

**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*

1

---

<sup>1</sup>Gesenius, 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. בן חכם ישמח אב. 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 A Ts*, and now (1910) in the third and much enlarged edition, is a valuable work which has been widely appreciated: the *Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A Ts*, 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 A Ts* in 1903, six popular lectures on *Die Poesie und die poetischen Bücher des A Ts* 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,<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 *Šwâ 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.<sup>2,3-6,7,8-11,12,13,14,15,16,17</sup> (as numbered in ordinary texts), and the 12 verses

of the sublinear (Palestinian) system, consisting of v.<sup>2-3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10.11.12.13-16.17</sup>.—S. R. D.]

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

[Editions often vary in individual passages, as regards the accentuation of the first syllable: but in the 7 occurrences of אָּא, and the 6 of אָּה, Baer, Ginsburg, and Kittel agree in having an accent on both syllables (as אָּ אָּ) in Gn 50:17, Ex 32:31, Ps 116:16, and Metheg on the first syllable and an accent on the second syllable (as אָּ אָּ) 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 אָּה. —S. R. D.]

Page 79, § 22 s, before הַרְדִּיפָהוּ 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 Ḥayyim 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 הַהוּא read הוּא.

Page 123, § 45 e, add: cf. also מְהַפְּכָה followed by אַת, 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 פֿ"ן, as P. Haupt has suggested to me in conversation.) But cf. Kautzsch, 'Die sog. aramaisierenden Formen der Verba ע"ע 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. יָגַר, but יָגַרְהוּ, יָחַל, and יָחַל, יָסַב, and יָסַב, יָשַׁם and יָשַׁם), and elsewhere no doubt to dissimilate the vowels (as יָגַר, יָדַל never יָגַר, יָדַל &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* שׁמֵה 2 S 13:20.

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

Page 273, § 93 qq end, *add* מוֹסְרוֹת Jer 5:5, רַבְעִים, שְׁלִשִׁים Ex 20:5, שׁ יְמוֹת Is 49:8, מִמִּים 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.*<sup>3</sup> = 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*, Camb. 1890; H. Reckendorf, 'Zur Charakteristik der sem. Sprachen,' in the *Actes du X<sup>me</sup> 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 *Semitic*<sup>1</sup> *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.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 <sup>1</sup> First used by Sohlözer in Eichhorn's *Repertorium für bibl. u. morgenl. Literatur*, 1781, p. 161.

2 <sup>2</sup> 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 subdivided<sup>1</sup> 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 Sabaeen 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 Mēša, 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 Mandaean (Nasoraean, 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'.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.*<sup>3</sup>, ii. p. 644 ff.

<sup>2</sup> In a wider sense *all* Jewish Aramaic is sometimes called 'Chaldee'.

<sup>1</sup> 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 (*Tigré*, *Tigrîña*, 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-Germanic<sup>2</sup> 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*. xlvii, 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 (onomatopoeica), 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 onomatopoeic words, or as stem-sounds of a similar character, we may compare, e.g. לקק, לקק, לקק λέγω, *lingo*, Skt. *lih*, Eng. *to lick*, Fr. *lécher*, Germ. *lecken*; גלל (cf. גלל, גלל) κυλίω, *volvo*, Germ. *quellen*, *wallen*, Eng. *to well*; גרד, טרד, קרד, קרד, χαράττω, Pers. *khâriđan*, Ital. *grattare*, Fr. *gratter*, Eng. *to grate*, *to scratch*, Germ. *kratzen*; פּרַק *frango*, Germ. *brechen*, &c.; Reuss, *Gesch. der hl. Schriften A.T.'s*, Braunsch. 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 אָמַם (whence אָמַם *people*, properly *assembly*), עַם (*with*) *samt*, מִגַּם *also*, *moreover*, Arab. *gama* *to collect*; Pers. *ham*, *hamah* (*at the same time*); Skt. *samâ* (*with*), Gk. ἄμα (*ἄμω*), ὁμός, ὁμοῦ (*ὁμιλος*, *ὁμοδος*, and harder *κοινός*, Lat. *cum*, *cumulus*, *cunctus*; with the corresponding sibilant Skt. *sam*, Gk. σύν, ζύν, ζυνός=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.*<sup>3</sup>, ii. p. 648 ff.), in Egypt, Persia, or India, e.g. נָהָר (also in the plural) *river*, from Egyptian *yoor*, generally as the name of the Nile (late Egypt. *yaro*, Assyr. *yaru*), although it is possible that a pure Semitic יָאָר has been confounded with the Egyptian name of the Nile (so Zimmern); אֶרֶב (Egyptian) Nile-reed (see Lieblein, 'Mots égyptiens dans la Bible,' in *PSBA.* 1898, p. 202 f.); פֶּרְדֵּס (in Zend *pairidaēza*, circumvallation=παράδεισος) *pleasure-garden*, *park*; דָּרַחֲמַיִם *daric*, Persian gold coin; תְּפִיִּים *peacocks*, perhaps from the Malabar *tôgai* or *tôghai*. Some of these words are also found in Greek, as כַּרְבָּס (Pers. *karbâs*, Skt. *karpâsa*) *cotton*, κάρπασος, *carbasus*. On the other hand it is doubtful if אָפֶה corresponds to the Greek κῆπος, κῆβος, Skt. *kapi*, *ape*.

(b) In Greek, &c.: some originally Semitic names of Asiatic products and articles of commerce, e.g. בּוּץ בּוּסְסוֹס, *byssus*; לְבָנָה לִיבָנוֹס, λιβανωτός, *incense*; קָנָה קָאֵנָה קָאֵנָה, *canna*, cane; כִּמְצִיאָה קָאֵסְסִיאָה, *cassia*; מְלָא מְלָא מְלָא, *camelus*; בּוֹן אֶרְרָאבּוֹן, *arrhabo*, *arrha*, pledge. Such transitions have perhaps been brought about chiefly by Phoenician trade. Cf. A. Müller, 'Semitische Lehnworte im älteren Griechisch,' in Bezenberger'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 pervenerint*,

KAT. *KAT.*<sup>3</sup> = 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 Archæology. 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 to reproduce the sounds of a 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,<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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 Mēša, 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 Mēša. 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 <sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>2</sup> The Sabaeen (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,<sup>1</sup> 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 זכר 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 Shalmanezar II, 859–829 B.C. (cf. A. Šanda, *Die Aramäer*, Lpz. 1902, p. 26), and those found in 1888–1891 at Zinjîrlî 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. *Ezr* 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. (Sabæan 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.<sup>1</sup> Even here, however, there appeared, through the

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> Even now the language of some of the Bêdawî 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 עִבְרִית) Ἑβραϊστικὴ γλῶσσα τῶν Ἑβραίων, ἑβραϊστί) does not occur in the Old Testament itself. Instead of it we find in Is 19:18 the term *language of Canaan*,<sup>1</sup> 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* (עִבְרִית) Ἑβραϊστικὴ) 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

---

<sup>1</sup> That Hebrew in its present form was actually developed in Canaan appears from such facts as the use of *yām* (sea) for the west, *nēgeb* (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 Ἑβραῖοι, Hebraei,<sup>2</sup> &c., alone occurs. Of the many explanations of the gentilic עִבְרָי, the derivation from עֵבֶר *a country on the other side* with the derivative suffix יָ ( § 86 h) appears to be the only one philologically possible. The name accordingly denoted the Israelites as being those who inhabited the עֵבֶר, 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 עִבְרָי 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.<sup>1</sup>

The term Ἑβραῖστί 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 Ἑβραῖς 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 Dībôn (now Dībân), 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.<sup>2</sup> Of old Hebrew: (2) an

<sup>2</sup> The Graeco-Roman form of the name is not directly derived from the Hebrew עִבְרָי, but from the Palestinian Aramaic עֵבְרָיָא, 'the Hebrew.'

<sup>1</sup> We may also leave out of account the linguistically possible identification of the עִבְרָיִם with the עִבְרִי who appear in the Tell-el-Amarna letters (about 1400 B.C.) as freebooters and mercenaries in Palestine and its neighbourhood.

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup>) 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 names<sup>2</sup>; (4) coins of the Maccabean prince Simon (from 'the 2nd year of deliverance', 140 and 139 B.C.) and his successors,<sup>3</sup> 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 *Altsemitische 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.]

1<sup>1</sup> 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  $\eta' \psi' \eta'$  (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.]

2<sup>2</sup> 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.*<sup>2</sup> (Tübingen, 1907), pp. 80, 225 ff., which includes the beautiful seal inscribed  $\eta' \psi' \eta'$  from the castle-hill of Megiddo, found in 1904; [Cooke, p. 362].

3<sup>3</sup> 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.*<sup>3</sup>, Lpz. 1901, i. p. 20 ff.; [Cooke, p. 352 ff.].

To this old Hebrew, the language of the Canaanitish or Phoenician <sup>4</sup> stockscame 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. מִלְכֵי־צִדְקָה, קִרְיַת סֶפֶר, &c.; on ‘Canaanite glosses’<sup>1</sup> 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*.<sup>3</sup>, 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 Vogüé, 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 Ešmūnazar 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. אל *God*, אדם *man*, בן *son*, בת *daughter*, מלך *king*, עבד *servant*, בהן *priest*, זבה *sacrifice*, בעל *lord*, שמש *sun*, ארץ *land*, ים *sea*, אבן *stone*, כסף *silver*, ברזל *iron*, שמן *oil*, עת *time*, קבר *grave*, מצבת *monument*, מקם *place*, משכב *bed*, כל *all*, אחד *one*, שנים *two*, שלש *three*, ארבע *four*, חמש *five*, שש *six*, שבע *seven*, עשר *ten*, כן (=Hebr. היה) *to be*, שמע *to hear*, פתח *to open*, נדר *to vow*, ברך *to bless*, בקש *to seek*, &c. Proper names: צדן *Sidon*, צר *Tyre*, חנא *Hanno*, חנבעל *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 בת for בית *house*, קל for קול *voice*, צדן for צידון *priests*, אלנם (in Plaut. *alonim*) *gods*; the fem., even in the absolute state, ending in ת (*ath*) (§ 80 b) as well as א (*ô*), the relative אשר (Hebr. אשר), &c. The differences in pronunciation are more remarkable, especially in Punic, where the *i* was regularly pronounced as *û*, e.g. שִׁפֵּט *sûfēt* (judge), שָׁלוֹשׁ *sâlûs* (three), רִישׁ *rûs* = אִישׁ *head*; *i* and *e* often as the obscure dull sound of *y*, e.g. הַיְנִינִי *yynnynnu* (ecce eum), יִתְ (אית) *yth*; the *e* as *o*, e.g. מֹעַקַר *Mocar* (cf. מֹעַקָה LXX, Gn 22:24 Μωϋά). See the collection of the grammatical peculiarities in Gesenius, *Monuments Phœnicia*, p. 430 ff.; Paul Schröder, *Die phœniz. Sprache*, Halle, 1869; B. Stade, ‘Erneute Prüfung des zwischen dem Phœnic. und Hebr. bestehenden Verwandtschaftsgrades,’ in the *Morgenländ. Forschungen*, Lpz. 1875, p. 169 ff.

<sup>4</sup> <sup>4</sup> כְּנַעֲנִי, כְּנַעַן is the native name, common both to the Canaanitish tribes in Palestine and to those which dwelt at the foot of the Lebanon and on the Syrian coast, whom we call Phoenicians, while they called themselves כְּנַעַן on their coins. The people of Carthage also called themselves so.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. inter alia : *aparu*, also  $\square$  *aparu* (Assyr. *epru*, *ipru*)=עֶפְרָה;  $\square$  *ullu*=עֹל (with hard *e*; cf. § 6 c, and Assyr.  $\square$  *umri*=עֶמְרִי,  $\square$  *azzatu* = עֶזָה); *iazkur* = יִזְכֹּר, *zuru*  $\square$  *u* = זֹרֵעַ, *abadat* = אֲבָדָה, *ša*  $\square$  *ri* = שַׁעַר, *gate*; *ba*  $\square$  *nu* = בֶּטֶן, *belly*; *kilûbi* = כְּלוֹב, *net*;  $\square$  *aduk* = אֲדֹק (צִדְדִיק), &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 groundforms<sup>1</sup> 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 these ground-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

---

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

נַעַר *boy, youth*, for עַרְהָּ, *girl*, and הוּא for היא, 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. Giesebrecht, '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 Hexateuch*, Freib. 1893; Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*<sup>8</sup>, Edinburgh, 1908; Strack, *Einleitung ins A. T.*<sup>6</sup>, 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.; *Psalmprobleme, &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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.; Döllner, *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.*<sup>5</sup>, Tübingen, 1905, p. 11 ff.; Rothstein, *Zeitschr. für d. ev. Rel.-Unterricht*, 1907, p. 188 ff. and his *Grundzüge des hebr. Rhythmus*, Lpz. 1909 (also separately *Psalmentexte 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. Propheten*<sup>3</sup>, p. 236 ff., Munich, 1908.—In full agreement with Sievers is Baethgen, *Psalmen*<sup>3</sup>, 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, *Klagelied*<sup>2</sup>, 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 prophetic 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

---

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

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. אָנוּשׁ *man* = אָדָם; אַרְבַּח *path* = דֶּרֶךְ; מִלָּה *word* = דְּבָר; הִזֵּה *to see* = רָאָה; אָתָּה *to come* = בּוֹא.

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

Of word-forms, we may note, e.g. the longer forms of prepositions of place (§ 103 n) עָלַי = עַל, אֵלַי = אֵל, עָדַי = עַד; the endings יָ, וֹ in the noun (§ 90); the pronominal suffixes מוֹ, מוֹ, מוֹ; מוֹ for מוֹ, מוֹ, מוֹ (§ 58); the plural ending יָן for יָם (§ 87 e). To the *syntax* belongs the far more sparing use of the article, of the relative pronoun, of the accusative particle אֶת; 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.<sup>1</sup> When it had finally ceased to exist as a living language, it was still preserved as the *language of*

<sup>1</sup> 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 prophetic 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. אָהוּהָ declaration, אָנַס compel, בֵּר son, גֵּיִר chalk, עַתּ = זָמַן time, זָקַר raise up, חָסַד Pi. reproach, טָלַל Pi. roof over, טָעָה stray, כָּהֵן rock, מְלִיץ advise, סוּף = קֵץ end, קָבַל = לָקַח take, רָעַע = רָצַץ break, שָׂגָא be many, שָׁלַט = מָלַךְ rule, תָּקַף = אָמַץ be strong.—  
*Later meanings* are, e.g. אָמַר (to say) to command; עָנָה (to answer) to being speaking.—  
*Orthographical and grammatical peculiarities* are, the frequent *scriptio plena* of וּ and יָ, e.g. דְּוִיד<sup>1</sup> (elsewhere דָּוִד), even קוֹדֵשׁ for קֹדֶשׁ, רֹב for רַב; the interchange of הָ and אָ final; the more frequent use of substantives in וּן, וְ, וַ, &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 Giesebrecht 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 שָׁ, a common form in Phoenician (as well as אָש), for אָשָׁר (§ 36), which afterwards recurs in Jonah, Lamentations, the Song of Songs, the later Psalms, and Ecclesiastes.

Rem. 1. Of dialectal 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 שָׁ 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 Mēša □ (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.

---

<sup>1</sup> דְּוִיד in the Minor Prophets throughout (*He 3:5*, &c.) is due merely to a caprice of the Masorettes.

2. It is evident that, in the extant remains of old Hebrew literature,<sup>2</sup> 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 *Encykl. 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 (תרגומים 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 (מסורה, *traditio* ?).<sup>1</sup> From this the text

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 subdivision in the O.T.

<sup>1</sup> 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 (מִסְרָה; מִסְרָה, i. e. מִסְרָה, מסורה, *traditio* ?).

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. Ḥayyîm [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<sup>r</sup>ê (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. Sa'adya,<sup>1</sup> 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 מְסֹרֶה (by the side of the equally well-attested form מְסֹרֶת) does not seem to us to be invalidated by his arguments, nor by Blau's proposal to read מְסֹרֶת (*JQR*. xii. 241). The remark of Levias (l.c.) deserves notice, that with the earlier Masoretes מסורה 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 מסר *to hand on* is not found in the O.T., it must be a late denominative in this sense.

JQR. *JQR*. = Jewish Quarterly Review.

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

Hebrew, were the still extant works of the grammarians R. Yehuda Ḥayyûḡ (also called Abu Zakarya Yaḥya, about the year 1000) and R. Yona (Ahu l-Walîd Merwân ibn Ġanâḥ, about 1030). By the aid of these earlier labours, Abraham ben Ezra (commonly called Aben Ezra, ob. 1167) and R. David Qimḥi (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 פעל, certain *voces memoriales*, as קָנַךְ and the like.<sup>1</sup>

4. The father of Hebrew philology among Christians was John Reuchlin (ob. 1522),<sup>2</sup> 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 of fruitful service to Hebrew grammar.

5. In the nineteenth century<sup>3</sup> 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

---

1 <sup>1</sup> 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-ʿamim 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 initiis 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.

2 <sup>2</sup> 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.

3 <sup>3</sup> Of the literature on 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. König<sup>1</sup> in his very thorough researches into the phonology and accident 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 18:13–20<sup>19</sup>, Jer 52 = 2 K 24:18–25<sup>30</sup>, 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.<sup>1</sup>—*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.

---

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> *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.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> This *scriptio continua* is also found in Phoenician inscriptions. The inscription of Mēša □ 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, *Deuterocesaja*, 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.*<sup>2</sup>, 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*<sup>2</sup>, 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 *inflexion*, 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).

---

<sup>2</sup>Gesenius, 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*.<sup>3</sup>, Lpz. 1906, p. 766 ff.; Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäologie*<sup>2</sup>, 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. Buchwesens 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* (קְּתָב מִרְבָּעַ), also the *Assyrian character* (כְּתָב אֲשׁוּרִי),<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>1</sup> The name אֲשׁוּרִי (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*<sup>2</sup>) 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 Mēša<sup>62</sup>, as well as in that of Siloam. The characters on the Maccabaeian 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 gradually<sup>1</sup> (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.<sup>2</sup>

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. Yīshāqî, in the twelfth century) with its straight strokes, square corners and ‘tittles’ (tāgîm), 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):—

<sup>2</sup> 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 Mēša character, or from some kindred and hardly older script, but from some unknown and *much* earlier form of writing.

<sup>1</sup> 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 bet den Juden im Gebrauch?’ in *Kaufmanngedenkbuch*, Breslau, 1900, p. 44 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Not 176, as formerly held. Driver and Lidzbarski now read ערבייה, correctly, not טרבייה.

JQR. *JQR.* = Jewish Quarterly Review.

FORM.	NAME.	PRONOUNCIATION.	NUMERICAL VALUE.
א	<i>Ālēph</i>	<i>spiritus lenis</i>	1
ב	<i>Bēth</i>	<i>b</i> ( <i>bh</i> , but see § 6 n)	2
ג	<i>Gimēl</i> ( <i>Giml</i> )	<i>g</i> ( <i>gh</i> , " " ")	3
ד	<i>Dālēth</i>	<i>d</i> ( <i>dh</i> , " " ")	4
ה	<i>Hē</i>	<i>h</i>	5
ו	<i>Wāw</i> ( <i>Wāu</i> )	<i>w</i> ( <i>u</i> ) <sup>1</sup>	6
ז	<i>Záyñ</i>	<i>z</i> , as in English (softs)	7
ח	<i>Hēth</i>	<i>ħ</i> , a strong guttural	8
ט	<i>Ṭēth</i>	<i>ṭ</i> , emphatic <i>t</i>	9
י	<i>Yôd</i>	<i>y</i> ( <i>i</i> ) <sup>1</sup>	10
כ, final	<i>Kaph</i>	<i>k</i> ( <i>kh</i> , but see § 6 n)	20
ך			
ל	<i>Lāmēd</i>	<i>l</i>	30
מ, final	<i>Mēm</i>	<i>m</i>	40
ם			
נ, final ן	<i>Nûm</i>	<i>n</i>	50
ס	<i>Sāmēkh</i>	<i>s</i>	60
ע	<i>Āyñ</i>	<i>ʿ</i> a peculiar guttural (see below)	70
פ, final	<i>Pē</i>	<i>p</i> ( <i>f</i> , see § 6 n)	80
ף			
צ, final	<i>Ṣādē</i>	<i>ṣ</i> , emphatic <i>s</i>	90
ץ			
ק	<i>Qôf</i>	<i>q</i> , a strong <i>k</i> <sup>2</sup> formed at the back of the palate	100
ר	<i>Rēš</i>	<i>r</i>	200
ש	<i>Śîñ</i>	<i>ś</i>	300
שׁ	<i>Šîñ</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>š</i> , pronounced <i>sh</i>	300
ת	<i>Tāw</i> ( <i>Tāu</i> )	<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 קַמְנֶפְחֶסֶף *Kamnèphäṣ*, or better, with A. Müller and Stade, קַמְנֶפְחֶסֶף i. e. *as the breaker in pieces*.<sup>1</sup> Of these, ך, ן, ף, ץ are distinguished from the common form by

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

2<sup>2</sup> As a representation of this sound the Latin *q* is very suitable, since it occupies in the alphabet the place of the Semitic ק (Greek κόππα).

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

1<sup>1</sup> In the Talmud, disregarding the alphabetical order, קַמְנֶפְחֶסֶף *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 קַמְנֶפְחֶסֶף = 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.<sup>2</sup> In the case of ם the letter is completely closed.

4. Hebrew is read and written from right to left.<sup>3</sup> Words must not be divided at the end of the lines;<sup>4</sup> 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 םהלתם <sup>a</sup>*haltèm*). In some MSS. other letters suitable for the purpose are also employed in this way, as ך, ם, ן; 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. יָד), but as a letter simply the sound ' (y), with which this word begins; *Āyîñ*, originally a circle, properly an *eye* (יָיַן), stands for the consonant ן. 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 (א, ב, ג, ד, ה) 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 letters<sup>5</sup> is: אֶלֶף *ox*, בַּיִת *house*, גַּמֶּל *camel* (according to Lidzbarski, see below, perhaps originally אַרְבַּע *axe* or *pick-axe*), דֶּלֶת *door*

---

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

2<sup>2</sup> 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.

3<sup>3</sup> 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 Sabaeen, and in the Safa-inscriptions of the first three centuries A.D., cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 116 f.

4<sup>4</sup> This does not apply to early inscriptions or seals. Cf. Měša, 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.

5<sup>5</sup> 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. שֵׁן *tooth*) are to be noticed, amongst others, for *Daleth*, *Zain*, Št□n. 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* = *pê*, p□, mouth, and the vowel of ρῶ = *rōš*, head, are all Hebraeo-Phoenician.

(properly *folding door*; according to Lidzbarski, perhaps דָּ the *female breast*), אָ air-hole (?), lattice-window (?), וּ hook, nail, וָנ weapon (according to Nestle, comparing the Greek ζῆντα, rather וֵית olive-tree), חָ fence, barrier (but perhaps only differentiated from הּ by the left-hand stroke), טָ a winding (?), according to others a *leather bottle* or a *snake* (but perhaps only differentiated from תּ by a circle round it), יָ hand, בָּ bent hand, לָ ox-goad, מָ water, נָ fish (Lidzbarski, ‘perhaps originally נָה snake,’ as in Ethiopic), פָּ prop (perhaps a modification of פּ), עָ eye, פָּ (also פִּי) mouth, צָ fish-hook (?), קָ eye of a needle, according to others *back of the head* (Lidzb., ‘perhaps קָשׁ bow’), רָ head, שָּ tooth, תָּ 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.<sup>1</sup> 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. südsem. 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 ält. Schriftsystems od. der Urspr. der Keilschriftzeichen dargel.*, 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*<sup>2</sup>, p. 173 ff. This theory is by no means convincing.

<sup>1</sup> In the excavations at Jericho in April, 1907, E. Sellin found a jar-handle with the Canaanite characters תּ 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<sup>b.c.</sup>, 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.  $\aleph$  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 *ālef* (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 alphabetic<sup>1</sup> poems: Ps 9 (א–כ, cf. Ps 10:1 ל, and vv<sup>12–17</sup> ק–ת; 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, ג, exactly fit in between ט, ז, י, and that Ps 10:1, 3, 5 therefore has the reverse order ל, ג, י); also  $\psi\psi$  25 and 34 (both without a separate  $\aleph$ -verse and with  $\aleph$  repeated at the end<sup>2</sup>); 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., *tôrā, edûth*, &c.); La 1–4 (in 2–4  $\aleph$  before  $\nu$ <sup>3</sup>, 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  $\aleph$  before  $\nu$ <sup>3</sup>); also in Na 1:2–10 Pastor Frohnmeyer 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 Ecclus 51:13–30, with the omission of the  $\aleph$ -verse and with  $\aleph$ <sup>1</sup> at the end. His conjectures have been brilliantly confirmed by the discovery of the Hebrew original, although the order from א to ל is partly disturbed or obscured. If א before  $\nu$  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.

1<sup>1</sup> 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*<sup>2</sup>, Gött. 1907, p. vii ff.

2<sup>2</sup> On this superfluous  $\aleph$  cf. Grimme, *Euphemistic liturgical appendices*, Lpz. 1901, p. 8 ff., and Nestle, *ZAW*. 1903, p. 340 f., who considers it an appendage to the Greek alphabet.

3<sup>3</sup> [Perhaps also originally in Ps 34.]  $\aleph$  before  $\nu$  is probably due to a magic alphabet, see above, n. 1. According to Böhmer, *ZAW*. 1908, p. 53 ff., the combinations אב, גד, הו, &c., were used in magical texts;  $\aleph\psi$  was excluded, but by a rearrangement we get  $\aleph\sigma$  and  $\aleph\tau$ .

1<sup>1</sup> See note 3 on p. 29.

N. Schlögl, *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 כ, ג, ד, and of the three liquids ל, מ, נ, 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, Ayin* 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 ט-א, the tens by צ-י, 100–400 by ת-ק, the numbers from 500–900 by ת (=400), with the addition of the remaining hundreds, e.g. תק 500. In compound numbers the greater precedes (on the right), thus יא 11, קכא 121. But 15 is expressed by טו 9+6, not יה (which is a form of the divine name, being the first two consonants of יהוה).<sup>2</sup> For a similar reason טז is also mostly written for 16, instead of יז, which in compound proper names, like יואל, also represents the name of God, יהוה.

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

b. The reckoning of the years in Jewish writings (generally ליציירה *after the creation*) follows either the *full chronology* (לפ"ג or לפ"ט גדול) with the addition of the thousands, or the *abridged chronology* (לפ"ק טון), 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.<sup>3</sup> A point, or later an oblique stroke, serves as the sign of abridgement in old MSS. and editions, e.g. יש' for ישׁרָאֵל, פ' for פְּלִינִי *aliquis*, ד' for דְּבָר *aliquid*, וגו' for וְגוֹמְרֵי *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 ט"ם). Two such strokes are employed, from § 41 d onward, to mark the different classes of weak verbs.—Note also יי' or יי̇ (also ה') for יהוה.

---

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

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

<sup>3</sup> 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, *Jüüd. 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. כ Gn 1:1, ו Lv 11:42 as the middle consonant of the Pentateuch, י Nu 14:17), and *minusculae* (e.g. ה Gn 2:4). (3) The *literae suspensae* (Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 334 ff.) ו Ju 18:30 (which points to the reading מִשֶׁה for מִנְשֶׁה, ע Ps 80:14 (the middle of the Psalms<sup>1</sup>) and Jb 38:13, 15. (4) The ‘mutilated’ *Wāw* in שְׁלוֹם Nu 25:12, and ק Ex 32:25 (בְּקִמְיָהֶם), and Nu 7:2 (הַפְּקוּדִים). (5) *Mēm clausum* in לְמַרְבָּה Is 9:6, and *Mēm apertum* in הַמְּפֹרָצִים Neh 2:13. (6) *Nûn inversum* before Nu 10:35, and after ver. 36, as also before Ps 107:23–28 and <sup>40</sup>; 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> As, however, corresponding signs for several sounds (ט, ש, ז, ק, שׁ) are wanting in the Greek alphabet, only an approximate

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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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 ׀ and ב, it may be remarked:—

I. Among the gutturals, the glottal stop א 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. אמר *āmār*, אָשָׁם *yāšām*. Even before a vowel א is almost lost to our ear, like the *h* in *hour* and in the French *habit*, *homme*. After a vowel א generally (and at the end of a word, always) coalesces with it, e.g. אָרָא *qārā* for an original *qārā*, Arab. *qārā*; see further, § 23 a, 27 g.

ה 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. נָהַפְּךָ *nāhpakh*; at the end of a word the consonantal ה has a point—Mappîq—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.

ע is related to א, but is a much stronger guttural. Its strongest sound is a rattled, guttural g, cf. e.g. עָצָה, LXX Γάζα, עָמַר Γόμορρα; elsewhere, a weaker sound of the same kind, which the LXX reproduce by a *spiritus* (*lenis* or *asper*), e.g. עָלִי Ἠλί, עָמַלְקָם Ἀμαλέκ.<sup>4</sup> 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 ע entirely, in reading and transcribing words (עָלִי *Eli*, עָמַלְקָם *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 עָרְבָא *arba*, עָד *ad*.

ח 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 ע it was, however, pronounced in many words feebly, in others strongly.

As regards ב, 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 ב, cf. o.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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 ט, צ and ש).

ש and ש were originally represented (as is still the case in the unpointed texts) by only *one* form ש; 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. wissenschaft. Theol.*, 1873, p. 121; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 133). In the Masoretic punctuation they were distinguished by means of the diacritical point as ש (sh) and ש (ś).<sup>1</sup>

The original difference between the sounds ש and ש<sup>2</sup> sometimes marks a distinction in meaning, e.g. סָכַר to close, שָׂכַר to hire, סָכַל to be foolish, שָׂכַל to be prudent, to be wise. Syriac always represents both sounds by ס, and in Hebrew also they are sometimes interchanged; as סָכַר for שָׂכַר to hire, *Ezr* 4:5; שְׂכִלּוֹת for סְכִלּוֹת *folly*, *Ec* 1:17.

ט (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 צ are pronounced with a strong articulation and with a compression of the larynx. The first two are thus essentially different from ת and כ, which correspond to our t and k and also are often aspirated (see below, נ). צ 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 צ, cf. G. Hüsing, 'Zum Lautwerte des צ,' in *OLZ*. x. 467 ff.

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

ב ג ד כ פ ת (בְּגִדְכֶפֶת)

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*.<sup>1</sup> 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, *Dageš lene* (§ 13), placed in the consonants, viz. בּ b, גּ g, דּ d, כּ k, פּ p, תּ 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 *Dageš*. 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.

1<sup>1</sup> The modern Samaritans, however, in reading their Hebrew Pentateuch pronounce ש invariably as ש.

2<sup>2</sup> The original value of ש, and its relation to the original value of ש and ש, 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 Habaschitisch-punische Dialekte in Südarabien*, Munich, 1902, pp. 19 ff.—On the phonetic value of ש see G. Hüsing, *OLZ*. 1907, p. 467 ff.

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

1<sup>1</sup> 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: כן א, כן χ; פן π, פן φ; תן τ, תן θ. In the same way ל should be pronounced like the North German *g* in *Tage*, *Wagen*, and ר like *th* in *the*, as distinguished from ל and ד.

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. רב *rav* (or even *raf*), בית *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>	א, ה, ע, ח;
(b) <i>Palatals</i>	ק, ג, כ;
(c) <i>Dentals</i>	ד, ט, ת;
(d) <i>Labials</i>	ב, פ;
(e) <i>Sibilants</i>	צ, ש, ס, ז;
(f) <i>Sonants</i>	י, ו, ל, ר, נ, מ.

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-ℓ'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 ל	כ	ק	ג	כ
	Dental ד	ת	ט	ד	ת
	Labial ב	פ	—	ב	פ
2. Sibilants:	... ז	ש, ס	צ		
3. Sonants:	... ו, י	ל, ר	נ, מ		

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. ל and כ as palatals), consonants whose sound is of the same nature *homogeneous* (e.g. ו and י 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.  $\gamma = \tau$ ,  $\eta = \psi$ ,  $\upsilon = \nu$ ). Further transitions are not, however, excluded, as e.g. the interchange of  $\eta$  and  $\rho$  ( $\eta = \rho = \gamma$ ). 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 instances as they 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  $\upsilon$  '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  $\upsilon$  and  $\eta$  were pronounced merely as  $\kappa$ , and so in Ethiopic,  $\upsilon$  like  $\kappa$ ,  $\eta$  like  $h$ ,  $\psi$  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.  $\kappa$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\tau$  (as to  $\eta$ , cf. § 23 k), or those which are most frequently affected by the changes described in § 19 b–l, as again  $\kappa$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $\eta$ , and in certain cases  $\eta$  and  $\lambda$ ; finally the gutturals and  $\gamma$  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.  $\acute{e}$  by modification from  $i$  or  $\check{a}$ ; short  $\check{o}$  from  $\check{u}$ ;  $\acute{e}$  by contraction from *ai* (properly *ay*); and  $\acute{o}$  sometimes by modification (obscuring) from  $\acute{a}$ , sometimes by contraction from *au* (properly *aw*).<sup>1</sup>

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.  $\text{שׁוֹט}$  Arab. *sauṭ*, and  $\text{עֵינַי}$  Arab. 'ainain. It was only in later Arabic that they became in pronunciation  $\acute{e}$  and  $\acute{o}$ , at least after weaker or softer consonants; cf.  $\text{בַּיִן}$  Arab. *bain, bēn*,  $\text{יָאֻם}$  Arab. *yaum, yōm*. The same contraction appears also in other languages, e.g. in Greek and Latin ( $\theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha$ , Ionic  $\theta\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ ; *plaustrum = 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.).<sup>1</sup>

2. The partial expression of the vowels by certain consonants ( $\eta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\tau$ ;  $\kappa$ ), 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 stages<sup>2</sup>:—

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> In proper names the LXX often use the diphthongs  $\alpha\acute{i}$  and  $\alpha\acute{u}$  where the Hebrew form has  $\acute{e}$  or  $\acute{o}$ . It is, however, very doubtful whether the  $\alpha\acute{i}$  and  $\alpha\acute{u}$  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.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> 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*.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> 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 ה 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 ה"ל, the vowels  $\bar{a}$ ,<sup>3</sup>  $\bar{e}$ ,  $\hat{e}$ ). After the employment of ו as a vowel letter for  $\hat{o}$  and  $\hat{u}$ , and of י for  $\hat{e}$  and  $\hat{i}$ , 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 הו. But in the places where this הו with a preceding *a* is contracted into  $\hat{o}$  (after the rejection of the ה), we find the ה still frequently retained as a vowel letter, e.g. ה עיר ה, סוּת ה Gn 49:11, cf. § 91 e; so throughout the *Mêša* inscription ארצ'ה, בית'ה (also בת'ה), הלת'ה, קמ'ה, ל'ה, ב'ה, בנ'ה; on the other hand already in the Siloam inscription רעו ימה<sup>4</sup>. *Mêša*, 1.8 = רשיו *his days* is unusual, as also רשה 1. 20 if it is for ראשיו *his chiefs*. The verbal forms with ה suffixed are to be read וילפה (1. 6), וְאֶקְהֶבֶה (1. 12f.) and ויג'רשה (1. 19).

As an example of the original consonant being retained, we might also include the י of the constr. state plur. masc. if its  $\hat{e}$  (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  $\hat{e}$ , nor any other final vowel.<sup>1</sup>

(b) The employment of ו to denote  $\hat{o}$ ,  $\hat{u}$ , and of י to denote  $\hat{e}$ ,  $\hat{i}$ , may have resulted from those cases in which a ו with a preceding *a* was contracted into *au* and further to  $\hat{o}$ , or with a preceding *u* coalesced into  $\hat{u}$ , and where י with *a* has been contracted into *ai* and further to  $\hat{e}$ , or with a preceding *i* into  $\hat{i}$  (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 א also will in the first instance have established itself as a vowel letter only where a consonantal א with a preceding *a* had coalesced into  $\hat{a}$  or  $\bar{a}$ .

3<sup>3</sup> According to Stade, the employment of ה for  $\bar{a}$  probably took place first in the case of the locative accusatives which originally ended in ה ה, as ארצ'ה, ימג, קד'ימג.

4<sup>4</sup> The form רעו 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<sup>1</sup> Thus there occurs, e.g. in Melit. 1, 1. 3 שובן = שְׁנֵי בְנֵי *the two sons*; elsewhere כ for כִּי (but כִּי in the *Mêša* and Siloam inscr.), ז for זֶה (the latter in the Siloam inscr.), בנת = בְּנֵי (so *Mêša*) or בְּנֵי־תִי, &c. Cf. on the other hand in *Mêša*, אנכ = אנכי (unless it was actually pronounced *anôkh* by the Moabites!). As final  $\bar{a}$  is represented by ה and א and final  $\hat{i}$  by י, so final  $\hat{u}$  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 י) were not added in all cases. So Chwolson, 'Die Quiescentia הוּ 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 אַשׁ, אָצְבָּם, מִימֶן (or מִימָן); אַמֶּת, קֹל, שְׁלֹשׁ, צָר. On the other hand מוֹצָא (from *mauša*), עוֹר (from *aud*); מִימֶן also, if it is to be read מִימָן, is an instance of the retention of a י which has coalesced with *i* into *i*. Instances of the retention of an originally consonantal א as a vowel letter are ים, מוֹצָא, מֵאֵת ים, and קָרָא, as also אֵשׁ ר. Otherwise final *ā* is always represented by ה: אֵמָה, הֵיָה, זֹרָה, נִקְבָּה. To this י alone would form an exception (cf. however the note on יום, § 96), instead of יום (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, דִּיבֶן (= *Daibōn*, as the Δαἰβών of the LXX proves), חוֹרֶן (ὄ from *au*), and הֵ בֵית (ê from *ai*), but also even הֵשְׁעֵנִי<sup>2</sup> instead of הוֹשְׁעֵנִי (from *haus-*), וַאֲשֶׁב = אֵין אָן = אֵן, לֵילָה = לָלָה, for בֵּית הֵ and בֵּית הֵ (from *bait*); אֵן אָן = אֵן אָן or אֵין אָן.

(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 ו to mark an *ō* or *û*, arising from contraction, and of י for *ê* or *i*, is by far the more common, while we seldom find an originally consonantal א 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 ים and ות) 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> הֵשְׁעֵנִי is the more strange since the name of king הוֹשֵׁעַ is represented as *A-u si* in cuneiform as late as 728 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> Thus e.g. קטל can be read *qāṭal*, *qāṭāl*, *qāṭōl*, *q<sup>e</sup>ṭōl*, *qōṭēl*, *qiṭṭēl*, *qaṭṭēl*, *quṭṭal*, *qēṭel*, and several of these forms have also different senses.

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

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.*<sup>3</sup>, 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. Punctuation*, 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

---

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> 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 *ā*, *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 Masorettes 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 *שֶׁבַע מְלָכִים* *seven kings* were reckoned (*vox memor.* in Elias Levita *מִן יִיאָרְוּ אֶלְיָהוּ*), *Šureq* 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 Masorettes (*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*, *ê*, *ô* when written *plene*) in a very great number of cases, since not only does ׀ stand, according to circumstances, for *ā* or *ā̄*, and ׀̄ for *ā* or *ā̄*, but also ׀̄̄ for *ē* or *ě*, and ׀̄̄̄ for *ō* or *õ*, e.g. *קָבֵד* and *קָטַן*, out of pause *kābēd*, *qā-ōn* (form *קָטַן*), but in pause *kābēd*, *qā-ōn*.

I readily admit, with regard to *Qameṣ* and *S̄gol*, 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. *עֵנַב* = *ēnab* or *בֹּרַחַב* = *bōrakh*, in spite of the analogy cited by Sievers (p. 18, note 1) that ‘in old German e.g. original *i* and *ū* often pass into *ě* 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.*

1. ֿ<sup>1</sup> *QāmēṢ* denotes either  $\bar{a}$ ,  $\hat{a}$ , more strictly  $\acute{a}$  (the obscure Swedish  $\acute{a}$ ) and  $\hat{a}$ <sup>2</sup> as  
 אֲ *yād* (hand), ראִשִׁים *rā'sîm* (heads), or  $\acute{a}$  (in future transcribed as  $\acute{o}$ ),  
 A called *QāmēṢ ḥāṭûph*, i. e. hurried QameṢ. The latter occurs almost  
 exclusively as a modification of  $\ddot{u}$ ; cf. c and § 9 u.

2. ֿ *Páthăḥ*,  $\check{a}$ , בַּת *băth* (daughter).

Also 3. ֿ *S<sup>e</sup>gól*, an open *e*,  $\hat{e}$  ( $\check{e}$  or  $\acute{e}$ ), as a modification of  $\check{a}$ ,<sup>1</sup> either in an untuned  
 closed syllable, as in the first syllable of אֲדָכְחֵם *yădkhêm* (your hand) from *yădhêm*—or  
 in a tone-syllable as in אֲפֶסַח *pěsaḥ*; cf.  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ , and on the really monosyllabic character  
 of such formations, see § 28 e. But *S<sup>e</sup>gól* in an open tone-syllable with a following  $\dot{y}$ ,  
 as in אֲלֶנָּה *g<sup>e</sup>lênā* (cf. § 75 f), אֲדֶכְחָה *yădêkhā* (cf. § 91 i), is due to contraction from *ay*.

### Second Class. I- and E-sounds.

1. יֿ *Hîrêq* with *yod*, almost always  $\hat{i}$ , as צַדִּיק *ṣaddîq* (righteous).

I 2. ֿ either  $\hat{i}$  (see below, i), as צַדִּיקִים *ṣaddîqîm*, only orthographically different from  
 צַדִּיקִים (צַדִּיקִים),—or  $\check{i}$ , as צִדְקוֹ *ṣîdqô* (his righteousness).

3. יֿ *Ṣerî* or *Ṣerê* with *yod*= $\hat{e}$ , e.g. בֵּיתוֹ *bêthô* (his house).

E ֿ either  $\hat{e}$ , but rarely (see below, i), or  $\bar{e}$  as שֵׁם *šēm* (name).

1<sup>1</sup> 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.), Pathah with *Holem*, the latter  
 suggesting the obscure pronunciation of *QameṢ* as  $\acute{a}$ . Cf. also Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p.  
 609.

2<sup>2</sup> Instead of the no doubt more accurate transcription  $\acute{a}$ □,  $\hat{a}$ □ we have retained  $\bar{a}$ ,  $\hat{a}$   
 in this grammar, as being typographically simpler and not liable to any  
 misunderstanding. For *QameṢ ḥāṭûph*, in the previous German edition expressed by  
 $\acute{a}$ □, we have, after careful consideration, returned to  $\acute{o}$ . The use of the same sign ֿ for  
 $\acute{a}$ □ ( $\hat{a}$ □) and  $\acute{a}$ □, 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 *QāmēṢ rāḥāh*, or broad QameṢ, and *QāmēṢ ḥatûph*,  
 or light QameṢ. It is quite impossible that in the living language an  $\bar{a}$  lengthened from  
 $\check{a}$ , as in *dābār*, should have been indistinguishable from e.g. the last vowel in אֲשֵׁר  
 or the first in אֲשֵׁרִים.—The notation  $\bar{a}$ ,  $\hat{e}$ ,  $\acute{o}$  expresses here the vowels essentially long,  
 either naturally or by contraction; the notation  $\bar{a}$ ,  $\bar{e}$ ,  $\acute{o}$  those lengthened only by the  
 tone, and therefore changeable;  $\check{a}$ ,  $\check{e}$ ,  $\check{o}$  the short vowels. As regards the others, the  
 distinction into *i* and  $\check{i}$ ,  $\ddot{u}$  and  $\check{u}$  is sufficient; see § 9.—The mark □ 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. אֲשֵׁר□.

1<sup>1</sup> These *S<sup>e</sup>gól*s, modified from  $\check{a}$ , 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.

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

4. ֿ S<sup>e</sup>gól, ă, a modification of i, e.g. הַפְּצִי ḥăfšî (ground-form ḥfš); -ֿ šän (ground-form šñ).

*Third Class. U- and O-sounds.*

1. ֿ Šûreiġ, usually ū, מוֹת mûth (to die), rarely ũ.

U 2. ֿ Qibbûš, either ũ, e.g. סֻלָּם sūllām (ladder): or ū, e.g. קוּמוּ qūmū (rise up), instead of the usual קוּמוּ.

3. ֿ and ֿ Hōlēm, ô and ô, קוֹל qôl (voice), רֹב rōbh (multitude). Often also a defective ֿ for ô; rarely ֿ for ô.

O On the question whether ֿ under some circumstances represents ǒ, see § 93 r.

4. ֿ On Qāmēs ḥāṭūph=ǒ, generally modified from ũ, as הֹק ḥōq (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 פִּתּוּחַ opening; צֶרֶת a wide parting (of the mouth), also פְּצוּחַ (=i) breaking, parting (cf. the Arab. *kasr*); חִטּוּחַ (also חִרְקַח) narrow opening; חִטּוּחַ closing, according to others *fullness*, i.e. of the mouth (also מְלֵא פִּי <sup>1</sup>fullness of the mouth). קָמֵץ <sup>2</sup> also denotes a slighter, as שׁוּרְקַח and קְבוּץ (also קְבוּץ פִּי) a firmer, compression or contraction of the mouth. S<sup>e</sup>gól (סְגוּל bunch of grapes) takes its name from its form. So שְׁלֵשׁ נִקְדוּת (three points) is another name for Qibbûš.

Moreover the names were mostly so formed (but only later), that the sound of each vowel is heard in the first syllable (קָמֵץ for קֵץ, פִּתּוּחַ for פְּתוּחַ, צֶרֶת for צֵרֶת); in order to carry this out consistently some even write Sägól, Qomeš-ḥaṭūf, Qübbûš.

2. As the above examples show, the vowel sign stands regularly *under* the consonant, *after* which it is to be pronounced, רָ rā, רֶ rā, רֵ rē, רֹ rō, &c. The *Pathah* called *furtivum* (§ 22 f) alone forms an exception to this rule, being pronounced *before* the consonant, רוּחַ rûḥ (wind, spirit). The *Hōlēm* (without *wāw*) stands on the left above the consonant; רֹ rō (but לֹ=lō). If א, as a vowel letter, follows a consonant which is to be pronounced with ô, the point is placed over its right arm, thus אֹ, but אֵ; e.g. אֶבֶן, since א here begins a syllable.

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

2 <sup>2</sup> The usual spelling קָמֵץ and פִּתּוּחַ takes the words certainly rightly as Hebrew substantives; according to De Lagarde (*Gött. gel. Anz.* 1886, p. 873, and so previously Luzzatto), קָמֵץ and פִּתּוּחַ are rather Aram. participles, like *Dageš*, &c., and consequently to be transliterated *Qamēs* and *Pâthah*.

No dot is used for the Hōlem when  $\bar{o}$  (of course without  $wāw$ ) is pronounced after  $\acute{s}n$  or before  $\acute{s}î\acute{n}$ . Hence שִׁנְאֵי  $\acute{s}ônē$  (hating), נָשָׂא  $n^e\acute{s}\bar{o}$  (to bear), מִשָּׂה  $m\acute{o}s\acute{e}$  (not מִשָּׂה); but שֹׁמֵר  $\acute{s}ômēr$  (a watchman). When  $\bar{o}$  precedes the  $\acute{s}in$ , the dot is placed over its right arm, e.g. יִרְפֹּס  $yirp\acute{o}s$  (he treads with the feet), הַנֹּשְׂאִים  $hann\acute{o}s^e\acute{i}m$  (those who carry).

In the sign  $\dot{\imath}$ , the  $\imath$  may also be a consonant. The  $\dot{\imath}$  is then either to be read  $\bar{o}w$  (necessarily so when a consonant otherwise without a vowel precedes, e.g. לֹוֶה  $\acute{l}\bar{o}w\acute{e}$ , lending) or  $w\bar{o}$ , when a vowel already precedes the  $\imath$ , e.g. אָוֹן  $\acute{a}w\acute{o}n$  (iniquity) for אָוִן. In more exact printing, a distinction is at least made between  $\dot{\imath}wo$  and  $\dot{\imath}$  (i.e. either  $\acute{o}$  or, when another vowel follows the  $wāw$ ,  $\acute{o}w^3$ ).

---

3

<sup>3</sup> Since 1846 we have become acquainted with a system of vocalization different in many respects from the common method. The vowel signs, all except  $\imath$ , are there placed *above* the consonants, and differ almost throughout in form, and some even as regards the sound which they denote: tone-bearing  $\acute{a}$  and  $\acute{e}$  and in an unsharpened syllable toneless  $\check{a}$  and  $\check{e}$ , and also Hāṭeph Pathaḥ; toneless  $\check{e}$  and Hāṭeph S<sup>e</sup>ghōl; and Hāṭeph 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* (בְּקִי בְּבָבֶלִי), as it is called, see A. Harkavy and H. L. Strack, *Katalog der hebr. Bibelhandschr. der Kaiserl. öffentl. Bibliothek zu St. Petersburg.*, St. Petersburg 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 Petropolititanus* (St. Petersburg, 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. Petersburg. 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  $\imath$ ). 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. Jahreshb. der ZDMG.* 1879, p. 124, established the probability that the

3. The vowels of the first class are, with the exception of יָ 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—

יָ may be combined with *Hîrêq*, *Šērê*, *S<sup>e</sup>gôl* (יָ, יָ, יָ).

י with *Šûrêq* and *Hôlêm* (י and י).<sup>1</sup>

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

4. The omission of the vowel letters when writing *i, û, ê, ô* is called *scriptio defectiva* in contrast to *scriptio plena*. קוֹל, קוֹם are written *plene*, ק'ל, ק'ם *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, ê, ê*, as well as for *è* in הָהּ &c. (§ 9 f), also generally with *â, â* (cf. however § 9 d), e.g. מַלְכֵי, נְדִי, קָטָלְתִּי, קָטְלוּ. (But the Masora requires in Jer 26:6, 44:8; Ezr 6:21; 2 Ch 32:13 גוֹיִ instead of גוֹיִי; Zp 2:9 גוֹיִ [perhaps an error due to the following י] for גוֹיִי; Is 40:31 וְקוֹיִ [followed by י] for וְקוֹיִי; Jer 38:11 בְּלוֹיִ for בְּלוֹיִי.) 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. גוֹיִם (*nations*) for גוֹיִים, מְצוֹת (*commandments*) for מְצוֹת.

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

vowels of the superlinear punctuation arose under *Arab* influence from the vowel letters יא (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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 נְבִיאִים; צָדִיק, but צְדִיקִים; קוֹל, but קוֹלֹת; הַיְהוֹשֻׁעַ, but הַיְהוֹשֻׁעִים.

(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. וָי, וֵי, יֵי, יִי, יָי, a diphthong (*au, ai*)<sup>2</sup> 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 ו and י (§ 5 b, note 2). Thus such words as וָי, יָי, גֹּי, עֹי, תֹי, בֹי are not to be pronounced according to the usual Jewish custom<sup>1</sup> as *vāv, hay, gôy, āsûy, gēv, bayith* (or even as *vaf, &c.*; cf. modern Greek *av af, ev ef* for αὐ, εὐ), but with the Italian Jews more like *wāu, hai, &c.* The sound of יֵי is the same as וָי, i.e. almost like *āu*, so that וָי is often written defectively for יֵי.

### § 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 *â* (in Arabic regularly written אָ), which is not readily shortened and never wholly dropped (§ 25 c), e.g. כְּתָב *k<sup>e</sup>thâbh* (writing); very seldom with a following א, as שְׂאֵר 2 S 12:1, 4 (see the examples in § 72 p).<sup>2</sup>

The writing of אָ Ho 10:14 for אָ would only be justifiable, if the *ā* of this form were to be explained as a contraction of *āā* cf. however § 72 a; אָ Neh 13:16 for אָ (*dāg*) is certainly incorrect.—The rarity of the *â* in Hebrew arises from the fact that it has for the most part become an obtuse *ô*; 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 *Mèthĕg*, see below), or just before or after it. This sound is invariably lengthened from an original *ǎ*,<sup>3</sup> and is found in open syllables, i.e. syllables ending in a vowel (§ 26 b),

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

<sup>1</sup> In MSS. ו and י, in such combinations as וָי, יָי, are even marked with Mappiq (§ 14 a).

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> In Arabic this *ǎ* is always retained in an open syllable.

e.g. לָךְ, קָטַל, יָקוּם, אָסִיר (Arab. *lākā, qātālā, yaqūmū, āsirū*), as well as in closed syllables, i.e. those ending in a consonant, as יָד, כּוֹכַב (vulgar Arab. *yād, kaukāb*). In a closed syllable, however, it can only stand when this has the tone, רָדַךְ, עוֹלָם; whereas in an open syllable it is especially frequent *before* the tone, e.g. רָדַךְ, יָקוּם, לָךְ. 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 *ă* (*Pathah*) is retained in a closed syllable, while in an open syllable it becomes *Š<sup>e</sup>wa* (§ 27 i): מְדַבֵּר, constr. state מְדַבֵּר (ḥ<sup>h</sup>khām); דְּבַר, דְּבַר (*d<sup>e</sup>bhār*); קָטַל, קָטַל. For examples of the retention, in the secondary tone-syllable, of *ā* lengthened from *ă*, see § 93 xx.

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

On תָּ for *ō* see below, f.

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

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

3. *S<sup>e</sup>gôl* (*ě, è* [*ā*]) 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. יָדַכְּ (for *yadkhèm*), or with the tone, e.g. אָרַץ from *'arṣ*, אָרַץ Arab. *qārn*, אָמַח Arab. *qāmḥ*. This *S<sup>e</sup>gôl* is often retained even in the strongest tone-syllable, at the end of a sentence or of an important clause (in *pause*), as מָלַךְ, מָלַךְ, מָלַךְ (*mālākh, sādāq*). As a rule, however, in such cases the *Pathah* which underlies the *S<sup>e</sup>gôl* is lengthened into *Qumeṣ*, e.g. מָלַךְ, מָלַךְ. A *S<sup>e</sup>gôl* apparently lengthened from *Š<sup>e</sup>wa*, but in reality traceable to an original *ă*, stands in pausal forms, as פָּרַי (ground-form *pāry*), יָהִי (*yāhy*), &c. On the cases where a י (originally consonantal) follows this *S<sup>e</sup>gôl*, see § 75 f, and § 91 k.

#### *Second Class. I- and E-sounds.*

4. The long *i* is frequently even in the consonantal writing indicated by י (a *fully* written *Hireq* יָ); but a naturally long *i* can be also written *defectively* (§ 8 i), e.g. צַדִּיק (righteous), plur. צַדִּיקִים *ṣaddîqîm*; יִירָא (he fears), plur. יִירָאוּ. 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 אָרַיְ from the *Metheg* attached to it (§ 16 f).

5. The *short Hireq* (always<sup>1</sup> written *defectively*) is especially frequent in sharpened syllables (אָמִי, קָטֹל) and in toneless closed syllables (מְזֹמֹר *psalm*); cf. however אָרַיְ in a closed tone-syllable, and even אָרַיְ, with a helping S<sup>e</sup>gôl, for *wayyiphn*. It has arisen very frequently by attenuation from *ǎ*, as in אָרַיְ from original *dābārê*, אָרַיְ (ground-form *šādāq*),<sup>2</sup> or else it is the original *i*, which in the tone-syllable had become *ē*, as in אָרַיְ (thy enemy) from אָרַיְ (ground-form *'āyīb*)<sup>3</sup> It is sometimes a simple helping vowel, as in אָרַיְ, § 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* אָרַיְ (more rarely defective אָרַיְ, e.g. אָרַיְ for אָרַיְ Is 3:8; at the end of a word also אָרַיְ) is as a rule contracted from אָרַיְ *ay* (*ai*), § 7 a, e.g. אָרַיְ (*palace*), Arab. and Syriac *haikal*.

7. The *Şere* 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. אָרַיְ (ground-form *sīphr*) *book*, אָרַיְ (Arab. *siñāt*) *sleep*, or with *Metheg* (see § 16 d, f) in the secondary tone-syllable, e.g. אָרַיְ *my request*, אָרַיְ *let us go*. On the other hand in a closed syllable it is almost always with the tone, as אָרַיְ *son*, אָרַיְ *dumb*.

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

8. The S<sup>e</sup>gôl of the I(E)-class is most frequently an *ě* modified from original *i*, either replacing a tone-long *ē* which has lost the tone, e.g. אָרַיְ from אָרַיְ (*give*), אָרַיְ (thy creator) from אָרַיְ, or in the case discussed in § 93 o, אָרַיְ from the ground-forms *hīlq*, 'izr; cf. also § 64 f. S<sup>e</sup>gôl appears as a simple helping-vowel in cases such as אָרַיְ for *siph*r, אָרַיְ for *yigl* (§ 28 e).

### *Third Class. U- and O-sounds.*

9. For the U-sound there is—

1<sup>1</sup> At least according to the Masoretic orthography; cf. Wellhausen, *Text der Bb. Sam.*, p. 18, Rem.

2<sup>2</sup> Jerome (cf. Siegfried, *ZAW*. 1884, p. 77) in these cases often gives *ǎ* for אָרַיְ.

3<sup>3</sup> Cf. the remarks of I. Guidi, 'La pronuncia del *šērē*,' 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 *û*, either (a) written fully, ו *Šureq*, e.g. גְּבוּל (*boundary*), or (b) defectively written ׀ *Qibbûš* גְּבוּלוֹ, מִתּוֹן;

(2) the short *ũ*, mostly represented by *Qibbûš*, in a toneless closed syllable and especially common in a sharpened syllable, in e.g. שֵׁלֶחַן (*table*), בֹּתֵךְ (*booth*).

Sometimes also *ũ* in a sharpened syllable is written ו, e.g. הַפֶּה Ps 102:5, יוֹדֵךְ Jb 5:7, כּוֹלֵם Jer. 31:34, מְשׁוֹכְתוֹ Is 5:5, עֲרוּמִים Gn 2:25 for הֶכֶה, &c.

For this *u* the LXX write *o*, e.g. וְעָדְלָם Ὀδολλάμ, from which, however, it only follows, that this *ũ* was pronounced somewhat indistinctly. The LXX also express the sharp *ħireq* by *ε*, e.g. אֶמֶר Ἐμμήρ. The pronunciation of the *Qibbûš* 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 Palestine<sup>1</sup>; 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; ו (*Holem plenum*), e.g. שׁוֹט (*a whip*), Arab. *sauṭ*, עוֹלָה (*iniquity*) from עוֹלָה. More rarely *defectively*, as שׁוֹר (*thine ox*) from שׁוֹר Arab. *ṭaur*.

(2) The long *ô* which arose in Hebrew at an early period, by a general process of obscuring, out of an original *â*,<sup>2</sup> 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. קָטֹל Arab. *qâtīl*. Aram. *qâṭēl*, אֵלוֹהַּ Arab. *ʾilāh*, Aram. *ʿlāh*, plur. אֵלֵהִים; שׁוֹק (*leg*), Arab. *sāq*; גְּבוּר (*hero*), Arab. *gābbār*; הוֹתֵם (*seal*), Arab. *ḥātām*; רְמוֹן (*pomegranate*), Arab. *rūmmān*; שְׁלֹטוֹן (*dominion*), Aram. שְׁלֹטָן and שְׁלֹטָן Arab. *sūlṭān*; שְׁלוֹם (*peace*), Aram. שְׁלָם, Arab. *sālām*. Sometimes the form in *â* also occurs side by side with that in *ô* as שְׁרָיִן and שְׁרִיֹן (*coat of mail*; see however § 29 u). Cf. also § 68 b.

(3) The tone-long *ō* which is lengthened from an original *ũ*, or from an *ō* arising from *ũ*, 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. קִדְּוֹ (ground-form *quḏ*) *sanctuary*; בֹּרַךְ for *burrakh*, יְקֹטֵן Ps 104:28, as well as (with *Metheg*) in the secondary tone-syllable; אֶהְיֶה. But the original *ō* (*ũ*) is retained in a toneless closed syllable, whereas in a toneless open syllable it is weakened to *Šwa*. Cf. לֹּ all, but כֹּל (*ko*□*l*), כֹּלָם (*kūllām*); יְקֹטֵן, יְקֹטֵן and יְקֹטֵלוֹ, where original *ũ* is weakened to *Šwa*: *yiqṭlū*, Arab. *yaqtūlū*. This tone-long *ō* is only as an exception written fully.

(4) ׀ *Qameš-ħaṭuph* represents *ō* (properly *ā*, cf. § 8 a, note 2) modified from *ũ* and is therefore classed here. It stands in the same relation to *Holem* as the *S<sup>e</sup>gōl* of the second class to *Sere*, כֹּל *kōl*, וַיִּקְרָא *wayyāqōm*. On the distinction between this and *Qameš*, see below, u.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Delitzsch, *Physiologie u. Musik*, Lpz. 1868, p. 15 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above, b, end. On Jerome's transliteration of *o* for *ā*, 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 <i>ā</i> (Arabic א ◌̄).	◌̄ <i>ē</i> , from original <i>ay</i> ( <i>ai</i> ).	◌̄ <i>ō</i> , from original <i>aw</i> ( <i>au</i> ).
	◌̄ or ◌̄ long <i>i</i> ˆ.	◌̄ or ◌̄ <i>ō</i> obscured from <i>ā</i> .
		◌̄ or ◌̄ <i>ū</i>
◌̄ tone-long <i>ā</i> (from original <i>ā</i> ) chiefly in the tone-syllable but also just before it.	◌̄ tone-long <i>ē</i> (from <i>i</i> ˆ generally in the tone-syllable but also just before it.	◌̄ tone-long <i>ō</i> (from original <i>ū</i> in the tone-syllable, otherwise in an open syllable.
◌̄ (as a modification of <i>ā</i> ) sometimes a tone-long <i>ē</i> , sometime <i>ě</i>	◌̄ <i>ě</i>  ◌̄ short <i>i</i> ˆ	◌̄ <i>ō</i> , modified from <i>ū</i>  ◌̄ short <i>ū</i> , especially in a sharpened syllable.
◌̄ short <i>ā</i>	Utmost weakening to ◌̄ <sup>a</sup> , ◌̄ <sup>ē</sup> , or ◌̄ <sup>e</sup> .	Utmost weakening to ◌̄ <sup>a</sup> , ◌̄ <sup>ē</sup> , ◌̄ <sup>o</sup> , or ◌̄ <sup>e</sup> .
◌̄ <i>i</i> ˆ attenuated from <i>ā</i> ; see <b>h</b> .		
Utmost weakening to ◌̄ <sup>a</sup> , ◌̄ <sup>ē</sup> , ◌̄ <sup>e</sup> .		

Rem. *On the distinction between Qameṣ and Qameṣ-ḥaṭuph.*<sup>1</sup>

According to § 8 a, long *ā* or *ā*<sup>o</sup> (*Qameṣ*) and short *ō* or *ā*<sup>v</sup> (*Qameṣ-ḥaṭuph*) are in manuscripts and printed texts generally expressed by the same sign (◌̄), e.g. קָמֶץ *qām*, כֹּלֶךְ *kōl*. 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 ◌̄<sup>1</sup> is *ō* in a toneless closed syllable, since such a syllable can have only a short vowel (§ 26 o). The above case occurs—

(a) When *Ṣewā* follows as a syllable-divider, as in חֵכֶם *ḥōkh-mā* (wisdom), אֶלֶם *’ōkh-lā* (food). With *Metheg* ◌̄ is *ā* (*ā*<sup>v</sup>) and according to the usual view stands in an open syllable with a following *Ṣewā* mobile, e.g. אָכַלָּה *’ā-kh<sup>e</sup>lā* (she ate); but cf. § 16 i.

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

<sup>1</sup> In the Babylonian punctuation (§ 8 g, note) *ā* and *ō* are carefully distinguished. So also in many MSS with the ordinary punctuation and in Baer's editions of the text since 1880, in which ◌̄<sup>v</sup> is used for *ō* 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 ◌̄<sup>v</sup> for ◌̄ is misleading.

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

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

In Ps 35:10 and Pr 19:7 *Maqqēph* with לֵךְ is replaced by a conjunctive accent (*Mer<sup>e</sup>kha*); so by *Darga*, Ju 19:5 with וַיִּצְדַּק, and Ez 37:8 with וַיִּקְרָם (so Baer after Qimḥi; ed. Mant., Ginsburg, Kittel ויקרם).

(d) In a closed final syllable without the tone, e.g. וַיִּשְׂטָן *wayyáqōm* (and he stood up).—In the cases where *â* or *ā* in the final syllable has become toneless through *Maqqēph* (§ 16 a) and yet remains, e.g. בְּהַדְרָתָם Est 4:8, וַיִּשְׁתַּלְּחֵם Gn 4:25, it has a *Metheg* in correct manuscripts and printed texts.

In cases like הַלְּמָה לָמָּה, the tone shows that ם is to be read as *ā*.

2. The cases in which ם appears to stand in an open syllable and yet is to be read as *ō* require special consideration. This is the case, (a) when *Haṭeph-Qameš* follows, e.g. הַעֲלֵנוּ *his work*, or simple vocal *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*, e.g. רָבִיבָה *ox goad*; בְּרֹבֵץ Jo 4:7; וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ (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); *Haṭeph-Pathah* follows in לִמְשֵׁךְ (so Ginsburg; Baer לִמְשֵׁךְ) 1 S 15:1, לְהַרְגֵם 24:11, and לְפָגְשֵׁךְ (so Baer, Gn 32:18, others לְפָגְשֵׁךְ); (b) before another *Qameš-ḥaṭuph*, e.g. הַעֲלֵנוּ *thy work*; on אֲרָה־לִי and אֲרָה־לִי Nu 23:7, see § 67 o; (c) in the two plural forms הַמְּשֵׁכִים *sanctuaries* and הַשְּׂרָפִים *roots* (also written 'קד and 'שר). In all these cases the Jewish grammarians regard the *Metheg* accompanying the ם as indicating a *Qāmeš raḥabh* (broad *Qameš*) and therefore read the ם as *ā*; thus *pā-<sup>o</sup>lō*, *dā-r<sup>e</sup>bān*, *pā-ōl<sup>e</sup>khā*, *qā-dāš<sup>im</sup>*. 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 הַעֲלֵנוּ &c., § 93 q. As a matter of fact, however, we ought no doubt to divide and read *p<sup>o</sup>-lō* (for *p-lō*), *pō-<sup>e</sup>lkhā*, *qōdā-šim*.—Quite as inconceivable is it for *Metheg* to be a sign of the lengthening into *ā* in הַיָּמִים (Ex 11:8), although it is so in הַיָּמִים *bā-<sup>o</sup>ni* (in the navy), since here the *ā* of the article appears under the ב.

### § 10. The Half Vowels and the Syllable Divider (*Š<sup>e</sup>wā*).

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 *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*. Under some circumstances, however, the original short vowel may reappear.

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

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

The vocal *Šēwâ* 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 לִּטְּלָהּ *qē tōl* (to kill), מִמְלֵא *mē mallē* (filling), or (b) in the middle of the word, as הִלְלָהּ *qō-šlā*, יִיקְלֵל *yiq-šlū*.

In former editions of this Grammar *Šēwâ* was distinguished as *medium* when it followed a short vowel and therefore stood in a supposed 'loosely closed' or 'wavering' syllable, as in מִלְּבִי. 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<sup>e</sup>gadh<sup>e</sup>phath 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 אֶזְרָא (from אֶזְרָא), אֶזְרָא (from אֶזְרָא) the dropping of the *Dageš forte* shows that the original vowel is completely lost.

The sound *ě* has been adopted as the normal transcription of simple *Šēwâ 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, ἡλιούα, more frequently by α, Σαμουήλ, but very frequently by assimilating its indeterminate sound to the following principal vowel, e.g. Σόδομα, Σολομών (as well as Σαλωμών), Σαβαώθ, Ναθαναήλ.<sup>1</sup> A similar account of the pronunciation of *Šēwâ* is given by Jewish grammarians of the middle ages.<sup>2</sup>

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

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

<sup>1</sup> The same occurs frequently also in the Greek and Latin transcriptions of Phoenician words, e.g. מַלָּגָה *Malaga*, גּוּבּוּלִים *gubulim* (Schröder, *Die phöniz. Spr.*, p. 139 ff.). Cf. the Latin augment in *momordi*, *pupugi*, with the Greek in τέτοφα, τετομμένοσ, and the old form *memordi*.

<sup>2</sup> 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 *Šaḥoth*, 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 *Šēwâ mobile*: so too the *Dikduks ha-šeamim*, ed. by Baer and Strack, Lpz. 1879, p. 12 ff. Cf. also Schreiner, *ZAW*. vi. 236 ff.

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

(⸀) *Ḥāṭēph-Páthăḥ*, e.g. מֹר ḥmôr, ass.

(⸁) *Ḥāṭēph-Ṣēgôl*, e.g. מֹר ḥmôr, to say.

(⸂) *Ḥāṭēph-Qāmēš*, e.g. לִי ḥli, sickness.

These *Ḥāṭēphs*, or at least the first two, stand especially under the four guttural letters (§ 22 1), instead of a *simple Šwā mobile*, since these letters by their nature require a more definite vowel than the indeterminate *simple Šwā mobile*. Accordingly a guttural at the beginning of a syllable, where the *Šwā* is necessarily vocal, can never have a mere *Šwā simplex*.

On ⸀ the shorter *Ḥāṭef* as compared with ⸁ cf. § 27 v.

Rem. A. Only ⸀ and ⸁ occur under letters which are not gutturals. *Ḥāṭēph-Pathaḥ* is found instead of *simple Šwā* (especially *Šwā mobile*), chiefly (*a*) under strengthened consonants, since this strengthening (commonly called doubling) causes a more distinct pronunciation of the *Šwā mobile*, שְׁבָרִים *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, *Intro.*, p. 466; cf. Foote, *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars*, June 1903, p. 71 f.), the *Ḥāṭēph* is *necessary*<sup>1</sup> when, in a strengthened *medial* consonant with *Šwā* (consequently not in cases like וְיָהִי, &c.), preceded by a *Pathaḥ*, the sign of the strengthening (*Dageš forte*) has fallen away, e.g. לְלוּ (but ed. Mant. and Ginsb. לְלוּ *praise ye!* וְתִאָּזְעָהוּ Ju 16:16; no less universally, where after a consonant with *Šwā* the same consonant follows (to separate them more sharply, and hence with a *Metheg* always preceding), e.g. סוֹרְרִים Ps 68:9; קָלָלְתָּךְ (ed. Mant. and Ginsb. קָלָלְתָּ Gn 27:13 (but not without exceptions, e.g. הִקָּקִי Ju 5:15, Is 10:1; צָלָלְתָּ Jer 6:4, and so always הִנְגִּי *behold me*, הִנְנוּ *behold us*; on ך before the suffix ך, see § 20 b); also in certain forms under *Kaph* and *Rēš* after a long vowel and before the tone, e.g. תִּאָּבֶּה Gn 3:17; רָכִי Ps 103:1; וְתִשָּׁבֶתְהוּ 1 K 1:4 (but וְיִתְקַבְּרוּ Ps 72:17, cf. Jer 4:2, 1 Ch 29:20, because the tone is thrown back on to the *ā*. After *ē Šwā* remains even before the tone, as בִּרְכוּ &c.; but before *Maqqef* לְכֹהֵנִים Baer Ex 4:18, 2 S 15:7 Jer 40:15, but ed. Mant., Jabl., Ginsb. לְכֹהֵנִים<sup>2</sup>; (*b*) under initial sibilants after ו copulative, e.g. וְזָהב Gn 2:12; cf. Jer 48:20; וְסִחָר Is 45:14; וְשָׂדֵה Lv 25:34; וְשָׂקָה Gn 27:26; וְשָׂמַע 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 *Šwā*. For the same reason under the emphatic ט in הוֹטְלוּ Jer 22:28; cf. Jb 33:25; after *Qôph* in וְקָדְרָתִי (so Baer, but ed. Mant., Jabl., Ginsb. וְקָרָבִי Ps 55:22; cf. Jer. 32:9; under *Rēš* in וְרָדָה (ed. Mant. אֲרָרָה). Gn 18:21; וְרָעַם Ps 28:9; even under ת Eze 26:21; under ב Est 2:8; וְבִרְכָה so Jabl., Ginsb., but ed. Mant. וְבִרְכָה Dt 24:13; (*c*) under sonants, sibilants or *Qôph* after *i*, e.g. וְצָחַק Gn 21:6, cf. 30:38 and Ez 21:28 (under ק) אֲמָרוּת Ps 12:7; וְהִתְמַלֵּךְ Jer 22:15; וְגִרוּת Jos 11:2;

<sup>1</sup> See Delitzsch, 'Bemerkungen über masoretisch treue Darstellung des Alttestam. Textes,' in the *Ztschr. f. luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, vol. xxiv. 1863, p. 409 ff.

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

־Ps 74:5, —for the same reason as the cases under *b*<sup>3</sup>; according to Baer also in פְּמוֹת 1 S 30:28; שָׁךְ, Gn 32:18 after *ō* (cf. § 9 v), as well as after *a* in הַקְּשִׁיבָה Dn 9:19; הַבְּרִכָּה Gn 27:38; הַמְצֵא רְעִים 2 K 7:8.

**B.** The *Ḥateph-Qameṣ* is less restricted to the gutturals than the first two, and stands more frequently for a simple *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā mobile* when an original O-sound requires to be partly preserved, e.g. at the beginning, in רָאִי (ground-form *rōy*) *vision* (cf. § 93 z); בְּנִיָּהוּ 2 Ch 31:12, &c., *Q<sup>e</sup>rē* (*K<sup>e</sup>eth*. "כּוּנִי"); עַמּוֹנִיּוֹת *Ammonitish women*, 1 K 11:1 (sing. עַמּוֹנִית); יִרְדְּפֶךָ for the usual יִרְדְּפֶךָ Ez 35:6, from יִרְדֵּךָ; תִּקְבֶּנּוּ Nu 23:25, Jer 31:33, and elsewhere before suffixes, cf. § 60 a; קִדְקָדוֹ *his pate* (from קִדְקָדָה) Ps 7:17, &c.; אֶשְׁקָטָה Is 18:4 *Q<sup>e</sup>rē*. Further, like ׀, it stands under consonants, which ought to have *Dageš forte*, as in לִקְחָהּ Gn 2:23. In this example, as in וְסָעָה 1 K 13:7; וְסָעָה 2 K 7:18; and וְצָעָה Jer 22:20, the *Ḥateph-Qameṣ* is no doubt due to the influence of the following guttural as well as of the preceding U-sound. (Elsewhere indeed after ו in similar cases *Ḥateph-Pathah* is preferred, see above, **b**; but with לִקְחָהּ cf. also סָבְלוֹ Is 9:3, 10:27, 14:25, where the U-sound must necessarily be admitted to have an influence on the *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā* immediately following.) In וְטָהֲרָה (û-*ḥōr*) Jb 17:9 it is also influenced by the following O-sound. In קָטְמִי 1 S 28:8 *Q<sup>e</sup>rē*, the original form is קָטְמִי, where again the *ō* represents an *ō*. It is only through the influence of a following guttural that we can explain the forms נִקְרָאָה Est 2:14; נִבְרָהּ Pr 28:22; נִטְרָהּ Jer 49:7; נִאֲשָׁמְעָה Is 27:4; נִאֲשָׁמְעָה Dn 8:13; נִשְׁמָעָה Ps 39:13; נִסְעָה 2 K 2:1 (Baer's ed. also in ver. 11); הִקְהָתִים 2 Ch 34:12 (ed. Mant., Opius, &c. הִקְהָתִים). Finally in most of the examples which have been adduced, the influence of an emphatic sound (ק, ט, cf. also אֶלְקָטָה Ru 2:2, 7), or of a sibilant is also to be taken into account.

**3.** The sign of the *simple Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā ׀* serves also as a mere syllable divider. In this case it is disregarded in pronunciation and is called *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā 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 ׀* (to distinguish it better from final ו), e.g. מֶלֶךְ *king*, and in the less frequent case, where a word ends with a mute after another vowelless consonant as in נָרַדְךָ *nard*, תָּאֲתָ *thou fem.* (for 'ant), תָּאֲמַלְתָּ *thou fem. hast killed*, וַיִּשְׁקָהּ *and he watered*, וַיִּשָּׂבֶךָ *and he took captive*, אַל-תִּשְׁתֵּהּ *drink thou not*; but וַיִּרְאָהּ.<sup>1</sup>

However, in the examples where a mute closes the syllable, the final *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā* comes somewhat nearer to a vocal *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā*, especially as in almost all the cases a weakening era final vowel has taken place, viz. אַתְּ □ *att<sup>e</sup>* from אַתִּי *att<sup>e</sup>* (*anti*), קָטְמִלְתָּ from קָטְמִי (cf. in this form, the 2nd sing. fern. perf. Qal, even בָּאֵת, after a vowel, Gn 16:8, Mi 4:10, &c., according to the readings of Baer), וַיִּשְׁבֶּהּ *yišb<sup>e</sup>* from וַיִּשְׁבֶּהּ, &c. The Arabic actually has a short vowel in analogous forms. In נִרְדֶּךָ borrowed from the Indian, as also in קֹשֶׁף (qōš<sup>ḥ</sup>) Pr 22:21; and in אֶל-תּוֹסְרָה *ne addas* (for which we should expect תּוֹסְרָה) Pr 30:6 the final mute of itself attracts a slight vowel sound.

Rem. The proper distinction between *simple Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā mobile* and *quiescens* depends on a correct understanding of the formation of syllables (§ 26). The beginner may observe for the present, that (1) *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā* is always *mobile* (*a*) at the beginning of a word (except in שְׁתִּי, שְׁתִּי § 97 b, note); (b) under a consonant with *Dageš forte*, e.g. גִּיד-דְּפִי *gid-d<sup>e</sup>phū*; (c) after another *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā*, e.g. יִקְלִלְךָ *yiq<sup>l</sup>lū* (except at the end of the word, see above, **i**). (2) *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā* is *quiescens* (*a*) at the end of a word, also in the ׀; (b) before another *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā*.

<sup>3</sup> Ben-Asher requires ׀ for ׀ (even for *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā quiescens*) generally before a guttural or ר; hence Baer reads in 2 S, 15:5 בְּקִרְבִּי, Ps 18:7 קָרָא; אָ, 49:15 לִשְׂאוֹל; 65:5 בָּחַר; 68:24 תִּמְחָזֵן; Pr 30:17 תִּלְעַג, Jb 29:25 בָּחַר; אָ, cf. Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 12:7, note.

<sup>1</sup> On יתְ as an ending of the 2nd sing. fern. perf. Qal of verbs לִי, 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  $\dot{\text{w}}$  and  $\dot{\text{v}}$ , 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) *Mappiḳ*, a sign to bring out the full consonantal value of letters which otherwise serve as vowel letters (§ 7 b), especially in the case of  $\eta$  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,<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> denotes, according to § 11, (a) the *strengthening*<sup>3</sup> of a consonant (*Dageš forte*), e.g.  $\dot{\text{q}}\dot{\text{i}}\dot{\text{t}}\dot{\text{t}}\dot{\text{e}}\dot{\text{l}}$  (§ 20); or (b) the *harder* pronunciation of the letters  $\dot{\text{p}}\dot{\text{t}}\dot{\text{t}}\dot{\text{e}}$  (*Dageš lene*). For a variety of the latter, now rarely used in our printed texts, see § 13 c.

The root  $\dot{\text{w}}\dot{\text{g}}\dot{\text{t}}$  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  $\dot{\text{w}}\dot{\text{g}}\dot{\text{t}}$  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.  $\dot{\text{w}}\dot{\text{g}}\dot{\text{t}}$  *acuens (literam)* would then be a sign of sharpening and hardening (like *Mappiḳ*  $\dot{\text{p}}\dot{\text{r}}\dot{\text{f}}\dot{\text{e}}$  *proferens*, as *signum prolotionis*), for which purposes a *prick* of the *pen*, or *puncture*, was selected. The opposite of *Dageš* is  $\dot{\text{p}}\dot{\text{r}}\dot{\text{f}}\dot{\text{e}}$  *soft*, § 14 e, and § 22 n.

2. In grammar *Dageš*  $\square$  *forte*, the *sign of strengthening*, is the more important. It may be compared to the *sicilicus* of the Latins (*Lucul*  $\square$  *us* 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.

---

1 <sup>1</sup> 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.

2 <sup>2</sup> *Wāw* with *Dageš* ( $\dot{\text{v}}$ ) cannot in our printed texts be distinguished from a *wāw* pointed as *Šūrēq* ( $\dot{\text{v}}$ ); in the latter case the point should stand higher up. The  $\dot{\text{v}}$  *û* is, however, easily to be recognized since it cannot take a vowel before or under it.

3 <sup>3</sup> 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 בְּגִדְקָפֶת letters (§ 6 n) as a sign that they should be pronounced with their original hard sound (without aspiration), e.g. מֶלֶךְ *mèlèkh*, but מַלְכוֹ *mal-kô*; תָּפַר *tāphār*, but יִתְּפֹר *yith-pōr*; שָׁתָה *šāthā*, but יִשְׁתֶּה *yis-tè*.

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*, רַבִּים *rabbîm* must be *forte*, but in יְגִדָּל *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 *Ḥaṭefs* discussed in § 10 g. It is inserted in consonants other than the *B<sup>e</sup>gadk<sup>e</sup>phath* to call attention expressly to the beginning of a new syllable: (a) when the same consonant precedes in close connexion, e.g. בְּכֹל־לִבִּי Ps 9:2, where, owing to the *Dageš*, the coalescing of the two *Lameds* is avoided; (b) in cases like מַחְסֵי Ps 62:8 = *maḥ-si* (not *māḥ<sup>f</sup>-si*); (c) according to some (including Baer; not in ed. Mant.) in אֵל in the combination אֵלֹ Dt 32:5, or אֵלֹ Hb 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 orthophonikum* 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<sup>e</sup>gadk<sup>e</sup>phath*, the strengthening necessarily excludes its aspiration, e.g. אֲפִי, from אֲפִי.

### § 14. Mappîq and Rāphè.

1. *Mappîq*, like *Dageš*, also a point *within* the consonant, serves in the letters א ה ו י 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 ה at the end of words (since ה can never be a vowel letter in the middle of a word), e.g. גָּבְהָה *gābháh* (to be high), אֶרְצָה *arṣāh* (her land) which has a consonantal ending (shortened from *-hā*), different from אֶרְצָה *arṣā* (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 ה has lost its consonantal character (the *Mappîq* of course disappearing too), so that it remains only as a vowel letter; cf. § 91 e on the 3rd fem. sing.

The name מַפְיֵק 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 *Rāphè* (see e) is the opposite of both.

2. In MSS. Mappîq is also found with א, ו, י, to mark them expressly as consonants, e.g. גִּי (gôy), קָו (qāw, qōu), for which י is also used, as צִוּן, &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 אָ), Gn 43:26, Lv 23:17, Ezr 8:18 and Jb 33:21 (אָ; 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. *Rāphè* (רַפֵּה 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 בגדכפת letter has either *Dageš lene* or *Rāphè*, e.g. מֶלֶךְ *mèlèkh*, וְשֵׁה תִפֹּרֶר. In modern editions (except Ginsburg’s 1st ed.) *Rāphè* 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, משפטי הטעמים [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 früh-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 הא"ם (see below, *h*), S. Beer, תורת אמת [Accental Laws of the Books אמ"ת], Rödelheim, 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 אמ"ת [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

---

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

reading to chanting or singing. The accents then served as a kind of musical notes.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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. מְלִרָע i.e. accented below<sup>3</sup>), e.g. לְקָטַל *qāṭāl*; a word which has the tone on the penultima is *Milél* (Aram. מְלִעֵיל, accented above), e.g. מְלֵכָה *mèlēkh*. Besides this, in many cases a *secondary tone* is indicated in the word by *Mèthëg* (cf. § 16). Examples such as יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה Is 50:8 (cf. 40:18, Ex 15:8, Jb 12:15, La 2:16) are regarded by the Jewish grammarians as even *proparoxytone*.<sup>4</sup>

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 כ"א 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*, אֶמְצָא, from the initial consonants of the names, תהלים Psalms, מְשָׁלִי Proverbs, אֵיּוֹב Job, or more correctly, according to their original sequence, תא"ם (תא"ם *twin*), so that אֶמְצָא תא"ם means the accents (sing. אֶמְצָא) 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, 1).

#### DISJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (*Distinctivi* OR *Domini*).<sup>1</sup>

1 <sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>2</sup> 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. *Athnâh* 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 <sup>3</sup> 'Above' in this sense means what comes before, 'below' is what comes after; cf. Bacher, *ZAW.* 1907, p. 285 f.

4 <sup>4</sup> Cf. Delitzsch on Is 40:18.

1 <sup>1</sup> All the disjunctives occur in Is 39:2.—The earlier Jewish accentuologists already distinguish between מְלִכִּים *Reges* and מְשָׁרְתִים *servi*. The division of the disjunctive accents into Imperatores, Reges, Duces, Comites, which became common amongst

1. (־) סִלּוּק Sillûq (*end*) always with the tone-syllable of the last word before Sôph pāsûq (:), the verse-divider, e.g. : ׀־רָאָהּ.
2. (־) אֲתַנְּחָה Athnâḥ or אֲתַנְּחָתָה Athnaḥtâ (*rest*), the principal divider within the verse.
- 3 a. (־) אֲתַגְּלִתָּה S<sup>c</sup>gôltâ, *postpositive*, marks the fourth or fifth subordinate division, counting backwards from Athnâḥ (e.g. Gn 1:7, 28).
- 3 b. (|־) שְׁלִשְׁלֵת Šalšèleth (i.e. *chain*), as disjunctive, or Great Šalšèleth, distinguished by the following stroke<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>a</sup>, 6, 13, 9), and the highest (3<sup>b</sup>, 11, 12, 10); cf. Wickes, כ"ט p. 12 ff.—The name אֲתַגְּלִתָּה (later=*accents* in general) was originally restricted to the disjunctives, see Kahle, 1. c., p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> This stroke is commonly confused with *Paseq*, which has the same form. But PaÆseq (= *restraining, dividing*, also incorrectly called P<sup>c</sup>siÆeq) 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 PaÆseq is divided into *distinctivum, emphaticum, homonymicum, and euphonicum*. The conjecture of Olshausen (*Lehrb.*, p. 86 f.), that Pâsêq served also to point out marginal glosses subsequently interpolated into the text, has been further developed by E. von Ortenberg, 'Die Bedeutung des Pâsêq für Quellenscheidung in den BB. d. A. T.,' in *Progr. des Domgymn. zu Verden*, 1887, and in the article, 'Pâsêq 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.). Praëtorius, *ZDMG.* 1899, p. 683 ff., pointed out that *Paseq* (which is pre-masoretic and quite distinct from L<sup>e</sup>garmêh) 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 Masorettes, 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<sup>c</sup>gôltā (seven times altogether) when this would stand at the head of the sentence; cf. Gn 19:16, &c.

- 4 a. ( - ) זָדוּל זָקַף Zâqēph ḡdôl, and
- 4 b. ( - ) זָקַף קָטוֹן Zâqēph qāṭôn. 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. ( - ) טִפְחָה Tiphhā or טַרְחָה Tarhā, a subordinate disjunctive before Sillûq and Athnâh, but very often the principal disjunctive of the whole verse instead of Athnâh; 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<sup>c</sup>bhîa.
7. ( - ) זָרְקָה Zarqā, *postpositive*.
- 8 a. ( U ) פַּשְׁטָה Paštā, *postpositive*,<sup>1</sup> and
- 8 b. ( - ) יְתִיב Y<sup>c</sup>thîbh, *prepositive*, and thus different from M<sup>c</sup>huppākh. Y<sup>c</sup>thîbh is used in place of Paštā when the latter would stand on a monosyllable or on a foretoned word, not preceded by a conjunctive accent.
9. ( A□ ) תְּבִיר T<sup>c</sup>bhîr.
- 10 a. ( - ) גֶּרֶשׁ Gèrēš or טְרֶס Tères, and
- 10 b. ( - ) גֶּרֶשׁ יָם G<sup>r</sup>□šáyim<sup>2</sup> or Double Gèrēš, used for Gèrēš, when the tone rests on the ultima, and Azlā does not precede.
- 11 a. ( - ) פָּזֵר Pâzēr, and
- 11 b. ( - ) פָּזֵר גָּדוּל Pâzēr ḡdôl (Great Pâzēr) or קַרְנֵי פָּרָה Qarnê phārā (*cow-horns*), only used 16 times, for special emphasis.
12. ( - ) תְּלִישָׁא גְדוּלָה T<sup>c</sup>liā g<sup>d</sup>dôlā or Great T<sup>c</sup>lišā, *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.

1<sup>1</sup> If the word in question has the tone on the penultima, Paštā is placed over it also, e.g. תָּהָה Gn 1:2; cf. below, 1

2 2. Wickes requires Geršáyim (גֶּרֶשׁ יָם).

13. (| -) לְגַרְמָה L<sup>e</sup>garmēh, i.e. Mûnah (see below) with a following stroke.

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

14. (-) מוֹנַח Mûnah.

15. (-) מְהַפָּךְ M<sup>e</sup>huppākh or מַהפָּךְ Mahpākh.

16 a. (-) מִירְכָא or מְאַרְכָא Mêr<sup>e</sup>khā, and

16 b. (-) כְּפוּלָה מ' Mêr<sup>e</sup>khā kh<sup>e</sup>phûlā or Double Mêr<sup>e</sup>khā.

17. (-) דַּרְגָא Dargā.

18. (˘) אֲזֵלָא Azlā, when associated with Gèrēš (see above) also called Qadmā.

19. (-) תְּלִישָׁא קְטַנָּה T<sup>e</sup>lîšā q<sup>e</sup>ṭannā or Little T<sup>e</sup>lîšā, *postpositive*.

20. (-) גַּלְגַּל Galgal or יְרָה Yèrah.

[21. (-) מְאַיְלָא M<sup>e</sup>ayy<sup>e</sup>lā or מְאַיְלָא Mây<sup>e</sup>lā, a variety of Tiphḥa, serves to mark the secondary tone in words which have Sillûq or Athnâḥ, or which are united by Maqqēph with a word so accentuated, e.g. הַיְצִיא־נִי Gn 8:18.]

*The Accents of the Books* ת"א.

*Distinctivi.*

1. (˘) Sillûq (see above, I, 1).

2. (- -) עוֹלָה וְיִרְדָּה Ôlè w<sup>e</sup>yôrēd, <sup>1</sup> a stronger divider than

3. (-) Athnâḥ (see above, I, 2). In shorter verses Athnâḥ suffices as principal distinctive; in longer verses Ôlè w<sup>e</sup>yôrēd serves as such, and is then mostly followed by Athnâḥ as the principal disjunctive of the second half of the verse.

4. (-) R<sup>e</sup>bhî<sup>a</sup> gādôl (Great R<sup>e</sup>bhî<sup>a</sup>).

5. (-) R<sup>e</sup>bhî<sup>a</sup> mugrāš, i.e. R<sup>e</sup>bhî<sup>a</sup> with Gèrēš on the same word.

6. (-) Great Šalsêleth (see above, I. 3 b).

---

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> Wrongly called also Mêr<sup>e</sup>khā m<sup>e</sup>huppākh (*Mêr<sup>e</sup>kha mahpakhatum*), although the accent underneath is in no way connected with Mêr<sup>e</sup>khā; cf. Wickes, l. c., p. 14.

7. (-) צָנוּרִית Šinnôr (Zarqā), as *postpositive*, is easily distinguished from צָנוּרִית Šinnôrîth similarly placed, which is not an independent accent, but stands only over an open syllable before a consonant which has Mêr<sup>e</sup>khā or Mahpākh.
8. (-) R<sup>e</sup>bhî<sup>a</sup> qāṭôn (Little R<sup>e</sup>bhî<sup>a</sup>) immediately before Ôlè w<sup>e</sup>yôred.
9. (-) דְּהִי D<sup>e</sup>hî or דְּיִפְהָא Tīphhā, *prepositive*, to the right underneath the initial consonant, e.g. הַגִּי (consequently it does not mark the tone-syllable).
10. (-) Pâzēr (see above, I, 11 a).
- 11 a. (| -) M<sup>e</sup>huppākh l<sup>e</sup>garmēh, i.e. Mahpākh with a following stroke.
- 11 b. (| -) Azlā l<sup>e</sup>garmēh, i.e. Azlā with a following stroke.

*Conjunctivi.*

12. (-) Mêr<sup>e</sup>khā (see above, I. 16 a).
13. (-) Mûnaḥ (see above, I. 14).
14. (-) עֲלוּי Illûy or Mûnaḥ superior.
15. (-) תַּרְחָא Tārḥā (under the tone-syllable, and thus easily distinguished from No. 9).
16. (-) Galgal or Yèraḥ (see above, I. 20).
17. (-) M<sup>e</sup>huppākh or Mahpākh (see above, I. 15).
18. (ˆ) Azlā (see above, I. 18).
19. (ˆ) Šalšèleth q<sup>e</sup>ṭannā (Little Šalšlèth). The last three are distinguished from the disjunctives of the same name by the absence of the stroke.
- [20. (-) Šinnôrîth, see above under No. 7.]

REMARKS ON THE ACCENTS

*As Signs of the Tone.*

1. As in Greek and English (cf. εἰμί and εἴμι, *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. בָּנוּ *banú* (they built), בָּנוּ *bánu* (in us); קָמָה *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 Pašṭā (see above, I. 8 a, note); e.g. **טָרָם יִשְׁכּוּ בוּ Gn 19:4**; so the prepositive sign in cases like **וַיְהִי 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 Sillûq, 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 (Zâqêph, R<sup>e</sup>bhîâ) occur consecutively, the accent which precedes marks a greater division than the one which follows; cf. e.g. the Zâqêph, **Gn 1<sup>20 a</sup>**.

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 *Maqqêph* 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 further the rule that in the accentuation of the books **תא"ס**, the *R<sup>e</sup>bhî<sup>a</sup> mugrâš* before *Sillûq*, and the *D<sup>e</sup>hû* before *Athnâh*, must be changed into conjunctives, unless at least two toneless syllables precede the principal disjunctive. For this purpose Š<sup>e</sup>wâ *mobile* after Qameṣ, Sere, or Holem (with Metheg) is to be regarded as forming a syllable. After Ôlè w<sup>e</sup>yôrêd the Athnâh 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 **וישכב** 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 **עבדים** (instead of **פני**) 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 **עֲבָדִים** at the end of v. 2 has Silluq (to close the 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<sup>e</sup>bhî<sup>a</sup>. Again **פני**, regarded as closing v. 3, is pointed **פָּנֵי** (pausal Qameṣ with Silluq), but in the upper accentuation it is **פָּנֵי** with Pathah because not in pause. (Originally there may have been a third accentuation requiring **עֲבָדִים** and **פָּנֵי**, 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 Maqqêph and Mèthëg*

These are both closely connected with the accents.

1. Maqqēph (מקף 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. כָּל־אָדָם *every man*, אֶת־כָּל־עֵשֶׂב *every herb*, Gn 1:29, אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ *all that he had*, Gn 25:5.

Certain monosyllabic prepositions and conjunctions, such as אֶל־ *to*, עַד־ *until*, עַל־ *upon*, עִם־ *with*, אֶל־ *ne*, אִם־ *if, whether*, מִן־ *from*, לֶסָּף־ *lest*, are almost always found with a following Maqqēph, provided they have not become independent forms by being combined with prefixes, e.g. מֵעַל, מֵעִם, 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 אֶל־כָּל־; Ps 47:5, 60:2, Pr 3:12 in the case of אֶת־, the objective particle. Longer words are, however, connected by Maqqēph with a following monosyllable, e.g. הִתְהַלְּךְ־נָ, Gn 6:9, וַיְהִי־כֵן, Gn 1:7; or two words of more than one syllable, e.g. שִׁבְעָה־עָשָׂר *seventeen*, Gn 7:11. Cf. the Greek proclitics ἐν, ἐκ, εἰς, εἰ, ὠς, οὗ, which are *atonic*, and lean on the following word.

2. Mètheg (מֶתֶג 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 Mèthëg are *Ma<sup>a</sup>rikh*, i.e. *lengthener*, and *Gayā*, i.e. *raising of the voice*, which is *Great Gayā* with long vowels, otherwise *Little Gayā*.<sup>1</sup>

It is divided into: 1. The *light Mèthëg*. This is subdivided again into (a) the ordinary Mèthëg of the counter-tone, as a rule in the second (open) syllable before the tone, e.g. אָדָם, הָ (cf. also such cases as אֶל־צָרָה); but also in the third when the second is closed, e.g. אֶרְבַּע־יָמִים (also in such cases as אֶרְבַּע־הַיָּמִים), and when the third is not suitable for it, even in the fourth (open) syllable before the tone. This Mèthëg may be repeated in the fourth syllable before the tone, when it already stands in the second, e.g. שִׁבְעָה־עָשָׂר. 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 Mèthëg (e.g. בְּגַן־עֵדֶן, on the on her hand אֶת־הַגֵּן, or to a word beginning with *Šwā* before the tone-syllable, e.g. מִן־הַיַּיִן, &c.; the object being to prevent the *Šwā* from becoming *quiescent*.

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Cf. as the source of this account of Mèthëg, the exhaustive treatment by S. Baer, 'Mèthëg-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-š'amim*, p. 30 ff.

through retraction of the tone, in order to prevent its being pronounced as *S<sup>e</sup>ghól*, e.g. אָהָב Pr 12:1 (not *ôhēbh*). (δ) With all vowels before composite *S<sup>e</sup>wâ*, e.g. זָעַמְדָּ, וְעָקִים, &c. (except when the following consonant is strengthened, e.g. וְיָקָו Is 62:2, because the strengthening by *Dageš* excludes the retarding of the vowel by *Mèthëg*); so in the cases discussed in § 28 c, where a short vowel has taken the place of a *Ḥaṭeph*, as וְעָמְדָּ, &c. (ε) In the preformative syllable of all forms of הָיָה *to be*, and הָיָה *to live*, when *S<sup>e</sup>wâ quiescens* stands under the ה or ה, e.g. הָיָה, הָיָה, תִּהְיֶה (yih-yè, tih-yè), &c., cf. § 63 q. (ζ) With the *Qameṣ* of the plural forms of הַיָּתָב *house* (thus יַתָּבָת *bâttîm*, cf. § 96 under הַיָּתָב), and with הָאֵץ<sup>1</sup> *pritheē!* to guard against the pronunciation *böttîm, önnâ*.—Every kind of light *Mèthëg* may in certain circumstances be changed into a conjunctive accent, e.g. הָאֵץ 2 Ch 34:11, &c.

2. The *grave Mèthëg* (*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 *S<sup>e</sup>wâ*: (a) with the *Pathah* of the article or of the prefixes ב, כ, ל, when followed by *S<sup>e</sup>wâ* under a consonant without *Dageš*, e.g. הַמְסֵלָה, הַמְסֵלָה, &c., but not before י (before which י also remains without *Mèthëg*, with the exception of יִהְיֶה, יִהְיֶה, 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 *Mèthëg*; 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 י, *Dageš forte* or the tone-syllable of the word), e.g. הָאֵץ. When a *S<sup>e</sup>wâ* follow the ה and after the *S<sup>e</sup>wâ* there is an untoned syllable, Baer places the *Mèthëg* to the right of the *Pathah*, e.g. הַבְּרָכָה Gn 27:38 (but ed. Mant. and Ginsb. הַבְּרָכָה); (c) with the *Pathah* or *S<sup>e</sup>gol* of the article before a guttural (which cannot take *Dageš*), e.g. הַהָיִים, הַהָרִים.—The *S<sup>e</sup>wâ-Gayā* ( , ) is especially important in the accentuation of the אָמַר, for purposes of musical recitation; it stands chiefly in words whose principal tone is marked by a disjunctive without a preceding conjunctive, e.g. הָאֵץ 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. הָאֵץ Gn 24:9; הָאֵץ (here to avoid a hiatus) 28:2, or in such cases as הָאֵץ Jb 33:4, &c.; הָאֵץ Gn 1:11.

*Mèthëg* (especially in the cases mentioned in 1, b, a) is a guide to correct pronunciation, since it distinguishes *ā* from *ō* (except in the case noted in § 9 v, b) and *i* from *i*, e.g. הָאֵץ *ā-kh<sup>e</sup>lā* (she has eaten), but הָאֵץ *ōkhlā* (food), since the ה stands here in a toneless closed syllable, and must therefore be a short vowel; thus also הָאֵץ *yi-r<sup>e</sup>û* (they fear), but הָאֵץ *yirû* (they see), הָאֵץ (they sleep), but הָאֵץ (they repeat). The Jewish grammarians, however, do not consider the syllables lengthened by *Mèthëg* as open. They regard the *S<sup>e</sup>wâ* as *quiescent* in cases like הָאֵץ, 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-ḥamim*, p. 13.

### § 17. Of the *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* and *K<sup>e</sup>thîbh*. Masora marginalis and finalis

On *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* and *K<sup>e</sup>thîbh* see Ginsburg, *Intr.*, p. 183 ff.]

<sup>1</sup> The common form is אָאֵץ, 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 קרי<sup>2</sup> *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<sup>e</sup>rê*) 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<sup>e</sup>thibh*) its own vowels are to be used. Thus in Jer 42:6 אָנֹכִי קָרִי אֲנִי we (or according to Jewish tradition אָנֹכִי) in the text, in the margin אָנֹכִי קָרִי. 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 קרי וְלֹא כְתִיב (*scriptum et non legendum*), e.g. אַח Jer 38:16, אַח 39:12, יִדְרֹךְ 51:3. Conversely, words not contained in the text, but required by the Masora (as indicated by the insertion of their vowels), are called קרי וְלֹא כְתִיב, e.g. 2 S 8:3, Jer 31:38. See further Strack, *Prolegomena Critica*, p. 85; *Dikduke ha-ḥamim*, §§ 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<sup>e</sup>thibh*, it has not been considered necessary to place the *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* in the margin, but its vowels are simply attached to the word in the text. This *Q<sup>e</sup>rê perpetuum* occurs in the Pentateuch in הוּא (*Q<sup>e</sup>rê הוא*) wherever הוּא stands for the feminine (§ 32 l), and in נֶעְרָה (*Q<sup>e</sup>rê נערה*, נֶעְרָה) always, except in Dt 22:19 (but the Sam. text always has היא נערה). 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; נער for נערה is rather a survival of a system of orthography in which a final vowel was written defectively, as in קִטְלָה; cf. § 2 n.—Other instances are: יֵשׁׁ:שָׁכָר (Q. יֵשׁׁ:כָּר) Gn 30:18 &c., see the *Lexicon*, and Baer and Delitzsch, *Genesis*, p. 84, and below, note to § 47 b; יְרוּשָׁלַם (Q. יְרוּשָׁלַם), properly יְרוּשָׁלַם; יְהוָה (Q. יְהוָה) *the Lord*, or (after אֲדֹנָי) יְהוָה (Q. יְהוָה) properly יְהוָה *Yahwè* (cf. § 102 m, and § 135 q, note); on שְׁתִי, שְׁנִי for שְׁתִי, שְׁנִי, 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> On the necessity of the punctuation קרי as passive participle (= *legendum*) instead of קרי *Q<sup>e</sup>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 אִסּוּרֵי אֶתְנַחֵּם סוּף פְּסוּקֵי אִסּוּרֵי אֶתְנַחֵּם in the formula בְּלֹא אִסּוּרֵי אֶתְנַחֵּם *without Athnaḥ or Soph-pasuaq* i.e. *although no Athnaḥ or Soph-pasuaq is written*.

בְּ with, before names of vowels or accents, as בְּזָקֶף קָמֶשׁ *Qameṣ with Zaqeph* used instead of Pathaḥ (§ 29 i).-ב' as a numeral=two, as in ב' טַעֲמִים *two accents*. במקצת, see מקצת = בג"א = בְּנוֹסְחָא אַחֲרֵינָא (Aramaic) *in another copy*; pl. בְּנוֹסְחֵי אַחֲרֵינָא. בְּנוֹסְחֵי אַחֲרֵינָא = בס"א. בְּנוֹסְחֵי אַחֲרֵינָא *in other books*. בְּתַר (Aram.) *after*.

דְּגוּשׁ fem. דְּגוּשָׁה *marked with Dageṣ (or Mappiq)*. דָּף *leaf, page*.

זְעִיר fem. זְעִירָא (Aram.) *small*.

הוֹל *profane, not sacred*, e.g. אֲדֹנָי Gn 19:2 because not referring to God. חֹסֵר *except*. חֹסֵר *written defectively*, also wanting as 'א ה' *aleph is omitted*.

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

יִתְרֵי *superfluous*.

כָּאן *here*. כָּלֵל (Aram.) *total, as adv. in general*.

לֵית=לֵי (Aram., from לֵית אֵית *non est*)=the form *is not found elsewhere*.

מְדוּקָא *accurately corrected*. מְלֵא *full* i.e. *written plene*. מְלַמְטָא *below*=מְלַרְעָא (§ 15 c). מְלַרְעָא מְלַמְטָא *separated*, the name of the strangely formed Nûns before Ps 107:23 ff. (§ 5 n). מְקַרָא *that which is read*, the name for all the O. T. scriptures. מְקַצָא *part*.

נָח fem. נְחָה *quiescent*, i.e. not sounded. נְעָלָם *concealed*, i.e. only retained orthographically. נְקוּדָא *a point*. נְקוּדָא *pointed*.

סְכּוּם = סָרִי see סְכּוּם סִימְנָא *sign, esp. a mnemonic word or, frequently, sentence*. סְכּוּם = סָרִי *total*. סָרִי = סָרִי (§ 15 f).

עַמּוּד *column* of a page.

פְּסוּקָא *a masoretic verse*. פְּסוּקָא *a space*, esp. in the phrase פְּסוּקָא פְּסוּקָא *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.

קָרִי, see above, c. קָרִי קָרִי *properly* קָרִי *before*. קָרִי קָרִי fem. קָרִי קָרִי *pointed with Qameṣ*. קָרִי קָרִי *reader of the sacred text*.

רַבְתָּא, רַבְתָּה, רַבְתֵּי (Aram., all fem. sing.) *large*.

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

## 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*<sup>1</sup> may take place between consonants which are either *homorganic* or *homogeneous* (cf. § 6 q), e.g. עָלַם, עָלַם, עָלַם *to exult*, הָלַץ, הָלַץ, Aram. הָלַץ *to be weary*, חָצַק and חָצַק *to press*, סָגַר and סָגַר *to close*, מָלַט and מָלַט *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. חָצַק into חָצַק *to laugh*, חָצַק into חָצַק *to reject*, and the sibilants into the corresponding mutes: שׁ into ט, שׁ into ט, שׁ into ט. 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 stems<sup>2</sup> than to grammatical inflexion. To the latter belong the interchange (a) of ת and ט in *Hithpaël* (§ 54 b); (b) of ו and ו in verbs *primae Yôd* (§ 69), וָלַד for וָלַד, &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 מ, e.g. מִן־שָׁם (for *min-šām*) *from there*, מִן־זֶה (for *min-zè*) *from this*, יָתַן (for *yintēn*) *he gives*. מ is not assimilated after the prefix ל, e.g. לָמַד, nor as a rule before gutturals (except sometimes before ה), nor when it is the third consonant of the stem, e.g. מָלַט (cf. however מָלַט for *nāthántā*) 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 מָלַט and מָלַט Ps 68:3, see § 51 k, and § 66 f.

---

1 <sup>1</sup> Cf. Barth, *Etymologische Forschungen*, Lpz. 1893, p. 15 ff. ('Lautverschiebungen').

2 <sup>2</sup> 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. קַחַּ (for *yilqah*) *he takes*; מִדְּבַר for *mithdabbēr*; יִתְּמָא for *yithṭammā*; תִּתְּכֹנֵן for *tithkônēn*; אֲתַנְּשׂ for אֲתַנְּשׂ; תִּחַּדַּת for *aḥadt*; but in 1 S 4:19 for לִלְתַּל read probably לְתַלְתַּל.

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

In all these cases, instead of the assimilated letter, a *Dageš forte* appears in the following consonant. *Dageš*, 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. אֲנַפִּיתְּ *nose* (from *anp*), תַּתְּתְּ *to give* (from *tint*).

The cases are less frequent where a weak letter is lost in pronunciation,<sup>1</sup> and in place of it the preceding stronger sound is sharpened, i.e. takes *Dageš*, e.g. קִטְּלַתְּ from קִטְּלַתְּ ( § 59 g). אֲפִיִּיתְּ for אֲפִיִּיתְּ ( § 66 e) is an Aramaism.

**3. Complete rejection** takes place only in the case of weaker consonants, especially the sonants ו and ל, the gutturals א 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, ו) are not supported by a full vowel, but have only Š<sup>e</sup>wâ, e.g. וְהוּנַּ *we*, also אֲנַפִּיתְּ; דַּעַד for דַּעַד; קַחַּ for קַחַּ; שֶׁנַּ for שֶׁנַּ; הִיִּיתְּ for הִיִּיתְּ Ez 2:10.

Aphaeresis of a weak consonant with a full vowel is supposed to occur in דַּעַד Ju 19:11 for דַּעַד; in תַּתְּתְּ 2 S 22:41 for תַּתְּתְּ; in שׁוּב for שׁוּב Je 42:10; on קַחַּ Ez 17:5 for קַחַּ, and on קַחַּ Ho 11:3 for קַחַּ, 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<sup>e</sup>wâ precedes the weak consonant<sup>2</sup>; thus in the case of א (see further § 23 b–f, and § 68 b–k), e.g. in מוּם for מוּם. As a rule in such cases, however, the א is orthographically retained, e.g. אֲקַרְאַתְּ for אֲקַרְאַתְּ. Syncope occurs frequently in the case of ה, e.g. לִמְּלִי for לִמְּלִי ( § 23 k and § 35 n), אֲקַטְּיִל for אֲקַטְּיִל ( § 53 a).

Syncope of א with Š<sup>e</sup>wâ occurs in such cases as אֲדַנִּי for אֲדַנִּי (cf. § 102 m); אֲעֶשֶׂר Zc 11:5.<sup>1</sup> On the cases in which א is wholly omitted after the article, see § 35 d.

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

<sup>1</sup> Such a suppression of a letter is sometimes inaccurately called ‘backward assimilation’.

<sup>2</sup> Syncope of a strong consonant (ע) occurs in אֲפִיִּיתְּ *prithes!* if this stands for אֲפִיִּיתְּ (see *Lexicon*), also in וּנְשָׁקָה Am 8:8, *K<sup>e</sup>thūbh* for וּנְשָׁקָה (cf. וּנְשָׁקָה 9:5), and in אֲבִלָה Jos 19:3 for אֲבִלָה (as in 15:29). Probably, however, וּנְשָׁקָה and אֲבִלָה are only clerical errors, as is undoubtedly אֲבִיִּיתְּ Am 8:8 for אֲבִיִּיתְּ (9<sup>5</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> Frensdorff, *Ochla Wochla*, p. 97 f., gives a list of forty-eight words with quiescent א.

(c) At the end of a word (*apocope*), e.g. גִּילְנִי pr. name of a city (cf. גִּילְנִי Gilonite); גִּירָא, where א though really rejected is orthographically retained, &c. On the apocope of ו and י in verbs לִי"ה, 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 תֵּית *āth* to תֵּית *ā*, see § 44 a, and § 80 f.

4. To avoid harshness in pronunciation a helping sound, Aleph prosthetic<sup>2</sup> with its vowel, is prefixed to some words, e.g. אָזְרוּעַ and זְרוּעַ *arm* (cf. ξθέας, ἔχθός; *spiritus*, French *esprit*).—A prosthetic ע occurs probably in עֶקְרָב *scorpion*; cf. Arab. *usfūr* bird (stem *ṣafara*).

5. *Transposition*<sup>3</sup> occurs only seldom in the grammar, e.g. הַשְּׂמֵרָה for הַשְּׂמֵרָה (§ 54 b) for the sake of euphony; it is more frequent in the lexicon (שֶׁבַע פָּ and פֶּשֶׁבַע *lamb*, שֶׁמְלָה and שֶׁלְמָה *garment*), but is mostly confined to sibilants and sonants.

6. *Softening* occurs e.g. in כּוֹכַב *star*, from *kaukabh*=*kawkabh* for *kabhkabh* (cf. Syriac *raurab*=*rabrab*); תּוֹטְפוֹת *phylacteries* for *ṭaphṭāphôth*; according to the common opinion, also in אִישׁ *man* from *inš*, 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 *Šewâ mobile*; thus we have נִתְּנוּ for נִתְּנוּ *nāthän-nû* and שִׁתִּי for שִׁתִּי.

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

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

(c) When it is characteristic of a grammatical form, e.g. לָמַד *he has learned*, לָמַד *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. גְּמָלִים *camels* for *g<sup>e</sup>mālîm*; 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 *Šewâ mobile*. In the latter case, according to the correct Masora, a *compound Šewâ* should be used, preceded by *Methëg*, e.g. הַזְּלִיחַ, הַזְּלִיחַ, &c. (cf. §§ 10 g, 16 f). This pointing is not used before the suffix כֵּן, e.g. הַזְּבִיבֵי, Gn 27:4, but the first כ has a *vocal Šewâ*, otherwise the second כ would have *Dageš lene*. Also when the former of the two consonants

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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 Š<sup>e</sup>wā*, and any further contraction is therefore impossible. This applies also to cases where *Dageš forte* has been omitted (see below, **m**, e.g. הָלֵלוּ properly לֵלוּ=hal-*l*ū. The form הָלֵלוּ נִי Ps 9:14 (not הָלֵלוּ נִי) might be explained as imperat. Piēl=הָלֵלוּ נִי; if it were imperat. *Qal* the non-contraction of the monosyllabic root would be as strange as it is in הָלֵלוּ Jer 49:28, and in the imperf. הָלֵלוּ 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 occurs<sup>1</sup>—

(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,<sup>2</sup> when closely connected with the preceding word, if that word ends in a tone-bearing *Qameṣ* (הָ) with *Š<sup>e</sup>wā mobile* preceding, or a tone-bearing הָ, —called דְּחִיק (i.e. *compressed*) by the Jewish grammarians.

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

Some limit the use of the *D<sup>e</sup>hîq* to the closest connexion of a monosyllable with a following *B<sup>e</sup>gadk<sup>e</sup>phath*. However, it also applies to cases like הָלֵלוּ לְכֹהֵנִים Nu 22:6; הָלֵלוּ לְקֹהֵל־וְיָאֵת Gn 2:23; הָלֵלוּ יְצִנְה־לְךָ Ps 91:11; and even with *Rêš*, הָלֵלוּ מַעֲנֵה־רַךְ Pr 15:1; הָלֵלוּ וּמַעֲנֵה־כָּסֶף 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 הָלֵלוּ 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 הָלֵלוּ וְזֶה־שֶׁמֶן Jer 23:6, but also in הָלֵלוּ פְּרִי־הָאָרֶץ Nu 13:27, 1 Ch 22:1. In הָלֵלוּ הַנְּהַיָּה Gn 19:2 (where *Maqqēph* is represented by a conjunctive accent, § 9 u, 1 c, and § 16 b), the *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* coincides with the secondary tone-syllable. On the origin of *Dag. f. conj.* after מַה־ (for מַה) *what?*, see § 37 b, c.

2. Such cases as הָלֵלוּ הָלֵלוּ Ex 15:1, 21, the 2nd כֹּהֵן in ver. 11, הָלֵלוּ ver. 13, כֹּהֵן 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 *milêl* ending in הָ or הָ. Such a *milêl* is called by the Jewish grammarians אֶתִּי מֵרֶחֶק (Aram.=Heb. אֶתִּי מֵרֶחֶק) *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. הָלֵלוּ יְשֻׁבֵי יִתְּשׁוּ־בֵי Ps 68:19; הָלֵלוּ הוֹשֵׁעַ יַעֲקֹב Ps 118:25 (so ed. Mant., but Ginsburg and Kittel הָלֵלוּ הוֹשֵׁעַ־יַעֲקֹב); הָלֵלוּ הַרְחֵק יְבָהּ־שׁוֹל Is 5:14; הָלֵלוּ אֶרְצָה Gn 11:31. The *Milêl* may, however, also be due to a subsequent retraction of the tone (*nāsôg aḥôr*, § 29 e), as in הָלֵלוּ עֲשֵׂה־פְּרִי־הָאָרֶץ Gn 1:11.—The prefixes הָ, הָ, הָ and הָ alone do

<sup>1</sup> 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 הָ or הָ).  
<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> הָ alone, although having the tone on the ultima, invariably takes the *Dageš forte conj.* when מַשֶּׁה with a conjunctive accent precedes, Ex 6:10, 29, 15:24, &c.

not take a Dageš in this case, except in לך, always, and ללילה Ps 19:3. Such forms as Gn 21:23, הַשׁ בְּעֵה לִי Ps 26:10, מִן לְאֵה שׁ־חֶד, Jb 21:16, and even עֲמֶדָה חֶד Is 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 *milél*. On the other hand, e.g. הָרָה לְךָ Gn 4:6, not לְךָ since the first *ā* of הָרָה 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. עֶשׂה פְּרִי Gn 1:12; הִנֵּה יָדָה־נָּא 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*, הַמָּה יִירָשׁוּ Ps 37:9; אֵל לָהּ לְעֵקֶב בִּי Is 44:21; עֲשֵׂה יְתֵ קַעֲרֵ תִיּוֹ Ex 25:29, provided that the second word does not begin with a *B<sup>e</sup>gadh<sup>k</sup>phath* letter (hence e.g. אֵל לָהּ תוֹלְדוֹת Gn 2:4).

Rem. Such cases as קָנָךְ Dt 32:6, and כֶּשֶׁת יָתֶ 32:15, and נָעוֹת (so Baer, but not ed. Mant., &c.) 1 S 1:13 are therefore anomalous; also, because beginning with a *B<sup>e</sup>gadh<sup>k</sup>phath*, אֵלֶם, Ex 15:11 (cf. however above, e); תִּלִּי Jos 8:28; בְּזָרוּעַ Ps 77:16; בְּיָהִיא 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 *û*, such as קוֹמוּ צִאוּ Gn 19:14, Ex 12:31; Ex 12:15 (שׁ־אֵר), Dt 2:24; also לֵא Gn 19:2, 1 S 8:19; לוֹ Ju 18:19, Est 6:13 (where P. Haupt regards the *Dageš* as due to the enclitic character of the לוֹ); מָעֻט Ho 8:10; דָּדוּ Jer 49:30; דָּדוּ 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 *S<sup>e</sup>wâ*. The extension of the use of *Dageš* to consonants with a strong vowel, seems, however, to indicate that these are cases of the מְרַחֵק, which was required by some Masoretes but not consistently inserted. On the other hand, the *Dageš forte* in ם after a preceding *i* (Ps 118:5, 18), and even after *û* (Ps 94:12), is due to an attempt to preserve its consonantal power; see König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 54 b.

(b) When a consonant with *S<sup>e</sup>wâ* is strengthened by *Dageš forte dirimens* to make the *S<sup>e</sup>wâ* 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. עֲנָבִי Lv 25:5, Dt 32:32 (for עֲנָבִי); בְּנִלְתָךְ Is 33:1 (where, however, בְּכִלְיֹתְךָ is to be read); cf. Na 3:17, Jb 9:18, 17:2, Jo 1:17 (with מ); Is 57:6 (with ל); Ju 20:43, <sup>1</sup> 1 S 1:6 (with ר); Gn 49:10, 17 (and so always in עֲקָבִי Ju 5:22, Ct 1:8 and עֲקֹבוֹת Ps 77:20, 89:52); Ex 15:17, Dt 23:11, Ju 20:32, 1 S 28:10 (ק)<sup>2</sup>; Ex 2:3, Is 58:3, Am 5:21, Ps 141:3, Pr 4:13 (צ); Pr 27:25 (שׁ); Is 5:28, Ps 37:15, Jer 51:56, Neh 4:7 (שׁ). Also, with כ Ho 3:2; with ב Is 9:3, Jer 4:7; with ח 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 (חֶד לוֹ), Jb 29:21 (וַיִּחַ לוֹ), 22:12 (מִוּוּ, רַ); Ez 27:19 (in ו); in ח Is 33:12, 41:17, Jer 51:58, perhaps also Jb 21:13 (וַיִּחַ, תוּ).

1 <sup>1</sup> The ordinary reading הוֹרֵדֶיךָ, where ד is without *Dageš*, is only intelligible if the ר has *Dageš*.

2 <sup>2</sup> Also in Ps 45:10 read בְּיָקָרוֹתֶיךָ with Baer and Ginsburg, following Ben Asher, and in Pr 30:17 לְיִקְהָתָה (Ben Naphthali 'בִּיקָ' and 'לִיקָ').



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

### § 21. The Aspiration of the Tenues.<sup>1</sup>

The *harder* sound of the six *B<sup>e</sup>gadk<sup>e</sup>phath* 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<sup>e</sup>wā mobile* it is softened and aspirated by their influence, e.g. *פָּרָץ* *pāraṣ*, *יִפְרֹץ* *yiphrōṣ*, *כֹּל* *kōl*, *לֶכֶלֶךְ* *l<sup>e</sup>khōl*. Hence the *B<sup>e</sup>gadk<sup>e</sup>phath* take *Dageš lene*

(1) at the beginning of words: (a) without exception when the preceding word ends with a vowelless consonant, e.g. *עַל־כֵּן* *al-kēn* (*therefore*), *עֵץ פְּרִי* *ēṣ p<sup>e</sup>ri* (*fruit-tree*); (b) at the beginning of a section, e.g. *בְּרֵאשִׁית* 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 כֵן אֲשֶׁר* *and it was so, that when*, Ju 11:5 (but *וַיְהִי־כֵן* Gn 1:7).

Rem. 1. The vowel letters ה, י, ו, א, as such, naturally do not close a syllable. In close connexion they are therefore followed by the aspirated *B<sup>e</sup>gadk<sup>e</sup>phath*, e.g. *וּמָצָא בָּהּ* &c. On the other hand, syllables are closed by the consonantal ו and י (except *קוֹרֵת הוּ* Is 34:11; *שָׁלוֹ בָּהּ* Ez 23:42; *אֲדָנִי בָּהּ* Ps 68:18), and by ה with *Mappiq*; hence e.g. there is *Dageš lene* in *פִּיהֶם* and always after *וַיְהִי*, since the *Q<sup>r</sup>ē perpetuum* of this word (§ 17) assumes the reading *אֲדָנִי*.

2. In a number of cases *Dageš lene* is inserted, although a vowel precedes in close connexion. This almost always occurs with the prefixes בָּ and כֹּ in the combinations *בָּב*, *כֹּכ*, *כֹּפ* (i.e. when a *B<sup>e</sup>gadk<sup>e</sup>phath* with *Š<sup>e</sup>wā* precedes the same or a kindred aspirate) and *בָּם* (see Baer, *L. Psalmorum*, 1880, p. 92,<sup>2</sup> on Ps 23:3); cf. e.g. 1 S 25:1, Is 10:9, Ps 34:2, Jb 19:2; *כָּג* is uncertain; *בָּד*, *כָּד*, and *כֹּכ* according to David Qimḥi do not take *Dageš*, nor *כָּג*, *כָּב*, and *כָּפ* according to the *Dikduke ha-ṣ<sup>e</sup>amim*, p. 30. Sometimes the *B<sup>e</sup>gadk<sup>e</sup>phath* letters, even with a full vowel, take *Dageš* before aspirant (and even before ה in *הַמִּשְׁעָה* 1 K 12:32); cf. the instances mentioned above, § 20 e (mostly *tenues* before א). 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 כ and פ, even at the beginning of a syllable, by χ and φ; Χερουβί, Χαλδαῖοι, Φαρφάρ, &c.—The forms *כֹּכְךָ* (after *וַיִּשְׁמָתָ י* Is 54:12, and *לֶכֶלֶךְ* (after *וַיִּלָּא יתי* Jer 20:9 are doubly anomalous.

(2) In the middle of words after *Š<sup>e</sup>wā quiescens*, i.e. at the beginning of a syllable immediately after a vowelless consonant,<sup>1</sup> e.g. *יִרְפָּא* *yirpā* (*he heals*), *יֵקְטִילְתֶּם* *ye have killed*; but after *Š<sup>e</sup>wā mobile*, e.g. *רִפָּא* *r<sup>e</sup>phā* (*heal thou*), *בְּרֵבָהּ* *she was heavy*.

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

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

<sup>1</sup> The exceptions *יִקְתָּל* Jos 15:38 (see *Minḥat shay*, on this passage), 2 K 14:7, and *יִקְדָּע* Jos 15:56 may perhaps be due to the character of the ק.

On קטלת, קטלת, and similar forms, see § 10 i.

Whether Š<sup>e</sup>wā 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. רדפו *pursue ye* (not רדפו) from רדפי; מלכי (not מלכי), because originally *mālākhē*, but מלכי from the ground-form *malk*.

(b) With the כ of the pronominal suffixes of the 2nd pers. כ, כם, כן, כן, since Š<sup>e</sup>wā mobile is characteristic of these forms (see § 58 f; § 91 b).

Rem. Forms like תשלח *thou* (fem.) *hast sent*, in which we should expect an aspirated ת after the vowel, cf. תשלח, תשלח, &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 ה, 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 ה.

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.<sup>2</sup> For a distinction must again be drawn between the full lengthening of *Pathah* into *Qameš*—mostly before א (always under the ה of the article, see § 35), as a rule also before ע, less frequently before ה, and least often before ה—and the modification of *Pathah* to *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, mostly before a guttural with *Qameš*. 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 ה, usually with ה, less frequently with ע, and very seldom with א. Examples of (a) מאן, אדם, העם, הקהר, קבא, קבא (for *yiḥābhē*); also אהג, אהג, אהג, אהג (see more fully on the pointing of the article before ע in § 35).—Of (b) מחוט, חוט, חוט, חוט (from *minḥūt*), אהג, אהג, אהג, אהג, &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. h), a short A-sound, because this vowel is organically the nearest akin to the gutturals. Hence

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *terra* and the French *terre*, the Gorman *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, *Pathaḥ* readily (and always before ה, ח, ע closing a syllable) takes the place of another short vowel or of a rhythmically long ē or ō, e.g. זָבַח *sacrifice*, not *zēbēḥ*; מָעַן *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, שֶׁלַח *send thou*, יִשְׁלַח *he will send* (not *yīšlōḥ*); Perf. Piel שָׁלַח (but in Pausa שֶׁלַח); יִחְמֹד *he will desire* (not *yīḥmōd*); וַיִּנָּח *and he rested* (not *wayyānōḥ*); וַיַּעַר *a youth*. In שֶׁלַח and יִחְמֹד *ā* is the original vowel.

Rem. In such cases as אָשַׁח, אָנַח, אָפַח, אָפַח, אָפַח, אָפַח, 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 gutturals<sup>1</sup> (consequently not א), when standing at the end of the word, require the insertion of a rapidly uttered *ā* (*Pathaḥ furtivum*) between themselves and the vowel. This *Pathaḥ* 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. רוּחַ *rūḥ*, גוּעַ, רַעַב, הַשְׁלִיחַ, גְּבוּהַ, (when consonantal ה is final it necessarily takes Mappîq), but e.g. רוּחַי, &c., since here the rapidly uttered *ā* is no longer heard.

*I'ch* for *ich*, &c., in some Swiss dialects of German, is analogous; a *furtive Pathaḥ* is here involuntarily intruded before the deep guttural sound. In Arabic the same may be heard in such words as *mesiāḥ*, although it is not expressed in writing. The LXX (and Jerome, cf. ZAW. iv. 79) write ε, sometimes α, instead of *furtive Pathaḥ*, e.g. נִיחַ NŌε, יְדִיעַ 'Ιεδδοῦα (also 'Ιαδδοῦ).

Rem. 1. The guttural may also have an influence upon the *following* vowel, especially in Segholate forms, e.g. נַעַר (not *naēr*) *a youth*, פֹּעַל (not *pōēl*) *deed*. The only exceptions are אֶחָד, בְּיָד, לְחָם, קָחַם.

2. Where in the present form of the language an *i*, whether original or attenuated from *Pathaḥ*, would stand before or after a guttural in the first syllable of a word, a *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* as being between *ā* and *i* is frequently used instead, e.g. יְחַבֵּשׁ (also יְחַבֵּשׁ), יְחַבֵּשׁ, יְחַבֵּשׁ, יְחַבֵּשׁ, &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. הִלַּל, הִנֵּה, הִטָּה; but when this sharpening is removed, *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* is again apt to appear, e.g. הִגִּיזִין constr. הִגִּיזִין constr. הִגִּיזִין.

3. Instead of *simple S<sup>e</sup>wâ mobile*, the gutturals take without exception a compound *S<sup>e</sup>wâ*, e.g. אֶשְׁחַט, אֶשְׁחַט, אֶשְׁחַט, אֶשְׁחַט, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Prätorius, *Ueber den rückweich. Accent im Hebr.*, Halle, 1897, p. 17, &c., remarks that *Pathaḥ 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. יְצוּד, יְשׁוּב would also be pronounced *yasībh*, *yašūdh* 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 Š<sup>e</sup>wâ* happens to close a syllable in the middle of a word, the strongly closed syllable (with *quiescent Š<sup>e</sup>wâ*) may remain; necessarily so with ה, ע, and ה at the end of the tone-syllable, e.g. וְשָׁלַח הָ, יָדַעַתְּ, 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 *Ḥaṭeph* (as being suited to the guttural) taking the place of the *quiescent Š<sup>e</sup>wâ*, and in particular that *Ḥaṭeph* which repeats the sound of the preceding vowel, e.g. וְיָחַדְתָּ (also וְיָחַדְתָּ); וְיָחַדְתָּ (also וְיָחַדְתָּ); וְיָחַדְתָּ (for *pōlō*). But when, owing to a flexional change, the strong vowel following the *Ḥaṭeph* is weakened into *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ mobile*, then instead of the *Ḥaṭeph* its fall vowel is written, e.g. וְיָחַדְתָּ (from וְיָחַדְתָּ), וְיָחַדְתָּ (from וְיָחַדְתָּ). The original forms, according to § 28 c, were *yam<sup>e</sup>dhû*, *ner<sup>e</sup>mû*, *pōl<sup>e</sup>khā*. Hence וְיָחַדְתָּ, &c., are really only different orthographic forms of וְיָחַדְתָּ, &c., and would be better transcribed by *ya<sup>a</sup>m<sup>e</sup>dhû*, &c.

Rem. 1. On the use of simple or compound *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ* in guttural verbs, see further §§ 62–65.

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

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

(b) In the middle of a word after a long vowel, a *Ḥaṭeph-Pathah* takes the place of a *simple Š<sup>e</sup>wâ mobile*, e.g. וְיָחַדְתָּ (see § 63 p); but if a short vowel precedes, the choice of the *Ḥaṭeph* is generally regulated by it, e.g. *Perf. Hiph.* וְיָחַדְתָּ (see above, i), *Infīn.* וְיָחַדְתָּ (regular form וְיָחַדְתָּ); *Perf. Hoph.* וְיָחַדְתָּ (regular form וְיָחַדְתָּ); but cf. וְיָחַדְתָּ 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. וְיָחַדְתָּ *he has blessed* for *birrakh*, וְיָחַדְתָּ *to bless* for *barrēkh*.

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

The exceptions to *a* are וְיָחַדְתָּ *mōrrāth*, Pr 14:10; וְיָחַדְתָּ *khōrrāth* and וְיָחַדְתָּ *šōrrēkh*, Ez 16:4 (cf. Pr 3:8); וְיָחַדְתָּ Ct 5:2; וְיָחַדְתָּ 1 S 1:6; וְיָחַדְתָּ 1 S 10:24, 17:25, 2 K 6:32; exceptions to *b* are וְיָחַדְתָּ Ju 20:43 (cf. § 20 h); וְיָחַדְתָּ 1 S 23:28, 2 S 18:16; also on account of וְיָחַדְתָּ (§ 20 c), Pr 15:1, 20:22, 2 Ch 26:10; and on account of וְיָחַדְתָּ (§ 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 מ for מן) is found in וְיָחַדְתָּ Is 14:3. In Samaritan and Arabic this strengthening has been retained throughout, and the LXX write e.g. Σάρρα for וְיָחַדְתָּ.

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

1. The  $\aleph$ , 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. מְצָא, מְלָא, הוֹצִיא (but when a syllable is added with an introductory vowel, according to *b* below, we have, e.g. הוֹצִיאַנִי, מְצָאנִי, since the  $\aleph$  then stands at the beginning of the syllable, not מְצָאנִי, הוֹצִיאנִי), מְצָא (cf., however, § 74 a), מְצָאָה (for *māṣatā*), תְּמַצֵּאנָה. Similarly in cases like חָטָא, וְיָרָא, וְשָׂא, &c. (§ 19 l), and even in פָּלַא (see above, § 22 e), the  $\aleph$  only retains an orthographic significance.

2. On the other hand,  $\aleph$  is in general retained as a strong consonant whenever it begins a syllable, e.g. מְצָא, מְצָאָה, or when it is protected by a *Haṭeph* after a short syllable, e.g. לְאָכַל, and finally, when it stands in a closed syllable with quiescent  $\aleph$  after a preceding *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* or *Pathah*, e.g. נָדָדַר, נִיָּאָסַר. Even in such cases the consonantal power of  $\aleph$  may be entirely lost, viz.

(a) when it would stand with a long vowel in the middle of a word after *S<sup>e</sup>wā mobile*. The long vowel is then occasionally thrown back into the place of the *S<sup>e</sup>wā*, and the  $\aleph$  is only retained orthographically, as an indication of the etymology, e.g. רֵאשִׁים *heads* (for *r<sup>e</sup>āšîm*), מֵאוֹת *two hundred* (for *m<sup>e</sup>āthayim*), שְׁאֵטָה *Ez 25:6* for שְׁאֵטָה; בּוֹדָאָם *Neh 6:8* for בּוֹדָאָם; מֵאוֹת *Jb 31:7*, דָּן *Dn 1:4* for מֵאוֹת; פְּאָרָה *Is 10:33* for פְּאָרָה; הֶחֱטִיָּאִים *1 S 14:33* for הֶחֱטִיָּאִים (cf. § 74 h, and § 75 oo); הֶרְאוּבֵנִי *Nu 34:14*, from הֶרְאוּבֵן; so always הֶחֱטִיָּאִים or הֶחֱטִיָּאִים *1 K 14:16*, מִי *1:5*, &c., for הֶחֱטִיָּאִים. Sometimes a still more violent suppression of the  $\aleph$  occurs at the beginning of a syllable, which then causes a further change in the preceding syllable, e.g. מְלָאָה *work* for מְלָאָה (as in the Babylonian punctuation), יִשְׁמַעֵאל for יִשְׁמַעֵאל; שְׂמֵאֵל or שְׂמֵאֵל *the left hand*, ground form *simāl*.

(b) When it originally closed a syllable. In these cases  $\aleph$  is generally (by § 22 m) pronounced with a *Haṭeph*, ֶ or ֶ. The preceding short vowel is, however, sometimes lengthened and retains the following  $\aleph$  only orthographically, e.g. אֶצֶל *Nu 11:25* for אֶצֶל (cf. *Ju 9:41*), and פְּאָרוֹר *Jo 2:6* for פְּאָרוֹר; לְאָמַר for לְאָמַר; לְאֵלֵהֶם for לְאֵלֵהֶם; but the contraction does not take place in אֶלֵי־יְהוָה *Is 10:11*. The short vowel is retained, although the consonantal power of  $\aleph$  is entirely lost, in אֶדְנִי, &c. (see § 102 m), וְיָאָה *Is 41:25*, אֶצֶל־נִי *Ez 28:16* for אֶצֶל־נִי; cf. *Dt 24:10*, *1 K 11:39*, *Is 10:13*.

Instead of this  $\aleph$  which has lost its consonantal value, one of the vowel letters ו and י is often written according to the nature of the sound, the former with *ô* and the latter with *ô* and *i*, e.g. בִּפְּלוֹ *buffalo* for בִּפְּלוֹ. At the end of the word ה also is written for  $\aleph$ , הִמְלֵא *he fills* for הִמְלֵא *Jb 8:21* (see below, l).

3. When  $\aleph$  is only preserved orthographically or as an indication of the etymology (quiescent), it is sometimes entirely dropped (cf. § 19 k), e.g. יָצָא *Jb 1:21* for יָצָא; מְלָאָה *Jb 32:18* for מְלָאָה; מְצָאָה *Nu 11:11*; הָיָה *2 S 20:9*; וְיָרָא *Jer 8:11* for וְיָרָא; וְיָרָא *2 S 22:40*, but וְיָרָא *Ps 18:40*; תּוֹמָם *Gn 25:24* for תּוֹמָם; אֶחְטֵאָה *31:39*, for אֶחְטֵאָה; הִבְרִיתִי *Jb 22:29* for הִבְרִיתִי; וְיָרָא *1 S 1:17* for וְיָרָא; וְיָרָא *Ps 22:22* for וְיָרָא; וְיָרָא *Jb 22:29* for וְיָרָא; וְיָרָא *1 Ch 11:39* for וְיָרָא, and so וְיָרָא *2 S 23:37*; וְיָרָא *1 Ch 12:38* for וְיָרָא; וְיָרָא *2 K 19:25*

*K<sup>e</sup>thibh* for לְהַשְׁאוֹת (cf. Is 37:26); הַמָּהּ Jb 29:6 for הַמָּהּ.<sup>1</sup> In מִכֹּחַ לֵךְ 1 K 5:25 (for מִצְּכִי) the strengthening of the following consonant by Dageš compensates for the loss of the א; in מִסֵּרֶת Ez 20:37, if for מִצְּסִי (but read מוֹסֵר, with Cornill), the preceding vowel is lengthened; cf. above, c. On מִרְאֵי for אִמְרֵי, 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 a long *a*, whereas in Hebrew it very rarely occurs as a mere vowel letter after Qameš; as in קָאם Ho 10:14 for קָם *he rose up*; רָאשׁ Pr 10:4, 13:23 for רָשׁ *poor*; but in 2 S 11:1 the *K<sup>e</sup>thibh* הַמְלָאֲכִים *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 *S<sup>e</sup>uā*, takes the corresponding full vowel, e.g. אָזוֹר *girdle* for אָזוֹר; cf. § 84 a, q, and the analogous cases in § 52 n, § 63 p, § 76 d, § 93 r (אֵהָלִים).

3. An א is sometimes added at the end of the word to a final *ū*, *i*, or *ō*, e.g. הָלְכוּ for הָלְכוּ, Jos 10:24 (before א!), אָבוּא Is 28:12. These examples, however, are not so much instances of ‘Arabic orthography’, as early scribal errors, as in יָשׁוּא Je 10:5 for יָשׁוּ; and in יָשׁוּא Ps 139:20 for יָשׁוּ. Cf. also יְהוּא Ec 11:3 (§ 75 s); נְקִיאָ for נְקִי *pure*; לִיּוּ for לִי *if*; אָפוּא for אָפוּ *then (enclitic)*; רְבוּאָ for רְבוּ *myriad*, Neh 7:66, 71. On הוּא 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 word<sup>1</sup> 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 הֵ, with *Rāphè* as an indication of its non-consonantal character, e.g. הֵלָּה *to her* for הֵלָּה, Zc 5:11, &c. (cf. § 103 g, and §§ 58 g, 91 e); cf. also יָהּ for יָהֵ (from יָהוּ) in proper names like יִרְמְיָהּ, &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 *S<sup>e</sup>wā mobile* (see above, c, with א), e.g. קָרָהּ for קָרָהּ (the ה of the article being syncopated as it almost always is); בְּנֵיהֶם for בְּנֵיהֶם [but see § 35 n], בְּשֵׁמֶיִם for בְּשֵׁמֶיִם; יוֹנָתָן for יוֹהוֹנָתָן; perhaps also בְּנֵיהֶם for בְּנֵיהֶם Ez 27:32. (b) By contraction of the vowels preceding and following the ה, e.g. סוּסוּ (also written סוּסֵהּ) from *sūsahu* (*a+u=ō*).—A violent suppression of ה together with its vowel occurs in בָּם (from בָּהֶם), &c.

Rem. In connexion with *ō* and *ē*, a ה which only marks the vowel ending is occasionally changed into ו or י (רָאֵה=רָא, חָכֵה=חָכֵי Ho 6:9), and with any vowel into א in the later or Aramaic orthography, but especially with *ā*, e.g. שָׁנָא *sleep*, Ps 127:2 for שָׁנָה; נָשׂא Jer 23:39 for נָשָׂה, &c. Thus it is evident that final ה as a vowel letter has only an orthographical importance.

## § 24. Changes of the Weak Letters ו and י.

<sup>1</sup> In Jer 22:23, נְחֻמָּה is unquestionably a corruption of נְחֻמָּה for נְחֻמָּה.

<sup>1</sup> Only apparent exceptions are such *proper names* as עֶשְׂרֵהָאֵל, פְּרֻזָּא, which are compounded of two words and hence are sometimes even divided. Cf. forms like הוּזָאֵל for הוּזָאֵל. Another exception is יִפְהֵפְיָהּ, the reading of many MSS. for the artificially divided form יִפְהֵפְיָהּ in the printed texts, Je 46:20.

Philippi, *Die Aussprache der semit. Konsonanten ו und י* (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, *Metrische Studien*, i. 15.

ו and י 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 ו or י occurs as one of the three radical consonants (§ 69 ff., § 85, § 93).

1. The cases in which ו and י 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.<sup>1</sup>

The instances may be classified under two heads:

(a) When either ו or י with *quiescent*  $\check{S}^e w\hat{a}$  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 (ו as *u*, י 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 הוּשַׁב for *huwšab*; יִיקָץ for *yiyqaš*, so also at the end of the word, e.g. עִבְרִי *a Hebrew*, properly *ibriy*, fem. עִבְרִיָּה, pl. עִבְרִיִּים (and עִבְרִים); עֶשׂוּ Jb 41:25 for עֶשׂוּ (cf. עֶשׂוּת 1 S 25:18 *Kethubh*). On the other hand, if the preceding vowel be heterogeneous, ו and י are retained as full consonants (on the pronunciation see § 8 m), e.g. שָׁלוֹ *quiet*, וַיְ the month of May, גּוֹי *nation*, גְּלוּי *revealed*. But with a preceding  $\check{a}$  the ו and י are mostly contracted into  $\hat{o}$  and  $\hat{e}$  (see below, f), and at the end of a word they are sometimes rejected (see below, g).

Complete syncope of ו before  $\hat{i}$  occurs in אֵי *island* for אֵי; עֵי *ruins* for עֵי; רֵי *watering* Jb 37:11 for רֵי; [כֵי *burning* Is 3:24 for כֵי, cf. §§ 84a c, e, 93 y].

Thus an initial י after the prefixes בּ, נּ, כּ, לּ, which would then be pronounced with  $\hat{i}$  (see § 28 a), and also almost always after הּ (see § 102 b), coalesces with the  $\hat{i}$  to  $\hat{i}$ , e.g. בְּיְהוּדָה *in Judah* (for בְּיְ), וּיְהוּדָה *and Judah*, כֵּי אֵל *as the Nile*, לְיְהוּדָה *for Judah*, מִיְדֵי *from the hands of*.

(b) When ו and י without a vowel would stand at the end of the word after *quiescent*  $\check{S}^e w\hat{a}$ , they are either wholly rejected and only orthographically replaced by ה (e.g. בְּכָה from *bikhy*, as well as the regularly formed כְּכִי *weeping*; cf. § 93 x) or become again vowel letters. In the latter case י becomes a homogeneous *Hireq*, and also attracts to itself the tone, whilst the preceding vowel becomes  $\check{S}^e w\hat{a}$  (e.g. פִּירִי from *piry*, properly *pariy*); ו is changed sometimes into a toneless *u* (e.g. תִּהּ from *tuhw*).

<sup>1</sup> Or as consonantal vowels (see above), and are then transcribed by P. Haupt, Philippi, and others, as  $u\check{\square}$ ,  $i\check{\square}$ , following the practice of Indogermanic philologists. ו for ו and, alone is a standing exception, see § 26. 1 and § 104 e. On י=*i* at the beginning of a word, cf. § 47 b, note. According to § 19 a, end, *initial* ו in Hebrew almost always becomes י; always in verbs originally פִּי, § 69 a. Apart from a few proper names, initial ו occurs only in וּ *hook*, וְלֵד *child* Gn 11:30, 2 S 6:23 *Kethubh* [elsewhere לְדֵ], and the doubtful וְדָ 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 *y* or *ȳ*. The LXX also, in accordance with this, write Ἰουδα for יהודה, Ἰσαάκ for יצחק. 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<sup>e</sup>wā*, e.g. (according to the reading of Ben-Naphtali<sup>1</sup>) וְיִלְלֵהְךָ Jer 25:36 for וְיִלְלֵךְ (so Baer), וְיִתְרוֹן Ec 2:13 for וְיִתְרוֹן, cf. also the examples in § 20 h, note 2; even וְיִתְרוֹן Jb 29:21 (in some editions) for וְיִתְרוֹן. According to Qimḥi (see § 47 b) וְיִקְטֹל was pronounced as *iqṭōl*, and therefore the 1st pers. was pointed וְיִקְטֹל to avoid confusion. In fact the Babylonian punctuation always has *i* for *ā* in the 1st pers.

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

(a) With a short *homogeneous* vowel *ו* and *י* are contracted into the corresponding long vowel (*ū* or *i*), see above, b.

(b) With short *ā* they form the diphthongs *ō* and *ē* according to § 7 a, e.g. מִיֻּטִיב from מִיֻּטִיב; מִיֻּשִׁיב from מִיֻּשִׁיב, &c.<sup>2</sup>

Rem. The rejection of the half vowels *ו* and *י* (see above, b) occurs especially at the end of words after a heterogeneous vowel (*ā*), if according to the nature of the form the contraction appears impossible. So especially in verbs לִיָּה, e.g. originally לִיָּה=לִיָּה, since *ā* after the rejection of the *י* stands in an open syllable, and consequently must be lengthened to *ā*. The *י* is simply an orthographic sign of the long vowel. So also שָׁלַח for *šālaw*.<sup>1</sup> On the origin of יִגְלֶה, see § 75 e; on קָם as perf. and part. of קָם, see § 72 b and g; on גָּלַד, &c., from וָלַד, see § 69 b.—On the weakening of *ו* and *י* to *א*, see § 93 x.

## § 25. Unchangeable Vowels.

What vowels in Hebrew are unchangeable, i.e. are not liable to attenuation (to *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*), 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<sup>e</sup>wā*.

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

<sup>2</sup> Instances in which no contraction takes place after *ā* are, מִיֻּמִּינִים 1 Ch 12:2; אִיֻּסִּירָם Ho 7:12 (but cf. § 70 b); הַיֻּשֶׁר Ps 5:9 *Qérê*; the locatives בַּיְתָהּ, מִצֶּרֶךְ, &c.—On the suffix יָכִי for יָךְ see § 91 l.—Sometimes both forms are found, as עוֹלָה and עוֹלָה; cf. *living*, constr. state הַיֻּ. Analogous is the contraction of מָוֶת (ground-form *mawt*) *death*, constr. מוֹת; עַיִן (ground-form *ayn* [*ain*]) *eye*, constr. עֵינִי.

<sup>1</sup> The Arabic, in such cases, often writes etymologically גָּלַי, but pronounces *galā*. So the LXX Σῖνᾱ, Vulg. *Sina*; cf. Nestle, *ZAW*. 1905, p. 362 f. But even in Arabic שָׁלַח is written for שָׁלַח 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,  $i, \hat{e}, \hat{u}, \hat{o}$ , can often be recognized by means of the vowel letters which accompany them (יָ, יֵ, יוּ, יוֹ); e.g. יַיִטִּיב *he does well*, פַּלְאֵס *palace*, גְּבוּל *boundary*, קוֹל *voice*. The *defective* writing (§ 8 i) is indeed common enough, e.g. יִטֵּב and יִטִּיב for יַיִטִּיב; גָּבַל for גְּבוּל; קָל for קוֹל, but this is merely an orthographic licence and has no influence on the quantity of the vowel; the  $\hat{u}$  in גָּבַל is just as necessarily long, as in גְּבוּל.

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

2. The essentially or naturally long  $\hat{a}$  (*Qameš impure*),<sup>2</sup> unless it has become  $\hat{o}$  (cf. § 9 q), has as a rule in Hebrew no representative among the consonants, while in Arabic it is regularly indicated by  $\aleph$ ; on the few instances of this kind in Hebrew, cf. § 9 b, § 23 g. The naturally long  $\hat{a}$  and the merely tone-long  $\bar{a}$  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. מְלִבוּשׁ *garment*, מְדִבְרָר *wilderness*, מְמַלְכָה *kingdom*; similarly, short vowels in sharpened syllables, i.e. before *Dageš forte*, e.g. גַּנֵּב *thief*.

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

### § 26. Syllable-formation<sup>1</sup> 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  $\check{S}wā$ , 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  $\aleph$  and  $\iota$  (cf. note on § 5 b), a consonantal vowel.<sup>2</sup> The copula is a standing exception to this rule. According to the Tiberian pronunciation  $\eta$  *and* is resolved into the corresponding vowel  $\aleph$  before  $\check{S}wā$ , and the labials, e.g. וְדַבֵּר, וְנָלַךְ; the Babylonian punctuation in the latter cases writes  $\eta$ , i.e.  $\eta$  before a full vowel.

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

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> By *vocales impurae* the older grammarians meant vowels properly followed by a vowel letter. Thus קֶתֶב  $kēthābh$  was regarded as merely by a licence for קֶתֶבָּ, &c.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> We are not taking account here of the few cases in which initial *Yodh* is represented as simple *i*, by being written יָ or יֵ, see § 24 e, and especially § 47 b, note; nor of certain other cases in which  $\aleph$  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 אָהַב 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 אָהַב, אָהַב. See below, o, p. Such are also the syllables ending in a strengthened consonant, as the first in אָהַב *qat-tēl*. See below, q.

(c) With *two* consonants, a *doubly closed* syllable, as אָהַב *qōš-t*, אָהַב. Cf. below, r, and § i-1.

3. *Open* or *simple* syllables have a long vowel, whether they have the tone as in אָהַב *in thee*, אָהַב *he goes*, or are toneless as in אָהַב, אָהַב *a bunch of grapes*.<sup>3</sup> A long vowel (Qameṣ, less frequently Šere) is especially common in an open syllable before the tone (pretonic vowel), e.g. אָהַב, אָהַב, אָהַב.<sup>1</sup>

*Short* vowels in *open* syllables occur:

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

(b) In the verbal suffix of the 1st pers. sing. (אָהַב *me*), e.g. אָהַב (Arab. *qātālāni*). The uncommon form אָהַב, 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<sup>3</sup> 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 *bi-kā, qātālā, i-nāb*. 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 *ū* in an open syllable into *ē* and *ō*.

1<sup>1</sup> 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 Ibrâhîm=אָהַב. 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 *Šewā* (אָהַב, אָהַב); and even in Hebrew, when the tone is thrown forward the pretonic vowel almost always becomes *Šewā*, see § 27. It would, however, be incorrect to assume from this that the pretonic vowel has taken the place of *Šewā* 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 *Šewā*.

even when the *Nun* is not expressly written with *Dageš*. In cases like נִּי אֲדָנָי (§ 102 m) *Pathah* is retained in the counter-tone after the *ṣ* has become quiescent.

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

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 נִּי אֲדָנָי above, *g*; cf. the effect of the *arsis* on the short vowel in classical prosody.

(d) In the combinations הָ, הָ, הָ, e.g. בְּנֵי עֶרְוָה *his boy*, יִבְעַסְרָה *he will bind*, פְּעֻלָּה *his deed*. In all these cases the syllable was at first really closed, and it was only when the guttural took a *Haṭeph* that it became in consequence open (but cf. e.g. יִבְעַסְרָה and יִבְעַסְרָה). The same vowel sequence arises wherever a preposition בְּ, בִּ, לְ, or ו copulative is prefixed to an initial syllable which has a *Haṭeph*, since the former then takes the vowel contained in the *Haṭeph* (see § 102 d and § 104 d). To the same category belong also the cases where these prepositions with *Hireq* stand before a consonant with simple *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ* mobile, e.g. בְּדָבָר, בְּדָבָר, &c.

(e) In forms like יְהִיזְקוּ *yähä-z<sup>e</sup>-qû* (they are strong), פְּעֻלָּה *pöŏ l<sup>e</sup>khā* (thy deed). These again are cases of the subsequent opening of closed syllables (hence, e.g. יְהִיזְקוּ also occurs); פְּעֻלָּה is properly *pöŏ l<sup>e</sup>khā*; cf. generally § 22 m, end, and § 28 c.

Such eases as הָהָהָהָ (§ 96), הָהָהָהָ (§ 67 w) do not come under this head, since they all have *ä* in a virtually sharpened syllable; nor does the tone-bearing *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* in suffixes (e.g. דְּבָרָה), nor *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* for *ä* before a guttural with *Qameṣ* (§ 22 c). On וְשִׁים and קְדָשִׁים, 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<sup>e</sup>wâ*, simple or compound. Such a consonant with vocal *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ* 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. לְהָי (cheek) *l<sup>e</sup>hî*; הִלָּה (sickness) *h<sup>e</sup>li*; יְלִמְדוּ *yilim<sup>e</sup>dhû*. This concerns especially the prefixes בְּ, בִּ, לְ. See § 102.

The *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ* mobile is no doubt in all such eases weakened from an original full vowel (e.g. יְקַטְלוּ Arab. *yaqtülû*, בְּךָ 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<sup>e</sup>wâ* 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,<sup>1</sup> e.g. מַלְקָה *queen*, וְשִׁים *understanding*, חֵכְמָה *wisdom*, וְנָסַח *and he turned back*, וְנָקַם, וְנָקַם (*wayyāqōm*).

<sup>1</sup> In exceptions such as וְשִׁים 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*),



becomes מִטָּר; עָקֵב (Arab. *āqīb*) *heel*, dual עֲקֵבִים, dual *construct* (with attenuation of the original *ā* of the first syllable to *i*) עֲקֵבַי [on the ק, see § 20 h]; יָקֵט ל' (Arab. *yāqtūl*), plur. יָקֵטְלוּ (Arab. *yāqtūlū*). For instances of complete loss, as in בְּכַסְפֵּי, 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 יַד־יְהוָה ה' *the hand of Yahwe*; בֶּן *son*, but בֶּן־הַמֶּלֶךְ לֵךְ *the son of the king*; כֹּל *the whole*, but כָּל־הָעָם *the whole of the people*; so also when a tone-bearing closed syllable loses the tone on taking a suffix, e.g. יָבֵב *enemy*, but יָבֵבְךָ אֵל *thy enemy*; finally, when the tone recedes, עָקֵב, but עָקֵבִים (wayyāqōm); יָלַךְ, but יָלַךְ.

(b) To the same category belong cases like סֵפֶר *book*, but סֵפֶרִי *my book*; קֹדֶשׁ *holiness*, but קֹדֶשִׁי *my holiness*. In spite of the helping vowel, סֵפֶר and קֹדֶשׁ are really closed syllables with a tone-long vowel; when the syllable loses the tone, the original *i* or *ō* (properly *ũ*) reappears.

The same is true of syllables with a virtually sharpened final consonant: the lengthening of original *i* to *ē* and *ũ* to *ō* takes place only in a tone-bearing syllable; in a toneless syllable the *i* or *ō* (or *ũ*) remains, e.g. אִמָּךְ *mother*, but אִמִּי *my mother*; חֹק *law*, plur. חֻקִּים; but חֹזֶק *strength*, עֲזָי (and עֲזָי) *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*; סוֹסֵי סוֹסִים primarily from סוֹסֵי. Similarly *ā* mostly becomes *ā* even before a suffix beginning with *Š<sup>e</sup>wā mobile*; e.g. קָטַלְךָ from קָטַל, סוֹסֵיךָ from סוֹסֵי.

