this form are e.g. the infinitives *Pi'el* (prop. *Pa'el*), cf. § 55 d.

31. The ground-form *qăṭṭūl*; so the plur. גְּבָנִים ridges (with sharpening of the *Nün*, as in No. 29).

32. The ground-form *qăṭṭāl*, in פָּרָה a brood.

33. The ground-form *quṭṭāl*, in אַמְלָל faint.

34. The ground-form *qăṭṭūl*, e.g. עַבְתִּיט plunder, סָגֵר rain-storm, שְׁפִירִיר glittering tapestry, Jer 43:10 *Q're*; with attenuation of the ā to i כָּמְרִירִים all that maketh black, Jb 3:5 (but the better reading is כָּמְרִירִי).

35. The ground-form *qăṭṭūl*, e.g. שְׁפָרוֹר Jer 43:10 *Keth.*; גְּאַפּוֹפִים adulteries.

Nouns with the Second and Third Consonants repeated.

36–39. *Q'tăltăl*, *q'tăltăl*, *q'tăltăl*; *q'tăltăl*, *q'tăltăl* (in fem. and plur. often with the last consonant sharpened for the reason given in a above); cf. חַלְקָלָקוֹת slippery places, עַקְלָקָלוֹת cooked (ways); לְפָתָת tortuous; also words denoting colours, אַדְמָצָם Lv 13:42, 49 in pause) reddish, fem. אַדְמָצָם, plur. אַדְמָצָם תְּ יְנָקָנָק blackish, fem. יְנָקָנָק תְּ; *q'tăltăl*, יְפִיבִּיה very fair (to be read in Jer 46:20 for יְפִיה); *q'tăltăl*, שְׁנָרָה blackish (fem.) blackish; *q'tăltăl*, אַסְפָּסֶף a rabble (augmented from אָסְפָּסֶף collected). From a verb פְּיִ with aphaeresis of the initial syllable עַיְלָאָם, עַיְלָאָם offspring. Moreover, of the same form, probably, is חַצְזָרָה a trumpet (for חַצְזָרָה, cf. § 55 e). Also in Is 2:20 לְפָרָהָרָה is to be read instead of פָּרָהָרָה (from the sing. לְחַפְּרָה a digging or burrowing animal, perhaps the mole). But חַקְקָה opening, Is 61:1 (ed. Mant., Baer, Ginsb.) is an evident mistake due to dittography; read חַקְקָה as in 42:7.

Nouns in which the Whole (Biliteral) Stem is repeated.

Naturally this class includes only isolated forms of the stems עַיְלָאָם and עַיְלָאָם (on פְּיִיּוֹת see § 96 under פָּה). Thus:—

40. גָלֵל *a wheel*, and, with attenuation of the first *ă* to *i*, גָלֵלֶת (from *gallil*); fem. חַלְקַלָּה *anguish* (from חַלֵּל or חִילָּה); כְּקַרְבָּה (for *kirkar*) *a talent*; cf. also פְּכַרְבָּה (for *karkar*) *a star* (from *kāwkāb*, Arabic *kaukāb*, for *carab*) *bands*, for طَوْطَفَةٌ *bands*; אַלְצָלָה probably *a whirring locust*.

41. פְּלִפְלָל infin. *Pilpel* (prop. *Palpiš*) from פְּלִילָה; fem. טְלִטְלָה *a hurling* (from טִיל).

42. כְּדַד perhaps a *ruby* (for *kădkūd*), from כְּדַד.

43. קְדֻקְדָּה *the crown of the head* (for *qudqud*), from קְדָד; fem. לְתָגָלָה *a skull* (for *gulgult*), from גָלֵל.

44. זְרוּרִיר *girded*, from זָרָר *bottle*; זָרָר בְּקָרְבִּים *fattened birds*(?).

§ 85. Nouns with Preformatives and Afformatives.

These include nouns which are directly derived from verbal forms having preformatives (*Hiph'îl*, *Hoph'al*, *Hithpa'el*, *Niph'al*, &c.), as well as those which are formed with other preformatives (א, י, מ, ב, ח), and finally those which are formed with afformatives. The quadrilaterals and quinqueliterals also are taken in connexion with these formations, inasmuch as they arise almost always by the addition or insertion of one or two consonants to the trilateral stem.

Nouns with Preformatives.

45. Nouns with נ prefixed. Cf. the substantives with נ *prosthetic* (§ 19 m), such as אַזְרֹעַ *arm* (*Jer 32:21*, *Jb 31:22*; elsewhere always אַזְרֹעַ); אַצְבָּע *a finger*, אַרְכָּב *a locust*, אַגְּרָוף *fist* (others *mattock*, or *clod*), רַחֲמָם *a watch*. In these examples the נ is a ‘euphonic’ prefix (Barth, *ibid.*, § 150 b); in other cases it is ‘essential’; cf. especially the adjectives, אַקְנָב *deceitful*, אַכְזָר *cruel*, אַיִן *perennial* (for ‘aitan’) [=the Arab. ‘elative’, used for expressing the compar. and superl. degrees]. The fem. אַזְבָּרָה *fragrant part*¹ (of the meal-offering) is a *nomen verbale* of *Hiph'îl*, answering to the Aramaic infinitive of the causal stem ('*Aph'îl*), hence with suff. אַזְבָּרָה *Lv 2:2*, &c.

46. Nouns with ה prefixed. Besides the ordinary infinitives of *Hiph'îl* and הַקְּטִיל of *Niph'al*, הַקְּטִילָל, הַקְּטִילָה (for *hinq.*), and of the conjugations formed with the prefix הַ, this class also includes some rare *nomina verba* derived from *Hiph'îl* (cf. § 72 z), viz. הַכְּרָה *appearance* (from נְכַר), *Is 3:9*; הַנְּפָה *a swinging* (from נְפַף), *[Is 30:28]*; הַנְּחָה *a rest-giving*, *Est 2:18*; הַצְּלָה *deliverance* (from צְלָה), [*Est 4:14* an Aram. form: cf. הַצְּלָה *Dn 5:20*]; perhaps also הַיְּכָל *palace*, from *haikâl*, unless it is borrowed from the Assyrian; see the Lexicon. Cf. also הַנְּקָה *Ezr 4:22*.

47. Nouns with י prefixed, as יַאֲקָר *oil*, יַלְקֹוט *wallet*, יַנְשׁוּרָה *owl*(?); from verbs יָעַזְבָּה *a living thing*, יָתַרְבָּה *a range*; from a verb יָרִיב *an adversary*. Of a different character are the many proper names which have simply adopted the imperfect form, as יַעֲקֹב, יַעֲשָׂה, &c.

48. Nouns with מ prefixed. This *preformative Mêm*, which is no doubt connected with מי who, and מה what (see § 37 and § 52 c), appears in a very large number of nouns, and serves to express the most varied modifications of the idea of the stem: (1) מ subjective, when preformative of the participles *Pi'el*, *Hiph'îl*, *Hithpa'el*, and other active conjugations. (2) מ

¹ Or perhaps more correctly with Jacob, *ZAW*. 1897, p. 79, ‘declaration,’ i.e. the part of the meal-offering which ‘announces the sacrifice and its object’.

objective, when preformative of the participles *Pu'āl*, *Hoph'āl*, and other passive conjugations, as well as of numerous nouns. (3) מ *instrumental*, as in מִקְתָּה *a key*, &c. (4) מ *local*, as in מִקְבֵּר *a drive for cattle*, &c.

As regards the formation of these nouns, it is to be remarked that the preformative מ was originally in most cases followed by a short ā. This ā, however, in a closed syllable is frequently attenuated to ī; in an open syllable before the tone it is lengthened to ā (so also the ī, attenuated from ā, is lengthened to ē), and in אַן *shield* (with suff. עַיִן *eye*) it even becomes unchangeable ā. But in an open syllable which does *not* stand before the tone, the ā necessarily becomes Šēwā.

The following forms are especially to be noticed: (a) ground-form *māqṭāl*, in Hebrew מִקְטָל¹, e.g. מִקְטָל *food*; fem. מִקְטָלָה *kingdom*, מִקְטָלָא *a knife*, (for مִלְאָכָה *business*; from a verb פָּרָא *to give*; from verbs מָזַחֲנָה *a going forth*, מָזַחֲנָה *a seat*; from verbs מָזַחֲנָה *the best* (from *maiṭāb*); with י (or ו) assimilated, עַזְבָּה *a bed*; from verbs עַזְבָּה *a screen*, and with the shortening of the ā under the preformative, מָרָבָה *bitterness* (from נָמָר *developed* to a segholate), fem. מָשָׁלָה *desolation*; from a verb עַזְבָּה, probably of this class is מָקוֹם *place*, the ā lengthened to ā and obscured to ô (Arabic *māqām*); from verbs לְהַדְרָה *appearance*, מָעֵן *intention*, only in לְעֵן *on account of, in order that*.

(b) Ground-form *miqṭāl* (the usual form of the infin. *Qal* in Aramaic), Hebr. מִקְטָל, e.g. מִקְבֵּר (in *Jer 2:31* also, where Baer requires מִקְבֵּר, read with ed. Mant., Ginsburg, &c.) *a cattle-drive*, fem. מִקְבָּה *war*, מִקְבָּה *a chariot* (with *S'ghōl* instead of ī, but in *constr. st.* Gn 41:43; cf. קָרְחָה *distance*), רַתְחָה *a watch*; from verbs עַזְבָּה, e.g. מִסְבָּה *surroundings* (from *miśāb*; ī in the open syllable being lengthened to ē); but cf. also קָשָׁשָׁה *Is 33:4* as *constr. state* from קָשָׁשָׁה with sharpening of the first radical; cf. § 67 g); from verbs לְהַדְרָה *a possession*, fem. מִקְנָה.

(c) Ground-form *māqṭīl*, Hebr. מִקְטִיל, e.g. מִשְׁעָנָה *a support* (fem. מִשְׁעָנָה *a smith*, מִשְׁעָנָה *a tithe*; fem. מִשְׁעָנָה *a ruin*; from a verb פְּנִיתָה *an overthrow*, מִשְׁעָנָה *a pillar*; from verbs עַזְבָּה, עַזְבָּה *a shield*; fem. מִשְׁעָנָה *a roll* (from גָּלֵל *roll*); מִשְׁעָנָה *a curse* (for *m'*^eirrā from אֶרְרָה); from a verb פְּנִיתָה *a snare* (from *māwqiš*).

(d) Ground-form *miqṭīl*, Hebr. מִקְטִיל, e.g. מִקְטִיל *mourning, מִזְבֵּחַ an altar (place of sacrifice)*; from a verb עַזְבָּה, e.g. מִסְבָּה (?) *consensus*; (e) ground-form *māqṭīl*, Hebr. מִקְטִיל; fem. תְּמִיקָה *food*; רַתְחָה *wages*; from a verb עַזְבָּה, fem. מִסְבָּה *a covering* (from סְבָבָה). Also from עַזְבָּה, according to the Masora, עַזְבָּה and עַזְבָּה, plur. עַזְבִּים, עַזְבִּים, but, very probably, most if not all of these forms are to be referred to the stem *to flee for safety*, and therefore should be written עַזְבִּי, עַזְבִּי, &c. The form עַזְבָּה, if derived from the stem עַזְבָּה, would mean *stronghold*.—Cf. also קָרְחָה *faintness*, developed to a segholate, probably from קָרְחָה, for *mārōkh* from קָרְחָה, like מִתְהַמֵּם *soundness of body*, from מִתְהַמֵּם.

With a long vowel in the second syllable: (f) ground-form *maqṭāl*, with ā always obscured to ô, e.g. מִקְטָה *booty*; from verbs עַזְבָּה, e.g. מִגְנָרָה *fear*, fem. מִגְנָרָה and מִגְנָרָה (with the ô depressed to ī in a toneless syllable; cf. § 27 n), מִגְוָה, &c., Is 22:5. (g) Ground-form *muqṭāl*, in Hebr. again מִקְטָל, e.g. מִקְטָל *a covert*, מִקְשָׁל *a stumbling-block* (cf. above under i, *mākhšēlā*); fem. מִקְטָל *a fishing-net*; (h) the ground-forms *maqṭīl*, *miqṭīl* (cf. מִקְטִים).

¹ In Ct 5:16, Neh 8:10, the first syllable is artificially opened to avoid the cacophony; on the ā of the second syllable cf. § 93 ee.

are found only in participles *Hiph'îl*, the fem. מְבִילִינִית *cheerfulness*, is a denominative formed from a participle *Hiph'îl*; (*i*) ground-form *măqṭîl*, as מְלֹבֵש *a garment*.

Rem. On נ as preformative of the participles of all the conjugations except *Qal* and *Niph'âl*, cf. § 52 c. Many of these participles have become substantives, as נָזְעַת רָתָה *snuffers*, מְשִׁיחִית *destroyer, destruction*.

49. Nouns with נ prefixed. Besides the participles *Niph'âl* (ground-form *năqṭâl*, still retained e.g. in נָוְלָד for *năwlâd*, but commonly attenuated to *niqṭâl*, Hebr. נִקְטָל) and the infinitive *Niph'âl* of the form נִקְטָל, the prefix נ is found in נִפְתּוֹלִים *wrestlings*, Gn 30:8, which is also to be referred to *Niph'âl*, and נִזְׂיד *boiled pottage* (stem זִיד).

50. With ש prefixed, e.g. שֶׁלֶה בָתָה *a flame*. On this *Šaph'âl* formation, cf. § 55 i.

51. Nouns with ת prefixed. Examples of this formation are numerous, especially from weak stems, for the purpose of strengthening them phonetically (see Barth, *ibid.*, p. 283), and notably from verbs פְּנַזֵּעַ and פְּנַזֵּעַ. They may be classified as follows:—(*a*) the ground-form *tăqṭâl* in אַשְׁרָה *ostrich* (?); from verbs חָזֵב, פְּנַזֵּעַ *a settler; fem. expectation*, חָזֵקְתָּה (from the *Hiph'îl* חָזַק) *correction*; from a verb פְּנַזֵּעַ, פְּנַזֵּעַ *the south*; from verbs חָזֵקְתָּה and פְּנַזֵּעַ *thanksgiving, law*, both from *Hiph'îl*; from a verb פְּנַזֵּעַ and לְאַזְׂעָתָה, חָזֵקְתָּה *issues*; probably belonging to this class, from verbs עָזֵב, עָזֵב *confusion*, and סָמֵךְ *a melting away* (developed from חָבֵל and תָּמֵס, from בָּלֵל and סָסֵךְ).

(*b*) *Tiqṭâl*, e.g. fem. תִּפְאַרְתָּה *glory*; from a verb לְהַנְּהָרָה, e.g. hope; (*c*) *tăqṭîl*, e.g. תִּשְׁבְּצָה *chequer work*; fem. תִּרְכְּזָה *deep sleep* (probably from the *Niph'âl* נִרְכָּז); from a verb לְהַנְּחָה, פְּנַזֵּעַ *correction* (from the *Hiph'îl*-stem, like the constr. st. plur. תִּזְׂלְדוֹת *generations*); from verbs עָזֵב, עָזֵב *praise, prayer* (from the *Pi'âl* of the stems הַלְּלָה and פְּלָל).

With a long vowel in the second syllable: (*d*) *tiqṭâl*, as תִּהְוֵם *the ocean, the deep* (for *tiḥâm*; in Assyrian the fem. *tiāmtu*, constr. st. *tiāmat*, is the usual word for sea), unless it is to be derived with Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, p. 113, from the stem תָּהֵם; (*e*) *tāqṭîl* (in Arabic the usual form of the infinitive of conjugation II. which corresponds to the Hebrew *Pi'âl*), e.g. from a verb לְהַנְּחָה, פְּנַזֵּעַ *completeness; increase, usury*, with a parallel form מְרֻבִּית; in a passive sense, תִּלְמִיד *a disciple*; (*f*) תִּפְאַתְּוֵל, e.g. תִּפְאַתְּוֵל *an apple* (for *tānpū'âh*); very frequently used to form abstracts, e.g. תִּגְמֹול *a benefit* (also גָּמֹול); from verbs עָזֵב, עָזֵב *a treading down, a waving* (like תִּרְמַמָּה *a lifting up*, from the *Hiph'îl* stem), תִּשְׁוֹקָה *a longing, &c.*; very frequently also as an abstract plural, e.g. תִּחְפּוֹת *pervereness, guidance*, תִּמְרוֹרִים *bitterness*, תִּנְחֹמוֹת *consolation*; from a verb עָזֵב, עָזֵב *toil*.

Nouns with Afformatives.

52. Nouns with ל affixed. Perhaps בְּרַזְלָל *amber*(?), and probably בְּרַזְלָל *garden-land* (*S^eghôl* in both cases is probably a modification of the original ā in the tone-syllable), גְּבַעַל *bloom*, cf. § 30 q.—According to Prætorius, *ZDMG*, 1903, p. 530 ff., al is an affix of endearment in the proper names בְּנַיְלָל *little lizard?* (also אֲבִיגַל *l* also אֲבִיגַן).

53. Nouns with מ affixed. With an original ām as afformative, אַיְלָם *vestibule* (although the ā in the sing. remains unchangeable), plur. לְאַיְלָם; but in כְּנַמְּם *a swarm of gnats*, the מ is radical. With original afformative ūm, מְעַרְמָם *naked* (from עָרָם), plur. עַיְלָמִים *Gn 3:7*, parallel form עַרְמִים *Gn 2:25*.—To this class also belong the adverbs in ām and ūm,

mentioned in § 100 g, and many proper names, as גָּרְשֹׁם, גָּרְשָׂוֹם (patronymic גָּרְשָׂוֹן), also גָּרְשָׂוֹן, גָּרְשָׂוֹם, גָּרְשָׂוֹן (patronymic גָּרְשָׂוֹן), גָּרְשָׂוֹן, גָּרְשָׂוֹם, גָּרְשָׂוֹן, גָּרְשָׂוֹם, &c.; but for פְּקִיּוֹם *ransom* (?), Nu 3:49, probably פְּדוּיִם is to be read.

54. Nouns with נ affixed. The נ is added by means of a simple helping vowel in Canaan, and נָרָן *a finger nail*; more frequently the addition is made by means of a tone-bearing ā, which in Hebrew is modified to S^eghōl (as גֶּרְזֵן *axe*) or lengthened to ā (but cf. also קְדָמִית אֲחָתָה and קְדָמִית); e.g. קְנָנָה *a possession*, קְלָלָה *a table*, קְרָבָן *an offering*. From an original ā being changed into an obscure ô we may probably explain such forms as קְאַבְוָן *a pining away*; קְרָבָן *a goad*; קְרָבָן *hunger*; from verbs הָנָה, הָעָזָן *pride*, הָמָן *noise*, הָתָוָן *a vision*; שְׁרָיוֹן *a coat of mail*; from a verb פָּנָן, פָּנָן *guile* (the only instance with both מ preformative and ḥōn afformative)¹; very frequently from the simple stem with an unorganic sharpening of the second radical, e.g. זְכָרוֹן *memorial*, כְּלִיוֹן *destruction* (*constr. st.* זְכָרָוֹן and כְּלִיוֹן זְכָרָוֹן), &c.; cf. also רְיוֹן *pregnancy* (for הָרָיוֹן) and § 93 uu; קְשָׁלוֹן *shame*, for קְלָלָה לְשׁוֹן. Proper names occur with the termination ḥōn, as יְשָׁרוֹן, § 86 g, and others.

Rem. A large number of proper names now ending in הָנָה or הָנָן used to be classed as nouns originally formed with the affix יָנָה. The subsequent rejection of the final Nūn seemed to be confirmed by the form אָגָדוֹן, once used (Zc 12:11) for אָגָדוֹ (and conversely in Pr 27:20 קְתִיבָה, Q^erē אָבָדָה for אָבָדָה *destruction*), also by the fact that for הָנָה the LXX give the form Σολωμών or Σαλωμών, and especially that in patronymics and tribal names (§ 86 h) a Nūn appears before the termination הָנָה, as שְׁילָה נָנָה from שְׁילָה נָנָה *Gilonite* from שְׁילָה נָנָה and שְׁילָה נָנָה (modern name *Sailün*). Wetzstein, however (in Delitzsch's *Commentary on Job*, 1st ed., p. 599), explained the Nūn in אָגָדוֹן as a secondary addition to the common old-Palestinian termination ô (רְמָנוֹן, עַפְוָן, &c.), and Barth (*Nominalbildung*, § 224 b) has since shown the unsoundness of the prevailing view on other grounds: the rejection of the Nūn would be much more likely to occur in the numerous appellatives in ḥōn than in proper names, and שְׁילָה נָנָה and שְׁילָה נָנָה are due to the necessity of avoiding, for euphonic reasons, such forms as gilō-î, šilō-î, &c.; cf. also שְׁלָה נָנָה from שְׁלָה נָנָה.

On the afformatives יָתָה, יָתָה, יָתָה, see below, § 86 h-l.

Quadrilaterals and Quinquilaterals.

55. גָּלְמוֹד *barren*, שְׁלָמִישׁ *a flint*, and the fem. חָלְעָפָה *heat*, &c., have probably arisen from the insertion of a חָלְעָפָה *a locust*, מְרָעָפָה *a branch*, Ez 31:5 (verses 6, 8 חָלְעָפָה), שְׁרָעָפִים (also שְׁרָעָפָה) *anxious thoughts*, שְׁרָבִיט *sceptre*, from insertion of a ר, which is common in Aramaic. Cf., moreover, חָרְמָשׁ *a sickle*, סְמָמָה *vine-blossom*; with an initial עָטְלָרָה *a bat*, עָכְבָּרָה *a spider*, עָכְבָּרָה *a mouse*, עָקְרָבָּה *a scorpion*, &c.—Quinquilateral, צְפָרְדָּע *a frog*.

§ 86. Denominative Nouns.

¹ The plurals נְצָנִים *flowers*, Ct 2:12, and the fem. קְנָפְשָׁוֹם *thorns* appear to be formed directly from the singulars נְצָה (cf. נְצָה) and קְנָפָשׁ with the insertion of ḥōn (which in קְנָפָשׁ is obscured to ḥōn). See Nöldeke, Mand. Gr., p. 169, Rem. 3; similarly, according to Hoffmann, 'Einige phöniz. Inschriften,' p. 15 (*Abh. der Gött. Ges. der Wiss.*, xxxvi), מְנָצָב *wares*, Ez 27:14, 16 from בְּזָבָן אֲזָבָן.

¹ Derenbourg (*REJ.*, 1883, p. 165) infers from the above examples and a comparison of the Arabic 'uṣfūr, *sparrow* (from ṣafara, *to chirp*), that unction was especially employed to form quadrilateral names of animals.

1. Such are all nouns formed *immediately* from another noun, whether the latter be primitive or derived from a verb, e.g. קָדוֹמָן *eastern*, immediately from מִזְרָחַ *the east* (verbal stem מִזְרָחַ *to be in front*).

2. Most of the forms which nouns of this class assume have already been given in §§ 84 and 85, since the denominatives, as secondary (although in some cases very old) forms, invariably follow the analogy of the verbal derivatives. As, for instance, the verbals with a prefixed נ (§ 85 e to m) express the place, &c., of an action, so the denominatives with נ local represent the place where a thing is found or its neighbourhood (see e).

The most common forms of denominatives are—

1. Those like the *participle Qal* (§ 84a s), e.g. שָׁעֵר *a porter*, from שָׁעָרָה *a gate*; בָּקָר *a herdsman*, from בָּקָר *a herd*; כָּרְבָּן *a vinedresser*, from כָּרְבָּן *a vineyard*.

2. Those like the form qāṭṭāl (§ 84b b), e.g. תַּשְׁקֵף *an archer*, from תְּשֻׁקָּה *a bow*. Both these forms (c and d) indicate customary occupations, inhering in the subject, like Greek nouns in τῆς, τεύς, e.g. πολίτης, γραμματεύς.

3. Nouns with נ prefixed, denoting the place where a thing is (cf. § 85 e), or its neighbourhood, e.g. מִזְרָחָן *a place of fountains*, from מִזְרָחָה *the place about the feet*, תְּאֵנָה *the place about the head*, from תְּאֵן *a hill*; רְאֵשָׁה *(for מִקְשָׁה)* *a cucumber field*, from אֶשְׁבָּה *cucumber*. Cf. ἀμπελών from ἄμπελος.

4. Nouns with the termination נִ or נֵי expressing adjectival ideas: קָדוֹמָן *eastern*, from מִזְרָחָן *posterior*, from מִזְרָחָה; חִיצָׁן *exterior*, from חִיצָׁה; probably also לִינִיתָן *coiled*, hence coiled animal, serpent, from לִינָה *a winding*; בָּרָזְבָּן *brazen*, from בָּרָזֶן *brass*. Also abstracts, e.g. עֲנָרָן *blindness*, from עֲנָרָה. Cf. § 85 u.—With a double termination (ən or ən with i) אַרְמָנִי *reddish*, נִיְקָעִי *a knowing (spirit)*; נִיְמָנִי *basilisk*; נִיְמָנָה *merciful* [fem. plur.].

וְنִ appears to be used as a diminutive ending (cf. the Syriac וְנִ *little man* (in the eye), *apple of the eye*, from יִשְׂרָאֵל¹; on the other hand וְשִׁיפְנִ *adder*, which was formerly regarded as a diminutive, is properly an adjectival form from שִׁפְנָה *to rub* (hence, as it were, a rubbing creature); in the same way יְשָׁרוּן is a *denominative* from יְשָׁרָה (=שְׁרָה), properly upright (righteous people), and not a *diminutive* (*pious little people*, and the like); finally, שְׁבָרָן is not *lunula*, but an *artificial moon* (used as an ornament), and not little neck, but necklace (from צְבָר *neck*). Cf. Delitzsch on Ct 4:9.

1 [¹ Cf. Barth, § 212; König, ii. 1, 413. Diminutives in Semitic languages are, however, most commonly formed by inserting a y after the second radical, e.g. Aram. עֲוִילָם, Syr. عَوْلِيَّا, Arab. عَلَيْلَم *a very young man*, kulaib, a little dog, &c. Since Olshausen (§ 180), עַזְרָה *a little* (Is 28:10, 13, Jb 36:2) has commonly been regarded as an example of the same form, to which others have added שְׁבִיכִים Is 3:18 (as though a foreign dialectical form for šumais, *little sun*), and נְמַנְזָה 2 S 13:20, as a contemptuous diminutive form of נְמַנְזָה; cf. Ewald, § 167, W. Wright, *Arab. Gramm.*² i. § 269, De Lagarde, *Nominalbildung*, pp. 85–87, König. ii. 1, p. 143 f. The existence of the form in Hebrew is disputed by Barth, § 192 d.]

Instead of יְנֵה we find in a few cases (a) the ending יְנֵה (as in Aram.), e.g. (crafty, or, according to others, *churlish*) if it stands for נִכְלֵי and is not rather from a stem חָרַק; נֶלֶה or כָּלָא (white cloth, Is 19:9 in pause; perhaps also גָּבֵי a swarm of locusts, Am 7:1 (Na 3:17); hardly נִנְחֵת Is 38:20, Hb 3:19; but certainly in proper names as בָּרְזִילֵי (*ferreus*) Barzillai;² and (b) הַנְּבָנָה, arising from אֵי, in אֲשֵׁה belonging to fire (שָׁא), i.e. a sacrifice offered by fire; (prop. milky) the storax-shrub, Arabic *lubnay*.

6. *Abstract nouns formed from concretes by the addition of תְּהִלָּה* [§ 95 t], cf. our terminations *-dom*, *-hood*, *-ness*, e.g. יִלְדוֹת *youth*, מֶלֶכִיּוֹת *kingdom* (the omission of the *Dageš* in תְּ shows that the Šwâ is weakened from a full vowel; on *malik* as underlying the present form לְ cf. § 84a a); אַלְמָנָה *widowhood*, from אַלְמָן *widower*, אַלְמָנָה *widow*. In Aram. this fem. ending תְּ (or תְּ with rejection of the ה) is a common termination of the infinitive in the derived conjugations (cf., as substantival infinitives of this kind, הַשְׁמַעְיוֹת *the announcing*, Ez 24:26, and הַקְבִּרְיוֹת *the making of a league*, Dn 11:23); in Hebr. תְּ as a termination to express abstract ideas (including some which appear to be directly derived from the verbal stem, as סְכִילָה *folly*, רְפָאָה *a heating*¹) becomes more common only in the later books. It is affixed to adjectives ending in *i* (see above, h) in אַכְזָרִיּוֹת *cruelty*, and קַזְמָמִיּוֹת *upright position* (Lv 26:13, used adverbially).

The ending ית is found earlier, e.g. in the **גָּשִׁית** *remainder*, *principium*, from **רָאשׁ** (*head*) *princeps*. The termination *ôth* seems to occur in **הַכְּמֹת** *wisdom* (in [Pr 1:20, 9:1](#), joined to a *singular*; so also [Pr 14:1](#), where, probably, **חַכְמֹת** should likewise be read) and in [Ec 1:17](#), &c., with the parallel form [Ec 10:13](#).

§ 87. Of the Plural.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 426 ff., and on the feminines, p. 441 ff.; M. Lambert, 'Remarques sur la formation du pluriel hébreu,' *REJ*. xxiv. 99 ff., and 'Les anomalies du pluriel des noms en Hébreu,' *REJ*. xlivi. 206 ff.; P. Lajčiak, *Die Plural- u. Dualendungen im semit. Nomen*, Lpz. 1903; J. Barth, 'Beiträge zur Pluralbildung des Semit.', *ZDMG*. 1904, p. 431 ff., i. 'the *ai* of the constr. st.'

1. The regular *plural* termination for the *masc* gender is יְם, always with the tone, e.g. סֹס horse, plur. סֹסִים horses; but also very often written defectively מְם, especially when in the same word one of the vowel letters, ו or י, precedes, e.g. Gn 1:21. Nouns in יְם make their plural in עֲבָרִיִם a Hebrew, plur. (Ex 3:18); but usually contraction takes place, e.g. שְׂנִירִים שְׂנִיר crimson garments, from شَنِير.

2¹ On ' - as an old fem. ending, see above, § 80 l.

¹ [See a complete list of instances in König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 1, p. 205 f.]
 REJ. *REJ.* = *Revue des Études Juives*. Paris, 1880 ff.

Nouns in הַ lose this termination when they take the plural ending, e.g. חֲנָה *seer*, plur. (cf. § 75 h).—In regard to the loss of the tone from the סַ in the two old plurals מְיֻם *water* and יְמַן *heaven*, cf. § 88 d and § 96.

The termination יַ is sometimes assumed also by feminines (cf. נְשִׁים *women*, § 96 under הַ; שְׁנָה *years*, from רְחֵלִים *ewes*, from רְחֵל), so that an indication of gender is not necessarily implied in it (cf. also below, m–p).—On the use of this termination יַ to express abstract, extensive, and intensive ideas, cf. § 124.

The ending *īm* is also common in Phoenician, e.g. צְדוֹנִים *Sidonii*; Assyrian has *āni* (acc. to P. Haupt originally *āmi*, cf. § 88 d); Aramaic has *īm*; Arabic *ūna* (nominative) and *īna* (in the oblique cases, but in vulgar Arabic *īm* is also used for the nominative); Ethiopic *ān*. Cf. also the verbal ending וַ in the 3rd plur. perf. (§ 44 l) and in the 3rd and 2nd plur. impf. (§ 47 m).¹

Less frequent, or only apparent terminations of the plur. masc. are—

(a) יַ, as in Aramaic,² found almost exclusively in the later books of the O. T. (apart from the poetical use in some of the older and even the oldest portions), viz. מֶלֶכִין *kings*, Pr 31:3, אַבְנָן 1 K 11:33, רְצִין the guard, 2 K 11:13, חַטִּין *wheat*, Ez 4:9; defectively אַיִן *islands*, Ez 26:18; יְמִין *days*, Dn 12:13. Cf. also מְקִין *carpets*, Ju 5:10, in the North-Palestinian song of Deborah, which also has other linguistic peculiarities; עַיִן *heaps*, Mi 3:12 (before ו; cf. § 44 k); מְלִין *words* (from the really Aram. מְלַה), Jb 4:2, and twelve other places in Job (beside מְלִים ten times in Job); further, חַיִין Jb 24:22, אַחֲרֵין 31:10, and שׂוֹמְמִין La 1:4, פְּנִין 4:3.—The following forms are doubtful:

(b) יַ (with the ס rejected, as, according to some, in the *dual* for יַיִם *two days*, Ez 13:18, cf. § 88 c), e.g. מְגִינִי *stringed instruments*, Ps 45:9 for מְגִינִים (unless it is to be so written)³; עַמִּי *peoples*, Ps 144:2, and, probably, also La 3:14 (in 2 S 22:44 it may be taken as עַמִּי *my people*; cf. in the parallel passage Ps 18:44 סְמִים; also in Ct 8:2 the רְמִי of the suffix is better regarded as a *suffix*); see also 2 S 23:8 as compared with 1 Ch 11:11, and on the whole question Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude*, p. 524 ff. More doubtful still is—

(c) יַ (like the constr. state in Syriac), which is supposed to appear in e.g. שָׁרִי *princes*, Ju 5:15 (perhaps *my princes* is intended: read either the constr. st. שָׁרִי, which also has good authority, or with LXX שָׁרִים); for חַלְוִני וְסִירִים Jer 22:14 (according to others *dual*, see § 88 c, or a loan word, cf. ZA. iii. 93) read חַלְוִני גּוּבִי and סִירִים, which have also been so explained, see above, § 86 i.—Is 20:4 (where the right reading is certainly קְשׁוּפִי) must be intended by the Masora either as a singular with the formative syllable יַ = *bareness* or, more probably, as a constr. st. with the original termination *ay* (cf. § 89 d) to avoid the harsh combination

¹ On the connexion between all these endings see Dietrich's *Abhandl. zur hebr. Gramm.*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 51 ff.; Halévy, *REJ.* 1888, p. 138 ff. [cf. also Driver, *Tenses*, § 6, Obs. 2].

² So also always in the Mêša' inscription, e.g. line 2 שְׁלֵשִׁין *thirty*; line 4 מֶלֶכִין *kings*; line 5 יְמִין *many days*, &c.

³ According to some this וַ is simply due to a neglect of the point (§ 5 m), which in MSS. and elsewhere marked the abbreviation of the plur. ending.

ZA. ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete, ed. by C. Bezold. Lpz. 1886 ff.

*h^asūfē šēt*⁴; in נָאך־יְהוָה *the Lord* (prop. *my lord*, from the plur. *majestatis*, אֲנָאך *lord*), the *ay* was originally a *suffix*, § 135 q.

(d) מִן a supposed plural ending in כַּבְיִם=כַּבְמִן *gnats* (or *lice*), and סֶלֶם *ladder* (supposed by some to be a plur. like our *stairs*); but cf. on the former, § 85 t.

2. The plural termination of the *feminine gender* is generally indicated by the termination וֹת (often written defectively וֹת, e.g. תְּהִלָּה *song of praise, psalm*, plur. תְּהִלּוֹת (only in post-biblical Hebrew תְּהִלּוֹת, as in the headings of the printed editions, as well as in פְּרִתְהִלּוֹת *the Book of Psalms*); רֹת אֲנָאך *a letter*, plur. בָּאֵרָות; אֲגָרוֹת *a well*, plur. בָּאֵרוֹת. Feminines in וֹת form their plural in וֹת, e.g. מִצְרִית *an Egyptian woman*, plur. מִצְרִיות; and those in וֹת either make יֹתָות, as מֶלֶכֶת *kingdom*, plur. מֶלֶכְיוֹת, Dn 8:22 (cf. תְּהִלּוֹת *cells*, Jer 37:16), or are inflected like קְזֹתָות עֲדָה *testimonies* (pronounced 'ēdh^ewōth for 'ēdhūwōth).

It is only from a mistake or disregard of these feminine endings וֹת and יֹת that some words ending with them form their plural by the addition of יִם or וֹת, e.g. שֶׁבֶט *spear*, plur. שֶׁבְּטוֹת and חַנִּיתָה *whoredom*, plur. חַנִּיתִים (by the side of חַנִּינִים); אַלְמָנוֹתִים *widowhood*; שְׂפָתָה *pits, amulets* (if connected with Assyr. kāsu, *to bind*), &c.

The termination -ōth stands primarily for -āth (which is the form it has in Arab., Eth., in the *constr. st.* of Western Aramaic, in Eastern Syriac, and also in Assyrian; on the change of ā into an obscure ô, see § 9 q). On the other hand, it is doubtful whether this āth is to be regarded as a lengthened and stronger form of the singular fem. ending āth (cf. § 80 b).

How the changeable vowels of a noun are shortened or become Š^ewā in consequence of the addition of the plural endings is explained in §§ 92–5.

3. Words which in the singular are used both as masculine and feminine (§ 122 d), often have in the plural parallel forms with the masculine and feminine terminations, e.g. עַבְדָּי *cloud*, plur. עַבְדּוֹת and עַבְדִּים; and each form may be treated either as masculine or feminine, according to the usage of the particular word.—But even those words, of which the gender is invariable, sometimes have both plural forms, e.g. זָרָה masc. *a generation*, plur. זָרּוֹת and זָרָה fem. *a year*, plur. שָׁנָה and שָׁנּוֹת (see the Rem.). In these words the gender of both plural forms remains the same as in the singular, e.g. אָרִי masc. *a lion*, plur. אָרְיִוֹת musc., Zp 3:3; זָרּוֹת musc., Jb 42:16.

Sometimes usage makes a distinction between the two plural forms of the same word. Thus, יְמִינִים *days*, שָׁנִינִים *years* are the usual, but מְנוֹת (only twice, in the *constr. st.* Dt 32:7, Ps 90:15) and שְׁנָנוֹת (also only in the *constr. st.* and before suffixes) are rarer poetic forms.

A difference of meaning appears in several names of members of the body, the dual (see § 88) denoting the living members themselves, while the plur. in וֹת expresses something like them, but without life (§ 122 u), e.g. יָדָה hands, יָדּוֹת *artificial hands*, also e.g. the arms of a throne; יָדָה hands, כְּפָתָה handles (Lat. manubria); עַם foot, פְּעַמּוֹת *artificial feet* (of the ark), יָמָן horns, קְרֻנוֹת *horns* (of the altar); עַיִן eyes, עַיְנוֹת fountains; cf. also אַרְיִים lions, קְרֻנוֹת יְמִינָה *the*

4⁴ Prætorius, *ZDMG*. 1903, p. 525, regards as an instance of the affix of endearment (cf. קָלִיבִי, אַחֲרִימִי) transferred to an appellative, but such an explanation is rendered unlikely by the meaning of this isolated instance.

figures of lions on Solomon's throne, תְּמִרֵה palm, a palm-like column, plur. תְּמִרִים and תְּמִרּות.

4. A considerable number of masculines form their plural in זָה, while many feminines have a plural in יַם. The gender of the singular, however, is as a rule retained in the plural.

Undoubted instances of masculines with (masculine) plural in זָה are: אֲבָבָר father, אֲזָקָר treasure, תְּמִרֵה palm, בָּאָר cistern, בָּזָבָב tail, קְלִילָה dream, לְבָבָה heart, קְטָבָה tablet, בָּאָרֶב throne, לְבָבָה tablet, קְלִילָה dream, בָּאָרֶב throne, לְבָבָה heart, קְטָבָה tablet, בָּאָרֶב cistern, בָּאָרֶב palm, בָּאָרֶב treasure, בָּאָרֶב dream, בָּאָרֶב heart, קְלִילָה tablet, בָּאָרֶב tablet, בָּאָרֶב night, בָּאָרֶב altar, בָּאָרֶב place, בָּאָרֶב skin-bottle, בָּאָרֶב lamp, בָּאָרֶב skin, בָּאָרֶב voice, בָּאָרֶב table, בָּאָרֶב name, בָּאָרֶב trumpet.

Feminines ending in יַם which take in the plural the termination זָה are אַלְהָה terebinth, אַלְמָה terror (but also אַיְמָה), קְבָלָה a cake of figs, קְבָנָה wheat, קְבָנָה a brick, מְלָה (only in poetry) a word, אַהֲה seā, a dry measure, שְׂעֹורָה barley, and the following names of animals קְבוּרָה a bee and יְזָה a dove; also, for בָּיִצָּה fem. eggs, a singular בָּיִצָּה is to be assumed. שְׂנָה אַלְמָה sheaf and year (see above, n) take both יַם and זָה; cf. finally שְׁבָבָה an ear of corn, plur. שְׁבָבָלִים, and without the fem. termination in the singular פְּרִילְגָּה concubine, plur. פְּרִילְגָּשִׁים.

5. A strict distinction in gender between the two plural endings is found, in fact, only in adjectives and participles, e.g. טֻבִּים boni, טֻבָּות bonae, קְטָלִים musc., קְטָלָות fem. So also in substantives of the same stem, where there is an express distinction of sex, as בָּנִים filii, בָּנָות filiae; מֶלֶךְ reges, מֶלֶכָּות reginae.

Rem. 1. In some few words there is added to the plural ending זָה a second (masculine) plural termination (in the form of the constr. st. יַם, cf. § 89 c), or a dual ending יַם, e.g. בָּמָה a high place, plur. constr. st. בָּמָתִי (also בָּמָתִי bāmōthē, Is 14:14, Jb 9:8, &c., sometimes as Q̄rē to the K̄thībh; see § 95 o); בָּמָות from Saul's head, 1 S 26:12; wall, plur. בָּמוֹת moenia, whence dual חֹמֶת יַם double walls. This double indication of the plural appears also in the connexion of suffixes with the plural ending זָה (§ 91 m).

2. Some nouns are only used in the singular (e.g. אָדָם man, and collectively men); a number of other nouns only in the plural, e.g. מְנֻחִים men (the old sing. מְנוּחוֹת is only preserved in proper names, see § 90 o; in Eth. the sing. is mēt, man); some of these have, moreover, a singular meaning (§ 124 a), as פָּנִים face. In such cases, however, the same form can also express plurality, e.g. פָּנִים means also faces, Gn 40:7, Ez 1:6; cf. אֱלֹהִים God, and also gods (the sing. אֱלֹהָה, a later formation from it, occurs only ten times, except in Job forty-one and in Daniel four times).

§ 88. Of the Dual.

Cf. the literature on the Semitic dual in Grünert, *Die Begriffs-Präponderanz und die Bugle a potiori im Altarub.* (Wien, 1886), p. 21; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 455 ff.

1. The *dual* is a further indication of number, which originated in early times. In Hebrew, however, it is almost exclusively used to denote those objects which naturally occur in pairs (see e). The dual termination is never found in adjectives, verbs, or pronouns. In the noun it is indicated in both genders by the termination יַם, יַם appended to the ground-form,¹ e.g. יַם יַם both hands, יַם יַם two days. In the feminine

1 On dual endings appended to the plural see § 87 s and § 95 o at the beginning.

the dual termination is always added to the old ending *ath* (instead of **הָתְ**), but necessarily with *ā* (since it is in an open syllable before the tone), thus **תִּמְ**, e.g. **שְׁפָה** *lip*, **יִמְ** *both lips*. From a feminine with the ending **תִּתְ**, e.g. **תַּחַת** (from *n^eħušt*) the dual is formed like **תִּמְ** *double fetters*.

With nouns which in the singular have not a feminine ending, the dual termination is likewise really added to the ground-form; but the latter generally undergoes certain changes in consequence of the shifting of the tone, e.g. **כְּנֵף** *wing* (ground-form *kānāph*), dual **כְּנֵפִים**, the first *ā* becoming *š̄wā*, since it no longer stands before the tone, and the second *ā* being lengthened before the new tone-syllable. In 1 K 16:24, 2 K 5:23b the form **כְּפֶרְ** *im* (which should be **כְּפֶרְ** *im*) evidently merely points to the *constr. st.*, which would be expected before **סְפִּירִ**; cf. **יִם** in 2 K 5:23 a, and on the syntax see § 131 d. In the segholate forms (§ 84a a) the dual ending is mostly added to the ground-form, e.g. **גָּלְ** *foot* (ground-form *rāgl*), dual **גָּגְלִים**; cf., however, **יִם** (*only in the book of Daniel*), as well as **קָרְנִים** from **קָרְנָה** *horn*, and **לְחִיִּים** from **לְחִיָּה** *cheek* (*as if from the plurals קָרְנוֹת* **לְחִים**).—A feminine dual of an adjective used substantively occurs in **עֲצָלָתִים** *a sluggish pair* (of hands) Ec 10:18 from the sing. **עַזְלָ**.

Rem. 1. Certain place-names were formerly reckoned as dual-forms (so in earlier editions of this Grammar, and still in König's *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 437), viz.—(a) those in **ןִן** and **ןְנִ**, e.g. **תְּןִתְ** Gn 37^{17a} (locative **תְּנִתְ**, but in ^{17b} **תְּנִתְנִ**), and **תְּנִתְנִ** 2 K 6:13; Jos 21:32, identical with **תְּנִתְ** in 1 Ch 6:61 (cf. also the Moabite names of towns in the Mēšā' inscription, line 10 **קְרִיתָן** = Hebrew **תְּנִתְ** = **בַּתְּנִתְ** Jer 48:22; lines 31, 32 **חַרְונִים** = Hebrew **חַרְונָה** Is 15:5, &c.); (b) in **םִן**, **יִםְ** (= **עִינִים** Gn 38:21). The view that **ןִן** and **םִן** arise from a contraction of the dual terminations **ןִנְ** (as in Western Aramaic, cf. also nom. *āni*, accus. *aini*, of the dual in Arabic) and **יִםְ** seemed to be supported by the Mēšā' inscription, where we find (line 20) **מְאַתְןִ** *two hundred* = **מְאַתְןִ**, Hebrew **יִםְ** **מְאַתְןִ**. But in many of these supposed duals either a dual sense cannot be detected at all, or it does not agree at any rate with the nature of the Semitic dual, as found elsewhere. Hence it can hardly be doubted that **ןִן** and **םִן** in these place-names only arise from a subsequent expansion of the terminations **ןִנְ** and **יִםְ**: so Wellhausen, *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, xxi. 433; Philippi, *ZDMG*, xxxii. 65 f.; Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 319, note 5; Strack, *Kommentar zur Genesis*, p. 135. The strongest argument in favour of this opinion is that we have a clear case of such an expansion in the *Q'ré perpetuum* (§ 17 c) **םִן** for **יִרְוִישָׁלָם** (so, according to Strack, even in old MSS. of the *Mišna*; cf. *Urusalim* in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and the Aramaic form **יִרְוִישָׁלָם**): similarly in the Aramaic **ןִנְ** = **שְׁמַרְזָן** for the Hebrew **שְׁמַרְזָן**. **Samaria**.—We may add to this list **גְּהָנָם**, **אֶפְרָיִם** *the river country* (in the Tel-el-Amarna letters *nárima*, *na'rīma*), **מִצְרָיִם** *Egypt*, Phoenician *mczrm*; also the words denoting time, **הָרָבָה** *im* **עָרָבָה** *in the evening*, if the regular expression **עָרָבָה** *im* Ex 12:6, 16:12, &c., is only due to mistaking **עָרָבָה** *im* for a dual: LXX πρὸς ἐσπέραν, τὸ δειλινόν, ὄψε and only in Lv 23:5 ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἐσπερινῶν. The Arabs also say *el išā'ān*, *the two evenings*, cf. Kuhn's *Literaturblatt*, iii. 48.

Instead of the supposed dual **יְנִין** Ez 13:18 read **חַלְזָנִי**. On **יְנִין** (generally taken to be *a double window*) Jer 22:14, see above, § 87 g.

2. Only apparently dual-forms (but really plural) are the words מים *water* and שמיים *heaven*. According to P. Haupt in *SBOT*. (critical notes on Isaiah, p. 157, line 18 ff.), they are to be derived from the old plural forms (found in Assyrian) *mâmi*, *šamâmi*, whence the Hebr. מים, שמיים arose by inversion of the *i* *mâmi*, *mâimi*, *maim*. It is simpler, however, to suppose that the primitive singulars *may* and *šamay*, when they took the plural of extension (§ 124 b), kept the tone on the *ay*, thus causing the *īm* (which otherwise always has the tone, § 87 a) to be shortened to *im*. Cf. the analogous formations, Arab. *tarḍaina*, 2nd fem. sing. *imperf.* of a verb ل, for *tarḍay* + *iñā*, corresponding to *taqtulīñā* in the strong verb; also bibl.-Aram. בְּנֵי נ (לִי), which otherwise always ends in *iñ* with the tone, e.g. in the *ptcp. Qal* of the strong verb, קבָּחַ *sacrificing*.

2. The use of the dual in Hebrew is confined, except in the numerals 2, 12, 200, &c. (see § 97), practically to those objects which are by nature or art always found in pairs, especially to the double members of the body (but not necessarily so, cf. זר עים 'arms, never in the dual), e.g. יְמֻתְּבָּשָׂר both hands, יְמֻתְּבָּשָׂר both ears, שְׁנָאָבָּשָׂר teeth (of both rows), also מְאַזְנֵי יָמִם a pair of sandals, מְאַזְנֵי יָמִם a pair of scales, Lat. *bilanx*, &c.; or things which are at least thought of as forming a pair, e.g. יְמֻתְּבָּשָׂר two (successive) days, Lat. *biduum*; שְׁנַת יָמִים two weeks; שְׁנַת יָמִים two years (in succession), Lat. *biennium*; יְמֻתְּבָּשָׂר two cubits.¹

In the former case the dual may be used for a plural, either indefinite or defined by a numeral, where it is thought of in a double arrangement, e.g. ארבע רגלי four feet, Lv 11:23; שְׁשָׁנֶה קְנֵפֶי יָמִם six wings (i.e. three pairs), Is 6:2, Ez 1:6; even שְׁבַע עֵינֵי יָמִם seven eyes, Zc 3:9, כל־קְנֵפֶי יָמִם all knees, Ez 7:17; כל־יָדֵי יָמִם all hands, Ez 21:12; כל־כָּלְבָּדָקִים cymbals, Ezr 3:10; שְׁפַת יָמִם double-hooks, Ez 40:43.—To express a certain emphasis the numeral *two* is used with the dual, as in Ju 16:28, Am 3:12.—See some other remarks on the use of the dual in § 87 o and s.

It is not impossible that Hebrew at an earlier period made a more extensive and freer use of the dual, and that the restrictions and limitations of its use, mentioned above, belong to a relatively later phase of development. The Arabic literary language forms the dual in the noun, pronoun, and verb, almost as extensively as the Sanskrit or Greek; but in modern Arabic it has almost entirely disappeared in the verb, pronoun, and adjective. The Syriac has preserved it only in a few stereotyped forms, with which such duals as the Latin *duo*, *ambo*, *octo* may be compared. In the same way, the dual of the Sanskrit is lost in the modern Indian languages, and its full use in Old Slavonic has been restricted later, e.g. in Bohemian, just as in Hebrew, to pairs, such as hands, feet, eyes, ears. On the Germanic dual, see Grimm's *Gramm.*, 2nd ed., i. p. 814.

§ 89. The Genitive and the Construct State.

Philippi, *Wesen und Ursprung des Stat. Constr. im Hebr....*, Weimar, 1871, p. 98 ff: on which cf. Nöldeke in the *Gött. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1871, p. 23.—Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 459 ff.

SBOT. SBOT. = Sacred Books of the Old Testament, ed. by P. Haupt. Lpz. and Baltimore, 1893 ff.

¹ But for קְרַבְּכָּי Pr 28:6, 18 (which the Masora takes as two roads leading from the cross-ways) קְרַבְּכִים is to be read.

1. The Hebrew language no longer makes a living use of *case-endings*,¹ but either has no external indication of case (this is so for the *nominative*, generally also for the *accusative*) or expresses the relation by means of prepositions (§ 119), while the *genitive* is mostly indicated by a close connexion (or interdependence) of the *Nomen regens* and the *Nomen rectum*. That is to say, the noun which as genitive serves to define more particularly an immediately preceding *Nomen regens*, remains entirely unchanged in its form. The close combination, however, of the governing with the governed noun causes the tone first of all to be forced on to the latter,² and the consequently weakened tone of the former word then usually involves further changes in it. These changes to some extent affect the consonants, but more especially the vocalization, since vowels which had been lengthened by their position *in* or *before* the tone-syllable necessarily become shortened, or are reduced to Š^ēwā (cf. § 9 a, c, k; § 27 e–m); e.g. *דְּבָרָם* *word*, *דְּבָרַי הָאֱלֹהִים* *word of God* (a sort of compound, as with us in inverted order, *God's-word*, *housetop*, *landlord*); *דְּ* *hand*, *דְּ* *the hand of the king*; *דְּבָרִים* *words*, *דְּבָרֵי הָעָם* *the words of the people*. Thus in Hebrew only the noun which stands *before a genitive* suffers a change, and in grammatical language is said to be dependent, or in the *construct state*, while a noun which has not a genitive after it is said to be in the *absolute state*. It is sufficiently evident from the above that the *construct state* is not strictly to be regarded as a *syntactical* and *logical* phenomenon, but rather as simply *phonetic* and *rhythmical*, depending on the circumstances of the tone.

Very frequently such interdependent words are also united by *Maqqeph* (§ 16 a); this, however, is not necessary, but depends on the accentuation in the particular case. On the wider uses of the *constr. st.* see the Syntax, § 130.

2. The *vowel* changes which are occasioned in many nouns by the *construct state* are more fully described in §§ 92–5. But besides these, the *terminations* of the noun in the *construct state* sometimes assume a special form. Thus:

(a) In the *construct state*, plural and dual, the termination is '־', e.g. *סֹוסִים* *horses*, *סֹוסִי פְּרָעָה* *the horses of Pharaoh*; '־ם' *עֵינִים* *eyes*, *עֵינִי הַקָּנָף* *the eyes of the king*.

Rem. The '־' of the dual has evidently arisen from '־ם' (cf. '־ם'), but the origin of the termination '־' in the *constr. st.* plur. is disputed. The Syriac *constr. st.* in *ay* and the form of the plural noun before suffixes (*סֹוסִיךְ*, *סֹוסִים*, &c., § 91 h) would point to a contraction of an original '־', as in the dual. But whether this *ay* was only transferred from the dual to the plural (so Olshausen, and Nöldeke, *Beitr. zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb. 1904, p. 48 ff.), or is to be regarded as the *abstract, collective* termination, as in *הַשָּׁמֶן* (see f) and *חוֹרֵי אָשָׁר* (so Philippi, *ThLZ*. 1890, col. 419; Barth, *ZDMG*. 1904, p. 431 ff.), must be left undecided.

¹ On some remains of obsolete case-endings see § 90.

² The same phenomenon of the tone may also be easily seen in other languages, when two words are closely connected in a similar way. Observe, for example, in German the natural stress on the last word in 'der Thron des Königs'; though here the other order of the words (inadmissible in Hebrew) 'des Königs Thron' exhibits the same peculiarity.

ThLZ. *ThLZ.* = Theologische Literaturzeitung, ed. by E. Schürer. Lpz. 1876 ff.

(b) The original תְּ is regularly retained as the feminine termination in the *construct state* sing. of those nouns which in the *absolute state* end in הָ, e.g. מַלְכָה queen, מַלְכֶת שְׁבָא the queen of Sheba. But the feminine endings תְּתְּ, תְּתְּתְּ, and also the plural יְזָהּ, remain unchanged in the *construct state*.

(c) Nouns in הָ (cf. § 75 e) from verbs לֹהֵה (§ 93, Paradigm III c) form their *constr. st.* in הָ, e.g. אֲהָרָן seer, constr. אֲהָרָן. If this הָ is due to contraction of the original יְ, with הָ added as a vowel letter, we may compare יְסָד sufficiency; יְמִין life; גְּנִיא (גִּיא) valley, constr. גְּנִיא (גִּיא) valley.

On the terminations וְ and וָ in the *constr. st.* see § 90.

§ 90. *Real and Supposed Remains of Early Case-endings.* נְ local, וְ in compound proper names, וָ and וְ in the Construct State.

K. U. Nylander, *Om Kasusändelserna i Hebreiskan*, Upsala, 1882; J. Barth, ‘Die Casusreste im Hebr.,’ *ZDMG*. liii. 593 ff.

1. As the Assyrian and old Arabic distinguish three cases by special endings, so also in the Hebrew noun there are three endings which, in the main, correspond to those of the Arabic. It is, however, a question whether they are all to be regarded as real remnants of former case-endings, or are in some instances to be explained otherwise. It can hardly be doubted (but cf. h, Rem.) that the (locative) termination נְ is a survival of the old accusative termination *a*, and that וְ in certain compound proper names is the old sign of the nominative. The explanation of the וְ as an old genitive sign, which, as being no longer understood in Hebrew, was used for quite different purposes, and the view that וְ is a form of the nominative termination וְ, are open to grave doubts.

In Assyrian the rule is that *u* marks the nominative, *i* the genitive, and *a* the accusative,¹ ‘in spite of the many and various exceptions to this rule which occur’ (Delitzsch, *Assyrische Gramm.*, § 66). Similarly, the Arabic case-endings in the fully declined nouns (*Triptotes*) are: -*u* for the nominative, -*i* for the genitive, and -*a* for the accusative; in the *Diptotes* the ending -*a* represents the genitive also. In modern Arabic these endings have almost entirely disappeared, and if they are now and then used, as among the Beduin, it is done without regularity, and one is interchanged with another (Wallin, in *ZDMG*. v, p. 9, xii, p. 874; Wetzstein, *ibid.*, xxii, p. 113 f., and especially Spitta, *Gramm. des arab. Vulgärdialekts von Ägypten*, Lpz. 1880, p. 147 ff.). Even as early as the Sinaitic inscriptions, their regular use is not maintained (Beer, *Studia Asiatica*, iii. 1840, p. xviii; Tuch, *ZDMG*. iii. 139 f.). Ethiopic has preserved only the -*a* (in proper names -*hā*), which is, however, still used for the whole range of the accusative, and also (the distinction of case being lost) as a termination of the *constr. st.* to connect it with a following genitive.

2. As remarked above, under *a*, the *accusative* form is preserved in Hebrew most certainly and clearly in the (usually toneless) ending נְ, originally *ă*, as in the old Arabic accusative. This is appended to the substantive:

¹ This rule is almost always observed in the Tell-el-Amarna letters (see § 2 f); cf. the instances cited by Barth, l. c., p. 595, from Winckler’s edition.

(a) Most commonly to express *direction towards* an object, or *motion to a place*,² e.g. **וַיֵּלֶךְ** **שָׂמֶחָה** *seaward, westward, eastward, northward*, **וַיַּעֲשֶׂה** **אֶל-אָסָרִים** *to Assyria*, **וְלֹא** **בְּבָבֶל** *to Babylon*, **בְּרַכְתָּה** (from **הַר**) *to the mountain*, Gn 14:10, **אֶל-אָרֶץ** *to the earth*, **בְּבֵית** *to the house*, **בְּתִירֶזֶת** *to Tirzah* (**תִּירֶזֶת**) 1 K 14:17, &c., **בְּעַזְבָּן** *to Gaza* (**עַזְבָּן**) Ju 16:1; with the article the **בְּרַכְתָּה** *to the mountain*, **בְּבֵית** *into the house*, **בְּבֵית הַבָּנָה** *into the chamber*, 1 K 1:15; **בְּבַיִלָּה**³ *into the tent*, Gn 18:6, &c.; similarly with adverbs, as **אֵלֶּה** **שָׁם** *thither, whither?*; even with the *constr. st.* before a genitive **בְּיַתְהָ** *into Joseph's house*, Gn 43:17, 24; **אֶל-אָרֶץ הַגָּבֵן** *toward the land of the south*, Gn 20:1; **אֶל-אָרֶץ מִצְרַיִם** *to the land of Egypt*, Ex 4:20; **בְּמִדְבָּר הַדְּמָשָׁق** *to the wilderness of Damascus*, 1 K 19:15; **שָׁמֶן** *toward the sun-rising*, Dt 4:41; and even with the plural **בְּכָשְׂדֵינָה** *into Chaldea*, Ez 11:24; **בְּשָׁמָן** *towards the heavens*.

Rem. The above examples are mostly rendered definite by the article, or by a following genitive of definition, or are proper names. But cases like **בְּבֵית** **בְּבֵית** *to show that the locative form of itself possessed a defining power.*

(b) In a somewhat weakened sense, indicating the place *where* something is or happens (cf. § 118 d), e.g. **בְּבֵית מַהְנוֹם** *in Mahanaim*, 1 K 4:14; **בְּשָׁם** *there* (usually *thither*, see c), Jer 18:2, cf. 2 K 23:8, and the expression *to offer a sacrifice* **בְּהַמִּזְבֵּחַ**, properly *towards the altar* for *on the altar*. On the other hand, **בְּבַבְתָּה** Jer 29:15, and **בְּבַבְתָּה** **בְּבַבְתָּה** *Hb 3:11*, are to be regarded as ordinary accusatives of direction, *to Babylon, into the habitation*; also expressions like **בְּפָאָת צָפֵן** *the quarter towards the north*, Jos 15:5 (at the beginning of the verse, **בְּבֵית גָּבֵיל** **בְּבֵית גָּבֵיל** *the border toward the east*), cf. 18:15, 20, Ex 26:18, Jer 23:8.

(c) The original force of the ending **ה** is also disregarded when it is added to a substantive with a preposition prefixed (cf. also **בְּבַבְתָּה** **עַד-****אָנָה** *how long?*), and this not only after **לְ**, **אֶל-** or **עַד** (which are easily explained), e.g. **בְּעַלְתָּה** **לְעַלְתָּה** *upwards, downwards*, **בְּעַלְתָּה** **לְעַלְתָּה** *downwards*, **בְּבַבְתָּה** *to Sheol*, Ps 9:18; **בְּעַד-****אֲפֵק** **בְּבַבְתָּה** *unto Aphek*, Jos 13:4; **אֶל-הַצָּפֵן** **בְּבַבְתָּה** *toward the north*, Ez 8:14, cf. Ju 20:16; but also after **בְ**, and even after **בְּ**, e.g. **בְּבֵית גָּבֵה** *in the south*, Jos 15:21, cf. Ju 14:2, 1 S 23:15, 19, 31:13, 2 S 20:15, Jer 52:10; **מִבְבָּבֶל** **בְּבַבְתָּה** *from Babylon*, Jer 27:16; cf. 1:13, Jos 10:36, 15:10, Ju 21:19, Is 45:6.

Rem. Old locative forms (or original accusatives) are, according to the Masora, still to be found in

² On this meaning of the accusative see the Syntax, § 118 d, and cf. the Latin accusative of motion to a place, as in *Romam profectus est, domum reverti, rus ire*.

³ **בְּבַבְתָּה** in Baer's text, Gn 18:6, is an error, according to his preface to Isaiah, p. v.

(a) לִילָה, in *pause* לִילָה, the usual word in prose for *night*, which is always construed as masculine. The nominative of this supposed old accusative¹ appeared to be preserved in the form לֵיל, only used in poetry, Is 16:3, *constr. st.* לֵיל (even used for the *absol. st.* in pause Is 21:11). Most probably, however, לֵיל is to be referred, with Nöldeke and others, to a reduplicated form לְלִילִי; cf. especially the western Aramaic לְلִילִיא, Syr. *lilya*, &c.—Another instance is מַמָּאָמָה something, probably from מַמָּוֹם *spot, point*, generally with a negative=none. Similarly רְצָה אֲרְצָה Is 8:23 and (in *pause*) Jb 34:13, סְוָף Ho 8:7, and the place-name הַדְּבָרִים 1 Ch 6:63, might be explained as accusatives. Elsewhere, however, the toneless הַ can be regarded only as a meaningless appendage, or at the most as expressing poetic emphasis; thus הַדְּבָרִים (in *pause*) Jb 37:12; הַמְּתָה death, Ps 116:15; נְגַדְּדָלָה Ps 116:14, 18; חֶלְהָ stream, Ps 124:4; לְבָשָׁם amber, Ez 8:2 [in 1:4 הַכְּשָׁמָל, cf. § 80 k], &c. In Jos 15:12 הַיְהָ is probably only a scribal error (dittography). In Ju 14:18 instead of the quite unsuitable poetic word הַרְסָה (towards the sun??) read as in 15:1 הַדְּרָה to the bride-chamber.

(b) In the termination מַה often used in poetry with feminines, viz. מַתָּה אֵיְתָה *terror* (= אֵיְתָה), Ex 15:16; עַזְרָה help (= עַזְרָה), Ps 44:27, 63:8, 94:17; מִשְׁעָנָה salvation (= מִשְׁעָנָה), Ps 3:3, 80:3, Jon 2:10; עַזְנוֹת unrighteousness (= עַזְנוֹת), Ez 28:15, Ho 10:13, Ps 125:3; עַלְמָה Ps 92:16 *Keth*. Jb 5:16; עַזְרָה Ps 120:1; עַזְרָה darkness, Jb 10:22; מִזְמָרָה Jer 11:15 is corrupt, see the LXX and Commentaries. These cases are not to be taken as double feminine endings, since the loss of the tone on the final syllable could then hardly be explained, but they are further instances of an old accusative of direction or intention. In examples like מִזְרָחָה for help (Ps 44:27) this is still quite apparent, but elsewhere it has become meaningless and is used merely for the sake of poetical emphasis.¹

This termination הַ usually has reference to *place* (hence called הַ locale²); sometimes, however, its use is extended to time, as in מִמָּאָמָה מִמָּאָמָה from year to year. Its use in לִילָה properly *ad profanum*!=*absit!* is peculiar.

As the termination הַ is almost always toneless (except in מִזְרָחָה *constr. st.* Dt 4:41; מִתְּמָןָה and מִתְּפָנָה Jos 19:13) it generally, as the above examples show, exercises no influence whatever upon the vowels of the word; in the *constr. st.* רְהָא מִקְרָבָה Jos 18:12, 1 K 19:15, and in the proper names מִתְּבָנָה 1 K 2:40, מִתְּבָנָה 2 S 24:6 (so Baer; ed. Mant. and Ginsb. קְנָה), מִתְּבָנָה 2 Ch 14:9, מִתְּבָנָה 1 K 17:9, מִתְּבָנָה 1 K 4:12, an ā is retained even in an open tone-syllable (cf., however, מִתְּבָנָה Gn 14:10, מִתְּבָנָה Gn 28:2 from פְּנֵן, with modification of the a to ē; also בְּרִאָה לְהָא 1 S 25:5 from בְּרִאָה). In segholate forms, as a general rule, the הַ local is joined to the already developed form of the *absol. st.*, except that the helping-vowel before הַ naturally becomes

¹ Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 113, also takes it as such, *láylā* being properly *at night*, then *night* simply. Barth, however (*Sprachwiss. Abhandlungen*, p. 16, note 1), refers it to an original לִילָה, like אֲנָה from אֲנָה.

¹ The form clings also to a few place-names, as גִּלְגָּלָה Dt 10:7; שְׂלָמָה 1 S 9:4, 2 K 4:42; Nu 33:22 f.; יְטֻמָּה verse 33 f.; תְּמִימָה Jos 19:43, &c.; אֲפָרָה Mi 5:1, &c.]

² Cf. Sarauw, ‘Der hebr. Lokativ,’ ZA. 1907, p. 183 ff. He derives the הַ from the adverbs מִתְּפָנָה, מִתְּמָן and holds that it has nothing whatever to do with the old accusative.

גַּחֲלָה Gn 18:6, &c.; בִּיתָה קָאֵת עֲרָה Jos 17:15, הַעֲרָה Ju 20:16, &c., but also גַּחֲלָה Nu 34:5 (*constr. st.*; likewise to be read in the *absolute* in Ez 47:19, 48:28) and עֲרָה Is 28:6 (with *Silluq*); cf. הַגְּבָה Ez 47:19 and רְנָה גְּרָנָה Mi 4:12 (both in *pause*).—In the case of feminines ending in הַ the הַ *local* is added to the original feminine ending הַ (§ 80 b), the ā of which (since it then stands in an open tone-syllable) is lengthened to ā, e.g. מִתְּמֻמָּה.—Moreover the termination הַ is even weakened to הֶ in נֶכֶם to Nob, 1 S 21:2, 22:9; נֶה אֵן whither, 1 K 2:36, 42 and נֶצֶן to Dedan, Ez 25:13.

3. Of the three other terminations i may still be regarded as a survival of the old nominative ending. It occurs only in the middle of a few (often undoubtedly very old) proper names,¹ viz. אֲחֹוּמִי (if compounded of אָחוּ and מַי), קְמַטְּלִי (for which in Jer 52:1 *K^eth.*, קְמַטְּלִי and לְחַמְתּוּשׁ לְחַמְתּוּשׁ (otherwise in Hebrew only in the plur. מִתְּמִימִים men; to מהַ corresponds most probably בְּתוּאֵל in בְּתוּאֵל Gn 32:31 (but in ver. 32 face of God (otherwise only in the plur. פְּנִים constr. st. פְּנִים—פְּנִים Neh 6:6 (elsewhere שְׂמָךְ), is the name of an Arab, cf. 6:1. On the other hand the terminations i and o are most probably to be regarded (with Barth, l. c., p. 597) as having originated on Hebrew soil in order to emphasize the *constr. st.*, on the analogy of the *constr. st.* of terms expressing relationship.

In view of the analogies in other languages (see b) there is nothing impossible in the view formerly taken here that the *litterae compaginis* i and o are obsolete (and hence no longer understood) case-endings, i being the old genitive and o for the nominative sign u. Barth objects that the i and o almost invariably have the tone, whereas the accusative הַ is toneless, and that they are long, where the Arab. i and u are short. Both these objections, however, lose their force if we consider the special laws of the tone and syllable in Hebrew. The language does not admit a final i or u, and the necessarily lengthened vowel might easily attract the tone to itself. On the other hand a strong argument for Barth's theory is the fact that these *litterae compaginis* are almost exclusively used to emphasize the close connexion of one noun with another; hence especially in the *constr. st.* Consequently it seems in the highest degree probable that all these uses are based upon forms in which the *constr. st.* is expressly emphasized by a special termination, i.e. the *constr. st.* of terms of relationship, אֲבִי, אֲחִי, אֲמִי from בֶּן father, בָּנָה brother, בָּנָה father-in-law (cf. § 96). The instances given under l and m followed this analogy.

Like i, o is also used only to emphasize the *constr. st.* (see o), and must therefore have a similar origin, but its exact explanation is difficult. According to Barth, this o corresponds to a primitive Semitic ā (cf. § 9 q) and is traceable to abā, aħā, the accusatives of terms of relationship in the *constr. st.*, which have ā only before a genitive. Against this explanation it may be objected that there is no trace of the supposed Hebrew accusatives אָבוֹ, אָחוֹ, מָמוֹן, and only of the analogous בָּנוֹ. It is also remarkable that so archaic a form should have been preserved (except in בָּנוֹ) only in two words and those in quite late passages. However we have no better explanation to offer in place of Barth's.

³ So Qimhi, and the Mant. ed. (Baer *הַשְׁעָרָה*), i.e. locative from עַרְעָשׁ (Is 7:20). The reading עַרְעָה (Opit., Ginsb.) implies a feminine in הַ.

¹ Cf. the list in L. Kaila, *Zur Syntax des in verbaler Abhängigkeit stehenden Nomens im alttest. Hebr.*, Helsingfors, 1906, p. 54.

² The name שְׁמַיָּאֵל formerly regarded as a compound of שְׁמַיָּה = name and אל = El, is better explained with Prätorius, *ZDMG*. 1903, p. 777, as a name of affection, for שְׁמַיָּעֵל = יְהִי עַזְלֵל [but see Driver on 1 S 1:20]; similarly, according to Prätorius, פְּתֻחָה = פְּתֻחָה אֵל = אל and many others.

Finally we cannot deny the possibility, in some cases, of Barth's explanation of the *i* in compound proper names like בְּתוֹאֵל, &c. (see above), as due to the analogy of terms of relationship with nominative in *i*. But this in no way militates against the view expressed above, that in some very old names, like בְּתוֹאֵל, פְּנוֹאֵל, &c., the original common nominative sign has simply been preserved.

The instances found are:

(a) Of the ending *i* the *בָּנִי הַצָּאן* *his ass's colt*, Gn 49:11; *בָּנִי אֶת־נָזֶן* *that leaveth the flock*, Zc 11:17 (cf. the preceding שָׁכְנִי סְנָה; רְעִי הַאֲלִיל *the dweller in the bush*, Dt 33:16 (on cf. below Jer 49^{16a}, Ob³); appended to the feminine שָׁכְנִי *on whether stolen by day or stolen by night*, Gn 31:39 (in prose, but in very emphatic speech); *רַבְתִּי מִשְׁפָט plena iustitiae*, Is 1:21; *רַבְתִּי עַם full of people*, La 1:1 (on the retraction of the tone before a following tone-syllable, cf. § 29 e; in the same verse the second *רַבְתִּי* and *שְׁרַבְתִּי*, see below, follow the example of *רַבְתִּי*, although no tone-syllable follows; cf. also Ho 10:11 below); *עַל־דָּבָרִתִּי מֶלֶכִיָּצֶדֶק after the order of Melchizedek*, Ps 110:4; cf. also Ps 113:9, Jer 49^{16b}. To the same category belong the rather numerous cases, in which a preposition is inserted between the *construct state* and its genitive (cf. § 130 a), without actually abolishing the dependent relation, e.g. *רַבְתִּי בְּגּוּיִם she that was great among the nations*, *princess among the provinces*, La 1:1; *אֲחָתִי לְדוֹשָׁה that loveth to tread*, Ho 10:11; cf. also Jer 49:16a, Ob³.—In Ex 15:6 can only be so explained if it is a vocative referring to *יהוה*, but perhaps we should read *נָאָדָרָה* as predicate to *יְמִינָךְ*.

Further, the *Hireq compaginis* is found with certain particles which are really also nouns in the *constr. st.*, as זָלְתִּי (= זָלַת *except*) (מִן *from*, אַפְסִי *not*, בָּלְתִּי *not* (poetical for זָלְתִּי) (מִן *from*, אַנְיִי *I am*, and there is none else beside me; but many take the *i* as a suffix here), Is 47:8, 10, Zp 2:15. [The above are all the cases in which this *i* is attached to independent words in the O.T.; it occurs, however, besides] in compound proper names (again attached to the *constr. st.*), as מֶלֶכִיָּצֶדֶק (*king of righteousness*), גְּבָרִיאֵל (*man of God*), חֲנִינָאֵל (*favour of God*), and others (cf. also the Punic name *Hannibal*, i.e. חֲנִיבָע *favour of Ba'al*).

Otherwise than in the *constr. st.* the *Hireq compaginis* is only found in participial forms, evidently with the object of giving them more dignity, just as in the case of the construct forms in *i*. We must distinguish, however, between passages in which the participle nevertheless does stand in close connexion, as Gn 49:11, Is 22:16 (*חַצְבָּנִי*, also in impassioned speech), Mi 7:14 (probably influenced by Dt 33:16), Ps 101:5, 113:7; and passages in which the *i* added to the participle with the article merely serves as an ornamental device of poetic style, e.g. in the late Psalms, 113:5, 6, 7, 9 (on verse 8 see n), 114:8, 123:1.

In *Kethibh* the termination *i* also occurs four times in *i.e.* יְשֻׁבָּתִי, Jer 10:17, 22:23 (before בָּ), Ez 27:3 (before עַלְתִּי), La 4:21 (before בָּ). The *Q're* always requires for it (or יְשֻׁבָּתִי), except in Jer 22:23 *Maknati* *Q're*, and finally Jer 51:13 *sh'kunati* *Q're*. Perhaps יְשֻׁבָּתִי and יְשֻׁבָּתִי are *formae mixtae*, combining the readings יְשֻׁבָּתִי, בָּתִי *sh'kunati* *Q're*. &c. and יְשֻׁבָּתִי (2nd fem. perf.), &c., but may be merely assimilated to יְשֻׁבָּתִי which immediately precedes it.

The following are simply textual errors: 2 K 4:23 *הַלְכָתִי K^eth.*, due to the preceding אַתִּי, and to be read הַלְכָתָה as in the Q^re; Ps 30:8 (read הַבְּרִית), 113:8 (read לְהַזְשִׁיבָו), 116:1 (read קֹל תְּחִי, as in five other places). On בְּרִית, thrice, in Lv 26:42, cf. § 128 d.

(b) Of the ending i¹ (always with the tone): in prose only in the Pentateuch, but in elevated style, Gn 1:24 חַיְתָה־אָנָּךְ the beast of the earth (=חַיְתָה ver. 25); similarly in Ps 50:10, 79:2, 104:11, 20, Is 56:9 (twice), Zp 2:14; otherwise only in בֶּן־צְפָר son of Zippor, Nu 23:18; בֶּן־בֵּר son of Beor, Nu 24:3, 15; and מַעֲיָנוֹ מִימָּן a fountain of waters, Ps 114:8.

§ 91. The Noun with Pronominal Suffixes.

W. Diehl, *Das Pronomen pers. suffixum 2 u. 3 pers. plur. des Hebr.*, Giessen, 1895; A. Ungnad, ‘Das Nomen mit Suffixen im Semit.’, *Vienna Oriental Journal*, xx, p. 167 ff.

With regard to the connexion of the noun with pronominal suffixes, which then stand in a genitive relation (§ 33 c) and are, therefore, necessarily appended to the *construct state* of the noun, we shall first consider, as in the verb (§ 57 ff.), the forms of the suffixes themselves, and then the various changes in the form of the noun to which they are attached. The nouns are also tabulated in the Paradigms of the flexion of the noun in § 92 ff. Cf. also Paradigm A in the Appendix. We are here primarily concerned with the different forms of the suffixes when added to the singular, plural, and dual.

1. The Suffixes of the singular are—

With nouns ending in a—

	<i>Vowel.</i>	<i>Consonant.</i>
Sing. 1st Person. c. <i>my.</i>	,	,
2nd Person, m. <i>thy.</i>	תְּ	תְּ (pause תְּ)
f.	תָּ	תָּ
3rd Person, m. <i>his.</i>	וְהָ	וְ(הָ), וְ
f. <i>her.</i>	תְּהָ	תְּהָ, תְּהָ
Plur. 1st Person, c. <i>our.</i>	נוּ	נוּ
2nd Person, m. <i>your.</i>	מְ	מְ
f.	מְהָ	מְהָ
3rd Person, m. <i>eorum.</i>	מוּ	מוּ (poet. מוּ)

¹ Cf. Kaila, l. c., p. 59 ff.

Rem. 1. There is less variety of forms in these than in the verbal suffixes; the particular forms are used as follows:—

(a) Those without a connecting vowel (on the derivation of these ‘connecting vowels’ from original stem-vowels, see note on § 58 f) are generally joined to nouns of a peculiar form (see § 96), the *constr. st.* of which ends in a vowel, as אָבִיָהוּ and אָבִיְהוּ, אָבִינוּ, אָבִיךְ, אָבִינוֹ, אָבִיכְ, אָבִינוֹ, אָבִיכְם, sometimes also to segholate forms ending in לִיהְ from stems (see § 93 x, y), e.g. פְרִיקָהּ the fruit of them, Am 9:14 (also Is 37:30, &c.), Jer 29:28 (also verse 5); cf., moreover, Lv 8:16, 25 and similar examples with הַןּ (Is 3:17) Gn 21:28, Ez 13:17, 16:53.¹ Also in Gn 1:21, 4:4, Ez 10:12, Nah 2:8, &c., the K^eth. perhaps intends the singular, לֶמֶת יִנְהָם, &c., but the Masora requires the plural with defective ē.

The forms with *ē* in the above-mentioned persons are common only with nouns in הָ (from stems לְהַ), constr. st. הָ (cf. § 89 f), e.g. שָׂעִיר his field; הָאֶלְעָזֶר its leaf, Is 1:30; הָמָרְאָה the appearance thereof, Lv 13:4 (from *mar'ah*; on the *S'ghôl* see k); but שָׂעִיר her field. The orthographic retention of the ' , e.g. תְּשִׁיבָה, מְשִׁיחָה, מְשִׁיחָה, gives to many forms the appearance of plurals; see the instances in § 93 ss.

Apart from these forms the connecting vowel ē in the 3rd pers. occurs only in isolated cases; אָוֶר הַזְׁה his light, Jb 25:3; לְמִינֵּה הוּא after its kind, Gn 1:12, 25 [+ 12 times]; Na 1:13; in Ju 19:24 read פְּיַלְגָשׁוּ as in vv. 2, 25. On the other hand קְ- in the 2nd sing. fem. and קְ- in the 1st plur. are by far the more common forms, while נְ- and קְ- are of rare occurrence; see e.—Instead of קְ- in Gn 10:19, Ex 13:16, Jer 29:25, &c., cf. בְּכָה (with Šwā mobile), if the last consonant of the noun is a guttural, the forms are קְ- בְּכָם, e.g. רַוחַךְ thy spirit, אֱלֹהֵיכָם thy creator, Is 43:1, רַעֲנָךְ your friend, Jb 6:27 (on such cases as בְּתַחְכָּמָם Hag 2:5, see § 10 g).—With Nun *energicum* (cf. § 58 i, and on עַזְנֵן Jb 5:1, &c., cf. § 61 h) קְ- occurs in Pr 25:16, in principal pause.

2. Rare or incorrect forms are—

Sing. 1st pers. Ez 47:7 (certainly only a scribal error, caused by in **בְּשִׁבַּת נֵי** in verse 6).

2nd pers. *m.* in pause נָךְ, e.g. כְּהֵן (*thy hand*), Ps 139:5, cf. Pr 24:10; once חָנַךְ Ps 53:6 (cf. the analogous cases in the verbal suffix § 75 II); *fem.* יָקְנָה Ez 5:12 (in 16:53 also for probably שָׁבִיתָנָה is intended), Jer 11:15, Ps 103:3, 116:19, 135:9 (corresponding to the Aramaic suffix of the 2nd *fem. sing.*; on the wholly abnormal נָא 2:14, cf. I), *K^eth.* 2 K 4:2, Ct 2:13. Also נָא Is 22:1, Ez 23:28, 25:4.

¹ Also in Jer 15:10 read (according to § 61 h, end) בְּלָהֶם קָלֹלֹנוּ; in Ho 7:6 probably אֲפַהֵם for אֲפָהֶם.

3rd pers. הִ- (cf. § 7 c), e.g. אָקָלְהִ Gn 9:21, 12:8, 13:3, 35:21 (always with *Q^{rē}* אָקָלְוִ); הַנְּ Nu 10:36; הַלְּ Dt 34:7; הַבְּ Jer 20:7, Na 2:1 *Q^{rē}*; הַצְּ 2 K 19:23 *K^{th.}*, for which אָקָרְ is read in Is 37:24; הַעֲרֵת and הַסּוֹתְהִ Gn 49:11, cf. Ex 22:26 (*Q^{rē}* עִירְוָתְהִ); הַסּוֹתְהִ Ps 10:9, 27:5 *K^{th.}*; הַמְּוֹנְגְהִ Ez 31:18, &c., *K^{th.}*; הַכּוֹבְאָתְהִ Ez 48:18 [altogether fourteen times in the Pentateuch, and some forty times in other books: see Driver, *Samuel*, p. xxxv, and on 2 S 2:9, 21:1].

3rd fem. הִ- for הִ- (with the softening of the *Mappiq*, cf. § 23 k, and the analogous cases in § 58 g) occurs repeatedly before *B^eghadkh^ephath* and other soft consonants, Ex 9:18 (before יְ, if the text is right), Lv 13:4 (before נְ), Nu 15:28, 31, 1 S 1:9 (unless אָכְלָהִ, the infin. with fem. termination, is intended; הַתְּψִ follows), Ez 16:44, 24:6 (before בְּ), 1 S 20:20, 2 K 8:6, Pr 12:28 (before נְ), Na 3:9 (before גְּ), Ps 48:14 (before טְ), Ez 47:10, Jb 31:22 twice (before הְ), Is 21:2, Jer 20:17 (before הְ), Nu 32:42, Am 1:11 (before יְ), Lv 6:2 (before וְ); even in *pause*, Lv 12^a and ^b; Is 23:17, Pr 21:22, also with *Zaqeph*, Is 45:6, Jer 6:6 (probably), 44:19; on הַהְנָהְ Lv 26:34, &c., see § 67 y. Cf. also אִ- Ez 36:5.—Sometimes the Masora appears (but this is very doubtful) to regard the הִ- with feminines as a shortening of הַהְ- e.g. הַנְּ Gn 40:10 for הַהְנָהְ, נְנָהְ Pr 7:8 for פְּנָהְ; also סִ- for סִםְ Ho 13:2, and שְׁרָמִים Jb 5:13. The examples, however, are for the most part uncertain, e.g. in Is 28:4 the reading is simply to be emended to בְּפֶרְחָה, and in Zc 4:2 to הַלְּגָגָה, Jb 11:9 to מְקֻדָּה, Neh 5:14 to פְּנָהְ. [See also, after prepositions, § 103 g.]

Plur. 1st pers. וּ- in *pause* קִיְמָנוּ Jb 22:20 (where, however, וּמְקָדָם is certainly to be read); cf. Ru 3:2 [Is 47:10, cf. § 61 c, h], and so always וּ- all of us, Gn 42:11, &c [cf. אָתָנוּ, בָּנוּ, לְנוּ, בְּנוּ, נְנוּ].

2nd pers. *fem.* נָהְ Ez 23:48, 49.

3rd pers. *masc.* וּ- Ps 17:10 (on יְמָנוּ וּ in the same verse, and in Ps 58:7 see l); סִםְ Ho 1-2 S 23:6, according to Sievers probably to call attention to the reading סִלְלָהָם. *Fem.* הַנְּ 1 K 7:37, Ez 16:53 (in *pause*); הַנְּ Gn 41:21; הַנְּ Gn 30:41; הַנְּ Ru 1:19; elsewhere generally in *pause* (Gn 21:29, 42:36, Jer 8:7, Pr 31:29, Jb 39:2); finally הַןְּ as suffix to a noun, only in Is 3:17.

For examples of singulars with plural suffixes see l.

2. In the *plural masc.* and in the *dual* the suffixes are to be regarded primarily as affixed to the original ending of the *construct state* (וּ- , cf. § 89 d). This ending, however, has been preserved unchanged only in the *2nd fem.* In most cases it is contracted to וּ- , as in the *constr. st.* without suffixes (so throughout the plur. and in the poetical suffix יְהָוָה of the *3rd sing. masc.*); in the *2nd masc.* and *3rd fem. sing.* it is וּ- (cf. k). On the *1st pers.* and *3rd masc. sing.* see i.—Thus there arise the following

Suffixes of Plural Nouns.

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1. c. <i>my.</i> וּ- , <i>pause</i> וּ-	1. c. <i>our.</i> וּ- יְמָנוּ
2. m. וּ- יְנָהְ <i>thy.</i>	2. m. <i>your.</i> וּ- יְכָם
f. וּ- יְנָהְ <i>pause</i> וּ- יְנָהְ	f. וּ- יְנָהְ

3. m. <i>his.</i>	יְהוּ, poet.	3. m. <i>their.</i>	יְמֹנוּ, poet.
f. <i>her.</i>	יְהָוָה	f.	יְמֹנוֹת

Thus the original יְהָוָה is (a) contracted in the *3rd sing. masc.* יְהוּ and throughout the *plural*, as סּוֹסִי יְהוָה, סּוֹסִי יְהוּ, &c.; (b) retained unchanged in the *1st sing.* סּוֹסִי, the real suffix-ending יְהָוָה (see b) being united with the final *Yôdh* of the ending יְהָוָה; and in the *2nd fem. sing.* יְהָוָה, with a *helping-Hireq* after the *Yôdh*. On the other hand (c) the *Yôdh* of יְהָוָה is lost in pronunciation and the ā lengthened to ā in the *3rd masc. sing.* סּוֹסָאָו, i.e. *sûsâw* (pronounced *susā-u*).¹ The *2nd masc. sing.* סּוֹסִי and the *3rd fem. sing.* יְהָוָה were formerly also explained here as having really lost the יְ, and modified the a of *sûsakā*, *sûsahā* to *S'ghôl*; but cf. the view now given in g and k.

Rem. 1. As סּוֹסִי represents *sûsai-nû*, so יְהָוָה סּוֹסִי represent *sûsai-kâ*, *sûsai-hâ*, and the use of *S'ghôl* instead of the more regular *Sere* is to be explained from the character of the following syllable,—so P. Haupt who points to הַ קְטַלְלָה as compared with יְקְטַלְלָה. In support of the view formerly adopted by us that the יְ is only orthographically retained, too much stress must not be laid on the fact that it is sometimes omitted,² thereby causing confusion in an unpointed text with the singular noun. A number of the examples which follow may be due to an erroneous assumption that the noun is a plural, where in reality it is a singular, and others may be incorrect readings. Cf. הַ קְרָכָךְ *thy ways* (probably קְרָכָךְ is intended), Ex 33:13, Jos 1:8, Ps 119:37; for other examples, see Jos 21:11 ff. (הַ מְגֻשָּׂה; but in 1 Ch 6:40 ff. always הַ), Ju 19:9, 1 K 8:29, Is 58:13, Ps 119:41, 43, 98 (probably, however, in all these cases the sing. is intended); Nu 30:8 (cf. v. 5); הַ מְפַתֵּחַ הַ רְעֵה הוּא for רְעֵה הוּא *his friends* 1 S 30:26, Pr 29:18; Jb 42:10 (but it is possible to explain it here as a *collective singular*); צוֹנָנוּ *our iniquities*, Is 64:5, 6, Jer 14:7; Ex 10:9, Neh 10:1 (לוּיָנוּ from לוּיָם which is always written defectively); נְסָכָם Nu 29:33; תְּבַמָּה Jer 44:9; בְּצָבָת Ps 134:2; לְמִינְהָם after their kinds, Gn 1:21 (but see c), cf. 4:4 and Na 2:8. The defective writing is especially frequent in the *3rd masc. sing.* יְהָוָה, which in Q'reh is almost always changed to יְהָוָה, e.g. חֲצָרָיו *his arrows*, Ps 58:8, Q'reh חֲצָרָיו. On חֲצָרָיו only three times יְהָוָה, cf. § 135 r.

2. Unusual forms (but for the most part probably only scribal errors) are—*Sing. 2nd pers. fem.* הַ יְהָוָה (after אֲשֶׁר happy! Ec 10:17, which has become stereotyped as an interjection, and is therefore unchangeable; cf. Delitzsch on the passage); *Cf. יְבִיכְךָ* (cf. Syr. 2 K 4:3, and 7 in Keth., Ps 103:3–5, 116:7 (בִּיכְךָ in pause).—In Ez 16:31 הַ יְכִם (so הַ יְכִם in 6:8) occurs with an *infin.* ending in הָוָה, the הָוָה being therefore treated as a plural ending; similarly, the plural suffix is sometimes found with the feminine ending הָוָה (Nu 14:33, Is 54:4, Jer 3:8, Ez 16:15, 23:7, as well as in 16:20 Q'reh, and Zp 3:20), with the ending i (Lv 5:24, reading תְּוֹשֵׁבְךָ), and even with the ordinary feminine ending ath; Is 47:13, Ez 35:11, Ps 9:15, Ezr 9:15.—Wholly |

¹ In the papyrus of the decalogue from the Fayyûm, line 16, וַיִּקְדְּשֵׁה occurs for וַיִּקְדְּשָׁה Ex 20:11. Gall, ZAW. 1903, p. 349, takes this as an indication that the traditional forms of the noun-suffix יְ or וְ represent aiū or eu. P. Haupt aptly compares the Greek use of the *iota subscript* (ᾳ).

² So in the Mêša' inscription, l. 22 מְגַלְתָּה *its towers* (along with שַׁעֲרִיה *its gates*). Can it have been the rule to omit יְ after the termination ôth? Cf. below, n.

abnormal is מַלְאָכִים כֵּה *thy messengers*, Na 2:14, evidently a case of dittography of the following ה: read מַלְאָכִים כֵּה.

3rd masc. יְהֹוָה הָיָה *Hb* 3:10, Jb 24:23; הָיָה הָיָה *S* 30:26, Ez 43:17, Na 2:4; הָיָה (a purely Aramaic form) Ps 116:12.—*3rd fem.* אֲנָה Ez 41:15.

Plur. The strange *2nd pers. masc.* פְּרִזְוֹתֶיכֶם (with *i*, so Qimhi; cf. Norzi) Jer 25:34, is probably a mixed form combining פְּרִזְוֹתֶיכֶם and פְּרִזְוֹתֶיכֶם; *fem.* נָה נָה Ez 13:20.

3rd masc. יְהֹוָה הָיָה Ez 40:16; *fem.* נָה נָה Ez 1:11.

3. The termination מוֹן (also with the *dual*, e.g. Ps 58:7, 59:13), like מוֹן, occurs with the noun (as with the verb, § 58 g) almost exclusively in the later poets [viz. with a substantive in the singular, Ps 21:11, 17:10, 10, 58:7, 59:13, 89:18; with a dual or plural, Dt 32:27, 32, 37, 38, 33:29, Ps 2:3, 3, 11:7, 35:16, 49:12, 58:7, 59:14, 73:5, 7, 83:12, 12, 140:4, 10, Jb 27:23; after prepositions, see § 103 f, o, notes], and cannot, therefore, by itself be taken as an indication of archaic language. On the other hand there can be no doubt that these are revivals of really old forms. That they are consciously and artificially used is shown by the evidently intentional accumulation of them, e.g. in Ex 15:5, 7, 9 Ps 2:3, 5, and 140:4, 10, and also by the fact observed by Diehl (see the heading of this section) that in Ex 15 they occur *only* as verbal suffixes, in Dt 32 *only* as noun suffixes.

3. It is clear and beyond doubt that the *Yôdh* in these suffixes with the plural noun belongs, in reality, to the ending of the *construct state* of the masculine plural. Yet the consciousness of this fact became so completely lost as to admit of the striking peculiarity (or rather inaccuracy) of appending those *suffix-forms* which include the plural ending וָן, even to the feminine plural in וָתָה (וָתָה, סְוָתָה, יְתָה, &c.), so that in reality the result is a double indication of the plural.¹

Such is the rule: the singular suffix, however (see b), also occurs with the ending וָן (probably through the influence of Aramaic), e.g. קָוָתִי Ps 132:12 (unless it be *sing.* for עָוָתִי, as, according to Qimhi in his Lexicon, תְּקָנָתִי 2 K 6:8 is for *past*, Dt 28:59 (treated on the analogy of an *infin.* לְהָבִרְתָּ); אֲמָצָתִי Ez 16:52. On the other hand מְצָוָתִי (so Baer, Ginsb.; but Opit. יְתָה) Ps 119:98, Dn 9:5 is merely written defectively, like קָרְאָתִי according to Baer (not Ginsb.) in Pr 1:9, &c. In the *3rd plur.* the use of the singular suffix is even the rule in the earlier Books (see the instances in Diehl, l. c., p. 8), e.g. אֲבוֹתָם (their fathers) oftener than אֲבוֹתָם (this only in 1 K 14:15, and in Jer, Ezr, Neh, and Ch [in 1 K, Jer, Ezr, however, אֲבוֹתָם is more common]); so always אֲשָׁמוֹתָם, שָׁמוֹתָם their names, their generations. From parallel passages like 2 S 22:46 compared with Ps 18:46, Is 2:4 with Mi 4:3, it appears that in many cases the longer form in יְתָה can only subsequently have taken the place of וָן.

4. The following Paradigm of a masculine and feminine noun with suffixes is based upon a monosyllabic noun with one unchangeable vowel. With regard to the ending וָן in the *constr. st.* of the fem. it should be further remarked that the short *a* of this ending is only retained before the *grave* suffixes בָּם and בָּן; before all the others (the *light* suffixes) it is lengthened to *ā*.

¹ See an analogous case in § 87 s. Cf. also the double feminine ending in the *3rd sing. perf.* of verbs הָיָה, § 75 i.

Singular.

<i>Masculine.</i>			<i>Feminine.</i>		
Sing.	<i>com.</i>	סֹס a horse.	סֹסָה a mare.		
1.			סֹסֶתִי my mare.		
2. <i>m.</i>		סֹסֶךְ thy horse.	סֹסֶתְךָ thy mare.		
<i>f.</i>		סֹסֶךְ thy horse.	סֹסֶתְךָ thy mare.		
3. <i>m.</i>		סֹסֶו equus eius (suus).	סֹסֶתְוָה equa eius (sua).		
<i>f.</i>		סֹסֶה equus eius (suus).	סֹסֶתְה equa eius (sua).		
Plur.	<i>com.</i>	סֹסֶנּוּ our horse.	סֹסֶתְנּוּ our mare.		
1.					
2. <i>m.</i>		סֹסֶכְם your horse.	סֹסֶתְכָם your mare.		
<i>f.</i>		סֹסֶכְנוּ your horse.	סֹסֶתְכָנוּ your mare.		
3. <i>m.</i>		סֹסֶם equus eorum (suus).	סֹסֶתְם equa eorum (sua).		
<i>f.</i>		סֹסֶן equus earum (suus).	סֹסֶתְן equa earum (sua).		

Plural.

<i>Masculine.</i>			<i>Feminine.</i>		
Sing.	<i>com.</i>	סֹסֶים horses.	סֹסֶות mares.		
1.		סֹסֶי my horses.	סֹסֶותִי my mares.		
2. <i>m.</i>		סֹסֶיךְ thy horses.	סֹסֶותְיךָ thy mares.		
<i>f.</i>		סֹסֶיךְ thy horses.	סֹסֶותְיךָ thy mares.		
3. <i>m.</i>		סֹסֶיו equi eius (sui).	סֹסֶותְיו equae eius (suae).		
<i>f.</i>		סֹסֶוחַ equi eius (sui).	סֹסֶותְחַ equae eius (suae).		
Plur.	<i>com.</i>	סֹסֶינּוּ our hourses.	סֹסֶותְנּוּ our mares.		
1.					
2. <i>m.</i>		סֹסֶיכְם your horses.	סֹסֶותְיכָם your mares.		
<i>f.</i>		סֹסֶיכְנוּ your horses.	סֹסֶותְיכָנוּ your mares.		
3. <i>m.</i>		סֹסֶיכְם equi eorum (sui).	סֹסֶותְיכָם equae eorum (suae).		
<i>f.</i>		סֹסֶיכְנוּ equi eorum (sui).	סֹסֶותְיכָנוּ equae eorum (suae).		

§ 92. Vowel Changes in the Noun.

1. Vowel changes in the noun may be caused (*a*) by dependence on a following genitive, (*b*) by connexion with pronominal suffixes, (*c*) by the plural and dual terminations, whether in the form of the absolute state or of the construct (before a following genitive of a noun or suffix).

2. In all these cases, the tone of the noun is moved forward either one or two syllables, while the tone of the *construct state* may even be thrown upon the following word. In this way the following changes may arise:—

(a) *When the tone is moved forward only one place*, as is the case when the plural and dual endings, **וְיֶם** and **וְיֶה**, are affixed, as well as with all monosyllabic or paroxytone suffixes, then in dissyllabic nouns the originally short vowel of the first syllable (which was lengthened as being in an open syllable before the tone) becomes Šwā, since it no longer stands before the tone. On the other hand, the originally short, but tone-lengthened vowel, of the second syllable is retained as being now the pretonic vowel; e.g. קָרְבָּן *word* (ground-form *dābār*), plur. קָרְבָּנִים; with a light suffix beginning with a vowel, קָרְבָּנוּ, קָרְבָּנִי, &c.; plur. קָרְבָּנִים. With an unchangeable vowel in the second syllable: פָּקִיד *overseer*, plur. פָּקִידִים; with the suffix of the sing. פָּקִידַנוּ, פָּקִידַיְךְ, &c.; with the suff. of the plur. פָּקִידִים, פָּקִידִיְךְ, &c. With an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable: עֹלָמָם *eternity*, plur. עֹלָמִים, with suff. עֹלָמִי, &c.¹

But in participles of the form קְטַל, with tone-lengthened ē (originally ī) in the second syllable, the ē regularly becomes Šwā *mobile* before a tone-bearing affix, e.g. בְּנֵי אֵיבָר *enemy*, plur. בְּנֵי אֵיבִים, with suff. בְּנֵי, &c. Likewise in words of the form קְטַל, קְטַלְכָה, &c. (with ē in the second syllable; § 84b d, l, p; § 85 i and k), e.g. אֲלָמָם *dumb*, plur. אֲלָמִים.

(b) *When the tone of the construct state, plural or dual, is carried over to the following word, or, in consequence of the addition of the grave suffixes to the constr. st. plur. or dual, is moved forward two places* within the word itself, in such cases the originally short vowel of the second syllable becomes Šwā, while the vowel of the first syllable reverts to its original shortness, e.g. קְבָרִי הָעָם *the words of the people*, קְבָרִיחָם *your words*, קְבָרִיכָם *their words* (in all which instances the ī of the first syllable is attenuated from an original ā).

In the segholate forms in the singular and mostly in the dual the suffix is appended to the ground-form (*my king*, מֶלֶךְ *no*, מֶלֶךְ *you*, &c.); on the other hand, before the endings **וְיֶם**, **וְיֶה** (sometimes also before **יֶם**, **יֶה**) a *Qames* regularly occurs,¹ before which the vowel of the first syllable then becomes vocal Šwā (אַלְכִים, אַלְכִות). This *Qameṣ* (on which cf. § 84a a) remains even before the light suffixes, when attached to the plur. masc. (אַלְכַּיְךְ, אַלְכַּתְּךְ, &c.). On the other hand, the *constr. st.* plur. and dual, regularly, according to *d*, has the form מֶלֶכִיִּם, with grave suffix *מֶלֶכִים*, &c., מֶלֶכִים, &c., from קְלָתִים *folding-doors*.

(c) Before the Šwā *mobile* which precedes the suffix **ךְ** when following a consonant, the *a*-sound, as a rule, is the only tone-lengthened vowel which remains in the final syllable (being now in an open syllable *before* the tone), e.g. קְרָבְךָ, קְרָבְךָ, מְנֻחָךָ, &c. (on the forms with ē in the second syllable, see § 93 qq); but before the grave suffixes **כְּם** and **כְּן** in the same position it reverts to its original shortness, as קְבָרָכָם.

¹ The participles *Niph 'al* נִפְחַד Dt 30:4, 2 S 14:13, and some plurals of the participle Niph. of verbs לְאָיָה form an exception; cf. § 93 oo.

¹ For the rare exceptions see § 93 l and § 97 f, note 2.

(*d'bhārkhem*), &c. In the same way the tone-lengthened *ā* or *ē* of the second syllable in the *constr. st.* sing. also becomes short again, since the *constr. st.* resigns the principal tone to the following word, e.g. חָצֵר הַבָּיִת (from חָצֵר).

Rem. The Masora (cf. *Diqduqe ha-ṭamim*, p. 37) reckons thirteen words which retain *Qameṣ* in the *constr. st.*, some of which had originally *â* and therefore need not be considered. On the other hand, אוֹלֶם or אָלֶם 1 K 7:6, Ez 40:48, &c. (in spite of the *constr. st. plur.* לְפִי, נ); מַבָּה Ps 65:6, Pr 25:19; מַצֵּב 1 S 13:23 (so Baer, but ed. Mant., Ginsburg, &c.); מַשְׁקָל Ezra 8:30 and מַתָּן Pr 18:16 are very peculiar.

3. The vowel changes in the inflexion of *feminine nouns* (§ 95) are not so considerable, since generally in the formation of the feminine either the original vowels have been retained, or they have already become Šwā.

Besides the vowel changes discussed above in *a–g*, which take place according to the general formative laws (§§ 25–28), certain further phenomena must also be considered in the inflexion of nouns, an accurate knowledge of which requires in each case an investigation of the original form of the words in question (see §§ 84–86). Such are, e.g., the rejection of the *n* of *הַל* stems before all formative additions (cf. § 91 d), the sharpening of the final consonant of *עַז* stems in such cases as קָרְבָּן, קִרְבָּן, &c.

§ 93. Paradigms of Masculine Nouns.¹

Masculine nouns from the simple stem may, as regards their form and the vowel changes connected with it, be divided into *four* classes. A synopsis of them is given on pp. 264, 265, and they are further explained below. Two general remarks may be premised:

(a) That all feminines without a distinctive termination (§ 122 h) are treated like these masculine nouns, e.g. **רָבָה** f. *sword*, like **מֶלֶךְ** m. *king*, except that in the plural they usually take the termination **וֹתָה**; thus **חֲרֵבּוֹת**, constr. **חֲרֵבּוֹת** (and so always before suffixes, see § 95).

(b) That in the plural of the first three classes a changeable vowel is always retained even before the light suffixes as a lengthened pretonic vowel, whenever it also stands before the plural ending יְם. All suffixes, except יְם, are called *light*. Cf. § 92 e.

Explanations of the Paradigms (see pp. 264, 265).

1. Paradigm I comprises the large class of *segholate* nouns (§ 84a a–e). In the first three examples, from a strong stem, the ground-forms, *mălk*, *sip̥hr*, *quđš* have been developed by the adoption of a helping *S^ghól* to לְקָדֵשׁ (with *ā* modified to *e*), בְּרָכָה (i'

¹ A sort of detailed commentary on the following scheme of Hebrew declensions is supplied by E. König in his *Hist.-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Spr.*, it. 1, p. 1 ff.

lengthened to ē), שָׁלֵּךְ (*ū* lengthened to ō).² The next three examples, instead of the helping *S^eghōl*, have a helping *Pathaḥ*, on account of the middle (*d, f*) or final guttural (*e*). In all these cases the *constr. st. sing.* coincides exactly with the *absolute*. The singular suffixes are added to the ground-form; but in *c* and *f* an ō takes the place of the original ū, and in *d* and *f* the guttural requires a repetition of the ā and ō in the form of a *Hateph* (הַטֵּפֶת, בַּעֲרֵת, פַּעֲלֵת); before a following Š^ewā this *Hateph* passes into a simple helping vowel (ă, ō), according to § 28 c; hence עַרְכָּת, עַרְבָּת, &c.

In the plural an *a*-sound almost always appears before the tone-bearing affix מִן (on the analogy of forms with original *a* in the second syllable; cf. § 84a a), in the form of a pretonic *Qameṣ*, whilst the short vowel of the first syllable becomes vocal Š^ewā. The original *a* of the 2nd syllable is elided in the *construct state*, so that the short vowel under the first radical then stands in a closed syllable. The omission of *Dageš* in a following *Begadkephath* (מְלֹכִי, not مְלֹכִי, &c.) is due to the loss of a vowel between ל and כ. On the other hand, the pretonic *Qames* of the *absolute state* is retained before the light plural suffixes, whilst the grave suffixes are added to the form of the *construct state*.—The ending of the *absolute state* of the dual is added, as a rule, to the ground-form (so in *a-d* and *h*, but cf. *k*). The *construct state* of the dual is generally the same as that of the plural, except, of course, in cases like *m*.

Paradigms *g* and *h* exhibit forms with middle *u* and *i* (§ 84a c, γ and δ); the ground forms *maut* and *zait* are always contracted to *mōth*, *zēth*, except in the *absol. sing.*, where *u* and *i* are changed into the corresponding consonants נ and נ.

Paradigm *i* exhibits one of the numerous forms in which the contraction of a middle *u* or *i* has already taken place in the *absol. sing.* (ground-form šauṭ).

Paradigm *k* is a formation from a stem לְהַ (§ 84a c, ε).

Paradigms *l, m, n* are forms from stems עַיִל, and hence (see § 67 a) originally biliteral, *yam, im, huq*, with the regular lengthening to מִן, מִן, קְחָנָה. Before formative additions a sharpening, as in the inflexion of verbs עַיִל, takes place in the second radical, e.g. יְמִינָה, יְמִינָה, &c. (see § 84a c, β).

REMARKS.

1. A. On I. *a* and *d* (ground-form *qaṭṭ*). In *pause* the full lengthening to ā generally takes place, thus מִן הַבְּדִיל vineyard, מִן הַעֲדָה seed (from עַד), and so always (except Ps 48:11), in אָרֶץ earth with the article, אָרֶץ, according to § 35 o (cf. also in the LXX the forms Ἀβέλ, Ιαφέθ for בָּבֶל, יְהָבֶל). However, the form with ē is also sometimes found in pause, along with that in ā, e.g. מִן הַבְּדִיל together with מִן הַבְּדִיל; and very frequently only the form with *S^eghōl*, e.g. לְקַרְבָּן, אַשְׁלֵנָה grass, מִן הַבְּדִיל perpetuity, לְאַזְנָה a wonder, קְדֻשָּׁה righteousness, מִן הַבְּדִיל the East, עַשְׂרֵה help, &c.—With two *S^eghōls*, although with a middle guttural, we find מִן הַבְּדִיל bread (in *pause* מִן הַבְּדִיל) and מִן הַבְּדִיל womb (in *pause* מִן הַבְּדִיל), besides מִן הַבְּדִיל Ju 5:30 (in *pause* מִן הַבְּדִיל). A helping *S^eghōl* always stands

² According to P. Haupt ‘The book of Nahum’ in the *Journ. of bibl. Lit.*, 1907, p. 29, the *e* in פֶּרֶשׂ and the *o* in שֶׁלֶךְ are not long but accented, and hence to be pronounced σέφρ, ὅζν (οὐτά), a theory unknown at any rate to the Jewish grammarians.

before a final אָ, as בְּרָא, פְּנַנְךָ (with *suff.* פֶּן), קְשַׁרְתָּ (also written קְשַׁרְתָּה), except in נִגְעָה, see **V**.

B. The *constr. st.* is almost always the same as the *absolute*. Sometimes, however, under the influence of a final guttural or ר, Pathahּ appears in the second syllable as the principal vowel (see below, s), e.g. בְּרֵבָה Ps 18:26; יְנֻעַ (only in Nu 11:7, before Maqqeph), תְּזַרְעִי Ju 3:24 (but Ct 3:4), עֲשָׂרֶנֶת, שְׁמָרֶנֶת as well as עֵדָה, רֵאָה, &c.; cf., moreover, תְּהִנְתֵּן 2 K 12:9 (for תְּהִנְתֵּן, *infin. constr.* from לְהִנְתֵּן).

Paradigms of Masculine Nouns.

	I							I						
Sing. absolute	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	g.	h.	i.	k.	l.	m.	n.	
" construct	מֶלֶךְ (king)	סְפִּרְךָ (book)	קֹדֵשׁ (sanctuary)	בָּעֵר (a youth)	בָּצָח (perpetuity)	פָּעַל (work)	מָותָה (death)	זִיתָה (olive)	שָׁוֹטָה (whip)	פְּרִיָּה (fruit)	יָםָם (sea)	אֶםְמָה (mother)	חֲקָקָה (statute)	
" with light suff.	מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְכֶם	סְפִּרְךָ סְפִּרְךָכֶם	קֹדֵשׁ קֹדֵשׁכֶם	בָּעֵר בָּעֵרְכֶם	בָּצָח בָּצָחְכֶם	פָּעַל פָּעַלְכֶם	מוֹתָה מוֹתָהכֶם	זִיתָה זִיתָהכֶם	שָׁוֹטָה שָׁוֹטָהכֶם	פְּרִיָּה פְּרִיָּהכֶם	יָםָם יָםָםכֶם	אֶםְמָה אֶמְמָהכֶם	חֲקָקָה חֲקָקָהכֶם	
" with grave suff.	מֶלֶכִים מֶלֶכִיכֶם	סְפִּרְכִּים סְפִּרְכִּיכֶם	[קֹדְשִׁים] [קֹדְשִׁיכֶם]	בָּעֵרִים בָּעֵרְכֶם	בָּצָחִים בָּצָחְכֶם	פָּעַלִים פָּעַלְכֶם	[מוֹתִים] [מוֹתִיכֶם]	זִיתִים זִיתְכֶם	שָׁוֹטִים שָׁוֹטְכֶם	גָּדִים גָּדִיכֶם	יָמִיס יָמִיסכֶם	אֶמוֹת אֶמוֹתיכֶם	חֲקִים חֲקִיםכֶם	
" construct	מֶלֶכִי מֶלֶכִיכֶי	סְפִּרְכִּי סְפִּרְכִּיכֶי	קֹדְשִׁי קֹדְשִׁיכֶי	בָּעֵרִי בָּעֵרְכֶי	בָּצָחִי בָּצָחְכֶי	פָּעַלִי פָּעַלְכֶי	מוֹתִי מוֹתְכֶי	זִיתִי זִיתְכֶי	שָׁוֹטִי שָׁוֹטְכֶי	גָּדִי גָּדִיכֶי	יָמִי יָמִיכֶי	אֶמוֹת אֶמוֹתיכֶי	חֲקִי חֲקִיכֶי	
" with light suff.	מֶלֶכִי מֶלֶכִיכֶי	סְפִּרְכִּי סְפִּרְכִּיכֶי	[קֹדְשִׁי] [קֹדְשִׁיכֶי]	בָּעֵרִי בָּעֵרְכֶי	בָּצָחִי בָּצָחְכֶי	פָּעַלִי פָּעַלְכֶי	מוֹתִי מוֹתְכֶי	זִיתִי זִיתְכֶי	שָׁוֹטִי שָׁוֹטְכֶי	(kids) זִיתִי	יָמִי יָמִיכֶי	אֶמוֹתִי אֶמוֹתיכֶי	חֲקִי חֲקִיכֶי	
" with grave suff.	אֶמוֹתִיכֶם אֶמוֹתִיכֶיכֶם	יָמִיכֶם יָמִיכֶיכֶם	שָׁוֹטִיכֶם שָׁוֹטְכֶיכֶם	זִיתִיכֶם זִיתְכֶיכֶם	פָּעַלִיכֶם פָּעַלְכֶיכֶם	בָּצָחִיכֶם בָּצָחְכֶיכֶם	מוֹתִיכֶם מוֹתְכֶיכֶם	סְפִּרְכִּיכֶם סְפִּרְכִּיכֶיכֶם	קֹדְשִׁיכֶם קֹדְשִׁיכֶיכֶם	בָּעֵרִיכֶם בָּעֵרְכֶיכֶם	מֶלֶכִיכֶם מֶלֶכִיכֶיכֶם	חֲקִיכֶם חֲקִיכֶיכֶם		
Dual absolute	שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם	כְּפָהִים כְּפָהִים	לְקָצִיןִים לְקָצִיןִים	מַתְנִיןִים מַתְנִיןִים	רְגָלִים רְגָלִים					עִינִים עִינִים	יּוֹםִים יּוֹםִים	לְקָצִיןִים לְקָצִיןִים	שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם	
	(feet)	(two heaps)	(loins)	(sandals)						(eyes)	(two days,	(cheeks)	(hands)	(teeth)
" construct	רְגָלִי רְגָלִי		מַתְנִי מַתְנִי	נְעָלִי נְעָלִי										biduum)
Sing. absolute	II							III			IV			
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	g.	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.	
" construct	כְּבָר (word)	דָּבָר (wise)	חָכָם (an old man)	זָקָן (shoulder)	כְּמֻרָּח (court)	חָצָר (field)	שָׂקָה (eternity)	עוֹלָם (enemy)	אִיבָּה (seer)	חָזָה (overseer)	פְּקִידָה (poor)	עֲנֵי (writing)		

" construct " with light suff.	לְבָרֶךְם	לְבָרֶךְם	זַקְנֵנוּ	בְּפָרֶךְ	חֲצִירָה	שְׁוֹדָה	עוֹלָמָם	אַיִבָּה	חַזְהָה	פְּקִידָה	עֲנֵנִי	כְּחֵבֶב		
" with grave suff. Plur. absolute "	לְבָרֶכְם	לְבָרֶכְם	זַקְנֵינוּ	בְּפָתְפִי	חֲצִירִי	שְׁלִי	עוֹלָמִי	אַיִבָּי	חַזְיָה	פְּקִידִי	עֲנֵנִי	כְּחֵבֶב	כְּתֵבִי	
" construct " with light suff. " with grave suff. " with grave suff.	לְבָרֶכְם	לְבָרֶכְם	זַקְנֵינוּ	בְּפָתְפִי	חֲצִירִי	פָּנִים	עוֹלָמִים	אַיִבָּים	חַזְיִים	פְּקִידִים	עֲנֵנִים	כְּחֵבִים	[כְּחֵבִים]	
" with light suff. " with grave suff. " with grave suff.	לְבָרֶכְם	לְבָרֶכְם	זַקְנֵינוּ	בְּפָתְפִי	חֲצִירִי	פָּנִי	עוֹלָמִי	אַיִבָּי	חַזְוִי	פְּקִידִי	עֲנֵנִי	כְּחֵבִי	[כְּחֵבִי]	
" with grave suff. Dual absolute "	לְבָרֶכְם	לְבָרֶכְם	זַקְנֵיכֶם	פָּכְמִיכֶם	חֲצִירִיכֶם	פָּנִיכֶם	עוֹלָמִיכֶם	אַיִבָּיכֶם	חַזְיִיכֶם	פְּקִידִיכֶם	עֲנֵנִיכֶם	כְּחֵבִיכֶם	[כְּחֵבִיכֶם]	
	בְּפָטְפִי		זַקְנֵיכֶם		חֲצִירִיכֶם		פָּנִיכֶם		עוֹלָמִיכֶם		אַיִבָּיכֶם		חַזְיִיכֶם	פְּקִידִיכֶם
	(wings)	(loins)	(thighs)		(face)		(pair of tongs)		(balance)		(two weeks)		שְׁבַע יְמִים	
" construct													מְאַזְנֵנִי	

C. The ה-locale is, according to § 90 i, regularly added to the already developed form, e.g. בְּגַדְתִּי Ps 116:14, 18; בְּהַרְחָה Gn 19:6, *to the door*; but also with a firmly closed syllable בְּגַבְתִּי Ex 40:24; under the influence of a guttural or ר, דְרָה, חְרָא, אֲרָצָה, אֶזְרָחָה, in *pause* אֶזְרָחָה (cf. אֶזְרָחָה 1 Ch 14:16, from זְרָחָה).

D. The suffixes of the singular are likewise added to the ground-form, but forms with middle guttural take *Haṭeph-Pathaḥ* instead of the *Šwâ quiescens*; בְּעָרִי, &c. (but also לְהַמִּי, וְעָמִי, &c.). In a rather large number of *qâṭl*-forms, however, before suffixes in the sing., as well as in the *constr. st.* plur. and dual, the *ă* of the first syllable is attenuated to *i*,¹ thus בְּטֻנִי my womb, יְתָרֹו; so in בְּשָׁעָרָה, בְּבָחָרָה, בְּצָעָרָה, בְּפָתָחָה, בְּגָדָה, בְּשָׁעָרָה, בְּבָרָךְ, בְּקָרָךְ, בְּצָעָרָךְ, and many others. In some cases of this kind besides the form with *ă* there most probably existed another with original *β̄* in the first syllable; thus certainly with שָׁעָרָה beside שָׁעָרָה, and with חָצֵה beside חָתֵה, &c. (According to the *Diqduqe ha-ṭamim*, § 36, the *absolute st.* in such cases takes *ē*, the *constr. ē*; cf. נָעָר Nu 30:4 (*absol.*) and נָעָר 30:10 (*constr.*); בָּר Lv 24:20 (*absol.*) and בָּר Am 6:6 (*constr.*). According to this theory² בְּלֹא (so the best authorities) Is 9:5 would be the *constr. st.*, although the accentuation requires an *absol. st.*)—A weakening of the firmly closed syllable occurs in בְּגִזְעִי, &c. from בְּגָדָה and בְּקָרָה; בְּגִזְעִי Dt 15:14, 16:13, in both cases evidently owing to the influence of the palatal in the middle of the stem. With *S̄ghôl* for *i*: בְּגִזְעִי, בְּשִׁעַרְכִּי, הַבְּלִי: &c.

¹ According to M. Lambert, *REJ.* 1896, p. 21, *a* tends to remain with labials; so in 14 cases out of 22 masculines, and in 3 out of 6 feminines.

² Probably only a theory of one particular school and not generally accepted, or at any rate not consistently carried out; cf. König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 22.

E. In the plural the termination **ות** is found as well as **ים**, e.g. **בְּפִשְׁוֹת**, **בְּפִשְׁוֹתָה**, **בְּפִשְׁוֹתָהָה** together with **בְּפִשְׁוֹתָהָה** (Ez 13:20 [but read **בְּפִשְׁחָה**; see comm.]), &c., *constr. st. בְּפִשְׁוֹתָה*. Other nouns have only the ending **ות**, e.g. **אַרְצָה**, *constr. st. אַרְצָהָה* from **רֵץ** § 4. Without *Qameš* before the ending **ם** we find **בְּחֻמְמָה** (*bowels*) *mercy*. On the numerals **עָשָׂרִים** *twenty*, &c., cf. § 97 f, note 2. Moreover *a* is not inserted before plural suffixes with the tone on the penultima in **אֲשֶׁרְךָ**, **אֲשֶׁרְךָהָה**, &c., properly *thy happiness!* (a word which is only used in the *constr. st. pl.* and at an early period became stereotyped as a kind of interjection).

F. In the *constr. st. plural* a firmly closed syllable is sometimes found, contrary to the rule, e.g. Gn 42:25, 35; Ct 8:6 (רְשֵׁפִי) Ps 76:4; Ez 17:9; Is 5:10, and so always in Nu 29:39, נְסִיבָתָם Ps 16:4, &c. (on the other hand, according to the best authorities *not* in Is 55:3, &c., though in Ps 107:43 Ginsburg reads חֲסִינִי); cf. § 46 d. Even with a middle guttural בְּעַלְקָה Est 1:17, 20.—The attenuation of *ă* to *i* also occurs sometimes in this form (see above, k), e.g. זְבַחִי, &c., even לְזִבְחִי Is 57:4 beside לִזְבְּחִי Ho 1:2, &c.

G. In the *dual absol.* beside forms like רְגַלִּים *feet*, with suff. אֶלְפִּים two thousand, בְּרַכִּים *sandals*, בְּרַכִּיּוֹם knees (ă attenuated to ī, *constr. st.* with a firmly closed syllable), with suffixes בְּרַכִּיהם, &c. (cf., however, בְּרַכִּיהם Ju 7:6), forms with pretonic *Qames* are also found (in consequence of the tendency to assimilate the dual to the plural in form: so König, Lehrgeb., ii. 17), as קְרֻנוֹם *horns*, with suff. קְרֻנוֹים (*Dn* 8:3 ff.; elsewhere always קְרָנוֹם, &c.), and so always קְלָתִים, constr. st. קְלָתִי *folding-doors*, (?) double way.

2. On Paradigms *b* and *e*. With a final **א** rejected (but retained orthographically) we find אַתָּה *sin*. An initial guttural before suffixes generally receives *S^ghōl* instead of the original *i*, e.g. צְלָקִי, עֲזָרִי, &c., so in the *constr. st. plur.* עֲגָלִי, &c. forms קָרְבָּנִים 2 K 10:29, &c., retaining the *Qameṣ* of קָרְבָּנִים before the weak א.—The pausal forms פָּנָא and בָּנָא (out of pause always פָּנָה בָּנָה) go back to by-forms פָּנָה בָּנָה (constr. st. plur. of פָּשָׁב בָּנָה).—On פָּנָה בָּנָה go back to by-forms פָּנָה בָּנָה (constr. st. plur. of פָּשָׁב בָּנָה), cf. § 20 h; שְׂמָךְ אֶתְמָנִים sycamores, without *Qameṣ* before the termination יִם (see above, I), is probably from the sing. שְׂמָךְ אֶתְמָנָה found in the Mišna.

3. On Paradigms *c* and *f*. קַשְׁפָה occurs in Pr 22:21 without a helping vowel; with a middle guttural פֶּלֶם, &c., but with also הַלֵּה also בְּנֵי, אֲנָלִים, &c.; with a final guttural רְבָעִים, בְּהָאָתָן, &c., but with אֲנָא, אֲנָאָתָן; with a firmly closed syllable אֲסֹפִים Mi 7:1.

Before suffixes the original *ū* sometimes reappears in the sing., e.g. לְגָדַל (Ps 150:2) beside פְּעָלָב from *gādēl*, greatness; (with *Dageš forte dirimens*, and the *ū* repeated in the form of a *Hateph-Qameṣ*, cf. § 10 h) Is 9:3, &c.; הַמְלָאֵךְ Ez 22:24.—Corresponding to the form פְּעָלָב pōəōl^h*khem* we find קְטָנִי Ho 13:14, even without a middle guttural; similarly (so Jablonski and Opitius) 1 K 12:10, 2 Ch 10:10, from קְטָן little finger; but the better reading is, no doubt, קְטָנִי (so ed. Mant., ‘the ℚ proleptically assuming the vowel of the following syllable’; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 69), and the form is to be derived, with König, from קְטָן, not *qūtūn*, as Brockelmann quotes him, in *Grundriss*, p. 103. The reading קְטָנִי (Baer and Ginsburg) is probably not due to a confusion of the above two readings, but ת is merely intended to mark the vowel expressly as *ō*. In the forms תְּאַרְוֹן פְּעַלְוִי Is 1:31 (for עַלְוִי) and תְּאַרְוֹן פְּעַלְוִי Is 52:14 (for אַרְוֹן 1 S 28:14), the lengthening of the original *ū* to *ō* has been retained even before the suffix; cf. § 63 p and § 74 h אֲקָבָם Gn 32:20.—In the same way *ō* remains before הַלְּכָה locale, e.g. רָנוּתָה Gn 18:6, 24:67, &c. Dissimilation of the vowel (or a by-form כְּחָה?) seems to occur in נְכָחוּ Ex 14:2, Ez 46:9, for נְכָחוֹ.

In the *absol. st. plur.* the original *ū* generally becomes *S̄wā* before the *Qameṣ*, e.g. בְּקָרִים from *morning*, פְּעָלִים *lances*, שְׁעָלִים *handfuls* (*constr. st.* בְּ קָר Ez 13:19); on the other hand, with an initial guttural the *ū*-sound reappears as *Hāṭeph Qameṣ*, e.g. הַרְשִׁים *months*, עֲרָחוֹת *ways*; and so even without an initial guttural, the *הַגְּרָנוֹת* *the threshing-floors*, 1 S 23:1, Jo 2:24; קְדֵשִׁים *sanctuaries*, and שְׁרִים *roots* (*qōdhāšim*, &c., with *ō* for *ū*); also קְדַשֵּׁי [but קְדַשִּׁי, קְדַשְׁוִי, once קְדַשְׁוִי], where, however, the reading frequently fluctuates between ' and קְדַשְׁוִי; with the article לְ, קְדַשְׁוִי, according to Baer and Ginsburg. On these forms cf. especially § 9 v. From *tent*, both אֶלְלִים and אֶלְלִי (cf. § 23 h and above) are found; with light suffixes אֶלְלִי, אֶלְלִי, &c.; so from *way*, אֶלְלִי (also אֶלְלִי—hence only with initial אֶ, ‘on account of its weak articulation’ (König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 45). It seems that by these different ways of writing a distinction was intended between the plural of *caravan*, and of *way*; however, אֶלְלִי is also found in the former sense (*in constr. st.* Jb 6:19) and אֶלְלִי in the latter (e.g. Jb 13:27 according to the reading of Ben Naphtali and Qimḥi); cf. also אֶזְזִיוֹת 2 Ch 8:18 *Kēth.* (אֶן *Qērē*).—The *constr. st. plural* of בְּחָנָן *thumb* is Ju 1:6 f., as if from a sing. נְבָה: of *brightness*, Is 59:9 תְּבָהּ נָוָת (on these *qōṭol*-forms, cf. t).—If אֶפְנִי Pr 25:11 is not dual but plural (see the Lexicon) it is then analogous to the examples, given in *l* and *o*, of plurals without a pretonic *Qameṣ*, cf. בְּטַנִּים *pistachio nuts*, probably from a sing. בְּטַנָּה. According to Barth, *ZDMG.* xlii, 345 f. אֶפְנִי is a sing. (אֶפְנִי, the ground-form of אֶגְנָה, with suffix).

In the *constr. st. plur.* the only example with original *ū* is בְּכָסִי Ps 31:21; otherwise like אֶלְלִי, קְדַשִּׁי, &c.

4. Besides the forms treated hitherto we have to consider also a series of formations, which have their characteristic vowel under the *second* radical, as is ordinarily the case in Aramaic (on the origin of these forms see further, § 84a e). Thus (a) of the form קְבָשׁ *honey*, טַעַמָּה *little*; in *pause*, קְבָשׁ, קְבָשׁ; גְּבָר *man* (as *constr. st.*, see above, h), Ps 18:26 (elsewhere always גְּבָר), and *infinitives* like שְׁכַב *lie down* (§ 45 c; *on constr. st.*, see above, h); סְכֻם *shoulder*, ā being modified to ē (but in *pause* סְכָם); locative שְׁמָה, שְׁמָה, also שְׁמָה Ho 6:9. With suffixes in the usual manner שְׁכָמִי, שְׁכָמִי, Gn 19:33, 35 (an infin. with suffix, therefore not שְׁכָמָה). On the other hand, the ā is retained in the *plur. absol.* by sharpening the final consonant: אֶגְמִים (*constr. st.* אֶגְמִי) *marshes*, הַדְּמִים *myrtles*, few.

(b) Of the form קְטַל *a well*, בְּאָר *wolf*, &c.¹; locative בְּאָרָה, בְּאָרָה, with suff. plur. זְאָבִים, בְּאָרִי, but אֶאָרִי, constr. st. בְּאָרוֹת, but בְּאָרוֹת, cf. § 76 b.

(c) of the form לְקָטֵן *stench* (with suff. בְּאָשָׁוֹן, just as בְּאָשָׁוֹן occurs in Jer 4:7 along with the *constr. st.* קְטַבֵּן Ps 74:5; cf. for the Dageš, § 20 h), perhaps also לְאָמִים *nation*, pl. לְאָמִים.

5. Paradigms *g–i* comprise the segholate forms with middle וּ or יְ: (a) of the form *qāṭl* with *Wāw* as a strong consonant, in which cases the original ā is almost always lengthened to ā (Paradigm g), thus וְנָתָה, וְנָתָה vanity, וְלָעֵד *iniquity*, וְלָעֵד *midst*; with final וּ, אֲנָשָׁה *falsehood*; cf. however, also וְלָעֵד *space*. In the *constr. st.* contraction always occurs, מְוֹתָה, &c. (from original *maut*), and likewise before suffixes מְוֹתָה, &c. Exception, וְלָעֵד as *constr. st.* Ez 28:18 (according

ZDMG. *ZDMG.* = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

¹ The proposal of Haupt (*SBOT*. ‘Proverbs’, p. 34, l. 44 ff.) to read בְּאָר, בְּאָר, &c., does not seem to be warranted. The case here is quite different from that in Pr 1:22 where the Masora requires בְּאָרָה, בְּאָרָה, no doubt on the analogy of בְּאָרָה, &c., for בְּאָרָה, which was probably intended, see § 63 m.

to Qimħi) and with suff. ՚-l-ż-ż. The contraction remains also in all cases in the plural (but see below, w).

(b) Of the form *qăṭl* with consonantal *Yôdh* (Paradigm *h*). With final נִיאָ (also נִיאַ), in **Is 40:4 נִיאָ**, in the *constr. st.* (also *absol. Zc 14:4*) נִיאָ (also נִיאַ); plur. **2 K 2:16** and **Ez 6:3 K^eth.** according to Baer נְאֹותָן, i.e. doubtless נְאֹותָן (cf. נְאֹתָן Ez 35:8; according to another reading [and so Ginsburg] נְגִיאֹותָן, i.e. doubtless נְגִיאֹותָן), but in *Q^ere*, and all other passages, נְאֹיָה. The uncontracted form (in the *absol. st.* with helping *Hireq*) remains also before הַ *locale*, e.g. שִׁיחַתּוֹ בַּיְתָה (but in the *constr. st.* e.g. בַּיְתָה—הַ). בַּיְתָה (from עַד Gn 49:11) is peculiar, so also Is 10:17 (from יַחֲשֵׁב).—In the plural *absol.* uncontracted forms occur, like נְהִלִּים *hosts*, נְצִינּוֹת *springs*, נְעִינּוֹת *young asses*, תְּנִיעִים *he-goats*, &c.; as *constr. st.* Pr 8:28 עִינּוֹת for עִינּוֹת.

(c) With the contraction of the ו and ו even in the *absol. st.* sing. (Paradigm i). In this way there arise formations which are unchangeable throughout; thus from the ground-form *qăṭl*: יְמִין (cf. however, § 96), שׂוֹר, סֻף, &c.; with middle *Yôdh* פָּיַל 1 Ch 9:13 (elsewhere Is 21:11 (elsewhere פָּיַל, in prose פָּיַלה, see above, § 90 f); from the ground-form *qiṭṭl*, זִין, שִׁיר, לִיל, פִּילָה, see above, § 90 f); from the ground-form *quṭṭl*, צְוִית, גָּוֹר, רֵיחַ, &c. The plurals שְׁוָקִים *pots*, צְדִיקִים *streets*, שְׁזֶרֶת *oxen*, have a strong formation (but for חֲזִקִים 1 S 13:6 read חֲזִירִים as in 14:11). Finally, forms with a quiescent middle נ also belong to this class, such as רָאשׁ *head* (obscured from שָׁרָאשׁ = *raš*, see § 96) and צָאן *sheep*.

(b) From the ground-form *qiṭṭ*, half, in pause, with suff. חַצְיָה, &c.—From stems with middle *Wāw* arise such forms as אֵי (from *iwv*), אֲיִם, אֲיִים, &c.; instead of the extraordinary plur. נְזִים Nu 24:24 read with the Samaritan נְזִיאִים, and for בְּצִים Ez 30:9 read probably with Cornill אֲצִים.

(c) From the ground-form *qūṭl* sometimes forms like בְּ הַוְתָּהּ (from *tūhw*, *būhw*), sometimes like אֲרִיְתָמִי (also אֲרִיְיָפִי, קְמִי, עֲנִי, חֲלִי, &c.; in pause עֲפִי, plur. חֲלִילִים; &c., with suff. חֲלִילָוּ, plur. חֲלִילִים). From *branch*, there occurs in Ps 104:12 the plur. עֲפָאִים (analogous to פְתָאִים, &c., see above, x); the K^eeth. evidently intends עֲפָאִם (so

¹ Nöldeke, *Beiträge*, p. 58: the direct or indirect retention of this וְ is hardly a feature of early Hebrew. The true Hebrew forms from קָצַח would be קִצְחָה, קִצְחָתָה, קִצְחָתָה, the aramaizing forms קִצְחָה, קִצְחָתָה.

Opitius and others). Dual, with *suff.* Nu 24:7, *bucket* (from קְלִי, for קָלִי), more correctly, with the Masora, קָלִי with *Munah* for *Metheg*. This unusual *Metheg* is to be treated as following the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 9 v.

7. On Paradigms *l–n*: segholate forms from stems *v"v* (see § 84a c, β).

(a) In the *qaṭl*-form the *ă* of the contracted formation is sometimes lengthened in the *absol. st.*, sing. as in יָם (so also in the *constr. st.*, except in the combination יָם־סֻוֹף the Red sea; and even before *Maqqeph*, חַדְקָה בְּיַם־חַדְקָה the salt sea), sometimes it remains short, e.g. מִתְּמָרֵת *morsel*, וּמִמְּבָשֵׂר *people*, but even these formations generally have *Qameṣ* in pause, as well as after the article (e.g. וּמִמְּבָשֵׂר). Adjectives under the influence of a guttural either have forms like לְחַיִם, חַיִם, צְחִים, or, with *compensatory lengthening*, רְכִיעִים, רְכִיעִי, רְכִיעִים living (in the plural also a substantive, *life*), and קְיִם sufficiency, are contracted to קִיְם¹ and קִיְם. As a locative form notice הַרְהָה to the mountain, Gn 14:10 (see § 27 q) beside הַרְהָה. The stem is expanded to a triliteral form in הַרְרִי (unless it is simply derived from a by-form on the analogy of *qāṭal*-forms) Jer 17:3 (but in Ps 30:8 for הַרְרִי read הַרְרִי, and Gn 14:6; plur. constr. Nu 23:7, &c. (but only in poetical passages), with suffix, הַרְרִי יְהָה Dt 8:9; הַרְרִי יְהָה Ju 5:14 (where, however, read probably בְּעַמְּדָה), Neh 9:22; עַמְּדָה Neh 9:24: elsewhere עַמְּדָה, עַמְּדָה).—Before suffixes and in the plur. *ă* is sometimes attenuated to *i*, e.g. פְּתִיחָה, פְּתִיחָה, from פְּתִיחָה and סְפִיחָה (also סְפִיחָה 2 S 17:28) from סְפִיחָה. Before הָ *ă* is retained in a virtually sharpened syllable, e.g. פְּחִים traps.

(b) *Qitl*-forms: אָמַר, שָׁאַל fire (with suff. יְשַׁאֵל, but cf. also אָשְׁבָּה Is 50:11), פָּנָא favour, &c.; of a triliteral form, the plur. קָצָצִים Ps 77:18.

(c) *Qūṭl*-forms: כָּלְךָ, קָרְבָּךְ, before *Maqqeph* מֻקָּפֶה, with suff. עַזְּקִי, &c., with omission of *Dageš forte* (according to § 20 m) always עַזְּקִי, קָרְבָּקִי, but from עַזְּקִי, עַזְּקִים, עַזְּקָה, but from עַזְּקִי, עַזְּקִים, עַזְּקָה, for which עַזְּקִי and עַזְּקָה are also found. *חֲקָקִי*, expanded to a trilateral form, Ju 5:15 and Is 10:1, generally explained as a secondary form of עַזְּקִי with abnormal weakening of the ū to ī, is more probably to be referred to a *qitl*-form=Arabic *higg*.

The forms with assimilated middle *Nün* likewise follow the analogy of Paradigms *l–n*, e.g. אַנְסָה *nose, anger* (אַפִּי, dual אַפְּתָם, also *face*) for *anp*; חַנְקָה *palate* for *hink*, צַקְנִים *fetters*, עַזְבִּים *goat*, plur. עַזְבִּים, for עַזְבֵּן, probably also אַבְנֵן *green herb*, for *inb*.

2. Paradigm II comprises all formations with original short vowels, whether in the first or second syllable; cf. § 84a f-i, and the general laws of formation, § 92 b-g.

Rem. 1. On Paradigms *a* and *b*: ground-form *qăṭăl*. The lengthening of the second ā to ā is maintained in the *constr. st. sing.* only in נָלַל-forms, e.g. אֲבָא אֲבָבָא army, לְבָנָן חֶלְבָּן milk, לְבָנָן white, Gn 49:12, instead of the ordinary *absolutes* לְבָנָן, חֶלְבָּן, a secondary form must be assumed; from עַשְׂנָה smoke, the *constr. st. sing.* עַשְׂנָה occurs once, Ex 19:18, beside עַשְׂנָה, from הַדְּרָה ornament the *constr. st. sing.* הַדְּרָה Dn 11:20, beside the common form הַדְּרָה.—

¹ only in Dn 12:7 as *constr. st.*, since in the asseverative formulae (cf. § 149) חַי (‘*alive*’) is a contracted form of the *absol. st.* (prop. *living* is *Pharaoh!* &c.). It is evidently only a rabbinical refinement which makes the pronunciation חַי distinctive of an oath by God (or of God by himself), as in the regular formulae חַי אָנִי (Dt 32:40) and חַי הָנָה אָנֹכִי (= ‘*I am alive*’).

The plur. פְּרָשִׁים *horses*, Is 21:7 (instead of פְּרָשִׁים, ground-form *pārăš*) is no doubt due to a confusion with the *qattâl*-form פְּרָשׁ *horseman*.

