

MATERIALS FOR A NON-MASORETIC
HEBREW GRAMMAR III

A GRAMMAR OF THE SAMARITAN DIALECT
OF HEBREW

BY

A. MURTONEN

II

The Syntax of Sentences

Introduction

§ 112. Method.

a Some remarks on the method applied in the treatment of the syntax are necessary, since it is not the historical one familiar from the first half of this grammar, nor even any simple one normally used in the description of the syntax, but in a way a combination of both. The reasons necessitating the use of such a complex method are partly due to the nature of the text, partly to the purpose of the study.

b The text we have at our disposal, i.e. the Samaritan Pentateuch, is rather limited both temporally and regarding the extent. True, we have reason to believe that different parts of it have been written down at different times, perhaps with an interval of many centuries between the oldest and youngest parts, but in the opinion of the present writer the results of the Pentateuchal criticism are far from convincing as yet, and furthermore, we have ample evidence that far-reaching harmonization has occurred afterwards. This has demonstrably led to the effect that in certain cases *nomm.act.* have been re-interpreted as forms of *af.*, in others probably even as *nomm. ag.*, and certainly most such — and analogous — changes cannot be discovered any longer. Moreover, it is evident that the dialect underlying the pronunciation is not identical with the one in which the original text was written, which fact might be responsible for a number of already mentioned and additional discrepancies.

c Even the extent of the text would be too limited as material for a historical syntax, but for a synchronical description it is well more than sufficient. This became evident to the present writer, when he went through the text in a search for all possible types of

sentences: the first 4 chapters of Genesis already contained more than a fourth of them, the first 12 about a half, the first 18 more than two thirds, and the first 24 more than five sixths. After the 30th chapter of Genesis, new types of sentences are practically all almost indistinguishable variants of the earlier ones. The exactitude of the distinction of different types can be estimated on the ground of the total number, which is near 600.

d Such an amount of material can be classified in many different ways. Since ours is a preliminary study for a historical grammar, it is natural to take the historical aspect into account as far as possible. Therefore the present writer decided not to separate composite sentences from the simple ones, nor subordinate clauses from the main ones, all the more since the latter distinction does not make any justice at all to the structure of our text, but starting from the simplest possible forms of sentence and means of combination to follow the course of the development of the more specified syntactical forms from these and other elements. This is *not* to say that the development in every single instance or even in all the major branches has been similar to that described — we just established that we have not material enough to demonstrate that —, but it does say that these elements have been used originally more independently — or perhaps in combination with other elements and according to different principles, many of them probably representing combinations of still earlier elements — and only gradually became more closely attached to one another.

e So we can briefly describe our method as quasi-historical or *derivational*, the latter understood in the formal sense of the word.

§ 113. THE DIVISION OF THE TEXT BY THE SAMARITANS.

a The division of the Pentateuch into five books is maintained also by the Samaritans; nowadays they are called by the first (significant) word in the text of the respective book, as by the Jews, viz., Barâšet, Shêmot, Wjîqra, Bamâdbar, and Debârem, but the original names are still to be seen in the older mss., viz. 'ésfar 'erra-

'*šon*, '*šfar* '*eššémí* etc., i.e., simply The First (Second, etc.) Book. The extent of the single books corresponds to that in MT, apart from their inner differences.

b A second major division is that into sections or *qišsem* the number of which varies in the single books as well as in the whole Pentateuch. According to the edition of v. Gall, p. 439, only three mss. give the number of the sections of the whole Pentateuch, two of them as 966, and the third as 960. According to the numbers given at the end of every single book in a number of mss., the numbers for the whole Pentateuch vary between 958 and 969, the most frequently occurring figure being 965. The reasons for the differences may be local and periodical differences in the liturgical customs as well as mistakes in the tradition chain. The end of each section or *qišša* is marked by means of a sign the form of which is different in different mss.; common to the vast majority of them, however, are the familiar colon: and a lengthy horizontal line normally on the level of its middle; the result, —:, is the normal form in most of the oldest mss., while most of the later ones add one or more, sometimes highly ornamental figures between these two basic parts, sometimes double the whole, and so on. In a few mss. an oblique line / or an angle < appears instead of the horizontal line. Normally the sign has the same form throughout the ms., but in a couple of mss. the present writer has observed slight variation.

c The colon: alone is used — equally from earliest times we have evidence — originally apparently to separate independent sentences, but in later mss. even to mark smaller caesuras of the text; it is called *šfaq* »interruption», and may be identical with the Tiberian *Sof pasuq*. The normal sign for marking smaller sections, such as subordinate clauses, substitutes of sentences, and so on, is the same sign turned into horizontal position on the level of the main line of writing, called *šged* (the original meaning of the term is unknown; perhaps »restraint» as a lighter modification of interruption?). Still one sign can properly be numbered among the pure inter-punctuation marks, viz. *aná'u* »rest»; it is intended to indicate that a longer time has passed between actions narrated in the sentences

which it separates, and is accordingly a stronger variant of *áfsaq*. It is rarely used, since mostly the sign of *qíssa* appears in such places. Its sign is a small circle on the level of the main line of writing °.

d The rest of the interpunctuation signs have a clear reference to the contents of the expression they mark, often emotionally accented. We enumerate them in the order they usually appear in Samaritan lists (*anged*, *áfsaq*, and *aná'u* precede in this order): 4) *arkánu* »submissiveness», consisting of an oblique line, the upper end toward the right /; it marks expressions of meekness and submission; 5) *šíla* »question», consisting of the horizontal colon and an angle with point toward the left below it <̂; it corresponds — in general — to our question-mark; 6) *zîqa* »shout, cry», consisting of a point and of a line after it, the latter normally in a slightly oblique position, falling toward the left /'; it marks expressions calling attention of human beings; 7) *atmá'u* »surprise», consisting of the normal colon and an angle (as in no. 5) after it < :; it marks expressions of surprise; 8) *bá'u* »request, prayer», consisting of one point and the familiar angle <. ; it marks humble petitions, above all prayers to God; 9) *zâf* »(burst of) anger», consisting of double no. 6 = :; it marks expressions of vehemence and anger; and 10) *tîru* »teaching», consisting of the familiar colon and of a vertical line after it |; it marks didactic expressions.

e The use of the above marks, however, is anything but consistent. As mentioned, even the appearance of *áfsaq* varies very remarkably between different mss. and — can be added here — even within one and the same ms. The same is the case with *anged*; moreover, among the oldest there are mss. in which it does not appear at all or does rather infrequently (to the latter belongs even the famous »holy» scroll attributed to Abiša). The rest of the signs seem to appear slightly later still, being perhaps invented by one man, at least a part of them. Their appearance remains rather infrequent throughout, except for some certain (different) signs in certain few mss.

f Single words are normally separated by means of a dot on the level of the middle of the normal letters ·, where interpunctuation

marks do not appear. In the oldest mss., as well as in a number of less skillfully written younger ones, the latter do not appear at all, and in them the dot usually is put even at the end of lines, where in the other mss. normally only the interpunctuation marks proper appear.

Part one

The division of the text into sentences.

§ 114. General remarks.

a Before we can start dealing with different types of sentences and single sentences, we must define what we mean with the term »sentence». Since sentences as a rule do not appear isolated, but as elements in a more or less continuous flow of speech — may it be of one subject, or of several alternating subjects —, and the meaning of single sentences is mostly dependent on the meaning of its context to a considerable extent, it seems best to start from the text both in the definition referred to and in the determination of the types of sentences.

b Accordingly, as a working hypothesis, we preliminarily define a sentence as a part of speech conveying an idea and capable of being understood without any additions. This does not exclude the possibility that a sentence can appear as a part of another sentence. Of the parts of the speech equally conveying an idea, but incapable of being understood without any additions we use the terms »clause» and »substitute of a sentence».

§ 115. First-rate sentences.

a In Gn 1 1 we read: *barāšet bāra 'ælúwem it eššámem wit áreš.* The statement tells us that somebody, viz., God, did something, viz. created, and additionally the temporal circumstances as well as the result of the action. The local environment is included in the result, which needs no attributes to be more exactly defined, nor

the subject of the action. Even the verb could be very well understood without any definition of local, temporal, and modal circumstances, since its meaning has nowhere been attested as depending on them; therefore the lack of mention of the modal circumstances is no defect, and the express statement of temporal circumstances adds something to the basic idea. However, no part of the statement conveys an idea in itself; on the other side, neither is the statement a part of a larger statement conveying a single and coherent idea. Therefore we can call it *a simple first-rate sentence*.

b In Gn i 3, again, we read: *wja'ûmer 'alûwicem jâ'i 'or wjâ'i 'or*. Again, there is somebody, God, who does something, viz. speaks; and additionally we are told the contents of this speaking and even its effect. But this time the initial statement, that God spoke, is quite enough to fulfil the requirements of being a sentence, and two statements are left each conveying an idea as well. Moreover, the second statement: »Let there be light!» is capable of being understood without any additions as well as the first; but these two sentences together equally well form a statement conveying a single and coherent idea and capable of being understood without additions. We therefore could call the latter *a compound first-rate sentence*.

c Actually, however, this is not the case. To be a first-rate sentence, a statement must additionally fulfil the condition that it is not a part of a larger statement conveying a single and coherent idea. In our passage, there is still the statement: », . . . and so there was light». This, of course, is not capable of being understood without any additions, since it tells us the result of an action. That action being told in the two preceding sentences, it completes the idea already contained in them, just as »heaven and earth» does in v. 1. On the other hand, it has all the other characteristics of a real sentence: it conveys an idea and both the acting subject and the verb expressing the action appear independently of the other parts of the first-rate sentence. We therefore call it *a resultative clause*, and the whole v. 3 *a complex first-rate sentence*.

d Again, in Gn i 14 we read: . . . *jâ'i ma'ûrot bærqî 'eššâmem lâ'er 'al 'âreš* . . . and in Gn ii 17: . . . *ëbjom 'êklak mimmbinnu mot*

têmot. Instead, we could in the former instance say the same thing by . . . *wa'iru 'al 'âreş* . . . , in the second, by . . . *êbjom 'êşar ta'ûkel* . . . Accordingly, *nomm.act.* in these sentences represent whole sentences; therefore we could call them *substitutes of sentences*. In the first instance, however, as it stands now, the subject of the *n.act.* is identical with that of the whole sentence, and therefore it is most natural to interpret the *n.act.* as a mere supplement to the main verb, while in the second instance this explanation does not apply. True, even there the subject of the *n.act.* is materially identical with that of the main sentence, but formally this is not the case, since it is expressed by means of a suffixed pronominal form attached directly to the *n.act.*, while that of the main sentence is included in the verbal *prf.* form functioning as the predicate. Accordingly, the *n.act.* represents a sentence and conveys a coherent idea, but cannot be properly understood without any additions, which is why we call it a substitute of a sentence. From a clause it is additionally distinguished through its dependence from the prepositional construction *êbjom* appearing as a temporal adverb both to it and to the main sentence. For the whole first-rate sentence beginning with this word we must coin a new term; including as it does a kind of embryo in its inner it might most properly be called a *gravid first-rate sentence*.

e But is it indeed a first-rate sentence? Above (*e*) we established that a first-rate sentence must fulfil the condition that it is not part of a larger statement conveying a single and coherent idea. The statement now dealt with seems indeed to belong together with the preceding one, with which it is even combined by means of the particle *ki*, which is usually regarded as a means of subordination; moreover, the sentence serves as a statement of the reasons for the prohibition contained in the preceding sentence. However, this need not be so. The particle *ki* appears even as a general deictic particle to indicate that something very important follows, in the way of '*inna*: »lo, behold», and from the context it can be easily seen that the intention is not to state the actual reason why the eating from that tree must be avoided, but rather to tell its dire consequences.

The idea of death being unmentioned therefore, it seems best to interpret *ki* in the sense of a deictic particle stressing it as something quite new.

f However, it cannot remain unrecognized that the sentence *is* in some connection with the preceding one, which again is a continuation of the one preceding it, and all of them are, in a way, overshadowed by their predecessor. To represent their mutual relations we use the term *period*. With a period we mean a series of two or more first-rate sentences combined with one another by means of coordinative conjunctions or asyndetically, the ideas conveyed by sentences being in an uninterrupted chain of mutual connections and coordination. This means that, in our example, the words of God in v. 16 b—17 form a period of three first-rate sentences, while the whole period is a predicative supplement to the main sentence in v. 16 a. A period, accordingly, can appear as a part of a larger sentence, in which position a single first-rate sentence cannot appear, since the idea conveyed by it can, in such a case, be co- or subordinated to that of the main sentence and accordingly both sentences amalgamate into one first-rate sentence (cf. *b-c*).

§ 116. Second-rate sentences.

a In Gn i 3, we met two regular sentences: *wja'úmer 'ælúwem*, and: *já'í or*, but were compelled to state that they are not first-rate sentences, since they are but parts of a larger statement conveying a single and coherent idea (viz., how God created light). Being genuine sentences, but nevertheless subordinated to a larger whole called a first-rate sentence, we regard it as most convenient to call them *second-rate sentences*. A second-rate sentence, accordingly, is one having all the characteristics of a real sentence, but appearing as a part of a larger statement conveying a single and coherent idea.

§ 117. Elementary sentences.

a It could seem that with the conception of second-rate sentences, the category of sentence could be exhausted. This, however,

is not the case. For as in the first-rate sentences not all of their elements are genuine sentences, since clauses and substitutes of sentences cannot be properly understood without any additions, while the genuine sentences included in them can, so even in the first-rate sentences composed of one single sentence, and in the second-rate sentences there are elements which cannot be understood separated from the rest, and others for which the other elements are semantically unnecessary. E.g., in Gn i 1, the words *bâra 'ælûwem* »God creating» are well understandable without the rest of the words of that verse, and the addition of the latter does not alter their basic meaning in any way, but only add occasional circumstances. Moreover, there are sentences which do not have any parts expressing such circumstances, e.g., in v. 3: . . . *jâ'i* or . . . The same role can be played even by one word, e.g., in v. 28: . . . *fêru* . . . »be ye fruitful!» When appearing accompanied by words expressing more or less occasional circumstances, such sentences are elements of larger sentences — be it that the other elements are not comparable to them in every respect —, and therefore those shortest possible forms of sentences may best be called *elementary sentences*.

Part two

Analysis of single sentences.

§ 118. G E N E R A L R E M A R K S.

a In the first part, we found it most convenient to start from the whole text as a given entity and — with one exception — to proceed from larger entities toward smaller ones. In this part, the course of procedure will be different. The elementary sentences forming — so-to-say — the trunk of all the sentences, round which the other parts of sentence are grouped as branches and twigs, it seems to us best to begin with them to create a convenient starting point for the analysis of larger sentences, which even that is — for analogous reasons — best to perform *a minori ad maius*.

A. *Elementary sentences.*

§ 119. G E N E R A L R E M A R K S.

a It is customary to divide sentences into nominal and verbal ones, and we shall observe that distinction too, where it is performable without interpretational difficulties, since it in such cases influences the form of sentences. In the elementary sentences, however, this is not always the case, since certain usages of n.act. do not allow any characteristics on the basis of which that distinction could be made. Moreover, the use of certain forms of the suffixed personal pronoun in connection with n.act. (cf. § 124 *d*) shows that no such distinction was made in principle, either. Therefore we might be entitled to regard that kind of usage of n.act. as a connective link between nominal and verbal sentences and, consequently,

ideally as the primitive form or source from which both types have developed. Therefore we also may best begin with them, and call them — with the above-mentioned reservation — *primitive sentences*.

I. SENTENCES CONSISTING OF ONLY ONE MEMBER.

§ 120. Primitive sentences.

a In Lv ii 6 we read: *fátat útæ féttém* . . . Formally, the initial word could be regarded as an imp., cf. the root *šr* II, but the fact that Tg has imp. only as a ms.var. might indicate that originally, at least, the form was regarded as a n.act. Accordingly, the form is a primitive sentence which we may best translate with »crumbling», and fitted into its context freely: »The next phase of its treatment is crumbling (it into small pieces) . . .» Imperative can be equally used as a free — and shorter — rendering. A comparable instance is Nm iv 2: *nášæ 'it ré'oš bāni qæt* . . ., where the initial *n* prevents us from taking the initial word as an imp. (supposed to be permanent, its vowel would be abnorm). In general, however, this form of sentence is strongly in decrease when compared with its appearance in the MT; usually the imperative is substituted (cf., e.g., Ex xiii 3, xx 8, Dt i 16, v 12).

b That adverbially used n.act. which can be interpreted as a primitive sentence has met with a comparable fate. E.g., in Gn viii 3, where MT has *wajjāšūbu hammájim me'ál há'áræš hālôk wāšôb* . . ., SP has, instead of the two last words, 'aláku ušábu, i.e., af.pl. Again, in Gn xxvi 13 we read *wjgdal a'iš wjálak álek wgdal* . . . instead of . . . *hālôk wgdál* . . . of MT. True, even *álek* does appear as a form of n.act. of this root (cf. vol. II sub voce), but the normal form of the adverbially used n.act. being *'álok*, the form here may best be interpreted as n.ag., as the following word is even in MT. This use of n.act. being — in the passage of time — in decrease even in MT (cf., e.g., Sperber in HUCA XIV p. 226, 228; §§ 98, 101), there might be no uncertainty of which reading is the original one. Of the state of affairs in Gn xii 9, however, Sperber — following

v. Gall's main text against the vast majority of mss. — gives a wrong picture: SP reads here *wjissæ 'ábram álok wnása 'ennígbaē*. There being no doubt of the nature of *álok*, even *wnása* may best be interpreted as n.act., and both words as forming a hendiadyoin: »journeying».¹

§ 121. Immediate modifications of primitive sentences.

a 1. In § 120 *a* we met with a primitive sentence used in an imperative sense, but without the subject receiving the expressed command being specified. We also found that this kind of command is in decrease, the regular imperative being used instead. The imperative itself, however, is nothing but a light modification of n.act. so used. So particularly when sg. is used in a collective sense, e.g. *šémor* »take heed!» Ex xx 8 Dt v 12 addressed to the whole nation: only the vocalization is slightly modified — due to the different stress, cf. § 11 *c* —, and no respect is paid even to the number of the addressed. Where this is done, an old characteristic of plural, the affirm. *-u*, is used in forms by which a plurality is addressed, while special forms taking even the quality of the addressed into account — the so-called fem. — bring the specification still farther. As can be expected from the source of this form of speech, it is used not only in an expressly imperative sense, but also in propositions and admonitions, e.g. Gn xiv 21: . . . *warrákoš qá-lak*; more often, however, this kind of imp. is provided with a final vowel, which seems to modify its meaning into that very direction, e.g., in the same verse: . . . *tánaē li ennáfiš . . .*; and even when stating what will happen, e.g., Gn xii 3: . . . *wēbi baráka*.

b 2. On the other hand, there are cases which can be conceived as reductions of the primitive sentences to the nominal direction,

¹ In Gn viii 7, where I earlier (vol. II sub voce) interpreted *wšeb* as a form of n.act., it may be best to take this word for a n.pat. used instead of n.ag., cf. the root *mVt* (vol. II, sub voce); and § 49 *b*, *k* no. 16 (and § 10 *p*).

the actional (or verbal) aspect being for some reason or other so clear that it does not need to be expressed. So e.g. in answers to certain kinds of questions, as 'áni Gn xxvii 24 as an answer to the question 'átta zē bēni 'išab. And of course there are many other cases in which the unexpressed supplement would not have been predicative, e.g. tob Gn i 10 a.e. (preceded by the deictic particle ki »behold!«), where it is the subject (e.g., hū') which is »lacking«. These kinds of sentences are often described as »elliptical«, as if they would have been created by means of leaving out parts of fuller, »regular« sentences. As a matter of fact, the actual development might in most cases have been just the contrary, seeing that those shorter, »elliptical« forms are much more usual in the spoken language than in the written one, and nobody might question which of these two is the primary one.

II. SENTENCES CONSISTING OF TWO MEMBERS.

§ 122. General remarks.

a In most cases it is impossible to express an idea clearly enough without mentioning the subject spoken of, and adding something relevant to that subject. Therefore we might be entitled to presuppose that the normal sentences always have two or more parts which at least historically can be distinguished from one another. And since it is possible to reduce sentences containing more than two parts into sentences of two parts (see above, § 117), we might be entitled further to conclude that no sentences consisting of more than two parts can belong to the elementary sentences. Therefore we can regard sentences consisting of two parts as the *normal form of elementary sentences*.

b As stated above, the subject is always — at least ideally; cf. § 126 — mentioned in this group of sentences. Accordingly, it is the nature of the other element according to which they can be divided into more limited sub-classes. The main division is customarily made between sentences indicating characteristic or quality

(in the formal sense of these words) the predicate of which consists normally of a noun, and sentences indicating — again formally — some kind of state or action, the predicate of which regularly consists of a verbal form. However, there are cases in which one and the same form can be used both in a nominal and in a verbal sense. In such cases it has been customary conventionally to agree, which forms are to be regarded as nominal and which as verbal; so, e.g., the construction *l* + n.act. is agreed to be nominal. The basis for this agreement might have been provided, apart from the appearance of the prep., by the view that n.act. is to be regarded primarily as a noun; in the light of § 120 *ab*, however, this is at least questionable. Therefore we deem it most appropriate to abandon this division in its normal schematic form and to try to classify even this group as seen from the historical point of view. Even so, nominal and verbal sentences remain the most important sub-classes, but some transitory forms and other variations are also attested.

c Since even all the verbal forms have their origin in those that either at the time of their formation had already acquired a nominal character or later on acquired that (see § 10), it seems best to start with the nominal sub-class.