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

(c) When a weak consonant (א, ו, י) following the short vowel quiesces in this vowel, according to § 23 a, c, d, § 24 f, e.g. אָצַץ for אָצַץ, where the א, 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 *Š<sup>e</sup>wā mobile*, or even be entirely lost, so that its place is taken by the mere syllable-divider (*Š<sup>e</sup>wā quiescens*). Examples of the first case are, שֵׁם *name*, pl. שֵׁמוֹת, but שֵׁמִי *my name*, שֵׁמוֹתָם *their*

names, דְּבָר word, constr. st. דְּבָר; צְדִיקָה righteousness, constr. st. צְדִיקָה; an example of the second case is, בְּרָכָה blessing, constr. st. בְּרָכָה. Whether the vowel is retained or becomes  $\check{S}^e w\hat{a}$  (דְּמִי, דְּמִי, but שָׁמִי, שָׁמִי), 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  $\check{S}^e w\hat{a}$ .

Thus the change into  $\check{S}^e w\hat{a}$  takes place in—

(a) The  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{e}$  of the first syllable, especially in the inflexion of nouns, e.g. דְּבָר word, plur. דְּבָרִים; גְּדוֹל גדול, fem. גְּדוֹלָה heart, לבב, my heart, לִבִּי; but also in the verb, תֵּשׁב she will return, plur. תֵּשׁבִי, 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  $\bar{a}$  lengthened from  $\check{a}$  before the tone is retained in the *Perfect consecutive* of Qal even in the secondary tone, e.g. נִקְטָל; cf. § 49 i.

(b) The short, or merely tone-long, vowels *a, e, o* of the ultima, especially in verbal forms, e.g. קָטַל fem. קָטְלָה  $q\bar{a}l\bar{a}$ ; יִקְטֹלו  $yiq\check{t}l\bar{u}$ ; but note also יִלְקֹטוּ, &c., according to § 47 m and o. The helping vowels are either entirely omitted, e.g. מֶלֶךְ king (ground-form *malk*), מִלְכִי my king; or, under the influence of a guttural, are weakened to Hatafep, e.g. בֵּן boy, בְּנֵי his boy. If the tone remains unmoved, the vowel also is retained, notwithstanding the lengthening of the word, e.g. יִקְטֹלוּ pausal-form for יִקְטֹלוּ.

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  $\check{S}^e w\hat{a}$ . Cf. דְּבָר word; in the plur. דְּבָרִים; with heavy suffix דְּבָרֵיהֶם (cf. § 28 a) *their words*. On the attenuation of the  $\check{a}$  to  $i$ , see further, *s, t*.

Rem. 1. An  $\hat{o}$  arising from *aw=au*, or by an obscuring of  $\hat{a}$  (see § 9 b), sometimes becomes  $\hat{u}$ , when the tone is moved forward, e.g. נָקוּם וְהָיָה נָקוּם (see Paradigm *Perf. Niph.* of נָקוּם); מְנוּסָה flight, fem. מְנוּסָה, with suffix, מְנוּסָהִי. The not uncommon use of  $\hat{u}$  in a sharpened syllable, as בְּהִיקָי Ez 20:18 (for בְּהִיקָי, cf. also the examples in § 9 o), is to be regarded as an orthographic licence, although sometimes in such cases  $\hat{u}$  may really have been intended by the *K<sup>e</sup>thibh*.

Of the vowels of the U-class,  $\hat{u}$  and tone-long  $\bar{o}$  stand in a tone-bearing closed final syllable, and  $\bar{o}$  in a toneless syllable, e.g. יָקוּם he will arise, יָקוּם jussive, let him arise, וַיָּקָם and he arose. The only instance of  $\check{u}$  in an ultima which has lost the tone is וַיָּרָם Ex 16:20 (see § 67 n). Similarly, of vowels of the I-class,  $\hat{e}$ ,  $\hat{i}$ , and  $\bar{e}$  stand in a tone-bearing closed final syllable, and  $\check{e}$  in a toneless syllable, e.g. יָרִים he will raise, יָרִים let him raise, וַיָּרָם and he raised. The only instance of  $i$  in an ultima which has lost the tone is וַיָּרָם Ju 9:53 (see § 67 p).

2. In the place of a *Pathah* we not infrequently find (according to § 9 f) a  $\check{S}^e gh\hat{o}l$  ( $\check{e}$ ,  $\check{e}$ ) as a modification of  $\check{a}$ :

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

in a closed penultima, e.g. יָדְךָ, but also יָדְךָ *your hand*, for *yad<sup>e</sup>khèm*. 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 *Haṭeph Qameṣ*, where the strengthening has been dropped, provided that a lengthening of the *Pathaḥ* into *Qameṣ* be not necessary, e.g. אָחָיו *his brothers*, for *'ahāw*; שֶׁבַע *false*, for *kaḥās*; פֶּהַח *governor*, constr. st. פֶּהַח; פֶּהַח *coal*; יְחַיִּי *the living* (with the article, הֵּ for הַ); Nu 23:19, &c., and so always before הֵּ and הָ, as חֳדָשִׁים *the months*, see § 35 k. Before הֵּ and שֶׁ *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* generally stands only in the second syllable before the tone, e.g. הַרְרִים *the mountains*; עוֹן *the guilt*, immediately before the tone *Pathaḥ* is lengthened into a (pretonic) *Qameṣ*, e.g. הַרְרִים; but cf. also הַרְרִים Nu 8:7. Before the weak consonants א and ר (cf. § 22 c, q), the lengthening of the *Pathaḥ* into *Qameṣ* almost always takes place, e.g. אָב *the father*, pl. אָבוֹת; אֵשׁ *the head*, pl. ראָשִׁים. Exceptions, הָרָה *towards the mountain*, Gn 14:10, in the tone-syllable, for *harrā*; הַרְרִים (pr. name) for הַרְרִים. On הֵּ as a form of the interrogative הֵּ (הַ), see § 100 n; on מָה for מַה (מָה), § 37 e, f. Finally, אֶכְלֶךָ Ex 33:3 also comes partly under this head, in consequence of the loss of the strengthening, for אֶכְלֶךָ, and יְחַזְקֶנּוּ *Ezekiel* for יְחַזְקֶנּוּ = יְחַזְקֶנּוּ *God strengthens*.

(c) As a modification of the original *Pathaḥ* 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<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, is modified into קָלֵב (also in modern Arabic pronounced *kelb*),<sup>1</sup> *yarḥ* (*month*), with a helping *Pathaḥ*, יָרַח. The same phenomenon appears also in the formation of verbs, in cases like יָגַל (jussive of the Hiphîl of גָּלַה), with a helping *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, for *yagl*.

3. The attenuation of *ā* to *i* is very common in a toneless closed syllable.

(a) In a firmly closed syllable, מְדוּ *his incasure*, for מְדוּ (in a sharpened syllable); יִלְדֶתְךָ *I have begotten thee*, from יִלְדֶתְךָ with the suffix תְּ; 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 *qaṭl*, when combined with singular suffixes, e.g. צַדִּיקִי *my righteousness*, for *ṣadqī*.

(b) In a loosely-closed syllable, i.e. one followed by an aspirated *Begadk<sup>e</sup>phath*, as דְּמָמְךָ *your blood*, for דְּמָמְךָ, and so commonly in the *st. constr. plur.* of segholates from the ground-form *qaṭl*, e.g. בְּגָדִי from בְּגָד (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.<sup>1</sup>

4. *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* 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 (הַ תְּ for הַ תְּ) in 1 S 28:15 (? see § 48 d), Ps 20:4 (?), Is 59:5, Pr 24:14 (see § 48 1); for examples of Locative forms in הַ תְּ see § 90 i end.

<sup>1</sup> So the LXX write Μελαχισεδέκ for דְּמָמְךָ.

<sup>1</sup> Analogous to this attenuation of *ā* to *i* is the Lat. *tango, attingo; laxis, prolixus*; to the transition of *ā* to *ē* (see above, a), the Lat. *carpo, decerpo; spargo, conspergo*.

5. Among the *Ḥaṭeph*-sounds ַ is shorter and lighter than ָ, and consequently the vowel group ַ, ַ is shorter than ָ, ָ; e.g. אֶדוֹם *Edom*, but אֶדְמוֹנִי (*Edomite*), shortened at the beginning because the tone is thrown forward; אֶמֶת (*mèth*) *truth*, אֶמֶתוֹ *his truth*; הַעֲלֵם *hidden*, pl. הַעֲלֵמִים but הַעֲבֵרְתִּי but also conversely הַעֲשֵׂה fem. הַעֲשֵׂתָה 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.<sup>2</sup> Hence לֹלֵא for *lû lô* (unless). Cf. also הַיְצוֹן from הַצֹּן; רֵאשׁוֹן from רֵאשׁוֹן; תִּיכּוֹן from תִּיכּוֹן; נֶכַח from נֶכַח; עֵירִם from עֵירִם; עוֹר from עוֹר; most probably also יְלוֹד *offspring*, קַפּוֹד *porcupine*, for יְלִי, קַפּוֹ, see § 68 c, note.—On the proper names יְהוּא and יְשׁוּעַ, which were formerly explained in the same way, see now Praätorius, *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<sup>e</sup>wâ* mobile (always weakened from a short vowel), can only occur in close dependence on a full syllable. If another half-syllable with simple *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ* follows, the first takes a full short vowel again.<sup>3</sup> This vowel is almost always *Ḥireq*. In most cases it is probably an attenuation of an original *ǎ*, 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 בּ, פּ, לּ before a consonant with *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ* mobile become בַּ, פַּ, לַּ, e.g. בְּפָרִי, פְּפָרִי, לְפָרִי; before י they are pointed as in יְהוּרָה בַּ (from *bi-yeh<sup>e</sup>dûā*, according to § 24 c); so too with *Wāw* copulative, e.g. יְהוּרָה בַּ for יְהוּרָה בַּ. The first half-syllable, after the restoration of the short vowel, sometimes combines with the second to form a firmly closed syllable, e.g. לִנְפֹל Nu 14:3 for *lin<sup>e</sup>phōl*, and so almost always in the infin. constr. after ל (§ 45 g); in isolated cases also with בּ, as בְּזַפֵּר Jer 17:2.

2. If a guttural with *Ḥaṭeph* follows, the original *ǎ* of the prefixes is retained before *Ḥaṭeph* Pathah, but before *Ḥaṭeph* S<sup>e</sup>ghol or *Ḥaṭeph* Qameṣ it is modified to the short vowel contained in the *Ḥaṭeph*. Thus arise the vowel groups ַ, ַ, ַ, e.g. אֶנִּי *and I*, אֶשֶׁר *as*, לְעַבֵּד *to serve*, לְאָכַל *to eat*, לְחָלִי *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 *Ḥaṭeph*, e.g. לְחָטַב for לְחָטַב; לְחָמַם Is 47:14 for לְחָמַם (see § 67 cc); לְאָסַר but also לְאָסַר; and even לְעַצֵּר Jb 4:2, cf. Gn 32:16. So always in the Infin. and Imperat. Qal of the verbs הָיָה *to be* and הָיָה *to live*, e.g. לְהִיֹּת *to be*, וְהִיֹּת *and be ye*; even with מָן, as מְהִיֹּת, on which cf. § 102 b; but הָיָה וְהִיֹּת *and be*, וְהִיֹּת *and live*, have *ě* instead of *i* under the prefix. For the Metheg, cf. § 16 f, ε.

3. When a *Ḥaṭeph* in the middle of a word, owing to flexional changes, would stand before a vocal *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ*, it is changed into the short vowel, with which it is compounded. This applies especially to cases in which the *Ḥaṭeph* stands under a

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Except וְ *and*, which generally becomes ו before a simple *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ*, cf. § 104 c.

guttural instead of quiescent  $\check{S}^e w\hat{a}$ , as an echo of the preceding short vowel, e.g.  $\text{וַיִּצַמְדוּ}$  *he will stand* (for  $\text{וַיִּצַמְדוּ}$ ), but plur.  $\text{וַיִּצַמְדוּ$  for  $ya^a m^e dh\hat{u}$ , and  $\text{וַיִּפְּכוּ$  for  $n\check{e}h^a ph^e kh\hat{u}$  (*they have turned themselves*),  $\text{וַיִּשְׁלְמוּ}$  *thy work*, cf. § 26 k. The syllables are to be divided  $y\check{a}\check{a}-m^e dh\hat{u}$ , and the second  $\check{a}$  is to be regarded exactly as the helping *Pathah* in  $\text{וַיִּעַד}$  &c.<sup>1</sup>

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, ת<sup>2</sup>), e.g.  $\text{וַיִּשָּׁבֵט}$  *let him turn aside*,  $\text{וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ}$  *and he caused to drink*,  $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַעְתָּ$  *thou (fem.) hast said*,  $\text{וַיִּבְכֶּה}$  *and he wept*,  $\text{וַיִּרְדּוּ$  *and let him have dominion*,  $\text{וַיִּשְׁבֹּר}$  *and he took captive*.

This harsh ending is elsewhere avoided by the Masora,<sup>3</sup> which inserts between the two final consonants a helping vowel, usually  $\check{S}^e gh\hat{o}l$ , but with medial or final gutturals a *Pathah*,<sup>1</sup> and after י a *Hireq*, e.g.  $\text{וַיִּגְלוּ}$  *and he revealed*, for *wayyigl*;  $\text{וַיִּרְבּוּ}$  *let it multiply*, for *yirb*;  $\text{וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ}$  *holiness*, ground-form *qudš*;  $\text{וַיִּנְחַל}$  *brook*, ground-form *naḥl*;  $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַחְתָּ$  for  $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַחְתָּ}$  *thou hast sent*;  $\text{וַיִּבַּח}$  *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.  $\text{וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ}$  *my holiness*,  $\text{וַיִּבַּחְתָּ$  *home-ward*.

5. On the rise of a full vowel in place of a simple  $\check{S}^e w\hat{a}$ , under the influence of the *pause*, see § 29 m; on initial א for א, 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.  $\text{וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּבַּח}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּנְחַל}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַחְתָּ}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַעְתָּ}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּרְבּוּ}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּנְחַל}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַחְתָּ}$ —in the last five examples on the formative additions to the stem. Less frequently it rests on the penultima, as in  $\text{וַיִּלְחַץ}$  *night*,  $\text{וַיִּלְחַץ}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּלְחַץ}$ ; but a closed penultima can only have the tone if the ultima is open (e.g.  $\text{וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּבַּח}$ ,  $\text{וַיִּנְחַל}$ ), whilst a closed ultima can as a

1 <sup>1</sup> In Ju 16:13 read  $\text{וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ}$  not (with Opius, Hahn and others)  $\text{וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ}$ .

2 <sup>2</sup> With a final א, the only example is  $\text{וַיִּתְחַבֵּר}$  Pr 30:6, where several MSS. and printed editions incorrectly have א without Dageš. Instead of this masoretic caprice we should no doubt read  $\text{וַיִּתְחַבֵּר}$ .

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

1 <sup>1</sup> On the apparent exceptions  $\text{וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ}$  &c., cf. § 22 e; other instances in which א has entirely lost its consonantal value, and is only retained orthographically, are  $\text{וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ}$  *sin*,  $\text{וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ}$  *valley* (also  $\text{וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ}$ ),  $\text{וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ}$  *vanity* (Jb 15:31 *K<sup>e</sup>thu□bh*  $\text{וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ}$ ).

2 <sup>2</sup> In this form (§ 65 g) the *Dageš lene* remains in the final *Tāw*, 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  $\text{וַיִּחַד}$  *yiḥād* from  $\text{וַיִּחַד}$  (§ 75 r).

rule only be without the tone if the penultima is open, e.g. גַּם, גַּם; 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. דְּבַר דְּבַר *word*, plur. דְּבַרְךָ יָם; דְּבַרְיָם *your words*; שְׂדֵה קֹדֶשׁ *holy thing*, plur. שְׂדֵה קֹדֶשׁ; קָטָן לְתֵּת; קָטָן לְתֵּת with suffix הוּ קָטָן לְתֵּת, with *Wāw consecutive* וְקָטָן לְתֵּת. 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* (·גַּם see § 49 c–e), e.g. אָמַר יְיָ אֱמַר *he will say*, אָמַר וַיֹּאמֶר *and he said*; יֵלֵךְ *he will go*, יָלַךְ *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 ו *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-syllables<sup>1</sup>. This rhythmical retraction of the tone, however (נָסוּג אָחֹר *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 לְיֵהוָה 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. אָכַל לֶחֶם Gn 3:19, Jb 3:3, 22:28.<sup>2</sup> The *grave* suffixes כָּם, כֹּן, קָם, קֹן 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 הִיָּה, and before א; cf. Qimḥi, *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenberg (Lyck, 1862), p. 4<sup>b</sup>, line 13 ff.

1<sup>1</sup> 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 *Darcho 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. וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים Is 45:7, where the object probably is to avoid a kind of hiatus; but cf. also Am 4:13. Prätorius, *Ueber den rückweich. Accent im Hebr.*, Halle, 1897, has fully discussed the *nasog 'aḥor*.

2<sup>2</sup> The reading יָמִים עָדְיָם (so even Opatius and Hahn) Ez 16:7 for יָמִים עָדְיָם 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 *Ṣere* 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<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, e.g. לָבַעַר קָוֹן 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 Pathah* Pr 1:19, 11:26, &c., although there is no question here of two successive tone-syllables. In other cases the shortening into *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* does take place, e.g. הוֹלֵם פֶּעַם *who smiteth the anvil*, Is 41:7, for הוֹלֵם פֶּעַם; מֵאֵת שֶׁמֶר 1 K 16:24.—The retraction of the tone even occurs when a half-syllable with a *Ṣwâ* mobile precedes the original tone-syllable, e.g. לֹא מָרוּ לוֹ Gn 19:5, and frequently; יוֹרְדֵי בּוֹר Ps 28:1; לִי טָמְנוּ לִי Ps 31:5; מִטְּעֵנִי הָרֵב Is 14:19; as also when the tone-syllable of the second word is preceded by a half-syllable, e.g. עֲשֵׂה פְרִי Gn 1:11 (on the *Dag. f.*, cf. § 20 f); לָתֵת לָךְ 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. אָחַר כֵּן 1 S 10:5, § 101 a; נֶכְחָשׁ בּוֹ Jb 8:18, cf. Lv 5:22, Ho 9:2; לָצֵק קֶבֶן 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 הָקָם עַל 2 S 23:1; נִכְרַשׁוּעַ Jb 34:19; cf. also יִקָּם-קֶן Gn 4:24, with *Metheg* of the secondary tone. We should read either הָקָם, or, with Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 167, Ginsb., Kittel, after Bomb., הָקָם. Other abnormal forms are וַיִּחְזַק בּוֹ Ex 4:4 (for similar instances see § 15 c, end) and וַיִּהְיוּ שָׁם 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. וַיִּכְתֹּב-שָׁם *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*, *Athnâḥ*, and in the accentuation of the books תַּאֲמִם, *Ôlè w<sup>e</sup>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<sup>e</sup>golta*, *Zaqeph qaṭon*, *R<sup>e</sup>bhi<sup>e</sup>*, and even with *Pašṭa*, *Tiphṭa*, *Gereš*, and (Pr 30:4) *Pazer*.<sup>1</sup> The changes are as follows:

<sup>1</sup> In most cases, probably on account of a following guttural or (at the end of a sentence) ו (cf. e.g. Ex 21:31, Jer 3:9 [but Ginsb. וַתַּחַנֵּן], Ru 4:4, Ec 11:6 [but Ginsb. וַיִּכְשַׁר]; before וַיְיָ Jer 17:11) [see also § 29 w]. וַיִּשְׁפֹּט 1 S 7:17, וַיִּחְזַק Is 65:17, Pr 25:3, where *ā* has *munaḥ*, are very irregular, but the lengthening here is probably only to avoid the cacophony *šphá-ṭēt*. In the same way וַיִּצְלַח Ez 17:15 (with *Mahpakh* before ה) and וַיִּקְרָם Ez 37:8 (with *Darga* before ע) are to be explained. The four instances of וַיִּנֶּה for וַיִּנֶּה 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, קָטַל, מָיִם, מָיִם, קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ. An  $\check{a}$  which has been modified to  $S^e gh\acute{o}l$  usually becomes  $\bar{a}$  in *pause*, e.g. קָשָׁר (ground-form *qašr*) in *pause* קָשָׁר 2 K 11:14; אָרְצָא אָרְצָא Jer 22:29; also in 2 K 4:31 read קָשָׁב with ed. Mant., &c. (Baer בָּשָׁב).—דָּבָר becomes in *pause* דָּבָר.

Sometimes, however, the distinct and sharper  $\check{a}$  is intentionally retained in *pause*, especially if the following consonant is strengthened, e.g. יָבִיחַ Jb 4:20, or ought to be strengthened, e.g. כָּבַח 2 S 12:3, זָבַח Is 8:1, &c.; but also in other cases as יָבִיחַ Gn 27:2, because from יָבִיחַ, cf. below, q; עָד Gn 49:27; שָׁנוּ 2 Ch 29:19 (so Baer, but Ginsb. 'הקד', ed. Mant. 'הקד'); and regularly in the numeral אַרְבַּע *four*, Lv 11:20, &c. In the accentuation of the three poetical books (§ 15 d) the use of *Pathah* with *Athnah* is due to the inferior pausal force of *Athnah*, especially after *Ôlè w<sup>e</sup>yored* (§ 15 o); cf. Ps 100:8, Pr 30:9, and Qimḥi, *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenberg, p. 5<sup>b</sup>, line 4 from below. Compare the list of instances of pausal  $\check{a}$  and  $\acute{e}$  in the appendices to Baer's editions.

(b) When a full vowel in a tone-bearing final syllable has lost the tone before an affirmative, and has become *vocal Šwâ*, it is restored in *pause* as tone-vowel, and, if short, is lengthened, e.g. קָטַל, *fem.* קָטַלְתָּ (qāṭlā), in *pause* קָטַלְתָּ; שָׁמַעוּ (*šm<sup>e</sup>û*), in *pause* עוּ שָׁמַעוּ (from sing. שָׁמַע); מָלְאָה, מָלְאָה, מָלְאָה (sing. מָלְאָה). The fuller endings of the Imperfect וִין and יִין (§ 47 m and o) alone retain the tone even when the original vowel is restored. In segholate forms, like לָחִי, פָּרִי (ground-form *lahy, pary*), the original  $\check{a}$  returns, though under the form of a tone-bearing  $S^e gh\acute{o}l$ , thus לָחִי; פָּרִי; original  $i$  becomes  $\bar{e}$ , e.g. הָצִי, in *pause* הָצִי; original  $\acute{o}$  ( $\acute{u}$ ) becomes  $\bar{o}$ , הָלִי (ground-form *huly*), in *pause* הָלִי (93 x, y, z).

On the analogy of such forms as לָחִי, &c., the shortened Imperfects יִהִי and יִהְיֶה become in *pause* יִהִי, יִהְיֶה, because in the full forms יִהְיֶה *he will be*, and יִהִי *he will live*, the  $i$  is attenuated from an original  $\check{a}$ . Similarly שָׁכַם *shoulder*, in *pause* שָׁכַם (ground-form *šakhm*), and the pron. אֲנִי *I*, in *pause* אֲנִי; cf. also the restoration of the original  $\check{a}$  as  $\acute{e}$  before the suffix יִי, *thy, thee*, e.g. דְּבָרְךָ *thy word*, in *pause* דְּבָרְךָ; יִשְׁמְרֶךָ *he guards thee*, in *pause* יִשְׁמְרֶךָ; but after the prepositions בְּ, לְ, אֶת (את) the suffix יִי in *pause* becomes יִי, e.g. בְּךָ, לְךָ, אֶתְךָ.

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

---

*Metr. Studien*, i. 236, also explains pausal forms like קָטַלְתָּ, יִקָּטַלְתָּ 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.

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

*w<sup>e</sup>yōrēd*, has only the force of a *Zaqeph*; hence also וּמָלָא Pr 24:4 instead of וּמָלָא<sup>2</sup>; עַתָּה *now*, עַתָּה; and in other sporadic instances, like כָּל־וּ Ps 37:20 for וּכָל; but in 1 S 12:25 תִּפְּקוּ 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. וַיָּמָת *and he died*, in *pause* תַּיִמָּת.

Of other effects of the *pause* we have still to mention, (1) the transition of an *e* (lengthened from *i*) to the more distinct *ā* (see above, l), e.g. הַתִּזּוּ for הִתִּזּוּ Is 18:5 (cf. § 67 v; § 72 dd); קָמַל Is 33:9; אָצַל 1 Ch 8:38 (beside אֶצַּל [, see v. 37. Cf. בָּאֵלִי Is 7:6 (Ezr 4:7); אֶשְׁשֶׁר Jer 22:14; סָפַר Ob 20; וַיִּצַּפּ־שׁ Ex 31:17; וַיִּצַּב־שׁ 2 S 12:15 (below, § 51 m)—S. R. D.]); הִפָּר Gn 17:14; הִפָּצַר 1 S 15:23; תָּאֲחָר Ps 40:18; הִרְחַק Jb 13:21, mostly before liquids or sibilants (but also בִּהְשֵׁב Is 42:22, and without the *pause* תִּרְדּוּ La 3:48). So also וַיִּלָּךְ (shortened from וַיִּלָּךְ) becomes in *pause* וַיִּלָּךְ; cf. וַיִּלָּךְ La 3:2; וַיִּלָּךְ for וַיִּלָּךְ Ju 19:20. On *S<sup>c</sup>ghôl* in *pause* instead of *Ṣere*, el. § 52 n, 60 d, and especially § 75 n, on וַיִּהְיֶה Pr 4:4 and 7:2.

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

(3) The *pausal Qameṣ* (according to § 54 k, lengthened from original *ā*) in *Hithpaël* (but not in *Piël*) for *Ṣere*, e.g. וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ Jb 18:8 for וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ. But *pausal* forms like וַיִּשָּׁבֵט (in the *absol. st.* וַיִּשָּׁבֵט, *ṣ*) go back to a secondary form of the *abs. st.* וַיִּשָּׁבֵט, *ṣ*.

(4) The restoration of a final *Yodh* which has been dropped from the stem, together with the preceding vowel, e.g. וַיִּבְרַע יוֹ אֶת־יוֹ Is 21:12, for וַיִּבְרַע יוֹ, 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 *ō* to *ā* in *pause*: as וַיִּשְׁאַל־הָ Is 7:11, if it be a locative of וַיִּשְׁאַל, and not rather imperat. Qal of וַיִּשְׁאַל לְתִי; וַיִּשְׁכַּח לְתִי Gn 43:14 for וַיִּשְׁכַּח לְתִי; וַיִּצַּד Gn 49:3; וַיִּטְרַף Gn 49:27; perhaps also וַיִּשְׁרַן 1 K 22:34, Is 59:17, and וַיִּשְׁקָ לָהּ Is 28:17, cf. 2 K 21:13. On the other hand the regular *pausal* form וַיִּתְּפַח (ordinary imperfect וַיִּתְּפַח) corresponds to a perfect וַיִּתְּפַח (see § 47 h).

(6) When a *Pathah* both precedes and follows a virtually strengthened guttural, the second becomes *ā* in *pause*, and the first *S<sup>c</sup>ghôl*, according to § 22 c and § 27 q, e.g. וַיִּשְׁאָל my brothers, in *pause* וַיִּשְׁאָל. Similarly in cases where an original *Pathah* after a guttural has been attenuated to *i* out of *pause*, and then lengthened to *ē* with the tone (cf. § 54 k), e.g. וַיִּתְּנֶהּ, but in *pause* וַיִּתְּנֶהּ Dt 32:36; cf. Nu 8:7, 23:19, Ez 5:13, Ps 135:14.—On *pausal Ṣere*, for *S<sup>c</sup>ghôl*, in *infin.*, *imperat.*, and *imperf.* of verbs לִי, 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 וַיַּעַבְדוּ, Is 8:15, 40:24, Ho 4:12, 8:7, Dn 9:15, and very often in such cases.]

---

<sup>2</sup> וַיִּפְּקוּ Ps 45:6, cf. also וַיִּלְמְדוּ Ps 40:15, is to be explained in the same way, but not וַיִּלְמְדוּ Zc 2:11, where, on the analogy of וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ Je 9:3, we should expect וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ.

# SECOND PART

## ETYMOLOGY, OR THE PARTS OF SPEECH

### § 30. *Stems and Roots*<sup>1</sup>: *Biliteral, Triliteral, and Quadriliteral.*

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. עמק (עמק or ק'מ'ע; the 3rd pers. sing. perf. does not occur) *it was deep*, ק'מ'ע *deep*, ע'מק *depth*, ע'מק *a valley, plain*. Such a stem may be either a verb or a noun, and the language commonly exhibits both together, e.g. שָׂרַע *he has sown*, רַעַי *seed*; חָכַם *he was wise*, חָכֵם *a wise man*. For practical purposes, however, it has long been the custom to regard as the stem 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. שָׁדַח *he was holy*, שְׁדִיחַ *holiness*, קִדְוִישׁ *holy*.

Sometimes the language, as we have it, exhibits only the verbal stem without any corresponding noun-form, e.g. סָקַל *to stone*, בָּרַח *to bray*; and on the other hand, the noun sometimes exists without the corresponding verb, e.g. סָבֵן *stone*, נֹבֵן *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 *ābinā* (*to become compact, hard*) corresponds to בָּן *to be dry*, and the Aramaic verb *n<sup>e</sup>gab* (*to be dry*) to נָבַן.

Rem. 1. The Jewish grammarians call the stem (i.e. the 3rd pers. sing. Perf. Qal) שָׂרַע *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: מָלַךְ, the indeterminate idea of *ruling*.

Verb-stem, מָלַךְ *he has reigned*.

Noun-stem, מֶלֶךְ *king*.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 trilateral stem (see f).<sup>1</sup>

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. קָטַל. 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. קָם from *qāwām*; or from stems whose second and third consonants are identical, e.g. צַל and צָרַר (but see below, §§ 67, 72). The dissyllabic forms have themselves no doubt arisen, through a loss of the final vowel, from trisyllables, e.g. קָטַל from *qātālā*, as it is in literary Arabic.

2. The law of the trilateral 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. פָּרַח for the inf. constr. of verbs פָּרוּ; cf. § 69 b. Conversely such nouns, as אָב *father*, אִמָּה *mother*, אָח *brother*, which were formerly all regarded as original monosyllabic forms (*nomina primitiva*), may, in some cases at least, have arisen from mutilation of a trilateral stem.

On the other hand, a large number of trilateral stems really point to a biliteral base, which may be properly called a *root* (*radix primaria, biliteralis*), since it forms the starting-point for several trilateral 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. □ כַּר as the root of כָּרַר, כָּרַה, כָּוַר, אָכַר. 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 דָּבַר, דָּוַר, דָּבַא, דָּבַה may all be traced to the idea of *striking, breaking*, and the root common to them all is evidently the two strong consonants דָּב (*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.<sup>1</sup> 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 קָץ (no doubt *onomatopoetic*, i.e. imitating the sound), which represents the fundamental idea of *carving off, cutting in pieces*, are derived directly: קָצַץ and קָצַה *to cut, to cut off*, the latter also metaph. *to decide, to judge* (whence קָצִין, Arab. *qāḏī, a judge*); also קָצַב *to cut off, to shear*, קָצַף *to tear, to break*, קָצַע *to cut into, to cut off, to reap*. With a dental instead of the sibilant, קָט, קָד, whence קָטַב *to cut in pieces, to destroy*, קָטַל *to cut down, to kill*, קָטַף *to tear off, to pluck off*. With the initial letter softened, the root becomes כָּס, whence כָּסַב *to cut off*, and כָּסַם *to shave*; cf. also נָכַס Syr. *to slay (sacrifice), to kill*. With the greatest softening to גָּז and גָּד, גָּזַז *to cut off, to shear*; גָּזַה *to hew stone*; גָּזַם, גָּזַם,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Philippi, 'Der Grundstamm des starken Verbums,' in *Morgenländische Forschungen*, Leipz. 1875, pp. 69–106.

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





laws, must remain undecided. At all events, the many peculiarities of their formation<sup>2</sup> 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 (קָטַל, קִטַּל, קֵטַל; קָטַל, קִטַּל, קֵטַל, &c.). This is accompanied in numerous cases by external formation also (הִתְקַטַּל, הִתְקַטַּל, &c.), and even these formative additions again are subject to internal change, e.g. הִתְקַטַּל, הִתְקַטַּל. 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.*

---

<sup>2</sup> 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. ἔγώ, 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>I.</i> אָנִי in <i>pause</i> אָנִי; אָנִי, in <i>pause</i> אָנִי	<i>we.</i> אָנִי אָנִי in <i>pause</i> אָנִי אָנִי (אָנִי, in <i>pause</i> אָנִי אָנִי), (אָנִי)
2nd Person, Masc. <i>thou.</i> אַתָּה (אַתָּה), in <i>pause</i> אַתָּה or אַתָּה	<i>ye.</i> <i>m.</i> אַתָּם
2nd Person, Fem. <i>thou</i> אַתְּ (אַתְּ properly אַתְּ), in <i>pause</i> אַתְּ	אַתְּנָה (אַתְּנָה); אַתְּנָה
3rd Person, Masc. <i>he (it)</i> הוא	<i>they.</i> הֵם (הֵם), הֵן
3rd Person, Fem. <i>she (it)</i> היא	הֵן after <i>prefixes</i> הֵן, הֵן

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 אָנִי is less frequent than אָנִי<sup>1</sup> The former occurs in Phoenician, Moabite, and Assyrian, but in no other of the kindred dialects;<sup>1</sup> from the latter the suffixes are derived (§ 33). The *ô* most probably results from an obscuring of an original *â* (cf. Aram. אָנִי, Arab. 'ána). The pausal form אָנִי occurs not only with small disjunctive accents, but even with conjunctives; so always in אָנִי אָנִי *as I live!* also Is 49:18 with Munaḥ, Ps 119:125 with Merkha

<sup>1</sup> On the prevalence of אָנִי 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 אָנִי is not found at all, and hardly at all in the Talmud. [For details see the *Lexicon.*, s. v. אָנִי and אָנִי.]

<sup>1</sup> In Phoenician and Moabite (inscription of Mēša, line 1) it is written אָנִי, without the final י. 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<sup>e</sup>hū), 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 אנו (אָנוּ) from which the suffix is derived occurs only in [Jer 42:6](#) *K<sup>e</sup>thūbh*. The form אָנוּנוּ (cf. [§ 19 h](#)) only in [Ex 16:7, 8](#), [Nu 32:32](#), [La 3:42](#); אָנוּנוּ in *pause*, [Gn 42:11](#); in Arabic *nāḥnu* is the regular form. In the Mišna אנו (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, אַתְּמָה, אַתְּמָה, &c., are contracted from *'antā*, &c. The kindred languages have retained the *n* before the ת, e.g. Arab. *'anā*, fem. *'anti*, thou; pl. *'antum*, fem. *'antūnna*, ye. In Syriac אַתְּמָה, fem. אַתְּמָה are written, but both are pronounced *'at*. In Western Aramaic אַתְּמָה is usual for both genders.

אַתְּ (without ה) occurs five times, e.g. [Ps 6:4](#), always as *K<sup>e</sup>thūbh*, with אַתְּמָה as *Q<sup>e</sup>rē*. In three places אַתְּמָה appears as a masculine, [Nu 11:15](#), [Dt 5:24](#), [Ez 28:14](#).

The feminine form was originally אַתְּמָה as in Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic. This form is found seven times as *K<sup>e</sup>thūbh* ([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 אַתְּמָה יָנִי, [§ 59 a](#) [c]; cf. also *i* as the ending of the 2nd fem. sing. of the imperative and imperfect. The final *i* was, however, gradually dropped in pronunciation, just as in Syriac (see above, [f](#)) it was eventually only written, not pronounced. The *y* therefore finally disappeared (cf. [§ 10 k](#)), and hence the Masoretes, even in these seven passages, have pointed the word in the text as אַתְּמָה to indicate the *Q<sup>e</sup>rē* אַתְּמָה (see [§ 17](#)). The same final *y* appears in the rare (Aramaic) forms of the suffix כִּי יָנִי, כִּי יָנִי ( §§ 58, 91).

5. The plurals אַתְּמָה (with the second vowel assimilated to the fem. form) and אַתְּמָה (אַתְּמָה), with the tone on the ultima, only partially correspond to the assumed ground-forms *antumū*, fem. *antinnā*, Arab. *āntūm* (Aram. אַתְּמָה, אַתְּמָה) and *āntūnna* (Aram. אַתְּמָה, אַתְּמָה). The form אַתְּמָה is found only in [Ez 34:31](#) (so Qimḥi expressly, others אַתְּמָה); אַתְּמָה (for which some MSS. have אַתְּמָה) only four times, viz. [Gn 31:6](#), [Ez 13:11, 20, 34:17](#); in [13:20](#) אַתְּמָה (before a מ) is even used as feminine.

#### *Third Person.*

6. (a) In אָנוּ and אָנוּ ( *hū* and *hū* ) the א (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 לויא, לויא, &c. The ך is, however, always written in the case of the separate pronouns,<sup>1</sup> and only as a toneless suffix (§ 33 a) does הויא appear as הוי, while הויא becomes הוי. In Arabic (as in Syriac) they are written הוי and הוי but pronounced *húwā* and *híyā*, and in Vulgar Arabic even *húwwa* and *híyya*. This Arabic pronunciation alone would not indeed be decisive, since the vowel complement might have arisen from the more consonantal pronunciation of the ו and י; but the Ethiopic *we<sup>e</sup>tû* (= *hua-tû*) for הויא, *ye<sup>e</sup>tî* (= *hia-tî*) for הויא (cf. also the Assyrian *ya-u-a* for הויא) show that the ך was original and indicated an original vocalic termination of the two words. According to Philippi (*ZDMG.* xxviii. 175 and xxix. 371 ff.) הויא arose from a primitive Semitic *ha-va*, הויא from *ha-ya*.

(b) The form הויא also stands in the consonantal text (*K<sup>e</sup>thibh*) of the Pentateuch<sup>2</sup> (with the exception of eleven places) for the *fem.* הויא. In all such cases the Masora, by the punctuation הויא, has indicated the *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* הויא (*Q<sup>e</sup>rê* 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 הויא and הויא are found close to one another; (3) that outside the Pentateuch the distinction is found in the oldest documents, so that the הויא 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 הויא. Consequently there only remains the hypothesis, that the writing of הויא for הויא 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 הויא for הויא in 1 K 17:15, Is 30:33, Jb 31:11, or הויא for הויא in Ps 73:16, Ec 5:8, 1 Ch 29:16. The Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch has the correct form in the *K<sup>e</sup>thibh* throughout. Levy's explanation of this strange practice of the Masoretes is evidently right, viz. that originally הויא was written for both forms (see k, note), and was almost everywhere, irrespective of gender, expanded into הויא. On the whole question see Driver, *Leviticus* (in Haupt's Bible), p. 25 f. In the text Driver always reads הויא.

7. The plural forms הויא (הויא) and הויא (after *prefixes* הויא, הויא) are of doubtful origin, but הויא, הויא have probably been assimilated to הויא which goes back to a form *hinnā*. In Western Aram. הויא, הויא, Syr. *henûn* (*enûn*), Arab. *hūmū* (archaic form of *hum*), and Ethiop. *hômû*, an *ô* or *ô* is appended, which in Hebrew seems to reappear in the poetical suffixes הויא, הויא, הויא (§ 91 I, 3).

In some passages הויא 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 הויא 2 K 9:18 read הויא (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.

<sup>1</sup> In the inscription of King Mêša (see § 2 d), lines 6 and 27, we find הויא for הויא, and in the inscription of Ešmunazar, line 22, for הויא, but in the Zenzirli inscriptions (see § 1 m) both הויא and הויא occur (Hadad i, l. 29).

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> 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. הוּ (toneless) and וְ (from *āhû*) *eum* and *eius*, יהוּ קָטַלְתָּ I have killed him (also קָטַלְתָּוּ), הוּ קָטַלְתָּ הוּ or (with *āhû* contracted into *ô*) וְ קָטַלְתָּ *thou hast killed him*; אוֹרְוּ (also אוֹרְ הוּ) *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 ἔμοῦ; 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. יהוּ קָטַלְתָּ 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*, סוּסוֹ *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. בֵּינֵי *literally interstitium mei, between me* (cf. *mea causa*); but הִנֵּנִי *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 (לְ sign of the dative, בְּ *in*, מִן *from*, § 102), e.g. לוֹ *to him (ei)* and *to himself (sibi)*, בּוֹ *in him*, מִנִּי (usually מִןִּי) *from me*.

3. The suffixes of the 2nd person (ךָ, וְ, &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. קָטַלְתָּ).

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. מֵנִי *me*, מֵי *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.

---

<sup>1</sup> On apparent exceptions see § 135 d.

§ 34. The Demonstrative Pronoun.

Sing. <i>this</i> m. f.	הַי <sup>1</sup>  זוּ (זוּ, הַי) אַת <sup>2</sup>	Plur. com. <i>these</i>	אֵלֶּה (rarely אֵלָּה)
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------

Rem. 1. The feminine form אַתּוּ has undoubtedly arisen from אַתּוּ, by obscuring of an original *ā* to *ō* (for אַי = הַי cf. the Arab. *hā-dā*, *this*, masc.; for תּ as the feminine ending, § 80), and the forms הַי, זוּ, both of which are rare,<sup>3</sup> are shortened from אַתּוּ. In Ps 132:12 זוּ is used as a *relative*, cf. זוּ below. In Jer 26:6, *K<sup>e</sup>thiḥh*, הַי אַתּוּ (with the article and the demonstrative termination הַי) is found for אַתּוּ. The forms אֵלֶּה and אֵלָּה are the plurals of הַי and אַתּוּ by usage, though not etymologically. The form אֵלָּה 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, אֵלֶּה [as well as אֵלָּה, אֵלֶּה frequently], and in 1 Ch 20:8 without the article [cf. Driver on Dt 4:42].<sup>4</sup> 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), לְזֹאת, לְזֹאתוֹ *to this* (fem.), לְאֵלֶּה, לְאֵלָּה *to these*; אֶת־זֶה *hunc*, אֶת־זֹאת *hanc*, אֶת־הֵם *hos*, also without אֶת־, even *before* the verb Ps 75:8, &c. Note also זֶה מְקַיֵּר *pretium huius* (1 K 21:2), &c.

2. The secondary form זוּ occurs only in poetic style, and mostly for the relative, like our *that* for *who* [see *Lexicon.*, s. v.]. Like אַיְשֶׁר (§ 36), it serves for all numbers and genders.

Rem. 1. This pronoun takes the article (הַי, אַתּוּ, הַי אַתּוּ, אֵלֶּה אֵלָּה) according to the same rule as adjectives, see § 126 u; e.g. הַי אֵלֶּה אֵלָּה *this man*, but הַי אֵלֶּה אֵלָּה *this is the man*.

2. Rarer secondary forms, with strengthened demonstrative force, are הַיְזֶה Gn 24:65, 37:19; זוּ fem. Ez 36:35; and shortened הַיְזֶה, 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<sup>1</sup> In many languages the demonstratives begin with a *d*-sound (hence called the *demonstrative sound*) which, however, sometimes interchanges with a sibilant. Cf. Aram. אַי, אַיְזֶה *masc.*, אַיְזֶה, אַיְזֶה *fem.* (*this*); Sansk. *sa, sã, tat*; Gothic *sa, sô, 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. אַי, and Aram. אַי, אַי.]

2<sup>2</sup> That אַיְזֶה may stand for the feminine, cannot be proved either from Ju 16:28 or from the certainly corrupt passage in Jos 2:17.

3<sup>3</sup> אַיְזֶה 2 K 6:19, and in seven other places; זוּ only in Hos 7:16, Ps 132:12.

4<sup>4</sup> According to Kuenen (cf. above, § 2 n) and Driver, on Lev 18:27 in Haupt's Bible, this אֵלָּה 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 הַי. In Phoenician also it was written אֵלָּה, 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 ה, with *ā* and a strengthening of the next consonant, e.g. הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ *the sun*, הַיָּרְדֵּן *the river*, הַלְוִיִּים *the Levites* (according to § 20 m for הַיָּרְדֵּן, הַלְוִיִּים).

Rem. With regard to the *Dageš* in ה after the article, the rule is, that it is inserted when a ה or ע follows the ה e.g. הַיְהוּדִים *the Jews*, הַיְעֵפִים *the weary* (כִּי־עָנִים La 4:3 *Q<sup>erê</sup>* is an exception), but הַיָּאֹר, הַיְלָדִים, הַיְסוּד, &c. *Dageš forte* also stands after the article in the prefix ה in certain nouns and in the participles *Piēl* and *Pual* (see § 52 c) before ה, ע and ר, except when the guttural (or ר) has under it a short vowel in a sharpened syllable; thus הַמְּעֵרָה Ez 22:5 *the cave*, הַמְּרַעֵים Ps 37:1 (cf. Jb 38:40, 1 Ch 4:41); but הַמְּהַלֵּךְ Ps 104:3 (Ec 4:15, 2 Ch 23:12; before ע Ps 103:4); הַמְּעַשְׂקָה Is 23:12; הַמְּרַגְלִים Jos 6:22. Before letters other than gutturals this ה 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 *Pathah* of the article (since it stands in an open syllable) is always lengthened to *Qameš*, e.g. הָאָב *the father*, הָאֲחֵר *the other*, הָאִמָּה *the mother*, הָאִישׁ *the man*, הָאֹר *the light*, הָאֵל הַיָּם ὁ θεός *the foot*, הָרֵג *the foot*, הָרֵשָׁע *the wicked*.

So also הַשְּׁפוֹת Neh 3:13, because syncopated from הַשְּׁפוֹת (cf. verse 14 and Baer on the passage); הַשְּׁפוֹת (as in Nu 11:4, Ju 9:41, 2 S 23:33, with the א orthographically retained), for הַשְּׁפוֹת Jer 40:4 (cf. הַשְּׁפוֹת verse 1); הַשְּׁפוֹת Ec 4:14 for הַשְּׁפוֹת; הַשְּׁפוֹת 2 Ch 22:5 for הַשְּׁפוֹת (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 ח and ה, less often with ע—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<sup>e</sup>ghôl* or fully lengthened to *Qameš*. That is to say:—

A. When the guttural has any other vowel than *ā* (ֶ) or *ō* (ֹ), then

(1) before the stronger sounds ח and ה the article regularly remains ה; e.g. הַחֹדֶשׁ *that*, הַחֹדֶשׁ *the month*, הַחֹדֶשׁ *the force*, הַחֹדֶשׁ *the wisdom*. Before ח, *ā* occurs only in הַחֹדֶשׁ Gn 6:19 [not elsewhere], הַחֹדֶשׁ Is 3:22, הַחֹדֶשׁ Is 17:8 [not elsewhere]; before ה, always in הַחֹדֶשׁ, הַחֹדֶשׁ.

(2) before *ṣ* the *Pathaḥ* is generally lengthened to *Qameṣ*, e.g. הַעַיַן *the eye*, הַעִיר *the city*, הַעֲבָדִים *the servant*, plur. הַעֲבָדִים; 1 K 12:32; also in Gn 10:17 הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן is the better reading. Exceptions are הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן Ex 15:10, הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן 2 S 5:6, 8, Is 42:18, הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן Is 24:2, הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן Is 65:11, הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן Ez 22:7, הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן Pr 2:13 and הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן Pr 2:17, הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן 1 S 16:7, Ec 11:7; but הַעֲרֵקֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן 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 הֶ or ṣ the article is always הֶ, otherwise it is הֶ; e.g. הַעַמִּים *the people*, הַהָרִים *the mountain*, הַעַיַן (in pause) *the eye*, הַהָרִים *towards the mountain*; but (according to § 22 c) הַהָרִים *the mountains*, הַעֲוֹנוֹת *the iniquity*.

(2) before הֶ the article is invariably הֶ without regard to the tone; e.g. הַחָכָם *the wise man*, הַחֲגֵלָה *the festival*.

C. When the guttural has הֶ the article is הֶ before הֶ e.g. הַחֳדָשִׁים *the months*; הַמְּדֵבוֹת *in the waste places* (without the article הֶ, הַמְּדֵבוֹת *bōḥrābhōth*) Ez 33:27, הַמְּדֵבוֹת Ez 36:35, 38, cf. 2 Ch 27:4; but הֶ before ṣ, as הַשְּׂמֵרִים *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 הֶ is generally considered to have been הֶ, the הֶ of which (owing to the proclitic nature of the article) has been invariably assimilated to the following consonant, as in הַיַּלְקָה from *yilqaḥ*, § 19 d. This view was supported by the form of the Arabic article *al* (pronounced *hal* by some modern Beduin), the הֶ of which is also assimilated at least before all letters like *s* and *t* and before *l*, *n*, and *r*, e.g. *'al-Qur'ân* but *'as-sāñā* (Beduin *has-sana*)=Hebr. הַשָּׁנָה *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*,<sup>1</sup> cf. Arab. *hāda*, Aram. *hādēn*, &c. The sharpening of the following consonant is to be explained exactly like the sharpening after הֶ consecutive (§ 49 f; cf. also cases like הַבְּמָה, הַבְּמָה, &c., § 102 k), from the close connexion of the *ha* with the following word, and the sharpening necessarily involved the shortening of the vowel.<sup>2</sup>

The Arabic article is supposed to occur in the Old Testament in הַמְּדֵבוֹת 1 K 10:11, 12 (also הַמְּדֵבוֹת 2 Ch 2:7, 9:10, 11), *sandal-wood* (?), and in הַיַּלְקָה *hail, ice*=גִּיבִים (Arab. *gībs*) Ez 13:11, 13, 38:22, but this explanation can hardly be correct. On the other hand, in the proper name הַמְּדֵבוֹת Gn 10:26 the first syllable is probably הַמְּדֵבוֹת *God*, as suggested by D. H. Müller (see *Lexicon*, s. v.) and Nöldeke, *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.*, 1882, p. 1186. הַמְּדֵבוֹת Pr 30:31, commonly explained as=Arab. *al-qaum*, the militia, is also quite uncertain.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> In the Lihyanitic inscriptions collected by Euting (ed. by D. H. Müller in *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Arabien*, Wien, 1889) the article is הֶ, and also in a North Arabian dialect, according to E. Littmann, *Safa-inschriften*, p. 2, Rem., and p. 34.

2. When the prefixes  $\text{בְּ}$ ,  $\text{לְ}$ ,  $\text{כִּי}$  (§ 102) come before the article, the  $\text{ה}$  is elided, and its vowel is thrown back to the prefix, in the place of the Š<sup>e</sup>wâ (§ 19 k, and § 23 k), e.g.  $\text{בְּשָׁמַיִם}$  in the heaven for  $\text{בְּהַשְׁמַיִם}$  (so Ps 36:6);  $\text{לְעָם}$  for  $\text{לְהָעָם}$  to the people,  $\text{בְּהָרִים}$  on the mountains,  $\text{בְּחֳדָשִׁים}$  in the months; also in Is 41:2, read  $\text{כִּי עָפָר}$  instead of the impossible  $\text{כִּי עָפָר}$ . 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<sup>e</sup>rê*. A distinction in meaning is observed between  $\text{בְּהַיּוֹם}$  about this time (Gn 39:11, 1 S 9:13, &c.) and  $\text{בְּיוֹם}$  first of all (Gn 25:31, &c.). After the copula  $\text{וְ}$  (and) elision of the  $\text{ה}$  does not take place, e.g.  $\text{וְהָעָם}$ .

3. The words  $\text{רָצָה}$  earth,  $\text{הָר}$  mountain,  $\text{הַג}$  feast,  $\text{עָם}$  people,  $\text{פָּד}$  bull, always appear after the article with a long vowel (as in pause);  $\text{הָרָצָה}$ ,  $\text{הָהָר}$ ,  $\text{הָהַג}$ ,  $\text{הָעָם}$ ,  $\text{הָפָד}$ ; cf. also  $\text{אֲרוֹן}$  ark (so in the absol. st. in 2 K 12:10, 2 Ch 24:8, but to be read  $\text{אֲרוֹן}$ ), with the article always  $\text{הָאֲרוֹן}$ .

### § 36. The Relative Pronoun.

The relative pronoun (cf. § 138) is usually the indeclinable  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  (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. (1<sup>7</sup>), Chron. (twice), Ezra (once),—and always in the Canticle (cf. also Ju 7:12, 8:26, 2 K 6:11),  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  is used instead; more rarely  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  Ju 5:7, Ct 1:7 (Jb 19:29?); once  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  before  $\text{א}$  Ju 6:17 (elsewhere  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  before a guttural), before  $\text{ה}$  even  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  Ec 3:18, and according to some (e.g. Qimḥi) also in Ec 2:22.<sup>3</sup> [See Lexicon, s. v.]

### § 37. The Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns.

1. The interrogative pronoun is  $\text{מִי}$  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  $\text{מִי בַת־מִי}$  whose daughter? Gn 24:23;  $\text{לְמִי}$  to whom?  $\text{מִי אֶת־מִי}$  whom?)— $\text{מָה}$ ,  $\text{מַה}$  (see b) what? (of things).— $\text{אֵי־זֶה}$  which? what?

The form  $\text{מָה}$ ,  $\text{מַה}$ , &c. (followed by *Dageš forte conjunct.*: even in  $\text{מַה}$ , Hb 2:1, &c., against § 20 m) may be explained (like the art.  $\text{הַ}$  § 35 l, and  $\text{וְ}$  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  $\text{ה}$  ( $\text{מָה}$ , 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  $\text{מִן}$  (what?), used in Ex 16:15 in explanation of  $\text{מִן}$  manna, while  $\text{מִן}$  is the regular Aramaic for *who*. Socin calls attention to the Arabic *mah* (in pause with an audible *h*: *Mufaṣṣal*, 193, 8). Observe further that—

(a) In the closest connexion, by means of *Maqqeph*,  $\text{מָה}$  takes a following *Dageš* (§ 20 d), e.g.  $\text{מָה־הִנֵּה}$  what is it to thee? and even in one word, as  $\text{מָה־לְּךָ}$  what is it to you? Is 3:15; cf. Ex 4:2, Mal 1:13, and even before a guttural,  $\text{מָה־ה}$  Ez 8:6 *K<sup>e</sup>thiḥ*.

<sup>3</sup> The full form  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  does not occur in Phoenician, but only  $\text{א}$  (=  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$ ?), pronounced *asse*, *esse* (also *as*, *es*, *is*, *ys*, *us*), or—especially in the later Punic and in the *Poenulus* of Plautus— $\text{א}$  (*sa*, *si*, *sy*, *su*). Also in New Hebrew  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  has become the common form. Cf. Schröder, *Phön. Sprache*, p. 162 ff. and below, § 155; also Bergsträsser, ‘Das hebr. Präfix  $\text{א}$ ,’ 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  $\text{מָה}$  is used with a virtual strengthening of the guttural (§ 22 c), so especially before  $\text{ה}$ , and, in Gn 31:36, Jb 21:21, before  $\text{ך}$ —or the doubling is wholly emitted. In the latter case either (cf. § 35 e–k)  $\text{א}$  is fully lengthened to *Qames* (so always before the  $\text{ה}$  of the article, except in Ec 2:12; also before  $\text{מָה}$   $\text{ה}$ ,  $\text{נָה}$   $\text{ה}$ , and so  $\text{ה}$  (Hb 2:18),  $\text{א}$  (2 S 18:22, 2 K 8:14),  $\text{ע}$  (Gn 31:22, 2 K 8:13), or modified to *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, especially before  $\text{צ}$ ,  $\text{ק}$ , and generally before  $\text{ה}$ . The omission of the strengthening also takes place as a rule with  $\text{ה}$ ,  $\text{ח}$ ,  $\text{ע}$ , when they have not *Qames*, and then the form is either  $\text{מָה}$  or  $\text{מַה}$ , the latter especially before  $\text{ה}$  or  $\text{ע}$ , if *Maqqeph* follows.

The longer forms  $\text{מָה}$  and  $\text{מַה}$  are also used ( $\text{מָה}$  even before letters which are not gutturals) when not connected by *Maqqeph* but only by a *conjunctive accent*. As a rule  $\text{מָה}$  is then used, but sometimes  $\text{מַה}$  when at a greater distance from the principal tone of the sentence, Is 1:5, Ps 4:3. (On  $\text{מָה}$  in the combinations  $\text{בְּמָה}$ ,  $\text{בְּמָה}$ , and even  $\text{מָה}$   $\text{ל}$ , 1 S 1:8, cf. § 102 k and l.)

(c) In the principal pause  $\text{מָה}$  is used without exception; also as a rule with the smaller *disjunctives*, and almost always before gutturals ( $\text{מָה}$  only in very few cases). On the other hand,  $\text{מַה}$  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  $\text{מִי}$  and  $\text{מַה}$  as indefinite pronouns in the sense of *quicumque*, *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.  $\text{מָלַךְ}$  *he has reigned*.

(b) *Verbal derivatives*, i.e. *secondary* verbal stems, derived from the pure stem (letter *a*), e.g.  $\text{קִדַּשׁ}$  *to sanctify*,  $\text{הִתְקַדַּשׁ}$  *to sanctify oneself*, from  $\text{קָדַשׁ}$  *to be holy*. These are usually called *conjugations* (§ 39).

(c) *Denominatives*,<sup>1</sup> 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.  $\text{אָהַל}$ , *Qal* and *Pi'el*, *to pitch a tent*, from  $\text{אֶהֱלָא}$  *tent*;  $\text{הִשְׁרִישׁ}$  and  $\text{שָׁרַשׁ}$  *to take root*, and  $\text{שָׁרַשׁ}$  *to root out*, from  $\text{שֹׁרֵשׁ}$  *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.  $\text{לְבַנָּה}$  *a brick* (verbal stem  $\text{לָבַן}$  *to be white*), *denomin.*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. J. Gerber, *Die hebr. Verbs denom., insbes. im theol. Sprachgebr. des A. T.*, Lpz. 1896.

לָבַן *to make bricks*; דָּג *a fish* (verbal stem דָּגָה *to be prolific*), denomin. דָּוַג *to fish*; חָרַף *to winter* (from חָרַף *autumn, winter*, stem חָרַף *to pluck*); קָוַץ *to pass the summer* (from קָוַץ *summer*, stem קָוַץ *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. קָטַל *he has killed*, כָּבֵד *he was heavy*, קָטַן *he was little*.<sup>2</sup> From this form the other persons of the *Perfect* are derived, and the *Participle* also is connected with it. קָטַל or קָטַל, 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 עָוַן (i.e. with ו 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 ו, which appears in the Imperative and Infinitive; e.g. שׁוּב *to return* (3rd pers. perf. שָׁב): the same is the case in most stems with medial ו, e.g. דָּן *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. לָמַד *to learn*, לָמַד *to teach*; שָׁכַב *to lie*, הִשָּׁכַיב *to lay*; שָׁפַט *to judge*, נִשְׁפָּט *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 בְּנֵינִים, i.e. *formations*, or more correctly *species*), and are always treated together in the grammar and lexicon.<sup>1</sup>

3. The changes in the primitive form consist either in internal modification by means of vowel-change and strengthening of the middle consonant (קָטַל, קָטַל; קָטַל, קָטַל; cf. *to lie, to lay; to fall, to fell*), or in the repetition of one or two of the stem-consonants (קָטַל, קָטַל), or finally in the introduction of formative additions (נִקְטַל), which may also be accompanied by internal change (הִתְקַטַּל). 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

<sup>2</sup> For the sake of brevity, however, the meaning in Hebrew-English Lexicons is usually given in the Infinitive, e.g. לָמַד *to learn*, properly *he has learnt*.

<sup>1</sup> The term *Conjugation* thus has an entirely different meaning in Hebrew and Greek or Latin grammar.

reflexives with the prefix הָהּ, הָאּ, הָאָ 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* (קָל *light*, because it has no formative additions); the others (כְּבִדִים *heavy*, being weighted, as it were, with the strengthening of consonants or with formative additions) take their names from the paradigm of פָּעַל *he has done*,<sup>1</sup> 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	קָטַל <i>to kill.</i>	(Cf. § 52 e.)
2. Niph'al	נִקְטַל <i>to kill oneself</i> (rarely passive).	
3. Pi'el	קָטַל <i>to kill many, to massacre.</i>	4. Pu'al קִטְּלוּ.
5. Hiph'il	הִקְטִיל <i>to cause to kill.</i>	6. Hoph'al הִקְטַל.
7. Hithpa'el	הִתְקַטַּל <i>to kill oneself.</i>	[Very rare, Hothpa'al הִתְקַטַּל.]

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. *Pô'el* and *Pô'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 1); 9. *Pi'lel* (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 (*Šaph'el* and *Tiph'el*). (3) The reflexive or passive *Niph'al*.

<sup>1</sup> This paradigm was borrowed from the Arabic grammarians, and, according to Bacher, probably first adopted throughout by Abulwalîd. It was, however, unsuitable on account of the guttural, and was, therefore, usually exchanged in later times for פָּקַד, after the example of Moses Qimḥi. 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. פָּקַדָּהּ, פָּקַדְתָּהּ. The paradigm of קָטַל, 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. קַתַל) 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 קָטַל leave the beginner in doubt as to whether or not there should be a *Dageš* in the *B<sup>e</sup>gadk<sup>e</sup>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 *inflexion* 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. m.	· · ·		3. c.	ַ	· · ·	
3. f.	ְּ · · ·					
2. m.	ְּ · · ·		2. m.	ְּ	· · ·	
2. f.	ְּ · · ·		2. f.	ְּ	· · ·	
1. c.	ְּ · · ·		1. c.	ְּ	· · ·	
			IMPERFECT			
<i>Singular.</i>				<i>Plural.</i>		
3. m.	· · ·	י	3. m.	ַ	· · ·	י
3. f.	· · ·	ת	3. f.	ְּ	· · ·	ת
2. m.	· · ·	ת	2. m.	ַ	· · ·	ת
2. f.	ְּ · · ·	ת	2. f.	ְּ	· · ·	ת
1. c.	· · ·	א	1. c.	ַ	· · ·	א

§ 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* פ"ן, ע"ע, and ע"ו, as שגג, קל, קים, §§ 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 ישב, אצף, גלה.

Taking the old paradigm פעל 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* פ"א for a verb whose first radical is א (*primae radicalis* [*sc. literae*] א); ע"ו for *mediae radicalis* ו; 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 affirmatives 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 קטל, with *ā* (*Pathah*) in the second syllable, especially in *transitive* verbs (but see § 44 c). There is also a form with *ē* (*Ṣere*, originally *i*), and another with *ō* (*Holem*, originally *ū*) in the second syllable, both of which, however, have almost always an *intransitive*<sup>1</sup> meaning, and serve to express states and qualities, e.g. כבד to be heavy, קטן 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 כבד is chosen as showing, at the same time, when the *Dageš lene* is to be inserted or omitted.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>e</sup>wā*, e.g. קָטַלְתָּ 2nd plur. masc. In the Aramaic dialects the vowel of the first syllable is always reduced to *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*, as קָטַל=Hebr. קָטַל. The intransitive forms in Arabic are *qātūlā, qātūlā*; 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: הָמַר to cover with pitch, from הָמַר pitch; מָלַח to salt, from מָלַח salt; שָׁבַר (usually *Hiph.*) to buy or sell corn, from שָׁבַר corn; see above, § 38 c.

#### § 44. Flexion of the Perfect of *Qal*.<sup>1</sup>

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*), אֶתְהוּ קָטַל he was fearing, יָרְאוּ ye were fearing=אֶתְהוּ יָרְאוּ. The ending of the 1st pers. plur. (וְנוֹ) is also certainly connected with the termination of וְנוֹ אֲנִי we (§ 32 b, d). The affirmative of the 1st pers. sing. (תִּי) is to be referred, by an interchange of כ and ת (cf. § 33 f), to that form of the pronoun which also underlies כִּי אֲנִי, I.<sup>2</sup> In the *third* person הָ (originally תָּ, 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. *ūna* in Arabic and *ū* (often also וְ) in Hebrew, also *ūna* (in the construct state *ū*) as the plural termination of masc. nouns in literary Arabic.

2. The characteristic *Pathah* of the second syllable becomes *Š<sup>e</sup>wā* before an affirmative beginning with a vowel, where it would otherwise stand in an open syllable (as קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ; but in *pause* קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ). Before an affirmative beginning with a consonant the *Pathah* remains, whether in the tone-syllable (קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ) or *before* it. In the latter case, however, the *Qameṣ* of the first syllable, being no longer a pretonic vowel, becomes vocal *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*; as קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ; 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 *Pathah* (frequently so even in the 3rd sing. masc. Perf.). This tendency to assimilate to the more common verbs *middle a* may also

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 *Ṣere*, and never of *Hireq*, of which the *Ṣere* is a lengthening (cf. § 26 p). On the other hand, *Ṣere* is retained in an open syllable; regularly so in the weak stems ל"י (§ 74 g), before suffixes (§ 59 i), and in the pausal forms of the strong stem in an open tone-syllable, e.g. דָּבַר קָהּ *it cleaveth*, Jb 29:10 (not דָּבַר קָהּ, cf. 2 S 1:23, Jb 41:15; even (contrary to § 29 q) in a *closed* pausal syllable, e.g. שָׁכַן, Dt 33:12 (out of pause שָׁכַן, Is 32:16); but לָמַד 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 וְיִרְשָׁתָּהּ יְרֵשׁ *and thou shalt possess it*, Dt 17:14; וְיִרְשָׁתָּם Dt 19:1; וְיִרְשָׁתָּם Dt 4:1, and frequently; from יָבֵא *to bring forth, to beget*; יָבֵא Ps 2:7 (cf. Nu 11:12, Jer 2:27, 15:10); from פִּישָׁתָּם Mal 3:20; from שָׁאַלְתִּי שָׁאַלְתִּי I have asked him, 1 S 1:20 (Ju 13:6), and three times שָׁאַלְתָּם 1 S 12:13, 25:5, Jb 21:29. Qimḥi already suggests the explanation, that the *i* (ē) of these forms of שָׁאַל and יֵרֵשׁ is the original vowel, since along with שָׁאַל and יֵרֵשׁ are also found שָׁאַל and יֵרֵשׁ (see the Lexicon). The possibility of this explanation cannot be denied (especially in the case of יֵרֵשׁ, 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. יָגַדְתָּ *thou didst tremble*; יָכַח לוֹ *in pause* for יָכַחוּ *they were able*; but in a toneless closed syllable the original short vowel appears in the form of a *Qameṣ haṭuph*; יָבַלְתִּי I have prevailed against him, Ps 13:5; וְיָבַלְתָּ (see § 49 h) *then shalt thou be able*, Ex 18:23; in a toneless open syllable it becomes vocal *Ṣewā*, e.g. לֵי, יָבַלְתָּ, לָהּ.

4. Rarer forms<sup>1</sup> are: *Sing. 3rd fem.* in תַּ (as in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Aramaic), e.g. אָזְלָתָּ *it is gone*, Dt 32:36; וְנִשְׁכַּחְתָּ Is 23:15 (in the Aramaic form, for וְנִשְׁכַּחְתָּ); from a verb עָשָׂתָּ, cf. § 72 o. This original feminine ending *-ath* is regularly retained before suffixes, see § 59 a; and similarly in stems ל"י, either in the form *āth* (which is frequent also in stems ל"י § 74 g), or with the *Pathah* weakened to *vocal Ṣewā* before the pleonastic ending הַ תַּ, e.g. לָתָהּ, § 75 i. In Ez 31:5 the Aramaic form אָבַחְתָּ occurs instead of אָבַחְתָּ.

2nd *masc.* תָּהּ for תָּ (differing only orthographically), e.g. בָּגַדְתָּ *thou hast dealt treacherously*, Mal 2:14; cf. 1 S 15:3, Gn 3:12 (תָּהּ which is twice as common as תָּ, 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 הָלַכְתְּ *thou wentest*, Jer 31:21; cf. 2:33, 3:4, 5, 4:19 (but read the ptc. שָׁמַעְתְּ, with the LXX, instead of the 2nd fem.),<sup>46</sup> and so commonly in Jeremiah, and Ez (16<sup>18</sup>, &c.); see also Mi 4<sup>13</sup>, Ru 3:3, 4, הָלַכְתְּ, &c., is really

<sup>1</sup> Many of these forms, which are uncommon in Hebrew, are usual in the other Semitic dialects, and may, therefore, be called Aramaisms (Syriasms) 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  $\text{הָלֵךְ}$  (without  $\text{י}$ )<sup>1</sup> as in the corresponding pronoun  $\text{יָאָרְ$  ( $\text{יָאָר}$ ) § 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  $\text{תָּוּ}$  Ps 140:13, Jb 42:2, 1 K 8:48, Ez 16:59 (all in K<sup>c</sup>thîbh), Ps 16:2, without a Q<sup>c</sup>rê; in 2 K 18:20 also  $\text{תָּוּ}$  is really intended, as appears from Is 36:5. The Q<sup>c</sup>rê requires the ordinary form, to which the vowels of the text properly belong, whilst the K<sup>c</sup>thîbh is probably to be regarded as the remains of an earlier orthography, which omitted vowel-letters even at the end of the word.

$\text{וּ}$  as the termination of the 2nd plur. m. for  $\text{וּם}$  Ez 33:26, might just possibly be due to the following  $\text{ו}$  (cf., for an analogous case, Mi 3:12, § 87 e), but is probably a copyist's error. Plur. 2nd fem. in  $\text{וּהָ}$ - (according to others  $\text{וּהָ}$ -) Am 4:3, but the reading is very doubtful; since  $\text{ו}$  follows, it is perhaps merely due to dittography; cf., however,  $\text{וּהָ}$  § 32 i.

3rd plur. comm. has three times the very strange termination  $\text{וּן}$ <sup>2</sup>;  $\text{וּן}$ ;  $\text{וּן}$ ; Dt 8:3, 16 (both before  $\text{א}$ , and hence, no doubt, if the text is correct, to avoid a hiatus), and in the still more doubtful form  $\text{וּן}$  Is 26:16; on  $\text{וּן}$  in the Imperf. see § 47 m; on the affixed  $\text{א}$  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  $\text{וּן}$ , 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  $\text{וּן}$ , 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  $\text{וּן}$  is often found as a mistake for  $\text{ו}$ . On the other hand Mayer Lambert (*Une série de Qeré ketib*, Paris, 1891, p. 6 ff.) explains all these K<sup>c</sup>thîbh, as well as Ps 73:2, Jer 50:6 (?), and (against Nöldeke) 1 K 22:49 (where  $\text{וּן$  is undoubtedly the article belonging to the next word), Jb 16:16 (where the masc.  $\text{וּן}$  requires the marginal reading), also Jer 48:41, 51:56, Ez 26:2, Ps 68:14, as remains of the 3rd fem. plur. in  $\text{וּן}$ . 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  $\text{וּן}$ , as  $\text{וּן}$  *K<sup>c</sup>thîbh* six times in the above examples.

5. The affirmatives  $\text{וּן}$ , ( $\text{וּן}$ ),  $\text{וּן}$ ,  $\text{וּן}$  are generally toneless, and the forms with these inflexions are consequently *Milêl* ( $\text{וּן}$  לְ, &c.); with all the other affirmatives 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  $\text{S}^{\text{c}}\text{wâ}$  under the second stem-consonant is restored by the pause; as  $\text{וּן}$  for  $\text{וּן}$  ( $\text{וּן}$  for  $\text{וּן}$ ), and  $\text{וּן}$  for  $\text{וּן}$  ( $\text{וּן}$  for  $\text{וּן}$ ); (b) in certain cases after *wāw consecutive* of the Perfect (see § 49 h).

1<sup>1</sup> Where the Masora apparently regards the  $\text{וּן$  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  $\text{וּן}$ , 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  $\text{וּן}$  as  $\text{וּן}$  instead of 3rd sing. fem.  $\text{וּן}$  (as LXX).

2<sup>2</sup> That these examples can hardly be referred to a primitive Semitic ending  $\text{ûn}$  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*<sup>3</sup>, p. 6 note.]

6. Contraction of a final ת with the ת of the affirmative occurs e.g. in חַיִּי חַיִּי Hag 2:5, &c.; cf. Is 14:20, &c., in the *Perf. Poel*; Dt 4:25 in the *Hiphil* of שָׁחַת; Is 21:2, &c., in the *Hiphil* of שָׁבַח. Contraction of a final נ with the affirmative נו occurs in נִתְּנוּ Gn 34:16; in *Niph.* Ezr 9:7, cf. 2 Ch 14:10; in *Hiph.* 2 Ch 29:19; with the affirmative נָה in the *Imperfect Qal* Ez 17:23; *Piḥl* Ps 71:23, where with Baer and Ginsburg נָה תִּרְבֶּנּוּ is to be read, according to others תִּרְבֶּנּוּ נָה (cf. in *Polel* תִּקְוֹנֶנּוּ נָה Ez 32:16), but certainly not נָה תִּרְבֶּנּוּ with the Mantua ed., Opitius and Hahn; with נָה 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 לְקַטֵּל, <sup>1</sup> sometimes incorrectly לקטול), 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 (לְקַטֵּל 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 קַטֵּל, sometimes also לְקַטֵּל, 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).<sup>1</sup>

The flexibility and versatility of the Infinitive construct and the rigidity and inflexibility of the Infinitive absolute are reflected in their vocalization. The latter has unchangeable vowels, while the *ō* of the Infinitive construct may be lost. For לְקַטֵּל, according to § 84a, e, goes back to the ground-form *qūṭāl*.

Other forms of the Infinitive construct. Qal of the strong verb are—

(a) לקטל, e.g. שָׁכַב to lie, Gn 34:7; שָׁפַל to sink, Ec 12:4; especially with verbs which have *ā* in the second syllable of the Imperfect: hence sometimes also with those, whose second or third radical is a guttural (frequently besides the ordinary form). All the examples (except שָׁכַב, 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 לְקַטֵּב (verse 20, in pause לקטב) as an Infinitive=קַטֵּב; probably לקטב should be read.

(b) קַטְלָה and, attenuated from it, קַטְלָה; קַטְלָה and קַטְלָה (which are feminine forms<sup>2</sup> of קַטֵּל and לְקַטֵּל, mostly from intransitive verbs, and sometimes found along with forms having no feminine ending in use), e.g. לְאָשָׁמָה to be guilty, Lv 5:26, אָהַבָה to love, שָׂנְאָה to hate; לְיָרָא,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the analogous forms of the noun, § 93 t.

<sup>1</sup> The terms *absolute* and *construct* are of course not to be understood as implying that the Infinitive construct לְקַטֵּל forms the *construct state* (see § 89) of the Infinitive absolute (קטול ground-form *qāṭāl*). In the Paradigms the *Inf. constr.*, as the principal form, is placed before the other, under the name of Infinitive simply.

<sup>2</sup> According to the remark of Elias Levita on Qimḥi's *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenb., 14 a, these feminine forms occur almost exclusively in connexion with the preposition לְ.

often in Dt., *to fear*; זָקְנָה *to be old*; קָרְאָה *to meet* (in לקראת § 19 k); לְרַבְּעָה *to lie down*, Lv 20:16; לְמַשְׁחָה *to anoint*, Ex 29:29; לְרַחֲצָה *to wash*, Ex 30:18, &c.; לְטִמְאָה (also a subst.= *uncleanness*, like טִמְאָה) *to be unclean*, Lv 15:32; לְקַרְבָּה *to approach*, Ex 36:2, &c.; cf. Lv 12:4, 5, Dt 11:22, Is 30:19, Ez 21:16, Hag 1:6; also רַחֲקָה *to be far off*, Ez 8:6; חָמְלָה *to pity*, Ez 16:5; cf. Ho 7:4. On the other hand in חָמְלָה Gn 19:16, the original *ā* has been modified to *é*; cf. חָזְקָה Is 8:11, &c.

(c) In the Aramaic manner (מקטל but cf. also Arab. *maqtal*) there occur as *Infin. Qal*: מְשַׁלְּחָה *to send*, Est 9:19; מְקַרָּא *to call* and מְסַע *to depart*, Nu 10:2 (Dt 10:11); מְקַחָה *to take*, 2 Ch 19:7, &c.; מְשַׁא *to carry*, Nu 4:24, &c. (cf. even לְמַשְׁאוֹת Ez 17:9); also with a feminine ending מְעֹלָה *to go up*, Ezr 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 מְהַפְּכָה followed by את, Is 13:19, Am 4:11, (§ 115 d).

(d) יִבְשֵׁת in יבֹשֶׁת Gn 8:7; יִכָּלֵת Nu 14:16; probably also יִשָּׁת Ex 31:5, 35:33.

2. A kind of *Gerund* is formed by the *Infin. constr.* with the preposition לְ; as לְקַטֵּל *ad interficiendum*, לְנַפֵּל *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. לִישָׁבֵב Gn 34:7; לְנַפֵּל Ps 118:13, with *Dageš lene* in the פ=lin-pōl; hence, also liq-tōl, &c.; but לְבִנְפָל bin<sup>e</sup>phōl, Jb 4:13; לְנַפֵּל 2 S 3:34. Exceptions אֲלַצְבֵּב Nu 4:23, 8:24; לְנִתּוֹשׁ וְלְנִתּוֹץ Jer 1:10, 18:7, 31:28; לְשִׁדּוֹד Jer 47:4; לְטַבּוֹחַ Jer 11:19, &c., Ps 37:14; לְבִדּוֹק 2 Ch 34:10; according to some also לְסַבֵּב Nu 21:4 and לְכַבֵּשׁ 2 Ch 28:10 (Baer *לְכַבֵּשׁ*); on the other hand לְדַרְיֹשׁ Ezr 10:16 read לְדַרֵּשׁ.

## § 46. The Imperative.

1. The ground-forms of the Imperative, קַטֵּל (properly *q<sup>e</sup>tūl*, which is for an original *qūṭūl*), and קַטֵּל (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).<sup>1</sup> 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. אַל-תִּקַּטֵּל *ne occidas* (not אַל-קַטֵּל). The passives have no Imperative, but it occurs in the reflexives, as Niphal and Hithpaēl.<sup>2</sup>

2. The Affirmatives 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 הַּ *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 קַטֵּל (sometimes also *plene*, e.g. שָׁמֹר Ec 12:13; before *Maqqeph* קַטֵּל־ with *Qameṣ haṭṭuph*), those verbs which have an *a* in the final syllable of the

1<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> 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  $\bar{e}$ ) make their Imperative of the form קָטַל, e.g. לְבַשׁ *dress!* (Perf. לָבַשׁ and לְבַשׁ); שָׁכַב *lie down!* in pause שָׁכַב 1 S 3:5, 6, 9.

2. The first syllable of the sing. fem. and plur. masc. are usually to be pronounced with  $\check{S}w\acute{a}$  mobile ( $qi\check{S}li$ ,  $qi\check{S}l\acute{u}$ , and so שָׁפָּי, &c., without *Dageš lene*, and even מְשָׁכוּ with *Metheg*, Ex 12:21; but cf. אֶסְפִּי Jer 10:17, and with the same phonetic combination הִשְׁפִּי Is 47:2; see analogous cases in § 93 m); less frequently we find an  $\check{o}$  instead of the  $i$ , e.g. מְלִכִי *rule*, Ju 9:10; מְשָׁכוּ *draw*, Ez 32:20; הִרְבּוּ Jer 2:12 (cf. הִרְבֵּי Is 44:27); on קָמְמִי 1 S 28:8 *Q're*, Jer. 22:20 (cf. 1 K 13:7), see § 10 h. This  $\check{o}$  arises (see above, a) from a singular ground-form  $qu\check{S}il$ , not from a retraction of the original  $\check{u}$  of the second syllable. We must abandon the view that the forms with  $i$  in the first syllable (cf. also אֶמְרִי, הִגְרִי, מְכַרִי, עֲבָרִי) arise from a weakening of the characteristic vowel  $\check{o}$ . 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 יָזוּרוּ 1 K 3:26; from שָׁמַע עו, שָׁמַע, &c.; similarly the 2nd sing. fem. in *pause* is עֲבִירִי Is 23:12; even without the *pause* מְלִי וְכִי Ju 9:10, 12, *K<sup>e</sup>th.*; קָס וְמִי 1 S 28:8, *K<sup>e</sup>th.* (cf. with this also מְלוֹכָה, &c., § 48 i); from שָׁמַח הִי, שָׁמַח Jo 2:21.

3. In the 2nd plur. fem. שָׁמַע occurs once, in Gn 4:23 (for שָׁמַע עֲנָה) with loss of the הָ and insertion of a helping vowel, unless it is simply to be pointed שָׁמַע עֲנָה. Also instead of the abnormal קָרְאָן Ex 2:20 (for קָרְאָה) we should perhaps read as in Ru 1:20 קָרְאָן (cf. מָצָאָן 1:9 and לָבָן 1:12).

On the examples of a 2nd plur. fem. in יָ, Is 32:11, see § 48 i.

#### § 47. *The Imperfect and its Inflexion.*

1. The persons of the Imperfect,<sup>1</sup> in contradistinction to those of the Perfect, are formed by placing abbreviated forms of the personal pronoun (preformatives) *before*

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 (לִּקְטַל). 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 affirmatives, the preformatives of the Imperfect appear in a much more abbreviated form than the affirmatives of the Perfect, only *one* consonant (י, ת, א, נ) 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 *affirmatives*. Cf. the table, § 40 c.

2. The derivation and meaning, both of the preformatives and the affirmatives, can still, in most cases, be recognized.

In the *first pers.* לִּקְטַל, plur. לִּקְטַלְוּ, א is probably connected with אָנִי, and נ with נָנוּ; here no indication of gender or number by a special ending was necessary. As regards the vocalization, the Arabic points to the ground-forms *āqṭūl* and *nāqṭūl*: the *i* of the 1st plur. is, therefore, as in the other preformatives, attenuated from *a*. The *S<sup>e</sup>ghōl* of the 1st sing. is probably to be explained by the preference of the א 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 לִּקְטַל (which is the Babylonian punctuation) and לִּקְטַל, which, according to this view, was likewise pronounced *iqṭōl*.<sup>1</sup>

The preformative ת of the *second persons* (לִּקְטַת, ground-form *tāqṭūl*, &c.) is, without doubt, connected with the ת of אָתָּה, אָתָּם, &c., and the *affirmative* יָ of the 2nd fem. sing. יִקְטַתְּ with the *i* of the original feminine form יִקְטַתְּ (see § 32 h). The *affirmative* ו of the 2nd masc. plur. יִקְטַתְּוּ (in its more complete form, ווּ, 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,<sup>2</sup> while the affirmative נָ (also נ) of the 3rd and 2nd plur. fem. is probably connected with נָהּ הָ *eae* and נָהּ אָתָּה *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<sup>1</sup> Cf. § 24 e. In favour of the above view of Qimḥi may be urged the phonetic orthography אָ (in Pr 18:24 אִישׁ, 2 S 14:19 (unless, with Perles, אָשׁ is to be read), Mi 6:10, for אִישׁ, and אִישׁי 1 Ch 2:13 for אִישׁי (as verse 12). Also אָזְכָּהּ, הָ Mi 6:11 is probably for אָזְכָּהּ = אָזְכָּהּ, אָזְכָּהּ Is 10:12 for אָזְכָּהּ; אָזְכָּהּ Is 51:19 for אָזְכָּהּ; and conversely אִישׁ is for אִישׁ=אִישׁ. Similarly, 1 S 14:49 is probably for אִישׁי or אִישׁי; in 2 S 23:8 יֵשֶׁב בְּשֶׁבֶת is, according to the LXX, an error for אִישׁ=יֵשֶׁב. In Assyrian also the simple *i* corresponds to the Hebrew י as the preformative of the Impf. Qal.

2<sup>2</sup> 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 *q<sup>e</sup> ṭālû*, *q<sup>e</sup> ṭālûn*, with the feminine form *q<sup>e</sup> ṭālên*, in Western Aram. *q<sup>e</sup> ṭālû*, fem. *q<sup>e</sup> ṭālâ*; in Arab. *qātālû*, fem. *qātālñā*, Eth. *qātālû*, *qātālâ*.

The preformatives of the *third* persons (י in the masc. יִקְטֹל, ground-form *yāqṭūl*, plur. יִקְטְלוּ, ground-form *yāqṭūlū*; ת in the fem. תִּקְטֹל, plur. תִּקְטְלוּ) have not yet met with any satisfactory explanation. With ת might most obviously be compared the original feminine ending תִּ of nouns, and of the 3rd fem. sing. perfect. For the affirmatives ו (וּן) and נָה, see c.

3. The characteristic vowel of the second syllable becomes  $\mathcal{S}^e wā$  before tone-bearing affirmatives which begin with a vowel, but is retained (as being in the tone-syllable) before the toneless affirmative נָה. Thus: יִקְטֹל ו, יִקְטְלוּ ו, תִּקְטֹל ו (but in *pause* יִקְטֹל ו &c.), תִּקְטֹל ו נָה.

Rem. 1. The  $\bar{o}$  of the second syllable (as in the inf. constr. and imperat.), being lengthened from an original  $\bar{u}$  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 *Qames ḥaṭṭuph*, e.g. וַיִּכְתֹּב שָׁם; and he wrote there, Jos 8:32 (but cf. also Ex 21:37, Jos 18:20); (c) it becomes  $\mathcal{S}^e wā$  before the tone-bearing affirmatives י ו and ו (see above, e; but Jerome still heard e.g. *iezbuleni* for וַיִּזְבֹּל נִי; cf. *ZAW*. iv. 83).

Quite anomalous are the three examples which, instead of a shortening to  $\mathcal{S}^e wā$ , exhibit a long  $\bar{u}$ : מִן יִשְׁפֹּטוּ הָ, Ex 18:26, immediately before the principal pause, but according to Qimḥi (ed. *Rittenb.* p.18<sup>b</sup>), ed. Mant., Ginsb., Kittel against the other editions, with the tone on the ultima; likewise לֹא־תֵעָבֶר יִמְנָה Ru 2:8; מִן תִּשְׁמֹר, (in principal pause) Pr 14:3. In the first two cases perhaps וַיִּשְׁפֹּטוּ and תֵּעָבֶר וְרִי (for וַיִּשְׁפֹּט וְרִי, &c.) are intended, in virtue of a retrogressive effect of the pause; in Pr 14:3 מִן תִּשְׁמֹר is to be read, with August Müller.

2. The  $\bar{o}$  of the second syllable is to be found almost exclusively with transitive verbs middle *a*, like קָטַל. Intransitives *middle a* and  $\bar{e}$  almost always take  $\check{a}$  (*Pathah*)<sup>1</sup> in the impf., e.g. יָרַבַּץ, יָרַבַּץ to couch, שָׁכַב, יִשְׁכַּב to lie down (לָמַד, לִמְדָה to learn is also originally intransitive = to accustom oneself); יָגַדְלָה, יָגַדְלָה to become great (but cf. שָׁכַן and שָׁכַן imperf. יִשְׁכֹּן to dwell and to inhabit, נָבַל imperf. לֹא־יָבֹל to wither); also from verbs *middle o*, as קָטַן to be small, the imperf. has the form יִקְטֹן.

Sometimes both forms occur together; those with  $\bar{o}$  having a transitive, and those with  $\check{a}$  an intransitive meaning, e.g. יִקְצֹר he cuts off, יִקְצָר he is cut off, i.e. is short; יִשְׁלַח impf.  $\bar{o}$ , to overcome, Ex 17:13; impf.  $\check{a}$ , to be overcome, Jb 14:10. More rarely both forms are used without any distinction, e.g. יִשֹּׁבֵד and יִשֹּׁבֵד he bites, יִתְקַפֵּץ and יִתְקַפֵּץ 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), ע"ע (§ 67 p), פ"י (§ 69 b), and פ"א (§ 68 c), and in יָתַן for *yintēn* from יָתַן to give, instead of  $\check{a}$  or  $\bar{o}$  a movable *Sere* (originally *i*) is found in the second syllable. A trace of these *i*-imperfects<sup>2</sup> in the ordinary strong verb is probably to be found in וַיִּתְמַן 2 K 7:8, since תָּמַן 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<sup>1</sup> This  $\check{a}$  is, however, by no means restricted to intransitive *strong* verbs; apart from verbs third guttural (§ 65 b), it is to be found in פ"ן and ע"ע, and in many verbs פ"א and פ"י (§§ 69–71).

2<sup>2</sup> Cf. Barth, 'Das  $\iota$ -Imperfekt im Nordsemitischen,' *ZDMG*. 1889, p. 177 ff.

3. For the *3rd sing. fem.* תִּקַּטְל (=tiq-*tōl*), Baer requires in 1 S 25:20 תִּפְגַּשׁ (but read with ed. Mant., &c. תִּפְגַּשׁ). For the *2nd sing. fem.* (תִּקַּטְלִי) the form תִּקַּטְל 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 תִּזְרַעְנָהּ is to be read with Marti for תִּזְרַעְנָהּ.— For the *3rd plur. fem.* תִּקַּטְלָהּ we find in Jer 49:11, in pause תִּבְטַחְנָהּ (for תִּבְטַחְנָהּ), and thrice (as if to distinguish it from the 2nd pers.) the form תִּקַּטְלָהּ with the preformative י (as always in Western Aram., Arab, Eth., and Assy.), in Gn 30:38, 1 S 6:12, Dn 8:22. On the other hand, תִּקַּטְלָהּ 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 תִּשְׁלַחְנָהּ Ju 5:26 (where, however, perhaps תִּשְׁלַחְנָהּ is to be read), and Ob<sup>13</sup>, for 2nd sing. masc., according to Olshausen a corruption of תִּשְׁלַחְנָהּ; in Pr 1:20, 8:3 for תִּרְנָהּ read תִּרְנָהּ as in Jb 39:23; in Ex 1:10 read תִּקְרָאָהּ with the Samaritan.—In Is 27:11, 28:3, as also in Jb 17:16 (if we read תִּזְרַעְנָהּ with LXX for the 2nd *תקיותי*), 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 נָהּ we frequently find, especially in the Pentateuch and mostly after *wāw consecutive*, simply נָהּ, 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 תִּלְכָּהּ שָׁן (2 S 13:18) is the only example of this kind in the strong verb. The form תִּתְגַּבְּהָ יָנָהּ (so also Qimḥi and ed. Mant.; but Baer, Ginsb. תִּתְגַּבְּהָ יָנָהּ) for תִּתְגַּבְּהָ יָנָהּ *they were high*, Ez 16:50, is irregular, with יָ inserted after the manner of verbs עִיַּע and עִיַּו, § 67 d; § 72 i; according to Olshausen it is an error caused by the following form.

4. Instead of the plural forms in וּ there are, especially in the older books, over 300 forms<sup>1</sup> with the fuller ending וּן (with *Nûn paragogicum*), always bearing the tone; cf. § 29 m and § 44 l; on its retention before suffixes, see § 60 e; also defectively וּןִי 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 וּן תִּלְקֹטְנָהּ *they collect*, Ps 104:28; וּן תִּרְגְּזוּ *they tremble*, Ex 15:14; וּן תִּשְׁמַעְנָהּ *ye shall hear*, Dt 1:17; cf. Ex 34:13, with Zaqeph qatōn, Athnah, and Silluq; Jos 24:15, with Segolta; Is 13:8 and 17:13 with Zaqeph qatōn, 17:12 with Athnah and Silluq, 41:5 after *wāw consec.* Without the pause, e.g. Ps 11:2 קָשַׁתְךָ וּןִי, cf. 4:3, Gn 18:28, 29, 30 ff., 44:1, Nu 32:23, Jos 4:6 (וּןִי אֶלְלוּ); Is 8:12, 1 S 9:13, Ru 2:9 (וּןִי קָצַרְתִּי) and (וּןִי אֶצְבֹּן); 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 א or ע. 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: וּןִי וּןִי תִּרְאוּ וּןִי תִּשְׁתַּבְּשׁוּ *they see not; may they see and become ashamed*. All this applies also to the corresponding forms in the Imperfect of the derived conjugations.<sup>1</sup> In Aramaic and Arabic this earlier וּן (old Arabic *ūnā*) is the regular termination; but in some dialects of vulgar Arabic it has also become *ū*.

<sup>1</sup> [See details in F. Böttcher, *Lehrb.*, § 930; and cf. Driver on 1 S 2:15.]

<sup>1</sup> It is to be observed that the Chronicles often omit the *Nûn*, 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  $\aleph$  we find (in the imperf. Niphal) יִשְׁוֹא Jer 10:5, evidently an error for יִשְׁוֹא, caused by the preceding יִשְׁוֹא.—In יִשְׁוֹא Is 35:1, since  $\aleph$  follows, the  $\aleph$  is no doubt only due to dittography.

5. Corresponding to the use of  $\aleph$  for  $\aleph$  there occurs in the 2nd sing. fem., although much less frequently, the fuller ending  $\aleph \text{ } \aleph$  (as in Aram. and Arab.; old Arab. *inā*), also always with the tone, for  $\aleph \text{ } \aleph$ , generally again in the principal pause, and almost in all cases with retention of the vowel of the penultima; thus תִּדְבְּרִי Ru 2:8, 21, cf. 3:4, 18, 1 S 1:14 (תִּשְׁפְּרִי), Jer 31:22, Is 45:10.

6. On the reappearance in pause of the  $\bar{o}$  which had become  $\mathcal{S}^e w\bar{a}$  in the forms יִשְׁוֹא, &c., see above, e; similarly, the imperfects with  $\bar{a}$  restore this vowel in pause and at the same time lengthen it (as a tone-vowel) to  $\bar{a}$ , hence, e.g. יִגְדֵּל, יִגְדֵּל. This influence of the pause extends even to the forms without affirmatives, e.g. יִגְדֵּל, in pause יִגְדֵּל. But the fuller forms in *ûn* and *in* have the tone always on the ultima, since the vowels *û* 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*).<sup>2</sup> 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 affirmatives, 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  $\bar{a}$  (הָ) affixed to the 1st pers. sing. or plur., e.g. הִלְכֶּם from הִלַּךְ.<sup>1</sup> It occurs in almost all conjugations and classes of the strong and weak verb (except of course in the passives), and this final הָ has

---

<sup>2</sup> The perfect has only *one* form, since it cannot be used, like the imperfect, to express mood-relations (see § 106 p).

<sup>1</sup> Probably this  $\bar{a}$  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 affirmatives ו and י ך would have it. As before these endings, so also before the ה ך cohortative, the movable vowel of the last syllable of the verbal form becomes *Šewâ*, e.g. in Qal אֶשְׁמְרֶה *I will observe*, in Piel בְּנַתְּקֵהּ *let us break asunder*, Ps 2:3; on אֶשְׁקַטְּךָ Is 18:4 *Q'rê* (cf. also 27:4, Ezr 8:25, &c.), see § 10 h; with the *Kethîbh* of these passages, compare the analogous cases ישׁפוטו, &c., § 47 g.—On the other hand, an unchangeable vowel in the final syllable is retained as tone-vowel before the ה ך, as (e.g.) in Hiph. אֶזְכֹּרְךָ *I will praise*. In pause (as before *û* and *î*), the vowel which became *Šewâ* is restored as tone-vowel; thus for the cohortative אֶשְׁמְרֶה the pausal form is רַחֵם׃ Ps 59:10; cf. Gn 18:21, Is 41:26.

The change of ה ך into the obtuse ה ך seems to occur in 1 S 28:15, unless, with Nestle, we are to assume a conflate reading, אֶקְרָא, וְאֶקְרָא; 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 ה ך into the obtuse ה ך in *l* and in §§ 73 d, 80 i, 90 i. In Ps 20:4, however, יִדְשֵׁנִי—*with suffix*—is probably intended. An ה ך 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'rê*, but in both these cases without any effect on the meaning. Probably another instance occurs in Jb 11:17, although there תֵּעַפֶּה might also, with Qimhî, be regarded as 2nd masc. For the doubly irregular form תֵּב ואתָה Dt 33:16 (explained by Olshausen and König as a scribal error, due to a confusion with תבואת in verse 14), read תֵּב ואתָה. For תֵּבּוֹאֲתֶךָ Jb 22:21 the noun תֵּבּוֹאֲתֶךָ *thine increase*, might be meant, but the Masora has evidently intended an imperfect with the ending *ath*, instead of ה ך, before the suffix, on the analogy of the 3rd sing. fem. perfect, see § 59 a; on ותבאתי 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. יִקְטֹל, ind. יִקְטִיל), and similarly in the weak verb, wherever the imperfect indicative has *î* in the second syllable, e.g. from יִשָּׁב impf. *Hiph.* יוֹשִׁיב, juss. יוֹשִׁיב; from מוֹת and יָמִית, also in *Qal* of the verbs ע״ו and ע״י, as יָמַת, ind. יָמֵת, ind. יָגִיל, ind. יָגִיל; in all conjugations of verbs ל״ה, so that the rejection (*apocope*) of the ending ה ך in *Qal* and *Hiph.* gives rise to monosyllabic forms, with or without a helping vowel under the second radical, e.g. *Qal* ind. יָגֵל, juss. יָגֵל; *Hiph.* ind. יָגֵל, juss. יָגֵל; and in the *Piel* יִצוּ



§ 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 tenses<sup>1</sup> 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. וְהָיָה) *in that day ...*

This progress in the sequence of time, is regularly indicated by a pregnant *and* (called *wāw consecutive*<sup>1</sup>), 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 *Pathah* and a *Dageš forte* in the next letter, as וַיִּקַּט־לְ and *he killed*; before ׀ of the 1st pers. sing. (according to § 22 c) with *Qameṣ*, as וַאֲקַט־לְ and *I killed*. Exceptions are, וַאֲכַפֵּךְ Ez 16:10 according to the *Dikduke ha-ṣ'amim*, § 71; also וַאֲמַתְתֵּהּ 2 S 1:10 according to Qimḥi; but in Ju 6:9 וַאֲגַרְשֵׁנִי should be read according to Baer, and וַאֲיִ in both places in Ju 20:6. *Dageš forte* is always omitted in the preformative ׀, 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 וַיִּקְטַל (§ 53 n). The tendency

---

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> 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 זכר of Hamāth (cf. Noöldeke, *ZA.* 1908, p. 379) where we find ירִי וַאֲשֵׁא and *I lifted up my hand*, ויעַנֵנִי and *he answered me*, after a perfect of narration.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> 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. יָקוּם, juss. אֲקוּם, with *wāw consec.* אָקוּם and *he arose* (§ 67 n and x, § 68 d, § 69 p, § 71, § 72 t and aa, § 73 e).<sup>1</sup>

In the *first* pers. sing. alone the retraction of the tone and even the reducing of the long vowel in the final syllable (*û* to *ō*, *i* to *ē*, and then to *ō* and *ě*) are not usual,<sup>2</sup> at least according to the Masoretic punctuation, and the apocope in verbs ל"ו occurs more rarely; e.g. always אָקוּם (or אֲקוּם, a merely orthographic difference) and *I arose*; *Hiph.* אֲקוּם (but generally written אָקוּם, implying the pronunciation *wāāqēm*, as אֲקוּם implies *wāāqōm*); אָרָא and *I saw*, more frequently than אָרָא, § 75 t. On the other hand, the form with final הָ is often used in the 1st pers. both sing. and plur., especially in the later books, e.g. אָשַׁלְחָהּ and *I sent*, Gn 32:6, 41:11, 43:21, Nu 8:19 (אָשַׁלְחָהּ, as in Ju 6:9, 1 S 2:28, and often, probably a sort of compensation for the lost הָ); 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, אָשַׁלְחָהּ before אָ, for euphonic reasons. In Is 8:2 אָשַׁלְחָהּ may have been originally intended; in Ps 73:16 אָשַׁלְחָהּ and in Jb 30:26 אָשַׁלְחָהּ. In Ez 3:3 read אָשַׁלְחָהּ or אָשַׁלְחָהּ.

This וּ is in meaning a strengthened *wāw copulative*, and resembles in pronunciation the form which is retained in Arabic as the ordinary copula (*wā*).<sup>3</sup> The close connexion of this *wā* with the following consonant, caused the latter in Hebrew to take *Dageš*, especially as *ā* could not have been retained in an open syllable. Cf. בְּמִהָ, בְּמִהָ, לְ מִהָ (for לְ מִהָ), where the prepositions בְּ and לְ, and the particle מִ, are closely connected with מִהָ in the same way (§ 102 k).

The retraction of the tone also occurs in such combinations, as in לְ מִהָ (for לְ מִהָ § 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 (וּ, וְ, וֹ, as 2 K

<sup>1</sup> The plural forms in וְ also occur less frequently after *wāw consecutive*; cf., however, וְיָבִינּוּ 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*.

<sup>2</sup> In the 1st plur. וְ עָמִיד Neh 4:3 is the only instance in which the vowel remains unreduced (cf. וְנָשׁוּב, i.e. וְנָשׁוּב, 4:9 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*; *Q<sup>e</sup>rē* וְנָשׁוּב). On the treatment of the tone in the imperfect, imperative, and infinitive *Niphal*, see § 51 n.

<sup>3</sup> In usage the Hebrew *wāw* does duty for the Arabic *fā* (*wāw apodosis*, see § 143 d) as well as *wā*.

7:4, and וַיְהִי; e.g. הִנֵּה, 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 הָלַךְ *I went*, consecutive form וְהָלַךְ *and 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 *ō̄*, e.g. וְהִנֵּה 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. וְנִשְׁבַּח Gn 34:16; (b) regularly in Hiphil before the affirmatives הַיָּמִים and הַיָּמִים, see § 53 r; and (c) in many cases in verbs אֲלִי and לִי, almost always in the 1st sing. of לִי (Jer 29:14), and in לִי 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 א) and the 2nd sing. masc. of Hiphil-forms before א, Nu 20:8, Dt 20:13, 1 S 15:3, 2 K 13:17; similarly in Piēl before א, Ex 25:24, Jer 27:4. On the other hand the tone is generally moved forward if the second syllable has *e* (in לִי Gn 27:10 &c., in לִי Ex 40:4, Jer 33:6, Ez 32:7); but cf. also וְהָיָה Lv 19:14, 32 and frequently, always before the counter-tone, Jo 4:21, Ps 19:14.<sup>1</sup> With *ā* in the penultima the form is וְנִשְׁבַּח Is 14:4, and probably also וְנִקְרָה Jer 2:2, 3:12, 1 S 10:2 with little Tēlîšā, a postpositive accent.

But before a following א the ultima mostly bears the tone on phonetic grounds, e.g. וְבָאָה Gn 6:18, Ex 3:18, Zc 6:10 (by the side of וְבָאָה), &c. (cf., however, וְנִקְרָה, before א, Gn 17:19, Jer 7:27, Ex 36:29); וְהָיָה Ju 6:16, cf. Ex 25:11, Lv 24:5 (but also וְהָיָה לִי Lv 25:21). Likewise, before ה, Am 8:9, and ע, e.g. Gn 26:10, 27:12, Lv 26:25 (cf., however, וְנִקְרָה אתִּי עָלָיו, Ez 38:21); on verbs ע"ע, see § 67 k and § ee.

(d) The tone always keeps its place when such a perfect stands in *pause*, e.g. וְנִשְׁבַּח Dt 6:11, 11:15; וְנִשְׁבַּח 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 qaton*; and frequently also immediately *before* a tone-syllable (according to § 29 e), as in וְנִשְׁבַּח בְּהַיָּמִים Dt 17:14, Ez 14:13, 17:22, Am 1:4, 7, 10, 12—but also וְנִשְׁבַּח בְּהַיָּמִים 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 (פֹּעֵל), and a passive, *Pāūl* (פְּעוּל).<sup>1</sup>

*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 *quṭṭāl* are better

<sup>1</sup> The irregularity in the tone of these perfects manifestly results from following conflicting theories, not that of Ben Asher alone.

<sup>1</sup> The constr. st. נֶאֱמַר in the formula נֶאֱמַר 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 פָּעוּל 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. יָשָׁן *sleeping*, from יָשַׁן; יָגֹר (only orthographically different from the perf. יָגַר) *fearing*; cf. the formation of the participle in *Niphal*, § 51 a. On the other hand, the participle of verbs *mid. a* takes the form קָטַל (so even from the *transitive* שָׂנֵא *to hate*, part. שָׂנֵא). The *ô* of these forms has arisen through an obscuring of the *â*, and is therefore unchangeable, cf. § 9 q. The form קָטַל (with a changeable *Qameṣ* in both syllables), which would correspond to the forms יָשָׁן and יָגֹר, is only in use as a noun, cf. § 84a f. The formation of the participle in *Piël*, *Hiphil*, and *Hithpaël* follows a different method.

3. Participles form their feminine (קָטְלָה or קָטְלָת) 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 יָשָׁן is lengthened from *ǎ*, and consequently changeable (e.g. *fem.* יָשְׁנָה); and that the *ô* of קָטַל on the other hand is obscured from an unchangeable *â*.<sup>2</sup> In Arabic the verbal adjective of the form *qāṭil* corresponds to the form *qāṭel*, and the part. *qāṭil* to *qōṭel*. In both cases, therefore, the *ē* of the second syllable is lengthened from *i*, and is consequently changeable (e.g. קָטְלִים, plur. כָּבֵד, constr. pl. כְּבֹדִי).

תּוֹמִיךְ Ps 16:5, instead of the form *qōṭel*, is an anomaly; it is possible, however, that תּוֹמִיךְ (incorrectly written fully) is intended (cf. סִבְיָה 2 K 8:21), or even the *imperfect Hiphil* of יָמַךְ. The form יִסְרָה in Is 29:14, 38:5 appears to stand for יִסְרָה, but most probably the Masora here (as certainly in יוֹסִיף Ec 1:18) intends the 3rd sing. imperf. Hiph., for which the better form would be יוֹסִיף; אֹבְדִיל 1 Ch 27:30, being a proper name and a foreign word, need not be considered.—אִבְדָּ (constr. state of אָבַד), with *ǎ* in the second syllable, occurs in Dt 32:28 (cf. moreover, § 65 d). On הוֹלֵם Is 41:7 (for הוֹלֵם), see § 29 f.

2. A form like the pass. ptc. *Pāül*, but not to be confused with it, is sometimes found from *intransitive verbs*, to denote an inherent quality, e.g. אֱמוּןָ *faithful*; אֲנָשׁ *desperate*, Jer 15:18, &c.; בְּטוּחָ *trustful*, Is 26:3, Ps 112:7; עֲצוּם *strong*; שְׂכוּרָ *drunken*, Is 51:21; and even from *transitive verbs*, אֲחֻזָּה *handling*, Ct 3:8; מְדַבֵּרָ *mindful*, Ps 103:14; יָדוּעָ *knowing*, Is 53:3; cf. § 84a m.

## VERBA DERIVATIVA, OR DERIVED CONJUGATIONS.

### § 51. Niphal.<sup>1</sup>

1. The essential characteristic of this conjugation consists in a prefix<sup>2</sup> to the stem. This exists in two forms: (*a*) the (probably original) prepositive *nǎ*, as in the Hebrew perfect and participle, although in the strong verb the *ǎ* is always attenuated to *i*: נִקְטַל.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Vollers, 'Das *QaÆtil-partizipium*, ' in *ZA*. 1903, p. 312 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Rieder, *De linguae Hebr. verbis, quae vocantur derivata nifal et hitpaël*, Gumbinnen (Progr. des Gymn.), 1884, a list of all the strong Niphal forms (81) and Hithpaël forms (36) in the Old Testament; and especially M. Lambert, 'L'emploi du Nifal en Hébreu,' *REJ*. 41, 196 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See Philippi in *ZDMG*. 1886, p. 650, and Barth, *ibid.* 1894, p. 8 f.

for original *nā-qāṭāl*, participle *נִקְטָל*, infinitive absolute sometimes *נִקְטֹל*; (b) the (later) proclitic *in* (as in all the forms of the corresponding Arabic conjugation VII. *inqāṭālā*), found in the imperfect *יִקְטֹל* for *yinqāṭēl*, in the imperative and infinitive construct, with a secondary ה added, *הִקְטֹל* (for *hinqāṭēl*), and in the infinitive absolute *לִיקְטֹל*. 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. *נִלְחַם* to *thrust oneself (against)*, *נִשְׁמַר* to *take heed to oneself*, *φυλάσσεισθαι*, *נִסְתַּר* to *hide oneself*, *נִגְאָל* to *redeem oneself*, cf. also *נִעָנָה* to *answer for oneself*. Equally characteristic of *Niphal* is its frequent use to express emotions which react upon the mind; *נִחַם* to *trouble oneself*, *נִאָּנַח* 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. *נִדְרַשׁ* to *search, to inquire*, *Niph. to allow oneself to be inquired of*, Is 65:1, Ez 14:3, &c.; so the *Niph.* of *נִצְּרָה* to *find*, *נִסַּר* to *warn, to correct*, Jer 6:8, 31:18, &c.

(b) It expresses *reciprocal* or mutual action, e.g. *נִדְבַר* to *speak*, *Niph. to speak to one another*; *נִשְׁפַּט* to *judge*, *Niph. to go to law with one another*; *נִיַּעַץ* to *counsel*, *Niph. to take counsel*, cf. the *middle* and *deponent* verbs *βουλεύεσθαι* (*βουλεύω*), *μάξεσθαι* (*μάξω*), *altercari*, *luctari* (*ἀλλοτρίω* to *strive with one another*) *proeliari*.

(c) It has also, like *Hithpaël* (§ 54 f) and the Greek *middle*, the meaning of the active, with the addition of *to oneself (sibi)*, *for oneself*, e.g. *נִשְׁאַל* to *ask (something) for oneself* (1 S 20:6, 28, Neh 13:6), cf. *αἰτοῦμαι σε τοῦτο*, *ἐδύσασθαι χιτῶνα* 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*<sup>1</sup> of *Qal*, e.g. *נִלְדָּ* to *bear*, *Niph. to be born*; *נִקָּבַר* 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 *Piël* and *Hiphil*, e.g. *נִכְבַּד* to *be in honour*, *Piël to honour*, *Niph. to be honoured* (as well as *Pual* *נִכְבַּד*); *נִכְהַד* *Piël to conceal*, *Hiph. to destroy*, *Niph. passive of either*. In such cases *Niphal* may again coincide in meaning with *Qal* (*הִלָּךְ* *Qal* and *Niph. to be ill*) and even take an accusative.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Halfmann, *Beiträge zur Syntax der hebraäischen Sprache*, I. Stück, Wittenb., 1888, 2. St. 1892 (Gymn.-Programm), statistics of the *Niphal* (*Pual*, *Hophal*, and *qāṭûl*) 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 נָזַד; but probably נִזְכָּר should here be read); גִּלְבָּב *cordatum fieri*, Jb 11:12 (from לָבַב *cor*); doubtless also נִבְנְהָ *to obtain children*, Gn 16:2, 30:3.

The older grammarians were decidedly wrong in representing *Niphal* simply as the passive of *Qal*; for *Niphal* 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 נִגְאָלוּ Is 59:3, La 4:14, is not to be regarded as a passive of *Niphal*, but with Koönig and Cheyne as a *forma mixta*, in the sense that the punctuators intended to combine two optional readings, נִגְאָלוּ, perf. *Niph.*, and גִּאָלוּ, perf. *Pual* [cf. also Wright, *Compar. Gramm.*, p. 224]. Although the passive use of *Niphal* was introduced at an early period, and became tolerably common, it is nevertheless quite secondary to the reflexive use.

Rem. 1 The *infin. absol.* נִקְטוּל is connected in form with the perfect, to which it bears the same relation as קָטַל to קָטַל in *Qal*, the *ō* in the second syllable being obscured from an original *ā*. Examples are, נִבְכַּסְתָּ Gn 31:30; נִגְלַחְתָּ Ju 11:25; נִנְשָׂא 1 S 20:6, 28, all in connexion with the perfect.

Examples of the form הִקְטַל (in connexion with imperfects) are, הִקְטַלְתָּ Jer 32:4; הִקְטַלְתָּ Lv 7:18; once אֶדְרַשׁ Ez 14:3, where, perhaps, the subsequent אֶדְרַשׁ has led to the substitution of א for ה.—Moreover, the form הִקְטַל is not infrequently used also for the *infin. absol.*,<sup>2</sup> e.g. Ex 22:3, Nu 15:31, Dt 4:26, 1 K 20:39. On the other hand, קָהַנְדָּךְ should simply be read for the wholly abnormal קָהַנְדָּךְ, Ps 68:3 (commonly explained as being intended to correspond in sound with the subsequent קָהַנְדָּךְ but probably a ‘*forma mixta*’, combining the readings קָהַנְדָּךְ and קָהַנְדָּךְ).

Elision of the ה after prepositions is required by the Masora in שְׁלוּ בְּךָ Pr. 24:17 (for בְּהִקְיָ), Ez 26:15 and עָטַף בְּ עֵצִים La 2:11; also in verbs לִי Ex 10:3 (לְעֵנוֹת); 34:24, Dt 31:11, Is 1:12 (לְרֵאוֹת); in verbs עָוִי Jb 33:30 (לְאוֹר). It is, however, extremely doubtful whether the *infin. Qal* of the *Kethibh* 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, *Pathah* often occurs in pause, e.g. לִי Gn 21:8; cf. Ex 31:17, 2 S 12:15 (with final ש); 17:23 (with ק); Jon 1:5 (with מ); see § 29 q. In the 2nd and 3rd plur. fem. *Pathah* predominates, e.g. תִּזְכְּרִי Is 65:17; *Sere* occurs only in תִּעַנְנִי Ru 1:13, from עָנָן, and hence, with loss of the doubling, for תִּעַנְנִי; cf. even תִּאֲמַנְי Is 60:4.—With *Nūn paragogicum* (see § 47 m) in the 2nd and 3rd plur. masc. are found, יִלְכְּדוּן, יִלְקַחְדוּן, &c., in pause הִלְכוּן, יִלְכְּדוּן, &c.; but יִלְקַחְדוּן (cf. 24:24).

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 gone on the first syllable, the tone is, as a rule (but cf. וַיִּאָּבֶק אִישׁ Gn 32:25), shifted back from the ultima to the penultima, while the ultima, which thus loses the tone, takes *S̄ghôl* instead of *Sere*; e.g. יִשָּׁל בָּהּ Ez 33:12; וַיִּעַן הָרִי לוֹ Gn 25:21; in the imperative, 13:9.—So always הִשָּׁר לָךְ (since לָךְ counts as *one* syllable) Gn 24:6, &c., cf. 1 S 19:2; and even with *Pathah* in the ultima, תִּעַן זָבֹב אֶרֶץ Jb 18:4 (but cf. תִּרַעַתְרָה).

<sup>2</sup> But, like הִקְטַל, *only* in connexion with imperfects, except Jer 7:9. Barth is therefore right in describing (*Nominalbildung*, p. 74) both forms as later analogical formations (in addition to the original Semitic נִקְטוּל), intended to assimilate the infinitive to the imperfect which it strengthens.

אָלֵהֶם 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. וַיִּשְׁׁרֶן Gn 7:23; וַיִּלְחֶם Nu 21:1 and frequently, וַיִּצְּקֵד 25:3; and always so in the imperative הִשְׁׁרֵן 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 *Athnaḥ*), and imperfect (Pr 24:4, &c.), see § 29 o, and note; on the other hand, always הִמְלֵט, יִמְלֵט, &c.

In the *imperative*, הִקְבֵצִי, for הִקְבֵצִי, with the rejection of the initial ה, occurs in Is 43:9, and in Joel 4:11 in *pause* צִוּ קִבְצִי (cf. וְלִוּוּ Jer 50:5); but in these examples either the reading or the explanation is doubtful. The 2nd sing. imperat. of נִשְׁבַּע is always (with ה *paragogicum*) הִשְׁבַּעֵנִי swear to me, Gn 21:23, &c. (also הִשְׁבַּעֵה לִּי Gn 47:31, 1 S 30:15).

4. For the 1st sing. of the *imperfect*, the form אֶקְטֹל is as frequent as אֶקְטֹל, e.g. אֶדְרֹשׁ I shall be inquired of, Ez 14:3; אֶשְׁבַּע I will swear, Gn 21:24; cf. 16:2, Nu 23:15, Ez 20:36, and so always in the cohortative, e.g. אֶקְמֵה I will avenge me, Is 1:24; cf. 1 S 12:7, Ez 26:2, and in the impf. Niph. of פִּיַּו (§ 69 t). The Babylonian punctuation admits only *i* under the preformative of the 1st person.

## § 52. Pi□ēl 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 קִטַּל (cf. the Arabic conj. II. *qāttālā*) would naturally follow as the *perfect* of the active (*Pi□āl*). The *Pathaḥ* of the first syllable is, however, with one exception (see m), always attenuated to *i* 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 frequently<sup>1</sup> this *ā* also is attenuated to *i*, which is then regularly lengthened to *ē*, under the influence of the tone. Cf. in Aram. קִטַּל; but in Biblical Aramaic almost always קִטַּל. On the three cases in which *ā* before a final ר or ס has passed into *S<sup>e</sup>ghōl*, see below, l.—Hence, for the *3rd sing. masc. perfect*, there arise forms like אֶבַד, לָמַד, אֶבַד, אֶבַד, &c.—Before affirmatives beginning with a consonant, however, *ā* is always retained, thus קִטַּלְתָּ, קִטַּלְתֶּם, קִטַּלְתָּ, &c. In the *infinitives (absol. קִטַּל*, obscured from *qaṭṭāl*; *constr. קִטַּל*), *imperfect (יִקְטֹל)*, *imperative (קִטַּל)*, and *participle (קֹטֵל)* the original *ā* of the first syllable reappears throughout. The vocal *S<sup>e</sup>wā* of the preformatives is weakened from a short vowel; cf. the Arabic imperfect *yūqāṭṭil*, participle *mūqāṭṭil*.

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 *q*, which in the remaining conjugations also is the prefix of the participle, is probably connected with the interrogative or indefinite (cf. § 37) pronoun מִי *quis? quicumque* (fem. i.e. neuter, מִיָּה); cf. § 85 e.

<sup>1</sup> So in all verbs which end in *Nūn*, 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'el* and *Pu'al*, is often omitted (independently of verbs *middle guttural*, § 64 d) when the middle radical has *Ṣwā* under it (cf. § 20 m), e.g. שְׁלַחָהּ for שְׁלַחָהּ Ez 17:17; בְּקִשׁוֹ 2 Ch 15:15 (but in the *imperative* always בְּקִשׁוּ 1 S 28:7, &c.), and so always in הִלְלוּ *praise*. The vocal character of the *Ṣwā* under the *litera dagessanda* is sometimes in such cases (according to § 10 h) expressly emphasized by its taking the form of a *Haṭeph*, as in הִלְלוּ Gn 2:23, with הִלְלוּ owing to the influence of the preceding *u*, cf. פָּעִלוּ for פָּעִלוּ, &c.; Gn 9:14, Ju 16:16. In the *imperfect* and *participle* the *Ṣwā* under the preformatives (*Haṭeph-Pathaḥ* under א 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 Boöttcher<sup>2</sup> (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, § 904 ff. and § 1022), many supposed perfects of *Pu'al* are in reality passives of Qal. He reckons as such all those *perfects*, of which the *Pi'el* (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'al*. Such *perfects* are the *quṭṭal* form of the stems אָבַל (*imperfect* תִּאָּבְלוּ Is 1:20), חָפַשׁ, חָטַר, יָלַד, יָצַר, לָקַח, עָבַד, שָׁגַל, שָׁטַף, שָׁפַךְ. Barth (see below) adds to the list the apparent *Pu'al-perfects* of אָסַר, בָּזַז, זָנַח, חָצַב, זָנַח, כָּרַת, חָצַב, זָנַח, בָּזַז, אָסַר, and of verbs with middle ר (hence with *ū* of the first syllable lengthened to *ō*), הָרַג, הָרַהּ, הָרַהּ Jb 3:3 [זָרַהּ, see § 67 m], זָרַע, זָרַק, מָרַט, מָרַט, קָרַא, שָׁרַף, שָׁרַף; also the infinitives absolute הָרַו הָרַו הָרַו 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. *quṭṭālā* 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'el*, 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),<sup>1</sup> e.g. חָקַץ to laugh, *Pi'el* to jest, to make sport (to laugh repeatedly); שָׁאַל to ask, *Pi'el* to beg; hence when an action has reference to *many*, e.g. קָבַר to bury (a person) Gn 23:4, *Pi'el* 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. פָּתַח to open, *Pi'el* to loose; סָפַר to count, *Pi'el* to recount: [cf. פָּתַח, חָשַׁב, הִלְךְ, רָפָא, חָפַשׁ, מָרַצַח, מָאָהָב, תִּפְשׁ].

The eager pursuit of an action may also consist in *urging* and *causing* others to do the same. Hence *Pi'el* has also—(b) a *causative* sense (like *Hiph'ul*), e.g. לָמַד to learn, *Pi'el* to teach. It may often be turned by such phrases as *to permit to*, *to declare* or

<sup>2</sup> 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 Jubiläum Hildesheimer* (Berlin, 1890), p. 145 ff.

<sup>1</sup> 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. הִיָּה to cause to live, צִדֵּק to declare innocent, יָלַד 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. קָנַן to make a nest, to nest (from קָן), עָפַר to throw dust, to dust (from עָפַר), עָנַן to gather the clouds together (from עָנַן), שָׁלַשׁ to divide in three parts, or to do a thing for the third time (from שָׁלַשׁ); probably also דִּבֶּר to speak, from דִּבֶּר 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. שָׁרַשׁ, from שָׁרַשׁ to root out, to extirpate, זָנַב prop. to injure the tail (זָנַב), hence to rout the rear of an army, to attack it; לָבַב to ravish the heart; דָּשַׁן to remove the ashes (דָּשַׁן); חָטָא to free from sin (חָטָא), עָצַם to break any one's bones (עָצַם; cf., in the same sense, גָּרַם from גָּרַם); סָעַף to lop the boughs, Is 10:33 (from סָעַף a bough). Some words are clearly denominatives, although the noun from which they are derived is no longer found, e.g. סָקַל 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. בִּקֵּשׁ *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. גָּלָה, *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. חָתַת in *Pi'ēl* to be broken in pieces, Jer 51:56; פָּחַד to tremble, Is 51:13, Pr 28:14; הָרַה to be drunken, Is 34:5, 7; [מָעַט to be few, Ec 12:3]; but in Is 48:8, 60:11 instead of the *Pi'ēl* of פָּתַח the *Niph'al* 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. גָּדַל Is 49:21 with גָּדַל Jos 4:14, Est 3:1; מָלַט Ez 33:5 with מָלַט Ec 9:15; קָצַץ 2 K 8:16 with קָצַץ Ps 129:4; but *Qameṣ* never appears in this pausal form. The *3rd sing. fem.* in *pause* is always of the form קָטְלָה, except קָטְלָהָּ Mi 1:7; the *3rd plur.* always as קָטְלוּ; the *2nd* and *1st sing.* and *1st plur.* of course as קָטְלָהּ, קָטְלוּ, קָטְלוּ, קָטְלוּ (but always קָטְלוּ and קָטְלוּ), קָטְלוּ. In the *3rd sing. perf.* דִּבֶּר to speak, כָּפַר to pardon, and כָּבַס to wash clothes (also כָּבַס Gn 49:11) take *S'ghôl*, but become in *pause* דִּבְרָה, כָּפַס (2 S 19:25); the *pausal* form of כָּפַר does not occur.

*Pathah* in the first syllable (as in Aramaic and Arabic) occurs only once, Gn 41:51, נָשַׁחְנִי he made me forget, to emphasize more clearly the play on the name מְנַשֵּׁחַ.

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'ghôl*, e.g. בִּקֵּשׁ-לוּ he seeks for himself, Is 40:20; קְדַשְׁ-לִי sanctify unto me, Ex 13:2. *Pausal-forms* with *S'ghôl* instead of *Sere*, as יִרְחַק Dt 32:11, אֲרַחֵם 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 *Haṭeph-Pathah*, under the preformative א; אָזְרָה Lv 26:33, Ez 5:12, 12:14 and וְאָסַע זְרָם Zc 7:14 (in accordance with § 23 h).—Before the full plural ending ון (see § 47 m) the *Sere* is retained in *pause*, e.g. תְּדַבֵּר ון Ps 58:2 (but Gn 32:20 ון תְּדַבֵּר), cf. 2 K 6:19, Dt 12:3; so before *Silluq* Ps 58:3, Jb 21:11 and even before *Zaqeph qaton* Dt 7:5. Instead of תִּקְטַט לְנָה, forms like תִּקְטַט לְנָה are also found, e.g. Is 3:16, 13:18, in both cases before a sibilant and in *pause*. Also פִּלַּג Ps 55:10 occurs as the 2nd sing. imperative (probably an intentional imitation of the sound of the preceding פִּלַּע) and קָרַב (for *qarrabh*) Ez 37:17.

3. The *infinitive absolute* of *Pi'el* has sometimes the special form קִטַּל given in the paradigm, e.g. נִסֵּר *castigando*, Ps 118:18; cf. Ex 21:19, 1 K 19:10 (from a verb לִי"א); Ps 40:2 (from a verb לִי"ה); but much more frequently the form of the *infinitive construct* (קִטַּל) is used instead. The latter has also, in exceptional cases, the form קִטַּל (with *ā* attenuated to *i* as in the *perfect*), e.g. in 1 Ch 8:8 וְשָׁלַח; perhaps also (if not a substantive) קִטַּר Jer 44:21; and for the sake of assonance even for *infinitive absolute* in 2 S 12:14 (נִאֲזַץ נִאֲצַת). On the other hand, שָׁלַח Dt 32:35 and דִּבֵּר Jer 5:13 are better regarded as substantives, while דִּבֵּר Ex 6:28, Nu 3:1, Dt 4:15 (in each case after בְּיָוִם), Ho 1:2 (after תְּהַלֵּת), in all of which places it is considered by König (after Qimḥi) to be *infinitive construct*, is really *perfect* of *Pi'el*.

The *infinitive construct* *Pi'el*, with the *fem.* ending (cf. § 45 d), occurs in יִסְרָה Lv 26:18; וְזָמְרָה Ps 147:1; with ת of the *fem.* before a suffix צִדְקָתָךְ Ez 16:52. On the verbal nouns after the form of the Aram. inf. *Pa'il* (קִטַּלְהָ), see § 84b e.

Instead of the abnormal מְאָסְפִיר (so Baer, Is 62:9) as ptcp. *Pi'el*, read מְאָסִי with ed. Mant. and Ginsburg.

4. In *Pu'al* *ō* is sometimes found instead of *ū* in the initial syllable, e.g. מְאֻדָּה *dyled red*, Ex 25:5, &c., Na 2:4, cf. 3:7 וְשִׁדְדָה; Ez 16:4, Ps 72:20, 80:11. According to Baer's reading also in וְתִרְצָחוּ Ps 62:4, and so also Ben Ašer, but Ben Naphtali וְתִרְצָחוּ. It is merely an orthographic licence when *ū* is written fully, e.g. יוּלַד Ju 18:29.

5. As *infinitive absolute*, of *Pu'al* we find בָּנָב Gn 40:15.—No instance of the *inf. constr.* occurs in the strong verb in *Pu'al*; from לִי"ה with suffix עֲנֹתוֹ Ps 132:1.

6. A few examples occur of the *participle Pu'al* without the preformative (מְ), e.g. אָכַל Ex 3:2; יוּלַד (for מְיֻלַד) Ju 13:8; לָקַח 2 K 2:10; עָרָה 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 וּיְקַשִּׁים, according to § 20 n, stands for 'קָ = 'מִיָּק'); but, according to the Masora, not Ez 26:17, since הִהֵלֵלָה as *Mil'el* can only be the *perfect*. The rejection of the מְ may be favoured by an initial מ, as in Is 18:2, 7 (but also מְמַשֵּׁךְ; Pr 25:19 (where, however, read מוּשֵׁךְ); so also in the *participle Pi'el* מְאָן Ex 7:27, 9:2 (always after אָם, but cf. also הִמְאָנִים Jer 13:10, where, however, הִמְאָנִים = הִמְאָנִים is to be read, with Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 264 f.) and מְהָרָה Zp 1:14 (and Is 8:1, 3?). Notice, however, Barth's suggestion (*Nominalbildung*, p. 273) that, as the active of forms like אָכַל 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 מְרַבַּע Ez 45:2, see § 65 d.

## § 53. Hiph'ûl and Hoph'al.

1. The characteristic of the active (*Hiph'ûl*) is a prefixed ה (on its origin see § 55 i) in the perfect ה (with the *ā* attenuated to *i*, 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. *'aqtālā*, and in Hebrew the return of the *Pathah* in the 2nd and 1st pers. הַקָּטַלְתָּ, &c. After the attenuation of this *ā* to *i*, it ought by rule to have been lengthened to *ē* in the tone-syllable, as in Aramaic אַקְטַל, beside הַקָּטַל in Biblical Aramaic. Instead of this, however, it is always replaced in the strong verb by *i*,<sup>1</sup> יִקְטַל, but sometimes written defectively יִקְטַל; cf. § 9 g. Similarly in the infinitive construct יִקְטַל, and in the imperfect and participle יִקְטַל and יִקְטַל, which are syncopated from יִקְטַל and יִקְטַל; § 23 k. The corresponding Arabic forms (*juqtīl* and *muqtīl*) point to an original *i* in the second syllable of these forms. In Hebrew the regular lengthening of this *i* 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 הַקָּטַלְתָּ, הַקָּטַלְתָּ 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'al*) the preformative is pronounced with an obscure vowel, whilst the second syllable has *ā* (in pause *ā*), as its characteristic, thus:—*Perf.* הִקְטַלְתָּ or הִקְטַלְתָּ, *Imperf.* יִקְטַל (syncopated from יִקְטַל) or יִקְטַל, *Part.* מִקְטַל or מִקְטַל (from מִקְטַל); but the *infinitive absolute* has the form הִקְטַל.

Thus the characteristics of both conjugations are the ה preformative in the *perfect*, *imperative*, and *infinitive*; in the *imperfect* and *participle Hiph'ûl*, *Pathah* under the preformatives, in the *Hoph'al* *ō* or *ū*.

2. The *meaning* of *Hiph'ûl* is primarily, and even more frequently than in *Pi'ēl* (§ 52 g), *causative* of *Qal*, e.g. אָצַף to go forth, *Hiph.* to bring forth, to lead forth, to draw forth; קָדַשׁ to be holy, *Hiph.* to sanctify. Under the *causative* is also included (as in *Pi'ēl*) the *declarative* sense, e.g. הִצְדִּיק to pronounce just; הִרְשִׁיעַ to make one an evil doer (to pronounce guilty); cf. עָקַב, in *Hiph'ûl*, Jb 9:20, to represent as perverse. If *Qal* has already a transitive meaning, *Hiph'ûl* then takes two accusatives (see § 117 cc). In some verbs, *Pi'ēl* and *Hiph'ûl* occur side by side in the same sense, e.g. אָבַד *periit*, *Pi'ēl* and *Hiph'ûl*, *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. כָּבַד *gravem esse*, *Pi'ēl* to honour, *Hiph'ûl* to bring to honour, also to make heavy. Verbs which are intransitive in *Qal* simply become transitive in *Hiph'ûl*, e.g. נָטַח 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'ûl*-form. To these *inwardly transitive* or *intensive Hiph'ûls* belong: (a) *Hiph'ûl* stems which express the obtaining or receiving of a

<sup>1</sup> This יִקְטַל may have been transferred originally from the imperfects of verbs עָוָה, 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'ûl*; 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'ûl*.) Thus אהל, זהר, יפע, צוץ *to be bright, to shine* (to give forth brightness); opposed to חשך *to become dark*; אמץ, גבר, חזק *to be strong* (to develop strength), עטף *to be weak*; ארך *to be long* (to acquire length); גבה *to be high*; הום *to be in tumult*, זעק *to cry out*, רוע, רנן *to make a noise, to exult*; חלף *to sprout* (to put forth shoots), cf. פרה *to bloom*, עדף, שוק *to overflow*; חרש, חשה, סכת, צמת *to be silent* (*silentium facere*, Pliny); מתק *to be sweet*; צלה *to have success*; שפל *to be low*; אדם *to become red*, לבן *to become white*.

(b) Stems which express in *Hiph'ûl* the entering into a certain condition and, further, the being in the same: אמן *to become firm, to trust in*; באש *to become stinking*; זוד *to become boiling, to boil over*; חלה *to become ill*; הסר *to come to want*; הרה *to become hot*; יבש *to become dry, to become ashamed*; יתר *to attain superiority*; סכן *to become familiar*; עור, קוץ *to become awake*; קשה *to become hard*; רגע, שקט *to become quiet* (to keep quiet); שמם *to be astonished*. The *Hiph'ûl* forms of some verbs of motion constitute a variety of this class: נגש *to draw near*; קרב *to come near*; רחק *to withdraw far off* (all these three are besides used as causatives); קדם *to come before*.

(c) Stems which express action in some particular direction: הטא *to err*; חלק *to flatter* (to act smoothly); יטב *to act well, to do good*; סכל *to act foolishly*, שכל *to act wisely*; ערם *to act craftily*; צנע *to act submissively*; רעע, רשע *to act wickedly, godlessly*; שחת, תעב *to act corruptly, abominably*; שלם *to act peacefully, to be at peace, to be submissive*.

Further, there are in *Hiph'ûl* a considerable number of *denominatives* which express the bringing out, the producing of a thing, and so are properly regarded as causatives,<sup>1</sup> e.g. אצר *to set over the treasury*, Neh 13:13 (unless צנה, נא is to be read, as in Neh 7:2); בכר *to bring forth a firstborn*; גשם *to cause to rain*; זרע *to produce seed*; ימן (*Hiph'ûl* הימין) *to go to the right*, cf. השמאל *to go to the left*; פרס *to get or to have hoofs*; קרן *to get or to have horns*; שכל *to produce abortion*; שלג *to become snow-white*; שמן *to grow fat*; שרש *to put forth roots, &c.*; so also according to the ordinary acceptation יהו אצנ יהו Is 19:6, they have become stinking, from אצנה *stinking or stench*, with retention of the א prosthetic, § 19 m (but see below, p).

Of a different kind are the *denominatives* from: און (scarcely *to prick up the ears*, but) *to act with the ears, to hear*; cf. לשן *to move the tongue, to slander*, and the German *äugeln* (to make eyes), *füsseln, näseln, schwänzeln*; שבר *to sell corn*; שכם *to set out early* (to lead the back [of the camel, &c.]?); opposed to עריב *to be late*.

3. The meaning of *Hoph'al* is (a) primarily that of a *passive* of *Hiph'ûl*, e.g. השליך *proiecit*, השלך or השלך *proiectus est*; (b) sometimes equivalent to a *passive* of *Qal*, as נקם *to avenge*, *Hoph. to be avenged* (but see below, u).

Rem. 1. The *i* of the 3rd sing. masc. perf. *Hiph'ûl* 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, *ā*) takes its place. In an open syllable the *i* is retained almost throughout; only in very isolated instances has it been weakened to *S<sup>e</sup>wā* (see n and o).

<sup>1</sup> The same ideas are also paraphrased by the verb עשה (*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 *Ṣere* without *Yodh*, e.g. הַקְדִּישׁ Ju 17:3; less frequently it takes יָ, 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 א instead of ה (probably a mere scribal error, not an Aramaism) we find אֲשַׁעֲרָם Jer 25:3. Rare exceptions, where the form with *Ṣere* stands for the *infinitive construct*, are, e.g. Dt 32:8 (Sam; בְּהִנְחִיל; read perhaps בְּהִנְחִל), Jer 44:19, 25, Pr 25:2, Jb 13:3 (?); on the other hand, for לְעֶשֶׂר Dt 26:12 (which looks like an infinitive *Hiph'āl* with elision of the ה, for לְהַעֲשִׂיר) the right reading is simply לְעֶשֶׂר, since elsewhere the *Pi'ēl* alone occurs with the meaning *to tithe*; for בְּעֶשֶׂר Neh 10:39 perhaps the inf. *Qal* (בְּעֶשֶׂר) 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'ēl*.

Instead of the ordinary form of the *infinitive construct* הַקְטִיל the form הַקְטִיל 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 הַקְצוּת for הַקְצוּת Lv 14:43 from קָצָה; scarcely, however, Lv 7:35 (see § 155 I), 2 S 22:1 (Ps 18:1), 1 K 11:16 (after עָד), and in the passages so explained by König (i. 276) where הַשְׁאִיר appears after prepositions<sup>1</sup>; [cf. Driver on Dt 3:3, 4:15, 7:24, 28:55].

With *ā* in the second syllable there occurs הַזְכִּירָם Ez 21:29 (cf. the substantival infin. הַפְצִיר 1 S 15:23).—In the Aram. manner לְהַשְׁמִיעוּת is found in Ez 24:26 (as a construct form) for the *infinitive Hiph'āl* (cf. the *infinitive Hithpa'el*, Dn 11:23). On the elision of the ה after prefixes, see q.

3. In the *imperative* the *i* is retained throughout in the open syllable, according to *i*, and consequently also before suffixes (see § 61 g) and הָ *paragogic*, e.g. הַקְשִׁיבָה *attend to*, הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא Ps 118:25, as in ed. Mant., Jabl., Baer, not הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא as Ginsb. and Kittel; with the tone at the end only הַצְלִיחָה ibid. v. 25<sup>b</sup>. On the other hand, in the 2nd sing. masc. the original *i* (cf. Arabic *'āqtūl*) is lengthened to *ē*, e.g. הַשְׁמֵן *make fat*, and becomes *Se'ghōl* before *Maqqeph*, e.g. הַסְכִּינָא Jb 22:21.—The form הַקְטִיל for הַקְטִיל 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 הַבִּיטָה is required by the *Q<sup>e</sup>rē* for הַבִּיטָה.

4. In the *imperfect Hiph'āl* the *shorter* form with *Ṣere* prevails for the jussive in the 3rd masc. and fem. and 2nd masc. sing., e.g. אַל-תַּגְדֵּל *make not great*, Ob 12; יַכְרֵת *let Him cut off!* Ps 12:4; even incorrectly תַּגְדֵּל Ex 19:3 and תַּגְדֵּל Ec 10:20; cf. also יַבְעֵר Ex 22:4, where the jussive form is to be explained according to § 109 h, and אֶבֶר Jb 39:26 before the principal pause. Similarly, after ו consec., e.g. וַיִּבְדֵּל *and He divided*, Gn 1:4. On the other hand, *i* is almost always retained in the 1st sing., e.g. וְאֶשְׁמֵד Am 2:9 (but generally without י, as וְאֶסְתֵּר Ez 39:23 f., &c.); cf. § 49 e and § 74 I, 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 וַתֹּחֵר Ru 2:14, and in the lesser pause, Gn 49:4; before a sibilant (see § 29 q) וַיִּגַּשׁ Ju 6:19; in the lesser pause וַיִּקָּרַח La 3:5. Before *Maqqeph* the *Ṣere* becomes *S'ghōl*, e.g. וַיִּזְקֹק-בוֹ Ju 19:4. In the plural again, and before suffixes, *i* remains in the forms יִקְטֹל יָלוּ, יִקְטֹל יָלוּ, even in the jussive and after ו consecutive, e.g. וַיִּדְבֹּק יָקוּ Ju 18:22. The only exceptions, where the *i* is weakened to *S'wā*, are וַיִּדְרָכוּ Jer 9:2; וַיִּדְבֹּקוּ 1 S 14:22, 31:2, 1 Ch 10:2; וַיַּעֲבְרוּ Jer 11:15; וַיִּזְכְּרוּ Neh 13:13, if it is *Hiph'āl* of אָצַר, but probably וַיִּזְכְּרוּ is to be read, as in 7:2; perhaps also וַתִּהְיֶינָה Jb 19:3 (according to others, *imperfect Qal*). The same weakening occurs also in the imperfect in 3rd and 2nd 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'ēl*=וַיִּעֲקֹשְׁנִי, since the *Hiph'āl* is not found elsewhere. It is hardly likely that in these isolated examples we have a trace of

<sup>1</sup> 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, *yaqtūl*, 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. *ישל* Is 44:28), and partly are intended, as *formae mixtae*, to combine the forms of *Qal* and *Hiph'ūl*. Instead of the firmly closed syllable, the Masora requires in Gn 1:11 *ישא*, with euphonic Ga'ya (see § 16 h).

5. In the *participle*, *מ וצא* Ps 135:7 appears to be traceable to the ground-form, *maqtīl*; yet the *Ṣere* may also possibly be explained by the retraction of the tone. The Masora appears to require the weakening of the vowel to *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā* (see above, n) in *מהלכים* Zc 3:7 (probably, however, *מהלכים* should be read), also in *מהלמים* Jer 29:8, *מעזרים* 2 Ch 28:23 (but as *ם* 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'ūl*, see above, n), and in the *Q<sup>eré</sup>* *מהצרים* 1 Ch 15:24 &c. (where the *K<sup>e</sup>thūbh* *מהצרים* is better).—The fem. is ordinarily pointed as *מזכרת* Nu 5:15, *משגת* Lv 14:21; in pause *משכ* Pr 19:14.

6. In the *perfect* there occur occasionally such forms as *הקל* 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 *ינהראית* Na 3:5.—In *אגאליתי*<sup>1</sup> *I have stained*, Is 63:3, *א* stands at the beginning instead of *ה*, cf. above, k, on *אשבים*. On the other hand, *אזנ יחו* 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 *ה* is regularly elided after the preformatives, thus *מקמיל*, *מקמיל*; but it is retained in the *infinitive* after prepositions, e.g. *להקמיל*. The exceptions are in the *imperfect*, *הושיע* *He will save* for *יושיע* 1 S 17:47, Ps 116:6 (in *pause*); *הודנה* *He will praise* for *יודנה* Neh 11:17, Ps 28:7, 45:18 (cf. the proper name *יהובל* Jer 37:3, for which 38:1 *יובל* [and *הוסר* Ps 81:6]; [*הילילו*] (§ 70 d) Is 52:5; *יהת לו* Jer 9:4; *תהת לו* Jb 13:9] and *מהקצעות* Ez 46:22; in the *infinitive* (where, however, as in *Niph'al*, § 51 i, the *infinitive Qal* is generally to be read) *לסתר* Is 29:15 for *להסתיר*; *לנפל* and *לצבות* Nu 5:22; *לעביר* 2 S 19:19; *להק* Jer 37:12; *לחטיא* Ec 5:5; *ללבו* (doubly anomalous for *להלבין*) Dn 11:35; *לשמע* Ps 26:7; *לחדיב* 1 S 2:33; *לשמד* Is 23:11; *ולשבית* Am 8:4 (certainly corrupt); *לבעיר* for *בהעיר* Ps 73:20 (but *in the city* is probably meant); *לביא* Jer 39:7 (2 Ch 31:10); *למרות* Is 3:8, Ps 78:17; *לנחותם* Ex 13:21; *כנלות* (see, however, § 20 h) Is 33:1; *לראתכם* Dt 1:33; cf. further, from verbs *ליה*, Nu 5:22, Jer 27:20; on Dt 26:12 and Neh 10:39, see above, k; for *למחות* Pr 31:3 read *למחות* or *למחות*.

8. With regard to the tone it is to be observed that the affirmatives *ו* and *ה* in *Hiph'ūl* have *not* the tone, even in the *perfect* with *waw consecutive* (except in Ex 26:33 before *ה*, Lv 15:29 before *א*, to avoid a hiatus); but the plural ending *ון* (see § 47 m) always has the tone, e.g. *תקרבון* Dt 1:17.

9. The passive (*Hoph'al*) has *ū* instead of *Qameṣ ḥaṭuṭh* in the first syllable (*הקטל*), 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. *משחת* Pr 25:26); e.g. *השכב* Ez 32:32 (beside *השכבה* 32:19); *השלך* *impf.* *משלך* *part.* *משלך* 2 S 20:21 (beside *השלכת* Is 14:19) *השלך* Ez 16:4; in the *partic.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Most probably, however, *גאליתי* (*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, *ואדרכם* and *ויזו* (instead of *אדך* and *ויזו*) are made future instead of past. Jewish exegesis applied these Edomacles to the Roman (i.e. Christian) empire. So G. Moore in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1887, col. 292.

Hoph. without elision of the ה: מְהַקְצֵעוֹת Ez 46:22; on the other hand, verbs פִּי׳ן always have ũ (in a sharpened syllable): הִגֵּד, הִגֵּד (cf. § 9 n).

10. The *infinitive absolute* has in *Hoph'al* (as in *Hiph'il*) *Ṣere* in the last syllable, e.g. הִמְלִיךָ and הִמְלִיךָ Ez 16:4; הִגֵּד Jos 9:24. An *infinitive construct* does not occur in the strong verb.

11. With regard to the *imperative Hoph'al*, see above, § 46 a, note.

12. According to Böttcher (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, § 906) and Barth (see above, § 52 e) a number of supposed imperfects *Hoph'al* 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'il*), nor the other tense of the same conjugation (i.e. here the perfect *Hoph'al*) is found; so with יָקַם (for יִקְרָם, cf. *yuqtālū* as imperfect *Qal* in Arabic) and יָתַן, from יָקַם and יָתַן; יָקַח from לָקַח (cf. § 66 g); יוֹאֵר Nu 22:6 from יָאָר; יָחַר from יָחַר; יָחַד Ho 10:14 (cf. Is 33:1) from יָחַד; Barth adds the verbs יָחַד: עִיָּר Ez 19:12 from יָחַד; יָחַד Lev 11:35 from יָחַד; the verbs יָחַד: עִיָּר Jb 19:23 from יָחַד; יָחַד &c. from יָחַד; the verb יָחַד: עִיָּר from יָחַד; the verbs יָחַד: עִיָּר, יָחַד, יָחַד from יָחַד and יָחַד. On יָחַד &c., § 73 f. In point of fact it would be very strange, especially in the case of יָתַן and יָקַח, that of these frequently used verbs, amongst all the forms of *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*, only the *imperfect Hoph'al* 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'el.

1. The *Hithpa'el*<sup>1</sup> is connected with *Pi'el*, being formed by prefixing to the *Pi'el*-stem (*qaṭṭel*, *qaṭṭal*) the syllable הֵת (Western Aramaic הֵת, but in Biblical Aramaic הֵת; Syr. 'et<sup>2</sup>). Like the preformative הֵת (הֵת) of *Niph'al*, הֵת has also a reflexive force.

2. The ת of the prefix in this conjugation, as also in *Hothpa'al* (see h), *Hithpōel*, *Hithpa'lēl* 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 ת and the sibilant change places (cf. on this *metathesis*, § 19 n), and at the same time the ת after a צ becomes the corresponding emphatic ט: thus הֵתִשָּׁמֵר *to take heed to oneself*, for הֵתִשָּׁמֵר, הֵתִשָּׁמֵר *to become burdensome*, for הֵתִשָּׁמֵר; הֵתִצַּדֵּק *to justify oneself*, from יָצַדַּק. The only exception is in Jer 49:3, וְהֵתְשׁוּט טָנָה, to avoid the cacophony of three successive *t*-sounds.

(b) When the stem begins with a *d*- or *t*-sound (ד, ט, ת), the ת of the preformative is assimilated to it (§ 19 d), e.g. מְדַבֵּר *speaking, conversing*; הֵדָבַס *to be crushed*, הֵטָהַר *to purify oneself*, הֵטָמַא *to defile oneself*, הֵתָמַם *to act uprightly*. (An exception occurs in Ju 19:22.) The assimilation of the ת occurs also with נ and כ, e.g. הֵנְבִיא *to prophesy*, as well as הֵתְנַבֵּא (cf. Nu 24:7, Ez 5:13, Dn 11:14); הֵתְכַוֵּן Nu 21:27 (cf. Is 54:14, Ps 59:5); הֵתְכַפֵּס Pr 26:26; with ש Ec 7:16 with ר Is 33:10.

1<sup>1</sup> A. Stein, *Der Stamm des Hithpael im Hebr.* pt. 1, Schwerin, 1893, gives alphabetical statistics of the 1151 forms.

2<sup>2</sup> So also in Hebrew הֵתְחַבֵּר 2 Ch 20:35; cf. Ps 76:6 (אֲשֶׁתוֹלְלוּ).

Rem. Metathesis would likewise be expected, as in the cases under *b*, when ת and ז come together, as well as a change of ת to ד. Instead of this, in the only instance of the kind (Is 1:16) the ת is assimilated to the ז, —unless indeed הַזְכֵּר, *imperative Niph'al* of זכר, is intended.

3. As in form, so also in meaning, *Hithpa'el* is primarily (a) *reflexive* of *Pi'el*, e.g. הִתְאַזַּר *to gird oneself*, שִׁוְוֵה *to sanctify oneself*. Although in these examples the intensive meaning is not distinctly marked, it is so in other cases, e.g. הִתְנַקַּם *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. הִתְנַדָּל *to make oneself great, to act proudly*; הִתְחַכֵּם *to show oneself wise, crafty*; הִתְחַלֵּה *to pretend to be ill*; הִתְעַשֵּׂר *to make, i.e. to feign oneself rich*; הִשְׁתַּרַר Nu 16:13, *to make oneself a prince*; הִתְנַבֵּא 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'al*, § 51 d, e.g. הִתְרְאָה *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'al*, § 51 e). *Hithpa'el* in such cases readily takes an accusative, e.g. הִתְפָּרַק Ex 32:3 and הִתְנַצַּל Ex 33:6 *to tear off from oneself*; הִתְפַּשֵּׂט *exuit sibi* (*vestem*), הִתְפַּתַּח *solvit sibi* (*vincula*); הִצְטִיחַ Jos 9:12, *to take (something) as one's provision*; without an accusative, הִתְהַלֵּךְ *to walk about for oneself* (*ambulare*); הִתְפַּלֵּל *sibi intercedere* (see Delitzsch on Is 1:15); הִתְחַקֵּה *to draw a line for oneself*, Job 13:27; on Is 14:2, see § 57, note.

(d) Only seldom is it *passive*, e.g. הִיא תִּתְהַלֵּל Pr 31:30 *she shall be praised*; הִשְׁתַּפַּח *to be forgotten*, Ec 8:10, where the reflexive sense (*to bring oneself into oblivion*) has altogether disappeared. Cf. *Niph'al*, § 51 f.

The passive form *Hothpa'al* is found only in the few following examples: הִטְמָא *to be defiled*, Dt 24:4; infinitive הִכְבַּס *to be washed*, Lv 13:55, 56; הִד שָׁנָה (for הִתְדַשְׁנָה, the נָה being treated as if it were the affirmative of the *fem. plur.*) *it is made fat*, Is 34:6. On הִתְפָּקַד, see 1.

Denominatives with a reflexive meaning are הִתְנַיַּד *to embrace Judaism*, from הַיָּד (יהודה) *Judah*; הִצְטִיחַ *to provision oneself for a journey*, from צִידָה *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, פ) has retained the original *Pathah* in the final syllable (while in the ordinary form it is attenuated, as in *Pi'el*, to *i* and then lengthened to *e*), e.g. הִתְאַנַּף Dt 4:21, &c.; cf. 2 Ch 13:7, 15:8; with ו consecutive Is 8:21; so also in the imperfect and imperative, e.g. תִּתְחַכֵּם 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; הִתְחַזַּק 1 K 20:22, Ps 37:4, Est 5:10; וָאֵתְחַפֵּק 1 S 13:12.—In Lv 11:44, 20:7 and Ez 38:23, *i* takes the place of *a* in the final syllable of the stem before ש (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 *Hithpō'el*, *Hithpa'lēl*, *Hithpalpēl*, § 55) the original *a* always returns in *pause* as *Qameṣ*, e.g.

Ps 93:1; יתאבֵּל Ez 7:27; יתהלֵךְ Jb 18:8; יתלַפּ, דו 38:30; Jos 3:5; cf. Jb 33:5 and § 74 b.—The *ā* also appears before the fuller ending ון in the plural of the imperfect (cf. § 47 m) in Ps 12:9, Jb 9<sup>6</sup>, 16:10.—Like the *Pi□ēl* תִּקַּט לָנֶה (§ 52 n), forms occur in *Hithpa□ēl* like תִּתְהַלֵּךְ 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* הִתְהַבְּרוּת occurs in Dn 11:23 (cf. the *Hiph□ūl* inf. הִשְׁמָעוּת in Ez 24:26).

2. As instances of the *reflexive* הִתְקַטַּל (connected with *Pi□ēl*) a few reflexive forms of the verb פָּקַד (*to examine*) are also probably to be reckoned. Instead of a *Pathah* in a sharpened syllable after the first radical, these take *Qameṣ* in an open syllable, e.g. קָדוּ הַהֶפֶץ, Ju 20:15, 17, *imperfect* יִתְפַּקֵּד 20:15, 21:9. The corresponding passive form קָדוּ הַהֶפֶץ 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 אֲתִקְטַל, Syr. אֲתִקְטַל) and the Ethiopic *taqaṭ<sup>l</sup>la*, Arab. *iqṭatala*, 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 *ן* transposed, occurs in הִלְתַּחַם (on the analogy of O.T. Hebrew *to be pronounced* הִלְתַּחַם) in the inscription of the Moabite king *Mēša□*, with the meaning of the O.T. *Niph□al* נִלְחַם *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 וְנִלְחַם; in line 19 in the *infinitive* with suffix, בִּי הִלְתַּחַם, *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□ūl*. 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 *ה* of *Hiph□ūl*. Amongst the conjugations analogous to *Pi□ēl* are included the *passive* forms distinguished by their vowels, as well as the reflexives with the prefix הִתְ, 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* קוּטַל, passive *Pō□al* קוּטַל, reflexive *Hithpō□ēl* הִתְקוּטַל, corresponding to the Arabic conj. III. *qātālā*, pass. *qūtālā*, and conj. VI. reflexive *tāqātālā*; *imperfect* יִקוּטַל, *participle* מְקוּטַל, *imperfect passive* יִקוּטַל &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* מִשׁוֹפֵטִי מִשׁוֹפֵטִי *mine adversary, who would contend with me*, Jb 9:15; טָלוּשׁוֹנִי (denominative from לָשׁוֹן *the tongue*) *slandering* (as if *intent on injuring with the tongue*) Ps 101:5 *Keth*. (The *Q<sup>re</sup>* requires מְלוֹשְׁנִי *m<sup>e</sup>lōšni* as Na 1:3 (וּגְדוּלֵי-רָמוֹת) *they have poured out*, Ps 77:18 (if not rather *Pu□al*); יוֹדֵךְ עָתִי *I have appointed*, 1 S 21:3 (unless הוֹדֵךְ עָתִי should be read); יָסַעַר Ho 13:3; שָׁרַשׁ *to take root*, passive שׁוֹרֵשׁ, denominative from שָׁרַשׁ *root* (but שָׁרַשׁ *to root out*); in *Hithpō□ēl* עָשׂוּ הַתְּנֵנָה *they shall be moved*, Jer 25:16; imperf. 46:8; from a verb לִיִּה שׁוֹשׂוֹתִי Is 10:13. The *participle* מְנִיֵּץ Is 52:5 is probably a *forma mixta* combining the readings מְנִיֵּץ and מְנִיֵּץ.

*Po□el* proper (as distinguished from the corresponding conjugations of verbs עִיֵּעַ § 67 l and עִיֵּעַ § 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 *עוין 1 S 18:9 Q<sup>e</sup>rê* (probably for קועוין, cf. § 52 s; § 55 f: *seeking to cast an evil eye*).

