

STUDIA ORIENTALIA

EDIDIT

SOCIETAS ORIENTALIS FENNICA

REDIGENDA CURAVIT

JUSSI ARO

VOL. XXIX

HELSINKI 1964

STUDIA ORIENTALIA

edita Societas Orientalis Fennica

Helsinki, Snellmanink. 9—11.

Vol. I. (Commentationes in honorem *Knut Tallqvist*.) 396 S. *K. Donner*: Über soghdisch nom »Gesetz« und samojedisch nom »Himmel, Gott«. *H. Ehelolf*: Ein Huldigungsterminus im Hethitischen. *E. Fliñch*: Eine mithrische Inschrift aus Ostia. *C. Gadd*: On Two Babylonian Kings. *E. Gulin*: Die Nachfolge Gottes. *R. Gyllenberg*: Gott, der Vater, im. A. T. und in der Predigt Jesu. *A. Hjelt*: *aven* im AT. *H. Holma*: Die assyrischen Vogelnamen des Omentextes K. 3557. *U. Holmberg*: Der Todesengel. *L. Itkonen*: Edom und Moab in den Psalmen. *P. Jensen*: Der Königsson beim Teufel. *S. Langdon*: Assyriological Comments on Some Difficult Passages. *J. Lindblom*: Altchristliche Kreuzessymbolik. *B. Meissner*: Zu Maqlû III, 170—173. *A. Poebel*: *Sipa(d)* »Hirte« im Sumerischen. *A. Puukko*: Die altassyrischen und hethitischen Gesetze und das AT. *H. Ranke*: Zur »Narmers-Palette. *E. Rein*: Die mythologischen Anspielungen in den Acta disputationis Acacii. *J. Reuter*: Die neuen Lautzeichen im Tocharischen. *A. Saarisalo*: Benjamins Mispa. *G. Schmidt*: Zum Konjugationssystem des Abchasischen. *A. Schott*: Verkappte Satzvergleiche im Akkadischen. *O. Schroeder*: Über einige Keilschrifttexte aus Assur. *E. Setälä*: Ein urindoeuropäisches Wort im Finnisch-ugrischen. *U. Sirelius*: Vogel- und Pferdemonie der karelischen Broderien. *E. Stenij*: Die orientalischen Studien in Finnland. *A. M. Tallgren*: The Copper Idols from Galich. *O. J. Tallgren*: Sur l'Astronomie espagnole d'Alphonse X et son modèle arabe. *E. Weidner*: Ein astrologischer Kommentar aus Uruk. *F. Weissbach*: Zur neubabylonischen Chronologie. *Y. Wichmann*: Tscher. *Id-Bar* »Axt«. — 1925.

Vol. II. 283 S. *A. F. Puukko*: Paulus und das Judentum. *A. Saarisalo*: The Targum to the Book of Ruth. *Knut Tallqvist*: Himmelsgehenden und Winde. Eine semasiologische Studie. *M. Hammarström*: Die komplementären Zeichen des griechischen Alphabets. *O. J. Tallgren*: Survivance arabo-romane du Catalogue d'étoiles de Ptolémée. Études philologiques sur différents manuscrits. I. — 1928.

Vol. III. 157 S. *O. J. Tallgren-Tuulio* et *A. M. Tallgren*, Idrisi. La Finlande et les autres pays baltiques orientaux (*Géographie*, VII 4). — 1930.

Vol. IV. 1. *A. Saarisalo*: Songs of the Druzes. VII + 144 S. — 2. *M. Räsänen*: Chansons populaires turques du nord-est de l'Anatolie. 51 S. — 3. *Knut Tallqvist*: Der Assyrische Gott. 135 S. — 1932.

Vol. V. 1. *A. Saarisalo*: A Waqf-Dokument from Sinai. 24 + 8 S. — 2. *M. Räsänen*: Türkische Sprachproblem aus Mittel-Anatolien. I. Sivas VII. 151 S. — 3. *A. Saarisalo*: New Kirkuk Documents Relating to Slaves. VII + 100 S. — 4. *Knut Tallqvist*, Sumerisch-akkadische Namen der Totenwelt. 47 S. — 1934.

Vol. VI. 1. *M. Räsänen*: Zu dem türkischen Runenschriftentrag in der uigurischen Übersetzung des buddhistischen Sūtra Sākiž Jūkmāk. 3 S. — 2. *M. Räsänen*: Türkische Sprachproben aus Mittel-Anatolien. II. Jozgat VII. 106 S. — 3. *O. J. Tuulio (Tallgren)*: Du nouveau sur Idrisi. X + 242 S. — 1936.

Vol. VII. *Knut Tallqvist*: Akkadische Götterepitheta. Mit einem Götterverzeichnis und einer Liste der prädikativen Elemente der sumerischen Götternamen. XVI + 521 S. — 1938.

Vol. VIII. 1. *William J. Martin*: Tribut und Tributleistungen bei den Assyren. 50 S. (1936). — *M. Räsänen*: Türkische Sprachproblem aus Mittel-Anatolien. III. Ankara, Kaiserli Kirşehir, Çankiri, Afyon VII. 130 S. (1937). — 3. *A. Salonen*: Zum Verständnis des sumerischen Schiffbautextes AO 5673 mit Berücksichtigung des Textes VAT 7035. 23 S. (1938) — 4. *A. Salonen*: Die Wasserfahrzeuge in Babylonien nach sumerisch-akkadischen Quellen (mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der 4. Tafel der Serie H A R - r a = *hubullu*). XVI + 199 S. (1939).

Vol. IX. 1. *H. Holma* & *A. Salonen*: Some Cuneform Tablets from the Time of the Third Ur Dynasty. 60 S. 17 Tafeln (1940). — 2. *O. J. Tuulio*: Ibn Quzmān, poète hispano-arabe bilingue. Édition critique partielle et provisoire. Chansons X, XIX, XX, LXXIX, LXXXIV, LXXXVII, XC, XX + 138 S. (1941). — 3. *K. Huuri*: Zur Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Geschützwesens aus orientalischen Quellen. III + 261 S. (1941).

Vol. X. 1. *E. K. Neuvonen*: Los arabismos del español en el siglo XIII. 332 S. (1941). — 2. *M. Räsänen*: Türkische Sprachproben aus Mittel-Anatolien. IV. Konja VII. 82 S. — (1942).

Vol. XI. 1. *A. Salonen*: Nautica Babylońska. III + 118 S. — 2. *M. Räsänen*: Hochzeitsgebräuche der Mischär-Tataren. 8 S. — 3. *A. Salonen*: Der Abschnitt »Wagen« der 5. Tafel der serie H A R - r a = *hubullu*. 21 S. — 4. *P. Aalto*: Notes on Methods of Decipherment of Unknown Writings and Languages. 26 S. — 5. *E. Linkomies*: Die Syrerinnen im Kaiserpalats Roms. 8 S. — 6. *G. J. Ramstedt*: Das deverbale Nomen auf -i in den altaischen Sprachen. 8 S. — 7. *Y. M. Biese*: Some Notes on the Formation and Use of Nominal Compounds in the Rig-Veda. 14 S. — Veröffentlichungen von Professor *Knut Tallqvist*: 7 S. — 1945.

Vol. XII. *Knut Tallqvist*: Mänen i mynt och dikt, folktrö och kult. VIII + 396 S. 1948.

Vol. XIII. (Commentationes in honorem Harri Holma). 170 S. 1. *M. Räsänen*: Ein Überblick über die ältesten Denkmäler der türkischen Sprachen. 22 S. (1946). — 6. *A. Salonen*: Prozessionswagen der babylonischen Götter. 10 S. (1946). — 3. *E. Beck*: Das christliche Mönchtum im Koran. 29 S. (1946). — 4. *S. Moscatti*: Le califat d'al-Hādī,

- 28 S. (1946). — 5. N. Schneider: Götterschiffe im Ur III-Reich. 13 S. (1946). — 6. A. Deimel: Zur Etymologie der Namen der Körperteile. 16 S. (1946). — 7. G. Schmidt: Lautgeschichtliche Fragen der tschetschenischen Gruppe der kaukasischen Sprachen. 20 S. (1947). 8. A. Saarisalo: Zehn altorientalische Rollsiegel in Helsinki. 8 S. (1947). — 29. J. Suolahti: On the Persian Sources Used by the Byzantine Historian Agathias. 13 S. (1947). — 10. Knut Tallqvist: Sumer. kur.gi. = fi. kurki »Kranich? 11 S. (1947).
- Vol. XIV. (Commentationes in honorem G. J. Ramstedt.) 208 S. 1. M. Räsänen: Regenbogen — Himmelsbrücke. S. 11. (1947). — 2. A. Salonen: Notes on Wagons and Chariots in Ancient Mesopotamia. S. 8. (1950). — 3. E. Haenisch: Grammatische Besonderheiten in der Sprachen des Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an. S. 26. (1950). — 4. G. Schmidt: Achaäische Lehnwortstudien. S. 27. (1950). — 5. A. von Gabain: Ueber Ortsbezeichnungen im Altürkischen. S. 15. (1950). — 6. P. Aalto: Notes on the Altan Gerel. S. 26. (1950). — 7. K. Tallqvist: Zwei christlich-arabische Gebete aus dem Libanon. S. 17. (1950). — 8. N. Poppe: The Groups *uya and *üge in Mongol Languages. S. 15. (1950). — 9. A. Mostaert: Trois passages de l'Histoire secrète des mongols. S. 7. (1950). — 10. P. Jyrhänkallio: Übersicht über die türkischen Völker unserer Zeit. S. 31. (1950). — 11. E. Karahka: Zur Frage nach ursprünglichen Vokallängen im Tschuwassischen. S. 11. (1950). — 12. K.-E. Henriksson: Sprachwissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen von Prof. Dr. G. J. Ramstedt. S. 14. (1950).
- Vol. XV. M. Räsänen: Materialien zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen. 249 S. 1949.
- Vol. XVI. 1. J. Sundwall: Kleinasiatische Nachträge. S. 50. (1950). — 2. M. Seligson: The Meaning of NPŠ MT in the Old Testament. S. 100. (1951). — 3. A. Murtonen: The Appearance of the Name YHWH outside Israel. S. 11. (1951). — 4. P. Siro: Ueber die Symmetrie des sumerischen Satzes. S. 7. (1951). — 5. H. Smith: 'Retractiones rhythmicae S. 37. (1951).
- Vol. XVII. (Commentationes in memoriam saeculari G. A. Wallin) 129 S. 1. H. Holma: Georg August Wallin. 16 S. — 2. A. Salonen: Alle Substrat- und Kulturwörter im Arabischen. 12 S. — 3. A. Saarisalo: Arabic Tradition and Topographical Research. 24 S. — 4. G. Schmidt: Über Aufgaben und Methoden der Kaukasologie. 16 S. — 5. G. J. Ramstedt: Marginal Notes on Pashto Etymology. 14 S. — 6. M. Räsänen: Beiträge zu den türkischen Runeninschriften. 7 S. — 7. P. Aalto: Altaistica. 17 S. — 8. P. Jyrhänkallio: Zur Etymologie von russ. *tolmač* »Dolmetscher und seiner türkischen Quelle. 11 S. — 9. E. K. Neuvonen: La negacion *gatt* en el cancionero de Ibn Quzmān. 12 S.
- Vol. XVIII. 1. A. Murtonen: A Philological and Literary Treatise on the Old Testament Divine Names 'el etc. 105 S. (1952) — 2. T.-E. Eriksson: Die Armenische Büchersammlung der Universitätsbibliothek zu Helsinki. 85 S. (1955). — 3. M. Räsänen: Uralaltaische Wortforschungen. 59 S. (1955) — 4. Rintchen: I. Монгол köjür. Le jeu de cartes mongol. II. A propos du chamanisme mongol. 16 S. (1955) — 5. De novis libris iudicia. 41 S. (1956).
- Vol. XIX. (Commentationes in honorem Martii Räsänen.) 230 S. — 1. A. J. Joki: Wörterverzeichnis der Kyzyl-Sprache. 47 S. — 2. A. Salonen: E₂-ku₂-nu-ku₂ »Das Haus, das Fische nicht frisst. 3 S. — 3. Y. H. Toivonen: Finn. *jantukka*. 7 S. — 4. A. Rudne: Randbemerkungen zu russ. *endosa* 1 S. — 4. W. Heissig: Some Glosses on Recent Mongol Studies. 14 S. — 5. N. Poppe: I. Bemerkungen zu G. J. Ramstedt's Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft. II. Ein altes Kulturwort in den altaischen Sprachen. 25 S. — 6. K. Granbeck: Mongolian in Tibetan Script. 8 S. — 7. H. Smith: Analecta rhythmica. 17 S. — 8. J. Nobel: Über die Bedeutung der tibetischen Versionen für das Verständnis des 'buddhistischen hybriden Sanskrit'. 15 S. — 9. J. Mägiste: Russ. (dial.) und ural **nulh* 8 S. — 10. A. Saarisalo: The Turkish Waqf. 6 S. — 11. J. Aro: Abnormal Plene Writings in Akkadian Texts. 19 S. — 12. P. Aalto: Prolegomena to an Edition of the Paicaraksā. 48 S. — 13. P. Jyrhänkallio: Die sprachwissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichungen von Prof. Dr. Martii Räsänen. 14 S.
- Vol. XX. J. Aro: Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik. 175 S. — 1955.
- Vol. XXI. Martii Räsänen: Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen. 256 S.
- Vol. XXII. Jussi Aro: Glossar zu den mittelbabylonischen Briefen. 123 S. — 1957.
- Vol. XXIII. 1. A. Murtonen: The Living Soul. A Study of the Meaning of the Word *nešəš* in the Old Testament Hebrew Language. 105 S. — 2. Oguz Tansel: Quand il pleut en même temps que le soleil brille. 9 S. — 3. W. R. Mead: G. A. Wallin and the Royal Geographical Society. 10 S. — 4. J. Aro: Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften den Universitätsbibliothek zu Helsinki. 84 S. — 5. De novis libris iudicia. 29 S.
- Vol. XXIV. A. Murtonen: Materials for a Non-masoretic Hebrew Grammar II. An Etymological Vocabulary to the Samaritan Pentateuch. 225 S. — 1960.
- Vol. XXV. 1. Martii Räsänen: Türkische Miscellen. 22 S. — 2. T. Canaan: Vom arabisch-palästinischem Familienleben. 20 S. — 3. C. R. Bawden: Mongolian in Tibetan Script. 17 S. — 3. De novis libris iudicia. 23 S. — 1960.
- Vol. XXVI. Jussi Aro: Die Akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen. 361 S. — 1961.
- Vol. XXVII. 1. Erkki Salonen: Untersuchungen zur Schrift und Sprache des Altbabylonischen von Susa. 175 S. — 2. Pentti Aalto: De novis libris iudicia. 10 S. — 1962.
- Vol. XXVIII. (Commentationes in honorem Martii Räsänen.) 1. A. Saarisalo: Sites and Roads in Asher and Western Judah. 30 S. — 2. Sir Gerard Clauson: Turks and Wolves. 22 S. — 3. N. Poppe: On some Altaic Names of Dwellings. 11 S. — 4. G. Hazai: Contribution à l'histoire des dialectes osmanlis-turcs. 9 S. — 5. A. v. Gabain: Die Schreiber der alt-türkischen Brāhmī-Texte. 11 S. — 6. O. Pritsak: Zum Parallelismus im Alt-türkischen. 8 S. — 7. D. Storer: Yul. 8 S. — 8. K. H. Menges: Etymologica. 32 S. — 9. R. Arat: Bruchstücke eines Gebetsbuches. 16 S. — 10. I. S. Valros: Neskol'ko nazvanij obuvi vstrečajuščih'sja v severnovelikorusskikh govorač. 12 S. — 11. J. Aro: Der *masdar al-mīmā* und seine Funktion im Arabischen. 19 S. — 12. A. J. Joki: Der wandernde Apfel. 19 S. — 13. P. Aalto: Zum Atavakāvadāna. 14 S. — 14. J. Németh: Zu den E-Lauten im Türkischen. 19 S. — 15. R. Holthoer — A. Salonen — H. Zilliacus: Five Grave-Stelae from Sudanese Nubia. 27 S. — 16. Rintchen: Un cachet de bronze avec un caractère inconnu. 4 S. — 17. Die Sprachwissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichungen von Prof. Dr. Martii Räsänen. 5 S. — 18. De novis libris iudicia V. 6 S.

STUDIA ORIENTALIA
EDIDIT SOCIETAS ORIENTALIS FENNICA
XXIX

MATERIALS FOR A NON-MASORETIC
HEBREW GRAMMAR III

A GRAMMAR OF THE SAMARITAN
DIALECT OF HEBREW

BY

A. MURTONEN

HELSINKI 1964

Preface

Completed essentially in the early months of 1961, the publication of this volume was delayed for financial and technical reasons. As can be seen, it is a composite one, the first part, phonology and morphology being purely historical, while the syntactical part, which is also confined to the analysis of sentences, is based on essentially synchronic material, although analyzed employing a basically historical method. The fact that the volume is meant to be material for a historical grammar may justify this; as always, I have tacitly avoided any statements contrary to facts known from the other Hebrew dialects and related languages, and at the time of writing this volume some important problems of the syntax of the single parts of speech were not yet settled in my mind; moreover, if their treatment were included in this volume, the corresponding section of the final grammar would have to consist largely of its repetition. On the other hand, the inclusion of the syntax of sentences was necessary, since it contains the basic series of arguments for my theory of the development of SamH — and largely, common Semitic — verbal system; this is in agreement with the now prevalent view that morphology and syntax belong basically to one and the same structure.

SamH offers a good example of the accommodation of a language no longer in everyday use to the framework of the language which has superseded it. The influence of the latter appears to be totally *negative* in nature: not one single structurally important element has been taken over by the former, but all such elements which are not present in the latter have been discarded. So in phonology, the gutturals have not been reinstated as phonemes, but the alveolar and labial spirants *ʔ*, *ɖ*, and *v* have been replaced by *t*, *d*, and *b/f*,

since those sounds are not present in Samaritan Arabic, and similarly the labial stop *p* by *b*, and recently *q* largely by *'*. In morphology, the radical decrease in the use of internal passive forms may have been due largely to its absence from their Aramaic dialect, in syntax, the re-interpretation of n.vb. to similar reasons; while all the morphological and syntactical structures present in the modern recitation can be traced back to the early Hebrew formations without difficulty. Some rare forms may have been preserved supported by those like them in the Aramaic and Arabic dialects, which thus have partially helped in preserving the ancient character of the dialect; but there are always distinctive characteristics disproving any hypothesis of borrowing. The effective exclusion of all important positive influences from everyday speech may partly have been due to the sacred character of the text, but even so it constitutes a strong argument for the view that structural influences between languages in contact are mainly negative in nature.

My thanks are due to the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation to which this volume is dedicated as a modest expression of my deep gratitude for its help in time of need, and to the University of Melbourne for a grant towards the cost of the publication, and to the Finnish Oriental Society for taking the study in its series of publications, as well as to all the — public and private — libraries and other institutions and private persons which have granted me access to their collections and provided me with information, advice and constructive criticism; it would take far too long to mention all of them by name, but I trust that they will not therefore believe my gratitude to be less sincere.

The Finnish Literary Printing House has performed the actual printing work in its habitual painstaking and careful way.

On the Indian Ocean,
on board s/s Canberra,
23rd December, 1963

A. MURTONEN.

TO THE
ALEXANDER KOHUT
MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

List of Abbreviations

A	= secondary verbal stem formed by means of a prepositive '.
abs.	= (status) absolutus.
act.	= active; (nomen) actionis.
adj.	= adjective.
adv.	= adverb, adverbial(is).
a.e.	= and elsewhere.
af.	= afformal, the affirmative conjugation (commonly called perfect).
aff.	= affix (cf. 169c).
afform.	= affirmative.
Akk.	= Akkadian.
Amor.	= Amoritic.
a.o.	= and others.
App.	= Appendix.
app.	= apposition.
-a-prf.	= prf. (q.v.) provided with an -a-afformative.
Arab.	= Arabic.
Aram.	= Aramaic.
art.	= article.
attr.	= attribute.
augm.	= augment.
BabH	= Hebrew according to the Babylonian punctuation.
B.C.	= before the birth of Christ.
beg.	= (in the) beginning.
B-L, BL	= BAUER, H. & P. LEANDER, Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments I.
BZAW	= Beihefte zur ZAW (q.v.).
C	= consonant.
c.	= cum; (generis) communis.
ca.	= circa.
cap.	= capitulum (chapter).
cf.	= confer.
ch.	= chapter.
cit.	= citatum.

- cj. = conjunction.
 coll. = collective.
 comm. = (generis) communis.
 cons. = consonant.
 consec. = consecutive.
 cop. = copula(tivum).
 cs(tr). = (status) constructus.
 D = secondary verbal stem formed by means of doubling (= geminating) the second radical.
 dd. = dominated (see 58e n. 1).
 dem. = demonstrative, -vum.
 Dillm. = DILLMANN, CHR. FR. A., *Lexicon linguae Aethiopiae* (reprinted 1955).
 dir. = directionis, -onal.
 D ps = the passive form of D (q.v.)
 Dt = Deuteronomy.
 dt. = dominant (see 58e n. 1).
 du. = dual(is).
 ed. = edition.
 Eg. = Egyptian.
 e.g. = for example.
 encl. = enclitic(um).
 Engl. = English.
 esp. = especially.
 etc. = and so forth.
 Eth. = Ethiopic.
 EtS = BARTH, J., *Etymologische Studien*.
 Ex = Exodus.
 Ez = the Book of Ezekiel.
 f(em). = feminine, -num.
 fut. = future.
 FW = foreign word; cf. LW.
 gem. = geminatae.
 gen. = genitive, -vus; generis.
 Gn = Genesis.
 gutt. = guttural(is).
 H = secondary verbal stem formed by means of a prepositive '₂.
 Hbr = Hebrew.
 hN = secondary verbal stem formed by means of a preformative consisting of a prepositive *n* with a prothetic '₂.

- Hos = the Book of Hosea.
- H ps = the passive form of H (q.v.).
- hQ = secondary verbal stem formed by means of a prepositive \dot{h} but inflected like Q (q.v.); the sense reflexive.
- HUCA = Hebrew Union College Annual.
- ib(id). = ibidem.
- i.e. = that is.
- imm. = immediate (method of combination; cf. 170b).
- imp. = imperative, -vum.
- Indo-Eur. = Indo-European.
- interr. = interrogative, -vum.
- intj. = interjection.
- intr. = intransitive.
- itrm. = intermediate (method of combination; cf. 170b).
- JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society.
- Jer = the Book of Jeremiah.
- JPOS = Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.
- JQR = Jewish Quartely Review.
- JRL = John Rylands Library (Manchester).
- juss. = jussive.
- 1 K = the First Book of Kings.
- kt = ktib.
- L = secondary verbal stem formed by means of lengthening the primary stem.
- l. = line.
- Lat. = Latin.
- loc. = locus.
- Lv = Leviticus.
- LW = loan word, a word borrowed from a foreign language or dialect, but adapted to the conditions of this dialect (as opposed to FW, q.v.).
- m(asc). = masculine, -num.
- MGWJ = Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums.
- mQ = defective secondary verbal stem formed by means of a prepositive *m*.
- ms., Ms. = manuscript.
- Ms(s). A(BCD) see 1q.
- MT = (the) Masoretic Text (of the Old Testament).
- N = secondary verbal stem formed by means of a prepositive *n*.
- n. = nomen; note.

n.act.	= nomen actionis.
n.ag.	= nomen agentis.
NB.	= observe!
nD	= secondary verbal stem formed from the stem of D (q.v.) by means of a prepositive <i>n</i> ; or from that of D ps (q.v.) by means of the transformation of the first radical in analogy with N (q.v.).
neg.	= negation, negative.
n.gnt.	= nomen gentis, -ntilicum.
n.l.	= nomen loci.
Nm	= Numbers.
no.	= number.
nomm.	= nomina; cf.n. with the relevant addition.
n.pat.	= nomen patientis.
n.pot.	= nomen potentis.
n.pr.	= nomen proprium, nomen personae.
nQ	= secondary verbal stem formed by means of a prepositive <i>n</i> , but partly sharing the characteristics of Q (ps; q.v.).
NT	= the New Testament.
n.unit.	= nomen unitatis.
obj.	= object.
objv.	= objective.
obs.	= NB. (q.v.).
op.	= opus.
orig.	= original(ly).
p.	= page.
par.	= parallel.
part.	= particle.
pers.	= person(al, -ale).
pl.	= plural(is).
Pr	= the Book of Proverbs.
prdc.	= predicate.
prdv.	= predicative.
prec.	= (the) preceding (one).
preform.	= preformative.
prep.	= preposition.
prf.	= preformal, the preformative conjugation (commonly called imperfect).
pron.	= pronoun, -nomen.
ps	= passive, -va.

- Q = the primary verbal stem called Qal.
 Q ps = the passive of Q.
 q.v. = which see.
 R = secondary verbal stem formed by means of reduplication.
 rad. = radical (consonant).
 redupl. = reduplicated.
 reg. = (nomen) regens.
 rel. = relative.
 rem. = remark.
 resp. = respectively.
 Ryl. = JRL (q.v.).
 Š = secondary verbal stem formed by means of a prepositive š.
 Sam. = Samaritan.
 SamAram = Samaritan Aramaic.
 SamGrm = PETERMANN, J. H., *Brevis linguae Samaritanae grammatica* . . .
 (Porta linguarum Orientalium III).
 SamH = Samaritan Hebrew.
 SArab. = Southern Arabic.
 sbj. = subject.
 SbÖA = Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-
 historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte.
 sc. = namely.
 sepr. = separate.
 sf. = suffix(ed, -um).
 sg. = singular(is).
 SP = the Samaritan Pentateuch.
 spl. = (predicative) supplement.
 sq. = and the following one.
 Št = secondary verbal stem formed by means of prepositive š and *t*
 and a prothetic '₂.
 st. = status.
 subst. = substantive.
 Syr. = Syriac.
 tant. = tantum.
 tD = secondary verbal stem formed of the stem of D (q.v.) by means
 of a prepositive *t* with a prothetic '₂.
 Tg = the Samaritan Pentateuch Targum (ed. J. H. PETERMANN &
 K. VOLLERS).
 TibH = Hebrew according to the Tiberian punctuation.
 tL = secondary verbal stem formed of the stem of L (q.v.) by means
 of a prepositive *t* with a prothetic '₂.

tQ	= secondary verbal stem formed by means of a prepositive <i>t</i> with a prothetic '₂.
tR	= secondary verbal stem formed of the stem of R (q.v.) by means of a prepositive <i>t</i> with a prothetic '₂.
tr.	= transitive.
Ug.	= Ugaritic.
V	= vowel, vocalis.
v.	= verse.
var.	= variant (reading).
vb.	= verb.
viz.	= namely.
vol.	= volume.
vs.	= as against.
w-af.	= af. (q.v.) provided with <i>w</i> consec.
w-prf.	= prf. (q.v.) provided with <i>w</i> consec.
W.-Sem.	= West-Semitic.
ZAW	= Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZDMG	= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
Repeated last letter of an abbreviation indicates plural, e.g., vv. = verses.	

* *

Since it seems that certain reviewers of vol. I do not pay any — or at least any serious — attention to my remark about the relation of my work to TibH (see Preface), my return to the subject once more may be justified. At the same time I may use the opportunity to make a few additional remarks on some details.

I begin with Dr. M. WALLENSTEIN'S review in *Vetus Testamentum* X (1960) p. 234–39. Answer to remark 1: For *me* it is hard to understand how a systematic non-Masoretic grammar could be composed without including material familiar from the Masoretic grammar, since the former does not deviate from the latter at every point. The only way to avoid that would have been constant reference to TibH — the very thing I did my utmost to avoid for reasons stated in the remark referred to above (cf. even vol. II p. 4 n.). As to remark 2, basically the same reasons — i.e., avoidance of foreign influence — prevented me from too daring comparisons with the other non-Masoretic traditions as well; and it seems to me too daring indeed to combine a sign formally identical — at least I am unable to find any difference between the two mentioned perpendicular lines and the bulk of the rest even by means of a magnifying-glass — with a frequently used vowel sign in the punctuation system in which it appears, with a diacritical sign *appearing in another punct-*

uation system in a function in which another — and clearly distinguishable — sign appears in our system. Rather, it is possible that in *šwvj*m the horizontal and vertical lines mean one and the same vowel, being written by different hands (the vertical one is rather thin, as usual, and therefore perhaps not observed by the second hand). On the variants between the two publications of the Psalm fragments see below (p. 13 sqq.). As to the third remark, suffice it to refer to my statement (vol. I p. 20) that »the only purpose of the notes to the translation is to make it comprehensible in detail», and not, e.g., to provide a few early mediaeval piuts with as complete a commentary as possible. Similarly, the purpose of the translation was to make the text intelligible even to those Hebraists who are not experts in the language of the piuts, and at the same time to form the shortest possible argumentation for the use of the word forms in the grammatical sketch. If at the same time it elucidates the contents, the better; in any case that was not my chief purpose, and therefore I considered it best to use the shortest possible way of expression everywhere, though because of that I had to suppress many interesting details, as e.g. the identification of the *Makkir* with Abraham, of which I was very well aware even before ORMANN pointed it out. Because of the prepositional construction *lah*, I considered it better to translate the word. And I do not understand how I »failed to see the parallel of *mšwd* to *wmlmd*»; cannot *learning* be understood as a parallel to *counsel*? (The latter is intended to be understood in *both* nominal *and* verbal senses.) On the other hand, the Syriac meaning of *lmd* I failed to take into account.

The most detailed review I have seen thus far is that by Dr. A. BENDAVID in *Kirjath Sepher* vol. XXXIII (Jerusalem 1958) p. 482—91 (in Hebrew); but unfortunately his view-point suffers so strongly from the influence of TibH that he almost consistently fails to understand my statements correctly. The contents of the book are correctly described apart from the opening statement that »in this book fragments of piuts and a few Psalms are published». True, this seems to correspond to the sub-title of the volume, but from my statement in the beginning of the introduction (p. 20), where such an interpretation is expressly rejected, it should be clear that the sub-title is elliptical.

The main part of the review is devoted to the grammatical sketch; or rather to the grammatical forms of all the Palestinian texts thus far published, accordingly breaking the limits of a normal review. We can take only a few illustrations. P. 483 col. I—II: »(There is) even the *Shwa* (*mobile* only), even if its usual sign is like the sign of *Seghol* . . .»; cf. p. 486 sqq.: the terminology is wholly Tiberian, the names of the Tiberian vowel signs are — according to the Tiberian pattern — used for the vowels themselves (that the names are actually attached to the signs and not to the sounds is irrefutably demonstrated by the great variety of sounds corresponding to each sign in differ-

ent local usages) even in spite of that it is admitted that not always one and the same sign is used as an indication of that — supposedly — one and the same vowel! In other words, we are told that now the sign of *a*, now that of *æ*, now that of *e* etc. is used to express a vowel which according to some authorities is normally pronounced as *a*, according to others as *e*, in certain surroundings additionally as *æ*, or *o* or *i*, but which in spite of that, is in every instance — basically, at least — one and the same vowel! This calls to mind the famous statement that the German *sch*-sound is composed of the *sounds* of *s*, *k*, and *h*; it might perhaps be entitled to a place in the history of linguistics, but hardly as a serious statement in an article in a modern scholarly periodical. But this shows how deeply rooted the traditional way of thinking is in our reviewer: since the shortest varieties of any vowels are included under the same heading of «Shwa» by the classical Jewish grammarians, and in modern linguistics there is no real equivalent to that term, he — not unlike the vast majority of the Hebraists of our own day — mistakes the term for the name of a single vowel, and since — for him — TibH is the only «correct» form of Hebrew, he *must* find a counterpart to that «sound» in the other traditions too; and since in PalH there is no uniform sign for it, he declares that now one, now another sign normally expressing other vowels are used to indicate it! Conjectures of other scholars in the same direction are for him evident certainties which need no argumentation.

P. 485 sec. 2: «. . . *Seghol* is completely distinguished from *Pathach*, and in the confused texts it is even completely intermingled with *Şere* . . . » More than that he does not pay attention to the different *systems* of usage exhibited by the two signs used for — apparently different — *e*-sounds (see my book p. 31 sq.). Note further that *none* of them corresponds even to some extent to the Tiberian distinction between *Seghol* and *Şere*, as he would have us believe (toward the end of the section). He *knows* that the transcriptions of Origen and Jerome (as in p. 484: the pronunciation represented by the Dead Sea Scrolls) form one coherent whole, from which the Babylonian punctuation has *certainly* developed, and were the Palestinian punctuation older than the Tiberian one, it *must* have developed from the Babylonian one; since this seems improbable, the Palestinian punctuation *must* be youngest of all! Would he only reveal the source of his knowledge on these points that are so obscure to us other Hebrew dialectologists!

P. 485 col. II sec. I (gutturals): «. . . that these stops, since their punctuation is scarce, were accordingly not pronounced, just in the way of the Samaritans. This idea was pronounced by KAHLE in his time . . . and now MURTONEN comes and accepts it as a thing in which there is no doubt . . . » while I state in my book, e.g., p. 27 (no. 8): «The material is too limited for an absolute solution of this problem, but from the position of the vowel signs it seems that

the second hand has mostly pronounced the sound represented by this character (= *h*), the first hand mostly not; and similar statements on other gutturals (nos. 1, 5, 16). In the continuation too he is silent about this distinction between the first and second hand (in the ms. *a*), which indeed totally deprives his impressive list of its value; for wherever a vowel sign standing at a guttural is — from the colour of ink — clearly discernible as being written by the first hand, it stands alone — apart from the second hand signs — and mostly upon the middle of the character thus indicating the quiescence of the latter — just as it is with the vowel letters proper (*w*, *j*). There is no need to dwell further on this review.

The statement of the official opponent, Professor ARMAS SALONEN, was published in *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* LXIII (Helsinki 1958) p. 174–78 (in Finnish). He does not object to my avoidance of touching TibH; the following remarks are, accordingly, answers to his objections to some details. As to the composition of the book, its schematic character is due to the fact that it is almost a mere collection of facts (cf. p. 25); therefore I avoided bringing in premature conclusions even indirectly. For an argumentation for the order in which the different word classes were treated see § 3 of this volume. The statement that the script is Syriac square indicates the provenance of the mss. as exactly as I can state it; and from stating their age I refrained deliberately for lack of sufficient data to determine it. The Akkadian *kablu* (for *ḫablu*) apparently is based on a hasty note from GESENIUS-BUHL which remained unchecked. The term «genitive suffix» I avoided mainly since in Hebrew there are no cases; for details cf. 4e of this volume. On l. 5 it appears even after a «finite» form; where is the argumentation for my syntactical weaknesses? The remark on p. 39: I mentioned DRIVER, since his treatment of this problem is most detailed; as to the matter itself, my statement is a mere conjecture, the matter being continually open to many questions (cf., however, § 109 of this volume); but the opponent's statement on the Septuagint-transcriptions is definitely erroneous, as may be evident from the same paragraph (particularly *ll*). On p. 41: I did not intend to enumerate every instance of each type. On p. 49: Where do I state or even suggest that all my statements contain something new? The lack of reference is due to the great familiarity of the statement about the genders. On p. 50: *eban* is indeed an exceptional form (perhaps scribal error, even the sign of *a* being exceptionally thick and long) that I failed to record; the others may be instances of defective vocalization. On p. 52: Where does the opponent place such adjectives as *gāḏol*, *ʿāḡol*, *ʿāmoq*, *ʾāḏom*, etc., if not with the type **qatul*? In my opinion, the gemination of the last radical has more weight as an argument than the present colour of the second vowel, since in genuinely Hebrew nouns of this kind of types the last radical is never geminated after an *a* vowel, while *o* has the tendency to

develop into *a* even outside SamH (cf., e.g., *Qāmæš ḥātuḥ*), and the dorsal consonants likewise prefer *a*. The meaning of the remark on p. 57 I fail to understand. As it should be clearly stated there, I regard the affirmative *-l* as not of uniform origin, and *ʔumlal* as perhaps a n.pat. of L ps deprived of its preformative. On p. 58: What is the «Kraft» expressed by words like *zallim*, *ḥalhālāh*, etc.? I would rather prefer their definition as frequentatives. On p. 61: According to J. G. HAVA, S.J., *Arabic-English Dictionary* (Beirut 1951) p. 695, *lamma* has — a.o. — the following meanings: 1° *Negative particle*. Not yet. But. Only, since, because; cf. HANS WEHR, *Arabisches Wörterbuch: Arabisch-Deutsch* p. 782. By the way, even the suggestion was not mine, but ZULAY'S. The character *m* is disformed in the photograph, as numerous other characters elsewhere. On p. 85: According to GESENIUS-BUHL and KOEHLER, only one tD form of *nbʔ* is inflected as if from *nbV*, while b. ĞANNAH apparently regarded the whole tD as belonging to the latter, which is presupposed even by the noun *nibbuḥ* (for the normal *nibbuʔ* from *nbʔ*). Spelling *muṣṭalḥig* with *ṣ* for *s* is apparently an unconscious adaptation to Hebrew — in a study dealing with Hebrew.

Professor G. R. DRIVER'S notice in *Book List* (1958) p. 59 sq. apparently due to a kind of Homer's slumber contains the erroneous statement that the text and translation with comments are totally Dr. ORMANN'S work; actually, his contribution is confined to the parts upon which his name appears (in the upper edge of every second page), the main preparation of the Hebrew text of QALIR'S qeroba, and what is stated in the Preface.

On Professor S. SEGERT'S review in *Archiv Orientalní* 27 (1959) p. 347 sq. I need only remark that I do not state that the basic present form *qatull* «der hypothetischen protosemitischen genau entspricht»; my words are «almost exactly» (p. 52): «almost» because of that very gemination which is generally held to be secondary.

* * *

The mss. fragments T-S 20/58 and 20/52 of the University Library of Cambridge published by me in vol. I (p. 38—44 of the Hebrew part) were also published at about the same time by Dr. N. ALLONY and Prof. A. DIEZ MACHO in *Estudios Biblicos* vol. XVII: 1, Madrid 1958, p. 90—100. Having become aware of my publication, Dr. ALLONY contacted me asking my co-operation for the examination of the differences between the two publications and their causes. His letter, however, due to some adverse circumstances reached me only several months later, and since I had my hands full with the Samaritan tradition at that time, I felt it would harmfully interfere with that work, if I then took up the fragments once more. Moreover, I considered the whole examination useless without seeing the originals, to which I had

no opportunity at that time. Meanwhile, however, the two scholars had decided to publish a list of variants between the two publications, and it appeared in *Estudios Biblicos* XVIII: 3, Madrid 1959, p. 293—298. As they state p. 293, their edition was based upon photographs of the fragments, and the same photos were also used for this later comparison. My publication, again, was based upon a copy made from the originals themselves, and when preparing the publication itself I also had several photographs at my disposal; and now, preparing this statement, I have examined the originals once more comparing them first with the list of variants published by ALLONY and DIEZ MACHO in 1959, and then with the two publications themselves. I should like to point out that, apart from the normal preference to be given to a publication based upon the originals, in this case the acquaintance with these is the more important, since in the mss. there is a great number of meaningless points which often greatly resemble punctuation marks even in the best photographs, the irrelevance of which can be seen only from the originals, and contrarily, occasionally it is difficult or even impossible to recognize punctuation marks as such in places where the ms. is stained and/or ink faded (the latter is the case particularly often where the signs have been written by the first hand). As to the vocalization and accentuation systems discovered by me in the fragments, I did not find anything in discrepancy with them even where I found myself to have erroneous reading. After these preliminary remarks, I proceed to examine the differences one by one, taking up first those included in the *Lista de variantes* of ALLONY and DIEZ MACHO:

A) T-S 20/58:

Ps xli: v. 5 the two horizontal lines belonging to *h* and *l* in *h²tj lk* are erroneously omitted from my final text. From similar or analogous phenomena appearing even elsewhere in my publication (cf. below) it seems to me that in spite of my diligence in preparing the text, errors due to the fact that the final text had to be fixed at one time, without the necessity of repetition caused by the reading of several proofs, have crept in. However, these mistakes being almost always omissions of entire punctuation marks, they cannot lead to any erroneous conclusions; and even where they may be of another nature, no statement in the grammatical sketch has been based upon them, apart from the fact that they are clearly recognizable as mistakes, being quite anomalous. True, there are even other readings which at the first sight may appear anomalous, but as far as they are really found in the mss., mention of them has been made either in the notes to the text or in the grammatical sketch (in respective connections). v. 6 printing error in ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO. v. 7 the two points above *b²* are not ink. In *jdb^r*, the vertical line above *d* is written by the first hand and rather faded; its upper end is shadowed by a spot which is not ink. In *jš²*, a similar meaningless point is situated below *j*, while the

lower point of the sign for *e* (placed to the right) is quite at the edge of a lengthy fissure of the ms., and apparently not visible in the photograph of ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO. In the 2nd *jdbr*, they themselves now admit that there is no punctuation sign below *b*. v. 8 printing error in ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO. v. 9 in *lqwm* even I have the horizontal line above *l*, and above *w* there are only spots which are not ink. v. 10 also ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO now admit my reading to be correct, in *šlmj*, and in *bḥlj*, the latter horizontal line written *pm* and rather faded may not have been visible in their photograph. Above *qb*, again, the left point of the sign for *o* and the horizontal line following it are quite as well legible as the two other points of the *o* sign; all of them are *pm* and slightly faded, probably also attempted to be destroyed. v. 14 there is a mark resembling a point below *m* of *ʾmn*, but its distance from this character would be unparallelled, if we were to take it for a punctuation mark; moreover, the direction of its slightly longish shape is abnormal (the lower end pointing straight down or rather slightly to the right instead of the normal left); so it might be an unintentional vestige of the scribe's pen.

Ps xlii: v. 5 in *wšpk* I have the text of *pm*, ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO that of *sm*. In *bsk* (*sic*, and not *bsq* as in the «Lista de variantes»), the — normal *pm* — horizontal line is slightly higher than the average, but not unparallelled. v. 7 a second point above the *ʾ* of *ʾlhj* does not exist (perhaps outside the photograph of ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO). At the end of the verse there is no *h* after the word *mšʿr*, but only a colon — representing Sof pasuq — provided with a — not unusual — decoration. v. 10 the points above *ʾ* in *ʾl* are quite on the edge of a fissure (cf. Ps xli 7). v. 11 the points above *bʾmrm* read by me may, after all, be stains rather than faded vowel signs, as those above *hjwm* certainly are. v. 12 *ʾjjj* actually written to fill up the line, as remarked by me. In . . *wdnw*, the point below the first *w* is a stain (certainly not ink).

Ps xliii: v. 1 the point above *ʾ* in *ʾpltnj* is perhaps not ink (perhaps a natural blemish of the vellum). v. 2 the mark above *h* in *ʾthlk* may be intended to mark the correction (cf. my book ad loc.). v. 3 printing error in ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO. v. 4 in *wʾbwʾh* the sign — *pm* — is there, though even I cannot interpret it (an accent?).

Ps xliv: v. 2 *sprw*: there are stains above this word, but unmistakably even the vowel signs read by me. Above *ʿ* of *pʿl*, the horizontal line can be clearly recognized in the original, although it is rather faded. The signs above *pʿl* have been written by me mistakenly even above *pʿlt* (dittography). v. 3 above *gwjm* there are no ink points, only stains. v. 5 my consonantal reading of *jšwʿt* is now admitted correct by ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO; but even the vowel sign is there above *j*, though the points are faint. v. 10 the points above *j* of . . *tjnw* may indeed be stains. v. 17 above *mqwl* the horizontal line above *l* and two points in a horizontal position above *w* are still visible of the signs

written *pm*, and since there is no punctuation mark consisting of two points in a horizontal position above the line in these fragments (except perhaps once or twice in exceptional circumstances), I might be entitled to conclude that there has been still a third one above the middle of the two visible points, forming a sign for *o/u* together with these. The supposed third point has been covered by a larger one written *sm* in addition to another similar one situated above it; together with the horizontal line — which, as normally, is rather short — these two new points are apparently intended to form a new sign for *o/u* and in that way to abolish the independent value of the horizontal line. v. 23 the other point above *k* of *ʿljk* may be unintentional, being in a slightly unnatural position to the other one; both of them, however, are ink. Below *g* of *hrgnw* there is indeed a somewhat oblique line, but being quite unparallelled in these fragments and exceptionally thin, I should attribute it to an occasional wavering of the scribe's hand which — as I state p. 22 of my book — seems to have been rather clumsy. v. 27 the two points below *m* of *qwmh* may indeed be spots.

Ps xlv: v. 2 there are stains above *swpr*, but certainly even the vowel sign for *o/u* above *sw*. v. 11 the two points after *bt* being written *pm* and clearly intended to show that the following *w* begins a new word, I considered it better actually to separate the words in the text and to mention the points in the notes only. v. 18 the two points (= the most usual accent sign) below *š* of *šm* . . . were omitted by me mistakenly from the final text.

Ps xlvi: v. 6 below *j* of *ʿlthjm* there are actually two points, but both clearly unintentional drops of ink; the larger one is attempted to be erased.

B) T-S 20/52:

Ps liii: v. 7 above *mšjwn* there are no ink points, but only other spots; in *jšwʿ* . . . my reading is now admitted correct by ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO.

Ps liv: v. 8 my reading admitted correct by ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO.

Ps lv: v. 1 the sign is there above *ldwd*, although rather faded. v. 6 even I actually read a point above *wt* of *wtksnj* (see p. 35 of my book), though it in the final text came rather to resemble a vertical line; but now I observed from the original that in fact there is no point there, but a hole in the ms. v. 22 below *pjw* there is the most usual accent sign, written *pm*, in a normal position — why should it not be intentional?

Ps lvi: v. 4 my reading admitted correct by ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO. v. 5 *lw* for *lʷ* — even if presumably — not necessarily a scribal error, but *dativus commodi vel incommodi*. v. 14 one of the points below *d* of *mdhj* is certainly ink; but the other one may be a spot.

Ps lvii: v. 9 below *kbwdj* there is no ink point. Below *ʿwrh* following I have again mistakenly omitted the most usual accent sign from the final text.

Ps lviii: v. 1 the single point above *mktm* (mentioned p. 35 of my book) again

mistakenly omitted by me. v. 3 the vertical line above ϵ of $tp^{\epsilon}lwn$ may, after all, be genuine, though it looks like an erasure. v. 5 the sign above l of lm . . is certainly a line, though short (the horizontal line is normally short in these mss., while a point, when slightly line-shaped, is never in a horizontal position). v. 7–8 the mark between l of $ml^{\epsilon}wt$ and j of $jdrk$ is a hole in the ms. (beside it, there is still a spot which is not ink). v. 10 above \dot{s} of $j\dot{s}^{\epsilon}rnw$ there is the normal — circumflex — sign indicating the pronunciation of this letter as s . v. 11 above n of nqm there is no vertical line, but a «Masoretic» sign referring to a correction in the margin (see my note to the text, ad loc.) v. 12 above $\prime thjm$ there is no ink point, but only stains.

Ps lix: v. 1 all the points read by me below $t\dot{s}ht$ $ldvd$ are certainly ink, even if those below h in a slightly unusual position to each other (probably due to the clumsy hand of the scribe). v. 3 the vowel sign above $mp^{\epsilon}lj$ mistakenly omitted by me.

Ps lx: v. 6 as Ps lix 3 (above $n\dot{t}h$).

Ps lxi: v. 8 the sign above mn apparently unintentionally written by me in an earlier copy of the text and introduced unchecked into the final text.

These were the differences between the two publications dealt with by Dr. ALLONY and Prof. DIEZ MACHO in their «Lista de variantes» mentioned in the beginning. However, when comparing the publications I found a few further cases not mentioned by them. For the sake of completeness I shall deal with them briefly here.

A) T-S 20/58:

Ps xlv: v. 7 ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO omit the vertical line appearing after t of $\prime b\dot{t}h$; in the ms., it is clearly recognizable, although rather faded.

Ps xlv: v. 13 ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO supplement $bm[n\dot{h}h$ after the pattern of MT, but in the ms. about one half of the third letter is still preserved, and that seems to be part of a t or r ; h and \dot{h} (and even d) are also possible, but no other; accordingly, my reading $bmtnh$ is to be preferred. v. 18 ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO have printed $\prime zkjrk$ for $\prime zkjrh$; apparently a printing error.

B) T-S 20/52:

Ps lvi: v. 6 ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO read $\prime wph = MT$, instead of $\prime jph$ read by me and the ms. (without any doubt). v. 13 they omit the circumflex sign above \prime of $\prime p$ here indicating the quiescization of \prime (it is somewhat clumsy and faded, but traces of ink are clearly recognizable); at the end of the line they again have $mmnw = MT$ for $mmnj$ of the ms. v. 15 they have . . $mitq$ for . . $mtjq$ (apparently a printing error again). v. 17 they have $wjhzh$ for $wjhwh$ (printing error again). v. 19 they have the Tiberian signs for a and i below p and \dot{s} (resp.) of $np\dot{s}j$ as it indeed seems to be in the ms., but more exactly examined the signs are seen to be conglomerates of unintentional points for

the most part erased (after *j* there is one still). v. 23 they again read *lšdq* = MT for *lšdq* in the ms.

Ps lvi: v. 2 they omit the most usual accent sign below *ḥ* of *lḥm*; true, the points are rather faded, but so are the letters around too. v. 6 they omit the same sign below *d* of *dbṛj*; even here, the points are faded (the black spot is unintentional).

Ps lvii: v. 7 they supplement *btwk[h slh* after MT, although in the ms. there is absolutely no room for such a supplement, nor even a hole or blemish where it could have stood; *h* of *btwkḥ* is clearly visible, and traces of a colon (= Sof p.) can still be discovered after it in the original.

Ps lviii: v. 4 they have *zdw* for *zrw* (= MT); probably a printing error.

Ps lix: v. 4 the scribe has written the last word of the verse, *ḥwh*, below the line, as can be recognized by 1) its unusual position, the characters being written *above* the ruled writing line, and 2) the normal colon indicating the end of a verse after it; ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO, however, have taken the word for that appearing in the following verse, though it is not verse final there, nor can I discover any traces of letters in the other remnants of the edge of the ms., though at least one or two of them are so large that some traces are to be expected, if something ever has been written below the last complete line (apart from the word mentioned).

Ps lx: v. 9 *ḥwd* . . is quite clear in the original; *mw²b* (read by ALLONY-DIEZ MACHO) might be a guess from an unclear photograph.

Ps lxi: v. 4 certainly there is a spot of ink above *ng* . . (as read by me), but perhaps unintentional. v. 8 I have *dr* for *dwr* of the ms. (= MT); *w* might have been dropped by me unobservedly.

* * *

Because of a series of unlucky accidents the time I could use for a re-examination of these fragments was confined to one day. Therefore I was not able to check the fragments T-S 20/53–54 published by me in vol. I (p. 33–38 of the Hebrew part) and by ALLONY and DIEZ MACHO in the periodical *Sefarad* vol. XVIII (1958) p. 254–271. However, we trust that the list above compared with the «Lista de variantes» of ALLONY and DIEZ MACHO will give to the reader enough material for a general orientation for judging the trustworthiness of the publications of these two other fragments as well. As far as I know, ALLONY and DIEZ MACHO have not published any list of variants on these two fragments, either.

On the Indian Ocean, on board s/s Oriana

December 21st, 1960

A. MURTONEN

* * *

While the manuscript of this book was waiting to be printed, Professor Z. BEN-HAYYIM of the Hebrew University at Jerusalem published the 1st part of the 3rd vol. of his *Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans*, sub-titled *Recitation of the Law*. It consists mainly of extensive transcription texts based on the present-day recitation of SP by certain Samaritan priests and other readers. At the end of the English preface (the bulk of the book is in Modern Hebrew, as are the earlier volumes) he records the appearance of my *Etymological Vocabulary to the Samaritan Pentateuch*, stating correctly that my approach to the Samaritan Hebrew dialect is quite different from his own, and therefore refraining from discussing my book in detail. However, I feel that this very reason compels me to discuss at least the most important points in which we are at variance, since otherwise the readers will remain in uncertainty regarding them; still, this is not intended to be a complete review of his book.

The two general remarks B.-H. makes in the preface are perfectly characteristic of his own approach. He states that, while reading final proofs, he re-examined the major points of variance with his informants, finding that *only* the forms published by him were known to them; he then blames my book for lack of references for most of the word forms (which, if I correctly understand, means that I should have written a concordance instead of a vocabulary), which prevented him from making a complete comparison and examination before his book was published (why couldn't he postpone the publication, if he wanted to make such a comparison?). The first remark reveals his attitude to the language he is studying: to him, it is a fixed entity where no variants must occur; apparently, in the course of his study, he has got his informants convinced of that too, which is the more easily done, as the Samaritan readers themselves lay much weight on «correct» reading — and so are induced to deny even the existence of variants, which some of my informants, when listening to the reading of the others (which I had taken on tape) termed grave mistakes and blunders; actually, some of them were real, but phonetically well comprehensible mistakes, while others were historically correct forms, but stamped as false to make room for innovations demanded by some exegetical reasons (see below). In this light even his statement that the phonetic notes published by me in Appendix II to P. KÄHLE's *The Cairo Geniza*² (see note 2, p. 10) suffer from «numerous blunders» is understandable; perhaps to give me an opportunity to save face he supposes that all of them might be misprints. Actually, there are three misprints in the whole appendix: p. 327 lines 5—6 read: dabbā-timma; same page, l. 14: 'æm-mâšal; p. 333 l. 6 from below: ^uō (for: ^wō). All the other «mistakes» are simply phonetic variants occurring in *any* form of spoken language, the recitation of any «dead» language

included. B.-H.'s failure to understand this fact which is of primary importance for any study of phonology is apparent throughout the introduction to his book; e.g., p. 10—11, when dealing with the just mentioned notes he takes the numeral *šābæ^h* and its phonetic variant *šābā^h* as exemplifying a vowel sound which he states to be somewhere between *a* and *æ*, or in any case different from the vowel of the first syllable. As a matter of fact, in this word (as in most others) there is no phonemic difference between the *a* and *æ* sounds, even if the latter in the last syllable is far more common (*a* occurs only when the first vowel of the next word also is *a*, being accordingly due to vocalic attraction; this, however, does not prevent the normal *æ* from appearing even in that position at times); true, it seems that *a* and *æ* have begun to develop into different phonemes, but the development has not advanced far as yet.

The second remark reveals that he has fallen prey to the insistence of the Samaritan readers on «correct» reading, which does *not* — as one might think — mean the correct pronunciation of single sounds or different words and word forms in general, but the «correct» pronunciation of certain «key words» in certain passages, as can be seen still more plainly in n. 2 p. VIII, and in the place the note refers to, p. 27 sq. Actually, in most of these cases the «correct» reading is an innovation demanded by some exegetical reason to replace the historically more original reading, which one often can still hear from the mouth of other readers stamped as «blunderers». It seems indeed that I have omitted to notice some of such variants — as far as my informants, which I did not choose according to their credentials among the Samaritan community, but solely according to my own judgment about their pronunciation, did pronounce them at all —, but for reasons just given I do not think it is great loss for a *linguistic* study.

It is a great pity that B.-H. in this work has not followed the transcription system normally used (also by himself in his earlier publications); deviating from it he has greatly impaired his certainly very painstaking and careful study. I cannot find any need nor justification for his introduction of the symbol *ā* for a phonetic variant of *a*; true, in the pronunciation of *one* of my informants this phoneme normally was slightly coloured in that direction in the neighbourhood of back vowels and certain consonants, but even in that case far from enough to justify the use of the symbol for Tiberian Qāmāṣ (Ḥāṭuf, in present pronunciation). Again, the sound which he transcribes with *a* normally inclines towards *e* so clearly that *æ* would be a far better phonemic symbol for it; in addition, occasionally the more open and sometimes even closer variant of *e* in my notes and recordings correspond to his *a*; it seems that here he has really tried to unite a group of allophones and phonetic variants under one

phonemic symbol, particularly since most of them historically indeed derive from an *a* sound. In some cases, however, the sound has rather recently originated from zero, for which he in some other cases uses the symbol *a*, which is another totally unnecessary one, since it is normally pronounced as plain *e* (a more closed phonetic variant, approximately *i*, sometimes occurs), as he himself admits (p. 21); I suspect that his *unconscious* reason for the use of this symbol is to create some kind of counterpart to the Tiberian Shwa even in SamH. The partial or total amalgamation of *u* and *i* into one phoneme in the Arabic dialect of Damascus, which he adduces as a parallel, is really quite a different phenomenon, since his *a* — apart from a few scattered exceptions, cf. above — always represents the original *i* phoneme in an unstressed closed syllable. Its position also helps to understand its sometimes vague nature: unstressed short vowels are often not very carefully pronounced in any language.

B.-H.'s attempt to prove the phonemic value of certain vowels (p. 22) does not account for the significance of the context at all; and on the next page, he admits that he has not actually been able to make all these distinctions, but has concluded their existence on the ground of some other phenomena! In other words, he makes the facts conform to a scheme which he has built up from quite different elements, and asks us to believe that his construction is reliable, although admitting that it is not in conformity with his own observations!

When reading RITTER-SCHAADE'S phonetic notes *for the first time*, I observed that at the end of words, an *-u* vowel often corresponded to the pron.sf. of 3rd masc.sg. after a sg. form, and an *-o* to the same suffix after a pl. form (in TibH *-o*, *-aw*, respectively), and thought that by that means it was possible to make a distinction between these two forms. However, some inconsistencies remained, and when making my own recordings, I found the exceptions from the mentioned regularity still more frequent. From this I concluded that there might have been such a distinction in the form of the suffix at the time when *o* and *u* were different phonemes in SamH, but the distinction started gradually to be abolished after these two phonemes were amalgamated into one. If B.-H. really has found an informant who makes this distinction regularly (as he states p. 24), well and good; but even that is not enough to split the Samaritan *u/o* into two phonemes again, since the short *u* occurs practically only in this suffix and long *o* is non-existent; and to recognize the noun to which the sf. is attached either as a sg. or pl. the internal vocalization or the context is enough. Moreover, in the light of his other schematizations I suspect that even in this case he has ignored the existing variants or induced his informant(s) to do so; and as regards the distinction of the two sounds in

writing, which he states he has induced one of his informants to do, it is not difficult to distinguish the *long u* and *short o phonetically* from each other, and in the distinction of the *short u* from *o* the consonant text might have served as a guide, since the form of the suffix after the sg. forms is *-w*, after pl., *-jw*.

Even the distinction of an overlong vowel from an ordinary long one arouses suspicions in me. Certainly, I have observed myself that not infrequently the long vowels created after the quiescization of the gutturals are pronounced slightly longer than other long vowels; but in most cases this seemed to be due to the fact that the reader needed a short while to recognize the quiescent letter as such and continue to the next one (in the mss. of SP, the letters are often written with remarkable distances between them), and such a prolongation was far from regular. Moreover, in most cases there is another distinctive characteristic connected with this group of vowels: in the middle of a word, the consonant following is normally geminated, while elsewhere gemination never occurs after a long vowel, and at the end, the vowel bears the word stress, which is the only case of the word stress being placed on the last syllable. Only a number of cases in which the article is involved could raise the claim for phonemicity — were it not that the article in SamH has lost its syntactical significance and become rather an optional thing (see 159 *h*); even the fact that — at least as I hear it from my tape recordings — the prolongation rather infrequently occurs in this particular case might substantially weaken the claim.

Admittedly, it is not easy to distinguish phonemes in the present pronunciation of SamH. The fact that it is never used in actual speech, but only in the recitation of a certain text, which, moreover, is not very extensive, makes it understandable that the written text has a considerable influence on the pronunciation and, consequently, on the phonemic inventory of the dialect. Basically, B.-H.'s unsuccessful attempt to distinguish the phonemes in the present pronunciation may be due to these complications; and it is one of the principal reasons why I did not even make such an attempt, but treated phonology from the historical point of view only.

Still a word concerning B.-H.'s informants. Those on whose reading he has based the present publication are all relatively young men, between 28 to 38 years of age, and living in the State of Israel; of only one of them can he say that there is no influence of Modern Hebrew on his reading — apparently since he has not gone to a Modern Hebrew school, as all the others have done. Even so, however, I am not assured that that is the case, since I have traced Modern Hebrew influence even in the pronunciation of many Nablus readers, although they certainly have not been taught that language in the

school; and certain features could have escaped his attention — e.g., the distinction between the two forms of the sf. of 3. sg.m. (see above), if it really exists, could be due to indirect influence of Modern Hebrew, where such a distinction is made, and even the forms in colloquial speech tend to develop into the same direction.

This may be enough for the present; if B.H. wants to continue discussion, the present writer is ready to go into details.

Melbourne, March 1962

A. MURTONEN

Part one

Phonology

§1. Distinction and classification of phonemes

a 1. In the traditional Hebrew alphabet we have, as is known, twenty-two different signs or *letters*, which most naturally can be supposed to have originally represented as many semantically distinctive groups of sounds or *phonemes*. It is true that the alphabet might not have its origin in the area in which the dialects, out of which the language here called Hebrew later developed, but we may safely suppose that if the alphabet which the ancestors of the people who came to speak that language — or, as we may call them, the Hebrews — received — whether immediately or not — from the inventors of that alphabet, did not correspond to the phonemic inventory of their language, they very soon adapted it to the latter through the omission of unnecessary signs or the creation of a few new ones, or the change of the function of some existing ones — just as did the Ugarites, Greeks, Arabs, or any other people of the world who has borrowed its writing system from other people. It is the only intelligible course to be supposed.

(b) 2. With the passage of time, however, the phonemic inventory of a language can, and often does, change. Positional variants or allophones can develop into independent phonemes, or foreign influence can also cause the splitting of existing phonemes. In these cases the orthography is usually changed either by means of employing another letter which better corresponds to the new sound, or of some kind of modification of the old one. But when it happens that distinctions between old phonemes are abolished, the old

orthography often continues to be employed, so that one phoneme is often historically written by several, different letters; to say nothing of the cases in which the pronunciation of a phoneme changes radically without falling together with another phoneme.

c 3. In the Semitic languages, however, a fundamental difference between consonantal and vocalic phonemes is often said to exist, and even I believed this to be correct while writing the first volume of this series (Vol. I, p. 25). Since then, however, my views have changed, and at present it seems to me that the difference is not between consonants and vowels, but between such phonemes as are necessary to the understanding of the text or also — later on — to some extent facilitate it, and those that do not belong to this category. It is true that these latter consist of vowels only, but this is due to the small part they play in the understanding of the text, and not to their vocalic character, as is evidenced by the fact that among the first group there are vowels as well.

d 4. The classification of individual phonemes we can conveniently begin with the sound represented by the first letter of the traditional alphabet, which we transcribe with the sign '. It belongs to the group of sounds which we call the *gutturals*, with which term we mean the sounds the chief articulation basis of which lies behind the velar region. ' represents the simple glottal stop, which in the present pronunciation of our dialect often serves as a glide between *a* (and the shades of *e* which are nearer to it than to *i*) and some other vowel immediately following. It could thus be defined as the consonantal counterpart of the vowel *a*, which would thus belong to this group. With regard to vowels proper, however, we cannot speak of more than affiliation perhaps. When the Hebrew alphabet was established, it contained three more sounds probably belonging to this group, though we have no means of determining their exact pronunciation any longer. True, in a treatise written toward the end of the eighteenth century (see. Z. BEN-HAYYIM, *Ivrit wa-aramit nusah Šomron II*, p. 329 sqq.) the learned Samaritan IBRAHIM AL-'AYYA gives instructions for their pronunciation, but they are, except rather superficial, obviously influenced by the learned Arabic

tradition and usage of that time; it is impossible to believe that the Samaritans would have pronounced these sounds as in the Arabic of that time *to change* their usage apparently without any reason to the present one during a few decades. In other words, from the treatise mentioned we do not learn more of the pronunciation of those phonemes in the ancient Hebrew than from any other poorly written treatise of the phonetics of Arabic by a poor phonetician. From the pronouncements of JEROME we learn that at his time there were still differences in their pronunciation, but he himself apparently already regards them as vowels. It can be that the sounds were pronounced approximately as they are in most of the Modern Arabic dialects (see, e.g., GAIRDNER), but there is no conclusive evidence for that. In any case, they have a predilection for *a* vowel and usually colour any vowel lower. Having undergone several changes (see below, § 109) they became amalgamated into one phoneme, which is mostly pronounced as ' , but there is an important allophone, which we transcribe by the sign ' , since it best resembles the Arabic pronunciation of the sign corresponding in their alphabet to the sixteenth letter of the Hebrew one. It appears almost exclusively in the beginning of words, mostly corresponding to a written ' before the vowel *a* and the shades of *e* that are nearer to it than to *i*. However, there are exceptions, as e.g. 'â^h, 'ê^h, in which it corresponds to a written ' (followed by an ' ₃), *ā'êd*, where corresponding to the same sequence it is still preceded by the article, 'âror, where it also corresponds to a written ' (followed by *r*), 'âlad, where it represents the article followed by ' , 'âlla, where the article is followed by a written ' ₄, and frequently it represents a written ' ₃ (see the roots beginning with this letter; also e.g. ^u'âfa^f Dt 33: 12). There are great differences between different persons in this respect; if I can rely on DR. GARBELL'S notes in this respect, most of her informants (see vol. II, p. 8) pronounced ' hardly ever, as it seems to have been with PETERMANN too; for had he heard the sound as often as I did, he would surely not have written the note on BARGES (see *Versuch*, p. 3) as it stands now; and if we suppose that he already knew of BARGES'S booklet when recording his texts, we may be

fairly sure that his informant did not pronounce them except as ' . In the texts recorded by SCHAADE (see Appendix II to the second edition of P. KAHLE's *The Cairo Geniza*) ' also does not appear as often as I heard it from my informant in the same texts. Moreover, there are differences in the usage of one and the same informant at different times; it seems that ' is pronounced *more* often when the reading is *less* careful. Not infrequently on such occasions I heard it even in the middle of a long vowel, curiously merged into it, e.g. prf. *jâlli*, *wâel* (root 'LV). In a few cases (regularly followed by a vowel) I heard it even at the end of words. In these two cases it always represented a written ' . This is the case even in the texts recorded by RITTER (see KAHLE, *ibid.*) where, however, it appears at the end of words much more often and usually not immediately followed by a vowel; therefore R. may be right when stating (in a letter to the present writer) that he can have been influenced by the written text. Other allophones are zero, which often interchanges with ' particularly in the beginning of words, and normally appears in closed syllables (often followed by secondary gemination) in their midst, and *h*, the appearance of which is confined to the end of words where it often appears even without any written equivalent (with the exception of a few individual variants; see, e.g., root *q'J*).

e To sum up: it seems that in the period when the traditional Hebrew alphabet first came into use there were four guttural sounds, which are conventionally transcribed as ' , *h*, *h*, and ' , and represented by the first, fifth, eighth, and sixteenth letters of that alphabet. With the passage of time they underwent several changes, becoming amalgamated finally into one phoneme, ' . In recent times, however, an important allophone ' began to emerge, but this might never have phonemic value (in cases where it may seem so, as in 'âreb »sword» against 'âreb »raven», 'êmeq »valley» against 'êmeq »deep» etc. it is very easy to see from the context which meaning is correct). It is possible, however, that ' will develop into an independent phoneme, if opportunity is given.

f Proceeding from gutturals we first find — in our dialect —

the voiceless unaspirated velar *q*, which also, particularly in less careful recitation, tends to lose its identity and become amalgamated with *ʔ*. Even in such cases, however, it is normally more strongly pronounced than a written *ʔ*, which is why in such cases we transcribe it with *q̇*.

g Of the palatals proper, the voiceless aspirated *k* and voiced unaspirated *g* are found. The articulation basis of both of them is very near to each other, so that no voiced *k* or unvoiced *g* in normal recitation exist; when following a voiced sibilant in an environment where voiced elements are even otherwise heavily represented, *k* can be voiced, the result being *g* (cf. *zkr* H), but not necessarily (there is a voiceless variant). Conversely, in some cases *g* can be unvoiced, the result being *k* (cf. SCHAADÉ GN 1: 26: *efdêkêt*; see above *a*), but even that remains occasional (my informant read *-êg-*). The aspiration of *k* is normally light. Neither of them seem ever to have been spirantized, not to speak of syllabization.

h Of the number of sounds formed by means of the alveolus, two separate groups can roughly be formed. One of them is conventionally called *dentals*, since the sounds (or some of them) belonging to it in some languages are formed with the help of the teeth, but in our dialect this is not the case. Of the three stops, *t* and *d* are formed by means of apex against alveolus, the former voiceless and lightly aspirated, the latter voiced and unaspirated; the articulation basis of *d* is also more to the front. *ṭ* is formed otherwise like *t*, but the back of the tongue is raised considerably toward the palate, which also means that a larger area of the surface of the tongue is pressed against the alveolus and prevents aspiration. Often, however, particularly in more rapid (and less careful) recitation, its pronunciation resembles more that of *t*, leading occasionally to complete identification (cf., e.g., root *mVṭ*). Conversely, sometimes *ṭ* appears for *t* without fixed rules (cf. the root *t₃t*), except that after the dorso-alveolar sibilant *š* it is regular (e.g. *šdq tD*). There is no spirant in this group at present, if we do not count *j* among them (cf. below), nor was there any at the time the alphabet was fixed (cf. above *a*), but in the meantime both *t* and *d* seem occasionally at

least, to have been spirantized (cf. BEN-HAYYIM, *op.cit.* I p. 213), and even made syllabic (cf. the roots *dbl*, *dr'*₄, *tkn*, *tfl*, *tš*, and § 109 *kk*). *d* is occasionally unvoiced (*d̥*) particularly at the end of words (see, e.g., root *'₃rd*).

i The other group consists only of spirants, which are more properly called *sibilants*. Of them, *s*, *z*, and *š* have mutual relations analogous to those of the preceding group; *s* is voiceless, *z* voiced, and *š* dorso-alveolar; the main difference from the preceding group is the low groove on the upper side of the tongue through which the breath passes. In addition, there is the so-called sibilant proper *ṣ̌*, in the pronunciation of which the tongue is turned more up and backward, towards the hard palate, and the groove upon it is both broader and deeper. There are traces which seem to indicate that not all of the occurrences of this sound were originally pronounced in one and the same way, so above all its exceptional treatment in the af.) (and n.act.) of the root *'₄šV*, in which the preceding vowel appears to be permanently short, and the sound itself is often followed by that of *j*, a feature which extends to other forms of this root as well; the preservation of the preform. vowel *a* in the root *šn'* is also an indication of something exceptional, and in the root *šV* the secondary *-j* appears too. It might be significant that in all of these roots *ṣ̌* corresponds to a Tib. *š*, but in the light of the fact that all the other roots having the same correspondence behave quite normally in every respect, we might do better not to attach too much significance to it, particularly since the mutual relations of the Semitic sibilants are anything but cleared up yet; cf. the story in Jdg 12: 6, which it is hard to combine with the present usage in SamH. An indication pointing to the actual solution of the question may be the present usage, in which the three voiceless sibilants are not very infrequently interchanged, though this occurs so occasionally and at different times in different roots, that it does not often appear in vol. II; cf., e.g., roots *šrs*, *ns'*₄. Common to all the sibilants is the tendency to change the colour of the preceding (and sometimes following) vowel to a higher one ($a > e$, $e > i$); only that *ṣ̌* does not normally share this characteristic because of its more «emphatic»

pronunciation (cf. below, *u*). *s* and *š* (and *š*? cf. the roots *šb'y*) show signs of syllabization, see the roots *sfr II*, *škm*, *šqs*, etc., and § 109 *q*, *kk*. A sibilant cannot immediately follow an alveolar stop. Sometimes it is secondarily geminated; cf. the roots *mš' II*, *ns'₄*, etc.

k Apart from the two preceding groups, there is still another sound which because of its articulation basis can be called alveolar, but usually because of the appearance of the nasal resonance as the most prominent feature in its pronunciation, is called *nasal* and grouped together with a labial sound which has the same characteristic. It is this very resonance that distinguishes this sound *n* from the voiced apico-alveolar stop, *d*, while the labial nasal *m* is additionally distinguished from the corresponding non-nasal stop *b* (see *l*) through its considerably less intense pronunciation. It is uncertain whether either of them has ever been spirantized, but we have ample evidence of the syllabization of both of them (for *n* see, e.g., roots *nqr*, *nqV*, *nš' I*, *nšr*, and § 109 *q*, *kk*, for *m*, above all, n.ag. [& pat.] of secondary stems). In the early history of the dialect, probably during the Old Canaanite period, *n* was completely assimilated with a consonant immediately following (for the apparent exception in the case of gutturals see below, § 27 *e*). Whether the same was the case at a still earlier period (cf. Akk.), cannot be decided (it may be a question of parallel development). From the latest development we can give one parallel instance in the case of the name of mountain *š'jjar* Dt 3: 9 (kt: *šnr*). The intensity of pronunciation (particularly of *n*) varies and has sometimes led to secondary gemination after the main stress (cf., e.g. roots *jmn*, *kn'₄ I*).

l Having thus dealt with the labial nasal *m* we can conveniently proceed to other *labials*. In the present pronunciation two phonemes appear that can be called labials proper, viz. the bilabial voiced stop *b*, and the labio-dental voiceless spirant *f*. Both of them appear as allophones to each other, *f* for *b* almost exclusively in the prep. *b*, when this immediately precedes a voiceless — and not infrequently, but without fixed rules, even a voiced — consonant; in some cases, notably preceding *g*, another allophone *v* and its unvoiced variant (*b*) also appear in a few cases dominantly (cf. the roots *gb'₃*, *gl II*)

but mostly as individual variants. Another instance of *f* for *b* is in the n.pr. *eftû'el* Gn 22: 22 a.e. All of these instances indicate that at some time *b* in the beginning of words was made not only spirant, but even syllabic, which presupposes a less intense pronunciation than that of to-day, probably strongly resembling that of *w* (see below). Again, *b* — and frequently its unvoiced variant (*b*) — appears for *f* mainly in cases in which a geminated *p* (a sound which does not appear in SamH except in a few individual instances which are obviously due to Modern Hebrew) corresponds to it in MT. This makes it probable that even this phoneme was originally a bilabial stop in this dialect too, but was afterwards spirantized, except in cases where it was geminated. There are also signs of its syllabization in the beginning of words (see the roots *ʃsl*, *ʃr'₃*). Its influence on the neighbouring vowels is similar to that of the sibilants (cf. *i* end).

m There is still one bilabial spirant, but it shares so important characteristic with the alveolar spirant *j* that it is best grouped together with this as semi-vowels, viz. the ability to appear syllabic even in present-day pronunciation, which they alone possess (for one exception see *n*), mainly due to their easy transformation into pure vowels. True, their ability to form diphthongs has been lost almost entirely, except where the semi-vowel appears geminated (for the few exceptions see the roots *ʃjV*, *ʃtV* *I*, *r'š* *I*: all of them are either due to exceptional accentuation or the rapid recitation), which is due to the general transformation of diphthongs into simple (long or short) vowels or into two syllables by means of glides. This means that where they do not appear geminated, they are mostly pronounced as the corresponding vowels, *w* as *u*, and *j* as *i* (often long, cf., e.g., the tQ of the roots beginning with *j*), but in the copula the former often appears even as a real syllabic consonant, closely attached to the following consonant without any vocal element between them. Even so, however, — as might be self-evident — the pronunciation closely resembles that of *u*. On the other hand, there are signs that the pronunciation under certain conditions has been more intense, above all the appearance of an allophone *b* regularly

where the sound has been geminated from the earliest periods (e.g. root *šwV D*), but also elsewhere (e.g. root *w*, regarding which cf. the statement of ELAZAR B. PINHAS B. JOSEPH in BEN-HAYYIM, *op.cit.* I p. 213—15, with note 1 p. 214). When the copula is pronounced as a vowel, it is often, particularly if the preceding word ends with a vowel, preceded by ' or, if the vowel in question is *o* or *u*, omitted; and equally frequently, when it is preceded by a pause — however short — it is hardly perceivable. *w* also appears as a glide — mainly for a quiescent guttural, but also *j* — between two vowels the first of which is *u*, and similarly *j* after *i*; exceptions are very rare (e.g. n.pr. *eftú'el* Gn 22: 22 a.e.) apart from the cases mentioned in vol. II p. 8. The intensity of their pronunciation varies strongly; it is highest normally in the immediate neighbourhood of the main stress, where they often appear geminated, but this secondary gemination is quite as easily given up, partly perhaps because of the preceding unrelated long vowel (cf., e.g., the roots *'wV*, *'₂jV*), but partly without fixable rules, varying according to the vigour of recitation and occasionally to the rhythm; the lowest intensity is found after a consonant, where the sounds normally appear as vowels, except where an unrelated vowel follows, in which case even *b* can occasionally appear for *w* (e.g. *jdV tD*), and in the case of *j* after the copula, where the disappearance of *j* is an exception (e.g. *skr nD*). In the beginning of practically all roots (*w* may be the only genuine exception) *w* has developed into *j*, which originally seems to have been in this position rather infrequently. The preceding vowel tends to assimilate to both of these consonants, to *j* even the following one.

n The phonemes thus far dealt with have the common characteristic that their articulation basis determines them either definitely or in any case to a considerable extent. This is not the case with *r* and *l*, the two phonemes left of those that in our dialect on some real basis can be called consonants. True, in the normal pronunciation of *r* the apex has a trembling motion against the alveolus, but in the neighbourhood of *q* I got the impression that the trembling took place further back, and occasionally apparently additional

motions of the tongue took place, which resulted in the sound strongly resembling that of *l* (so, e.g., in *elzárā^l*, *ezzárā^l* Nm 26: 13). I cannot give any special reason for this phenomenon, apart from that it mostly occurred in passages which were recited in an exceptionally schematic way. As for *l*, its normal pronunciation is like that of the English one, a »thick» variant appearing mostly after the so-called back vowels *a* and *u* (cf., e.g., root *fl*), but even that only occasionally. Once *l* appears syllabic in *ʰšáʹl* Ex 30: 34; signs of earlier syllabization appear at least in the prep. *l*, the root *lšm*, and perhaps *lšV* where, however, contraction seems more probable; for the same phenomenon in *r* see, e.g., roots *rb₄ II*, *rbV I*, *rgl*, *rjV*, etc. The intensity of the pronunciation of both sounds varies considerably, approximately like that of the semi-vowels, being least intense in the beginning of words, which may also explain why the signs of syllabization appear only there (the present-day example of *l* is plainly individual), even if in the middle of words they cannot be easily discovered. In the immediate neighbourhood of the main stress, secondary gemination also appears (cf., e.g., the roots *bl*, *gl I*, *jrq*, *frd*), but in *l*, the contrary phenomenon is likewise attested (e.g., roots *l₃m*, *l₃s*).

o So we have the vowels proper left. It is not easy to determine how many different phonemes we have to distinguish among them. First, taking the matter purely synchronically, there seems to be more than one kind of *e*, inasmuch as that vowel in *zâqen* is lengthened to *ī* in pl., while in the normal type of n.ag. Q it is lengthened into *ē*, in nouns like *ʹâres* into *ā* — in which type it in some other forms is also corresponded by zero —, while in the pl. *gādēllem* it is corresponded by *o* in sg. A special case is the pronoun *zē*, since *ē* does not normally appear at the end of words, but has developed into *ī*. But if we abandon this principle of classification and suppose that different stems are used in each different case, things are not much better, since sounds which in normal usage appear as allophones (e.g. *ʹâ/ʹâ̄*, see *ʹ₃*, *ʹâres/-ēs/-is*, *ʹrs*), in many cases involve a difference in meaning which often cannot be indicated in any other way (see, e.g., *ʹ₄rb IV*; *ʹēgel* Nm 31: 50/ʹēgēl Ex 32: 4; etc.).

This seems to indicate that purely synchronic analysis cannot give us a reliable basis for the distinction of the vocalic phonemes of our dialect.

p If so, where can we find a reliable starting point? First, we must establish that, at present at least, the length of the vowel alone never seems to have a phonemic value. It is always determined by environmental and recitational factors (when the copula is never counted as a pure vowel, cf. above *m*). So we can without hesitation regard short vowels to which long vowels of the same quality correspond in other forms of one and the same word, as belonging to one phoneme with the corresponding long vowel. Vowels having such correspondences we call *simple vowels*. Beginning from the back of the mouth again, we find such an *a* in quite a number of words, e.g. in the verb 'álak (²lk Q af. 3. m.sg), to which 'álašū corresponds in pl.; in the subst. kittánét, to which kittántu corresponds with sf., and kittánot in pl.; or in the adj. rak, to which 'ærráka corresponds in f.; and in numerous other forms of the same kind. The phoneme in question can be called *a*, even if in certain environments it has an allophone *æ* (var. *ä*, *ê*), e.g. 'áħ/'æħ (³), and often in the neighbourhood of (mainly preceding) a sibilant, *j* or *f*. Going to the other end of the mouth, we do not find one single instance of a short *i* or *u* to which a long one would correspond in some other form of the same word — apart from individual variants —, nor even of the same type. Moreover, there are numerous instances in which an *i* preceding a geminated consonant is corresponded by an *e* (or its var.) in positions where the consonant does not appear (e.g. 'æm, c.art. 'áem, sf. 'immak, immu; 'm II; cf. '3n, '2n I, etc.); and in other positions, where the short *i* frequently appears, so to say, protected by a following double consonant (e.g. prf. Q, prep. l preceding n.act., etc.), it is normally represented by some other vowel, when in the corresponding forms a single consonant for some reason appears instead of the double one. The same is the case with the short *u*; even two syllables can in such instances appear in its stead. Thus we have reason to believe that there is no simple *i* phoneme in this dialect, nor *u*. Turning then inside the mouth, we

first establish that no long *o* appears at all, except as an occasional variant, which in some cases (e.g., following an *a* vowel) *can* be influenced by the environment, but even that is anything but certain. Thus we cannot have a simple *o* phoneme, either. With *e*, however, the case is different. We have here quite a number of instances in which a short *e* (or its var.) (normally in sg.m.) corresponds to a long one in other forms of the same word, above all in the most frequent type of n.ag. Q, af., prf., imp., and n.ag. D, and some nominal types (see, e.g., 'l III, '§). It has a variant *é* (or even *i*) in the same environments as *a* has *æ* (, *ä*, *ē*), and *ē*, *æ* (and rarely *a*) in the immediate neighbourhood of *r* and the so-called emphatic sounds *q*, *t*, and — when pronounced normally — *š*, which we propose to call *dorsal*, since the back of the tongue has a more active part in their pronunciation than in the other consonants.

q The phonemes *a* and *e*, then, were the only simple vowels we found. What is to be done with the rest? In the classification of consonants we had the alphabet as a helpful means of tracing the different realization of various phonemes to a common source. As regards vowels, we also have some such guides, even if much younger, and we shall now turn to examine them. In the introduction to vol. II, p. 9, a few vocalized mss. are briefly described and designated as Mss. ABCD; we shall use the same symbols here. To begin with the oldest, Ms. A, we first find there a horizontal line (̄) above certain letters, primarily probably used to call attention to some exceptional feature, such as the reading of a *f* or *w* as *b*, cases in which it seems to have been used consistently (the few omissions are obviously due to inadvertency); and since this normally presupposed the gemination of *f* and *w*, the gemination of certain consonants, mainly of final *m* in pronominal suffixes, verbal affirmatives, and the word *šemma* (§m IV); and since in these cases it can equally well be interpreted as the sign for final *a*, it came to be used in this function even in other cases, particularly in the 2. pers.m.sg.af., which is almost always written without a final quiescent letter; on the other hand, its appearance particularly often in pronominal forms led to its use even with other kinds of

them, first perhaps to those which similarly ended with *-a* (independent 2. m.sg., sf. 3. f.sg.), but then even others (sf. 1. sg., 3. m.sg.). In addition, there are many single cases which I cannot explain, as its use in certain verbal forms (mainly N, but not always) in cases where to-day *e* or *i* is pronounced. Apart from this sign, there are three signs, the function of which is quite clear: a vertical line (|), which obviously indicates *a*, although nowadays *e*, occasionally even *i* or *u* corresponds to it, particularly in the beginning of words, as well as after the prep. *l* and after certain verbal preformatives; a wedge-shaped sign (∧) with its angle mostly to the left, but the position occasionally varying towards a more vertical one (the angle downwards), to denote *e* and *i*; and the Arabic *Damma* (◌◌◌) to denote *o* and *u*. In Ms. B, the horizontal line is used to some extent in the same functions as in Ms. A, but particularly to denote the *a* vowel at the end of words and in connection with geminates, thus having largely same functions as the vertical one. The wedge-shaped sign seems to have split into two, one with the angle to the left and denoting *i* and the closed variety of *e* (*ē*), the other with the angle downwards and denoting mainly *æ* and the other more open varieties of *e*; but their use is not always consistent. However, we always transliterate this sign with *æ* when it appears in this Ms. The vowels *o* and *u* in this Ms. are indicated by means of a similar sign, but with the angle upwards (∨), while still another wedge, with the angle to the right (∩), indicates the gemination of the letter upon which it lies. The horizontal line preserves some of its original character even in the Mss. C and D, but particularly in C it is rather sparsely used, and at the end of words appears normally in an oblique position (·). In D, another oblique stroke of the same position (obviously identical with Arab. *Kasra*, but we transliterate it with *æ* in this Ms.) is used to indicate *e* and *i*, alongside the normal wedge-shaped sign, the sides of which sometimes are more open (∧); in C, the wedge alone appears in this function. *u* and *o* are indicated by *Damma* in both these Mss. Two new signs, apparently combinations of the Arab. *Hamza* with the vertical and horizontal lines respectively (⊥, ⊞) are occasionally used in the beginning of words

in places where ' is now pronounced (but with much less frequency). In the fragment JRL Sam. VII b the oblique stroke serves to indicate any final vowel in verbal forms, its original horizontal form calling attention mainly to the pronunciation of *w* and *f* as *b*, while the vertical line and wedge-shaped sign (with the angle to the left) as well as *Damma* have their usual functions. Ms. C has the most copious vocalization; it can be stated safely that with a superficial knowledge of SamH and its help the fourteenth-century recitation of SP can be ascertained. In Ms. D the vocalization is not much less frequent, and there are passages in Ms. B at about the same level. For additional information about these mss. see Appendix I.

r From the vocalization of these mss. we gather, among other things, that even the Samaritans are at variance whether to divide the different shades of *e* and *i* into two phonemes or not, as well as that the present *e* vowel has developed from different sources even during the last few centuries. The only really significant information in this respect that we get from them is, however, that the prothetic vowel developed before consonants that at some earlier period were made syllabic in the beginning of numerous words, was 6—700 years ago, and probably originally *a*. We can thus define the *e* which (with environmental variants) appears in this position, *historically* as an allophone of *a*. To discover the origin of the other, so to say, allophonic *e*'s we must go farther back. Let us take two adjectives, *zâqen* and *rêkel*, to which *zâqen* and *râkîl* correspond in TibH. The postulated Proto-Semitic forms are **zaqin* and **rakîl*. We thus learn that the *e* of the second syllable of both these adjj. is historically an allophone of *i*. But is there a phonemic difference between the two *i*'s, the short and long one? As we established above (*p* beg.), in present-day pronunciation no such difference exists. But we have reason to believe that earlier such a difference existed; the different treatment of the vowel of the first syllable points to that. It seems that when the length of the second vowel was abandoned, thus making the two forms identical, the difference was preserved by means of the alteration of the colour of the first vowel; the *e* appearing there is thus a historical allophone of *a*. This difference in form

has a correspondence in meaning, too (cf. § 109 *aa*). Still another *e*, which interchanges with *i*, we have in nouns of the type *rêgel*, sf. *riġlu*, pl. I *rêġâlem*, while that of the second syllable has zero and *a* as its counterparts. The supposed Proto-Semitic form in this case being **riġl*, the two *e*'s are allophones of *i* and zero, resp., while the zero in this case has still another allophone, *a*. But there are cases in which *e* appears as an allophone of zero even in pl., see, e.g., roots *drk*, *krm*, and still others in which zero has managed to preserve itself even in pl., e.g. 'šr I, *fšt*. This means of course that the svarabhaktis now appearing as allophones have originated at different times, and in the cases in which this origin has taken place later than normal, or not at all, we might be entitled to speak, in some sense, of a semi-syllabic consonant. The remaining allophonic *e* will be dealt with in the next section.

s As for *u* and *o*, we learn from the mss. that the Samaritans regard them as one phoneme. This is also in the best accordance with data, for in most cases a short *o* corresponds to a long *u* in different inflexional forms of one and the same word (e.g., n.pot/pat. Q, nouns of the types *ġêbol*, *kâbod*, etc.). But exceptions to this rule exist, e.g. in the type of adj. *ġâdol* an *e* vowel corresponds to *o* in the other forms. The supposed Proto-Semitic form here being **ġadul*, we call this *e*, as well as the corresponding *o*, a historical allophone of *u*. The same allophonic *e* may further appear in some forms of af. Q (see, e.g., the root 'llk), where in doubly closed syllables (with occasional exceptions) it corresponds to *a* in others. The explanation may be that in these (as well as some other) forms, *u* preserved itself longer in doubly closed syllables, while in simply closed ones it was made *o*, which then developed further into *a*; for details, as well as reasons, see § 109. Accordingly, the old (whether Proto-Semitic or Old Canaanite) *o* is no longer distinguishable from *a* on the basis of the Samaritan material alone. As regards *u*, it has an allophone *i* in the present pronunciation of the pf. of Q ps and H ps (3. sg.), as evidenced by Ms.B (cf. the root *ngd*). For the cases in which one single vowel has developed into two (plus a glide between them) see below, § 109 *cc-ee*. For a possible case of phonemic *ā* see below, § 5 *b*.

15. These then were the historical phonemes of SamH. How many there are of them depends on the solution of the question whether we should regard certain consonants and vowels as allophones to each other. These would be $a/ʼ$, i/j , and u/w . For as regards $ʼ$, its appearance in the middle (or at the end) of words is so consistently confined to that after a and the shades of e that are near to it, that at present it must be regarded as belonging together with a . The exceptions, in spite of being somewhat more numerous in GARBELL's texts (see vol. II, p. 8), are so rare that they must be regarded as purely occasional, and not even individual (if we do not take PETERMANN's texts into account, where this phenomenon is the rule, but open to serious suspicion because of his method, cf. vol. II, p. 7). In the beginning of words, again, it interchanges with zero so commonly that it must be suspected as having lost its phonemic value even there. On the other hand, the appearance of $ʼ$ speaks against this. It can be recalled, too, that when $ʼ$ appears against the rule above, it corresponds to a written guttural probably not originally a glide. This reminds us of the fact that our phonemes are not syn-, but diachronic, historical, even if drawn from present-day material. This also leads us to divide the existing occurrences of $ʼ$ into two classes: those that have originated as a glide after an a or another vowel resembling it, and those that have not. The former belong to the phoneme a as a consonantal allophone, the others not. The distinction can in most cases be made according to kt: a written $ʼ(-_4)$ normally corresponds to the latter; but not always, e.g. in the word $rē'oš'$ must have become quiescent, and the present one originated as a result of the splitting of the secondary o which bore a double peak accent (cf. § 60 c). The same is the case with u and i , with the former still clearer: there is a syllabic w (the normal pronunciation of the copula) which is not phonetically identical with u ; and where such a w is pronounced as u , we must nevertheless regard it as belonging to the phoneme u , as a historical allophone; and on the other hand, there is a glide w belonging as a consonantal allophone to the phoneme u . Here also, the distinction is mostly easy to make: the allophonic w normally corresponds to a written $ʼ(-_4)$, except

where together with both surrounding vowels it has developed from a long *u* which at some time developed a double peak accent. And with *j* even this exception is practically excluded, for here such a long vowel was united under one accent again and appears now as a long *i* which is accentuated even when occurring in a final syllable (for an exception, cf. § 76 *b*). An allophonic *j*, accordingly, does not normally appear except where an '(-₄) corresponds to that sound in *kt*. Consequently, the phonemic inventory of SamH is as follows:

	Labials	Alveolars	Palatals	Velars	Gutturals
Stops	b	d, t, ʔ	g, k	q	
Spirants	f	z, s, ʃ, š	(š)		
Tremulant		r		(r)	
Lateral		l			
Nasals	m	n			
Semi-vowels	w	j			
Vowels	u	i			
			e		
		o		(zero/svarabhakti)	
				a	

(Where more than one sound belongs to one and the same, doubly defined group, the voiced sound is placed first, then the voiceless, and the dorsal one last. The dotted line indicates that the phonemes below it belong only loosely to the categories mentioned in the upper part of the scheme. It did not seem useful to distinguish voiced and voiceless phonemes in such doubly defined categories where only one phoneme exists, since this difference apparently plays no part in them, and even where that difference actually exists, it only partially determines the voiced phoneme as distinct from the voiceless one, their articulation basis not being identical, either.)

u 6. It would of course be possible to classify the phonemes, at least partly, according to many other principles, but we will choose only one of them, since it alone can really add something to what has been said above; and we will deal with it with regard to the peculiar-

ity in question. It is the distinction of the dorsal group (the alveolars *l* and *ʃ*, and the velar *q*) from the rest. Together with *r* it has the common characteristic of favoring lower vowels in the neighbourhood ($i > e, e > a$), but only when they are pronounced distinctly; in more rapid and careless recitation they lose this characteristic (just as *r*, when it is pronounced weakly), and *ʃ* can then even share the common characteristic of sibilants, which is just contrary to this one: the favouring of higher vowels (see above *i* end); and even *q*, when it is pronounced more like ' , can show amazing vacillation in this respect (cf., e.g., root *ʃ'q*).