§ 123. ELEMENTARY NOMINAL SENTENCES.

a It has been stated that the nominal sentences composed of two parts, subject and predicate, have developed from those consisting of only one part, viz. subject, provided with an attribute¹. Again, I must differ. The independent use of such sentences is in any case confined to the cases in which the attribute is a possessive suffix, and even among them the vast majority of cases belong to two stiffened formulas the main words of which must usually be regarded as mere copulas and have not been originally nouns at all, either (cf. §§ 184 *b*, 190 *a*. The appearance of nouns proper in

¹ Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax § 14 a.

such a function provided with a possessive suffix may have originated through the analogy of the so-called dominant concept (cf. § 157); e.g. *ufilgášu* Gn xxii 24 can be interpreted »and as regards his concubine . . .» as well as »and he had a concubine . . .»; interpreted in the latter way, it became analogous to **ufilgáš lu* and could afterwards get followers even in cases where the former kind of interpretation is not applicable. The other kinds of nominal sentences consisting of only subject provided with an attribute do not appear except in the middle of larger ones, and can therefore most naturally be interpreted as originating from bipartite sentences the predicate of which has been transformed into an attribute in connection with its amalgamation with the larger entity, and not vice versa.

b So we might do best supposing that the bipartite nominal sentence originated from the monopartite one simply either by the division of the original primitive expression (cf. § 120), or through the addition of an expression indicating a state or quality of the subject already mentioned. Of course, if we choose to call this expression an attribute, we may do so; but in my opinion, the word »attribute» better fits a conception more narrowly defined than »predicate», the former being normally used of a quality or possessor of the thing expressed by the main word, while the latter etymologically means anything publicly uttered about the subject, and even in common use is on the whole less subjected to restrictions or any kinds of rules than the attribute.

c The thing about which something is stated is in most cases — even if far from all — more important than the thing stated about it. Again, the most important thing is normally recalled first; accordingly, in speech it normally receives its expression first. Hence *the basic principle of Hebrew syntax: Subject precedes to the predicative and dominates the whole sentence.* This is generally recognized to be true in nominal sentences; as to verbal sentences — where the very opposite is normally held to be the case —, we return to the matter in § 125.

d The normal word order might be familiar enough to need no examples; however, since it is the normal opinion that pronouns as

subject are an exception, we want to correct this basically wrong idea. True, in the vast majority of nominal sentences pronoun as a sbj. follows to its predicate, but this is due to a certain and quite simple reason, to which we soon return; and we need not go far to find an example of the normal order with a pronoun as a sbj.: Gn ii 4 *'illa túldat eššámem wáreš . . .* Note that the pronoun is in no way particularly stressed; but not without stress, either.

e As already referred to, there are exceptions — and not few — to the normal word order. However, when examining them more closely, we find that actually they are no «exceptions» in the normal sense of this word, but expressions of the same rule an expression of which even the normal word order is: *the most important thing is mentioned first*. Normally — or rather mostly — the sbj. is the most important; but where predicative — or a part of it — is particularly stressed, or where sbj. loses stress, the latter is postponed.

f The most usual reason for sbj. to lose its stress is its familiarity. In long sequences of sentences, where one sbj. alone appears, it normally cannot attract special attention after its introduction; therefore what is stated about it is more interesting, accordingly is felt more important. E.g. Gn x 20 *'illa báni 'am . . .* after a long enumeration of their names. In such connections the noun indicating sbj. is often exchanged for a pronoun, which thus in itself is an indication that sbj. has become unstressed, e.g. Gn iv 11 *'áror átta . . .*; accordingly, this is the reason why pronoun as a sbj. normally is postponed — only a pronoun referring to what follows need not be unstressed as a sbj.

g Even the other cases in which sbj. is unstressed may lastly go back to its familiarity. So e.g. Gn iii 16 *wel 'išek tešúqátek . . .*; although woman's desire is not expressly mentioned before, it is obviously one of the things the story is intended to explain, and therefore certainly familiar to the author. Another example: Gn iv 13 *gádol 'úni minnáše . . .*; even if a word appearing as a sbj. is not mentioned before, the matter expressed thereby is dealt with in the preceding sentences.

h Then there are cases in which the predicate is particularly

stressed and for this reason precedes to the sbj., although this has not lost its stress. The last example above already may be akin to them; a clearer example is Gn xxxiii 1 . . . *wimmu 'árba má'ot 'iš*. It is stressed that Esau is not coming alone, he has an escort; the number of men — though even that surely not devoid of interest — is less important this time, it being already known to Jacob. Another one is Gn xlix 9 *gor 'árja jē'áda* . . ., though here again a kind of familiarity of the sbj. has had some influence too, since Judah was to be expected after Levi in the normal order of Jacob's sons. However, even the prd. is more than normally stressed, since thereby the superior quality Judah's compared with the before mentioned — and most other — brethren is expressed.

i The dominant position of sbj. in the sentence is expressed even in other ways. The most important of these may be the so-called congruence, which means that prdv. agrees in the so-called gender and number with the sbj. Again, it is customary to state a number of exceptions from this rule; but at a closer examination they are found to be only apparent. First, the »exception» that the predicate agrees with the idea of the sbj. rather than with its form, is actually the basic rule, since language in the first place is a conveyor of thoughts and only secondarily their creator; therefore, as soon as a word formally sg. comes to express a pluralistic concept, it is natural to construct the word even in the language as a pl., since it in any case is thought of as a pl.; and contrarily, when a word formally pl. acquires a sg. meaning; e.g. Dt xxviii 31 . . . *šē'únak netinot lijjábek* . . ., where even the pl. form of the receivers helped to think of the small cattle as of a group individual animals; and contrarily, Gn xxvii 29 . . . *'arêrek 'áror wembærrêkek bârok*, where the possibly pluralistic groups of those that curse or bless Jacob are conceived as one collective soul each, the distinctive characteristic of such a soul being its very function according to which it is called¹.

k Another »deviation» from the congruence is stated to be the circumstance that a demonstrative pronoun when appearing as a

¹ Cf. the author's treatise »The Living Soul» (Helsinki 1958), esp. Chapter IV.

sbj. follows to the prdv. in gender and number, and not vice versa. However, it is hard to imagine how a prdv. which in these cases consists mainly of a substantive, could follow to the sbj. in gender at least, and even the number is normally determined by other factors. And second, the demonstrative pronoun itself being of an adjectival character, always agreeing in gender and number to the substantive it refers to, it does not seem to me proper to state that it *follows* to the prdv.subst. in gender and number, but rather, that they are in mutual agreement — due to factors that determine the outward form of them both, i.e., in the first place to the contents of the statement¹.

l Dem.pron. as a sbj., however, is already an indication of the fact that the influence of the sbj. upon the prdv. is smaller than that of the main word upon its attribute. Another indication clearer still of the same fact is that the prdv. does not follow to the sbj. in determination, even if this of course is due to the nature of the matter, since prdv. always indicates something unknown in comparison with a determined sbj. However, dissimilarity exists, whatever its cause may be. For the phenomenon of determination itself, its nature and causes, see § 159.

m In this connection it might not be out of place to say some words of the so-called gender and number of the noun in general, their use having even syntactical significance. It is a fact that most words used of feminine beings have special endings to indicate this affiliation. It is, however, also a fact that there are numerous words in the nature of which nothing specially feminine can be discovered, but which nevertheless regularly use these endings. And at last, there are even nouns without doubt meaning feminine beings which do not show these endings in their basic forms at least. However, the adjectives attached to the last group regularly show them. The last mentioned fact seems to indicate that development in these

¹ Since no du. form appears in SP as a sbj., we cannot deal with a third phenomenon which is sometimes regarded as a deviation from the normal congruence.

relations has taken place. Therefore it does not seem that the endings originally would have been attached to the feminine words properly. And when we examine the nature of the non-fem. words using these endings, we find that they regularly indicate something *weak* compared with the concept expressed by the word form lacking this ending, e.g. the so-called nomm.unit. to collective nouns (as SamH 'énjot »(Single) ships» to TibH 'éni »fleet», TibH šá'ará »a hair» to SamH šár »(the) hair»; accidentally no collective noun with its n.unit. is preserved in SamH). One single representative of a certain class is very conveniently conceived as weaker than the whole class. And since women are generally regarded as the weaker sex, it is easy to understand that these two groups — names for weaker beings and those for feminine ones — probably originally overlapped already, and ultimately in the syntax were totally confused¹; but since this was not originally the case, and the group even to-day is much larger than can plausibly be included in the conception of »feminine», I repeat the suggestion made in § 58 e n. 1 that the terms »gender», »masculine», and »feminine» should, in the Semitic grammar, be replaced by »power», »dominant» (abbr. »dt.»), and »dominated» (abbr. »dd.»), respectively; for reasons stated there, however, these terms have not been taken into use in this grammar yet.

n As to the number of the noun, we find the state of affairs still more complicated. As can be expected from TibH — and the rest of the ancient Semitic languages —, sg. appears as the by far

¹ Exceptions, such as *dob šakkāl* MT Hos xiii 8, are only apparent; probably in such cases the sex of the relevant animal was not thought of at all, but it was spoken of as a collective being, the adjective being accordingly in its basic form. As to the feminine collective nouns, such as (TibH; in SamH they are not preserved) *bat j^erušálájim*, *b^etulat bat j^esrá' él*, it is my opinion that they are not formed as collectives to — usually unattested — singular nouns of the type *bæn-j^erušálájim*, but rather as a kind of »second-rate collectives» to the proper names Jerusalem, Israel, etc. themselves, which in themselves are collectives of a higher grade, and accordingly probably considered stronger than the feminine ones (which this time might even originally have been really feminine, as the terms suggest and a population — as children of a mother — can easily be conceived of).

most general number. In addition, we have at least traces of no less than eight formations expressing a plurality, viz. those formed by means of attaching the endings 1) *-á'em*, 2) *-em* (var. *-ím*), 3) *-i*, 4) *-on*, 5) *-ot*, and 6) *-at* (var. *-et*), at the end of the sg. stem — usually with more or less different vocalization, on the causes of which see the relevant paragraphs in Morphology — of the relevant word; and additionally 7) one formed by means of reduplication of a simple pl. form, and finally 8) one which is formally quite as sg. — but has its prd. in pl. Of these, no. 1) appears very rarely and always indicating that of the relevant entities two are spoken of: *šēnatá'em* »2 years», *'alafá'em* »2000»; it is therefore to be regarded as a special dual ending. However, even in that function it is being replaced by a more general pl. ending, e.g., *máttem* »200», and so regularly in nouns usually appearing in pairs, e.g., *'ínem* »eyes», *regálem* »feet». No. 6), again, is actually a var. of no. 5), the different vocalization being caused by that of the neighbouring syllables. No. 7) appears in one word only, viz. that for »water», which appears only in pl. (perhaps because of the pluralistic appearance of the water e.g. when it is raining); in the passage of time, the pluralistic meaning can have been forgotten — the form being analogous to a sg. with vocalic ending —, and a new pl. formed; but the latter can also be an ancient »pl. of pl.» familiar from some other Semitic languages. In any case, even it is very old, since reduplication as a means for pl. formation seems to be used at very early times only; on the other hand, in cases like this, where the application of the normal ending would probably have led to the original form, and even in the best case to a form differing only slightly from the original one, the use of this ancient method could be resorted to even some time after it was generally outdated. Of the rest, nos. 2) and 3) are the normal endings of the so-called masc.pl., the latter being used in st.cstr. apparently because of the close attachment of the word to the following one; it is even possible that it has originated from no. 2) through the omission of the final consonant (see § 58 f). No.5), again, is the normal ending of the so-called fem.pl. The fact that these three endings sometimes appear contrary to the normal usage

(e.g., 'ábot »fathers», 'inšem, 'inši »women»), however, suggests that this distinction is secondary, and it is in deed possible that no. 5) is not of uniform origin¹. Finally, nos. 4) and 8) are somehow related to each other, even if mutually contrariwise. The former appears in other Semitic languages (Akk., Aram., etc.) as a common pl. ending, in Arabic frequently attached to so-called »broken plural» types with mainly collective meaning, and in a similar function we find it even in Hbr. True, in SamH we do not find it any more constructed syntactically as a pl., but a collective meaning is easily discovered in many instances; e.g. *fêmmôn* the essential character of which consists of an indefinite number of *fêm*'s, small »steps» or moves; *âmon*, now in the first place a (noisy) multitude, but originally the humming voices emitted by that multitude; probably also such as *šafâfon*, now attested only as meaning a single viper (? compared to a collective entity), but originally perhaps that species in general; and perhaps even such as 'illijjon, if this be analogous to 'elûwem (from that the more frequent use of this ending to form adjectives could be secondarily derived). No. 8, again, seems to bear witness for the still larger use of sg. even in pluralistic meaning in the ancient times; there might be no doubt that they originally were syntactically constructed as sg., as most of the collective nouns still in our material are; but the fact they now are constructed that way is psychologically interesting, since it — together with some other phenomena — indicates that in the formation of language, idea precedes to the regular formation by some interval, and meanwhile forms appear that we aptly call *constructiones ad sensum*. (Cf. above, *i.*)

§ 124. Transitional forms of sentences.

a As stated before (§ 10 *e-f, m*), the normal verbal forms used in our material may have originated from nominal ones or such

¹ Cf. P. Haupt, Akk. Sprache (1883) p. xxxvii; Cyrus Adler, Hebraica vol. III p. 269.

which closely resembled them. Before reaching a definitely verbal stage, however, they underwent a preparatory change which resulted in forms that can be used verbally as well as nominally. These remained as a part of the inventory of the language, and we call them verbal nouns (n.act., n.ag., n.pat., n.pot.).

b Sometimes it is possible definitely to state that a sentence with a verbal noun as sbj. belongs to the nominal or verbal category, e.g., *ṭob ṭitti* Gn xxix 19 is without doubt verbal, it being constructed with an object; and the frequently occurring *lîmor* «as an (official) utterance», which is to be regarded as the subject of the following utterance, is quite as certainly nominal. But even in the former instance we see a nominal characteristic, viz. the possessive suffix, which cannot in any way be reconciled with the verbal character of the whole sentence. And in cases like *lâ-ṭob 'éjjot 'âdam elbéddu* Gn ii 18 we do not find any characteristic by which we — on an objective basis — could place it into *whichever* class. It is only because of that conventional — which is to say, arbitrary — agreement that n.act. is basically a noun, that it is usually placed among the nominal sentences.

c Remaining upon objective grounds, and at the same time regarding the matter from the historical point of view, we must state that the sentences in which a verbal noun appears as a sbj., are not — or no longer — nominal sentences, nor yet verbal sentences in the proper sense of the word. In other words, they are in a kind of transition from nominal to verbal sentences. A good illustration of this development is the type *ṭob ṭitti*. The position of the prd. — due to a special stress upon it — is here irrelevant; sbj. alone counts. We could replace the sentence by *ṭob 'êšar itten*, since we know that a future affair is in question, and neither the action of giving nor the role of the giver is particularly stressed; but in so doing we would profoundly change its nature. It would then cease to be a simple elementary sentence and become a complex second-rate sentence, with *ṭob* as a predicative clause. And on the other hand, its replacement by a genuine nominal sentence would demand a long paraphrasis, e.g. *mattâna ṭûba lak wnetîna ṭûba lî wgam lâ*

netinâta 'al jêdi (presupposing that all these words and phrases would exist in SamH). These attempts teach us two things: first, that it is possible to replace a sentence by another belonging to a different class, and second, that the transitional form of sentence, where it is used, is simpler than its both verbal and nominal counterparts. This may also be the main reason why they appear continually through all the phases of the language in spite of their constant tendency to become verbal.

d The tendency to become verbal is apparent in the form *tîtti* already. True, the suffix *-i* is possessive, accordingly definitely nominal, but actually the whole form, to be clearly understood, must be interpreted »that I give», and not literally »my giving». This is a further reason why the relevant suffix should be called »the sbj. form of the pronominal suffix» rather than just »possessive suffix» — not to speak of a »genitive suffix» at all (cf. § 4 *b, e*). In fact, it is quite analogous to the affirmative of 1st pers.sg.af., with the only difference that it is attached to a n.act., and the latter to a n.ag. (/pat.). This is further corroborated by the fact that the sf. form *-i* attached to n.act. can express even the formal obj. (see Nm xxii 13, Dt xxv 7); n.act. is in such cases passive.

e However, *tîtti* is not verbal in the full sense of the word. Nor is that the class of nomm.act. that we call substitutes of sentences. In a way, every n.act. is a substitute of a sentence, but where a n.act. already has acquired a verbal character comparable to *tîtti*, having direct dependencies of a verbal character, or where it even without them — as *'éjjot* Gn ii 18 — occupies a central position in a larger sentence, they seem to me in the first place to belong to these larger connections. A good example of a substitute of a sentence is *'êklak* Gn ii 17. Analogous to *tîtti*, it can be replaced by *'êšar ta'úkel*. The suffix again represents the sbj., and the form is a cross-breeding of prf. and af., the elements corresponding to those of prf., their sequence to that in af. More limited in time is *bæbbara'immê* Gn ii 4, which corresponds to a *ka'êšar nibbarâ'u*. Most examples of this class, however, are furnished by the common construction of *l + n.act.*

f True, the construction of *l* + n.act. appears sometimes even as a subj., e.g. *éltet* Gn xxix 26, *lâššut* xxxi 29, and there are numerous examples of its having definitely verbal dependencies, e.g. *lâšqot it éggan* Gn ii 10, *lebbâda welšémra* v. 15. Both of these phenomena, however, seem to me secondary, and the majority of cases are at any rate ambiguous, as e.g. *lâššut* Gn ii 3, which best may be interpreted »as his work», . . . *lâ'er 'al âreš wlcémšal béjjom ubellîlê wlabdel bin â'or ubin . . .* i 17—18, where the nomm.act. could be replaced by the corresponding w-prf.'s without any other changes, but also — in principle at least — by the corresponding nouns out of the same roots¹ (provided that these would exist in SamH): . . . *elma'ûrot 'al âreš welmemšalat béjjom ubellîlê wlabdâlat bin . . .*; as is seen, the prepositions are supposed to function as nomm.recta in such a case.

g However, the replacement of *l* + n.act. by a noun does not correspond to the normal usage in SamH any longer. This is an indication of the fact that the construction is getting a definitely verbal character. From the last example we see that this character is closely related to that of the normal w-prf. Why, then, was this new form created beside the old w-prf. at all? I think this must be ascribed to two factors. First, during the (first) heavy stress period the vowel of the *w* of the w-prf. became deprived of stress and subsequently lost, which in numerous forms — sooner or later — led to the formal identification of w-prf. and the normal prf. provided with *w* used in its later, conjunctive sense². Such a confusion had naturally to be avoided. And for the second, it seems that at about the same time many temporal distinctions so far neglected — or expressed in another way — became acute³. So it was perhaps earlier on enough to state the purpose of a command or deed by means of a w-prf. even in cases in which it had not yet been finally fulfilled, e.g. — in our example — . . . *wja'iru 'al âreš . . .*, as it still can be done when — at the time the story is narrated — the

¹ Cf. §§ 165 *e*, 168 *b*, and Brockelmann, Hebr. Syntax § 82 *b*.

² Cf. §§ 41—47.

³ Cf. § 125 *h*.

command has been finally carried out (Ex xxvii 20, Lv xxiv 2 a.e.). But from that time on a tendency to distinguish between these two kinds of actions began to be realized, and the construction of *l + n.act.* was mainly used to express a purpose not yet completely fulfilled. Therefore it — by way of analogy — was secondarily used even as a *sbj.* or other part of sentence to express the same thing (cf. above, *f*). This secondary usage is, at the same time, an indication that the construction has definitely broken the limits of a normal nominal construction a characteristic of which is that it never appears as a *sbj.* On the other hand, however, it cannot yet be regarded as a real conjugation, either, since the pronominal suffixes attached to it can express subject as well as object without changing their form (apart from the 1st pers.sg.).

h The other verbal nouns do not appear as a *sbj.*, but even they show a definite tendency to become mainly verbal in character. At the same time they give a good illustration of the development leading to the formation of the affirmative conjugation¹. As can be expected, the action or state expressed by them can belong to any temporal sphere (past, present, future, indefinite), e.g., *wnâr jâşa . . Gn ii 10*, which is apparently thought of as continuing at the time of the narrator and indefinitely later, as also *'û essûbab* in the next verses. The same is the case with *jadâ'i tob wrâ iii 5*, where the form is still nominal, and the construction a genuine substitute of a sentence (equivalent to **wjadallimma tob wrâ*). A *n.pot.* appears in the same position in *'âror âtta iii 14, a.e.*, but here the time is future, as also in *'anâki mâmṭer vii 4*. The present time is implied in *jâri 'anâki xxxii 12*, *'attimma mabæqqêsem Ex x 11 a.e.*, the past in *'i muṣât Gn xxxviii 25 a.e.* (in Qal it is often difficult to distinguish *n.ag/pat.* from *af.*, they being formally identical in the 3rd pers.sg.; the origin of *af.* is still recognizable even in this circumstance).

i A nominal sentence is temporally undetermined in itself, but it can be placed into different temporal spheres by various means

¹ Even this was originally undetermined temporally; cf. § 125 *g*.

one of which, the use of the so-called copula, belongs here. To place a nominal sentence into past or future, the preformative and affirmative conjugations of the verb 'ִV Qal are used as a copula, and for the present or undetermined time, the 3rd pers.pron. E.g., *wennāš 'éjja 'ārom . . .* »and the serpent was most cunning . . .» Gn iii 1, *zākar unaqāba jājju . . .* »they are to be male and female . . .» vi 19, where even a modal aspect is included, as apparently even in *la 'éjju 'abādek cēm^m raggêlem* »your servants (= we) have not been spies» xlii 11 (affirmative). Of an undetermined sphere of time: *'a'enāšem a'illa šélmem imma . . .* Gn xxxiv 21; of the present time: *wjúsif 'ú 'eššallet* xlii 6; a.e. But even a particle can appear in the function of a copula; it has then reference to the present or undetermined time, e.g. *wāreš inna rábbot jêdem . . .* Gn xxxiv 21, *'ēm ješkímma 'āšem . . .* xxiv 49; the latter is conjugated in *'cēm jāšat nāfeškímma liqbar . . .* xxiii 8, accordingly shifted to definitely verbal category, even if the origin of the form is spurious (cf. MT, and Ms. D = main text in the edition of v. Gall).