A. Sometimes a sharpening of the third radical takes place, in order to keep the preceding vowel short, e.g. *גִּמְלִים* camels, *קִמְגִים* small ones, *פָּלָגֹות* brooks (see § 20 a).—The attenuation of the *ă* of the first syllable to *i* does not take place in the *constr. st. plur.* as a rule after an initial guttural, as *בְּהִרְיָה*, but *חִזְקִי*, and never before a middle guttural, e.g. *עֲנֵנִי*, *חַכְמִי*, *זַגְבּוֹת* tails, (according to König, owing to the influence of the nasal) in the non-guttural forms *tails*, *בְּנֵנֶת* wings, from *בָּרֶקֶת* river, shows an abnormal omission of the lengthening of the *ă* before a tone-bearing termination, but cf. § 88 c.

B. From **עַי** stems, forms like **חָלֵל**, **עָזָן**, &c., belong to this class.

C. The few nouns of the ground-form *qit̄al* follow the same analogy, such as לְבָב *heart*, שָׁכֶר *strong drink*, שָׂנֵב *grape*, &c. From שְׁعַר *hair*, in the *constr. st.* besides שָׁעַר the form שְׁלֹעַ is also found (perhaps a survival of a secondary form like those in Paradigm I, d); so from שְׁלֹעַ *rib*, שְׁלֹעַ and even שְׁלֹעַ 2 S 16:13 (so ed. Mant., Ginsb.; but Baer שְׁלֹעַ), both, probably, old secondary forms (also used for the *absol. st.*) of שְׁלֹעַ; cf. also שְׁלֹעֲיוֹ and שְׁלֹעֲיוֹתָיו, as well as the *constr. st. plur.* שְׁלֹעֲיוֹתָיו; also from נִכְרָה *strangeness*, the *constr. st.* נִכְרָה is found, Dt 31:16.

2. On Paradigms *c–e*: ground-form *qāṭel'*, developed to *qāṭēl'*; with a final guttural, e.g. שָׁבֵעַ *satisfied*. In the *constr. st.* the original *i* of the second syllable, probably on the analogy of the forms discussed in § 69 c, becomes *ă*, e.g. קָנֵן, קָנֵסֶר, קָנֵל, &c., but not before suffixes, בְּתָפִי, &c., nor in forms from stems, e.g. לְאָמַלְאָ, full; cf., moreover, Gn 25:26 from עֲקָב *heel*, and אֲכָלָה Ps 35:14, *mourning*. Paradigm *d* represents forms which in the *constr. st.* instead of the ordinary, בְּתָפִי, &c., have a segholate form, as רְקָדָה, רְקָדָה, רְקָדָה, &c. (Ez 44:9), constr. st. of אָרְקָדָה *long*, אָרְקָדָה *wall*, יְרָקָדָה *thigh*, אָרְקָדָה *robbery*, אָרְקָדָה *uncircumcised*. In Is 11:14 בְּכָתָף would be altogether without precedent as a *constr. st.* (for בְּכָתָף); most probably the *absol. st.* is intended by the Masora (according to Nöldeke, Gött. Gel. Anzeigen, 1871, No. 23 [p. 896] for בְּכָתָף *with one shoulder*, i.e. *shoulder to shoulder*); [cf. Driver, Tenses, § 190, Ohs.].

In the *plur. constr.* the ē lengthened from i is frequently retained in verbal adjectives of this formation, e.g. יְהִי also (with ē under the protection of the secondary tone) from יְתַחַד *tent-peg*. On the other hand from רֹאֵי fearing, always רֹאֵי; cf. also Ps 35:20 from רָעֵעַ.—With ā retained in the initial syllable cf. אֶחָר *alias* (with a virtual sharpening of the ח).—From עַז stems come forms like מֵת *dead person*, גָּזֵר *resident stranger*, וָזֵעַ *witness*, with unchangeable *Ser Ē*; hence מְתִים, &c.

Kindred in character are the formations from the ground-form *qāṭil*. This ground-form is regularly lengthened to *qāṭol*, e.g. לָןַן round, קָמַעַ deep, מָאֵד red; but before formative additions the short *ū* returns, protected by the sharpening of the following consonant (see ee above), as שָׁחַר rim, בָּקַעַ hole, &c. (but in stems with a third guttural or ר, רִים rims, בְּקִיעַ hole). The form נָגֹז, 1 K 10:19, is abnormal; likewise עֲמוֹקָה Pr 23:27, Jablonski (ed. Mant. עַמְקָה, Baer and Ginsburg עַמְקָה).

3. On Paradigm *f.* ground-form *qāṭāl* from לְהַ stems. As in verbs § 75 h, the general rule is that before the terminations of the plur. and dual and before suffixes beginning with a vowel, the third radical is usually elided altogether. But besides שָׁנָה the form שָׁנִי, with the final *Yôdh* retained, is also found in poetry (cf. also the singulars with suffixes, like משָׁמֵם, in ss); in the same way final וּ is retained in עֲנוּנִים *the poor, constr.* עֲנוּנִי. The plur. of שָׁנָה שָׁנֹות, *constr.* שָׁנּוֹת (also שָׁנִי, unless this is a sing., contracted from שָׁנִי; so Barth, *ZDMG*. xlii, p.

351). The *qitāl*-form (see § 84a i) לְעֵה 2 S 15:37, 16:16, 1 K 4:5 is remarkable as a *constr. st.* (the reading רַעַה of Opitius and others is opposed to the express statement of the Masora). To the category of these forms also belongs without doubt פָּנִים *face* (only in *plur.*), פָּנִים, פָּנִים, פָּנִים, &c.

In a few formations of this kind the vowel of the second syllable appears to have been already lost in the *absol. st. sing.*; so according to the ordinary view, in יָד hand, *constr. st.* יָד, with *suff.* יָדוֹ, but יָדָם; plur. יָדָות, *constr. st.* יָדוֹת, dual יָדָם, יָדָיִם, with *suff.* יָדָיִם, &c., and in בָּשָׂר blood, *constr. st.* בָּשָׂר, with *suff.* בָּשָׂרִי, but יָדָמָה (ă attenuated to i), plur. יָדָמִים. But perhaps both these nouns are to be regarded as primitive (§ 81), and as original monosyllabic formations.

3. Paradigm III comprises forms with an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable, whilst the vowel of the second syllable has been lengthened from an original short vowel, and is therefore changeable. The special cases are to be distinguished in which the original short vowel is lengthened both *in* and *before* the tone, but in an open syllable becomes Š^ēewā (Paradigm a, but cf. also examples like wheels, for אֲוֹפָגִים, and בָּשָׂרִים, לְבָזָרִים, & porches), secondly, the cases in which the vowel becomes Š^ēwā even *before* the tone (Paradigm b), and finally, those in which the termination of לְה formations is entirely lost (Paradigm c).

Rem. 1. On the model of עֹלֶם (which, moreover, is obscured from □ālām), the following forms also are inflected: מְקֻלָּל (§ 85 h), in some cases with virtual sharpening of the third radical (see § 20 a), as הַמְּבֻמָּה Jer 17:7, Ps 40:5, Jb 8:14, &c.; אַלְלָא nouns of this form maintain the *Qameṣ* in the *constr. st. plur.*, e.g. מְקֻרָאִי from לְאַלְלָא¹; on the other hand, in the plur. of the *participles Niph.* (§ 85 n) of verbs (which likewise belong to this class), are found not only regular forms like נְקֻרָאִים but also נְנִבְאָאִים Jos 10:17, נְנִמְאָאִים Ez 20:30 f., and so always נְנִבְאָאִים (except Ez 13:2) and נְנִמְאָאִים 1 S 13:15, 2 K 14:14, &c. (except Ezr 8:25 נְנִמְאָאִים in pause).¹

Moreover, the other participles in ā also follow the analogy of עֹלֶם as regards the final syllable (מְקֻלָּל, מְקֻלָּה; cf. however, הַמְּטוּשָׁב Gn 43:12 in close connexion; see the analogous cases in § 65 d); also שְׁלָלָה table (§ 85 u; plur. שְׁלָלָנּוֹת, constr. st. plur. קְרָבָן, hence in plur. *constr. st. with suff.* Lv 7:38; עַקְרָבִים (§ 85 w), plur. עַקְרָבִים (with sharpening of the final consonant for מְקֻרָבִים, cf. also עַקְרָבִים Gn 3:7 [but in 2:25 עַרְוָפִים], according to § 9 o an orthographic licence for עַרְוָפִים from עַרְוָה nakedness, 2 Ch 28:15; מְלָאָבִי Is 23:8 f.; פְּעַלְמָאָבִי Ps 18:3; even with attenuation of the ā to i, מְלָרָגִי threshing instruments, 2 S 24:22, 1 Ch 21:23, from מְלָרָגִי (§ 85 g), מְגַנְּגָנִי (§ 85 i), עַמְּלָאָבִי (§ 85 k), inasmuch as they retain the ā of the first syllable, contrary to rule, even when not pretonic, e.g. גְּנִי, גְּנִי, גְּנִי, גְּנִי; תְּשַׁבְּבִי (§ 85 g); תְּשַׁבְּבִי (§ 85 p), *constr. st. plur.* תְּשַׁבְּבִי 1 K, 17:1; also isolated forms according to § 84a t, and § 84b b, c, k, m, n, o. Cf. finally, צְוָאָר neck (from šawār), *constr. st. plur.* צְוָאָר Jer 28:10 ff., *constr. st. plur.* צְוָאָר Gn 45:14, &c.

2. (Paradigm b; cf. § 84a s.) Instead of the original i in such forms as אַיְבָּקָם (cf. 2 K 22:29), the second syllable more frequently has ē, e.g. יְאָרָךְ thy creator; with a closing guttural (according to § 91 d; but cf. also אַבְּדָה Dt 32:28) forms are found sometimes like

¹ Ez 7:24 for מְקֻדְשִׁים (from מְקֻדָּשָׁה) is wholly irregular; perhaps, however, the part. Pi□el is intended, without *Dagesh* in the 7 (according to § 20 m).

¹ Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 659, observes that except in 2 Ch 5:11, 35:17 is always followed by a preposition governing a word, so that the punctuators perhaps intended to indicate a sort of *constr. st.*

שׁלֵךְ, sometimes like בְּאַךְ; constr. st. without suff. שׁלֵךְ פָּנִים, מִקְרָפֶל, &c.), see further, in § 84b d, גָּבֵן, &c. (but with exceptions, as רְבָעִים שְׁלֵשִׁים), and ibid. l, p; § 85 i, k (מִזְבֵּחַ altar, constr. st. מִזְבְּחוֹת, plur.), and ibid. q, but here also there are exceptions like Ps 26:12, מִזְבְּרוֹת Jer 5:5, רְבָעִים שְׁלֵשִׁים Ex 20:5, מִזְמֹות Is 49:8, מִמְמִימִים La 1:16 (cf. König, ii. 109).

3. (Paradigm c: part. *Qal* of verbs לְהַיָּה, differing from Paradigm II, f in the unchangeableness of the vowel of the first syllable.) In Ez 17:15 ē in the *absol. st.* is abnormal, and *S'ghôl* in the *constr. st.* in 2 S 24:11 (so Opitius, Ginsburg; but Baer הַחֲיוֹה), Ec 2:15 (according to Baer, but not the Mantua ed.; Ec 3:19 is in the *absol. st.*). To this class belong, as regards their formation, the נִיְלִי-forms mentioned in § 84a r, § 85 g (with suff., e.g. עַלְכֶם Dt 20:1, which brought thee up), and h.

In a few instances, before a suffix beginning with a consonant, the original āy of the termination has been contracted to ē, and thus there arise forms which have apparently *plural suffixes*; as מִתְּחִשְׁבָּה Is 5:12, Dn 1:10, 16; מִרְאִקְמָה their appearance, Dn 1:15, Gn 41:21, cf. Na 2:5; נִוְטִיכָם who stretched them forth, Is 42:5; defectively אֲפָהָם Ho 7:5 (cf. נִוְתָּחָם Ez 34:14); on the other hand, the examples in Is 14:11, Gn 47:17, which were formerly classed with the above, are really plurals. But מִקְנָה יְהֻנָּה thy camp, Dt 23:15 (הַמִּקְנָה occurs just before), מִרְאָה יְהֻנָּה thy cattle, Is 30:23 (probably also 1 K 2:26), מִרְאָיו יְהֻנָּה Ct 2:14, and the sight of him, Jb 41:1 (with the ה here retained orthographically), מִעְלָיו Ez 40:31, &c., are still to be explained as singulars.—On a few other examples which may perhaps be thus explained, see § 124 k. Before the plural ending the original termination ay reappears in מִתְּחִשְׁבָּה Is 25:6 (part. *Pu.* from הַחֲנוֹן).

4. Paradigm IV comprises the forms with a changeable vowel (a, b), or a vowel which has already become Šwâ (c), in the first syllable, and an unchangeable vowel in the second. With Paradigm c (which, however, for the most part consists merely of forms based on analogy, without biblical parallels) are also connected all the forms which have unchangeable vowels in both syllables, and therefore (like כְּתָבָב) cannot undergo any vowel changes.

Rem. 1. Analogous to פְּקִיד (ground-form *pāqid*) are § 84a k, גְּדוֹלָה, &c. (with ô, not changeable ô for û); in substantives like שְׁלוֹם, this □ is demonstrably obscured from â (Arab. *sâlâm*); ibid. l, m, אֲסֹור, אֲסֹרָה, &c.; § 85 u, זְכָרָון, constr. st. חְזִירָון, constr. constr. בְּלִיּוֹן, constr. עַזְבָּונִיּוֹן (cf., however, the forms in the *constr. st.* עַזְבָּנוֹן, עַצְבָּנוֹן, and with the plural suffix Ez 27:12 ff.); § 85 w, חְלִמְיָשׁ, constr. st. חְלִמְיָשׁ; § 85 l, אַקְוּם, &c.

2. צְנִי (ground-form □*āniy*, stem עַנְהָה) represents forms in which a final *Yôdh* has been resolved into i, before formative additions the original *Yôdh* under the protection of a *Dageš forte* again becomes audible as a firm consonant, whilst the (originally short) vowel of the first Syllable becomes Šuâ; cf. § 84a l, בְּנִי, plur. בְּנִים, and § 87 a.

3. with unchangeable â in the second syllable, whilst the Šuâ is weakened from a short vowel (Arab. *kitâb*); constr. st. בְּנִתְבָּב Est 4:8 (readings like בְּנִת 2 Ch 35:4 are incorrect, although יְקָרָב and בְּנִתְבָּב 4:8 are supported by fairly good authority; however, these *q' tâl*-forms in Hebrew are probably all loan-words from the Aramaic). The only plural form found in the O. T. is עַבְּדִים לְיִהְמָם their deeds, Ec 9:1. In a narrower sense the forms enumerated in § 84a n–p belong to this class; in a wider sense all those which have unchangeable vowels

throughout, thus § 84a u, § 84b e (קְפָל, cf., however, the anomalous forms mentioned there), ibid. f–i, m (No. 34 f.), n (No. 39), p (No. 44), also partly § 85 b–w (especially l and r).

In opposition to the anomalous shortening of the form קְפָל (see above), cases are also found where pretonic vowels are retained even in the antepenultima (with the secondary tone); cf. above, ii and pp, also of the form קְטִיל (properly *qāṭil*) the examples פֶּרֶץ, רִיצִים, סֶרֶץ, מִצִּים, &c., cf. also פֶּרֶץ, סֶרֶץ, מִצִּים, לִישִׁים, whilst the *constr. st. sing.* according to the rule, changes the ā into Š̄wā. (These are not to be confounded with forms like צָרִיךְ *tyrant*, which is for צָרִיךְ, and consequently has an unchangeable *Qameṣ*.) Of the form קְטִיל (*qāṭil*) in this class are שְׁבוּעַ *week*, plur. שְׁבֻעוֹת, שְׁבֻעַת, שְׁבֻעַת, constr. שְׁבֻעַת, but with *Metheg* of the secondary tone in the fifth syllable from the end, שְׁבֻעַת, שְׁבֻעַת, שְׁבֻעַת, &c., cf. § 85 k.

§ 94. Formation of Feminine Nouns.

1. The feminine ending הָה, when appended to the masculine forms treated in § 93, effects in almost all cases the same changes as are produced in the masculine forms by the addition of a light suffix, since in both cases the tone is moved one place farther forward (see § 92 b). The following scheme is based on the same division into four classes, with their subdivisions, as in § 93; a few special forms will be treated in § 95 in connexion with the paradigms of feminine nouns.

Paradigm I: segholate forms, with the feminine ending always added to the ground-form, (a) מלְכָה *queen*, כְּבֵשָׂה *lamb*, רָצֶף *hot stone*, Is 6:6 (from another root אָפָה; see Baer on Ez 40:17), בְּזִקָּה *strength* (unless belonging to Paradigm b); (b) סְתִּירָה *covering* (masc. סְתִּירָה); עֲדָנָה *pleasure* (עֲדָנָה), not to be confounded with the unchangeable forms with a prefixed מ, derived from להָה stems, as מְצֻוָה *command*, plur. מְצֻוֹת; (c) חֲלָדָה *mole*, אֲכָלָה *food* (אֲכָלָה); (d) בָּעָרָה *girl* (בָּעָרָה); (f) בָּרָה *weed*, טָהָרָה *purity* (טָהָרָה); (g) עֲנוּלָה *wrong* (also עֲנוּלָה, Paradigm i); (i) אֲצִיכָה *victuals* (masc. אֲצִיכָה, cf. Paradigm h); from *qiṭl* and *quṭl*-forms, בִּינָה *understanding*, סְוֻפָה *tempest*; (k) אֲלִילָה *fat tail* (as if from אֲלִילָה, בְּשִׁיבָה *captivity* (שִׁיבָה), לְבִיה *wreath* (probably an original *qiṭl*-form); (l) חִיה *life*, מִזְהָה *measure* (attenuated from עַזְהָה). Adjectives derived from עַזְהָה stems also belong in flexion to this class, as רְבָה *multa*, with middle guttural רְעָה *mala*; (m) זְמָה *plan*; (n) נְקָה *statute* (נְקָה).

Paradigm II: ground-form *qāṭalat*, &c., (a) נְקָה *vengeance* (נְקָה); (b) אֲדָמָה *earth*; (c) נְבָלָה *corpse*; (d) עִיָּפָה *languida*; (f) יְפָה *beautiful*, קְצָה *end* (from קְצָה, יְפָה). From stems עַזְהָה arise such forms as עַזְהָה (masc. עַזְהָה, properly part. *Qal* from עִזְהָה) *female witness*. From the ground-form *qāṭul*, נְקָה *profunda* (masc. נְקָה), עֲבָדָה *servitude*, &c.

Paradigm III: unchangeable vowel in the first, changeable in the second syllable, (a) לְבָה *a woman with child* (cf. the examples in § 84a s, and the retention of the ē in the *part. Pi*־ēl, Ex 22:17, 23:26; in the *Hithpa*־ēl 1 K 14:5 f.), but also with the change of the ē (originally i) into Š̄wā, בְּבָשָׁה *dwelling*, Na 3:8. However, in these participial forms the feminine is mostly indicated by תָה (see below, h); (c) גּוֹלָה *those of the captivity* (masc. גּוֹלָה), but also with a return of the final *Yôdh*, הַמִּזְהָה *clamorous*, Pr 7:11, and the examples in § 75 v. On the ā of the participles of verbs עַזְהָה, which also belong to this class, such as נְגָזָה *peregrina*, cf. § 72 g

Paradigm IV: originally changeable vowel in the first syllable, unchangeable in the second, (a) **גָּדְלָה** *magna*, **בָּסִיךְה** *stork*, properly *pia*; (b) **בָּתָולָה** *virgin*, properly *seiuncta*; (b) **עֲזֵינָה** *misera*.

2. A simple **ת** is added as feminine ending in forms like **בְּכִיתָה** *weeping* (masc. § 93 x, a), **בְּרִיתָה** *covenant*; but *feminine participles* of verbs, **מְצַאתָה**, **אֲתָה**, **מְצַאָתָה**, may be due to contraction from **yôšet**, &c. (hardly to lengthening of the *i* in the ground-form **môši**), whilst forms like **נְשָׁאתָה**, **מְנוֹצָאתָה** (see § 74 i) are to be explained on the analogy of the forms treated in § 93 t. Apart from the **לְהָ** formations, we find the simple **ת** in the participle **מְשֻׁרְתָּה** 1 K 1:15, contracted from **מְשֻׁרְתָּה**. But **וַיְלַקְתָּה** Gn 16:11, Ju 13:5, 7 is the ground-form of the ptcp. **וַיְלַקְתָּה** (as in the same connexion in Gn 17:19, Is 7:14), cf. § 80 d and the **Q^ere** **תְּבַשֵּׁשָׁה**, &c., discussed in § 90 n.

The forms which arise by appending the **ת** feminine to masculine nouns with a changeable vowel in a closed final syllable are, as a rule, developed exactly in the same way as masculine segholate forms. Thus there arise in Paradigm I (a) from **גָּבְרִתָּה** (for original *g^ebirt*; § 69 c), the form **בָּתָה** **גָּבְרִתָּה** *mistress* (but only in *construct st.*; in Is 47:7 also **מְלִכָּתָה** **בָּתָה** **עֶד** are to be taken together; the *absolute st.* is **גָּבְרִירָה**); from **QUEEN** (in Paradigm II, a); **פָּתָה** **חַתָּה** (**פָּתָה** = **חַתָּה** = **pit**) Lv 13:55; (c) **גָּדָרָה** **בָּתָה** **גָּדָרָה** (**גָּדָרָה** = *g^edirt*; cf. **קָרְנוֹן** as *construct st.* of **קָרְנוֹן**); on the other hand, **חַתָּה** **חַתָּה** is *construct st.* of **חַתָּה** **מֵשֶׁבֶת** *five*, with lengthening of the original *i* of **חַתָּה**.

Formations with a changeable *ō* in the second syllable belonging to this class are **כַּתָּה** **בָּתָה** **כַּתָּה** **בָּתָה** the *constr. st.* of **בָּתָה** *coat*, perhaps also **כַּתָּה** **בָּתָה** **כַּתָּה** **בָּתָה** *writing* (unless it be obscured from **כַּתָּבָה**, § 93, Paradigm IV, c).—Paradigm III, (a) **חַתָּה** **חַתָּה** (**חַתָּה** from **חַתָּה**), masc. **חַותָּם** *seal*; (b) **יְנַגְּקָה** (*properly sucking*) *sprout* (in *pause*, e.g. **חַתָּה** **חַתָּה** Ex 26:4, &c.), and so most feminines of participles **קְטַלָּה**. On this transition of the ground-form **qôṭilt** to **תְּqôṭil** (regularly before suffixes in **וַיְלַקְתָּה**, &c.), cf. § 69 c; **qôṭalt** serves as the ground-form under the influence of a guttural as well as before suffixes, e.g. **דְּעַתָּה**, feminine of **יְדַעַתָּה** *knowing*; in a wider sense, **לְגַלְגָּלָה** *skull* may also be included here, see § 95, Paradigm IV, c.

On the endings **וְתָה** and **וְתָהָה**, see § 86 k, l, § 95 at the end.

§ 95. Paradigms of Feminine Nouns.

In accordance with the general formative laws, stated in § 92 b–k, the following cases have chiefly to be considered in the flexion of feminines also: (1) a tone-lengthened vowel on the removal of the tone reverts to its original shortness (thus the *ā* of the termination **תָּה** becomes again *ā* in the *construct st.* **תָּה**). On the other hand, even an originally short vowel is retained as (a long) pretonic vowel *before* the endings **תָּה** and **וְתָה** in the *abs. st.*, e.g. **בָּתָה**, **אֲתָה**; (2) without the tone or foretone an originally short vowel almost always becomes **Šewâ**; on the other hand, *before* a vowel which had thus become **Šewâ** the *ā* in the first syllable which had hitherto also been reduced to **Šewâ** returns, although usually attenuated to *i*, e.g. from **אֲזַחְתָּה**; (3) in the plural of the feminines of segholate forms before the termination of **וּ** or **וּתָה**, and in formations of the latter kind also before the light suffixes, a

pretonic Qameš reappears, while the short vowel of the first syllable becomes Šewâ. This short vowel, however, returns in the *construct st. plur.*, whether ending in וֹת or וּ; in formations of the latter kind also before the grave suffixes.

The following Paradigms (with the exception of I, d) deal only with such of the forms treated in § 94 as incur some vowel changes or other. All forms with unchangeable vowels follow the analogy of Paradigm I, d.

	I.				
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Sing. absolute	מלכה (queen)	[כָּלִיה] (kidney)	הַרְפָּה (reproach)	שְׁרֵבֶה (waste)	חַקָּה (statute)
Sing. construct	מלכה		חרפה חַרְפָּה	חרבת חַרְבָּת	גַּבְּרָת אֲבָרְתִּי
Sing. with light suff.	מלכתי		חרפתי חַרְפָּתִי	חרבתי חַרְבָּתִי	אֲבָרְתִּי
Sing. with grave suff.	מלכתחם		חרפתכם חַרְפָּתְכֶם	חרבותכם חַרְבָּתְכֶם	אֲבָרְתָּכֶם
Plur. absolute	מלוכות	כליות	חרפות חַרְפּוֹת	חרבות חַרְבּוֹת	תקות תְּקוֹת
Plur. construct	מלוכות	כליות	חרפות ¹ חַרְפּוֹת	חרבות חַרְבּוֹת	תקות תְּקוֹת
Plur. with suff.	מלוכתי	כלiotyi		חרבומי חַרְבּוּמִי	תקותי תְּקוֹמִי
Dual absolute			רְקַמְּתִים (a double piece of embroidery)		מְצֻלָּתִים (cymbals)

	II.			III.	
	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.
Sing. absolute	אֲרֻקָה (righteousness)	זַעֲקָה (outcry)	שָׁנָה (year)	יְונָקָת (sprout)	גַּלְגָּלָת (skull)
Sing. construct	אֲרֻקָת	זַעֲקָת	שָׁנָת	יְונָקָת	גַּלְגָּלָת
Sing. with light suff.	אֲרֻקָתִי	זַעֲקָתִי	שָׁנָתִי	יְונָקָתִי	גַּלְגָּלָתִי
Sing. with grave		זַעֲקָתְכֶם	שָׁנָתְכֶם	יְונָקָתְכֶם	גַּלְגָּלָתְכֶם

¹ Only in Ps 69:10, contrary to rule, with a firmly closed syllable, cf. § 93 m.

<i>suff.</i>	אֶצְקּוֹת	שְׁנָוֹת ¹	[יְוַנְקּוֹת]
<i>Plur.</i>	אֶצְקּוֹת	שְׁנָוֹת	יְוַנְקּוֹת
<i>absolute</i>			גָּלְגָּלוֹת
<i>Plur.</i>	אֶצְקּוֹת	שְׁנָוֹת	יְוַנְקּוֹת
<i>construct</i>			גָּלְגָּלוֹתִי
<i>Plur. with suff.</i>	אֶצְקּוֹתִי	שְׁנָוֹתִי	יְוַנְקּוֹתִי
<i>Dual absolute</i>	[נְחַשְׁתָ יִם] (fetters of brass)	שְׁפֵתִים (lips)	
<i>Dual construct</i>		שְׁפֵתִי	

REMARKS.

1. Paradigm I: feminines of segholate forms. (a) The locative of this class has the form **בַּעֲבֹעַ** *towards Gibeah* (masc. **בָּעַ**). In some cases, especially with an initial guttural, there is no means of deciding whether the form in question is to be referred to a *qāṭl* or a *qiṭl* base, e.g. **גָּזָקָה** *strength* (cf. **חִרְפָּה** under b). A *dual* of this form occurs in **יָמָשְׁתָ** *seven times* (cf. **בָּעַ** *seven, fem.*). Analogous to masculine forms like **קְדֻשָּׁה** *myrtle*.—From masculines of the form **הַלְּךָ** (cf. § 93 I, k) arise feminines sometimes like **אֶלְלָה**, **שְׁלָה**, **גָּדְלָה** (see above, § 94 b), sometimes like **כְּכִיה** (§ 94 f); occasionally the final **ה** is retained before the plural ending, as if it belonged to the stem (cf. § 87 k), e.g. **שְׁלָלִות** *spears*. Forms like **גָּדְלָה** (*gazelle*, a *qūṭl* form) are derived directly from the masculine forms **גָּדֵד** *kid*, **אָנֵן**, **אָנֵןָה**, *a fleet*.—(b) From a stem **עַזְעַזָּה** *wheat* (for **חַטְבָה**), *plur. constr.* **עַזְעַלִים**.—(c) From **עַלְלָה** *foreskin*, the *plur. absol.* is **עַרְלָלִות** (cf. § 93, Paradigm I, f), *constr.* **עַרְלָלִים**.—(d) Example of a feminine segholate form from a stem **עַזְעַזָּה** (ground-form *qūṭl*, like **חִיה** of the form *qāṭl*, **טַה** of the form *qiṭl*), with **וֹ** for **וּ**, **אַחֲרָה** *terror*, Is 19:17 (Aramaic orthography for **חִיה**).

(e) To the list of segholate forms with **ה** fem. belong also the infinitives of verbs **פָּנִים** and **פָּנִין**, which have rejected the weak consonant at the beginning, as **בְּהַתְּשִׁיבָה** (from **יַשְׁבָה**), **בְּהַתְּשִׁיבָה** (from **יַקְרָב**), as well as **בְּקַהְתָּה** (from **קָהַת**); cf. § 69 m and § 66 b and g. The infinitives of verbs **פָּנִים** are, however, also found in the form **בְּקַהְתָּה**, **בְּדַעְתָּה**, **בְּלַדְתָּה**, **בְּצַדְקָתָה**, and of the same origin also are **בְּעַדְתָּה** *congregation* (from **יָעַד**), **בְּעַזְעָה** *counsel* (from **יעַזְעָה**), **בְּשַׁבְּעָה** *sleep* (from **יִשְׁבָּע**), *constr.* **בְּשַׁנְתָּה**, **בְּשַׁנְתָּה**, while in the *constr.* forms **בְּעַזְעָה** *sweat*, Gn 3:19 (from **עַזְעַזָּה** *to flow*), and **בְּעַזְעָה** *excrement*, Ez 4:12, the Sere has remained firm.

From a stem **עַזְעַזָּה** (cf. בָּוּשָׁה *to be ashamed*) is **בְּשַׁתִּי** *shame*, with suffix **בְּשַׁתִּי**. From a stem **לְהַלְלָה**, cf., however, Barth, *ZDMG*. 1887, p. 607, who assumes a stem **יַלְלָה** (the masculine **לְלָה** appears to have been formed after the rejection of the final *Yodh*, and afterwards the feminine **ה** of **לְלָה** was added) the feminine **לְלָה** *door*; but in the *plural constr.* **לְלָלִות**, the **ה** of the termination is retained (see above, d, חַנִּיתָה). In a similar way **רְפַתִּים** *stalls*, Hb 3:17, has arisen, if it is from the stem **רְפָה**, and **קְתַתִּים** *trough* (from **קָתָה**), of which the masc. must have been **קְתִי**; on the other hand, the *plur. constr.* **קְתַתִּות**, **שְׁתַתִּות** Gn 30:38 (again retaining the feminine **ה** as an apparent radical) can only be an abnormal formation from the *singular* **קְתַתִּ** **שְׁתַתִּ**, not from a kindred form **קְתַתִּ** **שְׁתַתִּ**.

1¹ On **שְׁנָוֹת** as a less frequent (poetic) form for **שְׁנִים** see § 87 n.

ZDMG. *ZDMG.* = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz.
1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

2. Paradigm II: ground-form *qăṭālāt*, &c., cf. § 94 c, Paradigm II, *a* and *b*. Analogous to the masculine forms like קָרְקָא, plur. קָרְקָאִים, we find קָרְקָה *parva*, &c.—The *constr.* forms, like צַדְקָה (*Sidh^eqāth*), are distinguished by the vocal Š^ewā (§ 10 d) from the segholate forms, like קְבָשָׁת (*kibh-sāth*). Consequently the *constr. st.* בָּרְכָה (*Gn 28:4*, &c. (from בָּרְכָה *blessing*), and 1 S 14:15, &c. (from חֲרֵזָה *a trembling*), are abnormal.—Under the influence of a guttural (see Paradigm *b*) the original ā is retained in the first syllable in the *constr. st.* (cf. also אָמָה *earth*, אָמָתָה); in other cases it is modified to Š^eghōl, e.g. עָגָלָה *wagon*, עָגָלוֹתָו. Frequently from an *absol. st.* in הָ the *constr.* is formed with the termination הָ, e.g. עָרָה *crown*, constr. רָתָעָה (*from עָרָה*); along with עָצָרָה *assembly*, עָצָעָה is found usually, even in the *absol. st.*; בָּבָם (*levir*) before suffixes is pointed as in יְבָמָתִי, and thus entirely agrees with Paradigm I *e*. From a stem לִין (*אָמַן*) is formed אָמָתָה *truth* (from *a'mant*, and this no doubt for an original āmint, § 69 c) before suffixes אָמָתִי, &c.

From the masc. form קָטָלָה (*qăṭāl*) are formed, according to rule, גָּדרָה *wall*, גָּבְלָה *corpse*, constr. תָּהָרָה *cattle*, constr. הָמָתָה בָּהָמָתָה; גָּבְלָה בָּגְלָה (for גָּבְלָה); with suffix בָּהָמָתָה Lv 19:19. More frequently, however, the ē of the second syllable is retained before the termination *ath* of the *constr. st.*; thus from גָּבְלָה once גָּבְלָה Is 26:19, and always גָּדְלָה בָּרְכָתָה *pool*, גָּדְלָה גָּזְלָה *prey*, גָּדְלָה עָמָלָה *unclean*, עָמָלָה אָמָלָה full, Is 1:21 (with *Hireq compaginis*, see § 90 l), אָמָרָה רָתָי Jb 16:13; שָׁאָמָלָה 1 S 1:27, &c. (with elision of the אָ, שָׁאָמָלָה 1 S 1:17), also אָמָלָה שָׁאָמָלָה Jb 6:8. Cf. the analogous forms of the *constr. st.* מָגָפָת *plague*, תְּרֵדָתָה *deep sleep*, from תְּרֵדָה מָגָפָה.

As dual we find יְרֻכָּתִים *sides* (cf. Gn 49:13, from the obsolete feminine of יְרֻכָּה); the *constr. st.* יְרֻכָּתִים is perhaps to be referred to a segholate form (יְרֻכָּה, cf. יְרֻכָּה as *constr. st.* of יְרֻכָּה), unless the closed syllable be due to the analogy of חֲרֵזָתִים (see g).

In the forms with simple הָ feminine the ground-form *qăṭāl* is developed (§ 69 c) to *q^etalt*, and this again regularly to לָתָעָה. Thus the feminine of הָבָרָה *companion* is לָתָעָה (with suffix Mal 2:14, cf. שָׁבָרָה Ex 3:22), of גָּדָר fem. besides גָּדָרָה.—Of עַיִל stems the segholate forms חַתָּה *rest* and חַתָּה *pit* (from חַתָּה, נוֹחַ, שָׁוֵיכַ) belong to this class; Böttcher (*Gram.* i. 411) rightly distinguished the latter from שָׁוֵיכַ corruption (stem חַתָּה); in the same way also חַתָּה *rest* is distinct from חַתָּה *a lighting down* (stem חַתָּה).

The feminines of the form *qăṭāl* from stems עַיִל, as קָרְקָה *mortua*, קָרְקָה *witness* (from עַד, מָוֶת), have likewise an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable. Cf., on the other hand, the forms from פְּיִל stems mentioned above, under e, such as שָׁבָה *sleep*, constr. st. שָׁבָה; moreover, קָרְקָה *anger*, constr. st. מָמָתָה (but מָמָתָה *a leatheren bottle*, in pause מָמָתָה [so Baer, Ginsb., but Kittel מָמָת] Gn 21:15, constr. st. מָמָת Gn 21:14, perhaps from a stem חַמְתָּה).

The feminines of the form *qăṭāl*, like קָרְקָה (masc. קָרְקָא), maintain the original ū by sharpening the following consonant (cf. § 93 kk); on the other hand, by appending the fem. הָ, segholate forms arise like חַתָּה, before suff. מָמָתָה, נָמָתָה, &c. Dual Dual נָמָתָה יְמָמָתִים (see Paradigm II *a*); but cf. קָרְקָה La 3:7.

A few (aramaising) feminines from הָלָי stems (Paradigm II, *c*) are found with the ending āth; due to the rejection of the final *Wāw* or *Yôdh* and contraction of the preceding ā with the ā of the termination āth; thus מָנָיָתָה *portion* (for *mānayāth* or *mānawāth*), תְּאַזְּקָה *end* (also תְּאַזְּקָה and תְּאַזְּקָה), plur. מָנָיָותָה (*constr. st.* Neh 12:47, 13:10) and מָנָאָותָה (Neh 12:44); אַזְּוֹתָה Ex 38:5; cf. 37:8 and 39:4 *K^eth.*; on אַיִל *valleys*, see § 93 v.—אותָה *sign* (stem אַוָּה) is obscured from אַוָּה, and

this is contracted from *âyâth* = *ăwâyâth*; plur. חָתֹת *ā*, with the double feminine ending; cf. above, f, and § 87 k.—The retention of the *ā* in the first syllable in אֶלְתִּי, &c., &c., is abnormal.

3. Paradigm III, cf. the various forms in § 94 d and f-h. The *dual* חַמֵּת יִם two walls, Is 22:11, &c., taken directly from the plur. חֲמוֹת יִם, is abnormal (cf. § 87 s, and the proper name יְמִים גָּתָר Jos 15:36).—Among the forms resembling participles *Qal* of verbs עַז, such as זָרָה (masc. זָרָה from *zâir*, hence with unchangeable *â*), must be reckoned also בָּמָה high place (from בָּוּם), which has for its *constr. st. plur.* the pleonastic form בָּמָה, מָתִי בָּמָה, or written defectively בָּמָה (see § 87 s); for this the Masora everywhere requires בָּמָה, בָּמָה, which is to be read *bām^othē* (not *bōm^othē*), with an anomalous shortening of the *ô* to *ɔ*; but with suffixes בָּמָה, מָתִי בָּמָה, &c.

In a wider sense the feminines of the form קְשָׁל (§ 84b e) belong to this class, in so far as they shorten the *â* of the second syllable before the termination ת, e.g. קְשָׁל inflammation (from *dallâqt*), with suff. צְקָנָת Ez 16:52; עַת signet; also fem. of the forms קְטַל and קְטַל (§ 84b c and d), as חָלָת אָלָת folly (for *iwwâlt*), and of all the forms which have a changeable vowel in the second syllable, and are formed with the prefix מ (§ 85 g-k), e.g. מְדָלָה kingdom, constr. always מְדָתָה; מְזֻמָּה pruning-hook, plur. מְשֻׁפָּה reward, with suff. מְשֻׁבָּת; cf. also the examples given in § 85 g and p, like מְוִילָה birth (but from אָוָא outgoing), תְּוִילָה generation, תְּוִעָבָה abomination, constr. תְּוִעָבָת, &c.

Sometimes the plural of these forms is to be traced to a secondary form, e.g. אָרָת a letter, plur. אָגָרות (as if from אָגָרָה); also יְנוּקָות, which is merely formed on the analogy of the other plur. fem. of participles *Qal*, is to be referred to a sing. יְנוּקָה. Cf., moreover, מְחַרְשָׁת ploughshare, plur. מְחַרְשָׁות (as if from הַרְשָׁה)¹; on the other hand, כְּתָרָות capitals (of columns), and תְּכַחְתּוֹת reproofs, are the regular plurals of כְּתָה and תְּכַחְתּוֹת.

In בְּתַת נְתָת coat the original *u* of the first syllable is maintained by the sharpening of the following consonant (cf. Arab. *qūtūn*), with suff. בְּתַתְנָתִי, the *constr. st.*, however, is (as also in the *absol. st.* in Ex 28:39); plur. בְּתַתְנָות, constr. בְּתַתְנָות.—The form לְתַתְנָת given in Paradigm III, b is a *Pǔlpǔl*-form of the stem בְּתַתְנָת, cf. בְּתַתְנָת Is 2:2, § 84b p.

4. To the fourth class, for which no Paradigm is required, belong all the numerous forms which in classical Hebrew have unchangeable vowels throughout, the originally short vowel of the first syllable having become Š^ēwâ, owing to the tone being thrown forward. Of the forms mentioned in §§ 84 and 85 those from עַז stems especially belong to this class, as מְנֻלָּה scroll, הַלְלָה praise, הַפְלָה prayer (§ 85 i and q), as well as the feminine of the participle *Hiphil* of verbs עַז, e.g. מְאִיר enlightening (from אִיר), and generally the feminines of עַז stems which are compounded with the preformative מ, as מְנֻחָה rest (from נֻחָה), see § 85 l; from נְלִיל stems perhaps also תְּשֻׁלָּה conduit (*constr. st.* תְּשֻׁלָּה Is 7:3, &c.) and תְּלִאָה travail. Thus all these forms coincide externally with those which already, in the masculine form, have unchangeable vowels throughout (see the list of them in § 93 ww).

¹ Astarte (plur. תְּשֻׁלָּשָׁן *Astarte*) was formerly included among these examples, is most probably due to an intentional alteration of the original תְּשֻׁלָּה, like מְלָךְ Lv 18:21, &c. (for מְלָאָה), with the vowels of תְּשֻׁלָּה shame, the latter word being substituted in reading for the name of the goddess.

5. The feminine ending **ת** (apart from forms like **לְהַ**, **בְּכִיתָה**, **מְלֹכָה**, § 94 f) arises from the addition of the feminine **ת** to the ending **וֹת**, which is employed to form adjectives, &c., see § 86 d, h, and k. The ending **וֹת**, mentioned there, is attached, in segholate forms, sometimes to the ground-form, as in **עַשְׂתָות** **Jb 12:5** (v.l. **לְהַ**) **עַשְׂתָה** **מֶלֶךְ** *kingdom*; from **לְהַ** stems we find forms sometimes like **שְׁבוּתָה** *captivity* (according to others from the stem **שָׁבַת**, like **לוֹזָה** *perverseness* from **לוֹזָה**), sometimes like **בְּכוּתָה** *weeping*, **גָלוּתָה** *exile*, **חִזּוּתָה** *vision*; the latter retain the **ā** of the first syllable even in the *constr. st.* and before *suffixes*. From a **qāṭel**-form is formed **כְּבִדָה** *heaviness*; from a **qāṭal**-form **פְּקִדָה**, &c.

In the plural of these forms different methods of treatment may be distinguished. In some cases the whole ending **וֹת** is retained, as if belonging to the stem (cf. above, f), e.g. **אַלְמָנוֹתָה** **Dn 8:22** (no doubt for **אַלְמָנוֹת**, in others this ending is resolved, as in **מְלָכִיּוֹת** **Dn 8:22** **עַצְקָה** **וֹת** **עַצְקָה** *testimony*, but only with suffixes, **Ps 119:14**, &c.; **עַצְקָה** **וֹת** **עַצְקָה** **1 K 2:3**, &c.).

§ 96. Nouns of Peculiar Formation.

In the following Paradigms,¹ pp. 282 to 284, a number of frequently used nouns are arranged, whose flexion presents more or less striking peculiarities. These peculiarities, however, are almost always subordinate to the usual phonetic laws, and the usual designation of the nouns as *irregular* is, therefore, not justified, when once the groundforms are properly recognized on which the present forms are based.

אֶחָד	אֶחָdot	אֶשְׁתָה	אֶשְׁתָה	אֶמֶתָה	בֵּיתָה	בֵּן	בֵּתָה	יּוֹם	כְּלֵי	[מֵי]	עִירָה	פֶּה	אֶשְׁתָה
(brother)	(sister)	(man)	(woman)	(handmaid)	(house)	(son)	(daughter)	(day)	(vessel)	(water)	(city)	(mouth)	(head)
אֶחָדִי	אֶחָdotִי	אֶשְׁתָהִי	אֶשְׁתָהִי	אֶמֶתָהִי	בֵּיתִי	בֵּןִי	בֵּתִי	יּוֹםִי	כְּלֵיִי	מֵיִי	עִירִי	פִּיִּי	אֶשְׁתִּי
אֶחָדִים	אֶחָdotִים	אֶשְׁתָהִים	אֶשְׁתָהִים	אֶמֶתָהִים	בֵּיתִים	בְּנִים	בֵּתִים	יּוֹםִים	כְּלִים	[מֵיִם]	עִירִים	פִּוּתִים	אֶשְׁתִּים
אֶחָdotִים	אֶחָdotִים	אֶשְׁתָהִים	אֶשְׁתָהִים	אֶמֶתָהִים	בֵּיתִים	בְּנִים	בֵּתִים	יּוֹםִים	כְּלִים	מֵיִם	עִירִים	פִּוּתִים	אֶשְׁתִּים
אֶחָdotִים	אֶחָdotִים	אֶשְׁתָהִים	אֶשְׁתָהִים	אֶמֶתָהִים	בֵּיתִים	בְּנִים	בֵּתִים	יּוֹםִים	כְּלִים	מֵיִם	עִירִים	פִּוּתִים	אֶשְׁתִּים
אֶחָdotִים	אֶחָdotִים	אֶשְׁתָהִים	אֶשְׁתָהִים	אֶמֶתָהִים	בֵּיתִים	בְּנִים	בֵּתִים	יּוֹםִים	כְּלִים	מֵיִם	עִירִים	פִּוּתִים	אֶשְׁתִּים

¹ The only omissions from these Paradigms are **קְמוֹתָה**, **קְמָם**, **אֶחָדִים**, and **אֶשְׁתִּים** (on which see the remarks), and all forms which are not found in the O. T.

REMARKS.

אָב *father*; the *constr.* אָבִי and בְּנִי (which occurs once), belongs to the connective forms discussed in § 90 k, which serve as the model for the *Hireq compaginis*. However, אָב also occurs in compound proper names, e.g. אַבְשָׁלוֹם, beside אָבָה, &c.; also Gn 17:4 f. אָבָה for the purpose of explaining the name *הָמָן*. On the plur. see אָבּוֹת § 87 p.

אֶחָד brother. The plur. *absol.* אֶחָדים has *Dageš forte implicitum* (§ 22 c); it stands for אֶחָד according to the phonetic law stated in § 27 q, and so also יְחָד in *pause* for יֶחָד. The sharpening of the ה merely serves to keep the preceding *Pathaḥ* short, as in גַּמְלִים, &c. (§ 93 ee).

נַחֲנָה one (for נַחֲנָה, likewise with *Dageš forte implicitum*, § 22 c, cf. § 27 q), constr. and otherwise in close connexion, נַחֲנָה, Gn 48:22, 2 S 17:22, Is 27:12, Zc 11:7; and especially before נִמְלָא (q) Gn 3:22, Ex 30:14, Nu 16:15, Ju 17:5, 1 S 9:3, Ez 18:10; fem. נַחֲנָה una (for נַחֲנָה, according to § 19 d), in pause נַחֲנָה. Once נַחֲנָה masc. (by aphaeresis, § 19 h), Ez 33:30, as in Aramaic; plur. אֲחֶדְתָּם some, but also *idem*.

אֶחָזֶת sister, from *ăḥawāt* or *ăḥayāt*, with elision of the ו or י, and with the *â*, which has arisen from *ăā*, obscured to *ō*.¹ In Nu 6:7 תְּהִזְבֵּחַ stands for אֶחָזֶת (with virtual sharpening of the ה). The plur. *absol.* (אֶחָזִית) does not happen to occur. In Ez 16:52 אֶחָזֶת occurs (for אֶחָזִית). In the forms אֶחָזָת Jos 2:13 *K^eth.*, אֶחָזָת יְהִי Ez 16:51, 55, 61 (to be read also in verse 45 for אֶחָזֶת), which has been erroneously assimilated to the singular occurring in vv. 48, 49, 56), and אֶחָזָת בָּם Ho 2:3 (for which, however, read אֶחָזָת בָּם), the third radical has been entirely lost.

שִׁנְ man, according to the common opinion either incorrectly lengthened for שִׁנָּ (from *išš*, with assimilation of the *Nün* of the ground-form *inš*, which again has been attenuated from

¹ This explanation of תִּתְחַזֵּק (and תִּתְחַזֶּה q. v.) still seems to us more probable than the assumption that the fem. ending *āth* is lengthened to compensate for the loss of the 3rd radical (so Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, vi. 258), or that the form is derived from *aḥā*, the old-semitic *constr. st.* of the accusative, with *n* feminine (so Barth, *ZDMG*. 1899, p. 598).

anš from the stem *אנְשָׁ*), or softened directly from *inš*. It is, however, probable that a separate stem (*שׁוֹא* to be strong?) is to be assumed for the singular¹; consequently the stem *שׁוֹא* to be sociable, would be connected only with the plur. אֲנָשִׁים *אֲנָשִׁים* is found only in [Is 53:3](#), [Ps 141:4](#), [Pr 8:4](#)).

אַנְחָה slave, handmaid; with the plur. אַנְחָות, with consonantal ה, cf. in Aram. אֲבָהָן fathers, and similarly in Phoen. דָלָת from דָלָת, also Arab. *abahât* (fathers), *ummahât* (mothers), with an artificial expansion into a trilateral stem.

אַנְשָׁה woman, probably for אֲנָשָׁה i.e. not (as Aram. אֲנָשָׁה shows); from *שׁוֹא* to be sociable (see above, on *שׁוֹא*) but *שׁוֹא* to be weak (Arab. *ānūtā*). So De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, p. 68; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 159 f. The form *נָשָׁה* (for *išt*, with ה fem., from *išš*, after rejection of the doubling and lengthening of the *i* to *e*) occurs in [Dt 21:11](#), [1 S 28:7](#), [Ps 58:9](#), even in *absol. st.* [cf., however, below, § 130. 4, 5].—In [Ps 128:3](#) בְּנָשָׁה is found for בְּנָשָׁק אַנְשָׁה. Instead of the plur. נָשִׁים, we find in [Ez 23:44](#) בְּנָשִׁים¹.

בְּבֵית house, locative בְּבֵיתה, בְּבֵיתָה, בְּבֵיתָה, בְּבֵיתָה, constr. בְּבֵיתָה, plur. בְּבֵיתִים (but in [Dt 6:11](#), [1 Ch 28:11](#) בְּבֵית without *Metheg*), pronounced *bâttîm*. The explanation of the *Dageš* in the ה is still a matter of dispute. The Syriac *bâttîn*, however, shows that the *Dageš* is original, and belongs to the character of the form.² According to Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 88, בְּבֵיתִים is simply contracted from *bai-tîm* (as אַנְ from עַיְנָם אַנְ from עַיְנָם, &c.), and the *Dageš*, therefore, is *lene*; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 56, proposes the name *Dageš forte orthoconsonanticum*; on the other hand Rahlfs, *ThLZ*. 1896, col. 587, suggests that the ה is assimilated to the ה, while Philippi, *ZDMG*. xlix, p. 206, assumes for the plural a stem distinct from that of the singular. A definite solution is at present impossible. The +incorrectness of the formerly common pronunciation *bottîm* is sufficiently shown by the Babylonian punctuation (see § 8 g, note 3), which leaves no doubt as to the â.

בָּן son ([Gn 30:19](#) בָּן־שָׁׁבֶת) constr. usually בָּן (also with a conjunctive accent as an equivalent for *Maqqeph*, [Gn 17:17](#), [Is 8:2](#), &c., [1 Ch 9:21](#); even with smaller disjunctives, especially in the combination מִבְּנָן, [Ex 30:14](#), [Lv 27:3](#), &c. [מִבְּנָן only after מִזְבֵּחַ and before שָׁׁבֶת, also in [Is 51:12](#); see Strack on [Ex 30:14](#)]), rarely בָּן (Dt 25:2, [Jon 4:10](#) twice, [Pr 30:1](#),

1¹ So already Gesenius in his *Thes. linguae Hebr.*, i. 83 f., and recently again Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolegg.*, p. 160 ff., Praetorius in Kuhn's *Orient. L.-B.*, 1884, p. 196; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 38; while Nöldeke (*ZDMG*. 1886, p. 739 f.), against Delitzsch, would connect both שָׁׁבֶת and נָשִׁים with the stem אַנְשָׁ.

1² Friedr. Delitzsch (in his Babylonian glosses to Baer's text of Ezekiel, p. xi) on [Ez 23:44](#) remarks that in Assyro-Babylonian the plur. of *aššatu* (woman) is *aššâti*, corresponding, therefore, to תָוּשָׁה, not to the ordinary plur. נָשִׁים. The *a* of נָשִׁים (instead of *i* as in Arab. or *e* as in Syr.) is to be explained with Barth (*Orient. Studien zu Ehren Th. Nöldekes*, Giessen, 1906, p. 792) from the natural connexion of the ideas 'men' and 'women', נָשִׁים and אַנְשָׁ.

2² This disposes of the traditional view that the *Dageš* (after a firm *Metheg*, see § 16 f.) only serves to distinguish if from בֵּיתִים passing the night, ptcp. Qal of בֵּית, a stem which never occurs in the O. T. According to P. Haupt the stem is בָּאָ to go in, ה therefore being the feminine termination, as in *bint daughter*, and the original form *batu*, *bâtu* (*entrance*) is preserved in the plural *bâttîm* where the *tt* is to be explained as due to the analogy of trisyllabic stems. In the singular *bât* passed into *bêt* (?), and this was resolved into *bait*, as *Yrušâlêm* into *Yrušâlayim*.

ThLZ. *ThLZ*. = Theologische Literaturzeitung, ed. by E. Schürer. Lpz. 1876 ff.

and so always in the combination בָּנֵמִין [but בְּנִימִין] *Benjamite*] and בָּנֵי Pr 30:1), once בָּנֵי (cf. § 90 1) Gn 49:11, and בָּנָו (§ 90 o) Nu 23:18, 24:3, 15.—In Gn 49:22 בָּן, for which בָּנֶה ought to be read, is intended by the Masora for the *absol. st.*, not the *constr.*

בָּת daughter (from *bant*, and this again, according to the law stated in § 69 c, for *bint*, fem. of בָּן), with suff. בָּתִי for בָּתִי. Plur. בָּתִות, from the sing. בָּתָה, comp. בָּתִים sons.

חָם husband's father, only with suff. חָמִיךְ יְהָה, חָמִיךְ; and חָמֹות husband's mother, only with suff. חָמֹותָה, חָמֹותָה. Cf. אָבָה, אָמָה, and especially אָמָה.

יּוֹם day (Arab. *yaum*),¹ dual יּוֹעַם *Yō'ūm*; the plur. יּוֹמִים is probably from a different sing. (ם *yām*), constr. יּוֹמִי and (poetically) יּוֹמֹתָה, Dt 32:7, Ps 90:15.

כָּלִים vessel, in pause בְּלִיכָּה (with suff. בְּלִיכָּה Dt 23:25) from בְּלִיה to contain, plur. כָּלִים (as if from בְּלִיה, בְּלִיה; according to König, ii. 63, shortened from *kilyim*).

מַיִם water; on the plur. cf. § 88 d.

עִיר city. The plur. עִירִים is scarcely syncopated from עִירִים, as it is pointed in Ju 10:4 (no doubt erroneously, in imitation of the preceding עִירִים ass colts), but from a kindred sing. עִיר, which still occurs in proper names.

פֶּה mouth, constr. st. פִּי (for original פֶּה = פִּי ?). Its origin is still disputed. According to Gesenius and König (ii. 103), פֶּה stands for פְּאַה (ground-form *piəay*) from פָּאַה to breathe, to blow; according to Olshausen, for פִּי, from a stem פְּיִה or פְּנִיה. But parallel with the Hebrew פֶּה are Assyr. *pû*, Arab. *fû*, *fam*, *famm*, *fumm*, bibl. Aram. פָּמָה, פָּמָה, Syr. *pûm*, *pûmâ*, so that Barth, *ZDMG*. xli, p. 634, assumes two forms of development from the same stem (פְּמוֹ), viz. *fm* and *fw*. פִּי my mouth, from *pi-y*; for פִּיהם we find in Ps 17:10, 58:7, 59:13 פִּים. The supposed plur. פִּים 1 S 13:21 is generally explained as a contraction from פִּים, but the text is altogether corrupt. The plur. פִּיות, for the edges of a sword, occurs in Pr 5:4; reduplicated פִּיִּיות Is 41:15, Ps 149:6.

רָאשׁ head (obscured from רָאשׁ=*răš*); plur. רָאשִׁים (for רָאשִׁים, § 23 c); only in Is 15:2.

שִׂיחָה a head of small cattle (sheep or goat), constr. st. שִׂיחָה, with suff. שִׂיחָה 1 S 14:34 and שִׂיחָה Dt 22:1, according to König, ii. 131, from a ground-form *siay*, but according to De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, 81 f., from a stem וְשִׁיחָה (*say=say=wisay*).

שַׁם name, constr. generally שַׁם (only six times שַׁם); cf. בָּנָם.

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, *Beiträge*, p. 58, *yaum*, probably an extension of a biliteral word which has survived in יּוֹם, יּוֹמִים. Barth, however, *Orient. Studien*, p. 791 (see above on הָאָשָׁה), sees in יּוֹם, יּוֹמִים new formations in Hebrew, caused by the naturally close connexion and association of these plurals with שָׁנִים, שָׁנָה, שָׁנָות, שָׁנִינִים years, to which they became assimilated in form. The view that יּוֹם is merely an incorrect obscuring of יּוֹם, and therefore distinct from the Arab. *yaum*, is contradicted by the invariable spelling יּוֹם, &c., notwithstanding the spelling וְבִיִּם (= ?) in the Siloam inscription, line 3 (cf. § 7 f), and יּוֹם מִיּוֹם Ho 6:2. Cf. also the note on § 100 g.

םַיִשׁ heaven (§ 88 d).

§ 97. Numerals. (a) Cardinal Numbers.

Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 116 ff.; *Grundriss*, i. 484 ff.

1. The formation of the cardinal numbers from 3 to 10 (on 1 and 2 see below) has this peculiarity, that numerals connected with a masculine substantive take the feminine form, and those with a feminine substantive take the masculine form. The common explanation of this strange phenomenon used to be that the primary form of the numeral was an abstract noun in the feminine (cf. § 122 p). This was originally attached in the *constr. st.* to the word qualified, then came to be also used in apposition to it, and finally was placed after it like an adjective. The consequence of the appositional, and finally adjectival, construction was, that for numerals connected with feminine nouns a special shorter form came to be used, whilst the original forms, with the abstract feminine ending, were used in connexion with masculine nouns, after as well as before them.

On this view the historical process would have been that originally the abstract numerals (like Latin *trias*, *decas*, Greek πεντάς, δεκάς, &c.) were placed in the *constr. st.* before masculines and feminines alike, e.g. רְתָה שֶׁת בְּנִים *trias filiorum*, מִלְשָׁדָה בְּנִים *decas mulierum*. A trace of this earlier usage was seen in the examples mentioned under c, like שֶׁת בְּנִים.— Further, it was possible to say בְּנִים שֶׁת *trias*, sc. *filii*, as well as בְּנִים שֶׁת *filii*, *trias*. From this second appositional construction it was only a step to the treatment of the abstract numeral as an adjective, *filii tres*. Similarly the subsequently shortened forms of the abstract numeral, which were used in connexion with feminines, might stand either in the *constr. st.* before, or in apposition before or after the word numbered, thus בְּנָוֹת שֶׁלֶשׁ *trias filiarum*, or בְּנָוֹת שֶׁלֶשׁ *trias*, sc. *filiae*, or בְּנָוֹת שֶׁלֶשׁ *filiae*, *trias*, or adjectivally *filiae tres*.

A different and much more intelligible explanation of the striking disagreement between the gender of the numeral and that of the word numbered has recently been given by Reckendorf, *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen*, pt. ii, Leiden, 1898, p. 265 ff. He also considers that the earliest forms were abstract numerals which were placed in the *constr. st.* before the noun numbered, the latter depending on them in the genitive. The original form, however, of the abstract numerals from 3 to 9 is not the feminine, but the masculine, used for both genders, as it still is in the tens, 20, 30, &c. The feminine abstract numeral was first distinguished by a special form in the numbers from 13 to 19 (see further, below) when connected with masculines, and this distinction was afterwards extended to the numbers from 3 to 10. This explanation does not affect the view stated above that the appositional and adjectival use of the abstract numerals was only adopted later in addition to their use in the genitive construction.

The differentiation of the numerals (originally of common gender) into masculine and feminine forms in the second decade, was occasioned, according to Reckendorf, by the use of the abstract feminine שֶׁרֶה in compounds. So long as it was felt that שֶׁרֶה simply meant *the three of the decade*, the gender of the noun numbered made no difference. When, however, the consciousness of this meaning became weakened and the combination of units and tens came to be felt as a copulative rather than a genitive relation, it seemed suitable to connect only feminine nouns with the feminine form שֶׁרֶה. New forms were therefore invented, both of the units and the tens, for use with masculine nouns. The former, however,

no longer had the form of the *constr.* but of the absolute state, clearly showing that the consciousness of the original syntactical relation in פֶלְשָׁרָה, &c., was lost. On the other hand, after the extension of these new formations to the first decade, the new feminine forms readily came to be used also in the genitive construction (and therefore in the *constr. st.*) on the analogy of the earlier masculine forms.

Of the first two numerals, אַחֲרֵיךְ, *one*, with its fem. אַחֲתָה (see § 96), may be recognized, from its form and use, as an adjective, although even so it admits of such combinations as אַחֲרֵיךְ הַרְמִים *unus e montibus*. The numeral two, as would be expected, appears as an abstract in the *dual*, but, like the other numerals, can also stand in apposition to the noun numbered. In form it always agrees with the gender of its noun. Accordingly, the numerals from 1 to 10 are as follows:

	<i>With the Masculine.</i>		<i>With the Feminine.</i>	
	<i>Absol.</i>	<i>Constr.</i>	<i>Absol.</i>	<i>Constr.</i>
1.	אַחֲרֵיךְ	אַחֲרֵיךְ	אַחֲתָה	אַחֲתָה
2.	שְׁנַיִם	שְׁנַיִם	שְׁתַּיִם ¹	שְׁתַּיִם
3.	שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשָׁה
4.	אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבָּעָה
5.	חֲמָצֵה ²	חֲמָצֵה	חֲמָצֵה	חֲמָצֵה
6.	שְׁשָׁה	שְׁשָׁה	שְׁשָׁה	שְׁשָׁה
7.	שְׁבָעָה	שְׁבָעָה	שְׁבָעָה	שְׁבָעָה ³
8.	שְׁמָנָה	שְׁמָנָה	שְׁמָנָה	שְׁמָנָה
9.	תְּשִׁבְעָה	תְּשִׁבְעָה	תְּשִׁבְעָה	תְּשִׁבְעָה ³
10.	עֲשָׂרָה	עֲשָׂרָה	עֲשָׂרָה	עֲשָׂרָה

On the connective forms עֲבָבָעַ, עֲשָׂעָה, cf. the analogous forms in § 93 h.

The other Semitic languages also exhibit the same peculiarity in the external differentiation of the numerals from 3 to 10 as regards gender. The fem. form of the numeral

¹ Shortened from יְמִינָה, which would be the regular feminine form of יְמִינָה. Nevertheless, the *Dageš* in יְמִינָה, &c. (even after מִן; מִן Ju 16:28), can by no means be regarded as a *Dageš forte* arising from assimilation of the *Nûn*, for in that case the word could only be יְמִינָה (cf. Arab. *tintāni*). This form does occur in the Codex Babylonicus of A.D. 916, but it is only a later correction for יְמִינָה, while in the Berlin MS. or. qu. 680 described by Kahle (Lpz. 1902) there is no trace of the *Dageš*. It is rather to be read *štáyi m*, *šté* (with *Dageš lene*), cf. יְמִינָה, representing the later Palestinian pronunciation (Philippi, ZDMG. xlix, p. 206), and Arab. *iṭnātāni* (with a kind of prosthetic ئ; cf. § 19 m), as a further feminine form of *iṭnāni*, *duo*. According to Barth (*Orient. Studien ... Th. Nöldeke*, ii. 792 f.) the irregularity of יְמִינָה (he takes the *Dageš* as *Dageš forte*) is due to the complete assimilation of its vowels to those of the masc. يَمِين where the سَوْلَه mobile is normal.

² With *Dageš* probably on the analogy of הַשְׁשָׁה, as תַּשְׁעָה on the analogy of תַּשְׁעָה. Cf. also J. K. Blake on حَمَّاصَة, يَمَّاصَة in JAOS. 1905, p. 117 ff.

³ عَشَعَة and عَشَعَة appear only as connective forms before شَرَعَة and مَأْوَاتَه.

abstracts is only rarely found in connexion with feminine nouns,⁴ e.g. **שָׁלַשׁ נְשִׁים** Gn 7:13, 1 S 10:3, Jb 1:4, Ez 7:2 *K^eth.*; probably also Jos 17:11, where we should read with Dillmann 'שְׁנָה'. In apposition, Zc 3:9, 4:2, cf. Jer 36:23. From what was said above, under *a*, it follows that these cases are not a return to original usage, but only an intrusion of the form used before masculines into the sphere of the feminine. Conversely in Gn 38:24 **שְׁלֹשׁ קָרְבָּנִים** (but in the Samaritan **תְּשִׁבְעָה**).—For **שְׁבֻעָה seven**, there occurs in Jb 42:13 the strange form **הַשְּׁבֻעָה**, according to Ewald [*Ausführl. Lehrb.*⁸, § 269 b] an old feminine substantive (German *ein Siebend, a set of seven*), but more probably a scribal error.

2. The numerals from 11 to 19 are formed by placing the units, without the *copula*, before the number ten (in the form **עֶשֶׂר עֲשֶׂרֶת** masc., **עֲשֶׂרֶת אֲשֶׁר** fem.), but without the two words being joined into one. As was said above, under *a*, and as is proved by the use of **אַחַת** in the numeral 11, the feminine numerals from 13 to 19 are to be regarded as *construct* forms in a genitive connexion. The connective forms of the masculine abstracts, like **תְּשִׁבְעָה**, &c., are not admitted in combination with **עֶשֶׂר**, since they are merely in apposition, and not in a genitive relation (see the rare exceptions at the end of *e*). On the other hand **שְׁנִי** and **שְׁתִּי** in the numeral 12 are undoubtedly true *constructs*, like **אַחַת** and the fem. numerals 13–19. But instead of **שְׁנִי יְמִין** (Ex 28:21, Jos 3:12 and four other places) and **שְׁתִּי יְמִינִים** (Jos 4:8 and three times in Ezek.), we generally find **שְׁנִים** and **שְׁתִּים**. Two explanations have been given of these forms: (1) that the *K^ethibh* really intends **יְמִין יְמִינִים**, in the *absol. st.*, which was first introduced in the case of **שְׁנִי**, on the analogy of **עֲשֶׂרֶת**, &c., and then extended to **יְמִין**; the Masora, however, required **שְׁנִי**, **שְׁתִּי** (but see below), and therefore pointed **שְׁנִים**, **שְׁתִּים** as a *Q^{rē} perpetuum* (see § 17).—(2) that the *absolute* forms **שְׁנִי יְמִין**, **שְׁתִּי יְמִין** (*introduced on the analogy of **עֶשֶׂר***, &c.) were contracted to **שְׁנִים**, **שְׁתִּים** to facilitate the pronunciation of the duals when closely connected with **עֶשֶׂר** and **עֲשֶׂרֶת**, and that the contraction is founded on an early and correct tradition. The second explanation is supported by the large number of examples of **שְׁנִים** (66) and **שְׁתִּים** (34). It would be strange if the Masora required the alteration of the far commoner forms on account of isolated instances of **שְׁנִי** and **שְׁתִּי**. As a matter of fact even in regard to the latter forms the tradition often varies between **שְׁנִי** and **שְׁנִים**, &c., cf. e.g. Ginsburg on Jos 3:12. We cannot therefore assume a *Q^{rē} perpetuum*.

Accordingly the numbers from 11 upwards are—

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
11.	אַחַת עֶשֶׂר עֲשֶׂרֶת עֶשֶׂר ¹	אַחַת עֲשֶׂרֶת עֲשֶׂרֶת עֲשֶׂרֶת

⁴ In the vulgar dialects of Arabic, and in Ethiopic, the feminine form of the numeral is by far the more common. This form appears also in Hebrew, when the number is regarded in the abstract, as in the multiplicatives (see § 97 h).

¹ **עֲשֶׂרֶת עֶשֶׂרֶת**, which remained for a long time unexplained, was recognized (first by J. Oppert) in the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions in the form *ištin* or *ištēn*; cf. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 203, and P. Haupt, in the *American Journal of Philology*, viii. 279. Accordingly, **עֲשֶׂרֶת עֶשֶׂרֶת** is a compound, like the Sansk. *ékâdaçan*, ἔνδεκα, *undecim* (analogous to the combination of units and tens in the numerals from 12 to 19), and is used at the same time in the composition of the feminine numeral

12.	שְׁנִים עָשֶׂר שְׁנֵי עָשֶׂר	שְׁתִים עָשֶׂרְה שְׁתֵי עָשֶׂרְה
13.	שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשֶׂר	שְׁלִשָּׁה עָשֶׂרְה

&c., on the analogy of the last. These numerals regularly have only the above form. In regard to their syntax, cf. § 134 f.

Very rarely the units appear in the *masc.* in the *constr. st.*, as חמשת עשר fifteen, Ju 8:10, 2 S 19:18; שמשת עשר eighteen, Ju 20:25.—Connected by נ we find עשרה נ חמישת עשר in Eze 45:12.

3. The tens from 30 to 90 are expressed by the plural forms of the units (so that the plural here always stands for *ten times* the unit), thus, ארבעים 40, ששים 30, חמישים 50, שבעים 60, שמונים 70, תשעים 80, מאה 90. But *twenty* is expressed by עשרים, plur. of עשר ten.² These numerals are all of common gender, and do not admit of the *construct state*.—In compound numerals, like 22, 23, 44, &c., the units may precede (*two and twenty*, as in Arabic and English), e. g. Nu 3:39, 26:14. Very frequently, however, the reverse order is found (*twenty and two*, as in Syriac, cf. French and English *twenty-two*), e. g. 1 Ch 12:28, 185.¹ In all cases the units and tens are connected by the *copula*, ordinarily נ, but נ, before numerals with the tone on the penultima, נ before כ, נ before Šwā see § 104 d, e, g.

The remaining numerals are the substantives—

100	הָמָת fem., <i>constr. st.</i> הָמָתָה.
200	אַמְתָּה dual (contracted from מְמֻתָּה; cf. § 23 c).
300	מְאֹות plur. (but in 2 K 11:4, 9, 10, 15, K ^e th. הָמְאֹות).
1000	אַף masc.
2000	אַלְפָה dual.
3000	עַשְׁלֵל plur., and so on (except עשרה אלפים in 2 S 18:3, 2 K 24:14 K ^e th.; elsewhere always עַשְׁלֵת אלפים).
10000	רַבּוֹת, רַבּוֹ, רַבּ, in the later books the aramaising ² forms (properly multitude, cf. μυριάς).

eleven. On the gradual substitution of עַחַת 'אַחַת 'עַחֲד 'עַחֲנִי for עַחֲנִי 'עַחֲנִי 'עַחֲנִי see Giesebrécht in ZAW. 1881, p. 226; עַחֲנִי occurs only in Jer., Ez., in the prologue to Deuteronomy (1³), in the Priestly Code, and in passages undoubtedly post-exilic, so that it may very well be a loan-word from the Babylonian.

2² For שְׁבָעִים, שְׁבָעָה (from the *segholates* עָשֶׂר, עָשֶׂרְה, עָשֶׂרְהָה), we should expect עָשָׂרִים, עָשָׂרְה, עָשָׂרְהָה. Is this very unusual deviation from the common formation (see above, § 93 l, o, r) connected with the special meaning of these plurals, or are these survivals of an older form of the plural of segholates?

1¹ According to the conclusions of König (*De Criticae Sacrae Argumento*, p. 61, and *Lehrgeb.*, ii. p. 215 ff.), the smaller number more commonly precedes in Ezek. and the Priestly Code, but the larger always elsewhere. S. Herner (*Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.*, Lund, 1893, p. 71 ff.) arrives at the same conclusion by a full examination of the statistics; cf. also his remarks on König in ZAW. 1896, p. 123, and König's reply, *ibid.*, p. 328 f.

2² Cf. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im A.T.* (Halle, 1902), p. 79 f.

20000	רַבָּא שְׁתִי Raboth Shethi dual (see below, h); but Neh 7:70 (also Neh 7:71).
40000	אֶרְבָּעָה Rebaa
60000	אֶלְפִי רְבָבָה Elphi Rebaba. Ezra 2:69 (Baer and Ginsburg שְׁרֵבָבָה) and as in Dn 11:12. thousands of myriads, Gn 24:60.

Rem. 1. The dual form which occurs in some of the units has the meaning of our ending -*fold*, e. g. שְׁבַעַת יָמִים *sevenfold*, Gn 4:15, 24, Is 30:26, Ps 12:7, 79:12 (cf. § 134 r). The dual רְבָת יָמִים Ps 68:18 (explained by אלף שְׁנָאֵן *thousands of duplication*) is not meant to be taken in the sense of *two myriads* or *twice the number of myriads*, but in a multiplicative sense.³—Besides the plural which denotes the tens, there are also the plurals אחדים *some*, also *idem*, and עשְׂרָה *decades* (not *decem*) Ex 18:21, 25.

2. The *suffixes* to numerals are, as with other nouns, properly genitives, although they are translated in English as nominatives, e. g. בְּתַשְׁלִיחָה your triad, i.e. you three, Nu 12:4; וְנֵצֶחַ his fifty (i.e. the 50 belonging to him) 2 K 1:9–13, and יְקָרְבָּנִים 2 K 1:10, 12.

§ 98. Numerals. (b) Ordinal Numbers.

The ordinal numbers from 2 to 10 are formed from the corresponding cardinals by adding the termination יְנִי (§ 86 h), before which another יְנִי also is generally inserted between the second and third radicals. They are as follows: **רביעי**, **שְׁלִישִׁי**, **שְׁנִי** *second*, **רְבָעִי**, **שְׁמִינִי**, **צְבָעִי**, **עֲשִׂירִי**, **עֲשֶׂרִי** *first*, (like the prosthetic אַ, which appears in אַרְבָּעָה, &c.), without the prosthetic אַ, which appears in אַרְבָּעָה, &c.), or (which, according to Strack, is always to be read for אַרְבָּעָה, שְׁבִיעִי, שְׁשִׁי, חֲמִשִּׁי, שְׁמִינִי, צְבִיעִי, עֲשִׂירִי, עֲשֶׂרִי). The ordinal *first* is expressed by רְאֵשׁ (cf. § 27 w), from *head*, *beginning*, with the termination וָן (§ 86 f). On the use of אַנְדָּא as an ordinal in numbering the days of the month, cf. § 134 p; in such cases as Gn 1:5, 2:11, the meaning of *first* is derived solely from the context.

The feminine forms have the termination **תִּתְ**, more rarely (and only in the case of 3 and 10) **תִּתְהָ**. They are employed also to express fractions, e.g. **מֵשֶׁנֶּה fifth part** or **מֵתֶנֶה fifth part**, **עַשְׂרִית tenth part**, and **עַשְׂרִיתָה tenth part**. Side by side with these, in the same sense, there are also forms like **רַבֵּעַ a quarter**, **חֲמִשֵּׁה a fifth part**, and with the afformative **וְרֹזֶן** (plur. **עַשְׂרָנוֹתִים**) *a tenth part*; these are to be regarded as abstracts, and are denominatives from the cardinal numbers. Cf. finally **עַבְדָּלָה week**; **עַשְׂרָה a decade (of days)**, and also the *tenth day*.

On the expression of the other relations of number, for which the Hebrew has no special forms, see the Syntax, § 134 q and r.

CHAPTER IV

THE PARTICLES

§ 99. General View.

³ Cf. D. H. Müller, 'Die numeralia multiplicativa in den Amarnatafeln u. im Hebr.,' *Semitica*, i, Wien, 1906, p. 13 ff.

1. The particles, which in general express the secondary modifications of thought in speech, the closer relation of words to one another, and the mutual connexion of sentences, are for the most part either borrowed or derived from noun-forms, sometimes also from pronouns and verbs (§ 30 s). *Primitive* particles (apart from a few demonstrative forms, see § 100 i) can only be so called in the sense defined in § 81 f.

2. So far as the origin of the particles can be discovered with certainty, they are either (1) *borrowed* from other parts of speech; i.e. certain forms of the noun, pronoun, or verb, with more or less loss of their original meaning, have come to be employed as particles; cf. in the Indo-Germanic languages, e. g. the Latin *certo, falso, partim, verum, causa*, the German *statt, anstatt, wegen, weg*, and the English *instead, away*; or (2) *derived* from other parts of speech, either (a) by the *addition* of formative syllables, as מִמְיוֹן by day, from יוֹם (cf., however, § 100 g); or most commonly (b) by *abbreviations* effected in various ways, the extent of their mutilation being in proportion to the frequency of their use, so that in some cases (see below) the original stem has become wholly unrecognizable.

Cf. in German *gen*, from *gegen, Gegend*; *seit*, from *Seite*; *weil* (originally a particle of time, like our *while*), from *Weile*.

Still more violent abbreviations occur in Greek, Latin, and the Romance languages, e.g. ἀπό, *ab, a*; ἐξ, *ex, e*; *ad*, Fr. *à*; *aut*, Fr. *ou*, Ital. *o*; *super*, Ital. *su*.¹

The greatest shortening occurs in those particles which have entirely lost the character of an independent word, by being reduced to a single consonant with its vowel (generally short) or Šwâ. According to the laws of syllable formation in Hebrew (§ 26 m), such particles cannot stand by themselves, but are united, as prefixes, with the following word (§ 102), very much like the preformatives of the imperfect (§a–d).

The view that this shortening of whole words to single letters has actually taken place in the gradual course of linguistic development is rendered highly probable by the fact that similar abbreviations in later Hebrew and in Aramaic, i.e. as the development of the original Semitic speech progresses, become more and more striking and frequent. Thus the Biblical Aramaic יַ becomes at a later period ئ; in modern Arabic, e. g. *hallaq* (now) is from *halwaqt; lēš* (why?) from *li-ayyi-šaiñ*, &c. Cf. also the analogous cases mentioned above from the Western languages. Nevertheless, the use of the simplest particles is found already in the earliest periods of the Hebrew language, or, at any rate, in the earliest documents which have come down to us.

3. Less frequently particles are formed by *composition*; as מִזְעֵן wherefore? for עַד quid edoctus? (τί μαθόν;) or *quid cognitum?*; בְּלֹעֲדִי (from בְּלֹא and עֲדִי) *besides*; מִלְּפָנֶה (from מִלְּפָנֶה פָּנָה) *from above, above*.

¹ Even short phrases are contracted into one word: Lat. *forsitan*, from *fors sit an*, δηλονότι, δηλαδή, Fr. *peut-être*, Eng. *prithee* from *I pray thee*.—In Chinese most of the particles are verbs or nouns; e. g. *iù* (to give), also the sign of the dative; *i* (to make use of), *to, for; n*□*i* (the interior), *in*.

More frequent is the combination of two words into one without contraction, e. g. אֲחָרִיכֶנּוּ, אֲיַמְנָה; cf. also the compounds of אֵי with demonstrative pronouns, as אֲפָנִיכֶנּוּ, כִּיְאָם, אֲפָנִיכִי from what?; אֲיַלְלָתֶן wherefore? [R. V. how]. See the lexicon under אֵי.

§ 100. Adverbs.

On demonstrative adverbs cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 323; on interrogative adverbs, *ibid.*, i. 328; on adverbs in general, i. 492 ff.

1. The negative אֵלֹא not, and a few particles of place and time, as מַשֵּׁה there, are of obscure origin.

2. Forms of other parts of speech, which are used adverbially without further change, are—

(a) Substantives with prepositions, e. g. בְּאַחֲרֵיךְ (with might) very; alone (prop. *in separation*, Fr. *à part*), with suffix אַלְכִי I alone; מִתְבָּנִים from within, within; cf. also כְּאַחֲרֵךְ (as one) together, לְעַמְתָּה and מִלְעַמְתָּה (originally *in connexion with*) near to, corresponding to, like, &c., cf. § 161 b.

(b) Substantives in the accusative (the adverbial case of the Semites, § 118 m), cf. τόν ἀρχήν, δωρεάν, e. g. מִאֵן (might) very, סְפִירָה cessation no more, הַיּוֹם (the day) today (cf. § 126 b), מִרְחָבָה¹ to-morrow, מִרְחָבָה (union) together. Several of these continued to be used, though rarely, as substantives, e. g. סְבִיבִים, plur. circuit, as adverb circum, around; others have quite ceased to be so used, e. g. בָּרוּךְ (length) long ago [Aram.: only in Ec.]; עוֹד (repetition, duration) again or further.

(c) Adjectives, especially in the feminine (corresponding to the Indo-Germanic neuter), e. g. רְאשׁוֹנָה primum, formerly (more frequently בְּרִאשׁוֹנָה, also בְּרִאשׁוֹנָה); רְבָה (rarely בְּרִאשׁוֹנָה); רְבָת [both rare] multum, much, enough; נְפָלָאת wonderfully (properly *mirabilibus*, sc. modis), יְהוּדִית Jewish, i.e. in the Jewish language.

(d) Verbs in the infinitive absolute, especially in *Hiphil* *iṭl*, which are likewise to be regarded as accusatives (§ 113 h), e. g. הַרְבָּה (prop. *a multiplying*) much [frequent], הַרְבָּה [rare and late] in multitude; הַשְׁפֵּט (mane faciendo) early; הַעֲרָבָה (vespere faciendo) in the evening.

(e) Pronouns and numerals, e. g. הָזֶה (prop. *there=at this place*) here, הַזֶּה here, hither (also of time, הַזֶּה עַד־זֶה till now, cf. the late and rare וְעַד־זֶה=זֶה); אַחֲתָה, עַד־זֶה=זֶה (once); אַתָּה עַד־זֶה=זֶה (twice); שְׁבַע עַד־זֶה=זֶה (seven times); מֵאַת עַד־זֶה=זֶה (a hundred times); שְׁנִית (for the second time).

3. Some adverbs are formed by the addition of formative syllables (most frequently מִן-) to substantives or adjectives, e.g. אֲמָנוּם and אֲמָנוּת truly (from אֱמָנוּ אֵת truth); חֲנָם (by favour) gratis (from חָנָה gratia); בְּרִקְמָה in vain, frustra, but also empty, (from בְּרִקְמָה empty, emptiness, vanum), Ru 1:21, parallel with the fem. יוֹמָם מְלָאָה full; מְלָאָה by day (from

¹ Generally derived from the *ptcp. Pu'al* מְרַחֵב m^eōḥēb (=m^eoḥēb) and hence to be read mōḥēb (cf. מְרַחֵב morning); but according to P. Haupt (notes to Esther, p. 159) from יוֹם אַחֲרֵי.

וְיֹמָם¹; with *ô* in the last syllable, מִפְתַּחַם, for פִּתְחַם, *in a twinkling, suddenly* (from עַפְתָּא a *twinkling*, the *ô* being probably obscured from an original *â*).²—Moreover, cf. אֲחֵרֶתֶת backward, and כַּדְרֶתֶת darkly attired, Mal 3:14. In both these cases, the formative syllable *an* has been first attached to the stem, and then the feminine ending *īth*, which is elsewhere used to form adverbs, has been added to it.

The termination מְ־ occurs also in the formation of substantives, e. g. אַיִלָּמָן *porch*, and hence the above adverbs may equally well be regarded as nouns used adverbially, so that מְ־, מְ־, would correspond to نَّـ, وَـ (§ 85, Nos. 53, 54), cf. מְבִפְתַּחַם (with prep.) *suddenly*, 2 Ch 29:36. According to others, this *am* is an obsolete accusative ending, to be compared with the indeterminate accusative sing. in *ān* in Arabic.

4. A number of forms standing in very close relation to the demonstrative pronoun may be regarded as primitive adverbs, since they arise directly from a combination of demonstrative sounds. Some of these have subsequently suffered great mutilation, the extent of which, however, can now very rarely be ascertained with certainty. Such are e. g. אֲנוֹ *then*, הָנָה *here* (according to Barth, *Sprachwiss. Abhandlungen*, p. 16, formed from the two demonstrative elements *hin* and *na*), בַּנְּוּ *thus* (cf. יְכַהֵּא, אֲנָה, how?), נִזְנָא *only*, אַכְנָא *truly* (on all these adverbs, see the Lexicon), and especially the interrogative הָ (Hē interrogativum), e. g. אָלָה (Dt 3:11 הָלָה nonne?, מִנְמָה num etiam?). This *Hē interrogativum* is perhaps shortened from הָלָה, which is still used in Arabic, and, according to the view of a certain school of Masoretes, occurs also in Hebrew in Dt 32:6.¹

The ה interrogative takes—(1) *Hateph-Palhaḥ* generally before non-gutturals (even before ר), with a firm vowel, e. g. הָמַשְׁתָּה *hast thou set?* see the interrogative clause, § 150 c (but Lv 10:19 is an exception).

(2) Before a consonant with Šewâ, usually *Pathaḥ* without a following *Dageš forte*, e. g. Gn 27:38, cf. 18:17, 29:5, 30:15, 34:31; less frequently (in about ten passages), *Pathaḥ* with a following *Dageš forte*, e. g. הַבְּךָנָה *num in via*, Ez 20:30, הַלְּבָנָה Gn 17:17, 18:21, 37:32, Nu 13:19, Jb 23:6; even in ר, 1 S 10:24, 17:25, 2 K 6:32.

(3) Before gutturals, not pointed with either *Qameṣ* or *Hateph-Qameṣ*, it takes *Pathaḥ*, e. g. הַאֲלֹךְ *shall I go?*, הַנְּאָמֵן *num tu?*, מִנְמָה *num si*; Mal 1:13; also in Ju 6:31 read הַנְּאָמֵן (not אֲמֵן), likewise הַ in Ju 12:5, Jer 8:19, Neh 6:11.—In שְׁאָמֵן Nu 16:22, the Masora intends

1 1 Is this מְ־ an instance of the locative or temporal termination (cf. especially צְהָרָם) mentioned in § 88 c? Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xl. p. 721, considers מְיֻמָּן a secondary substantival form (used adverbially like נִילָה noctu), corresponding to the Phoenician and Aramaic מִמְמָ, Syr. *imāmā*; cf. on the other hand, König, ii. 255, who follows Olshausen in maintaining that the *ām* is an adverbial termination.

2 2 מְיֻמָּן *silent* (an adjective in Is 47:5, La 3:26; a substantive in Hb 2:19), which was formerly included under this head, is better taken, with Barth (*Nominal-bildung*, p. 352, Rem. 2), as a participle formed like בְּבָבָ, שְׂוָלָ, עַזְלָ, so that מְיֻמָּן (perhaps assimilated to דְּמָה) stands for original דְּמָה.

1 1 The separation of the ה at the beginning of Dt 32:6, expressly noticed by Qimḥi (ed. Rittenb., p. 40 b) as an unique instance, is perhaps a protest against admitting a particle הָל.

the article; read **הַקְרִיב**, and cf. Dt 20:19; in Ec 3:21 read **הַעֲלֵת** and **הַקְרִיב**; the article is a correction due to doctrinal considerations.

(4) The ה takes *S'ghol* before gutturals pointed with *Qameṣ* or (as in Ju 9:9 ff.) *Hateph-Qameṣ*, e.g. מִזְבֵּחַ Mi 2:7; יְהֹוָה Jb 21:4; בְּעֵד הָנֶשֶׁב Jo 1:2; וְיַעֲשֶׂה Gn 24:5 (cf. the analogous instances in § 22 c, § 35 k, § 63 k). The place of this interrogative particle is always at the beginning of the clause [but see Jb 34:31, Neh 13:27, Jer 22:15, where one or more words are prefixed for emphasis].

5. Some adverbs occur also in connexion with suffixes, thus יִשְׁבָּךְ *thou art there*, 3rd sing. masc. יִשְׁנָנוּ² (but see note below), 2nd plur. masc. אַיְמָדָם *I am not*, 2nd sing. אַיְמָדָךְ, fem. אַיְמָדָה, 3rd sing. fem. אַיְמָדָת, 2nd plur. masc. אַיְמָדָתִים.—Also עֹזֶךְ *I am yet* only in עֹזֶיךְ (מֵעֹזֶךְ, עֹזֶיךְ, עֹזֶיךְ) and בָּעֹזֶיךְ *only in* בָּעֹזֶיךְ (La 4:17 *Q'reh*; *K'rh.*; the oriental school [see above, p. 38, note ²] recognize only the reading עֹזֶיךְ).—Also אַיְמָת *where art thou?*, אַיְמָתָה *where is he?*, אַיְמָתִים *where are they?* The same applies to אַיְמָתָה (הַנֵּה) and הַנֵּה (הַנֵּה) *behold!* (prop. *here, here is*; see § 105 b), only in Gn 19:2: with suffixes, once הַנֵּה בְּנִי (Gn 22:7 with *Munaḥ*), in pause הַנֵּה בְּנִי (here am I), (pause הַנֵּה הוּא and הַנֵּה הוּא, both very rare), behold me (here am I), (in pause הַנֵּה נָנוּ, הַנֵּה נָנוּ; [see more fully in the Lexicon, p. 243].

§ 101. *Prepositions.*

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 494 ff.

1. All words, which by usage serve as prepositions, were originally substantives, viz.:

2 2 This form, which occurs in Dt 29:14, 1 S 14:39, 23:23, Est 3:8, is textually very doubtful, and cannot be supported by the equally doubtful קָבְנָה (for קָבֵן) Nu 23:13. Most probably, with Stade, *Gramm.*, § 370 b, and P. Haupt, *SBOT. Numbers*, p. 57, line 37, we should read קָבְנִי.

² The most important of these differences are, (a) those between the Orientals, i. e. the scholars of the Babylonian Schools, and the Occidentals, i. e. the scholars of Palestine (Tiberias, &c.); cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 197 ff.; (b) amongst the Occidentals, between Ben-Naphtali and Ben-Asher, who flourished in the first half of the tenth century at Tiberias; cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 241 ff. Both sets of variants are given by Baer in the appendices to his critical editions. Our printed editions present uniformly the text of Ben-Asher, with the exception of a few isolated readings of Ben-Naphtali, and of numerous later corruptions.

(a) Substantives in the accusative and in the construct state, so that the noun governed by them is to be considered as in the genitive, and in Arabic actually has the genitive ending, cf. in German *statt dessen*, *kraft dessen*, in Greek τούτου χάριν, in Latin *huius rei causa*, or *gratia*, *montis instar*.¹ Cf. אַחֲר (hinder part*) *behind, after* (*Miləēl* in Lv 14:36, Dt 21:13, 1 S 10:5; אֶת־בָּרְךָנִהְיָה 2 Ch 32:9); אֶל (side) *close by; בין* (intermediate space*) *between; בְּעֵד* (distance²) *behind, around; זֹלֶת*, or with *Hireq compaginis* זֹולֶת (removal, want) *except; בְּעֵן* (purpose) *on account of; מִלְּאָמָר* (only in Dt 1:1) *before, over against; מִן* (separation; cf. § 119 v) *from, out of; גָּדָע* (coming in front, that which is over against) *before, over against; עַד* (progress, duration*) *during, until; עַל* (height, upper part*) *upon, over; עַם* (connexion?) *with; it is doubtful whether this is to be derived from the same stem as לְעַמָּת, עַמָּת near, beside, like; תְּחִת* (under part*) *under, instead of.*

(b) Substantives in the construct state, but to be regarded as in the genitive, since they depend on prepositions (especially the inseparable), e. g. לְפָנֵי (in the face of*) *before; כְּפִי*, כְּפִי (according to the mouth, i.e. the command of*) *according to; בְּגָלֵל* (in the concern of) *on account of; לְפָנֵן* (for the purpose of) *on account of.*

2. Substantives used adverbially very frequently become prepositions in this way, e. g. בְּאֵסֶס, בְּאֵין, בְּלֹתִי, מְבָלִי, בְּכָלִי, בְּכָלִי. During; בְּדִי, בְּדִי (according to the requirement of) *for, according to.*

§ 102. Prefixed Prepositions.

1. Of the words mentioned in § 101, מִן *from, out of*, frequently occurs as a prefix (§ 99 c), with its *Nün* assimilated to the following consonant (by means of *Dageš forte*), e.g. מִי עָר *out of a forest.*

Rem. The separate מִן (always with a following *Maqqeph*) is usual (but not necessary, cf. Ju 20:14 with verse 15, Ez 43:6, &c.) only before the article, e. g. מִן־הַצָּבָא, and sometimes occurs before the softer consonants, e. g. מִן־בְּנֵי Jer 44:18; Jo 1:12, 1 Ch 5:18; cf. Ex 18:14, Lv 1:14, 14:30, Ju 7:23, 10:11, 19:16, Ps 104:7 (2 K 23:36 before ר; also before נ in Ps 18:49), and elsewhere in the later books (as in Aramaic¹); there is besides a poetic by-form מִנְיָה (cf. § 90 m) and מִנְיָה Is 30:11. Its form is most commonly מִן with a following *Dagesh*, which may, however, be omitted in letters which have Šwā (cf. § 20 m). With a following ה the מ is, as a rule, contracted to מִין, e. g. מִינִי or מִינִי (but cf. מִינִישָׁנִי Dn 12:2; תְּמִינָה 2 Ch 20:11); before gutturals it becomes מִן (according to § 22 c), e. g. מִן־אָזְמָן, מִן־עַמָּם; before ה the מ occurs with the guttural virtually sharpened in מִיחִיזָה *on the outside*, and in מִחוֹזָה Gn 14:23; before ה the מ (cf. § 28 b and § 63 q). The closed syllable here is inconsistent with the required virtual

¹ In the examples which follow, the meaning of the noun is added in parentheses, and, when it is actually in use [though it is mostly in such cases very rare], is marked with an asterisk.—On a similar use in other languages, see W. von Humboldt, *Über die Kawisprache*, iii, p. 621.

² So also J. Hoch de Long, *Die hebr. Präpos.* בְּעֵד, Lpz. 1905.

¹ König, *Einleitung ins A. T.*, p. 393 (cf. also the almost exhaustive statistics in his *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 292 ff.), enumerates eight instances of מִן before a word without the article in 2 Samuel and Kings, and forty-five in Chronicles.

sharpening of the ה; probably הַיּוֹת הַ is merely due to the analogy of הַיּוֹת הַ); similarly Is 14:3 before ר; but in 1 S 23:28, 2 S 18:16 מְרֻד הַ is to be read, according to § 22 s.

2. There are also three other particles, the most commonly used prepositions and the particle of comparison, which have been reduced by abbreviation (§ 99 c) to a single prefixed consonant with Šwā (but see below, and § 103 e), viz.:

בָ [poet. בָמָו] *in, at, with.*

לְ [poet. לִמְוֹ] *towards, (belonging) to, for, Lat. ad.*

כְ [poet. כָמָו] *like, as, according to* (no doubt the remnant of a substantive with the meaning of *matter, kind, instar*).

With regard to the pointing it is to be observed that—

(a) The Šwā mobile, with which the above prefixes are usually pronounced, has resulted from the weakening of a short vowel (an original ā, according to f²); the short vowel is regularly retained before Šwā: before Šwā simplex in the form of an ī, attenuated from ā: before a Ḥateph the prefix takes the vowel of the Ḥateph, e. g. לְפָרִי *for fruit*, אֲרִי *as a lion*, בָּזָן *in affliction* (sometimes with the syllable subsequently closed, cf. § 28 b, and the infinitives with ל § 63 i): before weak consonants it follows the rule given in § 24 c, e. g. לְיַהְוָה *for God*. When the prefixes בָ, נָ, כָ, לָ, precede weak consonants it follows the rule given in § 24 c, e. g. בָּאֵל *to say*, for בָּאֵל, &c. (once also in the sing. לְאֵל הָבָדָה *Hb 1:11*); also regularly לְאֵם רָאֵם *to say*, for רָאֵם, see § 23 d.

(b) When the prefixes precede the article, the ה is almost always dropped, and they take its vowel. See further in § 35 n.

(c) Immediately before the tone-syllable, i.e. before monosyllables and dissyllables with the tone on the penultima (in the fore-tone), they take *Qameṣ* (undoubtedly a lengthening of an original ā, cf. § 26 e, § 28 a), but only in the following cases:

(aa) לְ before infinitives of the above-mentioned forms, as לְתַתָּה *to give*, לְדִין *to judge*, לְבִזּוּ *to plunder*, לְגַזֵּל *to shear*, לְחַזֵּק *to keep a festival*, לְלַקְּחַת *to bring forth*, לְלַקְּחַת *to go*, לְלַקְּחַת *to take*, except when the infinitive (as a *nomen regens*) is closely connected with another word (especially its subject, § 115 e), and consequently, as being in a sort of *constr. state*, loses the principal tone, e. g. לְצַאת *Ex 19:1*, לְשַׁבַּת *Gn 16:3*, and so always לְבָאֵת *Nu 13:21*, &c. (in such cases as לְבִזּוּ *Ex 5:21* the ā is protected by the secondary tone; before infinitives of verbs יַעַשֵּׂה, the לְ is retained even in close connexion; cf. Ez 21:20, 25, 22:3);

(bb) before many pronominal forms, e. g. בָּזָה (so also in 1 S 21:10; not בָּזָה), לְזָה (so also in 1 S 21:10; not בָּזָה), לְזָה (in close connexion, however, לְזָה Gn 2:23; בָּזָה Gn 45:23); בָּאֵת *as these*; an especially בָּאֵת *Ez 21:20*, בָּאֵת *Ez 21:25*, בָּאֵת *Ez 22:3*, see § 103 e;

² Jerome (see Siegfried, ZAW. iv. 79) almost always represents בָ by *ba*.

³ Gesenius, F. W. (2003). *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar* (E. Kautzsch & S. A. E. Cowley, Ed.) (2d English ed.) (Page 278). Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

(cc) הַ before monosyllables or fore-toned nouns in such combinations as פֶה לְפָה mouth to month, 2 K 10:21, בֵין מִים לֹא יָמַר between waters and waters, Gn 1:6; רַחֲלַת for a trouble, Is 1:14, but always before the principal pause. The instructive example in Dt 17:8 also shows that the punctuation הַ is only possible with at least the lesser pause after it; in Is 28:10, 13 the הַ is twice repeated, even before the small and smallest disjunctives;

(dd) in certain standing expressions, which have become stereotyped almost as adverbs, e.g. לְעוֹלָה to eternity, בְּרִאַת in multitude, שְׁמֵדָה in security, לְעוֹלָה to eternity, but לְכָל נְצָחִים to all eternity, Is 34:10. Cf. also שְׁמֵדָה for the dead, Lv 19:28, Nu 5:2, 9:10.

(d) With the interrogative **הַ** they are pointed as in **הַבָּ**; in *pause* and before **וְ** as in **הַבָּ** *by what?* (before a following relative clause, as in Ec 3:22, **הַמָּ**; cf. Delitzsch, *Jesaias*, 4th ed., on Is 2:22); **הַכָּ** *how much?* but also **הַכָּ** 1 K 22:16, in close connexion, and at a greater distance from the *pause*. The *S'ghôl* in these forms arises from a modification of the original **ă**, while the **וְ** is sharpened in order to maintain the original **ă** of the prefixes.

When הַ (prop. *la*) is united to הָאָ, it takes, according to § 49 f, g, the form הָאָהַ (Jb 7:20 *הָאָהַ*, 1 S 1:8 *הָאָהַ* הַ, all *Mil el*, and hence the *a* in the tone is lengthened to *ā*) *for what? why?* Before the gutturals נ, ת, ע, ח הַנְּ is used for euphonic reasons (exceptions 1 S 28:15, 2 S 14:31, Jer 15:18, before ת; 2 S 2:22, Ps 49:6, before נ); הָאָהַ, however, remains before ת. Before letters which are not gutturals, הַנְּ is found in Ps 42:10, 43:2 (immediately after a tone-syllable).

§ 103. Prepositions with Pronominal Suffixes and in the Plural Form.

1. As all prepositions were originally nouns (§ 101) in the accusative, they may be united with the noun-suffixes (§ 91 b–l), e. g. אַצְלִי (prop. at my side) *by me*, אַפְנֵי (in my proximity) *with me*, תַּחֲנֹתָם (in their place) *instead of them*, like the Latin *mea causa, for my sake*.

Rem. 1. The preposition **את** (usually **אַתָּה**) *near, with*, is distinguished from **את** (see below, and § 117 a, note 4), the sign of the definite accusative (§ 117 a), in its connexion with suffixes, by a difference of pointing, the former making אַתְךָ, אַתְּךָן, in *pause* אַתְּךָ, 2nd fem. (Is 54:10 אַתְּךָוּ, אַתְּךָם, אַתְּךָנִי) (also in the later books, especially in Kings, and always in Jer. and Ezek., incorrectly אַתְּחִי *with me; from thee*, 1 K 20:25; מֵאַתְּחָוּ *from him*, 1 K 22:7; אַתְּחִים *with them*), while the

¹ Another vox memor. is all is hidden in him.

latter retains its *ô* (obscured from *â*) before the light suffixes, but before grave suffixes is pointed with *S^gghôl*. This *S^gghôl* is to be explained, with Praetorius, *ZDMG*. Iv. 369 f., as the modification of an *ă* which again was shortened from original *â* (in *âthî*, *aîhô*, &c.) in a closed syllable (*ăth-hem*, &c.). The same shortening and modification of the original *â* takes place before words in close connexion, hence לְאַתְּ, &c. When not in close connexion, the toneless נִקְּשׁוּ becomes tone-long, e. g. את הַשָּׁמֶן Gn 1:1. Hence the following forms arise:—

	Sing.	Plur.
1. c. <i>me.</i>	אַתִּי אתִי	<i>us.</i> אַתָּנוּ אתָנוּ
2. m. <i>thee</i>	אַתְּ pause אַתְּ אתְ pause אתְ	<i>you.</i> אַתְּכֶם אתְכֶם you.
f.	אַתְּ אתְ
3. m. <i>him.</i>	אֲ�תוֹ אתֹ	<i>them.</i> אֲתָהֶם, rarely אֲתָהָם אתָהֶם, rarely אתָהָם
f. <i>her.</i>	אֲתָהָה אתָהָה

Less common are the plene forms אָזְתָּךְ, אָזְתִּי (Nu 22:33 אֲזֶכְה before ה), אָזְתָּךְ (Ex 29:35; אָזְתָּם, אָזְתָּנוּ אָזְתָּה אָזְתוֹ אָזְתָּךְ), and אָזְתָּךְם (Jos 23:15; for אָזְתָּם, אָזְתָּךְם, אָזְתָּנוּ אָזְתָּה אָזְתוֹ אָזְתָּךְ, five times אָזְתָּה אָזְתָּךְ (Gn 32:1, Ex 18:20, &c.), and in Ez 23:45 אָזְתָּה אָזְתָּךְ (Gn 19:8, &c. [13 times]), אָזְתָּה אָזְתָּךְ (only found in Ez 16:54; Ex 35:26 אָזְתָּה אָזְתָּךְ; Ez 34:21 אָזְתָּה אָזְתָּךְ), and אָזְתָּה אָזְתָּךְ Ez 23:47.—No instance of the 2nd fem. plur. אָזְתָּנָה occurs in the O. T.; in Cant 2:7, &c., אָזְתָּנָה is used instead.

2. The preposition **עם-** (*with* (with suffixes on the model of stems עַיְ, עַמִּי, עַמִּים) [1 S 1:26 עַפְקָה עַמְּכָה], in *pause* עַמְּךָ; 2nd fem. עַמְּתָה עַמְּתָה) is united with the suffixes נָם, קָם, and by a (pretonic) *Qameṣ*, which causes the sharpening of the *Mêm* to be distinctly audible: עַמְּנָה, עַמְּמָה (so in Nu 22:12, Dt 29:16, both in principal pause, and often in very late passages, otherwise עַמְּמָה is generally used). In the first person, besides עַמִּי, we also find עַמְּדִי (probably from original עַנְדִּי; cf. Arab. **inda**, beside, with).

3. It is but seldom that prepositions occur with verbal suffixes, as תְּחַת נִי 2 S 22:37, 40, 48 (for which Ps 18:37, 40, 48 תְּחַתִּי), בְּעֵד נִי Gn 2:21 and בְּשׁוֹפֵט נִי Ps 139:11 (here probably for the sake of the rhyme with יְשׁוֹפֵט נִי).¹

2. When pronominal suffixes are added to the prefixes (§ 102), there appears occasionally, especially in the case of the shorter suffixes, an endeavour to lengthen the preposition, so as to give it more strength and body. Hence to **ة** is appended the syllable **ةن** (see below, k), and **ة** and **ةن** take at least a full vowel, **ةن** and **ةن** (§ 102 d, f).—The following deviations from the analogy of the noun with suffixes are to be noticed

ZDMG. *ZDMG.* = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz.
1846 ff since 1903 ed by A. Fischer

¹ *Fi-ni* and *bi-ni* (in me), in vulgar Arabic for *fiyya* and *bi*, are compared by Socin. Brockelmann, ZA. xiv. 347, note 1, suggests that they are later formations on the model of מִנְיָה when its origin from the reduplication of the preposition had become obscured, but see below, m.

(a) in the pausal forms בְּקָרָא, אַפְּקָרָא, עֲמָקָרָא (not *bekhā*, &c.); (b) in the similar forms with the suffix of the 2nd sing. fem. (not *bekh*, &c.) and in נָנוּ, בָּנוּ, עָנוּ, &c. (not *bēnū*, &c.).

(a) לְ with Pronominal Suffixes.

Sing.	Plur.
1. c. to me. לִי	to us. לָנוּ
2. m. to thee. לְךָ f. לְךָה	to you. לָכֶם לְכָנָה [לְכָן] ²
3. m. to him. לוּ	to them לָמוּ poet. לְהָמָה, לְהָמָם [53 times] ³
f. to her. להָ	לְהָמָה, לְהָמָם ⁴

בָּ, takes suffixes in the same manner: בָּבָי (Ex 7:29, 2 S 22:30, Ps 141:8, as in Gn 27:37, 2 S 18:22, Is 3:6 לְכָה [for 2nd fem. לְקָה the *K^ethibh* occurs in 2 K 4:2, Ct 2:13, cf. § 91 e]), בָּוּ, &c.; except that for the 3rd plur., besides בָּמָם (especially in the later books) and בָּהָה (only in Ex 30:4, 36:1, Hb 1:16; הָהָה only in Jer 14:16), the form בָּמָם is also used; and for the feminine, besides בָּהָה (three times), בָּהָן is found fifteen times, and בָּהָן only in 1 S 31:7, Is 38:16, Ez 42:14.—According to the Masora, אַלְמָא is found fifteen times for לוּ (as conversely in 1 S 2:16, 20:2 for לְאַלְמָא), e.g. Ex 21:8, 1 S 2:3, Is 9:2, Ps 100:3 (and, as has been conjectured, also Jb 41:4); cf. Delitzsch on Ps 100:3.—In Nu 32:42, Zc 5:11, Ru 2:14, the Masora requires הָהָה instead of הָהָה (in all three places before a following tone-syllable; cf. § 23 k, and the analogous cases of the loss of *Mappiq* in § 58 g, § 91 e).

(b) מְ with Pronominal Suffixes.

2² does not occur in the O. T., by a mere accident, no doubt; Ez 13:18 לְכָנָה.

3³ The question whether מוּמָא can also stand for the sing. לוּ, which Rödiger and recently W. Diehl (*Das Pronomen pers. suff. ... des Hebr.*, p. 20 f.) and P. Haupt (*SBOT*. on Pr 23:20, a contraction of *la-humū*) have altogether denied, must be answered in the affirmative unless we conclude with Diehl and Haupt that *all* the instances concerned are due to corruptions of the text. It is true that in such places as Gn 9:26, 27, Dt 33:2, Is 30:5, Ps 73:10 (all *in* or immediately before the principal pause; in Dt 33:2 with *Zaqeph qatōn* at least) מוּמָא can be better explained as plural (in reference to collective nouns); and in Is 53:8 for מוּמָא גַּעַלְתָּה we should read with the LXX μέματος γεγάγα. On the other hand, in Is 44:15 its explanation as plural would be extremely forced. Even then there would remain—presuming the traditional text to be correct—Ps 11:7 and מוּמָא יְמִינֵךְ Jb 27:23, as well as פְּנִימֵינוּ, three times, Jb 20:23, 27:23 (beside יְמִינֵךְ), and especially Jb 22:2. In all these places the most extreme exegetical artifices can only be avoided by simply admitting a singular suffix (= פְּנִימֵינוּ, פְּנִימֵינוּ).—On the question of the antiquity of the suffixes in מוּ see § 91 l.

4⁴ The form לְהָן in Ru 1:13 is Aramaic (=therefore).

	Sing.	Plur.
1. c. <i>as I.</i>	כִּי מַנְיָה ⁵	כִּי מַנְיָה
2. m. <i>as thou.</i>	כִּי מַנְיָה ⁵	כִּי מַנְיָה, כִּי כְּם, rarely
f.
3. m. <i>as he.</i>	כִּי מַנְיָה	כִּי מַנְיָה, [כִּי מַנְיָה, כִּי כְּם]
f. <i>as she.</i>	כִּי מַנְיָה	[כִּי מַנְיָה,]

(c) נִגְעָר with Pronominal Suffixes.

	Sing.	Plur.
1. c. <i>from me.</i>	מִנְעָר poet. מִנְעָר [4 times], in <i>pause</i> also מִנְעָר [6 times]	מִנְעָר
2. m. <i>from thee.</i>	מִנְעָר, in <i>pause</i> מִנְעָר	מִנְעָר
f.	מִנְעָר	מִנְעָר
3. m. <i>from him.</i>	מִנְעָר, Jb 4:12 in pause מִנְעָר, מִנְעָר or מִנְעָר: see below]	מִנְעָר [twice], Jb 11:20 מִנְעָר [7 times]
f. <i>from her.</i>	מִנְעָר	מִנְעָר

The syllable מִנְיָה (in Arabic *mâ* مَا=Heb. מַנְיָה *what*) in (probably from כִּי מַנְיָה אֵנִי *I*, prop. according to what I, for as I) is, in poetry, appended to the three simple prefixes קִי, קִי, לִי, even without suffixes, so that מִנְיָה, קִי מִנוֹן, לִי מִנוֹן appear as independent words, equivalent in meaning to קִי, קִי, לִי. Poetry is here distinguished from prose by the use of longer forms; in the case of מִנְיָה, on the other hand, it prefers the shorter, which resemble the Syriac and Arabic.

The form כִּי, enclosed in brackets above, occurs only in [2 K 17:15](#) (in *pause*), נִגְעָר only in [Jer 36:32](#) (in *pause*); כִּי (Baer following Qimhi כִּי) only in [Ez 18:14](#). Cf. Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 234 ff.—For כִּי as *ye*, Qimhi requires כִּי כְּם (invariably or only in [Jb 16:4?](#)); in [Jos 1:15](#), [Ju 8:2](#), [Ezr 4:2](#) Baer gives כִּי.

With regard to מִנְיָה with suffixes, מִנְיָה from *me* is usually explained as arising, by a reduplication of מִנְיָה, from an original מִנְיָה, just as מִנְיָה from *him*, from מִנְיָה-הָוּ, identical in

⁵ The use of מִנְיָה here for כִּי (cf. above, d) might be due to euphonic reasons.—כִּי מִנְיָה (defectively) only in the Pentateuch, כִּי מִנְיָה Ex 15:11.

form with מִנּוּ נָא¹ from us, from מִנּה נָא¹ from her, goes back to מְנוֹנָה. Far simpler, however, is Mayer Lambert's explanation (*REJ.* xxiii. 302 ff.), that מִנּוּ נָא¹, &c., have arisen from מִנּוּי, &c., and that the forms of the suffixes are to be explained on the analogy of אֵין נָא¹, אֵין נָא¹, נָא¹ תְּמִתָּה, § 100 o.—The bracketed form נָא¹ הַנָּא¹, for which Baer, following Qimḥi and others, writes הַנָּא¹, occurs only in *Ps 68:24*, and is there regarded by Delitzsch, Hupfeld, and others (following Simonis) as a substantive (פָּרָה=portion). The expression מְנִיהוּ נָא¹ (for מְנִיהוּ נָא¹??) *Is 18:2, 7* is very strange.—מְנִיה¹ occurs only in *Jer 10:2, Ec 12:12 (Jb 11:20)* מְנִיחָה¹; מְנִיחָה¹ (so Baer and Ginsburg, following the best authorities, instead of the ordinary reading מְנִיחָה¹) only in *Ez 16:47, 52*.

3. Several prepositions, especially those which express relations of space and time, are (like the German *wegen*) properly plural nouns (for the reason, see § 124 a), and are, therefore, joined with the pronominal suffixes in the form of the plural *construct state*, just like other plural nouns (§ 91 g). On the other hand, the apparent connexion of אֶלְיָהּ, עַדְיָהּ, עַלְיָהּ with plural suffixes is explained from the ground-forms of those prepositions (from stems אֶלְיָהּ, עַדְיָהּ, עַלְיָהּ contracted to אֶלְיָי, עַדְיָי, עַלְיָי, &c.).¹

Without suffixes these prepositions are—

אַחֲר, more frequently אַחֲרִי (prop. *hinder parts*) *behind, after*.

אֶלְיָהּ,² poet. [4 times in Job] also אֶלְיָי (region, direction), *towards, to, according to*.

בֵּין (interval) *between*; the suffixes indicating the singular are added to the singular בֵּין, thus בֵּינָךְ, בֵּינָךְ, &c. (*Gn 16:5* בֵּין יְךָ, בֵּין, בֵּין, &c.), the second *Yôdh* is, however, marked with a point as critically doubtful; בֵּינוּ, which occurs three times, is only the Masoretic *Q're* for בֵּינוּ, which is found e.g. in *Gn 30:36*). On the other hand, the suffixes indicating a plural are attached to the plural forms or בֵּינוֹת.

סְבִיבָה (circuit) *around*, as a preposition, always has the plural form, sometimes masc. סְבִיבָךְ, &c. [10 times], but much more frequently in the few. סְבִיבָות (surroundings). In *Ez 43:17* סְבִיב אֲזֻתָּה is a corruption of תְּמִתָּה; [in *1 K 6:5* סְבִיב אֲזֻתָּה תְּמִתָּה, &c., also is so contrary to usage, that it must be due to some textual error].

¹ The Babylonian Masora writes מִנּוּ נָא¹ (to distinguish it from the 3rd sing.), which is justly blamed by Ibn Ezra.

² *REJ.* = *Revue des Études Juives*. Paris, 1880 ff.

¹ The reference of these forms to original plurals has been again expressly supported by De Lagarde, *Sygmicta*, ii. 101 ff.; *Nachrichten der G. g. G.*, 1881, p. 376, cf. *Mittheilungen*, 1884, p. 63; also *GGA*. 1884, p. 280 f. According to Barth, *ZDMG*. xlvi. p. 348 ff., and *Nominalbildung*, p. 375 ff., תְּמִתָּה, תְּמִתָּה, &c., was only formed on the analogy of תְּמִתָּה, &c., and אֲזֻתָּה, אֲזֻתָּה, &c., only on the analogy of לְפִנֵּי, לְפִנֵּי, &c., since the real plural forms ought to be תְּמִתָּה, תְּמִתָּה, אֲזֻתָּה, אֲזֻתָּה, &c.; cf., however, König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 305 f.

² On the use of this particle see § 119 g.

עד- (*continuation, duration*, from **עדָה** *as far as, unto*, poet. [12 times]. In Jb 32:12 **עַד־דִּכְמָם**, with the *ā* retained in the secondary tone, is abnormal. Also in 2 K 9:18 for **עַד־הֶם** read **עַד־הָם**.

על- (*upon, over* (cf. the rare subst. **עלָלָה** *height* [see Lexicon], from **עַלְלָה** *to ascend*), poet. [40 times, and 2 *Q're*].

under (prop. *what is beneath*). On **תְּחִתָּה נִי**, &c.; cf. above, d.

With Suffixes.

1	<i>Sing.</i>	אֲחֵרִי	בֵּיןִי	סֹבֵבִי	פְּתַחְתִּי	אֶלְיִ	עַדְיִ	עַלְיִ
		(<i>after me</i>)	(<i>between me</i>)	(<i>around me</i>)	(<i>beneath me</i>)	(<i>to me</i>)	(<i>unto me</i>)	(<i>on me</i>)
2	<i>S. m.</i>	אֲחֵרִיךְ	בֵּיןְךָ	סֹבֵבְךָ	פְּתַחְתְּךָ	אֶלְיךָ	עַדְךָ	עַלְיךָ
2	<i>S. f.</i>	אֲחֵרִיךְ			סֹבֵבְיךָ &	אֶלְיךָ		עַלְיךָ
3	<i>S. m.</i>	אֲחֵרִיו	בֵּינוֹ	סֹבֵבָתוֹ	פְּתַחְתוֹ	אֶלְיוֹ	עַדְיוֹ	עַלְיוֹ
3	<i>S. f.</i>	אֲחֵרִיהָ		סֹבֵבְיהָ &	פְּתַחְתְּיהָ	אֶלְיהָ	עַדְיהָ	עַלְיהָ
1	<i>Plur.</i>	אֲחֵרִינוּ	בֵּינוּ	סֹבֵבָינוּ	פְּתַחְתוּנוּ	אֶלְינוּ	עַדְינוּ	עַלְינוּ
			¹ בֵּינּוֹתִינוּ &					
2	<i>Pl. m.</i>	אֲחֵרִיכֶם	בֵּינְיכֶם	סֹבֵבְותִיכֶם	פְּתַחְתִיכֶם	אֶלְיכֶם	עַדְיכֶם	עַלְיכֶם
3	<i>Pl. m.</i>	אֲחֵרִיהם	בֵּינְיהם	סֹבֵבְותִיהם	פְּתַחְתִיהם	אֶלְיהם	[עַדְיהם]	עַלְיהם
			בֵּינוֹתָם &	סֹבֵבָם	פְּתַחְתָם	אֶלְתָם &	[עַלְתָם] ²	
3	<i>Pl. f.</i>	אֲחֵרִינוֹ		סֹבֵבָתָם	פְּתַחְתָתָם	אֶלְתָתָם		עַלְתָתָם

¹ As Mayer Lambert observes, usage (cf. esp. Gn 26:28) distinguishes between the two forms: **בֵּינוּ**, means *between us and you*, whereas (**בֵּינוּ** before 28) means *between us on the one side*.

² The poetical form **אֶלְתָם** only in Ps 2:5; **עַלְתָם**, on which see note 3 on f, 12 times [viz. Dt 32:23, Ps 5:12, 55:16, 64:9, Jb 6:16, 20:23, 21:17, 22:2, 27:23, 29:22, 30:2, 5].

§ 104. *Conjunctions.*

1. The conjunctions serve to connect sentences, and to express their relations one to another. They may be either—

(a) Original pronouns, e.g. the demonstrative **כִּי** *that, because, for.*

(b) Original substantives, which afterwards were reduced to the rank of pronouns, adverbs, or conjunctions; so perhaps **אֲשֶׁר** (see § 36), which is sometimes used to express the general idea of relation, sometimes as a relative pronoun (properly a demonstrative), but in many cases stands simply for **כִּי**; also **אֵלֹּא** (*nothing, that not*); **פֶּגֶן** (*the Greek μή of prohibition*), &c. To these may be added the adverbial combination of substantives with prepositions, e.g. **בְּרִמְנָה** (*in the not yet*) *earlier, before*, for which **רִמְנָה** is also used. On the combination of two particles to express complex ideas (e.g. **אַף־כִּי** *added to this, that=much more*), see the Syntax, § 163 f.

(c) Prepositions, which with the addition of the conjunction **כִּי** or **אֲשֶׁר** together form one single conjunction, e.g. **בִּן עַזְרָאָשֶׁר** *because, prop. on account of the fact that;* **עַזְרָאָשֶׁר**, and more frequently **אַחֲרָאָשֶׁר** *after that;* **אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר**, *according as (with בְּ)*; **עַקְבָּאָשֶׁר** and **עַקְבָּאָשֶׁר** *in consequence of the fact that, for the reason that, because.* Sometimes, however, the conjunction in such cases is omitted, and the preposition itself used as a conjunction, e.g. **עַל־אֲשֶׁר** (*for although*), Jb 16:17.

So, at any rate, according to our linguistic principles. It would, however, be more correct to say, that instead of the intermediary **אֲשֶׁר** the whole of the succeeding sentence is regarded as *one substantival idea*, under the immediate government of the preposition. In the same way, all prepositions governing the gerund in English may be paraphrased by conjunctions with the finite verb, see §§ 114 and 115, *passim*.

2. Besides those already mentioned, there are certain other small words now used as conjunctions, of which the derivation or original meaning is altogether obscure, thus **וְ** *or, -ם if* (also *or* before the second member of a double question), **וְאַ** *also, וְ* *and, and others.*

Rem. The pointing of the **וְ** (originally **וּ**, as still before *Hateph Pathah* and—with a following *Dageš forte*—in *wāw consecutive* of the imperfect; cf. § 49 f) is in many respects analogous to that of the prefixes **בְּ**, **בָּ**, **לְ** (§ 102 d-i), but as being a weak consonant, the *wāw copulative* has some further peculiarities:

(a) Usually it takes simple **Š'wâ** (!).

(b) Before words which begin with a guttural having a *compound Š'wâ*, it takes the vowel with which the **Š'wâ** is compounded (according to § 28 b), e.g. **וְעַבְדִּים**, **וְבָכְתָּךְ** *and be thou wise, and servants,* **וְעַזְזָתְךָ** *and strength,* **וְאָכְלָךְ** *and eat thou,* **וְעַלְלָךְ** *and sickness.* On **וְאַלְלָךְ**, **וְאַלְלָתְךָ**, **וְאַלְלָתְךָ**, &c., see § 102 d; on **וְאַדְנָתְךָ**, &c., see § 102 m; on such cases as **וְעַצְרָךְ** Jb 4:2, cf. § 28 b.

(c) Before words with simple **Š'wâ** under the first consonant (except in the cases under f), the *Wāw* becomes the vowel **û** (cf. § 26 a), e.g. **וְלָכְךָ** *and to all*, so also

(except in the case under *g*) before the cognate labials בּ, מּ, פּ, hence וְלֹךְ. On the cases in which *simple Šwâ* has become a *Hateph* after וְ *copulative* (e.g. Gn 2:12), cf. § 10 g.

(d) With a following וְ the וְ coalesces to form וְ according to § 24 b, as וַיְהִי *and let him be*. On the peculiar punctuation of the *wāw copulative* before forms with initial Šwâ from בְּ *to be* and חַיָּה *to live* (e.g. וְחַיָּה Jos 8:4, וְחַיָּה Gn 20:7), cf. § 63 q.

(e) Immediately before the tone-syllable it frequently takes *QameS*, like לְ (see § 102 f), but in most cases only at the end of a sentence or clause (but cf. also 1 K 22:30), e.g. וְמֵת Ex 21:12 (on the other hand, in verse 20 וְמֵת is in closer logical connexion with what follows); 2 K 7:4 וְמֵתנוּ; Ru 3:3 וְסַבַּת; Ps 10:15 וְעַזְבָּן; 1 S 9:4 וְעַזְבָּן; Ez 47:9 וְלִילְכָּה; cf. also (with *Tiphâha*) Gn 33:13, 2 S 15:12. The very frequent connexion of nouns expressing kindred ideas, by means of וְ, is due simply to considerations of rhythm, for even in such cases the *Wāw* must immediately precede the tone-syllable, which must be marked by a disjunctive accent, e.g. יְהִי יוֹם וְלֹא יְלֹה Gn 1:2, הִי תְּהִלָּה Gn 8:22 (see also the previous examples); Gn 13:14 (thrice); Ex 25:3 וְתִשְׁמַד וְתִשְׁמַד Ps 96:7 וְבָזֶב; Ps 76:7 וְבָזֶב; Gn 7:13 וְתִשְׁמַד וְתִשְׁמַד; Gn 1:8 וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל כִּי thus and thus; Est 1:8 וְכָה וְכָה וְלֹא יָשַׁב at the end of the verse, but in Ps 87:5 אִישׁ וְאִישׁ in spite of the *D'hi* with the second אִישׁ, because it is closely connected with the following predicate. Also with three words פְּתַח וְתַת וְה Is 24:17. On the other hand, the rapid pronunciation וְ occurs before a conjunctive accent (and, when farther removed from the principal pause, even with the smaller disjunctives, in spite of a following tone-syllable), e.g. צְאֵן וְצָדֵק Gn 32:6; cf. Gn 31:40, Lv 7:23, Dt 2:21, and among the examples given above, Gn 7:13 and Ps 76:7. (Exceptions: וְקַדְמָה Gn 13:14, where evidently the וְ is intended to ensure the slow and solemn recitation of the promise, but also וְזַיְף Jos 15:55, וְבָנָן 19:7, 19:25, all immediately before the pause.) For the same rhythmical reason וְ (not וְ) is used regularly with certain monosyllables which, by their nature, lean more closely upon the following word, thus וְזַהֲהָה, וְאַתְּ אַתְּ, וְגַם גַּם, וְאַתְּ אַתְּ if not, with *Zaqeph gadol*, 2 K 5:17), and others.

§ 105. *Interjections.*

1. Among the interjections some (as in all languages) are simply natural sounds, or, as it were, vocal gestures, called forth involuntarily by certain impressions or sensations, e.g. אהָה (Ez 30:2 אהָה), אהָ ah! הָהָהָה aha! (cf. this הָהָ also in אֲהָלִי and אֲהָלִי utinam!), אֲהָה Ex 32:31, &c. (Gn 50:17 אֲהָה ah! (from אהָ and אָהָ), otherwise written הָהָהָה 2 K 20:3, Jn 1:14, Ps 116:4; also סְהָה (in pause סְהָה, even in the plural hold your peace! Neh 8:11 hush! (Am 5:16) הָהָ wo! woe! (Ps 120:5), אֵי אֵי זְהָה (in Ec 4:10; אֵי-לֹךְ 10:16) woe!

2. Others, however, originally expressed independent ideas, and become interjections only by rapid pronunciation and by usage, e.g. הָהָה (אָהָה) or behold! (prop. here); הָהָה behold! (prop. imperative); הָבָה, plur. הָבָה (prop. give, imperative of בָּבָה; as to the tone, cf. § 69 o), come, the Latin age, agite! לְהָהָה (also לְהָהָה), go (prop. go,

imperative of **לֹךְ**) with the same meaning¹; **חַל יָלֶה** *far be it!* (prop. *ad profanum!*) (see the Lexicon) *I beseech, hear me! נָאַזֵּן pray!*¹ used to emphasize a demand, warning, or entreaty, and always placed after the expression to which it belongs.²

THIRD PART

SYNTAX¹

CHAPTER I

THE PARTS OF SPEECH

Syntax of the Verb.

USE OF THE TENSES AND MOODS.²

¹ ¹ **רָאָה** (Dt 1:8), **בָּהִ** and **לְכָה** are also used in connexion with the feminine and the plural, which proves that they have become quite stereotyped as interjections.

¹ ¹ **אָזֶן** serves to express the most various shades of expression, which are discussed in the various parts of the syntax. It is used especially (*a*) after the *imperative*, either in commands or entreaty, see § 110 d; (*b*) with the *imperfect*, either in the cohortative (§ 108 b) or jussive (§ 109 b); (*c*) once with *perfect*, Gn 40:14; (*d*) after various particles: **אָזֶן-הַנֶּה** *behold now*; particularly after the conjunctions **אֲלֹא** and **אָמָ**: **אֲלִי-נָא** *ne quaeso* and **אָס-נָא** *if now*, **אֵלִפְתֵּר**, **אֵלִפְתֵּה if**, in a deprecatory sense, expressive of politeness or modesty. In Nu 12:13 **אָזֶן** stands after a noun; but we ought certainly to read **אֲלִי-אָזֶן**.—In polite language this particle is used constantly in all these ways, Gn 18:3, 4, 19:7, 8, 19, and 50:17.

² ² Against the usual view which regards **אָזֶן** as a hortatory particle (=*up! come!* analogous to the original imperatives **בָּהִ** and **לְכָה** and the Ethiopic **nā** **â**, properly *hither, also come!*), P. Haupt, in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, xiii, no. 114, p. 109, justly observes that we should then expect the particle to be *prefixed* to the imperative, &c. He proposes to describe **אָזֶן** as an emphatic particle. Haupt's suggested identification of this **אָזֶן** with the Assyrian, Arabic, and Ethiopic particle **mā** (which is also an enclitic of emphasis), and ultimately with the interrogative **mā**, we shall not discuss here.

¹ ¹ Recent works on Hebrew syntax are: A. B. Davidson, *Introductory Heb. Gram.*, vol. ii, *Heb. Syntax*, Edinburgh, 1894; Ed. König. *Hist.-compar. Syntax der hebr. Sprache*, Lpz. 1897 (see above, § 3 f). Important contributions to Hebrew syntax are also contained in H. Reckendorf's work *Die syntakt. Verhältnisse des Arab.*, 2 pts., Leiden, 1895, 1898, of which we have already made use in § 97 a. Cf. also the same author's very instructive discussions *Ueber syntakt. Forschung*, Munich, 1899.

² ² Cf. the sketch of the tenses and moods used in Hebrew in § 40; and on the general characteristics of the perfect and imperfect see the note on § 47 a; also Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (Oxford, 1874; 3rd ed. 1892); Bennett, 'Notes on the Use of the Hebrew Tenses' (*Hebraica*, 1886, vols. ii, iii). A partial modification of the accepted definition of the Semitic perfect and imperfect was proposed by J. A. Knudtzon, *Om det saakaldte Perfektum og Imperfektum i Hebraisk*,

§ 106. Use of the Perfect.

The perfect serves to express actions, events, or states, which the speaker wishes to represent from the point of view of completion, whether they belong to a determinate past time, or extend into the present, or while still future, are pictured as in their completed state.

The definition formerly given here ('the perfect serves to express *completed* actions') applies, strictly speaking, only to some of the varieties of the perfect discussed under b-p: hence the above modification based on the arguments of Knudtzon (for the title see note 2, and cf. further § 107 a).

More particularly the uses of the perfect may be distinguished as follows:—

1. To represent actions, events, or states, which, after a shorter or longer duration, were terminated in the past, and hence are finally concluded, viz.:—

(a) Corresponding to the perfect proper in Latin and the English perfect definite, in assertions, negations, confirmations, interrogations, &c., e.g. Gn 18:15 *then Sarah denied, saying, I laughed not* (אַחֲ קֹתֶן לֹא ...); *and he said, Nay, but thou didst laugh* (אַחֲ קֹתֶן); Gn 3:11 מִי הָקִיד לְךָ who told thee? Cf. 3:13, 14, 17, 22. Also pointing to some undefined time in the past, e.g. Is 66:8 מִי־יָשַׁמֵּעַ בְּאֹת who hath (ever yet) heard such a thing?

Rem. In opposition to this express use of the perfect to emphasize the completion of an event, the imperfect is not infrequently used to emphasize that which is still future, e.g. Jos 1:5 *as I was* (הָיָה) *with Moses, so will I be* (הָיָה) *with thee*; Jos 1:17, Ex 10:14, Dt 32:21, 1 K 2:38, Is 46:4, 11, Jo 2:2, Ec 1:9.

(b) As a simple *tempus historicum* (corresponding to the Greek aorist) in narrating past events, e.g. Gn 4:4 *and Abel, he also brought* (הָבִיא), &c.; Gn 7:19 *the waters did prevail* (בָּרָו), &c.; Jb 1:1 *there was a man* (אִישׁ הָיָה) *in the land of Uz*, &c.; even in relating repeated actions, 1 S 18:30.

Rem. As the above examples indicate, the perfect of *narration* occurs especially at the head of an entire narrative (Jb 1:1; cf. Dn 2:1) or an independent sentence (e.g. Gn 7:11, 13), but in co-ordinate sentences, as a rule, only when the verb is separated from the copulative 1 by one or more words (cf. above Gn 4:4 and 7:19). In other cases, the narrative is continued in the imperfect consecutive, according to § 111 a. The direct connexion of the narrative perfect with 1 copulative (not to be confounded with the perfect consecutive proper, § 112) agrees rather with Aramaic syntax (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aram.*, § 71, 1 b). On the examples (which are in many respects doubtful) in the earlier texts, see § 112 pp-uu.

Kristiania, 1890; of which a summary entitled 'Vom sogenannten Perf. und Imperf. im Hebr.' appeared in the *Transactions of the Oriental Congress at Stockholm*, section sémitique b, p. 73 ff. (Leiden, 1893). Cf. also Knudtzon's articles, 'Zur assyrischen und allgemein semitischen Grammatik' in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, especially vi. 422 ff. and vii. 33 ff.

(c) To represent actions, &c., which were already completed in the past, at the time when other actions or conditions took place (pluperfect),¹ e.g. 1 S 28:3 *now Samuel was (long since) dead*² ... and Saul had put away (הִסַּר) those that had familiar spirits ... out of the land. Both these statements, being as it were in parentheses, merely assign a reason for the narrative beginning at verse 6. Cf. 1 S 9:15, 25:21, 2 S 18:18.—Gn 20:18 (*for the Lord had fast closed up, &c.*); 27:30, 31:19, 34, Dt 2:10; and in a negative statement, Gn 2:5 *for the Lord God had not (up to that time) caused it to rain, &c.* This is especially frequent, from the nature of the case, in relative, causal, and temporal clauses, when the main clause contains a tense referring to the past, e.g. Gn 2:2 *and he rested ... from all his work which he had made* (נָשַׁבֵּע); Gn 7:9, 19²⁷, &c.; 29:10 *now when Jacob had seen Rachel* (בְּאֶמְרָת רָאָה) ..., Jacob went near, &c.; so also in clauses which express the completion or incompleteness of one action, &c., on the occurrence of another, as in Gn 24:15, 27:30, &c.; cf. § 164 b, with the note, and c.

2. To represent actions, events, or states, which, although completed in the past, nevertheless extend their influence into the present (in English generally rendered by the present):

(a) Expressing facts which were accomplished long before, or conditions and attributes which were acquired long before, but of which the effects still remain in the present (present perfect), e.g. Ps 10:11 הָסַתֵּיר פָּנָיו *he hath hidden his face (and still keeps it hidden)*; Ps 143:6 פֶּרֶת שְׂפָתִי *I have spread forth my hands (and still keep them spread forth)*. This applies particularly to a large number of perfects (almost exclusively of intransitive¹ verbs, denoting affections or states of the mind) which in English can be rendered only by the present, or, in the case mentioned above under f, by the imperfect.² Thus, יְדַעְתִּי *I know* (prop. *I have perceived, have experienced*) Jb 9:2, 10:13; לֹא יְדַעְתִּי *I know not* Gn 4:9, &c.; on the other hand, e.g. in Gn 28:16, Nu 22:34, the context requires *I knew not*; זָכַר רָנוּ *we remember* Nu 11:5; מָנָה she refuseth Jb 6:7; עָלָז *it exulteth*; שָׁמַע חָתֵת *I rejoice* 1 S 2:1; בְּקַשׁ he requireth Is 1:12; קָנָה יְתִי *I wait* Gn 49:18, Ps 130:5 (parallel with חָפֵץ אַתִּי) (הָזַח, לְתִי); I delight Ps 40:9 (mostly negative, Is 1:11, &c.); אֶחֱבָתִי *I love* Gn 27:4; שָׁנַג אַתִּי *I hate* Ps 31:7; מָאַסְתִּי *I despise* Am 5:21; וְנִזְבַּח *they abhor me* Jb 30:10; בְּטַח קָתֵת *I trust* Ps 25:2; I put my trust Ps 31:2; אֲצַד קָתֵת *I am righteous* Jb 34:5; פָּקַד קָתֵת *I have decided to requite* 1 S 15:2.—We may further include a number of verbs which express bodily characteristics or states, such as גָּדוֹלָתְךָ *thou art great* Ps 104:1; קָטָןְךָ *I am little* Gn 32:11; גָּדוֹלָתְהוּ *they are high* Is 55:9; גָּדוֹלָתְךָ *they stand aloof* Jb 30:10; טָבוֹתְךָ *they are goodly* Nu 24:5; נָאוֹתְךָ *they are*

¹ Cf. P. Haupt in the *Notes on Esther*, 9:2.

² Incorrectly, e.g. in the Vulgate, *Samuel autem mortuus est ... et Saul abstulit magos, &c.*

¹ With regard to the great but very natural preponderance of intransitive verbs (expressing an existing state), cf. the lists in Knudtzon (see above, p. 309, note 2), pp. 117 and 122 in the Danish text.

² Cf. *novi, odi, memini; οἶδα, μέμνημαι, ἔσικα, δέδορκα, κέκραγα*; in the New Testament, ἔλπικα, ἤγαπηκα.

beautiful Is 52:7; זָקֵן עִתִּי *I am old* Gn 18:13; גַּעֲמִי *I am weary* Ps 6:7; שָׁבַע עִתִּי *I am full* Is 1:11, &c.

Rem. To the same category probably belong also the perfects after **Ex 10:3** *how long hast thou already been refusing* (and refusest still ...? which really amounts to *how long wilt thou refuse?*), **Ps 80:5**, **Pr 1:22** (co-ordinate with the imperf.), and after עַד־אָנֶה **Ex 16:28**, **Hb 1:2**.

(b) In direct narration to express actions which, although really only in process of accomplishment, are nevertheless meant to be represented as already accomplished in the conception of the speaker, e.g. תִּהְרֹם I lift up (my hand in ratifying an oath) Gn 14:22; יִשְׁבֶּה עִתִּי I swear Jer 22:5; תִּהְגֹּזֶב I testify Dt 8:19; תִּשְׁבַּח עִתִּי I counsel 2 S 17:11 (but in a different context in ver. 15, *I have counselled*); תִּשְׁפַּט רְשִׁי (prop. *I say*) I decide (*I consider as hereby settled*) 2 S 19:30; I declare Jb 9:22, 32:10.

(c) To express facts which have formerly taken place, and are still of constant recurrence, and hence are matters of common experience (the Greek *gnomic aorist*), e.g. Ps 9:11 *for thou, Lord, hast not forsaken* (לֹא־עָזַבְתָּךְ) *them that seek thee*. Cf. ver. 13, also Ps 10:3, 119:40 and Gn 49:11 (כְּבָס).

Rem. In almost all the cases discussed in No. 2 (included under the English present) the imperfect can be used instead of the perfect, wherever the action or state in question is regarded, not as already completed, but as still continuing or just taking place (see § 107 a). Thus, לֹא־יָכַל I am not able **Ps 40:13** and לֹא אָוְנָל Gn 31:35 have practically the same meaning. Hence also it very frequently happens that the imperfect corresponds to such perfects in poetic or prophetic parallelism, e.g. **Is 5:12**, **Ps 2:1** f., **Pr 1:22**, **Jb 3:17**.

3. To express *future* actions, when the speaker intends by an express assurance to represent them as finished, or as equivalent to accomplished facts:

(a) In contracts or other express stipulations (again corresponding to the English present, and therefore closely related to the instances noted under i), e.g. Gn 23:11 *the field I give* (בְּתֵeni) *thee*; cf. ver. 13 and 48:22, 2 S 14:21, 24:23, Jer 40:4; in a threat, 1 S 2:16, 2 S 5:6 (unless, with Wellhausen, בְּיַסְךְּ is to be read).—Especially in promises made by God, Gn 1:29, 15:18, 17:20, Ju 1:2.