§ 2. Rhythm and tone.

a 1. When concerned with a dialect of a language that ceased to be spoken in everyday use perhaps more than twenty centuries ago, and which at present is perpetuated only as the means of recitation of a book that is considered highly sacred, one must keep in mind that such a language contains several features that are far from natural. In SamH, we get some glimpses into these secondary features through the differences of the three existing main types of recitation. Their main difference consists of differences in speed, and we call them, beginning with the slowest one, *solemn*, *normal*, and *rapid recitation*. Of course, speed can, and does, change even within the limits of each of them, particularly of the normal one, but they can nevertheless usually be distinguished without difficulty. In addition, a few passages (such as Ex 15 and Dt 32) are normally *sung*, but regarding rhythm this does not differ essentially from solemn recitation, less still a mixture of both, sometimes used in these and other passages of poetic character, which we call *song-like recitation*.

b 2. The most important feature, common to all kinds of recitation, is the place of the main stress upon the penultimate syllable. Exceptions are only cases in which a guttural has become quiescent after the stressed vowel, and those in which a double peak \bar{i} has become united under a circumflex again; in these cases the stress

mostly lies upon the ultimate¹. At the same time they show that the law of the position of the main stress upon the penultimate had ceased to function before the quiescization of gutturals and the abolition of the double peak accent. During recent decades, however, an increased tendency to place the stress uniformly upon the penultimate again has been apparent (cf., e.g., not only roots rb'_4 , $\$b'_4$ II, a.c., but also nb' , ns'_1 I, sr'_3 , fl' , etc., and § 109 *pp*, and particularly such as tm' , js'_4 , lw'_3 , etc., in which this process is at present taking place). The contrary phenomenon, the shifting of stress to the ultimate, is very rare; I have recorded it only in instances in which the pronominal sf. of 3. sg. f. appears (roots krV , lkd), apart from one case in which it appears twice, both on the penultimate and on the ultimate (lq'_3 Q ps) and may be due to a mistake: the f. affirmative has momentarily been mistaken for sf.; and another (sm'_3), where the erroneous analogy may derive from H; in the first case it must be observed that the fem.sf. after most verbal forms appears stressed (cf. § 4 *g* end), from which it is only a short way to extending the same usage to the remaining exceptions.

c There are two kinds of main stress: one appearing in closed, not overlong syllables, and accordingly being shorter and sharper than the other, which demands a long vowel and often, particularly in long words and sentences, is not easily distinguished from secondary accents. This rises normally rather rapidly, but drops off slowly, not infrequently still leaving upon the following syllable a kind of secondary stress, but since this varies much between different individuals and even in the usage of one and the same informant at different times and in different types of recitation, I have not normally marked it. In addition, there are two kinds of secondary stress which overlap at times: one appearing upon the syllable which in the basic form bears the main stress, e.g. *aggādēlem* Gn 1: 16, and another upon every second syllable backwards from the main stress, e.g. *afšālāmu* Gn 1: 27, *wmījjēlābijjinnæ* Gn 4: 4, and both overlapping

¹ Accordingly, PETERMANN'S practice of placing the stress invariably upon the penultima may be an error of memory.

e.g. in *aṣṣālāmānu* Gn 1: 26. As can be expected, in many cases another main stress appears instead of a secondary one, e.g. *bēbbārā'imme* Gn 2: 4, *miššēnījīmme* Gn 2: 24. But even these two secondary stresses interchange or are lacking so often that in vol. II, I have mostly omitted to record them if they have not been confirmed by another informant.

d In a pause, the stress is often exceptional. First, the speed of recitation normally slows down and its intensity increases, which means that the stress is still more evenly divided between different syllables and the place of the main stress determined by the rhythm alone. Normally I have not paid any attention to this phenomenon in vol. II, since there are always reliable analogies by means of which the proper place of the word accent can be determined even for forms which do not appear except in a pause; moreover, in very many (perhaps most) cases the place of the accent coincides with the normal one even in a pause. There is, however, a notable exception, viz. the nomina gentilica appearing in Nm 26. The enumeration of the Israelite families there is so schematic that an exceptionally fixed rhythm has developed for those passages, and it places the stress almost invariably upon the antepenultimate in the names of the families; therefore I regarded it proper to mark this exceptional pausal stress in them, though I have no doubt that even they would have the normal penultimate stress if appearing outside the pause.

e 3. Such a schematic rhythm has always a tendency to brevity. This again leads to various kinds of contractions wherever possible and fit for rhythm. In consequence of this, mainly the proper names appearing in such sections show an exceptional construction. From the passage mentioned, Nm 26, we can pick some characteristic examples: *iljāb* (< **ēlījāb?*), *lārāddī* (< *lārbāddī*), *elḥūae'* (< **alfūw-wā*), and from a similar passage in Ex 6: *'aezzīl* (< **'aezzī'el*), etc. Therefore it is in no way amazing that even a few common nouns frequently appearing in such passages, have similar exceptional forms in those passages. In the word *tāldat* (root *jld*) this form is the only one, since the word does not appear except in such fixed formulas, perhaps also, since *l* by its nature (see § 1 *n*) was suitable

for this semi-syllabic position resulting from the elision of its vowel. We find another similar case in the root $lšV$, where the word $liššun$ has contracted forms after the prep. l and with sff. in Gn 10: $liššōnu$ (for $*lilliššūnu$); here the inclination of l for syllabization is quite obvious. A third case appears in the root $šf'_3$, where the word $mešfē$ in such passages has the pl. form $mešfūt$ alongside with $mešfā'ot$ elsewhere (e.g. Gn 12: 3); here the contraction was easier, since ' by itself tends to disappear within words. However, since ' is normally able to preserve itself between two unidentical vowels, the regular form appears in passages where the mechanical rhythm is lacking¹. Outside such passages, however, some instances of similar contractions also appear, equally due to recitational rhythm; e.g. $arrámšet$ Gn 1: 21.28 (confirmed by Ms. C), where the form normally appearing without article (cf. § 11 *k*) is substituted for the expected $'arrūmīšat$, which actually appears Lv 11: 46, where the sequel, and accordingly the rhythm, is different. It can be pointed out that here, too, the two consonants following the vowel in the overlong syllable thus created, are capable of syllabization, and accordingly might have lost their vowel under heavy stress: $*'arrámšt$; similar consonants play central roles even in the rest of the instances in which similar or still easier contractions have taken place, (see the roots bqr , $bšr$, gnb , mt'_3 , ($sbt_k?$), ($flgš$, $fldš$), $flš$, fr'_3 , $r'V$).

f 4. Apart from the penultimate main stress, there are other, secondary features common to all kinds of recitation. One of them is that there are no short syllables before the main stress; that is, no short vowels in open syllables are tolerated. Therefore even the one case that could be called an exception, is no real exception, viz. the copula that, as we established above (§ 1 *t*), even when pronounced as u , represents the phoneme w . Other exceptions are both individual and occasional; for the two that appear with some frequency (roots $'_4šV$, zV) see §§ 5 *b*, 37 *c* no. 9. Regarding the one syllable that follows the stress, the same consistency is present, if

¹ Cf. *Kirjath Sepher* vol. XXXIII p. 297 b (Jerusalem 1958); and herewith the objections of BEN-ḤAYYIM (*Lěšonenu* XXII p. 231 n. 18) are refuted.

not greater still: if it is closed, its vowel is invariably short, if open, the vowel is anceps apparently in any word, although in vol. II I have marked as long or short such final vowels of which I have not recorded other examples. The length in them is determined by rhythm. It should be observed, however, that *i* seems to have rather an inclination to appear long, *o* again short; even when not short, it is usually only half-long. A long variety of the anceps *o* tends to become *u*, which is why I have sometimes used the symbol \hat{u} for it.

g 5. The differences between different kinds of recitation are not great. The main difference lies in speed, but as it appears from what is said above, the change of speed does not normally affect the relative lengths of the vowels. To begin with the peculiarities of solemn recitation (including the song-like one, as well as song), some kinds of »binding vowels» between different words appear, where it fits the rhythm better, e.g. Gn 1:1 *Bārāšèl' bārā ēlúuwèm ùt eššāmèm wit' árèš*. The vowel, as here, has normally the colour of *i*, but *e* also sometimes appears, as I once heard in Gn 1:3: *wjâómer' cēlúuwèm . . .* Two other peculiarities of solemn recitation also appear in these examples: secondary stresses appear very often and even in places in which it is neither in the place of the main stress of the basic form of the word, nor two syllables apart from it; and secondly, the absence of '. In fact, in these examples the latter is occasional, but in any case ' is considerably less frequently used in this kind of recitation than in the normal one. One more peculiarity is that the anceps vowels tend to appear long or at least half-long.

h The peculiarities of rapid recitation, as compared with the normal one, are: a remarkable sharpness of the main stress and the almost total absence of secondary stresses; the anceps vowels tend to be short and are never more than half-long; overlong syllables tend to become normally long by means of shortening the vowel (cf. the root 'anq), and two unidentical vowels can be contracted into a diphthong (cf. *r'š D*), while the separating ' disappears; the dorsal consonants tend to weaken the dorsal element or appear as their nondorsal counterparts or variants; and ' tends to appear more often than in normal recitation.

i 6. If, then, we try to induce some conclusions from these data, one thing may be self-evident: the position of the main stress normally upon the penultimate is inherited from the living language, since it must go back before the time of the quiescization of the gutturals, and the latter can hardly have taken place after the dialect ceased to be spoken in everyday use; for if we attribute this phenomenon to the influence of Aramaic, it is very difficult to understand how Aramaic in this one respect could have influenced SamH so deeply, when we do not find any other phenomena in this dialect that with some certainty could be attributed to such an influence, and even such a possibility does not exist, except in a few individual cases. Even the fact that in careful recitation the quiescence of gutturals (except ') has been preserved except for a slight increase in the appearance of ' , in spite of the fact that for some thousand years the Samaritans have spoken Arabic in which gutturals have preserved their full force as their everyday language, strongly suggests that they have consistently done their best to protect the sacred language from outside influence, particularly since the other evidence referred to above clearly points in the same direction. And even if we could attribute the quiescization of gutturals to Aramaic influence, in the case of the penultimate stress that is simply impossible. For, to take only one example, how could we imagine that the accentuation of a form *q'tál* could have altered that of a form **qatál* into *qátal*?! Such coincidences as between Syr. pl. *q'tál* and SamH *qātálū* are so plainly accidental that nothing can ever be built upon them; in the case mentioned it may simply be a question of the prevalence of the sg. over the pl., which has ultimately led to the total identification of the forms; it is not the first nor last example of such a phenomenon; moreover, as kt shows, the development has been rather late. In any case it cannot be used to support the supposition that the present penultimate stress of SamAram would be original and that of SamH secondarily derived from it¹. For, apart from such extremely few coincidences as just mentioned, there is no

¹ As supposed by BEN-HAYYIM (orally, spring 1956).

evidence whatsoever to suggest that in other Aramaic dialects there could ever have been penultimate stress after the omission of final short vowels. And secondly, even in SamAram there are words stressed on the ultimate, viz. the names of letters and some others used in formulas in which archaistic features are often preserved (see PETERMANN, SamGrm cap. I § 6; the last example there, however, is due to the fact that the copula cannot take a stress); it is thus strongly suggested that even in SamAram the stress was originally upon the ultimate syllable. PETERMANN in his suggestion (*loc.cit.*) that Arabic might have caused this shift of accent may be justified to some extent, but I would rather attribute it to the joint influence of both Arabic and SamH. For after SamAram ceased to be their everyday language, and began to be used in prayers only, it soon dropped in importance even below the sacred SamH, and as a language of the divine service was more closely comparable to the latter. And while we cannot speak of any influence of SamAram upon SamH worth mentioning, the influence of the latter upon the former is quite obvious: e.g., in the verbal conjugation we find Hebrew forms side by side with the genuine Aramaic ones in practically every category and stem, occasionally even outnumbering the latter. Similarly, in the nominal declension we find Hebrew affirmatives side by side with the Aramaic ones, and even in pronouns, Hebrew forms (even if, for the most part, rather rarely) appear instead of the latter. And as we know, after the eleventh century SamAram had to give place even as the main liturgical language to that mixture of Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic that we can perhaps call Samaritan Neo-Hebrew, since the Hebrew element in any case is dominant in it¹. So we may consider it proved that the penultimate stress of SamH derives from the living language. Whether this means that the ultimate stress of TibH is due to the influence of Aramaic, and if so, to what an extent, will be dealt with in the final volume.

k As regards other features dealt with, the permanent length of vowels in open syllables before and under stress, even if going

¹ Cf. COWLEY, *The Samaritan Liturgy* II p. xxxiv sq., xli.

through all kinds of recitation (the varr. of rapid recitation in the roots *dbr*, *j'd*, etc. are individual) is obviously secondary, and probably created or in any case finally shaped in synagogal recitation. Thus we see that even the SamH spoken in Palestine on the eve of the final conquest of Aramaic cannot be traced any more in all of its essential factors, even if, as far as individual forms are concerned, in practically every case we are able to trace it far beyond that. That the syllable *following* the main stress, even when closed, has often contained a long vowel, is in many cases self-evident (cf., e.g., § 1 r). These two features together witness that the influence of stress in the shaping of this dialect has been, and is, in many senses decisive; which is no wonder: we need only glance to the English language to find a parallel still more eloquent. Consequently, it must be borne in mind when seeking explanations for different developments in our dialect, that possible alterations of stress may play an important role in them.

l Note. The regularities in phonetic developments (or «phonetic laws»), even if mainly belonging to phonology, will be dealt with in connection with the general survey of the development of this dialect (see § 109), since this will spare us quite a lot of cross-references and will make the presentation easier to digest.

m Note 2. The study of the compatibility of different consonants and groups of consonants is omitted, since the relatively scant nature of the material could easily lead to wrong conclusions. In the morphology, however, it will be taken into account where reason appears (see, e.g., §§ 11 f, 100 g, ff, and 1 i). In the final volume the whole question will be dealt with in detail.

Part two

Morphology

I. GENERAL REMARKS

§ 3. Order of word classes

a In spite of modern re-arrangements of the order of treatment of different word classes, it seems to me best to preserve the traditional order. Firstly, pronouns must in any case be treated first, since parts of them return again and again in the treatment of other classes. Secondly, the verb has so prominent a place in Semitic — or in any case, Hebrew — speech that, considering what follows, it should be given preference before the noun. For — thirdly — as long as the outward form of presentation resembles that of the traditional grammar, there is no reason to remove particles and interjections from their place after the main classes. Interjections, then, are best placed last, they being least numerous, least flexible, and least important. Particles stand nearest to them in all of these respects, and not far from them are numerals, they being singularia or pluralia tantum and often showing syntactical peculiarities; but when inflected, treated as nouns, among which they are normally numbered. This makes it most natural to place numerals apart from other nouns, as a kind of connecting link between them and particles, though they resemble other nouns so much that they cannot be separated from them. And since in the verb there is not the least resemblance to particles — even when a *n.act.* appears as *adv.*, its syntactical treatment is like that of a denominative particle, which means that this use derives from the nominal use of *n.act.* —, it seems best to place the noun immediately before particles, particul-

arly since the resemblance of pronouns to nouns is not very great, either; in the first place, their inflection is quite different, the form of the former changing to much greater extent and not showing the normal inflectional endings of a noun, and secondly, they mostly appear attached to words belonging to other classes, a characteristic that is practically never shared by these other classes. Even their syntactical treatment — in functions common to nouns — does not entitle us to equate them with the latter, since those same functions are often performed by particles, whole clauses, and — in the Semitic languages at least — even by verbal forms.

II. PRONOUNS

§ 4. The personal pronoun.

a 1. It seems best to treat first the earliest traces of this pronoun that we can find, viz. those appearing in the verbal flexion, more exactly in preformal and afformal. In neither of them, the preformatives and affirmatives respectively of the 3rd person bear any resemblance to the corresponding pers. of the separate pronoun, and indeed it seems that they have originated from deictic elements (see § 10 *h*) and nominal endings. So we have 1st and 2nd persons left. In *prf.*, which as the earlier one (see § 10 *f*, *n*) we take first, in the 1st pers.sg. we find an *ʔ*, and in pl. *n*, and in the 2nd pers. everywhere a *t*, every one accompanied by a vowel the colour of which differs in different stems and even inside one and the same stem, according to the neighbouring consonants and the stem vowel, but out of which, it seems (cf. § 109 *i*), *a* may be the primary one everywhere. So we get as the earliest traceable form of the pronoun 1st pers.sg. *ʔa*, pl. *na*, and 2nd pers.comm. *ta*. It is of course possible that these forms are but shortened — and perhaps even otherwise transformed — from early separate forms, but it need not be so, even if the only one form for the 2nd pers. in both numbers may seem strange at the first glance, particularly considering the two forms for the first. But after all it is quite natural. The concept of

*Tavaton me'atav
 pericula delectata
 polidordelium!*

»we» is quite different from that of »I»: »we» is not equivalent to »more than one I» and, consequently, no plural of »I», which makes a different term for »we» both semantically necessary and psychologically understandable. That is not the case with »you» or the 2nd pers. (as we see, the same phenomenon appears in present-day English, though for different reasons): »ye» can be a plural of »thou» (even if also »thou and the others with thee» is possible). The collective perception of the ancient Semites, it seems, made no clear distinction between different numbers even regarding numerous nouns¹; so it is no wonder that we find the same phenomenon in pronouns, the nature of which — as representing potentially any being — is very vague from the first (at least in the 2nd pers.). The only really important thing was to find a suitable designation for the (one(s) addressed; the number and sex was at first felt to be irrelevant.

b In the afformal, we find a picture already more developed. In sg.1., it is true, the present form may not be the original one, whatever the latter may have been (cf. below, § 10 *n*), for it does not seem very likely to the present writer that the Akk.-Eth. *-ku*, either, would represent the original element. From what we found in prf., we would have reason to expect a vocalic element, perhaps accompanied by the gemination of the last radical (as a result of the assimilation of the initial *'*, if this is not secondary; cf. the similar treatment of *'*₂ of certain pronominal suffixes). Such a form (without gemination) seems actually to have been preserved in *'ārēmī* Gn 39: 15, but considering that it would be the only instance — as far as I know — in all Semitic literature, it might be better regarded as an instance of the use of n.act. instead of afformal, the preceding *kī* having preserved its original, deictic nature. Perhaps the *t* stems from the feminine form of the n.ag. which served as the basis for this conjugation? (cf. § 10 *m-n*), though of course the same consonant in the affirmatives of the 2nd pers. helped its preservation (for details see *ib.*). In that case the vowel *-ī* would naturally be identical with the sbj. form of the pronominal suffix of this person (to prevent hasty criticism I may add that in such usage there is nothing more

¹ Cf. A. MURTONEN, *The Living Soul* (Helsinki 1958), p. 32.

strange than in the practice of indicating the genitive relation through juxtaposition of relevant words, a construction that also serves to express some quality of the subject, the word indicating quality normally preceding when the subject is expressed by a pronoun; and this is one of the reasons why I call this form »subject form of the pronominal suffix», and not »genitive suffix»; for additional reasons see below, *e*). As to the pl. form, its consonantal element is the same as in *prf.*, but the vowel is different, \bar{u} ; this may be identical with the common pluralic \bar{u} . The 2nd person has differentiated itself into four forms: in *sg.*, the form found in *prf.* has been appropriated by *masc.*, while *fem.* has the vowel *i* instead of *a*; whence this derives cannot be definitely stated, but perhaps the analogy of the pronominal *fem. ti* (cf. Arab., Eth.) has influenced the matter. In pl., *masc.* has now the form *-tamma/a*, *fem. -ten*. In the light of the fact that in TibH this pl. afform. has the form *-tu-* before suffixes, we may be entitled to regard the present forms as influenced by the corresponding separate forms (cf. below). The origin of the colour of the vowel I do not know, if it is not connected with the pluralic \bar{u} appearing in the 1st person too, (cf. above).

e 2. From the affirmative forms of the personal pronoun we can conveniently pass over to the separate ones. In the 1st and 2nd persons, in which we found the former occurring, the latter seem to be formed from them by means of various additions at the beginning. In the 1st *sg.* this addition seems to go back to **'an-* or **'anak-*, in 1st pl. to **'anah-*, in the second person everywhere to **'an-*. The element **'an-* in the beginning being common to all forms, we may be justified in regarding it as identical in all of them and separating the elements *-ak-* and *-ah-* for a while for separate discussion. The two forms, parts of which these elements are, being otherwise either identical or analogical, and the sounds *k* and *h* not far from one another, it does not seem impossible that these elements were originally identical as well, particularly since it is difficult to find a Semitic pronominal element containing a *h*, apart from this one¹. True, there does not seem to be any certain example of a

cf. Mascat,
 Inbr. § 13.10
 prof. sec.
nahnu!

¹ See, e.g., BARTH, *Pronominalbildung*.

Proto-Semitic *k* becoming *h*, but the number of instances in which *k* has become *h* = *h*, and the latter *h* is so large that no examples need be mentioned. The pronouns belonging to the earliest inventory of the languages, and being very rarely changed for entirely different words, we might be entitled to presume that these two developments in some remote period of the Proto-Semitic dialect or its predecessor, from which no other certain analogical cases have survived, have occurred one after the other, in limited environments. The fact that *k* in the sg. form is preserved presupposes that at least the development *k* > *h* was limited, perhaps to the position before other consonants¹. Taking, then, both these elements as representatives of an original *-ak-, we may identify its *k* with that of various particles in Hebrew, all of which in some way express the idea of «this», «here», as well as of many pronominal forms expressing the same idea in other Semitic languages, while *a* may simply be a means of combining this element to the preceding 'an-. This element, again, appears so consistently as such that there does not seem to be any justification for dividing it further; perhaps it is related to that common element 'n/hn which serves apparently to call attention in interjections, and, through the implication of presence inherent in such usage, acquired the notion of «hence» in adverbial usage. For the stems see under *g*.

d The pronouns of the 3rd person derive from another stem, which in kt is expressed by the consonant '₂. In sg., in the SP¹ even

¹ In Finnish, we have an analogical phenomenon in early loans from Indo-European (Swedish): *makt* > *mahti*, *Victor* > *Viktori* etc. (the *h* of which is more intense than the normal Indo-European or Semitic *h*, even if not quite like *h*), but: *källare* > *kellari*, *kyrka* > *kirkko*, etc.

¹ The lack of this distinction in MT kt seems to me simply to indicate that the dialect upon which it rests, i.e., probably the old Jerusalem dialect, had given up the feminine form early and used masculine alone for both genders; and when fem. made its reappearance with the influx of people from Northern Israel after the permanent occupation of the country by foreign forces, the earlier usage was still perpetuated among the always conservative priestly circles for a considerable time (i.e., until the consonantal text was regarded as unalterable), while in the other, «less sacred» parts even of the Masoretic Bible the Northern Israelite use set in earlier, if not even at the time they were written down.

kt distinguishes a masc., and a fem. form, which are now pronounced 'û, 'î. The stress, particularly in the form with article: 'ā'û, 'ā'î, which is used as a demonstrative (cf. below, § 5 f), shows that the vowel is a result of contraction (see § 2 b), but this resulted not from a bisyllabic prototype, but from an original long vowel terminated by ' , which meanwhile had obtained a double peak accent (see § 109 cc). This shows that the final ' in both forms must go back to the Old Canaanite period (see *ib.*) at least; whence it comes, I cannot say, if it is not the remains of an earlier additional syllable -'a (cf. CHRISTIAN, SbÖA 228: 2 p. 38) from which the final vowel had again dropped early (perhaps at the same time as this occurred in adverbs, see § 102 dd). Originally it would, in such a case, be only a separating element between two vowels that do not form a diphthong; the length of the vowel might derive from a still earlier period (cf. Akk.). That the latter cannot be original either, is equally shown by Akkadian casus obliqui and pl., where in SamH we find the forms 'imma, f. 'inna. It may well be that the u vowel appearing in masc.sg. originally served as the stem vowel in masc.pl. too (cf. Akk., again, where it cannot be a result of assimilation), but a detailed discussion must be left to the final volume. As to the second consonant, a comparison with the other Semitic languages shows that the original consonants are preserved here; thus, n in the Akk. masculine is due to the influence of fem., while in Eth., masc. has prevailed in this respect. As for the gemination of this consonant, it derives from the Old Canaanite period (cf. § 109 u). The provenience of the second syllable as a whole can here only be conjectured; assuming that the pl. forms were originally collective, the supposition that they were formed by means of the indefinite ma (the vowel anceps) seems most plausible; in fem., the consonant was transformed into the n homogeneous with i (cf. § 1 k, m); the existence of a collective-pluralic n seems to me very questionable.

e 3. The forms used as suffixes, i.e., attached — with few exceptions, on which see § 101 — to certain nominal forms to indicate the possessor or other subject of the thing expressed by the main word, or to certain verbal forms to indicate the object of the action expressed by the verb, remain. They have not been left to last

Kummallista!
 Teliyan kolo
 huomo on hom-
 Synop verbin;
 genitivisuffix
 substantivociss
 oval horelle sim
 aoz!

because they are the youngest of all; on the contrary, it is probable that at least most of them in their present shape are older than the present separate forms, some perhaps going back to forms that were concurrent with those used to form the affirmative conjugation, at the time when both were used even separately. How they became to be used as suffixes will be described in the final volume in detail; but even now some outlines must be drawn to make intelligible what follows. The starting-point may have been in the attachment of the preformatives to the primitive nouns of action, and of the affirmatives to the primitive nouns of agent, to form what has now developed into the present preformal and afformal; the pronominal elements represent in both cases the subject. From this, it is only one step to attaching such elements even to other nouns to indicate subject, by which term at this time, when special forms for expressing passive had not yet developed, the most important being — in the broadest sense of the word — in the relevant connection is meant.

For connections indicating state, the most important being is that which governs situation, accordingly for a connection that we are used to calling genitive construction, the so-called *nomen rectum*. When attached to nouns indicating action — above all, the verbal n.act. —, the pronoun was apt to indicate the object of the action as well as its subject, according to the situation, a usage which is still reflected in the construction of n.act., since the object of the action can very well be more prominent than its subject, particularly if the latter is not mentioned at all. On the other hand, after the preformative and affirmative conjugations were established, they contained at least the idea of the subject in themselves, and new pronominal elements were attached to them to denote the object of action, when opportunity was given. Thus, both these functions derive ultimately from one and the same source, and this, besides the fact that neither a genitive nor an accusative case exists in Hbr. (cf. syntax), is why we do not call these pronouns genitive, accusative suffix, respectively, but the *subject* and *object form of the pronominal suffix* where a difference exists between the two forms.

f In the 1st pers.sg. there is such a difference. The subj. form is

subject form
 hyon hāmān
 fēmi!

at present *-ī*, the obj. one, when attached to a form ending with a vowel, *-nī*, when to one ending with a consonant, *-ānī* or *-innī*. Examples: *lēmmī* (*l_{3m}*), *lēqā'ī* (*lq₃*), *fijjī* (*fV*), *'inī* (even pl.) (*'_{4Vn}*), *jālīdī* (pl.) (*jld*); *zābādānī* (*zbd*), *wāzgirānī* (*zkr H*), *kā'ēsūnī* (*k_{4s D}*), *jārāgānī*, *'ālārāgānī* (*'_{2rg}*), *jēmūšinnī* (*mš*), *jizbālīnī* (*zbl*). The sbj. form seems to be a very old element originally perhaps deictic: »here»; from where the *n* of the obj. form comes, can again only be conjectured. It is in any case impossible to identify the latter with the shorter separate form as a whole, even if we suppose the initial *'* of the latter to be secondary, for in such a case the var. *-innī* would be quite anomalous and even the presupposed disappearance of *'a* without any traces after a long *u* against everything we know of its behaviour in such a connection (cf. § 57 *a*). However, it seems possible that the separate form has had some influence on its formation, for the most plausible solution — even that, indeed, only conjectural — of its origin may be that at first the additional *n* was employed to fill a hiatus between the suffix proper and the final vowel of the verb form. This can be supposed to have taken place at a period when final vowels began to spread into most verbal forms (cf. § 109 *g*); and once the *n* became established in the obj. form thus created, the analogy of the separate form influenced the development further, resulting in the prevalence of the *a* vowel before *n*; the form *-anī* thus fixed, then became attached to the last consonant of the verbal forms directly, if there was not a long vowel after it in the relevant form. Meanwhile, however, and probably under the influence of the »energetic» form of the 3rd pers. (see § 57 *b*), a concurrent form of *-innī* had developed; its existence continued, presumably due to the same analogy with the 3rd pers. However, the Old Akk. *-anni* shows that the development *can* have been quite different.

g In the other persons both forms are essentially identical; if we do not consider the vowel combining it with the final consonant of the main word. Since this vowel, even when it does not properly belong to the main word, in any case cannot be regarded as a part of the suffix, we do not take it into account here except when it has become inseparably amalgamated with the suffix, as was the case

above. In the 1st pers.pl., then, the suffix is identical with the affirmative form, *-nū*; cf. above *b*. But in the 2nd person we have everywhere a consonant quite different from that in both pre- and afformal and the separate form, *k*. Now, it is very well known that in the speech of children *t* often appears instead of *k*, since the latter is more difficult to pronounce, and we also know that in the development of languages the trend is toward easier forms more often than into the opposite direction. Further, some phenomena in both Semitic and Hamitic languages (cf. Eth., Eg., Hausa) suggest that *k* was earlier more general in this person than it is now. And finally, pronouns are words used even by relatively young children — even if not the youngest — rather frequently. Therefore it does not seem impossible to me that the original consonant in this person was *k*, which was first made *t* in children's speech but gained ground rapidly and ultimately made *k* nearly obsolete; on the other hand, nothing may prevent us from even supposing that both forms existed as variants from the earliest times. Both are only conjectures. In any case, the obsolescence of *k* may be regarded as a fact, and its preservation in the pron.sf. of this person may mainly be due to the fact that it made distinction between it and the affirmative forms easier than some modifications of vocalization would have done. As regards vocalization, the sg. forms of the 2nd pers. at present normally lack it, but their different »binding» vowel, which combines them with the main word, points to a former vocalization of a different kind in different genders, which can be induced from the related languages and four passages in MT (cf. B-L § 29 *j*) as well. On the basis of the prominence of *a* as the vowel of combination (cf. §§ 57, 100) it seems to me that it originated, after all, even in Hbr from the old inflexional vowels; the fact that accusative tends to become the normal case when the old case system disintegrates is so widespread that no further argumentation for that is needed. In special cases, however, even nom. and gen. can win; here it seems that gen. won in fem. partly supported by the *i* vowel in the old form of the sf., which still appears in the interjection-like *mālikī* Gn 21: 17 (cf. § 8 *b*); partly because of the tendency to preserve the distinction

between masc. and fem. even after the dropping of final short vowels. This also implies that the final vowels in sg. had become short before the end of the Old Canaanite period in the ancestor of our dialect ¹. The present forms (with the vowels of combination) are m. *-(a)k*, f. *-(e)k*. In pl., the development would seem rather strange, had we not parallels in the separate forms. On the basis of Akk. we might postulate *u* as the Proto-Semitic vowel for masc., *i* for fem., and supposing the indefinite *-ma* (see *d* end) as the end of the forms, we would get *-ku-ma* and *-ki(-ma >)-na* (see *ib.*) as the prototypes for suffixes, and accordingly *'an-tu-ma*, *'an-ti-na* for separate forms. The final vowel was anceps. The subsequent development can again only be conjectured. It might first have happened that the vowel of the masc. stem was assimilated to that of the fem., which brought about the fact that it was no longer homogeneous with the following cons. and, accordingly, less easy to pronounce. This brought with it an intensification of the pronunciation of that vowel, which led to the gemination of the following consonant and apparently even to some prolongation of the final vowel, enabling it to preserve itself during the periods of the heavy accent (see § 109 *u*, *kk*, etc.) ². In fem., in our dialect apparently no gemination (would-be analogical to masc.) nor prolongation took place, and consequently the final vowel was lost; its preservation in some cases in MT (mainly Ez) is a parallel to that of the sf. 2. f.sg. (see above), which is normally not preserved in SP, either; different cases are the affirmative and separate forms of 2. f.sg., in which the final vowel is preserved in SP: *-ti*, *'etti*, but not in MT. As to the 2. sg.m., things are different: the final vowel is preserved in the separate form practically everywhere, except 8 passages (of which 5 only *kt*) in MT (see B-L § 28 *e*), which are so dispersedly distributed that it is difficult to attribute them to any Old Hbr dialect, if not to that apparently Northern Israelite one which even otherwise might have influenced the Je-

¹ We must of course suppose that in the Old Canaanite there were many dialects, as is evident even from what follows.

² Cf. Arab., where the development was just the contrary.

rusalem dialect in the latter part of the Old Testament period and is prominent in the Mishna. In that case it could be identified with the one that had preserved the final vowel of the sf. 2. sg.f. (cf. *ib.*), but even that is only a second-rate conjecture. To return to somewhat firmer ground, the final vowel was preserved in the affirmative form in SamH and the dialect underlying MT qre, while MT kt (= probably the old Jerusalem dialect) presupposes its elision. In sf., the isoglosses are different, again: SamH and MT kt have elided the final *-a*, while MT qre has it. In both cases MT kt has a few exceptions with the final vowel, of which even SP seems to share one: the form *bāka* (see root *bV'*) appearing four times in SP (Gn 10: 19.30 13: 10 25: 18), which seems to be corroborated even by some Tg mss (*m'lj*). It must be observed, however, that the Samaritans in every passage conceive it as a part of a place name, accordingly a foreign word; and *'jk'*₂ in Gn 3: 9 (partly *'jk*) is interpreted as a simple adverb. The sf. forms of the 3rd person do not cause difficulties: the sg.m. is identical with the separate form, apart from the final *'*, which is lacking; this might mean that it is secondary (cf. above *d*). Sg.f. normally bears the accent (for exceptions see § 2 *b*: *-ā*) and must accordingly go back to *-ā-hā*; *-hā* might be a parallel form to *hū'* deriving from older times. The pl. forms are identical with the separate ones (see *d*). The «energetic» forms belong properly to verbal flexion and are therefore treated there (§ 57 *b*).

h Note. The contention of the Samaritan ABU SA'ID (see BEN-HAYYIM, *op.cit.* I p. 141—3), that the sf. 2. pl.m. should be pronounced with the «small fatha», i.e., probably *æ/e* (since the same name is used of the sound of the Babylonian sign *𐤅*, with which this suffix is provided in the Babylonian system, see *ib.* p. 141 l. 10—11), while the pronunciation *-kīmma* would be corrupted, has no support elsewhere, as far as I can see, and is probably due to the distinct vocalization of this person in sg. in Arabic, to which he points as a parallel, perhaps also to his general tendency to substitute an *e* for *i* before geminates (see his fifth rule, *op.cit.* p. 149—51), although his argumentation there is different; even the vowel *preceding* the sg.sf. in SamH, it being identical with the sf. vowel in Arab., might

have had its influence on this artificial distinction. His statement that the »Sha'mians» (i.e., Tiberian school) pronounce this sf. with a »light great fatha» is somewhat strange. True, the term »light» could perhaps refer to the ungeminated state of the following *m*, since even elsewhere it is frequently used of the lack of gemination, but the »great fatha» means elsewhere *a*. There is still the possibility that the terms »small» and »great» in this passage are used to designate the quantity of the vowel, »light» meaning a more forward articulation basis = *e*, but this would be unique in this treatise at least, even if not quite impossible in his time (13th century, see BEN-HAYYIM, *op.cit.* I p. TS sq.), when the Jewish grammarians had also distinguished between certain short and long vowels. But the supposition that our author has here simply confused the 2nd pers. with the 3rd is far more in accordance with the normal use of these terms.

§. 5. Demonstrative pronouns

a 1. Since the question was once raised in the presence of the present writer, as to whether it is proper to call the demonstrative element of a language a *pronoun*, or whether *adjective* would not be a more fitting term, we first state the fact that at least as regards Hebrew *pronoun* seems to correspond better to the actual usage. E.g., in Gn 5: 1.29 it is used in a way to which it might be hard to find a parallel among adjectives which are used as substantives.

b 2. The demonstrative pronouns for the nearer object are derived from two different roots. The pronoun used for sg. has apparently a stem of only one radical, *z*, to which an *a* vowel follows. Whether it was originally a pure *a* or its more forward variant, *ä* (= *e*), cannot be definitely stated. The fact that in TibH it is represented by Segol, to which in our dialect an *ē* (var. *ē*) corresponds, points rather to the latter, but we have no means of demonstrating the existence of a positional variant *ä* for *a* even for the Old Canaanite period (cf. § 10 *g*), less still for earlier times, which is what our case would demand, the vowel standing in an open syllable. So we put

za* (zä*?) as the primary form for masc. The vowel was probably aneeps. When preceded by the definite article, its vowel is practically always short, and even the consonant usually lacking gemination, probably because it is very lightly stressed.

c The feminine goes back to a stem with ' after the vowel. This may be an old variant of the one appearing in masc., perhaps from a Proto-Semitic dialect; at least we have no certain indications of an aneeps (or long) *a* becoming *a'* at a later period, and the opposite development is made improbable even by the related languages in this case. The feminine *-t* (or *-ti*?) was appended, the result being **za'tu*. When the case vowels were dropped, in the ancestor of our dialect ' lost its consonantal value, the result being **zāt* and, with the development $\acute{a} > \acute{o}$ still operating, **zōt*. In this shape it remained until the development of the double peak accent in overlong syllables, when it developed over **zōot* into **zō'ot* and then, with the dissimilation of the first vowel, into the present *zē'ot* (cf. § 60 *c*).

d This stem appears apocopated in the form 'állaz occurring twice (Gn 24: 65 37:19) in SP. Its construction resembles that of the Arab. 'alladī very closely, though the function is different. (Even functions can very well be derived from a common source.) The middle element may be identical even etymologically, but how far the first element is, I hesitate to decide. In their present shape both of them seem to contain definite articles, which are not etymologically identical (see the next paragraph), but if our supposition of the origin of the Arab. article (see *ib.*) is correct, the Arab. compound can later have been adjusted to conform to the final article form. So we put **ha-la-z(a/i)* as the primary form of this compound; its function is slightly different from that of the preceding pronoun, but in any case we may be justified when placing it among the pronouns denoting the nearer object. To the apocopation of the final vowel cf. the same tendency in the simple form with art. (above, *b*).

e The pronoun used for pl. (common to both genders) seems originally to have been a collective from a root 'l, which ultimately might be connected with the demonstrative *l* constituting the middle

element of the compound just mentioned. The present normal form is *'illa*, which is also the oldest we can trace with any certainty. No variants — except phonetic — appear in SP.

f 3. For the farther object, the forms used are identical with the separate forms of the third person of the personal pronoun, q.v.

§ 6. The definite article

a Though not a pronoun in the proper sense of the word, the article may best be treated here because of its primarily demonstrative — or deictic — character. In our days its phonetic form normally consists of ' followed by an *a* or *e* vowel, which in turn is followed by the gemination of the following consonant, if this has not grown quiescent, in which case the vowel is lengthened and has invariably an *a* colour. In such a case also this vowel normally swallows the vowel following the quiescent consonant, if the latter is short and has developed from an earlier *a* (occasionally even in other cases, cf., e.g., root *'₃br* I). The inclination of a word-initial *a* to become *e* (cf. § 1 r) and *kt* considered, it seems that the primary form of the article would have been **ha* + an assimilatory consonant, which in Hbr in the first place could have been *n*. It is, however, possible that even *l* earlier had a similar characteristic to a larger extent than now, and it has even quite recently¹ been supposed that the primary form of the Hebrew article may have been identical with the Arab. one. This, however, does not seem very probable. In the first place, considering the relatively large number of various demonstrative and deictic elements, it is not necessary to suppose that a quite identical combination of them would have, independently from one another, obtained identical functions in these two languages, while the Aramaic dialects, which are much more closely related to Hbr, do not show the same development. And secondly, in SamH there is a phenomenon which definitely shows that the present gemination of the consonant following article is secondary: as already mentioned

Ugaritic hnd?

¹ V. CHRISTIAN, *op.cit.* p. 48.

above (§ 1 *l*), the Proto-Semitic *p* appears in our dialect as *b* always when it was geminated at the time of the final quiescization of gutturals and spirantization of the labial and alveolar stops. A glance at the vocabulary, letter *f*, suffices to show that this sound almost without exception appears as *ff* after the article at the beginning of nouns. There are only two exceptions: the word *far*, c.art. *ēb̄bar*, in which the article bears the accent, which might have already caused the secondary gemination of the first rad. at an earlier period; in any case there should be nothing to prevent us from supposing that the gemination at some earlier period was secondary, since in the majority of cases it is demonstrably so. The gemination appearing in a part of the longer forms of this word is apparently analogically transferred to them from this basic one. The other exception, in the roots *f₄m* and *f₄r*, can be explained in two different ways: first, it is possible that they have nothing to do with each other, but that in the first instance it is due to the adverbial character of the two forms in which it appears: *ebbēm*, *hebbēm*, in them the article having preserved its demonstrative meaning: *this* (time), and because of the greater intensity presumably following such a special meaning, having been able secondarily to geminate the following consonant, even before the accented syllable. The other instance, the name of a mountain and/or place written *f₄er*, would have acquired its *b* from the form *bāl būr* in which this sound without doubt is due to the influence of the preceding *l*; this interpretation is supported by the fact that no vocalized ms. indicates the gemination of the first rad. of this name. Another possible explanation is that the article actually bore the main stress during the second heavy stress period; for the former at least this would be nothing strange, its stem being monosyllabic at that time (cf. §§ 60 *c*, 109 *ll*). So we conclude that the primary form of the article consisted of the consonant *h* and an *a* vowel following it.

b As to the length of the vowel, it is commonly supposed that it was originally long, the gemination of the following consonant being a compensation for its shortening. There is nothing to disprove this, but later on (cf., e.g., §§ 14, 24, 53) we shall find very many

instances in which a secondary gemination has taken place after a *short* vowel, while quantitative metatheses of this kind are rather few. So it seems to me more probable that the primary form was **ha-* with a short vowel. This would also partly preserve the connection with the Arab. article; the frequent interchange of *ʿ* and *h* considered, the latter could be regarded as a compound of this element and the demonstrative *l*.¹

§ 7. The relative particle

s Even this cannot properly be called a pronoun, since it normally appears accompanied by a noun, and not instead of it, and even in cases in which it stands alone, it is apparently a question of the ellipse of the main word, e.g. **māššī* Dt 4: 3, as far as it is not used in its original sense »place«, as can be the case, e.g., in Gn 21: 17. In spite of that we place it here, since its function does not remind us of that of normal conjunctions, but rather has a demonstrative character.

b As already indicated, the word can most conveniently be derived from a noun meaning »place«; we have such a noun from the root of this word in Akk., Ug., and Aram. There are no phonetic nor semantic difficulties. The primary form has apparently been **ašr* (cf. Akk.), which after the omission of case vowels was made **ašar* (cf. §§ 1 *u*, 109 *w*); the present *ʿšar* owes the colour of its first vowel to the influence of *š* (cf. § 1 *i*) and the tendency of *a* to become *e* in the beginning of words (ib. *q*).² As to the semantic development, the use of Akk. *ušar* in the so-called local sentences (v. SODEN § 175) is not far from that in cases like Gn 21: 17, and I find it impossible to understand why in Akk. *imtaši bīt ašar iwwaldu* could not have been written as well as it was written in Hebrew *bmqwm šr hw' šm*. The fact that in Akkadian it never came to that is a

¹ This idea is not mine, but the source is not available to me now.

² The vocalization in MT is wholly parallel to that of the type *q^etel* of st.cstr. considering that even in MT *r* favours more »backward« vowels, cf., e.g., *mærkâbâ^h*, *mærqâhâ^h* | *mišpâhâ^h*, *milhâmâ^h*, and B-L § 18 *i*.

matter of *usage*, not of any semantic difficulty, and probably due to the fact that in Akkadian the determinative pronoun *ša* was so common that no relative particle was able to occupy its place even temporarily.

e Note. Even the demonstrative pronoun *zē* is sometimes used in the function of a relative.

§ 8. The interrogative pronoun.

a The form used for persons is *mī*, which is also the oldest form we can trace; it is the only form in existence, but in Ex 10: 8 the distributive sense of pl. is expressed by means of a kind of reduplication: *mī wmi*.

b The normal form for things is *mā* (mostly without accent). Since the second syllable of the separate and suffixed forms of the prep. *k-* (cf. § 104 *w*) may be identical with it, the vowel might originally have been anceps. Occasionally it appears proclitic (even in *kt*), e.g. *mallikī* Gn 21: 17.

c A solitary parallel form *mān* for the latter appears in Ex 16: 15. It has parallels in Amarna letters, perhaps in the Amorite names (see TH. BAUER, *Ostkanaanäer* 64), and SArab. So it might be an old parallel form which grew obsolete at an early period.

§ 9. The indefinite pronouns.

a 1. The interrogative pronoun is used even indefinitely, e.g. Ex 32: 33 Gn 28: 17 39: 8 a.e. An intensification of the form used for things may be *mē'āmā^h* Gn 22: 12 a.e., with which it is used quite parallel, cf., e.g., Gn 39: 6.8. Originally, like *mī wmi* (§ 8 *a*), it might have had a distributive sense; after the obsolescence of which it was contracted more closely together; the primary form would thus be **ma-wa-ma*.

b 2. Various nouns, especially *kal*, but even *'iš*, *'iš . . . rē'u/ā'o*, etc., are used in collective, reciprocal, distributive, and other indefinite senses, but their character as pronouns is open to question. The demonstrative *zē* is also used distributively in Ex 26: 13 32: 15.

III. VERBAL SYSTEM

§ 10. General remarks.

a 1. In the following the different verbal stems will be treated in the following order: 1) the primary stem, Q, with its passive and t-stem, 2) the so-called reflexive-passive or N-stem together with its variant nQ, 3) the so-called causative or H-stem together with its passive, A-variant and reflexives hQ and Št, 4) the doubling stem or D together with its passive, n-stem, and t-stem, 5) the lengthening stem or L together with its t-stem, 6) the reduplicating stem, R, together with its t-stem, and 7) the four-radical stem. This order was chosen for the reason that it best combines the two principles that to me seem the most essential in the arrangement of material of this kind: firstly, to give preference to the forms appearing most frequently, and secondly, to keep together forms most resembling one another. For the latter reason, D, in spite of its more frequent occurrence than both H and N, was postponed to fourth place, since it resembles the rest of the stems more closely than any of the preceding ones, which, again, occur much more frequently than they do.

b Within single stems, variants are still found. So in certain verbs we have a Q II alongside the normal one, once even its passive; of N there are three basic variants, distinguished mainly according to whether both the first and second radicals are geminated in af., or only the first one, or neither; in H there is an H II also, known even from TibH; and L has two basic types: one lengthening the stem by means of the repetition of the last consonant only, the other additionally lengthening the stem vowel also; the former is sometimes difficult to distinguish from D because of the secondary gemination of the second radical.

c The order of treatment of the different conjugations within single stems is also newly arranged to keep the related elements more closely together. With reference to the age of the single conjugations, the group based on the so-called infinitive or n.act. is treated first; additionally, it comprises the imperative, and the so-

called imperfect or prf. together with its w- and -a- forms; for the other group, n.ag. (in ps n.pat.), n.pot., and the so-called perfect or af. remain. The argumentation for this arrangement is contained in section 2. For the terminology see the introduction to vol. II, p. 5—6.

d Due to the quiescence of the gutturals, there are many more weak verbs than is supposed in the traditional Hebrew grammar, but on the other hand, because of many similarities between different classes — e.g., I gutt. and w-augm., III ' and III gutt. —, it seemed best to group them first more loosely according to which radical — or radicals — is affected by the infirmity, leaving out only the hollow roots and the so-called chain duratives (II gem.) These two classes, again, belong rather closely together, their relation resembling to some extent that between the two types of the L-stem, to which they are also closely related. The larger groups are then divided into single classes and sub-classes.

e 2. We will now try to survey briefly the pre-history and development resulting in the verbal system of SamH. It seems that the earliest form of sentence we can trace was of the type afterwards called *simple nominal sentence*. It did not need to contain more than one word, used to indicate some need, desire, wish, and hence as an imperative, e.g., a word like *' *ukl* could, according to the situation, mean both »I want to eat» and »eat!». When distinctions between different word classes began to develop, we can say this word acquired three different connotations: imperative, meaning »eat!»; verbal noun, meaning »eating» in the widest sense of the word; and substantive proper, meaning »food, nourishment». In that way the forms developed from that common source have continued to be used throughout the history of the Hebrew language. This stage can best be called pre-verbal.

f The verbal period can be said to have begun when different elements modifying the meaning of the word began to be attached to the original word, which we now propose to call *stem*. It seems that at the time this began to take place, the order of words in the simple nominal sentence consisting of the two main parts of speech

was subject-predicative. From the fact that the stem alone would have sufficed to indicate the action, as it had hitherto done, we may induce that at least in the majority of cases the element indicating subject was more important and, consequently, more heavily stressed. Accordingly, when they were attached more closely to each other so as to form one word, it was the subject element that bore the main stress. In accordance with the self-centredness of normal men, this might have happened first in the 1st pers.sg., then the 2nd sg. as the one addressed, and then the same persons in pl. The 3rd person came last, since the mere stem (eventually provided with the pl.afform. where necessary) was normally enough to express the thing intended; it might have got its preformative largely through analogy (we should remember that in everyday speech it is the first person that is most frequently used, and not the third, as in narratives and in most other literature). The subject element was, in the first and second persons, the most primitive form of the personal pronoun we could trace (§ 4 a), the stem again seems to have been mostly of the type CVCC. Normalizing this as **qull*, the combination of both in 1st sg. would yield *'*á-qull*, but because of the main stress on the first syllable, a transposition takes place and we get *'*áqtul*. Only a part of stems have consonants in the first and second place that cannot tolerate immediate contact with each other; in these cases the result is simply the breaking up of the end of the stem and the formation of the type *'*á-qVtVl*. The latter development is necessary because of the drop of the final short vowel which we must suppose to have existed in the stem word before this period for reasons soon to be dealt with. In addition, it is naturally possible that, originally, bisyllabic stems existed.

g This first type of preformal might have had the character of the later so-called jussive/cohortative or, to cover them with one concept, *voluntative*.¹ This is best in accordance with both the stressed subject element and the line of development leading from the imperative to other verbal forms. With such a content, it is natural that

¹ In the widest sense, comprising even the unconscious »will» or tendency.

the subject element is stressed. This being in the beginning of the word, the end is pronounced considerably less intensely, and the looser elements there are apt to be omitted. Such elements are, above all, word-final short vowels, particularly if they have no significant function, as in this case there seems to have been none; they were only supporters in pronunciation: CVCC is with many realizations of the final cluster, practically impossible to pronounce. But when, say, **á-qullu* was made **áqtulu*, no such supporting vowel was needed; on the contrary, on many occasions it could interfere disturbingly with the rapid rhythm characteristic of expressions of wish, demand, command, etc., and so it was omitted. At the same time the stem vowel, if it was *u*, was modified into *o*, and *i* similarly into *e*, because of their getting into an unaccented simply closed syllable (cf. § 109 *g*); if *a* suffered a comparable change (e.g., into *ä*), we have no means of discovering it. All this has very probably taken place during the Proto-Semitic period at the latest, and for the most part before that time.

22. *h* Alongside with this voluntative usage, however, there must have been another one, which we might do best to call *narrative*. At all times it has had a subordinate position compared with the former, which means that it follows the voluntative usage through all the most essential changes, deviating from it only in the minor ones. In this case, the deviation consisted of the preservation of the final vowels, which brought with it even the preservation of the colour of the stem vowel. This deviation was due to the slower flow of speech in the narrative usage, which favours more vowels (cf. § 2 *g*). From the narrative usage the uniform preformative *ja-* for the 3rd pers. (masc.) may even derive, which seems to have been originally an exclamatory demonstrative particle (cf. BARTH, *EtS* 59); at what time the distinction of genders was introduced, I cannot state. Out of the characteristics of fem., the preform. cons. *t-* may be identical with the same sound as the affirm. of fem. nouns; the affirm. *-i* is parallel to that in the separate form of the pers.pron. of the same person, and *-(in)na* in pl. has a parallel source. The fact that the pl. affirm. is lacking in the 1st pers. shows the gradual

origin of the system: it was not necessary to distinguish the form from sg. The *-n* occasionally preserved in 2.3. pl.m. may also originally belong to narrative (cf. Arab.).

i The development continued, however. To the narrative usage, a conjunction was introduced. Originally it might have been an adverb, meaning »hence, then», but due to its frequent use and perhaps even original shortness, it was closely attached to the word following. It seems to have carried stress. Now, when this additional element came to lengthen verbal forms, drawing stress further forward, the end of the word naturally lost in intensity of pronunciation and became inclined to omit the unnecessary final vowel. So the form used in connection with the prefixed conjunction (or *w-prf.*) came to have identical vocalization with the voluntative form. Whether this development took place during the common West Semitic period (if there ever was such a period) or later, I cannot decide.¹ On the other hand, the separation of a self-exhorting or »cohortative» form from the common voluntative one might have occurred at that time at the latest, since the Arab. »energetic» form can hardly be detached from it. But whether the *n*-element in Arab. is secondary or lost in Canaanite, I cannot state, either, nor anything of the relation of the Hbr particle *nā* to both. Its origin is equally quite obscure if it is not connected with the *-a directionis* attached to certain nouns (cf. § 58 *h*); with any pronominal element I cannot combine it.

*Was there ever
such a vowel*

k The last constructional development deriving from the old stem was the prefixation of the prep. *l-* to it to form a kind of final verb form. This apparently did not occur before the Old Canaanite period. This resulted in the stem word in a change identical with that in *prf.*; accordingly, the prefix was stressed, as it still normally is. The new combination, however, did not develop real inflection, and cannot therefore be detached from *n.act.*

l The development of *prf.* took place at a time when the *n-* and

¹ It seems that a similar construction appears in Arabic (cf. RECKENDORF, Synt. Verhältnisse § 177), but in very few examples. In any case, the SArab. attestations presuppose an early tendency to such an effect.

w-augments were not yet prefixed to their future bases. So there was quite a number of only two-radical, really one-syllabic stems that did not suffer any change when the preformatives were attached to them. As a result, the preform. syllable remained open and its vowel long, and when some time during the Old Canaanite period every stressed long *a* became *o* (cf. § 109 *o*), the preform. vowel, being stressed, developed into *ō*, as far as it had not earlier lost its *a* colour, as seems to have occurred if the stem vowel was *a* (cf. § 109 *i*), so that the development took place only where the stem vowel was *i/e*; cf., e.g., root *jsf*; of the case of *u/o* as the stem vowel we have no certain examples. In *w*-prf., the prefixed particle still appears to have been stressed, since the preform. vowel in it remained *a* (in most verbs the different prf. forms have been partly confused later on).

m The other group apparently had n.ag. as the starting point, and can accordingly be called *agential*. It seems to have originated from three basic forms: adjectives of the types **qatal*, **qatil*, and **qatul*. Toward the end of the Proto-Semitic period the word order in nominal sentences having a pronoun as the subject seems to have been *predicative-subject*. The subject seems to have had heavier stress even in this case(?), and consequently the adjective, when immediately preceding, was brought to a state comparable to st.cstr., and lost its final vowel. As a result, the vowel of the second syllable was modified as described above (*g*). From this, the language began to differentiate between the adjective types mentioned and these forms that now really can be called *nomina agentis*, and the type **qatal/-el/-ol*¹ was established in this function even when it occurred outside the combination described, thence even in fem. and pl. forms.

n Probably at about the same time, the development continued in another direction: the pronoun was attached to the predicative

¹ This seems to indicate that the second *a* of the type **qatal* was different from that in the corresponding adjective (cf. *g*), but it is well known that deviations from such schemes are frequent. At any rate, the present outcome from both is the same (*a*, both long and short, when not affected by outside factors).

noun as an affirmative, and so the present *afformal* was created; the forms of the afform. are described above (§ 4 b). They seem to have been originally identical with the preform. elements, considering the form **-tū* (which appears in MT before suffixes: in SP this person may not appear suffixed) as the original one for 2. pl.; the *u* vowel is probably to be connected with the pluralic *u* used in verbal flexion from the earliest times. The 3rd pers.sg. did not get any affirmative, the 3rd pl. the normal afform. of pl. The 2nd pers.pl. might have got its present affirmatives (from the separate forms) in connection with the differentiation of fem. from masc. This was made in a way comparable to that in prf. (cf. *h*): the 3rd pers.sg. obtained the normal fem. afform. of nouns (originally probably *-t*, cf. § 58 g), the consonantal element of which normally disappeared later on except in the class with a vocalic ending; in pl., we still have traces of an afform. *-ā* (cf. § 11 r); it might be identical with the corresponding afform. of the Akk. stative¹, deriving ultimately from the fem.pl. afform. of nouns. Apparently it fell into disuse after the omission of *-t* from sg., with which it then became identical. Neither of them has been stressed, as is natural, as they are not real subject elements; nor probably the afform. of 3rd pl.masc., which after the disappearance of the fem. form became gen.comm. The *-i* of sg. 2. f. was taken from the separate form again. In the 1st sg., the *t*, if it does not stem from the fem. form of n.ag., was apparently inserted after the analogy of the 2nd pers., partly to prevent the amalgamation of the affirmative with other vocalic elements which form the end of certain roots. Even after that, *'a* was not useful, since it had made this affirmative quite identical with that of the 2nd pers.sg.; moreover, it is possible that at this time *-ī* in this Proto-Semitic dialect had already become established as the subject form of the pron.sf. and as the final vowel of the separate forms.

o The adjective type **qatul* had come to express some permanent

¹ It is apparently the Akk. counterpart of W.-Sem. af.; cf. even § 11 r and § 15 b.

quality. From this general idea, the notion of being occupied by, and in possession of, the potency or quality expressed by the relevant root, was distinguished, and an »intensified» type with prolonged second vowel developed for it. Close to the idea of action — being indeed its basis — as this was, the form was subsequently felt as related to the verb, and — in principle — formed from any verbal root. So it became what we call *nomen potentis*, since the idea of potency, possibility and/or qualifications needed in order to act, primarily seems to have been its governing idea or central concept.¹ With the passage of time, however, when the *u* vowel acquired a specially passive connotation, the idea of being occupied by the relevant potency or quality grew more prominent, particularly since in some groups of verbs it was the only one possible (e.g. those expressing some defect); this caused the effect that the passive side of the scales grew heavier, and in a number of instances this type has already been used to form *nomen patientis* even of active verbs.

p The types of n.ag. with *a* in the first syllable, though apparently most frequent, were not the only ones. Among the others, there seem to have been at least two types with *u* therein, **qutel* and **qatal*. They were formed, at least prominently, from stative stems; cf., e.g., roots *jšb* and *rbš*. As such, they easily acquired a passive connotation, and developed into a special *nomen patientis*. The development may otherwise have been analogous to that of n.ag. (cf. *m*), but by this time new final vowels had become established (cf. § 109 *g*), so that the development *i* > *e* did not take place, and this difference was employed by the language to distinguish between this type of n.ag., which in a few cases remained in a medial-reflexive sense, and the newly developed n.pat. This seems to have occurred after the Proto-Semitic period, but before Canaanite had separated from the ancestors of the later Aramaic and Arabic.

q Probably toward the end of the Old Canaanite period, when

¹ Cf. E. PORATH, *Die Passivbildung des Grundstammes im Semitischen*, Breslau 1926 (Sonderabdruck aus MGWJ), p. 24 sq. and passim; and earlier JOUS. PEDERSEN, *Israel I—II* (engl. ed. p. 199).

the main stress grew heavier (cf. § 109 *t*), nomina agentis and patientis, when occurring in st.estr. or a state comparable to that, lost their accent; on the other hand, in positions in which they continued to bear a main stress — so probably in pl.st.abs., and in any case when provided with the article —, the stressed (= first stem) syllable was lengthened and its vowel, when it was *a*, developed into *o*. The starting point may have been provided by the old »professional» types of n.ag. (**qātel/-al*, cf. § 11 *k-l*). Hence in n.ag. the correspondence of the type *šākeb/eššúkeb*, in n.pat. *šēfek/eššúfek*. Later on the distribution of the two types was partly confused, the former types apparently gaining some ground in our dialect, while in that upon which MT gre is based, the latter occupied the whole field, except some scanty remains of the former.¹

| on

Active Participle
~~Passive~~ verbal adjectives
confused.

r Before this development, however, the newly created n.pat. became attached to the same pronominal elements as n.ag. before (cf. *n*), resulting in a *passive afformal*. The *passive preformal* was subsequently formed in analogy with the active one of the type **jaqtal*, which had become attached to the afformal of the type **qatel*, since the vocalization of the second syllable in this type best corresponded to that in the majority of the passive stems; the preformative acquired the vowel *u* as a characteristic of the passive voice.

s Among the types of n.ag., there were even ones with a geminated middle radical, some of which have been preserved until to-day in SamH; see, e.g., roots *'₄br* I, *grš*, *dbr*. Out of them, at the time of the formation of the afformal, an af. and subsequently prf. were formed. But at the same time the nominal types with geminated middle radical had become expressions for something regular, occurring often, professional, intensive, and similar things. Many of the verbal stems of this type (e.g., *dbr*, *grš*) also contained some such idea. Therefore analogical formations began to be used even from stems having originally an ungeminated middle rad., and this new formation thus became a new, secondary stem, out of which the same conjugations and other formations could be formed as from

¹ The same result in Arabic may be due to a parallel development in that language; cf. § 109 *p*.

the primary one. With reference to the characteristic doubling of the middle radical we call this stem D. As a distinction from the primary stem, its n.ag. is formed by means of a preformative *ma-*, which is probably identical with the indefinite pronoun of this type, originally apparently gen.comm. As to the vowel of the preformative in prf., it seems to have got its colour from the Q prf. with bisyllabic stem (cf. § 109 *u*); in D, the vowel apparently was short - and accordingly unstressed -, since it was influenced by the nature of the first radical: where this was a guttural, *a* prevailed. In some cases in which the middle radical was primarily geminated (e.g., *dbr*), the n.ag. was formed both with and without the preformative, the result thus being a kind of mixture of Q and D.

t The roots consisting of only two radicals appear to have had a tendency to be lengthened. This took place normally by means of the repetition of the second radical, and led partly to a new verbal class, the so-called chain duratives, and partly to a new secondary stem, which we call L; its simpler form can often be distinguished from the class of the chain duratives only by the fact that it has one or more stems with only two radicals at its side. The longer form — with prolonged stem vowel — seems to have originated very late, obviously in poetry, and influenced by certain consonants appearing as the 2nd rad.

v In some cases, however, both radicals of a biradical stem were repeated. This led to the reduplicated or R-stem, which could also appear independently as a four-radical root — the boundary between them is vague —, as definitely resulted from the repetition of one of the radicals of a triradical root.

w At the same time, new stems were created even in another way, viz., by means of prefixing certain, probably pronominal elements to the primary stem, which thereby mostly suffered vocalic changes. A remarkable characteristic of these stems is their logical uniformity, even if this now appears confused by numerous phonetic and a few analogical changes. True, in the first of them the regularity is not as great as in others. It seems to have been formed by means of prefixing an element *na-* to the primary stem, partly at

a time when certain consonants (ʿ, h, n, s, etc.) were in a state of total or semi-syllabicity (cf. § 109 *q, t*), which resulted in the loss of the first stem vowel (= the normal form in TibH); mostly, however, both stem vowels were preserved, whether the middle radical was geminated or not. Later on, when D ps — apparently for phonetic reasons, cf. § 109 *bb* — began to be disused, it sometimes was transformed as if deriving from N, the result being a kind of nD. In the last phase of development even the 1st rad., when it had a vowel, was regularly geminated (cf. § 14 *d*); from earlier times we have only one certain example (root *frd*) for the explanation of which see D. YELLIN, JPOS IV, p. 96 sq. and § 14 *d*. The pronominal element in this stem probably represents the first person, in which *n* was present in most forms, both in sg. and pl. Since it could not represent the subject, which was represented by the affirmatives (and in *prf.*, which was formed subsequently by means of the established preformatives of Q *prf.*, by these), the necessary conclusion is that it represented a being which in one way or other was the object of the action expressed by the root, or to whom the quality or state in question pertained, which again, considering that the pronominal element represents the first person, leads precisely to that medial-reflexive-passive connotation which is the common idea represented by the different, individual meanings of N derived from different roots.

x The second group is formed by means of a preformative, the main element of which is apparently *t*, which may stem from the 2nd pers. of pers.pron. The meaning is, consequently, rather similar to that of N, only that reciprocal relations have been added, which is quite in accordance with the fact that the starting point has been the second person. It is formed of Q, D, L, and R, but not of N or H, which is another indication of its close relationship with these two stems. We can, therefore, regard them as one larger group, which can best be called the *externally enlarged* one according to its most conspicuous formal characteristic, while the rest of the secondary stems can be called the *internally modified* group, since even in the cases of an outward enlargement in this group the addition stems

from the root itself. Moreover, it should be observed that the former group is, so-to-say, in a commanding position over the latter, in so far as it can use this as a basis for a new formation, but not vice versa. That the lack of a *t*-stem of H, however, is in a way accidental, is shown by related languages and the one instance of Št-stem attested in SamH (root '₃*wV*). Normally *t* is prefixed to the root, supported by a prothetic vowel which in Hebrew acquired '₂ as an initial aspiration; when the first rad. is a sibilant, *t* is transposed after it according to the phonetic rule that does not tolerate sequence dental(/alveolar)-sibilant. The same is obviously the case in the Št-stem as well.

γ The third group is in Hebrew properly represented by H alone — the instances of A are either old scribal errors or have a peculiar history behind them, and a Š-stem does not appear at all, even if it seems to be presupposed by the one instance of Št just mentioned. In any case, considering even these, it seems to me clear that this so-called causative stem is connected with the 3rd pers. of the pers.pron. Furthermore, I cannot see any reason why the three forms of the preformative could not have ultimately derived from a common ancestor. True, in the Semitic languages the development of a sibilant to *h* is with certainty attested only under certain conditions in Mehri, but even this may be enough to show that even in this area it was not impossible, and on the other hand, the personal pronoun is of so great antiquity that it can well have undergone many more linguistic developments than common words. Of course it cannot be taken as proved, but it is quite possible that some time during the Proto-Semitic period or earlier (cf. Indo-Eur.!) a large part of the dialects then in existence were affected by a development of this kind, and as an outcome two parallel forms for the 3rd pers. of the personal pronoun were established. That *h*, again, can become ' is best demonstrated by SamH. But be that as it may, we may presuppose that the preformative *ha-* is connected with the 3rd pers. of the pers.pron. and that it, like the *n-* and *t-* elements dealt with above, represents a kind of object of the action expressed in the stem to which it is prefixed.

This object, however, being in the 3rd pers. — i.e., ideally absent —, it cannot include a subject, which was still possible in the 2nd pers. through the reciprocal aspect; consequently, the subject is concretely and even virtually unmentioned (the subject expressed by the affirmatives and in prf. by the preformatives of preformal is of course out of the question here, it being subordinated to the object represented by the preform. of H). This, again, leads us precisely to the causative connotation central in this stem: **ha-pqad/-id* = »(one makes = there is) some one governing the act of appointment», but even to the intransitive use of this stem: **ha-šqap/-ip* = »(one makes = there is) one commanding the view = looking down here». The idea of commanding might also have caused the stress to fall upon the preformative, which has resulted in the loss of the vowel of the first radical, which at least normally has caused even the simplification of a geminated second radical. In the second syllable all the three vowels *a*, *i*, *u* may originally have been represented as in Q af., but later on — probably influenced by the tendency to polarity — *i* prevailed; *u* has disappeared altogether, and *a* preserved only where it was protected by a guttural. In this case, the tendency to polarity brought about the change of the preform. vowel to *i*, which afterwards — after the rule of polarity had ceased to function, cf. §§ 109 *qq*, 110 *d* — spread to a part of the stems with *i* in the second syllable also, where the first syllable was open (in TibH this became the general rule). H seems to have been created later than D, N, and t-group, probably at about the time of Q ps, when new final vowels already had become established, and as a result the *i* of the 2nd syllable was not modified into *e* (cf. *p*). It does not seem to have become lengthened before the end of the pre-Christian period, and even after that only in open syllables. In prf., *h* was elided probably toward the end of the Old Canaanite period (cf. § 109 *t*).

z As has already been indicated in places, in the secondary stems af. was created before prf., and all the different forms within single stem are formed from one and the same basis. The passive forms were formed subsequently after the pattern of Q ps, i.e., with *u* in the

first stem syllable, but in the second one *a* prevailed. In *prf.*, *a* seems to have been the normal preform. vowel, but was exchanged in D ps for *u* after the pattern of D (cf. *s*). Since N and the t-group have the idea of passivity in themselves, no special passive forms of them, at least in our dialect, appear.

a a Note. For the development of the syntactical use see syntax, particularly § 125. The phonetic background of the above development is described in § 109. Details will be given in connection with the treatment of single items, which now follows.

A. STRONG VERB

§ 11. Q a l.

a 1. In conformity with our principle of the order of treatment we will first study the group which obtained its definitely verbal character before the other one, viz. the *actional* one, as we can call it, since it developed from a basis most closely resembling the form of the verb we now call *nomen actionis*. This, again, being accordingly the most primitive representative of this group, is best to begin with. In the present state of the dialect, 21 types of apparently basic differences between one another appear, but out of them three represent historically the same type as three others, two seem to be rather late creations, and one appears only as a variant. So there remain 15 basic types, out of which 7, however, do not appear in the strong verb, even if the absence of at least two of them may be accidental. The two late creations and the variant are also attested. The form appearing most frequently is **qull*, which out of a total of about 210 instances seems to have 57 representatives or about 27 %.¹ 25 of them are from strong roots. Its normal form nowadays

¹ The numbers, as those in other connections, are approximative, since it is impossible to find out the exact figure even regarding the total of occurrences because of the considerable development of single forms, which means that two forms coming from the same primary type cannot be recognized as such any longer, and on the other hand, originally different types can in

is *dáraš*, with prep. *lidraš*, sf. *'eššébrī*. The last form goes directly back to **šubr-ī*, with the regular development $\check{u} > e$ in a stressed syllable (see § 109 *bb*). The form with prep. developed from **la-durš* through **la-druš* (cf. § 10 *k*), further **la-droš* (ib.) and, the vowel of the preposition modified according to the rule of polarity, **ledroš* into its present form. The plain form, again, has undergone the following development: **durš^u* > **durš* > **dor^aš* > **doraš* (cf. § 61) > **dáraš*. In the roots *gnb* and *ṭrf* the vowel of the second syllable is *e* instead of the normal *a*. This might indicate that their second vowel was elided during the second heavy stress period, which is not surprising, the 2nd and 3rd radicals of both of them being capable of syllabization at that time; cf. § 109 *kk*. Another possibility is of course that the original type was **ganeb*, but prf. presupposes monosyllabic stem. In the root *mšk* the independent form *múšak* derives from the time of the syllabicity of *š* (cf. § 1 *i* end), which coincided with the first period of the heavy stress (cf. § 109 *w, x*): *u*, being stressed, was lengthened on its account, though *š* did not get a svarabhakti, since it could do without that, before the period was over and the long *u* sufficiently established. In the root *qdš* a svarabhakti, which resulted from the incompatibility of *d* and *š* in this order (cf. § 1 *i* end), established itself between these two radicals even in sf. forms: *elqādēš^u*. In the root *qsr*, the sf. form *wafqāšerkinna* is apparently influenced by the corresponding substantive, insofar as we should not regard it as derived from it. Finally, of the verbs I *j* we must reckon *jkl* in this respect as belonging to the strong verbs, since it does not omit its first radical; its main forms of n.act. are *júkal* and *jākálat*, which show that *l* was syllabic at some time: the former goes back to **jukl*, which was treated as bisyllabic; when *l* became syllabic, the first syllable was accordingly opened, and as a compensation for the lost closing consonant, lengthened under the stress during the strong accent

the course of development have come together. Regarding this type, it is actually possible that there are forms going back to **qatl*, since these two types can only be distinguished in the sf. form from each other (and under certain phonetic conditions, not even there).

period (cf. above *mšlc*); the latter is enlarged with the feminine *-t* and seems to go back to **juklat*; the development has proceeded analogously with that of the fem. form of this type of noun (see § 61 b).¹

b Another type appearing frequently is **qatāl*, of which we have 20 examples or nearly a tenth of all, out of which, however, only three belong to the strong verbs proper, viz. those from the roots *gnb*, *mlk*, and *qbr*. Only the plain form is attested, the present type being *gānob*. It is found in the root *ntn* also, which accordingly follows the strong pattern in this respect. For the type **qatl* I have counted 18 probable examples, mostly supported only by MT and/or the intr. meaning of the root; out of these, only one belongs to the strong verb proper, viz. that of the root *škb*, which is attested in the forms **šākab*, *liškab*, *beškābak*. As to their development, it is analogous to that of **qull*, except that the vowel has been *a* all the time. The type **qatal*, which seems to be attested about as frequently as the preceding one, does not furnish us with one wholly genuine example among strong roots; in the root *ft* we find it at its purest: *fātat*; this may accordingly be a rather late formation. In the root *zkr*, it has an addition both in the beginning and at the end: *lēzākāra*. From where the final *-a* comes, I cannot even suggest, if it, again, is not connected with the identical afform. of *-a*-prf. and thus the *-a directionis* in nouns (cf. § 10 *i* end); the meaning seems to favour this conjecture. As for the prefix vowel, it can derive from *a* (by the influence of *z*) just as well as from *u* (cf. prf.). The place of the stress on the last stem syllable also prevented the first radical from becoming geminated, although the prefix vowel was preserved (contrary to the normal case, cf. below and D), which again might be due to a secondary stress created two syllables before

¹ It is possible that even *jēbēšat* (root *jbs*) belongs to this group, the *e* vowel in both stem syllables being due to *j*, resp. *š* (cf. § 1m, *i*), but the influence of certain individual sounds does not normally appear in verbal forms, at least not the influence of *j* upon the following vowel. So it seems more probable that the stem was bisyllabic of old, probably a kind of passive n.act., the primary form having been **jubuš-t* or **jubaš-t* (the form in MT seems to support the former).

the main one (cf. § 2 c). In the verbs formed by means of *n*-augment, *nbl* and *nfl* have forms that can go back to this type, they being accordingly late, but to **qall* as well; the vowel of the first radical would, in the latter case, have been preserved because of the incompatibility of *n* and any immediately following consonant, since the former was preserved through »Systemzwang». The type **qil* seems to have been preserved in 16 cases, of which 5 are strong: *bgd*, *zkr*, *fqd*, *qrb* I, *škn*. The normal forms are: *bāfēqad*, var. *zēkar* probably individual; sf. *bābigdū*, with fem. afform. *ʾəfqiṛbātinnmæ*. The forms of the root *škn* are exceptional (NB. even in MT there is discrepancy): *bēšken* seems to go back to this type, but the sf. *ʾəššēkēnu* rather to **šeken*, while *liškānī* seems rather to suggest **šukn* (cf. MT). It seems possible, however, that the last form has developed its *æ* from *e* through the influence of polarity, which does not favour a sequence *-iCCēCī* (see § 109 i), and the other sf. form may have originated under the influence of the D form *ʾəššēkken*, which appears in a similar context six verses later, if it does not derive from **ššēken*(!) during the second heavy stress period. The type **qatel* is attested eight times, one of them strong: *kbd* Q II, of which we have two forms: *kābed*, sf. *kābēdak*. The form *lēfāšē* does not reveal its original type; the present one is **V-qtal(-a)*, in a way parallel to *lēzākāra* (cf. above), but the svarabhakti has found its place in the beginning; this is due to the one-time syllabicity of *t* (cf. § 109 *kk*). In the type **qetal*, again, the first vowel is probably a svarabhakti after the period of the syllabicity of the first radical. It is attested, perhaps, four times, out of which *rēgam* and sf. *dēbāro* belong to the strong verb; the latter is usually written as a pl. noun, but since such a construction (Gn 37: 4) of *jkl* is unique, it may be better to suppose that the *kt* has been altered after *qre*, when this type of *n.act.* in this root had grown obsolete; however, it is by no means certain that the vocalization of this word has thus remained intact. The type **qutūl* appears only as a var. in Ms. B: **jēkol*; the sf. form *fēquḏī* Ex 32: 34 is probably a substantive. Finally, of the types with geminated middle radical only **qettel* is attested in the strong verb, in the roots *grš*, *dbr*, *lqt*, *mkr*, and *frš* II,

the original form being preserved with the modifications of vocalization caused by neighbouring consonants: *dëbber*, *gërreš*; *elmekkêrê* (sf.). A mixture of this form and **qetal* (cf. above) can be the sf. *kād(d)ëbbêra^h* Gn 39: 10: the long vowel of the preposition presupposes a prothetic *a*, which again can have followed only a phase with vowelless first radical; hence, the gemination of the second radical might be secondary, as is of course that of the first radical in the variant. As to the original colour of the (present) second stem vowel, nothing certain can be stated (cf. above, on **qetal*). As it appears from the examples cited, the quality of the stem vowels is not affected by the attachment of pronominal suffixes except in the one-syllabic types, where in this case it goes back to the forms without a svarabhakti (with exceptions given).

c The normal form of imperative is in the present pronunciation *kêfar*, with final *-a*, which apparently is identical with that of the *-a*-prf., *šëkâba^h*; f. *šëkâbî*; pl. *kêlâbû*; the feminine pl. form does not appear in strong verbs, but if we reconstruct it on the basis of the existing weak forms (see § 29 *a*), it is **qêlâlen*. This form seems to go back to **qull* which developed a svarabhakti at the time this got the colour of its »mother» vowel; it attracted the stress before long (cf. Arab.), which led to the prolongation of the new vowel on special occasions still preserved in a variant form **qêtol* appearing in the roots *zkr* and *šmr* in solemn connections: *zêkor*, *šêmor*, insofar as this can best be explained as a secondary prolongation of the second vowel on account of the solemn, hence slower than normal, pronunciation of the form, particularly since the normal type appears side by side with this in both roots, though now confined to pl. The first vowel may be an outcome of the strong reduction of its predecessor during the 2nd heavy stress period, which led to its total elision in a number of instances, viz. in the roots *fsl*: *êfsel*, *škm*: *êškam*, *šqf*: *êšqef*, in the strong verb. The type in the first instance may be defined as **¹a-qtel*, in the others as **¹i-qtal*, but even **¹o-qtol* is in the latter case quite possible (cf. Arab., where this formation has spread to all strong verbs). In addition, it occurs in the root *kth* alternating with *kêteb* and **kêtab* (Ms. B Ex 17: 14),

the form being written in Mss. CD: **akt(a)b* (Ex 17: 14) and pronounced **'éktab*. The form *kéteb* may etymologically be the genuine one; although it is the only preserved descendant of **kiḇ* in direct line; the form in Ms. B may be conscious adaptation to the general type (cf. App. I), while the form with prothesis, being apparently late, as witnessed by the preservation of *kéteb* and its rivalry, may be the first step — which remained the only step — in the path that Arabic has followed to its end (cf. above): the spread of this formation to strong roots other than those having had a syllabic sound as the first radical after the analogy of the latter, probably supported by the influence of the Arabic pattern. The type with geminated second rad. **qattel* appears in the forms sg. *gáerreš*, *débbber*, pl. *debbérū*, *leqqêṭū*. The normal type seems to have supplanted the rest of the strong ones, apparently supported by the tendency to distinguish the imperative from n.act. The normal form seems to indicate that imp. either was unstressed during the 2nd heavy stress period or bore the stress upon the ultima; in spite of the irregularity implied thereby, the latter seems to me more probable, since the accentuation of imp. often shows irregularities (cf. Arab.!), which are characteristic of heavy stress periods too, and on the other hand, the stress in imp. in any living language is often heavier than elsewhere.

d The preformative conjugation developed as described above (§ 10 *f-h*). We take the third person sg.m. as normal form because of its by far more frequent occurrence. Originated probably as **já-qull^V* (cf. § 109 *d*), it soon developed in strong roots into **jáqtol* (§ 10 *f-g*), thence through a kind of tendency to polarity, perhaps even supported by the preformative consonant, **jéqtol*. When *o* became *a* (cf. § 109 *aa*), the preformative vowel again followed suit, and thus the present normal form was created: **jíqtal*; apart from this, it is possible that the preform. vowel already attained this colour earlier through the influence of its consonant — the other persons following analogically —, as seems to have been the case in the dialect underlying TibH in this respect. The type based upon n. act. **qatl* already resulted in the same form earlier: **já-qall^V* > **jáqtal* > **jíqtal*.

So we are no more able to distinguish between these two types with certainty, but only with a view to the type of the afformal, where this is attested, and to the active or stative nature of the verb, but these do not yield certain results (cf. § 109 *i*). This type has also spread itself over most other ones, so that even the one based upon **qíl*, due to special circumstances in each case, now appears in two roots only, one of which is strong, *fqd*. Here it occurs side by side with the normal one, and is preserved because of difference in meaning; the form is *jéfqed*, which on account of *f* comes from **jáfqed* (*jéfqed* still appears as a var.). The secondary identity of the normal H prf. with this type in forms where it ends with a consonant may have been a strong factor in its disappearance from Q.

e In addition, there are types the stem of which is bisyllabic. Some of them have a geminated second radical (cf. above *b*), a prf. being attested in seven roots altogether. Four of these are strong: *grš*, *dbr*, *lqt*, and *mkr* I. The present normal form is *jēdebber*, which is modified by *q* as the second rad.: **jēlāqqet*, *jēlāqqētū*; the influence of *r* in the same position is similar. In each case the primary form may thus have been **ju-qettel*, *u* having been transformed into *e* when this change occurred universally, cf. § 16 *e* for details.

f The other group, with simple second radical, is not so easily disposed of. Apart from the cases where the 2nd rad. is an ' — which have probably a separate origin for this phenomenon, see § 27 —, there are 20 roots having a prf. of a type belonging to this group, 10 of which are strong, viz: *bqr*, *dqr*, *zkr*, *zmn*, *kbd*, *kfr*, *fgš*, *fsl*, *fšr*, and *škr* II. Out of these, *kbd* (Q II) and *škr* form a smaller group, which is characterized by the geminated first radical: *ikkābēdak* (sf.), *wjīššākar*. The gemination is secondary, but shows that the short *i* as the preformative vowel derives from the Old Canaanite period at the latest (cf. § 109 *u*); the prototypes are, accordingly: **ji-kabed*, **ji-šakar*. A form of the root *mkr* I seems to be a combination of this and the preceding type: *jimmáekkar* (* < *ji-mekker*), but it may be a contamination with N. The rest, with simple first radical, are also divided into two types, one of which is represented by *jēkáfer* (*kfr* Q II), pl. *jēzāmēnu*. Accordingly they go back to a

type **ju-kaper*. For the other type, *jēbāqar* may serve as a paradigm; the prototype is **ju-baqar*. Here, it deserves attention that the vowel of the preformative is identical with that in D (see § 10 s), though in the first group that was not the case; consequently, it seems to suggest that this group is younger, and perhaps somehow secondary in relation to that one. And this is indeed even what is suggested by the composition of the relevant roots. When studying the behaviour of the consonants which in them serve as the first and second radicals, we do not find one single instance in SamH in which, in the same order, they were in immediate contact with one another; there is an apparent exception, viz. *ūfgāw* (root *fgā*), but as the only one of its kind beside several of the type now dealt with in the same verb, it is obviously secondary, created after the spirantization of the former sound, which was originally *p*; hence, the incompatibility in this case was between *p* and *g*, but not between *f* and *g*. Consequently, it is probable that in these roots the stem was originally one-syllabic, either **qull* or **qatl*, which remained so (i.e., **jā-qu/atl^V*) until the drop of the final vowel, when they were made **jā-qotol / -qatal* and, with the development *ā > ō*, further **jō- >* (with the shift of the stress to the penultima) **ju- > *je-*. Thus, the forms are quite consistent even without any influence from D; indeed, their relation can be the very opposite (cf. § 16 c).

g In the strong verb, the addition of *w* before prf. forms to form w-prf. did not affect the development in principle; the stress seems to have remained upon the preformative where this was open, unless we suppose that the vowel afterwards has been changed analogically to the plain prf., which indeed seems possible in the light of the weak verbs, where variation between them exists, but not to such an extent that it would make the total abolition of the original type of w-prf. here at all probable. So it seems that the main stress at the time of the creation of w-prf. could not be drawn further toward the beginning of the word than the third syllable from the end, if this contained a long vowel.

h The addition of *-a* to form *-a-prf.* in the 1st pers. (sg. and pl.)

does not affect the vocalization as to its quality: *nilbāna^h* (root *lbn*), *wēdebbêrē* (*dbr*), etc. So it seems to have been relatively independent an element at the time of the omission of final short vowels (cf. § 10 *g*), or the analogy of the plain forms has later transformed them (cf. the comparable effect of sg. upon pl. below, *i*).

i The colour of the stem vowel established in the 3rd pers.m.sg. — and other persons ending with a consonant — was, by way of analogy, spread to other persons as well: after the pattern of **jīqtal* (< **jāqtol*) even *jīkrātu* (< **jakrutū*), *tidrāšu* (< **ladrušū*), *jēdebbêrū* (< **judebbirū*), cf. *wā'ōmērīnna* (< **tōmirīnna* < **ta'murīnna*), etc.; since we have no indications of a one-time separate existence of the pl. afform. *-ū*, it does not seem possible to attribute this phenomenon to the relative independence of the affirmative elements at the relevant period (cf. above *h*). Moreover, there are signs in certain weak verbs suggesting that in some cases the difference remained and developed further (see the roots *'bd*, *'al*, etc.).

k The present forms of n.ag. seem to derive from 15 different types out of which, however, two are rather doubtful, and a further two can be variants of two others, caused by the influence of certain consonants as radicals in them. Eight types, one of them doubtful, seem to be represented in the strong verb. The most common of the types goes back to **qatēl*. Out of a total of about 137 examples, it seems to be attested in 50 cases or ca. 36.5 % of all. Of these, only 9 belong to strong roots, and even one of them seems doubtful (cf. below). The normal type is now *šākeb*, pl. *šāmêrī* (cs.); for the other forms — lacking in strong verb — cf. root *'kl*: sg.sf. *'ākêlu*; pl. *'ākêlem*; f. *'ākêla*, *-at*; and root *š'b*: f.pl. *'eššē'êbot*. In addition, in 13 roots, forms appear presupposing a prototype **qātēl*, which must be regarded as a stress variant of this one (cf. § 10 *g*), since in many cases it appears side by side with this one, always with some addition at the beginning. Of these roots, 6 are strong, the addition consisting in 5 cases of the article, viz., in the roots *zrq*, *škb*, *škn*, *šrf*, and *šrš*, the forms attested being of the type *eššūkeb*, f. *'aeššūrīšat*. The *i* vowel in the latter may be caused by the sibilant (cf. § 1 *i*, *u*). In the root *šmr* the addition consists of the interr.part.: *āšōmer*. In addition

to these, in the root *rmš* a considerable confusion seems to exist at present. The forms are: *rêmeš*, c.art. *errêmeš* & *errûmeš* (the latter appearing after the noun *rmš*); f.c.art. *errâmšêt* & *'errûmîšat*. Of them, only the two forms placed last in masc. and fem. may be genuine followers of the original type, while the others are derived from the corresponding substantive, the fem. form apparently influenced by the stress (cf. § 2 e). In the root *šfk*, the 1st and 2nd rad. apparently cause the pronunciation *šêfek*, *šê-*, i.e., practically identical with n.pat., but the meaning is clearly opposite. It is possible that even the other examples of the prototype **qātel* have the same origin, but the lengthening of the first syllable must have occurred earlier, since it appears even in the plain sg.m. form. There are altogether 6 examples, all of them having a professional or otherwise more intensive meaning than is normal; this may have been the immediate reason for the lengthening of the first (= stressed) syllable. Three of them have all radicals firm: *fqd*, *ftv*, and *rdf*, the forms being *fūqed*, *fûter*, *rûdef*.

l The other group very frequently attested has **qatal* as the basic prototype; attested examples which seem to be derived directly from this one are ca. 37 or 27 % of all¹. Out of them, again, only 7 belong to the strong verb, viz. those from the roots *drš*, *mšl*, *frš* I, *qsm*, *qrb* I (?), *štm*, and *tfš*. The type is *māšal*, pl. (c.art.) *'ammāšálem*; for fem.cf. *nfl*: *nāfálat*. In addition, even here a variant with long vowel in the first syllable of the prototype appears under the same conditions as in the preceding type, but instances are only 4 in number, of which none belongs here; the examples of the same type, but belonging to the older, »professional» class number 7, of which two are strong: *šúfat*; pl. *šūfátem*, *sūlári*, sf. *šūláro*, *šūfātikimmē*.

m The series is completed by a postulated type **qatol*, which has now come together with **qatal*. It is supposed to consist of at

¹ It is possible that among this number there are some (e.g. that from the root *qrb* I) originally belonging to the following group, which has come together with this one as to its form. The present division is made according to the meaning, supposing that the roots which denote a lasting state and do not have a guttural as the third radical belong to the following type.

least two examples, one of which belongs here: *uġādal* (*gdl*). For another possible instance, cf. above *l*. There are no instances of types with an old long vowel in the first syllable; if such existed, its second vowel dissimilated into *e* after the development $\acute{a} > \acute{o}$ in the first syllable (cf. this development in the prf. of 'kl, 'nr, see § 20 *c*) and so came together with the first group (above *k*).

n A strange form is *šēbīrem* (*šbr* II). In form it is exactly like a n.pat. (cf. below § 12 *b*), but the meaning can be conceived only as medial-reflexive. The verb being denominative, it can have been created at a time when this meaning was felt nearer to passive than to active (cf. § 10 *p*), and therefore its n.ag. got this form; it would thus represent a prototype **šubīr*.

o There are also types which seem to derive from one-syllabic stems. Of **qall*, however, only one uncertain example has been preserved (perhaps **qull*?), and even that not of strong roots. Out of **qill*, we seem to have six attestations, one of them belonging here: *rēkab*, sf. *rikbu*; for fem., cf. *nqm* : *nīqmat*.

p Two types, roots with geminated 2nd rad., remain. One seems to go back to **qattel*: it is represented by three strong verbs: *ġérreš*; *dēbber*, pl. *dēbbērim*; f.pl. *debbērot*; and *mēkker*. The other type is represented here by *rāqqam*, as it is pronounced nowadays; but the variant in Ms. B (*ræqam* kt) suggests an earlier *qrē* **rēqqam*, the change of the colour of the first vowel being brought about by the following *q* (cf. § 1 *u*); for the form of pl. in such a case, we could refer to *jīššēbēm* (*jšb*). Other types with geminated 2nd rad. are not attested in the strong verb.

q The flexion of n.ag. is typically nominal and fairly free from the influence of the stem form as well as of the suffixes. The original form is preserved only in the one-syllabic type, in masc.sg. before a sf., and in fem.sg.st. cstr. The addition of flexional endings does not cause any qualitative changes in the types originally bisyllabic, which indicates, among other things, that the vowel of the pl.afform. *-em* is etymologically short, since otherwise any *a* vowel in the preceding syllable would not exist (cf. § 1 *r*). The original flexion would thus have been: **qatel*, pl. **qatelim*, **qatelaj* (or *-li*, vowel anceps?);

f. **qatell*, pl. **qatelāt*. In the fem.pl. the stress seems to have been on the affirmative before the omission of the case vowels (see § 109 *o*); in masc.pl. in our dialect apparently not, which may have caused its shortness (as against, e.g., TibH). The form of m.pl.st.estr. can be conceived as etymologically identical with that of st.abs., but without the ending *-m* — which might derive from the indefinite pronoun — attached to it in the latter (cf. *ib.*). In the fem.sg., the final cluster originated by the omission of case vowels was dissolved by a svarabhakti, which normally developed into *a* (cf. § 109 *w*). In the one-syllabic type the development was, accordingly: **qil^V* > **qel^{al}* > **qetal*, which perfectly accords to the attested *rēkēb* (in this environment *e* is always a variant of *a*). The fem.sg. in this type is formed by means of the ending *-at*, as in nouns the stem of which ends in a cluster (cf. § 58 *g*): **qillat*. In the other types the inflexion is analogous to that of **qatel*. The attachment of pronominal suffixes does not affect vocalization as to its quality, except in the form of the one-syllabic type already referred to, where the original vocalization is preserved; *rikbu* (< **rikb-a-hu*).

r Of the types of the afformal, the one deriving from **qatal* is attested in the vast majority of all instances, except for certain types of weak verbs. The 3rd pers.sg.m., as stated, goes back to **qatal*. Fem., in conformity with n.ag., goes back to **qatalt*, and like this (probably at the same time when it finally obtained its verbal character) was soon made into **qatalat*; the final *-t* was lost when this occurred universally (see § 109 *y*). The rest of the persons go back to the stem of the masc. form to which the affirmatives of the various persons (see § 4 *b* & 10 *n*) are attached: sg. 2. m. **qatalta*, f. **qatalti* (the final vowel anceps; not attested in the strong verb, but e.g. in the root *jld*), l.c. **qatalti*; pl. 3. m. (and normally c.) **qatalū*, f. **qatalā* (*kābādā* Gn 48: 10), 2. m. **qataltīm* (final vowel anceps), f. **qatalten*, l.c. **qatalnū*. The accent was placed universally upon the penultima when this occurred in all the parts of speech — at least — in our dialect (see § 109 *z*); for earlier phases of development see the paragraph cited. The other types, as far as the strong verb is concerned, are preserved only in scanty remains; the type

**qatel* in the root *škb* only in a part of the instances of sg. 3. m.: *šákeb*, while all the other persons have taken the main type over; another instance is *udábēq*. For fem., we have *kābēda* Gn 18: 20 as a genuine example, *šādīqē* suffering from the weak pronunciation of *q* (cf. § 1 *u*), and *gādēllā* Gn 19: 13 quoted by PETERMANN, *Versuch* 16, as *gadēla* and belonging here, being apparently conceived as an adjective. In the sf. form *ganvātīmma* Gn 31: 32 the second stem vowel has disappeared altogether, probably for reasons dealt with in § 2 *e* (end). The sg. 2. m. is exemplified by *gānūbta*, f. is lacking; i.e. can be represented by *fāgēštī* and *šākēntī*; of pl., we have no genuine example, if we do not regard *wāškentīmma* as such (root *škm*), but it obviously contains a prothetic vowel (cf. below; MT: H); for a few further examples of sg. see the roots *rkb*, *škr* I, and *šlm*, perhaps even *zqn* in which, however, the relevant form cannot be distinguished from n.ag. For the type of af. going back to **qatol* we are in a slightly better position than when dealing with n.ag. of the same type, insofar as the original *u* seems to have returned to the verbal form in cases where it came to stand before a cluster of two consonants followed by a vowel, i.e., in the first and second persons of af. Of the strong verb, however, we have only a very defective paradigm: sg. 3. m. *gādal*, i.e. *šākēltī*, pl. 3. c. *šākālū*; we can supplement it by some forms of the root ²*lk*: sg. 3. m. ¹*alak*, f. *wālākā*, 2. m. ¹*ālīktā*, i.e. ¹*ālīktī*, pl. 3. c. ¹*ālākū*, 2. m. ¹*ālek-ūmmā*, i.e. ¹*ālāknū*. Such a return of *u* for *o* in the position mentioned is not at all odd; it is quite parallel to the appearance of *i* instead of *e* in the same position occurring very frequently nowadays in SamH, as illustrated even by the above examples. The only deviation from the rule is the form of pl. 1., but even for this PETERMANN has a variant (with cop.) *walēknu* Gn 34: 17 supported even by Ms. D; so we can safely regard the main form as influenced by the majority type **qatal*. The form of sg. 3. m. shows that at the time of the creation of af. it cannot have had any final vowel (cf. § 10 *m*), but it does not prevent the possibility that one appeared afterwards only to disappear again later. It must be observed, however, that the present paradigm of ²*lk* can be explained even as a combin-

ation of two prototypes: **halak* and **halek*, on which cf. Arab. Moreover, the root *jkl* has an *a* throughout, even if it could be explained as an influence of the three forms with simple cons. after it, supported by the main type; in the remaining probable instance of this type, *qtn*, we also have *qāṭāntī*, but even that can be attributed to the preceding *ṭ* (cf. § 1 *u*). In any case, our surmise rests only upon the variation in the root *škl* III, but it receives support from the nominal flexion (cf. § 100 *a*).

s Apart from these, so-to-say simple types, there are others with some kind of increase in them. The only one with a prothetic vowel appearing in af. has already been mentioned above (root *škm*); the form of prf. (*jīškam*) shows that it is not H (as in MT). The verb is denominative from **šikm*, which may best explain the exceptional formation: the connection with the noun may have remained living until the time of the syllabization of *š* (cf. § 109 *kk*); then the noun via the intermediary form **šekem* (or **š₂kem?*) developed to **škem*, which closely corresponds to the present MT form; after the period of syllabicity was over, an auxiliary vowel was created to support the first radical: *a-škem*, which underlies the present forms in SamH and even the MT verbal form, though this was later on interpreted as H; perhaps even there, Jer 25: 3 *kt* is still reminiscent of the old character of the form? The same development may have taken place in the root *rgm* up to the last phase, but here ways parted: with no nominal analogy *r-* was dissolved into *re-* (cf. § 13 *c*).

t The other method of «increase», the gemination of the second radical, has already been met in n.act., imp., prf., and n.ag. The only stem belonging to this group in the strong verb, **qattel*, has here also preserved its old form with the small deviations caused by the neighbouring sounds: e.g., sg. 3. m. *mákkar*, 2. m. *ugerríšta*, pl. 3. c. *leqqêṭū* (but *mekkéṭū*). In other respects they offer nothing to be explained.

u The form of n.pot. (Q) goes back to **qatūl*, f. **qatūlat*, with stress on the second syllable; otherwise its inflexion is like that of n.ag., with no influence from the side of pronominal suffixes. The n.pat. developed from it, once takes the form of **qutūl*: *génob*,

f. *gēnūbat*. This may be due to the influence of this type of common noun, insofar as it is possible to conceive of the existing examples as nouns as well, particularly since there is a variant for the fem. form in Ms. B, with *a* in the first syllable, even if it is possible to attribute this to the tendency toward »correctness» exhibited by this ms. in general (cf. App. I).

§ 12. The passive of Qal.

a 1. We have traces of the existence of Q ps in 42 verbal roots, even if in one case (root *kt*) the form is obviously based upon an error, in another (*škb*) also appears only as a variant, and in three further instances (*jšb*, *rbš*, *fš'₄*) it is doubtful whether the forms should properly belong here or be considered as representatives of that medial-reflexive meaning of Q from which the whole Q ps developed (see § 10 *p*). In any case, we have at least 37 genuine examples, of which eleven belong to the strong verb, viz. *gbr*, *znq*, *ṭrf*, *kfr*, *sgr*, *fqd*, *qsḡ*, *šṭf*, *škl* III, *šfk*, and *ṭfš*. The uncertain instances *škb* and *rbš* increase the number to thirteen.

b 2. As established (ib.), the development started from n.pat., which we will therefore take as our starting point here as well. In the strong verb, however, we do not have any quite clear examples of **qutīl*, since *sēger* Ex 13: 4 can be conceived of as af. as well, the pl.cs. *tēfēšī* apparently comes from **qutal* (cf. § 1 *i* end); and *rbš*, beside its doubtful character (cf. *a*) has forms of two kinds: *rēbaš*, pl. *rēbišem*, f. *rēbišat*. Because of the considerable preponderance of the type **qutīl* in the other forms, however, we may be entitled to conclude that it has gained ground at the expense of **qutal*, thus representing an earlier phase in the path that Arabic has followed to its end — while in the dialect underlying TibH the opposite development has apparently taken place, thus paving the way for the identification of this form with D ps through secondary gemination —, for which reason it is probable that the pl. and fem. forms are secondary adaptations to the prevalent type (an ungeminated *š* would hardly have transformed an *e* into *a*, cf. § 1 *u*). Nevertheless,

in the examples cited we have material for the construction of a paradigm: **qutīl* and **qutal*, pl. **qutīlem*, **qutīlaj/li* (cf. § 11 *q*) and **qutalaj/li*, f. **qutīlt*. In other words, it follows the pattern of n.ag., except that *it presupposes the existence of final short vowels at the time of the creation of Q ps* (cf. even below *e*), since we have no reason to suppose that the rule of an *i* becoming *e* in a final simply closed syllable, which has remained operative in SamH until the present time, would have been waived in this particular case.

e In af., there are more examples; we can choose *fēqed* to represent the sg. 3. m. of the type **qutīl*, of which we find the sg. 1. c. and pl. 3. c. also represented by *šēkīltī* and *gēbērū*; in the latter the *e* in the second syllable — instead of *i* — is due to the influence of *r* (see § 1 *u*). The paradigm can be supplemented by the root *ntn*, from which the following forms are attested: sg. 3. m. *nēten*, f. *nētinē*, pl. 3. c. *nētinu*, 2. m. *unūtettīmmae*. The last form is very important, insofar as together with a ms. var. (see the root *ngf*), it shows irrefutably that the Samaritan Q ps cannot have originated from the Aramaic n.pat. *qēṭīl*, as PETERMANN, *Versuch* 30sq.a. c., and following him the other students of this dialect have supposed. On the reasons for the preservation of *u* nothing certain can be stated; we refer only to the fact that in both cases it appears in the same person after the combination *wn-*, and perhaps having born a secondary stress (cf. § 2 *c*). In the root *ṭrf*, the joint influence of the 1st and 2nd rad. (see § 1 *u*) has transformed the first vowel into *a*: *ṭāref*. Of the type **qutal*, we can quote only more or less uncertain examples: sg. 3. m. can be represented by *šāṭaf* and *kāfar* (Ex 29: 33), the first vowel being due to the influence of active, in the former instance supported by *t*, but nothing makes this hypothesis more probable than the supposition that both vowels have been changed (for an example of this, see the root *šfk*); both active and passive meanings are conceivable, but Tg has passive. So the only fairly certain instances are from the root *rbs*, the genuinely passive character of which was doubted (see *a*): sg. 3. m. *rēbaš* Gn 49: 9 (and even there the interpretation as a n.pat. is not excluded), pl. 3. c. *urēbāšu* Dt 29: 19. *The preservation of i in open*

syllables in the paradigm of the type **qutīl* indicates that at the time of the creation of Q ps even afformal was provided with final vowel in sg. 3. m. (cf. above *b*), since the analogy of act. might make it probable that the other persons would have followed its analogy, had it been transformed into **qutēl* when acquiring definitely verbal character. It fits even the fact that in Akkadian there are no final vowels in the verbal forms (proper), nor a passive of the primary stem very well, while in (classical) Arabic there are both. In the Old Canaanite the former would have been lost again.¹

d 3. Of prf., there are two types. One is represented by *jéznaq̄* and f. *ʔtérbaš*, both of which are perfectly regular and go back to **ju-qtal* (cf. § 10 *r*). The other represents the passive of Q II of the root *kfr*, having consequently an analogous form *jēkâfar*, which goes back to **ju-kapar*. In the root *qsḥ*, there is a form *wjīqsaf*, 2. m. *tīqsaf*, which can go back to the former prototype, but even be an old neutral prf. of Q (af. having given way to Q ps), of which besides and af. of N we have certain examples (see, e.g., root *mVl* or *fl*). In some instances it seems possible that an old prf. of Q ps has been transformed later so that it seems to derive from N, above all in cases where no other forms of N exist, as in the roots *gbr*, *trf*, *sgḥ*, *štf*, and *šfk*, even if MT seems to suggest that the lack in some cases may be accidental.

e Note. For a possible instance of n.act., cf. § 11-*a* n. 2.