§ 125. ELEMENTARY VERBAL SENTENCES.

a Under the term of »verbal sentences» we understand such sentences as are composed of a nominal or pronominal — which elliptically may be even lacking — sbj. and of a prd. expressing a state or action of the sbj. Both can have been fused together, as is normally the case, when sbj. is represented by certain pronominal elements.

b In the light of what has been said in the preceding paragraphs, it is apparent that genuinely verbal sentences are principally represented by those in which forms of different preformative and affirmative conjugations appear. The relations of these two types of conjugations have not been cleared up until the present time, even if different theories explaining a large amount of facts have been advanced¹. Following our principle, we refrain from their

¹ Cf., e.g., Brockelmann, *Hebr. Syntax* § 40.

detailed discussion in this volume, but hold that some remarks on Brockelmann's hypothesis — which the present writer has not seen refuted in detail anywhere — of the nature of af. as simply establishing, of prf. as a cursive aspect are necessary. First, the explanation given in Hebr. Syntax § 41 *e* for the appearance of af. in certain sentences seems to me rather far-fetched, for a modal sense can at least equally easily be discovered in many prf. forms too, e.g. the example given by him in § 42 *g*: *kī šām^e 'á kī-šām^e jōk^elū līhām* can be translated »... essen *sollten*» at least as well as »... würden». And what is more, his own observation that even af. is used of repeated actions in the past (§ 41 *a*) makes his argumentation for § 42 *d* (»Der kursive Aspekt dient manchmal auch zum Ausdruck sich wiederholenden Handlungen der Vergangenheit») quite unsatisfactory. Since this concerns one of the key points in the controversy, we believe that this alone is enough to show his whole hypothesis to be unsatisfactory.

c The present writer now tries to demonstrate his own view of the nature of differences between the two conjugations and of their origin in the limits of the Samaritan material. In principle it is very simple, but the development of the dialect has complicated it so far that a distinction between an older and a younger stage must be made, the time limit — in my opinion — coinciding with the heavy stress period leading from the Old Canaanite over to the historical period of Hebrew (cf. §§ 109 *p-w*, 111). However, no real contradiction can be observed even between any forms created during different periods.

d The basic rule is identical with that governing the word order even in nominal sentences: that which is most important, or most interesting, and accordingly *most stressed, is mentioned first*. In the normal flow of speech, when various subjects alternate from time to time, it is in the majority of cases the sbj. which attracts the main stress; but if it is one and the same sbj. which throughout the presentation or conversation is being dealt with, or if the hearer otherwise is expected to know the sbj. beforehand, the prdv. or some part of it normally attracts the stress, particularly if it has

some kind of special interest or importance. In verbal sentences — except imp., which we in § 121 found to be essentially pre-verbal, and where the direct voluntative tendency found its expression — this generally greater stress laid upon the sbj. materialized in the earlier formation of the preformative conjugation (cf. § 10), in which each personal form in itself is a complete elementary verbal sentence. True, in the 3rd pers. the element representing sbj. is not pronominal in the proper sense of the word (ib. *h*), but — as stated there — not far from that, either (actually, it might perhaps be cognate to the so-called fem. form of 3rd pers.pron.sg. originally used in indirect voluntative expressions, which — at least in principle — imply that the addressed one is being dominated, cf. § 123 *m*; e.g. **jā-ʾukl*^V »he may eat«).

e The need of emphasizing some other part of the sentence than sbj. was more urgent only in the narratives — in everyday speech imp. might have reduced that need to a pretty small amount —, and in the earliest times nominal sentences and the use of verbal nouns might have satisfied that need so that the final establishment of an affirmative conjugation took place rather late. In it, the forms of the 3rd pers. have formally remained on the stage of n.ag (/pat)., since no pronominal elements are attached to represent the sbj.; this is either expressed by a separate word or only ideally implied (in this case we can really speak of elliptical sentences, provided that the sbj. is not impersonal, in which case it is implied in the stem itself).

f The affirmative conjugation seems to have preserved its character unchanged up to the end of the period represented by our material. This might to a large extent be due to its rather late establishment: the pronominal character of the affirmatives might still have been conscious to the people at the time of the great transformation leading from the Old Canaanite over to the historical form of Hebrew. With prf., the things were otherwise. There was not much left of a similarity between the — suffixed or separate — pronominal forms and its preformatives, and apparently had not been for a long time. Therefore the sbj. was no more felt to be in-

cluded in the verbal form in the full sense of the word, and where sbj. was specially emphasized, it began to be added even before the verbal form, e.g. *šêma 'alûwî 'abulikîmma jâsef* . . . Dt i 11. The process of the sbj. as included in the verbal form getting forgotten was naturally accelerated by the fact that, especially in narratives, a special mention of sbj. in the 3rd pers. was often needed; this took normally place in the form of an apposition, which usually was placed immediately after the verbal form. When the sbj. included in the latter was forgotten, the appositional character of that word fell into oblivion too, and it began to be regarded as the real sbj. Thus, the impression that the normal word order in verbal sentences is contrary to that in the nominal ones was created. However, since an emphasized sbj. was continually placed before any verbal form, no substantial confusion was thereby created, the only significant change being that prf. from now on could be used even where prdv. (or its part) was more stressed than sbj., even if this in many cases did not mean any change in the word order, e.g. in w-prf., where it originally was the — adverbially used — particle *wa* which bore the main stress (cf. § 10 i), depriving the verbal form of its own, but now lost it to the latter, which then was considered to be most stressed, inheriting the position of the former adverb which now became prefixed to it and with its stress also lost its emphasized, adverbial sense, being transformed into a common conjunction. On the other hand, for the so-called jussive form of prf. the change meant an addition to its possibilities of expression, since it thereafter was capable of emphasizing the action without repeating the word stem before the verbal form (cf., e.g., *jîqqâbu 'émme* Gn i 9 with *môt témot* ii 17, etc.).

g As a result we establish that the use of af. or prf. in a certain sentence does not depend on anything else than the question, which of the two is more stressed, sbj. or prdv. (or its part). Another question is, how this distinction is materialized in practice? If the sbj. is in the 1st or 2nd pers., af. is used, if action is more stressed than sbj., e.g. *'arîmti* Gn xiv 22, *'a'îbla* xxii 2. Where no other part of the sentence than the verbal form is stressed enough to appear

in the beginning of the sentence, but even the verbal form is not particularly stressed, prf. is used; and so even if the verbal form is stressed, if the stress is due to voluntative tendency (»jussive») and »cohortative»), since this affects even sbj. But if some other part of sentence is stressed, both prf. and af. can be used. Hence, it seems, complications and even confusion can arise.

h However, the latter is not the case. This is due to the growing tendency to transform the conjugations into real tenses (which, as known, in Mishnaic Hebrew appears completed). A seed for this development was present from the earliest phases of the formation of the verbal system, when prf. was created in the first place to express voluntative ideas; a voluntative expression virtually always implies that its fulfilment lies in the future. On the other hand, as we saw above, the need for af. was in the main present in longer narratives, which — due to the nature of the matter — mainly dealt with past and — to some extent — present events. Therefore it was natural that, after the tendency to temporal division began to be urgent, prf. developed mainly to express future things, af. mainly past (while n.ag. little by little gained ground as an expression for the present tense, even if it did not develop into a real conjugation until the most recent phase of Modern Hebrew). The tendency appears even in the fact that where af. appears meaning future events, it is always accompanied by a particle (mostly *w-*) showing that it is a question of future event in relation to what has been said before or can be presupposed to be known as a general background to the statement, e.g. *'anâki 'immak wšamártek* Gn xxviii 15, *'ad mêti ma'intæ* Ex x 3; and similarly, when prf. is used of past events, it is normally accompanied by particles turning it into a kind of relative future, as the frequent *wjâ'i* »then it happened that . . .»; *'ez jâšar mûši* »thereupon Moses sang . . .» Ex xv 1; *wkæl ši eššâdi tærem jêjji . . .* »and before there was to be any growth of the field . . .» Gn ii 5; but of course it was possible to use even af. in such connections, as in *'û tærem kâllæ* »he had not yet finished» xxiv 15, cf. v. 45 (prf.). In the position after a stressed part of sentence — as far as I have checked — af. indeed always (apart from

poetry, Dt xxxiii 3) appears with reference to past, prf. referring to future (with the exceptions just mentioned). These are the general principles; as regards details, they are better dealt with in connection with a text specimen.

i Gn xxx seems to the present writer very suitable for such a purpose, since all the essentially different usages of af. and prf. appear there in a relatively short, continuous part of the text. Therefore we now briefly examine every such form in that chapter, in the order they occur therein: v. 1: *wtêrê râ'el* »then R. understood», i.e., in consequence of the events told in ch. xxix. Sbj. is familiar, therefore postponed. *ki lâ jalâda* »that she would not bear»; sbj. is familiar, and negation slightly stressed, as usually; therefore af. *wteqénnî* »therefore (R.) was jealous»; relative fut., therefore prf.; familiar sbj. postponed. *wtâ'ûmer* »and therefore she said»; relative fut. v. 2: *wjâr af jáqob* »thereupon J.'s wrath arose»; rel.fut.; sbj. familiar, therefore postponed (*af* is essentially a complement to the verb, J. actual sbj.). *wja'ûmer* »so that he said»; rel.fut. *mâna* »has withdrawn»; rel.past. ('êšar sbj.), therefore af. v. 3: *wtâ'ûmer* »thereupon she said»; rel.fut. *wtâlad* »so that she will bear»; relative as well as absolute future; as is seen, w-prf. is used even of future events. *wibbénni* »and so I shall get children»; as the preceding case. v. 4: *wtitten* »so she gave»; rel.fut. *wjâba* »and (J.) went»; rel.fut. v. 5: *wtâr balê* »and B. conceived»; rel.fut., familiar sbj. *wtâlad* »and bore»; rel.fut. v. 6: *wtâ'ûmer râ'el* »thereupon R. said»; rel.fut, familiar sbj. *danâni 'elûwcem* »God has given me right»; rel.past, verb stressed, therefore af. and (additionally familiar) sbj. postponed. *wgè'm šâma*: parallel to the preceding one. *wjitten* »and therefore gave»; rel.fut. *'âl-ken qarâ* »therefore she called»: cj. stressed, therefore af. v. 7: *wtâr . . . wtâlad* as in v. 5. v. 8: *wtâ'ûmer râ'el* as in v. 6. *niffatâlti* »I have fought»: rel.past, also stressed obj. preceding. *wgè'm jakâlti*: parallel to the preceding one. *wtiqra* »and so she called»; rel.fut. v. 9: *wtêrê lijja* »then L. observed»; rel.fut. *ki 'amâda* »that she had ceased»; rel.past. *wtiqqa* »and took»; rel.fut. *wtitten* »and gave»; parallel to the preceding one. v. 10: *wtâlad zîlfa* »so Z. bore»; rel.fut., sbj. familiar. v. 11: *wtâ'ûmer lijja* »thereupon L. said»:

rel.fut., sbj. familiar. *wtiqra* »so she called»: parallel to the preceding one. v. 12: *wtâlad zilfæ*: as in v. 10. v. 13: *wtâ'ûmer lijja*: as in v. 11. 'ašarûni bânot: the verb is stressed, therefore af., and sbj. postponed. *wtiqra* »so she called»: parallel to *wtâ'ûmer*. v. 14: *wjâlak re'ûben* »thereafter R. went»: rel.fut., familiar sbj. *wjimša* »and found»: parallel to the preceding one. *wjibi* »and brought»: rel.fut. *wtâ'ûmer râ'el* »then R. said»: rel.fut., sbj. familiar. v. 15: *wtâ'ûmer* »so she said»: rel.fut.; sbj. familiar, therefore even omitted (elliptical sentence). *wleqqætti* »so that you would take»: rel.fut., but af., since action is stressed. *wtâ'ûmer râ'el* »so R. said»: rel.fut. *jiškab* »he may lie»: the action stressed, but in a voluntative sense (= including sbj.), therefore pf. v. 16: *wjâba jâqob* »so, when J. came»: rel.fut., sbj. familiar. *wtišša lijja* »so L. went out»: parallel to the preceding one. *wtâ'ûmer* »and said»: equally parallel. 'ili tabû »to me shall you come»: particle stressed, and rel.fut., therefore pf. šakar šakértek: action is stressed to the extent that the word stem is repeated; therefore af., too. *wjiškab* »so he lay»: rel.fut. 17: *wjišma 'ælûwem* »in consequence thereof God heard»: rel.fut. *wtâr wtâlad* »so that she conceived and bore»: rel.fut. twice subsequently. v. 18: *wtâ'ûmer lijja* »thereupon L. said»: as in v. 11. *nâtan 'ælûwem* »God did give»: action is stressed; *natâtti* »I gave» rel.past. *wtiqra* as in v. 13. v. 19: *wtâr . . . wtâlad* as in v. 5. v. 20: *wtâ'ûmer-lijja* as in v. 11. *zabadâni 'ælûwem*: action is stressed. *ebbâm jizbalinni* »this time (my husband) may elevate my rank» (?): the particle is stressed, and rel.fut., therefore pf. *jalâditi*: action is stressed; also rel.past. *wtiqra* as in v. 13. v. 21: *wâ'er jalâda*: particle detaches the verb from connection with the preceding verbal forms and, being stressed, demands af. *wtiqra*: rel.fut. v. 22: *wjezâkar 'ælûwem* »then God remembered»: rel.fut., sbj. familiar. *wjišma . . . wjišta* »and heard . . . and opened»: parallel to the preceding one. v. 23: *wtâr wtâlad* »and so she conceived and bore»: rel.fut. twice subsequently. *wtâ'ûmer* »therefore she said»: parallel to the preceding one (or rel.fut.). 'âsef »(God) has removed»: the verb is stressed (and rel.past), therefore af. v. 24: *wtiqra*: parallel to *wtâ'ûmer* in v. 23. *jâsef šêma* »may the Lord add»: the verb is stressed, but so is sbj. too (»jussive»), therefore pf.

v. 25: *wjâ'i* »and it happened»: parallel to the preceding statement or rel.fut. *jalâda râ'el* »R. had born»: the particle preceding is stressed, and rel.past, therefore af. *wja'ümer jâqob* »that J. said»: parallel to *wjâ'i. welâka* »that I may go»: both the action and sbj. are stressed (»cohortative»), therefore prf. v. 26: 'abâdî »I have served»: the preceding particle is stressed (as shown by the following *binnæ*), and rel.past, therefore af. *welâka* as in v. 25. 'atta jadâtta »you know yourself»: sbj. is stressed, and rel.past (literally »you have become acquainted with»). 'abâdtek »I have served you»: the preceding particle is stressed (as rel.part. always, through the reference it has to its correlative), and rel.past, therefore af. v. 27: *wja'ümer* »thereupon (L.) said»: rel.fut. 'ëm na maşâtî »if I possibly have found»: the part. is stressed, and rel.past, therefore af. *ne'îšti* »I have divined»: verb is stressed (because of the nature of the action), therefore af. *wjebèrrekâni* »and found that (the Lord) has blessed me»: rel.fut. (being the result of the action mentioned before). v. 28: *wja'ümer* »therefore he said»: rel.fut. *wittêna* »so I will give»: both verb and sbj. are stressed (also rel.fut.), therefore prf. v. 29: *wja'ümer* »thereupon he said»: rel.fut. 'atta jadâtta . . . 'abâdtek as in v. 26. 'éjja: the preceding part. is stressed (cf. v. 26), and rel. past, therefore af. v. 30: 'éjja: the preceding part. is stressed, and rel.past, therefore af. *wjîfras* »and it has spread»: rel.fut. *wjebérrek* »for (the Lord) has blessed»: parallel to the preceding one. *mêti 'êşji gêm anâki* »when could even I make?»: part. is stressed, and rel.fut.; therefore prf. v. 31: *wja'ümer* »so he said»: rel.fut. *mæ'itten* »what should I give?»: the pron. is (formally, at least) most stressed, and rel.fut., therefore prf. *wja'ümer jâqob* »thereupon J. said»: rel.fut. *lâ tîttten* »you need not give»: neg. is stressed (as a neg. always), and rel.fut., therefore prf. 'ëm lâşji: parallel to the preceding one. 'eşûbah 'erê'i »I will return and shepherd»: both sbj. and action stressed (»cohortative»), therefore prf. 'işmar »I shall guard»: the preceding object stressed, and rel.fut. v. 32: 'êbbar »I shall go through»: both sbj. and action are — and not much — stressed, therefore prf. *wêjja* »and it shall be»: sbj. is familiar (and even omitted), therefore af. v. 33: *wanâta . . . şadiqâti* »and my fairness will testify»: the

action is more stressed than sbj., since the latter could partially be expected from what precedes; therefore af. *ki jabú* »if there will come»: part. is stressed, and rel.fut., therefore prf. v. 34: *wja'úmer lában* »thereupon L. said»: rel.fut. *wín la jéjji* »if it will not be . . .!»: part. is stressed, and rel.fut. v. 35: *wj'iser* »so he removed»: rel.fut. *wjitten* »and gave»: rel.fut. v. 36: *wjášem* »then he put»: rel.fut. v. 37 a: *wja'úmer malák* »then angel said»: rel.fut., and sbj. essentially familiar. *wja'úmer*: parallel to the preceding one. *wja'úmer . . . wja'úmer*: rel.fut. twice subsequently. *ra'iti* »I have seen»: action is stressed (and rel.past). *mašátta . . . nadérta* »you anointed . . . promised»: the prec. particle stressed, and rel.past (twice). *wi'teb* »so I shall do good»: rel.fut. v. 37 b: *wjítqqa* »so (J.) took»: rel.fut. *wjefášal* »and scaled»: rel.fut. v. 38: *wjášseg* »then he placed»: rel.fut. *fášal* »he had scaled»: the preceding part. is stressed, and rel.past. *taba'innæ*: the preceding rel.part. is stressed (cf. v. 26), and the verb is potentially rel.fut.: »(where the small cattle) were to come»; therefore prf. *wjaminnæ* »that they would be ruttish»: parallel to the preceding one. v. 39: *wjaminnæ* »and so (they) became ruttish»: rel.fut. *wtaladinna* »and bore»: rel.fut. v. 40: *'éfred jáqob* (J. (had?) separated»: action is stressed (because different; and rel.past?), therefore af. *wjitten* »and put»: rel.fut. *wjášet* »and set»: par. to the preceding one. *wla šatínma* »thus he did not set them»: par. to *'éfred*. v. 41: *wjá'i* »and so it happened»: rel.fut. *jášem jáqob* »J. would set»: the preceding adv. stressed, and rel.fut. v. 42: *la jášem* »he would not set»: par. to the preceding one. *wájju* »and so resulted»: action is stressed. v. 43: *wjifraš* »and so prospered»: rel.fut. *wjá'i* »so that (he) got»: par. to the preceding one.

§ 126. B O R D E R C A S E S.

a In this group we include all the elementary sentences not yet dealt with, though they partly differ largely from one another. They are called »border cases» not because their nature as real sentences could be called into question — in that sense, the substitutes of sentences would rather be »border cases» —, but because they formally

differ from the bulk in some respect (word order, nature of a part of the sentence), and because of their relatively rare occurrence therefore seem to be scattered along the borders of the field of sentences.

b The most important sub-class is formed by interrogative sentences. True, most part of these are quite regular nominal or verbal sentences, the frequent position of *prdv.* before *sbj.* being due to the fact that it expresses what is wanted to know, and accordingly receives a greater emphasis; examples: *mî 'átta* »who are you?» Gn xxvii 18, *mî jakkilánu bášar* »who would feed us with meat?» Nm xi 4. However, the latter is already on the way toward a stiffened formula meaning »would that . . .», and a sentence like *mî jítten 'êreb* Dt xxviii 67 has gone that way to the end: there is no longer anything left of the question, who would that being be that would »give» the evening. Another instance of a stiffened formula is *má-ze ma'irtæ* Gn xxvii 20, the original meaning of which was »What is this? you have been quick», but which now means »How did you manage to be so quick?» When the interrogative particle *'a* appears followed by a rhetorical question, it also has lost its independent significance and serves only to emphasize the word or sentence following, e.g., *'ašómer 'á'i 'anáki* iv 9; when the whole sentence is stressed, a negation is normally added after the particle, e.g., *'alú 'á'ek rá'em béškem* Gn xxxvii 13, which of course totally abolishes the interrogative sense.

c Another group is formed by the so-called existential sentences and the corresponding negative ones, in which the *prdv.* consists of a particle to which *sbj.* is sometimes appended in the form of a pronominal suffix, e.g. *winínu* Gn v 24, which originally meant »and where is he?», in this connection already »and then he passed away», and finally faded away into a mere copula (see § 124 *i*). It can be combined with the interrogative particle and gains then back its existential sense: *'àjaškimma 'a'êbem* »whether you indeed love» Dt xiii 4.

d A third sub-class is formed by sentences the predicate of which consists of an interjection (or, more exactly, deictic particle) which also contains the idea of *sbj.* and to which the *obj.* again

can be appended in the form of a pronominal suffix, e.g., *'innāni* »here am I» Gn xxii 1 a.e; (literally: »behold me»); similarly with a noun as prd.: *wēnnæ 'ēlom* »and it appeared to be dream» xli 7.

e The adverb *'ūd* (originally n.act., in which sense it still appears in *budīnī 'áj* Dt xxxi 27) also when provided with a pronominal suffix normally loses its independent sense and is transformed into a kind of copula preserving, however, its character as predicative, e.g., *'u' 'udīnnu šemma* »while he was (still) there» Gn xliiv 14. When provided with the interrogative particle, it again regains its independent sense, e.g., *'a' udīmna 'ájjem* »whether they be still alive» Ex iv 18.

B. SIMPLE FIRST- AND SECOND-RATE SENTENCES.

§ 127. General remarks.

a The first- and second-rate sentences are dealt with together, since the latter, when their context is not taken into consideration, do not differ in any way from the former. Simple sentences are in some cases identical with the elementary ones; for these see the preceding paragraphs.

b In § 115 *a* we defined a simple first-rate sentence as one conveying a single and coherent idea capable of being understood without any additions and not containing any statement of the same qualifications. Accordingly, the sentences to be dealt with under this entry letter are those the predicative part of which is of compound nature, but which do not differ from elementary sentences in any other essential aspect (the possible compound character of sbj. does not affect the syntactical character of a sentence in a sense now dealt with). For a rough classification, we divide predicative into predicate (prd.) and one or more additional parts called object (obj.), objective (objv.), predicative supplement (spl.), and different kinds of adverbial elements (adv.¹), mainly to be divided into groups

¹ The conception corresponding to that of adverb in morphology, no confusion might arise from the use of identical abbreviations for both.

formed without or with prepositional elements. An apposition (app.) does not affect the structure of a sentence, either.

§ 128. Sentences with one or more objects.

a The position of an object in a sentence is determined by the general rule of the most stressed part of sentence: if it is the most stressed part of a sentence, it is placed in its beginning, e.g., *šâr têsji lettîba* Gn vi 16, where the *šâr*, whatever it may mean, is apparently considered an essential part of the ark, which again was already familiar to the reader. The normal position of an object, however, is after the predicate or, where this precedes to the subj., after the latter, e.g., *wjîgra 'ût šemîmma 'âdam* v 2, *wjerê'u bâni 'a'ælûwewem it bânot 'âdam* vi 2. The latter rule, however, is broken when obj. is appended to the verb as a pron. sf., e.g., *wjimšâ malâk šêma* . . . xvi 7; so even if it is appended to a nota obj., e.g., *ka'âšar atâ 'ûti 'ælûwewem* . . . xx 13, but this is not rule: *'ûta 'ukâtta* xxiv 14 (stressed). Apparently the position after the most stressed part of the sentence was particularly lightly stressed. The rules are not influenced by the number of objects, e.g., *wjîgra 'abrâm it šem ammâqom a'û šêma jerê'i* xxii 14, *êb âmon gûwewem natâttek* xvii 5 (where the effected obj. is particularly stressed). In one case an obj. has been expressed twice: *zabadâni 'ælûwewem 'ûti zâbad tob* xxx 20, though even no apparent reason for its stressing can be found; maybe the text is not in order.

b As it appears from above, we distinguish different kinds of objects. The most usual is what is called *affected* obj., or one toward (in, against etc.) which the action is directed. Such a one we meet in Gn i 1 already: *barâšet bâra 'ælûwewem it eššâmem wit âreš*, even if this according to the religious philosophy of our own day would rather belong to what is called *effected* obj., or one resulting from an action (for an example see xvii 5 above). A sub-class of the latter is the so-called *inner* obj., which is mostly formed of the same stem (or root, at least) as the verb governing it, e.g., *amâlok tîmlak 'alînu 'æm-mâšal tîmšal bânu* xxxvii 8, *wjêrrad jêsâq 'ariddæ gadêlla* . . .

xxvii 33; as is seen, it appears attached to verbs normally regarded as intransitive by our standards. This is due to the fact that between obj. and predicative supplement or adverbial there is no clear boundary in Hebrew. The *pronominal* object does not differ from the other ones in principle; its normally unstressed position is due to its familiarity (for examples see above, *a*). The *paronomastic* obj., similarly, is only formally distinguished from the rest (for examples see above, at the inner object).