(b) To express facts which are undoubtedly imminent, and, therefore, in the imagination of the speaker, already accomplished (*perfectum confidentiae*), e.g. Nu 17:27 *הִנֵּה עָנוּ אֶבֶן כָּל נָאָבֶן* *behold, we perish, we are undone, we are all undone*. Gn 30:13, Is 6:5 (נִצְמַתִּי) *I am undone*¹), Pr 4:2. Even in interrogative sentences, Gn 18:12, Nu 17:28, 23:10, Ju 9:9, 11, Zc 4:10 (?), Pr 22:20.² This use of the perfect

¹ Cf. the similar use of ὄλωλα (διέφθορας, Il. 15. 128) and *perii!* On the kindred use of the perfect in conditional sentences, cf. below, p.

² In Gn 40:14 *a perf. confidentiae* (after מִכִּי; but cf. § 163 d) appears to be used in the expression of an earnest desire that something may happen (*but have me in thy remembrance, &c.*). Neither this passage, however, nor the use of the perfect in Arabic to express a wish or imprecation, justifies us in assuming the existence of a

occurs most frequently in prophetic language (*perfectum propheticum*). The prophet so transports ports himself in imagination into the future that he describes the future event as if it had been already seen or heard by him, e.g. Is 5:13 *therefore my people are gone into captivity* (גָּזַב); 9:1 ff., 10:28, 11:9 (after כִּי, as frequently elsewhere); 19:7, Jb 5:20, 2 Ch 20:37. Not infrequently the imperfect interchanges with such perfects either in the parallel member or further on in the narrative.

(c) To express actions or facts, which are meant to be indicated as existing in the future in a completed state (*futurum exactum*), e.g. Is 4:4 אֵם רְחִצָּה when he has washed away=when he shall have washed away (an *imperfect* follows in the co-ordinate sentence; cf. the conditional sentences in § 107 x); Is 6:11 (after עַד, as in Gn 28:15, Nu 32:17; also 2 S 17:13 after עַד אֲשֶׁר, Gn 24:19 after עַד אָמַן and elsewhere frequently after temporal conjunctions); Mi 5:2 (הָלַכְתִּי); Gn 43:14 בְּאַשְׁר שָׁכַן לֹתִי, לֹתִי and I—if I am bereaved (*orbus fuero*), I am bereaved, an expression of despairing resignation. Cf. Pr 23:15, Est 4:16.

4. To express actions and facts, whose accomplishment in the past is to be represented, not as actual, but only as possible (generally corresponding to the Latin imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive), e.g. Gn 31:42 *except the God of my father ... had been with me, surely now hadst thou sent me away empty* (נִזְלַחֲתָה נִיְשָׁבָת); Gn 43:10, Ex 9:15 (שָׁלַחֲתִי) I had almost put forth, &c.); Nu 22:33, Ju 13:23, 14:18, 1 S 13:13 (הָפִין); 2 K 13:19; so frequently after טַעַט easily, almost, Gn 26:10, Is 1:9 (where טַעַט is probably to be connected with the word after it), Ps 73:2, 94:17, 119:87, Pr 5:14. Cf. also Jb 3:13, 23:10 (בְּקַחְנֵנִי), Ru 1:12 (if I should think, &c.; cf. 2 K 7:4); in the apodosis of a conditional sentence, 1 S 25:34.—So also to express an unfulfilled desire, Nu 14:2 לוּ מִתְנוּ would that we had died ...! (לוּ with the imperfect would mean would that we might die! 1 S 14:30). Finally, also in a question indicating astonishment, Gn 21:7 מִי מִלְּלֵי who would have said ...? quis dixerit? Ps 73:11.

§ 107. Use of the Imperfect.¹

The imperfect, as opposed to the perfect, represents actions, events, or states which are regarded by the speaker at any moment as still continuing, or in process of accomplishment, or even as just taking place. In the last case, its occurrence may be represented as certainly imminent, or merely as conceived in the mind of the speaker, or simply as desired, and therefore only contingent (the modal use of the imperfect).

Knudtzon (see above, Rem. on §106 a), comparing the Ass.-Bab. usage, would prefer the term *present* rather than imperfect, on the ground that the tense expresses what is either actually or mentally present. In any case, the essential difference between the perfect and imperfect consists, he argues, in this, that the perfect simply indicates what is actually complete, while the imperfect places the action, &c., in a more direct relation to the judgement or feeling of the speaker.

precative perfect in Hebrew. In Jb 21:16, 22:18, also, translate *the counsel of the wicked is far from me*. Cf. Driver, *Tenses*³, p. 25 f. In Is 43:9 either נִקְבַּצְתִּי is *imperative* (see § 51 o) or we must read בְּקַצְתִּי, corresponding to יִאָסְפֶּה which follows.

¹ Cf. the literature cited above, p. 309, note 2.

More precisely the imperfect serves—

1. In the sphere of *past time*:

(a) To express actions, &c., which *continued* throughout a longer or shorter period,¹ e.g. Gn 2:6 *a mist went up continually* (הַלְּזָעֵר), 2:25, 37:7, 48:10, Ex 1:12, 8:20, 13:22, 15:6, 12, 14, 15, Nu 9:15 f. 20 f., 23⁷, Ju 2:1, 5:8, 1 S 3:2, 13:17 f., 2 S 2:28, 23:10, 1 K 3:4, 21:6, Is 1:21, 6:4 (אֲלֹפֶת), 17:10 f., 51:2 x, Jer 13:7, 36:18, Ps 18:7, 14, 17 ff. 38 ff., 24:2, 32:4, 5 (אָז, יִשְׁעַת), 47:5, 68:10, 12, 104:6 ff., 106:19, 107:18, 29, 139:13, Jb 3:11, 4:12, 15 f., 10:10 f., 15:7 f.—very frequently alternating with a perfect (especially with a frequentative perfect; cf. Nu 9:15–23 and § 112 e), or when the narration is continued by means of an imperfect consecutive.²

Rem. 1. The imperfect is frequently used in this way after the particles אֲזֶנֶּה *then*, מִתְּכֻלָּה *not yet*, מִתְּכֻלָּה *before*, עַד *until*, e.g. Ex 15:1 אֲזֶנֶּה יְרַמְּשָׁה *then sang Moses, &c.*; Nu 21:17, Dt 4:41, Jos 10:12, 1 K 3:16, 8:1, Ps 126:2, Jb 38:21. (The perfect is used after אֲזֶנֶּה when stress is to be laid on the fact that the action has really taken place, and not upon its gradual accomplishment or duration in the past, e.g. Gn 4:26 אֲזֶנֶּה הִחְלִיל *then began, &c.*; Gn 49:4, Ex 15:15, Jos 22:31, Ju 5:11, Ps 89:20.)³ After מִתְּכֻלָּה e.g. Gn 19:4 בְּמִתְּכֻלָּה בָּו *before they lay down*; Gn 2:5, 24:45, 1 S 3:3, 7, always in the sense of our *pluperfect*. (In Gn 24:15 instead of the perf. הַלְּזָעֵר, the imperf. should be read, as in verse 45; so also in 1 S 3:7 [הַגָּאָתָה] an imperf. is co-ordinated with עַד). After מִתְּכֻלָּה (sometimes also simply מִתְּכֻלָּה Ex 12:34, Jos 3:1), e.g. Jer 1:5 אֲזֶנֶּה מִתְּכֻלָּה *before thou camest forth*; Gn 27:33, 37:18, 41:50, Ru 3:14 (perhaps also in Ps 90:2 an imperf. was intended instead of עַד; cf. Wellhausen on 2 S 3:2; but note also Pr 8:25, in a similar context, *before the mountains were settled*, עַד טְהָרָתָךְ, the predicate being separated from מִתְּכֻלָּה, by the perf. הָרִים, as in Ps 90:2). After עַד Jos 10:13, Ps 73:17 (*until I went*), 2 Ch 29:34; on the other hand, with the perf., e.g. Jos 2:22. As after אֲזֶנֶּה, so also after מִתְּכֻלָּה, and עַד the imperf. may be used, according to the context, in the sense of our *future*, e.g. 2 K 2:9, Is 65:24, Jb 10:21; after עַד e.g. Is 22:14. The imperf. is used in the sense of our *present* after מִתְּכֻלָּה in Ex 9:30, 10:7.

2. Driver (*Tenses*³, p. 35 f.) rightly lays stress upon the inherent distinction between the *participle* as expressing *mere duration*, and the *imperfect* as expressing *progressive duration* (in the present, past, or future). Thus the words וְנַהֲרָה צָבָא Gn 2:10 represent the river of Paradise as going out of Eden in a continuous, uninterrupted stream, but יְפַרְּחָה, which immediately follows, describes how the parting of its waters is always taking place afresh. In the same way עַלְהָה Gn 2:6 represents new mists as constantly arising, and יְמַלְּא Is 6:4 new clouds of smoke. Also those actions, &c., which might be regarded in themselves as single or

1 Cf. the *Mēša* inscription, l. 5, כִּי יָאָנָף כִּמְשׁ בָּאָרֶץ *for Chemosh was angry with his land*. As Driver, *Tenses*, 3rd ed., § 27, 1 a, remarks, this vivid realization of the accomplishment of the action is especially frequent in poetic and prophetic style.

2 According to the Masora such imperfects occur in Is 10^{13 bis} (where, however, וְיָאָסֵר might also mean *I am wont to remove, &c.*), Is 48:3, 57:17, Ps 18:38a, also (according to § 49 c) in 2 S 1:10 and Ez 16:10. In some other cases וְ is no doubt a dogmatic emendation for וְ (imperf. consec.) in order to represent historical statements as promises; cf. Is 42:6, 43:28 [contrasted with 42:25], 51^{2 bis}, 63:3 ff. and the note on § 53 p.

3 After אֲזֶנֶּה *then* (to announce future events) the imperfect. is naturally used in the sense of a future, Gn 24:41, Ex 12:48, Mi 3:4, Zp 3:9, Ps 51:21.

even momentary, are, as it were, broken up by the imperfect into their component parts, and so pictured as gradually completing themselves. Hence מִזְבֵּחַ מוֹעֵד Ex 15:12 (after a *perf.* as in verse 14) represents the Egyptians, in a vivid, poetic description, as being swallowed up one after another, and בָּקָר Nu 23:7 the leading on by stages, &c.

(b) To express actions, &c., which were *repeated* in the past, either at fixed intervals or occasionally (the *modus rei repetitae*), e.g. Jb 1:5 *thus did* (וְעַשָּׂה) Job continually (after each occasion of his sons' festivities); 4:3 f., 22:6 f., 23:11, 29:7, 9, 12 f., Gn 6:4, 29:2, 30:38, 42:31, 39 (*I used to bear the loss of it*), Ex 1:12, 19:19, 33:7 ff. (מִתְּקַנֵּן *used to take every time*), 40:36 ff., Nu 9:17 f. 20 ff., 11:5, 9, Ju 6:4, 14:10, 21:25, 1 S 1:7, 2:22, 9:9, 13:19, 18:5, 27:9, 2 S 1:22, 12:3, 13:18, 1 K 5:25 (of tribute repeated year by year), 10:5, 13:33, 14:28, 2 K 4:8, 8:29, 13:20, 25:14, Jer 36:23, Ps 42:5, 44:3, 78:15, 40, 103:7, Est 2:14; even in a negative dependent clause, 1 K 18:10.

2. In the sphere of *present time*, again

(a) To express actions, events, or states, which are *continued* for a shorter or longer time,¹ e.g. Gn 37:15 מַה־תִּקְרַב שֶׁ מַה seekest thou? 19:19 לֹא־אָנוּכְלָה I cannot; 24:50, 31:35, Is 1:13. Other examples are Gn 2:10, 24:31, 1 S 1:8, 11:5, 1 K 3:7, Ps 2:2, and in the prophetic formula הִנֵּה יֹאמֶר יְהוָה saith the Lord, Is 1:11, 18, &c., cf. 40:1. So especially to express facts known by experience, which occur at all times, and consequently hold good at any moment, e.g. Pr 15:20 *a wise son maketh a glad father*; hence especially frequent in Job and Proverbs. In an interrogative sentence, e.g. Jb 4:17 *is mortal man just before God?* In a negative sentence, Jb 4:18, &c.

(b) To express actions, &c., which may be *repeated* at any time, including therefore the present, or are *customarily* repeated on a given occasion (cf. above, e), e.g. Dt 1:44 *as bees do* (are accustomed to do); Gn 6:21, 32:33, 43:32, Ju 11:40, 1 S 2:8, 5:5, 20:2, 2 S 15:32, Is 1:23, 3:16, Ps 1:3. So again (see f) especially to express facts known by experience which may at any time come into effect again, e.g. Ex 23:8 *a gift blindeth* (עֲזֹר), &c.; Gn 2:24, 22:14, Is 32:6, Am 3:7, Mal 1:6, Jb 2:4, &c. Of the same kind also is the imperfect in such relative clauses (see § 155), as Gn 49:27 *Benjamin is* זָאֵב יִטְרֹךְ *a wolf that ravineth* (properly, is accustomed to ravin). Finally, compare also the formulae גַּם אָמַר it is (wont to be) said (to introduce proverbial expressions) Gn 10:9, 22:14, &c.; גַּם אָנֹכִי עֲשָׂה כֹּן it is not (wont to be) so done (and hence *may not, shall not be*, see u), Gn 29:26, 20:9, 34:7, 2 S 13:12.

(c) To express actions, &c., which although, strictly speaking, they are already finished, are regarded as still lasting on into the present time, or continuing to operate in it, e.g. Gn 32:30 *wherefore is it that thou dost ask* (אַתָּה שׁוֹאֵל) *after my name?* 24:31, 44:7, Ex 5:15, 2 S 16:9. In such cases, naturally, the perfect is also admissible, and is sometimes found in the same formula as the imperfect, e.g. Jb 1:7 (2²) מִן יָמֵינוּ אָתָּה whence comest thou (just now)? but Gn 16:8 (cf. 42:7) אָתָּה בְּאַתָּה whence camest thou? The imperfect represents the coming as still in its last stage, whereas the perfect represents it as an accomplished fact.

¹ It is not always possible to carry out with certainty the distinction between *continued* and *repeated* actions. Some of the examples given under f might equally be referred to g.

3. In the sphere of *future time*. To express actions, &c., which are to be represented as about to take place, and as continuing a shorter or longer time in the future, or as being repeated; thus:

(a) From the standpoint of the speaker's present time, e.g. Ex 4:1 *they will not believe* (בְּאָמַרְתִּי) *me, nor hearken* (יִשְׁמַעְתִּי) *unto my voice: for they will say* (בְּאָמַרְוּ), &c., 6:1, 9:5, &c.

(b) In dependent clauses to represent actions, &c., which from some point of time in the past are to be represented as future, e.g. Gn 43:7 could we in any wise know *that he would say* (בְּאָמַרְתִּי)? 2:19, 43:25, Ex 2:4, 2 K 3:27 אֲשֶׁר־יָמַלְתִּי *qui regnaturus erat*; 13:14, Jon 4:5, Jb 3:3, Ec 2:3, Ps 78:6 *that the generation to come might know, בְּנָים יְלֹדוֹ the children which should be born* (*qui nascituri essent*; the imperfect here with the collateral idea of the occurrence being repeated in the future).

(c) To represent a *futurum exactum*; cf. Is 4:4, 6:11 (co-ordinated with a perfect used in the same sense, see § 106 o); so also sometimes after the temporal particles עַד, Ps 132:5, and עַד אֵשֶׁת *until*, Gn 29:8, Nu 20:17, &c.

4. Finally to the sphere of future time belong also those cases in which the (modal) imperfect serves to express actions, events, or states, the occurrence of which is to be represented as willed (or not willed), or as in some way conditional, and consequently only contingent. More particularly such imperfects serve—

(a) As an expression of will, whether it be a definite intention and arrangement, or a simple desire, viz.:

(1) Sometimes in positive sentences in place of the cohortative (cf. e.g. Ps 59:17 with verse 18; 2 S 22:50 with Ps 18:50; Ju 19:11, &c.), of the imperative (Is 18:3), or of the jussive (which, however, in most cases, does not differ from the ordinary form of the imperfect), e.g. תְּרִאֵה let it appear Gn 1:9, 41:34, Lv 19:2, 3, 2 S 10:12 (and so frequently in verbs הָלַךְ; cf. § 109 a, note 2); Zc 9:5 (פָּקַד); Ps 61:7 (תֹּסֶף); Pr 22:17 (פָּקַד); 23:1, Jb 6:23 (co-ordinated with the imperative), 10:20 *Keth.*; so probably also יְדַעֵן let him judge! Ps 72:2.—So also in the 1st pers., to express a wish which is asserted subsequently with reference to a fixed point of time in the past, e.g. Jb 10:18 עָשָׂה I ought to [not should as A.V., R.V.] have, (then, immediately after being born) given up the ghost; cf. verse 19 אָמַת and Lv 10:18, Nu 35:28. Even to express an obligation or necessity according to the judgement of another person, e.g. Jb 9:29 עָרֵשׁ I am to be guilty, 12:4. Cp. Jb 9:15, 19:16; in a question, Ps 42:10, 43:2.

(2) To express the definite expectation that something will not happen. The imperfect with אַל־ represents a more emphatic form of prohibition than the jussive¹ with אַל־ (cf. § 109 c), and corresponds to our *thou shalt not do it!* with the strongest expectation of obedience, while אַל־ with the jussive is rather a simple warning, *do not that!* Thus אַל־ with the imperfect is especially used in enforcing the divine commands, e.g. לֹא תִגְנַב thou shalt not steal Ex 20:15; cf. verses 3, 4, 5, 7, 10 ff. So אַל־ with the 3rd pers. perhaps in Pr 16:10.

¹ As stated in § 46 a, a prohibition cannot be expressed by אַל־ and the imperative.

Rem. The *jussive*, which is to be expected after **אֲלֵה**, does not, as a rule (according to *n.*, and § 109 a, note 2), differ in form from the simple imperfect. That many supposed jussives are intended as simple imperfects is possible from the occurrence after **אֲלֵה** of what are undoubtedly imperfect forms, not only from verbs **לֹא** (cf. § 109 a, note 2), but also from verbs **עַז**, to express a prohibition or negative wish, **אֲלִיכְבִּיט** Gn 19:17, **אֲלִיכְבִּיט** Jos 1:7, **אֲלִיכְנָה** 1 S 25:25. Even with the 1st pers. plur. (after an imperative) **וְאֲלִיכְנוּתָה** *that we die not*, 1 S 12:19. Also to express the conviction that something cannot happen, **אֲלִיכְנוּם** *he will not slumber*,² Ps 121:3; cf. Jer 46:6, 2 Ch 14:10.

(3) In dependent clauses after final conjunctions (§ 165 b), as **אֲשֶׁר** Gn 11:7 (**אֲשֶׁר** *that they may not understand*); **כִּי** Gn 21:30, 27:4, 19, Ex 9:14, &c.; **לְפָנֶיךָ** Nu 17:5; **לְפָנֶיךָ** Dt 4:1, Ps 51:6, 78:6, and **אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁן**¹ Ez 12:12, *in order that*²; *that ... not*, Ex 20:20, 2 S 14:14; also after **פְּנָן** *that not, lest*, Gn 3:22, 11:4, 19:15, &c.³; cf. also the instances introduced by **וְלֹא** in § 109 g.—In Lv 9:6 such an imperfect (or jussive? see the examples in § 109 f) is added to the expression of the command by an asyndeton, and in La 1:19 to the principal clause simply by **וְ**: *while they sought them food and let him hope, i.e. that he should hope*; so after an interrogative clause, Ex 2:7. Finally also in a relative clause, Ps 32:8 **בְּדַקְתָּךְ וְלֹא** *in the way which thou shouldst go*.

(b) To express actions, &c., which are to be represented as possibly taking place or not taking place (sometimes corresponding to the *potential* of the classical languages, as also to our periphrases with *can, may, should*⁴). More particularly such imperfects are used—

(1) In a permissive sense, e.g. Gn 2:16 *of every tree of the garden* (**אָכְלָתָךְ**) *thou mayest freely eat* (the opposite in verse 17); 3:2, 42:37, Lv 21:3, 22, Jb 21:3. In the 1st pers. Ps 5:8, 22:18 (*I may, or can, tell*); in a negative sentence, e.g. Ps 5:5.

(2) In interrogative sentences, e.g. Pr 20:9 **מַיִּדְךָ אָמַר** *quis dixerit?* Cf. Gn 17:17, 18:14, 31:43, 1 S 11:12, 2 K 5:12 **בַּל אָרְחֵץ כַּהֲם** *may I not wash in them?* Is 33:14, Ps 15:1, 24:3, Ec 5:5. So especially in a question expressing surprise after **אִיךְ**, e.g. Gn 39:9 *how then can I ...?* 44:34, Is 19:11, Ps 137:4, and even with regard to some point of time in the past, looking forward from which an event might have been expected to take place, e.g. Gn 43:7 **כִּינְדוּעַ בְּדַע** *could we in any wise know ...?* Cf. 2 S 3:33 (**ימָתוֹת**).

² ² To regard this as an optative (so Hupfeld) is from the context impossible. It is more probably a strong pregnant construction, or fusion of two sentences (such as, *do not think he will slumber!*). Verse 4 contains the objective confirmation, by means of **וְלֹא** with the imperf., of that which was previously only a subjective conviction.

¹ ¹ But **אֲשֶׁר נִ□עַז** in a causal sense (*because, since*), e.g. Ju 2:20 (as **אֲשֶׁר** Gn 34:27) is followed by the perfect. On Jos 4:24 see above, § 74 g.

² ² R.V. *because he shall not see..]*

³ ³ In 2 K 2:16 **פָּנָה** occurs with the perf. in a vivid presentment of the time when the fear is realized and the remedy comes too late. (In 2 S 20:6, since a *perfect consec.* follows, read with Driver **אָצַב**.)

⁴ ⁴ By this, of course, is not meant that these finer distinctions were consciously present to the Hebrew mind. They are rather mere expedients for making intelligible to ourselves the full significance of the Semitic imperfect.

was Abner to die as a fool, i.e. was he destined to die ...?), and so probably also Gn 34:31 (*should he deal ...?*). Very closely connected with this is the use of the imperfect—

(3) In a consecutive clause depending on an interrogative clause, e.g. Ex 3:11, *who am I* (כִּי אֲלֹךְ) *that I should (ought, could) go?* 16:7, Nu 11:12, Ju 9:28, 1 S 18:18, 2 K 8:13, Is 29:16, Jb 6:11, 21:15, similarly after אָשֶׁר Gn 38:18, Ex 5:2.

Rem. In passages like 1 S 11:5, Ps 8:5, 114:5, the context shows that the imperfect corresponds rather to our present. In such sentences the perfect also is naturally used in referring to completed actions, e.g. Gn 20:10, Ju 18:23, 2 S 7:18, Is 22:1.

(4) In *negative sentences* to express actions, &c., which cannot or should not happen, e.g. Gn 32:13 אֲשֶׁר לَا יִפְאַד מֵר ב which cannot be numbered for multitude; 20:9 *deeds* אֲשֶׁר לֹא־אִיְצָה that ought not to be done (cf. above, g); Ps 5:5.

(5) In *conditional clauses* (the *modus conditionalis* corresponding to the Latin present or imperfect conjunctive) both in the protasis and apodosis, or only in the latter, Ps. 23:4 גַם כִּי־יָלֹךְ ... לְאָדָירָא רָע ... I fear (or I would fear) no evil; Jb 9:20 *though I be righteous, mine own mouth shall condemn me*. After a perfect in the protasis, e.g. Jb 23:10. Very frequently also in an apodosis, the protasis to which must be supplied from the context, e.g. Jb 5:8 *but as for me, I would seek unto God* (were I in thy place); 3:13, 16, 14:14 f., Ps 55:13, Ru 1:12. However, some of the imperfects in these examples are probably intended as jussive forms. Cf. §109 h.

§ 108. Use of the Cohortative.

The cohortative, i.e. according to § 48 c, the 1st pers.¹ sing. or plur. of the imperfect lengthened by the ending הָ, ² represents in general an endeavour directed expressly towards a definite object. While the corresponding forms of the indicative rather express the mere announcement that an action will be undertaken, the cohortative lays stress on the determination underlying the action, and the personal interest in it.

Its uses may be divided into—

1. The cohortative standing alone, or co-ordinated with another cohortative, and frequently strengthened by the addition of the particle נָ:

(a) To express self-encouragement, e.g. Ex 3:3 וְהִנֵּן וְגַם I will turn aside now, and see ...! So especially as the result of inward deliberation (in soliloquies), e.g. Gn 18:21, 32:21 (rarely so used after אלְ, Gn 21:16 let me not look ...! Jer 18:18), and also as a more or less emphatic statement of a fixed determination, e.g. Is 5:1 I will sing³ ...! 5:6, 31:8. Cf. also Gn 46:30 now let me die (I am willing to die), since I have

¹ For the few examples of cohortatives in the 3rd sing., see § 48 d.

² But verbs הָלָ, according to § 75 l, even in the cohortative, almost always have the ending הָ; cf. e.g. in Dt 32:20 הָרְאָה after יְהִי □תָּסָא.

³ [R.V. let me sing.]

seen thy face; and Ps 31:8. In the 1st pers. plur. the cohortative includes a summons to others to help in doing something, e.g. Ps 2:3 *גַּעֲמֵת קָה come! let us break asunder!* &c., and Gn 11:3.

(b) To express a wish, or a request for permission, that one should be allowed to do something, e.g. Dt 2:27 *אָעֶבֶרְה may I be allowed to pass through* (*let me pass through*)! Nu 20:17 *וְעֹבֶרְה נָא may we be allowed to pass through!* Jer 40:15 *let me go, I pray thee!* &c.; 2 S 16:9; so after *אָלֶה* 2 S 18:14; after *אָלִי* 2 S 24:14, Jer 17:18, Ps 25:2 *אָלִי אָבֹשֶׁה let me not be ashamed*; cf. Ps 31:2, 18, 71:1); 69:15. After *אָלִי נָא* Jon 1:14.

2. The cohortative in dependence on other moods, as well as in conditional sentences: (a) In dependence (with *wāw copulative*; Ps 9:15 after *לְ*) on an imperative or jussive to express an intention or intended consequence, e.g. Gn 27:4 *bring it to me, that I may eat*, prop. *then will I eat*; Gn 19:5, 23:4, 24:56, 27:25, 29:21, 30:25 f., 42:34, 49:1, Dt 32:1, Ho 6:1, Ps 2:8, 39:14, Jb 10:20 *Q're*; Is 5:19 *and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come*, *וְגַדֵּעַה that we may know (it)*! Gn 26:28, 1 S 27:5. Also after negative sentences, Gn 18:30, 32, Ju 6:39, and after interrogative sentences, 1 K 22:7, Is 40:25, 41:26, Am 8:5.

(b) In conditional sentences (with or without *םָ*) to express a contingent intention, e.g. Jb 16:6 *אִם־אָדַבְרָה should I determine to speak, my grief is not assuaged*, *וְאִמְתַּחַלְנָה and should I forbear, what am I eased?* without *םָ* Jb 19:18, 30:26 (where, however, *וְאִיחַלְה* is probably intended); Ps 73:16 (unless *וְאַחֲרָה* should be read), 139:8 f. After the 3rd person, Jb 11:17 *though it be dark*, &c. So perhaps also 2 S 22:38 *וְאִרְקַפְתָּה if I determined to pursue, then ...*, but cf. Ps 18:38.

(c) Likewise in the apodosis of conditional sentences, e.g. Jb 31:7 f. *if my step hath turned out of the way ... , then let me sow*; cf. 16:4 f. *I also could speak as ye do, if ...!* So even when the condition must be supplied from the context, e.g. Ps 40:6 *else would I declare and speak of them*; 51:18 *else would I (gladly) give it*, i.e. if thou didst require it (cf. the precisely similar *וְשָׁאַלְתָּה* Ps 55:13); Jb 6:10. In the 1st plur. Jer 20:10. To the same category belong the cohortatives after the formula expressing a wish *וְיִתְהַנֵּן בְּנֵי מִצְרָיִם*, e.g. Jer 9:1 *oh, that I had ... , then (i.e. if I had) should I (or would I) leave my people, &c.*; Ju 9:29; without *Wāw* Is 27:4, Ps 55:7, Jb 23:4 (cf. also verse 7).

Rem. 1. The question, whether a resolution formed under compulsion (a *necessity*) is also expressed by the cohortative (so, according to the prevailing opinion, in Is 38:10 *כִּי־אָלֶה*; Jer 3:25, 4:19, 21, 6:10, Ps 55:3, 18 (?); 57:5, where, however, with Hupfeld, *כִּי־אָלֶה* should be read; 77:7, 88:16, and in the 1st plur. Is 59:10), is to be answered in the sense that in these examples the cohortative *form* is used after its meaning has become entirely lost, merely for the sake of its fuller sound, instead of the ordinary imperfect. This view is strongly

supported by the rather numerous examples of cohortative forms after *wāw consec.* of the imperfect (cf. § 49 e, as also Ps 66:6 *שֶׁנְשָׁגַבָּה there did we rejoice*¹; Ps 119:163 *בְּנֵתָה אָתָּה*; Pr

¹ Analogous to this cohortative (as equivalent to the imperfect) after *םָ* is the use of the historic imperf. after *וְ*, § 107 c.

7:7), which can likewise only be explained as forms chosen merely for euphony, and therefore due to considerations of rhythm.

2. The cohortative is strange after עַד־ אָבִיְנָה Ps 73:17 *until I went ... I considered their latter end*; possibly a pregnant construction for ‘until I made up my mind, saying, I will consider’, &c. (but אָבִיְנָה Pr 7:7 is still dependent on the preceding 1); עַד־אֲרֹגֵי יְשֻׁה Pr 12:19 is at any rate to be explained in the same way (in Jer 49:19, 50:44 we have פִּיא' with a similar meaning), *as long as I (intentionally) wink with the eyelashes (shall wink)*. On the other hand, in Ex 32:30 אֲכִפֶּר is to be read, with the Samaritan, instead of אֲכִפֶּרֶת after אָוְלִי.

§ 109. Use of the Jussive.

As the *cohortative* is used in the 1st pers., so the *jussive* is especially found in the 2nd and 3rd pers. sing. and plur. to express a more or less definite desire that something should or should not happen (cf. for its form, which frequently coincides with that of the ordinary *imperfect*,² § 48 f, g). More particularly its uses may be distinguished as follows:

1. The *jussive* standing alone, or co-ordinated with another jussive:

(a) In affirmative sentences to express a command, a wish (or a blessing), advice, or a request; in the last case (the optative or precative) it is frequently strengthened by the addition of נִ. Examples: Gn 1:3 נְהִי אֹזֶר let there be light! Gn 1:6, 9, 11, &c. (the creative commands); Nu 6:26 *the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace!* cf. verse 25. After particles expressing a wish, Gn 30:34 לֹא יְהִי I would it might be; Ps 81:9 אִם תָּשִׂמְעֵל if thou wouldest hearken unto me! As a humble request, Gn 44:33 יְשַׁבְּדָנָא עֲבָדָךְ ... וְהַנְּעִיל עַל ... let thy servant, I pray thee, abide, &c., and let the lad go up, &c., Gn 47:4.

(b) In negative sentences to express prohibition or dissuasion, warning, a negative wish (or imprecation), and a request. The prohibitive particle used before the jussive (according to § 107 o) is almost always אֲלַי (in negative desires and requests frequently אֲלַנְנָא); e. g. Ex 34:3 אִישׁ אֲלַי־רָא neither let any man be seen! Pr 3:7 *be not wise in thine own eyes!* Jb 15:31 אֲלַי אָמַן ne confidat. In the form of a request (prayer), Dt 9:26 אֲלַפְשָׁהָה destroy not! 1 K 2:20, Ps 27:9, 69:18.

Rem. 1. The few examples of לֹא with the jussive could at most have arisen from the attempt to moderate subsequently by means of the jussive (voluntative) form what was at first intended to be a strict command (אָלַי with imperf. indic.); probably, however, they are either cases in which the defective writing has been misunderstood (as in 1 K 2:6, Ez 48:14), or (as in Gn 24:8) instances of the purely rhythmical jussive form treated below, under k. Moreover, cf. יְזַסֵּף Jo 2:2 and from the same verb Gn 4:12 (unless it is to be referred to h) and Dt 13:1. The same form, however, appears also to stand three times for the cohortative (see below), and in Nu 22:19 for the ordinary imperfect (but see below, i). Thus it is doubtful

² With regard to verbs הָלַח, it is true that the full form of the imperfect is frequently used with the meaning of the jussive (as also for the cohortative, see § 108 a, note 2), e. g. אֲלַי־רָא Jb 3:9 (but previously יְקַו let it look for!): especially *in* (Neh 2:3) and immediately *before* the principal pause, Gn 1:9 רָאָה, Ju 6:39 יְהִי, but previously נִיהִי; Is 47:3 רָאָה, previously תָּבִל; Ps 109:7. On the attempt to distinguish such jussives from the imperfect by means of a special meaning נִ, see § 75 hh.

whether an imaginary by-form of the ordinary imperf. is not intended by the Masora in all these cases, and whether consequently יְזַבֵּחַ, &c., should not be restored.—On לֹא־אָדַחֲךָ עַזְבֶּנְךָ, &c., Dt 7:16, 13:9, &c., Ez 5:11, &c., cf. § 72 r, according to which the jussive should probably be read in every case.—The jussive appears in the place of the cohortative after לֹא (1 S 14:36) (co-ordinated with two cohortatives), 2 S 17:12; cf. Is 41:23 *K^eth.* (וְגַם רָא, i. e. after another cohortative); also (see above) לֹא אָסַף Dt 18:16, Ho 9:15, and even without Ez 5:16.

2. אַל־ with the jussive (or imperf., cf. § 107 p) is used sometimes to express the conviction that something cannot or should not happen; cf. Is 2:9 (where, however, the text is very doubtful) לֹא־כִּסְתָּשֵׁךְ אַל־תִּשְׁכַּח and thou canst not possibly forgive them [R. V. therefore forgive them not]; Ps 34:6, 41:3, 50:3, 121:3 (אַל־יִתְפַּתֵּן); Pr 3:25, Jb 5:22 אַל־תִּירְאָה neither needest thou be afraid; 20:17, 40:32.

2. The jussive depending on other moods, or in conditional sentences:

(a) Depending¹ (with *Wāw*) on an imperative or cohortative to express an intention or an assurance of a contingent occurrence, e. g. Gn 24:51 *take her and go, and let her be* (וְתַהֲרֵה prop. and she will be)...; 30:3, 31:37, 38:24, Ex 8:4, 9:13, 10:17, 14:2, Jos 4:16, Ju 6:30, 1 S 5:11, 7:3, 1 K 21:10, Ps 144:5, Pr 20:22, Jb 14:6. Also after interrogative sentences, which include a demand, Est 7:2 (say) *what is thy desire..., שַׁעַת וְתַהֲרֵה and it shall* (i. e. in order that it may) *be granted!* 1 K 22:20, Is 19:12, Jb 38:34f. Depending on a cohortative, e. g. Gn 19:20 אַפְתָּה נָא שֶׁ פָה oh, let me escape *thither...* וְתַחֲי נֶפֶשִׁי that my soul may live; even after a simple imperf. (cf. below, g), 1 K 13:33 *whosoever would, he consecrated him ...* וְיָהִי that he might be a priest (read חָנָן) of the high places, but probably the LXX reading γένηται is to be preferred.

Rem. In 2 Ch 35:21 a negative final clause with אַל־ is dependent on an imperative, *forbear from* (meddling with) God ... that he destroy thee not. As a rule, however, negative final clauses are attached to the principal sentence by means of נִילָה and a following imperfect; so after an imperative, Gn 42:2, 1 K 14:2, 18:44; after a jussive, Ex 30:20, Neh 6:9; after a perfect consec., Ex 28:35, 43, 30:12, Nu 18:5; after נִילָה with an imperfect, Lv 10:6, Nu 18:3, Dt 17:17 *neither shall he multiply wives unto himself* (וְלֹא יִסְרַר לְבָבוֹן) that his heart turn not away; 1 S 20:14, 2 S 21:17, Jer 11:21; after אַל־ with jussive, Lv 10:9, 11:43, 16:2, 2 S 13:25, Jer 25:6, 37:20, 38:24 f.; after the asseverative מִנְאָה with the impft., Gn 14:23; even after a simple imperfect, Jer 10:4 *with nails ... they fasten it* (וְלֹא יִפְקַד) that it move not; after a participle, Jb 9:7.

(b) Frequently in conditional sentences (as in Arabic), either in the protasis or in the apodosis, cf. Ps 45:12 יְתַהֵּא should he desire ... then ...; 104:20 וְיָהִי שֶׁתְּ הַנּוּ if thou makest darkness, then it is night; so also in the protasis, Ex 22:4, Lv 15:24, Is 41:28, Ez 14:7 (עַל), Jb 34:29; in the apodosis, Ex 7:9 *then will it (not, then shall it) become a serpent;* Pr 9:9 after an imperat. in the protasis; Jb 10:16, 13:5, 22:28. In a negative apodosis, Gn 4:12 (מִנְאָה, but see above, d). In 2 K 6:27 אַל־יַוְשַׁעַךְ (if the Lord do not help thee, &c.) is to be explained as a jussive in a negative protasis.

Rem. Undoubtedly this use of the jussive (in conditional sentences) is based on its original *voluntative* meaning; let something be so and so, then this or that must happen as a

¹ This does not include the cases in which the jussive is not logically dependent on a preceding imperat., but is merely co-ordinated, e. g. Gn 20:7, Ps 27:14, &c.

consequence. Certain other examples of the *jussive*, however, show that in the consciousness of the language the *voluntative* has in such cases become weakened almost to a *potential* mood, and hence the *jussive* serves to express facts which may happen *contingently*, or may be expected, e. g. Nu 22:19 (*הַיְיָ מֵהֶם*, but cf. above, d); Jb 9:33 *there is no daysman betwixt us, that might lay* (*תִּשְׁׂא*, hence plainly a *subjunctive*=*qui ponat*; also in Nu 23:19 *בְּכֹזֶב* *that he should lie* is probably intended as a *jussive*); Ec 5:14; so after interrogative sentences, Jer 9:11 *who is the wise man, יְיָ בָּן qui intelligat hoc?*; Ho 14:10.

Moreover, in not a few cases, the *jussive* is used, without any collateral sense, for the ordinary imperfect form, and this occurs not alone in forms, which may arise from a misunderstanding of the defective writing, as Dt 28:21, 36, 32:8, 1 K 8:1, Is 12:1, Mi 3:4, 5:8, Ps 11:6, 18:12, 21:2 Q^erê (*מֵהֶם יָגַע*, *K^eth. יָגַע*), 25:9, 47:4, 90:3, 91:4, 107:29, Pr 15:25, Jb 13:27, 15:33, 18:9, 20:23, 37:22, 33:11, 36:14, 38:24, Ec 12:6 (verse 7 *בְּשָׁנָה*, but immediately afterwards *שָׁנָה*), Dn 8:12,—but also in shortened forms, such as *הִי* Gn 49:17 (Sam.; *הִי*), Dt 28:8, 1 S 10:5, 2 S 5:24, Ho 6:1, 11:4, Am 5:14, Mi 1:2, Zp 2:13, Zc 9:5, Ps 72:16 f. (after other *jussives*), 104:31, Jb 18:12, 20:23, 26, 28, 27:8, 33:21, 34:37, Ru 3:4. This use of the *jussive* can hardly be due merely to poetic licence, but is rather to be explained on rhythmical grounds. In all the above-#ited examples, in fact, the *jussive* stands at the beginning of the sentence (and hence removed as far as possible from the principal tone), in others it is immediately before the principal pause (Is 42:6, 50:2, Ps 68:15, Pr 23:25, Jb 24:14, 29:3, 40:19), or actually *in pause* (Dt. 32:18, Jb 23:9, 11, La 3:50), and is then a simply rhythmical shortening due to the strong influence of the tone. Moreover, since the *jussive* in numerous cases is not distinguished in form from the imperfect (§ 48 g), it is frequently doubtful which of the two the writer intended. This especially applies to those cases, in which a *subjunctive* is to be expressed by one or other of the forms (cf. § 107 k and m-x).

§ 110. *The Imperative.*

Mayer Lambert, ‘Sur la syntaxe de l’impératif en hébreu,’ in *REJ.* 1897, p. 106 ff.

1. The imperative,¹ which, according to § 46, is restricted to the 2nd pers. sing. and plur., and to *positive* commands, &c., may stand either alone, or in simple co-ordination (as in 1 K 18:44, Is 56:1, 65:18) with other imperatives:

(a) To express real commands, e. g. Gn 12:1 *get thee out of thy country*; or (like the *jussive*) mere admonitions (Ho 10:12) and requests, 2 K 5:22, Is 5:3; on the addition of *וְ* see below, Rem. 1. The imperative is used in the sense of an ironical challenge (often including a threat) in 1 K 2:22 *ask for him the kingdom also*; 22:15, Ju 10:14, Is 47:12 (with *וְ*), Jer 7:21, Ez 20:39, Am 4:4, Jb 38:3f., 40:10ff., La 4:21. The imperative has a concessive sense in Na 3:15 (though thou *make thyself many*, &c.), and in the cases discussed under f, e. g. Is 8:9 f., 29:9.

(b) To express permission, e. g. 2 S 18:23 after previous dissuasion, (then) *run* (as far as I am concerned)! Is 21:12, 45:11.

(c) To express a distinct assurance (like our expression, *thou shalt have it*)² or promise, e. g. Is 65:18 *but be ye glad*, &c. (i. e. ye will have continually occasion to

¹ On the close relation between the imperative and *jussive* (both in meaning and form), cf. § 46 and § 48 i.

² Like the threatening formulae in the Latin comic writers, e. g. *vapula*, Ter. Phorm. v. 6, 10=*vapulare te iubeo*, Plaut. Curc. vi. 4, 12.

be glad); and Is 37:30, Ps 110:2; in a threat, Jer 2:19. So especially in commands, the fulfilment of which is altogether out of the power of the person addressed, e. g. Is 54:14 *be far from anxiety* (meaning, thou needst not fear any more); Gn 1:28, &c. (for other examples, such as 1 K 22:12, 2 K 5:13, see below, f). Most clearly in the case of the imperative *Niph[□]al* with a passive meaning, e. g. Gn 42:16 **וְאַתָּה תִּשְׁבֹּרֶת** *and ye shall be bound*; Dt 32:50, Is 49:9 (Is 45:22, see below, f).

Rem. 1. The particle **אָהֵן age!** (§ 105) is frequently added to the imperative, as to the jussive, sometimes to soften down a command, or to make a request in a more courteous form (see above, a), Gn 12:13, 24:2, sometimes to strengthen an exhortation uttered as a rebuke or threat (Nu 16:26, 20:10) or in ridicule (Is 47:12).

2. The imperative after the desiderative particle **לוּ** Gn 23:13 (at the end of verses 5 and 14 also read **לוּי** for **לוּ** and join it to the following imperative) is due to an anacoluthon. Instead of the imperfect which would be expected here after **לוּ**, the more forcible imperative is used in a new sentence.

2. The imperative in logical dependence upon a preceding imperative, jussive (or cohortative), or an interrogative sentence, serves to express the distinct assurance or promise that an action or state will ensue as the certain consequence of a previous action. So especially:

(a) The imperative when depending (with *wāw copulative*) upon another imperative. In this case the first imperative contains, as a rule, a condition, while the second declares the consequence which the fulfilment of the condition will involve. The imperative is used for this declaration, since the consequence is, as a matter of fact, intended or desired by the speaker (cf. *divide et impera*), e. g. Gn 42:18 **זֶאת עֲשֵׂה וְלֹא תֵּחֶנֶּה** *this do, and live*, i. e. thus shall ye continue to live. Gn 17:1, 1 K 22:12, 2 K 5:13, Is 36:16, 45:22 (**וְהַנְּשַׁעַר**), Jer 6:16, Am 5:4, 6, Ps 37:27, Pr 3:3f., 4:4, 7:2, 13:20 *K^eth.*, Jb 2:9, 2 Ch 20:20; in Jer 25:5, Jb 22:21 **אָהֵן** is added to the first imperative. In other cases, the first imperative contains a mocking concession, the second an irrevocable denunciation, e. g. Is 8:9 **רַע עַמִּים נַחַת** (continue to) *make an uproar, O ye peoples, and ye shall be broken in pieces*; cf. verse 9 b.

Rem. 1. If a promise or threat dependent on an imperative be expressed in the 3rd pers. then the jussive is naturally used instead of the 2nd imperative Is 8:10, 55:2.

2. In Pr 20:13 the second imperative (containing a promise) is attached by asyndeton; elsewhere two imperatives occur side by side without the copula, where the second might be expected to be subordinated to the first, e. g. Dt 2:24 **הַחֲלֹל בְּשָׁ** (where **שָׁ** is virtually, as it were, an object to **הַחֲלֹל**) *begin, take in possession* for to *take in possession* (cf., however, Ju 19:6 **הַזָּלֵל נָא וְלֹא** *be content, I pray thee, and tarry all night*, and on this kind of co-ordination in general, cf. § 120 d). But such imperatives as **לְקַ** (**לְכַי**), **קְוִם** (**קְוִי**), when immediately preceding a second imperative, are for the most part only equivalent to interjections, *come! up!*

(b) The imperative, when depending (with *wāw copulative*) upon a jussive (cohortative), or an interrogative sentence, frequently expresses also a consequence which is to be expected with certainty, and often a consequence which is intended, or in fact an intention; cf. Gn 20:7 *and he shall pray for thee, נַחֲתָךְ and thou shalt live*; cf. Ex 14:16, 2 K 5:10, Jb 11:6, Ps 128:5 *the Lord bless thee ... so that (or in order*

that) thou seest, &c.; Ru 1:9, 4:11; after a cohortative, Gn 12:2, 45:18, Ex 3:10 *וְהַצֵּא*; *that thou mayest bring forth;* Ex 18:22, 1 S 12:17, 1 K 1:12; Jer 35:15 (after imperative and jussive); after an interrogative sentence, 2 S 21:3 *wherewith shall I make atonement, וְכֹה that ye may bless, &c.*—In Nu 5:19 the imperative without *וְ* (in 32:23 with *וְ*) is used after a conditional clause in the sense of a definite promise.

Rem. The 2nd sing. masc. occurs in addressing feminine persons in Ju 4:20 (*כִּי*), according to Qimḥī an infinitive, in which case, however, the infinitive absolute *כִּי* should be read; but probably we should simply read *עֲמָד* with Moore), Mi 1:13 and Zc 13:7 (after *עוֹרֶךְ*); and in Is 23:1, the 2nd plur. masc. (On the four forms of the 2nd fem. plur. imperative in Is 32:11, erroneously explained here in former editions, see now § 48 i). In Na 3:15 the interchange of masc. and fem. serves to express totality (the nation in all its aspects). Cf., moreover, § 145 p on other noticeable attempts to substitute the corresponding masculine forms for the feminine.

§ 111. *The Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive.*

1. The *imperfect* with *wāw consecutive* (§ 49 a–g) serves to express actions, events, or states, which are to be regarded as the temporal or logical sequel of actions, events, or states mentioned immediately¹ before. The *imperfect consecutive* is used in this way most frequently as the *narrative tense*, corresponding to the Greek *aorist* or the Latin *historic perfect*. As a rule the narrative is introduced by a perfect, and then continued by means of imperfects with *wāw consecutive* (on this interchange of tenses cf. § 49 a, and especially § 112 a), e. g. Gn 3:1 *now the serpent was* (*וְיָתַר*) *more subtil ... and he said* (*וְיֹאמֶר אָדָם*) *unto the woman;* 4:1, 6:9ff., 10:9f., 15:19, 11:12ff. 27ff., 14:5f., 15:1f., 16:1f., 21:1ff., 24:1f., 25:19ff., 36:2ff., 37:2.

Rem. 1. To this class belong some of the numerous *imperfects consec.* after various expressions of time, whenever such expressions are equivalent in meaning to a perfect² (viz. *וְהִנֵּה it came to pass*), e. g. Is 6:1 *in the year that king Uzziah died, I saw* (*וְאָנֹה*), &c.; Gn 22:4, 27:34, Ju 11:16, 1 S 4:19, 17:57, 21:6, Ho 11:1; on the use of *וְיִהִי* to connect expressions of time, see below, g.—It is only in late books or passages that we find the simple *perfect* in a clause following an expression of time, as 1 S 17:55 (cf. Driver on the passage), 2 Ch 12:7, 15:8, &c., Dn 10:11, 15:19; the *Perfect* after *וְ* and the subject, 2 Ch 7:1.

2. The continuation of the narrative by means of the *imperfect consec.* may result in a series of any number of such imperfects, e. g. there are forty-nine in Gn. 1. As soon, however, as the connecting *Wāw* becomes separated from the verb to which it belongs, by the insertion of any word, the perfect necessarily takes the place of the imperfect, e. g. Gn 1:5 *and God called* (*וְיֹקַרְא*) *the light Day, and the darkness he called* (*וְלֹא שָׁךְ קָרָא*) *Night;* verse 10, 2:20, 11:3 and frequently.

3. Of two co-ordinate *imperfects consecutive* the former (as equivalent to a temporal clause) is most frequently subordinate in sense to the latter, e. g. Gn 28:8f. *וְיָרָא עַשְׂוֹ ... וְלֹכֶד ...* *when Esau saw that ... , he went, &c.*; so also, frequently *עֲמָדְשָׁוְתָה*, &c., Gn 37:21, &c. On the other hand, a second *imperfect consecutive* is seldom used in an explanatory sense, e. g. Ex

¹ On an apparent exception (the *imperf. consec.* at the beginning of whole books) see § 49 b note.

² Cf. Is 45:4, where the *imperf. consec.* is joined to an abrupt statement of the cause, and Jb 36:7, where it is joined to an abrupt statement of the place.

2:10 (**אָמַרְתִּי** *for she said*); cf. 1 S 7:12. Other examples of the imperfect consecutive, which apparently represent a progress in the narrative, in reality only refer to the same time, or explain what precedes, see Gn 2:25 (**וַיְהִי** *they were*; but Jos 4:9, 1 K 8:8 *they are*); Gn 36:14 (**וַיְהִי** *and*), 36:32 (**וַיְיָמֵלֶךְ**, 1 K 1:44).

4. The imperfect consecutive sometimes has such a merely *external* connexion with an immediately preceding perfect, that in reality it represents an antithesis to it, e. g. Gn 32:31 *and (yet) my life is preserved*; 2 S 3:8 *and yet thou chargest me*; Jb 10:8, 32:3; similarly in dependence on noun-clauses, Pr 30:25 ff.

2. The introduction of independent narratives, or of a new section of the narrative, by means of an *imperfect consecutive*, likewise aims at a connexion, though again loose and external, with that which has been narrated previously. Such a connexion is especially often established by means of **וַיְהִי** (*kai ἐγένετο*) *and it came to pass*, after which there then follows either (most commonly) an *imperfect consecutive* (Gn 4:3, 8, 8:6, 11:2, Ex 12:29, 13:17, &c.), or *Wāw* with the perfect (separated from it), Gn 7:10, 15:12, 22:1, 27:30, or even a perfect without *Wāw* (Gn 8:13, 14:1f., 40:1, Ex 12:41, 16:22, Nu 10:11, Dt 1:3, 1 S 18:30, 2 K 8:21, &c.), or finally a noun-clause introduced by *Wāw*, Gn 41:1.

Rem. 1. This loose connexion by means of **וַיְהִי**¹ is especially common, when the narrative or a new section of it begins with any expression of time, see above, b; cf., in addition to the above-mentioned examples (e. g. Gn 22:1 *and it came to pass after these things, that God did prove Abraham*), the similar cases in Gn 19:34, 21:22, 1 S 11:11, Ru 1:1. Elsewhere the statement of time is expressed by **בָּ** or **בְּ** with an infinitive (Gn 12:14, 19:17, 29 39:13, 15:18f., Ju 16:25) or by an independent sentence with the perfect (equivalent to a pluperfect, cf. § 106 f), e. g. Gn 15:17, 24:15, 27:30, or by a temporal clause introduced by **כִּי** *when*, Gn 26:8, 27:1, Ju 16:16, **כִּי** *when*, Gn 12:11, 20:13, **אֲזַנְתָּ** *from the time that*, Gn 39:5; or, finally, by a noun-clause (cf. § 116 u), e. g. 2 K 13:21 **וַיְהִי** **הִם** **קָבְרִים אִישׁ** *and it came to pass, as they were (just) burying a man* (prop. they burying), *that ...*; Gn 42:35, 2 K 2:11 (the apodosis in both these cases being introduced by **וְהִיא**); 1 S 7:10, 2 S 13:30, 2 K 6:5, 26, 19:37 (=Is 37:38).—In 1 S 10:11, 11:11, 2 S 2:23, 15:2 a noun standing absolutely follows **וַיְהִי** (as the equivalent of a complete sentence; see below, h), and then an *imperfect consecutive* follows.

2. Closely related to the cases noticed in g are those in which the *imperfect consecutive*, even without a preceding **וַיְהִי**, introduces the apodosis either—(a) to whole sentences, or (b) to what are equivalent to whole sentences, especially to nouns standing absolutely. As in certain cases of the *perfect consecutive* (see § 112 x), so the *imperfect consecutive* has here acquired a sort of independent force. Cf. for (a) 1 S 15:23 *because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord*, **כִּי** *he hath rejected thee* (cf. Nu 14:16, Is 48:4, where the causal clause precedes in the form of an infinitive with preposition), Ex 9:21; for (b) Gn 22:24 **וְיָלַשְׂתָּ** *and (as to) his concubine ...*, **תְּבָרֵה** *she bare*, &c.; Ex 38:24, Nu 14:36f., 1 S 14:19, 17:24, 2 S 4:10, 19:41 *K^eth.*, 21:16, 1 K 9:20f., 12:17, 2 K 25:22, Jer 6:19, 28:8, 33:24, 44^{25,2}.—In 1 K 15:13, 2

¹ Exhaustive statistics of the use of **וַיְהִי** in its many and various connexions are given by König in ZAW. 1899, p. 260 ff.

² Cf. the *Mēša* inscription, l. 5 (*Omri*) *the king of Israel, וַיְעַנֵּן he oppressed Moab*, &c.—The peculiar imperfect consecutive in Gn 30:27 b (in the earlier editions explained as equivalent to an object-clause) arises rather from a pregnant brevity of expression: *I have observed and have come to the conclusion, the Lord hath blessed me*, &c.—In Gn 27:34 read, with LXX, **וְיָהִי** before **עַ**.

K 16:14 the preceding noun, used absolutely, is even regarded as the object of the following imperfect consecutive, and is therefore introduced by **וְהַ**.

3. The *imperfect consecutive* serves, in the cases treated under *a–h*, to represent either expressly, or at least to a great extent, a *chronological* succession of actions or events; elsewhere it expresses those actions, &c., which represent the logical consequence of what preceded, or a result arising from it by an inherent necessity. Thus the *imperfect consecutive* is used—

(*a*) As a final summing up of the preceding narrative, e. g. Gn 2:1, 23:20 **וְיָקֹם** **בַּשְׁלָחָה וְגַ** so (in this way) *the field became (legally) the property of Abraham, &c.*; 1 S 17:50, 31:6.

(*b*) To express a logical or necessary consequence of that which immediately precedes, e. g. Gn 39:2, Jb 2:3 *and he still holdeth fast his integrity,* **וְנִפְסִיתָ בָּנִי וְגַ** so that thou thus (as it now appears) *groundlessly movedst me against him*; Ps 65:9 *so that they are afraid ...;* even a consequence which happens conditionally, Jer 20:17 **וְמֵתִי** so that my mother should have been ... Another instance of the kind perhaps (if the text be correct) is Jer 38:9 **וְנִתְנַ** so that he dies (must die).

Rem. Such consecutive clauses frequently occur after interrogative sentences, e. g. Is 51:12 *who art thou* (i. e. art thou *so helpless*), **וְהִ** **ירְאִ** *that thou art (must needs be) afraid?* Ps 144:3 (cf. Ps 8:5, where in a very similar context **כִּי** *that* is used with the imperfect); Gn 12:19 (**חַקְ****אָ****נִ**); 31:27 **וְאָשַׁלְ** **חָנָ** *so that I might have sent thee away.*

4. As regards the range of time it is to be carefully noticed—

(*a*) That the *imperfect consecutive* may represent all varieties in the relations of tense and mood, which, according to § 107 a, follow from the idea of the imperfect;

(*b*) That the more precise determination of the range of time to which an *imperfect consecutive* relates must be inferred in each case from the character of the preceding tense (or tense-equivalent), to which it is attached, in a more or less close relation, as temporal or logical sequence. Thus the *imperfect consecutive* serves—

(1) To represent actions, events, or states, which are *past* (or were repeated in past time), when it is united with tenses, or their equivalents, which refer to an actual past.

Cf. the examples given above, under *a* and *f*, of the imperfect consecutive as an historic tense. The imperfect consecutive also frequently occurs as the continuation of a perfect (*preterite*) in a subordinate clause; e. g. Gn 27:1, Nu 11:20, Dt 4:37, 1 S 8:8, 1 K 2:5, 11:33, 18:13, &c.; also in Is 49:7 **וַיִּבְחַר** **ךְ**. Cf. **וְשָׁרֶ**.—In Jb 31:26, 34 the imperfect consecutive is joined to an imperfect denoting the past in a conditional sentence. An imperfect consecutive occurs in dependence on a perfect which has the sense of a pluperfect (§ 106 f), e. g. in Gn 26:18, 28:6f., 31:19, 34 (*now Rachel had taken the teraphim, מִמְשָׁרֶת וְהַ* and had put them, &c.); Nu 14:36, 1 S 28:3, 2 S 2:23, Is 39:1. Finally there are the cases in which an infinitival or participial construction representing past time, according to § 113 r, § 116 x, is taken up and continued by an imperfect consecutive.

(2) To represent *present* actions, &c., in connexion with tenses, or their equivalents, which describe actions and states as being either present or lasting on into the present (continuing in their effect); so especially,

(α) In connexion with the present perfects, described in § 106 g, e. g. Ps 16:9 *therefore my heart is glad* (כִּי־שָׁלֵג) and *my glory rejoiceth* (לֹא־יָנַע); Is 3:16 (parallel with a simple imperfect). Cf. also such examples as Ps 29:10 נִיְשָׁבָת (prop. he sat down, and has been enthroned ever since), Ps 41:13.

(β) In connexion with those perfects which represent experiences frequently confirmed (see § 106 k), e. g. Jb 14:2 *he cometh up* (אָמַת) *like a flower, and is cut down* (לֹא־יָנַע); *he fleeth* (יָנַבַּח) *also as a shadow, לֹא־צָמַד and continueth not*; Jb 20:15, 24:2, 11, Is 40:24, Pr 11:2.

(γ) In connexion with imperfects which, in one of the ways described in § 107. 2, are used in the sense of the present; e. g. Jb 14:10 *but man dieth* (וּמוֹת) and *becometh powerless* (שָׁלֵג), &c., i. e. remains powerless; Jb 4:5, Ho 8:13, Hb 1:9f., Ps 55:18, 90:3, Jb 5:15, 7:18, 11:3 (*when thou mockest*), 12:25, 34:24, 37:8 (parallel with a simple imperfect); 39:15. In the apodosis of a conditional sentence, Ps 59:16, so also after an interrogative imperfect, 1 S 2:29, Ps 42:6 (וְאַתָּה תִּשְׁאַל for which in verse 12 and in 43:5 we have וְאַתָּה תִּשְׁאַל and why art thou disquieted?).

(δ) In dependence on participles, which represent what at present continues or is being repeated, e. g. Nu 22:11, 1 S 2:6, 2 S 19:2 *behold the king weepeth* (הַבָּךְ) and *mourneth* (יָתַבֵּל) for Absalom; Am 5:8, 9:5f., Na 1:4, Ps 34:8, Pr 20:26, Jb 12:22 ff., but cf. e. g. Jb 12:4 קָרָא לְאֶלְוֹן who called upon God, שָׁנֵן חַדְשָׁה and he answered him.

(ε) In dependence on other equivalents of the present, as in Is 51:12, Ps 144:3 (see above, m); Jb 10:22. So especially as the continuation of an infinitive, which is governed by a preposition (cf. § 144 r), Is 30:12, Jer 10:13, Ps 92:8, &c.

(3) To represent *future* actions, &c., in dependence on—(α) an imperfect which refers to the future, Ps 49:15, 94:22f.;—(β) a perfect consecutive, or those perfects which, according to § 106 n, are intended to represent future events as undoubtedly certain, and therefore as though already accomplished (*perf. propheticum*); cf. Is 5:15 (parallel with a simple imperfect separated from 1); 5:16 (cf. 2:11, 17, where the same threat is expressed by the perfect consecutive); 5:25, 9:5, 10f., 13^{15,17ff.}, 22:7 ff., Jo 2:23, Mi 2:13, Ez 33:4, 6, Ps 7:13, 64:8 ff.;—(γ) a future participle, Jer 4:16.¹

Rem. An imperfect consecutive in dependence on a perfect or imperfect, which represents an action occurring only conditionally, is likewise used only in a hypothetical sense, e. g. Jb

¹ Also in Jer 51:29 the imperfects consecutive are attached to the threat virtually contained in the preceding imperatives. On the other hand יְנַחֲלֵל Ho 8:10 would be very remarkable as expressing a future; the text is, however, certainly corrupt, and hence the Cod. Babyl. and the Erfurt MS. 3 endeavour to remedy it by יְנַחֵל, and Ewald reads יְנַחֲלֵל—In Ez 28:16 (cf. Jer 15:6f.) נְאַתְּלֵלְךָ appears to announce an action irrevocably determined upon, and therefore represented as already accomplished; cf. the prophetic perfects in verse 17 ff.

9:16 אם־הָרַת אֶתְךָ וְעַבְנִי if I had called, and he had answered me, yet ...; Ps 139:11 מִרְאֵתִי if I should say (previously, in verse 8 f., hypothetical imperfects are used).—In Is 48:18f. an imperfect consecutive occurs in dependence on a sentence expressing a wish introduced by לוֹא utinam (*וְיִהְיֶה* and it, or so that it were, equivalent to *then should it be*). Cf. also the examples mentioned above, under *l* (Jer 20:17) and *m* (Gn 31:27), where the imperfect consecutive expresses facts occurring *contingently*.

§ 112. *The Perfect with Wāw Consecutive.*

G. R. Berry, ‘Waw consecutive with the perfect in Hebrew,’ in *Bibl. Lit.*, xxii. (1903), pp. 60–69.

1. The perfect, like the imperfect (§ 111), is used with *wāw consecutive* (cf. § 49 a; on the external differentiation of the perfect consecutive by a change in the position of the tone, see § 49 h) to express actions, events, or states, which are to be attached to what precedes, in a more or less close relation, as its *temporal* or *logical* consequence. And as, according to § 111 a, the narrative which begins with a perfect, or its equivalent, is continued in the imperfect consecutive, so, vice versa, the perfect consecutive forms the regular continuation to a preceding imperfect, or its equivalent.

Rem. 1. This alternation of perfect and imperfect or their equivalents is a striking peculiarity of the *consecutio temporum* in Hebrew. It not only affords a certain compensation for the lack of forms for tenses and moods, but also gives to Hebrew style the charm of an expressive variety, an action conceived as being still in progress (*imperfect*, &c.), reaching afterwards in the *perfect* a calm and settled conclusion, in order to be again exhibited in movement in the *imperfect*, and vice versa.² The strict regularity of this alternation belongs indeed rather to the higher style, and even then it depends upon the view and intention of the speaker, whether he wishes the action, &c., to be regarded as the logical consequence of what has preceded, or as simply co-ordinate with it, and so in the same tense.

2. A succession of any number of other *perfects consecutive* may be co-ordinated with a *perfect consecutive* (cf. e.g. Ez 14:13, Am 5:19, Ru 3:3, four perfects in each case, Is 8:7 five, Ex 6:6f. eight). It is true, however, of the perfect (as conversely of the *imperfect*, § 112 c), that as soon as the *Wāw* is separated by any intervening word from the verb to which it belongs, an *imperfect* necessarily takes the place of the *perfect*, e.g. Gn 12:12 *when the Egyptians shall see thee, they shall say* (וְיִרְאֶוּ), *This is his wife: and they will kill me* (הִנֵּה אֲنָתָךְ) but *thee they will save alive* (וְיִצְחַרְתָּ).

² It is difficult to give a proper explanation of this phenomenon (according to § 49 a, note, to be found only in the Canaanitish group of languages), when we have given up the theory of a special *wāw conversivum* in the unscientific sense mentioned in § 49 b, note, at the end, and if we accept the fact that the *perfect* and *imperfect consecutive* cannot possibly be used in a way which contradicts their fundamental character as described in §§ 106 and 107. In other words, even the *perfect consecutive* originally represents a finally completed action, &c., just as the *imperfect consecutive* represents an action which is only beginning, becoming or still continuing, and hence in any case incomplete. The simplest view is to suppose, that the use of the *perfect consecutive* originated from those cases, in which it had to express the conclusion (or final consequence) of an action which was continued (or repeated) *in past time* (see the examples above), and that this use was afterwards extended to other cases, in which it had to represent the temporal or logical consequence of actions, &c., still in progress, and thus in the end a regular interchange of the two tenses became recognized.

2. The perfect consecutive, like the imperfect consecutive, always belongs to the period of time expressed by the preceding tense, or its equivalent, with which it is connected as the temporal or logical consequence. The particular cases may be classed under three heads: (a) the perfect consecutive in *immediate dependence* (see e), (b) in loose connexion (see x) with the preceding, and (c) the perfect consecutive at the beginning of the apodosis to other sentences, or their equivalents (see ff).

3. The perfect consecutive in immediate dependence on the preceding tense, or its equivalent, serves

(a) As a frequentative tense to express *past actions, &c.*, i.e. actions repeatedly brought to a conclusion in the past, and follows tenses, or their equivalents, representing actions which have *continued* or been *repeated in the past*:

(α) After a simple imperfect, e.g. Gn 2:6 **וְעַלְהָ אֵת** *there went up a mist (again and again) from the earth,* **וְנִשְׁׁמַרְתָּ** *and watered (as it were, and ever watered afresh), &c.* This frequentative use of the perfect consecutive is equally evident after frequentative imperfects, Gn 2:10 (**וְהִי֏ה** *and it became* again every time; **וְיִהְיֶה** would mean, and it became so once for all); 29:2f. (four perfects consecutive referring to actions repeated daily); Ex 33:7–11 **וַיַּקְרֹב** *he used to take* at each new encampment *the tent,* **וְנִצְחַטֵּה** *and to pitch it again every time without the camp;* notice, amongst the numerous frequent. perff. consec., the imperf. in vv. 7, 8, 9, 11, always in a frequentative sense; 34:34f., Nu 9:19, 21 (among several simple imperfects), 10:17, Ju 2:19, 1 S 2:19 **וְעַשְׂתָה** *she used to make ...* **וְהַעֲלִתָה** *and brought it to him from year to year;* 27:9 (**וְלֹא**), 1 K 14:28, 2 K 3:25, 12:15 (in verses 16^f imperfects occur again). So also in dependent sentences, Gn 6:4 (**וְיָבֹא** *as a continuation of* **וְיָלֹךְ**), Jb 31:29.¹

(β) After an imperfect consecutive, e.g. Ex 39:3 (**וְקִצְצֹו**), 1 S 5:7 (? see § 112 rr), 7:16, 2 S 15:2, 5, 16:13 *and he threw stones at him,* **וְעַפְרָה** *and east dust* continually; 12:16, 31, 2 K 6:10, 12:11 ff. 15, Jer 37:15, Jb 1:5.

Rem. The frequentative perfect consecutive is sometimes joined even with imperfects consecutive which simply express one *single* action or occurrence in the past; thus Ex 18:26, 40:31 f., 1 S 1:4, 2 S 15:1 f., 1 K 14:27 (cf. verse 28); 1 K 18:4, 2 K 12:10. For other examples of a loosely connected frequentative perfect consecutive, see below, dd.

(γ) After a perfect, Gn 37:3 (**וְעַשְׂתָה** **לֵז**), i.e. as often as he needed a new garment)²; Gn 31:7, Nu 11:8, 1 S 16:14, 2 K 3:4, Ps 22:6;³ in interrogative sentences, 1 S 26:9 *who has ever, &c.;* Ps 80:13, Jb 1:1, 4, Ru 4:7.

1¹ Also in Ez 44:12 (where Stade, ZAW. v. 293, would read **וְרָתַי** and **וְיִהְיֶה**) the unusual tenses may have been intentionally chosen: *because they continually ministered and so always became afresh ...*

2² Driver, on this passage, rightly refers to 1 S 2:19.

3³ Am 4:7 would also come under this head, if **וְהַמְּתֻמָּתָה** is really intended, and the statement refers to the past; **וְגַעֲשֵׂת** might, however, also be a perfect expressing positive assurance (§ 106 m), and the passage would then come under s.

(δ) After an infinitive, Am 1:11 **עַל־קָרְבֹּו** because he did pursue his brother, **וְשָׁחַת** and (on each occasion) *did east off all pity* (then an imperfect consecutive); after an infinitive absolute, Jos 6:13, 2 S 13:19, Jer 23:14.

(ε) After a participle, Is 6:3 (**וְקָרְבָּא**), &c., frequentative, as a continuation of **עַמְּדִים**, verse 2); 1 S 2:22, 2 S 17:17.⁴

(ζ) After other equivalents of tenses, e.g. Gn 47:22 *the priests had a portion from Pharaoh, and did eat* (year by year), &c.; 1 K 4:7.

(b) To express *present* actions, &c., as the temporal or logical consequence of actions or events which continue or are repeated in the present, especially such as have, according to experience, been at all times frequently repeated, and may be repeated at any time:

(α) After a simple imperfect, e.g. Gn 2:24 *therefore a man leaves (בַּזֵּבֶן) is accustomed to leave*) ... **וְצַבֵּק** and cleaves, &c., here, as frequently elsewhere, clearly with the secondary idea of purpose, i.e. in order to cleave; Is 5:11 (if is to be taken as a continuation of **וְקָרְבָּא**); Is 28:28, Jer 12:3, Ho 4:3, 7:7, Ps 90:6, Jb 14:9; also in dependent clauses, Lv 20:18, Is 29:8, 11 f., Am 5:19.

(β) After a participle, as the equivalent of a sentence representing a contingent action, &c., e.g. Ex 21:12 **מִכֶּה אִישׁ וְמִתְהִיא** (instead of there is in verse 20, &c.) **וְכִי יָכֵה** if one smite a man and (so that) he die, &c., Ex 21:16, Is 29:15, Am 6:1, Hb 2:12.

(γ) After an infinitive absolute, Jer 7:9 f. *will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery* (simple infinitives absolute; cf. § 113 ee), **וְבָאתֶם** and then come and stand before me ... and say, &c.; cf. below, u.

(c) To express *future* actions, &c., as the temporal or logical consequence of tenses, or their equivalents, which announce or require such future actions or events. Thus—

(α) After imperfects in the sense of a simple future, e.g. Am 9:3 f. **מְשֻׁנְנָה וְלֹא חֲתָמִים** I will search and take them out thence, &c.; Gn 4:14, 40:13, Ex 7:3, 1 S 17:32, 2 K 5:11, Jb 8:6 f. (also with a change of subject, Gn 27:12, Ju 6:16, &c.); and in interrogative sentences, Gn 39:9, Ex 2:7, 2 S 12:18, 2 K 14:10, Am 8:8, Ps 41:6; cf. also Ru 1:11; in sentences expressing a wish, 2 S 15:4; as well as in almost all kinds of dependent clauses. Also in conditional clauses after **אִם** Gn 32:9, Ex 19:5, 1 S 1:11, or **כִּי** Gn 37:26, or **הִנֵּה** Jer 3:1; in final clauses after **עַזְלָה** Gn 12:13, Nu 15:40, Is 28:13; after **אֲשֶׁר** Dt 2:25, or **פְּנֵי** Gn 3:22, 19:19, 32:12, Is 6:10, Am 5:6; in temporal clauses, Is 32:15, Jer 13:16; and in relative clauses, Gn 24:14, Ju 1:12, 1 S 17:26.

⁴ That **וְלֹא**, &c., are frequentatives (*the maid-servant used to go repeatedly and tell them*) may be seen from **לֹא כִּי** (necessarily an imperfect, since it is separated from **וְ** by **הָמָם**) and **וְיָכְלִי**; on the other hand in verse 18 **וְיָרָא** and **וְלֹא כִּי** of actions which happened only once.

(β) After the jussive (or an imperfect in the sense of a jussive or optative) or cohortative, with the same or a different subject, e.g. Gn 1:14 f. יְהִי מֵאַרְתָּה ... וְלֹא־יְהִי let there be lights ... and let them be, &c.; Gn 24:4, 28:3, 31:44, 1 K 1:2, 22:13, Ru 2:7, 1 Ch 22:11; after a jussive expressing an imprecation, Ps 109:10.

(γ) After an imperative, also with the same or a different subject, e.g. 2 S 7:5 לֹךְ וְאֶמְרֶךְ go and tell (that thou mayst tell), &c., and often, *perf. consec.* after לֹךְ (as also the *perf. consec.* of אָמַר very frequently follows other imperatives); Gn 6:14, 8:17, 27:43 f., 1 S 15:3, 18, 1 K 2:36, Jer 48:26.

(δ) After perfects which express a definite expectation or assurance (cf. § 106 m and n), e.g. Gn 17:20 הִנֵּה בָּכְתִּי אֲ�תָּה וְהִפְרֹתִי אֲתָּה behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, &c.; Is 2:11, 5:14; on Am 4:7 see above, note 3 on h; in an interrogative sentence, Ju 9:9, 11:13.

(ε) After a participle, e.g. Gn 7:4 *for yet seven days*, אֲנָכִי מַמְטִיר and I will cause it to rain ... וְמַחַת i.e. in order to) destroy, &c.; Jer 21:9; also with a different subject, Gn 24:43 f. *the maiden which cometh forth* (הַזָּאת ... הַיְלָדָה to whom I shall say ..., וְאִתָּה and she (then) shall say, &c. This use of the perfect consecutive is especially frequent after a participle introduced by הִנֵּה, e.g. Gn 6:17 f.; with a different subject 1 K 20:36, Am 6:14; after a complete noun-clause introduced by הִנֵּה (cf. § 140), Ex 3:13 *behold, I come* (i.e. if I shall come) ... וְאֶמְרָתִי לְךָם and shall say unto them ..., וְאֶמְרָתִי and they (then) shall say, &c.; 1 S 14:8 ff., Is 7:14, 8:7 f., 39:6.

(ζ) After an infinitive absolute, whether the infinitive absolute serves to strengthen the finite verb (see § 113 t), e.g. Is 31:5, or is used as an emphatic substitute for a cohortative or imperfect (§ 113 dd and ee), e.g. Lv 2:6, Dt 1:16, Is 5:5, Ez 23:46 f.

(η) After an infinitive construct governed by a preposition (for this change from the infinitive construction to the finite verb, cf. § 114 r), e.g. 1 S 10:8 עַד־בָּאָתִיךְ till I come unto thee (prop. until my coming) and show thee, &c.; Gn 18:25, 27:45, Ju 6:18, Ez 39:27; cf. 1 K 2:37, 42.

Rem. To the same class belong 1 S 14:24, where the idea of time precedes, *until it be evening and until I be avenged*, &c., and Is 5:8, where the idea of place precedes, in both cases governed by עַד.

4. The very frequent use of the perfect consecutive in direct dependence upon other tenses (see above, d–v) explains how it finally obtained a kind of independent force—especially for the purpose of announcing future events—and might depend loosely on sentences to which it stood only in a wider sense in the relation of a temporal or logical consequence. Thus the perfect consecutive is used—

(a) To announce *future* events, &c., in loose connexion with a further announcement, e.g. Gn 41:30 וְיִקְרָא and two co-ordinate perfects consecutive, equivalent to *but then shall arise*, &c.; frequently so after הִנֵּה with a following substantive (1 S 9:8), or a participial clause (cf. the analogous instances above, under t), e.g. 1 S 2:31 *behold, the days come*, וְיִהְיֶה תְּעִנֵּי that I will cut off, &c.; Is 39:6, Am 4:2,

8:11, 9:13, and very often in Jeremiah; after an expression of time, Ex 17:4, Is 10:25, 29:17, Jer 51:33, Ho 1:4. Further, when joined to a statement concerning present or past facts, especially when these contain the reason for the action, &c., expressed in the perfect consecutive; cf. Is 6:7 *lo, this hath touched thy lips*, וְסָר therefore thine iniquity shall be taken away, &c. (not copulative *and it is taken away*, since it is parallel with a simple imperfect), Gn 20:11, 26:22, Ju 13:3 (here in an adversative sense); Ho 8:14. In loose connexion with a noun-clause, a long succession of perfects consecutive occurs in Ex 6:6 ff. Also in Amos 5:26 וְנִשְׁאַתֶּם may be an announcement *yea, ye shall take up*; but cf. below, rr.

Rem. 1. Very frequently the announcement of a future event is attached by means of וְיֻחָדֵה¹ and it shall come to pass (cf. the analogous continuation in the past by means of וְיָהִי, § 111, 2), after which the event announced (sometimes after a long parenthesis) follows in one or more (co-ordinate) perfects consecutive, Gn 9:14, 12:12 (=if, as in 46:33, Ex 1:10, 22:26 and frequently), 1 K 18:12, Is 14:3 f., Am 8:9; or in the imperfect, Gn 4:14, Is 2:2, 3:24, 4:3, 7:18, 21 ff. (cf. 29:8); or in the jussive, Lv 14:9. It very rarely happens that the verb which is thus loosely added, agrees in gender and number with the following subject, as in Nu 5:27, Jer 42:16 וְיִתְהַגֵּן (before בְּהַבָּדָה), and in Jer 42:17 אֲנָשִׁים (before כָּלִידָה).

2. The jussive form וְיִהְיֶה occurs (in the sense described in y) instead of וְיֻחָדֵה in 1 S 10:5, 2 S 5:24 (1 Ch 14:15), 1 K 14:5, Ru 3:4, although in the first three places a jussive is wholly inadmissible in the context, and even in Ru 3:4 (where an admonition follows) וְיֻחָדֵה would be expected (see below, bb). In 1 K 14:5 the form is a textual error, and the pointing should simply be וְיִהְיֶה. In the other passages וְיִהְיֶה (always before an infinitive with a preposition) stands at the beginning of the sentence at an unusually long distance from the principal tone, and hence is certainly to be explained according to § 109 k, except that in 1 S 10:5, &c., the simply rhythmical jussive form takes the place, not of the full imperfect form, but (exceptionally) of the perfect consecutive.

(b) To introduce a command or wish: Dt 10:19 *love ye therefore the stranger*; 1 S 6:5, 24:16, 1 K 2:6 (in Gn 40:14 the precative perfect consecutive, as elsewhere the cohortative, jussive, and imperative, is strengthened by means of אַתְּ). So, also, in loose connexion with participial and other noun-clauses (see above, x), Gn 45:12 f., 1 K 2:2 f., Ru 3:3 f., 3:9.—In Gn 17:11 the perfect consecutive (וְנִמְלֹאת and ye shall be circumcised, &c.) is used to explain a preceding command.

Rem. As in the cases mentioned above under y, the connexion may be made by means of וְיֻחָדֵה. Thus with a following perfect consecutive, e.g. Gn 46:33, 47:24, Ju 4:20. Cf. also Gn 24:14, where the real wish, at least as regards the sense, is contained in the next sentence.

(c) To introduce a question, whether in loose connexion with another interrogative sentence (see above, p), e.g. Gn 29:15 *art thou my brother* (equivalent to, *Surely thou art*), וְעַבְדָּתָךְ בְּנִי and shouldest thou then serve me for naught? or with a positive statement, e.g. Ex 5:5 (וְהַשְׁפִּתָּם will ye then make them rest?); Nu 16:10, 1 S 25:11, and (if it is Mil'ra□) Ps 50:21 (וְהַרְשָׁתִי).

(d) To introduce actions frequently repeated hence analogous to the numerous examples of a frequentative perfect consecutive, above, under e), e.g. 1 S 1:3 (וְעַלְיָה of annual festival journeys); 13:21 (where, however, the text appears radically corrupt);

¹ On the various combinations with וְיֻחָדֵה see König's statistics in ZAW. xix. 272 ff.

27:9 (*בָּכֶלְבֶּלֶת*, i.e. every time, therefore continued by means of *וְלֹא יִתְהַיֵּה* (*וְלֹא* *אַיְתָה*); 1 K 5:7, parallel with a simple imperfect); 9:25, Jer 25:4, Ho 12:11, Dn 8:4.—In Jb 1:4 f. a series of frequentative perfects consecutive is interrupted by an imperfect consecutive, while a simple imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae*) forms the conclusion. In Jer 6:17 a similar perfect is expressly marked, by placing the tone on the final syllable (according to § 49 h), as parallel with the real perfects consecutive.

Rem. The loose connexion of *tempora frequentativa* by *וְהִיא* (cf. the Rem. on **y** and **bb**) is also very common in this sense; thus with a following perfect consecutive, Gn 30:41 f. (but in verse 42^a, where the verb is separated from the *Wāw* by an insertion, we find *וְאַיְשִׁים* *לֹא יִשְׁׁמַר* *he used not to put them in*, according to § 107 e); Gn 38:9, Ex 17:11, 33:7 ff. (see above, e), Nu 21:9, Ju 6:3, 19:30, 1 S 16:23 (followed by five perfects consecutive); 2 S 15:5; with a following imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae*), Ju 2:19, 2 S 14:26.—In Ju 12:5 f. *וְהִיא*, contrary to what would be expected, is continued by means of the imperfect consecutive, and in 1 S 13:22 by *וְלֹא* with the perfect (instead of the imperfect).

5. Further, the perfect consecutive is very frequently employed with a certain emphasis to introduce the apodosis after sentences (or their equivalents) which contain a condition, a reason, or a statement of time. Such an apodosis, as in the cases already treated, may represent either future events, or commands and wishes, or even events which have been often repeated in the past. Thus—

(a) The perfect consecutive occurs in the apodosis to conditional sentences¹ (§ 159 g, o, s):

(α) After **מִשְׁׁנָה** with the imperfect, e.g. 2 K 7:4b *אִם־יִמְתַּחֲנֵנוּ וְמִתְנַחֲנֵנוּ if they kill us*, (well then) *we shall but die*; here the perfect consecutive is used obviously with greater emphasis than the imperfect (*בְּנִיהָ*) which immediately precedes; Gn 18:26, 24:8, 41, 32:9, Nu 30:15, Ju 4:20, 1 S 1:11, 20:6, 1 K 3:14, Na 3:12, Ec 4:11.

(β) After **מִשְׁׁנָה** with the perfect (in the sense of a *futurum exactum*), Nu 5:27, 2 K 5:20, 7^{4a}, Is 4:4 f.; as precative apodosis after **אִם־נָא** with the *perf. preteritum*, Gn 33:10; as a frequentative perfect consecutive, to represent past events in the apodosis after **מִשְׁׁנָה** with a perfect, Gn 38:9, Nu 21:9, Ju 6:3, Jb 7:4; after **מִשְׁׁנָה** with imperfect, Gn 31:8.

(γ) After **כִּי** (*in case, suppose that*) with the imperfect, Gn 12:12, Ex 18:16, Ju 13:17, Is 58:7, Ez 14:13.² Frequentative with reference to the past, after **כִּי** with frequentative perfect, Ju 2:18, Jb 7:13f.

(δ) After **שֶׁנָּא** with the imperfect, Gn 44:9 *אֲשֶׁר יִמְצָא אֶתְךָ ... וְמֵת* *with whomsoever ... it be found, let him die*; with the perfect, Ex 21:13 *and if a man lie not in wait, &c.*; Ju 1:12.

¹ In a number of the examples of this kind the protasis is already loosely connected by means of *וְהִיא*, and hence some of them had to be already mentioned above, under **y**, **bb**, **ee**.

² In 1 S 24:19 a question appears to be expressed by the perfect consecutive, *for if a man find his enemy, will he let him go well away?* Probably, however, with Klostermann, *וְכִי* *וְמִי* should be read for *וְכִי*.

(ε) Very frequently after a perfect consecutive (one or more) containing the condition, e.g. Gn 44:29 וְלֹקַחְתָּם גַּם־אַתֶּה זוּ ... *and if ye take* (or shall have taken) *this one also ... ye shall bring down*, &c.; cf. Gn 33:13, 42:38, 44:4, 22, 47:30, Nu 30:12, Ru 2:9, and probably also Ez 39:28.—Also frequentative in reference to the past, e.g. 1 S 17:34 f. ... וְבָא הָאָרִי וְצָאתֵי *and when there came* (as sometimes happened) *a lion ... I went out*, &c.; Ex 33:10, Nu 10:17 ff., 1 K 18:10, Jer 20:9 (the perfects consecutive being regularly continued in the apodosis by נִיל with an imperfect¹).

Rem. The perfect consecutive may be used also in the protasis to express a condition when the employment of the perfect consecutive in the apodosis has become impossible, owing to an emphatic word having to stand before it; thus in Ez 14:14 on account of הַנִּזְבֵּן; 33:4 on account of הַמְּנוּנָה.—In 1 S 14:52 the imperfect consecutive, contrary to what might be expected, stands in the apodosis, *and when Saul saw any ... valiant man, he took him unto him*, where הַנִּזְבֵּן suggests the special case, rather than a repeated occurrence; cf. 2 S 15:2. Conversely, in 1 S 2:16 (וְאַתָּה הַמְּנֻמָּר) perhaps a mere mistake for (אַתָּה), 17:35 b an imperfect consecutive stands in the protasis.

(ζ) After various equivalents of sentences, which contain a condition; thus, after a substantive standing absolutely, or a participle (*a casus pendens*), Gn 17:14 ... וְעַד לִזְכָּר ... *and the uncircumcised male* (in case such an one be found), *he shall be cut off*, &c.; cf. Gn 30:32, Ex 12:15, 2 S 14:10, Is 6:13, and (after an infinitive with a preposition) 2 S 7:14; in a wider sense also Ex 4:21, 9:19, 12:44, Is 9:4, 56:5.

(β) The perfect consecutive serves as the apodosis to causal clauses; thus e.g. after בַּיִם with the perfect, Is 3:16 f.; after בְּעַד אֲשֶׁר with perfect, 1 K 20:28; after בְּעַד כִּי with perfect, Nu 14:24; also after what are equivalent to causal clauses, e.g. Ps 25:11 (לְפָנֶיךָ ... וְסַלְחָנָךְ ... *for thy name's sake ... pardon ...*); Is 37:29 after בְּעַד with an infinitive.

(γ) The perfect consecutive occurs as the apodosis to temporal clauses or their equivalents, e.g. 1 S 2:15 בְּפָנֶיךָ לְבִן עַד הַפְּנֵי ... וְבָא הַלְּבָד *before they burnt the fat, the priest's servant came* (used to come), &c., hence a frequentative perfect consecutive relating to the past, as in Ex 1:19; also after participial clauses (§ 116 w), e.g. 1 S 2:13 f. כִּל־אִישׁ זֶבֶחַ זֶבֶחַ ... וְבָא *when(ever) any man offered sacrifice, then came*, &c. (so Ju 19:30, 2 S 20:12), with a frequentative perfect consecutive. The perfect consecutive is very frequently used to announce future actions or events after simple expressions of time of any kind; thus Gn 3:5, Ex 32:34 (after בַּיּוֹם with the infinitive), cf. also such examples as Gn 44:31, Ju 16:2, Jos 6:10, 1 S 1:22, 16:23 (numerous frequentative perfects consecutive after the infinitive with a preposition; so 2 S 15:5, see above, ee); 1 S 20:18, 2 S 14:26, 15:10, Is 18:5; moreover, Ex 17:4, Is 10:25, 29:17, 37:26; even after single disconnected words, e.g. Ex 16:6 עַד רְבָב נִידְעָמָם *at even* (when it becomes evening) *then ye shall know*; cf. verse 7, Lv 7:16, 1 K 13:31, Pr 24:27.

¹ In all these examples (not only in the frequentative perfects consecutive) the original idea of the perfect, which also underlies the perfect consecutive, comes out very distinctly. Gn 44:29 (see above) implies in the mind of the speaker, If it ever shall have come to this, that ye *have taken* this one also, then ye *have thereby brought me down to Sheol*.

6. Finally there still remains a number of passages which cannot be classed with any of those hitherto mentioned. Of these, some are due to the influence of Aramaic modes of expression, while in others the text is evidently corrupt.¹ In a few instances we can do no more than merely call attention to the incorrectness of the expression. (We are not of course concerned here with the cases—usually occurring in dependent clauses—in which a 2nd pers. *perf.* with Wāw copulative is simply co-ordinate with what precedes, as in Gn 28:6, and probably Nu 21:15, Dt 33:2.)

(a) The influence of the Aramaic construction of the perfect with **וְ** as the narrative tense, instead of the Hebrew imperfect consecutive (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 71 b), is certainly to be traced in *Qoheleth*, and sporadically in other very late books,² perhaps also in a few passages in the books of Kings, which are open to the suspicion of being due to later interpolation; so probably 1 K 12:32 **וְעַמִּיךְ וְרָאָתָה**; 2 K 11:1 **K^eth.**; 14:14 **וְלֹקֶחֶת** (in the parallel passage, 2 Ch 25:24, the word is wanting); 2 K 23:4 **וְנִשְׁתַּחֲווּ**, &c.; verse 10 **וְנִפְטַּרְתֶּן**, &c.; verse 12 **וְנִשְׁלַּחַ**, &c.; verse 15 **וְנִשְׁרַּף**, &c.³ Cf. also Ez 37:2, 7, 10.

(b) The text is certainly corrupt in Is 40:6 (read with the LXX and Vulgate אָמַר); Jer 38:28, where the narrative breaks off in the middle of the sentence; 40:3 (**וְהִיא**, &c., wanting in the LXX); also in Ju 7:13 **וְנִפְלֵה אָכָל** is altogether redundant; in 1 S 3:13 read, with Klostermann, the 2nd sing. masc. instead of **וְהַגְדֵּתְךָ**; in 1 K 21:12 **וְהַשְׁבֵּתְךָ** is, no doubt, incorrectly repeated from verse 9, where it is an imperative.

Of other questionable instances, (a) the following, at any rate, may also be explained as frequentatives, Gn 21:25, 49:23, Ex 36:38, 38:28, 39:3, 1 S 5:7, 17:20, 24:11 (but even so **וְאָמַרְתָּ** would be expected); 2 K 23:12, Is 28:26 (parallel with an imperfect); Am 5:26 (unless it is rather, *yea, ye shall take up*; see above, x); Ps 26:3, Ezra 8:36.

(β) A longer or constant continuance in a past state is perhaps represented by the perfect with **וְ** (as a variety of the frequentative perfect with **וְ**), in Gn 15:6, 34:5, Nu 21:20, Jos 9:12, 22:3b, Is 22:14, Jer 3:9. But the unusual *perfects consec.* in Jos 15:3–11, 16:2–8 (ultimately parallel with an imperf. as in 17:9, 18:20), 18:12–21, 19:11–14.22.26–29.34, are without doubt rightly explained by Bennett (*SBOT*, Joshua, p. 23) as originally containing the directions either of God to Joshua or of Joshua to the people; cf. the evident trace of this in

¹ Mayer Lambert, *REJ.* xxvi. 55, is probably right in pointing some of these forms as *infin. abs.* instead of *perfects*.

² In the whole of *Qoheleth* the imperfect consecutive occurs only in 1:17 and 4:1, 7. Several of the perfects with **וְ** can no doubt be explained as frequentatives, e.g. 1:13, 2:5, 9, 11, 13, 15, 5:18, compared with 6:2; but this is impossible in such passages as 9:14 ff. In Ezra, Driver reckons only six examples of the historical perfect with **וְ**, in Nehemiah only six, and in Esther six or seven.

³ Stade in *ZAW.* v. 291 ff. and in *Ausgeählte akad. Reden*, Giessen, 1899, p. 194 ff. and appendix p. 199, discusses, in connexion with 2 K 12:12, a number of critically questionable perfects with **וְ**. He considers that the whole section, 2 K 23:4 from **וְנִשְׁתַּחֲווּ** to verse 5 inclusive, is to be regarded as a gloss, since the continuation of an imperfect consecutive by means of a perfect with **וְ** never occurs in pre-exilic documents, except in places where it is due to corruption of the original text. The theory of frequentative perfects consecutive (even immediately after imperfects consecutive), which has been supported above, under f and g, by a large number of examples, is quite inconsistent with the character of the action in 2 K 23:5, **וְהַשְׁבִּיתָ**, verse 8 **צָרָתָ**, and verse 14 **וְשִׁבַּרְתָּ**.

SBOT. *SBOT*. = Sacred Books of the Old Testament, ed. by P. Haupt. Lpz. and Baltimore, 1893 ff.

15:4b. A redactor transformed the directions into a description but left the *perfects consec.*, which are to be explained as in aa. In the same way וְקַיִם Ex 36:29 is most simply explained as repeated from 26:25.

(γ) The following are due to errors in the text, or to incorrect modes of expression: Ex 36:29 f., Ju 3:23, ¹ 16:18 (read עָלָיו), 1 S 4:19, 17:38, 2 S 16:5, 19:18 f. (read לְחַזֵּץ and עָבָרָו), 1 K 3:11 (where וְשָׁאַלְתָּה is, no doubt intentionally, assimilated to the four other perfects); 13:3, 20:21; 2 K 14:7 (where, with Stade, שְׁפָעַת לְעֹלָה should be read); 14:14, 18:4 (where, at any rate, שְׁבָרֶת might be taken as a frequentative, but not וְכָרְתָּה, &c.; evidently the perfects are co-ordinated only in form with הָוָא הַסִּיר); 18:36, 21:15, 24:14, Jer 37:15 (where וְהַכְּפִי, but not וְהַנְּגִין, might be frequentative); Ez 9:7 (omit וְאַזְּבֵן with Stade, and read וְהַכְּפִי); 20:22 (Mil[□]el before an imperfect consecutive); Am 7:4 (וְאַכְלָה after an imperfect consecutive); Jb 16:12.

Finally, in 1 S 1:12, 10:9, 17:48, 25:20, 2 S 6:16, 2 K 3:15, Jer 37:11, Am 7:2 וְיִהְיֶה is to be read throughout instead of וְקַיִם, but in Gn 38:5 וְקִיאָה with the LXX.

THE INFINITIVE AND PARTICIPLE.

§ 113. *The Infinitive Absolute.*

Cf. the dissertation of J. Kahan, and, especially, the thorough investigation by E. Sellin, both entitled, *Ueber die verbal-nominals Doppelnatur der hebräischen Participien und Infinitive, &c.*, Lpz. 1889; F. Prätorius, ‘Ueber die sogen. Infin. absol. des Hebr.’ in *ZDMG*. 1902, pp. 546 ff.

1. The infinitive absolute is employed according to § 45 to emphasize the idea of the verb *in the abstract*, i.e. it speaks of an action (or state) without any regard to the agent or to the circumstances of time and mood under which it takes place. As the *name* of an action the infinitive absolute, like other nouns in the stricter sense, may form part of certain combinations (as a subject, predicate, or object, or even as a genitive,¹ see below); but such a use of the infinitive absolute (instead of the infinitive construct with or without a preposition) is, on the whole, rare, and, moreover, open to question on critical grounds. On the other hand, the infinitive absolute frequently exhibits its character as an expression of the *verbal idea* by taking an object, either in the accusative or even with a preposition.

Examples of the use of the infinitive absolute:—

(a) As subject, Pr 25:27 לֹא טוֹב קְבֻשׁ הַרְבּוֹת אֲכַל it is not good to eat much honey; Jer 10:5, Jb 6:25, Ec 4:17; epexegetically, after a demonstrative pronoun, Is 58:5 f., Zc 14:12.

(b) As predicate, Is 32:17 and the effect of righteousness (is) תְּחִשְׁבָּט בְּמִזְרָחָה quietness (prop. to find rest) and confidence.

¹ Or does וְנַעַל, as a frequentative, imply fastening with several bolts? It is, at all events, to be noticed, that in 2 S 13:18 also follows an imperfect consecutive. ZDMG. ZDMG. = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

¹ The infinitive absolute can never be joined with a genitive or a pronominal suffix.

(c) As object, Is 1:17 **לְדֹדוּ הַיְטֵב** *learn to do well*; Is 7:15, Pr 15:12, Jb 9:18; according to the sense also Jer 9:23 23:14, as well as Is 5:5 (**רָצַח** and **פָּרֶץ** virtually depend on the idea of the wish contained in **הַשְׁעָם**); Is 22:13, where a long series of infinitives absolute is governed by **הַבָּה**, and 59:13 (six infinitives governed by **וְיַם** in verse 12); Dt 28:56 is strange since the object precedes the infinitive absolute which governs it,² also Is 42:24, where the statement of place precedes the infinitive absolute.—In Jer 9:4, Jb 13:3 the infinitive absolute as the object of the verb is placed before it for the sake of emphasis (with the verb negated by **אַל** in Is 57:20, Jer 49:23), so also in La 3:45 where it is the remoter object and co-ordinated with a substantive.

(d) As genitive, Is 14:23 **בְּמִטְמָטָה הַשְׁמָד** *with the besom of destruction*; so perhaps also 4:4 **בְּרִיתְךָ בַּעֲדָךְ**; cf. further, Pr 1:3, 21:16. The infinitive absolute is never used in immediate connexion with prepositions³ (which as being originally substantives govern the genitive), but always the infinitive construct; but if a second infinitive is co-ordinated by **וְ** with such an infinitive construct, it has the form of the infinitive absolute (since it is released from the immediate government of the preposition), e.g. 1 S 22:13 ... **בְּאֶלְיוֹן לֹא תַתְּקַרְבֶּנּוּ** *in that thou hast given him bread ... and hast enquired of God for him*; Ez 36:3; 1 S 25:26, 33 (after **בְּ**); after **לְ** Ex 32:6, Jer 7:18, 44:17.

(e) Governing an accusative of the object, e.g. Is 22:13 **כַּרְגֵּבְךָ וְשָׂחַם צָאֵן** *slaying oxen and killing sheep*; cf. Ex 20:8, 23:30, Dt 5:12, Is 37:19, Ez 23:30, and of the examples in a–d, Dt 28:56 Is 5:5, 58:6 f., Pr 25:27, &c.; followed by a preposition, e.g. Is 7:15 **מְאֹס בָּרָע וּבָחָור** *to refuse the evil and choose the good*; Pr 15:12 **לְהַבְּטָבֵב** *(לְ)*.

If the object be a personal pronoun, then, since the infinitive absolute can never be united with a suffix (see the note on ^a), it is affixed by means of the accusative-sign **תְּ** (**תְּאַת**), e.g. Jer 9:23 **וַיַּדְעַת אָתְּ** *and knoweth me*; Ez 36:3.

2. Analogous to the use of the infinitive absolute as the accusative of the object, mentioned in d, is its employment as a *casus adverbialis*¹ in connexion with some form of the finite verb, to describe more particularly the manner or attendant circumstances (especially those of time and place) under which an action or state has taken place, or is taking place, or will take place; e.g. Jer 22:19 *he shall be buried with the burial of an ass*, **וְהַשְׁלִיךְ** *a drawing and casting forth*, i.e. being drawn and cast forth, &c.; Gn 21:16 (**הַרְחִיק** *a removing*, i.e. distant; cf. Ex 33:7, Jos 3:16); Gn 30:32, Ex 30:36, Nu 6:5, 23, 15:35 (where a subject is added subsequently; see below, gg); Jos 3:17, 1 S 3:12 (**הַחֲלֵל וּכְלָלָה** *a beginning and ending*, i.e. from beginning to end); 2 S 8:2, Is 7:11 (**הַעֲמִק** *and the deep*, prop. *a making deep ...*, and *a making high*, i.e. whether thy request extend to the world below or to the height above); 57:17 (**הַסְּתַר** *in hiding*, sc. my face); Jer 3:15 (**דַּעַת וְהַשְׁפֵּיל** *with knowledge and understanding*); Hb

² Perhaps **הַצָּא** according to § 53 k should be explained as an infinitive construct, or should be written **הַצָּא**.

³ 1 S 1:9 is impossible Hebrew, and as the LXX shows, a late addition.

¹ That this *casus adverbialis* also was originally regarded as an accusative, may be seen from classical Arabic, where an infinitive of this kind expressly retains the accusative ending. In Latin the ablative of the gerund corresponds in many ways to this use of the infinitive absolute.

3:13 (**עֲרָוֹת**, for the form cf. § 75 aa); Zc 7:3, Ps 35:16 (**קַרְעַ**, to define more precisely verse 15); Jb 15:3.²

Rem. 1. To an adverbial infinitive absolute of this kind, there may further be added a *casus adverbialis* (the accusative of state or circumstance), or even a circumstantial clause, to define more exactly the manner in which the action is performed, e.g. Is 20:2 *and he did so walking naked and barefoot*, prop. in the condition of one naked, &c.; Is 30:14 *a breaking in pieces* (acc. to the reading **כִּתְחֻתָּה**; the Masora requires **כִּתְחֻתָּה**) *without sparing*.

2. A few infinitives of this kind, all of which are in Hiph'il, have, through frequent use, come to be treated by the language as simple adverbs; so especially **הַרְבָּה** (cf. § 75 ff) *multum faciendo*, i.e. *multum*, very frequently strengthened by **זֶה אָמֵן** *very* and even used without connexion with a finite verb (see the Lexicon); also **הַיּוֹטֵב** *bene faciendo*, i.e. *bene*, used especially to express the careful and thorough performance of an action (e.g. Dt 13:15); in Dt 9:21, 27:8 it is added epexegetically to another adverbial infinitive absolute, in Jon 4:9 it twice precedes the verb for the sake of emphasis. Finally, **הַשְׁבָּם** *mane faciendo*, i.e. *early in the morning*, then in general *early* with the additional idea of earnestness; in 1 S 17:16 joined with the infinitive absolute **בְּרַב** a denominative from **צָהָב** *evening (morning and evening)*, i.e. *early and late*), elsewhere (with the exception of Pr 27:14) always joined with the infinitive absolute of the governing verb, e.g. Jer 11:7 *for I earnestly protested* (**בְּעֵד** *unto your fathers ...* **הַשְׁבָּם וְהַעֲדָה** *rising early and protesting*, i.e. with earnest protestation; Jer 25:3, 26:5 (where **ו** should be omitted before **בְּ**); Jer 29:19, 32:33, 2 Ch 16:15.

3. The infinitive absolute occurs most frequently in immediate connexion with the finite verb of the same stem, in order in various ways *to define more accurately or to strengthen the idea of the verb*.¹

These infinitives absolute joined immediately to the finite verb belong in a sense to the *schema etymologicum* treated in § 117 p, i.e. they are objects of the finite verb in question, except that the infinitive absolute (as a *nomen abstractum*) lays stress rather on the actual occurrence or the energy of the action (see the examples below), while the noun proper emphasizes the result or extent of the action; cf. e.g. Ex 22:22 **אָמַד-צָעַק נָאֵל יִצְעַק קָרְבָּן** *if it actually happens that he cries to me*, with Gn 27:34 (as it were, *he cried*, so that *a great cry was heard*).

We must further distinguish—

(a) The infinitive absolute used *before* the verb to *strengthen* the verbal idea, i.e. to emphasize in this way either the certainty (especially in the case of threats) or the forcibleness and completeness of an occurrence. In English, such an infinitive is mostly expressed by a corresponding adverb, but sometimes merely by putting greater stress on the verb; e.g. Gn 2:17 **מוֹת קָרְבָּן** *thou shalt surely die*, cf. 18:10, 18, 22:17, 28:22, 1 S 9:6 (*cometh surely to pass*); 24:21, Am 5:5, 7:17, Hb 2:3, Zc 11:17; with

² Also in 2 K 21:13 for **וְהַפְּנֵי** **מְחַנָּה וְהַפְּנֵי** read with Stade and Klostermann **מְחַנָּה**; similarly, with Stade, **נְשָׁקָר** in Ju 4:24; **זָוָה** in Jer 23:14, and on Is 31:5 cf. t.

¹ Cf. A. Rieder, *Die Verbindung des Inf. abs. mit dem Verb. fin ... im Hebr.*, Lpz., 1872; also his *Quae ad syntaxin Hebraicam ... planiorem faciendam ex lingua Graeca et Latina afferantur*, Gumbinnen (Programm des Gymnasiums), 1884. G. R. Hauschild, *Die Verbindung finiter und infiniter Verbalformen desselben Stammes in einigen Bibelsprachen*, Frankfurt a. M., 1893, discussing especially the rendering of such constructions in the Greek and Latin versions.

the infinitive strengthened by אָקֵן Gn 44:28 (but 27:30 *and Jacob was yet scarce gone out*, &c.); Gn 43:3 נִשְׁאַל נִשְׁאַל הָעֵד בָּנוֹ he did solemnly protest unto us; 1 S 20:6 הָעֵד הָעֵד בָּנוֹ *he did solemnly protest unto us*; 1 S 20:6 נִשְׁאַל נִשְׁאַל וְהִנְרִישׁ לְאָתָה וְהִנְרִישׁ לְאָתָה *and did not utterly drive them out*; especially typical instances are Am 9:8 *I will destroy it from off the face of the earth* אֶשְׁמִיד אֶשְׁמִיד וְגַם saving that I will not utterly destroy, &c.; Jer 30:11 *and will in no wise leave thee unpunished*; cf. further Gn 20:18, 1 K 3:26, Jo 1:7, Jb 13:5.

The infinitive absolute is used before the verb with less emphasis:

(1) Frequently at the beginning of the statement; cf. Driver on 1 S 20:6. However, in these cases a special emphasis on the following verb is sometimes intended; cf. above, n, on Gn 43:3, 1 S 20:6; also Gn 3:16, 26:28, 32:17, 1 S 14:28, 20:3. Elsewhere the infinitive absolute is evidently used only as possessing a certain fullness of sound (hence for rhythmical reasons, like some uses of the separate pronoun, § 135 a), as in Gn 15:13, 43:7, 20, Ju 9:8, 1 S 10:16, 23:10, 2 S 1:6, 20:18.

(2) Very frequently in conditional sentences after אם, &c. The infinitive absolute in this case emphasizes the importance of the condition on which some consequence depends, e.g. Ex 15:26 *if thou wilt diligently hearken*, &c., Ex 19:5, 21:5, 22:3, 11 f. 16, 22 (see above, m); 23:22, Nu 21:2, Ju 16:11, 1 S 1:11, 12:25; after לו 1 S 14:30.

The infinitive absolute is used to give emphasis to an antithesis, e.g. 2 S 24:24 *nay; but I will verily buy* (קָנָה) *it of thee*, &c. (not receive it as a gift); Ju 15:13 *no; but we will bind thee fast ... but surely we will not kill thee*; cf. further Gn 31:30 (*thou art indeed gone=*) *though thou wouldest needs be gone* (Vulg. *esto*), *because thou sore longedst*, &c.; Ps 118:13, 18, 126:6 (the second infinitive absolute as a supplement to the first—see below, r—comes after the verb).—Hence also, as permissive, Gn 2:16 f. תִּאְכַּל אֶת־אָכְלָךְ *thou mayest freely eat, but*, &c. (so that verse 16 is in antithesis to verse 17); or concessive, 1 S 2:30 *I said indeed ...*, 14:43.

The infinitive absolute is used to strengthen a question, and especially in impassioned or indignant questions, e.g. Gn 37:8 הַמְלֵךְ תִּמְלֵךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל shalt thou indeed reign over us? Gn 37:10, 43:7, Ju 11:25, 1 S 2:27, 2 S 19:43, Jer 3:1, 13:12, Ez 28:9, Am 3:5, Zc 7:5; but cf. also Gn 24:5 *must I needs bring again?*

(b) The infinitive absolute *after the verb*, sometimes (as in n) to intensify¹ the idea of the verb (especially after imperatives and participles, since the infinitive absolute can never precede either, e.g. Nu 11:15, Jb 13:17, 21:2, 37:2 שְׁמֹעַ שְׁמֹעַ *hearken ye attentively*; Jer 22:10; after participles, e.g. Is 22:17, also elsewhere, e.g. Nu 23:11, 24:10 *thou hast altogether blessed them*; Jos 24:10, 2 K 5:11, Dn 11:10, and with the infinitive absolute strengthened by means of מִן Gn 31:15, 46:4, Nu 16:13); sometimes to express the long *continuance* of an action; here again after an imperative, Is 6:9 שְׁמֹעַ שְׁמֹעַ *hear ye continually*; after a perfect, Jer 6:29; after a participle, Jer 23:17; after an imperfect consecutive, Gn 19:9, Nu 11:32.

¹ In Arabic also, the intensifying infinitive regularly stands *after* the verb, but in Syriac *before* the verb.

To this class belong especially those cases in which a second infinitive absolute is co-ordinated with the first; the latter then expresses either an accompanying or antithetical action or the aim to which the principal action is directed; e.g. 1 S 6:12 *וְלֹכֶד וּגְנָעֵן* *lowing as they went* (lowing continually; so after a participle, Jos 6:13b *Q̄rē*); Gn 8:7 *it went forth to and fro*²; Is 19:22 *smiting and* (i.e. but also) *healing again*; Jo 2:26 (see above, m).

Rem. 1. Instead of a second infinitive absolute (see above) there is sometimes found a perfect consecutive (*Jos. 6:13* a and *2 S 13:19* [but Stade's *וְעַזְקִין* is preferable], in both places as perfect frequentative; *Is 31:5* referring to the future, unless with Stade, *ZAW.* vi. 189, we read *וְחַצְלִיל* and *וְחַמְלִיט*), or an imperfect consecutive (*1 S 19:23, 2 S 16:13*) or participle (*2 S 16:5*); cf. also *u.*

2. The idea of long *continuance* is very frequently expressed by the verb *לָלוּךְ* *to go*, along with its infinitive absolute, or even by the latter alone, and this occurs not only when it can be taken in its literal sense (*to go, to walk*, as in the examples given above, *Jos 6:9, 13, 1 S 6:12, 2 S 3:16, 13:19*; cf. also, *Is 3:16*, where both infinitives stand *before* the verb, and *Ps 126:6*, where *לָלוּךְ* precedes), but in cases where *לָלוּךְ* in the sense of *to go on, to continue*, merely performs also the function of an adverb. The action itself is added in a second infinitive absolute, or sometimes (see above, *t*) in a participle or verbal adjective. Examples, *Gn 8:3* *וַיְשׁוּבֵ בְּהַמֵּעָן ... לָלוּךְ יְמִינֵי* *and the waters returned ... continually*; *Gn 8:5, 12:9, Ju 14:9, 2 K 2:11*; with a participle following, *Jer 4:16* (unless we read *וְבַבְּהָרָה*, as in *2 S 3:16*); with an adjective following, *Gen 26:13, Ju 4:24, 1 S 14:19, 2 S 5:10* (*1 Ch 11:9, 2 S 18:25*).¹

On the other hand, in *1 S 17:41* the participle *הַלְּכוּ* is used instead of the infinitive absolute. Of a different kind are the instances in which the participle *הַלְּכוּ* is used as predicate along with the co-ordinate adjective (*Ex 19:19, 1 S 2:26, 2 S 3:1, 15:12, Est 9:4, 2 Ch 17:12*) or participle (*1 S 17:15, Jon 1:11, Pr 4:18, Ec 1:6*).

3. The regular place of the negative is between the intensifying infinitive absolute and the finite verb,² e.g. *Ex 5:23* *לֹא-אָדַתְּךָ תִּלְאַל* *neither hast thou delivered at all*, *Ju 15:13, Jer 13:12, 30:11*; cf. *Mi 1:10* (*אֲלָג*). Exceptions are *Gn 3:4* (where the negation of the threat pronounced in *2:17* is expressed in the same form of words); *Am 9:8, Ps 49:8*.

4. With a finite verb of one of the derived conjugations, not only the infinitive absolute of the *same* conjugation may be connected (*Gn 28:22 Pi[□]ēl; 17:13, Ex 22:3, Ez 14:3 Niph[□]al; Gn 40:15 Pu[□]al; Ho 4:18 Hiph[□]il; Ez 16:4 Hoph[□]al*), but also (especially with Niph[□]al, rarely with Pi[□]ēl and Hiph[□]il; see Driver on *2 S 20:18*) that of *Qal* as the simplest and most general representative of the verbal idea, *2 S 20:18* (with Pi[□]ēl; but in *Gn 37:33, 44:28* *טָרַף* is a passive of *Qal*, § 52 e); *46:4* (with Hiph[□]il); *Ex 19:13, 21:20, 2 S 23:7, Is 40:30, Jer 10:5, Jb 6:2* (with Niph[□]al); *Is 24:19* (with Hithpo[□]ēl); *הַשְׁׁרֵךְ* in the same verse must also, according to the Masora, certainly be the infinitive absolute *Qal*; see § 67 o), and so always *מוֹת יִמְתַּה he shall surely be put to death*. Elsewhere the infinitive absolute of a conjugation with kindred meaning is found, *Lv 19:20, 2 K 3:23 Hoph[□]al* for Niph[□]al (but most probably we should

² ² Also in *Ez 1:14* for the distorted form *רְצֻוֹא יִצְׁרֹא* reads simply *צְרֹרְאָה*.

ZAW. *ZAW.* = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

¹ Cf. in French, *Le mal va toujours croissant, la maladie va toujours en augmentant et en empirant*, ‘continually increases and becomes worse and worse.’

² Cf. Rieder, *Quo loco ponantur negationes אַל et אֲלָג ... (Zeitschrift für Gymn. Wesen*, 1879, p. 395 ff.).

read, with Driver, the *infin.* *Niph.* in both places, הַרְבָּה and הַרְבָּה; 1 S 2:16 (Pi \square ēl for Hiph \square il, unless יְקַרְבֵּן is to be read); Ez 16:4 (Hoph \square al for Pu \square al).³ Finally, the infinitive absolute may equally well be represented by a *substantive* of kindred stem.¹ In Is 29:14 the substantive intensifying the verb is found *along with* the infinitive absolute.

5. Instead of the infinitive absolute immediately connected with the finite verb, an infinitive construct form appears (cf. § 73 d), in Nu 23:25 נָגַם קְבָב (cf. Ru 2:16 לְשָׁמֶן; Jer 50:34 רִיבֵי בָבָן); Pr 23:1 בֵין תְּבִין (רִיב בָבָן). In the last instances the infinitive is probably assimilated to the imperfect, like the infinitive Niph \square al in the forms noticed in § 51 k and note.—Cf. also 2 K 3:24 וַיַּבְאֵר אֹו בְאַתְּ הַכּוֹת (read so with the LXX) before א, hence, no doubt due to the dislike of a hiatus; so in Ps 50:21, Neh 1:7 הַבְבָל, all in rapid style; after the verb, Jos 7:7, unless הַעֲבֵיר is intended.

4. Finally the infinitive absolute sometimes appears as *a substitute for the finite verb*, either when it is sufficient simply to mention the verbal idea (see z), or when the hurried or otherwise excited style intentionally contents itself with this infinitive, in order to bring out the verbal idea in a clearer and more expressive manner (see aa).

(a) The infinitive absolute as the continuation of a preceding finite verb. In the later books especially it often happens that in a succession of several acts only the first (or sometimes more) of the verbs is inflected, while the second (or third, &c.) is added simply in the infinitive absolute. Thus after several perfects, Dn 9:5 (cf. verse 11) *we have sinned ... and have transgressed thy law*, וְסָרַב (prop. *a turning aside* took place); so after a *perfect* Ex 36:7 (?), 1 S 2:28, Is 37:19, Jer 14:5, 19:13, Hag 1:6 (four infinitives), Zc 3:4 (but read with Wellhausen, after the LXX, וְהַלֵּב שׁוֹ אֶתְוֹ), 7:5, Ec 8:9, 9:11, Est 3:13, 9:6, 16, 18, 12:6 ff., Neh 9:8, 13, 1 Ch 5:20, 2 Ch 28:19; ² after the *perfect consecutive*, Zc 12:10; after the *perfect frequentative* 1 K 9:25 (unless וְהַקְרִיר be intended); after the simple *imperfect*, Lv 25:14, Nu 30:3, Jer 32:44 (three infinitives), 36:23, 1 Ch 21:24; after a *cohortative*, Jos 9:20; after the *imperfect consecutive*, Gn 41:43 (as a continuation of וְיִרְכֶּב); Ex 8:11, Ju 7:19, Jer 37:21, Neh 8:8, 1 Ch 16:36, 2 Ch 7:3; with וְ or after the *jussive*, Dt 14:21, Est 2:3, 6:9; after the *imperative*, Is 37:30b, Am 4:4f.; after the *participle*, Hb 2:15 (strengthened by וְאַתָּה, and regarded, like the participle itself, as an adverbial accusative); Est 8:8.

(b) At the beginning of the narrative, or at least of a new section of it. The special form of the finite verb which the infinitive absolute represents must be determined

¹ On these substantives (and on the use of the infinitive absolute generally as absolute object, see above, m), cf. the *schema etymologicum* treated in connexion with the government of the verb in § 117 p, q.

² In Ez 7:14 a perfect appears to be continued by means of an infinitive construct; but the text is quite corrupt; Cornill reads תִּקְרֹעַ הַכָּנֵן יְהוָה.

from the context. The infinitive absolute is most frequently used in this way, corresponding to the infinitive of command in Greek, &c.¹:—

(α) For an emphatic imperative,² e.g. שְׁמֹר (thou shalt, ye shall), *observe* Dt 5:12; זִכּוּר (thou shalt) *remember*, Ex 13:3, 20:8 (the full form occurs in Dt 6:17 שְׁמֹר תִּשְׁמַרְיוֹן; 7:18 זִכְרֵךְ); Lv 2:6, Nu 4:2, 25:17, Dt 1:16, 2 K 5:10, Is 38:5, Jer 2:2, followed by a *perfect consecutive*; Jos 1:13, 2 K 3:16, Is 7:4, 14:31 (parallel with an *imperative*; in Na 2:2 three imperatives follow). But הַבִּיט Ps 142:5 may be only an incorrect spelling of הַבָּט *imperative*.³

(β) For the jussive, Lv 6:7, Nu 6:5, 2 K 11:15, Ez 23:46; cf. also Pr 17:12 (*let it rather meet*).

(γ) For the cohortative, Is 22:13b וְאֶתְּהָא אָכְלָה (the exclamation of the mocker); Ez 21:31, 23:30, 46; perhaps also Jer 31:2 (הַלְּזָקֵן).⁴

(δ) For the imperfect in emphatic promises, e.g. 2 K 4:43 ye shall *eat and leave thereof*, 19:29 (Is 37:30), 2 Ch 31:10; also in indignant questions, Jb 40:2 *shall he that cavilleth contend with the Almighty?*⁵ (on the addition of the subject cf. the Rem. below); Jer 3:1 *and thinkest thou to return again to me?* Jer 7:9 ff. (six infinitives, continued by means of the *perfect consecutive*; cf. § 112 o).

(ε) For any historical tense (like the Latin *historic infinitive*) in lively narration (or enumeration) and description, even of what is still taking place in present time, e.g. Hos 4:2 *swearing and breaking faith, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery* (in these they are busied); 10:4 (after a *perfect*); Is 21:5, 59:4, Jer 8:15, 14:19, Jb 15:35; cf. further Jer 32:33, Ec 4:2.—In Ez 23:30, Pr 12:7, 15:22, and 25:4, the infinitive absolute is best rendered by the passive.

Rem. The subject is sometimes added to the infinitive absolute when it takes the place of the finite verb, e.g. Lv 6:7, Nu 15:35, Dt 15:2, Ps 17:5, Pr 17:12, Jb 40:2, Ec 4:2, Est 9:1. So, probably, also in Gn 17:10, Ex 12:48, although here קָלְזָר according to § 121 a might also be taken as *an object* with a passive verb; cf. Est 3:13. In 1 S 25:26, 33 the subject follows an infinitive absolute which is co-ordinated with an infinitive construct, see above, e.

1¹ Cf. also such infinitives in French as *voir* (page so and so, &c.), *s'adresser ... , se méfier des voleurs!*

2² Praetorius, *op. cit.*, p. 547: the extraordinarily common use of the infinitive form *qāṭol* in the sense of an imperative, jussive, or cohortative has long since caused it to be compared with the Arab. *fa-āli*. It thus appears that the infin. *qāṭol* in Hebrew could be used from early times as a kind of fixed, invariable word of command.

3³ In Ez 21:31, for the infinitives construct זִיכְרֵךְ, קָרֵם, הַשְׁפֵּיל (beside הַגְּבֵּה) read with Cornill the infinitives absolute זִיכְרֵךְ, קָרֵם, &c. The Kethibh probably intends זִיכְרֵךְ, &c.

4⁴ In 2 S 3:18 the infinitive construct appears to be used instead of the cohortative, but עֲזֹשֵׂה should certainly be read for עֲזֹעֵה. Also in 1 K 22:30 (2 Ch 18:29), which was formerly included under this head (I will *disguise myself and go into the battle*), read בָּא אַחֲרֵפֶשׂ וְאַבָּא.

5⁵ In Jb 34:18 in a similar question instead of the infinitive constr. we should rather expect the infinitive absolute (רְאִמְצָרֵךְ), unless with the LXX and Vulg. the participle with the article (אֲמָרֵךְ) is to be read.

§ 114. *The Infinitive Construct.*

1. The infinitive construct, like the infinitive absolute, may also represent a *nomen verbale* (§ 45 a), but of a much more flexible character than the infinitive absolute (cf. § 113 a). Its close relation with nouns properly so called is especially seen in the readiness with which the infinitive construct may be used for any case whatever; thus,

(a) As the nominative of the subject, e.g. Gn 2:18 לֹא־טוֹב הַיּוֹת הָאָדָם לְפָרָדוּ, literally, *not good is the being of man in his separation*; Gn 30:15, 1 S 23:20, Is 7:13, Pr 17:26, 25:7, 24 (but cf. 21:9 טֹוב לִשְׁבַּת בָּת in the same statement); Ps 32:9 prop. *there is not a coming near unto thee*, but the text is probably corrupt. With a *feminine* predicate, 1 S 18:23, Jer 2:17.

(b) As genitive, e.g. Ec 3:4 עֵת קֶפוֹד וְעֵת רַקְוֹד *a time of mourning and a time of dancing*; Gn 2:17, 29:7, Neh 12:46, 2 Ch 24:14. This equally includes, according to § 101 a, all those cases in which the infinitive construct depends on a preposition (see below, d) [and Driver, *Tenses*, § 206].

(c) As accusative of the object, e.g. 1 K 3:7 לֹא אֶדְעַ צָאת וּבָא *I know not the going out or the coming in* (*I know not how to go out and come in*); Gn 21:6, 31:28, Nu 20:21, Is 1:14, 37:28 (even with תָּגַת), Jer 6:15, Jb 15:22 (cf. for the use of the infinitive absolute as object, § 113 f); as accusative with a verb expressing fullness, Is 11:9.

2. The construction of the infinitive with prepositions (as in Greek, ἐν τῷ εἰ̄ναι, διὰ τὸ εἰ̄ναι, &c.) may usually be resolved in English into the finite verb with a conjunction, e.g. Nu 35:19 בְּפָגֹעַ-בָּו *in his meeting him*, i.e. if (as soon as) he meets him; Gn 27:45 (עַד-שׁוֹב); Is 30:12 יְעַזְּנֵן מִמְּסֻכָּם *because ye despise*; Jer 2:35 עַל-אֱמֹרֶךָ *because thou sayest*; Gn 27:1 וְהַלְאָה מַרְאָה *from seeing*, i.e. so that he could not see.

This use of the infinitive construct is especially frequent in connexion with הַ or בְּ to express time-determinations (in English resolved into a temporal clause, as above the combination of the infinitive with עֵת or עַל- is resolved into a causal clause), especially after נִיחַי (see the examples, § 111 g), e.g. 1 S 2:27 בְּהַיּוֹתֶם בְּמִצְרַיִם *when they were in Egypt*; Gn 24:30 וַיַּחֲנֹן כְּרָאָת אֶת-הַצְּדָקָה זֶם ... וְקִשְׁמַעַת גַּם ... *and it came to pass, when he saw (prop. in the seeing) the ring ..., and when he heard (prop. in his hearing)*, &c.

But by far the most frequent is the connexion of the infinitive construct with לְ.¹ Starting from the fundamental meaning of לְ, i.e. *direction towards something*, infinitives with לְ serve to express the most varied ideas of purpose or aim, and very commonly also (with a weakening or a complete disregard of the original meaning of the לְ) to introduce the object of an action, or finally even (like the infinitive absolute

¹ Cf. § 45 g, according to which the close union of the לְ with the first consonant of the infinitive (לְקַתְּ בָּ, בְּקַתְּ בָּ, בְּקַתְּ בָּ, &c.) seems to point to the formation of a special new verbal form. Quite distinct are the few examples where the infinitive with לְ serves to express time, as Gn 24:63 לְפָנָה *at the eventide* (prop. at the time of the return of evening); cf. Dt 23:12, Ex 14:27, Ju 19:26; 2 S 18:29 *when Joab sent the king's servant*.

used adverbially, § 113 h, and the Latin gerund in *-ndo*) to state motives or attendant circumstances. See the instances in the Remarks.

Rem. 1. The original meaning of the **ל** is most plainly seen in those infinitives with **ל** which expressly state a purpose (hence as the equivalent of a final clause), e.g. **Gn 11:5 and the Lord came down**, **לראת את העיר**? *to see the city*; also with a change of subject, e.g. **2 S 12:10 and thou hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite**, **ל להיות לך לאשתו**? *to be (i.e. that she may be) thy wife*; cf. **Gn 28:4, Jer 38:26** (**למוות**).—If there is a special emphasis on the infinitive with **ל**, it is placed, with its complement, before the governing verb, e.g. **Gn 42:9, 47:4, Nu 22:20, Jos 2:3, 1 S 16:2** with **בזאת**; **Ju 15:10, 1 S 17:25** with **עליה**.

2. Just as clearly the idea of aiming at a definite purpose or turning towards an object may be seen in the combination of the verb **היה** *to be*, with **ל** and an infinitive. In fact **היה לעשות** may mean, either (a) *he was in the act of, he was about to* (as it were, he set himself), *he was ready, to do something*, or (b) *he or it was appointed or compelled, &c., to do the action in question*. In the latter case **היה לעשות** corresponds to the Latin *faciendum erat*, cf. also the English *I am to go*. In both cases **היה** (as elsewhere when copula) is often omitted.

Examples of (a) **Gn 15:12** **וניה השמש**: *and when the sun was going down* (just about to set); **2 Ch 26:5** **וניה לזרען אל הים** *and he set himself to seek God* (here with the secondary idea of a continuous action); with the omission of **היה** **Is 38:20**, **ני הלהו שיעני** *the Lord is ready to save me*; **1 S 14:21** (?), **Jer 51:49, Ps 25:14** (*et foedus suum manifestaturus est eis*); **Pr 18:24** (?), **19:8** (**א**? **לצערך**? *consecuturus est*, unless we simply read **אצטם**? with the LXX)¹; **20:25, Ec 3:15** **לחיות אפר** *quod futurum est*; **2 Ch 11:22, 12:12** (in a negative statement); in a question, **Est 7:8** (*will he even ... ?*). Cf. also **1 S 4:19**.

Of (b) **Jos 2:5** **וניה שער** *and the gate was to be shut* (had to be shut); **Is 37:26, Ps 109:13**.² Mostly with the omission of **היה**, e.g. **2 K 4:13** **לעשות לך גוי** *what is to be done for thee?* (**היה** *wouldest thou be* (lit. is it to be) *spoken for to the king, &c.?* **2 K 13:19** **להכוה** *it was to smite* equivalent to *thou shouldest have smitten*; **Is 5:4, Ps 32:9, 68:19** (?), **Jb 30:6** (*habitandum est iis*), **1 Ch 9:25, 10:13, 22:5, 2 Ch 8:13** (?), **11:22, 19:2, 36:19** (?), **Ho 9:13, Hb 1:17**. In a question **2 Ch 19:2**; after **א** **ל** **1 Ch 5:1, 15:2**; after **אין** **1 Ch 23:26, 2 Ch 5:11** and frequently.

Of the same kind also are the cases, in which the infinitive with **ל** depends on the idea of an obligation or permission (or prohibition); especially in such forms of expression as **2 S 18:11** **עליך לחתך גוי** *it was upon me, i.e. it would have been my duty to give thee, &c.*³; cf. **Mi**

¹ P. Haupt (*SBOT.*, Proverbs, p. 52, lines 10 ff.; *Critical Notes on Esther*, p. 170, on 7:8) considers it possible that here and in **Pr 2:8, 6:24, 7:5, 16:30, 30:14**, as well as in **14:35, 17:21** before a noun, the **ל** is a survival of the emphatic **ל** with an *imperf.*, which is especially common in Arabic. In that case **א**? **לצערך** must be read **לצערך**, i.e. **לצערך**. But all the above instances can be taken as infinitives with **ל** without difficulty.

² Somewhat different are the cases where **היה** **ל** with the infinitive (which is then used exactly as a substantive) implies *to become something*, i.e. to meet with a particular fate, as **Nu 24:22** (cf. **Is 5:5, 6:13**) **לכער** *for wasting*, for which elsewhere frequently **לבלות** and the like; probably also **Ps 49:15** is to be explained in this way, the **היה** being omitted.

³ **2 S 4:10** (*cui dandum erat mihi*) appears to be similar; it may, however, be better, with Wellhausen, to omit the **א**.

3:1 (2 Ch 13:5) *it is not for you to* (i.e. are ye not bound to)?⁴ with a negative, 2 Ch 26:18 לֹא it pertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but only to the priests; also אַיִן לְ with an infinitive expresses *it is not permitted* (nefas est), *may not*, e.g. Est 4:2 פִּ依ָן אַיִן לְבֹא for none might enter; 8:8, 1 Ch 15:2; ⁵ אַיִן לְ with an infinitive is used in a somewhat different sense, equivalent to *it is not feasible, not possible*, e.g. in Ps 40:6, Ec 3:14, 2 Ch 5:11.⁶—With either meaning לְ can be used instead of אַיִן, e.g. Am 6:10 לְאַלְהָנְכֵיר nefas est, *to make mention of the name of the Lord: but Ju 1:19 for it was not possible to drive out, &c.*, perhaps, however, the text originally stood as in Jos 17:12 לְאַלְהָנְכֵיר בְּלֹא לְהָנְכֵיר; 1 Ch 15:2.

3. A further class comprises the very numerous cases, in which the infinitive with לְ is used as the object¹ of a governing verb, hence, again, for the *direction* which an action takes. The verbs (or conjugations) which occur most frequently in this combination with לְ and an infinitive are: הַחֲלָל (with an infinitive without לְ, e.g. Dt 2:25, 31, Jos 3:7), הַואֵל, to begin, הַסִּפְר (prop. to add) to continue, very frequently, even in prose, with an infinitive without לְ, as Gn 4:12, 8:10, 12, 37:5, 1 S 3:8, Jb 27:1, &c.; הַכְּלָל to cease from, to desist; to complete, to make an end of; הַמְּפֻם to be finished; הַקְּרִיב to come near to, Gn 12:11; הַמֵּהֶר to hasten (with an infinitive without לְ Ex 2:18); אַכְּבָה to be willing (with an infinitive without לְ Is 28:12, 30:9, Jb 39:9); הַצְּדָקָה to will, to desire; אַזְּנָה to refuse (to be unwilling); בְּקַשׁ to seek; לְבִּנְהָה to be able (with an infinitive without לְ, e.g. Gn 24:50, 37:4, Ex 2:3, 18:23, Nu 22:38, Jb 4:2); נְתַנְהָה with an accusative of the person in the sense of *to give up to some one, to cause, or permit him to do something*, e.g. Gn 20:6, Ps 16:11 (with an infinitive abs. Jb 9:18, see § 113 d); יַעֲשֵׂה to understand how to do something (in Jb 3:8 הַעֲתִידָם עַירְךָ is analogous); לְמַדָּה to learn; קְוָה to wait, expect (with a change of subject, e.g. Is 5:2 *and he waited for it to bring forth grapes*).

We must further mention here a number of verbs in Hiphil (partly denominatives), which express an action in some definite direction (cf. § 53 f), as הַשְׁפֵּל to do greatly, to make (it) low, הַגְּבִּיבָה to make (it) high, הַעֲמִיקָה to make (it) deep, הַרְחִיקָה to make (it) far, distant, הַיְמִיןָה to make (it) good (with an infinitive without לְ Ps 33:3, but 1 S 16:17, in the same combination, with לְ); הַשְׁכִּיםָה to do anything early (Ps 127:2, along with its opposite אַחֲרָה to do something late, with an infinitive without לְ); הַרְבָּה to make (it) much, הַפְּלָא to make (it) wonderful (even with a passive infinitive 2 Ch 26:15),² &c.

4⁴ But in 1 S 23:20 after וְלִלְנוּ and our part shall be the infinitive without לְ stands as the subject of the sentence.

5⁵ Quite different of course are such cases as Is 37:3 וְכֵן אֵין לְלִדְהָ and there is not strength to bring forth; cf. Nu 20:5, Ru 4:4.

6⁶ In 2 S 14:19 שָׁאָל (= יִשְׁאָל it is, there is) is used in a similar sense after אַם, the negative particle of asseveration, *of a truth it is not possible to turn to the right hand or to the left*.

1¹ This view is based upon the fact, that in numerous expressions of this kind (see the examples above) the לְ may be omitted, and the infinitive consequently stand as an actual accusative of the object (see above, c). However, the connexion of the verb with the object is in the latter case closer and more emphatic (hence especially adapted to poetic or prophetic diction), than the looser addition of the infinitive with לְ; thus לְאַבְיוֹ Is 28:12 is equivalent to *they desired not obeying* (לְ also with the infin. abs. in Is 42:24; cf. § 113 d); but לְאַבְיוֹ לְשִׁמְעָה Ez 20:8 rather expresses *they could not make up their mind as to hearkening*. When connected with לְ, the governing verb has a more independent sense than when it directly governs the accusative of the object.

2² In almost all these examples the principal idea is properly contained in the infinitive, whilst the governing verb strictly speaking contains only a subordinate

4. Finally, the infinitive with הַ is very frequently used in a much looser connexion to state motives, attendant circumstances, or otherwise to define more exactly. In English, such infinitive constructions (like the Latin gerund in *-do*; cf. f) must frequently be turned by *that* or a gerund; e.g. 1 S 12:17 לְבָם אֶלְךָ לִשְׁאֵל “in asking you a king”; 14:33, 19:5, 20:36, Gn 3:22, 18:19, 34:7, 15, Ex 23:2, Lv 5:4, 22, 26, 8:15, Nu 14:36, 2 S 3:10, 1 K 2:3 f., 14:8, Jer 44:7 f., Ps 63:3, 78:18, 101:8, 103:20, 104:14 f., 111:6, Pr 2:8, 8:34, 18:5, Neh 13:18. Sometimes the infinitive with הַ is used in this way simply by itself, e.g. 1 Ch 12:8 *as the roes upon the mountains* לְמֹרֶךְ (as regards hastening) *in swiftness*; Gn 2:3, 2 S 14:25 (לִלְכָל); Is 21:1 (לִלְזָה); Jo 2:26, Pr 2:2, 26:2 and so very frequently the infinitive לְאָמֵן “dicendo” which has become stereotyped as an adverb to introduce direct narration (in the sense of *thus, as follows*).¹

5. In a number of instances—especially in the later books—the infin. constr. with הַ appears to be attached by *Wāw* (like the infinitive absolute, § 113 z), as the continuation of a previous finite verb. In most examples of this kind it is, however, evident that the infinitive with הַ virtually depends on an idea of intention, effort, or being in the act of, which, according to the sense, is contained in what has preceded, whilst the copula, as sometimes also elsewhere, is used in an emphatic sense (*and that too*); thus e.g. Ex 32:29 (if the text be right) *fill your hand to-day* (sc. with an offering) *for the Lord ... and that to bring a blessing upon you*, i.e. that ye may be blessed; cf. 1 S 25:31 (otherwise in verses 26 and 33 where the infinitive absolute is used, see § 113 e); Ps 104:21,² Jb 34:8, Ec 9:1, Neh 8:13, 2 Ch 7:17.—In Lv 10:10 f. וְלֹא־בָקַד might be regarded as an explanatory addition to the command contained in verse 9^b (= this prohibition of wine before the service shall ye observe, and that in order to put a difference, &c.); but probably the text has been disturbed by a redactor.—In 2 Ch 30:9 וְלֹא־שׁוּב depends on the idea of receiving favour which lies in לְךָ חֲנִימִים. On the other hand, in 1 S 8:12 it is sufficient to explain *and in order to appoint them unto him for captains of thousands* (sc. he will take them). In Is 44:28 translate *and he (Cyrus) shall perform all my pleasure, and that in saying of Jerusalem, &c.*

3. The period of time to which an action or occurrence represented by the infinitive construct belongs, must sometimes be inferred from the context, or from the character of the principal tenses; cf. e.g. Gn 2:4 *these are the generations of the heaven and of the earth, בָּהֶם רָאָم when they were created* (prop. in their being created); Ju 6:18 עד־בָּאֵי וּגְזִי until I come unto thee, and bring forth, &c. Cf. 1 S 18:19 (= when she should have been given); 2 K 2:1, Ho 7:1.

adverbial statement, and is therefore best rendered in English by an adverb; e.g. Gn 27:20 *how is it that thou hast found it so quickly?* (prop. how thou hast hastened to find!), Gn 31:27 *wherefore didst thou flee secretly?* So frequently with הַרְבָּה (= often, abundantly), Ex 36:5, 1 S 1:12, 2 K 21:6, Is 55:7, Am 4:4, Ps 78:38, &c.; with שׁוּב (= again), Dt 30:9, 1 K 13:17, Ho 11:9, Ezr 9:14; cf. also 2 S 19:4, Jer 1:12, Jn 4:2, and the analogous instances in § 120 g; also 2 K 2:1 *thou hast asked a hard thing*.

¹ לְאָמֵן is very often so used after נִזְכֵּר in the Priestly document (Gn 8:15, 17:3, &c., and numberless times in the legal parts of Exod., Lev., and Num.)—a pleonasm which is not surprising considering the admittedly prolix and formal style of the document.

² When Delitzsch on Ps 104:21, referring to Hb 1:17, explains the infinitive with הַ as an elliptical mode of expressing the *coniugatio periphrastica* (equivalent to *flagitaturi sunt a deo cibum suum*), this is, in point of fact, certainly applicable to this and a few other places mentioned above; but all these passages, in which the infinitive with וְ follows, are to be distinguished from the cases treated above under h, where the infinitive with הַ without *Wāw* corresponds to a Latin gerundive, or is actually used to express the *coniugatio periphrastica*.

Rem. 1. The constructions of the infinitive with a preposition, described above under d, are almost always continued in the further course of the narrative by means of the *finite verb*, i.e. by an independent sentence, not by a co-ordinate infinitive. Such a finite verb we regard as governed by a conjunction, which corresponds to the preposition standing before the infinitive. Thus the infinitival construction (frequently even with a change of subject) is continued by a perfect (with אֲלֹת), **Jer 9:12** because they have forsaken (**עַל-צְבָט**) my law ... וְאַנְתָּם וְאֶת־מִשְׁעָיו and have not obeyed my voice; **Gn 39:10**, **1 S 24:12**, **Am 1:9**; without לְאַנְתָּם וְאֶת־מִשְׁעָיו (perf. after לְ and infin.); by a perfect with הַ (cf. § 112 i and § v) **Am 1:11** עַל-רְקָפָו וְגַם and did cast off continually all pity (a frequentative perfect; for examples of the perfect consecutive proper see **Gn 27:45**, **Ju 6:18**, **1 S 10:8**, **2 K 18:32** [**Is 36:17**], always after עד־בְּאֵי until I come); by a simple imperfect, e.g. **Pr 1:27** (after בְּ); **Is 30:26** (after בַּיּוֹם in the day, a temporal phrase which has here become equivalent to a preposition); **Is 5:24** (after בְּ), **10:2**, **13:9**, **14:25**, **45:1**, **49:5**, **1 S 2:8**, **Pr 2:8**, **5:2**, **8:21** (always after בְּ)¹; by an imperfect consecutive, e.g. **Gn 39:18** and it came to pass, כַּאֲשֶׁר יָשַׂרְאֵל as I lifted up my voice and cried, that ...; **1 K 10:9**, **Jb 38:13** (after בְּ); **1 K 18:18**, **Is 38:9**, **Jb 38:7**, 9 ff. (after בְּ); **Is 30:12**, **Jer 7:13**, **Ez 34:8** (after בְּ).