¹ This conclusion is supported by the existence of a system of final vowels quite similar to that in Arabic, in Ugaritic verbal flexion; on the other hand, it seems to me very doubtful whether in Amarna letters genuine remains of such a system any longer exist, since by far the most examples here relevant have no vowel at all, and existing vowels often have the «wrong» colour, e.g., af.sg. 3. m. has more often an *i* than *a* at the end, and, what is more, the scribes have often added similar superfluous vowels to the end of many other word forms, where their etymological existence is surely not justified, apparently from lack of skill.

§ 13. The secondary stems of Qal.

a 1. In the preceding paragraphs, a stem called Q II has sometimes been referred to. Normally we apply this to a stem of a regular Q type existing side by side with another Q stem derived from the same root. There are four such instances in all, of which three are strong, viz. *kbd*, *kfr*, and *sfr*. In all of them, Q II corresponds to a D in MT. In *kbd*, n.act. and prf. show a stem **kabed*, the preform. of prf. being based upon **ji-* (cf. § 11 *f*). The imperative is of normal type, as in the other roots mentioned. In *kfr*, all the other formations can equally be based upon **kaper* — here af. is also attested —, as in *sfr* upon **saper*, but the form of n.act. would make **kuṣr* and **suṣr* or **siṣr* equally possible. With a view to the general uniformity in these stems, however, it is more probable that the second *a* in *efkāfārak* is due to the influence of *r* (§ 1 *u*), and the first *e* in *séfer* to the influence of (*s* and) *f* (together?), as it would even be were it based upon **suṣr*. The preformative of prf. is here based upon *ju-*.

b The prf. of Q II ps of the root *kfr*, has already been cited in the preceding paragraph. Another possible instance of Q II ps is perhaps preserved in the root *šlb*, in the form of n.pat.f.pl. *'āmšālēbot*, the prototype being **ma-šalab* (MT: D ps). It is apparently denominate from **šalab*, a noun not appearing in SamH, but preserved in MT 1 K 7: 28 sq., which ultimately goes back to a Š-stem of a root *lbV*. However, apart from the fact that there are no signs of the existence of this root and hardly more of that of a Š-stem in Hebrew, its form makes a direct connection between this form and such a stem impossible. On the other hand, since the stem resembles that of a normal Q, without any increase, and denominative verbs in our dialect normally appear in Q instead of H of MT (cf. roots *škm*, *šqf*), and the sense is reflexive-passive, it seems most natural to place the form here in spite of its being formed by means of a preformative¹, unless we want to establish a special category (e.g., mQ) for it.

¹ As a matter of fact, there is nothing in the character of this element to prevent its use even in Q, as the Arab. n.pat. Q also shows.

c 2. The stem(s) dealt with above cannot actually be separated from Q proper. A stem derived from Q by means of prefixing a t-containing element to it is called tQ here. It appears to occur in 15 roots altogether, of which only three are strong, viz. *mkr*, *fqd*, and *rgz*. Even each one of them represents a type of its own, corresponding to the stem of Q: of *fqd*, af.pl. 3. c. is attested three times, it having the form 'ūtāqādū; of *mkr*, af.pl. 2. m. *wētmekkertimæ*; and of *rgz*, prf. pl. 2. m. *tīrēgāzu*. They seem to have developed from the prototypes **hitpaqad*, **hit-mekker*, and **ja-hit-rgaz*, thus showing the principle according to which this stem is formed: first af., by means of placing the element *t* before the stem of Q af., as vowelless supported by a prothetic *i*, which in turn developed a *spiritus asper* as initial; then the other conjugations by means of prefixing the relevant preformative — as far as it existed — before the new stem so formed. In the last instance the first radical was later made syllabic, its vowel disappearing; therefore, strictly speaking, even it should be counted among the weak verbs in this respect (cf. § 19).

d 3. For an instance of a stem hQ (not appearing in the strong verb) see § 53 e no. 20. A mixed stem nQ will be treated in connection with N; even this lacks strong examples.

§ 14. N - s t e m.

a 1. In this paragraph we deal with types derived from Qal by means of a preformative, the main element of which is *n*. Consequently, the stem nD does not belong to them, but will be studied among the secondary stems of D.

b 2. The commonest type appears in af. with geminated first radical, which of course is followed by a vowel, almost exclusively *a*. It is attested in 91 roots, of which in seven, however, even some other type appears beside it, the total occurrence of N being about ¹ 141. Accordingly, this type covers more than three fifths of the total.

¹ cf § 11 a n. 1.

Of the roots, 27 are strong. As demonstrated by the roots with *f* as the first radical, the gemination of this is secondary in most cases (for an exception see *d* below), since it nowadays appears as *ff* (cf. §§ 1 l, 109 ll, *mm*), and from some types of weak verbs we can conclude that the vowel of the preformative, which now normally appears as *i*, was originally *a* (cf. §§ 24, 49, etc.); consequently, we can suppose that this basic type originally consisted of three variants: **na-qatal*, *-qatel*, and *-qatol*. By now, the last mentioned one has disappeared without leaving traces, and even the second is probably considerably reduced, but there are sufficient cases to enable us to establish that the vowel of the second stem syllable really was *e* and not *i*, e.g. imp.pl.m. *'ibbādēlū*, prf.pl. 3. m. *jiddābēqu*, n.act. *wlēddābēqē*, n.pat.pl. *enniṣṣāmēdem*, even if for af. itself examples are lacking. The phenomenon of *e* giving way to *a* is illustrated even inside some roots, e.g., *str*, where the former is still left in prf.sg. 1. c.: *issāter*, but even in the same person of pl.: *nissātar* long ago given way to *a*, as shown by Ms. A, and similarly in af. and n.pat. In MT, as known, the outcome of this struggle between *a* and *e* has been the establishment of the former in af. and n.pat., and of the latter in the other forms. The question of preformatives seems slightly complex; on the basis of the present forms it seems that the form **na-* established for af. (see above) also appears in n.pat. (vel ag.), while n.act. and imp. equally clearly point to a form **hin-*, and prf. can be explained from a **ja-na-* as well as from a **ja-hin-*. It could seem now that in N the distribution of various conjugations to these two stems would correspond to that in Q to the two stems originated from n.act. and n.ag., particularly since the vocalization in MT seems to support this supposition. But, as stated above, the vocalization of N in MT is apparently the result of a secondary development, which was probably supported by the analogy of Q just referred to. Moreover, even in MT there is a factor which does not fit this scheme: the n.act. formed by means of **na-*preform., and below (*d*) we shall meet with an example of af. which presupposes the combination of both types of the preform., and there is reason to suppose that such a phenomenon was more common than can

be demonstrated, since it cannot become visible except in roots beginning with *f* (see above). So it seems that both forms have existed side by side, say, from the latter part of the Proto-Semitic period, where they may mostly have been divided between different dialects or, which to me seems more plausible, but cannot be demonstrated in any way, **(h)in-* has originated from **na-* after a period during which *n* was syllabic, but the latter was used even after that because its meaning was continually consciously realised, resulting in the frequent interchange of both in one and the same dialect; the meaning of **(h)in-*, on the other hand, was more easily forgotten, hence its growing avoidance in the formation of this stem from new roots, and at last the application of **na-* even before it. Therefore, and since it seems evident that every conjugation ultimately is based upon the stem of Q af., we suppose **na-* to have played a greater role in the formation of this stem, and can therefore put it everywhere where the original state of affairs can no longer be discovered, as in prf., which we accordingly derive from **ja-na-*. The vowel *e* remaining permanent in the last stem syllable (see above) suggests that the formation of this stem occurred at the same period at which Q af. obtained its definitely verbal character; cf. § 109 *g*.

c The type which in TibH dominates the field almost alone (for exceptions see, e.g., I. ERTAN, JQR 12 p. 30 sq.), viz. the one without vowel after the first rad., is attested in 32 roots, in 6 of which there are forms of other types beside it; accordingly, it covers about one fifth of all occurrences. It is apparently originally a variant of the preceding form, created through the syllabization of the first radical of the relevant roots; there are only two cases in which this explanation does not seem probable, viz. the roots *kbd* and *ksf*, since we do not have any certain cases of the syllabization of *k*, but they are easily explained as being analogous formations after the pattern of the rest, a development that continued in TibH through practically all the roots. Due to the nature of the matter, at least the first radical in most roots is weak, and there are only five entirely strong roots with this type of N-stem, viz. in addition to those already mentioned, *str*, *šqf*, and *tš*. Af. is attested in *ksf*; sg. 2. m. *nekséfta*,

str: sg. 3. f. *unistára*, and *tfš*: sg. 3. f. *nitfášæ*. All of them can go back to **na-qtal* (§ 1 i, l end), even if in the first case *-qtel* seems more probable. Prf. is as in the preceding type (e.g., sg. 1. c. *'ikkâbed*, -a-prf. *wikkâbêdā*), and so is n.act. (sf. *bēkkâbêdī*); imp. is not preserved. Of n.pat. & ag. there are two types: one is represented by *nīkbad*, *'ənnišqaf*, pl. *nīkbâdem*, *wənnistârem*, f. *enneš'êfā* (root *šqf*), pl. *'ənnistârot*. It goes back to **na-qtal*; the *e* vowel in sg.f. is due to the joint influence of the *q* pronounced like ' and of *f* (see § 1 u, l end), as shown by the masc. form. The other type is represented by *nēksef*, to which n.act. corresponds in MT. That the form cannot be conceived of here as n.act. is evident from the parallel phrase just preceding, where the corresponding member is a n.ag. (*'ālek*; true, even this form appears as n.act. also, but in this verb *'ālok* is used in this, so-to-say, affirmative position). It goes back to **na-ksep*.

d The third type, with a geminated second radical, cannot always be distinguished from nD; apart from that, the gemination can sometimes be secondary. There are 13 instances in all, but more than half are more or less uncertain, apart from the two cases in which another type is still formed of the same root. Certain cases are only those in which Q is attested with geminated second radical; there are two such roots, both of them strong, viz. *mkr* and *qbš*; other strong roots belonging to this type, the origin of the gemination of which is obscure, are *mlt*, *skr*, *frd*, and *šmd*. In *mkr*, the original stem **na-mekker* is still recognizable in prf.sg. 3. m. *jimmēkker*, but in pl. 3. m., as well as af. and n.act. *a* has established itself in the last stem syllable, which is the case in the root *qbš*, of which we have imp.pl. *iqqabbāšu*, seemingly going back to **hin-qabbas*, but originally probably *-qabbes* (cf. Q). The root *mlt* (e.g., n.act. *lēmmlat* from **la-hin-mallat*) may owe its geminated *l* to the intensive meaning of the verb, in the light of which even the D of MT (here lacking) might better be understood as a Q of this type; in such a case, even this instance would be genuine. In the light of the development in *mkr*, the prf.pl. 3. m. *wissekkāru* (Gn 8: 2) might go back to **ja-na-sekker*; from where the gemination stems, I do not know, unless the verb is derived from a noun like Akk. *sikkāru*.

With *šmd*, things are the same as with *mlt*, apart from the fact that the twin stem, the passive of which our N (e.g., af.sg. 1. c. *wniššam-mádⁱtī*, from **na-šammad*) is, here is H; therefore the gemination can have arisen spontaneously within this stem. The root *frd* is most interesting, since it furnishes us with an example of an old gemination of the 1st rad. in af.: pl. 3. c. *nibbarrādu* Gn 10: 5.32, which accordingly may go back to **na-hin-parrad* (cf. above *b*).¹ The gemination is also recorded in two punctuated mss. (C and Ryl. VII b). As to the gemination of the second radical, nothing certain can be stated; probably it is simply secondary, due to the nature of *r* (cf. § 1 *n* and roots *grm*, **gVr* III, *'₃r_f* I, *'₃rš* I, etc.).

e Note. A stem nQ (a kind of mixture of N and Q/Q ps) does not appear in the strong verb; see §§ 22 *d*, 29, 49, etc.

f Note 2. As was already done in § 13, the different t-stems are treated in connection with the main stems to which they are attached, since there is no independent T-stem comparable to N and H; we therefore proceed to H.

§ 15. H - s t e m s.

a 1. In this paragraph, apart from the stem(s) derived from the primary stem by means of a preformative the main element of which — according to kt — is the consonant *'₂*, we will treat even those in which its historical variants *'* and *š* (cf. § 10 *y*) appear instead, i.e., the A- and Št-stems. There is the more reason to do so, since A seems to be only a variant of H (see below *e*).

¹ We can of course be fairly sure that this is not the only instance of this formation — which we perhaps can call hN — in SamH still in existence, but this is the only one that can be proved; another probable example is *'unikkāfer* Dt 21: 8, to which *w^enikkapper* corresponds in MT; the latter is also much more easily explained in this way than by the supposition that here we would have an instance of the conjugation Nithpa'el, the existence of which in Biblical Hebrew cannot be demonstrated, with *t* assimilated to the first radical, an assimilation which in this language would occur only in this and a few other, wholly analogous cases!

b 2. At present, the only type of H attested in the strong verb, apparently goes back to **ha-qtil*, as can be demonstrated, e.g., by the following examples: root *bdl*: af.sg. 3. m. *ēbdel*, f. *wābdīla*, l. *eb-dīlū*, pl. 2. m. *wābdēlīmma*; prf.sg. 3. m. *jēbdel*, 2. m. *tēbdel*, l.c. *wābdel*; n.ag. *mēbdēl*; root *frd*: af.sg. 3. m. *ēfred*; prf. pl. 2. m. *tēfrīdū*; n.act.sf. *bāfrīdu*; root *qdš*: af.sg. 1. c. *'æqdīštī*, prf.sg. 3. m. *jéqdeš*, 2. m. *téqdeš*, pl. 3. c. *jaqdīšū*, n.act.sf. *lāqdīšāni*, n.ag.pl.m. *mæqdīšem*. The *h* was elided in prf. and n.ag. probably at the time of the first weakening of gutturals (see § 109 *t*) after the preformatives *ja-* etc. (see § 4 *a*) and *ma-*, the vowel of the preformatives preceding having probably disappeared shortly before (ib.). From the form of the stem we can conclude that the stem preformative originally bore the main stress — unlike, apparently, that of N —, since the vowel of the first stem syllable has disappeared entirely, which also indicates that it attracted the stress even from the preformative of prf.; and that *during the time of its creation, final vowels in all verbal forms existed*. This shows that it was created after, say, Q af. or N, and apparently during the same period as Q ps. This may seem to contradict the fact that in Akkadian the corresponding stem is fully developed, while the counterpart of our af., stative, seems to stand nearer to the nominal form from which it has developed. On the other hand, however, it must be observed that (according to GELB) stative is already present in the Old Akkadian in the same form as in later periods, and the cause for its lack of further development is apparent: the function corresponding to the main one of the West Semitic af. had meanwhile been taken over by another conjugation newly developed in that language; and the connection between Akkadian Š- and Canaanitic H-stem cannot have been very close, as is witnessed by the different form of the preformative. It is quite possible that both have been created rather independently from one another after the departure of Akkadian from the common idiom, only guided by the tendencies toward such a development already present in Proto-Semitic — for, if our hypothesis of the origin of these stems (§ 10 *w-y*) is correct, this stem is but a third-person parallel to the first-person N, which was already formed in

Proto-Semitic (§ 14 *b*). In the strong verb, as has been stated, the *i* vowel has established itself as the only one in the second stem syllable, but in certain weak verbs (e.g., *bV'*, *r'_4*) even *a* appears in some forms indicating that here a development opposite to that in N has taken place: *i* has supplanted *a*, where this had originally existed, almost entirely. This was doubtless supported by the tendency to polarity, as illustrated even by the fact that in practically all the cases — the exceptions are caused by the nature of the following consonant or by the analogy of Q in biradical stems — in which *a* has preserved itself in the primary stem, the vowel of the preformative is supplanted by *i*, e.g. *'ibátta*; later on, when the rule of polarity had ceased to function, *i* spread further to some other roots, probably through the mediation of the forms not having *a* in the stem syllable either, in the roots in which other forms had it, e.g. *'ibi*¹. In the root *zkr*, the incompatibility of *z-k* (cf. § 11 *f*) has led to a form of n.ag. with a vowel after the 1st rad.: *māzâker*, while in af. *k* is voiced: *wāzgirtânî*.

e H ps seems to be preserved in 20 roots, none of which, however, is strong. Moreover, the only case in which the first radical is not weak in some way, *'éšmē* Dt 4: 33, is of doubtful origin: in the MT Q with the interr. prefix corresponds to it, which fits the context much better, apart from the fact that a H ps of this verb is not attested anywhere else. With the help of two *n*-augmented roots, *ngd* and *nkV*, we can, however, reconstruct its prototype with some probability. The attested forms are: af.sg. 3. m. *'úkkā*, prf.sg. 3. m. *wjūggad*, var. (Ms. B) *wjūggad*, n.pat. (m. & f.) *cem-*

¹ In his seventh rule (see BEN-HAYYIM, *op.cit.* I p. 153) the Samaritan ABU SA'ID tries to forestall this development by ruling — possibly influenced by TibH where, as is known, *i* (or its variant *e*) had established itself everywhere in af., but *a* was preserved in prf. — that where the preformative of H has *i* in af., *a* in prf. must correspond to it, but apparently the former was already so common in his time in prf. that its establishment even there could not be prevented any longer. The former existence of *a* in the stem syllable to a much larger extent is implied by the state of affairs in Arabic too, where it has prevailed over *i*.

múkkā, pl.m. *mákkem*. The preservation of *u* apparently served to distinguish the forms from active ones, in n.pat. perhaps supported by the presence of *m*; the prototype was accordingly **hu-qtal*, to which the preformatives of prf. and n.ag. (here in negative sense), **ja-* and **ma-* were attached, as in the active form to **ha-qtíl*, the development afterwards being analogous to that described above (*b*).

d A stem called H II is attested in one root or perhaps two, but neither of them is strong; moreover, the form of the root apparently influences the present pronunciation so strongly that the prototype cannot be recognized with any certainty; cf. § 51 *e*.

e 3. A stem with ' instead of '₂ as the preformative consonant appears sometimes in mss., as a variant to the main stem (see App. D); we call it A. Mostly it has doubtless originated through a scribal error, forms with '₂ always appearing beside it, but in one case the origin is different; it is the only case in strong roots worth mentioning here. The root is *zkr*, the form, af.sg. 1. c.: 'ēzākártī, appearing in Ex 20: 24, where prf.sg. 1. c. 'azkír corresponds to it in MT. It is clear that the ' — which in this single case has no '₂ variant in any ms. known to me, including the edition of v. GALL — stems from the preformative of prf., the present form being a dogmatic correction parallel to that in Dt in the passages in which the divine choice of a certain place is spoken of, the MT prf. (= future) having been altered into af. (= past), since according to the Samaritans the Mount of Garizim had already been selected as the Holy Place when the Pentateuch was written. The vowel of the first radical, again, stems from the incompatibility of *z-k* (cf. § 11 *f*).

f 4. The only instance of the reflexive Š-stem preserved derives from a root which does not contain one single firm radical ('₃cV); therefore it will be treated in connection with that group (see § 47 *b*).

§ 16. D - s t e m.

a 1. An active D-stem is preserved in 86 roots. Judging from the present forms, it seems to go back to four different types, the distribution of which is the following: 1) **gattel*, 32 attestations, of

which 8 are in strong roots; 2) **qettel*, 30 and 19, resp.; 3) **qattal*, 20 (of which 4, however, are only by-forms beside **qettel*; see *b* below and § 30 *b*) and 5, resp., and 4) **qettal*, 8 and 1, resp. In this paragraph, even roots beginning with *j* or *n* are regarded as strong, since their weakness does not influence the inflexion in any way.

b The origin of the whole stem was dealt with in § 10 *s*. As to the formation of different types, two main factors seem to have had an influence upon it above all others. Firstly, the influence of the single radicals of which the root is composed seems to have left the clearest traces, insofar as certain consonants prefer *e*, the others *a*. So in every instance of the type **qettal* the last radical is either *r* or a guttural or dorsal consonant (cf. § 1 *u*), or represented by a vowel, regarding which it must be observed that the roots ending with a vowel in the 3rd pers.sg. (m. & f.) of af. have an *a* in this place, in the other forms *i* (cf. TibH), apart from a few exceptions in certain forms (see § 30 *d*). Again, all the roots with a guttural as the second rad. invariably belong to the type **qattel*; on the other hand, only three roots with vocalic ending belong to this type, and in every case there is a guttural (*h*) or dorsal (*q*) as the first or second radical; the remaining four, of which only one has a guttural (') as the first radical, the others no such sound nor *r*, have passed over to **qettel*, which in this case appears as **qetti*; apparently the long *i* has caused the transformation (cf. §§ 1 *r*, 30 *b*). Even for the type **qattal* there are only three exceptions (roots 'bd, '3h, fl) from the rule established for **qettal*, and if we suppose that the *l* of the two last roots has been »thick», as particularly in *fl* it still often is today, only one remains. Again, there are only two instances of *e* as the first stem vowel after a guttural (and ') as against 19 instances of *a*, and only one after a dorsal (*q*) as against 9 *a*'s; on the other hand, *e* appears as the first stem vowel in 10 cases after a sibilant (except *s*) or *f*, *a* in the same positions only 6 times, of which 4 can be caused by the following consonant (', *q*, *t*). The other important factor is when the primary form of a noun is in a close relationship to the relevant stem; in the first place it can be seen in the cases which furnish exceptions to the rules mentioned above. So the MT

'*abaddon* may suffice to explain the form of our *'abbad; similarly our *qes*, f. *qēsšā* account for **qēsšas*, *šāncē* is responsible for **šanna*', and *šābar* for **šabbar*, particularly as the two last nouns have the character of n.act. A tendency to vowel harmony has already been referred to above in connection with the development of the roots ending with a vowel; perhaps even *'emmes — as a late development? — can be attributed to it; and *imala* may have had some influence too, but it varies between different informants. Finally, in the roots *rgl* and *šqs*, the denom. D uses the basic noun as its n.act.

c 2. The afformal was formed from these stems by means of the normal affirmatives already familiar (§ 4 b), in accordance with the type of Q af. with a geminated 2nd rad., and perhaps similarly prf.: as in the type of Q prf. with two-syllabic stem (§ 11 e-f), the preformative syllable remained open and accordingly long, and with the shift $\acute{a} > \bar{a}$ during the Old Canaanite period, further **jō-*; with the shift of stress to the penultimate and a subsequent period of strong accent, the vowel was shortened and identified with *u* (cf. § 11 f), which again was made *e* in connection with the universal development. This construction, however, seems to have three weaknesses; even if none of them is decisive: firstly, it could seem more natural for the first stem syllable to carry the stress than the preformative, the vowel of which may not have been originally long; but we should remember that D originated from a type of Q, and since in Q in general the stress in any case was upon the preformative, this analogy continued its influence long enough to make the length of the preformative vowel permanent. Thereafter, the preformative could retain the accent rather easily. Another possible comment, which has more weight, is that the roots containing a guttural as the first radical seem always to have had *a* as the preformative vowel; at least the present forms go back to ones presupposing that. On the other hand, it is possible that the preformative vowel retained its o-colour throughout because of the influence of the guttural, and was accordingly transformed to *a* during the last great sound shift (see § 109 aa). A third weakness is that the development from a long *o* to a short *u* cannot be demonstrated in

detail, but on the other hand it cannot be regarded as impossible either, since the difference between *o* and *u* ceased to be phonemic at some time during the Old Testament period, and the quantities of the vowels were strongly changed during the periods of heavy stress and immediately after them (see § 109 *q-aa*). Altogether, however, these arguments seem to have so much weight that it is more probable that the stress lay on the first stem syllable, with the preform. vowel accordingly short, and *u* taken over from a form in which it had developed »lawfully» and which also bore a resemblance with D great enough to make such a loan possible; the form of Q prf. with bisyllabic stem, but the second radical ungeminated, seems to satisfy all these demands (see § 11 *f*). So it has been thought best to record the earliest form to which we can go back with certainty, i.e., in normal roots *u*, in those beginning with a guttural *a*, as the prototype from which the present preformative vowel derives.

d The other forms correspond to those of Q of the same type (§ 11 *b-c*), except n.ag., the stem of which is the same, but which is formed by means of a preformative **ma-*, which might also have its origin in the indefinite usage of the interrogative pronoun. In most cases it has lost its vowel, become syllabic, and lastly got a prothetic vowel, so that its original vowel could not be discerned, had not a few cases with the original vowel been left, above all in the roots beginning with *m* — or a guttural, but these cases are not relevant here —, but even in others, e.g. *mābēqqēš*. All of these show forms presupposing *a* as the preform. vowel in the prototype, from which we conclude that it never bore the main stress.

e The forms with *e* in the last stem syllable preserve it permanently unchanged through the whole inflection, which indicates that D as a real secondary stem was still formed during the period from which Q af. and N derive, when the last system of final vowels had not yet developed to the verbal forms (cf. § 10 *m*).

f 3. Of D ps — which is attested in 24 roots, four of the cases, however, being uncertain — we have only a few strong examples, in the roots *brk*, *bšl*, *šbš*, *šzr*, *šlš*, and perhaps *rbk*. Most of the instances are of n.pat.; only *bšl* has preserved other forms: af.sg. 3. f.

bəššēlā, prf.sg. 3. f. *tēbāššēl*, n.pat. *ʾəmbāššēl*. As it appears, the forms rather closely resemble active ones, and this is indeed the case in very many forms of D ps, especially in contexts in which they can somehow be interpreted as active; in most cases Tg has decided which is to be regarded as original. The vocalization resulting from regular development might be preserved in *ʾəməššēzar*; that the *e* is not caused by the two neighbouring sibilants (§ 1 *i*), may be shown, a.e., by the form *əlmēqəššāot* (root *qsʾ*₄); the *e* vowel of its preformative is caused by the prefixed preposition, the form being derived lastly from **lṁqəššāʾot* through **alṁ-* where it is surrounded by two dorsals, even *š*, as geminated, representing a genuine dorsal (cf. § 1 *u*). Thus we may conclude that the prototype of this stem was **quttal* provided with the same pre- and affirmatives as the active in corresponding conjugations, but due to the relative rarity of its appearance, underlay the influence of the active forms and was assimilated to the latter wherever contextual meaning somehow permitted.

§ 17. The secondary stems of D.

a 1. As from the type of Q with bisyllabic stem and geminated second rad., a N-stem was sometimes formed even from D; in addition, with the growing obsolescence of D ps, some of the forms of the latter, which it was not possible to interpret as active forms, were transformed so that they now seem to belong to N, but the gemination of the second radical normally preserved together with the corresponding MT form or even that of another conjugation in SP itself, normally betrays the origin of these forms. In some isolated cases, however, it is not certain to which of these etymologically different groups the form should be assigned, and since their outward form is at present identical, we will deal with them together as a stem called nD. To the genuine type belong at least the roots *ṁnʾ*, *jsd*, *kbš*, *klV I*, *nqš*, and *qdš*, perhaps even *nšl*, while the forms in the roots *bkr*, *gbr*, and *gnb* are plainly transformations of D or Q ps and those in *kbs* and *qšr* (for the latter of which I rely on the authority of PETERMANN alone) are more or less obscure.

b The strong forms of the genuine type invariably go back to **qattal* provided with the normal pre- and affirmatives of the corresponding N conjugations; n.act. is preserved only provided with the affirmative *-a* : ' *ʿejjæssádā* (root *jsd*, which even in this stem — as well as in tD — can be regarded as strong); accordingly, it goes back to **hin-jassad-a*. A n.pat. is not preserved, but from some forms in MT (cf. root *ʿm*) we can conclude that it, too, followed the pattern of N. In the root *bkr* both D and this form *jibbákkar* are denominatives from *bákor*; the meaning of the latter verbal form being purely passive, we derive it from **ju-bukkar* by way of **je-bekkar* and the semantic analogy of **jiqqattal* to the present form. With *wjiggabbáru* the pre-history has been still longer, as the parallel af., which belongs to Q ps, indicates together with the variant *ujiggebaru* recorded by PETERMANN (Gn 7: 18); the earliest traceable form seems thus to be **ji-gubar*; perhaps it is another instance preserved of Q ps prf. with bisyllabic stem? In the root *gnb* it is the afformal that is transformed, simply by means of adding *n* even in kt; the gemination of the 2nd rad. has been given up in sg. 1. c. as well as in prf. (to which N corresponds even in MT); therefore it is best classified as N. As to the root *kbs*, its form of af. ' *ikkábbas* seems to indicate that it is a genuine nD formed by means of the preform. **hin-* (cf. § 14 *b*), but the *æ* vowel of the first stem syllable points to a former *u*; on the other hand, this can be due to the initial *i*. The prf.sg. 3. f. *tikkabbas* supports the latter alternative. Finally if the form *ammaqqāšárot* be genuine, it might have been derived from an original **ma-quššar* mainly by means of a transfer of the gemination from the second to the first radical, but some other factors must have co-operated besides that.

c 2. The more usual form of the reflexive-passive of D is formed from the latter by means of prefixing the preformative **hit-* to the normal D stem, just as tQ from Q; it is therefore called tD. In the stem, however, no vocalic variation — apart from one exception, in the root *brk* — appears any longer; the universal prototype appears now to be **hit-qattal*. Apart from the single exception, the state of things in TibH, where the opposite development has gone almost

as far, suggests, that it has obtained this position — to which cf. the fifth stem of Arabic — at the expense of at least a former **hitqattel*.

d The different conjugations have been formed from this stem of tD by means of prefixing the normal affirmatives of af., and the preformatives of prf. (in the original form **ja-* etc.) and n.ag./pat. in the secondary stems to it, the theme being accordingly: af. **hitqattal*, prf. **ja-hit-qattal*, imp. **hit-qattal*, n.act. **hit-qattal*, n.ag./pat. **ma-hit-qattal*. The stress probably lay upon the first syllable of the basic stem, the subsequent development having been comparable to that in H (cf. §§ 15 b, 109 t).

§ 18. F O U R - R A D I C A L V E R B .

a In the SP, two verbal forms based upon a four-radical stem are preserved. One of them has strong radicals, viz. *ušēlšittā* Dt 19: 3. It seems to be a denominative from *šlšet* »a third (part)«, to which it corresponds in meaning, even if it is of course possible that it has been created from a triradical **šellišta* (to which cf. the corresponding MT form) by means of a simple transposition, influenced by the form of the noun mentioned. The latter alternative, however, seems to me less probable, since the D of the root *šlš* in this meaning is a *hapax legomenon* even in MT, nor is the passive of this meaning represented by its D ps in either dialect.

b Note. No other verbal stems are attested in the strong verb in SamH.

c Note 2. The verb with suffixes will be treated *en bloc* after the weak verbs.

B. THE WEAK VERBS

i. Verba primae infirmae.

§ 19. G E N E R A L R E M A R K S .

a It is not very easy to determine which sounds are to be regarded as weak when they stand at the beginning of verbal roots. Above (§ 13 c) we met a form of a root beginning with *r*, which at some

time had become syllabic and thus shared a characteristic which in that position normally appears only in semi-vowels (see § 24 *f*). In another place (§ 11 *s*) we found even *š* in the beginning of a root in a state presupposing one-time syllabicity, the state itself also being irregular. On the other hand, as we saw in §§ 16—17, the verbs *primae j vel n* do not cause any irregularities when inflected in the D-stem and its relatives. Moreover, even in one and the same root strong forms sometimes appear side by side with the weak ones, e.g., the forms of n.act. Q of the root *ntn*. And finally, in the hollow roots forms appear which seem to presuppose the addition of *w* as the first radical (see § 48 *c, e*). The last phenomenon, however, seems to be only phonetic in nature; as to the others, we must endeavour to exclude more or less accidental or unessential cases. Following the lead given by this principle, we conclude that this class comprises all the verbs the roots of which begin with an ' (going back to any guttural), and additionally, those the roots of which begin with a *j* (going back to *j* or *w*) or *n*, and the verbal root *lq'*₃, except in the group of secondary stems with an internal modification, in which they are numbered among the strong verbs in this respect; they also differ from the group beginning with an ' in so far as the first radical in them in most roots is a relatively late augmentation. Therefore we will also treat them separately, beginning with the guttural group, since this bears closer resemblance to the strong verb. The hollow roots and the so-called chain duratives here as well as in the following classes are excluded because of their essentially different nature, and will be treated separately after all the other classes.

a. Verba primae ' (seu gutturalis).

§ 20. ' *kl, ' mr.*

a 1. Among the verbs *primae '*, there are two which behave in a special way. As in the rest of this class, the inflection of n.act. without prefixes, of imp., or of the agential group (see § 10 *m-*) of Q does not normally differ from that in the strong verb. As to the n.act. with prefixed prepositions, we have here two instances of it,

both of the root *'mr* : *bē'ûmer* and *lîmor*. The former seems to go back to **'umr*, as also the form without any additions, *'ûmar* (= strong verb). The form *lîmor* belongs to the established type *l + n.act.*, which already acquired the form **leqtol* at an early time (see § 10 *k*), it seems to be based upon the type **qatâl*, the first stem vowel having disappeared as described in § 30 *b*; during the second heavy stress period, *e* might have been »sharpened» into *i*, and with the final quiescization of ', *i* was of course lengthened. On the other hand, the combination with *b* was of course accidental, probably a combination of **ba* and **'ómor*, resulting in **be'ómor*. Apparently toward the end of the Old Hebrew period, the articulation of *m* slackened so that it came to resemble *w* (cf. §§ 1 *k*, 109 *hh*). As a consequence of this, the *o* preceding it, being now homorganic, became lengthened under the stress after the normal pattern of semi-vowels preceded by the homorganic stressed vowel (cf. § 1 *m*; the gemination of a semi-vowel is only a phonetic variant of the lengthening of the homorganic vowel immediately preceding); the length was preserved even after the pronunciation of *m* was intensified again (cf. § 109 *x*); the second vowel was elided during the 2nd heavy stress period (cf. §§ 11 *a*, 109 *nn*).

b The main peculiarity distinguishing these two from the rest of I' verbs appears in *prf.*, and must derive from the time before the establishment of the main stress upon the penultimate syllable, since the *-a-prf.* does not share it: *wēmêra* Ex 3: 17 (true, there is a variant after the normal pattern of *prf.*, and in *'kl* such a form alone appears, but it can much more easily be supposed to be secondary, since there is no obvious parallel according to which the quoted form — which is even older, recorded by SCHAADE — would have been formed; and cf. what follows); this form seems to go back directly to an Old Canaanitic **(wa)'a'mara*, which presupposes the stress upon one of the two last syllables in this conjugation and the preservation of the original *u* in the last stem syllable until the universal change $\ddot{u} > \ddot{e}$. Even the latter is quite conceivable, since even in the plain *prf.* there were no forms with *o* in the last stem syllable the pattern of which *-a-prf.* could have followed, since that sound in them had already dissimilated into *e* earlier (cf. below *c*).

e The prf. forms presuppose a prototype $*j\acute{a}'ukl > *j\acute{a}'kul / -ol$. Toward the end of the Old Canaanite period, when the gutturals became capable of syllabization (cf. § 109 *q*), the first radical ' became homorganic with the preceding *a* vowel (cf. § 1 *d*), and as a consequence completely assimilated to it. The result was a long *a*, which subsequently developed into a long *o*; at least in this case the main stress in w-prf. seems to have shifted to the penultimate before the rule of a stressed long *a* becoming *o* had ceased to function, unless we suppose that w-prf. later on was completely transformed according to the plain prf. or that \bar{a} became \bar{o} even unstressed (cf. § 109 *o*). It is possible that the preformative vowel during the period of the syllabization and final quiescization of ' was pronounced energetically enough to attract the stress from the prefixed conjunction. In any case, the result was $*j\acute{o}'kol$, which was dissimilated into $*j\acute{o}'kel$, a form which remained as such in TibH. In SamH, however, the development continued. It seems that *k* came to belong to both syllables (cf. § 109 *r*), which means that the first syllable became overlong, and its vowel together with long vowels in closed, hence overlong syllables during the subsequent light stress period, a developed double peak accent, which led to the breaking up of that syllable and the development of a glide between the two vowels thus created; one of the vowels was subsequently dissimilated. The glide created was of course homorganic with the two vowels; since in this case it was ', we can conclude that the phonemic identification of *o* and *u* had not yet followed. The development seems, accordingly, to have been: $*j\acute{o}'kel > *j\acute{o}'kel > *j\acute{o}'okel > *j\acute{o}'\acute{o}kel > *j\acute{a}'\acute{o}kel$. When comparing the result with that in the noun $r\acute{e}'\acute{o}š$ etc., however, we see that the outcome of the dissimilation is different. From where it comes, I cannot decide, but perhaps the final place of the stress played some part in it, insofar as the presence of accent sometimes even to-day seems to favour more forward vowels (cf. even such phenomena as in MT H of this verb: $ha'\acute{e}k\acute{a}lti$, but $w^e ha'^a k\acute{a}lti$, -*tím*); another possible factor is the place of this phenomenon, insofar as *e* did not appear in the verbal preformatives

at that time apart from a couple of instances in special circumstances (cf. § 24 *d*).¹

d The rest of the forms resemble those in the other verbs I ' in N, both seem to have used a **qatel*-type primary stem, and in 'kl it is irregular insofar as the onetime syllabicity of ' is presupposed in af.: *unâkkel* (< **na-kel*), but not in n.pat.f.: *'annîjjâkêlat* (< **na-akel-t*). In both H af. has the type **ha-qal*, e.g., *'â-kâllî*, *'âmârak* (sf.), but in the other conjugations ('kl prf. and n.ag. are preserved) *i* has supplanted *a* as the stem vowel (cf. § 15 *b*). Q ps is from the type **qutîl*.

§ 21. The normal type of I ' based upon n. act. Q
**qutl*.

a 1. This group comprises at least thirty roots, which do not have other weak consonants among their radicals; true, there are cases in which even other forms appear, which seem to presuppose a different stem, viz. *'₂rg*, *'₄bd?* (**qatl*), *'₃bl* I (**qattel*), *'₄md?* (**qatal?* **qattal?*), and *'₂lk*, on which cf. § 11 *r*. In Q, the forms are like strong ones in most conjugations; the only exceptions are, again, the forms of n.act. which are provided with a prefixed particle, and the various prf. forms. Out of many instances, we choose some of the root *'₄zb* as typical: n.act. *lâzzab*; prf. *jâzzab!*, *wjâzzab*, *tâzzab*, sf. *'âzzâbak*; they go back to **la'zob*, **ja'zob*, which developed otherwise like the corresponding forms of the strong verb, but the vowel of the prefix and preformative respectively remained *a* on account of the influence of the guttural, until the total quiescization of the latter, when the vowel, as a compensation for the lost radical, was lengthened, and the following consonant geminated, so that we can speak of the assimilation of the guttural to the following consonant (cf. § 109 *ll*). The overlong syllable so created was afterwards occasionally shorten-

¹ The form *v'âklehu* Job 20:26 probably derives from a pronunciation similar to that in our dialect.

ed, either by means of shortening its vowel (as in *jāzzab*), or more often by the simplification of the consonant (e.g., *wjāšāmū*, root $'_4sm$). The roots with *f* as the second radical show that this developed into a spirant before the final quiescization of the guttural, since the result of the gemination is $-ff^{-1}$, e.g. *wjāffālū* (root $'_4fl$ I), unless we suppose that the gemination is wholly secondary and followed independent of the quiescization of the guttural and some time after it, which of course is not wholly excluded, but considering the fact that the gutturals before their quiescization, and once even earlier (see *d* below) shared with *n* one of its most important characteristics, capability of syllabization, and as a consequence of that, often syllabicity, it seems less probable than the alternative mentioned first; and cf. § 109 *ll*.

b 2. Regarding *Q* ps and the secondary stems, the limitation mentioned in the rubric of this paragraph is naturally not valid. Considering that the type of n.act. **qull* is the most general one, we can regard it as a normal basis of *Q*, and deal with the passive voice and the secondary stems here, since the normalization in them has gone so much farther that rival forms in them very rarely have any influence on the peculiarities caused by the guttural.

c *Q* ps is attested in four roots belonging to this group, viz., $'_4fl$, $'_2fk$, $'_3gr$, and $'_3mš$. In $'_2fk$, two forms of af.: sg. 3. m. *ēfek*, f. *'ifika*, and prf.sg. 3. m. *'jifek*, are attested, in the others only n.pat.pl., e.g., m. *'ēgêrem*, f. *'ēfilot*. All the forms go back to the type **qutīl*; the *é* is caused by the following *r* (§ 1 *u*) the *'i-* in af.f. by the context in general; an *ī* immediately preceding (Lv 13: 10), and *f* following (cf. § 1 *l*). In the prf. form, *f* has influenced both of the neighbouring vowels, regarding the former perhaps supported by *j*, since otherwise **jêfak* should be the outcome of **juhpak* (cf. § 109 *bb*).

d *tQ* does not offer much requiring explanation: the first radical is simply omitted after the stem preformative, e.g., prf.sg. 3. m.

¹ There appears to be one exception, *jābbaš* from the root $'_3š$, but it may be due to the influence of Modern Hebrew, since it has no support in the vocalized mss. (cf. App. I; the form is recorded from one informant only).

wjēṭābal (< **ja-hit-'abal*), n.ag.f. *emmēṭāfēkēt* (< **ma-hit-hapek-t*). In the third root, 'šb, the primary stem is **qattal* : *jēlāššab* (cf. § 23 e). In the N-stem, the forms preserved often presuppose the syllabification of the guttural before its disappearance, viz. in the roots 'dr, 'zlk, 'kl, cf. § 20 d), 'mn, '₃md, '₃rf, and '₃šl of this group; e.g., n.pat.pl. 'annā-šālem of the last mentioned group. Most of the roots, however, show another type, usually **na-qtel*, e.g. n.pat. *annāmen*, pl. *nāmēnem*, f. *nāmēnot*; in this root it is possible that even in prf. ' has become syllabic, insofar as **jāmēnū* can have undergone the following development: **já-na-'men* > **ján-'men* < **já''men* > **jāmen*; another possibility is that the latter is an old prf. of Q, which acquired N af.etc. next to it, the whole forming a kind of nQ (cf. § 14 e a.e.). In '₃md, again, the form of n.ag. *nēmmad* seems to go back to **ne-hmad*; on the colour of the preformative vowel cf. the next paragraph. In n.ag. *nādārī* Ex 15: 6.11 there is an additional -i attached to the end; from where it stems, I do not know, unless it is simply an emphatic affirmative like -*jā^h* (TibH; cf. M. JASTROW, ZAW 16, p. 16, and TH. NÖLDEKE, BZAW 33, p. 378 sq.). These instances show without doubt that the original shape of the N preformative was **na-*; in the remaining stem syllable *e* prevailed, due to the tendency to polarity, except in the cases in which the last rad. preferred *a* (if this supposition is correct, it might mean that the *l* in the root '₃šl was »thick»). As to the deviation of the root '₃md from this rule, its cause can only be conjectured: perhaps its N was formed at a time when the rule of polarity had already changed the form of the N preform. to **ni-* in a normal environment (cf. the parallel development **ja-* > **ji-* in Q prf. already presupposed by the forms to be dealt with in the next paragraph). In this type, an example of af. is not preserved (except 'kl, cf. § 20 d). For the other type, we can take the root '₂fk as an example; af.sg. 3. m. *nījjāfak*, pl. 3. c. *unījjāfākū*; accordingly, it goes back to **na*(> *ni*)-*hapak*; in this type, again, it is possible that no n.ag./pat. is preserved (except 'kl, cf. § 20 d).¹ Considering this, it would seem that the

¹ The n.pat. *nījjāsaf* (root 'sf) (Gn 49: 29) can also be conceived of as an af., in the sense of a *futurum exactum* in temporal clause.

difference is not between different types of the whole stem, but between af. and n.ag./pat., and it is probable that this indeed was originally the case (cf. § 109 *t*). The type of prf. is everywhere the same, e.g. sg. 3. f. *tījjāsar* (root '₄sr), m. *ijjābad* ('₄bd); that the latter has finally developed from **ijjābad*, PETERMANN, *Versuch* 38 sq., has already recognized. The whole development would have been: **já-na-'abad* > **jln-'abad* > **jí-'abad* > **ji-'abad* > **ijjābad* > '*ijjābad* (diss.). On the dissimilation in the last phase the forms provided with the conjunction *w-* may have had an influence, insofar as, e.g., a form **wijjāfak* would naturally tend to become the actually attested *wījjāfak* (root '₂fk). In the root '₃š I it seems that we have an instance of the type with geminated 2nd rad: pl.l.c. *nījjāllaš*, but in the absence of any other signs of the relevant gemination in this root, it being lacking even in the other form of N prf. attested, we may rather certainly attribute the phenomenon to the aptitude of *l* to be secondarily geminated (see § 1 *n* end). On the other hand, it seems that in the root '₃šb the gemination of the 2nd rad. has been given up secondarily in this stem — perhaps because of the secondary gemination of the 1st rad. —, since Q and tQ have it practically throughout the inflection. The forms of imp. and n.act. do not contain anything surprising, e.g., imp.pl. '*ijjāsāfū*, n.act. '*ijjāsaf*; the form of imp.sg. '*ujāsaf* is a rapid reading variant of **wijjāsaf*; in n.act. '*ijjāsēfā* the familiar but etymologically obscure *-a* has been appended; the preceding *e* vowel owes its colour to the neighbouring consonants (§ 1 *i*, *l*).

e H corresponds to the strong type in other respects except that first radical is supplanted by the lengthening of the H preform. vowel and normally the gemination of the following consonant; the vowel mentioned being practically throughout *a* (or its phonetic variant *æ*). Examples: af.sg. 3. m. '*āddēf* (root '₄df), *wēmmēd*, sf. *wēmmēdu* ('₄md), prf. sg. 3. m. *jērrek*, *wjárrek*, pl. 3. c. *jērrīku* ('₄rk); imp. '*āzzeq*, f. *wēz'iqī* ('₃zq); n.act. '*ābbeṭ* ('₄bt), *lābēd* ('₄bd), *ubāttif* ('₄tf); n.ag. *māzzeq* ('₃zq), sf. *ammākkīlak* ('kl), pl. *māmīnem* ('mn); f. *māmēset* ('₃mš). Accordingly, they go back to **ha-qtīl*, **ja-ha-qtīl*, **ha-qtīl*, **ha-qtīl*, **ma-ha-qtīl*, resp. (cf. § 15 *b*). In two roots, 'sf and

'_2lk , exceptional forms appear. As to the former, it is represented by n.act. only, which has the form $l\acute{s}ef$ (Lv 19: 25, kt normally $l_2'sjf$; in a few mss. ' omitted); the reason for the appearance of i instead of the expected a may be the tendency to differentiate the form from the n.act. of Q — the existence of which in the living language must of course be postulated —, which would similarly have the form $*l\acute{s}esef$ (cf. above a ; the e vowel in the stem syllable to account for the influence of s and f , cf. § 1 i, l); the analogy of the hollow roots (cf. § 49 e) has of course supported the development, as indicated even by the kt var. The root '_2lk , again, can in a certain sense be equated with $\text{'}kl$ and $\text{'}mr$, even if the reason of the irregularity here is different in form; the basic factor may, in any case, be their frequent use and apparently great age, which are but two aspects of one and the same matter. This may ultimately have caused the fact that they anticipated the development later performed — at least in a part of the phases — by all their classes. The decisive step was thus the quiescization of the first radical, in this case h . It seems that the identical consonant in the preform. has thus had some influence, to judge from the fact that in Ugaritic, where the corresponding stem is formed by means of the \acute{s} -preform., h is preserved in that stem, although dropped in Q as in Hbr (cf. the next paragraph, b). The preserved forms are: af.sg. 3. m.sf. $\text{'}\acute{u}l\acute{i}k\acute{a}ek$, prf.sg. 3. m. $j\acute{u}lek$, l.c.: $u'\acute{u}lek$; imp.f. $\text{'}\acute{a}l\acute{i}k\acute{i}$; n.ag.sf. $\text{'}\acute{e}mm\acute{u}l\acute{i}k\acute{a}k$. The development has been, as it seems: af. $*h\acute{a}-hlik > *h\acute{a}lik > *h\acute{o}lik = *h\acute{u}lik > *\acute{u}lek$; prf. $*ja-h\acute{a}-hlik > *jh\acute{a}lik > *j\acute{o}lik = j\acute{u}lek$; imp., apparently a late formation, and therefore created as from the root $*lk$, analogously with the Q form (cf. even TibH form): $*h\acute{a}-lik > *\acute{a}lek$; n.ag. $*ma-h\acute{a}-hlik > *mh\acute{a}-lik > *m\acute{o}lik = *m\acute{u}lek$. Of H ps, no instances are preserved.

f The deviations of D from the strong verb correspond to those in Q; n.ag. is in this respect wholly parallel to prf. Examples: prf.sg. 3. m. $u'j\acute{a}mm\acute{e}\acute{s} < *ja\acute{h}mm\acute{e}\acute{s}^1 < *ja-\acute{h}amm\acute{e}\acute{s}$; $wj\acute{a}ll\acute{a}f < *ja\acute{h}ll\acute{a}f$

¹ The transcription is roughly approximative; as a matter of fact, the vowel of the preformative might in this stage have been rather short (cf. § 109 $kk-ll$), and the first radical may also have preserved something of its original vowel;

< **ja-hállap*; n.act. *láššar* < **la^zššar* < **la-‘áššar*; n.ag. *mássef*
 < **ma^zssef* < **ma-‘ássep*; etc. In the root *‘lm* we meet an exceptional
 form: *mā-lémmem* (pl.); it might nevertheless have originated as
 **ma-‘állem*, and acquired its present form (from **māllémem*) due to
 the influence of the following noun pl. *‘ālémmem* together with the
 natural tendency to dissolve overlong syllables, though of course
 it is possible that the form is a denominative from the latter, in
 which case it belongs rather to the sphere of Q, as a kind of Q II
 (cf. § 13 b). Another similar case, in the light of the type of the cor-
 responding adj. in MT, could be *mādémmem* (root *‘dm*), but here
 we have the difficulty that in SamH there is no sign of a gemination
 of the last radical (f. *‘idmæ*; pl. and sf. forms are lacking); on the
 other hand, it cannot be regarded as impossible either, since the
 masc. form seems to belong to the type **qatul*, the last radical of
 which often appears geminated (cf. § 65) (f. would, in that case,
 belong to another type). Otherwise, the gemination would have been
 transferred from *d* to *m* only due to the tendency to normalize over-
 long syllables and, perhaps, to increase the perceptibility of the
 stressed syllable. Finally, there is the possibility that the form was
 originally passive, its meaning being stative-reflexive, e.g. **ma-
 ‘uddam*, the present form having been derived from pl. **mādúmmem*,
 which again would go back to **ma‘uddámem*; the transposed *u* would
 have carried the gemination over, again to the consonant following
 it (cf. § 65), supported, of course, by the tendency just mentioned.
 The other instances in which D ps would fit the sense best — and
 actually read in MT — are equally obscure; in most cases — roots
‘rš, *‘₃br*, *‘₄bd* — the form is obviously active, even if in the first
 instance this can have developed from the passive one through the
 influence of the geminated *r* (§ 1 u); in *‘₃br* even Tg presupposes the
 active. But even in the remaining two instances (*‘₃šq*, *‘₄zb*) the *æ*

otherwise the regular preservation of the gemination of the 2nd rad. would be
 hard to explain (cf. Q; for in such a case the preform. vowel would have natu-
 rally attracted the stress). The preform. vowel was preserved as *a* because of
 the guttural; the *e* of *‘₂rs* was apparently taken over from Q, the meaning of
 which is hardly different.

vowel can just as well be due to the following sibilant (§ 1 *i*) as to a reminiscence of an earlier *ū*. In tD, again, the deviation from the strong verb consists of the omission of the first radical after the stem preformative as in tQ (above *d* beg.): *ēlānnaf*, prf. *wjētānnaf* (from **het'ānnaf* < **hit'ānnap*; **jel'ānnaf* < **ia-hit'ānnap*), etc.

§ 22. I ' Q a l based upon n. act. **qatl*.

a In another way than in the strong verb, in this class of weak verbs we can make a fairly¹ certain distinction between the types of Q based upon the two types of n. act. the prototypes of which are **qull* and **qatl*, in cases where forms of prf., or n. act. provided with the prep. *l-*, are preserved, since the vowel of the preform., and prefix respectively has remained *a* in the former instance, but in the latter has participated in the general transformation into *i*. Even in the latter case, however, it has remained, so-to-say, half-way, i.e., *e*, without doubt due to the influence of the guttural, and has become lengthened after the quiescization of the latter, prf. sg. 3. m. *jēmaš* (< **jē'maš* < **ji-'amš*)², *wjēllam* (< **jēhlam* < **ji-halm*); n. act. *lēbbad* (< **lē'bad* < **li-'abd*; in this root forms based on both types appear, and it is questionable whether one of them is secondary due to some analogy no longer to be discovered, or a result of the mixture of two dialects, e.g., the type based on **'ubd* from the Jewish dialect, cf. MT).

b We return once more to the root *'₂lk*. Most of its forms in the actional group of conjugations seem to be based upon the two firm radicals only, as in the roots the agential group of which shows a *w*-augment in the beginning. In this case the corresponding augment

¹ Analogous formations can, of course, have disturbed the picture, perhaps even the influence of certain sounds.

² We stress once more the circumstance that the ultimate link in the chain of derivation is not intended to reproduce any coherent form that would have existed at some time in the language, but only to give the normal types of the elements which played essential roles in the forms resulting from their combination.

would be '₂. We could therefore suppose that the root would originally have been a denominative H from a noun the radicals of which were *lk*. Its meaning should have been »leg», »foot» »going», or something else like that (cf. § 10 *y*), but in the Semitic languages no such noun seems to appear. Moreover, the Akk. *aláku* presupposes an original initial consonant throughout the inflection. Therefore in principle it seems best to try to explain the divergent forms starting from the supposition that the primary form of the root was **hVlk*, in which the symbol *V* can represent any one of the three vowels *a*, *i*, or *u*, to judge from the present forms in both SamH and TibH. First, we have the normal type of prf., which may be represented by the normal form *jêlak*, and its w-form: *wjálak*. The latter would be old enough to derive from the time when the prf. type **jaqtal* had not yet been polarized into **jiqtal*, which latter stage is presupposed by the plain prf. form, as well as by all the forms of the other preserved instances of prf. in the roots belonging to the group dealt with in this paragraph. The stem of prf. would, accordingly, have been **halk*, and the development as follows: w-prf. (and its predecessor, voluntative): **já-halk* > **jáhlak* > **jálak*; but in w-prf. the stress lay upon the prefixed conjunction: **wá(j)jálak* (§ 10 *l*), which is why the preform. vowel probably grew short and did not develop into *o*. In the plain preformal, the elements **ji-halk* at first gave **jêhlak* as the result, which by means of the quiescization of the 1st rad. was made the present *jêlak*, which did not suffer any further permanent changes. The present imp. and n.act. forms presuppose *lik* as their basis; it is still preserved in imp.sg.m. as such. The loss of the first radical does not seem very strange; as was stated above (§ 10 *c*), it seems that at an early period the stress in imp. lay upon the ultimate syllable, and being heavier than in most other words, it led to the shortening of the vowel of the first syllable; in our root, *h* thus became practically attached to the 2nd rad., and in a word often used was easily dropped altogether. To judge from the practice in imp. in general (cf. *ib.*), it would seem that the form from which the original imp. form derives was **hilk*, but it is possible that the verbs I ' followed another pattern, with *a*

invariably after the guttural, the colour of the svarabhakti varying (cf. Akk.), though this now has normally given way to the normal pattern. Accordingly, it is possible that even this form stems from **halk*. In n.act., *lik* obtained the fem. *-t* as an affirmative after the pattern of the *w*-augmented class, which it now resembled in many respects, and was subsequently modified into **leket*, from which the present forms derive. As to the other forms of imp. and n.act., in which the consonantal *h* was preserved long enough to appear in kt, they apparently derive, imp. from **helak* (cf. § 11 e), n.act. **halāk*, **halek*, even if *lā' êlek* shows an exceptional form; its *e* vowel, however, might be due to the rule of *a* and *e* vowels normally appearing respectively before and after a quiescent guttural (cf. especially § 27 b); on the other hand, this also means that the primary form can have had almost any vocalization, and the corresponding MT form (*lah^alok*) indeed suggests **hulk*. On the forms of afformal cf. § 11 r. The primary form of prf. *wtállek* I cannot state (seemingly **jahilk* > **jáhlik* / *-ek*, but this would be the only instance of such a stem in this verb; perhaps D? even the MT form is quite anomalous: *wattih^alak*).

§ 23. Other types of Q in the verbs I '.

a 1. For various irregular forms in the root '₂lk see the preceding paragraph.

b 2. The only certain instance of the type based upon n.act. **qil* (for the other see *e* below) is at the same time III ' , and since this fact seems to affect even the formation of the preformatives, we will deal with it in § 36 b; for the instances of the verbs with vocalic ending of this class see § 37.

c 3. So we have, apparently, the types based on n.act. with bisyllabic prototypes left. Out of them, ''₂b belongs even to class II ' and will be dealt with in § 32. In the root 'šm, the intr. usage has n.act. of the type *lāšāmat*, which may go back to **(la-)'ašam-t*; the type **qal* — presupposed by MT — is in any case excluded (see the preceding paragraph), and the difference between tr. and

intr. forms in af. (**qatal* vs. **qatel*) normally presupposes some difference in n.act. as well. Moreover, the addition of the feminine *-t* (the form *-at* may be secondary, see § 58 *g*) is best conceivable in a form having a vowel between the two last radicals. In the root '_4md , on the other hand, the two sf. forms of n.act. seem to have obtained the form resembling this type secondarily, in consequence of a one-time incompatibility of *m* and *d* in this order, to judge from the fact that the independent form of n.act. seems to presuppose still another type (**qatel*), while af. and prf. are most naturally derived from the common **qatal* / **ja-qull*, and that the sound sequence cited does not appear except in a foreign name and apparently rather late formations (see the roots $\text{'}dm$, '_3md , and *dVlk*).

d The type of n.act. **qatāl* is attested in the roots '_4bt : *lēboṭ*, and, as a variant, '_4br : *'ābor*. The *æ* in the former may be due to imala.

e Of the types with geminated 2nd rad., **qattal* and **qattel* are attested, in conformity with the characteristic of the gutturals to favour *a*. The former is represented by $\text{'}bd$ and '_4br . The gemination is preserved throughout the inflexion and even in H, which presupposes the preservation of the vowel of the first radical in this stem also, probably even that the same bore the accent from the earliest times. After the quiescization of *h*, the forms came to resemble those of D rather closely, which may be why the latter has supplanted H in the root $\text{'}bd$, in most cases even in kt (in '_4br , D does not exist), the meaning of these two stems being apparently identical; on the other hand, the resemblance of Q to D in the same root has in most cases led to the simplification of the 2nd rad. in Q, and even in '_4br such a tendency appears, but here, in the absence of any D, it must be attributed to the influence of the normal type alone. As an example of the type **qattel*, we take the root '_3bl I, where forms with geminated 2nd rad. are provided by prf.: *jēbbel*, *tābbel*, and n.ag.: *'ēbbel*. Other roots possibly belonging to this type are '_3bt , '_3bq , etc., but in the absence of the form of n.ag. the matter is not certain, since the gemination can be secondary, created after the quiescization of the guttural, as can be the case with '_3bt — in which case

the type of its n.act. would be **qitl* —, or the form is D, as perhaps in *'₃bq*. A mixed stem is *'₃šb*, in which n.ag. has the form of **qattal*, but all the others **qattel*, apart from af.sg. 3. m., which has yielded to the influence of the commonest type; tQ follows n.ag. As to the form of prf. *jābbaš* (root *'₃fš*), in the light of the absence of any signs of the gemination in the other forms of this root, and even in this form in the old punctuated mss., it is probably a mistake of the reader, it being recorded from one informant only.

f *Note.* For the roots *'_jb* and *'₄wr* see § 33.

§ 24. Verba primae semivocalis.

a 1. From the verbs I' we can conveniently pass over to this class, first since this has more resemblance to the preceding one than the one remaining (see the next paragraph) of verba primae infirmae, particularly in prf. qre because of the often occurring simplification of the geminate resulting from the quiescization of the first radical in the class I'; the root *'₂lk* shows that this resemblance is not a product of later times alone, and the Ugaritic *hlm* suggests that that root was not an isolated example of such a phenomenon even at that earlier period. Secondly, when dealing with this class now, we follow an alphabetical order. The two sounds *w* and *j* have so many common characteristics that it seemed best to unite them under this common rubric, particularly since they have often fallen together, at times even outside Q and D (etc.) af., normally into *j*.

b 2. In the afformal of Q and the group of secondary stems with only internal modification no difference from the strong verb *apperas*, and the same is true of all the other forms without any preformatives, except imp. and n.act. Q; when provided with certain preformatives, vacillation can be observed (cf. below). As to the form of n.act., it normally appears without the semi-vowel and provided with the feminine *-t* at the end; for the question whether the roots originally lacked the semi-vowel or whether it was omitted secondarily, see *e* below. The vowel between the two radicals, at

least in the instances recorded, seems to go back to either *i* or *a*, but it must be observed that the behaviour of an original *u*, in the absence of ascertainable analogies, cannot be stated with certainty; if it followed the analogy of the strong type, as the behaviour of *i* seems to suggest, the fem. *-t* functioning as a third radical —, it fell together with *a*. In any case, the MT forms support the supposition presented. As examples we can cite, 1) *ablêdet*, the derivation of which may have been **ledet* < **lîdt*^V < **lîd-t*; and 2) *'aelsâqat* < **šaqat* < **šaq*^V < **šaq-t*. The n.act. of the root *jsf* has yielded to the analogy of the roots with vocalic ending early enough to obtain secondary gemination before the spirantization of *p*: *ælsâb-bot* < **sappôt* < **sappât* > **sap-ât*. A parallel root **sfV* could of course be postulated for it, but the gemination would even in such a case remain irregular, and it seems to me easier to suppose that it was created in connection with the transformation of an original **sapat* into **-ât*, rather than apparently quite spontaneously. The forms of n.act. of the roots *jbš* and *jkl* have been dealt with in connection with the strong verb (see § 11 *a* with n. 2). In addition, there are a few roots similarly showing the semi-vowel in this form, and even if two of them are at the same time III', they can be mentioned here, since the latter characteristic has no decisive influence upon their form: *jâšâ*, which probably derives from **jaša'* or **jas'*; and *eljârâ*, which may go back to **jar'-at*. The former is only a variant in adverbial usage, but the latter has no counterpart deprived of the semi-vowel, which even appears in all the other forms of the root. The third type is *jârad*, which can go back to **jurd* or **jard* as well; it, too, is only an adverbial variant. For the root *jd'*₄ see § 38 *b*.

c In imp., all the three vowels seem to be represented, even if not always quite genuinely. Of *a*, we can cite the root *jrš* as an example: *râš*, pl. *râšû*; of *i*, *jšb*, but here the analogy of the normal type has exercised its influence, probably through the enlarged sg.m. form, which is now quite analogous to it: *šêb*, *šêbâ*, pl. *šêbû*; f. *šêbû*; of *u*, *jrd*: *râd*, *râdâ*, pl. *rêdû*; in this case, *u* apparently preserved its colour unchanged in forms with vocalic affirmative, but in the simply closed syllable it was modified into *o*, just as we found in

§ 11 *a* a.e.; the enlarged form of sg.m. may owe its stem vowel to the short form, just as in the case of *i* in the first phase of development. No imp. forms showing the semi-vowel are attested.

d Of prf., we again have several types. The only example from a root II' (j'_3m), however, we will keep for § 34. Elsewhere, it seems that in the cases in which the stem vowel was *a*, the preform. vowel was turned into *i* probably at the same time as the same phenomenon in the strong verb; the 2nd radical, when following the preform., was subsequently geminated, as it seems, as a compensation for the lost length (cf. below) of the preform. vowel and corresponding to the double consonant in strong roots. This would mean that gemination took place immediately after the transformation of the preform. vowel, which seems to agree with some other phenomena (cf. § 109 *l*); it is a pity that no example of prf. of roots with *f* as the 2nd rad. has been preserved so that we could say something definite on the matter. In the w-prf. (originally voluntative), however, the original *a* vowel was preserved in the preformative; this may be due to the analogy of the hollow roots, the corresponding form of which — when isolated — is indistinguishable from this one. Later the distribution of these forms has become confused to some extent, but in the majority of cases the original state of things can still be discovered without any difficulty. As an example for this type we can take the root *jšb*: prf. *jīššab*, w-prf. *wjāšab*; but there are even forms like *jāšābū* and, on the other hand, *wenīššab* (mostly as individual variants). -a-prf. seems to follow the normal prf., cf. *widdā* (root jd'_4). In the roots in which the semi-vowel — demonstrably, or judging from related dialects or languages — is preserved in n.act. and imp., it was assimilated to the preform. vowel, a development which ultimately resulted in the lengthening of the latter, e.g. *jītab* (< **ji-jtab*), *wjīšan* (< **ji-wšan*). As is seen from the latter example, w-prf. here follows the main prf., as is natural. In the types with other stem vowels, certain transformations have apparently taken place. To begin with the easiest case, with *u* as the stem vowel, the preform. vowel preserved its colour and length, and was consequently transformed into *ō* (later *ū*) in connection with the

general development $\acute{a} > \acute{o}$. This again caused the dissimilation of the stem vowel into e , familiar to us from § 20 *c*. In w-prf., with unstressed preformative, no such changes of course appeared. The two types were again slightly confused; the main representative is the root *jsf*, e.g. *lûsef* / *wjâsef*, but even *jâsef* / *wjûsîfû*; the *i* vowel may be due to the influence of the neighbouring consonants. For further examples see, e.g., the roots *jnV*, *jsq* — in the latter one of which only the form belonging properly to w-prf. appears —, and *jqd*. In the type with *i* — if we may trust the evidence of Arabic, cf. even TibH — as the original stem vowel, we meet with two different forms; one of them, the main representatives of which are the roots *jld* and *jrd*, has *jêrad*, w-prf. *wjârad* as normal forms; -a-prf. follows the main one again. The original *i* having become e in the forms without affirmatives, and analogously in the rest, we can regard the present a as an outcome of a dissimilation after the long e in the preformative, particularly since a and e often appear as a pair bearing polarity (cf. H-stem). The question remains as to where the development of the stressed long a into e instead of the normal o came from. We could perhaps suppose this to have been a case of a »Sonderentwicklung» to prevent the form from falling together with H prf.; another possibility is that there did exist two kinds of a during the Old Canaanite period, from which one would have appeared in connection with u / o and resembled more this vowel, the other with i / e resembling more this one. The latter would have developed into \acute{e} at the time when the former developed into \acute{o} . In such a case, however, its appearance in an accented syllable would have been very limited (for possible other cases, see §§ 5 *b*, 49 *e*, *i*?); perhaps we can combine both factors by means of the supposition that the e in the following syllable exercised an influence upon it to such an extent that the tendency to keep the form apart from H prf. was able to take the difference so created as a starting point. The other form is represented by the root *jrš* alone, but it is a real puzzle, unless we suppose that the preformal is formed from a stem in which the semi-vowel was present and already transformed into *j*. The combination $*ja-j-$ yielded $jî-$ (cf. § 109 *ff*), whereupon the stem vowel was dissimilated into a (cf. above). The preform.

vowel in MT seems to support this supposition, and perhaps even the existence of a nominal form from this root showing the semi-vowel. Cf., however, *e* (end) below.

e It is now time to take up the question whether the semi-vowel originally belonged to the root or not. Considering that the actional group of conjugations is older than the agential one (see § 10 *c*, *e* sqq., 11 *a*), and that almost everywhere it is based upon a stem form lacking the semi-vowel, while the latter invariably has it, the conclusion seems most natural that the semi-vowel has been added to the beginning as a kind of augment after the creation of the actional group. The fact that in a few roots the existence of the semi-vowel is presupposed even by the latter — either partly or wholly — need not be in contradiction to this; we can either suppose that there were a few roots from earlier times in which the semi-vowel was radical in the full sense of the word, and not a later augment; or also, that these roots were created after the establishment of the actional conjugations. On the other hand, however, we saw above (§ 22 *b*) that the first radical can even be dropped secondarily in this very same group; and that a semi-vowel in the beginning of a word can fall prey to this development is best illustrated by Akkadian, cf. even the tendency to omit the copula in the modern pronunciation of SamH. The vowel \bar{o} / \bar{u} presupposed by the present preform. vowel in these roots could perhaps be derived from the combination $-a + w-$, and the corresponding vowel in w-prf. be attributed to the analogy of the hollow roots; in the roots with *a* as the stem vowel, the gemination of the second radical would be a result of the assimilation of the semi-vowel to this radical, just as has been supposed to have happened in the TibH verbs *jšg*, *jšʿ*, *jšt*. Here, however, difficulties begin. Firstly, the assimilation of a semi-vowel to the following consonant cannot be demonstrated with certainty — at least — in any of the Semitic languages. Supposing the first alternative to be correct, the forms of TibH mentioned are results of a similar secondary gemination as took place in the Q prf. of our dialect, and by no means unknown in biradical verbal stems of TibH either (cf. B-L § 58 *h*); it is accordingly quite possible that the two instances of H attested follow their analogy, as even suggested by the existence

of such forms in a few further stems beside regular ones. The *t*-stems in Akkadian and Arabic apparently showing this kind of assimilation, again, may go back to the period before the establishment of the semi-vowel in the beginning of the root, their gemination being accordingly also secondary, as strongly suggested by the fact that in Old Akkadian this formation is preceded by another, where no gemination of *t* exists and also the vowel following it is lacking (e.g., *itbal* instead of the later normal *ittabal*, root *wbl*); that the form is no dialectal peculiarity, may be clear from the fact that it still appears during the Old Babylonian period, the longer form thus replacing it only gradually (cf. v. SODEN § 103 g). Thus, there is nothing to disprove our first alternative; on the other hand, even in SamH itself there are phenomena giving evidence against the second. Firstly, as we have stated, in preformal — apart from *w*-prf. — the preform. vowel apparently carried the stress during the Old Canaanite period (cf. § 10 f) and as we shall see below (cf., e.g., below g), the normal outcome from the combination of *w* with a preceding stressed *a* is *-ūwā-* in our dialect, and there is no reason to suppose a deviation from the general rule in this class; at any rate, a solution which presupposes such an exception may be less acceptable than another in which that is not the case. The fact, again, that the *w*-prf. itself follows the analogy of the hollow roots in some of the cases — and were the second alternative correct, in all the cases in which the semi-vowel is omitted — may be enough to exclude the possibility that the main prf. could follow the analogy of the genuine *w*-prf. (i.e., behave as if the preform. vowel was unstressed, in which case the combination *a + w* does yield *ō / ū* even in our dialect). So we can conclude that at least in the cases in which the actional group of conjugations omits the semi-vowel, this is a later augment to the original biradical root¹. As to the roots in which it is preserved, the

¹ The fact that in Arabic the preformative vowel in corresponding verbs is short *a* corroborates this conclusion, since there is no trace of a combination *a + w* resulting in that sound in the language mentioned. The question whether (some of) the roots have earlier had a semi-vowel at the beginning — in which case the agential group would simply have preserved it — cannot be included in the scope of this study.

question remains whether the semi-vowel in them is an original radical from earlier times or the whole root created after the attachment of the semi-vowel to the other roots of this class in general. The root *jrš* provides us with a starting point for the solution of the problem, in so far as its preform already presupposes the development $w > j$ in the beginning of the root. The root being universally West-Semitic, but not attested in Akkadian, it might have been created at the time when in a number of Proto-Semitic dialects — the ancestors of the later North-West-Semitic — *j* began to gain ground from *w* as the augment of this class. At that time the connections between the tribes speaking Proto-Semitic dialects were already loosened, which is why the new tendency won but little admission in the other, later East- and South-Semitic groups, as witnessed by the small number of roots beginning with *j* in them. In the ancestors of the North-West-Semitic, however, the new tendency set in practically completely, so that even the old roots beginning with *w* were transformed according to it. It is now significant that in most cases in which the semi-vowel is preserved in the actional group, the East- and / or South-Semitic parallels — as far as they exist — have *j* as the first radical. This may turn the scales for the alternative that the roots preserving the semi-vowel in the actional group are of relatively late origin. On the other hand, however, the starting point itself is dubious, since the form itself could as well be explained supposing that — unlike in n.act. or Arabic — the stem vowel was originally *a*, and the preform. vowel accordingly *i*; then the preserved semi-vowel can equally well have been *w*. Moreover, if we stick to the explanation offered at *d* (end) above, we must suppose that the main prf. would follow the analogy of w-prf., since the stressed *a + j* would yield *-ājī-* or something similar (cf. *g* below); this in itself is not quite inconceivable, since the w-prf. is more frequently attested, but not quite natural, either. In any case, in the root there is something irregular, and therefore it is better to save the detailed treatment of this question for the final volume.

f 3. The agential group of conjugations of Q follows the strong paradigm. The same is true of Q ps, apart from a prf. form of the root *jsq*, which follows the analogy of H ps (see below, at *g*); for

*jd'*₄ see § 38 *b*. In addition, a prf. *jūkal* < **ju-kal* replaces act. in *jkl*. The agential group is mostly based upon the type **qutīl*, only *jbš* seems to presuppose **qutal*. In the reflexive of Q, the semi-vowel has become syllabic and subsequently transformed into a vowel throughout; e.g. prf. *tittāgar* < **ta-hit-jgor*; af. 'ettūdē < **hit-wda*'. Otherwise it offers nothing peculiar requiring explanation. The fact that the semi-vowel is almost always *j* (root *jd'*₄ is the only exception) might indicate that this stem is of relatively late origin¹.

g 4. As to the secondary stems formed by means of external enlargement, we again keep the roots having an ' as the second radical for § 32. Similarly, the root *jd'*₄ is saved for special treatment (see § 38 *b*). As regards the rest, in the actional group of N (prf. even here included; this would support the supposition that prf. is formed from the *hin*-type of stem, had we not to reckon with large analogous transformations, see § 14 *b*) the semi-vowel has preserved its vowel throughout, apparently since at the time of the syllabification of the semi-vowels *n* was already assimilated, hence the 1st rad. geminated, and at this time geminates seem to have resisted simplification. The semi-vowel is *w* throughout (for the one possible exception see *h* below), and it has regularly transformed the preform. vowel into *u*; this again, apparently quite recently, has in some cases caused the disappearance of the semi-vowel in the pronunciation and even swallowed the first stem vowel where this was not stressed, and H — with which the result was identified — could be read instead of N. Examples of all the cases can be found in the root *jld*: prf. *jūwāled*, var. *jūāled*; pl. *jūwālidū*, var. *jūlidū*; n.act. *bē'ūwāled* (imp. is not attested). In the agential group the practice varies, even if the semi-syllabification of the semi-vowel seems to be more frequent in n.pat. / pot., but here it may stem from the Old Canaanite period (cf. § 109 *q*). Examples: af. *nuwwātar* (< **nawwātar* < **na-wātar*); 'unūšentimma (< **nawšantimma* < **na-ūšan-tu-*

¹ This would agree with the fact that the form of this stem varies even within the West-Semitic languages; apparently the formation was completed only after the separation of the North-West-Semitic, Arabic, and Ethiopic groups from each other.

ma); n.pat. *ennûtar* (< **na-wtar*), f. *nûšâbat* (< **na-wšab-t*); but also *ennûwâled* (< **nawwâled* < **na-wâled*). The reason for these differences does not seem to be in any phonetic rule (such as certain cases of incompatibility or something of that kind), since variation appears inside individual roots and wholly analogous formations; so it could be that the forms presupposing the semi-syllabification of the semi-vowel are the »lawful» ones, the rest owing their existence to the influence of the (integrally) strong pattern. Another possibility is that the latter derive from the cases in which the preform. vowel was preserved as *a* longer than in other cases, for after obtaining the accent this connected with *w* would equally have yielded *-awwâ-* (cf. below), while in others, in which the preform. vowel was turned into *i*, this and *w* together would have yielded *u*; but this sequence seems to have resulted in *i* in other cases in our dialect (see the root *jšn*), apart from the fact that in such a case great confusion in the distribution of the two forms should be supposed, since — according to the rule of polarity, § 109 *i* — the preform. vowel *a* would have preserved its colour alongside *e* as the stem vowel, while with *a* in the latter function it would have first turned into *i* (in the present material no such distinction can be made). So it seems that in this class the preform. vowel never turned into *i*; and this offers us a clue to the definite solution of the problem. For, as we shall see later on (cf. below, in connection with H of the roots primarily I *j*, and § 109 *cc*), the development of a stressed *a* with a semi-vowel following, into two syllables was apparently rather late, so that we may safely assume it did not take place until the period of the main stress invariably lying upon the penultimate. This would mean that only in af.sg. 3. m. and n.pat. / pot.sg.m. did the development into two syllables mentioned above take place, while in the rest the sequence *-aw-* developed into *o / u*, since the stress did not lay upon it. Later on the distribution of the types changed its nature mostly so that in one root, one type took hold, in another root, the other type, but even then discrepancies remained, particularly between af. and n.pat. / pot. of certain roots. In H, the change of distribution in the forms with *w* as the semi-vowel has been quite

regular: the form with simple *u* as the outcome of the development has prevailed in the active without exceptions, while *-uwwâ-* has taken over the passive. The only exception is n.pat.f. *māšât* (*js'*). The fact that in H ps the combination *-uw-* already in existence in similar conditions also yielded *-uwwâ-* might have influenced the final colouring of the result. The regularity of the present distribution has naturally a semantic basis. In the roots with *j* as the semi-vowel the matter is otherwise, since in them no passive voice exists. In them, the tendency has been to eliminate the forms developed from the diphthong when bearing the stress, so that now only three forms of this type are attested, and only two of them are genuine, viz. af.sg. 3. m. and n.act. of the root *jtb*, the normal form of both of which is *'ā'itab*; a var. *aj'itab* is attested of the latter. Both of them apparently derive from **hājtab* (< **ha-jtab*) through **hāj'itab* > **haj'itab*. The third form is from the root *jnq*, af.sg. 3. f. *ājānāqā*; it is «corrected», since it was believed to contain the interrogative prefix, although this renders the sense unintelligible; this shows that the origin of the forms soon fell into oblivion, and also explains the tendency to eliminate them. This form, however, must have had analogous origin, since it cannot have had the main stress upon the preformative; so we can conclude that the present attestations are scanty remains of a formation once more widespread. The forms of n.ag. of the same root are probably contaminations with a parallel root **nVq*; cf. vol. II *sub voce*.

h 5. D with its passive following the strong pattern¹, only tD and nD remain. Even of them, only one root of each is attested, and even that in the case of tD is not quite genuine, it being one with a vocalic ending, *jdV*. Of it, two forms of af. are recorded: sg. 3. m. *wētbādda*, pl. 3. *wētbēddu*. They seem to show that *w* immediately following a voiceless consonant and followed by a vowel was transformed into an explosive, but the material being so scanty, this

¹ A certain exception is prf. *jāssar*, which has omitted its preformative altogether, certainly due to the first radical, even if not as a haplology in the exact sense of the word; this occurred apparently during the second heavy stress period, when the preform. vowel grew exceptionally short (cf. § 109 *kk*).

cannot be taken for more than a surmise; cf. §§ 45, 46 *b*. The vocalization follows the normal pattern of III V (see § 35). The only case of nD is n.act.sf. 'eĵĵassâda (< *hin-jassad-ah), accordingly formed after the augment had been transformed into *j*; whether the same be true of the whole stem, cannot be studied inside the scope of this volume.

§ 25. Verba primae assimilantis.

a 1. In SamH, there are two consonants which as first radicals in verbal stems immediately followed by the 2nd rad. are assimilated to the latter, viz. *n*, which behaves so almost always (for exceptions see below *e*), and *l*, of which there is only one such example, viz. the root *lq'*₃, and even that being at the same time weak in its third radical, it will be dealt with in § 40 *d*. Accordingly, in this paragraph we have to do only with verbs I *n*.

b 2. Following from what was said above at *a*, the weakness properly affects only forms in which the first two radicals were brought into contact at a sufficiently early period that the first became assimilated, in the Q group accordingly only the preforms of Q and Q ps, as well as those in which the 1st rad. is dropped altogether, i.e. imp. and n.act., but as supplements to the strong examples we can cite some other forms of Q ps and tQ as well, in suitable connections.

c For reasons to be explained below, we begin with Q prf. Its pattern is *ĵiššak*, which could go back to **ĵi-šak* as well as **ĵi-nšak* (< **našk*), supposing that the laws governing the strong verb are in force here also. Here, however, difficulties begin. Considering that in the group I semi-vowel, only such biradical stems as have *a* as their stem vowel had their first radical secondarily geminated, we should suppose this to have been the case in all the verbs of this class, if we stick to the opinion that the stem of prf. was originally biradical in this class too. The suspicion aroused hereby becomes a certainty because of the fact that there actually exist even to-day cases in which the *e* and even *o* as the stem vowel is preserved; cf.

the roots *ntn*, *ntr*, *nqm*. The gemination of their second radical cannot thus be secondary, but it goes back to the assimilation of *n* to it. The reason for the preservation of *o* in the last root may be the tendency to keep the form apart from the passive form (cf. below) supported by the semi-syllabic nature of *m*, which by its quality can also have been able to maintain the colour of *o* (cf. § 109 *hh*). The only attestation of *ntr*, again, may have followed the analogy *ūqqom* just preceding, perhaps also supported by the semi-syllabic nature of *r*. *Ex analogia* we could now conclude that *n* belonged to the root from olden times, and in all roots became assimilated to the second radical. But in such a case we should suppose as well that all the cases of imp. and n.act. without *n* in this class are analogical formations after the biradical roots with *a* as the stem vowel, which is not probable, either. Moreover, we have one instance — even if only one — of prf. demonstrably based upon a biradical stem, viz. the form *wjāfālu* (root *nfl*) in Gn 4: 5. True, even in that root all the other attestations of prf. are now pronounced with *-bb-*, but the fact that the sg. 3. f. in Gn 24: 64 shows no sign of such a gemination in any vocalized ms. — while all the others have it in every preserved passage in them — seems to indicate that at the time of the writing of those mss., that form was pronounced **wtāfal*. This, again, suggests that in still other forms the geminate may be secondary — even if older —, and indeed it is difficult to find any other dividing line between the two types, one with gemination and one without it, than that actually attested in the verbs treated in the preceding paragraph, viz. that between main prf. and w-prf.: *jūbbal* / **wjāfal*. The latter — presupposedly genuine — cannot be derived from a stem containing *n*. On the other hand, it does not seem probable that a verb would have two stems in the actional conjugations of Q, which causes us to suppose that the gemination of *f* / *p* is secondary, perhaps even early enough to derive from the time before the spirantization of this sound, even if this is not certain (cf. below). All this seems to indicate that among the verbs of this class there were both those which had inherited their *n* as the 1st rad. from earlier periods, and others to which it was added after the formation of the

actional group of conjugations, a suggestion which is supported even by the forms of n.act. and imp. (cf. *d* below). Apart from the root *nfl*, which seems to have belonged to the latter group, however, no certain division between roots belonging to each type can be made on the basis of the present material. It would seem that those having inherited their *n* from earlier times were in the majority, since their type became dominant — the preservation of *wjāfālu* is probably due to the great familiarity of that passage, which did not allow such an analogous change in its recitation —, but it is also possible that in the two-radical stem the former one was secondarily geminated very early (cf. above and, as a parallel case, § 24 *d*), and after *o* was transformed into *a*, such a type spread very easily to these newly created cases of essentially the same type.

d Such a division cannot be made on the basis of n.act. either, for there we meet with apparently late formations side by side with older ones. So the only preserved example of n.act. of the root *nfl*, which we have just met as the only fairly certain example of an originally biradical root in this class, is *welnāfal*, which presupposes a primary form **napal*. This could be derived from an earlier **pal* by means of prefixing the root determinative or rather formative *na-* to it, instead of the more common method of affixing the feminine *-t*. The ms. B offers yet another variant, with *æ* after the first radical (no other vowel signs are present), which is hard to explain in any other way than as a n.act. of Q ps, going back to **nupVl* (cf. § 11 *a n. 2*). Another similar case may be *nābal*, even if phonetically it can go back to **nabl* (or **nubl*) as well. A case of an old *n* as the first radical is probably presented by the root *ng*₄, but it will be treated in § 40 *bc*. As an example of the normal method we can take the root *ngš* II, of which we have the recitational forms *'avygiššat*, sf. *gēštu*, *ēfgeštimmæ*; for the last form, Ms. C provides us with a variant *-ga-*. In the light of prf. and imp., both of which show *a* throughout, the latter may contain the original vowel, *e / i* owing its existence to *š* (see § 1 *i*); the prototype is, accordingly, **gaš-t*. The form without sf. contains a secondary gemination, for which see § 109 *l*. Another group of roots presupposes a one-time syllabicity

of *n*, but the forms resulting from its abandonment are different in different roots, without, it seems, any phonetic reason. It may be that the difference at first depended on the place of the accent, accordingly existing between different forms of each root, but was later gradually turned into the present direction by analogy, since the fact of different forms of one and the same root belonging together made itself more clearly felt than the conformity of parallel forms in different roots. In the root *ndv*, vacillation actually exists, since beside the modern *lennêdar*, *alnêdar* is presupposed by the vocalization of Ms. C. Both may go back to **l̥ndor*, the syllabic *n* of which was dissolved into *-ne-* in the latter form, which accordingly is the more original one; the same method also appears in the root *nqb*; on the other hand, the former seems to combine this method with another one, which is attested in *ngf*: *lingaf*, sf. *bingâfo*; there the secondary vowel is placed before *n*, and that that has happened rather early is suggested by the fact that in the latter form the vowel in some mss. has been written by $\dot{2}$. These roots also seem to have an old *n*; in the case of *nqb*, this is supported by *imp.*, which also preserves its *n*, and follows the normal strong pattern. For the type omitting *n*, we cite the root *ntn* — which will otherwise be dealt with in § 42 —, since its paradigm is the most complete one: *wtæn*, *tânē*, pl. *tânū*; f. *tânī*; of sg.m., the form with final *-a* (/ *-æ*) is the regular one. The only stem vowel attested is *a*, if not *šēl* might have had *e* (which is uncertain, cf. § 1 *i*).

e Accordingly, we see that analogy has confused the relations of this class to such an extent that it is hazardous to try to distinguish roots with an old *n* radical from those in which it is a later augment. The starting point of this confusion being *prf.*, it was natural to begin with it, and as a concluding example of it, we can even quote the root *nšr* which, to judge from MT forms, belongs to the group with old *n*; in SP, only three forms are attested, one of them *prf.pl. 3. j̥nšêrū*, another *w-prf.sg. 3.m.sf. wj̥šârinnê'u*. It is of course possible that the difference is originally dialectal, the two forms belonging to different poetical pieces, but even so different analogous development in different dialects must be supposed, whatever

stem we may regard as the original one, either the biradical, which is preserved in our w-prf., or that of our prf., which we can call strong, since it does not assimilate its *n* — in SamH, it is the only one of its kind outside II', for which see § 27 —, or the normal type of TibH, which also shows a »fixed» *n*, but assimilates it to the second radical.

f Q ps is rather frequently attested in this class; the agential group usually stands for N of MT, prf. for that outwardly resembling H ps, but there are exceptions. In some cases it seems as if it had gained ground from N and / or Q, e.g. the root *nšb*, where it is difficult to derive the forms of af. *wnaššibta*, *nāšābū* from Q ps; but, on the other hand, it is also difficult to suppose the existence of Q, Q ps and N (even that would be slightly exceptional in form) in one and the same meaning of one verbal root; for details see vol. II *sub voce*. All the forms of the agential group seem to be based upon the type **qutīl*; af.pl. 2. m. *wnāgaftimmæ* seems to be an exception, but it doubtless follows the active form, and the older form — attested in mss. CD — is only known in its first stem vowel, which is *u*; this vowel is preserved up to this day in the same form of the root *ntn*, which reads *wnūteltimmæ* (< **nutin-tuma*). These forms prove beyond any doubt that Q ps is no secondary formation from the Aramaic n.pat. *qetīl* in our dialect, as PETERMANN (*Versuch* p. 31 a.e.), and following him even other students have supposed; cf. below, and § 12 *c*. Of n.act., there is one — slightly dubious — example in a vocalized ms.; see *d* above. Prf. is represented by three (?) different types: 1) *jīqqam*, which apparently goes back to **jūqqam* > **ju-nqam*; the preform. vowel has assimilated to the consonant, as in all the other cases in this class (for a preserved *u*, see § 40 *d*); 2) *jétten*, var. *ittēn* (< **ju-ntin*); and from a bisyllabic stem 3) *jīn-néten*; this seems to go back to **ji-nutin*, being accordingly a kind of combination of N and Q ps, and of recent origin; it probably never existed in the living language, but was created for the kt *jntn*; the transformation of many examples of D ps into nD at the same period (cf. §§ 17 *b* and 109 *bb*) probably furthered the development. In n.pat. of the root *nšk*, the form provided with an article is analogous

to that of n.ag. Q (see § 11 k): *ennūšek* (< **ha-nūšik*), and might follow its analogy; its meaning is clearly passive, which is even corroborated by a var. *-næ-* in Ms. B (Mss. CD agree with the spoken form). It also makes impossible the supposition that the first stem vowel would have developed from a late murmuring vowel (cf. above), since under no circumstances does such a one give *u* as a result in our dialect.

g tQ is possibly attested in one root, which at the same time is III¹; see § 40 c no. 4. As regards N, only one example, in some sense certain, seems to be attested of roots containing two firm radicals, in so far as the stem, out of which a prf. of the type **jīqqattal* exists in the roots *nšl*, *nqr*, and *nqš*, can be nD as well; the other stems of *nšl*, however, make N — from a primary stem with geminated second radical — more probable in that root. The example referred to is likewise prf., *ūnnāgēfū*, but even that becomes spurious by the fact that an af. and n.pat. of Q ps stand beside it, which, additionally, seem to be old in this root to judge from the preserved *u* (cf. above *f*). So the N in prf. is probably due to kt, somehow like the peculiar Q ps prf. in the root *ntn* (cf. ib.); but in this case the formation seems to follow N more exactly, it being identical with the normal strong pattern. Apparently N has lost ground to Q ps, cf. above (*f*), and § 49 i. The other independent stem with external enlargement, H, follows the strong pattern with the only difference of the assimilation of *n*; we can give some examples of the root *ngd*: af. *éggéd*, pl. *wāggīdū*; prf. *wjéggéd*, pl. *wjeggīdū*; imp. *eggīda^h*, pl. *eggīdū*; f. *eggīdī*; n.act. *lāgged*; n.ag. *mégged*. In af.sg. 2. m. the 3rd rad. is assimilated to the afform. cons., perhaps influenced by an exceptional stress: *eggīllá* (an enclitic follows); in the first person a svarabhakti has been created between them: *eggīdīlī*. In the same root, we have an example of the prf. of H ps: *wjīggad*. The preform. vowel, which is thus assimilated to the consonant, is still preserved in a ms. (B) var.: *wju-*. Other conjugations of H ps, for the most part with preserved *u*, are attested in the root *nkV*, and have already been mentioned in § 15 c, q.v.

§ 26. A four-radical stem.

a The other four-radical verbal root attested in SamH belongs to the class I'; because of its peculiar construction we place it separately here. The root is 'sfs, the only preserved form n.ag. *mâsfes*, apparently derived from **ma-ḥaspes* through **mḥasfes*, analogically to the development of n.ag.D.

ii. *Verba secundae infirmae.*

§ 27. Verba II'.

a 1. Since the so-called hollow roots (or II V) will be treated separately because of their peculiar construction, the two rubrics cover each other. In addition, the roots containing yet another weak radical will be separated into different classes; in this paragraph we accordingly deal with roots, the first and third radicals of which are strong, or behave as such, with an ' as the middle radical.

b 2. In this class, it is best to treat Q and D together, since they greatly resemble each other, and if n.ag. and pat. are lacking, there is normally no formal characteristic by which they could be separated from each other with confidence. Apart from a few exceptions, for which see *c*, there are two types of stems in the present pronunciation, which can be described as **qâtel* and **qâl*. It would seem that these go back to **qatel* and **qatal* / -ol, resp., which are familiar from the strong verb, *a-a* having, after the quiescization of the guttural in their middle, contracted into *â*, but in such a case the considerable numerical superiority of the former type is surprising; moreover, the fact that forms of both types are attested in one and the same stem, and even as individual variants of one and the same form (e.g., *utâr* / -â'er both as Q and D, even if the former is much more frequent in both cases), makes us believe that the latter type *can* at least be a contraction of the former. This is further supported by the fact that the Samaritan grammarian ABU ISHAQ ŠEMS-UL-HUKAMA' seems to know only the former type (see BEN-ḤAYYIM, *op.cit.* I p. 73,

77—79, 89) in both stems¹. Consequently, we might be entitled to regard all the present forms as deriving from the type **qatēl*, or **qatal* (and perhaps **qull*) in a few permanently contracted roots. The contracted form might have originated in rapid recitation, in which it is still much more frequent to-day than in the other ones. Sometimes the contracted *â* has been dissolved into *â'a* (cf. § 1 I). On the other hand, **qatēl* itself may have its origin in an earlier contraction with syllabic guttural.

c The question now arises: how old is this prototype **qatēl* and by what process has it originated from earlier forms? That there have been different forms earlier is suggested by the exceptional forms referred to at *b* above, and by a peculiarity in the inflexion of *prf.* in certain roots. To begin with the former, first we have the root *b'š*, which forms an *af.* *wbêš*, and a *w-prf.* *wjābêš*, f. *wtābêš*. The stem seems to be **bi'š*, which ultimately yielded **be'eš* through **be'š* (cf. § 109 *ll*); this reminds us of the normal form of this verb (*bi'sa*) in Arabic, which is usually regarded as a contraction from the form *ba'isa* more rarely attested (for details see WRIGHT-DE GOEJE § 183 *rem. b*). In the light of our form the relation seems to be just the contrary, and it is indeed quite possible that this is a remnant of a once more numerous class of one-syllabic triradical stems in the agential group of Q; the same conclusion is suggested by the existence of one-syllabic nomina agentis (cf. § 11 *o*), which are attested in six² roots: *bt'₃*, *lq'¹*, *nqm*, *rkb*, *rf'*, and *rs'₃* (cf. even

¹ The vocalized mss. cannot give decisive evidence here, because their vocalization is very defective; but even in them the type **qatēl* is found now and then in the place of the now normal **qāl* (cf., e.g., root *t'₂r D*).

² or seven; the possible seventh case belongs to this very class, the root being *s'₃r*, but the forms are obscure. The sg.m. *elsār* seems rather to derive from a bisyllabic prototype (cf. § 11 *b*), **sahār* being most likely, while pl. *sérrem* can hardly be explained even from **sahr*; considering the influence of *r* (§ 1 *u*), *i* best explains the colour of the vowel, even if *u* is not quite excluded either; but the assimilation of the guttural to *r* without prolongation of the preceding vowel would in any case remain exceptional. So it might be best to regard the gemination of *r* as secondary (cf. § 1 *n*); but the time of its taking place and the fate of the vocalization before that I cannot state.