§ 129. Sentences containing an objective.

a In § 128 *b* we stated that there is no clear boundary between obj. and adv. in Hebrew. This is best exemplified by the existence of a transitional form between them, for which we choose the term *objective*. It is formally like an obj., but expresses the being to whose benefit, disadvantage or something else like that the action is directed, e.g., *lūk-lak . . . ʿēšar ʿarrāk* Gn xii 1, *wjeggidak* Dt xxxii 7, *wjān ʿifron it abram . . .* Gn xxiii 14. In most cases, however, this relation is expressed by means of the preposition *l* (or some other preposition); see § 132 *e-f*, a.e.

In a number of cases, again, this construction seems to have become so fixed that we are entitled to regard it as another expression for the idea of obj., e.g. in the first example above and *utinīq-lik* Ex ii 7.

b Objv. is governed by the same principles as obj. Since it is normally represented by a pronominal sf. or a familiar proper name, it normally occurs in an unstressed position (for examples see above); in a particularly stressed position it is regularly replaced by the prepositional construction, e.g., *welšarra ʿamar* Gn xx 16.

§ 130. Sentences with supplemented predicate.

a A third kind of addition to elementary sentences without the help of prepositions is a predicative supplement. It is a kind of counterpart of obj., attached to the so-called intransitive verbs.

Therefore, the so-called inner obj. could equally well be placed in this class, but its close relationship to the other kinds of effected obj. may justify our present procedure.

b The circumstantial features belonging to the sphere of adv., the only statements to be called spl. are those giving a new characteristic of the action or idea expressed by prdc. In the first place the so-called verbs of abundance and of privation belong here, e.g. *tišbá'u léem* Ex xvi 12, *wšáras éjjar šefardê'em* vii 28. Then, there is a great number of other intr. verbs so constructed, e.g. *wjtsa erra'išon 'adamáni* Gn xxv 25, *wjá'el na 'iš adâma* ix 20, etc. Apparently from the verbs of abundance etc. this part of sentence has gained ground even among transitive verbs, in the first place those having an obj. beside it, e.g., *wit eqqerâšem šabbah zâb* Ex xxxvi 34 (»and the boards he overlaid to be golden»), *wla nâtan sîjjon it jîšrá'el 'âbbar* Nm xxi 23 a; then it can be used even when no obj. is standing beside it, e.g., *wšâqta mimminnu 'éddaq* »then you shall rub away out of it to be fine powder» (if not *mimminnu* be taken as an obj.) Ex xxx 36, *ašúfaṭ kacel 'âreṣ la jéšši méšfaṭ* »would the arbiter of the whole earth not handle according to correct principles?» Gn xviii 25.

c As is seen from the above examples, the place of spl. is normally at the end of the sentence. This, however, does not mean that it would be devoid of stress. As a matter of fact, the final position is another particularly stressed one, even if not quite equal to the initial one — provided that the sentence is not very short. This is due to the common psychological — or better, perhaps, instinctive — realization that what is said last remains best in memory, which is also illustrated by various specially pausal formations in many languages, among them Hebrew. It is also well in accordance with the nature of spl. always to contain something new, which is apt to attain interest.

§ 131. Sentences with non-prepositional
adverbial elements.

a There are also elements not introduced by prepositions that we must relegate to the general adverbial category. This category includes all the parts of the sentence describing the circumstances in which the action expressed by the verb occurs or which are attached to it indirectly. In spite of this, it is not always easy to distinguish it from an obj., particularly since one and the same verb can appear both transitive and intransitive¹, e.g., *derek em-malek nelak* Nm xx 17, where '₂lk could be understood in the sense of German *betreten*, the »Kingsway» accordingly as an affected obj. But since this verbal root in the vast majority of cases is used intransitively, and in many others (e.g., Lv xxvi 21.23) governs non-prepositional elements that in any case cannot be understood as obj., it seems most consistent to regard even the first instance as an adv., and together with it other analogous cases.

b The most important group belonging to this sub-class may be what is often called directional accusative and mostly provided with *-a directionis*, e.g., *wjârad âbram mišrîma* Gn xii 10, and similarly even in some passive constructions, e.g., *utûqqah 'a'îšša bîtah fâru* v. 15; without *-a*, e.g., *wjâl miššemma bêr šâba* xxvi 23. It is of course possible that these instances represent a rest of an earlier accusative case, but calling them acc. in a language where there are no regular case characteristics is, in my opinion, at least misleading. Instead, we propose to call this form *directional adv.*

c For another one we choose the name of *modal*² adv., expressing the way action is being performed. It seems mostly to have originated from n.act., e.g., *sâru.mâ'er* Ex xxxii 8. Closely related to it is *numeral* adv., e.g., *wjîštâbbî 'ârša šâba fâmmem* Gn xxxiii 3, *šibbuwatâ'em jîqqam qén* iv 24.

d An *instrumental* adv. can be discovered, e.g., in *wamâru* ...

¹ Cf. Brockelmann, *Hebr. Syntax* § 90 a.

² In the narrow sense of the word.

gol râm Dt xxvii 14, *la jîmmekêkâru memkêrat 'âbed* »they shall not be sold in slave-trade» Lv xxv 42. A number of cases can, viewed from the opposite side, be called *material adv.*, e.g., *mêli 'it 'æmtât 'a'ænâšem 'âkal* Gn xlv 1; cases like *'abânem šêlmot tâbni 'it mézbæ šêmah* Dt xxvii 6 belong definitely to this class.

e Generally *spacial advv.* are, e.g., *wâ'er tabbâru* Gn xviii 5, *šakâbti 'âmeš it âbi* xix 34, *wagbîlta 'it 'âr sâbeb* Ex xix 12, etc. (see § 102).

f A *confirmative adv.* is met with in *'âf 'amenîmmæ 'ûled* Gn xviii 13; the same word, without the pron.sf., is often elliptically used as a confirmation. Its *negative* counterparts, *æl* and *la*, appear much more often. The former seems to have had originally a prohibitive, the latter plainly negative sense, but later on the latter has gained more ground on the cost of the other, e.g., *la tîrša* Ex xx 13.

g An example of *interrogative advv.* is *meddû battîmma 'îli* Gn xxvi 27. An adv. indicating doubt or *possibility* is attested, e.g., in *'ûli la tâba 'a'išša* xxiv 5. Finally, an adv. of quite vague character is found in *'âm-ken 'âfu zê'ot 'êšu* xliii 11 a.e.; it is not certain, whether it belongs in the first place to the imp. sentence or to the preceding cj.

h It would be possible to find still other adverbial sub-classes (e.g., an adv. of *limited reach*, attested in *wnamaltîmmæ 'it bâšar 'arellatkîmmæ* Gn xvii 11, as a sub-class of *spacial advv.*, or a special *temporal adv.*, eg., *wjâšab 'îmmu 'âdeš jâmem* xxix 14), but the justification of very detailed division seems questionable to the present writer. The ancient Israelites hardly felt such distinctions, as is indicated even by the fact that there are transitional forms between different groups.

i As the name indicates, *advv.* appear normally in verbal sentences. In some cases, however, they have found acceptance even in nominal ones, e.g., the *material adv.* in *šenijîmmæ malûcwem sâlet* Nm vii 13—79, *'ešîrat 'a'îfa qâma šârem* v 15, a.e. From instances like these there is not long step to others in which such *advv.* cannot any longer be distinguished from normal appositions, e.g., the *directional one* in *'al dêrek timnâta* Gn xxxviii 14, or the con-

firmative one in *toḅ mē'od* i 31 a.e. Even they bear witness to the unsettled character of Biblical Hebrew, being in a way *constructions ad sensum*.

§ 132. Sentences with prepositional adverbial elements.

a It might seem artificial to distinguish two adverbial groups on the basis of an outwardly formal characteristic only, particularly since the limit between them even so remains in some cases unclear (see below, *g*, *ι*). However, logically thinking — as we on the strength of our method are entitled to do — the use of prepositions generally belongs to later phases of a language, since more and more refined and precise features are intended to be expressed by means of them, and from the history of the Jewish Biblical Hebrew we know that their usage actually has increased with the passage of time. We may therefore consider them as representatives of a younger phase in the development of our dialect, and so this division is justified even from the historical point of view.

b As stated in § 104 *a*, perhaps all of the prepositions have their origin in nouns. Some of them, however, have been transformed so far that their original form is impossible to find out, and therewith the root from which they derive (provided such a root would still be in existence). This is apparently due to their great age and frequent use. We do not deal with them one by one, but in groups according to their syntactical connections.

c The generally *spacial* (or statively local-temporal) usage is very large. However, we cannot conveniently divide it even here, since the basic prep. in this group, *ef-*, is used both locally and temporally without any objective indication that either of the usages would be secondary. Examples: *Barâšet bâra 'elûwem . . . Gn i 1*, where the temporal meaning is prominent, while in *jâ'i êrqi 'éftok émmem v. 6* the same preposition together with a noun forms a compound prep. of a definitely local character; cf. v. 14—15. In *wjibra 'elûwem it âdam ešalâmu* the meaning is already being shifted

into more detached direction — we can call this usage *paternal*; cf. Ex vi 3 —, but the local sense is still transparent. Similarly, the local sense lies behind usages like *wrêdu efdêgêt 'éjjam* v. 28, which is closely related to *wenniššârem bakînma* Lv xxvi 36, etc.; we can define them as examples of *inwardly local* advv. Only a special kind of this one is the so-called *comitative* usage: *wjâgar šemma bamêti mâl* Dt xxvi 5 (cf. xxviii 62), even if this occasionally has developed further: *bamaqêli 'abbârti 'it ejjârdan* Gn xxxii 11. This again might have led to the *instrumental* usage, e.g., *la târreš êfšor ubêmor jâddu* Dt xxii 10. A special instance of this, again, is the usage of this prep. to introduce commercial or other *price*, e.g., *wjitten lêmma jûsef lêm bessûsem . . .* Gn xlvii 17. From the inwardly local meaning we are led even to *hostile* or *adverse* usage through examples like *unêllâ'em bânu* Ex i 10; as is known, the verb originally meant close fighting, so that fighting *against* an enemy literally meant fighting *among* them. On the other hand, *nomm.act.* combined with this prep. have mostly temporal meaning, e.g., *'illa tûldat eššâmem wâreš bæbbâra'imme* Gn ii 4, which at the same time is an instance of the use of prepositional advv. in nominal sentences; this is much more frequent than the use of non-prepositional ones in them.

d The other spacial prepositions follow the same pattern. Examples: *wnatâtî lak welzerâk 'a' ûrek . . .* Gn xvii 8 (temporal), *wariqî a'urikîmma 'ârêb* Lv xxvi 33 (local); *râ'el bittu bâh 'em aššê'on* Gn xxix 6 (comitative), *neftâli 'elûwem niffatâlti 'em 'a'ûti* xxx 8 (hostile); *wjân šemma jîšrâ'el nêged âr* Ex xix 2 (concrete), *'êšji lu 'âzar kanîgdu* Gn ii 18 (abstract); *têt* »under, beneath» vs. *tât* »instead of, in the place of»; etc. etc.

e A group of *directional* advv. is headed by those formed by means of the prepp. *l-* and *'el* (which nowadays are completely interchangeable and even originally might have been mutually related; even pronunciation has largely fallen together — see vol. II sub vocibus —, but in this paragraph as well as in § 104 we distinguish them for the sake of clarity in details), the primary meanings of which might, in Hebrew, have been »to» and »toward», resp. Some characteristic examples may illustrate the development of usage:

l-: In *wjenéššeq elbáno welbanúto . . . wjášab lában elmaqúmo* Gn xxxii 1 the character of *l-* to express movement *close* to the goal is very well illustrated; this closeness leads occasionally to expressions in which the goal already appears reached, e.g., *wjašabtimmæ elbêta 'alôjjæ* Lv xxv 19. For the same reason it is very popular, when action with another person is described, e.g., *wjiqra 'abimélek labrâm* xx 9 (while in *wjiqra malák šéma 'el abrám* xxii 15 'el is used apparently in accordance with the distance, which is here regarded as longer), *wjitten li bén* xxx 6. Hence, the goal thought as reached again, the use of *l-* to denote *possessor*: *wjitten abrám út-kæel êšar-lu* xxv 5, etc. Then, the movement can be thought of as directed toward an abstract goal, e.g., *lik-lak* xii 1, 'iššámer *lak . . .* xxiv 6 a.e., or the movement itself is abstract, e.g., *wtâr lu* xxxviii 18, *la ra'iti ka'innæ . . . élrae* xli 19 (»to the direction of badness«); and even both movement and goal can be abstract, e.g., *wleqâtti 'it-kinnæ li lám* Ex vi 7, *wjísma máši 'it 'ám báki 'elmešfúto* Nm xi 10. As the statively spacial adv., these have their temporal side as well, e.g., *ze šémi lúlam wze zékri eldar -u-dór* Ex iii 15, and also with the goal already reached, e.g., *wjábrek eggamálem . . . let 'ereb let šijjat eššæ' ébot* Gn xxiv 11. And as a peak of the development, it forms what can be called *prepositional object*, closely related to the effected one, e.g., *wéššak elgúwwi gádol* xii 2, and analogically to that in connection with an intr. verb, e.g., *wjá'i 'ádam elnáfiš 'ájja* ii 7.

f The prep. 'el is used in similar connections as *l-*, but in general there seems to be a wider distance between the one who acts and the goal, as hinted above (*e*) already, even if the prepp. really are completely interchangeable. So, e.g., we mostly find the verb *db* D »to tell« constructed with 'el, e.g., the often repeated *wjedébbber šéma 'el máši límor*, while the more personal *qr'* »to call« normally has *l-* (cf. *e*). Similarly, *šVb* »to return« is normally used with the former, e.g., *wjášab abrám 'el náero* Gn xxii 19; only occasionally, when it is question of a narrowly limited and apparently customary place, can — but does not need — even *l-* be used (cf. Gn xxxii 1 above, *e*; and xxxiii 16, Ex xiv 27, Nm xxiv 15). However, even

this prep. can be used of a goal already reached, e.g., *wa'íta qârob îli* Gn xlv 10; but even in such cases the basic difference normally can be discovered, e.g., here in the fact that being near is a result of coming nearer, but not necessarily quite close. The use of this prep. in an expression meaning sexual union, e.g., *wjâba 'ilîjja* xxxviii 18, is to be explained in the same sense as the whole expression, i.e., as a euphemism: the intimacy is reduced thereby.

g Again, there are other, partly compound prepp. attached to this group. One of them, 'ad, the primary meaning of which is »up to« — again in both local and temporal meaning — is also very frequently used, therefore also has many different shades of meaning. Examples: *wjabâ'u 'ad gâran 'âṭad* Gn I 10, *uṭêmi 'ad 'âræb* Lv xv 5 a.e.; *wjêrad jeṣâq 'ariddæ gadêlle 'ad mē'od* (superlative) Gn xxvii 33, . . . *lâk 'itteninnæ welçerâk 'ad 'ûlam (= lûlam)* xiii 15. Other prepp.: *wjîṣqaf abimêlek . . . bêd 'állon* (through) xxvi 8, *kî 'âṣar 'âṣar 'ælûw-wem bêd kæl râm . . .* (prepositional obj.) xx 18; *mēn*, which still in some cases has preserved its nominal character so that it rather appears as an independent part of sentence than introducing such a one, e.g., *wliqqa miffiro* iii 6 (»out of«), *wla jêllen men ebbâṣar . . .* Dt xvi 4 (»nothing of«); then expressing the origin, e.g., *eklîlu 'înem mijjêjjen* Gn xlix 12, *wla jikkâret ûd kæl bâṣar mínmi emmébbol* ix 11 (agent); then the starting point in general, e.g., *ukassâta eṣ-ṣarât it-kæln ennéga mirre'ûṣu . . .* Lv xiii 12, *wæm miššénat ejjûbêl jéqdeš . . .* xxvii 17 (temporal); then it is used to express even quantitative or qualitative difference, e.g., *wennæš éjja 'ârom mîkkæln 'âjjat eššâdi* Gn iii 1, and, on the other hand, even the region or place which is the scene of the action (= in the original sense, as *pars pro toto*), e.g. *wjîṭṭa šêma^h 'ælûw-wem gån bêden miqqêdem* ii 8. Accordingly, the development of the meaning is quite analogical to that of *l-* apart from the basic direction which is exactly the contrary. Apart from these simple prepositions, there are quite a number of composite ones, in which the original nominal character is still more apparent; e.g., *wjîṣṣa melfâni fâru^h* Gn xlvi 10 (from the presence of); *wâzza^h 'el nêka fâni 'â'ol mâw-wed* Nm xix 4 (toward the front of); . . . *welmîbbet elfarêket* xviii 7 (and regarding what is inside of); etc. etc.

h A third group of spacial prepp., which we here call *positional*, is headed by 'al. Its basic meaning seems to be »above, upon», e.g., *wjiktāb 'al ellebūt* Dt x 4, *wténna^h ettíbae . . . 'al 'ári 'ararat!* Gn viii 4, then even in a metaphorical sense, e.g., *amálok tímlak 'alínu* xxxvii 8, and particularly of heavy burdens, e.g., *effúqed 'ím 'ábot 'al bānem . . .* Ex xx 5, *kí 'ázaq 'alijémmae ęrráb* Gn xlvii 20; hence the meaning of exerting an influence, e.g., *wjedébbber 'al lèb ennāre* xxxiv 3. This can be further shifted to mean even the reason or cause for something, e.g., *fęn 'émot 'alijja* xxvi 9. On the other hand, it can express even a comparatively larger size or quantity, e.g., *natátti lak 'éškem 'át 'al 'áek* xlvi 22, *wnuwúwásaf gęm 'ú 'al šænnae'ínu* Ex i 10. In a temporal sense it is not attested. Often it is combined with other words to form more specified prepp., e.g., *'alékat 'al-jed éjjar* (on the shore of) ii 5, *wjišqáfu 'al fáni sádem* (to the direction of) Gn xvii 15, *wjamat šęmma máši . . . 'al fi šéma^h* (according to the word of) Dt xxxiv 5.

i Other positional prepp.: *bin* »distinction», e.g., *'ęšar 'ábbar bin ęgazárem* Gn xv 17, but mostly repeated, e.g., *tęjji na 'ála binatánu binánu ubínak* xxvi 28, or combined with another prep., e.g. *wjá'i mébdel bin mēm ęlmim* i 6; the meaning can be concrete or metaphorical (see the examples), the central meaning being »between»; *'ęšel* »side», e.g., *liškab 'išla* (»beside», by way of euphemism) xxxix 10, *utammánne 'ęšel ęfférot* xli 3, etc., always in a concrete sense. It would be possible to place, e.g., *tét* in this group as well, but its close affinity to *tát* might justify its present classification as one of the generally spacial prepp.

k The generally *modal* group is headed by *k-* »so, thus». This supposed original meaning comes best into appearance in the independent usage, e.g., *kí kámok kafáru* Gn xlv 18. Mostly, the prep. is used to indicate that the following expression must not be understood quite literally or exactly, but *about* as stated, e.g., *wjíttaš el emmēni kadérek jom . . .* Nm xi 31, *mekkera kájjom it bakurátak li* (»as I would have it to-day») Gn xxv 31; from this, so-to-say, general comparison more precise similar expressions might have originated, e.g. *nęšji 'ádam afšalamánu "kademutánu* i 26, and the prep. is often repeated before both members of the comparison, e.g., *kattát*

kāšam tûra 'ât lēmmæ Lv vii 7, and can then appear even before the sbj. (cf. Gn xlv 18 above). Apart from the pronominal *ma*, it is not often combined with another word; e.g., *wāšab lu kāfi šēno* . . . Lv xxv 52 (»according to the number of«).

l Another important modal preposition is ' *it*, the so-called *nota objecti*. The name is not — in my opinion — very happy, since there is a large number of objects — even determined ones — that do not have this particle before them, nor is its use limited to that position, e.g., *wīš it qadēšo lu jējji* Nm v 10; true, such cases are a tiny minority. All in all, the particle seems to indicate that the following word contains something important or essential; therefore the primary function of the particle seems to be to cancel the apparent diminution of the importance of the word caused by its position and so to create another heavily stressed part of sentence. In the passage of time, of course, the stress was diminished to the extent that it could be used even to strengthen the stress of a word already stressed by its position — as in the example above — or to mark the object as in most cases the most stressed part of the sentence beside sbj. and prdc. Supposed the primary meaning to have been »being (= Wesen)«, this interpretation is very fitting even etymologically.

m Other generally modal prepp. are, e.g., *'temânæ 'inikmmæ rā'em zulâti qól* (»but only«) Dt iv 12; *wakkē'u el fāno kādi rešāttu* (»according to the grade of«) xxv 2; . . . *jékki it rē'u babāli dāt* (»in the absence of, without«) xix 4; etc.

n Regarding the position of advv. in various sentences, what is stated on other parts of the sentence, particularly obj. (cf. above, *l*), holds good. The fact that a prepositional construction can appear even as sbj. (above, *k*) again indicates the flexible state of Hebrew at the time of the origin of our text.

C. COMPOUND SENTENCES.

§ 133. General remarks.

a In § 115 *b* we found a compound sentence to be an entity conveying a single and coherent idea, but at the same time composed

of more than one sentence, each of which equally conveys a single and coherent idea capable of being understood without any additions. This is only possible, if one of the simple sentences included in the compound one has a governing position; i.e., if the other one(s) can be interpreted as part(s) of that sentence. Such subordinated sentences we call *clauses*, they being syntactically comparable to elements meant in § 114 *b*.

b An examination of the text shows that clauses can represent any part of the sentence. However, we must equally state that in most cases clauses cannot be understood without the main sentence, which is why we postpone their treatment to the class next to be dealt with. The only clauses to be dealt with here are either asyndetically or by means of a normally co-ordinative conjunction combined with the main sentences. Since such subject (nor objective) clauses do not appear in SP, we divide this class into sentences containing 1) object, 2) predicate, 3) predicative supplement and 4) adverbial clauses. The last ones can be introduced even by prepositions.