With קוּטַל 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 *ā* attenuated to *ī*=*Pi□lēl<sup>1</sup>* (*Pi□lal*), קטלל and קטלל; the *ē* in the final syllable also arises from *ī*, and this again from *ā*; passive *Pu□lal* קטלל, reflexive *Hithpa□lēl* קטלל, like the Arabic conjugations IX. *iqṭāllā* and XI. *iqṭāllā*, the former used of permanent, the latter of accidental or changing conditions, e.g. of colours; cf. *עוין, שׁ, נון* to be at rest, *עוין, ר, עוין* to be green, passive *קטלל* to be withered, all of them found only in the *perfect* and with no corresponding *Qal* form. (For the barbarous form *עוין* *Ps 88:17* read *עוין*; for *עוין* *Ez 28:23*, which has manifestly arisen only from confusion with the following *עוין*, read *עוין*). These forms are more common in verbs ע"ו, where they take the place of *Pi□ēl* and *Hithpa□ēl* (§ 72 m). Cf. also § 75 kk.

3. *P<sup>e</sup>□al□al*: קטלל with repetition of the last two radicals, used of movements repeated in quick succession; e.g. *עוין* to go about quickly, to palpitate (of the heart) *Ps 38:11*, from *עוין* to go about; passive *עוין* 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 *עוין* (denom. from *עוין* a trumpet, but only in the *participle*, *1 Ch 15:24* &c. *K<sup>e</sup>th.*) for *עוין*, by absorption of the first *ע*, lengthening of *ā* in the open syllable, and subsequent obscuring of *ā* to *ō*. On the other hand, for the meaningless *עוין* *Ho 4:18* (which could only be referred to this conjugation if it stood for *עוין*) read *עוין*, and for the equally meaningless *עוין* *Ps 45:3* read *עוין*. In both these cases a scribal error (*dittography*) has been perpetuated by the punctuation, which did not venture to alter the *K<sup>e</sup>thibh*. On the employment of *P<sup>e</sup>□al□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 ע"ע, ע"י, and ע"י, e.g. *עוין* to roll, from *עוין=עוין*; reflexive *עוין* to roll oneself down; *עוין* from *עוין*, passive *עוין*; cf. also *עוין* (so Baer and Ginsb. after Qimḥi; others *עוין*) *Is 14:23*, and with *ā* in both syllables owing to the influence of *ע*, *עוין* from *עוין* *Nu 24:17* (cf. however, in the parallel passage, *Jer 48:45* *עוין*) and *Is 22:5*, in the *participle*; *עוין* *Is 17:11* to hedge in, acc. to others *make to grow*. Probably to this form also belongs *עוין*, the emended reading of *Jb 39:30* instead of the impossible *עוין*; also *עוין* *Is 27:8*, if that form is to be referred to an *infinitive* *עוין*; perhaps also *עוין* *Ez 39:2* for *עוין*. This form also commonly expresses rapidly repeated movement, which all languages incline to indicate by a repetition of the sound,<sup>1</sup> e.g. *עוין* to chirp; cf. in the Lexicon the nouns derived from *עוין*, *עוין*, and *עוין*.

As *Hithpalpel* we find *עוין* *Na 2:5*; *עוין* *Est 4:4*; *עוין* *Dn 8:7*, *11:11*. Of the same form is *עוין* *Is 38:15*, if contracted from *עוין* or *עוין* from the root *עוין* or *עוין*, and also *עוין* *Is 29:9* (but read probably *עוין*, (in pause) *Gn 19:16*, &c., if it is to be derived from *עוין*, and not *Hithpa□el* from *עוין*).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Wolfensohn, 'The Pi□lel in Hebrew,' *Amer. Journ. of Or. Studies*, xxvii (1907), p. 303 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lat. *tinnio*, *tintinno*, our *tick-tack*, *ding-dong*, and the German *wirrwarr*, *klingsklang*. The repetition of the radical in verbs ע"ע also produces this effect; as in *עוין* to lick, *עוין* to pound, *עוין* 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. *Tiph□ēl* (properly *Taph□ēl*<sup>2</sup>): תִּקְטֵל, with ת prefixed, cf. תִּרְגַּל לְתִי *to teach to walk, to lead* (denominative from קָלַךְ *a foot*?) Ho 11:3; from a stem ל"ה, the *imperfect* יִרְתַּח *to contend with*, Jer 12:5; *participle*, 22:15 (from תִּרְחַח *to be hot, eager*). Similarly in Aramaic, מִתְרַגַּם *to interpret*, whence also in Hebrew the *passive participle* מִתְרַגַּם Ezr 4:7.

6. *Šaph□ēl*: שִׁקְטֵל, frequent in Syriac, e.g. שִׁלְהַב from להב *to flame*; whence in Hebrew שִׁלְהַב *flame*. Perhaps of the same form is שִׁבְלוּל *a snail* (unless it be from the stem שבל), and שִׁקְעָרוֹר *hollow strakes*, cf. § 85, No. 50. This conjugation is perhaps the original of *Hiph□ūl*, 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. קִטְלַט, *passive* קִטְלַט; as קִטְלַט מִחֶסֶפֶס *peeled off, like scales*, Ex 16:14, from קִטַּף, *to peel, to scale*.

8. קִטְלַט, in יַרְזִיף *a rain-storm*, from יָרַף.

9. נִתְקַטַּל (regularly in Mishnic Hebrew<sup>3</sup>) a form compounded of *Niph□al* and *Hithpa□ēl*; as נִתְקַטַּל for וְנִתְקַטַּר *that they may be taught*, Ez 23:48; נִתְכַּפַּר probably an error for הִתְכַּפַּר *to be forgiven*, Dt 21:8. On נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה Pr 27:15, see § 75 x.

### § 56. *Quadriliterals.*

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 *Pi□ēl*: כָּרַסָּם, *imperfect* יִכְרַסְקָנָה *he doth ravage it*, Ps 80:14 from כָּרַס, cf. גָּזַם. *Passive* תִּטְפַּשׁ אֵיךָ *to grow fresh again*, Jb 33:25. *Participle* מְכַרְבֵּל *girt, clothed* (cf. Aramaic כַּבַּל *to bind*), 1 Ch 15:27. It is usual also to include among the quadrilaterals פָּרִישׁוּ 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 *Pi□lel* formation, from פָּרַשׁ *to spread out*, with euphonic change of the first שׁ to שׁ, and the second to ז. Moreover, the reading פָּרִישׁוּ 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 *Hiph□ūl*: הִשְׁמְאִיל, by syncope הִשְׁמְאִיל and הִשְׁמִיל *to turn to the left* (denom. from שָׂמַל) Gn 13:9, Is 30:21, &c. On אָזַן יָחוּ cf. § 53 p.

### STRONG VERB WITH PRONOMINAL SUFFIXES.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> The existence of a *Taph□ēl* is contested on good grounds by Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 279.

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> [See Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, Oxf. 1909, p. 30 ff.]

§ 57.

The accusative of the personal pronoun, depending on an active verb,<sup>2</sup> may be expressed (1) by a separate word, אַתְּ the accusative sign (before a suffix תְּ אַתְּ, תְּ אַתְּ) with the pronominal suffix, e.g. הוּא הִטְלָהּ אֶתְּ he has killed him; or (2) by a mere suffix, הוּא הִטְלָהּ or הוּא הִטְלָהּ he has killed him. The latter is the usual method (§ 33), and we are here concerned with it alone.<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>al</sup> or Hithpa<sup>el</sup> (§§ 51 and 54), e.g. הִתְקַדְּשָׁהּ he sanctified himself, not הִקְדִּישׁוּ, which could only mean he sanctified him.<sup>4</sup>

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 גביאים ראשונים, Leipzig, 1890. W. Diehl, *Das Pronomen pers. suff. ... des Hebr.*, Giessen, 1895. J. Barth, 'Beitraäge 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.	נִי	נִי (in pause נִי)	נִי me.
2. m.	ךָ	ךָ (in pause	ךָ, also כָּ thee.
f.	ךָ	ךָ, rarely כָּ	ךָ
3. m.	וּ, הוּ	וּ, הוּ (הוּ)	הוּ him.
f.	הָ	הָ	הָ her.
Plur.			
1. com.	נוּ	נוּ	נוּ us.
2. m.	כֶּם	כֶּם	כֶּם you (vos).

1 <sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>2</sup> An accusative suffix occurs with *Niph<sup>al</sup>* in Ps 109:3 (since הִלָּחֵם is used in the sense of *to attack*), and according to some, in Is 44:21; with *Hithpa<sup>el</sup>* Is 14:2 (הִתְנַהֵּל to appropriate somebody *to oneself as a possession*); cf. above, § 54 f, and § 117 w.

3 <sup>3</sup> On the cases where אַתְּ is necessary, see § 117 e.

4 <sup>4</sup> The exceptions in Jer 7:19, Ez 34:2, 8, 10 are only apparent. In all these instances the sharp antithesis between הִתְקַדְּשׁוּ אֶתְּ (themselves) and another object could only be expressed by retaining the same verb; also in Ex 5:19 הִתְקַדְּשׁוּ אֶתְּ after an active verb serves to emphasize the idea of *themselves*.

f.	..... <sup>1</sup>				
3. m.	םָ, םִ <sup>1</sup>	םָ (from םָ םָ, םָ םָ		םָ (from םָ םָ)	<i>eos.</i>
poet.	מוּ -	מוּ םָ		מוּ םָ	
f.	ן־	ן־ םָ, ן־ םָ		..... <sup>1</sup>	<i>eas.</i>

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, נוּ, הֵי, הָ (and ךָ, when a long vowel in an open syllable precedes) never have the tone, which always rests on the preceding syllable; on the other hand, םָ and םָ always take the tone.

In the 3rd pers. masc. הֵי םָ, by contraction of *a* and *u* after the rejection of the weak ה, frequently gives rise to *ô* (§ 23 k), ordinarily written ו, much less frequently ךָ (see § 7 c). In the *feminine*, the suffix םָ should be pronounced with a preceding *a* (cf. below, f, note), as הָ םָ or הָ םָ, on the analogy of *āhû*; instead of הָ םָ, however, it was simply pronounced הָ םָ, with the rejection of the final vowel, and with *Mappiq*, since the ה is consonantal; but the weakening to הָ םָ 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 נִי םָ, הֵי םָ, ו (only after *i*), נוּ םָ, (םָ) םָ, &c. These are attached to verbal forms which end with a vowel, e.g. יִקְטֹל וְנִי; קִטְלָתָ יְהוּ, for which by absorption of the ה we also get קִטְלָתָי, pronounced *q<sup>e</sup> taltû*; cf. § 8 m.

(b) A second and third with what are called *connecting vowels*<sup>1</sup> (נִי םָ, נִי םָ), used with verbal forms ending with a consonant (for exceptions, see § 59 g and § 60 e).

<sup>1</sup> According to Diehl (see above), p. 61, םָ occurs only once with the perfect (see § 59 e), 7 times with the imperfect, but never in pre-exilic passages, whereas the accus. םָ םָ occurs 40 times in Jer. and 36 times in Ezek.—םָ occurs only once as a *verbal* suffix (Dt 32:26, unless, with Kahan, *Infinitive u. Participien*, p. 13, אָפְאִיָּהָם from אָפְאִיָּהָם is to be read), while the forms םָ (2nd f. pl.) and םָ and םָ (3rd f. pl.), added by Qimḥi, never occur.

<sup>1</sup> 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. יְהוּ קִטְלָתָי. Observe e.g. the Hebrew form *q<sup>e</sup> t̄al-ani* in connexion with the Arabic *qatala-ni*, contrasted with Hebrew *q<sup>e</sup> t̄alat-ni* and Arabic *qatalat-ni*. König accordingly prefers the expression ‘vocalic ending of the stem’, instead of ‘connecting syllable’. The connective *ē*, אֵי, 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 לִי מְחַיֵּי (מְחַיֵּי = מְחַיֵּי from *m<sup>e</sup> ḥaini*), 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. קָטַלְתְּ, קָטַלְתְּ, קָטַלְתְּ (on קָטַלְתְּ, 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. יִקְטַלְתְּ, יִקְטַלְתְּ; 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 הִיָּ (cf., however, § 60 d). With הִיָּ, the connecting sound is only a vocal *S<sup>e</sup>wā*, which has arisen from an original short vowel, thus הִיָּ, e.g. הִיָּ, e.g. הִיָּ (q<sup>e</sup> *tāl'khā*), or when the final consonant of the verb is a guttural, הִיָּ, e.g. הִיָּ. In *pause*, the original short vowel (*ǎ*) reappears as *S<sup>e</sup>ghōl* with the tone הִיָּ (also הִיָּ, see g). On the appending of suffixes to the final הִיָּ of the imperfect (§ 47 m), see § 60 e.

Rem. 1. As *rare* forms may be mentioned *sing.* 2nd pers. *masc.* הִיָּ Gn 27:7, 1 K 18:44, &c., in *pause* also הִיָּ (see below, i); *fem.* הִיָּ, הִיָּ Ps 103:4, 137:6. Instead of the form הִיָּ, which is usual even in the perfect (e.g. Ju 4:20, Ez 27:26), הִיָּ 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.* הִיָּ Ex 32:25, Nu 23:8; in the 3rd *fem.* הִיָּ without *Mappiḳ* (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 הִיָּ. —The forms הִיָּ, הִיָּ, הִיָּ occur 23 times, all in poetry<sup>1</sup> (except Ex 23:31) [viz. with the perfect Ex 15:10, 23:31, Ps 73:6; with the imperfect Ex 15:5 (הִיָּ for הִיָּ), 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 i 3; on הִיָּ and הִיָּ as suffixes of the 3rd fem. plur. of the imperfect, § 60 d.—In Gn 48:9 הִיָּ (cf. הִיָּ 1 Ch 14:11 according to Baer), הִיָּ has lost the tone before *Maqqeph* and so is shortened to הִיָּ.—In Ez 44:8 הִיָּ is probably only an error for הִיָּ.

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. הִיָּ, הִיָּ, הִיָּ (*me*) with הִיָּ (*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 (אתּ in הִיָּ, &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-syllable<sup>2</sup> (*ǎn*)<sup>3</sup> is inserted between the suffix and the verbal stem. Since, however, this syllable

1<sup>1</sup> Thus in Ps 2 הִיָּ occurs five times [four times attached to a noun or preposition, §§ 91 f, 103 c], and הִיָּ only twice.

2<sup>2</sup> 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 l, 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 הִיָּ and הִיָּ, but with *waw consec.* הִיָּ and הִיָּ or הִיָּ; with the jussive in the 2nd and 3rd pers. always הִיָּ, הִיָּ, the 1st pers. more often הִיָּ than הִיָּ, and always הִיָּ.

3<sup>3</sup> 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 *ā* is invariably (except in the 1st pers. sing.) modified to tone-bearing *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*. This is called the *Nûn energeticum*<sup>4</sup> (less suitably *demonstrativum* or *epentheticum*), and occurs principally (see, however, Dt 32:10 *bis*) in pausal forms of the imperfect, e.g. יְבָרֵךְ, יְבָרֵךְ, יְבָרֵךְ *he will bless him* (Ps. 72:15, cf. Jer 5:22), אֶתְקַדְּשׁ, אֶתְקַדְּשׁ Jer 22:24; יְבָרֵךְ, יְבָרֵךְ *he will honour me* (Ps 50:23) is unusual; rarely in the perfect, Dt 24:13 בָּרַךְ, בָּרַךְ. On examples like יְבָרֵךְ Gn 30:6, cf. § 26 g, § 59 f. In far the greatest number of cases, however, this *Nûn* is assimilated to the following consonant (ג, כ), or the latter is lost in pronunciation (so ה), and the *Nûn* consequently sharpened. Hence we get the following series of suffix-forms:—

1st pers. יְבָרֵךְ (even in pause, Jb 7:14, &c.), יְבָרֵךְ (for יְבָרֵךְ, יְבָרֵךְ).

2nd pers. יְבָרֵךְ (Jer 22:24 in pause יְבָרֵךְ) and, only orthographically different,

יְבָרֵךְ (Is 10:24, Pr 2:11 in *pause*).

3rd pers. יְבָרֵךְ (for יְבָרֵךְ),<sup>1</sup> fem. יְבָרֵךְ for יְבָרֵךְ.

[1st pers. plur. יְבָרֵךְ (for יְבָרֵךְ), see the Rem.]

In the other persons *Nûn energeticum* 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 יְבָרֵךְ as 1st plur. occurs perhaps in Jb 31:15 [but read יְבָרֵךְ and cf. § 72 cc], hardly in Ho 12:5; cf. יְבָרֵךְ behold us, Gn 44:16, 50:18, Nu 14:40 for יְבָרֵךְ (instead of יְבָרֵךְ; see § 20 m).— In Ez 4:12 the Masora requires יְבָרֵךְ, without Dageš in the *Nûn*.

That the forms with *Nûn energeticum* are intended to give greater emphasis to the verbal form is seen from their special frequency in *pause*. Apart from the verb, however, *Nûn energeticum* 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 תְּ or תִּ is used for הִּ.

<sup>4</sup> So König, *Lehrgeb.*, i. p. 226.

<sup>1</sup> On יְבָרֵךְ = יְבָרֵךְ Nu 23:13, see § 67 o.

(b) In the *2nd sing. masc.* besides תָּ we find תַּ, to which the connecting vowel is directly attached, but the only clear instances of this are with נָיַ ַ.<sup>2</sup>

(c) In the *2nd sing. fem.* הִי, the original form of תָּ, appears; cf. אָתִי, § 32 f; § 44 g. This form can be distinguished from the 1st pers. only by the context.

(d) *2nd plur. masc.* תִּי for תָּי. The only examples are Nu 20:5, 21:5, Zc 7:5. The *fem.* תִּי never occurs with suffixes; probably it had the same form as the masculine.

We exhibit first the forms of the perfect *Hiph*□*il*, 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. הקמיל	3. c. הקטילו
3. f. הקמילת	
2. m. הקטלת, הקטלת	2. m. הקטלתו
2. f. הקטלת, הקטלת	
1. c. הקטלתי	1. c. הקטלנו

The beginner should first practise connecting the suffixes with these *Hiph*□*il* 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 antepenultima; 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 *Šwā*; (b) the original *Pathah* of the second syllable, which in the *3rd sing. fem.* and *3rd plur.* had become *Šwā*, 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. אָהַבְתִּי 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. קטל	3. c. קטלו
3. f. קטלת (קטלת, see g)	
2. m. קטלת (קטלת, see h)	2. m. קטלתו
2. f. קטלת (קטלת, see h)	
1. c. קטלתי	1. c. קטלנו

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 Pi*□*el* changes sometimes into *Sghôl*, and sometimes into *vocal Šwā*.

<sup>2</sup> On the *ā* as an original element of the verbal form, see § 58 f, note.

Rem. 1. The suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd pers. plur. כֹּם and הֹם, 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 כֹּה and הֹה) with the *noun*, § 91. With a perfect כֹּם alone occurs, Ps 118:26. The form קָטַל which is usually given as the connective form of the 3rd sing. masc. before כֹּם and כֹּה is only formed by analogy, and is without example in the O.T.

2. In the 3rd sing. masc. קָטַל הוּ (especially in verbs ל"ה; in the strong verb only in Jer 20:15 in *Pi□ēl*) is mostly contracted to קָטַלוּ, according to § 23 k; likewise in the 2nd sing. masc. קָטַלְתָּ הוּ. —As a suffix of the 1st sing. הֵי occurs several times with the 3rd sing. masc. perf. Qal of verbs ל"ה, not only in *pause* (as עָנָה הֵי Ps 118:5; קָנָה הֵי Pr 8:22 with *D°hi*), but even with a conjunctive accent, as הֵי הֵרַ הֵי Jb 30:19; עָנָה הֵי 1 S 28:15 (where, however, the reading עָנָה הֵי is also found). With a sharpened הֵי: עָנָה הֵי Gn 30:6; יָסַר הֵי Ps 118:18.

3. The 3rd sing. fem. קָטַלְתָּ (=קָטַלְתָּהּ) has the twofold peculiarity that (a) the ending *ath* always takes the tone,<sup>1</sup> and consequently is joined to those suffixes which form a syllable of themselves (הֵי, הֵי, הוּ, הוּ, הוּ), 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. הֵי, הֵי, הֵי, e.g. אָהַבְתְּךָ she loves thee, Ru 4:15, cf. Is 47:10; שָׁדְדָהְתְּם she has stolen them, Gn 31:32; שָׂרַףְתְּם it burns them, Is 47:14, Jos 2:6, Ho 2:14, Ps 48:7. For הֵי תָנִי, הֵי תָנִי &c., in *pause* הֵי תָנִי is found, Jer 8:21, Ps 69:10, and הֵי תָנִי Ct 8:5; and also without the *pause* for the sake of the assonance הֵי תָנִי, she was in travail with thee, *ibid*. The form קָטַלְתָּ הוּ (e.g. Ru 4:15) has arisen, through the loss of the הֵי and the consequent sharpening of the תָ (as in הוּ תָ and הוּ תָ for הוּ תָ and הוּ תָ, cf. § 58 i), from the form קָטַלְתָּ הוּ, which is also found even in *pause* (אָהַבְתְּ הוּ 1 S 18:28; elsewhere it takes in *pause* the form קָטַלְתָּ הוּ Is 59:16); so קָטַלְתָּ הוּ from קָטַלְתָּ הוּ, 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 הֵי, which is consequently always a more vowel-letter.

4. In the 2nd sing. masc. the form קָטַלְתָּ is mostly used, and the suffixes have, therefore, no connecting vowel, e.g. הוּ פָרַצְתָּנוּ הוּ זָנַחְתָּנוּ thou hast cast us off, thou hast broken us down, Ps 60:3; but with the suff. of the 1st sing. the form קָטַלְתָּ הֵי is used, e.g. הֵי קָטַרְתָּ הֵי Ps 139:1; in *pause*, however, with *Qameṣ*, e.g. הֵי עָזַבְתָּ הֵי Ps 22:2; Ju 1:15 (with *Zaqeph qatōn*); but cf. also הֵי עָרַפְתָּ הֵי Ps 17:3 with *Mer<sup>e</sup>kha*. —In the 2nd sing. fem. הֵי — is also written defectively, הֵי 1 S 19:17, Ju 11:35, Jer 15:10, Ct 4:9. Occasionally the suffix is appended to the ordinary form הֵי, viz. הֵי הֵי שָׁבַעְתָּ הֵי thou (fem.) dost adjure us, Ct 5:9, Jos 2:17, 20; cf. Jer 2:27, and, quite abnormally, with *Sere* הֵי הוּרַדְתָּ הֵי thou (fem.) didst let us down, Jos 2:18, where הוּרַדְתָּ הֵי would be expected. In Is 8:11 הֵי יָסַר הֵי is probably intended as an *imperfect*.

5. In verbs *middle ē*, the *ē* remains even before suffixes (see above, c), e.g. אָהַבְתָּ Dt 15:16, אָהַבְתָּ הוּ 1 S 18:28, cf. 18:22; יָרָא הוּ Jb 37:24. From a verb *middle o* there occurs יָרָא הוּ I have prevailed against him, Ps 13:5, from יָרָא הוּ with *ō* instead of *ō* in a syllable which has lost the tone (§ 44 e).

<sup>1</sup> □ Ct 8:5 is an exception. כֹּם 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 affirmatives, the vowel *ō* of the second syllable mostly becomes *ṭ* (simple *Šēwā mobile*), sometimes *ṭ*; 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 *ṭ*, *ṭ*, *ṭ*, however, it is shortened to *Qameṣ haṭuph*, e.g. *ישמרו* (but in *pause* *ישמרו* or *ישמרו*; with *Nūn energicum*, see § 58 i), *ישמרו*, &c. Instead of *תקטלנה*, the form *תקטלו*<sup>1</sup> 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. *יתברך* Ps 94:20 is an anomalous form for *יתברך* (cf. the analogous § 67 n) and *ישפג* (so Baer; others *ישפג*) Gn 32:18 for *ישפג*. To the same category as *יתברך* belong also, according to the usual explanation, *תעבדם* (from *עבד*, Ex 20:5, 23:24, Dt 5:9, and *עבד* 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 *ניעבד*)? 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 *Šēwā* before suffixes; but the *Pathah*, coming to stand in an open syllable before the tone, is lengthened to *Qameṣ*, e.g. *וילבשני* Jb 29:14; *יגאלוהו* 3:5; *וישליחם* Jos 8:3; *יקראוהו* Ps 145:18; but *יקראו* Jer 23:6, is probably a *forma mixta* combining the readings *יקראו* and *יקראו*, cf. § 74 e.

2. Not infrequently suffixes with the connecting vowel *a* are also found with the imperfect, e.g. *תדבקני* Gn 19:19, cf. 29:32, Ex 33:20, Nu 22:33, 1 K 2:24 *Qéré*, Is 56:3, Jb 9:18; also *ני*, Gn 27:19, 31, Jb 7:14, 9:34, 13:21 (in principal *pause*); *ניבירה* Gn 37:33, cf. 16:7, 2 S 11:27, Is 26:5, Jb 28:27, 1 Ch 20:2; *ניביר* Is 63:16 (manifestly owing to the influence of the preceding *נידע*); *ילבשם* Ex 29:30, cf. 2:17, Nu 21:30, Dt 7:15, Ps 74:8; even *אמילם* 118:10–12; *וישיעון* Ex 2:17, and *יחיתו* Hb 2:17 (where, however, the ancient versions read *יחיתו*); even *ירדפו* (*ō* from *āhu*) Ho 8:3; cf. Ex 22:29, Jos 2:4 (but read *ותצפנם*; 1 S 18:1 *Keth.*, 21:14 (where, however, the text is corrupt); 2 S 14:6 (where read with the old versions *וירך*); Jer 23:6 (see § 74 e), Ps 35:8, Ec 4:12.—On pausal *Sēghōl* for *Sere* in *וואב, רב, ם* Gn 48:9 and *ותאלץ* (so Baer, but ed. Mant., Ginsb. *ותאלץ* Ju 16:16, see § 29 q.

3. Suffixes are also appended in twelve passages to the plural forms in *ו*, viz. *תדכאני*, *will ye break me in pieces?* Jb 19:2; *ישרתוני* (here necessarily with a connecting vowel) Is 60:7, 10; Pr 5:22 (i but probably corrupt); elsewhere always without a connecting vowel; *יקראוני* with two other examples Pr 1:28, 8:17, Ho 5:15; cf. *וירך* - Ps 63:4, 91:12; *נהו* - Jer 5:22; *ונה* - Jer 2:24, all in principal *pause*. [See Böttcher, *Lehrb.*, § 1047 f.]

<sup>1</sup> This form is also found as feminine without a suffix, in Jer 49:11, Ez 37:7. In the latter passage *ותקרבו* is probably to be regarded, with König, as a clumsy correction of the original *ויק*, intended to suggest the reading *ותקרו* to agree with the usual gender of *מות*.

4. In *Pi□ēl*, *Pō□ēl*, and *Po□lēl*, the *Šere* of the final syllable, like the *ō* in *Qal*, becomes vocal *S<sup>c</sup>wā*; but before the suffixes ךְ ךְ and ךְ ךְ it is shortened to *S<sup>c</sup>ghōl*, e.g. יִקְבְּצֶךָ Dt 30:4, Ps 34:12, Is 51:2. With a final guttural, however, יִשְׁלַחֲךָ Gn 32:27; also in Pr 4:8, where with *Qimḥi* יִתְכַבֵּרְךָ is to be read. *ē* is retained in the tone-syllable; an analogous case in *Hiph□iḥ* is יִגְדֹלְךָ Dt 32:7. Less frequently *Šere* is sharpened to *Hireq*, e.g. אֶמְצָכֶם 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* אֶסְפְּךָ 1 S 15:6; cf. § 68 h.

5. In *Hiph□iḥ* the *i* remains, e.g. תִּלְבִּישׁ נִי Jb 10:11 (after *wāw* consecutive it is often written defectively, e.g. וַיִּלְבַּשׁ־נִי Gn 3:21 and often); but cf. above, f, Dt 32:7. Forms like תִּעֲשֶׂךָ 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. (ן), the suffix of the 3rd plur. masc. (ם) is affixed to the affirmative ו, to avoid a confusion with the personal ending וני; cf. וַיִּמְלֹאֵם Gn 26:15 (previously also with a perf. סִתְּמוּם); Gn 26:18, 33:13, Ex 2:17 (where וַיִּשְׁעֶן occurs immediately after); 39:18, 20, 1 S 6:10 (where also בְּנִיָּהֶם is for בְּנֵיהֶם, a neglect of gender which can only be explained by § 135 o).—For הִרְגֵנוּ Zc 11:5 read perhaps הִרְגֵנוּ 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. לְדַרְשׁ־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. עָבְרִי my passing by; מְלִכּוֹ his reigning, see § 115 a and e. The infinitive *Qal*, then, usually has the form *qōḥ*, retaining the original short vowel under the first radical (on the probable ground-form *quḥ*, see § 46 a). The resulting syllable as a rule allows a following B<sup>c</sup>gadh<sup>c</sup>phath to be spirant, e.g. בְּכַתְּבוֹ in his writing, Jer 45:1; cf., however, הִפְּכִי Gn 19:21; נִגְפוֹ (so ed. Mant.; others נִגְפוּ) Ex 12:27; עָצְבִי 1 Ch 4:10; before ךְ ךְ and ךְ ךְ also the syllable is completely closed, e.g. בְּאֶסְפְּךָ Ex 23:16, Lv 23:39 (but in pause לְהִרְגֵךָ Gn 27:42), unless the vowel be retained in the second syllable; see d. With the form קִטְל generally, compare the closely allied nouns of the form קִטְל (before a suffix קִטְל or קִטְל), § 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 *qiḥ* before suffixes, e.g. בְּבִגְדֹי Ex 21:8; מְכַרְם Am 2:6 (but מְכַרְהָ Ex 21:8) נִפְלוֹ 2 S 1:10 (but נִפְלוּ 1 S 29:3), לְשִׁטְנוֹ Zc 3:1, שִׁבְרִי 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 קִטְל (§ 45 c) in verbs middle or third guttural (but cf. also שִׁכְבָּה Gn 19:33, 35—elsewhere שִׁכְבְּךָ and שִׁכְבוֹ) before suffixes sometimes take the form *qaḥ*, as וְעָפוֹ Jon 1:15 (and, with the syllable loosely closed. פִּעְמוֹ Ju 13:25), מְהַאֲרְךָ and רִקְעֶךָ Ez 25:6; sometimes *qiḥ*, with the *a* attenuated to *i*, especially in verbs third guttural; as בְּלַעֲי, בְּבִטְחֶךָ, בְּקִעְעוֹ, בְּקִעְעֵם—Contrary to § 58 f יִנִּי (1 Ch 12:17) and נוֹ (Ex 14:11) are sometimes found with the *infinitive* instead of יִנִּי and נוֹ. On רְדוּפִי my following Ps 38:21 (but *Q<sup>e</sup>ré* רְדִפִי), cf. the analogous examples in § 46 e.

2. With the suffixes כָּם־ and כָּי־, contrary to the analogy of the corresponding nouns, forms occur like אָכְלָךְ־ *thy eating*, Gn 2:17; אָכְלָכֶם־ Gn 3:5; יַעֲמֶדְךָ־ (others יַעֲמֶדְךָ־) Ob<sup>11</sup>, 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 קָצַרְכֶם־ *your harvesting*, Lv 19:9, 23:22 (with retention of the original *ū*), and מִצְאָכֶם־ (read *mōōs<sup>e</sup>khēm*) *your despising*, Is 30:12; cf. Dt 20:2; on אָכֶם־ בְּמִצְרַיִם־ Gn 32:20 (for בְּמִצְרַיִם־), see § 74 h.—Very unusual are the infinitive suffixes of the 2nd sing. masc. with *energicum* (on the analogy of suffixes with the imperfect, § 58 i), as יִסְרֶךָ־ Dt 4:36, cf. 23:5, Jb 33:32, all in principal pause.

Examples of the *infinitive Niph<sup>o</sup>al* with suffixes are, הִשָּׁה־ מְדַךְ־ Ex 14:18; הִשָּׁה־ מְדַךְ־ Dt 28:20 (in *pause*, הִשָּׁה־ מְדַךְ־ verse 24); הִשָּׁה־ פְטוֹ־ Ps 37:33; הִשָּׁה־ בְרָכְכֶם־ Ez 21:29; הִשָּׁה־ מְדַם־ Dt 7:23. In the *infinitive* of *Pi<sup>o</sup>el* (as also in the *imperfect*, see § 60 f) the *ē* before the suff. כָּם־, כָּי־ becomes *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, e.g. דָּבַר־ךְ־ Ex 4:10, and with a sharpening to *ī* פִּרְשָׁכֶם־ Is 1:15 (see § 60 f). In the *infinitive* *Pô<sup>o</sup>el*, בּוֹשֵׁכֶם־ occurs (with *a* for *ē* or *ī*) Am 5:11, but probably בּוֹסְכֶם־, with Wellhausen, is the right reading; the correction *ō* has crept into the text alongside of the *corrigendum* *ō*.

2. The leading form of the *imperative Qal* before *suffixes* (קָטַל־) is due probably (see § 46 d) to the retention of the original short vowel of the first syllable (ground-form *qūṭīl*). In the *imperative* also *ō* is not followed by *Dageš lene*, e.g. כֹּחֲבֵם־ *kōthbēm* (not *kōthbēm*), &c.<sup>1</sup> 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. כָּתַבְהָ Is 30:8; cf. 2 S 12:28.—The forms קָטַלְךָ־, קָטַלְכֶם־, which are not exhibited in Paradigm C, undergo no change. Instead of לְנָה־ קָטַלְךָ־, the masc. form (קָטַלְךָ־) 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. שְׁלַח־נִי־ *send me*, Is 6:8; שְׁלַח־נִי־ Ps 26:2; שְׁלַח־נִי־ Ps 50:15; שְׁלַח־נִי־ Gn 23:8. In Am 9:1, שְׁלַח־נִי־ (so ed. Mant., Baer, Ginsb., instead of the ordinary reading שְׁלַח־נִי־) is to be explained, with Margolis, *AJSL*. xix, p. 45 ff., from an original שְׁלַח־נִי־, as שְׁלַח־נִי־ Am 9:4 from original שְׁלַח־נִי־.—In the *imperative Hiph<sup>o</sup>el*, the form used in conjunction with suffixes is not the 2nd *sing. masc.* תִּקְטַלְךָ־, but תִּקְטַלְךָ־ (with *ī* on account of the open syllable, cf. § 60 g), e.g. תִּקְטַלְךָ־ הַקְּרִיב־הוּ־ *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<sup>e</sup>wā* before the suffix, as in the corresponding noun-forms, e.g. from the form קָטַלְךָ־: קָטַלְךָ־, קָטַלְךָ־, &c.; but before *S<sup>e</sup>wā mobile* יִצְרַח־ךָ־, &c., or with the original *ī*, יִצְרַח־ךָ־ Ex 23:4, &c., יִצְרַח־ךָ־ 2 K 22:20 (coinciding in form with the 1st *sing. imperfect Qal*, 1 S 15:6; cf. § 68 h); with a middle guttural (יִצְרַח־ךָ־, יִצְרַח־ךָ־); with a third guttural, יִצְרַח־ךָ־ Is 43:1, but יִצְרַח־ךָ־ Jer 28:16, cf. § 65 d. The form יִקְטַלְךָ־, with suffix קָטַלְךָ־; before *S<sup>e</sup>wā* sometimes like יִקְטַלְךָ־ Is 48:17, sometimes like

<sup>1</sup> יִצְרַח־ךָ־ required by the Masora in Ps 16:1 (also יִצְרַח־ךָ־ Ps 86:2, 119:167; cf. Is 38:14 and יִצְרַח־ךָ־ Ob<sup>11</sup>), belongs to the disputed cases discussed in § 9 v and § 48 i note.

מֵאֲסָפְכֶם 52:12. In Is 47:10 נִי רֵאֵן is irregular for נִי רֵאֵן; instead of the meaningless כָּל־הַ בְּלֵהֶם Jer 15:10 read בְּלֵהֶם קָלֵל וְנִי.

Also unusual (see above, **d**) with participles are the suffixes of the 2nd sing. masc. with *energicum*, as עֹנֵךְ 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<sup>al</sup>* 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 יִקְטֹל, which elsewhere is attenuated to יִקְטֹל.—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 פִּי־א (§ 68), in a few א־ע (§ 73 g), and in most א־ל (§ 74). In all these cases, however, the **א** was at least originally a full consonant, while the **ה** in verbs ה־ל 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. קָמַץ 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<sup>e</sup>wā mobile*, the initial guttural takes a *compound Š<sup>e</sup>wā* (*Haṭeph*, § 10 f, § 22 l). Thus the *infinitives* אֲכַל, לֶאֱכֹל *to eat*, and the *perfects*, 2nd plur. masc. אֲכַלְתֶּם, אֲכַלְתֶּם from אֲכַל *to be inclined*, correspond to the forms אֲכַלְתֶּם and אֲכַלְתֶּם; also אֲכַלְתֶּם to אֲכַלְתֶּם, and so always with initial **א** 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 *Haṭeph* 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<sup>e</sup>ghôl*.

Examples: (*a*) of firmly closed syllables after the original vowel of the preformative (always with *ō* in the second syllable, except אֲדַבַּר Ez 23:5, אֲדַבַּר &c. from אֲדַבַּר *to adorn oneself*, and אֲדַבַּר; but cf. e): אֲדַבַּר, אֲדַבַּר, אֲדַבַּר, אֲדַבַּר Jer 9:3

(probably to distinguish it from the name נִּצְקָה, just as in Jer 10:19, &c., the participle fem. Niph<sup>al</sup> of נִּצְקָה is נִּצְקָה to distinguish it from נִּצְקָה), &c., and so generally in the *imperfect Qal* of stems beginning with ה, although sometimes parallel forms exist, which repeat the *ā* as a *Haṭeph*, e.g. נִּצְקָה, &c. The same form appears also in the *imperfect Hiph<sup>al</sup>* נִּצְקָה, &c. Very rarely the original *ā* is retained in a closed syllable under the preformative ה of the *perfect Niph<sup>al</sup>*: נִּצְקָה Gn 31:27; cf. 1 S 19:2, Jos 2:16; also the *infinitive absolute* נִּצְקָה Est 8:8, נִּצְקָה 1 Ch 5:20, and the *participle fem.* נִּצְקָה (see above), *plur.* נִּצְקָה Pr 27:6. In these forms the original *ā* is commonly kept under the preformative and is followed by *Haṭeph-Pathaḥ*; thus in the *perfect* of some verbs לִּי, e.g. נִּצְקָה, &c.; in the *infinitive absolute*, נִּצְקָה Est 9:1; in the *participle* נִּצְקָה, Ps 89:8, &c.

(b) Of the corresponding *Haṭeph* after the original vowel: נִּצְקָה (but נִּצְקָה Jb 5:18 in pause), נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה, and so almost always with ע and often with ה in the *imperfects* of *Qal* and *Hiph<sup>al</sup>*; in *Hoph<sup>al</sup>*, נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה; but cf. also נִּצְקָה Is 42:22, נִּצְקָה Ez 16:4.

The *ā* of the preformative before a guttural almost always (§ 22 i, cf. § 27 p) becomes *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* (cf., however, q). This *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* again appears sometimes

(c) in a closed syllable, e.g. נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה, always with *ā* in the second syllable, corresponding to the imperfects of verbs ע"ע, with original *i* in the first and *ā* in the second syllable, § 67 n, and also to the imperfects of verbs ע"י, § 72 h; but cf. also נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה, and נִּצְקָה; in *Niph.*, e.g. נִּצְקָה Am 6:6, &c.; in *Hiph.* נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה 2 K 4:7 &c.: sometimes

(d) followed by *Haṭeph-S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, e.g. נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה in *imperfect Qal*; נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה *Hiph<sup>al</sup>*; נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה *Niph<sup>al</sup>*.

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 ה invariably takes *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, whether in a firmly or loosely closed syllable, e.g. נִּצְקָה (with the cohortative נִּצְקָה), &c. In Jb 32:17 נִּצְקָה must unquestionably be *Hiph<sup>al</sup>*, since elsewhere the pointing is always נִּצְקָה. Cohortatives like נִּצְקָה Gn 27:41 and נִּצְקָה Jb 16:6, are explained by the next remark. (3) The shifting of the tone towards the end frequently causes the *Pathaḥ* of the preformative to change into *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, and vice versa, e.g. נִּצְקָה, but נִּצְקָה 3rd *sing. fem.*; נִּצְקָה, but נִּצְקָה, but with *wāw consecutive* נִּצְקָה, &c.; so נִּצְקָה Gn 8:3 the plur. of נִּצְקָה, cf. Gn 11:8; and thus generally a change of the stronger *Haṭeph-S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* group (נִּצְקָה) into the lighter *Haṭeph-Pathaḥ* group takes place whenever the tone is moved one place toward the end (cf. § 27 v).

3. When in forms like נִּצְקָה, נִּצְקָה, the vowel of the final syllable becomes a *vocal S<sup>e</sup>wā* in consequence of the addition of an affirmative (ו, י, ה) or suffix, the compound *S<sup>e</sup>wā* of the guttural is changed into the corresponding short vowel, e.g. נִּצְקָה, *plur.* נִּצְקָה (*ya-a-m<sup>e</sup>-dhû* as an equivalent for *ya-a-m<sup>e</sup>-dhû*); נִּצְקָה, *she is forsaken*. But even in these forms the hard combination frequently occurs, e.g. נִּצְקָה, *they take as a pledge* (cf. in the *sing.* נִּצְקָה, also נִּצְקָה); נִּצְקָה (also נִּצְקָה) *they are strong*. Cf. m and, in general, § 22 m, § 28 c.

4. In the *infinitive, imperative, and imperfect Niph<sup>al</sup>*, where the first radical should by rule be strengthened (לְקַטֵּל, הִקְטִיל), the strengthening is always omitted, and the vowel of the preformative lengthened to *Sere*; יַעֲמֵד for *yi<sup>l</sup>amēd*,<sup>1</sup> &c. Cf. § 22 c—For יַעֲשֶׂה Ex 25:31 (according to Dillmann, to prevent the pronunciation יַעֲשֶׂה, which the LXX and Samaritan follow) read יַעֲשֶׂה.

## REMARKS

### On Qal.

1. In verbs פִּי"א the *infinitive construct* and *imperative* take *Haṭeph-S<sup>gh</sup>ôl* in the first syllable (according to § 22 o), e.g. גִּירְךָ *gird thou*, Jb 38:3, אֶהֱבֶךָ *love thou*, Ho 3:1, זַחֲצֵךְ *seize thou*, Ex 4:4 (on אַפּוֹ *bake ye*, Ex 16:23, see § 76 d); לֶאֱכַל *to eat*; infinitive with a prefix זַחֲצֵךְ לֶאֱכַל, לֶאֱכַל לֶאֱכַל Is 5:24; לֶאֱכַל לֶאֱכַל Ec 3:8. Sometimes, however, *Haṭeph-Pathaḥ* is found as well, e.g. *infinitive* זַחֲצֵךְ 1 K 6:6; אֶכְלֵךְ לֶאֱכַל Nu 26:10 (before a suffix אֶכְלֵךְ, אֶמְרֵךְ, אֶכְלֵךְ, אֶמְרֵךְ § 61 d); cf. Dt 7:20, 12:23, Ez 25:8, Ps 102:5, Pr 25:7 (אֶמְרֵךְ), Jb 34:18, always in close connexion with the following word. With a firmly closed syllable after ל cf. לְהַסּוֹת Is 30:2; לְהַפְּרֹךְ Jos 2:2 f. (on Is 2:20, cf. § 84b n); לְהַתּוֹת Is 30:14, Hag 2:16; לְהַשִּׁיב Ex 31:4, &c.; לְעֹזֵר 2 S 18:3 *Q<sup>r</sup>é*, but also עֹזֵר 1 Ch 15:26.

הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ Ju 9:9, 11, 13 is altogether anomalous, and only a few authorities give הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ (Hiph<sup>il</sup>), adopted by Moore in Haupt's Bible. According to Qimḥi, Olshausen, and others, the Masora intended a *perfect Hoph<sup>al</sup>* with syncope of the preformative after the ה interrogative = הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ, or (according to Olshausen) with the omission of the ה interrogative. But since the *Hiph<sup>il</sup>* and *Hoph<sup>al</sup>* of הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ nowhere occur, it is difficult to believe that such was the intention of the Masora. We should expect the *perfect Qal*, הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ. But the *Qameṣ* under the ה, falling between the tone and counter-tone, was naturally less emphasized than in הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ, without the ה interrogative. Consequently it was weakened, not to simple *S<sup>w</sup>â*, but to *â*, in order to represent the sound of the *Qameṣ* (likewise pronounced as *â*) at least in a shortened form. The *S<sup>gh</sup>ôl* of the ה interrogative is explained, in any case, from § 100 n (cf. the similar pointing of the article, e.g. הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ, § 35 k). For the accusative after הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ, instead of the usual מִן, 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<sup>gh</sup>ôl*, e.g. אֶסְבְּרֶךָ *gather thou*, Nu 11:16; עֲרַבְךָ *set in order*, Jb 33:5; חֲשֹׁפֶיךָ *strip off*, Is 47:2 (on this irregular *Dageš* cf. § 46 d), especially when the second radical is also a guttural, e.g. אֶהָבֶךָ Am 5:15, Ps 31:24; cf. זַחֲצֵךְ Ct 2:15; cf. also in verbs לִי"ה עֲנוּ *sing ye*, Nu 21:17, Ps 147:7 (compared with עֲנוּ *answer ye*, 1 S 12:3) and אֶלֶיךָ Jo 1:8.—*Pathaḥ* occurs in הוֹדֵךְ תְּבַלְּהוּ *hold him in pledge*, Pr 20:16, and probably also in Ps 9:14 (הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ).—As a pausal form for הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ (cf. the *plur.* Jer 2:12) we find in Is 44:27 הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ (cf. the *imperf.* הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ) with the *ō* 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 *ā* with *S<sup>gh</sup>ôl* under the preformative in a firmly closed syllable (e.g. הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ) regularly gives way to the soft combination in verbs which are at the same time לִי"ה, e.g. הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ &c. (but cf. הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ &c., הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ Pr 6:27, הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ ed. Mant., Ex 3:20). Even in the strong verb הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ is found along with הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ. Cf. also הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ Ez 23:5; הַיְהוֹדֵהְךָ Gn 27:36 (so Ben-Asher; but Ben-Naphtali 'עָקָה; Neh

<sup>1</sup> יַעֲמֵד Jb 19:7 (so even the Mantua ed.) is altogether abnormal: read יַעֲמֵד, with Baer, Ginsb.

9:22, and so always in the *imperfect Qal* of עָוַר with suffixes, Gn 49:25, &c.—תָּאֵהָבוּ 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 תָּאֵהָבוּ with Haupt in his Bible, *Proverbs*, p. 34, l. 44 ff.; cf. the analogous instances under *p*, and such nouns as בָּאָר, זָאָב, § 93 t.—On יִתְבַּרַךְ Ps 94:20 for יִתְבָּרַם (according to Qimḥi, and others, rather *Pu□al*) cf. § 60 b.

יֵאָטֵם Ps 58:5 and יַעֲרֵם *to deal subtly*, 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 יַעֲרִים Ps 83:4.—Instead of the unintelligible form וַיִּקְרָם (so ed. Mant.; Baer and Ginsb. as in 24:3) 1 Ch 23:6 and וַיִּקְרָם 24:3 (partly analogous to וַיַּעֲבֹד § 60 b) the *Qal* וַיִּקְרָם is to be read. The form וַיִּרְדֵּי Ps 7:6 which is, according to Qimḥi (in *Mikhlol*; but in his Lexicon he explains it as *Hithpa□el*), a composite form of *Qal* (וַיִּרְדֵּי) and *Pi□el* (וַיִּרְדֵּי), can only be understood as a development of וַיִּרְדֵּי (cf. § 64 h on וַיִּצְחַק, and § 69 x on וַיִּהְלַךְ Ex 9:23, Ps 73:9). Pathā has taken the place of *Haṭeph-Pathah*, but as a mere helping-vowel (as in וַיִּשְׁמַעָה § 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 וַיִּרְדֵּי (*impf. Qal*) and וַיִּרְדֵּי (*impf. Pi□el*).

### On Hiph□il and Hoph□al.

3. The above-mentioned (*f*, 3) change of וָו to וּו occurs in the *perfect Hiph□il*, especially when *wāw consecutive* precedes, and the tone is in consequence thrown forward upon the affirmative, e.g. וְהָעַמְדָה, but וְהָעַמְדָה Nu 3:6, 8:13, 27:19; וְהָעַבְרָתִי, but וְהָעַבְרָתִי Jer 15:14, Ez 20:37; even in the 3rd *sing.* וְהָאֵוִן Ps 77:2.—On the contrary וּו occurs instead of וָו in the *imperative Hiph□il*, Jer 49:8, 30; and in the *infinitive* Jer 31:32. The preformative of עָתָר in *Hiph□il* always takes *a* in a closed syllable: Ex 8:4 וְהָעֵתָרִי; verse 5 וְהָעֵתָרִי; also verse 25 and Jb 22:27.

4. In the *perfect Hiph□il* וּו is sometimes changed into וָו, and in *Hoph□al* וּו into וָו (cf. § 23 h); וְהָעַבְרָתִי Jos 7:7, וְהָעֵלָה Hb 1:15, וְהָעֵלָה Ju 6:28, 2 Ch 20:34, Na 2:8, always before ע, and hence evidently with the intention of strengthening the countertone-syllable (וְהָ or וְהָ) before the guttural. On a further case of this kind (וְהָעֵמָה) see § 64 c. Something similar occurs in the formation of *segholate nouns* of the form *qōḥ*; cf. § 93 q, and (on אָמוֹן &c. for אָמוֹן) § 84a q.—In the *imperfect consecutive* וְהָעֵתָרִי the tone is thrown back on to the first syllable. On the *Hoph□al* וְהָעַבְרָתִי Ex 20:5, &c., see § 60 b.

### וְהָעֵתָרִי and וְהָעֵתָרִי.

5. In the verbs וְהָעֵתָרִי *to be*, and וְהָעֵתָרִי *to live*, the guttural hardly ever affects the addition of preformatives; thus *imperfect Qal* וְהָעֵתָרִי and וְהָעֵתָרִי, *Niph□al* וְהָעֵתָרִי (נ, וְהָעֵתָרִי); but in the *perfect Hiph□il* וְהָעֵתָרִי (2nd *plur.* וְהָעֵתָרִים Jos 2:13, and even without *wāw consecutive*, Ju 8:19). Initial ה always has *Haṭeph-Seghōl* instead of *vocal Šwâ*; וְהָעֵתָרִי 1 S 25:7, וְהָעֵתָרִי (except וְהָעֵתָרִי *be thou! fem.* Gn 24:60). The 2nd *sing. fem. imperative* of וְהָעֵתָרִי is וְהָעֵתָרִי *live thou*, Ez 16:6; the *infinitive*, with suffix, וְהָעֵתָרִי Jos 5:8. After the prefixes וְ, וְ, וְ, וְ, וְ (=וְ) both ה and ה retain the *simple Šwâ* (§ 28 b) and the prefix takes *l*, as elsewhere before strong consonants with *Šwâ*; hence in the *perfect Qal* וְהָעֵתָרִי,

*imperative* וְהָיוּ, *infinitive* לְהָיוּ, לְהָיוֹת, &c. (cf. § 16 f, ε). The only exception is the 2nd *sing. masc.* of the *imperative* after *wāw*; וְהָיָה Gn 12:2, &c., וְהָיָה Gn 20:7.

§ 64. *Verbs Middle Guttural, e.g. שָׁחַט to slaughter.*

The slight deviations from the ordinary inflexion are confined chiefly to the following<sup>1</sup>:—

1. When the guttural would stand at the beginning of a syllable with simple *S<sup>e</sup>wā*, it necessarily takes a *Haṭeph*, and almost always *Haṭeph-Pathah*, e.g. *perfect* שָׁחַט, *imperfect* יִשְׁחַט, *imperative Niph<sup>al</sup>* שָׁחַט, *imperative Qal*, before the affirmatives *i* and *u*, the original *Pathah* is retained in the first syllable, and is followed by *Haṭeph-Pathah*, thus, יִשְׁחַט, &c.; in אֶחָבּוּ the preference of the *א* for *S<sup>e</sup>ghōl* (but cf. also יִשְׁחַטְוּ Jer 13:21) has caused the change from *ā* to *ě*; in שָׁחַטְוּ Jb 6:22, even *i* remains before a *hard* guttural.

So in the *infinitive Qal fem.*, e.g. אֶחָבּוּ *to love*, אֶפְסוּ *to pine*; and in the *infinitive* with a suffix עָדָה לְ Is 9:6; the doubtful form שָׁחַטְוּ Ho 5:2, is better explained as *infinitive Pi<sup>al</sup>ēl* (= שָׁחַטְוּ).

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* שָׁחַט (with the fem. ending and retraction and shortening of the *o* רַחֲצָה and רַחֲקָה cf. § 45 b), but generally also the *Sere* in the *imperfect Niph<sup>al</sup>* and *Pi<sup>al</sup>ēl*, e.g. יִלְחֶם *he fights*, יִנְחֶם *he comforts*, and even the more feeble *S<sup>e</sup>ghōl* after *wāw* consecutive in such forms as וַיִּלְחֶם, וַיִּנְחֶם Gn 41:8 (cf., however, וַיִּנְחֶם 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. שָׁחַט, יִשְׁחַט; יִזְעַק, יִזְעַק; יִבְחַר, יִבְחַר; with *suffixes* (according to § 60 c), *imperative* יִשְׁחַטְוּ, *imperfect* יִשְׁחַטְוּ.

With *ō* in the *imperative Qal*, the only instances are נָעַל 2 S 13:17; אָחַז Ex 4:4, 2 S 2:21, *fem.* אֶחָזוּ Ru 3:15 (with the unusual repetition of the lost *ō* as *Haṭeph-Qameṣ*, 2nd *plur. masc.* in *pause* אָחַזְוּ Neh 7:3; without the *pause* אֶחָזוּ Ct 2:15); אָחַזְוּ Ju 19:8.<sup>2</sup> Finally אֶחָזוּ for אֶחָזוּ, 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 יִנְחֶם Lv 5:15, Nu 5:27 (but וַיִּמְעַל 2 Ch 26:16); cf. וַיִּשְׁחַטְוּ Ez 16:33; וַיִּפְעַלְוּ Jb 35:6. Also in the *perfect Pi<sup>al</sup>ēl*, *Pathah* occurs somewhat more frequently than in the strong verb, e.g. נָחַם *to comfort* (cf., however, נָחַם, נָחַם, נָחַם); but *א* and *ע* always have *ē* in 3rd *sing.*—On the *infinitive* with suffixes, cf. § 61 b.

3. In *Pi<sup>al</sup>ēl*, *Pu<sup>al</sup>*, and *Hithpa<sup>al</sup>ēl*, the *Dageš forte* being inadmissible in the middle radical, the preceding vowel, especially before ה, ה and ע, nevertheless,

1 <sup>1</sup> *Hoph<sup>al</sup>*, which is not exhibited in the paradigm, follows the analogy of *Qal*; *Hiph<sup>al</sup>* is regular.

2 <sup>2</sup> Also Ju 19:5 (where *Qimḥi* would read *s<sup>e</sup>āḏ*), read *s<sup>e</sup>ōḏ*, 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* שָׁחַק גִּהְלוּ Jos 14:1, וַיִּבְעַרְתִּי 1 K 14:10, נָהַג Ex 10:13 (cf., however, אָחַר Gn 34:19; לָתַּת Ex 15:13, but in the *imperfect* and *participle* יְנַהֵל, &c.; in verbs ל"ה, e.g. רָעָה), *infinitive* שָׁחַק, *Pu*□*al* רָחַץ (but cf. דָּחוּ Ps 36:13 from דָּחָה, also the unusual position of the tone in בָּחַן Ez 21:18, and in the *perfect Hithpa*□*ēl* הִתְרַחַץ צָתִי Jb 9:30); *Hithpa*□*ēl perfect* and *imperative* הִטְהַרְוּ, &c.; in *pause* (see §§ 22 c, 27 q, 29 v, 54 k) הִטְהַרְוּ Nu 8:7, 2 Ch 30:18; יִתְנַחֲמוּ Nu 23:19, &c.

The complete omission of the strengthening, and a consequent lengthening of the preceding vowel, occurs invariably only with ר (כָּדַת Ez 16:4 is an exception; כָּרְתָה also occurs, Ju 6:28), e.g. בָּרַךְ (in *pause* בָּרַךְ), *imperfect* יְבָרַךְ, *Pu*□*al* בָּרַךְ. Before א it occurs regularly in the stems בָּאָר, גָּאָל, מָאָן, פָּאָר, and in the *Hithpa*□*ēl* of בִּאָה, רִאָה, and שִׂאָה; on the other hand, א is *virtually* strengthened in the *perfects*, גָּאָר (once in the *imperfect*, Jer 29:23) *to commit adultery*, נָאָץ *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* יְנַאָץ Ps 74:10), נָאָר *to abhor* La 2:7 (also נָאָרְתָה Ps 89:40) and שִׂאָל Ps 109:10; moreover, in the *infinitive* יֵאָשׁ Ec 2:20, according to the best reading. On the *Mappiá* in the *Pu*□*al* רָאָו Jb 33:21, cf. § 14 d.

Rem. 1. In the verb שָׁאֵל *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 א stands in an open syllable, cf. שָׁאֵל לְךָ Gn 32:18, Ju 4:20; שָׁאֵל וְגַי Ps 137:3; but in a closed syllable, even without a suffix, שָׁאֵלְתֶם 1 S 12:13, 25:5, Jb 21:29; שָׁאֵלְתָּ יהוָה 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 *ě*. Also in the *Hiph*□*il*-form יהוָה שָׁאֵלְתָּ יהוָה 1 S 1:28 the א is merely attenuated from א.

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<sup>c</sup>ghól*. Thus (a) before monosyllables, according to § 29 e, e.g. לְשָׁרְתָהּ שָׁמַיְמָה *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. וַיְבָרֶכְהוּ אֹתוֹ *and he blessed*, Gn 1:22 and frequently, וַיִּגְדֹּל אֹתוֹ *and he drove out*, Ex 10:11, וַיִּתְחַפֵּץ עִמָּם Dn 2:1.

3. The following are a few rarer anomalies; in the *imperfect Qal* יִצְחַק Gn 21:6 (elsewhere יִצְחַק, &c., in *pause* יִצְחַק, cf. § 10 g (c) and § 63 n); in the *perfect Pi*□*ēl* הִרְוּ אֶת הַיָּם Ju 5:28 (perhaps primarily for הִרְוּ אֶת הַיָּם; according to Gn 34:19 הִרְוּ אֶת הַיָּם would be expected), and similarly מִתְנִי יָמָי Ps 51:7 for מִתְנִי יָמָי; in the *imperative Pi*□*ēl* קָרַב Ez 37:17 (cf. above, § 52 n); finally, in the *imperative Hiph*□*il* הִרְחַקְהוּ Jb 13:21 and הִמְעַד 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* הִרְחַק Pr 4:24, &c.; but also הִנְחַת Jo 4:11.

4. As *infinitive Hithpa*□*ēl* with a suffix we find הִתְיַחֵשׁוּ Ezr 8:1, &c., with a firmly closed syllable, also the *participle* מִתְיַחֵשִׁים Neh 7:64; Baer, however, reads in all these cases, on good authority, הִתְיַחֵשׁוּ, &c.—The quite meaningless *Kethibh* וְנִשְׂאָר Ez 9:8 (for which the

<sup>1</sup> בָּחַן is explained by Abulwalīd as the 3rd pers. *perfect Pu*□*al*, but by Qimḥi as a noun.

*Q<sup>e</sup>rē* requires the equally unintelligible שָׁרַר (וְשָׁרַר) evidently combines two different readings, viz. שָׁרַר (part. *Niph.*) and שָׁרַרְתָּ (imperf. *consec.*); cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, i. p. 266 f.—In שָׁרַרְתָּ Is 44:13 (also שָׁרַרְתָּ in the same verse) an *imperfect Pi□ēl* appears to be intended by the Masora with an irregular shortening of the *ō* for שָׁרַרְתָּ; cf. § 55 b מְלַשְׁנֵי Ps 101:5 *Q<sup>e</sup>rē*; on the other hand Qimḥi, with whom Delitzsch agrees, explains the form as Pi□ēl, with an irregular □ for □, as in the reading אֶלְקָטָה Ru 2:2, 7; cf. § 10 h.

5. A few examples in which א, 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. שָׁלַח to send.<sup>1</sup>

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 י, ו, ו ( § 25 b) are always retained, even under such circumstances; hence *inf. abs.* *Qal* שָׁלוּחַ, *part. pass.* שָׁלוּחַ, *Hiph.* הַשְּׁלוּחַ, *imperf.* מְשַׁלֵּחַ, *part.* מְשַׁלֵּחַ. So also the less firm *ō* in the *inf. constr.* שָׁלַח is almost always retained: cf., however, שָׁלַח, in close connexion with a substantive, Is 58:9, and גָּוַע Nu 20:3. Examples of the *infinitive* with suffixes are בְּרַחֲמֶיךָ Gn 35:1; בְּפָגְעוֹ Nu 35:19; לְרַבְעָה Lv 18:23, &c.

(b) The *imperfect* and *imperative Qal* almost always have *ā* 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 שָׁלַח, יִשְׁלַח, &c.; with suffixes נִי שְׁלַחְתָּ, נִי שְׁלַחְתָּ, see § 60 c.

Exceptions, in the *imperfect* אֶסְלוּחַ Jer 5:7, *K<sup>e</sup>th.* (אֶסְלַח *Q<sup>e</sup>rē*); in the *imperative* טָבֵב Gn 43:16. On such cases as אֶפְשָׁעָה Is 27:4, cf. § 10 h.

(c) Where *Ṣere* would be the regular vowel of the final syllable, both forms (with *ē<sup>a</sup>* and *ā*) 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*, *Pi□ēl* and *Hithpa□ēl*, the forms שָׁלַח (with suff. שָׁלַחְתָּ, but שָׁלַחְתָּ), and מְשַׁלֵּחַ (with suff. מְשַׁלֵּחְתָּ), and מְשַׁלֵּחַ are used exclusively; except in verbs ל"ע where we find, in close connexion, also נָטַע Ps 94:9, רָגַע Is 51:15, Jer 31:35, רָקַע Is 42:5, 44:24, רִקַּע Ps 136:6, שָׁטַע Lv 11:7, all with the tone on the last syllable.—The part. Pu□al is מְרַבֵּעַ Ez 45:2 according to the best authorities (Kittel מְרַבֵּעַ).

2. Similarly, in the *imperf.* and *inf. Niph□al*, and in the *perf. inf.* and *imperf. Pi□ēl* the (probably more original) form with *ā* commonly occurs in the body of the sentence, and the fuller form with *ē<sup>a</sup>* in *pause* (and even with the lesser distinctives, e.g. with *D<sup>e</sup>hi* Ps 86:4 in the *imperative Pi□ēl*; with *Tiphḥa* 1 K 12:32 in the *infinitive Pi□ēl*; Jer 4:31 *imperfect Hithpa□ēl*; Jer 16:6 *imperfect Niph□al*), cf. e.g. יָגַרַע Nu 27:4, with יָגַרַע 36:3; וַיִּשְׁבַּע Dt 1:34, even with retraction of the tone in the *inf. abs.* *Niph□al* הִשְׁבַּע Nu 30:3 (elsewhere הִשְׁבַּע Jer

<sup>1</sup> Verbs ל"ה in which the ה is *consonantal* obviously belong also to this class, e.g. גָּבַהּ to be high, תָּמַהּ to be astonished, מָהַה (only in *Hithpalpel*) to delay.

7:9, 12:16 twice, in each case without the pause); תִּבְקַע־ Hb 3:9, with תִּבְקַע־ Ez 13:11; בָּלַע *to devour* Hb 1:13, Nu 4:20 with בָּלַע La 2:8; for *infinitive Hithpa'el*, cf. Is 28:20. The *infinitive absolute Pi'el* has the form שָׁלַח Dt 22:7, 1 K 11:22; the *infinitive construct*, on the other hand, when without the pause is always as שָׁלַח except לְשַׁלַּח Ex 10:4.—יָזַבַּח Hb 1:16 has  $\bar{e}$ , though not in *pause*, and even יִזְבַּח 2 K 16:4, 2 Ch 28:4; but *a* in *pause* in the *imperative Niph'al* אָנַח Ez 21:11; *jussive Pi'el* תִּאָּחַר Ps 40:18; cf. § 52 n. An example of  $\check{a}$  in the *imperative Pi'el* under the influence of a final ר is כְּתַר־ Jb 36:2, in the *imperfect Niph'al* עָצַר נֹתַ עָצַר Nu 17:13, &c.—In יִפְרֶה 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 *Hiph'al* which end in gutturals, *a* alone occurs, e.g. הִצְלַח *prosper thou*, יִבְטַח *let him make to trust*, וַיַּצְמַח *and he made to grow* (so in *Hithpalpel* יִתְמַחְמַח &c., Hb 2:3); even in *pause* הִצְלַח 1 Ch 29:23, and, with the best authorities, הִיוֹצַח 1 Ch 12:17; וַיִּשְׂעַר Is 35:4 is perhaps to be emended into וַיִּשְׂעַר (= וַיִּשְׂעַר).—In the *infinitive absolute* *Sere* remains, e.g. הִגְבַּהּ *to make high*; as *infinitive construct* הִוָּצַח also occurs in close connexion (Jb 6:26); on הִוָּשַׁע as *infinitive construct* (1 S 25:26, 33), cf. § 53 k.

2. When the guttural with *quiescent S<sup>e</sup>wā* stands at the end of a syllable, the ordinary strong form remains when not connected with suffixes, e.g. שָׁלַח הָתִי, שָׁלַח הָתִי. But in the 2nd *sing. fem. perfect* a *helping-Pathah* takes the place of the *S<sup>e</sup>wā*, שָׁלַח הָתִי Jer, 13:25 (§ 28 e); also in, 1 K 14:3, לָקַח הָתִי is to be read, not לָקַח הָתִי.

Rem. The soft combination with *compound S<sup>e</sup>wā* occurs only in the 1st *plur. perfect* with suffixes, since in these forms the tone is thrown one place farther forward, e.g. יָדַעְנוּךָ we *know thee*, Ho 8:2 (cf. Gn 26:29, Ps 44:18, 132:6). Before the *suffixes* ךַּ and ךָּ, the guttural must have ךַּ, e.g. אֶשְׁלַחְךָ I *will send thee*, 1 S 16:1; אֶשְׁלַחְךָ Gn 31:27; אֶשְׁמַרְךָ Jer 18:2.

On the weak verbs ל"ו, see especially § 74.

### *The Weak Verb.*<sup>1</sup>

#### § 66. *Verbs Primae Radicalis Nûn* (נ״ן), e.g. נִגַּשׁ *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 Nûn (*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 נִגַּשׁ, *imperfect* נִגַּשׁ, *infinitive* properly נִגַּשׁ, but always

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the summary, § 41.

lengthened by the feminine termination ת to the segholate form תַּשְׁאֵ<sup>2</sup>; with *suffix* אַשְׁתוּ Gn 33:3; with the concurrence of a guttural נָגַע *to touch*, imperfect נִגַּע, infinitive תַּגַּע (also נָגַעַ, see below); נָטַע *to plant*, infinitive טַעַ (also נָטַעַ, see below); on the verb נָתַן *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. נָפַל *to fall*, imperfect נִפַּל, infinitive לִפְּל, with *suffix* נָפְלוּ, also נִפְּלוּ; נָדַד Nu 6:2, &c.; cf., moreover, נָגַד Gn 20:6, &c., נָגַדַּ Ex 19:12 (even נָגַדַּ Jb 6:7; cf. Jer 1:10); with *suffix* נָגַדַּ Lv 15:23. Also נָטַע Is 51:16 (but נָטַעַ Ec 3:2); נָשָׂא Is 1:14, 18:3; with *suffix* נָשְׂאוּ Ps 28:2 (elsewhere נָשָׂא, cf. § 74 i and § 76 b), נָשְׂאוּ 2 S 20:9.

(b) In the *imperative*. Here the *Nûn* is always dropped in verbs with a in the *imperfect*, e.g. נָגַשׁ, *imperative* שָׁגַ (more frequently with *paragogic ā*, נָגַשׁ; before *Maqqeph* also נָשַׁ Gn 19:9), *plur.* נָשׂוּ, &c. Parallel with these there are the curious forms with *ō*, נָשׂוּ Ru 2:14 (with *retarding* Metheg in the second syllable, and also *nasog aħor*, according to § 29 e, before תָּלַם and נָשׂוּ Jos 3:9 (before נָהַם), 1 S 14:38 (before תָּלַם) and 2 Ch 29:31; in all these cases without the *pause*. With *Nûn* retained, as if in a strong verb, נָהַג *drive*, 2 K 4:24 (*imperfect* נִהַג, without assimilation of the *Nûn*), נָהַגוּ 2 K 19:29, Is 37:30, Jer 29:5, 28; cf. also the verbs נָהַל, which are at the same time נָהַל Ez 32:18, נָהַל Ex 32:34, נָהַל Ex 8:1, &c.; the verb נָשָׂא Ps 10:12 (usually נָשָׂא); cf. § 76 b. But, as in the infinitive, the *aphaeresis* never takes place in verbs which have *ō* in the *imperfect*, e.g. נָצַר, נָתַן, &c.

2. When, through the addition of a *preformative*, *Nûn* stands at the end of a syllable, it is readily assimilated to the second radical (§ 19 c); thus in the *imperfect Qal*,<sup>1</sup> e.g. יִפֹּל for *yinpōl*, *he will fall*; יִנְגַּשׁ for *yingaš*; יִתֵּן for *yintēn*, *he will give* (on this single example of an *imperfect* with original *i* in the second syllable, cf. h)<sup>2</sup>; also in the *perfect Niph*□*al* נִגַּשׁ for *ningaš*; throughout *Hiph*□*ū* (נִהַגִּישׁ, &c.) and *Hoph*□*al* (which in these verbs always has *Qibbuṣ*, in a sharpened syllable, cf. § 9 n) נִהַגִּישׁ.

The other forms are all quite regular, e.g. the *perfect*, *infinitive absolute* and *participle Qal*, all *Pi*□*ēl*, *Pu*□*al*, &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 פִּי"י (§ 71), and even in verbs עִ"ע (§ 67). The *infinitive* תַּשְׁאֵ and the *imperative* שָׁגַ, also נָשַׁ (Gn 19:9) and יִתֵּן, resemble the corresponding forms of verbs פִּי"י (§ 69).—On נָהַל, נָהַל, and נָהַל, from נָהַל *to take*, see g.—In יִקֹּם (*imperfect Niph*□*al* of יָקַם), and in similar forms of verbs עִ"י (§ 72), the *full* writing of the *ō* indicates, as a rule, that they are not to be regarded as *imperfects Qal* of יָקַם,

<sup>2</sup> The 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).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mayer Lambert, 'Le futur qal des verbes פִּי"י, פִּי"ן, פִּי"א', in the *REJ.* xxvii, 136 ff.

<sup>2</sup> An imperfect in *a* (נָהַגִּישׁ) is given in the Paradigm, simply because it is the actual form in use in this verb.

&c.—Also אָטַק (Ps 139:8) is not to be derived from נַטַק, but stands for אָטַלַק (with a sharpening of the ט as compensation for the loss of the ל), from טַלַק *to ascend*, see § 19 f, and Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 44. Similarly the *Hiphil*-forms יָקוּהָשׁ Ez 39:9, יָשׁוּהָשׁ Is 44:15, and the *Niph'al* נָשׂוּהָשׁ Ps 78:21 are most probably from a stem שׁ־לַק, not שׁ־קַשׁ.

Rem. 1. The instances are comparatively few in which the forms retain their *Nûn* before a firm consonant, e.g. נָטַר, imperfect יָנַטַר Jer 3:5 (elsewhere יָטַר); also from נָצַר the pausal form is *always* נָצַרְוּ (without the *pause* נָצַרוּ Pr 20:28); similarly in Is 29:1, 58:3, Ps 61:8, 68:3 (where, however, תִּנְדָּר is intended), 140:2, 5, Pr 2:11, Jb 40:24, the retention of the *Nûn* is always connected with the *pause*. In *Niph'al* this never occurs (except in the irregular *inf.* הָיָה־נָה־רָה־נָה־רָה־נָה־רָה Ps 68:3, cf. § 51 k), in *Hiphil* and *Hophal* very seldom; e.g. תִּנְדָּרוּהָשׁ Ez 22:20, תִּנְדָּרוּהָשׁ Ju 20:31; for לָנַפַל Nu 5:22 read לָנַפַל, according to § 53 q. On the other hand, the *Nûn* is regularly retained in all verbs, of which the Second radical is a guttural, e.g. יָנַחְהָשׁ *he will possess*, although there are rare cases like יָנַחְהָשׁ (also יָנַחְהָשׁ) *he will descend*, Jer 21:13 (even יָנַחְהָשׁ Pr 17:10; without apparent reason accented as *Milēl*), plur. יָנַחוּהָשׁ Jb 21:13 (cf. § 20 i; the Masora, however, probably regards יָנַחְהָשׁ and יָנַחוּהָשׁ as *imperfect Niph'al* from יָנַחְהָשׁ); *Niph'al* יָנַחוּהָשׁ for יָנַחוּהָשׁ *he has grieved*.

2. The ל of לָקַח *to take* is treated like the *Nûn* of verbs פִּיץ (§ 19 d). Hence *imperfect Qal* יָקַחְהָשׁ, cohortative (§ 20 m) אֶקַּחְהָשׁ, *imperative* קַחְהָשׁ, in *pause* and before *suffixes* קַחְהָשׁ (on קַחְהָשׁ־נָא Gn 48:9, see § 61 g), *paragogic* form קַחְהָשׁ, &c. (but cf. also לָקַחְהָשׁ Ex 29:1, Ez 37:16, Pr 20:16, לָקַחְהָשׁ 1 K 17:11, perhaps a mistake for לָקַחְהָשׁ, cf. LXX and *Lucian*); *infinitive construct* קַחְהָשׁ (once קַחְהָשׁ 2 K 12:9, cf. § 93 h); with לְ, לְקַחְהָשׁ; with *suffix* קַחְהָשׁ; *Hophal* (cf., however, § 53 u) *imperfect* יָקַחוּהָשׁ; *Niph'al*, however, is always יָקַחוּהָשׁ.—The meaningless form קַחְהָשׁ Ez 17:5 is a mistake; for the equally meaningless קַחְהָשׁ Ho 11:3 read אֶקַּחְהָשׁ.

3. The verb נָתַן *to give*, mentioned above in d, is the only example of a verb פִּיץ with *imperfect* in ē (יָתַן for *yintēn*; יָתַן<sup>1</sup> only in Ju 16:5, elsewhere before *Maqqeph* יָתַן, &c.), and a corresponding *imperative* יָתַן or (very frequently) יָתַןְהָשׁ (but in Ps 8:2 the very strange reading יָתַןְהָשׁ is no doubt simply meant by the Masora to suggest יָתַןְהָשׁ); before *Maqqeph* יָתַןְהָשׁ, fem. יָתַןְהָשׁ, &c. Moreover, this very common verb has the peculiarity that its final *Nûn*, as a weak nasal, is also assimilated; יָתַןְהָשׁ for *nāthnti*, יָתַןְהָשׁ or, very frequently, יָתַןְהָשׁ, with a kind of orthographic compensation for the assimilated *Nûn* (cf. § 44 g); *Niph'al perfect* יָתַןְהָשׁ Lv 26:25, Ezr 9:7.

In the *infinitive construct Qal* the ground-form *tint* is not lengthened to *tēneth* (as יָתַןְהָשׁ from יָתַןְהָשׁ), but contracted to *titt*, which is then correctly lengthened to יָתַןְהָשׁ, with the omission of *Dageš forte* in the final consonant, see § 20 l; but with *suffixes* יָתַןְהָשׁ, &c.; before *Maqqeph* with the prefix לְ = יָתַןְהָשׁ, e.g. Ex 5:21, and even when closely connected by other means, e.g. יָתַןְהָשׁ Nu 20:21 and יָתַןְהָשׁ Gn 38:9; cf. § 69 m, note 2. On the other hand, for יָתַןְהָשׁ 1 K 6:19 read either יָתַןְהָשׁ or simply יָתַןְהָשׁ, just as the *Qéré*, 1 K 17:14, requires יָתַןְהָשׁ for יָתַןְהָשׁ.

In other stems, the נ is retained as the third radical, e.g. יָשַׁבְהָשׁ, cf. § 19 c and § 44 o. On the entirely anomalous aphaeresis of the *Nûn* with a strong vowel in יָשַׁבְהָשׁ (for יָשַׁבְהָשׁ) 2 S 22:41, cf. § 19 i.—On the *passive imperfect* יָשַׁבְהָשׁ, cf. § 53 u.

### § 67. Verbs עָרַב, e.g. סָבַב *to surround*.

1 <sup>1</sup>P. Haupt on Ju 16:5 in his Bible, compares the form of the Assyrian imperfect *iddan* or *ittan* (besides *inādin*, *ināmdin*) from *nadānu* = יָתַן. But could this one passage be the only trace left in Hebrew of an imperf. in *a* from יָתַן?

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 155 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 632 ff. B. Harper, 'The Participial formations of the Geminat 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 affirmatives, 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. סָבַב, סָבְבָה, סָ, סָבְבוּ, סָ, סָבְבוּ Gn 33:5 (but with suffix הַנִּי Gn ver. 11); sometimes with an evident distinction between transitive and intransitive forms, as צָרַר *to make strait*, צָר *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. הָלַל, שָׁדַד), and (b) as a rule, whenever the 2nd radical is followed or preceded by an essentially long vowel, as, in Qal, סָבַב, סָבְבוּ, in Pô□l and Pô□al, סוֹבַב, סוֹבְבוּ.

2. The biliteral stem always (except in *Hiph□l* and the *imperfect Niph□al*, 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. תָּמַח answering to קָטַח, תָּמַח to the ground-form *qāṭḥāt*, מָחַח to the ground-form *qāṭḥāt*; *infinitive*, חָטַח to סָחַח.

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. תָּמַח, סָחַח, not תָּמַח, סָחַח; but it appears again on the addition of affirmatives or suffixes, e.g. חָטַח, חָטַח, &c.

4. When the affirmative begins with a consonant (ג, 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 affirmative. In the *perfect* this vowel is ו, in the *imperative* and *imperfect* י, e.g. חָטַח, חָטַח, *imperfect*

---

<sup>1</sup> So (partly following Ewald and Boöttcher) 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.

הַסְבֵּי יָנָה (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.<sup>1</sup>

The *perfect* תָּמְנוּ (for תָּמּוּ) Nu 17:28, Ps 64:7 (Jer 44:18 תָּמְנוּ with *Silluq*), owing to omission of the separating vowel, approximates, if the text is right, to the form of verbs עָוּי (cf. קָוּי from קוּי).

5. Since the preformatives of the *imperfect Qal*, of the *perfect Niph<sup>al</sup>*, and of *Hiph<sup>al</sup>* and *Hoph<sup>al</sup>* 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<sup>al</sup>* יָסַב for *yā-sēb*, *imperative* הַסְבֵּה for *yā-sēb*, &c. Where the preformatives in the strong verb have *i*, either the original *ā* (from which the *i* was attenuated) is retained and lengthened, e.g. יָסַב in *imperfect Qal* for *yā-sōb*, or the *i* itself is lengthened to *ē*, e.g. הַסְבֵּה *perfect Hiph<sup>al</sup>* for *hū-sēb* (see further under h). The vowel thus lengthened can be maintained, however, only before the tone (except the *û* of the *Hoph<sup>al</sup>*, הַסְבֵּה for *hū-sāb*); when the tone is thrown forward it becomes *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*, according to § 27 k (under *š* and ה *compound Š<sup>e</sup>wā*), e.g. הַסְבֵּה, but תָּסַב יָנָה; *imperfect Hiph<sup>al</sup>* תָּסַב יָנָה; *perfect* תָּסַב יָנָה, &c.

Besides the ordinary form of the imperfects, there is another (common in *Aramaic*), in which the *imperfect Qal* is pronounced יָסַב or יָסַב, the *first* radical, not the second, being strengthened by *Dageš forte*, cf. יָשַׁב 1 K 9:8, &c.; Gn 24:26; with *a* in the second syllable, יָסַב Lv 11:7, יָסַב Is 17:4, &c.; יָסַב Is 2:9, &c.; יָסַב Am 5:13 and frequently, יָסַב Dt 9:21, &c.; יָסַב (*turn intrans.*) 1 S 5:8, &c.; יָסַב Lv 24:11, &c.; יָסַב Ez 47:12, &c.; יָסַב (with *Dageš forte implicitum*) 1 K 1:1; in the plural, יָסַבו Nu 14:35, &c. (in pause יָסַבו Ps 102:28); perhaps also יָסַבו (unless these forms are rather to be referred to *Niph<sup>al</sup>*, like יָסַבו 1 S 2:9; יָסַבו Jb 24:24); with suffix יָסַבו occurs (cf. § 10 h) in Nu 23:25; *Imperfect Hiph<sup>al</sup>* יָסַבו, *Hoph<sup>al</sup>* יָסַבו, &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 affirmatives or suffixes, so that even before these additions the second radical is not strengthened, e.g. יָסַבו Gn 43:28, &c., for יָסַבו and they bowed the head; יָסַבו and they beat down, Dt 1:44 (from יָסַבו); יָסַבו Dt 32:8; יָסַבו Ex 15:16, Jb 29:21 (cf., however, יָסַבו Ju 18:23, 1 S 5:8, יָסַבו Jer 46:5, Jb 4:20). To the same class of apparently strong formations belongs יָסַבו (without the separating vowel, for יָסַבו, 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<sup>al</sup>*, 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 פָּיַן, as P. Haupt has suggested to me in conversation.) But cf. Kautzsch, 'Die sog. aramaisierenden Formen der Verba ע"ע 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. יָסַב, but יָסַב and יָסַב, but יָסַב, but יָסַב and יָסַב).

<sup>1</sup> 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 לָיַה. We must, however, regard סְבוּתָה as formed on the analogy not of יָסַב, but (with P. Haupt) of a form גָּלוּתָה (= *gālautā*, cf. Arab. *gazauta*), while תָּסַב יָנָה follows the analogy of תָּגַל יָנָה. [See also Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, 229 f.]

and  $\text{יָגַר}$ ,  $\text{יָדַל}$  never  $\text{יָגַר}$ ,  $\text{יָדַל}$  &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*  $\text{יָסַב}$  for *yā-sōb* (cf. §§ 47 b, 63 b, and for verbs ע"ו § 72); (b) in the *perfect Niph*  $\text{יָסַב}$  for *nā-sāb* (§ 51 a); (c) in *Hoph*  $\text{יָסַב}$ , with irregular lengthening (no doubt on the analogy of verbs פ"ו) for *hōsāb* from *hū-sab*, imperfect  $\text{יָסַב}$  from *yū-sab*, &c.

On the other hand, an already attenuated vowel (*i*) underlies the intransitive *imperfects Qal* with  $\text{יָמַד}$  in the second syllable (probably for the sake of dissimilating the two vowels), e.g.  $\text{יָמַד}$  for *yi-mār* (see p); and in the preformative of *Hiph*  $\text{יָמַד}$  from *hi-sēb* (ground-form  $\text{יָמַד}$ , § 53 a), as well as of the participle  $\text{יָמַד}$  (ground-form  $\text{יָמַד}$ ), on the analogy of the perfect. In the second syllable of the Perf. the underlying vowel is *i*, attenuated from an original  $\text{יָמַד}$ , which in the strong verb is abnormally lengthened to  $\text{יָמַד}$  (§ 53 a). The lengthened from  $\text{יָמַד}$  is, of course, only tone-long, and hence when without the tone and before *Dageš forte* we have e.g.  $\text{יָמַד}$ . On the retention of the original  $\text{יָמַד}$  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 affirmatives  $\text{יָמַד}$ ,  $\text{יָמַד}$  and  $\text{יָמַד}$  (2nd *sing. fem. imperfect*); e.g. 3rd *sing. fem. perfect*  $\text{יָמַד}$ , in *pause*  $\text{יָמַד}$ ; with  $\text{יָמַד}$  and gutturals  $\text{יָמַד}$  (for  $\text{יָמַד}$ ),  $\text{יָמַד}$  Ps 44:26; on the other hand, with *wāw consecutive*  $\text{יָמַד}$  Is 6:12 (but  $\text{יָמַד}$  Ex 1:16). In the 3rd *plur. perfect* the tone-syllable varies; along with  $\text{יָמַד}$ ,  $\text{יָמַד}$ , we also find  $\text{יָמַד}$  and  $\text{יָמַד}$  Is 59:12,  $\text{יָמַד}$  Hb 3:6, &c.; but in *pause* always  $\text{יָמַד}$ ,  $\text{יָמַד}$ , &c. The tone likewise remains on the stem-syllable in the *imperfect Qal* in  $\text{יָמַד}$ ; *perfect Hiph*  $\text{יָמַד}$ ,  $\text{יָמַד}$ ; *imperfect*  $\text{יָמַד}$ ,  $\text{יָמַד}$  &c. In the forms with separating vowels, the tone is moved forward to these vowels (or to the final syllable, cf. ee), e.g.  $\text{יָמַד}$ ,  $\text{יָמַד}$ , &c.; except before the endings  $\text{יָמַד}$  and  $\text{יָמַד}$  in the *perfect*, which always bear the tone. This shifting of the tone naturally causes the shortening of the merely tone-long vowels  $\text{יָמַד}$  and  $\text{יָמַד}$  to  $\text{יָמַד}$  and  $\text{יָמַד}$  (or  $\text{יָמַד}$ , see n), hence  $\text{יָמַד}$  from  $\text{יָמַד}$ ,  $\text{יָמַד}$  from  $\text{יָמַד}$ ; on cases in which the vowel of the preformative becomes *S<sup>e</sup>wā*, see above, f

8. In several verbs ע"ע, instead of *Pi*  $\text{יָמַד}$ , *Pu*  $\text{יָמַד}$  and *Hithpa*  $\text{יָמַד}$ , the less frequent conjugation *Pō*  $\text{יָמַד}$ , with its passive and reflexive, occurs (most probably on the analogy of the corresponding forms of verbs ע"ו, cf. § 72 m), generally with the same meaning,<sup>1</sup> e.g.  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *ill-treat*, passive  $\text{יָמַד}$ , reflexive  $\text{יָמַד}$  (from  $\text{יָמַד}$ ; cf. the *Hithpō*  $\text{יָמַד}$  from  $\text{יָמַד}$  and  $\text{יָמַד}$  Is 24:19 f.); in a few verbs also *Pilpēl* (§ 55 f) is found, e.g.  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *roll*, *Hithpalpēl*  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *roll oneself* (from  $\text{יָמַד}$ ); imperative with suffix  $\text{יָמַד}$  *exalt her*, Pr 4:8;  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *comfort*, to *delight in*; passive  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *be caressed* (from  $\text{יָמַד}$ ). These forms cannot appear in a biliteral form any more than *Pi*  $\text{יָמַד}$ ,

<sup>1</sup> Sometimes both *Pi*  $\text{יָמַד}$  and *Pō*  $\text{יָמַד}$  are formed from the same stem, though with a difference of meaning, e.g.  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *break in pieces*,  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *oppress*;  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *make pleasing*,  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *have pity*;  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *turn*, to *change*,  $\text{יָמַד}$  to *go round*, to *encompass*.

*Pu*□*al*, and *Hithpa*□*ēl*; cf. עָנְעִים (Is 19:14) and קָנְקוּ (Is 18:2, 7).—For תִּתְבָּר 2 S 22:27 read, according to Ps 18:27, תִּתְבָּרָר.

## 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. מוּרָם *they are exalted*, Jb 24:24 to כָּמְרוּ בּוּרָם *they shot*, Gn 49:23 to רָבּוּ דוּרָם Is 1:6 to זָרָר. But this explanation is very doubtful: דוּרָם especially is rather to be classed among the passives of Qal mentioned in § 52 e.

2. *Imperfects 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 יָעַז, יָמַד, יָהַן (trans. *he breaks in pieces*, but יָרַע intrans. = *he is evil*); imperfects with *ā* 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 *Hōlēm* of the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect* (יָסַב, סָב) is only tone-long, and therefore, as a rule, is written defectively (with a few exceptions, chiefly in the later orthography, e.g. צוּר *bind up*, Is 8:16; גוּל Ps 37:5; דוּם ver. 7; לָבּוּז for לָבּוּז *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*, רָרָה (*rōn*) *to rejoice*, Jb 38:7; נָגַב Ju 11:18 (once even with *ū* in a toneless final syllable, נָגַב Ex 16:20); on the other hand, in the *plur.* בּוּרָם *fem.* נָגַבְתֶּם יָנָה, נָגַבְתֶּם יָנָה; (b) before a tone-bearing *affirmative* or *suffix*, e.g. *imperative 2nd sing. fem.* יָנָה (cf. ff); יָנָה *pity me*; קָלָהָ Jer 50:26; יָשָׁדָה Pr 11:3 *Q<sup>o</sup>rê*; הָהָה Ex 12:14 (for the defective writing, cf. יָסַבְהָ Jb 40:22). In יָהָהָ Gn 43:29, Is 30:19 (for יָהָהָ) this *ō* is thrown back to the preformative.

On the 2nd plur. fem. imperat. עָרָה *make yourselves naked* Is 32:11, cf. the analogous forms in § 48 i.—Quite abnormal is the *infinitive absolute* עָרָה Is 24:19 (as הָ follows, probably only a case of dittography for עָרָה, cf. קָבָה Nu 23:25 and שָׁלָה Ru 2:16); so also are the *imperatives* קָבָה־לִי Nu 22:11, 17, and אָרָה־לִי 22:6, 23:7, with הָ *paragogic*. We should expect קָבָה־הָ, אָרָה־הָ. If these forms are to be read *qōballi*, *ōralli*, they would be analogous to such cases as מָדַבְהָ (§ 90 i), the addition of the *paragogic* הָ causing no change in the form of the word (קָבָה like רָרָה 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* (קָבָה־לִי, &c.; cf. § 9 v). Still more surprising is קָבָהּ *curse him*, Nu 23:13, for קָבָהּ or קָבָהּ<sup>1</sup>.

3. Examples with *Pathā* in the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect* are בָּרָה (in לָבְרָה *to prove them*, Ec 3:18); רָה Is 45:1; שָׁךְ Jer 5:26; בָּשָׁגָם *in their error*, Gn 6:3 (so ed. Mant., but there is also good authority for בָּשָׁגָם, from שָׁ = שָׁ = אָשָׁר and גָּם also; so Baer and Ginsburg). Also גָּל *take away*, Ps 119:22; and the *imperfects* יָחַם *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*; יָרַךְ *it is soft*, Is 7:4; יָתַשׁ *it is*

<sup>1</sup> For נוּ as suffix of the 3rd person a parallel might be found in יָשָׁנוּ, § 100 o, and probably also in the *Nūn* of the Phoenician suffix נָם: cf. Barth, *ZDMG*. xli. p. 643, and the note on § 100 o.

*desolate*, Ez 12:19 (in *pause* תִּשָּׁשׁוּ Gn 47:19); לְתַקַּל *she was despised*, Gn 16:4 (but elsewhere in the *impf. consec.* with the tone on the penultima, e.g. וַיִּצָּר Gn 32:8, &c.; וַיִּרַע Gn 21:11, &c., cf. Ez 19:7); in the 1st *sing. imperfect* אֶתֶם<sup>2</sup> Ps 19:14, abnormally written fully for אַתֶּם, unless אַתֶּם is to be read, as in some MSS., on the analogy of the 3rd *sing. impf.*—In the *impf. Qal* of שָׁלַל the reading of Hb 2:8 varies between יִשָּׁל וְ (Baer, Ginsb.) and יִשָּׁל וְ (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 *Hiph*□*l* in the same sense: וַיִּגַּל Gn 29:10; וַיִּגַּן Is 31:5, &c.; וַיִּסַּךְ Ex 40:21, Ps 91:4, &c.; perhaps also וַיִּתְּצֵן 1 S 3:11 and וַיִּהַל Job 31:26, &c.; in accordance with this last form, וַיִּהַל (בְּ) Job 29:3 would also be an *infinitive Qal*, not *Hiph*□*l* (for וַיִּהַלּוּ (בְּ), as formerly explained below, under *w*). Finally the very peculiar form וַיִּתְּרַן Ju 9:53 may probably be added to the list.

Imperfects, with an original *u* in the second syllable, are also found with this *û* lengthened to *û* (instead of *ō*), e.g. וַיִּרוֹן, if the text is correct, in Pr 29:6; וַיִּשׁוּד Ps 91:6 (unless it be simply an imperfect from שׁוּד *to be powerful, to prevail*); וַיִּרְוֹץ (if from רְוֹץ *to be powerful, to prevail*) Is 42:4, &c. (also defectively וַיִּרְוֹץ Ps 18:30; but in Ec 12:6, according to Baer, וַיִּתְּרוֹץ); וַיִּתְּתֵם Ez 24:11 (on the sharpening of the ת cf. *g* above).<sup>3</sup>

A similar analogy with verbs ע״ו is soon in the infinitives לְבוֹר (בְּ) Ec 9:1; בְּהַקֵּוּ Pr 8:27 (cf. בְּהַקֵּוּ Pr 8:29) for בְּהַקֵּוּ, and in the *imperfect* שָׁךְ אֶמְשָׁךְ Gn 27:21. (The forms הַנּוֹת in Ps 77:10, שְׁמוֹת Ez 36:3, וְהִי הָל וְהִי Ps 77:11, formerly treated here as infinitives from ע״ע stems, are rather to be referred to ל״ה 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 וַיִּשְׁאַסֵּךְ for וַיִּשְׁסֹסֵךְ occurs in *K<sup>e</sup>thûbh*, Jer 30:16 (the *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* indicates a *participle* from שָׁסַךְ); וַיִּפְּרָה Pr 25:19 appears to be a contraction from וַיִּפְּרָה, *part. fem.* = *breaking in pieces*.

#### On Niph□al.

5. Besides the ordinary form of the *perfect* נָסַב with *Pathah* (in *pause* נָסַב) and the *participle* נֹסֵב with *Qameṣ* in the second syllable, there is also another with *Ṣere*, and a third with *Holem*, e.g. *perfect* נִמַּס *it melts*, Ez 21:12, 22:15; נֹסֵב (for נֹסֵבָה) Ez 26:2; *part.* נֹמֵס *molten*, 1 S 15:9, Na 2:11; נִקְלָה *it is a light thing*, 2 K 20:10, Is 49:6 (*perf.* נִקְלָה); with *ō*, e.g. וַיִּגְלוּ *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 ע״ו (from which König would also explain the *perfects* with *ō*), we find וַיִּתְּדֵךְ *thou shalt be brought to silence*, Jer 48:2 (unless this form should be referred to *Qal* with *Qimḥi*, Olshausen, König); וַיִּרְוֹץ *he suffers hurt*, Pr 11:15, 13:20; וַיִּתְּרוֹץ (for *tirrōṣ*) Ez 29:7; with *ē* in the second syllable וַיִּתְּתֵם *she profanes herself*, Lv 21:9, but וַיִּתְּתֵם Ez 22:26, and וַיִּתְּתֵם Is 48:11, Is 7:8, &c. For *infinitives*, cf. הִמַּס *to melt*, Ps 68:3 (as *inf. constr.*; 2 S 17:10 as *inf. absol.*); again, with compensatory lengthening in the first syllable, וַיִּתְּתֵם Ez 20:9, 14:22, but with suffix וַיִּתְּתֵם Lv 21:4; also וַיִּתְּתֵם *to be*

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> Also in Ez 6:6, instead of וַיִּתְּתֵם, which could only come from יִשָּׁם, יִתְּתֵם is intended, and וַיִּתְּתֵם in the same verse is probably only an error for וַיִּתְּתֵם.

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

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> According to Stade, *Grammatik*, § 95, Rem., the pronunciation with *û*, since it also appears in Neo-Punic [and in Western Syriac, see Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.*, § 48], was that of everyday life.

plundered, and הַבּוּק *to be emptied*, Is 24:3; in the *imperative*, only הִבְּרוּ *be ye clean*, Is 52:11. On מוּרָהּ *get you up*, Nu 17:10, and the corresponding *imperf.* יִרְמוּ Ez 10:17, &c., cf. **dd**.

Examples of the *perfect Niph<sup>al</sup>* with sharpening of the initial syllable are, נָחַל *it is profaned*, Ez 22:16, 25:3 (from חָלַל); נָחַר (from חָרַר Ps 69:4, 102:4 (also נָחַר Jer 6:29); נָחַת *fractus est* (from חָתַת Mal 2:5; cf. with this in the *participle*, נָחַתִּים (for *niḥḥāmîm*) Is 57:5, and נָחַתִּים Mal 3:9: in the *imperative* and *infinitive Niph<sup>al</sup>* 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* נִשְׁעָהּ Mic 2:4 is abnormal.

#### On Hiph<sup>al</sup> and Hoph<sup>al</sup>.

6. The second syllable in *Hiph<sup>al</sup>* sometimes has *Pathaḥ* instead of *Sere*, especially under the influence of ר and the gutturals, e.g. *perfect* הִמַּר *he made bitter*, הִשָּׁח *he bowed*, הִפַּר *he hath broken*, Gn 17:14, in *pause*, cf. § 29 q; otherwise הִפַּר, *plur.* הִפְרוּ Is 24:5. In הִפְרוּ Ps 33:10, Ez 17:19, cf. Ps 89:34, and in הִשְׁפִּירוּ Ho 8:4 (perhaps also in הִיִּתְּנוּ Hab 2:17, but cf. § 20 n) there is an assimilation to the corresponding forms of verbs ע"ו, see z. Also הִצַּר Dt 28:52, (in *pause*) Is 18:5; *inf.* לְהַבֵּר *to cleanse*, Jer 4:11, in *pause*. But also with other consonants, e.g. הִדַּק 2 K 23:15, הִקַּל Is 8:23; הִרַךְ Jb 23:16; *plur.* הִסְבוּ 1 S 5:9, 10 (and so usually in the 3rd *plur. perf.*, except before ר and gutturals, e.g. הִהַרְעוּ); *imper.* הִשְׁעוּ *besmear*, Is 6:10; *plur.* הִשְׁמוּ *be astonished*, Jb 21:5; *imperfect* תִּפְרַע *Thou dost afflict*; *part.* מִצַּל (on *ē* in the first syllable, see under i) *shadowing*, Ez 31:3 (but מִסִּידָהּ Ju 3:24 is assimilated to the form of verbs ע"ו, unless, with Moore, we simply read מִסִּידָהּ, or, with incorrect spelling, מִסִּידָהּ. So in the *imperative* הִמְיִשׁוּ Ju 16:26 *Q<sup>erē</sup>*, and in the *infinitive* הִתְּמַךְ is 33:1).

The *ē* of the second syllable, when without the tone, may become *ě*, e.g. הִתְּלַבֵּי Gn 31:7 (see also x). It is unusual (cf. § 53 k) to find the *ē* written fully as in the *infinitive* לְהַפְּיִר Zc 11:10. Instead of *Haṭeph-Pathaḥ* a *Haṭeph-S<sup>g</sup>hōl* is found under the preformative in הִקַּלְתָּ 2 S 19:44, and a *Pathaḥ* occurs before ה (with a virtual sharpening of the ה) in such forms as הִתְּחַתְּ Is 9:3; cf. Gn 11:6, Dt 2:31, 3:24, 1 S 22:15, Est 6:13—in all these cases before ה.—On בְּהִלּוֹ Jb 29:3, see above, p; on וְהִתְּתַיִ Jer 49:37, see below, **dd**.

7. In the *imperfect consecutive* of verbs whose second radical is a guttural, *ā* is retained (§ 22 d) in the second syllable instead of *ě*, e.g. וְיִרְעוּ 1 K 16:25: so also with ר, as וְיִצַּר 2 Ch 28:20, Dt 2:9—but cf. also וְיִפְרַח Neh 4:9.

8. Aramaizing forms (but cf. Rem. § 67 g) in *Hiph<sup>al</sup>* and *Hoph<sup>al</sup>* are, וְיִסַּב Ex 13:18, &c.; cf. Ju. 18:23; אֶל־תִּמְרוּ Ex 23:21, but read אֶל־תִּמְרוּ from מִרְחָהּ Dt 1:44 (cf. Nu 14:45), but וְיִסַּבּוּ Ju 18:23, 1 S 5:8, 2 Ch 29:6; אֶחָל *profanabo*, Ez 39:7; תִּתַּסּ Jb 22:3; without elision of the ה (cf. § 53 q), וְיִתְּחַל 1 K 18:27, but יִתְּחַל לוֹ Jer 9:4, יִתְּחַל לוֹ Jb 13:9; with *i* in the second syllable יִשְׁיִים Jer 49:20, 50:45; cf. וְיִנְשִׂים Nu 21:30; in the *perfect* הִזִּי לְוִיָּהּ La 1:8. In *Hoph<sup>al</sup>*, הִמְכּוּ *they are brought low*, Jb 24:21; יִפְּתָהּ *he is smitten*, Is 24:12 (*plur.* יִפְּתוּ Jer 46:5, Mi 1:7); in *pause*, יִתְּקוּ Jb 19:23, but also יִפְּתוּ Jb 4:20 (so Baer, Ginsb., but ed. Mant., Jabl. יִפְּתוּ); with *ō* in the initial syllable, הִשְׁמָהּ (*infinitive with suffix* = הִשְׁמָהּ, cf. § 91 e) Lv 26:34 f., cf. 2 Ch 36:21; בְּהִשְׁמָהּ, with irregular syncope for בְּהִשְׁמָהּ, Lv 26:43.

#### In General.

9. Verbs ע"ע are most closely related as regards inflexion to verbs ע"י (§ 72). The form of verbs ע"ע is generally the shorter (cf. e.g. יָקוּם and יָקוּם, יָקוּם and יָקוּם); in a few cases, however, the two classes exactly coincide, e.g. in the *imperfect Qal* and *Hiphil* with *wāw consecutive*, in *Hophal* 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 affirmative or with an affirmative beginning with a vowel) of transitive verbs, or verbs, at any rate, expressing action, e.g. סָבַב, סָבַב, סָבַב (but before a suffix also וָנִי, as well as וָנִי, וָנִי &c.); אָפַפּוּ, אָפַפּוּ, אָפַפּוּ, &c. Sometimes the contracted, as well as the uncontracted form, is found, e.g. בָּזַז *to plunder, plur.* בָּזְזוּ; in other parts, only בָּזַז *Dt 2:35*, as well as בָּזַז *Dt 3:7*; זָמַתִּי *Zc 8:14, 15* and זָמַתִּי *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 יָהֲחִתֶּתִי *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. דָּק *Dt 9:21* (*Ex 32:20* דָּק; elsewhere always a transitive verb); חָתָה, *fem.* חָתָה; מָרָה, *fem.* מָרָה (for *marrā*); צָרָה, *fem.* צָרָה (cf. וָרָה *Ez 24:11*); שָׁחָה, *fem.* שָׁחָה &c.; *plur.* חָתוּ, חָתוּ &c. (but on the tone, cf. *ee* below). Exception, עָשָׂה *Ps 6:8*.

The intransitive but developed perfects לָלוּ (also לָלוּ), לָלוּ (also לָלוּ), (in *pause* לָלוּ), לָלוּ, לָלוּ, לָלוּ, לָלוּ, (also לָלוּ), almost all have, as Mayer Lambert observes, at least an active, not a stative meaning. Triliteral forms of the *infinitive* after לָ are לָלוּ *Nu 21:4*; לָלוּ *Jer 47:4*; לָלוּ *Gn 31:19* (also לָלוּ *Gn 38:13*); cf. also לָלוּ *Is 47:14*, in *subordinate pause*, for לָלוּ; with *suffix* לָלוּ *Is 30:18*, and, from the same form לָלוּ, with retraction and modification of the vowel, לָלוּ *Ps 102:14*; also לָלוּ *Is 60:14*; לָלוּ *1 S 25:2*; לָלוּ *Is 10:18*; לָלוּ *Pr 8:28*; לָלוּ *Pr 26:8*.—*Imperative* לָלוּ *Jer 49:28* (cf. § 20 b, and *ibid.* also on לָלוּ *Ps 9:14*); in the *imperfect*, לָלוּ *Na 3:7* (*Ps 68:13*; cf. *Gn 31:40*) from לָלוּ; the strong form here, after the assimilation of the *Nūn*, was unavoidable. On the other hand, לָלוּ *Jer 5:6* is anomalous for לָלוּ (*Pr 11:3 Q<sup>erē</sup>*; the eastern school read the *Po<sup>el</sup>* in the *Kethibh*); the strengthening of the second radical has been afterwards resolved by the insertion of a *vocal Šwā*. Cf. also לָלוּ *Am 5:15* (elsewhere לָלוּ). In *Niphil*, the triliteral form לָלוּ is found, *Jb 11:12*; in *Hiphil*, all the forms of לָלוּ, thus *imperative* לָלוּ, *imperfect* לָלוּ; *infinitive* לָלוּ *Mi 6:13*; *participle* לָלוּ *Ez 3:15*. That the developed (triliteral) forms possess a certain emphasis is seen from their frequent use in *pause*, as in *Ps 118:11* after a biliteral form (סָבַב וָנִי).

11. The above-mentioned (see *g*) neglect of the strengthening in aramaizing forms, such as לָלוּ and the like, occurs elsewhere tolerably often; in the *perfect Qal* לָלוּ for לָלוּ *Nu 17:28* (*Jer 44:18*; cf. above, *e*); *imperfect* לָלוּ *1 S 14:36* (*parag.* without any influence on the form, cf. *o*); even with the firm vowel reduced to *vocal Šwā*; לָלוּ *Gn 11:7* for לָלוּ (cohortative from לָלוּ); לָלוּ *ibid. ver. 6*, *they purpose*; following the analogy of verbs ע"י (see above, *r*); from *intransitive imperfects Qal*, לָלוּ *Is 49:19* (*plur. masc. Jb 18:7*); לָלוּ *Neh 2:3*; also לָלוּ *Ez 6:6* (for which read לָלוּ=לָלוּ) might be explained in the same way.—*Perfect Niphil* לָלוּ for לָלוּ *Ez 41:7*; לָלוּ *Ju 5:5* for לָלוּ; לָלוּ for לָלוּ *Gn 17:11* (as if from לָלוּ not לָלוּ to *circumcise*), cf. *Is 19:3*, *Jer 8:14*; *imperfect* לָלוּ *Zc 14:12*; *participle* לָלוּ, cf. *u*. So also לָלוּ *1 S 13:11*, לָלוּ *Gn 9:19* (cf. *Is 33:3*), are perfects

*Niph*□*al* from פָּצַץ (= פָּרַץ), not *Qal* from נָפַץ.—In *Hiph*□*il* הִתְלַתְּ לָתֶּ (for הִתְלַתְּ לָתֶּ) Ju 16:10 (2 S 15:34); הִעָּזָה for הִעָּזָה Pr 7:13 (cf. Ct 6:11, 7:13).

No less irregular is the suppression of the vowel of the stem-syllable in לְהִפְרֹקֶם Lv 26:15.—On the perfect הִלִּי Pr 26:7, cf. § 75 u.

12. Cases in which the tone is thrown forward on the affirmatives (see **k**) are (a) in the *perfect*, the 1st *sing.* regularly (but cf. הִצִּירְתִּי Jer 10:18 before לְהִקְדֹּם) after *consec.*, Ex 33:19, 22, 2 K 19:34, &c., also Is 44:16 (before הַמִּוֹתֵי); Ps 92:11 (but the text is certainly corrupt; see the Lexicon), 116:6, perhaps also Jb 19:17, וְהִנֵּנִי תִי (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.* וְקִצְצֹתָּהּ (before א) Dt 25:12; in the 3rd *plural*, רַבּוּ *multi sunt*, Ps 3:2, 104:24, Jer 5:6, 1 S 25:10; רַבּוּ *they are soft*, Ps 55:22 וְקָלוּ *they are swift*, Jer 4:13, Hb 1:8; וְזָכוּ *they are pure*, Jb 15:15, 25:5, La 4:7; וְשָׁחוּ *they did bow*, Hb 3:6; וְהָרָוּ *they are burned*, Is 24:6. A by form of שָׁחוּ (עִי, cf. § 72 dd) is וְשָׁחוּ Ps 49:15, 73:9.

(b) In the *imperative* (a command in an emphatic tone) וְרַבֵּי *sing*, Is 54:1, Zp 3:14, Zc 2:14; וְרַבּוּ Is 44:23, 49:13, Jer 31:7 (but וְרַבֵּי *lament*, La 2:19), וְהִקְדֵּם *keep (thy feasts)*, Na 2:1, Jer 7:29; וְעִזָּה (= עִזָּה) before א, Ps 68:29. On the retention of the short vowels *ũ* (*ô*) and *i* before *Dageš forte*, in place of the tone-long *ō* and *ē*, see above, **k**; on the change of the vowel of the preformative into *š<sup>e</sup>w*□, when it no longer stands before the tone, see **g**.

#### THE WEAKEST VERBS (*Verba Quiescentia*).

##### § 68. Verbs פִּי"א e.g. אָכַל *to eat*.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 140 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 589 ff.

So far as א retains its full consonantal value as a guttural, these verbs share all the peculiarities of verbs *primae gutturalis*, mentioned in § 63. They are, however, to be treated as *weak* verbs, when the א 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. אָבַד *to perish*, אָבָה *to be willing*, אָכַל *to eat*, אָמַד *to say*, אָפָה *to bake*) regularly make the א quiesce in a long *ô*, e.g. יֹאכַל.<sup>1</sup> In a few others the ordinary (strong) form is also in use, as יֹאחֵז (18 times) and יֹאחֶז (3 times) *he takes hold*; יֹסֵף (see h), also יֹסֵף, *he collects*. This *ô* has primarily arisen from an obscuring of *ô* (§ 9 q), and the *â* from אָ, the weak consonant א coalescing with *â* to *â*; cf. § 23 a.

In the second syllable *ō* (for original *ũ*) never appears, but either *ē*<sup>2</sup> or *ǎ*; and in *pause* almost always *ē*, even before the tone-bearing *heavy* affirmative וְ, e.g. וְיֹאכַל.

<sup>1</sup> So in the modern vulgar Arabic of South Palestine, *yakul* (*he eats*) becomes *yôkul*.  
<sup>2</sup> On this *ē* (originally *i*□) as a dissimilation from *ō* (originally *ũ*), 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 *u* in the *imperfect* of אָכַל is



and even *plene* אומר Neh 2:7, &c., אומרה Ps 42:10. In the other cases, also, where the *æ* 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 אָסַף, as אָסַף תּוֹסַף for אָסַף תּוֹסַף Ps 104:29; אָסַף נִי 2 S 6:1 (but for אָסַף Jb 27:19 read אָסַף יוֹסַף=יֹסַף with the LXX); cf. also in the 1st pers. אָסַף מִי 1 S 15:6, which is apparently (from the *Metheg* with the *i*), intended for an *imperfect Hiph* אָסַף: instead of it, however, read, with the Mantua edition, אָסַף אָסַף (with *i*, according to § 60 f). But אָסַף תּוֹסַף Ex 5:7 (for אָסַף תּוֹסַף), אָסַף נִי 1 S 18:29 (for אָסַף נִי), and אָסַף Jb 27:19 (see above) are due to a mistake, since all three forms must be derived from the stem אָסַף. Furthermore, אָסַף נִי Ps 139:20 (where certainly אָסַף is to be read); אָסַף תּוֹסַף Pr 1:10 (cf. § 75 hh); אָסַף נִי 1 S 28:24; אָסַף נִי Ez 42:5; אָסַף תּוֹסַף 2 S 19:14; אָסַף נִי 2 S 20:9; אָסַף תּוֹסַף thou gaddest about (from אָסַף), Jer 2:36; אָסַף נִי Dt 33:21 (for אָסַף תּוֹסַף), according to other readings (on the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 75 p) אָסַף תּוֹסַף or אָסַף תּוֹסַף.

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* אָסַף Nu 32:30, Jos 22:9; *Hiph.* אָסַף Nu 11:25 (but the statement in verse 17 is אָסַף, therefore *Qal*); equally doubtful is the punctuation of אָסַף נִי (for אָסַף נִי?) and he laid wait, 1 S 15:5, and אָסַף I listen, Jb 32:11 (on the analogy of verbs אָסַף); cf. also אָסַף (ô from â) I give to eat, Hos 11:4; אָסַף (ô from â) I will destroy, Jer 46:8; אָסַף נִי 2 S 20:5 *Q<sup>re</sup>* (for אָסַף); the *K<sup>e</sup>thûbh* appears to require the *Pi* אָסַף, from אָסַף as a secondary form of אָסַף; but אָסַף=אָסַף for אָסַף as *imperfect Qal* is not impossible. On אָסַף Neh 13:13, cf. § 53 n.—*Infinitive* אָסַף Ez 21:33 (=אָסַף unless it is rather *infin. Hiph.* from אָסַף); *Participle* אָסַף Pr 17:4 (clearly by false analogy of verbs אָסַף, for אָסַף); *Imperative* אָסַף Jer 12:9 (from אָסַף). (On the same form used for the *perfect* in Is 21:14, cf. § 76 d.)

2. In the *Pi* אָסַף the *æ* is sometimes elided (like ה in אָסַף), thus אָסַף (as in Aramaic and Samaritan) *teaching*, for אָסַף Jb 35:11; אָסַף (if not a mere scribal error) for אָסַף Is 13:20; אָסַף thou hast girded me, 2 S 22:40, for אָסַף as Ps 18:40; אָסַף Ez 28:16; cf. § 23 c.

### § 69. Verbs אָסַף. First Class, or Verbs originally אָסַף, e.g. אָסַף 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. אָסַף 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 *Yādh* to the following consonant on the analogy of the *Nūn* in verbs פ"ו (see § 71).

With regard to verbs פ"ו (i.e. פ"ו 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 *Yōdh*. The complete rejection (or *elision*) takes place regularly in eight verbs (see h) in the following manner:

A. *Imperfect* יִשָּׁב, יִדַּע with an unchangeable<sup>1</sup> *Šere* in the first syllable and original *i* in the second, which in the tone-syllable (according to § 27 c) becomes  $\bar{e}$  (thus יִלֵּד, יִצָּא, יִרָד, יִלָּךְ, see x), or, under the influence of a guttural, with  $\check{a}$  in the second (יִדַּע, יִקַּע, יִחַד).

The tone-long  $\bar{e}$  of the second syllable is of course liable to be shortened or to become  $\check{e}wā$ , e.g. יִשָּׁב, יִשָּׁבוּ, &c.; in the same way  $\check{a}$  becomes  $\check{e}wā$  in such cases as יִדַּע, &c., but is lengthened to *Qameṣ* in *pause* (יִדַּעַ) and before suffixes (יִדַּעַם).

B. *Imperative* שָׁב with *aphaeresis* of the *Wāw* and with tone-long  $\bar{e}$ , from *i*, as in the *imperfect*.

C. *Infinitive* שָׁבַת from original *šibh*, by addition of the feminine ending (ת) lengthened to a *segholate* form; as in verbs פ"ו (cf. § 66 b) this lengthening affords a certain compensation for loss of the initial consonant.

Rem. Since the infinitives יִדַּעַ, יִלָּדַת (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 שָׁבַת, &c., the ground-form *šibt* (which, therefore, reappears in שָׁבַתִּי, &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 פ"ו the original *Wāw* in the above-mentioned forms gives place to *Yōdh*, which, unless it suffers *aphaeresis* (see f), appears:—

in the *imperatives* יִצָּק, יִרָץ and *infinitives* יִסָּד, יִרָא, as a strong consonant, but

in the *imperfect* יִירָשׁ, properly *yiyraš*, merges with the preceding *i* into *i*.

---

<sup>1</sup> The *e* of the first syllable is really  $\hat{e}$ , not tone-long  $\bar{e}$ , since it is retained not merely before the tone, and in the counter-tone (e.g. יִדַּעַ Ho 14:10), but also in יִדַּעַ Ex 33:13, 17. It is no objection to this view that the *scriptio plena* of this  $\hat{e}$  occurs (with the exception of יִיקַר Ps 72:14, elsewhere pointed יִיקַר) only in Mi 1:8 and Ez 35:9 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*; in Ps 138:6 the Masora prefers to point יִידַּעַ.—Of the various explanations of the  $\hat{e}$  the most satisfactory is that of Philippi (*ZDMG.* xl. p. 653) that an original *yāh□d*, 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  $\hat{e}$  instead of  $\bar{e}$ ) to a trilateral form.

In the second syllable *imperfects* of this form regularly have *ǎ*.

(a) That the latter forms are derived from verbs with an original *Wāw* (not *Yôdh*) is shown partly by the inflexion of these verbs in *Niph*□*al*, *Hiph*□*u*□*l*, and *Hoph*□*al* (where the original *Wāw* reappears throughout), and partly by the Arabic, in which verbs פ"ו likewise exhibit a twofold formation; cf. *wālādā*, imperf. *yālīđu*, with elision of the *Wāw*, and *wāǧūǎ*, *yaūǧalu*, with retention of the *Wāw*.

(b) Sometimes both forms, the weaker and the stronger, occur in the same verb; cf. זק 2 K 4:41 and יצ'ק pour, Ez 24:3 (cf. יצקו 1 K 18:34 and the *infin.* יקו Ex 38:27); רש take possession, Dt 1:21, 1 K 21:15 (but cf. s), רש (in *pause* for רש) Dt 2:24, 31; plur. רשו Dt 1:8, 9:23, but also, with ה־ה *paragogic*, ירשה Dt 33:23. In the *imperfect* ייקר Dt 32:22 and יקר Is 10:16 *it shall be kindled*; ייקר *it was precious*, 1 S 18:30 and יקר Ps 49:9 (cf. ייקר Ps 72:14).— The form יקמו Gn 30:39, for יקמו, beside יקמו verse 38, is remarkable; cf. § 47 k.

(c) On ירד Ju 19:11 for ירד and ישוב Jer 42:10 for the *infinitive absolute* ישוב, cf. § 19 i.— But ירד Ju 5:13 (twice) is not intended by the Masora either as *perfect* (for ירד, which really should be restored) or as *imperative* of ירד, but as an apocopated *imperfect Pi*□*el* from ירדה (=ירדה) *to have dominion*.

(d) The eight verbs,<sup>1</sup> of which the initial consonant in the above-mentioned forms always suffers elision or aphaeresis, are ילד *to bring forth*, יצא *to go forth*, ישב *to sit, to dwell*, ירד *to descend*, also ילך *to go* (cf. below, x); and with *ǎ* in the second syllable of the *imperfect*, ידע *to know*, יחד *to be united*, יקע *to be dislocated*. Examples of the other formation (יירש, &c.) are יעף *to be wearied*, יעץ *to counsel*, ישן *to sleep*, ירא (*imperfect* יירא, *imperative* ירה) *to fear*.

2. The original *Wāw* is retained as a firm consonant: (a) in the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect Niph*□*al*, being protected by the strengthening, e.g. הנישב, הנישב, which are consequently strong forms like הקטל, הקטל; (b) in the *Hithpa*□*el* of some verbs, e.g. התנדע from ינדע, התנפח from ינפח, התנודה from ינדה; otherwise a radical *Wāw* at the beginning of a word is now found only in a few nouns, e.g. וילד *offspring* from ילד *to bear*. At the end of a syllable *Wāw* with the homogeneous vowel *ǔ* coalesces into *ǔ*; so throughout *Hoph*□*al*, e.g. הושב for *hūwšabh*; but with a preceding *a* the *Wāw* is contracted into *ô* (i); so in the *perfect* and *participle Niph*□*al* and throughout *Hiph*□*u*□*l*, e.g. נושב from an original *nāwšābh*, הושב from an original *hāwšābh*.

The first radical always appears as *Yôdh* in the *perfect* and *participle Qal*, ישב, &c., ישוב, ישוב, even when ן precedes, e.g. וישב (but וישב, according to § 24 b), also throughout *Pi*□*el* and *Pu*□*al*, e.g. יחל *to wait*, ילד *to be born*, and in the *imperfect* and *participle* יחל מידע, יחל *known* (from ידע), and, as a rule, also in *Hithpa*□*el*, e.g. התילד, התניב (as against התנדע, &c., with *Wāw*).

---

<sup>1</sup> A ninth יסף *to add*, is also to be included. In the *Mēša*□-inscription, l. 21, the *infinitive* is written לספת (cf. יספתי, l. 29); hence read in Is 30:1 (Nu 32:14, Dt 29:18) פת□ס for ספות. The 2nd *plur. masc. imperative* ספו Is 29:1, Jer 7:21 corresponds to שבו; thus in proof of a supposed ספה *addere*, there remains only אספה Dt 32:23, for which, according to 2 S 12:8, read אספה.

The beginner may recognize verbs פִּי׳ in the *imperfect Qal* partly by the *Sere* under the preformatives; in *Niph*□*al* and *Hiph*□*al* by the *Wāw* (ו, ו) before the second radical. (The defective writing, as in ה' לִיד, is rare.) Verbs פִּי׳ have forms like שָׁב (דַּע), שָׁבַת, in common with verbs פִּי׳. Similarly *Hoph*□*al* has the same form as in verbs עִי׳ and עִי׳.

Rem. 1. The *infinitive Qal* of the weaker form (שָׁבַת, ground-form *šibt*, רָשַׁת; cf. above, c) with suffixes is pointed as שָׁבַתִּי, <sup>1</sup> רָשַׁתִּי (the strong form only in לִירְשֵׁנוּ **Ju 14:15**). The masculine form is very rare, e.g. דָּע *to know*, **Jb 32:6, 10**, as also the feminine ending הָ, e.g. דָּעָה **Ex 2:4**, לָדָה **Is 37:3** (2 **K 19:3**); **Jer 13:21**, **Ho 9:11**; מָרְדָה, <sup>2</sup> *to descend*, **Gn 46:3**, where the change of the *ē* into vocal *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā* is to be explained, with König, from its position between the principal and secondary tone. From דָּע, under the influence of the guttural, דָּעַ is formed, with *suff.* דָּעַתִּי, &c.; but from יצא, יצאת. From יָרַד there occurs in **Ps 30:4** in *Q<sup>re</sup>re* מְיָרְדִי (the *K<sup>eth</sup>* requires מְיָרְדִי) a very remarkable case of the strong form (for מְרָדִי). For לַת **1 S 4:19** (generally explained as a case of assimilation of ד to ת in the supposed ground-form *ladt*; according to Mayer Lambert pausal of לַת=*lidt*, see above, c) read simply לַת.

Examples of the strong form of the *infinitive* are יָרַא *to fear*, **Jos 22:25**, with preposition דִּי **Is 51:16** (but **2 Ch 31:7** according to Ben Naphtali לִיִּסִי, where the י is only retained orthographically, but is really assimilated to the ס; the reading of Ben Asher, לִיִּסִי, accepted by Baer, is meaningless); לִישׁוֹן **Ec 5:11**; לָרָא **1 S 18:29** is irregular, but probably לָרָא (for לָרָא) is intended. With *suff.* בְּיָסְדִי **Jb 38:4**, cf. **Ju 14:15**, **Ezr 3:12**; with *fem.* לָתֵּן *to be able*, **Nu 14:16**. On יָבֵשׁ, which is likewise usually referred to this class, cf. the note on § 70 a.

2. The *imperative Qal* frequently has the lengthening by הָ, e.g. שִׁבְתָּ *sit thou*, יָרַדְתָּ *descend thou*. From יָתַתְּ *to give*, Arab. *wāhābā*, only the *imperative* is used in Hebrew; it has the form יָתַתְּ *give*, lengthened יָתַתְּ generally with the meaning *age, go to*, hence in **Gn 11:3, 4** even addressed to several persons (**Gn 29:21** יָתַתְּ before אֵל to avoid the hiatus); *fem.* יָתַתְּ **Ru 3:15**, *Milra*□ on the analogy of the plural יָתַתְּ (once in **Jb 6:22** יָתַתְּ before the tone-syllable; but cf. **Dt 32:3**), whilst, on the analogy of other *imperatives Qal* of verbs פִּי׳, יָתַתְּ, יָתַתְּ would be expected.—On דָּעָה **Pr 24:14**, cf. § 48 1.

3. The *imperfect* with ו elided takes *ā* in the second syllable, besides the cases mentioned above (under f), also in תָּרַד **Jer 13:17** (cf. **La 3:48**) and in the pausal form יָלַךְ **Jb 27:21**, &c. (from הִלַךְ, see x); on יָקַד **Is 10:16** see above, f. The *ā* in the second syllable, when followed by the affirmative הָ (תָּרַדְתָּ &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 *S<sup>e</sup>ghōl*, when the tone is drawn back (before a tone-syllable or after *wāw* consecutive), e.g. יָשָׁבְנָא **Gn 44:33**; יָשָׁב, יָשָׁב; but *ē* is retained in an open syllable, even with *Mil*□*el*-tone, in יָצָא **Ex 16:29**, **Ju 9:39**, in both cases with *nasog aħor*, § 29 e. The *pausal* is either of the form יָשָׁב **Ru 4:1** or יָשָׁב **Ps 18:10**; the 1st pers. sing., whether in or out of pause, is יָשָׁב, יָשָׁב, &c., except יָשָׁב **Jb 19:10**, see x.—For יָיַד **Ps 138:6** (cf. the note above, on b and the analogous cases in § 70 d) יָיַד is intended.

1 <sup>1</sup> יָשָׁבְתִי **Ps 23:6** can hardly be intended for an *infin.* with suffix from יָשָׁב, but rather for a *perf. consec.* from יָשָׁב; but read יָשָׁבְתִי.

2 <sup>2</sup> The infinitives דָּעָה and יָרַדְתָּ belong to the source marked E (Dillmann's B) in the modern criticism of the Pentateuch. The same document also has יָתַתְּ *to give*, for יָתַתְּ; יָלַךְ *to go*, for יָלַךְ; and יָעָשָׂה *to make*, for יָעָשָׂה. See Dillmann, *Die BB. Num., Deut., Jos.*, p. 618.

The *imperfect* of the form יִרְשׁ is frequently (especially before affirmatives) written defectively, in which case the *i* can always be recognized as a long vowel by the *Metheg* (see § 16 f), e.g. יִרְשׁוּ Is 40:30, יִרְשׁוּ Is 65:23; and so always יִרְאוּ *they fear*, as distinguished from יִרְאוּ *they see* (*imperf. Qal* of רָאָה).—On יִשְׂעוּ Gn 50:26, 24:33 *Keth*, and יִסְכּוּ Ex 30:32, see § 73 f.

From יִכַּל *to prevail, to be able*, the *imperfect Qal* is יִכַּל, which can only have arisen through a depression of the vowel from יִכַּל (ground-form *yaukhal*=*yawkhal*), to distinguish it, according to Qimḥi, from אִכַּל, just as, according to § 47 b, אִקַּט is differentiated from יִקַּט. Cf. the Arabic *yauru*□*u* (*yôru*□*u*) from *waru*□*a*, *yauǧalu* (*yôǧalu*) from *waǧila*, as also the vulgar Arabic (among towns-people) *yûṣal*, &c., from *waṣala*. Others regard יִכַּל as an *imperfect Hoph*□*al* (*he is enabled*=*he can*), always used instead of the *imperfect Qal*; cf., however, § 53 u.—יִתְרוֹק, לִי occurs in Jer 3:5 as 2nd *sing. fem.* for יִתְרוֹק, according to König because the 2nd *fem.* had been sufficiently indicated previously.—Further יִרְהַ or יִרְהָ is to be regarded with M. Lambert (*REJ.* xxxvii, no. 73) as *impf. Qal* (not *Hiph*□*il*) of יִרְהַ *to throw, shoot* (the supposed *impf. Qal* of יִרְהַ 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 Hiph*□*il*).

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 פִּי in a few forms of יָלַד Nu 11:12, Jer 2:27, Ps 2:7, &c. (always after ׀), as well as of יָרַשׁ, e.g. יָרַשׁוּם, &c., Dt 4:1, 8:1, 17:14, 19:1, 26:1, 31:3 (always after ׀ for ׀). In both cases the attenuation might be explained from the tendency to assimilate the vowels, especially if the initial ׀ was pronounced, as in Syriac, like *i* (§ 47 b). In the case of יָרַשׁ, however, a secondary form יִרְשׁ (cf. § 44 d) is probably to be assumed, since in Arabic also the verb is *wāriṣā*. The forms יִרְשׁוּ Ez 36:12 and יִרְשׁוּ Ps 69:36, &c., are most simply explained from the return of this *i*.

5. As an exception, the *imperfect Niph*□*al* sometimes has a *i* instead of the ׀, e.g. יִיָּהַל *and he stayed*, Gn 8:12 (unless the *Pi*□*ēl* or יִיָּהַל, as in ver. 10, is to be read), cf. Ex 19:13; 1 S 13:8 *Kethibh*.—The first person always has the form אִיָּשָׁב, not אָשָׁב, cf. § 51 p.—In the *participle* the plural בּוֹיָה (from יָהַ, with depression of *ō* to *ū*, 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* בּוֹלְדוּ *null<sup>e</sup>dhū*, 1 Ch 3:5, 20:8, for בּוֹלְדוּ which appears to be required by the *wāw* in the initial syllable.

6. In the *imperfect Pi*□*ēl* elision of the first radical (׀) sometimes takes place after *wāw consec.* (as in the case of אָ, § 68 k), e.g. בָּיָהַ for בּוֹיָהַ *and he has grieved*, La 3:33, בָּיָדוּ for בּוֹיָדוּ *and they have cast*, verse 53, from יָדָה, which may also be a true verb פִּי (on the other hand, in יָדוּ גוֹרְלָהּ *they have east lots*, Jo 4:3, Ob<sup>11</sup>, Na 3:10, a *perfect Qal* of יָדָה is required by the context; but as this, being a *transitive perfect*, ought to have the form יָדָהּ according to § 67 a, perhaps we should read יָדוּ). So from a verb פִּי, of the second class, הִיבֵשׁוּ for הִיבֵשׁוּ *and he made it dry*, Na 1:4; cf. הִיבֵשׁוּ 2 Ch 32:30 *Qere* (the *Keth.* points either to *Pi*□*ēl* הִיבֵשׁוּ or *Hiph*□*il* הִיבֵשׁוּ).

7. The *imperative Hiph*□*il*, instead of the usual form הוֹשֵׁב, sometimes has *i* in the second syllable; הוֹשִׁיעַ Is 43:8; הוֹשִׁיעַ Ps 94:1 (before ה, hence probably a mere mistake for הוֹשִׁיעַ). On the uncertainty of the tone in הוֹשִׁיעַ-הִיבֵשׁוּ see § 53 m. When closed by a guttural the second syllable generally has *ā*, as הוֹשִׁעַ, הוֹדַע, cf. also הִקַּר Pr 25:17 (as in the *infin. constr.* הִבֹּכַח Jb

6:26; see § 65 f). On the other hand, *i* always appears when the syllable is open, thus הוֹשֵׁב יָבִי, הוֹשֵׁב יָבִי, and so also before suffixes (§ 61 g). הוֹצֵא Gn 8:17 *Q<sup>e</sup>ré* (*K<sup>e</sup>th*, הוֹצֵא, see § 70 b) is irregular.—The *jussive* and the *imperfect consecutive Hiph<sup>l</sup>il* when the tone is drawn back take *S<sup>c</sup>ghôl* in the second syllable, as in *Qal*, e.g. יוֹסֵף that he may increase, Pr 1:5, before קָה; cf. Ex 10:28 and Dt 3:26 after אֶל־; cf. Pr 30:6 is anomalous); in *pause*, however, also תוֹסֵף as *jussive*, Jb 40:32 (usual *jussive* in *pause* יוֹשֵׁב, &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 יִד־ע and ח (jussive) and יוֹכֵחַ (&c.); with a final ר in *pause* וְתִת־ר Ru 2:14: on נִשְׁעַם־ Is 35:4, cf. § 65 f).—On forms like הוֹשִׁיעַ, see § 53 q.

In *Hoph<sup>l</sup>al ô* stands instead of ו, in הוֹדַע (for הוֹדַע) Lv 4:23, 28, הוֹגֵה 2 S 20:13, and perhaps in יוֹרֵא (for יוֹרֵה) Pr 11:25; but cf. Delitzsch on the passage.—*Ptcp* מוֹדַע Is 12:5 *Q<sup>e</sup>re* (מְדַע *K<sup>e</sup>th*).—An *infinitive Hoph<sup>l</sup>al* with feminine ending occurs in הִלְדָּת Gn 40:20, for הוֹלִידָה; cf. above, t, on נוֹלְדוּ, and § 71 at the end.

8. The verb הִלֵּךְ *to go*, also belongs in some respects to the פ"ו class, since it forms (as if from הִלַּךְ) *imperfect* יִלְכֶּךָ, with *wāw consecutive* וַיֵּלֶךְ (in *pause* וַיֵּלֶךְ Gn 24:61, &c.), 1st sing. יִלְכֶּךָ (but in Jb 19:10 יִלְכֶּךָ); *infinitive construct* לֵלְכֶּךָ with suff. לְכַתִּי (*S<sup>c</sup>ghôl* under the influence of the following palatal, as in נִכְדִּי, cf. also נִגְדִּי); *imperative* לֵךְ, לְךָ, in the lengthened form לֵכֶה (as an interjection referring even to a *feminine*, Gn 19:32, or a *plural*, Gn 31:44) and לֵךְ (Nu 23:13, Ju 19:13, 2 Ch 25:17); *Hiph<sup>l</sup>*. הוֹלִיךְ (also in Ex 2:9 2nd *fem. imperative* is to be read for הִילֵךְ, which probably arose merely through confusion with the following הוֹלִיךְ); *imperfect* יוֹלִיךְ, but in the 1st sing. of the *imperfect consecutive* always וַיִּלְכֶּךָ Lv 26:13, Am 2:10, &c. Rarely, and almost exclusively late or in poetry, the regular inflexions of הִלֵּךְ are also found: *imperf.* יִלְהֶךָ (Ps 58:9, &c.; but תִּלְהֶךָ Ex 9:23, Ps 73:9; cf. § 64 a and h); יִלְהֶךָ Jb 16:22, also Mēša<sup>l</sup> inscription, line 14, אִהֲלֶךָ; *infinitive* הִלֵּךְ (Ex 3:19, Nu 22:13 f. 16, Ec 6:8, 9); *imperative plur.* הִלְכוּ Jer 51:50. On the other hand, the *perfect Qal* is always הִלַּךְ, *participle* הֹלֵךְ, *infinitive absolute* הִלֵּךְ, *Niph<sup>l</sup>al* הִלְכָה, *Pi<sup>l</sup>el* הִלְכָה, *Hithpa<sup>l</sup>el* הִתְהַלְכָה, so that a י never arrears unmistakably as the first radical. The usual explanation of the above forms is nevertheless based on a supposed obsolete הִלֵּךְ. It is, however, more correct to regard the apparent פ"ו forms of הִלֵּךְ with Praetorius (*ZAW*. ii. 310 ff.) as originating with the *Hiph<sup>l</sup>il*, of which the ground-form *hahlīkh* became *hālīkh*, and this again, on the analogy of the *imperfect Qal* of verbs פ"י, *hōlīkh*. This *hōlīkh* being referred to a supposed *hauīkh* (properly *hawīkh*) gave rise to new formations after the manner of verbs פ"ו.

§ 70. Verbs פ"י. *Second Class, or Verbs properly פ"י*, e.g. יָטַב *to be good*. *Paradigm L*.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 143 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 603 ff.

Verbs properly פ"י differ from verbs פ"ו in the following points:

1. In *Qal* the initial *Yôdh* never suffers aphaeresis or elision; hence the *infinitive* has the form יָבֵשׁ,<sup>2</sup> the *imperfect* יִבְשֶׁה, יִבְשֶׁה, יִבְשֶׁה. (in *pause* יִבְשֶׁה), also written יִבְשֶׁה, &c.;

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> This may be inferred from בִּיבֵשׁ (=בִּיֵשׁ) Is 27:11, which with its *fem.* יִבְשֶׁה 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 *ā* in the second syllable, even after *wāw consec.*, e.g. וַיִּיקָץ, except וַיִּיקָץ Gn 9:24, and וַיִּיצַר Gn 2:7, 19, unless וַיִּיצַר is to be included among verbs פִּי״ו (cf. וַיִּיצַר Is 43:10).

2. In *Hiph*□*ūl* the original form הִיטִיב is regularly contracted to הִיטִיב (rarely written הִיטִיב, הִיטִב, &c.); *imperfect* יִטֵּב, וַיִּטֵּב. Instances of the uncontracted form are וַיִּישָׂרוּ Pr 4:25, according to Barth (see above, § 67 p), an example of an *i-imperfect* of *Qal*, since the *Hiph*□*ūl* is otherwise always *causative*; הִיֶּשֶׁר (*imperative*) Ps 5:9 *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* (the *K<sup>e</sup>th.* requires הוֹשֶׁר according to the form of verbs פִּי״ו; cf. Is 45:2, אֶיֶשֶׁר, *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, אֶיֶשֶׁר, *Q<sup>e</sup>rê*), cf. Gn 8:17 *Q<sup>e</sup>rê*; מִמֵּינִים 1 Ch 12:2, to be explained as a denominative from הִמִּין; אֶסְרֶם; הִמִּין Ho 7:12 (§ 24 f, note), but perhaps the punctuation here is only intended to suggest another reading אֶסְרֶם.

Rem. 1. The only verbs of this kind are: יָטַב *to be good* (only in the *imperfect Qal* and in *Hiph*□*ūl*; in the *perfect Qal* טוב, a verb ע״ו is used instead), יָנַק *to suck*, יָקָץ *to awake*, יָצַר *to form* (but see above, a), יָלַל only in *Hiph*□*ūl* הִילִיל *to bewail*, יָשַׁר *to be straight, right*, also יָבֵשׁ (Arabic *yābīšā*) *to be dry* (but *Hiph*□*ūl* הוֹבִישׁ 2 S 19:6, on the analogy of verbs פִּי״ו; on Is 30:5, cf. § 72 x), and the *Hiph*□*ūl* הִמִּין (denominative from הִמִּין), infin. לְהִמִּין 2 S 14:19 *to go to the right*.

2. In some examples of the *imperfect Hiph*□*ūl* the preformative has been subsequently added to the contracted form: יִמֵּיב Jb 24:21; יִלִּיל Is 15:2, 3, 16:7; אֶלִּיל Jer 48:31; plur. יִלִּי Ho 7:14, cf. Is 65:14. Qimḥi and others explain the above forms from a phonetic interchange of *Yôdh* and *He*, arising from the uncontracted forms הִילִיל, &c. (cf. Is 52:5). It is, perhaps, more correct to suppose that the regular forms (יִטֵּב, יִלִּיל) 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*□*ūl* בְּהִיטֵב Ez 36:11 with separating vowel (for הִיטֵב בְּהִיטֵב) on the analogy of verbs ע״ו; *imperfect* יִטֵּיב for הִיטֵיב 1 K 1:47; הִיטֵבִי (*imperfect Qal* for הִיטֵבִי Na 3:8; הִיטֵבִי הוּ) *imperfect Hiph*□*ūl* Ex 2:9, either an error for הִיטֵבִי, or an irregular shortening of the first syllable, caused by the forward movement of the tone. Similarly, the *Hiph*□*ūl* הִקִּיץ (from קוֹץ) is always used instead of הִקִּיץ from קָץ; hence also הִקִּיצוּ, הִקִּיצוּ, הִקִּיצוּ, *imperat.* הִקִּיצוּ, *infin.* הִקִּיץ.—On וַיִּבְשָׁה Na 1:4, see § 69 u).

### § 71. Verbs פִּי״ו. Third Class, or Verbs with *Yôdh* assimilated.

In some verbs פִּי״ו, the *Yôdh* (or the original *Wāw*) does not quiesce in the preceding vowel, but is regarded as a full consonant, and, like *Nûn*,<sup>1</sup> is assimilated to the following consonant. These forms, therefore, belong properly to the class of strong verbs. Assimilation invariably takes place in יָצַע (prop. וַצַּע) *to spread under*; *Hiph*□*ūl* הִצִּיעַ, *Hoph*□*al* הִצַּע; יָצַת *to burn*, *imperfect* יִצַּת, *Niph*□*al* נִצַּת, *Hiph*□*ūl* הִצִּית (in Is 27:4 also אֶצִּיתָ is to be read with König; in 2 S 14:30 the Masora has rightly emended the *K<sup>e</sup>thûb* הוֹרִצִּיתָ, which could only be the 1st sing. perf. of a verb פִּי״ו, to

---

*imperative Qal* is found: consequently the forms יָטַב, &c. (in Paradigm L of the earlier editions of this Grammar), are only inferred from the *imperfect*.

<sup>1</sup> These verbs, like verbs ע״ע (cf. above, note on § 67 g), may perhaps have been influenced by the analogy of verbs פִּי״ו.

the imperative הַצִּיב in agreement with the context and all the early versions); הַצִּיב, *Hiph*□*al* הַצִּיב *to place*, *Hoph*□*al* הַצִּיב; and probably also in the forms ordinarily derived from הַצִּיב, viz. הַצִּיב (*Niph*□*al*), הַצִּיב, הַצִּיב, הַצִּיב; at any rate a stem הַצִּיב is implied by the *Hithpa*□*el* הַתְּהַצִּיב; instead of the anomalous הַתְּהַצִּיב Ex 2:4 read with the Samaritan הַתְּהַצִּיב, i.e. הַתְּהַצִּיב. Besides the common form we find once הַצִּיב in Is 44:3 (from הַצִּיב *to pour*) with a *transitive* meaning, beside הַצִּיב *intransitive*, 1 K 22:35. Elsewhere the *imperfect consecutive* has the form הַצִּיב Gn 28:18, 35:14, &c., cf. § 69 f, where also other forms of הַצִּיב are given; הַצִּיב and הַצִּיב (Is 44:12, 49:8, Jer 1:5 *Q<sup>re</sup>*), from הַצִּיב *to form*, are, however, used in the same sense. Cf. also הַצִּיב Ho 10:10; הַצִּיב (for הַצִּיב according to § 47 k) 1 S 6:12; הַצִּיב 2 Ch 31:7 (cf. § 69 n) and הַצִּיב Is 28:16. This assimilation is found always with sibilants (most frequently with הַצִּיב) except in the case of הַצִּיב 1 K 3:15 (so ed. Mant., Ginsb., Kittel; but *Jabl.*, Baer הַצִּיב) and in הַצִּיב Gn 40:20, Ez 16:5 (cf. הַצִּיב verse 4), *infinitive Hoph*□*al* of הַצִּיב (cf. הַצִּיב § 69 t).

§ 72. Verbs ע״ו (*vulgo ע״ו*), e.g. קום *to rise up*. *Paradigm M*.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 144 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 605 ff.

1. According to § 67 a 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 *û* of which is characteristic also of the *imperative* and of the *imperfect indicative Qal*. These stems are consequently termed verbs ע״ו or more correctly (see below) ע״ו.<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> The term ע״ו was consequent on the view that the *Wāw* (or *י* in the case of verbs ע״ו) in these stems was originally consonantal. This view seemed especially to be supported by the return of the *Wāw* in *Pi*□*el* (עַוֵּל, the *ו* usually passing into *י* as in קום, cf. Arabic *qāwwāma*), and by certain forms of the *absolute state* of the nouns of such stems, e.g. הַמָּוֶת *death*, compared with מות *to die*. Hence in explaining the verbal forms a supposed stem *qawam* (in verbs ע״ו e.g. *šayat*) was always assumed, and יקום was referred to an original *yaqwūm*, the *infinitive absolute* קום to original *qawōm*, the *participle passive* קום to original *qawūm*. It must, however, be admitted: (1) that forms like עַוֵּל, קום (see m) are only to be found in the latest books, and are hence evidently secondary as compared with the pure Hebrew forms קום, &c.; (2) that to refer the verbal forms invariably to the stem קום, 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 ע״ו stems are therefore to be rigidly distinguished from the real ע״ו stems of the strong forms, such as הַמָּוֶת, הַמָּוֶת, &c. (see below, gg).—As early as the eleventh century the right view with regard to ע״ו stems was taken by Samuel Hannagid (cf. Bacher, *Leben und Werke des Abulwaléd*, p. 16); recently by Böttcher (*Lehrbuch*, § 1112), and (also as to ע״ו stems) especially by Müller, Stade, and Wellhausen (see above, § 67 a, note). On the other hand, the old view of *ו* and *י* as consonants has been recently revived by Philippi, Barth, M. Lambert, and especially Brockelmann (op. cit.).

2. As in the case of verbs ע"ע, the monosyllabic stem of verbs ע"י 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 *Hoph*□*al*, see d), e.g. 3rd *sing. mast. perf.* קָם, *fem.* קָמָה, *plur.* קָמוּ, but in a closed *penultima* קָמַת, &c.<sup>1</sup>; (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 מָת *he is dead*; verbs *middle o* have the form אָר *he shone*, בָּשׁ *he was ashamed*, מָוֹב *he was good*.<sup>2</sup> Cf. n–r.

3. In the *imperfect Qal*, *perfect Niph*□*al*, and throughout *Hiph*□*al* and *Hoph*□*al* the short vowel of the preformatives in an open syllable before the tone is changed into the corresponding tone-long vowel. In *Qal* and *Niph*□*al* the original *ā* is the basis of the form and not the *i* attenuated from *ā* (§ 67 h; but cf. also h below, on יְבוֹשׁ), hence יָקוּם, for *yāqûm*; נָקוּם for *nāqôm*; on the other hand, in the *perfect Hiph*□*al* הִקִּים for *hiqûm*; *participle* מְקִים (on the *Şere* cf. z); *perfect Hoph*□*al* הֻקַּם for *hūqam*.

A vowel thus lengthened before the tone is naturally changeable and becomes *vocal Šwā* when the tone is moved forward, e.g. יָמִיתָּו *he will kill him*; so also in the 3rd *plur. imperfect Qal* with *Nûn paragoric*; יָמִיתוּ (without *Nûn* יָמִיתוּ). The wholly abnormal *scriptio plena* of *ē* in יְהִימִיר Jer 2:11 (beside הִימִיר in the same verse) should, with König, be emended to יְהִימִיר; the incorrect repetition of the interrogative necessarily led to the pointing of the form as *perfect* instead of *imperfect*.—But in *Hoph*□*al* the *û* is retained throughout as an unchangeable vowel, when it has been introduced by an abnormal lengthening for the tone-long *ō* (as in the *Hoph*□*al* of verbs ע"ע).

4. The cases of unusual vowel lengthening mentioned in *b* are: *imperfect Qal* יָקוּם (also in Arabic *yāqûmu*), but *jussive* with normal lengthening (§ 48 g), יָקֹם, with retraction of the tone יָקֹם (יָקֹם), *imperative* יָקֹם, with normal lengthening of the *û* in the 2nd *plur. fem.* יָקֹמָה, since, according to § 26 p, the *û* cannot be retained in a closed *penultima*; *infinitive construct* יָקוּם. In *Hiph*□*al* the original *i* is naturally lengthened to *i* (הִקִּים, *imperfect* יָקִים, *jussive* יָקֹם, with retraction

<sup>1</sup> In Aramaic, however, always מָת□; also in Hebrew grammars before Qimḥi מָת□, &c., are found, but in our editions of the Bible this occurs only in *pause*, e.g. מָת□ Mi 7:8, מָת□ 2 K 7:3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> According to Stade (*Grammatik*, § 385 e and f) the *e* in מָת is of the nature of a diphthong (from *ai*, which arose from the union of the vowel *i*□, the sign of the intransitive, with the *ā* of the root), and likewise the *o* in אָר, &c. (from *au*). But *ō* (from *au*) could not, by § 26 p, remain in a closed *penultima* (בָּשָׁת, &c.); consequently the *o* of these forms can only be tone-long, i.e. due to lengthening of an original *û*, and similarly the *ē* of מָת to lengthening of an original *i*□. This is confirmed by the fact that the *ō* in בָּשָׁת, בָּשָׁתִי, בָּשָׁתִי is always, and in בָּשָׁו, 3rd *plur. perfect*, nearly always (the instances are 11 to 2), written defectively. Forms like בָּשָׁה, בָּשָׁו, &c., are therefore due to orthographic licence.

of the tone קָם, קָם); on the transference of this  $i^{\wedge}$  to the *Hiph*□*il* of the strong verb, cf. § 53 a.

The following forms require special consideration: the *participle Qal* קָם is to be traced to the ground-form with  $\hat{a}$  unobscured, Arab. *qâtīl*, § 9 q, and § 50 b. On this analogy the form would be *qâim*,<sup>1</sup> which after absorption of the  $i^{\wedge}$  became קָם, owing to the predominating character of the  $\hat{a}$ . The unchangeableness of the  $\hat{a}$  (*plur.* קָמִים, *constr.* קָמֵי, &c.) favours this explanation.

In the *imperfect Qal*, besides the forms with original  $\check{u}$  (now  $\hat{u}$ ) there are also forms with original  $\check{a}$ . This  $\check{a}$  was lengthened to  $\bar{a}$ , and then further obscured to  $\hat{o}$ ; hence especially יָבֹא (יָבֹא), &c., from the *perfect* בָּא *he has come*. In the *imperfects* יָאֹר (but cf. יָאֹר 1 S 14:27) and יָבוֹשׁ from the *intransitive perfects* אֹר, בָּשׁ (see above, c), most probably also יָאֹר 2 K 12:9, יָאֹר Gn 34:15 from an unused *to consent*, and perhaps יָאֹר 1 S 4:5, &c., as in the cases noticed in § 63 e and especially § 67 n, the  $\bar{e}$  of the preformative is lengthened from  $i^{\wedge}$  (which is attenuated from original  $\check{a}$ ) and thus *yī-bāš* became *yī-bāš*, and finally *yē-bōš*. Finally the *Niph.* קָמִים (*nā-qām*), *imperfect* יָקָם from *yīqqām*, originally (§ 51 m) *yinqām*, arises in the same way from the obscuring of  $\bar{a}$  lengthened from  $\check{a}$ .

5. In the *perfect Niph*□*al* and *Hiph*□*il* a  $\check{i}$  is inserted before the affirmatives beginning with a consonant in the 1st and 2nd persons, and יָ regularly (but see Rem.) in the *imperfect Qal*, sometimes also in the *imperfect Hiph*□*il* (as in יָבֹא Lv 7:30, cf. יָבֹא Mi 2:12), before the termination of יָ. As in verbs עָנָה (§ 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*□*il*, however, before the  $\check{i}$ , instead of the  $i^{\wedge}$  an  $\bar{e}$  is somewhat often found<sup>2</sup> (as a normal lengthening of the original  $i^{\wedge}$ ), especially after *wāw consecutive*, Dt 4:39, 30:1, as well as before the affirmatives יָ and יָ 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  $\check{i}$  to the following syllable, and this forward movement of the tone produces at the same time a weakening of the  $i^{\wedge}$  to  $\bar{e}$ ; thus יָקָם, יָקָם (or יָקָם; on יָקָם Ex 19:23, cf. x), but יָקָם, יָקָם, &c., Ex 26:30, &c.; Dt 4:39, Nu 18:26 (cf., however, יָקָם Mi 5:4). In the same way in the 1st *pers. sing.* of the *perfect Niph*□*al*, the  $\hat{o}$  before the separating vowel is always modified to  $\hat{u}$  (יָקָם); cf. v. In the *imperfect Qal* and *Hiph*□*il* the separating vowel יָ always bears the tone (יָקָם).

Without the separating vowel and consequently with the tone-long  $\bar{o}$  and  $\bar{e}$  instead of  $\hat{u}$  and  $i^{\wedge}$  we find in *imperfect Qal* יָבֹא (see § 76 g); יָבֹא Ez 16:55 (also יָבֹא in the same verse); יָבֹא 1 S 7:14 (cf. Ez 35:9 *Qrê*; on the *K<sup>e</sup>thibh* יָבֹא cf. above, note on § 69 b); יָבֹא 1 S 14:27, from אֹר (*K<sup>e</sup>thibh* יָבֹא *and they saw*, see § 75 w); in *Hiph*□*il*, e.g. יָבֹא.

<sup>1</sup> So in Arabic, prop. *qâtīm*, since the two vowels are kept apart by the insertion of an  $\check{a}$ , cf. Aram. קָאם; but also contracted, as *šāk*, *hār*, for *šāi*□*k*, &c. (cf. Wright's *Gramm. of the Arabic Language*, 2nd ed. vol. i. p. 164).

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> יָבֹא 1 S 6:7 (cf. 2 Ch 6:25) could only be an orthographic licence for יָבֹא; perhaps, however, יָבֹא was originally intended.





*rested*; **וַיָּנַע** and *it was moved*; **וַיִּטְּ** and *he turned aside*, Ju 4:18, Ru 4:1 (distinguished only by the sense from *Hiph*□*l* **וַיִּטְּ** and *he removed*, Gn 8:13); **וַיִּצַר** Ex 21:4, 2 K 5:23, 17:5 (but also **וַיִּגַר** from both *גור* to *sojourn*, and *גור* to *fear*); **וַיִּעַף** (to be distinguished from **וַיִּעַף** 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 **וַיִּעַף** for **וַיִּיעַף** from **וַיִּעַף** is intended. For **וַיִּתְלוּשׁ** 2 S 13:8 *Keth.*, the Q<sup>r</sup>ê rightly requires **וַיִּתְלוּשׁ**. On the other hand, in an open syllable always **וַיִּקְוּ** and **וַיִּקְוּ**, &c. On **וַיִּקְוּ** (וַיִּקְוּ), see § 49 e.

Examples of the full plural ending **וּן** with the tone (see above, l) are **וּן** Gn 3:3, 4; **וּן** Ps 104:7; **וּן** Jo 2:4, 7, 9.

#### On Niph□al.

5. The form of the 1st *sing. perf.* **וַיִּקְוּ**, which frequently occurs (**וַיִּקְוּ**, cf. also the *ptcp. plur.* **וַיִּקְוּ**, Ex 14:3), serves as a model for the 2nd *sing.* **וַיִּקְוּ**, and the 1st *plur.* **וַיִּקְוּ** given in the paradigm, although no instances of these forms are found; but of the 2nd *plur.* the only examples found have *ô* (not *û*), viz. **וַיִּקְוּ** *ye have been scattered*, Ez 11:17, 20:34, 41, and **וַיִּקְוּ** and *ye shall loathe yourselves*, Ez 20:43, 36:31.—To the *i* (instead of *ā*) of the preformative may be traced the *perfect* **וַיִּקְוּ** Zc 2:17 (analogous to the *perfect* and *participle* **וַיִּקְוּ**, see below, ee), *imperfect* **וַיִּקְוּ** for **וַיִּקְוּ**.—The *infinitive construct* **וַיִּקְוּ** occurs in Is 25:10; in **וַיִּקְוּ** Jb 33:30, the Masora assumes the elision of the **וַיִּקְוּ** (for **וַיִּקְוּ**); but probably **וַיִּקְוּ** (*Qal*) is intended (see § 51 l).—**וַיִּקְוּ** Is 14:31, **וַיִּקְוּ** Is 59:13 are to be regarded as *infinitives absolute*.