§ 40 *d*). That they, particularly in af., have given way to bisyllabic formations is only natural because of the early omission of final short vowels in verbal forms (see § 109 *e*), and once the bisyllabic stems had obtained decisive majority, the analogy furthered the development still more. In D, we also have an exceptional formation in the root *b'r* I, the n.act. of which is *béjjar*. It could seem that the form actually stems from a root variant *bjr*, but there is no trace of a semi-vowel as the second radical of a triradical verbal root in SamH except in certain cases of I or III infirmae, where they are due to quite particular factors (see §§ 33 *a*, 46 *a*); so we conclude that it holds good even for our dialect. The starting point may have been a stem **bi'r*; when D was formed, the gemination of the second radical caused the creation of a svarabhakti after it, and its quality was determined by the 3rd rad. as *a* (cf. § 1 *u*), the result being **bi''ar*. At the time of the first weakening of the gutturals (if not earlier) ' assimilated to the preceding vowel: **bijjar*, a phonetic variant of which the present form is. In another root, *n'm*, we perhaps have a fem. form: *ném^ma* < **ni'm-at*; but more probably it is an adjective.

d The peculiarity in prf. referred to at *c* above is the gemination of the first radical, as we have met it in certain, both strong and weak types of Q prf. as well as some secondary stems. Common to all of them, as far as they have not originated from assimilation, is that the preform. vowel from a very early period has been *i* (cf. §§ 11 *f*, 24 *d*, 25 *f*, *g*). This again seems to presuppose *a* as the stem vowel (see § 11 *d*), as far as there was only one, which we may be entitled to suppose to have been originally the case in most roots even in this class, to judge from the other classes and the TibH forms of even this class. The roots in which this phenomenon is attested at present are *b'r* I, *m'n*, *n'l* I, *n'm*, and *s'r* in this class. The forms are: *jibbár* (var. f. *utēbâér*), *wjimmá'en*, *jinnál* (var. *tēnâél*), *wjinnâ'em* (var. *jēnēmmanū* sf.), *wjissárū* (var. *wjassárū* obviously an error). The three varr. may show the direction of development: the number of the roots showing the gemination has without doubt considerably decreased from what it was in the beginning, to judge from the fact that in TibH *a* is almost always the stem vowel in this class (cf.

Arab.). The reason for the decrease may have been the tendency to avoid confusion with N.

e Placed side by side with the normal type, which may be represented by *jēgā'el*, the group under *d* may give us a clue to a solution of the problem. The normal type is identical with D, the other one differs from it regarding the preformative, a difference which is abolished in the variants. Accordingly, the present preform. vowel seems to stem from D (and the other forms of prf. resembling it; see §§ 11 *f*, 16 *c*), which presupposes a bisyllabic stem. The latter cannot thus be a creation of analogy; consequently, it may be due to a characteristic of the gutturals which later disappeared. What was this characteristic? To judge from the fact that *n*, which normally assimilates itself to another consonant immediately following, hardly ever does so to a following guttural, we could conclude that during the period when *n* was susceptible to assimilation, it was incompatible with gutturals; and since *n* is one of the consonants which shows least incompatibility with gutturals (cf. JOSEPH H. GREENBERG in *Word* 6, the lists p. 164—66), we could further assume that during that period gutturals were incompatible with any consonants. This, however, does not seem to fit the fact that in N, *n* does assimilate itself to gutturals as to other consonants (see below *h*), and considering the fact that gutturals in numerous cases show traces of a one-time syllabicity (cf. § 109 *q*, *kk*), we would prefer the supposition that the vocalic quality presupposed by this syllabicity left a svarabhakti before the guttural even after this period; its creation was supported by the tendency of the first radical to become geminated after *i* as the preform. vowel (cf. above *d*), which was able to make itself felt during the period of the syllabicity of the guttural, and was completed after the creation of the svarabhakti, the colour of which was of course determined by the guttural: *a*. This would also explain the different behaviour of *n* in N af. as the 1st rad.: it seems that in earlier times the secondary gemination occurred only immediately after the stressed vowel (cf. §§ 6 *a*, 11 *f*, and particularly 109 *l*), and, as we have established (§ 15 *b*), the preformative of N did not originally carry stress; while

in H, where the situation was the opposite (see *ib.*), *n* was again not assimilated. On the other hand, the fact that in TibH there is a verb (*nḥt*) in which *n* is assimilated in *prf.*, seems to indicate that there were differences, and since yet another form of even that verb does have the *n*, we may conclude that such forms were more numerous earlier, but have been radically diminished because of the influence of the more numerous type. The difference may ultimately go back to the two classes of the verbs I *n* (see § 25), and supports the supposition that the roots with an »old» *n* were more numerous than those in which it was added later as an augment. In any case, in SamH *n* now behaves in this class as a strong radical. This, however, does not help us further than to establish that the period of the syllabicity of gutturals must have coincided (which in itself is very plausible; cf. § 109 *q-s*) with that of the susceptibility of *n* of assimilation, if our premisses are correct.

f So we must make a fresh attempt. The question left to be answered is: from where does the *e* — as far as it is not swallowed secondarily — universally attested in the second stem syllable come? We will now take up the exceptional root *b'š*, the *af.* of which was studied at *e* above. Its *prf.* obviously goes back to **ja-bi'š*, which through the common transposition was made **jáb'is* > *-eš*. With the coming and passing of the period of the syllabicity of the gutturals, however, the created svarabhakti did not acquire the colour of *a*, but apparently *e*, which is in conformity with the rule of svarabhaktis following the colour of their »mother» vowel (see § 109 *ll*). Following this lead, we find that in the normal type the colour of the svarabhakti created was *a*, since this was the colour of the old stem vowel as well (and not because of the guttural, though even this might have had some influence upon it). Following the rule of polarity (see § 109 *i*), the old stem vowel in the normal type was then transformed into *e*; the starting point may have been got from strong stems of this construction (cf., e.g., the stems *kbd* Q II, *kfr* Q II), and the development was without doubt supported by a similar one in the agential group, where it might have had a starting point within its own boundaries, in the old type **qatel*; the stem Q II

in general may have stood as a further parallel, as an example of both actional and agential groups being based upon identical stems. In the root *b's*, the new form **jabbé'eš* had no such parallel as a starting point, and perhaps the craving for polarity was satisfied by the opposition *a-e* between preformative and stem vowels, particularly after the giving up of the gemination of the 1st rad., which might have taken place rather late after the shift of the accent upon the stem, since we do not seem to have early instances of secondary gemination after an *a* vowel except when this bears the main stress (cf. § 109 *mm*). In D, the transformation of the geminated guttural into a simple ' led to the present form by itself.

g After this there is not much left to be explained. In *wjātānē'u* (prf.sf.), the preform. vowel, even if supported by Ms. B, may be of relatively late origin, being taken over from the w-prf. of the hollow roots after the total quiescization of the guttural, apparently because of the dorsal nature of the 1st rad. (see § 1 *u*). In the form *wjāggār* (root *g'ar*) (supported by Ms. D), on the other hand, a comparatively late transformation of the stem vowel — under the influence of the guttural and *r* — can be traced (the verb having thus earlier been a parallel to *b's*); the gemination of the first radical may be late, to judge from the length of the preform. vowel, and from the fact that in PETERMANN'S text it is lacking. Another possibility is that the form is H (cf. *h* below). In the root *l'ak*, the present form of n.act. *kālē'ek* might have got its first *e* through the influence of the second one, since Mss. BC show *a* instead of it. For the form *nēm^ma* Gn 49: 15 (root *n'am*), if verbal, cf. *b's* at *e* above, and the same root in Arabic. In the root *š'l* I, the af. var. *šā'áltā* (beside regular form) might be simply a mechanical breaking up of the contracted form, while the n.act. *šā'al* adverbially used may really go back to a prototype **šā'l*. Of Q ps, n.pat.pl. *z'ifem* (root *z'af*) is attested; it goes via **zē'if* back to **zu'ip*. Of tQ, there is nothing peculiar, perhaps apart from the fact that the contraction is almost a rule in it. The same is true of tD, with the reservation that uncontracted forms are found somewhat more often. The only preserved case of D ps, *'āmābānem* (n.pat.pl. of the root *b'ān*, with a cj.), is

made spurious by the kt var. (from a root $*_3bn$), but probably the form is quite «lawful», deriving from $*ma-buḥḥan$ through $*ma-boḥḥan$ (because of the guttural) $> *ma-bá''an > *ma-bá'an > *mābān$; in pl., the last radical can have been geminated, but even its omission is nothing exceptional.

h As regards the stems with external enlargement, N was already referred to above in the statement that *n* as the 1st. rad. is assimilated even to a guttural as the 2nd one in its af. However, we have but one instance of it, sg.l. $nē'imtī$ from the root n'_3m , so that we can mention it as an exception to the general rule of the preservation of *n* as the 1st rad. in this class. As an example of N in general we can take the root l'_3m , where we have the following forms: af. $unēl-lē'em$, pl.l. $unēlē'imnū$; prf. $jēlē'em$, pl. 2. $tēlē'emū$; imp. $'ellē'em$; n.act. $lellē'em$, var. $-ēem$; n.ag. $'ennillē'em$, var. $-ēem$. As we see, the vocalization follows the pattern of Q and D, and the same is true of N in general; the omission of the gemination of the 1st rad. is a peculiarity of *l*, and apparently due to the vocalic nature of this sound, since even a secondary gemination of this sound is nothing unusual; cf. § 1 *n*¹. In H again, as stated, even *n* behaves wholly as a firm radical (cf. above *e*), and a svarabhakti has obviously been created before the guttural before its quiescization (cf. ib.), since the primary stem syllable now bears the stress even where the word ends with it, e.g. prf.sg. 3. m. $jānīl$, n.act. $bānīl$ ($< *ja-ha-nḥīl, *ba-ha-nḥīl$ through $*jannīḥīl, *bannīḥīl$). The stem vowel has been preserved as *a* more often than usual, e.g. af.sg. 3. m.sf. $wēššātmmē$ (root s'_3t ; all the other forms have *i*), and particularly in the neighbourhood of *r*, e.g. prf.sg. 3. m.sf. $wjērābak$ (r'_4b), prf.sg. 3. m. $wjānār$ (n'_4r), af.sg. 2. m. $wāš'ārta$ (s'_2r); but not always even in that position: af.sg. 3. m. $'āšīr$ (s'_3r III; and so all the other forms in that root); perhaps the additional influence of a stronger guttural

¹ As is known — and self-evident —, the quantities of vowels are much more easily changed than those of most consonants; so it is not surprising that consonants which even otherwise have vowel-like qualities — e.g., potential syllabicity, durability, etc. — more than most others also share this characteristic with the vowels proper.

than ' was needed. H ps is not attested in this class (apart from the doubly weak *r'V*, for which see § 44 b).

iii. Verba tertiae infirmae.

§ 28. General remarks.

a In the following paragraphs we deal with roots, the two first radicals of which are — or behave like — strong consonants, while the third radical is either an ', or is represented by a vocalic element. The semi-vowels as second radicals are considered as weak consonants (as well as in the first place), since they are often transformed into another sound — either vocalic or consonantal. Class III V has exerted some influence upon the original class III ', as is shown by the fact that some forms of the latter follow its pattern (cf., e.g., root '₃t'), but all of these examples being of doubly weak roots, we need not pay attention to it here; moreover, even so the clear majority of that group accords to the rest of the present III ', so that even the division of this greater class into the two mentioned subclasses is without doubt justified in principle.

§ 29. Verba III '.

a According to what has been said in the preceding paragraph, this class comprises verbs, the third radical of which is — or has been — a guttural, while the two others are strong. The only characteristic which distinguishes them from the strong verb is that the forms without affirmatives in present pronunciation end without a consonant after the vowel of the second radical, which again, apart from H and a few exceptions, is invariably *a*. In the forms provided with affirmatives which begin with a consonant, this is normally geminated in consequence of the quiescization of the guttural; when the affirmative begins with a long or stressed vowel — or perhaps a guttural (which has disappeared early) —, it is now separated from the stem by means of an ' or, if the vowel in question was short and

unstressed, it is now contracted together with the last stem vowel. Examples: af. *bārā* < **bara'*, f. *māšá* < **maša'-t*, 2. m. *bārátta* < **bara'-ta*, 1. *šāmát-tī* < **šama'-tī*; pl. 3. *wšēmá'u* < **šama'-ū* (*e* is apparently due to the preceding *š*, § 1 *i*, or confusion with imp., cf. below); prf. *jīšma* < **ji-šam'*, pl. 3. m. *wjimšá'u* < **ji-maš'-ū*, f. *wtimlā'inna* < **ti-mal'-(h)inna*; imp. *šēma* < **šema'*, pl. *šēmá'ū* < **šema'-ū*, pl.f. *šēmān* apparently < **šema'-an* (< -*n* < -*na* < -(*h*)*inna*), but *qērīn* < **qera'-(h)in* (< -(*h*)*inna*)¹; n.act. *šāna* apparently < **šan'*; n.ag. *šāma* < **šama'*, pl. *šēmēm*, **eššēmīm* < **šama'-im*; f. *šāmát* < **šama'-t*; Q ps n.pat. *fēšā*: < **puša'*, *zāri* < **zuri'* (cf. below), pl. *māšim* < **muša/iḥ-im* (apparently secondarily transformed vocalization, as perhaps even in:), *qārīē* (var. *qerjē ī*) < **qurī'-ai/i*; H: prf. *wjašmā^h* < **ja-ha-šmīḥ* (> **jašmīḥ* > **jašmī'*, cf. § 109 ll: > **jašmīj'* > **jašmīj^v* > **jašmījī*); the stress of Q prf. *jašmāē^h* apparently follows H; in f. *tēdēšī* the stress has secondarily receded to the svarabhakti which is due to the incompatibility of *d* and *š* in this order. Sometimes *a* is preserved as the stem vowel: prf. *jīflā* etc. (cf. § 109 *i*). Other secondary stems normally do not show anything peculiar.

b A few exceptional forms have already been mentioned above. In the root *ml'*, there is a whole stem Q II, the second stem vowel of which goes back to *e* (*i*); this has developed into *ī* when not followed by an affirmative; followed by an affirmative *ū*, it has turned into *ē* / *æ*, but with an *a* it has contracted into *á* / *ê*; N has this stem too. Examples: af. *mālī*, f. *mālā*, pl. *mālē'ū*; n.act. *mālēt* (< **male'-t*). In a few other roots, analogous forms are attested, e.g. *qr'* II N prf. (but af. -*a*). In *bi'*, the actional stem apparently already dissolved the final cluster at its creation: **biṭ^v* > **beta'*; cf. § 109 *e*. Apart from them, in Q prf. of the two roots *šm'₃* and *šn'*, there is the peculiarity that their preformative vowel is *a* in spite of the fact that the stem vowel in them has the same colour. In spite of the contrary evidence of TibH — and regarding the latter, even of Arab. — the simplest solution may be that the stem vowel

¹ The sg. form *qērī* apparently follows class III V.

was originally *e*, and was supplanted by *a* only after the rule of polarity had ceased to function. This supposition is supported by the almost exclusive appearance of *a* as the stem vowel in this class; the scanty remains of *e* show in any case that that was not the original state, and their often scattered appearance suggests that they are remnants of an earlier more widespread class, particularly since the spread of *a* at the expense of *e* in the neighbourhood of gutturals is much more easily explained than the contrary phenomenon; on the other hand, the entrance of *e/i* into the af. of *śn' / šn'* in TibH and Arab. might have taken place in connection with the increasing normalization of this vocalization in the stative verbs — as we saw, among other things, above and in § 27, ' has not so strong a predilection for *a* as the other gutturals have. In the root *rs'*₃, even af. - like n.ag. — seems to go back to **rišh*; cf. § 40 d.

§ 30. V e r b a I I I V.

a 1. This class is called *verba tertiae vocalis* because of the peculiarity that the primary form of its stem from which the present inflexion can best be explained does not seem to have had any consonantal element after the vowel of its second radical; during the period when most verbal forms bore short inflexional vowels (see § 109 *g-i*), secondary glides might have been formed after the stem final vowels to bear the former, as is seen, e.g., in Ugaritic. The colour of the glides might — naturally — have been determined according to the colour of the preceding vowels so that *i* created *j*, *u* respectively *w*, and *a*, '. The fact that the latter in that respect falls together with the class of original III ' might have been the original cause of the partial falling together of these two classes; in principle, however, they are kept apart by the fact that the vowel representing a radical seems normally to have been long (cf. below *b*). True, in w-prf. forms appear which rather presuppose a short stem final vowel, but even beside them there are others in which the case seems to be the contrary; so we may temporarily content ourselves with the assumption that the characteristic vowel of this class was normally

long, but became anceps under certain circumstances; standing in an open syllable it preserved its original colour; for details see below.

b 2. As is normally the case in Akkadian, and as the analogy of other verbal classes suggests, the stem in each root might originally have been identical at least within each of the two groups of conjugations, the actional and agential one; this means, among other things, that the final vowels within these limits were originally identical through the inflexion of one and the same root. At present the situation has changed. There are a number of exceptions, to which we shall return below, but the general rule is that the *a* vowel is confined to the 3rd pers.sg. of af., n.act., and a part of nomina agentis (sg.); *i* is now found in all the other cases, except where the affirmative is, or begins with, a vowel, which then normally replaces it. It is now significant that where two stem vowels appear, the first of them, when it appears as *a* in a form in which the stem ends with *a*, in the forms in which the stem ends with *i* it is transformed into *e*, if the neighbouring consonants do not favour *a* (in addition, the analogy of other classes has in many cases re-established *a*); this shows that at least *i* in such forms was long as the representative of the third radical (see § 1 *r*). The few cases of confusion are easily understandable as being of late origin, when the rule of transformation $aC\bar{i} > eCe/\bar{i}$ did not function any more. In Q prf., the preform. vowel ultimately became *i*, apparently to distinguish it clearly from H prf. Examples: Q: af.sg. 3. m. *wtāla* < **talā*, f. *fāšatta* < **pašā-t(a)* (the secondary gemination of *t*, which rarely appears in this class, is apparently caused by the analogy of the class III '); the final *a* is probably secondary, added after the fem. *-t* during the period when this generally grew quiescent so that this form normally came to end with *-a*; by that time the rule $\acute{a} > \acute{o}$ had ceased to function, cf. § 109 *o, w-y*); 1. *šēlītī*, pl. 3. *fārū*, 2. m. *rābūtimmā*; but in Q af., where the differentiation from imp. might have functioned as an additional factor, *a* has practically always been re-established even outside the 3rd pers.sg., even if examples in which the influence of the neighbouring sounds cannot have influenced the matter are very few; e.g. *bākītmā* (< **bakī-tuma*); in Q prf., where no such

analogies — positive or negative — need be taken into account, *e* appears regularly in bisyllabic stems: *wjēbēkkī* (the gemination, even if old, may be secondary, cf. af. above), *tēfēdī*, *tēfēšī* (< **tu-pašī*) etc.; and the same is the case in D, cf. af.sg. 3. f. *kassātā*, but 2. m. *ukessītā*, pl. 3. ^u*késsū*, 1. *wkessínū*; similarly e.g. root *fnV*: sg. 1. *fennītī*, pl. 3. *ufénnū* (as against Q: sg. 2. m. ^u*fānītā*, 1. *fānīti*), cf. above); in the root *nsV*, some confusion appears, the modified vowel (through the influence of *s* further transformed into *i*) having intruded even into sg. 3. f.: *nissāta*, while *a* appears in 2. m.sf.: *nāssītē'u* (beside regular forms sg. 3. m. *nāssa^h*, pl. 2. m. *nēssītimmā*); the n.act. Q used adverbially seems invariably to go back to **qalā*, e.g. *dāta*; the normal type quite as invariably to **qalā-t*, i.e., the same type provided with the fem. affirmative; e.g. *ālōt* (no example of roots with two firm radicals has been preserved), with prep. *l*: *libnot*; and analogously in D: *nāssot* (< **nassā-t*). The present difference in vocalization is due to the circumstance that in the adverbial form the stress has all the time remained upon the penultima, since apparently only in special cases was the ultima able to attract the stress during the Old Canaanite period (cf. § 11 *b* a.e.) — and probably at least some time earlier —, and a long vowel alone was apparently not able to break this rule; on the other hand, either the overlong syllable which was created through the suffixation of *t* could do that, or the form was used as a common noun before it obtained a definite verbal character, and as a noun — at least, for the most part of the Old Canaanite period — carried the final case vowels; then it was only natural that the penultima had the stress, since it contained the only long vowel of the word; and even after the form obtained its present function and consequently lost the case vowels, the final overlong syllable was able to preserve the stress which it had of old, until the great shift of the stress universally to the penultimate at the close of the Old Canaanite period (see § 109 *z*). But shortly before that the construction *l* + n.act. seems to have become established in its present state as a special verbal form (cf. § 10 *k*). Probably analogically to *prf.*, the prefix acquired the stress, but it seems strange that the first stem vowel was swallowed.

Two explanations seem possible: first, if the establishment of the construction took place before the beginning of the heavy stress period, the final syllable was not shortened in spite of its loss of accent; the first stem vowel thus came between a stressed and a long vowel and in consequence of this was not able to retain its former vocal fullness, but was reduced and soon totally extinguished; if, again, the establishment of the construction — as seems more probable since it in any case presupposes the development $\acute{a} > \acute{o}$ completed — took place after the word stress had begun to grow heavier, the loss of the first stem vowel after the now heavier stressed syllable is quite as understandable, even if the vowel of the final syllable was now doubtless shortened¹. In n.ag. Q the stem final vowel seems to have been anceps, as is indicated by the fact that the first stem vowel has never been made *e*, where the second stem vowel — in sg.m. — is *i*, for the analogy of the other forms alone could not have achieved this, to judge from D, where *e* in such cases does appear. Examples: *fāne* < **pana*, *bānce*^h < **bana*, *bākī* < **bakī*, pl. *bākem* < **bak-im* (cf. § 58 f); true, even here attestations are not many; D: *ēmnessī* < **m-néssī* < **ma-nassī*; *āmkeśśī* (interr.); these are the only examples here, but even if it is possible that *e* in both be due to the following *s* (§ 1 i), this may be less probable, since the influence of this sound even in the other forms of D of these roots does not achieve so much (cf. above), and the correspondance of *-a-a* to *-e-i* is particularly regular just in D. The type of n.pot. is *tālūwī* (< **talawj* < **talūj*, cf. § 109 ce). As to N, the material, even if very scanty, clearly points to the state of the characteristic vowel having been anceps: af. *niggāla*, *niššāba* (< **na-gala* etc.), var. *niššābi* (< **na-šabi*); pf. *jīššātī* (< **ja-na-šati*), f. *tiggālī*, **tibbāni* (Mss. CD, root *bnV* I). In H, again, we are in need of good material, but from the appearance of *æ* in the neighbourhood of consonants which normally prefer *a*, we may be able to draw the conclusion that the characteristic *i* in them was permanently

¹ The same development is presupposed by the type of n.act. **gatāl* of the other classes (§ 41 b); cf. the roots 'mr, 'bt.

long; the distribution of *-a* and *-i* is as in D. Examples: af. 3. m. *árbā*, 1. *wārbīti*; prf.sg. 3. m. *jérbī*, 2. m. *térbī*, pl. 2. m. *tárbū*; n.act. *érbī*, *lárbot*; n.ag. *márbī*, pl. *márbem* (apparently < **ma-rbī-(i)m* at a comparatively early time); in the root *šqV*, *e* appears naturally everywhere apart from where a particle is prefixed (see vol. II *sub voce*), so that from it we cannot draw any conclusions; but perhaps from the forms of the root *nrV*: prf.sg. 2. m. *tímrī*, pl. 2. m. *útémrū*; n.ag.pl. *mémrem*.

c When comparing the examples presented above at *b*, it appears that all the forms in which the characteristic vowel seems to have been permanently long rather than anceps, are longer than those in which the contrary seems to have been the case, unless N is considered. This would mean that the length of the vowel was dependent on the stress which the form obtained, apparently during the heavy stress period at the close of the Old Canaanite, when most bisyllabic forms seem to have been without stress (see § 109 *p*); the deviation of N from the general rule could be due to the generalization of *a* in the first primary stem syllable in this stem (cf. § 14 *b*); moreover, as was stated above, the attestations are few. The conclusion is supported by the state of affairs in the w-prf. (Q and H) of this class which, in contrast to TibH, omits the characteristic vowel, as it seems, only when the first radical was capable of syllabization, or totally assimilated to the second; for only so the form in its totality was able of becoming bisyllabic. Examples: *wjībni* < **wá-ji-bni* (the last vowel anceps), but *wlírrib* < **wá-ti-rib* < **wá-ti-rbi*, *wjáz^zar* < **wá-ja-zr* < **wá-ja-zri*, and H *wjérref* < **wá-ja-rp* (< **wa-ja-ha-rpi*); for further cases of apocoptation see §§ 37, 41, 44, 46, 47. An exception seems to be the root *fnV*, where we meet with a form *wjáfān*, which seems to go back to **wá-ja-pn*; and it is hard to suppose that *p* could have been syllabic during that period (the Old Canaanite, if not earlier); but the forms of *-a*-prf. (*wéfānā* etc.) suggest that there has been another prf. stem with preserved vowel after the first radical and developed analogically to the strong Q prf. with bisyllabic stem (§ 11 *f*): **ju-pani*; w-prf. *wa-ja-pani*, from which the last vowel dropped (cf. § 10 *i*), as in the jussive-prohibitive,

which is represented by $tēfen < *tu-pan(i)$; in these forms the last vowel was short because of the stress lying on the first syllable (cf. *ib.*). In the other forms of w-prf. — as also in the common prf. — the first stem vowel — which had already been extinguished earlier for the same reasons as in n.act. provided with the prefixed *l*, see above at *b* — might have been *i*, where the preform. vowel is now *a*, and *a* or *u*, where it is *i* (cf. the strong verb in its present form); as to the original characteristic vowel, nothing certain can be said, even if it is conceivable that at some period it has been identical in colour with the first stem vowel (cf. the present state in af.sg. 3.). The reasons for the total disappearance of *u* are equally obscure (as a comparison with TibH shows, it took place probably during the Old Canaanite period); for af., prf., and imp., the avoidance of confusion with certain plural forms could be cited, but even in prf. and imp., the avoidance of confusion with certain feminine forms could equally well have caused the disappearance of *i*. But perhaps the confusion with plural was felt to be more disturbing.

d A number of irregular forms remain to be dealt with. We will take them in the alphabetical order of roots. 1) *bzV*: af. *ávzā*, w-prf. *wjábēz* apparently go back to the period when *b* was syllabic (cf. § 109 *hh-kk*), are accordingly of late formation: $*bza$, $wjábz$, where *b* accordingly might have been rather like *w*, though not identical with it, since they have been kept apart. 2) *bkV*: the n.act. *ælbékkot* might have acquired the colour of its first stem vowel alongside with prf. (which also earlier had *a*, cf. the ms.var.). 3) *bnV* II: the prf. *'ibbénnī* apparently goes back to $*ji-beni$ (cf. § 11 *f*), the root being a denominative from *ben* »son»; this formation has spread to the root *bnV* I as well, where we have one regular form (sg. 3. m.), and a w-prf. pl. with the gemination of the 1st rad. given up, of it. 4) *glV*: n.pot. $*gálo$ is a st.estr. form preceding an *i* vowel in both of its attestations; this may be why it has not developed into $*gālúwi$ (since it apparently lacked stress, cf. § 109 *ff*), and why the written final *j* is not perceivable in pronunciation. In N, n.pat.pl.f. *wenniglá'ot* is a transposition for $*wenniggálot$ apparently caused by the preceding *'ennistárot*; cf. even the corresponding form in the root *fl'*. In D w-prf., the final

vowel is \bar{e} instead of $-i$ in the common prf.; it is apparently a variant of a , which is found even elsewhere in this position. 5) *dIV*: prf.pl. 3. f. *wtidlā'inna* seems to stand for **wtidlinna* probably influenced by the immediately preceding and following forms both of which lawfully have the ending $\bar{a}'inna$; cf., however, below *klV*, *nsV*. 6) *klV* I: imp.sf. *kēlē'innæ* seems to be an instance of the preservation of the characteristic vowel before an ending (in this case, pronominal sf.) beginning with a vowel; this may ultimately go back to a confusion between the two original classes III $-a$ and III $'$ (cf. a above). For D w-prf. cf. *glV*; here the vowel has even spread to a form of common prf.; in n.ag., the final \bar{i} seems to have become permanent. Here we even have the stem nD, represented by three prf. forms; the primary elements can have been **ja-hin-kellV* (the first stem vowel in D seems to have been e) as well as *-kullV* (cf. § 17 b); the preform. vowel i seems to have spread in one case even to D ps, where of course it appears lengthened. 7) *ksV* II: in D prf., the final \bar{i} appears permanent before a sf. 8) *nsV* D: the sf. form of af.sg. 3. m. shows the preservation of the characteristic $-a$ analogous to the imp. of *klV* I, q.v. 9) *fdV*: in H, the characteristic vowel cannot be seen, since only sf. forms are attested; the 1st and 2nd rad. are kept apart apparently because of the incompatibility of p and d , which appears even in Q of this root, and similarly in H ps, if the form *wāfāda* Lv 19: 20 is its n.act.; the development cannot be traced in detail. (In Q, the incompatibility has led to regular forms from bisyllabic prf. stems.) 10) *frV*: the final \bar{i} appears permanent in H n.ag. before a sf. 11) *ftV* II: the prf. *jéfet* seems to be a H rather than Q, cf. *rfV* and MT, but the form being a hapax legomenon, the radicals are uncertain, and the obscurity is further increased by the fact that the form is part of a play on words. 12) *sbV* I: n.act. *alsābat* — which corresponds to an irregular n.act. H in MT — seems to go back to **šaba-t* with two short vowels (only thus is the preservation of the first one explicable, cf. above at b , since there never seems to have been incompatibility between $\$$ and b), but a reason for the shortness of the second a I cannot give (unless a parallel root *šbt* for the verbal forms could be supposed?). 13) *qnV* II: here we

have the same phenomenon as 6 and 8 above, only that the vowel preserved is *-i*, which is transformed into *æ* before the sf. (in prf.). 14) *rbV* I: some confusion with the parallel root *rb*; cf. vol. II *sub voce*. 15) *ršV* I: on the accent of n.pot. *râšûj* cf. above 4. 16) *šqV*: the final *-i* has become permanent in H prf.pl. 3. f. (before the affirm.) and imp.f. (before the sf.). The phenomenon can be regarded as a higher potency of that mentioned at 13 above.

e Note. Herewith the simply weak roots among verbs which at least partly behave like triradical ones, are dealt with. The latter characteristic appearing to the present writer as more essential, we proceed now to study the doubly and triply weak roots of these classes, before taking up the essentially biradical roots.

iv. Verba primae et secundae infirmae.

§ 31. G E N E R A L R E M A R K S.

a The sound *n* does not appear as a weak consonant except at the beginning of a root or secondary stem (apart from an exception for which see § 42), and since it does not normally behave as a weak consonant before gutturals, which are the only weak consonants that can follow it in the second place of a root belonging to the classes now to be studied, the roots beginning with *n* need not be taken into account here. Theoretically, then, four (sub-)classes remain: 1) I et II ', 2) I ' et II semivocalis, 3) I semi-vocalis et II ', and 4) I et II semi-vocalis. Even of them, however, the last mentioned is omitted, since there are no such verbal roots in SamH.

§ 32. V E R B A I E T I I '.

a 1. Even this class is by no means numerous. Firstly, in SamH two gutturals in the beginning of a triradical root are attested only when the root begins with an (original) '. Secondly, two identical radicals in the beginning of a Semitic root are an impossibility. Third, ' and '₄ are incompatible in any SamH root. Thus, only roots beginn-

ing $''_2$ or $''_3$ are possible in this class, and actually, the roots $''_2b$, $''_2l$, $''_3z$, and $''_3r$ are the only ones attested.

b 2. Q is represented in all of them. The afformal follows the common pattern of II $'$, e.g., sg. 3. m. $'á'ez$, 2. m. $'ā'ibtā$. The preformal, which is attested in all four, presupposes one-time syllabicity of a guttural $'$, e.g. $wá'er < *wá-'zher < *wá-'a-'ahr$; $wjá'eb < *wa-já-'heb < *wá-ja-'hb < *wá-ja-'ahb$ (unless analogy be responsible for the present form). The other forms follow the pattern of II $'$; in $''_2b$, n.act. has the fem. afform. in the end: $'ā'ēbæ$, cs. $míjjā'ēbæ$ ($< *'ahb-at$, as it seems, with a svarabhakti after h created in analogy with the other forms).

c Q ps is represented by n.pat. $'áæz$ which, accounting for the influence of z (see § 1 *i*), might go back to $*'uhæz$ rather than $-iz$; $'$ is naturally responsible for a instead of e . The same root forms N too, of the type without vowel after the 1st rad.: n.pat. $ná'éz < *na-'hez$; and its prf. presupposes even the syllabicity of $'$: pl. 3. $wjá'ézū < *wá-ja-n-'hez-ū$, unless an old neutral Q prf. is used instead, which, however, is hard to suppose for semantic reasons. D, attested in $''_3r$, is wholly analogous to Q, e.g. prf. $já'er < *ja'h(h)er < *ja-'ahher$.

§ 33. Verba I' et II semi-vocalis.

a This class is smaller still; it comprises two roots. The first of them is $'_2wr$; it is represented only by prf.sg. 3. m. $jāwwar$, which apparently goes back to $*ja-'war$. The question as to what the form is to which the latter could be traced is harder. It is striking that the only cases in which a semi-vowel can appear as a second radical are after a guttural and preceding a guttural or a vowel which represents the third radical. Consequently, it might be absurd to suppose that the primary elements were $*ja'awr$; we should rather seek an explanation which in some way would account for some peculiarity of the gutturals. On the other hand, we cannot suppose that the root actually would have been $'_4Vr$, since we have many hollow roots with gutturals as the first radical, and even with exactly

these same radicals, which do not behave in that way. In MT this verb stands in D, but our form is probably Q, since an early geminated *w* in the present pronunciation seems to appear regularly as *b* (cf. particularly § 109 *ii*). Yet it seems that the root is connected with $\text{'}_4\text{Vr}$ I, in so far as the basic idea of the latter (»to have eyes open», which is not far from »to see») may be used euphemistically in it to mean the contrary. Now the Q prf. of $\text{'}_4\text{Vr}$ — attested in MT — presupposes *u* as the stem vowel, and if we assume that after the euphemistic use of the root had established itself as a regular expression, the need of differentiation was felt, for which an opportunity was given when the gutturals and *r* (among other things) became syllabic; it was then possible to transform $\text{*j}\acute{a}\text{-}\acute{u}r$ into $\text{*j}\acute{a}\text{-}\acute{w}r$, in which the preformative vowel was soon shortened (and, if it had already begun to develop into *o*, due to the now stronger influence of the guttural, it returned to *a*); after the period of the syllabicity of *r* was over, the form $\text{*j}\acute{a}\text{'war}$ resulted, the colour of the svarabhakti, in the absence of any »mother» vowel, being determined by *r* (see § 1 *u*).¹ Cf. § 109 *q-w*.

b The other root, $\text{'}jb$, is represented by af.sg. 1. *wejjábtī* and n.ag. $\text{'}i/\acute{o}'\acute{u}jjab$. The gemination of the 2nd rad. is apparently secondary in both cases (cf. § 1 *m*), so that there does not seem to be any reason to regard the former as D, since even the meaning is apparently identical. The af. form accordingly goes back to $\text{*}ajab\text{-}\acute{t}\acute{i}$ (*e* in the first syllable is due to the following *j*, cf. *ib.*), the n.ag. to $\text{*}\acute{a}jab$; in the forms with *i* in the first syllable this is a product of assimilation to *j* (cf. *ib.*, again). The reason for the early prolongation of the first vowel might be an emotional intensity caused by the meaning of the word, as e.g. in *rúdef* (cf. § 11 *k*).

§ 34. Verba I semi-vocalis et II ¹.

a 1. This class is little larger than the earlier ones, even if at present only *j* can stand at the beginning of roots in the primary

¹ In MT, the present D might be an erroneous restitution from a form like ours, or also a dialectal peculiarity developed earlier (see the final volume).

stem forms that do not bear preformatives; on the other hand, as far as can be ascertained, in all the cases now to be dealt with, it goes back to a former *w*. There being no state of incompatibility between semi-vowels and any other consonant, any guttural can appear as the second radical, the roots actually attested being *j'l* I and II, *j'₂b*, *j'₃m*, and *j'₄d*.

b 2. Q is represented by a prf.pl. 3. f. *ujāmīnna*, and imp. *ābaḥ*, pl. *'ēbū*, *wābū*. The latter is apparently based upon a stem **hab*, the *e* vowel in the first pl. form being due to its position at the beginning of the word (cf. § 1 *r*). The former has still preserved the ancient preformative *ja-* (cf. Akk., Arab., Eth., Aram.), going back to a prototype **wá-ja-ḥam-(h)inna*, with preform. and stem vowels contracted together after the disappearance of the guttural.

c In N, two types are attested. The one lacking a vowel after the first rad. is represented by af.pl.l. *nūwacēlnū*; it comes from **na-w'el-nū*. Of the other, we have four forms, viz. af.sg. 1. *unūwacē'ldtī*, pl. 3. *unūwacē'ēdu*; prf.sg. 1. *'ūwawā'ed*; and n.ag.pl. *ænnūwawā'ēdēm*. The prototype of af. and n.ag. is obviously **na-wā'ed*, of prf. **jā-n(a)-wa'ed*, the gemination of the 1st rad. being accordingly secondary (cf. § 1 *m*). The preform. vowels were preserved as *a* apparently 'due — after the assimilation of *n* even in preformal — to the immediately following *w*, which then in the latest phases of the dialect — probably during or after 13th—14th century, cf. Appendix I — further developed them into *u*.

d H is also attested in two roots, for the most part with very interesting forms. In the root *j'l* II, af. behaves as can be expected: sg. 3. m. *'ūwawā'el*, 1. *'ūwawā'ellī*, which go back to a prototype **ha-w'al*, but its prf. is already exceptional: *wjā'el*, and so are both forms attested in *j'₄d*: af.sg. 3. m.sf. *'ā'idā*, prf.sg. 3. m.sf. *jā'idānnā*; they rather resemble forms which we shall meet when studying the hollow roots, a resemblance which has been brought even into kt in the latter root. In the former, however, it is significant that even in MT, kt in two passages presupposes a primary form without the semi-vowel as the first radical, and the same is true of the latter in one passage. The phenomenon being again (cf. § 33 *a*) limited to one doubly weak class — as an additional instance we could perhaps

introduce two forms of a root j'_4s , but since this has a parallel root $'_4V_s$ even in MT, it was regarded as better to attribute the forms to it, since this does not imply any irregularity —, a solution should be found which would take some peculiarity of both of them into account. In addition, the three cases of *kt* in MT (cf. above) might demand that the decisive step must be placed to the Old Canaanite period. Since in H — as in the secondary stems in general — all the other conjugations are based on *af.*, this might be in the key position. The immediate predecessor of our *af.* form seems now to have been $*ha-'id(-ah)$. There does not seem to be any possibility of tracing this back to $*ha-w'id$. But we remember that H was the last of the secondary stems with external enlargement to be formed (cf. § 15 *b*), and that, apparently, during the period of its formation the change of the semi-vowel at the beginning of roots was taking place (see §§ 24 *g* and 109 *g-m*). So it is possible that this stem was formed from a prototype $*há-j'id$, which during the period of the syllabicity of \bar{g} gutturals yielded $*ha-j'd$; through a metathesis this would give $*há-j'd > -'id$; (these changes could have taken place even in the reverse order); *prf.* would have followed suit; as to $j'l$ II, either its *prf.* would have analogically followed this pattern, or *af.* would have yielded to the influence of the normal pattern of I semi-vowel. However, we do not have an example of the presupposed metathesis except in Arabic dialects (BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 98 c 1 μ), and the normal outcome of a syllabic j is a long i (cf. § 24 *f*), which again would have demanded e as the preform. vowel at a later period (cf. § 1 *r*). But perhaps the joint influence of the guttural and of the »Systemzwang« demanding a as the preform. vowel of H, when the stem vowel is i , was enough to keep the a colour in it. For other possible solutions see vol. II *sub vocibus*; but most probably it may be a case of parallel formations (cf. § 109 *n*). H *ps* is perhaps represented by a *ms.var.* $*'uwwád$ (?) (instead of N *prf.*, cf. above at *e*); it can go back to $*hu-w'ad$ (*af.sg.* 3. *m.*).

e D is represented by *n.act.* $jám$, *sf.* $cljámínna$; it follows the regular type of II ' with contraction; the most probable prototype is $*jahham$.

v. *Verba primae et tertiae infirmae.*

§ 35. General remarks.

a This group contains all the verbs the middle radical of which is, or behaves like, a firm consonant, while the two others are weak consonants or the third is represented by a vocalic element. Consequently, it is divided into the following (sub-)classes: 1) I et III', 2) I' et III V, 3) I semi-vocalis et III', 4) I semi-vocalis et III V, 5) I assimilantis et III', 6) I assimilantis et III V. In addition, there is one case in which *n* is assimilated even as the third radical to an immediately following consonant; it forms the class of 7) I et III assimilantis.

§ 36. Verba I et III'.

a 1. This class comprises three roots, '3t', '4t', and 'n'3. The only one of them more richly developed is '3t', which is attested in Q, H, D, and tD, while the two others are only represented by Q prf.

b 2. The inflexion of '3t' is rather strongly influenced by the pattern of III V, perhaps supported by its own original vocalization. In Q, af. follows the pattern mentioned almost completely; the only exception is pl. 3. 'ātā'ū. The 3rd pers. seems thus to be based upon a stem *hata', while the rest would have *hati (without ', for the following cons. is nowhere geminated); the sg. 3. f. might have got its *e* in the first syllable from the other conjugations through some analogy. Prf. also follows the same pattern throughout: sg. 3. m. jētṭī, f. and 2. m. tētṭī; in pl. 2. m. tētṭījjū the final -i has become permanent. For, as far as I understand, *e* as the preform. vowel of a verb the 1st rad. of which is — or has been — a guttural is only explicable, if the stem vowel is an old *a*, — not transformed from *o* — as in MT is actually the case. We thus put *ji-hat' as the primary elements of this conjugation; the present -i is accordingly secondary. In the root '4t': jētṭā, the original elements are of the same type: *ji-'at', but the outcome is regular. In 'n'3, again, the attested form

of w-prf., *wjānā'u* (pl. 3. m.), apparently stems from **wá-ja-'anh-ū* through *wája'nahū*. The n.act. *lētta*, in spite of its resemblance to the noun 'éṭa, without doubt even goes back to **lī-ḥat'* through **lēḥta'*.

c In H, no foreign influence need be supposed, since the prototype — prf.pl. alone is attested — **ja-há-ḥti'-ū* even without that yields the present *jāttijjū*. But in D, its cloven hoof is again to be seen in prf. and n.ag., as well as in af. outside the 3rd pers.: af. *wáttā*, but *wāttā* (the gemination secondarily given up; cf. the final vol.), prf. *wjāttī* etc., n.act. *lāttā*, n.ag. *ammāttī*; as is seen, **ḥattī* contends for the position of the stem prototype with **ḥatṭa'* as it would with a **ḥattā*, if the root belonged to class III V. That this is not the case is seen, apart from Q prf. (cf. above b) and the form of n.act. D, also in tD, the prf. of which shows a permanent -a at the end of the stem; accordingly *jēlāttā* doubtless goes back to **ja-hit-ḥattā'* (for III V, cf. *wjitgēllī* < **ja-hit-gallī*).

§ 37. Verba I' et III V.

a 1. This class is comparatively numerous. It comprises all the roots having a firm consonant as the middle radical, surrounded by the two mentioned in the rubric; their number is at least seventeen, viz. 'bV, '₄bV, '₃dV, '₃zV, '₃lV, '₄lV, 'nV, '₃nV, '₄nV I and II, '₃sV, 'fV I, '₃sV, '₃sV, '₂rV, '₃rV, '₄sV, and possibly '₄tV (cf. below c).

b 2. The inflexion normally follows that of I' and III V; as an example we choose the roots '₄lV and '₄nV II, which present a rather copious variety of forms. Q: af. 'ālā, 2. m. 'ālītā, pl. 3. 'ālū, 1. 'ēlīnū etc.; prf. *jēllī*, *jē-*, pl. 2. m. *tāllū*, etc.; w-prf. *wjēl* etc.; imp. 'ēlī (m. & f.), pl. 'ēlū; n.act. 'ālā, 'ālot; n.ag. 'āla (m. & f.), pl. 'ālem, f. 'ālot; the prototypes are thus **'ala*, -i, prf. **jā-'lī*, -l, imp. **'elī*, n.act. **'alā*, -ā-t, n.ag. 'ala, the final vowels anceps, where not indicated as long; but were it long or anceps, it gives way to a vowel which begins an affirmative. Similarly in N: *nijjāla* < **nī-'āla* < **nī'āla* < **na-'ala*; impl.pl. *'ijjēlū* < **hī-'ālū* < **hīn-'ala-ū*; etc.; and H. e.g.: af.sg. 3. m. *wēlā* (< **(wa-)há-'la*, with a secondary

elimination of gemination after an overlong syllable), 2. m. *wēllitā* (< *(wa-)hā-'lī-ta), n.act. *lēllot* (< *la-hā-'lā-t, with an early shift of accent from the preformative to the characteristic vowel in conformity with the other stems in class III V); D: af.sg. 3. m. 'énnāē < *'anna, but 2. m. 'áennitā < *'anni-ta; prf. *lēnnī* < *ta-'annī; n.act. 'ánnā < *'annā (with secondary lengthening of the first vowel, see vol. II *sub voce*), *lēnnot* < *la-'annā-t; D ps: prf.f. *tījēnnāē* < *ti-'unnā < *tu-'unnā; tD: imp.f. *wēlānnī* < *(wa-)hīt-'ann(i)-ī.

c Finally, we again deal with irregularities and uncertain cases in the alphabetical order of the roots: 1) 'bV: prf. has -a as the characteristic vowel as well as in the preformative; it is significant that all the attested forms are preceded by a negation, which makes it probable that they stem from the old voluntative (§ 10 g); the primary elements which can be traced may therefore actually have been *ja-'ba. 2) 'zV: the monster *wjāūzu* is a late theologumenon; cf. vol. II *sub voce*. 3) 'nV I: af.sg. 2. m. *wēnnīta* is perhaps an erroneous D form caused by the — regular — gemination of *n* in prf. 4) 'sV: af.pl. 3. 'isjū (+ an encl.) shows a permanent *i* before the pl. affirm.; the stem is accordingly *hasī, the last vowel of which becomes consonantal before the vowel *u*; the transformation of *a* into *i* at the beginning of a word and before the combination -sj- is not difficult to assume (cf. § 1 *i, m, r*). 5) 'fV: prf.pl. 2. m. *téfū* < *táfū < *tōpū- < *tāpū < *tā-'p(V)-ū (cf., e.g., 'mr and the hollow roots, the analogy of which guided the development of this form after the disappearance of '); while in w-prf. ' was preserved until its total quiescization, without doubt due to the different stress: *wjáfū* < *wā-ja-'p(V)-ū. In N prf., -i has become permanent: *tijjāfijinnaē* < *ti'apijinna < *tin-'apī-(h)inna < *ta-na'-i. 6) 'šV: n.pat.pl. 'āšūwem is no exception, but deserves mention, since the root is parallel to 'Vš, which MT reads in its stead; cf. the same formation of the root *tVr* (see § 49 *k* no. 33). 7) 'sšV: prf. *wjā'ēš* is a secondary dissolution of an overlong syllable *wjāš (< *wā-ja-ḥš(V)); a second-rate secondary offspring of this may be the prf.var. (pl. 3.) *jā'īšon*, which now looks like H of a parallel root 'ššV (cf. no. 6). 8) 'šrV: the prf. *jār* is prohibitive except in one case (Ex 32: 11) which may

follow the analogy of the rest. 9) $'_4\delta V$: in af., the first stem vowel often appears as short, while the 2nd rad. even in other conjugations either appears geminated, or followed by j , but occasionally even simple, thus causing the vowel to appear as short even in an open syllable. The simplest solution may be that the final $-i$ had become permanent everywhere, but in later times was often either dissolved into the following i , or assimilated to the preceding δ thus causing its secondary gemination; in one case (n.act. $'\acute{a}\delta j\acute{o}t$) it has intruded into the realm of a . The conclusion is supported by the fact that the $-i$ appears permanent even elsewhere (prf.pl. 3. f. Q and N). 10) $'_4tV$: $'\acute{a}t\acute{i} < *'ati$ can formally best be conceived as a n.ag., but the root being apparently confined to SamH (for its meaning cf. vol. II *sub voce*) and even here represented only by a *hapax legomenon*, it might be reasonable to restrain from definitive statements (in MT, adj. corresponds to it).

§ 38. Verba I semi-vocalis et III '.

a 1. This class is of smaller size again. It is at present represented in our dialect by seven roots, viz. $j'd'_4$, $j'k'_3$, $j'f'_4$ $j's'_3$, $j'q'_4$, $j'r'$, and $j's'_4$. The first and fourth in this order are among those most used in SP, while the third and fifth are represented only by one form each, and the rest by an average number of attestations.

b 2. The inflexion is again a combination of the two classes represented by the two infirm radicals, e.g., Q: af. $j\acute{a}da < *j\acute{a}da'$, pl. 2. f. $j\acute{a}d\acute{a}tten < *j\acute{a}da'-tina$; prf.sg. 2. m. $tidd\bar{e} < *t\acute{i}-da'$, pl. 2. m. $tidd\acute{u}n < *tidd\acute{a}'\acute{u}n < *t\acute{i}-da'-\acute{u}-na$; w-prf. $wj\acute{a}da < *w\acute{a}-ja-da'$; imp. $d\acute{a} < *d\acute{a}'$; n.act. $j\acute{a}d\bar{a}$, interr. $'\acute{a}j\acute{u}d\bar{e}$; both go back to $*j\acute{u}d'$, the difference going back to the first period of heavy stress (cf. § 109 x). The other type of n.act., e.g. $ald\acute{a}t$, goes back to $*(la-)d\acute{a}'-t$ through $*(l)da'at$; n.ag. $j\acute{a}da$ derives from $*j\acute{a}da'$. Q ps is represented by prf.sg. 3. m. $j\acute{u}d\bar{e}$ and n.pat.pl. $wj\acute{e}d\acute{a}im$; the former seems still to go back to the biradical stem form ($*j\acute{u}-da'$, with a long preform. vowel as a compensation for the lacking radical; if this seems improbable, a combination $*j\acute{u}-wda'$ would yield the present form as well; however,

there is nothing strange in the former supposition either, since Q ps prf. seems to have been formed analogically to Q prf. — cf. § 10 *r* —, where the stem was biradical; and not of independent elements); the form of n.pat. seems to come from **(wa-)juda'-im*; a form **judi'-im* would have probably yielded something like **jēdiijem*, even if a contraction even in such a case would not have been wholly excluded (cf. § 29 *a*). The secondary stems similarly: tQ: af.sg. 3. m. *'ettūdā* < **hūt-wda'*, etc.; N: af.sg. 3. m. *nūdā*, etc. from **na-wda'* (without stress or stress upon the semi-syllabic *w*; the former supposition seems more probable, to judge from the variant *unūwâdā* which in such a case would have had stress on account of the additional syllable in the beginning — cf. above —: **wâ-na-wda'*, with the shift of the stress to the penultima when this took place universally; otherwise, an analogical development or a different primary stem **wada'* with preserved vowel after the semi-vowel should be supposed); H: af.sg. 2. m. *u'ūdētē* < **(wâ-)ha-wda'-ta*, n.act. *'ūdî* < **hâ-wdi'* (for the accent, cf. § 29 *a*), etc.; H ps: af. *ūwâdā* < **hū-wda'*; as it seems, H and H ps preserved the accent even in bisyllabic forms (cf. § 24 *g*); n.pat.f. *mūsât* < **ma-hū-wsâ'-t*; this stem again indicates that the development of a stressed *a* or *u* plus *w* into two syllables took place after the general shift of accent to the penultima, as is indicated even by the fact that it is lacking in MT. D-group is not attested.

c A few irregular cases are found: 1) *jk'*₃: N af.sg. 2. f. *unūkât* < **wanawkâhat* < **wâ-na-wkah-ti* lacks the normal final vowel, probably since the form has been only secondarily conceived as verbal, and was originally (a preposition used as) an adverb, as even a Tg var. still interprets it. 2) *js'*: n.act. *elšijjat* goes back to **(la-)šî'-t* through **l-šî'-t* > **âlšî't* > **-šajt*; cf. § 109 *cc*. 3) *jr'*: Q and tQ presuppose *j* as permanent and original, while N has *w*; perhaps N is the oldest stem of this root (note that it is limited to Hbr and Ug.)? N.ag. Q has two types: *jârî* < **jare'*; pl. *jârâ'î*, which is most naturally derived from **jara'-î / ai*, but considering the influence of *r* and *'*, **jare'-* is also conceivable. 4) *js'*₄: in H prf. without sf., the stress has receded, and in n.act. it is receding at present (cf. §§ 2 *b*, 29 *a*).

§ 39. Verba I semi-vocalis et III V.

a This class comprises four roots, viz. *jdV*, *jnV*, and *jrV* I and II. Q is attested in one or two of them; examples: af.sg. 3. m. *jārā* < **jara*; n.act. *jārā* < **jarā*; prf.pl. 2. m. *tūnū* < **tā-n(V)-ū*, but here H (< **ta-ha-wn(V)-ū*) is also possible. The root *jrV* shows a permanent and original *j* in the prf.pl. 1. (sf.) *uṅram* (< **na-jr(V)-am*; on the highly exceptional form of the sf. see § 57 *e*). H also normally follows the two-fold pattern of I semi-vocalis and III V: af.sg. 1. *'uṛitti* < **(wá-)ha-wri-ti* (with secondary gemination of *t*, cf. § 30 *b*), prf.sg. 1. *údi* < **a-ha-wdi*, n.act. *lúrot* < **la-ha-wrā-t*. tD is attested in af.sg. 3. m. *wēlbádda* < **(wá-)hit-wadda*, pl. *wēlbéddu*. In other stems, regular forms are not attested.

b One slightly irregular form (*'uṛitti*) has already been mentioned. Another is found in *jrV* I N prf.sg. 3. m. *'ijjārā'i* (seemingly < **ja-na-jara'-i*), where apparently it is a question of confusion with the root *r'V* (cf. vol. II *sub voce jrV* I).

§ 40. Verba I assimilantis et III '.

s 1. This class, again, is little more numerous: it comprises fourteen roots. They are: *lq'₃*, *nb'*, *ng'₃*, *ng'₄*, *nd'₃*, *nt'₄*, *ns'₃*, *ns'₄*, *nf'₃*, *ns'* I–IV, and *nt'₃*. In this class we accordingly meet with the only exception to the rule that *n* is the only assimilating consonant as the first radical of verbal roots in Hbr. On the other hand, here we have gathered all the roots beginning with *n* and ending with an ' , even if forms in which the assimilation appears are not attested of all of them. This may be justified by the fact that in our dialect there is only one, apparently dialectally conditioned (cf. § 25 *e*) case of a not assimilated *n* in a position in which the assimilation can take place.

b 2. The inflexion is again a combination, this time of I *n* and III ' . Examples: af. *nāgā* < **naga'*, prf. *jiggae* < **jinga'* < **ji-nag'* (or, in this case, rather **ja-nug'*), n.act. *uṅgā* < **(wa-)nug'* (cf. § 38 *b*), n.ag. (c.art.) *'aennūgā* < **(ha-)nāga'* (cf. § 11 *k, l*). N: af.pl.

2. m. *unisscētlimmæ* < **(wa-)na-nsah-tu-ma*; H: af.sg. 3. m.(sf.): *eš-šijjāni* < **ha-nšī'-anī*; prf.sg. 3. m. *wjāssā* < **(wa-)ja-ha-nsa'*; D: af.sg. 3. m. *néllā* probably < **nattah*; prf.sg. 2. m. *tēnāttā* < **tu-nattah*.

c There is again a number of unusual or obscure forms: 1) *nḥ'*: tD: prf.pl. 3. m. *witnebbū*; the preform. cons. has been dissolved into the following vowel, and the last stem vowel swallowed by the afform. vowel, as in the other instances of this stem; the stem is apparently **hit-nebbe'*. 2) *ng'*₄: in H, the gemination resulting from the assimilation partly given up (cf. the ms.var., vol. II *sub voce*). 3) *nd'*₃: the type of n.act. is obscure; it seems that the present form goes back to **l-ndaḥ* (cf. § 25 d). In this root we also meet with a mixture of Q, Q ps, and N; which of the two latter is original, I cannot state (Q is impossible for semantic reasons). Af. seems now to go back to **na-ndaḥ* (*unādā* would accordingly imply secondary abolition of gemination, cf. above 2), n.pat. to **nudaḥ* (not *-ih*, cf. § 38 b). 4) *nš'* I: H: af.pl. 3. *wāššī'u* shows the exceptional preservation of ' after an *i*; probably it is an occasional variant, the form being recorded only from one informant. In Nm 23: 24 24: 7 there are two concurrent pronunciations: one as tQ, another as tD, and I am again unable to decide which one is original (cf. vol. II *sub voce*). 5) *nš'* IV: the D form and its derivation are doubtful because of the varying kt; the meaning of the root apparently having fallen into oblivion, the latter could have influenced the pronunciation; however, it is remarkable that *š* has not influenced it in any way, nor the additional middle radical in a kt var.

d The root *lq'*₃ deserves its own section. The assimilation of *l* in Hbr and in the ancient Semitic languages in general being very rare, and usually conditioned by occasional factors, the supposition that the assimilation would be due to some particular quality inherent in *l* in this root, does not seem probable. Again, the assimilation being limited to Hbr and Ug. in this root, while the latter is common Semitic, does not support the supposition that *l* in this root would be augment, either. On the other hand, it is remarkable that the assimilation does not take place except where the main meaning

of the root apparently is »to take». So the old supposition that the behaviour of *l* in this root is due to a semantically inverse analogy from the root *ntn* (resp. *jtn*, in Ug.) »to give» might still have to be accepted. But in our dialect, the peculiarities of this root do not end here. As we have seen before (e.g., § 11 *o*), some forms of n.ag. presuppose **qil* as the prototype, and the same is the case in this root: *lêqā*. But in our root this is not true of the n.ag. alone, but af. presupposes the same type: sg. 3. m. *lêqa^h*, f. *lêqâ^h*, 2. m. *wlêqâtta* etc. The stem to which they immediately go back is **leqa^h*, but considering the type of n.ag. and the fact that af., as a conjugation in general, is derived from n.ag., there might be little doubt that **liqh^v* lies at the bottom of both. The transformation into **leqa^h* took place in the same connection, when the form acquired a definitely verbal character and lost its final vowel (cf. § 10 *m*). This also suggests that there were more such cases earlier, although now, apparently by accident, only one such af. outside this root (cf. § 29 *b*) is attested; in the other roots in which n.ag. is of this type, af. is normally not attested; in *rk^b* apparently a transposition has taken place, the original vowel of the first stem syllable having been exchanged for that of the second one, and vice versa. This may have been due to the influence of the overwhelming majority of the roots having *a* in the first stem syllable in Q af., which also might have led to the generalization of this type in TibH without exceptions. The prototype of the stem of the actional group cannot be derived with any certainty; in prf. we cannot go farther back than **ji-lqa^h*, in which the stem vowel could be due to the joint influence of the neighbouring consonants, as well as in imp. **qa^h* too, which has dropped its first radical in conformity with I *n*; there is all the more reason to suppose so, since the n.act. *elqêt* can stem only from **(la-)qih-t* (> *-qehet*), in which the vowel surely is not due to the neighbouring consonants. But perhaps this form as well as the fact that *i / e* in Akkadian frequently appears as the stem vowel of this root, justifies us in assuming that even the actional group of this verb is derived from the prototype **liqh^v*, which would mean that it was identical with that of the agential group. In the light of this, it

would be possible to assume further that the same was the case in other types as well, particularly since this conforms perfectly to the cases in which the stem of Q is bisyllabic; so that a part of the afformals type **qatal* would go back to **qal* and — through **qotal* < **qoll* — **qull*. Even ideally it is not impossible that an agent can be indicated by the same expression as his action; as is known, even in our days particularly in professional speech this is often the case. However, positive evidence cannot be adduced from SamH. To return to *lq'₂*, the two imp. forms with preserved *l* may be due to — semantical? — mistakes in textual transmission, while n.ag.pl. *lōqā'ī* is probably analogical (note that there is a ms. var. with *le-*). Q ps is of the type **qutil*; in prf.sg. 3. f. *wtūqqaḥ* (< **wa-tu-lqaḥ*), *u* is preserved in a closed syllable, apparently supported by a tendency to preserve an outward characteristic of the passive meaning of the word.

§ 41. Verba I assimilantis et III V.

a 1. According to the definition (§ 35), only roots with a firm middle radical are taken into account here. The roots belonging to this class are, accordingly: *nzV* I and II, *nṭV*, *nkV*, *nsV*, *nṣV*, and *nqV*, i.e., seven in all. Their inflexion is again a combination of the two classes represented by both their weak radicals, including the peculiarity that in certain forms (roots *nṭV*, *nqV*) the gemination originated from the assimilation of *n* tends to be eliminated.

b 2. Examples: Q: af.sg. 3. m. *nātē* < **naṭa*, f. *nāṭāllā* (involves probably a quantitative metathesis: *-āt-* > *-āll-*, cf. § 30 b; a secondary gemination might have functioned as a mediator), but 2. m. *nāṭāllā* < **naṭi-la*; prf.sg. 1. *'ētī* < **'éttī* < **'a-nṭī*; w-prf. *wjāt* < **wá-ja-nṭ(V)*; imp. *nētē* < **neṭa*; n.act. *lintot* < **la-naṭā-t* (for details, see § 30 b; this form supports the theory presented there, since *n* is not assimilated); *unāqā* < **naqā*; n.ag. is not attested; n.pat.pl. *nāṭūwī* < **naṭūj-i*; in the fem. form *nāṭūḥa*, var. *nāṭijjæ*, the written text might have caused the substitution of *j* instead of the regular *w*. In the root *nṣV*, we have an example of a bisyllabic

stem with geminated second radical: prf.pl. 3. m. *jēnāṣṣū* < **ju-naṣṣ(V)-ū*, n.ag.pl. *nāṣṣim* < **naṣṣ(V)-im*. In the secondary stems: N: af. *unāqā* < *(*wa-*)*na-nqa* (cf. above *a*), prf.sg. 2. m. *tinnāqī* < **ta-na-naqi*; imp.f. *'innāqqī* < **hin-naq(i)-ī*, with a secondary gemination perhaps to distinguish the form from the masc. — not attested —, which otherwise would have been pronounced quite identically, cf. prf. H: af.sg. 3. m. *ēkkā* < **ha-nka*, 2. m. *ēkkāta* < **ha-nki-ta* etc.; imp. *wékkī* < *(*wa-*)*ha-nkī*; n.act. *'ékkā* < **ha-nkā*, *ēkkot* < **ha-nkā-t*; n.ag. *mékkī* < **ma-ha-nkī*. H ps: af.sg. 3. m. *'úkkā* < **hu-nka*, n.pat. *ammúkkā* (m. & f.), pl. *mákkem*; the characteristically passive vocalization preserved except in the last form, on which cf. vol. II *sub voce*. D behaves naturally as in class III V.

c An irregular form: *nzV* I: prf.sg. 3. m. *jézzā*; it is probably due to the *kt* var. *jz'*₃, cf. even MT. On the irregularities in the root *nsV* cf. § 30 *b*.

§ 42. Verbum I et III assimilantis.

a As stated above (§ 35), this class contains in our dialect the root *ntn* alone. It is one of the most used verbal roots, which is perhaps an explanation of the irregularity it shows. Apart from this, it is one of the roots showing *i/e* as the stem vowel in prf. and n.act. (but not in imp., apparently due to some analogy). We give some examples of its peculiar forms: af.sg. 2. m. *nālūtta* < **natan-ta*, prf.sg. 3. m. *jūtten* < **ja-tin*, n.act. *tet* < **tin-t*. Otherwise it behaves like class I *n* in general. For the forms, partly peculiar, of Q ps cf. § 25 *f*.

vi. Verba secundae et tertiae infirmae.

§ 43. General remarks.

a In this group all such verbal roots will be studied the first radical of which is, or behaves like, a firm consonant, while the two others are either weak consonants, or are represented by vocalic

elements. The only weak consonants when appearing as the second radical being gutturals and semi-vowels, and as the third radical, the gutturals alone (apart from the exception dealt with in the preceding paragraph), the group is theoretically divided into the following (sub-)classes: 1) II et III', 2) II' et III V, 3) II semi-vocalis et III', and 4) II semi-vocalis et III V. However, the only examples of the first of these classes in our dialect are those in which both consonants are originally identical, which means that even they are only apparent, since in such cases it is a question of the repetition of the second radical of a genuinely biradical root (see § 48 a). Thus, classes 2—4 remain to be dealt with here.

§ 44. Verba II' et III V.

a 1. This class comprises twelve roots, viz. b'_4V (not attested in MT), $g'V$, t'_3V , k'_2V , $l'V$, m'_3V I and II, $r'V$, r'_4V I, $š'_4V$, $t'V$ I, and t'_4V . As is seen, all the original gutturals are represented, though $'_2$ by one example only. The inflexion is partly a composition of the two weak classes involved, but partly, particularly in af., contraction appears, giving the forms the appearance of coming from biradical roots.

b 2. As an example we choose the root $r'V$: Q: af.sg. 3. m. $râ < *ra'a$, var. $urâ'â$, f. $râ'âtâ < *ra'a-t(a)$ (cf. § 30 b), 2. m. $râ'itâ < *ra'i-ta$ etc.; prf.sg. 3. m. $jêrê'î < *jer'eî$ (in connection with the final weakening of gutturals, see § 119 ll) $< *jer'î < *ja-r'î$; etc.; w-prf. $wjêrê, -êrê < *wâ-ja-r'(V)$; imp. $rê'î < *re'î$; n.act. $râ'û < *râ'ô < *rô'o < *rô' < *rô'a < *râ'u < *râ'â$; this is the adverbially used and apparently always stressed form, which caused the lengthening of the first syllable and the development $a > o$ during the first heavy stress period, and the swallowing of the final a with its consequences during the subsequent light stress period; that the vowel resulting from dissimilation is a and not e , as normally, may be due partly to the influence of the type of n.act. $*qatâl$, partly to the tendency of dissimilation from impl.pl. ($rê'û$); the influence of r might have given the initial impulse needed; the other forms are

$ra'ā < *ra'ā$ (appearing as st.cstr. and therefore without stress during heavy stress periods) and $elr'ot < *(la-)ra'ā-t$; n.ag. $ra'ī$ (var. $re'ī$, apparently a late offspring of the rule $-aCī > -eCī$, cf. § 1 r) $< *ra'ī$; f.pl. $'err'ot < *ra'(i)-āt$. Q ps is perhaps represented by prf.sg. 3. f. $turr'ī < *tu-r'ī < *tu-r'ī$; but H ps (from $*ta-hu-r'ī$) is equally possible both formally and semantically (Gn 1: 9); the gemination is in any case secondary, which is nothing unusual in r and prf.; the w in the beginning of the form was not audible. In N, the characteristic stem vowel is $-i$ everywhere in the forms without affirmatives: $nirr'ī =$ both af.sg. 3. m. and n.ag.; but that this in af. is secondary, is indicated by f. $w^nirr'ā < *wa-na-ra'a-(a)$; n.act. $ārr'ot < *hīn-ra'ā-t$. H: af.sg. 3. m. $'ārī < *har'ī < *hā-r'ī$ etc.; the forms of n.act. ($l'ērr'āt$ etc.) are confused with N and additionally through a hasty recitation. In H ps, the u of the preformative seems to have become o at an early period in af.: $wārī < *(wa-)har'ī < *har'ī < *hor'ī < *hu-r'ī$, unless the active has influenced it, as is suggested even by $-i$ (normal would be $-a$, cf. § 15 c and the passive voices is general); and 2. m. $'arr'ātā$ which, however, equally presupposes an early o : $*har'āta < *har'ata < *hor'ata < *hu-r'a-ta$; in n.pat.f. $mīrr'ā < *ma-hu-r'a-t$, the u seems to have preserved itself until it has been changed to i , which in the first place may stem from N (as another passive stem, with secondary gemination as here); the form also indicates that r has had decisive influence on the colour of the svarabhakti (or perhaps the following vowel, if $-i$ in af. has been taken over only afterwards?). D is not attested; for D ps see below.

c The forms deviating from the above pattern are: 1) $b'₄V$: prf. $jēbī$ apparently $*ju-ba'ī$, from a biradical stem. 2) $k'₂V$: prf.pl. 3. f. $utākijj'inna < *(wa-)ta-khī-(h)inna$, with a permanent i . 3) $l'₃V$: $kāmū'awī$ is probably a D ps (n.pat.pl.) with the prep. $k-$; it would accordingly go back to $*(ka-)ma-tuḥaw-i / aī$; this is best in accordance with kt, since most mss. already presuppose the pronunciation with u , while the secondary development of a to u because of a following w seems to be rather a recent phenomenon (cf. App. I). The exact translation of the passage would thus be: »... (as much)

as such things which are thrown from a bow». However, even a noun is not quite excluded. 4) *l'V*: here we have a N w-prf., which has dropped the final vowel: sg. 3. f. *utélla* < **wá-ta-na-la'(V)*. 5) *m'₃V I*: the prf. *wjimmí^h* presupposes again a bisyllabic stem, this time with *i* as the preform. vowel: **wá-jí-mahī*; this makes one suspect that the final *-i* in this root is secondary, since the stem **qati/el* normally takes *u* as the preform. vowel; however, *kbd* Q II is analogous to this form. The n.act. *mē^h*, although used adverbially, goes back to **māhā* seemingly without accent; probably the analogy of the latter, more frequent form has substituted it for the expected **má'ū* < **mōha* (perhaps even influenced by the middle radical). 6) *r'₄V I*: in prf.sg. 1. *ērī'ī* and imp.pl. *rú'u*, the final vowels are apparently late, the forms having been contracted: **ērī* < **a-r'ī* (> **ar'ī*), and **rú* < **ra'(V)-ū*; in prf.pl. 3. f. *utārijjinnā* < **wata-r'ī-(h)inna*, the stem final *-i* is again permanent, as well as in n.ag.f. *rā'ijjā* < **ra'j-at*. 7) *l'V I*: if the form (prf.p. 2. m.) is Q, the components are **ti-ta'(V)-ū* > *tillá'u*; but it can be regular N as well.

§ 45. Verbum II semi-vocalis et III '.

a As the rubric indicates, even this class is represented in our dialect by one root only. It is *gw'₄*. As is indicated by its counterpart in Arabic, *gá'a*, it belongs primarily to the hollow roots. What was the reason for the creation of the consonantal *w*? The guttural as the final radical alone cannot have been enough, there being many other hollow roots with any guttural as the final radical. But among the hollow roots, the stem vowel of which normally seems to have been primarily short since its length now varies according to functional factors (cf. § 48 *a*), there seem to be some the stem vowel of which is permanently long (see *ib.*). Supposing this to have been the case in this root, we can further assume (cf. Arab.) that the primary elements of prf. were **já-gū'*. With the coming of the period of the syllabicity of gutturals, the form was made ideally trisyllabic, **já-gū-^o*, which because of its abnormality and of the analogy of the strong roots might soon have given way to **já-gw^o*, which at the

close of that period yielded $*j\acute{a}gwa' > *j'gwa'$, which is the form found in TibH. In our dialect, the development $w > b$ (the reasons of which in cases like this I cannot state) produced the present $j'gbae$. In af., the primary form presumably was $*g\bar{a}'$, which yielded $*g\bar{o}' > *g\bar{o}-' > *g\bar{o}-a'^1$ and then, influenced by the new consonantism of prf., and properly caused by the incompatibility of ' and ', $*gaw-a' > *gawa'$, whence the present $g\acute{a}ba$. N.act., assuming it to have started from $*g\bar{a}'$, resulted through similar syllabization and desyllabization of ' and diphthongization of its long vowel, in an identical present form: $'abg\acute{a}bae$.

§ 46. Verba II semi-vocalis et III V.

a 1. It can be questioned whether it is fitting to deal with this class in this connection, insofar as the roots belonging to it can be conceived as analogous to the so-called chain duratives (or II gem.). It is indeed possible to conceive of them as having been formed from earlier roots composed of one consonantal radical and a vocalic element after it, by means of repeating this vocalic element; thereby a consonantal glide would have originated between the vocalic elements, of course determined by these as to its quality. However, at least in our dialect the fates of the semi-vowel — whether its origin is that described above or not — are so different from those of the vocalic element which now represents the third radical that, in my opinion, we cannot speak of them as one repeated element as far as we can trace their history back. Therefore it might be justifiable to co-ordinate them with the rest of the roots III V in this respect, and accordingly deal with them here. The relevant roots are: hwV , hwV II and III, nwV I (we deal with it here, since it does not have any form in which n would be assimilated), swV , qwV I and II. All of them, seven in number, are thus II *w*.

¹ This is a suggestion as to where the Tiberian *Pataḥ furtivum* comes from: it is an auxiliary vowel placed before the guttural after its period of syllabicity — which in our dialect led to its total quiescence — was over; as is known, even in TibH this vowel appears only after long vowels.

b 2. The variable nature of *w* causes a number of irregularities, which again means that only *lwV* II and *šwV* can to a certain extent be used as paradigms. The former furnishes us with three forms of N: af.pl. 3. *unilláwu* < **(wa-)na-law(V)-ū*; prf.sg. 3. m. *jillábi* < **ja-na-lawī*, pl. *wⁱjilláwu*. It may be that *b* in cases where an ungeminated *w* has preceded it — at least in earlier times —, is an intruder from the passages in which it has regularly developed from a geminated *w*; a neighbouring *u* seems to protect a simple *w*, but there are many other cases in which it is preserved. In *šwV*, we have a richly attested D, e.g.: af.sg. 3. m. *šába* < **šawwa*, 2. m. *šābītā* < **šawwi-ta*; prf.sg. 3. m. *jēšābī* < **ju-šawwī*; w-prf.sg. 3. m. *wjē-šāba* < **wa-ju-šaww(a)*, the last vowel a svarabhakti created after the period allowing a geminate (which equals a cluster) at the end of a word (cf. § 109 *t, w*) was over; imp. *šābī* < **šawwī*; n.act. *elšābat* < **(la-)šawwā-t*, with a dissimilation *o* > *a* after the labial; n.ag. *ēmsābī* < **ma-šawwī*, with a permanent *-i*, cf. f. *'emšābījjā* < **ma-šawwī-at*. A form of D ps is perhaps preserved in af.sg. 1. *šābītī*, but in such a case it would have entirely fallen together with act., and since it is semantically possible to conceive of the form as active (as the main reading of Tg has already done), the supposition that the present form derives from act. is most natural.

c The other forms may again be mentioned in the alphabetical order of the roots: 1) *twV*: af.pl. 3. *túwwū* < **taw(V)-ū*, with a secondary gemination of *w* after the stress and subsequent assimilation of the stem vowel to it (cf. § 1 *m*). 2) *lwV* III: prf.sg. 2. m. *tilléwwī* < **ti-lawī*, again with a secondary gemination and its consequences as above, even if the final outcome is slightly different. H: af.sg. 2. m. *wālwītā* < **wa-ha-lwi-ta*, quite regular, but in prf.sg. 2. m. *tél^{lww}wī*, the inclination of *l* to become secondarily geminated (cf. § 1 *l*) has tended to create a whole secondary syllable (one such is established in a hollow root form, cf. § 49 *k* no. 29); the prototype is of course **ta-ha-lwī*. 3) *nwV* I: prf.sg. 1. (sf.) *wēnābē'u* can be taken for D as well as Q; the prototype may in any case be **'u-naww(V)*.

vi. *Verba trium infirmarum.*

§ 47. Verba I ' II semi-vocalis III V.

a 1. The root *mwV* I having been dealt with in the preceding paragraph, the class mentioned in the rubric alone forms this group. The roots attested are: *'wV*, *'₂wV* I, *'₃wV* I, *'₂jV*, and *'₃jV*. Their distribution is very unequal; the fourth in order is the most frequently used verb of the Hebrew language, although it forms only two stems; the last — which forms three stems — is also attested very frequently; the third is only used as a technical term in a stem which is elsewhere not attested at all; the first has three forms divided between two stems; and the second only replaces the Q imp.sg. of the fourth one. None of them forms a properly passive stem, the meaning of every one having a medial-reflexive character. The distribution being so unequal, it may be best to deal with them in the alphabetical order of the roots.

b 2. So we take 1) *'wV*: Q is represented by prf.sg. 3. f. *tāwwā*. It could go back to **ta-'wā*, but in such a case the final vowel would be very exceptional, and that of the preformative still more so (cf. §§ 11 d, 30 b). In a bisyllabic stem such phenomena are easier to understand on account of the analogy of the **qattal* type of D; as we have seen (§ 21 f), the preform. vowel of D is regularly *a* before a guttural as the first radical. So we put **ta-'awa* as the prototype; even the D of MT is better understandable from this starting point. tQ is represented by two forms: af.pl. 3. *'ētāwwū* < **hit-'aw(V)-ū*, and n.ag.pl. *'ammētāwwem* (< **(ha-)ma-hit-'aw(V)-im*. 2) *'₂wV* I: Q imp. *wēbī*, *'ēbī* (m. & f.) < **hawī*, (f.) **haw(V)-ī*; on *b* in these forms cf. § 46 b. 3) *'₃wV* I: the stem attested is causative-reflexive *Št*, the conjugations as follows: af. sg. 2. m. *wēštābbūā*, pl. 3. *wēštābbū*, 2. m. *wēštābbūtmmē*; the stem could thus be everywhere **hit-ša-hwī*, but sg. 3. lacking, *-a* has no opportunity to appear. Prf.sg. 3. m. *wjštābbī* < **(wa-)ja-hit-ša-hwī*, etc.; pl. 3. f. *tištābijinna* shows a permanent *-i*. N.act. *lēštābbot* < **(la-)hit-ša-hwā-t*; n.ag.pl. *mištābbim* < **ma-hit-ša-hw(V)-im*. The stem preformative is thus formed of

two independent elements, the causative *ša-* appearing by itself in other Semitic languages, and the medial-reflexive *t-* provided by its normal prothetic vowel and initial spiritus asper; *š* and *t* changed position because of the incompatibility of an alveolar (dental) stop and sibilant in this order. 4) $'_2jV$: the middle radical is replaced by *i* between the vowels *a* and *i* in this order; in other connections it is preserved (an exception: var. *nē'i*), mostly geminated. Prf.pl. 3. f. shows a permanent *-i* again; contractions occur now and then. Examples: af.sg. 3. m. $'ájjā < *haja$, f. $'ájjāta < *haja-t(a)$, 2. m. $'ā'ita < *haji-ta$, pl. 3. $'ájjū < *haj(V)-ū$; prf.sg. 3. m. $jájjī < *ja-hjī$, juss. $jā'i < *ja-hj(V)$, w-prf. $wjā'i < *wá-ja-hj(V)$; prf.pl. 3. f. $tā'ijjinnā$, varr. $tāj(j)innā$, $tājinnā < *ta-hjī-(h)inna$; imp.pl. $'ájjū < *haj(V)-ū$; n.act. $ájo < *hájā$ (used adverbially; cf. § 44 b; apparently analogical formation), $ájjūt < *hajā-t$. Of N, there are two forms of af.: sg. 3. f. $nījjāta < *nihjata < *na-hja-t(a)$, 2. m. $nā'ita < *na-hji-ta$. 5) $'_3jV$: this root shows the same main characteristics as the preceding one, but additionally a couple of peculiarities which serve to distinguish it from the other. Examples: Q: af.sg. 3. m. $áj < *haj$, without final vowel, but a ms. var. has $*wája < *(wa)-haja$; f. $wajjāta < *(wa)-haja-t(a)$; these forms may show that the apocopated form is secondary, even if — to judge from kt — in some passages very early; 2. m. $wā'itā < *(wa)-haji-ta$, pl. 3. $'ájjū < *haj(V)-ū$; in this form, ' can be regarded as phonemic, since it distinguishes the form from the corresponding one in the preceding root (the context alone is not always able to indicate which root the form comes from); prf. is formed in two different ways, one like that in $'_2jV$, but that may be due to confusion with this root, while the genuine prf. has *-a* as the stem final vowel, and accordingly *i* in the preformative, e.g. sg. 3. m. $jījjā < *ji-hjā$, 2. m. $lījjā < *ti-hjā$, pl. 2. m. $lījjon < *ti-hj(a)-ū-n(a)$, 1. $unījjā < *(wa)-ni-hjā$; juss. $jī < *ji-hj(V)$, w-prf. $wjī < *wa-ji-hj(V)$; wbi in pause is apparently a mistake; imp.sg. $wījjā < *(wa)-hijā$, pl.: $wējū < *(wa)-hij(V)-ū$ is apparently the genuine form; n.act. $lījot < *li-hajā-t$ can be H as well (cf. below and vol. II *sub voce*). H: af.sg. 1. $wā'itī < *ha-hji-tī$ (the pl. 2. m. var. $*'ájjātīmma$ may be D: $< *hajja-tu-ma$); imp.pl. $'ájjū$

< **ha-hj(V)-ū* can also be D (see below and vol. II *sub voce*); n.act. *lijjot* < *(*li-*)*ha-hjā-t* (cf. above). D: (af. cf. under H), prf.sg. 2. m. *tājjī* < **ta-hajjī*, pl. 3. f. *utā'ina* < **wa-ta-hajj(V)-(h)inna* (with a secondary simplification of *n*); imp.pl. *'ájju* < **hajj(V)-ū*; n.act. *lájjot* < *(*la-*)*hajjā-t*.

viii. *Radices cavatae.*

§ 48. General remarks.

a The origin of the hollow roots has been much disputed. Without any intention to interfere with the disputation, we can establish that the primary form from which the present forms in our dialect can be derived without need to suppose any exceptional developments, is two consonantal radicals and a short vowel between them; there seem to be only three roots, *dVn* I, *ʔVb* and *šVd*, which surely presuppose a permanently long stem vowel (for possible other cases see § 50 *b, e*). That being so, it seems that the attribute »hollow» is not especially fitting for them, and that it would be better to call them simply biradical roots and deal with them together with the following class, the so-called chain duratives. However, these two classes have one important difference, which at the same time justifies us in using these names for them; namely, during a period in the pre-history of our dialect when short vowels in open syllables were not tolerated, and the narrative preformal was provided with final vowels everywhere, these two classes took a different escape from the dilemma: the hollow roots by means of lengthening their stem vowel, chain duratives geminating their second radical, which subsequently, in forms fitting for the purpose, led even to the repetition of it, which is why we propose to replace the term »chain duratives» by *continuable roots*. To return to the hollow roots, the above described process leading to the origin of this class is also the reason why the present writer renders the word »hollow» by »cavatus» in Latin: they are secondarily made hollow, and are not that by nature (= »cavus»). Subsequently, the long stem vowel in Q prf. and H attracted the stress from the preform. vowel (cf. § 109 *f, l*).

b Among the hollow roots, in our dialect there is none beginning and ending with a guttural, nor one beginning with a semi-vowel, nor one ending with a vocalic element; *n* as the first radical behaves as a strong consonant. Accordingly, we can divide this class into the following sub-classes: 1) regularia, 2) I', and 3) II'. The difference in the original length or colour of the stem vowel does not seem sufficient to justify further division.

§ 49. Verba cavata regularia.

a 1. The rubric is an abbreviation from »verba regularia de radicibus cavatis» or something else like that, which seemed to the present writer too cumbersome to be used in its whole length. This sub-class accordingly contains all the hollow roots the first and last radicals of which are — or behave like — firm consonants, regardless of the colour or the original length of the stem vowel. It comprises the large bulk of verbs derived from the hollow roots, including many among the most used verbs in the Hebrew language, e.g. *kVn*, *mVl*, *qVm*, *rVm*, *šVb*, and *šVm*, from which we will take characteristic examples in the following.

b 2. Q: af.sg. 3. m. *šab* < * =, f. *šābā^h* < *šabat < *šab-t, 2. m. *šābta* < *(wa-)šab-ta, 1. *ušēbtī* < *(wa-)šab-tī (regular against »Systemzwang«!), pl. 3. *wšābu* < *(wa-)šab-ū, etc.; prf. *jēšob* < *ja-šúb (> *jušúb > *jēšúb; the long stem vowel assimilated the preform. vowel to itself; cf. § 109 *f*, *bb*), f. *tēšob*, etc.; w-prf. sg. 3. m. *wjášab* < *wá-ja-šob, f. *wtášab*, etc.; -a-prf. *ēšúbā* < *'á-šúb-a (cf. prf.); imp.sg.m. *šób* < *šúb, f. *šúbi* < *šúb-ī; n.act. *šob* < *šúb, *wšeb* < *(wa-)šab (cf. § 1 *i*); both forms are used adverbially, but the former pre-, the latter postpositively, which may have already caused the latter to lose the stress in the living language, which led to the shortening of its stem vowel and the subsequent transformation of this into *e* (cf. § 109 *bb*); n.ag. *šām* < *šam, pl. *'arrámem* < *(ha-)ram-im; f. *rāmā* < *ramat < *ram-t.

c Q ps: for af., see below, *k* no. 16; prf.sg. 3. m. *wjawwášam* < *(wa-)jū-šam (> *jaw- < *jaw^a-; cf. § 109 *ee*); n.pat. *met* < *mit,

pl. **mîṭēm* < **mit-im*; f. *mêtā* either has acquired its present stem vowel from masc., or it is due to a foregone gemination of *t* **melt* < **mit-t*; the final *-a* is in any case secondary, taken analogically from the same form of the roots not ending with *-t*, in which the fem. *-t* had developed analogically to n.ag. (cf. above *b* end).¹ tQ is not attested.

d N: in the regular type only n.pot. is preserved: e.g. *nākon* < **na-kān*; this form further supports our statement that the preformative of N did not bear stress (§ 15 *b*) before the universal shift of the latter to the penultima: without stress the stem vowel, being originally short (§ 48 *a*) could not have been lengthened and developed into *o*, nor had the preformative vowel — whether originally short or anceps — remained *a*, if stressed, as shown by the actual behaviour of the stem vowel; pl. *nākūnem* < **na-kān-im*. For the other forms of N see below *i*.

e H: the normal form has ungeminated first radical, and seems to presuppose mostly *i* (or *e* < *ä*? cf. § 24 *d*) as the vowel of the stem preformative, e.g. af.sg. 3. m. *išeb* < **hi-šib*, 1. *wišībtī* < **(wa)-hi-šib-tī*, pl. 3. *wišībū* < **(wa)hi-šib-ū*; prf. *jīšeb* < **ja-hi-šib*; imp. *išeb* < **hi-šib*; n.act. =; n.ag. *mīšeb* < **ma-hi-šeb*. However, there are signs that seem to show that this is a result of a secondary development. Firstly, in the other type (with geminated first radical; cf. below *k*) the preform. vowel seems to have developed from *a*; secondly, even in this type in some roots *a* occasionally appears instead of *i* (cf. below *k*); and thirdly, before *r* as the first radical, *a* appears universally, e.g. af.sg. 3. m. *wārem* < **(wa)ha-rim*, pl. 3. *ārimū* < **ha-rim-ū*; prf.sg. 3. m. *jārem* < **ja-ha-rim*, n.ag. *mārem* < **ma-ha-rim*. It seems that the process *a* > *i* began when — after *h* had become quiescent — the initial *a* vowel began to develop into *e* (cf. § 1 *r*; in the 13th cent. careful readers still pronounced *a* in prf., though *i* in af., see BEN-HAYYIM, op.cit. I p. 153); true, this presupposes that this development must have occurred in open syllables before closed ones, but this is nothing unusual; cf. the development

¹ On the other conjugations of *mVt* Q (act. and / or pass.) cf. below *k*.

of English *a* in open and closed syllables respectively in general, in the same direction. H ps: af.sg. 3. m. *'uwwâram* < **hû-ram*, prf.sg. 3. m. *jûwwâram* < **ja-hû-ram* (cf. Q ps above *c*); n.pat. *cmmâšab* < *(*ha-*)*ma-hû-šab*; the different outcome from apparently identical premisses is due to analogous influence in the latter case: the development *-û-* > *-aw-* took place in stressed syllables at a time when the stress was already invariably upon the penultima (cf. § 109 *ee*), but the results were apparently afterwards re-arranged so that single conjugations became uniform in this respect, the majority in each of them getting the upper hand. In prf., in which bisyllabic forms were in the majority even among different persons of the paradigm, the new form naturally won, but in n.pat., f.sg. & pl. together with m.pl. were able to thrust aside m.sg., though the latter without doubt was more used. As for af., in a passive conjugation used mainly to express past tense, the 3rd person might have been used almost alone, and — as is well known — sg. being used much more than pl. in the ancient Hebrew, the originally bisyllabic pattern of sg. 3. m. was able to assert itself in spite of the formal majority of the other persons and f. The analogy of prf. may have supported the development. Another possible way of explaining the different behaviour of n.pat. is perhaps the assimilating effect of the initial *m-*, which prevented the following *-u-* from developing into *-aw-*; maybe both factors co-operated.

f D is not attested; instead, we have L. In this sub-class, two different types are found. One of them only repeats the last radical, with an *a* vowel between the two; the stem vowel is *u*, and the second radical secondarily geminated. The result thus resembles a chain durative: *bēššaš* < **buš-aš* (af.sg. 3. m.). Of its reflexive, tL, prf. pl. 3. m. *jîlbeššašu* < **ja-hit-buš-aš-û*, is attested. Of course, it would be possible to explain the forms as D and tD of a chain durative, but in the next paragraph a form not allowing such an explanation will be found, and the MT forms of this root make this interpretation more probable even here. The other type has the stem vowel (originally *a*) lengthened, the additional element being *e* + the second radical. It is attested only with suffixes: af.sg. 3. m. *kûnênu*

< **kān-en-hu*; prf.sg. 3. m. *ʷjēkūnēnak* < *(*wa-*)*ju-kān-en-ak*. tL is again represented by a prf. form, sg. 3. f. *utlīkūnēn* < *(*wa-*)*ta-hīt-kān-en*.

g 3. A large number of irregular and even mixed forms are found; some of them are apparently due to differences in the original elements from which the forms derive, others to later, more or less secondary factors. We will take first a couple of somewhat general phenomena, i.e. such which extend over several roots, and then deal with the rest in the alphabetical order of the roots.

h First, then, we take the verbs with *i* as the stem vowel in the actional group of Q instead of the normal *u*. The root *šVm* may serve as a paradigm: prf.sg. 3. m. *jāšem* < **ja-šim*, pl. 3. *wjāšimū* < *(*wa-*)*ja-šim-ū*; -a-prf. *ʾāšimā* < **ʾa-šim-a*; imp. *šim* < =, pl. *šimū* < **šim-ū*; n.act. *šim* < *šim*. The most important feature of these forms is that the preform. vowel in prf. has preserved its original quality; this indicates that the stem vowel was short.

i The other feature common to several roots is the transformation of N af. and n.pat. after the pattern of Q ps. Here we can take *mVl* as an example, since it shows this development still uncompleted. The original form is apparently preserved in af.pl. 2. m. *unāmaltimmā* < *(*wa-*)*na-mal-tu-ma*; the rest: af.sg. 3. m. *nēmel*, pl. 3. *nēmīlu*, n.pat.pl. *nēmīlem*, seem to presuppose **na-mīl* as the stem, but the interchange of short *a* and long *i* in one and the same conjugation would be something so exceptional that I feel it much easier to assume that the latter formation follows the pattern of Q ps. (cf. § 25 *f-g*), with which it is semantically closely related; the primary form would thus be **numīl* (or the type in general, **nu-qīl*); but this is naturally not intended to represent its primary elements.

k The appearance of a geminated first radical in H being rather scattered, we will deal with it, too, in connection with single roots, which we will now proceed to study. 1) *bVn*: L prf.sg. 3. m. (sf.): var. *wjēbēnēnēʿū* < *(*wa-*)*ju-bun-en-e-hu* is the regular form, *wjēbennēʿu* being a contraction from it. 2) *gVz*: w-prf.sg. 3. m. *wjiggaz* < **wá-ji-gaz?* has an exceptional preform. vowel in any case; the prototype here assumed is explicable as a contamination with the

ordinary prf. — not attested — and the contamination of the latter with class I *n* or *w*. 3) *gVr* I: af.sg. 3. m. *gàr*, 2. m. *gérta*, etc. is based upon the stem **ger*, cf. *mVt*, but n.ag. stems from **gar*, apparently after the analogy of the normal type, to distinguish it from the noun *ger*, which always precedes it; pl. and f. are from n.pat. **gír*. 4) *dVb* I: H n.ag.pl.f. *umādibot* < **(wa-)ma-ha-dib-āt* shows a preform. vowel *a* (instead of the normal *i*); but perhaps the root was originally *d'b?* (cf. MT var., Arab.). 4 b) *dVn* I: considering the MT form, the stem vowel was *ā*; this presupposes the stress on the stem syllable. 5) *dVf*: H prf.sg. 3. m.(sf.) *jēddīfīnnū* < **ja-ha-dip-Vn-hu* has also preserved *a* as the preform. vowel — unlike the other forms of this root —, apparently because of the geminated 1st rad. The reason may be confusion with a root **ndp*, which corresponds to it in MT. 6) *dVq*: cf. above 2. 7) *zVd*: H (or Q?) prf. with geminated 1st rad.: *jézzed* etc. < **ja-ha-zid*; the *e* in the preformative is caused by *z* (§ 1 *i*); the cause of gemination I cannot tell (probably some analogy); in pl. 2. m. *utēzīdū* it is lacking. 8) *ṭVb* presupposes a long stem vowel throughout: af.sg. 3. m. *ṭob* < **ṭāb*, n.act. 'élṭob < **(la-)ṭūb*, n.ag. *ṭob* < **ṭāb*; af.pl. 3. *ṭābu* has acquired its present stem vowel through dissimilation (cf. § 51 *b*). 9) *kVl*: this root acquaints us with a new stem, R, which is related rather to the chain duratives, but because of the other forms of this root in TibH and the related languages, we place it here. Three forms are attested: af.sg. 1. *ukel-kiltī* < **kel-kel-tī*, prf.sg. 3. m. *wjēkélkel* < **(wa-)ju-kelele*, 1. 'ēkélkel. Accordingly, the stem is formed by means of repeating a biradical stem, and appears to be the same throughout, as normally in D, with which it has also the preform. vowel in common. 10) *kVn*: here a form with geminated first rad. also appears, H prf.sg. 2. m. *tékken* < **ta-ha-kin* (alongside pl. 3. *wjīkīnū*); no special reason can be given even now; perhaps at the time from which these formations stem, the secondary gemination was used as equal with the lengthening of the vowel as a means of avoiding short open syllables, but afterwards the latter got the upper hand. 11) *lVn* I: the inclination of *l* to become secondarily geminated (§ 1 *n*) seems to be responsible for the present forms both in Q prf. and H, which seem

to go back to **ji-lan* and **ha-lin*, resp.; the form of the ordinary prf. has supplanted w-prf., also. 12) *IVn* II: the same phenomenon as in the preceding, this time in Q prf. and n.act., the prototypes being **ja-lin*, **la-lin*. 13) *IVš*: *a* as the preform. vowel in H n.ag. *'ammâliš* < **(ha-)ma-ha-liš*. 14) *mVt*: On the change *ʔ > t* cf. § 1 h. 15) *mVI* I: Q prf. replaces even N prf. The phenomenon may be late, not belonging to the living language, since the ordinary prf. form could not have developed organically except from a prototype **ja-māl*. N.act. N has similarly been transformed after the normal Q pattern, so that they now seem to derive from a root **₂ml*: the form used adverbially, *'âmol* < **hamāl*, the other one (sf.) *bāmâlu* < **(ba-)huml-a-hu*, which is obviously impossible. 16) *mVt*: Q (ps?) af. has again *e* as the stem vowel: sg. 3. m. *met* < =, pl. 3. *mêtu* < **met-û*, etc.; sg. 3. f. *mêtē* has, like n.pat.f. (cf. above *e*), got its final vowel by way of analogy; n.ag. is replaced by n.pat. (cf. ib.). In H, two forms again have *a* as the preform. vowel: af.sg. 1. *wāmîlî*, and prf.sg.1. *'âmet*; in the former case (Ex 23: 27) this can be a remnant from the form of another root, which has been re-interpreted as belonging to this one (cf. MT). H ps prf.sg. 3. m. *jûmat* is an instance of the victory of the shorter type (see § 109 ff) even in H ps. 17) *nVd*: n.ag. *wneḏ* can come from **(wa-)ned* (or *-nid* = n.pat.?) as well as from **(wa-)nad*; particularly since the subsequent name of territory *neḏ* can have influenced the pronunciation. 18) *sVg*: H prf. and n.ag. have geminated *s*; cf. above 7. 19) *sVt*: H prf. as in the preceding. 20) *fVš*: the two prf. forms preserved seem to presuppose a permanently long stem vowel *a* and unstressed preformative; one being w-prf., and the other preceded by prohibition, this is possible. On the other hand, however, the form of N, af.sg. 3. f. *nāfâša* < **na-paš-t* is inexplicable from a long stem. The solution is perhaps that the root originally belonged to the continuable roots (cf. Arab.), but during a comparatively late period the *š* for some reason was simplified and the preceding vowel, as a compensation, lengthened. In N this could not become visible, since the rule of long stressed *a* becoming *o* did not function any longer at that time. In H, prf.sg. 1.(sf.) has preserved *a* as the preform. vowel.