§ 134. Sentences with object clauses.

a In Gn ii 19 we read: *wjâšar šĕma^b . . . 'it-kæl 'ájjat eššâdi . . . wjibi el 'âdam ĩlrâ'ot ma jiqra-lû^b . . .* Supposed the subjects of the discourse to be known — as they indeed are from what precedes —, we can understand the last sentence perfectly well: »What name will he call on it?«, and quite as well the preceding one: »Then he brought (them) to Adam to make observations«. The last sentence states more exactly, what kind of observations he wanted to make; therefore it is a clause representing an affected obj.

b A kind of effected obj. might be called *oratio obliqua*, e.g., *'amâri na 'a'ûti 'étli* Gn xii 13. The last sentence is not an exact reproduction of the words wanted to be uttered by the addressed one, accordingly no *prdc.* or *spl.* Less still can it be an *adv.* — since it does not describe any outward circumstance —; accordingly, *obj.* is the only possible interpretation, and since it anyway represents a result of the action expressed in the main sentence, the effected one is nearest.

c Cases like 'æl jár bîni 'adénni kí-la 'ûkal élgom miífânek Gn xxxi 35 could also be included in this group, if kí be taken in its original sense: »behold!», the most natural interpretation of jár bîni being impersonal. However, kí in such a connection is more naturally taken for a subordinating cj., the clause introduced by it being accordingly a sbj. clause of a complex sentence.

§ 135. Sentences with predicate clauses.

a Prdc. clauses are more frequent. Some cases of *oratio recta* can be included in them. Examples: *nâm balâm . . . 'ere'innu wla 'atta^h . . .* Nm xxiv 15.17; the leading words form the main sentence, which of course can be interpreted as an elliptic predicate itself (»This is . . .»), the words forming accordingly a spl. However, as the words stand now, there is no trace of the missing sbj., and although such sayings are not frequent in SP, from MT we know that that formula was very common in Hebrew; and if we are to suppose ellipses to occur very frequently, it is, in my opinion, an indication that the theory in that point has gone astray. Therefore it seems better to take the leading words as a sbj. and the saying itself as a prdc., the whole being comparable to a nominal sentence. Dt xxxii 1—43 can also be regarded as a prdc. clause by way of *constructio ad sensum*, sbj. being contained in the preceding verse.

b Other instances of prdc. clauses: *mî jîlten wêjja lèbabimmæ zq lèmmæ . . .* Dt v 26 contains a pious wish, which formally is constructed as a subordinated final clause, but as a matter of fact together with its stiffened introductory formula (mostly even pronounced *mijîlten*) forms an impersonal optative, accordingly predicative clause. A clearer case is the so-called »relative clause without relative pronoun (or particle)», e.g. *nêzam zâb bâqa mešqêlu* Gn xxiv 22 (which as a whole is used as an obj.); the only deviation from an ordinary nominal sentence is the pronominal sf. at the end which, however, admittedly has not a relative character. Accordingly, the clause is an expression of a characteristic of the before mentioned thing, i.e., its predicative, and since capable of being under-

stood by itself, a prdc. clause. The irrelevance of the sf. is indicated even by the fact that it can be omitted, e.g., *binjâmem zîb jîtraf* xlix 27 (to which a sf. hardly ever could be attached).

c Note. Sentences like Dt ix 11: *wjâ'i miqqeş ʕrbîm jom wʕrbîm lîlê nâtan šêma^h* . . . may also best be understood as belonging to this class, with *wjâ'i* as a copula representing even the impersonal sbj.; should we take it as a real vb., the clause beginning with *nâtan* would be its spl. To take *nâtan*-clause as sbj. would mean depriving the sentence of prdc. (since in that case, with *nâtan* as an af. form, *wjâ'i* could not be anything but a copula); as an illustration we may alter the word order: **nâtan šêma^h 'éjja miqqeş* . . .; with *nâtan* as an af. form, the sentence is plainly anomalous.

§ 136. Sentences with predicative supplement clauses.

a These are very frequent. The vast majority of the instances of *oratio recta* belong to them. Examples: *wja'ûmer ʕelûwem jâ'i 'erqi ʕftok ʕmmem wjâ'i mébdel bin mêm ʕlmîm* Gn i 6. The first words can be understood separately: »And God spoke», and the rest quite as well, as can be induced even from the fact that they are represented as being spoken without any introduction. Being the contents of what God spoke, they supplement the predicate quite essentially. Again, when we read, e.g., Lv xii 1—2: *wjedébbber šêma^h ʕl mâši limor débber ʕl bâni jîsrâ' ʕl limor 'iššæ* . . ., we first have a spl. *limor*₁ and as a spl. to it or a second-rate spl. *débber* . . . *limor*₂; what follows thereafter is a third-rate spl. to the prdc. *wjedébbber*.

b Also *oratio obliqua* can appear as spl., e.g., . . . *lâgged la'îš 'a'ûd lakîmmæ 'ʕê^h* Gn xliii 6. True, the expression is borrowed from an earlier one (cf. v. 7), but in its present connection it can only be interpreted: ». . . whether you have another brother still», cf. the identical use of the interr. part. in viii 8 a.e.

c Again, in Ex xx 20 we read: . . . *elbêbor néssot itkîmmæ ba 'a'ʕelûwem 'bêbor tējji jarâttû 'al fanikîmmæ elbîlti tettîjju*. The last utterance is in any case a spl. to the prdc. of the preceding

sentence (. . . *têjji jarâttû* . . .), since it only expresses an immediate consequence of the latter; accordingly, it is an instance of spl. introduced by a prep. (It can look like the spl. could not be understood without the preceding sentence, but when we omit the prep., which is no integral part of it, the rest can very well be understood, even if the sense is contrary.) But not only that, even the utterances beginning with *elbêbor* . . . **bêbor* can equally well be understood in an analogous way, as parallel spl. to the prdc. *ba*, they expressing ideas directly connected with the latter (and not outward circumstances, as advv.); in that case, the second of them is another instance of spl. clause introduced by a prep. (to say that *bêbor* is here used as a cj. is only to call the same thing by another name), and the final utterance, being a spl. to this one, is accordingly a second-rate spl.

§ 137. Sentences with adverbial clauses.

a Even these occur rather frequently, but since those formed without the help of a prep. are only a small minority, we do not separate them from the rest. Examples: *wjâṭ 'a'ûlo bit'el mijjam wa'î miqqêdem* Gn xii 8, where two nominal sentences are combined to form a local adv. clause; *wjâlak wkæl tob 'adénno ebjêdu* xxiv 10, in which the one nominal sentence forms a comitative adv. clause; *'âf 'amenîmma 'êlad wâni zaqânti* xviii 13, where we have a verbal temporal adv. clause; etc.

b Some of the clauses introduced by prepp. are wholly comparable to those mentioned above, e.g., *la terê'u fâni bîlti 'ajakîmmæ 'ittakîmmæ* Gn xlii 3, where the prep. could very well be removed without any effect on the syntactical form (the meaning would, of course, turn just the contrary). It is also comitative. A temporal clause, e.g., is introduced by *ef-* in *la ra'itîmmæ kēl temûnæ ebjom débber šêma^h ḡluuciwikîmmæ búreb* . . . Dt iv 15, where *débber* can be taken either for a n.act., in which case the clause would consist of a transitional form of sentence; or for an af. form, in which case it would be verbal. (The ancient Israelites hardly were aware of this

possibility of choice; it is again an indication of the fluctuating state of the language at that time.) A causal adv. clause, again, begins the following complaint: 'amibbāli 'în qabârem hamšrem leqattānu elmot beḡmāédbar Ex xiv 11; the same thing could, again, be expressed by *'a'în . . . wleqattānu with the omission of the introductory prep.; etc.

c But there are other cases in which the introductory prep. cannot be detached from the clause. In Nm xiv 24, e.g., we read: wābdi kīlab 'ēqeb 'æjjāta rū 'a'ēret 'immu wjīmlæ 'a'ūri wibattījju el āreš . . . The main sentence is here divided into two parts, the so-called dominant idea (see § 157) being placed at the head of the whole compound; the adv. clause 'ēqeb . . . 'a'ūri could independently be translated »a consequence of that another spirit was with him and that he filled in my footsteps», which can be understood as an answer to a question. But if we remove 'ēqeb, the copula 'æjjāta will obtain an unnaturally stressed position, unless we take the clause for a question, in which case the introduction of the second part by *w-* would be anomalous. Other similar cases: šēbi 'ilmēnæ bit ābek 'ad jīgdal šīlæ bēni Gn xxxviii 11 (temporal; 'ad jīgdal = the time (he) will grow up; independently = with the time (he) will grow up); ufāra bébbet 'a'ūri 'alīšu it abānem Lv xiv 43 (again temporal; »the time after they had removed the stones»); etc.

D. COMPLEX SENTENCES.

§ 138. General remarks.

a As is seen in § 115 *bc*, complex sentences differ from compound ones in one essential point only, viz. in that they include clauses which have all the characteristics of real sentences, but which cannot be understood detached from their environment. Therefore we can concentrate our attention to this deviating point only.

b The limit between this class and the preceding one is not clear. Particularly in the clauses introduced by the rel.part. there are instances in which the particle seems to be easily detachable,

leaving the rest quite intelligible. But since in the vast majority of cases the rel.part. is clearly a part of the sentence at the head of which it stands, we suppose this to be the case even where other interpretations seem conceivable, and accordingly place all the relative clauses here. Again, there are cases in which the clause is headed by a conjunction normally regarded as co-ordinative (usually *w-*), but in these cases the conjunction is an integral part of the clause, and therefore to be regarded as subordinative.

c These clauses can represent any part of the sentence. Since in the adverbial group there are remarkable differences between different kinds of clauses, we — in that respect following a long established practice — divide this class into sentences containing 1) subject clauses, 2) object clauses, 3) objective clauses, 4) predicate clauses, 5) predicative supplement clauses, 6) causal clauses, 7) conditional clauses, 8) concessive clauses, 9) temporal clauses, 10) circumstantial clauses, 11) final clauses, and 12) we shall still briefly examine the characteristics of relative clauses independently of their position in the sentences.

§ 139. Sentences containing subject clauses.

a In Gn iii 1 we read: *'áf-ki 'ámar elúwem la ta'ukêlu míkkæl iṣ éggan*. As to its contents, it is an interrogative sentence, but without a formal interrogative element. We can translate it: »Is it indeed so that God said, 'Do not eat from any tree of the garden?« The first four words, corresponding to the mere *'áf* in Hbr, form the prdv., the rest being what is being questioned, accordingly the sbj. Again, in xxxvii 26 we find a question: *ma bēša ki nárrag it 'ajānu wkessīnu. it démmu*. Here we have a formal interrogative element too, but it only serves as a copula to bind the prdc., *bēša*, and the rest as sbj. together.

b Analogically constructed clauses can appear even in positive statements, e.g., *wála šénet 'a'êlom 'el fāru^b fammâ'em ki nákon eddêbar mijjem 'a'elúwem . . .* Gn xli 32. The stressed position of the verb indicates that the part of the sentence it introduces is not

the most important one by nature; and here being only two alternatives, it must be prdv.; accordingly, we translate the statement: »And regarding that the dream came up to the Pharaoh twice (it must be stated) that the matter is established from the side of the God», i.e., with the *ki*-clause as sbj. Instead of *ki*, the rel.part. also may introduce such a sbj. clause, e.g., *wzē 'āšar tēšji 'ūta šēlaš mā'ot 'amma 'āreḳ ettība^h . . .* Gn vi 15, may the introductory demonstrative be interpreted as a copula or prdc. (in that case, with *šēlaš . . .* as a spl.).

§ 140. Sentences containing object clauses.

a Instead of a noun as an obj., tr. verbs often have a sentence introduced by *ki* or the rel.part. indicating the thing toward which the action is directed, e.g., *wlēḡ 'a'iššāe ki-ṭob 'a'iš elmākal* Gn iii 6; the same thing could have been expressed: **. . . 'it 'a'iš ṭob . . .*, i.e., by means of two nominal objj. An obj. clause can also stand for a single nominal obj., e.g., *wjišmā'u ki fāqad šēma^h it bāni jīšrā'el* Ex iv 31 (where the *ki*-clause could be replaced by **fēqiddat bāni j. 'al jēdi . . .*), or for another obj. beside a nominal one, e.g., *wjerē'u emmāsrem it a'iššāe ki jēfāe^h 'i mē'od* Gn xii 14, where *ki* and *'i* could simply be omitted. The instances introduced by the rel.part. do not essentially differ from those mentioned above, e.g., *zēkor wael tiššākae 'it 'ēšar eqšāfta 'it šēma^h 'aelūwawak . . .* Dt ix 7.

§ 141. Sentences containing objective clauses.

a Objv. clauses are rare. They are some kind of intermediate form between obj. and prdc. (or. spl.) clauses, with a by-shade of benefit (or loss) to the being or thing aimed at, e.g., *wérbāe ejjādot jējji lakimmāe elzēra eššādi . . . wla'āšar babèttikimmāe . . .* Gn xlviii 24. Actually, it is only an instance of prepositional obj., separated from this merely because of the existence of a non-prepositional nominal objv. (cf. § 129 *a.*)

§ 142. Sentences containing predicate clauses.

a Prdc. clauses are counterparts of obj. clauses in connection with intr. verbs. Examples: 'el jár bîni 'adénni kí-la 'úkal élgom miffáne^k Gn xxxi 35, the introductory clause being impersonal; sa'iqat sádem wæmírra kí rábba waṭattímmæ kí kabáda mē'od xviii 20, where the two occurrences of *kí* are still in the original, deictic (and emphasizing) sense. This group, however, is rather small, since the majority of such clauses belong to the sub-class next to be dealt with.

§ 143. Sentences containing predicative supplement clauses.

a These clauses properly supplement the intr. verbs, e.g., *mì égged lak kí 'árom átta^h* Gn iii 11; *égged* being the prdc. and *kí*-clause telling the contents of the report, the latter is a spl. of the former. It can also appear beside an obj., e.g., *wešbíjjak . . . 'éšar la tíqqa išša elbéni . . .* xxiv 3, and even governed by a noun, e.g., *wzê-lak a'ót kí 'anáki šælláttek* Ex iii 12, where the initial demonstrative most naturally is interpreted as the sbj., it being particularly stressed; there being no verb, *a'ót* is naturally prdc. and the *kí*-clause its spl; and the whole a sbj. clause to the following statement (*bušíjjak . . .*) as prdc.

b Probably to this group belong even cases like *ma 'aššiti lak . . . kí 'ibátta 'éli wal mamlákti 'etá gadélla* Gn xx 9. The introductory *ma . . . kí* is only an emphasized form of the question »why?», but on the strength of the substantival character of *ma* this can be taken for sbj., the verb being naturally prdc. But since this is rhetorically used, the same combined with the prep. construction is best translated: » . . . caused you to . . . »; for the rest cf. xxiv 3 (cited above). Maybe the *kí*-clause could be interpreted even as an effected (»inner») obj., but at least to my mind such an interpretation is rather far-fetched.

§ 144. Sentences containing causal clauses.

a The causal clauses can be introduced by a mere *ki*, e.g., *ki 'ašlta zē'ot 'ārōr 'átta . . . Gn iii 14*, or by the rel. part., e.g. . . . *wje-debbēru 'āšār tammā'u it dīna 'a'utimmæ xxxiv 13*, as also normal advv. can appear without being introduced by *prepp*.

b In most cases, however, either of these particles is provided with a motivating or explanatory prep. to form a cj. that we can call properly causal, to introduce such clauses, e.g., *jæn 'ēšār 'aššlta zē'ot . . . bīrrok 'ebærrēkak Gn xxii 16—17*, . . . *ki-ēm 'útak bāšār 'étti 'ištu xxxix 9*; . . . *'ál-ki 'in 'eláuwī 'efqirbi maššāni 'errá'ot 'a'illa Dt xxxi 17*.

c Sometimes it even seems more plausible to interpret a prep. used without either of those particles as a real cj. than the clause introduced by it as being kind of »substantivized» by the relevant prep. (cf. § 137), e.g., . . . *mibbāšār bāno 'āšār ja'úkel mibbāli 'ašir lu . . . Dt xxviii 55*; the prep. is not easily detachable from the rest of the clause; or when the prep. is repeated, e.g., *wimma jeršu 'it unimmæ jæn ebjæn bamešfāti mæ'ésu Lv xxvi 43*.

§ 145. Sentences containing conditional clauses.

a Conditional clauses are usually divided into two groups, according to whether the conditions are thought of as real or not real. The former can appear without being introduced by any subordinate cj. (cf. § 144 a), e.g., *wāzzab 'abijju 'umét Gn xlv 22*; often also introduced by an emphasizing particle (which may be related in origin to the Aram. conditional cj.), e.g., *'innæ 'anáki ba 'el bāni jšrā'el . . . ma 'ē'úmer 'ilijimmæ Ex iii 13*.

b Mostly, however, the conditions regarded as real are introduced by the particle *'æm* »if». It appears combined with practically any verbal form, as is natural, since the stress laid upon different parts of sentence mainly determines, what conjugational type is used. The resultative clause is either appended asyndetically, e.g., *'æm zarā 'eššimeš 'álo dánm-lu Ex xxii 2*, or by means of a co-ordinative

cj., e.g., 'em-ka ja'umer neqûdem jêjji šêkrak wjalâdu kæl eššê'on neqûdem Gn xxxi 8. This, however, need not mean that the two sentences actually were co-ordinated, but only that the cj. *w-* was used to indicate a consequence even in larger connections than *w-prf.* (and *w-af.*), and that the same relation could be left to be induced even from the mere context (a *constructio ad sensum* again). If another conditional clause was added before a common resultative one, it was co-ordinated to the preceding one, e.g., 'æm nêšek ennâš it a'iš wâbbet el nâš ennâššet . . . Nm xxi 9.

c Apart from 'æm, even *ki* appears sometimes introducing a conditional clause, e.g., *ki tiqni 'âbed 'ibri šeš šênem jebbâdak* Ex xxi 2. It might be a reminiscence from an earlier period, when *ki* seems to have been used as a general subordinative cj. (cf. the preceding and following paragraphs). Once even *en* appears in this function — whether it be a loan from Aram. or a result from a development parallel to that in Aram., which has remained lonely, I dare not decide —, viz. *en nîzbæ tuwêbat mišrem linijimmæ wla jisqalânu* Ex viii 22.

d Note. On the other hand, it seems to me doubtful, whether the rel.part. ever has been used in a conditional sense; the instances where this seems to be the case (Lv iv 22 Nm v 29 Dt xi 27, in the first place) can very well be understood purely temporally, since the phenomena discussed in them can be supposed at least sometimes to occur with full certainty (cf. the frequent use of *ki* in such clauses; the event mentioned in the *ki*-clause above — *c* —, on the other hand, cannot be supposed to occur to every Israelite).

e At an earlier period, 'æm seems to have been used as a conditional cj. in general, since it still occurs even introducing clauses in which certainly an unreal condition is mentioned, e.g., 'æm jûkal 'iš limnot it 'âfar 'âreš gem zerâk jimmâni Gn xiii 16. In our texts, the original optative particle *lû-* (*lêbi*) appears beside it, the resultative clause often emphasized by means of *ki*; e.g., *lû-ješ 'âreb ebjêdi ki 'âtta 'arîgtek* Nm xxii 29; with a neg.: *lû-la 'ælûuwi 'âbi . . . éjja li ki 'âtta rîqem šellattâni* Gn xxxi 42. This sub-class does not appear often in SP.

§ 146. Sentences containing concessive clauses.

a Concessive clauses are rare in SP. They are actually a variation of conditional clauses, being introduced by *kī*, e.g., *kī tēbbad it 'adāma la tūsif tet kūwāh lak* Gn iv 12; or by 'ām, e.g., 'em-ba 'ēl 'iššat 'ā' o wšāt 'ārša xxxviii 9. Examples of combined concessive cjj. do not appear in SP.

§ 147. Sentences containing temporal clauses.

a Also temporal clauses are often introduced by *kī*, e.g., *kī 'ā'el 'ādam ēlrab 'al fāni 'adāma ubānot jelidu lēmmæ wjerē'u . . .* Gn vi 1—2, and rarely by the rel.part. e.g., . . . *kamēšfat ęrra'išon 'ēšar a'ūta mešqē'u* xl. 13.

b Mostly, however, the introductory elements are composed of one of these or similar partt. and a temporal prep., e.g., *ka'ēšar kēllu ęggamālem lištot wjāqqa . . .* Gn xxiv 22; *wjēkku 'ūtu wit-kael 'āmmo 'ad bilti 'ašīr-lu šārēd* Nm xxi 35 (where 'ašīr can be taken for an af. form as well as n.act.; cf. MT); *la jēsor šabat mijjē'ūda . . . 'ād-ki jabū šīla* Gn xlix 10; sometimes even the conditional 'ām appears in these cjj., now beside the rel.part., e.g., *la 'azzābak 'ad 'ēšar 'ām 'aššīti 'it 'ēšar debbirti lak* xxviii 15; now without it, e.g., . . . *ešē'eb 'ād-ęm kēllu lištot* xxiv 19; in both of these types some kind of conditionality of the result can still be observed; in connection with *k-*, the indefinite *ma* can replace the rel.part., e.g., *wkāmu aššār 'āla wja'īšu aммalākkem . . .* xix 15¹.