2. The negation of an infinitive construct, on account of the predominance of the noun-element in its character, is effected not by the verbal negative אֲלֹא (except in the compound בְּלִתִּי, which has come to be used as a preposition, without, **Nu 35:23**, **Pr 19:2**), but by בְּלִתִּי, originally a substantive (see the Lexicon), with לְ prefixed (but also **Nu 14:16** מִבְּלִתִּי), e.g. **Gn 3:11** לֹא־בְּלִתִּי עֲשָׂו אֶת־כָּל־מְצֻוֹתִי not to eat of it; in a final sense, **4:15** lest any finding him should smite him; only in **2 K 23:10** is לְ repeated before the infinitive. In **Ps 32:9** (if the text be right) בְּלִתִּי negatives, not the infinitive, but the predicate which is understood.

§ 115. Construction of the Infinitive Construct with Subject and Object.

1. Like the infinitive absolute (see § 113 a), the character of the infinitive construct as a *verbal noun* is shown by its power of taking the case proper to its verb, and hence in transitive verbs² the *accusative of the object*, e.g. **Nu 9:15** בַּיּוֹם הַקִּים אֲתִת־הַמְשִׁבֵּן on the day the tabernacle was reared up; **1 S 19:1** לֹא־בְּלִתִּי תֵּדַבֵּר that they should slay David; **Gn 14:17**, **19:29**, **Ex 38:27**, **1 K 12:15**, **15:4**; with a negative, e.g. **Lv 26:15** so that ye will not do all my commandments; with the accusative of the personal pronoun, e.g. **Dt 29:12** לֹא־בְּלִתִּי תִּשְׁׁלַח that he may establish thee; **Gn 25:26**, **Jer 24:7**; with a verbal suffix, e.g. **Ex 2:14** לְהַרְגֵּנִי to kill me; **Jer 38:26** לְבַלְתִּי תָּשִׁיבֵנִי that he would not cause me to return (on the suffix, cf. c). In **Is 49:6** the object even precedes the infinitive with לְ; on this order cf. the note on § 114 r.—If the verb governs a double accusative, the infinitive may also take the same, e.g. **Gn 41:39** אֲתִת־כָּלֵיז אֲתִת־כָּלֵיז as God hath showed thee all this; **Dt 21:16**.

¹ The great frequency of examples of this kind, especially in the poetical books, is due to a striving after what is called *chiasmus* in the arrangement of the parallel members in the two halves of the verse, i.e. in the instances given, the finite verb *at the end* of the second (co-ordinate) clause is parallel with the infinitive *at the beginning* of the first. In this way the verbal form necessarily became separated from the הַ, and consequently the imperfect had to be used instead of the perfect consecutive. Such a parallelism of the *external* and *internal* members of a verse is frequent also in other cases, and was evidently felt to be an elegance of elevated—poetic or prophetic—style.

² For examples of the accus. of the object with a pass. infin., see § 121 c.

Rem. 1. The object after the infinitive construct must also always be regarded as in the accusative, even when it is not expressly introduced (as in all the above examples) by the *nota accusativi*־הַ, and when therefore the substantive in question might easily be taken as the *genitive of the object* governed by the infinitive (the usual construction in Arabic), e.g. **Pr 21:15** טָשׁוּת מִשְׁפָט to do judgement. Against regarding it as a genitive, which is in itself possible (*the doing, the executing of judgement*), is the fact (a) that elsewhere the *nota accusativi* is so frequently added; (b) that in such a case the secondary forms of the infinitive, such as רָאֵה for (בָּ) Gn 48:11 (cf. Ps 101:3, Pr 16:16), would be unintelligible; (c) that certain infinitive forms, if they were to be regarded as in the construct state, could hardly retain the pretonic Qameš without exception, whereas, when connected with suffixes (i.e. with real genitives; cf. § 33 c), this Qameš necessarily becomes Šewâ; e.g. Gn 18:25 לְמִתְּצִדִּיק to slay the righteous (never as בְּמִתְּצִדִּיק; cf., on the other hand, above, בְּשִׁיבָה); 2 K 21:8, Ez 44:30. Similarly in such cases as Is 3:13 (Ps 50:4) instead of לְדִין עֲצִים we should rather expect לְדִין, if the infinitive were regarded as in the construct state, and עֲצִים as the genitive. Hence also in cases like Is 58:9 (חַלֵּשׁ for חַלֵּל) we must assume, with Sellin, op. cit., p. 78, a merely ‘external phonetic connexion’ and not the genitive construction.

2. The verbal suffixes added to the infinitive are (with the exception of לְהַזְצֹצֵן הָיָה Jer 39:14) only the suffix of the 1st pers. sing. (besides the above examples cf. also 1 S 5:10, 27:1, 28:9, Ru 2:10, 1 Ch 12:17, &c.) and plural; e.g. לְהַשְׁמִיךְ נָא to destroy us, Dt 1:27 (immediately after נָא, so that נָא is doubtless a *verbal* not a *noun*-suffix, although in form it might be either); Nu 16:13, Ju 13:23 (after הַמִּתְּחִילָה). Elsewhere the pronominal object is appended either by means of the accusative sign (e.g. Gn 25:26 בְּלָת אֶתְּנָם prop. in the bearing them; תְּדַעַת אֶתְּנִי to know me, Jer 24:7) or in the form of a noun-suffix (as genitive of the object). The latter occurs almost always, whenever the context excludes the possibility of a misunderstanding; e.g. 1 S 20:33 תְּהִבֵּה (prop. for his smiting) to smite him, not, as the form might also mean, in order that he might smite; cf. 1 K 20:35; with the suffix of the 3rd sing. fem. Nu 22:25; of the 3rd plur. Jos 10:20, 2 S 21:2, &c. Hence also the suffixes of the 2nd sing. with the infinitive, as לְהַבְּחַק Jer 40:14, cf. Mi 6:13, and even גְּדוּלָה to magnify thee, Jos 3:7, must certainly be regarded as *nominal* not *verbal* suffixes. The connexion of the noun-suffix, as genitive of the object, with the infinitive, was so fully established, that it could be used not only in such strange cases, as Gn 37:4 לֹא יָכְרֹבוּ לְשָׁלָם they could not speak to him peaceably, cf. Zc 3:1 לְשָׁנוּ to be an adversary to him, but ultimately even in the 1st sing., as in Nu 22:13 לְתַחְתִּי to give me leave [Dt 25:7 לֹא אָכְבָה בְּמִי he will not perform the duty of a husband’s brother unto me; 1 Ch 4:10 לְבַלְתִּי עַזְבֵּי that it may not grieve me!]

3. The power of governing like a verb is also retained in those verbal nouns which, although originally secondary forms of the infinitive, have fully acquired the value of nouns, e.g. Is 11:9 דְּבָרֵי־הָנָדָה (prop. to know the Lord) the knowledge of the Lord; לִירְאָה אֶתְּנִי to fear me, Dt 4:10, 5:26, 10:12; an accusative follows לְאַחֲבָה? Dt 10:12, 15, Is 56:6 (cf. also 1 K 10:9, Ho 3:1); לְהַנְּפָה Is 30:28; בְּשֻׁנְאָה יָהָנָה Dt 1:27; after verbal nouns formed with the prefix נָ (cf. § 45 e), Nu 10:2, Is 13:19, Am 4:11, Ez 17:9. The accusative of the object likewise remains after infinitives (or their secondary forms) which have the article, e.g. Gn 2:9, Jer 22:16, or a suffix, e.g. Gn 5:4, &c., 28:4, 6, 29:19 f., 30:15, 38:5, 2 S 3:11, Is 29:13.

2. The subject of the action represented by the infinitive is mostly placed immediately¹ after it, either in the *genitive* or *nominative*. The subject is in the

¹ In Gn 24:30 the subject of בָּרָא הָנָה is wanting (but follows); the original reading was undoubtedly בָּרָא הָנָה, and the text is now in a state of confusion; verse 30a should come before verse 29b. In Gn 19:29, 25:26, Ex 9:16, 13:21, 1 S 18:19, Jer

genitive (§ 33 c) whenever it has the form of a noun-suffix, and also when the infinitive has the termination of the constr. st. fem. sing. (see f); probably also in many other cases, where the infinitive in form and meaning is used more like a substantive, and accordingly governs like a noun. On the other hand, the subject of the infinitive is certainly to be regarded as a nominative, when it is separated from the infinitive by any insertion, and according to certain indications (see g) very probably in many other instances.

Rem. 1. Examples of genitives of the subject after infinitives in the connective form are Dt 1:27 בְּשִׁנְאָתָה יְהוָה אֲנָה נֹ^{וּ} prop. *in the Lord's hating us*; cf. 7:8, Gn 19:16, 1 K 10:9, Is 13:19, 47:9, Ho 3:1, Am 4:11. The subject of the infinitive is probably also to be regarded as genitive in such cases as Ex 17:1 *and there was no water* הַעַם לֹא־יָשַׁת תְּהִלָּתָה *for the people to drink* (prop. for the drinking of the people), and in cases like Gn 16:16 בְּכָל־קֶת הַצָּר (*the woman to bear*); Gn 16:3, Ex 19:1, Nu 20:3, 4, 33:38, 1 K 6:1, Ps 133:1, 2 Ch 7:3, &c.

2. Examples in which the subject is separated from the infinitive by an insertion, and hence must certainly be regarded as a nominative, are Jb 34:22 פְּעֻלֵּי אָנוּ תְּרַשְּׁמָם לְהַסְּפָּר that the workers of iniquity may hide themselves there (prop. for the hiding themselves there the workers of iniquity); cf. Gn 34:15, Nu 35:6, Dt 19:3, Ju 9:2, 2 S 24:13, Ps 76:10, and below, i. The subject is likewise to be regarded as a nominative, whenever the *Lamedh* is prefixed to the infinitive by means of a pretonic Qameṣ (cf. b above), e.g. 2 S 19:20 לְשָׁוֹם הַמְּלָכָבָן, since, if the infinitive were used as a *nomen regens*, we should rather expect לְשָׁוֹם according to § 102 f. That the subject of the infinitive is regarded elsewhere also as nominative is again (see above, b) probable, since in such forms as קְנִיחָה Dt 25:19, Is 14:3, קְמִיר Ps 46:3, &c., the pretonic Qameṣ is retained without exception, whereas on the analogy of קְנִיחָה Ez 24:13, קְמִיר Jer 23:20, &c., we should expect קְנִיחָה, קְמִיר, &c., if the infinitive were regarded as a *nomen regens*. Or was the retention of the Qameṣ (assuming the thorough correctness of the Masoretic punctuation) rendered possible even before a following genitive, because that vowel was characteristic of the form? It is at all events certain that owing to the lack of case-endings,¹ a distinction between the genitival and nominatival constructions could not have been consciously made in the case of most infinitives, e.g. in unchangeable forms like לְקָטָן, קָוָם, &c.

3. When both a *subject* and an *object* are connected with the infinitive, the rule is, that the subject should immediately follow the infinitive, and then the object. The latter, in such a case, is necessarily in the accusative, but the subject (as in e) may be either in the genitive or in the nominative. The noun-suffixes again are, of course, to be regarded as genitives, e.g. Gn 39:18 כִּי־קֹלִי as I lifted up my voice (cf. 1 K 13:21, and the examples, Gn 5:4, &c., enumerated above, under d), and so also substantives which follow a connective form, Dt 1:27, &c.; see above, d and f.

On the other hand, the subject appears necessarily to be in the nominative in such cases as Is 10:15 שֶׁבְּקָהְגִּיף אֶת־מְרִיאֵי בָּט as if a rod should shake them that lift it up (for

41:6, Ps 42:4 the subject, although not indicated, is easily supplied from the context. The infinitive in such cases is best rendered in English by a passive.

¹ In Arabic, where the case-endings leave no doubt as to the construction, it is equally possible to say either *qatlu Zaidin* (gen. of subj.) □*Amran* (acc.), literally *Zaid's killing* □*Amr*, or *qatlu □Amrin* (gen. of obj.) *Zaidun* (nom. of subj.), or even *el-qatlu* (with article) *Zaidun* (nom. of subj.) □*Amran* (acc. of obj.).

the plur. מִרְימֵי cf. § 124 k), not בַּטְשׁוֹן cf. הַנִּינִּי, as would be expected (see g above), if they were in the genitive; cf. 2 S 14:13, Jb 33:17. And so probably also in other cases, as Gn 5:1, 13:10, Jos 14:7, 1 K 13:4, 2 K 23:10, Is 32:7. The subject is separated from the infinitive by an insertion (and consequently must necessarily be in the nominative; see g above), e.g. in Jer 21:1.

Rem. Less frequently the object is placed immediately after the infinitive, and then the nominative of the subject, as a subsequent complement, e.g. Is 20:1 בָּשָׂלֶת כִּי אָתָּה סְגֻּנוֹן when Sargon sent him; Gn 4:15, Jos 14:11, 2 S 18:29, Is 5:24, Ps 56:1, Pr 25:8. In Nu 24:23 the subject follows an infinitive which has a noun-suffix in place of the object.

§ 116. *The Participles.*

Cf. Sellin (see above at the head of § 113), p. 6 ff., and Kahan, p. 11 ff.

1. Like the two infinitives, the participles also occupy a middle place between the noun and the verb. In form they are simple nouns, and most nearly related to the adjective; consequently they cannot in themselves be employed to represent definite relations of tense or mood. On the other hand, their verbal character is shown by their not representing, like the adjectives, a fixed and permanent quality (or state), but one which is in some way connected with an *action* or *activity*. The *participle active* indicates a person or thing conceived as being in the continual uninterrupted *exercise* of an activity. The *participle passive*, on the other hand, indicates the person or thing in a state which has been brought about by external *actions*.

Rem. That the language was fully conscious of the difference between a state implying action (or effected by external action) and mere passivity, is seen from the fact, that participles proper cannot be formed from the purely stative Qal, but only verbal adjectives of the form *qāṭēl* (אֲתַל, קָבַד, &c.) or *qāṭōl* (אֲתַבַּה, קָבַד, &c.), whereas the *transitive* Qal נִשְׁׁבַּח to hate, although it coincides in form with the intransitive Qal (as a verb middle *e*), nevertheless forms a participle active נִשְׁׁבַּח, and participle passive שְׁׁבַּחֲנִית (cf. the feminine הַשְׁׁבַּחֲנִית).—In cases where the participle proper and the verbal adjective both occur, they are by no means synonymous. When the Assyrians are called in Is 28:11 לְעִזִּים שְׁׁבַּחֲנִית men of stammering lips, a character is ascribed to them which is inseparably connected with their personality. On the other hand קָלְהַלְלִי Jer 20:7, describes those about the prophet as continually engaged in casting ridicule upon him. Cf. also Ps 9:18 (שְׁׁבַּחֲנִית) with 50:22 (קָלְלִי).

On the difference between the participle as expressing *simple* duration and the imperfect as expressing *progressive* duration, cf. what has been stated above in § 107 d. Nevertheless the participle is sometimes used—especially in the later books, cf. e.g. Neh 6:17, 2 Ch 17:11—where we should expect the action to be divided up into its several parts, and consequently should expect the finite verb. But the substitution of the participle for the *tempus historicum*, which becomes customary in Aramaic (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 76. 2, d, and e), is nevertheless quite foreign to Hebrew.

2. The period of time indicated by (a) a participle active, either as an attribute or predicate, must be inferred from the particular context. Thus הַמְּרוּאֵן may mean either *moriens* (Zc 11:9), or *mortuus* (so commonly; with the article הַמְּמוּר regularly = *the dead man*), or *moriturus* (Dt 4:22); אַתָּה coming, come Gn 18:11, &c., venturus 1 S 2:31, &c.; נִפְלֵא falling, but also fallen, Ju 3:25, 1 S 5:3, and ready to fall (threatening ruin, Is 30:13, Am 9:11). For other examples of perfect participles see Gn 27:33, 43:18 (בַּשְׁׁבַּחֲנִית that was returned; cf. Ezr 6:21, &c., הַשְׁׁבַּחֲנִים which were come again from

the captivity); Gn 35:3, Ex 11:5, Zc 12:1, Ps 137:7, Pr 8:9, Jb 12:4 (**קָרְאַת**), and see m below. For future participles see Gn 41:25, 1 K 18:9, Is 5:5, Jon 1:3, &c., probably also **לִקְרָאֵת** Gn 19:14. On the *futurum instans* (esp. after **הִנֵּה**) see p below.

(b) Of the passive participles, that of *Qal* (e.g. **קָטוּב** *scriptus*) always corresponds to a Latin or Greek perfect participle passive, those of the other conjugations, especially *Niph[□]al*, sometimes to a Latin gerundive (or to an adjective in *-bilis*), e.g. **נוֹרָא** *metuendus, to be feared*, Ps 76:8, &c.; **נוֹחֶם** *desiderandus (desiderabilis)* Gn 3:6, Ps 19:11, &c.; **נוֹבָא** *creandus* Ps 102:19; **נוֹלָד**, usually *natus*, but also (like **הַיּוֹלֵד** Ju 13:8) *procreandus, nasciturus* 1 K 13:2, Ps. 22:32; **נוֹעָרָץ** *terribilis* Ps 89:8; **נוֹתָעָב** *abominable* Jb 15:16; **נוֹשָׁב** *aestimandus* Is 2:22; **הַנְּאָכֶל** *that may be eaten (an animal)* Lv 11:47. In *Pu[□]al* **מְהֻלָּל** *laudandus, worthy to be praised* Ps 18:4. In *Hoph[□]al*, 2 S 20:21 **מְשֻׁלָּךְ**; 2 K 11:2 **מְוֹמָכִים**; Is 12:5 **Q^orē**¹ *מַזְעֵךְ עֲתָה*.

3. The participles active, in virtue of their partly verbal character, possess the power of governing like verbs, and consequently, when used in the absolute state, may take after them an object either in the accusative, or with the preposition with which the verb in question is elsewhere usually construed, e.g. 1 S 18:29 **אָיֵב אֶת־דָּוִיד** *hating David*; Gn 42:29; with the suffix of the accusative, e.g. Ps 18:33 **עַשְׂנֵי** *that made me* Jb 31:15; **רַגְם** *who seeth us?* Is 29:15 (in Is 47:10 **רַגְמָן** is abnormal); **רַגְמָן** *ruling them* Ps 68:28, sometimes also with the article, e.g. Ps 18:33 **הַמָּازֵךְ בְּנֵי** *that girdeth me* (LXX ὁ κραταιῶν με); Dt 8:14–16, 13:6, 11, 20:1, 2 S 1:24, Is 9:12 (where, however, Cheyne omits the article), 63:11, Ps 81:11, 103:4, Dn 11:6; followed by a preposition, e.g. 1 K 9:23 **רַפְאַלְךָ** *which bare rule over the people*; 2 K 20:5 **הַנְּבִיא רַפְאַלְךָ** *behold, I will heat thee.*²

By an exhaustive examination of the statistics, Sellin (see the title at the head of § 113), p. 40 ff., shows that the participle when construed as a *verb* expresses a single and comparatively transitory act, or relates to particular cases, historical facts, and the like, while the participle construed as a *noun* (see g) indicates repeated, enduring, or commonly occurring acts, occupations, and thoughts.

So also the verbal adjectives of the form *qāṭel* may take an accusative of the person or thing, if the finite verb from which they are derived governs an accusative, e.g. Dt 34:9 **רִיחַת חַכְמָה מְלָא** *full of the spirit of wisdom*; Ps 5:5 **חַפְצָה שָׁעַת** *that hath pleasure in wickedness.*

As a sort of noun the participle may, however, also exercise the same government as a noun, being in the construct state, and followed by the object of the action in the genitive (see § 89 a; and cf. § 128 x), e.g. Ps 5:12 **אֲהֵבִי שָׁמָן** *that love thy name*; cf. Ps 19:8 f.; also when a verbal adjective, e.g. Gn 22:12 and often **יִרְאָה** *one fearing*

¹ Such examples as **נוֹרָא**, **נוֹחֶם**, **נוֹהַל** show plainly the origin of this gerundive use of the participle passive. A person or thing *feared, desired, or praised at all times* is shown thereby to be *terrible, desirable, or praiseworthy*, and therefore also *to be feared, &c.*

² On the other hand, in Is. 11:9 *as the waters* **לִים מִכְסִים** *covering the sea*, the **ל** serves only to introduce the object preceding the participle [cf. the Arabic parallels cited by Driver, *Tenses*, § 135, 7 Obs.]. Cf. Hab. 2:14.

God; *Hb 2:15*; with an infinitive, *Ps 127:2*; with a noun-suffix (which, according to § 33 c, also represents a genitive), e.g. *Gn 4:14* *כלְמַצֵּאי whosoever findeth me* (prop. my finder; cf. *עֲשֵׂי my maker*); *12:3* *בָּקַבְּךָ יְהִי קָרְבָּךְ that bless thee*, *אַקְלָלְךָ יְהִי כָּרְכָּךְ that curseth thee* (but read either *בָּקַבְּךָ יְהִי*, or *מַבְרָכֶךָ* in the preceding clause); *27:29*, *1 S 2:30*, *Is 63:13*, *Ps 18:49*. In *Jer 33:22* read *מַשְׁרָתִים אֲתִי*.¹

Rem. To the class of objective genitives belong also specifications of place after the participles *אָנִי iniens* and *אָגָד egrediens*, since the verbs *בֹּזָא* and *אָגָד*, in the sense of *ingredi*, *egredi*, can be directly connected with an accusative; e.g. *Gn 23:10, 18* *בְּאֵי שָׁעַר עִירֹוֹ that went in at the gate of his city*; *La 1:4*; after *אָגָד*: *Gn 9:10, 34:24, 46:26*, &c.—In poetic language the participle in the construct state may be connected not only with a genitive of the object, but also with any other specifications (especially of space) which otherwise can only be made to depend on the verb in question by means of a preposition; cf. *Is 38:18*, and frequently, *שְׁבָתִים they that go down into the pit (the grave)*; *Ps 88:6* *שְׁבָתִים בְּקֶרֶב that lie in the grave*; *Dt 32:24* (*Mi 7:17*); *1 K 2:7, 2 K 11:5, 7, 9* *those that came in (or went out) on the sabbath*, *Pr 2:7, 1 Ch 5:18*, &c.; instead of the construction with *מִן*, e.g. *Is 59:20* (*those who turn from transgression*), *Mi 2:8* (cf. § 72 p).

These genitives of nearer definition appear also in the form of a noun-suffix, e.g. *Ps 18:40, 49* *קָמִים עַלְיִם* (*that rise up against me*; cf. *Ex 15:7, Dt 33:11, Ps 44:6, Ex 32:25, Is 1:27* *שְׁבָתִים* *her converts*; *Ps 53:6* *חַדְּבָתִים* *all that go unto her*; the construction is especially bold in *Is 29:7* *כָּל־צָבָא יְהִי וּמְצָדְתָה all that fight against her and her stronghold* (for *כָּל־הָצָבָא* *against them* *עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ* *they that are mad against me* (?), but read perhaps with Olshausen *מִזְבֵּחַ* *who pierce me*).—In *Is 1:30* *as a terebinth נְלָתָה fading as regards its leaf*, it remains doubtful whether *נְלָתָה* is in the absolute state, and consequently *עַלְתָּה* in the accusative, or whether it is to be regarded as construct state, and *הַעַלְתָּה* as the genitive. In the latter case it would be analogous to *Pr 14:2* (see k).

4. The passive participles also may either be in the absolute state, and take the determining word in the accusative,² or may be connected with it in the construct state, e.g. *Ju 18:11, 1 S 2:18, Ez 9:2* *לְבוֹשׁ בְּדִים clothed in linen*, cf. verse 3 *לְבָבָשׁ הַבְּדִים* *rent as regards his coat* *2 S 15:32*; with the participle following *Ju 1:7*; but *Ez 9:11* *לְבוֹשׁ הַבְּדִים the one clothed with linen*; *2 S 13:31 קְרָבֵי*

¹ When, as in *Jb 40:19*, the participle with the noun-suffix *הַעֲשֵׂה he that made him*, also has the article (cf. § 127 i), the anomaly is difficult to understand, since a word determined by a genitive does not admit of being determined by the article.—No less remarkable is the use of the constr. st. of the participle before the accusative in *Jer 33:22*: *תִּשְׁמַשׁ רְתִי אֲתִי* *that minister unto me* (for which there is *מַשְׁרָתִים* in verse 21). In *Am 4:13* an accusative of the product follows the genitive of the object, *עַשְׂתָּה שְׁחַר עִיפָּה maker of the morning into darkness*. In *Jer 2:17* is supposed to mean *at the time when he led thee*; perhaps the perfect (*הָולֵךְ*) should be read as in *6:15*. In *Ez 27:34*, the ancient versions read *נִשְׁבַּרְתָּה* (*now thou art broken*, instead of the difficult *נִשְׁבַּרְתָּה רְתִי*). In *1 K 20:40* read *עַשְׂתָּה* before *הַבְּנָה*.

² On the proper force of this accusative when retained in the passive construction cf. below, § 117 cc, &c., and § 121 c, d. So also *Neh 4:12* is to be understood, *and the builders were girded every one with his sword on his side, and building.*

בָגְדִים *rent in respect of clothes*, equivalent to *with their clothes rent* (cf. Jer 41:5); Nu 24:4, Dt 25:10, Is 3:3, 33:24, Jo 1:8, Ps 32:1 (**נַשׁוֹרֶת שׁעֲלֵה** *forgiven in respect of transgression, covered in respect of sin*); with a suffix to the noun, Pr 14:2 (**וּלֹזֶרֶן** *he that is perverse in his ways*).

Rem. The passive participle occurs in the construct state before a genitive of the *cause*, e.g. in Is 1:7 **שְׂנָפֹת אֵשׁ** *burnt with fire*; cf. Gn 41:6, Ex 28:11, Dt 32:24; before a genitive denoting the *author*, e.g. Gn 24:31 **בָּרוּךְ יְהֻנָּה** *blessed of the Lord* (but Ps 115:15 **בָּרוּכִים לִיהְנָה** see § 121 f); cf. Is 53:4, Ps 22:7, Jb 14:1 (15¹⁴, 25:4); hence also with noun-suffixes (which are accordingly genitive) Pr 9:18 **קְרָאָה** *her invited ones*, i.e. those invited by her; cf. 7:26, Ps 37:22.

5. The use of the participle as predicate is very frequent in noun-clauses (which, according to § 140 e, describe established facts and states), in which the period of time intended by the description must again (see above, d) be inferred from the context. Thus:

(a) As *present*, in speaking of truths which hold good at all times, e.g. Ec 1:4 **דוֹר הַלְּךָ וְדוֹר נָא** *one generation goeth, and another generation cometh; and the earth abideth* (**תְּעַמֵּד**) *for ever*; cf. verse 7; also to represent incidental (continuous) occurrences which are just happening, Gn 3:5, 16:8 (*I am fleeing*); 32:12, Ex 9:17, 1 S 16:15, 23:1, 2 K 7:9, Is 1:7; when the subject is introduced by the emphatic demonstrative **הִנֵּה** *behold!* (§ 100 o and § 105 b), e.g. Gn 16:11 **הִנֵּה תָּנַךְ** *behold, thou art with child, &c.*; 27:42; frequently also in circumstantial clauses (connected by *Wāw*), cf. § 141 e, e.g. Gn 15:2, &c.

(b) To represent *past* actions or states, sometimes in independent noun-clauses, e.g. Ex 20:18 **וְכָל־הָעָם רָאִים אֶת־הַקּוֹל** *and all the people saw the thunderings, &c.*; 1 K 1:5; in negative statements, e.g. Gn 39^{23 a}; sometimes in relative clauses, e.g. Gn 39^{23 b}, Dt 3:2 (cf. also the frequent combination of the participle with the article as the equivalent of a relative clause, e.g. Gn 32:10 **מְרָאָה** *which saidst*; 12:7, 16:13, 35:1, 3, 36:35, 48:16, 2 S 15:31, &c.); sometimes again (see n) in *circumstantial* clauses, especially those representing actions or states which occurred simultaneously with other past actions, &c., e.g. Gn 19:1 *and the two angels came to Sodom* **וְלוֹט יָשַׁב** *and (i.e. while) Lot sat, &c.*; 18:1, 8, 16, 22, 25:26, Ju 13:9, 2 Ch 22:9; also with the subject introduced by **הִנֵּה** 37:7, 41:17. (On the **הַלְּךָ** with a following adjective or participle to express an action constantly or occasionally recurring, cf. § 113 u.)

(c) To announce *future* actions or events, e.g. 1 K 2:2, 2 K 4:16 *at this season when the time cometh round*, **בְּקַת בָּן** *thou shalt embrace a son*; so after a specification of time, Gn 7:4, 15:14, 17:19, 19:13, Hag 2:6 (but in Is 23:15, where, after **הִנֵּה** we should rather expect a perfect consecutive, it is better to explain **תְּהִנֵּה**, with Qimḥi, as the 3rd sing. fem. of the perfect; on the form, cf. § 44 f); or in relative clauses, Gn 41:25, Is 5:5 *what I am doing*, i.e. am in the act of doing; in a deliberative question, Gn 37:30; but especially often when the subject is introduced by **הִנֵּה** (especially also if the subject be attached as a suffix to **הִנֵּה** as **הִנֵּה**, **הִנֵּה**, &c.), if it is intended to announce the event as imminent, or at least near at hand (and sure to happen), when it is called *futurum instans*, e.g. Gn 6:17, 15:3, 20:3, 24:13 f., 48:21, 50:5, Ex 3:13, 8:25, 9:3, 34:10, Jos 2:18, Ju 7:17, 9:33, 1 S 3:11, 2 K 7:2, Is 3:1, 7:14, 17:1, Jer 30:10, Zc 2:13, 3:8; with a participle passive, 2 S 20:21: cf. also § 112 t.

Rem. 1. As the above examples show, a noun-clause with a participle as predicate may have for its subject either a substantive or a personal pronoun; in both cases the participle, especially if there be a certain emphasis upon it, may precede the subject. Also in noun-clauses introduced by **הִנֵּה** the subject may be either a substantive, or (e.g. Gn 37:7) a separate

personal pronoun, or a suffix attached to the **הַבָּה**. In the same way, the subject may also be introduced by **שִׁי** (*est*, see the Lexicon) with a suffix, and in negative sentences by **אֵין** (*non est*) with a suffix, e.g. Ju 6:36 **עַמְּדִישָׁךְ מֹשֶׁׁשׁ אֵין** if thou wilt save; Gn 43:5 **אֵם־אֵין מִשְׁלָחָן** if thou wilt not send; 1 S 19:11.—In such cases as Is 14:27 **יְדוֹ הַגְּטֻיוּתָה** the stretched out hand is his, **הַגְּטֻיוּתָה** is not, like **בְּטֻיוּתָה** in 9:11, 16, &c., the predicate (in which case the participle could not take the article), but the subject; cf. Gn 2:11, 45:12, Is 66:9, Ez 20:29, Zc 7:6 (cf. § 126 k), where the participle with the article likewise refers to the present, also Nu 7:2, Dt 3:21, 4:3, &c., 1 S 4:16, where it refers to the past. In 1 K 12:8 and 21:11 even in relative clauses after **אֲשֶׁר**.

2. To give express emphasis to an action continuing in the *past*, the perfect **הִיָּה** in the corresponding person is sometimes added to the participle, and similarly the imperfect **וַיְהִי** (or the jussive **וְיַהְיֶה**, or the imperfect consecutive) is used to emphasize an action continuing in the *future*, e.g. Jb 1:14 **הַבָּקָר הַיּוֹחֶשׁ** the oxen (cows) were plowing; Gn 37:2, 39:22, Ex 3:1, Dt 9:24, Ju 1:7, 1 S 2:11, 2 S 3:6; the same occurs with a passive participle, e.g. Jos 5:5, Zc 3:3; **וְיִהְיֶה** with a participle is found e.g. in Is 2:2; the jussive in Gn 1:6, Ps 109:12;¹ and **וַיְהִי** with a participle in Ju 16:21, Neh 1:4.

3. The *personal pronoun* which would be expected as the subject of a participial clause is frequently omitted, or at least (as elsewhere in noun-clauses, cf. Is 26:3, Ps 16:8, Jb 9:32) the pronoun of the 3rd pers. **וַיַּאֲ**, e.g. Gn 24:30, 37:15, 38:24, 41:1, 1 S 10:11, 15:12, Is 29:8 (the participle always after **הַבָּה**); cf., moreover, Gn 32:7, Dt 33:3, 1 S 17:25, 20:1, Is 33:5, 40:19, Ps 22:29, 33:5, 55:20, Jb 12:17, 19 ff., 25:2, 26:7.—**הַיִּיאָה** is omitted in Lv 18:28; **הַנִּאָה** in Is 32:12, Ez 8:12, Neh 9:3; in a relative clause, Gn 39:22, Is 24:2.—The personal pronoun of the 2nd pers. masc. (**הַתָּאָ**) is omitted in Hb 2:10; the 2nd fem. (**הַתָּאָה**) in Gn 20:16 (where, however, for the participle **וְנִכְחָה** the 2nd fem. perf. **הָנִכְחָה** is to be read); the pronoun of the 1st sing. in Hb 1:5 (?), Zc 9:12, Mal 2:16; the 2nd plur. (**הַתָּאָה**) 1 S 2:24 (if the text be right), 6:3, Ez 13:7 (?). But these passages are all more or less doubtful.

Of a different kind are the cases in which some undefined subject is to be supplied with the participle; e.g. Is 21:11 **אֱלֹהִים קָרְבָּה** there is one calling unto me (= one calleth; § 144 d); cf. Is 30:24, 33:4.—So with participles in the plur., e.g. Ex 5:16 (**מִקְרִים** sc. the taskmasters); Jer 38:23 (in 33:5 the text is corrupt), Ez 13:7 (?), 36:13, 37:11 (equivalent to *sunt qui dicant*).

4. We must mention as a special class those noun-clauses which occur at the beginning of a period, and are intended to lay stress upon the fact that the first action still continues on the occurrence of the second (always introduced by **וְ**); e.g. Jb 1:16 f. **עַזְּזָה מִזְכָּרְבָּה בָּאָה** he was yet speaking, and (=when) another came, &c.¹; cf. Gn 29:9, 1 S 9:11, 27, 20:36, 1 K 14:17 **שֶׁ** she was entering the threshold of the house, when the child died; 2 K 2:23, 4:5, Dn 9:20 f.; also in Ju 19:22, 1 S 9:14, 17:23, 1 K 1:42, Jb 1:18 f., in all which passages the apodosis is introduced by **הַבָּה**.—On the other hand, in 1 K 1:14 the noun-clause itself is introduced by **הַבָּה** (as in verse 22 by **הַבָּה**), and denotes an action only just impending.² Finally, when the

¹ A jussive is practically to be supplied also in the formulae of blessing and cursing, **בָּרוּךְ** blessed be ... Gn 9:26, &c.; **אָרוּר** cursed art thou ... 3:14, &c.

¹ The independent noun-clause here lays stress upon the simultaneous occurrence (and consequently the overlapping) of the events far more forcibly than could be done by a subordinate expression of time (as e.g. **בְּגַבְרָה**). In English it may be represented by *scarcely had he finished speaking when. ...* As the above examples show, the apodosis also frequently consists of a noun-clause.

² At the same time the preceding **עַזְּזָה** still shows that what is announced is not merely a future event, but a future event *contemporaneous* with something else; the case thus entirely differs from the examples given in § 112 t, where **הַבָּה** refers to the

whole sentence is introduced by means of וַיְהִי (cf. § 111 g), and the apodosis by הַבָּה, Gn 42:35, 2 K 2:11, 13:21; without הַבָּה in the apodosis, 1 S 7:10, 2 K 19:37 (Is 37:38).

Participles active, which are used in the sense of the perfect participle, and also *participles passive*, in accordance with their meaning, express in such noun-clauses a state still continuing on the occurrence of the principal action, e.g. Gn 38:25 *הַוְאָ מִוּצָאת וְהִיא שׁוֹלֵת* she was being brought forth, when she sent, &c.; cf. Gn 50:24. [See further in Driver, *Tenses*, §§ 166–169.]

5. Different from the examples treated in *u* and *v* are the instances in which a participle (either alone or as the attribute of a noun) stands at the beginning of the sentence as a *casus pendens* (or as the subject of a *compound noun-clause*, see § 143 c) to indicate a condition, the contingent occurrence of which involves a further consequence; e.g. Gn 9:6 *שֶׁפְךָ זָמֵן קָרְבָּן אֲדֹם דָמָו יִשְׁפַּךְ* shedding man's blood, i.e. if any one sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; Ex 21:12, Ps 75:4, Pr 17:14, Jb 41:18; so especially if כִּלְלָג every precedes the participle, Gn 4:15, 1 S 3:11 (2 K 21:12), 2 S 5:8 (whosoever smiteth), 1 Ch 11:6. The apodosis is very often introduced by וְ (wāw apodosis), e.g. Ex 12:15 (with a following perfect consecutive), Nu 35:30; 1 S 2:13 *הַפְנֵן כָּלִידָאשׁ וְכַנְּזֵבָה וְבָא נְעֵר* when any man offered sacrifice, the priest's servant came, &c.; 2 S 14:10 (participle with article); 22:41 (where, however, the text is to be emended in accordance with Ps 18:41); 2 S 23:3 f., Pr 23:24 *K^eth.*; 29:9.—As in the instances discussed under *u*, such sentences are sometimes preceded by וַיְהִי, cf. 1 S 10:11, 11:11, 2 S 2:23 *וַיְהִי כָּלִידָבָא* and it came to pass, that as many as came, &c. [or by וַיְהִי, frequentative, Ju 19:30].—On the other hand, וְהַנִּשְׁבַּת *Dn* 8:22 is a mere catchword (equivalent to *and as for that which was broken*) to call to mind the contents of verse 8.

6. On the use of the participle after the infinitive absolute הַלְוֹךְ cf. § 113 u.

7. Almost as a rule the participial construction beginning a sentence (like the infinitival constructions according to § 114 r) is continued by means of a finite verb with or without וְ, before which the English construction requires us to supply the relative pronoun implied in the participle; thus, continued by means of a perfect, Is 14:17 *שֶׁסֶם חָבֵל פְּמִירָבָר וְעָרְיוֹ נָרָס* that made the world as a wilderness, and overthrew the cities thereof¹; 43:7, Ez 22:3, Ps 136:13 ff., Pr 2:17; by a perfect without Wāw, Gn 49:11; by a simple imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae* in the present), Is 5:23, 46:6, Pr 7:8, Jb 12:17, 19 ff., 24:21; by an imperfect without Wāw, e.g. 1 S 2:8, Is 5:8, Pr 2:14, 19:26; by an imperfect consecutive, Gn 27:33, 35:3, 1 S 2:6, Jer 13:10 (after several participles), Ps 18:33, 136:10f.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE VERB.

§ 117. *The Direct Subordination of the Noun to the Verb as Accusative of the Object. The Double Accusative.*

L. Kaila, *Zur Syntax des in verbaler Abhängigkeit stehenden Nomens im alttest. Hebr.*, Helsingfors, 1906.

following participle, while here it belongs properly to the apodosis, before which it is therefore generally placed; see the examples.

¹ On the parallelism between the *external* and *internal* members, which appears here and in many other examples of this kind, see the note on § 114 r.

1. The simplest way in which a noun is subordinated to a verbal form is by the addition of an accusative of the object to a transitive verb.² In the absence of case-endings,³ this accusative can now be recognized only from the context, or by the particle **את** (אַתָּה, before suffixes also הָאַתְּ, תָּאַתְּ)⁴ prefixed to it. The use of this *nota accusativi* is, however, somewhat rare in poetry, and even in prose it is not invariably necessary but is restricted to those cases in which the accusative of the object is more closely determined by being a proper name, or by having the article, or by a following determinate genitive (hence also by the suffixes), or in some other way (see below, c), e.g. Gn 4:1 *and she bare Cain*; 6:10, 1:1 *God created the heaven and the earth* (but 2:4 *רֹאשׁ הָאָדَم*); 1:25 *and God made the beast of the earth*; 2:24.

Rem. 1. The rare occurrence of the *nota accusativi* in poetic style (e.g. it never occurs in Ex 15:2–18, Dt 32, Ju 5, 1 S 2, &c., though it is frequent in the late Psalms) may be explained from the fact that in this as in other respects (cf. § 2 q) poetry represents a somewhat more archaic stage of the language than prose. The need of some external means of indicating the accusative could only have been felt after the case-endings had become wholly extinct. Even then the **תְּ** would probably have been used at first to indicate only an object placed *before* the verb (when it followed, it was already sufficiently characterized by its position as depending

2² The verb in question may either have been originally transitive, or only have become transitive by a modification of its original meaning. Thus the vocalization shows that **חִפֵּז** (*to have pleasure*, usually with **בְּ**) *to desire*, **מִלְאָה** (*to be full of something*, also transitive) *to fill*, were originally intransitive. Cf. also such cases as **בִּכְתָּה** *to weep* (generally with **עַל-**, **אֶל-** or **לְ**), but also *to bewail* with an accusative; **יִשְׁבֶּה** *to dwell* (usually with **בְּ**), but also *to inhabit* with an accusative (cf. further, under u).—The examples are different in which verbs of motion such as **בָּוָא** *intrare*, also *aggredi*, **אֲצַקֵּה** *egredi* (cf. § 116 h above), **שָׁבֵב** *redire*, Is 52:8, take an accusative of the aim of the motion, while **בָּזָה** according to the Old Semitic usage, even takes an accusative of the person (at least in poetry, equivalent to **בָּוָא אֶל-** in prose).

3³ On traces of these endings, especially the remains of a former accusative ending in **a**, cf. § 90 c.

4⁴ **את** (toneless owing to the following Maqqeph), and **תְּ** (with a tone-long ē, אַתָּה, only in Jb 41:26), **הָאַתְּ** or **וְאַתְּ** before the light suffixes (on all these forms cf. § 103 b: the underlying form *āth* was obscured in Hebrew to *ōth*, shortened to *ăth* before suffixes beginning with a consonant and then modified to **תְּ**, whence finally the secondary form **תְּ** with the tone), Phoenician **יתְּ** i.e. probably *iyyāth* (for the Phoenician form, cf. G. Hoffmann, *Einige phönik. Inschriften*, Göttingen, 1889, p. 39 f.), Punic *yth* or (according to Euting) pronounced even as a mere prefixed *t*, Arabic, before suffixes, *iyyâ*, Aram. **תְּ**, **תִּ**. It was no doubt originally a substantive, meaning *essence, substance, self* (like the Syriac *yāth*; on the other hand, any connexion with the Hebrew **תְּוָא**, Syriac *'āiā*, Arabic *'ayat, a sign*, must, with Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xl. 738, be rejected), but now united in the construct state with a following noun or suffix stands for the pronoun *ipse, αὐτός*. In common use, however (cf. Wilson, ‘The particle **תְּ** in Hebrew,’ *Hebraica*, vi. 2, 3, and the precise statistics of the use of **תְּ** on p. 140 ff.), it has so little force (like the oblique cases **αὐτοῦ**, **αὐτῷ**, **αὐτόν**, sometimes also *ipsius, ipsum*, and the Germ. *dasselben*, &c.) that it merely serves to introduce a determinate object; **μήτηρ** **της** **αὐτής** prop. **αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν** (cf. **αὐτὴν Χρυσηῖδα**, Iliad i. 143) is no stronger than the simple **μήτηρ** **τὸν οὐρανόν**. Cf., further, P. Haupt on Pr 18:24 in his Rainbow Bible, and also in the *Notes on Esther*, p. 191.

on the verb), or proper names.¹ Finally, however, the *nota accusativi* became so customary everywhere in prose, that even the pronominal object was expressed rather by **תְּאֵן** with suffixes than by verbal suffixes, even when none of the reasons mentioned under *e* can be assigned for it; cf. Giesebricht in *ZAW*. 1881, p. 258 ff., and the statistics of H. Petri, cited above at the head of § 58. Such examples as **כִּכְלָא אֲשֶׁר צִנָּה אַתְּ הַיְם** **Gn 6:22** in the *Priestly Code*, beside **בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר-צָנָה הוּא הַנָּה** **7:5** in the *Jahvist*, are especially instructive.

2. As accusatives determined in other ways, we have in the first place to consider the collectives introduced by **כְּלָא** *entirety*, without a following article or determinate genitive, inasmuch as the meaning of **כְּלָא** includes a determinative sense, cf. e.g. **Gn 1:21, 30, 8:21, Dt 2:34, 2 K 25:9**. **אֲתָה-כְּלָא** is used absolutely in **Gn 9:3**, cf. **39:23**; similarly, **יְהִי** is determinate of itself, since it always denotes a person, hence **אֲתָה-יְהִי quem?** e.g. **Is 6:8, 37:23, &c.**, but never **אֲתָה quid?** So also the relative **אֲשֶׁר** in the sense of *eum qui* or *quem*, &c., e.g. **1 S 16:3**, or *id quod*, **Gn 9:24**, &c. Cf. also such examples as **Jos 2:10, 1 S 24:19**, where **אֲתָה אֲשֶׁר** is equivalent to *the circumstance, that, &c.*—Elsewhere **אֲתָה** stands before nouns which are determinate in sense, although the article is omitted, which according to § 126 h is very frequently the case in poetic or otherwise elevated style; thus **Lv 26:5, Jos 24:14, 15, Is 41:7** (to distinguish the object from the subject); **50:4** (with the first of two accusatives, also for the sake of clearness); **Ez 13:20, 43:10, Pr 13:21** (where the **צְדִיקִים** are to be regarded as a distinct class); **Jb 13:25** (unless, with Beer and others, we read **וְאַתְּ** for **אֲתָה**); also **Ec 7:7** may be a quotation of an ancient maxim.

On the other hand **אֲתָה** occurs very seldom in prose before a noun actually or apparently undetermined. In **1 S 24:6** **כְּנַפְתָּח** is more closely defined by means of the following relative clause; in **2 S 4:11** **אִישׁ צְדִיקִים** refers to Ishboseth (as if it were *him, who was an innocent man*); in **1 K 6:16** **אֲתָה עֲשָׂרִים אַפְתָּח** refers to the particular twenty cubits. In **Ex 21:28** (otherwise in verse 29) perhaps the **אֲתָה** is used in order to avoid the combination **שֹׂר אִישׁ** (as in **Nu 21:9** to avoid the cacophony **שֹׂר שֹׂר הַבָּקָשׁ**?); in **Lv 7:8** and **20:10** the accusatives are at any rate defined by the context.—In **Nu 16:15** **אֲתָה-אֶחָד מֵהֶם** probably means *even a single one* (and then *ipso facto* a definite one) *of them*, as also in **1 S 9:3** **אֲתָה-אֶחָד מִהְנֻעָרִים** may refer to some definite one of the men-servants. In **Gn 21:30** we should read **אֲתָה-שָׁלֵשׁ בְּעַמְבָּשָׁת** with the Samaritan, since the seven lambs have been already mentioned; in **Ex 2:1** translate with Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 79, **אֲתָה-בָתְלָנִי** *the daughter of Levi*; in **Ex 28:9** read **הַמְּשֻׁבְּשָׁת** with the Samaritan; in **Lv 20:14** **אֲתָה-אַשְׁר** is probably a scribal error due to **הַמְּשֻׁבְּשָׁת**; in **1 S 26:20** read **נְפָשִׁי** with the LXX for **פְּרֻעָשׁ אֲתָה**; in **2 S 5:24** read **הַצּוּרָה** as in **1 Ch 14:15**; in **2 S 15:16** the **אֲתָה** is incorrectly inserted from **20:3**, where it refers to the women already mentioned; in **2 S 18:18** read **הַמְּפֹתֵחַ בַּת**, or omit both **אֲתָה** and **אֲשֶׁר** with the LXX and Lucian; in **1 K 12:31** omit **אֲתָה**; in **2 K 23:20** probably **אֲתָה-עֲצָמוֹתָם** is to be read; in **2 K 25:9** the text is corrupt. In **Ez 16:32** **אֲתָה-זִרְעִים** might refer to *the strangers in question*; but see Smend on the passage.

3. The pronominal object *must* be represented by **אַתְּ** with a suffix (instead of a verbal suffix), when (a) it precedes the verb, e.g. **Nu 22:33** **אֲתָה כְּרָב גַּפְתִּי וְאַתְּ הַנִּי I had slain thee and saved her alive**; **Gn 7:1, Lv 22:28, 1 S 8:7, Is 43:22, 57:11, Jer 4:17, 22, 7:19**; (b) when a suffix is already attached to the verb, and as a rule when a second accusative with **וְ** follows, e.g. **2 S 15:25** **וְהָרְאֵנִי אֲתָה וְאַתְּ הַוְיָה and he will show me it**; **Ex 17:3** **לְהַמִּית אֲתָה וְאַתְּ בְּנֵינוּ to kill us and our children**; **Nu 16:32, 1 S 5:11, 2 S 14:16** (but cf. also **Dt 11:6, 15:16, &c.**, and Driver on **1 S 5:10**); (c) after an infinitive absolute, see above § 113 a note; (d) after an infinitive construct,

¹ Thus, in **Dt 33**, **אֲתָה** occurs only in verse 9 (twice, with an object preceding the verb), in **Gn 49** in the blessing of Jacob only in verse 15 with a co-ordinate second object (consequently farther removed from the verb). Of the thirteen instances of **אֲתָה** in the *Mêša'* inscription, seven stand directly and four indirectly before proper names.

when it is immediately followed by the subject, e.g. Gn 41:39, or when the combination of a suffix with the infinitive might lead to a misunderstanding, e.g. Gn 4:15 *לְבָלַתִּי הַפּוֹתֵת אֶתָּךְ* *lest one should smite him, &c.*, where *לְבָלַתִּי הַפּוֹתֵת* might also mean *lest he should smite*.

4. The pronominal object is very frequently omitted, when it can be easily supplied from the context; so especially the neuter accusative referring to something previously mentioned (the English *it*) after *verba sentiendi* (עַמְשָׁה) and *dicendi*, e.g. Gn 9:22, &c., וַיֹּאמֶר and he told (it); also after בְּנָה to give, Gn 18:7, 24:41, &c., לְקַח to take, הַבְּרִיא to bring, שִׂים to lay, Gn 9:23, &c., אָמַד to find, Gn 31:33, &c. A personal object is omitted, e.g. in Gn 12:19, 24:51 (after חַקְתָּה).—The omission of the plural object is remarkable, because it leaves an opportunity for a misunderstanding, in Gn 37:17 אֲרָרִים עֲתָה וְשָׁמְמֻעָתִים I heard them saying; perhaps, however, we should read שָׁמְמֻעָתִים with the Samaritan.

5. In common formulae the substantival object is also sometimes omitted (an elliptical expression); thus e.g. כְּרִתָּה 1 S 20:16, &c. (see the Lexicon) stands for כְּרִתָּה בְּרִית like the English *to close* (sc. a bargain) with any one; נְטוּר to keep (sc. אֵן anger) equivalent to *to be resentful*, Ps 103:9, &c.; so also שְׁמָר Jer 3:5 (beside נְטוּר); for נְשָׁא קֹול to lift up the voice, Is 3:7; נְשָׁא לְשָׁא to take away any one's sin (to forgive), Gn 18:24, 26, Is 2:9; נְשָׁא to put forth (sc. יָד the hand) equivalent to *to reach after something*, 2 S 6:6, Ps 18:17.

6. *Verba sentiendi* may take a second object, generally in the form of a participle or adjective and necessarily indeterminate, to define more exactly the action or state in which the object is perceived, e.g. Nu 11:10 מִשְׁמָעָה אֲתָה־הָעָם בְּכָה and Moses heard the people weeping; Gn 7:1 אַתָּךְ בְּאַתְּ יְתִי צְדִיק thee have I seen righteous. Frequently, however, the second object is expressed by a separate clause. This is especially frequent with רַא to see, e.g. Gn 1:4 and God saw the light, that it was good; Gn 6:2, 12:14, 13:10, 49:15, Ex 2:2, Ps 25:19, Pr 23:31, Jb 22:12, Ec 2:24, 8:17; so with יֵדָה to know, Ex 32:22, 2 S 3:25, 17:8 (with two objects); 1 K 5:17.

7. In certain instances הָא serves apparently to introduce or to emphasize a nominative. This cannot be regarded as a reappearance of the original substantival meaning of the הָא, since all unquestionable examples of the kind belong to the later Books of the Old Testament. They are rather (apart from textual errors or other explanations) cases of virtual dependence on an implied *verbum regens* understood. The constant use of הָא to indicate a clause governed by the verb, necessarily led at length to the use of הָא generally as a defining particle irrespective of a governing verb. So in the Hebrew of the Mishna¹ (see above, § 3 a) הָא and הָא are prefixed even to a nominative without any special emphasis.

Naturally the above does not apply to any of the places in which הָא is not the *nota accusativi*, but a preposition (on הָא with, cf. § 103 b), e.g. Is 57:15, 1 S 17:34 וְאַתָּה־הָזֹב (and that, with a bear; הָא here, however, has probably been interpolated from verse 36, where it is wanting); nor the places in which the accusative is subordinate to a passive (according to § 121 c) or to a verb of wanting as in Jos 22:17 and Neh 9:32, see below, z. In Ez 43:17 סְבִיב about governs like a verb, being followed by הָא.

Other cases are clearly due to attraction to a following relative pronoun in the accusative (Ez 14:22, Zc 8:17; but Hag 2:5a, מִמְצָרִים, must be omitted, with the LXX, as a later addition), or the accusative depends on a verbal idea, virtually contained in what has gone before, and consequently present to the speaker's mind as governing the accusative. Thus Nu

¹ According to the ordinary rules of syntax (cf. § 116 t) we should translate, *I heard men who said, &c.*

¹ Cf. Weiss, משפט לשון המשנה (Vienna, 1867), p. 112.

3:26 (the verbal idea contained in verse 25 is *they had to take charge of*); in Jos 17:11 it implies *it was given up* or *they gave him*; 1 S 26:16 *see where* is equivalent to *search now for*; in 2 S 11:25 *אל-ירע בעיניך* is used in the sense of *noli aegre ferre*²; Jer 36:33 *and he had the brazier before him*; in Ec 4:3 a verb like *I esteem* is mentally supplied before *את אָשַׁר*. On Jos 22:17, Neh 9:32, see below, aa.—Aposiopesis occurs in Dt 11:2 *for not your children* (do I mean); still more boldly in Zc 7:7, where either *תִּשְׁמַע* or *תִּשְׁמַעְתָּם* (שׁוֹעֵז, פָּנָא) is to be supplied.

Setting aside a few undoubtedly corrupt passages³ there still remain the following examples, in which *את* in the later Hebrew manner (almost in the sense of the Latin *quod attinet ad*) introduces a noun with more or less emphasis, Nu 3:46, 5:10, 35:6, Ju 20:44, 46, Ez 17:21, 20:16, 35:10, 44:3, Neh 9:19, 34, Dn 9:13, 2 Ch 31:17.—In Ez 47:17–19 (cf. also 43:7) it is simplest to emend *את* for *את*, according to verse 20. However, even the LXX, who have *ταῦτα* only in verse 18, can hardly have known any other reading than *את*; consequently in all these passages *את* must be regarded as virtually dependent on some governing word, such as *ecce* (LXX 43:7 ἔώακας), and 47:17 ff. as equivalent to *thou shalt have* as a border, &c.

8. Another solecism of the later period is finally the introduction of the object by the preposition *ל* (prop. *in relation to, in the direction of*), as sometimes in Ethiopic¹ and very commonly in Aramaic.² Less remarkable is this looser connexion of the object with a participle, as with *אכל* La 4:5, *חָפַץ* Nu 10:25, *זָקַן* Ps 145:14 (but cf. 146:8), *אָרַךְ* Nu 25:18, *אָגִיא* and *הַשְׁפֵּשׁ* Jb 12:23; *before* the participle Is 11:9.—To introduce an object *preceding* the finite verb *ל* is employed in Jb 5:2 (cf. also Dn 11:38); also *after* *אָהָב* Lv 19:18, 34; *Ps 129:3; Ezra 8:24, 2 Ch 25:10; הַבְּין* Jb 9:11; *בְּרֻךְ* 1 Ch 29:20 (immediately before with an accusative); *1 Ch 5:26; קָרְשָׁה* Ezr 6:21, 1 Ch 22:19, 2 Ch 17:13; *הַגְּלָה* Gn 45:7, where, however, read *פֶּלֶטְה* with the LXX for and take *לכֶם* as a *datus commodi*; *הַלְּל* 1 Ch 16:36, 2 Ch 5:13; *הַרְגֵּג* 2 S 3:30, Ps 135:11 (verse 10 with accusative), 136:19 f.; *חַבְשָׁה* (*to bind up*) Is 61:1 (Ez 34:4 *before* the verb); *יְדָעָה* Ps 69:6; *כַּפֵּד* Ps 86:9; *לְקַחַת* Jer 40:2, 2 Ch 23:1; *הַמְּלִיכָה* and *מְשָׁה* 1 Ch 29:22; *נְהָל* 2 Ch 28:15; *סְמִךְ* Ps 145:14; *צָבֵב* 1 Ch 16:37; *עַלְהָה* Ez 26:3; *Ps 116:16; רְצֵף* Jb 19:28; *הַצְדִּיק* Is 53:11; *שְׁכַרְתָּ* 2 Ch 24:12 (previously accusatives); *שִׁים* 1 S 22:7 (but probably *וְלִכְמָה* is to be read); *הַשִּׁיבָה* *לְ* (in the connexion, *ל*) 2 Ch 10:6 (but verse 9 and 1 K 12:9 with an accusative); *שִׁיחָתָה* Nu 32:15, 1 S 23:10; *שִׁיחָתָה* Ps 73:18; *לִלְשָׁן* Ezr 8:16, 2 Ch 2:12, 17:7; *שְׁמָרָה* 1 Ch 29:18, 2 Ch 5:11.

9. Sometimes the verb, on which an accusative of the object really depends, is contained only in sense in the verb which apparently governs, e.g. Is 14:17 *אֲסִירָיו לְאַפְתָּח בָּיִתָּה* *his prisoners he let not loose nor sent them back to their home*. On this *constructio praegnans* in general, see § 119 ff.

2² So also in 1 S 20:13 the Qal (בִּיטָּב) is, with Wellhausen, to be read instead of the *Hiph'i'l*.

3³ Thus 1 S 26:16, where *וְאֵי* is to be read for *את*; 1 K 11:25, where at present the predicate of the relative clause is wanting; in 2 K 6:5 the *את* is probably derived from a text which read the *Hiph'i'l* instead of *בְּפִלְל*. In Jer 23:33 instead of the artificial explanation *what a burden* (is, do ye ask?) we should read with the LXX and Vulg. *אֲשֶׁר אַתָּם הַמִּשְׁאֵל ye are the burden*. In Ez 10:22 *מִרְאֵיכֶם וְאַתֶּם* is unintelligible; in 37:19 read with Hitzig *אֲשֶׁר אַתָּם* for *את*; in Hag 2:17 for *אתֶם בְּכֶם* [or *אֲנִיכֶם*]; for the *לְאָלָה* cf. 2 K 6:11, Jer 15:1, Ez 36:9].

1¹ Dillmann, *Grammatik der äthiopischen Sprache*, p. 349.

2² With regard to Biblical Aramaic, see Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 151 f. In other ways, also, a tendency may be observed in later Hebrew to make use of the looser connexion by means of prepositions instead of the closer subordination of the noun in the accusative.

2. With the proper accusatives of the object may also be classed what is called the *internal* or *absolute object* (also named *schema etymologicum* or *figura etymologica*), i.e. the addition of an object in the form of a noun derived from the same stem,¹ e.g. Ps 14:5 חָדוֹשׁ פַּחַד they feared a fear (i.e. they were in great fear), Pr 15:27; also with the object preceding, e.g. La 1:8 בְּמֹתֶךָ יְרֻשָּׁלָם אָמֵת חָטָאת Jerusalem hath sinned a sin; with a double accusative (see below, cc), e.g. 1 K 1:12, יְעִצָּמָךְ נָא עִצָּמָה let me, I pray thee, give thee counsel; 1 K 1:12.²

Rem. (a) Strictly speaking the only cases of this kind are those in which the verbal idea is supplemented by means of an *indeterminate substantive* (see the examples above). Such a substantive, except in the case of the addition of the internal object to denominative verbs (see below), is, like the infinitive absolute, never altogether without force, but rather serves like it to strengthen the verbal idea. This strengthening is implied in the indeterminateness of the internal object, analogous to such exclamations as, *this was a man!*³ Hence it is intelligible that some intensifying attribute is very frequently (as in Greek usually) added to the internal object, e.g. Gn 27:34 דְּלֹה וּמֹרֶה עַזְּנָמָן אֲשֶׁר־קָרְבָּן he cried (with) an exceeding great and bitter cry; cf. the Greek νοσεῖν νόσον κακήν, ἔχαρησαν χαρᾶν μεγάλην (Matt. 2:10); *magnam pugnare pugnam, tutiorem vitam vivere, &c.*

Examples of an internal object *after* the verb, and without further addition, are Ex 22:5, 2 S 12:16, Is 24:22, 35:2, 42:17, Ez 25:15), 26:15, 27:35, Mic 4:9, Zc 1:2, Pr 21:26; with an intensifying attribute, Gn 27:33, Ex 32:31, Ju 15:8, 2 S 13:36, 1 K 1:40 (cf. Jon 4:6, 1 Ch 29:9); Is 21:7, 45:17, Jon 1:10, Zc 1:14, 8:2a, Dn 11:3; along with an object proper the internal object occurs with an attribute in Gn 12:17, 2 S 13:15; cf. also Is 14:6, Jon 4:1.—An internal object without an attribute *before* the verb: Is 24:16, Jer 46:5, Hb 3:9, Jb 27:12; with an attribute *before* the verb: Jer 14:17, Zc 1:15 (cf. also Gn 30:8, Jer 22:19, 30:14, Ps 139:22). Instead of the substantive which would naturally be expected, another of kindred meaning is used in Zc 8:2.

(b) Only in a wider sense can the *schema etymologicum* be made to include cases in which the denominative verb is used in connexion with the noun from which it is derived, e.g. Gn 1:11, 9:14, 11:3, 37:7, Ez 18:2, Ps 144:6, probably also Mi 2:4, or where this substantive, made determinate in some way, follows its verb, e.g. Gn 30:37, Nu 25:11, 2 K 4:13, 13:14, Is 45:17, La 3:58,⁴ and, determinate at least in sense, Jer 22:16; or precedes it, as in 2 K 2:16, Is 8:12, 62:5, Zc 3:7; cf. also Ex 3:9. In both cases the substantive is used, without any special emphasis, merely for clearness or as a more convenient way of connecting the verb with other members of the sentence.

3. Verbs which denote *speaking (crying out, weeping)*, or any external act, frequently take a direct accusative of the organ or means by which the action is performed. In this case, however, the accusative must be more closely determined by an attributive adjective or a noun in the genitive. This fact shows the close relation

¹ On a kindred use of the infinitive absolute as an *internal object*, see above, § 113 w.

² Cf. βουλὰς βουλεύειν, Iliad x. 147.

³ The Arab grammarians assign to the indeterminate cases generally an intensive sense in many instances; hence the commentators on the Qur'an usually explain such cases by adding *and what ...!* see §125 b.

⁴ Also in Ps 13:4 *lest I sleep the sleep of death*, מִתְּהִלָּתְהָ שְׁנָתְהָ (cf. Jer 51:39), as Is 33:15 for קְרַבְתָּ אֶלְקָוֹתְךָ. On the similar use of הַלְּקָמִים in Ps 15:2, see § 118 n.

between these accusatives and the *internal objects* treated under *p*, which also, according to *q*, mostly take an intensifying attribute. On the other hand, they must not be regarded as adverbial (instrumental) accusatives, nor are they to be classed with the second (neuter) subjects treated below in § 144 l.

Examples of the accusative following the verb are *וְאָזַעֲקָה קֹלֶךְ גָּדוֹל* *and I cried a loud voice*, i.e. with a loud voice, Ez 11:13, 2 S 15:23 (after the proper object, Dt 5:19, 1 K 8:55); Ps 109:2 *they have spoken unto me קָרְשׁוּנִי שָׁׁמֶר* *a tongue of deceit*, i.e. with a lying tongue; Pr 10:4 *he becometh poor עַמְּשֵׁה כַּפְרָקִיה* *dealing a slack hand*, i.e. who dealeth with a slack hand; cf. the German *eine schöne Stimme singen*, to sing a fine voice, *eine tüchtige Klinge schlagen*, to smite a trusty sword, *Schlittschuhe laufen*, to run skates (i.e. to skate), and our *to write a good hand*, *to play ball*, &c.— Examples of the accusative preceding are *שְׁפָתִי רְגֻנוֹת יְהִלְלִפִּי* *my mouth shall praise with joyful lips*, Ps 63:6; cf. Ps 12:3, where a *casus instrumenti* with *בְּ* follows the accusative.

4. Many verbs originally intransitive (sometimes even in form; see a, note 2 may be used also as transitives, in consequence of a certain modification of their original meaning, which has gradually become established by usage; cf. e.g. *רִיב* *to strive*, but also with an accusative *causam alicuius agere* (so even in Is 1:17, &c.; elsewhere with *לְ* of the person for whom one strives); *לִכְدֹּן* *absolutely to be able*, with an accusative *to prevail over any one*; *חִפֵּז* *to be inclined* and *רָצַח* *to have pleasure* (usually with *בְּ*), with an accusative *to wish for some one or something*; *שְׁכַב* *cubare*, then in the sense of *concubere*, originally joined with *עִם* *cum*, but quite early also with the accusative, equivalent to *comprimere (feminam)*, &c. So in 2 S 13:14, &c., unless in all or some of the passages the preposition *אֵת* is intended, e.g. *הַקְּרָבָה* for *אֵת קְרָבָה*; in the earlier passages *עִם* is the more usual.

Rem. 1. It is certainly difficult to decide whether some verbs, which were afterwards used absolutely or joined with prepositions, were not nevertheless originally *transitive*, and consequently it is only the supposed original meaning, usually assigned to them in English, which causes them to appear *intransitive*.¹ In that case there is of course no syntactical peculiarity to be considered, and a list of such verbs would at the most be requisite only for practical purposes. Moreover, it is also possible that certain verbs were originally in use at the same time both as transitive and intransitive, e.g. perhaps *לְבִשָּׁה* *to be clothed* along with *לְבִישָׁה* *to put on* (a garment). Finally the analogy of certain transitives in constant use may have led to intransitives of kindred meaning being also united directly with the accusative, so that, in other words, whole classes of verbs came to be regarded in a particular aspect as transitives. See below, *y*.

2. The modification of the original meaning becomes especially evident when even reflexive conjugations (*Niph'al*, *Hithpa'el*, &c.) take an accusative (cf. § 57, note 2); e.g. *בָּאֵת* *to prophesy*, Jer 25:13; *גָּסֶב* (prop. *to put oneself round*) *to surround*, Ju 19:22; *גָּלַחַם* *to fight*, Ps 109:3 (where, however, the *Qal* *וַיְלַחַם וּבָנִי* should be read; cf. Ps 35:1); also *הַתְּגִילָה* *to shave (something) for oneself*, Num 6:19; *הַתְּבִנָה* *to take some one for oneself as a possession*, Is

¹ Thus e.g. *צָהָה* *to reply to* (*ἀμείβεσθαι τινα*), *to answer any one*; *צָהָה* *to command* (*iubere aliquem*); *זָכַר* *to remember*; *קָנָה* (also with *לְ*) *to wait for any one* (to expect any one); *רָשַׁב* *to bring glad tidings to any one* (see the Lexicon); *בָּאֵת* and *בָּאֵת* *to commit adultery (adulterare matronam)*; *עָבֵד* *to serve (colere)*; *עָבֵד* *to become surety for ...*, and many others.

14:2; **הַתְּנַכֵּל** to make some one *an object of craft*, Gn 37:18; **הַתְּנַצֵּל** to strip a thing off oneself, Ex 33:6; **הַתְּעֹבֶר** to bring on oneself the anger of any one, to anger him; **הַתְּבִין** to consider something, Jb 37:14; **הַתִּפְרֹךְ** to break something off from oneself, Ex 32:3. In Gn 34:9 after **הַתְּחִנָּנוּ** make ye marriages, read **אַתֶּן** instead of **נָהָרָתֶן**. Cf. § 54 f.

3. So also it is only owing to a modification of the original meaning of a verb (except where the expression is incorrect, and perhaps derived from the popular language), when sometimes the remoter object (otherwise introduced by **ל**) is directly subordinated in the form of an accusative suffix, e.g. Zc 7:5 **בְּצֹוֹם צְמַת נִי אָנָּי** did ye fast at all unto me, even to me? as though to say, have ye *be-fasted* me? have ye reached me with your fasting? Still more strange is Jb 31:18 **גַּדְלָל נִי קָאָב** he (the orphan) grew up to me as to a father; cf. Is 27:4, 65:5, Jer 31:3, and in Aramaic Dn 5:6; but **בְּרַץ הָנָבָת נִי** Jos 15:19 is to be regarded as a double accusative after a verb of giving, see ff. In 1 S 2:25 read וּפְלִילָו for; in Is 44:21, instead of the Niph'el, read **בְּנַשְׁתִּינִי**; in Ez 29:3 either **עֲשִׂירִים נִי** is to be read with Olshausen or **עֲשִׂירִים** (and previously with Smend); in Ps 42:5 **אַדְדָה** or **אַדְדָם**; in Ps 55:23 (where König takes **יְקַבֵּר** as *he has given it to thee*) we must certainly assume a substantive **יְקַבֵּר** (=fate?).

4. Whole classes of verbs, which, according to v above, are regarded as *transitive*, either on account of their original meaning or (for the sake of analogy) by a modification of that meaning, are—

(a) Verba *induendi* and *exuendi*, as **לִבְשַׁ** to put on, **שִׁפְשַׁ** to put off a garment, **עַדְהָ** to put on ornaments, to adorn oneself with (cf. also **זָהָב** **קָשְׁבָּזִים** enclosed in gold, Ex 28:20). Also in poetic expressions such as Ps 65:14 **לְבָשָׂוֹתְרִים הָצָאָן** the pastures are clothed with flocks, cf. Ps 109:29; 104:2 (**הַטְּעַטְּעַ**); 65:14b (**הַטְּעַטְּעַ**), &c.¹

(b) Verba *copiae* and *inopiae* (also called verba *abundandi* and *deficiendi*), as **אַלְלָאָ**, to be full of something, Ex 8:17; here, and also frequently elsewhere, construed with **אָהָ**, and hence evidently with an accusative; Gn 6:13; with a personal object, Ex 15:9 *my lust shall be satisfied upon them*; with an accusative preceding the verb for the sake of emphasis, e.g. Is 1:15 *your hands* **אָהָלָם** **יְמִים מְלָאָ** are full of blood, cf. Is 22:2; so also the Niph. **בְּנַתְּלָא** to fill oneself with something, e.g. Gn 6:11, Ex 1:7 (where the object is connected by **תָּה**); Is 2:7 f., 6:4, Pr 3:10; **בְּנַרְזָ** to be fructified with, Nu 5:28; **שְׁנַרְזָ** to swarm with, Gn 1:20, 21 Ex 7:28; **שְׁבַע** (**שְׁבַע**) to be full of, Is 1:11, Jo 2:19, Pr 12:11; **גָּבָר** to become strong, to wax mighty in something, Jb 21:7; **פְּרֹזֶ** to overflow with something, Pr 3:10 (with the object preceding); **יַרְדֵּ** prop. to descend, poetically also to pour down, to overflow with something (cf. in Greek προπέσειν ὕδωρ, δάκρυα στάζειν), e.g. La 3:48 **פְּלִגִּי מִים תְּרֵד עַיִנִי** mine eye runneth down (with) rivers of water; 1:16, Jer 9:17, 13:17, Ps 119:136; so also **הַלְּךָ** to run over with, to flow with, Jo 4:18; **גָּזֶל** to gush out with, Jer 9:17; **טָפַח** to drop, to overflow with, Ju 5:4, Jo 4:18a; **פְּרֹחַ** to break forth, Ex 9:9; **טְפַח** to overflow, but also (transitively) to overflow with, probably in Is 10:22; **נוֹבֵ** to bud with, Pr 10:31; so perhaps also **עַבְרָ** to pass over, to overflow with, Jb 5:28; **אָזַעַ** to go forth with, Am 5:3.—Especially bold, but still on the analogy of the above examples, is Is 5:6, where it is said of a vineyard **תְּהִלָּה שְׁמַר וְשָׁה** **וְעַלְהָ** but it shall come up (it shall be overgrown) with briers and thorns; cf. Pr 24:31, and still more boldly, Is 34:13.

With the opposite idea, **חַסְרָ** to be in want of, to lack, Gn 18:28; **לְשַׁ** to be bereaved of (as though it were to lose), Gn 27:45.—In Jos 22:17 even **הַמְעֻט־לֹא** (prop. was there too little for

¹ From the idea of covering oneself with something, we might also, if necessary, explain Ex 30:20 **יְרַחַצּוּ מִים** they shall wash themselves with water; but the reading is simply to be emended to the ordinary **בְּמִים**.

us of ...?) as being equivalent to a verbum inopiae (= *had we too little of ...?*) is construed with an accusative; cf. Neh 9:32.

(c) Several verbs of *dwelling*; the accusative in this case expresses either the place or the thing *at* which or *with* which any one tarries; thus Gn 4:20, Ps 22:4 after נִשְׁבַּת, cf. § 118 g; Ju 5:17, Is 33:14 after גָּוֹר; Ps 57:5 after שָׁכֵב; Ps 68:7, Pr 8:12, Is 33:16 with שָׁכֵן; or even the person (the people) with whom any one dwells or is a guest, as Ps 5:5, 120:5 after גָּוֹר, Gn 30:20 after בָּבֶל, Ps 68:19 with שָׁכֵן.

5. *Two accusatives* (usually one of the person and one of the thing) are governed by—

(a) The causative conjugations (*Pi'ēl, Hiph'îl*, sometimes also *Pilpel*, e.g. Gn 47:12, &c.) of verbs which are simply transitive in *Qal*, and hence also of *verba induendi* and *exuendi*, &c. (cf. above a and u, and also y, z), e.g. Ex 33:18 קְרָא נִיְּנָא אֲתָה־כָּבֵד נָא show me, I pray thee, thy glory. Thus very frequently the *הַזְׁדִּיעַ* *to cause* some one *to know* something; לְמַד docere aliquem aliquid, &c.; cf. further, Gn 41:42 וַיְלַבֵּשׂ אֲתָה בְגִנְעִילָשׁ and he caused him to put on vestures of fine linen (he arrayed him in vestures, &c.); cf. in the opposite sense, Gn 37:23 (both accusatives after הַפְּשִׁיר introduced by תְּאֵן); so with מַלְאֵן *to fill, to fill up* with something, Gn 21:19, 26:15, Ex 28:3; אָזַר *to gird* some one with something, Ps 18:33; עַצֵּר *to crown*, Ps 8:6, &c.; to cause some one *to lack* something, Ps 8:6; קָאכֵיל to feed some one with something, Ex 16:32; הַשְׁקָה to make some one drink something, Gn 19:32 ff.

(b) Many verbs (even in *Qal*) which express an influence upon the object through some external means. The latter, in this case, is attached as a second object. They are especially—

(a) Verbs which express *covering, clothing, overlaying*, חָגָר Ex 29:9, חָפֵחַ Ex 26:29, &c., חָזַק Ez 13:10 ff., צָרֵר Ps 5:13; cf. also רָגַם אָקְרָן Jos 7:25, &c.; hence also verbs which express *sowing* (אָרַע Jud 9:45 Is 17:10 30:23), *planting* (Is 5:2), *anointing* (Ps 45:8) *with* anything.

(β) Expressions of *giving*, thus קָרְבָּן Jos 15:19 where the accusative of the thing precedes; *endowing*, זָבֵד Gn 30:20; and its opposite *taking away*, as קָבַע Pr 22:23; בָּרַךְ to bless some one with something, Gn 49:25, Dt 15:14; to give graciously, חָנַן Gn 33:5; to sustain (i.e. to support, to maintain, to furnish) with anything, e.g. Gn 27:37, Ps 51:14 (מְאַתָּה); Ju 19:5 (עַד); to do something to one, בָּמַלְשֵׁל Gn 50:15, 17, 1 S 24:18; cf. also קָרְבָּם to come to meet any one with something, Ps 21:4, בָּמַלְשֵׁל to repay some one with something (with two accusatives, Ps 35:12, Pr 13:21), and for the accusative of the person cf. εὖ, κακῶς πράττειν τινά. In a wider sense we may also include such phrases as *they hunt every man his brother with a net*, Mi 7:2; to shoot at one with arrows, Ps 64:8 (though this is against the accents); Pr 13:24 seeks him early (with) discipline, i.e. chastises him betimes, &c.

(γ) Expressions of *asking* some one *for* something, *desiring* something *from* some one (אָלַף Dt 14:26, Ps 137:3); *answering* any one anything (עָנָה Mi 6:5, &c.; cf. in the other conjugations הָשִׁיבְתְּ בָּרֵךְ prop. *verbum reddere*, with an accusative of the person, 1 K 12:6, &c., also in the sense of *announcing*; sometimes also הָגִיד to declare something to some one, Jb 26:4, &c., for ?הָגַת); חָזַק to enjoin a person something, Ex 34:32, Dt 1:18, 32:46, Jer 7:23.

(8) Expressions which mean *to make, to form, to build something out of* something; in such cases, besides the accusative of the object proper, another accusative is used for the material of which the thing is made, e.g. Gn 2:7 **וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים עֲשֵׂה מִן-דָּבָר אֶת-אָדָם** *and the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground*; so with **יָצַר** also in 1 K 7:15; further Ex 38:3 **כָּל-כְּלֵי וְשָׁתָח** *all the vessels thereof made he of brass* (for another explanation of the accusative **בְּשָׁתָח** [into brass], linguistically possible but excluded by the context, see below, ii with kk); cf. Ex 25:18, 28, 26:1, 14 f.29, 27:1, 36:8, 1 K 7:27; with a preceding accusative of the material, Ex 25:29, 29:2, Dt 27:6 **אֶבֶנִים שָׁלָמוֹת תָּבִנֶּה אֶת-מִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה** *of unhewn stones shalt thou build the altar of the Lord.*

(c) Verbs which express *making, preparing, forming into* anything, along with the object proper, take a second accusative of the product, e.g. Gn 27:9 **אָתָּה אֶת-תְּמִימָנִים מִצְבָּחָךְ וְיִבְנֶה אֶבֶנִים מִזְבֵּחַ** *I will make them (the kids) into savoury meat; and he built the stones (into) an altar*; cf. 10:12. So also **אָפַח**, with two accusatives, *to bake something into something*, Ex 12:39, Lv 24:5; **שִׁים** (prop. *to set up for* something, cf. Gn 27:37, 28:18, Ps 39:9, and similarly Gn 31:45) *to change into* something, Jos 8:28, Is 50:2, 51:10, Mi 1:7, 4:13; with two accusatives of the person (*to appoint, promote* any one to the position of a ...), Is 3:7; **נָתַן** is also used in the same sense with two accusatives, Gn 17:5, and **שִׁית** 1 K 11:34; as a rule, however, the description of the office, and also frequently of the product, is introduced by **ל** *to*, § 119 t; also **שִׁית** *to make a thing so and so* (Is 5:6, 26:1; with a personal object, Ps 21:7, 191:9); **הַחַשֵּׁיךְ** *to make dark*, Am 5:8. Of the same class also are instances like Jb 28:2 **אֲבָן יִצְקַח נְחֹשֶׁה** *a stone they smelt into brass; 1 K 11:30 וַיִּקְרַע הַשְׁנִים עַשֶּׂר קְרֻעִים* *and rent it (the garment) into twelve pieces*; cf. Is 37:26, accusative of the product before the object proper, after **לְהַשְׂאוֹת** *to lay waste*. On a second object with *verba sentiendi* (as **יִדּוּ** *to know something to be* something, Ec 7:25; **רָאָה** *to see, find to be*, Gn 7:1; **חָשַׁב** *to esteem one to be something*, Is 53:4, elsewhere always construed with **ל** or **בְּ**), cf. h.

Rem. At first sight some of the examples given above appear to be identical in character with those treated under *hh*; thus it is possible, e.g. in 1 K 18:32, by a translation which equally suits the sense, *he built from the stones an altar*, to explain **מִזְבֵּחַ** as the nearer object and **אֶבֶנִים** as an accusative of the material, and the construction would then be exactly the same as in Dt 27:6. In reality, however, the fundamental idea is by no means the same. Not that in the living language an accusative of the material in the one case, and in the other an accusative of the product were consciously distinguished. As Driver (*Tenses*, § 195) rightly observes, the remoter accusative in both cases is, strictly speaking, in apposition to the nearer. This is especially evident in such examples as Ex 20:25 *thou shalt not build them (the stones of the altar) as hewn stones*, cf. also Gn 1:27. The main point is, which of the two accusatives, as being primarily affected (or aimed at) by the action, is to be made the more prominent; and on this point neither the position of the words (the nearer object, mostly determinate, as a rule follows immediately after the verb), nor even the context admits of much doubt. Thus in 1 K 18:32 the treatment of the stones is the primary object in view, the erection of the altar for which they were intended is the secondary; in Dt 27:6 the case is reversed.

¹ Cf. a very pregnant expression of this kind in Ps 21:13 **כִּי תִשְׁעַת מִזְבֵּחַ** *for thou shalt make them (as) a neck, i.e. thou shalt cause them to turn their necks (backs) to me*; similarly Ps 18:41 (2 S 22:41, Ex 23:27); **אִיבִּי גַּתְתָּה לִי עַכְפָּה** *thou hast given mine enemies unto me as a back*; cf. Jer 18:17.

(d) Finally, the second accusative sometimes more closely determines the nearer object by indicating the part or member specially affected by the action,¹ e.g. Ps 3:8 *for thou hast smitten all mine enemies* לְפָנֶיךָ (as to) *the cheek bone*, equivalent to *upon the cheek bone*; cf. Gn 37:21 *let us not smite him* שֵׁנִים in *the life*, i.e. let us not kill him; Dt 22:26, 2 S 3:27; also with שַׁוְתָה Gn 3:15; with רַעַת Jer 2:16; in poetry the object specially concerned is, by a bold construction, even placed first, Dt 33:11 (with עַזְבָּת).

§ 118. *The Looser Subordination of the Accusative to the Verb.*

1. The various forms of the looser subordination of a noun to the verb are distinguished from the different kinds of the accusative of the object (§ 117) by their specifying not the persons or things directly affected by the action, but some *more immediate circumstance* under which an action or an event takes place. Of such circumstances the most common are those of *place*, *time*, *measure*, *cause*, and finally the *manner* of performing the action. These nearer definitions are, as a rule, placed *after* the verb; they may, however, also precede it.

Rem. That the cases thus loosely subordinated to the verb are to be regarded as *accusatives* is seen first from the fact that in certain instances the *nota accusativi* (תְּאַתְּ) is prefixed; secondly from the fact that in one form of the *casus loci* a termination (ןְ) is employed, in which (according to § 90 c) the old accusatival ending is preserved; and finally from the consistency with which classical Arabic puts these nearer definitions in the accusative (which may be recognized by its form) even under circumstances in which one would be rather inclined to expect a nominative in apposition.

The relation subsisting between the circumstantial accusative and the accusative of the object is especially apparent when the former (as e.g. in a statement of the goal after a verb of motion) is immediately connected with its verb. But even the more loosely connected circumstantial definitions are certainly to be regarded as originally objects of a governing word habitually omitted, only that the consciousness of this closer government was at length lost, and the accusative more and more acquired an independent value as a *casus adverbialis*.

2. The accusative serves to define more precisely the *place* (*accus. loci*), either (a) in answer to the question *whither?* after verbs of motion,¹ or (b) in answer to the question *where?* after verbs of *being*, *dwelling*, *resting*, &c. (but also after transitive verbs, see the examples), or finally (c) to define more precisely the *extent* in space, in answer to the question *how far? how high? how much?, &c.*

Instead of the simple accusative, the locative (see above, § 90 c)² is frequently found in the cases mentioned under f (sometimes also in those under g) or the preposition לְאַתְּ³, especially before persons as the aim of the movement, or בָּ, usually, to express being *at a place*.

¹ Analogous to this is the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ κατὰ μέρος in Greek epic poetry, e.g. ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγε ἔρκος ὁδόντων.

¹ So commonly in Sanskrit; in Greek only poetically, e.g. Iliad i. 317 κνίση δ'
οὔρανὸν ἵκεν: in Latin, e.g. *rus ire, Romam proficisci*.

² Hence e.g. in 1 S 9:26 the Masora requires הַגְּדָלָה instead of the *Keth.* גְּדָלָה.

³ So in Ju 19:18 for אֲתָּה־בַּיִת the better reading is אֲלָבֵת.

Examples of (a) נָצַא הַשָּׂדֶה let us go out into the field, 1 S 20:11; cf. Gn 27:3, 31:4, Jb 29:7; לְבֵית טְרִישׁוֹת to go to Tarshish, 2 Ch 20:36; cf. Gn 10:11, 13:9, 24:27, 26:23, 31:21, Ex 4:9, 17:10, Ju 1:26, 2 K 11:19, Na 1:8 (?), Ps 134:2; with לְהַחַן Nu 23:14; with בְּמִתְנָה Jos 6:24; with the *accus. loci* emphatically preceding (cf. Driver on 1 S 5:8), 1 K 2:26, Is 23:12, Jer 2:10, 20:6, 32:5; with בְּזֹאת (in the sense of *aggredi*, equivalent to בְּזֹעַ, cf. § 117 a, note 2) the *personal aim* also is poetically added in the accusative, Ez 32:11, 38:11, Pr 10:24, 28:22, Jb 15:21, 20:22; but in the last passage it is better taken as an accusative of the object (cf. the German *einen ankommen, überkommen*). See also Nu 10:36 (where שָׁבַב can hardly be transitive); Ju 11:29, 1 S 13:20 (where, however, לְאַל has probably fallen out after יִשְׂרָאֵל so Strack).—Finally, cf. also the use of אֲשֶׁר for הַהֵּנָּה ... אֲשֶׁר whither, Nu 13:27.—The *accus. loci* occurs after a passive, e.g. Gn 12:15.

Examples of (b): Gn 38:11 *remain a widow* בֵּית אָבִיךְ in thy father's house; cf. Gn 24:23, 1 S 17:15, 2 S 2:32, Is 3:6, Hos 12:5, Mi 6:10, 2 Ch 33:20; פֶּתַח הָאָכָל in the tent door, Gn 18:1, 10, 19:11, and frequently. As observed by Driver on 1 S 2:29, accusatives of this kind are almost without exception (but cf. 1 K 8:32, Is 16:2, 28:7, 2 Ch 33:20) connected with a noun in the genitive. In all the above examples, however, the accusative may have been preferred to the natural construction with פָּ (which is not rare even with בֵּית and פֶּ) for euphonic reasons, in order to avoid the combination of such sounds as בָּבְ'; and בְּפָ'; cf., moreover, Gn 2:14, 4:16, Ex 18:5, Lv 6:8 instead of the usual המזבח הַמִּזְבֵּחַ Ex 29:13, &c.); Dt 1:2, 19,¹ 2 S 17:26, 1 K 7:8, Pr 8:3, 9:14. On Is 1:30 see § 116 i; on שָׁבֵעַ, with the *accus. loci*, see § 117 bb. On the other hand, in Dt 6:3, according to the LXX, a verb of giving has dropped out before רֹצֶן.

Examples of (c): Gn 7:20 fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; Gn 31:23, 41:40 רקְנָה הַכְפֵא אֲגָדֶל מִתְךָ only in the throne will I be greater than thou; Dt 1:19 we went (through) all that great and terrible wilderness; cf. Jb 29:3. Of the same kind also are such cases as Ex 16:16 (according to the number of your persons, for which elsewhere לְמִסְפֵּר is used); 1 S 6:4 (with the accus. preceding); 6:18, 2 S 21:20, Jb 1:5.—A statement of weight is put in the accusative in 2 S 14:26.

3. The accusative is employed to determine more precisely the *time* (*accus. temporis*), (a) in answer to the question *when?* e.g. *היום* *the day*, i.e. *on the day* (in question), *at that time*, but also *on this day*, i.e. *to-day*, or finally *by day*, equivalent to *יום*, like *בְּעֶרֶב at evening*, *בְּקָרֶב noctu*, *early*, Ps 5:4, &c., *בְּיֹמָם at noonday*, Ps 91:6; *יְوָמָה on one and the same day*, Gn 27:45; *שְׁנָאָשָׂן in sleep*, Ps 127:2; *(קְחַלֵּת קָצִיר שְׁעָרָם)* (*Q^erē bēt^q*) *at the beginning of barley harvest*, 2 S 21:9; in stating a date, Gn 11:10, 14:4 *in the thirteenth year*.

(b) In answer to the question *how long?* e.g. Gn 3:14, &c., **כל ימי חייך** *all the days of thy life*; 7:4 *forty days and forty nights*; 7:24, 14:4, 15:13, 21:34, 29:18, Ex 20:9 (*for six days*); 23:15, 31:17; **נצח מים** *for ever*, 1 K 8:13; also with the accusative made determinate, Ex 13:7 **את שבעת הימים** *throughout the seven days* in question, mentioned immediately before; cf. Ju 14:17, Dt 9:25.

4. The accusative is sometimes used of abstract ideas to state the reason (*accus. causae*), e.g. Is 7:25 *thou shalt not come thither* וְרָאֶת שָׁמֵר, *for fear of briers.*

¹ In Ps 2:12 יְמִינֶךָ is not to be taken as an *accus. loci* (*on the way*), but as an *accus. of respect* (*with regard to the way*); see below, m.

5. Finally the accusative is used very variously (as an *accus. adverbialis* in the narrower sense), in order to describe more precisely the *manner* in which an action or state takes place. In English such accusatives are mostly rendered by *in, with, as, in the form or manner of ..., according to, in relation to, with regard to*. For more convenient classification we may distinguish them as—

(a) Adjectives expressing *state*, placed *after* the verb to describe more accurately some bodily or other external condition, e.g. Is 20:2 *walking עָרֹם וַיֵּחֶר naked and barefoot*; cf. verse 3, 8:21, Gn 15:2, 33:18 (לִמְפָנֵי), Ju 8:4, Mi 1:8, Ps 107:5 (but in 15:2 מִמְּנָה is rather a substantive directly dependent on הַוֹּלֶךְ = *he that walketh in uprightness*; cf. § 117 r, note); Jb 30:28. After an accusative, e.g. Dt 15:18, to specify some mental state, e.g. Gn 37:35 (אֲבִיכֶם).—*Before* the verb (and then with a certain emphasis), Am 2:16, Jb 1:21, Ec 5:14; Lv 20:20, Jb 19:25, 27:19, 31:26 (unless יְקַר be a substantive); Ru 1:21 (*בְּלֹאָה מִלְאָה* parallel with the adverb מִלְאָה). In Mi 2:7 the text is clearly corrupt.

Those examples are especially instructive in which the adjective expressing a state, although referring to several, is nevertheless used in the singular, e.g. Jb 24:10 *עָרֹם הַלְכָיו naked*, i.e. in the condition of one naked, *they go about*; cf. verse 7 and 12:17. In Is 20:4 the singular occurs *after* a plural object, and in Is 47:5 the *masc.* after the 2nd sing. *fem.* imperative, which clearly proves that the term expressing the state is not conceived as being in apposition, but as an indeclinable adverb.

(b) Particles, again either *after* the verb, Nu 16:27, Jer 2:27, 43:2, Ps 7:3, Jb 24:5, Ct 2:8, or *before* it, Gn 49:11, Is 57:19, Ez 36:35, Ps 56:2, 92:14, Pr 20:14; cf. also the substantival use of the participles Niph'al נִפְאָאֹת *in a fearful manner* (Ps 139:14) and *in a wonderful manner*, Jb 37:5, Dn 8:24.—Also participles in connexion with genitives, as מְחֻלָּךְ Gn 3:8 (cf. also בְּאָה 1 K 14:6), are to be regarded as expressing a state and not as being in apposition, since in the latter case they would have to take the article.—In 2 S 13:20, 1 K 7:7 and Hb 2:10 the *explicative Wāw* (equivalent to *and that too*) is also prefixed to the participle. In Ps 69:4 for מִתְּהִלָּה read מִתְּהִלָּת. —On 1 K 11:8, 2 K 10:6, 19:2, Hag 1:4, cf. the note on § 131 h.

(c) Substantives¹ in the most varied relations: thus, as describing an external state, e.g. Mi 2:3 *תְּלַכְּוּ אַתֶּם רֹמָה neither shall ye walk haughtily* (as opposed to חֹמֶשׁ Is 60:14); Lv 6:9 (accus. before the verb=as unleavened cakes), Dt 2:9, 4:11, Ju 5:21, Is 57:2, Pr 7:10, Jb 31:26, La 1:9; as stating the position of a disease, 1 K 15:23 *he was diseased אַתְּדַבְּרָלִין in his feet* (2 Ch 16:12), analogous to the cases discussed in § 117 ll and § 121 d (d); as describing a spiritual, mental, or moral state, e.g. Nu 32:14, Jos 9:2 (*בְּפָה אֲחֵךְ with one accord*, 1 K 22:13; cf. Ex 24:3, Zp 3:9), 1 S 15:32, 2 S 23:3, Is 41:3 (unless שְׁלֹוּם is adjectival, and the passage is to be explained as in n); Jер 31:7, Ho 12:15, 14:5, Ps 56:3, 58:2, 75:3, Pr 31:9, Jb 16:9, La 1:9; Lv 19:16, &c., in the expression חַלְקָה *to go up and down as a tale-bearer*; also בְּבָבָל *unawares*, Gn 34:25, Ez 30:9; מִשְׁרִים *uprightly*, Ps 58:2, 75:3 (in both places *before* the verb); as stating the age, e.g. 1 S 2:33 (if the text be right) מִמְּתוּ אֲנָשִׁים *they shall die as men*, i.e. *in the prime of life*; cf. 1 S 2:18 (*בְּעָרָה*), Is 65:20, and Gn 15:16; as specifying a number more accurately, Dt 4:27, 1 S 13:17, 2 K 5:2, Jер 31:8 [in Jер 13:19 שְׁלֹוּמִים wholly (?) is corrupt; read גָּלוּת שְׁלֹמָה with LXX for *הַגָּלוּת שְׁלֹמָה*]; as stating the consequence of the action, Lv 15:18, &c.

The description of the external or internal state may follow, in poetry, in the form of a comparison with some well-known class, e.g. Is 21:8 *וַיַּקְרָא אֶרְרִיהַ and he cried as a lion*; cf. Ps

¹ Cf. above, § 100 c, on certain substantives which have completely become adverbs; and § 113 h and k on the adverbial use of the infinitive absolute.

22:14, Is 22:18 (**כְּדוֹר** like a ball); Is 24:22, Zc 2:8, Ps 11:1 (unless צָפֹר be vocative); 58^{9 b} (unless the force of the preceding הַ is carried on, as in Ps 90:4); Ps 144:12, Jb 24:5 (**פֶּרְאִים**, before the verb); 41:7 *shut up together* as with a close seal.²

6. To the expressions describing a state belong finally those nouns which are introduced by the comparative particle הַ,³ since the הַ is to be regarded as originally a substantive¹ in the sense of *amount, kind (instar)*, standing in the accusative (so that הַ is equivalent to *as a kind of, after the manner of, according to*), while the following noun represents a genitive governed by the הַ. From this, which is the proper meaning of the הַ, may be explained its power of representing a great many pregnant relations, which in English can only be rendered by the help of prepositions.² Thus the comparison may refer to—

(a) The place, e.g. Is. 5:17 **כְּבָדְבָרָם** *after the manner of*, i.e. *as in their pasture*; 23:15 as (it is said) *in the song of the harlot*; 28:21, 29:7 **כְּחַלּוּם** *as in a dream*.

(b) The time, especially in the combination **כְּיֻמָּה** *after the manner of the day*, equivalent to *as in the day*, Is 9:3, Ho 2:5; **כְּיִמֵּי** *as in the days of ...*, Is 51:9, Ho 2:17, 9:9, 12:10, Am 9:11; cf. moreover, Lv 22:13, Ju 20:39, Is 17:6, Jb 5:14, 29:2, and the expressions **בְּיֹום** *as day by day=as in the former days*, 1 S 18:10; **כְּעַם** **כְּעַם** *as at other times*, 1 S 3:10, &c.; **כְּשָׁנָה** **כְּשָׁנָה** *as in former years*, 2 K 17:4; cf. § 123 c. Of a different character is the use of הַ as a simple particle of time, e.g. Gn 18:10 **כְּעַת חַיָּה** *at this time* (not *about the time*), when it lives again, i.e. at the end of a year; Gn 25:29 **כְּעַת מָחר** *to-morrow at this time*; cf. Is 23:5, and the frequent connexion of הַ with the infinitive construct to express a definite time (in the sense of a pluperfect), Gn 12:14, 27:34, Ex 9:29, &c.

(c) The person, e.g. Gn 34:31 *should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?*

(d) The thing, e.g. Is 10:14, Ps 33:7, Jb 28:5 **כְּמֹזְאֵשׁ** *as a fire*, i.e. *as it were by fire* (cf. Is 1:25 **כְּבָשָׂר** *as with lye*); Jb 29:23 **כְּמַטָּר** *as for the rain* (they waited for me); Jb 38:14 (*as in a garment*); 38:30 **כְּאָבן** *as to stone* (the waters are solidified in freezing).

2² It is, as a matter of fact, permissible to speak of the above examples as *comparatio decurtata*, but it must not be assumed that the comparative particle הַ, which is otherwise regularly prefixed (see s), has actually dropped out.

3³ On the use of הַ as a prefix, cf. § 102 c.

1¹ Schwabe (הַ nach seinem Wesen und Gebrauch im alttestam. Kanon gewürdigte, Halle, 1883) contests this explanation (which is defended especially by Fleischer and is certainly indisputable). He, with Gesenius and Ewald, places הַ as a preposition on the same footing as בְּ and לְ, and believes it to be probably connected with the stem כִּין as well as with כִּי and כִּן. The above view of הַ as a substantive of course does not imply that the language as we have it is still in every case conscious of the substantival meaning.—On הַ in numerical statements, in the sense of *about, nearly*, see the Lexicon.

2² It would be altogether unsuitable here also (see above, note 2 on r) to assume a loss of the preposition. Such examples as Is 1:26 (**כְּבָר אֲשֶׁר נָהָר**), Lv 26:37 (**כְּמַמְפִנִּי**) are to be explained from the fact that here the preposition and substantive had already become simply *one* word before the הַ was prefixed. We find also **כְּעַל** Is 59:18, 63:7, Ps 119:14, and 2 Ch 32:19; cf. Driver on 1 S 14:14 (**כְּבָשָׂר, צָבֵב**), where the text is wholly corrupt.

Rem. According to the earlier grammarians, כִּי is sometimes used pleonastically, i.e. not to indicate a similarity (as in Lv 14:35 *as it were*, i.e. *something like*), but simply to introduce the predicate (*Kaph veritatis*), e.g. Neh 7:2 *for he was a faithful man*; cf. 1 S 20:3 עָשָׂה, La 1:20 כַּאֲنֹת כִּי אֵין כְּאִישׁ אֶלְכָה. Such a pleonasm is of course out of the question. At the most a *Kaph veritatis* can only be admitted in the sense that the comparison is sometimes introduced by כִּי with a certain emphasis (equivalent to *in every respect like*); thus כִּי in Neh 7:2 means simply *of the nature of a faithful man*, i.e. as only a faithful man can be; cf. Nu 11:1, Is 1:7, 13:6, Ho 4:4, 5:10, Ob¹¹, Jb 24:14, 27:7, La 1:20, 2:4; also מְעֻמָּק in such passages as Ps 105:12 *yea, very few*; but e.g. in Is 1:9 *only just, a very small ...*

§ 119. The Subordination of Nouns to the Verb by means of Prepositions.

1. In general. As is the case with regard to the looser subordination of nouns to the verbal idea (§ 118), so also their subordination by means of prepositions is used to represent the more immediate circumstances (of place, time, cause, purpose, measure, association, or separation) under which an action or event is accomplished. In the case of most prepositions some idea of a relation of *space* underlies the construction, which then, in a wider sense, is extended to the ideas of time, motive, or other relations conceived by the mind.

On the origin of the prepositions and the original case-relation in which they stand to the nouns governed by them, cf. § 101, where a list of the prepositions is given with their original meanings. Cf. also § 102 on the prefixes, and § 103 on the union of prepositions with suffixes.

2. A not unimportant part is played in Hebrew by the *compounding* of prepositions to represent more accurately the relations of place, which either precede or follow the action. In the former case אֶל-, and in the latter (which is not so frequent) אַל- occurs before other prepositions of place; cf. e.g. Am 7:15 *the Lord took me from behind the flock*; 2 K 9:18 *turn thee אֶל-אַחֲרֵי to behind me*, i.e., *turn thee behind me*; מִן- מִמְּתַת from being with ..., as in French *de chez, d'après quelqu'un*.¹ For further examples, see c.

Rem. 1. We must *not* regard as combined prepositions in the above sense either those *substantives* which have become prepositions only by their union with prefixes, as לִפְנֵי *before*, לְפָנֵי *on account of* (but e.g. מִלְבָנֵי *from before*, Gn 4:16, &c., is such a compound); nor *adverbs*, which are also formed by combining words which were originally substantives (also used as prepositions) with prepositions, as מִחוּץ without, מִתְּחִית in the sense of *below*,² מִעַל-

¹ In other cases French, as well as English and German, can only emphasize *one* of the two combined ideas; thus, such expressions as *il prend le chapeau sur la table*, German and English *er nimmt den Hut vom Tisch*, *he takes his hat from the table*, all regard the action from one point of view only; the Hebrew here brings out both aspects of it by means of מִעַל- *from upon*, cf. e.g. Is 6:6.

² Hence not to be confounded with מִתְּחִית *from under*, in such examples as Pr 22:27, which is a real compound preposition. In the above-mentioned adverbs also the מִן was *originally* by no means pleonastic; מִתְּחִית denotes properly the locality, regarded primarily as a place *from beneath* which something proceeds, and so on. This original sense of the מִן, however, has become so much obscured by its regular combination with words of place to form independent adverbs, that it is even prefixed (evidently only on the analogy of such common adverbs as מִעַל- חַת, מִתְּחִית) in cases where it is really inadmissible, owing to the meaning of the adverb, e.g. in מִבְּלָעֵדִי,

above (so also in Gn 27:39, 49:25, not *from above*). These adverbs of place, however, may become prepositions by the addition of **ל**, e.g. מִחוֹז־לְ outside as regards ..., i.e. *outside of something*, in 1 K 21:13 even after a transitive verb of motion; **לְמִתְהַת** below as regards ..., i.e. *under something* (cf. עַד־מִתְהַת until they came under ..., 1 S 7:11), **מִעַל־לְ** over something, &c.; **לְבַד** prop. *in separation*; **לְבַדּוֹ** *in separation from*, i.e. *apart from, besides*. Only rarely in such a case is the **ל** omitted for the sake of brevity, e.g. Jb 26:5 מִתְהַת מִים beneath the waters; Neh 3:28 (**מִעַל־**).

2. Real combinations of prepositions (each retaining its full force) occur—

(a) With **מִן־** in **מֵחֲנָה**, **מֵאַחֲרִי**, **מֵאַחֲרִי** (see above) *from behind something*; **מִן־** and **מִן־** *from with* (see above); or **מִבּוֹנִין** *from between something* (with motion in either direction, see e.g. Gn 49:10); **מִלְפָנִים** *from before* (see above); sometimes also **מִמְ�וֹלֶךְ** *from upon*, i.e. *off from*; **מִתְהַת** away from under (see footnote² on p. 377).

(b) With **אֶל־**, in **אֶל־אַחֲרִי** *to behind*, **אֶל־** *to between*; **אֶל־מִבֵּית** **לְ** *forth between* 2 K 11:15; **אֶל־** *forth without*, i.e. *out in front of*, Nu 5:3; **אֶל־תֹּוךְתְּ** **לְ** *down under*.¹—In Jb 5:5 the two prepositions of motion are combined in a peculiarly pregnant construction, **אֶל־מִצְנִים** (he goes thither and takes it) *out of the thorns*, i.e. he taketh it *even out of the thorns*, but the text is hardly correct.

3. A general view of the union of certain verbs, or whole classes of verbs, with particular prepositions, especially in explanation of certain idioms and pregnant expressions.²

(a) **אֶל־**³ *towards*, properly an expression of *motion* or at least *direction* towards something (either in the sense of *up to*=**עַל**, or *into*=**בְּ**), is used after verbs not only in answer to the question *whither?* but by a specially pregnant construction, in answer to the question *where?* e.g. Jer 41:12 *they found him אֶל־צָמָת by the great waters*; cf. Dt 16:6, 1 K 13:20, and a still more remarkable instance in 8:30 **אֶל־הַשָּׁמֶן יְמִם**. This combination of *two* different ideas, of motion *to* a place and being or acting *in* the place (very plainly seen in Dt 16:6 *but to the place which the Lord thy God shall choose ... shalt thou*

מִן־ *without*, cf. also such examples as **מִן־בַּד**, **מִן־בַּד**, **מִן־בַּד** *(there)*, &c. Since a **מִן־** is not usually repeated after **מִן־**, it appears as if **מִן־** by a transposition of the **מִן־** stood for the usual **לְבַד** **מִן־**. In reality, however, the preposition which forms the adverb into a preposition is omitted here, as in **מִתְהַת**, **מִעַל** without a following **ל** (see above). Properly **מִן־** has a purely adverbial meaning= *taken by itself*, like **מִלְמַעַלְהָ** **מִלְמַעַלְהָ** *above* (Syriac *men le'el*) *above* (adv.), as distinguished from **לְ** **מִלְמַעַלְהָ** (Syriac *le'el men*), *over, upon something*.—Also **מִן־** *from ... onward* is not for **לְ**, but the **ל** serves merely (just like the Latin *usque* in *usque a, usque ad, usque ex*) to indicate expressly the starting-point, as an exact *terminus a quo* (of place or time).

1¹ Also in 1 S 21:5 **אֶל־תֹּוךְתְּ** by a pregnant construction is virtually dependent on the idea of *coming into*, contained in the preceding **אֵין־**.

2² A summary of *all* the relations and senses in which a preposition may be used, belongs not to the Grammar but to the Lexicon.

3³ Cf. Mitchell, 'The proposition *el*,' in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1888, p. 143 ff., and especially A. Noordtzij, *Het hebreeuwsche voorzetsel אל*, Leiden, 1896, a thorough examination of its uses, and especially of the relation between **אֶל־** and **עַל־**.

bring thine offering and *there shalt thou sacrifice*, &c.), is the same as the Greek use of εἰς, ἐς for ἐν, the Latin *in potestatem, in amicitiam ditionemque esse, manere* (Cic. Verr. 5, 38; Div. 2, 14, &c.); cf. also the common German expressions *zu Hause, zu Leipzig sein, zu Bette liegen*, &c.

(b) ¹ Underlying the very various uses of this preposition is either the idea of being or moving within some definite region, or some sphere of space or time (with the infinitive, a simultaneous action, &c.), or else the idea of *fastening on* something, *close connexion with* something (also in a metaphorical sense, following some kind of pattern, e.g. the advice or command of some one *כִּי בְּצַדְקָתֶךָ בְּצַדְקָתֶךָ פֵּי בְּצַדְקָתֶךָ* in our image, after our likeness; cf. 1:27, 5:1, 3), or finally the idea of *relying* or *depending* upon ..., or even of merely *striking* or *touching* something.

Thus the use of בְּ is explained—

(1) In the sense of *among* (in the domain of), e.g. Mi 7:2 יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲקָם אֵין בְּ there is none upright among men; in the sense of *consisting of*, in specifying the constituents of a collective idea, e.g. Gn 7:21 and all flesh died ... in (=consisting of) fowl, &c. 8:17, 9:10, Ho 4:3. Also after ideas of *appearing, manifesting oneself, representing, being*, in the sense of *as, in the capacity of* (prop. in the sphere, after the manner of, see above), *consisting of ..., tanquam, the בְּ essentiae* of the earlier grammarians, corresponding to the Greek ἐν, the Latin *in*, ² and the French *en*, e.g. Ex 6:3 I appeared unto Abraham ... בְּאֵל שָׁדַי as El Shaddai; Jb 23:13 הוּא בְּאֶחָד but he is (manifests himself as) one, i.e. he remains always the same; Dt 26:5, 28:62 בְּמִתְהָרָה in the condition of being few, cf. 10:22 to the number of seventy; Is 40:10, Ps 39:7.—Cf. also such examples as Ex 18:4 (Ps 35:2, 146:5) בְּעֹזֶר as my help; Dt 26:14 being unclean; Is 28:16 in Sion (i.e. I make Sion a foundation); Ez 20:41 as a sweet savour; Pr 3:26, perhaps also Ex 3:2 in (i.e. as) a flame of fire; Is 66:15 with (i.e. like) fire; Ps 31:22, 37:20 (102⁴). For the origin of all these forms of expression Ps 54:6 is especially instructive, since אֲדֹנֵי בְּסָמְכֵי נָפְשֵׁי is not meant to refer to the Lord as *belonging to* the soul, but only to ascribe to him a similar character, i.e. *the Lord is one who upholds my soul*; so also Ps 99:6, 118:7, Ju 11:35 [the plur. as in § 124 g–i].³—Cf. Gesenius, *Thes. Linguae Hebr.*, i. 174 f., and Delitzsch on Ps 35:2.

(2) To introduce the object after transitive verbs, which denote *touching, striking, reaching to* (thus to some extent a fastening on, see above) something, in English sometimes rendered by *at, on, &c.*, and in German generally by compounds with *an*, e.g. *anfassen*=בְּחַזֵּק, *anrühren*=בְּגַעַגֵּע, &c. To the same category belongs also the construction of verbs denoting *authority* (ךְ, נִגְשָׁה, מִשְׁלָל, the last prop. to *tread on ...*) with בְּ, inasmuch as the exercise of the authority is regarded as a laying hold of the person ruled; so also, the introduction of the object by בְּ after certain *verba dicendi*, or when the mental action is to be represented as extending to some one or something: e.g. בְּקָרָא to call on some one, בְּנִשְׁבַּע to swear per aliquem, בְּאַלְפָשָׁע to enquire of some one. Again: בְּרָאָה to look upon, בְּשִׁמְעָה to hearken to (but cf. also *m*), generally with the secondary idea of participation, or of the pleasure with which one sees or hears anything, especially pleasure at the misfortunes of others, hence בְּרָאָה to see his

¹ Cf. Wandel, *De particulae Hebr.* בְּ *indole*, vi, *usu*, Jena, 1875.

² e.g. *res in praeda captae*, i.e. things taken as spoil; see Naägelsbach, *Lat. Stilistik*, § 123:4. On the Hebrew בְּ essentiae, see Hauschild in the *Festschrift zur Einweihung des Goethegymn.* Frankf. a. M. 1897, p. 163.

³ Other instances formerly cited here (Is 26:4, Ps 55:19, where בְּ is used before the subject) as well as Ps 68:5 בְּיְהָוָה שֵׁמוֹ Jah is his name, are textually very uncertain. Cf. Cheyne, *SBOT. Isaiah*, p. 173, on Is 26:4.

desire on any one or anything; cf. however, Gn 21:16 let me not look upon the death of the child; 1 S 6:19 because they had looked [irreverently] at the ark of the Lord.

Closely related to this is the use of בְּ:

(3) To introduce the person or thing, which is the object of a *mental act*, e.g. בְּ אֶמְתַּיָּהוּ to trust in (to cleave trustingly to) somebody or something; בְּ בְּטַח to have confidence in ...; בְּ שִׁמְחָה to rejoice in or at something, &c.; בְּ צֹבֵר to speak of (about) some one or something, Dt 6:7, 1 S 19:3 f., &c.

(4) The idea of an action as extending to something, with at the same time the secondary idea of participation in something, underlies finally the *partitive* use of בְּ, e.g. אֲכַל בְּ to share in eating something, Ex 12:43 ff., Lv 22:11; also simply to eat, to taste of something, Ju 13:16, Jb 21:25; so also בְּ לֹא מִן־ to eat of, and בְּ שִׁתְהָה בְּ to drink of something, Pr 9:5; בְּ שִׁמְעָה to hear a whisper of something, Jb 26:14; בְּ אֲצַחַת they found remaining of her only ..., 2 K 9:35; בְּ אֲשָׁר to bear a share of something, Nu 11:17, Ez 18:20, Jb 7:13. Cf. also בְּ חַלְקָה בְּ to give a share of something, Jb 39:17; בְּ בָּנָה to do building to, Neh 4:4.

(5) With the idea of *touching, striking against anything* is naturally connected that of proximity and vicinity near, and further that of association with something; cf. Gn 9:4 בְּ בְּנֶפֶשׁ־ with the life thereof, 15:14, 32:11 בְּ גַּדְלָה־ with my staff. Sometimes בְּ combined with a verb of motion (to come with something), expresses the idea of bringing, e.g. Ju 15:1 Samson visited his wife with a kid, i.e. he brought her a kid; Dt 23:5, Ps 66:13, 1 Ch 15:19 ff., 16:6.

(6) From the idea of connexion with something, being accompanied by something (see n), is developed, finally, the *instrumental* use of בְּ, which represents the means or instrument (or even the personal agent), as something with which one has associated himself in order to perform an action; cf. Mi 4:14 בְּ שֵׁבֶת they smite with the rod; Is 10:24; Ps 18:30 בְּךָ by thee (so also 44:6, parallel with בְּךָ); Is 10:34, Ho 1:7, 12:14; cf. also עַבְדָּךְ to labour by means of some one, i.e. to cause him to labour at it, Ex 1:14, &c. On בְּ with the passive to introduce the means or the author, see § 121 f.

A variety of the בְּ *instrumenti* is בְּ pretii (the price being considered as the means of acquiring a thing), cf. Gn 23:9, 29:18 (בְּ רַחַל); 30:16, 33:19, 34:15 (בְּ אֶת on this condition); 37:28; also, in a wider sense, Gn 18:28 בְּ for the sake of, 1 S 3:13.

Rem. The use of בְּ *instrumenti* to introduce the object is peculiar in such expressions as Ps 44:20 and thou coveredst over us בְּ צָלָם וְהַ with the shadow of death; Jb 16:10 בְּ עָרוֹעַלְיָהִים they have opened wide their mouth against me (prop. have made an opening with their mouth); cp. Ps 22:8, Ex 7:20 he lifted up בְּ the rod; Lv 16:4 קָנָג and followed by בְּ; Jos 8:18, La 1:17. Analogous to some English expressions we find both to gnash the teeth, Ps 35:16, and to gnash with the teeth, Jb 16:9; to wink the eye, Pr 10:10, and to wink with the eye, Pr 6:13; shake the head, Ps 22:8, and to shake with the head, Jer 18:16, Jb 16:4.—In all these instances the verb (intransitive) construed with בְּ has a greater independence, and consequently more emphasis than the verb construed with a direct accusative; the latter conveys a sort of necessary specification of the action, while the noun introduced by בְּ is used rather as a merely adverbial complement. An instructive example of this is בְּתַנְךָ קֹל vocem

¹ To be distinguished from בְּ שִׁתְהָה בְּ=to drink from (a cup, &c., Gn 44:5, Am 6:6), as in Arabic and Aramaic (Dn 5:2). Cf. also ἐν ποτηρίοις (Xen. Anab. vi. 1, 4), ἐν χρυσώμασι πίνειν (3 Ezr 3:6), *venenum in auro bibitur*, Seneca, Thyestes 453, and the French *boire dans une tasse*.

emittere, to utter a voice, also *to thunder*, while in נִתְן בְּקֹולוֹ Ps 46:7 (68³⁴, Jer 12:8), has an independent sense = *he thundered with his voice* (i.e. mightily).

(c) ¹ to, a very general expression of *direction towards* anything, is used to represent the most varied *relations* of an action or state with regard to a person or thing. On the use of לְ as a periphrasis for the *genetivus possessoris* or *auctoris* (the idea of belonging to), see § 129; on לְ with the passive, to introduce the author or the cause, see § 121 f; on לְ in a purely local sense (e.g. לֵב יָמֶن at thy right hand, prop. *towards thy right hand*), or temporal (e.g. בְּעַשְׂרֵה at evening, &c.) or distributive, see the Lexicon

The following uses of לְ properly belong to the government of the verb:

(1) As a *nota dativi*² to introduce the remoter object; also

(2) To introduce the *dativus commodi*. This *dativus commodi* (or *incommodi*, e.g. Ez 37:11) is used—especially in colloquial language and in later style—in the form of a pronoun with לְ, as an apparently pleonastic *dativus ethicus*, with many verbs, in order to give emphasis to the significance of the occurrence in question *for* a particular subject. In this construction the person of the pronoun must always agree with that of the verbal form.³ By far the most frequent use of this לְ is with the pronoun of the 2nd person after imperatives, e.g. לֹךְ go, *got thee away*, Gn 12:1, 22:2, Dt 2:13 (also in the feminine, Ct 2:10, 13); לֹכֶד turn thee aside, 2 S 2:21; סָעוּ לְכֶם take your journey, Dt 1:7; עֲבֹדוּ לְכֶם pass ye over; לֹכֶד flee (to save thyself), Gn 27:43; עֲלֹתֶךָ get thee up, Is 40:9; פָּנוּ לְכֶם turn you, Dt 1:40; שׁוּבוּ לְכֶם return ye, Dt 5:27; לֹא יָאִי rise up, Ct 2:10; שָׁבוּ לְכֶם abide ye, Gn 22:5; לֹא תַּעֲזִיר forbear thee, 2 Ch 35:21 (in the plural, Is 2:22); הַבּוּ לְכֶם take you, Dt 1:13, Jos 18:4, Ju 20:7, 2 S 16:20, and so almost regularly לֹא תַּשְׁמִיד לְכֶם (see above, § 51 n) *cave tibi!* and *take heed to yourselves*; רָאֵה be thou like, Ct 2:17 (cf. verse 9), 8:14, is remarkable; after a perfect consecutive, 1 K 17:3, 1 S 22:5; after an imperfect consecutive, e.g. Is 36:9 וְתַבְטַח לֹא and puttest thy trust.—In the 3rd person, e.g. הִשְׁבַּתְהָנָה and sat her down, Gn 21:16, cf. 22:5, Ex 18:27, Ps 120:6, 123:4, Jb 6:19; even after a participle, Ho 8:9.—In the 1st person plural, Ez 37:11.

(3) To introduce the result after verbs of making, forming, changing, appointing *to* something, esteeming *as* something; in short, in all those cases in which, according to § 117 ii, a second *accusative* may also be used.

(4) In loose connexion with some verbal idea in the sense of *in reference to, with regard to* ... (§ 143 e); so after a *verbum dicendi*, Gn 20:13; 1 K 10:23, cf. Is 36:9; even before the verb, Jer 9:2.—To the same class belongs also the *Lamedh inscriptionis* (untranslatable in English, and hardly more than a mere quotation-mark) which introduces the exact wording of an inscription or title; thus Is 8:1 write upon it ... (the words) מְהֻדָּשׁ וְגֹוי (cf. verse 3, where the לְ naturally is not used); Ez 37:16.

¹ Cf. Giesebrécht, *Die hebr. Präpos.* Lamed, Halle, 1876.

² Just as in the Romance languages the Latin preposition *ad* (Italian *a*, before vowels *ad>*, French *à*, Spanish *á*) and in English *to* are used as a periphrasis for the dative.—On the introduction of the nearer object by לְ, cf. § 117 n.

³ Such expressions as the analogous English *he plucked me ope his doublet, but me no buts*, and the like, are accordingly inadmissible in Hebrew.

(d) נִמְצָא, originally (according to § 101 a) *separation*,¹ represents both the idea of *distance, separation or remoteness from* something, and that of *motion away from* something, hence also *descent, origin from* a place, Am 1:1.

(1) From the idea of *separation* is naturally derived on the one hand the sense of (*taken from among ...*, *e numero*, e.g. Gn 3:1 *subtil as none other of the beasts*, &c.; cf. 3:14, Dt 33:24, 1 S 15:33, Ju 5:24 (so especially after the idea of choosing *out of*² a larger class, 1 S 2:28; cf. Ex 19:5, &c.), and on the other hand, the sense of *without* (separated, free from ...), e.g. Is 22:3 נֹשֶׁת אַפְקָן דַּו without the bow (i.e. without one needing to bend a bow against them) they were made prisoners; cf. Jer 48:45 חֲבֵד without strength; Ho 6:6, as the first half-verse shows, not more than burnt offerings (as R. V.), but and not burnt offerings; Mi 3:6, Ps 52:5, Jb 11:15, 19:26, 21:9, also such examples as Nu 15:24 far from the eyes, i.e. unobserved by the congregation; Pr 20:3.

Here also belongs the use of נִמְצָא after the ideas of *restraining, withholding from, refusing to* any one, frequently in pregnant expressions, which we can render only by complete final or consecutive clauses, e.g. 1 S 15:23 *he hath rejected thee נִמְצָא לְקָטָן away from* (being) king, instead of מִן הַחַיּוֹת מִן (as in verse 26), *that thou be no longer king*; cf. 1 K 15:13, Is 17:1 מִשְׁעִיר so that it is no longer a city; Jer 17:16, Jb 28:11 *he bindeth the streams נִמְצָבִי that they trickle not*; Gn 16:2, 23:6 מִקְבָּר that thou shouldst not bury thy dead; Is 24:10.

The נִמְצָא has a still more pregnant force in those examples in which the idea of precluding from anything is only indirectly contained in the preceding verb, e.g. Gn 27:1 *his eyes were dim נִמְצָא הַרְאָה away from seeing*, i.e. so that he could not see; Is 7:8 *Ephraim shall be broken in pieces סְמֻנָּה that it be not a people* (just as in Is 23:1, Jer 48:2, 42, Ps 83:5); Lv 26:13, Is 5:6, 49:15, 54:9, Ezr 2:62 (for other pregnant constructions with נִמְצָא see below, ff)³; on מִלְּאָן and נִמְצָא without, cf. § 152 y.

1¹ Cf. O. Molin, *Om prepositionen min i Bibelhebreisken*, Upsala, 1893, and especially N. Zerweck, *Die hebr. Praep. min*, Leipzig, 1893, who, instead of the partitive meaning (formerly accepted by us also), more correctly takes ‘separation’ as the starting-point of its various uses.

2² All the *partitive* uses of נִמְצָא also come most naturally under this idea of separation *out of* a larger class. Thus נִמְצָא is used in the sense of *some, something*, and even *one*, in such expressions as *and he slew ... also מִשְׁבְּרִי יִשְׁבְּרָאֵל* (*divers*) of the princes of Israel, 2 Ch 21:4; Lv 4:2; 1 K 18:5; מִזְבֵּחַ קָפֵר some of the blood of the bullock, Ex 29:12, &c.; Jb 27:6 *my heart doth not reproach me נִמְצָבִי for any*, i.e. for one, of my days; 38:12 נִמְצָבֵךְ one of thy days, i.e. ever in thy life (this explanation is confirmed by 1 K 1:6; cf. also 1 S 14:45, 25:28). In this way also, the frequently misunderstood Hebrew (and Arabic) idiom is to be explained, by which נִמְצָא before זָהָר אַחַת is equivalent to *ullus*; e.g. Lv 4:2 *and shall do נִמְצָא אַחַת מִתְהַנְּתָן any one of these things*; 5:13, Dt 15:7, Ez 18:10; so before a *nomen unitatis* (see § 122 t), 1 S 14:45 (2 S 14:11, 1 K 1:52) שְׂעִיר רְאשָׁוֹנָה נִמְצָא not one hair of his head.—נִמְצָא is used in the sense of the Arabic *min el-beyān* or explicative *min* (often to be simply translated by *namely*), e.g. in Gn 7:22 *of all that was*, i.e. so far as it was, probably also Gn 6:2 (=whomsoever they chose).

3³ On the use of נִמְצָא to express the comparative, which likewise depends on the idea of *distance from ...*, cf. below, § 133 a; on נִמְצָא as expressing the distance of time from a fixed limit, in the sense of *after*, e.g. Ps 73:20 οὐκέτι μετά after awaking (cf. ἐξ, ἀπίστου, ab itinere), or *after the lapse of ...*, e.g. Gn 38:24, Ho 6:2, and very frequently נִמְצָא from the end of, i.e. *after the lapse of ...*, see the Lexicon; also for the use of נִמְצָא to represent resting beside anything, like the Latin *prope abesse ab ...*

(2) On the sense of *motion away from* anything depends the use of γένεσις after such ideas as *to take away from, to beware, to be afraid of, to flee, to escape, to hide oneself from* (cf. καλύπτω ἀπό, *custodire ab*), sometimes again in pregnant expressions, e.g. Is 33:15. On the idea of *starting from* anything depends finally the very frequent *causative* use of γένεσις *on account of, in consequence of* (cf. our *that comes from ...*), *prae*, e.g. οὐ γένεσις for *multitude*, 1 K 8:5.

(e) **עַל**.¹ The two original local meanings of this preposition are *upon* (*ἐπί*)² and *over* (*ὑπέρ*, *super*).

(1) From the original meaning *upon* is explained the use of על after ideas of commanding, commissioning (*עֲקָד עַל*), &c., inasmuch as the command, obligation, &c., is laid upon the object. The construction is self-evident in the case of *to lie, rest, lean, rely, press upon* something; cf. also, for the last, such examples as Is 1:14, Jb 7:20, 23:2, and especially 2 S 18:11 וְעַלִי prop. *upon me* would it have been, it would have been incumbent upon me, &c.

(2) From the original meaning *over* is explained the use of עַל- after ideas of *covering*, *protecting*, *guarding*, בְּסֵה עַל-, גָּנוּ עַל-, רְחִם עַל- also the combinations to have compassion upon ... to spare some one, arise from the idea of a compassionate or protective bending over something. Cf. also Ju 9:17 = to fight for some one, i.e. in his defence.

(3) Moreover עַל- is used after verbs of *standing* and *going*, to express a towering *over* some one or something, sometimes in phrases, in which the original local idea has altogether fallen into the background, and which are therefore to be rendered in English by means of other prepositions (*by, with, before, near*), e.g. Gn 41:1, &c., *Pharaoh ... stood עַל-הַיָּם* *by the Nile* (above the water level; cf. Ps 1:3), and so especially עַמְדָע עַל- in the pregnant sense *to stand serving before* some one (prop. *over* one who sits or reclines at table) Zc 4:14 (cf. Is 6:2, where עַמְדָע is used for *עִלְיָה*); *הַתִּצְבֶּא עַל-* *to present oneself* by command *before* some one, Jb 1:6, &c. Cf. also עַל-יָדֵךְ, *עַל-יָדֵיךְ* (Jb 1:14) *near, at (on) the side of* some one or something.

(4) From the original meaning *above* (not, as formerly, explained, *on to* something, *at* something) there arise finally all the various constructions with **על** in the sense of *towards*, *against*. The original idea (which in many of these constructions has become wholly unrecognizable) starts from the view that the assailant endeavours to take up his position *over* the person attacked, so as to reach him from above, or to *over* power him; cf. especially **קום על** to rise up *over*, i.e. *against* some one, then with a transference of thought applied to any kind of hostile approach, **נלחם על** to fight against ..., **חנו על** to encamp against ..., **אסף על** to be gathered together, to assemble against ([Mi 4:11](#); cf. [Ps 2:2](#)), &c.; even after verbs which express a mental action, e.g. **חשב רעה על** to imagine evil against any one, &c.

4. Sometimes a preposition appears to be under the immediate government of a verb, which, by its meaning, excludes such a union. In reality the preposition is

¹ Cf. Budie, *Die hebr. Präpos.* $\square Al$ (לע), Halle, 1882.

² Since the placing *upon* anything is an addition to it, **לְעַל** also implies *in addition to* something, cf. Gn 28:9 (31⁵⁰); 30:40, 32:12 (probably a proverbial saying=mother and children); Dt 22:6. Also **לְעַל notwithstanding** is no doubt properly *in addition to*, e.g. Jb 10:7 *although thou knowest*, prop. *in addition to thy knowing*.—From the original meaning *upon* is also derived that of *on account of* (prop. *upon the ground of*) and *in agreement with, according to*, since the pattern is regarded as the foundation *upon* which a thing stands or rests.

dependent on a verb (generally a verb of motion), which, for the sake of brevity, is not expressed, but in sense is contained in what is apparently the governing verb.

Various examples of this *constructio praegnans* have been already noticed above in *x* and *y* under מִן; cf. also Ps 22:22 וְמַקְרֵבָנִי דְּמִים עֲגִינֶת בַּי and thou hast answered and saved me from the horns of the wild oxen (in Is 38:17, which Delitzsch translates by thou hast loved and delivered my soul from the pit, read קָשָׁר כַּפֵּן with the LXX); Gn 25:23, 2 S 18:19, Jb 28:12; cf. also בַּשְׁעַ מִן־זֹהַן Ps 73:27 to go a whoring from any one i.e. to be unfaithful to him; Ps 18:22 = to depart wickedly from God; Ps 28:1 to be silent from one (to turn away in silence); cf. Jb 13¹³ [; so with פְּעָל Jb 30:17, 30].

Pregnant constructions with אָחִיד: Nu 14:24 equivalent to נִימְלָא לְלֹכֶד אָחִיד 'and he made full to walk i.e. walked fully after me; in 1 S 13:7 read with the LXX they trembled, i.e. went trembling away from him; with אלְלֹכֶד Gn 43:33 הַמְהֻאָלֵל 'to turn in astonishment to some one (cf. Is 13:8); Is 11:10, &c., to turn inquiringly to some one; Is 41:1 to turn in silence to some one; אלְלֹכֶד Gn 42:28 to turn trembling to some one (cf. הַמְרֻשָּׁא to come trembling to meet, 1 S 21:2 [also with שָׁאָר, שָׁאָרָה and other verbs, Ju 14:5, 15:14, 19:3; see Lexicon]); cf. further Jer 41:7, Ps 7:7, 2 Ch 32:1; with הַ Ps 55:19 he hath redeemed and hath put my soul in peace, exactly like Ps 118:5; with לְ Ps 74:7 they have profaned and cast ... even to the ground; cf. 89:40.

5. In poetic parallelism the governing power of a preposition is sometimes extended to the corresponding substantive of the second member,¹ e.g. הַ Is 40:19, 48:14 he shall perform his pleasure בְּבָבֶל on Babylon, and his arm shall be בְּשָׂדִים (for בְּבָבֶל) on the Chaldaeans; Jb 15:3; לְ Is 28:6, 42:22 (but probably לְ has fallen out after another לְ), Ez 39:4, Jb 34:10 (perhaps also Gn 45:8; מִשְׁלָל may, however, be taken here as a second accusative according to § 117 ii); לְעַן Is 48:9; מִן Is 58:13, Ps 141:9 (unless קְשׁוֹת is to be read); לְעַת Is 15:8; תְּחִתָּה Is 61:7.

6. Adverbs which have acquired a substantival value are sometimes governed by prepositions, e.g. אַחֲרֵיכֶם in vain, Ez 6:10; אַחֲרֵי־כֵן after this; בְּכֵן (Ec 8:10, Est 4:16) then, on this condition; לְכֵן and עַד־כֵּן therefore; עַתְּה hitherto.

§ 120. Verbal Ideas under the Government of a Verb. Go-ordination of Complementary Verbal Ideas.

1. When a *relative* verb (incomplete in itself) receives its necessary complement in the form of a verbal idea, the latter is, as a rule, subordinated in the infinitive construct (with or without לְ), less frequently in the infinitive absolute, in a few instances in the form of a participle (or verbal adjective), or finally in the imperfect without the copula. In these combinations the principal idea is very frequently represented by the subordinate member of the sentence, whilst the governing verb rather contains a mere definition of the manner of the action; cf. d and g below, and § 114 n, note 2.

(a) On the subordination of an infinitive construct as an accusative of the object, and as the complement of relative verbal ideas, see above, § 114 c, and the numerous examples

¹ Similarly the force of a negative is sometimes extended to the parallel member; see § 152 z.

given in § 114 m; on the infinitive absolute as object, see § 113 d.—The complement in the form of a participle (as in Greek, and also frequently in Syriac) occurs in Is 33:1 כִּי תַּחֲזִק שׁוֹקֵד (cf. for the form, § 67 v) *when thou hast ceased as a spoiler*, i.e. to spoil; Jer 22:30 לֹא יָצַלְתָּה בָּשָׂבָב *he shall never prosper, sitting*, i.e. so as to sit, &c.; Jon 1:6 what meanest thou, sleeping? i.e. that thou sleepest,¹ by a verbal adjective, 1 S 3:2 now his eyes כְּהוֹת הָחָר had begun being dim, i.e. to wax dim (unless we read כְּהוֹת=כְּהוֹת, cf. § 114 m); by a substantive, Gn 9:20 and Noah began to be an husbandman (omitting the article before אֶחָדָה).

(b) Examples of the subordination of the complementary verbal idea in the imperfect² (in English usually rendered by *to, in order to or that*) are—(1) with both verbs in the same person: after the perfect, Is 42:21 יְהִינֶנּוּ הַחְפֵץ ... יְגִידֵל it pleased the Lord ... to magnify, &c.; Jb 30:28, 32:22 לֹא יְعַתֵּן אֱכָנָה I know not to give flattering titles; after a perfect consecutive, 1 S 20:19 (where for תַּרְדֵּד we should read with the LXX ἔπειτα); after an imperfect, Ps 88:11, 102:14, Jb 19:3, 24:14; after an imperf. consec., Jb 16:8; after a participle, Is 5:11a.—(2) with a difference in the persons: after a perfect, Lv 9:6 this is the thing תְּעַשׂ which the Lord commanded (that) ye should do; a negative imperfect follows צְנָה in La 1:10; after the imperfect, Is 47:1 (⁹) כִּי לֹא תֹסֵף יְפֵי עוֹד קָרְאָוְלָן for thou shalt no more continue (that) they call thee, i.e. thou shalt no longer be called, &c.; Ho 1:6 לֹא אָוְسִיף עוֹד אַרְחָם I will no longer continue (and) have mercy, i.e. I will no more have mercy; Is 52:1, Pr 23:35.—Nu 22:6 peradventure I shall prevail (that) we may smite them, and (that) I may drive them out of the land אִיכְלֵל may, however, be a scribal error for נָכְלֵל, due to the preceding אִילֵל, and in that case the example would belong to No. 1); after a participle, 2 S 21:4.—A perfect is possibly subordinated in La 1:10; but the explanation of אוֹתָהּ as a relative clause is preferable.

2. Instead of subordination (as in the cases mentioned in a–c), the *co-ordination* of the complementary verbal idea in the finite verb (cf. above, c) frequently occurs, either—

(a) With the second verb co-ordinated in a form exactly corresponding to the first (but see below, e) by means of וְ (וְ, וְ).¹ As a rule, here also (see above, a) the principal idea is introduced only by the second verb, while the first (especially הַוְסִיף, שׁוּב²) contains the definition of the manner of the action, e.g. Gn 26:18 וְיִשְׁבֶּן וְיִחְפֶּד and he returned and digged, i.e. he digged again; 2 K 1:11, 13; in the perfect consecutive, Is 6:13; with הַוְסִיף, e.g. Gn 25:1 and Abraham added and took a wife, i.e. again took a wife; Gn 38:5 and frequently; with הַוְאֵיל in the jussive, Jb 6:9; in the imperative (cf. § 110 h), Ju 1⁶ וְלִין הַוְאֵיל נָא be content, I pray thee, and tarry all night (cf. the English *he was persuaded and remained, for to remain*); 2 S 7:29; with מַהְד Gn 24:18, 20, &c.; with חַפְּד Ct 2:3.

¹ In 1 S 16:16, which appears to be a case of this kind, two different readings are combined, וְיִדְעַתְנָה and the simple מִנְנָה.

² This kind of subordination is frequent in Arabic and in Syriac (cf. e.g. the Peshitā, Luke 18:13); as a rule, however, a conjunction (corresponding to our *that*) is inserted. Cf. moreover, the Latin *quid vis faciam?* Terence; *volo hoc oratori contingat*, Cicero, Brut. 84; and our *I would it were; I thought he would go*.

¹ Cf. the English colloquial expression *I will try and do it*.

² Of a different kind are the cases in which יִסְף with a negative is co-ordinated with a verb to emphasize the non-recurrence of the action; cf. Nu 11:25 *they prophesied and added not, sc. to prophesy*, i.e. *but they did so no more*; Dt 5:19, Jb 27:19 (reading וְלֹא יִאָסֵף).

Rem. 1. Instead of an exact agreement between co-ordinate verbal forms, other combinations sometimes occur, viz. imperfect and perfect consecutive (cf. § 112 d), e.g. Dt 31:12 *that they may learn, and fear the Lord*, i.e. *to fear the Lord*; Is 1:19, Ho 2:11, Est 8:6, Dn 9:25b; perfect and imperfect, Jb 23:3 (*O that I knew how I might find him*); perfect and imperfect consecutive, Jos 7:7, Ec 4:1, 7; jussive and imperative, Jb 17:10; cf., finally, Gn 47:6 *and if thou knowest and there are among them, &c.*, i.e. that there are among them.

2. Special mention must be made of the instances in which the natural complement of the first verb is suppressed, or is added immediately after in the form of an historical statement, e.g. Gn 42:25 *then Joseph commanded and they filled*³ (prop. that they should fill, and they filled ...; cf. the full form of expression in Gn 50:2); a further command is then added by means of **ל** and the infinitive; Ex 36:6; another instance of the same kind is Gn 30:27 *I have divined and the Lord hath blessed me, &c.*, i.e. that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake.

(b) With the second verb (which, according to the above, represents the principal idea) attached *without the copula*⁴ in the same mood, &c. In this construction (cf. § 110 h) the imperatives קַיְמָת (קִים וּמִת, &c.) and לְכִי, לְכָה (לְקִי, &c.) are exceedingly common with the sense of interjections, before verbs which express a movement or other action, e.g. Gn 13:17, 19:15, 27:43; in the plural, Gn 19:14; Ex 19:24 *go, get thee down*; 1 S 3:9; with a following cohortative, 1 S 9:10; the הָאֵיל (sometimes to express the idea of *willingly* or *gladly*) in the perfect, Dt 1:5, Ho 5:11; in the imperative, Jb 6:28; **הַרְבָּה**=*much*, 1 S 2:3 **אֲלֹתְרָבוּ תַּעֲבְרוּ** **בְּ** **הַ** **בְּ** *do not multiply and talk*, i.e. talk not so much *arrogancy*; in the imperative, Ps 51:4; Dt 2:24 **בְּ** **הַ** **חַלְ** *begin, possess*; **בְּ** **לְ** *בְּ* **כִּי** **לְ** **יָגַע** *without men's being able to touch*, &c.; **מִתְ**=*quickly*, in the perfect, Ps 106:13; in the imperative, Gn 19:22, Ju 9:48, Est 6:10.—Other examples are: Ho 9:9 **עַמְקִיק**=*deeply, radically*; Zp 3:7 **הַשְׁפִּים**=*early* (even in the participle, Ho 6:4, 13:3); Is 29:4 **שְׁפֵל**=*low*, cf. Jer 13:18; Jos 3:16 **מַתָּה**=*wholly*; Ps 112:9 **פָּנָר**=*plentifully*.