21) $\text{\textcircled{S}}Vd$ I: the stem vowel is permanently long, cf. n.ag. *áṣṣod* < *(*ha*)-*ṣād*. 22) $\text{\textcircled{S}}Vq$: H prf.pl. 3. m. has preserved *a* as the preform. vowel. 23) $\text{\textcircled{S}}Vr$ I: prf.sg. 2. m. *lêṣṣor*: the intensification of $\text{\textcircled{S}}$ might be occasional. 24) qVm : in Q, n.ag. (attested in pl. and f.) has two types, one from a monosyllabic, the other from a bisyllabic stem. The former, from **qam*, is attested in pl.sf., and in f. as a var.; it shows no peculiarities. The other is attested in pl. *'aeqqē'imem* and f. *qā'êma*; it seems to go back either to **qa'em* or **qa'im*, but even **qu'im* is possible. In the last case, the forms should rather be defined as n.pat., but this would presuppose semantic confusion, since pl. has clearly an active sense. Another possibility is, naturally, an Aramaic influence; but this cannot be demonstrated with certainty anywhere in SamH. A third possibility is that this root was an original II' in a Northern Israel dialect, cf. MT Hos 10: 14 kt; this could have left traces on the late SamH, and since in late Hbr in general, due to the influence of Aramaic, the use of n.ag. strongly increased (cf. vol. I p. 46) at the expense of af. and prf., these traces could best appear just in n.ag., as is actually the case. But even this I hesitate to assert. In addition, there is a suffixed form which is perhaps best defined as a n.pat. (or n.pot.; pl.) *efqūn'jinnmē* (Ex 32: 25; cf. vol. II *sub voce*), though Tg has already taken it for a n.act., which it in any case cannot be, n.act. forming no pl. In H, af.pl. 3. has preserved *a* as the preform. vowel; in n.ag. *mêqim*, apparently occasional transposition of vowels has taken place 25) $qV\text{\textcircled{S}}$ I: for w-prf.sg. 1., cf. above 2. 26) rVb : for w-prf.sg. 3. m., cf. above 2. The genuine type has *i* as the stem vowel. 27) rVm : the prf.sg. 3. m. var. *wjârom* is a partial contamination with w-prf. caused by the (copulative) *w*. In H, the form *'ârēmī* Gn 39: 15 which is usually taken for an af.sg. 1., is perhaps actually a n.act.sf. with the preceding *kī* in its original function as an interjection calling for attention; imp. *'êram* is apparently a new creation after the strong Q pattern from the stem form with preserved *a* vowel, from which even n.act. may derive. L (attested only sf.) is of the type with long stem vowel. 28) $\text{\textcircled{S}}Vb$ II: in H af., there is a form strongly deviating from the normal type, viz. sg. 2. m. *wiṣṣibūtā* (var. *wiṣṣib-*),

which apparently goes back to **hi-šib-ā-ta*; since it seems to be genuine (see vol. II *sub voce*), we might learn from it that both in SamH and in TibH there was a struggle between this type with the so-called separating vowel between stem and affirmative, and the other without it; but while — to judge from kt — the former in TibH gained ground considerably at the expense of the latter, in SamH this won the field almost completely. H ps: on n.pat.cf. above *e.* 29) *šVd*: af.sg. 2. m. *ušādātā* < **(wa-)šad-ta* is a good illustration of the creation of secondary roots: the svarabhakti created to make the pronunciation of the two alveolars easier has established itself and thus made the form to look like that of a root III V. 30) *šVr* IV: prf.sg. 3. m. *jāšar* (in a connection comparable to w-prf.) looks as though it derived from **ja-šar*, but probably **ja-šer* is more correct, *a* being due to *r* (cf. § 1 *u*); imp.pl. *'āširū* (Ex 15: 1) has apparently been mistaken for an A-stem, being originally a mistake for the -a-prf. of MT; its vowel has transplanted itself even to the normal imp.pl. *širū*. 31) *šVš*: the stem vowel is *a* throughout; in prf., apparently the not attested w-prf. has replaced the preform. vowel of the ordinary prf. 32) *šVt*: on w-prf., cf. above 2. 33) *tVr*: n.ag.pl. *'ātūrem* show an exceptional vocalization and prothetic *'*; the present form seems to be an imitation of n.pot., but its origin I cannot explain.

§ 50. Verba cavata I '.

a 1. This class comprises twelve or thirteen roots. They are: *'₄Vd*, *'₄Vz*, *'₃Vl* II, *'₂Vm*, *'₂Vn*, *'₃Vs*, *'₄Vf* I, *'Vš*, *'₄Vš*, *'Vr*, *'₄Vr* I, *'₃Vš*, and probably *'Vt*. Mainly Q and H are attested; additionally Q ps, H ps, and L by one instance of each.

b 2. Examples: Q: af.sg. 3. m. *wáš* < **wa-ḥaš*, *'or* < **'ār*; the latter seems, accordingly, to have a permanently long stem vowel, but the Akk. *urru* seems to suggest some such development as in § 49 *k* no. 20, particularly since even in our dialect, H is better explained starting from a short stem vowel, even if it is not impossible that *a* there as the preform. vowel has been preserved by

some analogy. Prf.sg. 3. f. *têf* is apparently contracted; the colour of the stem vowel cannot be discovered any longer (root $'_4Vf$ I); 2. m. *tá'os* belonging to a prohibition (= comparable to w-prf.); the prototype is, accordingly, **ta-hās* (or *-hūs*) with a permanently long stem vowel; but even here TibH forms indicate some confusion, and although this can be due simply to the transformation of the root to conform to the normal pattern, we cannot be quite certain of it, there being no other instances of Q prf. preserved in this sub-class, apart from $'Vt$, for which see *e* below. (E.g., a secondary dissolution of an earlier vowel created through contraction — as in the other example — could be supposed.) Other conjugations of Q are not attested. The instance of Q ps is n.pat.pl. *'išem* < **hiš-im*.

c H: af.sg. 3. m. *'á'ed* < **ha-'id*, 2. m. *ā'idtā*; pl. 3. *wā'ērū* < **(wa-)ha-'ir-ū*; prf.sg. 3. m. *já'er* < **ja-ha-'ir*; pl. 3. *wjā'išu* < **(wa-)ja-ha-'is-ū*; -a-prf. *wī'idā* < **(wa-)ha-'id-a*; imp. *'á'ez* < **ha-'iz*; n.act. *'á'ed* < **ha-'id*; n.ag. *má'ed* < **ma-ha-'id*. Exceptional forms are not attested. The form of H ps is af.sg. 3. m. *wēūwā'ed* < **(wa-)hū-'ad*; cf. § 49 *e*.

d L: the form is prf.sg. 3. m. *jâ'fæf*, which apparently stems from **ja-'ap-ap*; the intensification of the former *f* can naturally be conceived as a remnant of an earlier gemination, which is being given up; but having the sound of *f*, and not of *b*, it cannot be old; so it is not possible to take the form for a D of chain duratives; moreover, we have a noun with long stem vowel of the same root.

e The root $'Vt$ is left. Two persons of Q prf. are attested: pl. 3. m. *jē'uwātu*, 1. *nē'ūw^hat*, var. *nēwwot*. If belonging here, the forms seem to go back to **ju-'āt-ū*, **nu-'āt*, the var. being a result of contraction. The forms presuppose that the stress was shifted — in these forms — to the penultima before the rule of a stressed long *a* becoming *o* ceased to function, and also before the omission of final short vowels. Another possibility is to put **'ūt* as the stem; this allows the assumption that the stress remained upon the preformative until the general shift, but does not prevent the above mentioned possibility either.

§ 51. Verba cavata ultimae.

a 1. This sub-class comprises only eight roots, viz. bV' , tV'_3 , $nV' II$, nV'_3 , qV' , rV'_3 , rV'_4 , and $sV'_3 II$. Again, Q and H are almost the only stems attested; in addition, N and H ps appear in one root each. In the root nV'_3 , two types of H are present, one with geminated first radical, the other without gemination (cf. § 49 *k*, no. 7 a.e.).

b 2. The root bV' being most richly attested, it may serve as an example for Q and the normal type of H. Q: af.sg. 3. m. $bá < *ba'$, f. $bá^h < *ba'al < *ba'-t$, 2. m. $ubátta < *(wa-)ba'-ta$, f. $báti < *ba'-ti$ (with a secondary simplification of the gemination, perhaps to distinguish the form from:) 1. $bátti < *ba'-tī$; pl. 3. $bá'ū < *ba'-ū$; etc.; prf.sg. 3. m. $jábú < *já-ba' (> *bá' > *bá' > *baw' > *baw^{wa'}$ etc. (cf. § 109 *cc*); the preform. vowel did not develop into *u*, since the stem vowel acquired that colour rather late, cf. ib.; 2. m. $tábú$ etc.; pl. 3. m. $jábá'u < *ja-bá'-ū$, 2. m. $tábá'u < *ta-bá'-ū$: the stem vowel was preserved as, or dissimilated into *a* before another *u*. W-prf.: $wjábā < *wá-ja-ba'$ etc.; imp. $bá < *bá'$ etc.; n.act. $bā < *ba'$ (without stress), $lábú < *(la-)bá'$, etc.; n.ag. $bá^h < *ba'$, etc.

c H: af.sg. 3. m. ibi , f. $wibijjā$, but 2. m. $'ibátta$, 1. $wibátti$, pl. 2. m. $'ibáttimmā$, var. $'ibijjáttimmā$; etc. For the original preform. vowel see § 49 *e*; here we conventionally write *i*, since *a* never appears in the present forms of this root. Accordingly, the stem in the 3rd pers. seems to be $*hi-bi'$, elsewhere $*hi-ba'$, except in the pl. 2. m. var. — as well as in pl.1., which is attested with a sf. — $*hi-bī'$; elsewhere *i* has asserted itself in all forms, e.g., prf.: sg. 3. m. $wjibi$, 2. m. $tibi$ ($< *ta-hi-bi'$), etc.; imp. $'ibi < *hi-bi'$, etc.; n.act. = imp.; n.ag. $mibi < *ma-hi-bi'$. This root also has H ps: af.sg. 3. m. $'uw-wébbā < *hū-ba'$, etc.; n.pat.pl. $mūbá'em < *ma-hū-ba'-im$ (cf. § 49 *e*).

d The only N form attested is n.act. $'áttā$ which can best be derived from $*han-tāh$. Of course, one cannot straightway deny the possibility that the alternative preformative of N, $hin-$, can be secondarily developed from $*han-$ (just as $ni-$ from $*na-$), but positive evidence for the latter cannot be adduced from SamH, since even

here the *a* vowel can very well be due to the following geminated *l*, the influence of which is still supported by the preceding — though secondary — *ʿ*.

e 3. The other forms we will again study root by root. 1) *nV'* II: in H, the first rad. is geminated in af. (sg. 3. m.), prf.sg. (3. m.), and n.act. For the reason see § 49 *k* no. 10. The preform. vowel is *a*. 2) *nV'*₃: the same phenomenon in w-prf. Q and in the whole H II (the one exception is obviously analogous to H I), in which it serves as the main distinction from H I. The 3rd pers.sg. of w-prf. — both Q and H II — has *a* as the stem vowel: *wjén̄nā* < **wa-ja-(ha-)nah*; elsewhere *i* has replaced it. Even the preform. vowel presupposes *a* everywhere: *i* is attested only in one form of H I. 3) *qV'*: Q: the stem vowel in prf. is *e*: sg. 3. f. *têqī* < **ta-qe'* (cf. § 29 *b*). 4) *rV'*₄: H: as in *nV'*₃ H II (above no. 2). 5) *šV'*₃: n.act. *elšú* presupposes bisyllabic stem form at the time of the last syllabicity of *l* (about: *lšúwwa(ʿ)*); cf. § 109 *hh-kk*.

ix. Radices continuabiles.

§ 52. General remarks.

a This rubric seems to me to fit the nature of the verbs belonging to this class better than any derived from the Latin verb »durare», since the latter expresses only continuation in time, which admittedly fits the often occurring gemination of the second radical well, but not as clearly the fact that it can even be repeated; moreover, the prolongation of the stem vowel, which is the main characteristic of the preceding class, can equally well be understood as a duration.

b The origin of this class from purely biradical roots has already been dealt with (§ 48 *a*); as a matter of fact, in many forms this purely biradical shape still appears (cf., e.g. § 53 *d*), which is why we chose the expression »continuabilis» instead of »continuatus»; the root can — and often does — appear lengthened in one way or the other, but not always.

c Again, there is no verbal root belonging to this class which

would begin with a semi-vowel; on the other hand, two instances of *I n* are attested. Accordingly, the class is divided into the following sub-classes: 1) regularia, 2) *I ' , 3) I assimilantis, and 4) II ' ; for a possible group II V see § 46 a.*

§ 53. Verba continuabilia regularia.

a 1. For the rubric cf. § 49 *a.* This sub-class, accordingly, comprises such originally probably biradical roots the radicals of which are unidentical firm consonants and the latter of which can in certain forms be either geminated or repeated. The number of the roots belonging to it is 49. The inclination of *l* and *r* to become easily geminated appears even here, in so far as more than one third of these roots have one of them as the second radical, viz. *l* in 11 and *r* in 6 cases; nasals appear 9 times together, the four sibilants 8 times, and the various stops (*t* is lacking) 3 times each on the average; *f* is not attested.

b 2. There are two main types of inflexion in af. of Q, N, and H; the essential difference between them is that the primary stem in one appears as monosyllabic, in the other as bisyllabic. Normally the difference is at the same time semantic: the former comprises mostly roots the basic meaning of which is stative, while in the other it is active; however, exceptions appear (e.g., roots *gl, kl I*). In general, only a few forms of each root are attested.

c Examples of the bisyllabic type: Q: af.sg. 3. m. *zâmam* < **zam-am*, pl. 3. *bâzâzû* < **baz-az-û*, 1. *bâzâznû* < **baz-az-nû*; prf.sg. 2. m. *tébbaz* < **ti-baz*, pl. 3. m. *wjibbâzû* < *(*wa-*)*ji-baz-û*; -a-prf. *wékkâtâ* < *(*wa-*)*i-kat-a*; imp.pl. *šârârû* < **šar-ar-û*; n.act. *fatat* < **pat-at*; n.ag. *'aššârar* < *(*ha-*)*šar-ar*; n.pot. *bâlol* < **bal-ûl*; no clear N forms are attested; H: af.pl. 3. *eklilu* < **ha-klil-û*; D: af.sg. 3. m. *mâllel* < =; prf.pl. 3. m. *wjëmærrêrû* < *(*wa-*) *ju-merrêr-û*; n.act. *elqâllêl* < *(*la-*)*qellel*; n.ag. *mâmêššêš* < **ma-mêššêš*; tD: n.act. *lêtqâllal* < *(*la-*)*hit-gallal* (or *-gal-al* = tQ with secondary gemination? cf. below); L: prf.sg. 3. m. (sf.) *jêšûbêbênnê'û* < **ju-sâb-ab-Vn-hû*; n.act. *êlsûbab* < *(*la-*)*sâb-ab*; tL: prf.sg. 2. m. *lištûræw*

< **ta-hit-šār-er*; n.act. *īštūræv* < **hit-šār-er*; n.ag. *mestūlal* < **ma-hit-sāl-al*.

d Different forms of the one-syllabic type: Q af.sg. 2. m. *uqāštā* < **(wa-)qas-ta*, pl. 3. *qālu* < **qal-ū*; n.act. 'āb < **qob*; N: af.sg. 3. m. *unīqqal* < **(wa-)na-qal*, prf.sg. 3. f. *utīqqal* < **(wa-)ta-na-qal*; but also af.sg. 3. m. *unāmas* < **(wa-)na-mos*, pl. 3. *nāsābū* < **na-sob-ū*; H: af.sg. 3. m. *wāššar* < **(wa-)ha-šar*, 1. *wāššūktī* < **(wa-)ha-šik-tī*; prf.sg. 3. m. *wjāmeš* < **wa-ja-ha-miš*; n.act. 'āddaq < **ha-daq*.

e 3. In addition, there are again a number of exceptional forms, with which we shall deal in the alphabetical order of the roots.

1) *bl* I: af.sg. 3. m. *bāllal* has a secondarily geminated *l*, cf. § 1 *n* and a-prf.pl. *wēbēlli*, which in its present shape looks like D of a root **blV*; both are apparently Q, the former going back to **bal-al*, the latter to **(wa-)na-bul(-)a*. 2) *gd* IV: tL prf.pl. 2. m. *tīgādēdū* < **ta-hit-gad-ed-ū* has a short vowel in the primary stem; cf. § 50 *d*.

3) *gz*: n.act. 'ālgōz is influenced by the hollow root pattern; var. *gāz*, if really belonging here — and not an ordinary noun — represents the genuine monosyllabic type; the influence of the hollow roots is also spreading to prf.sg. 2. m. *tiggāz* at present; var. *tēgaz* has chosen the way of lengthening the preform. vowel (< **tugaz* < **tō-gaz* < **tā-gaz*). 4) *gl* I: developed as no. 1 and additionally acquired the *e* vowel even in af. (in the ms. var. still *a*). 5) *gr*: the present form of prf.sg. 3. m. *jiggōwcar* seems to presuppose a permanently long stem vowel with the stress upon it; this being even in itself very exceptional, the strangeness is made still greater by the noun *gērræ*, which is formed of the same root; the latter corresponding to the TibH form well, the logical conclusion may be that the verbal form is hopelessly corrupted. 6) *zl*: n.ag. *zūlal* < **zāl-al*, cf. § 11 *k*, *l*.

7) *kt*: the apparent Q ps prf.pl. 3. m. *jukkātū* (< **ju-kat-ū*) is a lapsus linguae. 8) *md*: af.pl. 2. m. **maddātīmā* is a secondary development from **umādadtīmā*, apparently to keep *d-t* apart in pronunciation (cf. § 49 *k* no. 29); the secondary gemination of *d* has then spread even to prf. (? cf. no. 1). 9) *ms* II: H follows the analogy of the hollow roots. 10) *mš*: the forms of Q (prf.sf.) look as

though derived from a root $*mVš$, but those of D and H make this improbable; moreover, the fact that in TibH only one form is of that type, might be an indication that the development is secondary, it having begun in the first person under the stress and spread afterwards to the whole prf.; the analogy of the hollow roots furthered the development. 11) *sb*: the influence of the hollow roots is seen in w-prf.pl.l., which is perhaps an original -a-prf. (cf. vol. II *sub voce*); otherwise it follows the pattern of the ordinary prf. of the hollow roots; and in n.act. H ps (n.pat.f.pl.) is also attested here; it is quite like that of the hollow roots. 12) *sk*: af.sg. 2. m. ${}^u sēktā$ seems to have *e* as the stem vowel, even if *a* is not quite excluded, either (see § 1 *i* end). 13) *sr*: cf. no. 6. 14) *fz*: prf.pl. 3. m. *wjēfēzzu* perhaps $*wa-jū-puz-ū$. 15) *qb* I: imp. *qēbā* follows the strong pattern; the sf. form ${}^u qābbēnnū < *(wa-)qob-Vn-hū$ might have preserved the original type. 16) *qd* I: in the w-prf., the two ways of replacing the short open preform. syllable are represented: sg. 3. m. *wjāqad*, 1. *wīqqad*; both may go back to $*wā-j / 'a-qad$. 17) *ql*: in H, the form of n.ag. *miqqēllā* is hopelessly corrupted. 18) *qš* I: af. H follows the hollow roots pattern; n.act. $'ā'āššot$ seems to go back to $*ha-qas-ūt$, accordingly a contamination with class III V. 19) *rm* I: w-prf. *wjērrem* either derives from $*wā-jā-rem$ or is H. 20) *rm* II: the imp.pl. H $'ērāmū$ is again a new formation after the Q pattern (cf. no. 15). The stem is semantically equivalent to a neutral Q; therefore we designate it as hQ. 21) *šk* III: cf. no. 16. 22) *šm* III: in N, the 2nd rad. is also geminated: af.pl. 3. $uniššémnū < *(wa-)na-šam-ū$.

§ 54. Verba continuabilia I '.

a 1. This sub-class comprises 16 roots, viz. $'_3b$ I and II, $'_3g$, $'_2l$, $'_3l$ I, $'_4l$ II, $'_2m$ III, $'_3m$ II, $'n$, $'_3n$, $'_4n$, $'_2s$, $'_3f$, $'_3q$, $'r$, and $'_3t$. An examination of their last radicals partly corroborates, partly rectifies the results arrived at in § 53 *a*. It shows that the so-called liquids and nasals are considerably more frequently attested in this position than their average frequency in the whole language would presuppose,

and at the same time brings the two groups nearer to each other, since here four liquids against five nasals are attested; in the two groups of 65 roots together, their share is thus $21 + 14 = 35$ or 54 % of all; *l* alone is found in 14 cases or $21 \frac{1}{2}$ %. On the other hand, gutturals and semi-vowels are still outside these groups.

b 2. Apart from Q af.sg. 3. m. 'ānan < *han-an, and n.act. (sf.) bānānī < *(ba-)'an-an-ī, the one-syllabic primary stem alone is attested outside the sphere of D and L, as well as n.ag. Q and n.pot.; of the latter, we may cite 'ūbceb < *hāb-ab, and 'ānon < *han-ūn as an example. Provided with various preformatives and other prefixed elements, the stem vowel was apparently swallowed everywhere in the contraction taking place after the final quiescization of the gutturals; afterwards the contraction vowel was in many cases broken up again, the result being regularly -a'e / i- (the colour of the second vowel depending on the following consonant and stress); accordingly, from these forms we cannot ascertain the colour of the original stem vowel. Therefore we automatically put *a* as the stem vowel in Q and N everywhere forms without prefixed elements do not suggest some other vowel, since *a* is the commonest vowel in the neighbourhood of gutturals, and *i* in H. Examples: Q: af.pl. 2. m. wē'eglinmā < *(wa-)ḥag-tu-ma, prf.sg. 2. m. tē'eg < *ta-ḥag, pl. 2. m. tēggu < *ta-ḥag-ū; n.act. kām < *(ka-)ḥam; N: af.sg. 2. m. nā'ēbta < *na-ḥab-ta; prf.sg. 2. m. tē'at < *ta-na-ḥat; H: af.sg. 3. m. 'ā'el < *ha-ḥil, prf.sg. 3. m. wjā'el, var. wjā'el < *wa-ja-ha-ḥil; n.act. = af. H ps is represented by af.sg. 3. m. i'ael, which apparently stems from *hū-ḥal (> *hūḥhal > *heḥhal > *'ē'al). D: af. sg. 3. m. 'āllel < *ḥallel; prf.sg. 3. m. jēllel < *ja-ḥallel; n.ag. mānnen < *ma-'annen; pl. 'emmārrārem < *(ha-)ma-'arrar-im; tD: af.sg. 2. f. 'ētāllālti < *hit-'allal-ti; wētānnan < *(wa-)a-hit-ḥannan; and, as it seems, n.pat.pl. kāmtennēnem < *(ka-)ma-hit-'unnen-im; L: af.sg. 3. m. wūfæf < *(wa-)ḥāp-ap; prf.sg. 2. m. tūlel < *ta-'āl-el; n.ag. mūqaq < *ma-ḥāq-aq; tL is not attested.

c The abnormal or obscure forms are again treated in the alphabetical order of the roots: 1) 'ḡb I: the root has a secondary final vowel -a in two stems, which now look like D ps and tQ: prf.sg. 1.

wā'ibba and w-prf.sg. 3. m. *wjētāba*; in the light of the N form (see above *b*), the primary forms may have been **(wa-)u-ḥab* (i.e. Q ps), and **wa-ja-hit-ḥab*; when the final *a* — probably because of *kt* — was added, the former was transferred into its present category. (However, this is only a surmise.) 2) '₃l I: in D, and slightly in H, the vowel of the final stem syllable varies between *a-e-i*, perhaps owing to the nature of *l*. 4) 'r: prf.sg. 2. m. *tē'ar* seems to go back to **tā'or* (through **tō'or* < **tē'or* at an early period); for a surmise of the development of Q ps prf.sg. 3. m. *ājār* see vol. II *sub voce*.

§ 55. Verba continuabilia I assimilantis.

a Since *n* as the 1st rad. does not assimilate itself to a guttural as the 2nd rad., *n'₄* does not belong to this sub-class; accordingly, it consists of *nb* and *nd* only. The latter is represented by Q w-prf.sg. 3. f. *utādad*, which in the light of TibH forms may stem from **wa-ta-ndad*, an early parallel form to *-nVd* apparently existing of old. The former provides us with n.pot. *nābob* < **nab-ūb*.

§ 56. Verba continuabilia II '.

a This sub-class comprises four roots in our dialect, viz. *m'₂*, *n'₄*, *r'₄*, and *l'₄*. The first of them is represented by three forms of the stem tR — otherwise not attested —, the last by one form of the stem R, which we have met once above (§ 49 *k* no. 9), the two others by Q and H each. We begin with the latter two.

b Q: af.sg. 3. m. *rā* > **ra'*, f. *wrā* < **(wa-)ra'-t*; prf.sg. 3. m. *jērā* (apparently < **jērā*, cf. var. and:) f. *tirā* < **ti-ra'*; w-prf.sg. 3. m. *wjerrā* = prf.; n.ag. *nā* < **na'*. H: af.sg. 3. m. *ārū* < **ha-ra'*, 1. *'errātti* < **ha-ra'-ti*; prf.pl. 3. *wjerrijju* < **(wa-)ja-ha-ri'-ū*, 1. *nerrī* < *na-ha-ri'* (cf. § 29 *a*); n.act. *lārī* < **(la-)ha-ri'*.

c R: n.ag. *kammētāta* apparently from **(ka-)ma-ta'-ta'* through **kmta'ta'* (cf. § 25 *d*). tR: af.pl. 1. *'itmāmmānu* < **hit-mah-mah-nū*, prf.sg. 3. m. *wjitmāmmā* < **(wa-)ja-hit-mah-mah*, n.act. *lētmmā* < **(la-)hit-mah-mah*.

C. VERBUM CUM SUFFIXIS

§ 57.

a 1. Suffixes indicating the object of the action of the relevant verbal form are attached to the active conjugations of Q, H, D, and L; in n.ag., however, they formally fall together with the subject forms and are therefore left out of account here (for them, as well as the forms indicating sbj. in connection with n.act., see § 100).

b 2. The normal way of attaching suffixes is very simple: the forms described in § 4 *f-g* are attached to the forms normally by means of a combination vowel, which before the sf.sg. 3. m. in prf. and imp. is *e*, anywhere else *a* (sg. & pl. 2. f. are not attested), if the form does not begin with a stressed vowel. If the verbal form ends with a vowel which is representative of the third radical, this normally gives way to the combination vowel (for exceptions see below); if with an inflexional vowel, the combination vowel is omitted and, if the sf. consists of only one consonant, the long inflexional vowel is replaced by its short equivalent (i.e., *ū* by *o*, *ī* by *e*); however, before a sf. the main element of which is *u*, an inflexional *u* is dissimilated into *e*. As a result, the forms of the 3rd pers.m. of prf. with the sf.sg. 3. m. would fall together, which may have furthered the use of the so-called »energetic» form, where the sf. is provided with a prefixed *n* to which the *h* of the sf. is normally assimilated; in forms ending with a consonant, the form is preceded by a combination vowel *i*: *-innu*. The fem. form mostly followed suit, resulting in *-inna*. To judge from TibH, in which such forms occur even in sg. 2. m. and pl. 1. suffixes, the *n* might originally have been identical with the so-called nun archaisticum; this assumption is supported by the fact that it never occurs after af., nor in the suffixes attached to nouns. Again, if the form ended with a guttural which later became quiescent, the (last) stem vowel contracted together with the combination vowel if both were identical; even in other cases, contraction could take place, with various results (cf. *c* below), but normally the vowels were kept apart by means of a glide homogeneous with

the preceding vowel. The original form of the sf.sg. 3. m. after af. and n.act. cannot be derived from SamH; to judge from TibH, it could be *-a-hu* with an early dismissal of *h*; the present form in our dialect is normally *-u*. As to the result of the combination of the sf.sg. 3. f. with the pl. *-ū*, it apparently developed as follows: **-ū-ha* > **-ūhā* > **-āwhā* > **-āw^ahā* > **-awwāhā* > *-uwwā* (cf. § 109 *ce-ee*). Accordingly, the forms with stress upon the sf. are regular, the others presupposing a secondary regression of the stress (cf. § 2 b). Examples: sg. 1. *wāzgir^tānī* < **(wa-)ha-zkir-ta-nī*, *'ālā-rāgānī* < **(ha-)la-harg-a-nī*, *jēmūšⁱinnī* < **ju-mūš-Vn-nī*; 2. m. *uqabbēšak* < **(wa-)qabbeš-a-k*, *laddijjak* < **(la-)ha-ndih-a-k*, *wjā-fādak* < **(wa-)ja-pad-a-k*; *'āriḡtek* < **hareg-tī-k*; *māšā'ok* < **mašā'-ū-k*; 3. m. *wābdilu* < **(wa-)ha-bdil-a-(h)u*, *sāmakⁱijju* < **samak-tī-hu*, *urēšā'ū* < **(wa-)r^šah-a-(h)u*; *'ēkālē'u* < **'ekal-ū-hu*, *wjāb-bēqē'u* < **(wa-)ja-ḥabbeq-e-hu*, *jāllilinnu* < **ja-ḥallel-Vn-hu*, *tēšab-binnū* < **tu-šapp(i)-Vn-hu*; 3. f. *wāfādō* < **(wa-)ha-pad-a-hā* (>*-ah*), *lēznūta* < **(la-)ha-znā-t-a-hā*, *jāukēlūwāh* < **ja-'ukl-ū-hā*; *tēkel-linnah* < **tu-kell-Vn-ha*; pl. 1. *jākkilānū* < **ja-ha-'kil-a-nū*, *jēšā-bānū* < **ju-šawc-a-nū*; 2. m. *'ibijjākimmē* < **ha-bi'-a-ku-ma*; 3. m. *lēššūtkimmē* < **(la-)'ašā-t-(h)imma*, *wjikkātūmmē* < **(wa-)ji-kat-ū-mma*, *qā'emmē* < **qah-(h)imma*; *jāzzāmu* < **ja-V^hz-a-mā*; f. *eljāmīna* < **(la-)jahham-(h)inna*.

c 3. Even here, irregular forms are found. One of them, however, perhaps follows a rule, viz. the dissimilation of *u* to which another *u* in the final syllable follows, even when a firm consonant is between hem: *'āllitānu* < **ha-'li-tū-nū*, which by a Tg var. has already been taken for sg.; *jisqālānū* < **ja-suql-ū-nū*; *jēkassijjāmū* < **ju-kassī-ū-mā*. The second has still a ms. var. *-unu*. Another, in some sense coherent group of irregularities is formed by various cases of contraction or omission of vowels, e.g. *wjēnnūmmē* alongside *wjennē'immē* < **(wa-)ja-na'-(h)imma*, *wjēbennē'ū* alongside *wjēbēnēnē'ū* < **(wa-)ju-bun-en-e-hu*; *wjārūmmē* < **(wa-)ja-ha-r'-ū-mma*; *wijjābbādnū* for **-ādānū*. A permanent stem final *-i* might lie behind *utaršīnī* < **(wa-)ta-ha-ršī-nī*; in *wjēnnīnū* < **(wa-)ja-'annī-ū-nū* such a one seems to have wholly cut off the pl. affirmative, apparently supported by

the tendency to dissimilation mentioned above. In *ānānī* < **han-an-a-nī* it is a question of haplology, in *kēlē'imma* (root *klV*) and some others, permanent stem final *a*. In *jēsūbēbēnnē'ū* < **ju-sāb-eb-Vn-e-hu*, the combination vowel appears even after the element *Vn*; the n.act. H *'asfīnē'u* might have acquired its form of sf. from the preceding prf., and some such analogy may also lie behind *elqādēšēhu*, while *wjēqaddišu* is an example of opposite confusion. In *'ērāgēnī* for *-ānī*, and *tēšā'ēlek* for *-ak*, it may be a question of a vocalic attraction. The accentuation of *wiqbārā* is probably a mere mistake, unless the basic form is an *-a*-prf.; finally, the provenience of *i* in the form *'ākālittu* < **'akal-(a)t-hu* I cannot even guess, while the interpretation of *'nīram* (see § 39 *a*) as a sf. form may be taken over from the Jews; in any case it is quite obscure.

IV. NOUN

§ 58. General remarks.

a 1. It is general custom in the Semitic grammar, to deal with the formation of nominal stems or types separately and before their declension in gender, number, state, and case. This is natural in so far as the formation of stems must of course be presupposed as the basic condition for their subsequent declension. However, even in principle it can be questioned whether it is right to keep them apart, since the inflexional elements often appear even in the service of the stem formation, and even so that it is difficult to decide to which of these two «realms» the element in question primarily belongs (cf. below *g*). Moreover, even in the declension many different types can often be observed, their types being normally determined by the basic types of the relevant nouns. This means that their separate treatment causes much unnecessary repetition, as for Hebrew can best be seen in BAUER—LEANDER's classical grammar. Furthermore, as far as the present work is concerned, it is not our intention to enumerate here all the words belonging to the relevant types, since this has already been done in vol. II, but only to give some characteristic

examples of each of them, which would make the repetition relatively still larger if stem formation and declension were treated separately. Therefore they are here combined and treated in connection with the various types, apart from some general remarks on both presented here.

b 2. As to the origin of the nouns, they are usually divided into the so-called primitive ones or such which are not derived from any verbal stems, and others, so-called derived or derivational nouns which are supposed to have their origin in verbal roots. However, this division seems to me both obscure and unnatural, firstly since in very many cases it is impossible to apply it, it being a rather frequently occurring phenomenon that old words and even word families fall into disuse and are replaced by others; this can have led in many cases to the total disappearance of the verbal forms of a root, while a noun belonging to it survived, particularly in a language the word power of which is as limited as that of ancient Hebrew. So we cannot with certainty regard any nouns as primitive ones, apart from quite special cases, such as the so-called nouns of relationship and names of parts of the body etc.; and even among them there are uncertain cases. And secondly, as we have stated above (§ 10 *c*), it seems that in the pre-history of the Semitic languages there was a period during which one and the same expression was used in both nominal and various verbal senses; from this *basis* — as it is called by BROCKELMANN¹ — different expressions for different senses were then subsequently formed by means of different formative elements or other factors. Accordingly — assuming this supposition to be correct — no nouns would, in principle and in the strict sense of that word, be derivational, but both nominal and verbal forms would be different realizations of these old bases. Accordingly, the only appropriate division of nouns seems to be according to their outward, formal characteristics into the groups which we here call *types*.

c In the nominal forms attested in the Samaritan Pentateuch,

¹ GRUNDRISS I, p. 287.

about 150 (probably 153) different nominal types seem to be realized, apart from some obscure forms. They can be grouped grossly in two different ways: firstly, according to the number of the radicals in the roots from which they are formed, and secondly, according to the nature of their distinguishing characteristics. The former is recommended by the fact that the number of radicals has often given the decisive mark to the relevant type; but on the other hand, identical formative elements have been used promiscuously in connection with any roots to so much wider an extent that it is more practical to use the latter for the principal classification and introduce the former as a means of a subdivision only. Following this principle, we arrive at the following division: A) types composed without pre- and affirmatives: i) simple types containing three radicals, ii) simple types containing two radicals, iii) types formed of more than three radicals and of lengthened or reduplicated stems; B) types formed by means of preformatives; C) types formed by means of affirmatives; and D) irregular nouns and obscure cases. The groups B and C overlap in some cases. The division also follows the principle of frequency.

d The types based upon monosyllabic bases from triradical roots are most frequently attested; the first place is occupied by **qatl*, but **qull* is not very far from it (at times it is impossible to make a distinction between them; cf. § 109 *aa*); both are attested for certain in more than one hundred roots, the former possibly passing one hundred and fifty; for **qil*, the number is ca. 120. Of bisyllabic types, **qatal* is nearly one hundred, with **qatil* some 10—20 cases behind, while **qatul* is surpassed even by **qatil* (near 50) and **qatūl*; among the biradical types, the two types of **qal* — one always with simple second rad., the other on occasion geminating it — as well as **qil* are of the same frequency as the two last mentioned ones, while in the class with preformatives, **ma-qtal* reaches about 60—65, and **ma-qtil* little more than one half of that. Add **qāl*, **qīl*, and **qūl*, and the rest of the types are attested in less than twenty roots.

e 3. Regarding declension, the following must be stated. Feminine forms are in most cases provided with an outward characteristic,

which at present appears either as an *-a* vowel attached to the end of the relevant stem, or as *-t* preceded by a vowel in the same position. However, the fact that in a number of words of this gender, which are generally reckoned among the oldest in any language, this characteristic is lacking, suggests that this usage is secondary. And when we examine the substantives to which this characteristic is attached, we indeed see that the vast majority of them is not characteristically feminine, but rather belongs to the class of »things», lifeless objects and ideas. Of course, this is nothing new; we know very well that in Semitic »things» are grammatically treated as feminine. However, I should rather say that in Semitic during later periods most — and finally, syntactically at any rate, all — beings which from the Indo-European grammar we are accustomed to regard as feminine, are included in the class of »things»¹. This being so, it seems to me that this affirmative is combinable with the *t* appearing in the 2nd pers. of the personal pronoun, both of them representing that which is opposite or object of the action, the 2nd pers. because of its position — as the addressed one —, »things» by their nature; that the fem. affirmative goes back to *t* will be shown below *g*.

f The numbers are singular and plural; of dual, the remnants left are still less than in TibH; e.g., the words for certain parts of the body appearing in pairs do not form du., nor even the numerals for 2, etc. However, in the word for »2 years», *šēnātā' em*, we appar-

¹ This means that actually the terms »gender», »masculine», and »feminine» are misleading in Semitic grammar, and should be replaced by others; instead, we propose to call the relevant relations »power», »dominant» (abbr. »dt.»), and »dominated» (abbr. »dd.»); these terms seem to me to fit their nature best, since the so-called masculine in cases in which both »genders» are involved, prevails over the other; and on the other hand, neither is a division between »animate» and »inanimate» or something like that, quite exact, since in the latter class animate beings would also be included. In this grammar, however, we still use the traditional terms in order not to introduce too much new terminology at one time, and so confuse the reader, since even the old terms can be used consistently. We hope that even this proposition will be discussed before the composition of the final volume.

ently meet with a du. affirmative; it seems to be a technical question whether we should regard *-tá'em* or *-á'em* as its exact form, but on its solution depends whether even the word for »200», *máttem*, should be regarded as a dual or not; *-em* alone is not enough, it being the regular ending for pl.; consequently, the word stands in dual only if *-tem* can be regarded as an alternative ending of du. This can apparently be the case only if *-tá'em* can be taken as the other alternative. This again would mean that fem. would have two endings of du., both different from that of masc., which is *-á'em* (attested in *'ālāfá'em* »2000»). That being so, it may be best to regard *máttem* as pl. I of *má^h*, *má'ot* being pl. II, just as there are two pl. forms even for the words for »hand», »foot», etc. This solution is in accordance with the general tendency to replace du. by pl. To judge from *kt*, the du. affirmative goes back to *-ajm*, which after the omission of the final vowel once appended to it, yielded *-ájim* or *-ájem*; the semi-vowel was replaced by ' in connection with the lengthening of *a*, when it was felt as a glide filling hiatus which had to be made homorganic with the preceding vowel (cf. § 1 *t*). The masc.pl. endings are *-em* and *-ī*; the former goes back to **-im* with short *i*, since it never changes an *a* appearing in the preceding syllable into *e* (cf. § 1 *r*); for the latter, prototypes **-ī* and **-aj* are possible (long *i* is excluded for the same reason as in the other form); if the former alternative is correct, it might have originated from the former type by means of the omission of the final *-m* (supposed that mimation in the Old Canaanite, as in Akkadian, and nunation in Arabic, once existed, this could have been treated like it — if both are not really identical, a question which does not belong to the scope of this work — in a position where its omission made pronunciation easier, cf. below); the latter would naturally be identical with the common Semitic *-aj* / *-e*. The fem.pl. ending is *-ot*, with a vowel immediately following *-ūt*; apparently it goes back to *-āt*, in which *ā* might be the pl.afform. proper and *-t* the fem. characteristic (cf. above *e*). In a few cases, *a* or *e* appears instead of *o* / *u*, mostly due to vocalic attraction by the vowels of the neighbouring syllables.

g The states are two, so-called status absolutus, which is used when

the relevant word is not in close connection with the following one, and status constructus, which is used when such a connection does exist. In the present pronunciation, the two states are normally differentiated only in sg.f. and pl.m., in which the state affects the ending, since the vocalization of the stem is uniform in both states (apart from a few exceptions, which are due to special circumstances). In pl.m., then, the two states are distinguished by means of the ending quite consistently, *-em* being used in st.abs., and *-i* in st.cstr. In sg.f., on the other hand, the distinction between *-a* and *-Vt* is not at all so regular; true, even here *-a* is used only in st.abs., but *-Vt* appears in both states: first of all, regularly when the vowel is other than *a* (or its phonetic variant), but also occasionally when *a* stands in this place. This, I believe, gives us a hint to the solution of the question of what the original shape of the fem.afform. was. For the last radical in every root in which the fem. ending *-at* (/ *-et*) appears outside st.cstr. is capable of syllabization. This again might mean that at the time when the word final *-t* after a short vowel grew quiescent outside st.cstr. (cf. § 109 *y*), in these roots this affirmative was still attached to the last radical without a vowel between them. Considering that the phenomenon is limited to a group of sounds of a certain characteristic (the influence of the other, more frequent type has naturally further reduced the number), it is probable that the same was the case with other nouns in earlier times, when the case vowels were not yet dropped; the most plausible supposition is that this was the case in all the cases (at least) in which the stem ended with a simple consonant preceded by a short vowel. The stems with a long vowel in the second syllable before a simple final consonant being apparently intensifications of those with a short vowel of the same quality in the same position, it seems probable that they have secondarily originated from the latter; so the vowel, as far as it was originally inserted in them before the fem.afform., is, in some sense at any rate, secondary. Similarly, in the stems ending with a vowel, the fem.afform. apparently presupposes a mere *-t* as the prototype from which it developed. Furthermore, since BAUER—LEANDER's arguments for the elision of

short vowels in open syllables after the main stress in Proto-Semitic (§ 12 *b-c*) seem quite untenable (cf. our §§ 10 *f*, 14 *b-c*, 15 *b*, 109 *e*), there does not seem to be any reason to suppose that such an elision would have taken place in the fem.afform. either. So we put *-t* as the original form of this affirmative, and regard the vowel which apparently was inserted between it and the stem at least in cases in which the latter ended with a cluster of at least two consonants or a geminate, as a secondary auxiliary vowel. The colour of this vowel seems, to judge from its present outcome, to have been invariably *a*; whether this was the case from the very first, or represents the result of a secondary development, cannot be determined any longer. In any case the supposition that this vowel would have originally belonged to the fem.afform. cannot be supported by the analogy between it and fem.pl. either, the long *a* in the latter being a neutral pl. affirmative, as shown by its appearance in a number of other Semitic pl. and du. endings.

h In the present form of SamH there are no cases. Whether the final *-a* used to indicate direction toward the thing expressed by the main word is identical or closely related with the acc. vowel, I cannot say. Even in connection with st.estr. construction, the construction with the particle *'it*, as well as words provided with suffixes, it is erroneous to speak of genitive and accusative. In the Indo-European grammar, from which these terms have been borrowed, they always express certain morphological entities with a certain formal characteristic distinguishing them from other entities parallel to them; and never — if not erroneously, as when some English grammars call the construction with the prep. *of* »genitive» — syntactical relations such as those mentioned above. True, it seems clear that in the Old Canaanite ancestor of our dialect there were short vowels attached to the final consonants of the nominal forms, and it is of course nearest to identify them with the case vowel system actually attested in some other Semitic languages, but even this cannot be demonstrated; on the contrary, the very few cases of such final vowels preserved to us suggest that they have been purely euphonic. So e.g. *-i* in *nādārī* cannot be interpreted as a

genitive affirmative in the present context, and it is difficult to imagine how it at all could have intruded into that phrase, if interpreted as such; similarly, it is difficult to see how the nominative *-u* can have preserved itself as an ending of st.cstr. in *bēnu šibbor*, if that was its original character. The same vowel in a few proper names can of course also be euphonic or even caritative. On the other hand, it is naturally possible that such euphonic usage originated at the time of the decay of an earlier case system, when the meaning of the vowels was forgotten, but they themselves were in some cases — e.g., in poetry, from which these examples come — preserved for rhythmical or euphonic reasons.

i Note. Since suffixes do not considerably influence the stem form, the sf. forms are treated *en bloc* before numerals.

A. TYPES FORMED WITHOUT PRE- AND AFFIRMATIVES.

i. Simple types containing three radicals.

§ 59. General remarks.

a As in the verbal system, even a final vowel representing the third radical is reckoned as a radical. Again, «simple» means one in which no radical of the relevant root is repeated; thus, this group includes even types in which the second or the third radical appears geminated. The single types are called by their assumed Proto-Semitic prototypes, as in the other groups.

§ 60. q a t l.

a Development: $*qatl^V > *qat^e l > *qá t e l > *qá t e l$; pl. $*qá t l - i m^V > *qá t l e m > *qá t^a l e m > *qatá l e m > *qā t á l e m$; fem. $*qat l - a t^V > *qá t l a t > *qá t l a > *qá t^a l a > *qatá l a > *qā t á l a$; f.pl. $*qat l - ā - t^V > *qá t l ā t^V > *qat l ā t^V > *qá t l o t > *qá t^a l o t > *qatá l o t > *qā t á l o t$. The pl. type used as st.cstr. developed parallel to that in st.abs. apart from its ending, for which see § 58 *f*; f.sg.st.cstr.

equally like its st.abs., apart from that the final *-t* was not omitted. Therefore I deem it unnecessary to insert them in the paradigms. The development is naturally described in a very schematic way; possible individual changes before the normalization of the strongest alternative cannot of course have been taken into account, even though there are some indications of them (cf. below), nor even probable repetitions of one and the same development, which can have taken place particularly about the time of the two heavy stress periods (cf. § 109 *p-x, kk*). The different colour of the svarabhakti in sg.m. vs. all the other forms, indicates that it has originated at two different times, in sg.m. at a time when the svarabhaktis created got the colour of *e*, in all the others when it got the colour of *a*. True, judging from this type alone, it would be possible that in the latter case it got the colour of the preceding vowel, but below (§ 62) we shall see that that is not the case. As a matter of fact, it is quite natural that the svarabhakti was created at different times, since its environment was different. In sg.m., the omission of the final vowel created a final cluster of two consonants, which was difficult to pronounce at least if none of them was capable of syllabization, and after the period of syllabicity — which apparently coincided with the period of heavy stress — was over, in any case. Then the natural way was to break the cluster open. In the other forms no such need existed, since in them a vowel immediately followed the cluster dividing the latter between two syllables. Why, then, was the svarabhakti created in them at all? The supposition that it took place due to the analogy of the sg.m. does not seem probable, since in such a case identical colour in both would be expected. True, it is possible that the colour of the svarabhakti in sg.m. has changed, since we have indications that during the second heavy stress period it disappeared, only to appear again anew later (cf. § 109 *kk, nm*). It is thus possible that before, the svarabhakti had developed into *a*, a colour which was transferred to the secondary svarabhakti in the other forms, in which it obtained the accent and therefore was preserved over the second heavy stress period, which abolished its prototype in sg.m., in which a new svarabhakti was created after-

wards due to a genuine need, which is why it could obtain a new colouring as well. However, this development cannot be demonstrated in its totality, nor is it necessary to do so. For it is quite conceivable that with the passage of time, the stress lightened continually, until certain clusters of two consonants in certain environments were felt too hard to pronounce, and were therefore broken up¹; this having started, it spread further according to the rule of greater easiness, and supported by the analogy of originally bisyllabic types, and it is significant that in all the cases in which the middle cluster has preserved itself, at least one, but usually both of its consonants were capable of syllabization during the second heavy stress period (cf. *b*, §§ 61—62, and 109 *w*).

b Examples: m.sg. 'āben; pl. 'ābānem, -nī, sf. -no; f.sg. bārāka, cs. -at, sf. bārākātī; pl. abbārākot. These are the regular forms. In addition, some irregular ones appear even in roots composed of three firm radicals. So we have first of all the bisyllabic pl., which in this type is attested in the roots *bšm*, *kṣf*, *kšd*, *nfš*, and *frs*: *bóšmem*, *néřšot*, etc. (cf. above *a*). Comparable to them are those in which the middle cluster is broken by *e* (cf. § 109 *nn*). Elision of short vowel in open syllable after the main stress occurs equally, e.g. *bārécikī* alongside the regular form above; such cases are mostly — and apparently primarily — due to the rhythm of the passage, which changes the place of the word stress. (Perhaps some of the bisyllabic plurals are due to the same factor, at least their preservation.) Thirdly, the consonants favouring higher vowels especially as the second radical tend to transform the stem vowel into *e* (cf. above) or even *i* (e.g., *kíšdem* from sg. *kášad*); cases like *gêbar* are probably due to imaks supported by some analogy (in this case, *gêbér*).

c From weak roots: I infirmae naturally behave like strong ones (cf. 'bn above *b*); II ' : 'á'ol, pl. 'ā'úlem (< *'ahl) apparently already lost its *h* during the first period of the weakening of the gutturals

¹ In a number of Finnish dialects, such phenomena appear, e.g. *silimä* for *silmä* (»eye»), *jálaka* for *jálka* (»foot, leg»), *vánaha* for *vánha* (»old»), *kúluki* for *kúlki* (»went»), etc.; but not in any cluster, e.g. *vánki* (»prisoners») and even *márski* (»marshal») are so pronounced.

(cf. § 109 *q, t*); the result was 'áí, the vowel of which then developed as described in § 20 *c*. The normal type: *bál* < **ba'l*, pl.cs. *béli*; f. **lêne* < *(*wa-*)*la'nat*. All the present forms apparently go back to a form without svarabhakti after the guttural, until, as it seems, during the second heavy stress period (cf. § 109 *ll*). That, however, presupposes that in this class no svarabhakti was created after the guttural in m.pl. and f.sg. & pl. even between the two heavy stress periods, or that contraction took place universally afterwards; the normal vocalization in TibH presupposes the former to have been the case in f.sg., the latter in pl., but whether the same is the case in SamH, we have no means of finding out. Apparently to this type belongs even *rē'oš* (root *r's*); the prototype is **ra's* which, probably after the omission of the case vowels¹, developed analogically to 'á'ol (cf. above), apart from the last phase in which the first *o* was dissimilated into (the normal) *e*. An analogous case is *šē'on* < **ša'-n* (root *jš'*).

d II semi-vocalis: even here, we find more than one type, apparently due to the great flexibility of the second radical as well as the origin of the words. As to II *w*, the form *kūcwas* arouses most surprise, since according to the related languages and TibH, the word should have developed from **kās*, which would normally result in *kōs* at present. True, in Arab., a variant form **ka's* is found; this would make possible the supposition that the word, being apparently originally non-Semitic, would have been preserved in slightly varying forms in various dialects, the one in SamH being **kauc*. But perhaps the explanation is simpler. Because of its meaning the word could often be used with a special stress, which was preserved even during the heavy stress periods, and this meant that the vowel preserved its length and developed accordingly into two syllables (cf. § 109 *ce*) during the last of these periods. So the word might ultimately go

¹ The quiescization of ' is easier to understand if the syllable was doubly closed; the Amarna form *rāšunu* is no proof to the contrary, since old forms are regularly preserved longer in connection with suffixes; moreover, the numerous scribal errors in the Amarna letters make it possible that the *u* between *š* and *n* is simply due to a mistake.

back to **kās*, but because of its exceptional development, the first stage of that development, **kaws*, was put as the prototype. The name of a bird, *'ekkewas*, might have followed its analogy, but the final change in the colour of the vowel has been omitted for some reason and *imala* taken place instead. The word *'aššūwāmēm* might have been pl.tant.; hence, its *ū* was always stressed. If we may suppose that the word has developed from the same prototype as in TibH, fem. is represented by another name of a bird, *ajjābāna*; the prototype was apparently **(ha-)jāwnat*, whence $> *jāwna > *jāwvāna > *jāwvāna > jābāna$ (cf. ib.). The word might come from a non-Semitic substrate language, since no satisfactory Semitic etymology has been found. Among the instances of II *j*, *jéjjen* $< *jajn$ corresponds to this method of treating the semi-vowel as the middle radical (with the original stem vowel coloured by the neighbouring *j*'s). The fem. *'ijjābe*, var. *ājībe*, *ā'ībe* comes from **'ājbat* ($> *'ājba > *'ājiba > *'ajība$; this may be the genuine development — cf. § 24 *g* — resulting ultimately in the latter form of the var.; the main form is influenced by the preceding type in the second phase: **'ājjaaba > *'ajjāba > *'ajjāba*, with finally the assimilation of the original stem vowel to the semi-vowel).

e II *n*: this sound was assimilated to the 3rd rad., which as a consequence was geminated, but in the forms ending with the last radical, the geminate was simplified probably rather soon and in any case before the spirantization of *p*; the only example is *éf* $< *'anp$, sf. *ébbu*, pl. *'ébbem*. To an ' as the third radical, *n* is not assimilated, see the roots *tn'*, *šn'*. Another exception is the root *knf*, in which the present forms of the word *kānef* / *-if*, pl. I *kānāfem*, pl. II *kénfol*, seem to be explicable only from **kanp*, cf. even Akk. To judge from these and the TibH forms, the solution may be that after the separation of East Semitic from the Western group, in the latter a svarabhakti was created after *n* to facilitate pronunciation. In the ancestor of SamH it did not develop into a full vowel at first, but prevented the assimilation of *n* to *p*, and was occasionally lost again after the latter was made spirant *f*.

f III ' behave like strong roots without svarabhakti in f. and pl.,

except that the final consonant is lacking or represented by a vowel + glide, and that contraction occurs: *bēša* < **baš'* (for *e* see § 1 *i* end), sf. *elḫāšē'ī* < *(*la-*)*paš'-ī* (the stem final vowel is the last outcome from the final liquefaction of the guttural, cf. § 109 *ll*); pl. is *perhaps* attested in *qēlīm*, which in such a case is contracted from **qalV'em* (< **qal'-im*), with a late change *a* > *e* in a syllable before *ī*. The change is more easily understood, if *q* was pronounced rather like *ʔ*, which is possible, although I have not marked it; at least there are variants so pronounced. For fem., cf. e.g. *ḵārát* < **jar'-at*; pi. is not attested.

g III V make naturally no distinction between this type and **qatal* in forms ending with *a*; but such cases are not numerous; for an example see *h* below. Of forms ending with *w* we have no certain instances; to judge from the TibH forms, a possible instance is *qšV* I: f.pl. *'aeqqāšot*, sf. *uqāššūto*, which in that case may derive from **qašw-ā-t*, with the dissolution of *w* into the pl.afform. in the simple form, and its assimilation to *š* in the sf. one. Another is sg.f. *fādōt* < **padw-t*. The main type is that derived from the form with *i* as the characteristic vowel, which before a vowel was transformed into *j*; and since this in the basic (sg.m.) form during the Old Canaanite period and earlier was apparently always the case, we put the stem as always ending with *j*, which is equivalent to a long *i*. Examples: *bēkī* < **bakj*, sf. *middéljo* < *(*men-*)*dalj-a-hu*; f. *bēket* < **bakj-t* (/ **bakīt*). sf. *bēkitu*; *'ālja* < *(*ha-*)*'alj-at*; as is seen, before the fem.afform. *i* was treated sometimes as vocalic, sometimes as consonantal the latter apparently in analogy with the m.form. In sf. *bālītī*, the stem vowel preserves its *a* colour, but the form may be originally verbal (cf. MT). In *gādī*, the palatal *g* slightly favouring backward vowels may have had the same effect. As to the formation of pl.(m), it is uncertain in so far as the two possible instances, *fānem* and *šāmem*, are pluralia tantum; if they represent the genuine type of pl., this was formed without the characteristic stem vowel: **pan-im*; moreover, according to the TibH form, *šāmem* can have originally belonged to the type **qatal* (**šama-im* > **šamaim*). F.pl. is not attested.

h Finally, there are a few examples of doubly weak (II & III infirmae) roots. Among II ' III V, *bē'ū* seems to be an instance of III *w*, as is indicated by the TibH form; the prototype is thus *(*ba-*)*'ahw*. Another possible instance, with the fem.afform., is (sf.) *gā'ūtak* (in the two varr., the latter vowel is swallowed), but it can equally well go back to **ga'ā-t*, its meaning being that of a n.act. Instead, the equally sf. *rā'ūta* apparently really goes back to **ra'w-t*, unless the colour of the stem vowel is secondary (due to *r* and '). The type with *a* as the stem final vowel may be represented by the name of a bird, *'eddāē* < *(*ha-*)*da'a-t*. The type -ī, again, is in sg. perhaps attested in *tē'ī*, if from **ta'j*; but **tu'j* is quite as possible; in pl.(m.) we have no forms of it. The opposite type (II semi-vocalis III ') is represented by only one root: *wēba*, apparently from *(*wa-*)*rawh*; *elrēbe* is its var.; f. *'errēbā* < *(*ha-*)*rawh-at*, but probably the primary stem was **rūh* which, as a result of the tendency to distinguish it from the formally identical noun meaning »wind, spirit«, during and after a period of the syllabicity of *r* and gutturals yielded **rwh* > **rewah*, from where the present forms come. The type should, accordingly, be described as **ql*, but because of the syllabicity included in the 1st rad.¹, we add the basic vowel *a* after it; another alternative would naturally be to use the svarabhaktis created afterwards: **qetal*, but the primary form would not thereby be expressed. Finally, there is the type from the roots II semi-vocalis III V, all of them II *w*: *'wV*, *'₃wV*, *gwV*, *dwV*, and *twV*. The only masc. forms are *gūwwi* < **gawj*, pl. *gūwem* < **gawj-im* (through **gāwim*); as to the sg. which, being unstressed during the second heavy stress period, should have resulted in **gōj* (cf. § 109 ff), it is probably originally the form of pl.cs. which for dogmatic reasons was interpreted as sg. (cf. vol. II *sub voce*); and afterwards the form was spread to the genuine sg. instances as well. The only case of f.st.abs. is strange in so far as the stress is placed upon the final syllable: *tuwá*, *miṭṭuwá*; in the latter case, an enclitic follows, but

¹ The syllabicity of the last rad. is accounted for by the final vowel, always unexpressed.

not in the former. Perhaps, however, this is due to the analogy of the other, the words occurring in subsequent verses. St.cstr. is represented by two slightly different forms, 'áwweł < *hawa-t, and 'úcwat, which appears both as its variant and going back to *'awa-t. The difference in the root '₃wV might be due to two different pronunciations, one with ' and the other without it, as early as at the time of the general transformation of an *a* followed by *w* into *u* (cf. § 109 qq); the guttural protected *a* even against imala, which affected the second vowel instead. Finally, in the root *dwV* it is anything but certain whether the adj.f. *dāba* belongs to this type or not — the pronunciation of the 2nd rad. favours the supposition that it was originally geminated, even if does not necessitate it, cf. § 46 b —, but the sf. form *dābāta* may in any case be best explained as belonging here, accordingly as an abstract noun, the form deriving from **dawa-t-a-h(a)*; true, there is one parallel form even if it is interpreted as n.act. (cf. § 30 d no. 12), but since even that in one respect remained unexplained, we prefer the above interpretation in this case.

§ 61. q u t l.

a We deviate from the normal order — of treating **qill* after **qall*— for two reasons: first, since **qull* in this dialect seems to be represented considerably more frequently than **qil*, and secondly, since **qull* in the present pronunciation has mostly fallen together with **qall*.

b The normal development: **qull*^V > **qot^el* > **qótel* > **qátel*, pl. **qull-ím* > **qútle^m* > **qót^alem* > **qotálem* > **qātálem*; f. **qull-at*^V > **qúlla* > **qót^ala* > **qotála* > **qātála*, pl. **qull-ā-t*^V > **qut-lát*^V > **qullót*^V > **qútlot* > **qót^alot* > **qotálot* > **qātálot*. The development *u* > *o* apparently took place together with the development of the svarabhakti which broke the cluster, and *o* > *a* after the 2nd heavy stress period, when the language was hardly spoken any longer; cf. § 109 aa. For the other phases of the development, cf. § 60 a.

c Examples of the normal pattern: 'ádem II, pl. *ēlqāmāsem*; f.

'*ākālā^h*'; f.pl. is not attested. Deviations are, however, rather frequent. Some of them are slight, such as '*ākal*', which may be due to the influence of n.act. Q of the same root, and to the tendency to distinguish the form from the n.ag. '*ākel*'. Similarly, imala and /or neighbouring consonants exert their influence too, e.g. '*ēzen*' (sf. even *iznīmā^h*), pl. *wēzēnem*. But there are stronger ones: 1) the preservation of *u* as the stem vowel, which appears in masc. forms in the roots '*4mr*', '*3fn*', *bšr* (in n.l.), *kmz?*, *kfr*, and *šfr* I, apart from a couple of weak roots. In all of them it is significant that both the second and the third radical were capable of syllabization during the second heavy stress period (cf. § 109 *kk*); accordingly, we may assume that their development after the stage **qotel* (*b* above) was the following: **qóŀ* **qóŀ* **qútal* (*o* and *u* finally represented an identical phoneme in this phase). The svarabhakti appears everywhere as *a*, which is why we use it in the paradigm, but actually there is no certainty of its normal colour in sg., only pl. forms being attested in the root '*3fn*', the prototype of *kūmaz* being quite uncertain (perhaps from a substrate language?), and *r* regularly colouring the preceding svarabhakti as *a* (§ 1 *u*). In the fem. form *šúrā*, *u* may have been lengthened on account of the semi-syllabic *r*. 2) The bisyllabic pl. which, however, seems to be of twofold origin. One appears in the root '*zn*', but only in the cs. and sf. forms *bēznī*, *bēznī-jīmā^h*, and seems to derive from an old du., which in fact appears in TibH; considering this, it seems that the svarabhakti in the abs. form *wēzēnem* is of relatively late origin and in any case originated after the second heavy stress period; this again seems to indicate that the svarabhaktis created after the period mentioned acquired the colour of *e*, even if it is here possible to attribute that to the preceding *z* (§ 1 *i*). The other type is represented by *bāṭnem*, and it is again significant that in any case one member of the medial cluster was capable of syllabization during the two heavy stress periods. Its preservation may thus be due to the circumstance that when the medial clusters were broken up, this combination was not felt as a cluster of two consonants, but rather as a combination of consonant and sonant, resembling more that of consonant and vowel;

later on, however, most of such combinations followed the analogy of entirely consonantal clusters, the rule of greater easiness supporting the development, as is indicated even by the fact that most of the preserved clusters are combinations of two consonants *both* of which are capable of syllabization (cf. § 60 a); the determination of the individual preserved cases may have happened by recitational rhythm, though this is no more always demonstrable (apparently the rhythm has changed with the passage of time). 3) Some other cases: the pl. *ā'ānātem* seems semantically to belong to this type, but the preservation of the *n* before another alveolar is not only unparallelled, but also — for sound-physiological reasons — very hard to suppose. If the form is genuine, we could perhaps surmise that before the period of the assimilation of *n* to the following consonant a parallel type **qatal* or **qotal* was formed to this one, a survival of which our form would be. The form *zérrat* also can derive from this type, cf. the ms. form *zaræt*, the secondary gemination of *r* being nothing unusual. In such cases, also, the colour of the preceding vowel tends to become more forward, cf. *irref*, to which *horæf* corresponds in TibH (in this case, however, the type **qill* is more probable in our dialect), and the two fem. forms *ēmírra* and *kēbérat*, of which the former (root *'₄mr*) at least may belong to this type. The same is the case with *qēbírrat* (cf. the sf. forms). In the first instance the gemination can have been psychologically motivated, cf. vol. II *sub voce*.

d The normal type of II ' may be represented by *nām*, which through **na'm* must necessarily go back to **no'm* (for **nu'm*, because of the influence of the guttural) without any intermediary bisyllabic form, for had there ever existed such an intermediary stage, the colour of the svarabhakti would, according to all the analogies — nominal as well as verbal —, have been *o*, and the present form accordingly **nē'om* (cf. § 60 c); and had we to suppose that *u* would have preserved its original colour in spite of the guttural, the result would have been **núwicam* (cf. § 60 d). A form resembling the former alternative is actually preserved in *mē'od*, but this is due to the fact that that word is used as an adverb in the overwhelming major-

ity of cases; hence, it already acquired its svarabhakti probably during the Old Canaanite period (cf. § 102 *dd*). The other deviation from the normal pattern, *má'er*, is simply a case of breaking up an overlong syllable (**mâr* from **mohr*) so common just in these roots (cf. § 27 *b*). The form *báq* (from **bohq*), if not a mistake of the reader, may come from a birabical root form (without guttural), to which cf. Akk. and Eth. (DILLM. 1430). Secondary gemination of *r* appears in *'afšérrem* the ending of which has perhaps originally been locative (**šohr-aim*)¹, if the word derives from *šár* Gn 6: 16.

e The roots III¹ may be represented by *'ára^h* which through **'óraḥ* derives from **'urḥ*, with fem. *'ārát* perhaps from **'urḥt* (during the first heavy stress period) through **'óraḥt* > **'oráḥat* (true, only cs. is attested). A fem.st.abs. may be *bāqá^h*, to judge from the stem vowel in that form and pl. *ubēqá'ot*, even if **qil* is not quite excluded, either (cf. § 1 *u*): *u* can have preserved its original colour under the influence of *b* until it universally developed into *e*, but *e* can hardly have originated from an *a* just preceding *q*. In *afṭēmát* from **ṭum¹-at* (st.cstr.), *m* has obviously functioned as the preservative of *u*. Again, there are even stronger deviations, viz. the preservation of *u* in the roots *kr³*, *qr³* I—II, and *ll⁴*; even here it is significant that even the second rad. of all the relevant roots is a sonant (cf. above *e*). In *réqqē*, apparently a secondary change of type has occurred: the present form seems to go back to **ruqqāḥ*, but this may derive from **ruqh* in connection with the breaking up of the final cluster: *q* was then geminated under the influence of the stem of Q, where the same development had earlier taken place due to the professional character of the root (cf. § 109 *o*); or the form is simply a confusion with n.ag.

f In the group III V the regular form may be represented by *bābī* (from **'ubj*) and *mījjāfi* (< **'upj*), though even they suffer from a slight irregularity: the stem vowel is represented by *a* in spite of the long *i* in the following syllable (cf. § 1 *r*); this is doubtless due to the guttural which disappeared later. In the sg.m. forms, the secondary gemination of the second radical is common; e.g. *'annī*

¹ Cf. TORCZYNER, Die Entstehung des semitischen Sprachtypus, p.

from **unj* (where it also serves to distinguish the form from the adj. *'ānī*), *šarrī* from **šurj*; the expected *e* comes into appearance in fem. (sf.) *wefšēlitta* from **šulj-t*, and is preserved in pl. also, where the long vowel turns into semi-vowel again, e.g. *kēljot* from **kulj-ā-t*. In the pl. *'ālem* < *hulj-im*, the last radical is melted together with the afform. vowel. In addition to these stems ending with *j*, there are a few with final *w*, viz. 1) *'ēdot*, apparently from **udw-t*, which appears only in a composite preposition, 2) possibly *evdēmūt* < **dumw-t*; but **qitl* is equally possible; and 3) probably *késsot* < **kusw-t* (cf. TibH form), with a secondary gemination of *s*.

g A few doubly weak roots are left. Three of them are II' III V, viz. 1) *ubē'ū* from **buhw*, 2) *rū'ī* from **ro'j* < **ru'j*, and 3) *tē'ū* from **tuhw*; the colour of the stem vowel in 1) and 3) may be comparable to that in *rē'oš* — i.e., an outcome of dissimilation —, cf. the corresponding TibH forms. The fourth is rather obscure; the only attested form is pl. *lēbūt*(, var. *lēbūt*, to which cf. § 2 b); the basic form, considering the TibH sg. *lū^ah*, could best be supposed to have been **luwh* — the only weakness is that I do not know a parallel to such a formation; so it might be best to regard **lūh* as the original form, from which something like **luwh* developed during the period of the syllabicity of the gutturals, and after that was over, the final cluster was broken up by means of a svarabhakti, the semi-vowel secondarily geminated, and so sg. developed over **lūwcah* to **lēbā*, to which development we do have a parallel in the root *rV₃*, but there it is motivated by semantic differentiation, while here we cannot point any such factor out; in any case, the form **luwh* is best put as the prototype, since even in the latter alternative it is the form which can be reached as the beginning of a regular development.

§ 62. q i t l.

a Development: **qitl^v* > **qitl* > **qetel* > **qétel* > **qêtel*, pl. **qitl-im* >> **qitlem* > **qét^alem* > **qetálem* > **qêtálem*; fem. **qitl-at* >> **qitla*; pl. is not attested.

b Examples of the normal pattern: *dégel* < **dígl*, 'ébeḷ < *'íbl; *r* takes *a* as the svarabhakti preceding: *gêdar* < **gídr*; pl. *dēhārem* < **dībr-im*, *rēgālem* < **rígl-im* (or *-aim*, originally du.); f. 'ikmā < *'híkm-at. The fact that fem. has not developed svarabhakti between the 2nd and 3rd rad. is explained partly by the fact that in all the preserved instances at least one of the members of the cluster is capable of syllabization (cf. § 61 *c*), partly by the nature of the vowel *i*, which seems to be more energetic than the other vowels; so, e.g., the secondary gemination appears after this vowel far more frequently than after all the other vowels together (cf. §§ 24 *d*, 25 *a*). So even the bisyllabic pl. appears in this type more frequently than in the preceding ones, viz. in the roots '4br I (quater), '4rb III, *dbq* (var.), *kšb*, *lbn*, *nsk*, *fšt*, and *trf*; as is seen, even here at least one, but usually both members of the stem final cluster were capable of syllabization during the second heavy stress period (see § 109 *kk*). In the roots *drk* and *ḵrk*, the cluster was broken up late: *dērēkem*, *ḵērēkem* (cf. § 109 *nn*). Secondary gemination especially in *r*: *irref* < *'hīrp, *érreš* and 'irreš < *'hīrš ('3rš I and II), but also elsewhere: *tekkēlet* apparently from *'híkl-t (cf. the TibH form).

e In class II' this type appears rarely, as is natural, since gutturals do not favour the *i* vowel. As a compensation for the loss of the 2nd rad., the stem vowel is simply lengthened: *zīb* from **zīb*, f. *bīmmā* < **bīhm-at*; a following *r* often changes its colour into *e*: *bēr* < **bīr*, but not always: pl. *ebbīrot*. It seems that even here — as in the preceding type — no svarabhakti was ever created after the guttural, although this cannot be proved conclusively, since the outcome of an early development of glide and svarabhakti after *i* is simply a long *i* (cf. § 29 *a*). True, normally it bears the stress even in the ultima of a word with more than one syllable, which is not the case here — e.g., *ébbir* —, but we could reckon with a secondary recess of the accent (§ 2 *b*). However, the fact that such a recess is normally uncommon, while here it should be universal, and the complete analogy of **quīl* and at least partial one of **quīl* make it probable that our assumption is correct. Having thus found the behaviour of all the gutturals certainly in the preceding type and

probably in this type uniform in this respect in any inflectional form, we may be entitled to conclude that the same holds good in **qatl* as well. This again may give us reason enough to establish that as early as in the period between the two heavy stress periods, which roughly coincides with the appearance of Hebrew proper as an everyday language (see § 111), gutturals did not behave as strong consonants of full value, but were some kind of intermediate things between consonants and vowels, in certain respects — as here — resembling more vowels than even liquids and semi-vowels. So it seems that the two heavy stress periods were fatal to the gutturals: during the first they were degraded from the range of real consonants, and during the second they quiesced altogether — at least in this dialect. To return to the type **qil*: the preservation of the original colour of *i* — for, e.g., **ze'b* would of course result in **zēb* — is somewhat of a surprise as well (cf. § 1 d); but perhaps the influence of the gutturals was not so marked before the omission of the case vowels, when the stem syllable was not doubly closed, and after that their semi-syllabicity allowed the stem vowel to be lengthened enough to be able to preserve its original colour.

d In II *n* the second rad. is assimilated to the last: 'é \bar{z} , pl. 'izzem < *'inz(-im); 'ittā < *'hint-at. An exception is formed again by a form — the only one of its kind — from a root III ' : qēnā < *qin'-at (through *qin'a > *qén^a'a > *qenā'a); again an indication that gutturals were not treated as normal consonants. At the same time, when compared with the normal form (above *a*), it shows that the transformation of *i* into *e* — and analogically probably of *u* into *o* — did not take place in closed syllables, but probably in connection with the creation of the svarabhakti (since, on the other hand, *i* in an open syllable was not made *e*, see *f* below).

e Class III ' may be represented by 'éta < *'hit', f. ētā < *'hit'-at; the development is in masc. strong, apart from the last phase, the quiescization of ' ; for fem., cf. above *d*. In pl.m. also, contraction occurs: jērīm < *jirḥ-im (through *jér^ahem > *jerāhem and apparently — during the second heavy stress period — *jerá'e / im > *jeráim > *jeréim), but not always: nēgā'im < *nig'-im; perhaps '

was able to withstand quiescization longer than *h*, so that the contraction of the svarabhakti with the affirm. vowel did not have time to take place during the heavy stress period, and then the vowels began to get more length, causing the preservation of ' as a glide. But the difference can also be due to more occasional factors, as the preservation of *-ā'em* as the affirmative of *du.* in some cases, though it has mostly fallen together with pl. *-em*. In pl.f., the glide is also preserved: *šēlē'ot* < **šil'-ā-t*.

f In class III V, three groups are distinguished: 1) III *a*, represented by *'ifa* from **ipa-t*, and *ā'išæ* < *(*ha-*)'*iša-t* — as is seen, *i* preserved its original colour in an open syllable (cf. above *d*). 2) III *w*: *'érba^h* from **'irw-at*, and pl. *æffidwem* from *(*ha-*)*pidw-im*; in the suffixed form *ufidju* a dissimilation *-wu* > *-ju* has taken place. This may partly be due to the influence of the commonest group, 3) III *j*, from which we take *kīlī* < **kilj* as the representative; in the pl. *kilem*, *kīlī*, the stem final vowel has been swallowed by that of the affirmative. Fem. may be represented by *bērēt* from **birj-t*, and *kellibja* < *(*ka-ha-*)*libj-at*, pl. *kāšibjot* < *(*ka-*)*šibj-ā-t*; a *du.* form seems to be preserved in n.l. *qarjâtem* < **qirj-at-aim* (*a* as the stem vowel is due to the neighbouring *q* and *r*, cf. § 1 *u* and forms like *miqqirjat*, TibH, etc.). In *mīrri* < **mirj*, secondary gemination appears. The suffixed *'idjæk* (root *'₄Vd*) can be interpreted as a case of transposition, but originally it belonged without doubt to a root **'₄dV* (cf. MT). The collective *firi* < **pirj* has been taken mostly for a pl.: sf. *fīro* < **pir-i* / *aj-hu* for **fīrju* < **pirj-a-hu*.

g There is one case of a doubly weak root: pl.f.sf. *gibjūtīnu* < **gīwj-ā-t-i-nu*.

§ 63. q a t a l.

a The type has not suffered many changes: **qatal^V* > **qátal* > **qátal* pl. **qatal-im* > **qatálem* > **qātálem*; f. **qatal-t^V* > **qátalt* > **qátal^at* > **qatálat* > **qātálat* or, instead of the last phase, > **qatála* > **qātála* (only in st.abs.), pl. **qatal-ā-t^V* > **qatalát^V* **qatalót^V* > **qatálot* > **qātálot*.

b Examples of strong roots: *'ādam* from **'adam*; pl. *'āgāmem* < **'agam-im*; f. *'ādāma^b*, cs. *'ādāmat* < **'adam-(a)t*, *kādārat* (not cs.!) < **(ka-)'adar-t*, pl. *'āšādōt* < **'ašad-ā-t*. There are very few irregularities. The variant of the last mentioned form, *'āšādet* Dt 3: 17, is due to vocalic attraction by the following word, *effēsga*; in *ujāttad* we have a late instance of secondary gemination; the others are due to suffixes, and accordingly will be treated in § 100. Of the two types of f.sg., the latter — which has preserved its *-t* even in st.abs. — belongs properly to this type, as to all the types ending with a simple stem final consonant, though the other, primarily formed for the types the stem of which ends with a cluster (§ 58 *g*), supported by the rule of greater easiness, has obtained so wide a distribution that it now predominates even here.

e Class II': *zāb* < **zahab*, cf.c.art. *ezzāb*; pl. *ennāššēm* < **(ha-)naḥaš-im*; f. *wrābba^b* < **(wa-)raḥab-(a)t*, pl. *rābbot* < **raḥab-ā-t*.

d In the class II semi-vocalis, we have probably *'ējjal* from **'ajal*, with the common secondary gemination of *j* after the main stress; with f. *ejjālē* < **'ajal-(a)t*; and certainly *šūwwar* from **šawar*, equally with a secondary gemination of the semivowel (cf. § 109 *ee*), which geminate has then assimilated even the preceding vowel. The formation of the assumed prototypes might have taken place in some such way as described in §§ 60 *d*, *h* 61 *g* (liquids being quite as capable of syllabization as gutturals).

e III': *ejjāra* < **(ha-)jaraḥ*, *šābā* < **šaba'*, pl. *errēšā'em* < **(ha-)raša'-im* (*e* is due to the following *š*, § 1 *i*); f. *'ēṭāt* < **ḥata'-t*, pl. *šābā'ot* < **šaba'-ā-t*.

f In the class III V, only uncertain cases appear. The fem. *'āla* < **'ala-t*, pl. *'ālot* < **'al(a)-ā-t*, the form is clear, but not type, the stem final *a* standing for the last radical; the word is the fem. of n.ag. Q. In *'ēnū*, the prototype can be **'anaw*, cf. TibH, but **'anw* as well. In *afšētāj* the vowel of the first syllable is of uncertain origin; here the colour is attributed to *š*, cf. § 1 *i*.

g Again, we have one doubly weak root, viz. *j₄V*, which is attested in pl.: *ejjā'īm* < **(ha-)ja'aj-im* (through **ja'ājim* > **ja'áim* > **ja'éim*); in the sf. form *wājo* dissimilatory transposition has taken

place: **wa-ja'aj-i* / *aj-hu* > **wja'áj(j)ew* > **wja'áiw* > **wja'éu*
> **wjá'ú* > **wējú*; cf. *máw'wab*. pl.

§ 64. qatíl

a Normal development: **qatil*^V > **qátel* > **qátel*, pl. **qatíl-im*
**qatílem* > **qātílem*; f. **qatíl-t*^V > **qátilt* > **qátel^{at}* > **qatél^{at}*
> **qatēla* > **qātēla*, which is the regular development, but usually
— probably to prevent the form from falling together with n.ag.Q,
and influenced by the vocalization of pl. — **qātíla* resulted, or more
frequently the development from the 3rd phase onwards was **qátí^lat*
> **qatíllat* > **qatílla* > **qātílla*, again an example of the tendency
of *i* to create secondary geminations; f.pl. **qatíl-ā-t*^V > **qatí^lāt*^V
qatí^lót^V > **qatílot* > **qātílot*. To indicate the difference of the develop-
ment, we put *-at* as the fem. affirm. in the geminating group, since
the vowel probably appeared in them earlier than in the other one.

b Examples: *ā'átem* < *(*ha-*)*ḥatim*, pl. *'ādīrem* < *'*adir-im*; f.
nāšēma < *'*našim-t*, *'ālima* < *'*alim-(a)t*, *'āriddē* < *'*harid-at*, pl.
gādīrot < *'*gadīr-ā-t*. After an ' as the first rad., the vowel often
turns toward *e*: *'ēbidda* < *'*abid-at*, *'ēbe* < *'*abil*; cf. § 1 *r* (beg.).
In pl. *wibīšem*, f. *jēbēšē* considerable uncertainty about the correct
form appears (pl. has additionally a var. of the type **qatí^ll*), but this
type seems most plausible: in the pl. form *j* has coloured the original
a of the first syllable into *e* (as it still appears in f.), after which the
combination *wjē-* has melted into *wī-*; the 2nd vowel of f. may stem
from Q ps. In *jémmen*, dir. *ejjēmīnā*, this type may also have been
original, cf. the sf. form *mijjāmīnu* and n.pr. *eljámīn*.

c II ' follow the strong pattern. There is one case of II *w*: *'áwīcer*
< *'*awīr*, f. *'awwēret*; as is seen, the middle radical is rather late
secondarily geminated. III ' is represented by a number of m.sg.,
e.g. *ujāgī* < *(*wa-*)*jagī'*, which may also indicate that ' was semi-
syllabic allowing *i* to be lengthened to some extent, so that it did
not get the colour of *e* (and so the other gutturals); and f. *ejjārījjē*
< *(*ha-*)*jari'-(a)t*, pl. *jārījjot*. In III V, e.g. *'ālī* < *'*alī*; pl. is formed
without the stem final vowel: **mānēm* < **man(i)-im*, *'ázot* < *'*haz(i)-*

\bar{a} -t, and so f.sg. also: $q\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{a}$, cf.m. $q\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{i}$. A case of doubly weak root again: $n\bar{a}bi < *nawi$.

§ 65. q a t u l .

a Normal development: $*qatul^V > *q\bar{a}tol > *q\bar{a}tol$, pl. $*qatul-im > *qat\bar{u}lem > *qat\bar{e}lem > *q\bar{a}t\bar{e}lem$ (rarely $-ellem$); f. $*qatul-t^V > *q\bar{a}tult$ ($> *q\bar{a}tol^at > *qat\bar{o}lat > *qat\bar{a}lat > *q\bar{a}t\bar{a}lat$, but again the vocalization of pl. exerts its influence and the result is) $> *q\bar{a}tul^at > *qat\bar{u}lat > *qat\bar{u}la > *qat\bar{e}la > *q\bar{a}t\bar{e}la$ (or $-ella$), pl. $*qatul-\bar{a}-tr > *qat\bar{u}l\bar{a}t^V > *qat\bar{u}l\bar{o}tr > *qat\bar{u}lot > *qat\bar{e}lot > *q\bar{a}t\bar{e}lot$ (or $-el\bar{lot}$).

b Examples: $g\bar{a}dol < *gadul$, pl. $g\bar{a}d\bar{e}llim$, $-el\bar{e}m$, $-ol\bar{e}m$ (an individual variant which, however, might represent a transitory stage in the development of u to e); f. $g\bar{a}d\bar{e}ll\bar{e}^h$, pl. $g\bar{a}d\bar{e}llot$; $f\bar{a}r\bar{e}ket < *paruk-t$ (2nd e caused by the preceding one), pl. $\bar{a}g\bar{e}rot < *ha-gur-\bar{a}-t$. For the irregularities of $\bar{a}don$ see vol. II *sub voce*. In $z\bar{a}q\bar{i}-nem$ confusion with the pl. of the adj. $z\bar{a}qen$ has taken place; the ms. var. $z\bar{a}q\bar{a}nem$ is doubtless the original one, cf. the sf. forms and f. $mizz\bar{a}q\bar{a}nn\bar{a}$; the a vowel — instead of the normal e — is caused by the preceding q (§ 1 u). In $q\bar{a}tan$, f. $q\bar{a}t\bar{a}nna$ the same phenomenon is caused by t and extended even to m.sg. (for o ; the derivation from $*qatan$ is made improbable by the fact that the secondary gemination of the last rad. does not appear in the type $*qatal$; and on the other hand, relatively recent transformation $o > a$ appears even elsewhere, cf., e.g., $\bar{z}lk$ (n.ag.f.pl.); cf. even TibH).

c II ' follow the strong pattern, apart from $k\bar{a}nna$, cs. $k\bar{a}nn\bar{a}et$, where contraction has taken place, if from $*kahun-at$ (cf. TibH). This, however, is by no means certain. The other weak class attested, III ', is not uniform: normally, it seems, the characteristic u was early transformed into o and accordingly finally resulted in a , whether stressed or not. So $g\bar{a}b\bar{e} < *gaboh$ (for $-uh$); pl. $egg\bar{a}b\bar{e}'im < *(ha-)gaboh-im$; f. $g\bar{a}b\bar{a}^h < *gaboh-t(a)t$, cs. $g\bar{a}b\bar{a}t < *gabo'-(a)t$, pl. $'egg\bar{a}b\bar{a}'ot < *(ha-)gabo'-\bar{a}-t$. In n.l. $\bar{l}\bar{a}b\bar{u}$ the accentuation certainly stems from n.act. Q of the root bV' (cf. Tg), but the name itself may come from $*labu'$ in which case we might conclude that u in this position was treated by the original ' as i was by any guttural (cf. § 64 c).

§ 66. q a t ā l.

a This type is attested in a few roots only. Development: *qatāl^V > *qatōl^V > *qātol. Only m.sg. appears, mostly in connections which suggest that the whole type derives from n.act. Q. Examples: wāṣom < *(wa-)ʿaṣām, kābod < *kabād. II ' follow the same pattern: qā'on < *gaḥān.

§ 67. q a t ī l.

a This type is considerably more widely used. Semantically it is closely related to *qatīl, being a kind of elative to it. Development: *qatīl^V > *qātīl > *qētīl > *qētīl > *qéteḷ > *qétel, pl. *qatīl-im > *qatīlem > *qetīlem > *qētīlem; f. *qatīl-at > *qatīlat > *qatīla > *qetīla > *qētīla, pl. *qatīl-ā-t^V > *qatīlāt^V > *qatīlōt^V > *qatīlot > *qetīlot > *qētīlot.

b Examples: gēbēr < *gabīr, pl. gēdīlem < *gadīl-im; f. ṭērīfē < *ṭarīp-at, pl. ēlīfot < ḥalīp-ā-t. In I ' it is not always easy to distinguish between this type and *qatīl, *a* in the beginning of words tending to become *e* (§§ 1 r, 64 b). In the sf. *essīdak* < *ḥasīd(-ak), the middle rad. is secondarily geminated, probably for rhythmical reasons (it appears in a poem). Even here, the 3rd rad. can appear geminated: f.sf. *gēberrātī* apparently from *gēbīr-t > *gēbīrt > *gēbīr^{rat} > *gēbīrrat. In *kērītet* < *karīt-at, the affirm. vowel has been subdued to the influence of the preceding ones. In *affālet*, the surprising vocalization on both sides of *f* — which normally even turns an *a* to *e* — is perhaps the prolonged influence of the vocalization of the preceding word, *wjāba*. To 'eḷṣēmūtēt, cf. *kērītet* above.

c In II ', contraction occurs in normal cases. So apparently *šīr* < *ša'īr through *šē'īr > *šé'īr > *šē'īr > *šé'īr, with pl. *eššīrem*, *šīrī*; probably also *šīr* < *ša'īr, f. *aššīra* < *(ha-)ša'īr-at; etc. In pl.sf. *-mbejjāro* < *(men-)baḥīr-aj / i-hu, the phase *bē'īr has developed into *bēj^r, which may indicate that *r* was syllabic; perhaps the suffix was represented by a mere *-w* at that time? cf. § 109 *kk*). In III ', the ultima normally bears the stress; so *ūbārī* stems from *(wa-)bārīḥ through *bārajḥ > *bāraj^{ja}ḥ > *ba-

rájjah > **barájja* > **baráj* > **baréj* > **baríj* > **bari* (cf. § 109 *cc*); *r* has preserved — or more probably, considering the vocalization of other forms restored — the original colour of the first stem vowel. The pl.cs. *bērījī* is regular, whether from **barīh-i* or *-aj*, but in abs. *berjīm* < **barīh-īm* a combined contraction and transposition (from **bērījīm*) has taken place. The same is true of the sf. form, in which the stress has additionally receded (§ 2 *b*), as also in the proper noun *bérje*, which apparently stems from **barī'a*, being therefore comparable to f.sg. There the long *i* has assumed its equivalent consonantal form, *j*, which is due to its new position immediately before another vowel, but the same phenomena have taken place even in the variant of **bārī*, *webbárj*, where no vowel follows in the same word. Therefore its *r* is semi-syllabic, as indicated even by the long *a*. Similarly, in f.pl. *bér'jot* < **barī'-ā-t*, the stress has receded and *ī* assumed consonantal form; in its var. **bérjūt*, the stress is receding at present, the prehistory of the form being apparently comparable to that of *berjīm* above. In *gēbī* < **gabī'*, we have a wholly regular m.sg., but in its pl. *gēbīm*, the sequence *-íjī-* has resulted in *-ī-*, either directly or via transpositional form *-jī-* (cf. above) through the absorption of *j* by the long *i*. In *nēbī* < **nabī'*, the stress has equally receded, as in pl. *nibjem*, which is otherwise comparable to f.pl. above; on the other hand, f. **ænnēbījā* < *(*ha-*)*nabī'-at* is regular. In pl. *fēqē'em*, the joint influence of *q* and *h* apparently has been able to transform the characteristic vowel into *e* early enough, so that when the gutturals grew silent, ' resulted as the glide instead of *j*, and prevented the contraction with the afform. vowel. To *kaššēfījjet* < *(*ka-ha-*)*šapīh-at*(?) cf. *kērītet* (above *b*). Of class III V, only *nēqī* < **naqī* appears; even its pl. follows another type (see the next paragraph).

§ 68. q a t ū l.

a This type, in its turn, is semantically an relative of **qatul*, and thereby still more closely related to n.pot. Q; apparently they both derive from one and the same source (cf. § 66). Development: **qātūl* > **qátul* > **qátol*, pl. **qātūl-īm* > **qatúlem* > **qātúlem*; f. **qa-*

tūl-at > **qatūlat* > **qatūla* > **qātūla*, pl. **qatūl-ā-t*^V > **qatūlāt*^V
> **qatūlōt*^V > **qatūlot* > **qātūlot*.

b Examples: *bākor* < **bakūr*, pl. *ubārūdem* < *(*wa-*)*barūd-im*;
f. 'abbākūrā^h < *(*ha-*)*bakūr-at*, pl. *mibbākūrot* < *(*men-*)*bakūr-ā-t*.

c II ' normally follow the strong pattern: 'ā'or < *'aḥūr, pl. 'ārrā'ū'em < *(*ha-*)*raḥūq-im*; f. *rā'ūqa* < **raḥūq-at*, pl. *rā'ūt* < **raḥūq-ā-t*. In *būr* < **baḥūr*, however, contraction has taken place, cf. the same phenomenon in n.pot. Q; perhaps *b* assimilated its vowel to such an extent that after the quiescization of the 2nd rad., the long *u* was able to swallow it. III ' have undergone a similar development to that in the type **qatīl* : *uṭālū* from *(*wa-*)*ṭālū*' through **ṭālūw* > **ṭalū'u* > **ṭalūwu* > **ṭalūw* > **ṭalū*; in pl. the development leading to *uṭālūwem* seems to have been **ṭalū'-im* > **ṭalū'em* > **ṭalūw(w)em*. Of III V, only two pl. forms are attested, both of which have fallen together with III ': 'əqqēšūwem which, to judge from the sg. form of n.pot. of this class (§ 30 *b*), stems from *(*ha-*)*qašūj-im* through **qašūjim* > **qašūwim* > **qašūwim*; in pl. alone this development cannot be argued, but apparently it follows the analogy of a — non-attested — sg.: **qāšūj* > **qāšuwj* **qāšuw^{wi}j* > **qašūw^{wi}j* > **qašūw^{wi}i* > **qāšūw^{wi}i*, where the development -ū- > -uw^{wi}- underlies the rule of overlong syllables (see § 109 *cc*). The other instance is *neqqū^wwem*, which shows secondary gemination of the 2nd rad., probably to stress the meaning of the word (cf. imp.f. N), which also may have caused the transformation of the first stem vowel into *e* (cf. § 61 *c* end).

§ 69. q u t ū l

a This type seems to be further semantically related to the preceding one. Maybe they have a similar origin, but this one is older, so that at the time when a long *u* assimilated an *a* of the preceding syllable (cf. § 109 *f*), it obtained the form mentioned in the rubric; later on analogous formations after its pattern took place of course, but even **qatūl* was revived through new formations from **qatūl*. Development: **qūtūl* > **qūtūl* > **qūtōl* > **qētōl* > **qētōl*, pl.

**qutūl-im* > **qutūlem* > **qetūlem* > **qētūlem*; f. **qutūl-at* > **qutūlat* > **qutūla* > **qetūla* > **qētūla*, pl. **qutūl-ā-t*^V > **qutūlāt*^V > **qutūlōt*^V > **qutūlot* > **qetūlot* > **qētūlot*.

b Examples: *jētom* < **jutūm*, pl. *jētūmem*; f. *bētūla* < **butūl-at*, pl. *bētūlot*.

c There are two examples of a weak class, III', viz. *æljēšū^{wā}*, cs. *jēšūat*, which comes from **jūšū^t-at* through **jūšū^t-at* > **jūšū^t-a* > **jūšūw^a-a* > **jūšūw^{wā}-a* > **jūšūw^{wā}-a* > **jūšūw^{wā}-a* > **jūšūw^{wā}* > **jēšūw^{wā}* (apparently after the analogy of a not attested masc., cf. § 68 c); the stress has accordingly receded, cf. the other example *šēbuw^{wā}* < **šubū^t-at*.

§ 70. Types with geminated second radical.

a This group falls into two parts: 1) types with two short vowels, and 2) types with a long vowel in the second stem syllable. Both the prolongation of a vowel and the gemination of a radical being means of intensification, the first group is comparable to the types dealt with in the four preceding paragraphs, i.e., as kinds of elative to the basic types, while the latter group can be defined as elatives of elatives. That this is not mere theory, is shown by many still existing differences of meaning, e.g., *gēbar* < **gabar* »man», *gēbēr* < **gabēr* »master», *gibbor* < **gibbār* »hero». We will deal with the single types within each group in alphabetical order.

b 1) a. *qattal*: Development: **qáttal*, pl. **qattal-im* > **qattálem* > **qattálem*; f. **qattal-t* > **qáttalt* > **qáttal^t* > **qattálat* > **qattálat*, pl. **qattal-ā-t*^V > **qattalāt*^V > **qattalōt*^V > **qattálot* > **qattálot*. Examples: *eggánnab* < *(*ha-*)*gannab*, pl. *farrášem* < **parraš-im*; f. *ebjabbášat* < *(*ba-*)*jabbáš-t*, *šábbat* < **šabbat-t*, pl. *šēbbētot*. The vocalization of the last form is due to *š*, the influence of which (cf. § 1 i) has spread even to the second stem syllable through vocalic attraction. In f.sg., there is one case of the omission of the afform. consonant: *'ajjabbáša* < *(*ha-*)*jabbáš-(a)t*. III' — only pl. *'atṭá'em* < **ḥatṭa'-im* is attested — follows the strong pattern; in III V: *'ájjā* < **ajja*, the same is the case.

ce b. qattil: Development: *qattil > *qáttel, pl. not attested; f. *qattil-t > *qáttilt > *qáttel^at > *qattélat > *qattélat (> *qattélet through vocalic attraction), pl. not attested. Examples: rábbed < *rab-bid, f. jæbbélet* < jæbbil-t. In 'āšemémēnæ (interr.) we again have a case of the omission of the affirm. consonant (cf. *b*); the first *e* is due to *š*. In II', the first stem vowel is lengthened as a compensation for the lost geminate: lā'ēbē < *lahhib-(a)t; to 'eššāfēt cf. vol. II root š'af *sub voce*. III': tabbēt > *tabbi'-t through *tábbi't > *tábbe'at > *tabbé'at > *tabbé'at > *tabbé'et; as is seen, a guttural did form a svarabhakti, when the stress did not lie upon the preceding vowel (cf. § 62 *c*); pl. tabbé'ot < *tabbi-ā-t.

d c. qattul: This type seems to have been foreign to our dialect, since it does not appear except in a loan word: kēbbāret < *kappur-t (to judge from the TibH form; *ē* is due to imala, *a* to *r*, while *e* as the outcome of the svarabhakti instead of the normal *a* is perhaps even inherited from the Jewish dialect, if the Segol appearing there is an old dialectal peculiarity; in that case even *a* could be a regular outcome from the Tib. Ḥolām — or rather the vowel which the latter represents in TibH).

e d. qettel: This type originated from n.act. D. It is represented by ušellem < *(wa-)šellem.

f e. qettVI: Even this type is connected with D. The only example is in pl. and belongs to the class III V: kēllot < *kell(V)-ā-t; therefore the second stem vowel is unknown.

g f. qittal: The only strong example is 'illam, which accordingly has preserved its ancient shape. The others belong to III V: nidda, cs. niddat < *nidda-t; pl.sf. jennûto < *pinn(a)-ā-t-i-hu; and probably wqēdda < *(wa-)qidda (FW).

h g. quttal: Attested only in a non-Semitic word: wækkessâmet < *(wa-ha-)kussam-t. The last rad. may have been semi-syllabic during the second heavy stress period, which is why the svarabhakti after it appears as *e* (cf. § 109 *nn*).

i h. quttul: The only strong example is pl. šebbélem which, to judge from TibH and the related languages, most probably goes back to *šubbul-im. The other one belongs to III': meḷḷē'em < *mul-

lu'-im; the passive vocalization is well in accordance with the nature of the ceremony.

k 2) a. qattīl: *uléh̄h̄éd* < *(*wa-*)*lappīd*; pl. *qeddīšem* < **qaddīš-im*. Used mainly in pl. along with sg. forms of some not intensified type (mainly **qatīl*, q.v.), of words containing the idea of something eminent or elative by nature.

l b. qattūl: This type seems to be the substantified higher potency of n.pot. Q. The only strong example is '*émmōd* < *'*ammūd*, pl. '*emmūdem*. In addition, there is an example of III': pl. *rāq-qūwī* < **raqqū-i* / *aj*; and another of III V: *šabbūwī* < **šappūj* (for their development cf. § 68 c).

m c. qittāl: This type seems to be so closely connected with **qall* (cf. above *a*) that we believe its original form to have been **qattāl* the lack of which also causes some surprise. The present prototype may accordingly stem from the time of the activity of the rule of polarity (cf. § 109 *i*). Development (m.sg.): **qittāl*^V > **qittōl*^V > **qittol*. Examples: *gibbor* < **gibbār*, pl. *eggibbūrem*; f. *šibbōra* < **šippār(a)t* (n.pr.), pl. *wittānot* < *(*wa-*)'*ittān-ā-t*.

n d. qittīl: Represented by one form only: *qiddeṃ* < **qiddīm*, semantically apparently related to the type **qattīl* (*k* above) and perhaps originated from it through the assimilation of the first stem vowel to the long one. This would even explain the fact that at least most of the present forms of **qattīl* are obviously of recent origin.

o e. qittūl: This type too is related to D. Only masc. forms appear; examples: *wibbod* < *(*wa-*)'*ippūd*, pl. *širrūgēm* < **širrūg-im*; III': *šibbū* < **šibbū'* (for the development see § 68 c), du. *šibbūwá'em* < **šibbū'-aim*; pl. *fiṭtūwī* < **pittūh-i* / *aj*. In n.pr. *fiṭtū* < **pillū'*, the stress has accordingly receded (§ 2 b).

p f. quttīl: This type seems to be the passive counterpart of **qattīl* / *qittīl*. The only attestation is f.pl. *šennīmot*, accordingly from **šunnīm-ā-t*.

q g. quttūl: The passive counterpart of **qittūl*. The only attestation belongs to III V: *kessūwī* < **kussūj* (for the development see § 68 c).