§ 148. Sentences containing circumstantial clauses.

a The term »circumstantial» is a collective one; under this rubric we intend to deal with clauses expressing some less central feature attached to the main idea of the governing sentence, such as contrar-

¹ Sentences introduced by temporal prepp. without any additional elements are again better interpreted as parts of compound sentences (cf. § 137).

ity, exceptionality, an alternative possibility, comparison, etc. All of them are of relatively infrequent occurrence in SP.

b Adversative clauses appear regularly after negative ones, often introduced — even they — by the mere *ki*, e.g., *wja'umêru lâ-ki berrâb nêllen* Gn xix 2. In most cases, however, the conditional 'æm is even here added to form an adversative cj. proper, e.g., *la jirâšak ze ki-ëm 'âšar jîšša mimmîk . . . xv 4*.

c From contrariness it is not a long step to exceptionality; actually, the latter can be defined as limited contrariness. Therefore the same cj. is used here as in the adversative clauses, e.g., *la 'ešallâk kî-ëm berriktâni* Gn xxxii 27. Cases like this indicate that the cj. originated in this sense, the conditional sense of 'æm being still clearly recognizable; and only afterwards shifted to be used even in a generally adversative sense. Actually, the idea of exceptionality is less abstract than that of general contrariness, and might therefore have preceded to the latter. 'æm is also combined with a neg. and another part. to form an »exceptional» cj., viz., . . . *la niššâr elfâni 'adenni bilti-ëm gibjutînu . . . xlvii 18*. A third cj. of this group appears in . . . *wgàm 'âlabudâbaš . . . 'âfes ki 'âz 'âm . . .* »only that the people is strong . . .» Nm xiii 27—28, cf. Dt xv 4.

d Alternative clauses have their origin in conditional ones, e.g., *ibbarrad na mijjâli 'æm eššæmâla wejjemîna wæm ejjemîna weššæmâla* Gn xiii 9. A transitory form might have been the cases in which the first resultative clause has been elliptically omitted, but such are not extant in SP. It would lead over to direct requests and demands, e.g., *'âba-li bânem wæm 'în mêtâ 'anâki xxx 1*. Sometimes, the normally co-ordinative cj. 'u »or» is used in a subordinative sense (about = *wæm* »but if»), and can then introduce an alternative clause, e.g., *'u nuwâda ki bîmmæ mûkka 'î . . . šêllem ješêllem . . .* Ex xxi 36.

e From alternation we go conveniently over to comparison. Comparative clauses belonging to this class are sometimes introduced by the rel.part., e.g., *umalcê'u bêttek . . . 'âšar la râ'u 'abûtek . . .* Ex x 6; but normally it is supplemented by the prep. *k-*, e.g., *wêb-bâ'em zâkar unaqâba . . . ka'âšar šâba 'ûtu celûuwem . . .* Gn vii 16;

sometimes with a supplementary word still between these elements, e.g., *wjáš na kákal 'éšar šába 'útu alúwem . . . vi 22.*

f In Gn iii 22—23 we read: *wátta fēn jēšállā jēdu 'lēqa gēm miš 'ájjim wákal wi lúlam wjēšállā 'ē'u . . .* According to the principles of a regular modern grammar, it is best defined as a prohibitive clause the main sentence of which is omitted; but quite as well we can translate *fēn* by »let us take care of that he will not«, taking the word in its primitive, pre-verbal and pre-nominal sense (cf. § 120 *a*). Again, in xxxi 52 we read: *'ed éggal ézze . . . 'em áni la 'ēbbar ílek ít éggal ézze . . . cēbrá^h.* Here we have a variation of the known oath formula having its origin in a conditional sentence, often with the resultative clause omitted, e.g., . . . *wjīššábe limor 'em jēřē'i 'iš ba'ēnāšem 'a'illā 'éddor érze 'ézze 'it áreš eřtúbē . . . Dt i 34—35.* In the above example, however, the negation makes a resultative clause quite impossible; accordingly, here we have an instance of the use of *'em* to introduce a spl. clause.

§ 149. Sentences containing final clauses.

a Final clauses can be attached to the main sentence by the normally co-ordinative cj. *w-*; in those cases this is a special final sub-class of *w consec.*, mostly to be translated »(in order) that«, »(in order) to«, e.g., *'ibi 'it íšti . . . wabú 'ilijje Gn xxix 21.* As a sub-class of this kind of final clauses, the *resultative* ones may be regarded, even if these do not imply a conscious purpose; anyway, even they tell the final outcome of the action told immediately before, and the cjj. used to introduce them are included in those starting final clauses in the common sense of the word. In them, *w-* is to be translated »so that«, »and so«, e.g., *wja'úmer alúwem já'i or wjá'i or i 3.*

b Sometimes it is stated that *ki* can introduce final clauses (or, more exactly, resultative ones), but these are better interpreted as predicative supplements (cf. § 143 *b*). On the other hand, the rel. part. does appear even in this function, e.g., *wēšnijimma it debári 'éšar jilmádon eljará 'itti . . . Dt iv 10;* but even it is growing obsolete, as is indicated even by the existence of a var. *jèlemmédun* which

makes the clause an attributive one and *debâri* its subj.; that this is secondary, is clearly indicated by the absence of an obj. to the verb. An example of the resultative usage is *wjâgra 'abrâm it šêm ammâqom a'û šéma jerê'i 'êšar 'ijjâmer éjjom . . .* Gn xxii 14.

c Specifically final cjj. are compositions of a prep. and the rel. part., e.g., *wibâtta lâbek wâkal bêbor 'êšar jebærrêkak elfâni mâtu* Gn xxvii 10; *zêkron elbâni jišrâ' el elmân êšar la jiqrab iš zâr . . .* Nm xvii 5; the rel. part. can, however, elliptically be even omitted, so that cases appear outwardly resembling clauses introduced by prepp. (cf. § 137 *c*), e.g., . . . *wê'ûkel bêbor tebærrêkak néfši . . .* Gn xxvii 4; their true nature is revealed by the existence of longer constructions beside them in an identical meaning and similar surroundings, but nevertheless even they bear witness to the changing nature of Biblical Hebrew.

§ 150. Relative sentences.

a In the preceding paragraphs we have often met with clauses introduced by the rel. part., learning that it is possible to introduce almost any kind of subordinate clause by means of it; and, considering the relatively small extent of our text, it is indeed possible that the cases where this cannot be demonstrated are due to mere chance. We can, therefore, state that the rel. part. is used as a generally subordinative cj.

b The vast majority of sentences introduced by the rel. part., however, does not fit any class of the subordinate clauses just mentioned. And there is indeed a class of subordinate clauses that we have not yet mentioned, since its counterpart in the nominal parts of the sentence does not essentially affect the construction of the sentence, and accordingly was not dealt with in that connection, viz., the attributive ones. From about one thousand examples we pick up only one: *ešlîku 'ûtu el êbbor ézzêh 'êšar bëmmedbar . . .* Gn xxxvii 22, where the original local meaning of the rel. part. still is transparent, though not quite obvious.

c There are also sentences introduced by the rel. part. which

cannot be defined as any kind of subordinate clauses at all, e.g., *wjúsif 'ámar la'âšar 'al bítu . . .* Gn xlv 4, which literally translated runs: »Then Joseph spoke to that above his house . . .» The construction does not differ from that in, e.g., *gèr jéjji zérák bâreš la lémna* xv 13 (»stranger will your offspring be in a country not theirs»). In both cases, the adv. constitutes a simple nominal sentence, with sbj. mentioned first. As a third link in this chain of comparison we cite *ra'iti 'alúwvem fánem 'el fánem . . .* xxxii 31. Here, the so-called circumstantial clause (not to be mixed with those dealt with in § 148, which are always introduced by *cjj.*) is constructionally quite comparable to the adv. in the preceding instances, hence an adv. clause itself. Logically thinking — which we on the strength of our method are again entitled to do — the rel. clause, accordingly, is nothing but a nominal sentence distinguished from the others by the mere fact that its sbj. is a word very often used to introduce subordinate clauses. This — I believe — gives us a glimpse to the origin of the relative particle: it was a commonly used noun with a wide sphere of meaning which, when the period of transition from Old Canaanite to various dialects was over and *constructiones ad sensum* began to be avoided, assumed its present role on the strength of this wide meaning which was easy to generalize and abstract: originally perhaps »vestige», then »place», »stead» (cf. »instead») and »representation» = »(something) which». Hence even its very wide usefulness.

d Accordingly, the so-called relative sentences may be related in origin to the so-called circumstantial clauses (in the sense used above, *c*) which again are nothing but a form of the so-called asyndesis closely related to the general appearance of *constructiones ad sensum*. However, the wide use of the rel.part. — or rather its prototype — enabled this eventually to assume even more specific subordinative functions (introducing various adv. clauses) while, on the other hand, even asyndetic sentences similar in meaning to those introduced by the rel.part. continued to be used, probably under the influence of the continual use of other clauses similarly constructed. Therefore the so-called relative clauses should not be sharply distin-

guished from that larger whole which most appropriately — in my opinion — could be called *immediately subordinate clauses* (cf. § 170 *b*; instead of circumstantial ones = German *Zustandssätze*); as a matter of fact, the loose group of sentences accustomed to be called relative forms a connecting transitional zone between these and the subordinate clauses introduced by subordinative *cjj.* proper; even if the subordination does not always seem obvious (cf. above, *c*).

E. GRAVID SENTENCES.

§ 151. General remarks.

a In § 115 *d* we found gravid sentence to be one including a substitute of sentence in its middle. This being the only characteristic which distinguishes it from simple and compound (or complex) sentences, we can again concentrate our attention to it, which this time includes even its influence on the construction of the sentence outside of the substitute, something which most clauses do not exert.

b Substitutes of sentences cannot always be distinguished from real sentences due to the identity of *n.act.* with the basic form of *af.* in certain stems. However, we do not include such cases in this group, but consider the relevant forms as *af.* on account of the relative scarcity of the substitutes of sentences.

c Substitutes of sentences can regularly be converted into clauses introduced by the *rel.part.* Like these, they can represent any part of the sentence. However, since the latter characteristic does not affect their construction, we do not divide them according to that principle, but according to a formal characteristic, which also affects their construction, viz. those based on a *n.act.* and those based on other verbal nouns.

§ 152. Sentences containing substitutes based on *nomina actionis*.

a In Gn xxxviii 5 we read: *wjâ'i 'æfkezêbæ æbledêtæ 'ûtu* »and he stayed at Kezeba at her bearing him». The *sbj.* of the substitute

being different from that of the main sentence, the only means of avoiding subordinate clause is the use of the substitute. This kind of the substitute is the most frequent one; another example: . . . *wjájju bino kajâmem 'âdem ba'ebâtu 'ûta* »and they were in his eyes as a few days because of his loving her» xxix 20. In both cases we see, how the construction of the sentence is simplified and shortened by means of the use of the substitute, if we convert them into rel. clauses, e.g., the former: . . . **ka'âšar jalâda* . . ., if not still an additional pronoun corresponding to the pron.sf. be considered necessary to clarify the situation. On the other hand, even in the substitute such a sf. can be omitted, e.g., *wjâš abram méšti gâdol ébjom iggâmel it ješâq b'enu* xxi 8, which omission makes the substitute impersonal.

b An example of the type with sbj. essentially identical with — though formally different from — that of the main sentence is *ébjom éklak mimminnu mot tâmot* Gn ii 17. In this case, there had been even other possibilities of avoiding a subordinate clause, e.g., . . . **akâlta mimminnu 'tâmot*; that the substitute was chosen is perhaps due to the beginning temporal (past) connotation attached to af. (cf. § 125 *h*).

c A third type of this kind of substitute is what can be called genuinely impersonal, there being no even passive or elliptically omitted personal sbj., e.g. the attributive substitute in . . . *wiš eddât tob wrâ^h* Gn ii 9. Its conversion into a verbal sentence would, therefore, cause a long paraphrase, e.g., . . . **éšar judî bin tôb ubîn râ^h*.

§ 153. Sentences containing substitutes based on other verbal nouns.

a The rest of the verbal nouns — the so-called participles — do not differ from each other in their function as elements upon which substitutes of sentences are based. The type with sbj. different from that of the main sentence may be exemplified by n.ag. in . . . *wje-débber el 'atêno loqâ' i banûto* »and he told his sons-in-law (that were)

going to marry his daughters» Gn xix 14. Again, the conversion into real sentences is most conveniently done by rel.part., the n.ag. can always be converted into w-af. or w-prf., or *oratio recta* can be used. The type with sbj. identical with that of the main sentence may be represented by *wjtgba kæl bâšar errâmêš 'al âreš búf ubébbîma^h . . .* Gn vii 21, where the exact nature of the sbj. of the substitute is obscure; perhaps it is one of the »medial» cases of n.ag. from which n.pat. developed (cf. § 10 p); syntactically it is comparable to the preceding type (convertible, e.g., into . . . **bærrâmêš errûmeš 'al âreš . . .*, which detaches *búf . . .* now belonging to the substitute).

§ 154. The relation of the substitute of sentence to the predicative supplement.

a As we see in § 115 d already, the relation of the substitute of sentence to the predicative supplement is very close. In fact, it seems that the former has its origin in the latter. This can be illustrated, e.g., by the two verses Gn i 14.16: . . . *jà'í ma'ûrot bêrqi eššânim lâ'er 'al âreš . . . wjaš ælûwem ít šcêni amma'ûrot eggadêlem . . . elmemšâlat éjjom . . . elmemšâlet ellile . . .* In the first instance, the n.act. is a spl. to the verbal prdc. (which in its voluntative sense cannot be taken for a mere copula), while in the second it is a prdc. itself, in spite of the similarity of the constructions *ma'ûrot . . . lâ'er* and *amma'ûrot . . . elmemšâlat*. The difference is created by the position of the sbj. of the n.act. in the larger sentence, in which *ma'ûrot* equally is sbj., but *amma'ûrot* an obj. Similarly, in cases in which a substitute of sentence is being used as an attributive, its origin can be traced to an enlarged nominal attribute — cf. e.g., Gn vii 21. cited in § 153—, which again is nothing but a predicative more closely attached to its main word (cf. §§ 123 a, 164 a); the enlargement which converts an attribute into an attributive substitute of sentence corresponds then to the predicative supplement.

Part three

Description of the single parts of the sentence.

§ 155. G e n e r a l r e m a r k s.

a In the second part, when dealing with the composition of the sentences, we also learnt some details of most of the parts of the sentence, viz. of those the position of which has an influence on the composition of the sentence, and particularly of those represented by sentences or substitutes of sentences themselves. Actually, these latter were, due to their nature, described there to the extent necessary for their understanding, and therefore we omit their description in this part, referring only to the respective paragraphs of the second part in respective connections.

b On the other hand, there are parts of sentence that were hardly mentioned at all in the preceding part, since they do not influence the composition of the sentence. Therefore their description will demand the more space in this part. And since they, together with their centre — the *subj.* — in several characteristics differ from the rest, we consider it appropriate to divide the parts of sentence into two groups which we call *subjective* (to be understood in the same sense as, e.g., in »subjective genitive») and *predicative*.

A. SUBJECTIVE PARTS OF THE SENTENCE.

§ 156. G e n e r a l r e m a r k s.

a This group contains those parts of the sentence that describe the subject of the action or state (or relation etc.) expressed in the relevant sentence. They are usually divided into subject, two kinds

of attributes which we propose to call adjectival and substantival, and an apposition which is always substantival in character. As to the sbj., there are two kinds of it also, one grammatical or formal, and another one which is called natural or — in certain contexts — dominant concept (or idea). In accordance with our leading principle, we begin with the latter, whereby we even can conveniently bridge the transition from the description of the relations of the parts of the sentence to their individual characteristics.

§ 157. Natural subject.

a As established before (§ 125 *d*), it is in the majority of cases the sbj. that attracts most attention and accordingly the main stress in the sentence. Sometimes, however, there are more than one concept included in a sentence that demand emphasizing, and this leads to formal complications. E.g., in the sentence 'āreṣ āšar ātta šākeb 'alijje lāk 'itteninna wēlzerāk Gn xxviii 13 we find three particularly stressed things: the Land of Canaan, which is the main subject of the statement and therefore stressed twice; second, the fact that it is to be given to Jacob, which is why the objv. is put in a stressed position; and third, the fact that it is the Lord himself who takes care of the matter, which is why the verb is used — otherwise the stress could not be expressed. Therefore 'āreṣ is the sbj., the rel. clause its attr., and what follows prdv. An analogous case, even if a co-ordinative cj. is used as a helping means, is e.g. kæl 'ākel 'āmeṣ wnīkkarāta annāfēš a'ī mijjišrā'el Ex xii 15. This time, however, the stressed parts are only two: first, the eater of the leaven(ed food), which therefore is again referred to even in the prdv.; and second, the fact he will be uprooted, which is why the verb is placed at the head of the same.

b If the dominant idea is other than what can be expressed by a noun, it can be formed into a sbj. clause by means of the auxiliary verb, e.g., wjā'ī mīqqeš 'erbīm jom wjīfta^h na^h it 'ālon ētkiba āšar 'āša Gn viii 6. Often, however, even the copula is omitted, which makes the natural sbj. to seem quite isolated and its prdv. as if an

independent sentence, e.g., *béjjom eššeliši wjišša abram it 'ino . . .* xxii 4.

c As it appears from above, the natural sbj. does not exert any formal influence on the other parts of the sentence. This is due to its nature: even it belongs to the large group of formations that can be commonly called *constructiones ad sensum*. Actually, the use of verbal copula means already a step out from that group or at least to its outskirts, and the same thing is effected by the use of a prep. or the so-called *nota objecti*, which joins the dominant idea to its prdv. formally in the position the element referring to it in the latter has therein, e.g., *'it-kæl areš ešar átta rá'i lák 'itteninnæ . .* Gn xiii 15; *wmiš éddát tob wrá lu ta'ókél minminnu . . .* ii 17.

d There is still another kind of natural sbj. which is more difficult to identify. It has arisen from an apposition and develops into a formal sbj. We mean the phenomenon discussed in § 125 *f*; the supposition that the development was not yet finally completed at the time of the formation of our text is suggested at least by the incongruence of the verbal prdc. in some cases with what is usually regarded as the sbj., e.g., *já'i ma'úrot . . .* Gn i 14, where the verb can be interpreted impersonally as the whole main sentence, and what follows as an apposition to the impersonal sbj. On the other hand, however, it is possible — as is generally done — to interpret the appearance of m.sg. in such cases as an effect of the nature of the masculine gender as the more powerful one, and of the far more frequent occurrence of the singular number.

§ 158. Different kinds of grammatical subject.

a The sbj. being — in average — the most important part of the sentence, it is natural that it seeks an expression for itself which is both short enough to be easily kept in mind, and at the same time particular enough to allow for a relatively exhaustive definition of the relevant concept. The result is, naturally, that a substantive is mostly used as the sbj., be it an appellative, as e.g. *wli ru jáqob 'abijimmæ* Gn xlv 27, or a proper name, e.g., *wja'úmer jišrá'el* v. 28.

b Sometimes, however, the substantive is replaced by an adjective, e.g., *zâkar unaqâba mikkæl bâšar bâ'u* . . . Gn vii 16. Actually such cases are illustrations of how adjj. are converted into substt., as has demonstrably happened to many words appearing in our text as substt., cf., e.g., *ger* »sojourner» with n.pat. Q of the corresponding verbal stem.

c Still more often the sbj. is represented by a pronominal element. In verbal sentences — as we saw in § 125 *d-f* — this was originally the governing principle, but when the pronominal character of the pre- and affirmatives began to be forgotten, the nominal elements originally attached by way of an apposition to the 3rd pers. began to get the character of the sbj., and by now they must normally be regarded as such. In the 1st and 2nd pers., however, the pre- and affirmatives must still be regarded as representing the sbj., even if the idea might no longer have been attached particularly to them, but to the forms in general. Sometimes an additional pronominal form is used to stress such a sbj., e.g., *wetimmæ šanat-
timmæ 'ûti* . . . Gn xxvi 27. The other pronouns also appear as sbj. from time to time, e.g., *mî kâmok ba'ilem* Ex xv 11; *illa tôldat eššâmin
wârêš* . . . Gn ii 4; *ze jencæmmânu mimmæššînu* . . . v 29.

d Occasionally the sbj. can be represented even by an adv. or an adverbial construction, e.g., . . . *kâmok kafâru* »as the Pharaoh is, so are you» Gn xlv 18. It is not far from a sbj. clause, for which cf. § 139.

e As an abbreviation of sbj. clause, a n.act. also can represent sbj., e.g., *toḅ tîtti 'ûta lak* . . . Gn xxix 19. Due to the establishment of the construction *l + n. act.*, this also can appear as a sbj., e.g., *jæš lil jêdi læššut 'immak râ* xxxi 29 (where *jæš* serves as a copula).

f Apart from this formal classification of different kinds of sbj., there is another one with regard to its sense. In most cases — as in all the examples cited above — the sbj. is either a living being or other thing which is clearly definable, but there are cases where this is not so, e.g., *wjâšar lu* Gn xxxii 8; *wjîqra šêmu 'âlon bêkêt* xxxv 8. In the former example it is a question of an *impersonal* sbj., one which has no clearly definable identity at all; in the latter,

of an *indeterminate* sbj., i.e., one the identity of which is not definable for some occasional reason. The impersonal sbj., however, is often avoided by means of a sbj. of metaphorical or naively natural sense, cf., e.g., *wjár ʕlqén mʕʕod* iv 5 with *wjár ʕbbu* xxxix 19; while the indeterminate one can be circumscribed by means of a reflexive or passive construction, e.g., *ʕlzʕʕot jiqqâri ʕššʕ ki mîša læqijjâh zʕʕot* ii 23, which makes the natural obj. into grammatical sbj. Another means to avoid the indeterminate construction is paronymasia, e.g., *wki jémot met ʕlo . . .* Nm vi 9; or the use of a common noun in an indefinite sense, e.g., *wnâfêš ki têtî . . .* Lv v 1 a.e., and naturally the use of an indefinite pronoun.

g Finally, the sbj. can be omitted even for some occasional reason, normally since it has been mentioned shortly before in a similar connection, e.g., *ʕejjêh šarrah ʕštak wjaʕmēr ʕinna^h bâʕol* Gn xviii 9; or since it otherwise can easily be induced from the context (cf. *wjaʕmēr* in the example above); such omissions are properly called elliptical.