#### On Hiph□l, Hoph□al, and Pi□l.

6. Examples of the *perfect* without a separating vowel (see above, k), are: **וַיִּקְוּ**, &c. (see further, § 76 g); **וַיִּקְוּ** (from *מדות*) for *hēmāth-tā* (cf. § 20 a); **וַיִּקְוּ** 1st *plur. perfect* *Hiph*□*l* from **וַיִּקְוּ** 2 Ch 29:19, even **וַיִּקְוּ** (§ 27 s) Nu 17:6, &c.; cf. 1 S 17:35, 2 S 13:28, also **וַיִּקְוּ** Ex 1:16, and **וַיִּקְוּ** Ho 2:5; but elsewhere, with *wāw consecutive* **וַיִּקְוּ** Is 14:30; cf. **וַיִּקְוּ** Jer 16:13, and **וַיִּקְוּ** 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 **וַיִּקְוּ** (1 Ch 15:12, &c.) or more frequently **וַיִּקְוּ**, and in the syllable before the antepenultima it is necessarily **וַיִּקְוּ** (e.g. **וַיִּקְוּ** 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 *Haṭeph-S<sup>c</sup>ghōl*, in the other persons always *Haṭeph-Pathah* (König); on **וַיִּקְוּ** 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.* **וַיִּקְוּ** 1 K 21:25 is quite abnormal for **וַיִּקְוּ** from *סות* or *סית*.

As in verbs **וַיִּקְוּ** with **וַיִּקְוּ** for their first radical (§ 67 w), all the forms of **וַיִּקְוּ** Ex 19:23 (where against the rule given under *i* we find **וַיִּקְוּ** with *ē* instead of *i*), Dt 8:19, Neh 9:34, Jer 42:19, and **וַיִּקְוּ** Is 41:25, 45:13, take *Pathah* in these conjugations instead of **וַיִּקְוּ**. The irregular **וַיִּקְוּ** Zc 10:6 has evidently arisen from a combination of two different readings, viz. **וַיִּקְוּ** (from *יָשַׁב*) and **וַיִּקְוּ** (from *יָשַׁב*): the latter is to be preferred.—On **וַיִּקְוּ** and **וַיִּקְוּ** as a (metaplastic) *perfect Hiph*□*l* of **וַיִּקְוּ**, cf. § 78 b.

7. In the *imperative*, besides the short form **וַיִּקְוּ** (on **וַיִּקְוּ** Is 42:22 with *Silluq*, cf. § 29 q; but in Ez 21:35 for **וַיִּקְוּ** read the *infinitive* **וַיִּקְוּ**) the lengthened form **וַיִּקְוּ** is also found. With

suffix *הַקִּימָה* נִי, &c. The *imperative* *הִבֵּיא* Jer 17:18 is irregular (for *הִבֵּא* Gn 43:16); perhaps *הִבֵּיא* (as in 1 S 20:40; cf. 2 K 8:6) is intended, or it was originally *הִבֵּי יֵאָה*.

In the *infinitive*, elision of the ה occurs in *לְבִיא* Jer 39:7, 2 Ch 31:10 (for *לְהִבֵּיא* ה); *הֵ* fem. is added in *הַנִּפְחָה* לְ Is 30:28; cf. Est 2:18, 4:14 and the analogous *infinitive Haphel* in biblical Aramaic, Dn 5:20.—As *infinitive absolute* *הִבֵּינָה* 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 *עִיעַ* (§ 67 i). On *מְבִי* 2 S 5:2, &c. (in *K<sup>e</sup>thibh*), see § 74 k.

On the shortened forms of the *imperfect* (*קָם*, *נָי*, but always *אָ* *וְיָבֵא*; in the *jussive* also with retraction of the tone *אֶל־תֵּשֶׁב* 1 K 2:20) see above, f. With a guttural or ר the last syllable generally has *Pathah* (as in *Qal*), e.g. *וַיְעַד* and *he testified*, 2 K 17:13; *הִרְחַח* *let him smell*, 1 S 26:19; *וַיִּרְחַח* Gn 8:21; *וַיִּסַּח* and *he took away*, Gn 8:13. The 1st sing. of the *imperfect consecutive* commonly has the form *וַיִּשָּׂא* Neh 2:20, or, more often, defectively *וַיִּשָּׂא* 1 K 2:42, less frequently the form *וַיִּשָּׂא* Jos 14:7.—For *אָסַח* Zp 1:2 (after *אָסַח*) and in verse 3, read *אָסַח* from *אָסַח*, on the analogy of *אָסַח* § 68 g: similarly in Jer 8:13 *אָסַח* instead of *אָסַח*.

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. *וַיְהִי* Pr 14:34; *וַיְהִי* Jb 35:14; cf. Pr 25:23, and acc. to Baer *וַיְהִי* Jb 30:20 (ed. Mant., Ginsb. *וַיְהִי*), always in principal pause; on the *Metheg* with *Sere*, cf. § 16 f γ.—As *Pôlal* cf. *וַיְהִי* Is 16:10.

As *participle Hophal* *הַמְוִשֵׁב* occurs in close connexion, Gn 43:12; cf. § 65 d.

Peculiar contracted forms of *Pôlêl* (unless they are transitives in *Qal*) are *וַיִּבְנֶה* Jb 31:15, *וַיִּבְנֶה* Is 64:6 for *וַיִּבְנֶה* and *וַיִּבְנֶה* (cf. § 58 k), and *וַיִּבְנֶה* or *וַיִּבְנֶה*, and *וַיִּבְנֶה*; also *וַיִּבְנֶה* Jb 17:4, for *וַיִּבְנֶה*.—In Is 15:5 *וַיִּבְנֶה* appears to have arisen from the *Pilpel* *וַיִּבְנֶה*, the *ā* after the loss of the ר having been lengthened to *ā*, which has then been obscured to *ô*.—For the strange form *וַיִּבְנֶה* Ps 139:21, which cannot (according to § 52 s) be explained as a *participle* with the מ omitted, read *וַיִּבְנֶה*.

#### In General.

8. The verbs *עִיעַ* are primarily related to the verbs *עִיעַ* (§ 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 *Hiphil* with *wāw consecutive*, the whole of *Hophal*, the *Pilpel* of verbs *עִיעַ*, and the *Pôlêl* of verbs *עִיעַ*; see § 67 z. Owing to this close relation, verbs *עִיעַ* sometimes have forms which follow the analogy of verbs *עִיעַ*, e.g. *perfect Qal* *בָּז* *he has despised* (from *בָּז*, as if from *בָּז*) Zc 4:10; *perfect Niphil* *נָמַר* Jer 48:11 (for *נָמַר* from *מָוַד*, as if from *מָרַר*). The same explanation equally applies to *נָקַט* Jb 10:1 for *נָקַט* (cf. § 67 dd) = *נָקַט* from *קָוַט*, and *נָקַט* Ez 6:9 (for *נָקַט* and *וַיִּמְוַד* Ez 10:17 and *וַיִּמְוַד* verse 15; *imperative* *הִדֵּמוּ* Nu 17:10; *פָּסַג* Mi 2:6; *Hiphil perfect* *הִתְזוּ* Is 18:5 for *הִתְזוּ* (cf. § 29 q), which is for *הִתְזוּ* from *תְּזוּ*. On the other hand the *imperfects* *נָמַר* Ez 48:14 (unless it be intended for *נָמַר*, cf. Ps 15:4) and *נָפַח* Hb 2:3, are to be regarded according to § 109 i, simply as rhythmically shortened forms of *נָמַר* and *נָפַח*.

9. In common with verbs *עִיעַ* (§ 67 g) verbs *עִיעַ* sometimes have in *Niphil* and *Hiphil* 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. *הָסִיֵּת* *to incite*, imperfect *יָסִיֵּת* (also *הָסִיֵּת*, *הָסִיֵּת*); *הָסִיֵּג*, imperfect *יָסִיֵּג* *to remove* (from *סוּג*), also *Hophal* *הָסִיֵּג* **Is 59:14** (on *הָסִיֵּג* cf. § 29 g); sometimes with a difference of meaning, as *הָנִיחַ* *to cause to rest*,<sup>1</sup> but *הָנִיחַ* (*imperfect consecutive* *הָנִיחַ*, *consecutive* *הָנִיחַ* **Gn 39:16**; *imperative* *הָנִיחַ*, plur. *הָנִיחוּ*) *to set down*; for *הָנִיחַ* (Baer, Ginsburg *וְהָנִיחַ*) **Zc 5:11** (which at any rate could only be explained as an isolated passive of *Hiphil* on the analogy of the biblical Aramaic *הָנִיחַ* **Dn 7:4**) we should probably read *הָנִיחַ* with Klostermann after the LXX. In **Dn 8:11** the *K<sup>e</sup>thibh* *הָנִיחַ* is intended for a *perfect Hiphil*. There is also a distinction in meaning between *יָלַיְתִי* *to spend the night, to remain*, and *מָלַיְתִי* **Ex 16:7** *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* (*K<sup>e</sup>thibh* *תִּלְוֵנוּ*; conversely, verse 2 *K<sup>e</sup>thibh* *יָלַיְתִי*, *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* *וְנִי*), *participle* *מָלַיְתִי* **Ex 16:8**, **Nu 14:27, 17:20**, *to be stubborn, obstinate*: in the latter sense from the form *יָלַיְתִי* only *יָלַיְתִי* is found, **Ex 17:3**. Other examples are *Niphil* *נִמְוֵל* *he was circumcised*, **Gn 17:26** f.; *participle* **34:22** (from *מִוֵּל*, not *נִמְוֵל*); *נִמְוֵר* *he is waked up*, **Zc 2:17** (see above, v); *Hiphil* *הָזִיל* **La 1:8**; *יָזַו* **Pr 4:21**.

Perhaps the same explanation applies to some forms of verbs *first guttural* with *Dageš forte implicitum*, which others derive differently or would emend, e.g. *וַתְּחַשׁ* for *וַתְּחַשׁ* and *she hastened* (from *חָוַשׁ* **Jb 31:5**; *וַתְּחַשׁ* (another reading is *וַתְּחַשׁ*), **1 S 15:19, 25:14** (*14<sup>32</sup> Q<sup>e</sup>rê*) from *עָוַשׁ* or *עָוַשׁ* *to fly at anything*. Both, as far as the form is concerned, would be correct *apocopated imperfections* from *חָוַשׁ* and *עָוַשׁ* (ל"ה), but these stems only occur with a wholly different meaning.

10. Verbs with a consonantal *Wāw* for their second radical, are inflected throughout like the strong form, provided the first or third radical is not a weak letter, e.g. *הָוֹר*, *imperfect* *הָוֹר* *to be white*; *גָּוַע*, *imperfect* *יָגֹוַע* *to expire*; *רָוַח* *to be wide*; *צָוַח* *to cry*; *Pi<sup>l</sup>ēl* *עָוַל*, *imperfect* *יַעְוֹל* *to act wickedly*; *עָוַת* *to bend*, *Hithpa<sup>l</sup>ēl* *הִתְעָוַת* *to bend oneself*; and this is especially the case with verbs which are at the same time ל"ה, e.g. *צָוַח*, *Pi<sup>l</sup>ēl* *צָוַח* *to command*, *קָוַח* *to wait*, *רָוַח* *to drink*, *Pi<sup>l</sup>ēl* *רָוַח* (on *רָוַח* **Is 16:9**, see § 75 dd) and *Hiphil* *הָרָוַח* *to give to drink*, &c.

### § 73. Verbs middle *i* (vulgo ע"י), e.g. *בִּיַּן* *to discern*. Paradigm N.

1. These verbs agree, as regards their structure, exactly with verbs ע"י, and in contrast to them may be termed ע"י, 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"י verbs having *û* lengthened from original *ũ* and ע"י having *î* lengthened from original *î*. In other respects verbs ע"י simply belong to the class of really monosyllabic stems, which, by a strengthening of their *vocalic* element, have been assimilated to the triliteral form<sup>1</sup> (§ 67 a). In the *perfect Qal* the monosyllabic stem, as in ע"י, has *ā* lengthened from *ă*, thus: *שָׁת* *he has set*; *infinitive* *שֵׁת*, *infinitive absolute* *שׁוֹת*, *imperative* *שֵׁת*, *imperfect* *יִשֵּׁת*, *jussive* *יִשֵּׁת* (§ 48 g), *imperfect consecutive* *שֵׁת*.—The *perfect Qal* of some verbs used to be treated as having a double set of forms, a regular series, and others like *Hiphil*

<sup>1</sup> As the passive of this *Hiphil* we should expect the *Hophal* *הוּנַח*, which is, no doubt, to be read for *הוּנַח* in **La 5:5**.

<sup>1</sup> That verbs ע"י and ע"י 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 *בִּינָתִי* and *רִיבֹתִי* are to be referred to *Hiphil* with the preformative dropped.

without the preformative, e.g. בִּין Dn 10:1; תִּי בִּין Dn 9:2, also בָּנָה Ps 139:2; רִיב וְתָּ *thou strivest*, Jb 33:13, also בָּתָּךְ La 3:58. The above *perfects* (בִּין, רִיב, &c.) might no doubt be taken as forms *middle ē* (properly *i*), the *i* of which has been lengthened to *i*ˆ (like the *u* lengthened to *u*ˆ in the *imperfect Qal* of קָוָה). It is more probable, however, that they are really shortened forms of *Hiph*□*u*ˆ. This is supported by the fact that, especially in the case of בִּין, the shortened forms are few and probably all late, while the corresponding unshortened forms with the same meaning are very numerous, e.g. *perfect* הִבִּין (but בִּין only in Dn 10:1), *infinitive* הִבִּין (but *infin. abs.* בִּין only in Pr 23:1), *imperative* הִבֵּן (only in Dn 9:23 immediately before וְהִבֵּן, also בִּינָה three times, and בִּינָה Ps 5:2), *participle* מִבִּין.<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere *Hiph*□*u*ˆ-forms are in use along with actual *Qal*-forms with the same meaning, thus: מָרִיב (also רָב), *placing* (but only in Jb 4:20, which, with the critically untenable יָמִי עֵז Ez 21:21, is the only instance of שָׂוָה in *Hiph*□*u*ˆ), *breaking forth* מִגִּיתָה Ju 20:33, with *infin. Qal* הָרָשׁוּ they rushed forth Ju 20:37, with *תִּשְׂתִּי, תִּשְׂתִּי* *glancing*, also in *perfect* הִקְיָא he spat out, with *imperat. Qal* קִי. As *passives* we find a few apparent *imperfects Hoph*□*al*, which are really (according to § 53 u) *imperfects passive of Qal*, e.g. יוּהַל Is 66:8 from הִל to turn round, יוּשָׁר from שָׁר to sing, יוּשַׁת from שַׁת to set.

2. The above-mentioned *Hiph*□*u*ˆ-forms might equally well be derived from verbs עִי; and the influence of the analogy of verbs עִי is distinctly seen in the *Niph*□*al* נָבֹן (ground-form *nabān*), *Pôlêl* בּוֹנֵן, and *Hithpôlêl* הִתְבּוֹנֵן. The very close relation existing between verbs עִי and עִי is evident also from the fact that from some stems both forms occur side by side in *Qal*, thus from הִל to turn round, *imperative* also הִלֵּי Mi 4:10; שִׁים to place, *infinitive construct* commonly שָׂוָה (2 S 14:7 *Q<sup>e</sup>re*), *imperfect* יִשְׂוֶה, but Ex 4:11 יִשְׂוֶה. In other verbs one form is, at any rate, the more common, e.g. גִּיל to exult (גִּיל only Pr 23:24 *K<sup>e</sup>thûbh*); from לָוַן (perhaps denominative from לָל to spend the night, לָלוֹן occurs six times as *infinitive construct*, לָלוּ only in Gn 24:23; but the *imperative* is always לָלוּ, &c.—Of verbs עִי the most common are שִׁית to set, רִיב to strive, דִּין to judge, שִׂישׁ to rejoice; cf. also *perfect* בָּל (*middle Yôdh* in Arabic) to comprehend, to measure, Is 40:12; עֵיט (as in Arabic and Syriac) to rush upon, and the denominative *perfect* קָץ (from קָץ) to pass the summer, Is 18:6. On the other hand, וְדָגוּם and they shall fish them, Jer 16:16, generally explained as *perfect Qal*, denominative from דָּג fish, probably represents a denominative *Pi*□*êl*, וְדָגוּ.

Corresponding to verbs properly עִי, mentioned in § 72 gg, there are certain verbs עִי with consonantal *Yôdh*, as אָבַח to hate, עָפַח to faint, הָיָה to become, to be, הָיָה to live.

Rem. 1. In the *perfect Qal* 3rd fem. sing. וְנָה occurs once, Zc 5:4, for וְנָה, with the weakening of the toneless *ā* to *ě* (as in the fem. *participle* וְנָה Is 59:5); cf. the analogous examples in § 48 l and § 80 i.—2nd sing. masc. שָׁתָה Ps 90:8, *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* (before ע; cf. § 72 s); 1st

<sup>1</sup> Since בָּנָה Ps 139:2 might be intended for בָּנָה, there remains really no form of בִּין which must necessarily be explained as a *Qal*, except the *ptcp. plur.* בְּנִים Jer 49:7. Nevertheless it is highly probable that all the above instances of *Hiph*□*u*ˆ-forms, parallel with *Qal*-forms of the same meaning, are merely due to a secondary formation from the *imperfects Qal* יִבִּין, יִשְׂוֶה, &c., which were wrongly regarded as *imperfects Hiph*□*u*ˆ: so Barth, *ZDMG*. xliii. p. 190 f., and *Nominalbildung*, p. 119 f.

sing. once י שְׁתֵּי Ps 73:28, *milra*□, without any apparent reason; 1st plur. וְנִלְנוּ Ju 19:13 for *lán-nû*. The lengthened *imperative* has the tone on the ultima before gutturals, יהוה רִיבֶה יְהוּה Ps 35:1; see further, § 72 s.—Examples of the *infinitive absolute* are: רַב *litigando*, Ju 11:25, Jb 40:2; שׁוֹם Jer 42:15; שׁוֹת *ponendo*, Is 22:7. On the other hand, דִּיב יָדִיב (דִּבֵּב Jer 50:34, בִּין תְּבִין Pr 23:1, חוּל תְּחִיל Ez 30:16 *Keth.*), are irregular and perhaps due to incorrect *scriptio plena*; for the last the *Q<sup>r</sup>rê* requires הוּל תְּחִיל, but read חוּל; cf. § 113 x.

2. The *shortened imperfect* usually has the form יָשָׁם, יָשָׁת, יָשָׁם; more rarely, with the tone moved back, e.g. לֹו רַב לוּ Ju 6:31, cf. Ex 23:1, אֶל־תֵּשֶׁת 1 S 9:20. So with *wāw consecutive* וְנִשָּׁם *and he placed*, וְנִבֵּן *and he perceived*; with a middle guttural וְנִשָּׁם 1 S 25:14 (see § 72 ee); with ר as 3rd radical, וְנִשָּׁר Ju 5:1. As jussive of לִיִן, וְנִשָּׁר is found in Ju 19:20 (in *pause*) and Jb 17:2, for וְנִשָּׁר.—For אֶל־תְּרוּב Pr 3:30 *Keth.* (*Q<sup>r</sup>rê* תְּרִיב) read תְּרִב.

3. As *participle active Qal* לִן *spending the night*, occurs once, Neh 13:21; *participle passive* שִׁים Nu 24:21, 1 S 9:24, Ob<sup>4</sup>; *feminine שׁוּמָה* 2 S 13:32, in the *Q<sup>r</sup>rê*, even according to the reading of the Oriental schools (see p. 38, note <sup>2</sup>): the *K<sup>e</sup>thūbh* has שִׁימָה. A *passive of Qal* (cf. above, § 52 e and s, and § 53 u) from שִׁים may perhaps be seen in וְנִשָּׁם Gn 50:26 (also Gn 24:33 *K<sup>e</sup>thūbh* וְנִשָּׁם, *Q<sup>r</sup>rê* וְנִשָּׁם; the Samaritan in both places has וְנִשָּׁם), and also in יִסְךָ Ex 30:32, Samaritan יוֹסֵךְ. Against the explanation of יִסְךָ as a *Hoph<sup>al</sup>*-form from יוֹסֵךְ, Barth (*Jubelschrift ... Hildesheimer*, Berlin, 1890, p. 151) rightly urges that the only example of a *Hiph<sup>al</sup>* of יוֹסֵךְ is the doubtful יִסְךָ, which is probably an *i*-imperfect of *Qal*.—The explanation of וְנִשָּׁם, &c., as a *passive of Qal* arising from *yiysam*, &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 ע"א the א always retains its consonantal value; these stems are, therefore, to be regarded as verbs *middle Guttural* (§ 64). An exception is נִאָּץ Ec 12:5 if it be *imperfect Hiph<sup>al</sup>* of נִאָּץ (for נִאָּץ); but if the form has really been correctly transmitted, it should rather be referred to נִאָּץ, and regarded as incorrectly written for נִאָּץ. On נִאָּץ (from נִאָּץ), which was formerly treated here as ע"א, see now § 75 x.

#### § 74. Verbs א"ל, e.g. מִצָּא to find. *Paradigm O.*

The א in these verbs, as in verbs א"פ, 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 א, the final syllable always has the regular vowels, if long, e.g. מִצָּא, מִצָּא, מִצָּא, מִצָּא, i.e. the א simply quiesces in the

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> 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 *û* the *κ* may originally have preserved a certain consonantal value. On the other hand, if the final *κ* quiescens in a preceding *ǎ* (as in the *perfect*, *imperfect*, and *imperative Qal*, in the *perfect Niph<sup>al</sup>*, and in *Pu<sup>al</sup>* and *Hoph<sup>al</sup>*) this *ǎ* is necessarily lengthened to *ā*, by § 27 g, as standing in an open syllable; e.g. *κָפַחַ*, *κָפַחַי*, &c.

The *imperfect* and *imperative Qal* invariably have *ā* in the final syllable, on the analogy of verbs *tertiaie gutturalis*; cf., however, § 76 e.—In the *imperfect Hithpa<sup>al</sup>* *ē* 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<sup>e</sup>kha*, Nu 6:7, and even before *Maqqeph* in Nu 19:12.

2. When *κ* stands at the end of a syllable before an affirmative beginning with a consonant (ת, נ), it likewise quiescens with the preceding vowel; thus in the *perfect Qal* (and *Hoph<sup>al</sup>*, see below) quiescing with *ǎ* it regularly becomes *Qumeš* (תָּאָפַחַ for תָּאָפַחַ, &c.); but in the *perfect* of all the other active and reflexive conjugations, so far as they occur, it is preceded by *S<sup>ere</sup>* (תָּאָפַחַ, &c.), and in the *imperative* and *imperfect* by *S<sup>ghôl</sup>*, תָּאָפַחַ, תָּאָפַחַי.

(a) The *S<sup>ghôl</sup>* of these forms of the imperfect and imperative might be considered as a modification, and at the same time a lengthening of an original *ǎ* (see § 8 a). In the same way the *ē* of the *perfect* forms in *Pi<sup>al</sup>*, *Hithpa<sup>al</sup>*, and *Hiph<sup>al</sup>* 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 *ǎ*. According to another, and probably the correct explanation, however, both the *Sere* and the *S<sup>ghôl</sup>* are due to the analogy of verbs ה"ל (§ 75 f) in consequence of the close relation between the two classes, cf. § 75 nn.—No form of this kind occurs in *Pu<sup>al</sup>*; in the *perfect Hoph<sup>al</sup>* only the 2nd *masc. sing.* הָבֵי אֶתָּהּ Ez 40:4, lengthened according to rule.

(b) Before suffixes attached by a connecting vowel (e.g. יִקְרָא נִי) the *κ* retains its consonantal value; so before ך and ךּ, e.g. אָמַץ אָמַץ Ct 8:1; אָבַר אָבַר Ez 28:13 (cf. § 65 h), not אָמַץ אָמַץ, &c., since these suffixes, by § 58 f, are likewise attached to the verb-form by a connecting vowel in the form of *S<sup>wā</sup> mobile*.—As *infinitive Qal* with suffix notice אָמַץ אָמַץ Ez 25:6; *participle* with suffix אָבַר אָבַר Is 43:1; *infinitive Pi<sup>al</sup>* אָבַר אָבַר.—The doubly anomalous form יִקְרָאוּ Jer 23:6 (for יִקְרָאוּ or יִקְרָאוּ) is perhaps a *forma mixta* combining the readings יִקְרָאוּ and יִקְרָאוּ.

3. When *κ* begins a syllable (consequently before affirmatives 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. *māš<sup>al</sup>* אָמַץ אָמַץ, &c. (in *pause* אָמַץ אָמַץ).

#### REMARKS.

1. Verbs *middle e*, like מָלֵא *to be full*, retain the *Sere* also in the other persons of the *perfect*, e.g. מָלֵא אֶתִּי (מָלֵא Est 7:5 has ךּ owing to its transitive use; for יִרְאֶתֶם Jos 4:24 read with Ewald יִרְאֶתֶם). Instead of אָמַץ אָמַץ the form אָמַץ אָמַץ *she names*, on the analogy of the ה"ל-forms noticed in § 75 m, occurs in Is 7:14 (from אָמַץ אָמַץ, cf. § 44 f), and with a different meaning (*it befalls*) in Dt 31:29, Jer 44:23, in both places before *κ*, and hence, probably, to avoid a hiatus

(on the other hand, *Ex* 5:16, could only be the and *sing. masc.*; the text which is evidently corrupt should probably be emended to *לְעִמָּךְ לְעִמָּךְ* with the LXX); in *Niph*□*al* *Ps* 118:23; in *Hoph*□*al* *Gn* 33:11.—The 2nd *fem. sing.* is written *קָרְאתָ* by Baer, *Gen* 16:11, &c., according to early MSS.

2. The *infin. Qal* occurs sometimes on the analogy of verbs ל"ה (גלות, &c., see § 75 nn) in the feminine form; so always *את מל' to fill* (as distinguished from *מל' fullness*), *Lv* 8:33, 12:4, 6, 25:30, *Jer* 29:10, *Ez* 5:2, also written *מל' אור* *Jer* 25:12, *Jb* 20:22, &c., and *מלוואת* *Est* 1:5. Cf. further, *את* *Ju* 8:1; *את* *Pr* 8:13; before suffixes, *Ez* 33:12, and likewise in *Niph. Zc* 13:4; also in *Pi*□*el* *את מל' את* *Ex* 31:5, 35:33, or *למלאות* *Dn* 9:2, &c. *Kethibh*; with suffix 2 S 21:2.—On the (aramaizing) *infinitives* *מש' and מש'א*, see § 45 e; on *לְקָרְאתָ obviam*, § 19 k.—*כִּמְצֹאֲכֶם* when ye find, *Gn* 32:20, stands, according to § 93 q, for *מִצְאֲכֶם*. The tone of the lengthened *imperative* *הִפָּאֵץ* *Ps* 41:5 as *Mil'ra*□ (before *נִפְשִׁי*) 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 *אֲנִי מִצְאֵן* and in verse 20 *קָרְאֵן*; on the other hand, the Mantua edition and Ginsburg, on good authority, read *קָרְאֵן מִצְאֵן*.

3. The *participle fem.* is commonly contracted, e.g. *מִצְאָתָא* (for *מִצְאָתָא*) 2 S 18:22, cf. *Est* 2:15; so *Niph*□*al* *נִפְלְאָה* *Dt* 30:11, *Zc* 5:7 (but *נִשְׁאָתָא* *Is* 30:25), and *Hoph*□*al*, *Gn* 38:25; less frequent forms are *מִצְאָתָא* *Ct* 8:10; *נִשְׁאָתָא* 1 K 10:22 (cf. § 76 b, *נִשְׁאָתָא* beside *לְשִׁאָתָא* as *infinitive construct* from *נִשְׁאָתָא*) and without *א* (see k) *יוצָתָא* (from *יוצָאָתָא*) *Dt* 28:57. In the forms *חַטְיָאִים* *sinning*, 1 S 14:33, cf. *Ps* 99:6; *בִּדְאָתָא* *feigning them*, *Neh* 6:8, the *א* 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 *א* which is quiescent is omitted in writing (§ 23 f): (*a*) in the middle of the word, e.g. *בִּנְיָן* 1 S 25:8; *מִצְאָתָא* *Nu* 11:11, cf. *Jb* 1:21; *צָמְתָא* *Ju* 4:19, cf. *Jb* 32:18. In the *imperfect* *תִּשְׁבַּח* *Jer* 9:17, *Zc* 5:9, *Ru* 1:14 (but the same form occurs with *Yódh* pleonastic after the manner of verbs ל"ה in *Ez* 23:49, according to the common reading; cf. § 76 b and *Jer* 50:20); in *Pi*□*el* *נִפְלְאָה* (after elision of the *א*, cf. § 75 oo) *Gn* 31:39; and also in *Niph*□*al* *נִשְׁמַחְתֶּם* *Lv* 11:43; cf. *Jos* 2:16. (*b*) at the end of the word; *וַיִּבְרָא* 1 K 12:12 *Kethibh*; *וַיִּבְרָא* *Hiph*□*u* of *וַיִּבְרָא* formed after the manner of verbs ל"ה); in the *imperfect Hiph*□*u* *וַיִּשְׁבַּח* *Ps* 55:16 *Kethibh*; *וַיִּבְרָא* *Ps* 141:5; *וַיִּבְרָא* 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 *Kethibh* (*מְבִי*, always before *א*, hence perhaps only a scribal error).

5. In the *jussive, imperfect consecutive, and imperative Hiph*□*u* a number of cases occur with *i* in the final syllable; cf. *וַיִּשְׁבַּח* *Is* 36:14 (in the parallel passages 2 K 18:29, 2 Ch 32:15 *וַיִּשְׁבַּח*); *וַיִּבְרָא* *Neh* 8:2 (before *ע*); *וַיִּבְרָא* 2 K 21:11 (cf. 1 K 16:2, 21:22); *וַיִּבְרָא* 2 K 6:29; *וַיִּבְרָא* *Dt* 4:20, 2 K 11:12, *Ps* 78:16, 105:43; *imperative* *וַיִּבְרָא* *Jer* 17:18; *וַיִּבְרָא* *Is* 43:8 (in both cases before *ע*). If the tradition be correct (which at least in the defectively written forms appears very doubtful) the retention of the *i* 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 *ו* *consecutive*, the *i* is always reduced to *e*. In the examples before *ע* considerations of euphony may also have had some influence (cf. § 75 hh).—In *Ez* 40:3, Baer reads with the Western school *וַיִּבְרָא*, while the Orientals read in the *Kethibh* *וַיִּבְרָא*, and in the *Qere* *וַיִּבְרָא*.

On the transition of verbs ל"ה to forms of ל"ה see § 75 nn.

§ 75. Verbs ל"ה, e.g. *וַיִּבְרָא* to reveal. Paradigm P.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 149 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 618 ff.—G. R. Berry, ‘Original Waw in ל"י verbs’ in *AJSL*. xx. 256 f.

These verbs, like the verbs פ"י (§§ 69, 70), belong to two different classes, viz. those originally ל"י and those originally ל"י,<sup>1</sup> which in Arabic, and even more in Ethiopic, are still clearly distinguished. In Hebrew, instead of the original ו or י 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 ל"י, e.g. גָּלָהּ for גָּלַי *he has revealed*; שָׁקַחַּ for שָׁקַחַי *he has rested*. By far the greater number of these verbs are, however, treated as originally ל"י; only isolated forms occur of verbs ל"י.

לָּשָׁקַחַּ *to be at rest* may be recognized as originally ל"י, in the forms in which the *Wāw* appears as a strong consonant, cf. 1st *sing. perfect Qal* שָׁקַחַּ וְחַי *Jb 3:26*, the *participle* שָׁקַחַּ וְשָׁקַחַּ and the derivative שָׁקַחַּ *rest*; on the other hand the *imperfect* is יִשָּׁקַחַּ. (with *Yôdh*). In עָנָה (Arab. *عنى*) *to answer*, and עָנָה (Arab. *عنى*)<sup>2</sup> *to be afflicted*, are to be seen two verbs originally distinct, which have been assimilated in Hebrew (see the *Lexicon*, s. v. עָנָה).

Of quite a different class are those verbs of which the third radical is a *consonantal ה* (distinguished by *Mappiq*). These are inflected throughout like verbs *tertiaie gutturalis*. Cf. §65 note on the heading.

The grammatical structure of verbs ל"י (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 קָטַחַּ וְקָטַחַּ, &c.), that a final vowel must be indicated by a vowel letter. In verbs ל"י 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—

הַ in all perfects, גָּלָהּ, נָגַלָהּ, גָּלָהּ, &c.

הַ in all imperfects and participles, יִגָּלֶהּ, גָּלֶהּ, &c.

הַ in all imperatives, גָּלֶהּ, גָּלֶהּ, &c.

---

AJSL. *AJSL*. = American Journal of Semitic Languages.

1<sup>1</sup> According to Wellheusen, ‘*Ueber einige Arten schwacher Verbs*’ in his *Skizzen*, vi. p. 255 ff., the ל"י verbs, apart from some true ל"י and some probable ל"י, are to be regarded as originally biliteral. To compensate for their arrested development they lengthened the vowel after the 2nd radical, as the ע"י verbs did after the 1st radical. But although there is much to be said for this view, it fails to explain pausal forms like קָטַחַּ וְקָטַחַּ (see u). It seems impossible that these should all be *late* formations.

2<sup>2</sup> In the Mēša inscription, line 5, ויענו *and he oppressed* occurs as 3rd *sing. masc. imperfect Pi ēl*, and in line 6, אענו *I will oppress* as 1st *sing.*

ה־ in the infinitive absolute (הִלָּךְ, &c.), except in *Hiph*□*l*, *Hoph*□*al*, and generally also *Pi*□*ēl*, see aa and ff.

The *participle passive Qal* alone forms an exception, the original י (or ו, see v) reappearing at the end, וְלֹיִי; and so also some derived nouns (§ 84a c, ε, &c.).

The *infinitive construct* always has the ending הִ (with ה *feminine*); *Qal* הִלֹּתָ, *Pi*□*ēl* הִלֹּתָ, &c.; for exceptions, see n and y.

These forms may be explained as follows:—in the *perfect Qal* הִלָּךְ stands, according to the above, for (י)לָךְ, and, similarly, in *Niph*□*al*, *Pu*□*al*, and *Hoph*□*al*. The *Pi*□*ēl* and *Hithpa*□*ēl* may be based on the forms הִתְקַטַּל, קִטַּל (§ 52 l; and § 54 k), and *Hiph*□*l* on the form הִתְקַטַּל, on the analogy of the *ā* in the second syllable of the Arabic □*áqtālā* (§ 53 a). Perhaps, however, the final *ā* of these conjugations simply follows the analogy of the other conjugations.

The explanation of the final tone-bearing הִ 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*. xlv. 695 f., against Philippi's objections in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, 1890, p. 356 f.; also *ZDMG*. lvi. 244, where Barth appeals to the rule that, in the period before the differentiation of the North Semitic dialects, final *iy* becomes י (constr. הִ י), not *i* (cf. 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 *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* in the last syllable merely follows the analogy of the *impf. Qal*, and secondly, that the *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* of the *impf. Qal* does perhaps ultimately represent a contraction of the original termination י י (= *ai*), although elsewhere (e.g. in the *imperative* of הִלֵּךְ) *ai* is usually contracted to *ê*.

2. When the original *Yôdh* stands at the end of the syllable before an affirmative beginning with a consonant (ה, ו) there arises (*a*) in the *perfects*, primarily the diphthong *ai* (י י). In the middle of the word this ought always to be contracted to *ê* (י י), but this *ê* is only found consistently in the passive conjugations, whilst regularly in *Qal*, and frequently in the other active and reflexive conjugations (especially in *Pi*□*ēl*), 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 *ê*, 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*, י י with the tone always appears before the affirmative הִ. On the most probable explanation of this י י, see above, e.

**Summary.** Accordingly before affirmatives beginning with a consonant the principal vowel is—

In the perfect *Qal* *i*, e.g. הִלֵּךְ;

In the perfects of the other active and reflexive conjugations, sometimes *ê*, sometimes *i*, הִלֵּךְ and הִלֵּךְ; הִלֵּךְ and הִלֵּךְ; הִלֵּךְ and הִלֵּךְ;

In the perfects passive always *é*, e.g.  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{י}$ ;

In the imperfects and imperatives always *ı̄*, e.g.  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ ,  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ .

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. sing. g<sup>e</sup>lait* (but 1st *pers. sing. sing. g<sup>e</sup>lait*), and so too the Western Aramaic  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ , but also  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ .

3. Before the vocalic affirmatives ( $\text{ו}$ ,  $\text{י}$ ,  $\text{ה}$ ,  $\text{ה}$ ) the *Yôdh* is usually dropped altogether, e.g.  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$  (ground-form *g<sup>a</sup>lyû*),  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ , *participle fem.*  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ , *plur. masc.*  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ ; 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.  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$  (see ll).

4. In the 3rd *sing. fem. perfect*, the original feminine ending  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$  was appended to the stem; hence, after elision of the *Yôdh*, arose properly forms like  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ , 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  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$  was added pleonastically to the ending  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ . Before the  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$  the vowel of the ending  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$ , which thus loses the tone, becomes *S<sup>e</sup>wā*, and thus there arise such forms as  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ ,  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ , &c. (but in *pause*  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$ , &c.).

For similar cases see § 70 d; § 91 m.

5. Finally, a strongly-marked peculiarity of verbs  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  is the rejection of the ending  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  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  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  (see cc, gg).

6. The ordinary form of the *imperfect* with the ending  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  serves in verbs  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  to express the cohortative also (§ 48 c); cf. Gn 1:26, 2:18, 2 Ch 25:17, &c. With a final  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  there occur only: in *Qal*,  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$  Ps 119:117,  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה}$  (with the *ı̄* retained, see below, u) Ps 77:4; and in *Hithpa*  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  Is 41:23 (with *Tiphha*, therefore in lesser pause).

#### REMARKS.

##### On Qal.

1. The older form of the *fem.* of the 3rd *sing. perf.*  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$ , mentioned above, under i (cf. § 74 g), is preserved in  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  (before  $\text{א}$ ) Lv 25:21 (cf. 2 K 9:37 *K<sup>e</sup>thibh*)<sup>1</sup>; likewise in *Hiph*  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  (before  $\text{א}$ ) Lv 26:34;  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  Ez 24:12; and in *Hoph*  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  (before  $\text{ו}$ ) Jer 13:19.—The 2nd *sing. fem.* is also written  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$ ; thus in the *textus receptus* 2 S 14:2, and always in Baer's editions (since 1872), as in most other verbs;  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  and  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  Is 57:8;  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  Jer 2:23, Ez 16:48, &c. (so  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  1 K 17:13 from  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$ ). In the 3rd *pers. plur.* the tone, instead of keeping its usual place ( $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$ , &c.), is retracted in Ps 37:20,  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$ , both on account of the *pause* and also in

<sup>1</sup> In the Siloam inscription also (see above, § 2 d), line 3,  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  may be read  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$  quite as well as  $\eta \dot{\text{ל}} \text{ינָה$ .

rhythmical antithesis to the preceding כָּלוּ; also in *Is* 16:8 תָּעוּ (according to Delitzsch for the sake of the assonance with נָגְעוּ); and in *Jb* 24:1 הָזוּ.—On the tone of the *perfect consecutive* see § 49 k.

2. The *infin. absol.* frequently has ו (probably a survival of the older orthography) for ה־, e.g. הָיוּ *Gn* 18:18; עָשׂוּ *Jer* 4:18, &c., עָשׂוּ *Ez* 31:11; קָנוּ 2 *S* 24:24; רָאוּ *Gn* 26:28, *Is* 6:9 (cf. 1 *S* 6:12), &c., beside ה־. The form שָׁתוּת *Is* 22:13 (beside שָׁתוּ in the same verse) appears to have been chosen on account of its similarity in sound to שָׁחַט; so in *Is* 42:20 *Q<sup>r</sup>ré* and *Ho* 10:4, אָלוּת (unless it is a substantive, *oaths*) and כָּדוּת; cf. also עָרוּת *Hb* 3:13.—Conversely, instead of the *infinitive construct* גָּלוּת such forms are occasionally found as גָּל־ה־ or גָּלוּ, cf. רָא־ה־ *Gn* 48:11; קָנ־ה־ *Pr* 16:16; עָשָׂה *Gn* 50:20, *Ps* 101:3, also עָשׂוּ *Gn* 31:28 (cf. *Pr* 31:4), and even with the *suffix* ה־ the very remarkable form עָשׂוּ ה־ *Ex* 18:18.<sup>2</sup>—The feminine form רָאָה (for רָאוּת) *Ez* 28:17, analogous to nouns like גָּאָה (cf. § 45 d), is strange, but רָאָה as *infin.* *Ez* 21:15 is quite inexplicable.—The forms ה־ג־ and ה־רוּ *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 *Pō*□*ēl*.—The 2nd *sing. masc. imperative* יְהִי, יְהִי 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 *é* for *ē*, and conversely *ē* for *é*; cf. the analogous examples in § 52 n, and especially § 75 hh, also Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 17, 2, Rem. 1.—On the reading יְהִי *Ct* 3:11 (for יְהִי, on the analogy of the reading מְצִיאָה, &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 *S<sup>g</sup>hōl*, or, if the second radical is a guttural, a helping *Pathah* (according to § 28 e). Thus יָגַל for יִגְלֶה; וַיִּבְזֶה *and he despised*, *Gn* 25:34; וַיִּבְנֶה *and he built*; וַיִּשָּׂע *he looks*; וַיִּמָּח *and he destroyed*, *Gn* 7:23.

(b) The *i* of the preformative is then sometimes lengthened to *ē*, e.g. יִרְאֶה *he sees*. This, however, mostly happens only after the preformative ת, whilst after י the homogeneous *i* remains, e.g. וַתִּכַּל (but וַתִּכְלֶה), וַתִּפֹּן (but וַתִּפְּנֶה), וַתִּרְבֶּה (but וַתִּרְבְּהֶה); with middle guttural תִּתַּע *Jb* 17:7 (from וַתִּתַּעַה). The unusual position of the tone in וַתִּרְאֶה *Zc* 9:5, אֶוַתִּרְאֶה *Mi* 7:10 (so Baer and Ginsb.; ed. Mant. אֶוַתִּרְאֶה, וַתִּרְאֶה) is best explained (except in אֶוַתִּרְאֶה *Gn* 41:33, before פ) on the analogy of וַתִּקְרָא, &c., § 72 s, as due to the following א. But cf. also hh

(c) The helping vowel is elsewhere not used under the circumstances mentioned in § 28 d; וַיִּשָּׂא *Nu* 21:1, *Jer* 41:10, cf. וַיִּשָּׂא *Jb* 31:27; on the other hand, with *i* lengthened into *ē* (see p) וַיִּשָּׂא. The form וַיִּרְאֶה *he sees*, occurs parallel with וַיִּרְאֶה *and he saw* (but 3rd *fem.* always וַתִּרְאֶה), the latter with the original *Pathah* on account of the following ר, and identical with the 3rd *sing. masc.* of the *imperf. consec.* *Hiph'ūl*, 2 *K* 11:4.

(d) Examples of verbs *primae gutturalis* (§ 63), and at the same time לִיָּה, are וַיַּעַשׂ *and he made*, from וַעֲשֶׂה; וַיַּעֲנֶה *and he answered*, from וַעֲנֶה (always identical with the corresponding forms in *Hiph'ūl*), וַיַּחְזֵק *and he divided*, from וַחֲזַק. On some similar forms of פ"א see § 76 d.—In the following cases the initial (hard) guttural does not affect the form: וַיִּחַר

<sup>2</sup> All these infinitives construct in *ō*, in the Pentateuch, belong to the document called E; cf. § 69 m, second note.

and he was wroth, וַיִּחַן and he encamped (3rd plur. וַיִּחַן, וַיִּחַן, וַיִּחַן) (with *Dageš lene* and *Š'wâ*) let it rejoice, Jb 3:6; cf. Ex 18:9.—On וַיִּחַן, וַיִּחַן, וַיִּחַן (ל"ה as well as פ"ן), &c., see § 76 b, c, f.

(e) The verbs הָיָה *to be*, and יָחַי *to live*, of which the shortened imperfects ought to be *yihy* and *yihy*, change these forms to יְהִי and יַחֲיֶה, the second *Yôdh* being resolved into *i* at the end of the word; but in *pause* (§ 29 n) הִי יְהִי, תִּי יַחֲיֶה, with the original *ā* modified to *S'ghôl* with the tone (cf. also *nouns* like בָּכִי for *bakhy*. in *pause* בִּי בָּכִי; עֹנִי for 'ôny, &c., § 84a c, and § 93 x). For תִּשִּׁי, however, in Dt 32:18, since no verb תִּשֵּׂה exists, we must read either תִּשֵּׂה, or better תִּשֵּׂה (Samaritan תִּשֵּׂה), as *imperfect Qal* of נָשָׂה *to forget*.—Analogous to יְהִי from הָיָה, there occurs once, from הָיָה *to be*, the form יְהוּא for יְהוּהוּ *he will be*, Ec 11:3, but no doubt הוּא is the right reading.

The *full* forms (without apocope of the ה, cf. § 49 c) not infrequently occur after *wāw consecutive*, especially in the 1st pers. and in the later books, e.g. וַיִּרְאֶה and *I saw*, twenty times, and Jos 7:21 in *Kethibh*, but never in the Pentateuch (וַיִּרְאֶה fifteen times, of which three are in the Pent.); also in the 3rd pers. וַיַּעֲשֶׂה Ez 18:28, Jb 42:16 *Qere*; וַיַּעֲשֶׂה and *he made*, four times (but וַיַּעֲשֶׂה over 200 times); cf. also Ju 19:2 (וַיִּתְּנָה); 1 K 10:29 (וַיִּתְּנָה); Dt 1:16 (וַיִּתְּנָה), 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 יְהוּא Jb 6:21 (doubtless caused by the following וַיִּרְאֶה), read יְהוּא *ye see*, with Ginsburg.

4. The original *y* sometimes appears even before affirmatives beginning with a vowel (cf. above, **h** and **l**), especially in and before the *pause*, and before the full plural ending וַיִּן, or where for any reason an emphasis rests on the word. *Perfect* הָיָה Ps 57:2, וַיִּן Dt 32:37, cf. Ps 73:2 *Qere*; *imperative* בָּעֵי Is 21:12. *Imperfect* יְהִי Jb 16:22, 30:14 (without the *pause*, Ps 68:32); יִשְׁלַח Ps 122:6, Jb 12:6, cf. Ps 77:4; יִרְבֶּינָה Dt 8:13; Ps 36:9: more frequently like יִשְׁתַּיִן 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 לִי לִי, as *perf. Qal* from דָּלַח, was perhaps originally intended, but hardly לִי לִי, since these full forms, though they may stand out of *pause*, do not begin sentences; לִי לִי probably points to לִי לִי from דָּלַח as the right reading, since the sense requires an intransitive verb. Cf. further, **v**, **x**, **dd**, **gg**.

5. The *participle active* (cf. Vollers, 'Das Qaâtîl-Partizipium,' ZA. 1903, p. 312 ff., and on the participles of ל"ה, *ibid.*, p. 316 ff.), besides feminine forms like עֹלָה Ju 20:31, &c., רֹאֶה Pr 20:12, has also a *feminine* which retains the 3rd radical *y*, viz. בֹּכֵיהָ (= בָּכָה) *weeping*, La 1:16; הִתְמַחֵהּ *tumultuous*, Is 22:2 (*plur.* Pr 1:21); צֹפֵיהָ *spying*, Pr 31:27, פְּרִיָּהּ *fruitful*, Ps 128:3, *plur.* הַתְּיָוֹת *the things that are to come*, Is 41:23. With the ordinary strong inflexion *y* appears in עֹטֵיָהּ Ct 1:7, but perhaps there also עֹטֵיָהּ was intended, unless it should be עֹטֵיָהּ *a wanderer*. For רֹאֶה Is 47:10, רֹאֶה is to be read.—On עֹשֶׂה 1 K 20:40 for עֹשֶׂה, cf. § 116 g, **note**.—In the *participle passive* the 3rd radical still sometimes appears as ו (**§ 24 b**), cf. עָשׂוּ *made*, Jb 41:25, צָפּוּ Jb 15:22, contracted from עָשׂוּ, עָפּוּ; and before a formative ending, it even has its consonantal sound, הַעֲשׂוּם (read עֲשׂוּם) 2 K 23:4; עֲשׂוּת (read "sûwôth) 1 S 25:18 *Kethibh*, נְשׂוּת (read n' tûwôth) Is 3:16 *Kethibh*. The shortening of the *ûin* רֹאֵיָהּ Est 2:9 is irregular.

6. The defective writing is rare in such forms as וַיִּחַן 2 S 15:33; וַיִּחַן 1 K 8:44, cf. 1 K 9:3; וַיִּחַן Ex 2:16 (cf. Jer 18:21, 48:6, 1 Ch 7:15, Jb 17:5, &c.), and the pronunciation

תִּרְאֶה יָנֵה **Mi 7:10**, cf. תִּעַנְּנָה **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'al.

7. Here the forms with יָ in the 1st and 2nd *pers. sing.* of the *perfect* predominate יָ only in **Gn 24:8**); on the other hand in the 1st *plur.*, always יָ, as יָנוּ **1 S 14:8**. No examples of the 2nd *plur.* occur.—With יָ retained in *pause* יָטוּי **Nu 24:6**; once with an initial guttural יָ, **Ct 1:6** for יָהָרִי, probably arising from the ordinary strong form *niħru*, but the harshness of ה immediately followed by ר is avoided by pronouncing the ה with *Haṭeph-Pathaḥ*.—In the 3rd *sing. fem.* יָשֶׁתָּה **Pr 27:15** (in *pause* for יָשֶׁתָּה) and תָּ may be transposed for euphonic reasons; but probably we should simply read יָשֶׁתָּה.—Among Niph'al forms of ל"ה must be classed, with Buxtorf and others (cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xxx. 185), יָאָנָה from יָאָנָה, not Pi'lel of נָאוּ = נָאוּ; hence, according to § 23 d, יָאוּי they are beautiful (for יָאוּי) **Is 52:7**, **Ct 1:10**; but in **Ps 93:5**, where Baer requires יָאָנָה, read יָאָנָה with ed. Mant., Ginsb.

8. The *apocope* of the *imperfect* causes no further changes beyond the rejection of the הָ, e.g. יָגַל from יָגַלְהָ; in one verb *middle guttural*, however, a form occurs with the *Qameṣ* shortened to *Pathaḥ*, viz. יָמַח (for יָמַח) **Ps 109:13**, as in verbs יָעַע; but in *pause* יָמַח verse 14. Cf. **bb**.—The *infinitive absolute* יָגַלְהָ emphasizing an *infinitive construct*, **2 S 6:20**, is very extraordinary; probably it is a subsequent correction of an erroneous repetition of הַגְלוֹת.—The *infin. constr.* יָלֶהָ רָאָה occurs in **Ju 13:21**, **1 S 3:21** for יָלֶהָ רָאָה; cf. above, **n**.—On the *infinitive Niph'al* with the ה elided, see § 51 i.—The irregular יָעָלוּ **Ez 36:3** has probably arisen from a combination of the readings יָעָלוּ (*Qal*) and יָעָלוּ (*Niph'al*). Similarly the solecism יָמַבְּנָה **1 S 15:9** might be due to a combination of the *participle fem. Niph'al* (יָמַבְּנָה, cf. יָמַבְּנָה) with the *Hoph'al* (יָמַבְּנָה); but it is more correct, with Wellhausen, to explain the מ from a confusion with נָמַס and to read, in fact, יָמַבְּנָה וְנָמַסָּה.

### On Pi'el, Pô'el, Pu'al, and Hithpa'el.

9. In the 1st and 2nd persons of the *perfect Pi'el* the second syllable in most of the instances has יָ on the analogy of *Qal* (see **f**), as יָקַו יָתִי, דָּמַי יָתִי; always so in the first *plur.*, and before *suffixes*, e.g. יָכַסּוּ **Gn 37:26**, דָּכַיְתוּ **Ps 44:20**. The form with יָ 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'el* of ל"ה, see § 49 k.—*Hithpa'el* has (besides יָ **Jer 17:16**) as a rule יָ (**Pr 24:10**, **1 K 2:26**, **Jer 50:24**). On the other hand, *Pu'al* always has יָ, e.g. יָעַשׂ יָתִי **Ps 139:15**.—A 1st *sing. perfect Pô'el* (שוֹשֵׁתִי = שוֹסֵתִי) occurs in **Is 10:13**.

10. The *infinitive absolute Pi'el* takes the form יָבֹלָה (like יָבֹלָה, the more frequent form even in the strong verb, see § 52 o); with *ô* only in **Ps 40:2** יָקוּהָ; with *ôth* **Hb 3:13** יָעוּהָ (cf. above, **n**). On הָרוּ and הָגוּ, *infinitives absolute* of the passive of *Qal*, not of *Pô'el*, see above, **n**.—As *infinitive construct* יָבֹלָה occurs in *Pi'el*, **Ho 6:9** (only orthographically different from יָבֹלָה, if the text is correct); יָבֹלָה **Dn 9:24** (on the א see **rr**); יָבֹלָה **2 Ch 24:10**, **31:1**, for which in **2 K 13:17**, **19**, **Ezr 9:14** יָבֹלָה with *infin. abs.*; in *Pu'al* יָבֹלָה **Ps 132:1**.

11. The *apocopated imperfect* must (according to § 20 l) lose the *Dageš forte* of the second radical, hence יָצַו and he commanded, תָּעַר (for תָּעַר=תָּעַר) **Ps 141:8**; cf. **Gn 24:20**; even in the principal *pause* יָצַו אֶל-תָּגַל **Pr 25:9**; *Hithpa'el* יָתְגַל and he uncovered himself, **Gn 9:21**; יָתְרַע **Pr 22:24**; cf. **Ps 37:1**, **7**, **8**. With the lengthening of *Pathaḥ* to *Qameṣ*, יָתְרַע and he made marks, **1 S 21:14** (but read with Thenius יָתְרַע, and instead of the meaningless יָתְרַע *ibid.* read יָתְרַע). In *Hithpa'el* יָתְרַע, in close connexion, **Dt 2:9**, **19**; יָתְרַע **Is 41:10**; according to

*Qimḥi* also תִּמְחִי, Ps 45:12, Pr 23:3, 6, 24:1, 1 Ch 11:17, whilst Baer and Ginsburg read with the best authorities תִּתְחַו, תִּתְחַו (but cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, i. 597).<sup>1</sup>—On אֶחָדְךָ Jb 15:17 (for אֶחָדְךָ) cf. § 20 m; on אֶכְלֶךָ Ex 33:3, see § 27 q; on יָרַד Ju 5:13, see § 69 g. Finally, on דָּלִי, which is referred to *Pi'el* by some, as a supposed *imperative*, see above, u.

12. Examples of apocopated *imperatives* in *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el* are: צַו, also צַוְהָ *command thou*, גַּל, *open thou*, Ps 119:18, 22; מִן *prepare thou*, Ps 61:8; נִסּוּ *prove thou*, Dn 1:12; לִי *feign thyself sick*, 2 S 13:5; cf. Dt 2:24.—On רָבָה Ju 9:29, cf. § 48 l.—In Ps 137:7 עָרַו *rase it*, is found twice instead of עָרְוּ (for *'arrū*) for rhythmical reasons (cf., however, עָרַו in the *imperfect*, 2 Ch 24:11).

13. Examples of forms in which the *Yôdh* is retained are the *imperfects* תִּמְכִּיּוּן Is 40:18, cf. verse 25 and 46:5; יִכְסִימוּ *they cover them*, Ex 15:5; *participle Pu'al* מְמַחֵם Is 25:6; for אָרַבְךָ Is 16:9 (from רָבָה) read with Margolis, אָרַבְךָ.

### On Hiph'al and Hoph'al.

14. The 3rd *sing. perfect* *Hiph'al* sometimes has *S'ghôl* in the first syllable instead of *i* (§ 53 p), especially in הִגְלָה (but *perfect consecutive* וְהִגְלָה 2 K 24:14), הִקְלָה, הִקְלָה; also with *suffixes*, e.g. הִגְלַם 1 Ch 8:7, הִקְלַאֲנִי Jb 16:7, וְהִקְפְּדָה Ex 21:8. The *S'ghôl* also occurs in the 1st *sing.*, e.g. הִקְלַאתִיךָ Mi 6:3. On וְהִקְרַאתִיךָ Na 3:5, cf. § 53 p. The forms with *e* in the second syllable (also written defectively, as יִהְבֶּתֶי 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, *e* in Ex 4:12, Mi 6:3, Pr 4:11. On the tone of the *perf. consec. Hiph.* of לִי, see § 49 k. In *Hoph'al* only יִי occurs in the 2nd syllable.

15. In the *infinitive Hiph'al* of רָבָה *to be abundant*, besides the *construct* הַרְבִּיּוֹת we find the *absolute* הִרְבָּה taking the place of the common form הִרְבָּה, 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're* requires הִרְבָּה for the *Kethibh* הִרְבִּית, an evident scribal error for הִרְבִּיּוֹת. Cf. Gn 41:49, 22:17, Dt 28:63; the pointing הִרְבָּה Jer 42:2 probably arises from regarding this form as a noun.—On הִמְרוֹת Jb 17:2 (with *Dageš f. dirimens*) see § 20 h.—In 2 K 3:24 הַכּוֹת (before א) 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 ה, cf. § 53 q.

16. The *shortened imperfect Hiph'al* either takes no helping vowel, as יַפְתֵּהּ *let him enlarge*, Gn 9:27; יַרְדֵּךְ *he shall subdue*, Is 41:2; וַיִּשְׁקֵךְ *and he watered*, Gn 29:10, &c.; וַיִּרְאֵה *and he showed*, 2 K 11:4 (see § 28 d): or else has a helping vowel, as יִגְלֵךְ (for גִּלְךָ, see § 27 r), e.g. 2 K 18:11; וַיִּפְרֵךְ Ps 105:24; וַיִּתְמַרְךָ Ez 5:6; וַיִּתַּעַךְ 2 Ch 33:9; וַיִּוָּאֲרַב i.e. probably וַיִּוָּאֲרַבְךָ Jos 24:3 *Kethibh* (וַיִּוָּאֲרַבְךָ *Q're*).—Examples of verbs *first guttural*: וַיִּעַל Nu 23:2, וַיִּוָּאֲרַבְךָ, &c., which can be distinguished as *Hiph'al* from the similar forms in *Qal* only by the sense.—The *apocopated imperative Hiph'al* always (except in verbs פִּיץ, e.g. הִט, § 76 c) has a helping vowel, *S'ghôl* or *Pathah*, e.g. וַיִּזְכֹּרְךָ *increase thou* (for *harb*, הִרְבָּה) Ps 51:4 *Q're*, also Ju 20:38; where, however, it cannot be explained the text stands; וַיִּתְחַוְךָ *let alone* (for הִרְפָּה, הִרְפָּה Dt 9:14, &c.; וַיִּעַל

<sup>1</sup> In Nu 34:7 f., according to verse 10, תִּתְחַוּ (=תִּתְחַוּוּ) is intended to be read for תִּתְחַוּוּ (*imperfect Pi'el* from תִּתְחַוּוּ).

(for *עָלָה*) Ex 8:1, 33:12; but for *הִשָּׁע* Ps 39:14, which could only be *imperative Hiph 'l* of *שָׁעַ* (=smear over, as in Is 6:10), read with Baethgen *שָׁעַ* look away.—The *imperfect Hiph 'l* with *Yôdh* retained occurs only in *תּוֹגְיִיוֹן* Jb 19:2, from *יָגַע*. Cf. u.

### In General.

17. In Aramaic the *imperfect* and *participle* of all the conjugations terminate in אָ or יָ. The Hebrew *infinitives*, *imperatives*, and *imperfects* in הָ, less frequently אָ or יָ, may be due to imitation of these forms. On the *infinitive construct* *Pi 'el* הָפִי see above, aa; *imperative Qal* הָוֹא Jb 37:6 (in the sense of *fall*); *imperfect* יֵרֵא let him look out, Gn 41:33 (but see above, p); *עָשָׂה* he will do, Is 64:3; *אֶל־תֵּהִי־הָיָה* Jer 17:17; *בָּא* אֶל־תֵּבִיא consent thou not, Pr 1:10; *עָשָׂה* אֶל־תֵּבִיא do thou not, 2 S 13:12 (the same form in Gn 26:29, Jos 7:9, Jer 40:16 *Q<sup>e</sup>re*); *אֶהְיֶה* (so Baer and Ginsburg, after cod. Hillel, &c.) I will be, Jer 31:1; *וַיַּעֲשֵׂה* Jos 9:24; *תִּרְצָה* Dn 1:13. Cf. also in *Niph 'al* יִמְצָה Lv 5:9; *תִּבְנֶה* (according to Qimḥi) Nu 21:27; in *Pi 'el* תִּגְלֶה Lv 18:7, 8, 12–17, 20:19, in each case ל' אֶת־תִּגְלֶה, beside תִּגְלֶה with a minor distinctive; *יִנְפֶה* (Baer *יִנְפָה*) Na 1:3; *אֶזְרָה* Ez 5:12 (with *Zaqeph*; Baer *אֶזְרָה*). 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 *Ṣere* 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*.<sup>1</sup> 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 *ê* is probably intended to soften the hiatus caused by a following אָ or עָ; cf. the analogous cases above, § 74 l.

The ending יָ appears to stand for הָ in the *imperfect Qal* in *וַתִּגְיִי־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 'l* *מְתִי* אֶל־תֵּת־מְתִי Jer 18:23; but the *Mil'el*-tone probably points to *תִּמָּה* as the correct reading (cf. Neh 13:14). The יָ stands for הָ in the *perfect Hiph 'l* *הִלִּי* he made sick, Is 53:10, which is probably for *הִחֲלִיא* from *חָלָא*, a secondary form of *חָלָה*; see rr. The *plur.* *הִמְסִיוּ* (Baer *הִמְסִין*) they made to melt, Jos 14:8, is a purely Aramaic form.

18. In two verbs the rare conjugation *Pa 'lél* or its reflexive (§ 55 d) occurs: *מִטְּחָוּ* archers, Gn 21:16 (from *טָחָה*); but most frequently in *שָׁקַח* to bend, *Pa 'lél* *שָׁקַח* not in use, whence reflexive *הִשָּׁתַח* to bow oneself, to prostrate oneself, 2nd *pers.* in *יָתַח* and 1st *pers.* in *יָתַח*, *imperfect* *הִשָּׁתַח*, consecutive 3rd *sing. masc.* *וַיִּשָּׁתַח* for *wayyīštāḥw* (analogous to the noun-forms, like *שָׁח* for *saḥw*); 3rd *plur.* *וַיִּשָּׁתַחוּ*.—Instead of the aramazing *infinitive* with *suffix* *תִּי* *בָּהִשָּׁתַח*, 2 K 5:18 read with König *הוֹתִי* *בָּהִשָּׁתַח*; in Ez 8:16 *מִשָּׁתַח* *חִיֹּתָם* is still more certainly a scribal error for *מִשָּׁתַח* *חִיֹּתָם*.

19. Before *suffixes* in all forms ending in הָ, a connecting vowel is employed instead of the הָ and the connecting vowel which precedes it (§ 58 f), e.g. *נָחַ* Gn 24:27; in *pause* *נָחַ* 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 *נָחַ*), Jb 30:19; cf. § 59 h; *עָנָךְ*, in *pause* *עָנָךְ*, Is 30:19 (and even when not in *pause* Jer 23:37) or like *קָנָךְ* Dt 32:6; *נִפְרָךְ*, *נִרְבָּךְ*, Gn 28:3; cf. also *עָנָה* *עָנָה*, *imperfect* *עָנָה*, *נָחַ*, *Hiph 'l* *נָחַ*, *הִכָּה* *עָנָה*, *הִכָּה* *עָנָה*.

<sup>1</sup> Possibly these examples (like the eases of *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* 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 יָ before suffixes, e.g. אֶפְאַיֶהֶם Dt 32:26; יָכַסּ יָמוּ Ps 140:10 *Q<sup>r</sup>é*; הִכּ יָנִי 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 גָּלָה (see i) is always used before a *suffix*, e.g. כָּל תּוֹ (for כָּל־תּוֹהוּ) Zc 5:4; in *pause* עָשָׂה תְּנִי Jb 33:4; רָאֲתָךְ 42:5.

#### *The Relation between Verbs לִי"ה and לִי"א*

20. The close relation existing between verbs לִי"ה and לִי"א 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 לִי"א—

(a) Which have adopted the vowels of verbs לִי"ה, e.g. *perfect Qal* כָּל אֲתִי *I have refrained*, Ps 119:101; *participle* חוֹטֵא (חָטָא) *sinning*, Ec 2:26, 8:12, 9:2, 18; cf. Is 65:20; מוֹצֵא Ec 7:26; *lending*, 1 S 22:2; *Pi'el perfect* מָלֵא *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; רַפֵּי אֲתוֹ *I heal*, 2 K 2:21; cf. Jer 51:9; *imperfect* יִגְמָא Jb 39:24; *Niph'al perfect* נִפְלְאָה (like נִגְלְתָה) *it was wonderful*, 2 S 1:26; *Hiph'il perfect* הִפְלְאָה Dt 28:59; תִּהְבֵּאָה (not תֵּאָה, cf. above, 2 S 1:26) *she hid*, Jos 6:17. On the other hand, forms like חָטָאִים 1 S 14:33, קָרָאִים Ps 99:6, נִרְפָּאוּ Ez 47:8, תִּדְכָּאוּנִי Jb 19:2 (cf. Gn 31:39 *אֲחַטְנָה*), and *imperative plur. masc.* יִרְאֵה Jos 24:14, 1 S 12:24, Ps 34:10, are due to the elision of the א, see § 74 i. On יִגְשׂוּא Jer 10:5 and יִגְשׂוּא Ps 139:20, see § 23 i.

(b) Forms in ה, but keeping their לִי"א vowels, e.g. *imperfect Qal* אֲרַפֶּה Jer 3:22; *imperative* רַפֵּהְךָ *heal thou*, Ps 60:4; *Niph'al*; נִהְבֵּה Jer 49:10 (which must evidently be a *perfect*; read with Ewald the *infinitive absolute* הִנְחַבְהִי as in verse 23), and תִּהְבֵּה *to hide oneself*, 1 K 22:25, cf. Jer 19:11; *Pi'el imperfect* יִמְלֵא *he will fill*, Jb 8:21.

(c) Forms entirely of a לִי"ה character, e.g. *perfect Qal* וְצָמְתָה *and when thou art athirst*, Ru 2:9, cf. 2 S 3:8; כָּלוּ they shut up, 1 S 6:10; cf. 25:33; מָלוּ they are full, Ez 28:16, cf. 39:26; *infinitive* חָטוּ (see above, n) *to sin*, Gn 20:6 (on מָלֵא see above, § 74 h); *imperative sing. fem.* חִבֵּי Is 26:20; *imperfect* יִכְלֵה (for יִכְלֵא) *he will keep back*, Gn 23:6; תִּרְפֵּינָה *they heal*, Jb 5:18; *participle* בּוֹטֵא Pr 12:18; *fem.* יִצָּא Ec 10:5; *plur.* יִהֵ צָרָה Is 29:7; *participle passive* נִשְׂוִי Ps 32:1; *Niph'al* תִּהְבֵּה Jer 51:9; תִּהְבֵּהְךָ thou hast prophesied, Jer 26:9 (cf. Ps 139:14, Jb 18:3); *imperfect* חָטוּ 2 K 2:22 (*infinitive* Jer 19:11); *Pi'el imperfect* וְיִרְפֹּה Jer 8:11, cf. Gn 31:39; *Hiph'il* מִקְנֵה Ez 8:3; *Hithpa'el* יִתְחַבֵּב 1 S 10:6; *infinitive* תִּתְנַבֹּת 1 S 10:13. For the *K<sup>e</sup>thibh* להִשׂוּת 2 K 19:25, Jablonski and others require as *Q<sup>r</sup>é* the form לְהִשְׂאוּת (so Is 37:26); the *K<sup>e</sup>thibh* would have to be read לְהִשׂוּת, with elision of the א and retraction of the vowel.

22. On the other hand, there are forms of verbs לִי"ה, which wholly or in part follow the analogy of verbs לִי"א, e.g. in their consonants אָתָה *he comes*, Is 21:12; בָּרָא 2 S 12:17 (*textus receptus* בָּרָה); וְרָצָהְךָ Ez 43:27; יִשְׁנָא Jb 8:11; יִשְׁנָא La 4:1; וְיִחַלָּא 2 Ch 16:12; תִּקְרָה אָנָה Ex 1:10, Lv 10:19; Dt 28:66 (cf. Ho 11:7); נִקְרָא (*infinitive absol. Niph'al* beside יִתִּי 2 S 1:6; יִשְׁנָא 2 K 25:29; מִרְפָּא Jer 38:4; יִשְׁנָא Ec 8:1; in their vowels, אָתָהְךָ Jer 3:22; יִקְרָה Dn 10:14; תִּכְלֵה 1 K 17:14; in both, יִקְרָה Gn 49:1; cf. 42:4, Is 51:19; 2 S 21:12 *Q<sup>r</sup>é*; לִירוּא 2 Ch 26:15 (cf. 2 S 11:24 *K<sup>e</sup>thibh*); מִרְאָה (*participle fem. Qal*) Zp 3:1; יִפְרִיא Ho 13:15; מִסְלָאִים La 4:2.—For פִּרְאוּת (so Baer, Ez 17:6, cf. 31:8), which can only be intended for פִּרְאוּת *participle fem. plur.* from פִּרְהָ=פִּרְהָ, read פִּרְאוּת *branches*, 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 *נָדַד* to flee, the *imperfect* is *יָדוּד* in Na 3:7 and *יָדַד* in Gn 31:40 (on the analogy of verbs פִּי"ן); *Hiph'āl* הִדָּד (like a verb ע"ע), but the *imperfect Hoph'al* again יָדַד (as פִּי"ן).

2. The following are examples of difficult forms, which are derived from doubly weak verbs:

(a) Verbs פִּי"ן and ל"א (cf. § 66 and § 74), e.g. *נָשָׂא* to bear, imperative *שֵׂא* (Ps 10:12 *נָשָׂא*, of which *נָסָה* Ps 4:7 is probably only an orthographic variation); *infinitive construct* *שֵׂאת* (for *שֵׂא*; see the analogous noun-formations in § 93 t), also *נָשָׂא* Is 1:14, 18:3; Gn 4:13 *נָשָׂא*; Ps 89:10 *שֵׂא* (perhaps only a scribal error); after the *prefix* ל always *לְשֵׂאת* (otherwise the contracted form only occurs in *תוּ* *לְשֵׂא* Jb 41:17, with rejection of the א); *imperfect* *תֵּשׂ* for *תֵּשׂ* Ru 1:14; wholly irregular are *תֵּשׂ* Ez 23:49 (so Baer after Qimḥi; *textus receptus*, and also the Mantua ed., and Ginsburg, *תֵּשׂ* אינה) and *נִשְׂא* 2 S 19:43 as *infinitive absolute Niph'al* (on the analogy of the *infinitive construct Qal*?); but most probably *נִשְׂא* is to be read, with Driver.

(b) Verbs פִּי"ן and ל"ה (cf. § 66 and § 75), as *נָטָה* to bow, to incline, *נָכָה* to smite. Hence *imperfect Qal* *יָטָה*, *apocopated* *נָטָה* (Gn 26:25 *וַיִּטָּה* and he bowed; *נָטָה* (so, probably, also Is 63:3 for *וַיִּטָּה*) 2 K 9:33 and he sprinkled (from *נָטָה*); *perfect Hiph'āl* *הִכָּה* he smote, *imperfect* *יָכָה*, *apocopated* *יָכָה*, *נָכָה* (even with *Athnaḥ* 2 K 15:16; but also ten times *נָכָה* Dt 2:33; so also *נָכָה* Lv 8:11, 30; *נָכָה* Ps 141:4 (cf. Jb 23:11); *imperative* *הִכָּה*, *apocopated* *הִכָּה* smite thou (like *הִכָּה* incline, with *הִטָּה*), *infinitive* *הִכּוּת*, *participle* *מִכָּה*; *Hoph'al* *הִכָּה*, *participle* *מִכָּה*.

(c) Verbs פִּי"א and ל"ה (cf. § 68 and § 75), as *אָבָה* to be willing, *אָפָה* to bake, *אָתָה* to come. E.g. *imperfect Qal* *אָבָה*, *יָאָבָה*, *plur.* *יָאָבוּ* (cf. § 68 h) Dt 33:21 for *וַיִּאָבְדוּ* (= *וַיִּאָבְדוּ*); *imperfect apocopated* *וַיִּאָבְדוּ* Is 41:25 for *וַיִּאָבְדוּ*; *imperative* *אָבְדוּ* Is 21:12, 56:9, 12 (cf. *אָבְדוּ* *bake ye*, Ex 16:23) for *וַיִּאָבְדוּ* (cf. § 23 h; § 75 u); *Hiph'āl* *perfect* *וַיִּבְרַח* for *וַיִּבְרַח* Is 21:14; *imperfect apocopated* *וַיִּבְרַח* and he adjured, 1 S 14:24, properly *וַיִּבְרַח* from *אָבָה*, whence *אָבָה*, and, with the obscuring to *ô*, *יָאָבָה*; instead of the simple *apocope* (ל) the א which had already become quiescent, is made audible again by the helping *S<sup>c</sup>ghôl* (unless perhaps there is a confusion with the *imperfect consecutive Hiph'āl* of *יָאָבָה*).

(d) Verbs פִּי"י and ל"א (cf. § 69, § 70, and § 74), as *יָצָא* to go forth, *יָצָא* go forth, with *הָ* *paragogic* *יָצָא* Ju 9:29 in principal pause for *יָצָא*; 2nd fem. plur. *יָצָא* Ct 3:11; *infinitive* *יָצֵאת*; *Hiph'āl* *וַיִּצֵא* to bring forth.—*יָרָא* to fear, *imperfect* *יָרָא* and *יָרָא* (or *יָרָא*), *imperative* *יָרָא*; *imperfect Niph'al* *יָרָא* Ps 130:4, *participle* *יָרָא*.

(e) Verbs פִּי"י and ל"ה (cf. § 69, § 70, and § 75), e.g. *יָדָה* to throw, *Hiph'āl* *וַיִּתְּבַח* to confess, to praise, and *יָדָה* to throw (both properly verbs פִּי"י), and *יָדָה* to be beautiful. *Infinitive* *יָדָה*; *imperative* *יָדָה*; *imperfect consecutive* *וַיִּתְּבַח* Ez 31:7 (cf. also *וַיִּתְּבַח* 16:13); with *suffixes* *וַיִּתְּבַח* we have shot at them (from *יָדָה*) Nu 21:30; perhaps, however, it should be read with the LXX *וַיִּתְּבַח* and their race (also in the very corrupt passage Ps 74:8 *וַיִּתְּבַח* is probably a *substantive*, and not the *imperfect Qal* with *suffix* from *יָדָה*; *Pi'el*; *וַיִּתְּבַח* for *וַיִּתְּבַח* (§ 69 u). *Hiph'āl* *וַיִּתְּבַח*, *וַיִּתְּבַח*;

*infinitive* הוֹדֵד (as *infinitive absolute* 2 Ch 7:3); *imperfect* יוֹרְהָה, cf. Jer 22:3; *apocopated* גִּיּוֹר 2 K 13:17.

(f) Verbs עָוִי and לִיֵּא, particularly בּוֹא *to come*. *Perfect* בָּא, אָתָּה, בָּ, אַתָּה or בָּאָתָּה (Gn 16:8, 2 S 14:3, Mi 4:10; cf. § 75 m), once בּוֹ for אָנוּ בּוֹ 1 S 25:8; for בּוֹ אָוִי Jer 27:18, which is apparently the *perfect*, read אָוִי. In the *imperfect Qal* the separating vowel occurs (אָוִי יָנָה) instead of the more common אָנָה אָוִי, cf. also אָוִי יָנָה Gn 30:38) only in Jer 9:16, Ps 45:16, and 1 S 10:7 *K<sup>e</sup>thibh*.

For וְתָבֵא 1 S 25:34 *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* (the *K<sup>e</sup>thibh* וְתָבֵא evidently combines the two readings וְתָבֵא and וְתָבֵא; cf. Nestle, *ZAW*. xiv. 319), read וְתָבֵא; on the impossible forms Dt 33:16 and Jb 22:21 cf. § 48 d.—In the *perfect Hiph' il* הִבִּיא אָתָּה, הִבִּיא אָתָּה and (only before a suffix) הִבִּיאָתָּה; the latter form is also certainly intended in Nu 14:31, where the Masora requires יָבִיאָתָּה, cf. 2 K 9:2, 19:25, Is 43:23 Jer 25:13, Ct 3:4. Before suffixes the  $\bar{e}$  of the first syllable in the 3rd *sing.* always becomes *Haṭeph-S<sup>g</sup>hól*, e.g. יָבִיאָתָּה, יָבִיאָתָּה; elsewhere invariably *Haṭeph-Pathah*, e.g. יָבִיאָתָּה or יָבִיאָתָּה. On the other hand,  $\bar{e}$  is retained in the secondary tone in the *perfect consecutive* when without suffixes, e.g. וְיָבִיאָתָּה. Cf. moreover, וְיָבִיאָתָּה (in Opius and Hahn is altogether incorrect), Pr 25:16, from קִיאָ; but קִיאָ *spue ye*, Jer 25:27 (perhaps only a mistake for קִיאָ), is not to be referred to קִיאָ but to a secondary stem קִיאָ. In the *imperfect* וְיָבִיאָתָּה is found once, Lv 18:25, besides וְיָבִיאָתָּה (analogous to וְיָבִיאָתָּה).—On אָבִי (for אָבִיא), גָּבִי, מָבִי, see § 74 k.

(g) The form וְיָבִיאָתָּה *to live*, in the *perfect Qal*, besides the ordinary development to וְיָבִיאָתָּה (*fem.* וְיָבִיאָתָּה), is also treated as a verb עָוִי, and then becomes וְיָבִיאָתָּה in the 3rd *pers. perfect*, in *pause* וְיָבִיאָתָּה, and with *wāw consecutive* וְיָבִיאָתָּה Gn 3:22, and frequently. In Lv 25:36 the contracted form וְיָבִיאָתָּה is perhaps *st. constr.* of וְיָבִיאָתָּה *life*, but in any case read וְיָבִיאָתָּה *perfect consecutive* as in verse 35. The form וְיָבִיאָתָּה occurs in Ex 1:16 in *pause* for וְיָבִיאָתָּה (3rd *fem.*) with *Dageš* omitted in the  $\bar{e}$  on account of the pausal lengthening of  $\bar{a}$  to  $\bar{a}$ .

### § 77. Relation of the Weak Verbs to one another.

The close relation which exists between some classes of the weak verbs (e.g. between פָּוִי and פָּוִי, לִיֵּא and לִיֵּא, עָוִי and עָוִי, עָוִי and עָוִי) 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 דָּךְ there occur with the same meaning דָּכָה, דָּכָה, דָּכָה *to strike, to crush*; and from the root נָד there are נָדָה, נָדָה, נָדָה *to flee*.

In this manner the following classes are related in form and meaning:

1. Verbs עָוִי and עָוִי in which the first and third consonants are the same in both, as being essential to the meaning; e.g. מָכַר and מָכַר *to become poor*; מִשַּׁשׁ and מִשַּׁשׁ *to feel*; נָדָה and נָדָה *to flee*.

2. Verbs פ"י and פ"ן; e.g. נָצַב and נִצַּב *to place*, יָקַשׁ and יִקְשׁוּ (*yāqōš*) *to lay snares*. Moreover, stems belonging to the classes mentioned in 1 (especially ע"י) are frequently related also to verbs פ"י and פ"ן, e.g. גָּוַר and גִּוַר *to fear*; טוֹב and יָטַב *to be good*; נָפַח and פּוּחַ *to blow*; נָפַץ and פּוֹץ *to dash to pieces*. Verbs פ"א are less frequently connected with these classes, e.g. אָדַשׁ and דּוּשׁ *to thresh*, &c.

3. Verbs ל"א and ל"ה (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 דָּבַא and דָּבַהּ *to crush*, קָרָא and פָּרַהּ *to meet* (cf. § 75 nm); to verbs of the other classes, in מָצָה and מָצַץ *to suck*, דָּחָה and דּוּחַ *to thrust*, &c.

4. Verbs ע"ע and ל"ה, on which cf. Grimm, *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, 1903, p. 196; e.g. אָנָה and אָנַן *to sigh*, דָּמָה and דָּמַם *to be quiet*, הִנָּה and הִנֵּן *to incline*, כָּלָה and כָּלַל *to end*, קָלָה and קָלַל *to despise*, שָׁגָה and שָׁגַג *to err*, שָׁחָה and שָׁחַח *to bend down*, שָׁסָה and שָׁסַס *to plunder*.

5. Verbs ע"י and ע"ה; e.g. מָהַל and מוּל (New Hebrew; in O. T. only מוּל *Is 1:22*) *to circumcise*, מָוַר and מוּרָה *to exchange*, נוֹר (in מְנוֹרָה *a light*) and נָהַר *to shine*; cf. also קְהָטִים *secret arts*, Ex 7:11 with לֵט *secret*, from לוּט.

### § 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. ἦλθον, fut. ἔλεύσομαι, 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—

בָּשׁ *to be ashamed*. Hiph 'ל' הִבִּישׁ (inferred from הִבִּישׁ וְתָהּ), but also הִבִּישׁ, הִבִּישׁ as if from יָבַשׁ, on the analogy of verbs פ"י; also in Is 30:5 the *Q're* requires הִבִּישׁ, where the *K'thibh* has בָּאֵשׁ הִבִּיאִישׁ.

טוֹב *to be good*. Perfect טוב; but imperfect יָטַב. and Hiph 'ל' הִיטִיב from יָטַב (but cf. הִטִּיבָהּ 2 K 10:30).

יָגַר *to be afraid*. Imperfect יִגוֹר (from גוֹר).

יָקַץ *to awake*, only in the imperf. יִיקָץ; for the perfect, the Hiph 'ל' הִקִּיץ is used (from קוֹץ).

נָפַץ *to break in pieces*. Imperfect יִפּוֹץ (from פוֹץ). Imperative פּוֹץ. Niph 'al נִפְּץ. Pi 'el נִפְּץ (from נִפְּץ). Pólél פּוֹלֵל (from פוֹץ). Reflexive הִתְפּוֹצֵץ. Hiph 'ל' הִפִּיץ. Also פָּצַץ Jb 16:12.

נָצַב (*Qal* in post-biblical Hebrew, in Aramaic and Arabic) *to place*, whence (possibly) Niph 'al נִצַּב and Hiph 'ל' הִצִּיב (see above, § 71); but Hithpa 'el הִתְנַצַּב.

שָׁתָה *to drink*, used in *Qal*; but in Hiph. הִשָּׁקָה *to give to drink*, from a *Qal* שָׁקָה which is not used in Hebrew.

On הָלַךְ (יָלַךְ) *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:

יָסַף *to add*. The *infinitive* (but cf. § 69 h, note) and *imperfect*, unused in *Qal*, are supplied by the *Hiph'āl* הוֹסִיף, הוֹסִיפָה (on יוֹסֵף as *imperfect indicative*, see § 109 d, cf. also § 109 i).

כָּשַׁל *to stumble*. *Perfect* from *Qal*, *imperfect* from *Niph'al*.

נִגַּשׁ *to approach*, unused in *perf. Qal*, instead of which *Niph'al* נִגַּשׁ is used; but *imperfect* יִגַּשׁ, *imperative* שִׁגַּשׁ, and *infinitive* לְיִגַּשׁ from *Qal* only are in use.

נָהַג *to lead*. *Perfect* usually נָהַג in *Qal*, so *imperative* נָהַג, but *imperfect* and *infinitive* always in *Hiph'āl*.

נָתַךְ *to be poured out*. *Perfect Niph'al* נִתְכַּךְ with *imperfect Qal* יִתְכַּךְ, 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*. xlv, 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.

---

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

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 verbalia* 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*.<sup>1</sup>

#### § 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 אִם *mother*, אִתָּן *a she-ass*, אִזָּה *a she-goat*, אִנָּה *an ewe* (cf. § 122 b). As a rule, however, the *feminine* had originally the ending תָּ, as in the 3rd *sing. perfect* of verbs (§ 44 a). This תָּ, 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 תָּ<sup>2</sup> (see

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> To speak of these changes as a declension of the Hebrew noun, as is usually done, is accordingly incorrect.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> In Mal 1:14 מְשֻׁמֵּת (so e. g. ed. Mant.) would stand for מְשֻׁמֵּתָהּ, the ptc. fem. Hophֶּל; but מְשֻׁמֵּת (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. סוּס *equus*, סוּסָה *equa*. Of nouns ending in הָ, like עֶבְרִי, the feminine (by § 24 b) is עֶבְרִיָּה, cf. § 86 h. As in the 3rd *sing. fem. perfect* (הָלָהּ, קָ, &c.), this הָ seems to have arisen by the rejection of the final ה, and the lengthening of the *ā* in the open syllable, whereupon the ה was added as an orthographic indication of the final long vowel: cf. the exactly similar origin of such forms as גָּלָהּ for גָּלִי, § 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 הָ.

(b) Simple ה with nouns ending in a vowel, e. g. יְהוּדִי *Jew*, יְהוּדִיָּה *Jewess*. The same ending ה 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<sup>e</sup>ghôl*, but after gutturals *Pathah*, e. g. קָטַלְתָּ, *fem.* קָטַלְתְּ, *killing*; before suffixes, e. g. קָטַלְתִּי, according to the rule given in § 69 c, cf. also § 84a s; מוֹדַע *an acquaintance, fem.* מוֹדַעַת. 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 יִלְדֶתָּ (for יִלְדֶתְּ, which is used elsewhere) Gn 16:11, Ju 13:5, 7; cf. Jer 22:23 and 51:13 *Q<sup>r</sup>é*, also מְשַׁרְתָּ 1 K 1:15, *participle fem.* Pi□I, properly *me<sup>e</sup>sāratt* = מְשַׁרְתָּ; also מְבַעֲתָּ (*participle fem.* Pi□ēl with suffix) arises from the form מְבַעֲתָּ which was developed into מְבַעֲתָּה.

Rem. 1. The fem. form in הָ הָ is in general less frequent, and occurs almost exclusively when the form in הָ הָ is also in use. It is only in the participles and infinitives that it is the commoner, e. g. קָטַלְתְּ more common than קָטַלְתָּ, לָדַת than לָדַתָּ.

2. *Rarer* feminine endings are—(a) הָ with the tone, e. g. יְרֵקָה *emerald*, Ez 28:13 (also יְרֵקָה Ex 28:17); שִׁפְעָה *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 הָ was the usual fem. ending, § 2 d) and other neighbouring tribes,<sup>1</sup> e. g. זָרֵפְתָּ *Zarephath*, גִּבְעָתָּ *Gibeath*, קִרְיָתָּ *Kiriath*, אֵילָתָּ Greek *Ailana* in Idumea, אֶחָזָתָּ Gn 26:26: on the reading אֶלְיָתָּ cf. g. Cf., moreover, נְגִינָתָּ Ps 61:1 (prob. originally נְגִינָתָּ); חֵיָתָּ (LXX חֵיָתָּ) 74<sup>19a</sup>; פּוּגָתָּ La 2:18; [רַבְּתָּ *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) הָ, which likewise occurs in some names of places, e. g. בְּעֵלְתָּ, בְּעֵלְתָּ, as well as in the  *masc.* proper name אֶלְיָתָּ 1 S 17:4, &c. (in 17:23, and 21:10, ed. Mant. has אֶלְיָתָּ), and in the *fem.* proper name שִׁמְעָתָּ; otherwise, almost only in poetry, viz. זִמְרָתָּ Ex 15:2, Is 12:2, Ps 118:14 (really for זִמְרָתִי *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 *Yôdh*, but is intended ‘to facilitate the absorption of הָ’; so Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 277 f.); נְחֵלְתָּ,

<sup>1</sup> 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, זֹאת הַבְּמָתָּה *this high place*; line 26, הַמְּסַלְתָּה *the highway* [see also Driver, *Tenses*, § 181, *note*].

heritage, Ps 16:6 (either again for הַלְתִּי, *my heritage*, or for הַלְתָּהּ, cf. § 90 g, as probably also עֲזָרָה *help*, Ps 60:13, 108:13 for תָּהָהּ). These forms are possibly survivals from a period when even final vowels were not supported by a vowel-letter. Cf. also פְּרִיָּה *fecunda* (a fruitful tree) Gn 49:22; יְתֵרָה *abundance*, Jer 48:36 (before *y*; but in Is 15:7 יְתֵרָה); שָׁנָה *sleep* (for שָׁנָה) Ps 132:4; and (unless the ת is radical) in prose קָצָה *pelican* (which reading is also preferable, in Is 34:11, to the form קָצָה), also הָרָהּ מָּה *the morrow*, but in *construct state* always מִמָּחָרָה.<sup>1</sup>—תְּהִלָּה Jer 45:25 *Q<sup>o</sup>ré* is no doubt intended to indicate the reading תְּהִלָּהּ, parallel to מְשֹׁשִׁי; cf. above, on זְמִרָה, &c.

(c) אָהַ, the Aramaic orthography for הָהַ, chiefly in the later writers; לֹאֲרָה *loathing*, Nu 11:20; אֲהָא *a terror*, Is 19:17; שָׁנָה *sleep*, Ps 127:2; לְבִיאָה *a lioness*, Ez 19:2 (unless לְבִיאָה is intended); מַטְרָה *a mark*, La 3:12; cf. also דִּשְׂאָה *threshing* (participle *Qal* from דִּשָׂה) Jer 50:11; מְרָה *bitter*, Ru 1:20. On the other hand, according to the western Masora, קָרְחָה *baldness* is to be read in Ez 27:31; see Baer on the passage.

(d) הָהַ, an obtuse form of הָהַ (§ 27 u), only in הַזְּוֹרָה for הַזְּוֹרָה Is 59:5 (unless it is again a *forma mixta* combining the *active ptcp. masc.* הַזְּוֹרָה and the *passive ptcp. fem.* הַזְּוֹרָה); cf. לָנָה for לָנָה Zc 5:4; אָנָה 1 K 2:36, 42 (§ 90 i, and § 48 d).

(e) הָהַ - without the tone, e. g. רָחָהּ Dt 14:17 [Lv 11:18 רָחָהּ]; *an oven heated*, Ho 7:4; cf. Ez. 40:19, 2 K 15:29, 16:18. In all those examples the usual tone-bearing הָהַ 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 הָהַ), and in Jb 42:13, Ho 7:4, the text is probably in error.]

(f) יָהַ, as an old feminine termination, preserved also in Syriac (*ai*; see examples in Nöldeke's *Syrische Gram.*, § 83), in Arabic and (contracted to *é*) in Ethiopic, very probably occurs in the proper name שָׂרַי *Sarai*, cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* xl. 183, and xlii. 484; also טֵן *ten* (*fem.*) undoubtedly arises from an original *esray*; so Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 138; König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 427.

3. It is wholly incorrect to regard the vowel-ending הָהַ<sup>2</sup> as the original termination of the feminine, and the *consonantal* ending הָהַ as derived from it. The Ethiopic still has the ת throughout, so too the Assyrian (*at, it*); in Phoenician also the feminines end for the most part in ת, which is pronounced *at* in the words found in Greek and Latin authors; less frequently in א (see Gesenius, *Monumm. 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.

<sup>1</sup> In 1 S 20:27 also, where the Masora (see Baer on Jos 5:11) for some unknown reason requires מִמָּחָרָה, read with ed. Mant., Jablonski, Opatius, and Ginsburg, מִמָּחָרָה.

<sup>2</sup> In this ending the הָהַ *h* can only be considered *consonantal* in the sense that the ת was originally aspirated, and afterwards ‘the mute ת was dropped before *h*, just as the old Persian *mithra* became in modern Persian *mihra*’; 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 אָב *father*, אִם *mother* (but see both words in the Lexicon; according to Stade and others אָב, אִם, &c., are children's words and terms of endearment, and so really primitive nouns), or *derivative*, i.e. either *Derivativa verbalia* (§§ 83–5), e. g. רָם *high*, רָמָה *high place*, מְרוֹם *height*, from רוּם *to be high*, or less frequently *Derivativa denominativa* (§ 86), e. g. מְרִגְלוֹת *the place at the feet*, from רַגַּל *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. מְלִכּוּת, מְמַלְכָּה. The formative letters used for this purpose are ה א מנת י ו ה א מנת י ו ה א מנת י ו),<sup>1</sup> 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. גַּבְרִיאֵל (*man of God*), יְהוֹרָם (Yahwe raises up), יְהוֹנָתָן (Yahwe gave), &c.<sup>2</sup>

## § 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 שְׂעִיר *he-goat* (prop. *shaggy*, from שָׁעַר), שְׂעֵרָה *barley* (prop. *prickly*, also from שָׁעַר), הָסִידָה *stork* (prop. *pia*, sc. *avis*), זָהָב *gold* (from זָהַב=זָהַב *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 קַרְנֵי *horn*, עֵינַי *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. אֹיֵב *enemy*, דַּעַת *to know, knowledge*. Still oftener, however,

<sup>1</sup> From this *vox memorialis* the *nomina aucta* are also called by the older grammarians *nomina heemantica*.

<sup>2</sup> G. Rammelt (*Über die zusammengesetzten Nomina im Hebr.*, Halle, 1883, and Leipzig, 1884) recognizes as appellatives only צְפַרְדֵּי (cf. below, § 85 w) and צִלְמֵן (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 לֹא, לֹא, לֹא, 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 לְקַטֵּל, the infinitives of the (Aramaic) form מְקַטֵּל (as a *noun* also מְקַטֵּל), further לְקַטֵּל, קַטֵּלָה, קַטֵּלָה, קַטֵּלָה ( § 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 מֵדָע *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*, *qitul*), sometimes by the lengthening of the characteristic vowel (*qatûl*, *qatûl*, *qatâl*), 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. לְקַטֵּל is the infinitive of the perfect stem, לְקַטֵּל the infinitive of the imperfect stem, וְשָׁכַב infinitive of וְשָׁכַב, &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 ‘metaplasm’, 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 incontestable 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. *Růzička*, ‘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 *qāṭl*, *qīṭl*, *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<sup>c</sup>ghôl or Pathah under the 2nd consonant of the existing developed forms, פֶּר, סָפַר, רָעַץ, &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,<sup>1</sup> and consequently disappear when no longer needed. Under certain circumstances even (e. g. in קִשָּׁט) 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 גִּדְרָה, יָרִיךְ, &c., the connective forms of גִּדְרָה, יָרִיךְ, &c., which latter can only come from ground-forms *gādirǝ*, *yāriḵ*, *kāriḵ*, *kātip*,.

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 *Qameṣ* under the 2nd radical before the termination יָם, fem. יָת, of the *absolute state*, as מְלָכִים, מְלָכוֹת, סְפָרִים, &c. This *Qameṣ* (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 *ǎ*. This is impossible from what has been said, especially under 1 and 2. Hence the explanation of the consistent occurrence of *Qameṣ* in the plurals of *all* Segholates can only be that the regularly formed plurals (i.e. from singulars with original *ǎ* in the 2nd syllable) became the models for all the others, and ultimately even for some really monosyllabic forms.<sup>2</sup>

(a) From the strong stem the above three ground-forms are further developed to קָטַל,<sup>3</sup> קָטַל, קָטַל (cf. § 27 r and in § 93 the explanations of Paradigm I, a–c); without a helping vowel (§ 28 d) קִשָּׁט *truth*. If the second or third radical be a guttural, a helping *Pathaḥ* takes the place of the helping *Sghôl*, according to § 22 d, e. g. יָרַע *seed*, עָצַח *eternity*, עָלַע *work*; but with middle ה or ח, note לֶחֶם *bread*, רֶחֶם (as well as חֶחֶם) *womb*, אֶהָל *tent*, בֶּהָל *thumb*; so with final א, רָאָה *a wild ass*, &c.; with a middle guttural also the modification of the principal

1<sup>1</sup> According to Delitzsch (*Assyr. Gram.*, p. 157 f.) the same is true in Assyrian of the corresponding *qaḥl*-forms. Without case-endings they are *kalab*, *šamas*, *aban* (= לָבֶלֶב, מְשִׁמְשִׁי, בֶּן־שָׁמֶשׁ), 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 *kālbū*, *sifru*, *quḏšu*, and partly from old construct-forms like the Assyrian types *kalab*, *sifir*, *quḏuš*.

2<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, Ungnad, *ZA*. 1903, p. 333 ff., rejecting all previous explanations, maintains that the *a* in *m<sup>e</sup>lākhim*, *m<sup>e</sup>lākhôth* is inserted merely to facilitate the pronunciation. From *qaḥlīm* arose *qaḥ<sup>l</sup>im*, then *qaḥalīm* and finally *q<sup>e</sup>tālīm*. See, however, Nöldeke, 'Zur semit. Pluralendung,' *ZA*. 1904, p. 68 ff., who points out that the Semitic nouns *faḥl*, *fiḥl*, *fuḥl* with their corresponding feminines *faḥla*, &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 Segholates' (*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<sup>e</sup>lākhim* as a *pluralis fractus*.

3<sup>3</sup> 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 גִּדְרָה, יָרִיךְ, אָדָר, אָדָר, אָדָר, אָדָר, but *cedem*, *secel*, *deber*, &c., for עָדָם, עָדָם, עָדָם, &c.

vowel *ā* to *è* does not occur, e. g. רָהַב, נָעַר, לָחַץ (exceptions, again, הָם, לָהֶם). On the inflexion, cf. § 93, Paradigm I, *a-f*, and the explanations. In אָטָּן *sin*, the א has wholly lost its consonantal value.

Examples of feminines: מַלְכָּה (directly from the ground-form *malk, king*), סְתָרָה *a covering* (also סְתָרָה), אֹכֵלֶת *food* (also אֹכֵל); with a middle guttural נַעֲרָה *girl*, טְהוּרָה *purity* (also טְהוּרָה). Cf. § 94, Paradigm I.

(b) From weak stems: (α) from stems ע"ן, e. g. אָף *nose* (from *ānp*, hence with formative additions, e. g. אָפִי for 'anpī, my nose); זָז *a she-goat* (ground-form *īnz*); fem. הַטָּה *wheat*; (β) from stems ע"ע (§ 93, Paradigm I, *l-n*); פַּת *a morsel*, עַם *people* (so, when in close connexion with the next word; unconnected עַם; with article הָעַם, הָעָם, &c.); רַב in the sense of *much*, but רַב *great, numerous* (in close connexion also רַב); רָע *evil*, with the article in close connexion רָעָה, unconnected רָעָה; with the *ā* always lengthened to *ā*, יָם *sea*; fem. חַיָּה *life*, and with attenuation of the *ā* to *i*, מִדָּה *measure*; from the ground-form *qitš*, אִם *mother*; fem. גִּזְזָה *a shearing*; from the ground-form *qūšš*, חֹק *statute*, fem. חֻקָּה. (γ) from stems ע"י (Paradigm I, *g* and *i*); מָוֶת *death* (from *má-ut*, the *u* passing into the corresponding consonant, as in מִתְּחִילָה *middle*) or contracted יוֹם *day*, שׁוֹט *whip*, שׂוֹר *a bull*; fem. עֲוֵלָה *perverseness* (also contracted עוֹלָה); from the ground-form *qūšš*, צוּר *a rock*; fem. סוּפָה *a storm*. (δ) from stems ע"י (Paradigm I, *h*); יֵת *an olive-tree* (with a helping *Hireq* instead of a helping *S<sup>e</sup>ghól*) from *zá-it*, the *i* passing into the corresponding consonant; or contracted חֵיק *bosom*, 2 K 18:17 (elsewhere חֵיק) *host*; fem. שֵׁבִיבָה *grey hair*; from the ground-form *qitš*, דִּין *judgement*; fem. בִּינָה *understanding*. (ε) from stems ל"ה (Paradigm I, *k*); partly forms such as בָּכָה *weeping*, הִגָּה *murmuring*, נָדָה *a present*, קֵץ *the end*, partly such as אַרְיָ, בְּכִי *a lion* (ground-form *bāky, āry*); cf. also the forms from stems originally ל"י *swimming* (ground-form *sāhw*); fem. שָׁלוּחַ *rest*, אֲנָה *exaltation*; from stems ל"י *a fat tail*, and with attenuation of *ā* to *i* שְׁבִיבָה *captivity*, also שְׁבִיבָה, formed no doubt directly from the masc. שְׁבִיבָה with the fem. termination ת; from the ground-form *qitš*, חֲצִי (from *hūšy*); fem. חֵדְוָה *joy*, עֲרֹנָה and עֲרֹנָה *nakedness*; from the ground-form *qūšš*, בָּהַר (from *bōhw*) *waste*, תֵּהוֹ *emptiness*; דָּלִי, דָּלִי *bucket*; fem. אֲנִיָּה *a ship* (directly from אֲנִי *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 קָטָל the *passive* or at any rate the *abstract* meaning is by far the more common (e. g. נְעוּרָה *youthfulness*, abstract of נַעֲרָה *boy*; אֹכֵל *food*, &c.).<sup>1</sup>

2. Nouns with one of the three short vowels under the second radical (present ground-form *q<sup>e</sup> tāl, q<sup>e</sup> šūl, q<sup>e</sup> šūl*), e. g. דְּבַשׁ *honey*, דְּבַשׁ *sickness*, תְּהַתָּה *terror*; and so always with middle א, בָּאֵד *a well*, זָאֵב *a wolf*, שְׁטֵנַח *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 דְּבַשׁ is supported both by the Hebrew דְּבַשׁ (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-

<sup>1</sup> M. Lambert also (*REJ.* 1896, p. 18 ff.), from statistics of the *Segholates*, arrives at the conclusion that the *qatš*-form is especially used for concretes (in nouns without gutturals he reckons twenty concretes as against two abstracts), and the *qšš*-form, and less strictly the *qšš*, for abstracts.

form of בָּאֵר is attested by the Arabic *bir*; for בָּשׂוּשׁ (Arabic *bus*) similarly a ground-form *buúš* may be inferred, just as a ground-form *qūṭāl* underlies the infinitives of the form לִקְטֹל.<sup>1</sup>

### Nouns with an original Short Vowel in both Syllables.

3. The ground-form *qāṭāl*, fem. *qāṭālāt*, developed in Hebrew to קָטַל (§ 93, Paradigm II, *a, b*) and קָטְלָה (§§ 94, 95, Paradigm II, *a, b*), mostly forms intransitive adjectives, as חָכָם *wise*, נֶדָוּשׁ *new*, יָשָׁר *upright*; but also substantives, as דְּבָר *a word*, and even abstracts, as אָשָׁם *guilt*, רָעָב *hunger*, שָׂבֵעַ *satiety*; in the fem. frequently abstract, as צְדִיקָה<sup>2</sup> *righteousness*; with an initial guttural אֶרֶץ *earth*.—Of the same formation from verbs ע"ע are בָּדָד *alone*, עָנָן *cloud*; passive הִלָּל *pierced*.—In verbs ל"ה a final *Yôdh* is almost always rejected, and the *ā* of the second syllable lengthened to *è*. Thus שָׂדֵי *field*, after rejection of the י and addition of ה as a vowel-letter, becomes שָׂדֵה (cf. § 93, Paradigm II, *f*); fem. e. g. שָׁנָה *year*; cf. § 95, Paradigm II, *c*. From a verb ל"ו the strong form עָנָו *afflicted* occurs.

4. The ground-form *qāṭāl*, fem. *qāṭālāt*, developed to קָטַל (§ 93, Paradigm II, *c–e*) and קָטְלָה, is frequently used as participle of verbs middle *e* (§ 50 b), and hence mostly with an intransitive meaning; cf. זָקֵן *old, an old man*; כָּבֵד *heavy*; fem. בְּהֵמָה *cattle*, חֹשֶׁךְ and חֹשְׁךָ *darkness*.—From verbs פ"י irregularly, לִיּוֹתָיו, הַיָּדִים *the branches of it, Jer 11:16, &c.*, generally referred to a *sing.* דְּלִית (דלה stem), and רִיּוֹתָיו הֵן *Ho 14:1 their women with child* (from הֵרָה, *st. constr.* הָרָה, *plur. st. absol. and constr.* הָרוֹת).—From a verb ל"ו with consonantal Wāw: שָׁלוֹ *at ease*, incorrectly written *plene* שָׁלִיו *Jb 21:23*.

5. The ground-form *qāṭāl*, developed to קָטַל (also written קָטוּל), generally forms adjectives, e. g. אִיָּם *terrible*, בָּרִד *piebald*, מְתוּק *sweet*, נֶקֶד *speckled*, עֵבֶת *interwoven*, עֵגֶל *round*, עֵמֶק *deep*, עֵקֶב *hilly*, צָהָב *golden*; קָטָן *small*, only in *sing. masc.*, with a parallel form קָטְנָה of the class treated under *f*, fem. קָטְנָה, *plur.* קָטְנִים. These forms are not to be confounded with those in No. III, from the ground-form *qāṭāl*.—Fem. כְּבוֹדָה *(glorious)*, עֲבֵתָה, עֲנִיָּה *(delicate)*, עֲגֵלָה, עֲמֻקָּה, with sharpening of the third radical, in order to keep the original *ū* short, and similarly in the plurals בְּרָדִים, נְקָדִים, עֲגֵלִים, אֲסָפִים *stores, &c.*

6. The ground-form *qīṭāl* develops to קָטַל (cf. § 93, Paradigm II, Rem. 1), e.g. לֵבָב *heart*, עֲנַב *a bunch of grapes*, שִׁבְרָה *strong drink*; from a verb ל"ה, probably of this class is רָעַה, generally contracted to רַע *friend*, ground-form *ri'ay*: the full form is preserved in רַעַה *his friend*, for רַעֵה *יהו*.

### Nouns with an original Short Vowel in the First and a Long Vowel in the Second Syllable.

7. The ground-form *qāṭāl* in Hebrew always develops to the form קָטוּל, the *ā* becoming an obscure *ô*. The fact that this form is also written קָטַל must not lead to the confusion of these forms with those mentioned in No. 5, from the ground-form *qāṭāl*.<sup>1</sup> Moreover the *qaṭōl*-class

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> In St. Jerome's time these forms were still pronounced *šadaca* (שָׂדָקָה), *šaaca* (שָׂעָקָה), *nabala* (נָבָלָה), &c., see Siegfried, *ZAW*. iv. 79. Moreover, the numerous abstracts of this form (e. g. even קִצְצָה *a splintering*, צָוּחָה *a crying, &c.*) are undoubtedly to be regarded (with Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 87) as feminines of infinitives of the form *qāṭāl*, the lengthening of the second syllable being balanced, as in other cases, by the addition of the feminine termination.

<sup>1</sup> In Na 1:3 only the *Q<sup>eré</sup>* requires קָדַל- (in the *constr. state*) for the *K<sup>ethi</sup> bh* קָדוּל.

includes forms of various origin, and therefore of various meaning, as (a) intransitive adjectives like גדול *great*, קדוש *holy*, fem. גדולה, the short vowel becoming Š°wā, whereas in גדולה, &c., before the tone it is lengthened to ā; (b) the infinitives absolute of the form קטול (§ 45 a) as representing the abstract idea of the verb, and abstract substantives like כבוד *honour*, שלום *peace* (Arab. *sālām*); (c) substantives and adjectives in an active sense, as בוחן *assayer* (of metals,) שופק *an oppressor*, מוץ *oppressing*; in the feminine גודה, ב *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 *qāṭōl*.

8. The ground-form *qāṭl* develops to קטיל (cf. § 93, Paradigm IV, a and b). Here also forms of various origin and meaning are to be distinguished: (a) adjectives used substantively with a passive meaning to denote duration in a state, as אסיר *a prisoner*, משיח *an anointed one*. These proper *qāṭl*-forms are parallel to the purely passive *qaṭl*-forms (see m), but others are due to a strengthening of original *qaṭl*-forms. These are either (b) intransitive in meaning, as צעיר *small*, and, from ל"י stems, נקי *pure*, עני *poor* (see § 93 vv), or (c) active, as נביא *a speaker* (prophet), פקיד *an overseer*.—Of a different kind again (according to Do Lagarde, infinitives) are (d) forms like אסף *the ingathering*, בציר *vintage*, הריש *ploughing time*, קציר *harvest*. On *qāṭl* forms with a kindred meaning, cf. § 84b f.

9. The ground-form *qāṭl* develops to קטול. As in the *qaṭl* and *qaṭl*-forms (see k and l), so here forms of various kinds are to be distinguished: (a) *qaṭl*-forms proper, with passive meaning, especially all the passive participles of Qal; fem. e.g. בתולה *virgin* (properly *secluded*). On the other hand, by strengthening an original *qaṭl*-form we get (b) certain stative adjectives (§ 50 f), as אנוש *incurable*, עצום *strong*, ערום *subtil*, or even transitive, as אחז *holding*; (c) active substantives, as קוש *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 *qiṭl* or *qūṭl*<sup>2</sup> in Hebrew changes the *i* to vocal Š°wā, and develops to קיטל (cf. § 93, Paradigm IV, c) or קטול, with *ā* obscured to *ō* (as above, k). Cf. שאר *remnant*, קר *honour*, כתב *book* (Arab. *kiṭāb*), קרב *war* (the last three probably loan-words from the Aramaic); of the other form, חלום *a dream*, חמור *an ass* (Arab. *ḥimār*), אלוה *God* (Arab. *ʿilāh*); with א prosthetic (§ 19 m), ארוע *arm* (twice: usually ארוע); fem. בשורה *good news* (Arab. *bišārāt*); עבודה *service*, כת *tattooing* (Arab. *kiṭābāt*).

11. The ground-form *qiṭl* seems to occur e.g. in Hebrew איויל *foolish*, איל *vanity*, בידל *lead*, כסיל *a fool*, חזיר *a swine* (the prop. name חזיר points to the ground-form *qiṭl*, cf. Arab. *ḥnziṭ*).

12. The ground-form *qiṭl* or *qūṭl*, Hebr. קטול, e.g. גבול *a boundary*, לבוש *a garment*; fem. גבורה *strength*, אמונה *faithfulness*.

Rem. When the forms *q<sup>e</sup>ṭl* and *q<sup>e</sup>tōl* begin with א, they almost invariably take in the singular a Šere under the א instead of the ordinary *Ḥaṭeph-S<sup>e</sup>ghōl*; cf. אבוס *a crib*, אטון *thread*, אמון *faithful*, אזוב *hyssop*, אזור *a waist-band*, אסור *a bond*, אפוד *an 'ephod'*; cf. § 23 h, and the analogous cases of Šere for *Ḥaṭeph-S<sup>e</sup>ghōl* in verbal forms § 52 n, § 63 p, § 76 d.

<sup>2</sup> On the *fu'āl*-forms (regarded by Wellhausen as original diminutives) see Nöldeke, *Beitrag* (Strassb. 1904), p. 30 ff. He includes among them נערת *tow*, and טהרים *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*, קוֹטַל (ק' טַל), e.g. עוֹלָם (§ 93, Paradigm III, a), Arab. 'ālām, *eternity*; חוֹתָם (Arab. ḥātām) *a seal* (according to Barth a loan-word of Egyptian origin), fem. חוֹתָם (from ḥōtāmī); תוֹלַע *worm* (unless from a stem וּלַע, like תוֹשֵׁב from וּשַׁב; see the analogous cases in § 85 b). On the participles *Qal* of verbs לִי"ה (§ 93, Paradigm III, c), cf. § 75 e; on the feminines of the participles *Qal*, which are formed with the termination ת, see below, s.

Rem. Of a different kind (probably from a ground-form *qauṭal*) are such forms as אוֹפֵן (or אוֹפֶן Ez 10:9 in the same verse) *a wheel*; גוֹזֵל *a young bird*, דוֹנַג *wax*, &c.

14. The ground-form *qāṭāl* also becomes in Hebrew almost invariably קוֹטַל (ק' טַל). Besides *participles active masc. Qal* this class includes also feminines of the form קוֹטַלְתָּ, if their ground-form *qōṭalt* (§ 69 c) goes back to an original *qāṭilt*. The substantives of this form, such as כֹּהֵן *priest* (Arab. kāhīn), were also originally participles *Qal*. The fem. of the substantives has *ē* (lengthened from *i*) retained before the tone, e.g. אִלְדָּה *a woman in travail* (cf. also בְּגַדָּה *the treacherous woman*, Jer 3:8; הַצֹּלְעָה *her that halteth*, Mi 4:6 f., Zp 3:19; סִבְחָה *a buckler*, Ps 91:4); the participles as a rule have the form אִלְדָּה, &c., the original *i* having become *S<sup>c</sup>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. שִׁמְרָה 2 S 13:20.

15. The ground-form *qūṭāl*, Hebrew קוֹטַל (as קוֹטַל *river*, Jer 17:8) or קוֹטַל e.g. עוֹבָב *a pipe*, commonly עוֹבֵב, and to be so read, with Baer, also in Ps 150:4, not עוֹבֵב.

*Nouns with a Long Vowel in each Syllable*

16. קוֹטַל, e.g. קוֹטַל *smoke*. The few forms of this kind are probably derived from the ground-form *qiṭāl* (*qiṭāl* ?), 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-formations 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 קוֹטַל; cf. אַיִל *a stag*, fem. אִילָה, *constr. st.* אִילָה (from 'āyyālt); cf. also the fem. (originating from *Qal*) לְהַבָּה *a flame* (according to § 27 q for *lāhhābhā*), הַרְבָּה *dry land* (for *ḥarrābhā*), דָּלֵה and דָּלֵה *a burning fever*, יָבֵשׁ and יָבֵשׁ *dry land*, טַבַּעַת *a seal-ring*, שֶׁמֶת *consumption*. Adjectives of this class ('intensified participles of the active verb', Barth, *ibid.*, § 33) are חַטָּא *sinful*, גָּזַל *wont to gore*,

קָנָא *jealous*, קָהַשׁ (for *kaḥhâš*, 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. גַּנָּב *a thief*, דִּין *a judge* (*constr. st.* Ps 68:6), טָבַח *a cook*, הָרַשׁ (for *ḥarrâš*) *artificer* (*constr. st.* הָרַשׁ, but *plur. constr. st.* הָרַשִׁי); פָּרָשׁ *horseman* (for *parrâš*), *constr. st.* פָּרַשׁ Ez 26:10.

18. The ground-form *qiṭṭāl* appears in צָהָה *dry*, גָּאָה *haughty* (the *i* being lengthened to *ē* according to § 22 c), if these forms go back to original *ṣiḥḥāy*, *gi'āy*. On the analogy, however, of the adjectives denoting defects (see d below), we should rather expect a ground-form *qiṭṭil*; moreover, 'iwwalt, ground-form of the fem. לְחָלְוֹת *foolishness*, goes back to an original *iwwilt*, see § 69 c.

19. The ground-form *qūṭṭāl* and *qūṭṭil*; cf. the fem. מְסֵלְתָא *spelt*, כֹּתֵבָה *coat*.

20. The ground-form *qāṭṭil*; from the intensive stem, the infinitives *Pi'ēl* of the form קָטַל.

21. The ground-form *qiṭṭil*, in Hebrew lengthened to קִטַּל. Of this form are a considerable number of adjectives which denote a bodily or mental fault or defect. Cf. אֵלֶם *disabled*, אֵלֶם *dumb*, גִּבּוֹן *hump-backed*, עִוֵּר *blind*, הֵרֵשׁ *deaf* (for *ḥirreš*), פֶּסֶחַ *lame*, קָרַח *bald*, עֵקֶשׁ *perverse*; פֶּקֶחַ *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'ēl* of the Aramaic form בְּקָרָה *a searching out*; בִּקְשָׁה *a request*; with middle guttural (see § 22 c) נֶאֱצָה *contumely*; but cf. also נִאֲצוּתָא Ez 35:12, with full lengthening of the original *ā* before א; נִחְמָה *comfort*. From the attenuation of the *ā* of this form to *i*, arises undoubtedly:

23. The ground-form *qiṭṭāl*, e.g. אֶכָּר *husbandman* (Arab. 'akkār).

24. The ground-form *qiṭṭōl*, 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. גִּבּוֹר *hero* (Arab. *gābbār*), יָסוּר *caviller*, צִפּוֹר *(piper or chirper) a bird*, שִׁכּוֹר *drunkard*. On the other hand, יָלוּד *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 *qāṭṭil*, קָטַיל, almost exclusively of persons, who possess some quality in an intensive manner, e.g. אֶבִּיר *strong*, צַדִּיק *righteous*, בְּרִיחַ *fugitive* (for *barri<sup>h</sup>*), עָרִישׁ *violent* (for 'ārriš).

That some of these are only by-forms of the *qāṭṭil*-class (see above, remark on a), appears from the *constr. st.* רַעֲוִי *ravenous*, Is 35:9 (but רִעִי, רִעִי, רִעִי always), and according to Barth (*ibid.*, 35 a) also from the *constr. st.* אֶבִּיר (but also אֶבִּיר 1 S 21:8) of אֶבִּיר. However, the form אֶבִּיר, as a name of God, may be intentionally differentiated from אֶבִּיר, a poetic term for the bull.

In the same way אֶסִּיר *prisoner*, סְרִיס *eunuch* (*constr. st.* always סְרִיס, plur. סְרִיסִים, *constr. st.* סְרִיסִי Gn 40:7, but in the book of Esther always סְרִיסִי, סְרִיסִי, &c.), and עִתִּיק *weaned*, may be regarded as by-forms of the *qāṭṭil*-class with passive meaning, see § 84a l.

26. The ground-form *qāṭṭil*, קָטַיל, e.g. חַנּוּן *gracious*, רַחוּם *compassionate* (with virtual strengthening of the ה), דִּלִּיגַנְט *diligent* (for *ḥarrūš*), probably, again, to a large extent by-forms of the *qāṭṭil*-class, § 84a m. The same applies to substantives like אֶשְׁרֵי *a step* (in אֶשְׁרֵי, as

well as אָשְׂרוּ, &c.), אָשְׂרוּ *pillar*; fem. הַבִּירָה *a stripe* (also רִתּוֹ, הַבִּירָה), *security*: cf. Barth, *ibid.*, § 84.

27. The ground-form *qāṭṭōl*; besides the infinitives absolute *Pi'ēl* of the form קָטַל, also קָנָא *jealous* (as well as קָנָא, an obscured form of *qāṭṭāl*, see e).

28. The ground-form *qīṭṭūl*, קָטוּל, e.g. צָפוּי *a coating of metal*, שְׁלוּם *requital*, שְׁקוּי *drink*, שְׁקוּי *detestable thing*; with concrete meaning לְמוּד *a disciple*, עֲזוּז *strong*; frequently in the plural in an abstract sense, as גְּדוּפִים *reproach*, מְלֵאִים *filling* (the induction of a priest), נִחְמִים, *consolations, compassion*, שְׁכָלִים *bereavement*, שְׁלֵחִים *dismissal*, שְׁמֵרִים *observance*.

### *Nouns with the Third Consonant repeated.*

29. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, e.g. שָׁנָן, שָׁנָן *quiet*, fem. שְׁאֲנָנָה (with sharpening of the second *Nûn*, in order to keep the preceding vowel short); רֵעֵנָה *green*, plur. רֵעֵנָה.

30. The ground-form *qāṭṭūl*, in Hebrew קָטַל; of this form are e.g. the infinitives *Pi'ēl* (prop. *Pa'lēl*), cf. § 55 d.

31. The ground-form *qāṭṭūl*; so the plur. רֵעֵנָה *ridges* (with sharpening of the *Nûn*, as in No. 29).

32. The ground-form *qīṭṭāl*, in פְּרִיחָה *a brood*.

33. The ground-form *qūṭṭāl*, in אֶמְלַל *faint*.

34. The ground-form *qāṭṭūl*, e.g. עֲבָטִיט *plunder*, סְגִירִי *rain-storm*, שְׁפִירִי *glittering tapestry*, Jer 43:10 *Q'ré*; with attenuation of the *ā* to *i* בְּמֵרִים *all that maketh black*, Jb 3:5 (but the better reading is בְּמֵרִי).

35. The ground-form *qāṭṭūl*, e.g. שְׁפָרוּר Jer 43:10 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*; אֶפְרוּסִים, *adulteries*.

### *Nouns with the Second and Third Consonants repeated.*

36–39. *Q' tāl tāl*, *q' tāl tāl*, *q' tāl tāl*; *q' tāl tāl*, *q' tāl tāl* (in *fem.* and *plur.* often with the last consonant sharpened for the reason given in a above); cf. הֶפְכָּפֶךְ *crooked*, הֶלְקֶלֶקוֹת *slippery places*, עֲקֶלְקֶלוֹת *cooked (ways)*; לִּי *tortuous*; also words denoting colours, אֶדְמָדָם (Lv 13:42, 49 in pause) *reddish*, fem. אֶדְמָדָמָה, plur. אֶדְמָדָמָה *greenish*, plur. fem. אֶדְמָדָמָה; *q' tāl tāl*, *q' tāl tāl* (to be read in Jer 46:20 for *יפהפיה*); *q' tāl tāl*, *q' tāl tāl* (fem.) *blackish*; אֶסְפָּסָף *a rabble* (augmented from אָסוּף *collected*). From a verb פָּי with aphaeresis of the initial syllable אֶפְפָּאִים *offspring*. Moreover, of the same form, probably, is הַצֹּפָרָה *a trumpet* (for הַצֹּפָרָה, cf. § 55 e). Also in Is 2:20 הַפְּרָפְרוֹת is to be read instead of פְּרוֹת (from the *sing.* הַפְּרָפְרָה *a digging or burrowing animal*, perhaps the *mole*). But פְּקֶקְקוֹת *opening*, Is 61:1 (ed. Mant., Baer, Ginsb. פְּקֶקְקוֹת), is an evident mistake due to dittography; read פְּקֶק as in 42:7.

### *Nouns in which the Whole (Bilateral) Stem is repeated.*

Naturally this class includes only isolated forms of the stems עִיָּע and עִיָּי (on פִּיפִיּוֹת see § 96 under פִּי). Thus:—

40. גַּלְגָּל *a wheel*, and, with attenuation of the first *ā* to *i*, גַּלְגָּלִי (from גלל); fem. חֲלָהּ *anguish* (from חול or חיל); כִּרְכָר (for *kirkar*) *a talent*; cf. also כּוֹכַב *a star* (from *kāwkāb*, Arabic *kaukāb*, for כִּכְבָּב), טוֹטְפֹת *bands*, for טַפְטַפֹּת probably *a whirring locust*.

41. פִּלְפֵל infin. *Pilpēl* (prop. *Palpāl*) from פול; fem. טֹטְלָה *a hurling* (from טול).

42. כִּדְדִי perhaps *a ruby* (for *kādkūd*), from כדד.

43. קֶדֶד *the crown of the head* (for *qūdqud*), from קדד; fem. גֻּלְגֻּלְתָּ *a skull* (for *gūlgūlt*), from גלל.

44. גִּרְדָּה *girded*, from זרר; בִּקְבוּק *a bottle*, from בקק; בְּרִבְרִים *fattened birds(?)*.

### § 85. Nouns with Preformatives and Affirmatives.

These include nouns which are directly derived from verbal forms having preformatives (*Hiph 'ūl, Hoph 'al, Hithpa 'ēl, Niph 'al, &c.*), as well as those which are formed with other preformatives (א, י, מ, ג, ת), and finally those which are formed with affirmatives. 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 א prefixed. Cf. the substantives with א *prosthetic* (§ 19 m), such as אֶזְרוֹעַ *arm* (Jer 32:21, Jb 31:22; elsewhere always זְרוֹעַ); אֶצְבַּע *a finger*, אַרְבֵּה *a locust*, אֶגְרוֹף *fist* (others *mattock*, or *clod*), אֶשְׁמוּרָה or רַת אֶשֶׁמַּח *a watch*. In these examples the א is a 'euphonic' prefix (Barth, *ibid.*, § 150 b); in other cases it is 'essential'; cf. especially the adjectives, אֶכְזָב *deceitful*, אֶכְזָר *cruel*, אֶיְתָן *perennial* (for 'aitan) [=the Arab. 'elative', used for expressing the compar. and superl. degrees]. The fem. אֶזְבָּחָה *fragrant part*<sup>1</sup> (of the meal-offering) is a *nomen verbale* of *Hiph 'ūl*, answering to the Aramaic infinitive of the causal stem ('Aph 'ēl), hence with suff. אֶזְבַּחָהּ Lv 2:2, &c.

46. Nouns with ה prefixed. Besides the ordinary infinitives of *Hiph 'ūl* הֶקְטִיל and הֶקְטִיל, of *Niph 'al* הֶקְטִיל, הֶקְטִיל (for *hinq.*), and of the conjugations formed with the prefix הֶה, this class also includes some rare *nomina verbalia* derived from *Hiph 'ūl* (cf. § 72 z), viz. הֶכְרָה *appearance* (from הִכַר), Is 3:9; הֶנְנִיחָה *a swinging* (from הִנִּיחַ), [Is 30:28; הֶנְנִיחָה *a rest-giving*, Est 2:18]; הֶצִּילָה *deliverance* (from הִצִּיל), [Est 4:14 an Aram. form: cf. הֶזְנָה Dn 5:20]; perhaps also הֶיכָל *palace*, from *haikāl*, unless it is borrowed from the Assyrian; see the Lexicon. Cf. also הֶנְנִיחָה Ezr 4:22.

47. Nouns with י prefixed, as יֶצֶהר *oil*, יֶלְקוּט *wallet*, יֶנְשׂוּף *owl(?)*; from verbs יִעִי, e.g. יֶקוּם *a living thing*, יֶתוּר *a range*; from a verb יִרִיב *an adversary*. Of a different character are the many proper names which have simply adopted the imperfect form, as יֶעֱקֹב, יֶעֱקֹב, &c.

48. Nouns with מ prefixed. This *preformative Mēm*, which is no doubt connected with מִי *who*, and מָה *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) מִ *subjective*, when preformative of the participles *Pi 'ēl, Hiph 'ūl, Hithpa 'ēl*, and other active conjugations. (2) מִ

<sup>1</sup> 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'al*, *Hoph'al*, and other passive conjugations, as well as of numerous nouns. (3) מ *instrumental*, as in מִפֶּתַח *a key*, &c. (4) מ *local*, as in מְדַבֵּר *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 *i*; in an open syllable before the tone it is lengthened to *ā* (so also the *i*, attenuated from *ā*, is lengthened to *ē*), and in מָגֵן *shield* (with suff. מְ, גִי) it even becomes unchangeable *ā*. But in an open syllable which does *not* stand before the tone, the *a* necessarily becomes *S<sup>e</sup>wā*.

The following forms are especially to be noticed: (a) ground-form *māqṭāl*, in Hebrew מִקְטָל, e.g. מִזֶּבֶד *food*; fem. מַמְלָכָה *kingdom*, מִזֶּבֶד לֵחַ *a knife*, מִלְאכָה (for מִלְאכָה by § 23 c) *business*; from a verb פָּתַח *a gift*; from verbs מוֹצֵא *a going forth*, מוֹשֵׁב *a seat*; from verbs מִיטֵב *the best* (from *maiṭṭāb*); with י (or ו) assimilated, מִצָּע *a bed*; from verbs מְסַךְ *a screen*, and with the shortening of the *ā* under the preformative, מִרְרָה *bitterness* (from מִרַר developed to a segholate), fem. מְשֻׁמָּה *desolation*; from a verb עָוָה, probably of this class is מקוֹם *place*, the *ā* lengthened to *ā* and obscured to *ō* (Arabic *māqām*); from verbs מְרָאָה *appearance*, מְעַוָּה (for מְעַנָּה) prop. *intention*, only in לְמַעַן *on account of, in order that*.

(b) Ground-form *miqṭāl* (the usual form of the infin. *Qal* in Aramaic), Hebr. מִקְטָל, e.g. מְדַבֵּר (in Jer 2:31 also, where Baer requires מְדַבֵּר, read with ed. Mant., Ginsburg, &c. מְדַבֵּר) *a cattle-drive*, fem. מְלִחְמָה *war*, מְרִכְבָּה *a chariot* (with *S<sup>e</sup>ghōl* instead of *i*, but in constr. st. מְרִכְבַּת Gn 41:43; cf. מְרִחְקָה *distance*), מְשַׁמְּרָה *a watch*; from verbs עָוָה, e.g. מְסַב *surroundings* (from *miṣāb*; *i* in the open syllable being lengthened to *ē*; but cf. also מְשַׁבֵּק Is 33:4 as constr. *state* from שקק with sharpening of the first radical; cf. § 67 g); from verbs מְקַנָּה *a possession*, fem. מְקַנָּה.

(c) Ground-form *māqṭāl*, Hebr. מִקְטָל, e.g. מְשַׁעֵן *a support* (fem. מְשַׁעֲנָה), מְסַגֵּר *a smith*, מְעִשֵׁר *a tithe*; fem. מְכַשְׁלָה *a ruin*; from a verb פָּרַח *an overthrow*, מְצַבָּה *a pillar*; from verbs עָוָה, מְגִן *a shield*; fem. מְגִלָּה *a roll* (from מְגַלָּה), מְאַרְרָה *a curse* (for *m<sup>e</sup> irrā* from אָרַר); from a verb פָּוַשׁ *a snare* (from *māwqiṣ*).

(d) Ground-form *miqṭāl*, Hebr. מִקְטָל, e.g. מְסַפֵּד *mourning*, מוֹבֵחַ *an altar (place of sacrifice)*; from a verb עָוָה, e.g. מְסַב (מְסַב?) *consessus*; (e) ground-form *māqṭāl*, Hebr. מִקְטָל; fem. מְאָכָה *food*, מְשַׁכְּרָה *wages*; from a verb עָוָה, fem. מְסַכָּה *a covering* (from סָכַח). Also from עָוָה, according to the Masora, מְעוֹז *a refuge*, with suffixes מְעוֹזִי and מְעוֹזִים, plur. מְעוֹזִים, but, very probably, most if not all of these forms are to be referred to the stem עוֹז *to flee for safety*, and therefore should be written מְעוֹזִי, &c. The form מְעוֹז, if derived from the stem עוֹז, would mean *stronghold*.—Cf. also מְרִיחָה *faintness*, developed to a segholate, probably from מְרִיחָה, for *mārōkh* from רָכַח, like מְרִיחָה *soundness of body*, from תָּמַח.

With a long vowel in the second syllable: (f) ground-form *maqṭāl*, with *ā* always obscured to *ō*, e.g. מְחַסֵּר *want*, מְחַסֵּר *booty*; from verbs עָוָה, e.g. מְגוֹרָה *fear*, fem. מְגוֹרָה and מְגוֹרָה (with the *ō* depressed to *ū* in a toneless syllable; cf. § 27 n), מְהוֹמָה, &c., Is 22:5. (g) Ground-form *miqṭāl*, in Hebr. again מִקְטָל, e.g. מְסַתֵּר *a covert*, מְכַשּׁוֹל *a stumbling-block* (cf. above under *i*, *mākhšēlā*); fem. מְכַמֵּה *a fishing-net*; (h) the ground-forms *maqṭāl*, *miqṭāl* (cf. מְקַיֵּם).

<sup>1</sup> In מְתַקֵּים 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 'ūl*; the fem. מְבִלְיָיִת, *cheerfulness*, is a denominative formed from a participle *Hiph 'ūl*; (i) ground-form *māqṭūl*, as מְלַבְרֵשׁ *a garment*.

Rem. On מ as preformative of the participles of all the conjugations except *Qal* and *Niph 'al*, cf. § 52 c. Many of these participles have become substantives, as מְזַמְּרֵת *snuffers*, מְשַׁחֵת *destroyer, destruction*.

49. Nouns with נ prefixed. Besides the participles *Niph 'al* (ground-form *nāqṭāl*, still retained e.g. in נוֹלָד for *nāwlād*, but commonly attenuated to *nīqṭāl*, Hebr. נִקְטָל) and the infinitive *Niph 'al* of the form נִקְטַל, the prefix נ is found in נִפְתוּלִים *wrestlings*, Gn 30:8, which is also to be referred to *Niph 'al*, and נִזְיָד *boiled pottage* (stem זייד).

50. With ש prefixed, e.g. שֶׁלֶה *a flame*. On this *Šaph 'ēl* 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 פִּי and עִי. They may be classified as follows:—(a) the ground-form *tāqṭāl* in תִּקְמָס *ostrich* (?); from verbs פִּי תוֹשֵׁב *a settler*; fem. תּוֹכָה לָת *expectation*, תּוֹכָה חַת (from the *Hiph 'ūl* הוֹכִיחַ *correction*; from a verb פִּי תִימֵן *the south*; from verbs פִּי and לִי תוֹדָה *thanksgiving*, and תוֹרָה *law*, both from *Hiph 'ūl*; from a verb פִּי and לִי תוֹצְאוֹת *issues*; probably belonging to this class, from verbs עִי תִבְלָה *confusion*, and תִּמָּס *a melting away* (developed from תִּבַּל and תִּמַּס, from בָּלַל and מָסַח).

(b) *Tiḳṭāl*, e.g. fem. תִּפְאָרָה and תִּפְאָרַת *glory*; from a verb לִי תִקְוָה *hope*; (c) *tāqṭāl*, e.g. תִּשְׁבָּץ *chequer work*; fem. תִּרְדָּמָה *deep sleep* (probably from the *Niph 'al* תִּרְדַּם); from a verb פִּי תוֹכְחָה *correction* (from the *Hiph 'ūl*-stem, like the *constr. st. plur.* תּוֹלְדוֹת *generations*); from verbs עִי תִפְלָה *praise*, תִּפְלָה *prayer* (from the *Pi 'ēl* of the stems תִּלַּל and פִּלַּל).

With a long vowel in the second syllable: (d) *tūḳṭāl*, as תְּהוֹם *the ocean, the deep* (for *tihām*; 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 תִּהַם; (e) *tāqṭāl* (in Arabic the usual form of the infinitive of conjugation II. which corresponds to the Hebrew *Pi 'ēl*), e.g. from a verb לִי תִמְלֵט *completeness*; fem. תִּרְבִּית *increase, usury*, with a parallel form תִּמְלֵט *in a passive sense, תִּלְמִיד a disciple*; (f) תִּקְטוּל, e.g. תִּפּוּחַ *an apple* (for *tānpū<sup>a</sup>ḥ*); very frequently used to form abstracts, e.g. תִּגְמוּל *a benefit* (also תִּגְמוּל); from verbs עִי תִבּוֹס *a treading down*, תִּנּוּפָה *a waving* (like תִּרְוּמָה *a lifting up*, from the *Hiph 'ūl* stem), תִּשׁוּקָה *a longing*, &c.; very frequently also as an abstract plural, e.g. תִּפְרוּרִים *guidance*, תִּפְרוּרִים *bitterness*, תִּנְחוּמִים and תִּנְחוּמוֹת *consolation*; from a verb עִי תִאָּנַח *toil*.

### *Nouns with Affirmatives.*

52. Nouns with ל affixed. Perhaps חֲשָׁמֶל *amber* (?), and probably בְּרִזָּל *iron*, גַּרְדֵּנְלַנְד *garden-land* (*S<sup>c</sup>ghōl* in both cases is probably a modification of the original *ā* in the tone-syllable), לִבְנוֹם *bloom*, cf. § 30 q.—According to *Prätorius*, *ZDMG*. 1903, p. 530 ff., *al* is an affix of endearment in the proper names מִיכָל *little lizard* (?), אֲבִיגַיִל (also אֲבִיגַיִל).

53. Nouns with ם affixed. With an original *ām* as affirmative, אֵיזֶל *vestibule* (although the *ā* in the *sing.* remains unchangeable), plur. אֵיזֵלִים; but in כְּנָם *a swarm of gnats*, the ם is radical. With original affirmative *ūm*, עֵרֶם (also עֵרֶם) *naked* (from עוּר), plur. עֵרֵמִים Gn 3:7, parallel form עֵרוֹם, plur. עֵרוּמִים Gn 2:25.—To this class also belong the adverbs in *ām* and *ōm*,

mentioned in § 100 g, and many proper names, as ג, רשׁם, also ג, רשום, and ג, רשון (*patronymic* ג, רשני), מלפׁם, עמׁרם, &c.; but for פְּדוּיִם ransom (?), Nu 3:49, probably פְּדוּיִם is to be read.

54. Nouns with ן affixed. The ן is added by means of a simple helping vowel in כְּנַעַן *Canaan*, and חֶפְצֵי אֶצְבָּע *a finger nail*; more frequently the addition is made by means of a tone-bearing *ă*, which in Hebrew is modified to *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* (as גְּרֵזֶן *axe*) or lengthened to *ā* (but cf. also רְנִיחַ and רְנִיחַת); e.g. קְנִיָּו *a possession*, שֻׁלְחָן *a table*, קְרָבָן *an offering*. From an original *â* being changed into an obscure *ô* we may probably explain such forms as דָּאָבוֹן *a pining away*; רְבוֹן (also רְבָן) *a goad*; רָעָבוֹן *hunger*; from verbs לִיָּאֹן *pride*, הִמּוֹן *noise*, תְּזוֹן *a vision*; שִׁרְיוֹן *a coat of mail*; from a verb מִשָּׂאֵן *guile* (the only instance with both מ preformative and *ôn* affirmative)<sup>1</sup>; very frequently from the simple stem with an unorganic sharpening of the second radical, e.g. זְכָרוֹן *memorial*, כְּלִיוֹן *destruction* (*constr. st.* זְכָרוֹן and כְּלִיוֹן), &c.; cf. also הַרְיוֹן *pregnancy* (for הָרָה) and § 93 uu; קִיְלוֹן *shame*, for קָלָקְלוֹן. Proper names occur with the termination *ûn*, as יִשְׂרוּן, § 86 g, and others.

Rem. A large number of proper names now ending in ה־ or ו־ used to be classed as nouns originally formed with the affix ה־ן. The subsequent rejection of the final *Nûn* seemed to be confirmed by the form מְגִדוֹן, once used (Zc 12:11) for מְגִדוֹ (and conversely in Pr 27:20 *K<sup>e</sup>thibh* הַאֲבָדוֹ, *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* הַאֲבָדוֹן *destruction*), also by the fact that for שְׁלֵמָה the LXX give the form Σολωμών or Σαλωμών, and especially that in patronymics and tribal names (§ 86 h) a *Nûn* appears before the termination *i*,<sup>1</sup> as גִּילְנִי *Gilonite* from גִּלְהָה and יִשְׁלֵיָה from יִשְׁלֵה (modern name *Sailûn*). Wetzstein, however (in Delitzsch's *Commentary on Job*, 1st ed., p. 599), explained the *Nûn* in מְגִדוֹן as a secondary addition to the common old-Palestinian termination *ô* (יְרִיחוֹ, עֵכוֹ, רְמוֹנוֹ, &c.), and Barth (*Nominalbildung*, § 224 b) has since shown the unsoundness of the prevailing view on other grounds: the rejection of the *Nûn* would be much more likely to occur in the numerous appellatives in *ôn* than in proper names, and גִּילְנִי and יִשְׁלֵיָה are due to the necessity of avoiding, for euphonic reasons, such forms as *gîlô-i*, *šîlô-i*, &c.; cf. also לְנִיָּה from שְׁלָה.

On the affirmatives יִ, יֵ, יֶ, יִת, יֵת, see below, § 86 h–l.

### *Quadrilaterals and Quinqueliterals.*

55. גְּלֵמוֹד *barren*, חֶלְמִישׁ *a flint*, and the fem זֶלְעָפָה *heat*, &c., have probably arisen from the insertion of a ל; חֶרְגֵל *a locust*, חֶרֶד־ם *an axe*, סְרַעְפָּה *a branch*, Ez 31:5 (verses 6, 8 סְרַעְפָּה), שְׂרַעְפִּים (also שְׂרַעְפִּים) *anxious thoughts*, שְׂרַבִּיט *sceptre*, from insertion of a ר, which is common in Aramaic. Cf., moreover, חֶרְמֶשׁ *a sickle*, סְמַדֶּר *vine-blossom*; with an initial ע, עֵטְלָף *a bat*, עֶבְכִישׁ *a spider*, עֶכְבָּר *a mouse*, עֶקְרָב *a scorpion*,<sup>1</sup> &c.—Quinqueliteral, עֶפְרַדֶּע *a frog*.

### § 86. *Denominative Nouns.*

<sup>1</sup> The plurals נְצַנִּים *flowers*, Ct 2:12, and קַמְשָׁנִים *thorns* appear to be formed directly from the singulars נֶצַח (cf. נֶצְחָה) and קַמוֹשׁ with the insertion of *ân* (which in קמׁ is obscured to *ôn*). See Nöldeke, *Mand. Gr.*, p. 169, Rem. 3; similarly, according to Hoffmann, 'Einige phöniz. Inschriften,' p. 15 (*Abh. der Gött. Ges. der Wiss.*, xxxvi), עֶזְבוֹנִים *wares*, Ez 27:14, 16 from עֶזְבוֹן=עֶזְבוֹן.

<sup>1</sup> Derenbourg (*REJ.*, 1883, p. 165) infers from the above examples and a comparison of the Arabic *'uṣṣûr*, *sparrow* (from *ṣafara*, *to chirp*), that ע 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. קְדָמוֹן *eastern*, immediately from קָדַם *the east* (verbal stem קָדַם *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 מ ( § 85 e to m) express the place, &c., of an action, so the denominatives with מ *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. שַׁעַר *a porter*, from שַׁעַר *a gate*; בֶּקֶר *a herdsman*, from בָּקַר *a herd*; כַּרְם *a vinedresser*, from כָּרַם *a vineyard*.

2. Those like the form *qāttāl* (§ 84b b), e.g. חֹשֶׁבֶת *an archer*, from חֹשֶׁבֶת *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 מ prefixed, denoting the place where a thing is (cf. § 85 e), or its neighbourhood, e.g. מַעְיָן *a place of fountains*, from מַעַן *the place about the feet*, מִצְחָה *the place about the head*, from מִצְחָה (for מִקְשָׁה) *a cucumber field*, from מִקְשָׁה *cucumber*. Cf. ἄμπελών from ἄμπελος.

4. Nouns with the termination יָן or יוֹן expressing adjectival ideas: קְדָמוֹן *eastern*, from קָדַם *posterior*, from אַחֲרָה *exterior*, from חָוָה; probably also לְיָתֵן *coiled*, hence *coiled animal, serpent*, from לְיָתֵן *a winding*; נְחֹשֶׁת *brazen*, from נֶחֶשֶׁת *brass*. Also *abstracts*, e.g. עִוְרוֹן *blindness*, from עָוַר. Cf. § 85 u.— With a double termination (ón or ân with י) אֲדָמָה *reddish*, יָדַע *a knowing* (spirit); צָפַע *basilisk*; חַמֻּם *merciful* [fem. plur.].

יוֹן appears to be used as a diminutive ending (cf. the Syriac יוֹן) in אִישׁוֹן *little man* (in the eye), *apple of the eye*, from אִישׁ<sup>1</sup>; on the other hand אֲדָמָה *adder*, which was formerly regarded as a diminutive, is properly an adjectival form from אֲדָמָה *to rub* (hence, as it were, a *rubbing creature*); in the same way יִשְׂרָאֵל is a *denominative* from יָשָׁר (= יָשָׁר), properly *upright* (*righteous people*), and not a *diminutive* (*pious little people*, and the like); finally, שֶׁחַרְשֵׁת is not *lunula*, but *an artificial moon* (used as an ornament), and צַוֵּן *neck*, but *necklace* (from צָוָה *neck*). Cf. Delitzsch on Ct 4:9.

---

1 [<sup>1</sup> 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. עוֹלֵימָא, Syr. □□□□□□□□, Arab. غُلَيْبٌ *a very young man, kulaib, a little dog*, &c. Since Olshausen (§ 180), יָעִיר *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 שְׁבִיטִים Is 3:18 (as though a foreign dialectical form for *sumais, little sun*), and אֲמִינוֹן 2 S 13:20, as a contemptuous diminutive form of אֲמִינוֹן; cf. Ewald, § 167, W. Wright, *Arab. Gramm.*<sup>2</sup> 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.]

5. Peculiar to denominatives is the termination יָיָ, which converts a substantive into an adjective, and is added especially to numerals and names of persons and countries, in order to form *ordinals*, *patronymics*, and *tribal names*; e.g. רַגְלִים *footman*, plur. רַגְלָיִם, from רַגַל *foot*; אַכְזָרִי *cruel*, plur. אַכְזָרִים, from אַכְזָר *strangeness*; תַּחְתָּי *lower*, from תַּחַת *below*, fem. תַּחְתִּית and plur. תַּחְתִּיִּים; שֵׁשִׁי *the sixth*, from שֵׁשׁ *six*; מוֹאָבִי *Moabite*, from מוֹאָב, plur. מוֹאָבִים, fem. מוֹאָבִיָּה and plur. מוֹאָבִיּוֹת; עִבְרִי *Hebrew*, plur. עִבְרִיִּים and fem. עִבְרִיָּה, plur. עִבְרִיּוֹת; יִשְׂרָאֵלִי *Israelite*, from יִשְׂרָאֵל. When the original substantive is a *compound*, it is resolved again into two words, e.g. בְּנֵי־יְמִינִי *Benjamite*, from בְּנֵי־יָמִין (cf. on the use of the article in such cases, § 127 d).

Instead of יָיָ we find in a few cases (a) the ending יָיָ (as in Aram.), e.g. פִּילִי (*crafty*, or, according to others, *churlish*) if it stands for נְכִילִי and is not rather from a stem כֹּלָא or כֹּלָה, חוֹרֵי *white cloth*, Is 19:9 in pause; perhaps also גִּבֵּי *a swarm of locusts*, Am 7:1 (יִגְוֹךְ Na 3:17); hardly יְנוּחֵי Is 38:20, Hb 3:19; but certainly in proper names as בַּרְזַלִּי (*ferreus*) *Barzillai*;<sup>2</sup> and (b) הָיָ, arising from *āy*, in אֶשְׁרָא *belonging to fire* (אֶשׁ), i.e. a *sacrifice offered by fire*; לְבָנָה (prop. *milky*) *the storax-shrub*, Arabic *lubnay*.

6. *Abstract nouns* formed from *concretes* by the addition of וֹת, ת[י] ( § 95 t), cf. our terminations *-dom*, *-hood*, *-ness*, e.g. יְלָדוֹת *youth*, מְלָכוֹת *kingdom* (the omission of the *Dageš* in כ shows that the *S<sup>e</sup>wā* is weakened from a full vowel; on *malik* as underlying the present form מַלְכָּה cf. § 84a a); אֶלְמָנוּת *widowhood*, from אֶלְמָן *widower*, אֶלְמָנָה *widow*. In Aram. this fem. ending וֹת (or ו with rejection of the ת) is a common termination of the infinitive in the derived conjugations (cf., as substantival infinitives of this kind, הַשְׁמָעוֹת *the announcing*, Ez 24:26, and הַתְּהַבְרוֹת *the making of a league*, Dn 11:23); in Hebr. וֹת as a termination to express abstract ideas (including some which appear to be directly derived from the verbal stem, as סְכָלוֹת *folly*, הַפְּאוֹת *a heating*<sup>1</sup>) becomes more common only in the later books. It is affixed to adjectives ending in *i* (see above, h) in אַכְזָרִיוֹת *cruelty*, and קוֹמְמִיוֹת *upright position* (Lv 26:13, used adverbially).

The ending יֹת is found earlier, e.g. in שְׂאֲרִית *remainder*, רֵאשִׁית *principium*, from ראש *head* ראש = ראש ( *head*) *princeps*. The termination *ôth* seems to occur in חֵכְמוֹת *wisdom* (in Pr 1:20, 9:1, joined to a *singular*; so also חֵכְמוֹת Pr 14:1, where, probably, חֵכְמוֹת should likewise be read) and in הוֹלָלוֹת Ec 1:17, &c., with the parallel form הוֹלָלוֹת 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.* xliii. 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 *masculine gender* is יִם, always with the tone, e.g. סוּס *horse*, plur. סוּסִים *horses*; but also very often written defectively יָיָ, especially when in the same word one of the vowel letters, ו or י, precedes, e.g. Gn 1:21 תַּנְיִנִם. Nouns in יָיָ make their plural in יִים, e.g. עִבְרִי *a Hebrew*, plur. עִבְרִיִּים (Ex 3:18); but usually contraction takes place, e.g. עִבְרִיִּים *crimson garments*, from עִבְרִיָּיִם.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup> On יָיָ as an old fem. ending, see above, § 80 l.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> [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 הָ lose this termination when they fake the plural ending, e.g. הָזֶה *seer*, plur. הַזֵּים (cf. § 75 h).—In regard to the loss of the tone from the הָ in the two old plurals מַיַּם *water* and שָׁמַיַּם *heaven*, cf. § 88 d and § 96.

The termination יָ is sometimes assumed also by feminines (cf. נָשִׁים *women*, § 96 under הָשָׁנָה; שָׁנִים *years*, from שָׁנָה; רְחֵלִים *ewes*, from רָחֵל), so that an indication of gender is not necessarily implied in it (cf. also below, m–p).—On the use of this termination יָ to express abstract, extensive, and intensive ideas, cf. § 124.

The ending *im* is also common in Phoenician, e.g. צִדְנִים *Sidonii*; Assyrian has *āni* (acc. to P. Haupt originally *āmi*, cf. § 88 d); Aramaic has *im*; Arabic *ūna* (nominative) and *īna* (in the oblique cases, but in vulgar Arabic *im* is also used for the nominative); Ethiopic *ān*. Cf. also the verbal ending הַן in the 3rd plur. perf. (§ 44 l) and in the 3rd and 2nd plur. impf. (§ 47 m).<sup>1</sup>

Less frequent, or only apparent terminations of the plur. masc. are—

(a) יָ, as in Aramaic,<sup>2</sup> 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. מְלָכִין *kings*, Pr 31:3; דְּגַיִן, 1 K 11:33, רְצִין *the guard*, 2 K 11:13, הַטִּין *wheat*, Ez 4:9; defectively אִינִים *islands*, Ez 26:18; יָמִין *days*, Dn 12:13. Cf. also מְדִין *carpets*, Ju 5:10, in the North-Palestinian song of Deborah, which also has other linguistic peculiarities; עֵיִן *heaps*, Mi 3:12 (before ת; cf. § 44 k); מְלִין *words* (from the really Aram. מְלָה), Jb 4:2, and twelve other places in Job (beside מְלִים, ten times in Job); further, חֵיִן Jb 24:22, אֶחָרִין 31:10, and שׁוּמִיִן La 1:4, תַּבִּין 4:3.—The following forms are doubtful:

(b) יָ (with the ה rejected, as, according to some, in the *dual* יָדִים for יָדֵי Ez 13:18, cf. § 88 c), e.g. מְנִים *stringed instruments*, Ps 45:9 for מְנִים (unless it is to be so written)<sup>3</sup>; עַמִּים *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 עַם; also in Ct 8:2 the *ι* of רַמְנֵי 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) יָ (like the constr. state in Syriac), which is supposed to appear in e.g. שָׁרִים *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 הַלֹּנֵי וְסִי Jer 22:14 (according to others *dual*, see § 88 c, or a loan word, cf. ZA. iii. 93) read הַלֹּנֵי סִפּוֹן. On הַוֹרֵי and הַוֹרֵי, which have also been so explained, see above, § 86 i.—(הַשׁוּפִי Is 20:4 (where the right reading is certainly הַשׁוּפִי) must be intended by the Masora either as a singular with the formative syllable יָ = *bareness* or, more probably, as a constr. st. with the original termination *ay* (cf. § 89 d) to avoid the harsh combination

<sup>1</sup> 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].

<sup>2</sup> So also always in the Mēša' inscription, e.g. line 2 שלשן *thirty*; line 4 מלכין *kings*; line 5 ימן רבן *many days*, &c.

<sup>3</sup> According to some this *ι* 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<sup>a</sup>sûfê šēr<sup>4</sup>*; in אֲדֹנָי *the Lord* (prop. *my lord*, from the plur. *majestatis*, אֲדֹנָי *lord*), the *ay* was originally a *suffix*, § 135 q.

(d) ם ך a supposed *plural* ending in כְּנִים=כְּנָם *gnats* (or *lice*), and סֵלָם *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 ךֹּת, e.g. תְּהִלָּה *song of praise, psalm*, plur. תְּהִלוֹת (only in post-biblical Hebrew תְּהִלִּים, as in the headings of the printed editions, as well as פֶּרְ תְּהִלוֹת *the Book of Psalms*); אֶרֶב a *letter*, plur. אֶרְבוֹת; בְּיָר a *well*, plur. בְּיָרוֹת. Feminines in ית ךֹּ form their plural in יוֹת ךֹּ, e.g. מִצְרַיִת *an Egyptian woman*, plur. מִצְרַיִתוֹת; and those in ית either make יוֹת ךֹּ, as מְלֻכּוֹת *kingdom*, plur. מְלֻכּוֹת, Dn 8:22 (cf. תְּהִיּוֹת *cells*, Jer 37:16), or are inflected like דְּוֹת ץ *testimonies* (pronounced 'ēdh<sup>e</sup>wōth for 'ēdhūwōth).

It is only from a mistake or disregard of these feminine endings וֹת ךֹּ and ית ךֹּ that some words ending with them form their plural by the addition of ים ךֹּ or יוֹת ךֹּ, e.g. תְּהִיּוֹת *spear*, plur. תְּהִיּוֹת and תְּהִיּוֹתוֹת *whoredom*, plur. תְּהִיּוֹתוֹת (by the side of תְּהִיּוֹתוֹת *widowhood*; תְּהִיּוֹתוֹת *pits*, תְּהִיּוֹתוֹת *amulets* (if connected with Assyr. *kāsu*, *to bind*), &c.

The termination *-ôth* stands primarily for *-âth* (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 *â* into an obscure *ô*, see § 9 q). On the other hand, it is doubtful whether this *âth* is to be regarded as a lengthened and stronger form of the singular fem. ending *âth* (cf. § 80 b).

How the changeable vowels of a noun are shortened or become *Š<sup>e</sup>wâ* 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. עָבַב *cloud*, plur. עָבָב and עָבָבוֹת; 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. דּוֹר masc. *a generation*, plur. דּוֹרִים and דּוֹרוֹת; שָׁנָה fem. *a year*, plur. שָׁנִים and שָׁנוֹת (see the Rem.). In these words the gender of both plural forms remains the same as in the singular, e.g. אֶרֶב masc. *a lion*, plur. אֶרְבוֹת masc., Zp 3:3, דּוֹרוֹת masc., Jb 42:16.

Sometimes usage makes a distinction between the two plural forms of the same word. Thus, יָמִים *days*, שָׁנִים *years* are the usual, but יָמוֹת (only twice, in the *constr. st.* Dt 32:7, Ps 90:15) and שָׁנוֹת (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. יָדַי *hands*, יָדוֹת *artificial hands*, also e.g. the *arms* of a throne; כַּפַּי *hands*, כַּפּוֹת *handles* (Lat. *manubria*); פְּעַי *foot*, פְּעֻמוֹת *artificial feet* (of the ark), קַרְנָי *horns*, קַרְנוֹת *horns* (of the altar); עֵינַי *eyes*, עֵינָיו *fountains*; cf. also אֶרְבֵּי *lions*, אֶרְבֵּי the

---

4<sup>4</sup> Prätorius, *ZDMG*. 1903, p. 525, regards הַשׁוּפֵי as an instance of the affix of endearment (cf. פְּלוּבֵי, אֶחָוִי) 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, תַּמָּר *palm*, תַּמָּרְהָ *a palm-like column*, plur. תַּמָּרִים and תַּמָּרוֹת.

4. A considerable number of masculines form their plural in תּוֹת, while many feminines have a plural in יָם. The gender of the singular, however, is as a rule retained in the plural.