§ 71. Other types with two short vowels.

a This group comprises a number of relatively rarely appearing, partly secondary, partly probably very old and apparently outmoded types. We will take them up in alphabetical order.

b a. qatel: This is the normal n.ag. Q used as a substantive. Examples: 'ākēm < *hākem, pl. 'ākēmēm; f. 'ākēmēt < *hākem-t, ušāfēle < *(wa-)šapel-(a)t, f. jētēdot < *jated-ā-t; the first *e* is due to *j*. II' behave similarly: ká'en < *kahen, pl. ká'ēmēm; f. bē'ē'ēmē < *(ba-ha-)qa'em-(a)t, apparently from an old North Israelite variant root *q'm* to the normal *qVm* (cf. MT Hos 10: 14 kt). Whether the III V forms f. šābē; ká'a, pl. kē'ot (root *k'₂V*) belong here, is uncertain; if they do, the last stem vowel is omitted in them.

c b. qetal: This type seems to have originated from *qill in the way that its final cluster for some reason has been broken permanently at an early period; we have two examples: 1) 'ēnab, pl. 'ēnābem, from *enab(-im), where the cause of the breaking may have been the desire to protect *n* from assimilation, the cause of which I cannot state; 2) bēgad < *begad, pl. bēgādem, where its cause may have been the tendency to distinguish it from n.act. Q — from which it might have originated — after its meaning had become quite concrete.

d c. qital: This is apparently an old type, fallen out of use early; we have only one example, the name of a commonly used material: īmar < *hīmar, apart from a few proper names, which are equally old.

e d. qutal: To this type, a sense of something shameful or ridiculous seems to be attached. The only strong example is f.sf. abgēnābtu < *(ba-)gunab-t-i-hu; in addition, there appears another example of III': 'eḡqārēttu < *(ba-)qurah-t-i-hu (*a* is due to the joint influence of *q* and *r*, cf. § 1 *u*; cf. the TibH form).

f e. qutil: This is the normal n.pat. Q used as a substantive (or adjective). Examples of strong roots: m.sg. is lacking; pl. can appear in 'ālēmēm, if from *ulim-im, but probably this word belongs to *qatul; f. gēbērē < *gubir-(a)t, sometimes with geminated 3rd rad.: 'ēgīddat < *ugid-at; pl. 'ā'ēmīdot < *(ha-)humid-ā-t. A case of II' is perhaps f.cs. bīlat, if from *bu'il-(a)t; a case of III': tēmī < *tumi',

pl. *tēmā'em*, f. *tēmājjā'h*, where the accentuation of the last form is a puzzle, considering that in m.pl. the second stem vowel has developed into *e* early enough to prevent *j* appearing as a glide in that form. The development of f. should accordingly have been **tūmī'-t* > **tūmī't* > **tūmī'at* > **tūmī'at* > **tūmī'a* > **tūmīj(j)a* > **tēmīj(j)a* > *tēmājjā*, which actually appears as a variant, even considering the influence of the types ending with a cluster (see § 63 *b*) and the possibility that *i* was half-long. The explanation may be that the accent has been shifted in analogy with the type **qatīl* (cf. § 67 *c*) to the second stem vowel so early that it had time to transform the latter into *-aj-* > *-aj^a-* > *-ajjā-* before the decisive weakening and disappearance of *'*; but even this has the weakness that in doing so this fem. form would have followed the analogy of the masc. of **qatīl*, which neither the masc. of the present word nor the fem. of **qatīl* followed — unless we were to suppose a secondary recess of the accent in them (but even that is impossible for the m.pl. of our word, see above).

g f. *qutul*: The origin of this type seems to be twofold. First, it appears in the names of many articles or things of value or otherwise remarkable, being in them probably an old type which has later fallen into disuse; and in some others clearly related to n.act. *Q*, and accordingly a parallel to **qutl*, from which it may have arisen through the breaking up of the final cluster at a period when a *svara*-*bhakti* acquired the colour of its »mother». The type is often difficult to recognize with certainty, since dissimilation combined with other factors has considerably altered the form in most of the single instances; therefore it is even impossible to give a paradigm of the general development. Typical examples: *'ālom* < **hulum*, originally meaning »dreaming», thence »dream»; pl. *šēlēmēm* < **šulum-īm*, probably even that originally in sg. a by-form of n.act., cf. the root *z^b'₃*, where the corresponding term is identical with n.act.; f. *'ēnikkat* < **hunuk-at* (cf. TibH), with the dissimilation of the second stem vowel and secondary gemination of the last rad.; the creation of the form itself may have been caused by a tendency to preserve *n* from assimilation to *k*; pl. *wērābbot* < **(wa-)urub-ū-t* (again cf.

TibH) — *a* is due to *r*, § 1 *u* —, originally probably a hole in the ceiling or wall for the light to come in and thereby connected with 'rb »to be skilful, artful, i.e., illuminated», cf. *šár* / *šérrem* for a somewhat similar connection (root *š'gr*). The f. *ubērêqat* < *(*wa-*)*buruq-t* is an instance of quite regular development, if our derivation is correct; in any case it is very difficult to derive an *e* in the immediate neighbourhood of *r* from *a* (cf. § 1 *u*), and since *u* after *b* is more natural than *i*, if we suppose an early transformation of the vocalization, and the word as the name of a valuable object very well fits this class, we can place it here. In *kākūfar* < *(*ka-*)*kupur* (again cf. TibH) the idea of covering — here substantified — may lie underneath; reasons for the lengthening of *u* I cannot give, but the *a* of the second stem syllable is obviously due to dissimilation (combined with the influence of *r*, § 1 *u*), which has taken place after the lengthening just mentioned (cf. § 20 *a*). In *qetlârêt* < **qutur-t* (again cf. TibH) it is the 2nd rad. which has suffered secondary gemination. A case of II ' is probably *nêššet* < **nuhuš-t* (again cf. TibH); as can be expected, contraction occurs. In III ' we have a masc. form *mêlâ*, which in its accentuation is analogous to the f. *tēmîjjê* (above *f*) and might have developed in a similar way; and here the explanation is more trustworthy, since no extra analogy need be supposed, our form being masc. (cf. § 68 *c*); and f. *nêkât* < **nuku'-t* (again cf. TibH) through **nuku't* > **nuko'at* > **nukóat* > **neká'at* > **nekât*.

§ 72. Other simple types containing three radicals.

a This group contains three sub-divisions: 1) those with long vowel in the first syllable and a short vowel in the second syllable, 2) those with a short vowel in the first syllable and a long vowel in the second syllable, which are not dealt with in the preceding group, and 3) those with a long vowel in both syllables. Their frequency of occurrence and its reasons are comparable with those in the preceding paragraph, to which they often seem to form kinds of relatives.

b 1) a. qātal: Development (m.ag.): *qātal > *qōtal > *qūtal. Examples: ūtam < *hātam, šūfar < *šāpar, pl. perhaps tūfānī < *tāpan-i/aj; f. jūtāret < *jātar-t, pl. gūrālot < *gāral-ā-t. A case of III V is perhaps attested in f.pl.sf. zūnātīkimmē < *zān(V)-ā-t-i- . . . (the afform. vowel is dissimilated, cf. vol. II *sub voce*); it is the n.ag.f. of the root znV, which in pl. is used as an abstract; moreover, the form in sg. is mostly used as a concrete substantive. Another case may be f.sf. qurātī < *qūr(V)-at-ī.

c b. qātil: Only two certain examples: jūbēl < *jābil, pl. eddūbērem < *(ha-)dābir-im: The type could be *qātel as well; in any case it is rather closely related to n.ag. (cf. the preceding type). In the third possible instance, 'eddūgīfat, however, it is impossible; but its *i* can have been long as well (cf. kt which, however, can be due to the rarity of the word). Cf. below *i*.

d 2) a. qitāl: Only one example of II': šījjol < *šī'āl, the name of the underworld — very well suited to this «relative of curiosity».

e b. qitīl: Only one fairly certain example, of III': bīrja < *birī'-at, for the development of which cf. § 67 c. The other two possible ones are of II': umīr < *(wa-)mihīr? and æbsēf, sf. šīfē < *šī'īp? (the TibH forms make *qatīl improbable, and *i* is more natural than *u* with long *i* in the second syllable).

f c. qutāl: This is apparently a very old type: it forms names of things closely connected with man: 'ēmor < *humār, pl. wēmūrēm »ass»; 'āron < *urān »ark, coffin»; šārog < *šurāg »shoelatchet»; III': zārū < *zurā' through *zurū'^V > *zurō'^V > *zūro' > *zūrāw' > *zūrāw^{wa}' > *zurāwā' > *zurāwā' > *zurāwā > *zerāwā > *zerāw > *zerō; the development presupposes that *o* remained half-long after the recession of the accent to *u* (cf. § 71 g); *a* in the final form instead of *e* is of course due to *r*, as in the preceding examples (§ 1 u); pl. zārū^{ww}i (regular). Cf. even § 109 cc.

g d. qutail: We reckon this kind of diphthong as a long vowel. The type forms diminutives; only one example is attested: pl.sf. 'anjāko < *hunāik-i/aj-hu through *honājkw > *honāj^{ak}kVw > *honāj^{ak}kVw > *onāj^{ak}kVw > *onjāku > 'anjāko (*o* in the 1st syllable because of *h*, § 1 d).

h 3) a. qītūl: qītor; f. n.pr. qīturā < *qītūr-at. The vowel of the first syllable is probably dissimilated from another *u* (whether long or short, I cannot decide; the dissimilation may have taken place rather early), the masc. form being apparently related to *qutur-t (cf. § 71 g).

i b. qūtīl? cf. above *c* (*addūgīfat < *(ha-)dūgīp-at?).

ii. Simple types containing two radicals.

§ 73. General remarks.

a This group falls into two main sub-divisions: 1) those with a short vowel between the two radicals, and 2) those with a long vowel between them. The former is further divided into two smaller groups: 1) those which do not geminate their second radical, and 2) those which geminate it. Apart from the type *qal, this difference comes into appearance even in their vocalization. The vast majority of these nouns are formed from the hollow roots and the continuable ones, but a number of primitives nouns also appear, and additional examples from roots which now generally appear provided with an added consonant or augment at the beginning; these nouns may have been formed — at least mostly — before the addition of the augment mentioned. The border between this group and that formed by the repetition of the last radical is not always clear; we follow the state in m.sg.

§ 74. Types with a short vowel and simple
second radical.

a a. qal: This type is not very numerous. Most of the examples are very old nouns and adjectives, a couple of them belonging to irregular nouns, for which see § 95. Examples: *jed* < **jad*, pl. I *jêdem*, II *jâdot*; the common *e* vowel in the inflexion of this word may be due to *j* and the *i* or *e* vowel generally following supported by the tendency to distinguish the word in the meaning »hand» from

that of »(so-and-so many) times» in which it appears in pl. II; f. *sāra* < *sar-(a)t, probably also *waqqābā* < *(wa-ha-)qab-(a)t. II ' : *lā* < *lah, pl. *lāem*; f. *alġā* < *(la-)pa'-(a)t, cs. *fāt*, du. *fātī*, pl. *aeffā'ot*; in this class it is of course not absolutely certain that the words belong to this type (and not to that of the geminating group), but since the words in question are probably very old, they may have been formed before the biradical roots began to be divided into continuable and hollow ones; moreover, the adjectives may originally have been nomm.ag. of the respective roots. The examples from augmented roots: *dāt* < *da'-t, *šāt* < *ša'-t, we may in any case regard as certain, they being identical with the respective nomm.act. The semi-vowel *w* is »hardened» into *b*: pl. *bābem* < *waw-*im*. The noun 'ar < *har has two pl. stems: besides 'ārem < *har-*im*, *mijjārārī* < *(men-)har-ar-i / aj appears.

b b. qel: When the biradical roots began to be differentiated into continuable and hollow ones, these nouns did not follow either course, probably since they had become too familiar to tolerate any radical changes. So they preserved their *e* vowel, which they had acquired during an early period when final vowels were not used (cf. § 109 *e*), unless inherited from still earlier times, and appended the formative elements to these established stems. Examples: *el* < *'el, cf. the sf. 'ēlī and the proper names in which the word appears as the first element; the pl. *bā'ilem* Ex 15: 11 is accordingly a theologumenon (against polytheism); pl. *šēnim* < *šen-*im* from f. *šēna*^h cs. *šēnat* < *šen-(a)t, du. *šēnātā'em*; f. pl. *šēmot* < *šem-ā-t from *šem* »name», from which a couple of variants occur, which seem to suggest *u* as the original stem vowel rather than *e*, viz. *šam* and *šēmm*, but since there is no sign of the gemination of the 2nd rad. in the inflected forms, which otherwise always follows a short *u* in this class (see § 75 *c*), and the *a* vowel is rather an outcome of *o* than of *u*, it is best to declare the latter as caused by vocalic attraction from the following *a* vowel, the gemination being due to unusual accentuation. Another type of f. may be *rēšet* < *reš-t (the prototype *riš-t is of course not excluded, but more probably it would yield *riššat, cf. § 75). A case of II ' is the sf. *rēk* < *re'-ak, from the

root r'_4V II, in which the final vowel may accordingly be an augment, added after the formation of our word. In $i\dot{s} < *i/ēs$, the stem vowel is sometimes long; the difference may stem from the time the hollow and continuable roots parted.

e c. qol: This type is not easy to recognize, since the stem vowel has regularly developed into *a*. The distinction can be made partly by means of the forms of TibH and related languages, partly by semantic considerations, many instances of this type being originally, or related to, nomm.act. Examples: $wām < *(wa-)hom$; f. (or n.unit.) $'āmet < *hom-t$, pl. $ālmālot < *(la-)mol-ā-t$; m.pl. is perhaps preserved in $mētī$, if we can attribute *e* to the following long *i* (cf. § 1 r), and regard the *e* appearing in the two proper names as coming from *u* which was preserved on account of the following case vowel now called *w* archaisticum by the present writer (cf. § 58 h); in any case this would be the only instance of an *u* preserved in this class up to the historical period of Hebrew without gemination; but perhaps the word belongs to the irregular ones, having developed its vowel into *o* only in sg. (used independently), but preserved the old *u* in the forms where some inflexional elements followed. An example of II ' : $'ē < *hoh$, f. perhaps $šēt$, if from $*šo'-t$ (ns' I).

§ 75. Types with a short vowel and geminated second radical.

a a. qal: Examples: $'am$; pl. $'ammim < *'am-im$; f. $amma$, cs. $bāmat$ from $*'am-at$ (in cs. the gemination secondarily — perhaps mistakenly — given up), du. $'ammātā'em$, pl. $'ammot$. A case of II ' may be $rā < *ra'$, pl. $rā'em$; f. $rā$, cs. $rēt$, pl. $rā'ot$; one of II j: $'aj < *haj$, pl. $'ajjim$; f. $'ajja$, pl. $'ajjot$ (from $'ajV$; cf. r'_4V , § 74 b).

b b. qil: This is the counterpart of $*qel$ of the preceding group. Examples: $<leb < *lib$, pl. $'iṣsem < *hiṣ-im$; f. $šiddā < *šid-at$, pl. $gibbot < *gib-ā-t$. In $'an < *hīn$, the guttural may early have transformed the normal *e* vowel of the sg.m. form into *a*, cf. the n.pr. $ānīl$; on the other hand, cf. the var., sf. form, and adv. A case of II ' is $rī < *riḥ$, another perhaps $fī < *piḥ?$ but the latter as

a st.cstr. is not certain, cf. the TibH forms also (but a **riḥ* in st.abs. would have given **rija*, cf. § 76 b). II V: *ši* < **šij*, pl. *mījjijjem* < **(men-)'ij-im* (n.1.).

c c. qul: This is the counterpart of **qol* of § 74. Examples: *kel* < **kul*, pl. *aṭṭérrém* < **(ha-)tur-im*; f. *zérre* < **zur-at*, pl. *'aššékkot* < **(ha-)suk-ā-t*. Most examples are difficult to recognize, since gutturals, dorsals and *r* mostly appearing as a radical in them tend to transform the stem vowel into *o* > *a*, and the very common *kel*, being usually unstressed, is also subjected to vocalic attraction by the neighbouring words, so that it can appear provided with almost any vowel. In *'ul* < **'ul*, and *qor* < **qur*, the syllabic nature of the 2nd rad. preserved the original colour of the vowel, which also led to a quantitative metathesis between the two sounds. In f. *dúkkā*, the preservation of *u* may be due to the plainly passive sense. An example of II ' : *rā* < **ru'* (or, actually, **ro'*).

§ 76. Types with a long vowel.

a a. qāl: Development: **qāl^V* > **qōl^V* > **qol* (> **qól*), pl. **qāl-im* > **qālem* > **qōlem* > **qūlem*; f.sg. & pl. analogically to the latter. Examples: *ṭob* < **ṭāb*, pl. *ṭūbem*; f. *ṭūba*, cs. *ṭūbat* < **ṭāb-at*, pl. *ṭūbot*. A case of II ' can be *kū^h*, if from **kāḥ*; but this is anything but certain; besides **kūḥ*, even **kūḥ* can be the primary form from which the present ones developed, if we suppose that the guttural was weak enough for the vowel to remain half-long during the historical Hebrew period (cf. § 71 g); and this view is best supported by the TibH form (= kt). In addition, there is one word which suggests that a form bearing main stress even after the loss of the case vowels might have developed in a different way (cf. below b), but it is not certain whether it belongs here. It is: *jābāna^h*, if from **jān-at* through **jānat* > **jōnat* > **jōna* (cf. the TibH form) > **jāwna* > **jāw^{wa}na* > **jāwāna*; and although it is the only one, it cannot be easily omitted, since it is well known that clumsy forms that have developed according to some phonetic rule tend to be omitted, if shorter or otherwise more convenient forms are preserved beside

them, as in this case (at least m.sg.st.cstr.); a comparable case is n.pr. *jāban*, if from **jōn* (cf. Greek *Iōnia*); maybe *jābāna^h* actually followed its analogy (cf. below).

b b. *qīl*: Here we have reason enough to suppose that the development was actually twofold, and are able to find out its rules. It seems that one of them occurred primarily only in a closed and therefore overlong syllable, i.e., in masc.sg., if this bore main stress (when unstressed, the vowel without doubt was soon shortened). This development seems to have been: **qīl* > **qájl* > **qájja^l* > **qáj-jal* > **qéjjal* > **qíjjal* > **qíjjil* > **qíjl* > **qīl*, the three last steps of which seem to have been taken during the purely recitational period of the language, to judge from the fact that in certain circumstances those steps have not been taken, viz. when the last rad. is guttural or the word stands in a pause. True, we have only one instance of each, viz. *'ebgíjjā* < *(*ba-*)*gī*', which has n. 1. *eggíjjā* (appearing 3 x) alongside it, and *'efšíjjad* < *(*ba-*)*šīd*, which occurs twice, Dt 27: 2.4, and there are, on the other hand, instances of this type in the pause that do not follow this pattern (e.g., *bébbet* Gn 39: 11), but it is easy to understand that after the vast majority of occurrences had come to follow the shorter pattern (cf. below), they absorbed even the rest, as far as there was no special reason to prevent this, and in these cases there is such a reason: *'efšíjjad* occurs only in the pause, so that there was not a shorter form of the same word which it could have followed (I cannot be certain of the matter, but as far as I have checked, it is the only case in this type), and (*'eb*)*gíjjā* is the only noun of II ' of this type occurring outside st.cstr. Considering the prolongation of vowels which normally occurs in the pause, the semi-vocalic nature of the gutturals particularly in the last phase of their development, and the fact that longer vowels in general preserve even their colour, not to speak of themselves, better than shorter ones, we understand that the preservation of both examples is due to natural and essentially the same factors. Pointing further in the same direction is the fact that all the cases in which the long vowel resulting from the completed development still bears the accent, are of the roots I ' : it seems

< *jawna*
jawana
 cf. *alab-*
lamana!

that when the gutturals became quiescent, they did not simply disappear, but left behind something equivalent to a vowel — which reminds us of Jerome's famous statement that ' is a vowel — which fused together with the original stem vowel enabled this to preserve its length — and accordingly, accent — even through the general recession of the accent in this type according to the shorter pattern, a recession which affected all the other forms and thereby rendered them identical with the forms resulting from the development of the form in unstressed position, which may have been as follows: *qīl > *qīl > *qel. Examples of I ' : 'īl, c.art. 'ā'īl (both from *'īl and *hīl), pl. 'īlem; f. (cs.) 'īlaet, pl. 'īnot < *'īn-ā-t; of the sound class: ger < *gīr, pl. gīrem; f. dīna < *dīn-at (n.pr.), pl. sīrot < *sīr-ā-t. The pl. of bit and 'īr < *'īr is irregular; cf. § 95 m, n.

c c. qūl: The development of this type may have been similar to that of the preceding one, though this cannot be ascertained any longer, apparently since in the instances — in the pause and II ' — in which the form analogical to *qijjal, viz. *qūwcal, nothing prevented w from assimilating a into o, which was then easily swallowed altogether, so that even in II ' — as in I ' — the only distinction from the sound class is the accent upon the ultimate. Examples: bor < *būr, pl. sūsem < *sūs-im; f. (sf.) šūbatak < *šūb-at(-ak), pl. abbūrot < *(ha-)būr-ā-t. I ' : ūr, c.art. 'ā'ōr from *'ūr; pl.f. ūrot. II ' : rū, c.art. 'aerrū from *rūh; pl. eššūwem < *(ha-)šūh-im; f. 'al-zūwa < *(la-)zū'-at.

iii. Types formed of more than three radicals and of lengthened or reduplicated stems.

§ 77. General remarks.

a This group falls into three main parts: 1) types formed of more than three radicals, 2) types formed by means of repetition of a part of the primary stem (= one or two radicals), and 3) types formed by means of repetition — at least essentially — of the whole stem. The first of these main divisions further falls into two sub-

divisions: 1) types formed by means of infixation of a further radical into an older triradical stem, and 2) ancient more-than-three-radical (at least mostly borrowed) words. The other two main divisions can be further divided into sub-divisions according to their basic roots or the number of the repeated radicals or of their resulting number of radicals.

§ 78. Types with an infixed fourth radical.

a Three consonants appear as infixes, viz. *r*, which is infixed before the second radical of the basic stem, and *l* and *t*, which are infixed after it, the latter, however, possibly because that radical is a sibilant.

b a. qartal: This type is represented by 'árgal < *(ha-)hargal, apparently from an older, »professional» noun *haggal from the root hgl. Since this root is represented by even another word, we have placed this word under it and not introduced *'argl as a separate root.

c b. qartil: This type seems to be represented by 'árnêbet < *(ha-)'arnib-t, but even here, *qartal is not quite excluded (with imala; cf. TibH). The basic root seems to be *'nb which, however, does not appear elsewhere.

d c. qirtil: This type appears in 'érmeš, which through *hirmiš apparently goes back to *himmiš, but even a root *hmš from which this word could be derived does not appear elsewhere in SP.

e d. qat-al-il: Represented by 'ātálef < *(ha-)'atalip, apparently based on a root *'atf not appearing elsewhere in SP.

f e. qat-t-al: This type probably appears in pl. wēštárot < *(wa-)'aštar-ā-t. The meaning of the word is not quite clear — it appears always in the combination wēštárot šē'únak —, but may in any case mean something eminent among small cattle, and in that case the idea of multiple procreation is not far-fetched; taking the *t* as reflexive, that idea again is well combinable with that of richness.

§ 79. Other simple words containing more than three radicals.

a It is impossible to arrange these words into regular types according to consistent principles; therefore we will deal with them in alphabetical order.

b 1) *mijjēlāmeš* < **hilmīš*(?) , perhaps related to Arab. *ḥamiša* »to be hard»; but can equally well be secondarily (by way of popular etymology) adapted to it, cf. TibH *ḥašmal*, *ḥašmannim* (KOEHLER *sub vocibus*), and originally perhaps from a substrate language.

c 2) *'ergāman* < **'argaman*, apparently not Semitic (Kulturwort).

d 3) *'ārātammem* probably from *(*ha-*)*ḥartum-im* (a due to t); Egyptian LW.

e 4) *abbādla* apparently from *(*ha-*)*budloḥ* (the 2nd a through vocalic attraction instead of e); cf. vol. II *sub voce*.

f 5) *bālil* seemingly from **bal-'il* (cf. kt var.), but the MT and NT varr. suggest that the word has been tampered with; perhaps it was originally a composition with **ba'l*?

g 6) *bárzel* < **barzil*; Kulturwort.

h 7) *gérzen* < **gīrzin*; Kulturwort.

i 8) *jēllam* < **jihlam* or **jihlom*? apparently Kulturwort.

k 9) *wjēšfe^h* < *(*wa-*)*jašpa* (? -e? cf. Greek *iaspis*); Kulturwort.

l 10) *káftar* < **kaptar*(?); Kulturwort.

m 11) *mekrēlījjimna* pl.sf.; cf. vol. II *sub voce* (Kulturwort).

n 12) *sānāfer* probably from **sanapir*, probably related to a Semitic root *spr* (cf. KOEHLER *sub voce*), but hardly of Hebrew origin, cf. the TibH form.

o 13) *fāru^h* probably from **par-'aw* through **fár'aw* > **fár'aw* > **fár'o/u*; Eg. LW.

p 14) *aššēfārdā* < *(*ha-*)*šuparda'*; probably from a substrate language.

q 15) *šátnez* < **ša'tniz*(?) (Kulturwort); for an attempt of etymology see KOEHLER *sub voce*.

r 16) *têrrē* apparently from **tīḥri'* or **tūḥri'* (= kt var., cf. TibH); Eg. LW.

§ 80. Types formed by means of repetition of one or two radicals of the primary stem.

a This group falls into three parts: 1) types formed from triradical roots by means of the repetition of its second and third radicals, 2) a type formed from a biradical root by means of the repetition of its first radical, and 3) types formed from biradical roots by means of the repetition of its second radical. The second of them is apparently an abbreviation of a reduplicated stem (cf. the next paragraph).

b 1) a. qatal-tal: Attested in three roots: 'dm, 'sf, and /tl. Examples *ʿfātāltal* < *(wa-)patal-tal; f. 'ādāmdāmit < *'adam-dam-t (*m* has been semi-syllabic during the second heavy stress period, hence the appearance of the svarabhakti as *i*, cf. § 109 nn), pl. 'ādāmdāmot.

c b. qatul-tul: Attested probably in f.pl. *āšīšārot* < *ḥašur-šur-ā-t through *ḥašuršurāt^V > *ḥašuršurōt^V > *ḥašuršurot > *ḥašuršurot (cf. the TibH form) > *ḥašīššurot (cf. § 72 h) > *ḥašīšurot > *ḥašīšerot (the present *a* because of *r*, § 1 u).

d c. qatal-tal: Attested in *jērāqraq* < *juraq-raq, pl.f. *jēraqraqot*.

e 2) a. qil-q: Attested in a root II V: f. *līlē* apparently from *lī-l-at.

f 3) a. qal-al: Attested in 6 roots. Examples: *ātat* < *ḥat-at, *bādād* < *bad-ad; f. *qālālā* < *qal-al-(a)t, pl. 'aqqālālot.

g b. qal-il: Attested in four roots. Examples: *tāmīm* < *tam-im, pl. *tāmīmem*; f. *tāmīmā*, pl. *tāmīmot*.

h c. qel-al: Attested in four roots. Examples: 'ēlal < *ḥel-at, pl. *ēlālem*.

i d. qul-ul: Attested with some probability in *dērror* < *dur-ur, pl. *mērārem* < *mur-ur-im, f.pl. *mērārot*, and *šāror* < *šur-ur, f.pl. *šārārot*; but because of the many modifications of the stem vowels by the neighbouring sounds this is not certain.

k e. qal-āl: Attested in *gādod* < *gad-ād (derivation according to Tg, which interprets the word — Gn 49: 19; MT: *gēduḏ* — as coming from the root *ngd*).

l f. qal-īl: Attested in eight roots. Examples: *ēbeb* < *'ab-īb;

pl. 'ēlilem < *'al-īl-im; there is only one fem. form, *mēlilat* Dt 23: 26, where the sense seems to require pl. (= MT), but the *a* vowel of the affirmative cannot in that case be explained in any way, there not even being a sound in the environment which could have caused its appearance instead of *o*; moreover, the affirmative is in all mss. written with a mere *t*, while in pl. *w* normally precedes. So it may be best to regard the word as one of the few cases in which a noun preceding a preposition is in st.cstr., the prototype being accordingly **mal-īl-at*.

m g. qal-ūl: The only genuine example may be *mārūrem* < **mar-ūr-im*; for the other pl. 'ālūlem < **hal-ūl-im*? cf. vol. II *sub voce*.

n h. qul-āl: The only example is *dārur* < **dur-ūr* (to judge from the passive meaning of the word).

o i. qallal: The only instance is pl. *fāllāl'em* (in a poetical text) < **pallal-im*.

p k. qillūl: Attested in *bāfirror* < *(*ba-*)*pirrūr*, and pl.sf. *gillūlijimmæ* < **gillūl-i / aj-hu-ma*.

q 1. qīl-ul: The type looks anomalous, and probably even the first syllable originally had *u* vowel, which later was dissimilated. The only instance is of the class II ': *nījja^h* < **nīh-uh* or rather, influenced by the two *h*'s, -*oh*; pl.sf. *nījjāikimmæ*.

r Most — if not all — types of the third group are apparently analogous formations after simple types of similar form (*qal-al* after *qatal*, etc.).

§ 81. Types formed by means of reduplication of the entire primary stem.

a Of this group, four types are attested. They are divided into two sub-divisions according to the length of their second vowel.

b 1) *a*. qal-qal: Attested in 10—13 roots. Examples: *wdārdar* < *(*wa-*)*dar-dar*; fem. *šanšēnet* < **šan-šan-t*. 'ād'ad < **qad-qad*? can equally well come from **qud-qud*, *q* having transformed *u* into *o*. Of the root *kb* we have an exceptionally — because early? — developed word *kūkab* < **kab-kab* through **kawkáb^V*?; perhaps even

kérkæb (cf. KOEHLER *sub voce*), but there are so many uncertain factors, that the matter is best left undecided. In *kékkær*, *r* is again assimilated to the following consonant, if from **kar-kar* (as it seems). From that, *kêkar* may be further differentiated by a simple quantitative metathesis because of a different meaning. In pl.f. *ṭāṭáfot* (root *ntf*), similar metathesis may have occurred after the assimilation of *p* to *t*, whether the basic form was *ṭap-ṭap-* or *ṭup-ṭup-ā-t*. In *'efqérqæ* < **(ba-)qar-qar* the final *r* has been transformed into ' for reasons unknown to me. In the roots II ', the 2nd rad. is naturally quiescent: *qáqā* < **qa'-qa'*.

c b. *qil-qal*: The only instance is f.pl. *širšārot* < **šir-šar-ā-t*, and it may even have belonged originally to the preceding type, as the Akk. and TibH forms indicate; the above prototype may accordingly stem from the period when the rule of polarity functioned (see § 109 *i*).

d e. *qul-qul*: Apart from the possible cases mentioned above *b*, we have two additional ones: 1) f. *'ælgilgálat* with ms.var. *-gal-galat*, pl.sf. *'ælgilgālūtimmæ*; considering the forms of the related languages and TibH, the prototype has been **gul-gul-t*, but the palatal *g* may early have modified the vowel into *o*, in addition to which the first vowel was dissimilated in the pronunciation now alone dominating. 2) f.pl. *lālê'ot* probably from **lu-lu-ā-t* (cf. KOEHLER *sub voce*), with ' as a glide between the two latter vowels; one of the stem vowels must have dissimilated early.

e 2) a. *qal-qûl*: The only example is *ubārúwar* < **(wa-ba)-har-hûr*; the development seems to have been: **hárhûr* < **hárhur* > **hár^ahur* > **haráhur* > **'ará'ur* > **'aráur* > **'arúwar* > **'arúwar* > **'arúwar* (cf. § 109 *cc*).

B. TYPES FORMED BY MEANS OF PREFORMATIVES.

§ 82. General remarks.

a The vast majority of the types belonging to this group seems to have been formed originally by means of four preformatives, viz.

(in the order of the frequency of occurrence) *ma-*, *ta-*, *'a-*, and *ja-*. Due to certain morphological and phonetic developments (such as the tendency to polarity, the influence of neighbouring sounds, etc.), however, the *i* vowel in many cases — mainly and apparently originally only when the stem vowel was *a* — replaced *a* as the preformative vowel, which in a number of certain further cases was modified into *e*. After *u* was established as a characteristic for the passive, it also appeared as the preform. vowel in a number of types the character of which was purely passive. In two cases, the preformative cons. ' was — according to kt, which is partly supported by the present pronunciation — «strengthened» into ' ; in one case, *m* was dissimilated into *n*.

b In addition, three types appear formed by means of three other preformatives, viz. *na-*, *sa-*, and *ša-*. The second of them — as the word in which it appears — seems, however, to be of foreign origin, and thus probably never belonged to the living stock of our language. The other two can be old preformatives which early fell into disuse, the latter, however, more probably a late intruder from Aramaic.

§ 83. Types formed by means of the preformative *ma-* (*mi-*, *mu-*).

a This preformative, originally apparently identical with the interrogative-indefinite *ma*, forms nouns essentially abbreviations of relative (originally interrogative) clauses. They are often called *nomina loci et instrumenti*, and it is true that this definition exhausts the majority of them, if we understand the terms in their widest possible sense, but even so not all of them; is e.g. *mēbār* «choice» or its synonym *mītab* a place or instrument? No; they are simply abbreviated object clauses, «what one chooses». Similarly, *mēgdal* is an abbreviated subject clause, «what is great, big», *mēzreq* an abbreviated adverbial (instrumental) clause, «what one sprinkles with», *māqom* an abbreviated adverbial (local) clause, «what one stands upon = where one stands = (standing) place». The single

instances are far too numerous to be mentioned here, but I have gone through them all, and not found one single instance in which this explanation would not work, and even without needing to widen the natural limits of the respective concepts.

b The group is divided according to the length and number of their stem vowels, and the number of their radicals. In normal cases, no distinction is made between *a*, *e*, and *i* as the preform. vowel, since in them it is impossible to make such a distinction with certainty; and since in such cases *a* apparently is the original vowel, and the differences for the most part originated very late (cf., e.g., the relation between BabH and TibH in this respect), we put *a* as the preformative vowel in such cases. It is preserved most purely in the cases in which it was followed by a consonant favouring *a*, by a consonant followed by a vowel, or by two consonants both capable of syllabization. In the two latter cases the vowel was apparently lengthened enough to be protected against remarkable changes.

c 1) *a. ma-qtal*: This type is of the largest occurrence in this group, but remarkably few of the instances are of strong roots. Examples: *médbar* < **ma-dbar*, *máqbar* < **ma-qbar*, pl. *mešfâtem* < **ma-špat-im*; f. *mešmâret* < **ma-šmar-t*; *mamlâkat* (cs.) < **ma-mlak-t*, pl. *'ammamlâkot*. I ' compensate their loss of the 1st rad. with the gemination of the second: *mâššar* > **ma-'šar*; f. pl. *mâššâbot* < **ma-ḥšab-â-t*; in *mâkal* < **ma-'kal* it is given up again. A comparable case is pl. sf. *mêllêlek* < **ma-'lal-i / aj-k* (exactly, from a type **ma-ql-al*). In I semi-vocalis the result depends on whether the first radical was *w* or *j*; in the latter case the preform. vowel apparently developed into *i* so early that we count them with the type **mi-qtal*. The combination **ma-w-*, again, yielded *mû-*, e.g. *mûšab* < **ma-wšab*, f. *mûrâšâ* < **ma-wraš-(a)t*. The nasal *n* was assimilated: f. *mattânâ* < **ma-ntan-(a)t*. In II ' , the result depends on the quality of the 1st rad.: gutturals being capable of syllabization, if the 1st rad. has the same characteristic, *a* is preserved pure: *bâmâššêl* < *(*ba-*) *ma-š'al*, pl. *mâlâkkem* < **ma-l'ak-im*; f. *mâššârat* > **ma-š'ar-t*, *mâlâka* < **ma-l'ak-(a)t*, pl. *mâlâmmot* < **ma-lham-â-t*; but if not,

it is modified into *e* apparently before the quiescization of the guttural: *mēbēār* < **ma-b̄har* (only this example preserved). III infirmae behave as usual: *ʾammārṣā* < *(*ha-*)*ma-rṣā*ʾ; *mássé* < **ma-nsa*; *mēksūt* < **ma-ksaw-ū*(?). Two or more radicals being weak their influence is normally combined, e.g. *mēār* > **ma-ʾhar*, *múṣā* > **ma-wṣa*ʾ, f. *maššēt* < **ma-nša*ʾ-*t*; in *ammēṭā* < *(*ha-*)*ma-nṭa*-*t*, apparently a secondary quantitative metathesis has taken place; in any case I find it impossible to explain the origin of the *e* vowel if it is supposed that the word was formed from a root form without *n*; in this case, *-ēṭ-* comes from *-éṭṭ-*, which again resulted — because of the influence of *t*, § 1 *u* — from the tendency to polarity (§ 82 *a*). Another interesting case is *mējjan* < **ma-ʾjan*, pl. *majjānot*; probably the original form was **ma-ʾīn*, which during a time of the syllabicity of both gutturals and *n*, changed its long *i* for its consonantal counterpart *j*: **ma-ʾjñ*, which after the period of the syllabicity was over, yielded **máʾjan*. The only instance of *trium infirmarum* is *elmējja* < *(*la-*)*ma-ḥja*-*t*, cs. *mējjat*, *umijjat*, which in the last form has advanced to the stage where the influence of the semi-vowel has totally abolished that of the disappeared guttural.

d b. ma-qtīl: The developments are analogical to those in the type **ma-qtal*, except that the rule of polarity has no effect, since polarity existed in this type from the very beginning. Examples: *emmēzreq* < *(*ha-*)*ma-zriq*, pl. *mæzrēqī*, (f.) *ʾemmēzreqot* (*e* for *i* due to both *r* and *q*, § 1 *u*); f. *mēmkrēt* < **ma-mkir*-*t*, etc. I ʾ: *māššēf* < **ma-ḥšīp*; f. *ʾammārrēkē* < *(*ha-*)*ma-ʾrik*-(*a*)*t*, pl. *mārrēkot*, etc. I *w*: *mūqeš* < **ma-wqīš*; f. *mūlēdet* < **ma-wlīd*-*t*. I *n*: f. *mēssīkē* < **ma-nsik*-(*a*)*t*, pl. sf. *mēsīkūtīmme* (the reason for the shortening of the geminate is apparently occasional), etc. II ʾ: *ammāšūt* < *(*ha-*)*ma-šhūt*, pl. *māšūttem*; f. *ʾammāgērel* < *(*ha-*)*ma-gʾīr*-*t*; in f. *amwē* ēšat < **ma-rḥīš*-*t*, the analogy of n.ag.D has taken over. III ʾ is lacking; III V: *māqni* < **ma-qni*, f. *māqnat* (cs.; sf. *maqnātu*) < **ma-qn-at*. I ʾ III V: *mānⁿi* < **ma-ḥni*, pl. (f.) *mānot* < **ma-ḥn-ā*-*t*; I *n* III V: *māṭṭī* < **ma-nṭī*, pl. (f.) *māṭṭot* < **ma-nṭ-ā*-*t*; etc. In II *w* III V pl. *mādūwī* < **ma-dw-i* / *aj* has a var. *mādūwī*, started apparently from a form with an occasional svarabhakti before *w*; the

semi-vocalic character of the latter apparently facilitated its creation, cf. the same development in II ' , where it finally took over everywhere. II ' III V: *māri* < **ma-r'i*; etc. In cs. *kāmīfkat* < **ka-ma-hpik-(a)t*, a transposition and contraction has taken place: **kāmāhpikat* > **kāmāhfikat* > **kāmhfikat* > **kāmhfikat* > *kām^a-hfikat* > **kāmā'ifkat* > *kāmāifkat* > **kāmēifkat*; f. *mā'ēbat* < **ma-ḥibit* < **ma-ḥibit-t* follows the analogy of continuable roots (cf. below *k*).

e e. ma-qtul: Attested perhaps in six roots, but even of them, most are uncertain: *mēkšol* < **ma-kšul* may be regarded as certain, the meaning being clearly passive; f.sf. *meškārāti* < **ma-škur-t-i* similarly and because of the TibH form (*u* > *a* because of *r*); the III ' f. *mēmlēt* also presupposes **ma-mluḥ-t* because of its meaning, but a late transposition (from **mamellā'at* or something like that; cf. TibH) is possible. On the other hand, the final *a* in *āmmēlqa* < *(*ha-*)*ma-lquḥ* may result from *o* to which *q* and *ḥ* had modified the original *u* (cf. TibH again). The TibH form equally supports the derivation of *māṭmon* from **ma-ṭmun*, as also its meaning, but a var. in TibH suggests that the word could be a more recent formation from **maṭamān*, only later assimilated to the present type. However, long *o* and *u* interchange often in TibH. Finally, the sf. *māsāru* could come from **ma-ḥsar* (*a* for *e* because of *r*), but *-ḥsar* is most natural, the vocalization in TibH representing a late adaptation to the normal passive type.

f d. mi-qtal: This type is attested in three roots, two of which are I *j*: *mīṭab* < **mi-jṭab*, pl.sf. *mīṭāro* < **mī-jṭar-i* / *aj-ḥu*. Both of them are apparently early modifications of **ma-qtal*, cf. above *e*. As to the third instance, *mīšār* < **mī-š'ar*, the matter is obscure; the word has a central role in a play on words the details of which are partly unintelligible to me; perhaps that has caused the exceptional vocalization.

g e. mu-qtal: Attested in III V *mākkā* < **mu-nka*, which partly is probably a late substitute for **naggāḥ*, which appears in MT in two passages: partly the *u* may be old, it being preserved because of the passive connotation of the word (MT: *makkā^h*).

h 2) a. *ma-qtāl*: Attested in four roots. It seems to represent some kind of higher potency to **ma-qtal*, a characteristic which in three cases is the only means of distinguishing it from **ma-qtul*. Examples: *æmmášqof* < **(ha-)ma-šqāp*; sf. *mākā'ūbu* < **ma-k'āb-a-hu*.

i b. *mi-qtāl*: This type may have originated from **ma-qtāl* in the way described above at *f*. It is attested in *'æmmišor* > **(ha-)mi-jšār*.

k 3) a. *ma-qitl*: This type is very interesting, although it is attested in two instances only, viz. *mābêṭā*, which apparently goes back to **ma-bit'*, and f. *æmmā'išē*, cs. *mā'išet*, sf. *mā'ēšitā^h*, which apparently originally derives from **ma-ḥišj-t* (cf. the sf. form and the TibH ones, the vocalization of the preformative of which in one part of them reminds us of this, that of the affirmative in the other one), but later, apparently under the influence of the normal fem. ending, was in our dialect transformed as if coming from **ma-ḥiš-(a)t*. The interest lies in the fact that here we have an expressed hint of the origin of the most usual (and apparently primarily formed) types of this group: **ma-qtal* and **ma-qtul*: it seems that they have been formed from **ma-qatl* and **ma-qill* through a transposition analogous to that in the formation of prf. (see § 10 f); this presupposes accent on the preformative: *máqatl* is easier to pronounce than *máqatl*, but not easier than **maqátl(u)*. In the two words above, this development did not take place apparently, since their stem was regarded as bisyllabic; in other words, our theory presupposes that these two nouns were formed during a period when both (the original) *'* and *j* were syllabic, which we know was so during the first heavy stress period at the latest (see § 109 q). That they did not follow the analogy of earlier words of the same construction is also best explained by the supposition that they were formed during such a period, when new phonetic developments had confused old regular patterns. If that be so, we can perhaps draw some further conclusions as well. As stated, the earliest types may have used **qatl* and **qill* only as the stems, and not **qull* at all — the instances of **ma-qtul* seem to be so clearly passive in character, that the whole type may originate from the period when

u had already become a characteristic of the passive, and thus be an analogical formation. And this is no chance: the type **qull* having apparently very early (cf. § 11 *a*) come in the first place to denote action, it could not be used in compositions of subject-pronoun and an active predicative. The latter should rather have the character of *nomen agentis*. And when we go through the list of nouns of the types **qatl* and **qill*, we indeed still find so many instances denoting an active being that it is quite possible that during a certain — and rather long — period those types have been used primarily — even if not exclusively — with such a connotation; moreover, we still have examples of the latter type as n.ag. (see § 11 *o*). And since the entering of a n.ag. into the verbal system took place by means of, or at least in connection with, the loss of its final vowel (see § 10 *m*) it seems very possible that many nomm.ag. of the type **qatel* have arisen from **qatl* at a period when a svarabhakti — in this case originated to break the final cluster — developed into *i/e*, and many of those of the type **qatal* at a period when it developed into *a* — just as the nomm.ag. of the type **qil* in m.sg. appear as **qêtal*.

l 4) a. ma-qatal: The type seems to appear in four roots: n.pr. *umâbâšam* < **(wa-)ma-bašam* is the only strong example; III V: *mâqâšce^h* < **ma-qaša*, *mâšâge* < **ma-šaga*, while pl.f. *mârrâbâbot* < **ma-rab-ab-a-t*, exactly defined, is of a type **ma-qal-al*.

m b. ma-qatil: *mâbâšer*, pl. *mâbâšîrem* < **ma-bašîr(-im)* is the only strong example. Of III V, there is n.pr. *mânâšî* < **ma-našî*, and perhaps *mêkêssî* < **ma-kasj* (with secondary gemination in connection with the transformation of *j* into vowel, and *e* in the preformative through vocalic attraction).

n c. ma-qatul: One instance: f.pl. *'æmgâbêllot* < **ma-gabul-â-t*; the meaning is passive.

o d. mi-qatal: One uncertain example: *mîrrêbât* < **mi-raba'-t?* (perhaps corrupted text; MT quite otherwise); or with prep. **men* in the beginning?

p 5) a. ma-qattal: This type, as well as the other ones in this sub-division, is closely connected with D; the only example is f.pl. *'æmgêbbê'ot* < **ma-gabba'-â-t* (developed analogically to n.ag.D).

q b. ma-qattil: Two instances: *wāmkéssī* < *(wa-ha-)ma-kassī (= n.ag.D), and fem. *'amsabbēt* < *ma-sappih-t.

r c. ma-qettel: Three instances: two strong, *umēgērreš* from *ma-gerreš (in cs. and pl. forms contracted as if from *ma-greš); and *'amšárret* < *ma-šerret, a n.ag.D used as a substantive; so even the instance of III V, f.pl. *āmneqqijjot*, from *(ha-)ma-neqqi-ā-t.

s d. ma-quttal: This is the n.pat.D used as a noun. Attested in four roots: two strong, m.pl. *'amšeqqādem* < *ma-šuqqad-im, and f.pl. *'āmšabbēšot* < *(ha-)ma-šubbaš-ā-t. An instance of III ' is *mēšéllē* < *ma-šullaḥ; another of II w III V, *emmēšāba*, if from *ma-šuwwa-t; but *ma-šawwa-t is grammatically equally possible.

t 6 a. ma-qal: Five instances, one of I w: sf. *umārākkemma* < *(wa-)ma-ra'-ku-ma, two others of I n: *māšē* < *ma-ša', and f. *māšāt* < *ma-ša'-t. All of these have been formed before the augment was added before the original biradical root. The other two: *mēšā* < *ma-šaḥ, and f.pl. *bemmāšlot* < *(ba-ha-)ma-šal-ā-t (from šVI).

u b. ma-qil: Attested in two continuable roots: *'émgen* from ma-gin through *māgen < *ṃgen (in an unstressed position), and *mēšek* < *ma-sik.

w c. ma-qul: Two instances, one of the hollow roots: pl.(tant.) *mēgērri* < *ma-gur-i / aj, apparently formed before the stem vowel was definitely lengthened; and one of the continuable ones: f. *bammāšellā* < *(ba-ha-)ma-sul-at.

x d. mi-qal: This might have originated from *ma-qal under the rule of polarity. Two instances of the continuable roots: *mērrak* < *mi-rak, and *mīttam* < *mi-tam.

y 7) a. ma-qāl: This type is attested in the hollow roots only. Examples: *bammāšor* < *(ba-ha-)ma-šār; f. *ubāmāšūra* < *(wa-ba-)ma-šār-at, pl. *'ammāqūmot* < *(ha-)ma-qām-ā-t. I ' have a twofold behaviour: *ammā'or* < *(ha-)ma-'ār, pl. *mā'ūrot*; but *mimmūn* *(men-)ma-'ān, f. *mūna^h*. The reason of the difference is unknown to me. II ' : *mābū* < *ma-bā' through *mabā'^V > *mabó'^V > *mábo' > *mábaw' . . . (cf. § 51 b); fem. *mānūuwé* < *ma-nāḥ-at, cf. ib. In *bemdúke* *(ba-)ma-dāk-at, *m* has been syllabic during the last heavy stress period. In f.cs. *mēvusat* < *ma-nās-at, the preform. vowel follows the analogy of *ma-qūl (see below).

z b. *ma-qūl*: Only one instance is preserved: *mēnūra* < **ma-nūr-at*; the vowel of the preformative was assimilated to the long stem vowel at an early period (cf. § 109 *f*); but to judge from the isolated nature of the form and its form in TibH, even it, and thus the whole type, might be of secondary origin, even if I cannot point out the analogy it followed (perhaps **ta-qūl*? see the next paragraph). Thus **ma-qāl* might originally have been the only type formed of the hollow roots by means of this preformative.

aa 8) Here we place the type formed by means of this preformative and an affirmative: *ma-qatl-īl*: It is attested in f.sf. *mārāšītu* < **ma-ra'š-īt-a-hu*.

bb *Note*. For the types **ma-ql-al* and **ma-qal-al* see above *c*, *l*.

§ 84. Types formed by means of the preformative *ta-* (*tī-*, *tu-*).

a As in the preceding paragraph, even here the original preformative vowel may have been *a*, the introduction of the other ones having taken place in a comparable way. As to its origin, it seems to me to be identical with the pronominal element *ta*, which originally meant «the opposite one» (see § 58 *e*) and was later differentiated into the pronoun of the second person (§ 4 *a*) and the characteristic of the so-called feminine gender in various positions, i.e., essentially neutral. It is mainly this neutral aspect that is characteristic of the present noun group; we see it best when comparing it with the preformative *ma-* in the roots where nouns of both types appear. So in the root *jš'*, the term *mūšā* is used in connection with living beings going out, while (sf.) *tūšā'ītu* means the flowing out of a lifeless thing (here, border); in *qVm*, *māqom* originally meant the place where one stands, *tēqūmā* the act of standing and the ability to stand itself; in *īld*, *mūlēdet* is the place where one is born, *tūldat* a certification of birth, etc.

b The group is divided into sub-divisions according to the same principles as the preceding one (see § 83 *b*).

c 1) *a*. *ta-qtal*: Only five attestations, all of them from weak

roots: I *j*: dir. *tīmāne^h*, var. *utēmānē*, which latter suggests that the development *-aj-* > *-ī-* has taken place rather late, perhaps due to a similar place name in the South, from which the word itself apparently has originated; we put accordingly **ta-jman(-a)* as the prototype. I *w*: *tūšab* < **ta-wšab*, pl. *utūšābem*; I *w* III V: f. *tūdā* < **ta-wda-t*, *tūrā* < **ta-wra-t*, pl. *túrot*; and I' II *w* III V: *tāwa* < **ta-'wa-t*.

d b. *ta-qtīl*: Six attestations, all of them feminine: *'attānšēmet* < **(ha-)ta-nšim-t*, *terdīmāe^h* < **ta-rdim(-a)t* (the gemination of *m* is occasional); I *w*: *tūdat* < **ta-wlid-t* (? the stem vowel after TibH) through **tāwliḏ^V* > **tōliḏ^V* > **tōliḏt* > **tōled^at* > **tōldat* (where *l* is semi-syllabic; the vocalic character of *l* made this possible; for the reasons for the development cf. § 2 e); I *w* II': *tyuwēbā*, cs. *tuwēbat* < **ta-w'ib(-a)t*; a prototype **tā'ib-t* is also possible; pl. *kātūwēfot* < **(ka-)ta-w'ip-ū-t*; and II' III V: *attēlījē* < **(ha-)ta-l'ī(j)-at*.

e c. *ta-qtul*: Attested probably in two roots, one of them I': *'attāmos* < **(ha-)ta-ḥmus*, the other III V: *tērbot*, probably from **ta-rbw-t* through **tārbūt* > **tūrbūt* (cf. § 109 f) > **tūrbot* (exactly, from a type **tu-qtul*).

f d. *ti-qtal*: Attested in *tīraš* < **ti-jraš*, apparently deriving ultimately from **ta-* (cf. § 83 f).

g e. *ti-qtīl*: This is attested in two III V roots, and has apparently originated from **ta-qtīl* by means of assimilation of the preform vowel to the stem vowel appearing long (cf. above e): *tībnet* < **ti-bn^j-t*, *utīrbēt* < **(wa-)ti-rbj-t*.

h Note. For **tu-qtul* see above e.

i 2) a. *ta-qt*: *tēr* < **ta-'r(V)*.

k b. *tu-qt*: *tār* < **tu-r'(V)* through **tur'* > **tu'r* > **to'ar* > **tō'ar* (cf. TibH) > **tā'ar*. These two types might have lost their final vowels in connection with the omission of the case vowels.

l 3) a. *tu-qattīl*: *tēšābbeš* < **tu-šabbīš*, apparently related to D.

m 4) a. *ta-qīl*: In spite of the *e* in the first syllable, *tēbel* may come from **ta-bīl*, cf. *kt* and the TibH form; apparently vocalic attraction has taken place. Similarly, *'attēllā* derives from **(la-)ta-ḥīl-at* and *bettēllā* from **(ba-ha-)ta-ḥīl-at*.

n b. ti-qal: One instance, of the hollow roots: f.pl. *tillânôt* < **tî-lan-â-t*.

o c. tu-qal?: sf. *tūšābak* Nm 24: 22, according to Tg deriving from the root *šVb*, which makes **tu-šab-ak* as the least exceptional prototype; but apparently the *jšb* is the original root, cf. above *e*.

p 5) a. ta-gīl: One instance, f.sf. *utēmīrātu* < *(*wa-*)*ta-mīr-at-a-hu*, apparently related to H.

q b. ta-qūl: Attested in eight roots; all occurrences feminine. Examples: *tēbūna* < **ta-būn-at* through **tabūnat* > **tubūnat* (cf. § 83 *z*); pl.sf. *tērūmātī* < **ta-rūm-ā-t-i-i* in which the pl.afform. is dissimilated, since a long *u* cannot appear in two subsequent syllables. It is interesting to notice that, like *a* in the preceding group, *u* in this group is apparently the only original vowel in the nouns formed of the hollow roots, and agreeing well with the theory advanced at *a* above, that the types formed by means of this preformative have a neutral character, and the fact that *u* was an important characteristic of the passive, neutrality not being far from passivity. II ' : *tēbūwā* < **ta-bū'-at*; the stress has receded (cf. below *r*).

r c. ti-qāl: Again this type may have arisen from **ta-qāl* under the rule of polarity. It is attested in two roots both II ' , which may explain the deviation from the rule of the colour of the stem vowel just established. F. *tīrrūwā*, cs. **tīrrūwāt* comes from **tī-rā'-at* through **tīrrā'at* > **tīrrō'at* > **tīrrāw'at* . . . (cf. §§ 83 *y*, 109 *ce*); the other example is f.sf. *tīnnūwātī* < **tī-nā'-at-i*.

s 6) a. ta-ql-īl: One example: *téršēš* < **ta-rš-īš*.

t b. ta-qil-al: f.pl. *ubettēllālot* < *(*wa-ba-ha-*)*ta-hil-al-ā-t*.

u c. ti-qal-al: *tībbāllal* < **tī-bal-al*.

w 7) a. ta-qtal-īt: One example, of I *w* III ' : f.sf. *tūšā'ītu* < **ta-wša'-īt-a-hu*.

§ 85. Types formed by means of the preformative 'a- ('i).

a This preformative is in our dialect considerably more frequently used than in TibH. At least to a certain extent this is due to the fact that a part of the instances have originated after the second

heavy stress period, when the dialect was no more in connection with the parent(s) of TibH and actually approaching its death as a spoken language. Then it appeared before numerous nouns, the first consonant of which during the heavy stress period had lost its vowel and become syllabic. This indicates the essential character of this preformative: it supports pronunciation. Among the group deriving from older times (= at least those in which the initial ' appears even in kt), however, there are a few instances where this explanation does not seem to hold good; but most — if not all — of them are demonstrably (by means of related languages) so old that their first radicals can have suffered considerable phonetic changes after their formation.

b The group is divided according to the principles followed in the two preceding paragraphs (cf. § 83 b).

c 1) a. 'a-qtal: Attested in 13 roots. Examples: 'éšfar < *'a-spar, pl. ešfâtem < *'a-špaṭ-im; f. 'eškâbat < *'a-škab-t, pl. ešfâkot < *'a-špak-â-t. A case of II ': ešâda < *'a-š'ad-(a)t; four of III ', e.g. 'éfsâ < *'a-psaḥ »Passover»; in f.pl. 'æmtât < *'a-mtaḥ-â-t, the pl.afform. has been swallowed by the stem vowel, partly perhaps due to confusion with the sg. form (both appear frequently in Gn 43: 12—44: 12). In (k)énšar, the monosyllabic prototype is still seen in the form c.art. 'ænnéšar < *'ha-nišr (?).

d b. 'a-qtel. Attested in six strong roots, e.g. eškem < *'a-škem, wâtken < *(wa-)'a-tken; pl. 'ešqêlem < *'a-šqel-im; f. 'æššêlê < *'a-bšel-(a)t. All of the occurrences derive from the latest period.

e c. 'a-qtıl: Three attestations, one III ': érqi < *'a-rqi', and two III V: 'ærfi < 'a-rpj and árbi < *'a-rbi(?) this is an old example).

f d. 'a-qtul: As it seems, two attestations: f. wâlêma < *(wa-)'a-ḥlum-(a)t(?), and bešmâret < *(ba-)'a-šmur-t.

g e. 'i-qtal: This appears perhaps in four roots, all of them old instances, and therefore probably transformed from *'a-qtal under the rule of polarity. One is I j: 'itan < *'i-jtan, the other three III ': 'išba < *'i-šba'; pl. 'ifrîm < *'i-praḥ-im (? -uḥ- is quite as possible, cf. TibH; the preform. i could be due to f), and f. wilṭâḥ < *(wa-)'i-ṭa'-(a)t.

h 2) a. 'a-qtīl: This is attested in four roots, mostly in pl., e.g. *ešqīdem* < *'a-šqīd-īm; f.pl. *benqīrot* < *(ba-)a-nqūr-ā-t. A case of III ' : 'ēnšī < *'a-nšī (the stress has receded, § 2 b), pl. (c.art.) *ānšījjā'em* (for the development of the long *i* cf. § 67 c; the pl. form has preserved the secondary syllable -*ja*, there being no cogent reason for its omission, although this in most cases took place after the analogy of sg., see ib.).

i b. 'i-qtāl: An old instance, *wēškol* < *(wa-)'i-škāl, pl. *iškūli*.

k 3) a. 'a-qatal: One uncertain instance, *lēzākāra* < *(la-) 'a-zakar-(a)l? ('*u*- is equally possible, cf. n.act. Q of this root.

l b. 'a-qatil: An old instance, *'ābāneṭ* < *'a-baniṭ, pl. *'ābāniṭem*.

m 4) a. 'a-qil: An old instance, *ēbel* < *'a-bīl (root probably *jbl* I; formed before the addition of the augment).

n b. 'a-ql: Two feminine instances: *'āšāmā* < *'a-šm-at, and *ešfāh* > *'a-šp-at, du. *ešfātēm*.

o 5) a. 'i-ql-al?: Perhaps in *'itnan* < *'i-tn-an?

p b. 'a-qal-qal: As it seems, in f.pl. *'ābabbā'ot* < *'a-ba'-ba'-ā-t.

q 6) a. 'a-qtīl-ān: An instance of III V: *ubanqījjon* < *(wa-ba-)'a-nqī(j)-ān.

r b. 'a-ql-am: *'ešfam* > *'a-šp-am.

§ 86. Types formed by means of the preformative *ja-*.

a This preformative is in our dialect attested in three types only. To judge from the few examples preserved, it calls attention to some striking or at least essential characteristic of the thing so named; hence, it may be identical with the exclamatory particle we met as the preformative of the 3rd pers. of preformal (§ 10 h), but because the examples are so few, we cannot assert that with certainty.

b a. *ja-qtal*: Attested in *jāšār* < **ja-šhar*.

c b. *ja-qtūl*: Attested in *ejjénšof* < *(ha-)ja-nšūp, probably through **júnšūp* (cf. § 84 c), and *u'jām^{mor}* < *(wa-)ja-ḥmūr, where the guttural prevented the assimilation of the preform. vowel or stopped it half-way in *o*, which later again was made *a*.

d c. ja-qūl: Attested in *ajjēqūm* < *(ha-)ja-qūm through **jūqūm* (cf. above *c*).

§ 87. Types formed by means of other preformatives.

a As stated above (§ 82 *b*), in our dialect only three preformatives appear beside those already dealt with, viz. *na-*, *sa-*, and *ša-*, and even each one of them in one instance only. In addition, another type of *na-* originated through dissimilation from *ma-*, and two types provided with a preformative 'a- have apparently originated from 'a-. As to the meaning of the three genuine preformatives, *sa-* and *ša-* may be identical with the verbal causative prefix, while *na-* may correspond to the reflexive one, if conclusions may be drawn from so few instances — in any case, our supposition fits the meaning of the words in an excellent way. The fact that in Akkadian — from which our *sa-* seems to be borrowed — the causative prefix also appears as *ša-* is no counter argument, since an Akkadian *š* often appears in Hebrew as *s*, e.g. 'Esar-ḥaddon (TibH) = Ašur-ah-iddin.

b We will take up the different preformatives in alphabetical order, which at the same time is the order of the frequency of their occurrence.

e 1) a. 'a-qtal: *wāqrab* < *(wa-)'a-qrab.

d b. 'a-qtāl(?): 'ākābor, if from *'a-kbār.

e 2) a. na-qtal (< *ma-): pl. *neftālī* < *na-ptal-i / aj.

f b. na-qīl: *nézzed* < *na-zīd, cf. TibH.

g 3) a. sa-qtal: pl. 'a^ssunnuwārēm apparently from *(ba-)sannar-im (cf. var. -sann-); a LW (at least ultimately) from Akkadian.

h b. ša-qtal-al: f.pl. *šaqqārārot* < *ša-q'ar-ar-ū-t.

C. TYPES FORMED BY MEANS OF AFFORMATIVES.

§ 88. General remarks.

a In this nominal class we find a relatively great number of types none of which is very frequently attested. The affirmatives

used are twelve in number, viz. *-aj*, *-al*, *-am*, *-an*, *-ān*, *-ī*, *-īl*, *-in*, *-īl*, *-n*, *-un*, and *-ūl*. A number of them, however, seem to be cognate or at least related to each other; actually it seems that only the consonantal element is relevant to the question of their ultimate origin. So it seems clear that the two affirmatives ending with *-t* have originated from the attachment of the characteristic *-t* of the so-called feminine to the roots with vocalic ending; cf., e.g., § 84 *e*, *g*. Similarly, the vowel of the two affirmatives ending with *l* seems to be determined by outward circumstances, in these cases apparently by the rule of polarity and the quality of the last radical. Again, *-aj* is semantically apparently related to *-ī*; their formal difference may be best explained by the supposition that the word in which the former appears, as a military term, is a LW. The largest group — which is also by far the most frequently used —, that ending with *-n*, however, seems to be heterogeneous. First of all we must place *-in* apart; it appears only in a LW. The rest, then, denotes partly collective and pluralistic entities, partly beings affected or provided with a characteristic expressed by the relevant root or stem, partly the diminutive. Apart from the fact that *-n* appears only in this last mentioned meaning, no correlation seems to appear between different meanings and different vowels. When more closely studied, however, it appears that there are very few unquestionable words formed with *-ān* that could not be traced back to a collective-pluralistic meaning, while few others seem necessarily to presuppose such a meaning. So we might be entitled to conclude that *-ān* originally formed collective nouns — which is well in agreement with the fact that elsewhere in Semitic languages it is used as a collective and plural affirmative —, while *n* provided with a short vowel was used of things provided or affected with a certain characteristic, and of the diminutive, where the mere *-n* could not appear in this latter function, but afterwards the types began to be confused with each other, which in our dialect has led to some inconsistencies, and in TibH to the expansion of the types provided with *-ān* which has gone so far that it has swallowed the types with *-un* altogether; even the stems of the types in that dialect

have suffered such far reaching changes that one of them has replaced almost all the others in st.abs., while in st.cstr. another one has obtained the same position.

b We will deal with the single types in the limits of the groups arrived at above, which we take up in the order of the frequency of their occurrence.

§ 89. Types formed by means of the affirmatives $-Vn$, $-n$.

a The group falls into sub-divisions according to the exact form of the affirmative, which are dealt with in the order of the frequency of their occurrence. Within each subdivision, the single types are arranged in the order of their stems, following the same principles as in the class of nouns formed by means of the preformatives (see § 83 *b*).

b 1) *a*. qatl-ān: Attested in ten roots, all of them weak. Examples: II ' : *fāmmōn* < **pa'm-ān*, pl. *affāmmūnem*; in *rā'īšōn* < **ra'š-ān*, the stem vowel has developed svarabhakti in analogy with its stem word (cf. § 60 *c*), although here was no need for it, the stem syllable not being overlong; but the stage **rē'ōšōn* was further dissimilated into **rē'īšōn* (cf. below *l*), from which the present form developed under the rule of polarity. Here we also have f. *rā'īšūnā* < **ra'š-ān-at*, even if used as an adverb; pl. *arrā'īšūnot*. III V: *rāšōn* < **raš(V)-ān*, *āmon* < **ham(V)-ān*: as we see, the stem final vowel is swallowed by that of the affirmative, and since there are numerous instances in which it was preserved (cf. below), the most natural explanation is that it was homogeneous with the latter, i.e., *a*. II ' III V: *bā'on* < **baha-ān*; *gā'on* < **ga'a-ān*.

c *b*. qitl-ān: This type seems to be attested in 11 roots. Four strong examples, e.g. *'ibron* < **hibr-ān* (n. 1.), *el'iqdon* < *(*la-*)*piqd-ān*; pl. *ēšrūnem* < **'iṣr-ān-im*. One instance of II *w*: *ubēwāron* < *(*wa-ba-*)*'iwr-ān* through **'iwrōn* > **'iwr^{wa}ron*; the rest are III V the development of which depends on whether the 2nd rad. is sonant or not; if it is, a svarabhakti is created after it analogically

to II *w* above, apart from that *j* as the last rad. colours it into *i*; e.g. 'illijjon < *'ilj-ān; if not, if follows the strong pattern, e.g. 'ibjon < *'ibj-ān, pl. ibjūnī. In šibbānā, it seems, *w* as the third radical is assimilated to *p*, if it comes from *šipw-ān-*a*; the final vowel may derive from -*a directionis*, which has become permanent. Apart from this doubly exceptional instance, the vocalic ending is regularly represented by *j*, as in the preceding type we found it represented by *a*; in the type *qult-ān the class III V is not attested, but this may be enough to suggest that the quality of the characteristic vowel in this class is determined by that of the stem vowel proper — or vice versa.

d c. qult-ān: This type is represented by one uncertain instance only, viz. the name of a mountain, 'ārmon < *'harm-ān? This suggests that the type which originally had this form has later suffered some alteration because of some phonetic rule. The instance mentioned may have been preserved outside the proper area of Hebrew, if that phonetic rule was not relevant there.

e d. qatal-ān: Attested, as it seems, in five roots, e.g. bāšābon < *(ba-)ašab-ān; one instance of III': ušāmā^on < *(wa-)šama'-ān (*o* was almost swallowed by the preceding *a*, cf. the same phenomenon — normally completed — in f.pl., e.g. § 85 *c*).

f e. qattal-ān: Attested in šabbāton < *šabbat-ān, a kind of superlative (orig. collective) of šābbat.

g f. qattil-ān: 'aššegqū^oon < *(ba-)šaggi'-ān, waftammājjon < *(wa-ba-)lammih-ān.

h g. qittal-ān: Attested, as it seems, in bēbāzon < *hīppaz-ān (with a secondary omission of gemination, cf. § 109 *ll*), and probably wq^enāmon < *(wa-)qinnam-ān (LW).

i h. qal-ān: Three attestations: 'ālon < *'al-ān, pl. bālūnī; 'ālon < *'hal-ān; 'ūn < *'a-ān, pl. 'ūnot.

k i. qil-ān: Four attestations, e.g. liššun < *liš-ān; f. ašqīšūnce < *(ha-)qīš-ān-(*a*)t. Both apparently formed before the time the hollow roots and the continuable ones began to be distinguished, since the other forms of the root *qs* II have the 2nd rad. geminated, and to the former, lāšon corresponds in TibH; apparently the basic

form was **laš-ān*, but the stem vowel was changed into *i* under the rule of polarity (in the present type *qal-ān* this may have been prevented by the guttural as the 1st rad.) before the development $\acute{a} > \acute{o}$, which may then have caused the secondary gemination of *š* also, cf. § 109 *i, l*.

l k. *qāl-ān*: As it seems, one example: *ettikon* < **(ha-)tāk-ān*, but apparently formed from the noun **tāk* after this was already transformed into **tōk^(V)*; the stem vowel was then dissimilated into *i*, cf. above *b*; the young origin of the form is also suggested by the fact that this affirmative does not appear in its original sense (see § 88 *a*): apparently it was already transformed into *-on*, and could therefore easily be confused with *-un*; that the latter in fact is not used, is suggested by the parallelism with *rā'išon* (see above *b*).

m 1. *qal-al-ān*: Attested twice: *bāšāson* < **(ba-)ḥaš-aš-ān* in a n.l., and the name of a reptile, *šāfāfon* < **šap-ap-ān*.

n 2) a. *qitl-an*: Three examples, one strong: f.pl. *umegdānot* < **(wa-)migd-an-ā-t*; II': *rēnan* < **ri'n-an*; III V: *qinjan* < **qinj-an*. The type may partly have originated from **qatl-an* under the rule of polarity, cf. the II' form in TibH (even here, the exact prototype would be **re'n-an*, apparently due to the guttural).

o b. *qutl-an*: Probably attested in two roots: *qārāban*, apparently from **qurb-an* (cf. TibH) through **qōrban* (because of *q* and *r*, § 1 *u*; this made it formally similar to the types which are just beginning to develop a svarabhakti between the 2nd and 3rd radicals, though there is no absolute need for it, cf. § 61 *b f.* and pl.), which may be why it followed suit:) > **qór^aban* > **qorāban* > **qarāban*: the other instance is *šālēn* < **šullḥ-an*, in which it was of course the guttural that caused the creation of the svarabhakti.

p c. *qal-an*: One attestation, pl.sf. *'āmānīkimmæ* < **ḥam-an-i / aj-ku-ma*.

q d. *qīl-an*: Two examples, one diminutive: *kā'išēn* < **(ka-)'iš-an* (for the development of the stem word see § 95 *h*); the other is *dīgan* < **dīg-an* (perhaps a late formation after *tīraš* (§ 84 *f*) by which it is normally followed, cf. the TibH form) the basic form has perhaps been **dag-an*, which was made **digan* under the rule of

polarity, the *i* being secondarily lengthened as stated above (that the stem vowel really was long, is made practically certain by its regular plene writing, cf. Appendix I). Accordingly, the whole type is rather late and secondary.

r e. qūl-an: This type is later still. It appears only in sf. *mījjū-dānī* < *(men-)'ūd-an-ī (Gn 49: 20) which seems to be based on a misinterpretation of the passage (cf. MT).

s 3) a. qītl-un: Two examples: *zékron* < **zīkr-un* (the var. *zékke^rron* is perhaps more original considering the tendency of *i* to create secondary geminations, § 109 l); and f. 'ilmēnā < *'ilm-un-(a)t, pl. 'ilmēnot.

t b. qatul-un: Again two examples, one strong: n.pr. *jāšáron* < **jašur-un* (cf. TibH; the second *a* is due to *r*, § 1 u); probably a diminutive, perhaps connected with *jīšrā'el* by a popular etymology. The other example is II ': 'ā'éron < *'aḥur-un, pl. *ā'ērīnnem*, in which the *u* of the affirmative was dissimilated into *i*.

u c. qīl-un: The stem vowel can be long as well as short. Two examples: *udībon* < **dīb-un*, *dīšon* < **dīš-un*.

w 4) a. qutul-n: One example, pl.sf. *šēfernījā* < **šupur-n-i / aj-ha*, apparently a diminutive (in MT, a dissimilation of the first vowel followed by a secondary gemination has taken place).

x b. qal-n: 'šēon < *'ša'n (root *jš'*); for the development see § 60 c.

y 5) qatl-in: As it seems, attested in pl. *mījjaršīnem*, if from *(men-)ḥarš-in-im; judging from the varying equivalents in TibH, Aram., and Arab., it may be a question of a LW (even if probably Semitic).

§ 90. Types formed by means of the affirmatives -Vt.

a This group falls into two sub-divisions: 1) those formed by means of the affirmative -ūt, and 2) those formed by means of the affirmative -ūt. The former occurs slightly more frequently. For the origin of both of them cf. § 88 a.

b 1) a. qatul-īt: Attested in II ' 'ā'eret < *'aḥur-ūt, cf.sf. 'ā'ērītī.

c b. qil-īt: Attested in *gizzet* < **giz-ūt*, and *šisset* < **šis-ūt*, pl. *šiššijot*. In the latter, the stem vowel can even be long. The origin of the affirmative is still clearly to be seen in pl.: the affirmative consonant is placed only after the pl. affirmative (vowel), as the feminine *-t* normally.

d Note. For the type **ta-qtal-ūt*, see § 84 w; **ma-qatl-ūt*, § 83 aa.

e 2) a. qil-ūt: One instance: 'ā'idot < *(*ha-*)'id-ūt; pl. = (from **-ā-t*). The stem vowel could even be long.

f b. qal-īl-ūt: 'ašcarrīrot < *(*ba-*)šar-īr-ūt.

g c. qitl-un-ūt: sf. 'ilmēnūtā < *'ilm-un-ūt-a-h(a).

h Note. An Aram. example of **qatl-ūt*: šā'ēdūta < *šahd-ūt-a'(?).

§ 91. Types formed by means of the affirmatives -Vl.

a The forms of the affirmatives are *-al* and *-īl*; both form two types:

b 1) a. qatl-il: *kārmēl* < **karm-īl*.

c b. qutl-il: *wērfel* < *(*wa-*)'urp-īl.

d 2) a. qitl-al: III ' : *gēbāl* < **gib'-al*.

e b. qutl-al: III ' : *ušēmāl* < *(*wa-*)šum'-al; even **šim'* were possible, but *u* before *m* in an old word is psychologically more natural; cf. Akk. The use of a meliorative affirmative in a word like this is explicable as a euphemism.

§ 92. Types formed by means of the affirmative -ī (/ -a j).

a This affirmative is copiously used to form nomm.gnt. from proper names; apart from that, we have the following types:

b 1) a. qatl-ī: Two examples: II ' : f. *rāšēt* < **ra'š-ūt*, formally identical with a type **qatl-ūt*, but because of its meaning we place it here. III ' : f. *fālījjā* < **pal'-ī(j)-(a)t*.

c b. qitl-ī: 'īfšī < **hipsš-ī*; even **hupš-* is possible, cf. § 11, r; and f. *gīfrēt* < **gipr-ūt*. Perhaps the difference from TibH is ex-

plicable in that the stem vowel was assimilated to the affirmative, when the neighbouring consonants so allowed (and furthered it).

d e. qutl-ī: Attested in pl. *ṭēṭīm* (sic) < **tuḥt-ī-īm* (the affirm. swallowed by the pl.affirm. vowel, cf.:) f. *tēṭet*; for the stem cf. § 104 ff.

e d. qatīl-ī: pl. *šēlīšā'em* after Aram. pattern, cf. below i.

f e. qutl-al-ī: f. *'aššēmālet* < *(*ha-*)*šum'-al-īl* (cf. § 91 e).

g f. qatal-ān-ī: *'ādāmūnī* < **'adam-ān-ī*.

h g. qittl-ān-ī: *jiddūnī* < **jiddV'-ān-ī*, pl. *ē'jjiddūnēm*; the second stem vowel was either *a* or *u*.

i 2) a. qittal-aj: *riḡḡālē'ī* < **riḡḡal-aj*, apparently an Aramaic LW; cf. above e.

§ 93. Types formed by means of the affirmative -am.

a Of the nouns formed by means of this properly adverbial affirmative, only two are preserved. One of them has already been dealt with in § 85 r; the other is of the type **qul-am* : *sēllam* < **sul-am*. It is interesting to notice that the meaning of both of them is very close to that of local — more exactly, directional — adverbs. So it is possible that they were originally directional adverbs used by way of abbreviation instead of nouns that they later replaced. If so, the affirmative was never used properly to form nouns.

D. IRREGULAR NOUNS AND UNCERTAIN CASES.

§ 94. General remarks.

a This »class» is divided into two groups: first, certain irregular nouns, which belong to the most commonly used stock of any language, such as the names of certain nearest relatives or members of the household, appellations of man in general, of parts of the body, of matters commonly used etc., are treated. The other group is formed by a number of words which are apparently nouns, but the type of which cannot be determined with any certainty.

§ 95. Irregular nouns.

a The nouns included in this paragraph are treated with their suffixed forms together, since in some of them special forms appear when suffixes are attached to them.

b 1) Names of certain nearest relatives or members of the household:

a. 'āb < *'ab »father»; cs. *eb* Gn 17: (4.)5, but usually 'ābi < *'abī, with a flexional *i* the origin of which is uncertain (for an attempt at explanation see BL § 65 *f*); that the vowel was long may be practically certain, since it is preserved even in TibH (and cf. Arab.), even if the variant seems to suggest the contrary (i.e., that it was, at least to some extent, anceps); this may be due to the play on words wherein the form takes a part. In connection with the establishment of the stress upon the penultimate, however, the vowel was shortened, since the stem vowel has not been transformed into *e* (cf. § 1 *r*). In the sg.sf. forms this vowel replaces the normal »binding» vowel *a* before the suffixes, in unstressed closed syllables being transformed into *e*, as usual; before the sf. of the 1st pers.sg., it is omitted apparently through haplogogy; examples: 'ābi < *'abi-ī, 'ābek < *'abi-k, 'ābījju < *'abi-hu, 'ābījjinnā < *'abi-hinna. In pl., the form resembles fem.: 'ābot as if from *'ab-ā-t, but considering the not unusual interchange of *o* and *u* even in TibH (cf., e.g., § 83 *y* and the corresponding fem. forms vs.masc. in TibH), the old supposition of PAUL HAUPT (*Akk. Sprache*, 1883, p. xxxvii; according to CYRUS ADLER, *Hebraica*, vol. III, p. 269) that the form is etymologically identical with the Akk. *abūti* may be the correct one. It is possible that this affirmative was originally more widespread in Hebrew, but after the omission of short final vowels and the recession of the accent to the penultimate, when it grew identical with the fem.pl. affirmative, it was disused in masc. words, being preserved only where it was firmly established to a much used word, as in this case.

c b. 'āḥ, 'āḥ < *'aḥ »brother», cs. 'āḥ < *'aḥī (cf. above *b*); the flexional *i* returns in most of sg.sf. forms, but this time the »binding» vowel is not abolished: 'ājak < *'aḥi-ak, 'ājānu < *'aḥi-

a-nū; etc.; in the form with sf.sg. 3. m., it does not seem to be present, but this is only apparent: the preceding *a* vowel, supported by the following *o*, has changed it for its normal glide ' : 'á'o < *'ah̄i-a-hu through *'áh̄jahu > *'áh̄jaw > *'áh̄jo (> *'áj̄o > *'á'o; in the form with sf.sg. 1. pers., it is omitted (cf. *b*): 'á'ī < *'ah̄i-ī. The reason for the preservation of the »binding» vowel in sg. may have been the tendency to prevent them from falling together with pl. forms, which would have taken place without that, if we suppose that the 2nd rad. — unlike in TibH — was not already geminated (from the present forms the matter cannot be seen), at an early period, and in any case later on, as in spite of that has actually happened in a couple of forms; examples: 'á'em < *'ah̄-im, cs. 'é'ī < *'ah̄-i / aj, sf. 'á'ī < *'ah̄-i / aj-ī (through *'áh̄ī / aj(j)), 'á'ek < *'ah̄-i / aj-k, 'á'o > *'ah̄-i / aj-hu (through *'áh̄Vw > *'áh̄ū > *'áh̄o > *'á'o), etc. The fem. 'á'ot, sf. 'á'ūtī apparently goes back to *'ah̄ā-t, with another long flexional vowel.

d c. The word for »mother», 'ám, appears in our material in sg. only; it goes back to *'im, cf. sf. 'immak < *'im-ak. The gemination is rather late, as is indicated by another word derived apparently from the same root, 'áma^h < *'am-(a)t »hand-maid», »concubine»; it has an exceptional pl. form, preserved only sf.: wāmūto, wāmāotkímma; the former could be regular, but the latter shows that the long *u* is a result of contraction; to judge from kt, the development has been: *'am-ah-ā-t- > *'amahāt- > *'amahōt- > *'ama'ōt- > *'amaōtVw > *'amaōtu / o > *'āmōto = 'āmūto and, instead of the last three phases, in the latter form: *'amā'ōtikímma with a minor stress on the syllable that in the form without sf. bore main stress, cf. § 2 c) > *'amā'otkímma (elision of the »binding» vowel apparently during the second heavy stress period, supported by the place of the minor stress) > *'āmā'otkímma. Still another word of the same root may be 'émmet < *'um-(a)t »tribe», »nation» (originally apparently »family», the descendants of one and the same mother); the development may have been: *'um-t > *'umt > *'om^{at} > *'ómat > *'omt (during the second heavy stress period, when *m* grew syllabic; when that was over, the development contin-

ued:) > *'ámt > *'ám^{met} (for the colour of the svarabhakti, cf. § 109 *nn*), whence the present form; the sf. form *lāmālimma* goes back to *(la-)'um-l(V)-himma through *'amatlimma < *'omatlimma etc.; the older svarabhakti was not swallowed here during the second heavy stress period, probably because of different accentuation and rhythm.

e d. The word for »son» seems to have two stems: sg. *ben* having preserved its ancient shape, cf. sf. *bēnī* < **ben-ī*, etc.; pl. *bānem* comes apparently from **ban-im*. It seems, however, that during the period when the tribes speaking the dialects which later developed into Hebrew and Arabic were already in close touch with each other, a heavy stress period occurred, during which the monosyllabic sg. of our word lost its stress — at least mostly and, *n* growing syllabic, its vowel too. When the period was over, the development took a different course in different dialects — a sign indicating that the period coincided with another critical period in the history of that society, — leading to its dissolution —: in Arabic, a prothetic vowel was made use of, while in Hebrew, a svarabhakti broke up the cluster. At that period, the svarabhaktis so originated obtained the colour of *e* (cf. § 109 *nn*). Therefore there is no need to suppose that the stem vowel before that period was different in sg. and pl., and we can conclude that the original stem was **ban*. The development of the fem. form, *bat*, *bet*, sf. *bittī* »daughter», was quite analogical: **ban-t* > **bánt* > **bnt* > **bént* > **bet(t)*; pl. *bānot* < **ban-ā-t*.

f e. The long flexional vowel (cf. *b*, *c* above) appears even in sf. *'āmek* < **hami-k*, *'āmījjā* < **hami-ha*, the word for »father-in-law». In the first instance (cf. § 4 *g*) the *e* vowel could be attributed to the fem. suffix, but the second shows that that is not correct.

g 2) Certain appellations of god(s) and men:

a. *'ēlā*, an appellation of »god» in general, apparently goes back ultimately to *'el (cf. § 74 *b*), but it has an additional radical at the end. As kt and the pl. form *'ēlūwem* < *'elāh-*im* suggest, the primary form was *'elāh, originally probably a vocative of *'el (cf. BL § 78 *e*, *f*). Whether the long vowel in sg. was ever stressed or not, cannot be decided (the former seems more natural, but cf. the

Arab. parallel cited by BL): in the former case, the development was: **elāh* > **elōh* (cf. TibH) > **eloh* > **elah*, from which the present form comes; in the latter: **elāh* > **elah* directly. In pl., the long vowel bore the stress all the time and, consequently, developed into *ō* / *ū*, which developed *w* as a glide to replace *h* when the gutturals grew quiescent. The pl.sf. forms *'ēlūwak* and *'ēlūwōwīju* seem to go back to **elāh-ak* and **elāhi-hu* (cf. above *b*) and are apparently intended as sg. (regular forms would be **elūwek* and **elūwo*, cf. above *c*).

h b. The common appellation for man, *'iš*, pl. *'ēnāšem*, is normally derived from two roots. To me, however, it seems that even the sg. form derives from *'nš*. The basic form was **inš*^(V), which was made **išš*^V during the assimilatory period of *n*; after the omission of the case vowels, even the geminate was simplified, and **iš* resulted. This stage is actually preserved at least in the name of Saul's son *'Ēšba'al*, in TibH, and might have preserved itself in the spoken language as a «context» form until the end. Such a form, however, could be used only unstressed or only lightly stressed, while a word with such a meaning as this must often occur rather strongly stressed. The lengthening of the consonant could add to the intensity of the word only slightly, if it was at all possible; the other alternative, the prolongation of the vowel, was thus even easier; therefore **iš* resulted. (Probably even this occurred during the first heavy stress period for the first time.) With the passage of time, the stress in general grew lighter, until overlong syllables were not tolerated any more; then our form changed via **ájš* into **ájiš* and, the stem vowel assimilated to the secondary consonant, **éjiš* > **íjiš*, which upon the advent of the second heavy stress period, via **íjjiš* became **íjš*, and thus the present *'iš*. The last seven phases explain why the stress remains upon *i* even in the form with the article, *'ā'iš*, cf. § 76 *b*; for the whole development, cf. even § 109 *cc*. The pl. stem, however, had early become bisyllabic for reasons that we cannot find out with certainty; perhaps a variant sg. form lies behind; when used in vocative, the word probably tended to drop its final vowel, which again caused the breaking up of the final cluster, and

*'enaš resulted (cf. § 71 c). The selection of this form for the stem of (the preserved) pl. might have been determined by another pl. resembling that of the other alternative, or by the influence of the form in the related dialects (cf. Aram. and Arab.), if — as seems probable — the connection with them was still close at that time. That latter form (originally a kind of elative?) appears here also: *mijjēnoš* < *(men-)'enaš in the meaning »man as a species» = »mankind»; the Samaritans, however, have taken this for an appellation of angels, and substituted an analogical pl. 'ēnūšem for 'ēnāšem even in the story of the divine visit to Abraham and Sodom.

i c. The word for »woman», 'iššæ, cs. 'iššat, does not belong to the same root as the words just dealt with, to judge from the related languages; however, it might be that the two roots have been differentiated during some remote period. The basic form was apparently *'inš-at, which apart from the assimilation of *n*, and the omission of *t* in st.abs., has not suffered essential changes. In the forms with suffixes, however, a shorter stem form appears: 'ištak as if from *'iš-tak, etc.; this stem may ultimately go back to the first heavy stress period too, after *n* was assimilated and š, being capable of syllabization, allowed the fem. affirm. vowel to be swallowed before the stress was uniformly shifted to the penultimate; the new, short form of *'inš: *'iš (cf. *h* above) originated at the same time, without doubt furthered the development. (In TibH this short form appears in st.cstr. too.) The plural apparently developed from a similar form to the pl. of *'inš (cf. *h*), but after the third radicals had fallen together in pronunciation, a variant which had dropped the first radical was established for fem. to distinguish it from masc. (cf. the TibH form). During the second heavy stress period the form apparently lost its stress for some time and, both consonants being capable of syllabization, the stem vowel too; first apparently in st.cstr.: *'ušī; after that period was over, a prothetic vowel was added, and so the present form was created; st.abs. followed the pattern of st.cstr., if it did not lose the stress itself.

k 3) Parts of the body:

a. *fā^h*, *fā* < *pa »mouth», the only noun in our dialect that can

be stated with certainty to contain only one radical. The flexional *i* (cf. above *b*, *c*) again appears in its st.cstr: $f\bar{i} < *pi$, and in the sf. forms, where it is not omitted even before the sf. of 1st pers.sg.: $f\bar{i}j\bar{j}i < *pi-\bar{i}$; the »binding» vowel is equally preserved: $f\bar{i}j\bar{j}ak < *pi-ak$, $f\bar{i}j\bar{j}\bar{e}'u < *pi-V-hu$; $f\bar{i}j\bar{j}u$ is a contraction of the latter, as also $b\bar{a}f\bar{i}mm\bar{u}e$ from $f\bar{i}j\bar{i}mm\bar{u}e < *pi-himma$. Pl. is not attested.

l *Note*. Names of other parts of the body do not show such irregularities in this dialect that they should be dealt with here; cf. §§ 60 *c*, 74 *a*, 85 *n*, 96.

m 4) Other common words:

a 'ir < *'ir, c.art. $\bar{a}'ir$ »town»; for the development of sg.cf. above *h* (after the assimilation of *n*); the pl. seems to go back to another stem: 'arrem, but it seems to me that here again we have a case of the lengthening of the stem vowel in sg., even if earlier than in 'is; accordingly, the basic form might have been *'ir, which is preserved in pl. (*r* secondarily geminated after the pattern of the continuable roots, as so often even elsewhere and particularly after *i*, cf. §§ 1 *n*, 109 *l*).

n b. The development of $bit < *b\bar{u}t$, pl. $b\bar{e}ttem < *bit-im$, was apparently quite analogous to that of the preceding word, apart from the last phase of the sg. form, where the st.cstr. form has prevailed, cf. § 76 *b*.

o c. Again, $j\bar{o}m < *j\bar{a}m$, du. $j\bar{u}m\bar{a}'em < *j\bar{a}m-aim$, pl. II $j\bar{u}mat < *j\bar{a}m-\bar{a}-t$, have the same relation to pl. I $j\bar{a}m\bar{e}m < *jam-im$ as the sg. in the preceding two words, apart from the colour of the stem vowel and the fact the 2nd rad. is not geminated in pl., which may be a consequence of the other difference. In pl. II, the pl.afform. vowel is dissimilated (cf. § 20 *a*, *c*).

p d. The name of an important item of clothing, $k\bar{i}t\bar{a}n\bar{e}t$, seems to go back to Akk. $k\bar{i}t\bar{i}nnu$ or rather its fem. form $k\bar{i}t\bar{i}ntu$, which contains the meliorative sf. $-innu$; in Hebrew, however, the word is treated rather as if coming from a root * ktn , and even the vocalization differs. To judge from TibH, the basic form was * $k\bar{u}tun-t$, but the first vowel seems to have been dissimilated rather early into *i*, which again caused the gemination of *i*, so that * $k\bar{i}ttunt^V$ resulted;

after the omission of the case vowels, this was modified into **kít-ton^{at}* > **kít-lónat*; during the second heavy stress period, the svarabhakti was swallowed, to appear thereafter as *e*; for the entire development, cf. § 109 *l-nn*.

q e. The word for »water», *mēm* < **maim*, a pl.tant., is perhaps another noun the stem of which contains only one radical, cf. Arab.; however, a long vowel representing a second radical can well have been suppressed. The st.cstr. *mī* may, in this case, go back to **mai*; from it, a redupl.pl. *mīmi* < **mai-mai* is formed. The latter alone appears in connection with suffixes: *mīmu* < **mai-mai-hu*, *mīmīj-jimmæ* < **mai-mai-himma*. An extension of this root — by the causative particle **ša* — is perhaps *šámem* < **ša-maim*, equally a pl.tant.: »sky, heaven», as an appellation of the place from which water (= rain) comes.

r f. The word *šī*, encl. *-šī*, c.art. *'éšji*, »an animal of small cattle», seems to go back to **šij* (or **šī*, with permanently long *i*), cf. the TibH forms with suffixes; if the ending does not belong to the original root, it is perhaps the flexional *i* (cf. above *b, c*), which has become permanent and therefore preserved its original length and become attached even to st.abs.

§ 96. Nouns of uncertain type.

a Strictly speaking, in many cases included in the preceding paragraph the type is equally uncertain. The main characteristic distinguishing the following nouns from them is that here the irregularities are due to relatively recent developments; in addition, a number of borrowed words are included. The words are taken up in the alphabetical order of the roots, where these can be sufficiently established, otherwise of the consonantal elements of the words themselves.

b *'izzob* seemingly from **'izzūb* (or *-āb*), but the forms in other languages (often *p* for *b*, the initial vowel lacking, etc.) suggest that the word ultimately derives from a substrate language.

c *'āznījjæ*, var. *'āznījāē* (c.art.), the name of an unclean bird. Its derivation is quite uncertain, even if it seems possible that the

ending $-(ij)ja$ is an emphatic affirmative, originally an interjection; this would leave $'_4sn$ as the root.

d 'âmet derives from the root $'mn$; the present form comes from $*'amt$ during the second heavy stress period, but the details of the development before that I cannot give; the assimilation of n to the affirmative presupposes stress upon the preceding vowel at that time (cf. § 109 s), but the quality of that vowel remains unknown, as it has been swallowed during the second heavy stress period.

e 'âqō, corresponded in TibH by $'aqo$, and combined by KOEHLER with Akk. *uniqu* (root jnq), the name of an eatable animal; apparently a LW, therefore the vocalization is uncertain (the present one suggests $*'aqw$ as the prototype).

f 'ârraš probably belongs to the root $'rš$ II, but the function (it occurs in Gn 4: 22) of the word is unknown (nomen rectum? apposition? gloss?), hence even its meaning; the first alternative seems most natural, but the type $*qattal$ in such a sense would be unique; perhaps the gemination of r is secondary and has caused the transformation of the first vowel into a from some other colour ($u?$).

g zérri seems to belong to zr I; for details see vol. II *sub voce*.

h zérrī perhaps belonging to zrV ; even its function is uncertain.

i jûrcē »early rain» perhaps from the preformative $ja-$ and a root $*rwV$ through an early metathesis; but in such a case the final vowel (which must go back to a) is surprising: both the rule of polarity and the affiliation to H (cf. TibH) demand i , and the preceding r alone would not be enough to prevent that, particularly when *no* consonant follows, not to speak of one supporting its influence. Perhaps, after all, the noun is a »professional» (or intensive) n.ag. (cf. § 11 k,l) from a root jrV (or $jr?$ cf. kt and MT Pr 11: 25) parallel to rwV used as a substantive? .

k kījor apparently from $*kij(j)ār$ or $-ur$ (cf. TibH, Akk.); Kulturwort (not Semitic).

l kinnar apparently from $*kin(n)ar$; Kulturwort (not Semitic).

m bāmīk < $*(ba-)mV^2-i / aj-ek$ »intestines», »womb»: the word is a pl.tant. probably from a biradical root, but even the stem vowel is unknown.

n (*bam*)*mālênem*, equally a pl.tant(?), cs. 'ēmtāni, sf. bēmtāno, *mālēnikimmæ*; in two forms, a recent stem 'e-*mtan* appears (created after a period of syllabic *m* under the second heavy stress period, cf. § 85 a), but in the two others, an old stem still is preserved, even if hardly recognizable: **matn* seems most natural, if we suppose *e* to be a late svarabhakti (cf. § 61 c, e.g.), but even in that case, **mutn* is equally possible; moreover, *e* can come from an *u* as well (cf. § 65 a), and even if in the related dialects and languages there is no support for a **matun*, it is the only prototype from which the stem form without prothetic vowel can be derived without any supposed irregularity.

o sim pl., apparently from **sV'-im*; the stem seems to be biradical, the stem vowel unknown.

p fim < **pVh-im*, cs. *fi*; as above.

q šē'en apparently belongs to a root **š'₃n*, but the vocalization is wholly unknown (the present one is the normal, often secondarily created one on both sides of a quiescent guttural, cf. § 27).

r tērre seems to go back to **tūhrī'*, but **tūhri'* is not quite excluded (in kt, var. is probably original, cf. MT); it is an Egyptian LW.