§ 159. The determination of the subject (and of noun in general).

a Actually, all the other parts of sentence belonging to the subjective group serve as determinants of the sbj., if we understand its more exact definition with this word. However, this kind of determination will be dealt with in the following paragraphs. It is with the special kind of determination or identification of the relevant word with one already mentioned or generally presupposed as known we have to do with in this paragraph.

b This kind of determination is apparently a relatively young phenomenon, which is quite comprehensible, since it does not belong to the necessities of human speech, but only to its conveniences. Therefore many generally known words still lack the article, e.g., *šâmem wâreš* Gn ii 4, though they in other passages have it (e.g., these words in i 1 in quite similar context). Since this usage is in the first place common and most consistent in words which must

have been frequently used, e.g., *šibbūnæ* and other points of compass, the conclusion is nearest that these cases represent the oldest usage.

c In general, however, the determination does take place in our text. As already referred to above (*b*), it is performed by means of prefixing the so-called definite article (see § 6) to the relevant noun. As stated there, it has originally been a demonstrative element (perhaps identical with what was the oldest form of the 3rd pers. pron., cf. the sg.f.sf.²), and has still preserved this nature in a few fixed formulas of mainly temporal character, e.g., *ellīlē* »to-night» Gn xxx 15.

d The most usual kind of determination is that of a noun already mentioned once, e.g., *jā'i érqī éftok émmem . . . wjâš ælūwem it árqī . . .* Gn i 6—7. The flexibility of the rule, however, is indicated by the fact that occasionally the determination does not appear until the third time, e.g., *jā'i or wjâ'i or wjâeræ 'ælūwem it á' or . . .* v. 3—4, where the immediate cause for this might have been the close analogy of the resultative clause to the saying of the God.

e On the other hand, the determination of generally known words also has gained ground considerably. Supposed it having started from concrete nouns which are the only representatives of their kind, such as *eššīmeš* »the sun», it easily shifted over to names of species, which even they are unique in a certain sense of the word, e.g., *ezzáb* Gn ii 11; and even further to the abstract names of »species» or qualities, e.g., *wjâ'æd jūtru 'ál-kæl eṭṭúbæ . . .* Ex xviii 9. Most of the examples of this kind, however, remain undetermined, e.g., *wit a'enášem . . . ikku æfsunnuwárem* Gn xix 11; *wébleb kæl 'ækém leb natátti 'ikmæ* Ex xxxi 6. This might be due to the late origin of the usage; at least I am unable to find any real principal difference between the determined and undetermined cases¹.

f On the other hand, the determination of more concrete concepts has proceeded considerably farther. Comparable to those dealt with under *e* are still e.g. the names of measures, cf. *wámar 'ešširat*

¹ There are differences even between SP and MT (e.g., in Gn xix 11 cited above), which point to the same direction.

a'ifa 'á Ex xvi 36, but a step further is taken by words determined when used in a superlative sense to mean some particular representative of the kind, e.g., *annár* »The River» = Euphrates. From this, the same usage has spread even to the adjectives, e.g., *eggadélla . . . aqqaṭánna* »the older one . . . the younger one» Gn xxix 16.

g Finally, this led in some cases even to the generalization of a given situation so that what was thought of as characteristic of such a situation could be taken for granted and introduced with an article without being previously mentioned, since even it, in such a case, was a representative of its class or species, e.g., *wjáraṣ ennár* »and the servant boy (belonging to the scene of action) ran» Nm xi 27; *wjáṣab 'al ébbir* »and sat at the well (included in the scene)» Ex ii 5. It is natural that even this usage cannot have become very common.

h In the last phases of the development of our dialect, however, a change to opposite direction has taken place, in so far as determined and undetermined forms cannot, in the pronunciation, in certain conditions be distinguished from one another. The main condition is that the relevant word begins with an ' followed by an *a* vowel (in the present pronunciation); so, e.g., the word for »earth», »land» is always pronounced 'áreṣ, whether it be provided with an article or not. In some cases, it is true, there appeared some difference between forms with an article and without it, e.g., the word for »court, court-yard» was pronounced 'áṣer without an article, but 'áṣer with it (one of the rare instances in which ' seems to have phonemic value). However, such instances may be due to the frequent interchange of ' and ' , as suggested even by the fact that a pl. form of this word is pronounced 'asírot! even when provided with an article. On the other hand, when the *a* vowel is followed by a geminate or double consonant, the form with an art. can be distinguished by means of the length of the vowel, e.g., 'ájjim, c.art. 'ájjim; but in certain instances even this does not hold good, e.g. 'árqi' »firmament» both with and without article (as recorded by Ritter), and often both in a rapid and in a solemn recitation. Furthermore, in a rapid recitation it is often hard to perceive the article even in front of a firm consonant, since it tends to be reduced to

a murmuring vowel with the consequence of the loss of gemination of the following consonant, whereupon the remnant of the vowel in certain conditions — mainly before consonants capable of syllabization — often disappears altogether, e.g., . . . *it-šámem* (actually pronounced as one word) . . . for *it eššámem* Gn i 1. So it seems that the article has lost, if not its whole meaning, in any case its one-time significance, and become rather an optional thing.

§ 160. Co-ordinate precision of the subject:
a p p o s i t i o n.

a In the preceding parts we often found that the simplest and — apparently — most primitive way of combining sentences was to put them simply side by side without any special elements of co- or subordination. When dealing with single parts of the sentence, the one bearing closest resemblance to that method is apposition. A word used as an apposition is simply placed side by side with the word the meaning of which it is intended to precise, neither of them exerting any influence on the form of the other one.

b The apposition may have common origin with the predicate, which it still resembles in many ways. True, the use of app. is not confined to being a precision of sbj., for it can be attached to almost any part of the sentence — objv. may be the only exception in principle —, but everywhere its relation to its main word is comparable to that of the prdc. to the sbj. So e.g. app. normally follows to its main word, as prdc. to sbj., e.g., *kijjor nâššet ukinnu nâššet* Ex xxx 18; only if the app. has a quite special meaning it does precede, e.g. *bênak júsif* Gn xlv 9, to which cf. xxxvii 3, xlv 27: Joseph was the son of Jacob *par excellence*; while in '*â*'i *binjâmem* xlv 12 it is not at all certain, whether the proper name is the main word or app., Benjamin being Joseph's only brother in the full sense of the word.

c App. can also be used to as large an extent as a prdc.; i.e., to express almost anything capable of nominal expression. Examples: *nâcra betûlca* »girl (which is a) virgin» Dt xxii 23 a.e., '*elûwem a' érem*

iš wāben »other gods (which are) wood and stone» xxviii 36; *ēšīrat a'ifa qāma šērem* Nm v 15; *mēsek 'išrem āmma* Ex xxvii 16; *wkāsēf mēšni* Gn xliii 12; etc. In these cases, app. always only defines more exactly the idea expressed by its main word, but there are even instances in which its sphere is enlarged, e.g., . . . *la jadātta 'atta wabūtek* . . . Dt xxviii 36; as is seen, a pron. can appear as an app. also, and in this connection it is interesting to note a phenomenon indicating that the obj. form of the pron.sf. was *not* regarded as a representative of a special (accusative) case, since the app. to it appears in the basic separate form, e.g., *berrekāni gēm 'āni* Gn xxvii 38, while the prepositions used before the main word are normally repeated before the app., e.g., . . . *labūtek labrām eljēšāq wel-jāqob* . . . Dt vi 10, and even farther going congruence of app. to its main word can be observed, e.g., the pron.sf. is repeated in . . . *bēnak bakūrak* Ex iv 23; *wil zērakkimmæ 'a'urikimmæ* Gn ix 9, where a prepositional construction appears as an app.; and even a st.cstr. governing a noun, e.g., *'enāši a'ir enāši sādēm* xix 4. The determination by means of art. naturally goes over to app., where this is presupposed as known, but where the idea expressed by app. is new or explanatory, app. remains undetermined, e.g., . . . *'innāni mibi it emmébbol mēm 'al āreš* . . . Gn vi 17.

§ 161. Subordinate precision of the subject in
the construct state.

a From app. we can conveniently go over to the construction in which sbj. appears in a special state normally called status constructus, the whole construction being called a genitive one. However, since we have established that in Hbr there are no cases, the latter appellation is misleading; and indeed the use of st.cstr. again furnishes us with additional evidence for the correctness of this statement. First, this construction interchanges with that of an app. and its main word; cf., e.g., . . . *wjzbā'u zebīm šelémmem el-šēma* . . . Ex xxiv 5, with . . . *wzebā'u zebī šelémmem elšēma* . . . Lv xvii 5, and the construction of numerals (§ 163). In m.sg. and

f.pl., where st.abs. and st.cstr. cannot be formally distinguished from each other in our dialect (apart from a couple of apparent exceptions which, nowever, actually have nothing to do with this construction; cf. § 2 e), it is often difficult to tell whether an app. or n. rectum is in question; e.g., such a common term as 'á'ol mítw-wad, which never appears determined by an art. In such cases, of course, it is perverted to ask which of these two constructions we have to do with; it means bringing conceptions of Indo-European grammar as a Procrustean bed into Hebrew grammar. In accordance with our principle, therefore, we call such constructions a transitory form between the appositional construction and this one.

b The interchange with the appositional construction, however, is not the only nor even the most important reason which prevents us from supposing that it would be essentially a genitive construction. True, due to the partial identity of st.abs. and st.cstr. referred to above (a) I have not found an instance of st.cstr. before a prep. in SP (which, however, does not mean that there cannot be such a one), but what is more important, even an adj. appears as a part of such a construction, e.g., *wennéæra tûbat marí . . .* Gn xxiv 16; *wjæbærræk æliwëm ét-jom æššæbí . . .* ii 3; at least the present writer does not know any parallel to such usages from languages where there are formal characteristics to distinguish different cases. Therefore it seems to me that this whole construction has arisen from the combination of two words ideally closely connected to each other, which ideal connection has led to even a kind of physical one in the pronunciation; the promoting factor has been difference in the importance of the two words, of which the preceding one apparently originally was the more important one and is therefore properly called *nomen regens*, even if secondarily, through different analogies, even the contrary order could appear (e.g., Gn ii 3 above, influenced by the normal position of adj.attr.). Therefore we propose to call the construction now dealt with a *subordinative construction* of nouns as opposed to the appositional and attributive constructions which, in principle at least, are co-ordinative by their nature.

c Above, some aspects of the use of the subordinative construc-

tion were already presented. We can call them appositional (under *a*) and attributive (*b*) because of their close relationship with these constructions. Of those more resembling the use of genitive in — say — Latin, we may first mention the possessive one, e.g., *inši lémek* Gn iv 23, from which that indicating the origin is not far, e.g., *enāši sādém* xix 4; this again can serve as a transition to the local or generally environmental one, e.g., *bérri ékkêkar* xiii 12; of this again, the temporal usage is only an aspect, e.g., *genúbat jom* xxxi 39. A variety of that indicating the origin is the kind of qualitative usage which also interchanges with the appositional construction, e.g., *mézbe^h ennâššet* Ex xxxviii 30, as also the subjective one, e.g., *wšadifot eqqiddem* Gn xli 27; of which again, the objective one, e.g., *ša'êqat sádém wamírra* xviii 20, is a reflected image. Another kind of qualitative usage, on the other hand, interchanges with the attributive construction, e.g., *ubegádi eqqâdeš* Ex xxix 29, or *iš firí* Gn i 11. The partitive usage, finally, is related to the environmental one, e.g., *'álqat eššádi* xxxiii 19.

d As stated above (*b*), there are cases in which *n. rectum* is more important than *n. regens*. This is particularly so where *n. regens* rather resembles an adjective or a particle, it being used only under certain conditions, e.g., *kæl 'áreg qen* »any one killing Cain» Gn iv 15; or where such a term is replaced by a paronomasia, e.g., *'álam 'élotm* Dt xiii 2 (cf. *bál 'a'elámot* Gn xxxvii 19). On the other hand, not all the cases of paronomasia belong here, there being even instances of *n. rectum* as the transformed one, e.g., *šákar šáker* Dt xv 15. Finally, the same construction is used even in a superlative sense, in which case both members might be equally important, e.g., *qâdeš eqqadêšem* Ex xxvi 33.34.

e Due to the original nature of the subordinative construction, it practically always consists of two members, one *n. regens* and one *n. rectum* (for examples see above); particularly regarding *n. regens*, there is no exception from this rule in the whole SP. Where two — or more — nouns ideally govern the same *rectum*, this is normally taken up by means of a pron.sf. after the postponed second reg., e.g., . . . *it-kæl 'ar'ámmi míšrem wít-kæl 'ákenîjje* . . . Gn xli 8;

occasionally the sf. can be even omitted: *mēšqi mâlek mišrem wâfa^h* . . . xl 1. On the other hand, an entire subordinative construction can appear as n. rectum, e.g., *šafûni tamûni 'ûl* (on the sense of *tamûni* cf. Ex ii 12) Dt xxxiii 19, not to mention those in which n. rectum is represented by a pron.sf. Even another combination of two nouns can appear as rectum, if they together form an expression for one rather coherent idea, such as »heaven and earth» for »universe» in *qâni šâmem wâreš* Gn xiv 19.22.

f Above (*b*) we already saw that adjectives can appear as parts of the subordinative construction; in addition, even advv. sometimes occur in the position of n. rectum. However, in such cases it is a question of either an adv. that has not yet totally lost its original nominal character, e.g., *bamêti mâl* Dt xxvi 5, or one which is on the way of becoming a regular substantive, e.g., *'âlat tâmêd* Ex xxix 38.42 a.e. (cf. Nm xxviii 10 — xxix where rectum is provided with an art., and still more frequently in MT). As it appears from some of the examples above (*e*), a pronoun can rather freely replace a noun as n. rectum. This applies even to rel.part., e.g., *kæl jâmi 'êšar* . . . Lv xiii 46; and occasionally even a subordinate clause can replace it: *êbjed tešçella* Ex iv 13.

g The close connection of both parts of the subordinative construction can obtain an expression even in the congruence in number: *šarârot kešfijimmæ* Gn xlii 35; the identical form of rectum appearing in v. 25 might be influenced by this one rather than contrarily, cf. the sg. in xliii 23 and everywhere else, which is also completely in accordance with the collective meaning of the word (cf. *zâb* and other appellations of comparable concepts).

h The same close connection is further expressed by the fact that, when the construction is determined by means of an art., this is prefixed to one part only. In normal cases this part is rectum, since reg., being itself determined by it¹, would thereby get an

¹ In my opinion, this is the case even in instances like those mentioned by Brockelmann (Hebr. Syntax § 73 a) as »generell determinierte Nomina» and others which would leave reg. undetermined; cases like *'in émmem* Gn

abnormally stressed position. In some cases, however, where the construction has obtained the nature of a regular substantive, or where there is a particular reason for the determination and rectum cannot be provided with an art., reg. assumes it: *'ārkaḥ* Lv xxvii 23 bis; *a'ūla šārra* Gn xxiv 67, where the construction has the sense of *ebbīta* »home«, which also always is provided with an art.

§ 162. Co-ordinate qualification of the subject:
adjective attribute.

a As we saw in the preceding paragraph (*b*), adj. can appear as parts of a subordinative construction. Normally, however, they appear alongside a subst. as main word to qualify it more exactly, in a state formally better comparable to that of a nominal apposition. Like this, it might have common origin with the nominal prdc.

b In conformity with the main principle of the Hebrew syntax — that the most important thing is mentioned first —, the place of adj.attr. is regularly after its main word, e.g., *mésti gādol* Gn xxi 8. This order is observed even where the subst. is a general term which by its own weight cannot attract much attention, e.g., *'iš šāru* (for *šarū*) Lv xiii 44. However, in such cases the subst. is mostly omitted and the adj. used independently, substantivized where needed, e.g., *waššarū* v. 45.

c The adj.attr. accords to its main word both in number and the so-called gender; e.g., *'ēlom 'ā'er* Gn xxxvii 16, *fārrot jēfot* xli 1; there being no instance of du. provided with an attr. in SP, we do not know how it would be constructed. In the instances of a collective noun provided with an adj.attr., the latter can be in pl. (as both nominal and verbal prdc. normally is), e.g., *šē'on rābbot* xxx 43; but even there the tendency is toward formal congruence, e.g.,

xvi 7 and *šēni mero* xxii 3 are comparable to those determined on the strength of the generalization of a given situation, cf. § 159 *g*, and *malāk šēma* Gn xxii 11 a.e. — apart from that the same explanation could be applied even to it — seems to me to be almost a proper name, since it interchanges with *'elūwem* and even with the Tetragram in the pericope Ex iii 1 sqq. (cf. vv. 6. 14 sq.).

šē'on lāban ʔnnutārēt v. 36 (MT pl.). Similarly, even the only instance of *'alūwem* in the meaning of the only God provided with an adj.attr. has this in pl.: *'alūwem 'ājjim* Dt v 23; on the other hand, the only similar instance of *'adūnem* in sg. meaning has the adj.attr. in sg.: *'adēnno emmišri* Gn xxxix 2.

d The closer connection of adj.attr. with its main word in comparison with that of prdc. with sbj. is indicated even by its congruence in determination: *béjjom eššeliši* Lv vii 17 etc.etc. As far as I can see, there is no exception from this rule in the whole SP apart from where the attr. is a dem.pron. which is determined by itself — e.g., *'utāti 'illæ* Ex x 1—; and even in them, the tendency is toward uniformity, e.g., *bellile a'û* Gn xxxii 22 (as against MT)¹.

e Sometimes even the phenomenon of paronomasia not infrequently appearing in sbj. -prdc. is extended to adj.attr. with its main word, although it here is purely pleonastic; e.g., . . . *errāmēš errūmēš 'al āreš* Gn i 26.

§ 163. An appendix to Part III: A: the syntax of the numerals.

a In most points, the syntactical behaviour of the numerals does not differ from that of the rest of the nouns, but since they because of their peculiar sense form a closed group and do have some special characteristics, it is best to deal with them separately. The ordinals, however, agree completely with the other adjectives (cf., e.g., § 162 *d*), and are therefore omitted from detailed consideration.

b The cardinals, as far as I can see, appear as any part of the sentence; as an app., however, only if the main word is another numeral. The word for one, *'ād*, f. *'āt*, can best be interpreted as an adj. everywhere; cf. *jom 'ād* Gn i 5, *éšfa^b 'āt wdēbārem 'ādēm* (ʔof

¹ In this kind of congruence, MT seems to differ even in other respects; cf. Brockelmann, Hebr. Syntax § 60 ab. In the quotations from the Pentateuch, however, SP differs in Gn xlii 19 — *'ād* provided with an art. —, and in vii 21, the attr. can be interpreted as referring to the whole construction *kæl bāšar* as well as to the latter word only.

one and the same kind») xi 1. It can be substantivized and appear as a subj., e.g., *'ád ba élgor . . .* xix 9. The rest are substt., but show a few syntactical peculiarities.

c The words for 2—10 have the common feature that the counted or enumerated thing stands in pl. The numeral, regardless of its position in the sentence (subj., obj. prdc., adv.) is, as far as I can see, regularly the main word, the thing enumerated normally standing as an app. or subordinate attr. (n. rectum) after it, e.g., *šéláša bánem* Gn xxix 34, *šélášat jámem* Nm x 33. Sometimes, when the word already occurs in the vicinity of the numeral, the thing enumerated is omitted, e.g., *kál náféš šíššem wšéš* (sc. *néšot*) Gn xlvii 26; *'arvá malékem it a'cemíšša* (sc. *ammalékem*) xiv 9. The word for 2, *šénim*, f. *šittem*, however, deviates from the rest both formally, being a pl., and syntactically, standing in the same gender as the thing enumerated: *šenišimmae* Gn ii 25 a.fr.; *šitti bánot* xix 8. The peculiarity of the words for 3—10, their assuming the gender form different from that of the enumerated thing (cf. the examples above), may best be explained by H. Bauer¹, viz. that the ending resembling that of fem. is a rest of a so-called numerative used in many languages in connection with numerals. Probably identical with Arab. *law* »single (thing)«, it may originally have been used attached to the numeral to indicate that the word was used in the numeral sense only, regardless of its original sense as a regular subst. (whatever it may have been); later on, when this was forgotten, and the numeral occasionally for some reason or other was more closely connected with the thing enumerated, the numerative — being still independent — was appended to the whole construction, since its task, due to the oblivion the substantival meaning of the numeral had fallen into, was now turned to be the indication of the enumeration in general, and this did not particularly demand its attachment to the numeral itself. During some heavy stress period, its diphthong was contracted into *ā* and the word lost its stress, became an enclitic, was affixed to the word preceding and finally identified with the fem. ending

¹ ZDMG 66 (1902), p. 267 sqq.; cf. Brockelmann, *Hebr. Syntax* § 84 a.

(if this indeed had not somewhat earlier originated from the same element). The numeral construction now had the peculiarity that — at least when the thing enumerated was masc., which it was in the large majority of cases — one of its members apparently stood in masc., the other one in fem.; this became the rule and was easily — alongside the many internal oppositions of the Semitic speech — preserved in practice.

d Numerals bigger than 10 mostly have the thing enumerated in pl., apart from words for different — whether material or temporal — measurements and collective nouns; e.g., *wâd 'âšar kukâbim* Gn xxxvii 9; *mât šēna wišrem šēna wšâba šēnem . . . xxiii 1*; the word for »man» is sometimes treated as a coll., e.g., *šabim 'iš ezzaqînem* Nm xi 25, sometimes not, e.g., *šēnem 'âšar anâšem* Dt i 23; other similar irregularities also occur, probably due to the rare occurrence of these bigger numerals with those less frequently used words. The enumerated thing also here normally follows to the numeral, but in one case, in a list, the order is reverse, probably to give more weight to the numeral in the position of the last part of a long sentence: . . . *'izzem mâtem utišem išrem . . .* Gn xxxii 15(—16). When the single units are multiplied to form larger numbers, they behave as in connection with other substt., e.g., *šelâšat alâfem u^mmâtem* Nm iv 44; *šelâša werbîm âlef wšâbae-mâot-u-šelašem* (sic! mechanical rhythm) xxvi 7; as is seen, the smaller units are added to the bigger ones mostly by means of the cj. *w-*, but sometimes even the thing enumerated is repeated, e.g., Gn xxiii 1 cited above. The bigger numbers are usually mentioned first, but even the contrary order does occur, e.g., *'emneš utiššim šēna wšamâna mâ'ol šēna* Gn v 17 (and regularly in that chapter).

e The numerals are, by their nature as appellations of exactly defined entities nearer to the proper names than the appellative nouns, and are therefore mostly not determined by the art., e.g., *'emiššem eššadâqem* Gn xviii 28; in cases like *a'emišša* xiv 9 the art. seems to have its original demonstrative meaning. However, the art. does appear prefixed to a numeral even in its normal meaning, sometimes when this is accompanied by a dem.pron., e.g., *eššelaš*

a'illæ Dt xix 9 — this type might perhaps have been served as a transition to the following one —, sometimes even without that, e.g., . . . *eššelaša waššabîm wemmâttem 'adêfem* Nm iii 46. This variation is again an indication of the fluent state of Hebrew during the Biblical period, a state which actually is quite natural in any language, but here seems to surpass the average.

f The cardinals also appear at times where in the modern languages ordinals are used. Regarding the word for one, this is not strange, it being an adj. itself (cf. above, *b*), but even the other single units are, even if very rarely, used in stating dates; e.g., *eftiššâ lâdeš* Lv xxiii 32. The ordinals existing only for the single units up to 10; the cardinals are used instead in all connections with larger numbers, e.g., *eššabâ^h 'âšar jom . . .* Gn viii 4; the word for »year» is often repeated in such connections, e.g., *'eššênat 'éššaš mâ'ot šêna^h . . .* vii 11; mostly, however, it appears only in the beginning, e.g., *'eššênat arbîm elšîjjat bâni jišrâ'el . . .* Nm xxxiii 38; more rarely only in the end, e.g., *wefšêlaš 'ašâra^h šêna marâdu* Gn xiv 4.

g There are some signs of the formation of more specialized numerals, but they seem to have remained half-way. Such a one is the expression used to indicate distribution, e.g., *šabâ^h šabâ^h zâkar unaqâba^h* Gn vii 2, accordingly consisting of the repetition of the relevant cardinal number; beside it, a prepositional construction also appears, e.g., . . . *'iš 'âd læššâbat* Dt i 23. The multiplicative idea has found a more developed expression in a kind of numeral adv., e.g., *šibbuwatâ'em* Gn iv 15.24, the development of which is not clear; in any case, it might have nothing to do with the rests of du., there being no sign of a du. being ever formed of Semitic numerals apart from that for 2 (cf. the stem of the word, too); Torczyner's theory of a local — or rather spacial, I should say — affirmative¹ seems to me more plausible. However, this type of adv. is very rarely used, the usual means of expressing the multiplicative idea being the use of cardinals with some suitable nouns, e.g., *'ašârat*

¹ Torczyner, Die Entstehung des sem. Sprachtypus p. 67 sqq. and cf. Wundt, Völkerpsychologie II p. 413 sqq.

mâném Gn xxxi 7.41, *'émmeš jádot* xliii 34, sometimes even cardinals by themselves, e.g., *šabim ušabê* iv 24. The frequentative idea, again, corresponding to the multiplicative one on the ordinal side, can similarly use the ordinals in an adverbial sense, e.g., *šénit* xxii 15. Finally, the fractional numbers seem to be formed in many different ways. In some cases, the cardinal number has been the basis from which it has been derived simply by means of the fem. *-t*; but the result is not identical with the longer cardinal form, since the cons. is retained even in st.abs., e.g., . . . *wnatattimmæ 'emiššat elfáru* Gn xlvii 24. Elsewhere, however, it seems that an afform. *-i* has been placed between the cardinal stem and the fem. afform., e.g., *šilšet a'in* Nm xv 6 sq., if not the *e* of the final syllable be ascribed to the influence of *š* and the written *j* be regarded as a leftover from the Jewish text; but this would be without ascertained parallels. And finally, it seems that even the fem. form of the ordinal can serve as a fractional expression, e.g., *rebiet a'in* Nm xxviii 5.7 a.e.; of course, on account of the disappeared guttural, this cannot be quite certain; but again, the written *j* is there — even in passages where it is lacking in MT —, and the stem is certainly different from that of the cardinal even if the prothetic ' of the latter would not be considered. Out of these three types, accordingly, the first and the last seem to be closely connected with cardinals and ordinals, respectively; so perhaps we may regard the type *šilšet* as a beginning of an independent formation of the fractional numbers; it might best be classified as a regular substantive.