Rem. This co-ordination without the copula belongs (as being more vigorous and bolder) rather to poetic or otherwise elevated style (cf. e.g. Is 52:1, Ho 1:6, 9:9 with Gn 25:1, &c.). Asyndeton, however, is not wanting even in prose; besides the above examples (especially the imperatives of קַיְמָת and **לְקִי** Gn 30:31, Dt 1:5, 2:24, Jos 3:16, 1 S 3:5) cf. also Neh 3:20, 1 Ch 13:2. For special reasons the verb representing the principal idea may even come first; thus Is 53:11 **יְרַאָה יִשְׁבַּע** *he shall see, he shall be satisfied* (sc. with the sight), for the satisfaction does not come until after the enjoyment of the sight; Jer 4:5 **קָרְאָה מַלְאָה** *cry, fill*, i.e. cry with a full (loud) voice.

§ 121. Construction of Passive Verbs.

Blake, 'The internal passive in Semitic,' JAOS xxii.

³ Cf. the analogous examples in Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, §102.

⁴ To be distinguished, of course, from the cases in which two equally important and independent verbs are used together without the copula in vigorous poetic imagery, e.g. Ex 15:9, Jb 29:8, &c.

1. Verbs which in the active take *one* accusative (either of the proper object, or of the *internal* object, or of some other nearer definition; cf. § 117 a, p, u) may in the passive, according to our mode of expression, be construed *personally*, the object of the active sentence now becoming the subject, e.g. Gn 35:19 **וְתַּחֲלֵל וְתִקְבֶּר** and *Rachel died, and was buried, &c.* The passive, however, is also used *impersonally* (in the 3rd sing. masc.), either absolutely, as Dt 21:3f., Is 16:10, Ez 16:34 (with a dative added, 2 S 17:16, Is 53:5, La 5:5), or, more frequently, with the object of the active construction still subordinated in the accusative,¹ e.g. Gn 27:42 **וַיֹּאמֶר לִרְبָּקָה אֶת־צְבָנִי עַשְׂוֵוּ** *and there were told (i.e. one told) to Rebekah the words of Esau;* 2 S 21:11, 1 K 18:13.

Other examples are: after Niph., **Gn 4:18 וַיַּגְּלֵד לְחִנּוּךְ אֶת־עִירָד** *and unto Enoch was born Irad* (cf. Nu 26:60, and after an infinitive, **Gn 21:5; 29:27**) (unless **וְגַתְּנָה** is 1st plur. cohortative); **Ex 21:28, 25:28, Lv 6:13, Nu 7:10** (after an infinitive); **26:55** (cf. verse 53); **Dt 20:8** (where, however, for **סַפֵּר** the Hiph. **סַפֵּר** should be read, according to 1:28); **Jos 7:15, Is 16:10**; with the object preceding, **Ex 13:7, Lv 2:8, 19:20, Nu 16:29, Dan 9^{24.1}** — Also after Pu[□]al, **Jer 50:20; before Pu[□]al, Is 14:3** (**שַׁבַּע** equivalent to the internal object **הַשְׁבָּע** = *which they have caused to be served by thee*); **Jb 22:9**; according to the Masoretic text also **Gn 46:22**, where, however, the Samaritan and LXX read **לִזְבַּח** for **לִזְבַּח**; the Samaritan in **Gn 35:26** and **46:27** also reads **לִזְבַּח**; and this (or **לִזְבַּח**) should certainly be read instead of **לִזְבַּח** in 2 S 21:22.—After Hoph., **Ex 10:8, 27:7, Lv 10:18, 16:27, Nu 32:5, 1 K 2:21, Pr 16:33, Jb 30:15**; after the infinitive Hoph., **Gn 40:20, Ez 16:4 f., 27:7; before Hoph., Is 17:1, 21:2, Ho 10:6, Zc 13:6**; after the infinitive **Hothpa[□]el, Lv 13:55 f.**

2. Verbs which in the active take two accusatives (§ 117 cc) retain in the passive construction at least *one* accusative, namely that of the second or remoter object, whilst the nearer object now becomes the subject. Thus, corresponding to **אֲשֶׁר אֶרְאֶנּוּ** *which I will show thee* (Gn 12:1) the passive is **אֲשֶׁר אָתָּה מְرֻאָה** (Ex 25:40) *which thou hast been shown*, i.e. which has been shown to thee; cf. Ex 26:30 (but in Lv 13:49 with an accusative of the person); **Jb 7:3**. In Ps 22:16 **מִקְרָב מִלְקֹות** depends on an assumed transitive **הַקְּבִּיק** governing two accusatives (= *my tongue is made to cleave to my jaws*); also in Is 1:20, **חַדְבָּתָּה בְּתַּאֲכֵלְךָ** *ye shall be devoured with the sword*, **חַדְבָּתָּה** is not an *accus. instrumenti*, but most probably an accusative of the object retained from the active construction.²

¹ ¹ When this is not recognizable either by the *nota accusativi*, or by its disagreement with the passive form in gender, number, and person, it naturally cannot be determined whether the construction is really impersonal. The construction itself can only be explained by supposing that while using the passive form the speaker at the same time thinks of some author or authors of the action in question, just as on the theory of the Arab grammarians a *concealed agent* is included in every passive. This accounts for the possibility (cf. § 144 g) of using the active without a specified subject as a periphrasis for the passive.

¹ ¹ In 2 K 18:30 **יִתְּנַחַן** is to be read or **אֶת-** is to be omitted, as in the parallel passage Is 36:15.

² ² In the active, the sentence would be *I will cause the sword to devour you*; by the rule stated above, under c, this would become in the passive, *the sword (nom.) shall be made to devour you (acc.)*. Instead of this, the remoter object is here made the subject, and the nearer object is retained in the accusative. Otherwise, the only

Rem. 1. Examples of the retention of the second accusative are—(a) with *verba induendi* and *exuendi* (§ 117 cc), Ps 80:11, כִּי תְּרִים אֶלְעָתָה the mountains were covered with the shadow of it (the vine); Pr 19:23. So also some of the examples in § 116 k of passive participles of these verbs, Ju 18:11, 1 S 2:18, 17:5, 1 K 22:10, Ez 9:2, 3; ¹ with the accusative preceding, Neh 4:12.—(b) with *verba copiae* and *inopiae*, Ex 1:7, Is 38:10 (equivalent to *I must forego the residue of my years*); Is 40:20.—(c) an accusative of the result (§ 117 ii) with the passive, Is 6:11, Zc 14:4, Jb 28:2; with the accusative preceding, Is 24:12, Mi 3:12 (Jer 26:18), Jb 15:7, 22:16.² Also in Ez 40:17 and 46:23, the accusative preceding עַשְׂתָּה (in 41:18 following it) can only be taken as the accusative of the result; some general idea, such as that of *place*, is to be understood as the subject of עַשְׂתָּה.—(d) an accusative of the member or part specially affected by the action (§ 117 ll), Gn 17:11, 14:24, Ju 1:7 (accusative before part. pass.); 2 S 15:32 (accusative with suffix after the part. pass.).

2. Both accusatives are retained in an unusual manner after the passive of a *verbum impleendi* in Nu 14:21; instead, however, of the *Niph.* וַיַּפְלֹא the *Qal* (which is sometimes used transitively elsewhere) should simply be read with the LXX; similarly in Ps 72:19, although there the LXX also translate the passive.

3. The efficient cause (or personal agent) is, as a rule, attached to the passive by ל (thus corresponding to the Greek and Latin dative), e.g. Gn 25:21 וַיַּעֲתֵר לוֹ יְהוָה the Lord let himself be intreated by him; cf. Lv 26:23, Ps 73:10 and the blessing בָּרוּךְ הוּא לְיְהוָה blessed be he of the Lord Ru 2:20; cf. Gn 14:19, Ju 17:2b, 1 S 15:13; also in the plural, 1 S 23:21 (2 S 2:5, Ps 115:15).—Before the verb, Pr 14:20 and frequently; less commonly by מִן (called מִן of origin=coming from), e.g. Gn 9:11; before the verb, Ps 37:23, Jb 24:1; by בְּ (instrumenti) [rarely, König § 106], Gn 9:6 (מִן בְּ by man); Nu 36:2, Is 14:3 b [but?=wherewith it was worked (§ 52 e) with thee; cf. Dt 21:3, König § 106; and see עַבְדָּה בְּ in the Lexicon], Ho 14:4, always to introduce a personal

agent.—On the connexion of the passive participle with a genitive of the agent, cf. § 116 l.

Syntax of the Noun.

§ 122. Indication of the Gender of the Noun.

Cf. F. Schwabe, *Die Genusbestimmung des Nomens im bibl. Hebr.*, Jena, 1894, and especially the thorough investigation by K. Albrecht, ‘Das Geschlecht der hebr.

possible explanation would be, according to the Arabic idiom, *to cause one to devour the sword* (remoter object), i.e. to give him over to it. It would then be simplest to read תְּאַכְּלֵי.

¹ Analogous to הַלְבוֹשָׁה הַבְּדִים who was clothed in linen, Ez 9:3, would be הַנּוֹתֵר אֶת-הַמִּזְבֵּחַ 2 Ch 31:10; but we must certainly read there הַנּוֹתֵר with the LXX.—Still less can Ps 87:3 be so explained, נְכֻבְדָּה being not an accusative, but the subject of a noun-clause. On the other hand, שְׁלִיחָה 1 K 14:6 may be explained with Ewald in the sense of *being charged with* something, so that, like צְמַח, it may be construed with an accusative.

² In reality וַיַּגְּרָם Ex 16:20, 26 (*it became putrid*) is equivalent to a passive (*it was changed*), to which קְוֹלָעִים is added as an accusative of the result.

Hauptwörter,’ in *ZAW*. 1895, p. 313 ff., and 1896, p. 61 ff. H. Rosenberg, ‘Zum Geschlecht der hebr. Hauptwörter,’ in *ZAW*. 1905, p. 325 ff. (supplementing Albrecht’s work by a treatment of the gender of many nouns in the Mishna); and his ‘Notizen aus der tannaitischen Literatur ...’ *ZAW*. 1908, p. 144 ff.

1. According to § 80 a, Hebrew, like the other Semitic languages, distinguishes only a *masculine* and *feminine* gender. To indicate the latter a special feminine ending is generally used (§ 80 b and § 87 i) both in the singular and plural (see, however, § 87 p), its use being most consistent in adjectives and participles; cf. § 87 r. The employment of these special endings is most natural when by means of them the feminine names of persons or animals are distinguished from the masculine of the same stem and the same formation, e.g. אָח brother, אֶתְּנָה sister; עֲלֵם a young man, עֲלֵה a young woman, maid; עַרְבָּה iuvencus, עַרְבָּה iuvenca; עַגְלָה vitulus, עַגְלָה vitula. On the other hand, the feminine plays an important part in denoting the gender of whole classes of ideas (see below, p, &c.), which the Hebrew regards as feminine. The language, however, is not obliged to use the feminine ending either for the purpose of distinguishing the *sex* of animate objects (see b), or as an indication of the (*figurative*) gender of inanimate things which are regarded as feminine (see h).

2. The distinction of *sex* may be effected even without the feminine ending, (a) by the employment of words of different stems for the masculine and feminine; (b) by the different construction (either as masculine or feminine) of the same word (*communia*). But the distinction may also, (c) in the case of names of animals, be entirely neglected, all examples of a species being included under one particular gender, either masculine or feminine (*epicoena*).

Examples of (a) are: אִבְּרָהָם father, אִמְּרָה mother; לְבָן ram, רְקָלָה ewe; שְׂעִיר he-goat, שְׂעִיר she-goat; חֲמֹר he-ass, חֲמֹר she-ass; אֲרָבָה lion, לְבָבָה lioness. Sometimes with the feminine ending as well, e.g. בָּדָשׁ male slave, man-servant, אַנְּשָׁה or שָׁפָחָה female slave, maid; קָנָה bridegroom, נָה bride.

Of (b): מֵלֵךְ camel. Plur. מֵלְכִים construed as masculine, *Gn 24:63*; as feminine, *Gn 32:16*; בָּקָר collect, oxen, *Ex 21:37*, construed as masculine, but in *Gn 33:13*, *Jb 1:14* as feminine. In *Jer 2:24* the construction of רְהָה wild ass, changes directly from the masculine (intended as epicene) to the feminine. Cf. the Greek ὁ, ἡ παῖς· ὁ, ἡ βοῦς.

Of (c): analogous to the epicene nouns of other languages, many species of animals which are strong and courageous, are regarded in Hebrew as always masculine, while the weak and timid are feminine; cf. ὁ λύκος, ἡ χελιδών, and the German *der Löwe*, *der Adler*, &c., but *die Katze*, *die Taube*, &c. Similarly in Hebrew, e.g. אַלְוָה ox (*Ps 144:14* even referring to cows when pregnant), בָּרָן bear, *Ho 13:8* דָּוֹב שְׁפִוֵּיל (a bear that is bereaved of her whelps; cf., however, *2 K 2:24*, *Is 11:7*), אַבְּרָהָם wolf, לְבָבָה dog, all masculine; but *אֲרָבָה* hare, נָה dove, יְנָה stork, בָּבָה bee, נָמָה ant, &c., feminine.

Rem. 1. Masculine nouns which either have a separate feminine form or might easily form one, are but seldom used as epicene; such are, חֲמֹר ass, *2 S 19:27* for אֲנָשָׁה; אַיִל hart, *Ps 42:2* for אֲנָשָׁה. In *Gn 23:3* ff. מֵת a dead body, refers more especially to the body of a woman; אֱמֹן a master workman, in *Pr 8:30* refers to wisdom (הָקְבָּדָה feminine, cf. Plin. 2, 1 *natura*

omnium artifex; and our use of *friend, teacher, servant, neighbour*, either as masculine or feminine; in German, *Gemahl*¹ spouse, also for fem. *Gemahlin, &c.*).

2. Of words denoting persons נָשָׂרִים עֲשָׂרִים, according to the formerly common opinion, was in early times used as epicene (see, however, above, § 2 n). The use of the plural נָשָׂרִים in Jb 1:19 and Ru 2:21 in the sense of *young people* (of both genders) does not, however, prove this. In this and in similar cases (cf. e.g. מִתְּמַנְּאָה Gn 1:27 and מִתְּמַנְּאָה 32:1) the masculine as *prior gender* includes the feminine.²

3. The following classes of ideas are usually regarded as feminine,³ although the substantives which express them are mostly without the feminine ending:⁴

(a) Names of *countries* and *towns*, since they are regarded as the mothers⁵ and nurses of the inhabitants; e.g. אֶسְרֵי Assyria, אֶדְום Idumaea, צִיר Tyre; cf. also such expressions as בָּתְבָבָל בָּתְצִיּוֹן daughter of Babylon, daughter of Zion, &c. On the other hand appellatives which are originally masculine, remain so when used as place-names, e.g. Am 5:5, בֵּיתְרָאֵל, בֵּיתְלָו, &c.

Rem. The same proper nouns, which as names of countries are regarded as feminine, are frequently used also as names of the people, and may then, like national names in other languages, be construed as masculine (the national name almost always being used also as the personal name of the supposed ancestor of the people); thus הַיּוֹקָה masc. Is 3:8, &c., *Judaei*; but Is 7:6, fem., *Judaea*; אֶדְום masc., *Idumaei*, Nu 20:20; fem., *Idumaea*, Jer 49:17. Nevertheless, it sometimes happens that by a very common transference of thought (just as we say *Turkey concludes peace*) these names are construed as feminine, even when they

1¹ So in early Arabic, *ba'l* (lord) and *zaug* (conjux) are used both for *maritus* and *uxor*; *'arūs* for *bridegroom* and *bride*; the later language, however, distinguishes the feminine from the masculine in all these cases generally by the ending *a* (*at*). In early Arabic also the feminine ending is commonly omitted in such participles as *hāmil*, *bātīn* (gravida), and the like, which from the nature of the case can only be used of females. Thus also نِسْمَة, at least in Nu 11:12 (Is 49:23?), probably means *nurse* (for نِسْمَة 2 S 4:4, &c.), not *nursing-father*.

2² The Arab grammarians call this use of the masculine plural and dual (e.g. *el-abawāni*, the two fathers, i.e. *parentes*) *taghlib* or *the making* (the masculine) *prevail* (over the feminine).—Cf. M. Grünert, *Die Begriffs-Präponderanz und die Duale a potiori im Altarab.*, Vienna, 1886.

3³ The masculine gender is attributed ‘by the Hebrews and the Semites generally to whatever is dangerous, savage, courageous, respected, great, strong, powerful ...; the feminine to whatever is motherly, productive, sustaining, nourishing, gentle, weak, ... subject, &c.’ (Albrecht, ZAW. 1896, p. 120 f.).

4⁴ When, on the other hand, words with a feminine-ending, such as נִשְׁמָךְ a bow (stem שָׁמַךְ), נִזְׁמָן time (see the Lexicon), are sometimes construed as masculine, this is owing probably in some cases to a misunderstanding of the formation of the word, the נ of the feminine being regarded as a radical.

5⁵ Cf. *a city and a mother* (מִשְׁמָר) in Israel, 2 S 20:19. In the same way מִשְׁמָר (like μήτηρ, *mater*) on Phoenician coins stands for *mother-city*, μητρά πόλεως. The same figure is used in such expressions as *sons of Zion*, Ps 149:2; *sons of Babylon*, Ez 23:15, &c., as also in speaking of the suburbs of a city as its *daughters*, e.g. Jos 15:45 ff., &c.—The comparison of Jerusalem to a woman is especially frequent in allegorical descriptions, e.g. Ez 16:23, La 1:1, &c.

denote not the country but the inhabitants; so יְהוּנָה La 1:3; cf. Gn 41:8, Ex 10:7, 12:33, 1 S 17:21, 2 S 8:2, 24:9, Is 7:2, 21:2, 42:11, Jer 50:10, Jb 1:15. Hence the frequent personification of nations (as well as of countries and towns, see h, note 5) as female beings, e.g. Is 50:1, 54:1 ff., and the use of the expressions בַּת בְּבֵל Is 47:1 ff. &c. (see above) as collective poetical personifications of the people.

(b) Appellative nouns, which denote a *circumscribed space*, such as אֶרֶץ *earth*, לָנוּן *land*, תְּבִלָּה *world*, שְׁאָלָה *the abode of the dead*, קָרֵבָה *circle* (of the Jordan valley), עִיר *a town*, בָּאָרֶךְ *a well*, צָפֹן *the north*, תְּמִימָה *the south*.

In the majority of nouns denoting place the gender is variable, e.g. נָחָת *a way* and נָחָת *a way* (usually feminine; the masculine gender only begins to predominate with Ezekiel; cf. Albrecht, l. c., 1896, p. 55), נִיאָה (*valley*), גַּדְעָה (*garden* (fem. Gn 2:15, unless לְעָבָד *is to be read*), הַיְכָל *palace, temple*, קְרֵבָה *court*, בְּמַתָּבֵל *vineyard*, שַׁעַר *door*, ¹ &c.; also מָקוֹם *place*, at least in Gn 18:24 (referring to Sodom), Jb 20:9, and 2 S 17:12 *K^ethibh*, is construed as feminine. The mountains and hills commanding the surrounding country are almost without exception masculine (see Albrecht, l. c., p. 60 f.).

(c) The names of *instruments*, *utensils*, and (on the same analogy) *members* and *parts of the body* in man or beast, since these are all regarded as subservient and subordinate (consequently as feminine).

Thus חֲבִשׂ *sword*, חֲטִיף *tent-peg*, קָצֵב *bucket*, כָּסֵס *cup*, שְׁלֵזָה *shoe*, שְׁלֵזָה *bed*, &c.; in other cases, as אָרוֹן *chest, ark* (with the article אָרוֹן הַ), פְּנֵוֹר *oven*, the gender is variable. ('Instruments for binding or holding, girdles and the like, as constraining and mastering, are masculine,' Albrecht, l. c., p. 89.)—Also אֵזֶן *ear* (and in general, members occurring in pairs, Albrecht, l. c., p. 73 f.)—Also אַצְבֵּעַ *finger* (and so probably בְּחֵן *thumb, great toe*), יָד *hand*, כְּפָר *right hand*, גַּלְעֵד *foot*, קָרֵךְ *knee*, יְגַגָּה *thigh*, קְרֵתָה *shoulder*, לְחֵזֶק *cheek*, בְּטֵן *belly*, קְנֵרָה *wing*, קְרֵן *horn*, שְׁן *tooth*; as a rule also עַרְוָעַ *arm* (masc. Is 17:5, &c.), לְשׁוֹן *tongue* (masc. Ps 22:16, Pr 26:28, &c.), עֵין *eye* (masc. Zc 3:9, &c.), שָׁוֹק *thigh* (masc. Ex 29:27).²

(d) Certain names of natural forces or substances are feminine, being probably regarded as instruments, while in the names of the heavens, the heavenly bodies and natural phenomena, the masculine generally predominates (cf. Albrecht, l. c., p. 323 ff.); thus feminine are שֶׁמֶן *sun* (but often also masc., Ps 19:6, 104:19); שָׁאָלָה (*Ethiopic 'ēāt*) *fire* (rarely *masc.*); נְגָה *brightness*, בָּן *a stone*, as a rule also רִוחָה *wind, spirit*; שְׁנָה *breath, soul*; also אור *light* in Jb 13:16, Jb 36:32, and others.

4. The following classes of ideas, which are also regarded as feminine in Hebrew (see above, h), are usually indicated by the feminine *form*, notwithstanding their occasional transference to masculine persons (see r and s):

¹ חֲנָה *camp* is feminine only when it is a collective, denoting the persons in a camp.

² אַף *nose*, יָגֵד *sinew*, זְבֻבָּה *tail*, קְרֵנָה *palate*, לְבָבָה *heart*, מִעְמִים *bowels*, כְּבָדָה *forehead*, עֹורָה *skin*, עַדְעָה *back of the neck*, פְּהָה *mouth*, צְעָרָה *neck*, קְרֵבָה *head*, שְׁכָם *shoulder*, also מִמְּבָדָה *womb*, except in Jer 20:17, are invariably construed as masculine.—מִצְּבָדָה *bone* is common.

(a) Abstracts¹ (sometimes along with masculine forms from the same stem, as נִקְמָה vengeance, as well as נַקְרָה עֹזֶרֶת help, as well as עֹז strength), e.g. אֲמֹנָה firmness, faithfulness, strength, גָּדוֹלָה greatness, מְלֹאתָה fullness, דָּוָתָה dominion, &c. Similarly, the feminine (sing. and plur.) of adjectives and participles is used substantively in the sense of the Latin and Greek neuter, e.g. נְכֹונָה stedfastness, Ps 5:10, טֻבָּה goodness, רָעָה evil, Gn 50:20, נְקַלָּה a light thing (i.e. a trifling thing), Jer 6:14; so especially in the plural, e.g. גָּדָלָה great things, Ps 12:4; הַשְׁבָּרוֹתָה the ruined places, Ez 36:36, along with הַבְּשָׁאָה that which was desolate, kindnesses, 2 K 25:28, נְכָרָתָה uprightness, honesty, Is 26:10, תְּעִימָה amoena, Ps 16:11 (but in verse 6 in the same sense נְפָלָות wonderful things, Ex 34:10 and frequently, קָשָׁוֹת hard things, roughly Gn 42:7, 30 (but cf. also נְיִקְמָה vain things, Pr 12:11, 28:19). Cf. moreover, the very frequent use of זֵאת, הֵיאָה (as well as הֵא and הֵוא), Ju 14:4, Ps 118:23, &c., in the sense of *hoc, illud* (also הֵה equivalent to *illa*, Is 51:19): also the use of the feminine form of the verb in Is 7:7 it shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass; cf. Jer 10:7; so too the suffixes Gn 15:6, Ex 10:11, Jb 38:18, referring back to a whole statement.²

(b) Titles and designations of office, properly a subdivision of the abstract ideas treated above, under **q**, and specially noticed here only on account of their peculiar transference to concrete male persons. Thus we have לְתַחַת קָרְבָּן that which takes part in or speaks in a religious assembly, hence LXX ἐκκλησιαστής, i.e. *concionator, preacher*; the proper names סָבָבָה רְתַתְּבָבָה Ezr 2:55, Neh 7:57, and פָּרְתַתְּבָבָה Ezr 2:57, Neh 7:59, and the foreign word פָּרָה viceroy; in the plural כָּנּוֹת prop. cognomina, then like-named, colleagues; פְּרָעוֹתָה princess (if this be the true meaning).³ All these words, in accordance with their meaning, are construed as masculine (in Ec 7:27 instead of 'אָמָר הָקְרָבָה the words should rather be divided as 'אָמָר הָקְרָבָה; cf. 12:8).

Abstract ideas include also—

(c) *Collectives* in the fem. form,¹ generally fem. participles used substantively, especially as the comprehensive designation of a number of *persons*, e.g. אֲרַמָּה (fem. of *travelling*), prop. *the travelling (company)*, i.e. travelling persons (a caravan); גּוֹלָה (fem. of לָגָל one going into exile) *the company of exiles* (also frequently used of those who had returned home again); בָּתִי יְוָשָׁבָת (that which inhabits) i.e. *the population*, Is 12:6, Mi 1:11 f.; תָּבָתָה (prop. that which is hostile) *the enemy*, Mi 7:8, 10 (cf. Mi 4:6 f. *the halting, cast off, driven away*, i.e. *those who halt, &c.*); קָלָה (the abject) *the poorest sort*; of living beings which are not persons, cf. סִינָה (that which lives) in the sense of *cattle, beasts*; קָבָה a shoal of fish, Gn 1:26 (but in Jon 2:2 as a

¹ Cf. the list of masculine and feminine abstracts in Albrecht, l. c., 1896, p. 111 ff.

² While in all these instances it is simplest to speak of the *feminine* in Hebrew as being used for the *neuter* (which in Latin, Greek, and German is commonly employed for similar purposes), it must yet not be forgotten that since the language is wholly wanting in *neuters*, the Semitic mind regarded the above-mentioned forms primarily as actual feminines. Hence the Arab commentators are accustomed to explain the feminines of adjectives and participles (which would be neuter in Latin, &c.) by supplying a feminine substantive.

³ This use of the feminine form is far more frequent in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Aramaic; cf. e.g. in Arabic *ḥaliqa* (fem. from *ḥalifa*, following after, taking the place of) in the sense of *the successor or representative (of Muhammad)*, and *'allāma* (great wisdom) as a title of learned men. Analogous to this is the Latin *magistratus, magistracy*, for *magistrate*, and our *his Majesty, Excellency, Highness, &c.*

¹ Cf. in Greek ή ἵππος, *the cavalry* (as well as τὸ ἵππικόν), ή κάμηλος, Hdt. 1, 80, &c., *the camel corps*.

nomen unitatis, cf. t, for גֶּת a fish, which in verses 1 and 11 is used as the *nomen unitatis*). Cf., moreover, נֶבֶלְהָ dead body, Is 26:19, &c. (construed as masculine), for a heap of dead bodies.—On the collective poetic personification of a nation, by means of בָּת daughter, in בָּת עֲמִי, בָּבָל (equivalent to בְּנֵי עֲמִי my countrymen, see above, i).

(d) Conversely the feminine form of substantives is sometimes used (as in Arabic) as a *nomen unitatis*, i.e. to indicate a *single* example of a class which is denoted by the masculine form; cf. אַיִל a fleet (1 K 9:26), אַיִלָּה a single ship (Jon 1:3 ff.); יְצָרָה hunting, game, הַיְצָר Gn 27:3 K^eth. (יְצָר Q^erē) a piece of venison; שְׂעִיר hair (coll.), שְׂעִירָה a single hair (Ju 20:16; in the plural, Ps 40:13, 69:5); יִרְשָׁה a poem, frequently collective, הַיִרְשָׁה a single song; so probably also חַתָּא a fig (the corresponding masculine *tiñ* is collective in Arabic); שׂוֹשָׁנָה a lily (also שׂוֹשָׁן); לְבָנָה a brick (Arab. *libina*, but *libin* collective), &c.

(e) The feminine is also used for things *without life* (as being weaker or less important), which are named from their resemblance to *organic* things expressed by the corresponding masculine form; cf. יְדָךְ side (of the body), thigh, or יְרֻכָּה or יְרֻכָּה back part, border (of a country, house, &c.); חַגָּה forehead, חַצְצָה greaves. On a similar distinction between the masculine for natural, and the feminine for artificial objects, see § 87 o.

Rem. The juxtaposition of the masculine and feminine from the same stem serves sometimes to express entirety; e.g. Is 3:1 מְשֻׁעָן וּמְשֻׁעָנָה stay and staff, i.e. every kind of support (unless we omit verse 1^b as a gloss and take *staff* as = *staff-bearer, official*; the list of officials begins in verse 2); cf. Is 16:6, Pr 8:13. For similar groupings in the case of persons, see Is 43:6, 49:22, 60:4 (sons and daughters); 49:23, Ec 2:8.

§ 123. *The Representation of Plural Ideas by Means of Collectives, and by the Repetition of Words.*

Besides the plural endings treated in § 87 a–i, the language employs other means to express a plurality of living beings or things:

(a) Certain words employed exclusively in a collective sense, while the individual members of the class are denoted by special words (*nomina unitatis*, but not in the same sense as in § 122 t).

Thus בָּקָר cattle, oxen¹ (even joined with numerals, e.g. Ex 21:37 חַמְשָׁה בָּקָר five head of cattle), but שָׂׂרֵה an ox; צָאן small cattle, i.e. sheep and goats (μῆλα), cf. Jb 1:3 שְׁבָעָת אַלְפִּים־צָאן seven thousand sheep; but הַשְׁׂעִיר a single head of small cattle (a sheep or a goat). Other more or less common collectives are: יְזִיר (prop. that which prowls or roams) wild beasts, טָר (perhaps prop. tripping) a number of little children; אַשְׁרָה fresh green herb, i.e. young plants, קָרְבָּה green, i.e. vegetation in general; עֲזָזָה birds, fowl; כְּבָשׂ chariots or cavalcade, רַבָּה worms, שְׁׂרָב creeping things (of small creatures), רַבָּה שְׁׂרָב swarming things.

(b) The collective use of substantives which at the same time serve as *nomina unitatis*; thus, אֲדָם (never in plur.) means both man (homo) and men (homines); יִשְׂרָאֵל a man (vir) and men (viri); הָנָשָׁה woman and women (Ju 21:16, 1 S 21:6); אַרְבָּה a locust,

¹ The plural form בָּקָר from בָּקָר is found only in very late Hebrew, Neh 10:37 (where according to the Mantua edition, Ginsburg, &c., even צְאַנְיָנוּ our sheep, is also to be read; Baer, however, has צְאַנְיָנוּ), and 2 Ch 4:3. In Am 6:12 read, with Hitzig, יְמָם בָּקָר יְמָם.

but usually *a swarm of locusts*; פֶּשֶׁת soul and souls (persons); מַקְלָה staff and staves (Gn 30:37); טַבֵּעַ a bird of prey and birds of prey; עַלְהָה a leaf and foliage; שַׁבַּע a plant and plants, herbs; עַץ a tree and trees (as it were foliage); פְּרִי fruit and fruits; שִׁיחָה a shrub and shrubs; in isolated instances also nouns like בֶּדֶךְ a man-servant, שִׁפְחָה a maid-servant, חֲמֹר ass, שׂוֹר ox (cf. Gn 32:6).—On the singular (especially of gentilic names) with the article (which may, however, be omitted in poetry, cf. e.g. Ps 12:2 יְחִידָה, Pr 11:14 יְעִזָּה) to include all individuals of the same species, cf. § 126 I. On the special meaning of the plurals formed from certain collectives, see § 124 I.

(c) The feminine ending; see § 122 s.

(d) The repetition of single words, and even of whole groups of words, especially to express entirety, or in a distributive sense. The following cases are more particularly to be noticed:

2. Repetition of words in an expressly *distributive* sense¹ (which may to some extent be noticed in the examples under c) equivalent to *one each*, &c., e.g. Nu 14:34 *forty days* יָמִים קָلְבָה counting for every day a year; cf. Ez 24:6, Ex 28:34 (three words repeated); also with the addition of בַּדֵּן *apart*, עַדְרָעַד לְבַדָּו *every drove by itself*, Gn 32:17; cf. Zc 12:12. Most frequently with the addition of a numeral (for the simple repetition of numerals for the same purpose, cf. § 134 q), and with the words not only in groups of two (Lv 24:8, Nu 13:2, 31:4) or three (Nu 7:11, 17:21), but even of six (Ex 26:3) or seven (Ex 25:33, 26:19, 21, 25); in Ex 25:35 five words even three times repeated.²

3. Repetition to express an exceptional or at least superfine quality; e.g. 2 K 25:15 which were of gold, gold, of silver, silver, i.e. made of pure gold and pure silver; Dt 2:27 only along by the high way; cf. Nu 3:8, 8:16 they are given, given to him, i.e. given

¹ Cf. in the New Testament St. Mark 6:39 f. συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιὰὶ πρασιάὶ (Weizsäcker, *tischweise, beetweise*).

² These repetitions of larger groups of words belong entirely to the *Priestly Code* in the Pentateuch, and are unquestionably indications of a late period of the language. Of quite a different kind are such examples as Ez 16:6, where the repetition of four words serves to give greater solemnity to the promise, unless here, as certainly in 1:20, it is a mere *dittography*; the LXX omit the repetition, in both passages.

exclusively for his service, for his very own. Also with a certain hyperbole in such examples as 2 K 3:16 בְּאֶרֶת חַמֵּר גָּבִים nothing but trenches; Gn 14:10 בְּאֶרֶת חַמֵּר all asphalt-pits.— Repetition serves to intensify the expression to the highest degree in Ju 5:22 by reason of the violent pransings of his string ones, Ex 8:10 (countless heaps), and Jo 4:14 (countless multitudes); cf. also טַעַט עַטָּה Ex 23:30 by little and little, very gradually; cf. §133 k.

4. Repetition with the copula to express *of more than one kind*; thus Dt 25:13 (Pr 20:10) אֲבָן וְאֲבָן a weight and a weight, i.e. two kinds of weight (hence the addition *great and small*); Ps 12:3 בְּלֹב וְלֹב with two kinds of heart, i.e. with a double-dealing heart; cf. the opposite בְּלֹב וְלֹב 1 Ch 12:33.

§ 124. The Various Uses of the Plural-form.³

1. The plural is by no means used in Hebrew solely to express a number of individuals or separate objects, but may also denote them collectively. This use of the plural expresses either (*a*) a combination of various external constituent parts (plurals of *local extension*), or (*b*) a more or less intensive focusing of the characteristics inherent in the idea of the stem (*abstract plurals*, usually rendered in English by forms in *-hood, -ness, -ship*). A variety of the plurals described under (*b*), in which the secondary idea of *intensity* or of an *internal multiplication* of the idea of the stem may be clearly seen, is (*c*) the *pluralis excellentiae* or *pluralis maiestatis*.

Examples of (*a*): Plurals of *local extension* to denote localities in general, but especially level surfaces (the *surface-plural*), since in them the idea of a whole composed of innumerable separate parts or points is most evident, as ים שָׁמֶן (§ 88 d) *heaven* (cf. also heights of heaven, Is 33:16, Jb 16:19; elsewhere מְרוּם water; יָמִים (the broad surface of the sea) poetically for ים sea; פָּנִים (prop. the side turned towards any one, then) *surface* in general, usually *face*; אַחֲרִים the back, Ex 26:12, 33:23, &c., צְאַרְיִם neck nape of the neck¹; also אַחֲרָאשָׁתָה the place at the head, אַחֲרָלָתָה place at the feet; עַבְרִים place on the other side (of a river); מַעַמְקִים מַעַמְקָם depth, מַשְׁבָּבִים מַשְׁבָּב distance, bed, Gn 49:4 (unless, with Dillmann, it is to be explained in the sense of *double bed*, i.e. *torus*), and מַשְׁכָּנִים Ps 46:5, and מַשְׁכָּנוֹת 43:3, 84:2, 132:5, dwelling (perhaps also אַחֲלִים encampment, in passages like 1 S 4:10). The last four belong, however, to poetic style, and are better reckoned amongst the plurals of *amplification* treated under d-f. So perhaps יְצֻעִים bed (Ps 63:7, Jb 17:13; but Gn 49:4, Ps 132:3, &c., in the singular); probably, however, יְצֻעִים (prop. *strata*) refers to a number of coverings or pillows.

The plural of extension is used to denote a lengthened period of *time* in עַזְלָמִים eternity (everlasting ages).

Rem. The plural of extension includes also a few examples which were formerly explained as simply poetic plurals, e.g. Jb 17:1 קְבָרִים לִי graves are (ready) for me, i.e. the

³ Cf. Dietrich, ‘Über Begriff und Form des hebr. Plurals,’ in the *Abhandl. zur hebr. Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 2 ff.

¹ Cf. the same use of the plural in τὰ στέρνα, τὰ νῶτα, τὰ τράχηλα, *praecordia, cervices, fauces*; on plurals of extension in general, cf. the prepositions of place and time in the plur. form, § 103 n. סְפָרִים is not a case in point, in the sense of *letter* (properly a sheet folded into several pages; elsewhere also כְּפָר □ סְפָר) 1 K 21:8 ff., 2 K 10:1, 19:14 (Is 37:14; referred to afterwards by the *singular* suffix); Is 39:1, Jer 29:25, 32:14 (after being folded, previously כְּפָר □ סְפָר).

place where there are many of them (as it were *the graveyard*) is my portion, Jb 21:32, 2 Ch 16:14; cf. 2 K 22:20.

Of (b): the tolerably numerous abstract plurals, mostly of a particular form (*q^eṭūlīm*, *qittūlīm*, &c.), may be divided into two classes. They sum up either the *conditions* or *qualities* inherent in the idea of the stem, or else the various single *acts* of which an action is composed. Cf. for the first class, *בָּחוֹרִים* *זָקְנִים* *גַּעֲרִים* *בָּתָולִים* *כְּלֹלוֹת* *מֵגְדָּלִים* *בָּשָׂרִים* *אַגְּוָרִים* *בָּתָןִים* *חַיִּים* *שְׁכוֹלִים* *עַזְעִים* *סְגָנָרִים*, *youth*, *old age*, *youth*; *maidenhood*, *bridal state*; *condition of a sojourner*, *fleshliness* (only in Pr 14:30), *life* (the abstract idea of the qualities of a living being); *childlessness*, *blindness*, *perverseness*.

There are also a number of plurals, found almost exclusively in poetry (sometimes along with the singular), which are evidently intended to intensify² the idea of the stem (plural of amplification), as *might*, Is 40:26; *אַמּוֹנֶה* (*as well as* *faithfulness*; according to § 93 1, only in the construct state plural or with suffixes = *the happiness of*), *happy*; *כּוֹשְׁרוֹת* (*complete*) *prosperity*, Ps 68:7; *בִּנְיוֹת* Is 27:11 and *תְּבוּנוֹת* Is 40:14, &c. (*keen*) *understanding*; *צְצָוֹת* (*true*) *counsel*, Dt 32:28; *קְعִים* Jb 37:16 and *דְּעוֹת* 1 S 2:3 (*thorough*) *knowledge*; *Jb 12:6* and *אַמְּבָטִיעִים* Is 32:18 (*full*) *confidence*; *בְּרָכוֹת* (*abundant*) *blessing*, Ps 21:7; *גְּבוֹרוֹת* (*exceptional*) *strength*, Jb 41:4; *הַוּות* Ps 5:10 (*very*) *wickedness*; *Dn 9:23* (*greatly*) *beloved*; *Ps 76:11*, &c. (*fierce*) *wrath*; *Dn 12:2* (*utter*) *contempt*; *יִשְׁעָוֹת* (*real*) *help*, Is 26:18, &c.; *מַרְאָה* Gn 46:2 (*an important*) *vision*; *מַעֲרָם* (*uprightness*; *perversity*; *נְקָמָות* (*complete*) *vengeance*, Ju 11:36, &c.; *מַחְשָׁבִים* and *חַשְׁכִּים* (*thick*) *darkness*; *מַסְתָּרִים* *a* (*close*) *hiding-place*; *נְגִידִים* (*nobility*; *שְׁמָנִים* Is 28:1 *fatness*; *אַחֲצָחוֹת* (*complete*) *aridity*; *מַמְתָּקִים* (*sweetness*; *פְּנִימָה* *preciousness*; *שְׁעָשִׂיעִים* *delight*; *עֲדָנִים* and *עֲגָגִים* *pleasure*; *בְּחִימִים* *compassion*; *מְנוּחוֹת* *rest, refreshment*; *תְּהֻנָּה* *tumult*. Probably also *יִקְידָּה* (*heartfelt*) *love*, Ps 45:1; *קָרָה* (*extreme*) *bitterness*, Jb 13:26; *מְרַמּוֹת* (*base*) *deceit*, Ps 38:13; *צְדָקָה* (*true*) *righteousness*, Is 33:15, &c.; *חַנְמָשָׁה* (*the highest*) *joy*, Ps 16:11. On the other hand, *חַכְמָה* (*Pr 1:20*, &c.) can hardly be a *plural* (=the essence of wisdom, or wisdom personified), but is a singular (see § 86 1).

A further extension of this plural of amplification occurs according to P. Haupt's very probable suggestion (*SBOT*. Proverbs, p. 40, line 50, &c.) in *אֶרְיָם* *the great river* (of the Nile, generally *אֶרְיָר*) Is 7:18, 19:6 (though with the predicate in the plural), Ez 30:12, Ps 78:44, but in Is 37:25, Ez 29:3 the usual explanation, *arms* or *channels of the Nile*, can hardly be avoided; also in Ps 24:2 of the ocean, which encircles the earth, 137:1 of the *great river*, i.e. the Euphrates, but in Is 18:1 *בְּהַרְיִ כּוֹשֵׁת* is evidently a numerical plural.—In Pr 16:13 *מֶלֶךְ* (*acc. to P. Haupt=the great king*) is very doubtful. In Ez 19:1 the second *yōdh* is evidently due to dittography, since follows.

The summing up of the several parts of an action is expressed in *embalming*, *כְּפָרִים* (*חַנְמִים* *atonement*, *filling*, sc. of the hand) *ordination to the priesthood*, *פְּלָאָהִים* *שְׁלָחָהִים* *dismissal*, *שְׁלָמִים* *retribution*, *פְּתָחִים* *fornication*, *זְנוּנִים* *whoredom*, *בְּאָפִים* *adultery*, *בְּחַמִּים* (*prop. no doubt, warm*) *compassion*, *כְּנָנוֹנִים* *supplication*, *בְּגַדִּים* *Jb 7:4* (*restless*) *tossing to and fro*, *פְּלָאָהִים* *wonder* La 1:9, *עַלְלָהִים* *gleaning*; perhaps also Ps 4:1, 6:1, &c., if it means *the playing on stringed instruments*, and *בְּנִים* Is 1:23 *bribery*, unless it be a plural of number.¹

² Cf. A. Ember, 'The pluralis intensivus in Hebrew,' *AJS*. 1905, p. 195 ff. SBOT. *SBOT*. = Sacred Books of the Old Testament, ed. by P. Haupt. Lpz. and Baltimore, 1893 ff.

¹ Mayer Lambert in *REJ*. xxiv. 106 ff., enumerates no less than ninety-five words ending in *i*□*m*, which in his opinion are to be regarded as *pluralia tantum*.

Of (c): the *pluralis excellentiae* or *maiestatis*, as has been remarked above, is properly a variety of the abstract plural, since it sums up the several characteristics² belonging to the idea, besides possessing the secondary sense of an *intensification* of the original idea. It is thus closely related to the plurals of amplification, treated under e, which are mostly found in poetry. So especially אֱלֹהִים Godhead, *God* (to be distinguished from the numerical plural *gods*, Ex 12:12, &c.). The supposition that אֱלֹהִים is to be regarded as merely a remnant of earlier polytheistic views (i.e. as originally only a numerical plural) is at least highly improbable, and, moreover, would not explain the analogous plurals (see below). That the language has entirely rejected the idea of numerical plurality in אֱלֹהִים (whenever it denotes *one God*), is proved especially by its being almost invariably joined with a singular attribute (cf. § 132 h), e.g. אֱלֹהִים צְדִיק Ps 7:10, &c. Hence אֱלֹהִים may have been used originally not only as a numerical but also as an abstract plural (corresponding to the Latin *numen*, and our *Godhead*), and, like other abstracts of the same kind, have been transferred to a concrete single god (even of the heathen).

To the same class (and probably formed on the analogy of אֱלֹהִים) belong the plurals קָדוֹשִׁים *the Most Holy* (only of Yahweh), Ho 12:1, Pr 9:10, 30:3 (cf. הָיוּ אֱלֹהִים קָדוֹשִׁים Jos 24:19, and the Aram. עַלְיָן *the Most High*, Dn 7:18, 22, 25); and probably הָרִיףִים (usually taken in the sense of *penates*) the image of a god, used especially for obtaining oracles. Certainly in 1 S 19:13, 16 only *one* image is intended; in most other places a single image *may* be intended¹; in Zc 10:2 alone is it most naturally taken as a numerical plural. In Ec 5:7 גָּבֵהּ הָיָם *supremus* (of God) is doubtful; according to others it is a numerical plural, *superiores*.

Further, אֲדֹנִים, as well as the singular אֲדֹן, (lordship) *lord*, e.g. אֲדֹנִים קָשֶׁה *a cruel lord*, Is 19:4; אֲדֹנִי הָאָרֶץ *the lord of the land*, Gn 42:30, cf. Gn 32:19; so especially with the suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd persons אֲדֹנִי, אֲדֹנָךְ, אֲדֹנָךְ, &c., also (except 1 S 16:16); but in 1st sing. always אֲדֹנִי². So also בָּעָלִים (with suffixes) *lord, master* (of slaves, cattle, or inanimate things; but in the sense of *maritus*, always in the singular), e.g. בָּעָלִי Ex 21:29, Is 1:3, &c.³

On the other hand, we must regard as doubtful a number of participles in the plural, which, being used as attributes of God, resemble *plurales excellentiae*; thus, יְעַשֵּׂה my Maker, Jb 35:10; כְּפָרְתָּה Is 54:5; נְעַטְתָּה Ps 149:2; עַטְתָּה Is 22:11; נְעַטְתָּה them stretching them out, Is 42:5; for

² The Jewish grammarians call such plurals רַבִּי הַכְּחֹות *plur. virium* or *virtutum*; later grammarians call them *plur. excellentiae, magnitudinis*, or *plur. maiestaticus*. This last name may have been suggested by the *we* used by kings when speaking of themselves (cf. already 1 Macc. 10:19, 11:31); and the plural used by God in Gn 1:26, 11:7, Is 6:8 has been incorrectly explained in this way. It is, however, either *communicative* (including the attendant angels; so at all events in Is 6:8, cf. also Gn 3:22), or according to others, an indication of *the fullness of power and might* implied in אֱלֹהִים (see Dillmann on Gn 1:26); but it is best explained as a plural of *self-deliberation*. The use of the plural as a form of respectful address is quite foreign to Hebrew.

¹ Even in Gn 31:34, notwithstanding the plural suffix in וְעַלְתָּם and עַלְתָּה, since the construction of these abstracts as numerical plurals is one of the peculiarities of the E-document of the Hexateuch; cf. Gn 20:13, 35:7, and § 145 i.

² On אֲדֹנִי (for אֲדֹן) as a name of God, cf. § 135 q.

³ Euting, *Reise in Arabien*, p. 61, mentions the interesting fact that the subjects of the Emir of Hâyel commonly speak of their ruler as *shiyûkh*, a plur. *majestatis*= *the great sheikh*.

all these forms may also be explained as singular, according to § 93 ss.⁴—*Is 3:12* might also be regarded as another instance, unless it be a numerical plural, *their oppressors*; moreover, אֲרִיכֵי *him who lifteth it up*, *Is 10:15* (but read probably אֲרִיכָו); שְׁלַחְיָה *him who sendeth him*, *Pr 10:26, 22:21* (so Baer, but Ginsburg קְשֻׁרְתָּה), *25:13* (in parallelism with נְאָזֶן). These latter plurals, however (including מְרַמִּים), may probably be more simply explained as indicating an indefinite individual, cf. o below.—For שְׁמָךְ קְשֻׁרְתָּה *Ps 121:5* (textus receptus) and בָּרוֹא קְשֻׁרְתָּה *Ec 12:1* (textus receptus) the singular should be read, with Baer.

Rem. 1. (a) Coherent substances, &c., are mostly regarded as *single*, and are, accordingly, almost always represented by nouns in the singular, cf. קָבָק *fine dust*, פָּרָס *ashes*, בְּדִיל *linen*, בְּדִיל *lead*, זְהָב *gold*, סְגָר *silver*, כְּהֵב *brass*, מִילָּה *wine*, קְלָב *dust*, הַמִּזְבֵּחַ *the ground*, עֵץ *wood*. Plurals are, however, formed from some of these words expressing materials in order to denote separate portions taken from the whole in manufacture (*plurals of the result*) or parts otherwise detached from it; thus, בְּדִים *linen garments*; קְסָפִים *silver pieces*, *Gn 42:25, 35*; יִם *נְחַשְׁתָּה* (dual) *fetters of brass*; עַצִּים *ligna* (*timber for building or sticks for burning*); also in a wider sense, בְּגִילִים *particles of alloy to be separated by smelting*, *Is 1:25*; עֲפָרוֹת *fragments of earth*, *Pr 8:26*, cf. *Jb 28:6* עַפְרָה *dust of gold*.

(b) To the class of *plurals of the result* belong also a few names of natural products, when represented in an artificial condition; thus, קְשִׁים *wheat in grain* (threshed wheat), as distinguished from חִטָּה *wheat* (used collectively) in the ear; cf. the same distinction between בְּשִׂמְמִים and בְּשִׂמְמָה *spelt*; עַדְשִׁים and עַדְשָׁה *(the singular preserved only in the Mishna) lentils*; רִים and שְׁעָרִים *barley*; also פְּשָׁקִים *linen*, תְּשִׁיחִים *flax* (to be inferred from פְּשָׁקִים).

(c) Finally, the distinction between בְּמִם *blood* and בְּמִים requires to be specially noticed. The singular is always used when the blood is regarded as an organic unity, hence also of menstrual blood, and the blood of sacrifices (collected in the basin and then sprinkled), and in *Nu 23:24* of the blood gushing from wounds. On the other hand, בְּמִים as a sort of plural of the result and at the same time of local extension, denotes *blood which is shed*, when it appears as blood-stains (*Is 1:15*) or as blood-marks (so evidently in *Is 9:4*). But since blood-stains or blood-marks, as a rule, suggest blood shed in murder (although בְּמִים also denotes the blood which flows at child-birth or in circumcision), בְּמִים acquired (even in very early passages) simply the sense of a *bloody deed*, and especially of *bloodguiltiness*, *Ex 22:1* f., &c.

In some few cases the plural is used to denote an indefinite singular; certainly so in *Dt 17:5* אֶל־שְׁעָרָה יְחִידָה *unto one of thy gates*; *Zc 9:9* נָתָתָה יְחִידָה (cf. *Ct 2:9*); *Ex 21:22* יְלִכְתָּה יְחִידָה (where evidently only *one* child is thought of, certainly though in connexion with a contingency which may be repeated); cf. also *Ec 4:10* (*if one of them fall*).—So probably also *Gn 8:4, 1 S 17:43, Dn 2:1, Neh 3:8, 6:2*; but not *Gn 19:29*, since the same document (*Gn 13:12*) makes Lot dwell *in the cities* of the Jordan valley; in *Gn 21:7* בְּנִים denotes the class with which the action is concerned. In *Ju 12:7* instead of the unusual בְּעָרִי גָּלְעָד *in the cities of Gilead* (formerly explained here as *in one of the cities of Gilead*) we should most probably read, with Moore (*SBOT*, Judges, p. 52), בְּעָרֵיו בְּמִצְפָּה גָּלְעָד *in his city, in Mizpeh (in) Gilead*.

2. When a substantive is followed by a genitive, and the compound idea thus formed is to be expressed in the plural, this is done—

⁴ In *Is 54:5* which in Is 54:5 is in parallelism with בְּעָלָה יְחִידָה, must then be explained as merely formed on analogy.

(a) Most naturally by using the plural of the *nomen regens*, e.g.mighty men of valour (prop. heroes of strength), 1 Ch 7:2, 9; so also in compounds, e.g. בני יְמִינֵי 1 S 22:7, as the plur. of Benjamite; but also

(b) By using the plural of both nouns,¹ e.g. גָּבוֹרִים חַיִלִים 1 Ch 7:5; and in prison houses, Is 42:22; cf. Ex 34:1, &c., שְׁנִידָחָת אֲבָנִים two tables of stone (but Ex 31:18 לְחָתָן אֶבֶן); Nu 13:32, Dt 1:28, Jos 5:2, 6:4, 2 K 14:14, 25:23, Is 51:9, Jer 41:16, Ezr 3:3, &c. בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים עַמִּי הָאָרֶצָה the people of the country; 2 Ch 26:14; so perhaps sons of God, Ps 29:1, 89:7 (according to others sons of gods); or finally even

(c) By using the plural of the *nomen rectum*;¹ e.g. בית אֲבוֹת Ex 6:14, Nu 1:2, 4 ff., &c., as plur. of father's house, family; בית הַכְּמֻוֹת the houses of the high places, 2 K 17:29 (also בְּתֵי הַכְּמֻוֹת בְּתֵי עֲזָבְנִים the houses of their idols, 1 S 31:9, Ez 46:24; cf. also Ju 7:25 the head of Oreb and Zeeb, i.e. the heads, &c.

Rem. When a substantive (in a distributive sense) with a suffix refers back to a plural, the singular form of the substantive suffices, since the idea of plurality is already adequately expressed by the suffix, e.g. פִּימֹו os (for ora) eorum, Ps 17:10; יָמִינָם their right hand, Ps 144:8 [so in the English RV.], for hands.

§ 125. Determination of Nouns in general. Determination of Proper Names.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 466 ff.

1. A noun may either be determinate in itself, as a proper name or pronoun (see below, d and i), or be made so by its context. In the latter case, the determination may be effected either by prefixing the article (see § 126), or by the connexion of the noun (in the construct state) with a following determinate genitive, and consequently also (according to § 33 c) by its union with a pronominal suffix (§ 127 a). It is to be taken as a fundamental rule, that the determination can only be effected in one of the ways here mentioned; the article cannot be prefixed to a proper name, nor to a noun followed by the genitive, nor can a proper name be used in the construct state. Deviations from this rule are either only apparent or have arisen from a corruption of the text.

Rem. Only in a few passages is a noun made expressly *indeterminate* by the addition of אֲחֵך in the sense of our indefinite article; cf. Ex 16:33, Ju 9:53, 13:2, 1 S 1:1, 7:9, 12, 1 K 13:11, 19:4, 20:13, 22:9, 2 K 4:1, 8:6, 12:10, Ez 8:8, Dn 8:3, 10:5 (in 8:13 אֲחֵך קָרוֹש meaning *a holy one*, is opposed to another).

It is further to be noticed, that in Hebrew the phenomenon sometimes occurs, which the Arab grammarians call *indeterminateness for the sake of amplification*; e.g. Is 31:8 and he shall flee from a sword, i.e. from an irresistible sword (God's sword); cf. Is 28:2 בְּזַעַק; 2 S 6:2 מִשְׁמָך; Ho 3:1 אֲשֶׁר הָאֲשֶׁר such a woman, without doubt to be referred to the Gomer mentioned in cap. 1; Am 6:14; גּוֹי; Ps 77:16 בְּזַר עַצְיָק, if with Delitzsch it is to be referred to God; Jb 8:10 מְלִילִים meaning important words, but in 15:13 מְלִין reproachful words. Cf. on this point, § 117 q, note 3, and Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, ed. 4, p. 79.

¹ Cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 438 f., according to whom the plural of the principal word exercises an influence on the determining genitive.

¹ Cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 482.

2. Real *proper nouns*, as being the names of things (or persons) only *once* met with, are sufficiently determinate in themselves. Such names, therefore, as יהוה, קָדוֹם, קְנַעֲן, צָקָב do not admit of the article,¹ nor can they be in the construct state. On the other hand, not only *gentilic* names (as denoting the *various* individuals belonging to the same class), but also all those proper names, of which the appellative sense is still sufficiently evident to the mind, or at least has been handed down from an earlier period of the language, frequently (often even as a rule) take the article (according to § 126 e), and may even be followed by a genitive.

Examples. Like the above-mentioned proper names of individuals, countries, and cities, so also national names, which are identical in form with the name of the founder of the race (e.g. אֶלְעָזָר, מֹאָב, אֶדְם, יִשְׂרָאֵל), are always determinate in themselves. Of gentilic names (e.g. הַעֲבָרִים, the Hebrews, Gn 40:15; הַעֲבָרִים, the Canaanite) the plural פְּלִשְׁתִּים, even when meaning the Philistines, is generally used without the article (but in 1 S 4:7, &c., הַפְּ); so always בְּרִים.—Evident appellatives (like such modern names as *the Hague*, *le Havre*) are the hill, in the construct state הַגִּבְעָה, i.e. *the Gibeath named after Saul* to distinguish it from others; הַרְמָה, the height; הַרְכָּבָה, the heap; (prop. the white mountain) the Lebanon; הַרְיָה (prop. the river) the Nile, cf. Am 8:8 כִּיאוֹר מִצְרָיָם like the river of Egypt; תִּירְצָה, the Jordan (according to Seybold, *Mittheil. und Nachr. des DPV.*, 1896, p. 11, probably the drinking-place [ワラダ, Arab. warada, meaning orig. to go down to drink]).

Rem. 1. In a few instances original appellatives have completely assumed the character of real proper names, and are therefore used without the article; thus אלְהִים God, to denote the one true God (as elsewhere יהוה) Gn 1:1 and so generally in this document of the Pentateuch up to Ex 6, elsewhere sometimes אלְהִים ὁ θεός (cf. § 126 e); also the sing. אלֹהָה God, the Most High, and שָׁמְךָ the Almighty never take the article.—Moreover, אדם Adam from Gn 5:1 onwards (previously in 2:7, &c., הָאָדָם the first man); שָׁטָן Satan, 1 Ch 21:1 (but Zc 3:1, Jb 1:6, &c., אַדְלָמָד מֹעֵד the tent of revelation (i.e. the tabernacle), always without the article.

To the class of nouns originally appellative, which the language regards as proper names, and which consequently never take the article, belong also certain archaic words mostly used only by poets, such as קָהָוּם שָׁאָוֵל Hades, קָבֵל world, קָהָוּם ocean, of the body of water which encircles the earth, Gn 1:2, &c.; but Is 63:13, Ps 106:9 בְּתֵה מוֹת through the depths, viz. of the Red Sea.¹

2. When nouns which the usage of the language always treats as proper names occasionally appear to be connected with a following genitive, this is really owing to an ellipse whereby the noun which really governs the genitive, i.e. the appellative idea contained in the proper name, is suppressed. So evidently in the case of הַחֲנָן הַאֲבוֹת Yahweh (the God) of

¹ Consequently, הַמְּנֻשָּׁה Dt 3:13, Jos 1:12, &c. (in the Deuteronomist) in the combination הַמְּנֻשָּׁה שָׁבֵט (for which elsewhere הַמְּנֻשָּׁה שָׁבֵט) is to be regarded *not* as a proper name but as a gentilic name (= *the tribe of the Manassites*), for which in Dt 29:7 שְׁבֵת הַלְוִיִּים שְׁבֵת הַקָּנָעָן is used, as in 10:8 שְׁבֵת הַלְוִיִּים, and in Ju 18:1 שְׁבֵת הַקָּנָעָן שְׁבֵת הַדָּנִים. — In Jos 13:7 הַמְּנֻשָּׁה (like gentilic names in יְ) is even used adjectivally.

² That various other words, such as אָנוֹשׁ man, וְרִיךְ deep darkness, צָלָמָה prince, רְבָעָה field, תְּרִישָׁה effectual working, are always found without the article is not to be attributed to any special archaism, but is to be explained from the fact that they belong solely to poetic language, which avoids the article; in other cases, such as תְּרִישָׁה deep sleep, there is no occasion for the article in the passages we possess.

hosts; the fuller form יְהוָה אֶל־קַי הַאֲבָאוֹת 2 S 5:10, &c., or יְהוָה אֶל־קַי אֲבָאוֹת Am 3:13, &c., is a secondary expansion of the original in אל הַיּוֹם אֲבָאוֹת; יְהֻן הַיּוֹם אֲבָאוֹת; affected in the 2nd and part of the 3rd book of the Psalms. So also in geographical names such as אֶרְזָרָעֵל *Ur* (the city) of the Chaldees, Gn 11:28; אַרְם בְּקַרְמִים Aram (the region) of the two rivers; בֵּית לְקַם יְהוּנָה Bethlehem (the city) of Judah; אַבְלָל מִם עַכָּה 2 S 20:14, &c., to distinguish it from Abel by the water, 2 Ch 16:4; וְשָׁבֵית 1 S 11:1, &c.; יְרֻדוֹ יְרֻחוֹ Nu 22:1, 26:3, 63, &c.; on Ju 8:32 cf. § 128 c; צִיּוֹן קָדְשָׁנוּ צָפִים read a Zuphite. Some of these examples (cf. also Am 6:2) come very near to the actual construct state (cf. above, § 126 g), since e.g. the addition of the genitive serves to distinguish the place from four others called Aram (see the Lexicon), or from another Bethlehem. Aram, Bethlehem, &c., are accordingly no longer names found only in one special sense, and therefore also are no longer proper names in the strictest sense.

3. Of the pronouns, the personal pronouns proper (the separate pronouns, § 32) are always determinate in themselves, since they can denote only definite individuals (the 3rd person, also definite things). For the same reason the demonstrative pronouns (§ 34) are also determinate in themselves, when they stand *alone* (as equivalent to substantives), either as subject (Gn 5:29) or as predicate (e.g. *this is the day*, Ju 4:14; *these are the words*, Dt 1:1), or as object (e.g. *these are the words*, Dt 1:1), or as genitive (*of this man* 1 K 21:2), or finally when joined to a preposition (*in those days* Gn 2:23; *at this time* 1 S 16:8, see § 102 g).

So also the personal pronouns הַזֶּה, הַזֶּה, הַזֶּה, הַזֶּה, הַזֶּה when they are used as demonstratives (=is, ea, id, ille, &c.) are always determinate in themselves, e.g. הַזֶּה that is the thing, Gn 41:28. They are made determinate by the article, when they are joined like adjectives (see § 126 u) with a determinate substantive, e.g. חָאשֵׁשׁ הַזֶּה this man; בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה וּבַעַת הַזֶּה in those days, and in that time, Jo 4:1. The demonstrative, however, even in this case, is frequently used without the article, as being sufficiently determinate in itself (cf. § 126 y).

§ 126. Determination by Means of the Article.

1. The article (הַ, הַ, הַ, § 35) was originally, as in other languages (clearly in the Romance; cf. also ὁ, ὅτι, τό in Homer), a demonstrative pronoun. The demonstrative force of the article, apart from its occasional use as a relative pronoun (see § 138 i), appears now, however, only (a) in a few standing phrases, and (b) in a certain class of statements or exclamations.

(a) Cf. *this day, hodie* (§ 100 c.); *this night, Gn 19:34*; *this time, Gn 2:23; this year (= in this year) Is 37:30, Jer 28:16*.

(b) includes those instances in which the article, mostly when prefixed to a participle, joins on a new statement concerning a preceding noun. Although such participles, &c., are no doubt primarily regarded always as in apposition to a preceding substantive, the article nevertheless has in some of these examples almost the force of *the* (אֲזֶה הַזֶּה) as the subject of a noun-clause; e.g. *Ps 19:10 the judgements of the Lord are true ...*, verse 11 *הַמְּצִידִים וְגַם* prop. *the more to be desired than gold*, i.e. *they are more to be desired, or even they, that are more*

*to be desired,*¹ &c.; cf. Gn 49:21, Is 40:22 f., 44:27 f., 46:6, Am 2:7, 5:7, Ps 33:15, 49:7 (הַבְּפָנֵים in the parallel half of the verse continued by a finite verb); Ps 104:3, Jb 6:16, 28:4, 30:3, 41:25 and frequently. When such a participle has another co-ordinate with it, the latter is used *without* the article, since according to the above it strictly speaking represents a second predicate, and as such, according to *i*, remains indeterminate; e.g. Jb 5:10 *who giveth* (הַיְהֵת rain, &c. *and sendeth* לְשִׁתְּ וְשִׁלְתְּ &c.).

The article is sometimes used with similar emphasis before a substantive, which serves as the subject of a compound sentence (§ 140 d); e.g. Dt 32:4 הַצֹּר פֶּמֶם פֶּאֱלָו i.e. as a fresh statement (not in apposition to the preceding dative), really equivalent to *he is a rock, perfect in his work* (i.e. *whose work is perfect*); cf. Ps 18:31.

2. The article is, generally speaking, employed to determine a substantive wherever it is required by Greek and English; thus:

(a) When a person or thing already spoken of is mentioned again, and is consequently more definite to the mind of the hearer or reader; e.g. Gn 1:3 *and God said, Let there be light*: verse 4 *and God saw the light* (אֲתָה־הָאָרֶךְ); 1 K 3:24 *fetch me a sword: and they brought the sword*; Ec 9:15. (In 2 S 12:2 therefore לְעַשֵּׂיר must be read.)

(b) With a title understood and recognized by every one, e.g. אָלָה βασιλεὺς Σαλωμών: Gn 35:8 *under the oak* (the well-known oak which was there).

(c) With appellatives to denote persons or natural objects which are unique, e.g. הַכֹּהן הַבָּשָׂר the high priest, שֶׁמֶן הַשֶּׁמֶן the sun, רָצֶחֶן הַגְּדוֹלָה the earth.

(d) When terms applying to whole classes are restricted (simply by usage) to particular individuals (like ὁ ποιητής, meaning Homer) or things, e.g. אָנָשׁ הַשָּׁמֶן the adversary, Satan; בָּעֵל הַבָּעֵל Baal as proper name of the god; אָדָם הַאָדָם the (first) man, Adam; אֱלֹהִים הָאֱלֹהִים or אֱלֹהִים הָאֱלֹהִים the one true God (cf. also ὁ Χριστός in the New Testament); also הַנָּהָר the river, i.e. Euphrates; הַכָּרֶב the circle, sc. of the Jordan, the Jordan plain [Gn 19:17, &c.].

(e) Very often with the vocative, e.g. 2 S 14:4 לְךָ הַזֶּה help, O king; Zc 3:8 אָלָה הַהֲשִׁיעַנָּה הַכֹּהֵן הַגְּדוֹלָה O Joshua the high priest; 1 S 17:58, 24:9, 2 K 9:5; in the plural, Is 42:18, Jo 1:2, 13; but cf. also Jos 10:12, Is 1:2, 49:13 (יִמְשְׁלָעַת and רְצָחָנָה); 23:16, Ho 13:14, Jo 1:5, Ps 34:12, Ec 10:17, 11:9, &c.² The vocative occurs *without* the article in Is 22:2, since it has been already defined by a preceding accusative.

Rem. Strictly speaking in all these cases the substantive with the article is really in apposition to the personal pronoun of the 2nd person, which is either expressly mentioned or virtually present (in the imperative), e.g. 1 S 17:58 thou, the young man. But such passages as

¹ On the analogous use of the article before participles which have a verbal suffix, as in Ps 18:33, &c., cf. above, § 116 f.

² On the subsequent change of אָדָם, אָדָם, אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים into real proper names by the omission of the article, cf. above, § 125 f.

² For further exceptions see Nestle, *ZAW*. 1904, p. 323 ff.

Is 42:18, where the vocative precedes the imperative, prove that in such cases the substantive originally in apposition eventually acquired the value of a complete clause.

(f) With words denoting classes (see particulars under l).

(g) In a peculiar way, to specify persons or things, which are so far definite as to be naturally thought of in connexion with a given case, and must be assumed accordingly to be there (see q-s).

(h) With adjectives (also ordinal numbers and demonstrative pronouns used adjectivally) which are joined to substantives determined in some way (see u).

Rem. The article may be omitted in *poetry* in all the above-mentioned cases; in general it is used in poetry far less frequently than in prose. Its use or omission probably often rests on rhythmical grounds;³ it is sometimes omitted also for rhetorical reasons. Cf. e.g. אַתָּה כִּי אַתָּה for אַתָּה כִּי אַתָּה 21:2; מְלָכִים as vocative, verse 10; לְךָ אַתָּה for לְךָ הַפָּרָן 2:2; שָׁמָךְ פָּדוֹל וּנוֹרָא (contrary to u, v) 99:3. In the instances in which the ה of the article is omitted after a prefix (§ 35 n), the vowel of the article is often retained after the prefix even in poetry, e.g. יְמֵן בְּשָׁמֶן Ps 2:4, &c.

(i) On the other hand, the article is always omitted when a person or thing is to be represented as indefinite (or indefinable) or as yet unknown; consequently also before the predicate, since this is from its nature always a general term, under which the subject is included, e.g. Gn 29:7 עַד הַיּוֹם גָּדוֹל as yet the day is great, i.e. it is yet high day; 33:13, 40:18, 41:26, Is 66:3.

Rem. 1. As exceptions to the above rule it is usual to regard those examples in which a determinate adjective or participle (equivalent to a relative clause) is used apparently as a predicate, e.g. Gn 2:11 הַוָּה הַסְבָּב it is the compassing, i.e. that is it which compasseth; 42:6, 45:12, Ex 9:27, Dt 3:21, 8:18, 11:7, 1 S 4:16, Is 14:27, Mal 3:2 (cf. in Greek, e.g. St. Mat. 10:20, where Winer, *Gram. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, § 58, 2, Rem., explains οἱ λαλοῦντες as a predicate with the article). In reality, however, these supposed predicates are rather subjects (acc. to § 116 q), and the only peculiarity of these cases is that the subject is not included under a general idea, but is equated with the predicate.

2. Sometimes the article is used with only one of two parallel words, as Na 1:5 מְחֻרִים and הַגָּבוֹעָה, 2 Ch 3:17 מִמְּנִימָן and אֲוֵל הַשְׁמָמָה.

3. The use of the article to determine the *class* is more extensive in Hebrew than in most other languages. In this case the article indicates universally known, closely circumscribed, and therefore well defined classes of persons or things. The special cases to be considered are—

(a) The employment of general names as collectives in the singular, to denote the *sum total* of individuals belonging to the class (which may, however, be done just as well by the plural); e.g. *the righteous, the wicked man*, Ec 3:17; *the woman*, i.e. *the female sex*, 7:26; הַרְבָּה הַרְבָּה the enemy, i.e. *the enemies* (?) Ps 9:7; אֲבָבָה אֲבָבָה the liars in wait, i.e. *the liars in wait*;

³ Cf. the useful statistics of J. Ley in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*, 2te Abteilung, 1891, Heft 7–9, and M. Lambert, ‘*L’article dans la poésie hébr.*’, REJ. 37, 263 ff.

הַמְּלָיוֹת *the armed man*, i.e. *soldiers*; הַמְּאֹפֶר *the rearguard*; הַשּׁוֹלֵחַ *the spoiler*, 1 S 13:17;¹ so also (as in English) with names of animals, when something is asserted of them, which applies to the whole species, e.g. 2 S 17:10 *as the courage of אֲרִיהַ*, הַlion. Especially also with gentilic names, e.g. *the Canaanite*, Gn 13:7 (cf. 15^{19 f.}); so in English *the Russian*, *the Turk*, &c., in Attic writers ὁ Αθηναῖος, ὁ Συρακόσιος, &c.

(b) Names of materials known everywhere, the elements and other words denoting classes, even though only a part and not the whole of them is considered, in which case in other languages, as e.g. in English, the article is usually omitted (cf., however, our *to fall into the water*, *into the fire*, &c.), e.g. Gn 13:2 *and Abram was very rich* בְּמִקְנָה בְּבָשָׂר וּבְנָבָט *in cattle, in silver and in gold*; Jos 11:9 *and he burnt their chariots* בְּאֵשׁ *with fire*; cf. Gn 6:14, 41:42 (unless this means, *the chain* necessarily belonging to the official dress); Ex 2:3, 3:14 (35³²), Is 1:22, &c., and גַּעַשׂ בְּשָׂבֵךְ *with oil*² very commonly in the sacrificial laws, Ex 29:2, &c., and also Dt 33:24, 2 S 1:21, Is 1:6, Ps 23:5, &c. Similarly the article is used with terms of measurement, as הַאֲפָה Ex 16:36, &c.: הַחַמֶּר and הַבְּתָה Ez 45:11; בְּחַמֶּר Ex 16:22; בְּלָבֶל 2 S 8:2.

(c) The expression of abstract ideas of every kind, since they are likewise used to represent whole classes of attributes or states, physical or moral defects, &c.; e.g. Pr 25:5 (בְּזַקְבָּן); Gn 19:11 *and they smote the men ... with blindness*; Am 4:9, &c.; but in הַשְׁעָרָק Is 60:2 the article is no doubt due to dittography of the ה, and the parallel נְעָרָפֶל has no article.

(d) *Comparisons*, since the object compared is treated not (as usually in English) individually but as a general term, e.g. Is 1:18 *white* כַּשְׁבַּת *as snow*, *red* כַּמֶּר *as wool*; *red like crimson*; Is 34:4 *and the heavens shall be rolled together* כְּסֻפֶּר *as a scroll*; cf. Nu 11:12, Ju 8:18, 16:9 *as a string of tow is broken*; 1 S 26:20, 1 K 14:15, Is 10:14, 24:20, 27:10, 29:8, 53:6, Na 3:15, Ps 33:7, 49:15; cf. also such examples as Gn 19:28, Ju 14:6, where the object compared is determined by a determinate genitive which follows (according to § 127 a).

Examples of indeterminate comparisons are rare, and perhaps due only to the Masora,—so at least in the case of singulars, while in such plurals as those in Gn 42:30, 1 K 10:27, Jo 2:4, 7, the omission of the article may be explained by the ordinary rules. On the other hand, the article is regularly omitted when the object compared is already defined by means of an attribute (or relative clause, Jer 23:9, Ps 17:12), e.g. Is 16:2 *כַּעֲזָבָן נוֹזֵד קָוָן מְשֻׁלָּחַ* *as wandering birds*, (as) *a scattered nest* (but cf. 10:14 עֲמָקָם); 14:19, 29:5 (but Ps 1:4 עַמְּצָם); Jer 2:30, Pr 27:8, Jb 29:25, 30:14.—In comparisons with persons also the Masora seems to avoid the use of the article, as in קָבָר Jb 16:14 and seven other places (only in Is 42:13), קָאָב Jb 31:18, בָּר קָגָר Jb 38:3, 40:7.

4. Peculiar to Hebrew¹ is the employment of the article to denote a single person or thing (primarily one which is as yet unknown, and therefore not capable of being

1¹ But in Ex 12:23 *הַמִּן* is either to be explained as *the destroyer* (now mentioned for the first time) according to *q*, or a particular angel is meant whose regular function it was to inflict punishments. Others again take *הַמִּן* even in Ex 12:23 impersonally = *destruction*.

2² In nearly all the above examples the presence of the article is only indicated by the vowel of the prefix (ה, ה, ה) and might therefore be merely due to the masoretic punctuation. There is, however, no reason to doubt the correctness of the tradition. The same is true of the examples under *n* and *o*.

1¹ Cf., however, analogous examples in biblical Aramaic in Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, 79 f, e.g. Dn 2:14, 3:2, &c.

defined) as being present to the mind under given circumstances. In such cases in English the indefinite article is mostly used.

Thus Am 5:19 *as if a man did flee from a lion* (הַאֲרִי), i.e. the particular lion pursuing him at the time), *and a bear* (הַבָּבֶן) *met him, &c.*, cf. 3:12, 1 K 20:36 (John 10:12); also Gn 8:7 f., 14:13 (הַפְּלִיט), i.e. *one that had escaped*, the particular one who came just then; so also Ez 24:26, 33:21; cf. 2 S 15:13); Gn 15:1, 11 18:7 *the servant*, who is regarded as being constantly at hand and awaiting his commands; cf. 2 S 17:17 (but here Nu 11:27 is used like above); Gn 19:30, unless בְּמֹעֵד means in the well-known *cave*; מִקְרָם Gn 28:11, according to Dillmann, upon *the place suitable for passing the night, or the right place*, but it may possibly also refer to *the sanctuary of Bethel afterwards so sacred and celebrated*; Gn 42:23, 46:2, 50:26, Ex 2:15, 3:2, 4:20, 21:20 (2 S 23:21), Lv 23:42, 24:10 (Samaritan without the article); Nu 17:11, 21:6, 9, 25:6, Dt 19:5, Jos 2:15, Ju 4:18, 8:25, 13:19, 16:19, 19:29, 20:16, 1 S 17:34, 19:13, 21:10, 2 S 17:17, 1 K 6:8, 13:14 (? most probably a particular tree is meant); 19:9, Is 7:14 (הַעֲלָה), i.e. *the particular maiden*, through whom the prophet's announcement shall be fulfilled; we should say *a maiden* [cf. Driver on 1 S 1:4, 6:8, 19:13]; Jb 9:31.

So always *to write in the book* (or *on the scroll*, Nu 5:23, Jer 32:10), i.e. not in *the book* already in use, but in the book which is to be devoted to that purpose, equivalent to *in a book, on a scroll*, Ex 17:14, 1 S 10:25, Jb 19:23. Especially instructive for this use of the article is the phrase גַּם הַיּוֹם, which does not simply refer back to the previous narrative in the sense of *the same day*, but is used exactly like our *one day* (properly meaning on the particular day when it happened, i.e. *on a certain day*), 1 S 1:4, 14:1, 2 K 4:8, 11:18, Jb 1:6, 13. In Gn 39:11 even כִּי יּוֹם הַזֶּה.

The article is sometimes used in this way before collectives in the singular, which are not meant to denote (like the examples given under I) a whole class, but only that part of it which applies to the given case; thus בְּרֵבָה Gn 8:7, הַצְּרָעָה Ex 23:28.

5. When a substantive is defined by the article, or by a suffix, or by a following genitive determinate in any way (see the examples below), the attribute belonging to it (whether adjective, participle, ordinal, or demonstrative pronoun) necessarily takes the article (see, however, the Rem.), e.g. Gn 10:12 הַעִיר הַגָּדוֹלָה *the great city*; Dt 3:24 הַיָּד הַזָּקָנָה, *thy strong hand*. A genitive following the substantive may, according to § 127 a, be determined either by the article, e.g. 1 S 25:25 אִישׁ הַבְּלִיעָל הַזֶּה *this worthless man* (prop. *man of worthlessness*; cf. also such examples as 2 Ch 36:18, where the article is prefixed only to a second genitive following the noun); or as a proper name, e.g. Dt 11:7 מַעַשְׂה יְהָנָה הַגָּדוֹלָה לְעַבְדֵי אֱלֹהֵי הַקָּטָנִים *the great work of the Lord*; or by a suffix, e.g. Is 36:9 עַבְדֵי אֱלֹהֵי הַקָּטָנִים *the least of my master's servants*.

When several attributes (whether connected by *Wāw* or not) follow a determinate substantive, each of them takes the article, e.g. Dt 10:17 הַאֱלֹהִים הַגָּדוֹלָה הַמָּנוֹתָא *the great God, the mighty, and the terrible*. Cf. also Ex 3:3, Dt 1:19, in both of which places a demonstrative with the article also follows the adjective.¹

Rem. 1. The article is, however, not infrequently used also—

¹ The demonstrative used adjectively is generally placed *after* the adjective proper; in such cases as עַמְקָה הַזֶּה הַגָּדוֹלָה 2 Ch 1:10 the adjective forms a further (fresh) addition to עַמְקָה הַזֶּה.

(a) With the attribute alone, when it is added to an originally indefinite substantive as a subsequent limitation; so always with ordinal numbers after יּוֹם, ² e.g. Gn 1:31 (cf. 2:3, Ex 20:10, &c.) יּוֹם הַשְׁשִׁי *the sixth day* (prop. *a day* namely *the sixth*; but יּוֹם שְׁנִי *a second day*, Gn 1:8); Ex 12:15 מִיּוֹם הַרְאֵשׁ *from the first day onward* (not before Dn 10:12 and Neh 8:18 is מִן־הַיּוֹם הַרְאֵשׁ used instead of it). On the other hand, the article is *always* found after הַ, hence בַּיּוֹם הַשְׁשִׁי, &c., although it is possible that the original reading in these cases was בַּיּוֹם, and that the article is only due to the Masora. In Ju 6:25 the text is evidently corrupt (see verse 26).—Especially also in certain frequently recurring combinations as in particularizing the gates in Jer 38:14, Ez 9:2, &c., Zc 14:10, and courts in 1 K 7:8, 12, &c., Ez 40:28; and very often when the attribute consists of a participle, e.g. Dt 2:23, Ju 21:19, 1 S 25:10, Jer 27:3, 46:16 קָרְבַּת הַיּוֹנָה *the sword which oppresses* (?); Ez 14:22, Zc 11:2 *K^eth. (the impenetrable forest?)* Pr 26:18, Ps 119:21.

Of the other examples, Gn 21:29 (where, however, the Samaritan reads הַכְּבָשָׂוֹת), 41:26 (but cf. verse 4), Nu 11:25, Ju 16:27, 1 S 17:17 may at any rate be explained on the ground that the preceding cardinal number is equivalent to a determinant; in Gn 1:21, 28:9, 10, &c., the substantive is already determined by כֶּלֶב, and in 1 S 14:29 (קָרְבַּת אַעֲטָה) by כֶּלֶב.—In 1 S 12:23, 2 S 12:4, Is 7:20 (where, however, הַשְׁבִּירָה might also be understood as a subsequent explanation of בְּעֵת שְׁרָה) and Neh 9:35, the omission of the article after the preposition is certainly due merely to the Masora. In 1 S 16:23 (unless רְחוֹת אֶל־הַיּוֹם is to be read twice), Zc 4:7 (where however נָתַר אֶל־הַיּוֹם is probably meant), Ps 104:18 (where a ה precedes הַרְיִם, hence probably a case of haplography), the omission of the article before אֶל, ר (?) and ה may be due to a regard for euphony (see z below). On the other hand, in 1 S 6:18 (read בְּנֵי הַנָּהָר), 17:12 (הַנָּהָר is a later addition), 19:22 (cf. the LXX), Jer 17:2, 32:14, 40:3 *K^eth.*, Ez 2:3 (read גְּזִי or omit גְּזִי with Cornill), Mi 7:11, Ps 62:4, either the text is corrupt, or the expression incorrect. But in 2 K 20:13, Jer 6:20, Ct 7:10 acc. to D. H. Müller (*Anzeiger der Wiener Akad.*, phil-hist. Kl. 1902, no. x) הַטּוֹב is the genitive of a substantive, *aromatic oil, sweet cane* (in Jer 6:20 read נִקְנָה), *like spiced wine*. In Is 39:2 read פְּנֵי הַטּוֹב and in Ps 133:2 כְּפָנֵי חַטָּאת.

(b) No article with the attribute, while the substantive is determined either by the article, or a suffix, or a following genitive. Thus the article is sometimes omitted with demonstratives, since they are already to a certain extent determined by their meaning (cf. also the Mēšā□ inscription, l. 3, הַבָּמָת זֹאת *this high place*); as with הַזֶּה Gn 19:33 (evidently for euphony, and so probably often); 30:16, 32:23, 1 S 19:10; with Gn 38:21; with זֶה Ps 12:8 (according to the Masora זֶה is a relative pronoun here, as always elsewhere); with אֶל 1 S 2:23, according to the present corrupt text (the original reading כֶּלֶב־עַם יְהוָה became כֶּלֶב־עַם, and אֶל־הַיּוֹם was then corrupted to אֶל־הַזֶּה); so, almost without exception, when the substantive is determined only by a suffix, e.g. Jos 2:20, Ju 6:14, 1 K 10:8, 2 K 1:2 and 8:8 f., where חַלְיִם, as in Jer 10:19, has arisen by contraction from חַלְיִיִם, or we should simply read חַלְיִים (in all these passages with תְּאֵן); Gn 24:8 (with תְּאֵן); Ex 10:1, 1 K 22:23, Jer 31:21 (with תְּאֵן).

² Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, 3rd ed., 209; M. Lambert, *REJ.* 31, 279 f.—The omission of the article from the substantive is not to be regarded in this instance as an indication of late style, and consequently cannot be put forward as a proof of the late origin of the ‘Priestly Code’ (cf. Dillmann on Gn 1:31, Holzinger, *Einl. in d. Hexateuch*, p. 465, and especially Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, xi. 229 f., against Giesebrécht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 265 f.). On the other hand, the common omission of the article from the substantive before a determinate adjective (e.g. כְּבָנָה הַגָּדוֹלָה *the great synagogue*, in the Mishna; cf. Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, p. 19 ff.) is certainly a later idiom.

The article is sometimes omitted also with the attributes referring to proper names,¹ as Jos 11:8, 19:28, קָרְמַת רֶכֶב Am 6:2. Other examples are Jos 16:3, 5, 18:13, 1 K 9:17 (but in 1 Ch 7:24, 2 Ch 8:5 with the article). In Gn 7:11, &c., קְהוֹם רֶכֶב is also a case of this kind, קְהוֹם being used (almost always without the article) as a sort of proper name; cf. also אל עָלֵינוּ the most high God and אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים עַלְיָהּ and גָּלִילָה are strange; Jos 15:19 has גַּם עַלְיוֹת and גַּם תְּהֻמּוֹת.

Of the remaining examples Is 11:9 explains itself; the direct connexion of the attribute with its substantive is broken by the insertion of לִי. In Ez 34:12, Hag. 1:4 (as Wellhausen says, a good instance of a Hebrew adjective in the stative form = *the same* סְפִינִים), Ps 143:10, Ct 6:12 (?) the substantive is also (see above) determined by a suffix, and consequently the attribute is less closely attached; the same applies to Gn 37:2, 42:19, 43:14, Ps 18:18, except that in these passages the omission of the article before ר, א, ע may at the same time be due to considerations of euphony (as also in Jos 16:1 before ע, Nu 14:37 before ר, 28:4, Ez 10:9 before א, 21:19 before ע).¹ In 1 S 13:17 f. (אֲשֶׁר) and 2 K 25:16 (שְׁנַיִם) after a determinate substantive, the attribute again, being a numeral, is determinate in itself (see above, x); in Is 65:2 the לְ א prevents the use of the article; finally, in 2 Ch 26:15 בְּחִזְצִים and אֶבְנִים and בְּ are to be read, as in Jer 2:21 פָּנָן אֶרְצָן for פָּנָן אֶרְץ; in 2 S 6:3 omit בְּדִשְׁתָּה, and in Ez 39:27 omit בְּבִים. Without any apparent reason the article is omitted in Dn 8:13 and 11:31.

2. When, as in Mi 7:12 (*in that day?*), the article is omitted from both substantive and demonstrative, and in Ezr 3:12, the demonstrative even precedes (הַבָּיִת הַזֶּה=זֶה הַבָּיִת), this is obviously due in both cases to a radical corruption of the text (not only in the words quoted). In Jos 9:12 נַעֲמָן לְחַמָּה is either in apposition to the independent demonstrative זֶה (= *this our bread, &c.*), as in verse 13 נַעֲמָות לְהַזֶּה is to אֵל, or they are complete sentences, *this is our bread, &c.* So also in Ex 32:1 מֹשֶׁה (= *that [iste] Moses, &c.*), and in Ps 48:15 אֱלֹהִים are to be taken in apposition to זֶה. On Ps 68:8 and Is 23:13 cf. § 136 d.

§ 127. The Noun determined by a following Determinate Genitive.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 475.

When a genitive, determined in any way, follows a *nomen regens*, it also determines the *nomen regens*, which, according to § 89 a, is always in the construct state. Moreover, every pronominal suffix attached to a substantive is, according to § 33 c, to be considered as a genitive determinate by nature. An independent genitive may be determinate—

(a) By its character as a *proper name* (according to § 125 a), e.g. קְבָר יְהֹוָה the word of the Lord.

(b) By having the article, e.g. אִישׁ הַמָּלחָמָה (prop. the man of the war) *the soldier* (but נָבָיָה אִישׁ מָלְכָה Jos 17:1, *a soldier*); Nu 31:49, the soldiers; קְבָר הַנְּבִיא אִישׁ הַמָּלְכָה the word of the prophet, Jer 28:9 (but e.g., on the other hand, מִצְוֹת אֲנָשִׁים אֲלֵלָה a commandment of men which hath been taught, Is 29:13; קְבָר־שְׁקָר word of falsehood, Pr 29:12).

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 48, n. 1.

¹ The same reason no doubt also favoured the omission of the article before הוּא and הַלְּאֵל, see above, under y. Also in Is 23:7 (*is this your joyous ...?*) the article is omitted before עַלְיָהּ probably only for euphony.

(c) By the addition of a pronominal suffix (see above), e.g. *my father's house*.

(d) By construction with another genitive determined in some way, e.g. Gn 3:2 *מְפֵרִי עַץ־חَدָן* *of the fruit of the trees of the garden*. Thus in Is 10:12 four, and in 21:17 even five, members of a series are determined by a concluding determinate genitive.

Rem. 1. The above explains also the various meanings of פֶל (prop. a substantive in the sense of *aggregate, whole*), according as it is followed by a determinate or indeterminate genitive. In the former case פֶל has the meaning of *the entirety*, i.e. *all, the whole* (like the French *tous les hommes, toute la ville*), e.g. פֶל־אָרֶץ *the whole (prop. the entirety of the) earth*, מְלֹה אָדָם *all men*; ¹ Ex 18:22, Nu 15:13, Jer 4:29, and cases like Nu 4:23, 47, 21:8 where פֶל is followed by a singular participle with the article. On the other hand, before an indeterminate genitive פֶل is used in the more indefinite (individualizing) sense of *of all kinds, any* (cf. *tout homme, à tout prix*), or distributively *each, every*, e.g. פֶל־עֵץ *every (kind of) tree*, Gn 2:9; cf. 4:22, 24:10, 1 Ch 29:2; פֶל־כָּבֵר *any thing*, Ju 19:19; בְּכָל־יֹם *every day, every time*, Ps 7:12.

It is, however, to be observed—

(a) That the article may in this case also (see § 126 h) be omitted in poetic style, although the substantive is to be regarded as determinate, e.g. **כָל־שְׁלֹחָנוֹת** *all (the) tables*, Is 28:8.

(b) That the meaning *every* is frequent even before singulars used collectively; afterwards the idea of *quisque* passes naturally into that of *totality*, e.g. **כל-חי** *each living thing*, i.e. *every* (not *every kind of*) *living thing*; **כל-בשר** *all flesh*, i.e. *all men or all living creatures* (with the article only in [Gn 7:15](#) before a relative clause, and in [Is 40:6](#)); sometimes also **כל-עצים** *all trees*, **כל-עוֹף** *all birds*; finally—

(c) That before the names of members of the human body, בָּלֶן frequently (as being determinate in itself) denotes the entirety, e.g. Is 1:5 *the whole head, the whole heart* (the sense required by the context, not *every head, &c.*, which the expression *in itself* might also mean); 9:11, 2 K 23:3, Ez 29:7 *all* (i.e. *the whole of*) *their shoulders ... all (the whole of) their loins*; 36:5.—On בָּלֶן with a suffix when it follows a noun in apposition (e.g. Is 9:8 *הַעֵם בָּלֶן* *the people, all of it*, i.e. *the whole nation*, more emphatic than בָּלֶן, cf. Driver on 2 S 2:9), as well as when it follows absolutely in the genitive (= *all men, every one*, e.g. Gn 16:12),² see the Lexicon, pp. 481^b, 482^b.

2. Gentilic names (or patronymics), derived from compound proper names (consisting of a nomen regens and genitive), are determined by inserting the article before the second part of the compound (since it contains the original genitive), e.g. בֶן-יְמָנִי (see § 86 h) *a Benjamite*, Ju 3:15, &c., *the Benjamite*; בֶן-יְהוֹלָהִים *the Bethlehemite*, 1 S 16:1, &c. (cf., however, 1 Ch 27:12 *Q'reb* בֶן-יְהוֹשָׁמֵן); בֶן-מַנְנִי *the Beth-shemite*, 1 S 6:14; בֶן-עֲזִירִי *the Abiezrite*, Ju 6:11, &c., cf. 1 K 16:34.

3. In a few instances the nomen regens appears to be used indefinitely notwithstanding a following determinate genitive; it is not so, however, in **Gn 16:7**, where the reference is to a well-known fountain; **21:28**, where in the original context there must have been some reason for *the seven ewe lambs of the flock*; **2 S 12:30** *the spoil found in the city*; but it often is so

¹ being a collective, cf. Ex 1:22 all sons, 2 S 15:2, all men, all daughters; in itself could also mean the whole man.

² In Ezr 10:17 instead of בְּכָל אֲנָשִׁים read simply בְּכָל־אֲנָשִׁים.

before a proper name, as in Ex 10:9 הַמֵּשֶׁה יְהוָה a *feast of the Lord* (unless it is *the* spring festival), Dt 7:25, and frequently קֹדֶשׁ בְּיַהוָה an *abomination unto the Lord*; cf. also Gn 46:34, Dt 22:19 *a virgin of Israel*; 1 S 4:12 *a man of Benjamin*; Pr 25:1, Ct 2:1, 3:9; similarly before appellatives with the article (or before a genitive determined by a suffix, as in Lv 14:34), 1 S 20:20 *three arrows*; 2 S 23:11 קָרְבָּנָת הָשָׂדֶה a *plot of the ground* (but see Gn 33:19, Jos 24:32); Ju 13:6, Jer 13:4, 41:16, Ct 1:11, 13 f., 5:13, 7:3, 8:2. On the other hand, שִׁיר הַעֲלָות in the titles of Psalms 120 to 134 (except 121:1) was most probably originally the title of a collection, in the sense of ‘*the pilgrimage-songs*’ (according to § 124 r), and was subsequently added to these Psalms severally.—In Ex 20:24 בְּכָל־הָאָקָם in *all the place*, sc. of the sanctuary, is a dogmatic correction of בְּכָל־מִקְדָּשׁ, *in every place*, to avoid the difficulty that several holy-places are here authorized, instead of the one central sanctuary. In Gn 20:13 also מְלֹאת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (unless it means *in the whole place*) is remarkable, since elsewhere *every place* is always (8 times) בְּכָל־מִקְדָּשׁ.

4. The deviations mentioned under *e*, from a fundamental rule of syntax, are in some cases open to suspicion on textual grounds, but much more doubtful are the instances in which the article is found before a noun already determined in some other way, as—

(a) Before a noun which appears to be determined by a following independent determinate genitive. The least questionable are the instances in which the genitive is a *proper name*, since these may be elliptical forms of expression like the apparent construction of proper names with a genitive, noticed in § 125 h, e.g. Nu 21:14 הַמִּקְדָּשִׁים אַרְנוֹן the *valleys*, namely the *valleys of Arnon*; 2 K 23:17 הַמִּזְבֵּחַ בֵּית־אֱלֹהִים the *altar*, namely the *altar of Bethel* (i.e. with the suppression of the real nomen regens, מִזְבֵּחַ without the article; by the pointing הַמִּזְבֵּחַ the Masora evidently intends to allow the choice either of reading הַמִּזְבֵּחַ or correcting it to מִזְבֵּחַ); Gn 31:13 (the LXX read הָאֱלֹהִים בֵּית־אֱלֹהִים) equivalent to הָאֱלֹהִים בֵּית־אֱלֹהִים; Ez 46:19 הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־וּרְאָה אֱלֹהִים כְּמַקוּם the *God who appeared to thee in the holy place*); Is 36:16 (probably a scribal error due to verse 13; it does not occur in the parallel passage, 2 K 18:31), cf. Jos 13:5, 2 K 25:11, Jer 38:6, Ez 47:15; in the vocative, Jer 48:32, La 2:13. On the other hand, שְׁרָה אַמְּתָה Gn 24:67 is no doubt only a subsequent insertion; so also יִשְׂרָאֵל Jos 8:33b (cf. LXX), 2 S 20:23, 2 K 7:13, 1 S 26:22 after הַנִּגְנִיה (simplified by the Masora to עַלְיָה Q^{rē}); 2 K 23:12, עַלְיָה אֲשֶׁר־וּרְאָה Is 36:8 (cf. 2 K 18:23), Ez 46:19 (unless the article with לְשֻׁכָּה is to be omitted), also הַמֶּלֶךְ Dn 8:13, and 2 Ch 15:8. In Ex 9:18 read with the Samaritan לְקָיוֹם; in 2 S 19:25 לְבָת might possibly be taken in apposition to לְמִן הַיּוֹם; in 2 K 10:1 restore אֲתִ-בְּנִי, with the LXX and Lucian, before אֲחָב; in 2 K 25:19 omit the article, as in Jer 52:25, before סְפִיר.

A similar ellipse must also be assumed in 2 K 23:17 *the sepulchre* is the sepulchre of the *man of God* (but most probably קָבֵר has dropped out after הַקָּבֵר) and Ps 123:4 (cf., however, the LXX, and observe that in the parallel member the genitive is paraphrased by ל).—In Jos 3:14 הַבְּרִית יְהוָה (verse 17) has been added to the original הַאֲרוֹן by a redactor; cf. similar syntactically impossible additions in verse 11 (also in 1 S 4:3, &c., where the LXX still had simply אֲרוֹן יְהוָה); in Ju 16:14 the Masora evidently combines two different readings הַיְהָד and קָדְשָׁה; and similarly in Jer 25:26 (where נָאָרֶץ was only subsequently introduced into the text), the two readings מִמְּלֹכֹת הָאָרֶץ and הַמִּלְכָה are combined.—In Jos 8:11, 1 K 14:24, Jer 31:40, Ez 45:16 the article, being usual after כְּלָי, has been mechanically added, and so also in 2 Ch 8:16 after תְּצִדְקָה; in 2 K 9:4 the second גַּן (instead of גַּע) is occasioned by the first; in Ez 7:7 מִהְוָמָה belongs as a nominative to what follows; in Ez 8:29 the meaning perhaps is in

¹ According to Philippi (*St. Constr.*, p. 38) בֵּית־אֱלֹהִים is rather a case of ‘sub-position’ in the accusative, as also הַמִּלְכָה Ez 47:15 (for which, however, in 48:1 there is the correct reading הַמִּלְכָה by the way to Hethlon; and in fact, Ez 47:15 may without difficulty be explained in this way; so שְׁנָה Ex 39:27 as an accusative of the material).

the chambers, in the house of the Lord, or the article is to be omitted; in 1 Ch 15:27 the text is manifestly corrupt.

Of another kind are the instances in which a determinate noun is followed by a definition of the material *in apposition* (hence, not in the genitive; cf. § 131), e.g. Zc 4:10 **הִיא בְּנֵי הַכֶּדֶל** *the weight, the lead*, i.e. *the leaden weight*; Ex 39:17, 2 K 16:14 (**הַמָּתָח**, both here and in verse 17, is probably only a later addition, while the **הַמְסֻגָּרוֹת** *the measurements* and **מְסֻגָּרוֹת** *the measurements*) In Jer 32:12 also **הַאֲקָנָה** (unless the article is simply to be omitted) is in apposition to **הַפְּרָט**.

(b) Before a noun with a suffix (which likewise represents a determinate genitive; see above, at the beginning of this section). This does not apply to cases in which a *verbal* (i.e. *accusative*) suffix is affixed to a participle which has the article, e.g. Is 9:12, **הַמְּפַבֵּשׂ הוּא** *the smiting him*; in Dt 8:15, 13:6 also **וְ** is a verbal suffix, but hardly the **וְ** in **שָׁוֹר** for **הַ** **שָׁוֹר** Job 40:19, nor the **וְ** in **הַ** **לְקָנָה** Dn 11:6; § 116 g. For **עַרְכָּה** **לְקָנָה** Lev 27:23, read **עַרְכָּה** as in verses 2, 3, 5, 7, 13, &c., twelve times (but cf. also the note on § 128 d).—Of the remaining examples **בְּבָרְתָּה** Is 24:2 (probably an intentional alliteration with the eleven other words beginning with **בְּ**) **לְעַבְדָּה** Pr 16:4, and **עַרְכָּה** **יְנוּהָה** (so Baer, following the best authorities) Ezr 10:14, rest only on the authority of the Masoretes, not of the authors. So also in **אַתְּאַתְּלִי** Jos 7:21, **אַתְּאַתְּזִי** Jos 8:33 (previously **אַתְּאַתְּזִי**), **רֹתֶה** **יְהִי** 2 K 15:16 (dittography of the **ה**), the article is simply to be omitted as syntactically impossible; the **וְ** of **הַכְּבָדוֹ** Mi 2:12 is the copula belonging to the next word.

§ 128. *The Indication of the Genitive Relation by means of the Construct State.*

Cf. especially Philippi's work cited at the head of § 89.

1. The genitive relation is regularly expressed (see § 89) by the close connexion of the *nomen regens* (in the construct state) with the *nomen rectum* (in the genitive). Since only *one* nomen regens can be immediately connected with a nomen rectum, it follows that the same genitive cannot depend on two or more *co-ordinate* nouns, but a second (sometimes even a third, &c.) regens must be added with a suffix referring to the nomen rectum, e.g. **בְּנֵי דָוִד וּבְנֵי תְּיֵא** *the sons of David and his daughters* (not **בְּנֵי וּבְנָות** **דָוִד**); cf. 1 K 8:28.¹ The language also prefers to avoid a series of several co-ordinate² genitives depending upon one and the same nomen regens (such as occur in Gn 14:19, Nu 20:5, 31:54 [1 Ch 13:1], 1 S 23:7, 2 S 19:6, Is 22:5, Ps 5:7, 8:3),³ and rather tends to repeat the nomen regens, e.g. Gn 24:3 **אֵלֶּה יְהִי הַשָּׁמֶן וְאֵלֶּה יְהִי הַצָּבָבָה** *the God of heaven and the God of the earth* (so in Jer 8:1 the regens is five times repeated). A lengthened series of genitives may, however, be formed by a nomen rectum serving at the same time as *regens* to a genitive depending on it (cf. § 127 a [d]); e.g. Gn 47:9 **יְמִינֵי חִי וְאַבְנֵי** *the days of the years of my fathers*; cf. Jb 12:24, where there are three genitives, Is 10:12 four, and 21:17 five (unless the last three are in apposition). As a

¹ Very rare, and only possible in very rapid utterance, are such exceptions as Ez 31:16 (**מְבָחר וּמְזֻבְּלָבָנוֹן**); Pr 16:11.—In Is 11:2 *the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord*, **עַתָּה** may at any rate also be taken as an absolute genitive, so also **בְּפָרָת** Dn 1:4.

² In Ps 114:1 a second genitive is added even without the copula, but the parallelism of the members renders any misunderstanding impossible.

³ In almost all these instances the two (or three) genitives form one closely connected whole, as *heaven and earth, sons and daughters*.

rule, indeed, such an inconvenient accumulation of genitives is avoided by means of a circumlocution in the case of one of them (see §129 d).

Rem. As the fundamental rules stated above are the necessary consequence not merely of *logical* but more especially of *rhythrical* relations (see § 89 a), we must feel the more hesitation in admitting examples in which genitives are supposed to be loosely attached to forms other than the construct state. Some of these examples (the supposed genitives following a regens which is determined by the article) have been already discussed in § 127 f–h. Compare, moreover:

(a) Genitives after the absolute state, e.g. Is 28:1 *אֶשְׁמָנִים הַלֹּטֶן יֵין יְאַשְׁמָנִים* *the fat valley of them that are overcome with wine*. The usual explanation that *forms one single idea* (in German *Fettigkeitstal*), on which the genitive *יֵין* then depends, in reality explains nothing; the text is almost certainly corrupt. In Dt 15:18 *מִשְׁנָה* would be expected; in Jos 3:11 *הַבְּרִית* is a later addition; in Is 32:13 (*שָׁוֹשָׁן*), and Ps 68:22 (*שְׁעָרָה*), the absolute for the construct state probably rests only on the authority of the Masoretes. In Ju 6:25 ff. the text is obviously in confusion. In Ju 8:32 (cf. 6:24) *קָפְרָה* should come either after *וְנִקְבָּרָה* or at the end of the verse, unless, with Moore, we omit *עִם* as a gloss (from 6:24); in Is 63:11 *מִשְׁהָ* is probably a gloss on *יְמִינָתָם* which has crept into the text; in 2 S 4:2 *לְאִישָׁב שְׁתָה*, according to the LXX, has dropped out before *בָּן*; in Ez 6:11 *רָעֹות* is to be omitted with the LXX; if originally in the text, it could only be genitive (= *all abominations of evils*), not an adjective; Pr 21:6 the text is altogether uncertain (the LXX read *מְוֹקָשִׁי* for *אֲבָקָשִׁי*); in 1 Ch 9:13 the preposition *לְ* (after a *לִ*) has dropped out before *מְלָאָכָת* (cf. 12:25).—Elsewhere (Dt 3:5, 1 K 4:13, 2 Ch 8:5) the supposed genitives are to be taken rather as words of nearer definition standing in apposition, i.e. *with high walls, gates, and bars*. In Jer 8:5 *ירֹשְׁלָם* is either in apposition to *הָעָם* or is better (since not in the LXX) omitted as a gloss.

(b) Genitives after a noun with a suffix (where the suffix prevents the direct government by the *nomen regens*). Thus in Lv 27:3, 5, 6, where the *הַזָּכָר* after *עַזְבָּקָה*¹ might be taken, contrary to the accents, as subject of the following clause; in Lv 5:15, 25 the suffix may refer to Moses. In Lv 6:3 *מִזְבֵּחַ בְּךָ* *his garment*, namely the garment of *linen*, unless simply in apposition, cf. § 131 d (or read *מִזְבֵּחַ?*); Lv 26:42, where *בְּרִיתִי* *בְּעֵקֶב בְּרִיתִי* could at most be explained as an ellipse for *בְּרִיתִי*, which was repeated also before *בְּרִיתִי*; cf. § 125 h (probably, however, it is a case of dittography of the *בְּ*, which was repeated also before *בְּ*; so Valeyton, ZAW. xii. 3); equally strange is *אֱמָם בְּנָה נָבָּה יְאָכֵם יְהֻנָּה* Nu 12:6 could not possibly mean *if your prophet be a prophet of the Lord*; the text is manifestly corrupt (probably *בְּנָה* *אֱמָם מִנְחָה* is to be read, with Marti). In Ps 45:7 (*בְּסָאָר אֱלֹהִים* usually explained as *thy divine throne*), is most probably a later addition [another suggestion is to read *כְּאֱלֹהִים like God(’s throne)*: cf. § 141 d, note]. In Jer 52:20 two readings are probably combined, *לְנַחַת בְּלַהֲלָלִים* without any addition, and *לְנַחַת שְׁלִוּם*. In Nu 25:12 is in apposition to *בְּרִיתִי זֶה*. On Ez 16:27, cf. § 131 r.

(c) The interposition of a word is assumed between *כָּל-* (*the whole*; cf. § 127 b) and the genitive governed by it in 2 S 1:9, Jb 27:3 (*עוֹד*), and, if the text is correct, in Hos 14:3 (אֲשָׁר). In reality, however, in all three places the genitive relation is destroyed by the transposition of the words (instead of *עוֹד כָּל-*, &c.), and *כָּל-* is rather to be taken adverbially (equivalent to *wholly*), e.g. 2 S 1:9 *because my life is yet wholly in me*, i.e. my whole life; cf. Philippi, Stat. Constr., p. 10.—On the instances in which the original construct state *אֵין non-existence* is used without a following genitive, see the negative sentences, § 152 o.

1¹ Halévy, J. A. xiv. 548, removes the difficulty by pointing עַזְבָּקָה.

ZAW. ZAW. = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

2. The dependence of the nomen rectum on the nomen regens by no means represents merely what is, properly speaking, the genitive relation (see the examples under g–i). Very frequently the nomen rectum only adds a nearer definition of the nomen regens, whether by giving the name, the genus or species, the measure, the material, or finally an attribute of it (*genit. epexegeticus* or *appositionis*,¹ see the examples under k–q).

Examples. The *nomen rectum* represents—

(a) A *subjective genitive*, specifying the possessor, author, &c., e.g. בֵּית־הַקָּדוֹשׁ לְךָ the king's house; בְּבָרֵךְ יְהוָה the word of the Lord.

(b) An *objective genitive*, e.g. Ob¹⁰ מִנְמָס אֲתַיָּךְ for the violence done to thy brother² (but in Ez 12:19 מִנְמָס is followed by a subjective genitive); Pr 20:2 אִימָתֶךָ the terror of a king; Gn 18:20 עֲקָתָךְ the cry concerning Sodom; Is 23:5 שְׁמֻעָץ־צָרָם the report of (about) Tyre, cf. 2 S 4:4; Am 8:10 אֲבָל יְחִידָם the mourning for an only son; Dt 20:14 שְׁלָל אֲיִיבִים praeda hostibus tuis erepta; cf. Is 3:14. In a wider sense this includes such examples as בְּדַרְכֵךְ אֲזִיזָה הַחַיִים the way of (i.e. to) the tree of life, Gn 3:24; cf. Pr 7:27, Jb 38:20; בְּדַרְכֵה הַיָּם the way of (by) the sea, Is 8:23; בְּזַבְחוֹת אֱלֹהִים שְׁבָעַת יְהוָה the sacrifices of (i.e. pleasing to) God, Ps 51:19; שְׁבָעַת יְהוָה the oath of (i.e. sworn before) the Lord, 1 K 2:48; בְּבָרֵךְ לְמוֹאָל the words of (i.e. addressed to) L., Pr 31:1.

(c) A *partitive genitive*; this includes especially the cases in which an adjective in the construct state is followed by a general term, e.g. חַכְמֹות שָׂרָטִים the wisest of her ladies, Ju 5:29; cf. for this way of expressing the superlative, § 133 h, and also r below.

Merely formal genitives (*genit. explicativus* or *epexegeticus*, *genit. appositionis*) are those added to the construct state as nearer definitions—

(d) Of the *name*, e.g. נָהָר פְּرָת the river Euphrates; אֶרְצָנוּ צָדָם the land of Canaan; בְּתוּלָת יִשְׂרָאֵל the virgin Israel (not of Israel), Am 5:2.

(e) Of the *genus*, e.g. Pr 15:20 (21²⁰) בְּסִיל אֲלָמָם a fool of a man (=a foolish man); cf. Gn 16:12, Is 1:4, 29:19, Ho 13:2, Mi 5:4, &c.

(f) Of the *species*, e.g. קְהֻנָּתְךָ בָּרָךְ a possession of a burying-place, i.e. hereditary sepulchre, Gn 23:4, &c.; תְּאַנֵּי הַפְּכָרֹת the early figs, Jer 24:2; אֲשֶׁל בֵּיתִי the tabernacle of my house, i.e. my dwelling-place, Ps 132:3.

(g) Of the *measure, weight, extent, number*, e.g. מַתִּי מִסְפָּר people of number, i.e. few in number, Gn 34:30, Dt 26:5; cf. also Ez 47:3–5 waters of the ankles, waters of the loins, waters of swimming, i.e. which reached up to the ankles, or loins, or necessitated swimming; but in verse 4 in apposition (?). מִים בְּרַכְתִּים

¹ The latter term is preferred especially by König, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1898, p. 528 ff.

² Cf. in Latin a similar use of the genitive after *iniuria* (Caes. *B. G.* 1, 30), *metus* (*hostium, Pompeii, &c.*), *spes*, and other words. In Greek, cf. εὔνοια τῶν φίλων, πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, 1 Cor. 1:18.

(h) Of the *material*³ of which something consists, e.g. קָלִי חַרְשׁ *a vessel of earthenware*, Nu 5:17; בְּכָסֶף vessels of silver (cf. the French *des vases d'or*); אָרוֹן עֵץ an ark of wood, שָׁבֵט a rod of iron, Ps 2:9; cf. Gn 3:21, 6:14, Ju 7:13, &c.

(i) Of the *attribute* of a person or thing, e.g. Gn 17:8 נְקֻזָּת עוֹלָם an everlasting possession; Pr 17:8 a precious stone; cf. Nu 28:6, Is 13:8, 28:4, Ps 23:2, 31:3, Pr 5:19, 14:5, Jb 41:19, and the examples of the genitive with a suffix given in § 135 n. Such a periphrasis for the expression of attributes frequently occurs, even when the corresponding adjectives are in use. Thus especially קָדָשׁ holiness very frequently serves as a periphrasis for the adjective קָדָשׁ (e.g. קָדָשׁ בְּגָדֵי הַקָּדָשׁ the holy garments, Ex 29:29), since קָדָשׁ is used almost exclusively in reference to persons (hence also with עָם people, and with שֵׁם the name of a person); the only exceptions are מִקְוָתָם קָדָשׁ holy place, Ex 29:31, &c.; מִים קָדָשִׁים holy water, Nu 5:17; קָדָשׁ as the predicate of יוֹם day, Neh 8:10 f., and of מִחְנָה camp, Dt 23:15. So also the use of קָדָשׁ צָדִיק righteous is always confined to persons, except in Dt 4:8; elsewhere the periphrasis with צָדְקָה or קָדָשָׁה is always used, e.g. מִצְדָּקָה just balances, Lv 19:36.

In a wider sense this use of the genitive also includes statements of the purpose for which something is intended, e.g. מִזְפָּר שְׁלֹמָךְ נָעֵץ sheep for the slaughter, Ps 44:23; the chastisement designed for our peace, Is 53:5; cf. 51:17 (the cup which causes staggering), Ps 116:13; finally, also, the description of the material, with which something is laden or filled, e.g. 1 S 16:20 חֲמָר לְקָם וּנְאָדָם an ass laden with bread and a bottle of wine (but probably עַשְׂרָה is to be read for קָמָר); cf. Gn 21:14, Pr 7:20, &c.

Rem. 1. Certain substantives are used to convey an attributive idea in the construct state before a partitive genitive; thus מְבָחר קָבֵר יְמֵנוֹ the choice of our sepulchres, i.e. our choicest sepulchres; Ex 15:4, Is 22:7, 37:24; other examples are, Is 1:16 the evil of your doings, emphatically, for your evil doings; Is 17:4, 37:24 (=the tall cedars thereof), Ps 139:22, Jb 15:26.—This is the more common construction with the substantive כָּל entirety, for all, the whole, every, see § 127 b; it is also frequent with טַעַמָּה a little, for few, 1 S 17:28, &c.

2. To the periphrases expressing attributive ideas (see p above) by means of a genitive construction may be added the very numerous combinations of the construct states אִישׁ a man, בָּעֵל master, possessor, בָּן son, and their feminines and plurals (including מִנְחָה men, used only in the plural), with some appellative noun, in order to represent a person (poetically even a thing) as possessing some object or quality, or being in some condition. In English, such combinations are sometimes rendered by single substantives, sometimes by circumlocution.

Examples:—

(a) Of the אִישׁ, &c.; אִישׁ קְבָרִים an eloquent man, Ex 4:10 (but אִישׁ שְׁפָתִים Jb 11:2 a man of lips, i.e. a boaster); אִישׁ לְשׁוֹן = a slanderer, Ps 140:12; אִישׁ דַעַת a man of knowledge, Pr 24:5; אִישׁ חָמָה a wrathful man, Pr 15:18; אִישׁ דְםִים a man of blood, 2 S 16:7, Ps 5:7; cf. further, 1 S 16:18, 1 K 2:26, Is 53:3, Pr 19:6, 26:21, 29:1, Ezr 8:18; also אִשָּׁה מְרִינִים a contentious woman, Pr 27:15; in the plural, e.g. Gn 6:4 אֶנְשָׁי הַשְׂמָךְ the men of renown, famous; cf. Gn 47:6, Is 41:11,

³ In the almost entire absence of corresponding adjectives (אָרוֹן made of cedar, a denominative from רְזֵץ, and בָּחָשֶׁן brazen are the only examples), the language regularly has recourse to the above periphrasis. On the form *qāṭil*, as expressing an inherent property, cf. § 50 f; cf. also the proper name, בְּרִזְלִי ferreus.

Jb 34:8, 10 אָנֹשִׁי לְבֶב (men of understanding); with מַתִּי רֻעֵב (famished men; but read probably מַזִּי רֻעֵב weak with hunger); Ps 26:4, Jb 11:11, 22:15.

(b) Of בְּ עַל hairy, 2 K 1:8; &c.; cf. Gn 37:19; Na 1:2, Pr 1:17, 18:9 (a destroyer), 22:24, 23:2 (disposed to eat, greedy), 24:8; feminine בְּ עַל-אֲוֹב a woman that hath a soothsaying spirit, 1 S 28:7; cf. Na 3:4; in the plural, e.g. בְּ עַל-חָצִים archers, Gn 49:23, בְּ עַל-בְּרִית confederates, Gn 14:13; בְּ עַל-שְׁבּוּעָה sworn supporters, Neh 6:18.

(c) Of בָּן, &c.: בָּן-שָׁנָה yearling, 1 K 15:2; בָּן-חַיִל heir, Gn. 15:2; בָּן-מָתָתָה centum annos natus, Gn 21:5; worthy to die, 1 S 20:31 (Luther, 2 S 12:5 ein Kind des Todes); cf. Dt 25:2 worthy to be beaten. Feminine, e.g. בָּנִי a wicked woman, 1 S 1:16; frequently also and even simply בָּנִי בִ' בָּנִי בַ' בָּנִי בָּנִי בָּנִי like the Latin *scelus* for *scelestissimus*, 2 S 23:6, Jb 34:18. Plural masculine, e.g. בָּנִים children of rebellion, Nu 17:25. בָּן is used poetically of things without life, e.g. Is 5:1 בָּן a fat, i.e. a fruitful (hill); Jon 4:10 i.e. grown in a night; Jb 41:20 son of the bow (i.e. an arrow); so also בָּנִי רְשָׁפָה = sparks, Jb 5:7; La 3:13; Ec 12:4 the daughters of song, probably meaning the individual notes.

There is another use of בָּן or בָּנִי to denote membership of a guild or society (or of a tribe, or any definite class). Thus בָּנִי הָלָדִים Gn 6:2, 4, Jb 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 (cf. also בָּנִי אֱלֹהִים or בָּנִי אֱלֹהִים Gn 29:1, 89:7) properly means not sons of god(s), but beings of the class of אֱלֹהִים or אֱלֹהִים 1 K 20:35 (singular in Am 7:14) persons belonging to the guild of prophets; similarly בָּנִי קָרְבָּנִים Neh 3:8 one of the guild of apothecaries, cf. 3:31 where בָּנִי קָרְבָּנִים is to be read. Similarly בָּנִי שָׁלְשִׁים Gn 50:23 are most probably not great-grandsons but grandsons, i.e. those belonging to the third generation. Cf. also בָּנִי גַּגְגָן Nu 4:27 f. Gershonites, בָּנִי קָרְבָּנִים 2 Ch 20:19, &c., Kohathites; בָּנִי קָרְבָּנִים dwellers in the East.

3. Special mention must be made of the not infrequent idiom by which adjectives (sometimes also ordinals, see § 134 o) are added in the genitive, like substantives, rather than as attributes in the same state, gender, and number as the noun which they qualify; thus, Is 28:4 צִיצַת נְבָל the flower of that which fades, for which verse 1 has the fading flower; cf. further, Is 22:24, Jer 22:17 (?), 52:13, Ps 73:10, 74:15 (but אִימָן may be a substantive), 78:49; also the use of רַע as a substantive, e.g. in Pr 2:14 b, 6:24 (עַשְׂתָּה רַע), &c., analogous to the New Testament phrase ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας, Luke 16:8, and the French *un homme de bien*.¹—Finally, an adverb (treated as a substantive) may likewise be used as an epexegetical genitive; cf. קָרְבָּנִי חַמֵּם blood shed without cause, 1 K 2:31; Pr 24:28, 26:2; Ez 30:16 (יְוָמָם).

3. The epexegetical genitives include finally the numerous nearer definitions which follow the construct state of adjectives (and of active and passive participles, or verbal adjectives, cf. § 116 f-l). For, while the word of nearer definition is added to the verb in the accusative (e.g. אָתָה חַלָּה אֲתָה diseased in his feet, 1 K 15:23), it may, with participles and verbal adjectives, be either in the accusative (§ 116 f and k) or in the genitive, the case of a word depending on a noun. Such a genitive relation is usually termed an *improper annexion*. The nearer definition contains a statement

¹ On the other hand, in such passages as Is 36:2 (2 K 18:17), Zc 14:4, Ec 8:10, &c., there is no apparent reason why the Masora requires the construct state instead of the absolute; hence חַיל Is 36:2 and קִיא Zc 14:4 must be intended as forms of the absolute state, shortened in consequence of their close connexion.

either of the *material*, e.g. Ex 3:8, &c., אָרֶץ בְּתַחַת תְּלֵב וּקְבַשׁ a land flowing with milk and honey; or of the *means*, e.g. חִלּוּיִת רַב slain with the sword, Is 22:2; or the *cause*, Ct 2:5 sick of love; or of the *scope* of the attribute,¹ e.g. Gn 39:6 אֲרָרִית יִפְהַת fair of form; cf. Gn 41:2, 4, Ex 34:6, Is 1:4, Jer 32:19, Na 1:3, Ps 119:1, Jb 37:16; or of the *manner*, e.g. Ps 59:6 אֲנָזְבִּים בְּגַדְיוֹן a faithless ones of wickedness (wickedly faithless).

Especially frequent is the use of this genitive to name the part of the body described as being affected by some physical or mental condition, e.g. Ps 24:4 נְקִי בְּפִימָה clean as regards hands, &c.; 2 S 9:3, Is 6:5, Jb 17:9; Is 19:10 אֲגַמִּינָן פְּשָׁע grieved in soul; 1 S 1:10, Jb 3:20. Also such examples as Am 2:16, Pr 19:1, where a suffix is attached to the substantive, must be regarded as instances of the genitive construction, on the analogy of Pr 14:2, see § 116 k.

§ 129. Expression of the Genitive by Circumlocution.

Pesides the construction of a nomen rectum dependent upon a nomen regens in the construct state (§§ 89 and 128), the connexion of two nouns may also be effected otherwise, either by simply attaching the dependent noun by means of the preposition לְ, which, according to § 119 r, expresses, besides other ideas, like that of *belonging to*,² or by the addition of a relative clause (לְ? אֲשֶׁר, see h below).

1. The introduction of a genitive by לְ sometimes occurs even when the construction with the construct state would be equally possible, e.g. הַצְּפִים לְשָׁאוֹל the watchmen of Saul; Ps 37:16, 2 Ch 28:18 (where indeed the circumlocution makes the sense much plainer); as a rule, however, this use is restricted to the following cases:—

(a) To prevent a nomen regens being determined by a following determinate genitive, e.g. 1 S 16:18 בָּן יְהִישָׁוֹן a son of Jesse (בָּן יְהִישָׁוֹן would be, according to § 127 a, *the son of Jesse*); cf. Gn 14:18, 36:12, 41:12, Nu 16:22 (27¹⁶), 1 S 17:8, 2 S 19:21, Ps 122:5. Hence, regularly מְזֻמָּוֶר לְדָוִד (Ps 3:1, &c.) *a psalm of David* (properly belonging to David as the author), for which לְדָוִד of David is used alone elliptically in Ps 11:1, 14:1, &c. Such a case as לְזֹבֶד מְזֻמָּוֶר (Ps 24:1, &c.) is not to be regarded as a transposition, but מְזֻמָּוֶר is used epexegetically for the general term omitted before לְזֹבֶד (as it were, a poem of David, a psalm). Moreover, the introduction of the author, poet, &c., by this *Lamed auctoris* is the customary idiom also in the other Semitic dialects, especially in Arabic.

(b) When a genitive is to be made dependent on a nomen regens, which is itself composed of a nomen regens and rectum, and represents, as a compound, one united idea, e.g. Ru 2:3 עַזְנֵי שָׂדֵה בְּשָׂדֵה the portion of field belonging to Boaz (עַזְנֵי שָׂדֵה בְּשָׂדֵה would be the portion of the field of Boaz); 2 K 5:9 at the house-door of Elisha. This especially applies to the cases in which the compound regens represents a term in very common use, the fixed form of which

¹ Cf. the Latin *integer vitae scelerisque purus; tristes animi*, &c.

² Cf. the σχῆμα Κολοφώνιον in Greek, e.g. ἡ κεφαλὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων for τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Bernhardy's *Syntax*, p. 88). The Arab grammarians distinguish a twofold genitive, one of which may be resolved by לְ, and the other by נִגְעָן [see Wright's *Arabic Grammar*, vol. ii, § 75 ff.]. The *de* of the Romance languages is a development of the latter idea; the Gascon, however, says e.g. *la fille à Mr. N.*, laying stress upon the idea of *belonging to* and not that of *origin*, as in *la fille de ...* of the literary language.

cannot be altered, e.g. 1 K 14:19 **עַל־סֵפֶר דָּבְרֵי הַיּוֹם לְמִלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** *in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel; 15:23, &c.; cf. also Jos 19:51.*

(c) When for any other reason the construction with the nomen regens in the construct state is inadmissible; cf. e.g. Lv 18:20, where שָׁכְבָתָה, on account of the suffix, cannot be used in the construct state; but Lv 15:16 ff., &c., רַע; Ju 3:28 *the Jordan fords of Moab* (*גִּרְעֹן*) as a proper name cannot be used in the construct state); Ex 20:5 *upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hats me*; וְעַל־דְּבָרֶבֶעִים must be kept in the absolute state for the sake of conformity with לְעַלְישׁ, and for the same reason also לְאַלְפִים לְאַנְבֵּי, and for the same reason also לְאַלְפִים לְאַנְבֵּי.

(d) After statements of number in such cases as Gn 8:14 בְּשְׁבָעָה וְעַשְׂרִים יוֹם לְחַדְשָׁה *on the seven and twentieth day of the month*; cf. 7:11, 16:3 and frequently, or as in Hag 1:1 בְּשָׁנָת דָּרִיאוּרִי וְשָׁנָה יָם לְחַדְשָׁה *in the second year of Darius*; the numeral here is always one compound idea with the substantive numbered, and consequently (as in the examples under b) does not admit of being in the constr. st. with a genitive. The same naturally applies also to such examples as 1 K 3:18 בְּיּוֹם חַדְשָׁה לְיִצְחָק *on the third day of my giving birth* (i.e. after my giving birth). Cf. also the standing phrase שָׁנָה בְּאַחֲרַת לְחַדְשָׁה *on the first (day) of the month*, Gn 8:5 and frequently.

Rem. In cases like 2 S 3:2 *and his firstborn was Amnon* לְאַחֲרֵי עַם *of Ahinoam*, the genitive expressed by circumlocution with לְ is in reality dependent on a regens which is omitted (בָּן לְאַחֲרֵי עַם *a son of Ahinoam*); cf. 2 S 3:3, 5, 1 K 14:13, Am 5:3 (unless לְבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל עַם originally depended on *thus spake the Lord*), and the remarks on לְקַדְשׁ מִזְמֹר under c above.

2. The periphrastic expression of the genitive by means of אֲשֶׁר לְ is used principally to state the possessor, e.g. Gn 29:9 הַצָּאן אֲשֶׁר לְאָבִיכָה *her father's sheep* (prop. *the sheep which belonged to her father*); Gn 47:4 and frequently. So also (according to § 128 a) when a genitive depends on more than one substantive, e.g. Gn 40:5 *the butler and the baker who (belonged) to the king of Egypt* וְאַפָּה אֲלֵךְ מַצְבָּה would indicate only the baker as belonging to the king); or when a genitive (as in the examples under d above) is added to a compound, which expresses one united idea (Ru 4:3); or when, as a fixed term (e.g. a title), it appears always in the same form, e.g. Ct 1:1 שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁלָמָה *the Song of songs, of Solomon*; 1 S 21:8, 2 S 2:8, 1 Ch 11:10; cf. also Gn 41:43.¹

§ 130. Wider Use of the Construct State.

The construct state, which, according to § 89 a, primarily represents only the immediate government by one substantive of the following word (or combination of words), is frequently employed in rapid narrative as a connecting form, even apart from the genitive relation; so especially—

(1) Before prepositions,¹ particularly in elevated (prophetic or poetic) style, especially when the nomen regens is a participle. Thus before בְּקָצֵר *the joy in the harvest*, Is 9:2, 2 S 1:21, Ps 136:8f.; in participles, Is 5:11, 9:1, 19:8, Ps 84:7, and especially often when בְּ with a suffix follows the participle, e.g. Ps 2:12 כָּל־חֹזֶקְיָהוּ בְּ;

¹ ¹ In New Hebrew شָׁל (derived from שָׁל = אֲשֶׁר לְ = شָׁל, see § 36, and cf. Ct 1:6, 3:7, شָׁלִי, נְשָׁלִי) is used like the simple relative יִ, ְ in Aramaic, as an independent sign of the genitive.

¹ Cf. König, ‘Διε Υεβερωυχηερυνγ δες Στ.-χονστρ.-Γεβραυχης ιμ Σεμιτ.,’ ZDMG. 53, 521 ff.

Na 1:7, Jer 8:16 (Ps 24:1); Ps 64:9 (unless רַאֲהֶה should be read); 98:7.²—Before הַ, Ho 9:6 (but read probably מִתְמָדֵי כִּסְפֵּם); Ps 58:5 (before לֹמֶן); Pr 24:9, Jb 18:2, La 2:18 (before לְ); 1 Ch 6:55, 23:28; in participles, Ez 38:11, Jb 24:5; before הַ with an infinitive, Is 56:10, and again before הַ with a suffix, Gn 24:21, Is 30:18, 64:3;³—before אֶלְיָהּ, Is 14:19, Ez 21:17; —before אֶחָד (with), Is 8:6; —before מַן, Gn 3:22, Is 28:9 (a participle); Jer 23:23, Ez 13:2, Ho 7:5; —before עַלְיָהּ, Ju 5:10; —before בְּלֹתִי, Is 14:6; —before the *nota accus.* אֶת, Jer 33:22; —before a locative (which in such cases also serves as a genitive), Ex 27:13, Jer 1:15.

(2) Before *wāw*; *copulative*, e.g. Ez 26:10; but חַכְמָת גִּילָת Is 33:6, 35:2, and 51:21 may be cases of an intentional reversion to the old feminine ending *ath*, in order to avoid the hiatus (וְהַ).

(3) When it governs the (originally demonstrative) pronoun אֲשֶׁר; so especially in the combination אֶקְוֹם אֲשֶׁר, Gn 39:20, 40:3, *the place where* (prop. *of that in which*) Joseph was bound; cf. § 138 g; or בְּאֶקְוֹם אֲשֶׁר Lv 4:24, 33, 2 S 15:21, 1 K 21:19, Jer 22:12, Ez 21:35, Ho 2:1. We should expect בְּאֶקְוֹם אֲשֶׁר, as in Gn 35:13, &c., *at the place which ...*, cf. § 138; but אֲשֶׁר is treated as a nomen rectum instead of as an attribute. Cf. also מִיּוֹם א' יְמִינִי Lv 13:46, Nu 9:18.¹

(4) When it governs independent sentences (cf. § 155), which virtually stand to the construct state (as nomen regens) in a sort of genitive relation, e.g. Ex 4:13 בְּיַד־תְּשַׁלֵּחַ prop. *by the hand of him whom thou wilt send*; Nu 23:3 קָרְנִית חָנָה תָּוֹדֵעַ the matter of that which he shall show me, i.e. whatever he shall; Is 29:1 קָרְנִית דָּוֵד the city where David encamped; Jer 48:36, Ps 16:3 (if the text be right), 65:5 (Pr 8:32), Ps 81:6, Jb 18:21 the place of him that knoweth not God; Jb 29:16, La 1:14 (if the text be right) into the hands of those against whom I cannot stand.² In Gn 39:4 (כלִישָׁלוֹ) the כָּלִיל takes after it a noun-clause, and in Ex 9:4, still more boldly, a subst. with הַ.—Very often a *time-determination* governs the following sentence in this way; thus אֲזָרִי thus followed by a perfect, Lv 25:48, 1 S 5:9; בַּיּוֹם Ps 102:3 (before a noun-clause), Ex 6:28, Nu 3:1, Dt 4:15, 2 S 22:1, Ps 18:1, 59:17, 138:3 (in every case before a following perfect), Ps 56:10 (before an imperfect); מִיּוֹם followed by the perfect, Jer

² In Ju 8:11 the article is even used before a construct state followed by בְּ, in order to determine the whole combination שָׁכְנוּ בְּ אֲחָלִים tent-dwellers, taken as one word; cf., however, the remarks in § 127 f-i on similar grammatical solecisms.

³ These are to be distinguished from the cases where הַ follows a construct state, which in conjunction with מַן (and the following הַ) has become a sort of preposition or adverb of place; thus, we have מִבֵּית־לְ Ex 26:33 (for which in Ez 1:27 merely הַ) meaning simply within; מִיָּמִין הַ (2 K 23:13, Ez 10:3) on the right hand (i.e. south) of, לְמִזְפָּן (Jos 8:11, 13, &c., Ju 2:9) on the north of; cf. also Jos 15:21 and Neh 13:4.

¹ In Dt 23:5 the construct state governs a sentence introduced by the *conjunction על־דבר אֲשֶׁר* by reason of the fact that, i.e. because); so also in 1 S 3:13.

² Probably Gn 22:14 is also to be so explained (contrary to the accents), and certainly (contrary to the very unnatural division of the verses) 2 Ch 30:18, which should read on thus: הַמּוֹבֵד יְכִפֵּר בְּעַד כָּל־לְבָבוֹ הַכִּינֵּן the good Lord pardon every one that setteth his heart to seek God. [See Wickes' *Accontuation of the Twenty-one Prose Books of the Old Testament*, p. 140.]

36:2; Lv 14:46, 1 S 25:15, Jb 29:2 (*כִּי-מֵי הַיּוֹם as in the days when ...*³; cf. and *כִּי-מֵי* before a perfect, Ps 90:15); *בְּעֵת* before a perfect, Jer 6:15 (cf. 49:8, 50:31); before an imperfect, Jb 6:17; *בְּתָהֳלָת* before a perfect Ho 1:2.

(5) Connected with a following word in apposition; certainly so in such cases as *בְּתִינְוֹלָת בְּתִצְׁוֹן the virgin, the daughter of Zion*, Is 37:22; cf. 23:12, Jer 14:17; also 1 S 28:7 *אֲשֶׁר בְּעַלְתָּאָוב a woman, possessor of a soothsaying spirit*; cf. Dt 21:11.—Gn 14:10, Ju 19:22 (but read probably *אֲנָשִׁים* with Moore, as in Dt 13:14, Ju 20:13, 1 K 21:10); 2 K 10:6, 17:13 *Q'ré;* Jer 46:9, Ps 35:16 (?), 78:9, Jb 20:17 *b* (unless *בְּהַרְיִי* or *בְּהַלְיִי* be a gloss).

Rem. Some of the above passages may also be explained by supposing that there exists a real genitive relation towards the preceding construct state, which has been, as it were, provisionally left *in suspenso*, in consequence of the insertion of some interrupting word, e.g. Is 37:22, &c.; Jb 20:17 *a*. Elsewhere (Dt 33:19, Ps 68:34) the *nomen regens* probably governs the following construct state directly.⁴

(6) The numeral *אֶחָד one* for *זָהָר* in close connexion, and even with small disjunctives, e.g. Gn 3:22, 48:22, 1 S 9:3, 2 S 17:22, Is 27:12, Zc 11:7.

The character of these passages shows that the numeral here cannot be in the construct state, but is merely a rhythmical shortening of the usual (tone-lengthened) form.

§ 131. *Apposition.*

1. Apposition in the stricter sense is the collocation of two substantives in the same case in order to define more exactly (or to complete) the one by the other, and, as a rule (see, however, below, under g), the former by the latter. Apposition in Hebrew (as in the other Semitic languages¹) is by no means confined to those cases in which it is used in English or in the classical languages. It is not infrequently found when either the *subordination* of one substantive to the other or some more circumstantial kind of epexegetical addition would be expected.

2. The principal kinds of apposition in Hebrew are:—

(a) The collocation of *genus* and *species*, e.g. *אֱלֹנָה אֲשֶׁר a woman (who was) a widow*, 1 K 7:14; *בְּעֵרָה בְּתִינְוֹלָה a damsel (that is) a virgin*, Dt 22:23, 28, Ju 4:4, 19:1, 21:12, 1 S 30:17, 1 K 1:2; cf. Gn 13:8, 21:20 (where, however, *תְּקַשֵּׁה* is probably an explanatory gloss); Ex 24:5 (1 S 11:15), 2 S 15:16, 1 K 3:16, 5:29 (but probably *בְּלָי* should be read instead of *סְבִּיל*); Is 3:24 (unless *מִצְשָׁה* is to be read), Jer 20:1. Perhaps also *שָׁרָאֵן כַּהֲן the priest (who is) the chief man*, 2 K 25:18, &c.; others take *כַּהֲן* as

³ Cf. Na 2:9 *מֵי-מֵי הַיּוֹם*, usually explained to mean *from the days* that *she* hath been, but the text is evidently very corrupt.

⁴ So also Is 28:16 *a corner stone of the preciousness* (*קָרְבָּת* is a *substantive* not an *adjective*) of a *fixed foundation*, i.e. a precious corner stone of surest foundation.—In 2 S 20:19 the text is wholly corrupt; in Ps 119:128 read *כָּלְפָקָוְךָ*.

¹ On certain uses of apposition peculiar to the Semitic languages, cf. the exhaustive discussion by Fleischer, ‘Ueber einige Arten der Nominalapposition im Arab.’ (*Kleine Schriften*, ii. 16); [and see also Driver, *Tenses*, Appendix IV.]

constr, st.—In 2 S 10:7 read **כָּל־צְבָא הַגֵּב'** with the LXX, as in the parallel passage 1 Ch 19:9 for **כָּל־צְבָא הָגִי**, which is evidently meant to refer to the reading in 2 S.

(b) Collocation of the *person* or *thing* and the *attribute*, e.g. Jb 20:29 (27¹³) **הַזֶּה כִּי לְקָדְעָם רֹשֶׁעָ** *this is the portion of a man, (who is) a wicked man* (but **רֹשֶׁעָ** might also be an adj.).; cf. Pr 6:12.—Lv 6:13, 16:4 (where, however, **קְשָׁ** is probably a gloss); Pr 22:21 **אֱמָרִים אֲמָתָה** *words (which are) truth; (immediately after אֲמָתָה אֱמָרִי)* cf. 1 S 2:13, Mi 1:11 (where, however, **בְּשָׁתָה** is most probably a gloss on **עֲרִיה**); Zc 1:13 (=comfortable words); Ps 45:5 (?) 68:17 (cf. verse 16). In a wider sense this includes also such cases as Ps 60:5 (?) 68:17 (*wine* which is *staggering* (intoxicating drink), which causes staggering²; 1 K 22:27, 2 Ch 18:26 **מִים לְחַזְמָן** (in Is 30:20 parallel with **לְחַם צָרָ**) *water which is affliction, drunk in trouble (imprisonment)*. Still more boldly, 1 K 5:3 **בָּקָר רָעֵי** *oxen* which were taken out of the *pastures*, and 1 K 6:7 *undressed stones* which come from the *quarry*, probably a corruption of **מַטְפָּעָ**. A person and a condition are in apposition in Ez 18:6 (unless **בְּנֵתָה** is to be read).—In 1 S 4:1 read **אֲבָן הַעֲ**, as in 5:1, 7:12.