E. NUMERALS.

§ 97. Cardinal numbers.

a The numerals apparently derive from various types of nouns treated in the preceding section, but their development shows a number of exceptional features — apparently due to their frequent use, partly perhaps great age — which may make it best to deal with them all in one place, and apart from the rest of the nouns.

b The most remarkable feature of the numerals, the combination of the so-called feminine forms with masc. nouns and vice versa, in the simple cardinal numbers from 3 onwards, belongs to the syntax; the other peculiarities are best dealt with in connection with single numbers. The forms with final *-*t* are here called feminine for the sake of uniformity.

c The attested cardinal numbers are:

1: 'éd, var. 'ád, c.art. ā'éd; pl. 'ádem; f. 'át, c.art. ā'ét. The basic form seems to have been *'aḥad; whether the middle rad. ever was geminated (as in TibH), we have no means of discovering, even if the uniform contraction seems to favour the assumption of an ungeminated prototype (this, however, can be due to the frequent use of the word). In fem., the last radical is assimilated to the affirmative, a phenomenon — the retrograde assimilation of *d* to *t* — unique in SamH, and apparently due to the frequent use of the word. Pl. is used in a pronominal sense »the same», »similar».

d 2: šénim, cs. šēni, sf. šēnijjimā; f. šittem, cs. šitti. Here the stem is obviously biradical: *šen, and the seemingly pluralic affirmative originally that of du., since the fem. -*t* is preserved before it. The assimilation of *n* to the latter is nothing exceptional, the stress lying on the preceding vowel.

e 3: šélaš, f. šēlašā, cs. šēlášat; the basic form may have been *šulš, even if other one-syllabic prototypes are not excluded, either; š has coloured the first vowel.

f 4: 'érbæ, f. 'erbâ^h, cs. 'erbât; the basic form is 'a-rba', even if the prothetic vowel shows tendency to develop toward *i*; cf. § 85 a, g.

g 5: 'ámmēš, f. ēmíšša, cs. 'émšat; the basic form is *ḥamiš, which apparently during the first heavy stress period already lost its second stem vowel in masc.: *ḥamšv, and the st.cstr. of fem., being without the final vowel, followed suit: *ḥamišt > *ḥámšt > *ḥámšat, from which the present form of st.cstr. The st.abs.fem., on the other hand, seems to have already drawn the accent on the penultimate before the omission of the final short vowels: *ḥamišt^v; that dropped, the final cluster was broken: *ḥamišt > *ḥamiššat > *ḥamiššat, from which the present form comes. The masc. form, again, may have broken its final cluster too at the same time; whether the resulting vowel was the normal svarabhakti *a* or *i* (> *e*) from the fem. st.abs., must be left undecided; in any case, during the second heavy stress period it may have been swallowed again, only to be broken again later, the resulting vowel being the present *e*, the normal svarabhakti of this period: *ḥamš > *ḥam^{me}š > *ḥám-meš, from which the present form comes.

h 6: *šęš*, f. *šiššā*, cs. *šiššat*, according to the forms of the related languages derives from **šidš*, accordingly, here again we have a unique example of assimilation instead of the normal transposition of alveolar and sibilant. That phenomenon must apparently be attributed to the great age of the word, having apparently occurred at the time when the last radical was still *t* (cf. SARab.); even if the phenomenon in this way thus remains unique, it is psychologically and physiologically easier to understand.

i 7: *šāba^h*, f. *šābā^h*, cs. *šābāt*, apparently goes back to **šab'*.

k 8: *šāmānā* appears both as masc. and fem., cs. of the latter being *šāmānat*; the prototype seems clear: **šamana*; the prolongation of the second vowel appearing in many (if not all) of the related dialects and languages is accordingly secondary.

l 9: *tiššē*, f. *tiššā*, cs. *eltiššēt*; the prototype may be **tiš'*, which after the omission of the case vowels was made **tišsa'* > **tišša'*, from which the present forms come.

m 10: *'āšar*, f. *'āšāra^h*, cs. *'āšarat* (, f.pl. *'āšārot*), seems to go uniformly back to **'ašar(-t)*; the pl. is used as an ordinary substantive: »groups of 10 man».

n 11: *'āšū* *'āšar*, *'ād* *'āšar*; f. *'āšū* *'āšāra^h*; 12: *šēnem* *'āšar*, f. *šittem* *'āšārā*; 13: *šēlašā* *'āšar* used with masc., *šēlaš* *'āšāra^h* with fem., etc. so up to 19, the smaller number in »feminine» combined with ten in masc., and *vice versa*. In certain passages, where the rhythm of recitation was exceptionally mechanical (cf. § 2 *d*, *e*), slightly contracted forms occur, e.g. *^ubē^hmiššā'ašar* Nm 29: 12, *elšūlāšāāšar* ib. 14.

o 20: *'išrem* < **'išr-im*, the pl. of ten, but from another stem.

p 30: *šēlāšem* < **šulš-im*; 40: *'ērbim* < **'a-rba'-im*, and so on: 50: *ēmiššem* (secondary gemination after f.sg.), 60: *šiššem*, 70: *šābim*, 80: *šāmānem*, 90: *tiššim*: every ten the pl. of the corresponding single number.

q 100 *mā^h*, cs. *māt* < **ma'-t*; du. *māttem* = 200. Pl.: *mā'ot*, is used with single numbers (in masc.) to form expressions for the corresponding number of hundreds, e.g. *šēlaš mā'ot* = 300 (a var.: *šēlašmā'ot*, cf. above *n*).

r 1000: 'álef < *'alp; du. 'ālāfá'em = 2000; pl.: 'ālāfem, cs. 'ālāfī, is used in an indefinite sense: »thousands», and with smaller numbers (when distinct, in fem.) to form expressions for the corresponding number of thousands, e.g. šēlāšat 'ālāfem = 3000.

s 10000: rābāba < *rab-ab-(a)t may occur in this sense in Lv 26: 8 Dt 32: 30; pl. rābābot is used apparently in an indefinite sense: »crowds».

§ 98. Ordinal numbers.

a Special forms for the indication of order exist only for the numbers from 2–10; for 1, the adjective rā'īšon (cf. § 89 *b*) or the corresponding cardinal number is used; for greater numbers, the last mentioned means. The attested special forms are:

b 2nd: šēnī < *šen-ī, pl. šēnim (the stress apparently receded); f. šēnēt.

c 3rd: šēlišī < *šalīš-ī, from another stem than the cardinal number; f. eššēlišet; the pl. šēlišá'em is used even as a substantive, and the peculiar affirmative might have come that way; cf. § 92 *e, i*.

d 4th: rēbī, var. rēbī (the stress receded), f. rēbīt, var. rēbīet (in a more solemn recitation), can go back to *rabī'-ī as well as *rabī'-ī. From the latter form certainly stems the pl. rēbījā'em (used only as a subst.), for the pl. affirmative of which cf. above *c*.

e 5th: amīšī is most naturally explained from *hamīš-ī.

f 6th: eššīšī < (ha-)šidš-ī, f. eššīšet.

g 7th: eššēbī, f. 'eššēbīt, probably from *šabī'-ī or *šabī'-ī (cf. above *c-e*).

h 8th: eššēmīni, f. eššēmīnet, probably from *šamīn-ī.

i 9th: 'eššīšī, f. 'eššīšīt, as it seems from *tīš'-ī.

k 10th: 'ešīrī, apparently from *ašīr-ī.

l As it seems, one part of the ordinal numerals are formed from the corresponding cardinal ones by means of the affirmative -ī, while in the other ones even the stem has been transformed; first perhaps into *qatīl, the form for 5th functioning as a mediator, then by means of the lengthening of the second vowel into *qatīl. To judge from the fact that in TibH the latter pattern has prevailed

everywhere apart from the word for 6th, its development in the dialect which later became Hebrew can have begun only after the assimilation of the middle radical to the last. Thus, the word for 6th is actually the only one — besides that for 2nd — in TibH that has preserved its ancient type.

§ 99. Other numerals.

a 1) Fractions are expressed in a three-fold way. One method is to use the fem. form of the ordinal numeral; this appears in the words for 3rd and 4th, the fem. forms of which can accordingly mean even the 3rd or 4th part. Besides this, a special form for the 3rd part sometimes appears, viz. *šūšet*; if — as it seems; *i* may be due to *š*, § 1 *i* — it comes from **šulš-i-t*, it may be the fem. form of the old ordinal replaced in its proper function by the new type (cf. § 98 *l*). A third method is to provide the stem of the new ordinal with the ending *-at*; this appears in the words for 5th: *ēmīššat* < **ḥamiš-at*, sf. *ēmīšāto*, and for 10th: *'ēšīrat* < **'ašīr-at*. To judge from the fact that the last form appears only where the fem. form of the ordinal does not appear, it may have been more general earlier, the first method being accordingly the younger, and obtained this function only after SamH ceased to be spoken language, influenced by the Jewish kt. On the other hand, the second method is obviously the older one, witness the stem, which cannot have suffered any changes before the formation of this word.

b 2) Special forms for distributive numerals are not attested; the idea is expressed by means of placing two cardinal numbers side by side, a phenomenon which is a matter of syntax. The numeral adverbs will be treated in connection with the other adverbs.

F. NOMEN CUM SUFFIXIS.

§ 100.

a As we found in verbs, even in nouns the stem is influenced very little by the addition of suffixes, apart from certain weak classes.

Actually, in many types the original form is most purely preserved in the sf. forms. That is the case above all in the three monosyllabic types composed of three radicals: *'áršak* goes directly back to **'arš-ak*, *gédlu* to **gudl-a-hu*, only the universal change $u > e$ having taken place in the stem, and *'iznak* to **'izn-ak*; occasional irregularities, such as *iznímmæ* < **'uzn-(a-)hímma* because of the influence of z and the word initial position, or *bátnek* from **bítn-ek* because of the influence of t , need not be taken into account here. In general, only the vocalization of the last stem syllable is affected by the addition of suffixes in so far as long vowels, which in separate forms appear shortened, are restored (or rather preserved), and short vowels in that position lengthened; but such regular changes appear clearly enough in the paradigms (see App. II), so that they do not concern us here.

b Even the irregularities caused by weak radicals are normally regular and can be described by paradigms (see *ib.*); the normal rule is that in the cases where the last radical is a (quiescent) guttural, the vowel preceding either swallows the »binding» vowel and becomes lengthened or, if this is impossible because of the incompatibility of the two vowels, creates a glide in accordance with its nature; in an analogous case of a root with vocalic ending, if the ending in the basic form was consonantal, it remains so; if it was vocalic, the »binding» vowel is normally omitted.

c Between the suffix and the word form to which the former is attached, a vowel normally appears. After a sg. form, this is normally *a*; since the quality of the vowel seems to be determined by the main word, the natural assumption is that it originally belonged to this, and in fact it may be the old case vowel of the accusative (for further argumentation, as well as the exception, see § 4 *g*). In masc. pl., no such vowel seems ever to have been present; and again it is natural, since the st.cstr. — with which the suffixes of course are combined — from olden times had vocalic or in any case a vowel-like (even if the affirmative was *-aj*; *j* is in any case half vowel) ending, being accordingly easily combinable with the initial consonant of the suffixes — moreover, for the same reason pl.masc.

st.cstr. hardly ever bore case vowels. In f.pl., again, the common case vowel for the oblique cases may — even in the ancestress of Hebrew — have been *i*, and this explains perfectly its regular appearance before suffixes.

d As stated, the appearance of the »binding» vowel is the normal rule, but there are exceptions, mainly due to stress conditions and the rhythm of the relevant passage, and in one case they are so numerous that its omission must be regarded as the rule, viz. when a sg. form is combined with the sf. of the 2. pers.pl. (masc.; fem. is not attested), and even that of the 3. pers.pl. seems to presuppose such a stage. This also may be due to accentuation, these two suffixes being the only ones bearing the stress. If the form attached to the 2nd pers.sf. ended with a cluster, this was broken by means of the svarabhakti normally appearing in the separate form.

e Here we place all the exceptions from the above rules, as far as they are not dealt with in §§ 95—96, in the alphabetical order of the roots or, if that cannot be determined with certainty, of the (historical) consonantal elements of the relevant word form.

f *'abdākīmma* < **'abd-a-kīmma*, instead of the regular **'ābed-kīmma*, probably preserved because the cluster *-bd-* is easier to pronounce than *-dk-*.

g *bādāšū* < *(*ba-*)*hūdš-a-hu*, instead of the regular **bédšū*, because of the incompatibility of *-dš-*.

h *'ēlīmātīkīmma* Gn 37: 7 pl. — instead of the regular *-ūt-* — is apparently due to the influence of *lālīmātī* at the end of the passage, with which it stands parallel.

i *'ēmīrtī* < **'amīr-t-ī*, *'ēmīrātak* < **'amīr-at-ak*. Which stem form is the original one? Every one of the three attestations is from poetical passage, hence solemn, song-like recitation; this means that either the first stem has been contracted or the second one prolonged *metri causa*. The first stem, however, appears twice, which makes it slightly more probable as the original one.

k *baršūtīmma* < *(*ba-*)*'arš-ā-t-(h)īmma*, instead of the regular **bārāšūtījīmma*, apparently because of the schematic rhythm of the passages in which it occurs (in some lists of nations); it is one of

the few examples of a foreign (apparently Jewish) sf. form in SP; for the other ones cf. *s*, *t*, *x*, *y*, *ce*, *hh*, *kk*, *nn* below; the Jewish kt and analogy of sg. forms probably furthered its spreading.

l ubābaqrānū < *(wa-ba-)baqar-a-nū: dissimilatory elision of an unstressed vowel.

m 'ūbérjo < *(wa)barīḥ-i / aj-hu: cf. § 67 c.

n ubāšārnu < *(wa-)bašar-a-nū: cf. *l* above.

n dēgālū < *diql-a-hu: *g* and *l* seem to have been incompatible at some time.

o mimmūlēđētak < *(men-)ma-wlīd-t-ak: the svarabhakti between *đ* and *t* is preserved even in this form to make their correct pronunciation easier.

p mūšā'imma < *ma-wša'-i / aj-(h)imma: a case of haplology (from *mūšā'ijj'imma).

q lēbāb^{be}nū < *leb-ab-a-nū: cf. *l* above (but broken again).

r mēlqā'ijje < *ma-lqaḥ-i / aj-ha; occasional contraction from the regular main form.

s lišūnōtimma < *(la-)liš-ūn-ā-t-(h)imma: cf. *k* above.

t nārūtimmæ < *nah(a)r-ā-t-(h)imma: cf. *k* above.

u nibjākimmæ < *nabi'-a-kimma: the »binding» vowel preserved because of the weak 3rd rad.; cf. § 67 c.

w nēbiltu < *nabīl-at-a-hu, a contraction for unknown reasons, but apparently furthered by the syllabic nature of *l*.

x nādābūtimmæ < *nadab-ā-t-(h)imma: cf. *k* above. -tkimmä: elision of an unstressed vowel *metri causa*.

y máttak < *ma-nṭi-ak: probably the influence of *ṭ* supported by the normal form of the sf.; *maṭṭūtimmæ*: cf. *k* above.

z mekkūtak < *ma-nk(V)-ā-t-i-ak: probably taken for a n.act. after Aram. pattern, cf. kt.

aa 'fidju < *pidw-a-hu: dissimilation -wo > -jo/u, cf. *fidjon* < *pidwon < *pidw-ān.

bb šā'ēqāta > *ša'iq-t-a-h(a): an occasional variant after st.cstr., perhaps influenced by the velar *q*, which is sometimes difficult to pronounce.

cc 'ēlšābā'ūtimmæ < *(la-)šaba'-ā-t-(h)imma: cf. *k* above.

dd 'afšādīqātī < *(ba-)šadiq-t-ī: cf. *bb* above.

ee cfqābārī < *(ba-)qubr-ī: probably taken for a pl. form.

ff qādēšak < *qudš-ak: cf. *g* above.

gg qālālātak < *qal-al-t-ak: again a form after the pattern of st.cstr.

hh elmāqūmūtīmma < *(la-)ma-qām-ū-t-(h)īmma: cf. *k* above.

ii tērūmātkīmma < *ta-rūm-ā-t-i-kīmma: the pl. affirm. is dissimilated, cf. § 95 o; cf. *x* above (end).

kk māšēvīntu < *ma-š'an-t-a-hu: *i* is a helping vowel necessitated by the very short pronunciation of *æ*; ubāmāšānūtīmma: cf. *k* above.

ll meškārātī < *ma-škur-t-ī: cf. *gg* above.

mm šāmēnā < *šamn-a-h(a): the svarabhakti become permanent for unknown reasons.

nn 'elmešfūtīmma < *(la-)ma-špaḥ-ā-t-(h)īmma: cf. *k* above.

V. PARTICLES.

§ 101. General remarks.

a As far as the etymology of the particles can be established with some certainty, the particles appearing in our material — as, by the way, in the Semitic languages in general — have been created from the other word classes, particularly of nouns. This may also be an indication that in the prototype of our dialect, the sentences were composed of mainly nominal, partly pronominal or half verbal expressions, perhaps apart from a few particles inherited from the preceding stage of the language, a supposition which may find some support from the fact that the majority of the particles are apparently young, their etymology being still clearly recognizable — sometimes it is even difficult to draw a limit between a particle and the noun from which it has originated —, and that the number of the particles the derivation of which no traces are left is very small.

b We count as particles all the elements of the speech not dealt with in the preceding section(s), and divide them into the following sub-classes: 1) adverbs, including all the particles used in connection

with verbal forms (which are sometimes elliptically omitted), 2) prepositions, used before nouns to modify their meaning, 3) conjunctions, used between sentences and single words to indicate their mutual relations, and 4) interjections, sudden expressions used either quite independently or to call attention to what follows.

A. ADVERBS.

§ 102. S p a c i a l.

a These adverbs could further be divided into local and temporal, but since place and time are no independent entities in relation to each other, the single instances are far from always clearly distinguishable to these categories. Therefore we will deal with them together, calling them *spacial*, in which *space* means the local-temporal continuum in which our universe exists. The attested instances are dealt with in the usual alphabetical order.

b 'á'er < *'aḥVr, a simple local adverb, originally noun meaning »back side», »place behind». From the same root more specific ones: bā'ērinnā < *ba-'aḥur-un-at »afterwards», lā'ērinnā < *la- »at last», ā'ērinnēt < *'aḥur-un-īl »backwards»; even of these, the last seems to be a former substantive, meaning »something lying behind», while the two others are formed from the corresponding adj.(f.) by means of prepositions. An old substantive is even mār < *ma-'ḥar »that which is after», »the next (day)» = »to-morrow», a specific form of it: mīm-mā'ēret < *men-ma-'ḥar-īl »a part of what is after» = »when the next day came».

c 'āz, 'ez »then, at that time»; originally a noun »time», cf. § 104 *e* (the prototype apparently 'az).

d bettēllā < *ba-ha-ta-ḥīl-at »in the beginning»: a noun provided with a prep.

e ālā < *hal'a(h) »away from here»; perhaps a composition of the article, the prep. *l*, and *-a directionis*, ' having originated as a glide between the two last components; but this is a mere surmise (e.g., the lack of gemination of *l* would be exceptional).

f 'âlam, if from *halom (cf. TibH), shows that the adverbs the stem of which ends consonantly, had no final vowels when the nouns had them last (cf. below); the components are unknown, even if the two first consonants remind us of the preceding word; the meaning is stative: »here».

g mimmâjjal < *men-men-'al »there above»; a composition of two prepositions, the latter of which itself has the same structure. A noun from the same root is mâlæ < *ma-'la, in milmâla^h provided with the prepositions *men and l (the gemination secondarily given up) to make the meaning precise.

h 'âmesš < *'amš »yesterday, last night», originally subst. »the preceding evening».

i 'âncæ^h < *hon-a(h) »here, to this place»; the last component is -a *directionis*.

k 'âtta^h < *'an-t-a(h) »now», originally a noun with -a *dir.*: »out of this moment».

l 'îfa < *'i-pa »where»: the interrogative particle 'i and the noun *pa »(this) place» (related to *p-* »mouth?»).

m 'ûd < *'ûd(?) »still», originally n.act. »continuation, presence»; sf. 'ûdînnu with the so-called »energetic» *n* the origin of which is obscure.

n jûmam < *jâm-am »by day», with the afform. -am, which even here has its normal modal sense (cf. § 103 *i*), but because of the meaning of the stem word it belongs even here.

o mêtî < *mat-aj »when?»; even this afform. seems to be modal, cf. § 103 *n*; the stem perhaps related to the pronominal element *ma*, whence the interrogative sense. The prep. 'ad is used to modify the meaning: 'ad mêtî »until when?» = »how long?»

p tâmed < *ta-mîd »always», orig. subst.: »regular continuation».

q minnêged < *men-nîgd »opposite»; a composition of two prepositions.

r mêtâ < *ma-ta, from the root now appearing as *nîV*, but before the addition of the *n*-augment; the influence of *t* prevented the transformation of the preform. vowel into *i* under the rule of polarity, which again may have caused the lack of gemination of the

consonant (though in TibH this resulted, apparently analogically to the other words formed from this root); originally a noun, meaning something declining. In *'almêta*, *mîlmêta*, the sense is again modified by means of prepp.

s sâbeb < **sab-ib*, originally a noun: »that which is around» = »surroundings», as still its fem. form in two passages. In *missâbeb* specified by a prep.

t 'afsâter < **ba-satr*, formed from a noun by means of a prep.

u elfanem < **la-pan-im* »before»; formed as the prec. one; *fânîmæ* < **pan-im-a(h)*, from the same noun by means of *-a directionis*: »inwards».

w fa < **pa* »here», originally perhaps a noun: »(this) place», cf. the Arab. *fa* = Ug. *p* = probably cognate to Ug. *ap* = Hbr *'af*, the meaning of all of which closely resembles that of »and», but is more emphasized: »then», »in these circumstances» (just related or presupposed as known).

x miqqêdem < **men-qidm* »in the Eastern parts»; a noun modified by a prep.

y rā'îšûnā < **ra'š-ân-(a)t* »at first», an adj.f.; in *bâr-*, *kâr-*, *lerrā'îšûnā* provided with various prepositions, but in about the same meaning.

z šêlšom, as it seems, from **šulš-ām*, a sf. perhaps cognate with the local-temporal *-aim* appearing in **šuhr-aim* »noon».

aa šemma < **šamma* »there»; not analyzable.

bb têt < **tuht* »there below», from the identical prep.; in *mittêt* modified by another prep.

cc tâmol < **tumâl?* »yesterday»; unanalyzable; modified in *mittâmol*.

dd When we compare certain consonantly ending forms with their respective TibH ones (*'êlam* / *h^alom*, *tâmed* / *tâmîd*, *sâbeb* / *sâbîb*), we find discrepancies which can best be explained by the supposition that the adverbs tended to lose their final vowels earlier than this happened universally: in *'êlam*, *a* can best be conciliated with TibH *o* and Arab. *u* by the supposition that the final vowel was omitted during the Old Canaanite period, whereupon the original

u became *o* (cf. § 109 *g*), while in the two others the short vowel of the second syllable might have been shortened from the long one presupposed by the TibH forms after the omission of the case vowels. On the other hand, however, the forms cited above *z*, *ce* presuppose the preservation of the final vowel, whatever their second vowel might have been originally. But this apparent discrepancy has its natural explanation: the adverbs having mostly originated from nouns, and the boundary between them and nouns being in numerous cases fluctuating, the final vowel did not disappear at once, and apparently it was preserved for a longer time in the words the stress of which was heaviest and had a long vowel in the last syllable; in the two instances cited that vowel — supposedly — was *a*, which has the greatest vocal sonance, as is well-known.

§ 103. M o d a l

a This section contains all the adverbs not mentioned in the preceding paragraph, and two of those mentioned as well. True, it is customary to separate the negations and affirmations, sometimes even interrogative particles into their own groups, but in fact the two first are nothing but special kinds of modal adverbs, while among the interrogative ones both spacial and modal are included, and since the number of these particles attested in SP is rather small, the omission of this sub-division may be justified.

b 'ā- < **ha-*, the normal interrogative particle always prefixed to its main word.

c ā'ērinnēt: cf. § 102 *b*.

d lētāj < **la-'iṭa-ī?* »at an easy pace»: prep. + subst. + sf.?

e ēk < *'ak, originally perhaps a subst.: »exception», »separation», »privation», cf. the Akk. root 'kV.

f ael < *'al, a negation or rather prohibition: »don't!», even this perhaps originally a noun: »nothingness», cf. Akk.

g āl- < **hal-* (proclitic); another interrogative particle, cf. Arab.; apparently of secondary origin (through misinterpretation).

h 'āmen < *'amen, a solemn formula of confirmation, originally

probably a noun: »true, truth»; in *'āmēnimmæ* provided with the sf. 3. pers.pl.m. (?) to confine the sphere within which the formula is presupposed as valid.

i 'innam < **hīn-am* »for nothing»: here we met with the frequent modal affirmative *-am*, which — as recognized by many scholars during the last decades — might originally have been identical with the accusative case ending; this might mean that at least a number of these words were established as special modal forms at the time the mimation was lost, which is why they were able to retain it, and after some time *-am* was taken as a special affirmative for modal adverbs.

k 'áf < **'ap*; cf. § 102 *w*.

l 'áfū < **'apū*(?), a particle of rather vague character, about as Lat. *tandem*; unanalyzable.

m 'ík < **'i-k* »how?»: the interrogative *'i* plus the deictic *k*, to which cf. below *x*; a longer form is preserved in *'ika*. Even *'in* < **'i-n* »nothingness» is apparently a combination of the same *'i* and an affirmative the origin of which is unknown to me, cf. *mijjā'in*, in which the interrogative sense is still present. Now *'in* regularly appears as a simple negation.

n 'áli < **'āl-aj*? »perhaps»: here we meet with another modal affirmative *-aj*, cf. § 102 *o*; here the stem may be related to *'VI* III, meaning apparently potency or possibility, while the origin of the affirmative is obscure (a var. of the affirmative of nomm.gnt. and ultimately related to genitive case ending?).

o 'elbad < **la-bad*, *'elbádad* »apart», composed of prep. + adj.; the synonymous *milbad* has an additional prep. (**men*) still.

p bêtā < **bīṭh*, »in safety, safely», originally a noun »refuge, safety»; in *'elbêtā* provided with a prep., but the same sense.

q jādū < **jaḥd-aw*, a combination with a third modal affirmative which, however, seems to be nothing but a var. of *-am*; if so, apparently originated in a dialect in which *m* strongly resembled — if not fell together with — *w* at an early period, cf. Akk., and borrowed by Hebrew from that dialect. It appears only in this word even in TibH, which supports the above supposition. Another pos-

sibility is of course that the affirm. is originally a sf., cf. *h* above, but in such a case *kt* is strange, and the *sg.* sf. gives quite as strange an impression.

r meḏdû < **ma-dû* »why?», from the root *jd*₄, but before the addition of the initial augment.

s ješ < **jaš* »existence», apparently a very old word the use of which resembles that of a copula, but also of an affirmative particle; a fem. *jāšat* appears in Gn 23: 8, but apparently secondarily created (cf. MT).

t jūmam: cf. § 102 *n*.

u kâ'êšar < **ka-'ašar* »so»: prep. + relative particle.

w kállā < **kella*(?) »finally» or something like that; the construction is obscure.

x kâ < **ka* »so», apparently related to the prep. *k* and cj.-intj. *kî*. In *kâkâ* reduplicated, but the sense is hardly more intensive.

y ken »so», orig. adj., as it still appears twice; the prototype is the same.

z lā < **la* »not», the usual negation; interr. *'âlû* < **ha-lā*: apparently the vowel was originally long, but in the normal form was probably shortened when unstressed.

aa mē'od »very», probably goes back to **mu'd*, cf. Akk.; after it began to be used mainly as an adverb, it lost its final vowel (cf. § 102 *dd*) and was consequently modified into **mo'od* > **mó'd*, which then dissimilated into the present form; cf. § 61 *d*.

bb máṭ < **ma'ṭ* »little», from the identical noun. A form with prep. *kāmáṭ* »almost» can be taken as a cj. too.

cc mā'er < **mahher* »quickly»; n.act. D.

dd mā, the interrogative and indefinite pronoun, is also used as an adverb; in *kāma* »how many?», *lēma* »what for?», it is modified by prepp.

ee nā < **na*'; an affirmative particle; unanalyzable.

ff ebbām < **ha-pa'm* »this time»: a noun with article.

gg fētām < **pīt'am* »suddenly»: a noun plus the affirm. *-am* (cf. above *i*).

hh qūmāmet < **qām-am-ūt* »upright», apparently from an adj. which itself uses an older adverb as its stem.

ii *árbā* < **ha-rba* »very (much)», apparently an old form of n.act. H.

kk *kārêgā* < **ka-riq*' »suddenly»: prep. + noun.

ll *raq* »only» from an adj. of the identical form.

mm *riqem* < **rīq-am* »empty-handed»: an adj. plus the afform. -*am* (above *i*); in *'ábreq* »in vain» the same adj. with a prep.

nn *šibbūwātá'em* < **šibbū'-at-aim* »sevenfold»: as it seems, a numeral substantive provided with an affirmative which looks like that of *du.*, but is perhaps a mimated variant of the affirmative dealt with in *n* above (but even this is a mere surmise).

B. PREPOSITIONS.

§ 104.

a As far as can be ascertained, prepositions were originally nouns — naturally in st.estr. —, even if it is possible that among the oldest some originating from deictic elements are included. The boundary between them and, on the one side, adverbs, on the other conjunctions, is not always quite clear. The attested examples are:

b *'á'er* »after»: cf. § 102 *b*.

c *bēbor* < **ba-'ubūr*, sf. *bēbūrek* »because of»: a noun with another prep.

d *'al-'édot* < **'al 'udw-t* »on account of»: as the prec. one.

e *mījjaz* < **men-'az* »since»: as the prec. ones (literally: »since the time of»).

f *'el* < **'il*, orig. **'ilj* or **'ilaj*, cf. sf. *'ilíkima*; »towards, to»; unanalyzable, but probably related to *l* (see below *x*).

g *'al*, from identical prototype, var. *'ālī* < **'alj* or **'alaj*; »above», »about», »against», etc.; unanalyzable; in *mījel*, *mījjal* specified (in the original local sense) by another prep.

h *'em* < **'im*, sf. *'immi* »with», perhaps originally a var. of *'am* »kin, kinship». The same root appears in *lēmet* < **la-'um-t*; the present form derives from **la'ómt* during the second heavy stress period (cf. § 109 *nn*); probably the word lost its stress before the end of the period, which is why the *m* was not geminated anew in connection with the creation of the svarabhakti.

i 'immâdî < *'imd-î sf., with a secondary gemination of the 2nd rad. (cf. vol. II *sub voce*); used in the place of the prec. one.

k jâ'n < *jâ-'n (< *-'nV) »because of»; the original sense perhaps »reaction».

l 'êšēl < *'išl, sf. 'išlî »beside, with»; originally »side».

m 'it, the so-called nota objecti, is wholly comparable with other prepositions. The form in closed syllable seems to have preserved its original form, but where the syllable is opened by a sf. beginning with, or preceded by a vowel, the form seems to derive from *'ât, e.g. 'ûtî. Since it is, however, in any case very exceptional that one and the same word would derive from two so different prototypes, attempts to combine them have generally been made, and here we will present one more. We start from the supposition that the primary form was *jât still preserved in Aramaic; when provided with a sf.-sequel beginning with a vowel, the vowel, being in an open syllable and sufficiently stressed preserved its length, but in a closed syllable and unstressed position, i.e., without suffix or provided with one beginning with a cons. and bearing the stress, its vowel was shortened and finally disappeared altogether, whereupon *j* was transformed into *i* and obtained a secondary ' in the beginning. The long form, on the other hand, simply lost its initial consonant at an early period, cf. the same phenomenon in Akkadian (universally), or was replaced by ' ; this can best be conceived of as having taken place at a time when the vowel still was *a*: the change *jâ- > *'â- is then comparable to the cases in which *j* has demonstrably given way to ' after an *a* as a glide, being accordingly a case of retrograde assimilation; but parallels are lacking, as far as I know.

n 'it, sf. 'ittî, comes from 'it; the meaning is »beside, with», which has led to attempts to derive the word ultimately from a fem. form of *jad »hand»: *jad-t or *id-t; this seems possible (cf. *m* above), but for lack of such a fem. form hardly demonstrable. In the var. 'ēlmmæ < *'it-(h)imma, a recent quantitative metathesis might have taken place.

o 'ad »to, until», from *ad; the general idea of the root ('₄Vd) seems to be »presence».

p *ef-*, *eb-*, *b-*, *bā-* etc. (cf. vol. II, sub *b*): the basic form is apparently **ba*, the primary meaning »in»; the first two forms, which appear regularly before firm consonants, have originated from the prototype through a stage of vowellessness and syllabicity; the consonant was obviously spirantical at that time, as it still is in the first form. It is also used to form combined prepositions from nouns, cf. above *e* and below.

q *bēd*, as it seems from **bu'd* (or **bi'd*) »through», originally perhaps »passage».

r *'elbad*, *milbad*: cf. § 103 *o*; in sf. *millēbēddū*, the gemination of *l* is still preserved, apparently since it remained stressed throughout the heavy stress periods.

s *bābālī* < **ba-balj* (*a* preserved as the stem vowel probably since *l* was »thick») »without»; the original meaning of **balj* may have been »wearing out», whence »absence», »non-existence»; in *mibbālī* it is combined with another prep., the sense being the same. In *biltī* < **bil-tī*, the stem appears without the final vowel, the sequel being probably identical with the old element appearing in various Semitic languages mainly in pronouns and adjectives as a characteristic of fem., since it does not seem to influence the meaning in any way. In *ēlbiltī* a prep. is prefixed to it, in *biltī em*, a cj. follows. In *bālēdj-* (proclitic), var. *bālēdī* < **bal-'adj*, the first component is equally biradical, while the other one seems to be related to **'ad* (cf. *o* above); in *mibbālēddī*, it has even obtained a prefixed prep., which does not influence the meaning either.

t *dī*, *dī-* (c.encl.), from *dī* »enough for», originally a noun »what is enough», sf. *dimmæ* contracted (from **dī-(h)imma*); in *kādī* slightly modified by a prep.

u *zūlātī* < **zūla-tī* »except», originally »going out»; cf. *biltī* (above *s*), but here the long stem vowel has caused the appearance of the svarabhakti(?) before the affirmative.

w *k-*, *kā-*, apparently from **ka* »as», and related to the formally identical adverb (§ 103 *x*) »so, thus»; when provided with a sf., it normally takes the indefinite **ma* as a sequel: *kāmūnī* < **ka-mā-nī*: being stressed, its vowel is permanently long. This longer form

appears sometimes even independently: *kámû*; it may be a »backwards» formation from the sf. forms and therefore follows its vocalization.

x l-, lǎ-, etc., from *la*, which may be related to **il* (cf. *f* above); the primary meaning may be »to»; its treatment in various positions is like that of *b-* (cf. *p* above). Frequently used to form compound prepp.

y men < **men* »from», »out of»; originally noun »part», and then the stem vowel naturally *i* (for the change cf. § 102 *dd*), which explains the secondary gemination of the 2nd rad. (cf. vol. II *sub voce*) in most sf. forms, which also appears in Aramaic, while the supposition of reduplication has no support elsewhere; hence this should be a young phenomenon, and since, on the other hand, reduplication always seems to imply some kind of plurality or at least continuity, this can hardly be considered even in principle to have taken place in a word meaning »part»; moreover, *mimmak* cannot have originated from **min-min-k(a)* — the supposition of a reduplicated stem **min-man* is so plainly anomalous that it might be unnecessary to consider it seriously —, even if it could of course be a late analogical formation after the normal form of the sf., as *mimmānū* is from *mimmīnnu*. In some cases — e.g. *'émkinnêret* < **men-kinnir-t* Dt 3: 17 — the gemination of the 1st rad. of the main word has been given up and *m* become syllabic during the second heavy stress period (§ 109 *kk*). Often used to form compounds.

z mol < **mūl* »in front of»; originally »front»; *mimmol* with **men* has the same sense.

aa nêged < **nigd* »opposite of», »corresponding to»; originally »counterpart»; provided with prepp. in about the same sense: sf. *elnigdī*, *kānigdū*; in *minnêged sābeb l-* accurately specified.

bb nêkā probably from **nukh* »opposite to», »towards», originally »opposition» (in friendly sense); in *elnêkā* slightly specified.

cc sābeb l- < **sab-ib la*: adv. + prep.; in *missābeb l-* with another prep., but in the same meaning: »around», as also mere f.pl.(sf.) *sābībūtījā* < **sab-ib-ā-t-i-ha*.

dd ɛlfānī < **la-pan-i / aj* »before», literally »towards the face

of»; the same noun provided with other different prepositions gives various meanings: *melfânî*, *miffânî* »from the presence of«, *kāmiffânî* »as by«, *'al fânî* »upon«, *mîjjal fânî* »from the surface of«.

ee efqêreb < **ba-qîrb* »in the midst of«, »in«; *mîqqêreb* accordingly: »from the midst of«.

ff tât < **taht* »instead of«; from the same root: *têt* < **tuht* »under«, in *mîttêt*, *mîttêt l-* slightly specified by prepp. In TibH, the latter has apparently fallen together with the former.

gg 'el-tok < **'il tāk* »into the midst of«; *éftok* < **ba-tāk* »in the midst of«, *mîttok* < **men-tāk* »from the midst of«: prep. + noun each one.

C. CONJUNCTIONS.

§ 105.

a It has become customary to deal with composite conjunctions apart from the simpler ones, but since the former have grown from simpler elements, it seems to me more natural to group them around some key word. The attested instances follow:

b bêbor »because»: cf. § 104 *c*.

c 'û, *û* > **'aw* »or«; originally perhaps an imp.: »choose!«

d mîjjaz »since»: cf. § 104 *e*.

e 'æm < **'em* »if«; unanalyzable.

f en < **hen* »if«; originally an intj., cf. § 106.

g jâen »since»: cf. § 104 *k*. It forms compounds: *jâen 'êšar* with the rel.part., *jâen-kî* with another cj., in about the original sense; in *jâen æbjâen* curiously reduplicated, which might contain reference to the long duration of the action spoken of, while the sense remains essentially the same. Another noun, basically probably with an identical sense, of the same root is contained in *'elmân* < **la-ma-'n* »in order that«, in *'elmân êšar* pleonastically supplemented by the rel.part.

h 'êeb < **'iqb* »for the purpose that«, originally »purpose«; in *'êqeb 'êšar* the pleonastic rel.part. appears again.

i 'êšar, the rel.part.: see § 7.

k 'ad »until»: cf. § 104 *o*.

l *bēšar* »therefore that», »because»: prep. **ba* + rel.part.

m *ēlbilti* »lest»: cf. § 104 *s*.

n *gæm* < **gam* »and, even»; unanalyzable.

o *w-*, *u-*, etc. < **wa-* »and»; its preservation in the beginning of words without the transformation of *w* into *j* suggests, however, that the form was longer in earlier times (perhaps **uwa* or something like that).

p *têrem* < **terem?* (< **tirm*, cf. § 102 *dd*) »when not yet»; in '*aftêrem* with pleonastic prep. **ba*; originally noun »beginning».

q *kā'ēšar* »as»: cf. § 103 *u*.

r *kī*, in its primary form, »that»; originally an intj., cf. § 106 *g*. In *kī-ēm* »apart from» combined with another cj. (*e* above).

s '*āl-ken* < **al ken* »therefore» is one of the many compounds formed by means of the adv. *ken* (§ 103 *y*); examples of the others: *ēlken* »therefore», *kā-... ken* »as ... so», *ken... kāmē'u* »so ... as». *kākal'ēšar... uken* »according to all ... so».

t *lēbī* < **lawj*, var. *lū-* < **law-* »would that», »if»; originally a noun: »inclination, wish?» (cf. Arab.). In *lū lū* with negation: »would that ... not», »if not».

u *fén* < **pen* »lest»; originally »turn»(?).

w *tāt'ēšar* < **taht'āšar* »therefore that»: prep. + rel.part.; in the synonymous *lāt-kī* the same prep. with another (cf. *r* above).

D. INTERJECTIONS.

§ 106.

a Whatever the age of the interjections may be, they are in any case emotional expressions, which is why their meaning is rather vague. True, it is possible to divide them into two groups, one of which could be called interjections in the narrower sense or purely emotional, and another, called deictic particles, in which some tendency can be recognized. But since the boundary between them is not clear — the same expression being sometimes used in both

ways — and their number in SP small, we will deal with them all in one group.

b 'āwwi, 'ū'j < 'awj? is an expression of pain and sorrow.

c 'ālīlā < *hālīla is an expression of disgust.

d ālā < *hal'a(h) is a dismissal; cf. § 102 *e*.

e ĕn < *hen normally calls attention to what follows: »lo, behold!«, but can be used as an expression of astonishment in general; 'inna < *hinna is its stronger form.

f 'ābal < *'a-bal, var. ābel »no doubt« is on the point of becoming an (affirmative) adverb, but in Gn 42: 21 it has clearly the character of an expression of sorrow.

g kī, normally a conjunction (§ 105 *r*), has sometimes preserved its deictic character: »behold!«

h 'āken, probably even that from the adverb ken (§ 103 *y*), is an expression of astonishment: »Is it indeed so that . . .?!«

i nā < *na' is an expression of supplication; intensified by means of the initial 'a-augment it expresses lamentation and urgent need: 'ānā.

§ 107. O b s c u r e w o r d s.

a These words, of which even the word class is not known, appear to be either intentional alterations or corruptions. They are five in number; we place them here for the sake of general view; for details see vol. II *sub vocibus*.

b ādšem < *'adšim?! corrupted.

c ēšdat < *'eš dat; dogmatic alteration; the original word unknown.

d leṭṭā'or < *la-ha-ṭahū'ār? corrupted.

e 'errēbā < *ha-rVwh-at?? corrupted.

f weṭšāncē'inā < *wa-la-šan'-in-at?? corrupted.

Part three

Synopsis

§ 108. General remarks.

a We have thus far studied the single phenomena of the phonology and morphology of the Samaritan Hebrew dialect from the diachronical aspect, but only occasionally endeavoured to trace them back to more general developments governed by the so-called sound laws which we will rather call *phonetic rules*, since the term »law» is apt to create the impression that it is a question of something not allowing any exceptions; and astonishingly enough, this has been maintained very frequently in spite of the fact that even the same persons have been very well aware that there is at least one powerful factor which — as it seems — has often invalidated such »laws» almost entirely, so that their one-time existence can be discovered only from occasional traces; viz., the so-called »false analogy» or, simply, analogy. The latter term, now generally established in use, has given support to the way of thinking mentioned in so far as it seems to imply that the factor so called is diametrically opposed to those »laws», so that they can be conceived of as two distinct »systems» continually at war against one another, and not as two sides of one and the same development deriving from parallel sources and very frequently and largely intertwining, which they in fact are. For, to take only one concrete example, contrary to what is generally believed, analogy is the source of power by which those very »laws» are established in use. For where we have an opportunity to follow the development of a language in detail during some critical period, during which the »laws» normally originate, we find

many competing and often contradictory tendencies in the midst of the changing phonetic structure trying to establish themselves; finally, a few of them are able to conciliate themselves with each other and gain the upper hand, while the others are little by little discarded. The form established is then spread to a larger area, until it either conquers the whole field, or reaches a limit by which it — for some reason or other — is stopped, or meets with a stronger factor by which its effects are wholly or partly abolished. The spread of the change takes place naturally through people speaking that language; they take it up at least half unconsciously, but the determining factor does not lie in their physical organs of speech, but in the example of men already having accepted it, which is only another way of saying that the spread takes place by way of analogy. True, it is not the analogy that primarily determines which of the competing tendencies gains the upper hand, but it is no exclusively phonetic factor either; actually it seems that there are many factors the influence of which is far from established as yet. One of them, in my opinion the most powerful one, is normally called linguistic economy or the principle of greater ease or something of that kind; for myself, I propose to call it the principle of greatest appropriateness, for even if this in most cases falls together with the greatest ease, the latter term has the secondary meaning of avoiding physical effort, which makes it misleading here, since sometimes greater physical effort in a proper place yields greater ease or appropriateness with regard to the whole. This reservation must be borne in mind particularly when dealing with the effects of changes of stress, as we shall see in the next paragraph; in the development of sounds the trend is much more clearly toward greater ease even in the sense of avoiding physical effort, while in morphology, mental ease is striven for. And here we find the true distinction between phonetic rules and analogy: the former are mainly expressions of a tendency toward better physical expediency, while the latter mainly strives for better mental expediency, which is why its achievements appear mainly in morphology. As stated, both of them are governed by the rule of greatest appropriateness; another great rule, which partly

covers that one, is the psychic counterpart of the law of inertia in the world of physics, which we propose to call the rule of conservatism, which limits the former, e.g., in the way that of two possibilities of about the same degree of expediency, the older one is chosen, since people are accustomed to that; but both of these rules, let it be expressly stated, must be conceived of as general tendencies which are often modified in details by occasional circumstances.

b A language — at least when observed from the diachronic point of view, as here — not being a system, but a historical process, its developments and the rules governing the latter are best discovered when the course of the process is followed. Therefore we will first try to survey the development of the dialect, beginning as early as is possible on the basis of the material dealt with above; as in the preceding parts, the material of related dialects and languages is mainly taken into account only in a negative sense, i.e. so that conclusions which it seems to make impossible are avoided, but it is not used to bridge gaps in, or to supplement the material drawn from Samaritan Hebrew, apart from where this occurs to prevent a possible misinterpretation and in a few cases for incidental reasons. Thereafter a systematic arrangement of the most important phonetic rules against their background is attempted, and at the end, a general conclusion follows.

§ 109. P H O N E T I C D E V E L O P M E N T S A N D T H E I R E F F E C T S I N T H E H I S T O R Y O F S A M A R I T A N H E B R E W.

a As stated above, we begin with the earliest traceable phenomenon which can be made use of to constitute a phonetic rule; at what time that appeared, we cannot state. From the pre-history of our dialect we know only a small number of such phenomena, which without doubt is due to many other factors, unknown to us, that have been determining the course of development. Upon the threshold of the relatively independent development of our dialect, during the period that we call the first heavy stress period, their number was considerably increased, and in the second half of the last pre-

Christian millennium, it seems, we can already follow practically all of the most important phonetic developments.

b References to passages in the phonological and morphological parts of this grammar are omitted except where the phenomenon referred to is dealt with elsewhere than in the most naturally expected connection which is to be found by means of the table of contents.

c The earliest traceable phonetic development¹ in the pre-history of our dialect seems to be the development $k > h$ before a consonant, which appears only in the personal pronoun of the 1st pl. As stated there, the development might have led via $*k = h$, in which case both stages can be paralleled from the later history of the Semitic languages, even if not both in one and the same position.

d Of the possible role of the stress in the preceding instance we cannot say anything, but in all the other developments its position seems to be relevant. Probably the earliest among these is the transposition of the vowel of the first radical to the second in monosyllabic stems to which a stressed particle or pronominal element is prefixed; this appears at least in the normal type of preformal Q, the entire H, and the normal types of noun formed by means of preformatives, at least *ma-* and *ta-*. The preformative vowel, since stressed, was probably long in the beginning of the process, which accordingly was approximately as follows: $*má-qàtl(v) > *má-qtal > *máqtal$: in the course of the process, the stem word lost its stress altogether, and the vowel of the preformative, having come into a closed syllable, was shortened.

e On the other hand, the elision of short vowels — if so, apparently to be assumed to have taken place in syllables immediately following the main stress — generally held to have occurred in Proto-Semitic, seems very questionable to the present writer, and in any case not demonstrable from the Samaritan Hebrew material. There

¹ The possible development $k > t$ in the 2nd. pers. of the personal pronoun must be left out of account because of its peculiar nature and uncertainty.

are certain phenomena that can be explained in that way, e.g., the assimilation of *n* in N prf., but even other factors can have had that effect, e.g. the stem of N prf. can have been **hin-qatal*, as in imp., and not **na-qatal*, or the loss of the vowel can have occurred in connection with the syllabization of *n*, cf. below *q-s*. Furthermore, there are phenomena bearing direct witness against such an assumption, first of all the Q prf. with bisyllabic stem and similar nouns formed by means of preformatives, but also N af. (the normal type), apart from scattered instances in other word forms; to some extent they could be explained through the incompatibility of certain consonants, but never all of them, as is evident even from the fact that the same consonants often appear attached to each other, not to speak of the cases in which the two types of Q prf. are attested side by side in one and the same root. The relatively small number of bisyllabic stems in Q prf. and the nouns formed by means of preformatives is apparently due to the influence of the normal type — which from the very first may have been in the majority —; for the explanation of the type of N af. which has lost the vowel of the 1st rad. see *t* below. On the other hand, when n.act. obtained a definitely verbal character, it lost its final vowel and developed a svarabhakti which acquired the colour of its »mother», the primary stem vowel, as apparently the normal imp. form too; see § 11 *b-c*. Accordingly, the stress was not of the lightest kind, and it seems that even the shortest nouns were deprived of their stress and final vowels, which modified their stem vowels (cf. § 74).

f As stated (*d* above), normally the stem word lost its stress when a stressed particle or pronominal element was prefixed to it; but in the cases where the former contained a long vowel, the development was reversed, apparently because of the greater sonority of the long vowel supported by the stronger stress which the stem word normally must have had by nature, it being longer than the preformative element in spite of the long (originally probably anceps) vowel of the latter. In the forms in which the final vowel was dropped (i.e., in the voluntative preformal of Q in the first place), the long vowel apparently was shortened and lost the stress, but elsewhere

it remained, while the preformative vowel during some period of stronger stress apparently was reduced to emerge afterwards assimilated to the long vowel. This did not affect forms with preformatives only, but all the types in which a short vowel appeared followed by a long one in the second syllable; so the old nominal type **qatūl* was made **qutūl*, **qattīl* > **qittīl*, etc., as well as **ta-qūl* > **tuqūl*, the normal preformal of the hollow roots **ja-qūm^V* > **juqūm^V*, and so forth. A characteristic of this period, accordingly, seems to have been that a secondary vowel obtained the colour of its «mother»; so it seems that the secondary type **qutūl* during this period originated from **qutl*, perhaps even some instances of **qatal* (and n.ag. of this type?) from **qatl*.

g At the time of the creation of Q n.ag. and af., the stress seems to have been about as heavy as at the time the pronunciation of both SP and MT in the synagogal recitation was established, i.e., the verbal forms — apart from those having affirmatives ending in a vowel — normally appeared without final vowels; thereby their *e* and *o* — instead of *i* and *u* in respective nominal types — are best accounted for, and for the same reason the formation of D, which was apparently little by little differentiated from Q (see § 10 s), and of N belong to the same period, while that of H and of Q ps presuppose a stage in which the stress had grown still lighter so that even the verbal forms — as well as probably nouns in st.estr., to which the verbal forms in general are comparable — were provided with final vowels as in the classical Arabic language, since *i* was preserved in their stem final syllables.

h To judge from the fact that Q prf. is attested at least in its normal type in all of the Semitic languages, and in the majority of them in both mono- and bisyllabic stem forms, while the languages in which only the normal form is found are represented only by such recent texts that the more rare bisyllabic type can well have been eliminated through the influence of the normal type and / or absorbed by other stems closely resembling it (D, the 3rd stem of Arab.), it seems that this conjugation was well established during the Proto-Semitic period, when the tribes speaking its dialects were

still in close contact with one another. The Q afformal, again, seems to have been created just before the final dispersion of the tribes or during that dispersion — indeed the slightly different construction and much more limited use of the Akkadian permansive or stative can best be understood by the supposition that its development was just at its beginnings, when the group using that dialect separated from the main body —, while the secondary stems seem to derive from the period of West Semitic unity. True, D and N appear in Akk. largely resembling the West Semitic forms, but at the same time their forms are so perfectly in analogy with the construction of the other verbal stems in Akkadian that the supposition of a common stem with the other Semitic languages is quite enough to explain the resemblances. Even for the formation of a causative stem an idea at least seems to have existed during the Proto-Semitic period, but before that idea was fully established in practice, even the common West Semitic period was apparently ending, so that its formation follows the original idea in each language, the stem preformative varyig according to the consonantism of the 3rd pers. of the personal pronoun; for had the stem been established before the dispersion, the original idea had probably begun to fall into oblivion and mutual influence from one dialect to the other at least to some extent confused the borders, as in fact later on in some individual instances seems to have happened (e.g., even our instance of Št, which may have been borrowed as a religious term).

i The light stress period might have continued for rather a long time — perhaps during the relatively tranquil sojourn in the steppes around the Arabian desert —, and during that period apparently Q ps was formed, and probably the «inner» passive forms of secondary stems subsequently after its pattern. This might have given new importance to the role of the vocalization as a modifier of the basic meaning expressed by the radical consonants, and revived a tendency which even earlier — to judge from some phenomena in Akkadian — might have existed in Semitic, viz. a tendency to vocalic dissimilation, when two *a* vowels appeared in two subsequent syllables of one and the same word. The *u* vowel having now become a charact-

eristic of the passive, the tendency mentioned assumed a definite form of contrast between *i* and *a* vowels, and following earlier usage we call in the tendency to polarity. This name is well suited to the phenomenon, since these two vowels in fact are two extreme poles of the vowel system in so far as *a* has most, *i* least sonority of all the (full) vowels. This fact might also have influenced the development: two *a* vowels in one word raised its sonority above the average, while the reduction of one of them to *i* reduced this to the average. The appearance of this tendency is at the same time an indication of an approaching heavy stress period, since under a light stress the differences in the sonority of different words can hardly be felt as inconvenient, while heavy stress normally also means increased rapidity of speech and thus reduced sonority of its single parts, which makes the differences in the latter all the more remarkable and disturbing. The fact that it seems mostly to be the first, stressed vowel that has been turned into *i* may have been caused by avoiding confusion with the old forms already having the vocalization *a-i*; where such a confusion was not imminent (as in H), *a-i* normally resulted.

k As stated, a heavy stress period was approaching. At the same time the West Semitic unity — if there ever was such a thing — was finally being broken into pieces, since the tendency to polarity does not appear in the verbal system of Arabic in the same form as in Hebrew. This marks the beginning of the period we term the Old Canaanite, the period from which we have the first written documents that can be directly used for the construction of the history of our dialect, viz., the Canaanite glosses in the Amarna letters; the period seems to have ended a couple of centuries after the Amarna age, the heavy stress period having just reached its highest stage.

l As stated, the tendency to polarity began to have effects just on the threshold of the Old Canaanite period. It might have given a start to another development of a similar nature, viz., the gemination of single consonants following a stressed *i*. As stated above at *i*, *i* is the vowel having least sonority, while the stress by nature tends to be placed on the syllable the sonority of which is greatest; if that

for some reason is impossible, as here it might have been because of the analogy of cognate forms, the loss of sonority must be compensated somehow. And when — as always when a heavy stress period is approaching — the expiratory accent is growing heavier, the gemination of the following consonant is much more natural than the lengthening of the stressed vowel itself, since the former makes stronger ictus more easily possible. During this period, however, the phenomenon seems to have been confined to forms with two permanently short vowels, i.e., in the main to the Q preformal of the roots having an initial augment, or from the continuable roots, and to the nouns formed by means of preformatives from the latter roots; whether the N of these roots followed suit, is uncertain, since no N of these roots belonging to I *f* is preserved (cf. below II).

m To this development even another tendency may have contributed, viz. that to a universal triradicality or at least to forms resembling it. This had already begun during the Proto-Semitic period; we do not deal with it in greater detail in this book, since this is hardly possible on the basis of SamH material, but we confine ourselves to the most obvious features. Such are, above all, the addition of certain augments before earlier biradical roots, which has apparently taken place in general after the formation of the actional group of Q, since this fairly regularly still seems to presuppose a biradical stem; there are also certain nouns etc. formed from similar root forms (cf. the roots *jd'*₄, *jr'*, *ns'*, etc.). The creation of such roots seems to have continued down to the Old Canaanite period; the augments were originally *w* and *n* (if originally a certain meaning was attached to them, this cannot be discovered from the SamH material), but in the beginning of the Old Canaanite period, when connections with the tribes speaking Aramaic dialects were still close, a universal shift of word initial *w* to *j* took place, and therewith the former augment took the shape of *j* also, so that the roots and new forms formed afterwards used this sound as the augment (e.g., the root *j!b*, which is obviously connected with *!Vb* while the root *jrš* shows forms both before (*mūrāšā*) and after (*tīrāš*) that development). Of the reasons for the development nothing

certain can be stated, but here is a surmise: in Proto-Semitic some beginnings of this development already seem to have taken place (cf. Eth.-Arab. *jbs*, Akk. *enēqu*, etc.), but the results apparently remained dialectal. The start, however, was made, and in the North-Western Semitic group the development seems to have continued little by little, perhaps to distinguish the augment from the usual conjunction *wa-*; even if the latter might not yet have had this monosyllabic form, it probably resembled it rather a lot. With the heavy stress period coming, the conjunction probably tended to be shortened, which made it resemble the augment still more, and the old pattern gained new impetus, probably yielding the present picture in a short time. Assuming *j* to have been a real spirant — as it is normally in SamH at present —, the new radical also corresponded better to the general tendency ruling the language at that time, firmer consonants being better in accordance with the stronger accent; the same effect would have followed from the transformation of *w* into the spirant *v* (which apparently took place at a later period, see *i* below), but that sound apparently did not belong to the phonemic inventory of the Semitic languages at that time, a fact which together with the earlier developments made it easier to choose *j*.

n Beside the use of augments, other means were available for lengthening biradical stems; these were the lengthening of the stem vowel, by means of which the hollow roots were created, and the repetition of a part or of the whole of the earlier stem, sometimes even infixation of a further radical, the last process apparently of dissimilatory character; but this latter method apparently never obtained wide distribution in Hebrew, while the partial or total repetition of the stem broke the limit of triradicality as well, but even that not in many instances. The use of both outward augments and inner modifications to lengthen the biradical stems led in many cases to the creation of two parallel secondary roots, e.g., *jtb* / *tVb*, *jrq* I/*rq* II, *nsk* / *sVk*, etc.

o A reduction of the sonority of single words also meant the development of every stressed long *a* into *o*, which seems to have

taken place in the latter half of this period, to judge from the fact that it is not participated by Aram., Amor. and Ug. In other words, it is confined to Canaanite proper. And since a long vowel by nature tended to attract the stress, this might mean that every long *a* turned into *o*; at least I do not know any instance where this with certainty was not the case. The assumption that the classical Arabic form of the type here termed **qattal* would be the original one (i.e., that it in reality would have been **qattāl*) is very vaguely argued; firstly, it should be clear to anybody that any vowel always prevails over any consonant in sonority; hence a short vowel followed by a geminate is always far from equal in sonority to a long vowel of the same quality (followed by one consonant); secondly, both the gemination of the middle radical and the lengthening of a stem vowel are means of intensification, so that a type which includes both of these means thus indicates something quite extraordinary (cf. § 70 *a* and the preceding and following few paragraphs), a meaning that by no means can be discovered in the majority of the representatives of this type; while on the other hand in later times such means of intensification were not infrequently used pleonastically (cf., e.g., *oo* below) when their original force was diminished.

p Such a diminution of force already affected one of these means, the lengthening of a stem vowel, during the Old Canaanite period. Among nomm.ag. Q, there were old instances of lengthened first stem vowel, since they — due to the meaning of the respective roots — apparently had a professional or otherwise intensified sense. Actually, it is quite possible that the others began to follow their example before this period (cf. Akk. and Arab., where this type has broken through altogether), but in the predecessor of our dialect this process cannot have begun a long time before the heavy stress period, so that the majority of cases would have met this period with the first stem vowel already lengthened; for every indication points to the assumption that a word with bisyllabic stem and a long vowel in one of the syllables did not lose its stress during the whole heavy stress period, and in this case we should assume that this already happened before the long *a* began to develop into *o* (and even this

with the additional assumption that this development was confined to stressed syllables). Viewed from the present conditions it seems that the secondary lengthening of the first stem syllables of nomm.ag. cannot have advanced much at the time the stress had grown heavy enough to drop the final vowels of st.cstr. and deprive words in this position of their independent stress; thereafter it was no longer possible to lengthen the vowel. On the other hand, in the independent forms the process continued, and with the general transformation of long *a*'s into *o*'s, the vocalization of n.ag. became twofold even in quality. After the heavy stress period was over, the borders of the two types became confused, and the form preserved in st.cstr. took over even the independent sg. form without article, while the other forms were occupied by the longer form, from which, e.g., the modern contrast *šákeb* / *eššákeb* comes; but there are still many exceptions.

q The dropping of final vowels in st.cstr. was soon accompanied by the same in the verbal system — we find this in the Amarna letters almost completed — and in noun st.abs. At the time the latter took place, probably most of the unstressed vowels were greatly reduced (cf. the state of affairs in present-day normal spoken English); a natural consequence of this was that numerous consonants — as far as they were capable of it — were made syllabic; there are indications that all the sonants, semi-vowels, sibilants, and gutturals were capable of this, even if there are not conclusive proofs for every single consonant; cf. §§ 24 *f*, 85, 97 *f*, and below.

r In this process, the gutturals seem to have been permanently weakened. First of all, ' , when coming into a doubly closed syllable before another consonant, or into a comparable position, was abolished, and the preceding vowel lengthened; only so can the contrast *rē'oš* / *rāšem* (see § 60 *c*) be explained. The development already seems to have taken place in st.cstr., since the *o* vowel is presupposed by the Amarna form, even if it is not ruled out that even st.abs. by that time had already lost the case vowels (the vocalization of a sf. form *rúšunu* only shows that the colour of the »binding» vowel was not yet fixed); if the first alternative is correct, the development of long *a* into *o* was possibly not depending on the ac-

centuation (cf. above *o*). The verbal forms (see § 20) sharing this development perhaps lost their stem vowel altogether, their last radical also being capable of syllabization; strictly formally this would mean that the second radical nevertheless belonged only to the second syllable, but actually a syllabic consonant is never wholly comparable to a genuine vowel, and therefore the 2nd rad. was probably felt as belonging to the first syllable too, and therefore ' disappeared before it. As to the other gutturals, cf. below *x*.

s The fate of the nasal *n* led still further: if it was preceded by a stressed vowel, it was assimilated to the following consonant, unless this was a guttural (an indication of the vocalic nature of the gutturals, cf. *x* below), or where (as normally in af. as the 3rd rad.) some analogy effected its preservation. The same tendency has appeared in Semitic again and again, but rarely so consistently carried out as here.

t The heavy stress effected the reduction of the vowel(s) of the preceding syllable(s) too. This, combined with the results of the tendency to polarity, yielded far-reaching changes in the verbal system. In N, where the primary stem apparently had preserved the main stress (cf. § 15 *b*), the stem preformative probably lost its vowel, which in af. and n.ag. / pat. later emerged again as *i*, in contrast to the *a* vowel of the first syllable of the primary stem, in accordance with the rule of polarity. If the first radical was capable of syllabization, the development went still further: even the vowel of the 1st rad. was elided, the rad. itself becoming syllabic. This development is understandable only if the whole word had lost its stress, and indeed it seems that it started from n.ag. / pat. (see § 21 *d*), which in st.cstr., particularly after the loss of the stem preform. vowel, being practically bisyllabic, without doubt normally was unstressed; toward the critical point of the heavy stress period this formation naturally grew more and more favoured (in TibH it conquered practically the whole field), so that even a few roots the 1st rad. of which was not capable of syllabization began to follow its analogy (as far as they were not inherited from a similar period earlier still? cf. Akk.), but after that was over, a reaction set in,

resulting in the present, somewhat confused conditions. In prf., the stem preform. cons. was naturally assimilated to the 1st rad. after the loss of its vowel, secondary gemination of the rad. being the result. In H, on the other hand, the stem preformative bore the main stress even in prf., as well as n.ag. (and pat.). The vowels of the preformatives of prf. and n.ag., accordingly, were elided, and the consonant of the stem preformative followed suit. When disappearing, perhaps it infected the preceding consonant, where this was possible (i.e., in the 2nd pers.prf.); if that was so, this might have been the beginning of the aspiration of the voiceless stops.

u During this period, even the pronominal elements acquired their final form. From where the final *-ū* of the 1st pl. of pers.pron. stems, is not quite clear; if it was phonetically developed from — apparently — the earlier *a*, it is exceptional, considering the TibH form (even if long *u* and *o* interchange now and then in TibH), while the pluralic *-ū* seems to have been useful in Canaanitic only in the verbal flexion. Perhaps both of these factors co-operated so that — presupposed that *a* was permanently long, and not anceps — the *o* resulting from the phonetic development was modified into *u* through the influence of the pluralic characteristic, this modification first taking place in the verbal affirmative. In the 2nd and 3rd pers.pl., the indefinite *-ma* (in fem. modified into *-na* by the preceding *i* vowel) was earlier established as a part of all the forms; then its vocalization was made uniform by means of substituting the fem. *i* in the masc. forms too, perhaps again because of the minor sonority of *i*, which also effected the secondary gemination of the following *m*, since this is physiologically foreign to *i*, so that its pronunciation here was more difficult than that of the fem. *n*, which for this reason remained ungeminated; cf. the reversely parallel development presupposed by Arab. The stronger effort required for the pronunciation of the geminate apparently also prolonged the final vowel of the masc. form enough to preserve it over the heavy stress periods up to the present time. In the separate forms, the *n* of the prefixed element assimilated to an immediately following consonant. In the types of preformal in which the preformative vowel had

preserved the stress standing in an open syllable — i.e., at least when the stem was bisyllabic and contained no long vowel nor geminate —, this vowel naturally developed into *o*, which through the influence of the passive forms of Q and H perhaps already emerged from this first heavy stress period as *u*, the stress having shifted to the stem (cf. below *z*); the other preformals with more-than-one-syllabic stems followed suit, first perhaps their passive voices attracted by the semantic analogy of Q ps and H ps, then the active voices through the formal analogy of the passive ones. At some stage of the development, however, a number of the instances with bisyllabic stems containing no long vowel nor geminate, turned to follow the formal analogy of N — apparently influenced by the tendency to polarity —; most naturally this can be conceived of as having happened when the stress shifted to its present place (cf. below, *z*), since the formal analogy was most complete only then.

w At the height of the heavy stress period, all short final vowels were dropped, and even within the words the majority of the unstressed ones might have been either elided or considerably reduced, so that their quality could be rather easily changed. Accordingly, many clusters of two and even three consonants were created. When the stress began to lighten, the syllabic consonants — as far as they were not wholly assimilated, as mostly *n*, or turned into a plain vowel, as the semi-vowels between two consonants — grew more difficult to pronounce as genuinely syllabic, not to speak of, e.g., two explosives as the two last members of a word final cluster of three consonants. Something had to be done to facilitate the pronunciation, and the means of breaking clusters through secondary vowels set in. It seems that where the neighbouring sounds did not determine the colour of these svarabhaktis, the *a* colour set in; this again may indicate that the development was rapid, the tendency being to increase the sonority of words determining the prevailing colour. The same tendency can be discovered in the fact that the *i* and *u* vowels preceding clusters that were broken in this way, were normally modified into *e* and *o* respectively; only if the following consonant was secondarily geminated, did this not occur. At first,

only triconsonantic, and word final biconsonantic clusters were broken, but little by little even the other biconsonantic ones followed suit, largely perhaps through the analogy of the earlier broken forms of the same types (for a good example, cf. §§ 60—62), but at least supported by the continuously lightening stress, so that only relatively light biconsonantic clusters, apart from those preserved through »Systemzwang», were extant with the coming of the second heavy stress period.

x A certain group of consonants, however, did not participate in this development in any position, viz., the gutturals. When a guttural appeared as the latter member of a (biconsonantic) word final cluster, it seems to have developed a svarabhakti earlier than this normally took place, e.g. the n.act. *jūdē* (from **jud'*), which still presupposes the existence of a relatively heavy stress during the period of the creation of the svarabhakti, so that the latter remained definitely shorter than the old vowel, a difference which was then preserved through the later periods. Again, when appearing as the first member of a cluster, it does not seem to have developed a svarabhakti at all (cf., e.g., § 61 *d*), except where this occurred rather late through »Systemzwang» (ib. *e*). This might indicate that gutturals already resembled vowels rather a lot at this time. Some other consonants — particularly *r* — that were syllabic during the first heavy stress period followed the example to some extent, cf. particularly § 61 *e*.

y A result of the creation of the *a*-coloured svarabhakti was that the fem.sg. affirmative from now onwards came to be uniformly *-at*. As such it was preserved before suffixes and in the st.cstr. of nominal forms, besides a relatively small number of nouns in which the svarabhakti was apparently created later on, after the development now to be mentioned. The reasons for the development are unknown — at most, an unconscious tendency to omit a stop which did not influence the meaning in any way after the uniform appearance of *a* before it could be surmised —, but there are certain parallels in various languages and families of languages; even if the identical development in Arab. cannot be demonstrated with ab-

solite certainty, it is in any case far more natural than the supposition of a parallel fem. affirmative *-a*, of which there is no trace in the oldest Semitic languages (against V. CHRISTIAN, *SbÖA* 228: 2 p. 153); the tendency to drop semantically unnecessary sounds particularly at the end of words is common to all linguistic families; especially as regards *t*, French is a good example, and even in the present pronunciation of SamH we have a good illustration of how the development probably took place, viz. in the place name *maq̄hêla^t* / *māq̄êla^t* Nm 33: 25 sq., in which the final *t* is written, but so faintly pronounced that — I believe — for me it would have been impossible to distinguish it from a final aspiration (even if slightly more intense, and stronger than normal), had not *t* been written. That the phenomenon appears only in these passages, and not elsewhere, finds its explanation in the fact that the chapter was recited in an exceptionally mechanical rhythm (cf. § 2 *d*), which equally accounts for the preservation of *h* in pronunciation in the first instance (both forms, by the way, stand in a pause, even if the latter in a minor one only).

z At the height of the heavy stress period, even the long vowels had doubtless lost much of their quantity, but since they were normally stressed, they nevertheless preserved their relative length compared with the short vowels. Another development, however, had to become more fatal, viz., the development of the long *a* into *o*; for when the svarabhaktis were created and rapidly developed into full *a* vowels, they challenged the power of the old long vowels to retain the stress, all of these having now less sonority than they regarding their quality. And when the final vowels were omitted, the long vowels standing in the syllable that now became the ultimate, without doubt were more or less reduced even in quantity. And when the final clusters that were created by the dropping of the final short vowels were broken by means of svarabhaktis, the number of words having stress upon the penultimate was greatly increased. Supposing that in the words the stem of which contained two short vowels, the stress of old lay on the first of them, in the vast majority of the word types most frequently occurring in speech,

the penultimate stress was now established. This explains most naturally the fact that some time — perhaps soon — after the end of the heavy stress period, the stress was uniformly shifted to the penultimate syllable, and upon that it has remained since then, apart from the occasional developments described in § 2 b.

aa This shift had far-reaching consequences. Firstly, when the long vowels of the last syllables were deprived of stress, they were not able to maintain their different quantity very long, but grew short. In connection with this, *u* and *i* vowels in this position naturally tended to turn into *o* and *e*, respectively. Had this occurred at once, it would have led to the amalgamation of many nominal types, which again would have created a large number of homonyms and, accordingly, semantic confusion. However, as long as the stress remained remarkably strong — though lightening continually —, some differences of quality apparently could be maintained, until the language found other means of preventing the imminent confusion. In the case of n.ag. **qatēl* and adj. **qatīl*, both of which ultimately derived from the same prototype, not many instances of confusion might have been imminent; they were easily prevented by means of some synonyms. Otherwise was it between **qatīl* and **qatīl*, the latter of which probably often represented a kind of elative to the former; therefore a difference between them was maintained by means of partial assimilation of the first stem vowel to the second: $a > e$ (an assimilation which, after the development was completed, in m.sg. turned out to be total). When the vowel of the second syllable was *u*, the situation was more complicated, since in the comparable case five types, viz. the nominal types **qatul*, **qatūl*, **qatal*, and **qatāl* (all of them, except the first, even verbal nouns), and n.ag. **qatōl*, were exposed to the danger. True, at first it might have seemed that **qatal* had nothing to do with the others, but in the end it was this very type with which **qatōl* was completely identified. And this was indeed the easiest way out of the dilemma, the primary meanings of these two types being so different — the former active, the latter stative — that hardly any confusion could arise from their amalgamation. The transformation $o > a$ appar-

ently took place while distance was being kept from the formerly long *o* arisen from long *a* (cf. *o* above) — the amalgamation of n.ag. with n.act. would have had more serious consequences. On the other hand, however, the latter came to be amalgamated with another type frequently used as a verbal noun, viz. **qatūl* (therefore, in this last long one it might have been confusion with this type, n.pot / pat., that was avoided), but the difference between them apparently was maintained long enough that the confusion was avoided in another way, viz., by means of substituting another type of n.act. (mainly, it seems, **qull*) in the place of **qatāl*; the latter was apparently preserved only in a few fixed formulas and in connections in which it was possible to interpret it as a n.pot. (or pat.?). The difference between this new type and **qatūl* is also abolished in m.sg. in the present pronunciation, but to judge from the other inflexional forms, in the living flow of speech it might have been maintained by means of geminating the last radical of the type **qatul*. Analogical changes took place little by little even where they were not semantically necessary; so **juqūm* developed into **juqom*, which might have influenced the development of **jaqom* into **jaqam*; again, analogically to this, **jaqtol* turned **jaqtal* and further, according to the rule of polarity, **jiqtal* (this occurred after the quiescization of the qutturals, since verbs I³ did not follow, cf. § 22 a). Last of all this change might have taken place in the nominal type **qull*, since *o* still appears in the noun *'āfar* < **'upr* in Ms. B Gn 18: 27 (however, the form can be comparable to those mentioned in § 61 e; cf. above *x*; in such a case, the present form would have replaced this genuine form rather more recently, perhaps influenced by the synonymous *'āfar* < **'apar*).

bb Still one further development seems to be directly connected with those above; I mean the transformation of a stressed (and secondarily ante-stress) short *u* into *e*. Even this development seems to have begun some time after the first heavy stress period, but is not yet wholly completed. There does not seem to be any cogent reason for this phenomenon, so it might be due to the nature of *u* as a «sister» sound of *o* that the former followed the development of

the latter, preserving the original distance (so that, when *o* turned into *a* apparently via *ā* — cf. TibH —, *u* yielded *e* apparently through *o* or something comparable to it), but primarily only in positions in which *u* and *o* alternately appeared in different inflexional forms of one and the same word. Most important of these was the nominal type **qull*, in which we stated above (*aa*) the development $o > a$ to have taken place latest. Therefore the fact that it has remained behind this development is quite comprehensible, as also, that post-stress *u* did not join the process: this had apparently already started, if not completed, the development peculiar to it (see above *aa*). Some instances of ante-stress *u* in open syllables were preserved over the second heavy stress period up to the synagogal pronunciation, where they were lengthened (cf., e.g., § 25 *f*) and thus preserved, as far as normal forms were not analogically substituted. The preserved instances of a stressed short *u* all appear before a geminated *k* or *q*. The spread of this development in ante-stress syllables might have started from the preformal **júqom* in which the preform. vowel through dissimilation, comparable to the tendency to polarity, easily followed the analogy of **qull* and other forms comparable to it; from this form, *e* then analogically spread to the other verbal preformatives in which *u* stood in an open syllable, and so forth; the details of the development cannot be given, but apparently the spreading of *e* took place analogically, driven by the influence of the groups in which the process was going on or already completed. The development became fatal to D ps and to some extent to the other inner passive forms, since they were thereby largely made to resemble the corresponding active ones; therefore they fell into disuse, partly transformed after N.

cc Through the omission of the final vowels, a number of over-long stressed syllables were created, viz. in the monosyllabic words the stem vowel of which was long. The stress continually lightening, it grew more and more hard to pronounce them as such. There were now two possible ways of getting out of the trouble: either the vowel could be shortened, or the word be broken into two syllables. The former way was supported by the existence of a — practically,

at least — unstressed form used in st.cstr., in which position the vowel was apparently invariably shortened. While stressed, however, the normal procedure was apparently to break the stem vowel into two by means of the so-called double peak accent, which may have originated so that the pronunciation of the vowel was slackened, to be invigorated again just before the pronunciation of the other consonant. Before long, a glide developed between the two parts of the vowel, for *o*, [˘] (which might indicate that the vowel was rather broad in quality), for *i*, *j*, and for *u*, *w*. Hereafter the development was somewhat different. [˘] was least vocalic in character; therefore it kept the two vowels clearly apart, until the first of them was dissimilated into *e*, again comparable to the rule of polarity (cf. above *bb*). This development was later accompanied by a similar one in the verbs I [˘] the first radical of which had grown quiescent and the preformative vowel developed into *o* during the Old Canaanite period (cf. above *r*); probably the fact that it was a stressed long *o* that underwent this transformation was able to create the analogy which was followed by these verbal forms in spite of the fact that the vowel did not stand in an overlong syllable in them (cf. below *dd*). On the other hand, the stressed *i* and *u* seem to have dissimilated from the glide at first, probably acquiring the colour of *a* (cf. TibH *bajit*, *māwæt*, and *dd* below), which had so much sonority that at first it effected the swallowing of the other part of the vowel by the glide; but since the syllable even so remained overlong, the glide developed a new svarabhakti, which according to the rule of the period obtained the colour of *a*; in connection with this, the glide seems to have been geminated. At a later period — which cannot be determined more exactly — the first vowel was again assimilated to the glide.

dd The development of *ī* and *ū* just described had further consequences also. As in the case of *o* (see above *cc*), it seems to have spread secondarily to every stressed long *i* and *u*. True, of the former we do not have certain instances, but if it may be supposed that in the verbs I *j* the stem preform. vowel of H turned into *i* when the tendency to polarity began to appear (cf. above *i*), the present forms

of af. and n.act. $\bar{a}'i\bar{t}ab < *ha-j\bar{t}ab$, etc., would be an outcome of this development; the difference is, in such a case, due to different accentuation: in the phase $-aji-$, the stress did not remain upon a , but was shifted to i , thus causing its preservation. The nouns $'ijj\bar{a}b\bar{a} / \bar{a}j\bar{i}b\bar{a} < *'ajb-at$ and those like them would belong to the same category. But if the presumed development $a > i$ did not take place in them, they apparently go directly back to the assumed prototype, having joined the development undergone by the stressed long i at the time it reached the corresponding stage.

ee Of the fates of a stressed long u in open syllables, on the other hand, we have numerous examples, above all the preformals of Q ps and H ps, and H ps af., of the hollow and continuable roots. In all of them, the development might have been: $-\bar{u}- > -au- > -aw- > -aw^{wa}- > -awwa- > -\bar{u}w\bar{w}a-$, and in the third stage, all the N- and H-stems of the roots I w apparently joined the development, H ps perhaps even in the beginning, if its u vowel had assimilated its consonantal counterpart w completely to itself at an earlier period.

ff All these developments (from *ee* onwards), however, were restricted through the existence of a parallel development in unstressed syllables alongside them: in the monosyllabic nouns, while they were in st.cstr., in the others (i.e., mainly verbal forms), in the forms having suffixes or affirmatives. In the closed, overlong syllables, the development consisted simply of the shortening of the vowel (which implied the transformation of i and u into e , resp. o); a long vowel in an open syllable apparently remained the same, while diphthongs the latter component of which was j yielded long i , and those with w , long u . These forms, being probably of more frequent occurrence, and additionally less cumbersome and shorter, gained ground from the longer forms after the conditions under which they had been created were changed, even if the latter, too, replaced a few shorter forms through »Systemzwang» in systems where they had a definite majority in the frequency of occurrence. That was the case above all in the passive conjugations mentioned above at *ee*, which in the living language might have already oc-

curred mainly in the 3rd pers.sg. This led to a re-arrangement of short and long forms between the active and passive voices of H in those classes: the former took over the whole active, while in the passive, the latter alone occur. Elsewhere the long forms were preserved — at least mainly, as it seems — only in special circumstances.

gg While the stress continually lightened and even the majority of biconsonantic clusters within words were dissolved, it is probable that even their final consonants obtained some kind of vowels as a help to pronunciation, even if this cannot be demonstrated, not to speak of the quality of those vowels. For some kind of parallels (from later periods) cf. vol. I p. 40 a.e., and A. SPERBER, HUCA XII—XIII p. 180. In any case, they did not influence the accentuation, probably because of their ephemeral nature.

hh During the period of the continuous lightening of the accent, a parallel development seems to have proceeded rather rapidly. Its first phase might have consisted of the aspiration of voiceless stops, for a surmise of the causes and beginning of which see *t* above. This was followed by a subsequent spirantization of the same sounds, and this latter development spread to other stops too. Indeed it seems that the nasal stop *m* followed the same example; its transformation may have consisted of the change of pronunciation resembling that of *b* for one resembling that of *w* (or *v*). However, of the spirantization of the palatals *k* and *g* there are no traces. To judge from the fact that the development must have been completed by the time of the final quiescization of the gutturals (see *ll* below), it must have been rather advanced at the time the aggravation of the stress again set in, which again explains the fact that the general intensification of the flow of speech did not lead to the restoration of the explosive pronunciation, but the spirantization was completed, apparently apart from old geminates (cf. *mm* below).

ii Somehow related to this, even if quite opposite, is the development of geminated *w* into the explosive *b*, which must have taken place via the spirant *v*; this first step might have been taken at the time of the spirantization of the explosives, which for the first time created the *v* phoneme in the Semitic languages, as far

as is known. The impulse for this development might have come from the creation of a secondary *w* as a glide (see above *ce*), which was felt as distinct from the old *w*; in many positions, the ungeminated old *w* followed suit, but at least a neighbouring *u* seems to have been able to preserve the semi-vocalic character of this sound (cf. § 46 *bc*), as also vowels on both sides of it.

kk The new heavy stress period having begun, the same tendencies as during the first one began to appear. The final vowels were dropped and the other unstressed ones reduced, often elided, in consequence of which a number of syllabic consonants were created; in addition to those attested during the first heavy stress period (cf. above *q*), the new spirants (see above *hh*) were now capable of syllabization. A stage parallel to this is represented by the forms preserved in the second column of Origen's Hexapla (cf. A. SPERBER in HUCA XII—XIII, particularly p. 75—78, 93; forms marked with *o*), and in Syriac parallels to the subsequent appearance of prothetic vowels are to be found (cf. F. R. BLAKE in JAOS 31 p. 219). As can be expected, prothetic vowels from this later period have been preserved much more than from the first one; the most notable cases are the normal forms of the prepositions *l* and *b* before nouns beginning with a consonant, and that of the preformative of n.ag. / pat. D. The cj. *w-*, however, has remained syllabic up to the present time; this has led partly to its turning into *u-*, partly to its neglect in pronunciation (cf. below *mm*); but mostly it is preserved as such. Again, syllabic *r* (in the beginning of roots at least) seems to have yielded *re-*, cf. the roots *rgz*, *rgl*, *rgm*, etc.

ll This time, *n* was not assimilated, but gutturals were further weakened until they were totally omitted in pronunciation. However, they did not disappear without leaving traces, for the following consonant — provided that the guttural was preceded by a vowel — was geminated. It could of course be thought that the gemination followed at a later period, but in such a case it would be difficult to understand why the other long vowels did not follow suit; therefore we may perhaps be entitled to speak of the assimilation of the gutturals or what was the last remnant of them. Before total dis-

appearance, those followed by a word final consonant developed a svarabhakti (cf. §§ 60—62), which drew the stress to the preceding vowel, but did not create a glide in the place of the guttural; so it must have taken place during this heavy stress period, the svarabhakti being coloured after its »mother» vowel. The development of *ī* and *ū* into two syllables before a word final guttural (apparently since they already earlier were half-long, cf. §§ 64 *c*, 71 *f*, *g*, a.e.) is related to this; after the disappearance of the guttural, the syllables were contracted into stressed long vowels. The fact that *f* in such cases always remains a spirant shows that the gutturals grew quiescent only after the completion of the spirantization of the explosives, at least that of *p*. In the word initial position, it is doubtful whether *ʿ* (and *h*) ever totally disappeared, since even in the 13th and 14th century vocalized mss. (cf. App. I) there are signs indicating the »strong» pronunciation of those gutturals, even if PETERMANN has no knowledge of it; in the last decades, this phenomenon has notably increased, apparently due to the influence of Arabic.

mm The quiescence of the gutturals probably caused another secondary gemination too, viz., that of the consonant following the article. With the coming of heavy stress period, the article lost its vowel (being normally in an unstressed position); when the gutturals grew quiescent, the whole article was in danger of disappearing. Because of its significance, however, this was not possible: therefore the vocalic remnant was protected against this danger by means of its more intense pronunciation, which might have effected the gemination of the following consonant; the late origin of this gemination is again demonstrated by the fact that even *f* affected by it appears as a spirant (cf. above *ll*). In the cases, however, where the main word is monosyllabic, and the article accordingly stressed, *f* as the first rad. appears regularly geminated as *bb*, which shows that the tendency to geminate consonants following any stressed vowel derives from the time before the period of spirantization already.

nn After the heavy stress period was over, the clusters having originated during it were broken again, but this time the normal

colour of the svarabhaktis became *e*. The stress continually lightening, a number of the medial clusters of the bisyllabic plurals left over the heavy stress period were broken, but most of them have been preserved up to the present time.

oo At the same time, more secondary geminations might have been created again (cf. e.g., 'émmet < *'um-t). This means, combined with the lengthening of the second stem vowel, seems to have been used to form a new kind of elative from existing nouns, e.g., *qaddiš from *qadiš »holy».

pp When the stressed vowel was followed by a guttural and a homorganic vowel, the quiescization of the former was followed by contraction (at times even under other conditions). After this, however, the stress did not recede to the preceding syllable; this shows that the tendency to place the stress upon the penultima had ceased to function. This might have been due to Aramaic influence, since in more recent times, when Aramaic cannot have any influence more, the old tendency has been resumed.

qq The rest of the changes seem to belong — at least mainly — to the recitational language, perhaps apart from the fusion of *o* and *u* into one phoneme, which may be a consequence of the disappearance of these vowels in numerous positions, they having been transformed into *a*, resp. *e*. Of later developments, the following deserve to be mentioned: the lengthening of the vowels in all the open ante-stress and stressed syllables, apparently due to the rhythm of recitation; the transformation of the spirants into explosives (and aspirates) again, apart from *f*, which remained spirant (this development was obviously dictated by the phonemic inventory of the Samaritan Arabic dialect, as best illustrated by the fact that geminated *p* was made *b*, there being no *p* in Arabic); the transformation of the *v* which had originated from *w*, into *b* (parallel to the preceding one); the influence of imala and a tendency to vowel harmony which, however, still differ rather strongly in the pronunciation of different informants.

§ 110. P H O N E T I C r u l e s .

a This is an attempt, systematically and — as far as can be found out — at the same time genetically to arrange the most important phonetic rules that in the preceding paragraph we stated to have found expression in the history of Samaritan Hebrew.

b As stated in § 108 *a*, the most important general principle governing linguistic development is the principle of greatest ease or appropriateness. Of the rules found in the preceding paragraph, the following obviously genetically derive from it: 1) The spirantization of the stops the articulation basis of which lies in the foremost parts of the organs of speech; as is known, the pronunciation of a stop requires considerably more energy than that of a spirant. But also 2) the contrary phenomenon, the restoration of most stops belongs to the same category, it being due to the fact that the abolished spirants were not included in the phonemic inventory of the dialect the Samaritans used as their everyday language at the time; therefore it grew all the more difficult to preserve the ability to pronounce them on those rather few occasions in which the »holy tongue» was needed. 3) The weakening and final abolition of the gutturals; despite their rather frequent use, their pronunciation was without doubt more cumbersome than that of the other consonants even to the ancient Semites, as to the other peoples of the world, witness their gradual weakening and/or disappearance everywhere. 4) During the heavy stress periods, the reduction or elision of unnecessary vowels, the general tendency of the language under such conditions being directed to semantic clarity alone, harmonistic tendencies being mostly disregarded as secondary in importance, and the heavy stress diminishing the need for physical ease. On the other hand, 5) during the light stress periods the last mentioned need grows in importance, and therefore the creation of svarabhaktis and other secondary sounds as means of lightening the pronunciation are in accordance with this principle. 6) The influence of imala, this phenomenon appearing in Palestinian Arabic (cf. 2). Less obviously, but in any case probably belonging under this principle are: 7) the

tendency to reduce the sonority of words during heavy stress periods by means of more «dark» colouring of vowels, including the tendency to polarity, and 8) the opposite tendency towards a vowel and to vowel harmony during the time the stress is growing lighter; these are related to the rules 4 and 5, respectively.

c Another great factor is the influence of the stress; we see its influence even in rules 4, 5, 7, and 8 above, and in the spread of the phenomenon defined in rule 1, it may have co-operated. In addition, the tendency to secondary geminations appears mainly after the main stress (sometimes, as in the case of the article, after a secondary one, see § 109 *mm*), particularly if the stressed vowel has little sonority. The last mentioned peculiarity links it to a rule governing the stress itself: it tends to be placed upon the syllable that has the greatest sonority in the word, unless other factors, such as its position in the great majority of occurrences, or the influence of another dialect spoken as the everyday language influence the matter. The last factor, however, is apparently of very little importance: it could only delay the return of the stress to its earlier uniformity after this uniformity had been broken by a phonetic development which had additionally resulted in a syllable having an exceptionally great sonority.

d A harmonizing tendency can be found both in the tendency to polarity and in that towards vowel harmony — in spite of the fact that they exclude each other —, in a certain sense in both dissimilation and assimilation in general. Related to these is the syllabization of certain consonants after their vowels had been reduced almost completely: this tends to reconstitute the balance between consonants and vowels (or rather sonants) disturbed by the reduction of the old, genuine vowels. The tendency to triradicality also belongs here.

§ 111. C o n c l u s i o n .

a As a general conclusion from what has been presented we may be entitled to establish that in phonology and morphology the Samaritan Hebrew dialect has accepted little — if any — foreign

elements; as far as foreign influence in the latest, synagogal period of the language has effected anything, it has been invariably negative in character: it has carried out the abolition of some older elements of the dialect, or helped to preserve an irregular innovation, but never has it brought anything in. The development of the dialect has been — as far as can be ascertained — consistent, the developments having taken place mostly rather slowly. The only phenomena that seem to call for a special explanation are the variations in the heaviness of the stress. They seem to me to be connected with the general conditions of life of the people speaking the dialect. It seems that the stress grew heavier when the conditions of life demanded more effort, and lighter, when life became more comfortable again: the first heavy stress period proper coincides with the troublesome Amarna age and Israel's »Landnahme», and it is quite possible — even if not demonstrable — that in the eighth century B.C. the stress already began to grow heavier afresh; in any case, the main part of the second heavy stress period seems to have been some time about the beginning of our era — with a margin of somewhat less than two centuries in both directions —, which were troublesome times in Palestine in general and in Samaria in particular, as is well known. However, another feature common to these periods of crisis is that frequent international intercourse occurred, and this may constitute linguistically more plausible basis for the explanation of the variation of stress and other changes. The whole problem cannot be solved until more comparative material is available.

Appendix I.

On the manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch in general and the vocalized ones in particular.

1. This is not an attempt to classify different mss. of the SP or divide them into families; such questions do not interest us in this connection. Rather we intend to give a sample of the peculiarities of the method of writing exhibited by practically all the mss. The sample is taken from Lv 16—20 (the passage was chosen quite arbitrarily), according to the first layer of the apparatus in the edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch by AUGUST FREIHERR VON GALL (Giessen 1918). We enumerate the variants in the order of their occurrence, only that we divide them into major groups according to their nature. The main reading is given first, then the variant(s) with the frequency of occurrence. The total number of mss. is as follows: Lv 16: 1—17 q'_2l 20, thence to 17: 4 $nj'_3'2$ 21, thence to 17: 5 $šlmjm$ 22, thence to 17: 6 $''_2l$ 21, thence to 17: 14 end 20, thence to 18: 30 end 19, thence to 19: 10 $wlgr$ 20, thence to 19: 20 end 19, thence to 19: 28 end 18, thence to 19: 36 $llcm$ 17, thence to 20: 6 $''_3rj'_2m$ 18, thence to 20: 27 end 19.

The largest group apparently owes its existence to the quiescence of the gutturals, they being interchanged with each other and occasionally with semi-vowels (when the guttural was provided with a vowel kindred to these), omitted or (rarely) added. Our sample contains the following instances: Chapter 16: v. 2 $'l$ 5°: $'_4l$ (v. GALL has this var. as the main reading, as even in most other cases his main reading is actually a rarely attested variant; we follow the majority of mss.) 4 x; v. 4 j'_3gr : $jjgr$ 1 x; v. 14 $b'_4šb'_4w$: $b'_4šb'w$ 1 x; v. 15 $'_4l$: $'l$ 4 x; v. 25 $'_2mzsb'_3'2$: $'_2mzsb'_3$ 3 x; v. 29 $ml'k'_2$: originally

*mlk'*₂ 2 x; v. 33 *'₄m* : *'₂₄m* originally 9, secondarily 11 x. Chapter 17: v. 3 *'w kšb* : *wkšb* (secondarily 1) 2 x; v. 4 *'₂bj'w* 1°: *jbj'w* 4 x; *'w šlmjm* : *wšlmjm* originally 1; *lršcnkm* : *lr'₃šcnkm* 1 x; *'₂bj'w* 2°: *jbj'w* 1 x; v. 5 *'₂bj'w* : *jbj'w* 3 x; v. 9 *jbj'nw* : *'₂bj'nw* 1 x; v. 15 *wtrf'₂* : *'w trf'₂* 1 x. Chapter 18: v. 9 (& 10) *'w bt*: orig. *wbt* 1 x; *'₃wš* : *'₄wš* 3 (orig. 4) x; v. 21 *l'₂'₄bjd*: orig. *l'₄bd* 1 x; *t'₃ll* : *t'₄ll* 1 x; v. 23 *lrb'₄'₂* : *lrb'₂'₂* 2 (orig. 3) x. Chapter 19: v. 5 *tzb'₃'₂w* : *tzb'₃w* 2 x; v. 10 *t'₄wll* : *tw'₄ll* 2 x; v. 18 *t'twr* : *t'₂t'r* 1 x; v. 19 *trbj'₄* : *trb'₂'₃* 3 x; *kl'jm* ter: *kl'₄jm* 2 x; v. 20 *'₃fšj* : *'₃fš'₂* 7 x; v. 25 *l'₂'₃sjf* : *l'₂sjf* 2 x; v. 28 *q'₄q'₄* : *qq'₄* 3 x; v. 29 *tzn'₂* : *tznj* 1 x; *wml''₂* : *wml'* 1 x; v. 36 *m'znj* : *mznj* 4 x. Chapter 20: v. 5 *l'znwt* : *l'₂znwt* 2 x; v. 6 item; v. 16 *lrb'₄'₂* : *lrb'₄* 7 x, *lrb'₄'₂* 2 x; v. 20 *gl'₂* : *gl'* 1 x; v. 26 *w'bdjl* : *w'₂bdjl* 1 (orig. 2) x; v. 27 *'w j'd'₄wnj* : *wj'd'₄nj* 2 x.