Undoubted instances of masculines with (masculine) plural in תּוֹת are: אָב *father*, אוֹצֵר *treasure*, בּוֹר and בּוֹרָא *cistern*, זָנָב *tail*, חֲלוֹם *dream*, כִּסֵּא *throne*, לֵב and לִבָּב *heart*, לִיטָה *tablet*, שֵׁלֶטֶן *voice*, עוֹר *skin*, נֶר *lamp*, גַּבְעוֹן *skin-bottle*, מָקוֹם *place*, לַיְלָה and לַיְלָה לַיְלָה *night*, מִזְבֵּחַ *altar*, שֵׁם *name*, שׁוֹפָר *trumpet*.

Feminines ending in הָ which take in the plural the termination יָם are אֵלֶּה *terebinth*, אֵימָה *terror* (but also אֵימוֹת), דֶּבֶלֶה *a cake of figs*, חִטָּה *wheat*, לֶבֶנָה *a brick*, מִלָּה (only in poetry) *a word*, סֵאָה *seā, a dry measure*, שְׂעוּרָה *barley*, and the following names of animals דְּבוּרָה *a bee* and יוֹנָה *a dove*; also, for בֵּיצִים fem. *eggs*, a singular בֵּיצָה is to be assumed. שְׂעֵלָה *sheaf* and שָׁנָה *year* (see above, n) take both יָם and תּוֹת; cf. finally לֶתְשֵׁבֶת *an ear of corn*, plur. שְׂבֵבִילִים, and without the fem. termination in the singular פִּילְגֶשֶׁת *concubine*, plur. יְלִגְשִׁים.

5. A strict distinction in gender between the two plural endings is found, in fact, only in adjectives and participles, e.g. טוֹבִים *boni*, טוֹבוֹת *bonae*, קָטָלִים *musc.*, קָטָלוֹת *fem.* So also in substantives of the same stem, where there is an express distinction of sex, as בְּנֵי *filii*, בָּנוֹת *filiae*; מְלָכִים *reges*, מְלָכוֹת *reginae*.

Rem. 1. In some few words there is added to the plural ending תּוֹת a second (masculine) plural termination (in the form of the *constr. st.* יָי, cf. § 89 c), or a dual ending יָי, e.g. בָּמָה *a high place*, plur. בָּמוֹת, *constr. st.* בָּמוֹתַי (also בָּמֹתַי, *bām'othê*, Is 14:14, Jb 9:8, &c., sometimes as *Q'rē* to the K<sup>c</sup>thîbh in בְּמוֹתַי; see § 95 o); מִרְאֵשׁ תֵּי שְׂאוּל *from Saul's head*, 1 S 26:12; חוֹמָה *wall*, plur. חוֹמוֹת *moenia*, whence dual חוֹמֹתַי *double walls*. This double indication of the plural appears also in the connexion of suffixes with the plural ending תּוֹת (§ 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. מְתִים *men* (the old *sing.* מֶת 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.* אֱלֹהִי, 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 יָי appended to the ground-form,<sup>1</sup> e.g. יָדַי *both hands*, יוֹמַי *two days*. In the feminine

<sup>1</sup> 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 הַ תְּ, but necessarily with *ā* (since it is in an open syllable before the tone), thus תְּ אִיפְּ, e.g. הַשְׁפָּה *lip*, תְּ אִיפְּ both *lips*. From a feminine with the ending תְּ אִיפְּ, e.g. תְּ אִיפְּ (from *n<sup>e</sup> hušt*) the dual is formed like תְּ אִיפְּ *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. תְּ אִיפְּ *wing* (ground-form *kānāph*), dual תְּ אִיפְּ, the first *ā* becoming *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*, 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 תְּ אִיפְּ (which should be תְּ אִיפְּ) evidently merely points to the *constr. st.* תְּ אִיפְּ, which would be expected before תְּ אִיפְּ; cf. תְּ אִיפְּ 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. תְּ אִיפְּ *foot* (ground-form *rāgl*), dual תְּ אִיפְּ; cf., however, תְּ אִיפְּ (only in the book of Daniel), as well as תְּ אִיפְּ from תְּ אִיפְּ *horn*, and תְּ אִיפְּ from תְּ אִיפְּ *cheek* (as if from the plurals תְּ אִיפְּ, תְּ אִיפְּ).—A feminine dual of an adjective used substantivally occurs in תְּ אִיפְּ *a sluggish pair* (of hands) Ec 10:18 from the sing. תְּ אִיפְּ.

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 תְּ אִיפְּ and תְּ אִיפְּ, e.g. תְּ אִיפְּ Gn 37<sup>17a</sup> (locative תְּ אִיפְּ, but in <sup>17b</sup> תְּ אִיפְּ), and תְּ אִיפְּ 2 K 6:13; תְּ אִיפְּ Jos 21:32, identical with תְּ אִיפְּ in 1 Ch 6:61 (cf. also the Moabite names of towns in the Mēša' inscription, line 10 קרייתן = Hebrew תְּ אִיפְּ; line 30 בת דבלתן = בית דבלת תְּ אִיפְּ Jer 48:22; lines 31, 32 ח'רוגן = ח'רוגן ים=חורגן Is 15:5, &c.); (b) in תְּ אִיפְּ, Jos 15:34 תְּ אִיפְּ (= תְּ אִיפְּ Gn 38:21). The view that תְּ אִיפְּ and תְּ אִיפְּ arise from a contraction of the dual terminations תְּ אִיפְּ (as in Western Aramaic, cf. also nom. *āni*, accus. *aini*, of the dual in Arabic) and תְּ אִיפְּ seemed to be supported by the Mēša' inscription, where we find (line 20) מאתן *two hundred* = תְּ אִיפְּ, Hebrew תְּ אִיפְּ. 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 תְּ אִיפְּ and תְּ אִיפְּ in these place-names only arise from a subsequent expansion of the terminations תְּ אִיפְּ and תְּ אִיפְּ: 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'rê perpetuum* (§ 17 c) תְּ אִיפְּ for תְּ אִיפְּ (so, according to Strack, even in old MSS. of the *Mišna*; cf. *Urusalim* in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and the Aramaic form תְּ אִיפְּ): similarly in the Aramaic תְּ אִיפְּ = תְּ אִיפְּ for the Hebrew תְּ אִיפְּ *Samaria*.—We may add to this list תְּ אִיפְּ, תְּ אִיפְּ, תְּ אִיפְּ *the river country* (in the Tel-el-Amarna letters *nārīma*, *na'rīma*), תְּ אִיפְּ *Egypt*, Phoenician תְּ אִיפְּ; also the words denoting time, תְּ אִיפְּ *midday* (Mēša' inscription, line 15 תְּ אִיפְּ), and perhaps תְּ אִיפְּ *in the evening*, if the regular expression תְּ אִיפְּ Ex 12:6, 16:12, &c., is only due to mistaking תְּ אִיפְּ for a dual: LXX πρὸς ἑσπέραν, τὸ δειλιόν, ὄψε and only in Lv 23:5 ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν. The Arabs also say *el 'išā'ân*, *the two evenings*, cf. Kuhn's *Literaturblatt*, iii. 48.

Instead of the supposed dual תְּ אִיפְּ Ez 13:18 read תְּ אִיפְּ. On תְּ אִיפְּ (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 מַיִם *water* and שָׁמַיִם *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. מַיִם, שָׁמַיִם 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 *îm* (which otherwise always has the tone, § 87 a) to be shortened to *im*. Cf. the analogous formations, Arab. *tarđaina*, 2nd fem. sing. imperf. of a verb تَرَدَّى, for *tarđay* + *îna*, corresponding to *taqtulîna* in the strong verb; also bibl.-Aram. כְּבִיזָא the *abs. st. plur.* of the *ptcp. Qal* of כְּבַז (כִּי), which otherwise always ends in *în* with the tone, e.g. in the *ptcp. Qal* of the strong verb, כְּבַזִּין *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. יָדַיְכֶם and יָרְעוֹתְכֶם *arms*, never in the dual), e.g. יָדַיְכֶם *both hands*, אָזְנוֹיְכֶם *both ears*, שֵׁנַיְכֶם *teeth* (of both rows), also נַעֲלָיְכֶם *a pair of sandals*, מֵאֲזָנוֹיְכֶם *a pair of scales*, Lat. *bilanx*, &c.; or things which are at least thought of as forming a pair, e.g. יְוֹמַיְכֶם *two* (successive) *days*, Lat. *biduum*; שָׁבָעַיְכֶם *two weeks*; שְׁנֵי שָׁנִים *two years* (in succession), Lat. *biennium*; אַמְתֵּיכֶם *two cubits*.<sup>1</sup>

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. אַרְבַּע רַגְלֵיכֶם *four feet*, Lv 11:23; שֵׁשׁ כַּנְּפֵיכֶם *six wings* (i.e. three pairs), Is 6:2, Ez 1:6; even שִׁבְעַת עֵינַיְכֶם *seven eyes*, Zc 3:9; כָּל-יָדְכֶם *all knees*, Ez 7:17; כָּל-יָדְכֶם *all hands*, Ez 21:12; מִצְלֹתַיְכֶם *cymbals*, Ezr 3:10; שְׁפָתַיְכֶם *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.

<sup>1</sup> But for דְּרָכֶיךָ־ים Pr 28:6, 18 (which the Masora takes as two roads leading from the cross-ways) דְּרָכֶיךָ is to be read.

1. The Hebrew language no longer makes a living use of *case-endings*,<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>e</sup>wâ* (cf. § 9 a, c, k; § 27 e–m); e.g. דָּבָר *word*, אֱלֹהִים דָּבָר *word of God* (a sort of compound, as with us in inverted order, *God's-word, housetop, landlord*); יָד *hand*, יַד הַמֶּלֶךְ *the hand of the king*; דְּבָרִים *words*, הָעָם דְּבָרָיו *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 יָ, e.g. סוּסִים *horses*, סוּסֵי פָּרֹעַ *the horses of Pharaoh*; עֵינַי *eyes*, עֵינֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ *the eyes of the king*.

Rem. The יָ of the dual has evidently arisen from יָ (cf. עֵינַי), but the origin of the termination יָ in the *constr. st. plur.* is disputed. The Syriac *constr. st.* in *ay* and the form of the plural noun before suffixes (סוּסֵי, &c., § 91 h) would point to a contraction of an original יָ, 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 אֲשֶׁר (see f) and הוֹרֵי (so Philippi, *ThLZ.* 1890, col. 419; Barth, *ZDMG.* 1904, p. 431 ff.), must be left undecided.

<sup>1</sup> On some remains of obsolete case-endings see § 90.

<sup>2</sup> 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 ת־ is regularly retained as the feminine termination in the *construct state* sing. of those nouns which in the *absolute* state end in ה־, e.g. מְלִכָּה queen, מְלִכַת שֶׁבַע the queen of Sheba. But the feminine endings ת־, ת־, and also the plural ת־, remain unchanged in the *construct state*.

(c) Nouns in ה־ (cf. § 75 e) from verbs ל"ה (§ 93, Paradigm III c) form their *constr. st.* in ה־, e.g. רֶאֶר seer, constr. רֶאֶר. If this ה־ is due to contraction of the original י־, with ה added as a vowel letter, we may compare יֶר, constr. יֶר sufficiency; יֶר, constr. יֶר life; אֶר (אֶר), constr. אֶר (אֶר) valley.

On the terminations י and י־ in the *constr. st.* see § 90.

§ 90. *Real and Supposed Remains of Early Case-endings. ה־ local, י in compound proper names, י־ and י in the Construct State.*

K. U. Nylander, *Om Kasusändelserna i Hebräiskan*, 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 ה־ is a survival of the old accusative termination *a*, and that י in certain compound proper names is the old sign of the nominative. The explanation of the *i* as an old genitive sign, which, as being no longer understood in Hebrew, was used for quite different purposes, and the view that י is a form of the nominative termination י, are open to grave doubts.

In Assyrian the rule is that *u* marks the nominative, *i* the genitive, and *a* the accusative,<sup>1</sup> 'in spite of the many and various exceptions to this rule which occur' (Delitzsch, *Assyrische Gram.*, § 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 *-hâ*), 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 ה־, originally *ă*, as in the old Arabic accusative. This is appended to the substantive:

---

<sup>1</sup> 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*,<sup>2</sup> e.g. *יָמָה* seaward, westward, *קִדְמָה* eastward, *צָפֹנָה* northward, *אֶשּׁוּרָה* to Assyria, *בָּבֶלְיָה* to Babylon, *הַר* (from *הָרָה*) to the mountain, Gn 14:10, *אֶרֶץ* to the earth, *בֵּית* to the house, *תִּרְצָה* to Tirzah (תִּרְצָה) 1 K 14:17, &c., *עֵזְרָה* to Gaza (עֵזְרָה) Ju 16:1; with the article *הַר* to the mountain, *בֵּית* into the house, *חַמְרָה* into the chamber, 1 K 1:15; *הַתֵּלָה*<sup>3</sup> into the tent, Gn 18:6, &c.; similarly with adverbs, as *שָׁמָּה* thither, *אֵימָה* whither?; even with the *constr. st.* before a genitive *יֹסֵף* into Joseph's house, Gn 43:17, 24; *הַיָּבֵשׁ הַדְּרֹמִי* toward the land of the south, Gn 20:1; *מִצְרַיִם* to the land of Egypt, Ex 4:20; *דְּמַשְׁקִי* to the wilderness of Damascus, 1 K 19:15; *הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ* toward the sun-rising, Dt 4:41; and even with the plural *כַּשְׂדִּימָה* into Chaldea, Ez 11:24; *הַשָּׁמַיִם* 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 *יָמָה*, *הָרָה*, *בֵּית* 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. *מַחֲנֵי יִמָּה* in Mahanaim, 1 K 4:14; *שָׁמָּה* there (usually *thither*, see c), Jer 18:2, cf. 2 K 23:8, and the expression *הַמִּזְבֵּחַ* to offer a sacrifice properly towards the altar for on the altar. On the other hand, *בָּבֶלְיָה* Jer 29:15, and *זְבֵלְיָה* Hb 3:11, are to be regarded as ordinary accusatives of direction, to Babylon, into the habitation; also expressions like *צָפֹנָה* the quarter towards the north, Jos 15:5 (at the beginning of the verse, *גְּבוּלֵי קִדְמָה* the border toward the east), cf. 18:15, 20, Ex 26:18, Jer 23:8.

(c) The original force of the ending *הַ* is also disregarded when it is added to a substantive with a preposition prefixed (cf. also *עַד־אָנָּה* how long?), and this not only after *לְ*, *אֶל-* or *עַד-* (which are easily explained), e.g. *לְמַעַל* upwards, *לְמַטָּה* downwards, *לְשֵׁאֵל* to Sheol, Ps 9:18; *עַד־אַפְּקָה* unto Aphek, Jos 13:4, *אֶל־הַצָּפוֹן* toward the north, Ez 8:14, cf. Ju 20:16; but also after *בְּ*, and even after *מִן*, e.g. *בְּיָבֵשׁ* in the south, Jos 15:21, cf. Ju 14:2, 1 S 23:15, 19, 31:13, 2 S 20:15, Jer 52:10; *מִבְּבֶלְיָה* 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

<sup>2</sup> 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*.  
<sup>3</sup> *הַתֵּלָה* in Baer's text, Gn 18:6, is an error, according to his preface to Isaiah, p. v.

(a) לַיְלָה, in pause לַיְלָה, the usual word in prose for *night*, which is always construed as masculine. The nominative of this supposed old accusative<sup>1</sup> appeared to be preserved in the form לַיְלָה, only used in poetry, Is 16:3, *constr. st.* לַיְלָה (even used for the *absol. st.* in pause Is 21:11). Most probably, however, לַיְלָה is to be referred, with Nöldeke and others, to a reduplicated form לַיְלִי; cf. especially the western Aramaic לַיְלִי, Syr. *lilya*, &c.—Another instance is מָא וְמָה *something*, probably from מָא, מָה *spot, point*, generally with a negative=*nothing*. Similarly רָצָה Is 8:23 and (in pause) Jb 34:13, and the place-name הַצָּה 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 רָצָה (in pause) Jb 37:12; הַמָּוֹת *death*, Ps 116:15; נְגִידָה־נָּא Ps 116:14, 18; הַנָּחַל *stream*, Ps 124:4; הַחֹשֶׁם *amber*, Ez 8:2 [in 1:4 הַחֹשֶׁם, cf. § 80 k], &c. In Jos 15:12 הַיְמָה is probably only a scribal error (dittography). In Ju 14:18 instead of the quite unsuitable poetic word הַחַרְסָה (towards the sun??) read as in 15:1 הַחַרְסָה *to the bride-chamber*.

(b) In the termination הַ is often used in poetry with feminines, viz. אֵימָה *terror* (=אֵימָה), Ex 15:16; עֲזָרָה *help* (=עֲזָרָה), Ps 44:27, 63:8, 94:17; יְשׁוּעָה *salvation* (=יְשׁוּעָה), Ps 3:3, 80:3, Jon 2:10; עֲוֹנוֹתָה *unrighteousness* (=עֲוֹנוֹתָה), Ez 28:15, Ho 10:13, Ps 125:3; עֲלֵהָ Ps 92:16 *K<sup>e</sup>th*. Jb 5:16; צַדִּיקָה Ps 120:1; עֵיפָה *darkness*, Jb 10:22; הַמְזֻמָּה 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 עֲזָרָה *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.<sup>1</sup>

This termination הַ usually has reference to *place* (hence called הַ *locale*<sup>2</sup>); sometimes, however, its use is extended to time, as in מִיָּמָה *from year to year*. Its use in הַיְלָה properly *ad profanum!*=*absit!* is peculiar.

As the termination הַ is almost always toneless (except in מְזֻמָּה *constr. st.* Dt 4:41; גִּתָּה and עֲתָה Jos 19:13) it generally, as the above examples show, exercises no influence whatever upon the vowels of the word; in the *constr. st.* מִדְּבָרָה Jos 18:12, 1 K 19:15, and in the proper names הַתָּה 1 K 2:40, הַנָּה 2 S 24:6 (so Baer; ed. Mant. and Ginsb. הַנָּה), הַצָּה 2 Ch 14:9, הַרְפָּה 1 K 17:9, הַרְתָּה 1 K 4:12, an *ā* is retained even in an open tone-syllable (cf., however, הַרְתָּה Gn 14:10, הַפָּה Gn 28:2 from הַפָּה, with modification of the *a* to *è*; also הַרְתָּה S 25:5 from הַרְתָּה). 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

<sup>1</sup> Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 113, also takes it as such, *láyālā* being properly *at night*, then *night* simply. Barth, however (*Sprachwiss. Abhandlungen*, p. 16, note 1), refers it to an original לַיְלָה, like אָנָה from הַאָנָה.

<sup>1</sup> [The form clings also to a few place-names, as הַגְּדִיָּה Dt 10:7; הַשָּׁה 1 S 9:4, 2 K 4:42; הַקְּהָלָה Nu 33:22 f.; הַיְטָבָה verse 33 f.; הַתְּמַנָּה Jos 19:43, &c.; הַתְּפָרָה Mi 5:1, &c.]

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Sarauw, 'Der hebr. Lokativ,' *ZA*. 1907, p. 183 ff. He derives the הַ from the adverbs הַמָּה, הַנָּה and holds that it has nothing whatever to do with the old accusative.



Finally we cannot deny the possibility, in some cases, of Barth's explanation of the ו in compound proper names like בְּתוֹאֵל, &c. (see above), as due to the analogy of terms of relationship with nominative in ו. But this in no way militates against the view expressed above, that in some very old names, like פְּנוּאֵל, בְּתוֹאֵל, &c., the original common nominative sign has simply been preserved.

The instances found are:

(a) Of the ending יָי *his ass's colt*, Gn 49:11; עֲזָבִי הַצֹּאֵן *that leaveth the flock*, Zc 11:17 (cf. the preceding אֶלְיִל (רְעִי הָאֶלְיִל); רְעִי הָאֶלְיִל *the dweller in the bush*, Dt 33:16 (on שְׂבִי בְּנִי cf. below Jer 49<sup>16a</sup>, Ob<sup>3</sup>); appended to the feminine תִּי יוֹם וַיִּגְנֹב, תִּי יוֹם וַיִּגְנֹב *whether stolen by day or stolen by night*, Gn 31:39 (in prose, but in very emphatic speech); מְלֵא מִלְּאֵתִי מִשְׁפָּט *plena iustitiae*, Is 1:21; רַב־תִּי עָם *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 רַב־תִּי and רַב־תִּי, see below, follow the example of רַב־תִּי, although no tone-syllable follows; cf. also Ho 10:11 below); אַחֲרֵי־מִלְכֵי־דָק *after the order of Melchizedek*, Ps 110:4; cf. also Ps 113:9, Jer 49<sup>16b</sup>. 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. רַב־תִּי בְּגוֹיִם *she that was great among the nations*, שֶׁר־תִּי בְּמַדְיָנוֹת *princess among the provinces*, La 1:1; אֲהַב־תִּי לְדוֹשׁ *that loveth to tread*, Ho 10:11; cf. also Jer 49:16a, Ob<sup>3</sup>.—In Ex 15:6 נִאֲדָרְתִּי can only be so explained if it is a vocative referring to יְהוָה, but perhaps we should read נִאֲדָרְתָּ as predicate to יָמִי, יָמִי.

Further, the *Hireq compaginis* is found with certain particles which are really also nouns in the *constr. st.*, as זִוְלָתִי (=זולת) *except*, מִן (poetical for מִן) *from*, בְּלֹתִי *not*, אֶפְסִי *not* (thrice in the formula אֲנִי וְאֶפְסִי עוֹד *I am, and there is none else beside me*; but many take the יָי as a suffix here), Is 47:8, 10, Zp 2:15. [The above are all the cases in which this יָי is attached to independent words in the O.T.; it occurs, however, besides] in compound proper names (again attached to the *constr. st.*), as מֶלְכֵי־דָק (king of righteousness), גְּבֻרֵי־אֵל (man of God), חַנּוּנֵי־אֵל (favour of God), and others (cf. also the Punic name *Hannibal*, i.e. חַנּוּנֵי־בָּאֵל *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 (אֶזְבִּי and אֶזְבִּי, 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 יוֹשְׁבֵי־תִי, i.e. יוֹשְׁבֵי־תִי, Jer 10:17, 22:23 (before בְּ, Ez 27:3 (before עַל־), La 4:21 (before בְּ). The *Qere* always requires for it יוֹשֵׁב־תִי (or יוֹשֵׁב־תִי), except in Jer 22:23 יוֹשְׁבֵי־תִי; cf. ibid. מְקַנְנֵתִי *Keth.*, מְקַנְנֵתִי *Qere*, and finally Jer 51:13 יוֹשְׁבֵי־תִי *Keth.*, יוֹשְׁבֵי־תִי *Qere*. Perhaps יוֹשְׁבֵי־תִי and יוֹשְׁבֵי־תִי are *formae mixtae*, combining the readings יוֹשֵׁב־תִי, &c. and יוֹשְׁבֵי־תִי (2nd fem. perf.), &c., but מְקַנְנֵתִי may be merely assimilated to יוֹשְׁבֵי־תִי which immediately precedes it.

The following are simply textual errors: 2 K 4:23 ההלכתי *Keth.*, due to the preceding אתי, and to be read הָהֵלַךְ as in the *Q're*; Ps 30:8 (read הָרַרִי), 113:8 (read לְהוֹשִׁיבוּ), 116:1 (read קוֹל תְּהִי, as in five other places). On בְּרִיתִי, thrice, in Lv 26:42, cf. § 128 d.

(b) Of the ending י<sup>1</sup> (always with the tone): in prose only in the Pentateuch, but in elevated style, Gn 1:24 הַיְתוֹ-אֲרָץ *the beast of the earth* (=הָאָרֶץ ver. 25); similarly in Ps 50:10, 79:2, 104:11, 20, Is 56:9 (twice), Zp 2:14; otherwise only in רִבְנוֹ צִפּוֹר *son of Zippor*, Nu 23:18; בְּנוֹ בְּעוֹר *son of Beor*, Nu 24:3, 15; and מְעַיְנוֹ מַיִם *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> .	י	יִ
2nd Person, m. <i>thy</i> .	ךָ	ךָ (pause) ךָּ
f.	ךִ	ךִי
3rd Person, m. <i>his</i> .	וֹ, הוּ	וֹ (הוּ), וִי
f. <i>her</i> .	הָ	הָ, הֶּ, הֵּ
Plur. 1st Person, c. <i>our</i> .	נוּ	נוּ
2nd Person, m. <i>your</i> .	כֶּם	כֶּם
f.	כֶּן	כֶּן
3rd Person, m. <i>eorum</i> .	הֶם	הֶם
	מוּ	(poet. מוּ)

<sup>1</sup> 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 אָב יָהּ, אָב יְהוּ and אָבִיו יָהּ, אָבִיו יְהוּ, אָבִיו יְהוּ, אָבִיו יְהוּ, sometimes also to segholate forms ending in *i* from ל”ה stems (see § 93 x, y), e.g. פְּרִיָהֶם *the fruit of them*, Am 9:14 (also פְּרִיָהֶם Is 37:30, &c.), פְּרִיָהֶן Jer 29:28 (also פְּרִיָהֶן verse 5); cf., moreover, הַלְבָּהֶן Lv 8:16, 25 and similar examples with הוּ (Is 3:17 הוּ) Gn 21:28, Ez 13:17, 16:53.<sup>1</sup> Also in Gn 1:21, 4:4, Ez 10:12, Nah 2:8, &c., the *K<sup>e</sup>th.* perhaps intends the singular, לְמַי יְנַהֵם, &c., but the Masora requires the plural with defective *ê*.

(b) The forms with connecting vowels (§ 58 f) are joined to nouns ending in a consonant. The connecting vowel is regularly *a* in the *3rd sing. fem.* הַּ (for *aha*) and *3rd plur.* הַּ, מוּ, מוּ, מוּ, מוּ, also in the *3rd sing. masc.* וּ (הַ), since the *ô* is contracted from *a[h]û*, and in the pausal form of the *2nd masc.* וּ (a modification of original וּ).

The forms with *ê* in the above-mentioned persons are common only with nouns in הַ (from stems ל”ה), *constr. st.* הַ (cf. § 89 f), e.g. שֵׁדֵי הוּ (from *sadaihû*) *his field*; עֵלֶף הוּ *its leaf*, Is 1:30; מְרָאָהּ *the appearance thereof*, Lv 13:4 (from *mar’aihā*; on the *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* see k); but שֵׁדֶהּ *her field*. The orthographic retention of the *i*, e.g. מְעֻשָׁיוּ, מְעֻשָׁיוּ, gives to many forms the appearance of plurals; see the instances in § 93 ss.

Apart from these ל”ה forms the connecting vowel *ê* in the 3rd pers. occurs only in isolated cases; אֹרֶךְ הוּ *his light*, Jb 25:3; לְמִיַּד הוּ *after its kind*, Gn 1:12, 25 [+ 12 times]; Na 1:13; in Ju 19:24 read יִלְגְּשׁוּ as in vv. 2, 25. On the other hand וּ in the *2nd sing. fem.* and נוּ in the *1st plur.* are by far the more common forms, while וּ, נוּ are of rare occurrence; see e.—Instead of וּ (כֹהּ in Gn 10:19, Ex 13:16, Jer 29:25, &c., cf. לְכֹהּ § 103 g), כֹּהּ, נוּ (with *S<sup>e</sup>wā mobile*), if the last consonant of the noun is a guttural, the forms are וּ, כֹּהּ, נוּ, e.g. רִיחַתְךָ *thy spirit*, בְּרֵאשִׁיתְךָ *thy creator*, Is 43:1, רֵעִיְכֶם *your friend*, Jb 6:27 (on such cases as בְּהוֹרֵיכֶם Hag 2:5, see § 10 g).—With *Nun energicum* (cf. § 58 i, and on עוֹנֵךְ Jb 5:1, &c., cf. § 61 h) יְיָ occurs in Pr 25:16, in principal pause.

2. Rare or incorrect forms are—

*Sing.* 1st pers. נִי in נִי בְּשׁוֹבֵךְ Ez 47:7 (certainly only a scribal error, caused by נִי בְּשׁוֹבֵךְ in verse 6).

*2nd pers. m.* in pause כֹּהּ, e.g. כֹּפְּךָ (thy hand), Ps 139:5, cf. Pr 24:10; once הַּ נְךָ Ps 53:6 (cf. the analogous cases in the verbal suffix § 75 II); *fem.* יְךָ Ez 5:12 (in 16:53 also for יְךָ probably שְׁבִיתְךָ is intended), כִּי Jer 11:15, Ps 103:3, 116:19, 135:9 (corresponding to the Aramaic suffix of the *2nd fem. sing.*; on the wholly abnormal כֹּהּ Na 2:14, cf. l), לְכִי *K<sup>e</sup>th.* 2 K 4:2, Ct 2:13. Also וּ Is 22:1, Ez 23:28, 25:4.

<sup>1</sup> Also in Jer 15:10 read (according to § 61 h, end) בְּלִיָּהֶם קָלְלוּנִי; in Ho 7:6 probably אֲפָהֶם for אֲפָהֶם.

3rd pers. הָ (cf. § 7 c), e.g. אָהֵל Gn 9:21, 12:8, 13:3, 35:21 (always with *Q're* אָהֵלוּ); Nu 10:36; לָהּ Dt 34:7; בְּלֵהּ Jer 20:7, Na 2:1 *Q're*; קָצָה 2 K 19:23 *Keth.*, for which קָצוּ is read in Is 37:24; עִירוֹ and סוּתוֹ Gn 49:11, cf. Ex 22:26 (*Q're* עִירוֹ); סָבָה Ps 10:9, 27:5 *Keth.*; הָמוֹנָה Ez 31:18, &c., *Keth.*; תְּבוּאָתָהּ 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. הֶּ for הָ (with the softening of the *Mappiq*, cf. § 23 k, and the analogous cases in § 58 g) occurs repeatedly before *B<sup>e</sup>ghadhk<sup>e</sup>phath* and other soft consonants, Ex 9:18 (before ך, if the text is right), Lv 13:4 (before ך), Nu 15:28, 31, 1 S 1:9 (unless אָקְלָה, the infin. with fem. termination, is intended; הֶּ שָׁתָּה follows), Ez 16:44, 24:6 (before ב), 1 S 20:20, 2 K 8:6, Pr 12:28 (before א), Na 3:9 (before ו), Ps 48:14 (before פ), Ez 47:10, Jb 31:22 twice (before ת), Is 21:2, Jer 20:17 (before ה), Nu 32:42, Am 1:11 (before ן), Lv 6:2 (before ע); even in *pause*, Lv 12<sup>a</sup> and <sup>b</sup>; Is 23:17, Pr 21:22, also with *Zaqeph*, Is 45:6, Jer 6:6 (probably), 44:19; on הֶּ שָׁתָּה Lv 26:34, &c., see § 67 y. Cf. also אָ Ez 36:5.—Sometimes the Masora appears (but this is very doubtful) to regard the הֶּ with feminines as a shortening of הָ, e.g. נָצָה Gn 40:10 for הָ נָצָה, פָּנָה Pr 7:8 for הָ פָּנָה; also הֶּ for הָ in פְּתוּבוֹנִים Ho 13:2, and עָרְמָם 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 בְּכוֹרָה, and in Zc 4:2 to גְּלָהּ, Jb 11:9 to מְדָהּ, Neh 5:14 to פְּחָהּ. [See also, after prepositions, § 103 g.]

*Plur.* 1st pers. נוּ, in *pause* קִימָנוּ Jb 22:20 (where, however, קִימָנוּ is certainly to be read); cf. Ru 3:2 [Is 47:10, cf. § 61 c, h], and so always בָּלָנוּ *all of us*, Gn 42:11, &c [cf. אָתָנוּ, לָנוּ, בָּנוּ, עִמָּנוּ].

2nd pers. fem. כִּיָּהּ Ez 23:48, 49.

3rd pers. *masc.* מוּ Ps 17:10 (on מוּ in פִּימוּ in the same verse, and in Ps 58:7 see l.); הֶם 2 S 23:6, according to Sievers probably to call attention to the reading כִּלְהֶם. *Fem.* הֵנָּה 1 K 7:37, Ez 16:53 (in *pause*); נָהּ Gn 41:21; נָהּ Gn 30:41; נָהּ Ru 1:19; elsewhere generally in *pause* (Gn 21:29, 42:36, Jer 8:7, Pr 31:29, Jb 39:2); finally הֵן 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* (יָ, cf. § 89 d). This ending, however, has been preserved unchanged only in the *2nd fem.* In most cases it is contracted to יָ, as in the *constr. st.* without suffixes (so throughout the plur. and in the poetical suffix יהוָי of the *3rd sing. masc.*); in the *2nd masc.* and *3rd fem. sing.* it is יָ (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>	יָ, <i>pause</i> יָ	1. c. <i>our.</i>	יָנוּ
2. m. <i>thy.</i>	יָךְ	2. m. <i>your.</i>	יָכֶם
f.	יָךְ, <i>pause</i> יָךְ	f.	יָכֶן

3. m. <i>his.</i>	יָ יְהוָה, poet.	3. m. <i>their.</i>	יְהוָה, poet. יְמוֹ
f. <i>her.</i>	יְהִי	f.	יְהִי

Thus the original יָ is (*a*) contracted in the *3rd sing. masc.* יְהוָה and throughout the *plural*, as סוּסֵי יָנוּ, סוּסֵי יָנוּ, &c.; (*b*) retained unchanged in the *1st sing.* סוּסִי, the real suffix-ending יָ (see *b*) being united with the final *Yôdh* of the ending יָ; and in the *2nd fem. sing.* סוּסִיךְ, with a *helping-ĥireq* after the *Yôdh*. On the other hand (*c*) the *Yôdh* of יָ is lost in pronunciation and the *ă* lengthened to *ā* in the *3rd masc. sing.* סוּסָיו, i.e. *sūsāw* (pronounced *susā-u*).<sup>1</sup> The *2nd masc. sing.* סוּסִיךְ and the *3rd fem. sing.* סוּסִיךְ were formerly also explained here as having really lost the יָ, and modified the *a* of *sūsakā*, *sūsahā* to *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*; but cf. the view now given in *g* and *k*.

Rem. 1. As סוּסֵי יָנוּ represents *sūsai-nū*, so סוּסִיךְ and יְהִיךְ represent *sūsai-kā*, *sūsai-hā*, and the use of *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* instead of the more regular *Sere* is to be explained from the character of the following syllable,—so P. Haupt who points to יְקַטְלֵהוּ as compared with יְקַטְלֵהוּ. In support of the view formerly adopted by us that the יָ is only orthographically retained, too much stress must not be laid on the fact that it is sometimes omitted,<sup>2</sup> 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. דְּרָכֶיךָ *thy ways* (probably דְּרָכֶיךָ is intended), Ex 33:13, Jos 1:8, Ps 119:37; for other examples, see Jos 21:11 ff. (מִגְרָשֶׁךָ); but in 1 Ch 6:40 ff. always יָ (יְהוָה), 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); אֶסְרֶךָ Nu 30:8 (cf. v. 5); מִכֶּתֶךָ Jer 19:8, 49:17; מְבִיאָה Dn 11:6. For the orthographic omission of יָ before suffixes cf. רַע יְהוּ for רַע יְהוָה *his friends* 1 S 30:26, Pr 29:18; Jb 42:10 (but it is possible to explain it here as a *collective* singular); אֲשֶׁרֵנוּ *our iniquities*, Is 64:5, 6, Jer 14:7; Ex 10:9, Neh 10:1 (לִנְנוּ from לְנוֹיָם which is always written defectively); נִסְכְּכֶם Nu 29:33; רַעֲתֶכֶם Jer 44:9; יְדָכֶם Ps 134:2; לְמַיְיָהֶם *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.* יָ, which in *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* is almost always changed to יוּ, e.g. הִצֵּנוּ *his arrows*, Ps 58:8, *Q<sup>e</sup>rê* הִצֵּנוּ. On יְהִיךְ, only three times יְהִיךְ, cf. § 135 r.

2. Unusual forms (but for the most part probably only scribal errors) are—*Sing.* 2nd pers. *fem.* יְהִיךְ (after אֲשֶׁרֵי *happy!* Ec 10:17, which has become stereotyped as an interjection, and is therefore unchangeable; cf. Delitzsch on the passage); יְכִי (cf. Syr. כִּי) 2 K 4:3, and <sup>7</sup> in *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, Ps 103:3–5, 116:7 (יְכִי in *pause*).—In Ez 16:31 יְהִיךְ (so יְכֶם in 6:8) occurs with an *infin.* ending in וְ, the וְ being therefore treated as a plural ending; similarly, the plural suffix is sometimes found with the feminine ending וְת (Nu 14:33, Is 54:4, Jer 3:8, Ez 16:15, 23:7, as well as in 16:20 *Q<sup>e</sup>rê*, and Zp 3:20), with the ending *ûh* (Lv 5:24, reading וְתוּ), and even with the ordinary feminine ending *ath*; Is 47:13, Ez 35:11, Ps 9:15, Ezr 9:15.—Wholly

<sup>1</sup> In the papyrus of the decalogue from the Fayyûm, line 16, וִיקדְשִׁיו occurs for וִיקדְשֶׁהוּ Ex 20:11. Gall, *ZAW*. 1903, p. 349, takes this as an indication that the traditional forms of the noun-suffix יוּ or ו represent *aiû* or *eû*. P. Haupt aptly compares the Greek use of the *iota subscript* (ῑ).

<sup>2</sup> So in the Mêša' inscription, l. 22 מגדלתה *its towers* (along with שעריה *its gates*). Can it have been the rule to omit יָ after the termination *ôth*? Cf. below, *n*.

abnormal is מְלַאֲכֵי כַּהּ *thy messengers*, Na 2:14, evidently a case of dittography of the following ה: read מְלַאֲכֵי יְהוָה.

*3rd masc.* יהוּ ַּ Hb 3:10, Jb 24:23; הוּ ַּ 1 S 30:26, Ez 43:17, Na 2:4; וְהִי (a purely Aramaic form) Ps 116:12.—*3rd fem.* יִהְיֶה ַּ Ez 41:15.

*Plur.* The strange *2nd pers. masc.* תְּפִיצוּתֵיכֶם (with *i*,<sup>1</sup> so Qimḥi; cf. Norzi) Jer 25:34, is probably a mixed form combining תִּפְצוּ and תְּפִיצוּתֵיכֶם; *fem.* יִכְנֶה ַּ Ez 13:20.

*3rd masc.* יִהְיֶה מָה ַּ Ez 40:16; *fem.* יִהְיֶה נָה ַּ Ez 1:11.

3. The termination מוּ ַּ (also with the *dual*, e.g. Ps 58:7, 59:13), like מוּ and מוּ ַּ, 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 י ַּ, even to the feminine plural in ות (וְסוֹתֵי יְנוּ, וְסוֹתֵי יָךְ, &c.), so that in reality the result is a double indication of the plural.<sup>1</sup>

Such is the rule: the singular suffix, however (see b), also occurs with the ending ות (probably through the influence of Aramaic), e.g. דְּוֹתֵי זָּ Ps 132:12 (unless it be *sing.* for דְּוֹתֵי זָּ, as, according to Qimḥi in his Lexicon, תְּהַגְּוֹתֵי תְּ 2 K 6:8 is for תְּהַגְּוֹתֵי תְּ); מִכְּתָבְךָ Dt 28:59 (treated on the analogy of an *infîn.* לִי); אֶחְיִיתֶךָ Ez 16:52. On the other hand מְצִיֹּתֶךָ (so Baer, Ginsb.; but Opat. יְךָ ַּ Ps 119:98, Dn 9:5 is merely written defectively, like גְּרָגְרִתֶךָ 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 אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם (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 שְׁמוֹתָן *their names*, דוֹרוֹתָם *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 יְהֵם ַּ can only subsequently have taken the place of ם ַּ.

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 ת ַּ in the *constr. st.* of the fem. it should be further remarked that the short *ă* of this ending is only retained before the *grave* suffixes כָּם and כָּךְ; before all the others (the *light* suffixes) it is lengthened to *ā*.

<sup>1</sup> See an analogous case in § 87 s. Cf. also the double feminine ending in the *3rd sing. perf.* of verbs לִיָּהּ, § 75 i.

## Singular.

		<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
Sing.	com.	סוס <i>a horse.</i>	סוסה <i>a mare.</i>
	1.	סוסי <i>my horse.</i>	קוסתי <i>my mare.</i>
	2. m.	קוסך <i>thy horse.</i>	סוסתך <i>thy mare.</i>
	f.	סוסך <i>thy horse.</i>	קוסתך <i>thy mare.</i>
	3. m.	סוסו <i>equus eius</i> (suus).	קוסתו <i>equa eius (sua).</i>
	f.	סוסה <i>equus eius</i> (suus).	קוסתה <i>equa eius (sua).</i>
	Plur. com.	סוסנו <i>our horse.</i>	קוסתנו <i>our mare.</i>
	1.		
2. m.	קוסכם <i>your horse.</i>	קוסתכם <i>your mare.</i>	
f.	קוסכן <i>your horse.</i>	קוסתכן <i>your mare.</i>	
3. m.	סוסם <i>equus eorum</i> (suus).	קוסתם <i>equa eorum (sua).</i>	
f.	סוסן <i>equus earum</i> (suus).	קוסתן <i>equa earum (sua).</i>	

## Plural.

		<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
Sing.	com.	סוסים <i>horses.</i>	סוסות <i>mares.</i>
	1.	סוסי <i>my horses.</i>	קוסותי <i>my mares.</i>
	2. m.	סוסיך <i>thy horses.</i>	קוסותיך <i>thy mares.</i>
	f.	סוסיך <i>thy horses.</i>	קוסותיך <i>thy mares.</i>
	3. m.	סוסיו <i>equi eius (sui).</i>	קוסותיו <i>equae eius (suae).</i>
	f.	סוסיה <i>equi eius (sui).</i>	קוסותיה <i>equae eius (suae).</i>
	Plur. com.	סוסינו <i>our horses.</i>	קוסותינו <i>our mares.</i>
	1.		
2. m.	קוסיכם <i>your horses.</i>	קוסותיכם <i>your mares.</i>	
f.	קוסיכן <i>your horses.</i>	קוסותיכן <i>your mares.</i>	
3. m.	קוסיהם <i>equi eorum</i> (sui).	קוסותיהם <i>equae eorum (suae).</i>	
f.	קוסיהן <i>equi eorum</i> (sui).	קוסותיהן <i>equae eorum (suae).</i>	

### § 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 ים, וֹת and ים־ 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  $\check{S}^e w\acute{a}$ , 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. דָּבַר *word* (ground-form *dābār*), plur. דְּבָרִים; with a light suffix beginning with a vowel, דְּבָרִי, דְּבָרְךָ, &c.; plur. דְּבָרַי, דְּבָרְךָ, &c.; דְּבָרֶיךָ *wing*, dual דְּבָרֶיךָ. With an unchangeable vowel in the second syllable: פָּקִיד *overseer*, plur. פְּקִידִים; with the *suffix* of the sing. פָּקִידִי, פָּקִידְךָ, &c.; with the *suff.* of the plur. פְּקִידַי, פְּקִידְךָ, &c. With an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable: עוֹלָם *eternity*, plur. עוֹלָמִים, with *suff.* עוֹלָמִי, &c.<sup>1</sup>

But in participles of the form קֹטֵל, with tone-lengthened  $\bar{e}$  (originally *i*) in the second syllable, the  $\bar{e}$  regularly becomes  $\check{S}^e w\acute{a}$  *mobile* before a tone-bearing affix, e.g. יָבֵא *enemy*, plur. יָבֵאוֹת, with *suff.* יָבֵאֵי, &c. Likewise in words of the form קֹטֵל, קֹטֵל, &c. (with  $\bar{e}$  in the second syllable; § 84b d, l, p; § 85 i and k), e.g. אֵלֶם *dumb*, plur. אֵלֶמִים.

(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  $\check{S}^e w\acute{a}$ , while the vowel of the first syllable reverts to its original shortness, e.g. דְּבָרֵי הָעָם *the words of the people*, דְּבָרֶיךָ *your words*, דְּבָרֵיהֶם *their words* (in all which instances the *i* of the first syllable is attenuated from an original  $\check{a}$ ).

In the segholate forms in the singular and mostly in the dual the suffix is appended to the ground-form (מֶלֶךְ *my king*, מֶלֶכְךָ, &c.); on the other hand, before the endings ים, וֹת (sometimes also before ים־) a *Qames* regularly occurs,<sup>1</sup> before which the vowel of the first syllable then becomes vocal  $\check{S}^e w\acute{a}$  (מֶלֶכֹת, מֶלֶכֹים). This *Qames* (on which cf. § 84a a) remains even before the light suffixes, when attached to the plur. masc. (מֶלֶכֹי, מֶלֶכֹךָ, &c.). On the other hand, the *constr. st.* plur. and dual, regularly, according to *d*, has the form מֶלֶכֵי, with grave suffix מֶלֶכֵיכֶם, &c., מֶלֶכֵי דְלָתַי *from folding-doors*.

(c) Before the  $\check{S}^e w\acute{a}$  *mobile* which precedes the suffix הַ 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. דָּבַרְךָ, דָּבַרְךָ, &c. (on the forms with  $\bar{e}$  in the second syllable, see § 93 qq); but before the grave suffixes כֶּם־ and כֶּן־ in the same position it reverts to its original shortness, as דְּבַרְכֶם

<sup>1</sup> The participles *Niph'al* נִדְּחָה Dt 30:4, נִדְּחוּ 2 S 14:13, and some plurals of the participle *Niph.* of verbs ל"א form an exception; cf. § 93 oo.

<sup>1</sup> For the rare exceptions see § 93 l and § 97 f, note 2.

(*d<sup>h</sup>bhārkhèm*), &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 fenowing word, e.g. דָּבַר אֵל הַיָּם; דְּבַר הַיָּם יָת (from דְּבַר).

Rem. The Masora (cf. *Diqduqe ha-ʿamim*, p. 37) reckons thirteen words which retain *Qameṣ* in the *constr. st.*, some of which had originally *ā* and therefore need not be considered. On the other hand, אֵלִים or אֱלִים 1 K 7:6, Ez 40:48, &c. (in spite of the *constr. st.* plur. אֱלִים); מִצְבָּח Ps 65:6, Pr 25:19; מִצְבָּח 1 S 13:23 (so Baer, but ed. Mant., Ginsburg, &c. מִצְבָּח); מִשְׁקָל Ezr 8:30 and מִתָּן 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 *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*.

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 ה of ל"ה stems before all formative additions (cf. § 91 d), the sharpening of the final consonant of ע"ע stems in such cases as קָה, קָה, &c.

A striking difference between the vowel changes in the verb and noun is that in a verb when terminations are added it is mostly the second of two changeable vowels which becomes *Š<sup>e</sup>wā* (קָה, קָה, קָה), but in a noun, the first (דְּבַר, דְּבַר, דְּבַר), cf. § 27. 3.

### § 93. Paradigms of Masculine Nouns.<sup>1</sup>

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. דָּבַר *f. sword*, like מֶלֶךְ *m. king*, except that in the *plural* they usually take the termination יָת; thus דְּבַר יָת, *constr.* דְּבַר יָת (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 יָת. All suffixes, except בָּם, בָּן, הֶם, הֵן (יָם, יָן, יָם, יָן), 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, *mālk*, *siphr*, *quḏš* have been developed by the adoption of a helping *S<sup>e</sup>ghōl* to מֶלֶךְ (with *ā* modified to *è*), מִסְפָּר (*i<sup>h</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> 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  $\bar{e}$ ),  $\text{שָׁדֶק}$  ( $\bar{u}$  lengthened to  $\bar{o}$ ).<sup>2</sup> The next three examples, instead of the helping  $S^e gh\bar{o}l$ , have a helping  $Pathah$ , 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  $\bar{o}$  takes the place of the original  $\bar{u}$ , and in  $d$  and  $f$  the guttural requires a repetition of the  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{o}$  in the form of a  $\text{Ha\text{t}eph}$  ( $\text{פָּעֲלִי, גַּעְרִי}$ ); before a following  $S^e w\bar{a}$  this  $\text{Ha\text{t}eph}$  passes into a simple helping vowel ( $\bar{a}, \bar{o}$ ), according to § 28 c; hence  $\text{גַּעְרִי, גַּעְרִי}$ , &c.

In the plural an  $a$ -sound almost always appears before the tone-bearing affix  $\text{יָם}$  (on the analogy of forms with original  $a$  in the second syllable; cf. § 84a a), in the form of a pretonic  $Qame\text{ṣ}$ , whilst the short vowel of the first syllable becomes vocal  $S^e w\bar{a}$ . 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  $Dage\text{š}$  in a following  $Begadkephath$  ( $\text{מְלֻכִּי}$ , not  $\text{מֶלְכִּי}$ , &c.) is due to the loss of a vowel between  $\text{ל}$  and  $\text{כ}$ . 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,  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$ ); the ground forms  $maut$  and  $zait$  are always contracted to  $m\bar{o}th, z\bar{e}th$ , except in the *absol. sing.*, where  $u$  and  $i$  are changed into the corresponding consonants  $\text{ו}$  and  $\text{י}$ .

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  $\text{šau\text{t}}$ ).

Paradigm  $k$  is a formation from a stem  $\text{ל"ה}$  (§ 84a c,  $\epsilon$ ).

Paradigms  $l, m, n$  are forms from stems  $\text{ע"ע}$ , and hence (see § 67 a) originally biliteral,  $yam, im, huq$ , with the regular lengthening to  $\text{יָם, יָם, קָה}$ . Before formative additions a sharpening, as in the inflexion of verbs  $\text{ע"ע}$ , takes place in the second radical, e.g.  $\text{אָמַי, אָמַי, אָמַי}$ , &c. (see § 84a c,  $\beta$ ).

#### REMARKS.

1. A. On I.  $a$  and  $d$  (ground-form  $qa\text{t}\bar{t}$ ). In *pause* the full lengthening to  $\bar{a}$  generally takes place, thus  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  *vineyard*,  $\text{רֵעַ, רֵעַ}$  *seed* (from  $\text{רֵעַ, רֵעַ}$ ), and so always (except **Ps 48:11**), in  $\text{רֶחַץ}$  *earth* with the article,  $\text{רֶחַץ, רֶחַץ}$ , according to § 35 o (cf. also in the LXX the forms  $\text{Ἀβέλ, Ἰαφέθ}$  for  $\text{רֶחַץ, רֶחַץ}$ ). However, the form with  $\bar{e}$  is also sometimes found in *pause*, along with that in  $\bar{a}$ , e.g.  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  together with  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$ ; and very frequently only the form with  $S^e gh\bar{o}l$ , e.g.  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  *grass*,  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  *perpetuity*,  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  *a wonder*,  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  *righteousness*,  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  *the East*,  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  *help*, &c.—With two  $S^e gh\bar{o}l$ s, although with a middle guttural, we find  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  *bread* (in *pause*  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$ ) and  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  *womb* (in *pause*  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$ ), besides  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$  **Ju 5:30** (in *pause*  $\text{רָבִיבָה}$ ). A helping  $S^e gh\bar{o}l$  always stands

<sup>2</sup> According to P. Haupt ‘The book of Nahum’ in the *Journ. of bibl. Lit.*, 1907, p. 29, the  $e$  in  $\text{פָּרִי}$  and the  $o$  in  $\text{פָּרִי}$  are not long but accented, and hence to be pronounced  $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\phi\omicron\rho, \acute{\omicron}\zeta\upsilon$  ( $\text{פָּרִי}$ ), a theory unknown at any rate to the Jewish grammarians.

before a final א, as דָּשָׂא, טָנָא (with *suff.* טַנְאָךְ, פָּרָא, פָּרָא (also written פָּרָה), except in גָּיָא, 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, Pathah appears in the second syllable as the principal vowel (see below, s), e.g. גִּבֹּר Ps 18:26; זָרַע (only in Nu 11:7, before Maqqeph), חָדַר Ju 3:24 (but Ct 3:4 חָדַר, נָטַע, סָחַר as well as רָע, &c.; cf., moreover, קָחַת 2 K 12:9 (for חָת, *infin. constr.* from חָקַח).

*Paradigms of Masculine Nouns.*

	I							I					
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	g.	h.	i.	k.	l.	m.	n.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	מֶלֶךְ	סֵפֶר	קֹדֶשׁ	נַעַר	נֶצַח	פְּעֹלָה	מָוֶת	זַיִת	שׁוֹט	פְּרִי	יָם	אֵם	חֹק
	(king)	(book)	(sanctuary)	(a youth)	(perpetuity)	(work)	(death)	(olive)	(whip)	(fruit)	(sea)	(mother)	(statute)
" <i>construct</i>	מֶלֶךְ	סֵפֶר	קֹדֶשׁ	נַעַר	נֶצַח	פְּעֹלָה	מוֹת	זַיִת	שׁוֹט	פְּרִי	יָם, יָם	אֵם	חֹק
" <i>with light suff.</i>	מֶלְכִי	סֵפְרִי	קֹדְשִׁי	נַעְרִי	נֶצְחִי	פְּעֻלָּי	מוֹתִי	זַיִתִּי	שׁוֹטִי	פְּרִיִּי	יָמִי	אִמִּי	חֻקִּי
" <i>with grave suff.</i>	מֶלְכְךָ	סֵפְרְךָ	קֹדְשְׁךָ	נַעַרְךָ	נֶצַחְךָ	פְּעֻלָּךְ	מוֹתְךָ	זַיִתְךָ	שׁוֹטְךָ	פְּרִיְךָ	יָמְךָ	אִמְךָ	חֻקְךָ
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מְלָכִים	סִפְרִים	[קֹדְשִׁים]	נַעֲרִים	נֶצְחִים	פְּעֻלִּים	[מוֹתִים]	זַיִתִּים	שׁוֹטִים	גְּדִיִּים	יָמִים	אֲמוֹת	חֻקִּים
" <i>construct</i>	מְלָכֵי	סִפְרֵי	קֹדְשֵׁי	נַעֲרֵי	נֶצְחֵי	פְּעֻלֵי	מוֹתֵי	זַיִתֵּי	שׁוֹטֵי	גְּדִיֵי	יָמֵי	אֲמוֹת	חֻקֵּי
" <i>with light suff.</i>	מְלָכֵי	סִפְרֵי	[קֹדְשֵׁי]	נַעֲרֵי	נֶצְחֵי	פְּעֻלֵי		זַיִתֵּי	שׁוֹטֵי	(kids)	יָמֵי	אֲמוֹתֵי	חֻקֵּי
" <i>with grave suff.</i>	מְלָכֵיכֶם	סִפְרֵיכֶם	קֹדְשֵׁיכֶם	נַעֲרֵיכֶם	נֶצַחֵיכֶם	פְּעֻלֵיכֶם		זַיִתֵיכֶם	שׁוֹטֵיכֶם		יָמֵיכֶם	אֲמוֹתֵיכֶם	חֻקֵיכֶם
<i>Dual absolute</i>	רַגְלֵי יָם	קַבְצֵי יָם	מְתַנֵּי יָם	נַעְלֵי יָם				עֵינֵי יָם	יוֹמֵי יָם	לְחֵי יָם	כַּפֵּי יָם	שֵׁנֵי יָם	
	(feet)	(two heaps)	(loins)	(sandals)				(eyes)	(two days,	(cheeks)	(hands)	(teeth)	
		[proper name.]						<i>biduum</i> )					
" <i>construct</i>	רַגְלֵי		מְתַנֵּי	נַעְלֵי				עֵינֵי		לְחֵי	בְּפִי	שֵׁנֵי	

	II						III			IV		
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	דְּבָר	חָכָם	זָקֵן	כַּתֵּף	חֲצָר	שָׂדֵה	עוֹלָם	אֹיֵב	חֹזֵה	פְּקִיד	עָנִי	כְּתָב
	(word)	(wise)	(an old man)	(shoulder)	(court)	(field)	(eternity)	(enemy)	(seer)	(overseer)	(poor)	(writing)

" construct	דָּבַר	חָכַם	זָמַן	כָּתַר	שָׁדָה	עוֹלָם	אֵיב	חַיָּה	פָּקִיד	עָנִי	כְּתָב
" with light suff.	דְּבָרִי	חֲכָמִי	זִמְנִי	כְּתָרִי	שָׁדִי	עוֹלָמִי	אֵיבִי	חַיָּי	פָּקִידִי		כְּתָבִי
" with grave suff.	דְּבָרְךָ	חֲכָמְךָ			שָׁדְךָ	עוֹלָמְךָ	אֵיבְךָ	חַיָּיְךָ	פָּקִידְךָ		כְּתָבְךָ
Plur. absolute	דְּבָרִים	חֲכָמִים	זִמְנִים	חֲצָרִים	פְּנִים	עוֹלָמִים	אֵיבִים	חַיָּים	פָּקִידִים	עָנִידִים	[כְּתָבִים]
" construct	דְּבָרַי	חֲכָמַי	זִמְנַי	חֲצָרַי	פְּנֵי	עוֹלָמִי	אֵיבִי	חַיָּי	פָּקִידִי	עָנִי	[כְּתָבִי]
" with light suff.	דְּבָרִי	חֲכָמִי	זִמְנִי	חֲצָרִי	פְּנֵי	עוֹלָמִי	אֵיבִי	חַיָּי	פָּקִידִי		[כְּתָבִי]
" with grave suff.	דְּבָרֶיכֶם	חֲכָמֶיכֶם	זִמְנֶיכֶם	חֲצָרֶיכֶם	פְּנֵיכֶם	עוֹלָמֶיכֶם	אֵיבֶיכֶם	חַיָּיֶכֶם	פָּקִידֶיכֶם	עָנֵיכֶם	[כְּתָבֶיכֶם]
Dual absolute	כְּנָפַיִם	חֲלָצַיִם	יָרְכַיִם			מְלָקַחַיִם	מְאָזְנַיִם		שָׁבַע יָם		
	(wings)	(loins)	(thighs)		(face)	(pair of tongs)	(balance)		(two weeks)		
" construct	כְּנָפַי						מְאָזְנַי				

C. The ה־ locale is, according to § 90 i, regularly added to the already developed form, e.g. נִגְדָה Ps 116:14, 18: הַפ־תָּחָה Gn 19:6, to the door; but also with a firmly closed syllable נִגְבָה Ex 40:24; under the influence of a guttural or ר, ה־דָה, אֶרְצָה, in pause אֶרְצָה (cf. זָרְהָ 1 Ch 14:16, from זָרָה).

D. The suffixes of the singular are likewise added to the ground-form, but forms with middle guttural take *Ḥateph-Pathah* instead of the *S<sup>wā</sup> quiescens*; נִעָרִי, &c. (but also לִחְמִי, &c.). In a rather large number of *qāṭ*-forms, however, before suffixes in the sing., as well as in the *constr. st. plur.* and dual, the *ā* of the first syllable is attenuated to *i*,<sup>1</sup> thus בְּטִנִּי *my womb*, יִתְרוֹ; so in בָּגַד, בָּצַע, בָּצָע, בָּצָע, בָּצָע, בָּצָע, בָּצָע, בָּצָע, בָּצָע, בָּצָע, and many others. In some cases of this kind besides the form with *ā* there most probably existed another with original *β* in the first syllable; thus certainly with שָׁעַי beside שָׁעַי, צַחַי beside צַחַי, &c. (According to the *Diquduq ha-ḥamim*, § 36, the *absolute st.* in such cases takes *è*, the *constr. st.* *ē*; cf. נִדָר Nu 30:4 (*absol.*) and נִדָר Nu 30:10 (*constr.*); שָׁרָר Lv 24:20 (*absol.*) and שָׁרָר Am 6:6 (*constr.*). According to this theory<sup>2</sup> פִּלְאֵ (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 בְּגָדִי, &c. from בָּגַד and יָקַבְךָ Dt 15:14, 16:13, in both cases evidently owing to the influence of the palatal in the middle of the stem. With *S<sup>ghōl</sup>* for *i*: הַבְּלִי, יִשְׁעָךְ, יִשְׁעָךְ, &c.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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. **נְפִשׁוֹת, נְפִשׁוֹת** together with **נְפִשִׁים** (**Ez 13:20** [but read **נְפִשִׁים**; see comm.]), &c., *constr. st.* **נְפִשׁוֹת**. Other nouns have only the ending **ות**, e.g. **אֲרָצוֹת, constr. אֲרָצוֹת** from **אָרֶץ**. Without *Qameṣ* before the ending **ים** we find **רַחֲמִים** (*bowels*) *mercy*. On the numerals **עֶשְׂרִים** *twenty*, &c., cf. § 97 f, note 2. Moreover *a* is not inserted before plural suffixes with the tone on the penultima in **יָדְךָ אֲשֶׁר יָדְךָ**, &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. **בְּסִפְיָהֶם** **Gn 42:25, 35**; **רִשְׁפֵי** **Ct 8:6** (**רִשְׁפֵי** **Ps 76:4**); **טְרַפֵּי** **Ez 17:9**; **צִמְדֵי** **Is 5:10**, and so always in **נִסְפִיכָם** **Nu 29:39**, **נִסְפִיָּהֶם** **Ps 16:4**, &c. (on the other hand, according to the best authorities *not* in **חֲסָדֵי** **Is 55:3**, &c., though in **Ps 107:43** Ginsburg reads **חֲסָדֵי**); cf. § 46 d. Even with a middle guttural **בְּעֲלֵיהֶן** **Est 1:17, 20**.—The attenuation of *ā* to *i* also occurs sometimes in this form (see above, **k**), e.g. **זִבְחֵי**, &c., even **יְלָדֵי** **Is 57:4** beside **יְלָדֵי** **Ho 1:2**, &c.

G. In the *dual absol.* beside forms like **רַגְלֵי יָדְךָ** *feet*, with suff. **רַגְלֵי יָדְךָ**, &c. **רַגְלֵי יָדְךָ** *two thousand*, **נְעָלֶיךָ** *sandals*, **בְּרַפְּיָיִךְ** *knees* (*ā* attenuated to *i*, *constr. st.* **בְּרַפְּיָיִךְ** with a firmly closed syllable), with suffixes **בְּרַפְּיָיִךְ**, &c. (cf., however, **בְּרַכִּיָּהֶם** **Ju 7:6**), forms with pretonic *Qameṣ* are also found (in consequence of the tendency to assimilate the dual to the plural in form: so König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 17), as **קַרְנֵי יָדְךָ** *horns*, with suff. **קַרְנֵי יָדְךָ** (**Dn 8:3 ff.**; elsewhere always **קַרְנֵי יָדְךָ**, &c.), and so always **דְּלָתֵי יָדְךָ**, *constr. st.* **דְּלָתֵי יָדְךָ** *folding-doors*, **דְּרַבְּיָיִךְ** (?) *double way*.

2. On Paradigms *b* and *e*. With a final **א** rejected (but retained orthographically) we find **סִינ** *sin*. An initial guttural before suffixes generally receives *S<sup>g</sup>ghôl* instead of the original *i*, e.g. **עֲזָרֵי, חֲלָקֵי**, &c., so in the *constr. st. plur.* **עֲזָרֵי, חֲלָקֵי**, &c.; **חֲטָאֵי** forms **חֲטָאֵי** **2 K 10:29**, &c., retaining the *Qameṣ* of **חֲטָאֵי** before the weak **א**.—The pausal forms **חֲטָאֵי** and **חֲטָאֵי** (out of pause always **חֲטָאֵי, חֲטָאֵי**) go back to by-forms **חֲטָאֵי, חֲטָאֵי**.—On **עֲשׂוֹתֵי** (*constr. st. plur.* of **עֲשׂוֹת**) **Pr 27:25**, cf. § 20 h; **שִׁקְמוֹתֵי** *sycamores*, without *Qameṣ* before the termination **ים** (see above, **l**), is probably from the sing. **שִׁקְמוֹתֵי** found in the Mišna.

3. On Paradigms *c* and *f*. **קִשְׁטֵי** occurs in **Pr 22:21** without a helping vowel; with a middle guttural **פִּעֵל**, &c., but with **ה** also **הִקֵּה, הִקֵּה**; with a final guttural **רִבְעָה, רִבְעָה** &c., but with **א**, **מִגָּא**; with a firmly closed syllable **מִיִּסְפֵי** **Mi 7:1**.

Before suffixes the original *ū* sometimes reappears in the sing., e.g. **גְּדֻלּוֹ** (**Ps 150:2**) beside **גְּדֻלּוֹ**, from **גְּדֻלָּה** *greatness*; **סִבְלֹו** (with *Dageš forte dirimens*, and the *ū* repeated in the form of a *Haṭeph-Qameṣ*, cf. § 10 h) **Is 9:3**, &c.; **גִּשְׁמָה** **Ez 22:24**.—Corresponding to the form **פִּעֵלְכֶם** *pōl'khèm* we find **קַטְבְּךָ** **Ho 13:14**, even without a middle guttural; similarly **קַטְבְּךָ** (so Jablonski and Opatius) **1 K 12:10, 2 Ch 10:10**, from **קַטְבְּךָ** *little finger*; but the better reading is, no doubt, **קַטְבְּךָ** (so ed. Mant., ‘the **ק** proleptically assuming the vowel of the following syllable’; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 69), and the form is to be derived, with König, from **קַטְבְּךָ**, not **קַטְבְּךָ**, as Brockelmann quotes him, in *Grundriss*, p. 103. The reading **קַטְבְּךָ** (Baer and Ginsburg) is probably not due to a confusion of the above two readings, but **ֵ** is merely intended to mark the vowel expressly as *ō*. In the forms **פִּעֵלוֹ** **Is 1:31** (for **פִּעֵלוֹ**) and **תִּצְרֹו** **Is 52:14** (for **תִּצְרֹו**) **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 (**בְּמִצְרָיִם** **Gn 32:20**).—In the same way *ō* remains before **ה** *locale*, e.g. **הַרְבֵּה** **Gn 18:6, 24:67**, &c. Dissimilation of the vowel (or a by-form **כַּח**?) seems to occur in **נִבְחָו** **Ex 14:2, Ez 46:9**, for **נִבְחָו**.

In the *absol. st. plur.* the original *ũ* generally becomes *S<sup>e</sup>wā* before the *Qameṣ*, e.g. בְּקָרִים from קָר בְּ morning, פְּעָלִים works, רִמְחִים lances, שְׁעָלִים handfuls (*constr. st.* עָלִי Ez 13:19); on the other hand, with an initial guttural the *ũ*-sound reappears as *Haṭeph Qameṣ*, e.g. חֳרָשִׁים months, עֲפָרִים gazelles, אֶרְחֹת ways; and so even without an initial guttural, the *threshing-floors*, 1 S 23:1, Jo 2:24; קְדָשִׁים sanctuaries, and רְשִׁים roots (*qōdhāšîm*, &c., with *ō* for *ũ*); also קְדָשִׁי [but קְדָשִׁי יְיָ, once 'ק], where, however, the reading frequently fluctuates between 'ק and 'ק; with the article הַקְּדָשִׁי, הַקְּדָשִׁי, הַקְּדָשִׁי, according to Baer and Ginsburg. On these forms cf. especially § 9 v. From אֶתְהָל tent, both אֶתְהָלִים and אֶתְהָלִים (cf. § 23 h and פְּעָלִים above) are found; with light suffixes אֶתְהָלִי, &c.; so from אֶתְהָל way, אֶתְהָלִי (also אֶתְהָלִי)—hence only with initial א, '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 אֶתְהָל caravan, and of אֶתְהָל way; however, אֶתְהָל is also found in the former sense (in *constr. st.* Jb 6:19) and אֶתְהָל in the latter (e.g. Jb 13:27 according to the reading of Ben Naphtali and Qimḥi); cf. also אֶתְהָל 2 Ch 8:18 *K<sup>e</sup>th.* (אֶתְהָל *Q<sup>e</sup>rē*).—The *constr. st.* plural of הָבֶטֶן thumb is הָבֶטֶט Ju 1:6 f., as if from a sing. הָבֶטֶן of הָבֶטֶן brightness, Is 59:9 (on these *q<sup>e</sup>tōl*-forms, cf. t).—If אֶתְהָל 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. בְּטַחַת pistachio nuts, probably from a sing. בְּטַחַת. According to Barth, *ZDMG.* xlii, 345 f. אֶתְהָל is a sing. אֶתְהָל, the ground-form of אֶתְהָל, with suffix).

In the *constr. st. plur.* the only example with original *ũ* is רְכָבִים Ps 31:21; otherwise like אֶתְהָלִי, &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 דְּבַשׁ, קֶטֶל honey, מְעַט little; in *pause*, דְּבַשׁ, מְעַט, גִּבּוֹר man (as *constr. st.*, see above, h), Ps 18:26 (elsewhere always דְּבַשׁ), and *infinitives* like שָׁכַב (§ 45 c; on קָחַת, see above, h); שָׁכַב shoulder, *ā* being modified to *è* (but in *pause* שָׁכַב); locative שָׁכַב מָה, also שָׁכַב מָה Ho 6:9. With suffixes in the usual manner שָׁכַבְתָּ, שָׁכַבְתָּ Gn 19:33, 35 (an *infin.* with suffix, therefore not שָׁכַבְתָּ). On the other hand, the *ā* is retained in the *plur. absol.* by sharpening the final consonant: אֶתְהָלִים (*constr. st.* אֶתְהָלִים) marshes, אֶתְהָלִים myrtles, מְעַטִּים few.

(b) Of the form קֶטֶל: בְּאֵר a well, זָאב wolf, &c.<sup>1</sup>; locative בְּאֵרָה, with *suff.* בְּאֵרִי, *plur.* זָאבִים, זָאבִי; but בְּאֵרוֹת, *constr. st.* בְּאֵרוֹת; on the *infin. constr.* שָׁאַת, cf. § 76 b.

(c) of the form קֶטֶל: בְּאֵשׁ stench (with *suff.* בְּאֵשׁוֹ, just as סָבְכוֹ occurs in Jer 4:7 along with the *constr. st.* סָבְכָה Ps 74:5; cf. for the Dageš, § 20 h), perhaps also לְאֵם nation, pl. לְאֵמִים.

5. Paradigms *g-i* comprise the segholate forms with middle ו or י: (a) of the form *qāḥ* with *Wāw* as a strong consonant, in which cases the original *ā* is almost always lengthened to *ā* (Paradigm *g*), thus מְנִיחַ vanity, עֲוֹנוֹ iniquity, מִדְּבַר midst, with final א, שְׁוֹא falsehood; cf. however, also רֵחַ space. In the *constr. st.* contraction always occurs, מוֹת, &c. (from original *maut*), and likewise before suffixes מוֹתוֹ, &c. Exception, עָלִי as *constr. st.* Ez 28:18 (according

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

<sup>1</sup> The proposal of Haupt (*SBOT.* 'Proverbs', p. 34, l. 44 ff.) to read זָאב, בְּאֵר, &c., does not seem to be warranted. The case here is quite different from that in Pr 1:22 where the Masora requires הָבִיב, הָבִיב, no doubt on the analogy of בְּאֵר, &c., for אֶתְהָל, which was probably intended, see § 63 m.





The plur. פָּרָשִׁים *horses*, Is 21:7 (instead of פָּרָשִׁים, ground-form *pārāš*) is no doubt due to a confusion with the *qaṭṭāl*-form פָּרָשׁ *horseman*.

A. Sometimes a sharpening of the third radical takes place, in order to keep the preceding vowel short, e.g. גַּמְלִים *camels*, קַמְגִים *small ones*, פְּלָגוֹת *brooks* (see § 20 a).—The attenuation of the *ā* of the first syllable to *i* does not take place in the *constr. st. plur.* as a rule after an initial guttural, as עֲנָנִי, חֲזַקִּי, but עֲנָנִי, חֲזַקִּי, and never before a middle guttural, e.g. נְהַרִּי; nor (according to König, owing to the influence of the nasal) in the non-guttural forms זַנְבוֹת *tails*, פְּנִפּוֹת, and (in the dual) כַּנְפֵי *wings*, from זָנַב, כָּנַף.—The dual נְהַרִּים from נָהַר *river*, shows an abnormal omission of the lengthening of the *ā* before a tone-bearing termination, but cf. § 88 c.

B. From ע"ע stems, forms like חֲקֵל, עֲנָן, &c., belong to this class.

C. The few nouns of the ground-form *qiṭāl* follow the same analogy, such as לֵב *heart*, שֶׁכָּר *strong drink*, עֵנַב *grape*, &c. From שֵׁעַר *hair*, in the *constr. st.* besides שֵׁעַר the form שֵׁעַר is also found (perhaps a survival of a secondary form like those in Paradigm I, d); so from צֶלַע *rib*, צָלַע and even לַע צָ 2 S 16:13 (so ed. Mant., Ginsb.; but Baer לַע צָ), both, probably, old secondary forms (also used for the *absol. st.*) of צָלַע; cf. also צָלַעַי and צָלַעוּ, as well as the *constr. st. plur.* צָלַעוֹת; also from נֶכְרָר *strangeness*, the *constr. st.* נֶכְרָר is found, Dt 31:16.

2. On Paradigms c–e: ground-form *qāḥl*, developed to *qāṭel*; with a final guttural, e.g. שָׂבַע *satisfied*. In the *constr. st.* the original *i* of the second syllable, probably on the analogy of the forms discussed in § 69 c, becomes *ā*, e.g. חֲדָל, חֲסַר, &c., but not before suffixes, כְּתָפִי, &c., nor in forms from ל"א stems, e.g. מְלֵא *full*, מְלֵא; cf., moreover, עֲקָב Gn 25:26 from עָקַב *heel*, and אֲבֵל- Ps 35:14, *mourning*. Paradigm d represents forms which in the *constr. st.* instead of the ordinary פָּתַח, &c., have a segholate form, as אֶרֶב, אֶרֶב, אֶרֶב, אֶרֶב, אֶרֶב (Ez 44:9), *constr. st.* of אֶרֶב *long*, אֶרֶב *wall*, אֶרֶב *thigh*, אֶרֶב *robbery*, אֶרֶב *uncircumcised*. In Is 11:14 בְּכַתֵּף would be altogether without precedent as a *constr. st.* (for בְּכַתֵּף); most probably the *absol. st.* is intended by the Masora (according to Nöldeke, *Gött. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1871, No. 23 [p. 896] for אֶתְּךָ בְּכַתֵּף *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. שָׂכַחִי, שָׂמַחִי, אֲבָלִי, יִשְׁנִי, חֲפָצִי; cf. also יִתְּדֵי תֵּי (with *ē* under the protection of the secondary tone) from יָתַד *tent-peg*. On the other hand from יָרָא *fearing*, always יָרָא; cf. also רָגַעִי Ps 35:20 from רָגַע.—With *ā* retained in the initial syllable cf. אֲחֵר *alius* (with a virtual sharpening of the ח).—From ע"י stems come forms like מֵת *dead person*, גֵּר *resident stranger*, עֵד *witness*, with unchangeable *ŠerÊ*; hence מֵתִים, מֵתִי, &c.

Kindred in character are the formations from the ground-form *qāḥl*. This ground-form is regularly lengthened to *qāṭol*, e.g. עֵרֶב *round*, עֵמֶק *deep*, אֶדָּם *red*; but before formative additions the short *ū* returns, protected by the sharpening of the following consonant (see ee above), as עֵרְבִים, &c. (but in stems with a third guttural or ר, אֶרֶב, אֶרֶב). The form עֵרְבִים, 1 K 10:19, is abnormal; likewise עֵמֶקָה Pr 23:27, Jablonski (ed. Mant. עֵמֶקָה, Baer and Ginsburg עֵמֶקָה).

3. On Paradigm f: ground-form *qāḥl* from ל"י stems. As in verbs ל"י § 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 שָׁדָה the form שָׁדָה, with the final *Yódh* retained, is also found in poetry (cf. also the singulars with suffixes, like מִשְׁתַּיְהֵם, in ss); in the same way final ו is retained in עֲנִיּוֹת *the poor*, *constr. st.* עֲנִיּוֹת. The plur. of שָׁדָה is שָׁדוֹת, *constr. st.* שָׁדוֹת (also שָׁדָה, unless this is a *sing.*, contracted from שָׁדָה; so Barth, *ZDMG*. xlii, p.

351). The *qiṭāl*-form (see § 84a i) רָעָה 2 S 15:37, 16:16, 1 K 4:5 is remarkable as a *constr. st.* (the reading רָעָה of Opatius 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.*), פָּנִי, פָּנִי, &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.*, with *suff.* יָדוּ, but יָדָם; plur. יָדוֹת, *constr. st.*, dual יָדַי, יָדֶיךָ, with *suff.* יָדֶיךָ, &c., and in דָּם *blood, constr. st.*, with *suff.* דָּמִי, but דָּמְךָ (*ā* attenuated to *i*), plur. דָּמִים, דָּמֶיךָ. 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 *Šewā* (Paradigm a, but cf. also examples like אֲוֹפְנִים *wheels*, for אֲוֹפְנִים, and לְמִים, לְמִים, *porches*), secondly, the cases in which the vowel becomes *Šewā* even *before* the tone (Paradigm b), and finally, those in which the termination of ל"ה formations is entirely lost (Paradigm c).

Rem. 1. On the model of עוֹלָם (which, moreover, is obscured from □*ālām*), the following forms also are inflected: מְקַמֵּל (§ 85 h), in some cases with virtual sharpening of the third radical (see § 20 a), as מְבַמְחוּ Jer 17:7, Ps 40:5, Jb 8:14, &c.; ל"א nouns of this form maintain the *Qameṣ* in the *constr. st. plur.*, e.g. מְקַרְאֵי from מְקַרְאֵי; on the other hand, in the plur. of the *participles Niph.* (§ 85 n) of verbs ל"א (which likewise belong to this class), are found not only regular forms like נְקַרְאֵים but also נְקַרְבָּאִים Jos 10:17, נְמַמְאִים Ez 20:30 f., and so always נְבָאִים (except Ez 13:2 ים הַנְּבָאִים) and נְמַצָּאִים 1 S 13:15, 2 K 14:14, &c. (except Ezr 8:25 ים הַנְּמַצָּאִים in pause).<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, the other participles in *ā* also follow the analogy of עוֹלָם as regards the final syllable (מְקַטֵּל, מְקַטֵּל; cf., however, הַמּוֹשֵׁב Gn 43:12 in close connexion; see the analogous cases in § 65 d); also שֶׁלֶחַן *table* (§ 85 u; plur. שֶׁלֶחָנוֹת, *constr. st.*, קַרְבֵּן, *constr. st.*, קַרְבָּן, hence in plur. *constr. st.* with *suff.* קַרְבְּנֵיהֶם Lv 7:38; עֶקְרֵב (§ 85 w), plur. עֶקְרָבִים (with sharpening of the final consonant for עֶקְרָבִים, cf. also עֵירֵם *naked*, plur. עֵירָמִים Gn 3:7 [but in 2:25 עֵירָמִים, according to § 9 o an orthographic licence for עֵרָמִים from עֵרֵם *nakedness*, 2 Ch 28:15; קַרְדָּם, קַרְדָּמוֹ, קַרְדָּמִי Is 51:10; מְנַבְבְּדֵי Is 23:8 f.; מְשַׁבְּבֵי Ps 18:3; even with attenuation of the *ā* to *i*, מְרוֹגֵים *threshing instruments*, 2 S 24:22, 1 Ch 21:23, from מוֹרֵג (§ 85 g), מִגֵּן (§ 85 i), מִעֵז (§ 85 k), inasmuch as they retain the *ā* of the first syllable, contrary to rule, even when not pretonic, e.g. מְגִנִּי, מְעִזִּי, מְשַׁבְּבֵי (§ 85 g); מוֹשֵׁב (§ 85 p), *constr. st. plur.* הַמּוֹשְׁבֵי 1 K, 17:1; also isolated forms according to § 84a t, and § 84b b, c, k, m, n, o. Cf. finally צְנָאֵר *neck* (from *šawār*), *constr. st.* צְנָאֵר Jer 28:10 ff., *constr. st. plur.* צְנָאֵרִי Gn 45:14, &c.

2. (Paradigm b; cf. § 84a s.) Instead of the original *i* in such forms as אֲיָבָם (cf. 2 K 22:29), the second syllable more frequently has *ē*, e.g. יִצְרֵךְ *thy creator*; with a closing guttural (according to § 91 d; but cf. also אֲבִד Dt 32:28) forms are found sometimes like

<sup>1</sup> Ez 7:24 מְקַדְשֵׁיהֶם for מְקַדְשֵׁי (from מְקַדְשֵׁי) is wholly irregular; perhaps, however, the *part. Pi□ēl* is intended, without *Dageš* in the *ד* (according to § 20 m).

<sup>1</sup> Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 659, observes that except in 2 Ch 5:11, 35:17 הַנְּמַצָּאִים is always followed by a preposition governing a word, so that the punctuators perhaps intended to indicate a sort of *constr. st.*

חָ, sometimes like בָּ, רָ, אָ; *constr. st.* without *suff.* נִטַּע Ps 94:9 (according to § 65 d); with a middle guttural אָלְךָ Is 48:17; cf. 43:14.—The same analogy also is followed in the flexion of the other participles which have *ē* in the final syllable (מְקַטֵּל, מְקַטֵּל, &c.), see further, in § 84b d, גָּבַן, &c. (but with exceptions, as שְׁלֵשִׁים, רִבְעִים, and *ibid.* *l, p*; § 85 i, k (מִזְבֵּחַ *altar, constr. st.* מִזְבְּחָ, plur. מִזְבְּחוֹת), and *ibid.* *q*, but here also there are exceptions like מְקַהֲלִים Ps 26:12. מוֹסְרוֹת Jer 5:5, רִבְעִים, שְׁלֵשִׁים Ex 20:5, שׁ מְמוֹת Is 49:8, שׁ מְמַיִם La 1:16 (cf. König, ii. 109).

3. (Paradigm *c*: *part. Qal* of verbs לִיָּה, 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<sup>e</sup>ghôl* in the *constr. st.* in 2 S 24:11 (so Opatius, Ginsburg; but Baer הִזָּה), Ec 2:15 (according to Baer, but not the Mantua ed.; מְקַרְהָ Ec 3:19 is in the *absol. st.*). To this class belong, as regards their formation, the לִיָּה-forms mentioned in § 84a r, § 85 g (with *suff.*, e.g. הֵמָּה, עָלְךָ 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 מִשְׁתַּיְהָם Is 5:12, Dn 1:10, 16; מְרִאֲיָהֶם *their appearance*, Dn 1:15, Gn 41:21, cf. Na 2:5; נֹטְיָהֶם *who stretched them forth*, Is 42:5; *defectively* אֶפְיָהֶם Ho 7:5 (cf. נְוָהָם 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 מִתְּחֵנֶיךָ *thy camp*, Dt 23:15 (מִתְּחֵנֶיךָ occurs just before), מִתְּחֵנֶיךָ *thy cattle*, Is 30:23 (probably also יְשִׁיךָ 1 K 2:26), מְרִאֲיָיךָ Ct 2:14, and מְרִאֲיָיו *the sight of him*, Jb 41:1 (with the י here retained orthographically), מְעַלְיָי 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 מִמֶּהֱיָם Is 25:6 (*part. Pu.* from מְהָה).

4. Paradigm IV comprises the forms with a changeable vowel (*a, b*), or a vowel which has already become *S<sup>e</sup>wā* (*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 כְּתָב) cannot undergo any vowel changes.

Rem. 1. Analogous to פָּקִיד (ground-form *pāqīd*) are § 84a k, גָּדוֹל, &c. (with *ô*, not changeable *ô* for *ū*); in substantives like שְׁלוֹם, this □ is demonstrably obscured from *â* (Arab. *sālām*); *ibid.* *l, m*, אָסוּר, אָסִיר, &c.; § 85 u, זָכְרוֹן, *constr. st.* זָכְרוֹן, *constr. st.* חֲזוֹן, *constr. st.* חֲזוֹן, *constr. st.* חֲזוֹן, *constr. st.* חֲזוֹן (cf., however, the forms in the *constr. st.* עֲצָבוֹן, קִנְמוֹן, and with the plural suffix יךְ עֲצָבוֹךְ Ez 27:12 ff.); § 85 w, חֲלָמִישׁ, *constr. st.* חֲלָמִישׁ; § 85 l, מְקוֹם, &c.

2. עָנִי (ground-form □ *āniy*, stem עָנָה) 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 *S<sup>e</sup>uâ*; cf. § 84a l, נָקִי, plur. נְקִיִּים, and § 87 a.

3. כְּתָב with unchangeable *â* in the second syllable, whilst the *S<sup>e</sup>uâ* is weakened from a short vowel (Arab. *kiʿâb*); *constr. st.* כְּתָבָה Est 4:8 (readings like כְּתָבָה 2 Ch 35:4 are incorrect, although יָקַר Est 1:4 and כְּתָבָה 4:8 are supported by fairly good authority; however, these *q<sup>e</sup> tâl*-forms in Hebrew are probably all loan-words from the Aramaic). The only plural form found in the O. T. is עֲבָדֵיהֶם *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 (קטל, 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 קטל (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 קטיל (properly *qāṭīl*) the examples סְרִיסִים, פְּרִיזִים, פְּרִיזִים, שְׁלִישִׁים, whilst the *constr. st. sing.* according to the rule, changes the *ā* into *Šwā* (פְּרִיזִין, סְרִיסִין). (These are not to be confounded with forms like עֲרִיץ *tyrant*, which is for עֲרִיץ, and consequently has an unchangeable *Qameṣ*.) Of the form קטול (*qāṭūl*) in this class are שְׁבוּעַת *week*, plur. שְׁבוּעוֹת and שְׁבוּעוֹת, *constr. st. sing.* שְׁבוּעוֹת, but with *Metheg* of the secondary tone in the fifth syllable from the end, שְׁבוּעוֹתֵיךְ. — On מְעוֹז, מְעוֹזִי, &c., cf. § 85 k.

#### § 94. Formation of Feminine Nouns.

1. The feminine ending הַ, 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) מַלְכָּה *queen*, כַּבֵּשֶׁת *lamb*, and with attenuation of *ā* to *i* רֶצֶף *hot stone*, Is 6:6 (from another root רֶצַף, see Baer on Ez 40:17), חֲזָקָה *strength* (unless belonging to Paradigm b); (b) סִתְרָה *covering* (masc. סִתֵּר); עֲדֻנָּה *pleasure* (עֲדוֹן), not to be confounded with the unchangeable forms with a prefixed מ, derived from ל"ה stems, as מִצְוָה *command*, plur. מִצְוֹת; (c) חֲלָדָה, proper name (חֲלָדִים *mole*), אֹכֶלֶת *food* (אֹכֵל); (d) נַעֲרָה *girl* (נַעַר); (f) בְּאִשָּׁה *weed*, טְהוֹרָה *purity* (טָהוֹר); (g) עוֹלָה *wrong* (also עוֹלָה, Paradigm i); (i) צִידָה *victuals* (masc. צִיד, cf. Paradigm h); from *qiṭl* and *quṭl*-forms, בִּינָה *understanding*, סוּפָה *tempest*; (k) אֶלְיָה *fat tail* (as if from אֶלִי), שְׂבִיָּה (*ā* attenuated to *i*) *captivity* (שְׂבִי), לִנְיָה *wreath* (probably an original *qiṭl*-form); (l) חַיָּה *life*, מִדָּה *measure* (attenuated from מִדָּה). Adjectives derived from ע"ע stems also belong in flexion to this class, as רַבָּה *multa*, with middle guttural רַעָה *mala*; (m) זְמָה *plan*; (n) חֲקָה *statute* (חֲקֵה).

Paradigm II: ground-form *qāṭālāt*, &c., (a) נִקְמָה *vengeance* (נִקְמָה); (b) אֲדָמָה *earth*; (c) גְּבִלָה *corpse*; (d) עֵינִפָה *languida*; (f) יִפָּה *beautiful*, קֵצָה *end* (from יִפָּה, קֵצָה). From stems ע"ו arise such forms as עֲדָה (masc. עָד, properly *part. Qal* from עווד) *female witness*. From the ground-form *qātūl*, עֲמֻקָה *profunda* (masc. עֲמֻקָּה), עֲבֻדָה *servitude*, &c.

Paradigm III: unchangeable vowel in the first, changeable in the second syllable, (a) יִלְדָה *a woman with child* (cf. the examples in § 84a s, and the retention of the *ē* in the *part. Pi*  $\square$  *ēl*, Ex 22:17, 23:26; in the *Hithpa*  $\square$  *ēl* 1 K 14:5 f.), but also with the change of the *ē* (originally *i*) into *Šwā*, יִשְׁבָּה *dwelling*, Na 3:8. However, in these participial forms the feminine is mostly indicated by תַּ (see below, h); (c) גּוֹלָה *those of the captivity* (masc. גּוֹלָה), but also with a return of the final *Yôdh*, הַמְּיָה *clamorous*, Pr 7:11, and the examples in § 75 v. On the *ā* of the participles of verbs ע"ו, which also belong to this class, such as זָרָה *peregrina*, cf. § 72 g

Paradigm IV: originally changeable vowel in the first syllable, unchangeable in the second, (a) *מַגְדָּלָה* *magna*, *סְטוֹרְקָה* *stork*, properly *pia*; *בְּתוּלָה* *virgin*, properly *seiuncta*; (b) *עֲנִיָּה* *misera*.

2. A simple ת is added as feminine ending in forms like *בְּכִיָּה* *weeping* (masc. *בָּכִי*, § 93 x, a), *בְּרִית* *covenant*, but *feminine participles* of verbs ל"א, as *מִצָּאת*, *יִצָּאת*, may be due to contraction from *yōšēet*, &c. (hardly to lengthening of the *i* in the ground-form *mōšī*), whilst forms like *מִוְצָאת*, *נִשְׁאָת* (see § 74 i) are to be explained on the analogy of the forms treated in § 93 t. Apart from the ל"ה formations, we find the simple ת in the participle *מְשַׁרְתָּ* 1 K 1:15, contracted from *מְשַׁרְתֶּתָּ*. But *וַיִּלְדֶּתָּ* Gn 16:11, Ju 13:5, 7 is the ground-form of the ptcp. *וַיִּלְדֶּתָּ* (as in the same connexion in Gn 17:19, Is 7:14), cf. § 80 d and the *Q<sup>e</sup>re* *שְׂבֵתָּ*, &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 *גְּבִירָתָּ* (for original *g<sup>e</sup>birt*; § 69 c), the form *גְּבִירָתָּ* *mistress* (but only in *construct st.*; in Is 47:7 also *עַד גְּבִירָתָּ* are to be taken together; the *absolute st.* is *גְּבִירָה*); from *מַלְכָּתָּ*, *מֶלֶךְ* *queen* (in Paradigm II, a); *פִּתָּ* (פִּתָּ = פִּתָּ = פִּתָּ *pit*) Lv 13:55; (c) *גְּדֵרָתָּ* *wall*, *גֵּדֵר* (from *גְּדֵרָתָּ* = *g<sup>e</sup>dirt*; cf. *זָקֵן* as *construct st.* of *זָקֵן*); on the other hand, *חֲמִשָּׁתָּ* is *construct st.* of *חֲמִשָּׁה* *five*, with lengthening of the original *i* of *חֲמִשָּׁתָּ*.

Formations with a changeable *ō* in the second syllable belonging to this class are *נְחֹשֶׁתָּ* *bronze* (from *נְחֹשֶׁתָּ*, *נָחַת* the *constr. st.* of *נָחַת* *coat*, perhaps also *כָּתָבָתָּ* *writing* (unless it be obscured from *כָּתָבָתָּ*, § 93, Paradigm IV, c).—Paradigm III, (a) *חֲתָמָתָּ* (from *חֲתָמָתָּ*), masc. *חֲתָמָה* *seal*; (b) *יוֹנְקָתָּ* (properly *sucking*) *sprout* (in *pause*, e.g. *חֲבִיבָתָּ* Ex 26:4, &c.), and so most feminines of participles *קָטְלָתָּ*. On this transition of the ground-form *qōṭilt* to *קָטְלָתָּ* (regularly before suffixes in *יוֹנְקָתָּ*, &c.), cf. § 69 c; *qōṭalt* serves as the ground-form under the influence of a guttural as well as before suffixes, e.g. *יָדְעָתָּ*, feminine of *יָדַעַתָּ* *knowing*; in a wider sense, *לְגִלְגָּלָתָּ* *skull* may also be included here, see § 95, Paradigm IV, c.

On the endings *תָּ* and *תָּה*, 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 *תָּה* in the *abs. st.*, e.g. *הִקְדָּתָּה*; (2) without the tone or foretone an originally short vowel almost always becomes *Šewā*; on the other hand, *before* a vowel which had thus become *Šewā* the *ā* in the first syllable which had hitherto also been reduced to *Šewā* returns, although usually attenuated to *i*, e.g. *הִקְדָּתָּה* from *šādhāqāth*; (3) in the plural of the feminines of segholate forms before the termination *תָּה* or *תָּה*, and in formations of the latter kind also before the light suffixes, a

*pretonic Qameṣ* reappears, while the short vowel of the first syllable becomes *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*. This short vowel, however, returns in the *construct st. plur.*, whether ending in *וּ* or *ִי*; 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.						
	<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>		<i>c.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>e.</i>
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	מַלְכָּה	[כְּלִיָּה]	הַרְפָּה	הַרְבָּה	הַקָּה	[גְּבִירָה]
	(queen)	(kidney)	(reproach)	(waste)	(statute)	(mistress)
<i>Sing. construct</i>	מַלְכָּה		הַרְפַּת	הַרְבַּת	הַקַּת	גְּבִירַת
<i>Sing. with light suff.</i>	מַלְכָּתִי		הַרְפַּתִּי	הַרְבַּתִּי	הַקַּתִּי	גְּבִירַתִּי
<i>Sing. with grave suff.</i>	מַלְכַּתְּכֶם		הַרְפַּתְּכֶם	הַרְבַּתְּכֶם	הַקַּתְּכֶם	גְּבִירַתְּכֶם
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מַלְכוֹת	כְּלִיּוֹת	הַרְפוֹת	הַרְבוֹת	הַקּוֹת	
<i>Plur. construct</i>	מַלְכוֹת	כְּלִיּוֹת	הַרְפוֹת <sup>1</sup>	הַרְבוֹת	הַקּוֹת	
<i>Plur. with suff.</i>	מַלְכוֹתַי	כְּלִיּוֹתַי		הַרְבוֹתַי	הַקּוֹתַי	
<i>Dual absolute</i>			רַקְמַת יָם			מַצְלַת יָם
			(a double piece of embroidery)			(cymbals)

  

II.			III.		
	<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>	<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>	
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	צַדִּיקָה	זַעֲקָה	שָׁנָה	יּוֹנֵקַת	גִּלְגָּלֶת
	(righteousness)	(outcry)	(year)	(sprout)	(skull)
<i>Sing. construct</i>	צַדִּיקַת	זַעֲקַת	שָׁנַת	יּוֹנֵקַת	גִּלְגָּלֶת
<i>Sing. with light suff.</i>	צַדִּיקַתִּי	זַעֲקַתִּי	שָׁנַתִּי	יּוֹנֵקַתִּי	גִּלְגָּלֶתִּי
<i>Sing. with grave suff.</i>	צַדִּיקַתְּכֶם	זַעֲקַתְּכֶם	שָׁנַתְּכֶם	יּוֹנֵקַתְּכֶם	גִּלְגָּלֶתְּכֶם

1<sup>1</sup> Only in Ps 69:10, contrary to rule, with a firmly closed syllable, cf. § 93 m.

<i>suff.</i>				
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	צָרְקוֹת	שָׁנוֹת <sup>1</sup>	[יוֹנְקוֹת]	
<i>Plur. construct</i>	צָרְקוֹת	שָׁנוֹת	יוֹנְקוֹת	גְּלָגְלוֹת
<i>Plur. with suff.</i>	צָרְקוֹתַי	שָׁנוֹתַי	יוֹנְקוֹתַי	גְּלָגְלוֹתַי
<i>Dual absolute</i>	[נְהַשְׁתַּיִם]	שִׁפְתַיִם		
	(fetters of brass)	(lips)		
<i>Dual construct</i>		שִׁפְתַי		

REMARKS.

1. Paradigm I: feminines of segholate forms. (a) The locative of this class has the form תָּהָה *towards Gibeah* (masc. גִּבְעָה). 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. הַזֶּקֶה *strength* (cf. הַרְפָּה under *b*). A *dual* of this form occurs in יָמַי שִׁבְעָתַיִם *seven times* (cf. שִׁבְעָתַי *seven*, fem.). Analogous to masculine forms like דְּבַשׁ (§ 93 s) is הַדְּסָה *myrtle*.—From masculines of the form פְּרִי (לִיָּהּ, cf. § 93 I, k) arise feminines sometimes like אֶלְיָהּ, שְׁלֹמֹה, אֶלְיָהּ (see above, § 94 b), sometimes like בְּכִיָּה (§ 94 f); occasionally the final ת is retained before the plural ending, as if it belonged to the stem (cf. § 87 k), e.g. הַנִּיחֹת *spears*. Forms like אֶלְיָהּ (cf. אֶלְיָהּ, a *qūṭl* form) are derived directly from the masculine forms אֶלְיָהּ *kid*, אֶלְיָהּ, *a fleet*.—(b) From a stem עִין הַטָּה *wheat* (for הַטָּה), plur. הַטָּה.—(c) From a stem עֶרְלָה *foreskin*, the plur. absol. is עֶרְלוֹת (cf. פְּעֻלִים, § 93, Paradigm I, f), constr. עֶרְלוֹת.—(d) Example of a feminine segholate form from a stem ע"ע (ground-form *qūṭl*, like הַיָּהּ of the form *qāṭl*, הַיָּהּ of the form *qiṭl*), with *ō* for *ū*, הַיָּהּ *terror*, Is 19:17 (Aramaic orthography for הַיָּהּ).

(e) To the list of segholate forms with ת fem. belong also the infinitives of verbs פ"ו and פ"ו, which have rejected the weak consonant at the beginning, as שָׁבַת (from יָשַׁב), דָּעַת (from יָשַׁב), as well as קָהַת (from לָקַח); cf. § 69 m and § 66 b and g. The infinitives of verbs פ"ו are, however, also found in the form דָּעַת, לָקַח, צָעַת, and of the same origin also are עֲדָה *congregation* (from יָעַד), עֲצָה *counsel* (from יָעַץ), שְׁנַת *sleep* (from יָשַׁן), constr. עֲדָת, while in the constr. forms זָעַת *sweat*, Gn 3:19 (from יָזַע *to flow*), and צָעַת *excrement*, Ez 4:12, the *Şere* has remained firm.

From a stem ע"ו (cf. בּוֹשׁ *to be ashamed*) is בּוֹשׁ *shame*, with suffix בּוֹשִׁיתַי. From a stem ל"ה (דָּלָה, cf., however, Barth, *ZDMG*. 1887, p. 607, who assumes a stem ידל) the masculine דָּל appears to have been formed after the rejection of the final *Yôdh*, and afterwards the feminine דָּלָה *door*; but in the plural דָּלוֹת, constr. דָּלוֹת, the ת of the termination is retained (see above, d, הַנִּיחֹת). In a similar way רַפְתָּי *stalls*, Hb 3:17, has arisen, if it is from the stem רַפָּה, and תַּרְחֹם *trough* (from שָׁקָה), of which the masc. must have been שָׁקָה = שָׁקָה; on the other hand, the plur. constr. שָׁקָה Gn 30:38 (again retaining the feminine ת as an apparent radical) can only be an abnormal formation from the singular שָׁקָה, not from a kindred form שָׁקָה or שָׁקָה.

1<sup>1</sup> On שָׁנוֹת as a less frequent (poetic) form for שָׁנַיִם see § 87 n.  
*ZDMG*. *ZDMG*. = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

2. Paradigm II: ground-form *qāṭlāt*, &c., cf. § 94 c, Paradigm II, *a* and *b*. Analogous to the masculine forms like קטן, plur. קטנים, we find קטנה *parva*, &c.—The *constr.* forms, like צדקה (*Sidh<sup>e</sup> qāth*), are distinguished by the vocal *S<sup>e</sup>wā* (§ 10 d) from the segholate forms, like כִּבְשָׁת ( *kibh-sāth*). Consequently the *constr. st.* בְּרָכָה Gn 28:4, &c. (from בְּרָכָה  *blessing*), and תְּרַדָּת 1 S 14:15, &c. (from תְּרַדָּת *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 אֲדָמָה *earth*, (אֲדָמָה); in other cases it is modified to *S<sup>e</sup>ghōl*, e.g. עֲגֹלָה *wagon*, עֲגֹלָתוֹ. Frequently from an *absol. st.* in הָ the *constr.* is formed with the termination ת, e.g. עֲטָרָה *crown*, *constr.* עֲטָרָת (from עֲטָרָה); along with עֲצָרָה *assembly*, עֲצָרָת is found usually, even in the *absol. st.*; יֶבֶמֶת (from יָבֵם *levir*) before suffixes is pointed as in יֶבֶמֶתִי, and thus entirely agrees with גָּבֵרָת (Paradigm I *e*). From a stem לִיִן (אָמֵן) is formed אֲמָת *truth* (from *a<sup>h</sup>mant*, and this no doubt for an original *āmint*, § 69 c) before suffixes אֲמָתִי, &c.

From the masc. form קָטַל (*qāṭl*) are formed, according to rule, גְּדֵרָה *wall*, נְבֵלָה *corpse*, *constr.* נְבֵלָת; בְּהֵמָה *cattle*, *constr.* בְּהֵמָת (for הֵמָת), with suffix בְּהֵמָתֶךָ Lv 19:19. More frequently, however, the *e* of the second syllable is retained before the termination *ath* of the *constr. st.*; thus from נְבֵלָה once לְתִי נְבֵלָה Is 26:19, and always בְּרֵכָת *pool*, גְּזֵלָת *prey*, טִמְאָת *unclean*, מִלְּאָתִי *full*, Is 1:21 (with *Hireq compaginis*, see § 90 i), מֵרְתִי Jb 16:13; שָׂא לְתִי 1 S 1:27, &c. (with elision of the א, שָׂא לְתִי 1 S 1:17), also אֶלְתִי Jb 6:8. Cf. the analogous forms of the *constr. st.* מַגֵּפָת *plague*, תְּרַדָּמָת *deep sleep*, from מַגֵּפָה, תְּרַדָּמָה.

As dual we find יָרְכָתִי *sides* (cf. יָרְכָתוֹ Gn 49:13, from the obsolete יָרְכָה, feminine of יָרַךְ); the *constr. st.* יָרְכָתִי is perhaps to be referred to a segholate form (יָרְכָה, cf. יָרַךְ as *constr. st.* of יָרַךְ), unless the closed syllable be due to the analogy of בְּרַבָּת and תְּרַדָּת (see *g*).

In the forms with simple ת feminine the ground-form *qāṭl* is developed (§ 69 c) to *q<sup>e</sup>ṭalt*, and this again regularly to קָטַלְת. Thus the feminine of הַבֵּר *companion* is תְּבֵרָת (with suffix תְּבֵרָתֶךָ Mal 2:14, cf. שְׂכָנָתֶךָ Ex 3:22), of גְּדֵרָה fem. תְּגֵדָת besides תְּגֵדָת.—Of ע"ו stems the segholate forms נַחַת *rest* and שְׁחַת *pit* (from נוּחַ, שִׁוּחַ) belong to this class; Böttcher (*Gram.* i. 411) rightly distinguished the latter from שְׁחַת *corruption* (stem שְׁחַת); in the same way also נַחַת *rest* is distinct from נַחַת *a lighting down* (stem נַחַת).

The feminines of the form *qāṭl* from stems ע"ו, as מְתוּהָ *mortua*, עֵדָה fem. *witness* (from מוּתָה, עוּדָה), have likewise an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable. Cf., on the other hand, the forms from פ"י stems mentioned above, under *e*, such as שְׁנָה *sleep*, *constr. st.* שְׁנָת; moreover, אַחַת *anger*, *constr. st.* אַחַת (but אַחַת *a leathern bottle*, in *pause* אַחַת [so Baer, Ginsb., but Kittel 'ה] Gn 21:15, *constr. st.* אַחַת מֵי Gn 21:14, perhaps from a stem אַחַת).

The feminines of the form *qāṭl*, like עֲמָקָה (masc. עָמֵק), maintain the original *ū* by sharpening the following consonant (cf. § 93 kk); on the other hand, by appending the fem. ת, segholate forms arise like נָחַת, before suff. נָחַתֶּךָ, &c. Dual נָחַתִּי (see Paradigm II *a*); but cf. נָחַתִּי La 3:7.

A few (aramaising) feminines from ל"ה stems (Paradigm II, *c*) are found with the ending *āth*; due to the rejection of the final *Wāw* or *Yōdh* and contraction of the preceding *ā* with the *ā* of the termination *āth*; thus מְנַחַת *portion* (for *mānāyāth* or *mānāwāth*), קֵצֶת end (also קֵצֶת and קֵצֶת), plur. מְנִיחֹת (*constr. st.* Neh 12:47, 13:10) and מְנַחֹת (Neh 12:44); קֵצֹת Ex 38:5; cf. 37:8 and 39:4 *K<sup>e</sup>th*; on אֵיִת *valleys*, see § 93 v.—אות *sign* (אווה) is obscured from אָת, and

this is contracted from *āyāth* = *āwāyāth*; plur. אֲתוֹת, with the double feminine ending; cf. above, f, and § 87 k.—The retention of the *ā* in the first syllable in אֲלֵתִי, &c, Gn 24:41, &c., is abnormal.

3. Paradigm III, cf. the various forms in § 94 d and f–h. The *dual* הַיְּמִינִים *two walls*, Is 22:11, &c., taken directly from the plur. הַיְּמִינִים, for הַיְּמִינִים, is abnormal (cf. § 87 s, and the proper name יְגֵד־רִתִּים Jos 15:36).—Among the forms resembling participles *Qal* of verbs ע״י, such as זָרָה (masc. זָר from *zār*, hence with unchangeable *ā*), must be reckoned also בְּמָה *high place* (from בּוֹם), which has for its *constr. st. plur.* the pleonastic form בְּמֹתַי, or written defectively בְּמֹתַי (see § 87 s); for this the Masora everywhere requires בְּמֹתַי, which is to be read *bām<sup>o</sup>thē* (not *bōm<sup>o</sup>thē*), with an anomalous shortening of the *ō* to *;*; but with suffixes בְּמֹתַי, &c.

In a wider sense the feminines of the form קָטַל (§ 84b e) belong to this class, in so far as they shorten the *ā* of the second syllable before the termination ת, e.g. דָּלָה *inflammation* (from *dallāqt*), with suff. צִדְקָתְךָ Ez 16:52; טַבַּעַת *signet*; also fem. of the forms קָטַל and קָטַל (§ 84b c and d), as אִנְּלִי *folly* (for *iwwālt*), 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. מְמַלְכָה *kingdom*, *constr.* always מְמַלְכָה; מְזַמְרָה (not used in the sing.) *pruning-hook*, plur. מְזַמְרוֹת; מְשַׁכָּרָה *reward*, with suff. מְשַׁכְּרָתִי; cf. also the examples given in § 85 g and p, like מוֹלַדָּת *birth* (but from מוֹצֵאֵת *outgoing*), דּוֹלָה *generation*, תּוֹעֵבָה *abomination*, *constr.* תּוֹעֵבָת, &c.

Sometimes the plural of these forms is to be traced to a secondary form, e.g. אֵלֶּךָ *a letter*, plur. אֵלֶּךָ (as if from אֵלֶּךָ); also יוֹנְקוֹת, which is merely formed on the analogy of the other plur. fem. of participles *Qal*, is to be referred to a sing. יוֹנְקָה. Cf., moreover, מְחַרְשֵׁת *ploughshare*, plur. מְחַרְשׁוֹת (as if from מְחַרְשָׁה)<sup>1</sup>; on the other hand, כְּתוּבוֹת *capitals* (of columns), and תּוֹכְחוֹת *reproofs*, are the regular plurals of כְּתוּבָה and תּוֹכַחָה.

In כְּתוּבָה *coat* the original *ū* of the first syllable is maintained by the sharpening of the following consonant (cf. Arab. *quṭṭūn*), with suff. כְּתוּבָתִי, the *constr. st.*, however, is כְּתוּבָה (as also in the *absol. st.* in Ex 28:39); plur. כְּתוּבוֹת, *constr.* כְּתוּבוֹת.—The form אֵלֶּךָ given in Paradigm III, b is a *Pūlpūl*-form of the stem אֵלֶּךָ, cf. אֵלֶּךָ, § 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 *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā*, owing to the tone being thrown forward. Of the forms mentioned in §§ 84 and 85 those from ע״י stems especially belong to this class, as מְנִלָּה *scroll*, תְּהִלָּה *praise*, תְּפִלָּה *prayer* (§ 85 i and q), as well as the feminine of the participle *Hiph<sup>o</sup>il* of verbs ע״י, e.g. מְאִירָה *enlightening* (from מְאִיר), and generally the feminines of ע״י stems which are compounded with the *preformative* מ, as מְנוּחָה *rest* (from מְנוּחָה, see § 85 l; from מְנוּחָה stems perhaps also מְעִלָּה *conduit* (*constr. st.* מְעִלָּת Is 7:3, &c.) and מְלָאָה *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).

<sup>1</sup> עֲשֵׂת־אֵשֶׁת *Astarte* (plur. עֲשֵׂתוֹת), which was formerly included among these examples, is most probably due to an intentional alteration of the original עֲשֵׂת־רַת, like מְלָךְ Lv 18:21, &c. (for מְלָךְ), with the vowels of עֲשֵׂת shame, the latter word being substituted in reading for the name of the goddess.

5. The feminine ending ית (apart from ל"ה- forms like בְּכִיתָ, § 94 f) arises from the addition of the feminine ת to the ending י, which is employed to form adjectives, &c., see § 86 d, h, and k. The ending ות, mentioned there, is attached, in segholate forms, sometimes to the ground-form, as עֲשֵׂתוֹת Jb 12:5 (v.l. עֲשֵׂתוֹת), sometimes to forms with a loosely-closed syllable, as מְלָכוֹת kingdom; from ל"ה stems we find forms sometimes like שְׁבוּת captivity (according to others from the stem שׁוּב, like לְוִזוּ perverseness from לוּזוּ), sometimes like בְּכוֹת weeping, גְּלוּת exile, חֲזוֹן vision; the latter retain the ā of the first syllable even in the constr. st. and before suffixes. From a qāḥl̄-form is formed כְּבֻדוֹת heaviness; from a qāḥl̄-form is formed פְּקֻדוֹת, &c.

In the plural of these forms different methods of treatment may be distinguished. In some cases the whole ending ות is retained, as if belonging to the stem (cf. above, f), e.g. אֲלֻמְנוֹתֵיךְ from אֲלֻמְנוֹת, in others this ending is resolved, as in מְלָכִיּוֹת Dn 8:22 (no doubt for māl̄<sup>e</sup>khuwwōth), and עֲדוּתֵיךְ □ēdh<sup>e</sup>wōth, from עֲדוּת testimony, but only with suffixes, עֲדוּתֵיךְ Ps 119:14, &c.; עֲדוּתֵיךְ 1 K 2:3, &c.

### § 96. Nouns of Peculiar Formation.

In the following Paradigms,<sup>1</sup> 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.

אָח	אָחוֹת	אִישׁ	אִשָּׁה	אֲמָה	בַּיִת	בֵּן	בַּת	יוֹם	קֵלִי	[מַי]	עִיר	פֶּה	רֹאשׁ
(brother)	(sister)	(man)	(woman)	(handmaid)	(house)	(son)	(daughter)	(day)	(vessel)	(water)	(city)	(mouth)	(head)
אָחִי	אָחוֹתַי	אִישׁ	אִשָּׁתִּי		בַּיִתִּי	בֵּן־י	בַּת־י	יוֹם־י	קֵלִי־י		עִיר־י	פִּי־י	רֹאשׁ־י
אָחִי	אָחֵי	אִישׁ־י	אִשָּׁתִּי	אֲמָתִי	בַּיִתִּי	בְּנֵי־י	בָּתֵּי־י				עִירֵי־י	פִּי־י	רֹאשֵׁי־י
אָחֵיךְ	אָחוֹתֶיךָ		אִשְׁתֶּךָ	אֲמָתֶךָ	בַּיִתְךָ	בְּנֶיךָ	בָּתֶיךָ		קֵלֶיךָ		עִירֶךָ	פִּיֶךָ	רֹאשֶׁךָ
						בְּנֶיךָ	בָּתֶיךָ						
אָחֶיךָ	אָחוֹתֶיךָ	אִישֶׁיךָ	אִשְׁתּוֹ	אֲמָתוֹ	בַּיִתּוֹ	בְּנֵי	בָּתוֹ	יוֹמוֹ			עִירוֹ	פִּיּוֹ	רֹאשׁוֹ
(אָחֵי הוֹ)												פִּי הוֹ	
אָחֵיךָ	אָחֵיךָ	אִישֶׁיךָ		אֲמָתֶיךָ	בַּיִתֶיךָ	בְּנֵיךָ	בָּתֶיךָ				עִירֶיךָ	פִּיֶיךָ	רֹאשֶׁיךָ
אָחֵיכֶם	אָחֵיכֶם					בְּנֵיכֶם	בָּתֵיכֶם					פִּיכֶם	רֹאשֵׁיכֶם
	[אָחוֹתֵיכֶם]												
אָחֵיכֶם	אָחֵיכֶם				בַּיִתְכֶם			יוֹמֵיכֶם			עִירֵיכֶם	פִּיֵיכֶם	רֹאשֵׁיכֶם
												פִּיֵיכֶם	רֹאשֵׁיכֶם
אָחֵיכֶם		אֲנָשִׁים	נָשִׁים	אֲמָהוֹת	בָּתִּים	בְּנִים	בָּנוֹת	יָמִים	כֵּלִים	מַיִם	עָרִים	פִּיּוֹת	רֹאשֵׁים

<sup>1</sup> The only omissions from these Paradigms are אָחֵד, אָחֵם, and חֲמוֹת (on which see the remarks), and all forms which are not found in the O. T.

אָחִי	אָנְשִׁי	נָשִׁי	אִמְהוֹת	בְּנֵי	בָּנוֹת	יָמִי	כְּלִי	מִימִי, מִי	עָרִי	אֲשִׁירִי
אָחִי, <i>pause</i>	אָחִיוֹתַי	נָשִׁי	אִמְהוֹתַי	בְּנֵי	בָּנוֹתַי	יָמִי	כְּלִי	מִמִּי	עָרִי	
אָחִי יָד	אָנְשֵׁי יָד	נָשֵׁי יָד	בְּנֵי יָד	בָּנוֹת יָד	יָמֵי יָד	כְּלֵי יָד	מִימֵי יָד	עָרֵי יָד		
אָחִי יָד	אָחִיוֹתַי יָד		בְּנֵי יָד	בָּנוֹת יָד	יָמֵי יָד			עָרֵי יָד		
אָחִיו	אָחִיוֹתַי	נָשִׁיו	אִמְהוֹתַי	בְּנֵיו	בָּנוֹתַי	יָמֵיו	כְּלֵיו	מִימֵיו	עָרָיו	אֲשִׁירָיו
אָחִי יָהּ	אָנְשֵׁי יָהּ		אִמְהוֹתַי יָהּ	בְּנֵי יָהּ	בָּנוֹתַי יָהּ	יָמֵי יָהּ	כְּלֵי יָהּ	מִימֵי יָהּ	עָרֵי יָהּ	אֲשִׁירֵי יָהּ
אָחִי יָנוּ	אָנְשֵׁי יָנוּ	נָשֵׁי יָנוּ	בְּנֵי יָנוּ	בָּנוֹת יָנוּ	יָמֵי יָנוּ	כְּלֵי יָנוּ	מִימֵי יָנוּ	עָרֵי יָנוּ		אֲשִׁירֵי יָנוּ
אָחִיכֶם	אָחִיוֹתֵיכֶם	נָשֵׁיכֶם	אִמְהוֹתֵיכֶם	בְּנֵיכֶם	בָּנוֹתֵיכֶם	יָמֵיכֶם	כְּלֵיכֶם		עָרֵיכֶם	אֲשִׁירֵיכֶם
אָחִיהֶם	אָחִיוֹתֵיהֶם	נָשֵׁיהֶם	אִמְהוֹתֵיהֶם	בְּנֵיהֶם	בָּנוֹתֵיהֶם	יָמֵיהֶם	כְּלֵיהֶם	מִימֵיהֶם	עָרֵיהֶם	אֲשִׁירֵיהֶם
	אָנְשֵׁיהֶן		אִמְהוֹתֵיהֶן	בְּנֵיהֶן						אֲשִׁירֵיהֶן

REMARKS.

אָב *father*; the *constr.* אָבִי, like אָחִי and בְּנֵי (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. אָבִי שְׁלוֹם, אָבִי יִשְׁלוֹם, &c.; also Gn 17:4 f. אָבִי אֲבִיהֶן for the purpose of explaining the name אָבִיר. On the plur. אָבוֹת see § 87 p.

אָח *brother*. The plur. *absol.* אָחִים has *Dageš forte implicitum* (§ 22 c); אָחִיו stands for אָחִי according to the phonetic law stated in § 27 q, and so also אָחִי in *pause* for אָחִי. The sharpening of the ה merely serves to keep the preceding *Pathah* short, as in גְּמִלִים, &c. (§ 93 ee).

אָחָד *one* (for אָחָד, likewise with *Dageš forte implicitum*, § 22 c, cf. § 27 q), *constr.* and otherwise in close connexion, אָחָד, Gn 48:22, 2 S 17:22, Is 27:12, Zc 11:7; and especially before מִן (מִן) Gn 3:22, Ex 30:14, Nu 16:15, Ju 17:5, 1 S 9:3, Ez 18:10; fem. אָחָת *una* (for אָחָת, according to § 19 d), in *pause* אָחָת. Once אָחָד masc. (by aphaeresis, § 19 h), Ez 33:30, as in Aramaic; plur. אָחָדִים *some*, but also *iidem*.

אָחָת *sister*, from *āḥwāt* or *āḥyāt*, with elision of the ו or י, and with the *ā*, which has arisen from *āā*, obscured to *ō*.<sup>1</sup> In Nu 6:7 אָחָת stands for אָחָת (with virtual sharpening of the ה). The plur. *absol.* (אָחָתוֹת) does not happen to occur. In Ez 16:52 אָחָתוֹת occurs (for אָחָתוֹת). In the forms אָחָתוֹת Jos 2:13 *Keth.*, אָחָתוֹת Ez 16:51, 55, 61 (to be read also in verse 45 for אָחָתוֹת, which has been erroneously assimilated to the singular occurring in vv. 48, 49, 56), and אָחָתוֹת Ho 2:3 (for which, however, read אָחָתוֹת), the third radical has been entirely lost.

אָחִישׁ *man*, according to the common opinion either incorrectly lengthened for אָחִישׁ (from *išš*, with assimilation of the *Nún* of the ground-form *inš*, which again has been attenuated from

<sup>1</sup> This explanation of אָחָת (and אָחָתוֹת 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 ה feminine (so Barth, *ZDMG*. 1899, p. 598).

*anš* from the stem אָנַשׁ), or softened directly from *inš*. It is, however, probable that a separate stem (אִישׁ *to be strong*?) is to be assumed for the singular<sup>1</sup>; consequently the stem אָנַשׁ *to be sociable*, would be connected only with the plur. אִישִׁים (אִישִׁים is found only in *Is* 53:3, *Ps* 141:4, *Pr* 8:4).

אָמָא *slave, handmaid*; with the plur. אָמָוֹת, with consonantal ה, cf. in Aram. אָבָהוּ *fathers*, and similarly in Phoen. דְּלָהַת from דָּלָהַת, also Arab. *abahât* (fathers), *ummahât* (mothers), with an artificial expansion into a trilateral stem.

אִשָּׁה *woman*, probably for אִשָּׁה; from אָנַשׁ i.e. not (as Aram. אָתָא shows); אָנַשׁ *to be sociable* (see above, on אִישׁ) but אָנַשׁ *to be weak* (Arab. *ānūṭā*). So De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, p. 68; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 159 f. The form אִשָּׁה (for *išt*, with ה fem., from *išš*, after rejection of the doubling and lengthening of the *i* to *ē*) 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 אִשָּׁהֶךָ is found for אִשָּׁתְּךָ. Instead of the plur. אִשָּׁהִים, we find in *Ez* 23:44 אִשָּׁהִים.<sup>1</sup>

בַּיִת *house*, locative בַּיְתָה, in *pause* בַּיְתָה, *constr.* בַּיְתָה, plur. בָּתִּים (but in *Dt* 6:11, *1 Ch* 28:11 בָּתִּים without *Metheg*), pronounced *bâtîm*. The explanation of the *Dageš* in the ת is still a matter of dispute. The Syriac *bâtîn*, however, shows that the *Dageš* is original, and belongs to the character of the form.<sup>2</sup> According to Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 88, בָּתִּים is simply contracted from *bai-tîm* (as אִין from אִין, &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 י is assimilated to the ת, 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*.

בֶּן *son* (*Gn* 30:19 בֶּן־יִשְׂשַׁכָּר *constr.* usually בְּנֵי־ (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 מִבְּנֵי, *Ex* 30:14, *Lv* 27:3, &c. [בְּנֵי only after אָמַר and before שֶׁ, also in *Is* 51:12; see Strack on *Ex* 30:14]), rarely בְּנֵי (*Dt* 25:2, *Jon* 4:10 twice, *Pr* 30:1,

<sup>1</sup> 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 אִישׁ and אִישִׁים with the stem אָנַשׁ.

<sup>1</sup> 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 *aššāti*, corresponding, therefore, to אִשָּׁהִים, not to the ordinary plur. אִישִׁים. The *a* of אִישִׁים (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', אִישִׁים and אִשָּׁהִים.

<sup>2</sup> This disposes of the traditional view that the *Dageš* (after a firm *Metheg*, see § 16 f ζ) only serves to distinguish if from בָּתִּים *passing the night*, ptc. Qal of בָּיַת, a stem which never occurs in the O. T. According to P. Haupt the stem is אָבָה *to go in*, ת therefore being the feminine termination, as in *bint daughter*, and the original form *batu, bātu (entrance)* is preserved in the plural *bâtîm* where the *tt* is to be explained as due to the analogy of trisyllabic stems. In the singular *bât* passed into *bēt* (?), and this was resolved into *bait*, as *Y<sup>e</sup>rūšālēm* into *Y<sup>e</sup>rūšālayim*.

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

and so always in the combination בְּיִמִּין [but בְּיִמִּיני *Benjamite*] and בְּיִקְהָה Pr 30:1), once בְּנֵי (cf. § 90 l) Gn 49:11, and בְּנוֹ (§ 90 o) Nu 23:18, 24:3, 15.—In Gn 49:22 בְּן, for which בְּנֵי ought to be read, is intended by the Masora for the *absol. st.*, not the *constr.*

בַּת *daughter* (from *bant*, and this again, according to the law stated in § 69 c, for *bint*, fem. of בֵּן), with suff. בְּתִי for בְּתֵי. Plur. בָּנוֹת, from the sing. בְּנָה, comp. בְּנָיִם *sons*.

הָם *husband's father*, only with suff. הָמִיךְ, הָמִיךְ; and הָמוֹת *husband's mother*, only with suff. הָמוֹתֵךְ, הָמוֹתֵךְ. Cf. אָב, אָמָה, and especially אָחוֹת.

יָוֵם *day* (Arab. *yaum*),<sup>1</sup> dual יָוֵם יָוֵם; the plur. יָמִים is probably from a different sing. (יָם *yām*), *constr.* יָמִי and (poetically) יָמוֹת, Dt 32:7, Ps 90:15.

כֶּלִי *vessel*, in pause כֶּלִי (with suff. כֶּלִיךָ Dt 23:25) from כָּלָה *to contain*, plur. כְּלָיִם (as if from כָּל לָה, according to König, ii. 63, shortened from *kilyim*).

מַיִם *water*; on the plur. cf. § 88 d.

עִיר *city*. The plur. עָדִים 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. עִר, which still occurs in proper names.

פֶּה *mouth*, *constr. st.* פִּי (for original פִּי = פֶּה?). Its origin is still disputed. According to Gesenius and König (ii. 103), פֶּה stands for פָּאָה (ground-form *pi□ay*) from פָּאָה *to breathe, to blow*; according to Olshausen, for פִּי, from a stem פִּיָּה or פִּיָּה. But parallel with the Hebrew פֶּה are Assyr. *pû*, Arab. *fû*, *fam*, *famm*, *fumm*, bibl. Aram. פִּמָּ, פִּמָּא, Syr. *pûm*, *pûmā*, so that Barth, *ZDMG*. xli, p. 634, assumes two forms of development from the same stem (פִּמוּ), viz. *fm* and *fw*. פִּי *my mouth*, from *pi-y*; for פִּיָּה we find in Ps 17:10, 58:7, 59:13 פִּיָּה. The supposed plur. פִּים 1 S 13:21 is generally explained as a contraction from פִּיָּים, but the text is altogether corrupt. The plur. פִּיּוֹת, for the *edges* of a sword, occurs in Pr 5:4; reduplicated פִּיּוֹתֵי פִּיּוֹת Is 41:15, Ps 149:6.

רֹאשׁ *head* (obscured from ראש=ראש); plur. רֹאשִׁים (for ראשִׁים, § 23 c); only in Is 15:2.

שֵׁה *a head of small cattle (sheep or goat)*, *constr. st.* שֵׁה, with suff. שֵׁהוּ 1 S 14:34 and שֵׁהוּ Dt 22:1, according to König, ii. 131, from a ground-form *siay*, but according to De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, 81 f., from a stem ושי (שֵׁה=say=wišay).

שֵׁם *name*, *constr.* generally שֵׁם (only six times שֵׁם); cf. בֵּן.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Nöldeke, *Beiträge*, p. 58, *yaum*, probably an extension of a biliteral word which has survived in יָמִים, יָמִי. Barth, however, *Orient. Studien*, p. 791 (see above on אֶשְׁהָ), sees in יָמִים, יָמִי, new formations in Hebrew, caused by the naturally close connexion and association of these plurals with שָׁנָה, שָׁנָה, שָׁנָה *years*, to which they became assimilated in form. The view that יָוֵם is merely an incorrect obscuring of יָם, and therefore distinct from the Arab. *yaum*, is contradicted by the invariable spelling יָוֵם, &c., notwithstanding the spelling וביים (= וביים?) in the Siloam inscription, line 3 (cf. § 7 f), and יָוֵם Ho 6:2. Cf. also the note on § 100 g.

שָׁמַיִם *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. *שָׁלֹשׁ בָּנִים* *trias filiorum*, *עֶשְׂרֵת נָשִׁים* *decas mulierum*. A trace of this earlier usage was seen in the examples mentioned under *c*, like *שָׁלֹשׁ נָשִׁים*.— Further, it was possible to say *שָׁלֹשׁ בָּנִים* *trias*, sc. *fili*, as well as *שָׁלֹשׁ בָּנִים* *fili*, *trias*. From this second appositional construction it was only a step to the treatment of the abstract numeral as an adjective, *fili 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 *שָׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת* *trias filiarum*, or *שָׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת* *trias*, sc. *filiae*, or *שָׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת* *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 *שָׁלֹשׁ* in compounds. So long as it was felt that *שָׁלֹשׁ* 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 *שָׁלֹשׁ*. 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 *שְׁלֹשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה*, &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, *אֶחָד*, *one*, with its fem. *אֶחָת* (see § 96), may be recognized, from its form and use, as an adjective, although even so it admits of such combinations as *אֶחָד הַהָרִים* *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.	אֶחָד	אֶחָד	אֶחָת	אֶחָת
2.	שְׁנַיִם	שְׁנַיִ	שְׁתַּיִם <sup>1</sup>	שְׁתַּיִ
3.	שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשָׁת	שְׁלֹשׁ	שְׁלֹשׁ
4.	אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבַּעַת	אַרְבַּע	אַרְבַּע
5.	חֲמִשָּׁה <sup>2</sup>	חֲמִשָּׁת	חֲמִשׁ	חֲמִשׁ
6.	שֵׁשׁ־הַ	שֵׁשׁ־ת	שֵׁשׁ	שֵׁשׁ
7.	שִׁבְעָה	שִׁבְעַת	שִׁבַּע	שִׁבַּע <sup>3</sup> [שִׁבַּע]
8.	שְׁמֹנֶה	שְׁמֹנַת	שְׁמֹנֶה	שְׁמֹנֶה
9.	תְּשַׁע	תְּשַׁעַת	תְּשַׁע	תְּשַׁע <sup>3</sup> [תְּשַׁע]
10.	עֶשְׂרֵה	עֶשְׂרֵת	עֶשְׂרֵה	עֶשְׂרֵה

On the connective forms *שִׁבַּע*, *תְּשַׁע*, 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 <sup>1</sup> Shortened from *שְׁנַיִת־יָם*, which would be the regular feminine form of *יָם־שְׁנַיִם*. Nevertheless, the *Dageš* in *יָם־שְׁתַּיִם*, &c. (even after *מִן* *שְׁתַּיִם*; Jon 4:11; cf., however, *מִשְׁתַּיִ* 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 *יָם־שְׁתַּיִם* (cf. Arab. *šntāni*). This form does occur in the Codex Babylonicus of A.D. 916, but it is only a later correction for *יָם־שְׁתַּיִם*, 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 *štáyim*, *šté* (with *Dageš lene*), cf. *יָם־שְׁתַּיִם*, representing the later Palestinian pronunciation (Philippi, *ZDMG.* xlix, p. 206), and Arab. *išnātāni* (with a kind of prosthetic *š*; cf. § 19 m), as a further feminine form of *išnāni*, *duo*. According to Barth (*Orient. Studien ... Th. Nöldeke*, ii. 792 f.) the irregularity of *יָם־שְׁתַּיִם* (he takes the *Dageš* as *Dageš forte*) is due to the complete assimilation of its vowels to those of the masc. *יָם־שְׁנַיִם* where the *šwā mobile* is normal.

2 <sup>2</sup> With *Dageš* probably on the analogy of *שֵׁשׁ־הַ*, as *שְׁתַּיִם־יָם* on the analogy of *שְׁתַּיִם־יָם*. Cf. also J. K. Blake on *יָם־שְׁנַיִם*, *יָם־שְׁנַיִם* in *JAOS.* 1905, p. 117 ff.

3 <sup>3</sup> *שִׁבַּע* and *תְּשַׁע* appear only as connective forms before *עֶשְׂרֵה* and *מֵאוֹת*.

abstracts is only rarely found in connexion with feminine nouns,<sup>4</sup> e.g. שלֵשׁ נָשִׁים Gn 7:13, 1 S 10:3, Jb 1:4, Ez 7:2 *Keth.*; probably also Jos 17:11, where we should read with Dillmann וְהַגִּפּוֹת. 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 שלֵשׁ חֳדָשִׁים (but in the Samaritan שְׁלֹשׁ שָׁנָה).—For שִׁבְעָה *seven*, there occurs in Jb 42:13 the strange form שִׁבְעָה נָה, according to Ewald [*Ausführl. Lehrb.*<sup>8</sup>, § 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 עָשָׂר masc., עֶשְׂרֵה fem.), but without the two words being joined into one. As was said above, under *a*, and as is proved by the use of אָחַד, אֶחָד 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 שְׁלֹשׁ, &c., are not admitted in combination with עָשָׂר, 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 שְׁנַי and שְׁתֵּי in the numeral 12 are undoubtedly true *constructs*, like אָחַד and the fem. numerals 13–19. But instead of שְׁנַי (Ex 28:21, Jos 3:12 and four other places) and שְׁתֵּי (Jos 4:8 and three times in Ezek.), we generally find שְׁנַיִם and שְׁתַּיִם. Two explanations have been given of these forms: (1) that the *Kethibh* really intends יָם, שְׁנַיִם, in the *absol. st.*, which was first introduced in the case of יָם, שְׁנַיִם, on the analogy of עֶשְׂרֵה, &c., and then extended to יָם, שְׁתַּיִם; the Masora, however, required שְׁנַיִם, שְׁתֵּי (but see below), and therefore pointed שְׁנַיִם, שְׁתַּיִם as a *Q'rê perpetuum* (see § 17).—(2) that the *absolute* forms יָם, שְׁנַיִם, שְׁתַּיִם (introduced on the analogy of שְׁלֹשָׁה, &c.) were contracted to שְׁנַיִם, שְׁתַּיִם to facilitate the pronunciation of the duals when closely connected with עָשָׂר and עֶשְׂרֵה, and that the contraction is founded on an early and correct tradition. The second explanation is supported by the large number of examples of שְׁנַיִם (66) and שְׁתַּיִם (34). It would be strange if the Masora required the alteration of the far commoner forms on account of isolated instances of שְׁנַיִם and שְׁתֵּי. As a matter of fact even in regard to the latter forms the tradition often varies between שְׁנַיִם and יָם, שְׁנַיִם, &c., cf. e.g. Ginsburg on Jos 3:12. We cannot therefore assume a *Q'rê perpetuum*.

Accordingly the numbers from 11 upwards are—

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
11.	אָחַד עָשָׂר עֶשְׂרֵה <sup>1</sup> עָשָׂר	אֶחָד עֶשְׂרֵה עֶשְׂרֵה עֶשְׂרֵה

<sup>4</sup> 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).

<sup>1</sup> עֶשְׂרֵה, which remained for a long time unexplained, was recognized (first by J. Oppert) in the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions in the form *istin* or *istên*; cf. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 203, and P. Haupt, in the *American Journal of Philology*, viii. 279. Accordingly, עֶשְׂרֵה עֶשְׂרֵה is a compound, like the Sansk. *êkâdaçan*, *ĕvðeka*, *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.	שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר שְׁנֵי עָשָׂר	שְׁתַּיִם עָשָׂרָה שְׁתֵּי עָשָׂרָה
13.	שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר	שְׁלֹשׁ עָשָׂרָה

&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 שְׁתֵּי עָשָׂר *fifteen*, Ju 8:10, 2 S 19:18; שְׁמֹנֶת עָשָׂר *eighteen*, Ju 20:25.—Connected by ן we find הַמֶּשֶׁה ן הָעֶשְׂרִים 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, שְׁלֹשִׁים 30, אַרְבָּעִים 40, חֲמִשִּׁים 50, שִׁשִּׁים 60, שִׁבְעִים 70, שְׁמֹנִים 80, תְּשַׁעִים 90. But *twenty* is expressed by עָשָׂרִים, plur. of עָשָׂר *ten*.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> In all cases the units and tens are connected by the *copula*, ordinarily ן, but ן, before numerals with the tone on the penultima, ן before ׁ, ן before Š<sup>e</sup>wā see § 104 d, e, g.

The remaining numerals are the substantives—

100	מֵאָה fem., <i>constr.</i> מֵאָת.
200	מֵאָתַיִם dual (contracted from מֵאָתַיִם יָם; cf. § 23 c).
300	שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת plur. (but in 2 K 11:4, 9, 10, 15, <i>K<sup>e</sup>th.</i> הַמֵּאוֹת).
1000	אֶלֶף masc.
2000	אֶלְפַיִם dual.
3000	שְׁלֹשׁ אֲלָפִים plur., and so on (except עָשָׂרָה אֲלָפִים in 2 S 18:3, 2 K 24:14 <i>K<sup>e</sup>th.</i> ; elsewhere always אֲלָפִים).
10000	רִבְבָּה, in the later books the aramaisings <sup>2</sup> רַבּוּ, רַבּוּא, רַבּוּת (properly <i>multitude</i> , cf. μῆδρα).

eleven. On the gradual substitution of עֶשְׂרֵי עָ for 'אָהַד ע' and 'אָהַת ע' see Giesebrecht in *ZAW*. 1881, p. 226; עֶשְׂרֵי עָ occurs only in Jer., Ez., in the prologue to Deuteronomy (1<sup>3</sup>), in the Priestly Code, and in passages undoubtedly post-exilic, so that it may very well be a loan-word from the Babylonian.

<sup>2</sup> For עֶשְׂרֵי עָ, שְׁבַעִים, שְׁבַעִים (from the *segholates* עָשָׂר, עָשָׂר, עָשָׂר, עָשָׂר), we should expect <sup>a</sup> *sārī*, *š<sup>e</sup>bhā*, *t<sup>e</sup>šā*. 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*?

<sup>1</sup> According to the conclusions of König (*De Criticæ 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.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im A. T.* (Halle, 1902), p. 79 f.



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 יוֹם *by day*, from יוֹ (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. ἄπό, *ab, a*; ἔξ, *ex, e*; *ad*, Fr. *à*; *aut*, Fr. *ou*, Ital. *o*; *super*, Ital. *su*.<sup>1</sup>

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 Š<sup>e</sup>wâ. 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 הָ becomes at a later period ה; in modern Arabic, e. g. *hallaq* (now) is from *halwaqt*; *lêš* (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 מִדָּוֵעַ *wherefore?* for מִדָּוֵעַ-הָ *quid edoctus?* (τί μαθών; ) or *quid cognitum?*; בְּלָעַדִּי (from בַּל and עָדִי) *besides*; מִלְּמַלְּמָה (from מִן, לְ, הַלְּמָה) *from above, above*.

<sup>1</sup> Even short phrases are contracted into one word: Lat. *forsitan*, from *fors sit an*, δηλονότι, δηλαδὴ, Fr. *peut-être*, Eng. *prithée* 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; *ì* (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. אֶהְרִיבֶנּוּ, אֶהְרִיבֵנּוּ, אֶהְרִיבֵנּוּ; cf. also the compounds of אֵי with demonstrative pronouns, as אֵי יִמְנָה *from what?*; אֵי לָזֶה *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 אֵל *not*, and a few particles of place and time, as שָׁם *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. בְּמֵאָד (with might) *very*; לְבַד *alone* (prop. *in separation*, Fr. *à part*), with suffix לְבַדִּי *I alone*; מִבֵּית *from within, within*; cf. also כְּאַחַד (as one) *together*, לְעִמָּת and מְלַעֲמָת (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. τὴν ἀρχήν, δωρεάν, e. g. מֵאָד (might) *very*, אֶפֶס (cessation) *no more*, הַיּוֹם (the day) *to-day* (cf. § 126 b), מָחָר <sup>1</sup> *to-morrow*, יַחַד (union) *together*. Several of these continued to be used, though rarely, as substantives, e. g. סְבִיב, plur. סְבִיבִים and סְבִיבוֹת, *circuit*, as adverb *circum, around*; others have quite ceased to be so used, e. g. כְּבָר (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. אֲשׁוּנָה, רַ *primum, formerly* (more frequently אֲשׁוּנָה, בָּרַ, also לְרֵאשׁוֹנָה); רַבָּה and רַבָּת [both rare] *multum, much, enough*; נִפְלְאוֹת *wonderfully* (properly *mirabilibus*, sc. *modis*), יהוּדִית *Jewish*, i.e. in the Jewish language.

(d) Verbs in the infinitive absolute, especially in *Hiph*□*l*, which are likewise to be regarded as accusatives (§ 113 h), e. g. הִרְבָּה (prop. *a multiplying*) *much* [frequent], לְהִרְבָּה [rare and late] *in multitude*; הִשָּׁבַח (mane faciendo) *early*; הָעָרַב (vespere faciendo) *in the evening*.

(e) Pronouns and numerals, e. g. זֶה (prop. *there=at this place*) *here*, הֵן *here*, הִיֶּהָ *hither* (also of time, עַד־הַנֵּה *till now*, cf. the late and rare עָדָן and עַד־הַנֵּה=*until now*); אַחַת, יָמַי, שָׁבַע, שְׁנַיִם, מֵאָה *once, twice, seven times, a hundred times*; שְׁנַיִם *for the second time*.

3. Some adverbs are formed by the addition of formative syllables (most frequently ם ך) to substantives or adjectives, e.g. אֲמָנָם and אֲמָנָם *truly* (from אֱמֶת *truth*); בְּחֵן (by favour) *gratis* (from חֵן *gratia*); בְּיָקָם *in vain, frustra*, but also *empty*, (from יָקָם *empty, emptiness, vanum*), Ru 1:21, parallel with the fem. מְלֵאָה *full*; יוֹמָם *by day* (from

<sup>1</sup> Generally derived from the *ptcp. Pu*□*al* מְאָחָר *m<sup>e</sup>ōhār* (= *m<sup>e</sup>oḥhār*) and hence to be read *mōhār* (cf. מֶחָרָה, *morning*); but according to P. Haupt (notes to Esther, p. 159) from אָחָר *יום*.

יוֹם<sup>1</sup>); with *ô* in the last syllable, פִּתְעָא־ם, for פִּתְעָא, *in a twinkling, suddenly* (from פִּתְעָא *a twinkling*, the *ô* being probably obscured from an original *â*).<sup>2</sup>—Moreover, cf. אָחָרָנִית *backward*, and קָדָרָנִית *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 *îth*, which is elsewhere used to form adverbs, has been added to it.

The termination ם־ occurs also in the formation of substantives, e. g. אֹרְלָם *porch*, and hence the above adverbs may equally well be regarded as nouns used adverbially, so that ם־, ם־, would correspond to ן־, ן־ ( § 85, Nos. 53, 54), cf. בְּפִתְעָא־ם (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. אָז *then*, הֵנָּה *here* (according to Barth, *Sprachwiss. Abhandlungen*, p. 16, formed from the two demonstrative elements *hin* and *na*), כֵּן, כֹּה *thus* (cf. אֵיכָּה, יִכְכָּה, אַי, *how?*), אֲזַל *only*, אֲזַל *truly* (on all these adverbs, see the Lexicon), and especially the interrogative הֵ ( *Hē interrogativum*), e. g. הֲלֹ (Dt 3:11 הֲלֹ) *nonne?*, הֲלֹ *num etiam?* This *Hē interrogativum* is perhaps shortened from הֵל, 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.<sup>1</sup>

The ה interrogative takes—(1) *Haṭeph-Palḥaḥ* generally before non-gutturals (even before ר), with a firm vowel, e. g. הֲשֵׁתָּ *hast thou set?* see the interrogative clause, § 150 c (הֲיִטְבֵּה Lv 10:19 is an exception).

(2) Before a consonant with *Š<sup>e</sup>wā*, usually *Pathaḥ* without a following *Dageš forte*, e. g. הֲבִרְכָה 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. הֲבִירְכָה *num in via*, Ez 20:30, הֲלִבְךָ 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 *Haṭeph-Qameṣ*, it takes *Pathaḥ*, e. g. הֲאֵלֶךְ *shall I go?*, הֲאַתָּה *num tu?*, הֲאָם *num si*; הֲאֶרְצָה Mal 1:13; also in Ju 6:31 read הֲאַתָּה (not הֲאָה), likewise הֲ in Ju 12:5, Jer 8:19, Neh 6:11.—In הֲאִישׁ Nu 16:22, the Masora intends

1 1 Is this ם־ an instance of the locative or temporal termination (cf. especially צהרם) mentioned in § 88 c? Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xl. p. 721, considers יוֹמָם a secondary substantival form (used adverbially like לַיְלָה *noctu*), corresponding to the Phoenician and Aramaic ימם, Syr. *imāmā*; cf. on the other hand, König, ii. 255, who follows Olshausen in maintaining that the *ām* is an adverbial termination.

2 2 דוֹמָם *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 שׁוֹכֵב, עוֹלֵל, so that דוֹמָם (perhaps assimilated to דוֹמָה) stands for original דוֹמָם.

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 הֵל.

the article; read הַאִישׁ, and cf. Dt 20:19; in Ec 3:21 read הַעֲלֵה and הַיִּרְדֵת; the article is a correction due to doctrinal considerations.

(4) The ה takes *S̄ghôl* before gutturals pointed with *Qameṣ* or (as in Ju 9:9 ff.) *Haṭeph-Qameṣ*, e.g. הַמְאֹרִי Mi 2:7; הַאֲנֹכִי Jb 21:4; הַהֵי יְהוָה Jo 1:2; הַהֵשֶׁבֶט 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 יְשֶׁנָּה *thou art there*, 3rd sing. masc. יִשְׁנֻ <sup>2</sup> (but see note below), 2nd plur. masc. יִשְׁכֶּם; יִשְׁכֶּם אֵינִי נִי *I am not*, 2nd sing. יִנָּה, אֵינִי נִי, fem. אֵינִי נִי, 3rd sing. אֵינִי נִי, fem. אֵינִי נִי, 2nd plur. יִנָּם, אֵינִי נִי, 3rd plur. masc. אֵינִי נִי.—Also עוֹדֵךְ נִי *I am yet* (מְ, עוֹדֵךְ only in בְּעוֹדֵךְ and עוֹדֵךְ, עוֹדֵךְ, עוֹדֵךְ, עוֹדֵךְ (La 4:17 *Q<sup>re</sup>*; עוֹדֵךְ יִנָּה *K<sup>th</sup>*); the oriental school [see above, p. 38, note <sup>2</sup>] recognize only the reading עוֹדֵךְ נִי), עוֹדֵךְ, אֵינִי נִי *where art thou?*, אֵינִי *where is he?*, אֵינִי *where are they?* The same applies to הֵן (הֵן) and הֵנָּה *behold!* (prop. *here, here is*; see § 105 b), only in Gn 19:2 הֵנָּה נִי; with suffixes, הֵנָּה נִי, once הֵנָּה נִי (Gn 22:7 with *Munaḥ*), in *pause* הֵנָּה נִי *behold me (here am I)*, הֵנָּה נִי (Ps 139:8), הֵנָּה נִי and הֵנָּה נִי [both very rare], הֵנָּה נִי (*behold us*), and הֵנָּה נִי (in *pause* הֵנָּה נִי), הֵנָּה נִי, [see more fully in the Lexicon, p. 243].

The usual explanation of these suffixes (especially of the forms with *Nûn energicum*) as verbal suffixes, which ascribes some power of verbal government even to forms originally substantival (e. g. יִשְׁנֻ *there is, he is*), is at least inadmissible for forms (like אֵינִי) which are evidently connected with noun-suffixes; even for the other forms it is questionable. Brockelmann suggests that the ך in connexion with these particles is a survival from הנה corresponding to the Arab. *anna* which introduces dependent clauses.

### § 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 קָבָנוּ (for קָבָנוּ) Nu 23:13. Most probably, with Stade, *Gramm.*, § 370 b, and P. Haupt, *SBOT*. Numbers, p. 57, line 37, we should read יִשְׁנֻ.

2 <sup>2</sup> 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 χάριτι, in Latin *huius rei causa*, or *gratia*, *montis instar*.<sup>1</sup> Cf. אָחַר ר (hinder part\*) *behind*, *after* (*Milqél* in אָחַר בּוּן Lv 14:36, Dt 21:13, 1 S 10:5; אָחַר זֶה 2 Ch 32:9); אַ צֶל (side) *close by*; בֵּין (intermediate space\*) *between*; בְּעֵד, בְּעֵד (distance<sup>2</sup>) *behind*, *around*; זוּלַת, or with *Hireq compaginis* זוּלַתִּי (removal, want) *except*; עַל (purpose) *on account of*; מוֹל (only in Dt 1:1) *before*, *over against*; מִן (separation; cf. § 119 v) *from*, *out of*; נֹגֵד (coming in front, that which is over against) *before*, *over against*; עֵד (progress, duration\*) *during*, *until*; עַל־ (height, upper part\*) *upon*, *over*; עִם (connexion?) *with*; it is doubtful whether this is to be derived from the same stem as עִמָּת, לְעִמָּת *near*, *beside*, *like*; תַּחַת (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. לְפָנָי (in the face of\*) *before*; לְפִי, כְּפִי (according to the mouth, i.e. the command of\*) *according to*; בְּגִלְלִי (in the concern of) *on account of*; לְמַעַן (for the purpose of) *on account of*.

2. Substantives used adverbially very frequently become prepositions in this way, e. g. בְּלִי, בְּבִלִי, בְּמִבְלִי, בְּלִתִּי, בְּצִיּוֹן, בְּצֵסָה (with cessation) *without*, בְּעוֹד (in the duration of) *during*; כְּדִי, כְּדִי (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 *Nûn* assimilated to the following consonant (by means of *Dageš forte*), e.g. מִן עֵר *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־הָאֵרֶץ, and sometimes occurs before the softer consonants, e. g. מִן־אֵץ Jer 44:18, מִן־בְּנֵי 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 ק in Ps 18:49), and elsewhere in the later books (as in Aramaic)<sup>1</sup>; there is besides a poetic by-form מִנִּי (cf. § 90 m) and מִנִּי Is 30:11. Its form is most commonly מִ with a following *Dageš*, which may, however, be omitted in letters which have *Šwâ* (cf. § 20 m). With a following י the מ is, as a rule, contracted to מי, e. g. מִי־מִי־מִי or מִי־מִי (but cf. מִי־שִׁנִּי Dn 12:2; מִי־שִׁנִּי 2 Ch 20:11); before gutturals it becomes מִ (according to § 22 c), e. g. מִ־אֲדָם, מִ־עַם; before ה the מ occurs with the guttural virtually sharpened in מַחוּץ *on the outside*, and in מַחוּט Gn 14:23; before ה in מַהֲיוֹת הַמִּיּוֹת (cf. § 28 b and § 63 q. The closed syllable here is inconsistent with the required virtual

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> So also J. Hoch de Long, *Die hebr. Präpos.* בְּעֵד, Lpz. 1905.

<sup>1</sup> 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.





latter retains its *ô* (obscured from *â*) before the light suffixes, but before grave suffixes is pointed with *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl*. This *S<sup>e</sup>ghôl* is to be explained, with Praetorius, *ZDMG*. Iv. 369 f., as the modification of an *â* which again was shortened from original *â* (in *âthi*, *aihô*, &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 לְאֶת־כֹּל, &c. When not in close connexion, the toneless אֶת becomes tone-long אֶת, e. g. אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם Gn 1:1. Hence the following forms arise:—

	Sing.	Plur.
1. c. <i>me.</i>	אֲתִי	<i>us.</i> אֲתָנוּ
2. m. <i>thee</i>	אֲתָךְ <i>pause</i> אֲתָךְ	<i>you.</i> אֲתֶכֶם <i>you.</i>
f.	אֲתְךְ . . . . .	. . . . .
3. m. <i>him.</i>	אֲתּוֹ	<i>them.</i> אֲתָם, rarely אֲתֵהֶם
f. <i>her.</i>	אֲתֶיהָ	אֲתֵהֶן, rarely אֲתֵנָּה

Less common are the plene, forms אֲתִי, אֲתָךְ (Nu 22:33 אֲתָךְ *before* ה), אֲתָנוּ (Ex 29:35, אֲתָנוּ), אֲתָנוּ, אֲתָנוּ, אֲתָנוּ, אֲתָנוּ. Moreover, for אֲתֶכֶם we find אֲתֶכֶם Jos 23:15; for אֲתָם, five times אֲתָם (Gn 32:1, Ex 18:20, &c.), and in Ez 23:45 אֲתָם; for אֲתֵהֶן (Gn 19:8, &c. [13 times]), אֲתֵהֶן (only found in Ez 16:54; Ex 35:26 אֲתֵהֶן; Ez 34:21 אֲתֵהֶן), and אֲתֵהֶן Ez 23:47.—No instance of the 2nd fem. plur. אֲתֵכֶן occurs in the O. T.; in Cant 2:7, &c., אֲתֶכֶם is used instead.

2. The preposition *עִם* *with* (with suffixes on the model of stems עִמִּי, עִמָּךְ, עִמָּנוּ [1 S 1:26 עִמָּכֶם], in *pause* עִמָּךְ; 2nd fem. עִמָּךְ; עִמָּנוּ, עִמָּנוּ) is united with the suffixes נוּ, כֶּם, and הֶם by a (pretonic) *Qameṣ*, which causes the sharpening of the *Mêm* to be distinctly audible: עִמָּנוּ, עִמָּכֶם, עִמָּהֶם (so in Nu 22:12, Dt 29:16, both in principal pause, and often in very late passages, otherwise עִמָּם is generally used). In the first person, besides עִמִּי, we also find עִמָּדִי (probably from original עִנְדִי; cf. Arab. *inda*, beside, with).

3. It is but seldom that prepositions occur with verbal suffixes, as אֲתָנוּ 2 S 22:37, 40, 48 (for which Ps 18:37, 40, 48 אֲתָנוּ), אֲתָנוּ Gn 2:21 and אֲתָנוּ Ps 139:11 (here probably for the sake of the rhyme with אֲתָנוּ).<sup>1</sup>

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 אֶת is appended the syllable מוּ (see below, k), and אֶת and אֶת take at least a full vowel, אֶת and אֶת (§ 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 <sup>1</sup> *Fi*□□ and *bi*□□ (in me), in vulgar Arabic for *fiyya* and *bi*□, are compared by Socin. Brockelmann, *ZA.* xiv. 347, note 1, suggests that תַּחְתָּנִי, תַּחְתָּנָה, are later formations on the model of אֶת□□ when its origin from the reduplication of the preposition had become obscured, but see below, m.

(a) in the pausal forms בָּךְ, לָךְ, אֵיךְ, אִתְּךָ, עִמָּךְ (not *bèkhā*, &c.); (b) in the similar forms with the suffix of the 2nd sing. fem. (not *bèkh*, &c.) and in נוּ בָּ, נוּ לָ, עִמָּנוּ, &c. (not *bēnû*, &c.).

(a) לָ with Pronominal Suffixes.

	Sing.	Plur.
1. c. to me.	לִי	to us. לָנוּ
2. m. to thee.	לָךְ (לְכָה), in pause	to you. לְכֶם
f.	לָךְ .....	לְכֶם [לְכֶן] <sup>2</sup>
3. m. to him.	לוֹ	to them לָהֶם, לָהֶן poet. לָמוֹ
f. to her.	לָהּ	[53 times] <sup>3</sup> לָהֶן, <sup>4</sup> לָהֶוּ

בָּ, takes suffixes in the same manner: בִּי, בָּךְ (Ex 7:29, 2 S 22:30, Ps 141:8 בְּכָה, as in Gn 27:37, 2 S 18:22, Is 3:6 לְכָה [for 2nd fem. לָךְ the *K<sup>e</sup>thûbh* לְכִי occurs in 2 K 4:2, Ct 2:13, cf. § 91 e]), בוּ, &c.; except that for the 3rd plur., besides בָּהֶם (especially in the later books) and בָּהֶן (only in Ex 30:4, 36:1, Hb 1:16; בָּהֶן only in Jer 14:16), the form בָּם is also used; and for the feminine, besides בָּהֶן (three times), בָּהֶוּ is found fifteen times, and בָּהֶוּ only in 1 S 31:7, Is 38:16, Ez 42:14.—According to the Masora, אֵל is found fifteen times for לוֹ (as conversely in 1 S 2:16, 20:2 לוֹ for אֵל), 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 לָהּ instead of לָהֶן (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) נוּ with Pronominal Suffixes.

2 <sup>2</sup> לְכֶן does not occur in the O. T., by a mere accident, no doubt; Ez 13:18 לְכֶן־נָה.  
 3 <sup>3</sup> The question whether לָמוֹ can also stand for the sing. לוֹ, 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-humû*) 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 qatôn* at least) לָמוֹ can be better explained as plural (in reference to collective nouns); and in Is 53:8 for לָמוֹ לְנוּ גַעֲנוּ we should read with the LXX גַּעֲנוּ לְנוּ. 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—פָּנוּ Ps 11:7 and פָּנוּ Jb 27:23, as well as עָלֵנוּ, three times, Jb 20:23, 27:23 (beside עָלֵינוּ), and especially Jb 22:2. In all these places the most extreme exegetical artifices can only be avoided by simply admitting a singular suffix (=פָּנוּ, עָלֵנוּ).—On the question of the antiquity of the suffixes in לָמוֹ see § 91 l.  
 4 <sup>4</sup> The form לָהֶוּ in Ru 1:13 is Aramaic (=therefore).