(c) Collocation of the *person* (Dt 28:36) or *thing* (form) and *material*,¹ or of the *place* or *measure* and its *contents*, e.g. 1 Ch 15:19 **בְּנֵת בְּמִצְלָת יְמִין** *with cymbals* which were *brass*, i.e. of brass; cf. Ex 26:25, Dn 11:8, 1 Ch 28:15, 18 (?); Ex 28:17 *four rows*, namely *stones* (for which 39:10 has **טוֹרִי**); cf. 2 Ch 4:13, Lv 6:3 (see, however, § 128 d); 2 K 7:1 **סְלָתָה סְלָתָה** *a seah of fine flour*; cf. 2 K 7:6, 18, Gn 18:6, Ex 16:33, Lv 5:11, Ru 2:17, 1 K 16:24, 2 K 5:23 **כְּפָר יְמִין** *two talents of silver*;² cf. 5:17, Ex 39:17, Ez 22:18 (if the text be right). With the *material* placed before the *measure*, Ex 30:23 f.—A *period of time* and its contents are placed in apposition **דְּשָׁנִים** *a month of days*, i.e. a month's time=for a whole month, Gn 29:14, Nu 11:20, 21, cf. Dt 21:13, 2 K 15:13, and **שְׁנָתִים יְמִינִים** *two years' time*, i.e. two full years, Gn 41:1, 2 S 13:23, 14:28, Jer 28:3, 11, Dn 10:2f..

Finally, under this head may be included all the cases in which a numeral (regarded as a substantive) is followed by the object numbered in apposition, e.g. **שְׁלִשָּׁה בְּנִים** *triad sc. filii*, § 97 a and § 134 b.

(d) Collocation of the *thing* and the *measure* or *extent, number, &c.*, e.g. Nu 9:20 **יְמִינִים מִסְפָּר** *days, (a small) number*, i.e. only a few days; **כְּסָף מִשְׁנָה** *money, repetition*, i.e.

² Unless it is to be translated *thou gavest us intoxication to drink as wine* (and so in 1 K 22:27 *give him affliction to eat as bread, &c.*); cf. Ps 80:6 and the analogous examples of apposition in the form of a second accusative in § 117 kk. Moreover, having regard to **יְמִין** *spiced wine*, Ct 8:2, and **עֵדָה עֵדָה** *a wild ass's colt*, Jb 11:12 (in which passages **יְמִין** and **עֵדָה** must certainly be in the construct state) we cannot but ask whether the Masora does not intend the **יְמִין** in Ps 60:5 to be taken as construct state (for which elsewhere **יְמִינִים**).

¹ Cf. also the examples treated above in § 127 h.

² On the anomalous form **כְּפָר יְמִין** (instead of **כְּפָר יְמִינִים**; cf. immediately before), see § 88 b.

twice as much money, Gn 43:12 (unless מַעַם be constr. st.); מַיְם בָּרֶךְ יִם water which was of the measure of the knees, which reached to the knees, Ez 47:4 (also מַיְם מִתְּחַנֵּן יִם water that was to the loins, in the same verse). This likewise includes the cases in which a noun is followed in apposition by a numeral (see § 134 c) or an adverb, originally conceived as a substantive, e.g. Neh 2:12 אֲנָשִׁים מְעֻטִים men, a few, i.e. some few men; 1 K 5:9 הַרְבָּה הַרְבָּה understanding, much-making, i.e. much understanding, unless הַרְבָּה is to be taken as an adverb with יִצְחַק, as in 2 S 8:8 with לְקֹדֶשׁ.

(e) Collocation of the *thing* and its *name*, e.g. בָּהּ בָּרֶם שְׂעִיר in their mountainous district, Seir (perhaps only a later gloss), Gn 14:6; כְּנָעָן רַזְקָעָן the land Canaan (probably only a later gloss), Nu 34:2; cf. Ezr 9:1, 1 Ch 5:9 (see under g below).—For examples of nouns in the construct state before a noun in apposition, see § 130 e.

Rem. 1. Only in certain combinations does the noun of nearer definition come first, e.g. קְדוּמָה הַמֶּלֶךְ king David, king Solomon (less frequently הַמֶּלֶךְ לְקֹדֶשׁ מֶלֶךְ as in 2 S 13:39, 1 K 2:17, 12:2, 2 K 8:29, 9:15, and in late Hebrew, Hag 1:1, 15 [cf. the Aramaic order דָרְיוֹשׁ מֶלֶכְא], and often in Chron.).—A chiasmus occurs in Is 45:4, the name standing after the defining noun in the first part of the verse, and before it in the parallel clause.

2. When the *nota accusativi* (אתֶת, אֶתֶת) or a preposition precedes the first substantive, it may be repeated before the noun in apposition, e.g. Gn 4:2, 22:2, 24:4, 47:29, Is 66:21; this usually occurs when the nearer definition precedes a *proper name*. As a rule, however, the repetition does not take place (Dt 18:1, Jer 33:18, 1 S 2:14). A noun in apposition is made determinate, even after a noun with a prefix, in the ordinary way, e.g. 2 Ch 12:13 בֵּירוֹשָׁלָם הַעֲרָבָה in Jerusalem, the city which, &c.¹

3. Sometimes a second adjective is used in apposition to a preceding adjective, in order to modify in some way the meaning of the first, e.g. Lv 13:19 בָּהּ בָּתּוֹת לְבָנָה אֲדָמָה מְתָה a white-reddish (light red) bright spot.

4. *Permutation* is to be regarded as a variety of apposition. It is not complementary like apposition proper (see a above), but rather *defines* the preceding substantive (or pronoun, see below), in order to prevent any possible misunderstanding. This includes cases like Gn 9:4 with the life thereof (which is) the blood thereof; Ex 22:30, Dt 2:26, 1 S 7:9, 2 K 3:4 an hundred thousand rams, the wool, i.e. the wool of the rams; Jer 25:15 this cup of the wine, that is of fury (but הַהְמָה is probably a gloss); Is 42:25 he poured upon him fury, namely his anger;² but especially the examples in which such a permutative is added to a preceding pronoun, viz.—

(a) To a separate pronoun, e.g. Ex 7:11; with regard to the vocative, cf. § 126 f.

(b) To an accusative suffix, e.g. Ex 2:6 she saw him, the child (unless אתֶת be a later gloss); Ex 35:5, Lv 13^{57 b}, 1 K 19:21 (where, indeed, הַבָּשָׂר appears to be a late gloss); 21:13, 2

¹ In 1 K 11:8 participles after לְכָלְנָשָׁיו, as in 2 K 10:6 after לְכָלְנָשָׁיו, in 19:2 after a determinate accusative, and in Hag 1:4 after בָּבּוֹ, תִּיכְמַם, are used without the article; these, however, are probably to be explained not as in apposition, but according to § 118 p.

² But מְבָלָם Gn 6:17 (cf. 7:6) is to be regarded as a later gloss upon the archaic מְבָלָל.

K 16:15 *K^eth.*, Jer 9:14, 31:2, Ez 3:21, Ec 2:21 (according to Delitzsch rather a double accusative).³

(c) To a noun-suffix, e.g. Ez 10:3 בְּ אֵת הָאִישׁ when he went in, the man; 42:14; cf. Pr 13:4 (?), Ez 3:12; so also after a preposition with suffix, e.g. Ec 4:10 אֵי לֹא אֶחֱזַק woe to him, the one alone; with a repetition of the preposition, Nu 32:33, Jos 1:2 לְבָנָם יִשְׂרָאֵל to them, to the children of Israel; Ju 21:7, Jer 51:56, Ez 42:5 (?), Dn 11:11, 1 Ch 4:42, 2 Ch 26:14.¹—Cf. finally, Ct 3:7, where the suffix precedes the genitive peripherastically expressed by 'לְשָׁ, as in Ez 9:1, where the genitive is expressed by 'לְ.²

Of a different kind are the cases in which the permutative with its proper suffix follows as a kind of correction of the preceding suffix, e.g. Is 29:23 when he (or rather) his children see, &c. (but יְלִכְיוּ is clearly a gloss); cf. Ps 83:12; in Jb 29:3 read בְּהַלְלוּ בָּ (infin. Hiph.) or at least its syncopated form בַּהֲלֹו.

5. Cases of apposition in a *wider sense* are those in which the nearer definition added to the noun was originally regarded as an *adverbial accusative*; on its use with the verb and on the relative correctness of speaking of such an accusative in Hebrew, cf. § 118 a and m. Owing to the lack of case-endings, indeed, it is in many instances only by analogies elsewhere (especially in Arabic) that we can decide whether the case is one of apposition in the narrower or in the wider sense; in other instances this must remain quite uncertain. However, the following are probably cases of apposition in the wider sense:—

(a) Such phrases as שְׁנָה כְּ מִשְׁנָה a double amount in money, Gn 43:15; cf. Jer 17:18; 1 S 17:5 five thousand shekels in brass, but this might also be taken (as in d) shekels which were brass; certainly such cases as Jb 15¹⁰ older than thy father in days, and the expression of the superlative by means of אַגְּ (originally a substantive), e.g. טֹוב אַגְּ very good, Gn 1:31 (cf. also Ec 7:16 צָדִיק כָּרְבָה נָאָר righteous over much), and the very frequent הַרְבָּה נָאָר prop. a much-making exceedingly great, i.e. exceedingly great, Gn 15:1, 41:49, also Pr 23:29 פְּצֻעִים חַנְמָם wounds without cause,³ perhaps also Gn 34:25 (חַנְמָם).

(b) A few examples, in which an epexegetical substantive is added to a substantive with a suffix; thus, Ez 16:27 מִזְרָכֶךָ זֹאת of thy conduct in lewdness (but it is also possible to explain it (as in c) of thy conduct, which is lewdness); cf. Ez 24:13, 2 S 22:33 עַזְעִיר יְלִיל my fortress in strength, i.e. my strong fortress (cf., however, Ps 18:33); Hb 3:8, Ps 71:7. While even in these examples the deviation from the ordinary usage of the language (cf. § 135 n) is strange, it is much more so in Ez 18:7, i.e. according to the context his pledge for a debt; Ezr 2:62 כְּתָבָם הַמְתִין חַשְׁבִּים their register, namely of those that were reckoned by genealogy (but

³ For יְשַׁנְנָה' 1 S 21:14 either 'is to be read or the *K^ethi*□bh is to be explained according to § 75 b, note. Also יְלַבְנָנוּ Pr 5:22 has hardly preserved the correct form.

¹ But in Is 17:6 we should certainly divide the words differently and read בְּסֻעַפִי אֶלְעָזֶר in Jer 48:44 read אֶלְעָזֶר for אֶלְעָזֶר הַשְׁמָרָה, and in Pr 14:13 אֶלְעָזֶר, הַפְּרִיה, אֶלְעָזֶר is a late gloss upon לֹו, and in Ez 41:25 אֶלְעָזֶר חַיָּה a gloss on אֶלְעָזֶר חַלְחוֹת הַיּוֹבֵל.

² Some of the examples given above are textually (or exegetically) doubtful, whilst in the case of others, especially those from the later Books, we cannot help asking whether such a prolepsis of the genitive by means of a suffix (as e.g. Ez 10:3) is not due to the influence of Aramaic, in which it is the customary idiom; cf. Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aram.*, § 81 e and § 88.

³ In Ps 69:5 חַבְמָם (like קָרְשָׁ in a false way, falsely, Ps 35:19 and 38:20) is used as an *adverbial accusative* with a participle; cf. § 118 q.

perhaps הַמְתִּין is in apposition to the suffix in בְּתֻבָם (כְּתֻבָם), also the curious combinations (mentioned in § 128 d) of בָּרִיתִי with a proper name ([Lv 26:42](#)), and in [Jer 33:20](#) with הַיּוֹם.⁴

6. In [Dt 33:4](#) מָרוֹן לְקֹהֶלֶת (מָרוֹן, perhaps is to be read), [33:27](#) מָעֵן (מָעֵן), [Ju 7:8](#) (אֶצְבָּה), the absolute state appears to be used instead of the construct to govern a following logical genitive; this, however, cannot be explained either as a special kind of apposition, or (with Hitzig) as a peculiarity of the dialect of Northern Palestine, but is merely a textual corruption. On the other hand, in [Jb 31:11](#) שׁוֹן is evidently intended to combine the readings שׁוֹן פְּלִילִים and שׁוֹן פְּלִילִי (as in verse 28).—The remarkable combination אֶל־הָיִם צְבָאוֹת in [Ps 80:8](#), 15 is due to the fact that in §§ 42–83 אֶל־הָיִם has almost throughout been subsequently substituted by some redactor for the divine name יהוה; on יהוה צְבָאוֹת cf. § 125 h. In [Ps 59:6](#), [80:5](#), [20](#), and [84:9](#) יהוה אֶל־הָיִם צְבָאוֹת¹ has been reinstated in the text before [§ 125 h](#).

7. Lastly, the nearer definition (qualification) of a noun may be effected by means of a preposition (either with a suffix or with an independent noun), but must then be distinguished from the cases in which the preposition is dependent on a verb or verbal idea, e.g. [Gn 3:6](#) and she gave also לְאִישָׁה עַזְתָּה unto her husband with her (= her husband who was with her); in [Gn 9:16](#) (that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh) and other places, the qualification of the noun is itself also qualified.

§ 132. Connexion of the Substantive with the Adjective.²

1. The adjective (like the participle used adjectivally), which serves as an *attribute* of a substantive, stands *after* the substantive, and agrees with it in *gender* and *number*, e.g. אֶנְיַשׁ גָּדוֹל a great man, אֶנְשָׁה יְפָה a beautiful woman. If the substantive is immediately connected with a genitive, the attribute follows the latter, since, according to § 89 and § 128 a, the construct state and the genitive belonging to it are inseparably united, e.g. [Est 8:15](#) רְתָה גָּדוֹלָה עַט a great crown of gold.—On the attribute when attached to a *determinate* substantive, see above, § 126 u.

Rem. 1. Where an adjectival attribute appears to stand *before* its substantive (according to the usual explanation, for the sake of special emphasis) the relation is really appositional in

4⁴ But in [Nu 25:12](#) שְׁלָוָם may also be explained, according to c, as really in apposition. Cf. on the whole question Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, 4th ed., p. 203, note 1.

1¹ Without this assumption it would be inconceivable that יהוה אֶל־הָיִם צְבָאוֹת should not have been written; that the anther of these Psalms regarded תָּהָת already as an independent name of God (so Gesenius and Olshausen) is out of the question.

2² On the expression of attributive ideas by substantives, cf. above, § 127 h, and § 128 o, with the note; § 135 n and § 141 c (substantives for adjectives as predicates of noun-clauses) and § 152 u (periphrases for negative qualities). On the use of the feminine of adjectives (and participles) to express abstract ideas, see § 122 q. It remains to mention further the employment (mostly only in poetry) of certain epithets in place of the substantives to which the quality in question belongs; e.g. אֲבִיר the strong one, i.e. God; אֲבִיר the strong one, i.e. the bull (in [Jer 8:16](#), &c., the horse); קָל swift=the runner (of the horse, [Is 30:16](#)); לְבָנָה alba, i.e. luna; פְּרִיה fructifera a fruitful tree, [Is 17:6](#) (so תְּהִת פ Gn 49:22); צְבָבָה a croucher, i.e. a crouching beast of prey, [Gn 4:7](#). Cf. also רְגִזָּה (gravis, augustus) and נְשִׂיאָה (elatus ?), i.e. a prince. The use of adjectives and participles for substantives is much more extensive in Arabic. In Greek and Latin poetical language cf. such examples as θάλασσα = the sea; merum for vinum, &c.

character; thus, **Is 10:30** עֲנֵיתָ עַנְתֹּה *O thou poor one, Anathoth!* (but probably עֲנֵיתָ יְהִי *answer her*, is to be read); cf. 23:12, 53:11 (*a righteous man, my servant*; but in 28:21 זֶר and בָּכָרִי *are predicates preceding the substantives*); **Jer 3:6, 10 f., Ps 18:4** *him who is worthy to be praised will I call upon the Lord; 92:12* (apposition after participles).—But **רַבָּות** and **רַבָּים**, many, are sometimes placed, like numerals, before the substantive, **Jer 16:16, Neh 9:28** (in **Ps 145:7** is a *subst. regens*, in **89:51** the text is corrupt); an appositional relation can scarcely be intended in these instances.

2. In a few expressions (mostly poetic) the adjective appears not as an attribute *after* the substantive, but in the construct state governing it; so in the singular, **Ex 15:16** (unless גַּל should be read); **1 S 16:7** (*the height of his stature*); in the plural, **1 S 17:40** חֲלָקִי אָגְנִים *smooth ones of (among) stones*, i.e. *smooth stones*; **Is 35:9, Ez 7:24, Ps 46:5**, and with a following collective instead of a plural, e.g. **Is 29:19** אַבְיוֹנִי אַךְם *the poor among men*, i.e. *poor men*; **Jer 49:20, Zc 11:7**; cf. in Latin *canum degeneres*. However, in almost all these cases the adjective which is made into a *regens* is strongly emphatic, and is frequently equivalent to a superlative (see below, § 133 g).

3. When *two* adjectives follow a feminine, sometimes only that standing next to the noun takes the feminine termination, e.g. **1 K 19:11** רֹוחַ נָדָק וְגַוִּי (but read נָדוֹל); **1 S 15:9** (but cf. § 75 y); **Jer 20:9, Ps 63:2**. A similar dislike of the feminine form may also be observed in the case of verbal predicates referring to feminine subjects, cf. § 145 p and t.

When an attribute qualifies several substantives of different genders, it agrees with the masculine, as being the *prior gender* (cf. § 146 d), e.g. **Neh 9:13** חֲקִים וּמְצֻחָתִים טוֹבִים; **Jer 34:9, Zc 8:5**.

When *three* attributes follow a substantive, the first two may stand without a conjunction, and the last be attached by *wāw copulative*, cf. **Zc 1:8**.

4. After feminines plural ending in יַם (§ 87 p) the adjectival attribute (in accordance with the fundamental rule stated above, under a) takes the ending תִּי, e.g. **Is 10:14** בִּיצִים עָזְבוֹת *forsaken eggs*; **Gn 32:16**. For a strange exception see **Jer 29:17** (differently in 24:2).

5. With regard to *number* it is to be remarked that—

(a) Substantives in the *dual* are followed by adjectives (or participles) in the *plural*, e.g. **Ps 18:28 (Pr 6:17)** עֵינֵינוּ יְמֹנוֹת *haughty eyes*; **Is 35:3, Jb 4:3 f.**, cf. § 88 a.

(b) *Collective ideas* are not infrequently joined with the *plural* of the adjective or participle (*constructio ad sensum*); thus, e.g. אָן זֶבַח sheep [with *fem. plur.*], **Gn 30:43, 1 S 25:18**; עַם=men, **1 S 13:15, Is 9:1**; כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל=all the Israelites, **1 S 2:14**; פָּלָלוֹת=the exiles, **Jer 28:4**; cf. also בְּנֵי פָּשָׁע two souls, **Gn 46:27**.¹ Cf. similar phenomena in the connexion of collectives with plural predicates in § 145 c.

(c) The *pluralis excellentiae* or *pluralis maiestatis* is joined, as a rule, to the singular of the attribute, e.g. **Ps 7:10** אֶל־הַיּוֹם צְדִיקָה; **2 K 19:4, 16** (=Is 37:4, 17); **Is 19:4**; but cf. אֶל־חַיִם חַיִם²

¹ But it is impossible to take קָמִימָם in Ez 46:6 as an attribute of בָּקָר; probably it is a correction intended to harmonize the passage with Nu 28:11 where *two young bullocks* are required.

² Cf. 1 S 28:13, where אֶל־הַיּוֹם (in the sense of *a spirit*) is followed by עַל־לִים as a second accusative; conversely in 1 S 19:13, 16, a singular suffix refers back to תְּרַפְּיִם.

Dt 5:23, 1 S 17:26, 36, Jer 10:10, 23:36, perhaps also Ex 20:3 = *another god*, and Jos 24:19 (but cf. above, § 124 g–k). On the other hand, 1 S 4:8 is to be explained as having been said by the Philistines, who supposed that the Israelites had several gods. On the connexion of **אֵלֶּה** with a plural predicate, see § 145 i.

2. On the adjective (in the construct state) governing a following genitive, see § 128 x; for the participle in the same construction, see § 116 f–l.

§ 133. The Comparison of Adjectives. (Periphrastic Expression of the Comparative and Superlative.)

A. Wünsche, ‘Der Komparativ im Hebr. im Lichte der arab. Gramm.,’ in *Vierteljahrsschrift für Bibelkunde*, 1904, p. 398 ff.

1. Hebrew possesses no special forms either for the comparative or superlative of the adjective.¹ In order to express a comparative, the person or thing which is to be represented as excelled in some particular quality is attached to the attributive word by the preposition **מִן** (מִן), e.g. 1 S 9:2 **בָּבָה מְפַלְּדָעָם** *higher than any of the people*. The fundamental idea evidently is, *tall away from all the people* (beyond all the people); cf. Ju 14:18 **מַה־אֲמֹתָק טַקְבֵּשׁ וּמַה עַזְּ אָרֵי** *what is sweeter than honey? and what is stronger than a lion?* Ez 28:3, Am 6:2 Frequently an infinitive appears as the object of the comparison, e.g. Gn 29:19 *it is better that I give her to thee, than that I should give her, &c.*; Ex 14:12, Ps 118:8f.²

Rem. 1. This use of **מִן** is also very common when the attributive idea is represented by an intransitive verb, e.g. 1 S 10:23 **וַיַּגְבֵּה מְפַלְּדָעָם** *and he was higher than any of the people*; Na 3:8. Jb 7:6. Elsewhere, especially after transitive verbs, **מִן** rather represents (on its different senses see § 119 v–z) the idea of a *separation, distinction* or *superiority* of one person or thing *from* or *over* others.¹ This is evident in such cases as **בְּחֵר מִן** *to choose something (to prefer it) before something else*, e.g. Jb 7:15, cf. Dt 14:2 (also **מִן ... יְהִרְוֹן** *the excellence of ...*)

household god (but not so in Gn 31:34), as in Ps 46:4 to the plural of amplification **יְמִימִים** *sea*. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether **רַבָּה** *much* Ps 78:15 is to be regarded as an attribute of **הָמֹתָה** and not rather as the adverb, *abundantly*.

1¹ There is in Arabic a special form of the adjective (the *elative*) for the comparative and superlative, which in Hebrew would have the form **לְאַקְזָן**. Instances of it, perhaps, are **אַקְזָר** *daring, cruel*, **אַקְזָב** *deceptive* (of a brook drying up), and its opposite **אַיְתָן** (contracted from *'aitan*) *constantly flowing, perennis*. These forms are, however, used without any perceptible emphasis, and cannot be regarded as more than isolated relics of an elative formation which has become obsolete, much as the Latin comparative disappears in Italian, and still more so in French, and is supplanted by the circumlocution with *più, plus*.

2² In Ju 11:25 the adjective is specially intensified by repetition, *art thou so much better than Balak?* It would also be possible, however, to translate *art thou really better ...?*

1¹ Cf. the Latin ablative with the comparative; also the etymology of such words as *eximus, egregius*, and the Homeric **ἐκ πάντων μάλιστα**, Il. 4, 96; **ἐκ πασέρων**, 18, 431.

over ..., Ec 2:13); it is also seen in examples like Gn 37:3 *now* וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל אֶחָד אֲתִי יוֹסֵף מִכֶּל־בְּנֵיו now Israel loved Joseph more than all his (other) children; 29:30, 1 S 2:29, Ho 6:6.²

2. A somewhat different idea underlies the use of מֵן after adjectives, or intransitive verbs possessing an attributive sense, when the thought to be expressed is that the quality is *too little* or *too much* in force for the attainment of a particular aim or object, e.g. Is 7:13 *הַמְּעֻט מִכֶּם* is it a small thing (i.e. too little) for you to ...? Jb 15:11; after an intransitive verb, e.g. Gn 32:11 *I am too insignificant* (קַטָּן) *for all the mercies* (I am not worthy of ...), &c.; cf. also the expressions מֵן־כַּכְד to be too heavy for one, Ex 18:18, Nu 11:14, Ps 38:5; קַשְׁתָּה מֵן־ to be too hard for one, Dt 1:17; מֵן־עֲצָם to be too few for something, Ex 12:4; גַּבֵּר מֵן־ to be too strong for one, Ps 65:4; עָצָם מֵן־ to be too mighty for one, Gn 26:16; רָום מֵן־ to be too high for one, Ps 61:3; אַרְגָּן־ קַצְּרָה מֵן־ to be too narrow for one, Is 49:19; קַצְּרָה מֵן־ to be too short for something, Is 50:2, and very frequently אַרְגָּן־ בָּפְלָא מֵן־ to be too wonderful for one (and, consequently, inconceivable or unattainable), Gn 18:14, Dt 17:8, 30:11, Jer 37:17, Pr 30:18; in Ps 139:6 קְלִילָה מֵן־ in the same sense is followed by מֵן.—This use is especially seen in the numerous instances in which the attribute is followed by מֵן with an infinitive e.g. 1 K 8:64 *the brazen altar ... was too little to receive* (to be able to receive) *the burnt offering*, cf. Gn 4:13, 36:7 *too great for them to dwell together*; after verbs, e.g. Ex 12:4, Is 28:20, Ps 40:6. Finally, cf. רב לְכָם מֵן־, followed by the infinitive, *it is enough* (prop. *too much*) for you to ..., meaning *ye have ... long enough*, 1 K 12:28; cf. Ex 9:28 and Ez 44:6 (מֵן followed by a substantive).³

In all these instances מֵן expresses either the *removal* of a thing *from* a person, or the *severance* of the person from some aim or object; cf. also the expression לֹא־יִכְּרַר מֵהֶם כִּי וְגוּ' *nothing will be unattainable for them* (prop. there shall not be cut off from them anything which, &c.), (Gn 11:6, Jb 42:3).

3. The attributive idea, on which מֵן logically depends, must sometimes, in consequence of a pregnant use of the מֵן (see the analogous examples in § 119 ff), be supplied from the context, e.g. Is 10:10 *וְפָטַל לִיהֶם מִירִישֵׁל יִם* whose graven images were more numerous than those at Jerusalem, &c.;⁴ Mi 7:4 *worse than a thorn hedge*; Ps 62:10 *lighter than a breath*; Jb 11:17 *clearer than the noonday*; Ec 4:17 *better than*, &c.

2. The correlative comparatives *greater—less* (*older—younger*) are expressed by the simple adjective with the article (*the great*, equivalent to *the greater*, &c.); Gn 1:16, 19:31, 34, 27:15, 29:16, 18, 26.

3. To express the *superlative* it is also sufficient (see above, f) to make the adjective determinate, either by means of the article or a following partitive genitive (or suffix); in this case the article or genitive indicates that the attribute in question belongs especially to one or more definite individuals;¹ e. g. 1 S 9:21 הַצְּעִירָה *the least*; 16:11 הַזָּקָן *the little one*, i.e. the youngest of eight sons; 17:14 David was הַקָּדוֹשׁ *the*

2² On the other hand, the phrase אֲזַק מֵנוּ expresses not a comparison, but only a relation existing between one person and another; thus, in Gn 38:26 נִזְקָה מִנְּךָ אַזְקָה מִנְּךָ means, *she is in the right as against me*; cf. Ps 139:12, Jb 4:17, 32:2.—In Pr 17:12 *rather (to meet with so and so) than ...* is expressed by וְאַל־ before the second member.

3³ Cf. also 2 K 4:3, where the idea of *doing something too little* is paraphrased by the Hiph. טַמְעַנְתָּה = *do not too little*, sc. לְאַשְׁלִין *in borrowing empty vessels*.

4⁴ With this *comparatio decurtata*, cf. the still bolder pregnant construction in Ps 4:8, תְּעֵדָה *greater gladness than at the time*, &c.

1¹ Cf. also עַלְיוֹן *the one above*, i.e. *the Most High*.

youngest, and the three great, i.e. elder, &c.; Gn 42:13, 44:2, Ct 1:8.—So also with a qualifying adjective, e. g. Gn 9:24 בָּנֶו הַקְטָן his youngest son; cf. Jos 14:15; also with a following genitive, 2 Ch 21:17 בָּנֵי קְטָן the youngest of his sons: Pr 30:24 *the least upon the earth*; with suffix, Mi 7:4 טוֹבָם their good one, i.e. the best of them; Jan 3:5 מְאֻדוֹלָם וְעַד־קְטָמָם from the greatest of them even to the least of them; cf. the inverse order in Jer 6:13, 31:34.

Rem. 1. The above examples apply only to the most common *relative* attributes (*great, small, good*), and to expressions which by usage easily came to be recognized as periphrases for the superlative. Other adjectives, however, when followed by a partitive genitive, also acquire the sense of a superlative; this appears from the context, e. g. Dt 33:19 *the most hidden treasures of the sand*; Ju 5:29 *the wisest amongst her ladies*; Is 14:30, 19:11, 23:8 f., 29:19, Jer 49:20, Ez 28:7, Zc 11:7, Ps 45:13, Jb 30:6 (*in the most horrible of valleys*), 41:22; probably also Ps 35:16. On this government by the adjective generally, cf. § 132 c.— Moreover, the combination of a substantive in the construct state with an adjective used substantively (§ 128 w) sometimes serves as a periphrasis for the superlative, e. g. Is 22:24 כָּל־כָּלִי הַקְטָן all the smallest vessels. On Ct 7:10 see § 126 x.

2. Other periphrases for the superlative are the use of a substantive in the construct state before the plural of the same word (which is naturally to be regarded as a partitive genitive; cf. our *book of books*), e. g. Ex 26:33 קָרְשִׁים the most holy place; שִׁיר הַשְׂרִירִים (Ct 1:1) the most excellent song; cf. Gn 9:25 (= servus servorum, the lowest servant); Nu 3:32, Dt 10:17 (Ps 136:2, 3)²; 1 K 8:27, Is 34:10 (cf. Gal 1:5, Rev 22:5); Jer 3:19, Ez 16:7, 26:7 (*king of kings*, of Nebuchadrezzar; cf. 1 Tim 6:15, Rev 17:14, 19:16, and another kind of periphrasis in Ps 95:3); Ec 1:2. Similarly in Jer 6:28 two participles are combined, and in Ho 10:15 two substantives in the singular. Finally, the same object is attained by connecting one substantive in the construct state with another of the same stem (שְׁבַת שְׁבָתוֹן a sabbath of solemn rest, i.e. an obligatory day of rest, Ex 31:15, &c.) or of the same meaning (e. g. חַשְׁךְ אֲפָלָה a thick darkness, Ex 10:22).

3. The intensification of attributes by means of repetition belongs rather to rhetoric than to syntax, e. g. Ec 7:24 קָמַע מָקָם exceeding deep; 1 S 2:3, Pr 20:14; the adjective is even used three times in Is 6:3.—Cf. the repetition of adverbs for the same purpose in Gn 7:19, Nu 14:7 (רַא אָמַר exceeding, also בָּאָמַר Ex 1:7, &c.); Ez 42:15.—On the other hand, in Dt 28:43 the repetition expresses a continuous progress, *higher and higher ... lower and lower*; in Dt 2:27 (see § 123 e) and 16:20 (*nothing but justice*) the constancy of the action. Cf. Ex 23:30 טַעַמְתָּ טַעַמְתָּ little by little, very gradually.¹

The repetition of substantives serves also as a periphrasis for the superlative in such cases as רַדְרַדְרַד (Ex 3:15) = *to the remotest generations*; cf. 17:16, Jer 6:14, 8:11 (*perfect peace*); Ez 21:32 (הַהַהַה three times);² 35:7, Na 1:2; cf. also Ho 2:21 f. and the emphatic combination of synonymous verbs in Is 33:10. Sometimes the completeness of an action or state is expressed by placing together two or even three substantives of the same stem and of similar sound, cf. Is 22:5, Ez 6:14 (33^{28 f.}, 35:3); 32:15, Na 2:11, Zp 1:15 (Jb 30:3, 38:27).

² ² God 1of gods, and Lord of lords, just as the supreme god of the Babylonians is called *bēl bēlī* (Tiele, *Compend. der Rel.-Gesch.*, p. 87).

¹ ¹ Adverbs of the same stem are connected in this way in Nu 6:9, Is 29:5, 30:13; of different stems in Is 5:26 and Jo 4:4. In Nu 12:2 the particles רַק אַךְ appear to be placed together for a similar purpose, equivalent to *simply and solely*.

² ² Different in kind from the triple utterance of the same words in 2 S 18:33, Jer 7:4 and 22:29, and the double exclamation in Jer 4:19 and La 1:16 (?).

§ 134. Syntax of the Numerals.

Cf. the exhaustive statistics collected by Sven Herner, *Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.*, Lund, 1893. E. König, ‘Zur Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.’, *AJSL*. xviii, 129 ff.

1. The numerals from 2 to 10, as being originally abstract substantives,³ may be connected with their substantives in three different ways. They may stand either—

(a) In the construct state *before* the substantive (the object numbered being consequently in the genitive), e. g. שְׁלֹשֶׁת יְמִים *a triad of days*, i.e. three days; שְׁנַי אֲנָשִׁים *the two men*; or

(b) In the absolute state *before* it (the object numbered being in apposition, § 131 d), e. g. שְׁלֹשָׁה בָּנִים *a triad, viz. sons*, i. e. three sons; שְׁנֵים אֲנָשִׁים *two men*; or

(c) In the absolute state (likewise in apposition) *after* the object numbered, e. g. בְּנוֹת פְּלִישָׁה. So especially in long lists, since in these the substantives naturally come first, e. g. Gn 32:15. Nu 7:17, 28:19. Apart from such cases, the frequency of this order in the later Books is due to the fact that the character of the numeral tended more and more to become adjectival rather than substantival.⁴

Rem. In Lv 24:22 נָאָת follows the construct state טְפַלָּת, but here as in Nu 15:16 מְשֻׁבָּת should be read. In Gn 42:19 נָאָת is in apposition to a substantive with a suffix (= *one of you brethren*; but verse 33 *the one of you brethren*). In Nu 31:28 נָאָת precedes the substantive in the Aramaic manner (= *one each*).—For מְאַחַד-שָׁנָה (Gn 17:17, &c.) we find regularly in the Priestly Code (except in Gn 17:17, 23:1) מְאַת שָׁנָה (Gn 5:3, &c.) *an hundred years*. On the connexion of abstract numerals with suffixes, as שְׁנִים קְדֻשָּׁם *their duality*, i.e. *they two*, Gn 2:25, &c. (also with a strengthening separate pronoun, as שְׁנֵי יְנֵי אֲנָה קְנֵי 1 S 20:42), cf. § 97 i.

2. The numerals from 2 to 10 take the object numbered in the plural,¹ with very few exceptions, such as Ex 16:22 (where שְׁנֵי הָעֵדָה קָר = *the double of an omer*), 2 K 2:21, Ez 45:1, cf. 2 K 8:17 and 25:17 *K^eth*. The numerals from 11 to 19 generally take the plural, but with certain substantives frequently used with numerals the singular is more common (see further, under f). The tens (from 20 to 90), when they precede, take the singular (in the accusative, cf. § 131 p) of certain nouns frequently used with

³ Cf. § 97 a, where it is shown that the masculine is the original form of the numerals (used for both genders), and that the feminine was afterwards differentiated and used with masc. nouns, primarily in the second decade and then in the first as well.

⁴ From Herner’s tables (op. cit., pp. 55–66) it appears, according to p. 68, that in the documents J, E, D of the Pentateuch, and in Jos 1–12, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Minor Prophets, Psalms, Megilloth, and Job, the numeral never, or very rarely, stands *after* its noun; in Kings and Ezekiel it stands several times *after*; in the Priestly Code nearly always *after*; in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, nearly as often *after* as *before* the noun. In Ex 28:10 the Masora makes the numeral in the genitive follow the construct state of the substantive numbered; we should, however, read נְשָׁמָות אֲנָשִׁים; for the omission of the article before ‘שׁ’, cf. § 126 w.

¹ On examples such as Gn 46:27 (יְמִים שְׁנֵים גְּשָׁמָות two souls), cf. § 132 g (collectives joined with the plural of the adjective).

numerals (אֶלָף *a thousand*, גֶּשֶׁב *a thousand*, פְּנַס *a thousand*, יֹם *a day*, אֵישׁ *a person*, בְּנָה *a house*, בְּנָוֹת *a girl*, עֲרֵי *a city*, בְּנִים *sons*)—but only in Ezekiel and the Priestly Code), otherwise the plural, as בְּנָה *a house*, בְּנָוֹת *a girl* (but cf. also Ju 11:33), &c.; on the other hand, the plural is necessary when they follow the object numbered in apposition (e. g. אֲמָנוֹת עֲשָׂוִים *twenty cubits*, 2 Ch 3:3 f.; with the exception of 2 S 24:24, only in late Books). After טָהָה and לְקָרָב the substantive numbered may be used either in the singular or plural, see further under g.

Rem. 1. After the numerals from 11 to 19 the singular is used, as a rule, with יוֹם *day*, שָׁנָה *year*, אִישׁ *man*, שְׁנָה *soul* (person), טָבָע *tribe*, מַצְבָּה *pillar* (Ex 24:4), sometimes with מַעַלְבָה *cubit*, שָׁנָה *month*, חָרֵב *city*, קְלָבָן *shekel* (compare our *four-year-old, ten pound*), e. g. Dt 1:2 אֶחָד עֲשָׂר שָׁנָה *one year and twelve months* (cf., however, such exceptions as Dt 1:23, Jos 4:2, &c.).—Substantives other than these are used in the plural with the numerals from 11 to 19, and the numeral may even follow the substantive, especially in later passages, as Nu 7:87 f., 1 Ch 4:27, 25:5.

2. After מֵאַת [so almost exclusively in the Priestly Code, e. g. always לְקָרָב], מֵאַתָּה [so almost exclusively in the Priestly Code, e. g. always לְקָרָב] and לְקָרָב (אֶלְפִים *thousands*) the substantives אֶלְפִי, אֶלְפִּים (except in Ez 40:27), יוֹם, שָׁנָה are regularly used in the singular, generally also אֶלְפִי, אֶלְפִּים (with the exception of Jos 7:21, 2 S 14:26, &c.); cf., moreover, Gn 33:19, 24:60 (אֶלְפִי רְכֻבָּה), Est 1:1, Ju 21:12, Dt 7:9, 1 K 5:12, 2 Ch 9:15.—Examples of the *plural* after מֵאַת are Gn 26:12, 1 S 18:25, 2 S 16:1, 1 K 18:4; after מֵאַת Ex 38:27; after מֵאַת Ju 15:4, 2 S 8:4, 1 K 10:17, Ez 42:17; after מֵאַת יָמִים 1 S 25:18, 1 K 7:20; after לְקָרָב 1 S 25:2, 1 K 3:4, 5:6, 2 K 3:4, Ps 90:4; after אֶלְפִים 1 S 17:5, Jb 42:12; after פְּנַס Mi 6:7; after פְּנַס יָמִים Is 36:8.—In Dn 12:11 the plural יָמִים precedes the numeral *twelve hundred*.

3. Numerals compounded of tens and units (like 21, 62) take the object numbered either *after* them in the singular (in the accusative), e. g. Gn 5:20 שָׁנָה יָמִין וּשָׁנָה יָמִינִים *two and sixty years* (שָׁנָה in the singular, according to *e*, since it conforms to the ten immediately preceding; but also שָׁנָה שָׁנָה Dt 2:14), or *before* them in the plural, especially in the later Books, Dn 9:26, &c.; or the object is repeated (but only in 1 K 6:1, and the Priestly Code; sometimes even several times, e. g. Gn 23:1, 25:7, 17 thrice) in the plural with the units, and in the singular with the tens and hundreds, e. g. Gn 12:4 שָׁנָה וּשְׁנָנִים שָׁנָה וּשְׁנָנִים שָׁנָה *seventy and five years*; Gn 23:1 מֵאַת שָׁנָה וּשְׁנָנִים שָׁנָה *an hundred and twenty and seven years*. Cf. Gn 5:6 ff.

Rem. 1. It may further be remarked with regard to the order, that the thousand or thousands always precede the hundreds, &c., and the hundreds almost always come before the smaller numbers (in Kings and Ezekiel sometimes, and in the Priestly Code usually, after the smaller numbers), the tens in the earlier Books (documents J and D of the Pentateuch, in Joshua 1–12, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, and also in Ezra and Nehemiah) *before* the units, but in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Priestly Code, Joshua 13–24 *after* the units (see Herner, op. cit., p. 73). After the hundreds the smaller number is very frequently added without וּ, especially in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel.

On the syntax of the cardinals in general:—

2. The cardinals are determined by the article, when they refer back (without being connected with the object numbered; cf., however, Lv 25:10 f., Nu 16:35, Jos 4:4, 2 S 23:13) to a number or list already mentioned, e. g. Gn 2:11 שֵׁם הַאֶחָד פִּישׁוֹן *the name of the one* (the first) *is Pishon*; Gn 14:9 *four kings against the five* (enumerated in verse 2); cf. 1 Ch 11:20 f., and the determinate tens in Gn 18:29, 31 f. A demonstrative with the article may also be

added to a numeral determined in this way, e. g. Dt 19:9 (but cf. also Gn 9:19, 22:23, where the numeral and demonstrative are practically determinate in themselves). In the case of the numerals from 11 to 19 the article may stand either before the unit (1 Ch 25:19, 27:15) or before שָׁנֶה (Jos 4:4); it is used before all three members of a compound number (273) in Nu 3:46.

In apposition with any determinate substantive the cardinal number is used *without* the article, not only when it precedes the substantive, as in Jos 15:14 (בְּנֵי הַשָּׂמֶן), where השָׁנִים is equivalent to a substantive determinate in itself; cf. Gn 18:28, Jos 6:8, 22 1 S 17:14, 1 K 11:31, and the passages discussed above in § 126 x, Gn 21:29, &c.), but also when it follows the substantive, e. g. 1 K 7:27, 43 f. שָׁנִים and שָׁנָה; the omission of the article may here, as in the cases noticed in § 126 z, be also due to the dislike of a hiatus, but cf. also מִן יְמֵי שָׁנִים 2 K 25:16 after a determinate substantive. The fact that it is by nature determinate would also be a very simple explanation of נְקָדָה Nu 28:4, 1 S 13:17 f., Jer 24:2, Ez 10:9, instead of the more usual נְקָדָה, and of אֲנָה 1 S 1:2 for שָׁנָה.

Such cases as שָׁבַעַת הַיּוֹם Ju 14:17 (which is determined by a following determinate genitive) are explained from § 127 b; 1 Ch 9:25 perhaps from § 126 q; in Is 30:26 probably the light of all the seven days of the week is meant; on the other hand, in 1 S 9:20 and 25:38 the article is, with Wellhausen, to be omitted.

3. Certain specifications of *measure*, *weight*, or *time*, are commonly omitted after numerals, e. g. Gn 20:16 שָׁנִים קָרְבָּנִים a thousand (shekels) of silver; so also before בְּזָהָב Gn 24:22, 1 K 10:16, Is 7:23, cf. Ps 119:72. Moreover, Ru 3:15 שָׁשָׁנִים שְׁשָׁנִים six (ephahs) of barley; 1 S 10:4 מִלְּבָד שְׁנִים two (sc. loaves, see verse 3) of bread, cf. 17:17 לְקָמָם עֲשָׂרָה שְׁנִים; 2 S 16:1, where before שְׁנִים a measure, or perhaps some term like *cakes*, is to be supplied.—The number of cubits is stated in the Priestly Code (Ex 26:2, &c.) and in 1 K 6 and 7 (otherwise only in Ez 40:5, 21, 47:3. Zc 5:2, 1 Ch 11:23, 2 Ch 4:2 f.) by the addition of אֲפָה בְּשָׁנָה prop. *by the cubit*. Also in Ex 27:11 the Samaritan and LXX read אֲפָה בְּשָׁנָה after שְׁנִים, and in 27:15 אֲפָה after שְׁנִים.

4. The *ordinals* above 10 have no special forms, but are expressed by the corresponding cardinals, which may then stand either before or after the object numbered, e. g. Gn 7:11 שְׁנָה בְּשָׁבְעָה עַשֶּׂר יוֹם on the seventeenth day; Dt 1:3 בְּאֶרְבָּעִים שְׁנָה in the fortieth year; cf. Gn 14:5, 2 K 25:27, and, with repetition of שְׁנִים in a compound number, 1 K 6:1; such a cardinal occurs without בְּ (and therefore in the *accus.* temporis, according to § 118 k) in Gn 14:4 (the Samaritan, however, has וּבְשָׁלֵשׁ); with the article (but without a numbered object, see under k), 1 K 19:19.¹—On the position of the numeral as a genitive following its noun, cf. e. g. 1 K 16:10 בְּשָׁנִים עַשֶּׂר בְּשָׁנִים עַשֶּׂר and with a determinate numeral, Ex 12:18, Nu 33:38, Dt 15:9. In this case, however, שְׁנִים is very frequently repeated, e. g. Gn 7:11, 2 K 13:10; after a determinate numeral, Lv 25:10.²

¹ Somewhat different from this is Ex 19:15 *be ready* לִשְׁלַחַת יְמִינָם prop. *after three days*, i.e. *on the third day* (in verses 11 and 16 and in Ezr 10:8 the ordinal is used), also 1 S 30:13 כִּי חִלִּיתִי הַיּוֹם שְׁלִשָּׁה because three days agone I fell sick, prop. *to-day three (days)*.

² All these expressions may indeed be explained by supposing that, e. g. in Lv 25:10, the proper meaning is *the year of the fifty years* which it completed, i.e. the fiftieth year; but it is more correct to regard שְׁנִים or בְּשָׁנִים in such cases not as a real

Rem. In numbering days of the month and years, the cardinals are very frequently used instead of the ordinals even for the numbers from 1 to 10, e. g. Gn 15:25; בָשְׁנִית 1 K 15:25; בָשְׁנִית שְׁנִים 2 K 18:1, &c., cf. Dt 15:9. The months themselves are always numbered by the ordinals שְׁלִישִׁי, up to שְׁבִיעִי, &c., but not the days of the month, e. g. Gn 8:5, בְּתַשְׁבִּעָה לְחֵן, Zc 7:1; Ez 1:1, &c., שְׁבִיעָה לְחֵן, Lv 23:32 (always, however, שְׁבִיעָה on the tenth day of the month). On the omission of יֹם in all these cases see under **n**; only in late passages is יֹם added, e. g. 2 Ch 29:17 בְּיֹם שְׁמֹונָה לְחֵן; Ezr 3:6 מֵיּוֹם אֶחָד לְחֵן.—Finally, when the year is stated by בָשְׁנִית governing a determinate ordinal, viz. 2 K 17:6 בָשְׁנִית הַקְרִיעִית in the ninth year; 2 K 25:1 (in Jer 52:4 בָשְׁנִית), Jer 28:1 K^eth., 32:1 K^eth., 46:2, 51:59, Ezr 7:8; but in such cases is again (see note 2 on o) to be explained according to § 128 k. This is supported by the fact that the Masora on Jer 28:1, 32:1 requires in the Q^{rē} בְשָׁנָה for בָשְׁנִית.

5. Distributives are expressed either by repetition of the cardinal number, e. g. Gn 7:9, 15 שְׁנִים two and two; 2 S 21:20 שְׁשָׁה וּשְׁשָׁה six each; with the numbered object also repeated, e. g. Jos 3:12 אֲיָשָׁה אֶחָד לְשָׁבֵט for every tribe a man; Nu 13:2, 34:18 (אֶחָד מֵעָשָׂה, as in Neh 11:1, one out of every ten); cf. § 123 d; or a periphrasis with לְאֶחָד is used, Nu 17:18, Dt 1:23, cf. Is 6:2 לְאֶחָד after six wings twice repeated; the simple distributive לְ is, however, sufficient (as in בְּקָרִים, § 123 c), e. g. לְמֵאוֹת וָלְאֶלְף imes by hundreds and by thousands.

6. The multiplicatives are expressed either (like the ordinals above 10, see under o) by the cardinals (in the feminine, probably owing to the omission of פְעֻמִים, פְעֻמִּים; so König, Lehrgeb., ii. 228), as בְּשְׁתִים twice, Jb 40:5; בְּעַשְׁתִים seven times, Lv 26:21, 24, Pr 24:16; cf. also אַחֲת once, 2 K 6:10, Jb 40:5, for which in Jb 33:14 בְּאַחֲת¹ along with בְּשְׁתִים (the latter also in 1 S 18:21); or by the *dual* of the numeral, thus Gn 4:15 (in verse 24 along with the cardinal 77 for 77 times); Is 30:26, Ps 12:7, 79:12; 2 S 12:6;² or periphrastically by עַם פְעֻמִים a time (prop. a step, with the article, עַם this time; cf. also בְּבַעַת, with the article, like above), as עַם אַחֲת בְּאַחֲת once (Neh 13:20 פְעֻמִים once and twice), פְעֻמִים גַּם וּשְׁתִים three times (for which in Ex 23:14, Nu 22:28, 32 Ez 41:6 thirty-three times; 2 S 24:3 an hundred times; Dt 1:11 a thousand times; 1 K 22:16 עד כֹּה פְעֻמִים until how many times, i.e. how often. Cf. also בְּבַעַת עַשְׁתִים ten times, Gn 31:17, 14, and many times, Neh 9:28.—In Gn 43:34, five times is expressed by חַמֵּשׁ יָדוֹת (prop. five hands),³ and in Ex 16:5 the double is expressed by מִשְׁנָה עַל (prop. a repetition over and above that which, &c.).—Of the ordinals שְׁנִית is used as a numeral adverb, Gn 22:15, &c., a second time, cf. the Latin *tertium consul;* בְּשְׁלִישִׁית the third time, 1 S 3:8; a fifth time, Neh 6:5; בְּשְׁבִיעִית at the seventh (time), 1 K 18:44, and בְּפָנָה עַם הַשְׁבִּיעִית Jos 6:16.

Rem. The collocation of a numeral with the next above it (either in the same or in different sentences) is a rhetorical device employed in *numerical sayings* to express a number,

nomen regens, but simply as a connective form to be explained on the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 128 k.

1¹ But Nu 10:4 is to be translated on one (trumpet).

2² Probably also כְפַלְלָה יָמִים Jb 11:6 (from כְפַלְלָה doubling) does not mean doubled but manifold.

3³ But אַרְבָּע הַיּוֹת Gn 47:24 means the (other) four parts; cf. 2 K 11:7, Neh 11:1.

which need not, or cannot, be more exactly specified. It must be gathered from the context whether such formulae are intended to denote only an insignificant number (e. g. **Is 17:6**, *two or at the most three*), or a considerable number, e. g. **Mi 5:4**. Sometimes, however, this juxtaposition serves to express merely an indefinite total, without the collateral idea of intensifying the lower by means of the higher number. Thus *one* and *two* are connected by **וְ**, **Dt 32:30**, **Jer 3:14**, **Jb 33:14, 40:5** (without **וְ**, **Ps 62:12**); *two* and *three*, **Is 17:6** (**Sirac 23:16, 26:28, 50:25**), and without **וְ**, **2 K 9:32**, **Ho 6:2**, **Am 4:8**; *three* and *four*, **Jer 36:23**, **Am 1:3–11**, **Pr 30:18, 21:29** (**Sirac 26:5**), and with out **וְ**, **Pr 30:15**; *four* and *five*, without **וְ**, **Is 17:6**; *six* and *seven*, **Jb 5:19**, **Pr 6:16**; *seven* and *eight*, **Mi 5:4**, **Ec 11:2**; (*nine* and *ten*, **Sirac 25:7**).

Syntax of the Pronoun.

§ 135. The Personal Pronoun.

1. The *separate* pronouns,—apart from their employment as the subject in noun-clauses (cf. § 141 a) and the idiom mentioned under *d–h*,—are used, according to § 32 b, as a rule, only to give express emphasis to the subject; e. g. **Gn 16:5**, **2 S 24:17** i.e. *I myself*, so also **אָנִי 2 S 12:28, 17:15** (after the verb), **Ez 34:15**, **Ps 2:6**; ¹ but **1 S 10:18, 2 S 12:7**, **Is 45:12** **אָנִי I** and none else; cf. also **אָנִי אָנִי I, I!** **Ho 5:14, &c.**; **אֲתָּה Gn 15:15, Ju 15:18, 1 S 17:56** (as in 20:8, 22:18, **Ex 18:19**, **Dt 5:24**, **Ju 8:21**, after the imperative); **1 K 21:7**; **אַתָּם Gn 9:7, Ex 20:19** (after the verb, **Ju 15:12**); fem. **Gn 31:6**; **אִיא 1 S 22:18**; **אִיא Gn 3:20, Ju 14:3; הִיא Jer 5:5**.—Sometimes, however, the separate pronoun appears to be placed before the verb more on rhythmical grounds, i. e. in order to give the statement a fuller sound than that of the bare verbal form (cf. the similar use of the infinitive absolute, § 113 o). Thus **Gn 14:23**, **Ps 139:2**, and most clearly in such passages as **Gn 21:24, 47:30**, **Ex 8:24**, **Ju 6:18, 11:9**, **1 S 12:20, 2 S 3:13, 21:6**, **1 K 2:18** (in solemn promises). The same explanation applies to **אָנִי** at the beginning of sentences, e. g. **Gn 24:45**, **Ho 5:3, 10:11, 12:11**, **Ps 39:11, 82:6**, **Jb 5:3**.²

Rem. 1. Different from this is the pleonastic addition of the separate pronoun immediately *after* the verb (according to Delitzsch on **Ct 5:5** perhaps a trace of popular language), e. g. **1 S 23:22(?)**, **Ct 5:5**, and (like other indications of the very late origin of the book) very frequently in Ecclesiastes, e. g. **1:16, 2:1, 11, 15, 3:17f.** and thirteen other places; in Aramaic, **Dn 5:16**.

2. Substantival subjects also are somewhat frequently resumed, and thus expressly emphasized, by the insertion of the corresponding separate pronoun of the 3rd person before the predicate is stated, e. g. **Gn 3:12** *the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she* (**אֵת**)

¹ ¹ Also **אֶלְيָהוּ הָיָה he himself, she herself** (of persons and things), e. g. **Is 7:14** *the Lord himself*, **Est 9:1** **הַיְהוּדִים הֵם the Jews themselves**. In the sense of *the same* (**ό αὐτός**) or (*one and*) *the same*, **הָיָה** is used in **Is 41:4, 43:10, 13, 46:4, 48:12** (always **אָנִי**), **Ps 102:28** (**אֲתָּה הָיָה**), and probably also **Jb 3:19**.—The position of **הָיָה**, as an accusative of the object, before a perfect in **1 Ch 9:22**, can at most be explained on the analogy of Aramaic (**Ezr 5:12**).

² As early as the **Mêsa'a** inscription (line 21 ff.) **אָנֹךְ** frequently stands at the beginning of a new sentence after the dividing stroke.

*gave me, &c.; 14:24 (מֵה); 15:4, 24:7, &c.; but נִה in Is 7:14 after the predicate and subject is equivalent to *he himself*.¹*

2. Not infrequently the separate pronoun serves to give strong emphasis to a suffix of the same person which precedes (or sometimes even to one which follows), whether the suffix be attached to a verb (as accusative) or to a noun or preposition (as genitive). In English such an emphasis on the pronoun can generally be rendered only by laying greater stress upon it, or sometimes by repeating it; cf., on the contrary, the French *mon livre à moi*. The separate pronoun in such instances is not to be regarded as *casus obliquus* (accusative or genitive), but as the subject of an independent sentence, the predicate of which must in each case be supplied according to the context.

Examples of emphasis:—

(b) On a noun-suffix with a substantive, by means of אַנְתָּה 2 S 19:1, Pr 23:15; by אַנְתָּה 1 K 21:19 אַתְּ דָּךְ thy blood, even thine; by הַוָּא 2 S 17:5, Jer 27:7, Mi 7:3; by אַגְּנָה 1 S 20:42, after שָׁנָה, but without special stress; Neh 5:2 (?); by הַם Nu 14:32; by הַם Ps 38:11 (without special stress), by הַמָּה Ps 9:7.—The separate pronoun precedes in Jb 21:4; Gn 40:16, Is 45:12, 1 Ch 28:2 (אַנְתִּי); Zc 9:11 (הַתָּאַת); Jos 23:9 (אַתָּה); Ez 33:17 (הַמָּה).—In Ps 89:48, where אַנְתִּי might be taken as strengthening חֲלֹד (equivalent in sense to חֲלֹדי), we should read אַנְתִּי for אַדְנִי, as in verse 51.

(c) On a suffix united with a preposition, 1 S 25:24 *בְּאַנְיִי upon me, upon me*; 1 K 1:26 *לִי* *עַל־יָדֶךָ upon you* *בְּאַנְיִי upon me*, *עַל־יָדֶךָ upon you*; 1 S 19:23 *לֹא־עַל־יָדֶךָ not against thee*; 1 S 35:21 *לֹא־עַל־יָדֶךָ upon him also*; Dt 5:3 *לֹא־עַל־יָדֶךָ not against thee*; Hag 1:4 *לְכֶם אַתֶּם for you yourselves*; Jer 25:14 *כִּי אַתֶּנוּ אַנְחֶנוּ —**בְּמַמְּדָה פָּה but with us, even us*; The separate pronoun precedes in 1 S 12:23; 1 K 1:20 *לִי אַתָּה ... עַל־יָדֶךָ ... אַתָּה*; Mi 5:1 *אַתָּה עַמְּכֶם*, and 2 Ch 28:10 *אַתָּה עַמְּכֶם*.

The same principle also explains Gn 4:26 קָרְבַּן־הָאֵלֶיךָ לְשֵׁת to Seth, to him also (not you); cf. 10:21, and Ex 35:34, Nu 4:22.

3. The *oblique* cases of the personal pronouns expressed by means of a preposition (or the *notus accus.* **את**) with a suffix may be used either in a demonstrative or reflexive sense,¹ as **לוֹ** to him, but also *to himself*, e. g. Ju 3:16 and Ehud made **לוֹ** for himself a sword, cf. Gn 33:17; so also **לְךָם** *sibi*, Is 3:9; **אלֵינוּ** *unto him*, and Gn 8:9 *unto himself*,

¹ Analogous to this is the resumption of a noun dependent on a preposition, by means of a pronominal suffix united with the same preposition, e. g. Gn 2:17, 2 S 6:22, 2 K 22:18, or of an object by means of the *nota accusativi* תְּאַת with suffix, e. g. 1 S 15:9 (where תְּאַת וְגַם is certainly to be read), Is 8:13.

¹ As in Luther's Bible *jm (ihm), jr (ihr)* for *sich*, and in our version *him, her* for *himself, herself*.

וְאַתָּה *with him*, and Gn 22:3 *with himself*; וְעַדְתָּה *with her*, and 1 S 1:24 *with herself*; also apparently as a pleonastic *dativus ethicus* (see § 119 s), Jb 12:11, 13:1.

Rarely, and only when marked emphasis is intended, is the *accusative* of the reflexive pronoun represented by the *nota accusativi* אַתָּה with a suffix (this being ordinarily expressed by the reflexive conjugations *Niph[□]al* and *Hithpa[□]el*²); thus, בְּמֵצֶב *se ipsos*, Ex 5:19, Jer 7:19 in sharp antithesis to תְּכַחֲתִי; Ez 34:2, 8, 10. Cf. § 57 at the end, together with note 2.

Rem. There is a similar emphasis in Is 49:26 on בְּשֶׁרֶם and בְּמַטָּה in the sense of *their own flesh, their own blood*. On the sometimes demonstrative, sometimes reflexive meaning of noun-suffixes of the 3rd person singular and plural, cf. § 91, p and q. For other circumlocutions to express the idea of *self*, see § 139 f.

4. The possessive pronouns are, according to § 33 c, expressed by the *suffixes of the noun* (in the genitive),³ which may represent either a *subjective genitive*, or (like the genitives proper, § 128 h) an *objective genitive*, e. g. בְּתַנְשֵׁי הָרָקְדָּשִׁי *the wrong done against me*, Gn 16:5, Jer 51:35; cf. Gn 9:2, 18:21, 27:13 (2 S 16:12 *K^eth.*); Gn 30:23, 39:21 (cf. Ex 3:21, &c.); 50:4, Ex 20:20, 21:35, Ju 4:9, 13:12 (*the treatment of him*); Is 56:7, Jer 9:7, Na 3:19, Pr 1:27, 24:22, Jb 20:29, 23:14, 34:6. Cf. also such pregnant expressions as Ps 20:3 יְשַׁלֵּח עֹזְרָךְ *he will send thy help (help for thee)*, i.e. he will send thee help; Gn 30:18, 39:21, Ex 2:9, Is 1:26 (*and I will restore judges for thee*); Ez 37:15.

When several substantives are co-ordinated, the pronominal suffix must be attached to each singly, e. g. Gn 36:6 *and Esau took his wives and his sons and his daughters*, &c.; 38:18, &c. In 2 S 23:5 the text is hardly correct.

5. When the genitive, following a construct state, is used periphrastically to express the idea of a material or attribute (§ 128 o and p), the pronominal suffix, which properly belongs to the compound idea (represented by the *nomen regens* and genitive), is, like the article (§ 127), attached to the second substantive (the genitive), e. g. הַר־קָדְשֵׁי prop. *the hill of my holiness*, i.e. my holy hill, Ps 2:6, &c.; עַיר קָדְשָׁךְ *thy holy city*, Dn 9:24; אֱלֹהִים כְּסֻפּוֹ *his idols of silver*, Is 2:20, 30:22, 31:7;¹ cf. Dt 1:41, Is 9:3, 28:4, 41:11, Ez 9:1f., Ps. 41:10, 150:1, Jb 18:7 *עַדְתִּי אָנוֹנוּ* *his steps of strength*; 38:6; after an adjective as *nomen regens*, Is 13:3 (Zp 3:11) עַלְיוֹן גָּאוֹתִי *my proudly exulting ones*.—On the same analogy is the use of e. g. Dt 1:41 *his*

² ² *Niph[□]al* according to § 51 e (like *Hithpa[□]el* according to § 54 f) may also include the *dative* of the reflexive pronoun.

³ ³ Like the substantival genitive, according to § 129 h, the possessive pronoun may also be paraphrased by a relative clause, e. g. Ru 2:21 הַגּוּעֲרִים אֲשֶׁר לִי *the young men, which are to me*, i.e. *my young men*; so especially, when the substantive, which should take a genitive suffix, is already followed by a genitive, e. g. 1 S 17:40. In this case, however, the suffix also is sometimes attached pleonastically, e. g. Ct 1:6 בְּרִמֵּי שְׁלֵי *my vineyard, which belongs to me*. Cf. Ct 3:7, and the analogous pleonasms in 2 S 22:2 (but see Ps 18:2) and Ps 27:2.

¹ ¹ On the other hand, more explicitly in prose, Gn 44:2 אַת־גָּבִיעִי גָּבִיעַ הַכֶּפֶר *my cup, the silver cup*.

weapons of war [cf. Is 41:12]; Is 56:7 בֵּית פְּלַתִּי my house of prayer, although the genitive here does not convey the idea of an attribute.

Rem. 1. Through a weakening in the distinction of gender, which is noticeable elsewhere (cf. § 110 k, 144 a, 145 p, t, u) and which probably passed from the colloquial language² into that of literature, *masculine* suffixes (especially in the plural) are not infrequently used to refer to *feminine* substantives; thus a noun-suffix in the singular, Ex 11:6, 25:19, Ju 11:34;³ in the plural, Gn 31:9, 32:16, 41:23, Ex 1:21, 2:17, Nu 27:7 (but the feminine suffix twice immediately after, and so the Samaritan also in verse 7); 36:6 (Samaritan אֲבִיכֶן, but also בָּעֵן, גִּנְחָם); Ju 19:24, 21:22, 1 S 6:7, 10b (גִּנְחָם); 9:20, Is 3:16, Ez 23:45 ff. (alternating with בָּעֵן); Am 4:1 f. (but afterwards a feminine suffix); Jb 1:14, 39:3 (בְּכָלִים in parallelism with בָּעֵן); 42:15, Ct 4:2, 6:6, Ru 1:8 ff. (along with feminine suffixes); Dn 1:5, 8:9. Verbal suffixes in the singular, Ex 22:25; in the plural, Ju 16:3, Pr 6:21, Jb 1:15. But Gn 26:15, 18, 33:13, Ex 2:17, 1 S 6^{10a} are to be explained according to § 60 h. On הָאָה as feminine, see § 32 n. On the use of the masculine in general as the *prior gender*, see § 122 g.

2. The suffix of the 3rd person singular feminine (as also the separate pronoun נָהָי Nu 14:41, Jos 10:13, Ju 14:4) sometimes refers in a general sense to the verbal idea contained in a preceding sentence (corresponding to our *it*); thus the verbal suffix, Gn 15:6, Nu 23:19, 1 S 11:2, 1 K 11:12, Is 30:8, Am 8:10; cf. Gn 24:14 (הָבָד thereby), 42:36, 47:26, Ex 10:11 (הָאָתָה that), Is 47:7. Elsewhere the suffix of the 3rd singular feminine refers to the plurals of things, e. g. 2 K 3:3 [but see Kittel; so 13:2, 6, 11; 10:26, but LXX מְצֻבָּת], Jer 36:23, Jb 6:20 (if the text is correct), 39:15 (read מְמֻחָה in v. 14), and to the plurals of names of animals, Is 35:7, Ezr 11:5. Conversely, plural suffixes refer to collective singulars, e.g. in Gn 15:13, Nu 16:3, 1 S 2:8, Zp 2:7 [but read עַל הַיּוֹם]; and to a verbal idea contained in the preceding clause, in Ez 33:18, Jb 22:21 (מִזְרָח thereby), Ez 18:26, 33:19 (מִלְּאָה on that account, thereby).¹ But the suffix in קָרְנוּ Dt 21:10 refers to the collective idea contained in קָרְנוּ אַתֶּם יְהִי; in Jon 1:3 מְהֻמָּם refers to the sailors included in sense under the term אָנָּה. In Jos 2:4 read וְנִתְּצִפְנָה; in Is 30:6 (מְהֻמָּם), 38:16, Ps 19:5 (מִזְרָח) the text is most probably corrupt.

3. In a few examples the force of the noun-suffix or possessive pronoun has become so weak that the language appears to be almost entirely unconscious of it. Thus in אָדָנִים my Lord, usually explained as being from the *pluralis maiestatis* אָדָן (§ 124 i) with the suffix of the 1st singular (always with *Qameṣ* to distinguish it from אָדָן my lords, Gn 19:2; but see note below), used exclusively of God, not only in addressing him (Gn 15:2, 18:3, Ps 35:23), but

² According to Diehl (see the title at the head of § 91 a), who adduces numerous instances on pp. 44 ff., 54 ff., 67 f., many of these cases may be set down to corruption of the traditional text, while the sudden (and sometimes repeated) change of gender in suffixes is mainly due to the influence exercised on the copyists by the Mishnic and popular Aramaic dialects, neither of which recognizes such distinctions. Such influence, however, is insufficient to explain the large number of instances of this weakening, occurring even in the earlier documents.

³ The Masora reckons six instances of נָהָי אָנָּה, where נָהָי אָנָּה would be expected (Ju 11:34, where, however, the text is most probably corrupt), Ex 25:15 (?), Lv 6:8, 7:18, 27:9, Jos 1:7; almost all these passages can, however, be easily explained in other ways.

¹ In 2 K 7:10 for שָׁעַר (the LXX had שָׁעַרְאָשׁ) read שָׁעַרְיָא.

ultimately (see, however, the note below), without any regard to the pronoun, as equivalent to *the Lord*.² On יְהֹוָה as a *Q're perpetuum* of the Masoretes see § 17 c and § 102 m.

A similar loss of vitality in the suffix is generally assumed in יְהֹוָה prop. *in his unitedness*, i.e. *he &c. together*, e.g. קָלַדְתִּים יְהֹוָה Ex 19:8; then, without regard to the suffix, even after the 1st person אַנְּחָנוּ 1 K 3:18 in reference to two women; Is 41:1, Jb 9:32, Neh 6:2, 7; after the 2nd person, Is 45:20, &c. But the supposed pronominal suffix is perhaps rather to be explained, with Brockelmann, ZA. xiv. 344 f., as an old adverbial ending, which survives in the Arabic adverbs *u* and in Assyrian.—Cf. further כָּלֵם prop. *their entirety*, but also after the 2nd person equivalent to *all together*, 1 K 22:28, Mi 1:2 (*hear, ye peoples, all of you*; cf. § 144 p), and even before the 2nd person, Jb 17:10 (in 1 S 6:4 read לְכָלֶם with the LXX).—On the redundant suffix in הָעֲרָקָךְ Lv 27:23, cf. § 127 i.

§ 136. *The Demonstrative Pronoun.*

The *demonstrative pronouns* are הֵזֶה, fem. אַתָּה, plur. הֵאֵלֶּה (§ 34), *hic, haec (hoc), hi, &c.*, and the personal pronoun הֵאֵת, likewise used as a demonstrative, fem. אֵת, plur. masc. הֵאֵת, fem. הֵאֵת (§ 32 b), *is, ea (id), or ille, &c., ii, eae or illi, &c.* The distinction between them in usage is that הֵזֶה (like *hic, ὅδε*) almost always points out a (new) person or thing present, while הֵאֵת (like *is, ille, αὐτός, ἐκεῖνος*) refers to a person or thing already mentioned or known (see the examples below).¹

Rem. 1. Compare the instructive examples in Gn 32:3, Ju 7:4 *of whom I say unto thee, this (הִזְהָר) shall go with thee, he (הַזְהָר) shall go with thee* (so afterwards with negatives). Moreover, הַזְהָר *this day*, i.e. the actual day on which one is speaking or writing (Gn 26:33, &c.), but הַזְהָר the day or period of which the historian has just been speaking (Gn 15:18, 26:32) or of which the prophet has just been foretelling (Is 5:30, 7:18, 20 ff.) and of which he continues to speak or foretell. Nevertheless הֵזֶה and הֵאֵלֶּה are also found in certain common combinations where הֵאֵת and הֵזֶה would be expected, and vice versa; thus almost always הַקְּבָרָה *with contempt* (like בְּקָרָב, plur. בְּקָרִים הֵהֶם or בְּקָרִים הֵאֵת הֵזֶה, but הַקְּבָרִים הֵאֵת הֵזֶה)—With a secondary sense of contempt (like

² Cf. the same weakening of the force of the possessive pronoun in prop. *my master*, from the second century A.D. onwards *the master*; so also in Syriac *מָרִי my lord*, and ultimately as a title *the lord*; in Italian *Madonna*, French *Madame, Notre Dame, Monsieur, Monseigneur, &c.* It can, however, hardly be doubted that the regular distinction between אַדְנִי as a holy name, and אַדְנִי as an ordinary appellative is merely due to the practice of the later Rabbis. G. H. Dalman, *Der Gottesname Adonaj und seine Geschichte* (Berlin, 1889), in an exhaustive discussion, shows that apart from the book of Daniel and the eight critically doubtful passages, in which אַדְנִי is used by God himself, there is nowhere any necessity to regard the suffix as *entirely meaningless*, since אַדְנִי is always used either in an address *to* or (like אַדְנִי, which also is never a mere phrase or title) in reverent language *about* God—as the Lord of the speaker—like the Assyrian *bēli-ia, my lord*. Against any original distinction between אַדְנִי and אַדְנִי it may be urged especially that when unconnected with suffixes the singular אַדְנָן is always used of God, and not the *pluralis maiestatis* presupposed by אַדְנִי.

ZA. ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete, ed. by C. Bezold. Lpz. 1886 ff.

¹ On הֵזֶה and הֵאֵת standing separately as determinate in themselves, see § 125 i. On the use of determinate demonstratives as adjectives, see § 126 u.

Latin *iste*) זֶה occurs, e.g. in 1 S 10:27, 21:16, 1 K 22:27, Is 6:10, &c. In the sense of the neuter, *this*, זֶה is more common than זֹה, as Is 5:25, 43:9, &c., but זֹה more common than זֶה.

2. Both זֶה and זֹה are sometimes used almost as enclitics to emphasize interrogative words (like the Latin *nam* in *quisnam*; cf. also *quis tandem*); e.g. Jb 38:2 זַי זֶה who now (darkeneth, &c.) ...? 1 S 17:55 f., Is 63:1, Jer 49:19, Ps 24:8, 25:12, &c.; מַה־זֶה what now? 1 S 10:11; how now? Gn 27:20; why now? Ju 18:24; but before the verb שׁוֹשֵׁנָה it is usually מַה־זֶה אַת wherefore now? Gn 18:13, 25:22, 1 S 17:28, 2 S 12:23, &c.—So also מִי־הוּא Is 50:9, Jb 4:7 ff.; and still more emphatically מִי־הוּא־זֶה Ps 24:10, Jer 30:21.

3. זֶה is likewise used as an enclitic (see c above): (a) *of place*, in such passages as Gn 27:21 הַזֶּה אַתָּה זֶה וְגַם whether thou (that art here) be my son Esau? 2 S 2:20 *is it thou?* הַנֶּה־זֶה behold, here, 1 K 19:5, Is 21:9; ² cf. also the strengthening of the separate pronoun by זֹה Is 43:25 (אָנוּ), 1 S 7:28, Is 37:16, Ps 44:5 (הֲזָה), and מֵלֵה these are, Gn 25:16, 1 S 4:8; (b) *of time*: עַתָּה זֶה now, 1 K 17:24; *just now*, 2 K 5:22; and rather frequently before words denoting number, e.g. Gn 27:36 זֶה פְּעִמִּים twice, now; cf. 31:38, 2 S 14:2, Jb 1:12, 7:3, 19:3; separated from the numeral in Gn 31:41 זֶה־לְיִלְלִי elliptically for *this*, i.e. this present period, *is to me*, i.e. makes altogether, twenty years, &c. The other examples are similarly elliptical.

§ 137. The Interrogative Pronouns.

The interrogative pronoun מַי who may refer either to a masculine or feminine person (Ct 3:6), or even to a plural, e.g. מַי אַתָּם who are ye? Jos 9:8; Gn 33:5, Nu 22:9 (more minutely, מַי וְנַי Ex 10:8, i.e. who exactly, who in particular?). It is used of the neuter only when the idea of a person is implied, e.g. מַי רַשְׁבָּם who are the Shechemites? Ju 9:28, 13:17, Gn 33:8, Mi 1:5; even more boldly, with the repetition of a מַי used personally, in 1 S 18:18, 2 S 7:18.—Another interrogative is אֲيָה which, what?; of persons only in Est 7:5.

Moreover, מַי may also be used in the sense of a genitive, e.g. בַּת־מַי אַתָּה whose daughter art thou? Gn 24:23, 1 S 17:55, 56, 58; בַּכְרִי מַי whose word? Jer 44:28, 1 S 12:3; in the accusative, אֲתָּה־מַי quemnam? 1 S 28:11, Is 6:8; with prepositions, e.g. בְּמַי 1 K 20:14 (in an abrupt question by whom?); לְמַי Gn 32:18; אֲתָּה־מַי 1 S 24:15.—Similarly זֶה מַה, זֹה מַה what? is used for the nominative, or accusative, or genitive (Jer 8:9), or with prepositions, e.g. עַל־מַה whereupon? Is 1:5, Jb 38:6; why? Nu 22:32, &c.; עד־מַה quousque? Ps 74:9.¹

² On the other hand, it is very questionable whether זֶה in Ps 104:25 (זֶה הַמְּדֻבָּר), Is 23:13 (זֶה הַעֲמָן), Ju 5:5, Ps 68:9 (זֶה הַסִּינִּי) can be taken, according to the common explanation, simply as a prefixed demonstrative particle (*the sea yonder*, &c.). In Ps 104:25 הַיּוּם may be in apposition to זֶה; cf. § 126 aa, on Ex 32:1, and Zc 5:7, where אֲתָּה־זֶה אֲתָּה־שׁוֹשֵׁנָה is in apposition to זֶה depending on זֶה, and also Ez 40:45, where תְּלִשְׁבָּה is in apposition to זֶה; otherwise it is most naturally taken as the subject, *this is the sea*. Is 23:13, Ju 5:5, 1 K 14:14, and Ps 68:9 might also be explained in the same way; but in these passages the text is almost certainly corrupt. In Ju 5:5 in fact סִינִּי is most probably to be regarded with Moore as a very early gloss, which subsequently found its way from this passage into Ps 68.

¹ A quite different use of זֶה was pointed out (privately) by P. Haupt in Ct 5:8 *will ye not tell him?* i.e. *I charge you that ye tell him*, and 7:1 = *look now at the Shulamite*,

§ 138. *The Relative Pronoun.*

Cf. Philippi, *Stat. constr.* (see heading of § 89), p. 71 f., and especially V. Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894.

Relative clauses are most frequently (but not necessarily; cf. § 155 b) introduced by the indeclinable **რվանդ** (see § 36).¹ This is not, however, a relative pronoun in the Greek, Latin, or English sense, nor is it a mere *nota relationis*,² but an original demonstrative pronoun [as though *iste, istius, &c.*].³ Hence it is used—

(1) In immediate dependence on the substantival idea to be defined, and virtually in the same case as it (hence belonging syntactically to the main clause); e.g. Gn 24:7 ... הָאָשֶׁר יְהִי ... הַזֶּה ... הַזֶּה נִי ... הַזֶּה יִשְׁלַח the Lord, iste, he took me ... he shall send, &c. (= who took me); Gn 2:2 and God finished his work, istud, he had made (it). Such qualifying clauses may be called *dependent relative clauses*.

corresponding to the late Arabic *mâ tarâ, just see!* *mâ taqûlu, say now!* It has long been recognized that ֤ is used as a negative in Ct 8:4.

¹ The etymology of the word is still a matter of dispute. Against the identification of **אֲשֶׁר**, as an original substantive, with the Arabic 'atar, *trace*, Aram. **אַתָּה** *place, trace*, Nöldeke urges (*ZDMG*. xl. 738) that the expression *trace of ...* could hardly have developed into the relative conjunction, while the meaning of *place* has been evolved only in Aramaic, where the word is never used as a relative. According to others, **אֲשֶׁר** is really a compound of several pronominal roots; cf. Sperling, *Die Nota relationis im Hebraäischen*, Leipzig, 1876, and König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 323 ff., who follows Ewald and Böttcher in referring it to an original **לְשָׁנָה**. According to Hommel (*ZDMG*. xxxii. 708 ff.) **אֲשֶׁר** is an original substantive, to be distinguished from **כִּי** and **כִּי** (an original pronominal stem), but used in Hebrew as a *nota relationis*, or (as **הַזֶּה** and **זֶה** are also sometimes used, see below, g and h) simply for the *relative pronoun*. Baumann (op. cit., p. 44) sees in the Assyrian **ša**, Phoenician, Punic, and Hebrew **ψ**, the ground-forms, of which the Phoenician and Punic **וְ** (see above, § 36 note) and the Hebrew **אֲשֶׁר** are developments.

² E.g. like Luther's use of *so*, in *die fremden Götter, so unter euch sind*, Gn 35:2.

³ This is the necessary conclusion both from the analogy of the Arabic *'allad-i*, which is clearly a demonstrative (like the Hebr. הַלֵּזֶה, הַלְּזָה), and from the use of הַ and הֲ as relatives.

Rem. 1. In the above examples אֲשֶׁר in Gn 24:7 is virtually in the nominative, in Gn 2:2 in the accusative. A further distinction between the examples is that in Gn 24:7 the main idea (יהוה), to which אֲשֶׁר is added in apposition, is only resumed in the qualifying clause by the subject (*he*) inherent in לְקֹדֶשׁ נִי, while in Gn 2:2 it is not resumed at all. This suppression of the retrospective pronoun¹ takes place especially when it (as in Gn 2:2) would represent an accusative of the object, or when it would be a separate pronoun representing a nominative of the subject in a noun-clause, e.g. Gn 1:7 הַמְּלָאָכִים אֲשֶׁר מִתְחַדֵּת לְךָ יְהֻנָּךְ the waters, those, under the firmament, &c. In negative sentences, however, the retrospective pronoun is not infrequently added, e.g. Gn 17:12 הַזֶּה אַתָּה אֲשֶׁר; 7:2 הַזֶּה; 1 K 9:20 הַזֶּה; Dt 20:15 הַזֶּה; but cf. also אֲשֶׁר הוּא חַי Gn 9:3. The addition of אַתָּה in a verbal clause, 2 K 22:13, is unusual.

The very frequent omission of the retrospective pronoun is noticeable in cases where the predicate of the qualifying clause is a *verbum dicendi*, e.g. Nu 10:29 we are journeying unto the place, אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהֹוָה אֲתָּה אֲשֶׁר לְכָם that place, the Lord said (of it), It will I give to you; cf. Nu 14:40, Ju 8:15, 1 S 9:17, 23, 24:5, 1 K 8:29, Jer 32:43.

2. When the substantive, followed by אֲשֶׁר and the qualifying clause, expresses an idea of *place*, it may also be resumed by the adverbs of place סֹמֵךְ there, הַנֶּאָמֵץ thither, מִשְׁבַּחַת thence, e.g. Gn 13:3 אֲשֶׁר-הַיָּה שָׁם אֲחֵלָה ה עַד-הַמִּקְומָה unto the place, that one, his tent had been there, i.e. where his tent had been; cf. Gn 3:23 סֹמֵךְ, Ex 21:13 הַנֶּאָמֵץ. But even in this case the retrospective word may be omitted, cf. Gn 35:14, Nu 20:13, Is 64:10, where סֹמֵךְ would be expected, and Gn 30:38, Nu 13:27, 1 K 12:2, where הַנֶּאָמֵץ would be expected.—When the appositional clause is added to a word of time, the retrospective pronoun is always omitted, e.g. 1 S 20:31 for all the days, אֲשֶׁר בָּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל those—the son of Jesse is living (in them); cf. Gn 45:6, Dt 1:46, 9:7, 1 K 11:42; see Baumann, op. cit., p. 33.

3. If the governing substantive forms part of a statement made in the first or second person, the retrospective pronoun (or the subject of the appositional clause) is in the same person, e.g. Gn 45:4 I am Joseph, אֲשֶׁר מִכְרַתָּם אַתָּה he—ye sold me, i.e. whom ye sold; Nu 22:30, Is 49:23; 41:8 thou, Jacob, אֲשֶׁר בְּחִרְתָּנוּ he—I have chosen thee; Jer 33:19, Ec 10:16 f.; Gn 15:7 I am the Lord, אֲשֶׁר הַזִּצְתָּנוּ he—I brought thee out, &c., Ex 20:2 (Dt 5:6).

(2) Not depending (adjectively) on a governing substantive, but itself expressing a substantival idea. Clauses introduced in this way may be called *independent relative clauses*. This use of אֲשֶׁר is generally rendered in English by *he who*, *he whom*, &c. (according to the context), or *that which*, &c., or sometimes *of such a kind as (qualis)*, cf. Ex 14:13 b, and in a dependent relative clause Is 7:17. In reality, however, the אֲשֶׁר is still a demonstrative belonging to the construction of the main clause as subject or object, or as a genitive dependent on a noun or preposition, e.g. Nu 22:6 רַבְנָא ר יְאַר iste—thou cursest (him)—is cursed, i.e. he whom thou cursest, &c.; Ex 22:8; ² אֲשֶׁר as object, Gn 44:1, 49¹, 1 S 16:3 ff., Mi 6:1 (אֲשֶׁר); and even preceding the verb, e.g. Is 52:15, Ps 69:5; אֲשֶׁר as genitive, Ez 23:28 I will deliver thee שְׁנִיאָת בֵּין אֲשֶׁר into the hand of those—thou hatest (them); depending on a preposition, e.g. לְאֲשֶׁר Gn 44:4, 2

¹ The instances in which, instead of a retrospective pronoun, the main idea itself is repeated (Gn 49:30, 50:13, Jer 31:32) are most probably all due to subsequent amplification of the original text by another hand.

² The absolute use of אֲשֶׁר is very peculiar in the formula אֲשֶׁר הִיא כְּבָר יְיָ אַל this (is it)—it came as the word of the Lord to ..., Jer 14:1, 46:1, 47:1, 49:34.

K 10:22; Gn 21:17, בְּאֵשֶׁר הַוָּשָׂם in that (place)—*he is there*, i.e. where he is; cf. Jul 17:8 and Ru 1:16 אֲלֹא-אֵשֶׁר whither;¹ 1 K 18:12 עַל-אֵשֶׁר whither; מִאֵשֶׁר Ex 5:11.

From these examples it follows that in independent relative clauses the retrospective suffix, or adverb of place, may be, and in fact generally is, omitted. As a rule, however (as in the dependent relative clause), this does not apply to cases in which the retrospective pronoun, by the construction of the sentence, depends on a preposition,² e.g. Gn 44:9 f. אֵשֶׁר וְמִתְמֻתָּה ... אֲלֹא-אֵשֶׁר *he—it (the cup) is found with him,—shall die* (for the Wāw of the apodosis in cf. § 143 d). In such cases אֵשֶׁר preceded by the preposition is quite anomalous, as in Gn 31:32 אֵשֶׁר וְמִתְמֻתָּה *with whomsoever thou findest*, where אֵשֶׁר is a relative pronoun in the English sense; on the other hand, in Is 47:12 (and probably also 56:4) אֵשֶׁר, הַ is to be explained (with Baumann, op. cit., p. 37) by reference to 47:15, as a demonstrative pronoun, *stand now with thine enchantments ..., with those—thou hast laboured (with them)*.

[With regard to the preceding explanation of אֵשֶׁר, the student will of course understand that, in Hebrew as we know it, אֵשֶׁר never occurs as a mere demonstrative. A particle which, whatever its origin, is uniformly used with reference to something in another, contiguous clause, will naturally have acquired in practice that force which we denote by the term ‘relative’.]

Like the original demonstrative pronoun אֵשֶׁר, the demonstratives proper הַ, זוּ, גַּזְעַן (the last commonly),³ and sometimes the article, are used somewhat frequently in poetic language to introduce both dependent and independent relative clauses. With regard to the construction of הַ, &c., the remarks on אֵשֶׁר, under *a* and *e*, also hold good.

Examples:—

(a) הַ in apposition to a governing substantive in the nominative, Ps 104:26 רְאֵתָךְ (there is) *leviathan, he—thou hast formed (him)*, i.e. *whom thou hast formed*; Is 42:24 (גַּזְעַן); in the accusative, Is 25:9, Ps 74:2 (in both cases with a retrospective pronoun; זוּ is used without it in Ps 132:12); in apposition to a genitive dependent on a preposition, Pr 23:22 שָׁמָעַ לְאָבָב יְהִי זֶה *hearken unto thy father, him—he begat thee, i.e. who begat thee*; Ps 17:9 (גַּזְעַן).—In Ps 104:8 זֶה in apposition to a governing substantive in the nominative,Ps 104:26 רְאֵתָךְ (there is) *leviathan, he—thou hast formed (him)*, i.e. *whom thou hadst founded for them* (cf. § 130 c), זֶה is in the genitive after the construct state קֹדֶם *to the place of that, thou hadst founded (it) for them*; on the same analogy we may also take, with Baumann (op. cit., p. 48), Ps 78:54, (זֶה גַּזְעַן) and Ex 15:13 (תְּמִימָנָה לְפָנֶיךָ), 15:16, Is 43:21, Ps 9:16, 10:2, 31:5, 32:8, 62:12, 142:4, 143:8 (all examples of גַּזְעַן).

To introduce independent relative clauses הַ is used as a nominative in Jb 19:19; as accusative, Jb 15:17 and גַּזְעַן Hb 1:11, Ps 68:29 (after a preposition, הַ Ex 13:8; but the text is evidently corrupt).

(b) More certain examples of the use of the article as a relative pronoun (more correctly, perhaps, of the demonstrative which is otherwise used as article) are 1 Ch 26:28 כָּל הַהֲקִידִישׁ שְׁמַוְתָּא all that Samuel had dedicated, &c.; 1 Ch 29:8 (where נִמְצָא can only be *perfect Niph'al*);

¹ In Zc 12:10 also, instead of the unintelligible אֱלֹי אֲתָּה אֲשֶׁר, we should probably read אֲלֹא-אֵשֶׁר, and refer the passage to this class.

² Such a strong ellipse as in Is 31:6, where נִמְצָא would be expected after העמִיקוּ, is only possible in elevated poetic or prophetic language.

³ The etymological equivalent יְהִי, הַ in Aramaic is always a relative.

2 Ch 29:36, Ezr 10:14. In connexion with a plural, Jos 10:24 *the chiefs of the men of war* לְכוּ אֲתֶנוּ who went with him; Ezr 8:25, 10:17, 1 Ch 29:17. Finally, in the sense of *id quod*, Jer 5:13 (where, however, we should read with the LXX הַקְרֵב) (see above). Cf. moreover, 1 S 9:24 *the thigh* בְּהַכְינָה and that which was upon it (but see k below); 2 Ch 1:4 equivalent to בְּאָשָׁר הַכִּין *to the place, that he had prepared.*

In all the examples adduced except 1 S 9:24 (where הִיא should probably be read for הַיְהָ) the הַ is followed by undoubted perfects; almost all the examples, moreover, belong to the latest Books (Ezra and Chronicles). On the other hand, another series of instances (even in the older texts) is extremely doubtful, in which the Masora likewise requires perfects, either by placing the tone on the penultima, as in Gn 18:21, 46:27, Jb 2:11 הַבָּאֵת; Is 51:10 הַשְׁמָה; Ez 26:17 הַכְּבָדָלֶת Ru 1:22, 2:6 and 4:3 הַשְׁבָּתָה, or by the punctuation, Gn 21:3 הַבְּזִילָה; 1 K 11:9, Dn 8:1 הַגְּרָאָה; Is 56:3 הַגְּלָלוֹה, while no doubt the authors in all these cases intended participles (and in fact perfect participles, cf. § 116 d) with the article, thus הַבָּאֵת, &c., Ez 26:17 הַקְּלָלוֹה for הַגְּלָלוֹת according to § 52 s, and in the other examples הַבְּזִילָה, הַגְּרָאָה, הַגְּלָלוֹה.

§ 139. Expression of Pronominal Ideas by means of Substantives.

Analogous to the periphrases for expressing materials and attributes by means of substantives (§ 128 o and p), is the use of substantives to represent certain kinds of pronominal ideas, for which no special expressions exist. Thus—

1. אִישׁ, אִשָּׁה, אֲשֶׁר man, woman, are used to express—

(a) The idea of *each*, *every* (in the sense of each severally) with reference to persons,¹ and even animals (**Gn 15:10**), e.g. **Gn 10:5**, feminine **Ex 3:22**; **וְאֵין** is the object, e.g. in **Jer 12:15**. On **וְאֵין**—**אֵין** cf. § 123 c.

In a few passages אִישׁ in the above sense is placed for the sake of emphasis before the governing noun (always a substantive with a suffix), thus מֵיד אִישׁ אֶחָיו Gn 9:5, according to the usual explanation, stands for מֵיד אֲחֵי אִישׁ at the hand of the brother of every man. But although the explanation seems to be supported by Gn 42:25 and Nu 17:17, it is inconceivable that such an inversion of *nomen regens* and *rectum* should occur. It is more likely, either that the second substantive is in apposition to אִישׁ (thus Gn 9:5 at the hand of every man, his brother, [unless it is a combination of the two readings אִישׁ and מֵיד אֶחָם]; similarly 15:10 and he laid each or, more exactly, one piece of it, &c., and so probably also Nu 17:17 every one, sc. his name), or אִישׁ precedes as a kind of *casus pendens*, and only receives its nearer definition from the following substantive with suffix; thus Gn 41:12, 42:25 (according to the context = to every one in his sack); 42:35, where אַרְזָרְעָלָל בְּשָׂקָו is virtually the predicate of אִישׁ; Ex 12:4, 28:21, Nu 5:10, 26:54, 2 K 23:35, and especially Zc 7:10.¹

¹ As a rule **שָׁנֶה** is used in the particularizing sense of *each man*, with the plural of the verb, e.g. Gn 44:11; sometimes, however, as subject to a verb in the singular, e.g. Gn 44:13.

¹ Cf. on the whole question the thorough discussion by Budde, *Die bibl. Urgeschichte*, p. 283 ff.: according to him, the words in Gn 9:5 are to be rendered *at the hand of one another* (from men mutually) *will I require it*. [In support of this view, Budde points to Zc 7:10 בְּלִבְבָּכֶם וְרַעַת אִישׁ אֲהֵינוֹ אֶל-תִּחְשֹׁבוּ, which in the light of 8:17 אִישׁ אֲתִידֵעַ רְעֵהוּ אֶל-תִּחְשֹׁבוּ בְּלִבְבָּכֶם, can only, he observes, be rendered ‘and devise not the hurt of one another in your heart’. So also König, *Syntax*, § 33.]

(b) *Any one, some one*, e.g. Gn 13:16, Ct 8:7, with a negative *no one*; ² so after אֵלֶּה Ex 16:19, 29, before אֲלֹהִים Gn 23:6 and frequently.—Instead of אִישׁ we sometimes find in a similar sense אָדָם *man, homo*, e.g. Lv 1:2 (cf. קָאָחַד הָאָדָם as *any one else*, Ju 16:7, 11), בַּפְשׁוֹת (soul) person, Lv 2:1, 5:1, &c., and in a neuter sense זְבָר (prop. word, thing) for *anything*, Gn 18:14, or קְלִזְבָּר Lv 5:2, Nu 31:23. With a negative זְבָר means *nothing*; thus after אֵלֶּה Gn 19:8; after אֲלֹהִים Ec 8:5.—Cf. finally, קָאָחַד הָאָדָם *any one*, Dt 15:7; *anything*, Ez 18:10 (but in Lv 4:2, 5:13 אֲחָתָה הָאָדָם) and the expressions noticed in § 144 e. The latter include also instances like Ez 18:32 *I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth*, i.e. *of any man*.

(c) In connexion with אֶחָד his brother or בְּצֹה his neighbour, אִישׁ one, masc. (as הַאֲשֶׁר one, fem., in connexion with אֶחָד her sister or בְּצֹה her neighbour) is used to represent the ideas of alter—alter, the one—the other³ (in reference to persons, animals, or things without life; see the Lexicon) or the idea of one another, e.g. Gn 13:11 and they separated them selves אִישׁ מֵעַל אֶחָד the one from the other; Ex 26:3 five curtains (הַיּוּשׁ fem.) shall be coupled together אֲשֶׁר אֶל-אֶחָד one to another.

2. שְׁנָה נִנְחָלָה soul, person expresses the idea of self,⁴ both in the singular, Pr 19:8, 16, 29:24, Jb 18:4 (in all cases שְׁנָה נִנְחָלָה equivalent to himself) and in the plural, Jer 37:9, &c. Similar to this is the use of בְּקֶרֶב Gn 18:12 (prop. in her inward part) in the sense of within herself.⁵

3. מֵבָן bone (then metaphorically for *substance*) expresses the idea of *self*, *selfsame*, *very same*, in reference to *things* (as בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה to persons, e.g. Gn 7:13; cf. Jos 10:27, Ez 24:2; כַּעֲמַד יְמִין הַשְׁמִינִי as it were the *very heaven* for clearness, Ex 24:10; בַּמְלֹאת אַחֲרֵי כָּלְבָד in the *very fullness* of his strength (= in the *midst* of his full strength), Jb 21:23).

4. The simple plural of words denoting time sometimes includes also the idea of *a few*, *some*; ¹ thus יְמִים *a few days*, Gn 24:55, 40:4 (here even of a longer period, = *for some time*); Is 65:20, Dn 8:27 (on the other hand, Gn 27:44, 29:20; גְּמִים אֶחָדим *one year*; שְׁנִים אֶחָד *two years*); see § 96 under אֶחָד); *some years*, Dn 11:6, 8.

CHAPTER II

² Cf. also Gn 39:11. On the expression of the idea of *no one* by means of אין with a following participle, see the *Negative Sentences*, § 152 1.

³ Elsewhere נִיּוֹת ... נִיּוֹת are used in a similar sense, Ex 14:20, Is 6:3; also נִיּוֹת נִיּוֹת ... נִיּוֹת, 2 S 14:6, or the substantive is repeated, e.g. Gn 47:21 (*from one end ... to the other end*).

⁴ On the representation of this idea by pronouns, separate and suffixed, see § 135 a, i and k.

⁵ In a similar way the idea of *self* in Arabic, as in Sanskrit (*âtman*), is paraphrased by *soul, spirit*; in Arabic also by *eye*; in Rabbinic by פֶּנְסָה body, מֶלֶךְ bone, in Ethiopic and Amharic by *head*, in Egyptian by *mouth, hand, &c.*; cf. also the Middle High German *mîn lîp, dîn lîp*, for *ich, du*. However, שְׁפָתָן in such cases is never (not even in Is 46:2 בְּשֶׁפֶתְּנֵי *they themselves*) a merely otiose periphrasis for the personal pronoun, but always involves a reference to the *mental* personality, as affected by the senses, desires, &c.

¹ Some in reference to persons in Ex 16:20 is expressed by אֲנָשִׁים, and in Neh 5:2–4 by אֲנָשֶׁר יְשַׁׁבֵּן, sunt qui, with a participle following.

THE SENTENCE

The Sentence in General.

§ 140. Noun-clauses, Verbal-clauses, and the Compound Sentence.

1. Every sentence, the subject and predicate of which are nouns or their equivalents (esp. participles), is called a *noun-clause*, e.g. יְהִינָּה מֶלֶכְנוּ *the Lord is our king*, Is 33:22; וְאַנְשֵׁי סֹדֶם רָעִים וְחַטָּאִים *now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners*, Gn 13:13; פֶּה לְקָם *a mouth is theirs*, Ps 115:5; see further, § 141.

2. Every sentence, the subject of which is a noun (or pronoun included in a verbal-form) and its predicate a finite verb, is called a *verbal-clause*, e.g. וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים *and God said*, Gn 1:3; וַיַּבְדֵּל *and he divided*, 1:7; see further, § 142.

Rem. In the last example the pronominal subject is at least indicated by the preformative (וַיַּ), and in almost all forms of the perfect by afformatives. The 3rd pers. sing. perf. however, which contains no indication of the subject, must also be regarded as a full verbal-clause.

3. Every sentence, the subject or predicate of which is itself a full clause, is called a *compound sentence*, e.g. Ps 18:31 קָאֵל תְּמִימִים דָּרְכוֹ *God—his way is perfect*, equivalent to *God's way is perfect*; Gn 34:8 שָׁקָה בְּנֵי חֶן שָׁקָה נְפָשׁוֹ בְּבָתְּכֶם *my son Shechem—his soul longeth for your daughter*; see further, § 143.

4. The above distinction between different kinds of sentences—especially between noun- and verbal-clauses—is indispensable to the more delicate appreciation of Hebrew syntax (and that of the Semitic languages generally), since it is by no means merely external or formal, but involves fundamental differences of meaning. Noun-clauses with a substantive as predicate, represent something *fixed*, *a state* or in short, *a being* so and so; verbal-clauses on the other hand, something *moveable* and *in progress*, an *event* or *action*. The latter description is indeed true in a certain sense also of noun-clauses with a participial predicate, except that in their case the event or action (as distinguished from that expressed by the verbal-clause) is of a fixed and abiding character.

Rem. By the Arab grammarians every clause beginning with an independent subject is regarded as a noun-clause, and every clause beginning with a finite verb as verbal. If a finite verb follows the noun-subject the two together (since the verb comprises its own subject and is thus a complete verbal-clause) form a compound noun-sentence, just as when the predicate consists of an independent noun-clause. Though this definition of the different kinds of sentence, which we formerly accepted (in § 144 a of the 22nd to the 24th German editions of this Grammar), is rejected above, *a-d*, we must, nevertheless, mention here the point in which this more complicated view of the Arab grammarians may be regarded as at least relatively correct, namely, in classifying verbal-clauses according as the subject precedes or follows the verb, a distinction which is often of great importance in Hebrew also; see further, in § 142 a.

§ 141. The Noun-clause.

1. The *subject* of a noun-clause (see § 140 a) may be—

(a) A substantive, e.g. Gn 2:10. *וַיְצַא מֵעַדֶּן וְאָגָר יָצַא* *and a river went out (was going out) of Eden,* Gn 2:10.

(b) A pronoun, e.g. Gn 7:4 *וְהִיא כִּי מִקְרָבֵר אָנֹכִי* *I will cause it to rain;* 14:18 *וְהִיא כִּי מִקְרָבֵר אָנֹכִי* *and he was priest;* 2:23 (*וְאַתָּה אֲלֹהָה* before a feminine predicate, as *אֲלֹהָה* before a plural in Ex 32:4); *מִי חָכָם מִי נָבִיא וְלֹא גָּדוֹל מִנּוּ* *who is wise? Ho 14:10.—In 1 Ch 5:2 and of him one became a prince, the subject is contained in* *מִנּוּ*.¹

2. The predicate of a noun-clause may be—

(a) A substantive, e.g. Dt 14:1 *בְּנֵיכֶם אֱלֹהִים וְגּוֹיִים ye are children of the Lord your God;* Gn 42:13. Specially characteristic of the Semitic mode of expression are the cases in which both subject and predicate are substantives, thus emphasizing their identity ('the thing is its measure, material, or equivalent'), e.g. Ez 41:22 *הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עַץ ... וְקַרְבָּן יְשִׁבָּה עַץ* *the altar (was) wood ..., and the walls thereof(were) wood, i.e. of wood. Cf. below, c.*

(b) An adjective or participle, e.g. Gn 2:12 *וְהַיָּה טוֹב הַזֶּה קָבֵד* *and the gold of that land is good;* now Ephron was sitting, &c., Gn 23:10.² Very frequently such noun-clauses, attached by *Wāw* to a verbal-clause, are used to represent a state contemporaneous with the principal action; cf. e below.

(c) A numeral, e.g. Gn 42:13 *שְׁנָנִים עֶשֶׂר עֲבָדֵךְ יְהֹוָה* *the twelve (of us) are thy servants.*

(d) A pronoun, e.g. Gn 10:12 (*הַיָּה*), Ex 9:27 (*אָנִי*), Gn 24:65 (*מִי*), 1 K 9:13 (*מִה*).¹

(e) An adverb or (esp. if formed with a preposition) any specification of time, place, quality, possessor, &c., which may be regarded as the equivalent of a noun-idea, e.g. *וְשָׁם הַבְּדֵד לְהָנִימָה* *there is the bdellium, Gn 2:12;* *אֵי הַבְּלִי לְהַבְּלִי* *where is Abel? 4:9;* *לְעוֹלָם* *his mercy endureth for ever, Ps 136:1 f.;* *עַשְׂרֵה בְּבִיתוֹ* *riches are in his house, Ps 112:3;* *לוֹ אָנוּחַ נָנוּ* *we are his, Ps 100:3 Q'ré.*

Rem. 1. The employment of a substantive as predicate of a noun-clause is especially frequent, either when no corresponding adjective exists (so mostly with words expressing the material; cf. § 128 o) or when the attribute is intended to receive a certain emphasis. For in all cases there is a much greater stress upon a substantival predicate,² since it represents

1¹ For other remarkable instances of ellipse in the Chronicler, see Driver, *Introduction*, ed. 8, p. 537, no. 27.

2² Cf. the numerous examples in § 116 n-p.

1¹ Why in these examples the pronouns, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, are to be considered as predicates and not as subjects, may be seen from what has been remarked above, § 126 k.

2² The same naturally applies to most of those cases which are not pure noun-clauses, but have the substantival predicate connected with the subject by *וְ* (e.g. Gn 1:2 *and the earth was a waste and emptiness;* cf. Ps 35:6, Pr 8:30, Jb 3:4) or where a preposition precedes the substantival predicate, as Ps 29:4 *the voice of the Lord is with power, i.e. powerful.*

something as *identical* with the subject (see above, b [a]), than upon an adjectival or verbal predicate; cf. Ct 1:10; Ps 25:10 *all the paths of the Lord are נָתְנָה לְךָ סֶדֶת lovingkindness and truth* (i.e. *wholly lovingkindness, &c.*; cf. Jer 10:10); Ez 38:5, Ps 10:5, 19:10, 23:5, 88:19, Pr 3:17,³ Jb 22:12, 23:2, 26:13, Ru 3:2. Sometimes the emphasis on the predicate is obtained by the use of the plural form (according to § 124 e), e.g. Ps 110:3 *thy people are נִצְבָּה תְּ altogether willingness*; Ct 5:16, Dn 9:23.

Sometimes the boldness of such combinations is modified by the repetition of the subject, as *regens* of the predicate, e.g. Jb 6:12 אַמְدֵב חֲבָבִים כַּחֲיִי *is my strength the strength of stones?* Pr 3:17. That the language, however—especially in poetry—is not averse even to the boldest combinations in order to emphasize very strongly the unconditional relation between the subject and predicate, is shown by such examples as Ps 45:9 *myrrh and aloes and cassia are all thy garments* (i.e. so perfumed with them that they seem to be composed of them); Ct 1:15 *thine eyes are doves*, i.e. dove's eyes (but 5:12, קְיוֹנִים⁴); Ps 23:5, 109:4, Jb 8:9, 12:12, Ct 2:13. In prose, e.g. Ex 9:31, Ezr 10:13 הַעַת גָּשְׁפִּים *the season is rain showers*, i.e. *the rainy season*; with a bold enallage of the number, Gn 34:30 וְאַנְּיִ מִתְּמַסֵּר *and I (with my family) am persons few in number*. For similarly bold expressions with הַיְהָ cf. Gn 11:1, 12:2, Ex 17:12, Is 5:12, Jer 2:28, and again with a bold enallage of the number, Jb 29:15 *I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame*, but in prose, Nu 10:31 *and thou shalt be to us לְעֵגִים ?*

2. The noun-clause connected by *wāw copulative* to a verbal-clause, or its equivalent, always describes a state *contemporaneous* with the principal action, or (when the predicate is a transitive participle) an action represented in constant duration (cf. § 107 d, as well as § 116 n and o), e.g. Gn 19:1 *and the two angels came to Sodom at even*, וְלֹוט יִשְׁבֶּן *while Lot sat, &c.*; 18:1, 8, 16, 22, 25:26, Ju 13:9, 1 S 1:9, 2 S 4:7, 11:4 (always with a participle); with an adjectival predicate, Gn 18:12; with a substantival predicate, 18:27; with an adverbial predicate, 9:23. Not infrequently such a *circumstantial* clause indicates at the same time some contradictory fact, so that וְ is equivalent to *whereas, whilst, although*, e.g. Gn 15:2, 18:27, 20:3, 48:14 (*although he was the younger*); Ju 16:15 *how canst thou say, I love thee, וְלֹבֶךְ אֵין אָתָּה whereas thine heart is not with me?* 2 S 3:39, Ps 28:3 *whilst mischief is in their hearts*. These clauses describing a state are, however, only a subdivision of the large class of circumstantial clauses, on which see § 156.

3. As the examples given under a and b show, the syntactical relation existing between the subject and predicate of a noun-clause is as a rule expressed by simple juxtaposition, without a *copula* of any kind. To what period of time the statement applies must be inferred from the context; e.g. 1 K 18:21 יְהִי הָאֱלֹהִים הָאָלֹה הָאָלֹה *the Lord is the true God*; 1 S 9:19; Is 31:2 גַם־הָוֹא חֲכָם yet he also is wise; Gn 42:11; on the other hand, Gn 19:1 אֵן כִּי מִמְּטִיר לֹוט יִשְׁבֶּן *and (=while) Lot was sitting*; Ez 28:15; Gn 7:4 I am raining, i.e. *I will rain*. Sometimes even a jussive or optative is to be supplied as predicate, Gn 27:13 *upon me be thy curse*; Gn 11:3, 20:13, Ex 12:2. Cf. § 116 r, note.

³ ³ שְׁלֹום here, as in Jb 21:9, is evidently a substantive after a plural subject; on the other hand, it is doubtful whether شְׁלֹום in such passages as Gn 43:27, 2 S 20:9, Ps 120:7, &c., is not rather to be regarded as an adjective.

⁴ ⁴ As a rule, in such comparisons כְּ (which is then to be regarded as *nominative*) stands before the predicate, e.g. Is 63:2 *wherefore are thy garments נִתְּנָתָנְתָּה like those of one that treadeth in the wine-press?* (prop. *the like of one that treadeth, instar calcantis*); Jer 50:9. The comparison is then much less emphatic than in the noun-clauses cited above.

Not infrequently, however, a connexion is established between subject and predicate (*a*) by adding the separate pronoun of the 3rd person singular or plural, expressly resuming and therefore strengthening the subject, or (*b*) (especially for the sake of a more exact specification of time) by the help of the verb **הִיְהָ**. The first of these will be a *compound* sentence, since the predicate to the main subject consists of an independent clause.

Examples of (*a*): **Gn 41:26** *the seven good kine* בַּעֲשָׂנִים הֵבֶשׂ they are *seven years*; **Dt 1:17, 4:24; Ec 5:18** זֶה מֵתָת אֱלֹהִים הִיא *this—it is a gift of God*; **Nu 3:27** אֲלֹהָה הַמִּזְבֵּחַ; in a question, **Gn 27:38**. Sometimes **הַוָּא** is used in this way to strengthen a pronominal subject of the first or second person, and at the same time to connect it with the predicate which follows,¹ e.g. אֲנִי כִּי הַוָּא **Is 43:25** *I, even I, am he that blotteth out, &c.*; **51:12**; אֲפָקָה הַוָּא **2 S 7:28**, **Is 37:16**, **Ps 44:5**, **Neh 9:6, 7**; in an interrogative sentence, **Jer 14:22**;² in **Jer 49:12** **הַוָּא** in a verbal-clause strengthens אֲפָקָה.

Of (*b*): naturally this does not apply to the examples, in which **הִיְהָ**, in the sense of *to become, to fare, to exist*, still retains its full force as a verb, and where accordingly the sentence is verbal, and not a noun-clause; especially when the predicate precedes the subject. On the other hand, such examples as **Gn 1:2** *and the earth was* (הַיְמָן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ) *waste and emptiness*, can scarcely be regarded as properly verbal clauses; **הִיְהָ** is used here really only for the purpose of referring to past time a statement which, as the description of a state, might also appear in the form of a pure noun-clause; cf. **Gn 3:1**. This is especially true of the somewhat numerous instances in which **הִיְהָ** occurs as a connecting word between the subject and the participial predicate; e.g. **Ju 1:7, Jb 1:14** (immediately afterwards a pure noun-clause). The imperfect of **הִיְהָ** announces what is future in **Nu 14:33**, &c.; cf. § 116 r. However, especially in the latter case, **הִיְהָ** is not wholly without verbal force, but comes very near to being a mere copula, and this use is more frequent in the later books¹ than in the earlier.

Rem. On the employment of **וְיֻ** *existence*, and **וְאַ** *non-existence*, which were originally substantives (on their tendency to be used as verbs, equivalent to *est*, and *non est*, cf. § 100 o, and the *Negative Sentences*, § 152) as a connecting link between a pronominal subject and a participial predicate (especially in conditional and interrogative sentences, **Gn 24:42, 49, 43:4**, &c.), see above, § 116 q, and the various kinds of subordinate clauses mentioned in §§ 150, 159.

4. The natural arrangement of words in the noun-clause, as describing a state, is *subject—predicate*; the principal stress falls on the former since it is the object of the description. Very frequently, however (and not merely in poetry, where greater freedom is naturally allowed in the arrangement of words), the reverse order is found, i.e. *predicate—subject*. The latter order *must* be used when special emphasis is laid on the predicate,² or when it consists of an interrogative word; thus with a substantival

¹ On a similar use of the separate pronoun of the third person in Aramaic (Dn 2:38, Ezr 5:11, &c.) see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 87. 3.

² This is of course to be distinguished from the use of **הַוָּא** (to be inferred from the context) as predicate in the sense of οὐτός; see above, § 135 a, note 1; or such cases as **Dt 32:39** *see now אֲנִי הַיְהָ that I, even I, am he*; **1 Ch 21:17**.

¹ According to Albrecht, *ZAW*. viii. 252, especially in Deuteronomy and in the Priestly Code.

² For the same reason specifications of place (e.g. **Gn 4:7**) or other adverbial qualifications may stand at the beginning of the sentence.

predicate, e.g. Gn 3:19 **אַתָּה עֹפֶר** *dust thou art*; 4:9, 12:13 (*my sister, not my wife*); 20:2, 12, 29:14, Is 6^{3 b}, Jb 5:24, 6:12; with an adjectival predicate, e.g. Is 6^{3 a}, 28:21, Jer 10:6; with a participle, Gn 30:1, 32:12; with an interrogative pronoun, e.g. Gn 24:65;³ with an adverbial interrogative, e.g. Gn 4:9.

Rem. On the above cf. the exhaustive investigations of C. Albrecht, ‘Die Wortstellung im hebr. Nominalssatz,’ *ZAW*. vii. 218 ff. and viii. 249 ff.; with a complete list of the exceptions to the order *subject—predicate*, p. 254 ff. The predicate *must* precede for the reasons stated (an *adjectival predicate* is particularly emphatic when it has the force of a comparative, e.g. **Gn 4:13**; the predicate expressed by means of a preposition precedes most frequently when it serves to convey the ideas of *having, possessing*, e.g. **Gn 18:14, 29:16**, &c.; cf. also **26:20, 31:16, 43**).

The predicate *may* precede: (a) when the subject is a pronoun, for ‘the person assumed to be generally known, does not excite the same interest as that which is stated about him;’ (b) ‘in order not to be a mere appendage to a subject which consists of several words,’ e.g. **2 K 20:19**; (c) in interrogative sentences (with a substantival or adjectival predicate or one compounded with a preposition), e.g. **1 S 16:4**; finally (d) in a relative clause, when the predicate is adverbial or compounded with a preposition, as a rule closely united (by Maqqeph) with **רְשָׁאָת**, e.g. **Gn 2:11 אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם**; **1:29 f. אֲשֶׁר־בָּוֹ**.

§ 142. *The Verbal-clause.*

1. By § 140 f there is an essential distinction between verbal-clauses, according as the subject stands before or after the verb. In the verbal-clause proper the principal emphasis rests upon the action which proceeds from (or is experienced by) the subject, and accordingly the verb naturally precedes (*necessarily* so when it is in the perf. consec. or imperf. consec.). Nevertheless, the subject does sometimes precede even in the verbal-clause proper, in the continuation of the narrative, e.g. Gn 7:19, 1 S 18:1, 2 S 19:12; especially so if there is special emphasis upon it, e.g. Gn 3:13 (it is not I who am to blame, but) *the serpent beguiled me*, cf. Gn 2:5, &c.¹ In the great majority of instances, however, the position of the subject at the beginning of a verbal-clause is to be explained from the fact that the clause is not intended to introduce a new fact carrying on the narrative, but rather to describe a *state*. Verbal-clauses of this kind approximate closely in character to noun-clauses, and not infrequently (viz. when the verbal form might just as well be read as a participle) it is doubtful whether the writer did not in fact intend a noun-clause.

The particular *state* represented in the verb may consist—

(a) Of an act completed long before, to which reference is made only because it is necessary for understanding the sequel of the principal action. If the predicate be a perfect (as it almost always is in these cases), it is generally to be rendered in English by a pluperfect; cf. the examples discussed above in § 106 f (**1 S 28:3**, &c.); also **Gn 6:8** (not *Noah found grace*); **16:1, 18:17, 20:4, 24:1, 39:1** (*and Joseph in the meanwhile had been brought down to Egypt*); **41:10, Ju 1:16, 1 S 9:15, 14:27, 25:21, 1 K 1:1**, &c.—In a wider sense this applies also to

³ The only exceptions, according to Albrecht (see the Rem. above), are Ex 16:7, 8. *ZAW*. *ZAW*, = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

¹ This of course applies also to the cases, in which the subject consists of a strongly emphasized personal pronoun, e.g. Gn 32:13 **אַתָּה עֹמֵד** *thou thyself*; 33:3 **אַתָּה הוּא** *he himself*.

such verbal-clauses as **Gn 2:6** (see further, § 112 e), since when they serve to represent an action continuing for a long period in the past, and thus to some extent a state.

(b) Of a fact, contemporaneous with the principal events or continuing as the result of them. To the former class belong all those instances in which the predicate is combined with הָיָה (provided that הָיָה has not, as in **Gn 1:2, 3:1**, &c., been weakened to a mere copula, in which case the precedence of the subject is fully explained from the character of the clause as a noun-clause; cf. § 141 i, and the examples of הָיָה, &c., with a participle, § 116 r); as an example of the second class, cf. e.g. **Gn 13:12** אֶבְרָם יִשְׁבֶּן בָּאַרְצָךְ עַז וְגֹרֵא Abraham accordingly continued to dwell in the land of Canaan, but *Lot dwelt, &c.*

Rem. 1. The close relation between verbal-clauses beginning with the subject and actual noun-clauses, is seen finally from the fact that the former also are somewhat frequently added with ו (or subordinated) to a preceding sentence in order to lay stress upon some accompanying circumstance; on such noun-clauses describing a *state* or *circumstance*, cf. § 141 e. This is especially the case, again, when the circumstantial appendage involves an antithesis; cf. **Gn 18:18** seeing that nevertheless *Abraham shall surely become, &c.*; **24:56, 26:27, Is 29:13, Jer 14:15, Ps 50:17, Jb 21:22**, and such examples as **Gn 4:2, 4, 29:17**, where by means of ו a new subject is introduced in express antithesis to one just mentioned. Moreover, in the examples treated above, under b and c (1 S 28:3, &c.), the subject is frequently introduced by ו, which then corresponds to the Greek δέ, used to interpose an explanation, &c., see Winer, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, § 53. 7^b.

2. By a peculiar construction verbal-clauses may be joined by means of ו and a following subject to participial clauses, e.g. **Gn 38:25** הִיא מִוּצָאת וְהִיא שׁ. לְהִנָּה she was already brought forth, when she sent, &c.; **44:3, 4, Ju 18:3, 19:11, 2 S 20:8**; for other examples, see § 116 u (where it is pointed out, note 1, that the apodosis also frequently appears in the form of a noun-clause, a further proof of the close relation between verbal-clauses beginning with the subject and noun-clauses proper). Without doubt there is in all these cases a kind of inversion of the principal clause and the temporal subordinate clause; the latter for the sake of greater emphasis being raised to an independent noun-clause, while the real principal action is added as though it were an accompanying circumstance, and hence in the form of an ordinary circumstantial clause. [Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 166 ff.]

2. According to what has been remarked above, under a, the natural *order of words* within the verbal sentence is: *Verb—Subject*, or *Verb—Subject—Object*. But as in the noun-clause (§ 141 l) so also in the verbal-clause, a variation of the usual order of words frequently occurs when any member of the sentence is to be specially emphasized by priority of position.¹ Thus the order may be:—

(a) *Object—Verb—Subject*: **Gn 30:40, 37:4, 1 S 15:1, 2 K 23:19** and frequently. Naturally the examples are far more numerous, in which the object precedes a verbal form which includes the subject in itself, e.g. **Gn 3:10, 14, 18, 6:16, 8:17, 9:13, Ex 18:23, Ju 14:3, 1 S 18:17, 20:9, 21:10, 2 K 22:8, Pr 13:5, &c.**

(b) *Verb—Object—Subject*: **Gn 21:7, Nu 5:23, 1 S 15:33, 2 S 24:16** (but המלאך is probably only a subsequent addition); **Is 19:13, Ps 34:22, Jb 11:19, &c.**

¹ Not infrequently also the striving after *chiasmus* mentioned in § 114 r, note, occasions a departure from the usual arrangement of words.

(c) *Subject—Object—Verb*: Is 3:17, 11:8, 13:18, Ho 12:11, Ps 6:10, 11:5, Jb 29:25.²

(d) *Object—Subject—Verb* (very rarely): 2 K 5:13, Is 5:17, 28:17, Ps 51:5, Pr 13:16 (read כָּל נָזַה).¹

(e) A substantival complement of the verb is placed first in Is 18:5 וְבָרֶךְ גָּמֵל הִיא וְנָזַה וְנָזַה *and a ripening grape the flower becometh.*

Rem. Of specifications compounded with a preposition those of *place* stand regularly after the verb, unless they are specially emphatic as e.g. Gn 19:2, 30:16, 32:5, Mi 5:1, Est 9:12; in Gn 29:25 בְּרֹחֶל with בְּ preti precedes for the sake of emphasis. Cf., however, in Gn 35:13 the order *verb—specification of place—subject*.—The remoter object precedes for the sake of emphasis, e.g. in Gn 13:15 (26³), 15:3; even before the interrogative. Gn 27:37 (cf. Jer 22:15 where the subject precedes an interrogative, and 1 S 20:8, Jb 34:31 where a prepositional specification precedes).—Prepositional specifications of *time*, such as בְּרָאשִׁית (Gn 1:1), בְּיֹם הַהוּא, בְּיֹם, &c. (but not בְּאַשְׁר, nor the simple הַיּוֹם, בְּתַחְלָה, רְאֵשׁ, לְעֹזֶל), stand, as a rule, before the verb, provided it be not in the perf. consec. or imperf. consec.; so also certain adverbs of time, such as אַז, עַתָּה, עַזְזָה, עַזְזָה, עַזְזָה, whilst others like עַזְזָה, עַזְזָה, עַזְזָה regularly follow the verb.

§ 143. *The Compound Sentence*

A compound sentence (§ 140 d) is formed by the juxtaposition of a subject² (which always precedes, see c) and

(a) An independent noun-clause, which (a) refers to the principal subject by means of a pronoun, e.g. Na 1:3 הִנֵּה הַבּוֹסִיפה דָּרְכֵנוּ *the Lord—in the storm is his way*; 2 S 23:6, Ps 18:31, 104:17, 125:2, Ec 2:14; cf. also Gn 34:23, where the predicate is an interrogative clause.—A personal pronoun is somewhat frequently used as the principal subject, e.g. Is 59:21 וְאַנְיִזְעַת בְּרִיתִי אֶתְּהָם *and as for me, this is my covenant with them, &c.*; Gn 9:9, 17:4, Is 1:7, 1 Ch 28:2;³ with an interrogative noun-clause,

2² This sequence occurs even in prose (Gn 17:9, 23:6, &c.); it is, however, more doubtful here than in the above prophetic and poetical passages, whether the preceding subject should not be regarded rather as the subject of a compound sentence (§ 143), the predicate of which is an independent verbal-clause; this would explain why the verbal-clause is usually separated from the subject by one of the greater disjunctives.—On the other hand, the sequence *Subject—Object—Verb* is quite common in Aramaic (e.g. Dn 2:7, 10); cf. Gesenius, *Comm.* on Is 42:24, and Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 84. 1 b. The pure Aramaic usage of placing the *object* before the *infinitive* occurs in Hebrew in Lv 19:9, 21:21, Dt 28:56, 2 S 11:19, Is 49:6, 2 Ch 28:10, 31:7, 36:19 (?).

1¹ This sequence occurs more frequently in noun-clauses with a participial predicate, e.g. Gn 37:16, 41:9, 2 S 13:4, &c., in interrogative sentences, e.g. 2 K 6:22, Jer 7:19; in all which cases the emphasized object is placed before the natural sequence of *subject—predicate*. [Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 208.]

2² In Gn 31:40 a verbal-clause (הִיְתִּי I was) occurs instead of the subject, and is then explained by another verbal-clause.

3³ In 1 Chr 28:2 (cf. also 22:7) might also be taken as strengthening the pronominal suffix which follows (equivalent to *I myself had it in my mind*), as e.g. Ez 33:17 *whereas their own way is not equal*; cf. § 135 f.

Gn 37:30, Jb 21:4, 38:19,—or (β) is without a retrospective suffix (in which case naturally the connexion between the subject and predicate is much looser), e.g. 1 S 20:23 *and as touching the matter which, &c. ... behold the Lord is between thee and me for ever*; Pr 27:2.

(b) An independent verbal-clause: (a) with a retrospective suffix,¹ e.g. Gn 9:6 (cf. § 116 w); 17:15 *as for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai*; 26:15, 28:13, 34:8; Ex 30:37, 32:1, 1 S 2:10, 2 K 10:29, Is 9:1, 11:10, Ez 33:2, Ho 9:11, Ps 11:4, 46:5, 65:4, 74:17, Dn 1:17; with a pronoun as the principal subject, Gn 24:27; (β) without a retrospective suffix, Is 19:17 *every one that mentions it (Judah) to it (Egypt), it (Egypt) is afraid*.

Rem. 1. In all the above examples prominence is given to the principal subject (by its mere separation from the context by means of a greater disjunctive, as a *casus pendens*²) in a manner which would be quite impossible in a simple noun or verbal-clause (e.g. Na 1:3 if it were בְּךָ יְהוָה בָּסָפָה); cf. the French *c'est moi qu'on a accusé*. But the statement or question contained in the clause which forms the predicate also receives greater weight. For the same purpose other members of the sentence also are sometimes placed at the beginning and resumed again by a following suffix; thus the object, Gn 13:15, 21:13, 35:12, 47:21 (with the Samaritan and LXX read perhaps עַל־ךָ); 1 S 25:29; a specification of place, Gn 2:17, 2 K 22:18, &c.; a substantive with נִ, 1 S 9:20, 2 S 6:23; cf. the examples in § 135 a.—In Nu 15:29 a dative is co-ordinated with the *casus pendens*, i.e. there is a transition to a different construction.

2. To compound sentences belong also the numerous examples already treated in the account of the tenses, where the predicate of a *casus pendens* is introduced by the *wāw apodosis*. The isolation and prominence of the principal subject is in this case still more marked than in the instances treated above; on the *casus pendens* with a following imperfect consecutive (e.g. Jer 6:19, 33:24), cf. § 111 h; with a following perfect consecutive (e.g. Ex 4:21, 12:44, Nu 23:3, 1 S 25:27, 2 S 14:10, Is 9:4, 56:6 f.), § 112 t and mm; on the participle as *casus pendens*, § 112 oo and § 116 w.—In Jb 15:17 *wāw apodosis* follows with the cohortative; in Jb 23:12, Ps 115:7, the imperfect is separated by נֶ־ from the *wāw apodosis*; in Jb 4:6 as for thy *hope*, it is the *integrity of thy ways*, 36:26, Ec 5:6, an incomplete noun-clause is appended by *wāw apodosis*. On *wāw apodosis* after disconnected specifications of time, cf. § 112 oo at the end, and Gn 40:9, 2 S 15:34 וְעַתָּה וְאַנְיִ עֲבָדְךָ and now (so far as the present is concerned) *I will be thy servant*, Nu 12:12, Jer 4:1 (*me thou needest not fear*).

3. Sometimes a substantive introduced by נִ (in respect to; cf. § 119 u) serves the same purpose as the *casus pendens* beginning the sentence, as Nu 18:8 (unless the נִ here serves to introduce the object, according to § 117 n); Is 32:1 (where, however, מִשְׁנֵים should most probably be read); Ec 9:4, 1 Ch 7:1, 24:20 ff., 2 Ch 7:21. On the other hand, Ps 16:3, 17:4, 32:6, 89:19, 119:91, are very doubtful. The suggestion of P. Haupt (*Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, xiii. no. 114; Baltimore, 1894) also deserves attention, that in passages like Ec 9:4, and in נִכְלֵל Gn 9:10, 23:10, Ex 27:3, 19, Ez 44:9, &c., נִ is not the preposition, but an

1¹ Cf. the Mêša□ inscription, l. 31, *and Horonain, therein dwelt, &c.*

2² But this term must not (any more than that formerly used ‘the subject preceding absolutely’) be misunderstood to mean that the principal subject is, as it were, floating in the air, and that the whole sentence results in an anacoluthon. On the contrary, to the Semitic mind, such sentences appear quite as correctly formed as ordinary noun- and verbal-clauses.

emphasizing particle, answering to the Arab. *lä*, *surely*; Assyrian *lû*; with לְבָדֶךָ it is equivalent to *in short*. Cf. also לְלִין—*sive—sive, et—et*, Jos 17:16, Ezr 1:11, Assyrian *lû—lû*.

§ 144. Peculiarities in the Representation of the Subject (especially in the Verbal-clause).

1. According to § 40 ff. most forms of the finite verb include a specification of the subject in the form of *personal afformatives* (in the imperfect also in the form of preformatives). Not infrequently, however, masculine forms are used in referring to feminines, e.g. נִצְעָמָה Ez 23:49; מִתְשַׁפֵּץ Ru 1:8; in the imperfect, Jo 2:22, Ct 2:7; in the imperative, Am 4:1, Zc 13:7 (for other examples, see § 110 k). On emphasizing the pronominal subject by the addition of the separate pronoun, see § 135 a and b.

On the masculine as *prior gender*, cf. § 122 g; on similar anomalies in the use of the personal pronoun, § 135 o, in the connexion between substantive and adjective, § 132 d, between subject and predicate, § 145 p, t, u.

2. The third person singular is often used impersonally, especially in the masculine, e.g. **וַיָּהּ**, *and it came to pass*, **וְהִיא**, *and it shall come to pass*; **חִרְחָה** followed by **לֹא**, &c., *it became hot to him*, i.e. *he became angry*, Gn 4:6, &c.; **נִצְרָךְ** lit. *and it became strait to him, he was distressed*, Gn 32:8; ¹ also in the feminine, e.g. 1 S 30:6 (Ju 10:9) **וְתִמְרוֹתָה** **אֲרֵלְזוֹד** in verse 31 be the subject); cf. also the impersonal passives, Is 1:6 (**רַקְבָּה**), 29:6 (**תְּפִקָּד**). Somewhat different are the instances in which the 3rd singular feminine occurs as the predicate of a feminine subject which is not mentioned, but is before the mind of the speaker, e.g. Is 7:7, 14:24, Jer 10:7, Jb 4:5, 18:15 (in 2 K 24:7 **כָּל־אֲשֶׁר** is used in this way with a feminine predicate, and in Jer 19:5 **אֲשֶׁר** alone); different, too, are the instances in which the 3rd singular masculine refers to an act just mentioned, e.g. Gn 17:11 **וְהִיא** *and this (the circumcision) shall be a token of a covenant*, &c.

Rem. The expressions for natural phenomena may be either in the 3rd sing. masculine or feminine, e.g. *it becomes light*, 1 S 29:10 (but with an explicit subject, Gn 44:3); *and it became light*; so also *it grows dark*, Jer 13:16; but *when there be darkness*, Jb 11:17; *it rains*, Am 4:7 (where, however, the context requires the reading *tempestuous*); Ps 50:3 *and it is tempestuous*.

3. The indefinite personal subject (our *they*, *one*, the French *on*, and the German *man*¹) is expressed—

(a) By the 3rd person singular masculine, e.g. אָרַק one (sc. any one who named it, see the Rem.) called (or calls) it, Gn 11:9, 16:14, 19:22, Ex 15:23; וַיִּקְרֹב Gn 35:8, 10,

¹ In Arabic and Ethiopic the masculine is commonly used in this case, in Syriac the feminine.—The forms חַם *hot*, טֹוב *good, well*, בָּרָךְ *bitter*, צָרָךְ *narrow*, רָעָם *evil* (frequently joined by יִ, לִ, &c.), which many regard as impersonal, are no doubt to be regarded in most cases not as forms of the 3rd pers. sing. perf., but, with Hupfeld on Ps 18:7, as adjectives.

1¹ In 1 S 9:9 הָאִישׁ (prop. *the man*) is used in exactly the same sense as our *one*.

2 S 2:16, Is 9:5; וַיֹּאמֶר one said, Gn 48:1, 1 S 16:4;² other examples are Gn 38:28 one put out a hand; Nu 23:21, 1 K 22:38, Is 6:10 וְרֹפֵא לוּ and one heals them; 8:4 (אֲשֶׁר); 46:7 (עֲצָצָם); Am 6:12, Mi 2:4, Jb 27:23; by the 3rd singular feminine (לִזְלָה) Nu 26:59.

Rem. The Jewish commentators, following the Arab grammarians, usually explain these singulars by the addition of the participle (generally determinate) of the same stem, e.g. קָרָא הַקָּרָא. This view is supported by the fact that such a complement sometimes occurs, e.g. Is 16:10 (דָּרְךָ הַדָּרְךָ ?דָּרְךָ ?דָּרְךָ the treader treads out, for one treads out; 28:4, 24 (doth one plow continually?); Dt 17:6 (Ez 18:32), Dt 22:8, 2 S 17:9 (Ez 33:4), Jer 9:23; with an indeterminate participle (as in Arabic, e.g. *qāla qāilun*, a sayer says, i.e. some one says), e.g. Nu 6:9, Am 9:1; cf. above, § 116 t, and, on the whole question, Driver on 1 S 16:4.

(b) Very frequently by the 3rd plural masculine, e.g. Gn 29:2 *for out of that well they* (i.e. people generally) *watered the flocks*; 26:18, 35:5, 41:14, 49:31, 1 K 1:2, Is 38:16, Ho 12:9, Jb 18:18, 34:20, Est 2:2, Neh 2:7.

Rem. The 3rd plur. also is sometimes used to express an indefinite subject, where the context does not admit of a human agent or at least not of several, e.g. Gn 34:27. In such a case the 3rd plur. comes to be equivalent to a passive, as very commonly in Aramaic (see Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 96. 1 c); e.g. Jb 7:3 *מִנְצָלִי wearisome nights have they allotted to me* (equivalent to were allotted to me; to make 'invisible powers' the subject is a merely artificial device); Jb 4:19, 6:2, 18:18, 19:26, 34:20, Ez 32:25, Ps 63:11, Pr 2:22 (in parallelism with a passive); 9:11.

(c) By the 2nd singular masculine, e.g. Is 7:25 לְאַתְּ בֹא שְׁאַה one will (or can) not come thither (prop. thou wilt ...); Jer 23:37, Pr 19:25, 30:28 (unless the reading should be בְּאַתְּ עֲדַב אַתְּ) or simply until (Gn 10:19, 30, 13:10 prop. until thy coming, i.e. until one comes.

(d) By the plural of the participle, e.g. Jer 38:23 *and all thy wives and thy children מִזְצָאִים* (prop. are they bringing out=) *they will bring out*, &c.; cf. Is 32:12, Ez 13:7, Neh 6:10 (*for some are coming to slay thee*) and the passages discussed above, § 116 t.¹ In 1 K 5:1 the text is corrupt.

(e) By the passive, e.g. Gn 4:26 אָז הִיחַל לִקְרָא then (was it begun=) began men to call upon, &c. (but read זָה הִיחַל he began).

4. A peculiar idiom, and one always confined to poetic language, is the not infrequent occurrence of two subjects in a verbal sentence,² one of the person and the

² Elsewhere in such cases נִאָמְרוּ usually occurs (but not in the perfect, e.g. 1 S 23:22), so that it is doubtful whether the present reading of Gn 48:1, &c., would not be better explained according to § 7 d, note. In Gn 48:2 for the extraordinary נִיאָד the common form נִיאָה is to be read; so in 50:26 for נִיְשָׁם (after a plural) either נִיְשָׁם or the 3rd plur.; in 2 K 21:26 נִיאָבָרְוּ.

¹ That this form of expression also (see g) comes to be equivalent to a passive is seen from the analogy of such Aramaic passages as Dn 4:22, which exclude any idea of human agency. Cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 76. 2 e at the end, and in post.-bibl. Hebrew, e.g. *Pirqe Aboth* 2, 16; 3, 5, &c.

² Two subjects occur in a noun-clause in Ps 83:19.

other of the thing. The latter then serves—whether it precedes or follows—to state the instrument, organ, or member by which the action in question is performed, and may be most often rendered in English by an adverb, as a nearer definition of the manner of the action. All the examples of this kind have this in common, that the subject denoting the thing takes a suffix in the same person as the personal subject.³ They are thus distinguished from the *accusatives* treated in § 117 s, with which they are often confused.

(a) Examples where the subject denoting the *thing* precedes, אֶל-יְהֹוָה אַקְרֵא קֹולִי *my voice—I cry unto the Lord*, i. e. *I cry aloud unto the Lord*, Ps 3:5, 27:7, 142:2; פֶּה יְדַבֵּר אֲתַּךְ *my mouth—I cried, I cried aloud*, Ps 66:17 (cf. 17:10); Is 26:9 נִפְשֵׁר *with my soul, fervently*, and parallel with it נִפְשֵׁר אֲתָּךְ; but נִפְשֵׁר Ps 57:5 is rather a periphrasis for the 1st pers. *I*.

(b) Where the subject denoting the *thing* follows, צְהַלְיִ קְרֹעֵן *cry—thy voice (i. e. aloud)*, Is 10:30; so also after an imperative, Ps 17:13 (צְרַבֵּנָה) and verse 14 (צְרַבֵּנָה); 60:7, 108:7; יְמִינְךָ נִגְבַּח; after a perfect, Hb 3:15 (סְוִסְוֵנִי); after a cohortative, Ps 108:2 אֲתָּךְ-כְּבָנִי). The subject denoting the *thing* stands between the personal subject and the predicate in Ps 44:3 אַתָּה נִגְבַּח.⁴

Rem. 1. Sometimes (as in other languages) an action is ascribed to a subject which can only have been performed at his direction by another person; cf. e. g. Gn 40:22 (41¹³), 41:14, 43:34 (*and he commanded to set before them, &c.*); 46:29, 2 S 12:9.

2. Supposed ellipses of a definite subject are due either to a misunderstanding of the passage, or to a corruption of the text. Thus in 1 S 24:11 after סַחְרָה either has dropped out (through confusion with עַל יְהֹוָה) or we should read with the LXX אַתָּה. In 2 S 13:39 (וְתַכְלִיל קְוֹדֵם) the text is obviously corrupt.

3. In poetic (or prophetic) language¹ there sometimes occurs (supposing the text to be correct) a more or less abrupt transition from one person to another. Thus from the 2nd to the 3rd (i. e. from an address to a statement), Gn 49:4 (?), Is 31:6 (?), 42:20, 52:14, 61:7, Mal 2:15 (where, however, for יְבָשָׂה we should undoubtedly read תְּבָשָׂה); Ps 22:9 [and regularly after a vocative, Is 22:16, 47:8, 48:1, 54:1, 11, Jer 22:16, 49:4, 16, Am 5:6f., Mic 1:2 (=1 K 22:28), Mal 3:9, 2 K 9:31; and after הַזֶּה Is 5:8, 29:15, Jer 22:13]. From the 3rd to the 2nd pers., Dt 32:15, Is 1:29 (but read probably מִמְּקֻמָּה קְרַבְתָּ לְמִמְּקֻמָּה, which has caused the insertion of אַתָּה), 5:8, Jer 29:19, Jb 16:7, cf. also Dt 32:17. From the 1st to the 3rd pers., La 3:1 (in a relative clause). In Jb 13:28 the 3rd pers. וְהַוָּא is probably employed δεικτικῶς for the 1st.

³ In Ex 6:3 מִשְׁמָרָה is subordinated to the following passive עֲתָה (§ 121 b); in 1 S 25:26, 33 יְהֹוָה, נִגְבַּח, are subjects to the infinitive absolute הַוְשָׁעַ, according to § 113 gg. In Ps 69:11 read אַתָּה עֲבָדָה for אַתָּה עֲבָדָה.