Another group, consisting of variations in the use of *matres lectionis* (mainly *w* and *j*), is about as large as the preceding one. Chapter 16: v. 6: *w'₂qrb*: orig. *w'₂qrb* 1 x; v. 8 *'₂'₄jrjm* : *'₂'₄arjm* 1 x; v. 10 *j'₄mjd* : *j'₄md* 2 x; v. 12 *wmlw'* : *wml'* 1 x; *'₃f'njw* : *'₃wf'njw* 6 (orig. 7) x; v. 22 *'₄wntm* : *'₄wntm* 5 x; v. 23 *šm* : *šm'₂* 1 x; v. 27 *jwš'* : *jwšj'* 3 x; *'₄wrtm* : *'₄wrtm* 2 x; v. 29 *l'₃qt* : *l'₃qwt* 1 x; *nfš'tjkm* : *nfš'wtjkm* 1 x; v. 31 item; v. 32 *'₃qt* : *'₃qwt* 1 x, *'₃wqt* 1 x. Chapter 17: v. 4 *'₄maw* : *'₄m'aw* 5 (orig. 6) x; v. 7 *'₃qt* : *'₃qwt* orig. 1 x; *ldwrtm* : *ldrtm* 7 x, *ldwrtm* 3 x; v. 11 *nfš'tjkm* : *nfš'wtjkm* 2 x; v. 15 *nbl'₂* : *nbl'₂'₂* 2 x. Chapter 18: v. 3 *wb'₃qtj'₂m* : *wb'₃qwtj'₂m*; v. 4 *'₃qwtj* : *'₃qtj* 6 (orig. 7) x; v. 5 item 5 (orig. 6) x; v. 9 *'₃ctk* : *'₃tk* 2 x; v. 10 *'₄wl'jn* : *'₄wl'n* 7 x; *'₂n'₂* : *'₂n* 1 x; v. 11 as v. 9; v. 18 *'₃wl'₂* : *'₃l'₂'₂* 2 x; v. 21 *l'₂'₄bjd* : *l(₂)'₄bd* orig. 2 x; v. 25 *w'fqd* : *w'f'qjd* 2 x; *jwšb'₂* : *jšb'₂'₂* 8 x; v. 26 as v. 4, 3 (orig. 4) x; *'₂tw'₄bwt* : *'₂tw'₄bt* 1 x, *'₂t'₄bwt* 1 x; v. 27 item; v. 29 item, but varr. 1 & 2 x, resp.; v. 30 *m'₃qwt* : *m'₃qt* 1 (orig. 2) x; *'₂tw'₄bwt* : *'₂tw'₄bt* 3 x. Chapter 19: v. 2 *qdjš'jm* : *qdš'jm* 4 x; v. 3 *šbtj* : *šbt'ctj* 3 x; v. 9 *wbqš'rk* : *wbqš'rk* 2 x; v. 10 *t'₄wll* : *t'₄ll* 8 x; v. 17 *'₂wk'₃* : *'₂wk'₃'₃* 2 x; *twk'₃'₃* : *twk'₃'₃* 2 x (here is a good example of the arbitrary method followed by v. GALL: in the first instance, he has put the variant into his main text, in the latter, the main reading, in spite of the fact that the var. in both cases is read in the same mss. The solution, however, is simple: he follows the Masoretic text.); v. 18

ttwr : *tt̄r* 2 x, *t̄₂tr* 1 x; v. 19 *'₃qwtj* : *'₃qtj* 4 x; v. 24 *'₃lljm* : *'₃lwljm* 8 x; v. 25 *'₂'₃mjšt* : *'₂'₃mšjt* 6 x; v. 30 as v. 3, 1 x; v. 31 *'₂'₂wbwt* : *'₂'₂bwt* 1 x; *'₂'₂jd'₄wnjm* : *'₂'₂jd'₄njm* 3 x, *'₂'₂jd'₄wnm* 1 (orig. 2) x; v. 35 *bmšqwl* : *bmšql* 6 x; v. 37 as v. 19. Chapter 20: v. 4 *j'₄lmw* : *j'₄ljmw* 5 x; v. 6 *'₂'₂wbwt* : *'₂'₂bwt* 3 x; *'₂'₂jd'₄wnjm* : *'₂'₂jd'₄njm* 6 (orig. 7) x; v. 7 *qđjšjm* : *qđšjm* 3 (orig. 4) x; v. 8 as 19; 19; v. 14 *w't'₂n* : *w'tj'₂n* 1 x; v. 17 *'₃wtw* bis: *'₃tw* 1° 10 (orig. 11) x; 2° 7 x; v. 20 *ddw* : *dwdw* 1 x; v. 22 as 19; 19, 3 x; *tqj* : orig. *tq'* 1 x; *šm'₂* : *šm* 1 x; v. 24 *'₂bdljtj* : *'₂bdjltj* 1 x; v. 25 *nfštjkm* : *nfšwtjkm* 3 x; v. 26 as v. 7, 4 (orig. 5) x; v. 27 *jd'₄wnj* : *wj'd'₄nj* 2 x (cf. the first group; the combination *'w jd'₄nj* which v. GALL has printed, does not appear in any ms.).

The rest of the groups are rather small. One of them is connected with the syllabization of certain consonants and the developments by which it was followed. It is exemplified by these instances: Chapter 16: v. 14 *'l fnj* : *lfnj* 1 x; chapter 18: v. 23 *lrb'₄'₂* : *lrb'₂'₂* 2 (orig. 3) x; chapter 20: v. 16 *lrb'₄'₂* : *lrb'₄'₂* 2 x; in addition to which all the instances of the transformation of *'w* into *w-* (see the first group), and a part of the omissions of *w-* (see the next group), could be included in it. A larger group contains variants of morphological and occasionally syntactical nature; these cannot always be distinguished from one another, so we place them together: Chapter 16: v. 2 *w'l* : orig. *wl'* 1 x; chapter 17: v. 5 *zb'₃'* : *zb'₃'jm* 3 (or 4) x; v. 10 *'t'₂* : *'tw* 4 (orig. 6, then 7) x; *'₄m'₂* : *'₄mw* 4 (orig. 6, then 7) x; v. 13 *btwckm* : *btackm* 3 (orig. 5) x; chapter 18: v. 14 *'₂'* : orig. *'₂w'* 1 x; v. 16 item; v. 30 *b'₂n* : *b'₂m* 4 (orig. 2) x; chapter 19: v. 3 *'l* : *w'l* 8 x; v. 13 *wl'* : *l'* orig. 1 x; *l'* 2° : *wl'* 5 x; v. 15 item 2 x; v. 16 *wl'* : *l'* 4 x; v. 17 *wl'* : *l'* 2 x; v. 23 *'l* 2° : *w'l* 1 x; v. 35 *l'₄šw* : orig. *l'₄š'₂* 1 x; v. 36 *'bnj* : *w'bnj* 3 (orig. 4) x; *'jft* : *w'jft* 4 (orig. 5) x; in addition, the cases of the transformation of *'w* into *w-* (first group) could belong here also. The rest of the instances may best be termed occasional: Chapter 16: v. 17 *wkl* : *wkn* 1 x is a misreading. *l* and *n* resembling each other to some extent; and even *wkn* gives a good sense; v. 22 *bmdbr* orig. omitted 1 x; apparently the eyes of the copyist have moved to the next word while he has been murmuring the first syllable of this one. Chapter 17: v. 3 *'w* *'šr* . . . *lm'₃n'₂* orig.

omitted 1 x; homœoteleuton; v. 5 $\overset{\cdot}{2}\overset{\cdot}{s}d\overset{\cdot}{2}$ omitted 1 x; cause unknown; $\overset{\cdot}{l}\overset{\cdot}{j}\overset{\cdot}{2}w\overset{\cdot}{2}2^{\circ}$ orig. omitted 1 x, as it seems at the end of a line; so perhaps the copyist had no courage even to murmur it and when changing line proceeded mechanically to the first word again pronounced; v. 7 $\overset{\cdot}{t}$ omitted 1 x, apparently due to the great resemblance of $\overset{\cdot}{t}$ and $\overset{\cdot}{z}$ (the initial letter of the next word); v. 8 $w\overset{\cdot}{l}\overset{\cdot}{j}\overset{\cdot}{2}m$ omitted 1 x; homœoteleuton; v. 12 *btuckm*: orig. *btuckm* 1 x; haplography. Chapter 19: v. 10 $\overset{\cdot}{r}_4z\overset{\cdot}{b}$ omitted 1 x, perhaps through a kind of homœoteleuton, $\overset{\cdot}{r}$ and $\overset{\cdot}{b}$ resembling each other to some extent; v. 12 $\overset{\cdot}{n}j\overset{\cdot}{:}\overset{\cdot}{n}$ 1 x; haplography ($\overset{\cdot}{j}$ - follows); v. 31 *tbqšw* omitted 1 x, as it seems when changing line (cf. above 17: 5 2° , but here any special reason cannot be given; both cases in the same ms.). Chapter 20: v. 2 *bnj* : *bn* 1 x; haplography ($\overset{\cdot}{j}$ - follows, cf. above 19: 12; again the same ms.); v. 6 $\overset{\cdot}{3}\overset{\cdot}{r}\overset{\cdot}{j}\overset{\cdot}{2}m$: orig. $\overset{\cdot}{3}\overset{\cdot}{r}\overset{\cdot}{j}\overset{\cdot}{2}mlk$ 1 x, which gives the impression of being a conscious attempt to introduce here a concrete term instead of the rather pale sf.; v. 18 $dmj\overset{\cdot}{2}$ omitted 1 x through unknown causes; v. 25 *nfštjkm*: orig. *nfšjtm!* (corrected into *nfštm*), perhaps from an obscure original through unexperienced copyist (the ms. is the first of its writer).

2. The different systems of vocalization were described in § 1 *q*, the old — about 13th—14th century — manuscripts in which they are used, in the introduction to vol. II, p. 9sq. Here, we again intend to give a sample of each of these mss.; this time, however, it is arbitrarily chosen only for the Mss. C and D, since in A and B the vocalization marks are very unequally distributed, and the fragment Ryl. VII b is so short that the selection is thereby determined.

For the Ms. A, we accordingly select a passage in which the punctuation marks are used rather copiously; such a one is Gn 13—14. We reproduce only the words showing punctuation marks, transliterating these as follows: the horizontal line $\bar{\quad}$ by means of the mark of the acute accent $\overset{\cdot}{\quad}$, the vertical line $\overset{\cdot}{\quad}$ by means of the letter *a*, the wedge-shaped sign $\overset{\cdot}{\wedge}$ by means of the letter *i*, and the Arabic Damma $\overset{\cdot}{\quad}$ by means of the letter *u*. For other possible signs see below, in respective connections. If the sign stands at the beginning of a word, its transliteration is placed before the first consonant of that

word, otherwise after the letter upon or after which it stands. Chapter 13: v. 2 . . . $bmqni'_2$. . . v. 3 . . . $alms'_4jw$. . . 'l . . . $\mathring{s}m'$ $''_2ulw$. . . v. 4 . . . $\mathring{s}m'$. . . $\mathring{s}m'$. . . $ab\mathring{s}m$. . . v. 5 . . . 't . . . $wbq'r w''_2uljm$ v. 6 . . . 'utm . . . v. 7 $mqni'_2$. . . $mqni'_2$. . . v. 9 . . . $'_2f'rd$. . . v. 12 . . . instead wj''_2l , wj''_3l is read, with two signs above and after j ; the latter seems to be a , the former perhaps ' (intended apparently as an addition to the consonantal text), but that I cannot confirm, since I have not seen the ms. itself (see vol. II, loc.cit.); . . . v. 14 . . . $'t'_2 \mathring{s}m'$ $\mathring{s}f'wn'_2$. . . v. 15 . . . $'t''_2$. . . v. 16 . . . jmn'_2 . . . v. 18 . . . $wja\mathring{s}b$. . . $mmri'$. . . $wjbn'i \mathring{s}m'$. . . Chapter 14: v. 1 . . . $mlik$. . . above $w'rj'ck$ two signs appear, one above the copula; its shape is that of a half circle, the open side down, and function unknown; the other is the normal horizontal line, probably belonging to the latter w , though in the copy it seems rather to be placed upon j (or between both these letters); $mlik$ 'lasr . . . $mlik$. . . $mlik$. . . v. 2 . . . 't . . . $mlik$. . . $w't$. . . $mlik$. . . $mlik$. . . v. 5 $wb'arb'_4$. . . 'tw . . . $ab\mathring{s}w''_2$. . . v. 7 . . . $qd'\mathring{s}$. . . v. 8 . . . 'it'm (or -tm'?) . . . v. 9 . . . $w'rjw'k mlik$ 'lasr . . . 't . . . v. 10 . . . $b'irwt$ $b'irwt$. . . $mlik$ $sdim$ $wmlik$ $wj'f'lw$. . . v. 11 . . . $sdim$. . . v. 12 . . . $j\mathring{s}ib$. . . v. 13 . . . $wjgid$. . . $\mathring{s}kin$. . . $mmri'$. . . $'_4nirm$. . . v. 16 $wj\mathring{s}ib$. . . $'_2an\mathring{s}jm$. . . v. 17 . . . $mlik$ $sdim$ $alqr'tw$ $''_3urj$. . . mi'_2kwt . . . 't'w (or -tw'?) . . . $'_2mlik$. . . v. 18 . . . $\mathring{s}diq$. . . v. 19 . . . qni'_2 . . . v. 20 . . . 'l . . . $amgin$. . . v. 22 . . . $mlik$ $sdim$. . . 'l . . . qni'_2 . . . v. 23 . . . $mi'_3w\mathring{f}$. . . $t'umr$. . . v. 24 . . . 'tij $'_4nirm$. . . $wmmri'$. . .

For the Ms. B, we choose the 27th chapter of Genesis. The horizontal and vertical lines are transliterated as before, and the wedge-shaped sign with angle upwards (\wedge) by u , the one with angle left, by \dot{z} , the one with angle down, with \mathring{a} , and the one with angle right, by the repetition of the consonant upon which it lies (from two similar consonants following each other this can be distinguished by means of kt). The examples are: v. 1 . . . $zaqan$. . . $wjq'r''$. . . v. 2 . . . $'_2n''_2 n''$ $zaqantj$. . . $j'd'_4tj$. . . v. 3 . . . $\mathring{s}'' n''$. . . $wq'\mathring{s}tk w\mathring{s}''$. . . v. 4 . . . $w'ukl$. . . $ab\mathring{t}rm$. . . v. 5 . . . $\mathring{s}'m'_4t$. . . v. 6 . . . $'mr''_2$. . . bn''_2 . . . $'_2n''_2$. . . v. 7 $'_2ab'$. . . $w'ukl''_2$. . . v. 8 $w'_4t''_2$. . . $\mathring{s}\mathring{a}m'_4$. . . $m\mathring{s}ww''_2$. . . v. 9 . . . n'' . . . v. 10 $w'_2b'ta$. . . v. 11 . . . $'_2n''_2$. . . $''_3j$. . . $'_3\mathring{a}lq$ v. 12 . . . $w'_2b'tij$. . . $q'lal''_2$. . . v. 13 $wt'm'r$. . . $q'laltk$. . . $\mathring{s}\mathring{a}m'_4$. . . v. 14 . . . $m\mathring{a}\mathring{t}\mathring{a}'_4mjm$

.. v. 15 .. bn''₂ .. '₂''₃mdwt .. ''t'₂ .. bn''₂ '₂'q'tn v. 16 .. '₂lbjš''₂
 .. '₃alqat .. v. 17 .. '₂mṭa'₄mjm .. '₄št''₂ .. bn''₂ v. 18 wjbi' .. v. 19
 .. n'' šəb''₂ w'əkl''₂ .. v. 20 .. lmš'' .. '₂qr'' .. v. 21 .. gš''₂ n'' ..
 v. 22 .. wjmaša'₂w .. v. 23 .. š'₄ijrwt .. v. 25 .. w'ukl .. wjagš
 .. wjbi' .. v. 26 .. gš''₂ n'' wšq''₂ .. v. 27 .. mal'' .. v. 28 .. mṭæl
 .. wməšəmnj .. v. 29 .. la'mjm .. v. 30 .. kl''₂ .. jaš' .. b'' .. v. 31
 .. wjbi' .. v. 33 .. '₃æræd'₂ gdl''₂ .. 'afw '₃səd .. wjib' .. w'ukal
 .. bṭærm .. v. 34 .. wjš'₄q š''₄q''₂ gdl''₂ wmr''₂ .. v. 36 .. wj'₄qbanj
 .. l'q'₃ .. '₄t''₂ l'q'₃ .. wj'm'r '₂la' .. v. 39 .. mšəmanj .. wmṭæl ..
 ma'₄l v. 40 .. '₃ærək .. t''dr (?) wfraqt .. šəw'rk v. 41 wjšt'm ..
 '₂brk''₂ .. barakw .. w'a'₂rg'₂ .. v. 42 wjugd .. wtqr'' .. bn''₂ ..
 '₂n''₂ .. v. 43 w'₄t''₂ .. '₃arn''₂ v. 44 wjašbta .. ''₃jk v. 45 .. ''₃jk
 .. wšak'₃ .. v. 46 .. l'q'₃ ..

In this Ms., the interpretation of the horizontal line is in a key position. In the sample above, (as in general) it is possible to interpret it as a sign for an *a* vowel in almost all instances. However, it does not seem to catch the proper sense of this sign at least in cases like *bn''₂* »her son», where it stands as a sign for the fem. pronominal sf., to distinguish the form from such as *bn'₂* »he built», where the corresponding syllable equally has an *a* vowel. Moreover, there are instances of this sign in syllables containing some other vowel, even in our sample at least ''t'₂ »with her», which can hardly have been pronounced otherwise than 'itta, as to-day; the sign is used in that preposition to distinguish it from the *nota obiecti*. In addition, it seems that the sign is used in the verb l'q'₃ »he took» in a syllable containing an *e* vowel, but this seems to me improbable, since in that case it is hardly understandable why the sign has been used at all. Rather it may belong to a peculiarity of this manuscript, viz. a tendency to normalize certain inflexional types by means of the abolition of exceptional forms. In many cases, this also implies a tendency to bring the forms nearer to the corresponding TibH ones. This is not surprising, since Samaritan grammarians apparently knew rather much of the activity of the Jewish ones (cf., e.g., § 4 h), and the Tiberian system must have made an impression on them by its apparent consistency and relative harmony when compared

with the outwardly — without knowledge of its history — confused mass of forms handed down to them, and even if they could not slavishly follow the foreign system, they tried to introduce certain elements of it; many instances of this are included particularly in ABU SA'IDS'S Principles of Recitation (published by Z. BEN-HAYYIM, The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans I, Jerusalem 1957, p. 129—170); cf., e.g., his first and second principles in which he tries to establish the Tiberian vocalization almost throughout the forms of the 2nd pers.pl.masc. pronoun and certain forms of af. provided with the sf. of 3rd pers.pl.masc. It seems to the present writer that the vocalization of Ms. B has been made according to some such attempt to bring »order» into the system of the traditionally inherited Samaritan Hebrew grammar, equally with some dependence on the Tiberian system — even if not to such an extent as ABU SA'ID —, and an element in this attempt is apparently the abolition of abnormal types of Q, at least of those having another vowel than *a* in the first stem syllable in af.; accordingly, the punctuation *l'q'_3* might mean that the first radical must be pronounced with an *a* vowel. But the type **qatal* seems to enjoy his special predilection even over that: it has taken over — in our sample — the root *zqn* too: v. 1 *zaqan*, v. 2 *zaqantj*; and not only that, but even a D form: v. 41 *barakw* instead of the normal *berrêku*. Comparable attempts to introduce »regular» forms are the hollow root n.ag. *'_2sad* instead of the normal *'aššod* (the root having a permanently long stem vowel), as well as the anomalous *wjmaša'_2w*; probably *wjamaš'_2w* = *wjāmāšē'u* was intended, in accordance with the normal pattern of the w-prf. of the hollow roots; which does not take into account that this root probably originally belonged to the continuable ones, the stem vowel having been prolonged only secondarily (see § 53 *e* no. 10). Fortunately for the scholarly study of the ancient Hebrew language and even the comparative study of the entire Semitic family, the Samaritan grammarians were not as energetic and influential as the Tiberian ones; the attempts to abolish the »corrupted» forms and harmonizing the dialect remained attempts, not one of them established itself

any more than the different attempts at revision of the Samaritan Targum led to an officially sanctioned *Textus receptus*. Accordingly, Ms. B cannot be regarded as a reliable witness for the pronunciation of Samaritan Hebrew in the 13th—14th century, in contrast to the other vocalized manuscripts.

For the Ms. C, we arbitrarily choose the 9th and 10th chapters of Leviticus. Here, the vowel signs proper are the vertical line for *a*, the wedge-shaped sign (with angle mostly down to the left) for *e*, and the Arabic Damma for *u*, with which we transliterate them. In addition, the horizontal line is used mostly — as in the sample — to indicate gemination, and the two signs denoting a sounded guttural (see § 1 *q*) for this purpose quite promiscuously; both of them are transliterated with ' before the guttural upon which they stand. In this ms., all the signs are used consistently in places in which uncertainty of pronunciation could arise. The attestations are: Chapter 9: v. 1. . . bajwm . . v. 2 . . '4egel . . baqr la'3t't . . tamjmēm . . v. 3 . . w'4egl wkabš . . tamjmēm . . v. 4 . . balwl'2 . . nra'e'2 . . v. 5 . . šw'2 . . '2ul . . wjqrabw . . wja'4mdw . . v. 6 . . '2debr . . šw'2 . . wjra'e . . v. 7 . . qerab . . we'4še'2 . . '3t'tk . . wkefar be'4dk wbe'4d . . we'4še'2 . . wkefar be'4dma . . šw'2 . . v. 8 wjqrab . . wjša'3t' . . '4egl '3t't . . v. 9 . . wjtbal . . bd'm (or b'dm? where ' = *a*) . . jašq . . v. 10 . . '2'3t't . . šw'2 . . v. 11 . . šarf be'š . . v. 12 wjša'3t' . . wjmšej'w . . wjzraqe'2w . . v. 13 . . '2mšej'w . . alnet'3j'2 . . v. 14 wjra'3š . . '2qerb . . '2kura'4jm . . v. 15 . . še'4jr . . wjša'3te'2w wja'3te'2w . . v. 16 . . wja'4ša'2 . . v. 17 . . kf'jw . . '2beqr v. 18 . . '2šelmjm . . la'4m wjmšej'w . . wjzraqe'2w . . v. 19 . . w'2mkse'2 . . wjwrtart '2kabed . . v. 21 . . '2enf . . šw'2 . . v. 22 . . '2'3t't . . v. 23 . . wjra'e'2 . . v. 24 . . wjre'w . . wjranw wj'falw . . Chapter 10: v. 1 . . w'bj'2uw' . . ma'3tjtw wjtenw be'2na . . wjašmw '4lj'2na . . wjqrējbw . . šw'2 'utm v. 2 . . wt'ukl 'utm wjmatw . . v. 3 . . abqrjbj 'qdaš . . 'kabed wjdam . . v. 4 . . mejš'l . . dud . . qerabw . . '3jkm . . v. 5 wjqrabw . . 'utm abkjtānw . . lam'2nj . . dber . . v. 6 . . tfra'4w . . tframw . . jqšaf . . '2šerf'2 . . šarf . . v. 7 . . '2ul mša'3t . . kadebr . . v. 9 . . tšte'2 'at'2 (or 't'2?) . . 'etk bab'km . . '2ul . . ldurtjkm . . v. 10 . . '2qadš . . '2'3al . . '2tme' . . v. 11 wl'2uwrwt . . abjd . . v. 12 . . '2nw-

tarjm qa³w . . w'ekluwa² . . v. 13 . . 'ut² bamaqwm qadwš . . me'šj
 . . šw'jtj v. 14 . . t'uklw bamqwm . . 'at² wbanjk wbanutjk 'etk
 . . 'aqak . . banjk netenw . . v. 15 . . 'a²elabjm . . la²nf . . wbanjk
 walbanutjk 'etk . . v. 16 . . 't²t darš darš . . wjqšaf . . v. 17 . .
 'kaltm . . 't²t bamqwm 'qadš . . w'ut² natn . . v. 18 . . dma²
 . . 'qadš fanjm² 'kal t'uklw 'ut² baqadš (or b'-'?) . . šw'jtj v. 19 . .
 't²tm . . 'utj . . w'kaltj 't²t . . 'jjtab . . v. 20 . . wjtab . .

It is possible that in this ms. the sign of which there is uncertainty whether it be *a* or '*'*, is in fact a ligature of both, it appearing regularly in syllables provided with an *a* vowel, which is followed by a geminate. The form 'a²al in 10: 10 is apparently a contraction of the now pronounced 'áel, unless the vowel sign should be placed between the two 's.

In the Ms. D, the horizontal stroke is mostly identified with the oblique one, which we transliterate with *æ*, although it is apparently another sign for *e* / *i* (cf. § 1 q). As a sample for this ms., Nm 22 was selected: v. 1 . . me⁴br . . v. 3 wjagr . . wjaqš . . v. 4 . . jræq 'šdæ²
 . . v. 5 . . fatar² . . jašæ² . . ješeb . . v. 6: lek² . . 'era² . . jada⁴tj . .
 tebrk . . te'r . . v. 8 . . we'ššbtj . . depr . . wjašbw šarj . . v. 11 . .
 jaš² . . wjksæ . . qeba² . . 'utw . . v. 12 . . telk 'm(æ)ma . . te'r . .
 v. 13 wjaqm . . šarj . . lekw . . l²lek . . v. 14 . . wjab'w . . 'lek . .
 v. 15 wjasæf . . wnkbadjm me'l² . . v. 16 . . tmana⁴ me²elk . . v. 17
 . . 'ekabedk . . wlek² . . v. 18 . . 'abadj . . le⁴br . . qaṭn² . . gadl²
 . . v. 19 . . šbw . . abze² . . 'æt² 'aljl² . . jasf . . a⁴mj . . v. 20
 wjab' . . læk 'æt² . . 'dbar . . 'ædr . . v. 21 wjaqm . . wja³bæš
 . . 'tunw . . šarj . . v. 22 wja³r . . 'lak . . bædrk . . 'tunw . . na⁴rjw
 a⁴mw v. 23 . . bædrk . . bæšd² wjkæ . . v. 30 . . 'tunk . . rakabt
 . . me⁴wdk . . v. 31 wjglæ . . bædrk . . v. 32 . . 'tunk . . 'ara⁴ drkak
 . . v. 33 . . 'utk . . w'ut² 'jjatj v. 34 . . 'æt' nešb . . 'šwbæ² . . v. 37
 . . lkta . . kabedk . . v. 40 . . wšarjm . . 'ætw . .

As is seen, in this ms. the signs are again not as consistently and frequently used as in the Ms. C, but on the whole, in any case, more so than in the Mss. AB. Again, it is possible that the sign *æ*, when preceding a geminate, is actually a ligature of *a* and '*'*. A very interesting phenomenon is the appearance of the preposition 'm provided

with an *a* vowel, which in this ms. is regularly placed on the right hand side of the letter '₄; this position may also indicate its origin: it is a prothetic vowel comparable to those placed before some other consonants after their period of syllabicity (cf. § 109 *kk*). When the guttural grew totally quiescent, the prothetic vowel was able to inherit its position. It seems, however, that gutturals were provided with such vowels only sporadically, probably due to their weakened state, and mostly retained the original vowels after them, which is why the latter method alone is preserved in the present-day pronunciation. Sometimes both methods appear to be combined, e.g. *a'₄ešjw* Ms. C Lv 14: 45, but mostly they may be due to the normal appearance of the vocalization *a-e* on both sides of a quiescent guttural (in this case, however, perhaps not), representing accordingly the prothetic vowel split into two syllables; thus they presuppose that the guttural has already grown quiescent, and not the contrary, though it could seem so at the first glance.

The use of the punctuation marks in the fragment Ryl. VII b is about the same as in Ms. D. We reproduce here the signs in Gn 10: v. 1 . . šem '₃am wjfet . . '₃urj . . v. 2 . . jfet gamr wmagwg madj wjaw'n . . v. 3 . . gamr 'škenez . . wtegrina'₂ v. 4 . . jaw'n 'aljš . . v. 5 . . n'radw . . a'₂gwjm . . llšunw (the following word is written *lmšf'₃etj'₂m*, a var. not recorded by v. GALL) . . v. 6 . . '₃am . . wkan'₄n v. 7 . . w'₃w'jl'₂ sbt'₂a wre'₄m'₂ . . re'₄m'₂ . . wdadan v. 8 . . '₂a'₃el l'₂ajwt . . v. 9 . . ja'mr . . v. 10 wta'₂j . . babel w'rek . . wkl'n'₂a . . šne'₄r v. 11 . . jaš' . . wjbnæ . . njnw''₂ . . ra'₃bwt . . v. 12 . . njnw''₂ . . kl'₂a '₂a'₄jr . . v. 13 . . jled . . ladjm . . '₄jnamjm . . l'₂abjm . . nfata'₃jm v. 14 . . ftrasjm . . ksla'₃jm . . jaš'w mšmæ felštjm . . v. 15 wkan'₄n jled . . bakwrw . . v. 16 . . '₂'amrj . . '₂grgešj v. 17 . . '₂'₃w'j . . '₂'₄arwqj (ʔ) . . v. 18 . . '₂'rw'dj . . '₂a'₃mtj . . mšfe'₃t '₂kan'₄jn v. 19 . . gebwl '₂kan'₄nj mna'₂r . . '₂na'₂r . . na'₂r fart . . v. 20 . . '₃am . . (Here the vocalization ends.)

When placing vowel signs around gutturals, our scribe does not seem to mind much whether the sign comes to stand on the «right» side of the letter or not, apparently because of the total quiescence of the gutturals. The only real variant is the name of a people,

n/ata'jm (v. 13), to which *neftá'em* corresponds in the present-day pronunciation; since there is no sign of the elision of vowels during the synagogal period of SamH, the forms may be old concurrent variants from older times, unless the former is simply a mistake of the scribe (no other ms. supports the reading).

Appendix II

Paradigms

In this appendix, paradigms for the normal pronominal, verbal, and nominal forms are given with their reconstructed primary elements of which they seem to be composed; for exceptional forms, see the relevant paragraphs in the body of the grammar. In verbal and nominal forms, the paradigms are based upon the conventional fictitious root **qtl*, with certain modifications where needed.

I. PRONOUN

Only the personal pronoun shows a certain inflexion; we distinguish the preformative, affirmative, separate, and suffixed pronominal elements:

	prf.	af.	sepr.	sf.
sg.				
1.	<i>'V-</i> * <i>'a</i> - <i>tī</i>	* <i>-t-ī</i>	<i>'ānī</i> <i>'ānākī</i>	* <i>'an-ī</i> (sbj.) - <i>ī</i> , (- <i>ī</i>) * <i>ī</i> * <i>'an-ak-ī</i> (obj.) - <i>nī</i> * <i>-n-ī</i>
2. m.	<i>tV-</i> * <i>ta</i> - <i>ta</i>	* <i>ta</i>	<i>'ātta</i>	* <i>'an-ta</i> - <i>k</i> * <i>k(a)</i>
2. f.	<i>tV-</i> * <i>ta</i> - <i>ti</i>	* <i>ti</i>	<i>'ētī</i>	* <i>'an-ti</i> - <i>k</i> * <i>k(i)</i>
3. m.	(<i>jV-</i> * <i>ja</i>) —		<i>'ū</i>	* <i>hū-'(a)</i> - <i>u</i> / <i>ō</i> * <i>hu</i>
3. f.	<i>tV-</i> * <i>īa</i> - <i>a</i> , - <i>ta</i>	* <i>-t(-a)</i>	<i>'ī</i>	* <i>hī-'(a)</i> - <i>ā</i> * <i>(-a)ha</i>
pl.				
1.	<i>nV-</i> * <i>na</i> - <i>nū</i>	* <i>n-ū?</i>	<i>'ānānnu</i>	* <i>'an-ak-nū</i> - <i>nu</i> * <i>n-ū?</i>
2. m.	<i>tV-</i> * <i>ta</i> - <i>timma</i>	* <i>t-u-ma</i>	<i>'attimma</i>	* <i>'an-t-u-ma</i> - <i>kimma</i> * <i>k-u-ma</i>
2. f.	<i>tV-</i> * <i>ta</i> - <i>ten</i>	* <i>ti-na</i>	(<i>w</i>) <i>étten</i>	* <i>'an-ti-na</i> - <i>ken</i> * <i>ki-na</i>
3. m.	(<i>jV-</i> * <i>ja</i>) —		<i>'immæ</i>	* <i>hu-ma?</i> - <i>imma</i> * <i>hu-ma?</i>
3. f.	<i>tV-</i> * <i>ta</i> —		<i>'innē</i>	* <i>hi-na?</i> - <i>inna</i> * <i>hi-na?</i>

II. VERB

A. Strong verb

1. Q a l

We begin with the actional group of conjugations. Different types of n.act.:

sepr.		with the prep. <i>l</i>	
<i>qātal</i>	* <i>qutl</i> , * <i>qatl</i>	<i>liqtal</i>	* <i>la-qutl</i> , * <i>li-qatl</i>
<i>qātol</i>	* <i>qatāl</i>	* <i>liqtol</i>	* <i>li-qatāl</i> (attested in weak verbs)
<i>qātel</i>	* <i>qatel</i>	* <i>elqātel</i>	* <i>l-qatel</i> (cf. weak verbs)
<i>qēttel</i>	* <i>qettel</i>	<i>elqēttel</i>	* <i>l-qettel</i>

the other types are comparable to these; cf. § 11 b.

Imperative:

masc.

sg.		pl.	
<i>qētal</i>	* <i>qetal</i> (< * <i>qutl</i>)	<i>qētdlū</i>	* <i>qetal-ū</i>
<i>qētāla</i>	* <i>qetal-ah</i>		

fem.

<i>qētālī</i>	* <i>qetal-ī</i>	* <i>qētālen</i>	* <i>qetal-(h)in(na)</i>
---------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------------

cf. § 11 c.

Preformal:

sg.		pl.		
1.	<i>iqtal</i>	* <i>ʾa-qutl</i> , * <i>ʾi-qatl</i>	<i>niqtal</i>	* <i>na-qutl</i> , * <i>ni-qatl</i>
2. m.	<i>tiqtal</i>	* <i>ta-qutl</i>	<i>tiqtālū</i>	* <i>ta-qutl-ū</i>
2. f.	* <i>tiqtālī</i>	* <i>ta-qutl-ī</i> (cf. the weak verbs)	—	
3. m.	<i>jiqtal</i>	* <i>ja-qutl</i>	<i>jiqtālū</i>	* <i>ja-qutl-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>tiqtal</i>	* <i>ta-qutl</i>	* <i>tiqtālīnna</i>	* <i>ta-qutl-(h)inna</i> (cf. the weak verbs)

other types:

3. m.	<i>jāqtel</i>	* <i>ja-qitl</i>	—	
3. m.	<i>jēqēttel</i>	* <i>ju-qettel</i>	<i>jēqēttēlū</i>	* <i>ju-qettel-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jēqātel</i>	* <i>ju-qatel</i>	<i>jēqātēlū</i>	* <i>ju-qatel-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jiqqātal</i>	* <i>ji-qatal</i>	* <i>jiqqātēlū</i>	* <i>ji-qatel-ū</i> (cf. a sf. form)
3. m.	<i>jiqqēttel</i>	* <i>ji-qettel</i>	—	

-a-preformal:

	sg.			pl.	
1.	<i>'iqtála</i>	<i>*'a-qutl-ah</i>	<i>níqtála</i>	<i>*na-qutl-ah</i>	
1.	<i>'ēqettēlā</i>	<i>*'u-qettel-ah</i>	—		

In the agential group, the basic form of n.ag. has the following paradigm in the normal type:

	sg.			pl.	
m.	<i>qátel</i>	<i>*qatel</i>	<i>qātēlem, -lī</i>	<i>*qatel-im, -i aj</i>	
f.	<i>qātēla, -at</i>	<i>*qatel-t</i>	<i>*qātēlot</i>	<i>*qatel-ā-t</i>	

other types:

m.	<i>qátal</i>	<i>*qatal</i>	<i>qātālem</i>	<i>*qatal-im</i>	
f.	<i>qātálat</i>	<i>*qatal-t</i>	—		
m.	<i>qátal</i>	<i>*qatol</i>	—		
f.	<i>qātálla</i>	<i>*qatol-(a)t</i>	—		
m.	<i>qútal</i>	<i>*qātal</i>	<i>qūtālem, -lī</i>	<i>*qātal-im, -i aj</i>	
m.	<i>qétal</i>	<i>*qitl</i>	—		
f.	<i>qítlat</i>	<i>*qitl-at</i>	—		
m.	<i>qéttel</i>	<i>*qettel</i>	<i>qettēlem</i>	<i>*qettel-im</i>	
f. —			<i>qettēlot</i>	<i>*qettel-ā-t</i>	

the rest are comparable to these.

Afformal: The normal type:

	sg.			pl.	
1.	<i>qātálti</i>	<i>*qatal-t-i</i>	<i>qātálnū</i>	<i>*qatal-n-ū</i>	
2. m.	<i>qātáлта</i>	<i>*qatal-ta</i>	<i>qātáltimma</i>	<i>*qatal-t-u-ma</i>	
2. f.	<i>qātálti</i>	<i>*qatal-ti</i>	<i>*qātáltēn</i>	<i>*qatal-ti-na</i> (cf. weak verbs)	
3. m.	<i>qátal</i>	<i>*qatal</i>	<i>qātálnū</i>	<i>*qatal-ū</i>	
3. f.	<i>qātála</i>	<i>*qatal-t</i>	<i>(qātállā)</i>	<i>*qatal-ā</i>	

other types:

1.	<i>qātélti</i>	<i>*qatel-t-i</i>	—		
2. m.	<i>qātíлта</i>	<i>*qatel-ta</i>	—		
3. m.	<i>qátel</i>	<i>*qatel</i>	—		
3. f.	<i>qātéla</i>	<i>*qatel-t</i>	—		
1.	<i>qātélti</i>	<i>*qatol (>-ul)-t-i</i>	<i>*qātélnū</i>	<i>*qatol (>-ul)-n-ū</i>	
2. m.	<i>*qātéлта</i>	<i>*qatol (>-ul)-ta</i>	<i>*qātéltimma</i>	<i>*qatol (>-ul)-t-u-ma</i>	

3. m.	<i>qâtal</i>	* <i>qatol</i>	* <i>qâtâlû</i>	* <i>qatol-û</i>
3. f.	<i>qâtâla</i>	* <i>qatol-t</i>	—	

for the not attested forms, see § 11 *r*.

The variation in the first stem vowel does not influence the inflexion. The stem with a prothetic vowel follows the pattern of H, that with geminated second radical, that of D.

Nomen potentis (= the later type of nomen patientis):

	sg.		pl.
m.	<i>qâtol</i>	* <i>qatûl</i>	<i>qâtûlem</i> , - <i>lî</i> * <i>qatûl-im</i> , - <i>i</i> / <i>aj</i>
f.	<i>qâtûla</i> , - <i>at</i>	* <i>qatûl-at</i>	<i>qâtûlot</i> * <i>qatûl-â-t</i>

2. Q a l p a s s i v e

The order is again mainly chronological.

Nomen patientis: Normal type:

	sg.		pl.
m.	<i>qêtel</i>	* <i>qutil</i>	<i>qêtilem</i> , - <i>lî</i> * <i>qutil-im</i> , - <i>i</i> / <i>aj</i>
f.	<i>qêtilat</i>	* <i>qutil-t</i>	* <i>qutil-â-t</i> (attested in weak verbs)

the other type:

m.	<i>qêtal</i>	* <i>qutal</i>	* <i>qêtalî</i>	* <i>qutal-î</i> / <i>aj</i>
----	--------------	----------------	-----------------	------------------------------

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.
1.	<i>qêtilî</i>	* <i>qutil-t-î</i>	—
2. m.	—	—	* <i>qûtehtimma</i> * <i>qutil-t-u-ma</i>
3. m.	<i>qêtel</i>	* <i>qutil</i>	<i>qêtilû</i> * <i>qutil-û</i>
3. f.	* <i>qêtila</i>	* <i>qutil-t</i>	—

cf. § 12 *c*.

the other type:

3. m.	<i>qêtal</i>	* <i>qutal</i>	<i>qêtalû</i>	* <i>qutal-û</i>
-------	--------------	----------------	---------------	------------------

Preformal:

sg. 3. m.	<i>jêqtal</i>	* <i>ju-qtal</i>	f. <i>têqtal</i>	* <i>tu-qtal</i>
-----------	---------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

the other type:

sg. 3. m.	<i>jêqâtal</i>	* <i>ju-gatal</i>
-----------	----------------	-------------------

Nomen actionis:

qētēlat **qutul-t?*

3. Q a l r e f l e x i v e

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.
3. m.	* <i>itqātal</i>	* <i>hit-qatal</i> (attested in weak verbs)	<i>'itqātlū</i> * <i>hit-qatal-ū</i>

another type:

2. m.	—	<i>'itqēttimma</i>	* <i>hit-qettel-t-u-ma</i>
-------	---	--------------------	----------------------------

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.
2. m.	—	<i>titqēdlū</i>	* <i>ta-hit-qetal-ū</i>
3. m.	* <i>jitqātal</i>	* <i>ja-hit-qatal</i> (attested in weak verbs)	—

4. N - s t e m.

Nomen patientis (vel agentis 1. potentis): Normal type:

	sg.		pl.
m.	<i>niqqātal</i>	* <i>na-qatal</i>	<i>niqqātālem</i> * <i>na-qatal-im</i>
f.	* <i>niqqātālat</i>	* <i>na-qatal-t</i> (attested in weak verbs)	—

other types:

m.	<i>niqqātel</i>	* <i>na-qatel</i>	<i>niqqātēlem</i> * <i>na-qatel-im</i>
m.	<i>niqtal</i>	* <i>na-qtal</i>	<i>niqtālem</i> * <i>na-qtal-im</i>
f.	<i>niqtāla</i>	* <i>na-qtal-t</i>	<i>niqtālot</i> * <i>na-qtal-ā-t</i>

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.
1.	<i>niqqātālī</i>	* <i>na-qatal-t-ī</i>	—
2. m.	<i>niqqātālta</i>	* <i>na-qatal-ta</i>	<i>niqqātaltimma</i> * <i>na-qatal-t-u-ma</i>
3. m.	<i>niqqātal</i>	* <i>na-qatal</i>	<i>niqqātālū</i> * <i>na-qatal-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>niqqātāla</i>	* <i>na-qatal-t</i>	= masc.

other types:

1.	* <i>niqtālī</i>	* <i>na-qtal-t-ī</i> (cf. weak verbs)	* <i>niqtālnū</i>	* <i>na-qtal-n-ū</i> (cf. weak verbs)
----	------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

2. m.	<i>nīqtālta?</i>	<i>*na-qtal-ta?</i>	—	
3. m.	<i>*nīqtal</i>	<i>*na-qtal</i> (cf. weak verbs)	<i>*nīqtālu</i>	<i>*na-qtal-ū</i> (cf. weak verbs)
3. f.	<i>nīqtāla</i>	<i>*na-qtal-t</i>	= masc.	
1.	<i>nīqqattālī</i>	<i>*na-qattal-t-ī</i>	—	
3.	—		<i>nīqqattālu</i>	<i>*na-hin-qattal-ū</i>

Preformal:

1.	<i>īqqātal</i>	<i>*'a-na-qatal</i>	<i>nīqqātal</i>	<i>*na-na-qatal</i>
2. m.	<i>tīqqātal</i>	<i>*ta-na-qatal</i>	<i>*tīqqātālu</i>	<i>*ta-na-qatal-ū</i> (cf. weak verbs)
3. m.	<i>jīqqātal</i>	<i>*ja-na-qatal</i>	<i>jīqqātālu</i>	<i>*ja-na-qatal-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>*tīqqātal</i>	<i>*ta-na-qatal</i> (cf. weak verbs)	—	

Instead of *-na-*, *-hin-* can have been the original element in any form of the preformal;

other types:

3. m.	<i>jīqqātel</i>	<i>*ja-na-qatel</i>	<i>jīqqātēlu</i>	<i>*ja-na-qatel-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jīqqettel</i>	<i>*ja-na-qettel</i>	<i>jīqqettēlu</i>	<i>*ja-na-qettel-ū</i>

-a-prf.:

sg. 1.	<i>īqqātēla</i>	<i>*'a-na-qatel-ah</i>
--------	-----------------	------------------------

Nomen actionis:

<i>īqqātal</i>	<i>*hin-qatal</i>
----------------	-------------------

other types:

<i>lēqqātēla</i>	<i>*la-hin-qatel-ah</i>
<i>lēqqāttal</i>	<i>*la-hin-qattal</i>

Imperative:

sg.		pl.	
<i>īqqātal</i>	<i>*hin-qatal</i>	<i>īqqātālū</i>	<i>*hin-qatal-ū</i>

other types:

m.	—	<i>īqqātēlū</i>	<i>*hin-qatel-ū</i>
m.	<i>īqqāttal</i>	<i>īqqattālu</i>	<i>*hin-qattal-ū</i>

5. H - stem

Afformal:

	sg.			pl.
1.	'eqtilī	*ha-qtil-t-ī	'eqtilnu	*ha-qtil-n-ū
2. m.	'eqtilta	*ha-qtil-ta	'eqteltimma	*ha-qtil-t-u-ma
3. m.	'éqtel	*ha-qtil	'eqtīlu	*ha-qtil-ū
3. f.	'eqtila	*ha-qtil-t	—	

Nomen actionis:

'éqtel	*ha-qtil; with prep. l : lāqtel	*la-ha-qtil
--------	---------------------------------	-------------

Imperative:

	sg.			pl.
m.	'éqtel	*ha-qtil	'eqtīlū	*ha-qtil-ū
f.	*'eqtilī	*ha-qtil-ī (cf. weak verbs)	—	

Preformal:

	sg.			pl.
1.	'éqtel	*'a-ha-qtil	néqtel	*na-ha-qtil
2. m.	téqtel	*ta-ha-qtil	teqtilū	*ta-ha-qtil-ū
3. m.	jéqtel	*ja-ha-qtil	jeqtilū	*ja-ha-qtil-ū
3. f.	téqtel	*ta-ha-qtil	—	
-a-prf.:				
sg. 1.	'eqtila	*ha-qtil-ah		

Nomen agentis:

	sg.			pl.
m.	méqtel	*ma-ha-qtil	meqtilem	*ma-ha-qtil-im
f.	meqtīla	*ma-ha-qtil-t	meqtīlot	*ma-ha-qtil-ā-t

6. H passive

Afformal:

sg. 3. m.	*'ūqtal	*hu-qtal
-----------	---------	----------

Preformal:

sg. 3. m.	*jūqtal	*ja-hu-qtal
-----------	---------	-------------

Nomen patientis:

	sg.			pl.
m.	*mūqtal	*ma-hu-qtal	*meqtālem	*ma-hu-qtal-im
f.	*muqtāla?	*ma-hu-qtal-t	—	

On the whole, cf. § 15 c.

7 D - s t e m

Afformal: The most common type:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>qettiltī</i>	* <i>qettel-t-ī</i>	<i>qettilnu</i>	* <i>qettel-n-ū</i>
2. m.	<i>qettilta</i>	* <i>qettel-ta</i>	<i>qetteltimma</i>	* <i>qettel-t-u-ma</i>
3. m.	<i>qéttel</i>	* <i>qettel</i>	<i>qettêlu</i>	* <i>qettel-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>qettêla</i>	* <i>qettel-t</i>	= masc.	

another type:

1.	<i>qattāltī</i>	* <i>qattal-t-ī</i>	—	
2. m.	<i>qattāлта</i>	* <i>qattal-ta</i>	<i>qattaltimma</i>	* <i>qattal-t-u-ma</i>
3. m.	<i>qáttal</i>	* <i>qattal</i>	<i>qattālu</i>	* <i>qattal-ū</i>

the change of the first stem vowel does not influence the inflexion.

Nomen actionis:

<i>qéttel</i>	* <i>qettel</i> ; with prep. <i>l</i> : <i>elqéttel</i>	* <i>]-qettel</i> ; <i>qittol</i> * <i>qittūl</i>
---------------	---	---

the change of the vowels does not influence the inflexion.

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>qéttel</i>	* <i>qettel</i>	<i>qettêlū</i>	* <i>qettel-ū</i>

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>'ēqéttel</i>	* <i>'u-qettel</i>	<i>nēqéttel</i>	* <i>nu-qettel</i>
2. m.	<i>tēqéttel</i>	* <i>tu-qettel</i>	<i>tēqettêlu</i>	* <i>tu-qettel-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jēqéttel</i>	* <i>ju-qettel</i>	<i>jēqettêlu</i>	* <i>ju-qettel-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>tēqéttel</i>	* <i>tu-qettel</i>	—	

another type:

1.	<i>'ēqáttal</i>	* <i>'u-qattal</i>	—	
2. m.	<i>tēqáttal</i>	* <i>tu-qattal</i>	<i>tēqattālu</i>	* <i>tu-qattal-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jēqáttal</i>	* <i>ju-qattal</i>	<i>jēqattālu</i>	* <i>ju-qattal-ū</i>

-a-prf.:

sg. 1.	<i>'ēqattāla</i>	* <i>'u-qattal-ah</i>
--------	------------------	-----------------------

Nomen agentis:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	'emqéttel	* <i>m(a)-qettel</i>	'emqettélem	* <i>m(a)-qettel-im</i>
f.	'emqattélet	* <i>m(a)-qattel-t</i>	'emqattélot	* <i>m(a)-qattel-ā-t</i>

another type:

m.	<i>māqéttel</i>	* <i>ma-qettel</i>	<i>māqettélem</i>	* <i>ma-qettel-im</i>
----	-----------------	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

8 D passive

Afformal:

sg. 3. f.	<i>qettāla?</i>	* <i>quttal-t</i>
-----------	-----------------	-------------------

Preformal:

sg. 3. f.	<i>tēqéttal?</i>	* <i>tu-quttal</i>
-----------	------------------	--------------------

Nomen patientis:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	'emqéttal	* <i>m(a)-quttal</i>		
f.	'emqettālat?	* <i>m(a)-quttal-t</i>	'emqettālot?	* <i>m(a)-quttal-ā-t</i>

On the whole, cf. § 16 f.

9. D reflexive I.

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>niqqattālti</i>	* <i>na-qattal-t-ī</i>	—	
2. m.	—		* <i>niqqattaltimma</i>	* <i>na-qattal-t-u-ma</i> (at-tested in weak verbs)
2. f.	<i>niqqattālti</i>	* <i>na-qattal-ti</i> (as pl.)		
3. m.	<i>niqqáttal</i>	* <i>na-qattal</i>	* <i>niqqattālu</i>	* <i>na-qattal-ū</i> (as above)
3. f.	<i>niqqattāla</i>	* <i>na-qattal-t</i>	—	

another type:

3. m.	' <i>iqqáttal</i>	* <i>hin-qattal</i>	—
-------	-------------------	---------------------	---

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
2. m.	* <i>tiqqáttal</i>	* <i>ta-na-qattel</i> (attested in weak verbs)	—	
3. m.	<i>jiqqáttal</i>	* <i>ja-na-qattal</i>	<i>jiqqattālu</i>	* <i>ja-na-qattal-ū</i>

3. f. *tiqqáttal* **ta-hin-qattal* ? (cf. weak verbs)
(cf. the note on N prf.)

Nomen actionis:

'iqqattála **hin-qattal-ah*

10. D e r e f l e x i v e II.

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.
1.	<i>'itqattálti</i>	* <i>hit-qattal-t-ī</i>	
2. m.	<i>'itqattálta</i>	* <i>hit-qattal-ta</i>	<i>'itqattaltimma</i> * <i>hit-qattal-t-u-ma</i>
2. f.	* <i>'itqattálti</i>	* <i>hit-qattal-ti</i> (attested in weak verbs)	—
3. m.	<i>'itqáttal</i>	* <i>hit-qattal</i>	<i>'itqattálu</i> * <i>hit-qattal-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>'itqattála</i>	* <i>hit-qattal-t</i>	

Nomen actionis:

'itqáttal **hit-qattal*

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.
m.	<i>'itqáttal</i>	* <i>hit-qattal</i>	<i>'itqattálu</i> * <i>hit-qattal-ū</i>

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.
1.	<i>'itqáttal</i>	* <i>'a-hit-qattal</i>	<i>nitqáttal</i> * <i>na-hit-qattal</i>
2. m.	<i>titqáttal</i>	* <i>ta-hit-qattal</i>	<i>titqattálu</i> * <i>ta-hit-qattal-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jítqáttal</i>	* <i>ja-hit-qattal</i>	<i>jítqattálu</i> * <i>ja-hit-qattal-ū</i>
3. f.	* <i>titqáttel?</i>	* <i>ta-hit-qattel</i> (cf. weak verbs)	—

-a-prf.:

sg. 1. *'itqattála* **'a-hit-qattal-ah*

Nomen agentis vel patientis:

sg. m. **mitqáttal* **má-hit-qattal* (attested in weak verbs, which see for the forms)

11. F o u r - r a d i c a l s t e m.

Afformal:

sg. 2. m. *qetlilta* **qitl-el-ta*

B. Weak verbs.

In the weak verbs, the weak radical or its replacement appears in the paradigm instead of the corresponding radical of the model verb. Only the forms in which the weak radical affects the inflexion are mentioned.

1. Verba primae³.a. The old I³: Qal:

Nomen actionis with the prep. *l*:

litol **la-ʾatāl*

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>ʿēʾūtel</i>	* <i>a-ʾutl</i>	<i>nāʾūtel</i>	* <i>na-ʾutl</i>
2. m.	<i>tāʾūtel</i>	* <i>ta-ʾutl</i>	<i>tāʾūtēlu</i>	* <i>ta-ʾutl-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jāʾūtel</i>	* <i>ja-ʾutl</i>	<i>jāʾūtēlu</i>	* <i>ja-ʾutl-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>tāʾūtel</i>	* <i>ta-ʾutl</i>	<i>tāʾūtēlinna</i>	* <i>ta-ʾutl-(h)inna</i>

-a-prf.:

sg. 1. *ʿētēla* **a-ʾutl-ah*

another type:

sg. 1. *ʿēʾūtēla* **a-ʾutl-ah*

The other stems are comparable to the common type.

b. The common type: Qal:

Nomen actionis with the prep. *l*:

lāttal **la-ʾutl*

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>ʾāttal</i>	* <i>a-ʾutl</i>	<i>nāttal</i>	* <i>na-ʾutl</i>
2. m.	<i>tāttal</i>	* <i>ta-ʾutl</i>	<i>tāttālu</i>	* <i>ta-ʾutl-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jāttal</i>	* <i>ja-ʾutl</i>	<i>jāttālu</i>	* <i>ja-ʾutl-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>tāttal</i>	* <i>ta-ʾutl</i>	<i>tāttālna</i>	* <i>ta-ʾutl-(hin)na</i>

Q ps: prf.sg. 3. m. *jētal* **ju-ʾtal*.

tQ: prf.sg. 3. m. *jētātal* **ja-hit-ʾatal*.

n.ag.sg.f. *mētātēlet* **ma-hit-ʾatel-t*.

- N: af.sg. 3. m. *nijjatal* **na-ʔatal*; another type: *nätel* **na-ʔtel*.
 n.pat. & ag.: as af.
 prf.sg. 3. m. *ʔijjatal* **ja-na-ʔatal*.
 n.act. *ʔijjatal* **hin-ʔatal*; another type: *ʔijjätala* **hin-ʔatal-ah*.
 imp.m.pl. *ʔijjätälü* **hin-ʔatal-ü*.
- H: af.sg. 3. m. *ʔätel* **ha-ʔtil*
 n.act. *ʔätel* **ha-ʔtil*
 imp.f.sg. *ʔätül* **ha-ʔtil-ü*; pl. **ätülnä* **ha-ʔtil-(hin)na* (in a root with final *n*)
 prf.pl. 3. m. *jätülu* **ja-ha-ʔtil-ü*
 n.ag.m.pl. *mätülem* **ma-ha-ʔtil-im*
- D: n.act. with the prep. *l*: *lättal* **la-ʔattal*.
 prf.sg. 3. m. *jättel* **ja-ʔattel*
 n.ag.sg.m. *mättel* **ma-ʔattel*
- D ps? see § 21 f.
- tD: af.sg. 3. m. *ʔätätal* **hit-ʔattal*
 n.act. *ʔätätal* **hit-ʔattal*
 imp.m.pl. *ʔätätälü* **hit-ʔattal-ü*
 prf.sg. 2. m. *tätätal* **ta-hit-ʔattal*
 n.ag.(/ pat.)m.sg. *mätätal* **ma-hit-ʔattal*

c. Other types: Qal:

Nomen actionis with the prep. *l*:

<i>lätal</i>	* <i>li-ʔatl</i>
<i>lätdla(t)</i>	* <i>la-ʔatal-t</i>
<i>lä(t)ol</i>	* <i>la-ʔatäl</i>
<i>lättal</i>	* <i>la-ʔattal</i>

Preformal:

- sg. 3. m. *jätal* **ji-ʔatl*
 sg. 3. m. *jättel* **ja-ʔattel*
 pl. 2. m. *tätälön* **ta-ʔattal-ü-n(a)*

For the root *ʔ₂lk*, see §§ 22 b, 21 c.

2. Verba primae semivocalis

Qal: Nomen actionis:

<i>tätel</i>	* <i>til-t</i>
<i>tätal</i>	* <i>tal-t</i> (vel * <i>tul-t</i>)
<i>jätal</i>	* <i>jatl</i> vel * <i>jutl</i>

Imperative:

	sg.			pl.	
m.	<i>tél, télā</i>	* <i>tel(-ah)</i>	<i>têlū</i>		* <i>tel-ū</i>
f.	<i>têlī</i>	* <i>tel-ī</i>	—		
m.	<i>tāl</i>	* <i>tal</i>	<i>tâlū</i>		* <i>tal-ū</i>
m.	<i>tāl, tâlā</i>	* <i>tol(-ah)</i>	<i>têlū</i>		* <i>tul-ū</i> (for * <i>tol-</i>)

Preformal:

	sg.			pl.	
3. m.	<i>jūtal</i>	* <i>ji-tal</i>	<i>jūtālu</i>		* <i>ji-tal-ū</i> etc.
2. m.	<i>tātel</i>	* <i>tā-tul</i>	<i>tūtēlu</i>		* <i>tā-tul-ū</i> etc.
1.	ʔ <i>ētal</i>	* <i>ā-til?</i>	<i>nētal</i>		* <i>nā-til?</i> etc.
3. m.	<i>jūtal</i>	* <i>ji-w/jtal</i>	<i>jūtālu</i>		* <i>ji-j/wtal-ū</i> etc.

w-prf.:

3. m.	<i>wjātal</i>	* <i>wa-ja-tVl</i>	<i>wjātālu</i>		* <i>wa-ja-tVl-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>wtātal</i>	* <i>wa-ta-tVl</i>	<i>wtātālinna</i>		* <i>wa-ta-til?-(h)inna</i> etc.

-a-prf.:

1.	ʔ <i>ētāla</i>	* <i>a-til?-ah</i>	<i>nētāla</i>		* <i>na-til?-ah</i>
1.	* <i>iūtāla</i>	* <i>i-tal-ah</i> (attested in a doubly weak root) —			

Q passive: Preformal:

sg. 3. m.	<i>juwwātal</i>	* <i>jū-tal</i>
-----------	-----------------	-----------------

another type:

	sg.			pl.	
1.	ʔ <i>ūtal</i>	* <i>u-tal</i>	<i>nūtal</i>		* <i>nu-tal</i>
3. m.	<i>jūtal</i>	* <i>ju-tal</i>	<i>jūtālon</i>		* <i>ju-tal-ū-n(a)</i> etc.

Qal reflexive: Afformal:

pl. 3.	ʔ <i>iūtālu</i>	* <i>hit-jtal-ū</i>
--------	-----------------	---------------------

Nomen actionis:

* <i>iūtūtal</i>	* <i>hit-wtal</i> (attested in a doubly weak root)
------------------	--

Imperative:

	sg.			pl.	
m.	ʔ <i>iūtātal</i>	* <i>hit-jtal</i> vel <i>-jtol</i>	ʔ <i>iūtātlū</i>		* <i>hit-jtal-ū</i>

Preformal:

	sg.			pl.	
2. m.	<i>tūtūtal</i>	* <i>ta-hit-jtol</i>	<i>tūtūtalū</i>		* <i>ta-hit-jtol-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jūtūtal</i>	* <i>ja-hit-jtal</i>	<i>jūtūtalū</i>		* <i>ja-hit-jtal-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>tūtūtal</i>	* <i>ta-hit-jtal</i>	—		

N-stem: Nomen patientis (vel agentis vel potentis):

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>nūtal</i>	<i>*nā-wtal</i>	<i>nūtdlem</i>	<i>*na-wtal-im</i>
f.	<i>nūtdlat</i>	<i>*na-wtal-t</i>	<i>*nūtdlot</i>	<i>*na-wtal-ā-t</i> (attested in a doubly weak root)

a variant:

m.	<i>nūwwātel</i>	<i>*na-watel</i>	<i>nūwwātēlem</i>	<i>*na-watel-im</i>
----	-----------------	------------------	-------------------	---------------------

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.
2. m.	—		<i>*nūwwātaltim- ma</i> <i>*na-watal-t-u-ma</i> (at- tested in a doubly weak root)

3. m.	<i>nūwwātal</i>	<i>*na-watal</i>	—
-------	-----------------	------------------	---

a variant:

2. m.	—		<i>nūwtaltimma</i> <i>*na-wtal-t-u-ma</i>
-------	---	--	---

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.
2. m.	<i>tūwwātel</i>	<i>*ta-na-watel</i>	<i>tūwwātālu</i> <i>*ta-na-watal-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jūwwātal</i>	<i>*ja-na-watal</i>	<i>jūwwātēlu</i> <i>*ja-na-watel-ū</i>

Nomen actionis:

(with a prep.) *bē'ūwwātel* **ba-hin-watel* (through **bēnw-* > **bēww-* > **bēuww-*)

Imperative is not attested.

H-stem: Afformal:

	sg.		pl.
1.	<i>ʔūtdlti</i>	<i>*ha-wtal-t-i</i>	<i>ʔūtdlnū</i> <i>*ha-wtal-n-ū</i>
2. m.			<i>*ʔūtdeltimma</i> <i>*ha-wtil-t-u-ma</i>
3. m.	<i>ʔūtel</i>	<i>*ha-wtil</i>	<i>ʔūtilu</i> <i>*ha-wtil-ū</i>

a variant:

3. m.	<i>ʔāʔital</i>	<i>*ha-jtal</i>	— (<i>ʔūtilu</i> <i>*ha-jtil-ū</i>)
-------	----------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

Nomen actionis:

ʔūtel, *ʔūtelet* **ha-wtil(-t)*

a variant:

ʔāʔital **ha-jtal* (with the prep. *l* : *litel* **la-ha-jtil*)

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.
m.	<i>ʔūtel</i>	<i>*ha-wtil</i>	<i>ʔūtilū</i> <i>*ha-wtil-ū</i>
f.	<i>*ʔūtili</i>	<i>*ha-jtil-i</i> (attested only sf.)	—

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	ʔütel	*ʔa-ha-wtil	*nütel	*na-ha-wtil (in a doubly weak root)
2. m.	tütel	*ta-ha-wtil	*tütülu	*ta-ha-wtil-ü
3. m.	jütel	*ja-ha-wtil	jütülu	*ja-ha-wtil-ü
3. f.	titel	*ta-ha-jtil	—	

Nomen agentis:

sg.m.	mütel	*ma-ha-wtil
-------	-------	-------------

H passive:

af. 3. m. sg. ʔuwwätel *hu-wtil; pl. ʔuwwätälu *hu-wtal-ü

Other forms are only attested in doubly weak roots.

D-stems: see § 24 h.

3. Verba primae assimilantis

Qal: Nomen actionis:

tillat	*til-t
*tälät	*tal-t (attested in a doubly weak root)
nätal	*natal vel *nutl; with the prep. l : lintal *la-nutl, elnätal / *l-natal

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.
m.	täl, tälā	*tal(-ah)	tälü
f.	tälī	*tal-i	—

another type:

sg.m. nétal, nētāla *netal(-ah)

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.
3. m.	jittal	*ji-tal, -nutl, *ja-nutl	jittälu
3. f.	tittal	*ti-tal	tittälinna
			*ti-tal-(h)inna etc.

a variant:

sg. 2. m. tétel *ta-nitl; 3. m. jétel *ja-nitl(, etc.)

w-prf.:

3. m. wjätal *wa-ja-tol wjätälu *wa-ja-tol-ü

Elsewhere = the main prf.

-a-prf.:

sg. 1. **ittēla* **a-ntil-ah* (?) (in a doubly weak root)

Q passive:

Preformal:

sg. 3. m. *jittal* (for **juttal*) **ju-ntal*; f. **tūttal* **tu-ltal* (in a doubly weak root)

sg.3.m. **jēttel* **ju-ntil* (in a doubly weak root)

II-stem: Afformal:

	sg.		pl.	
3. m.	<i>ʔēttel</i>	* <i>ha-ntil</i>	<i>ʔettilū</i>	* <i>ha-ntil-ū</i> etc.

Nomen actionis:

ʔēttel **ha-ntil*; with the prep. *l*: *lāttel* **la-ha-ntil*

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.
m.	<i>ʔēttel</i> , <i>ʔettila</i> , * <i>ha-ntil(-ah)</i>	<i>ʔettilū</i>	* <i>ha-ntil-ū</i>
	-illa		
f.	<i>ʔettili</i>	* <i>ha-ntil-i</i>	—

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
2. m.	<i>tēttel</i>	* <i>ta-ha-ntil</i>	<i>tettilū</i>	* <i>ta-ha-ntil-ū</i> etc.

Nomen agentis:

sg.m. *mēttel* **ma-ha-ntil*

H passive:

prf.sg. 3. m. *jittal* (for *jūttal* in Ms. B) **ja-hu-ntal*

For other forms (attested in a doubly weak root) cf. § 15 c.

4. Verba secundae '.

Qal: a. The old monosyllabic stem:

Afformal:

sg. 3. m. *qēl* **qīʔl*; f. perhaps *qēlla* **qīʔl-at*

Preformal:

sg. 3. m. *jāqēl* **ja-qīʔl*; f. *tāqēl* **ta-qīʔl*

b. The bisyllabic stem:

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.	
3. m.	<i>qāʔel</i> , <i>qāl</i>	* <i>qaʔel</i>	<i>qāʔēlu</i> , <i>qālu</i>	* <i>qaʔel-ū</i> etc.

Nomen actionis:

qāʔel, qāl **qaʔel*; with the prep. *l*: *elqāʔel, elqāl* **l-qaʔel*

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>qāʔel, qāl</i>	* <i>qaʔel</i>	<i>qāʔēlū</i>	* <i>qaʔel-ū</i>
f.	<i>qāʔēli</i>	* <i>qaʔel-i</i>	—	

another type:

sg.m. *qālā* **quʔl-ah(?)*

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
3. m.	<i>jēqāʔel, jēqāl</i>	* <i>ju-qaʔel</i>	<i>jēqāʔēlu, jēqālu</i>	* <i>ju-qaʔel-ū</i> etc.

other types:

3. m.	<i>jiqqāʔel</i>	* <i>ji-qaʔel</i>	—	
3. m.	<i>jiqqāl</i>	* <i>ji-qaʔal(? -el?)</i>	<i>jiqqālu</i>	* <i>ji-qaʔal-ū</i>
1.	<i>ʔēqāl</i>	* <i>a-quʔl?</i>	—	

Nomen agentis:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>qāʔel(, qāl)</i>	* <i>qaʔel</i>	* <i>qāʔēlem, -li</i>	* <i>qaʔel-im, -i aj</i>
f.	<i>qāʔēlat</i>	* <i>qaʔel-t</i>	<i>qāʔēlot</i>	* <i>qaʔel-ā-t</i>

H-stem: Afformal:

	sg.		pl.	
3. m.	<i>ʔāqīl</i>	* <i>ha-qʔil</i>	<i>ʔāqīlu</i>	* <i>ha-qʔil-ū</i> etc.

another type:

2. m.	<i>ʔāqālta</i>	* <i>ha-qʔal-ta</i>	<i>ʔāqāltimma</i>	* <i>ha-qʔal-t-u-ma</i> etc.
-------	----------------	---------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

Nomen actionis:

ʔāqīl **ha-qʔil*

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>ʔāqīl</i>	* <i>ha-qʔil</i>	<i>ʔāqīlū</i>	* <i>ha-qʔil-ū</i>

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
2. m.	<i>tāqīl</i>	* <i>ta-qʔil</i>	<i>tāqīlu</i>	* <i>ta-qʔil-ū</i> etc.

another type:

3. m.	<i>jāqāl</i>	* <i>ja-qʔal</i>	<i>jāqātu</i>	* <i>ja-qʔal-ū</i> etc.
-------	--------------	------------------	---------------	-------------------------

Nomen agentis:

sg.m. *māqīl* **ma-qʔil*

The other stems follow the pattern of the strong verbs, apart from the stem, which is identical with that of Q; for details, see § 27.

5. Verba tertiae '.

Qal: Nomen actionis:

<i>qāta</i>	*qat' (, *qut'?)	with the prep. l: <i>liqta</i>	*li-qat' (, *la-qut'?)
<i>qātāt</i>	*qat'-at		

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.
m.	<i>qēta</i>	*qeta'	<i>qētā'ū</i> *qeta'-ū
f.	—		<i>qētīn, -tān</i> *qeta'-(h)in(na), -n(a)

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.
3. m.	<i>jiqta</i>	*ji-qat'	<i>jiqtā'u</i> *ji-qat'-ū
3. f.	<i>tiqta</i>	*ti-qat'	<i>tiqtā'inna</i> *ti-qat'-(h)inna etc.

a-prf.:

sg. 1.	<i>'iqtā</i>	*'i-qat'-ah
--------	--------------	-------------

Nomen agentis:

	sg.		pl.
m.	<i>qāta</i>	*qata'	<i>qātīm, -ī</i> *qata'-im, -ī / aj
f.	<i>qātāt</i>	*qata'-t	<i>qātōt</i> *qata'-ā-t

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.
1.	<i>qātātī</i>	*qata'-t-ī	<i>qātānnu</i> *qata'-n-ū
2. m.	<i>qātātā</i>	*qata'-ta	<i>qātāttimma</i> *qata'-t-u-ma
2. f.	<i>qātātī</i>	*qata'-ti	—
3. m.	<i>qāta</i>	*qata'	<i>qātā'u</i> *qata'-ū
3. f.	<i>qātā</i>	*qata'-t	= masc.

another type: Nomen actionis:

<i>qātāt</i>	*qate'-t
--------------	----------

Preformal:

pl. 3. m.	<i>jēqātē'u</i>	*ju-qate'-ū
-----------	-----------------	-------------

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.
3. m.	<i>qātī</i>	*qate'	<i>qātē'u</i> *qate'-ū
3. f.	<i>qātā</i>	*qate'-t (via *qatē'at)	—

H-stem: Afformal:

	sg.		pl.	
3. m.	<i>ʔeqti</i>	<i>*ha-qtīʔ</i>	<i>ʔeqtiʃju</i>	<i>*ha-qtīʔ-ū</i> etc.
3. m.	<i>*ʔiqta</i>	<i>*ha-qtāʔ</i> (attested only with <i>w-</i>); etc.		

Nomen actionis:

<i>ʔeqti</i>	<i>*ha-qtīʔ</i>
--------------	-----------------

Imperative:

sg.m.	<i>ʔeqti</i>	<i>*ha-qtīʔ</i>
-------	--------------	-----------------

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
3. m.	<i>jeqti</i>	<i>*ja-ha-qtīʔ</i>	<i>jeqtiʃju</i>	<i>*ja-ha-qtīʔ-ū</i> etc.
3. m.	<i>jiqtā</i>	<i>*ja-ha-qtāʔ</i>	—	

Nomen agentis:

sg.m.	<i>meqti</i>	<i>*ma-ha-qtīʔ</i>
-------	--------------	--------------------

The other forms are again comparable to the strong verb, apart from the last radical and the vowel preceding it, which behave as in the above forms.

6. Verba tertiae vocalis

Qal: Nomen actionis:

qāta **qata*; *qātōt* **qatō-t*; with the prep. *l*: *liqtot* **la-qatā-t*

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>qētī</i>	<i>*qeti</i>	<i>qētū</i>	<i>*qet(V)-ū</i>
f.	<i>qētī</i>	<i>*qet(V)-ī</i>	—	

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
3. m.	<i>jiqtī</i>	<i>*ja-qtī</i>	<i>jiqtu</i>	<i>*ja-qt(V)-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>tiqtī</i>	<i>*ta-qtī</i>	<i>tiqtinna</i>	<i>*ta-qt(V)-(h)inna</i> etc.
w-prf.:				
sg. 3. m.	<i>wjiqqat</i>	<i>*wa-ji-qt(V)</i> ;	<i>wjāqqat</i> <i>*wa-ja-qt(V)</i> ;	<i>wjāqat</i> <i>*wa-ja-qat(V)</i>

-a-prf.:

sg. 1.	<i>ʔēqāta</i>	<i>*ʔu-qat(V)-ah</i>
--------	---------------	----------------------

Nomen agentis:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>qāta</i> , <i>-tī</i>	* <i>qata</i> , <i>-tī</i>	<i>qātem</i>	* <i>qat(V)-im</i>
f.	<i>qāta</i> , <i>-tat</i>	* <i>qat(V)-at</i>	<i>qātot</i>	* <i>qat(V)-ā-t</i>

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>qātītī</i>	* <i>qati-t-ī</i>	<i>qātīnu</i>	* <i>qati-n-ū</i>
2. m.	<i>qātīta</i>	* <i>qati-ta</i>	<i>qātītimma</i>	* <i>qati-t-u-ma</i>
2. f.	<i>qātīti</i>	* <i>qati-tī</i>	<i>qātīten</i>	* <i>qati-ti-n(a)</i>
3. m.	<i>qāta</i>	* <i>qata</i>	<i>qātu</i>	* <i>qat(V)-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>qātāta</i>	* <i>qata-t-a</i>	= masc.	

Nomen potentis:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>qātūwī</i>	* <i>qatū(j)</i>	<i>qātūwem</i> ,	* <i>qatū(j)-im</i> , <i>-i</i> / <i>aj</i>
f.	<i>qātūjja</i>	* <i>qatū(j)-at</i>	—	

The secondary stems again follow the pattern of the strong verb, apart from stem final vowel, which behaves as in Qal.

7. Verba duum vel trium infirmarum

These behave normally like the corresponding simply weak classes, the effects of the weak radicals being added to each other; for details, as well as certain exceptions, see the relevant paragraphs (32—47). In the triply weak roots, however, there is a new stem not attested elsewhere; therefore its paradigm is given here:

Št-stem: Afformal:

	sg.		pl.	
2. m.	<i>ʾištābbīta</i>	* <i>hit-ša-ʾwi-ta</i>	<i>ʾištābbītimma</i>	* <i>hit-ša-ʾwi-t-u-ma</i>
3.	—	—	<i>ʾištābbu</i>	* <i>hit-ša-ʾw(V)-ū</i>

Nomen actionis with the prep. *l*:

lēštābbot **la-hit-ša-ʾwā-t*

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>ʾištābbī</i>	* <i>ʾa-hit-ša-ʾwi</i>	—	
2. m.	<i>tištābbī</i>	* <i>ta-hit-ša-ʾwi</i>	—	

3. m.	<i>jištābbi</i>	<i>*ja-hit-ša-ʾwi</i>	<i>jištābbu</i>	<i>*ja-hit-ša-ʾw(V)-ū</i>
3. f.	—		<i>tištābijinna</i>	<i>*ta-hit-ša-ʾwi-(h)inna</i>

Nomen agentis:

pl.m. *mištābbim* **ma-hit-ša-ʾw(V)-im*

8. Radices cavatae.

a. The normal type. Qal:

Nomen actionis:

qol **qūl*; *qal* **qol*; with the prep. *l*: *élqol* **l-qūl*

Imperative:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>qol</i>	<i>*qūl</i>	<i>qūlū</i>	<i>*qūl-ū</i>
f.	<i>qūlī</i>	<i>*qūl-ī</i>	—	

Preformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>ʾéqol</i>	<i>*ʾa-qūl</i> (via <i>*ʾu-</i>)	<i>néqol</i>	<i>*na-qūl</i>
2. m.	<i>téqol</i>	<i>*ta-qūl</i>	<i>tēqūlu</i>	<i>*ta-qūl-ū</i>
3. m.	<i>jéqol</i>	<i>*ja-qūl</i>	<i>jēqūlu</i>	<i>*ia-qūl-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>téqol</i>	<i>*ta-qūl</i>	—	

w-prf.:

3. m.	<i>wjāqal</i>	<i>*wa-ja-qol</i>	<i>wjāqālu</i>	<i>*wa-ja-qol-ū</i>	etc.
-------	---------------	-------------------	----------------	---------------------	------

-a-prf.:

1.	<i>ʾēqūla</i>	<i>*ʾa-qūl-ah</i>	<i>nēqūla</i>	<i>*na-qūl-ah</i>
----	---------------	-------------------	---------------	-------------------

Nomen agentis:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>qal</i>	<i>*qal</i>	<i>qālem</i>	<i>*qal-im</i>
f.	<i>qāla</i>	<i>*qal-t</i>	—	

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>qēltī</i>	<i>*qal-t-ī</i>	<i>qālnu</i>	<i>*qal-n-ū</i>
2. m.	<i>qāлта</i>	<i>*qal-ta</i>	<i>qāltimma</i>	<i>*qal-t-u-ma</i>
3. m.	<i>qal</i>	<i>*qal</i>	<i>qālu</i>	<i>*qal-ū</i>
3. f.	<i>qāla</i>	<i>*qal-t</i>	= masc.	

Qal passive: Afformal:

	sg.		pl.	
1.	<i>qiltī</i>	<i>*qil-t-ī</i>	<i>qēlnū</i>	<i>*qil-n-ū</i> etc.

cf. § 49 c.

Nomen patientis:

	sg.		pl.	
m.	<i>qel</i>	* <i>qil</i>	<i>qilem</i>	* <i>qil-im</i>

for fem., cf. ib.

Preformal:

sg. 3. m. *juwwáqal* **jū-qal*

N-stem: Regular type:

n. pot. m. sg. *náqol* **na-qāl*; pl. *nāqûlem* **na-qāl-im*

af. pl. 2. m. *nāqaltimma* **na-qal-t-u-ma*

The type resulting from transformation after Q ps:

n. pat. m. sg. *nēqel* **nuqil*; pl. *nēqilem* **nuqil-im*

af. sg. 3. m. *nēqel* **nuqil*; pl. 3. *nēqilu* **nuqil-ū*

H-stem: The old type:

af. sg. 3. m. *ʔáqel* **ha-qil*; pl. 3. *ʔāqilu* **ha-qil-ū* etc.

n. act. **ʔáqal* **ha-qal* (attested only sf.)

imp. *ʔéqal* **ha-qal*; cf. § 49 k no. 27.

prf. sg. 3. m. *jáqel* **ja-ha-qil*; pl. *jāqilu* **ja-ha-qil-ū* etc.

n. ag. m. sg. *máqel* **ma-ha-qil*; pl. *māqilem* **ma-ha-qil-im*

The new type:

af. sg. 3. m. *ʔiqel* **hi-qil*; pl. 3. *ʔiqilu* **hi-qil-ū* etc.

n. act. *ʔiqel* **hi-qil*

imp. m. sg. *ʔiqel* **hi-qil*; pl. *ʔiqilū* **hi-qil-ū*

prf. sg. 3. m. *jīqel* **ja-hi-qil*; pl. *jīqilu* **ja-hi-qil-ū* etc.

n. ag. m. sg. *mīqel* **ma-hi-qil*

H ps:

af. sg. 3. m. *ʔuwwáqal* **hū-qal*

prf. sg. 3. m. *juwwáqal* **ja-hū-qal*

n. pat. sg. m. *múqal* **ma-hū-qal*

L-stems: The short type:

af. sg. 3. m. *qellal* **qul-al*

prf. sg. 3. m. *jēqēlel* **ju-qul-el*

The long type:

af. sg. 3. m. *qûlel* **qāl-el*

prf. sg. 3. m. *jēqûlel* **ju-qāl-el*

tL: The short type:

prf. pl. 3. m. *jīqellálu* **ja-hit-qul-al ū*

The long type:

prf. sg. 3. m. *tīqûlel* **ta-hit-qāl-el*

R-stem:

af. sg. 1. *qelqilti* **qel-qel-t-i*

prf.sg. 1. *ʔēqēlqel* *ʔu-qel-qel; 3. m. *jēqēlqel* *ju-qel-qel

b. Another type of Qal:

n.act. *qel* *qil

imp.m.sg. *qēl* *qil; pl. *qīlu* *qil-ū

prf.sg. 3. m. *jāqel* *ja-qil; pl. *jāqīlū* *ja-qil-ū

-a-prf. *ʔāqīla* *ʔa-qil-aḥ

The forms of the agential group are normal.

c. The type with permanently long vowel:

n.ag.sg.m. *qol* *qāl

af.sg. 3. m. *qol* *qāl; pl. *qālu* *qāl-ū (cf. § 49 k no. 8)

The forms of the actional group are normal.

d. The roots with ʔ as the first radical follow the strong pattern; only occasionally does contraction occur. Among them, the only example of L is attested:

prf.sg. 3. m. *jāllal* *ja-ʔal-al

e. ʔ as the last radical behaves as in triradical roots.

9. Radices continuabiles

a. The bisyllabic type: Qal.

Nomen actionis:

qālal *qal-al

Imperative:

m.pl. *qāldlū* *qal-al-ū

Nomen agentis:

m.sg. *qālal* *qal-al; pl. *qālālem* *qal-al-im

Afformal:

	sg.		pl.		etc.
3. m.	<i>qālal</i>	*qal-al	<i>qāldlu</i>	*qal-al-ū	

Nomen potentis:

m.	<i>qālol</i>	*qal-ūl	<i>qālūlem</i>	*qal-ūl-im
f.	<i>qālūla</i>	*qal-ūl-at	<i>qālūlot</i>	*qal-ūl-ū-t

In preformal, the monosyllabic type dominates alone.

H-stem:

af.pl. 3. *eqlilu* *ha-ql-il-ū

D-stem:

af.sg. 2. m. *qellīta* *qellel-ta; 3. m. *qället* *qallet; 1. *qallāti* *qallal-t-i; etc.

n.act. *qēllel* *qellel (*qel-el); *qället* *qallet (*qal-el)

prf.sg. 3. m. *jēqället* *ju-qallet; pl. *jēqellēlu* *ju-qellel-ū; etc.

n.ag.m.sg. *ʾemqellel* *m(a)-qellet; pl. *ʾemqellēli* *m(a)-qellel-i / aj; etc.

tD-stem:

n.act. with the prep. *l*: *lētqállal* *la-hit-qal-al

L-stem:

n.act. with the prep. *l*: *elqûlal* *l(a)-qâl-al

prf.sg. 3. m. *jēqûlal* *ju-qâl-al

lL-stem:

n.act. *itqûlel* *hit-qâl-el

prf.sg. 2. m. *titqûlel* *ta-hit-qâl-el

n.ag.m.sg. *mitqûlal* *ma-hit-qâl-al

b. The monosyllabic type: Qal:

af.sg. 2. m. *qâlta* *qal-ta; pl. 3. *qâlu* *qal-ū

n.act. *qâl* *qol

prf.sg. 2. m. *tiqqal* *ti-qal; pl. 3. m. *jiqqâlu* *ji-qal-ū

N-stem:

af.sg. 3. m. *nâqal* *na-qol; pl. 3. *nâqâlu* *na-qol-ū

another type:

af.sg. 3. m. *niqqal* *na-qal

prf.sg. 3. f. *tiqqâl* *ta-na-qal

H-stem:

af.sg. 1. *ʾaqqilti* *ha-qil-t-i; 3. m. *ʾâqqal* *ha-qal

n.act. *ʾâqqal* *ha-qal

prf.sg. 3. m. *jâqel* *ia-ha-qil

For the forms with weak radicals see the relevant paragraphs (54—56).

10. Verbum cum suffixis

The form resulting from the combination of a sf. with a verbal form depending mainly on the former, we do not need to repeat whole conjugations to give examples of any possible combination; it is enough to give examples of the verbal forms ending with different kinds of vowels or with a consonant, provided with suffixes which react to the different endings in a mutually different way. The suffixes of sg. & pl. 2. f. being not attested attached to verbal forms indicating object, and the verbal forms of prf. and af.sg. & pl. 2. f, pl. 3. f., and practically af.pl. 2. m. — for the one irregular

exception see § 57 *c* — not being attested suffixed, we can confine ourselves to the forms of af.sg. 1. provided with the suffixes of sg. 2. m. and 3. m.; af.sg. 2. m. provided with the sff.sg. 1., 3. m. and pl. 3. m.; and af.sg. 3. m. & f., pl. 3. (m.) provided with all these suffixes; and prf.sg. 3. m. with sf.sg. 3. m. in Q of the strong verb; of the weak verbs, the forms of III ' : Q or H af.sg. 3. m. with all these suffixes, and III V: Q af.sg. 3. m., prf.sg. 3. m. are sufficient.

i. Strong verb. Qal afformal:

		sg.		
1.	<i>qātātek</i>	* <i>qatal-t-ī-k</i>	2.	<i>qātātanī</i> * <i>qatal-ta-n-ī</i>
	<i>qātālijju</i>	* <i>qatal-t-ī-hu</i>		<i>qātāto</i> * <i>qatal-ta-hu</i>
				<i>qātālimma</i> * <i>qatal-t(a)-(h)u-ma</i>
3.m.	<i>qātālānī</i>	* <i>qatal-a-n-ī</i>	3. f.	<i>qātālātnī</i> * <i>qatal-t-n-ī</i>
	<i>qātālak</i>	* <i>qatal-a-k</i>		<i>qātālātak</i> * <i>qatal-t-a-k</i>
	<i>qātālo</i>	* <i>qatal-a-hu</i>		<i>qātālātu</i> * <i>qatal-t-hu</i>
	<i>qātālimma</i>	* <i>qatal-(h)imma</i>		
			pl.	
3.	<i>qātālūnī</i>	* <i>qatal-ū-n-ī</i>	<i>qātālōk</i>	* <i>qatal-ū-k</i> <i>qātālūmma</i> * <i>qatal-</i>
	<i>qātālē'u</i>	* <i>qatal-ū-hu</i>		<i>u-(hi-)ma</i>

Preformal:

sg. 3. m. *jiqtālē'u* **ja-qtal-u-hu*

ii. Verba III ' Q/H afformal:

sg. 3. m. *qātānnī* **qata²-a-n-ī* *eqtiĵjak* **ha-qtī²-a-k*
qātā'o **qata²-a-hu* *eqtiĵju* **ha-qtī²-a-hu*

iii. Verba III V. Qal afformal:

sg. 3. m. *qātānī* **qat(V)-a-n-ī* *qātak* **qat(V)-a-k*
**qāto* **qat(V)-a-hu* (actually not attested)

Preformal:

sg. 3. m. *jiqtānī* **jV-qt(V)-a-n-ī* *jiqtak* **jV-qt(V)-a-k*
jiqtē'u **jV-qt(V)-u-hu* —

A part of the examples are transferred from the secondary stems to the corresponding forms of Qal, when in the latter attestations were lacking.

III NOUN

The paradigms of the common nominal types are to be found in the beginning of the relevant paragraphs or their sections. Only for the suffixed forms are they lacking; therefore we give them here.

Nomen cum suffixis

The object form of the pronominal suffix attached to nominal forms does not normally affect more than the vowel of its last syllable (for exceptions see § 100). In the strong roots, therefore, we can content ourselves with three paradigms, viz., one for those in which the (secondary) vowel of the last syllable disappears before suffixes, another for those in which an originally short vowel is lengthened or an originally long, but in the normal form shortened vowel appears in its original length, and a third in which the last consonant is geminated. These we normalize as *qatl*, *qatal*, and *qatil*. In the weak roots, III ' equally demands three paradigms, according to the colour of the last vowel; accordingly, they are normalized as *qata'*, *qati'*, and *qatu'*. For III V, on the other hand, two are enough: one for the types in which the last stem vowel appears consonantal, and the other for those in which it is vocalic and accordingly omitted before suffixes; these we normalize as *qitj* and *qat(V)*. The pl. and fem. affirmatives being identical in all the classes, one paradigm is basically enough for them, but the early division of the fem. affirmative into *-t* and *-at* necessitates another one for it; in addition, ' as the last radical causes contraction in m.pl. and f.sg. forms, which demand one paradigm more each. The stem from which the pl. and fem. forms are derived is normalized as *qatal*; for the alternative stem of f.sg., **qail* must be assumed to be a basic form, but the two types are now frequently confused (see, e.g., root *brk*); in any case, we normalize them as *qatalt* and *qatlat*. Only the sf.pl. 2. m. (and its very rarely attested f.) has partly different influence on the stem; therefore it is always cited beside one or more normal forms.

A. Strong types. i. *qatl*:

	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qátlak</i>	* <i>qatl-a-k</i>	<i>qátelkimma</i>	* <i>qatl-a-k-u-ma</i> (* <i>qatlk-</i>)
3. m. <i>qátlu</i>	* <i>qatl-a-hu</i>	<i>qatlimma</i>	* <i>qatl-a-(h)u-ma</i>
ii. <i>qatal</i> :			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qátátlak</i>	* <i>qatal-a-k</i>	<i>qátalkimma</i>	* <i>qatal-a-k-u-ma</i>
2. f. <i>qátátlek</i>	* <i>qatal-i-k(i)</i>	<i>qátálken</i>	* <i>qatal-V-ki-n(a)</i>
iii. <i>qatil</i> :			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
1. <i>qātilī</i>	* <i>qatil-ī</i>	<i>qātillānu</i>	* <i>qatil-a-n-ū</i>
2. m. <i>qātillak</i>	* <i>qatil-a-k</i>	<i>qātillākimma</i>	* <i>qatil-a-k-u-ma</i>
iv. m.pl.:			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qātálek</i>	* <i>qatal-i/aj-k</i>	<i>qātālikimma</i>	* <i>qatal-i/aj-k-u-ma</i>
3. m. <i>qātálo</i>	* <i>qatal-i/aj-hu</i>	<i>qātālījjimma</i>	* <i>qatal-i/aj-hu-ma</i>
v. f.sg. <i>qatalt</i> :			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qātáltak</i>	* <i>qatal-t-a-k</i>	<i>qātālatkimma</i>	* <i>qatal-t-V-k-u-ma</i>
vi. f.sg. <i>qatlat</i> :			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qatáltak</i>	* <i>qatl-at-a-k</i>	<i>qātālatkimma</i>	* <i>qatl-at-V-k-u-ma</i>
vii. f.pl.:			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qātālútek</i>	* <i>qatal-ā-t-i-k</i>	<i>qātālūtīkimma</i>	* <i>qatal-ā-t-i-k-u-ma</i>

B. Types of III². i. *qata*²:

	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qāták</i>	* <i>qata²-a-k</i>	<i>qātākkimma</i>	* <i>qata²-a-k-u-ma</i>
ii. <i>qati</i> ² :			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qātījjak</i>	* <i>qati²-a-k</i>	<i>qātījjākimma</i>	* <i>qati²-a-k-u-ma</i>
iii. <i>qatu</i> ² :			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qātūvwak</i>	* <i>qatu²-a-k</i>	<i>qātūvwākimma</i>	* <i>qatu²-a-k-u-ma</i>
iv. m.pl.:			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qātik</i>	* <i>qatV²-i/aj-k</i>	<i>qātīkimma</i>	* <i>qatV²-i/aj-k-u-ma</i>
v. f.sg.:			

	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qātāttak</i>	<i>*qata²-t-a-k</i>	—	
C. Types ending with a vowel: i. <i>qitj</i> :			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qitjak</i>	<i>*qitj-a-k</i>	<i>qitjākimma</i>	<i>*qitj-a-k-u-ma</i>
ii. <i>qat(V)</i> :			
	sg.sf.		pl.sf.
2. m. <i>qdtak</i>	<i>*qat(V)-a-k</i>	—	

Table of contents

	Page
Preface	3
List of Abbreviations	7
PART ONE. Phonology.	
§ 1. Distinction and classification of phonemes	27
§ 2. Rhythm and tone	44
PART TWO. Morphology.	
I. General remarks.	
§ 3. Order of word classes	52
II. Pronouns.	
§ 4. The personal pronoun	53
§ 5. Demonstrative pronouns	63
§ 6. The definite article	65
§ 7. The relative particle	67
§ 8. The interrogative pronoun	68
§ 9. The indefinite pronouns	68
III. Verbal system.	
§ 10. General remarks	69
A. Strong verb.	
§ 11. Qal	82
§ 12. The passive of Qal	96
§ 13. The secondary stems of Qal	99
§ 14. N-stem	100
§ 15. H-stems	104
§ 16. D-stem	107
§ 17. The secondary stems of D	111
§ 18. Four-radical verb.	113
B. The weak verbs.	
i. Verba primae infirmae.	
§ 19. General remarks	113
a. Verba primae ' (seu gutturalis).	
§ 20. 'kl, 'mr	114

§ 21. The normal type of I ' based upon n.act. Q * <i>qutl</i>	117
§ 22. I ' Qal based upon n.act. * <i>qatl</i>	123
§ 23. Other types of Q in the verbs I '	125
§ 24. Verba primae semi-vocalis	127
§ 25. Verba primae assimilantis	137
§ 26. A four-radical stem	143
ii. Verba secundae infirmae.	
§ 27. Verba II '	143
iii. Verba tertiae infirmae.	
§ 28. General remarks	150
§ 29. Verba III '	150
§ 30. Verba III V	152
iv. Verba primae et secundae infirmae.	
§ 31. General remarks	159
§ 32. Verba I et II '	159
§ 33. Verba I ' et II semi-vocalis	160
§ 34. Verba I semi-vocalis et II '	161
v. Verba primae et tertiae infirmae.	
§ 35. General remarks	164
§ 36. Verba I et III '	164
§ 37. Verba I ' et III V	165
§ 38. Verba I semi-vocalis et III '	167
§ 39. Verba I semi-vocalis et III V	169
§ 40. Verba I assimilantis et III '	169
§ 41. Verba I assimilantis et III V	172
§ 42. Verbum I et III assimilantis	173
vi. Verba secundae et tertiae infirmae.	
§ 43. General remarks	173
§ 44. Verba II ' et III V	174
§ 45. Verbum II semi-vocalis et III '	176
§ 46. Verba II semi-vocalis et III V	177
vii. Verba trium infirmarum.	
§ 47. Verba I ' II semi-vocalis III V	179
viii. Radices cavatae.	
§ 48. General remarks	181
§ 49. Verba cavata regularia	182
§ 50. Verba cavata I '	189
§ 51. Verba cavata ultimae '	191
ix. Radices continuabiles.	

§ 52. General remarks	192
§ 53. Verba continuabilia regularia	193
§ 54. Verba continuabilia I '	195
§ 55. Verba continuabilia I assimilantis	197
§ 56. Verba continuabilia II '	197
C. Verbum cum suffixis.	
§ 57	198
IV. Noun.	
§ 58. General remarks	200
A. Types formed without pre- and affirmatives.	
i. Simple types containing three radicals.	
§ 59. General remarks	207
§ 60. qatl	207
§ 61. qutl	214
§ 62. qitl	218
§ 63. qatal	221
§ 64. qatil	223
§ 65. qatul	224
§ 66. qatāl	225
§ 67. qatīl	225
§ 68. qatūl	226
§ 69. qutūl	227
§ 70. Types with geminated second radical	228
§ 71. Other types with two short vowels	231
§ 72. Other simple types containing three radicals	233
ii. Simple types containing two radicals.	
§ 73. General remarks	235
§ 74. Types with a short vowel and simple second radical	235
§ 75. Types with a short vowel and geminated second radical	237
§ 76. Types with a long vowel	238
iii. Types formed of more than three radicals and of lengthened or reduplicated stems.	
§ 77. General remarks	240
§ 78. Types with an infixed fourth radical	241
§ 79. Other simple words containing more than three radicals ..	242
§ 80. Types formed by means of repetition of one or two radicals of the primary stem	243
§ 81. Types formed by means of reduplication of the entire primary stem	244

B. Types formed by means of preformatives.	
§ 82. General remarks	245
§ 83. Types formed by means of the preformative <i>ma</i> (<i>mi-</i> , <i>mu-</i>)	246
§ 84. Types formed by means of the preformative <i>ta-</i> (<i>ti-</i> , <i>tu-</i>) . .	253
§ 85. Types formed by means of the preformative <i>'a-</i> (<i>'i-</i>)	255
§ 86. Types formed by means of the preformative <i>ja-</i>	257
§ 87. Types formed by means of other preformatives	258
C. Types formed by means of affirmatives.	
§ 88. General remarks	258
§ 89. Types formed by means of the affirmatives <i>-Vn</i> , <i>-n</i>	260
§ 90. Types formed by means of the affirmatives <i>-Vt</i>	263
§ 91. Types formed by means of the affirmatives <i>-Vl</i>	264
§ 92. Types formed by means of the affirmative <i>-i</i> (<i>/-aj</i>)	264
§ 93. Types formed by means of the affirmative <i>-am</i>	265
D. Irregular nouns and uncertain cases.	
§ 94. General remarks	265
§ 95. Irregular nouns	266
§ 96. Nouns the type of which is uncertain	272
E. Numerals.	
§ 97. Cardinal numbers	274
§ 98. Ordinal numbers	277
§ 99. Other numerals	278
F. Nomen cum suffixis.	
§ 100.	278
V. Particles.	
§ 101. General remarks	282
A. Adverbs.	
§ 102. Spacial	283
§ 103. Modal	286
B. Prepositions.	
§ 104.	289
C. Conjunctions.	
§ 105	293
D. Interjections.	
§ 106.	294
§ 107. Obscure words	295
PART THREE. Synopsis.	
§ 108. General remarks	296

§ 109. Phonetic developments and their effects in the history of Samaritan Hebrew	298
§ 110. Phonetic rules	322
§ 111. Conclusion	323
APPENDIX I. On the manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch in general and the vocalized ones in particular	325
APPENDIX II. Paradigms	336

Addenda

To p. 26: When this work had reached the stage of folded proof, the present writer finally succeeded in obtaining a copy of FRITHIOF RUNDGREN'S book *Das althebräische Verbum — Abriss der Aspektelehre* (Uppsala 1961). Having read it through, I found to my contentment that the differences between his and my results are not nearly as great as I had been led to believe and the title of his work might suggest (cf. BROCKELMANN); as a matter of fact, his basic approach to the problem appears to be largely the same as mine, only that I — due to the nature of my study — must go much more deeply into the concrete material and emphasize the theoretical side only to a lesser degree. In many cases — e.g., in the interpretation of *wajjiqrā — qārā* Gn i 5, p. 103 sq. — the difference is only in terminology; on the other hand, e.g. the fact that he has not succeeded in bringing Waw cons., *āz*, *ṭæram*, etc. under a common denominator may mean that his solution — as regards the nature of his aspects — is inferior to mine; and since he himself admits that his results are only tentative as yet, he might profitably consider the present writer's alternative also. As to the difficulty caused by the necessity of assigning two different meanings to one and the same morphological category, it may best be solved by assigning the conflicting meanings to the *syntactical* construction of which the relevant word is only a part (dealt with in detail in a paper by the present writer unpublished as yet).

To p. 44 (note to § 1): Other kinds of phonemes are scarcely identifiable in SamH. In so far as long vowels and geminates can be assigned phonemic value, they were treated together with simple sounds; on the word stress, cf. § 2.