	Sing.	Plur.
1. c. <i>as I.</i>	כָּמֹנִי <sup>5</sup>	<i>as we.</i> כָּמוֹנוֹ
2. m. <i>as thou.</i> f.	כָּמוֹךָ <sup>5</sup> ...	<i>as ye.</i> כָּמוֹכֶם, כְּכֶם, rarely כָּמוֹכֶם .....
3. m. <i>as he.</i> f. <i>as she.</i>	כָּמוֹהוּ כָּמוֹהָ	<i>as they</i> כָּמוֹהֶם, [כָּמֹהָ, כָּמֹהֶם] כָּמֹהוּ, [כָּמֹהוּ]

(c) מִן with Pronominal Suffixes.

	Sing.	Plur.
1. c. <i>from me.</i>	מִמֶּנִּי poet. מִנִּי [4 times], in <i>pause</i> also מִנִּי [6 times]	<i>from us.</i> מִמֶּנּוּ
2. m. <i>from thee.</i> f.	מִמֶּךָ, in <i>pause</i> מִמֶּךָ מִמֶּךָ	<i>from you.</i> מִמֶּכֶם מִמֶּנּוּ
3. m. <i>from him.</i> f. <i>from her.</i>	מִמֶּנּוּ, Jb 4:12 in <i>pause</i> מִנֵּהוּ, [מִנֵּהוּ] or מִנֵּהוּ: see below] מִמֶּנָּה	<i>from them</i> מִמֶּהֶם, מִמֶּהָ [twice], מִמֶּהֶם Jb 11:20 מִמֶּהֶן, מִמֶּהָ [7 times]

The syllable מו (in Arabic *mā* ما=Heb. מָה *what*) in כָּמֹנִי (probably from אֲנִי *prop. according to what I*, for *as I*) is, in poetry, appended to the three simple prefixes לְ, כִּי, אֲנִי, even without suffixes, so that לְמוֹ, כִּימוֹ, אֲנִימוֹ appear as independent words, equivalent in meaning to לְ, כִּי, אֲנִי. Poetry is here distinguished from prose by the use of longer forms; in the case of מִן, on the other hand, it prefers the shorter, which resemble the Syriac and Arabic.

The form כָּמֹהֶם, enclosed in brackets above, occurs only in 2 K 17:15 (in *pause*), כָּמֹהָ only in Jer 36:32 (in *pause*); כָּמֹהוּ (Baer following Qimḥi [כָּמֹהוּ] only in Ez 18:14. Cf. Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 234 ff.—For כָּכֶם *as ye*, Qimḥi requires כָּכֶם (invariably or only in Jb 16:4?); in Jos 1:15, Ju 8:2, Ezr 4:2 Baer gives כָּכֶם.

With regard to מִן with suffixes, מִמֶּנִּי *from me* is usually explained as arising, by a reduplication of מִן, from an original מִנִּי, just as מִמֶּנּוּ *from him*, from מִנֵּהוּ, identical in

<sup>5</sup> The use of נִי here for י (cf. above, d) might be due to euphonic reasons.—כָּמֹנִי (defectively) only in the Pentateuch, כָּמֹנִי Ex 15:11.



עֲדִי (*continuation, duration, from עָדָה*) *as far as, unto*, poet. עֲדִי [12 times]. In Jb 32:12 עָדְכֶם, עָדְכֶם, with the *ā* retained in the secondary tone, is abnormal. Also in 2 K 9:18 for עָדְהֶם read עָדְהֶם.

עָלִי *upon, over* (cf. the rare subst. עָל *height* [see Lexicon], from עָלָה *to ascend*), poet. עָלִי [40 times, and 2 *Q<sup>e</sup>rē*].

תַּחַת *under* (prop. *what is beneath*). On תַּחַתְּנִי, &c.; cf. above, d.

*With Suffixes.*

1	<i>Sing.</i>	אֶחָדִי	בֵּינִי	סָבִיבוֹתַי	תַּחַתִּי	אֵלַי	עָדַי	עָלַי
		( <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>	אֶחָדְךָ	בֵּינְךָ	סָבִיבוֹתֶיךָ	תַּחַתְּךָ	אֵלֶיךָ	עָדְךָ	עָלֶיךָ
				& סָבִיבְךָ				
2	<i>S. f.</i>	אֶחָדְךָ		סָבִיבוֹתֶיךָ		אֵלֶיךָ		עָלֶיךָ
				& סָבִיבְךָ				
3	<i>S. m.</i>	אֶחָדֵינוּ	בֵּינֵנוּ	סָבִיבוֹתֵינוּ	תַּחַתֵּינוּ	אֵלֵינוּ	עָדֵינוּ	עָלֵינוּ
				& סָבִיבֵינוּ				
3	<i>S. f.</i>	אֶחָדֵיךָ		סָבִיבוֹתֵיךָ	תַּחַתֵּיךָ	אֵלֵיךָ	עָדֵיךָ	עָלֵיךָ
				& סָבִיבֵיךָ				
1	<i>Plur.</i>	אֶחָדֵינוּ	בֵּינֵנוּ	סָבִיבוֹתֵינוּ	תַּחַתֵּינוּ	אֵלֵנוּ		עָלֵנוּ
		&	<sup>1</sup> בֵּינֹתֵינוּ					
2	<i>Pl. m.</i>	אֶחָדֵיכֶם	בֵּינֵיכֶם	סָבִיבוֹתֵיכֶם	תַּחַתֵּיכֶם	אֵלֵיכֶם	עָדֵיכֶם	עָלֵיכֶם
3	<i>Pl. m.</i>	אֶחָדֵיהֶם	בֵּינֵיהֶם	סָבִיבוֹתֵיהֶם	תַּחַתֵּיהֶם	אֵלֵיהֶם	[עָדֵיהֶם]	עָלֵיהֶם
			& בֵּינֹתָם	& סָבִיבוֹתָם	usually תַּחַתָּם	& אֵלֵיהֶם		[עָלֵימֹו <sup>2</sup> ]
						[אֵלֵימֹו <sup>2</sup> ]		
3	<i>Pl. f.</i>	אֶחָדֵיהֶן			תַּחַתֵּיהֶן	אֵלֵיהֶן		עָלֵיהֶן

<sup>1</sup> As Mayer Lambert observes, usage (cf. esp. Gn 26:28) distinguishes between the two forms: בֵּינֹתֵינוּ, means *between us and you*, whereas בֵּינֵנוּ (Jos 22:25, 27, 28 before וּבֵינֵנוּ) means *between us on the one side*.

<sup>2</sup> The poetical form אֵלֵימֹו only in Ps 2:5; עָלֵימֹו, 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 אֲלֵּי (nothing), *that not*; כִּי־אֵי (that not (the Greek μή of prohibition), &c. To these may be added the adverbial combination of substantives with prepositions, e.g. קִטְרָה (in the not yet) earlier, before, for which מִקְטָרָה is also used. On the combination of two particles to express complex ideas (e.g. אֲרֵב־כִּי added to this, that=*much more*), see the Syntax, § 163 f.

(c) Prepositions, which with the addition of the conjunction אֲשֶׁר or כִּי together form one single conjunction, e.g. עַל אֲשֶׁר *because, prop. on account of the fact that*; אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר, and more frequently אַחֲרֵי כִּי, *after that*; כַּכֵּן אֲשֶׁר, *according as* (with כִּי); וְעַל כֵּן אֲשֶׁר *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־ (for עַל־אֲשֶׁר) *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 אוֹ *or*, אִם־ *if* (also *or* before the second member of a double question), אֲלֵּי *also*, וְ *and*, and others.

Rem. The pointing of the וְ (originally וּ, as still before *Haṭeph Pathaḥ*) 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 וּ, וְ, וֹ (§ 102 d-i), but as being a weak consonant, the *wāw copulative* has some further peculiarities:

(a) Usually it takes simple  $\check{S}^e wā$  (וְ).

(b) Before words which begin with a guttural having a *compound*  $\check{S}^e wā$ , it takes the vowel with which the  $\check{S}^e wā$  is compounded (according to § 28 b), e.g. וְנָחֵם, *and be thou wise*, וְעַבְדִּים, *and servants*, וְעִזָּוָה, *and strength*, וְאָכַל, *and eat thou*, וְחָלִי, *and sickness*. On וְאֵלֵּי הֵי, וְאֵלֵּי הִים &c., see § 102 d; on וְאֵד, וְאֵי, &c., see § 102 m; on such cases as וְנָצַר Jb 4:2, cf. § 28 b.

(c) Before words with simple  $\check{S}^e wā$  under the first consonant (except in the cases under f), the *Wāw* becomes the vowel *û* (cf. § 26 a), e.g. וְלֹכֵל *and to all*, so also



imperative of הָלֵךְ) with the same meaning<sup>1</sup>; הָלֵךְ לֵי לֵה *far be it!* (prop. *ad profanum!*) כִּי (see the Lexicon) *I beseech, hear me!* אֲנִי *pray!*<sup>1</sup> used to emphasize a demand, warning, or entreaty, and always placed after the expression to which it belongs.<sup>2</sup>

## THIRD PART

### SYNTAX<sup>1</sup>

#### CHAPTER I

##### THE PARTS OF SPEECH

###### *Syntax of the Verb.*

##### USE OF THE TENSES AND MOODS.<sup>2</sup>

---

1<sup>1</sup> הָאֵהָ (Dt 1:8), הָבֵהָ and הָלֵהָ are also used in connexion with the feminine and the plural, which proves that they have become quite stereotyped as interjections.

1<sup>1</sup> אֲנִי 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: אֲנִי הֵנִיהָ *behold now*; particularly after the conjunctions אֵל and אֵלֶּנָּא *ne quaeso* and אֲנִי אֵלֶּנָּא *if now*, εἴπερ, εἴποτε *if*, in a deprecatory sense, expressive of politeness or modesty. In Nu 12:13 אֲנִי stands after a noun; but we ought certainly to read אֲנִי־אֵלֶּנָּא.—In polite language this particle is used constantly in all these ways, Gn 18:3, 4, 19:7, 8, 19, and 50:17.

2<sup>2</sup> Against the usual view which regards אֲנִי as a hortatory particle (=up! come! analogous to the original imperatives הָבֵהָ and הָלֵהָ and the Ethiopic *nā-ā*, 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 אֲנִי as an emphatic particle. Haupt's suggested identification of this אֲנִי 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<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> 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* (אָזָּה קָחַתִּי לֹא) .....; *and he said, Nay, but thou didst laugh* (צָחַקְתָּ); Gn 3:11 *who told thee ....?* Cf. 3:13, 14, 17, 22. Also pointing to some undefined time in the past, e.g. Is 66:8 *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* (הָיִיתִי) *with Moses, so will I be* (אֶהְיֶה) *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* (וַהֲבִיֵּא), &c.; Gn 7:19 *the waters did prevail* (וַיִּבְרֹךְ), &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 ו 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 ו 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),<sup>1</sup> e.g. 1 S 28:3 *now Samuel was (long since) dead<sup>2</sup> ... and Saul had put away (הִסִּיר) 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 (עָשָׂה)*; Gn 7:9, 19<sup>27</sup>, &c.; 29:10 *now when Jacob had seen Rachel (בְּאֶשְׁרָה 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 *he hath hidden his face (and still keeps it hidden)*; Ps 143:6 *I have spread forth my hands (and still keep them spread forth)*. This applies particularly to a large number of perfects (almost exclusively of intransitive<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Thus, יָדַעְתִּי *I know* (prop. *I have perceived, have experienced*) Jb 9:2, 10:13, לֹא יָדַעְתִּי *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*; זָכַרְנוּ *we remember* Nu 11:5; מָאָצְנָה *she refuseth* Jb 6:7; עָלְזָה *it exulteth*; שָׂמַחְתִּי *I rejoice* 1 S 2:1; בָּקֵשׁ *he requireth* Is 1:12; קָוַיְתִי *I wait* Gn 49:18, Ps 130:5 (parallel with לָתִי, הוֹדָה לְתִי *I delight* Ps 40:9 (mostly negative, Is 1:11, &c.); אָהַבְתִּי *I love* Gn 27:4; שָׂנְאֵתִי *I hate* Ps 31:7; מָאָצְתִי *I despise* Am 5:21; וּנִי אָבוּרָה *they abhor me* Jb 30:10; בָּטַחְתִּי *I trust* Ps 25:2; הִטַּחְתִּי *I put my trust* Ps 31:2; צַדִּיקְתִּי *I am righteous* Jb 34:5; פָּקַדְתִּי *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 אַתָּה לָתָהּ *thou art great* Ps 104:1; קָטַנְתִּי *I am little* Gn 32:11; גָּבְהוּ *they are high* Is 55:9; הִתְקַדְּדוּ *they stand aloof* Jb 30:10; טוֹבוּ *they are goodly* Nu 24:5; נָאוּ *they are*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. P. Haupt in the *Notes on Esther*, 9:2.

<sup>2</sup> Incorrectly, e.g. in the Vulgate, *Samuel autem mortuus est ... et Saul abstulit magos, &c.*

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *novi, odi, memini*; οἶδα, μέμνημαι, ἔοικα, δέδορκα, κέκραγα; in the New Testament, ἤλπικα, ἠγάπηκα.

*beautiful* Is 52:7; יָקַן נָתִי *I am old* Gn 18:13; יָגַעְתִּי *I am weary* Ps 6:7; שָׂבַע עָתִי *I am full* Is 1:11, &c.

Rem. To the same category probably belong also the perfects after עַד־מָתַי *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־אָנָּה *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. הִרַמְתִּי *I lift up* (my hand in ratifying an oath) Gn 14:22; נִשְׁבַּע עָתִי *I swear* Jer 22:5; הִעֵד־תִּי *I testify* Dt 8:19; יָעַצְתִּי *I counsel* 2 S 17:11 (but in a different context in ver. 15, *I have counselled*); אָמַרְתִּי (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־עָזַבְתָּהֶן) *them that seek thee*. Cf. ver. 13, also Ps 10:3, 119:40 and Gn 49:11 (כַּבֵּס).

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־יָכֹלְתִי *I am not able* Ps 40:13 and לֹא־אוּכַל *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* (נָתַתִּי) *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, יִסִּיחַ 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 *behold, we perish, we are undone, we are all undone*. Gn 30:13, Is 6:5 (נִדְמַתִּי *I am undone*<sup>1</sup>), 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.<sup>2</sup> This use of the perfect

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> In Gn 40:14 *a perf. confidentiae* (after אָמַרְתִּי; 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* (הָלָה); 9:1 ff., 10:28, 11:9 (after פִּי, 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 אָם רָחַץ *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 אָשֶׁר אָם, as in Gn 28:15, Nu 32:17; also 2 S 17:13 after אָשֶׁר אָם, Gn 24:19 after אָם and elsewhere frequently after temporal conjunctions); Mi 5:2 (יָלֵךְ); Gn 43:14 אֲשֶׁר שָׁכַח לְתִי שָׁכַח לְתִי אֲנִי, and I—if I am bereaved (*orbis 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* (יִשְׁלַחַתְנִי); Gn 43:10, Ex 9:15 (יִשְׁלַחַתְנִי *I had almost put forth, &c.*); Nu 22:33, Ju 13:23, 14:18, 1 S 13:13 (הִפְיִן); 2 K 13:19; so frequently after בְּקִיעוּט *easily, almost*, Gn 26:10, Is 1:9 (where בְּקִיעוּט 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 (בְּהִינִי), 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 לֹא מָתָנוּ לֹא מָתָנוּ *would that we had died ...!* (לֹא 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 מָלַל מִי *who would have said ...? quis dixerit?* Ps 73:11.

#### § 107. Use of the Imperfect.<sup>1</sup>

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.

---

*precativ* perfect in Hebrew. In Jb 21:16, 22:18, also, translate *the counsel of the wicked is far from me*. Cf. Driver, *Tenses*<sup>3</sup>, p. 25 f. In Is 43:9 either נִקְבְּצוּ is *imperative* (see § 51 o) or we must read נִקְבְּצוּ, corresponding to אֲקַפּוּ which follows.

<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>1</sup> e.g. Gn 2:6 *a mist went up continually* (יַעֲלֶה), 2:25, 37:7, 48:10, Ex 1:12, 8:20, 13:22, 15:6, 12, 14, 15, Nu 9:15 f. 20 f., 23<sup>7</sup>, 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 (יַמְלִיא), 17:10 f., 51:2 x, Jer 13:7, 36:18, Ps 18:7, 14, 17 ff.38 ff., 24:2, 32:4, 5 (אֵוֶד, יַעֲרֶה), 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.<sup>2</sup>

Rem. 1. The imperfect is frequently used in this way after the particles אָז *then*, כִּי *not yet*, בְּטָרָם *before*, עַד־ *until*, e.g. Ex 15:1 יִשָּׂא יְרֵמֹשָׁה אָז *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 אָז 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 אָז הוֹחֵל *then began*, &c.; Gn 49:4, Ex 15:15, Jos 22:31, Ju 5:11, Ps 89:20.)<sup>3</sup> After טָרָם e.g. Gn 19:4 טָרָם יִשְׁכְּבוּ *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. כָּלָה, the imperf. should be read, as in verse 45; so also in 1 S 3:7 [יַגִּילָה] an imperf. is co-ordinated with יָדַע). After בְּטָרָם (sometimes also simply כִּי Ex 12:34, Jos 3:1), e.g. Jer 1:5 אֵיךְ בְּטָרָם הָיִיתָ *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 יָלְדוּ; cf. Wellhausen on 2 S 3:2; but note also Pr 8:25, in a similar context, *before the mountains were settled*, הִטְטְבוּ עוֹ, the predicate being separated from בְּטָרָם, by 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 אָז, so also after טָרָם, 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 כִּי in Ex 9:30, 10:7.

2. Driver (*Tenses*<sup>3</sup>, 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 וְנָהָר יֵצֵא Gn 2:10 represent the river of Paradise as going out of Eden in a continuous, uninterrupted stream, but וַיִּפְרֹד, which immediately follows, describes how the parting of its waters is always taking place afresh. In the same way יַעֲלֶה Gn 2:6 represents new mists as constantly arising, and יַמְלִיא Is 6:4 new clouds of smoke. Also those actions, &c., which might be regarded in themselves as single or

1<sup>1</sup> Cf. the *Mēša*□ inscription, l. 5, כִּי יֵאָנֶף כְּמֹשׁ בְּאַרְצָה *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<sup>2</sup> According to the Masora such imperfects occur in Is 10<sup>13 bis</sup> (where, however, אֲסִיר 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 ך is no doubt a dogmatic emendation for ך (*imperf. consec.*) in order to represent historical statements as promises; cf. Is 42:6, 43:28 [contrasted with 42:25], 51<sup>2 bis</sup>, 63:3 ff. and the note on § 53 p.

3<sup>3</sup> After אָז *then* (to announce future events) the imperf. 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 *תְּבַלַּע מִן* 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 *יִבְהֶה גִּי* 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* (*נִיַּעֲשֶׂה*) *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. (*יִקַּח 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,<sup>1</sup> e.g. Gn 37:15 *מה־תִּבְקֶשׁ* *what seekest thou?* 19:19 *לֹא־אֶחַיֵּכֶם* *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 *יְהוָה אָמַר 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* (*יַעְרֵר*), &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* *יִטְרַף יֶזְעֵב* *a wolf that ravineth* (properly, is accustomed to ravin). Finally, compare also the formulae *יְהוָה אָמַר* *it is* (wont to be) *said* (to introduce proverbial expressions) Gn 10:9, 22:14, &c.; *לֹא־יִעָשֶׂה כֵּן* *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 *whence is it that thou dost ask* (*תִּשְׁאַל*) *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 (2<sup>2</sup>) *מֵאַיְתָּה תָּבִיא* *whence comest thou* (just now)? but Gn 16:8 (cf. 42:7) *מֵאַיְתָּה בָּאתָ* *whence camest thou?* The imperfect represents the coming as still in its last stage, whereas the perfect represents it as an accomplished fact.

<sup>1</sup> 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* (יִאֲמְרוּ יִנּוּ) *me, nor hearken* (יִשְׁמְעוּ) *unto my voice: for they will say* (יִאֲמְרוּ), &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* (יִאֲמַר)? 2:19, 43:25, Ex 2:4, 2 K 3:27 *qui regnaturus erat*; 13:14, Jon 4:5, Jb 3:3, Ec 2:3, Ps 78:6 *that the generation to come might know*, יְלֵדֵי לְדוֹר *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 אֲשֶׁר *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. תֵּרָאֵה *let it appear* Gn 1:9, 41:34, Lv 19:2, 3, 2 S 10:12 (and so frequently in verbs לִיִּי; cf. § 109 a, note 2); Zc 9:5 (תִּהְיֶה לִי); Ps 61:7 (תִּוְסֶיף); Pr 22:17 (תִּשְׁפֹּט); 23:1, Jb 6:23 (co-ordinated with the imperative), 10:20 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*; so probably also יִדְדֵן *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 אֶגְנֹעַ *I ought to* [not *should* as A.V., R.V.] *have*, (then, immediately after being born) *given up the ghost*; cf. verse 19 אֶהְיֶה לֵאמֹר and לֵאמֹר 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 אֶרְשָׁע *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 אִלֵּי represents a more emphatic form of prohibition than the jussive<sup>1</sup> 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 אִלֵּי with the imperfect is especially used in enforcing the divine commands, e.g. לֹא תִגְנוֹב *thou shalt not steal* Ex 20:15; cf. verses 3, 4, 5, 7, 10 ff. So אִלֵּי with the 3rd pers. perhaps in Pr 16:10.

---

<sup>1</sup> As stated in § 46 a, a prohibition cannot be expressed by אַל־ and the imperative.

Rem. The *jussive*, which is to be expected after אַל־, 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 אַל־ of what are undoubtedly imperfect forms, not only from verbs לִיָּה (cf. § 109 a, note 2), but also from verbs עָוִי, to express a prohibition or negative wish, אֶל־תִּסּוּר Gn 19:17, אֶל־נָא Jos 1:7, אֶל־יָשִׁים 1 S 25:25. Even with the 1st pers. plur. (after an imperative) וְאֶל־נָמוּת *that we die not*, 1 S 12:19. Also to express the conviction that something cannot happen, אֶל־יָנוּם *he will not slumber*,<sup>2</sup> 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 לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ *that they may not understand*); וְעַבּוּר Gn 21:30, 27:4, 19, Ex 9:14, &c.;; לֹא עֵן אֲשֶׁר Nu 17:5; לֹא עֵן Dt 4:1, Ps 51:6, 78:6, and אֲשֶׁר יַעַן Ez 12:12, *in order that*<sup>2</sup>; לְבַלְתִּי *that ... not*, Ex 20:20, 2 S 14:14; also after פֶּן־ *that not, lest*, Gn 3:22, 11:4, 19:15, &c.<sup>3</sup>; 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 וְנִישַׁ יְבוּ אֶת־נַפְשָׁם to refresh their souls* (cf. also La 3:26, *it is good 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 בְּדֶרֶךְ רַחֲמוֹתֶיךָ תֵּלֶךְ *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*<sup>4</sup>). More particularly such imperfects are used—

(1) In a permissive sense, e.g. Gn 2:16 *of every tree of the garden (אֲכַל לִתְּאֵכֶל) 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 מִי יֵי אָמַר *quis dixerit?* Cf. Gn 17:17, 18:14, 31:43, 1 S 11:12, 2 K 5:12 הֲלֹא־אֶרְחֹץ בָּהֶם *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 אֵיךְ, 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 הֲיָדוּעַ נִדְעַ *could we in any wise know ...?* Cf. 2 S 3:33 (יָמוּת)

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> 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 אֶל־ with the imperf., of that which was previously only a subjective conviction.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> But אֲשֶׁר יַעַן 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.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> [R.V. *because he shall not see.*]

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> In 2 K 2:16 פֶּן־ 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 יִמְצָא.)

<sup>4</sup> <sup>4</sup> 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 (פִּי אֲלֶיךָ) 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 אָשָׁר 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 לֹא יִסְפַּד מֶרֶב לְאֲשָׁר *which cannot be numbered for multitude*; 20:9 *deeds (אֲשָׁר לֹא יִסְפַּד עֲשׂוֹת) 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 לֹא אֶיִרָא רָע ... לִי אֲלֶיךָ *yea, though I walk (or had to walk) ... 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.<sup>1</sup> sing. or plur. of the imperfect lengthened by the ending הָהֻ, <sup>2</sup> 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 הִנֵּה:

(a) To express self-encouragement, e.g. Ex 3:3 אֲנִי הִנֵּה וְגַ' *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 אֲלֵה־, 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 sing<sup>3</sup> ...!* 5:6, 31:8. Cf. also Gn 46:30 *now let me die (I am willing to die), since I have*

1 <sup>1</sup> For the few examples of cohortatives in the 3rd sing., see § 48 d.

2 <sup>2</sup> But verbs לִי, according to § 75 l, even in the cohortative, almost always have the ending הָהֻ; cf. e.g. in Dt 32:20 אֲרָאָה after יִרְהֹא.

3 [<sup>3</sup> 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 *בָּנֵי־קָהָה* *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 *אֶעְבְּרָה* *may I be allowed to pass through (let me pass through)!* Nu 20:17 *נִעְבְּרָה־נָּא* *may we be allowed to pass through!* Jer 40:15 *let me go, I pray thee!* &c.; 2 S 16:9; so after אֵל 2 S 18:14; after אֵל־ 2 S 24:14, Jer 17:18, Ps 25:2 (*אֵל־אֲבִי וְשִׁי*) *let me not be ashamed*; cf. Ps 31:2, 18, 71:1); 69:15. After אֵל־נָּא 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 לְמַ עֵן) on an imperative or jussive to express an intention or intended consequence, e.g. Gn 27:4 *bring it to me, הֲאֵכָלְךָ* *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'ê*; Is 5:19 *and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come, הֲבֵנָה* *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 אִם) to express a contingent intention, e.g. Jb 16:6 *אִם־אֶדְבַּרְהָ אֶשְׂמַח* *should I determine to speak, my grief is not assuaged, וְאִם־אֶשְׁתַּחֲוֶה* *and should I forbear, what am I eased?* without אִם Jb 19:18, 30:26 (where, however, וְאִם־הִיא is probably intended); Ps 73:16 (unless אִם־נֶאֱמַר 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 *אִם־אֶרְדֹּפֶה* *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 ...*, אֶזְרָעָה *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 אִם־שָׁשׂוּ 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 *וְיִיחַדְנִי*, e.g. Jer 9:1 *oh, that I had ...*, וְיִשְׁעֶיךָ *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 *אֶלְכָה*; Jer 3:25, 4:19, 21, 6:10, Ps 55:3, 18 (?); 57:5, where, however, with Hupfeld, *כָּבַה*, *שִׁ* 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 *שָׂמְנוּ־נֶשְׂמָה* *there did we rejoice*<sup>1</sup>; Ps 119:163 *נִשְׂמַח־בָּהּ*; Pr

---

1 <sup>1</sup> Analogous to this cohortative (as equivalent to the imperfect) after *שִׁ* is the use of the historic imperf. after *זָעַ*, § 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 עָדָה Ps 73:17 *until I went ... אָבַיְנָה I considered their latter end*; possibly a pregnant construction for ‘until I made up my mind, saying, I will consider’, &c. (but אָבַיְנָה Pr 7:7 is still dependent on the preceding וְ); עָדָה אֶרְגֵּי יָעָה Pr 12:19 is at any rate to be explained in the same way (in Jer 49:19, 50:44 we have אֶרְגֵּי with a similar meaning), *as long as I (intentionally) wink with the eyelashes (shall wink)*. On the other hand, in Ex 32:30 אֶכַּפֵּר is to be read, with the Samaritan, instead of אֶכַּפְרָה after אוֹלֵי.

### § 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*,<sup>2</sup> § 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 נָא. Examples: Gn 1:3 יְהִי אוֹר *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 לוֹי יְהִי *I would it might be*; Ps 81:9 אִם-תִּשְׁמַע-לִי אִם-תִּשְׁמַע-לִי *if thou wouldst hearken unto me!* As a humble request, Gn 44:33 ... וְהַנְּעִי יָעַל ... וְשִׁבְּ-נָא עִבְדְּךָ *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 אַל- (in negative desires and requests frequently אַל-יִנָּא); e. g. Ex 34:3 אִישׁ אַל-יֵרָא *neither let any man be seen!* Pr 3:7 *be not (אַל-תְּהָה) wise in thine own eyes!* Jb 15:31 אַל-יִצְמַח *ne confidat*. In the form of a request (prayer), Dt 9:26 אַל-תִּשְׁחַח *destroy not!* 1 K 2:20, Ps 27:9, 69:18.

Rem. 1. The few examples of אֶל 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 (אֶל 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. *Jo* 2:2 לֹא יוֹסֵף 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

---

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> With regard to verbs ל"ה, 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. אַל-יִרְאֶה Jb 3:9 (but previously יִקַּח *let it look for!*): especially *in* (Neh 2:3) and immediately *before* the principal pause, Gn 1:9 תִּרְאֶה; Ju 6:39 יִהְיֶה, but previously יִהְיֶה-נָא; Is 47:3 תִּרְאֶה, previously תִּגָּל; Ps 109:7. On the attempt to distinguish such *jussives* from the *imperfect* by means of a special meaning הַ, 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 יִסְרֵף, &c., should not be restored.—On לֹא־תִחַזֵּם עַיִן יִגְדֹךָ, &c., Dt 7:16, 13:9, &c., Ez 5:11, &c., cf. § 72 r, according to which תִּחַזֵּם should probably be read in every case.—The jussive appears in the place of the cohortative after לֹא 1 S 14:36 (רָאִי־נִשְׂאָרָה co-ordinated with two cohortatives), 2 S 17:12; cf. Is 41:23 *K<sup>c</sup>th.* (וּנְרָא, i. e. וְנָרָא, after another cohortative); also (see above) לֹא־אֶסְרֵף Dt 18:16, Ho 9:15, and even without אֶסְרֵף Ez 5:16.

2. לֹא 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) וְלֹא־תִשָּׁחַטְוּ אֶת־לֶהֱם *and thou canst not possibly forgive them* [R. V. *therefore forgive them not*]; Ps 34:6, 41:3, 50:3, 121:3 (וְלֹא־יִתֵּן); Pr 3:25, Jb 5:22 וְלֹא־תִירָא *neither needest thou be afraid*; 20:17, 40:32.

2. The jussive depending on other moods, or in conditional sentences:

(a) Depending<sup>1</sup> (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* (וְיִתְהַיָּי וְיִתְהַיָּי 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<sub>6</sub>. Also after interrogative sentences, which include a demand, Est 7:2 (say) *what is thy desire...*, וְתִעָשֶׂה *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 אֲמַן לְטָהָה נָא שָׁפָה *oh, let me escape thither...* וְיִתְהַיָּי נַפְשִׁי *that my soul may live*; even after a simple imperf. (cf. below, g), 1 K 13:33 *whosoever would, he consecrated him ... וְיִהְיֶה that he might be a priest* (read כֹּהֵן) *of the high places*, but probably the LXX reading וְיִהְיֶה is to be preferred.

Rem. In 2 Ch 35:21 a negative final clause with וְלֹא 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 וְלֹא 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 לֹא with an imperfect, Lv 10:6, Nu 18:3, Dt 17:17 *neither shall he multiply wives unto himself* (וְלֹא יִסוּר לְקַבּוֹ) *that his heart turn not away*; 1 S 20:14, 2 S 21:17, Jer 11:21; after לֹא with jussive, Lv 10:9, 11:43, 16:2, 2 S 13:25, Jer 25:6, 37:20, 38:24 f.; after the asseverative אִם with the imperf., Gn 14:23; even after a simple imperfect, Jer 10:4 *with nails ... they fasten it* (וְלֹא יִפְיֶק) *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 וְיִתְאַוּ *should he desire ... then ...*; 104:20 וְיִהְיֶה ... תִּשָּׁחַת *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 (וְיִעַל), 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 (וְלֹא־תִסְרֵף, but see above, d). In 2 K 6:27 וְלֹא־יִוָּשַׁעְךָ *(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

<sup>1</sup> 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 (מֵהָיִי סָרָה, but cf. above, d); Jb 9:33 *there is no daysman betwixt us, that might lay* (תִּשָּׂא, hence plainly a *subjunctive*=*qui ponat*; also in Nu 23:19 יִכְתֹּב, נָ 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*, וְיִבֶן, *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<sup>e</sup>ré* (מֵהָיִי לָלֵךְ, *K<sup>e</sup>th. גִּילֵל*), 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 יִשָּׂא בִּי, but immediately afterwards תִּשָּׂא), Dn 8:12, —but also in shortened forms, such as יִהְיֶה Gn 49:17 (Sam; יִהְיֶה), 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-mentioned 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,<sup>1</sup> 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 אָ 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 אָ), 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*)<sup>2</sup> or promise, e. g. Is 65:18 *but be ye glad*, &c. (i. e. ye will have continually occasion to

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> On the close relation between the imperative and *jussive* (both in meaning and form), cf. § 46 and § 48 i.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> 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<sup>al</sup>* with a passive meaning, e. g. Gn 42:16 וְאַתֶּם הֶאֱסָרוּ and *ye shall be bound*; Dt 32:50, Is 49:9 (Is 45:22, see below, f).

Rem. 1. The particle אָ 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 לִי Gn 23:13 (at the end of verses 5 and 14 also read לִי for לִי and join it to the following imperative) is due to an anacoluthon. Instead of the imperfect which would be expected here after לִי, 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 וְאַתֶּם עֲשׂוּ וְחַיִּיִּם *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 (וְהָיָה וְשָׁעַרְתֶּם), Jer 6:16, Am 5:4, 6, Ps 37:27, Pr 3:3f., 4:4, 7:2, 13:20 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, Jb 2:9, 2 Ch 20:20; in Jer 25:5, Jb 22:21 אָ 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 רְעוּ עַמִּים וְחִזְקוּ תוֹרֵי וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל *(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 הִקְהֵל רִשׁ *(where רִשׁ is virtually, as it were, an object to הִקְהֵל) begin, take in possession for to take in possession* (cf., however, Ju 19:6 הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לַיהוָה וְלֹא תִלְוֶה לַיָּמִים וְלַלַּיְלָה *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 לָךְ (לָכֵן), קוּמ, (קוּמוּ), 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*, וְחַיִּיִּם *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 הוֹצֵא *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*, וְכִי, כִּי *that ye may bless*, &c.—In Nu 5:19 the imperative without ך (in 32:23 with ך) 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 (עַמְּךָ, according to Qimḥi an infinitive, in which case, however, the infinitive absolute עַמְּךָ should be read; but probably we should simply read עַמְּךָ with Moore), Mi 1:13 and Zc 13:7 (after עֲוִירִי); 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 immediately<sup>1</sup> 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 imperfections with *wāw consecutive* (on this interchange of tenses cf. § 49 a, and especially § 112 a), e. g. Gn 3:1 *now the serpent was* (הָיָה) *more subtil ... and he said* (וַיֹּאמֶר) *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 perfect<sup>2</sup> (viz. הָיָה *it came to pass*), e. g. Is 6:1 *in the year that king Uzziah died, I saw* (וַיֵּרָא), &c.; Gn 22:4, 27:34, Ju 11:16, 1 S 4:19, 17:57, 21:6, Ho 11:1; on the use of וַיִּקְרָא 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 ך 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 imperfections, 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* (וַיִּקְרָא) *the light Day, and the darkness he called* (וַיִּקְרָא) *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. וַיֵּרָא עֵשָׂו ... וַיֵּלֶךְ *when Esau saw that ..., he went*, &c.; so also, frequently וַיִּשְׁמַע, &c., Gn 37:21, &c. On the other hand, a second *imperfect consecutive* is seldom used in an explanatory sense, e. g. Ex

1 <sup>1</sup> On an apparent exception (the *imperf. consec.* at the beginning of whole books) see § 49 b note.

2 <sup>2</sup> 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 (וַתֹּאמֶר *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 (וַתֵּלֶךְ), 36:32 (וַיִּמְלֹךְ), 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 (καὶ ἔγινετο) *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 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 וְ or וּ 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 אָשָׁר *when*, Gn 12:11, 20:13, מִזֶּמֶן *from the time that*, Gn 39:5; or, finally, by a noun-clause (cf. § 116 u), e. g. 2 K 13:21 וַיְהִי הֵם קֹבְרִים אִישׁ אֶת אִשׁוֹ *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 וַהֲבֵינָהּ); 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, וַיִּמְאַסְךָ 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 וּפִי יִלְגְּשׁוּ *and (as to) his concubine ...*, וַתֵּבֶרֶת *she bare*, &c.; Ex 38:24, Nu 14:36f., 1 S 14:19, 17:24, 2 S 4:10, 19:41 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, 21:16, 1 K 9:20f., 12:17, 2 K 25:22, Jer 6:19, 28:8, 33:24, 44<sup>25,2</sup>.—In 1 K 15:13, 2

1<sup>1</sup> Exhaustive statistics of the use of וַיְהִי in its many and various connexions are given by König in *ZAW*. 1899, p. 260 ff.

2<sup>2</sup> Cf. the *Mēša*□ inscription, l. 5 (*Omri*) *the king of Israel*, וַיַּעֲבֹד *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, וַיְהִי before וַעֲשֵׂה.

K 16:14 the preceding noun, used absolutely, is even regarded as the object of the following imperfect consecutive, and is therefore introduced by  $\text{וְהָיָה}$ .

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  $\text{וַיִּקַּח}$   $\text{וְהָיָה הַשָּׂדֶה וְגו'$  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*,  $\text{וַיִּתְּקַן יוֹנָתָן וְגו'$  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  $\text{וַיִּתְּקַן יְהוָה}$  so that my mother should have been ... Another instance of the kind perhaps (if the text be correct) is Jer 38:9  $\text{וַיָּמָת יְרֵמְיָהוּ}$  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)*,  $\text{וְהָיָה יְרֵאָי}$  that thou art (must needs be) afraid? Ps 144:3 (cf. Ps 8:5, where in a very similar context  $\text{כִּי}$  that is used with the imperfect); Gn 12:19 ( $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַח אֱלֹהֵי מִצְרָיִם}$ ); 31:27  $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַח אֱלֹהֵי מִצְרָיִם}$  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  $\text{וַיִּבְרָךְ יְהוָה}$  is the continuation of a preterite, contained, according to the sense, in the preceding  $\text{וַיִּשְׁרַח אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ .—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, וְהָיָה וְגו' 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* (שָׂמְחָה) *and my glory rejoiceth* (וַיִּגְלֵ); Is 3:16 (parallel with a simple imperfect). Cf. also such examples as Ps 29:10 וַיֵּשֶׁב (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* (וַיִּצְאֵ) *like a flower, and is cut down* (וַיִּמָּלֵ); *he fleeth* (וַיִּבְרַח) *also as a shadow*, וְלֹא יִצְמֹד *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* (וַיָּמוּת) *and becometh powerless* (וַיִּהְיֶה לֵישָׁן), &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 (וַיִּהְיֶה לָּךְ, הֲמִי for which in verse 12 and in 43:5 we have וַיִּמְדֶּה לָּךְ, הֲמִי *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* (בֹּרַחַ) *and mourneth* (וַיִּתְאַבֵּל) *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 וַיִּקְרָא לְאֱלֹהִים *who called upon God*, וַיַּעַבְדֵהוּ *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 ו); 5:16 (cf. 2:11, 17, where the same threat is expressed by the perfect consecutive); 5:25, 9:5, 10f., 13<sup>15.17</sup> ff., 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Also in Jer 51:29 the imperfects consecutive are attached to the threat virtually contained in the preceding imperatives. On the other hand וַיִּהְיֶה לָּךְ 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 וַיִּהְיֶה לָּךְ, and Ewald reads וַיִּהְיֶה לָּךְ—In Ez 28:16 (cf. Jer 15:6f.) וַיִּשְׁמַע לְךָ appears to announce an action irrevocably determined upon, and therefore represented as already accomplished; cf. the prophetic perfects in verse 17 ff.

9:16 אָמַרְתִּי לְיְהוָה וְהוֹדִיעַ לִּי אֶת־קוֹל אֱלֹהֵי מִצְרָיִם if I had called, and he had answered me, yet ...; Ps 139:11 אִם לֹא אֶמַּר 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 לִּי 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.<sup>2</sup> 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 (וַיֹּאמְרוּ), This is his wife: and they will kill me (וְהָרְגוּ אֶת־יְהוָה) but thee they will save alive (וְהָצִילְךָ יְהוָה).

<sup>2</sup> 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 אָדָּן יָצְעָהּ אֶלְמָהּ *there went up a mist* (again and again) *from the earth*, וְהִשְׁקָהּ *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 (וְהָיָה *and it became* again every time; וְהָיָה would mean, and it became so once for all); 29:2f. (four perfects consecutive referring to actions repeated daily); Ex 33:7–11 יָקָהּ *he used to take* at each new encampment *the tent*, וַיִּנָּטְהָ *and to pitch it* again every time *without the camp*; notice, amongst the numerous frequent. perf. 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 תַּעֲשֶׂהָ *she used to make* ... וְהֵבִיאָהּ *and brought it to him* from year to year; 27:9 (וְלָקָהּ), 1 K 14:28, 2 K 3:25, 12:15 (in verses 16<sup>f</sup> imperfects occur again). So also in dependent sentences, Gn 6:4 (וְהָיָה לָדוֹן as a continuation of וַיִּבְרָא), Jb 31:29.<sup>1</sup>

(β) After an imperfect consecutive, e.g. Ex 39:3 (Samaritan וּקִצְצוּ), 1 S 5:7 (? see § 112 rr), 7:16, 2 S 15:2, 5, 16:13 *and he threw stones at him*, וַעֲפָר *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 (וַעֲשֶׂהָ לּוֹ) *i.e. as often as he needed a new garment*<sup>2</sup>; Gn 31:7, Nu 11:8, 1 S 16:14, 2 K 3:4, Ps 22:6;<sup>3</sup> in interrogative sentences, 1 S 26:9 *who has ever*, &c.; Ps 80:13, Jb 1:1, 4, Ru 4:7.

---

1<sup>1</sup> Also in Ez 44:12 (where Stade, *ZAW.* v. 293, would read וַיִּהְיוּ וַיְשִׁי *and they continually ministered and so always became afresh* ...)

2<sup>2</sup> Driver, on this passage, rightly refers to 1 S 2:19.

3<sup>3</sup> Am 4:7 would also come under this head, if וְהִקְטַרְתָּ is really intended, and the statement refers to the past; מִן־עֵתִי 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 *עֲלִי־רִרְפוֹ* because he did pursue his brother, *וַיִּשְׁחַת* and (on each occasion) *דִּיד עָסַף אֶת־כָּל־רַחֲמֵי* (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 (*וְנִקְרָא*), &c., frequentative, as a continuation of *עַל־מְדִימִים*, verse 2); 1 S 2:22, 2 S 17:17.<sup>4</sup>

(ζ) After other equivalents of tenses, e.g. Gn 47:22 *וַיֵּלֶךְ הַכֹּהֲנָן וַיֹּאכְלוּ* 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 *וַיֵּזַבֵּן* is accustomed to leave) ... *וַיִּדְבֶקֶת* and cleaves, &c., here, as frequently elsewhere, clearly with the secondary idea of purpose, i.e. in order to cleave; Is 5:11 (if *וַיִּהְיֶה* is to be taken as a continuation of *וַיִּדְלִיקֶם*); 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 *וְיָמַת אִישׁ וַיָּמָת* (instead of *וְיָמָת* there is in verse 20, &c. *וְיָמָת* 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. *וְלֹא־תִשְׁטַלְטְלוּ* will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery (simple infinitives absolute; cf. § 113 ee), *וַיָּבֹאוּ* 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. *וַיִּשְׁפֹּט* 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 *וְאִם־* Gn 32:9, Ex 19:5, 1 S 1:11, or *כִּי* Gn 37:26, or *הִנֵּן* Jer 3:1; in final clauses after *וְעַתָּה* Gn 12:13, Nu 15:40, Is 28:13; after *וְאִשְׁרֵי* Dt 2:25, or *כִּי־* 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.

<sup>4</sup> That *וְהָלְכָה*, &c., are frequentatives (*the maidservant used to go repeatedly and tell them*) may be seen from *וַיִּלְכוּ* (necessarily an imperfect, since it is separated from *וְ* by *הָ*) and *וַיִּבְלֶהוּ*; on the other hand in verse 18 *וַיִּבְרָא* and *וַיִּלְכוּ* 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 מְאֹרֹת ... וְהָיוּ ... *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 לֵךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ *go and tell* (that thou mayst tell), &c., and often, *perf. consec.* after לֵךְ (as also the *perf. consec.* of אָמַר and דָּבַר 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 אֲתוֹ וְהִפְרִיתִי אֹתוֹ הִנֵּה בְרַךְ כְּתִי אֲתוֹ וְהִנֵּה בְרַךְ כְּתִי אֲתוֹ *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*, אָנֹכִי מְמַטֵּיר *and I will cause it to rain ...* וְהָיוּ יְתֵי *and I will* (i.e. in order to) *destroy*, &c.; Jer 21:9; also with a different subject, Gn 24:43 f. *the maiden which cometh forth* (הַיְצֵאתָ) ... אֶלְיָה *to whom I shall say ...*, וְאָמַרְתָּ *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) ... וְאָמַרְתִּי לָהֶם *and shall say unto them ...*, וְאָמְרוּ *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-בֹּאוֹי אֵלַי יָבֵן *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 וְקָמוּ *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*, וְנִדְעָתִי, וְנִדְעָתִי *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*, וְכִּי לִפְתָּחֵי שְׂפָתַי תִּפְתָּח וְיִשָּׁא אֶת־לִפְתָּחֵי שְׂפָתַי וְיִשָּׁא אֶת־לִפְתָּחֵי שְׂפָתַי וְיִשָּׁא אֶת־לִפְתָּחֵי שְׂפָתַי *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 וְנִשְׂאֶתְּם 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 וְהָיָה<sup>1</sup> *and it shall come to pass* (cf. the analogous continuation in the past by means of וַיְהִי, § 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 (וְהָיָה כִּי=*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 וְהָיָה לְךָ (before הָיָה לְךָ), and in Jer 42:17 וְהָיָה לְךָ (before אֲנִי וְהָיָה לְךָ).

2. The jussive form וְהָיָה occurs (in the sense described in y) instead of וְהָיָה 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) וְהָיָה would be expected (see below, bb). In 1 K 14:5 the form is a textual error, and the pointing should simply be וְהָיָה. In the other passages וְהָיָה (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 אָנֹכִי). 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 (וְנִמְלֶתְּם *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 וְהָיָה. 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*), וְיִעַבְדְּתָנִי *and shouldst thou then serve me for naught?* or with a positive statement, e.g. Ex 5:5 (וְהִשְׁבַּתְתָּם *will ye then make them rest?*); Nu 16:10, 1 S 25:11, and (if it is *Mil<sup>r</sup>ra*) Ps 50:21 (וְהָיָה לְךָ שִׂחִי).

(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 (וְנָעְלָה of annual festival journeys); 13:21 (where, however, the text appears radically corrupt);

<sup>1</sup> On the various combinations with וְהָיָה see König's statistics in *ZAW*. xix. 272 ff.

27:9 (וְהָיָה, i.e. every time, therefore continued by means of וְהָיָה אֲלֵהֶם); 1 K 5:7 (וְכִלְכְּלוּ), 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 וְהָיָה (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<sup>a</sup>, where the verb is separated from the *Wāw* by an insertion, we find לֹא יָשִׂים *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. וְהָיָה, contrary to what would be expected, is continued by means of the imperfect consecutive, and in 1 S 13:22 by אֲלֵהֶם 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 sentences<sup>1</sup> (§ 159 g, o, s):

(α) After אִם with the imperfect, e.g. 2 K 7:4b וְנָמְתָנוּ אִם יִמְיֹתָנוּ *if they kill us*, (well then) *we shall but die*; here the perfect consecutive is used obviously with greater emphasis than the imperfect (וְנָמְתָנוּ) 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 אִם with the perfect (in the sense of a *futurum exactum*), Nu 5:27, 2 K 5:20, 7<sup>4a</sup>, Is 4:4 f.; as precativ apodosis after אִם־נָא with the *perf. preteritum*, Gn 33:10; as a frequentative perfect consecutive, to represent past events in the apodosis after אִם with a perfect, Gn 38:9, Nu 21:9, Ju 6:3, Jb 7:4; after אִם 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.<sup>2</sup> Frequentative with reference to the past, after כִּי with frequentative perfect, Ju 2:18, Jb 7:13f.

(δ) After אֲשֶׁר with the imperfect, Gn 44:9 וְנָמַת ... אֲשֶׁר יִמְצָא אֹתוֹ *with whomsoever ... it be found, let him die*; with the perfect, Ex 21:13 וְאִם יִשְׁכַּח אִתּוֹ אִשׁוֹ *and if a man lie not in wait, &c.*; Ju 1:12.

<sup>1</sup> In a number of the examples of this kind the protasis is already loosely connected by means of וְהָיָה, and hence some of them had to be already mentioned above, under y, bb, ee.

<sup>2</sup> 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, וְיָמִי should be read for כִּי.

(ε) Very frequently after a perfect consecutive (one or more) containing the condition, e.g. Gn 44:29 והורדתם ... וילקחתם גם-את-זה *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. ... ויבא הַאֲרִי וַיִּצֵּא אֹתִי *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 וַלְאִ with an imperfect<sup>1</sup>).

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 הָמָה; 33:4 on account of דָּמוֹ.—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 וַיִּאֶסֶף הוּא suggests the special case, rather than a repeated occurrence; cf. 2 S 15:2. Conversely, in 1 S 2:16 (וַיִּאֲמַר perhaps a mere mistake for וַיִּצְמַח), 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 ... וַיִּעַרְל זָכָר *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.

(b) The perfect consecutive serves as the apodosis to causal clauses; thus e.g. after וַיַּעַן with the perfect, Is 3:16 f.; after וַיִּשְׁפָּר with perfect, 1 K 20:28; after וַיִּקַּב with perfect, Nu 14:24; also after what are equivalent to causal clauses, e.g. Ps 25:11 (לְמַעַן) וְסָלַחְתָּ *for thy name's sake ... pardon ...*; Is 37:29 after וַיַּעַן with an infinitive.

(c) The perfect consecutive occurs as the apodosis to temporal clauses or their equivalents, e.g. 1 S 2:15 וַיָּבֹא ... וַעַר הַכֹּהֵן *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. וַיָּבֹא ... וְכִי יִשָּׂא זֶבֶח *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 בְּיוֹם 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 וַעֲרֵב וַיִּדְעֻם *at even (when it becomes evening) then ye shall know*; cf. verse 7, Lv 7:16, 1 K 13:31, Pr 24:27.

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 ך 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,<sup>2</sup> 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 ךָ עָמִיד; 2 K 11:1 *K<sup>e</sup>th.* וְרָאִתָּה; 14:14 וְלָקַח (in the parallel passage, 2 Ch 25:24, the word is wanting); 2 K 23:4 וְנָשָׂא, &c.; verse 10 וְנָטְמָא, &c.; verse 12 וְהִשְׁלִיךְ, &c.; verse 15 וְשָׁרַף, &c.<sup>3</sup> Cf. also Ez 37:2, 7, 10.

(b) The text is certainly corrupt in Is 40:6 (read with the LXX and Vulgate וְאֵין מֵרָחֵק); Jer 38:28, where the narrative breaks off in the middle of the sentence; 40:3 (וְהָיָה, &c., wanting in the LXX); also in Ju 7:13 וְנִפְלָה הָאֵל הָלְלֵךְ is altogether redundant; in 1 S 3:13 read, with Klostermann, the 2nd sing. masc. instead of וְהִגְדַּתִּי; in 1 K 21:12 וְהִשָּׂא יָבִי is, no doubt, incorrectly repeated from verse 9, where it is an imperative.

Of other questionable instances, (α) 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 וְאָמַר 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, Ezr 8:36.

(β) A longer or constant continuance in a past state is perhaps represented by the perfect with ך (as a variety of the frequentative perfect with ך), 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 <sup>1</sup> Mayer Lambert, *REJ.* xxvi. 55, is probably right in pointing some of these forms as *infin. abs.* instead of *perfects*.

2 <sup>2</sup> In the whole of *Qoheleth* the imperfect consecutive occurs only in 1:17 and 4:1, 7. Several of the perfects with ך 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 ך, in Nehemiah only six, and in Esther six or seven.

3 <sup>3</sup> Stade in *ZAW.* v. 291 ff. and in *Ausgewählte 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 ך. He considers that the whole section, 2 K 23:4 from וְנָשָׂא to verse 5 inclusive, is to be regarded as a gloss, since the continuation of an imperfect consecutive by means of a perfect with ך 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 וְהִשְׁבִּיתָ, verse 8 וְנָתַן, and verse 14 וְשָׁבַר. *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 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, <sup>1</sup> 16:18 (read וְעָלוּ, 1 S 4:19, 17:38, 2 S 16:5, 19:18 f. (read וְלָחוּ, וְעָבְרוּ and וְעָבְרוּ), 1 K 3:11 (where ושאלת is, no doubt intentionally, assimilated to the four other perfects); 13:3, 20:21; 2 K 14:7 (where, with Stade, וְאֶת־הָסֵף לַע תִּפֹּשׁ should be read); 14:14, 18:4 (where, at any rate, וְשָׁבַר might be taken as a frequentative, but not וּכְרַת, &c.; evidently the perfects are co-ordinated only in form with הוּא הִסִּיר); 18:36, 21:15, 24:14, Jer 37:15 (where וְהָכִי, but not וְנָתַן, might be frequentative); Ez 9:7 (omit וְיָצְאוּ with Stade, and read וְהָכִי); 20:22 (Mil<sup>1</sup>él before an imperfect consecutive); Am 7:4 (וְאֶכְלָה 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 וְיָהִי is to be read throughout instead of וְהָיָה, but in Gn 38:5 וְהָיָה 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,<sup>1</sup> 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 טוב ל'א טוב ל'א דבש הרבות ל'א טוב *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) הַשְׁקֵט נָח טָה quietness (prop. to find rest) and confidence.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Or does ונעל, as a frequentative, imply fastening with several bolts? It is, at all events, to be noticed, that in 2 S 13:18 also ונעל follows an imperfect consecutive. *ZDMG*. *ZDMG*. = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.

<sup>1</sup> The infinitive absolute can never be joined with a genitive or a pronominal suffix.

(c) As object, Is 1:17 לְמַדּוּ הַיָּטִיב *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 (עֲשֵׂה and פֹּרֵץ virtually depend on the idea of the wish contained in עֲשֵׂה); Is 22:13, where a long series of infinitives absolute is governed by הִנֵּה, and 59:13 (six infinitives governed by יָד, עָנּוּם in verse 12); Dt 28:56 is strange since the object precedes the infinitive absolute which governs it,<sup>2</sup> 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 לֹא 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 בְּמִטְאָטָא הַשְּׂמַד *with the besom of destruction*; so perhaps also 4:4 בְּרוּחַ בְּעֵר; cf. further, Pr 1:3, 21:16. The infinitive absolute is never used in immediate connexion with prepositions<sup>3</sup> (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 ... בְּאֵלֵי הַיָּם ... בָּתְתַתְּךָ לוֹ לֶחֶם וְשָׂאוֹל לוֹ בְּאֵלֵי הַיָּם *in that thou hast given him bread ... and hast enquired of God for him*; Ez 36:3; 1 S 25:26, 33 (after מִן); after לְ Ex 32:6, Jer 7:18, 44:17.

(e) Governing an accusative of the object, e.g. Is 22:13 הָרַג בְּקֶרֶן וְשָׁחַם צֹאן *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 מְאַוֵּס בְּרָע וּבָחֹר *to refuse the evil and choose the good*; Pr 15:12 (הוֹכֵחַ לוֹ).

If the object be a personal pronoun, then, since the infinitive absolute can never be united with a suffix (see the note on <sup>a</sup>), it is affixed by means of the accusative-sign אֶת (תּ), e.g. Jer 9:23 תִּי אֶתְּיָדוּעַ *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*<sup>1</sup> 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*, הַשְּׂלַךְ סָחֹב וְהַשְּׂלַךְ *a drawing and casting forth*, i.e. being drawn and cast forth, &c.; Gn 21:16 הֲרִיקָה *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 הֵחֵל וְכִלָּה *a beginning and ending*, i.e. from beginning to end); 2 S 8:2, Is 7:11 הַעֲמִיק and הִגְבִּיהַ, 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 (הִסְתַּר *in hiding*, sc. my face); Jer 3:15 (וְהַשְּׂפִיל *with knowledge and understanding*); Hb

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps הִצִּיג according to § 53 k should be explained as an infinitive construct, or should be written הִצִּיג.

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> 1 S 1:9 is impossible Hebrew, and as the LXX shows, a late addition.

<sup>1</sup> 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 (עָרוֹת, for the form cf. § 75 aa); Zc 7:3, Ps 35:16 (הָרָק, to define more precisely וְהָרָק, verse 15); Jb 15:3.<sup>2</sup>

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 כָּתוּת; the Masora requires כְּתוּת) *without sparing*.

2. A few infinitives of this kind, all of which are in Hiph<sup>o</sup>l, have, through frequent use, come to be treated by the language as simple adverbs; so especially הִרְבֵּה (cf. § 75 ff) *multum faciendo*, i.e. *multum*, very frequently strengthened by מְאֹד *very* and even used without connexion with a finite verb (see the Lexicon); also הֵיטֵב *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, הֶשְׁכֵּם *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 וְהָעֶרֶב a denominative from עָרַב *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* (הָעֵד־תִּי) *unto your fathers ... rising early and protesting*, i.e. with earnest protestation; Jer 25:3, 26:5 (where ו should be omitted before ה); 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*.<sup>1</sup>

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 אִם יִצְעַק אֵלַי *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 תָּמוּת *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

---

<sup>2</sup> Also in 2 K 21:13 for מָחָה וְהָפַךְ read with Stade and Klostermann מָחָה וְהָפַךְ; similarly, with Stade, הָקֵשׁ in Ju 4:24; וְהָזוּק in Jer 23:14, and on Is 31:5 cf. t.

<sup>1</sup> 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 אָךְ Gn 44:28 (but 27:30 *and Jacob was yet scarce gone out, &c.*); Gn 43:3 בּוּ נִשְׂאֵל לְנִשְׂאֵל *he did solemnly protest unto us*; 1 S 20:6 נִשְׂאֵל לְנִשְׂאֵל *David earnestly asked leave of me*; Jos 17:13, Ju 1:28 וְהִדְרִישׁ לֹא הִדְרִישׁוּ *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* וְגַי אֲשַׁמְדִּיד אֲשַׁמְדִּיד *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 אִם, &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 לוּ 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 (קָנִי אֶקְנֶה) 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 wouldst 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. אָכַל לֵךְ אָכַל *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 וְעַלֵּינוּ תִּמְלֹךְ *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 intensify<sup>1</sup> 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 שְׁמַעוּ שְׁמַעוּ *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 אֲנִי 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 שְׁמַעוּ שְׁמַעוּ *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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 *לְכוּ הֵלֶךְ וְנָעוּ* *lowing as they went* (lowing continually; so after a participle, Jos 6:13b *Q<sup>ê</sup>rê*); Gn 8:7 *it went forth to and fro*<sup>2</sup>; 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 וְנָעוּק is preferable], in both places as perfect frequentative; Is 31:5 referring to the future, unless with Stade, *ZAW*. vi. 189, we read וְנָעוּק and וְנָעוּקִיט), 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 הֵלֶךְ *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 הֵלֶךְ precedes), but in cases where הֵלֶךְ 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 וְשׁוּב הֵלֶךְ וְשׁוּב *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 וְיָבִיחַ, 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.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, in 1 S 17:41 the participle הֵלֶךְ is used instead of the infinitive absolute. Of a different kind are the instances in which the participle הֵלֶךְ 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,<sup>2</sup> e.g. Ex 5:23 לֹא-הֵצַלְתָּ לִּי אֶת-הַצֵּלָה *neither hast thou delivered at all*, Ju 15:13, Jer 13:12, 30:11; cf. Mi 1:10 (אֶל). 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; וְצָהָר in the same verse must also, according to the Masora, certainly be the infinitive absolute Qal; see § 67 o), and so always מוֹת יוֹמָת *he shall surety 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

<sup>2</sup> Also in Ez 1:14 for the distorted form רָצוּא reads simply יָצוּא יָצוּא.

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

<sup>1</sup> Cf. in French, *Le mal va toujours croissant, la maladie va toujours en augmentant et en empirant, 'continually increases and becomes worse and worse.'*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Rieder, *Quo loco ponantur negationes et לֹא אֶל ...* (*Zeitschrift für Gymn. Wesen*, 1879, p. 395 ff.).

read, with Driver, the *infin. Niph.* in both places, הַקְפִּידָה and הַקְרַב); 1 S 2:16 (Pi□ēl for Hiph□îl, unless יִקְטְרוּן is to be read); Ez 16:4 (Hoph□al for Pu□al).<sup>3</sup> Finally, the infinitive absolute may equally well be represented by a *substantive* of kindred stem.<sup>1</sup> 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 (בָּגַם קָוָה; cf. Ru 2:16 לְגַם שׁוֹלֵל); Jer 50:34 (רִיב קָרִיב); Pr 23:1 (בֵּין תְּבִינִי). In the last instances the infinitive is probably assimilated to the imperfect, like the infinitive Niph□al in the forms noticed in § 51 k and note.—Cf. also 2 K 3:24 וְהַכּוֹת אִוּבֹא וְהָיָה בֵּן אִוּבֹא (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 (הָבִי לְ), all in rapid style; *after* the verb, Jos 7:7, unless הַעֲבִיר 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*, וְסוּר *and have turned aside* (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, וְהִלְבֵּשׁוּ אֹתוֹ), 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;<sup>2</sup> after the *perfect consecutive*, Zc 12:10; after the *perfect frequentative* 1 K 9:25 (unless וְהִקְטִיר 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 וַיִּרְכַּב); Ex 8:11, Ju 7:19, Jer 37:21, Neh 8:8, 1 Ch 16:36, 2 Ch 7:3; with אִוּ 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 אָרַץ, 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

<sup>3</sup> In three passages even the infinitive absolute of another stem of like sound occurs; but in Is 28:28 אֲדוֹשׁ is no doubt a mere textual error for דוֹשׁ, and in Jer 8:13, according to § 72 aa, we should read אָסְפִים, and in Zp 1:2 אֲסַף. Barth, *Nom.-bildung*, § 49 b, sees in אֲדוֹשׁ and אֲסוֹף infinitives Hiph□l□l, exactly corresponding in form to <sup>a</sup>qām[ā] the Aram. *infin.* Aph□ēl of קִיַּם; but there is no more evidence for a *Hiph.* of דוֹשׁ in Hebrew than for a stem אֲדוֹשׁ.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> In Ez 7:14 a perfect appears to be continued by means of an infinitive construct; but the text is quite corrupt; Cornill reads יָנוּ הַכּוֹת הַכּוֹת.

from the context. The infinitive absolute is most frequently used in this way, corresponding to the infinitive of command in Greek, &c.<sup>1</sup>:—

(α) For an emphatic imperative,<sup>2</sup> e.g. שָׁמֹר (thou shalt, ye shall), *observe* Dt 5:12; זָכוֹר (thou shalt) *remember*, Ex 13:3, 20:8 (the full form occurs in Dt 6:17 וְזָכוֹר תִּזְכָּר; 7:18 וְזָכוֹר תִּזְכָּר; 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 הִבִּיט Ps 142:5 may be only an incorrect spelling of הִבֵּט imperative.<sup>3</sup>

(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 22:13ב אֲכֹל וְנִשְׂתוּ (the exclamation of the mocker); Ez 21:31, 23:30, 46; perhaps also Jer 31:2 (הִלֹּךְ).<sup>4</sup>

(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?*<sup>5</sup> (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 כָּל־זָכָר 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.

---

1 <sup>1</sup> Cf. also such infinitives in French as *voir* (page so and so, &c.), *s'adresser* ..., *se méfier des voleurs!*

2 <sup>2</sup> Praëtorius, *op. cit.*, p. 547: the extraordinarily common use of the infinitive form *qāṭōl* in the sense of an imperative, jussive, or cohortative has long since caused it to be compared with the Arab. *faāli*. It thus appears that the infin. *qāṭōl* in Hebrew could be used from early times as a kind of fixed, invariable word of command.

3 <sup>3</sup> In Ez 21:31, for the infinitives construct הִסִּיר, הָרִים, הִשְׁפִּיל (beside הִגִּבָּה) read with Cornill the infinitives absolute הִסֵּר, &c. The K<sup>c</sup>thîbh probably intends הִסִּיר, &c.

4 <sup>4</sup> In 2 S 3:18 the infinitive construct appears to be used instead of the cohortative, but הוֹשִׁיעַ should certainly be read for אוֹשִׁיעַ. 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 אֶתְהַפֵּשׂ נָא בֵּא.

5 <sup>5</sup> In Jb 34:18 in a similar question instead of the infinitive constr. we should rather expect the infinitive absolute (הִזְמַר), unless with the LXX and Vulg. the participle with the article (הַזֹּמֵר) 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 הָיְוֹתָ הָאָדָם לְבַדּוֹ, 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 טוֹב לְשָׁכֵת 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 סִפּוּד וְעֵת רִקּוּד 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 אֲדַע צֵאת וְבֹא 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 אָחַ), 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 εἶναι, διὰ τὸ εἶναι, &c.) may usually be resolved in English into the finite verb with a conjunction, e.g. Nu 35:19 בְּפָגְעוֹ-בּוֹ in *his meeting him*, i.e. if (as soon as) he meets him; Gn 27:45 (עַד-שׁוּב) because ye *despise*; Jer 2:35 עַל-אֲמַרְךָ because *thou sayest*; Gn 27:1 וְעֵינָיו הָיוּ כְּמָרָא from *seeing*, i.e. so that he could not see.

This use of the infinitive construct is especially frequent in connexion with בְּ or כִּי to express time-determinations (in English resolved into a temporal clause, as above the combination of the infinitive with עַן or עַל- is resolved into a causal clause), especially after וַיְהִי (see the examples, § 111 g), e.g. 1 S 2:27 בְּהִיְוָתָם בְּמִצְרַיִם *when they were in Egypt*; Gn 24:30 וַיְהִי כִּי רָאָתָהּ וְכִשְׁמָעוֹ וְגו' ... וְכִשְׁמָעוֹ וְגו' *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.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. § 45 g, according to which the close union of the לְ with the first consonant of the infinitive (לְכַתּוֹב with a firmly closed syllable, as opposed to כְּכַתּוֹב, כִּכְתּוֹב, &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 לְפָנוֹת רֵבֶךָ 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*, לֵרְאֹת אֶת־הָעִיר, *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* לֵהָיִית לְךָ לְאִשׁוֹ הַ לְּבֵנָה *to be* (i.e. that she may be) *thy wife*; cf. Gn 28:4, Jer 38:26 (לְמִוִּת).—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 בּוֹא; Ju 15:10, 1 S 17:25 with עָלָה.

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 הָיָה *to be*, with ל and an infinitive. In fact הָיָה לְ עֲשׂוֹת 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 הָיָה לְ עֲשׂוֹת corresponds to the Latin *faciendum erat*, cf. also the English *I am to go*. In both cases הָיָה (as elsewhere when copula) is often omitted.

Examples of (a) Gn 15:12 *and when the sun was going down* (just about to set); 2 Ch 26:5 *and he set himself to seek God* (here with the secondary idea of a continuous action); with the omission of הָיָה Is 38:20, *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 (אֶל־מִצָּא *consecuturus est*, unless we simply read יִמְצָא with the LXX)<sup>1</sup>; 20:25, Ec 3:15 *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 *and the gate was to be shut* (had to be shut); Is 37:26, Ps 109:13.<sup>2</sup> Mostly with the omission of הָיָה, e.g. 2 K 4:13 *what is to be done for thee?* (הֲיִשׁ לְדַבֵּר־לְךָ) *wouldst thou be* (lit. is it to be) *spoken for to the king, &c.?* 2 K 13:19 *it was to smite* equivalent to *thou shouldst 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 אֵל 1 Ch 5:1, 15:2; after אֵין 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 *it was upon me*, i.e. it would have been *my duty to give thee, &c.*<sup>3</sup>; cf. Mi

<sup>1</sup> 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 אֶל־מִצָּא must be read לְמִצָּא, i.e. לְמִצָּא##. But all the above instances can be taken as infinitives with ל without difficulty.

<sup>2</sup> Somewhat different are the cases where הָיָה לְ 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) *for wasting*, for which elsewhere frequently לְשִׁמָּה and the like; probably also לְבִלּוֹת Ps 49:15 is to be explained in this way, the הָיָה being omitted.

<sup>3</sup> 2 S 4:10 (*cui dandum erat mihi*) appears to be similar; it may, however, be better, with Wellhausen, to omit the אֶשְׂרָה.



4. Finally, the infinitive with לְ 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 לְשֹׁאֵל לְקֹדֶם מֶלֶךְ *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 לְ is used in this way simply by itself, e.g. 1 Ch 12:8 *as the roes upon the mountains* לְמַהֵר (as regards hastening) *in swiftness*; Gn 2:3, 2 S 14:25 (לְהֵלֵל); Is 21:1 (לְהִלְוֶה); Jo 2:26, Pr 2:2, 26:2 and so very frequently the infinitive לְאָמַר *dicendo* which has become stereotyped as an adverb to introduce direct narration (in the sense of *thus, as follows*).<sup>1</sup>

5. In a number of instances—especially in the later books—the infin. constr. with לְ 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 לְ 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,<sup>2</sup> Jb 34:8, Ec 9:1, Neh 8:13, 2 Ch 7:17.—In Lv 10:10 f. וְלֹהֲבִדֵּי לֵי might be regarded as an explanatory addition to the command contained in verse 9<sup>b</sup> (= 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 וְלִשְׂרֹב depends on the idea of receiving favour which lies in לָרַחֵם. 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, בְּהֵבְרָאָם, רָאָם when they were created* (prop. in their being created); Ju 6:18 וְגַי וְגַי *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 הַרְבֵּה (= *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<sup>1</sup> לְאָמַר is very often so used after וְיִדְבֹר 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<sup>2</sup> When Delitzsch on Ps 104:21, referring to Hb 1:17, explains the infinitive with לְ 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 לְ *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 ל' א', Jer 9:12 *because they have forsaken* (עֲלֵצְזָבְם) *my law ... and have not obeyed my voice*; Gn 39:10, 1 S 24:12, Am 1:9; without ל' א' Jb 28:25 (perf. after ל' and infin.); by a perfect with ו' (cf. § 112 i and § v) Am 1:11 *because he did pursue his brother with the sword, 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 עַד-בֹּאִי *until I come*); by a simple imperfect, e.g. Pr 1:27 (after בְּ); Is 30:26 (after בְּיּוֹם *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 ל')<sup>1</sup>; by an imperfect consecutive, e.g. Gn 39:18 *and it came to pass, as I lifted up my voice and cried, that ...*; 1 K 10:9, Jb 38:13 (after ל'); 1 K 18:18, Is 38:9, Jb 38:7, 9 ff. (after בְּ); Is 30:12, Jer 7:13, Ez 34:8 (after עַן ו').

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 ל' א' (except in the compound ל' א' בְּ, which has come to be used as a preposition, *without*, Nu 35:23, Pr 19:2), but by בְּלֹאִי, originally a substantive (see the Lexicon), with ל' prefixed (but also Nu 14:16 (מִבְּלֹאִי), e.g. Gn 3:11 *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 ל' repeated before the infinitive. In Ps 32:9 (if the text be right) בְּלֹאִי 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 verbs<sup>2</sup> *the accusative of the object*, e.g. Nu 9:15 בְּיּוֹם הַקִּיּוֹם *on the day the tabernacle was reared up*; 1 S 19:1 לְהַמִּית אֶת-דָּוִד *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 לְמַעַן יִסְמְךָ ה' *that he may establish thee*; Gn 25:26, Jer 24:7; with a verbal suffix, e.g. Ex 2:14 לְהַרְגֵנִי *to kill me*; Jer 38:26 *that he would not cause me to return* (on the suffix, cf. c). In Is 49:6 the object even precedes the infinitive with ל'; 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 *forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this*; Dt 21:16.

<sup>1</sup> 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 ו', 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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* אַתְּ, 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 עֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט *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 הָרָא for (פָּנָה) רָאָה 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 Qameṣ without exception, whereas, when connected with suffixes (i.e. with real genitives; cf. § 33 c), this Qameṣ necessarily becomes *Ṣ<sup>e</sup>wā*; e.g. Gn 18:25 לְהַמִּית צַדִּיק *to slay the righteous* (never as הַמִּית לְ, cf., on the other hand, above, (הַשִּׁיב נִי); 2 K 21:8, Ez 44:30. Similarly in such cases as Is 3:13 (Ps 50:4) instead of עַמִּים לְדִין we should rather expect לְדִין, if the infinitive were regarded as in the construct state, and עַמִּים as the genitive. Hence also in cases like Is 58:9 (שָׁלַח for הָשִׁל) 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 הוֹצֵאָה 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. לְהַשְׁמִידֵנוּ *to destroy us*, Dt 1:27 (immediately after נוּ, לְהַתְּ אֹתֵנוּ, so that נוּ is doubtless a *verbal* not a *noun*-suffix, although in form it might be either); לְהַמִּיתֵנוּ Nu 16:13, Ju 13:23 (after הַפִּיץ). Elsewhere the pronominal object is appended either by means of the accusative sign (e.g. Gn 25:26 אֲתָם prop. *in the bearing them*; יָדַעְתָּ לִּי *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 לְהַכּוֹתוֹ (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 לְהַכּוֹתְךָ Jer 40:14, cf. Mi 6:13, and even גְּדַלְךָ *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 יָכוּל דַּבְּרוֹ לְשָׁלוֹם *they could not speak to him peaceably*, cf. Zc 3:1 לִשְׂטָנוֹ *to be an adversary to him*, but ultimately even in the 1st sing., as in Nu 22:13 לְהַתִּיתִי *to give me leave* [Dt 25:7 אֲבָהָה יִבְמִי *he will not perform the duty of a husband's brother unto me*; 1 Ch 4:10 לְבַלְתִּי עֲצֹבִי *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 דַּעַת יְהוָה אֲתֵּי (prop. to know the Lord) *the knowledge of the Lord*; לִירְאָה אֹתִי *to fear me*, Dt 4:10, 5:26, 10:12; an accusative follows לְאֶהְבָּה Dt 10:12, 15, Is 56:6 (cf. also 1 K 10:9, Ho 3:1); לְהַנְפִּיחַ Is 30:28; בְּשִׁנְאָת יְהוָה אֹתֵנוּ Dt 1:27; after verbal nouns formed with the prefix מ (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 immediately<sup>1</sup> after it, either in the *genitive* or *nominative*. The subject is in the

<sup>1</sup> In Gn 24:30 the subject of פָּרָא is wanting (but בְּשִׂמְעוֹ follows); the original reading was undoubtedly תוֹ, פָּרָא, 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 *וְהוּא יְהוָה אֲוֵתָנוּ* 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 *וְלִשְׁתֹּת מַיִם לְעַמֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל* for *the people to drink* (prop. for the drinking of the people), and in cases like Gn 16:16 (*בְּלִילֵי הַגֵּר*); 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 *וְעַלֵּי אֵין יִתְּחוּ* *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 *לְשׂוּם הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל-לְבוֹ*, since, if the infinitive were used as a *nomen regens*, we should rather expect *לְשׂוּם* 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 *הַגֵּיחַ* Dt 25:19, Is 14:3, &c., the pretonic Qameṣ is retained without exception, whereas on the analogy of *הַגֵּיחַ* Ez 24:13, Jer 23:20, &c., we should expect *הַגֵּיחַ*, &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,<sup>1</sup> a distinction between the genitival and nominative constructions could not have been consciously made in the case of most infinitives, e.g. in unchangeable forms like *קָטַל*, &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 *וַיִּקְרָא קוֹלִי* 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 *וְכִי יִשָּׁקֵץ כְּבֹדֵם* 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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. מרימיו cf. § 124 k), not הַנִּירָה, as would be expected (see g above), if שָׁבַט 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 בְּשָׁלַח אֶת־וֹסַרְגֹּן 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* (מְלֹא, מְבַד, &c.) or *qāṭōl* (מְבַב, &c.), whereas the *transitive* Qal שָׂנֵא *to hate*, although it coincides in form with the intransitive Qal (as a verb middle *e*), nevertheless forms a participle active שֹׂנֵא, and participle passive שְׁנוּא (cf. the feminine שְׁנוּאָה).—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 לְעִנְיֵי שִׁפְפֵה לִּי, *men of stammering lips*, a character is ascribed to them which is inseparably connected with their personality. On the other hand Jer 20:7, describes those about the prophet as continually engaged in casting ridicule upon him. Cf. also Ps 9:18 (שִׁפְפֵה) with 50:22 (שִׁפְפֵה).

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 מֵת may mean either *moriens* (Zc 11:9), or *mortuus* (so commonly; with the article הַמֵּת regularly = *the dead man*), or *moriturus* (Dt 4:22); בָּא *coming, come* Gn 18:11, &c., *venturus* 1 S 2:31, &c.; נֹפֵל *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 (שָׁבַט *that was returned*; cf. Ezr 6:21, &c., הָשָׁבַט *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 (קָרָא), and see m below. For future participles see Gn 41:25, 1 K 18:9, Is 5:5, Jon 1:3, &c., probably also לִקְהֵי Gn 19:14. On the *futurum instans* (esp. after הִנֵּה) see p below.

(b) Of the passive participles, that of *Qal* (e.g. פְּתוּב *scriptus*) always corresponds to a Latin or Greek perfect participle passive, those of the other conjugations, especially *Niph<sup>al</sup>*, sometimes to a Latin gerundive (or to an adjective in *-bilis*), e.g. נֹרָא *metuendus*, *to be feared*, Ps 76:8, &c.; נִחְמַד *desiderandus* (*desiderabilis*) Gn 3:6, Ps 19:11, &c.; נִבְרָא *creandus* Ps 102:19; נוֹלַד, usually *natus*, but also (like הַיּוֹלֵד Ju 13:8) *procreandus*, *nasciturus* 1 K 13:2, Ps. 22:32; נִעְרַץ *terribilis* Ps 89:8; נִתְעַב *abominable* Jb 15:16; נִחְשָׁב *aestimandus* Is 2:22; הֵנָּה אֵכָלָה *that may be eaten* (an animal) Lv 11:47. In *Pu<sup>al</sup>* מְהֻלָּל *laudandus*, *worthy to be praised* Ps 18:4. In *Hoph<sup>al</sup>*, מְשַׁלֵּךְ 2 S 20:21; מְמַחֲמִים 2 K 11:2; מֵרֵעַ Is 12:5 *Q're* <sup>1</sup>

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 אִיבֵּ אֶת־דָּוִד *hating David*; Gn 42:29; with the suffix of the accusative, e.g. עָשָׂה נִי *that made me* Jb 31:15; מִי רֵאָנוּ *who seeth us?* Is 29:15 (in Is 47:10 נִי רֵאָנוּ is abnormal); רִדְמָם *ruling them* Ps 68:28, sometimes also with the article, e.g. Ps 18:33 הַמְאַזְרֵנִי *that girdeth me* (LXX ὁ κραταῖων μῆ); 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 הַרְדִּים בָּעַם *which bare rule over the people*; 2 K 20:5 הִנְנִי רֵפָא לְךָ *behold, I will heat thee.*<sup>2</sup>

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 *qāṭēl* 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 מְלֵא רוּחַ הַחֵכְמָה *full of the spirit of wisdom*; Ps 5:5 הִפְצֵי רַחֲשָׁע *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 אֲהַבֵּי שְׁמִי *that love thy name*; cf. Ps 19:8 f.; also when a verbal adjective, e.g. Gn 22:12 and often יִרְאֵה אֵל *one fearing*

<sup>1</sup> Such examples as נֹרָא, נִחְמַד, נִבְרָא, מְהֻלָּל 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.

<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, in Is. 11:9 אֲרָבִים מְכַסִּים לְיָם *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 כָּל־מְצַאֵי מֵי *whosoever findeth me* (prop. my finder; cf. עֹשֵׂי מֵי *my maker*); 12:3 יְבָרְכְךָ יְיָ *that bless thee*, מְקַלְלֶךָ *that curseth thee* (but read either יְקַלְלֶךָ, or מְבָרְכְךָ in the preceding clause); 27:29, 1 S 2:30, Is 63:13, Ps 18:49. In Jer 33:22 read מְשַׁרְתִּים אֵתִי.<sup>1</sup>

Rem. To the class of objective genitives belong also specifications of place after the participles באֵי *iniens* and יֵצֵא *egrediens*, since the verbs בוא and יצא, in the sense of *ingredi*, *egredi*, can be directly connected with an accusative; e.g. Gn 23:10, 18 שָׁעַר עָרָא *that went in at the gate of his city*; La 1:4; after יֵצֵא 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, יוֹרְדֵי־בֹר *they that go down into the pit* (the grave); Ps 88:6 שָׁכְבֵי קֶבֶר *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 קָמִי (for קָמִים עָלַי) *that rise up against me*; cf. Ex 15:7, Dt 33:11, Ps 44:6, Ex 32:25, Is 1:27 יְהַפְּכֶנָּה *her converts*; Ps 53:6 (הַנֶּחֱדָה) Pr 2:19 כָּל־בָּאֵי יְהָ *all that go unto her*; the construction is especially bold in Is 29:7 וְיִמְצָאֶנָּה *all that fight against her and her stronghold* (for וְעַל־מִי יֵהָ עָלַי יְהָ וְעַל־מִי יֵהָ וְעַל־מִי יֵהָ); Ps 102:9 even with a participle Po□al, מְהוֹלְלֵי *they that are mad against me* (?), but read perhaps with Olshausen מְהוֹלְלֵי *who pierce me*.—In Is 1:30 as *a terebinth* הַיָּבֵשׁ עָלֶיךָ *fading as regards its leaf*, it remains doubtful whether הַיָּבֵשׁ is in the absolute state, and consequently עָלֶיךָ in the accusative, or whether it is to be regarded as construct state, and עָלֶיךָ 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,<sup>2</sup> or may be connected with it in the construct state, e.g. Ju 18:11, 1 S 2:18, Ez 9:2 לְבוּשׁ בְּדָיִם *clothed in linen*, cf. verse 3 הַלְבָּשׁ הַבְּדָיִם; (even with a suffix קָרוֹעַ בְּתֹנִתוֹ *rent as regards his coat* 2 S 15:32; with the participle following Ju 1:7); but Ez 9:11 לְבוּשׁ הַבְּדָיִם *the one clothed with linen*; 2 S 13:31 קָרְעֵי

<sup>1</sup> When, as in Jb 40:19, the participle with the noun-suffix עֹשֵׂי הֵ, *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 מְשַׁרְתִּים אֵתִי *that minister unto me* (for which there is מְשַׁרְתִּים in verse 21). In Am 4:13 an accusative of the product follows the genitive of the object, עֹשֵׂה שָׁחַר עֵיפָה *maker of the morning into darkness*. In Jer 2:17 בְּעֵת מוֹלְכֶךָ is supposed to mean *at the time when he led thee*; perhaps the perfect (הוֹלֵךְ) should be read as in 6:15. In Ez 27:34, the ancient versions read עֵתָּה נִשְׁבַּרְתָּ (הַ) *now thou art broken*, instead of the difficult עֵת נִשְׁבַּרְתָּ. In 1 K 20:40 read עֹשֵׂה הַנֶּחֱדָה before הַנֶּחֱדָה.

<sup>2</sup> 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*.

בְּגָדִים *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 (נְשִׂייתָ שָׁעָ *forgiven in respect of transgression*, כְּסוּי חַטָּאָה *covered in respect of sin*); with a suffix to the noun, Pr 14:2 גְּלוּז דְרַכָּיו *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 שְׂרִפּוֹת 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 זֶהְנָה בְרוּךְ יְהוָה *blessed of the Lord* (but Ps 115:15 בְּרוּכִים לִיהוָה *see § 121 f*); cf. Is 53:4, Ps 22:7, Jb 14:1 (15<sup>14</sup>, 25:4); hence also with noun-suffixes (which are accordingly genitive) Pr 9:18 קָרְאָהּ יְהִי *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 ה' לֶךְ וְדוֹר אֶבְדָּה *one generation goeth, and another generation cometh; and the earth abideth 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 הָיָה לְךָ בֶּן *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 רָאוּ אֶת-הַקּוֹלֹת *and all the people saw the thunderings, &c.*; 1 K 1:5; in negative statements, e.g. Gn 39<sup>23 a</sup>; sometimes in relative clauses, e.g. Gn 39<sup>23 b</sup>, 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 מֵרָחֵק *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 יָשָׁב *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 ה' לֶךְ 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*, ה' בָּרְכֵךְ בְּנֵי אֶתְּהָה *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 וְהָיָה we should rather expect a perfect consecutive, it is better to explain וְנִשְׁפָּחַת 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 הִנֵּנִי, הִנֵּךְ, &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 הַגִּיָּה. In the same way, the subject may also be introduced by יֵשׁ (*est*, see the Lexicon) with a suffix, and in negative sentences by אֵין (*non est*) with a suffix, e.g. Ju 6:36 אִם־יִשְׁעֶךָ מוֹשִׁיעַ *if thou wilt save*; Gn 43:5 אִם־יִשְׁלַח יְהוָה אֶת־יָדוֹ מִשְׁלַח *if thou wilt not send*; 1 S 19:11.—In such cases as Is 14:27 יָדוֹ הַנְּטוּיָה הַזֶּה *the stretched out hand is his*, הַנְּטוּיָה is not, like נְטוּיָה 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 הִגִּיָּה in the corresponding person is sometimes added to the participle, and similarly the imperfect הִגִּיָּה, ? (or the jussive יִהְיֶה, or the imperfect consecutive) is used to emphasize an action continuing in the *future*, e.g. Jb 1:14 הַבָּקָר הָיוּ חֹרְשׁוֹת *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; הִגִּיָּה, ? with a participle is found e.g. in Is 2:2; the jussive in Gn 1:6, Ps 109:12; <sup>1</sup> and ויהי 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. הוא, e.g. Gn 24:30, 37:15, 38:24, 41:1, 1 S 10:11, 15:12, Is 29:8 (the participle always after הַגִּיָּה); 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.—הוּא is omitted in Lv 18:28; הוּא הִנֵּה 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. (אַתָּה) is omitted in Hb 2:10; the 2nd fem. (אַתְּ) in Gn 20:16 (where, however, for the participle הָתַתּ הַנְּבִיָּא the 2nd fem. perf. הָתַתּ הַנְּבִיָּא is to be read); the pronoun of the 1st sing. in Hb 1:5 (?), Zc 9:12, Mal 2:16; the 2nd plur. (אַתֶּם) 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 אֵלַי קֹרֵא *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 (מְרַיָּם 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. עוֹד זֶה מְדַבֵּר וְזֶה בָּא *he was yet speaking, and (=when) another came, &c.*<sup>1</sup>; cf. Gn 29:9, 1 S 9:11, 27, 20:36, 1 K 14:17 *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 וְהִגִּיָּה.—On the other hand, in 1 K 1:14 the noun-clause itself is introduced by הַגִּיָּה (as in verse 22 by וְהִגִּיָּה), and denotes an action only just impending.<sup>2</sup> Finally, when the

<sup>1</sup> A jussive is practically to be supplied also in the formulae of blessing and cursing, בְּרֹךְ *blessed be* ... Gn 9:26, &c.; אָרוּר *cursed art thou* ... 3:14, &c.

<sup>1</sup> 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. וְיָהִי בְדַבְּרוֹ). 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.

<sup>2</sup> At the same time the preceding עוֹד *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 הִגִּיָּה refers to the

whole sentence is introduced by means of וַיְהִי (cf. § 111 g), and the apodosis by וַהֲיָה, Gn 42:35, 2 K 2:11, 13:21; without וַהֲיָה 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 הוּא מוֹצֵאת וְהִיא שָׁלְחָה, *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 שֶׁפָּךְ דָּם הָאָדָם, *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 כָּל- *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 וַ (wāw apodosis), e.g. Ex 12:15 (with a following perfect consecutive), Nu 35:30; 1 S 2:13 עַר וְכָא נִבְּחָה וְזָבַח וְכָא נִבְּחָה וְזָבַח *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 *Keth.*; 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 כְּלִי-הַבָּא *and it came to pass, that as many as came*, &c. [or by וַהֲיָה, frequentative, Ju 19:30].—On the other hand, וַהֲנַשְׁבֵּךְ רַת 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 הָלוֹךְ 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 וַ, 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 שָׁם תִּבְלַח בְּמַדְבָּר וְעָרֵיו הָרָס *that made the world as a wilderness, and overthrew the cities thereof*<sup>1</sup>; 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> In the absence of case-endings,<sup>3</sup> this accusative can now be recognized only from the context, or by the particle תָּא (תָּא, before suffixes also תָּא, תָּא)<sup>4</sup> 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* תָּא־תֵּקַיִן Cain; 6:10, 1:1 *God created* תָּא־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ the *heaven and the earth* (but 2:4 תָּא־הָאָרֶץ וְהַשָּׁמַיִם); 1:25 *and God made* תָּא־הַחַיָּה הָאָרֶץ 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 תָּא 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

2<sup>2</sup> 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 תָּפַח (to have pleasure, usually with בָּ) to desire, מָלָא (to be full of something, also transitive) to fill, were originally intransitive. Cf. also such cases as בָּכָה to weep (generally with עַל־, אֶל־ or לְ), but also to bewail with an accusative; יָשַׁב to dwell (usually with בָּ), but also to inhabit with an accusative (cf. further, under u).— The examples are different in which verbs of motion such as בָּוֵא intrare, also aggredi, אֶצְעָ egressi (cf. § 116 h above), שָׁבַר redire, Is 52:8, take an accusative of the aim of the motion, while בָּוֵא according to the Old Semitic usage, even takes an accusative of the person (at least in poetry, equivalent to בָּוֵא אֶל־ in prose).

3<sup>3</sup> On traces of these endings, especially the remains of a former accusative ending in a, cf. § 90 c.

4<sup>4</sup> תָּא (toneless owing to the following Maqqeph), and תָּא (with a tone-long ē, תָּא only in Jb 41:26), תָּא or תָּא before the light suffixes (on all these forms cf. § 103 b: the underlying form *āth* was obscured in Hebrew to *ōth*, shortened to *āth* before suffixes beginning with a consonant and then modified to תָּא, whence finally the secondary form תָּא with the tone), Phoenician תָּא 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, *'iyyā*, Aram. תָּא, תָּא. It was no doubt originally a substantive, meaning *essence, substance, self* (like the Syriac *yāth*; on the other hand, any connexion with the Hebrew תָּא, Syriac *'āiā*, Arabic *'āyat*, 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 תָּא in Hebrew,' *Hebraica*, vi. 2, 3, and the precise statistics of the use of תָּא on p. 140 ff.), it has so little force (like the oblique cases αὐτοῦ, αὐτῶ, αὐτόν, sometimes also *ipsius, ipsum*, and the Germ. *desselben*, &c.) that it merely serves to introduce a determinate object; תָּא־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ prop. αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανὸν (cf. αὐτῆν Χρυσήϊδα, Iliad i. 143) is no stronger than the simple תָּא־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ τὸν οὐρανὸν. 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.<sup>1</sup> Finally, however, the *nota accusativi* became so customary everywhere in prose, that even the pronominal object was expressed rather by את with suffixes than by verbal suffixes, even when none of the reasons mentioned under *e* can be assigned for it; cf. Giesebrecht in *ZAW*. 1881, p. 258 ff., and the statistics of H. Petri, cited above at the head of § 58. Such examples as כִּכְלֵ אֲשֶׁר צָוָה אֱלֹהִים in Gn 6:22 in the *Priestly Code*, beside בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר-צָוָה הוֹיָהוּ ה' 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 כֹּל *entirety*, without a following article or determinate genitive, inasmuch as the meaning of כֹּל includes a determinative sense, cf. e.g. Gn 1:21, 30, 8:21, Dt 2:34, 2 K 25:9. לְאֶת-כֹּל is used absolutely in Gn 9:3, cf. 39:23; similarly, מִי is determinate of itself, since it always denotes a person, hence אֶת-מִי *quem?* e.g. Is 6:8, 37:23, &c., but never אֶת-מִי *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 אֶת אֲשֶׁר is equivalent to *the circumstance, that*, &c.—Elsewhere אֶת 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 וְאֵם for וְאֵת); also Ec 7:7 may be a quotation of an ancient maxim.

On the other hand אֶת occurs very seldom in prose before a noun actually or apparently undetermined. In 1 S 24:6 כִּנְרָה is more closely defined by means of the following relative clause; in 2 S 4:11 צִדִיק אִישׁ צְדִיק refers to Ishbosheth (as if it were *him, who was an innocent man*); in 1 K 6:16 אֲמָה עֶשְׂרִים אֲמָה refers to the particular twenty cubits. In Ex 21:28 (otherwise in verse 29) perhaps the אֶת is used in order to avoid the combination שׁוֹר אִישׁ (as in Nu 21:9 to avoid the cacophony אִישׁ הַנֶּחֱשׁ אִישׁ); in Lv 7:8 and 20:10 the accusatives are at any rate defined by the context.—In Nu 16:15 אֶת-אֶחָד מֵהֶם probably means *even a single one* (and then *ipso facto* a definite one) *of them*, as also in 1 S 9:3 מִן-הַנְּעָרִים אֶת-אֶחָד may refer to some definite one of the men-servants. In Gn 21:30 we should read אֶת-שֵׁבַע הַכְּבָשֹׁת with the Samaritan, since the seven lambs have been already mentioned; in Ex 2:1 translate with Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 79, אֶת-בִּתְלִיָּה *the daughter of Levi*; in Ex 28:9 read הַשֵּׁהָם with the Samaritan; in Lv 20:14 אֶת-אִשְׁהָ is probably a scribal error due to וְאֶת-אֲמָה; in 1 S 26:20 read נִפְשֵׁי with the LXX for אֶת-אֶחָד; in 2 S 5:24 read הַצֶּעֱדָה as in 1 Ch 14:15; in 2 S 15:16 the אֶת is incorrectly inserted from 20:3, where it refers to the women already mentioned; in 2 S 18:18 read הַמֵּצָה, or omit both אֶת and אֲשֶׁר with the LXX and Lucian; in 1 K 12:31 omit אֶת; in 2 K 23:20 probably אֶת-עֲצָמוֹת is to be read; in 2 K 25:9 the text is corrupt. In Ez 16:32 אֶת-זָרִים might refer to *the strangers in question*; but see Smend on the passage.

3. The pronominal object *must* be represented by את with a suffix (instead of a verbal suffix), when (a) it precedes the verb, e.g. Nu 22:33 הָיָה יָדֵי וְנֹאדָתָהּ הָיָה יָדֵי וְנֹאדָתָהּ *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 ו follows, e.g. 2 S 15:25 הוֹרָא נִי אֲתוֹ *and he will show me it*; Ex 17:3 הָרַגְנוּ אֶת־בְּנֵי *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,

<sup>1</sup> Thus, in Dt 33, את 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 את in the *Méša'* 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 לְבַלְתִּי הַכּוֹתֶיּוֹ *lest one should smite him*, &c., where לְבַלְתִּי הַכּוֹתֶיּוֹ 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* (שָׁמַעַתְּ) and *dicendi*, e.g. Gn 9:22, &c., וַיֹּאמֶר *and he told (it)*; also after נָתַן *to give*, Gn 18:7, 24:41, &c., לָקַח *to take*, הָבִיא *to bring*, שָׁיַם *to lay*, Gn 9:23, &c., מָצָא *to find*, Gn 31:33, &c. A personal object is omitted, e.g. in Gn 12:19, 24:51 (after לָקַח).— The omission of the plural object is remarkable, because it leaves an opportunity for a misunderstanding, in Gn 37:17 שָׁמַעְתִּי אֶת מְרִימָם <sup>1</sup> *I heard them saying*; perhaps, however, we should read שָׁמַעְתִּים with the Samaritan.

5. In common formulae the substantival object is also sometimes omitted (an elliptical expression); thus e.g. כָּרַת 1 S 20:16, &c. (see the Lexicon) stands for כָּרַת כְּרִית like the English *to close* (sc. a bargain) with any one; נָטַר *to keep* (sc. אַף *anger*) equivalent to *to be resentful*, Ps 103:9, &c.; so also שָׁמַר Jer 3:5 (beside נָטַר); נָשָׂא for נָשָׂא קוֹל *to lift up the voice*, Is 3:7; נָשָׂא לְ for נָשָׂא עוֹן *to take away any one's sin* (to forgive), Gn 18:24, 26, Is 2:9; שָׁלַח *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 וַיִּשְׁמַע מֹשֶׁה אֶת-הָעָם בֹּכֶה *and Moses heard the people weeping*; Gn 7:1 רָא יְתִי צְדִיק *they have I seen righteous*. Frequently, however, the second object is expressed by a separate clause. This is especially frequent with רָאָה *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 יָדַע *to know*, Ex 32:22, 2 S 3:25, 17:8 (with two objects); 1 K 5:17.

7. In certain instances אַת serves apparently to introduce or to emphasize a nominative. This cannot be regarded as a reappearance of the original substantival meaning of the אַת, 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 אַת to indicate a clause governed by the verb, necessarily led at length to the use of אַת generally as a defining particle irrespective of a governing verb. So in the Hebrew of the Mishna<sup>1</sup> (see above, § 3 a) הוּ אַתְּ and הַתְּ אַתְּ are prefixed even to a nominative without any special emphasis.

Naturally the above does not apply to any of the places in which אַת is not the *nota accusativi*, but a preposition (on אַת *with*, cf. § 103 b), e.g. Is 57:15, 1 S 17:34 (וְאֶת-הַדּוֹב *and that, with a bear*); אַתְּ 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 סָבִיב *about* governs like a verb, being followed by אֹתָהּ.

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, to מַמְצְרִים, 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

<sup>1</sup> According to the ordinary rules of syntax (cf. § 116 t) we should translate, *I heard men who said*, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Weiss, משפט לשון המשנה (Vienna, 1867), p. 112.

3:26 (the verbal idea contained in ומשמרת verse 25 is *they had to take charge of*); in Jos 17:11 לִי ויהי 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 אֶל־יָרֵעַ בְּעֵינַיִךְ is used in the sense of *noli aegre ferre*<sup>2</sup>; Jer 36:33 *and he had the brazier before him*; in Ec 4:3 a verb like *I esteem* is mentally supplied before אֶת אֲשֶׁר. 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 תִּשְׁמְעוּ or תִּשְׁמְעוּ (ת, עֲשׂוּ) is to be supplied.

Setting aside a few undoubtedly corrupt passages<sup>3</sup> there still remain the following examples, in which אֶת 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 אֶת אֵל for אֶת־אֵל, according to verse 20. However, even the LXX, who have ταῦτα only in verse 18, can hardly have known any other reading than אֵל; consequently in all these passages אֵל must be regarded as virtually dependent on some governing word, such as *ecce* (LXX 43:7 ἔώρακα), 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 לְ (prop. *in relation to, in the direction of*), as sometimes in Ethiopic<sup>1</sup> and very commonly in Aramaic.<sup>2</sup> Less remarkable is this looser connexion of the object with a participle, as with אָכַל La 4:5, אָסַף Nu 10:25, זָקַף Ps 145:14 (but cf. 146:8), צָרַר Nu 25:18, הִשְׁגִּיחַ and שָׁטָה Jb 12:23; *before* the participle Is 11:9.—To introduce an object *preceding* the finite verb לְ is employed in Jb 5:2 (cf. also Dn 11:38); also *after* אָהַב Lv 19:18, 34; אָרִיךְ Ps 129:3; הִבְדִּיל Ezr 8:24, 2 Ch 25:10; הִבִּין Jb 9:11; בָּרַךְ 1 Ch 29:20 (immediately before with an accusative); הִגִּלָה 1 Ch 5:26; דָּרַשׁ Ezr 6:21, 1 Ch 22:19, 2 Ch 17:13; הִנֵּה Gn 45:7, where, however, read פְּלִיטָה with the LXX for לפליטה and take לָקַם as a *dativus commodi*; הִלֵּל 1 Ch 16:36, 2 Ch 5:13; הִרְגַּ 2 S 3:30, Ps 135:11 (verse 10 with accusative), 136:19 f.; הִבְשׁ (to bind up) Is 61:1 (Ez 34:4 *before* the verb); יָדַע Ps 69:6; כָּבַד Ps 86:9; לָקַח Jer 40:2, 2 Ch 23:1; הִמְלִיךְ and מָשָׁה 1 Ch 29:22; נָהַל 2 Ch 28:15; סָמַךְ Ps 145:14; עֹבַד 1 Ch 16:37; עָלָה Ez 26:3; פָּתַח Ps 116:16; רָדַף Jb 19:28; הִצְדִּיק Is 53:11; שָׁכַר 2 Ch 24:12 (previously accusatives); שָׁים 1 S 22:7 (but probably נִכְלָם is to be read); הִשִּׁיב (in the connexion, לְ הִשִּׁיב דָּבָר לְ) 2 Ch 10:6 (but verse 9 and 1 K 12:9 with an accusative); שָׁחַת Nu 32:15, 1 S 23:10; שָׁיַת Ps 73:18; שָׁלַח Ezr 8:16, 2 Ch 2:12, 17:7; שָׁמַר 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 אֶסְרִי־וּ לְ אֶפְתָּח בָּ יְתֵהּ *his prisoners he let not loose nor sent them back to their home*. On this *constructio praegnans* in general, see § 119 ff.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> So also in 1 S 20:13 the Qal (יִיטַב) is, with Wellhausen, to be read instead of the Hiph'  $\iota$ □l.

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> Thus 1 S 26:16, where נָאִי is to be read for נָאֵת; 1 K 11:25, where at present the predicate of the relative clause is wanting; in 2 K 6:5 the אֵל is probably derived from a text which read the Hiph'  $\iota$ □l instead of נָפַל. In Jer 23:33 instead of the artificial explanation *what a burden* (is, do ye ask?) we should read with the LXX and Vulg. אַתֶּם הַמְשָׁאֵי *ye are the burden*. In Ez 10:22 מְרֹאָיִהֶם וְאוֹתָם is unintelligible; in 37:19 read with Hitzig אֶל־ for אֵל; in Hag 2:17 for אַתְּכֶם read with the LXX בְּכֶם שׁ [or אֵינְכֶם; for the אֶל cf. 2 K 6:11, Jer 15:1, Ez 36:9].

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> Dillmann, *Grammatik der äthiopischen Sprache*, p. 349.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> 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,<sup>1</sup> e.g. Ps 14:5 הָדוּ 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 הַטָּאָה הַטָּאָה יְרוּשָׁלַם Jerusalem hath sinned a sin; with a double accusative (see below, cc), e.g. 1 K 1:12, הַצֵּן נָא עֲצָה let me, I pray thee, give thee counsel; 1 K 1:12.<sup>2</sup>

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!*<sup>3</sup> 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 וַיִּצְעַק צָעֶקֶת גְּדֹלָה וּמְרִיהָ עֲדִימָא ד he cried (with) an exceeding great and bitter cry; cf. the Greek νοσεῖν νόσον κακήν, ἔχάρησαν χαρὰν 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,<sup>4</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup> On a kindred use of the infinitive absolute as an *internal object*, see above, § 113 w.

2 <sup>2</sup> Cf. βουλάς βουλευέιν, Iliad x. 147.

3 <sup>3</sup> The Arab grammarians assign to the indeterminate cases generally an intensive sense in many instances; hence the commentators on the Qorân usually explain such cases by adding *and what ...!* see §125 b.

4 <sup>4</sup> Also in Ps 13:4 *lest I sleep the sleep of death*, וַיִּנָּחֵם is only used pregnantly for וַיִּנָּחֵם הַמָּוֶת (cf. Jer 51:39), as וַיִּדְרֹךְ Is 33:15 for וַיִּדְרֹךְ הַמָּוֶת. On the similar use of הַלְּמִים 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 *וַיִּזְעַק קוֹל־גְּדוֹל* 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* *לְשׁוֹן שֶׁ־קֶר* *a tongue of deceit*, i.e. with a lying tongue; Pr 10:4 *he becometh poor* *הִבְרִיחַ עֵשׂוֹ הַבְּרִיחַ־רַמְיָהוּ* *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 *פִּי־שִׁי* *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. *יָרִיב* *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); *יָכַל* absolutely *to be able*, with an accusative *to prevail over* any one; *יָרַח* *to be inclined* and *רָצָה* *to have pleasure* (usually with *בְּ*), with an accusative *to wish for some one* or *something*; *שָׁכַב* *cubare*, then in the sense of *concupere*, 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 *אֶת* is intended, e.g. *אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה* for *אִשָּׁה*; 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*.<sup>1</sup> 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 *לָבַשׁ* *to be clothed* along with *לָבַשׁ* *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. *נָבֵא* *to prophesy*, Jer 25:13; *נָסַב* (prop. *to put oneself round*) *to surround*, Ju 19:22; *נָלַח* *to fight*, Ps 109:3 (where, however, the *Qal* *נִלְחַם* וּנְיָ should be read; cf. Ps 35:1); also *הִתְגַּלַּח* *to shave* (something) *for oneself*, Num 6:19; *הִתְנַחֵל* *to take some one for oneself as a possession*, Is

<sup>1</sup> Thus e.g. *עָנָה* *to reply to* (ἀμείβεσθαί τινα), *to answer any one*; *צִוָּה* *to command* (iubere aliquem); *זָכַר* *to remember*; *קָנָה* (also with *לְ*) *to wait for any one* (to expect any one); *בָּשַׂר* *to bring glad tidings to any one* (see the Lexicon); *נָאֵף* and *נָאֵף* *to commit adultery* (adulterare matronam); *עָבַד* *to serve* (colere); *עָרַב* *to become surety for ...*, and many others.

14:2; *התנבל* to make some one an object of craft, Gn 37:18; *התנצל* to strip a thing off oneself, Ex 33:6; *התעבר* to bring on oneself the anger of any one, to anger him; *התבונן* to consider something, Jb 37:14; *התפרק* to break something off from oneself, Ex 32:3. In Gn 34:9 after *התחתנו* make ye marriages, read *אתנו* instead of *תנו*. 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 *הצום צמתה נני א* *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 *גדל נני כאב* *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 in Jos 15:19 *א רץ הנגב נתת נני* is to be regarded as a double accusative after a verb of *giving*, see ff. In 1 S 2:25 read *ופללו ופלו* for *ופלו ופלו*; in Is 44:21, instead of the Niph'al, read *תנש נני*; in Ez 29:3 either *עשיתי* is to be read with Olshausen or *עשיתי* (and previously *יא רי*) with Smend; in Ps 42:5 *אדדעם* or *אדדעה*; in Ps 55:23 (where König takes *כה* as *he has given it to thee*) we must certainly assume a substantive *קה* (= *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 *לבש* to put on, *פשט* to put off a garment, *צדה* to put on ornaments, to adorn oneself with (cf. also *זקה* *משבצים* enclosed in gold, Ex 28:20). Also in poetic expressions such as Ps 65:14 *ל בשו קרים הצאן* *the pastures are clothed with flocks*, cf. Ps 109:29; 104:2 (*עטה*); 65:14b (*עטה*), &c.<sup>1</sup>

(b) Verba *copiae* and *inopiae* (also called verba *abundandi* and *deficiendi*), as *מלא*, to be full of something, Ex 8:17; here, and also frequently elsewhere, construed with *את*, 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 are full of blood*, cf. Is 22:2; so also the Niph. *מלא* to fill oneself with something, e.g. Gn 6:11, Ex 1:7 (where the object is connected by *את*); Is 2:7 f., 6:4, Pr 3:10; *נזרע* to be fructified with, Nu 5:28; *שרץ* to swarm with, Gn 1:20, 21 Ex 7:28; *שבע* (שבע) to be full of, Is 1:11, Jo 2:19, Pr 12:11; *גבר* to become strong, to wax mighty in something, Jb 21:7; *פרץ* to overflow with something, Pr 3:10 (with the object preceding); *ירד* prop. to descend, poetically also to pour down, to overflow with something (cf. in Greek *προρραειν ὕδωρ, δάκρυα σταζειν*), e.g. La 3:48 *mine eye runneth down (with) rivers of water*; 1:16, Jer 9:17, 13:17, Ps 119:136; so also *הלך* to run over with, to flow with, Jo 4:18; *נזל* to gush out with, Jer 9:17; *נטף* to drop, to overflow with, Ju 5:4, Jo 4:18a; *פרח* to break forth, Ex 9:9; *שטף* to overflow, but also (transitively) to overflow with, probably in Is 10:22; *נוב* to bud with, Pr 10:31; so perhaps also *עבר* to pass over, to overflow with, Jer 5:28; *נצא* 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 *ושית שמיר ויעלה* but it shall come up (it shall be overgrown) with briars and thorns; cf. Pr 24:31, and still more boldly, Is 34:13.

With the opposite idea, *הסר* to be in want of, to lack, Gn 18:28; *שכח* to be bereaved of (as though it were to lose), Gn 27:45.—In Jos 22:17 even *המעטלנו* (prop. *was there too little for*

<sup>1</sup> From the idea of covering oneself with something, we might also, if necessary, explain Ex 30:20 *יתרחצו מים* they shall wash themselves with water; but the reading is simply to be emended to the ordinary *במים*.

*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 [ישב](#), cf. § 118 g; [Ju 5:17](#), [Is 33:14](#) after [גור](#); [Ps 57:5](#) after [שָׁכַב](#); [Ps 68:7](#), [Pr 8:12](#), [Is 33:16](#) with [שָׁכַן](#); or even the person (the people) with whom any one dwells or is a guest, as [Ps 5:5](#), [120:5](#) after [גור](#), [Gn 30:20](#) after [זָבַל](#), [Ps 68:19](#) with [שָׁכַן](#).

5. *Two accusatives* (usually one of the person and one of the thing) are governed by—

(a) The causative conjugations (*Pi'el*, *Hiph'il*, sometimes also *Pilpel*, e.g. [פָּלַל](#) [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](#) [הָרָא נִי נָא](#) [הָרָא](#) *show me, I pray thee, thy glory*. Thus very frequently [הוֹדִיעַ](#) *to cause* some one *to know* something; [לְמַד](#) *docere aliquem aliquid*, &c.; cf. further, [Gn 41:42](#) [וַיַּלְבֵּשׁ](#) *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 [הִפְשִׁיט](#) introduced by [אֶת](#)); so with [מָלֵא](#) *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](#); [עָטַר](#) *to crown*, [Ps 8:6](#), &c.; [הִסַּר](#) *to cause* some one *to lack* something, [Ps 8:6](#); [אָכַיל](#) *to feed* some one with something, [Ex 16:32](#); [הִשְׁקָה](#) *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—

(α) Verbs which express *covering, clothing, overlaying*, [הָגַר](#) [Ex 29:9](#), [צָפָה](#) [Ex 26:29](#), &c., [טוּחַ](#) [Ez 13:10](#) ff., [עָטַר](#) [Ps 5:13](#); cf. also [אָבָן](#) [Jos 7:25](#), &c.; hence also verbs which express *sowing* ([זָרַע](#) [Jud 9:45](#) [Is 17:10](#) [30:23](#)), *planting* ([Is 5:2](#)), *anointing* ([Ps 45:8](#)) with anything.

(β) Expressions of *giving*, thus [נָתַן](#) [Jos 15:19](#) where the accusative of the thing precedes; *endowing*, [זָבַד](#) [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*, [הִנֵּן](#) [Gn 33:5](#); *to sustain* (i.e. to support, to maintain, to furnish) with anything, e.g. [Gn 27:37](#), [Ps 51:14](#) ([סָמַךְ](#)); [Ju 19:5](#) ([סָעַד](#)); *to do something to one*, [גָּמַל](#) [Gn 50:15](#), [17](#), [1 S 24:18](#); cf. also [קָדַם](#) *to come to meet* any one with something, [Ps 21:4](#), [שָׁלַם](#) *to repay* some one with something (with two accusatives, [Ps 35:12](#), [Pr 13:21](#)), and for the accusative of the person cf. [εὔ, 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 ([שָׁאַל](#) [Dt 14:26](#), [Ps 137:3](#)); *answering* any one anything ([עָנָה](#) [Mi 6:5](#), &c.; cf. in the other conjugations [הִשִּׁיב דְּבָר](#) prop. *verbum reddere*, with an accusative of the person, [1 K 12:6](#), &c., also in the sense of *announcing*; sometimes also [הִגִּיד](#) *to declare* something to some one, [Jb 26:4](#), &c., for [הִגִּיד לְ](#)); [צִוָּה](#) *to enjoin* a person something, [Ex 34:32](#), [Dt 1:18](#), [32:46](#), [Jer 7:23](#).

(δ) 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 *and the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground*; so with יָצַר also in 1 K 7:15; further Ex 38:3 *all the vessels thereof made he of brass* (for another explanation of the accusative נְחֹשֶׁת [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 *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 *I will make them (the kids) into savoury meat*; cf. Gn 6:14, 16, Ex 26<sup>1b</sup>, 30:25, 32:4, Is 44:15, Ho 8:4, 1 K 18:32 *and he built the stones (into) an altar*; cf. 10:12. So also אָפַק, with two accusatives, *to bake something into* something, Ex 12:39, Lv 24:5; שָׂם (prop. *to set up for* something, cf. Gn 27:37, 28:18, Ps 39:9, and similarly הָרִים 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 אָשִׂית 1 K 11:34; as a rule, however, the description of the office, and also frequently of the product, is introduced by לְ *to*, § 119 t; also אָשִׂית *to make a thing so and so* (Is 5:6, 26:1; with a personal object, Ps 21:7, <sup>1</sup> 91:9); הַחֲשִׁיךְ *to make dark*, Am 5:8. Of the same class also are instances like Jb 28:2 *a stone they smelt into brass*; 1 K 11:30 *and rent it (the garment) into twelve pieces*; cf. Is 37:26, accusative of the product before the object proper, after לְהַשְׁאוֹת *to lay waste*. On a second object with *verba sentiendi* (as יָדַע *to know something to be* something, Ec 7:25; רָאָה *to see, find to be*, Gn 7:1; הָעִיב *to esteem one to be* something, Is 53:4, elsewhere always construed with לְ 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 אֶת־הָאֲבָנִים 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) גְּזִית 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.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. a very pregnant expression of this kind in Ps 21:13 מוֹשֵׁי־צַוֵּן לְפָנַי *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); אֲבִיבֵי־נַתְתָּה לִי עַד־רֶךְ *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,<sup>1</sup> e.g. Ps 3:8 *for thou hast smitten all mine enemies* תִּי לְ (as to) *the cheek bone*, equivalent to *upon the cheek bone*; cf. Gn 37:21 *let us not smite him* שִׁפְּךָ נֶּ in *the life*, i.e. let us not kill him; Dt 22:26, 2 S 3:27; also with שִׁוּרֵי Gn 3:15; with רִצְּהָ Jer 2:16; in poetry the object specially concerned is, by a bold construction, even placed first, Dt 33:11 (with צִתְּהָ).

§ 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* (תא) is prefixed; secondly from the fact that in one form of the *casus loci* a termination (הַ) is employed, in which (according to § 90 c) the old accusative 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,<sup>1</sup> 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)<sup>2</sup> is frequently found in the cases mentioned under *f* (sometimes also in those under *g*) or the preposition לְ,<sup>3</sup> especially before persons as the aim of the movement, or אֶ, usually, to express being *at* a place.

1 <sup>1</sup> Analogous to this is the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ κατὰ μέρος in Greek epic poetry, e.g. ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγε ἕρκος ὀδόντων.

1 <sup>1</sup> So commonly in Sanskrit; in Greek only poetically, e.g. Iliad i. 317 κνίση δ' οὐρανὸν ἴκεν: in Latin, e.g. *rus ire, Romam proficisci*.

2 <sup>2</sup> Hence e.g. in 1 S 9:26 the Masora requires הָאֶרֶץ instead of the *K<sup>e</sup>th*. הָאֶרֶץ.

3 <sup>3</sup> So in Ju 19:18 for יִתְבַּיֵּת the better reading is אֶל־בֵּית.

Examples of (a): *נִצְאָה הַשָּׂדֶה* *let us go out into the field*, 1 S 20:11; cf. Gn 27:3, 31:4, Jb 29:7; *לֵךְ לְךָ תַרְשִׁישׁ* *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 *לָקַח* Nu 23:14; with *נָתַן* 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 *בּוֹא* (in the sense of *aggredi*, equivalent to *עָלֵה בּוֹא*, 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 *שׁוֹב* can hardly be transitive); Ju 11:29, 1 S 13:20 (where, however, *אָלַי* has probably fallen out after *יִשְׂרָאֵל*; so Strack).—Finally, cf. also the use of *אָשֶׁר* for *מָה* ... *אָשֶׁר* *whither*, Nu 13:27.—The *accus. loci* occurs after a passive, e.g. Gn 12:15.

Examples of (b): Gn 38:11 *רְחַם בְּיַד אָבִיךָ* *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 הַדָּל* *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 *בְּ* (which is not rare even with *בֵּית* and *פֶּתַח*) for euphonic reasons, in order to avoid the combination of such sounds as *בְּבֵית* and *בְּפֶתַח*; cf., moreover, Gn 2:14, 4:16, Ex 18:5, Lv 6:8 (*הַמִּזְבֵּחַ* instead of the usual *הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַזֶּה* Ex 29:13, &c.); Dt 1:2, 19, <sup>1</sup> 2 S 17:26, 1 K 7:8, Pr 8:3, 9:14. On Is 1:30 see § 116 i; on *יָשַׁב*, 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 *אֶת הַתּוֹרָה*.

Examples of (c): Gn 7:20 *חֲמֵשָׁה עָשָׂר אַמּוֹת* *fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail*; Gn 31:23, 41:40 *רַק בְּמִן הַכִּסֵּא אֶגְדָּל מִמֶּךָ* *only in the throne will I be greater than thou*; Dt 1:19 *אָלַּי* *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 (*לְמִסְפָּר* *according to the number of your persons*, for which elsewhere *לְמִסְפָּר* 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. *הַיּוֹם* *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 *יוֹמָם*, like *עַרְבַּי* *at evening*, *לַיְלָה* *noctu*, *בֹּקֶר* *in the morning, early*, Ps 5:4, &c., *צָהֳרָיִם* *at noonday*, Ps 91:6; *אֶחָד* *on one and the same day*, Gn 27:45; *בְּשֵׁנָה* *in sleep*, Ps 127:2; *תְּחִלַּת קְצִיר הַבָּרֶךְ* (*Q<sup>re</sup>* *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., *כָּל־יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ* *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; *עוֹלָמִים* *for ever*, 1 K 8:13; also with the accusative made determinate, Ex 13:7 *אֶת שְׁבַע הַיָּמִים* *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 *לֹא תֵיָאֵר שָׁמָּה* *for fear of briers*.

<sup>1</sup> In Ps 2:12 *רַחֲמֵיךָ* 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 עָרוֹם וְיָחָף naked and barefoot*; cf. verse 3, 8:21, *Gn 15:2, 33:18* (שָׁלֵם), *Ju 8:4, Mi 1:8, Ps 107:5* (but in 15:2 תָּמִים is rather a substantive directly dependent on הוֹלֵךְ = *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* (אֲבֵל).—*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 יָקָר be a substantive); *Ru 1:21* (מִלְאָה parallel with the adverb רִיקָם). 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 עָרוֹם הֵלְכוּ 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) Participles, 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<sup>□</sup>al נוֹרְאוֹת *in a fearful manner* (*Ps 139:14*) and נִפְלְאוֹת *in a wonderful manner*, *Jb 37:5, Dn 8:24*.—Also participles in connexion with genitives, as מִתְהַלֵּךְ *Gn 3:8* (cf. also בָּאָה *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 מִיָּהָל read מִיָּהָל.—On *1 K 11:8, 2 K 10:6, 19:2, Hag 1:4*, cf. the note on § 131 h.

(c) Substantives<sup>1</sup> in the most varied relations: thus, as describing an external state, e.g. *Mi 2:3 רומֵה לֹכֵי רומֵה neither shall ye walk haughtily* (as opposed to שָׁחוֹת *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 אֶת־רַגְלָיו in his feet* (*2 Ch 16:12 בְּרַגְלָיו*), analogous to the cases discussed in § 117 II and § 121 d (d); as describing a spiritual, mental, or moral state, e.g. *Nu 32:14, Jos 9:2 פֶּה אֶחָד 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 שָׁלוֹם is adjectival, and the passage is to be explained as in n); *Jer 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 הֵלֵךְ רָכִיל *to go up and down as a tale-bearer*; also בְּטָח *unawares, Gn 34:25, Ez 30:9; מִיִּשְׁרָיִם, 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) יָמֵי וְתוֹ אֲנָשִׁים *they shall die as men*, i.e. *in the prime of life*; cf. *1 S 2:18* (נַעַר), *Is 65:20*, and *Gn 15:16*; as specifying a number more accurately, *Dt 4:27, 1 S 13:17, 2 K 5:2, Jer 31:8* [in *Jer 13:19* שְׁלוֹמִים *wholly* (?) is corrupt; read גְּלוֹת שְׁלֵמָה with LXX for שִׁי הַגְּלוֹת]; 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 וַיִּקְרָא אֶרְיָה and he cried as a lion*; cf. *Ps*

<sup>1</sup> 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 (כדור *like a ball*); Is 24:22, Zc 2:8, Ps 11:1 (unless צפור be vocative); 58<sup>9b</sup> (unless the force of the preceding ך is carried on, as in Ps 90:4); Ps 144:12, Jb 24:5 (פראים, before the verb); 41:7 *shut up together as with a close seal*.<sup>2</sup>

6. To the expressions describing a state belong finally those nouns which are introduced by the comparative particle ך, <sup>3</sup> since the ך is to be regarded as originally a substantive<sup>1</sup> in the sense of *amount, kind (instar)*, standing in the accusative (so that ך is equivalent to *as a kind of, after the manner of, according to*), while the following noun represents a genitive governed by the ך. From this, which is the proper meaning of the ך, may be explained its power of representing a great many pregnant relations, which in English can only be rendered by the help of prepositions.<sup>2</sup> Thus the comparison may refer to—

(a) The *place*, e.g. Is. 5:17 כדברם *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 כהלום *as in a dream*.

(b) The *time*, especially in the combination כיום *after the manner of the day*, equivalent to *as in the day*, Is 9:3, Ho 2:5; בימי *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 כיום כיום *as day by day=as in the former days*, 1 S 18:10; כפ עם כפ עם *as at other times*, 1 S 3:10, &c.; קשנה קשנה *as in former years*, 2 K 17:4; cf. § 123 c. Of a different character is the use of ך as a simple particle of time, e.g. Gn 18:10 הנה *at this time* (not *about the time*), when it lives again, i.e. at the end of a year; הנה *to-morrow at this time*; cf. Is 23:5, and the frequent connexion of ך 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 כמוראש *as a fire*, i.e. *as it were by fire* (cf. Is 1:25 כב ר *as with lye*); Jb 29:23 כמטר *as for the rain* (they waited for me); Jb 38:14 *(as in a garment)*; 38:30 כאבן *as to stone* (the waters are solidified in freezing).

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 ך, which is otherwise regularly prefixed (see s), has actually dropped out.

<sup>3</sup> On the use of ך as a prefix, cf. § 102 c.

<sup>1</sup> Schwabe (*ך nach seinem Wesen und Gebrauch im alttestam. Kanon gewüirdigt*, Halle, 1883) contests this explanation (which is defended especially by Fleischer and is certainly indisputable). He, with Gesenius and Ewald, places ך as a preposition on the same footing as ך and ך, and believes it to be probably connected with the stem כון as well as with כי and כן. The above view of ך 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 ך in numerical statements, in the sense of *about, nearly*, see the Lexicon.

<sup>2</sup> 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 (כבחהלה and אש נה), Lv 26:37 (כמפני) are to be explained from the fact that here the preposition and substantive had already become simply *one* word before the ך was prefixed. We find also כעל Is 59:18, 63:7, Ps 119:14, and 2 Ch 32:19; cf. Driver on 1 S 14:14 (כבחהצי), where the text is wholly corrupt.

Rem. According to the earlier grammarians, *בְּ* 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 תָּאֵיִשׁ אֲמֵת a faithful man*; cf. *1 S 20:3 בְּפִשֵׁעַ*, *La 1:20 בְּכִן הָאֵל*. 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 *בְּ* with a certain emphasis (equivalent to *in every respect like*); thus *תָּאֵיִשׁ אֲמֵת* 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, Ob*<sup>11</sup>, *Jb 24:14, 27:7, La 1:20, 2:4*; also *בְּמַעַט* 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 *מִן־*, and in the latter (which is not so frequent) *אַחֲרֵי־* occurs before other prepositions of place; cf. e.g. *Am 7:15 the Lord took me מֵאַחֲרֵי הַצֹּאֵן from behind the flock*; *2 K 9:18 turn thee אַחֲרֵי־אֶחָרַי to behind me*, i.e. *turn thee behind me*; *מֵעִם־מֵאֵת from being with ...*, as in French *de chez, d'après quelqu'un*.<sup>1</sup> 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 *לְפָנַי before*, *מִפְּנֵי on account of* (but e.g. *מִלְּפָנַי 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*, *מִתַּחַת in the sense of below*,<sup>2</sup> *מֵעַל*

<sup>1</sup> 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 *מֵעַל־ from upon*, cf. e.g. *Is 6:6*.

<sup>2</sup> Hence not to be confounded with *מִתַּחַת־ 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; *מִתַּחַת־* 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 *מֵעַל־ מִתַּחַת*) in cases where it is really inadmissible, owing to the meaning of the adverb, e.g. in *מִבְּלָעָדִי*,

above (so also in Gn 27:39, 49:25, not *from above*). These adverbs of place, however, may become prepositions by the addition of לְ, e.g. לְמִחוּץ *outside as regards ...*, i.e. *outside of something*, in 1 K 21:13 even after a transitive verb of motion; לְמִתַּחַת *below as regards ...*, i.e. *under something* (cf. עָדְמִתַּחַת לְ *until they came under ...*, 1 S 7:11), לְמַעַל *over something*, &c.; לְבַד *prop. in separation*; מִן־לְבַד *in separation from*, i.e. *apart from, besides*. Only rarely in such a case is the לְ omitted for the sake of brevity, e.g. Jb 26:5 מִתַּחַת מַיִם *beneath the waters*; Neh 3:28 (מַעַל־).

2. Real combinations of prepositions (each retaining its full force) occur—

(a) With מִן־, in מֵאַחֲרַי, מֵאַחֲרַי (see above) *from behind* something; מֵעִם and מֵאֵת *from with* (see above); מִבֵּין or מִבֵּינֹת *from between* something (with motion in either direction, see e.g. Gn 49:10); מִלְפָּנַי *from before* (see above); sometimes also מִמּוֹל *Lv 5:8, &c.*; מֵעַל־ *from upon*, i.e. *off from*; מִתַּחַת *away from under* (see footnote <sup>2</sup> on p. 377).

(b) With אֶל־, in אֶל־אַחֲרַי *to behind*, אֶל־בֵּינֹת *to between*; אֶל־מִבֵּית לְ *forth between* 2 K 11:15; אֶל־מִחוּץ לְ *forth without*, i.e. *out in front of*, Nu 5:3; אֶל־תַּחַת *down under*.<sup>1</sup>—In Jb 5:5 the two prepositions of motion are combined in a peculiarly pregnant construction, אֶל־מִצְנַיִם (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.<sup>2</sup>

(a) אֶל־ (אֶלַי)<sup>3</sup> *towards*, properly an expression of *motion* or at least *direction* towards something (either in the sense of *up to*=עַד־, or *into*=אֶל־תּוֹךְ־), 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־מַיִם רַבִּים *by the great waters*; cf. Dt 16:6, 1 K 13:20, and a still more remarkable instance in 8:30 אֶל־מְקוֹם שֶׁבָחַךְ אֱלֹהֵי־הַשָּׁמַיִם. 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*

מִלְבַּד *without*, cf. also such examples as מִבְּלִי, מִמּוֹל, מִנְּקֹד, מִשָּׁם (there), &c. Since a מִן־ is not usually repeated after מִלְבַּד, it appears as if מִלְבַּד 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 מֵעַל־תַּחַת without a following לְ (see above). Properly מִלְבַּד has a purely adverbial meaning=*taken by itself*, like מִלְמַן־עַל־ (Syriac *men le'el*) *above* (adv.), as distinguished from מִמַּן־עַל־ (Syriac *le'el men*), *over, upon something*.—Also לְמִן־ *from ... onward* is not מִן־לְ, but the לְ 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).

<sup>1</sup> Also in 1 S 21:5 אֶל־תַּחַת־הָהָרִים by a pregnant construction is virtually dependent on the idea of *coming into*, contained in the preceding אֵיךְ־.

<sup>2</sup> A summary of *all* the relations and senses in which a preposition may be used, belongs not to the Grammar but to the Lexicon.

<sup>3</sup> 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 hebreuwsche 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)  $\text{בְּ}$ .<sup>1</sup> 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  $\text{בְּ}$ ,  $\text{בְּדַבָּר פ'}$ ,  $\text{בְּ}$ ,  $\text{עֲצַת פ'}$ , or in a comparison, as in Gn 1:26  $\text{בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ}$  *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  $\text{בְּ}$  is explained—

(1) In the sense of *among* (in the domain of), e.g. Mi 7:2  $\text{יֵשֶׁר בְּ אֲדָם אֵין}$  *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  $\text{בְּ}$  *essentiae* of the earlier grammarians, corresponding to the Greek ἐν, the Latin *in*,<sup>2</sup> and the French *en*, e.g. Ex 6:3 *I appeared unto Abraham ... בְּאֵל שֵׁדִי as El Shaddai*; Jb 23:13  $\text{וְהוּא בְּאֶחָד}$  *but he is (manifests himself as) one*, i.e. he remains always the same; Dt 26:5, 28:62  $\text{בְּמִתֵּי מְעַט}$  *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)  $\text{בְּעֲזָרִי}$  *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 (102<sup>4</sup>). For the origin of all these forms of expression Ps 54:6 is especially instructive, since  $\text{אֲדֹנָי בְּסִמְיֹתַי}$  is not meant to refer to the Lord as *belonging to* the  $\text{סִמְיֹתַי}$ , 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].<sup>3</sup>—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*= $\text{בְּ}$   $\text{אָחַז}$ , *anrühren*= $\text{בְּ}$   $\text{נָגַע}$ , &c. To the same category belongs also the construction of verbs denoting *authority* ( $\text{מְלִכָּה}$ ,  $\text{מִשְׁלַל}$ ,  $\text{נָגַשׁ}$ ,  $\text{רָדָה}$ , the last prop. *to tread on ...*) with  $\text{בְּ}$ , 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  $\text{בְּ}$  after certain *verba dicendi*, or when the mental action is to be represented as extending *to* some one or something: e.g.  $\text{בְּ}$   $\text{קָרָא}$  *to call on* some one,  $\text{בְּ}$   $\text{נִשְׁבַּע}$  *iurare per aliquem*,  $\text{בְּ}$   $\text{שָׁאַל}$  *to enquire of* some one. Again;  $\text{בְּ}$   $\text{רָאָה}$  *to look upon*,  $\text{בְּ}$   $\text{שָׁמַע}$  *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  $\text{בְּ}$   $\text{רָאָה}$  *to see his*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Wandel, *De particulae Hebr. בְּ indole, vi, usu*, Jena, 1875.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. *res in praeda captae*, i.e. things taken as spoil; see Naägelsbach, *Lat. Stilistik*, § 123:4. On the Hebrew  $\text{בְּ}$  *essentiae*, see Hauschild in the *Festschrift zur Einweihung des Goethegymn.* Frankf. a. M. 1897, p. 163.

<sup>3</sup> Other instances formerly cited here (Is 26:4, Ps 55:19, where  $\text{בְּ}$  is used before the subject) as well as Ps 68:5  $\text{בְּיְהוָה שְׁמוֹ}$  *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* *הָאֱמִין* *to trust in* (to cleave trustingly *to*) somebody or something; *בְּ* *בָטַח* *to have confidence in* ...; *בְּ* *שָׂמַח* *to rejoice in* or *at* something, &c.; *בְּ* *דִבֶּר* *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. *בְּ* *אָכַל* *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* *לָחַם* *to eat of*, and *בְּ* *שָׁתָה*<sup>1</sup> *to drink of* something, Pr 9:5; *בְּ* *שָׁמַע* *to hear a whisper of something*, Jb 26:14; *בְּ* *נִצְּאָה* *they found remaining of her only* ..., 2 K 9:35; *בְּ* *נָשָׂא* *to bear a share of something*, Nu 11:17, Ez 18:20, Jb 7:13. Cf. also *בְּ* *הָלַק* *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 *בְּנַפְשׁוֹ* *with the life thereof*; 15:14, 32:11 *בְּמַקְלִי* *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* *שֵׁט* *they smite with the rod*; Is 10:24; Ps 18:30 *בְּ* *בָּךְ* *by thee* (so also 44:6, parallel with *בְּ* *שָׁמַרְךָ*); Is 10:34, Ho 1:7, 12:14; cf. also *בְּ* *עָבַד* *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* *רָחֵל*); 30:16, 33:19, 34:15 (*בְּ* *אֵת* *on this condition*); 37:28; also, in a wider sense, Gn 18:28 *בְּ* *לְ* *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* *צֵלְמֵי מוֹת* *with the shadow of death*; Jb 16:10 *בְּ* *פִּיָּהֶם* *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* *מִטְּהָ* *the rod*; Lv 16:4 *הִגִּיר* and *בְּ* *צִנָּף* 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 *בְּ* *קוֹל* *vocem*

---

<sup>1</sup> To be distinguished from *בְּ* *שָׁתָה*=*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 χυτρώμασι πίνευ* (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 *נָתַן בְּקוֹלוֹ Ps 46:7 (68<sup>34</sup>, Jer 12:8)*, *נָתַן* has an independent sense = *he thundered with his voice* (i.e. mightily).

(c) לָ<sup>1</sup> *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 לָ as a periphrasis for the *genetivus poseessoris* or *auctoris* (the idea of belonging to), see § 129; on לָ with the passive, to introduce the author or the cause, see § 121 f; on לָ in a purely local sense (e.g. *לְיָמֶיךָ יְיָ at thy right hand*, prop. *towards thy right hand*), or temporal (e.g. *לְעֶרְבַּי at evening*, &c.) or distributive, see the Lexicon

The following uses of לָ properly belong to the government of the verb:

(1) As a *nota dativi*<sup>2</sup> to introduce the remoter object; also

(2) To introduce the *dativus commodi*. This *dativus commodi* (or *incomodi*, e.g. *Ez 37:11*) is used—especially in colloquial language and in later style—in the form of a pronoun with לָ, 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.<sup>3</sup> By far the most frequent use of this לָ is with the pronoun of the 2nd person after imperatives, e.g. *לֵךְ-לְךָ go, got thee away*, *Gn 12:1, 22:2, Dt 2:13* (also in the feminine, *Ct 2:10, 13*); *לָךְ תָּטֵה turn thee aside*, *2 S 2:21*; *לָכֶם סַעוּ take your journey*, *Dt 1:7*; *לָכֶם עָבְדוּ pass ye over*; *לָךְ בְּרַח-לָךְ flee* (to save thyself), *Gn 27:43*; *לָךְ עֲלֵי-לָךְ get thee up*, *Is 40:9*; *לָכֶם פְּנוּ turn you*, *Dt 1:40*; *לָכֶם שׁוּבוּ return ye*, *Dt 5:27*; *לָךְ קוּמִי rise up*, *Ct 2:10*; *לָכֶם שְׁבוּ abide ye*, *Gn 22:5*; *לָךְ סַבֵּל forbear thee*, *2 Ch 35:21* (in the plural, *Is 2:22*); *לָכֶם הִבּוּ take you*, *Dt 1:13, Jos 18:4, Ju 20:7, 2 S 16:20*, and so almost regularly *לָךְ מִדְּשֵׁךָ cave tibi!* and *לָכֶם מְלִי הִשְׁמַעוּ take heed to yourselves*; *לָךְ דָּמָה 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 לָךְ וַתִּבְטַח and puttest thy trust*.—In the 3rd person, e.g. *וַתֵּשֶׁב לָהּ 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) *מִהֵד שְׁלֵל וּגוֹי* (cf. verse 3, where the לָ naturally is not used); *Ez 37:16*.

1 <sup>1</sup> Cf. Giesebrecht, *Die hebr. Präpos. Lamed*, Halle, 1876.

2 <sup>2</sup> 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 לָ, cf. § 117 n.

3 <sup>3</sup> 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) מן, originally (according to § 101 a) *separation*,<sup>1</sup> 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*<sup>2</sup> 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 מִקֶּשֶׁת שֶׁתֶּאֱסֹפוּ *without the bow* (i.e. without one needing to bend a bow against them) *they were made prisoners*; cf. Jer 48:45 מִכֹּחַ *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 מן 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 מִמֶּנִּי לֵךְ away from* (being) *king*, instead of מִהָיִיתָ מֶלֶךְ (as in verse 26), *that thou be no longer king*; cf. 1 K 15:13, Is 17:1 מִצֵּיר *so that it is no longer a city*; Jer 17:16, Jb 28:11 *he bindeth the streams מִמֶּכִּי that they trickle not*; Gn 16:2, 23:6 מִקָּבֵר *that thou shouldst not bury thy dead*; Is 24:10.

The מן 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 מִרְאֵה מִן away from seeing*, i.e. *so that he could not see*; Is 7:8 *Ephraim shall be broken in pieces מִצֵּם 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 מן see below, ff)<sup>3</sup>; on מִבְּלִי and מִאֲיִן *without*, cf. § 152 y.

---

1<sup>1</sup> 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.

2<sup>2</sup> All the *partitive* uses of מן also come most naturally under this idea of *separation out of* a larger class. Thus מן is used in the sense of *some*, *something*, and even *one*, in such expressions as *and he slew ... also מִשְׁרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (divers) of the princes of Israel*, 2 Ch 21:4; מִכָּל־ Lv 4:2; 1 K 18:5; מִדַּם הַפָּר *some of the blood of the bullock*, Ex 29:12, &c.; Jb 27:6 *my heart doth not reproach me מִיָּמִי for any*, i.e. for one, *of my days*; 38:12 מִיָּמִי *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 מן before אֵתָהּ, אֵתָהּ is equivalent to *ullus*; e.g. Lv 4:2 *and shall do מִן אֵתָהּ מֵהַגֵּזֶה 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) מִן אֵתָהּ *not one hair of his head*.—מן 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).

3<sup>3</sup> On the use of מן to express the comparative, which likewise depends on the idea of *distance from ...*, cf. below, § 133 a; on מן as expressing the distance of time from a fixed limit, in the sense of *after*, e.g. Ps 73:20 מִהִקְיָץ *after awaking* (cf. ἔξ, ἀρίστου, *ab itinere*), or *after the lapse of ...*, e.g. Gn 38:24, Ho 6:2, and very frequently מִקֵּץ *from the end of*, i.e. *after the lapse of ...*, see the Lexicon; also for the use of מן to represent *resting beside* anything, like the Latin *prope abesse ab ...*

(2) On the sense of *motion away from* anything depends the use of מן 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 מן *on account of, in consequence of* (cf. our *that comes from ...*), *prae*, e.g. מן מִדְּבַר for *multitude*, *1 K 8:5*.

(e) על-<sup>1</sup>. The two original local meanings of this preposition are *upon* (ἐπί)<sup>2</sup> and *over* (ὑπέρ, *super*).

(1) From the original meaning *upon* is explained the use of על- after ideas of *commanding, commissioning* (פָּקַד על-), &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* וְעָלַי 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 על- after ideas of *covering, protecting, guarding* עֲלֵה עֲלֵי, עֲלֵי עֲלֵי; also the combinations עֲלֵי רַחֵם *to have compassion upon ...*, עֲלֵי חַסֵּד *to spare* some one, arise from the idea of a compassionate or protective *bending over* something. Cf. also עֲלֵי נֶלְחָם *Ju 9:17 = to fight for* some one, i.e. in his defence.

(3) Moreover על- 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 עֲלֵי-הַיָּאֵר by the Nile* (above the water level; cf. *Ps 1:3*), and so especially עֲלֵי עֲמֵד 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 מִן עַל לְ is used for על-); עֲלֵי הַתִּצִּיב *to present oneself by command before* some one, *Jb 1:6*, &c. Cf. also עֲלֵי-דָדַי, עֲלֵי-יָדַי (*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 קוּם עֲלֵי- to rise up *over*, i.e. *against* some one, then with a transference of thought applied to any kind of hostile approach, עֲלֵי נֶלְחָם *to fight against ...*, עֲלֵי חֵנָּה *to encamp against ...*, עֲלֵי אֶסְפָּרָה *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. עֲלֵי דַעַת *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

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Budie, *Die hebr. Präpos.* □ *Al* (על), Halle, 1882.

<sup>2</sup> Since the placing *upon* anything is an addition to it, על- also implies *in addition to* something, cf. *Gn 28:9* (31<sup>50</sup>); *30:40, 32:12* (probably a proverbial saying=*mother and children*); *Dt 22:6*. Also על- *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 מן-; for מן- cf. also Ps 22:22 וּמִקֶּדְנֵי דְמִיִּים עֲנִיתָ נִי *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 הָשָׁבְתָהּ with the LXX); Gn 25:23, 2 S 18:19, Jb 28:12; cf. also מן- זָנְהָהּ Ps 73:27 *to go a whoring from any one* i.e. *to be unfaithful to him*; מן- רָשָׁעַ Ps 18:22 = *to depart wickedly from God*; מן- הֶרַשׁ Ps 28:1 *to be silent from one* (to turn away in silence); cf. Jb 13<sup>13</sup> [; so with מַעַל Jb 30:17, 30].

Pregnant constructions with אַחֲרַי: Nu 14:24 equivalent to יָלַלְתָּ אַחֲרַי *and he made full to walk* i.e. *walked fully after me*; in 1 S 13:7 read with the LXX הָרָדוּ מֵאַחֲרָיו *they trembled*, i.e. *went trembling away from him*; with אֶל- Gn 43:33 הִמְתָּה אֶל- *to turn in astonishment to some one* (cf. Is 13:8); אֶל- דָּרַשׁ Is 11:10, &c., *to turn inquiringly to some one*; אֶל- הִרְיֵשׁ Is 41:1 *to turn in silence to some one*; אֶל- הִרְדָּה Gn 42:28 *to turn trembling to some one* (cf. הִרְדָּה לִקְרֹאת *to come trembling to meet*, 1 S 21:2 [also with שָׂאג, הִרְיֵץ, שָׂמַת 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 כִּי 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;<sup>1</sup> e.g. כִּי Is 40:19, 48:14 *he shall perform his pleasure בְּבָבֶל on Babylon, and his arm shall be בְּשָׂדִים (for בְּבַשְׂמָנִים) 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; מִשָּׁל may, however, be taken here as a second accusative according to § 117 ii); לְמַעַן Is 48:9; מִן- Is 58:13, Ps 141:9 (unless וּמִמֶּן קְשׁוּת is to be read); מִן- Is 15:8; תָּהָת Is 61:7.

6. Adverbs which have acquired a substantival value are sometimes governed by prepositions, e.g. אֶל-הִנֵּם *in vain*, Ez 6:10; אַחֲרַי-כֵּן *after this*; כִּי-כֵן (Ec 8:10, Est 4:16) *then, on this condition*; לְכֵן and עַל-כֵּן *therefore*; עַד-כֵּן *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

<sup>1</sup> 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 *כִּתְּמָה מִן שׁוֹדֵד* (cf. for the form, § 67 v) *when thou hast ceased as a spoiler*, i.e. to spoil; Jer 22:30 ... *לֹא יִצְלַח* *he shall never prosper, sitting*, i.e. so as to sit, &c.; Jon 1:6 *what meanest thou, sleeping?* i.e. that thou sleepest;<sup>1</sup> by a verbal adjective, 1 S 3:2 *now his eyes had begun being dim*, i.e. to wax dim (unless we read *לְכָהוֹת=כָּהוֹת*, cf. § 114 m); by a substantive, Gn 9:20 *and Noah began to be an husbandman* (omitting the article before *אֲדָמָה*).

(b) Examples of the subordination of the complementary verbal idea in the imperfect<sup>2</sup> (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 *יִגְדִּיל ... יִהְיֶה הַפֶּץ* *it pleased the Lord ... to magnify*, &c.; Jb 30:28, 32:22 *לֹא יֵד עֲתִי אֶכְבֵּה* *I know not to give flattering titles*; after a perfect consecutive, 1 S 20:19 (where for *תִּרְד* we should read with the LXX *תִּפְקֹד*); 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 which the Lord commanded (that) ye should do*; a negative imperfect follows *צִוָּה* in La 1:10; after the imperfect, Is 47:1<sup>(5)</sup> *לֹא תוֹסִי יְפִי עוֹד יִקְרְאוּ לְךָ* *for thou shalt no more continue (that) they call thee*, i.e. thou shalt no longer be called, &c.; Ho 1:6 *לֹא אוֹסִיף עוֹד אֲרַחֵם* *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* (אֲוִלֵי may, however, be a scribal error for *וּבִכְלֵי*, due to the preceding *אוֹלֵי*, 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 *כִּי* 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).<sup>1</sup> As a rule, here also (see above, a) the principal idea is introduced only by the second verb, while the first (especially *שוב*, *הוֹסִיף*, *הוֹסִיף*, *הוֹסִיף*) contains the definition of the manner of the action, e.g. Gn 26:18 *וַיָּשָׁב וַיִּחְפֹּד* *and he returned and digged*, i.e. he digged again; 2 K 1:11, 13; in the perfect consecutive, Is 6:13; with *הוֹסִיף*, e.g. Gn 25:1 *and Abraham added and took a wife*, i.e. again took a wife; Gn 38:5 and frequently; with *הוֹאִיל* in the jussive, Jb 6:9; in the imperative (cf. § 110 h), Ju 1<sup>6</sup> *וְלִיִן הוֹאֵל-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 *מִהֵד* Gn 24:18, 20, &c.; with *הִמָּד* Ct 2:3.

<sup>1</sup> In 1 S 16:16, which appears to be a case of this kind, two different readings are combined, *וְיִדַע לְבָנָו* and the simple *וְיִדַע*.

<sup>2</sup> This kind of subordination is frequent in Arabic and in Syriac (cf. e.g. the Peshiṭtā, 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*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the English colloquial expression *I will try and do it*.

<sup>2</sup> Of a different kind are the cases in which *וְ* 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 יִוֹסִיף*).

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* אָת־יִהְיֶה ה' אוֹת־יִלְמְדוּ וַיִּירָאוּ אֶת־יְהוָה *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 וְאִם־יֵדַע עַתָּה וַיִּשְׂבָּם *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*<sup>3</sup> (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 לְ 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*<sup>4</sup> in the same mood, &c. In this construction (cf. § 110 h) the imperatives קוּם (קוּמָה), קוּמִי, קוּמֵי, &c.) and לֶךְ (לֶכֶה), לֶכֶי, &c.) are exceedingly common with the sense of interjections, before verbs which express a movement or other action, e.g. קוּם הִתְהַלֵּךְ *arise, walk*, Gn 13:17, 19:15, 27:43; in the plural, Gn 19:14; Ex 19:24 לֶךְ־רַד *go, get thee down*; 1 S 3:9; with a following cohortative, 1 S 9:10 לֶכֶה נֵלֶכְהָ *come, let us go*; Gn 31:44 and frequently.—Also with שׁוּב (a periphrasis for *again*) in the perfect, Zc 8:15; in the imperfect, Mi 7:19, Ps 7:13, 59:7, 71:20; in the jussive, Jb 10:16; in the cohortative, Gn 30:31; in the imperative, Jos 5:2, 1 S 3:5 *lie down again*; הוֹאִיל (sometimes to express the idea of *willingly* or *gladly*) in the perfect, Dt 1:5, Ho 5:11; in the imperative, Jb 6:28; הַרְבֵּה=*much*, 1 S 2:3 אַל־תִּרְבּוּ תְדַבְּרוּ *do not multiply and talk, i.e. talk not so much arrogancy*; in the imperative, Ps 51:4; הִחַל, Dt 2:24 הִחַל דָּשׁ *begin, possess*; יָכַל, La 4:14 אִי־יָכִלוּ יִגְעוּ *without men's being able to touch, &c.*; מְהֵרָה=*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 עֲמִיקָה=*deeply, radically*; Zp 3:7 הַשְׂפִּים=*early* (even in the participle, Ho 6:4, 13:3); Is 29:4 שְׁפַל=*low*, cf. Jer 13:18; Jos 3:16 תָּמַם=*wholly*; Ps 112:9 פָּנוּר=*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 קוּם and לֶךְ 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 יִשְׂבַּע יִרְאֶה יִשְׂבַּע *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 קָרָא מָלֵא *cry, fill*, i.e. cry with a full (loud) voice.

### § 121. Construction of Passive Verbs.

Blake, 'The internal passive in Semitic,' *JAOS* xxii.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the analogous examples in Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, §102.

<sup>4</sup> 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 וַתָּמָת רַחֵל וַתִּקָּבֵר *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,<sup>1</sup> e.g. Gn 27:42 וַיִּגְדּוּ לְרִבְקָה אֶת־דְּבָרֵי עֵשָׂו *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 וַיִּוָּלֵד לְ הֲנוֹךְ אֶת־עֵירֹד *and unto Enoch was born Irad* (cf. Nu 26:60, and after an infinitive, Gn 21:5); Gn 17:5, 21:8 (after an infinitive); 29:27 (unless וַיִּתְּנָהּ 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 מִסֵּף the Hiph. מִסֵּס 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<sup>24.1</sup>— Also after Pu□al, Jer 50:20; *before* Pu□al, Is 14:3 (אֲשָׁר equivalent to the internal object דָּה עָבַד=*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 לֵילֵד for יָלַד; the Samaritan in Gn 35:26 and 46:27 also reads לָדוּ, and this (or יָלַד) should certainly be read instead of יָלַדוּ 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 אֶרְאֶהְךָ *which I will show thee* (Gn 12:1) the passive is אֲשֶׁר אֶתְּהַ מְרָאָה *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 מְדַבֵּק מִלְּקוֹתַי depends on an assumed transitive הִדְבִּיק governing two accusatives (= *my tongue is made to cleave to my jaws*); also in Is 1:20, רַב תִּאֶכְלֶנּוּ רֶבֶךָ *ye shall be devoured with the sword*, רֶבֶךָ is not an *accus. instrumenti*, but most probably an accusative of the object retained from the active construction.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> In 2 K 18:30 יִבְתָּן is to be read or אֶת־ is to be omitted, as in the parallel passage Is 36:15.

<sup>2</sup> 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, כָּסוּ תְּרִים צֶלֶת, *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;<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Also in Ez 40:17 and 46:23, the accusative preceding עָשׂוּי (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 עָשׂוּי.—(d) an accusative of the member or part specially affected by the action (§ 117 II), 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 implendi* in Nu 14:21; instead, however, of the *Niph.* וַיִּמְלֵא 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 לְ (thus corresponding to the Greek and Latin dative), e.g. Gn 25:21 לוֹ יְהוָה הֵאֱמַן *the Lord let himself be intreated by him*; cf. Lv 26:23, Ps 73:10 and the blessing בְּרוּךְ הוּא לְ יְהוָה הֵאֱמַן *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 (בְּ אָדָם *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 בְּ עֲבָד 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 תִּאָּכְלוּ.

<sup>1</sup> Analogous to הִלְבוּשׁ הַלְבָדִים *who was clothed in linen*, Ez 9:3, would be הַנּוֹתֵר 2 Ch 31:10; but we must certainly read there נִוְתָר with the LXX.—Still less can Ps 87:3 be so explained, נִכְבְּדוֹת being not an accusative, but the subject of a noun-clause. On the other hand, שְׁלוּחַ 1 K 14:6 may be explained with Ewald in the sense of *being charged with* something, so that, like צָנָה, it may be construed with an accusative.

<sup>2</sup> In reality וַיִּרְחַם Ex 16:20, 26 (*it became putrid*) is equivalent to a passive (*it was changed*), to which הוֹלְעִים 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. אח brother, אחות sister; עַלְמָם a young man, עַלְמָה a young woman, maid; פָּר iuvencus, פָּרָה iuvenca; עֵגֶל vitulus, עֵגְלָה 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: אב father, אם mother; איל ram, עז ewe; שׂ he-goat, עז she-goat; חמור he-ass, שׂתון she-ass; אריה lion, לביא lioness. Sometimes with the feminine ending as well, e.g. עבד male slave, man-servant, אמה or שפחה female slave, maid; חתן bridegroom, כלה bride.

Of (b): גמל camel. Plur. גמלים construed as masculine, Gn 24:63; as feminine, Gn 32:16; בקר 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 פרה wild ass, changes directly from the masculine (intended as epicene) to the feminine. Cf. the Greek ὄ, ἡ παῖς: ὄ, 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. ὄ λύκος, ἡ χελιδὼν, and the German *der Löwe, der Adler, &c.*, but *die Katze, die Taube, &c.* Similarly in Hebrew, e.g. אילון ox (Ps 144:14 even referring to cows when pregnant), דב bear, Ho 13:8 דוב שפול (a bear that is bereaved of her whelps; cf., however, 2 K 2:24, Is 11:7), זאב wolf, כלב dog, all masculine; but ארנבת hare, יונה dove, סטורק stork, דבורה bee, נמלה 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, חמור ass, 2 S 19:27 for שתון; איל hart, Ps 42:2 for אילה. In Gn 23:3 ff. מת a dead body, refers more especially to the body of a woman; אמן a master workman, in Pr 8:30 refers to wisdom (הכמה feminine, cf. Plin. 2, 1 natura

*omnium artifex*; and our use of *friend, teacher, servant, neighbour*, either as masculine or feminine; in German, *Gemahl*<sup>1</sup> spouse, also for fem. *Gemahlin*, &c.).

2. Of words denoting persons נַעֲרַיִם, according to the formerly common opinion, was in early times used as epicene (see, however, above, § 2 n). The use of the plural נַעֲרַיִם 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. אֶתְּחַם Gn 1:27 and אֶתְּחַם 32:1) the masculine as *prior gender* includes the feminine.<sup>2</sup>

3. The following classes of ideas are usually regarded as feminine,<sup>3</sup> although the substantives which express them are mostly without the feminine ending:<sup>4</sup>

(a) Names of *countries* and *towns*, since they are regarded as the mothers<sup>5</sup> and nurses of the inhabitants; e.g. אַשּׁוּר Assyria, אֲדוּמָה Idumaea, צֵר Tyre; cf. also such expressions as בַּת בָּבֶל daughter of Babylon, בַּת צִיּוֹן daughter of Zion, &c. On the other hand appellatives which are originally masculine, remain so when used as place-names, e.g. אֵל בֵּית־אֵל Am 5:5, הַגִּלְגָּל, &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 יהוּדָיָה masc. Is 3:8, &c., *Judaei*; but Is 7:6, fem., *Judaea*; אֲדוּמָה 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

---

1<sup>1</sup> So in early Arabic, *ba'l* (lord) and *zauḡ* (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 *ḥāmīl*, *bāḥḥīn* (gravida), and the like, which from the nature of the case can only be used of females. Thus also אֶתְּחַם, at least in Nu 11:12 (Is 49:23?), probably means *nurse* (for אֶתְּחַם 2 S 4:4, &c.), not *nursing-father*.