⁴ In several of the above examples it might naturally be supposed that the subject denoting the *thing* (especially when it follows the verb) is to be explained rather as a *casus instrumentalis*, i. e. as an accusative, analogous to the adverbial accusatives in § 118 q. But although it is true that the subject denoting the *thing* often defines more closely the manner in which the action is performed, and although in similar (but still different) examples, Ps 89:2, 109:30, Jb 19:16, פִּי occurs with בָּיִת *instrumentale*, the explanation given above must nevertheless be accepted.

¹ In prose, Lv 2:8; but וְהַקְרִיבָה here is hardly the original reading. Different from this is Gn 26:7, where there is a transition to direct narration.

§ 145. Agreement between the Members of a Sentence, especially between Subject and Predicate, in respect of Gender and Number.

1. As in other languages, so also in Hebrew, the predicate in general conforms to the subject in gender and number (even when it is a pronoun, e. g. *this is my covenant*, Gn 17:10). There are, however, numerous exceptions to this fundamental rule. These are due partly to the *constructio ad sensum* (where attention is paid to the meaning rather than to the grammatical form; see b–l below), partly to the position of the predicate (regarded as being without gender) *before* the subject.

2. Singular nouns which include in themselves a collective idea (§ 123 a), or which occasionally have a collective sense (§ 123 b), may readily, in accordance with their meaning, be construed with the plural of the predicate, whether it precedes or follows. This is also the case, when the collective is itself feminine but represents, exclusively or at least generally, masculine persons.

Examples:—

(a) Of collectives proper (cf. § 132 g): (α) with the predicate preceding, Gn 30:38 *תְּבִנָה אֶنְחָאֵן* (cf. 30:39, 31:8 and 33:13); Ju 1:22 f. *בְּיִתְחָאֵן* representing persons belonging to the tribe; Mi 4:3 *בְּיָמֵינוּ*; 2 K 25:5 *עַמְּךָ* *עַמְּךָ*, *עַמְּךָ* *לְאֹום* *the people*; Nu 10:3 *כָּל־חָדְשָׁה*, *כָּל־חָדְשָׁה*, *כָּל־חָדְשָׁה* *all the congregation* (cf. 1 K 8:5); 1 K 1:40, Is 9:8, 25:3, Am 1:5 *עַם*; 1 S 17:47, Ezr 10:12 *קָהָל* *assembly*. Cf. also the construction of national names, as *אֲרָם* (§ 122 i), e. g. 1 K 20:20 *וְיָגַע סְוִוִילָה* *and the Syrians fled*; 1 S 4:5.—(β) with the predicate following, 1 K 8:5 *sheep and oxen*, construed with the plural in the following relative clause; Jb 1:14 *הַבָּקָר הַיּוֹתְרָה* *on the cattle (cows) were ploughing*; 2 S 3:1 and 1 Ch 10:6 *בְּיִתְחָרָה* = *family* (in 1 S 6:13 *שְׂמָחָה* on the analogy of names of countries, is used for *the inhabitants of Bethshemesh*); Ho 11:7, Ezr 4:4 *עַם*; Ps 68:11 *בְּהִיאָה* *herd* [if correct, figuratively for *people*]; Is 26:19 *גְּבָלָה* *dead bodies*; Is 27:11 *קָצֵיר* *boughs*; 1 S 4:1 *יִשְׂרָאֵל*, preceded by a predicate in the singular.

(b) Of substantives occasionally used as collectives: (α) with the predicate preceding, Gn 34:24 *בְּצָר*; Ju 9:55, 15:10 *שְׁאַלְמָנָה*; Is 16:4 *מִסְרָר* *the treader down*.—(β) with the predicate following, Jb 8:19 *אַחֲרָה* = *others*; Ez 28:3 *סְתֻוּם* *a secret*; [Ps 9:7, and even after *הָזֶה* Jb 19:19.]

(c) Of feminines as collective terms denoting masculine persons: (α) with the predicate preceding, 1 S 17:46 *וַיַּקְרְבַּן כָּל־הָאָרֶץ* *that all the earth may know*, the i. e. all the inhabitants of the earth; cf. Dt 9:28, Ps 66:1, 96:1, 9, &c.; Am 1:8 *שְׁאַרְיָה* *remnant*; (Ps 33:8 *כָּל־הָאָרֶץ*).—(β) with the predicate following, Gn 41:57, 2 S 15:23, 1 K 10:24, Gn 48:6 *מִלְּקָת* *issue*; 1 S 2:33 *כָּל־מְרָבִית* *all the increase*; Jb 30:12 *פְּרַהָה* *rabble*. In Hag 2:7 read *הַמְּדָנָה* with the LXX.

Examples of predicates in the singular, notwithstanding the collective meaning of the subject, occur in Gn 35:11, Ex 10:24, 14:10, Dt 1:39, &c.—For examples of bold enallage of the number in noun-clauses with a substantival predicate, see above, § 141 c.

Rem. Not infrequently the construction begins in the singular (especially when the predicate precedes; see o below), but is carried on, after the collective subject has been mentioned, in the plural; e. g. Ex 1:20 *וְרָב הָעָם וְעָצָמוּ* *and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty*; 33:4.

3. On the other hand, plurals which have a singular meaning (§ 124 a) are frequently construed with the singular, especially the *pluralis excellentiae* or *maiestatis* (§ g–i; on the union of these plurals with attributes, cf. § 132 h), as **אֱלֹהִים** Gn 1:1, 3, &c. (but see the Rem.), **אָדָם** master, Ex 21:4 **בָּעֵלִים** master, owner, Ex 21:29; cf., moreover, **פְּנִים** with the singular, Jb 16:16 *K^eth.*, Pr 12:10.—So feminine forms with a masculine meaning are construed with a masculine predicate, e. g. Ec 12:9 **חָכָם** **קָהַל** **חָכָה** *the preacher was wise.*

Rem. The construction of **אֱלֹהִים God** with the plural of the predicate may be explained (apart of course from such passages as **1 K 19:2, 20:10**, where the speakers are heathen, and **אֱלֹהִים** may, therefore, be a numerical plural) partly as an acquiescence in a polytheistic form of expression, partly from the peculiar usage of one of the early documents of the Hexateuch, called *E* by Wellhausen, &c., *B* by Dillmann; cf. his commentary on Numbers—Joshua, p. 618, and above, § 124 g, note 2. So **Gn 20:13** (but in conversation with a heathen); **31:53, 35:7**, cf. also **Jos 24:19**. That this construction was afterwards studiously avoided from fear of misconception, is shown by such passages as **Neh 9:18** compared with **Ex 32:4, 8**, and **1 Ch 17:21** compared with **2 S 7:23**. Cf. Strack's excursus on **Gen 20:13** in *Die Genesis*, Munich, 1905, p. 77.

4. Plurals of names of animals or things, and of abstracts, whether they be masculine or feminine, are frequently construed with the feminine singular of the verbal predicate¹ (on the collective sense of the feminine form, cf. § 122 s); thus **Jo 1:20** **גַּם** **הַקְמֹת** **שְׁקָה** **תְּעַרְגָּה** *the beasts of the field long*; **Jer 12:4** (where the predicate precedes), cf. also **Jb 12:7**; names of things with the predicate preceding occur in **2 S 24:13, Is 34:13, Jer 4:14, 51:29, Ps 18:35, 37:31, 73:2 K^eth.**, **103:5** (unless **שְׁקָה** is to be read for **שְׁתִּיקָּה**), **Jb 14:19, 27:20**; with the predicate following, **Gn 49:22** (**בָּנִים=branches**); **Dt 21:7, 1 S 4:15 (נְעִינִי קְנָה)**,² **2 S 10:9, Is 59:12, Jer 2:15 K^eth.**, **48:41, 49:24, Pr 15:22, 20:18, Jb 41:10.**³

5. Moreover, the plural of persons (especially in the participle) is sometimes construed with the singular of the predicate, when instead of the whole class of individuals, each severally is to be represented as affected by the statement. Undoubted examples of this *distributive* singular are **Gn 27:29** (**Nu 24:9**) **אֶבֶן יְהֹוָה אֲרוֹן** (*those that curse thee, cursed be every one of them, and those that bless thee, blessed be every one of them*; Ex 31:14, Lv 17:14 and 19:8 (in both places the Samaritan has **אֶבֶן**); Is 3:12 unless **בְּגָשֵׂין** is to be regarded as a *pluralis maiestatis* according to § 124 k; Pr 3:18, 35 (?), 18:21 (?), 21:27b, 27:16, 28:1b, 28:16 *K^eth.*

¹ Cf. in Greek the construction of the neuter plural with the singular of the predicate τὰ πρόβατα βαίνει; in Attic Greek the plural of the predicate is allowed only when the neuter denotes actual persons, as τὰ ἀνδράποδα ἔλαβον. In Arabic also the *pluralis inhumanus* (i. e. not denoting persons) is regularly construed with the feminine singular of the attribute or predicate, as are all the *plurales fracti* (properly collective forms).

² On the possibility of explaining forms like **הַנְּעִינִי** as 3rd plural feminine, cf. above, § 44 m; but this explanation would not apply to all the cases under this head, cf. Jo 1:20, Ps 37:31, 103:5.

³ In Pr 14:1 an abstract plural **חַכְמָה** (to be read thus with 9:1, &c., instead of **חַכְמָות**) is construed with the singular; but cf. § 86 l, § 124 e, end.

Rem. Analogous to the examples above mentioned is the somewhat frequent⁴ use of suffixes in the singular (distributively) referring to plurals; cf. the *verbal-suffixes* in Dt 21:10, 28:48, Am 6:10; and the *noun-suffixes* in Is 2:8, 30:22, Jer 31:14, Ho 4:8 (but since ו follows, נָשָׁו is undoubtedly a dittography for שָׁוֹ), Zc 14:12, Ps 5:10 (where, however, ו is clearly to be read with all the early versions); 62:5, 141:10 (?), Jb 38:32, Ec 10:15 [but LXX הַפְּסִיל]; finally, the suffixes with prepositions in Is 2:20 אֲשֶׁר עַשְׂרֵל which they made each one *for himself* (according to others, *which they (the makers) made for him*); 5:26, 8:20, Jb 24:5, in each case לָוּ; in Gn 2:19 לְוּ refers to the collectives חַיָּה and עַזְف; cf. further, Jos 24:7, Is 5:23 וְאַתָּה מְנֻחָה after צְדִיקִים (but read probably צְדִיק with the LXX, &c.). Conversely in Mi 1:11 עָבָרִי לְכֶם [cf. Jer 13:20 *K^{eth.}*], but the text is undoubtedly corrupt.

6. Subjects in the dual are construed with the plural of the predicate, since verbs, adjectives, and pronouns, according to § 88 a, have no dual forms; thus צַעַן יְמֵם, Gn 29:17 נִיעַנְיִי לְאַהֲרֹן and Leah's eyes were dull; 2 S 24:3, Is 30:20, Jer 14:6, Mi 7:10, Ps 18:28, 38:11 (on the other hand, in 1 S 4:15 the predicate is in the feminine singular *after* the subject, and in Mi 4:11 *before* it; on both constructions cf. k above); so also אַזְנֵי יְמֵם ears, 2 Ch 6:40; יָדֵי יְמֵם hands, Is 1:15, Jb 10:8, 20:10 (in Ex 17:12 even with the plural masculine כְּבָדִים; cf. p); שְׁפָתֵי יְמֵם lips, 1 S 1:13, Jb 27:4; שְׁדֵי יְמֵם breasts, Ho 9:14.

7. Variations from the fundamental rule (see above, a) very frequently occur *when the predicate precedes the subject* (denoting animals or things¹). The speaker or writer begins with the most simple form of the predicate, the uninflected 3rd singular masculine, and leaves us without indication as to which of the following subjects (and so which gender or number) is to define the predicate thus left temporarily indefinite.² Thus inflexions are omitted in—

(a) The verb, with a following singular feminine, Is 2:17 וְשָׁחַגְבָּהוּת הָאָדָם and bowed down shall be the loftiness of man; 9:18, 14:11, 28:18, 47:11; 1 S 25:27 (see note 1 below); 1 K 8:31b, 22:36, 2 K 3:26, Jer 51:46, Ec 7:7; with a following plural masc., Is 13:22 וְעַנְהָאִים and there shall cry wolves, &c.; Ju 13:17 *K^{eth.}*, 20:46, 1 S 1:2, 4:10, 2 S 24:15, 1 K 13:33, Jer 51:48, Ps 124:5, Est 9:23 (see note 1 below); Gn 1:14 יְהִי מְאַרְתָּה let there be lights; with a following plural feminine, Dt 32:35, 1 K 11:3a, Is 8:8, Jer 13:18, Mi 2:6, Ps 57:2; before collectives and mixed subjects, e. g. Gn 12:16, 13:5, 30:43, 32:6, &c.; before a following dual, Is 44:18, Ps 73:7 (where, however, with the LXX עַזְנֵנוּ should be read).

Rem. 1. The instances in which a preceding predicate appears in the plural masculine before a plural (or collective singular) feminine of persons (Ju 21:21, 1 K 11:3b), of animals (Gn 30:39 where however יְאָזֵן may refer specially to male animals) or of things (Lv 26:33, Jer 13:16, Ho 14:7, Ps 16:4, Jb 3:24, Ct 6:9), or before a dual (2 S 4:1, Zp 3:16, 2 Ch 15:7) are

⁴ In several of the above examples the text is doubtful, and hence Mayer Lambert (*REJ.* xxiv. 110) rejects the theory of distributive singulars generally. [Cf. Driver, *Jeremiah*, p. 362, on 16:7.]

¹ Only rarely does an uninflected predicate precede a personal subject, as 1 S 25:27 (but הָאָדָם should probably be read, as in verse 35); Est 9:23 (before a plur. mass.). Such examples as Jb 42:15 are to be explained according to § 121 a.

² In a certain sense this is analogous to the German *es kommt ein Mann, eine Frau, &c.*

to be explained not on the analogy of the examples under *o*, but from a dislike of using the 3rd plur. fem. imperf., for this is the only form concerned in the above examples (cf., however, *Na* 3:11 קָרְבָּנִי instead of קָרְבָּנִתִי); cf. the examples of a following predicate in the 3rd plur. masc., instead of the fem., under *t* and *u*, and on an analogous phenomenon in the imperative, see § 110 k.

2. As in the case of verbs proper so also the verb *הִיא*, when used as a copula, frequently remains uninflected before the subject; cf. *Gn* 5:23 ff., 39:5, *Dt* 21:3 (according to the accents); 22:23, *Is* 18:5 וּבְסֶרֶגֶל הַיִהְנֵה and a ripening grape the flower becometh.

(b) The adjective in a noun-clause, e. g. *Ps* 119:137 יִשְׁרֵךְ מִשְׁפָטֶיךָ upright are thy judgements; cf. verse 155.¹—On the other hand, *רְעֵבָה צָאן עֲבָדָךְ יְכָרְבָּה* in רְעֵבָה thy servants are shepherds, *Gn* 47:3, is either an unusual orthography or simply a misspelling for רְעֵבָה.

Rem. 1. As soon as a sentence which begins with an uninflected predicate is carried on after the mention of the subject, the gender and number of the subsequent (co-ordinate) predicates must coincide with those of the subject, e. g. *Gn* 1:14 יְהִי נֹאָרָת ... וְהִי אָרָת (see o above); *Nu* 9:6, *Ez* 14:1; cf. also *Gn* 30:39 (see p above).

2. The dislike mentioned in *p* above, of using the feminine form (cf., further, § 144 a, with the sections of the Grammar referred to there, and below, under *u*), is exemplified sometimes by the fact that of several predicates only that which stands next to the feminine substantive is inflected as feminine (cf. the treatment of several attributes following a feminine substantive, § 132 d); thus in *Is* 14:9 גְּזָה, and afterwards שָׂוָרֵר (but שָׂוָרֵר is better taken as an infin. abs.=excitando, reading קְרַבְמָה for קְרַבְמִים); 33:9 אָבֵל אַמְלָלָה אַרְצָה mourneth, languisheth the land. Cf. *Jer* 4:30, *Jb* 1:19, and the examples (§ 47 k) where only the first of several consecutive forms of the 2nd sing. fem. imperf. has the afformative *i*□, *Is* 57:8, *Jer* 3:5, *Ez* 22:4, 23:32 (הַתְּהִשְׁפַּת after הַתְּהִשְׁפַּת); on the converse sequence of genders in imperatives, *Na* 3:15, cf. § 110 k.—Of a different kind are instances like *Lv* 2:1, 5:1, 20:6, where שְׁנָה person (fem.) as the narrative continues, assumes (in agreement with the context) the sense of a masculine person.

3. The instances in which the gender or number of the *following* predicate appears to differ from that of the subject are due partly to manifest errors in the text, e. g. *Gn* 32:9 read with the Samaritan אָחָד instead of אָחָת, then follows correctly; 1 S 2:20 read with Wellhausen לְאָשָׁל, according to 1:28, instead of לְאָשָׁל; 1 S 16:4 read אָמָרוּ נְאָיָה; *Ez* 18:29 instead of יְתַבֵּן read the plural as in verse 25; so also *Ez* 20:38 for אָבֹן² and in *Jb* 6:20 for הַתְּבִנָה; in *La* 5:10 read בְּבָאָר, and cf. in general, § 7 d, note; 1 Ch 2:48 read לְלִיל; in *Jer* 48:15 also the text is certainly corrupt. Other instances are due to special reasons. The anomalies in *Is* 49:11, *Ho* 14:1, *Pr* 1:16 (after רְגָלִיו), *Ps* 11:4 (after צִוְּיוֹ), 63:4, *Pr* 5:2, 10:21, 32, 18:6, 26:23, *Jb* 15:6 (all after מְתַבֵּת), *Pr* 3:2 (after מְתַבֵּת), *Ps* 102:28, *Jb* 16:22 (after שְׁנָתָה), *Dn* 11:41 (read וְרַבָּות), and perhaps *Gn* 20:17 are also to be explained (see p) from the dislike of the 3rd plur. fem. imperf.; moreover, in *Jer* 44:19, *Pr* 26:23 the plur. masc. even of a participle occurs instead of the plur. fem.—In *Gn* 31:8 f. הַיְהָ, after a plural subject, is explained as a case of attraction to

¹ This does not include such cases as *Jb* 24:7, 10, where שְׁרוּם is rather to be explained as an accusative denoting a state, § 118 n.

² probably an error for יְבָאוּ. The Masora on *Lv* 11:34 reckons fourteen instances of אָבֹן, where we should expect the plural.

the following singular predicate.³—In Gn 4:7 רְבָץ is a substantival participle (*a lurker, a coucher*). In Gn 47:24 הַיִהְיֶה remains undefined in gender (masc.), although the noun precedes for the sake of emphasis; so also in Gn 28:22, Ex 12:49, 28:7, 32, Nu 9:14, 15:29, Jer 50:46, Ec 2:7 (הַיְהֵה לְ as if the sentence began afresh, *and servants born in my house ... there fell to my lot this possession also*). In Jb 20:26 אֲגַפֵּחַ לְ may (unless שָׁנָה is regarded as masculine, § 122 o) be taken impersonally, *fire, without its being blown upon*.—In Is 16:8 and Hb 3:17 the predicate in the singular is explained from the collective character of שְׂמֹת (see h above); on the other hand, the masculine form of the predicate is abnormal in Ps 87:3, Pr 2:10, 12:25, 29:25, Jb 8:7, 36:18.

§ 146. Construction of Compound Subjects.

1. When the subject is composed of a nomen regens (in the construct state) with a following genitive, the predicate sometimes agrees in gender and number not with the nomen regens, but with the genitive, when this represents the principal idea of the compound subject.¹ Thus 1 S 2:4 קָשַׁת גַּבְּ רִימַּת הַתִּים the bow of the mighty men is broken, as if it were *the mighty men with their bow are broken*; Ex 26:12, Lv 13:9, 1 K 1:41 (but the text is clearly very corrupt), 17:16, Is 2:11, 21:17, Zc 8:10, Jb 15:20, 21:21, 29:10, 32:7 רְבָבָשִׁים (רְבָב equivalent to *many years*); 38:21; with the predicate preceding, 2 S 10:9, unless it is to be explained according to § 145 k.

Rem. 1. The cases in which קֹול (voice, sound) with a following genitive stands at the beginning of a sentence, apparently in this construction, are really of a different kind. The קֹול is there to be taken as an exclamation, and the supposed predicate as in apposition to the genitive, e. g. Gn 4:10 *the voice of thy brother's blood, which crieth* (prop. *as one crying*) ...!=*hark! thy brother's blood is crying*, &c.; Is 13:4, 66:6. In Is 52:8 an independent verbal-clause follows the exclamation *the voice of thy watchmen!*; in Jer 10:22 and Ct 2:8 an independent noun-clause; in Is 40:3 קֹול קְרָא *the voice of one that crieth!* i. e. *hark! there is one crying* is followed immediately by direct speech; in Mi 6:9 *hark!* may be used disconnectedly (cf. the almost adverbial use of קֹול in § 144 m) and הַיְהֵה be taken as the subject to *קְרָא*.

2. When the substantive כָּל (כָּל-) *entirety* is used in connexion with a genitive as subject of the sentence, the predicate usually agrees in gender and number with the genitive, since כָּל is equivalent in sense to an attribute (*whole, all*) of the genitive; hence, e. g. with the predicate preceding, Gn 5:5 וְהִיוּ כָּל-יְמִינֵי אָדָם and all the days of Adam were, &c. (in 5:23, 9:29, 11:10; but the Samaritan reads וְהִיוּ here also); Ex 15:20; with the predicate following, Ps 150:6, &c. Exceptions are, e. g. Lv 17:14 (but cf. § 145 l), Jos 8:25, Is 64:10, Pr 16:2, Na 3:7. On the other hand, in such cases as Ex 12:16 the agreement of the predicate with כָּל is explained from the stress laid upon the latter, נְכָלָמְלָאָכָה לְ being equivalent to *the whole of work* (is forbidden).

2. When the subject of the sentence consists of several nouns connected by *wāw copulative*, usually

³ So also the pronoun נַהֲיָה emphatically resuming the subject (see § 141 h) is attracted to the predicate in number in Jos 13:14 הַוְאָנָה ... הַוְאָנָה ... אֲשֶׁר יְהִי יְהִי ... the offerings of the Lord ... that is his inheritance; in number and gender, Lv 25:33 Q're; Jer 10:3.

¹ Sometimes, however, the attraction of the predicate to the genitive may be merely due to juxtaposition.

(a) The predicate *following* is put in the plural, e. g. Gn 8:22 *seed time and harvest, and cold and heat ... shall not cease* (תו לְאַיִשְׁבָּה); after subjects of different genders it is in the masculine (as the *prior gender*, cf. § 132 d), e. g. Gn 18:11 אֶבְרָהָם וְאֶسְרָה זֹקְנִים *Abraham and Sarah were old*; Dt 28:32, 1 K 1:21.

Rem. Rare exceptions are Pr 27:9 רְתָה יִשְׂפַחַת־לֵב פָּנָן וְקָטָן שְׁמַע ointment and perfume rejoice the heart, where the predicate agrees in gender with the masculine פָּנָן (as in Is 51:3 with פָּנָן); on the other hand, in Ex 21:4 (where נְאָלָה הָנָן וְיִלְכְּדָה are the subjects) it agrees with נְאָלָה as being the principal person; in the compound sentence, Is 9:4, it agrees with the feminine subject immediately preceding.¹

(b) The predicate *preceding* two or more subjects may likewise be used in the plural (Gn 40:1, Jb 3:5, &c.); not infrequently, however, it agrees in gender and number with the first, as being the subject nearest to it. Thus the predicate is put in the singular masculine before several masculines singular in Gn 9:23, 11:29, 21:32, 24:50, 34:20, Ju 14:5; before a masculine and a feminine singular, e. g. Gn 3:8, 24:55 *then said* (מָרָא) her brother and her mother; 33:7; before a masculine singular and a plural, e. g. Gn 7:7 וְיָבָן אֱנוֹחַ וְבָנָיו and Noah went in, and his sons, &c.; Gn 8:18 (where feminines plural also follow); 44:14, Ex 15:1, 2 S 5:21; before collectives feminine and masculine, 2 S 12:2.

Similarly, the feminine singular occurs before several feminines singular, e. g. Gn 31:14 וְתַעֲנוּ רְחֵל וְלֵאָה then answered Rachel and Leah; before a feminine singular and a feminine plural, e. g. Gn 24:61; before a feminine singular and a masculine singular, Nu 12:1 וְתַדְבֵּר מִרְמָאָן אֶחָרָזָן then spake Miriam and Aaron; Ju 5:1; before a feminine singular and a masculine plural, e. g. Gn 33:7 (cf., on the other hand, Ps 75:4 גַּם־גַּם אֶרְצָה וְכָל־יִשְׁבָּה יְהָה dissolved are the earth and all the inhabitants thereof). The plural feminine occurs before a plural feminine and a plural masculine in Am 8:13.—In Jer 44:25 for אֶתְכֶם וְנִשְׁכַּבְתֶּם read אֶתְכֶם הַנְּשָׁמִים with the LXX, and cf. verse 19.

(c) When other predicates follow after the subjects have been mentioned, they are necessarily put in the plural; cf. Gn 21:32, 24:61, 31:14, 33:7, &c., and § 145 s.

§ 147. Incomplete Sentences.

1. Sentences are called *incomplete*, in which either the subject or the predicate or both must in some way be supplied from the context.¹ Besides the instances enumerated in § 116 s (omission of the personal pronoun when subject of a participial clause) and the periphrases for negative attributes § 152 u, this description includes certain (noun-) clauses introduced by הַיְהָ (see b below), and also a number of exclamations of the most varied kinds (see c below).

¹ Similarly with a mixed object, Gn 33:2 *he put ... Leah and her children after*; אֶתְכֶם גַּם agrees with the masculine immediately preceding.

¹ This does not apply to such cases as Gn 33:8, where an infinitive with הַ appears alone in answer to a question, the substance of the question being presupposed as a main clause; cf. also Gn 26:7, where הַיְהָ must again be supplied after אֲשֶׁר.

Rem. Incomplete sentences are very common in Chronicles, but are mostly due to the bad condition of the text; cf. Driver, *Introd.*⁶, p. 537, no. 27. Thus in 2 Ch 11:22b restore **חַשְׁבָּה**, with the LXX, before **לְתַאֲלִיכוֹ**; in 35:21 add **בָּהּ אַתִּי**, with the LXX, after **הַיּוּם** and read **פָּרָת** for **בֵּית**; in 2 Ch 19:6 and 28:21 the pronoun **הַזֶּא** is wanted as subject, and in 30:9 the predicate **נִמְצָא**; cf. also the unusual expressions in 1 Ch 9:33 (Ezr 3:3), 1 Ch 15:13 (*ye were not present?*), 2 Ch 15:3, 16:10, 12 (bis), 18:3.

2. The demonstrative particle **הִנֵּה**, *en, ecce* may be used either absolutely (as a kind of interjection, cf. § 105 b) before complete noun-or verbal-clauses, e. g. Gn 28:15 **וַיַּגֵּן** **הִנֵּה אַنְכִּי עִמָּךְ** *and, behold! I am with thee*; 37:7, 48:21, Ex 3:13, 34:10, or may take the pronoun, which would be the natural subject of a noun-clause, in the form of a suffix, see § 100 o. Whether these suffixes are to be regarded as in the accusative has been shown to be doubtful in § 100 p. However, in the case of **הִנֵּה** the analogy of the corresponding Arabic demonstrative particle *'inna* (followed by an accusative of the noun) is significant.² If **הִנֵּה** with a suffix and a following adjective or participle (see the examples in § 116 p and q) forms a noun-clause, the subject proper, to which **הִנֵּה** with the suffix refers, must, strictly speaking, be supplied again before the predicate.³ Sometimes, however, the pronoun referring to the subject is wanting, and the simple **הִנֵּה** takes the place of the subject and copula (as Gn 18₉ **בָּאָה** **הִנֵּה בְּאָה** *behold she is in the tent*; 42:28), or there is no indication whatever of the predicate, so that the sentence is limited to **הִנֵּה** with the suffix, as in the frequent use of **הָנִי**, *here am I*, in answer to an address. Elsewhere a substantive follows (or **הַנִּי** (Gn 11:6, Jb 31:35), and **הִנֵּה** then includes the meaning of a demonstrative pronoun and the copula, e. g. Gn 22:7 **הִנֵּה הַאֲשָׁר וְהַעֲצִים** *here is the fire and the wood, &c.*; 12:19 *behold thou hast thy wife!* Ex 24:8; with reference to the past, e. g. Am 7:1 **וְהִנֵּה לְקַשׁ וְגַם** *and lo, it was the latter growth, &c.* By a very pregnant construction the simple **הִנֵּה** is used as the equivalent of a sentence in Jb 9:19, *lo, here am I!*

3. Examples of exclamations (threatening, complaining, triumphing, especially warlike or seditious) in which, owing to the excitement of the speaker, some indispensable member of the sentence is suppressed, are—(a) with suppression of the predicate (which has frequently to be supplied in the form of a jussive), e. g. Ju 7:20 *a sword for the Lord and for Gideon!* (verse 18 without **רְבָּה**); 2 S 20:1 and 2 Ch 10:16 (cf. also 1 K 22:36) *every man to his tents, O Israel!* (i. e. *let every man go to or remain in his tent*); without **אִישׁ** 1 K 12:16; moreover, Is 1:28, 13:4 (on the exclamatory equivalent to *hark!* cf. § 146 b); 28:10, 29:16 (**הַפְּכַבֵּם** *O your perversity!* i. e. how great it is!); Jer 49:16 (if **תִּפְלַטְתָּה** be equivalent to *terror be upon thee!*); Jo 4:14, Mal 1:13 (**הִנֵּה מַתְאָה** *behold what a weariness!*); Jb 22:29; perhaps also Gn 49:4 **מִפְּנֵי חֹזֶק** *a bubbling over as water* (sc. happened), unless it is better to

² On the same analogy any substantive following **הִנֵּה** would have to be regarded as originally a virtual accusative. Since, however, Hebrew does not possess case-terminations (as the Arabic does, and uses the accusative necessarily after *'inna*), it is very doubtful whether, and how far, substantives following **הִנֵּה** were felt to be accusatives.

³ That these are real noun-clauses and that the participle (e. g. **מֵת** in Gn 20:8) cannot be taken as a second accusative (as it were *ecce te moriturum*), is also shown by the analogy of Arabic, where after *'inna* with an accusative the predicate is expressly in the *nominative*.

supply a subject **אתָךְ** (*thou wast*).—*(b)* With suppression of the subject, Ju 4:20, cf. § 152 k; Jb 15:23 **אַתָּה** *where sc. is bread?*—*(c)* With suppression of both subject and predicate, Ju 7:18 (see above); 1 K 12:16 (see above); 2 K 9:27 **בָּם** **אַתֶּן** *him also!* explained immediately afterwards by **הַכֹּהוּ** *smite him!* Ho 5:8 *after thee, Benjamin!* sc. is the enemy (differently in Ju 5:14); Ps 6:4, 90:13, Hb 2:6; Ps 74:9 **עַד־מֵה** *until*.—On **אַל־** *and if not* (unless **וְלֹא** is to be read), 2 S 13:26, 2 K 5:17, see § 158 dd.

Rem. 1. To the class of incomplete sentences naturally belong exclamations introduced by interjections הָהָה, אֲוִי, הַס, אֵי; ¹ cf. § 105. After the first two the object of the *threat* or *imprecation* follows regularly with ל (cf. *vae tibi*) or לְאָלֶן or עַלְּנָנוּ, e. g. *woe unto us!* 1 S 4:8, Is 6:5; cf. also אֲהָה לַיּוֹם *alas for the day!* Jo 1:15; on the other hand, the object of *commiseration* (after הָיִי) follows mostly in the vocative, or rather in the accusative of exclamation (cf. *vae te* in Plautus); so in lamentation for the dead, הָיִי אָחִי *alas, my brother!* 1 K 13:30, Jer 22:18; ah הָיִי גּוֹי חָטָא *sinful nation!* Is 1:4, 5:8, 11, 18, 20, 22 (*ah! they that ...*).—For סָה cf. Hb 2:20, Zp 1:7, Ze 2:17.

2. Finally, instances of noun-clauses shortened in an unusual manner may perhaps occur in יְדֵיכֶם and Ps 115:7, for יְדֵי מִן רְגָלֵיכֶם *they have hands*, &c.; cf. verses 5 and 6, הַדְלָמָה, &c. Perhaps also וְיַעֲשֶׂו Gn 22:24, and וְחִילְיוֹן Ec 5:16 are to be regarded in the same way, but hardly בְּיַאֲכָל Nu 12:6; cf. § 128 d above.

Special Kinds of Sentences.

§ 148. *Exclamations.*

The originally interrogative מָה is used to introduce exclamations of wonder or indignation = *O how!* or ridicule, *why! how!* sometimes strengthened by זֶאת or זֶה according to § 136 c.—Astonishment or indignation at something which has happened is introduced by אַף how (likewise originally interrogative) with the perfect; the indignant refusal of a demand by אִם (but also by מָה Jb 31:1) with the imperfect; an exclamation of lamentation by אַיכָה, less frequently אַיךְ how!; in Jo 1:18 by מָה.

Examples:—

הֲ (or הָהֲ with a following *Dageš*, see § 37) expressing admiration (or astonishment) before verbal-clauses, e.g. Gn 27:20 (הֲ-הֲ-הֲ); 38:29, Nu 24:5 (*how goodly are ...!*); Ps 21:2, Ct 7:2; before the predicate of noun-clauses, e.g. Gn 28:17, Ps 8:2; mockingly before the verb, 2 S 6:20 (*how glorious was ...!*); Jer 22:23, Jb 26:2 f.; indignantly, Gn 3:13 תְּאַהֲרֹן; 4:10, 20:9, 31:26 *what hast thou done!*

אֵיךְ with the perfect, e.g. Gn 26:9, Ps 73:19; in scornful exclamation, Is 14:4, 12; in a lament (usually אֵיכָה), 2 S 1:25, 27; with the imperfect, in a reproachful question, Gn 39:9, 44:8, Ps 11:1, 137:4; in a mocking imitation of lament, Mi 2:4.

with the perfect, Is 1:21, La 1:1; with the imperfect, La 2:1, 4:1.

Rem. 1. The close relation between a question and an exclamation appears also in the interrogative personal pronoun **מי** in such cases as **Mi 7:18** *who is a God like unto*

¹ We do not consider here the cases in which these interjections (e. g. מֹה Ju. 3:19, Am 6:10) stand quite disconnectedly (so always מֹה and מֹהָ).

thee? and so in general in *rhetorical* questions as the expression of a forcible denial; similarly in the use of an interrogative sentence to express a wish, see § 150 d, 151 a.

2. A weaker form of exclamation is sometimes produced by the insertion of a corroborative *כִּי verily, surely*, before the predicate, Gn 18:20; cf. 33:11, Is 7:9, and the analogous cases in the apodoses of conditional sentences, § 159 ee.

§ 149. *Sentences which express an Oath or Asseveration.*

The particle **אָמֵן**, in the sense of *certainly not*, and **אָמַלְאָה** (rarely Gn 22:16) in the sense of *certainly*, are used to introduce promises or threats confirmed by an oath (especially after such formulae as **כִּי יְהִי נֶפֶשׁ**, **חִי־נֶפֶשׁ**, **חִי־יְהִי נֶפֶשׁ**, &c., as well as after imprecations, see below), and also simple asseverations, e.g. 1 S 2:30, 2 S 20:20, Jb 27:5 after **חִילֵּיהֶה לִי far be it from me**, but mostly without any introductory formula.

Rem. No certain explanation of these particles has yet been given. According to the usual view, phrases expressing an oath depend on the suppression of an imprecation upon oneself, e.g. *the Lord do so unto me, if I do it* equivalent to *I certainly will not do it*; then naturally **אָמֵן** properly *if I do it not* equivalent to *I certainly will do it*. It is indeed difficult to understand such self-imprecations, put into the mouth of God, as in Dt 1:34 f., Is 14:24, 22:14, Jer 22:6, Ez 3:6, 35:6, Ps 95:11. Possibly, however, the consciousness of the real meaning of the formula was lost at an early period, and **אָמֵן** simply came to express *verily, verily not*.—In 1 S 25:22, where, instead of a self-imprecation, a curse is pronounced upon others, read **לֹא יְבִרֵךְ דָּוִד** with the Lxx for **לֹא יְבִרֵךְ דָּוִד**.

Examples:—

(a) The particles **אָמֵן** and **אָמַלְאָה** used after the utterance of an oath and after formulae of swearing, e.g. 2 S 11:11 (see note on ^a **כִּי־יְהִי נֶפֶשׁ כִּי־אָמֵן עֲשֵׂה אֶת־הַקְּבָרָה הַזֹּה** *as the Lord liveth, and as ray soul liveth, I will not do this thing*; 1 S 14:45, 2 K 5:16 (after **כִּי־יְהִי הַזֶּה**); in 1 S 14:39 and 29:6 **כִּי־יְהִי** is followed by a simple **כִּי**); Ct 2:7, 3:5 (after the **הַשְׁבָּעָה** *I adjure you*); cf. also Gn 14:23, 21:23, 26:29; spoken by God, Dt 1:34 f., 1 S 3:14, Ps 95:11; similarly **אָמַלְאָה** **אָמֵן** **נֶפֶשׁ**; spoken by God, Is 14:24, where **אָמַלְאָה** occurs first with the perfect in the sense of a prophetic perfect, § 106 n, but in the parallel clause with the imperfect; Jer 22:6; in Gn 31:52 the negative oath introduced by **אָמַרְתָּה**, **אָמַרְתָּנִי** is immediately afterwards continued by **אָמַלְאָה** with the imperfect.—In Ez 34:10 the threat introduced in verse 8 by **אָמַלְאָה** is, after a long parenthesis, resumed with **הַנְּנִי**.

(b) **אָמֵן** and **אָמַלְאָה** after formulae of cursing, e.g. 1 S 3:17 **כִּי־עֲשֵׂה־לְךָ אֱלֹהִים וְכִי־יְסִירָה** *God do so to thee, and more also! thou shalt not hide anything from me*, &c.; cf. 1 S 25:22. On the other hand, **כִּי** follows the curse, in 1 S 14:44, 1 K 2:23 (here with a perfect), and in 2 S 3:35 **כִּי אָמֵן**; in 1 S 25:34 the preceding **כִּי** is repeated before **אָמֵן**; in 1 S 20:13 the purport of the asseveration is repeated (after the insertion of a conditional sentence) in the perfect consecutive.

¹ Also combined **כִּי־יְהִי נֶפֶשׁ** 1 S 20:3, 25:26 *as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul (i.e. thou) liveth!* (Also in 2 S 11:11 read **כִּי־יְהִי הַזֶּה** instead of the impossible **כִּי־יְהִי נֶפֶשׁ**). On **כִּי** and **הַזֶּה** in these noun-clauses (prop. *living is the Lord, &c.*), cf. § 93 aa, note.

(c) מִגּוֹן אָמֵדְרָאָה וְרַמְחָה וְגַיְתָּאָם and אָמֵדְלָאָם as simple particles of asseveration, e.g. Ju 5:8 *truly*, there was not a shield and spear seen, &c., Is 22:14, Jb 6:28 (in the middle of the sentence); after חַל יְלָה חַל absit, 2 S 20:20; אָמֵדְלָאָם with the imperf. Is 5:9, with the perfect, Jb 22:20.

§ 150. Interrogative Sentences.

H. G. Mitchell, ‘The omission of the interrogative particle,’ in *Old Test. and Sem. Studies in memory of W. R. Harper*, Chicago, 1907, i, 113 ff.

1. A question need not necessarily be introduced by a special interrogative pronoun or adverb. Frequently¹ the natural emphasis upon the words is of itself sufficient to indicate an interrogative sentence as such; cf. Gn 27:24 אַתָּה זֶה בָּנִי עִשּׂוֹ thou art my son Esau? (but cf. note ¹ below) Gn 18:12, Ex 33:14 (פָּנִי יִ) (but cf. note ¹ below) 1 S 11:12 שָׁלֵׂוּם לֹעֲגָעָר שָׁאוֹל יִמְלָךְ עַל־עַמּוּד Saul shall reign over us? 1 S 22:7, 2 S 16:17, 18:29 is it well with the young man? (but cf. note ¹); 1 S 16:4, 1 K 1:24, Is 28:28, Ho 4:16, Zc 8:6 (should it also be marvellous in mine eyes?); Pr 5:16. So especially, when the interrogative clause is connected with a preceding sentence by וְ, e.g. Jn 4:11 וְאַנְתִּי לֹא־אָחַזְתָּ and I should not have pity? Ex 8:22 will they not stone us? Ju 11:23, 14:16, 1 S 20:9, 24:20, 25:11, 2 S 11:11, 15:20, Is 37:11, 44^{19b}, Jer 25:29, 45:5, 49:12, Ez 20:31, Jb 2:10, 10:9; or when (as in some of the examples just given) it is negative (with לֹא for לֹא־אָלָּה nonne?), 2 K 5:26 (but cf. note ¹), La 3:38.²

Rem. The statement formerly made here that the interrogative particle is omitted especially before gutturals, cannot be maintained in view of Mitchell’s statistics (op. cit. p. 123 f.). The supposed considerations of euphony are quite disproved by the 118 cases in which הָ or הַ occurs before a guttural.

2. As a rule, however, the simple question is introduced by *He interrogative* הָ (הַ; as to its form, cf. § k–n), *ne?* *num?* the disjunctive question by הָ (num? utrum?) in the first clause, and אָמָן³ (also אָמָן, less frequently אָוָן) *an?* in the second, e.g. 1 K 22:15

¹ ¹ Mitchell (op. cit.) restricts the number of instances to 39, of which he attributes 12 (or 17) to corruption of the text. Thus in Gn 27:24 he would read, with the Samaritan, הָאַתָּה as in verso 21, in 1 S 16:4 הָשָׁלֹם מִן־הַשְּׁלֹום as in verse 32; similarly he would read the interrogative particle in 2 K 5:26, Ez 11:3, Jb 40:25, 41:1; 1 S 30:8, 2 K 9:19, Ez 11:13, 17:9.

² ² But in 1 S 27:10 instead of אָלִי (which according to the usual explanation would expect a negative answer) read either either אָלָמִי (עלָמִי) with the LXX, or better, אָנָה (אָנָה) whither? with the Targum. In 2 S 23:5 read חַפְצִי חַל־אָלָמִי with Wellhausen.

³ ³ Quite exceptional is the use of the particle אִין אִין num? (common in Aramaic) in 1 S 21:9 אִין יִשְׁפַּחַת num est hic? The text is, however, undoubtedly corrupt; according to Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Sam.*, the LXX express the reading רְאֵה הַיּוֹשֵׁב; but cf. the full discussion of the passage by König, *ZAW.* xviii. 239 ff.—The above does not apply to interrogative sentences introduced by interrogative pronouns (§ 37) or by the interrogatives compounded with מה what? such as הַמְּפֻנָּה how many? הַמְּפֻנָּה why? (see § 102 k), why? (§ 99 e), or by אֵיה where? אֵיךְ how? (§ 148), &c. On the transformation of pronouns and adverbs into interrogative words by means of a prefixed אִי, see the Lexicon.

לֹא ... אָמַרְתָּנִי¹ shall we go ... or shall we forbear? Cf. also אֵזֶן where? whither? אֵזֶן whither, and J. Barth, *Sprachwiss. Untersuchungen*, i. 13 ff.

The particular uses are as follows:—

(a) The particle הֲ stands primarily before the simple question, when the questioner is wholly uncertain as to the answer to be expected, and may be used either before noun-clauses, e.g. Gn 43:7 הַעֲדָה אֲבִיכֶם חַי הִישׁ לְכֶם אֵחֶד is your father yet alive? have ye another brother? for שִׁבְעַת cf. Gn 24:23, 1 S 9:11; for הֲכִי is it that? Jb 6:22; for הֲכִי יֵשׁ is there yet? 2 S 9:1 (but in 2 S 23:19 for הֲכִי read הַנּוּ is there not? 1 K 22:7, &c.; or before verbal-clauses, e.g. Jb 2:3 hast thou considered הַשְׁמָךְ לְכָה my servant Job? In other cases הֲ (= num?) is used before questions, to which, from their tone and contents, a negative answer is expected, e.g. Jb 14:14 if a man die, הֲיֵה shall he indeed live again? Sometimes a question is so used only as a rhetorical form instead of a negative assertion, or of a surprised or indignant refusal,² e.g. 2 S 7:5 הַאֲתָה תָּבִנֵּה בֵּית shalt thou build me an house? (in the parallel passage 1 Ch 17:4 אַתָּה וְגַם לֹא אַתָּה and the two passages where הֲ is used before the infinitive (*constr.* Jb 34:18, *absol.* Jb 40:2; on both, see § 113 ee, with the note).—On the other hand, in 1 K 16:31 for הַקְרָב (after עִירָה) read הַקְרָבָה).

Rem. 1. A few passages deserve special mention, in which the use of the interrogative is altogether different from our idiom, since it serves merely to express the conviction that the contents of the statement are well known to the hearer, and are unconditionally admitted by him. Thus, Gn 3:11 surely thou hast eaten; Gn 27:36 הֲכִי קָרְנָא prop. is it so that one names? &c., i.e. of a truth he is rightly named Jacob; Gn 29:15 verily thou art my brother; Dt 11:30, Ju 4:6, 1 S 2:27 I did indeed, &c.; 20:37, 1 K 22:3 ye know surely ..., Mi 3:1, Jb 20:4.—In 1 S 23:19 (cf. Ps 54:2) a surprising communication is introduced in this way (by אֲלֹהִים) in order to show it to be absolutely true, and in Am 9:7 a concession is expressed by הֲלֹא I have, it is true, &c. Finally, we may include the formula of quotation הֲלֹא כֵּן Jos 10:13 or equivalent to surely it is, they are written (the latter in 1 K 11:41, 14:29, and very often elsewhere in the books of Kings and Chronicles), synonymous with the simple formula of assertion הֲלֹא כֵּן בְּתוֹךְ 2 S 1:18, and הֲלֹא כֵּן בְּתוֹךְ 1 K 14:19, 2 K 15:11, 2 Ch 27:7, 32:32.

Of very frequent occurrence also are questions introduced by מִהֳרָה, which really contain an affirmation and are used to state the reason for a request or warning, e.g. 2 S 2:22 turn thee aside ... wherefore should I smite thee to the ground? i.e. otherwise I will (or must) smite, &c.; cf. 1 S 19:17, and Driver on the passage; 2 Ch 25:16; also Gn 27:45, Ex 32:12 (Jo 2:17, Ps 79:10, 115:2); Ct 1:7, Ec 5:5, 7:17, Dn 1:10.

2. The rare cases in which a *simple* question is introduced by מִן (as sometimes in Latin by *an?* is it?) are really due to the suppression of the first member of a double question; thus 1 K 1:27, Is 29:16, Jb 6:12, 39:13.

¹ On the use of the *imperfect* in deliberative questions, see § 107 t; on the *perfectum confidentiae* in interrogative sentences, see § 106 n.

² Analogous to this is the use of the interrogative מִהֳרָה in the sense of a reproachful remonstrance instead of a prohibition, as Ct 8:4 מִהֳרָה-עִירָה why should ye stir up? i.e. pray, stir not up; cf. also Jb 31:1; see above, § 148.

(b) Disjunctive questions are, as a rule, introduced by מִנְּ—הַ (utrum—an?) or sometimes by מִנְּ¹—הַ, e.g. Jo 1:2, Jb 21:4 (even with הַ repeated after מִנְּ in a question which implies disbelief, Gn 17:17). In Jb 34:17, 40:8 f. special emphasis is given to the first member by הַנְּ prop. *is it even?* The second member is introduced by אָ or in 2 K 6:27, Jb 16:3, 38:28, 31:36 (Mal 1:8 הַאֲ), in each case before הַ, and hence no doubt for euphonic reasons, to avoid the combination 'מִנְּ הַ'; cf. also Ju 18:19, Ec 2:19.

Double questions with (מִנְּ) מִנְּ—הַ need not always be mutually exclusive; frequently the disjunctive form serves (especially in poetic parallelism; but cf. also e.g. Gn 37:8) merely to repeat the same question in different words, and thus to express it more emphatically. So Jb 4:17 *shall mortal man be just before God? or (מִנְּ) shall a man be pure before his Maker?* Jb 6:5 f., 8:3, 10:4 f., 11:2, 7, 22:3, Is 10:15, Jer 5:29. The second member may, therefore, just as well be connected by a simple יֵ, e.g. Jb 13:7, 15:7 f., 38:16 f.22, 32, 39; cf. also Ps 8:5 after הַמְּ; Jb 21:17 f. after הַמְּ; or even without a conjunction, Jb 8:11, 22:4; after הַמְּ Ps 144:3.

(c) With regard to *indirect* questions² after verbs of inquiring, doubting, examining,³ &c., simple questions of this kind take either הַ whether, Gn 8:8,⁴ or מִנְּ Gn 15:5, 2 K 1:2, Ct 7:13; even before a noun-clause, Jer 5:1; in 1 S 20:10 the indirect question is introduced by אָ, i.e. probably *if perchance*. In disjunctives (*whether—or*) מִנְּ—הַ Nu 13:18 at the end (or הַ—אָמֵל אָ—הַ Gn 24:21, 27:21, 37:32, Ex 16:4), and הַ—הַ Nu 13:18, which is followed by מִנְּ—הַ; also אָ—הַ Ec 2:19. The formula מִן יְדֵךְ יְדֵי has an affirmative force, *who knows whether ... not*, like the Latin *nescio an*, Est 4:14.

In Jon 1:7, 8 the relative pronouns ·יְ and רֹשֶׁר owing to the following הַלְּ have become also interrogative, *for whose cause?*

(d) הַ and הַוָּ (cf. § 136 c) immediately after the interrogative serve to give vividness to the question; so also אָפֹוָא (for which אָפֹוָא five times in Job) *then, now*, Gn 27:33 מִתְּאָפֹוָא הָוָא who then is he? Ju 9:38, Is 19:12, Jb 17:15; אָפֹוָא where then is ...? However, אָפֹוָא may also be placed at the end of the entire question (Ex 33:16, Is 22:1; also Ho 13:10, since either הַיְּ is a dialectical form of הַזְּ, or הַזְּ should be read instead of it) or at the beginning of the question proper, after a strongly emphasized word, as in Gn 27:37.¹

¹ ¹ מִנְּ occurs in Pr 27:24 after a negative statement; we should, however, with Dyserinck read אָמָן. Not less irregular is אָלְלַ instead of לְאָלַל in the second clause of Ju 14:15, but the text can hardly be correct (cf. Moore, *Judges*, New York, 1895, p. 337); in 1 S 23:11 the second הַ introduces a fresh question which is only loosely connected with the first.—In Nu 17:28 and in the third clause of Jb 6:13, הַמְּ is best taken with Ewald in the sense of אָלְלַ, since מִנְּ from its use in oaths (see above, § 149 b) may simply mean *verily not*.

² ² It should here be remarked that the distinction between direct and indirect questions cannot have been recognized by the Hebrew mind to the same extent as it is in Latin or English. In Hebrew there is no difference between the two kinds of sentence, either as regards mood (as in Latin) or in tense and position of the words (as in English). Cf. also § 137 c.

³ ³ In Gn 43:6 the הַ after לְהַגִּיד is explained from the fact that the latter, according to the context, implies *to give information upon a question*.

⁴ ⁴ Also in Ec 3:21 we should read הַלְּהַ and חַתְּחַתְּ (whether—whether) instead of the article which is assumed by the Masora.

¹ ¹ On the other hand, in Jb 9:24 and 24:25 אָפֹוָא is not prefixed to the יְ, but appended to the conditional sentence.

(e) Sometimes one interrogative governs two co-ordinate clauses, the first of which should rather be subordinated to the second, so that the interrogative word strictly speaking affects only the second; thus Is 5:4 after מִזְעָן wherefore looked I ... and it brought forth? i.e. wherefore brought it forth, while I looked, &c.; Is 50:2; after וְ Nu 32:6, Jer 8:4, also Nu 16:22 (read הַאֲשֶׁר); after וְ Jos 22:20; after וְ Is 58:3, 2 Ch 32:4; after אֵלֹתִים Is 40:25.² But וְ Jb 4:2 and וְ 4:21 are separated from the verb to which they belong by the insertion of a conditional clause.

3. The affirmative answer is generally expressed, as in Latin, by repeating the emphatic word in the question (or with the second person changed to the first, Gn 24:58, 27:24, 29:5, Ju 13:11), Gn 29:6, 37:32 f., 1 S 23:11, 26:17, 1 K 21:10, Jer 37:17. (On שִׁנְיָה if it be so in the corrected text of 2 K 10:15, see § 159 dd.) As a negative answer the simple וְ is sometimes sufficient, as in Gn 19:2, 1 K 3:22, &c.; cf. § 152 c; and in Ju 4:20 the simple אֵין equivalent to no or no one.

§ 151. Desiderative Sentences.

A wish may be expressed not only by the simple imperfect (§ 107 n), cohortative (§ 108, especially with וְ § 108 c), jussive (§ 109; with וְ § 109 b), imperative (§ 110 a), perfect consecutive (§ 112 aa) or by a simple noun-clause (§ 116 r, note, and § 141 g) but also in the following ways:—

1. By exclamations in the form of *interrogative* clauses:³ especially sentences with וְ followed by the imperfect as being the mood of that which is still unfulfilled but possible, and hence also of that which is desired, e.g. 2 S 15:4 מִי יִשְׂפַּט נִי שְׁפֵט who maketh me judge? i.e. O that I were made judge! 1 S 20:10, 2 S 23:15. On the other hand, וְ with the perfect (Gn 21:7, Nu 23:10, 1 S 26:9, Is 53:1, &c.) or participle (Ps 59:8, Pr 24:22, &c.), rather expresses a rhetorical question, i.e. a denial, cf. § 150 d. Especially frequent is the use of מִי יִתְּהַנֵּן (prop. who gives?) to introduce all kinds of desiderative clauses (see under b).—In Mal 1:10 the desiderative clause proper is co-ordinated with an interrogative clause, מִי גַם־בָּכֶם וַיִּסְגַּר דַּלְתָּה יְמִם would that one were among you and would shut the doors, i.e. O that one would shut the doors!

Rem. Sometimes the original sense of מִי יִתְּהַנֵּן is still plainly discernible, e.g. Ju 9:29 מִי יִתְּהַנֵּן אֲתָּה הַעַם כִּי בְּדָי who gives this people into my hand? equivalent to, O that this people were given into my hand! cf. Ps 55:7. In these examples, however, מִי יִתְּהַנֵּן is still equivalent to O had I! and in numerous other instances the idea of giving has entirely disappeared, מִי having become stereotyped as a more desiderative particle (*utinam*). Its construction is either—

(a) With the *accusative* (in accordance with its original meaning) of a substantive, Dt 28:67 would that it were even! ... morning! Ju 9:29, Ps 14:7 (53⁷), 55:7; with an accusative and a following infinitive, Jb 11:5; with two accusatives, Nu 11:29, Jer 8:23; with the accusative of an infinitive, Ex 16:3, 2 S 19:1 מִי יִתְּהַנֵּן מוֹתִי אַנְיִתְּחַפֵּךְ would that I had died for thee (for cf. § 135 f); of a participle, Jb 31:35; of a personal pronoun (as a suffix), Jb 29:2

² Cf. the analogous sentences after עַן because, Is 65:12, Jer 35:17; after causal וְ 1 S 26:23; after כי Is 12:1; likewise after וְ § 153 at the end; after פָּנָן Dt 8:12–14, 25:3, Jos 6:18, 2 S 12:28.

³ The transition from a question to a wish may be seen, e.g. in Nu 11:4 who shall give us flesh to eat? i.e. O that we had flesh to eat!

(with a following קָרְבָּן; but מִיְתַּבְנֵנִי Is 27:4 and Jer 9:1 with a following accusative is not simply equivalent to מִיְתַּבְנֵנִי, but is properly *who endows me with*, &c.; cf. § 117 ff).—With a still greater weakening of the original meaning מִיְתַּבְנֵנִי is used with an adjective in Jb 14:4 *could a clean thing but come out of an unclean!* i.e. *how can a clean thing come*, &c.; similarly in Jb 31:31 *who can find one that hath not been satisfied!*

(b) With a following perfect, Jb 23:3 (cf. § 120 e); with a perfect consecutive, Dt 5:26 *O that they had such an heart!*

(c) With a following imperfect, Jb 6:8, 13:5, 14:13; in Jb 19:23 the imperfect is twice added with *Wāw* (cf. a above, on Mal. 1:10).

On the cohortative in the apodosis to such desiderative clauses, cf. § 108 f.

2. The wish may also be expressed by the particles אֲמֹם (Ps 81:9, 95:7, 139:19, Pr 24:11, 1 Ch 4:10; always with a following imperfect) and לְוִי (for which in Ps 119:5 we have אֲמֹתִי, 2 K 5:3 אֲמֹתִי, from אָמַת ah! and לְוִי=לְוִי; both with a following imperfect) *si, o si! utinam.*¹ לְוִי is followed by the imperfect, Gn 17:18, Jb 6:2; by the jussive, Gn 30:34 (rather concessive, equivalent to *let it be so*); by the perfect, as the expression of a wish that something might have happened in past time (cf. § 106 p), Nu 14:2 *would that we had died*; 20:3 and Jos 7:7 (both times וְלוּ); on the other hand, Is 48:18 and 63:19 (both times וְלוּא) to express a wish that something expected in the future may already have happened.—On לְוִי with the imperative (by an anacoluthon) Gn 23:13 cf. § 110 e. On the perfect after בִּי אֲמֹם Gn 40:14, 2 K 5:20, cf. § 106 n, note 2.

§ 152. Negative Sentences.

1. Besides the use of rhetorical questions (§§ 150 d, 151 a), independent sentences are made negative by the adverbs לֹא (Jb 6:21, where instead of the *K^eth.* לֹא we must evidently read לֹא; perhaps preserved as a substantive) = the Greek οὐ, *not*, אֲלֹא = μή (Jb 24:25 as a substantive), אֵין (*it is*) *not*; מֵעַת not yet, סֶפֶת not, אַפְסִי (cf. § 90 m) *not*. The forms בְּלִתְיַי, בְּלִי, בְּלִי not belong almost entirely to poetry.—With regard to לֹא and אֵין the main distinction is that verbal-clauses (rarely noun-clauses, see e) are regularly negated by לֹא (besides its use as negating single words¹), while אֵין is used exclusively with noun-clauses (see the examples below).

1¹ Cf. a similar transition from a conditional to a desiderative particle, in consequence of the suppression of the apodosis, in the English, *O if I had!* and the like; e.g. Nu 22:29 *if there were* (לֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוו) *a sword in my hand now had I surely killed thee!*

1¹ Especially in compounds, e.g. לְאַל lit. *a no-God* (Germ. *Ungott*) who is indeed called a god, but is not really a god, Dt 32:21; לְאַלְכָה verse 17, cf. Jer 5:7, 2 Ch 13:9; לְאַעֲצָם lit. *a not-people* (Germ. *Unvolk*), Dt 32:21; לְאַתְּ nothing, Am 6:13; lit. *not-wood*, Is 10:15; לְאַנְקָם, לְאַנְשָׁם lit. *not-man, superhuman* (of God), Is 31:8; לְאַזְרָעָם unrighteousness, Jer 22:13, cf. Ez 22:29; לְאַסְטָרִים disorder, Jb 10:22; לְאַחֲמָה not-violence, 16:17; after לְאַדְעָז, לְאַכְּבָח helplessness, 16:17; cf. also Jb 26:2 f. (לְאַדְעָז, לְאַכְּבָח insipientia); cf. also Is 55:2 בְּלֹוֹא לְשָׁבָעָה for what is unsatisfying; Ps 44:13, Jb 8:11, 15:32, 1 Ch 12:33.—In Nu 20:5 a construct state with several genitives is negated by לֹא. Also לֹא is used with an infinitive, Nu 35:23; with an adjective, לְאַחֲם

The conjunctions **פַּאַר** and **לֹא** *that not*, serve to negative dependent clauses. The particular uses of these particles are as follows:—

(a) **לֹא** (less frequently **לִזְאָה**), like **וְ**, **וְנִקְ**, is used regularly for the *objective, unconditional negation*, and hence is usually connected with the perfect or imperfect (as indicative); on **לֹא** with the imperfect to express an unconditional prohibition, see § 107 o; on its use with the jussive, see § 109 d.—On **לֹא** for **כַּלְאָה** *nonne*, in interrogative sentences, cf. § 150 a. In connexion with **כֵּל** (= *any*), **לֹא** is used to express an *absolute negation, nullus, none whatever* (cf. the French *ne ... personne, ne ... rien*), usually in the order **כֵּל** ... **לֹא** ... **כֵּל**, e.g. Gn 3:1 **לֹא** ... **כֵּל** **אָכַל** **מִכֶּל** **עַץ** **הַדְּבָר** *ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden*; 9:11, Ex 10:15, 20:10, Lv 7:23, Dt 8:9, Jer 13:7, 32:17 (**לֹא** ... **כֵּל** **צְבָר**) *nothing at all*; cf. the same statement in the form of a rhetorical question, Jer 32:27); Pr 12:21, 30:30 and turneth *not away for any*; 2 Ch 32:15; but cf. also the inverted order, Ex 12:16 **בְּלֹא** **מְלָאָה** **לְאַיִלְעָשָׂה** *no manner of work shall be done*; 12:43, 15:26, 22:21, Lv 16:17, Jb 33:13, Dn 11:37. The meaning is different when **כֵּל** by being determinate is used in the sense of *whole*, e.g. Nu 23:13 **כָּלֹו** **לֹא** **תִּרְאֶה** *thou shalt not see them all*, but only a part.

Analogous to **לֹא** is the use of **אֵישׁ** ... **לֹא** ... **כִּל** ... **אֵישׁ** ... **לֹא** ... **כִּיל** in verbal-clauses in the sense of *no one at all, not a single one*. On **אֵיזֶבֶל** *nothing at all*, see under p.

Rem. 1. The examples in which **לֹא** is used absolutely as a negative answer, equivalent to *certainly not! no!* must be regarded as extremely short verbal-clauses, e.g. Gn 19:2 (**לֹא** according to the context for &c.); 23:11, 42:10, Hag 2:12, Jb 23:6, sometimes with a following **כִּי** *but*, Gn 19:2 (see above); Jos 5:14, 1 K 3:22.

2. The negation of *noun-clauses* by **לֹא** (as opposed to the regular negation by **אֵין**) always includes a certain emphasis, since the force of the negation falls rather upon a particular word (cf. e.g. Ez 36:32), than upon the whole clause. In 2 S 3:34 *thy hands were not bound*, a participle is thus specially negated by **לֹא**; cf. Ps 74:9, where, however, **אֵין** is separated from the participle by **נוּבָה**, and Jb 12:3. As a rule, noun-clauses with a pronominal subject are thus negated by **לֹא**, Gn 20:12, Nu 35:23 (Dt 4:42, 19:4); 1 S 15:29, 2 S 21:2, Jer 4:22, Ps 22:7, Jb 28:14, parallel with **אֵין**; generally with **לֹא** before a substantival predicate, e.g. Ex 4:10 **לֹא** **אִישׁ** **צְבָרִים** **אֲגָם** **כִּי** *I am not a man of words*; Am 5:18.—Noun-clauses with a substantival subject, Gn 29:7, Nu 23:19, Is 22:2, 44:19, Hag 1:2, Ps 22:3, Jb 9:32, 18:17, 21:9, 22:16, 36:26 (with **ן** of the apodosis); 41:2; in Jb 9:33 even **לֹא** **יִשְׁׁ** *non est* is used instead of **אֵין**.—In Pr 18:5 **לֹא** is used before an adjectival predicate; in 1 S 20:26 (where a preceding noun-clause is negated by **כְּלֹא**) read **לֹא** **טָהָר** (**כְּלֹא**) with the LXX, for **לֹא** **טָהָר**. On **לֹא** for **אֵין** in circumstantial clauses to express attributive ideas, see u below.

3. As a rule **לֹא** stands immediately before the verb, but sometimes is separated from it (frequently to bring into special prominence another word which follows it); thus Jb 22:7, Ec 10:10 before the object and verb; Nu 16:29 before the subject and verb; Dt 8:9, 2 S 3:34, Ps

unwise, Dt 32:6, Ho 13:13; **לֹא-עָזִים** *impious*, Ps 43:1; and **לֹא-עָז** *not strong*, Pr 30:25 f.; **לֹא** **טָהָר** *unsuitably*, 2 K 7:9; **לֹא-טָוב** *not-good*, Is 65:2, Ez 20:25, &c.; **לֹא** **טָהָר** *not-clean*, 2 Ch 30:17; with a participle, e.g. Jer 2:2 (*unsown*); (6⁸, Ez 4:14, 22:24, Zn 2:1, 3:5; the Masora, however, requires **מִתְחַנֵּן** in Is 54:11, **בָּהּ** in 62:12, **נִזְנַחַת** **בָּהּ** in Jer 6:8, **מִתְחַנֵּן** in Ho 1:6, i.e. always 3rd sing. fem. perf. in pause = *she was not comforted*, &c., and consequently not compounds, but either relative clauses or (Is 54:11, Ho 1:6, and especially 2:25) main clauses instead of proper names.—On the above compounds generally, cf. the dissertation mentioned in § 81 d, note 2; on their use in sentences expressing a state, to convey attributive ideas, see u below.

49:18, 103:10, Jb 13:16, 34:23 before a complementary adjunct. In Dt 32:5 לֹא according to the accentuation even stands at the end of the clause (*they offend him not*); but undoubtedly לֹא בְּנֵי are to be taken together.—On the position of לֹא with the infinitive absolute, see § 113 v.

(b) לֹא is used like μή and *ne* to express a *subjective* and *conditional* negation, and hence especially in connexion with the jussive (§ 109 c and e) to introduce prohibitions, warnings, negative desires, and requests. On לֹא with the imperfect, see § 107 p; with the cohortative, see § 108 c; on 2 K 6:27, see § 109 h.

Rem. 1. לֹא (like לֹא, see note on ^a above) maybe used to form a compound word, as in Pr 12:28 לֹא-מוֹת *not-death* (immortality); though all the early versions read לֹא. The instances in which לֹא appears to stand absolutely, equivalent to *no, certainly not* (like μή for μὴ γένεται), e.g. Ru 1:13 לֹא בָּנָת *nay, my daughters*, and Gn 19:18, 33:10 (אֲלֹא), are also due (see under c) to extreme shortening of a full clause (in 2 S 13:25 such a clause is repeated immediately afterwards); thus in 2 S 1:21, Is 62:2, Ps 83:2 יְהִי is evidently to be supplied, and in Jo 2:13, Am 5:14, Pr 8:10 the corresponding jussive from the preceding imperatives, in Pr 17:12 from the preceding infinitive absolute.

2. לֹא, like לֹא, regularly stands immediately before the verb, but in Is 64:8, Jer 10:24, 15:15, Ps 6:2, 38:2 before another strongly emphasized member of the sentence.¹

(c) אין construct state (unless it be sometimes merely a contracted connective form, cf. מֵשׁ for שֵׁם § 97 d) of אין *non-existence* (as also the absolute state, see below) is the negative of ישׁ *existence*; cf. e.g. Gn 31:29 with Neh 5:5. As ישׁ (*he, she, it is, was, &c.*) includes the idea of *being* in all tenses, so אין *not* includes the idea of *not being* in all tenses. Hence—

(1) The absolute state אין, with an evident transition to the meaning of a verbal predicate, *there does not exist*, always follows the word negated, e.g. Is 37:3 (2 K 19:3) וְכַח אֵין לְלִקְחָה and strength does not exist to bring forth; Gn 2:5 אין was not present; Ex 17:7 אִם־אִין or is he not? after ישׁ is he ...? (cf. Nu 13:20); Lv 26:37, Nu 20:5, Ju 4:20 (אין no). In 1 S 9:4 and 10:14 אין is used in reference to a plural; 1 K 18:10, Is 41:17, 45:21, 59:11, Mi 7:2, Pr 13:4, 25:14, Jb 3:9 אין אֵין and let there be none, let none come! Ec 3:19.—Cf. finally אִם־אִין if it be not so, Gn 30:1, Ex 32:32, Ju 9:15, 2 K 2:10.—Quite anomalous is אין Jb 35:15 before a perfect as an emphatic negation; the text, however, can hardly be correct.

(2) The construct state אין stands in its natural position immediately before the substantive whose non-existence it predicates, or before the subject of the sentence which is to be negated. To the former class belong also the very numerous instances in which אין is joined to a participle, e.g. 1 S 26:12 אֵין רָאֶה וְאֵין יָדַע אֵין מַקְרִיז and there was not one seeing, &c., i.e. and no man saw it, nor knew it, neither did any awake; so especially אין with a participle in subordinate circumstantial or descriptive clauses, such as Is 5:29 וְיִקְלִיט וְאֵין מַצִּיל and he shall carry it away, while there is none delivering, i.e. without any one's delivering it; Ps 7:3, &c.; Lv 26:6 &c., וְאֵין מַחְרִיך without any one's making you afraid; cf. § 141 e. אין is used as the negation of an entire noun-clause, e.g. in Gn 39:23, Nu 14:42 אֵין יְהוָה בְּקָרְבָּם the Lord is not among you; Gn 37:29 אֵין־יְוִסֶּף בְּבֹור Joseph was not in the pit.

¹ In Jer 51:3 the pointing לֹא occurs twice instead of לֹא, and is thus, in the opinion of the Masoretes, equivalent to *against him that bendeth*; but undoubtedly we should read לֹא.

(3) When the subject which is to be negated is a personal pronoun, it is joined as a suffix to אֵין, according to § 100 o, e.g. אַנְתָּן נִי I am not, was not, shall not be; fem. אַנְתָּךְ, thou art not, &c.; also absolutely, Gn 42:13 he is (5²⁴ he was) no longer alive; אַנְתָּם they are not, &c. When the accompanying predicate is a verb, it follows again (see l) in the form of a participle, since אֵין always introduces a noun-clause, e.g. Ex 5:10 אַנְתָּךְ נֹתֶן I will not give; 8:17, Dt 1:32.

Rem. In Neh 4:17 אֵין נִי for אֵין אֲנִי is due to its being co-ordinate with three other (substantival) subjects; these are again expressly summed up in אֵין אֲנָה נִנְחָנוּ.—In Hag 2:17 אֵין אֲתָּכֶם the pronominal complement of אֵין appears to follow with the sign of the accusative; but most probably we should read with the LXX אֲתָּכֶם בְּכֶם שׁ for אֲתָּכֶם בְּכֶם שׁ.

(4) The fact that אֵין (like אֵת) always includes the idea of a verb (*is not, was not, &c.*) led finally to such a predominance of the verbal element, that the original character of אֵין as a construct state (but cf. i above) was forgotten, and accordingly it is very frequently separated from its noun (substantive or participle); especially so by the insertion of shorter words (of the nature of enclitics), e.g. Is 1:6, לו Lv 11:10, 12, לה Gn 11:30, מ Ps 14:3, ש Ju 18:10, Ex 12:30; but cf. also Ps 5:10, 6:6, 32:2, and אֵין used absolutely in Ex 22:2, 1 K 8:9, Ru 4:4.—Hence, finally, even the transposition of אֵין and its noun became possible, e.g. Gn 40:8 and 41:15 וְתַּר אֵין אָתוֹ and an interpreter there is not of it; Gn 47:13, Ju 14:6, 1 S 21:2, Is 1:30, Jer 30:13, Hb 2:19, Pr 5:17 (אֵין=neve sint; cf. k above, on Jb 3:9); 30:27.—In Gn 19:31, Ex 5:16 אֵין is placed between the subject and predicate.

Rem. 1. Like אֵין כָּל (see b above) so also אֵין כָּל expresses an *absolute* negation, e.g. Ec 1:9 אֵין כָּל-חֶשֶׁךְ there is no new thing, &c.; 2 S 12:3, Dn 1:4 (cf. also there is nothing, 1 K 18:43, Ec 5:13); as also אֵין כָּל ... אֵין Hb 2:19; cf. Ju 14:6.

2. Undoubtedly akin to אֵין in origin is the negative syllable אֵי occurring in the two compounds אֵי קְבֻוד (as a proper name, 1 S 4:21; Baer אֵי קְבֻוד not innocent, Jb 22:30; but the proper name אֵי יְמָנָר is doubtful, and the fem. אֵין בָּל very doubtful. In Ethiopic this אֵי is the most common form of negation, prefixed even to verbs.

(d) סְפִּרְתִּי not yet, when referring to past time is used, as a rule (§ 107 c), with the imperfect, Gn 2:5 סְפִּרְתִּי ... none ... yet; see b and p above; Gn 19:4, 24:45, Jos 2:8, 1 S 3:3; with the imperfect in the sense of a present, Ex 10:7 הַצְּפָנָה תִּعְדָּה knowest thou not yet? Ex 9:30; but cf. Gn 24:15, and סְפִּרְתִּי בָּטָה with the perfect in Ps 90:2 (but see § 107 c), Pr 8:25.

(e) סְפִּירָה (prop. a substantive, *cessation*) no longer, including the verbal idea of existing, cf. Dt 32:36, Is 45:6, 14, 46:9; used absolutely, Am 6:10 in the question הַאֲסֵף עַזְּרָה אִישׁ is there none left? &c., 2 S 9:3; frequently also in the sense of non nisi; with יְהִי paragogic (§ 90 m) Is 47:8, 10, Zp 2:15 אַנְתָּךְ יְהִי עַזְּרָה I am, and there is none else.

(f) בָּלְתִּי² in poetic and prophetic style, and with a certain emphasis, = לֹא, is used with the imperfect, e.g. Is 26:14, 33:20, 23 (immediately afterwards with a perfect); Ho 7:2, Ps 49:13,

¹ According to De Lagarde, *Novaes psalterii graeci editionis specimen*, p. 26, Ps 3:3 is also an accusative after אֵין.

² Evidently from בָּלָה to waste away, from which stem also בָּלְתִּי (whence § 90 m), originally substantives, are formed.

Pr 10:30 (but Is 14:21 before the jussive, = אַל); before an adjective, Pr 24:23; before a preposition, Ps 16:2, Pr 23:7.

(g) בְּלִי with a perfect, Gn 31:20, Is 14:6; with an imperfect, Jb 41:18; to negative a participle, Ho 7:8, Ps 19:4; to negative an adjective, 2 S 1:21.

(h) בְּלֹתִי to negative an adjective, 1 S 20:26; on בְּלֹתִי Ez 13:3, see x; on לְבָלָתִי as the regular negative with the infinitive construct, see § 114 s; on לְבָלָתִי as a conjunction, see x below.

On אֲמֹן as a negative particle in oaths (*verily not*), see § 149 c above.

Rem. on אֲמֹן, אֵין, בְּלִי, אֵין, בְּלִי. To the category of negative sentences belongs also the expression of negative attributes by means of אֲמֹן, בְּלִי, not (both so used almost exclusively in poetic language) or אֵין with a following substantive, mostly in the simplest form of circumstantial clause; e.g. 2 S 23:4 בְּקֶרֶל אֲמֹן a morning when there are not clouds, i.e. a cloudless morning; cf. Jb 12:24, 26^{2 b}, 38:26 (לֹא-אִישׁ where no man is, i.e. uninhabited); 1 Ch 2:30, 32 אֵין בְּנִים childless; so also e.g. Jb 24:10 and e.g. Ps 88:5 I am as a man אֵין יְצָרָל there is not help, i.e. like a helpless man; Is 9:6 אֵין עָזָב endless; 47:1, Ho 7:11, אֵין יְמָסֵר countless, Ct 6:8, &c., but usually (Ps 104:25, &c.) like a proper circumstantial clause (cf. § 141 e) connected by *Wāw*, אֵין יְמָסֵר.—Less frequently such periphrases take the form of relative clauses (cf. § 155 e), e.g. Jb 30:13 לֹא עִיר לֹא they for whom there is no helper, i.e. the helpless (but probably עִיר is only an intrusion from 29:12, and we should read עַצְר without any one's restraining them; in 29:12 translate the fatherless and him that had none to help him; in Ps 72:12 עִיר is used in the same sense); Hb 1:14; with יְמִינְךָ Is 45:9 thy work is that of a man who hath no hands; Zc 9:11 out of the waterless pit.¹

How far such compounds finally came to be regarded by the language simply as negative adjectives, may be seen partly from the fact that they (as also relative clauses analogous to the above) are frequently co-ordinated with real adjectives, Jo 1:6, Ps 72:12, Jb 29:12; cf. also Is 59:10, where קָא עָזִין יְמִינְךָ is parallel with בְּעָזִים; partly from their being introduced by the sign of the dative ל, e.g. Is 40:29 (= and to the powerless); Jb 26^{2 a³}, Neh 8:10.

(i) לֹא lest, that not, at the beginning of a clause expressing a fear or precaution, hence especially after such ideas as fearing, Gn 32:12, &c. (cf. δείδω μή, vereor ne), taking heed, frequently after the idea of care, Gn 24:6, 31:24, &c., taking care, 2 K 10:23, &c. Not infrequently the idea on which לֹא depends, is only virtually contained in the main clause, e.g. Gn 19:19 I cannot escape to the mountain (because I am afraid), רְאֵה לֹא תִּקְרַבْנִי הַרְאֵה lest some evil overtake me; Gn 26:9, 38:11; also in Gn 44:34 from the rhetorical question how shall I ... ? we must understand I cannot, governing לֹא. This is especially the case after an appeal to do or not to do an action by which something may be prevented (in which case לֹא is simply equivalent to the final ne); cf. e.g. Gn 11:4, 19:15, Nu 20:18 (where לֹא lest is separated from the verb by a strongly emphasized substantive); Ju 15:12 after swear unto me; Pr 24:18.—In Gn 3:22 and now, lest he put forth his hand, &c., לֹא is to be regarded as virtually dependent on a cohortative, which immediately afterwards (verse 23) is changed into an historic tense; cf. also Gn 26:7, 31:31, 42:4 Ex 13:17, 1 S 13:19, 27:11, Ps 38:17, in every case after כִּי אָמַר, כִּי אָמַר, &c.=I thought, &c., I must beware lest, &c.

¹ In Pr 9:13 (perhaps also 14:7; but see Delitzsch on the passage) a verbal-clause is used co-ordinately in this way as a periphrasis for an adjective.

Rem. According to § 107 q, פֶּרְאָה is naturally followed by the imperfect; for the exceptions, 2 S 20:6, 2 K 2:16, see § 107 q, note 3; cf. moreover, 2 K 10:23 רֹאֵה פָּנִים־פָּה look lest there be here, &c.

(k) לְבַلְתִּי that ... not, with the imperfect, Ex 20:20, 2 S 14:14 (in Jer 23:14 read the infinitive שׁוֹב for בַּכְלָתִי יְרָאֵה). In Ez 13:3 בְּאַזְּנָבָן is a relative clause governed by לְ= according to things which they have not seen.

2. Two negatives in the same sentence do not neutralize each other (as in *nonnulli, non nemo*), but make the negation the more emphatic (like οὐκ οὐδείς, οὐκ οὐδαμῶς, *nulli—non, nemo non*); e.g. Zp 2:2 (if the text is correct) בְּפָנָם לֹא־יָבוֹא before there shall (not) come.¹ This especially applies to the compounds formed by the union of אֵין or מִן with בְּלִי without (§ 119 y), e.g. Is 5:9 (6¹¹) מִאֵין יוֹשֵׁב (for which in Jer 2:15 מִבְּלִי, prop. *without no inhabitant*, i.e. so that no inhabitant is left there. On the other hand, in Is 50:2 the מִן is causative, because there is no water; as also in Ex 14:11 מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָמַשׁ אֵין is it because there were no ...? 2 K 1:3, 6, 16. In Ec 3:11 מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָמַשׁ is it because that man cannot, &c.).

3. The negative sometimes extends its influence from the first to a second negative sentence parallel with it (which may or may not have *Wāw*); e.g. 1 S 2:3 talk not so much arrogance; let (not) boasting come out of your mouth; Ex 28:43, Lv 19:12, 22:9, 15 f., Nu 16:14, 23:19, Dt 7:25, Is 23:4, 28:27, 38:18, 47:14, Ez 16:47, Ps 9:19, 13:5, 35:19, 38:2, 44:19, 75:6, Jb 28:17 (so לֹא־מִהָּא why ... not? in Jb 3:11 also affects the parallel clause).

§ 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses.

The particles אך, רק only, serve to introduce restrictive clauses, and גם, אף also, besides, even, intensive clauses. It is to be observed that the force of these particles does not necessarily affect the word which immediately follows (as is the case with אך Gn 7:23, 34:15; רק Gn 6:5, Am 3:2; even אך הָרָק矣 he indeed only? Nu 12:2; גם Gn 27:34, Jb 7:11; אף Dt 15:17), but very frequently extends to the whole of the following sentence. Thus with אך, e.g. Nu 14:9, 1 K 17:13, Pr 17:11, Jb 13:15, 14:22, 16:7, 23:6; רק Gn 20:11, 24:8, Ps 32:6, Pr 13:10; וגם Gn 27:33, 32:21 (גם הָפֵה), 44:10; 1 S 22:7, 28:20, Zc 9:11, Pr 17:26, 20:11; אף Jb 14:3, 15:4.—In Mal 1:10 and Jb 2:10 וגם is placed before two co-ordinate sentences, although, strictly speaking, it applies only to the second. Cf. the analogous examples in § 150 m.

§ 154. Sentences connected by Wāw.

*Wāw copulativum*¹ (々) serves to connect two or more sentences, or single words (on its various vocalization, cf. § 104 d–g). Its use, however, is by no means restricted

¹ In 1 K 10:21 אף אַיִן־כִּסְף goes with what precedes and must be emended, with the LXX and Lucian, to כִּי הַכִּסְף.

¹ For further particulars of the use of *wāw copulativum*, see Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, i. 393 ff. On its use in the co-ordination of similar tenses and moods (e.g. five

imperfects consecutive in Gn 25:34, five perfects with **וְגַם** (וְגַם) as well as of dissimilar tenses and moods, the remarks made in the treatment of the tenses will suffice. With regard to the connexion of single *nouns* by **וְ** (which strictly speaking is always really a contraction of so many clauses into a single sentence) the following observations may be made:—

(a) Contrary to English usage, which in lengthy enumerations uses the *and* to connect only the last member of the series, in Hebrew *polysyndeton* is customary, as in Gn 12:16 *wāw copulativum* six times, 24:35 seven times, 15:19 ff. nine times, and in Jos 7:24 ten times. Sometimes, however, only the last two words are joined (so in a series of three members, Gn 5:32, 10:1, 11:26, 13:2, 14:1, 30:39, &c.; the last three out of a series of four, Jer 2:26); less frequently only the first two, Ps 45:9; cf. § 132 d. The formula **קָמָל שָׁלִשׁוֹם** *yesterday (and) the day before yesterday*, Ex 5:8, &c., is always without the copula. On the other hand, the *constructio asyndetos* in a series of verbs is used as a rhetorical expedient to produce a hurried and so an impassioned description; e.g. Ju 5:27 *at her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay*; Ex 15:9, Dt 32:15, 1 S 15:6, Jer 4:7, Am 5:21, Ps 10:10, 14:1, 45:5, Jb 20:19, 28:4, 29:8, Ct 2:11, 5:6, &c.

(b) Frequently *wāw copulativum* is also *explanatory* (like *isque, et—quidem*, and the German *und zwar*, English *to wit*), and is then called *wāw explicativum*, e.g. Gn 4:4 and (i.e. *namely*) *of the fat thereof* (unless it is simply copulative); Ex 24:12, 25:12 (*to wit two*); 27:14, 28:23, Ju 17:3 (in **וְעַפְרָה**; here as often elsewhere, to introduce an explanatory gloss, cf. Is 17:8, Ez 3:15, and especially P. Haupt, *SBOT. Isaiah*, p. 90, l. 21 ff.), 1 S 17:34 *and that too with the bear*; 2 S 13:20, Is 57:11, Jer 17:10, Am 3:11, 4:10, Ze 9:9, Pr 3:12, Neh 8:13, 2 Ch 23:10 (but in 1 S 28:3 the **וְ** before **בָּעֵירָה** is to be omitted with the LXX); cf. also such combinations as **וְעַד—מִן** *from ... and even to ...*, Gn 13:3, 14:23, 19:4, 11, &c.—In 1 S 6:11 (see Driver on the passage), 2 S 1:23, &c., **וְ** is equivalent to *yea, and*; in Is 32:7 *even*.

וְ is used to express emphasis (=*and especially*), e.g. in Gn 3:16 **וְרָא**; Is 2:1, Ps 18:1, perhaps also in Jb 10:17 *yea, a whole host*; 2 Ch 16:14.—An undoubtedly example of what is called *wāw concomitantiae* occurs in Jb 41:12 *a seething pot* **וְאַגְמָן** *with burning rushes*; cf. Ex 10:10 (*with your little ones*), 12:8, Lv 1:12, Is 42:5. In Arabic this *wāw concom.* is followed by the accusative.

וְוְ is used in the sense of *both—and* in Ps 76:7, Dn 1:3, 8:13. On **וְוְ** as meaning *sive—sive*, cf. § 162 b.

(c) See the Lexicon on adverbs used in a copulative sense, such as **וְגַם** *also, moreover*, summing up a number, e.g. **וְגַם־שְׁנִינָה** *both together*, Gn 27:45, Pr 17:15; **וְכָל** *all together*; as an intensive *and*, e.g. Gn 30:8, 37:7, 1 S 30:8; cf. also such examples as 1 S 24:12 *see, yea see!* **וְגַם** or **וְגַם־גַם** Gn 24:44= *both—and*; **וְ** occurs three times in Gn 24:25 and 32:20; also **וְאַךְ**, which is generally still more intensive, in the sense of *also, in addition to this, even*, and belongs rather to poetry, and to the later language; frequently also equivalent to a mere *and*, but sometimes adversative *but now*, Ps 44:10, &c.; and **וְאַךְ־וְאַךְ** (also three times), equivalent to *both—and*; cf. **וְאַךְ** **וְ** *and even*, Lv 26:44; **וְאַךְ־כִּי** prop. *add to this also that*, equivalent to *not to mention*, according to the context either *quanto magis* or *quanto minus*.

merely to joining sentences which are actually co-ordinate. Frequently the language employs merely the simple connexion by *Wāw*, even to introduce an antithesis (Gn 17:21, 19:19, Lv 2:12, Jb 6:25, and very frequently in circumstantial noun-clauses), or when one of the two clauses is not co-ordinated, but subordinated to the other. On the use of *ו* to introduce circumstantial clauses, cf. especially § 141 e and § 142 d; introducing causal clauses, § 158 a; comparative clauses, § 161 a; final clauses, § 165 a; consecutive clauses, § 166 a. On *wāw apodosis*, cf. § 143 d, and the sections there cited; on the use of *Wāw* in numerical sayings, cf. § 134 s.

Rem. Sometimes *wāw copulativum* joins a sentence apparently to what immediately precedes, but in reality to a sentence which is suppressed and which must, therefore, be supplied from the context. So especially *ו* with imperatives to express inferences, e.g. 1 K 2:22 *אָלִי וְשָׁבֵן* *ask now rather; Ez 18:32 for I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth ... wherefore turn yourselves*. Also at the beginning of a speech in loose connexion with an act or speech of another person, e.g. Ex 2:20, 2 S 18:11, 24:3, 2 K 4:14, 41, 7:13, 2 Ch 25:9; cf. also Jos 7:7 (*וְלֹא*), Ps 2:10, 4:4, Is 8:7. Sometimes the suppression of the protasis is due to passionate excitement or haste, which does not allow time for full expression; this is especially illustrated by Nu 12:14, 20:3 (*וְלֹא*), 1 S 10:12, 15:14, 22:14, 28:16, 2 S 18:12, 24:3, 1 K 2:22 (*וְלֹא*), 2 K 1:10, 7:19 (cf. verse 2); Is 3:14, Zc 2:10, Ps 2:6 (at the same time a circumstantial clause *whereas I=and yet I have, &c.*); cf. also a new clause beginning with the formula of wishing *וַיּוּחֶד* Nu 11:29, Ju 9:29; on the disconnected use of *וְלֹא* and *וְיִשְׁאַל* cf. § 159 dd.

§ 155. Relative Clauses.

See V. Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894 (cf. the heading of § 138 above); G. Bergsträsser, ‘Das hebr. Präfix *ו*,’ *ZATW* 1909, p. 40 ff.¹

1. By § 138 a, e, relative clauses are divided into two classes: those which are used for the nearer definition of a noun (substantive or pronoun), and those which are not dependent on a noun. The former may be called *incomplete*, the latter *complete* relative clauses.

Complete relative clauses, as a rule (see the exceptions under n), are introduced by the originally demonstrative pronoun *שֶׁ*; see further in § 138 e. Similarly, incomplete relative clauses may also be introduced by *שֶׁ*, or by some other demonstrative pronoun; see further in § 138 a and g–k. Very frequently, however, especially in poetic style, the attributive relation is expressed by simple co-ordination.¹

¹ In this exhaustive article the author shows that between *ו* (on the pronunciation see § 36) and *שֶׁ* there is syntactically no primary difference, but only a secondary distinction which arose in the course of the development of the language, namely that *שֶׁ* is preferred in combinations which are customary in the old literary language, and *ו* in those which are derived from the popular language or from Aramaic.

¹ The old view that all these cases arise from the *omission* of *שֶׁ* is incorrect. These co-ordinated attributive clauses are rather a mere subdivision of the various kinds of circumstantial clauses (see § 156) which may be attached to a *nomen regens*. Cf. in English *this is the letter (which) he wrote to me.*

The governing substantive or pronoun is frequently (in certain cases *always*) resumed by a pronominal suffix or an adverb. The resumption may, however, be omitted, just as in relative clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר, &c.; see § 138 f.

In Arabic a distinction is made between relative clauses used for the nearer definition of a *determinate* substantive (*sila*), and those which are attached to an *indeterminate* substantive (*sifa*). The former must be introduced by the demonstrative pronoun *allāqī*, the latter are always simply co-ordinated. The same distinction was no doubt originally observed in Hebrew, since simply co-ordinated relative clauses are most commonly found after *indeterminate* substantives (see the examples below), and in cases like Dt 28:49 (גּוֹי אֲשֶׁר עַמְּךָ תִּתְּשֻׂר, *a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand*; cf. Is 66:13, and especially 1 S 3:11), the addition of אֲשֶׁר is explained from the special stress laid on the indeterminate substantive,² *a nation of such a kind, thou understandest not their tongue*. On the other hand, in poetic style at least, אֲשֶׁר is somewhat frequently omitted even after a determinate noun, but only rarely in prose (except by the Chronicler; cf. 1 Ch 9:22, 12:23, 29:1 (read prob. אֲשֶׁר for אֲשֶׁר), 2 Ch 15:11; after קָלֵי 1 Ch 29:3, 2 Ch 18:23, 30:17, 31:19, Ezr 1:5, but also Gn 39:4; for further instances, see Driver, *Introd.*⁸, p. 537, no. 30); so Ex 18:20, Ju 8:1, 20:15, 1 K 13:12 (=which way), so 2 K 3:8, 2 Ch 18:23; Neh 13:23; after a pronominal subject, 1 S 6:9. In Jer 52:12 for עַמְּךָ read עַמְּךָ with the LXX.

2. If the nearer definition of a substantive or pronoun is effected by simple co-ordination of the relative clause, it may take the form—

(a) Of a noun-clause, e.g. 2 S 20:21 *a man of the hill country of Ephraim whose name was Sheba*; Zc 6:12, Jb 1:1, 3:15 *with princes that had gold*; Ps 11:4, Pr 22:11; when referring to a noun-suffix, e.g. Ps 49:14 זֶה דְּرָכֶם פֶּסֶל לְטוּ this is the way of them who have (self-)confidence.—On periphrases of this kind to express negative attributes, as in Jb 38:26 עַל־אֵין רֶצֶן אֶנְיָשׁ on a land where no man is, see § 152 u, and cf. for this very short form of the relative clause, Gn 15:13 *in a land that belongs not to them*; Dt 32:17 (לְשָׂדֵים לֹא אֶלְעָגָם); Hb 1:6, Pr 26:17 (לְאַלְעָגָם).

(b) Of a verbal clause.

Here we must distinguish the cases in which the retrospective pronoun—

(1) Is the subject of the relative clause, and is contained in the verb; so after a determinate substantive, Ps 34:9 *happy is the man that trusteth in him*; Jb 3^{3 b} חַסְדָּבָנוּ the night which said; after קָלֵי Ps 71:18; referring to a vocative, which is determinate in itself even without the article, Is 54:1, or to a noun-suffix (see under e), Ps 16:4; after an indeterminate substantive, e.g. Jb 31:12 *it is a fire (that) devoureth unto Abaddon*; Dt 32^{17 b}, 1 S 6:9, Is 55:13, 56:2, Ps 68:31, 78:6, Pr 30:17, La 1:10, 2 Ch 28:9; referring to the suffix in Is 28:16, prop. *behold me, who have laid*, &c., but perhaps the participle יִסְדַּק is to be read; 29:14, 38:5 (but probably again the participle יִסְדַּק should be read instead of the imperfect); Ez 25:7. The relative clause is used in this way especially to supply the place of an adjective, e.g. Gn 49:27 אָבִיךָ רָפָא a wolf that ravineth, i.e. a ravining wolf; Is 51:12; to express a negative quality, e.g. Is 40:20, Ho 4:14 עַם לֹא־יִדְבְּנָה an undiscerning people.

2² So Baumann, op. cit., p. 14 f., following Böttcher, *Lehrbuch*, ii. 80.

Rem. Very frequently such relative sentences are attached to substantives which have the particle of comparison ְכָא, e.g. **Jb 7:2** כָא בֶד יִשְׁאָפֵצֵל as a servant that earnestly desireth the shadow, &c.; **Dt 32:11**, **Is 62:1**, **Jer 23:29**, **Ho 6:3**, **Ps 42:2**, **83:15**, **Jb 9:26**, **11:16**; so also after **מוֹ** **Ps 58:5**; after a determinate substantive, e.g. **Is 53:7** (but the better reading is כָא without the article), **61:10 f.**, **Hb 2:14**, **Ps 49:13, 21, 125:1**; see also the examples under **h**. Sometimes it seems simpler in such cases, to take the verb directly as predicate to the preceding substantive, and to explain ְכָא (for אֲשֶׁר, ְכָא; see *Comparative Clauses*, § 161 b) as a conjunction—a view which even Hupfeld was ready to accept, at least as regards **Ps 90:5**, **125:1**, **Is 53:7**, **61:11**, but it can hardly be right.

(2) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun represents an accusative of the object, or would do so if not suppressed, as it usually is in such cases in relative clauses with אֲשֶׁר, cf. §138 b. Examples with the retrospective pronoun are, **Dt 32:17** אֱלֹהִים לֹא יִعْoם gods whom they knew not (see also the end of the verse); after a substantive with ְכָא (see above, g), **Jer 23:9**, **Jb 13:28**. Without a retrospective pronoun, after a determinate substantive, **Ju 8:1**, **Ps 33:12** (preceded by a relative clause with אֲשֶׁר); **Jb 28:1**. Other examples of this kind, though the article is omitted according to poetic usage, are **Is 15:7** (הַתְּהִרְתָּ עַשְׂתָּה, for which **Jer 48:36** יִתְהִרְתָּ עַשְׂתָּה with the substantive in the construct state governing the relative clause, see § 130 d), **Ps 7:16**, **51:10**, **La 1:21**.—Without the retrospective pronoun, after an indeterminate substantive, e.g. **Is 6:6** רָצֶפֶה בְּאָלָקָח יִמְלֹךְ מִעֵל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ a live coal which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar; **Ex 15:17**, **Is 42:16** (48¹⁷, **Ps 25:12**, all after ְכָא; but **Ps 32:8**); **Is 64:2**; **Ec 10:5** (in 6:1 the same clause with אֲשֶׁר); moreover, in **Jer 14:18** read with the LXX עַד אֶל-אֶרֶץ לֹא יִדְעַ, *into a land (that) they know not*.

(3) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun is dependent on a preposition, or its place is taken by the adverb שֶׁ, as in **Jer 2:6** end. Thus after a determinate substantive, **Ps 18:3** צוֹרִי אֵחֶזֶבֶן my rock in which I take refuge; **Ex 18:20**, **Is 42:1**; in **Jb 3^{3a}** also, the omission of the article with יָמָם is only a poetic licence. After an indeterminate substantive, **Jer 2:6**, last clause but one; **Ps 32:2**.

In this case also the retrospective word is not infrequently suppressed, giving rise to extremely short, bold expressions, such as **Is 51:1** look unto the rock חָצְבָתֶם (whence) ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit נִקְרָתֶם (whence) ye were digged; **Jb 21:27** the devices (where-with) ye act violently against me.—A retrospective adverb is suppressed in **Jb 38:19** where is the way (to the place where) the light dwelleth? cf. **38:24**.

Rem. 1. The omission of the retrospective word occurs most frequently in relative clauses which are governed by the construct state of a preceding substantive (especially an expression of time) and hence are virtually in the genitive. In addition to the instances already given in § 130 d, cf. the following: after יְמִין Lv 7:35, **Ps 56:10**; after simple יָמָם **Jer 36:2**; after simple יָמָם **Ps 56:4** (וְיֻמָּא אִירָא on the day when I am afraid); after בְּעֵת הַחַל הַעֲזָל (at the time when the burnt offering began); **20:22, 24:11**, **Jb 6:17**; after לְעֵת Dt 32:35; after עַד-עֵת **Mi 5:2**; after עַת Ps 4:8 thou hast put gladness in my heart more than (their gladness) at the time (when) their corn and their wine are increased.

2. The agreement (§ 138 d) of the retrospective pronoun with a pronominal regens in the 1st or 2nd person also takes place in a simple co-ordinated relative clause in **1 S 26:14** who art thou (that) criest? Cf., however, **Is 63:19** we are become as they over whom (בְּנָה not בְּנָה) thou no longer bearest rule.

3. Occasionally—chiefly in poetic or otherwise elevated style—even *independent* relative clauses are simply co-ordinated with a regens, whereas we should expect them always to be preceded by a demonstrative pronoun, on the analogy of the examples in § 138 e. The suppressed pronoun would stand—

- (a) As subject, Is 41:24 *an abomination* (is he) *that chooseth you* (but read perhaps *לְבָחַר*?); Jb 30:13, cf. § 152 u.
- (b) As object, Is 41:2, with a retrospective pronoun; Mal 2:16 *and him that covereth* (or read *וְכֹסֶה*?); Jb 29:12 *I delivered ... the fatherless also, and him that had none to help him.*
- (c) In the genitive governed by a substantive (cf. § 130 d), Ex 4:13 *שְׁלַח־נָא* *send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send*, i.e. by the hand of some one else; Ps 65:5 and Pr 8:32, verbal-clauses after *אֲשֶׁר O the happiness of* the man, &c.; Ps 81:6, 141:9, Jb 29:16, La 1:14; after *כִּלְיָאָשֶׁר יָשַׁלֵּחַ* as in verses 5 and 8; Ex 9:4; verbal-clauses after *כִּילִי* 1 Ch 29:3, 2 Ch 30:19, 31:19, Ezr 1:5.
- (d) Governed by a preposition; so verbal-clauses after *אֵלֶּה* (*=to the place where*), 1 Ch 15:12, but Ex 23:20 before the same verb; after *בְּ* *אֵלֶּה הַמְּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר* *to the place where*); after *לְ* *לִלוֹא שָׁא לָוֶה* *by them that asked not for me ...* *לְלִי אֲבָקָשׁ נִי* *them that sought me not*; Ez 13:3 *that which they have not seen*, but the text is hardly correct; after *עַל* Ps 119:136, cf. § 158 b; after *עַמּוּד* 2 Ch 16:9.—A noun-clause follows *לְ* in Neh 8:10. An analogous instance in Aramaic is Ezr 5:14 *to one whose name was Sheshbazzar* [so in the papyri, see the Lexicon, p. 1116^a].

§ 156. Circumstantial Clauses.

1. The statement of the particular circumstances under which a subject appears as performing some action, or under which an action (or an occurrence) is accomplished, is made especially (apart from relative clauses, see § 155) by means of noun-clauses connected by *Wāw* with a following subject (see further on this kind of *circumstantial clause* in § 141 e), and by verbal-clauses (see § 142 d). Very frequently, however, such statements of the particular circumstances are subordinated to the main clause by being simply attached, without *Wāw*, either as noun-clauses, sometimes extremely short (see c), or as verbal-clauses (see d–g).

Rem. Among relative clauses of this kind the commonest are the various noun-clauses, which are most closely subordinated to a preceding substantive without *אֲשֶׁר*, e.g. Gn 16:12; also statements of weight, Gn 24:22; of name, Jb 1:1 (also introduced by *וְשָׁמוֹן* Gn 24:29, 1 S 1:1, &c., or *וְהַמִּזְבֵּחַ* Gn 16:1, 22:24, &c.); of a condition of body, Ju 1:7, and others.—Noun-clauses which begin with *wāw* and the *predicate* have a somewhat more independent character than those introduced by *wāw* and the *subject*¹ (Gn 19:1, &c.). The former, however, are also to be regarded as circumstantial clauses, in so far as they describe a *state*

¹ In Dt 32:31 this form of sequence appears to be selected for another purpose, *and indeed our enemies are judges thereof*, with *wāw emphatic*; to take it as a circumstantial clause is too artificial.

which is simultaneous with the principal action; thus **Is 3:7** *I will not be an healer*, **בְּבַיִתִי אֵין** **לֹא** **בָּם** *while in my house is neither bread nor clothing*; **Is 6:6** (**Am 7:7**); **2 S 13:18, 16:1**. Cf. also the instances in § 152 1 of **וְאֵין** **מֵצִיל**, &c.

2. Characteristic examples of circumstantial *noun-clauses* are **Gn 12:8** *and pitched his tent* **בְּיְהוּדָה** *with Bethel on the west and Ai on the east*; **Nu 22:24, 2 S 18:14** *through the heart of Absalom*, **עַזְךָ וְחַי** *while he was yet alive*; **Jer 30:6, Ez 9:2** (cf. **Ct 3:8**), **Na 3:8, Zc 14:5, 2 Ch 23:10**; with the predicate preceding, e.g. **1 S 26:13, Ps 32:8**.—In **Gn 41:29** a noun-clause serves to announce a state in the future.—We may also include here certain set phrases, as prop. **פָנִים אֶל-פָנִים** *face to face* (prop. while *face* was turned *towards face*), **Gn 32:31, Ex 33:11, Dt 34:10, &c.**,¹ so also *to cast oneself down*, **אֶל-פָנִים אֶל-פָנִים** *the face being turned to the earth*, **Gn 19:1, &c.** (for we find **אֶל-פָנִים** in **1 K 1:31, Is 49:23**).²—Cf. finally the formula **אֶם עַל-בָנִים** *mother with children*, **Gn 32:12**; cf. **Ho 10:14** and § 119 aa note 2.

Rem. On circumlocutions of this kind to express negative attributes by means of short noun-clauses (complete or incomplete), cf. § 152 u.

3. As circumstantial *verbal-clauses*,³ we find (1) sometimes affirmative clauses (see below), but far more frequently (2) negative clauses (see f), and among these (3) a certain number of expressions which may be regarded simply as equivalent to negative adverbial ideas (see g).

Examples of (1) **Is 5^{11 b}** *woe unto them, that tarry late in the evening, while wine inflames them*; **Is 1:5, 10:24, 30:31, Jer 7:26, 20:15, Ps 4:3, 5:12, 21:13, 62:5**. The circumstantial verbal-clause is used to particularize an action which has before been expressed generally, in **Gn 44:12, 48:14**=*crossing his hands*; **Dt 2:27, Ju 6:19**; antithetically, **1 K 13:18** **לוֹא כִּי** *wherewith however he lied unto him*. The verbal-clause seems to assign a reason in **Ps 7:7** **מִשְׁפָט אַתָּה** *since thou hast commanded judgement*; a consequence in **Ps 103:5**.⁴

Rem. On the cases in which an imperfect in the sense of a final clause is subordinated to a verb of motion (generally **קָוָם**), see § 120 c.

Of (2), subordinate verbal-clauses with **לֹא** (in English usually rendered by *without* and the gerund, if the subject be the same as in the principal clause), e.g. **Lv 1:17** **לֹא יְבֻדֵיל** *without dividing it asunder*; **Jb 31:34**; **לֹא** with the perfect is so used in **Gn 44:4, Ex 34:28, 1 S 30:2**,

¹ ¹ The expression **הַתְּרַאָה פָנִים** *to look one another in the face* (i.e. to contend in combat) **2 K 14:8, 11, 2 Ch 25:17, 21**, is probably only a shortened form for **הַתְּרַאָה פָנִים אֶל-פָנִים**.

² ² That **אֶל-פָנִים** (**אֶל-רֹץ**) is really to be regarded as a virtual predicate to **אֶפְנִים**, and not as a *casus instrumenti*, is seen from **Is 49:23**, where **אֶל-רֹץ אֶפְנִים** precedes the verb.

³ ³ Some examples of these have been already discussed in another connexion above, § 120 a–c.

⁴ ⁴ In **Gn 21:14** the circumstantial verbal-clause **שֶׁם עַל-שְׁכָנָה** is only due to a harmonizing transposition; read **שֶׁ שְׁכָנָה עַל-לְדָבָר**. According to the source used in cap. 21 Ishmael was still a young child; according to 17:25 he was about 16 or 17 years old.

Jb 20:26 (*without its being blown upon it*). With a different subject, equivalent to a consecutive clause in English, Is 27:9 לֹא־יִקְרַב so that they shall rise up no more.—Moreover, verbal-clauses in the same sense (*without doing, &c.*) are frequently connected by וְ; cf. 1 S 20:2, Jb 24:22, 42:3; in a concessive sense, Is 33:1, Ps 44:18.

Of (3), cf. לֹא יָדַע (prop. *he knows it not*) *unawares*, Ps 35:8, Pr 5:6 לֹא יִחַם unsparely, Is 30:14 (after an infinitive absolute); Hb 1:17, Jb 6:10 (but Jb 16:13, 27:22; see f at the end); לֹא יִתְשַׁׁחֲט (prop. *they hide not*) *openly*, Is 3:9 (but Jb 15:18 לֹא כְּתַבְּנָה); בְּלִי תְּמֻנָּה (prop. *he restrains not*) *unceasingly*, Is 14:6; and Jb 41:15 (Ps 93:1 בְּלִי מִזְמָנוֹת) and Is 40:20 (without tottering) *immovably*; cf. also לֹא יִמְלֹט without wavering, Ps 26:1.

§ 157. Object-Clauses (Oratio Obliqua).

Clauses which depend on a transitive verb, especially on what are called *verba cordis*, i.e. verbs denoting any mental act, such as *to see, to hear, to know, to perceive, to believe, to remember, to forget, to say, to think, &c.*, may be subordinated to the governing verb without the help of a conjunction by simple juxtaposition (§ 120 a), or they may be co-ordinated with it either with or without *wāw copulative* (§ 120 d–h). As a rule, however, the objective clause is introduced by the conjunction כִּי that, less frequently by אֲשֶׁר that.¹

Examples:—

(a) Object-clauses without a conjunction. Besides the passages mentioned in § 120 (especially under e) there are a number of examples, in which a clause depending on a *verbum dicendi* or *sentiendi* (the *oratio obliqua* of the Latin and English Grammar) is added in the form of an independent noun-clause or verbal-clause; e. g. Gn 12:13 אַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ אֶתְךָ תֵּאֶת say, I pray thee, thou art my sister; Ps 10:13, Jb 25^{3a}¹⁴, Neh 6:6; Zc 8:23 (after עַמְשָׁה); verbal-clauses, e. g. Ps 50:21 thou thoughtest הַזִּוְתְּ אַתָּה כִּי וְךָ I was surely like thyself [but read עַמְשָׁה]; Gn 41:15, Ju 9:48 what ye have seen me do; Is 48:8, Ho 7:2.

(b) Object-clauses introduced by כִּי, e. g. Gn 6:5 וַיַּרְא יְהֹוָה כִּי רְבָה רָעַת הָאָדָם and the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great, &c.—Direct narration also is very frequently introduced by כִּי (analogous to the ὅτι *recitativum*; frequently, indeed, with the secondary idea of a particle of asseveration, as in Gn 26:9, 27:20), e. g. Gn 21:30, 22:16 f., 26:22, 29:32, 37:35, Jos 2:24, &c., even when the direct narration is not expressly indicated, Gn 4:25, 32:31, 41:51 f., Ex 18:4.—On the expression of a second object by means of a clause introduced by כִּי, see § 117 h.²

¹ On these clauses with כִּי and אֲשֶׁר and generally on clauses which we should render as subordinate, cf. P. Doörwald ‘Zur hebr. Syntax’ in *Neue Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädag.* 1890, p. 115 ff.

² Instead of a complete objective clause we sometimes find a kind of accusative and infinitive construction, especially after נָתַן (prop. *to give up*) in the sense of *to allow*, e. g. Nu 21:23 וְלֹא-נָתַן סִיחָן אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל עַבְרֵי בָּקְלָן and Sihon did not suffer Israel to pass through his border; 20:21; followed by an infinitive with ל, e. g. Gn 20:6, 31:7, Ex 3:19.—Cf. also the analogous examples in Dt 28:56 (after גַּפְתָּה to venture; see § 113 d); Ju 11:20 (after אָמַן, הַ to trust); 1 K 19:4 (after שָׁאַל to request).

(c) Object-clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר, e. g. Est 3:4 *כִּי־הָגִיד לְקַم אֲשֶׁר־הוּא יְהוָה* *for he had told them that he was a Jew*; 1 S 18:15, Ez 20:26, Ec 8:12,³ even before direct narration, 1 S 15:20, 2 S 1:4. Somewhat frequently אֲשֶׁר is preceded by the *nota accusativi* תֵּת (equivalent to *the circumstance, the fact, that*), e. g. Jos 2:10, 1 S 24:11, 19, 2 S 11:20, Is 38:3, but in Gn 30:29, Dt 29:15 equivalent to *the way in which*.

§ 158. Causal Clauses.

A complete clause, assigning the reason for statements, demands, threats, &c., sometimes follows with the simple *wāw copulative*, e. g. Ps 60:13 *give us help against the adversary, and (for) vain is the help of man*; Gn 6:17 (*אָנֹכִי*), 22:12, Ex 23:9, Jb 22:12, perhaps also Ps 7:10; or even without *Wāw*, e. g. Gn 17:14. As a rule, however, special conjunctions in various combinations are used to introduce causal clauses.

The most common causal conjunctions are יְעַן אֲשֶׁר כִּי *because, prop. on account of the fact that*; both, however, may also be shortened to the simple יְעַן Nu 20:12, &c., or to כִּי *because*, Gn 3:14, 17, &c., or to אֲשֶׁר Gn 30:18, 31:49, 34:13, 27, 1 S 15:15, 20:42, 26:16, 23, 1 K 3:19, 8:33, Ho 14:4, Zc 1:15; also בְּאֲשֶׁר Gn 39:9, 23. On the other hand, the simple יְעַן is sometimes repeated for emphasis, יְעַן וְעַן יְעַן (something like the German *sintemal und alldieweil*) Lv 26:43, Ez 13:10 (without וְ 36:3); also עַל־אֲשֶׁר 2 S 3:30, and עַל־כִּי¹ Dt 31:17, Ju 3:12, Mal 2:14 *on the ground that; because of the circumstance that*, Dt 23:5; עַל־כִּי־אֲשֶׁר דָּוחַת אֲשֶׁר *for this very cause that*, Jer 3:8. But just as the simple יְעַן is used for יְעַן אֲשֶׁר, so also the simple עַל־ with the perfect stands for Ps 119:136, Ezr 3:11; cf. Gn 31:20 and מִבְּלִי Dt 28:55 both with the perfect, equivalent to *because ... not*.—Cf. further עַל־קָבָר אֲשֶׁר Gn 22:18, 26:5, 2 S 12:6, all with the perfect, and עַל־קָבָר כִּי (2 S 12:10 with the perfect; Am 4:12 with the imperfect) *prop. in return for the fact that*; similarly again the simple עַל־קָבָר Nu 14:24 with the perfect, and Dt 7:12, 8:20 with the imperfect; finally, שֶׁר מִתְּאַשְׁר Is 43:4 *arising from the fact that, = because*; הַתְּאַשְׁר 1 S 26:21, &c., and הַתְּאַשְׁר Dt 4:37, Pr 1:29 *for the reason that*.

Rem. 1. The preposition עַל־ (*because of, on account of*) with the infinitive (§ 114 e) is frequently used as the equivalent of a full causal clause; cf. e. g. Am 1:3, 6, 13, 2:1, 6. Such a construction with the infinitive may, however, according to § 114 r, be continued by means of a finite verb, in which case עַל־ governs the verb as a conjunction; e. g. Am 1:9 ... עַל־הַסְּגִירָם וְלֹא־כִּרְאָו *because they delivered up ... and remembered not, &c.*; 1:11, 2:4; without *Wāw*, Is 30:14.

2. The choice of tenso is regulated by the general principles stated in § 106 ff., viz. the perfect (cf. especially § 106 f) refers to causes already brought fully into effect, the imperfect to those which may contingently arise; cf. e. g. Dt 7:12, 8:20, 1 K 8:33, where the imperfect leaves the possibility still open that the persons addressed will perhaps escape the threatened punishments by avoiding disobedience.—Cf. further, § 111 h on the imperfect consecutive, and § 112 nn on the perfect consecutive in the apodosis to causal clauses.

§ 159. Conditional Sentences.

³ In Jer 28:9 a *subject-clause* is thus introduced by אֲשֶׁר instead of the usual כִּי.

¹ Also יְמַעַל־כִּן prop. *for therefore*, Gn 18:5, 19:8, 33:10, 38:26, Nu 10:31, 14:43, 2 S 18:20 *Q'reh*, and אֲשֶׁר עַל־כִּן Jb 34:27, always mean *for as much as*.

Cf. H. Ferguson, ‘The Use of the Tenses in Conditional Sentences in Hebrew’ (*Journal of the Society of Bibl. Lit. and Exeg.*, Middletown, Conn., June and September, 1882).—P. Friedrich, *Die hebr. Conditionalsätze*, Königsberg, 1884 (Inaug.-Diss.).—Driver, *Use of the Tenses*, 3rd ed., p. 174 ff.

1. The great variety of construction in conditional sentences is owing to the fact that it frequently depends on the subjective judgement of the speaker, whether he wishes a condition to be regarded as *capable of fulfilment* (absolutely, or at least possibly), thus including those already fulfilled, or as *incapable of fulfilment*. On this distinction depends the choice both of the conditional particle to be used (see below), and especially (as also in Greek and Latin) of the tense. The use of the latter is naturally determined according to the general principles laid down in § 106 ff.¹ In the following sketch, for the sake of clearness, conditional sentences *without* conditional particles will be first discussed (under b), and afterwards sentences *with* these particles (under l).

2. The relation between condition and consequence may be expressed, as in English, by the simple juxtaposition of two clauses. At the same time, it is to be observed in general as a fundamental rule (in accordance with the original character of the two tenses), that the *imperfect*, with its equivalents (the jussive, cohortative, imperative, perfect consecutive, and participle), is used to express a condition and consequence which are regarded as being *capable of fulfilment* in present or future time, while the *perfect* represents a condition already fulfilled in the past, and its consequence as an accomplished fact. The other use of the perfect—to represent conditions regarded as *impossible*—occurs only in connexion with particles.

Examples:—

(a) *Imperfect* (cf. § 107 x) in protasis and apodosis, Jos 22:18, Ps 104:28 ff. פָּנָן יְלַקֵּס וְ (if) thou givest unto them, they gather, &c.; Ps 139:18, Pr 12:17, Jb 20:24, Ec 1:18, Neh 1:8; with an interrogative imperfect in the apodosis, Ju 13:12; with the jussive, Jb 10:16; with the cohortative, Pr. 1:23; with the perfect, Is 26:10 (yet will he not learn righteousness; the apodosis forcibly denies what the imperfect in the protasis had represented as still conceivable; cf. Ho 8:12); with the perfect consecutive, Gn 47:25, Ex 33:5; with the protasis suppressed, Jb 5:8 (see § 107 x).

(b) *Jussive* in protasis (cf. § 109 h, i) and apodosis, Ps 104:10 שֶׁק וַיְהִי לִילָה (if) thou makest darkness, it is night; imperfect in the apodosis, Ps 104²⁹ b; cohortative Pr 1:23. Also in Ex 7:9 יְהִי לְפָנֶיךָ it shall become a serpent, is the apodosis to a suppressed protasis if thou cast it down; so in 2 K 5:10 בְּגַיְשָׁךְ is the apodosis to a protasis if thou wash, contained in what precedes.

¹ It may, moreover, happen that a different idea is introduced in the apodosis, from that with which the protasis started—a source of many further variations.

² On the termination וְ- cf. § 47 m. In verse 28 b also וְשֻׁבְעָוֹן is probably to be explained from its immediately preceding the greater pause. These terminations in verses 28–30 and Ps 139:18 can scarcely have any connexion with the conditional sentence, although it is strange that וְ- in Nu 32:23 appears after אֲמִלָּא in the protasis. In Nu 16:29, 32:20 וְ- as before נָ (as in Jb 31:10 in the apodosis) is to be explained from the dislike of hiatus.

(c) *Cohortative* (see § 108 e) in the protasis; perfect in the apodosis, Ps 40:6; imperfect consecutive, Jb 19:18 אָק וְמִה וַיַּרְבֵּרְוּ־בִּי (if) *I arise, they speak against me*; on the cohortative in the apodosis, cf. § 108 f.

(d) *Imperfect consecutive* in the protasis (§ 111 x), Ps 139:11 אִם־כֵּן if *I say, &c.* (with a noun-clause as the apodosis); with a frequentative perfect consecutive in the apodosis, 1 S 2:16.

(e) *Perfect consecutive* in the protasis and apodosis (see the examples, § 112 kk and ll), Gn 44:22 וְעַבְדֵּב אָבִיו וְמֵת *and should he leave his father, his father would die*; 9:15, 44:29, Ex 4:14, 12:13, 1 S 16:2, 19:3, 2 S 13:28, 1 K 8:30; with frequentative perfects, Ex 16:21 (referring to the past, Jer 20:9); with imperfect in the apodosis (being separated from the *Wāw* by אֲלֹא), Nu 23:20, Jb 5:24; introduced by an infinitive absolute, 1 K 2:37; an interrogative clause in the apodosis, Lv 10:19; a noun-clause, Ps 37:10, Jb 7:21.

(f) *A simple perfect* (to represent actions which are to be regarded as completed) in the protasis and apodosis, Pr 18:22 מִצְאָה אֲשֶׁר־הַטּוֹב has one found a wife, he has found a good thing; an imperfect in the apodosis, Jb 19:4, 23:10; an imperfect consecutive, Ex 20:25, Pr 11:2, Jb 3:25, 23^{13 b}, 29:11; an interrogative clause, Nu 12:14, Jb 7:20 if *I have sinned* (prop., well, now I have sinned!) what can I do unto thee? 21:31, 35:6, Am 3:8; a noun-clause, Jb 27:19.

(g) *A participle as casus pendens* (cf. § 143 d, and the sections of the Grammar there cited, esp. § 116 w) or a complete noun-clause in the protasis; the apodosis mostly introduced by *wāw apodosis*, e. g. Pr 23:24 *K^eth*. בָּן חִכּוּם וַיִּשְׂמַח בָּן if one begetteth a wise child, he shall have joy of him; with perfect frequentative in the apodosis, 1 S 2:13, &c.; but also with a simple imperfect, e. g. Ex 21:12 (cf. § 112 n); with an interrogative imperfect, 2 K 7:2, 19; with an interrogative perfect, Ju 6:13.

(h) *Infinitive with preposition* (also as the equivalent of a conditional clause) in the protasis, and a perfect consecutive in the apodosis (cf. § 112 mm), e. g. 2 S 7:14 ff. בְּנָה עֲזֹתָה if he commit iniquity, I will correct him; Ex 34:34 f. (with imperfect, followed by perfects frequentative in the apodosis).

Rem. On the expression of condition and consequence by means of two co-ordinate *imperatives*, see § 110 f.

3. Particles used to introduce conditional sentences are אִם (for which in the later and latest Books sometimes הַן, see below, under w) and לֹא¹ (1 S 14:30, Is 63:19 לֹאִוְתָּה; Ec 6:6, Est 7:4, from אִם לוֹא) if, negative אִם לֹא and לֹאִילָא (לֹאִילָא) unless; כִּי supposing that (Lat. ut), in case that, sometimes used almost in the same sense as אִם. With regard to the difference between אִם לֹאִילָא (לֹאִילָא) and אִם לֹא, the fundamental rule is that אִם is used if the condition be regarded either as already fulfilled, or if it, together with its consequence, be thought of as possibly (or probably) occurring in the present or future. In the former case, אִם is followed by the perfect, in the latter (corresponding to the Greek ἐὰν with the present subjunctive) by the imperfect or its equivalent (frequently in the apodosis also). On the other hand, לֹאִילָא is used when the condition is to be represented as *not fulfilled* in the past, or as *not capable of fulfilment* in the present or future, and the consequence accordingly as not having occurred or never occurring. In the former case, לֹאִילָא and לֹאִים are necessarily followed by the perfect

1¹ On לֹא cf. Kohler in Geiger's *Zeitschr. für Wiss. und Leben*, vi (1868), p. 21 ff.

(mostly also in the apodosis) corresponding to the Greek εἰ with the indicative of an historic tense, and the Latin imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive. In the latter case (which is extremely rare) the perfect, or the participle, or even the imperfect, may be used.

Rem. Since it again frequently depends on the subjective judgement of the speaker (see under a), whether a condition is to be regarded as possible or impossible, we cannot wonder that the distinction between מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵד and לֹא is not always consistently observed. Although naturally לֹא and לֹא לֹא cannot take the place of מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵד and אָמֵן (on the strange use of לֹא in Gn 50:15 see below), yet conversely מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵד is sometimes used where לֹא would certainly be expected; cf. e. g. Ps 50:12, 137:5, 139:8, Ho 9:12 (cf. verse 11). These examples, indeed (מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵד with the imperfect), may without difficulty be explained from the fact that the connexion of לֹא with the imperfect was evidently avoided, because the imperfect by its nature indicates a still unfinished action, and consequently (as opposed to לֹא) a still open possibility. But מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵד is also used for לֹא in connexion with the perfect, especially when an imprecation is attached by the apodosis to the condition introduced by מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵד, e. g. Ps 7:4 ff. אִם־עָשָׂה יְקַנֵּי זֶאת ... רְאֵה וְתִגְתַּחֲוו if I have done this ..., let the enemy pursue my soul, &c., cf. Jb 31:9 ff. The speaker assumes for a moment as possible and even actual, that which he really rejects as inconceivable, in order to invoke the most severe punishment on himself, if it should prove to be the case.

On the frequent addition of an infinitive absolute to the verb in clauses with מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵד see § 113 o above.

Examples:—

A. מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵד 1. with *perfect* in the protasis to express conditions, &c., which have been completely fulfilled in the past or which will be completely fulfilled in the future (the perfect is here equivalent to the *futurum exactum*, § 106 o). The apodosis¹ takes—

(a) A *perfect* also, e. g. Pr 9:12 אִם־הַכְּמַת הַכְּמַת לֹא if thou art wise, thou art wise for thyself; Ps 73:15 (see below on לֹא).

(b) *Imperfect*, e. g. Dt 32:41 אִם־שְׁנָאֵנִי if I whet my glittering sword ... בְּשִׁיבָה I will render vengeance, &c.; Jb 9:15 f.30 (in both cases we should expect לֹא rather than אִם; so also in Ps 44:21 f., with an interrogative imperfect in the apodosis); Jb 11:13 (the apodosis is in verse 15).

(c) *Jussive* (or *optative*), e. g. Jb 31:9 ff. (see m above); Gn 18:3.

(d) *Perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112 gg), e. g. Gn 43:9 if אִם־לֹא תִבְרֹךְ, יְאִיר תְּזַבֵּחַ I bring him not ... then I shall have sinned, &c.; Ju 16:17, 2 S 15:33, 2 K 7:4. On the other hand, e. g. Gn 47:6, Mi 5:7, Jb 7:4 refer to actions already completed; in Gn 38:9 and Nu 21:9 the perfect with לְ is a perfect frequentative and refers to past time.

(e) *Imperfect consecutive* (see § 111 q), e. g. Jb 8:4 if thy children have sinned (אוּמָר), he has delivered them, &c.

¹ We are not here concerned with the fact that the logical apodosis (the consequence of the condition) is sometimes mentioned before the condition; as in Gn 18:28, 30, Ju 11:10, Ps 63:6 f., 137:6, and according to Dillmann Is 4:4.

(f) *Imperative*, e. g. Gn 50:4 אִם־נָא מֵצָא אֲתִי חַזְבָּע יִנְקֶם דָּבָרִינָא לְגַן if now I have found grace in your eyes, speak, I pray you, &c.; the imperative precedes in Gn 47:16 and Jb 38:4, 18.

(g) A (complete or incomplete) noun-clause, e. g. Jer 14:18 (a vivid realization of the future) *if I have gone forth into the field (= if I go, &c.), then, behold, the slain with the sword! &c.*; Pr 24:14 (apodosis with wāw apodosis).

2. נִשׁׁא with *imperfect* in the protasis, to express what is possible in the present or future, as well as (according to § 107 b) what has continued or been repeated in the past. The apodosis takes—

(a) The *perfect*, e. g. Nu 32:23 וְאִם־לֹא תַּעֲשׂוּ בְּנֵי הָבָה חַטָּאתְמָה but if ye will not do so, behold, ye have sinned; here the apodosis represents the time when the consequence has already taken place; so also Jb 20:12–14. On the other hand, Nu 16:29 (as also 1 S 6:9 and 1 K 22:28) is a case of a pregnant construction, *if these men die as all men die, then* (it will follow from this) *the Lord hath not sent me*.

(b) The *imperfect*, e. g. 2 K 7:4 אִם־יִחְיֶה נָנוּ הַחַיִּים if they save us alive, we shall live, &c.; Gn 13:16, 18:28, 30, 28:20 ff., Ex 20:25 (the second imperfect is equivalent to a *jussive*); Is 1:18, 10:22, Am 9:2–4, Ps 50:12 (where נִשׁׁא ironically represents an impossibility as possible); Jb 8:5 f. (with the insertion of a second condition in the form of a noun-clause); 9:3, 20, 14:7; a frequentative imperfect referring to the past, Gn 31:8 אִם־כִּי יֹאמֶר if (ever) he said thus ..., גַּם־לֹא then they bare ...; Ex 40:37. In Gn 42:37 the consequence (on קְמִיתָ cf. § 107 s) precedes the condition.

(c) The *jussive* (or *optative*), e. g. Ps 137:5; cf. § 109 h.

(d) The *cohortative*, e. g. Gn 13:9, Jb 31:7; cf. § 108 f.

(e) The *perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112 ff and gg), e. g. 1 S 20:6 אִם־פָּקַד־ךְ if thy father miss me at all, then shalt thou say, &c.; Gn 24:41, Ju 4:20; with a frequentative perfect consecutive, Gn 31:8 if he said (as often happened) ..., then, &c.

(f) The *imperfect consecutive*; so perhaps Ps 59:16, if נִילְיָנוּ is to be explained according to § 111 t.

(g) The *imperative*, e. g. Gn 31:50, 1 S 20:21 (with wāw apodosis, but in verse 22 simply לְךָ), 21:10, Jb 33:5.

(h) A noun-clause, e. g. Gn 4:7, Ps 139:8, Jb 8:6, 31:26 f.

3. נִשׁׁא with *cohortative*, e. g. Gn 30:31; cf. the passages in § 108 e.

4. נִשׁׁא with *infinitive*, Jb 9:27 אִם־אָקָרֵי prop. *if my saying is* (but probably we should read אָקָרֵי רְתִי).

5. נִשׁׁא with a noun-clause, e. g. Dt 5:22 (in the apodosis a perfect with wāw apodosis), Gn 27:46, Ju 9:15 (imperative in the apodosis); 11:9 (imperfect in the apodosis); 2 S 12:8 (cohortative in the apodosis); Ho 12:12; especially if the subject of the conditional clause be a personal pronoun. In an affirmative sentence this pronoun is often joined to נִשׁׁא, in a negative sentence to נִשׁׁא (cf. on both, § 100 o), while the predicate (cf. § 116 q) is represented by a participle, usually expressing the future, e. g. Ju 6:36 f. אִם־יִשְׁקַע מוֹשִׁיעַ if thou will save, &c.; Gn

24:49 אִם־יַשְׁבֶּם עַשְׂיָמִים if ye will deal, &c.; **1 S 23:23**. In **Gn 24:42** f. the condition is expressed in a more humble form by the addition of אַתָּה. With אֵין Gn 43:5 וְאִם־אַתָּה מַשְׁלֹךְ but if thou wilt not send, &c.; **20:7** (with imperative in the apodosis); **Ex 8:17, 9:2** f., **1 S 19:11** (all with a participle also in the apodosis). But שׁוּ and זִינָה may also be used after אִם without a suffix; thus שׁוּ Gn 23:8, **1 S 20:8, 2 K 9:15**, &c., זִינָה (if it be not the case) **Gn 30:1, Ex 32:32, Ju 9:15, 2 K 2:10**; cf. also אִם־זָקֵן if it be so, **Gn 25:22**.

B. הִנֵּה if, generally supposed to be originally identical with הִנֵּה behold!¹ Probably, however, הִנֵּה if, is a pure Aramaism, and since the Aramaic word never has the meaning behold, it is at least improbable that it had originally any connexion with הִנֵּה or הִנֵּה. Cf. **Ex 8:22, Lv 25:20, Is 54:15, Jer 3:1, Hag 2:12, 2 Ch 7:13**, and frequently in Job, as **9:11, 12, 12:14, 15, 19:7, 23:8, 40:23**, always with wāw apodosis following, except in **13:15**, where consequently the meaning see is no doubt preferable.

C. לֹא if, לֹא (לֹא) if not.

1. With *perfect* in the protasis and apodosis (cf. § 106 p), e.g. **Ju 8:19**; אַלְכָה is used in the same sense as לֹא in **Est 7:4**, cf. **Ec 6:6** (with a question in the apodosis).—With the perfect in protasis and apodosis after לֹא Gn 31:42, 43:10, **Ju 14:18, 1 S 25:34, 2 S 2:27, Is 1:9**. On the other hand, in **Dt 32:29** לֹא with a perfect is followed by an imperfect in the apodosis, *if they were wise, they would understand this*; in **Mi 2:11** by a perfect consecutive.

2. With *imperfect* after **Dt 32:27**, אָגֹור probably as the *modus rei repetitae, were it not that I ever and again feared, &c.*; so also the imperfect after לֹא with the apodosis suppressed, **Gn 50:15** supposing that Joseph should hate us; since, according to the context, the danger was real, the use of לֹא here is strange; conversely in other cases, e.g. **Ps 73:15, Jb 9:15** f. 30, לֹא would be more natural than אַלְכָה.

3. A noun-clause occurs after **2 S 18:12, 2 K 3:14, Ps 81:14**, all with imperfect in the apodosis; **Jb 16:4** לֹא יִשְׁאַל, with cohortative in the apodosis.

D. כִּי supposing that, if.—

1. כִּי with *perfect* in the protasis, e.g. **Nu 5:20** וְאַתָּה כִּי שָׁפֵת but thou, if thou hast gone astray, &c.; with a frequentative perfect consecutive in the apodosis, **Jb 7:13** f.; with an imperfect consecutive, **Jb 22:29**.

2. כִּי with *imperfect* in the protasis, e.g. **Ps 23:4** גַּם כִּי־אָלֹךְ yea, though I walk (have to walk)..., I will fear no (לְאָרֵיךְ evil; **37:24**; **Ex 21:2** כִּי־יִתְקַנֵּה בְּדַעֲבָרִי וְכִי if thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve (but in verses 3–5 a series of definite conditions with definite consequences is introduced by אַלְכָה; so also the כִּי in verse 7 is followed in verses 8–11 by the special cases with אַלְכָה; cf. also verse 17 ff.); cf. **Gn 4:24, 24:41, Jb 38:5**; with a perfect consecutive in the apodosis, **Gn 32:18** f., **Ex 18:16**; with a noun-clause, **Is 1:15**.

3. כִּי with a *noun-clause* (and imperfect in the apodosis), **2 S 19:8**.

Rem. According to § 107 q, פֶּרֶךְ is naturally followed by the imperfect; for the exceptions, **2 S 20:6, 2 K 2:16**, see § 107 q, note 3; cf. moreover, **2 K 10:23** רְאֵה פְּנֵי־שְׁפָט הָה look lest there be here, &c.

¹ There could be no doubt of their identity if וְהִנֵּה in **1 S 9:7, 2 S 18:11**, simply meant if. We must, however, keep to the meaning but behold.

(k) לֹבֶלְתִּי *that ... not*, with the imperfect, Ex 20:20, 2 S 14:14 (in Jer 23:14 read the infinitive בָּלְתִּי *irrational*). בָּלְתִּי יְרָאֵי for شׁוֹב in 27:8, אַיְלָה for בָּלְתִּי. In Ez 13:3 is a relative clause governed by לְ= *according to things which they have not seen.*

2. Two negatives in the same sentence do not neutralize each other (as in *nonnulli, non nemo*), but make the negation the more emphatic (like οὐκ οὐδείς, οὐκ οὐδαμῶς, *nulli—non, nemo non*); e.g. Zp 2:2 (if the text is correct) בְּפָנָם לֹא־יָבוֹא *before there shall (not) come.*¹ This especially applies to the compounds formed by the union of אין or בְּלִי with מִן־ *without* (§ 119 y), e.g. Is 5:9 (6¹¹) (מִן־יְשַׁב) (for which in Jer 2:15 מִבְּלִי יְשַׁב), prop. *without no inhabitant, i.e. so that no inhabitant is left there.* On the other hand, in Is 50:2 the מִן־ is causative, *because there is no water;* as also in Ex 14:11 מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־ *is it because there were no ...?* 2 K 1:3, 6, 16. In Ec 3:11 מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־ *except that (yet so that man cannot, &c.).*

3. The negative sometimes extends its influence from the first to a second negative sentence parallel with it (which may or may not have *Wāw*); e.g. 1 S 2:3 *talk not so much arrogance; let (not) boasting come out of your mouth;* Ex 28:43, Lv 19:12, 22:9, 15 f., Nu 16:14, 23:19, Dt 7:25, Is 23:4, 28:27, 38:18, 47:14, Ez 16:47, Ps 9:19, 13:5, 35:19, 38:2, 44:19, 75:6, Jb 28:17 (so לְאֵה לֹא־ *why ... not?* in Jb 3:11 also affects the parallel clause).

§ 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses.

The particles אך, רק *only*, serve to introduce restrictive clauses, and גם, אף *also, besides, even, intensive* clauses. It is to be observed that the force of these particles does not necessarily affect the word which immediately follows (as is the case with אך Gn 7:23, 34:15; רק Gn 6:5, Am 3:2; even אך *hath he indeed only?* Nu 12:2; גם Gn 27:34, Jb 7:11; אף Dt 15:17), but very frequently extends to the whole of the following sentence. Thus with אך, e.g. Nu 14:9, 1 K 17:13, Pr 17:11, Jb 13:15, 14:22, 16:7, 23:6; רק Gn 20:11, 24:8, Ps 32:6, Pr 13:10; גם Gn 27:33, 32:21 (*the same*), 44:10; 1 S 22:7, 28:20, Zc 9:11, Pr 17:26, 20:11; אף Jb 14:3, 15:4.—In Mal 1:10 and Jb 2:10 גם is placed before two co-ordinate sentences, although, strictly speaking, it applies only to the second. Cf. the analogous examples in § 150 m.

§ 154. Sentences connected by Wāw.

*Wāw copulativum*¹ (ג) serves to connect two or more sentences, or single words (on its various vocalization, cf. § 104 d–g). Its use, however, is by no means restricted

¹ In 1 K 10:21 אף goes with what precedes and must be emended, with the LXX and Lucian, to כי הָפְךָ.

1

¹ For further particulars of the use of *wāw copulativum*, see Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, i. 393 ff. On its use in the co-ordination of similar tenses and moods (e.g. five imperfects consecutive in Gn 25:34, five perfects with גם) as well as of dissimilar tenses and moods, the remarks made in the treatment of the tenses will suffice. With regard to the connexion of single nouns by ג (which strictly speaking is always really

merely to joining sentences which are actually co-ordinate. Frequently the language employs merely the simple connexion by *Wāw*, even to introduce an antithesis (Gn 17:21, 19:19, Lv 2:12, Jb 6:25, and very frequently in circumstantial noun-clauses), or

a contraction of so many clauses into a single sentence) the following observations may be made:—

(a) Contrary to English usage, which in lengthy enumerations uses the *and* to connect only the last member of the series, in Hebrew *polysyndeton* is customary, as in Gn 12:16 *wāw copulativum* six times, 24:35 seven times, 15:19 ff. nine times, and in Jos 7:24 ten times. Sometimes, however, only the last two words are joined (so in a series of three members, Gn 5:32, 10:1, 11:26, 13:2, 14:1, 30:39, &c.; the last three out of a series of four, Jer 2:26); less frequently only the first two, Ps 45:9; cf. § 132 d. The formula *קָמָל שְׁלִשׁוֹם* *yesterday (and) the day before yesterday*, Ex 5:8, &c., is always without the copula. On the other hand, the *constructio asyndetos* in a series of verbs is used as a rhetorical expedient to produce a hurried and so an impassioned description; e.g. Ju 5:27 *at her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay*; Ex 15:9, Dt 32:15, 1 S 15:6, Jer 4:7, Am 5:21, Ps 10:10, 14:1, 45:5, Jb 20:19, 28:4, 29:8, Ct 2:11, 5:6, &c.

(b) Frequently *wāw copulativum* is also *explanatory* (like *isque*, *et—quidem*, and the German *und zwar*, English *to wit*), and is then called *wāw explicativum*, e.g. Gn 4:4 and (i.e. *namely*) *of the fat thereof* (unless it is simply copulative); Ex 24:12, 25:12 (*to wit two*); 27:14, 28:23, Ju 17:3 (in *עַמְקָה*; here as often elsewhere, to introduce an explanatory gloss, cf. Is 17:8, Ez 3:15, and especially P. Haupt, *SBOT. Isaiah*, p. 90, l. 21 ff.), 1 S 17:34 *and that too with the bear*; 2 S 13:20, Is 57:11, Jer 17:10, Am 3:11, 4:10, Ze 9:9, Pr 3:12, Neh 8:13, 2 Ch 23:10 (but in 1 S 28:3 the *וְ* before *בָּעֵירָה* is to be omitted with the LXX); cf. also such combinations as *וְעַד—מִן* *from ... and even to ...*, Gn 13:3, 14:23, 19:4, 11, &c.—In 1 S 6:11 (see Driver on the passage), 2 S 1:23, &c., *וְ* is equivalent to *yea, and*; in Is 32:7 *even*.

וְ is used to express emphasis (=*and especially*), e.g. in Gn 3:16 *וְרַקְנָה*; Is 2:1, Ps 18:1, perhaps also in Jb 10:17 *yea, a whole host*; 2 Ch 16:14.—An undoubtedly example of what is called *wāw concomitantiae* occurs in Jb 41:12 *a seething pot* *וְאַגְמָן* *with burning rushes*; cf. Ex 10:10 (*with your little ones*), 12:8, Lv 1:12, Is 42:5. In Arabic this *wāw concom.* is followed by the accusative.