2<sup>2</sup> 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.

3<sup>3</sup> 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.).

4<sup>4</sup> When, on the other hand, words *with* a feminine-ending, such as אֶתְּחַם a bow (stem קוּשׁ), זֶמַח *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 ת of the feminine being regarded as a radical.

5<sup>5</sup> Cf. *a city and a mother* (אֵם) in Israel, 2 S 20:19. In the same way אֵם (like μήτηρ, *mater*) on Phoenician coins stands for *mother-city*, μητ πόλις. 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 יהודה 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 בְּבַל Is 47:1 ff., בַּת צִיּוֹן &c. (see above) as collective poetical personifications of the people.

(b) Appellative nouns, which denote a *circumscribed space*, such as אֶרֶץ *earth, land*, תֵּבֵל *world*, שְׂאֵל *the abode of the dead*, כְּכַר *circle* (of the Jordan valley), עִיר *a town*, בְּאֵר *a well*, צָפוֹן *the north*, תֵּימָן *the south*.

In the majority of nouns denoting place the gender is variable, e.g. אֶרֶץ and דֶּרֶךְ *a way* (usually feminine; the masculine gender only begins to predominate with Ezekiel; cf. Albrecht, l. c., 1896, p. 55), גֵּיאַ (גֵּי) *valley*, גַּן *garden* (fem. Gn 2:15, unless לְעֵבֶד הָ, &c., is to be read), הַיְכָל *palace, temple*, הַעֵר *court*, כַּרְם *vineyard*, שַׁעַר *door*,<sup>1</sup> &c.; also מְקוֹם *place*, at least in Gn 18:24 (referring to Sodom), Jb 20:9, and 2 S 17:12 *K<sup>e</sup>thibh*, 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 חֶרֶב *sword*, יֵתֵד *tent-peg*, כַּד *bucket*, כּוֹס *cup*, נַעַל *shoe*, עֶרֶשׁ *bed*, &c.; in other cases, as אֲרוֹן *chest, ark* (with the article אֲרוֹן הַ), תַּנּוּר *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 אָזְן *ear* (and in general, members occurring in pairs, Albrecht, l. c., p. 73 f.), אֶצְבָּע *finger* (and so probably בֶּהָן *thumb, great toe*), יָד and כַּף *hand*, יְמִין *right hand*, יָד הַיְמָיִם *right hand*, גֵּל *foot*, בֶּרֶךְ *knee*, יֵרֶךְ *thigh*, כַּתֵּף *shoulder*, לְחִי *cheek*, בֶּטֶן *belly*, כַּנָּף *wing*, קֶרֶן *horn*, שֵׁן *tooth*; as a rule also זְרוּעַ *arm* (masc. Is 17:5, &c.), לְשׁוֹן *tongue* (masc. Ps 22:16, Pr 26:28, &c.), עַיִן *eye* (masc. Zc 3:9, &c.), שׁוֹק *thigh* (masc. Ex 29:27).<sup>2</sup>

(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 שֶׁשׁ *sun* (but often also *masc.*, Ps 19:6, 104:19); אֵשׁ (Ethiopic 'ēāt) *fire* (rarely *masc.*); גִּיהַר *brightness*, אֶבֶן *a stone*, as a rule also רוּחַ *wind, spirit*; נְפֹשׁ *breath, soul*; also אֹר *light* in Jer 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 <sup>1</sup> מַחֲנֶה *camp* is feminine only when it is a collective, denoting the persons in a camp.

2 <sup>2</sup> אֵף *nose*, גֵּיד *sinew*, זָנָב *tail*, הַלְּחִי *palate*, כֶּבֶד *liver*, לֵב, לֵבָב *heart*, מְעֵיִם, הַמְּעֵיִם *bowels*, צִחֻק *forehead*, עוֹר *skin*, עַרְבָּה *back of the neck*, פֶּה *mouth*, צְנַאֲר *neck*, רֹאשׁ *head*, שֵׁקֶם *shoulder*, also הַמְּקוֹם *womb*, except in Jer 20:17, are invariably construed as masculine.—עֶצְמוֹת *bone* is common.

(a) Abstracts<sup>1</sup> (sometimes along with masculine forms from the same stem, as נקמה *vengeance*, as well as עזרה, נקם *help*, as well as עזר), e.g. אמונה *firmness, faithfulness*, גבורה *strength*, גדולה *greatness*, מלאה *fullness*, מקושלה *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. נכונה *steadfastness*, Ps 5:10, טובה *goodness*, רעה *evil*, Gn 50:20, נקלה *a light thing* (i.e. a trifling thing), Jer 6:14; so especially in the plural, e.g. גדולות *great things*, Ps 12:4; הנהרסות *the ruined places*, Ez 36:36, along with הנשמה *that which was desolate*, טובות *kindnesses*, 2 K 25:28, נכחות *uprightness, honesty*, Is 26:10, נעימות *amoena*, Ps 16:11 (but in verse 6 in the same sense נעימים *wonderful things*, Ex 34:10 and frequently, קשות *hard things, roughly* Gn 42:7, 30 (but cf. also ריקם *vain things*, Pr 12:11, 28:19). Cf. moreover, the very frequent use of היא, זאת (as well as זה and הוא), Ju 14:4, Ps 118:23, &c., in the sense of *hoc, illud* (also הנה equivalent to *illa*, Is 51:19): also the use of the feminine form of the verb in Is 7:7 הנה תל'א תקום ול'א ת'היה *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.<sup>2</sup>

(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 קהלת *Ec 1:1*, &c. (as a title of Solomon), properly no doubt *that which takes part in or speaks in a religious assembly*, hence LXX ἑκκλησιαστικῆς, i.e. *concionator, preacher*; the proper names ספרות *Ezr 2:55*, Neh 7:57, and פרות *Ezr 2:57*, Neh 7:59, and the foreign word פקה *viceroys*; in the plural פנות prop. *cognomina*, then *like-named, colleagues*; פרוצים *princes* (if this be the true meaning).<sup>3</sup> All these words, in accordance with their meaning, are construed as masculine (in *Ec 7:27* instead of קהלת the words should rather be divided as אמר הק; cf. 12:8).

Abstract ideas include also—

(c) *Collectives* in the fem. form,<sup>1</sup> generally fem. participles used substantively, especially as the comprehensive designation of a number of *persons*, e.g. אררה (fem. of *travelling*), prop. *the travelling* (company), i.e. *travelling persons* (a caravan); גולה (fem. of *one going into exile*) *the company of exiles* (also frequently used of those who had returned home again); יושבת (that which inhabits) i.e. *the population*, Is 12:6, Mi 1:11 f.; אררה (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.); דלה (the abject) *the poorest sort*; of living beings which are not persons, cf. הנה (that which lives) in the sense of *cattle, beasts*; דנה *a shoal of fish*, Gn 1:26 (but in Jon 2:2 as a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the list of masculine and feminine abstracts in Albrecht, l. c., 1896, p. 111 ff.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> This use of the feminine form is far more frequent in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Aramaic; cf. e.g. in Arabic *ḥaliḥa* (fem. from *ḥaliḥ*, following after, taking the place of) in the sense of *the successor or representative* (of Muḥammad), 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.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. in Greek ἡ ἵππος, *the cavalry* (as well as τὸ ἵπτικόν), ἡ κάμηλος, Hdt. 1, 80, &c., *the camel corps*.

*nomen unitatis*, cf. **t**, for **דג** *a fish*, which in verses **1** and **11** is used as the *nomen unitatis*). Cf., moreover, **גבולה** *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 **בת** *daughter*, in **בת עמי**, **בבבל** (equivalent to **בני עמי**) *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. **אֲנִי** *a fleet* (**1 K 9:26**), **אֲנִיָּה** *a single ship* (**Jon 1:3** ff.); **יד צ** *hunting, game*, **צידה** **Gn 27:3** *K<sup>e</sup>th*. (**יד צ** *Q<sup>e</sup>ré*) *a piece of venison*; **שער** *hair* (coll.), **שער** *a single hair* (**Ju 20:16**; in the plural, **Ps 40:13**, **69:5**); **שיר** *a poem*, frequently collective, **שיר** *a single song*; so probably also **תאנה** *a fig* (the corresponding masculine *tin* is collective in Arabic); **שושנה** *a lily* (also **שושן**); **לבנה** *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. **גרה** *side* (of the body), *thigh*, **גרה** or **גרה** *back part, border* (of a country, house, &c.); **מזנה** *forehead*, **מזנה** *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** **מִשְׁעָן וּמִשְׁעָנָה** *stay and staff*, i.e. every kind of support (unless we omit verse 1<sup>b</sup> 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 **בקר** *cattle, oxen*<sup>1</sup> (even joined with numerals, e.g. **Ex 21:37** **חמש בקר** *five head of cattle*), but **שור** *an ox*; **צאן** *small cattle*, i.e. sheep and goats (**μῆλα**), cf. **Jb 1:3** **שבעת אלפי צאן** *seven thousand sheep*; but **ש** *a single head of small cattle* (a sheep or a goat). Other more or less common collectives are: **זיו** (prop. that which prowls or roams) *wild beasts*, **טף** (perhaps prop. *tripping*) *a number of little children*; **שא** *fresh green herb*, i.e. young plants, **רק** *green*, i.e. vegetation in general; **עוף** *birds, fowl*; **רב** *chariots or cavalcade*, **רמה** *worms*, **מש** *creeping things* (of small creatures), **ש** *swarming things*.

(b) The collective use of substantives which at the same time serve as *nomina unitatis*; thus, **אדם** (never in plur.) means both *man* (homo) and *men* (homines); **איש** *a man* (vir) and *men* (viri); **אשה** *woman* and *women* (**Ju 21:16**, **1 S 21:6**); **ארבה** *a locust*,

<sup>1</sup> The plural form **בְּקָרִים** from **בקר** is found only in very late Hebrew, **Neh 10:37** (where according to the Mantua edition, Ginsburg, &c., even **צאן ינו** *our sheep*, is also to be read; Baer, however, has **צאן ינו**), and **2 Ch 4:3**. In **Am 6:12** read, with Hitzig, **בְּבָקָר ים**.

but usually *a swarm of locusts*; נַפְּשׁוֹת *soul* and *souls* (persons); מַקְלֵי *staff* and *staves* (Gn 30:37); עֵיט *a bird of prey* and *birds of prey*; עֵלֶה *a leaf* and *foliage*; עֵשֶׂב *a plant* and *plants, herbs*; עֵץ *a tree* and *trees* (as it were *foliage*); פְּרִי *fruit* and *fruits*; שִׁיחַ *a shrub* and *shrubs*; in isolated instances also nouns like עֶבְדָּא *man-servant*, שִׁפְחָה *maid-servant*, חֲמוֹר *ass*, שׁוֹר *ox* (cf. Gn 32:6).—On the singular (especially of gentile names) with the article (which may, however, be omitted in poetry, cf. e.g. Ps 12:2 חֲסִיד, Pr 11:14 יוֹעֵץ) to include all individuals of the same species, cf. § 126 l. On the special meaning of the plurals formed from certain collectives, see § 124 l.

(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:

1. The repetition of one or more words to express the idea of *every, all*, as יוֹם יוֹם Gn 39:10, &c., *day by day, every day*; שָׁנָה שָׁנָה Dt 14:22; *year by year*, Ex 36:4; with בָּ before each, as בָּבֹקֶר בָּבֹקֶר Ex 16:21 *every morning* (and similarly before a group of words, Lv 24:8), for which the *distributive* לְ is also used, לְבֹקֶר לְבֹקֶר 1 Ch 9:27, and with *one* plural לְבֹקְרִים Ps 73:14, לְבֹקְרִים Jb 7:18 parallel with לְהִנְעִים *every moment*. Somewhat different are the instances with בָּ before the second word only, e.g. יוֹם בְּיוֹם *day by day*, 1 Ch 12:22; שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה *year by year*, Dt 15:20, 1 S 1:7 (but in verse 3 בְּיָמָיו יָמֵי יָמָיו, (מְיָמָיו יָמֵי יָמָיו) 3 בפֶּעַם, 1 S 3:10 *as at other times*. Also With the two words united by means of *wāw copulative*, אִישׁ וְאִישׁ Ps 87:5, or אִישׁ וְאִישׁ Est 1:8; דּוֹר וְדּוֹר *all generations*, Dt 32:7; יוֹם וְיוֹם Est 3:4; cf. Est 8:9, Ezr 10:14, 1 Ch 26:13 and often (cf. Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, 1889, p. 479, according to whom the use of the ו copulative with the second word is especially common in Ch and Est, and therefore belongs to the later language; Driver, *Introd.*<sup>6</sup>, p. 538, No. 35); sometimes (but with the exception of Ps 45:18 only in very late passages) with a pleonastic כֹּל preceding, Ps 145:13, Est 2:11, 9:28, 2 Ch 11:12, &c.

2. Repetition of words in an expressly *distributive* sense<sup>1</sup> (which may to some extent be noticed in the examples under c) equivalent to *one each, &c.*, e.g. Nu 14:34 *forty days* יוֹם לִשְׁנָה יוֹם לִשְׁנָה *counting for every day a year*; cf. Ez 24:6, Ex 28:34 (three words repeated); also with the addition of לְבַד *apart*, עֶדֶר עֶדֶר לְבַדוֹ *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.<sup>2</sup>

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 בַּדֶּרֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל בַּדֶּרֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל *only along by the high way*; cf. Nu 3:8, 8:16 *they are given, given to him*, i.e. given

<sup>1</sup> Cf. in the New Testament St. Mark 6:39 f. συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιαὶ πρασιαί (Weizsäcker, *tischweise, beetweise*).

<sup>2</sup> 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 גְּבִים גְּבִים *nothing but trenches*; Gn 14:10 אָרֶת קָ, אָרֶת קָ, אָרֶת קָ *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 מְעַט מְעַט 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) כֶּבֶד וְזָקָן *a weight and a weight*, i.e. two kinds of weight (hence the addition *great and small*); Ps 12:3 בְּלֵב וּבְלֵב *with two kinds of heart*, i.e. *with a double-dealing heart*; cf. the opposite בְּלֵב וּבְלֵב 1 Ch 12:33.

### § 124. The Various Uses of the Plural-form.<sup>3</sup>

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 שָׁמַיִם (§ 88 d) *heaven* (cf. also מְרוֹמֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם *heights of heaven*, Is 33:16, Jb 16:19; elsewhere מְרוֹם יָם; *water*; יָמִים (the broad surface of the sea) poetically for יָם *sea*; פְּנִים (prop. the side *turned towards* any one, then) *surface* in general, usually *face*; אַחֲרֵי *the back*, Ex 26:12, 33:23, &c., צַוְאָרִים *neck nape of the neck*<sup>1</sup>; also מֵרֵאשִׁית מֵרֵאשִׁית *the place at the head*, מֵרֵגְלוֹת *place at the feet*; עֲבָרִים *place on the other side* (of a river); מֵצִמְקֵים *depth*, מֵרְחֵקִים (also מֵרְחֵק) *distance*, מִשְׁכְּבֵים *bed*, Gn 49:4 (unless, with Dillmann, it is to be explained in the sense of *double bed*, i.e. *torus*), and מִשְׁכְּבָנִים Ps 46:5, and מִשְׁכְּנוֹת 43:3, 84:2, 132:5, *dwelling* (perhaps also אֶהְלִים אֶהְלִים *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 יְצַעִים *bed* (Ps 63:7, Jb 17:13; but Gn 49:4, Ps 132:3, &c., in the singular); probably, however, יְצַעִים (prop. *strata*) refers to a number of coverings or pillows.

The plural of extension is used to denote a lengthened period of *time* in עוֹלָמִים *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 לִי הַקְּבָרִים *graves are (ready) for me*, i.e. the

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Dietrich, 'Über Begriff und Form des hebr. Plurals,' in the *Abhandl. zur hebr. Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 2 ff.

<sup>1</sup> 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 סְפָרִים) 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 סְפָרִים).

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<sup>e</sup> ḥūlīm*, *qitḥūlīm*, &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, בְּחֹרִים and בְּחֹרוֹת *youth*, זְקֵנִים *old age*, נְעוּרִים *youth*; בְּתוּלִים *maidenhood*, כְּלוּלוֹת *bridal state*; מְגוּרִים *condition of a sojourner*, בְּשָׂרִים *fleshliness* (only in Pr 14:30), חַיִּים *life* (the abstract idea of the qualities of a living being); שְׂכוּלִים *childlessness*, סְנוּרִים *blindness*, עֲנֻעִים *perverse*.

There are also a number of plurals, found almost exclusively in poetry (sometimes along with the singular), which are evidently intended to intensify<sup>2</sup> the idea of the stem (plural of amplification), as אוֹנִים *might*, Is 40:26; אֲמוּנִים (as well as אֲמוּנָה) and אֲמוּנוֹת *faithfulness*; אֲשֶׁרִי (according to § 93 I, only in the construct state plural or with suffixes = *the happiness of*), הַיְשָׁרוֹת (complete) *prosperity*, Ps 68:7; בִּינּוֹת Is 27:11 and תְּבוּנוֹת Is 40:14, &c. (keen) *understanding*; יְעֻזוֹת (true) *counsel*, Dt 32:28; דְּעוֹת Jb 37:16 and דְּעוֹת 1 S 2:3 (thorough) *knowledge*; מְבִטְחִים Jb 12:6 and מְבִטְחִים Is 32:18 (full) *confidence*; בְּרָכוֹת (abundant) *blessing*, Ps 21:7; גְּבוּרוֹת (exceptional) *strength*, Jb 41:4; הוֹרוֹת Ps 5:10 (very) *wickedness*; חֲמוּדוֹת Dn 9:23 (greatly) *beloved*; חֲמוּת Ps 76:11, &c. (fierce) *wrath*; חֲרָפוֹת Dn 12:2 (utter) *contempt*; יִשְׁעוֹת (real) *help*, Is 26:18, &c.; מְרָאֵת Gn 46:2 (an important) *vision*; מִישָׁרִים *uprightness*; תְּהַפְּכוֹת *perversity*; נְקָמוֹת (complete) *vengeance*, Ju 11:36, &c.; מְהַשְׁכִּים and מְהַשְׁכִּים (thick) *darkness*; מִסְתָּרִים *a (close) hiding-place*; נְגִידִים *nobility*; שִׁמְנִים Is 28:1 *fatness*; צָהָצְחוֹת (complete) *aridity*; מְמִתְקִים *sweetness*; מְמִדִּים *preciousness*; שִׂעֲשֻׁעִים *delight*; עֲדָנִים and עֲנָגִים *pleasure*; רַחֲמִים *compassion*; מְנוּחָת Ps 23:2 *rest, refreshment*; מְהוּמָת Am 3:9 *tumult*. Probably also תִּדְדִית (heartfelt) *love*, Ps 45:1; מְרָרוֹת (extreme) *bitterness*, Jb 13:26; מְרָמוֹת (base) *deceit*, Ps 38:13; צְדָקוֹת (true) *righteousness*, Is 33:15, &c.; שִׂמְחוֹת (the highest) *joy*, Ps 16:11. On the other hand, חֲכָמוֹת *wisdom* (Pr 1:20, &c.) can hardly be a *plural* (=the essence of wisdom, or wisdom personified), but is a singular (see § 86 I).

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 יְאֵרִים *the great river* (of the Nile, generally יְאֵר 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 נְהָרוֹת 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 הַיְרֵי כוּשׁ is evidently a numerical plural.—In Pr 16:13 מְלָכִים (acc. to P. Haupt=the *great king*) is very doubtful. In Ez 19:1 the second *yōdh* is evidently due to dittography, since יִשְׂרָאֵל follows.

The summing up of the several parts of an action is expressed in חֲנֻמִּים *embalming*, כְּפָרִים *atonement*, מְלֵאִים (prop. *filling*, sc. of the hand) *ordination to the priesthood*, שְׁלָחִים *dismissal*, נְשָׁלִים *retribution*, פְּתָחִים *engraving* (of a seal, &c.); אֲהָבִים *fornication*, זְנוּנִים *whoredom*, אֲפִים *adultery*; גְּחֻמִּים (prop. no doubt, warm compassion) *consolation*, תְּנוּנִים *supplication*, גְּדָדִים Jb 7:4 (restless) *tossing to and fro*, פְּלָאִים *wonder* La 1:9, עֲלִלוֹת *gleaning*; perhaps also נְגִינוֹת Ps 4:1, 6:1, &c., if it means *the playing on stringed instruments*, and שְׂלֵמִים Is 1:23 *bribery*, unless it be a plural of number.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. Ember, 'The pluralis intensivus in Hebrew,' *AJSL*. 1905, p. 195 ff. *SBOT. SBOT.* = Sacred Books of the Old Testament, ed. by P. Haupt. Lpz. and Baltimore, 1893 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Mayer Lambert in *REJ*. xxiv. 106 ff., enumerates no less than ninety-five words ending in *im*, 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 characteristics<sup>2</sup> 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 צַדִּיק 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 קְדוּשִׁים *the Most Holy* (only of Yahweh), Ho 12:1, Pr 9:10, 30:3 (cf. אֱלֹהִים קְדוּשִׁים Jos 24:19, and the Aram. עֲלִיּוֹנִין *the Most High*, Dn 7:18, 22, 25); and probably תְּרַפִּים (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 intended<sup>1</sup>; in Zc 10:2 alone is it most naturally taken as a numerical plural. In Ec 5:7 גְּבוּרֵי הַיָּם *supremus* (of God) is doubtful; according to others it is a numerical plural, *superiores*.

Further, אֲדָנִים, as well as the singular אֲדוֹן (lordship) *lord*, e.g. אֲדָנִים קָשָׁה a *cruel lord*, Is 19:4; אֲדָנֵי הָאָרֶץ *the lord of the land*, Gn 42:30, cf. Gn 32:19; so especially with the suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd persons אֲדָנֶיךָ, אֲדָנָיו Ps 45:12, &c., also אֲדָנִי (except 1 S 16:16); but in 1st sing. always אֲדָנִי.<sup>2</sup> So also בְּעָלִים (with suffixes) *lord, master* (of slaves, cattle, or inanimate things; but in the sense of *maritus*, always in the singular), e.g. בְּעָלָי Ex 21:29, Is 1:3, &c.<sup>3</sup>

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, עֹשֵׂי *my Maker*, Jb 35:10; עֹשֵׂיךָ Is 54:5; עֹשֵׂי יוֹ Ps 149:2; עֹשֵׂי יָהּ Is 22:11; שְׂטִייהֶם *stretching them out*, Is 42:5; for

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> The Jewish grammarians call such plurals רַבּוּי הַכּוֹחַ *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.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> Even in Gn 31:34, notwithstanding the plural suffix in וְהִשְׁמַחַם and עֲלִייהֶם, 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.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> On אֲדָנִי (for אֲדָנִי) as a name of God, cf. § 135 q.

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> Euting, *Reise in Arabien*, p. 61, mentions the interesting fact that the subjects of the Emir of Hâyel commonly speak of their ruler as *šiyûkh*, a plur. maiestatis = *the great sheikh*.

all these forms may also be explained as singular, according to § 93 ss.<sup>4</sup>—*וְגֹשְׁיוֹ* Is 3:12 might also be regarded as another instance, unless it be a numerical plural, *their oppressors*; moreover, *מְרַיְמֵוּ* *him who lifteth it up*, Is 10:15 (but read probably *מְרַיְמוֹ*); *שֶׁלֶחֶוּ* *him who sendeth him*, Pr 10:26, 22:21 (so Baer, but Ginsburg *שֶׁלֶחֶוּ*), 25:13 (in parallelism with *אֶדְנִי*). These latter plurals, however (including *מְרַיְמֵוּ*), may probably be more simply explained as indicating an indefinite individual, cf. o below.—For *שֶׁמֶרְיָךְ* Ps 121:5 (textus receptus) and *בְּוֹרְאֵיךָ* 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. *אֶבֶק* *fine dust*, *אֶפֶר* *ashes*, *בֵּד* *linen*, *בְּדִיל* *lead*, *זָהָב* *gold*, *כֶּסֶף* *silver*, *נְחָשֶׁת* *brass*, *חֵלֶב* *milk*, *יַיִן* *wine*, *עָפָר* *dust*, *הָאָרֶץ* *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, *בְּדָיִם* *linen garments*; *כֶּסֶפִּים* *silver pieces*, Gn 42:25, 35; *נְחָשֶׁת יָם* (dual) *fetters of brass*; *עֲצִים* *ligna* (*timber* for building or *sticks* for burning); also in a wider sense, *בְּדִילִים* particles of *alloy* to be separated by smelting, Is 1:25; *עֲפָרוֹת* *fragments of earth*, Pr 8:26, cf. Jb 28:6 *עֲפָרֹת זָהָב* *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, *חִטִּים* *wheat* in grain (threshed wheat), as distinguished from *חֵטָה* *wheat* (used collectively) in the ear; cf. the same distinction between *בֶּסֶם* and *בֶּסֶם מֵת* *spelt*; *עֲדָשִׁים* and *עֲדָשָׁה* (the singular preserved only in the Mishna) *lentils*; *שְׂעִירִים* and *שְׂעִירָה* *barley*; also *פְּשָׁתִים* *linen*, *פְּשָׁתָהּ* (to be inferred from *פְּשָׁתִי*) *flax*.

(c) Finally, the distinction between *דָּם* *blood* and *דָּמִים* 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, *דָּמִים* 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 *דָּמִים* also denotes the blood which flows at child-birth or in circumcision), *דָּמִים* 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-שַׁעַר יָךְ* *unto one of thy gates*; Zc 9:9 *בְּוֹרְאֵת נֹת* (cf. Ct 2:9); Ex 21:22 *יֶלֶד יְהִי* (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 *בְּנֵי־גִלְעָד* denotes the class with which the action is concerned. In Ju 12:7 instead of the unusual *בְּעָרֵי גִלְעָד* *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), *בְּעִירוֹ בְּמִצְפָּה גִלְעָד*, *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—

<sup>4</sup> *בְּעֵלְיָךְ*, which in Is 54:5 is in parallelism with *עֲשֵׂי־יָךְ*, must then be explained as merely formed on analogy.

(a) Most naturally by using the plural of the *nomen regens*, e.g. גְּבוּרֵי הַיָּל *mighty men of valour* (prop. heroes of strength), 1 Ch 7:2, 9; so also in compounds, e.g. בְּנֵי בְּנֵי 1 S 22:7, as the plur. of בְּנֵי־יְמִינִי *Benjamite*; but also

(b) By using the plural of *both* nouns,<sup>1</sup> e.g. גְּבוּרֵי הַיָּלִים 1 Ch 7:5; and in prison houses, Is 42:22; cf. Ex 34:1, &c., שְׁנֵי־לְחָת אֲבָנִים *two tables of stone* (but Ex 31:18 לְחָת 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. עַמֵּי הָאָרְצוֹת *the people of the country*; 2 Ch 26:14; so perhaps בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים *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*;<sup>1</sup> e.g. בַּיִת אֲבוֹת Ex 6:14, Nu 1:2, 4 ff., &c., as plur. of בַּיִת אָב *father's house, family*; בַּיִת הַבָּמוֹת *the houses of the high places*, 2 K 17:29 (also בַּיִת הַבָּמוֹת 23:19); בַּיִת עֲצָבֵיהֶם *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. אוֹס פִּימוֹ *os* (for *ora*) *eorum*, Ps 17:10; יְמִינָם *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 אֶהְדָּא 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 אֶהְדָּא קְרוּשׁ i.e. *one*, viz. *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 מִפְּנֵי־הָרֶב מִפְּנֵי־הָרֶב* from a sword, i.e. from an irresistible sword (God's sword); cf. Is 28:2 בְּיָדֶיךָ; 2 S 6:2 שֵׁם; Ho 3:1 הָאִשָּׁה *such a woman*, without doubt to be referred to the Gomer mentioned in cap. 1; Am 6:14 גּוֹי; Ps 77:16 בְּזֶרַע; Pr 21:12 צְדִיק, if with Delitzsch it is to be referred to God; Jb 8:10 מְלִים 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.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 438 f., according to whom the plural of the principal word exercises an influence on the determining genitive.

<sup>1</sup> 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, דָּוִד, בְּנֵי עַן, נְיָקָב, do not admit of the article,<sup>1</sup> 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. יִשְׂרָאֵל, אָדָם, מוֹאָב, אֲדָם), are always determinate in themselves. Of gentilic names (e.g. עִבְרִי, *the Hebrew*, עִבְרִים, *the Hebrews*, Gn 40:15; עֲנִי, *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 כַּפְתָּרִים.—Evident appellatives (like such modern names as *the Hague*, *le Havre*) are הַגְּבֵעָה, *the hill*, in the construct state שְׂאוּל, i.e. *the Gibeah named after Saul* to distinguish it from others; רֶמָה, *the height*; הַעֵי, *the heap*; הַלְבָנוֹן (prop. *the white mountain*) *the Lebanon*; הַיָּאֵר (prop. *the river*) *the Nile*, cf. Am 8:8 יָם מִצְרָיִם *like the river of Egypt*; הַיַּרְדֵּן, *the Jordan* (according to Seybold, *Mittheil. und Nachr. des DPV.*, 1896, p. 11, probably *the drinking-place* [ירד, 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 אֱלֹהִים *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 אֱלֹהִים, ὁ θεός (cf. § 126 e); also the sing. אֱלֹהִים *God*, עֲלִיוֹן, *the Most High*, and שְׂדֵי *the Almighty* never take the article.—Moreover, אָדָם *Adam* from Gn 5:1 onwards (previously in 2:7, &c., אָדָם, *the first man*); שָׂטָן *Satan*, 1 Ch 21:1 (but Zc 3:1, Jb 1:6, &c., הַשָּׂטָן, *the adversary*); cf. אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד *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 שְׂאוּל *Hades*, תְּבֵל, *world*, תְּהוֹם, *ocean*, of the body of water which encircles the earth, Gn 1:2, &c.; but Is 63:13, Ps 106:9 בְּתֵהּ מוֹת *through the depths*, viz. of the Red Sea.<sup>1</sup>

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 יְהוָה הַצְּבָאוֹת *Yahweh (the God) of*

<sup>1</sup> Consequently, הַמְּנַשֵּׁה, Dt 3:13, Jos 1:12, &c. (in the Deuteronomist) in the combination הַמְּנַשֵּׁה הַשְּׂבָט (for which elsewhere הַמְּנַשֵּׁה) 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 הַמְּנַשֵּׁה is used, as in 10:8 הַלֵּוִי *the tribe of the Levites*, and in Ju 18:1 הַדַּנִּי *the tribe of the Danites*.—In Jos 13:7 הַמְּנַשֵּׁה (like gentilic names in י) is even used adjectivally.

<sup>1</sup> That various other words, such as אָנוּשׁ *man*, צִלְמָן *deep darkness*, רִצֵּן *prince*, שְׂדֵי *field*, תְּיֹשֶׁה, *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 תְּרִדְמָה *deep sleep*, there is no occasion for the article in the passages we possess.



to be desired,<sup>1</sup> &c.; cf. Gn 49:21, Is 40:22 f., 44:27 f., 46:6, Am 2:7, 5:7, Ps 33:15, 49:7 (הַבְּטֹחִים 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* (הַגֹּיִם) *rain, &c. and sendeth* וְשִׁלְהָ &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 וְעָלוּ הַצִּיּוֹר תְּמִים פֶּּּּ 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* (אֶת־הָאוֹר); 1 K 3:24 *fetch me a sword: and they brought the sword*; Ec 9:15. (In 2 S 12:2 therefore לְעֶשֶׂיִר must be read.)

(b) With a title understood and recognized by every one, e.g. הַמֶּלֶךְ לְךָ יְשׁוּעָה ὁ 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. הַגָּדוֹל הַכֹּהֵן הַיְהוָה *the high priest*, הַשֶּׁשׁ הַשָּׁמַיְמָה *the sun*, הָאֶרֶץ *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. הַשָּׂטָן *adversary*, הַשָּׂטָן *the adversary*, *Satan*; הַיְהוָה *lord*, הַבַּיִת *Baal* as proper name of the god; הָאָדָם *the (first) man*, *Adam*; הָאָדָם הַיָּחִיד or הָאֵל ὁ θεός, *the one true God* (cf. also ὁ Χριστός in the New Testament); also הַנָּהָר *the river*, i.e. *Euphrates*; הַכֶּכָּר *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 הַמֶּלֶךְ לְךָ הוֹשֵׁעַ הַגָּדוֹל *help, O king*; Zc 3:8 הַגָּדוֹל הַכֹּהֵן הַיְהוָה הוֹשֵׁעַ הַגָּדוֹל *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 (שָׂמַיִם and אֶרֶץ); 23:16, Ho 13:14, Jo 1:5, Ps 34:12, Ec 10:17, 11:9, &c.<sup>2</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> On the analogous use of the article before participles which have a verbal suffix, as in Ps 18:33, &c., cf. above, § 116 f.

<sup>1</sup> On the subsequent change of שָׂטָן, אָדָם, אֶל־הַיָּחִיד into real proper names by the omission of the article, cf. above, § 125 f.

<sup>2</sup> 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;<sup>3</sup> it is sometimes omitted also for rhetorical reasons. Cf. e.g. הָאֵלֹהִים רָץ for רָץ אֱלֹהִים Ps 2:2; מְלָכִים as vocative, verse 10; מָלַךְ for הָמֶלֶךְ לְךָ 21:2; וְנוֹרָא שְׂמַךְ גְּדוֹל וְנוֹרָא (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. בִּשְׁמֵי יָם 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 עוֹד הַיּוֹם גְּדוֹל *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 הָיָא הַסֶּבֶב *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 הַרְיִים and הַגְּבָעוֹת, 2 Ch 3:17 מִן־מִיָּן and מִן־אֹרֶל.

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; הָאֹיֵב *the enemy*, i.e. *the enemies* (?) Ps 9:7; הָאֹרְבִים *the liars in wait*, i.e. *the liars in wait*,

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

הַלְלוּ, הַ the armed man, i.e. soldiers; הַמְצִיט הַ the rearguard; הַמְשִׁיחַ the spoiler, 1 S 13:17; <sup>1</sup> 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 אַרְיֵה הַ the lion. Especially also with gentile names, e.g. the Canaanite, Gn 13:7 (cf. 15<sup>19f.</sup>); so in English the Russian, the Turk, &c., in Attic writers ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, 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 וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱבְרָם בְּכֶסֶף וּבַזָּהָב in cattle, in silver and in gold; Jos 11:9 and he burnt their chariots בָּאֵשׁ with fire; cf. Gn 6:14, 41:42 (unless this means, the chain necessarily belonging to the official dress); Ex 2:3, 3:14 (35<sup>32</sup>), Is 1:22, &c, and בֵּשׂוֹלֵי מִן with oil<sup>2</sup> 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 אֶפֶס הַ Ex 16:36, &c.: הַחֶמֶר and הַבַּת Ez 45:11; הַעֵמֶר Ex 16:22; הַבָּהֶל 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 (בְּצָרְךָ); Gn 19:11 and they smote the men ... בְּסִגְרוֹתֵימָם with blindness; Am 4:9, &c.; but in הַחֶשֶׁךְ Is 60:2 the article is no doubt due to dittography of the הַ, and the parallel הַעֲרֵפֶל 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 לֶגְלֵי כֶסֶף as snow, כֶּסֶף מֶרְקַח as wool; red כְּחֹלֶעַת כִּדְמוּם; Is 34:4 and the heavens shall be rolled together כְּסֵפֶר as a scroll; cf. Nu 11:12, Ju 8:18, 16:9 as כְּתִיל־הַנֶּזֶעַר 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 כְּעוֹף נוֹדָד קִנּוֹ מְשֻׁלָּח as wandering birds, (as) a scattered nest (but cf. 10:14 כְּבָקָן); 14:19, 29:5 כְּמֵץ עֵבֶר (but Ps 1:4 כְּמֵץ); 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 כְּגִבּוֹר Jb 16:14 and seven other places (כְּגִבּוֹר only in Is 42:13), כְּאָב Jb 31:18, כְּבֶן־בָּרַךְ Jb 38:3, 40:7.

4. Peculiar to Hebrew<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> But in Ex 12:23 הַמֵּי 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 הַמֵּי even in Ex 12:23 impersonally = *destruction*.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> In nearly all the above examples the presence of the article is only indicated by the vowel of the prefix (וּ, וּ, וּ) 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*.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> 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* (יָאָרִי, i.e. the particular lion pursuing him at the time), *and a bear* (הַדָּב) *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 הַנָּעַר **Nu 11:27** is used like טַיִם הַפְּלִיט above); **Gn 19:30**, unless בְּמַעְרָה means in *the well-known cave*; **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 יְשֻׁרְאֵלִי 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** (הַעֲלָמָה, 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 וַיְהִי 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 כַּהַיּוֹם 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 *l*) a whole class, but only that part of it which applies to the given case; thus **הַיּוֹנָה**, **Gn 8:7**, **הַצִּדְקָה**, **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** הָעִיר הַגְּדֹלָה *the great city*; **Dt 3:24** הַיָּד הַחֲזָקָה, *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** הָאִישׁ הַבְּלִיַעַל 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** מַעֲשֵׂה יְהוָה הַגָּדֹל *the great work of the Lord*; or by a suffix, e.g. **Is 36:9** אֲדָנִי הַקְּטַנִּים *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** הָאֱלֹהִים הַגְּדֹלִים הַחֲזָקִים וְהַיּוֹרְאִים *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.<sup>1</sup>

Rem. 1. The article is, however, not infrequently used also—

---

<sup>1</sup> The demonstrative used adjectivally is generally placed *after* the adjective proper; in such cases as **2 Ch 1:10** הַזֶּה הַגְּדֹל עִמָּךְ the adjective forms a further (fresh) addition to עִמָּךְ 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 יום,<sup>2</sup> e.g. Gn 1:31 (cf. 2:3, Ex 20:10, &c.) יום הששִׁי the sixth day (prop. a day namely the sixth; but יום שני a second day, Gn 1:8); Ex 12:15 מִיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן from the first day onward (not before Dn 10:12 and Neh 8:18 is מִן־הַיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן used instead of it). On the other hand, the article is *always* found after בְּ, hence בְּיּוֹם הַשְּׁשִׁי, &c., although it is possible that the original reading in these cases was יוֹם, 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 הַרְבֵּה הַיּוֹנָה the sword which oppresses (?); Ez 14:22, Zc 11:2 *Keth.* (the impenetrable forest?) Pr 26:18, Ps 119:21.

Of the other examples, Gn 21:29 (where, however, the Samaritan reads הַכְּבוֹשׁוֹת), 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 כָּל־, and in 1 S 14:29 (דָּבֵשׁ) by מִעֵט.—In 1 S 12:23, 2 S 12:4, Is 7:20 (where, however, הַשֵּׁבִיבִי might also be understood as a subsequent explanation of עָר) 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 אֶל־הַיָּמִים is to be read twice), Zc 4:7 (where however אֶת־הַהָר is probably meant), Ps 104:18 (where a ה precedes הָרִים, hence probably a case of haplography), the omission of the article before א, ר (?) and ה may be due to a regard for euphony (see *z* below). On the other hand, in 1 S 6:18 (read הָאֵץ בְּן־הַגִּי, 17:12 (הָהָה is a later addition), 19:22 (cf. the LXX), Jer 17:2, 32:14, 40:3 *Keth.*, Ez 2:3 (read גִּי or omit גִּי 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 הַקָּנָה), *like spiced wine*. In Is 39:2 read מִן־הַטּוֹב and in Ps 133:2 מִן־חֵטְבִּי.

(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 *Méša* inscription, l. 3, הַבְּמַת זֹאת *this high place*); as with הוא Gn 19:33 (evidently for euphony, and so probably often); 30:16, 32:23, 1 S 19:10; with היא Gn 38:21; with זו Ps 12:8 (according to the Masora זו is a relative pronoun here, as always elsewhere); with אֵלָּה 1 S 2:23, according to the present corrupt text (the original reading כָּל־עַם יִהְיֶה became כָּל־עַם כָּל־עַם, and אֶל־הַיָּמִים was then corrupted to אֵלָּה); 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 הַלִּי, as in Jer 10:19, has arisen by contraction from הַלִּי, or we should simply read הַלִּי (in all these passages with הָהָה); Gn 24:8 (with זֹאת); Ex 10:1, 1 K 22:23, Jer 31:21 (with אֵלָּה).

<sup>2</sup> 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 Giesebrecht 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. הַגְּדוֹלָה כְּנִי־סֵת *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,<sup>1</sup> as *צידון רבָה* Jos 11:8, 19:28, *חַמַת רבָה* 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., *תְהוֹם רבָה* is also a case of this kind, *תְהוֹם* being used (almost always without the article) as a sort of proper name; cf. also *אֵל עֲלִיּוֹן* *the most high God* and *אֵל הַיָּם הַחַי* *the living God*. In Ju 1:15 *עֲלִית גִּלְת* and *תְהַתִּית גִּי* are strange; Jos 15:19 has *עֲלִיּוֹת גִּי* and *תְהַתִּיּוֹת גִּי*.

Of the remaining examples Is 11:9 explains itself; the direct connexion of the attribute with its substantive is broken by the insertion of *לִים*. In Ez 34:12, Hag. 1:4 (as Wellhausen says, a good instance of a Hebrew adjective in the stative form = *וְהָיָה סְפוּגִים*), 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, א, ע*, Ez 10:9 before *א, ח*, 21:19 before *ה*).<sup>1</sup> In 1 S 13:17 f. (*אֶהְרֵד*) and 2 K 25:16 (*שָׁנָיִם* after a determinate substantive), the attribute again, being a numeral, is determinate in itself (see above, x); in Is 65:2 the *ל* prevents the use of the article; finally, in 2 Ch 26:15 *בְּאֶבְנֵים* and *בְּהַצִּים* are to be read, as in Jer 2:21 *פָּן גִּי* for *פָּן הֵגִי*, in 22:26 *אֶרֶץ* for *הָאֶרֶץ*; in 2 S 6:3 omit *חֲדָשָׁה*, and in Ez 39:27 omit *רַבִּים*. Without any apparent reason the article is omitted in Dn 8:13 and 11:31.

2. When, as in Mi 7:12 (*יּוֹם הַהוּא* *in that day?*), the article is omitted from both substantive and demonstrative, and in Ezr 3:12, the demonstrative even precedes (*הַיְהוָה הַזֶּה חֵב יְהוָה*), this is obviously due in both cases to a radical corruption of the text (not only in the words quoted). In Jos 9:12 *לֶחֶם נֹי* is either in apposition to the independent demonstrative *זֶה* (= *this our bread*, &c.), as in verse 13 *נֹי אֲדוּת* is to *לֶחֶם*, 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 *אֵלֵהֶם* 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. *דְּבַר יְהוָה* *the word of the Lord*.

(b) By having the article, e.g. *אִישׁ הַמִּלְחָמָה* (prop. the man of the war) *the soldier* (but *אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה* Jos 17:1, *a soldier*); *אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה* Nu 31:49, *the soldiers*; *דְּבַר הַנְּבִיא* *the word of the prophet*, Jer 28:9 (but e.g., on the other hand, *מִצְוֹת אֲנָשִׁים מִלְמָדָה*, Is 29:13; *דְּבַר־שֶׁקֶר* Pr 29:12).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 48, n. 1.

<sup>1</sup> The same reason no doubt also favoured the omission of the article before *הוּא* and *לָא*, see above, under y. Also in Is 23:7 (*is this your joyous ...?*) the article is omitted before *עֲלִיּוֹת* probably only for euphony.

(c) By the addition of a pronominal suffix (see above), e.g. *בֵּית־אָבִי*, *my father's house*.

(d) By construction with another genitive determined in some way, e.g. Gn 3:2 *מִפְּרֵי עֵץ הַגָּן* *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 כָּל (prop. a substantive in the sense of *aggregate, whole*), according as it is followed by a determinate or indeterminate genitive. In the former case כָּל has the meaning of *the entirety*, i.e. *all, the whole* (like the French *tous les hommes, toute la ville*), e.g. *כָּל־הָאָרֶץ* *the whole* (prop. the entirety of the) *earth*, *כָּל־הָאָדָם* *all men*;<sup>1</sup> Ex 18:22, Nu 15:13, Jer 4:29, and cases like Nu 4:23, 47, 21:8 where כָּל is followed by a singular participle with the article. On the other hand, before an indeterminate genitive כָּל 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. *כָּל־עֵץ* *every* (kind of) *tree*, Gn 2:9; cf. 4:22, 24:10, 1 Ch 29:2; *כָּל־דָּבָר* *any thing*, Ju 19:19; *כָּל־יּוֹם* *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. *כָּל־שִׁלְהֵנוֹת* *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. *כָּל־חַי* *each living thing*, i.e. *every* (not *every kind of*) *living thing*; *כָּל־בָּשָׂר* *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 *כָּל־עֵץ* *all trees*, *כָּל־עוֹף* *all birds*; finally—

(c) That before the names of members of the human body, כָּל frequently (as being determinate in itself) denotes the entirety, e.g. Is 1:5 *כָּל־רֹאשׁ, כָּל־לֵב* *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 *כָּל־עַלְצָנָם* (i.e. *the whole of*) *their shoulders ... all* (the whole of) *their loins*; 36:5.—On כָּל with a suffix when it follows a noun in apposition (e.g. Is 9:8 *כָּל־הָעָם* *the people, all of it*, i.e. *the whole nation*, more emphatic than *כָּל־הָעָם*, 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),<sup>2</sup> see the Lexicon, pp. 481<sup>b</sup>, 482<sup>b</sup>.

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. *בְּנֵי־בִנְיָמִן* (see § 86 h) *a Benjamite*, *בְּנֵי־הַבְּנִימִי* Ju 3:15, &c., *the Benjamite*; *בְּנֵי־הַבְּתְלֵמִי*, *the Bethlehemite*, 1 S 16:1, &c. (cf., however, 1 Ch 27:12 *Q<sup>re</sup>* *בְּנֵי־יִמְנִי*); *בְּנֵי־הַשְּׁמִי*, *the Beth-shemite*, 1 S 6:14; *בְּנֵי־הָאֲבִיעִזִּי*, *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 *הַשִּׁבְעָה* *the spoil found in the city*; but it often is so

1 <sup>1</sup> *כָּל־הָאָדָם* being a collective, cf. *כָּל־הָאֲנָשִׁים* 2 S 15:2, *all men*, *כָּל־הַבָּנִים* Ex 1:22 *all sons*, *כָּל־הַבָּתּוֹת* *all daughters*; in itself *כָּל־הָאָדָם* could also mean *the whole man*.

2 <sup>2</sup> In Ezr 10:17 instead of *כָּל־הָאֲנָשִׁים* read simply *הָאֲנָשִׁים*.

before a proper name, as in Ex 10:9 הַג יְהוָה *a feast of the Lord* (unless it is *the* spring festival), Dt 7:25, and frequently הַיְהוָה *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 חֶלְקַת הַשָּׂדֶה *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, הַמַּעֲלוֹת in the titles of Psalms 120 to 134 (except 121:1, *לְמַעַלּוֹת*, *the ascent*) 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 כָּל־הַמָּקוֹם *in all the place*, sc. of the sanctuary, is a dogmatic correction of כָּל־מָקוֹם, *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 כָּל־הַמָּקוֹם (unless it means *in the whole place*) is remarkable, since elsewhere *every place* is always (8 times) כָּל־מָקוֹם.

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 הַנְּחָלִים אֲרִנּוֹן *the valleys*, namely the valleys of Arnon; 2 K 23:17 הַמִּזְבֵּחַ בֵּית־אֵל *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 הַמִּזְבֵּחַ); הָאֵל בֵּית־אֵל *the God of Beth-el*<sup>1</sup> (equivalent to אֵל בֵּית־אֵל), Gn 31:13 (the LXX read הָאֵל הַנִּרְאָה לְךָ בַּמָּקוֹם הַקֹּדֶשׁ *the God who appeared to thee in the holy place*); הַמֶּלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר *the king of Assyria*, 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, שָׂרָה אִמּוֹ 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, הַמֶּלֶךְ 1 S 26:22 after הַחַיָּה (simplified by the Masora to חַיָּה *Q<sup>r</sup>re*); עֲלִית אֶחָז 2 K 23:12, עֲלִית אֶחָז Is 36:8 (cf. 2 K 18:23), הַמֶּלֶךְ עֲזַרְיָה Ez 46:19 (unless the article with לְשִׁכּוֹת is to be omitted), also הַתְּמִיד Dn 8:13, and הַנְּבִיאָה 2 Ch 15:8. In Ex 9:18 read with the Samaritans לְמִיּוֹם; in 2 S 19:25 לְכָת might possibly be taken in apposition to הַיּוֹם; in 2 K 10:1 restore אֶת־בְּנֵי אֶחָב, with the LXX and Lucian, before אֶחָב; in 2 K 25:19 omit the article, as in Jer 52:25, before סֵפֶר.

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 קֶבֶר has dropped out after הַקֶּבֶר) and Ps 123:4 (cf., however, the LXX, and observe that in the parallel member the genitive is paraphrased by לְ).—In Jos 3:14 הַבְּרִית (verse 17 *בְּרִית יְהוָה*) has been added to the original הָאָרוֹן by a redactor; cf. similar syntactically impossible additions in verse 11 (also in 1 S 4:3, &c., where the LXX still had simply *יהוָה*); in הַיְיָחָד Ju 16:14 the Masora evidently combines two different readings הַיְיָחָד and הַיְיָחָד; and similarly in Jer 25:26 (where הָאֶרֶץ was only subsequently introduced into the text), the two readings הַמְּלָכּוֹת and הַמְּלָכּוֹת הָאֵל are combined.—In Jos 8:11, 1 K 14:24, Jer 31:40, Ez 45:16 the article, being usual after כָּל־, has been mechanically added, and so also in 2 Ch 8:16 after עֲדָה; in 2 K 9:4 the second עֲדָה (instead of עֲדָה) is occasioned by the first; in Ez 7:7 הַיּוֹם belongs as a nominative to what follows; in Ez 8:29 the meaning perhaps is *in*

<sup>1</sup> According to Philippi (*St. Constr.*, p. 38) בֵּית־אֵל is rather a case of ‘sub-position’ in the accusative, as also הַדֶּרֶךְ הַתְּלוּן Ez 47:15 (for which, however, in 48:1 there is the correct reading הַדֶּרֶךְ הַתְּלוּן) *by the way to Hethlon*; and in fact, Ez 47:15 may without difficulty be explained in this way; so שֵׁשׁ 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 הָאֵץ בֶּן הַבְּדִיל *the weight, the lead*, i.e. *the leaden weight*; Ex 39:17, 2 K 16:14 (הִנָּח שָׁת), both here and in verse 17, is probably only a later addition, while *המסגרות המכנות* in verse 17 has arisen from a confusion of two readings, *מסגרות המכנות* and *המסגרות מהמכנות*. In Jer 32:12 also הַמְקַנָּה (unless the article is simply to be omitted) is in apposition to הַסִּפְרִי.

(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. הוּ הַמִּכֵּה הוּ Is 9:12, *the one smiting him*; in Dt 8:15, 13:6 also ךְּ is a verbal suffix, but hardly the ם in הוּ עֲשֵׂה הוּ for הוּ עֲשֵׂה הוּ Job 40:19, nor the ם in הוּ לָדָה in הוּ לָדָה Dn 11:6; § 116 g. For הוּ עֲרַבְךָ Lev 27:23, read עֲרַבְךָ as in verses 2, 3, 5, 7, 13, &c., twelve times (but cf. also the note on § 128 d).—Of the remaining examples כְּגַבְרֵתָהּ Is 24:2 (probably an intentional alliteration with the eleven other words beginning with כְּ), הוּ לִמְעַבְּ הוּ Pr 16:4, and הוּ עֲרַבְךָ (so Baer, following the best authorities) Ezr 10:14, rest only on the authority of the Masoretes, not of the authors. So also in הוּ אֶהְדָּלִי Jos 7:21, הוּ אֶהְדָּלִי Jos 8:33 (previously הוּ אֶהְדָּלִי), הוּ אֶהְדָּלִי 2 K 15:16 (dittography of the הוּ), the article is simply to be omitted as syntactically impossible; הוּ אֶהְדָּלִי 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. הוּ בְנֵי דָוִד וּבְנֵי בָנוֹתָיו *the sons of David and his daughters* (not בְנֵי וּבְנֵי בָנוֹתָיו); cf. 1 K 8:28.<sup>1</sup> The language also prefers to avoid a series of several *co-ordinate*<sup>2</sup> 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),<sup>3</sup> and rather tends to repeat the *nomen regens*, e.g. הוּ אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהוּ אֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ *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. הַיָּמִים שְׁנֵי חַיֵּי אָבִי *the days of the years of the life 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

<sup>1</sup> Very rare, and only possible in very rapid utterance, are such exceptions as Ez 31:16 (מְבַחַר וְטוֹב לְבָנוֹן); Pr 16:11.—In Is 11:2 *the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord*, הוּ רִיחַ עֵץ may at any rate also be taken as an absolute genitive, so also הוּ אֶהְדָּלִי Dn 1:4.

<sup>2</sup> In Ps 114:1 a second genitive is added even without the copula, but the parallelism of the members renders any misunderstanding impossible.

<sup>3</sup> 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 *rhythmical* 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* יַיִן הַלְּוִיִּים הַשְּׂמֵנִים, *the fat valley of them that are overcome with wine*. The usual explanation that יַיִן הַלְּוִיִּים הַשְּׂמֵנִים forms *one* single idea (in German *Fettigkeitstal*), on which the genitive יַיִן הַלְּוִיִּים then depends, in reality explains nothing; the text is almost certainly corrupt. In *Dt 15:18* מְשֻׁנָּה would be expected; in *Jos 3:11* הַבְּרִית is a later addition; in *Is 32:13* (מְשֻׁשׁ), and *Ps 68:22* (שִׁעָר), 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) כְּעַפְרָה should come either after וַיִּקְבֹּר or at the end of the verse, unless, with Moore, we omit 'ע אָבִי הָ' as a gloss (from 6:24); in *Is 63:11* מְשֻׁה is probably a gloss on יַמֵּי-עוֹלָם which has crept into the text; in *2 S 4:2* לְאִישׁ-בַּשֵּׁט, according to the LXX, has dropped out before בָּן; in *Ez 6:11* רְעוֹת 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 מוֹקְשֵׁי for מוֹבְקְשֵׁי); in *1 Ch 9:13* the preposition לְ (after a ל) has dropped out before מְלֹאכֶת (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* יְרוּשָׁלַיִם is either in apposition to הַהַיָּהּ 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 הַזֶּכֶּךָ after עֲרֶכְךָ<sup>1</sup> 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* בְּדָוּ מְדוּ *his garment*, namely the garment of *linen*, unless simply in apposition, cf. § 131 d (or read מְדוּ?); *Lv 26:42*, where 'עֲקֹב וּגוֹ' בְּרִיתִי יְיָ עֲקֹב בְּרִיתִי יְיָ עֲקֹב בְּרִיתִי יְיָ, could at most be explained as an ellipse for 'עֲקֹב בְּרִיתִי יְיָ עֲקֹב בְּרִיתִי יְיָ, cf. § 125 h (probably, however, it is a case of dittography of the י, which was repeated also before אַבְרָהָם; so Valeton, *ZAW*. xii. 3); equally strange is הַיּוֹם בְּרִיתִי הַיּוֹם *Jer 33:20*, &c. On the other hand, אִם יְהִיָּה נָבִיא אֲנִי יְהוָה יְהוָה, *Nu 12:6* could not possibly mean *if your prophet be a prophet of the Lord*; the text is manifestly corrupt (probably מִיָּהּ נָבִיא יְהוָה is to be read, with Marti). In *Ps 45:7* אֵלֵּי הַיּוֹם (usually explained as *thy divine throne*), אֱלֹהִים is most probably a later addition [another suggestion is to read אֵלֵּי הַיּוֹם *like God('s throne)*: cf. § 141 d, note]. In *Jer 52:20* two readings are probably combined, לְנֶחֱשֶׁת לְנֶחֱשֶׁת, without any addition, and לְנֶחֱשֶׁת בְּלִ-הַכְּלִים. In *Nu 25:12* שְׁלוֹם is in apposition to בְּרִיתִי. On עֲרֶכְךָ זָמָה *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* (אֶשׁ). 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.

<sup>1</sup> Halévy, *J. A.* xiv. 548, removes the difficulty by pointing עֲרֶכְךָ.

*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*,<sup>1</sup> see the examples under k–q).

Examples. The *nomen rectum* represents—

(a) A *subjective genitive*, specifying the possessor, author, &c., e.g. בַּיַּת־הַמֶּלֶךְ *the king's house*; דְּבַר יְהוָה *the word of the Lord*.

(b) An *objective genitive*, e.g. Ob<sup>10</sup> מִן הַחַמַּס אֲתִיךָ *for the violence done to thy brother*<sup>2</sup> (but in Ez 12:19 חַמַּס מִן הַמֶּלֶךְ is followed by a subjective genitive); Pr 20:2 לֵךְ אַיִמַת מֶלֶךְ *the terror of a king*; Gn 18:20 וַיִּצְעַק סֹדֹם *the cry concerning Sodom*; Is 23:5 צִרְיָה שִׁמְעָה *the report of (about) Tyre*, cf. 2 S 4:4; Am 8:10 אֲבָל יְהוּדָה *the mourning for an only son*; Dt 20:14 אֲרִיבֵיךָ שָׁלַל *praeda hostibus tuis erepta*; cf. Is 3:14. In a wider sense this includes such examples as הַיַּיִם הַזֶּה הַדֶּרֶךְ *the way of (i.e. to) the tree of life*, Gn 3:24; cf. Pr 7:27, Jb 38:20; הַיָּם הַזֶּה הַדֶּרֶךְ *the way of (by) the sea*, Is 8:23; הַיָּם זִבְחֵי אֵלֹהִים *the sacrifices of (i.e. pleasing to) God*, Ps 51:19; שְׁבַעַת יְהוָה *the oath of (i.e. sworn before) the Lord*, 1 K 2:48; דְּבָרַי לְמוֹאֵל *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. הַחֲכָמוֹת שֵׁן רוּחֵיהֶן *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. הַנָּהָר פְּרַת *the river Euphrates*; אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן *the land of Canaan*; בְּתוּלַת יִשְׂרָאֵל *the virgin Israel (not of Israel)*, Am 5:2.

(e) Of the *genus*, e.g. Pr 15:20 (21<sup>20</sup>) אִדְמוֹת אֶדְמוֹת *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. קְבֹרָה יְרֵדָה *a possession of a burying-place, i.e. hereditary sepulchre*, Gn 23:4, &c.; תְּאֵנֵי הַבְּכֻרוֹת *the early figs*, Jer 24:2; אֶת הַבַּיִת *the tabernacle of my house, i.e. my dwelling-place*, Ps 132:3.

(g) Of the *measure, weight, extent, number*, e.g. מְתֵי 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 (?) מִן בְּרַב־יָם.

<sup>1</sup> The latter term is preferred especially by König, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1898, p. 528 ff.

<sup>2</sup> 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. εὐνοια τῶν φίλων, πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, 1 Cor. 1:18.

(h) Of the *material*<sup>3</sup> of which something consists, e.g. כְּלִי חָרָשׁ *a vessel of earthenware*, Nu 5:17; כְּלִי כֶסֶף *vessels of silver* (cf. the French *des vases d'or*); אֲרוֹן עֵץ *an ark of wood*, שֶׁטַח בְּרֹזֶל *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 אֶתְנַתְּ עוֹלָם *an everlasting possession*; Pr 17:8 אֶבֶן יָקָר *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 קְדוּשָׁה *holiness* very frequently serves as a periphrasis for the adjective קָדוֹשׁ (e.g. בְּגָדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ *the holy garments*, Ex 29:29), since קָדוֹשׁ is used almost exclusively in reference to persons (hence also with עַם and גּוֹי *people*, and with שֵׁם the *name* of a person); the only exceptions are מְקוֹם קָדוֹשׁ *holy place*, Ex 29:31, &c.; מַיִם קְדוֹשִׁים *holy water*, Nu 5:17; קָדוֹשׁ as the predicate of יוֹם *day*, Neh 8:10 f., and of מַחֲנֶה *camp*, Dt 23:15. So also the use of צַדִּיק *righteous* is always confined to persons, except in Dt 4:8; elsewhere the periphrasis with דָּק אֲזַנֵּי or צִדְקָה is always used, e.g. מִזְּבָלֵי דָק *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. צֶאֱן טְבָחָה *sheep for the slaughter*, Ps 44:23; מוֹסֵר שְׁלוֹמֵנוּ *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 חֲמֹר לֶחֶם וְבֹטְלוֹת *an ass laden with bread and a bottle of wine* (but probably עֲשָׂרָה is to be read for חֲמֹר); 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 מְבַחֵר *choice, selection*, as in Gn 23:6 יְבוֹתֵי הַמְּבַחֵר *the choice of our sepulchres*, i.e. our choicest sepulchres; Ex 15:4, Is 22:7, 37:24; other examples are, Is 1:16 הַרְעָה *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 כֹּל *entirety*, for *all, the whole, every*, see § 127 b; it is also frequent with מְעַט *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*, בַּעַל *master, possessor*, בֶּן־ *son*, and their feminines and plurals (including מְתִי *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 אִישׁ, &c.; אִישׁ דְּבָרִים *an eloquent man*, Ex 4:10 (but אִישׁ שֹׁפֵתֵי *a man of lips*, i.e. *a boaster*); אִישׁ לְשׁוֹן = *a slanderer*, Ps 140:12; אִישׁ דַּעַת *a man of knowledge*, Pr 24:5; אִישׁ הַמָּהָה *a wrathful man*, Pr 15:18; אִישׁ דָּמִים *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 אִשָּׁת מְדִינָה *a contentious woman*, Pr 27:15; in the plural, e.g. Gn 6:4 אַנְשֵׁי הַשָּׁמַיִם *the men of renown, famous*; cf. Gn 47:6, Is 41:11,

<sup>3</sup> In the almost entire absence of corresponding adjectives (אֲרוֹז *made of cedar*, a denominative from אָרָז, and נְחוֹשׁ *brazen* are the only examples), the language regularly has recourse to the above periphrasis. On the form *qāṭūl*, as expressing an inherent property, cf. § 50 f; cf. also the proper name, בְּרִזְלִי *ferreus*.



either of the *material*, e.g. Ex 3:8, &c., *אָ רַץ זָבַת חֵלֶב וְדָבַשׁ* a *land flowing with milk and honey*; or of the *means*, e.g. *רָבַח הַלְלִיָּהוּ* *slain with the sword*, Is 22:2; or the *cause*, Ct 2:5 *sick of love*; or of the *scope* of the attribute,<sup>1</sup> e.g. Gn 39:6 *אֵר יִפְהַת־תּ* *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 *אָנוּן אֶגְדִּי בְּ* *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 *יְקִי מִבְּרָאִים* *clean as regards hands*, &c.; 2 S 9:3, Is 6:5, Jb 17:9; Is 19:10 *אֲגַמִּי־נַפְשִׁי* *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*,<sup>2</sup> or by the addition of a relative clause (אֲשֶׁר לְ, 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. 1 S 14:16 *הַצִּיּוֹנִים לְשָׂאוֹל* *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 *בֶּן לְיִשָּׁי* *a son of Jesse* (בֶּן יִשָּׁי would be, according to § 127 a, *the son of Jesse*); cf. Gn 14:18, 36:12, 41:12, Nu 16:22 (27<sup>16</sup>), 1 S 17:8, 2 S 19:21, Ps 122:5. Hence, regularly מְזִמּוֹר 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 מְזִמּוֹר לְדָוִד (Ps 24:1, &c.) is not to be regarded as a transposition, but מְזִמּוֹר is used epexegetically for the general term omitted before לְדָוִד (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 *חֵצֵי הַשָּׂדֶה לְבֹאָז* *the portion of field belonging to Boaz* (חֵצֵי בֹאָז would be *the portion of the field of Boaz*); 2 K 5:9 *בֵּית דְּלִישָׁא* *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

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Latin *integer vitae scelerisque purus; tristes animi*, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the *σχημα Κολοφώνιον* in Greek, e.g. ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ 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 מִן [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־סֵם פֶּר דְּבָרֵי הַנְּמִים לְמַלְכֵי 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 *שָׁכַבְתָּךְ*, on account of the suffix, cannot be used in the construct state; but Lv 15:16 ff., &c., *שָׁכַבְתָּךְ רַע*; Ju 3:28 *הַיַּרְדֵּן* (as a proper name cannot be used in the construct state); Ex 20:5 *עַל־הַרְבַּעִים* upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hats me; *עַל־הַרְבַּעִים* must be kept in the absolute state for the sake of conformity with *עַל־שׁ:לְשִׁים*, and for the same reason also *לְאֶלְפִים לְאֶהָבִי*.

(d) After statements of number in such cases as Gn 8:14 *דָּשׁ לַח' לַח' יוֹם* on the seven and twentieth day of the month; cf. 7:11, 16:3 and frequently, or as in Hag 1:1 *בְּשָׁנָה שְׁנִי* 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 *בְּיוֹם הַשְׁלִישִׁי לְלִדְתִי* on the third day of my giving birth (i.e. after my giving birth). Cf. also the standing phrase *דָּשׁ לַח' בְּאַחַד לַח' יוֹם* on the first (day) of the month, Gn 8:5 and frequently.

Rem. In cases like 2 S 3:2 *וְעַמּוֹן בְּנוֹן לְאֶחָיו* of Ahinoam, the genitive expressed by circumlocution with *לְ* is in reality dependent on a regens which is omitted (*בְּנוֹן לְ אֶחָיו עַם* a son of Ahinoam); cf. 2 S 3:3, 5, 1 K 14:13, Am 5:3 (unless *לְבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל* originally depended on *thus spake the Lord*), and the remarks on *לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר* 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 *הַצֹּאֵן אֲשֶׁר לְאָבִי יֵה* 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 *הַמְּצַרְתִּי וְהַבֹּאֵקֵר* (belonged) to the king of Egypt (*מִלְּךְ מִצְרַיִם*) 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 לְשִׁלְמֹה* the Song of songs, of Solomon; 1 S 21:8, 2 S 2:8, 1 Ch 11:10; cf. also Gn 41:43.<sup>1</sup>

### § 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,<sup>1</sup> particularly in elevated (prophetic or poetic) style, especially when the nomen regens is a participle. Thus before *בְּ*, *שְׂמֵחַת בְּקִצְרֵךְ* 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 *בּוֹכֵם*; cf.

<sup>1</sup> In New Hebrew *שֶׁל* (derived from *אֲשֶׁר לְ* = *שֶׁל*, see § 36, and cf. Ct 1:6, 3:7 *שֶׁלִּי מֵהַ* (*שֶׁלִּשְׁלִי מֵהַ*) is used like the simple relative *דִּי*, *דְּ* in Aramaic, as an independent sign of the genitive.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. König, *Διε Υεβερωσχηρευνυ δεσ Στ.-χονστρ.-Γεβραυχης υμ Σεμυτ.*, ZDMG. 53, 521 ff.

Na 1:7, Jer 8:16 (Ps 24:1); Ps 64:9 (unless אָרֶה should be read); 98:7.<sup>2</sup>—Before לְ, Ho 9:6 (but read probably כְּמַדְי כְּכַפָּם); Ps 58:5 (before לָמוּ); Pr 24:9, Jb 18:2, La 2:18 (before לְךָ); 1 Ch 6:55, 23:28; in participles, Ez 38:11, Jb 24:5; before לְ with an infinitive, Is 56:10, and again before לְ with a suffix, Gn 24:21, Is 30:18, 64:3;<sup>3</sup>—before אֶל־, Is 14:19, Ez 21:17; —before אֶת־ (*with*), Is 8:6; —before מִן, Gn 3:22, Is 28:9 (a participle); Jer 23:23, Ez 13:2, Ho 7:5; —before עַל־, Ju 5:10; —before בְּלִתִּי, 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 הַכְמַת Is 33:6, גִּילַת 35:2, and שְׂכַרְתָּ 51:21 may be cases of an intentional reversion to the old feminine ending *ath*, in order to avoid the hiatus (וְ) הַ וְ.

(3) When it governs the (originally demonstrative) pronoun אֲשֶׁר; so especially in the combination אֲשֶׁר מְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר, Gn 39:20, 40:3, *the place where* (prop. *of that in which*) *Joseph was bound*; cf. § 138 g; or אֲשֶׁר בְּמְקוֹם 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 אֲשֶׁר מְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר, הַמְקוֹם 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' followed by a *perfect* in 1 S 29:8, and יָמֵי א' Lv 13:46, Nu 9:18.<sup>1</sup>

(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־הַתְּשֻׁלָּח prop. *by the hand of him whom thou wilt send*; Nu 23:3 דְּבַר מַה־יֵּרָא נִי *the matter of that which he shall show me*, i.e. whatever he shall; Is 29:1 קְרִיַת הַנָּה דָוִד *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*.<sup>2</sup> In Gn 39:4 (כְּלִי־יְשִׁילֹו) the כֶּל־ takes after it a noun-clause, and in Ex 9:4, still more boldly, a subst. with לְ.—Very often a *time-determination* governs the following sentence in this way; thus אֲהָרִי followed by a *perfect*, Lv 25:48, 1 S 5:9; בְּיוֹם 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

<sup>2</sup> In Ju 8:11 the article is even used before a construct state followed by כִּי, in order to determine the whole combination אֲהָלִים בְּ, אֲהָלֵי שְׂכֹנֵי בְּ *tent-dwellers*, taken as one word; cf., however, the remarks in § 127 f–i on similar grammatical solecisms.

<sup>3</sup> These are to be distinguished from the cases where לְ follows a construct state, which in conjunction with מִן (and the following לְ) 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 לְ בֵּית meaning simply *within*; מִיְמִין לְ (2 K 23:13, Ez 10:3) *on the right hand* (i.e. south) of; מִצְפּוֹן לְ (Jos 8:11, 13, &c., Ju 2:9) *on the north of*; cf. also Jos 15:21 and לְפָנֵי מִן Neh 13:4.

<sup>1</sup> In Dt 23:5 the construct state governs a sentence introduced by the *conjunction* אֲשֶׁר (עַל־דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר *by reason of the fact that*, i.e. *because*); so also in 1 S 3:13.

<sup>2</sup> 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: הַיְהוָה הַיָּמוּב יְכַפֵּר בְּעַד כָּל־לִבָּבו הַכִּין *the good Lord pardon every one that setteth his heart to seek God*. [See Wickes' *Accoutuation of the Twenty-one Prose Books of the Old Testament*, p. 140.]

36:2; כְּלַיְמִי Lv 14:46, 1 S 25:15, Jb 29:2 (כַּיְמֵי *as in the days when ...*<sup>3</sup>; cf. כַּיְמֵי and שְׁנוֹת before a perfect, Ps 90:15); בְּעֵת before a perfect, Jer 6:15 (cf. 49:8, 50:31); before an imperfect, Jb 6:17; תְּהִלָּת before a perfect Ho 1:2.

(5) Connected with a following word in apposition; certainly so in such cases as בְּתוּלַת בְּתֻצִיּוֹן *the virgin, the daughter of Zion*, Is 37:22; cf. 23:12, Jer 14:17; also 1 S 28:7 בְּעֵלְת־אֹזֶב אִשָּׁת אֵי *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'rê*; Jer 46:9, Ps 35:16 (?), 78:9, Jb 20:17 *b* (unless הָרִי, הָרִי 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.<sup>4</sup>

(6) The numeral אֶחָד *one* for אֶחָד 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 languages<sup>1</sup>) 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 expegetical addition would be expected.

2. The principal kinds of apposition in Hebrew are:—

(a) The collocation of *genus* and *species*, e.g. אִשָּׁה אֶלְמָנָה *a woman (who was) a widow*, 1 K 7:14; נַעֲרָה בְּתוּלָה, *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, קַשְׁתָּה is probably an explanatory gloss); Ex 24:5 (1 S 11:15), 2 S 15:16, 1 K 3:16, 5:29 (but probably סָבֵל should be read instead of סָבֵל); Is 3:24 (unless מְעֻשָׁה is to be read), Jer 20:1. Perhaps also כֹּהֵן הָרִאשׁוֹן *the priest (who is) the chief man*, 2 K 25:18, &c.; others take כֹּהֵן as

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Na 2:9 הֵיאָה כַּיְמֵי, usually explained to mean *from the days* that she hath been, but the text is evidently very corrupt.

<sup>4</sup> So also Is 28:16 *a corner stone of the preciousness* (יְקָרְתָּה 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 כָּל־פְּקוּדֶיךָ יָדָהּ.

<sup>1</sup> 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־צָבָא הַגִּבּוֹ with the LXX, as in the parallel passage 1 Ch 19:9 for כָּל־צָבָא הַגִּבּוֹ, 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 (27<sup>13</sup>) זֶה רִשָׁע הוּא לִקְדָּמָה אֲדָם רִשָׁע *this is the portion of a man, (who is) a wicked man* (but רִשָׁע might also be an adjunct.); cf. Pr 6:12.—Lv 6:13, 16:4 (where, however, דָּשׁ קִי is probably a gloss); Pr 22:21 אֲמָתִים אֲמָרִים אֲמָתִים *words (which are) truth*; (immediately after אֲמָרִים אֲמָתִים cf. 1 S 2:13, Mi 1:11 (where, however, בִּשְׁמֵחָה is most probably a gloss on עֲרִיבָה); 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 וַיִּין תַּרְעֵלָה wine which is *staggering* (intoxicating drink), which causes staggering<sup>2</sup>; 1 K 22:27, 2 Ch 18:26 מֵי לֶחֶץ (in Is 30:20 parallel with לֶחֶץ מַיִם) *water* which is *affliction*, drunk in trouble (imprisonment). Still more boldly, 1 K 5:3 בָּקָר רִיעִי *oxen* which were taken out of the *pastures*, and 1 K 6:7 אֲבָנִים מִן הַבְּרֵכָה *undressed stones* which come from the *quarry*, probably a corruption of מִן הַבְּרֵכָה. A person and a condition are in apposition in Ez 18:6 (unless בְּנִדְחָה is to be read).—In 1 S 4:1 read אֶבֶן הַעֵי, as in 5:1, 7:12.

(c) Collocation of the *person* (Dt 28:36) or *thing* (form) and *material*,<sup>1</sup> or of the *place* or *measure* and its *contents*, e.g. 1 Ch 15:19 שֵׁשׁ בְּמִצְלֹתַיִם *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 אֲבָנֵי אֶבֶן); cf. 2 Ch 4:13, Lv 6:3 (see, however, § 128 d); 2 K 7:1 סֵלֶת סֵלֶת *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 שֵׁשׁ כֶּסֶף *two talents of silver*;<sup>2</sup> 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 מִיָּמֵי דָוִד *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 יָמֵי שְׁנַיִם *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. יָמֵי שְׁלֹשָׁה בָנִים *trias sc. filii*, § 97 a and § 134 b.

(d) Collocation of the *thing* and the *measure* or *extent*, *number*, &c., e.g. Nu 9:20 יָמֵי מְסָפָר *days*, (a small) *number*, i.e. only a few days; כֶּסֶף מְשֻׁנָּה *money*, *repetition*, i.e.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 וַיִּין הַקָּחָה *spiced wine*, Ct 8:2, and אֲבִיבֵי אֲבִיבֵי *a wild ass's colt*, Jb 11:12 (in which passages וַיִּין and אֲבִיבֵי must certainly be in the construct state) we cannot but ask whether the Masora does not intend the וַיִּין in Ps 60:5 to be taken as construct state (for which elsewhere יִין).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also the examples treated above in § 127 h.

<sup>2</sup> On the anomalous form כֶּסֶף (instead of כֶּסֶף; cf. כֶּסֶף immediately before), see § 88 b.

twice as much money, Gn 43:12 (unless כֶּסֶף be constr. st.); מַיִם בְּרֶכְךָ יָם *water* which was of the measure of the *knees*, which reached to the knees, Ez 47:4 (also מַיִם מִתַּנּוּ יָם *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 מְעַט מְעַט *men, a few*, i.e. some few men; 1 K 5:9 תְּבוּנָה הַרְבֵּה *understanding, much-making*, i.e. much understanding, unless הַרְבֵּה is to be taken as an adverb with וַיִּתֵּן, as in 2 S 8:8 with לָקָה.

(e) Collocation of the *thing* and its *name*, e.g. בְּהַר־רָם שְׂעִיר *in their mountainous district, Seir* (perhaps only a later gloss), Gn 14:6; הָאָרֶץ רַץ כְּנָעַן *the land Canaan* (כְּנָעַן 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. הַמֶּלֶךְ לְךָ דָּוִד, הַמֶּלֶךְ לְךָ שְׁלֹמֹה *king David, king Solomon* (less frequently הַמֶּלֶךְ לְךָ דָּוִד 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 דְּרִיּוּשׁ [מְלִבְאָה], 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* (אֵת, אֶת־) 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 בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם *in Jerusalem, the city which, &c.*<sup>1</sup>

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 אַדְמַדְמָה לְבָנָה *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 הַמָּוֶה is probably a gloss); Is 42:25 *he poured upon him fury*, namely *his anger*; <sup>2</sup> 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 אֶת־הַיֵּלֶד be a later gloss); Ex 35:5, Lv 13<sup>57b</sup>, 1 K 19:21 (where, indeed, הַבָּשָׂר appears to be a late gloss); 21:13, 2

<sup>1</sup> In 1 K 11:8 participles after לְכַל־יְנֻשָׁיו, as in 2 K 10:6 after לִי הָעֵרִיר, in 19:2 after a determinate accusative, and in Hag 1:4 after בְּבָרְכֵיכֶם, are used *without* the article; these, however, are probably to be explained not as in apposition, but according to § 118 p.

<sup>2</sup> But מִיִּם Gn 6:17 (cf. 7:6) is to be regarded as a later gloss upon the archaic מִבּוֹל.

K 16:15 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, Jer 9:14, 31:2, Ez 3:21, Ec 2:21 (according to Delitzsch rather a double accusative).<sup>3</sup>

(c) To a noun-suffix, e.g. Ez 10:3 *כָּבַד אֶת 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 *וְהָאִישׁ לֹא יִשְׁתָּדֵד* woe to him, the one alone; with a repetition of the preposition, Nu 32:33, Jos 1:2 *לְבָנֵי 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.<sup>1</sup>—Cf. finally, Ct 3:7, where the suffix precedes the genitive periphrastically expressed by *שָׁלַי*, as in Ez 9:1, where the genitive is expressed by *לְ*.<sup>2</sup>

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 *יִלְדָיו* is clearly a gloss); cf. Ps 83:12; in Jb 29:3 read *בְּהִלְלוֹ* (infin. Hiph.) or at least its syncopated form *בְּהִלוֹ*.

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 *מִשְׁנֵה כָּסֶף* 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 15<sup>10</sup> older than thy father in days, and the expression of the superlative by means of *מְאֹד* (originally a substantive), e.g. *טוֹב מְאֹד* very good, Gn 1:31 (cf. also Ec 7:16 *צַדִּיק הַרְבֵּה* righteous over much), and the very frequent *מְאֹד הַרְבֵּה* prop. a much-making exceedingly, i.e. exceedingly great, Gn 15:1, 41:49, also Pr 23:29 *פְּצָעִים הַנָּם* wounds without cause,<sup>3</sup> perhaps also Gn 34:25 (*בְּטוֹחַ*).

(b) A few examples, in which an exegetical substantive is added to a substantive with a suffix; thus, Ez 16:27 *מִדְרֶכְךָ זָמָה* 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 *מִן עוֹזֵי הַיָּל* 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 *חֹב לָתוֹ חוֹב* Ez 18:7, i.e. according to the context his pledge for a debt; Ezr 2:62 *בְּתַבְּתֵי הַמִּתְּבִיחִים*, i.e. their register, namely of those that were reckoned by genealogy (but

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> For *וַיִּשְׁנֶה* 1 S 21:14 either 'וַיִּשְׁנֶה is to be read or the *K<sup>e</sup>thubh* is to be explained according to § 75 b, note. Also *וַיִּלְכְּדוּ* Pr 5:22 has hardly preserved the correct form.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> But in Is 17:6 we should certainly divide the words differently and read *בְּסַעֲפֵי הַפְּרִי*, in Jer 48:44 read *אֶלֶה* for *אֶלֶיָּה*, and in Pr 14:13 *אֶחָרִית הַשִּׁמְחָה*; in Gn 2:19 *אֶלֶיָּהוּ* is a late gloss upon *לוֹ*, and in Ez 41:25 *אֶלֶיָּהוּ* a gloss on *הַיָּבֵל*.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> In Ps 69:5 *הַנָּם* (like *וּשְׁוֹרֵי קֶרֶן* in a false way, falsely, Ps 35:19 and 38:20) is used as an *adverbial accusative* with a participle; cf. § 118 q.

perhaps 'הַמְתִּי is in apposition to the suffix in בְּתָבָם), also the curious combinations (mentioned in § 128 d) of בְּרִיתִי with a proper name (Lv 26:42), and in Jer 33:20 with הַיּוֹם.<sup>4</sup>

6. In Dt 33:4 (מִוֶּרֶשׁ), perhaps לְקַהֲלָה מִוֶּרֶשׁ is to be read), 33:27 (מִעֲנָה), Ju 7:8 (צִדְדָה), 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 עֵוֹן is evidently intended to combine the readings עֵוֹן פְּלִילִים and עֵוֹן פְּלִילִי (as in verse 28).—The remarkable combination אֱלֹהֵי הַיָּמִים צְבָאוֹת in Ps 80:8, 15 is due to the fact that in Ps 42–83 אֱלֹהֵי הַיָּמִים has almost throughout been subsequently substituted by some redactor for the divine name יְהוָה; on יהוה צְבָאוֹת cf. § 125 h. In Ps 59:6, 80:5, 20, and 84:9 יהוה has been reinstated in the text before אֱלֹהֵי הַיָּמִים צְבָאוֹת.<sup>1</sup>

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 לְאִישָׁהּ עִמָּה 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.<sup>2</sup>

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. אִישׁ גָּדוֹל *a great man*, אִשָּׁה 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 עֲטָרֹת זָהָב גְּדוֹלָה *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

---

4 <sup>4</sup> But in Nu 25:12 שְׁלוֹם may also be explained, according to *c*, as really in apposition. Cf. on the whole question Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, 4th ed., p. 203, note 1.

1 <sup>1</sup> Without this assumption it would be inconceivable that יהוה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת should not have been written; that the author of these Psalms regarded צְבָאוֹת already as an independent name of God (so Gesenius and Olshausen) is out of the question.

2 <sup>2</sup> 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*); קַל *swift=the runner* (of the horse, Is 30:16); לְבָנָה *alba*, i.e. *luna*; פְּרִיָּה *(fructifera) a fruitful tree*, Is 17:6 (so פֶּרֶת Gn 49:22); רֹבֵץ *a croucher*, i.e. *a crouching beast of prey*, Gn 4:7. Cf. also רֹגֵן (*gravis, augustus*) and נְעִיזָא (*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 Ὑγρὴ = *the sea*; *merum* for *vinum*, &c.

character; thus, Is 10:30 עֲנִיָּה עֲנִיתוֹת *O thou poor one, Anathoth!* (but probably יָהּ אָנִי *answer her*, is to be read); cf. 23:12, 53:11 (*a righteous man, my servant*; but in 28:21 זָר and נִכְרִי 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 רַבִּים and רַבּוֹת *many*, are sometimes placed, like numerals, before the substantive, Jer 16:16, Neh 9:28 (in Ps 145:7 רַב 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 גִּדְלָה should be read); 1 S 16:7 (*the height of his stature*); in the plural, 1 S 17:40 חֲלָקֵי אֲבָנִים *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 אֲבִיּוֹנֵי אָדָם *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 רִיחַ גֵּד לָהּ וְהֶזֶק וּגּוֹי (but read גֵּדוֹל); 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 וְהַקִּים וּמַצּוֹת 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 יִם (§ 87 p) the adjectival attribute (in accordance with the fundamental rule stated above, under a) takes the ending וֹת, e.g. Is 10:14 בְּיָצִים עֲזוּבוֹת *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) עֵינַי יָם רְמוֹת *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. צֹאן *sheep* [with *fem. plur.*], Gn 30:43, 1 S 25:18; עָם=*men*, 1 S 13:15, Is 9:1; כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל=*all the Israelites*, 1 S 2:14; גְּלוּת=*the exiles*, Jer 28:4; cf. also שְׁנֵי נַפְשֵׁי יָם *two souls*, Gn 46:27.<sup>1</sup> 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 אֵל־הֵים צַדִּיק; 2 K 19:4, 16 (=Is 37:4, 17); Is 19:4; but cf. אֵל־הֵים חַיִּים.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> But it is impossible to take תְּמִימִם 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.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 1 S 28:13, where אֵל־הֵים (in the sense of *a spirit*) is followed by עֲלִים as a second accusative; conversely in 1 S 19:13, 16, a singular suffix refers back to תְּרַפִּים

Dt 5:23, 1 S 17:26, 36, Jer 10:10, 23:36, perhaps also Ex 20:3 אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים = *another god*, and Jos 24:19 אֱלֹהֵי קְדָשִׁים (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 אֱלֹהִים 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 (מִי), e.g. 1 S 9:2 הַגָּבִיחַ מִכָּל־הָעָם *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 מֵהַמֶּתוּק טְדִבֵּשׁ וּמֵהַעֲזָה מִן־אֲרִי *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.<sup>2</sup>

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 וַיִּגְבֶּה מִכָּל־הָעָם *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.<sup>1</sup> This is evident in such cases as מִן בָּחַר *to choose* something (to prefer it) *before* something else, e.g. Jb 7:15, cf. Dt 14:2 (also מִן ... יִתְרוֹן *the excellence of* ...

---

*household god* (but not so in Gn 31:34), as in Ps 46:4 to the plural of amplification יַמִּים *sea*. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether רַבָּה Ps 78:15 is to be regarded as an attribute of מוֹת and not rather as the adverb, *abundantly*.

1<sup>1</sup> There is in Arabic a special form of the adjective (the *elative*) for the comparative and superlative, which in Hebrew would have the form אֶקְטֵל. Instances of it, perhaps, are אֶדָּר *daring, cruel*, אֶדְבֵּב *deceptive* (of a brook drying up), and its opposite אֶיֶּתֶן (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*.

2<sup>2</sup> 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 ...?*

1<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Latin ablative with the comparative; also the etymology of such words as *eximius, egregius*, and the Homeric ἕκ πάντων μάλιστα, Il. 4, 96; ἕκ πασῶν, 18, 431.

over ..., Ec 2:13); it is also seen in examples like Gn 37:3 וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל אֶהָב אֶת־יוֹסֵף מִכָּל־בְּנָיו *now Israel loved Joseph more than all his (other) children*; 29:30, 1 S 2:29, Ho 6:6.<sup>2</sup>

2. A somewhat different idea underlies the use of מִן 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 הַמְעַט 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* (קֵט נְתִי) *for all the mercies* (I am not worthy of ...), &c.; cf. also the expressions מִן כָּבֵד *to be too heavy for one*, Ex 18:18, Nu 11:14, Ps 38:5; מִן קָשָׁה *to be too hard for one*, Dt 1:17; מִן מְעַט *to be too few for something*, Ex 12:4; מִן גָּבַר *to be too strong for one*, Ps 65:4; מִן עָצָם *to be too mighty for one*, Gn 26:16; מִן רוּם *to be too high for one*, Ps 61:3; מִן צָר *to be too narrow for one*, Is 49:19; מִן קָצָר *to be too short for something*, Is 50:2, and very frequently מִן נִפְלְאָה *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 פְּלִיאָה in the same sense is followed by מִן.—This use is especially seen in the numerous instances in which the attribute is followed by מִן with an infinitive e.g. 1 K 8:64 הַבְּרָזִית הַזֹּאת ... *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. רַב לְכֶם מִן, 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 (מִן followed by a substantive).<sup>3</sup>

In all these instances מִן 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־יִבָּצֵר מֵהֶם כֹּל וְגוֹ' *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 מִן logically depends, must sometimes, in consequence of a pregnant use of the מִן (see the analogous examples in § 119 ff), be supplied from the context, e.g. Is 10:10 וְכַסּוֹת מִיְהוָה מִיְהוָה *whose graven images were more numerous than those at Jerusalem, &c.*,<sup>4</sup> 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;<sup>1</sup> e. g. 1 S 9:21 הַדְּעָרָה *the least*; 16:11 הַקָּטָן *the little one*, i.e. the *youngest* of eight sons; 17:14 *David was the* הַקָּטָן *the*

<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the phrase מִן צָדָק expresses not a comparison, but only a relation existing between one person and another; thus, in Gn 38:26 וַיִּבֶן מִן צָדָקָה *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.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also 2 K 4:3, where the idea of *doing something too little* is paraphrased by the Hiph. הִמְעִיט = *do not too little*, sc. לִישָׂא *in borrowing empty vessels*.

<sup>4</sup> With this *comparatio decurtata*, cf. the still bolder pregnant construction in Ps 4:8, מְעַט *greater gladness than at the time, &c.*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also עָלְיוֹן *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 בְּנוֹ הַקָּטָן *his youngest son*; cf. Jos 14:15; also with a following genitive, 2 Ch 21:17 קָטָן בְּנֵי אָבִיו *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 מִן הַגָּדוֹלִים וְעַד הַקָּטָנִים *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 substantivally (§ 128 w) sometimes serves as a periphrasis for the superlative, e. g. Is 22:24 כָּל כְּלֵי הַקְּטָן *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 קֹדֶשׁ הַקְּדוֹשִׁים *the most holy place*; שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים (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)<sup>2</sup>; 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 (שַׁבַּת שַׁבְּתוֹן *a sabbath of solemn rest*, i.e. an obligatory day of rest, Ex 31:15, &c.) or of the same meaning (e. g. חַשְׁךְ אָפֶלֶא *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 עֲמֹק עֲמֹק עֲמֹק *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 (מְאֹד מְאֹד *exceedingly*, also בְּמְאֹד מְאֹד 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 קְטַט קְטַט *little by little, very gradually*.<sup>1</sup>

The repetition of substantives serves also as a periphrasis for the superlative in such cases as לְדֹר דָּר (Ex 3:15) = *to the remotest generations*; cf. 17:16, Jer 6:14, 8:11 (*perfect peace*); Ez 21:32 (עָנָה three times);<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>28 f.</sup>, 35:3); 32:15, Na 2:11, Zp 1:15 (Jb 30:3, 38:27).

<sup>2</sup> *God Iof gods, and Lord of lords*, just as the supreme god of the Babylonians is called *bēl bēlī* (Tiele, *Compend. der Rel.-Gesch.*, p. 87).

<sup>1</sup> 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 אַךְ אַךְ appear to be placed together for a similar purpose, equivalent to *simply and solely*.

<sup>2</sup> 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,<sup>3</sup> 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. יָמֵי שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים *a triad of days*, i.e. three days; אֲנָשִׁים שְׁנַיִם *the two men*; or

(b) In the absolute state *before* it (the object numbered being in apposition, § 131 d), e. g. בְּנֵי אֶתְלָשָׁה *a triad, viz. sons*, i. e. three sons; אֲנָשִׁים שְׁנַיִם *two men*; or

(c) In the absolute state (likewise in apposition) *after* the object numbered, e. g. בְּנוֹת שְׁלוֹשׁ. 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.<sup>4</sup>

Rem. In Lv 24:22 אֶתְלָשָׁה follows the construct state מְשַׁפֵּט, but here as in Nu 15:16 מְשַׁפֵּט should be read. In Gn 42:19 אֶתְלָשָׁה 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 אֶתְלָשָׁה precedes the substantive in the Aramaic manner (= *one each*).—For מֵאֵה שָׁנָה (Gn 17:17, &c.) we find regularly in the Priestly Code (except in Gn 17:17, 23:1) מֵאֵה שָׁנָה (Gn 5:3, &c.) *an hundred years*. On the connexion of abstract numerals with suffixes, as שְׁנֵי אֲנָשִׁים *their duality*, i.e. *they two*, Gn 2:25, &c. (also with a strengthening separate pronoun, as שְׁנֵי יָנוּ אֲנִי וְהוּא 1 S 20:42), cf. § 97 i.

2. The numerals from 2 to 10 take the object numbered in the plural,<sup>1</sup> with very few exceptions, such as Ex 16:22 (where שְׁנֵי הָעֵרְ מֶרֶק = *the double of an omer*), 2 K 2:21, Ez 45:1, cf. 2 K 8:17 and 25:17 *K<sup>e</sup>th*. 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

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> <sup>4</sup> 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 אֶתְלָשָׁה שְׁמוֹת הַשָּׁרָפִים; for the omission of the article before 'ש', cf. § 126 w.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> On examples such as Gn 46:27 (שְׁנֵי נַפְשֵׁי אִישׁ *two souls*), cf. § 132 g (collectives joined with the plural of the adjective).

numerals (אָלף *a thousand*, איש, יום, כּוֹר, נֶפֶשׁ, בּוֹר, יוֹם, אֵישׁ—but only in Ezekiel and the Priestly Code), otherwise the plural, as עָרִים, בְּנוֹת, בְּנֵי (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. אַמּוֹת עֶשְׂרִים *twenty cubits*, 2 Ch 3:3 f.; with the exception of 2 S 24:24, only in late Books). After טָאַה and אָלף 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*, נֶפֶשׁ *soul* (person), שֵׁבֶט *tribe*, מַצֵּבָה *pillar* (Ex 24:4), sometimes with אַמָּה *cubit*, חֹדֶשׁ *month*, עִיר *city*, שֶׁקֶל *shekel* (compare our *four-year-old*, *ten pound*), e. g. Dt 1:2 אחד עֶשְׂרִי יוֹם (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 מֵאַתּ (מֵאַתּ) [so almost exclusively in the Priestly Code, e. g. always אָלף], מֵאוֹת, יוֹם, אַמָּה, אָלף, אִישׁ (except in Ez 40:27), אֶלֶף, אֵישׁ (אֶלֶף יוֹם, אֶלֶף יוֹם, אֶלֶף יוֹם) and אָלף are regularly used in the singular, generally also שָׁנָה, כּוֹר, בּוֹר, יוֹם (with the exception of Jos 7:21, 2 S 14:26, &c.); cf., moreover, Gn 33:19, 24:60 (אֶלֶף רֶבֶבָה), Est 1:1, Ju 21:12, Dt 7:9, 1 K 5:12, 2 Ch 9:15.—Examples of the *plural* after מֵאַתּ are Gn 26:12, 1 S 18:25, 2 S 16:1, 1 K 18:4; after מֵאוֹת Ex 38:27; after מֵאוֹת Ju 15:4, 2 S 8:4, 1 K 10:17, Ez 42:17; after יוֹם 1 S 25:18, 1 K 7:20; after אָלף 1 S 25:2, 1 K 3:4, 5:6, 2 K 3:4, Ps 90:4; after אֶלֶף 1 S 17:5, Jb 42:12; after אֶלֶף Mi 6:7; after יוֹם 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 שְׁנַיִם וְשֵׁשׁ יָמִים שָׁנָה *two and sixty years* (שָׁנָה in the singular, according to *e*, since it conforms to the ten immediately preceding; but also שְׁנַיִם וְשֵׁשׁ יָמִים 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 וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה *seventy and five years*; Gn 23:1 שָׁנָה וְעֶשְׂרִים 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 ׀, 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 הָאֶחָד 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 עֶשֶׂר (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 (אֶת־שְׁלוֹשָׁה בְּנֵי הָ עֵינָק), where שְׁלוֹשָׁה 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. עֶשֶׂר and עֶשְׂרֵה; 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 שְׁנַיִם 2 K 25:16 after a determinate substantive. The fact that it is by nature determinate would also be a very simple explanation of אֶחָד Nu 28:4, 1 S 13:17 f., Jer 24:2, Ez 10:9, instead of the more usual אֶחָד, הָ, and of אֶחָת 1 S 1:2 for אֶחָת הָ.

Such cases as שִׁבְעַת הַיָּמִים 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 אַ לָּף כֶּ סָף a thousand (shekels) of silver; so also before זָהָב Gn 24:22, 1 K 10:16, Is 7:23, cf. Ps 119:72. Moreover, Ru 3:15 שֵׁשׁ שְׁעֵרִים six (ephahs) of barley; 1 S 10:4 שְׁתֵּי־לֶחֶם two (sc. loaves, see verse 3) of bread, cf. 17:17 עֶשְׂרֵה לֶחֶם; 2 S 16:1, where before קֶיִץ 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 אַמָּה בָּ, prop. *by the cubit*. Also in Ex 27:11 the Samaritan and LXX read אַמָּה בָּ after אַרְבָּע, and in 27:15 אַמָּה after עֶשְׂרֵה.

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 יוֹם עֶשְׂרִים וְשֶׁבַע on the seventeenth day; Dt 1:3 בְּאַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה in the fortieth year; cf. Gn 14:5, 2 K 25:27, and, with repetition of שָׁנָה in a compound number, 1 K 6:1; such a cardinal occurs without בָּ (and therefore in the *accus. temporis*, according to § 118 k) in Gn 14:4 (the Samaritan, however, has ובשלוש); with the article (but without a numbered object, see under k), 1 K 19:19.<sup>1</sup>—On the position of the numeral as a genitive following its noun, cf. e. g. 1 K 16:10 בְּשָׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים וְשֶׁבַע in the twenty and seventh year, and with a determinate numeral, Ex 12:18, Nu 33:38, Dt 15:9. In this case, however, שָׁנָה is very frequently repeated, e. g. Gn 7:11, 2 K 13:10; after a determinate numeral, Lv 25:10.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Somewhat different from this is Ex 19:15 *be ready* לְשִׁלּוֹשֶׁת יָמִים 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 שְׁלֹשָׁה הַיּוֹם שָׁלַשְׁתִּי הָיִים because three days ago I fell sick, prop. *to-day three (days)*.

<sup>2</sup> 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 שָׁנָה or בְּשָׁנַת 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. בְּשָׁנָה שְׁתַּיִם 1 K 15:25; בְּשָׁנָה שְׁלִישׁ 2 K 18:1, &c., cf. Dt 15:9. The months themselves are always numbered by the ordinals (בְּרֵאשִׁוֹן), &c., up to עֶשְׂרִי (בְּ), but not the days of the month, e. g. דָּשׁ לְחָדָשׁ Gn 8:5, &c., בְּאַרְבָּעָה לְחָדָשׁ Zc 7:1; דָּשׁ לְחָדָשׁ Ez 1:1, &c., בְּשִׁבְעָה לְחָדָשׁ 2 K 25:8, דָּשׁ לְחָדָשׁ Lv 23:32 (always, however, דָּשׁ לְחָדָשׁ בְּעֶשְׂרִי לְחָדָשׁ *on the tenth day of the month*). On the omission of יום in all these cases see under n; only in late passages is יום added, e. g. 2 Ch 29:17 בְּיוֹם שְׁמוֹנֶה עָרְבָה; Ezr 3:6 מִיּוֹם אֶחָד לְחָדָשׁ לְחָדָשׁ.—Finally, when the year is stated by בְּשָׁנָה governing a determinate ordinal, viz. 2 K 17:6 בְּשָׁנָה הַתְּשִׁיעִית *in the ninth year*; 2 K 25:1 (in Jer 52:4 בְּשָׁנָה), Jer 28:1 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, 32:1 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, 46:2, 51:59, Ezr 7:8; בְּשָׁנָה 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<sup>r</sup>e* בְּשָׁנָה לְחָדָשׁ for בשנת.

5. *Distributives* are expressed either by repetition of the cardinal number, e. g. Gn 7:9, 15 שְׁנַיִם יָמִים שְׁנַיִם יָמִים *two and two*; 2 S 21:20 שֵׁשׁ וְשֵׁשׁ *six each*; with the numbered object also repeated, e. g. Jos 3:12 בָּטָא לְשֵׁבֶט אִישׁ אֶחָד אִישׁ אֶחָד *for every tribe a man*; Nu 13:2, 34:18 אֶחָד מֵעֵד (אֶחָד מֵעֵד), as in Neh 11:1, *one out of every ten*; cf. § 123 d; or a periphrasis with אֶחָד לְ is used, Nu 17:18, Dt 1:23, cf. Is 6:2 לְאַחַד אַחַד after *six wings* twice repeated; the simple distributive לְ is, however, sufficient (as in לְבָרְקָרִים, § 123 c), e. g. לְמֵאוֹת וְלְאַלְפִים *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 עַם, cf. König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 228), as יָמִים שְׁתַּיִם *twice*, Jb 40:5; שֵׁבַע שָׁבַע *seven times*, Lv 26:21, 24, Pr 24:16; cf. also אַחַת *once*, 2 K 6:10, Jb 40:5, for which in Jb 33:14 בְּאַחַת<sup>1</sup> along with יָמִים בְּשָׁנָה (the latter also in 1 S 18:21); or by the *dual* of the numeral, thus שְׁבַעֲתָיִם 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; <sup>2</sup> or periphrastically by עַם אֶחָד *a time* (prop. *a step*, with the article, עַם אֶחָד *this time*; cf. also הַזֶּה אֶחָד, with בְּ, like בְּאַחַת above), as עַם אֶחָד (Neh 13:20 *once and twice*), עַם אֶחָד וְעַם אֶחָד *twice*, שְׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים (for which in Ex 23:14, Nu 22:28, 32 *שְׁלֹשׁ רִגְלִים*) *three times*; cf. Ez 41:6 *thirty-three times*; 2 S 24:3 *an hundred times*; Dt 1:11 *a thousand times*; 1 K 22:16 *until how many times*, i.e. how often. Cf. also עֶשְׂרִי עָרְבָה מֵיָמִים *ten times*, Gn 31:17, 14, and רַבּוֹת עֵתִים *many times*, Neh 9:28.—In Gn 43:34, *five times* is expressed by חַמֵּשׁ יָדוֹת (prop. *five hands*),<sup>3</sup> and in Ex 16:5 the *double* is expressed by מְשֻׁנָּה עָלָיָהּ (prop. *a repetition over and above that which*, &c.).—Of the ordinals שְׁנִי is used as a numeral adverb, Gn 22:15, &c., *a second time*, cf. the Latin *tertium consul*; לִישָׁת בְּשִׁישׁ *the third time*, 1 S 3:8; פַּעַם חֲמִישִׁית *a fifth time*, Neh 6:5; בְּשִׁבְעִית *at the seventh (time)*, 1 K 18:44, and פַּעַם הַשְּׁשִׁית 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.

1<sup>1</sup> But בְּאַחַת Nu 10:4 is to be translated *on one* (trumpet).

2<sup>2</sup> Probably also יָמִים בְּפֶלֶל Jb 11:6 (from פֶּלֶל *doubling*) does not mean *doubled* but *manifold*.

3<sup>3</sup> But אַרְבַּע הַיָּדוֹת 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 ך, *Dt 32:30*, *Jer 3:14*, *Jb 33:14*, *40:5* (without ך, *Ps 62:12*); *two* and *three*, *Is 17:6* (*Sirac 23:16*, *26:28*, *50:25*), and without ך, *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 ך, *Pr 30:15*; *four* and *five*, without ך, *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* ךִּי אָנֹכִי i.e. *I myself*, so also ךִּי אָנֹכִי *2 S 12:28*, *17:15* (after the verb), *Ez 34:15*, *Ps 2:6*; <sup>1</sup> but *1 S 10:18*, *2 S 12:7*, *Is 45:12* ךִּי אָנֹכִי *I* and none else; cf. also ךִּי אָנֹכִי *I, I!* *Ho 5:14*, &c.; אָתָּה *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*; אָתָּם *Gn 9:7*, *Ex 20:19* (after the verb, *Ju 15:12*); fem. *Gn 31:6*; הִיא *1 S 22:18*; הִיא *Gn 3:20*, *Ju 14:3*; הִיאָ *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 ךִּי אָנֹכִי 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*.<sup>2</sup>

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* (הִיא)

<sup>1</sup> Also הִיאָ, הִיאָ *he himself, she herself* (of persons and things), e. g. *Is 7:14* הִיאָ ה' אֱלֹהֵינוּ *the Lord himself*, *Est 9:1* הֵמָּה הַיְהוּדִים *the Jews themselves*. In the sense of *the same* (ὁ αὐτός) or (*one and*) *the same*, הִיאָ is used in *Is 41:4*, *43:10*, *13*, *46:4*, *48:12* (always אָנֹכִי הִיאָ), *Ps 102:28* (אָתָּה הִיאָ), and probably also *Jb 3:19*.—The position of הִיאָ, 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*).

<sup>2</sup> As early as the Mêsā inscription (line 21 ff.) אָנֹכִי frequently stands at the beginning of a new sentence after the dividing stroke.

*gave me, &c.*; 14:24 (הָם); 15:4, 24:7, &c.; but הוּא in Is 7:14 after the predicate and subject is equivalent to *he himself*.<sup>1</sup>

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:—

(a) On a verbal suffix by means of אָנִי (אֵי) Gn 27:34 בֵּרַכְנִי גַם־אֲנִי  *bless me, even me also* (prop.  *bless me, I also* would be blessed); Zc 7:5; cf. also Ez 6:3, 34:11, 20 הִנְנִי אֵי אָתָּה (אֵי) Pr 22:19 (but the text is most probably corrupt).—The separate pronoun *precedes* in Gn 24:27 (אָנִי); 49:8 (אָתָּה, not *Judah, thou art he whom*, but *Judah thee, thee thy brethren shall praise!*), and Ec 2:15 אָנִי גַם.

(b) On a noun-suffix with a substantive, by means of אָנִי 2 S 19:1, Pr 23:15; by אָתָּה 1 K 21:19 אֶת־דַּמְּךָ גַם־אֲתָּה  *thy blood, even thine*; by הוּא 2 S 17:5, Jer 27:7, Mi 7:3; by אֲנִי הוּא 1 S 20:42, after שָׁנָה יָנִי, but without special stress; Neh 5:2 (?); by אֲתָּם Nu 14:32; by הֵם Ps 38:11 (without special stress), הֵם הֵאָּה Ps 9:7.—The separate pronoun *precedes* in Jb 21:4 (אָנִי); Gn 40:16, Is 45:12, 1 Ch 28:2 (אָנִי); Zc 9:11 (אָתָּה); Jos 23:9 (אֲתָּם); Ez 33:17 (הֵאָּה).—In Ps 89:48, where אָנִי might be taken as strengthening הוּא (equivalent in sense to הִלְדִּי), we should read אָנִי אָדָּנִי, as in verse 51.

(c) On a suffix united with a preposition, 1 S 25:24 אָנִי בִּי  *upon me, upon me*; 1 K 1:26 לִי אָנִי ...; 2 Ch 35:21 אֶתְּךָ יְיָ אֲתָּה לֹא־עָלַיְךָ  *not against thee*; 1 S 19:23 הוּא גַם עָלָיו  *upon him also*; Dt 5:3 אָנִי הוּא ...; Hag 1:4 אֲתָּם לְכֶם אֲתָּם  *for you yourselves*; Jer 25:14 אָנִי הוּא אֲתָּם לְכֶם אֲתָּם  *but with us, even us*; Mi 5:1 אֲתָּה ... אָנִי הוּא ... עָלַיְךָ  *unto him, unto himself*; 1 S 12:23 לִי ... אָנִי הוּא ... עָלַיְךָ  *unto him, unto himself*; 1 K 1:20 אֲתָּה ... עָלַיְךָ  *unto him, unto himself*; Mi 5:1 ... אֲתָּה  *unto him, unto himself*; 2 Ch 28:10 אֲתָּם עִמָּכֶם  *with you, with you*.

The same principle also explains Gn 4:26 הוּא לְשֵׁת גַם־הוּא  *to Seth, to him also* (not גַם־לוֹ); 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 *nots accus.* אֵת) with a suffix may be used either in a demonstrative or reflexive sense,<sup>1</sup> 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 אֲתָּה לְכֶם  *sibi*, Is 3:9; אֲלָיו  *unto him*, and Gn 8:9  *unto himself*;

<sup>1</sup> 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* אֵת with suffix, e. g. 1 S 15:9 (where אֵת אֲנִי is certainly to be read), Is 8:13.

<sup>1</sup> As in Luther's Bible *jm (ihm), jr (ihr)* for *sich*, and in our version *him, her* for *himself, herself*.

אִתּוֹ *with him*, and Gn 22:3 *with himself*; עִמָּהּ *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* אֶת with a suffix (this being ordinarily expressed by the reflexive conjugations *Niph<sup>al</sup>* and *Hithpa<sup>al</sup>*); thus, אֶתְּ אֵיפְסוֹס, Ex 5:19, Jer 7:19 in sharp antithesis to אֶתְּ אֵיפְסוֹס; 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 בְּשָׂרָם and דָּמָם 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),<sup>3</sup> which may represent either a *subjective genitive*, or (like the genitives proper, § 128 h) an *objective genitive*, e. g. הַמַּעֲשֵׂי הַזֵּאת *the wrong done against me*, Gn 16:5, Jer 51:35; cf. Gn 9:2, 18:21, 27:13 (2 S 16:12 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*); Gn 30:23, 39:21 (cf. Ex 3:21, &c.); 50:4, Ex 20:20, 21:35, Ju 4:9, 13:12 (הַיְעָשָׂה לְהִי *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 יִשְׁלַח עֲזָרְךָ *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* אֶתְּ נִשְׂוֹתָיו וְאֶתְּ בָנָיו וְאֶתְּ בָנֹתָיו *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־קֹדֶשׁי prop. *the hill of my holiness*, i.e. my holy hill, Ps 2:6, &c.; עִיר קֹדֶשְׁךָ *thy holy city*, Dn 9:24; אֱלֹהֵי כְּסָפוֹ *his idols of silver*, Is 2:20, 30:22, 31:7;<sup>1</sup> cf. Dt 1:41, Is 9:3, 28:4, 41:11, Ez 9:1f., Ps. 41:10, 150:1, Jb 18:7 עֲדֵי אֹרֹגוֹ *his steps of strength*; 38:6; after an adjective as *nomen regens*, Is 13:3 (Zp 3:11) אֶתְּ גִּבְעוֹתַי *my proudly exulting ones*.—On the same analogy is the use of e. g. אֶתְּ מְלָחֶמְתּוֹ Dt 1:41 *his*

---

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> *Niph<sup>al</sup>* according to § 51 e (like *Hithpa<sup>al</sup>* according to § 54 f) may also include the *dative* of the reflexive pronoun.

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> Like the substantival genitive, according to § 129 h, the possessive pronoun may also be paraphrased by a relative clause, e. g. Ru 2:21 לֵי אֲשֶׁר לִי הַנְּעָרִים *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 כַּרְמִי שְׂפִילִי *my vineyard, which belongs to me*. Cf. Ct 3:7, and the analogous pleonasm in 2 S 22:2 (but see Ps 18:2) and Ps 27:2.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> On the other hand, more explicitly in prose, Gn 44:2 כַּף הַכֶּהֱנִיעַ גִּבְעֵי אֶתְּ-גִבְעֵי *my cup, the silver cup*.

*weapons of war* [cf. Is 41:12]; Is 56:7 בַּיִת הַפִּלְתִּי *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 language<sup>2</sup> 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;<sup>3</sup> 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 אֲבִיָּהֶן, but also אֲבִיָּהֶם); Ju 19:24, 21:22, 1 S 6:7, 10b (בְּנֵיהֶם); 9:20, Is 3:16, Ez 23:45 ff. (alternating with הֶן); Am 4:1 f. (but afterwards a feminine suffix); Jb 1:14, 39:3 (הַלְלִיָּהֶן in parallelism with הַלְלִיָּהֶם); 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<sup>10a</sup> are to be explained according to § 60 h. On הָ מָה 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 הִיא 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 (בָּהּ *thereby*), 42:36, 47:26, Ex 10:11 (הָהִיא *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 מְצַבֵּת], Jer 36:23, Jb 6:20 (if the text is correct), 39:15 (read הִתְהַמָּה 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 הֵם]; and to a verbal idea contained in the preceding clause, in Ez 33:18, Jb 22:21 (בָּהֶם *thereby*), Ez 18:26, 33:19 (עַל־יָהֶם *on that account, thereby*).<sup>1</sup> But the suffix in הִתְנַגְּוּ Dt 21:10 refers to the collective idea contained in יָרֵךְ אֲיָבִיךָ; in Jon 1:3 עֲמָהֶם refers to the sailors included in sense under the term אֲנָיָה. In Jos 2:4 read וְהִתְצַפְּנִים; in Is 30:6 (מֵהֶם), 38:16, Ps 19:5 (בָּהֶם) 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 אֲדֹנָי *my Lord*, usually explained as being from the *pluralis maiestatis* אֲדֹנָיִם (§ 124 i) with the suffix of the 1st singular (always with *Qameṣ* to distinguish it from אֲדֹנָי *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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> The Masora reckons six instances of מִן־בְּנֵיהֶן, where מִן־בְּנֵיהֶם 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.

<sup>1</sup> In 2 K 7:10 for שֶׁ־עָרִי (the LXX had שֶׁ־עָרִי) read שֶׁ־עָרִי.

ultimately (see, however, the note below), without any regard to the pronoun, as equivalent to *the Lord*.<sup>2</sup> On אָדֹנָי as a *Qrê perpetuum* of the Masoretes for יהוה see § 17 c and § 102 m.

A similar loss of vitality in the suffix is generally assumed in יְהִדְדּוֹ prop. *in his unitedness*, i.e. *he &c. together*, e.g. כָּל־הָעַם יְהִדְדּוּ Ex 19:8; then, without regard to the suffix, even after the 1st person אֲנִי הָנוּ יְהִדְדּוּ 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 in *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 לָכֵם with the LXX).—On the redundant suffix in הָ, הַ, עֲרֶכְרֶךְ Lv 27:23, cf. § 127 i.

### § 136. The Demonstrative Pronoun.

The *demonstrative pronouns* are הֵן, fem. הֵן, plur. הֵן (§ 34), *hic, haec (hoc), hi, &c.*, and the personal pronoun הוּא, likewise used as a demonstrative, fem. הִיא, plur. masc. הֵם, fem. הֵן (§ 32 b), *is, ea (id), or ille, &c., ii, eae or illi, &c.* The distinction between them in usage is that הֵן (like *hic*, ὄδῃ) almost always points out a (new) person or thing present, while הוּא (like *is, ille*, αὐτός, ἐκεῖνος) refers to a person or thing already mentioned or known (see the examples below).<sup>1</sup>

Rem. 1. Compare the instructive examples in Gn 32:3, Ju 7:4 *of whom I say unto thee, this (הֵן) shall go with thee, he (הוּא) shall go with thee* (so afterwards with negatives). Moreover, הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה *this day*, i.e. the actual day on which one is speaking or writing (Gn 26:33, &c.), but הַיּוֹם הַהוּא 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 הֵן and הֵן are also found in certain common combinations where הוּא and הֵן would be expected, and vice versa; thus almost always הֵן הַזֶּה, plur. הֵן הַזֶּה, but הֵן הַזֶּה, הֵן הַזֶּה, but בְּיָמֵי הַזֶּה or בְּיָמֵי הַזֶּה—With a secondary sense of contempt (like

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the same weakening of the force of the possessive pronoun in רַבִּי prop. *my master*, from the second century A.D. onwards *the master*; so also in Syriac מַרִּי *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 אָדֹנָי as a holy name, and אָדֹנָי 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 אָדֹנָי is used by God himself, there is nowhere any necessity to regard the suffix as *entirely* meaningless, since אָדֹנָי is always used either in an address *to* or (like אָדֹנָי, 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 אָדֹנָי and אָדֹנָי it may be urged especially that when unconnected with suffixes the singular אָדֹנָי is always used of God, and not the *pluralis maiestatis* presupposed by אָדֹנָי.

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

<sup>1</sup> On הֵן and הוּא standing separately as determinate in themselves, see § 125 i. On the use of determinate demonstratives as adjectives, see § 126 u.

Latin *iste*) הַּ 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*, אַתּ is more common than הַּ, as Is 5:25, 43:9, &c., but הַּ is more common than הַּי.

2. Both הַּ and הַּא 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 מִי הַּנּוֹהוֹ *who now* (darkeneth, &c.) ...? 1 S 17:55 f., Is 63:1, Jer 49:19, Ps 24:8, 25:12, &c.; מַה־הַּנּוֹהוֹ *what now?* 1 S 10:11; *how now?* Gn 27:20; *why now?* Ju 18:24; but before the verb עָשָׂה it is usually אַתּ־הַּנּוֹהוֹ *how now?* Gn 3:13, 12:18, Ex 14:5, Ju 15:11; לְמַה־הַּנּוֹהוֹ *wherefore now?* Gn 18:13, 25:22, 1 S 17:28, 2 S 12:23, &c.—So also מִי־הַּנּוֹהוֹ Is 50:9, Jb 4:7 ff.; and still more emphatically מִי־הַּנּוֹהוֹ־הַּ Ps 24:10, Jer 30:21.

3. הַּ is likewise used as an enclitic (see c above): (a) *of place*, in such passages as Gn 27:21 וְגַם הַּ אֲתָהּ הַּנּוֹהוֹ *whether thou (that art here) be my son Esau?* 2 S 2:20 *is it thou?* הַּנּוֹהוֹ *behold, here*, 1 K 19:5, Is 21:9; <sup>2</sup> cf. also the strengthening of the separate pronoun by הַּא Is 43:25 (אֲנִי־כִי), 1 S 7:28, Is 37:16, Ps 44:5 (אֲתָהּ), and הֵם לְהַא *these are*, Gn 25:16, 1 S 4:8; (b) *of time*: הַּנּוֹהוֹ *now*, 1 K 17:24; *just now*, 2 K 5:22; and rather frequently before words denoting number, e.g. Gn 27:36 הַּנּוֹהוֹ שְׁנַיִם *twice, now*; cf. 31:38, 2 S 14:2, Jb 1:12, 7:3, 19:3; separated from the numeral in Gn 31:41 הַּנּוֹהוֹ־לִי 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 מִי *who* may refer either to a masculine or feminine person (Ct 3:6), or even to a plural, e.g. מִי אַתֶּם *who are ye?* Jos 9:8; מִי־אֵלֶּה Gn 33:5, Nu 22:9 (more minutely, מִי נָמִי 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. מִי־יִשְׁכְּבּוּ *who are the Shechemites?* Ju 9:28, 13:17, Gn 33:8, Mi 1:5; even more boldly, with the repetition of a מִי used personally, in 1 S 18:18, 2 S 7:18.—Another interrogative is אֵי־זֶה *which, what?*; of persons only in Est 7:5.

Moreover, מִי may also be used in the sense of a genitive, e.g. בַּת־מִי אַתְּ *whose daughter art thou?* Gn 24:23, 1 S 17:55, 56, 58; מִי דְבַר *whose word?* Jer 44:28, 1 S 12:3; in the accusative, אֶת־מִי *quemnam?* 1 S 28:11, Is 6:8; with prepositions, e.g. בְּמִי 1 K 20:14 (in an abrupt question *by whom?*); לְמִי Gn 32:18; מִי אֶתְּרִי 1 S 24:15.—Similarly מַה, מַה־, מַה־מִּי *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.; עַד־מַה *quousque?* Ps 74:9.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> On the other hand, it is very questionable whether הַּ in Ps 104:25 (הַּ הַיָּם), Is 23:13 (הַּ הַיָּם), Ju 5:5, Ps 68:9 (הַּ הַיָּם) can be taken, according to the common explanation, simply as a prefixed demonstrative particle (*the sea yonder*, &c.). In Ps 104:25 הַּ הַיָּם may be in apposition to הַּ; cf. § 126 aa, on Ex 32:1, and Zc 5:7, where אֶת־הַּ אֶת־הַּ is in apposition to אַתּ depending on הַּ, and also Ez 40:45, where הַּלְשֶׁכָּה is in apposition to הַּ; 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 הַּ הַיָּם is most probably to be regarded with Moore as a very early gloss, which subsequently found its way from this passage into Ps 68.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> A quite different use of מַה 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*,



Rem. 1. In the above examples אָשֶׁר 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 אָשֶׁר is added in apposition, is only resumed in the qualifying clause by the subject (*he*) inherent in לָקַח נִי, while in Gn 2:2 it is not resumed at all. This suppression of the retrospective pronoun<sup>1</sup> 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 אֲשֶׁר מִתַּחַת לָּ, רְקִיעַ הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר מִתַּחַת לָּ, רְקִיעַ הַמַּיִם *the waters, those, under the firmament, &c.* In negative sentences, however, the retrospective pronoun is not infrequently added, e.g. Gn 17:12 הוּא אֲשֶׁר הוּא חַי; 7:2 הָיָא; 1 K 9:20 הָיָא; Dt 20:15 הָיָא; but cf. also אֲשֶׁר הוּא חַי Gn 9:3. The addition of הָיָא 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 יְהוָה אֵל תוֹ אֶתְּנוּ לָכֶם, *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 אָשֶׁר and the qualifying clause, expresses an idea of *place*, it may also be resumed by the adverbs of place שָׁם *there*, שָׁמָּה *thither*, מִשָּׁם *thence*, e.g. Gn 13:3 אֲשֶׁר-הָיָה שָׁם אֶהְלֵה עַד-הַמָּקוֹם *unto the place, that one, his tent had been there*, i.e. *where his tent had been*; cf. Gn 3:23 מִשָּׁם, Ex 21:13 שָׁמָּה. But even in this case the retrospective word may be omitted, cf. Gn 35:14, Nu 20:13, Is 64:10, where שָׁם would be expected, and Gn 30:38, Nu 13:27, 1 K 12:2, where שָׁמָּה 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 בְּנֵי-יִשָׁי חַי *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-מָכַרְתֶּם אֵתִי *he—ye sold me*, i.e. *whom ye sold*; Nu 22:30, Is 49:23; 41:8 *thou, Jacob*, אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְתָּ יָדְךָ *he—I have chosen thee*; Jer 33:19, Ec 10:16 f.; Gn 15:7 *I am the Lord*, אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָ יָדְךָ *he—I brought thee out, &c.*, Ex 20:2 (Dt 5:6).

(2) Not depending (adjectivally) on a governing substantive, but itself expressing a substantival idea. Clauses introduced in this way may be called *independent relative clauses*. This use of אָשֶׁר 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 אָשֶׁר 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 אֲשֶׁר תָּאֵר יוֹאֵר *iste—thou cursest (him)—is cursed*, i.e. *he whom thou cursest, &c.*; Ex 22:8; <sup>2</sup> אֲשֶׁר as object, Gn 44:1, 49<sup>1</sup>, 1 S 16:3 ff., Mi 6:1 (אֵת אֲשֶׁר); and even preceding the verb, e.g. Is 52:15, Ps 69:5; אֲשֶׁר as genitive, Ez 23:28 *I will deliver thee אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד אֲשֶׁר into the hand of those—thou hatest (them)*; depending on a preposition, e.g. אֲשֶׁר לְ Gn 44:4, 2

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> The absolute use of אָשֶׁר is very peculiar in the formula *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, בְּאֶשֶׁר הוּא שָׁם, *in that (place)—he is there*, i.e. *where he is*; cf. Jul 17:8 and Ru 1:16 אֶל-אֶשֶׁר *whither*; <sup>1</sup> 1 K 18:12 עַל-אֶשֶׁר *whither*; מִן אֶשֶׁר 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,<sup>2</sup> e.g. Gn 44:9 f. אֶשֶׁר תִּמָּת *he—it (the cup) is found with him,—shall die* (for the *Wāw* of the apodosis in תִּמָּת cf. § 143 d). In such cases אֶשֶׁר preceded by the preposition is quite anomalous, as in Gn 31:32 אֶשֶׁר תִּמָּצָא *with whomsoever thou findest*, where אֶשֶׁר is a relative pronoun in the English sense; on the other hand, in Is 47:12 (and probably also 56:4) אֶשֶׁר בְּ 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 אֶשֶׁר, the student will of course understand that, in Hebrew as we know it, אֶשֶׁר 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 אֶשֶׁר, the demonstratives proper זֶה, זֹה, זו (the last commonly),<sup>3</sup> 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 זֶה, &c., the remarks on אֶשֶׁר, under *a* and *e*, also hold good.

Examples:—

(a) זֶה in apposition to a governing substantive in the nominative, Ps 104:26 לְוִיָּתָן זֶה יָצַר רָתָּהּ (there is) *leviathan, he—thou hast formed* (him), i.e. *whom thou hast formed*; Is 42:24 (זֶה); in the accusative, Is 25:9, Ps 74:2 (in both cases with a retrospective pronoun; זֹה is used without it in Ps 132:12); in apposition to a genitive dependent on a preposition, Pr 23:22 שָׁמַע לְאָבִיךָ זֶה הִיא *hearken unto thy father, him—he begat thee*, i.e. *who begat thee*; Ps 17:9 (זֶה).—In Ps 104:8 אֶל-מְקוֹם זֶה יָסַדְתָּ לָהֶם *unto the place which thou hadst founded for them* (cf. § 130 c), זֶה is in the genitive after the construct state מְקוֹם *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, (חַר זֶה) and Ex 15:13 (עַם-זֶה גָּאָלָהְתָּ), 15:16, Is 43:21, Ps 9:16, 10:2, 31:5, 32:8, 62:12, 142:4, 143:8 (all examples of זֶה).

To introduce independent relative clauses זֶה is used as a nominative in Jb 19:19; as accusative, Jb 15:17 and זֶה Hb 1:11, Ps 68:29 (after a preposition, זֶה 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 הַהַקְדִּישׁ שְׁמוֹרָאֵל *all that Samuel had dedicated*, &c.; 1 Ch 29:8 (where נִמְצָא can only be *perfect Niph'al*);

<sup>1</sup> In Zc 12:10 also, instead of the unintelligible אֵלֵי אֵת אִשְׁרָה, we should probably read אֶל-אֶשֶׁר, and refer the passage to this class.

<sup>2</sup> Such a strong ellipse as in Is 31:6, where מִן מְקוֹם בּוֹ would be expected after הַעֲמִיקוּ, is only possible in elevated poetic or prophetic language.

<sup>3</sup> The etymological equivalent דִּי, דְּ 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* וְהָלְכוּ אִתּוֹ *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 הַדְּבָר). Cf. moreover, 1 S 9:24 *the thigh* וְהָ עָלָיָהּ *and that which was upon it* (but see **k** below); 2 Ch 1:4 בְּהַכִּיּוֹן *equivalent to* בְּאֶשְׁרֵי הַכִּיּוֹן *to the place, that he had prepared*.

In all the examples adduced except 1 S 9:24 (where אֶלְיָהּ וְהָ should probably be read for וְהָ עָלָיָהּ the ה 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 הָהֵבֵא אֶתְּ; Is 51:10 הִשָּׁמָּה; Ez 26:17 הָהֵלֵךְ לָהּ Ru 1:22, 2:6 and 4:3 הִשָּׁבֵבָה, or by the punctuation, Gn 21:3 הַבּוֹלֵד; 1 K 11:9, Dn 8:1 הַנְּרָאָה; Is 56:3 הַנְּלִוָה, while no doubt the authors in all these cases intended participles (and in fact perfect participles, cf. § 116 d) with the article, thus הַבָּאָה &c., Ez 26:17 הַהֲלָלָה for הַמְהַלְלָה according to § 52 s, and in the other examples הַבּוֹלֵד, הַנְּרָאָה, הַנְּלִוָה.

### § 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 *man, woman*, are used to express—

(a) The idea of *each, every* (in the sense of each severally) with reference to persons,<sup>1</sup> and even animals (Gn 15:10), e.g. Gn 10:5, feminine Ex 3:22; אִישׁ is the object, e.g. in Jer 12:15. On אִישׁ—אִישׁ 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 מִיַּד אִישׁ אֶחָיו Gn 9:5, according to the usual explanation, stands for מִיַּד אֶחָיו 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 מִיַּד אִישׁ and מִיַּד הָאָדָם]; 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 צָרוּר־כֶּסֶף בְּשָׂקוֹ 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.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As a rule אִישׁ 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 אֶל־תִּתְּשֻׁבוּ אֶחָיו אֶל־תִּתְּשֻׁבוּ בְּלִבְבְּכֶם, which in the light of 8:17, וְאִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵת רֵעֵהוּ אֶל־תִּתְּשֻׁבוּ בְּלִבְבְּכֶם, 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*,<sup>2</sup> so after אֵל־ Ex 16:19, 29; before לֹא Gn 23:6 and frequently.—Instead of אִישׁ we sometimes find in a similar sense אָדָם *man, homo*, e.g. Lv 1:2 (cf. כָּאָדָם הָאֲדָם *as any one else*, Ju 16:7, 11), נַפְשׁ (soul) *person*, Lv 2:1, 5:1, &c., and in a neuter sense דְּבָר (prop. word, thing) for *anything*, Gn 18:14, or כְּלִי־דְבָר Lv 5:2, Nu 31:23. With a negative דְּבָר means *nothing*; thus after אֵל־ Gn 19:8; after לֹא Ec 8:5.—Cf. finally, מִן אֶחָד *any one*, Dt 15:7; *anything*, Ez 18:10 (but in Lv 4:2, 5:13 מִן אֶחָד) 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 אָחִיו *his brother* or רֵעֵהוּ *his neighbour*, אִישׁ *one*, masc. (as אִשָּׁה *one*, fem., in connexion with אָחוֹתָהּ *her sister* or רֵעוּתָהּ *her neighbour*) is used to represent the ideas of *alter—alter, the one—the other*<sup>3</sup> (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 אֶחָיו *the one from the other*; Ex 26:3 *five curtains (תֵּיבֵי יָרִיעַ fem.) shall be coupled together* אִישׁ אֶל־אָחֵהוּ *one to another*.

2. נַפְשׁ *soul, person* expresses the idea of *self*,<sup>4</sup> both in the singular, Pr 19:8, 16, 29:24, Jb 18:4 (in all cases נַפְשׁוֹ equivalent to *himself*) and in the plural, Jer 37:9, &c. Similar to this is the use of בְּקִרְבָּהּ Gn 18:12 (prop. *in her inward part*) in the sense of *within herself*.<sup>5</sup>

3. עֵצ׃ *bone* (then metaphorically for *substance*) expresses the idea of *self, selfsame, very same*, in reference to *things* (as נַפְשׁ to persons, e.g. בְּעֵצ׃ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה *in the selfsame day*, Gn 7:13, cf. Jos 10:27, Ez 24:2; כִּי עֵצ׃ הַשָּׁמַיִם לִמְנוּחֵי הָרָר *as it were the very heaven for clearness*, Ex 24:10; בְּעֵצ׃ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה *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*;<sup>1</sup> thus יָמִים *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 יָמִים אֶקְדִּים see § 96 under אֶקְדֵם); שָׁנִים *some years*, Dn 11:6, 8.

## CHAPTER II

2<sup>2</sup> Cf. also אִין־אִישׁ Gn 39:11. On the expression of the idea of *no one* by means of אִין with a following participle, see the *Negative Sentences*, § 152 l.

3<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere זֶה ... זֶה are used in a similar sense, Ex 14:20, Is 6:3; also הָאֶחָד ... הָאֶחָד 2 S 14:6, or the substantive is repeated, e.g. Gn 47:21 (*from one end ... to the other end*).

4<sup>4</sup> On the representation of this idea by pronouns, separate and suffixed, see § 135 a, i and k.

5<sup>5</sup> 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 גּוּי *body*, עֵצ׃ or עֵצ׃ *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, נַפְשׁ in such cases is never (not even in Is 46:2 נַפְשָׁם *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<sup>1</sup> *Some* in reference to persons in Ex 16:20 is expressed by אֶנְשֵׁים, and in Neh 5:2–4 by אֶשְׁרֵי אֶשְׁרֵי *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. יהוה מלכנו *the Lord is our king*, Is 33:22; רעים וחטאים הם רעים ואנשי סדום *now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners*, Gn 13:13; פה להם *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. ויאמר אל הים *and God said*, Gn 1:3; ויבדל *and he divided*, 1:7; see further, § 142.

Rem. In the last example the pronominal subject is at least indicated by the preformative (\*), and in almost all forms of the perfect by affirmatives. 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 האל תמים דרכו *God—his way is perfect*, equivalent to *God's way is perfect*; Gn 34:8 נפשך נפקה בבתכם *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. וְצֵא מֵעֵדֶן and a river went out (was going out) of Eden, Gn 2:10.

(b) A pronoun, e.g. Gn 7:4 אֲנִי כִי מְמַטֵּיר I will cause it to rain; 14:18 וְהוּא כֹהֵן and he was priest; 2:23 (את ז' before a feminine predicate, as אֵלָה before a plural in Ex 32:4); הַחָכִים מִי הָכֵם who is wise? Ho 14:10.—In 1 Ch 5:2 וּמִמֶּנּוּ and of him one became a prince, the subject is contained in מִמֶּנּוּ.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. The predicate of a noun-clause may be—

(a) A substantive, e.g. Dt 14:1 וְגֵוֹרֵי אֲתֶם 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 עֵץ ... וְקִירָיו תְּיֹוֹץ 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 וְהָאֲרָץ טוֹבָה and the gold of that land is good; ישב וְעָפְרוֹן יֵשֵׁב now Ephron was sitting, &c., Gn 23:10.<sup>2</sup> 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 יָךְ עֲבָדֶיךָ הַיְּשָׁרִים עֶשְׂרִים וְשְׁנָיִם the twelve (of us) are thy servants.

(d) A pronoun, e.g. Gn 10:12 (הִיא), Ex 9:27 (אֲנִי), Gn 24:65 (מִי), 1 K 9:13 (מָה).<sup>1</sup>

(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. לְעוֹלָם הַחַדְשָׁה הַזֹּאת there is the bdellium, Gn 2:12; אֵי הָאֵל where is Abel? 4:9; הַחַדְשָׁה הַזֹּאת his mercy endureth for ever, Ps 136:1 f.; עֲשָׂרָה בְּבֵיתוֹ riches are in his house, Ps 112:3; לוֹ אֲנִי we are his, Ps 100:3 *Q<sup>e</sup>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,<sup>2</sup> since it represents

---

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> For other remarkable instances of ellipse in the Chronicler, see Driver, *Introduction*, ed. 8, p. 537, no. 27.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> Cf. the numerous examples in § 116 n–p.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> 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 הִיָּה (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 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,<sup>3</sup> 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 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 *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 *בְּיוֹנִים*;<sup>4</sup> Ps 23:5, 109:4, Jb 8:9, 12:12, Ct 2:13). In prose, e.g. Ex 9:31, Ezr 10:13 *the season is rain showers*, i.e. *the rainy season*; with a bold enallage of the number, Gn 34:30 *and I (with my family) am persons few in number*. For similarly bold expressions with *הָיָה* 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* *לְעֵנַיִם*.

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, 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, while 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 *the Lord is the true God*; 1 S 9:19; Is 31:2 *yet he also is wise*; Gn 42:11; on the other hand, Gn 19:1 *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<sup>3</sup> שְׁלוֹם here, as in Jb 21:9, is evidently a substantive after a plural subject; on the other hand, it is doubtful whether שְׁלוֹם 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<sup>4</sup> As a rule, in such comparisons כִּי (which is then to be regarded as *nominative*) stands before the predicate, e.g. Is 63:2 *wherefore are thy garments 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 הָיָה. 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* הָיָה שֵׁבַע שָׁנִים הַנֶּזֶה *they are seven years*; Dt 1:17, 4:24; Ec 5:18 *this—it is a gift of God* זֶה מַתָּת אֱלֹהִים הִיא אֵלֶּיךָ; in a question, Gn 27:38. Sometimes הוּא 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,<sup>1</sup> e.g. אֲנִי כִי הוּא אֵלֶיךָ הוּא Is 43:25 *I, even I, am he that blotteth out, &c.*; 51:12; אֲתָה הוּא 2 S 7:28, Is 37:16, Ps 44:5, Neh 9:6, 7; in an interrogative sentence, Jer 14:22;<sup>2</sup> in Jer 49:12 הוּא in a *verbal*-clause strengthens אֲתָה.

Of (*b*): naturally this does not apply to the examples, in which הָיָה, 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* (הָיָה, הָיָה) *waste and emptiness*, can scarcely be regarded as properly verbal clauses; הָיָה 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 הָיָה 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 הָיָה announces what is future in Nu 14:33, &c.; cf. § 116 r. However, especially in the latter case, הָיָה is not wholly without verbal force, but comes very near to being a mere copula, and this use is more frequent in the later books<sup>1</sup> than in the earlier.

Rem. On the employment of יָשַׁב *existence*, and אֵין *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,<sup>2</sup> or when it consists of an interrogative word; thus with a substantival

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> This is of course to be distinguished from the use of הוּא (to be inferred from the context) as predicate in the sense of ὁ αὐτός; see above, § 135 a, note 1; or such cases as Dt 32:39 *see now* הוּא אֲנִי הוּא *that I, even I, am he*; 1 Ch 21:17.

<sup>1</sup> According to Albrecht, *ZAW*. viii. 252, especially in Deuteronomy and in the Priestly Code.

<sup>2</sup> 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 אָתָּה עֹפֵר אֶתְּךָ *dust thou art*; 4:9, 12:13 (*my sister*, not my wife); 20:2, 12, 29:14, Is 6<sup>3b</sup>, Jb 5:24, 6:12; with an adjectival predicate, e.g. Is 6<sup>3a</sup>, 28:21, Jer 10:6; with a participle, Gn 30:1, 32:12; with an interrogative pronoun, e.g. Gn 24:65;<sup>3</sup> with an adverbial interrogative, e.g. Gn 4:9.

Rem. On the above cf. the exhaustive investigations of C. Albrecht, ‘*Die Wortstellung im hebr. Nominalsatze*,’ *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 אָשֶׁר, e.g. Gn 2:11 אָשֶׁר-שָׁם; 1:29 f. אָשֶׁר-בּוֹ.

#### § 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.<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> This of course applies also to the cases, in which the subject consists of a strongly emphasized personal pronoun, e.g. Gn 32:13 אָתָּה *thou thyself*; 33:3 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 אַבְרָהָם יָשַׁב בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן וְלוֹט דָּוַל אֶת־אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן וְיָשַׁב אֶת־לוֹט אֶת־אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן *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 וְ (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 וְ 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 וְ, which then corresponds to the Greek δέ, used to interpose an explanation, &c., see Winer, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, § 53. 7<sup>b</sup>.

2. By a peculiar construction verbal-clauses may be joined by means of וְ and a following subject to participial clauses, e.g. Gn 38:25 הָיָה מוֹצֵאתָּהּ וְהָיָה לָהּ *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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

(d) *Object—Subject—Verb* (very rarely): 2 K 5:13, Is 5:17, 28:17, Ps 51:5, Pr 13:16 (read כ'ל).<sup>1</sup>

(e) A substantival complement of the verb *היה* is placed first in Is 18:5 *וּבְסֹרֵג מִלְּהֵי הַנֶּזֶה וְהַנֶּזֶה הַנֶּזֶה* 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 *בְּרֵהֶל* with *בְּ* *pretii* 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 (26<sup>3</sup>), 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 *בְּרֵאשִׁית* (Gn 1:1), *בְּיוֹם הַהוּא*, &c. (but not *נָה אֲשֶׁר*, *בְּרֵה*, nor the simple *נָה אֲשֶׁר*, *רֵה*, *בְּתַחֲלָה*, *לְעוֹלָם*, 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 *אָז*, *עַתָּה*, whilst others like *עוֹד*, *תָּמִיד* regularly follow the verb.

### § 143. The Compound Sentence

A compound sentence (§ 140 d) is formed by the juxtaposition of a subject<sup>2</sup> (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 *יְהוָה בְּסוּפֵה דְרִכּוֹ* 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 *אֲנִי זֶה אֶת בְּרִיתִי אִתָּם* and as for me, this is my covenant with them, &c.; Gn 9:9, 17:4, Is 1:7, 1 Ch 28:2;<sup>3</sup> with an interrogative noun-clause,

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> 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 (?).

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> 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.]

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> In Gn 31:40 a verbal-clause (*הִי יְהִי* *I was*) occurs instead of the subject, and is then explained by another verbal-clause.

<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup> In 1 Chr 28:2 (cf. also 22:7 *אֲנִי הָיָה עִמִּי לִבִּי*) *אֲנִי* 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,<sup>1</sup> 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*<sup>2</sup>) in a manner which would be quite impossible in a simple noun or verbal-clause (e.g. Na 1:3 if it were יהִנֵּה בְּסוּפָה הַיְהוָה יְהִי רָךְ; 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 יְהִי עִבְיִד); 1 S 25:29; a specification of place, Gn 2:17, 2 K 22:18, &c.; a substantive with לְ, 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 אֵל 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 אֲנִי עֶבֶדְךָ 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 לְ (*in respect to*; cf. § 119 u) serves the same purpose as the *casus pendens* beginning the sentence, as Nu 18:8 (unless the לְ here serves to introduce the object, according to § 117 n); Is 32:1 (where, however, וְשָׂרִים 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 לְכִי Gn 9:10, 23:10, Ex 27:3, 19, Ez 44:9, &c., לְ is not the preposition, but an

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Mēša□ inscription, l. 31, and *Horonain, therein dwelt, &c.*

<sup>2</sup> 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. *lā*, *surely*; Assyrian *lū*; with ל' ב' it is equivalent to *in short*. Cf. also לִי לִי *sive—sive, et—et*, Jos 17:16, Ezr 1:11, Assyrian *lū—lū*.

§ 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 affirmatives* (in the imperfect also in the form of preformatives). Not infrequently, however, masculine forms are used in referring to feminines, e.g. יִדְעָתֶם ה' Ez 23:49; עֲשִׂיתֶם 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. וַיְהִי, and *it came to pass*, וְהָיָה, and *it shall come to pass*; הָרָה followed by לו, &c., *it became hot to him*, i.e. *he became angry*, Gn 4:6, &c.; לוֹ נִצָּר לוֹ lit. *and it became strait to him, he was distressed*, Gn 32:8; <sup>1</sup> also in the feminine, e.g. 1 S 30:6 (Ju 10:9) וַתִּצָּר לְדָוִד Ju 11:39, Jer 7:31, Ez 12:25, Jb 15:32 (unless תִּמְוִיָּתוֹ in verse 31 be the subject); cf. also the impersonal passives, Is 1:6 (הִכָּה), 29:6 (תִּפְקֵד). 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־אִשָּׁר is used in this way with a feminine predicate, and in Jer 19:5 אִשָּׁר alone); different, too, are the instances in which the 3rd singular masculine refers to an act just mentioned, e.g. Gn 17:11 וְהָיָה *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. אוֹר *it becomes light*, 1 S 29:10 (but with an explicit subject, Gn 44:3); וַיֵּאֹר *and it became light*; so also יִהְיֶה *it grows dark*, Jer 13:16; but וְהָיָה שֶׁכָּהּ *though there be darkness*, Jb 11:17; תִּמְטֵר *it rains*, Am 4:7 (where, however, the context requires the reading אִמְטֵר); Ps 50:3 וַיִּשְׁעֶרָה *it is tempestuous*.

3. The indefinite personal subject (our *they, one*, the French *on*, and the German *man*<sup>1</sup>) is expressed—

(a) By the 3rd person singular masculine, e.g. קָרָא *one* (sc. any *one who named it*, see the Rem.) *called (or calls) it*, Gn 11:9, 16:14, 19:22, Ex 15:23; וַיִּקְרָא Gn 35:8, 10,

---

<sup>1</sup> In Arabic and Ethiopic the masculine is commonly used in this case, in Syriac the feminine.—The forms הָם *hot*, טוֹב *good, well*, מַר *bitter*, צָר *narrow*, רַע *evil* (frequently joined by לִי, לוֹ, &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.

<sup>1</sup> 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; <sup>2</sup> other examples are Gn 38:28 *one put out a hand*; Nu 23:21, 1 K 22:38, Is 6:10 *וַיִּרְפָּא לָוּ* *and one heals them*; 8:4 (*וַיִּשָׁא*); 46:7 (*וַיִּצְעַק*); Am 6:12, Mi 2:4, Jb 27:23; by the 3rd singular feminine (*וַיִּלְדָּה*) 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. *וַיִּלְדָּה הַקְּרָא הַקְּרָא*. This view is supported by the fact that such a complement sometimes occurs, e.g. Is 16:10 *וַיִּדְרֹךְ הַדֵּרֵךְ הַדֵּרֵךְ* *the treader 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* *וַיִּשְׁקוּ* *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 *wearisome nights* *וַיִּנְדְּוּ לִי* *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 *וְלֹא-תָבוֹא שָׁמָּה* *one will (or can) not come thither* (prop. *thou wilt ...*); Jer 23:37, Pr 19:25, 30:28 (unless the reading should be *וְתָבֹא*). Cf. also *וְעַד-בֹּאֲךָ* or simply *בֹּאֲךָ* (Gn 10:19, 30, 13:10 *וְעַד-בֹּאֲךָ*) 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* *וְהֵיוּ מְבִיאִים* (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.<sup>1</sup> In 1 K 5:1 the text is corrupt.

(e) By the passive, e.g. Gn 4:26 *וְהָיָה לְקָרָא* *then (was it begun=) began men to call upon*, &c. (but read *וְהָיָה לְקָרָא* *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,<sup>2</sup> one of the person and the

<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere in such cases *וַיִּאמְרוּ* 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 *וַיִּגְדּוּ* the common form *וַיִּגְדּוּ* is to be read; so in 50:26 for *וַיִּישָׂם* (after a plural) either *וַיִּישָׂם* or the 3rd plur.; in 2 K 21:26 *וַיִּקְבְּרוּ*.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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־יְהוָה הָאֶקְרָא קוֹלִי *my voice—I cry unto the Lord*, i. e. *I cry aloud unto the Lord*, Ps 3:5, 27:7, 142:2; פִּי־יִקְרֶה אֹתִי *my mouth—I cried*, i. e. *I cried aloud*, Ps 66:17 (cf. 17:10); Is 26:9 נַפְשִׁי בְּפִשִׁי *with my soul*, i. e. *fervently*, and parallel with it אֶרְרִיחֶיךָ; but נַפְשִׁי Ps 57:5 is rather a periphrasis for the 1st pers. *I*.

(b) Where the subject denoting the *thing* follows, הֲלִי קוֹלְךָ *cry—thy voice* (i. e. *aloud*), Is 10:30; so also after an imperative, Ps 17:13 (הֲרַקֶּךָ) and verse 14 (יִדְרֶךָ); 60:7, 108:7 (יִמְיֶךָ); after a perfect, Hb 3:15 (סוּסֵיךָ); after a cohortative, Ps 108:2 (אֶרְבֹּדֶיךָ). The subject denoting the *thing* stands between the personal subject and the predicate in Ps 44:3 אֲתָהּ נִדְרֶךָ.<sup>4</sup>

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 (41<sup>13</sup>), 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 וְהָאֵלֹהִים either עֵינַי has dropped out (through confusion with יָצָלָה) or we should read with the LXX אֶהְיֶה. In 2 S 13:39 (וַתִּבְלֶה דָּוִד) the text is obviously corrupt.

3. In poetic (or prophetic) language<sup>1</sup> 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 יִבְגֵּד we should undoubtedly read הִתְבַּגַּד); 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 הוּא Is 5:8, 29:15, Jer 22:13]. From the 3rd to the 2nd pers., Dt 32:15, Is 1:29 (but read probably הִמְדַּתְתָּם for הִמְדַּתְתָּם, which has caused the insertion of אֲשֶׁר), 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. הוּא is probably employed δεικτικῶς for the 1st.

3<sup>3</sup> In Ex 6:3 שְׁמִי is subordinated to the following passive עָתִיד־לִי (§ 121 b); in 1 S 25:26, 33 יָדֶיךָ, דְּרֹךְךָ are subjects to the infinitive absolute הוֹשִׁיעַ, according to § 113 gg. In Ps 69:11 read אֶעֱצֶנָה for אֶבְכֶּה.

4<sup>4</sup> 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 בְּ *instrumentale*, the explanation given above must nevertheless be accepted.

1<sup>1</sup> In prose, Lv 2:8; but וְהִקְרַיְתֶהּ 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. ז'את בְּרִיתִי *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 תָּבֹא אֵן (cf. 30:39, 31:8 and 33:13); Ju 1:22 f. יָת בְּ representing persons belonging to the tribe; Mi 4:3 גוֹי; 2 K 25:5 יָלָה אֶרְמֵי the army; Pr 11:26 לְאוֹם the people; Nu 10:3 כָּל־הָעֵדָה 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 וַיָּגֵדוּ אֲרָם and the Syrians fled; 1 S 4:5.—(β) with the predicate following, 1 K 8:5 וּבָקָר אֵן וּבָקָר sheep and oxen, construed with the plural in the following relative clause; Jb 1:14 הַבָּקָר הָיוּ חֹרְשׁוֹת the cattle (cows) were ploughing; 2 S 3:1 and 1 Ch 10:6 יָת בְּ=family (in 1 S 6:13 מִשְׁמֵחַ on the analogy of names of countries, is used for the inhabitants of Bethshemesh); Ho 11:7, Ezr 4:4 עַם; Ps 68:11 הֶזְיָה herd [if correct, figuratively for people]; Is 26:19 נַבְלָה dead bodies; Is 27:11 קִצִּיר 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 זָכַר; Ju 9:55, 15:10 אִישׁ; Is 16:4 מַסַּח the treacher down.—(β) with the predicate following, Jb 8:19 אֲחֵרִים=others; Ez 28:3 סֵתוּם a secret; [Ps 9:7, and even after זֶה Jb 19:19.]

(c) Of feminines as collective terms denoting masculine persons: (α) with the predicate preceding, 1 S 17:46 וַיֵּדְעוּ 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 שְׁאֲרִית 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 מוֹלַדָּת issue; 1 S 2:33 כָּל־מַרְבֵּית all the increase; Jb 30:12 פְּרֻחָה rabble. In Hag 2:7 read חֲמֹדֶיךָ 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 וַיִּבְרַח הָעָם וַיִּבְרַח הָעָם 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.), אֲדֹנָי *master*, Ex 21:4 בָּעֲלִים *master, owner*, Ex 21:29; cf., moreover, פְּנִים with the singular, Jb 16:16 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, רַחֲמִים Pr 12:10.—So feminine forms with a masculine meaning are construed with a masculine predicate, e. g. Ec 12:9 חָכֵם קָהָל לֵת הַחָכֵם *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 predicate<sup>1</sup> (on the collective sense of the feminine form, cf. § 122 s); thus Jo 1:20 אֵינִי הַצֶּמֶח וְהַיַּבֹּשֶׁת *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<sup>e</sup>th.*, 103:5 (unless הַיָּמִים is to be read for הַיָּמִים), Jb 14:19, 27:20; with the predicate following, Gn 49:22 (אֵינִי=branches); Dt 21:7, 1 S 4:15 (וְעֵינָיו קָהָל),<sup>2</sup> 2 S 10:9, Is 59:12, Jer 2:15 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, 48:41, 49:24, Pr 15:22, 20:18, Jb 41:10.<sup>3</sup>

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) אֲבִרְךָ יְהוָה וְאֲבִרְךָ יְהוָה *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 אֵל; Is 3:12 unless נְגַשִּׁי 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<sup>e</sup>th.*

1<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> On the possibility of explaining forms like קָהָל 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<sup>3</sup> In Pr 14:1 an abstract plural חַכְמוֹת (to be read thus with 9:1, &c., instead of חַכְמוֹת) is construed with the singular; but cf. § 86 l, § 124 e, end.

Rem. Analogous to the examples above mentioned is the somewhat frequent<sup>4</sup> 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, וּנְפִישׁוּ is undoubtedly a dittography for נִפְשׁוּ), Zc 14:12, Ps 5:10 (where, however, פִּימוֹ 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 שׁוּרֵלוֹ עָ, אֲשֶׁר עָ 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 לוֹ; in Gn 2:19 לוֹ refers to the collectives הָהֵן and עוֹף; cf. further, Jos 24:7, Is 5:23 עֲבָרֵי לָקֶם after צַדִּיקִים (but read probably צַדִּיק with the LXX, &c.). Conversely in Mi 1:11 לָקֶם עֲבָרֵי [cf. Jer 13:20 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*], 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 עֵינָיִם, Gn 29:17 רְפוּת לְאֵה רְפוּתָהּ 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 אָזְנוֹתַיְכֶם *ears*, 2 Ch 6:40; יָדַיְכֶם *hands*, Is 1:15, Jb 10:8, 20:10 (in Ex 17:12 even with the plural masculine כַּבְּדֵיכֶם; cf. p); שְׂפָתַיְכֶם *lips*, 1 S 1:13, Jb 27:4; שְׁדַיְכֶם *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 things<sup>1</sup>). 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.<sup>2</sup> Thus inflexions are omitted in—

(a) The verb, with a following singular feminine, Is 2:17 וְנִשְׁחָ גְבוּהוֹתָהּ, אֲדָמָהּ 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 וְעָנָה אֵימִים and *there shall cry wolves*, &c.; Ju 13:17 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, 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 מָאֵר רֵת 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 מִן צֶוֶן 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 נִצָּא 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

<sup>4</sup> 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.]

<sup>1</sup> Only rarely does an uninflected predicate precede a personal subject, as 1 S 25:27 (but יֵאָהֱבָה 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 תִּהְיֶינָה instead of תִּהְיֶינָה); 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 הָיָה, 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 וְהָיָה נֶצְחָה וּבִקְרֹב גִּמְלָתָהּ and *a ripening grape the flower becometh*.

(b) The adjective in a noun-clause, e. g. Ps 119:137 יָשָׁר מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ *upright are thy judgements*; cf. verse 155.<sup>1</sup>—On the other hand, רֵעָה צֹאן עֹבְדֶיךָ in יֵרָעָה *thy servants are shepherds*, Gn 47:3, is either an unusual orthography or simply a misspelling for רֵעֵי.

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 וְהָיוּ קָאֵרֹת ... וְהָיוּ (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 גָּזְזָהּ, גָּזְזָהּ, and afterwards עוֹרֵר (but עוֹרֵר is better taken as an infin. abs.=*excitando*, reading הַקִּים for הָקִים); 33:9 אֲבֵל אֲמַלְלָהּ אֶרֶץ *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 affirmative  $\iota$ □, Is 57:8, Jer 3:5, Ez 22:4, 23:32 (תִּשְׁתִּי after תִּהְיֶה); 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 פֶּשֶׁן *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 הָאֶחָד instead of הָאֶחָד; וְהָיָה then follows correctly; 1 S 2:20 read with Wellhausen שָׁאֵל, according to 1:28, instead of שָׁאֵל; 1 S 16:4 read וַיִּמְרוּ; Ez 18:29 instead of וַיִּתְּבוּ read the plural as in verse 25; so also Ez 20:38 for יָבוֹא,<sup>2</sup> and in Jb 6:20 for נִטָּה; in La 5:10 read וַיִּקְרַע, and cf. in general, § 7 d, note; 1 Ch 2:48 read וְהָיָה; 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 רִגְלֵי), Ps 11:4 (after עֵינָיו), 63:4, Pr 5:2, 10:21, 32 18:6, 26:23, Jb 15:6 (all after שָׁפַת יָם), Pr 3:2 (after מִצְוֹתַי), Ps 102:28, Jb 16:22 (after שְׁנוֹת), Dn 11:41 (read וְרִבֹּת), 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. וְהָיָה, after a plural subject, is explained as a case of attraction to

<sup>1</sup> This does not include such cases as Jb 24:7, 10, where עָרוֹם is rather to be explained as an accusative denoting a state, § 118 n.

<sup>2</sup> יָבוֹא probably an error for יָבֹאוּ. The Masora on Lv 11:34 reckons fourteen instances of יָבֹאוּ, where we should expect the plural.

the following singular predicate.<sup>3</sup>—In Gn 4:7 ר'ֹבֵץ is a substantival participle (*a lurker, a coucher*). In Gn 47:24 הַהֵיחָה 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 (לִי הַהֵיחָה as if the sentence began afresh, *and servants born in my house ... there fell to my lot* this possession also). In Jb 20:26 ל'ֹאֵ-בָּיִחַ may (unless אֵשׁ 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 שְׂמֹחִים (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.<sup>1</sup> Thus 1 S 2:4 קָשֶׁת גְּבֻרִים הִתְּיָרָה *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 (ר'ֹב שָׁנִים 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 קוֹל (*voice, sound*) with a following genitive stands at the beginning of a sentence, apparently in this construction, are really of a different kind. The קוֹל 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 קוֹל קְרָא *the voice of one that crieth!* i. e. *hark! there is one crying* is followed immediately by direct speech; in Mi 6:9 קוֹל *hark!* may be used disconnectedly (cf. the almost adverbial use of קוֹל in § 144 m) and יְהִי ה' be taken as the subject to יִקְרָא.

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 וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי אָדָם *and all the days of Adam were, &c.* (in 5:23, 9:29, וַיְהִי; but the Samaritan reads וַיְהִי 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, כָּל־מְלָאכָה ל' א, 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

<sup>3</sup> So also the pronoun הוּא emphatically resuming the subject (see § 141 h) is attracted to the predicate in number in Jos 13:14 הוּא נַחֲלָתוֹ ... הוּא יְהוָה *the offerings of the Lord ... that is his inheritance*; in number and gender, Lv 25:33 *Q<sup>e</sup>rê*; Jer 10:3.

<sup>1</sup> 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* (ל' א יִשָּׁב תו); after subjects of different genders it is in the masculine (as the *prior gender*, cf. § 132 d), e. g. Gn 18:11 אֲבָרָהֶם *Abraham and Sarah were old*; Dt 28:32, 1 K 1:21.

Rem. Rare exceptions are Pr 27:9 רֵת יִשְׂמַח־לֵב שֵׁן מֶן וּקְטָן ointment and perfume rejoice the heart, where the predicate agrees in gender with the masculine מֶן (as in Is 51:3 with שִׁשׁוֹן); on the other hand, in Ex 21:4 (where הָאִשָּׁה, הָאִשָּׁה, הָאִשָּׁה are the subjects) it agrees with הָאִשָּׁה as being the principal person; in the compound sentence, Is 9:4, it agrees with the feminine subject immediately preceding.<sup>1</sup>

(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* (וַיֵּאָמֶר) *her brother and her mother*; 33:7; before a masculine singular and a plural, e. g. Gn 7:7 וַיֵּבֶן אֱנוֹשׁ וּבָנָיו *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 וַתֵּעֲנֶה רָחֵל 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 וַתִּדְבֹר מִרְיָם וְאַהֲרֹן *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 נִמְגִים יֵהָרֵסוּ *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 וַתִּשְׁכַּח אֶת־נַפְשָׁהּ וַתִּשְׁכַּח אֶת־נַפְשָׁהּ read אֶת־נַפְשָׁהּ וַתִּשְׁכַּח אֶת־נַפְשָׁהּ 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 הִנֵּה (see b below), and also a number of exclamations of the most varied kinds (see c below).

<sup>1</sup> Similarly with a mixed object, Gn 33:2 *he put ... Leah and her children after*; אָחֵר־נִים agrees with the masculine immediately preceding.

<sup>1</sup> This does not apply to such cases as Gn 33:8, where an infinitive with ל appears alone in answer to a question, the substance of the question being presupposed as a main clause; cf. also Gn 26:7, where הִיא must again be supplied after אֲשֶׁתִּי.

Rem. Incomplete sentences are very common in Chronicles, but are mostly due to the bad condition of the text; cf. Driver, *Introd.*<sup>6</sup>, p. 537, no. 27. Thus in 2 Ch 11:22b restore הָשִׁב, with the LXX, before לְהַמְלִיכוֹ; in 35:21 add בְּ אֶתִי, with the LXX, after הַיּוֹם and read פָּרַת for בֵּית; in 2 Ch 19:6 and 28:21 the pronoun הוּא is wanted as subject, and in 30:9 the predicate יִהְיֶה; 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 הֵן, הֵנָּה *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 עִמָּךְ אָנֹכִי וְהֵנָּה אֲנִי כִי 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 הֵנָּה the analogy of the corresponding Arabic demonstrative particle 'inna (followed by an accusative of the noun) is significant.<sup>2</sup> If הֵנָּה 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 הֵנָּה with the suffix refers, must, strictly speaking, be supplied again before the predicate.<sup>3</sup> Sometimes, however, the pronoun referring to the subject is wanting, and the simple הֵנָּה takes the place of the subject and copula (as Gn 18<sup>9</sup> הֵנָּה בָּאָה הֵלֵךְ *behold she is in the tent*; 42:28), or there is no indication whatever of the predicate, so that the sentence is limited to הֵנָּה with the suffix, as in the frequent use of הֵנָּה אֲנִי *here am I*, in answer to an address. Elsewhere a substantive follows הֵנָּה (or הֵן Gn 11:6, Jb 31:35), and הֵנָּה then includes the meaning of a demonstrative pronoun and the copula, e. g. Gn 22:7 הֵנָּה הָאֵשׁ וְהָעֵצִים *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 וְהֵנָּה לְקֶשֶׁת וּגִ' *and lo, it was the latter growth, &c.* By a very pregnant construction the simple הֵנָּה 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 הָרַב); 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 קוֹל equivalent to *hark!* cf. § 146 b); 28:10, 29:16 (הַפְּכָכָם *O your perversity!* i. e. *how great it is!*); Jer 49:16 (if תִּפְלֶצְתָּךְ be equivalent to *terror be upon thee!*); Jo 4:14, Mal 1:13 (הֵנָּה מִתְלַאֵה *behold what a weariness!*); Jb 22:29; perhaps also Gn 49:4 הֵן כִּי בָּמָּי אֶפְרָח *a bubbling over as water* (sc. happened), unless it is better to

<sup>2</sup> On the same analogy any substantive following הֵנָּה 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 הֵנָּה were felt to be accusatives.

<sup>3</sup> That these are real noun-clauses and that the participle (e. g. מֵת in מֵת הֵנָּה 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 אַתָּה (*thou wast*).—(b) With suppression of the subject, Ju 4:20, cf. § 152 k; Jb 15:23 אַיִה *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 אַתּוֹ גַּם *him also!* explained immediately afterwards by הִכֵּהוּ *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 עַד־מָתִי; Ps 74:9 עַד־מָה.—On אֶלְאִי *and if not* (unless לֹא 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 אֵי, אוֹי, הוֹי, הֵם, <sup>1</sup> cf. § 105. After the first two the object of the *threat* or *imprecation* follows regularly with לְ (cf. *vae tibi*) or -לְ or -עַל-, e. g. הוֹי אוֹי לָנוּ *woe unto us!* 1 S 4:8, Is 6:5; cf. also אַל־לַיִם *alas for the day!* Jo 1:15; on the other hand, the object of *commiseration* (after הוֹי) follows mostly in the vocative, or rather in the accusative of exclamation (cf. *vae te* in Plautus); so in lamentation for the dead, הוֹי אָחִי *alas, my brother!* 1 K 13:30, Jer 22:18; הוֹי גּוֹי חַטָּא *ah, sinful nation!* Is 1:4, 5:8, 11, 18, 20, 22 (*ah! they that ...*).—For הֵם cf. Hb 2:20, Zp 1:7, Zc 2:17.

2. Finally, instances of noun-clauses shortened in an unusual manner may perhaps occur in יָדֵיהֶם and רַגְלֵיהֶם Ps 115:7, for יָדֵיהֶם לָהֶם *they have hands*, &c.; cf. verses 5 and 6 פִּי הַחַיִּים לָהֶם, &c. Perhaps also וּפִי יִלְגְּשׁוּ Gn 22:24, and וְהָלִיךְ Ec 5:16 are to be regarded in the same way, but hardly נָבֵא יֵאָכֵם Nu 12:6; cf. § 128 d above.

### *Special Kinds of Sentences.*

#### § 148. *Exclamations.*

The originally interrogative מַה is used to introduce exclamations of wonder or indignation = *O how!* or *ridicule, why! how!* sometimes strengthened by הֵן or אַתָּה according to § 136 c.—Astonishment or indignation at something which has happened is introduced by אַיִךְ *how* (likewise originally interrogative) with the perfect; the indignant refusal of a demand by אַיִךְ (but also by מַה Jb 31:1) with the imperfect; an exclamation of lamentation by אַיִכָּה, less frequently אַיִךְ *how!*; in Jo 1:18 by מַה.

Examples:—

מַה (or מַה־הֵן with a following *Dagě*, see § 37) expressing admiration (or astonishment) before verbal-clauses, e.g. Gn 27:20 (מַה־זֶּה); 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 מַה־הִיאַת 4:10, 20:9, 31:26 *what hast thou done!*

אַיִךְ with the perfect, e.g. Gn 26:9, Ps 73:19; in scornful exclamation, Is 14:4, 12; in a lament (usually אַיִכָּה), 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.

אַיִכָּה 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 מִי in such cases as Mi 7:18 מִי־אֵל כָּמוֹךָ *who is a God like unto*

<sup>1</sup> We do not consider here the cases in which these interjections (e. g. הֵם Ju. 3:19, Am 6:10) stand quite disconnectedly (so always אֵי and הֵאָה).

*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 אִם, in the sense of *certainly not*, and אִם־לֹא (rarely כִּי Gn 22:16) in the sense of *certainly*, are used to introduce promises or threats confirmed by an oath (especially after such formulae as הֲיִי־יְהוָה הַיּוֹם, הֲיִי־נִפְשְׁךָ, הֲיִי־נִפְשִׁי<sup>1</sup>, &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 הֲלֹא יִלְהֹתֵנִי לֵי *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 אִם־לֹא 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 אִם־לֹא simply came to express *verily*, אִם *verily not*.—In 1 S 25:22, where, instead of a self-imprecation, a curse is pronounced upon others, read לֹא־יָבִי כֹדֶר with the Lxx for לֹא־יָבִי כֹדֶר.

Examples:—

(a) The particles אִם and אִם־לֹא used after the utterance of an oath and after formulae of swearing, e.g. 2 S 11:11 (see note on <sup>a</sup>) הֲיִי־יְהוָה אֶת־הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה *as the Lord liveth, and as ray soul liveth, I will not do this thing*; 1 S 14:45, 2 K 5:16 (after הֲיִי־יְהוָה; in 1 S 14:39 and 29:6 הֲיִי is followed by a simple כִּי); Ct 2:7, 3:5 (after הֲשָׁבַעְתִּי *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 אִם־לֹא Gn 24:37 f.; spoken by God, Is 14:24, where אִם־לֹא 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 אִם־לֹא is immediately afterwards continued by אִם־לֹא with the imperfect.—In Ez 34:10 the threat introduced in verse 8 by אִם־לֹא is, after a long parenthesis, resumed with הֲנִי.

(b) אִם and אִם־לֹא after formulae of cursing, e.g. 1 S 3:17 כֹּה נַעֲשֶׂה־לְךָ אֱלֹהִים וְכֹה יוֹסִיף אֱמֹתֶיךָ *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 אִם; in 1 S 25:34 the preceding כִּי is repeated before אִם; in 1 S 20:13 the purport of the asseveration is repeated (after the insertion of a conditional sentence) in the perfect consecutive.

<sup>1</sup> Also combined הֲיִי־יְהוָה הַיּוֹם הֲיִי־נִפְשְׁךָ 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 הֲיִי־יְהוָה instead of the impossible הֲיִי־יְהוָה). On כִּי and הֲיִי in these noun-clauses (prop. *living is the Lord, &c.*), cf. § 93 aa, note.

(c) אַם and אִם-ל' אַ as simple particles of asseveration, e.g. Ju 5:8 'וְגַם אִם-יִרְאָה נֹר מִזֶּה וְגַם אִם-ל' אַ *truly, there was not a shield and spear seen, &c.*, Is 22:14, Jb 6:28 (in the middle of the sentence); after אִם-ל' אַ *absit*, 2 S 20:20; אִם-ל' אַ 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. Frequently<sup>1</sup> the natural emphasis upon the words is of itself sufficient to indicate an interrogative sentence as such; cf. Gn 27:24 אַתָּה זֶה בְּנִי עֵשָׂו *thou art my son Esau?* (but cf. note <sup>1</sup> below) Gn 18:12, Ex 33:14 (פָּנִי יי); 1 S 11:12 יוֹנָתָן בֶּן-חַיִל יִשְׁלֹם לְנֹעַם בִּן-נֹחַם *Saul shall reign over us?* 1 S 22:7, 2 S 16:17, 18:29 עַל-יְדֵי עַד *is it well with the young man?* (but cf. note <sup>1</sup>); 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 וְאַתָּה לָּמָּדָנוּ *and I should not have pity?* Ex 8:22 וְהִיא תִּשְׁלַח אֶת-בְּנֵיהֶם *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<sup>19b</sup>, 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 אִם-ל' אַ for אִם-ל' אַ *nonne?*), 2 K 5:26 (but cf. note <sup>1</sup>), La 3:38.<sup>2</sup>

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 הֵּ or הֶּ occurs before a guttural.

2. As a rule, however, the simple question is introduced by *He interrogative* הֵּ (הֶּ; as to its form, cf. § k-n), *ne? num?* the disjunctive question by הֵּ (num? *utrum?*) in the first clause, and אַם<sup>3</sup> (also אַםְוְ, less frequently אַוְ) *an?* in the second, e.g. 1 K 22:15

<sup>1</sup> 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, אַתָּה זֶה, as in verso 21, in 1 S 16:4 הֵּשְׁלֹם, in 2 S 18:29 הֵּשְׁלֹם 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.

<sup>2</sup> But in 1 S 27:10 instead of אִם-ל' אַ (which according to the usual explanation would expect a negative answer) read either אִם-ל' אַ (עַל-מִי) with the LXX, or better, אִם (אִםְוְ) *whither?* with the Targum. In 2 S 23:5 read אִם-ל' אַ with Wellhausen.

<sup>3</sup> Quite exceptional is the use of the particle אִםְוְ *num?* (common in Aramaic) in 1 S 21:9 וְאִםְוְ יִשְׁפֹּחַ הַיַּיִן *num est hic?* The text is, however, undoubtedly corrupt; according to Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Sam.*, the LXX express the reading הֵּשְׁפֹּחַ; 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 מַה *what?* such as אַתָּה מַה *how many?* מַה אִםְוְ *why?* (see § 102 k), אִםְוְ מַה *why?* (§ 99 e), or by אַיִן *where?* אִםְוְ אַיִן *how?* (§ 148), &c. On the transformation of pronouns and adverbs into interrogative words by means of a prefixed אִםְוְ, see the Lexicon.

ל אִם נִחַדְרָ ל shall we go ... or shall we forbear? Cf. also אַן where? whither? נָה אִם whither, and J. Barth, *Sprachwiss. Untersuchungen*, i. 13 ff.

The particular uses are as follows:—

(a) The particle הַ 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 אִם הַיֵּשׁ לְכֶם אָח is your father yet alive? have ye another brother? for הַיֵּשׁ cf. Gn 24:23, 1 S 9:11; for הַיֵּשׁ is it that? Jb 6:22; for הַיֵּשׁ is there yet? 2 S 9:1 (but in 2 S 23:19 for הַיֵּשׁ read הַנּוּ with 1 Ch 11:25); for הַיֵּשׁ is there not? 1 K 22:7, &c.; or before verbal-clauses, e.g. Jb 2:3 hast thou considered (הַיֵּשׁ מִתְּ לַבְרָ) my servant Job? In other cases הַ (= 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, הַיֵּשׁ הַיֵּשׁ 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,<sup>2</sup> e.g. 2 S 7:5 בֵּית הַיֵּשׁ תִּבְנֶה־לִּי בַיֵּת shalt thou build me an house? (in the parallel passage 1 Ch 17:4 לֹא אֶתֶּה וּגַ' thou shalt not, &c.); Gn 4:9 כִּי אֶהְיֶה אֲחֵי אָנֹכִי am I my brother's keeper? cf. 2 K 5:7, and the two passages where הַ 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 הַנִּקְלָ (after הַנִּיָּה) read הַנִּקְלָ.

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 הַיֵּשׁ קָרָא 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 הַיֵּשׁ) in order to show it to be absolutely true, and in Am 9:7 a concession is expressed by הַיֵּשׁ I have, it is true, &c. Finally, we may include the formula of quotation הַיֵּשׁ הַיֵּשׁ הַיֵּשׁ Jos 10:13 or הַיֵּשׁ הַיֵּשׁ הַיֵּשׁ 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 הַיֵּשׁ הַיֵּשׁ הַיֵּשׁ 2 S 1:18, and הַיֵּשׁ הַיֵּשׁ הַיֵּשׁ 1 K 14:19, 2 K 15:11, 2 Ch 27:7, 32:32.

Of very frequent occurrence also are questions introduced by לָמָּה, 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 אִם (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<sup>1</sup> On the use of the *imperfect* in deliberative questions, see § 107 t; on the *perfectum confidentiae* in interrogative sentences, see § 106 n.

2<sup>2</sup> Analogous to this is the use of the interrogative לָמָּה in the sense of a reproachful remonstrance instead of a prohibition, as Ct 8:4 מָה־תְּעִירִי 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 םא—ה (utrum—an?) or sometimes by םאן<sup>1</sup>—ה, e.g. Jo 1:2, Jb 21:4 (even with ה repeated after םאן 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 הָאָהָה prop. *is it even?* The second member is introduced by וָא or in 2 K 6:27, Jb 16:3, 38:28, 31:36 (Mal 1:8 הָאָהָה), in each case before ם, and hence no doubt for euphonic reasons, to avoid the combination םא; cf. also Ju 18:19, Ec 2:19.

Double questions with (םא) םא—ה 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 (םא) 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 ן, e.g. Jb 13:7, 15:7 f., 38:16 f., 22, 32, 39; cf. also Ps 8:5 after הָ; Jb 21:17 f. after הָהָה; or even without a conjunction, Jb 8:11, 22:4; after הָהָה Ps 144:3.

(c) With regard to *indirect* questions<sup>2</sup> after verbs of inquiring, doubting, examining,<sup>3</sup> &c., simple questions of this kind take either ה *whether*, Gn 8:8,<sup>4</sup> or םא 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 וָא, i.e. probably *if perchance*. In disjunctives (*whether—or*) םא—ה Nu 13:18 at the end (or םא—ה—ל' א Gn 24:21, 27:21, 37:32, Ex 16:4), and ה—ה Nu 13:18, which is followed by םא—ה; also וָא—ה Ec 2:19. The formula םא יודע םי מִי has an affirmative force, *who knows whether ... not*, like the Latin *nescio an*, Est 4:14.

In Jon 1:7, 8 the relative pronouns וָשׁ and וָשׁר owing to the following לְמִי have become also interrogative, *for whose cause?*

(d) הָהָה and הָהָה (cf. § 136 c) immediately after the interrogative serve to give vividness to the question; so also הָהָה (for which הָהָה five times in Job) *then, now*, Gn 27:33 הָהָה הָהָה *who then is he?* Ju 9:38, Is 19:12, Jb 17:15; הָהָה הָהָה *where then is ...?* However, הָהָה may also be placed at the end of the entire question (Ex 33:16, Is 22:1; also Ho 13:10, since either הָהָה is a dialectical form of הָהָה, or הָהָה should be read instead of it) or at the beginning of the question proper, after a strongly emphasized word, as in Gn 27:37.<sup>1</sup>

1<sup>1</sup> םא occurs in Pr 27:24 after a negative statement; we should, however, with Dyserinck read םאן. Not less irregular is םא ל' instead of םא ל' 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 הָ 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, םא is best taken with Ewald in the sense of םא ל', since םא from its use in oaths (see above, § 149 b) may simply mean *verily not*.

2<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> In Gn 43:6 the הָ after לְהַגִּיד is explained from the fact that the latter, according to the context, implies *to give information upon a question*.

4<sup>4</sup> Also in Ec 3:21 we should read הָהָה and הָהָה (whether—whether) instead of the article which is assumed by the Masora.

1<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, in Jb 9:24 and 24:25 הָהָה is not prefixed to the מִי, 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 **מָדַע** *wherefore looked I ... and it brought forth?* i.e. wherefore brought it forth, while I looked, &c.; **Is 50:2**; after **חַ** **Nu 32:6**, **Jer 8:4**, also **Nu 16:22** (read **הָאֵשׁ**); after **אֲלֵל** **Jos 22:20**; after **לָמָּה** **Is 58:3**, **2 Ch 32:4**; after **אֲלֵמִי** **Is 40:25**.<sup>2</sup> But **חַ** **Jb 4:2** and **אֲלֵל** **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 **שִׁי** *if it be so* in the corrected text of **2 K 10:15**, see § 159 dd.) As a negative answer the simple **אֵל** is sometimes sufficient, as in **Gn 19:2**, **1 K 3:22**, &c.; cf. § 152 c; and in **Ju 4:20** the simple **יִאָּ** 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 **אָ** § 108 c), jussive (§ 109; with **אָ** § 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:<sup>3</sup> especially sentences with **מִי** 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 יִשְׁפֹּט נִי שׁ פֶּט** *who maketh me judge?* i.e. *O that I were made judge!* **1 S 20:10**, **2 S 23:15**. On the other hand, **מִי** 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 יִיָּתֵן** (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־בְּכֶם יִסְגֹּר דְלָת יָם** *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 יִיָּתֵן** is still plainly discernible, e.g. **Ju 9:29** **מִי יִיָּתֵן** **אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה בְּיָדִי** *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 יִיָּתֵן** is still equivalent to *O had I!* and in numerous other instances the idea of *giving* has entirely disappeared, **מִי יִיָּתֵן** 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** (**53<sup>7</sup>**), **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 יִיָּתֵן מוֹתִי אֲנִי תִּהְיֶה יָדְךָ** *would that I had died for thee* (for **אֲנִי** cf. § 135 f); of a participle, **Jb 31:35**; of a personal pronoun (as a suffix), **Jb 29:2**

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the analogous sentences after **עַוָּ** *because*, **Is 65:12**, **Jer 35:17**; after causal **אֲשֶׁר** **1 S 26:23**; after **כִּי** **Is 12:1**; likewise after **גַּם** § 153 at the end; after **כִּן־** **Dt 8:12–14**, **25:3**, **Jos 6:18**, **2 S 12:28**.

<sup>3</sup> 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 ך; but ך׃ with יִיְהוָה נִי מְ, Is 27:4 and Jer 9:1 with a following accusative is not simply equivalent to לִי יִיְהוָה לִי מְ, but is properly *who endows me with*, &c.; cf. § 117 ff).—With a still greater weakening of the original meaning יִיְהוָה מְ 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 םא (Ps 81:9, 95:7, 139:19, Pr 24:11, 1 Ch 4:10; always with a following imperfect) and לו (for which in Ps 119:5 we have אֶהְיֶה לִי, 2 K 5:3 אֶהְיֶה לִי, from אה *ah!* and לו=לִי; both with a following imperfect) *si, o si! utinam*.<sup>1</sup> לו 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 לו מָתוּ ך׃ *would that we had died*; 20:3 and Jos 7:7 (both times לוּ ך׃); on the other hand, Is 48:18 and 63:19 (both times לוּ ך׃) to express a wish that something expected in the future may already have happened.—On לו with the imperative (by an anacoluthon) Gn 23:13 cf. § 110 e. On the perfect after םא בִּי 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 *Keth.* לוּ we must evidently read לֹא; perhaps preserved as a substantive) = the Greek οὐ, *not*, אֵי = μή (Jb 24:25 as a substantive), אֵין (*it is*) *not*; ך׃ ך׃ *not yet*, אֵפֶס *not*, אֵפֶסִי (cf. § 90 m) *not*. The forms בִּלְיָ, בִּלְיָ, בִּלְיָ *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* words<sup>1</sup>), while אֵין is used exclusively with noun-clauses (see the examples below).

<sup>1</sup> 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* (לוּ יִשׁ) *a sword in my hand now had I surely killed thee!*

<sup>1</sup> Especially in compounds, e.g. לֹא-אֱלֹהִים lit. *a no-God* (Germ. *Ungott*) who is indeed called a god, but is not really a god, Dt 32:21; לֹא-אֱלֹהִים verse 17, cf. Jer 5:7, 2 Ch 13:9; לֹא-אֲנָשִׁים lit. *a not-people* (Germ. *Unvolk*), Dt 32:21; לֹא-דָבָר *a nothing*, Am 6:13; לֹא-עֵץ lit. *not-wood*, Is 10:15; לֹא-אִישׁ, לֹא-אֲדָמָה lit. *not-man, superhuman* (of God), Is 31:8; לֹא-עֲוֹנוֹת *unrighteousness*, Jer 22:13, cf. Ez 22:29; לֹא-סִדְרָיִם *disorder*, Jb 10:22; לֹא-הֶקְמָה *not-violence*, 16:17; after לֹא Jb 26:2 f. (לֹא-כֹה) *helplessness*, לֹא-הֶקְמָה (*insipientia*); cf. also Is 55:2 לֹא-לֵשׁ בְּעֵצָה *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, לֹא-הָכֵחַ

The conjunctions **פֶּן** and **לְבַלְתִּי** *that not*, serve to negative dependent clauses. The particular uses of these particles are as follows:—

(a) **לֹא** (less frequently **לֹא־**), like οὐ, οὐκ, 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 **לֹא־הֵלֵךְ** *nonne*, in interrogative sentences, cf. § 150 a. In connexion with **לֹא־כֹל** (= *any*), **לֹא** is used to express an *absolute* negation, *nullus*, *none whatever* (cf. the French *ne ... personne*, *ne ... rien*), usually in the order **לֹא־כֹל** ... **לֹא**, e.g. Gn 3:1 **לֹא־תֹאכְלוּ מִכָּל־עֵץ הַגָּן** *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 (**כֹּל־דְּבָר**) ... **לֹא־** *nothing at all*; cf. the same statement in the form of a rhetorical question, Jer 32:27); Pr 12:21, 30:30 **לֹא־מִפְּנֵי־כֹל** ... **לֹא־** and *turneth not away for any*; 2 Ch 32:15; but cf. also the inverted order, Ex 12:16 **לֹא־יֵעָשֶׂה** *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 **לֹא־בְּכֹל** by being determinate is used in the sense of *whole*, e.g. Nu 23:13 **לֹא־תִרְאֶה** *thou shalt not see them all*, but only a part.

Analogous to **לֹא־כֹל** ... **לֹא** is the use of **לֹא־אִישׁ** Gn 23:6, &c., in verbal-clauses in the sense of *no one at all*, *not a single one*. On **לֹא־אִישׁ־כֹּל** *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 **לֹא־נָסוּר** &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 **לֹא־אֶסְרוּת** *thy hands were not bound*, a participle is thus specially negated by **לֹא**; cf. Ps 74:9, where, however, **לֹא** is separated from the participle by **וְגוֹ**, 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 דְּבָרִים אֲנִי** *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 **וְ** of the apodosis); 41:2; in Jb 9:33 even **לֹא־יֵשׁ** *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 **לְבַלְתִּי**) read **לֹא־טָהֵר** with the LXX, for **לֹא־טָהוֹר**. 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־אֶחְסִיד** *impious*, Ps 43:1; **לֹא־עָצוּם** and **לֹא־עָצוּם** *not strong*, Pr 30:25 f.; **לֹא־אֶבְרָן** *unsuitably*, 2 K 7:9; **לֹא־טוֹב** *not-good*, Is 65:2, Ez 20:25, &c.; **לֹא־טָהוֹר** *not-clean*, 2 Ch 30:17; with a participle, e.g. Jer 2:2 (*unsown*); (6<sup>8</sup>, Ez 4:14, 22:24, Zn 2:1, 3:5; the Masora, however, requires **לֹא־נִגְחָה** in Is 54:11, **לֹא־נִעְצָה** in 62:12, **לֹא־נוֹשָׁתָה** in Jer 6:8, **לֹא־רַחֲמָה** 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 א'ל according to the accentuation even stands at the end of the clause (*they offend him not*); but undoubtedly ל'א ב'ניו are to be taken together.—On the position of א'ל with the infinitive absolute, see § 113 v.

(b) א'ל 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 א'ל with the imperfect, see § 107 p; with the cohortative, see § 108 c; on 2 K 6:27, see § 109 h.

Rem. 1. א'ל (like א'ל, see note on <sup>a</sup> above) may be used to form a compound word, as in Pr 12:28 א'ל-מָוֶת *not-death* (immortality); though all the early versions read א'ל-מָוֶת. The instances in which א'ל appears to stand absolutely, equivalent to *no*, *certainly not* (like μή for μῆ γένηται), e.g. Ru 1:13 א'ל בְּנֵי נַי *nay, my daughters*, and Gn 19:18, 33:10 (א'ל-נָא), 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. א'ל, like א'ל, 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.<sup>1</sup>

(c) א'ל construct state (unless it be sometimes merely a contracted connective form, cf. שָׁנִים for יָשָׁנִים § 97 d) of א'ל non-existence (as also the absolute state, see below) is the negative of א'ל existence; cf. e.g. Gn 31:29 with Neh 5:5. As א'ל (*he, she, it is, was, &c.*) includes the idea of *being* in all tenses, so א'ל, א'ל includes the idea of *not being* in all tenses. Hence—

(1) The absolute state א'ל, 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) וְכֹחַ אֵל וְלִדְבָרָה *and strength does not exist to bring forth*; Gn 2:5 א'ל א'ל *was not present*; Ex 17:7 א'ל-אִם-אֵין *or is he not?* after א'ל *is he ...?* (cf. Nu 13:20); Lv 26:37, Nu 20:5, Ju 4:20 (א'ל *no*). In 1 S 9:4 and 10:14 א'ל 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 א'ל א'ל *and let there be none, let none come!* Ec 3:19.—Cf. finally א'ל-אִם *if it be not so*, Gn 30:1, Ex 32:32, Ju 9:15, 2 K 2:10.—Quite anomalous is א'ל א'ל Jb 35:15 before a perfect as an emphatic negation; the text, however, can hardly be correct.

(2) The construct state א'ל 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 א'ל is joined to a participle, e.g. 1 S 26:12 א'ל א'ל יוֹדֵעַ וְאֵין מִקְיִין *and there was not one seeing, &c.*, i.e. *and no man saw it, nor knew it, neither did any awake*; so especially א'ל with a participle in subordinate *circumstantial* or *descriptive clauses*, such as Is 5:29 א'ל א'ל מְצִיל *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., א'ל א'ל מְחַרֵּד *without any one's making you afraid*; cf. § 141 e. א'ל is used as the negation of an entire noun-clause, e.g. in Gn 39:23, Nu 14:42 א'ל א'ל יְהוָה בְּקִרְבָּכֶם *the Lord is not among you*; Gn 37:29 א'ל א'ל יוֹסֵף בְּבוֹר *Joseph was not in the pit*.

<sup>1</sup> In Jer 51:3 the pointing א'ל occurs twice instead of א'ל, and is thus, in the opinion of the Masorettes, equivalent to *against him that bendeth*; but undoubtedly we should read א'ל.

(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. אֵין־נִי *I am not, was not, shall not be*; אֵין־נָּה, fem. אֵין־נָּה, *thou art not, &c.*; אֵין־נָּה, fem. אֵין־נָּה *he, she is not, &c.*; also absolutely, Gn 42:13 *he is* (5<sup>24</sup> *he was*) *no longer alive*; אֵין־נָּה *they are not, &c.* When the accompanying predicate is a verb, it follows again (see 1) in the form of a participle, since אֵין always introduces a noun-clause, e.g. Ex 5:10 אֵין־נָּה־נִי *I will not give*; 8:17, Dt 1:32.

Rem. In Neh 4:17 אֵין־נָּה־נִי for אֵין־נָּה־נִי is due to its being co-ordinate with three other (substantival) subjects; these are again expressly summed up in אֵין־נָּה־נִי־נָּה־נִי. — In Hag 2:17 אֵין־נָּה the pronominal complement of אֵין appears to follow with the sign of the accusative;<sup>1</sup> but most probably we should read with the LXX אֵין־נָּה־נִי for אֵין־נָּה־נִי.

(4) The fact that אֵין (like אֵין־נָּה) 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. אֵין־נָּה Is 1:6, לוֹ Lv 11:10, 12, לָהּ Gn 11:30, גַּם Ps 14:3, שָׁם 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 אֵין־נָּה אֵין־נָּה *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־נָּה=*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־נָּה ... אֵין־נָּה or אֵין־נָּה ... אֵין־נָּה (see b above) so also אֵין־נָּה expresses an *absolute* negation, e.g. Ec 1:9 אֵין־נָּה־נָּה *there is no new thing, &c.*; 2 S 12:3, Dn 1:4 (cf. also אֵין־נָּה אֵין־נָּה *there is nothing, 1 K 18:43, Ec 5:13*); as also אֵין־נָּה ... אֵין־נָּה Hb 2:19; cf. אֵין־נָּה אֵין־נָּה Ju 14:6.

2. Undoubtedly akin to אֵין in origin is the negative syllable אֵין occurring in the two compounds אֵין־נָּה (as a proper name, 1 S 4:21; Baer אֵין־נָּה) and אֵין־נָּה, *not innocent*, Jb 22:30; but the proper name אֵין־נָּה is doubtful, and the fem. אֵין־נָּה very doubtful. In Ethiopic this אֵין is the most common form of negation, prefixed even to verbs.

(d) אֵין־נָּה *not yet*, when referring to past time is used, as a rule (§ 107 c), with the imperfect, Gn 2:5 אֵין־נָּה ... אֵין־נָּה *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 אֵין־נָּה־נָּה *knowest thou not yet?* Ex 9:30; but cf. Gn 24:15, and אֵין־נָּה with the perfect in Ps 90:2 (but see § 107 c), Pr 8:25.

(e) אֵין־נָּה (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 אֵין־נָּה עוֹד אֵין־נָּה *is there none left? &c.*, 2 S 9:3; frequently also in the sense of *non nisi*; with אֵין־נָּה paragogic (§ 90 m) אֵין־נָּה Is 47:8, 10, Zp 2:15 אֵין־נָּה אֵין־נָּה *I am, and there is none else*.

(f) אֵין־נָּה<sup>2</sup> in poetic and prophetic style, and with a certain emphasis, אֵין־נָּה, 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<sup>1</sup> According to De Lagarde, *Novae psalterii graeci editionis specimen*, p. 26, אֵין־נָּה Ps 3:3 is also an accusative after אֵין.

2<sup>2</sup> Evidently from אֵין־נָּה *to waste away*, from which stem also אֵין־נָּה and אֵין־נָּה (whence אֵין־נָּה § 90 m), originally substantives, are formed.

Pr 10:30 (but Is 14:21 before the jussive, =לֹא); 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) בְּלִי to negative an adjective, 1 S 20:26; on בְּלִי Ez 13:3, see x; on לְבִלִי as the regular negative with the infinitive construct, see § 114 s; on לְבִלִי as a conjunction, see x below.

On אֵם as a negative particle in oaths (*verily not*), see § 149 c above.

Rem. on לֹא, אֵין, בְּלִי. To the category of negative sentences belongs also the expression of negative attributes by means of לֹא 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 לֹא עָבוֹת בַּקֹּר לֹא עָבוֹת *a morning when there are not clouds*, i.e. *a cloudless morning*; cf. Jb 12:24, 26<sup>2 b</sup>, 38:26 (לֹא אִישׁ לִי *where no man is*, i.e. *uninhabited*); 1 Ch 2:30, 32 לֹא בָנִים *childless*; so also בְּלִי e.g. Jb 24:10 and אֵין e.g. Ps 88:5 *I am as a man יִנְאָז there is not help*, i.e. *like a helpless man*; Is 9:6 יִרְקֹץ אֵין *endless*; 47:1, Ho 7:11; יִרְמָסֶפֶר אֵין *countless*, Ct 6:8, &c., but usually (Ps 104:25, &c.) like a proper circumstantial clause (cf. § 141 e) connected by *Wāw*, וְאֵין יִרְמָסֶפֶר. —Less frequently such periphrases take the form of relative clauses (cf. § 155 e), e.g. Jb 30:13 לֹא עֹזֵר לָמוֹ they *for whom there is no helper*, i.e. *the helpless* (but probably עֹזֵר is only an intrusion from 29:12, and we should read עֹזֵר *without any one's restraining them*; in 29:12 translate *the fatherless and him that had none to help him*; in Ps 72:12 וְאֵין יִרְעֵי is used in the same sense); Hb 1:14; with אֵין Is 45:9 *thy work is that of a man who hath no hands*; Zc 9:11 *out of the waterless pit*.<sup>1</sup>

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 כָּאֵין יִרְעֵי is parallel with עֹזֵרִים; partly from their being introduced by the sign of the dative לְ, e.g. Is 40:29 (= *and to the powerless*); Jb 26<sup>2 a,3</sup>, Neh 8:10.

-----

(i) לֵאמֹר *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. δειδω μὴ, *vereor ne*), *taking heed*, frequently after מָרַד, מָרָה, מָרָה, Gn 24:6, 31:24, &c., *taking care*, 2 K 10:23, &c. Not infrequently the idea on which לֵאמֹר depends, is only virtually contained in the main clause, e.g. Gn 19:19 *I cannot escape to the mountain* (because I am afraid), לֵאמֹר יִרְעֵי הָרָעָה *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 פָּן. 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 לֵאמֹר is simply equivalent to the final *ne*); cf. e.g. Gn 11:4, 19:15, Nu 20:18 (where לֵאמֹר *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., לֵאמֹר 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 לֵאמֹר, אֲמַרְתִּי, &c.=*I thought, &c., I must beware lest, &c.*

---

<sup>1</sup> 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, פֶּן־ 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 הֲפֹרֵי־שֵׁפֶה־רָאָה *look lest there be here*, &c.

(k) לְבִלְתִּי *that ... not*, with the imperfect, Ex 20:20, 2 S 14:14 (in Jer 23:14 read the infinitive שׁוּב for בּוּ, in 27:8 אוּבִי for אוּבִי). In Ez 13:3 בְּלִתִּי יִרְאוּ 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 οὐδέεις, οὐκ οὐδαμῶς, *nulli—non, nemo non*); e.g. Zp 2:2 (if the text is correct) לֹא־יָבוֹא לְךָ־בָטָן *before there shall (not) come*.<sup>1</sup> This especially applies to the compounds formed by the union of אֵין or מְבִלִי with מִן־ *without* (§ 119 y), e.g. Is 5:9 (6<sup>11</sup>) מִצֵּי־יֹשֵׁב (for which in Jer 2:15 מְבִלִי (יֹשֵׁב), prop. *without no inhabitant*, i.e. *so that no inhabitant is left there*. On the other hand, in Is 50:2 מִן־ מֵאֵין מֵי־ the מִן־ is causative, *because there is no water*; as also in Ex 14:11 מְבִלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־ *is it because there were no ...?* 2 K 1:3, 6, 16. In Ec 3:11 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 לָמָּה לֹא־ *why ... not?* in Jb 3:11 also affects the parallel clause).

### § 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses.

The particles אֲךָ, רַק, *only*, serve to introduce restrictive clauses, and גַּם, אַף, *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 אֲךָ Gn 7:23, 34:15; רַק Gn 6:5, Am 3:2; even אֲךָ הֲרַק אֲךָ *hath he indeed only?* Nu 12:2; גַּם Gn 27:34, Jb 7:11; אַף Dt 15:17), but very frequently extends to the whole of the following sentence. Thus with אֲךָ, e.g. Nu 14:9, 1 K 17:13, Pr 17:11, Jb 13:15, 14:22, 16:7, 23:6; רַק Gn 20:11, 24:8, Ps 32:6, Pr 13:10; גַּם Gn 27:33, 32:21 (גַּם הִנֵּה), 44:10; 1 S 22:7, 28:20, Zc 9:11, Pr 17:26, 20:11; אַף Jb 14:3, 15:4.—In Mal 1:10 and Jb 2:10 גַּם 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*<sup>1</sup> (וְ) 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

<sup>1</sup> In 1 K 10:21 אֵין־כֶּן־סָרָה goes with what precedes and must be emended, with the LXX and Lucian, to כֶּן־סָרָה.

<sup>1</sup> 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 וַ) 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 וַ (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 *תָּמּוּל 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 וַיִּסְכֶּה; 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 וַ before בָּעִירוֹ is to be omitted with the LXX); cf. also such combinations as וַעַד—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., וַ is equivalent to *yea, and*; in Is 32:7 *even*.

וַ is used to express emphasis (=and especially), e.g. in Gn 3:16 וַיִּהְיֶה, Is 2:1, Ps 18:1, perhaps also in Jb 10:17 *yea, a whole host*; 2 Ch 16:14.—An undoubted example of what is called *wāw concomitantiae* occurs in Jb 41:12 *a seething pot וַיִּצְטַק 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.

וַ-וַ is used in the sense of *both—and* in Ps 76:7, Dn 1:3, 8:13. On וַ-וַ as meaning *sive—sive*, cf. § 162 b.

(c) See the Lexicon on adverbs used in a copulative sense, such as וַ also, *moreover*, summing up a number, e.g. וַיִּשְׁנֶם *both together*, Gn 27:45, Pr 17:15; וַיִּכְּלֹ *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!* וַיִּבְּרַח or וַיִּבְּרַח Gn 24:44=*both—and*; וַ occurs three times in Gn 24:25 and 32:20; also וַ, 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 וַ-וַ (also three times), equivalent to *both—and*; cf. וַ וַ *and even*, Lv 26:44; וַ-וַ 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 ך 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 ך with imperatives to express inferences, e.g. 1 K 2:22 אֲלֵי שׂ, ask now rather; Ez 18:32 for I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth ..., וְהִשִּׁיבוּ 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 (וְלִי), 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 (וְלִי), 1 S 10:12, 15:14, 22:14, 28:16, 2 S 18:12, 24:3, 1 K 2:22 (וְלִי קָה), 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 וְיִי Nu 11:29, Ju 9:29; on the disconnected use of אֵל and וְיִ cf. § 159 dd.

### § 155. Relative Clauses.

See V. Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894 (cf. the heading of § 138 above); G. Bergsträsser, 'Das hebr. Präfix ך,' *ZATW* 1909, p. 40 ff.<sup>1</sup>

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 אֲשֶׁר; see further in § 138 e. Similarly, incomplete relative clauses may also be introduced by אֲשֶׁר, 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.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> In this exhaustive article the author shows that between ך (on the pronunciation see § 36) and אֲשֶׁר there is syntactically no primary difference, but only a secondary distinction which arose in the course of the development of the language, namely that אֲשֶׁר is preferred in combinations which are customary in the old literary language, and ך in those which are derived from the popular language or from Aramaic.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> The old view that all these cases arise from the *omission* of אֲשֶׁר 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 אָשָׁר, &c.; see § 138 f.

In Arabic a distinction is made between relative clauses used for the nearer definition of a *determinate* substantive (*šifa*), and those which are attached to an *indeterminate* substantive (*šifa*). The former must be introduced by the demonstrative pronoun *allaḏī*, 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 (גוי אָשָׁר) *a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand*; cf. Is 66:13, and especially 1 S 3:11), the addition of אָשָׁר is explained from the special stress laid on the indeterminate substantive,<sup>2</sup> *a nation of such a kind, thou understandest not their tongue*. On the other hand, in poetic style at least, אָשָׁר 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. אָשָׁר for אָהָר), 2 Ch 15:11; after כִּלְ- 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.*<sup>8</sup>, 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 עֲמַד read עִמָּד 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* שֵׁבַע שְׂמוֹ *whose name was Sheba*; Zc 6:12, Jb 1:1, 3:15 *with princes* זָהָב לְהֵם *that had gold*; Ps 11:4, Pr 22:11; when referring to a noun-suffix, e.g. Ps 49:14 סוֹ לְ סוֹלָה כִּי דַרְבָּם *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-אֶרֶץ רֵץ לֹא-אִישׁ *on a land where no man is*, see § 152 u, and cf. for this very short form of the relative clause, Gn 15:13 לְאֵלֵהֶם *in a land that belongs not to them*; Dt 32:17 (לִישָׁרִים לֹא אֵלֵהֶם); Hb 1:6, Pr 26:17 (לֹא-לִוּוֹ).

(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* הַיֹּשֵׁב בְּיְהוָה *that trusteth in him*; Jb 3<sup>3 b</sup> רָצַח לַיְלָה אָמַר *the night which said*; after כִּלְ- 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<sup>17 b</sup>, 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 הִנְנִי Is 28:16, prop. *behold me, who have laid, &c.*, but perhaps the participle יֹסֵד is to be read; 29:14, 38:5 (but probably again the participle יֹסֵד 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 יָצַב יְטֹרֵךְ *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 אִישׁ יִבִּין עֵץ *an undiscerning people*.

<sup>2</sup> 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 ךְ, e.g. *Jb 7:2 יִשְׁאָר־צֶל כַּעֲבֹד יִשְׁאָר־צֶל* 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 *Ps 58:5*; after a determinate substantive, e.g. *Is 53:7* (but the better reading is *כִּשְׁה* 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 ךְ (for *אֲשֶׁר*, **ב**; 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* *וְלֹא יָדְעוּם אֱלֹהֵי הַיָּם לֹא יָדְעוּם* gods whom they knew not (see also the end of the verse); after a substantive with ךְ (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* (*יִתְרַח עֵשָׂה*), for which *Jer 48:36* *יִתְרַח עֵשָׂה* 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* *רֹצֵפָה בְּמִלְקָתָם יִם לָקַח מֵעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ* a live coal which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar; *Ex 15:17*, *Is 42:16* (*48<sup>17</sup>*, *Ps 25:12*, all after *בְּדֶרֶךְ*; but *Ps 32:8* *בְּדֶרֶךְ־יְיָ תִלְכֶּךָ*); *Is 64:2*; *Ec 10:5* (in *6:1* the same clause with *אֲשֶׁר*); moreover, in *Jer 14:18* read with the LXX *עַד עַד לֹא יָדְעוּ אֶל־אֶרֶץ רָצָה לֹא יָדְעוּ* 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 *שָׁם*, as in *Jer 2:6* end. Thus after a determinate substantive, *Ps 18:3* *בְּיָמֵי הַחֹסֶה־בּוֹ אֶת צוּרִי אֵל הַחֹסֶה־בּוֹ* my rock in which I take refuge; *Ex 18:20*, *Is 42:1*; in *Jb 3<sup>3</sup>*<sup>a</sup> also, the omission of the article with *יָם* 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* *לִבְרֵאשִׁית הַצִּבְרֹתָם* (whence) ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit *בְּקִרְיָתָם* (whence) ye were digged; *Jb 21:27* *הַמְּדַבְּרִים* (where-with) ye act violently against me.—A retrospective adverb is suppressed in *Jb 38:19* *אֵיךְ הַדָּבָר* (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 *בְּיָמֵם* *Lv 7:35*, *Ps 56:10*; after *מִיָּמֵם* *Jer 36:2*; after simple *יָם* *Ps 56:4* (*בְּיָמֵם אֵיךְ* on the day when I am afraid); after *בְּעֵת* *2 Ch 29:27* (*הַחֲלֵל הָעוֹלָה*) 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 *מִעֵת* *Ps 4:8* *תוֹשֵׁב מִעֵת* 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* *מִי אַתָּה (הַיָּמִינִי) מִי אַתָּה* who art thou (that) criest? Cf., however, *Is 63:19* *אֵיךְ הָיָה כִּי אֵלֵינוּ* as they over whom (בָּם not בּוֹ) 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 רַבְּבָהּ); Jb 30:13, cf. § 152 u.

(b) As object, Is 41:2, with a retrospective pronoun; Mal 2:16 וְנִכְסָהּ *and him that covereth* (or read וְנִכְסָהּ?); 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 וְשֵׁלֶחֶנְךָ *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־י *O the happiness of the man, &c.*; Ps 81:6, 141:9, Jb 29:16, La 1:14; after כִּלְי־ Gn 39:4, but we must certainly read here, with the Samaritan and LXX, וְשֵׁלֶחֶנְךָ as in verses 5 and 8; Ex 9:4; verbal-clauses after כִּלְי־ 1 Ch 29:3, 2 Ch 30:19, 31:19, Ezr 1:5.

(d) Governed by a preposition; so verbal-clauses after אֵת־ Jer 2:8; after אֵל־ (=to the place where), 1 Ch 15:12, but Ex 23:20 before the same verb אֲשֶׁר־הִמְקוֹם אֵשֶׁר; after בְּ Jer 2:11, 2 Ch 1:4 (הַכִּיּוֹן, הַבָּהּ=הַ, הַבָּהּ=to the place where); after לְ Is 65:1 לוֹ by them that asked not for me ... לְלֹא בָקְשׁוּ 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 עִם 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<sup>a</sup>].

### § 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 וְשֵׁמוֹ Gn 24:29, 1 S 1:1, &c., or וְשֵׁמָה 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*<sup>1</sup> (Gn 19:1, &c.). The former, however, are also to be regarded as circumstantial clauses, in so far as they describe a *state*

<sup>1</sup> 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*, וְגִבֵּיתִי אֵין, וְגִבֵּיתִי אֵין, 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 i of וְאֵין followed by a participle, as וְאֵין מְצִיל, &c.

2. Characteristic examples of circumstantial *noun*-clauses are Gn 12:8 *and pitched his tent* בֵּית־אֵל מִיַּם נְהַעִי מִקֵּדָם with *Bethel on the west and Ai on the east*; Nu 22:24, 2 S 18:14 *through the heart of Absalom*, עוֹדֶנּוּ הוּא, 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 וְאֵל־פְּנִים אֵל־פְּנִים *face to face* (prop. while *face* was turned *towards face*), Gn 32:31, Ex 33:11, Dt 34:10, &c.;<sup>1</sup> so also *to cast oneself down*, אָרְצָה, the *face* being turned *to the earth*, Gn 19:1, &c. (for אָרְצָה we find אָרְצָה in 1 K 1:31, Is 49:23).<sup>2</sup>—Cf. finally the formula אִם עִלְבָּנִים *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,<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>11b</sup> *woe unto them, that tarry late in the evening*, וְיִנְדְּלִיקֶם, 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 בְּהוֹשׁ לוֹ, *wherewith however he lied unto him*. The verbal-clause seems to assign a reason in Ps 7:7 יָתָּהּ מִשְׁפָּט צָנָה, *since thou hast commanded judgement*; a consequence in Ps 103:5.<sup>4</sup>

Rem. On the cases in which an imperfect in the sense of a final clause is subordinated to a verb of motion (generally קָוָה), see § 120 c.

Of (2), subordinate verbal-clauses with ל' (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 ל' אֵין יְבַדֵּיל, *without dividing it asunder*; Jb 31:34; ל' with the perfect is so used in Gn 44:4, Ex 34:28, 1 S 30:2,

1 <sup>1</sup> The expression הִתְרָאָה פְּנִים *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 הִתְרָאָה אֵל־פְּנִים.

2 <sup>2</sup> That אָרְצָה (אָרְצָה) is really to be regarded as a virtual predicate to אָרְצָה, and not אָרְצָה as a *casus instrumenti*, is seen from Is 49:23, where אָרְצָה אָרְצָה precedes the verb.

3 <sup>3</sup> Some examples of these have been already discussed in another connexion above, § 120 a–c.

4 <sup>4</sup> In Gn 21:14 the circumstantial verbal-clause אֵין עִלְבָּנִים is only due to a harmonizing transposition; read אֵין עִלְבָּנִים לְד' ע' ש'. 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 מוֹלֵאֵי יִקְרָאוּ לָאֵלֹהִים *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 לֹא יִקְמָל *unsparingly*, Is 30:14 (after an infinitive absolute); Hb 1:17, Jb 6:10 (but וְלֹא יִקְמָל Jb 16:13, 27:22; see f at the end); לֹא כָהָדוּ (prop. *they hide not*) *openly*, Is 3:9 (but Jb 15:18 כָהָדוּ); בְּלִי חֲשָׁךְ (prop. *he restrains not*) *unceasingly*, Is 14:6; בְּלִי־יָמוּט Jb 41:15 (Ps 93:1 (בְּלִי־תִמּוּט)) and לֹא יָמוּט Is 40:20 (*without tottering*) *immovably*; cf. also לֹא אֶמְעָז *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*.<sup>1</sup>

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 אָחִי אָתָּה אָמְרִי־נָא *say, I pray thee, thou art my sister*; Ps 10:13, Jb 25<sup>3a,14</sup>, Neh 6:6; Zc 8:23 (after שָׁמַע); Ps 9:21 (after יָדַע); verbal-clauses, e. g. Ps 50:21 *thou thoughtest* וְכַמּוֹן הָיִיתָ־אֵלֶיךָ *I was surely like thyself* [but read הָיִיתָ for הָיִיתָ]; 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 וַיִּרְא יְהוָה כִּי רַבָּה 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 ὄτι *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.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 יָשָׁרְאֵל עָבַר בְּגְבֻלוֹ *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 נָסָה *to venture*; see § 113 d); Ju 11:20 (after אֶמְיִן, *to trust*); 1 K 19:4 (after שָׁאַל *to request*).

(c) Object-clauses introduced by אָשַׁר, e. g. Est 3:4 אָשַׁר הָיָה יְהוּדִי לָהֶם אָשַׁר הָיָה יְהוּדִי לָהֶם *for he had told them that he was a Jew*; 1 S 18:15, Ez 20:26, Ec 8:12,<sup>3</sup> even before direct narration, 1 S 15:20, 2 S 1:4. Somewhat frequently אָשַׁר is preceded by the *nota accusativi* אֵת (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 (וַאֲנִי), 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 כִּי עַן Is 3:16, &c., and עַן אָשַׁר *because*, prop. *on account of the fact that*; both, however, may also be shortened to the simple עַן Nu 20:12, &c., or to כִּי *because*, Gn 3:14, 17, &c., or to אָשַׁר 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 אָשַׁר בְּ Gn 39:9, 23. On the other hand, the simple עַן is sometimes repeated for emphasis, עַן וְכִּי עַן (something like the German *sintemal und alldieweil*) Lv 26:43, Ez 13:10 (without וְ 36:3); also עַל־אָשַׁר 2 S 3:30, and עַל־כִּי<sup>1</sup> Dt 31:17, Ju 3:12, Mal 2:14 *on the ground that*; עַל־דִּבַּר אָשַׁר *because of the circumstance that*, Dt 23:5; עַל־כִּלְיָא דוֹת אָשַׁר *for this very cause that*, Jer 3:8. But just as the simple עַן is used for אָשַׁר עַן, so also the simple עַל־ with the perfect stands for עַל־אָשַׁר Ps 119:136, Ezr 3:11; cf. עַל־בְּלִי Gn 31:20 and מְבִלִי Dt 28:55 both with the perfect, equivalent to *because ... not*.—Cf. further אָשַׁר עַ קָב Gn 22:18, 26:5, 2 S 12:6, all with the perfect, and עַ קָב 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 עַ קָב Nu 14:24 with the perfect, and Dt 7:12, 8:20 with the imperfect; finally, אָשַׁר מִ Is 43:4 *arising from the fact that*, = *because*; אָשַׁר תִּתְּחַת 1 S 26:21, &c., and תִּתְּחַת כִּי 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־הִסְגִּיָרָם עַל־אֵל אֵל אֵל *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 nm on the perfect consecutive in the apodosis to causal clauses.

### § 159. Conditional Sentences.

<sup>3</sup> In Jer 28:9 a *subject*-clause is thus introduced by אָשַׁר instead of the usual כִּי.

<sup>1</sup> Also יַעֲלִיכֶן prop. *for therefore*, Gn 18:5, 19:8, 33:10, 38:26, Nu 10:31, 14:43, 2 S 18:20 *Q'erē*, and אָשַׁר עַל־כֵּן 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.<sup>1</sup> 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. תתן וילקום ון (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 ויהי לילה (if) *thou makest darkness, it is night*; imperfect in the apodosis, Ps 104<sup>29b</sup>; cohortative Pr 1:23. Also in Ex 7:9 יהי לתנין *it shall become a serpent*, is the apodosis to a suppressed protasis *if thou cast it down*; so in 2 K 5:10 וישׁב *is the apodosis to a protasis if thou wash*, contained in what precedes.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> On the termination ון- cf. § 47 m. In verse 28 b also וישׁבעון 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 ון- in Nu 32:23 appears after אִם-ל in the protasis. In Nu 16:29, 32:20 ון- as before א (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 וּמָה וְיִרְבְּרוּבֵי (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 וְאֵלֵּי אֶמְרָא *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 וְעָנַב אָבִיו וְנָמַת *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 אֵל), 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 מָצָא אִשָּׁה מְצָא טוֹב *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<sup>13b</sup>, 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<sup>e</sup>th* יוֹלֵד הַחֵם וְיִשְׂמַח בּוֹ *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. בְּהַעֲוֹתוֹ וְיִקְרַח אֹתוֹ *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 הִן, see below, under w) and לוֹ<sup>1</sup> (1 S 14:30, Is 63:19 לוֹא; Ec 6:6, Est 7:4 אִלּוּ, from לוֹ אִם) *if*, negative לֹא אִם and לוֹא (לוֹאִי) *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 (אִם לֹא) and לוֹ (לוֹאִי), 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 εἰ with the present subjunctive) by the imperfect or its equivalent (frequently in the apodosis also). On the other hand, לוֹ (לוֹאִי) 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, לוֹ and לוֹאִי are necessarily followed by the perfect

<sup>1</sup> On לוֹ 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 אַם and לוֹ is not always consistently observed. Although naturally לוֹ and לוֹלֵא cannot take the place of אַם and אֵלֵא (on the strange use of לוֹ in Gn 50:15 see below), yet conversely אַם is sometimes used where לוֹ would certainly be expected; cf. e. g. Ps 50:12, 137:5, 139:8, Ho 9:12 (cf. verse 11). These examples, indeed (אַם with the imperfect), may without difficulty be explained from the fact that the connexion of לוֹ with the imperfect was evidently avoided, because the imperfect by its nature indicates a still unfinished action, and consequently (as opposed to לוֹ) a still open possibility. But אַם is also used for לוֹ in connexion with the perfect, especially when an imprecation is attached by the apodosis to the condition introduced by אַם, e. g. Ps 7:4 ff. אִם-עָשָׂה יְהוָה זֶה אֲנִי ... תִּרְדֵּף נִי וְגו' *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 אַם see § 113 **o** above.

Examples:—

**A.** אַם 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 apodosis<sup>1</sup> takes—

(a) A *perfect* also, e. g. Pr 9:12 אִם-הָיָה חָכְמָתְךָ לְךָ *if thou art wise, thou art wise for thyself*; Ps 73:15 (see below on לוֹ).

(b) *Imperfect*, e. g. Dt 32:41 אִם-שִׁנּוּתִי *if I whet my glittering sword ... אֶשִׁיב I will render vengeance, &c.*; Jb 9:15 f.30 (in both cases we should expect לוֹ rather than אַם; 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 הָבִיא תִּיּוֹגוֹ *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 וְ 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 (הָאֵלֵהֶם) ..., הִשְׁלַחְתָּם he has delivered them, &c.*

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 *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. *אם* 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 *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 *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 *אם* 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 *if (ever) he said thus ...*, then they bare ...; Ex 40:37. In Gn 42:37 the consequence (on *תמיית* 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 *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 *יגל ינו* 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 *לך*), 21:10, Jb 33:5.

(h) A noun-clause, e. g. Gn 4:7, Ps 139:8, Jb 8:6, 31:26 f.

3. *אם* with *cohortative*, e. g. Gn 30:31; cf. the passages in § 108 e.

4. *אם* with *infinitive*, Jb 9:27 *if my saying is* (but probably we should read *אם רחי*).

5. *אם* 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 *שׁוּ*, in a negative sentence to *אין* (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. *if thou will save, &c.*; Gn

24:49 אַם־יִשְׁכַּחַם עֲשִׂים *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 נָא. With אִין Gn 43:5 יִגַּךְ קִשְׁלֶהָ *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 יִשׁ and יִן אִ may also be used after אִ without a suffix; thus יִשׁ Gn 23:8, 1 S 20:8, 2 K 9:15, &c., יִן אִ (if it be not the case) Gn 30:1, Ex 32:32, Ju 9:15, 2 K 2:10; cf. also אִם־כֵּן *if it be so*, Gn 25:22.

**B.** הִן *if*, generally supposed to be originally identical with הִן *behold!*<sup>1</sup> Probably, however, הִן *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 הִן 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.** לוֹ *if*, לוֹלֵא (לוֹלֵי) *if not*.

1. With *perfect* in the protasis and apodosis (cf. § 106 p), e.g. Ju 8:19; אֵלֵי is used in the same sense as לוֹ in Est 7:4, cf. Ec 6:6 (with a question in the apodosis).—With the perfect in protasis and apodosis after לוֹלֵא 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 לוֹ 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 לוֹלֵא Dt 32:27, אָגוּר probably as the *modus rei repetitae*, *were it not that I ever and again feared, &c.*; so also the imperfect after לוֹ 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 לוֹ here is strange; conversely in other cases, e.g. Ps 73:15, Jb 9:15 f.30, לוֹ would be more natural than אִם.

3. A noun-clause occurs after לוֹ 2 S 18:12, 2 K 3:14, Ps 81:14, all with imperfect in the apodosis; Jb 16:4 יִשׁ לוֹ, with cohortative in the apodosis.

**D.** כִּי *supposing that, if*:—

1. כִּי with *perfect* in the protasis, e.g. Nu 5:20 וְאָתָּה כִּי שָׁטִיתָ *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 כִּי־יֵאֲלֶךְ פֶּגַם *yea, though I walk (have to walk)...*, *I will fear no evil*; (לֵאֲי־אִירָא) *evil*; 37:24; Ex 21:2 כִּי־יִתְקַנֶּה עָבְדְּךָ עֶבְרִי וְגו' *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 אִם; so also the כִּי in verse 7 is followed in verses 8–11 by the special cases with אִם; 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, כִּי־ 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 הֲפֹךְ־יֵשֶׁב־הֵן *look lest there be here, &c.*

<sup>1</sup> There could be no doubt of their identity if הִנֵּה in 1 S 9:7, 2 S 18:11, simply meant *if*. We must, however, keep to the meaning *but behold*.

(k) לְבַלְתִּי *that ... not*, with the imperfect, Ex 20:20, 2 S 14:14 (in Jer 23:14 read the infinitive שׁוֹב for בּוֹ, in 27:8 אוֹרֵב for אוֹרֵב). In Ez 13:3 יִרְאוּ בְלִתֵּי יִרְאוּ 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 οὐδεὶς, οὐκ οὐδαμῶς, *nulli—non, nemo non*); e.g. Zp 2:2 (if the text is correct) לֹא־יָבוֹא בְּטָרָם *before there shall (not) come*.<sup>1</sup> This especially applies to the compounds formed by the union of אֵין or מְבִלִי with מִן *without* (§ 119 y), e.g. Is 5:9 (6<sup>11</sup>) מִצֵּיִן יוֹשֵׁב (for which in Jer 2:15 מְבִלִי (יֹשֵׁב), prop. *without no inhabitant*, i.e. *so that no inhabitant is left there*. On the other hand, in Is 50:2 מִן מֵיִם the מִן is causative, *because there is no water*; as also in Ex 14:11 מְבִלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא *is it because there were no ...?* 2 K 1:3, 6, 16. In Ec 3:11 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 arrogancy; 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 לֵּמָּה לֹא *why ... not?* in Jb 3:11 also affects the parallel clause).

### § 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses.

The particles אֲךָ, רַק *only*, serve to introduce restrictive clauses, and אֲף, גַּם *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 אֲךָ Gn 7:23, 34:15; רַק Gn 6:5, Am 3:2; even אֲךָ הִרְרַק *hath he indeed only?* Nu 12:2; גַּם Gn 27:34, Jb 7:11; אֲף Dt 15:17), but very frequently extends to the whole of the following sentence. Thus with אֲךָ, e.g. Nu 14:9, 1 K 17:13, Pr 17:11, Jb 13:15, 14:22, 16:7, 23:6; רַק Gn 20:11, 24:8, Ps 32:6, Pr 13:10; גַּם Gn 27:33, 32:21 (גַּם הִנֵּה), 44:10; 1 S 22:7, 28:20, Zc 9:11, Pr 17:26, 20:11; אֲף Jb 14:3, 15:4.—In Mal 1:10 and Jb 2:10 גַּם 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*<sup>1</sup> (וְ) 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

<sup>1</sup> In 1 K 10:21 אֵין־כֶּסֶף־וְכֶסֶף goes with what precedes and must be emended, with the LXX and Lucian, to כֶּסֶף־וְכֶסֶף.

<sup>1</sup> 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) 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

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 *תָּמּוּל 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 *וַיִּסְכֶּה*; 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 *ו* before *בְּעִירוֹ* 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., *ו* is equivalent to *yea, and*; in Is 32:7 *even*.

*ו* is used to express emphasis (=and especially), e.g. in Gn 3:16 *וְהָרָה וְיָגֵן*; Is 2:1, Ps 18:1, perhaps also in Jb 10:17 *yea, a whole host*; 2 Ch 16:14.—An undoubted example of what is called *wāw concomitantiae* occurs in Jb 41:12 *a seething pot וְאֶגְמֵן* 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.

*ו-ו* is used in the sense of *both—and* in Ps 76:7, Dn 1:3, 8:13. On *ו-ו* as meaning *sive—sive*, cf. § 162 b.

(c) See the Lexicon on adverbs used in a copulative sense, such as *אֲלֹ* also, moreover, summing up a number, e.g. *אֲלֹ אֲשֶׁר-בָּאֵם* both together, Gn 27:45, Pr 17:15; *לְאֵם-כָּל* 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!* *אֲלֹ-אֲלֹ* or *אֲלֹ-אֲלֹ* Gn 24:44=*both—and*; *אֲלֹ* occurs three times in Gn 24:25 and 32:20; also *אֲלֹ*, 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 *אֲלֹ-אֲלֹ* (also three times), equivalent to *both—and*; cf. *אֲלֹ אֲלֹ* and *even*, Lv 26:44; *אֲלֹ-אֲלֹ* 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 ך 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 ך with imperatives to express inferences, e.g. 1 K 2:22 אָלֵי אֲנִי, אֲשֶׁר אֲשַׁלֵּם *ask now rather*; Ez 18:32 *for I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth ...*, וְהִשִּׁיבוּ *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 (וְלִי), 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 (וְלִי), 1 S 10:12, 15:14, 22:14, 28:16, 2 S 18:12, 24:3, 1 K 2:22 (וְלִי אֲנִי), 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 וְיָמִי Nu 11:29, Ju 9:29; on the disconnected use of ך and ך־ cf. § 159 dd.

### § 155. Relative Clauses.

See V. Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894 (cf. the heading of § 138 above); G. Bergsträsser, 'Das hebr. Präfix ך', *ZATW* 1909, p. 40 ff.<sup>1</sup>

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 אֲשֶׁר; see further in § 138 e. Similarly, incomplete relative clauses may also be introduced by ך־, 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.<sup>1</sup>

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 ך־, &c.; see § 138 f.

<sup>1</sup> In this exhaustive article the author shows that between ך (on the pronunciation see § 36) and אֲשֶׁר there is syntactically no primary difference, but only a secondary distinction which arose in the course of the development of the language, namely that אֲשֶׁר is preferred in combinations which are customary in the old literary language, and ך in those which are derived from the popular language or from Aramaic.

<sup>1</sup> The old view that all these cases arise from the *omission* of אֲשֶׁר 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 (*ṣila*), and those which are attached to an *indeterminate* substantive (*ṣifa*). The former must be introduced by the demonstrative pronoun *allaḥ*, 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 (גוי אֲשֶׁר לֹא תִשְׁמַע לְשׁוֹנוֹ *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,<sup>2</sup> *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 אֲדָר), 2 Ch 15:11; after כִּלְ- 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.*<sup>8</sup>, 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 עָמַד read עִמְדָה 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 בַע שְׁמוֹ *whose name was Sheba*; Zc 6:12, Jb 1:1, 3:15 *with princes* לְהָבִיבִים *that had gold*; Ps 11:4, Pr 22:11; when referring to a noun-suffix, e.g. Ps 49:14 סוֹ לְסֵלֵךְ *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-אֶרֶץ רֵץ לֹא-אִישׁ *on a land where no man is*, see § 152 u, and cf. for this very short form of the relative clause, Gn 15:13 לְאֶרֶץ לֹא לְהֵם *in a land that belongs not to them*; Dt 32:17 (לֹא-אֵלֵהוּ); Hb 1:6, Pr 26:17 (לֹא-לִוּוֹ).

(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* בּוֹ יִתְקַדֵּשׁ *that trusteth in him*; Jb 3<sup>3 b</sup> רַחַל לַיְלָה אָמַר *the night which said*; after כִּלְ- 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<sup>17 b</sup>, 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 הִנְנִי Is 28:16, prop. *behold me, who have laid, &c.*, but perhaps the participle יֹסֵד is to be read; 29:14, 38:5 (but probably again the participle יוֹסֵף 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 יָצַב יִשָּׂרָף *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 לֹא-יִבְרִין עַם *an undiscerning people*.

Rem. Very frequently such relative sentences are attached to substantives which have the particle of comparison כִּי, e.g. Jb 7:2 כְּעֹבֵד יִשְׁאָף-צֶלֶל *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 כִּמּוֹ Ps 58:5; after a determinate substantive, e.g. Is 53:7 (but the better reading is כְּשֶׁה without

<sup>2</sup> 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 **כִּי** (for **אֲשֶׁר**; **כִּי**; 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 **אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָדְעוּם אֱלֹהֵי הַיָּמִים לֹא יָדְעוּם** *gods whom they knew not* (see also the end of the verse); after a substantive with **כִּי** (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 (**יִתְרַח עֲשָׂה**, for which Jer 48:36 **יִתְרַח עֲשָׂה** 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 **אֲשֶׁר לָקַח מֵעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ** *a live coal which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar*; Ex 15:17, Is 42:16 (48<sup>17</sup>, Ps 25:12, all after **בְּיַד יְהוָה**; but Ps 32:8 **בְּיַד יְהוָה תִּלְכַּח**); Is 64:2; Ec 10:5 (in 6:1 the same clause with **אֲשֶׁר**); moreover, in Jer 14:18 read with the LXX **אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָדְעוּ** *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 **שָׁמָּה**, as in Jer 2:6 end. Thus after a determinate substantive, Ps 18:3 **אֲסִי יְהוָה בְּיָמֵי הַחֲסִידוֹת** *my rock in which I take refuge*; Ex 18:20, Is 42:1; in Jb 3<sup>a</sup> also, the omission of the article with **יָמֵם** 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 **הִצְבֵּתֶם** (whence) *ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit **בְּקִרְתֶּם** (whence) *ye were digged*; Jb 21:27 **הַמְּדַבְּרִים** (where-with) *ye act violently against me*.—A retrospective adverb is suppressed in Jb 38:19 **אֵיךְ הַדָּבָר** (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 **בְּיָמֵם** Lv 7:35, Ps 56:10; after **מִיָּמֵם** Jer 36:2; after simple **יָמֵם** Ps 56:4 (**יָמֵם אֵיירָא** *on the day when I am afraid*); after **בְּעֵת** 2 Ch 29:27 (**בְּעֵת הַחֲלִיל הָעוֹלָה** *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 **מְעַתָּה** 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 **מִי אַתָּה** (that) *criest?* Cf., however, Is 63:19 **אֲנִי הָיִיתִי** *we are become as they over whom* (**בָּם** not **בְּנוֹ**) *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 רַבְּהָרָה); Jb 30:13, cf. § 152 u.

(b) As object, Is 41:2, with a retrospective pronoun; Mal 2:16 וְנִכְסָהּ *and him that covereth* (or read וְנִכְסָהּ?); 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 הַיְדֵי-תִשְׁלַח, *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 כִּלְיָהוּ Gn 39:4, but we must certainly read here, with the Samaritan and LXX, וְשִׁילֵי כִלְיָהוּ אֲשֶׁר יְשִׁילֵי as in verses 5 and 8; Ex 9:4; verbal-clauses after כִּלְיָהוּ 1 Ch 29:3, 2 Ch 30:19, 31:19, Ezr 1:5.

(d) Governed by a preposition; so verbal-clauses after אֶתְּרֵי Jer 2:8; after אֶל (=to the place where), 1 Ch 15:12, but Ex 23:20 before the same verb אֲשֶׁר אֶל-הַמְּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר; after כִּי Jer 2:11, 2 Ch 1:4 (הַכִּיּוֹן=הַמְּקוֹם=to the place where); after לְ Is 65:1 לֹא שָׁאַל לְּ by them that asked not for me ... לְּ 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 עַם 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<sup>a</sup>].

### § 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 וְשִׁמוֹ Gn 24:29, 1 S 1:1, &c., or וְשִׁמָּה 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*<sup>1</sup> (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*, וְרִבְיִיתִי אֵין

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

הָ הָּ לְּ *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 i of וְאֵין followed by a participle, as וְאֵין מְצִיל, &c.

2. Characteristic examples of circumstantial *noun*-clauses are Gn 12:8 *and pitched his tent* בֵּית־אֵל מִיַּם נְהַעִי מִקֵּדְם with *Bethel on the west and Ai on the east*; Nu 22:24, 2 S 18:14 *through the heart of Absalom*, עוֹדֶנּוּ הוּא *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 אֶל-פְּנֵים אֶל-פְּנֵים *face to face* (prop. *while face was turned towards face*), Gn 32:31, Ex 33:11, Dt 34:10, &c.;<sup>1</sup> so also *to cast oneself down*, אָרְצָה אֶפְסֵם *the face being turned to the earth*, Gn 19:1, &c. (for אָרְצָה we find אָרְצָה in 1 K 1:31, Is 49:23).<sup>2</sup>—Cf. finally the formula אִם עִלְ-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,<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>11b</sup> *woe unto them, that tarry late in the evening*, וְיִנְדְּלִיקֶם *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 *wherewith however he lied unto him*. The verbal-clause seems to assign a reason in Ps 7:7 *since thou hast commanded judgement*; a consequence in Ps 103:5.<sup>4</sup>

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 ל' א' (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 *without dividing it asunder*; Jb 31:34; ל' א' 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

1 <sup>1</sup> The expression הִתְרָאָה פְּנֵים *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 הִתְרָאָה פְּנֵים אֶל-פְּנֵים.

2 <sup>2</sup> That אָרְצָה (אָרְצָה רָצָה) is really to be regarded as a virtual predicate to אֶפְסֵם, and not אֶפְסֵם as a *casus instrumenti*, is seen from Is 49:23, where אָרְצָה רָצָה אֶפְסֵם precedes the verb.

3 <sup>3</sup> Some examples of these have been already discussed in another connexion above, § 120 a–c.

4 <sup>4</sup> In Gn 21:14 the circumstantial verbal-clause עָלְ-שִׁכְמָהּ is only due to a harmonizing transposition; read שִׁ ע' ש' לָד ע' ש'. 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 יִקָּמוּ מִן הַיָּמָיִם, *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 לֹא יִקָּמֵל *unsparingly*, Is 30:14 (after an infinitive absolute); Hb 1:17, Jb 6:10 (but וְלֹא יִקָּמֵל Jb 16:13, 27:22; see f at the end); לֹא כָּהָדוּ (prop. *they hide not*) *openly*, Is 3:9 (but Jb 15:18 כָּהָדוּ וְלֹא יִקָּמֵל); בְּלִי קֶשֶׁךְ (prop. *he restrains not*) *unceasingly*, Is 14:6; בְּלִי־יָמוּט Jb 41:15 (Ps 93:1 בְּלִי־תַמּוּט) and לֹא יָמוּט Is 40:20 (*without tottering*) *immovably*; cf. also לֹא אֶמְצָעָד *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*.<sup>1</sup>

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 תִּי אָתָּה אִמִּי אָמַרְתָּ אָחָה תִּי אָמַרְתָּ *say, I pray thee, thou art my sister*; Ps 10:13, Jb 25<sup>3a.14</sup>, Neh 6:6; Zc 8:23 (after שָׁמַע); Ps 9:21 (after יָדַע); verbal-clauses, e. g. Ps 50:21 *thou thoughtest* וְכַמּוֹן הָיִיתָ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים כִּי אֲנִי *I was surely like thyself* [but read הָיִיתָ for הָיִיתָ]; 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 וַיִּרְא יְהוָה כִּי רַבָּה 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 ὄτι *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.<sup>2</sup>

(c) Object-clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר, e. g. Est 3:4 אֲשֶׁר־הוּא יְהוּדִי לָהֶם אֲשֶׁר־הוּא יְהוּדִי *for he had told them that he was a Jew*; 1 S 18:15, Ez 20:26, Ec 8:12,<sup>3</sup> even before direct narration, 1 S

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 יָשָׁרְתָּ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל עַבְדְּךָ בְּגַבְלוֹ *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 נָסָה *to venture*; see § 113 d); Ju 11:20 (after אֶמְצָאֶנְךָ *to trust*); 1 K 19:4 (after שָׁאַל *to request*).

<sup>3</sup> 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 אָשֶׁר is preceded by the *nota accusativi* אֲתָּה (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 (וַיֹּאמֶר), 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 כִּי Is 3:16, &c., and אֲשֶׁר *because*, prop. *on account of the fact that*; both, however, may also be shortened to the simple עַן Nu 20:12, &c., or to כִּי *because*, Gn 3:14, 17, &c., or to אָשֶׁר 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 אָשֶׁר בְּ Gn 39:9, 23. On the other hand, the simple עַן is sometimes repeated for emphasis, עַן וְעַן עַן (something like the German *sintemal und alldieweil*) Lv 26:43, Ez 13:10 (without וְ 36:3); also עַל־אָשֶׁר 2 S 3:30, and עַל־כִּי Dt 31:17, Ju 3:12, Mal 2:14 *on the ground that*; אָשֶׁר עַל־דְּבַר אָשֶׁר *because of the circumstance that*, Dt 23:5; אָשֶׁר עַל־כִּלְיֵי דָוָת אָשֶׁר *for this very cause that*, Jer 3:8. But just as the simple עַן is used for אֲשֶׁר עַן, so also the simple עַל־ with the perfect stands for עַל־אָשֶׁר Ps 119:136, Ezr 3:11; cf. further עַל־כִּי Gn 31:20 and מְבַלִּי Dt 28:55 both with the perfect, equivalent to *because ... not*.—Cf. further אָשֶׁר עַן Gn 22:18, 26:5, 2 S 12:6, all with the perfect, and עַן 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 עַן Nu 14:24 with the perfect, and Dt 7:12, 8:20 with the imperfect; finally, אָשֶׁר מִן Is 43:4 *arising from the fact that*, = *because*; אָשֶׁר תִּתְּחַת 1 S 26:21, &c., and אָשֶׁר תִּתְּחַת 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־הַקְּרִיבָהּ וְעַל־הַזְּכָרָהּ *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 m 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.

<sup>1</sup> Also עַל־כֵּן prop. *for therefore*, Gn 18:5, 19:8, 33:10, 38:26, Nu 10:31, 14:43, 2 S 18:20 *Q'éré*, and אָשֶׁר 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.<sup>1</sup> 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. תָּתֵן יִלְקָם וְזָן (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 וְיָהִי לְיָלֶה (if) *thou makest darkness, it is night*; imperfect in the apodosis, Ps 104<sup>29b</sup>; cohortative Pr 1:23. Also in Ex 7:9 וְהָיָה לְתַנְיִן *it shall become a serpent*, is the apodosis to a suppressed protasis *if thou cast it down*; so in 2 K 5:10 וְיִשְׁבַּח 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 וְיִקְרְבוּרֵיבִי אֶקְוֶה (if) *I arise, they speak against me*; on the cohortative in the apodosis, cf. § 108 f.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> On the termination וְזָן cf. § 47 m. In verse 28 b also וְיִשְׁבְּעוּן 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 וְזָן in Nu 32:23 appears after אֶמְלִי in the protasis. In Nu 16:29, 32:20 וְזָן as before אֶ (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 *אִם אֶמַּדְּךָ* *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 *וְעָוַב אָבִיו וְנָמַת* *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 אֵל), 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 *הַמְצָא אִשָּׁה מְצָא טוֹב* *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<sup>13 b</sup>, 29:11; an interrogative clause, Nu 12:14, Jb 7:20 *אִם חָטָאתִי* (*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 *אִם יוֹלֵד חָכָם וְיִשְׂמַח בּוֹ* *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. *כִּי עָוֹנוֹ וְגַם כִּי חָטָא* *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 הִנֵּן, see below, under w) and לוֹ<sup>1</sup> (1 S 14:30, Is 63:19 *לוֹא*; Ec 6:6, Est 7:4 *אֵלּוּ*, from לוֹ אִם) *if*, negative לֹא אִם and לוֹא (לוֹאִי) *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 (אִם לֹא) and לוֹ (לוֹאִי), 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 ἔάν with the present subjunctive) by the imperfect or its equivalent (frequently in the apodosis also). On the other hand, לוֹ (לוֹאִי) 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, לוֹ and לוֹאִי 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.

<sup>1</sup> On לוֹ 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 אִם and לוֹ is not always consistently observed. Although naturally לוֹ and לוֹלֵא cannot take the place of אִם and אִם ל' (on the strange use of לוֹ in Gn 50:15 see below), yet conversely אִם is sometimes used where לוֹ would certainly be expected; cf. e. g. Ps 50:12, 137:5, 139:8, Ho 9:12 (cf. verse 11). These examples, indeed (אִם with the imperfect), may without difficulty be explained from the fact that the connexion of לוֹ with the imperfect was evidently avoided, because the imperfect by its nature indicates a still unfinished action, and consequently (as opposed to לוֹ) a still open possibility. But אִם is also used for לוֹ in connexion with the perfect, especially when an imprecation is attached by the apodosis to the condition introduced by אִם, e. g. Ps 7:4 ff. אִם-עָשָׂה יְהוָה זֶה ... יִרְדֵּךָ וְיִגְוֶיךָ *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 אִם see § 113 o above.

Examples:—

**A.** אִם 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 apodosis<sup>1</sup> takes—

(a) A *perfect* also, e. g. Pr 9:12 אִם-הָיָה חָכֵם מֵתָה לְךָ *if thou art wise, thou art wise for thyself*; Ps 73:15 (see below on לוֹ).

(b) *Imperfect*, e. g. Dt 32:41 אִם-שָׁנֹתִי *if I whet my glittering sword ... אֶשְׁיב I will render vengeance*, &c.; Jb 9:15 f.30 (in both cases we should expect לוֹ 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 הָבִיא תְּיָוֹג' *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 וְ 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 (הָיָה, הָיוּ) ..., וְיִשְׁלַחֵם he has delivered them*, &c.

(f) *Imperative*, e. g. Gn 50:4 אִם-נָא מְצָא תִי הֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ דְּבַר-נָא לִג' *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*).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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. אִם 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 תַעֲשׂוּן כְּכִלְיֵי הַיְהוָה הַטְּאָתֶם *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 הֲיִחַיֵּנוּ אִם יִחַיֵּנוּ הִיא *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 אִם 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 ...*, then they bare ...; Ex 40:37. In Gn 42:37 the consequence (on תְּמִיחָה 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־יִפְקֹדֶיךָ אִם־יִפְקֹדֶיךָ אִם־יִפְקֹדֶיךָ *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 וְיִלְיִנוּ 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 לֵךְ), 21:10, Jb 33:5.

(h) A noun-clause, e. g. Gn 4:7, Ps 139:8, Jb 8:6, 31:26 f.

3. אִם with *cohortative*, e. g. Gn 30:31; cf. the passages in § 108 e.

4. אִם with *infinitive*, Jb 9:27 אִם־יֹאמְרִי *prop. if my saying is* (but probably we should read אִם־רָחֵמִי).

5. אִם 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 אִם, in a negative sentence to אִין (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־יִשְׁעֶךָ מוֹשִׁיעַ *if thou wilt save, &c.*; Gn 24:49 אִם־יִשְׁכַּחְכְּמוּ עִשָׂיִם *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 אִין. With אִין Gn 43:5 אִם־יִשְׁלַח־יְיָ אֶת־יְיָ *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 אִם and אִין may also be used after אִם without a suffix; thus אִם־יִשְׁ Gn 23:8, 1 S 20:8, 2 K 9:15, &c., אִם־יִן (if it be not the case) Gn 30:1, Ex 32:32, Ju 9:15, 2 K 2:10; cf. also אִם־כֵּן *if it be so*, Gn 25:22.

**B.** הִנֵּה *if*, generally supposed to be originally identical with הִנֵּה *behold!*<sup>1</sup> 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.** לוֹ *if*, לוֹלֵא (לוֹלֵי) *if not*.

1. With *perfect* in the protasis and apodosis (cf. § 106 p), e.g. Ju 8:19; אֵלֵי is used in the same sense as לוֹ in Est 7:4, cf. Ec 6:6 (with a question in the apodosis).—With the perfect in protasis and apodosis after לוֹלֵא 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 לוֹ 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 לוֹלֵא Dt 32:27, אָגוּר probably as the *modus rei repetitae*, *were it not that I ever and again feared*, &c.; so also the imperfect after לוֹ 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 לוֹ here is strange; conversely in other cases, e.g. Ps 73:15, Jb 9:15 f.30, לוֹ would be more natural than אָם.

3. A noun-clause occurs after לוֹ 2 S 18:12, 2 K 3:14, Ps 81:14, all with imperfect in the apodosis; Jb 16:4 לוֹ יֵשׁ, with cohortative in the apodosis.

**D.** כִּי *supposing that, if*:—

1. כִּי with *perfect* in the protasis, e.g. Nu 5:20 וְאָתָּה כִּי שָׁטִיתָ *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 כִּי יֵאָלֵךְ אֲנִי וְיֵאָלֵךְ אֲנִי *yea, though I walk (have to walk)...*, *I will fear no evil*; (לְאִי-אִירָא) 37:24; Ex 21:2 וְכִּי יִקְנֶה עָבְדְּךָ וְגו' *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 אָם; so also the כִּי in verse 7 is followed in verses 8–11 by the special cases with אָם; 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 לוֹ; 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 אוֹ or, e.g. Ex 21:36 אוֹ נֹדַע וְגו' *or (another possible case) it is known that*, &c., i.e. *but if it be known*, &c., LXX ἔἰν 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 אָשֶׁר (which is interchangeable with כִּי in other senses also) Lv 4:22 (in verses 3 and 27 אָם), Dt 11:27 (verse 28 אָם), Jos 4:21, see the Lexicon.

<sup>1</sup> There could be no doubt of their identity if הִנֵּה 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 וְאִם-לֹא *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 וְיִשׁ alone in Ju 6:13 is peculiar, as also וְיִשׁ in 2 K 10:15 (where read with the LXX וְיִשׁ יְהוּא וְיִשׁ) in the sense of *if it be so*.—In 2 S 13:26, 2 K 5:17 אֲלֹא 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 עֲתָהּ, in Jb 31:28 by כִּי, in 2 K 13:19 by אֲזָא.—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 הִגֵּד must be supplied with עֲתָהּ כִּי 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 אֲזָא 2 S 2:27, 19:7, Jb 11:15; or כִּי עֲתָהּ *now verily*, Nu 22:29, 1 S 14:30 after לוֹ, Gn 31:42, 43:10 after לוֹלִי, Jb 8:6 after אִם. On this *corroborative* כִּי cf. such passages as Gn 18:20, &c., and § 148 d. On אִם כִּי 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 אִם 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 אִם *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 כִּי אֲזָא *yea though*, Is 1:15 with imperfect; for which we find simply אֲזָא 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 אֲזָא כִּי *even if, though*, Ec 4:14.

(c) By the preposition עַל־ governing a complete noun-clause, as Jb 16:17 עַל לֹא-הָיָה בְּכַפִּי *notwithstanding that no violence is in mine hands*, or a verbal-clause, Is 53:9. On עַל־ 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.

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.<sup>1</sup> Even without the connecting ׀ Jb 24:19 *drought and heat consume the snow waters*, אִוּ וְשֵׂאוֹל הִטּוּ אֹרֶץ so doth *Sheol* those who *have sinned* (cf. § 155 n); cf. Jer 17:11.

2. The conjunction ׀, אֲשֶׁר (cf. § 155 g; the simple אֲשֶׁר occurs in the same sense in Ex 10:6, 14:13, 34:18) *as, quemadmodum*, is used as a comparative conjunction (Ob<sup>15</sup>), frequently with ׀, *so*, corresponding to it in the apodosis, Is 31:4, 52:14 f.. Sometimes, however, ׀, *(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 כָּל-עֵצָמָת שֶׁ׀ *in all points as*.

Rem. On the use of ׀ *as*, with single nouns or pronouns to introduce comparisons, cf. 118 s; on the alleged use of ׀ as a conjunction (equivalent to אֲשֶׁר, ׀), cf. § 155 g.—It is to be further remarked that ׀—׀ 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 ׀—׀; Ps 127:4 and often, ׀—׀, cf. Jo 2:4), are not to be regarded as conjunctions, but as virtual substantives with a following genitive; כָּכֶם כְּגֵר יִהְיֶה, 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 כִּי.

In the sense of *sive—sive* we find אוּ—אוּ, or אִם—אִם, or אִם—וְאִם (see the examples in the Lexicon), also ׀—׀ 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 ׀—׀ (see § 143 e); cf. also ׀—׀ (in Gn 24:44 ׀—׀) *both—and*; but אִם ל'—אִם ל' (in Gn 21:26 אִם ל'—אִם ל') *neither—nor*. On disjunctive questions, see § 150 g.

<sup>1</sup> 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 עִם זֶה נִחְשָׁב *prop. to be counted with some one*, Ps 88:5, and עִם זֶה נִחְשָׁל *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 עִם cf. Jb 9:26, where *with* is equivalent to *like*.

<sup>2</sup> In spite of its form this particle has originally nothing to do with כָּל, *all*. The expression is compounded of ׀ and לְעֵמָת, like the Aramaic כָּל-קִבְלָא for כָּל, קִבְלָא; 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 אִם**, 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 **וְ**, Gn 17:5, **וְהָיָה** 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 אִם** in such cases becomes equivalent to *nay, rather*.

2. *Exceptive* clauses, depending on another sentence, are introduced by **כִּי אִם** **אֵל** *except that*, and (again after negative sentences, see a above) **כִּי אִם**<sup>1</sup> *unless*; especially **אִם כִּי** 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, **אִם בְּלִתִּי** *unless*, Am 3:4 (with perfect after a rhetorical question), or simply **בְּלִתִּי** 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 אִם** 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 **אֵל** for **כִּי**). Cf. Mi 6:8, where **כִּי אִם**, equivalent to *nothing but*, is used before an infinitive, and Jb 42:8, equivalent to *only*, before a noun. Similarly when **כִּי אִם** 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<sup>e</sup>th.*, Jer 51:14, Ru 3:12 *K<sup>e</sup>th.*, 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 **וְ** (or **וְהָיָה**), e.g. Gn 7:6 *and Noah was six hundred years old* (prop. *a son of six hundred years*), **וְהָיָה מִבּוֹל הַיָּה** and (i.e. *when*) *the flood was*. This is especially the case when the predicate of the noun-clause (frequently introduced by **עוֹד** *still*) is expressed by an active participle, e.g. Jb 1:16 f. **עוֹד יָה** *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 **כִּלְ** with a participial attribute in the sense of *whenever any one ...*, e.g. 1 S 2:13 **כִּלְ** *whenever any man offered sacrifice, then came*, &c.; 2 S 2:23, &c.; see

---

<sup>1</sup> Very probably this use of **כִּי אִם** 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 **אִם**. 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 אִם** *but* (before entire clauses as before single nouns); see a above.

the examples (in which the second member is generally introduced by *wāw apodosi*) in § 116 w.

(b) Sequence is expressed by the juxtaposition

(1) of two imperfects consecutive, e.g. Gn 24:19 ותָּכַל לְהַשְׁקֹתוֹ וְתֵּן אֵמָר *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 ךְּ, e.g. Gn 38:25; cf. § 116 v; in Gn 49:29 an imperative follows without ךְּ;

(3) of two perfects (frequently with the secondary idea of rapid succession<sup>1</sup> of the two actions or events in past time), e.g. Gn 19:23 וְלוֹט בָּא וְגַ' ... וְהַשֶּׁשֶׁשׁ יָמֵשׁ יָצָא *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 וְהַשְׁגִּיתָם וְאָטַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם *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 וְיָקִי 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 ךְּ 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 טָרְמָה (an adverb, not a conjunction) with the imperfect (according to § 107 c). The apodosi, which may consist of a subject and perfect or even of a noun-clause (Gn 24:15),<sup>1</sup> is then connected by ךְּ (or וְהִנֵּה) as in the examples above, under no. 3, e.g. Gn 19:4 (cf. Jos 2:8) וְגַ' בּוֹ וְגַ' ... וְנָס בּוֹ וְגַ' *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<sup>2</sup> *when* (כִּי with the imperfect also=*as often as*, Ps 8:4; with perfect Jb 1:5); less frequently אֲמָם<sup>3</sup> (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 כִּמּוֹ *when*, Gn 19:15; כִּי אֲשֶׁר *when, after that*;

1 <sup>1</sup> 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 אָךְ and the infinitive absolute, *Jacob was yet scarce gone out ... then Esau his brother came*; in 1 K 9:24 by אָךְ only in Ps 48:6 by כִּן and the addition of two more perfects without ךְּ.

1 <sup>1</sup> On the perfect in the protasis, which is critically doubtful, cf. § 107 c.

2 <sup>2</sup> On אֲשֶׁר as an original demonstrative, cf. § 138 a; hence עֵד־אֲשֶׁר נָשׁוּב *is properly up to that (moment)—we shall return*.

3 <sup>3</sup> Cf. the frequent use of *wenn* [prop. *if*] for *wann* [=when] in German.

עַד־אֲשֶׁר, עַד־כִּי *until* (also the simple עַד, 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 עַד־בְּלֹתִי לוֹ הַשָּׂאִיר *until there was none left remaining to him* (where indeed it would be very natural to read הַשָּׂאִיר 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*); אֶל־עַד־אֲשֶׁר ל' *before that*, Ec 12:1, 2, 6 with an imperfect, as in Pr 8:26 עַד with a perfect; עַד־אֵם, עַד־אֲשֶׁר *until the time when*; אַחֲרֵי־יִיאָשֶׁר (for which in Ez 40:1 אַחֲרֵי־אֲשֶׁר; Lv 25:48, 1 S 5:9 simply אַחֲרֵי; Lv 14:43, Jer 41:16, Jb 42:7 simply אַחֲרֵי) *after that*; מֵאָז (prop. *since that time*; the dependent clause is attached to it in the same way as the attributive clause to the demonstrative אֲשֶׁר § 138 e) *since*, Gn 39:5; בְּטָרָם (and simply טָרָם § 107 c) *before*; קִדְמַת (for אֲשֶׁר) *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 טָרָם, בְּטָרָם, and עַד with the imperfect as a *tempus historicum*, cf. 107 c.

2. Clauses introduced by עַד, עַד־כִּי, עַד־אֲשֶׁר, 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, עַד with the imperfect, Ps 110:1; עַד־כִּי with the perfect, Gn 26:13, with impf. 49:10; עַד־אֲשֶׁר with the perfect, Gn 28:15; with the imperfect, Ps 112:8.—Like the Arab. *حتى*, עַד may even introduce a main clause; e.g. Ex 15:16 עַד־יָעֹבֵר *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 בְּ may usually be rendered by *when, as, or whilst*; the infinitive with אֲשֶׁר 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 מִן by *since*. According to § 111 g such statements of time are generally preceded by וַיְהִי and the apodosis follows in the imperfect consecutive; hence in 1 S 17:55 (cf. Driver on the passage) וַיִּכְרַעֻהוּ 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, אֲשֶׁר appears to be used as the equivalent of a conjunction in כְּמִשִּׁיב *as he drew back*, Gn 38:29 (unless we should read כְּהִשִּׁיב [or כְּמוֹ הִשִּׁיב, cf. Gn 19:15]), and in כִּפְרֵי חַת *when it budded*, 40:10.

## § 165. Final Clauses.<sup>1</sup>

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 וַ, 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 וַ, Gn 29:21, 1 S 15:16, or a jussive, Neh 2:5 (§ 108 d); (γ) of a jussive with an imperative by וַ,

<sup>1</sup> 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 לְ, Jon 1:11 מָה with the 1st plur. imperf., and 2 Ch 29:10 עִם־לִבְכִי, which are equivalent to cohortatives); (δ) of an imperative with a jussive, cohortative, or interrogative sentence by וְ, § 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 אֲלֵּי to the imperfect (so Ex 28:43, 30:20; and 2 S 13:25 after אֲלֵּי־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 אֲלֵּי.—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 וְלֹא), cf. § 120 f.

For examples of the direct subordination of the final imperfect (without וְ) see § 120 c.

2. Final conjunctions are לְמַ עַן אֲשֶׁר *to the end that*; also simply לְמַ עַן Gn 12:13, 27:25, Ex 4:5, Ps 51:6, &c.; בְּ, עֲבוּר אֲשֶׁר prop. *for the purpose that*, Gn 27:10, and simply עֲבוּר בְּ Gn 27:4, Ex 9:14, 20:20; also the simple אֲשֶׁר<sup>1</sup> Dt 4:10, 40, 6:3, 32:46, Jos 3:7, Neh 8:14 f.; negatively, לֹא אֲשֶׁר לְ Gn 11:7, 24:3, 1 K 22:16; or וְשִׁ Ec 3:14; also negatively, אֲשֶׁר לְבִלְתִּי *for the matter (purpose) that ... not*, Ec 7:14; לְבִלְתִּי with imperfect, Ex 20:20, 2 S 14:14 *that ... not*.—Quite exceptional is the use of מִן (if the text be right) in Dt 33:11 מִן־יִקְוּמוּן, with the imperfect, equivalent to *that ... not* [in prose, מִקְוּם].

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 אֲלֵּי and פֶּן *that not, lest*, see § 152 f and w. On the infinitive with לְ<sup>2</sup> (also לְמַ עַן 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 לְבִלְתִּי, § 114 s. On the preposition מִן 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,<sup>3</sup> especially after negative and interrogative sentences, e.g. Nu 23:19 לֹא אִישׁ אֵל וְיִכְזֹב וְיִבְרֹאֲדָם וְיִתְנַהֵם *God is not a man, that he should lie, and (i.e. neither) the son of man, that he should repent*; Is 53:2 הוּא וְנִהְיֶה־הוּא *who is wise, that he may understand these things? prudent, that he may know them?* Jb 5:12 אֲלֵּי=*so that ... not*; in Pr 30:3 וְ 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*,

<sup>1</sup> In Ez 36:27 a final clause is introduced by אֲשֶׁר אֵת, thus at the same time taking the form of an object-clause.

<sup>2</sup> On לְ as a supposed conjunction (equivalent to the Arabic *li*) 1 K 6:19, see § 66 i.

<sup>3</sup> That such examples as וְיִכְזֹב 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 וַאֲשֶׁר=*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 וַאֲשֶׁר 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 לָב; on אֲשֶׁר ל' א'=*ut non*, cf. Dt 28:35, 1 K 3:8, 2 K 9:37.

On וְ 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,<sup>1</sup> 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 אֲשֶׁר); 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).<sup>1</sup> On Gn 23:13 (וְלִי with the imperative), see § 110 e.

3. We may mention as instructive examples of *involved series* of sentences Gn 24:14 and <sup>42</sup>ff., and Gn 28:6 ff.

## THE PARADIGMS.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 לָ; cf. § 147 a, note 1.

<sup>1</sup> 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.* *קָטְלָהּ* is the model for *קָטְלוּ*, which likewise has only a vocalic affirmative, and *קָטַלְתָּ* is the model for *קָטַלְתֶּם*, *קָטַלְתִּי* and *קָטַלְתֶּם*, which in the same way have a toneless affirmative beginning with a consonant. On the other hand, the forms *קָטַלְתֶּם* and *קָטַלְתִּי*, 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.<sup>1</sup>*

	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 energicum.</i>	B. Attached to a sing. noun.	
Sing. 1. c.	<i>I.</i> אֲנִי in pause אֲנִי; אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי	<i>me.</i> אֲנִי; אֲנִי	אֲנִי; אֲנִי	<i>my</i> אֲנִי (prop. gen. <i>mei</i> ).	<i>my.</i> אֲנִי	
2. m.	<i>thou.</i> אַתָּה (אַתָּה), in pause אַתָּה	<i>thee.</i> אֶתְּךָ; in pause אֶתְּךָ	אֶתְּךָ; אֶתְּךָ	<i>thy</i> אֶתְּךָ, in (prop. pause <i>tui</i> ). אֶתְּךָ; (אֶתְּךָ)	<i>thy.</i> אֶתְּךָ	
f.	אֶתְּךָ (אֶתְּךָ)	אֶתְּךָ; אֶתְּךָ	אֶתְּךָ; אֶתְּךָ	not found.	אֶתְּךָ; (אֶתְּךָ)	אֶתְּךָ
3. m.	<i>he.</i> הוּא	<i>him.</i> אֹתוֹ; (הוּא),	אֹתוֹ; (הוּא),	(אֹתוֹ) (אֹתוֹ),	<i>his</i> אֹתוֹ; ( <i>eius</i> הוּא)	<i>his.</i> אֹתוֹ; (אֹתוֹ*)

<sup>1</sup> Forms with an asterisk are exclusively poetic, those in parentheses () are rare, those in brackets [] do not occur (cf. § 58 a, note).



<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	2. m.	קָטַל*	כָּבַד*	הִקְטִיל*	קָטַל*	הִקְטִיל*	הִקְטִיל*	הִתְקַטַּל*	
	2. f.	קָטְלִי*	כָּבְדִי*	הִקְטִילִי*	קָטְלִי*	wanting.	הִקְטִילִי*	wanting. הִתְקַטַּלִי*	
<i>Plur.</i>	2. m.	קָטְלוּ	כָּבְדוּ	הִקְטִילוּ	קָטְלוּ	הִקְטִילוּ	הִקְטִילוּ	הִתְקַטַּלוּ	
	2. f.	קָטְלֵנָה*	כָּבְדֵנָה*	הִקְטִילֵנָה*	קָטְלֵנָה*	הִקְטִילֵנָה*	הִקְטִילֵנָה*	הִתְקַטַּלֵנָה*	
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יִקְטֹל*	יִכְבֹּד*	יִקְטִיל*	יִקְטֹל*	יִקְטֹל*	יִקְטִיל*	יִתְקַטַּל*	
	3. f.	תִּקְטֹל־ל*	תִּכְבֹּד	תִּקְטִיל	תִּקְטֹל	תִּקְטֹל	תִּקְטִיל	תִּתְקַטַּל	
<i>Plur.</i>	2. m.	תִּקְטֹלוּ	תִּכְבְּדוּ	תִּקְטִילוּ	תִּקְטֹלוּ	תִּקְטֹלוּ	תִּקְטִילוּ	תִּתְקַטַּלוּ	
	2. f.	תִּקְטְלִי*	תִּכְבְּדִי*	תִּקְטִילִי*	תִּקְטְלִי*	תִּקְטְלִי*	תִּקְטְלִי*	תִּתְקַטַּלִי*	
	1. c.	אֶקְטֹל־ל	אֶכְבֹּד	אֶקְטִיל	אֶקְטֹל	אֶקְטֹל	אֶקְטִיל	אֶתְקַטַּל	
	3. m.	יִקְטְלוּ	יִכְבְּדוּ	יִקְטִילוּ	יִקְטְלוּ	יִקְטְלוּ	יִקְטִילוּ	יִתְקַטַּלוּ	
	3. f.	תִּקְטְלֵנָה*	תִּכְבְּדֵנָה*	תִּקְטִילֵנָה*	תִּקְטְלֵנָה*	תִּקְטְלֵנָה*	תִּקְטְלֵנָה*	תִּתְקַטַּלֵנָה*	
	2. m.	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּכְבְּדוּ	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּתְקַטַּלוּ	
	2. f.	תִּקְטְלֵנָה*	תִּכְבְּדֵנָה*	תִּקְטְלֵנָה*	תִּקְטְלֵנָה*	תִּקְטְלֵנָה*	תִּקְטְלֵנָה*	תִּתְקַטַּלֵנָה*	
1. c.	נִקְטֹל־ל	נִכְבֹּד	נִקְטִיל	נִקְטֹל	נִקְטֹל	נִקְטִיל	נִתְקַטַּל		
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive)</i>						יִקְטֹל*			
<i>Part. act.</i>	קָטֹל*		כָּבַד	קָטֹן	נִקְטֹל*	מְקַטֵּל*	מְקַטֵּל*	מְקַטֵּל*	
	קָטוּל*					מְקַטָּל*			

C. Strong Verb with Suffixes.

		Suffixes	1 Sing.	2 Sing. m.	2 Sing. f.	3 Sing. m.	3 Sing. f.	1 Plur.	2 Plur. m.	2 Plur. f.	3 Plur. m.	3 Plur. f.	
<i>Perf. Qal</i>	3. m.	קָטַל נִי	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתָּ	קָטַלְתָּ	קָטַלְתָּ	קָטַלְנוּ	wanting.	wanting.	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּן	
	3. f.	קָטַלְתִּי נִי	קָטַלְתְּךָ	קָטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתְּ	קָטַלְתְּ	קָטַלְתְּ	קָטַלְתֵּנוּ	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	wanting.	
	2. m.	קָטַלְתִּי נִי	—	—	קָטַלְתָּ	קָטַלְתָּ	קָטַלְתָּ	קָטַלְתֵּנוּ	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	wanting.	
	2. f.	קָטַלְתִּי נִי	—	—	קָטַלְתָּ	קָטַלְתָּ	קָטַלְתָּ	קָטַלְתֵּנוּ	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	wanting.	
	1. c.	—	קָטַלְתִּיךָ	קָטַלְתִּיךָ	קָטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתִּי	—	קָטַלְתִּיכֶם	wanting.	קָטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתִּי	
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	קָטַלְתִּי וְנִי	קָטַלְתֶּךָ	קָטַלְתֶּךָ	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֵּנוּ	wanting.	wanting.	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּן
		2. m.	קָטַלְתִּי וְנִי	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֵּנוּ	—	—	wanting.	wanting.
		1. c.	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	wanting.	קָטַלְתֶּם	wanting.
	<i>Inf. Qal.</i>		קָטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתֶּךָ	קָטַלְתֶּךָ	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֵּנוּ	קָטַלְתֶּם	wanting.	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּן	
	<i>Inf. Qal.</i>	2.	קָטַלְתִּי נִי	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֵּנוּ	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	—
(from an Imperf. in a שְׁמַע וְנִי, שְׁלַחְנִי)						קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	—	

<i>Impf. Qal</i>	>3. m.	יִקְטֹלְנִי	יִקְטֹלְךָ	יִקְטֹלְכֶם	הוּ יִקְטֹל	הוּ יִקְבֹּשׁ	יִקְטֹלְנוּ	יִקְבֹּשׁוּ	יִקְטֹלְכֶם	wanting.	יִקְטֹלְכֶם	wanting.				
		יִקְטֹלְנִי	יִקְטֹלְךָ	יִקְטֹלְכֶם	הוּ יִקְטֹל	הוּ יִקְבֹּשׁ	יִקְטֹלְנוּ	יִקְבֹּשׁוּ	יִקְטֹלְכֶם	wanting.	יִקְטֹלְכֶם	wanting.				
	3. m.	יִקְטֹלְנִי	יִקְטֹלְךָ	—	יִקְטֹלְנוּ	יִקְטֹלְכֶם	יִקְטֹלְכֶם	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	with <i>Nûn energ.</i>															
<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	יִקְטֹלוּ	wanting.	יִקְטֹלוּ	wanting.
<i>Perf. Pi□ēl</i>	3. m.	קָטַלְנִי	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלְכֶם	קָטַלוּ	קָטַלוּ	קָטַלוּ	קָטַלוּ	קָטַלוּ	קָטַלוּ	קָטַלוּ	קָטַלוּ	קָטַלוּ	wanting.	קָטַלוּ	wanting.

D. Verbs primae gutturalis

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph□al.</i>	<i>Hiph□il.</i>	<i>Hoph□al.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	עָמַד	נָ, עָמַד*	הָ, עָמַיַד*	הָ, עָמַד*
	3. f.	עָמְדָה	נָ, עָמְדָה*	הָ, עָמְיַדָה*	הָ, עָמְדָה*
	2. m.	עָמַדְתָּ	נָ, עָמַדְתָּ	הָ, עָמַדְתָּ	הָ, עָמַדְתָּ
	2. f.	עָמַדְתְּ	נָ, עָמַדְתְּ	הָ, עָמַדְתְּ	הָ, עָמַדְתְּ
	1. c.	עָמַדְתִּי	נָ, עָמַדְתִּי	הָ, עָמַדְתִּי	הָ, עָמַדְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	עָמְדוּ	נָ, עָמְדוּ	הָ, עָמְדוּ	הָ, עָמְדוּ
	2. m.	עָמַדְתֶּם*	נָ, עָמַדְתֶּם	הָ, עָמַדְתֶּם	הָ, עָמַדְתֶּם
	2. f.	עָמַדְתֶּן*	נָ, עָמַדְתֶּן	הָ, עָמַדְתֶּן	הָ, עָמַדְתֶּן
	1. c.	עָמַדְנוּ	נָ, עָמַדְנוּ	הָ, עָמַדְנוּ	הָ, עָמַדְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>		עָמַד*	הָ, עָמַד*	הָ, עָמַיַד*	הָ, עָמַד*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>		עָמֹד	הָ, אָסַף נָ, עָמֹד	הָ, עָמַד*	הָ, עָמַד*
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	m.	עָמַד*	הָ, עָמַד*	הָ, עָמַד	הָ, עָמַד
	f.	עָמְדִי	הָ, עָמְדִי	הָ, עָמְדִי	wanting.
<i>Plur.</i>	m.	עָמְדוּ	הָ, עָמְדוּ	הָ, עָמְדוּ	הָ, עָמְדוּ
	f.	עָמְדִי	הָ, עָמְדִי	הָ, עָמְדִי	הָ, עָמְדִי
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יִעָמַד*	יִעָמַד*	יִעָמַיַד*	יִעָמַד*
	3. f.	תִּעָמַד	תִּעָמַד	תִּעָמַיַד	תִּעָמַד
	2. m.	תִּעָמַד	תִּעָמַד	תִּעָמַיַד	תִּעָמַד
	2. f.	תִּעָמְדִי*	תִּעָמְדִי*	תִּעָמְדִי	תִּעָמְדִי*
	1. c.	אָ, יִעָמַד*	אָ, יִעָמַד	אָ, יִעָמַיַד	אָ, יִעָמַד

Plur.	3.	יְעַמְדוּ*	יְהַזְקוּ*	יַעַמְדוּ	יַעַמְדוּ	יַעַמְדוּ
	m.					
	3.	תַּעַמְדִּי דְבָהּ	תַּהַזְזִי קְנָהּ	תַּעַמְדִּי דְבָהּ	תַּעַמְדִּי דְבָהּ	תַּעַמְדִּי דְבָהּ
	f.					
	2.	תַּעַמְדוּ	תַּהַזְזוּ	תַּעַמְדוּ	תַּעַמְדוּ	תַּעַמְדוּ
m.						
2.	תַּעַמְדִּי דְבָהּ	תַּהַזְזִי קְנָהּ	תַּעַמְדִּי דְבָהּ	תַּעַמְדִּי דְבָהּ	תַּעַמְדִּי דְבָהּ	
f.						
1.	נַעַמְדִּי	נַהַזְזִי	נַעַמְדִּי	נַעַמְדִּי	נַעַמְדִּי	
c.						

Shortened Impf. (Jussive.)

Part. act.	עֹמֵד	נֹזֵעַ*	יַעַמְדִּי*	יַעַמְדִּי*
pass.	עֹמֵד	עֹמֵד	יַעַמְדִּי	יַעַמְדִּי

E. Verbs mediae gutturalis.

			Qal.	Niph <sup>al</sup> .	Pi <sup>el</sup> .	Pu <sup>al</sup> .	Hithpa <sup>el</sup> .
Perf.	Sing.	3.	שָׁחַט	נִשְׁחַט	שָׁחַט*	בָּרַח*	הִתְבָּרַח*
		m.					
		3.	שָׁחַטָה*	נִשְׁחַטָה*	שָׁחַטָה	[בָּרַחָה]	הִתְבָּרַחָה
		f.					
		2.	שָׁחַטְתָּ	נִשְׁחַטְתָּ	שָׁחַטְתָּ	בָּרַחְתָּ	הִתְבָּרַחְתָּ
	m.						
	2.	שָׁחַטְתָּ	נִשְׁחַטְתָּ	שָׁחַטְתָּ	בָּרַחְתָּ	הִתְבָּרַחְתָּ	
	f.						
	1.	שָׁחַטְתִּי	נִשְׁחַטְתִּי	שָׁחַטְתִּי	בָּרַחְתִּי	הִתְבָּרַחְתִּי	
	c.						
Plur.	3.	שָׁחַטוּ*	נִשְׁחַטוּ*	שָׁחַטוּ	בָּרַחוּ	הִתְבָּרַחוּ	
	c.						
	2.	שָׁחַטְתֶּם	נִשְׁחַטְתֶּם	שָׁחַטְתֶּם	בָּרַחְתֶּם	הִתְבָּרַחְתֶּם	
	m.						
	2.	שָׁחַטְתֶּם	נִשְׁחַטְתֶּם	[שָׁחַטְתֶּם]	בָּרַחְתֶּם	הִתְבָּרַחְתֶּם	
f.							
1.	שָׁחַטְנוּ	נִשְׁחַטְנוּ	שָׁחַטְנוּ	בָּרַחְנוּ	הִתְבָּרַחְנוּ		
c.							
Inf.			שָׁחַט	הִשְׁחַט	שָׁחַט*	wanting.	הִתְבָּרַח*
Inf. absol.			שָׁחַט	נִשְׁחַט	שָׁחַט*		
Imp.	Sing.	m.	שָׁחַט*	הִשְׁחַט	שָׁחַט*		הִתְבָּרַח*
		f.	שָׁחַטִי*	הִשְׁחַטִי*	שָׁחַטִי*	wanting.	[הִתְבָּרַחִי]
	Plur.	m.	שָׁחַטוּ	הִשְׁחַטוּ	שָׁחַטוּ		הִתְבָּרַחוּ
		f.	שָׁחַטְנָה	הִשְׁחַטְנָה	שָׁחַטְנָה*		הִתְבָּרַחְנָה
Impf.	Sing.	3.	שָׁחַט*	יִשְׁחַט	יִשְׁחַט*	יִבְרַח*	יִתְבָּרַח*
		m.					
	3.	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּבְרַח	תִּתְבָּרַח	
	f.						
2.	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּבְרַח	תִּתְבָּרַח		
m.							

		2.	*תִּשְׁחָטִי	*תִּשְׁחָטִי	תָּבַרְכִי	[תָּבַרְכִי]	[תָּבַרְכִי]
	<i>f.</i>	1.	אֲשַׁחֵט	אֲשַׁחֵט	אֲבָרַךְ	אֲבָרַךְ	אֲתַבְרַךְ
	<i>c.</i>	3.	יִשְׁחָטוּ	יִשְׁחָטוּ	יִבְרְכוּ	יִבְרְכוּ	יִתְבַּרְכוּ
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>	3.	תִּשְׁחָטְנָה	תִּשְׁחָטְנָה	תְּבָרַכְנָה	תְּבָרַכְנָה	תִּתְבַּרְכְּנָה
	<i>f.</i>	2.	תִּשְׁחָטִי	תִּשְׁחָטִי	תְּבָרַכְנִי	תְּבָרַכְנִי	תִּתְבַּרְכְּנִי
	<i>m.</i>	2.	תִּשְׁחָטְנָה	תִּשְׁחָטְנָה	תְּבָרַכְנָה	תְּבָרַכְנָה	תִּתְבַּרְכְּנָה
	<i>f.</i>	1.	נִשְׁחָטְנִי	נִשְׁחָטְנִי	נִבְרַךְנִי	נִבְרַךְנִי	נִתְבַּרְכְּנִי
	<i>c.</i>						
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>			יִשְׁחָטֵהוּ				
<i>Part. act.</i>			שֹׁחֵט	נִשְׁחָט	*מְבָרַךְ		*מִתְבַּרְךְ
<i>pass.</i>			שֹׁחֵטוֹ			*מְבָרַךְ	

F. Verbs tertiae gutturalis.

			<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Pi<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Pu<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Hiph<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Hoph<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Hithpa<sup>al</sup>.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3.	שָׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	*שָׁלַח	שָׁלַח	*הִשְׁלִיחַ	הִשְׁלַח	*הִשְׁתַּלַּח
	<i>m.</i>	3.	שָׁלַחְהוּ	נִשְׁלַחְהוּ	*שָׁלַחְהוּ	שָׁלַחְהוּ	*הִשְׁלִיחְהוּ	הִשְׁלַחְהוּ	*הִשְׁתַּלַּחְהוּ
	<i>f.</i>	2.	שָׁלַחְתָּ	נִשְׁלַחְתָּ	*שָׁלַחְתָּ	שָׁלַחְתָּ	*הִשְׁלִיחְתָּ	הִשְׁלַחְתָּ	*הִשְׁתַּלַּחְתָּ
	<i>m.</i>	1.	*שָׁלַחְתָּ	*נִשְׁלַחְתָּ	*שָׁלַחְתָּ	*שָׁלַחְתָּ	*הִשְׁלִיחְתָּ	*הִשְׁלַחְתָּ	*הִשְׁתַּלַּחְתָּ
	<i>f.</i>	1.	שָׁלַחְתִּי	נִשְׁלַחְתִּי	שָׁלַחְתִּי	שָׁלַחְתִּי	הִשְׁלִיחְתִּי	הִשְׁלַחְתִּי	הִשְׁתַּלַּחְתִּי
	<i>c.</i>	1.	שָׁלַחְתִּי	נִשְׁלַחְתִּי	שָׁלַחְתִּי	שָׁלַחְתִּי	הִשְׁלִיחְתִּי	הִשְׁלַחְתִּי	הִשְׁתַּלַּחְתִּי
	<i>Plur.</i>	3.	שָׁלַחוּ	נִשְׁלַחוּ	שָׁלַחוּ	שָׁלַחוּ	הִשְׁלִיחוּ	הִשְׁלַחוּ	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
	<i>c.</i>	2.	שָׁלַחְתֶּם	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּם	שָׁלַחְתֶּם	שָׁלַחְתֶּם	הִשְׁלַחְתֶּם	הִשְׁלַחְתֶּם	הִשְׁתַּלַּחְתֶּם
	<i>m.</i>	2.	שָׁלַחְתֶּם	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּם	שָׁלַחְתֶּם	שָׁלַחְתֶּם	הִשְׁלַחְתֶּם	הִשְׁלַחְתֶּם	הִשְׁתַּלַּחְתֶּם
	<i>f.</i>	2.	שָׁלַחְתֶּן	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּן	שָׁלַחְתֶּן	שָׁלַחְתֶּן	הִשְׁלַחְתֶּן	הִשְׁלַחְתֶּן	הִשְׁתַּלַּחְתֶּן
	<i>c.</i>	1.	שָׁלַחְתֶּנּוּ	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּנּוּ	שָׁלַחְתֶּנּוּ	שָׁלַחְתֶּנּוּ	הִשְׁלַחְתֶּנּוּ	הִשְׁלַחְתֶּנּוּ	הִשְׁתַּלַּחְתֶּנּוּ
<i>Inf.</i>			*שְׁלַחְהוּ	*הִשְׁלַחְהוּ	*שְׁלַחְהוּ		*הִשְׁלַחְהוּ		*הִשְׁתַּלַּחְהוּ
<i>Inf. absol.</i>			שְׁלֹוֹחַ	נִשְׁלֹוֹחַ	שְׁלֹוֹחַ		*הִשְׁלֹוֹחַ		*הִשְׁתַּלְוֹחַ
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>m.</i>	*שָׁלַחְהוּ	*הִשְׁלַחְהוּ	*שָׁלַחְהוּ		הִשְׁלַחְהוּ		*הִשְׁתַּלַּחְהוּ
		<i>f.</i>	שָׁלַחְיָי	הִשְׁלַחְיָי	*שָׁלַחְיָי	wanting.	הִשְׁלַחְיָי	wanting.	הִשְׁתַּלַּחְיָי
	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>	שָׁלַחוּ	הִשְׁלַחוּ	שָׁלַחוּ		הִשְׁלַחוּ		הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
		<i>f.</i>	*שָׁלַחְנָה	*הִשְׁלַחְנָה	*שָׁלַחְנָה		הִשְׁלַחְנָה		*הִשְׁתַּלַּחְנָה
<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3.	*יִשְׁלַחְהוּ	*יִשְׁלַחְהוּ	*יִשְׁלַחְהוּ	יִשְׁלַחְהוּ	*יִשְׁלַחְהוּ	יִשְׁלַחְהוּ	יִשְׁתַּלַּחְהוּ

	<i>m.</i>	3.	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח*	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁתַּלַּח
	<i>f.</i>	2.	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁתַּלַּח
	<i>m.</i>	2.	תִּשְׁלַחֲךָ	תִּשְׁלַחֲךָ	תִּשְׁלַחֲךָ	תִּשְׁלַחֲךָ	תִּשְׁלַחֲךָ	תִּשְׁלַחֲךָ	תִּשְׁתַּלַּחֲךָ
	<i>f.</i>	1.	אֲשַׁלַּח	אֲשַׁלַּח	אֲשַׁלַּח	אֲשַׁלַּח	אֲשַׁלַּח	אֲשַׁלַּח	אֲשַׁתַּלַּח
	<i>c.</i>	3.	יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>	3.	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁתַּלַּחְנָה*
	<i>f.</i>	2.	תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
	<i>m.</i>	2.	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁתַּלַּחְנָה
	<i>f.</i>	1.	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁתַּלַּח
	<i>c.</i>								

Shortened Impf.  
(Jussive).

Impf. with Suff. יִשְׁלַחְנִי

<i>Part.</i>	<i>act.</i>		שִׁלַּח*	נִשְׁלַח	מִשְׁלַח*	מִשְׁלַח	מִשְׁלַח*	מִשְׁתַּלַּח*
	<i>pass.</i>		שְׁלוּח*			מִשְׁלַח	מִשְׁלַח	

G. Verbs mediae geminatae or double *y*.

			<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph</i> □ <i>al.</i>	<i>Hi</i> □ <i>ph</i> □ <i>il.</i>	<i>Hoph</i> □ <i>al.</i>	<i>Po</i> □ <i>el.</i>	<i>Po</i> □ <i>al.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	סָבַב, תָּם*	נָסַב, נָמַס*	הִסָּב, הִסָּב*	הוּסַב*	סוּבַב*	סוּבַב*
		3. <i>f.</i>	תָּמַה, סָבַבָּה*	נָסַבָּה*	הִסָּבָּה*	הוּסַבָּה	סוּבַבָּה	[סוּבַבָּה]
		2. <i>m.</i>	סָבַב וְתָ*	נָסַב וְתָ*	הִסָּב וְתָ*	[הוּסַב וְתָ]*	סוּבַב וְתָ	סוּבַב וְתָ
		2. <i>f.</i>	סָבַבְתְּ	נָסַבְתְּ	הִסָּבְתְּ	הוּסַבְתְּ	סוּבַבְתְּ	סוּבַבְתְּ
		1. <i>c.</i>	סָבַבְתִּי	נָסַבְתִּי	הִסָּבְתִּי	[הוּסַבְתִּי]	סוּבַבְתִּי	סוּבַבְתִּי
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>c.</i>	סָבַבוּ, תָּמוּ	נָסַבוּ	הִסָּבוּ, הִסָּבוּ לּוֹ	הוּסַבוּ	סוּבַבוּ	סוּבַבוּ
		2. <i>m.</i>	סָבַבְתֶּם	נָסַבְתֶּם	הִסָּבְתֶּם	[הוּסַבְתֶּם]	סוּבַבְתֶּם	סוּבַבְתֶּם
		2. <i>f.</i>	סָבַבְתֶּן	נָסַבְתֶּן	הִסָּבְתֶּן	הוּסַבְתֶּן	סוּבַבְתֶּן	סוּבַבְתֶּן
		1. <i>c.</i>	סָבַבוּ	נָסַבוּ	הִסָּבוּ	[הוּסַבוּ]	סוּבַבוּ	[סוּבַבוּ]
	<i>Inf.</i>		סָבֵב*	הִסָּב*	הִסָּב*		סוּבַב	
	<i>Inf. absol.</i>		סָבַב	הִסָּב, הִסָּב	הִסָּב*	הִשְׁבֵּה	סוּבַב	[סוּבַב]
	<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>m.</i>	הִסָּב	הִסָּב		סוּבַב	
		<i>f.</i>	סָבִי*	הִסָּבִי	הִסָּבִי	wanting.	סוּבַבִּי	wanting.
	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>	סָבִיבוּ	הִסָּבוּ	הִסָּבוּ		סוּבַבוּ	
		<i>f.</i>	[סָבִיבֵנָה]	[הִסָּבִיבֵנָה]	[הִסָּבִיבֵנָה]		סוּבַבְנָה]	

<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יָסַב*	(§ יקל 67 p) יָסַב*	יָסַב*	יָסַב, יָסַב*	יָסַב, יוֹסַב*	יָסוּבַב	יָסוּבַב
	3. f.	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	[תוֹסַב]	תָּסוּבַב	תָּסוּבַב
	2. m.	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תָּסַב	תוֹסַב	תָּסוּבַב	תָּסוּבַב
	2. f.	תָּסַב בִּי*	תָּסַב בִּי	תָּסַב בִּי*	[תָּסַב בִּי]	תוֹסַב בִּי*	[תָּסוּבַב בִּי]	תָּסוּבַב בִּי
	1. c.	אָסַב	אָסַב	אָסַב	אָסַב	[אוֹסַב]	[אָסוּבַב]	אָסוּבַב
<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יָסַבו	יָסַבו	יָסַבו	יָסַבו, יָסַבו	יָסַבו*	יָסוּבְבוּ	יָסוּבְבוּ
	3. f.	תָּסַבְינָה*	[תָּסַבְינָה]	[תָּסַבְינָה]	תָּסַבְינָה	[תוֹסַבְינָה]	[תָּסוּבְינָה]	תָּסוּבְינָה
	2. m.	תָּסַבוּ	תָּסַבוּ	תָּסַבוּ	תָּסַבוּ	תוֹסַבוּ	תָּסוּבְבוּ	תָּסוּבְבוּ
	2. f.	[תָּסַבְינָה]	[תָּסַבְינָה]	[תָּסַבְינָה]	תָּסַבְינָה	תוֹסַבְינָה	תָּסוּבְינָה	תָּסוּבְינָה
	1. c.	נָסַב	נָסַב	נָסַב	נָסַב	[נוֹסַב]	[נָסוּבַב]	[נָסוּבַב]
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>		וַיָּסַב*	(וַיָּסַב pause)		וַיָּסַב			
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>		יָסַבְנִי*			יָסַבְנִי*	(יָסַבְנִי)	יָסוּבְנִי	
<i>Part. act</i>		סָבַב			נָסַב	מָסַב*		מָסוּבַב
<i>pass.</i>		סָבַב			(נָסַבְתָּ fem)		מוֹסַב	מָסוּבַב

H. Verbs פִּי"ן

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Hiph<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Hoph<sup>al</sup>.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	[נָגַשׁ]	נָפַל	נָגַשׁ*	הִנָּגַשׁ*
	3. f.			נָגַשָּׁה	הִנָּגַשָּׁה
	2. m.			נָגַשְׁתָּ	הִנָּגַשְׁתָּ
	2. f.			נָגַשְׁתְּ	הִנָּגַשְׁתְּ
	1. c.	regular.		נָגַשְׁתִּי	הִנָּגַשְׁתִּי
<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.			נָגַשׁוּ	הִנָּגַשׁוּ
	2. m.			נָגַשְׁתֶּם	הִנָּגַשְׁתֶּם
	2. f.			נָגַשְׁתֶּן	הִנָּגַשְׁתֶּן
	1. c.			נָגַשְׁנוּ	הִנָּגַשְׁנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>		נָגַשׁ*	נָפַל*	הִנָּגַשׁ*	הִנָּגַשׁ*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>		נָגוּשׁ		נָגוּף, הִנָּגַשׁ	הִנָּגַשׁ*
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	m.	נָשׂ*	נָפַל*	הִנָּגַשׂ*	הִנָּגַשׂ*
	f.	נָשִׁי	נָפְלִי	הִנָּגַשִׁי	הִנָּגַשִׁי
<i>Plur. m.</i>		נָשׁוּ	נָפְלוּ	הִנָּגַשׁוּ	הִנָּגַשׁוּ

wanting.

	<i>f.</i>	ג שָׁנָה	נָפַל לָנָה	הִנָּג שָׁנָה	הִגָּ שָׁנָה	
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	יָגֵשׁ*	יָפֹל*	[יִנָּגֵשׁ]	יִגָּישׁ*	יָגֵשׁ*
	3. <i>f.</i>	תִּגְשֵׁ	תִּפֹּל		תִּגְיִשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁ
	2. <i>m.</i>	תִּגְשֵׁ	תִּפֹּל		תִּגְיִשׁ	תִּגְשֵׁ
	2. <i>f.</i>	תִּגְשֵׁי	תִּפְלִי		תִּגְיִשִׁי	תִּגְשֵׁי
	1. <i>c.</i>	אָגֵשׁ	אָפֹל		אָגִישׁ	אָגֵשׁ
<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	יָגֵשׁוּ	יָפֹלוּ	regular.	יִגְיִשׁוּ	יָגֵשׁוּ
	3. <i>f.</i>	תִּגְשֵׁנָה	תִּפֹּלְנָה		תִּגְיִשְׁנָה	תִּגְשֵׁנָה
	2. <i>m.</i>	תִּגְשֵׁשׁוּ	תִּפְלוּ		תִּגְיִשׁוּ	תִּגְשֵׁשׁוּ
	2. <i>f.</i>	[תִּגְשֵׁנָה]	תִּפֹּלְנָה		[תִּגְיִשְׁנָה]	[תִּגְשֵׁנָה]
	1. <i>c.</i>	נָגֵשׁ	נָפֹל		נָגִישׁ	נָגֵשׁ
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>						יָגֵשׁ*
<i>Part. act.</i>		נֹגֵשׁ		נֹגֵשׁ*	מֹגִישׁ*	
<i>pass.</i>		נֹגֵשׁ				מֹגֵשׁ

I. Weak Verbs, פ"א.

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph<sup>□</sup>al.</i>	<i>Hiph<sup>□</sup>al.</i>	<i>Hoph<sup>□</sup>al.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>		אָכַל	נִאָּכַל*	הִאָּכִיל*	הִאָּכַל*
Like Verbs <i>primae gutturalis</i> .					
<i>Inf.</i>		אָכַל, אֲכַל	הִאָּכַל	הִאָּכִיל	הִאָּכַל
<i>Inf. absol.</i>		אָכֹל	הִאָּכַל	wanting.	wanting.
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	<i>m.</i>	אָכַל*	הִאָּכַל	הִאָּכַל	
	<i>f.</i>	אֲכָלִי	&c.	&c.	wanting.
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>	אָכְלוּ			
	<i>f.</i>	[אָכַלְנָה]			
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	יֵאָכַל*	(in pause (יֵאָכַל) &c	יִאָּכִיל*	יֵאָכַל*
	3. <i>f.</i>	תֵּאָכַל	&c	&c	&c
	2. <i>m.</i>	תֵּאָכַל			
	2. <i>f.</i>	תֵּאָכְלִי			
	1. <i>c.</i>	אֲכַל*			
<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	יֵאָכְלוּ			
	3. <i>f.</i>	תֵּאָכְלֵנָה			
	2. <i>m.</i>	תֵּאָכְלוּ			

2. f. [ת' אכ' לְנָה]

1. c. נ' אכל

<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>	נִי' אָמַר	נִי' אָכַל			
<i>Part. act.</i>	אֹכֵל	אֹכֵל	נֹאֲכָל	מְאָכִיל	
<i>pass.</i>	אֹכּוּל				מְאָכָל

K. Weak Verbs, פ"י (for פ"ו).

L. Verbs properly פ"י.

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Hiph<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Hoph<sup>al</sup>.</i>	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Hiph<sup>al</sup>.</i>		
<i>Perf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יָשַׁב	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	יָטַב	*הִיטִיב
	3. f.		הוֹשִׁיבָה	הוֹשִׁיבָה	הוֹשִׁיבָה	הוֹשִׁיבָה		הִיטִיבָה
	2. m.		הוֹשִׁיבְתָּ	הוֹשִׁיבְתָּ	הוֹשִׁיבְתָּ	הוֹשִׁיבְתָּ		הִיטִיבְתָּ
	2. f.		הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי	הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי	הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי	הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי		הִיטִיבְתִּי
	1. c.	regular.	הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי	הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי	הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי	הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי	regular.	הִיטִיבְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.		הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ		הִיטִיבוּ
	2. m.		הוֹשִׁיבְתֶּם	הוֹשִׁיבְתֶּם	הוֹשִׁיבְתֶּם	הוֹשִׁיבְתֶּם		הִיטִיבְתֶּם
	2. f.		הוֹשִׁיבְתֵּן	הוֹשִׁיבְתֵּן	הוֹשִׁיבְתֵּן	הוֹשִׁיבְתֵּן		הִיטִיבְתֵּן
	1. c.		הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ		הִיטִיבוּ
<i>Inf.</i>		יֹשֵׁב, יֹשֵׁבָה, יֹשֵׁבִי	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	יָטַב	*הִיטִיב
<i>Inf. absol.</i>		יָשׁוּב	wanting.	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	יָטוּב	*הִיטִיב
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	m.	יָשֵׁב	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב		*הִיטִיב
	f.	יָשֵׁבִי	הוֹשִׁיבִי	הוֹשִׁיבִי	הוֹשִׁיבִי	wanting.		הִיטִיבִי
<i>Plur.</i>	m.	יָשׁוּבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ			הִיטִיבוּ
	f.	יָשׁוּבָה	[הוֹשִׁיבָה]	[הוֹשִׁיבָה]	[הוֹשִׁיבָה]			[הִיטִיבָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יֹשֵׁב	יֹשִׁיב	יֹשִׁיב	יֹשִׁיב	יֹשֵׁב	יִיטַב	*יִיטִיב
	3. f.	תֹּשֵׁב	תִּיֹשִׁיב	תִּיֹשִׁיב	תִּיֹשִׁיב	תֹּשֵׁב	תִּיטַב	תִּיטִיב
	2. m.	תֹּשֵׁב	תִּיֹשִׁיב	תִּיֹשִׁיב	תִּיֹשִׁיב	תֹּשֵׁב	תִּיטַב	תִּיטִיב
	2. f.	תִּיֹשֵׁבִי	תִּיֹשִׁיבִי	תִּיֹשִׁיבִי	תִּיֹשִׁיבִי	תִּיֹשֵׁבִי	תִּיטַבִּי	תִּיטִיבִּי
	1. c.	אֹשֵׁב	אֹיֹשִׁיב	אֹיֹשִׁיב	אֹיֹשִׁיב	אֹשֵׁב	אִיטַב	אִיטִיב
<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יֹשֵׁבוּ	יֹיֹשִׁיבוּ	יֹיֹשִׁיבוּ	יֹיֹשִׁיבוּ	יֹשֵׁבוּ	יִיטַבוּ	יִיטִיבוּ
	3. f.	תִּשְׁכַּבְנָה	[תִּירַשְׁנָה]	[תִּירַשְׁנָה]	[תִּירַשְׁנָה]	תִּשְׁכַּבְנָה	תִּיטַכְּנָה	[תִּיטִיכְּנָה]
	2. m.	תִּשְׁכַּבוּ	תִּירַשׁוּ	תִּירַשׁוּ	תִּירַשׁוּ	תִּשְׁכַּבוּ	תִּיטַבוּ	תִּיטִיבוּ
	2. f.	[תִּשְׁכַּבְנֵי]	[תִּירַשְׁנֵי]	[תִּירַשְׁנֵי]	[תִּירַשְׁנֵי]	[תִּשְׁכַּבְנֵי]	[תִּיטַכְּנֵי]	[תִּיטִיכְּנֵי]
	1. c.	נֹשֵׁב	נֹיֹשִׁיב	נֹיֹשִׁיב	נֹיֹשִׁיב	נֹשֵׁב	נִיטַב	[נִיטִיב]
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			יֹשֵׁב			יִיטַב		
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>	נִי' יָשַׁב		נִי' יָשַׁב			נִי' יָטַב		נִי' יָטַב
<i>Part. act.</i>	יָשַׁב		נֹשֵׁב	מֹשִׁיב		יָטַב		מִיטִיב
<i>pass.</i>	יָשׁוּב			מֹשֵׁב		יָטוּב		

M. Weak Verbs, ע"ו.

N. Weak Verbs,

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Pólēl.</i>	<i>Pólal.</i>	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i> קָם * מָת * 3. <i>f.</i> קָמָה * מָתָה * 2. <i>m.</i> קָמַת * מָתָה * 2. <i>f.</i> קָמַתָּה [מָתָה] [קָמַתָּה] 1. <i>c.</i> קָמַתִּי מָתִי <i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>c.</i> קָמוּ מָתוּ 2. <i>m.</i> קָמְתֶם [מָתֶם] [קָמַתְּם] 2. <i>f.</i> קָמַתְּוּ [מָתְוּ] [קָמַתְּוּ] 1. <i>c.</i> קָמוּ מָתוּ	3. <i>m.</i> נָקָם * 3. <i>f.</i> נָקְמָה * 2. <i>m.</i> נָקַמְתָּ [נָקַמְתָּ] 2. <i>f.</i> נָקַמְתְּוּ [נָקַמְתְּוּ] 1. <i>c.</i> נָקַמְתִּי	3. <i>m.</i> הִקִּים * 3. <i>f.</i> הִקְיָה * 2. <i>m.</i> הִקְיַמְתָּ * 2. <i>f.</i> הִקְיַמְתְּוּ [הִקְיַמְתְּוּ] 1. <i>c.</i> הִקְיַמְתִּי	3. <i>m.</i> הִוָּקַם * 3. <i>f.</i> הִוָּקְמָה [הִוָּקְמָה] 2. <i>m.</i> הִוָּקַמְתָּ * 2. <i>f.</i> הִוָּקַמְתְּוּ [הִוָּקַמְתְּוּ] 1. <i>c.</i> הִוָּקַמְתִּי	3. <i>m.</i> קִוְּמָם * 3. <i>f.</i> קִוְּמָמָה [קִוְּמָמָה] 2. <i>m.</i> קִוְּמַמְתָּ * 2. <i>f.</i> קִוְּמַמְתְּוּ [קִוְּמַמְתְּוּ] 1. <i>c.</i> קִוְּמַמְתִּי	3. <i>m.</i> קִוְּמָמָם * 3. <i>f.</i> קִוְּמָמָמָה [קִוְּמָמָמָה] 2. <i>m.</i> קִוְּמָמַמְתָּ * 2. <i>f.</i> קִוְּמָמַמְתְּוּ [קִוְּמָמַמְתְּוּ] 1. <i>c.</i> קִוְּמָמַמְתִּי	3. <i>m.</i> בָּן * 3. <i>f.</i> בָּנָה * 2. <i>m.</i> בָּנַת * 2. <i>f.</i> בָּנַתָּה [בָּנַתָּה] 1. <i>c.</i> בָּנַתִּי	3. <i>m.</i> נָבוֹן * 3. <i>f.</i> נָבְנָה * 2. <i>m.</i> נָבְנַת * 2. <i>f.</i> נָבְנַתָּה [נָבְנַתָּה] 1. <i>c.</i> נָבְנַתִּי
<i>Inf.</i>	<i>absol.</i>	קֹם * קֹם *	הִקְוֹם * הִקְוֹם * הִקְוֹם *	הִקְיִים * הִקְיִים * הִקְיִים *	הִוָּקַם * הִוָּקַם * הִוָּקַם *	קִוְּמָם קִוְּמָמִי [קִוְּמָמִי] קִוְּמָמוּ	קִוְּמָמָם קִוְּמָמָמִי [קִוְּמָמָמִי] קִוְּמָמָמוּ	בִּין * בִּין *	
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i> קֹם * 3. <i>f.</i> קֹמִי * <i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>m.</i> קֹמוּ 3. <i>f.</i> קֹמְנָה *	3. <i>m.</i> הִקְוֹם * 3. <i>f.</i> הִקְוֹמִי [הִקְוֹמִי] 2. <i>m.</i> הִקְוֹמוּ 3. <i>f.</i> הִקְוֹמְנָה [הִקְוֹמְנָה]	3. <i>m.</i> הִקְיִים * 3. <i>f.</i> הִקְיִימִי * 2. <i>m.</i> הִקְיִימוּ 3. <i>f.</i> הִקְיִימְנָה [הִקְיִימְנָה]	3. <i>m.</i> הִוָּקַם * 3. <i>f.</i> הִוָּקַמִי * 2. <i>m.</i> הִוָּקַמוּ 3. <i>f.</i> הִוָּקַמְנָה [הִוָּקַמְנָה]	קִוְּמָם קִוְּמָמִי [קִוְּמָמִי] קִוְּמָמוּ קִוְּמָמְנָה [קִוְּמָמְנָה]	wanting. קִוְּמָמִי [קִוְּמָמִי] קִוְּמָמוּ קִוְּמָמְנָה [קִוְּמָמְנָה]	בִּין * בִּינִי בִּינֹו —	
<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. <i>m.</i> יִקְוֹם * יִקְוֹם, יִבֹּא 3. <i>f.</i> תִּקְוֹם 2. <i>m.</i> תִּקְוֹם 2. <i>f.</i> תִּקְוִי * 1. <i>c.</i> אִקְוֹם <i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>m.</i> יִקְוֹמוּ 3. <i>f.</i> תִּקְוִי * תִּשְׁבְּחָה, תִּקְוִי * 2. <i>m.</i> תִּקְוֹמוּ 2. <i>f.</i> תִּקְוִי * יִבְחָה 1. <i>c.</i> נִקְוֹם	3. <i>m.</i> יִקְוֹם * 3. <i>f.</i> תִּקְוֹם 2. <i>m.</i> תִּקְוֹם 2. <i>f.</i> תִּקְוִי * [תִּקְוִי *] 1. <i>c.</i> אִקְוֹם 3. <i>m.</i> יִקְוֹמוּ 3. <i>f.</i> תִּקְוִי * יִבְחָה, תִּקְוִי * יִבְחָה 2. <i>m.</i> תִּקְוֹמוּ 2. <i>f.</i> תִּקְוִי * [תִּקְוִי *] 1. <i>c.</i> נִקְוֹם	3. <i>m.</i> יִקְיִים * 3. <i>f.</i> תִּקְיִים 2. <i>m.</i> תִּקְיִים 2. <i>f.</i> תִּקְיִי * 1. <i>c.</i> אִקְיִים 3. <i>m.</i> יִקְיִימוּ 3. <i>f.</i> תִּקְיִי * יִבְחָה, תִּקְיִי * יִבְחָה 2. <i>m.</i> תִּקְיִימוּ 2. <i>f.</i> תִּקְיִי * [תִּקְיִי *] 1. <i>c.</i> נִקְיִים	3. <i>m.</i> יִוָּקַם * 3. <i>f.</i> תִּוָּקַם 2. <i>m.</i> תִּוָּקַם 2. <i>f.</i> תִּוָּקְמִי * 1. <i>c.</i> אִוָּקַם 3. <i>m.</i> יִוָּקַמוּ 3. <i>f.</i> תִּוָּקְמִי * תִּוָּקְמִי * יִבְחָה, תִּוָּקְמִי * יִבְחָה 2. <i>m.</i> תִּוָּקַמוּ 2. <i>f.</i> תִּוָּקְמִי * [תִּוָּקְמִי *] 1. <i>c.</i> נִוָּקַם	יִקְוֹמָם תִּקְוֹמָם [תִּקְוֹמָם] יִקְוֹמָמוּ יִקְוֹמָמִי [יִקְוֹמָמִי] אִקְוֹמָם [אִקְוֹמָם] יִקְוֹמָמוּ יִקְוֹמָמִי [יִקְוֹמָמִי] אִקְוֹמָמִי [אִקְוֹמָמִי] יִקְוֹמָמוּ יִקְוֹמָמִי [יִקְוֹמָמִי] אִקְוֹמָמִי [אִקְוֹמָמִי] יִקְוֹמָמוּ יִקְוֹמָמִי [יִקְוֹמָמִי] אִקְוֹמָמִי [אִקְוֹמָמִי]	יִקְוֹמָם תִּקְוֹמָם [תִּקְוֹמָם] יִקְוֹמָמוּ יִקְוֹמָמִי [יִקְוֹמָמִי] אִקְוֹמָם [אִקְוֹמָם] יִקְוֹמָמוּ יִקְוֹמָמִי [יִקְוֹמָמִי] אִקְוֹמָמִי [אִקְוֹמָמִי] יִקְוֹמָמוּ יִקְוֹמָמִי [יִקְוֹמָמִי] אִקְוֹמָמִי [אִקְוֹמָמִי] יִקְוֹמָמוּ יִקְוֹמָמִי [יִקְוֹמָמִי] אִקְוֹמָמִי [אִקְוֹמָמִי]	יִגִּיל תִּגִּיל תִּגִּיל תִּגִּיל אִגִּיל יִגִּיל תִּגִּיל * יִבְחָה, תִּגִּיל * יִבְחָה תִּגִּיל תִּגִּיל * יִבְחָה נִגִּיל יִגִּיל	תִּגִּיל * יִבְחָה, תִּגִּיל * יִבְחָה תִּגִּיל * יִבְחָה, תִּגִּיל * יִבְחָה
<i>Shortened Impf.</i>		יִקְם *		יִקְיִים *				יִגִּיל	



1. c.	נִמְצָא	[נִמְצָא]	נִמְצָא	[נִמְצָא]	נִמְצִיא	נִמְצָא	[נִתְמַצָּא]
<i>Shortened. Impf. (Jussive).</i>					יִמְצָא		
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	נִי, יִמְצָא נִי, יִמְצָאךָ		יִמְצָא נִי		יִמְצִיא נִי		
<i>Part. act.</i>	מִצָּא	נִמְצָא	מִמְצָא		מִמְצִיא		מִתְמַצָּא
<i>pass.</i>	מְצוּא			מְמַצָּא		מְמַצָּא	

P. Weak Verbs, ל"ה.

			<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph</i> □ <i>al.</i>	<i>Pi</i> □ <i>ēl.</i>	<i>Pu</i> □ <i>al.</i>	<i>Hiph</i> □ <i>ūl.</i>	<i>Hoph</i> □ <i>al.</i>	<i>Hithpa</i> □ <i>ēl.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. m.	גָּלָה*	נִגְלָה*	גָּלָה*	גָּלָה*	הִגְלָה*	הִגְלָה*	הִתְגַּלָּה*
		3. f.	גָּלְתָה*	נִגְלַתְהוּ*	גָּלְתָה*	גָּלְתָה*	הִגְלַתְהוּ*	הִגְלַתְהוּ*	[הִתְגַּלַּתְהוּ]
		2. m.	גָּל יָתְ*	יִתְ, נִגְלַתְ יָתְ*	גָּל יָתְ*	גָּל יָתְ*	יִתְ, הִגְלַתְ יָתְ*	הִגְלַתְ יָתְ*	יִתְ הִתְגַּלַּתְ*
		2. f.	גָּלִית	נִגְלִית	גָּלִית	[גָּלִית]	יִתְ, הִגְלִית	[הִגְלִית]	[הִתְגַּלִּית]
		1. c.	גָּל יָתִי	נִגְלַתְ יָתִי	גָּל יָתִי, גָּל יָתִי	גָּל יָתִי	יִתְ, הִגְלַתְ יָתִי	הִגְלַתְ יָתִי	יָתִי הִתְגַּלַּתְ*
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	גָּלוּ*	נִגְלוּ	גָּלוּ	גָּלוּ	הִגְלוּ	הִגְלוּ	הִתְגַּלוּ
		2. m.	גָּלִיתֶם	[נִגְלִיתֶם]	גָּלִיתֶם	[גָּלִיתֶם]	יִתְ, הִגְלִיתֶם	[הִגְלִיתֶם]	הִתְגַּלִּיתֶם
		2. f.	גָּלִיתְוּ	[נִגְלִיתְוּ]	[גָּלִיתְוּ]	גָּלִיתְוּ	[הִגְלִיתְוּ]	הִגְלִיתְוּ	[הִתְגַּלִּיתְוּ]
		1. c.	גָּל יָבוּ	נִגְלַתְ יָבוּ	גָּל יָבוּ	[גָּל יָבוּ]	הִגְלַתְ יָבוּ	[הִגְלַתְ יָבוּ]	יָבוּ הִתְגַּלַּתְ*
<i>Inf.</i>			גָּלוֹת*	הִגְלוֹת*	גָּלוֹת*	גָּלוֹת*	הִגְלוֹת*		הִתְגַּלוֹת*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>			גָּלָה	הִגְלָה, נִגְלָה	גָּלָה, גָּלָה		הִגְלָה	הִגְלָה*	
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	m.	גָּלָה*	הִגְלָה*	גָּלָה, גָּל*		הִגְלָה*		הִתְגַּלָּה [הִתְגַּלָּה]
		f.	גָּלִי*	הִגְלִי*	גָּלִי*	wanting.	הִגְלִי*	wanting.	הִתְגַּלִּי
	<i>Plur.</i>	m.	גָּלוּ	הִגְלוּ	גָּלוּ		הִגְלוּ		הִתְגַּלוּ
		f.	גָּלְיָהוּ*	[הִגְלְיָהוּ]	[גָּלְיָהוּ]		[הִגְלְיָהוּ]		[הִתְגַּלְיָהוּ]
<i>Impf.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	3. m.	יִגְלֶה*	יִגְלֶה*	יִגְלֶה*	יִגְלֶה*	יִגְלֶה*	יִגְלֶה*	יִתְגַּלֶּה*
		3. f.	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	[תִּתְגַּלֶּה]
		2. m.	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּתְגַּלֶּה
		2. f.	תִּגְלִי*	[תִּגְלִי]	תִּגְלִי*	[תִּגְלִי]	תִּגְלִי*	תִּגְלִי*	תִּתְגַּלִּי*

	1.	אָגְלָה	אָגְלָה, אָגְלָה	אָגְלָה	[אָגְלָה]	אָגְלָה	אָגְלָה*	אָתְגַלְה
	c.							
Plur.	3.	יִגְלוּ	יִגְלוּ	יִגְלוּ	יִגְלוּ	יִגְלוּ	יִגְלוּ	יִתְגַּלוּ
	m.							
	3.	תִּגְלֵי יָנָה*	תִּגְלֵי יָנָה*	[תִּתְגַּלֵּי יָנָה]				
	f.							
	2.	תִּגְלוּ	תִּגְלוּ	תִּגְלוּ	תִּגְלוּ	תִּגְלוּ	תִּגְלוּ	תִּתְגַּלוּ
	m.							
	2.	תִּגְלֵי יָנָה	תִּגְלֵי יָנָה	[תִּתְגַּלֵּי יָנָה]				
	f.							
	1.	נִגְלָה	[נִגְלָה]	נִגְלָה	[נִגְלָה]	נִגְלָה	[נִגְלָה]	נִתְגַּלָּה
	c.							
<i>Shortened. Impf.</i>		יִגַּל*	יִגַּל*	יִגַּל*		יִגַּל*		יִתְגַּל*
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>		יִגְלֵנִי*, יִגְלֵךְ						
<i>Part.</i>	<i>act.</i>	גִּלָּה*	נִגְלָה*	מִגְלָה*		מִגְלָה*		מִתְגַּלָּה*
	<i>pass.</i>	גְּלוּי*			מְגֻלָּה*		מְגֻלָּה*	

*Q. Verbs ל"ה with Suffixes.*

	1. Sing.	2. Sing. m.	2. Sing. f.	3. Sing. m.	3. Sing. f.	1. Plur.	3. Plur. m.
<i>Perf.</i>	נָחַ נִי	נָחַ, נָחַךְ		נָחַ הוּ	נָחָה	נָחַנוּ	נָחֻם
<i>Qal. 3. m.</i>		נָחַךְ					
	<i>P.</i> נָחַ נִי	<i>P.</i> נָחַךְ, נָחַךְ					
3. f.	נָחַ תְּנִי			<i>Pi.</i> כָּל תּוּ	<i>Pi.</i> צָנַתָּה		<i>Hiph.</i> הִנָּחֶם
2. m.	נָחִיתָ נִי	<i>P.</i>		<i>Pi.</i> כָּסִיתוּ	עָשִׂיתָה	<i>Pi.</i> דָּכִיתָנוּ	עָנִיתָם
		<i>Pi.</i>					
2. f.	נָחִיתָ נִי						
1. c.		נָחִיתָ יָךְ	עָנִיתָךְ	עָשִׂיתָ יְהוּ	נָחִיתָ יְהוּ		נָחִיתָם
				נָחִיתָו			
<i>Plur.</i>	נָחֻנוּ וְנִי	נָחֻנוּ	<i>Pi.</i>	נָחֻנוּ וְהוּ	נָחֻנוּ		נָחֻמוּ
3. c.			כָּסִיתָךְ				
1. c.		<i>Pi.</i>		<i>Pi.</i> קִוִּינָה הוּ			
		קִוִּינָה וְךְ					
<i>Imper.</i>	נָחַ נִי					<i>Hiph.</i>	נָחֻמוּ
2. m.						נָחֻנוּ	
	נָחַ נִי						

2. f.	<i>Hiph.</i>	הִרְאָ יָנִי					
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Pi.</i>		תָּל וְהוּ			<i>Hiph.</i>	הִכּוּם
2. m.	כֹּס וְנִי						
<i>Impf.</i>	יִרְאָ נִי	יִפְדֶּךָ		יִרְאָ הוּ	יִרְאָ הָ	<i>Pi.</i>	יִצְנֶנּוּ בּוּ
3. m.		יִחַתֶּךָ		יִלְנֶנּוּ בּוּ	יִרְאָ נָה		יִעֲשֶׂם
3. f.		תִּשְׁכַּבְךָ		<i>Hiph.</i>			
				תִּשְׁקֶה הוּ			
2. m.	תִּרְאָ נִי			תִּעֲשֶׂה בּוּ	תִּעֲשֶׂה הָ	<i>Hiph.</i>	תִּזְכֶּם
						תִּתְעַנּוּ בּוּ	
2. f.							<i>Pi.</i>
1. c.		אִרְאָ הָ	אִעֲדֶךָ	אִרְאָ בּוּ	אִעֲשֶׂה נָה		תִּכְסִּים
		אִעֲנֶךָ		אִעֲנֶה הוּ			אִפְדֶּם
<i>Plur.</i>	יִעֲשֶׂה וְנִי	<i>Pi.</i>	<i>Pi.</i>	יִפְתֶּה וְהוּ	יִעֲשֶׂה וְהָ	<i>Pi.</i>	יִעֲנֶנּוּ בּוּ
3. m.		יִפְתֶּיךָ					
2. m.	תִּצְנֶנּוּ בּוּ						
1. c.				יִשְׁקֶה בּוּ	יִעֲשֶׂה נָה		תִּצְנֶם

<sup>4</sup>Gesenius, F. W. (2003). *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar* (E. Kautzsch & S. A. E. Cowley, Ed.) (2d English ed.) (Page 497). Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.