וְוְ is used in the sense of *both—and* in Ps 76:7, Dn 1:3, 8:13. On *וְוְ* as meaning *sive—sive*, cf. § 162 b.

(c) See the Lexicon on adverbs used in a copulative sense, such as *וְ* *also, moreover*, summing up a number, e.g. *וְיַמְשַׁנְנָה* *both together*, Gn 27:45, Pr 17:15; *וְכָל־כָל* *all together*; as an intensive *and*, e.g. Gn 30:8, 37:7, 1 S 30:8; cf. also such examples as 1 S 24:12 *see, yea see!* *וְוְ* or *וְוְגַם* Gn 24:44= *both—and*; *וְ* occurs three times in Gn 24:25 and 32:20; also *וְאַךְ*, which is generally still more intensive, in the sense of *also, in addition to this, even*, and belongs rather to poetry, and to the later language; frequently also equivalent to a mere *and*, but sometimes adversative *but now*, Ps 44:10, &c.; and *וְאַךְ-וְאַךְ* (also three times), equivalent to *both—and*; cf. *וְאַךְ* *וְ* *and even*, Lv 26:44; *וְאַךְ-כִּי* prop. *add to this also that*, equivalent to *not to mention*, according to the context either *quanto magis* or *quanto minus*.

when one of the two clauses is not co-ordinated, but subordinated to the other. On the use of **וְ** to introduce circumstantial clauses, cf. especially § 141 e and § 142 d; introducing causal clauses, § 158 a; comparative clauses, § 161 a; final clauses, § 165 a; consecutive clauses, § 166 a. On *wāw apodosis*, cf. § 143 d, and the sections there cited; on the use of *Wāw* in numerical sayings, cf. § 134 s.

Rem. Sometimes *wāw copulativum* joins a sentence apparently to what immediately precedes, but in reality to a sentence which is suppressed and which must, therefore, be supplied from the context. So especially **וְ** with imperatives to express inferences, e.g. 1 K 2:22 **אָלִי שׁוֹרֵךְ** *ask now rather*; Ez 18:32 *for I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth ... whence turn yourselves*. Also at the beginning of a speech in loose connexion with an act or speech of another person, e.g. Ex 2:20, 2 S 18:11, 24:3, 2 K 4:14, 41, 7:13, 2 Ch 25:9; cf. also Jos 7:7 (**וְ**), Ps 2:10, 4:4, Is 8:7. Sometimes the suppression of the protasis is due to passionate excitement or haste, which does not allow time for full expression; this is especially illustrated by Nu 12:14, 20:3 (**וְ**), 1 S 10:12, 15:14, 22:14, 28:16, 2 S 18:12, 24:3, 1 K 2:22 (**וְ**), 2 K 1:10, 7:19 (cf. verse 2); Is 3:14, Zc 2:10, Ps 2:6 (at the same time a circumstantial clause *whereas I=and yet I have, &c.*); cf. also a new clause beginning with the formula of wishing **וְ** *Nu 11:29, Ju 9:29*; on the disconnected use of **וְ** and **וַיְ** cf. § 159 dd.

§ 155. Relative Clauses.

See V. Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894 (cf. the heading of § 138 above); G. Bergsträsser, ‘Das hebr. Präfix **וְ**’, ZATW 1909, p. 40 ff.¹

1. By § 138 a, e, relative clauses are divided into two classes: those which are used for the nearer definition of a noun (substantive or pronoun), and those which are not dependent on a noun. The former may be called *incomplete*, the latter *complete* relative clauses.

Complete relative clauses, as a rule (see the exceptions under n), are introduced by the originally demonstrative pronoun **שֶׁ**; see further in § 138 e. Similarly, incomplete relative clauses may also be introduced by **שֶׁ**, or by some other demonstrative pronoun; see further in § 138 a and g–k. Very frequently, however, especially in poetic style, the attributive relation is expressed by simple co-ordination.¹

The governing substantive or pronoun is frequently (in certain cases *always*) resumed by a pronominal suffix or an adverb. The resumption may, however, be omitted, just as in relative clauses introduced by **שֶׁ**, &c.; see § 138 f.

¹ In this exhaustive article the author shows that between **וְ** (on the pronunciation see § 36) and **שֶׁ** there is syntactically no primary difference, but only a secondary distinction which arose in the course of the development of the language, namely that **שֶׁ** is preferred in combinations which are customary in the old literary language, and **וְ** in those which are derived from the popular language or from Aramaic.

¹ The old view that all these cases arise from the *omission* of **שֶׁ** is incorrect. These co-ordinated attributive clauses are rather a mere subdivision of the various kinds of circumstantial clauses (see § 156) which may be attached to a *nomen regens*. Cf. in English *this is the letter (which) he wrote to me.*

In Arabic a distinction is made between relative clauses used for the nearer definition of a *determinate* substantive (*sila*), and those which are attached to an *indeterminate* substantive (*sifa*). The former must be introduced by the demonstrative pronoun *allaqî*, the latter are always simply co-ordinated. The same distinction was no doubt originally observed in Hebrew, since simply co-ordinated relative clauses are most commonly found after *indeterminate* substantives (see the examples below), and in cases like Dt 28:49 (גּוֹי אֲשֶׁר לֹא-אָתַּה שָׁמֵעַ לִשְׁנָה) a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; cf. Is 66:13, and especially 1 S 3:11), the addition of אֲשֶׁר is explained from the special stress laid on the indeterminate substantive,² *a nation of such a kind, thou understandest not their tongue*. On the other hand, in poetic style at least, אֲשֶׁר is somewhat frequently omitted even after a determinate noun, but only rarely in prose (except by the Chronicler; cf. 1 Ch 9:22, 12:23, 29:1 (read prob. אֲשֶׁר for אֲשֶׁר), 2 Ch 15:11; after 1 Ch 29:3, 2 Ch 18:23, 30:17, 31:19, Ezr 1:5, but also Gn 39:4; for further instances, see Driver, *Introd.*⁸, p. 537, no. 30); so Ex 18:20, Ju 8:1, 20:15, 1 K 13:12 (=which way), so 2 K 3:8, 2 Ch 18:23; Neh 13:23; after a pronominal subject, 1 S 6:9. In Jer 52:12 for עַמְּךָ read עַמְּךָ with the LXX.

2. If the nearer definition of a substantive or pronoun is effected by simple co-ordination of the relative clause, it may take the form—

(a) Of a noun-clause, e.g. 2 S 20:21 *a man of the hill country of Ephraim* שֶׁ בַּעַשְׂמָוֹת whose name was Sheba; Zc 6:12, Jb 1:1, 3:15 *with princes* מִזְחָבָקְהָם that had gold; Ps 11:4, Pr 22:11; when referring to a noun-suffix, e.g. Ps 49:14 זֶה זְרַכְמִי סֶלְלָה זוֹ this is the way of them who have (self-)confidence.—On periphrases of this kind to express negative attributes, as in Jb 38:26 עַל־אֶבֶן־בָּצָר לֹא־אָנָּי on a land where no man is, see § 152 u, and cf. for this very short form of the relative clause, Gn 15:13 in בָּאָרֶץ לֹא־אֶלְקָחָם that belongs not to them; Dt 32:17 (לֹא־אֶלְקָחָם לְשָׁנָם); Hb 1:6, Pr 26:17 (לֹא־אֶלְקָחָם).

(b) Of a verbal clause.

Here we must distinguish the cases in which the retrospective pronoun—

(1) Is the subject of the relative clause, and is contained in the verb; so after a determinate substantive, Ps 34:9 *happy is the man* יִשְׁפַּחַד־בָּוֹן that trusteth in him; Jb 3^{3 b} הַלְּלוֹה אָמָר the night which said; after כל־ Ps 71:18; referring to a vocative, which is determinate in itself even without the article, Is 54:1, or to a noun-suffix (see under e), Ps 16:4; after an indeterminate substantive, e.g. Jb 31:12 *it is a fire* (that) devoureth unto Abaddon; Dt 32^{17 b}, 1 S 6:9, Is 55:13, 56:2, Ps 68:31, 78:6, Pr 30:17, La 1:10, 2 Ch 28:9; referring to the suffix in Is 28:16, prop. behold me, who have laid, &c., but perhaps the participle יֹסֵף is to be read; 29:14, 38:5 (but probably again the participle יֹסֵף should be read instead of the imperfect); Ez 25:7. The relative clause is used in this way especially to supply the place of an adjective, e.g. Gn 49:27 זָאָב יִצְחָר וְ as a wolf that ravineth, i.e. a ravining wolf; Is 51:12; to express a negative quality, e.g. Is 40:20, Ho 4:14 עַם לֹא־יִבְנֵן an undiscerning people.

Rem. Very frequently such relative sentences are attached to substantives which have the particle of comparison עַ, e.g. Jb 7:2 כַּא־יִשְׁאָף־צִלְלָה as a servant that earnestly desireth the shadow, &c.; Dt 32:11, Is 62:1, Jer 23:29, Ho 6:3, Ps 42:2, 83:15, Jb 9:26, 11:16; so also after כְּמוֹ Ps 58:5; after a determinate substantive, e.g. Is 53:7 (but the better reading is כְּשֶׁנֶּה without

2² So Baumann, op. cit., p. 14 f., following Böttcher, *Lehrbuch*, ii. 80.

the article), 61:10 f., Hb 2:14, Ps 49:13, 21, 125:1; see also the examples under h. Sometimes it seems simpler in such cases, to take the verb directly as predicate to the preceding substantive, and to explain הַ (for אֲשֶׁר, הַ; see *Comparative Clauses*, § 161 b) as a conjunction—a view which even Hupfeld was ready to accept, at least as regards Ps 90:5, 125:1, Is 53:7, 61:11, but it can hardly be right.

(2) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun represents an accusative of the object, or would do so if not suppressed, as it usually is in such cases in relative clauses with אֲשֶׁר, cf. §138 b. Examples with the retrospective pronoun are, Dt 32:17 אֱלֹהִים לְאֵין יְמִין gods whom they knew not (see also the end of the verse); after a substantive with הָאֵל (see above, g), Jer 23:9, Jb 13:28. Without a retrospective pronoun, after a determinate substantive, Ju 8:1, Ps 33:12 (preceded by a relative clause with אֲשֶׁר); Jb 28:1. Other examples of this kind, though the article is omitted according to poetic usage, are Is 15:7 תְּהִרְתָּה עַשְׂתָּה, for which Jer 48:36 תְּהִרְתָּה עַשְׂתָּה with the substantive in the construct state governing the relative clause, see § 130 d), Ps 7:16, 51:10, La 1:21.—Without the retrospective pronoun, after an indeterminate substantive, e.g. Is 6:6 רָאָסָה בְּאֶלְקָנָה יְמִין לְקָח מִיעֵל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ a live coal which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar; Ex 15:17, Is 42:16 (48¹⁷, Ps 25:12, all after בְּכָךְ; but Ps 32:8 בְּכָךְ רְקִיזָו תַּלְךְ; Is 64:2; Ec 10:5 (in 6:1 the same clause with אֲשֶׁר); moreover, in Jer 14:18 read with the LXX οὐκέτι εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν την οὐδὲν οἴδουσιν into a land (that) they know not.

(3) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun is dependent on a preposition, or its place is taken by the adverb מֵשָׁם, as in Jer 2:6 end. Thus after a determinate substantive, Ps 18:3 צוֹרִי אַחֲרָה-בָּבוֹ my rock in which I take refuge; Ex 18:20, Is 42:1; in Jb 3^{3 a} also, the omission of the article with יְמִין is only a poetic licence. After an indeterminate substantive, Jer 2:6, last clause but one; Ps 32:2.

In this case also the retrospective word is not infrequently suppressed, giving rise to extremely short, bold expressions, such as Is 51:1 *look unto the rock חַזְבָּקָתֶם* (whence) ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit נַקְרָפָתֶם (whence) ye were digged; Jb 21:27 *the devices* (where-with) ye act violently against me.—A retrospective adverb is suppressed in Jb 38:19 *where is the way* (to the place where) *the light dwelleth?* cf. 38:24.

Rem. 1. The omission of the retrospective word occurs most frequently in relative clauses which are governed by the construct state of a preceding substantive (especially an expression of time) and hence are virtually in the genitive. In addition to the instances already given in § 130 d, cf. the following: after בַּיּוֹם Lv 7:35, Ps 56:10; after בַּיּוֹם Jer 36:2; after simple יְמִין Ps 56:4 (אַיְלָה on the day when I am afraid); after בְּעֵת הַחְלָה, עַזְלָה at the time when the burnt offering began); 20:22, 24:11, Jb 6:17; after לְעֵת Dt 32:35; after בְּעֵת Mi 5:2; after בְּעֵת Ps 4:8 thou hast put gladness in my heart more than (their gladness) at the time (when) their corn and their wine are increased.

2. The agreement (§ 138 d) of the retrospective pronoun with a pronominal regens in the 1st or 2nd person also takes place in a simple co-ordinated relative clause in 1 S 26:14 *who art thou (that) criest?* Cf., however, Is 63:19 *we are become as they over whom* (בְּנֵי not בְּנֵי) thou no longer bearest rule.

3. Occasionally—chiefly in poetic or otherwise elevated style—even *independent* relative clauses are simply co-ordinated with a regens, whereas we should expect

them always to be preceded by a demonstrative pronoun, on the analogy of the examples in § 138 e. The suppressed pronoun would stand—

(a) As subject, Is 41:24 *an abomination (is he) that chooseth you* (but read perhaps לְבָחֶר?); Jb 30:13, cf. § 152 u.

(b) As object, Is 41:2, with a retrospective pronoun; Mal 2:16 *and him that covereth* (or read זִכְרָה?); Jb 29:12 *I delivered ... the fatherless also, and him that had none to help him.*

(c) In the genitive governed by a substantive (cf. § 130 d), Ex 4:13 פַּלְלָחָנָא בְּנֵידְתָשָׁל ח *send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send*, i.e. by the hand of some one else; Ps 65:5 and Pr 8:32, verbal-clauses after אֲשֶׁר O the happiness of the man, &c.; Ps 81:6, 141:9, Jb 29:16, La 1:14; after קָלֵי Gn 39:4, but we must certainly read here, with the Samaritan and LXX, קָלֵאָשֶׁר יִשְׁלֹל as in verses 5 and 8; Ex 9:4; verbal-clauses after קָלֵי 1 Ch 29:3, 2 Ch 30:19, 31:19, Ezr 1:5.

(d) Governed by a preposition; so verbal-clauses after אַל־*אַחֲרֵי* Jer 2:8; after אַל (=to the place where), 1 Ch 15:12, but Ex 23:20 before the same verb אַל; after קָלֵא שָׁא לְיָדָה =*to the place where*); after לְלֹא שָׁא לְיָדָה =*that asked not for me ...* לְלֹא בְּקָשָׁנִי *that sought me not*; Ez 13:3 that which they have not seen, but the text is hardly correct; after עַל Ps 119:136, cf. § 158 b; after עַל 2 Ch 16:9.—A noun-clause follows לְיָדָה in Neh 8:10. An analogous instance in Aramaic is Ezr 5:14 *to one whose name was Sheshbazzar* [so in the papyri, see the Lexicon, p. 1116^a].

§ 156. Circumstantial Clauses.

1. The statement of the particular circumstances under which a subject appears as performing some action, or under which an action (or an occurrence) is accomplished, is made especially (apart from relative clauses, see § 155) by means of noun-clauses connected by *Wāw* with a following subject (see further on this kind of *circumstantial clause* in § 141 e), and by verbal-clauses (see § 142 d). Very frequently, however, such statements of the particular circumstances are subordinated to the main clause by being simply attached, without *Wāw*, either as noun-clauses, sometimes extremely short (see c), or as verbal-clauses (see d–g).

Rem. Among relative clauses of this kind the commonest are the various noun-clauses, which are most closely subordinated to a preceding substantive without אַשְׁר, e.g. Gn 16:12; also statements of weight, Gn 24:22; of name, Jb 1:1 (also introduced by וְשָׁמָן Gn 24:29, 1 S 1:1, &c., or וְשָׁמָה Gn 16:1, 22:24, &c.); of a condition of body, Ju 1:7, and others.—Noun-clauses which begin with *wāw* and the *predicate* have a somewhat more independent character than those introduced by *wāw* and the *subject*¹ (Gn 19:1, &c.). The former, however, are also to be regarded as circumstantial clauses, in so far as they describe a *state* which is simultaneous with the principal action; thus Is 3:7 *I will not be an healer, אין גְּבֻרִיתִי*

¹ In Dt 32:31 this form of sequence appears to be selected for another purpose, and indeed our enemies are judges thereof, with *wāw* emphatic; to take it as a circumstantial clause is too artificial.

בַּבָּהּ לֹא קֶם while in my house is neither bread nor clothing; Is 6:6 (Am 7:7); 2 S 13:18, 16:1. Cf. also the instances in § 152 1 of אֲזִין followed by a participle, as, וְאַنְמַצֵּיל, &c.

2. Characteristic examples of circumstantial *noun*-clauses are Gn 12:8 *and pitched his tent* בַּיְתְּאֵל מִם וְהַעַד מֵקֶם with *Bethel on the west and Ai on the east*; Nu 22:24, 2 S 18:14 *through the heart of Absalom*, עַזְקֵב וְחַי while he was yet alive; Jer 30:6, Ez 9:2 (cf. Ct 3:8), Na 3:8, Zc 14:5, 2 Ch 23:10; with the predicate preceding, e.g. 1 S 26:13, Ps 32:8.—In Gn 41:29 a noun-clause serves to announce a state in the future.—We may also include here certain set phrases, as פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים *face to face* (prop. while *face* was turned *towards face*), Gn 32:31, Ex 33:11, Dt 34:10, &c.;¹ so also to *cast oneself down*, אָפֵף יָמָרֶץ *the face being turned to the earth*, Gn 19:1, &c. (for we find אָרְצָה in 1 K 1:31, Is 49:23).²—Cf. finally the formula אֶם עַל-בָּנִים *mother with children*, Gn 32:12; cf. Ho 10:14 and § 119 aa note 2.

Rem. On circumlocutions of this kind to express negative attributes by means of short noun-clauses (complete or incomplete), cf. § 152 u.

3. As circumstantial *verbal*-clauses,³ we find (1) sometimes affirmative clauses (see below), but far more frequently (2) negative clauses (see f), and among these (3) a certain number of expressions which may be regarded simply as equivalent to negative adverbial ideas (see g).

Examples of (1) Is 5^{11 b} *woe unto them, that tarry late in the evening, while wine inflames them*; Is 1:5, 10:24, 30:31, Jer 7:26, 20:15, Ps 4:3, 5:12, 21:13, 62:5. The circumstantial verbal-clause is used to particularize an action which has before been expressed generally, in Gn 44:12, 48:14= *crossing his hands*; Dt 2:27, Ju 6:19; antithetically, 1 K 13:18 כִּי חָשׁ לוּ *wherewith however he lied unto him*. The verbal-clause seems to assign a reason in Ps 7:7 צוֹתָה מִשְׁפָט *since thou hast commanded judgement*; a consequence in Ps 103:5.⁴

Rem. On the cases in which an imperfect in the sense of a final clause is subordinated to a verb of motion (generally קָם), see § 120 c.

Of (2), subordinate verbal-clauses with נִלְתָּן (in English usually rendered by *without* and the gerund, if the subject be the same as in the principal clause), e.g. Lv 1:17 לֹא יַבְדִּיל without dividing it *asunder*; Jb 31:34; נִלְתָּן with the perfect is so used in Gn 44:4, Ex 34:28, 1 S 30:2, Jb 20:26 (*without its being blown upon it*). With a different subject, equivalent to a

1¹ The expression הַתְּרַאָה פָּנִים *to look one another in the face* (i.e. to contend in combat) 2 K 14:8, 11, 2 Ch 25:17, 21, is probably only a shortened form for הַתְּרַאָה פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים.

2² That אָרְצָה (רֶצֶן) is really to be regarded as a virtual predicate to אָפֵף יָמָרֶץ, אָפֵף יָמָרֶץ as a *casus instrumenti*, is seen from Is 49:23, where רֶצֶן אָפֵף יָמָרֶץ precedes the verb.

3³ Some examples of these have been already discussed in another connexion above, § 120 a–c.

4⁴ In Gn 21:14 the circumstantial verbal-clause שֶׁם עַל-שְׁכָנָה is only due to a harmonizing transposition; read 'שֶׁמֶן אֶת-הַנְּזֵל'. According to the source used in cap. 21 Ishmael was still a young child; according to 17:25 he was about 16 or 17 years old.

consecutive clause in English, Is 27:9 לֹא־יַקְרִבּוּ so that they shall rise up no more.—Moreover, verbal-clauses in the same sense (*without doing, &c.*) are frequently connected by וְלֹא; cf. 1 S 20:2, Jb 24:22, 42:3; in a concessive sense, Is 33:1, Ps 44:18.

Of (3), cf. לֹא יָדַע (prop. *he knows it not*) *unawares*, Ps 35:8, Pr 5:6 *unsparely*, Is 30:14 (after an infinitive absolute); Hb 1:17, Jb 6:10 (but לֹא יָמַת *but* Jb 16:13, 27:22; see f at the end); לֹא חֲשֵׁךְ (prop. *they hide not*) *openly*, Is 3:9 (but Jb 15:18) (prop. *he restrains not*) *unceasingly*, Is 14:6; Jb 41:15 (Ps 93:1 *and* Is 40:20 *without tottering*) *immovably*; cf. also לֹא אָמַע *without wavering*, Ps 26:1.

§ 157. Object-Clauses (Oratio Obliqua).

Clauses which depend on a transitive verb, especially on what are called *verba cordis*, i.e. verbs denoting any mental act, such as *to see, to hear, to know, to perceive, to believe, to remember, to forget, to say, to think, &c.*, may be subordinated to the governing verb without the help of a conjunction by simple juxtaposition (§ 120 a), or they may be co-ordinated with it either with or without *wāw copulative* (§ 120 d–h). As a rule, however, the objective clause is introduced by the conjunction כִּי *that*, less frequently by אֲשֶׁר *that*.¹

Examples:—

(a) Object-clauses without a conjunction. Besides the passages mentioned in § 120 (especially under e) there are a number of examples, in which a clause depending on a *verbum dicendi* or *sentiendi* (the *oratio obliqua* of the Latin and English Grammar) is added in the form of an independent noun-clause or verbal-clause; e. g. Gn 12:13 תַּחֲנוּנִי אֶתְּנָא כִּי אַתָּה תֹּאמֶن say, I pray thee, thou art my sister; Ps 10:13, Jb 25^{3a,14}, Neh 6:6; Zc 8:23 (after עֲמָדָה); verbal-clauses, e. g. Ps 50:21 thou thoughtest אַתָּה קָרְבָּה כְּמָה וְךָ I was surely like thyself [but read עֲמָדָה for קָרְבָּה]; Gn 41:15, Ju 9:48 what ye have seen me do; Is 48:8, Ho 7:2.

(b) Object-clauses introduced by כִּי, e. g. Gn 6:5 וַיַּרְא יְהֻנָּה כִּי רְכֻבָּה רָעַת הָאָדָם and the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great, &c.—Direct narration also is very frequently introduced by כִּי (analogous to the Örti *recitativum*; frequently, indeed, with the secondary idea of a particle of asseveration, as in Gn 26:9, 27:20), e. g. Gn 21:30, 22:16 f., 26:22, 29:32, 37:35, Jos 2:24, &c., even when the direct narration is not expressly indicated, Gn 4:25, 32:31, 41:51 f., Ex 18:4.—On the expression of a second object by means of a clause introduced by כִּי, see § 117 h.²

(c) Object-clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר, e. g. Est 3:4 כִּי יְהָגִיד לְקָם אֲשֶׁר־הוּא יְהָוֵה for he had told them that he was a Jew; 1 S 18:15, Ez 20:26, Ec 8:12,³ even before direct narration, 1 S

¹ On these clauses with כִּי and אֲשֶׁר and generally on clauses which we should render as subordinate, cf. P. Doörwald ‘Zur hebr. Syntax’ in *Neue Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädag.* 1890, p. 115 ff.

² Instead of a complete objective clause we sometimes find a kind of accusative and infinitive construction, especially after נָתַן (prop. *to give up*) in the sense of *to allow*, e. g. Nu 21:23 וְלֹא־אָנַתָּן סִיחָן אֲתִי־שְׂרָאֵל עַבְרֵ בְּגַבְלָיו and Sihon did not suffer Israel to pass through his border; 20:21; followed by an infinitive with ל, e. g. Gn 20:6, 31:7, Ex 3:19.—Cf. also the analogous examples in Dt 28:56 (after נָסַח to venture; see § 113 d); Ju 11:20 (after עָמַדְתָּה to trust); 1 K 19:4 (after שָׁאַל to request).

³ In Jer 28:9 a subject-clause is thus introduced by אֲשֶׁר instead of the usual כִּי.

15:20, 2 S 1:4. Somewhat frequently אֲשֶׁר is preceded by the *nota accusativi* אֲחֵר (equivalent to *the circumstance, the fact, that*), e. g. Jos 2:10, 1 S 24:11, 19, 2 S 11:20, Is 38:3, but in Gn 30:29, Dt 29:15 equivalent to *the way in which*.

§ 158. Causal Clauses.

A complete clause, assigning the reason for statements, demands, threats, &c., sometimes follows with the simple *wāw copulative*, e. g. Ps 60:13 *give us help against the adversary, and (for) vain is the help of man*; Gn 6:17 (גַּם), 22:12, Ex 23:9, Jb 22:12, perhaps also Ps 7:10; or even without *Wāw*, e. g. Gn 17:14. As a rule, however, special conjunctions in various combinations are used to introduce causal clauses.

The most common causal conjunctions are יְמִינָה אֲשֶׁר Is 3:16, &c., and because, prop. *on account of the fact that*; both, however, may also be shortened to the simple יְמִינָה Nu 20:12, &c., or to כי because, Gn 3:14, 17, &c., or to אֲשֶׁר Gn 30:18, 31:49, 34:13, 27, 1 S 15:15, 20:42, 26:16, 23, 1 K 3:19, 8:33, Ho 14:4, Zc 1:15; also אֲשֶׁר בְּ Gn 39:9, 23. On the other hand, the simple יְמִינָה is sometimes repeated for emphasis, יְמִינָה וְיְמִינָה (something like the German *sintemal und alldieweil*) Lv 26:43, Ez 13:10 (without וְ 36:3); also על־אֲשֶׁר 2 S 3:30, and עַל־קְבִּיר¹ Dt 31:17, Ju 3:12, Mal 2:14 *on the ground that*; על־קְבִּיר אֲשֶׁר because of the circumstance that, Dt 23:5; דות אֲשֶׁר for this very cause that, Jer 3:8. But just as the simple יְמִינָה is used for because, so also the simple על־ with the perfect stands for Ps 119:136, Ezr 3:11; cf. Gn 31:20 and עַל־בְּלִי Dt 28:55 both with the perfect, equivalent to because ... not.—Cf. further עַל־קְבִּיר Is 43:4 arising from the fact that, = because; קְבִּיר 1 S 26:21, &c., and קְבִּיר Dt 4:37, Pr 1:29 for the reason that.

Rem. 1. The preposition על־ (because of, on account of) with the infinitive (§ 114 e) is frequently used as the equivalent of a full causal clause; cf. e. g. Am 1:3, 6, 13, 2:1, 6. Such a construction with the infinitive may, however, according to § 114 r, be continued by means of a finite verb, in which case על־ governs the verb as a conjunction; e. g. Am 1:9 ... על־הַסְגִּירָם אַזְרֹו because they delivered up ... and remembered not, &c.; 1:11, 2:4; without *Wāw*, Is 30:14.

2. The choice of tenso is regulated by the general principles stated in § 106 ff., viz. the perfect (cf. especially § 106 f) refers to causes already brought fully into effect, the imperfect to those which may contingently arise; cf. e. g. Dt 7:12, 8:20, 1 K 8:33, where the imperfect leaves the possibility still open that the persons addressed will perhaps escape the threatened punishments by avoiding disobedience.—Cf. further, § 111 h on the imperfect consecutive, and § 112 nn on the perfect consecutive in the apodosis to causal clauses.

§ 159. Conditional Sentences.

Cf. H. Ferguson, ‘The Use of the Tenses in Conditional Sentences in Hebrew’ (*Journal of the Society of Bibl. Lit. and Exeg.*, Middletown, Conn., June and September, 1882).—P. Friedrich, *Die hebr. Conditionalsätze*, Königsberg, 1884 (Inaug.-Diss.).—Driver, *Use of the Tenses*, 3rd ed., p. 174 ff.

¹ Also יְמִינָה כִּי־עַל־כֵּן prop. for therefore, Gn 18:5, 19:8, 33:10, 38:26, Nu 10:31, 14:43, 2 S 18:20 *Q'reh*, and אֲשֶׁר עַל־כֵּן Jb 34:27, always mean for as much as.

1. The great variety of construction in conditional sentences is owing to the fact that it frequently depends on the subjective judgement of the speaker, whether he wishes a condition to be regarded as *capable of fulfilment* (absolutely, or at least possibly), thus including those already fulfilled, or as *incapable of fulfilment*. On this distinction depends the choice both of the conditional particle to be used (see below), and especially (as also in Greek and Latin) of the tense. The use of the latter is naturally determined according to the general principles laid down in § 106 ff.¹ In the following sketch, for the sake of clearness, conditional sentences *without* conditional particles will be first discussed (under b), and afterwards sentences *with* these particles (under l).

2. The relation between condition and consequence may be expressed, as in English, by the simple juxtaposition of two clauses. At the same time, it is to be observed in general as a fundamental rule (in accordance with the original character of the two tenses), that the *imperfect*, with its equivalents (the jussive, cohortative, imperative, perfect consecutive, and participle), is used to express a condition and consequence which are regarded as being *capable of fulfilment* in present or future time, while the *perfect* represents a condition already fulfilled in the past, and its consequence as an accomplished fact. The other use of the perfect—to represent conditions regarded as *impossible*—occurs only in connexion with particles.

Examples:—

(a) *Imperfect* (cf. § 107 x) in protasis and apodosis, Jos 22:18, Ps 104:28 ff. תִּתְן יְלָק מֵן² (if) *thou givest unto them, they gather*, &c.; Ps 139:18, Pr 12:17, Jb 20:24, Ec 1:18, Neh 1:8; with an interrogative imperfect in the apodosis, Ju 13:12; with the jussive, Jb 10:16; with the cohortative, Pr. 1:23; with the perfect, Is 26:10 (*yet will he not learn righteousness*; the apodosis forcibly denies what the imperfect in the protasis had represented as still conceivable; cf. Ho 8:12); with the perfect consecutive, Gn 47:25, Ex 33:5; with the protasis suppressed, Jb 5:8 (see § 107 x).

(b) *Jussive* in protasis (cf. § 109 h, i) and apodosis, Ps 104:10 וַיְהִי לְיְלָה שֶׁךְ³ (if) *thou makest darkness, it is night*; imperfect in the apodosis, Ps 104^{29 b}; cohortative Pr 1:23. Also in Ex 7:9 יְהִי לְתَנִינִים⁴ *it shall become a serpent*, is the apodosis to a suppressed protasis *if thou cast it down*; so in 2 K 5:10 בְּיִשְׁבָּא⁵ is the apodosis to a protasis *if thou wash*, contained in what precedes.

(c) *Cohortative* (see § 108 e) in the protasis; perfect in the apodosis, Ps 40:6; imperfect consecutive, Jb 19:18 אַק וּמָה נִירְבֹּרְזִבִּי (if) *I arise, they speak against me*; on the cohortative in the apodosis, cf. § 108 f.

¹ It may, moreover, happen that a different idea is introduced in the apodosis, from that with which the protasis started—a source of many further variations.

² On the termination מ- cf. § 47 m. In verse 28 b also יְשֻׁבָּעָו is probably to be explained from its immediately preceding the greater pause. These terminations in verses 28–30 and Ps 139:18 can scarcely have any connexion with the conditional sentence, although it is strange that מ- in Nu 32:23 appears after אֲמָלָא in the protasis. In Nu 16:29, 32:20 מ- as before נ (as in Jb 31:10 in the apodosis) is to be explained from the dislike of hiatus.

(d) *Imperfect consecutive* in the protasis (§ 111 x), Ps 139:11 **וְאֵלֶּה** if I say, &c. (with a noun-clause as the apodosis); with a frequentative perfect consecutive in the apodosis, 1 S 2:16.

(e) *Perfect consecutive* in the protasis and apodosis (see the examples, § 112 kk and II), Gn 44:22 **וְעַבְדָּה אָבִינוּ וְמֻתָּה** and should he leave his father, his father would die; 9:15, 44:29, Ex 4:14, 12:13, 1 S 16:2, 19:3, 2 S 13:28, 1 K 8:30; with frequentative perfects, Ex 16:21 (referring to the past, Jer 20:9); with imperfect in the apodosis (being separated from the *Wāw* by **וְ**), Nu 23:20, Jb 5:24; introduced by an infinitive absolute, 1 K 2:37; an interrogative clause in the apodosis, Lv 10:19; a noun-clause, Ps 37:10, Jb 7:21.

(f) *A simple perfect* (to represent actions which are to be regarded as completed) in the protasis and apodosis, Pr 18:22 **הֲנִצְחָן אָשָׁר טֹב** has one found a wife, he has found a good thing; an imperfect in the apodosis, Jb 19:4, 23:10; an imperfect consecutive, Ex 20:25, Pr 11:2, Jb 3:25, 23^{13 b}, 29:11; an interrogative clause, Nu 12:14, Jb 7:20 if I have sinned (prop., well, now I have sinned!) what can I do unto thee? 21:31, 35:6, Am 3:8; a noun-clause, Jb 27:19.

(g) *A participle as casus pendens* (cf. § 143 d, and the sections of the Grammar there cited, esp. § 116 w) or a complete noun-clause in the protasis; the apodosis mostly introduced by *wāw apodosis*, e. g. Pr 23:24 **K^eth** if one begetteth a wise child, he shall have joy of him; with perfect frequentative in the apodosis, 1 S 2:13, &c.; but also with a simple imperfect, e. g. Ex 21:12 (cf. § 112 n); with an interrogative imperfect, 2 K 7:2, 19; with an interrogative perfect, Ju 6:13.

(h) *Infinitive with preposition* (also as the equivalent of a conditional clause) in the protasis, and a perfect consecutive in the apodosis (cf. § 112 mm), e. g. 2 S 7:14 ff. **בְּהַשׁוֹתָן וְהַכְּהַפְּרִיו** if he commit iniquity, I will correct him; Ex 34:34 f. (with imperfect, followed by perfects frequentative in the apodosis).

Rem. On the expression of condition and consequence by means of two co-ordinate *imperatives*, see § 110 f.

3. Particles used to introduce conditional sentences are **מִן** (for which in the later and latest Books sometimes **הַן**, see below, under w) and **לֹא**¹ (1 S 14:30, Is 63:19; לֹאֵלֶּה, Est 7:4, from **אֵלֶּה**, if, negative **אֵם** and **לֹא**) (**לֹאֵלִי**) unless; **כִּי** supposing that (Lat. *ut*), *in case that*, sometimes used almost in the same sense as **מִן**. With regard to the difference between **אֵם** (**אֵם לֹא**) and **לֹאֵלִי** (**לֹאֵלִי לֹא**), the fundamental rule is that **מִן** is used if the condition be regarded either as already fulfilled, or if it, together with its consequence, be thought of as possibly (or probably) occurring in the present or future. In the former case, **מִן** is followed by the perfect, in the latter (corresponding to the Greek *έὰν* with the present subjunctive) by the imperfect or its equivalent (frequently in the apodosis also). On the other hand, **לֹאֵלִי** (**לֹאֵלִי לֹא**) is used when the condition is to be represented as *not fulfilled* in the past, or as *not capable of fulfilment* in the present or future, and the consequence accordingly as not having occurred or never occurring. In the former case, **לֹאֵלִי** and **לֹאֵלִי** are necessarily followed by the perfect (mostly also in the apodosis) corresponding to the Greek *εἰ* with the indicative of an historic tense, and the Latin imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive. In the latter case (which is extremely rare) the perfect, or the participle, or even the imperfect, may be used.

¹ On **לֹא** cf. Kohler in Geiger's *Zeitschr. für Wiss. und Leben*, vi (1868), p. 21 ff.

Rem. Since it again frequently depends on the subjective judgement of the speaker (see under a), whether a condition is to be regarded as possible or impossible, we cannot wonder that the distinction between מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה and לֹא is not always consistently observed. Although naturally לֹא and לֹא can take the place of מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה and מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה (on the strange use of לֹא in Gn 50:15 see below), yet conversely מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה is sometimes used where לֹא would certainly be expected; cf. e. g. Ps 50:12, 137:5, 139:8, Ho 9:12 (cf. verse 11). These examples, indeed (מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה with the imperfect), may without difficulty be explained from the fact that the connexion of לֹא with the imperfect was evidently avoided, because the imperfect by its nature indicates a still unfinished action, and consequently (as opposed to לֹא) a still open possibility. But מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה is also used for לֹא in connexion with the perfect, especially when an imprecation is attached by the apodosis to the condition introduced by מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, e. g. Ps 7:4 ff. יְרַדֵּךְ וְיַחֲזִיקֵךְ אִם־עַשְׂתָּה ... if I have done this ..., let the enemy pursue my soul, &c., cf. Jb 31:9 ff. The speaker assumes for a moment as possible and even actual, that which he really rejects as inconceivable, in order to invoke the most severe punishment on himself, if it should prove to be the case.

On the frequent addition of an infinitive absolute to the verb in clauses with מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה see § 113 o above.

Examples:—

A. מִשְׁתַּחֲוָה 1. with *perfect* in the protasis to express conditions, &c., which have been completely fulfilled in the past or which will be completely fulfilled in the future (the perfect is here equivalent to the *futurum exactum*, § 106 o). The apodosis¹ takes—

(a) A *perfect* also, e. g. Pr 9:12 אִם־חָכֶם תִּהְבֹּא if thou art wise, thou art wise for thyself; Ps 73:15 (see below on לֹא).

(b) *Imperfect*, e. g. Dt 32:41 אִם־שְׁנָאֵת if I whet my glittering sword ... אָשָׁב I will render vengeance, &c.; Jb 9:15 f.30 (in both cases we should expect לֹא rather than אִם; so also in Ps 44:21 f., with an interrogative imperfect in the apodosis); Jb 11:13 (the apodosis is in verse 15).

(c) *Jussive* (or *optative*), e. g. Jb 31:9 ff. (see m above); Gn 18:3.

(d) *Perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112 gg), e. g. Gn 43:9 אִם־לֹא תִּבְרֹא if I bring him not ... then I shall have sinned, &c.; Ju 16:17, 2 S 15:33, 2 K 7:4. On the other hand, e. g. Gn 47:6, Mi 5:7, Jb 7:4 refer to actions already completed; in Gn 38:9 and Nu 21:9 the perfect with לֹא is a perfect frequentative and refers to past time.

(e) *Imperfect consecutive* (see § 111 q), e. g. Jb 8:4 if thy children have sinned (אוּתָהּ ...) ..., וְיִשְׁלַחֵם he has delivered them, &c.

(f) *Imperative*, e. g. Gn 50:4 אִם־נוּאָמֵץ אֶתְּנָאָמֵץ if now I have found grace in your eyes, speak, I pray you, &c.; the imperative precedes in Gn 47:16 and Jb 38:4, 18.

(g) A (complete or incomplete) noun-clause, e. g. Jer 14:18 (a vivid realization of the future) if I have gone forth into the field (= if I go, &c.), then, behold, the slain with the sword! &c.; Pr 24:14 (apodosis with wāw apodosis).

¹ We are not here concerned with the fact that the logical apodosis (the consequence of the condition) is sometimes mentioned before the condition; as in Gn 18:28, 30, Ju 11:10, Ps 63:6 f., 137:6, and according to Dillmann Is 4:4.

2. מִנְחָה with *imperfect* in the protasis, to express what is possible in the present or future, as well as (according to § 107 b) what has continued or been repeated in the past. The apodosis takes—

(a) The *perfect*, e. g. Nu 32:23 וְאַמְתָּל אֵת עֲשׂוֹן כִּי הָבָה חֶטְאָתֶם but if ye will not do so, behold, ye have sinned; here the apodosis represents the time when the consequence has already taken place; so also Jb 20:12–14. On the other hand, Nu 16:29 (as also 1 S 6:9 and 1 K 22:28) is a case of a pregnant construction, *if these men die as all men die, then* (it will follow from this) the Lord hath not sent me.

(b) The *imperfect*, e. g. 2 K 7:4 אִם־צִוָּה נָהָרָה if they save us alive, we shall live, &c.; Gn 13:16, 18:28, 30, 28:20 ff., Ex 20:25 (the second imperfect is equivalent to a *jussive*); Is 1:18, 10:22, Am 9:2–4, Ps 50:12 (where מִנְחָה ironically represents an impossibility as possible); Jb 8:5 f. (with the insertion of a second condition in the form of a noun-clause); 9:3, 20, 14:7; a frequentative imperfect referring to the past, Gn 31:8 אִם־כֵּה יֹאמֶר if (ever) he said thus ..., גַּם לֹא then they bare ...; Ex 40:37. In Gn 42:37 the consequence (on קְמִיתָ cf. § 107 s) precedes the condition.

(c) The *jussive* (or *optative*), e. g. Ps 137:5; cf. § 109 h.

(d) The *cohortative*, e. g. Gn 13:9, Jb 31:7; cf. § 108 f.

(e) The *perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112 ff and gg), e. g. 1 S 20:6 אִם־פָּקַד תִּזְבְּחָה if thy father miss me at all, then shalt thou say, &c.; Gn 24:41, Ju 4:20; with a frequentative perfect consecutive, Gn 31:8 if he said (as often happened) ..., then, &c.

(f) The *imperfect consecutive*; so perhaps Ps 59:16, if וְנִילְוָה is to be explained according to § 111 t.

(g) The *imperative*, e. g. Gn 31:50, 1 S 20:21 (with *wāw apodosis*, but in verse 22 simply לֹא), 21:10, Jb 33:5.

(h) A noun-clause, e. g. Gn 4:7, Ps 139:8, Jb 8:6, 31:26 f.

3. מִנְחָה with *cohortative*, e. g. Gn 30:31; cf. the passages in § 108 e.

4. מִנְחָה with *infinitive*, Jb 9:27 אִם־אָמַרְתִּי prop. if my saying is (but probably we should read אִם רָתִית).

5. מִנְחָה with a noun-clause, e. g. Dt 5:22 (in the apodosis a perfect with *wāw apodosis*), Gn 27:46, Ju 9:15 (imperative in the apodosis); 11:9 (imperfect in the apodosis); 2 S 12:8 (cohortative in the apodosis); Ho 12:12; especially if the subject of the conditional clause be a personal pronoun. In an affirmative sentence this pronoun is often joined to וְיָהּ, in a negative sentence to וְאַתָּה (cf. on both, § 100 o), while the predicate (cf. § 116 q) is represented by a participle, usually expressing the future, e. g. Ju 6:36 f. אִם־יָשַׁעַ מֹשִׁיעַ if thou will save, &c.; Gn 24:49 אִם־יְשַׁבֵּת if ye will deal, &c.; 1 S 23:23. In Gn 24:42 f. the condition is expressed in a more humble form by the addition of וְאַתָּה. With וְאַתָּה יְגַנֵּךְ אִם־אַתָּה but if thou wilt not send, &c.; 20:7 (with imperative in the apodosis); Ex 8:17, 9:2 f., 1 S 19:11 (all with a participle also in the apodosis). But וְיָהּ and וְאַתָּה may also be used after מִנְחָה without a suffix; thus וְיָהּ Gn 23:8, 1 S 20:8, 2 K 9:15, &c., וְאַתָּה (if it be not the case) Gn 30:1, Ex 32:32, Ju 9:15, 2 K 2:10; cf. also אִם־בָּכְן if it be so, Gn 25:22.

B. הִנֵּה *if*, generally supposed to be originally identical with הִנֵּה *behold!*¹ Probably, however, הִנֵּה *if*, is a pure Aramaism, and since the Aramaic word never has the meaning *behold*, it is at least improbable that it had originally any connexion with הִנֵּה or הַבָּה. Cf. Ex 8:22, Lv 25:20, Is 54:15, Jer 3:1, Hag 2:12, 2 Ch 7:13, and frequently in Job, as 9:11, 12, 12:14, 15, 19:7, 23:8, 40:23, always with wāw apodosis following, except in 13:15, where consequently the meaning *see* is no doubt preferable.

C. הַיְיָ (לֹא) if, *if not.*

1. With *perfect* in the protasis and apodosis (cf. § 106 p), e.g. Ju 8:19; אֲלֹתוֹ is used in the same sense as הַיְיָ in Est 7:4, cf. Ec 6:6 (with a question in the apodosis).—With the perfect in protasis and apodosis after לֹא Gn 31:42, 43:10, Ju 14:18, 1 S 25:34, 2 S 2:27, Is 1:9. On the other hand, in Dt 32:29 הַיְיָ with a perfect is followed by an imperfect in the apodosis, *if they were wise, they would understand this*; in Mi 2:11 by a perfect consecutive.

2. With *imperfect* after לֹא Dt 32:27 אָגֹור probably as the *modus rei repetitae, were it not that I ever and again feared, &c.*; so also the imperfect after הַיְיָ with the apodosis suppressed, Gn 50:15 *supposing that Joseph should hate us*; since, according to the context, the danger was real, the use of הַיְיָ here is strange; conversely in other cases, e.g. Ps 73:15, Jb 9:15 f.30, הַיְיָ would be more natural than מֵאָ.

3. A noun-clause occurs after הַיְיָ 2 S 18:12, 2 K 3:14, Ps 81:14, all with imperfect in the apodosis; Jb 16:4 הַיְיָ יְשַׁׁ, with cohortative in the apodosis.

D. כִּי supposing that, if.—

1. כִּי with *perfect* in the protasis, e.g. Nu 5:20 וְאַתָּה פִּי שְׂטִית but thou, if thou hast gone astray, &c.; with a frequentative perfect consecutive in the apodosis, Jb 7:13 f.; with an imperfect consecutive, Jb 22:29.

2. כִּי with *imperfect* in the protasis, e.g. Ps 23:4 גַּם כִּי־אֶלְךָ yea, though I walk (have to walk)..., I will fear no כִּי־יַדְקָנָה עַבְרִי גַּם if thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve (but in verses 3–5 a series of definite conditions with definite consequences is introduced by מֵאָ; so also the כִּי in verse 7 is followed in verses 8–11 by the special cases with מֵאָ; cf. also verse 17 ff.); cf. Gn 4:24, 24:41, Jb 38:5; with a perfect consecutive in the apodosis, Gn 32:18 f., Ex 18:16; with a noun-clause, Is 1:15.

3. כִּי with a *noun-clause* (and imperfect in the apodosis), 2 S 19:8.

REMARKS.

1. In 2 K 5:13 the particle אָבִי (Masora אָבִי, probably in the sense of *my father*) appears exceptionally for הַיְיָ; its meaning here is unquestionable, but its origin is obscure. Cf. the exhaustive discussion of Delitzsch and Wetzstein on Jb 34:36, where this אָבִי appears to be used as a desiderative particle.—Sometimes when one case has been already discussed, another of the same character is added by means of אָז or, e.g. Ex 21:36 אָז נָדַע וְאָז or (another possible case) *it is known that, &c.*, i.e. *but if it be known, &c.*, LXX ἐδει δέ, Vulg. *sin autem*; cf. Lv 4:23, 28, 5:1, 25:49, 2 S 18:13; with a following imperfect, Ez 14:17f.—On the hypothetical use of אָשָׁר (which is interchangeable with כִּי in other senses also) Lv 4:22 (in verses 3 and 27 מֵאָ), Dt 11:27 (verse 28 מֵאָ), Jos 4:21, see the Lexicon.

¹ There could be no doubt of their identity if וְהַבָּה in 1 S 9:7, 2 S 18:11, simply meant *if*. We must, however, keep to the meaning *but behold*.

2. The conditional sentence is frequently found in an abridged form, where the suppressed clauses can be easily supplied from the context; cf. Gn 13:9, 24:49, 1 S 2:16 *and if not*, i.e. *and if thou wilt not give it to me, then I take it* (perfect according to § 106 n) *by force*; cf. 1 S 6:9. The use of שִׁנְיָה alone in Ju 6:13 is peculiar, as also שִׁנְיָה in 2 K 10:15 (where read with the LXX עַתָּה) in the sense of *if it be so*.—In 2 S 13:26, 2 K 5:17 alone appears to be used in the sense of *if really ... not*, in each case with a following jussive equivalent to *may there at least, &c.* (cf. § 143 d); but perhaps with Matthes, *ZAW* 1903, p. 122 ff., following Kuipers, we should read וְלֹא *would that!*—In 1 S 13:13, Jb 3:13 the condition must be supplied from the preceding clause to complete the sentence introduced by כִּי עֲתָה, in Jb 31:28 by כִּי, in 2 K 13:19 by אֵன. The apodosis also appears sometimes in an abridged form (e.g. Gn 4:24, Is 43:2) or is entirely suppressed, e.g. Gn 30:27, 38:17, 50:15 (see y above), Ex 32:32, Ps 27:13, Jb 38:5, where properly must be supplied with כִּי תֵּן עַתָּה הַגָּד must be supplied with כִּי תֵּן עַתָּה, as in verses 4 and 18; cf. § 167 a.—In Ps 8:4, instead of the apodosis *I exclaim* which we should expect, the exclamation itself follows.

3. The absolute certainty with which a result is to be expected is frequently emphasized by the insertion of כִּי Is 7:9; כִּי אֵין 2 S 2:27, 19:7, Jb 11:15; or כִּי עַתָּה now verily, Nu 22:29, 1 S 14:30 after לֹא, Gn 31:42, 43:10 after לֹא, לֹא יָלִין, Jb 8:6 after אֵם. On this corroborative cf. such passages as Gn 18:20, &c., and § 148 d. On כִּי אֵם after an oath cf. 163 d.

4. Sometimes the force of a hypothetical particle extends beyond the apodosis to a second conditional clause, as in the case of מִנֶּה Pr 9:12, Jb 10:15, 16:6, 22:23, and כִּי Is 43:2.

5. In Ex 33:20 a negative statement takes the place of a condition with a negative consequence, *for a man doth not see me and live*, instead of *for if a man sees me, he does not live*; cf. the similar passages, Dt 22:1, 4 *thou shalt not see ... and hide thyself, instead of if thou seest ... thou shalt not hide thyself*.

§ 160. Concessive Clauses.

Besides the use of the imperative in the sense of a concession, meant either seriously (§ 110 a) or mockingly (§ 110 f), and of concessive circumstantial clauses (§ 141 e, § 142 d, and § 156 f), concessive clauses may be introduced—

(a) By a simple מִנֶּה *if*: thus Jb 9:15 with perfect, *if (=though) I had been in the right*; Is 1:18 and 10:22 with imperfect in reference to a contingent event.

(b) By *yea though*, Is 1:15 with imperfect; for which we find simply מִנֶּה in Is 49:15 with imperfect, *yea, though these may forget, yet ...*; on the other hand, with perfect, Jer 36:25, Ps 95:9, Neh 6:1; finally כִּי גַם even if, though, Ec 4:14.

(c) By the preposition על־אֲחַתְּמָס בְּכֶפֶת *notwithstanding that* no violence is in mine hands, or a verbal-clause, Is 53:9. On על־בְּלִי with the infinitive in a similar sense (equivalent to *in addition to the fact that = notwithstanding that*), cf. § 119 aa, note 2.

§ 161. Comparative Clauses.

ZAW. *ZAW*, = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.

1. A comparison between two facts is sometimes established by simply uniting them with *wāw copulative*, especially in gnomic poetry, when facts of a moral nature are compared with those of the physical world, e.g. Jb 5:7 *man is born unto trouble, and the sons of flame fly upward*, i.e. as the sparks by nature fly upward, so man, &c.; Jb 12:11 (in an interrogative form; in 34:3 the same comparison as a statement); 14:11 f., Pr 17:3, 25:3, 26:3, 9, 14, 27:21, &c.¹ Even without the connecting ו Jb 24:19 *drought and heat consume the snow waters*, שָׂאֹל חַטְאֵי so doth *Sheol* those who have sinned (cf. § 155 n); cf. Jer 17:11.

2. The conjunction **וְאַשְׁר** (cf. § 155 g; the simple **וְאַשְׁר** occurs in the same sense in Ex 10:6, 14:13, 34:18) *as, quemadmodum*, is used as a comparative conjunction (Ob¹⁵), frequently with **כִּי** *so*, corresponding to it in the apodosis, Is 31:4, 52:14 f. Sometimes, however, **כִּי** (*so also*) occurs even after independent statements, Is 55:9, Jer 3:20.—Exact coincidence of two facts is expressed in Ec 5:15 by **כֹּל־עֲמָת שָׁ**² *in all points as.*

Rem. On the use of **כִּי as**, with single nouns or pronouns to introduce comparisons, cf. 118 s; on the alleged use of **כִּי** as a conjunction (equivalent to **וְאַשְׁר**), cf. § 155 g.—It is to be further remarked that **כִּי—כִּי** when used in correspondence with one another, *as—so* (e.g. Lv 7:7, Ju 8:18, Is 24:2, Ho 4:9; also *so—as*, Gn 18:25, 44:18, Dt 1:17, 1 K 22:4; in Jos 14:11, 1 S 30:24—**כִּי**; Ps 127:4 and often, **כִּי—כִּי**, cf. Jo 2:4), are not to be regarded as conjunctions, but as virtual substantives with a following genitive; **כִּי כָּמֶם כִּי כָּמֶם** *like as like* Nu 15:15 properly means *the like of you shall be the like of the stranger*, i.e. *your duty shall be (also) the stranger's duty*; cf. Lv 24:22.

§ 162. Disjunctive Sentences.

The introduction of another possible case, excluding that which preceded, is effected by **אוּ** or, e.g. Ex 21:36, equivalent to the Latin *vel*; but also equivalent to *aut* with an exclusive antithesis, 2 K 2:16; so Is 27:5 **אוּ=it would then happen that**, for which elsewhere **אוּ כִּי**.

In the sense of *sive—sive* we find **אוּ אוּ אָמָם—אָמָם—אָמָם—אָמָם** (see the examples in the Lexicon), also **וְאוּ** Lv 5:3, Nu 9:14, Dt 24:7, Is 2:13 ff., Jer 32:20, Ps 76:7, Jb 34:29, perhaps also Ex 21:16 (but not Pr 29:9; cf. Delitzsch on the passage), and **לֹא—לֹא** (see § 143 e); cf. also **גַם—גַם** (in Gn 24:44—**גַם—גַם**) *both—and*; but **אַגְםָלָא—אַגְםָלָא** (in Gn 21:26—**אַגְםָלָא—אַגְםָלָא**; Zp 1:18—**אַגְםָלָא—אַגְםָלָא**) *neither—nor*. On disjunctive questions, see § 150 g.

1¹ On this *wāw adaequationis*, and in general on these proverbial comparisons, see Delitzsch, *Das Salomonische Spruchbuch*, p. 9 f. Moreover, instead of entire clauses, the nouns alone (without predicates) are frequently grouped together, e.g. Pr 25:25, 26:21, 27:21 (called by Delitzsch, the ‘emblematic Mashal’). The expressions **נַחֲשֵׁב עִם** *to be counted with some one*, Ps 88:5, and **נַפְצֵל עִם** *to be likened with some one*, Ps 28:1, 143:7, also arise from the idea of comparison implied in grouping things together. On this use of **מֵ** cf. Jb 9:26, where *with* is equivalent to *like*.

2² In spite of its form this particle has originally nothing to do with **כֹּל**, **כֹּל** *all*. The expression is compounded of **כִּי** and **לְעַמָּת**, like the Aramaic **כָּל־קָבֵל** for **כָּל**, **קָבֵל**; cf. M. Lambert, *REJ.* xxx. 47.

§ 163. Adversative and Exceptive Clauses.

1. After negative sentences (especially after prohibitions) the antithesis (*but*) is introduced by כִּי אַם, e.g. 1 S 8:19 *and they said, Nay, but we will have a king over us*; Ps 1:2, &c.; frequently also by כִּי alone, e.g. Gn 18:15, 19:2, or even simply connected with יְהִי, Gn 17:5, וְהִיא as perfect consecutive; 42:10; cf. Ex 5:18.

Rem. Sometimes the negation is only virtually contained in the preceding sentence, e.g. in the form of a rhetorical question (Mi 6:3 f.) or of conditions which are to be regarded as not having been fulfilled (Jb 31:18); כִּי or כִּי אַם כִּי in such cases becomes equivalent to *nay, rather*.

2. *Exceptive* clauses, depending on another sentence, are introduced by אֲבָס כִּי except that, and (again after negative sentences, see a above) כִּי אַם¹ unless; especially כִּי אַם with the perfect (equivalent to *unless previously*) after imperfects which contain a declaration, e.g. Gn 32:27 *I will not let thee go, except thou hast previously blessed me*; Lv 22:6, Is 55:10, 65:6, Am 3:7, Ru 3:18. Finally, בְּלֹתִי אַם unless, Am 3:4 (with perfect after a rhetorical question), or simply בְּלֹתִי Gn 43:3 with a noun-clause, *except your brother be with you*; Is 10:4 after a rhetorical question, with a verbal-clause.

Rem. The principal statement, to which כִּי אַם appends an exception, must sometimes be supplied from the context; thus, Gn 40:14 (I desire nothing else) *except that thou remember me*, equivalent to *only do thou remember, &c.* (cf. 106 n, note 2; but it is probably better to read נִזְקֵן for כִּי). Cf. Mi 6:8, where כִּי אַם, equivalent to *nothing but*, is used before an infinitive, and Jb 42:8, equivalent to *only*, before a noun. Similarly when כִּי אַם after an oath introduces an emphatic assurance, e.g. in 2 K 5:20 *as the Lord liveth* (I can do nothing else) *except I run after him, &c.*; cf. 2 S 15:21 *K^eth.*, Jer 51:14, Ru 3:12 *K^eth.*, and even without the oath, Ju 15:7; cf. the Rem. on c.

§ 164. Temporal Clauses.

1. The relations of time existing between two different actions or events are frequently expressed without the aid of a conjunction simply by juxtaposition:—

(a) Actions or events are represented as wholly or in part *simultaneous* by connecting a noun-clause with another noun-clause or verbal-clause introduced by יְהִי (or הַיְהָ), e.g. Gn 7:6 *and Noah was six hundred years old* (prop. *a son of six hundred years*), and (i.e. when) the flood was. This is especially the case when the predicate of the noun-clause (frequently introduced by עַזְזֵל still) is expressed by an active participle, e.g. Jb 1:16 f. עָזֶל זֶה מִדְבָּר זֹהֵא וְגַם he was yet speaking, and there came another, &c.; see the numerous examples in § 111 g and § 116 u. Instead of a complete noun-clause there often occurs a simple *casus pendens* after כִּי with a participial attribute in the sense of *whenever any one ...*, e.g. 1 S 2:13 זֶה בְּחֵץ בְּחֵץ וְכֵל־אִישׁ whenever any man offered sacrifice, then came, &c.; 2 S 2:23, &c.; see

¹ Very probably this use of כִּי אַם arises from the original meaning *for if, surely if* (כִּי in an affirmative sense); so evidently in Ex 22:22 as a forcible resumption of the preceding אַם. Thus, e.g. Ju 15:7 is simply *surely when I have been avenged of you, after that I will cease*, equivalent to, I will not cease, until I have, &c. When the exception follows, an ellipse must be assumed, e.g. Ru 3:18 *surely (or for) when he has finished it* (then the man will rest). It is far less natural to assume such an ellipse with כִּי אַם but (before entire clauses as before single nouns); see a above.

the examples (in which the second member is generally introduced by *wāw apodosis*) in § 116 w.

(b) Sequence is expressed by the juxtaposition

(1) of two imperfects consecutive, e.g. Gn 24:19 *וְתֵכֶל לְהַשְׁקָה וְתִזְבְּחָה* *and when she had done giving him drink, she said, &c.;* 28:8 f., 29:31, 30:9, 32:26, &c.; cf. § 111 d;

(2) of a noun-clause with a passive participle as predicate, and a verbal-clause attached by *וְ*, e.g. Gn 38:25; cf. § 116 v; in Gn 49:29 an imperative follows without *וְ*;

(3) of two perfects (frequently with the secondary idea of rapid succession¹ of the two actions or events in past time), e.g. Gn 19:23 *וְלֹא כִּי מָשַׁךְ הַשֶּׁמֶן ... וְלֹא בָּא גַּם* *the sun was just risen ... and (=when) Lot came, &c.,* cf. 1 S 9:5, 2 S 2:24; Gn 44:3 f., Ju 3:24, 15:14, 20:39 f.—In all these examples the subject follows immediately after the connective *Wāw*, and then the (simple) perfect. On the other hand,

(4) a perfect consecutive follows another perfect consecutive to express the contingent succession of future actions, e.g. Gn 44:4 *וְהַשְׁגַּת אֶלְעָם וְאֶתְרָחָה אָלְקָם* *and when thou dost overtake them* (as soon as thou shalt have overtaken), *thou shalt say unto them.* Naturally, examples of this kind are very closely related to conditional sentences; see, therefore, the examples in § 112 kk and § 159 g. On the connexion of an imperfect consecutive or a perfect with detached expressions of time (as equivalent to complete clauses), cf. § 111 b; on the imperfect consecutive after *וְ* and a statement of time, cf. § 111 g; on the perfect consecutive following a detached statement of time, as in Ex 16:6, cf. § 112 oo.—In 1 S 29:10 an imperative with *וְ* follows the perfect consecutive.

(5) The fact that one action or event has not yet taken place on the occurrence of another, is expressed by *רַם* *צָרָא* (an adverb, not a conjunction) with the imperfect (according to § 107 c). The apodosis, which may consist of a subject and perfect or even of a noun-clause (Gn 24:15),¹ is then connected by *וְ* (or *וְהַנֶּה*) as in the examples above, under no. 3, e.g. Gn 19:4 (cf. Jos 2:8) *רַם יִשְׁכַּן בּוֹ וְאֶנְשִׁי הָעִיר ... נָסַב בּוֹ וְ* *they had not yet lain down, and (=when) the men of the city ... compassed, &c.;* Gn 24:25.

2. Conjunctions used to introduce temporal clauses are *כִּי* (with perfect, e.g. Gn 6:1, Ju 1:28, 16:16, 1 S 1:12; with imperfect, Gn 4:12, 12:12, 24:41, Ex 3:21, Lv 21:9, Dt 31:21, Is 1:12, 8:19) and *אֲשֶׁר*² *when* (*כִּי* with the imperfect also = *as often as*, Ps 8:4; with perfect Jb 1:5); less frequently *אמֶת*³ (joined with a perfect), e.g. Gn 38:9, Nu 21:9, Ju 6:3, Ps 41:7, 94:18, cf. also Is 24:13 = *quotiescunque*; also in the same sense with an imperfect, Nu 36:4; with a perfect, equivalent to the *futurum exactum*, Is 4:4. Other conjunctions of time are the compounds *כִּמוֹ* *when*, Gn 19:15; *כִּי-אֲשֶׁר* *when, after that;*

¹ This secondary idea is implied here by the mere co-ordination of two independent *verbal-clauses*, just as the idea of simultaneous occurrence (according to § 116 u, note 1) is implied in the co-ordination of a *noun-clause* with another clause. In Gn 27:30 the immediate succession is especially emphasized by *אֲזֶה* and the infinitive absolute, *Jacob was yet scarce gone out ... then Esau his brother came*; in 1 K 9:24 by *אֲזֶה* only in Ps 48:6 by *כֵן* and the addition of two more perfects without *וְ*.

¹ On the perfect in the protasis, which is critically doubtful, cf. § 107 c.

² On *אֲשֶׁר* as an original demonstrative, cf. § 138 a; hence *בְּשֻׁבוּן-אֲשֶׁר* *is properly up to that (moment)—we shall return.*

³ Cf. the frequent use of *wenn* [prop. *if*] for *wann* [= *when*] in German.

עד־אָשֶׁר (also the simple עד־כִּי, e.g. Gn 38:11, Jos 2:22, 1 S 1:22 [with the imperfect=only when, as in 2 S 10:5]); 2:5, &c.; especially in the formula עד־בְּלֹתִי הַשְּׁאֵר לוֹ until there was none left remaining to him (where indeed it would be very natural to read the infin. constr., as elsewhere after בְּלֹתִי, § 114 s) Nu 21:35, Dt 3:3, Jos 8:22, 11:8 (but 1 S 14:19 while, as long as); עד אָשֶׁר לְאָזֶן before that, Ec 12:1, 2, 6 with an imperfect, as in Pr 8:26 עד אָמֵן until the time when; עד־אָשֶׁר אָמֵן until the time when; (for which in Ez 40:1 אָזֶן, אָזֶן; Lv 25:48, 1 S 5:9 simply אָזֶן; Lv 14:43, Jer 41:16, Jb 42:7 simply אָזֶן) after that; מִזְמָן (prop. since that time; the dependent clause is attached to it in the same way as the attributive clause to the demonstrative אָשֶׁר § 138 e) since, Gn 39:5; בְּפָנָם (and simply § 107 c) before; קָרְמָת אָשֶׁר (for קָרְמָת before, Ps 129:6).

Rem. 1. With regard to the tenses used with the above conjunctions, the rules are practically the same as those given in § 158 d for causal clauses. The perfect indicates actions completed in the past or future (in the former case corresponding to the Latin pluperfect, § 106 f, and in the latter to the Latin *futurum exactum*, § 106 o), the imperfect denotes actions occurring contingently in the future. On בְּמִזְמָן, בְּפָנָם, and עד with the imperfect as a *tempus historicum*, cf. 107 c.

2. Clauses introduced by עד, sometimes express a limit which is not absolute (terminating the preceding action), but only relative, beyond which the action or state described in the principal clause still continues; thus, עד with the imperfect, Ps 110:1; עד־כִּי with the perfect, Gn 26:13, with impf. 49:10; עד־אָשֶׁר with the perfect, Gn 28:15; with the imperfect, Ps 112:8.—Like the Arab. حتى, עד may even introduce a main clause; e.g. Ex 15:16 עַד־יָעַב־רָם prop. no doubt=thus it came to this—they passed through, i.e. so they passed through.

3. The infinitive construct governed by a preposition (§ 114 d, e) is very frequently used as the equivalent of a temporal clause; the infinitive with כִּי may usually be rendered by *when*, *as*, or *whilst*; the infinitive with כִּי by *when, as soon as* (in Pr 10:25 followed by a noun-clause introduced by *wāw apodosis*), or, when referring to the future, by *if*; the infinitive after נִזְמָן by *since*. According to § 111 g such statements of time are generally preceded by וַיַּהֲיָה and the apodosis follows in the imperfect consecutive; hence in 1 S 17:55 (cf. Driver on the passage) וְכָרָאוּ with a simple perfect following, is unusual. On the continuation of these infinitival constructions by means of the perfect consecutive, cf. § 112 v, and in general, § 114 r.—With the participle, כִּי appears to be used as the equivalent of a conjunction in בְּמִשְׁעֵב as he drew back, Gn 38:29 (unless we should read בְּמִשְׁעֵב [or בְּמִשְׁעֵב, cf. Gn 19:15]), and in כִּי חַת when it budded, 40:10.

§ 165. Final Clauses.¹

1. Like most of the dependent clauses hitherto treated, the final clause may also be joined by a simple *wāw copulative* to the main clause, unless the final clause is directly subordinated to the governing verb.

Examples of the connexion: (α) of a final imperfect (or jussive?) with a perfect by means of י, La 1:19, see § 107 q; with an interrogative sentence, 2 S 9:1, 3, Jb 38:24; with an optative, Ps 51:9; with an imperative, 1 K 11:21; (β) of a cohortative with an imperative by י, Gn 29:21, 1 S 15:16, or a jussive, Neh 2:5 (§ 108 d); (γ) of a jussive with an imperative by י,

¹ Cf. H. G. T. Mitchell, *Final Constructions of Biblical Hebrew*, Leipzig, 1879.

Ex 9:1, 2 S 16:11, 1 K 5:20, Ps 59:14, 86:17; with a jussive, Jb 21:19, or cohortative, § 109 f, g (cf. also 2 S 24:21 the infinitive with ל, Jon 1:11 מִהָּנָה with the 1st plur. imperf., and 2 Ch 29:10 עַמְלֵבָבִי, which are equivalent to cohortatives); (δ) of an imperative with a jussive, cohortative, or interrogative sentence by י, § 110 i; (ε) of a perfect consecutive after another perfect consecutive, Lv 14:36; after an imperfect, § 112 m and p; similarly after a jussive, § 112 q; after an imperative, § 112 r.—On negative final clauses joined by אֲלֹתֶל to the imperfect (so Ex 28:43, 30:20; and 2 S 13:25 after אֲלֹתֶל נָא with a jussive in the main clause) see the Rem. on § 109 g. In Ex 28:32, 39:23 the negative final clause is simply connected by אֲלֹתֶל.—On the use of an historical statement after verbs of commanding, where we should expect a final clause (e.g. Neh 13:9 *then I commanded, and they cleansed*, equivalent to *that they should cleanse, and they cleansed*; in Jb 9:7 a negative final clause is connected in this way by אֲלֹתֶל), cf. § 120 f.

For examples of the direct subordination of the final imperfect (without י) see § 120 c.

2. Final conjunctions are לְעֵן אֲשֶׁר *to the end that*; also simply לְעֵן Gn 12:13, 27:25, Ex 4:5, Ps 51:6, &c.; בְּעֹבֵר אֲשֶׁר *for the purpose that*, Gn 27:10, and simply בְּעֹבֵר Gn 27:4, Ex 9:14, 20:20; also the simple אֲשֶׁר¹ Dt 4:10, 40, 6:3, 32:46, Jos 3:7, Neh 8:14 f.; negatively, אֲשֶׁר לֹא Gn 11:7, 24:3, 1 K 22:16; or שֶׁ Ec 3:14; also negatively, אֲשֶׁר עַל־דְּבָרָת שֶׁל אֲלֹתֶל *for the matter (purpose) that ... not*, Ec 7:14; with imperfect, Ex 20:20, 2 S 14:14 *that ... not*.—Quite exceptional is the use of טַה (if the text be right) in Dt 33:11 מִנְקִומָוּן, with the imperfect, equivalent to *that ... not [in prose, מִקְומָם]*.

Rem. All the conjunctions here mentioned are naturally always used with the imperfect, see § 107 q (on the apparent exception in Jos 4:24, see § 74 g).—On the negative conjunctions אֲל and אֲלֹתֶל *that not, lest*, see § 152 f and w. On the infinitive with ל² (also לְעֵן Gn 18:19, 37:22, &c.) as the equivalent of a final clause (Gn 11:5, 28:4, &c.), see § 114 f, h, p. On the continuation of such infinitival constructions by means of the finite verb, see § 114 r. On the negation of the final infinitive by לְבָלָתֶל, § 114 s. On the preposition מ with a substantive or infinitive as the equivalent of a negative final clause (Gn 31:29, 1 S 15:23, &c.), see § 119 x and y.

§ 166. Consecutive Clauses.

1. Consecutive clauses are added by means of simple *wāw copulative* with the jussive,³ especially after negative and interrogative sentences, e.g. Nu 23:19 לֹא אִיש אֱלֹהִים God is not a man, that he should lie, and (i.e. neither) the son of man, that he should repent; Is 53:2 מִנְחָמָד הוּא who is wise, that he may understand these things? prudent, that he may know them? Jb 5:12 אֲלֹתֶל so that ... not; in Pr 30:3 י is separated from the predicate by the object. In Gn 16:10 a negative consecutive clause comes after a cohortative, and in Ex 10:5 after a perfect consecutive.—On the other hand, in Jb 9:32, 33 the jussive in the sense of a consecutive clause is attached without *Wāw* to the preceding negative sentence (in verse 32 a second jussive follows, likewise without *Wāw*, for he is not a man, as I am,

¹ In Ez 36:27 a final clause is introduced by אֲתָה אֲשֶׁר, thus at the same time taking the form of an object-clause.

² On ל as a supposed conjunction (equivalent to the Arabic *li*) 1 K 6:19, see § 66 i.

³ That such examples as וַיַּבְצֵב are to be regarded as jussive is probable from the analogy of Ho 14:10 and Jb 9:33.

that I should answer him, that we should come together in judgement). On the imperfect consecutive as expressing a logical consequence, see § 111 l; on the perfect consecutive as a consecutive clause after a participle, see § 112 n.

2. Conjunctions introducing consecutive clauses are again (see § 157 c, note 3) **כִּי** and **אֲשֶׁר**=*so that*; especially again after interrogative sentences, according to § 107 u; cf. Nu 16:11, **כִּי** with the imperfect, *that ye murmur*; but in Gn 20:10 with the perfect, in reference to an action already completed. On **רַבָּא** with the imperfect (or jussive) equivalent to *so that*, cf. further Gn 13:16, 22:14; with perfect and imperfect, 1 K 3:12 f., with the demonstrative force clearly discernible, depending on **לֹא** **אֲשֶׁר** **לֹא**=*ut non*, cf. Dt 28:35, 1 K 3:8, 2 K 9:37.

On **נִזְמָן** with a substantive or infinitive as the equivalent of a consecutive clause, see § 119 y.

§ 167. Aposiopesis, Anacoluthon, *Involved Series of Sentences*.

1. *Aposiopesis* is the concealment or suppression of entire sentences or clauses, which are of themselves necessary to complete the sense,¹ and therefore must be supplied from the context. This is especially frequent after conditional clauses; besides the examples already given in § 159 dd, cf. also Ex 32:32 (the LXX and Samaritan supply **אָתָּה**); Nu 5:20, Ju 9:16 (in verse 19, after a long parenthesis, an imperative follows as the apodosis to this conditional clause); 1 S 12:14 f., 2 S 5:8 (where indeed the text is probably very corrupt; cf. the addition in 1 Ch 11:6); 2 S 23:17, Ps 27:13, 1 Ch 4:10. For other examples of various kinds, see § 117 l, and especially § 147; in Aramaic, Dn 3:15.—On Gn 3:22, cf. § 152 w at the end.

2. *Anacoluthon* is the change from a construction which has been already begun to one of a different kind. It is found especially after long parentheses, because the speaker has either lost sight of the beginning of his sentence, or for the sake of clearness purposely makes a new beginning; thus Gn 20:13, 31:52 and Ez 34:10 (cf. § 149 at the end); Nu 14:21 ff., 32:20 ff., Dt 17:2 ff., 24:1 ff., 29:21 ff., Ju 10:11 (where, after a series of intermediate sentences, the predicate *I saved you* is suppressed; but the text can hardly be correct); perhaps also Is 66:18 (cf., however, Delitzsch on the passage, which is certainly corrupt).¹ On Gn 23:13 (**וְ** with the imperative), see § 110 e.

3. We may mention as instructive examples of *involved series* of sentences Gn 24:14 and ⁴² ff., and Gn 28:6 ff.

THE PARADIGMS.

¹ But those cases are not to be regarded as examples of aposiopesis, in which the answer, being closely connected with the question, is given simply in the infinitive with **לְ**; cf. § 147 a, note 1.

¹ On the other hand, from the Semitic point of view the various kinds of compound sentences are *not* to be regarded as instances of anacoluthon, e.g. Gn 17:14, 17, nor even Gn 31:40 (cf. § 143).

IN the paradigms of the verbs, those forms which are to be especially noticed by the beginner are marked throughout by an asterisk as model forms. Thus e.g. in the strong verb the 3rd sing. *fem.* **הִלְלָה** is the model for **לִלְלָה**, which likewise has only a vocalic affirmative, and **לִלְלָה** is the model for **קָטַת**, **קָטַתְּה** and **לִלְלָה**, which in the same way have a toneless affirmative beginning with a consonant. On the other hand, the forms **קָטָלָם** and **קָטָלָן**, where the affix beginning with a consonant has the tone, stand by themselves.—In the table of the pronouns the asterisk has a different meaning; see the footnote there.—The bracketed forms (for Paradigm G onwards) are merely analogous formations not occurring in the Old Testament.

The newly added paradigm (Q) consists of forms actually found, belonging to various verbs.

A. The Personal Pronoun.¹

Nominative of the Pronoun, <i>Pronomen separatum.</i>	Accusative of the Pronoun, or <i>Suffixum Verbi.</i>		Genitive of the Pronoun, or <i>Suffixum Nominis</i> (<i>Pron. possessivum</i>).			Attached to a noun plur. or dual.
	A.	B. Simple form.	A. With <i>Nûn energeticum.</i>	B. Attached to a sing. noun.		
Sing. 1. c.	I. אַנְכִי in pause אַנְכִי; אַנְכִי , in pause אַנְכִי	<i>me.</i> נִי; נִי;	נִי; נִי;	<i>my</i> (prop. gen. <i>mei</i>).	<i>my.</i>	
2. m.	<i>thou.</i> אַنְתָּה (אַתָּה), in pause אַנְתָּה	<i>thee.</i> תָּךְ; תָּךְ; in pause תָּךְ	תָּךְ; תָּךְ; (תָּךְ)	<i>thy</i> in <i>tui</i> .	<i>thy.</i>	
f.						
3. m.	<i>he.</i> הָוָה	<i>him.</i> הָוָה; הָוָה	(הָוָה; הָוָה)	<i>his</i> (<i>eius</i>)	<i>his.</i> הָוָה; הָוָה	

¹ Forms with an asterisk are exclusively poetic, those in parentheses () are rare, those in brackets [] do not occur (cf. § 58 a, note).

			הָ;	(נָנוּ); נָנוּ	וְ(הָ)	
f.	<i>she.</i>	הִיא	<i>her</i> (eam).	הָ; הַ; הֵ;	בָּהּ	and <i>suus</i>). <i>her.</i> הָ; הַ; הֵ;
Plur. 1. c.	<i>we.</i>	אֶתְנָנוּ (גְּתָנָנוּ), in pause אֶתְנָנוּ (גְּתָנָנוּ)	<i>us.</i>	נוּ; נָנוּ נוּ	? נָנוּ (see § 58 k)	<i>our.</i> הָ; נָנוּ (נָנוּ)
2. m.	<i>you.</i>	אַתָּם	<i>you.</i>	כָּם; כָּם	these forms are not found.	<i>your.</i> כָּם; כָּם
f.		אַתְּנָךְ, אַתְּנָה		[כָּנוּ]; [כָּנוּ]		<i>your.</i> כָּנוּ; כָּנוּ
3. m.	<i>they.</i>	הֵם, הֵמָּה	<i>them</i> (eos).	(הֵם); הֵם; * מָנוּ; * מָנוּ; * מָנוּ; * מָנוּ;	<i>their.</i> הֵם; הֵם;	<i>their.</i> יִהְיֶם; * יִמּוֹ*
f.		הֵמָּה	<i>them</i> (eas.).	[הֵנוּ], נָנוּ; [הֵנוּ], (נָנוּ); [הֵנוּ]		<i>your.</i> הֵנוּ; הֵנוּ;

B. Strong Verb.

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph[□]al.</i>	<i>Pi[□]el.</i>	<i>Pu[□]al.</i>	<i>Hiphi[□]el.</i>	<i>Hoph[□]al.</i>	<i>Hithpa[□]el.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. m.	*קָטַל	*כָּבֵד	*קָטָן	*נְקָטַל	*קָטַל	*הַקָּטַל
		3. f.	*קָטַלה	*כָּבְדָה	*קָטָנה	*נְקָטַלה	*קָטַלה	*הַקָּטַלה
		2. m.	*קָטַלְתָּ	*כָּבְדָתָ	*קָטָנָתָ	*נְקָטַלְתָּ	*קָטַלְתָּ	*הַקָּטַלְתָּ
		2. f.	קָטְלָתָ	כָּבְדָתָ	קָטָנָתָ	נְקָטָלָתָ	קָטְלָתָ	הַקָּטְלָתָ
		1. c.	קָטַלְתִּי	כָּבְדָתִי	קָטָנָתִי	נְקָטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתִּי	הַקָּטַלְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	קָטָלוּ	כָּבְדוּ	קָטָנוּ	נְקָטָלוּ	קָטָלוּ	הַקָּטָלוּ	הַקָּטָלוּ
	2. m.	*קָטְלָתָם	*כָּבְדָתָם	*קָטָנָתָם	נְקָטָלָתָם	קָטְלָתָם	הַקָּטְלָתָם	הַקָּטְלָתָם
	2. f.	קָטְלָתָנוּ	כָּבְדָתָנוּ	קָטָנָתָנוּ	נְקָטָלָתָנוּ	קָטְלָתָנוּ	הַקָּטְלָתָנוּ	הַקָּטְלָתָנוּ
	1. c.	קָטַלְנוּ	כָּבְדָנוּ	קָטָנוּ	נְקָטַלְנוּ	קָטַלְנוּ	הַקָּטַלְנוּ	הַקָּטַלְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	<i>absol.</i>		*שָׁכַב, קָטַל	*הַקָּטַל	wanting.	*הַקָּטַל	wanting.	*הַקָּטַל
			*קָטוֹל	*הַקָּטַל, נְקָטַל	*קָטַל	*קָטַל	*קָטַל	*הַקָּטַל

<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	2. <i>m.</i>	*קָטַל	*כָּבֵד	*הַקְטָל	*קָטַל	*הַקְטָל	*הַקְטָל	*הַקְטָל	*הַקְטָל
		2. <i>f.</i>	*קָטַלִי	*כָּבֵדי	*הַקְטָלִי	*קָטַלִי	wanting.	*הַקְטָלִי	wanting.	*הַקְטָלִי
		Plur.	2. <i>m.</i>	קָטָלוּ	כָּבְדוּ	הַקְטָלוּ	קָטָלוּ	הַקְטָלוּ	הַקְטָלוּ	הַקְטָלוּ
		2. <i>f.</i>	*קָטַלָּנָה	*כָּבֶדָּנָה	*הַקְטָלָנָה	*קָטַלָּנָה	*הַקְטָלָנָה	*הַקְטָלָנָה	*הַקְטָלָנָה	*הַקְטָלָנָה
<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	*יִקְטָל	*יִכְבֹּד	*יִקְטָל	*יִקְטָל	*יִקְטָל	*יִקְטָל	*יִקְטָל	*יִתְקְטָל
		3. <i>f.</i>	תִּקְטָל	תִּכְבֹּד	תִּקְטָל	תִּקְטָל	תִּקְטָל	תִּקְטָל	תִּקְטָל	תִּתְקְטָל
		2. <i>m.</i>	תִּקְטָל	תִּכְבֹּד	תִּקְטָל	תִּקְטָל	תִּקְטָל	תִּקְטָל	תִּקְטָל	תִּתְקְטָל
		2. <i>f.</i>	*תִּקְטָלִי	*תִּכְבֹּדִי	*תִּקְטָלִי	*תִּקְטָלִי	*תִּקְטָלִי	*תִּקְטָלִי	*תִּקְטָלִי	*תִּתְקְטָלִי
		1. <i>c.</i>	אֲקָטָל	אֲכָבֵד	אֲקָטָל	אֲקָטָל	אֲקָטָל	אֲקָטָל	אֲקָטָל	אֲתִקְטָל
		Plur.	3. <i>m.</i>	יִקְטָלוּ	כָּבְדוּ	יִקְטָלוּ	יִקְטָלוּ	יִקְטָלוּ	יִקְטָלוּ	יִתְקְטָלוּ
		3. <i>f.</i>	*תִּקְטָלָנָה	*תִּכְבֹּדָנָה	*תִּקְטָלָנָה	*תִּקְטָלָנָה	*תִּקְטָלָנָה	*תִּקְטָלָנָה	*תִּקְטָלָנָה	*תִּתְקְטָלָנָה
		2. <i>m.</i>	תִּקְטָלוּ	תִּכְבֹּדוּ	תִּקְטָלוּ	תִּקְטָלוּ	תִּקְטָלוּ	תִּקְטָלוּ	תִּקְטָלוּ	תִּתְקְטָלוּ
		2. <i>f.</i>	תִּקְטָלָנָה	תִּכְבֹּדָנָה	תִּקְטָלָנָה	תִּקְטָלָנָה	תִּקְטָלָנָה	תִּקְטָלָנָה	תִּקְטָלָנָה	תִּתְקְטָלָנָה
		1. <i>c.</i>	גַּקְטָלָל	גַּכְבֹּדָל	גַּקְטָלָל	גַּקְטָלָל	גַּקְטָלָל	גַּקְטָלָל	גַּקְטָלָל	גַּתְקְטָלָל
	<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive)</i>					*יִקְטָל				
<i>Part.</i>	<i>act.</i>		*קָטָל	*כָּבֵד	קָטָל	*מְקֻטָּל	*מְקֻטָּל	*מְקֻטָּל	*מְקֻטָּל	*מְתִקְטָל
	<i>pass.</i>		*קָטָול			*מְקֻטָּל	*מְקֻטָּל			*מְקֻטָּל

C. Strong Verb with Suffixes.

	<i>Suffixes</i>	1 <i>Sing.</i>	2 <i>Sing.</i>	2 <i>Sing.</i>	3 <i>Sing.</i>	3 <i>Sing.</i>	1 <i>Plur.</i>	2 <i>Plur.</i>	2 <i>Plur.</i>	3 <i>Plur.</i>	3 <i>Plur.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Qal</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	קָטַל <i>נוּ</i> שִׁכְחָנָה <i>נוּ</i>	קָטַל <i>לְךָ</i>	קָטַלְגָּנָה	קָטַל <i>הוּא</i> קָטַלְוָה	קָטַלְהָנָה	קָטַלְנוּ	wanting.	wanting.	קָטַלְנוּם לְבָשָׂם
		3. <i>f.</i>	קָטַל <i>תְּךָ</i>	קָטַל <i>תְּנָה</i>	קָטַל <i>תְּהוּ</i> קָטַלְתָּוּ	קָטַל <i>תְּנָה</i>	קָטַלְתָּנוּ	—	—	קָטַלְתָּמָם	wanting.
		2. <i>m.</i>	קָטַלְתָּמָה <i>נוּ</i>	—	—	קָטַלְתָּמָה <i>נוּ</i> קָטַלְתָּתָוּ	קָטַלְתָּמָה	—	—	קָטַלְתָּמָם	wanting.
		2. <i>f.</i>	קָטַלְתָּמָה <i>יָנִי</i>	—	—	קָטַלְתָּמָה <i>יָהּוּ</i> קָטַלְתָּתָיְהּ	קָטַלְתָּמָה <i>יָנִי</i>	—	—	קָטַלְתָּמִים	wanting.
		1. <i>c.</i>	—	קָטַלְתִּיְנָה	קָטַלְתִּיְךָ	קָטַלְתִּיְהָ	קָטַלְתִּיְךָ	—	קָטַלְתִּיכָם	קָטַלְתִּינָה	wanting.
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>c.</i>	קָטַל <i>וּנִי</i>	קָטַל <i>וְךָ</i> אַהֲבָה <i>וְךָ</i>	קָטַל <i>וְהוּ</i>	קָטַל <i>וְהָנוּ</i>	קָטַל <i>וְהָנוּ</i>	wanting.	wanting.	קָטַלְוּם	קָטַלְוָה
		2. <i>m.</i>	קָטַלְתָּה <i>וּנִי</i>	—	—	קָטַלְתָּה <i>וְהָנוּ</i>	קָטַלְתָּה <i>וְהָנוּ</i>	—	—	wanting.	wanting.
		1. <i>c.</i>	—	קָטַלְתָּה <i>וְהָנוּ</i>	קָטַלְתָּה <i>וְהָנוּ</i>	קָטַלְתָּה <i>וְהָנוּ</i>	—	wanting.	wanting.	קָטַלְנוּם	wanting.
<i>Inf.</i>	<i>Qal.</i>				קָטַלְנָה	קָטַלְוָה	קָטַלְנוּ	כַּתְבָּכָם	wanting.	קָטַלְנוּם	קָטַלְנוּ
<i>Imf.</i>	<i>Qal.</i>	2.	—	קָטַל <i>נוּ</i> (שָׁמַע וּנִי, שָׁלַחֲנִי, a Imperf. in a	—	קָטַל <i>הוּא</i> קָטַלְהָה	קָטַל <i>הוּא</i> קָטַלְהָה	—	—	—	—

<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Qal</i>	>3. m.		יִקְטַּלְהוּ	יִקְטַּלְתָּךְ	יִקְטַּלְתָּנוּ	יִקְטַּלְתָּם	wanting.	יִקְטַּלְכֶם	wanting.	יִקְטַּלְים	wanting.
				יִקְטַּלְתָּה								
		3. m.		—	יִקְטַּלְנָה	יִקְטַּלְנָנוּ	—	—	—	—	—	—
with <i>Nûn energ.</i>												
<i>Plur.</i>		3. m.		יִקְטַּלְוּ	יִקְטַּלְוָךְ	יִקְטַּלְוָנוּ	יִקְטַּלְוָתָם	wanting.	יִקְטַּלְוָכֶם	wanting.	יִקְטַּלְוָם	wanting.
				יִגְאַלְוּ הֵо								
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Pi\squareel</i>	3. m.		קִטְלָה	קִטְלָב	קִטְלָה	קִטְלָה	wanting.	קִטְלָה	wanting.	קִטְלָה	wanting.

D. Verbs primae gutturalis

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph\squareal.</i>	<i>Hiph\squareil.</i>	<i>Hoph\squareal.</i>	
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i> 3. <i>f.</i> 2. <i>m.</i> 2. <i>f.</i> 1. <i>c.</i>	עָמֵד עָמַדָה עָמַדְתָה עָמַדְתִּי עָמַדְתִּי עָמַדְתִּי	*גַּעֲמֵד *גַּעֲמַדָה גַּעֲמַדְתָה גַּעֲמַדְתִּי גַּעֲמַדְתִּי	*קַעֲמֵיד קַעֲמַדָה קַעֲמַדְתָה קַעֲמַדְתִּי קַעֲמַדְתִּי	*קַעֲמֵיד קַעֲמַדָה קַעֲמַדְתָה קַעֲמַדְתִּי קַעֲמַדְתִּי
		<i>Plur.</i> <i>c.</i>	עָמְדוּ *עָמְדוּם עָמְדוֹת *עָמְדוֹתָנוּ עָמְדוֹנוּ *עָמְדוֹתָנוּ	גַּעֲמְדוּ גַּעֲמְדוּם גַּעֲמְדוֹת גַּעֲמְדוֹתָנוּ גַּעֲמְדוֹנוּ גַּעֲמְדוֹתָנוּ	קַעֲמְדוּ קַעֲמְדוּם קַעֲמְדוֹת קַעֲמְדוֹתָנוּ קַעֲמְדוֹנוּ קַעֲמְדוֹתָנוּ	קַעֲמְדוּ קַעֲמְדוּם קַעֲמְדוֹת קַעֲמְדוֹתָנוּ קַעֲמְדוֹנוּ קַעֲמְדוֹתָנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>			עָמֵד	*קַעֲמֵיד	*קַעֲמֵיד	
<i>Inf.</i>	<i>absol.</i>		עָמוֹד	רַחֲמֵיד	*קַעֲמֵיד	
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>m.</i> f.	עָמֵד עָמַדִי	קַעֲזָק חַזְקִי	קַעֲמֵד קַעֲמִיד	
		<i>Plur.</i> <i>f.</i>	עָמְדוּ *עָמְדוֹתָנוּ	חַזְקָוָי קַעֲזָקָה	קַעֲמְדוּ קַעֲמְדוֹתָנה	
<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i> 3. <i>f.</i> 2. <i>m.</i> 2. <i>f.</i> 1. <i>c.</i>	עָמֵד תַּעֲמֵד תַּעֲמַדָה תַּעֲמַדְתָה תַּעֲמַדְתִּי אַעֲמֵד	גַּעֲזָק תַּعֲזָק תַּעֲזַקָה תַּעֲזַקְתָה תַּעֲזַקְתִּי אַעֲזָק	*קַעֲמֵיד תַּקְעֵמֵיד תַּקְעֵמִיד תַּקְעֵמִיד תַּקְעֵמִיד אַעֲמֵיד	*קַעֲמֵיד תַּקְעֵמֵיד תַּקְעֵמִיד תַּקְעֵמִיד תַּקְעֵמִיד אַעֲמֵיד

<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	גַּעֲמָדִי	*גַּחְזֹקָה	גַּעֲמָדִי	יְשַׁמֵּדִי	גַּעֲמָדִי	יְשַׁמֵּדִי
	3. <i>f.</i>	תַּעֲמָדֶת	תַּעֲמָדֶת קְנָה	תַּעֲמָדֶת	תַּעֲמָדֶת דְּנָה	תַּעֲמָדֶת	תַּעֲמָדֶת דְּנָה
	2. <i>m.</i>	תַּעֲמָדִי	תַּעֲמָדִי	תַּעֲמָדִי	תַּעֲמָדִי	תַּעֲמָדִי	תַּעֲמָדִי
	2. <i>f.</i>	תַּעֲמָדֶת	תַּעֲמָדֶת קְנָה	תַּעֲמָדֶת	תַּעֲמָדֶת דְּנָה	תַּעֲמָדֶת	תַּעֲמָדֶת דְּנָה
	1. <i>c.</i>	גַּעֲמָדֵךְ	גַּעֲמָדֵךְ	גַּעֲמָדֵךְ	גַּעֲמָדֵךְ	גַּעֲמָדֵךְ	גַּעֲמָדֵךְ
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive.)</i>							
<i>Part.</i>	<i>act.</i>		עֲמָדֵךְ	*גַּעֲמָדֵךְ	*מְעַמֵּידֵךְ		גַּעֲמָדֵךְ
	<i>pass.</i>		עֲמָדֵךְ	עֲמָדֵךְ	עֲמָדֵךְ		עֲמָדֵךְ

E. Verbs mediae gutturalis.

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph[□]al.</i>	<i>Pi[□]el.</i>	<i>Pu[□]al.</i>	<i>Hithpa[□]el.</i>	
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	גַּשְׁחַט	גַּשְׁחַט	*בְּרַךְ	*בְּרַךְ	*הַתְּבִרֵךְ
	3. <i>f.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטָּה	*גַּשְׁחַטָּה	בְּרַכָּה	[בְּרַכָּה]	הַתְּבִרְכָּה	
	2. <i>m.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטָּה	גַּשְׁחַטָּה	בְּרַכְתָּה	בְּרַכְתָּה	הַתְּבִרְכָּתָה	
	2. <i>f.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטָּה	גַּשְׁחַטָּה	בְּרַכְתָּה	בְּרַכְתָּה	הַתְּבִרְכָּתָה	
	1. <i>c.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטָּה	גַּשְׁחַטָּה	בְּרַכְתָּה	בְּרַכְתָּה	הַתְּבִרְכָּתָה	
<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>c.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטוּ	*גַּשְׁחַטוּ	בְּרַכוּ	בְּרַכוּ	הַתְּבִרְכּוּ	
	2. <i>m.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטָּם	גַּשְׁחַטָּם	בְּרַכְתָּם	בְּרַכְתָּם	הַתְּבִרְכָּתָם	
	2. <i>f.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטָּנוּ	גַּשְׁחַטָּנוּ	[בְּרַכְתּוּ]	בְּרַכְתּוּ	הַתְּבִרְכָּתּוּ	
	1. <i>c.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטָּנוּ	גַּשְׁחַטָּנוּ	בְּרַכְתָּנוּ	בְּרַכְתָּנוּ	הַתְּבִרְכָּתָנוּ	
<i>Inf.</i>		גַּשְׁחַט	גַּשְׁחַט	בְּרַךְ	wanting.	*הַתְּבִרֵךְ	
<i>Inf.</i>	<i>absol.</i>	גַּשְׁחַוט	גַּשְׁחַוט	בְּרַךְ			
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	גַּשְׁחַט	גַּשְׁחַט	בְּרַךְ		*הַתְּבִרֵךְ	
	<i>f.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטִּי	*גַּשְׁחַטִּי	בְּרַכִּי		[הַתְּבִרְכִּי]	
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>	גַּשְׁחַט	גַּשְׁחַט	בְּרַכָּה		הַתְּבִרְכָּה	
	<i>f.</i>	גַּשְׁחַטָּה	גַּשְׁחַטָּה	בְּרַכָּה		הַתְּבִרְכָּתָה	
<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	*יְשַׁחַט	יְשַׁחַט	*יְבַרְךָ	*יְבַרְךָ	*יְתִבְרֵךְ
	<i>f.</i>	תְּשַׁחַט	תְּשַׁחַט	תְּבַרְךָ	תְּבַרְךָ	תְּתִבְרֵךְ	
	2. <i>m.</i>	תְּשַׁחַט	תְּשַׁחַט	תְּבַרְךָ	תְּבַרְךָ	תְּתִבְרֵךְ	

							[תְּחִבָּרֶכָּי]
2. <i>f.</i>	*תְּשַׁחַטִּי	*תְּשַׁחַטִּי	תְּבִכֵּי				
1. <i>c.</i>	אֲשַׁחַט	אֲשַׁחַט	אֲבֹרֶךָ	אֲבֹרֶךָ			אֲתַבְּרֶךָ
<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	יְשַׁחַטְוּ	יְשַׁחַטְוּ	יְבִכְוּ	יְבִכְוּ		יְתַבְּרֶכָו
	3. <i>f.</i>	תְּשַׁחַטָּה	תְּשַׁחַטָּה	תְּבִכָּה	תְּבִכָּה		תְּתַבְּרֶכָה
	2. <i>m.</i>	תְּשַׁחַטְוּ	תְּשַׁחַטְוּ	תְּבִכְוּ	תְּבִכְוּ		תְּתַבְּרֶכָו
	2. <i>f.</i>	תְּשַׁחַטָּה	תְּשַׁחַטָּה	תְּבִכָּה	תְּבִכָּה		תְּתַבְּרֶכָה
	1. <i>c.</i>	נְשַׁחַט	נְשַׁחַט	נְבֹרֶךָ	נְבֹרֶךָ		נְתַבְּרֶךָ
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>		יְשַׁחַטְהוּ					
<i>Part.</i>	<i>act.</i>	שַׁחַט	נְשַׁחַט	*מְבֹרֶךָ			*מְתַבְּרֶךָ
	<i>pass.</i>	שַׁחוּט			*מְבֹרֶךָ		

F. Verbs tertiae gutturalis.

		Qal.	Niph [□] al.	Pi [□] el.	Pu [□] al.	Hiph [□] el.	Hoph [□] al.	Hithpa [□] el.
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	שַׁלַּח	גַּשְׁלַח	*שַׁלַּח	שַׁלַּח	*הַשְׁלִילָה	*הַשְׁלִילָה
		3. <i>f.</i>	שַׁלְקָה	גַּשְׁלָקָה	שַׁלְקָה	שַׁלְקָה	הַשְׁלִילָה	הַשְׁלִילָה
		2. <i>m.</i>	שַׁלְקָת	גַּשְׁלָקָת	שַׁלְקָת	שַׁלְקָת	הַשְׁלִילָה	הַשְׁלִילָה
		1. <i>f.</i>	*שַׁלְקָת	*גַּשְׁלָקָת	*שַׁלְקָת	*שַׁלְקָת	*הַשְׁלִילָה	*הַשְׁלִילָה
		1. <i>c.</i>	שַׁלְקָתי	גַּשְׁלָקָתי	שַׁלְקָתי	שַׁלְקָתי	הַשְׁלִילָה	הַשְׁלִילָה
<i>Plur.</i>		3. <i>c.</i>	שַׁלְחוּ	גַּשְׁלָחוּ	שַׁלְחוּ	שַׁלְחוּ	הַשְׁלִילָה	הַשְׁלִילָה
		2. <i>m.</i>	שַׁלְחוֹתִים	גַּשְׁלָחוֹתִים	שַׁלְחוֹתִים	שַׁלְחוֹתִים	הַשְׁלִילָה	הַשְׁלִילָה
		2. <i>f.</i>	שַׁלְחוֹתּוֹן	גַּשְׁלָחוֹתּוֹן	שַׁלְחוֹתּוֹן	שַׁלְחוֹתּוֹן	הַשְׁלִילָה	הַשְׁלִילָה
		1. <i>c.</i>	שַׁלְחוֹנוּ	גַּשְׁלָחוֹנוּ	שַׁלְחוֹנוּ	שַׁלְחוֹנוּ	הַשְׁלִילָה	הַשְׁלִילָה
<i>Inf.</i>			*שַׁלְהָ	*הַשְׁלָה	*שַׁלָּה		*הַשְׁלִילָה	*הַשְׁלִילָה
<i>Inf. absol.</i>			שַׁלְוֹחַ	גַּשְׁלֹוֹחַ	שַׁלְוֹחַ		*הַשְׁלִילָה	*הַשְׁלִילָה
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>m.</i>	*שַׁלַּח	*הַשְׁלָה	*שַׁלָּה	הַשְׁלָה		*הַשְׁלִילָה
		<i>f.</i>	שַׁלְחֵי	הַשְׁלָחֵי	*שַׁלְחֵי	wanting.	הַשְׁלָחֵי	הַשְׁתָּלֵתי
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>		שַׁלְחוּ	הַשְׁלָחוּ	שַׁלְחוּ	הַשְׁלָחוּ		הַשְׁלִילָה
		<i>f.</i>	שַׁלְחוֹנָה	הַשְׁלָחוֹנָה	*שַׁלְחוֹנָה	הַשְׁלָחוֹנָה		*הַשְׁלִילָה
<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3.	*יְשַׁלַּח	*יְשַׁלַּח	*יְשַׁלַּח	*יְשַׁלְּמָה	יְשַׁלְּמָה	

	מִשְׁתָּלוּחַ							
<i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	*תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ
<i>f.</i>								
<i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ
<i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ
<i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ
<i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ
<i>c.</i>	אֲשֶׁלֶח	אֲשֶׁלֶח	אֲשֶׁלֶח	אֲשֶׁלֶח	אֲשֶׁלֶח	אֲשֶׁלֶח	אֲשֶׁלֶח	אֲשֶׁלֶח
<i>Plur.</i>	יִשְׁלָחוּ	יִשְׁלָחוּ	יִשְׁלָחוּ	יִשְׁלָחוּ	יִשְׁלָחוּ	יִשְׁלָחוּ	יִשְׁלָחוּ	יִשְׁלָחוּ
<i>m.</i>								
<i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלֹלְחָנָה	תִּשְׁלֹלְחָנָה	*תִּשְׁלֹלְחָנָה	*תִּשְׁלֹלְחָנָה	תִּשְׁלֹלְחָנָה	תִּשְׁלֹלְחָנָה	תִּשְׁלֹלְחָנָה	תִּשְׁלֹלְחָנָה
<i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ
<i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ	תִּשְׁלֹחַ
<i>c.</i>	נִשְׁלָחָה	נִשְׁלָחָה	נִשְׁלָחָה	נִשְׁלָחָה	נִשְׁלָחָה	נִשְׁלָחָה	נִשְׁלָחָה	נִשְׁלָחָה
	<i>נִשְׁלָחָה</i>							
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>								
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִשְׁלֹחֵנִי							
<i>Part.</i>	<i>act.</i>							
	<i>pass.</i>	מִשְׁלָחָם	*שְׁלָמָה	גִּשְׁלָחָם	*מִשְׁלָחָם	מִשְׁלָחָם	*מִשְׁלָחָם	מִשְׁלָחָם

G. Verbs mediae geminatae or double y.

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph[□]al.</i>	<i>Hi[□]ph[□]al.</i>	<i>Hoph[□]al.</i>	<i>Po[□]el.</i>	<i>Po[□]al.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	* סָבֵב, תַּם	* נִסְבֵּב, גַּמֵּס	* הַסְבֵּב, הַסְבֵּב	* הַוְסֵב	* סָבֵב
		3. <i>f.</i>	תַּמְאָה	* נִסְבֶּה	* הַסְבֶּה	הַוְסֶבֶה	סָבְכָה
			* סָבָה				[סָבְבָה]
		2. <i>m.</i>	* סָבָות	* נִסְבֶּות	* הַסְבֶּות	* הַוְסֵבָת	סָבָבָת
		2. <i>f.</i>	סָבָות	נִסְבּוֹת	הַסְבּוֹת	הַוְסּוֹבּוֹת	סָבְבָתָה
		1. <i>c.</i>	סָבָות	נִסְבֶּות	הַסְבֶּות	הַוְסֵבָת	סָבְבָתִי
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>c.</i>	סָבָבוֹת, תַּמָּוֹת	הַסְבּוֹבָוֹת, הַהַסְבּוֹבָוֹת	הַוְסֵבָבָוֹת	סָבְבָבָוֹי	סָבְבָבָוֹי
		2. <i>m.</i>	סָבָות	נִסְבּוֹת	[הַוְסּוֹבּוֹת]	סָבְבָבָתָם	סָבְבָבָתָם
		2. <i>f.</i>	סָבָות	נִסְבּוֹת	הַוְסּוֹבּוֹת	סָבְבָבָתָן	סָבְבָבָתָן
		1. <i>c.</i>	סָבָות	נִסְבֶּות	הַוְסֵבָתָן	סָבְבָבָנוֹי	סָבְבָבָנוֹי
<i>Inf.</i>			* סָבָב	* הַסְבֵּב	* הַסְבֵּב	סָבָב	סָבָב
<i>Inf. absol.</i>			סָבָבָב	הַמִּסְבֵּב, הַטּוֹבָב	הַסְבֵּב	הַשְׁמַחַתָּה	סָבָבָב
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>m.</i>	* סָבָב	הַסְבֵּב	* הַסְבֵּב	סָבָב	סָבָב
		<i>f.</i>	* סָבִי	הַסְבִּי	הַסְבִּי	wanting.	קָוְרָנִי
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>		סָבָבוֹת	הַסְבּוֹבָוֹת	הַסְבּוֹבָוֹת	סָבְבָבוֹ	wanting.
		<i>f.</i>	[סָבְבָבָה]	[הַסְבָּבָה]	[הַסְבָּבָה]	[סָבְבָבָה]	

<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>3. m.</i>	* יָסַב	(§ יְקָל 67 p)	* יָסַב	* יָסַב, יָסַב	* יָסַב, יָסַב	* יָסַב, יָסַב	[יָסַב]	
		3. f.	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	
		2. m.	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	
		2. f.	* תָּסַבִּי	תָּסַבִּי	* תָּסַבִּי	[תָּסַבִּי]	* תָּסַבִּי	[תָּסַבִּי]	[תָּסַבִּי]	
		1. c.	אָסַב	אָסַב	אָסַב	אָסַב	אָסַב	אָסַב	אָסַב	
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>3. m.</i>	יָסַבו	יָסַבו	יָסַבו	יָסַבו	יָסַבו	יָסַבו	יָסַבו	יָסַבו	
		3. f.	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	
		2. m.	תָּסַבּו	תָּסַבּו	תָּסַבּו	תָּסַבּו	תָּסַבּו	תָּסַבּו	תָּסַבּו	
		2. f.	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	[תָּסַבְּנָה]	
		1. c.	נוֹסַב	נוֹסַב	נוֹסַב	נוֹסַב	נוֹסַב	נוֹסַב	נוֹסַב	
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>		* נִסְבָּב	(נוֹסַב)			נוֹסַב				
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>		* יָסַבְּנִי				* יָסַבְּנִי	(יָסַבְּכָס)			
<i>Part.</i>	<i>act</i>		סְבֻבָּה			נוֹסַב		* מָסַבָּב		
	<i>pass.</i>		* סְבֻבָּה			(נוֹסַבָּה)		מוֹסַבָּה	מָסַבָּב	

H. Verbs ۷

			<i>Qal.</i>		<i>Niph[□]al.</i>		<i>Hiph[□]il.</i>		<i>Hoph[□]al.</i>	
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. m.	[נִגְשָׁה]	נִפְלָה	* נִגְשָׁה	* נִגְשָׁה	* הָגִישָׁה	*	* הָגִישָׁה	
		3. f.			נִגְשָׁה		הָגִישָׁה		הָגִישָׁה	
		2. m.			נִגְשָׁה		הָגִישָׁה		הָגִישָׁה	
		2. f.			נִגְשָׁה		הָגִישָׁה		הָגִישָׁה	
		1. c.	regular.		נִגְשָׁה		הָגִישָׁה		הָגִישָׁה	
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>3. c.</i>				נִגְשָׁו	נִגְשָׁו	הָגִישָׁו		הָגִישָׁו	
						נִגְשָׁם	הָגִישָׁם		הָגִישָׁם	
						נִגְשָׁם	הָגִישָׁם		הָגִישָׁם	
						נִגְשָׁם	הָגִישָׁם		הָגִישָׁם	
						נִגְשָׁנוּ	הָגִישָׁנוּ		הָגִישָׁנוּ	
<i>Inf.</i>			* נִפְלָה	* נִפְלָה	הָנִגְשָׁה	* הָגִישָׁה	* הָגִישָׁה	*	* הָגִישָׁה	
<i>Inf. absol.</i>			* נִגְשָׁה	* נִגְשָׁה	נִגְשָׁה, הָנִגְשָׁה	* הָגִישָׁה	* הָגִישָׁה	*	* הָגִישָׁה	
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	m.	* נִפְלָה	* נִפְלָה	הָנִגְשָׁה	* הָגִישָׁה	* הָגִישָׁה	*	* הָגִישָׁה	
		f.	* גִּשְׁי	* גִּשְׁי	הָנִגְשָׁה	הָגִישָׁה	הָגִישָׁה		wanting.	
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>		* נִפְלָו	* נִפְלָו	הָנִגְשָׁו	הָגִישָׁו	הָגִישָׁו			

	<i>f.</i>	גַּשְׁנָה	גַּשְׁנָה	נֶפֶל	*יִפְלֵל	הַגְשָׁנָה	הַגְשָׁנָה	הַגְשָׁנָה	הַגְשָׁנָה
<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3.		יִגְשֵׁשׁ	*יִפְלֵל	[יִגְשֵׁשׁ]	*יִגְשֵׁשׁ	*יִגְשֵׁשׁ	*יִגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>m.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		3.		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>f.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		2.		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>m.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		2.		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>f.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		1.		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>c.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
	<i>Plur.</i>	3.		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	יִפְלֹלוּ	regular.	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>m.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		3.		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֵל		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>f.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֹלוּ		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		2.		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֹלוּ		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>m.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֹלוּ		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		2.		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֹלוּ		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>f.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֹלוּ		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		1.		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֹלוּ		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>c.</i>		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּפְלֹלוּ		תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁ
		<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>						*יִגְשֵׁשׁ	
<i>Part.</i>	<i>act.</i>			נִגְשׁ			*מְגִישׁ		
	<i>pass.</i>			נִגְשׁוּ			*מְגִישׁוּ		

I. Weak Verbs, פ"א.

			<i>Qal.</i>		<i>Niph[□]al.</i>		<i>Hiph[□]el.</i>		<i>Hoph[□]al.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>				*קָאכֵל	*קָאכֵיל	*קָאכֵל	*קָאכֵל	*קָאכֵל	*קָאכֵל
Like Verbs <i>prima gutturalis.</i>									
<i>Inf.</i>			*אָכֵל		הָאָכֵל	הָאָכֵל	הָאָכֵל	הָאָכֵל	הָאָכֵל
<i>Inf. absol.</i>			אָכֵל		הָאָכֵל	הָאָכֵל	wanting.	wanting.	wanting.
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>m.</i>	*אָכֵל		הָאָכֵל	הָאָכֵל			
		<i>f.</i>	אָכֵלי			&c.		&c.	wanting.
	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>	אָכְלוּ						
		<i>f.</i>	[אָכֵל לְנָהּ]						
<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	*יִאָכֵל	(in pause)	*יִאָכֵל	*יִאָכֵל	*יִאָכֵל	*יִאָכֵל	*יִאָכֵל
		3. <i>f.</i>	תִּאָכֵל	(יִאָכֵל)		&c		&c	&c
		2. <i>m.</i>	תִּאָכֵל						
		2. <i>f.</i>	תִּאָכְלִי						
		1. <i>c.</i>	*אָכֵל						
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	יִאָכְלוּ						
		3. <i>f.</i>	תִּאָכֵל לְנָהּ						
		2. <i>m.</i>	תִּאָכְלוּ						

		2. f.	[תַּאֲכֵל לְנָה]
		1. c.	בְּאַכֵּל
Impf. with consec.	Wāw	* וַיַּאֲמֵר	
		* וַיַּאֲכֵל	
Part. act. pass.		אַכֵּל אָכֹל	מִאֲכֵל מִאָכֹל

K. Weak Verbs, פ"י (for פ"ז).

L. Verbs properly
פ"י.

Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'il.	Hoph'al.	Qal.	Hiph'il.	
Perf. Sing. 3. m.		יָשַׁב	* הָוּשֶׁב	* הָוּשֶׁב	* הָוּשֶׁב	* הָיִיטִיב
3. f.			* נָוָשֶׁבָה	הָוּשֶׁבָה	הָוּשֶׁבָה	הָיִיטִיבָה
2. m.			הָוּשֶׁבָת	הָוּשֶׁבָת	הָוּשֶׁבָת	הָיִיטִיבָת
2. f.			הָוּשֶׁבָתָה	הָוּשֶׁבָתָה	הָוּשֶׁבָתָה	הָיִיטִיבָתָה
1. c.	regular.		הָוּשֶׁבָתִי	הָוּשֶׁבָתִי	הָוּשֶׁבָתִי	הָיִיטִיבָתִי
Plur.	3. c.		נוֹשְׁבוּ	נוֹשְׁבוּ	נוֹשְׁבוּ	הָיִיטִיבָו
	2. m.		הָוּשֶׁבָתָם	הָוּשֶׁבָתָם	הָוּשֶׁבָתָם	הָיִטְבָּתָם
	2. f.		הָוּשֶׁבָתָן	הָוּשֶׁבָתָן	הָוּשֶׁבָתָן	הָיִטְבָּתָן
	1. c.		נוֹשְׁבָנוּ	נוֹשְׁבָנוּ	נוֹשְׁבָנוּ	הָיִיטִיבָנוּ
Inf.		יָסַד, בָּשַׂת, שָׁבַת	* הָוּשֶׁב	* הָוּשֶׁב	* הָוּשֶׁב	* הָיִיטִיב
Inf. absol.		יָשֻׁב	wanting.	* הָוּשֶׁב	וַיְטַב	* הָיִיטִיב
Imp. Sing. m.		* שָׁב, עָשָׁע	* הָנִישֶׁב	* הָנִישֶׁב		* הָיִיטִיב
	f.	שָׁבִי	הָנִישֶׁבִי	הָנִישֶׁבִי	wanting.	הָיִיטִיבִי
Plur.	m.	שָׁבּוּ	הָנִישֶׁבּוּ	הָנִישֶׁבּוּ		הָיִיטִיבּוּ
	f.	שָׁבָה	[הָוּשֶׁבָנָה]	[הָוּשֶׁבָנָה]		[הָיִיטִיבָנָה]
Impf. Sing. 3. m.		* יָשַׁב	* יָרַשׁ	* יָשַׁב	* יָשַׁב	* יָיִיטִיב
	3. f.	מָשַׁב	תִּירְשׁ	מָשַׁב	מָשַׁב	תִּיטִיב
2. m.		מָשַׁב	תִּירְשׁ	מָשַׁב	מָשַׁב	תִּיטִיב
2. f.		תִּירְשׁ	תִּירְשׁ	תִּשְׁבַּי	תִּשְׁבַּי	תִּיטִיבִי
1. c.		אָשַׁב	אִירְשׁ	* אָשַׁב	אָשַׁב	אִיטִיב
Plur.	3. m.	יָשַׁבוּ	יִירְשׁוּ	יָשַׁבוּ	יָשַׁבוּ	יִיטִיבּוּ
	3. f.	מָשְׁבָנָה	[תִּירְשׁוֹנָה]	[תִּוּשֶׁבָנָה]	[תִּוּשֶׁבָנָה]	[תִּיטִיבָנָה]
	2. m.	תִּירְשׁוּ		תִּוּשֶׁבּוּ	תִּוּשֶׁבּוּ	תִּיטִיבּוּ
	2. f.	[תִּירְשׁוֹנָה]	[תִּירְשׁוֹנָה]	[תִּוּשֶׁבָנָה]	[תִּוּשֶׁבָנָה]	[תִּיטִיבָנָה]
	1. c.	גָּשַׁב	גִּירְשׁ	גָּשַׁב	גָּשַׁב	גִּיטִיבּ]
Shortened Impf. (Jussive).				* יָשַׁב	וַיְטַב	
Impf. with consec.	*	וַיָּשַׁב		וַיָּשַׁב	וַיְטַב	וַיְיִיטִיב
Part. act. pass.	שָׁב		* מָוּשֶׁב	* מָוּשֶׁב	וַיְטַב	מִיְּטִיב
	יָשִׁיב				וַיְזַבֵּב	וַיְזַבֵּב

M. Weak Verbs, ע"ז.

N. Weak Verbs,

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niphāl.</i>	<i>Hiphîl.</i>	<i>Hophâl.</i>	<i>Pôlēl.</i>	<i>Pôlal.</i>	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niphâl.</i>
Perf.	Sing.	3. <i>m.</i>	*קָם *מָתָה	*נִקּוּם *נִקְמָה	*הַקִּים [הַקִּמָה]	*הַוֹּקֶם [הַוֹּקְמָה]	*קוּם [קוּמָה]	*קוּם [קוּמָה]	*בָּנוּ [גָּבֵר וָנֶה]
		3. <i>f.</i>	*מָתָה *מָתָה	*נִקְמָה [נִקּוּם וְתָ]	*הַקִּמָה [הַקִּים וְתָ]	[הַוֹּקֶם] [הַוֹּקֶם מְתָ]	[קוּם] [קוּמָתָ]	[קוּם] [קוּמָתָ]	*בָּנָה [גָּבְנוֹתָה]
		2. <i>m.</i>	*מָתָה [מָתָה]	*נִקְמָה [נִקּוּם וְתָ]	*הַקִּים וְתָ	הַוֹּקֶם [הַוֹּקֶם מְתָ]	קוּם [קוּמָתָ]	קוּם [קוּמָתָ]	*בָּנָה [גָּבְנוֹתָה]
		2. <i>f.</i>	[מָתָה]	[נִקּוּם וְתָ]	[הַקִּים וְתָ]	הַוֹּקֶם [הַוֹּקֶם מְתָ]	[קוּמָתָ] [קוּמָתָ]	[קוּמָתָ] [קוּמָתָ]	[בָּנָה] [גָּבְנוֹתָה]
		1. <i>c.</i>	מָתָה [מָתָה]	נִקּוּם וְתָ	הַקִּים וְתָ	הַוֹּקֶם [הַוֹּקֶם מְתָ]	קוּם [קוּמָתָ]	קוּם [קוּמָתָ]	[בָּנָה] [גָּבְנוֹתָה]
	Plur.	3. <i>c.</i>	מָתוֹ [מָתוֹ]	נִקְמוֹ [נִקּוּמוֹ]	הַקִּמוֹ [הַקִּים וְמוֹ]	הַוֹּקֶמוֹ [הַוֹּקֶם מְמוֹ]	קוּמוֹ [קוּמָמוֹ]	קוּמוֹ [קוּמָמוֹ]	בָּנוֹ [בָּנוֹ]
		2. <i>m.</i>	[מָתוֹ] [מָתוֹ]	[נִקְמוֹ] [נִקּוּמוֹ]	[הַקִּמוֹ] [הַקִּים וְמוֹ]	[הַוֹּקֶמוֹ] [הַוֹּקֶם מְמוֹ]	[קוּמוֹ] [קוּמָמוֹ]	[בוֹתָם] [בָּנוֹתָם]	See Verbs ע"ג.
		2. <i>f.</i>	[מָתוֹ] [מָתוֹ]	[נִקְמוֹ] [נִקּוּמוֹ]	[הַקִּמוֹ] [הַקִּים וְמוֹ]	[הַוֹּקֶמוֹ] [הַוֹּקֶם מְמוֹ]	[קוּמוֹ] [קוּמָמוֹ]	[בָּנוֹתָם] [בָּנוֹתָם]	
		1. <i>c.</i>	מָתְנוֹ [מָתְנוֹ]	נִקּוּמוֹ [נִקּוּמוֹ]	הַקִּמוֹ [הַקִּים וְנוֹ]	הַוֹּקֶמוֹ [הַוֹּקֶם מְנוֹ]	קוּמוֹ [קוּמָנוֹ]	קוּמוֹ [קוּמָנוֹ]	בָּנוֹ [בָּנוֹ]
<i>Inf.</i>			*קוּם *קוּם	*הַקוּם *הַקוּם *הַקוּם	*הַקִּים *הַקִּים *הַקִּים	*הַוֹּקֶם *הַוֹּקֶם	קוּם [קוּמָ]	*בֵּין *בֵּין	
<i>Inf.</i>	<i>absol.</i>								
<i>Imp.</i>	Sing.	3. <i>m.</i>	*קוּם	*הַקוּם	*הַקִּם	*הַוֹּקֶם	קוּם [קוּמָ]	*בֵּין	
		3. <i>f.</i>	*קָוְמִי	[הַקָּוְמִי]	*הַקִּימִי	[הַוֹּקְמִי]	[קוּמָמִי] wanting.	בֵּין [בֵּין]	
	Plur.	3. <i>m.</i>	קוּמוֹ	הַקוּמוֹ	הַקִּימוֹ	הַוֹּקוּמוֹ	קוּמוֹ [קוּמָמוֹ]	בֵּין [בֵּין]	
		3. <i>f.</i>	*קָמָנָה	[הַקָּמָנָה]	[הַקִּמָנָה]	[הַוֹּקָמָנָה]	[קוּמָנָה] [קוּמָנָה]	—	
<i>Impf.</i>	Sing.	3. <i>m.</i>	*יָקוּם [יָקוּם יָבוֹא]	*יָקוּם	*יָקִים	*יָוֹקֵם	יָקוּם [יָקוּם]	יָגֵיל	
		3. <i>f.</i>	תָּקוּם	תָּקוּם	תָּקִים	תָּוֹקֵם	תָּקוּם [תָּקוּם]	תָּגֵיגִיל	
		2. <i>m.</i>	תָּקוּם	תָּקוּם	תָּקִים	תָּוֹקֵם	תָּקוּם [תָּקוּם]	תָּגֵיגִיל	
		2. <i>f.</i>	*תָּקָוְמִי	[תָּקָוְמִי]	*תָּקִים יְמִי	*תָּוֹקְמִי	[תָּקוּמָמִי] [תָּקוּמָמִי]	תָּגֵילִי	
		1. <i>c.</i>	אֲקוּם	אֲקוּם	אֲקִים	אֲוֹקֵם	אֲקוּם [אֲקוּם]	אֲגִיל	
	Plur.	3. <i>m.</i>	יָקוּמוֹ	יָקוּמוֹ	יָקִים	יָוֹקֵמוֹ	יָקוּמוֹ [יָקוּמוֹ]	יָגִילוֹ	
		3. <i>f.</i>	תָּבָנָה [תָּבָנָה] תָּקוּמָנָה		*תָּקִים יְנָה	*תָּוֹקֵם יְנָה	תָּקוּמָנָה [תָּקוּמָנָה]	תָּגִילָה [תָּגִילָה]	
		2. <i>m.</i>	תָּקוּמוֹ	תָּקוּמוֹ	תָּקִים יְמִי	תָּוֹקֵמוֹ	תָּקוּמוֹ [תָּקוּמוֹ]	תָּגִילָה [תָּגִילָה]	
		2. <i>f.</i>	תָּקוּמָנָה	[תָּקוּמָנָה]	[תָּקִים] [תָּקוּמָנָה]	תָּוֹקֵם מָנָה	תָּקוּמָנָה [תָּקוּמָנָה]	תָּגִילָה [תָּגִילָה]	
		1. <i>c.</i>	נוֹקוּם	נוֹקוּם	נוֹקִים	נוֹיָקֵם	נוֹקוּם [נוֹקוּם]	נוֹגִיל	
<i>Shortened Impf.</i>			*יָקָם	*יָקָם	*יָקָם			גָּגֶל	

<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>	* [*] קָם ([*] וַיָּקָם)	*וַיָּקָם				וְיָלֵל
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	*שׁוֹפֵטִי	*יִקְרַבְתִּי				וְיָרַבְתִּי
<i>Part. act. pass.</i>	קָם * קוּם	קָמָה * מוֹקָם	מָקוּם * מוֹקָם	מָקוּם * מוֹקָם	לְגַם, שֶׁבֶת שִׁים, שׁוּם	גָּבוֹן

O. Weak Verbs, אָל.

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph[□]al.</i>	<i>Pi[□]el.</i>	<i>Pu[□]al.</i>	<i>Hiph[□]el.</i>	<i>Hoph[□]al.</i>	<i>Hithpa[□]el.</i>	
<i>Perf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	*מָעָא	מָלָא	נִמְצָא	דָּכָא, מִצָּא	קָרָא [מִצָּא]	הִמְצִיא	[הִמְצָא]	הִמְצָא
3. f.	מָצָאה	מָלָאה	נִמְצָאה	[מִצָּאה]	מִצָּאה	הַמִּצְיאָה	הַמִּצְיאָה	הַמִּצְיאָה
2. m.	*מָצָא	מָלָאת	*נִמְצָאת	*מִצָּאת	*מִצָּאת	*הַמִּצְיאָת	*[הַמִּצְיאָת]	הַמִּצְיאָת
2. f.	מִצְאת	מִלְאָת	נִמְצָאת	[מִצָּאת]	מִצָּאת	הַמִּצְיאָת	הַמִּצְיאָת	הַמִּצְיאָת
1. c.	מִצָּאת	מִלְאָת	נִמְצָאת	[מִצָּאת]	מִצָּאת	הַמִּצְיאָת	הַמִּצְיאָת	הַמִּצְיאָת
<i>Plur.</i>								
3. c.	מָצָאו	מָלָאו	נִמְצָאו	מִצָּאו	מִצָּאו	הַמִּצְיאָו	הַמִּצְיאָו	הַמִּצְיאָו
2. m.	מִצְאָתָם	מִלְאָתָם	נִמְצָאתָם	מִצָּאתָם	מִצָּאתָם	הַמִּצְיאָתָם	הַמִּצְיאָתָם	הַמִּצְיאָתָם
2. f.	[מִצְאָתָנוּ]	[מִלְאָתָנוּ]	[נִמְצָאתָנוּ]	[מִצָּאתָנוּ]	[מִצָּאתָנוּ]	[הַמִּצְיאָתָנוּ]	[הַמִּצְיאָתָנוּ]	[הַמִּצְיאָתָנוּ]
1. c.	מִצָּאתָנוּ	מִלְאָתָנוּ	נִמְצָאתָנוּ	מִצָּאתָנוּ	מִצָּאתָנוּ	הַמִּצְיאָתָנוּ	הַמִּצְיאָתָנוּ	הַמִּצְיאָתָנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	מִצָּא	הַמִּצְיאָה	מִצָּא	wanting.	הַמִּצְיאָה	wanting.	הַמִּצְיאָה	הַמִּצְיאָה
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	מִצְוא	נִמְצָא	מִצָּא		הַמִּצְיאָה		wanting.	wanting.
<i>Imp. Sing. m.</i>	*מִצָּא	הַמִּצְיאָה	מִצָּא		הַמִּצְיאָה		הַמִּצְיאָה	הַמִּצְיאָה
f.	מִצָּאי	הַמִּצְיאָי	[הַמִּצְיאָי]	[מִצָּאי]	wanting.	הַמִּצְיאָי	wanting.	הַמִּצְיאָי
<i>Plur. m.</i>	מִצָּאו	הַמִּצְיאָו	מִצָּאו		הַמִּצְיאָו		הַמִּצְיאָו	הַמִּצְיאָו
f.	*מִצָּאנָה	[הַמִּצְיאָאנָה]	[מִצָּאנָה]	[מִצָּאנָה]	[הַמִּצְיאָאנָה]	[הַמִּצְיאָאנָה]	[הַמִּצְיאָאנָה]	[הַמִּצְיאָאנָה]
<i>Impf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	*יִמְצָא	*יִמְצָא	יִמְצָא	יִמְצָא	יִמְצָא	יִמְצָא	[יִמְצָא]	יִמְצָא
3. f.	תִּמְצָא	תִּפְצָא	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	[תִּמְצָא]	תִּמְצִיאָה	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא
2. m.	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא
2. f.	תִּמְצָאי	תִּמְצָאי	[תִּמְצָאי]	[תִּמְצָאי]	תִּמְצָאי	תִּמְצִיאָי	תִּמְצָאי	[תִּמְצָאי]
1. c.	אֲמָצָא	אֲמָצָא	אֲמָצָא	אֲמָצָא	אֲמָצָא	אֲמָצִיא	אֲמָצָא	[אֲמָצָא]
<i>Plur.</i>	יִמְצָאו	יִמְצָאו	יִמְצָאו	יִמְצָאו	יִמְצָאו	יִמְצָאו	יִמְצָאו	יִמְצָאו
3. m.	*תִּמְצָאנָה	*תִּמְצָאנָה	*תִּמְצָאנָה	*תִּמְצָאנָה	*תִּמְצָאנָה	*תִּמְצָאנָה	[תִּמְצָאנָה]	[תִּמְצָאנָה]
3. f.	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה
2. m.	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	[תִּמְצָאוֹתָה]	[תִּמְצָאוֹתָה]	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה	תִּמְצָאוֹתָה
2. f.	תִּמְצָאנָה	תִּמְצָאנָה	תִּמְצָאנָה	תִּמְצָאנָה	תִּמְצָאנָה	תִּמְצָאנָה	[תִּמְצָאנָה]	[תִּמְצָאנָה]

1. c.		נִמְצָא	[נִמְצָא]	נִמְצָא	נִמְצִיאָ	נִמְצָא	נִמְצָא	נִמְצָא
Shortened. Impf. (Jussive).								
Impf.	"נִמְצָא נִי"			"נִמְצָא נִי"		"נִמְצִיאָ נִי"		
with Suffix.	"נִמְצָא אֵך"							
Part. act.	מִצָּא	מִצָּא	מִמְצָא	מִמְצָא	מִמְצִיאָ	מִמְצָא	מִמְצָא	מִמְצָא
pass.	מִצְוָה			מִמְצָא		מִמְצָא		

P. Weak Verbs, 7.

			Qal.	Niph [□] al.	Pi [□] el.	Pu [□] al.	Hiph [□] il.	Hoph [□] al.	Hithpa [□] el.
Perf.	Sing.	3.	*גָּלַה	*גָּלַה	*גָּלַה	*גָּלַה	*גָּלַה	*גָּלַה	*הָגָלָה
		m.							
		3.	*גָּלַףָה	*גָּלַףָה	*גָּלַףָה	*גָּלַףָה	*גָּלַףָה	*גָּלַףָה	[הָגָלָףָה]
		f.							
		2.	*גָּלַיְתָ	*גָּלַיְתָ	*גָּלַיְתָ	*גָּלַיְתָ	*גָּלַיְתָ	*קָגָלִיְתָ	*הָקָגָלִיְתָ
		m.							
		2.	גָּלִית	גָּלִית	גָּלִית	גָּלִית	[גָּלִית]	[הָגָלִית]	[הָגָלִית]
		f.							
		1.	גָּלִיתִי	גָּלִיתִי	גָּלִיתִי	גָּלִיתִי	גָּלִיתִי	קָגָלִיתִי	הָקָגָלִיתִי
		c.							
	Plur.	3.	*גָּלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	הָגָלוֹ	הָקָגָלוֹ
		c.							
		2.	גָּלוּפָם	גָּלוּפָם	[גָּלוּפָם]	גָּלוּפָם	[גָּלוּפָם]	[הָגָלוּפָם]	[הָקָגָלוּפָם]
		m.							
		2.	גָּלוּפָנוֹ	[גָּלוּפָנוֹ]	גָּלוּפָנוֹ	[גָּלוּפָנוֹ]	[הָגָלוּפָנוֹ]	קָגָלוּפָנוֹ	[הָקָגָלוּפָנוֹ]
		f.							
		1.	גָּלוּנוּ	גָּלוּנוּ	גָּלוּנוּ	גָּלוּנוּ	הָגָלוּנוּ	הָקָגָלוּנוּ	הָקָגָלוּנוּ
		c.							
Inf.			*גָּלוֹת	*גָּלוֹת	*גָּלוֹת	*גָּלוֹת	*גָּלוֹת	*הָגָלוֹת	*הָקָגָלוֹת
Inf.	absol.		גָּלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	קָגָלוֹ	הָקָגָלוֹ
Imp.	Sing.	m.	*גָּלה	*גָּלה	*גָּלה, גָּל	*גָּלה	*גָּלה	*גָּלה	הָגָל
									[הָקָגָלָה]
		f.	*גָּלי	*גָּלי	*גָּלי	*גָּלי	*גָּלי	wanting.	הָקָגָלִי
	Plur.	m.	גָּלוֹ	הָגָלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	גָּלוֹ	הָגָלוֹ	wanting.	הָקָגָלוֹ
		f.	*גָּלוּנָה	[הָגָלוּנָה]	[גָּלוּנָה]	[הָגָלוּנָה]	[הָגָלוּנָה]	[הָקָגָלוּנָה]	[הָקָגָלוּנָה]
Impf.	Sing.	3.	*יִגְלָה	*יִגְלָה	*יִגְלָה	*יִגְלָה	*יִגְלָה	*יִגְלָה	*יִתְגָּלָה
		m.							
		3.	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	[תְּתָגָלָה]
		f.							
		2.	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	תְּגָלָה	תְּתָגָלָה
		m.							
		2.	*תְּגָלִי	[תְּגָלִי]	*תְּגָלִי	[תְּגָלִי]	*תְּגָלִי	*תְּגָלִי	*תְּתָגָלִי
		f.							

1.		אָגָלָה	אָגָלָה	אָגָלָה	אָגָלָה	אָגָלָה	אָגָלָה	אָגָלָה	אָגָלָה	אָגָלָה	* אָגָלָה	אָתְגָלָה
<i>c.</i>												
<i>Plur.</i>	3.	יִגְלֹו	יִגְלֹו	יִגְלֹו	יִגְלֹו	יִגְלֹו	יִגְלֹו	יִגְלֹו	יִגְלֹו	יִגְלֹו	יִתְגָלּוּ	
<i>m.</i>												
	3.	תַּגְלֵלִינָה	* פָּגָלִינָה	* פָּגָלִינָה	[תַּתְגָלִינָה]							
<i>f.</i>												
	2.	תַּגְלֹו	תַּגְלֹו	תַּגְלֹו	תַּגְלֹו	תַּגְלֹו	תַּגְלֹו	תַּגְלֹו	תַּגְלֹו	תַּגְלֹו	תַּתְגָלוּ	
<i>m.</i>												
	2.	תַּגְלֵלִינָה	תַּגְלֵלִינָה	תַּגְלֵלִינָה	תַּגְלֵלִינָה	תַּגְלֵלִינָה	תַּגְלֵלִינָה	פָּגָלִינָה	פָּגָלִינָה	[תַּתְגָלִינָה]		
<i>f.</i>												
	1.	נְגָלָה	[נְגָלָה]	נְגָלָה	נְגָלָה	נְגָלָה	נְגָלָה	נְגָלָה	נְגָלָה	[נְגָלָה]	נְתַגָּלָה	
<i>c.</i>												
<i>Shortened. Impf.</i>		* יִגְלֶל	* יִגְלֶל	* יִגְלֶל	* יִגְלֶל	* יִגְלֶל	* יִגְלֶל	* גָּלֶל	* גָּלֶל	* יִתְגָלֵל		
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>		, יִגְלֶל נִי	, יִגְלֶל נִי	, יִגְלֶל נִי	, יִגְלֶל נִי	, יִגְלֶל נִי	, יִגְלֶל נִי					
		יִגְלֶלֶךָ	יִגְלֶלֶךָ	יִגְלֶלֶךָ	יִגְלֶלֶךָ	יִגְלֶלֶךָ	יִגְלֶלֶךָ					
<i>Part.</i>	<i>act.</i>											
	<i>pass.</i>	* גָּלֶה	* גָּלֶה	* גָּלֶה	* גָּלֶה	* גָּלֶה	* גָּלֶה	* מְגָלָה	* מְגָלָה	* מַתְגָלָה		

Q. Verbs נְלָאַל with Suffixes.

	1. Sing.	2. Sing. <i>m.</i>	2. Sing. <i>f.</i>	3. Sing.	3. Sing. <i>f.</i>	1. Plur.	3. Plur. <i>m.</i>	עִשְׁשָׂם
<i>Perf.</i>								
<i>Qal.</i> 3.		נְחַנֵּי	נְחַנֵּךְ	נְחַנֵּה	נְחַנֵּהוּ	נְחַנֵּהוּ	נְחַנֵּנוּ	נְחַנֵּנוּ
<i>m.</i>			רְאַנְךָ					
		P.						
		עֲנֵיתָנִי						
2. <i>m.</i>	רְאִיתָנִי							עֲנֵיתִים
		P.						
		עֲנֵיתָנִי						
2. <i>f.</i>		Pi.						
		רְמִיתָנִי						
1. <i>c.</i>			רְאַתְּךָ	רְאַתְּךָ	עֲתַמָּן	רְאִיתִיךָ	רְאִיתִיךָ	רְעִיתִים
						רְאִיתִיךָ		
<i>Plur.</i>								
3. <i>c.</i>		עֲשָׂוִינוּ	רְאַוְתָּנוּ	Pi.	עֲשָׂוִינוּ	רְאַוְתָּנוּ	שְׁבוּם	
1. <i>c.</i>			Pi.		קְוִינֵנוּ	Pi.		
					קְוִינֵנוּ			
<i>Imper.</i>								
2. <i>m.</i>		נְחַנֵּנִי					Hiph.	רְעִם
		עֲנֵנִי						

הַרְאָנוּ

2. f.	Hiph.					
	הָרְאָיִנִי					
Plur.	Pi.			תַּל וְהוּא		Hiph.
2. m.	כֶּסֶף וְנִי					הַכּוּם
Impf.	יָרְאָנִי	יָרְאָנֵן		יָרְאָה הוּא	יָרְאָה הָנִי	יָצַצְמָה
3. m.		יָרְאָתֵן		יָלַע פֹּוֹ	יָרְאָתֵה	יָעִשְׁמָה
3. f.		תְּשַׁבֵּן		Hiph. פְּשַׁק הָוּה		
2. m.	תְּרָאָנִי			תְּעַשְׂנֵה	Hiph. תְּחַעֲנוּ	תְּזַרְעָם
2. f.						Pi. תְּכַסְפִּים
1. c.		אָרְאָנָה	אָעְלָנָה	אָרְאָנוּ	אָעְלָנוּ	אָפְדָם
		אָעְגָּה		אָעְגָּה	אָעְגָּה	
Plur.	יָעִשְׁנִי	Pi.		יִפְתָּח וְהוּא	יִעַשׂ וְהָנִי	
3. m.		יִפְתָּח וּנְךָ			Pi. יִעַשׂ וְהָנִי	
2. m.	תְּצַנְנֵי					
1. c.				גְּעַשְׂנֵה	גְּנַשְׂק פֹּוֹ	תְּצַנְמָה

⁴Gesenius, F. W. (2003). *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar* (E. Kautzsch & S. A. E. Cowley, Ed.) (2d English ed.) (Page 497). Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.