B. PREDICATIVE PARTS OF THE SENTENCE.

§ 164. General remarks.

a The predicative states what is not presupposed as known of the action, condition, or quality of the sbj. before. Accordingly, it is more loosely connected with the latter than the parts of the sentence dealt with in the preceding paragraphs, the position of which indicates that they are presupposed to be familiar in connec-

tion with the sbj. However, many of them have attained to this familiarity only through having been predicative before, e.g., *šába fárrot a' érot 'álot . . . rá'ot marî . . . wta'ukelinnæ efferrot rá'ot æm-marî . . .* Gn xli 3—4; in this particular case, accordingly, as a predicative supplement. Therefore there cannot be any definite distinction between this group and the preceding one, which means that a sentence has not two — or more — poles, but only one, the sbj., around which even the parts of the sentence of this group — even if more or less loosely are concentrated.

b The parts of sentences belonging to the predicative group are those which we already met in Part two, i.e., predicate, object, objective, predicative supplement, and different kinds of adverbial elements. Most of these can have appositions and attributes, but these do not differ in principle from those attached to the sbj., and therefore we do not take them into consideration here. As of sbj., there are two kinds of obj. also, but the natural one — where it is different from the grammatical obj. — has not so many peculiar characteristics that it should be dealt with in a different paragraph.

§ 165. P r e d i c a t e .

a In Ex xxviii 21 we read: *wabânem ta'ijjîna 'al šêmot jišrá'el šittem 'ašára 'al šemutimma fittûwi 'átam 'iš 'al šênu ta'ijjîna elšênem 'ášar šabať.* It is clear that the statement contains three simple first-rate sentences. But what kind of sentences they are, and where is the border line between the first and second one? The forms of the verb 'šV are in connections like this usually regarded as a mere copula, but if we now — as seems most natural — end the first sentence with *jišrá'el* and regard *ta'ijjîna* as a mere copula, we will have a sentence with a sbj., copula, and adv., but no prdc. In itself that would not be so surprising — we have an ample number of elliptic sentences —, but what is significant is that we could replace the verb by *'æmfettê'ot* without any change in the syntactical sense (cf. xxxix 6); true, the notion of the relative time would be omitted, but this is clear from the context in any case. And if

we include *šittem 'ašára* still in this sentence, the second one would lose its prdc., it being impossible to combine *'al šematimma* with *fittūwī 'átam* without assigning to *'al* a sense it has nowhere else. The second sentence would then have an adv. and an app. to an unexpressed prdc., the third one beginning with *'iš* in any case. Therefore I am rather inclined to regard the forms of *'₂V* as a real prdc. in connections like this, where no indisputable nominal prdc. exists in the sentence; it seems in them to have preserved something of its original sense »to happen«, in this case about »to be made«. It would of course be possible to say that the construction *'al šé-mot . . .* represents a nominal prdc. with its attr., but this would mean bringing psychical conceptions into language.

b Any other verb can equally appear as the prdc. of a verbal sentence, e.g., *barášet bára 'elūwīem . . .* Gn i 1; and the same is true of the verbal nouns in the transitory forms of sentences, e.g., *'ifa^b 'imma rá'im xxxvii 16; élnös(!) šemma cerrêša* Dt iv 42. For details, cf. §§ 124—125.

c In a nominal sentence, the predicate mostly consists of a noun, either subst., e.g., *šéma^b eššádeq wáni wámmi errešá'em* Ex ix 27; or adj., e.g., *æjjalidem rékkem* Gn xxxiii 13. A part of the sentences with a verbal noun as a prdc. apparently also belong to this group, viz. those formed by means of a copula, e.g., *wjá'i mébdel bin mèm élmim* i 6.

d Instead of a noun, a pronoun can naturally appear as a prdc., e.g., in the interrogative sentence *mī a'iš állaz 'álek beššádi* Gn xxiv 65, or in the entirely pronominal clause *'áni 'áni 'ú* Dt xxxii 39, where the second *'áni* can perhaps be interpreted as a copula (cf. § 169 *g*).

e Due to the fluent nature of the language favouring *constructions ad sensum*, many kinds of advv. also appear as prdc., e.g., a simple spacial one in *ufanišimma a'erínnel* Gn ix 23, or a modal one in *ka jéjji zerák* xv 5. The latter of these seems to be analogous to the sentence dealt with above (*a*), but there is an important difference: *ka* here contains a reference to the outside of the sentence, the starred sky which God is showing to Abram; that reference makes

the adv. equivalent to an adj.: »Of this kind, thus numerous». The same is the case, where the sentence is headed by a deictic part., e.g., *'inna rúbqa elfânek* xxiv 51; the part. is equivalent to a gesture, which replaces the natural prdc. and makes *rúbqa* natural obj.; natural sbj. is, of course, the servant implied in the part. As the pronominal construction in this example, also other kinds of prepositional advv. appear as prdc., e.g., *wkidda 'al šikma^b* v. 15. Common to all these kinds of adverbial predicate is that they appear in sentences which have some kind of reference to the outside of their own reach, either in the way described above or being circumstantial or subordinate clauses attached to larger sentences, as in the first and last examples above.

f A clause, or a substitute of sentence, can also appear as a prdc.; see §§ 135, 142, and 152 *a* (Gn xxi 8).

§ 166. O b j e c t.

a Different kinds of obj. were already enumerated in § 128 *b*. In this connection, we add one more, viz. a kind of *natural* obj., where it is distinct from the grammatical one. In § 165 *e* we already met even with such a one: in *'inna rúbqa elfânek* Gn xxiv 51, *rúbqa* is grammatically sbj., but the deictic part. governing the whole statement and (together with the gesture probably accompanying it) situation, it is in the first place comparable to an imperative and accordingly to be regarded as replacing both the natural sbj. and prdc.; *rúbqa* being the one pointed out can then only be the natural obj. The same is the case with all the sentences introduced by means of a deictic part., as is indicated even by the fact that where the grammatical sbj. is expressed by a pronominal element, it is the obj. form of pron.sf. that is used, e.g., *'innâni* xxii 1 a.e. A special case is *ša'iqat sâdêm wæmirra kî râbba watattimma kî kabâda mâ'od* xviii 20, where the parts preceding to *kî* in each sentence obviously form the natural sbj. However, the context suggests that this part. is directed toward Abraham, which thus makes him another natural sbj., and in relation to him *ša'iqat* etc. cannot be but a natural obj.

A natural object is thus the part of sentence which occupies an oppositional position to the natural subject and is connected with the latter through the predicate or its substitute. So even in passive sentences the grammatical sbj. can be natural obj., e.g., *wélšæt gèem 'û jêled ben . . . iv 26*: the emphasized *šæt* is the natural sbj. In general, however, the grammatical sbj. is the central figure in passive sentences, and accordingly even the natural sbj.

b In the vast majority of cases the grammatical obj. is expressed by a subst., e.g., *wjarêma maššibæ Gn xxxi 45*; the same example indicates that this can be replaced by a pron.sf. In cases like *eskîlta 'ášjot v. 28* even a n.act. is, at least formally, best interpreted as an obj.; of the other verbal nouns this is but natural, when they are substantivized, as e.g., *wjâfak it . . . kæl jušêbi aérrem xix 25*; and similarly even of substantivized adjj., e.g., *jadá'i tob wrá iii 5* (on the st.estr. cf. § 161 *ab*). For obj. clauses see §§§ 134, 140, and 152 *c*.

c *Note.* The so-called *nota objecti*, 'it, is often considered as a means or sign of the determination of the obj. However, there are numerous cases in which a determined obj. is introduced without that part., e.g., *'ifraš kèbbi Ex ix 29* (cf. vv. 33, 34 etc., as against v. 22, x 1 etc.), and on the other hand, there are cases in which it is very difficult to conceive a word introduced by this part. as determined even in a modified sense, e.g., . . . *wla 'errêtti 'it 'ád mij-jimmæ Nm xvi 15* (cf. the parallel clause just preceding, and a similar construction in Gn ii 21, both lacking 'it), or as an obj. at all, cf. § 132 *l* (where also further information on this part.).

§ 167. Objective.

a In its original, non-prepositional sense an objv. can, as it seems, only consist of a pron.sf., e.g., *wðigan 'tiraš samaktijju Gn xxvii 37* (»and corn and must did I attribute to him»), or of a proper name, cf. Gn xxiii 14 (cited in § 129 *a*). True, it would be possible to interpret cases like *wsádu lebakkîmma xviii 5* as constructed with an objv., cf. *la nekkînnu nâfêš xxxvii 21*, but it seems more natural to take the *lêbab* and pron.sf. for the main objv., and the *fat lêm* and

náfěš, respectively, for different kinds of nonprepositional advv. (cf. § 131 *d, h*).

b The form of objv. constructed with the prep. *l-*, again, can include substt. as well as pron.sff., e.g., *zêkor labrám eljěšâq wêljâqob 'abâdek 'êšar niššabbâtta lêmna bak* Ex xxxii 13. For further information cf. §§ 129, 141.

§ 168. P r e d i c a t i v e s u p p l e m e n t.

a The spl., being a parallel phenomenon to obj., again, can consist of almost any kind of words. In the first place, nouns are found in this position, e.g., *išrâšû(!) émmim šêraes nâfiš 'âjja* Gn i 20; *wjįssa erra'įson 'adamûni* xxv 25; also verbal nouns, e.g., *wla nâtan sįjjon it jįšrâ'el 'âbbar* Nm xxi 23 a; *wjâlak âlek "gâdal* Gn xxvi 13. Formally it would be possible to place here even constructions like *mot tâmot* ii 17, but the sense suggests an adverbial (affirmative) interpretation.

b Since the spl. always contains something new, however, a noun cannot be replaced by a pronoun in this position, but different adverbial constructions often appear in it. E.g., the frequent *wjâ' i ken* Gn i 7 a.e. is best explained in this way, the verb having here the meaning »to happen, take place» (cf. § 165 *a*), and cf. vv. 5, 8, 13 etc. (end). As examples of prepositional advv. constructions we may mention *wtâsêf lęllêdêt* iv 2; . . . *âšar šarâsu(!) émmem elmînijimmæ . . .* i 21 (»which make the waters to swarm their kind», cf. viii 17, ix 7).

c For spl. clauses etc. see §§ 136, 143, and 153 (Gn vii 21), where also further information. A boundary case between spl. and modal adv. is found in examples like *ra'iti 'ælûwem fânem æl fânem* Gn xxxii 31, where the reciprocal expression is related both to the verb and to its obj.

§ 169. F r e e a d v e r b i a l e l e m e n t s.

a The term »free» in the above rubric means that the adv. elements to be dealt with here are not in another way more closely

connected with *sbj.* (i.e., that they cannot be included in any of the parts of the sentence dealt with above), regardless of whether they are constructed with *prepp.* or *cjj.* (adv. clauses) or not. Even of them, the clauses as well as the syntactical characteristics of the other elements have been dealt with before (§§ 131—32, 137, 144—49, 152—53). Accordingly, their individual construction or quality only remains to be studied here, and even that with the exclusion of adv. clauses (and substitutes of sentences).

b As stated above, a part of the *advv.* are not constructed with *prepp.* Still in the last decade (cf., e.g., Brockelmann, *Hebr. Syntax* §§ 89, 104; Beer-Meyer, *Hebr. Grammatik* § 106) it has been customary to define these as accusative forms, although after the discovery of the Ugaritic texts it should have been clear that this term is at least in certain instances inadequate (cf. Beer-Meyer § 45.3). Having established that in Hebrew there were actually no cases, we formally define them as non-prepositional *advv.* However, even they fall into different divisions.

c First, formally the so-called directional or local *-a* is attached to certain nouns to form directional expressions. The origin of this *-a* has not been cleared up yet; therefore it might be best to use as neutral a name for it as possible, which is why we propose to call it an adverbial affix (*adv.aff.*). As stated, it appears affixed to *substt.* only, giving them a directional sense, e.g., *'ārša* »to(ward) the earth», »to the country». In a statively local sense it has not been attested in SP, except perhaps in *šemma* »there», where it is normally lacking any written sign, the word being always pronounced this way (cf. MT).

d Second, there are instances of nouns having been used without any additions in an adv. sense, e.g., *wabad^ttimma^e mā'er* Dt xi 17, *toḥ mā'od* Gn i 31. They may indeed have originated from the accusative of the relevant *adjj.* and *substt.*, provided that in the Old Canaanite case system was present, though in many cases *gen.* is not excluded, either (e.g., in the last example). In most cases of this group a sharp line between a noun and an adv. cannot be drawn, which is but natural, the latter normally originating from the former.

The so-called »inner obj.» often is actually an adv. of this kind too, e.g., *mot jémot* Ex xxi 12 a.e., as well as its partitive variety, e.g., *unamaltimmæ it bâšar 'arellalkimmæ* Gn xvii 11.

e Then there are of course simple adverbs which do not have anything of their former nominal character left (provided that they once have been nouns), but are used exclusively to indicate more or less abstract relations, sometimes intensified by means of the art., e.g., *zê'ot ebbám* Gn ii 23 (where the presence of the dem.pron. shows that the art. has *not* preserved its demonstrative character in this instance to the full extent at least); but mostly quite simply, e.g., *ka* »thus», *'ifa* »where?». A third type is formed by means of affirmatives, e.g., *'innam* »for nothing».

f The simple advv. can be combined with other elements, viz. prepp. and pron.sff. to form *composite* advv., e.g., *missábeb* Dt xii 10 a.e., *kaníqdu* Gn ii 18 a.e. This is apparently only a consequence of the analogous phenomenon in connection with the nouns, e.g., *lúlam* Gn iii 22, *limítu* xxxvii 18.

g The independent adverbial use of pronouns is limited to the interrogative-indefinite *ma* in connections like *ma núra æmmáqom ézze* Gn xxviii 17; it can be intensified by means of another pron. which then obtains the nature of a copula, e.g., *má-ze má'értæ* . . . xxvii 20. The other pronouns also can be combined with a prep., e.g., *'abzêot tibténnu* xlii 15, *lík-lak* xii 1, or with a noun, e.g., Gn xvii 11 cited above (*d*), occasionally even with an adv., e.g., *'udínnu 'áj* xliii 28 a.e. (the character of n.act. is still traceable) and perhaps *'amenímmæ* xviii 13 a.e.

h *Note.* The syntactical character of interjections will be dealt with in an appendix.

Part four

Combination of sentences and parts of sentences.

§ 170. General remarks.

a As was stated in Part one, various second-rate and elementary sentences mostly appear combined into larger units, be it that special elements are used in their combination or not; and even first-rate sentences into periods which, in their turn, occasionally can appear even as parts of still larger sentences. On the other hand, it is natural that the different parts of the sentence are in some way combined with each other; otherwise they would not form a sentence at all. The means of combination being largely identical or closely related to each other in both cases, we do not distinguish those used to combine sentences from those used to combine their parts in this connection.

b On the other hand, there appears to be fundamental difference between two methods of combination, viz. that without any special elements, commonly called *asyndetic*, and that which uses such elements, mostly called *conjunctions*, the method itself being called *syndetic*. In the latter, two inferior methods are still distinguished, called *co-ordinative* and *subordinative* according to the nature of combination. In my opinion, this division is not very happy, first since even the so-called *asyndetic* combination often is *subordinative*, and secondly, since the boundary line between the two main methods is not sharp. Even the term «*asyndetic*» is etymologically without sense in this connection, it properly meaning something *unconnected*, regardless of the means by which the connection could be made. As a consequence of this, the term «*syndetic*» also loses its relevant

sense, their being no »asyndetic« counterpart for it. Instead we propose to call the relevant relations *immediate* and *intermediate* (*imm.* and *itm.*, resp.), in addition to which we still distinguish a third transitory class between them. The division into co-ordinative and subordinative types we also preserve as an inferior one, and extend it even to the *imm.* combinations, even if it is very possible that the Hebrew mind did not do this distinction, at least not in the oldest phases of the language or the dialect preceding it. In accordance with our general method, we begin with the *imm.* one as the most primitive and accordingly — apparently, at least — most ancient method of combination.

A. IMMEDIATE METHOD OF COMBINATION.

§ 171. General remarks.

a Our general method rests on the postulate that, as a part of the speech, sentence is primary and its parts secondary; therefore we started with the division of the text into sentences and proceeded through the analysis of sentences into individual parts of the sentence. However, when dealing with sentences we found it most convenient to suppose that the primitive sentences were also the shortest ones, and that the normal first- and second-rate sentences had been created by the accumulation of additional parts of sentence around the elementary sentences, some of the parts, in their turn, consisting of whole sentences or clauses; and the combination of first-rate sentences into periods must, logically thinking — which we, again, on the strength of our method are entitled to do — at least, be regarded as a still more secondary or tertiary phenomenon. Therefore we start with the combination of different parts of the sentence.

§ 172. The immediate combination of the parts of the sentence.

a The immediate method of combination seems to imply a closer connection between the parts so combined; therefore it dominates

in the relations of different parts of the sentence, particularly in the *sbjv.group*. True, the *app.* is sometimes preceded by a prep., but in such cases its main word also has the same prep., e.g., *míjjed 'á'i míjjed íšab* Gn xxxii 12; therefore the prep. cannot be regarded as a means of combination even in a transitory sense, but as belonging to the *app.* itself, and the whole phenomenon referred to the field of congruence (cf. § 160 *c*). Similarly, *prdc.* and its *spl.*, *obj.* and the primary form of *objv.* also normally stand in an immediate connection to *sbj.* or their main word, and to a large extent this is true even of *adv.*, e.g., *sáru má'er* Ex xxxii 8.

b This immediate connection, however, does not prevent some parts of the sentence from being subordinated to others. In some sense we can regard all the other parts as subordinated to *sbj.*, this being the centre of the whole sentence. However, the position of *prdc.* is relatively independent, and the other *prdv.* parts stand in a closer connection with it than with the *sbj.*; and on the other hand, both *app.* and *adj.attr.* as qualitative expressions — in the largest sense of the word — are rather co-ordinated to their main words; and in the *prdv. group*, *spl.* often stands in a comparable relation to *prdc.* On the other hand again, the subordinate *attr.* is by definition subordinated to its main word, and the relation of *obj.*, *objv.*, some kind of *spl.*, and *adv.* to *prdc.* is best described by the same word, the two first being »targets» toward which the action expressed by the *prdc.* is directed, and *advv.* additionally conditioning that target, even if modal *advv.* sometimes approach the position *adj.attr.* has to its main word (e.g., Ex xxxii 8 cited above, *a*).

§ 173. The immediate combination of sentences.

a Sentences often appearing as parts of larger sentences, the boundary line between the preceding paragraph and this one is rather vague. The vagueness is still increased by the fact that it is not certain, whether the relevant sentence should be regarded as a subordinate clause, i.e., an *adv.* of the larger sentence, or as a co-ordinate, relatively independent sentence. E.g., in *wnikkaráta en-*

náfeš a'î mijjammijjæ it beriti 'îfer Gn xvii 14 can be translated »... that soul will be uprooted from its kinsfolk — it has broken my covenant» as well as »... since it has broken . . .»

b The immediate co-ordination is still in our text very usual in connections which give the impression of liveliness, e.g., *kâra rêbaš kârja* Gn xlix 9; this has led to the transformation of a couple of imp. forms to almost formal expressions, e.g., *likæ nikkarâta bêrit* xxi 44, *gom 'éli bit'el* xxxv 1. Appositional clauses also belong to this connection, e.g., *wabrâm zágen ba bejjâmem* xxiv 1.

c A common kind of immediate subordination is the use of *oratio recta*. Other subordinate clauses appear more rarely without any element of combination, e.g., an attr. in *'æluwem la jada'umma* Dt xxxii 17, a spl. in *'áli 'âkal nékki bu* Nm xxii 6, and an adv. in *wjať a'ôlu mijjam wa'î miqqêdem* Gn xii 8.

B. TRANSITORY FORMS OF COMBINATION.

§ 174. General remarks.

a Under the term »transitory» we understand in this connection phenomena the syntactical nature of which is being transformed in our text, in the first place the transformation of elements in their primary state best defined as prepositions, partly into conjunctions which mostly can best be conceived as standing outside the sentences they join together, partly preserving their prepositional nature into fixed parts in the sentences or parts of sentences they introduce.

b Apart from those elements, there are a few others, verbal, adverbial, or deictic in their nature, that can best be dealt with in this connection. Since prepp. have partly developed from advv., and the existence of advv. presupposes that of verbs, we start with the verbal elements, which also are best apt to bridge the difference between imm. and itrm. methods of combination.

§ 175. Combination by means of verbal elements.

a In § 173 *b* we met with two imp. forms which are on the way toward losing their verbal character and becoming formal introductions for the following verb. Another imp., which has gone slightly different way, has proceeded considerably farther, so that its verbal character can hardly be recognized any more, introducing sentences in a prohibitive sense, and can best be translated by an adv., e.g., *qòm qa 'il ištak . . . fen tissáfi bân a'ír* »up, take your wife . . . otherwise you will be swept away because of the iniquity of the town» Gn xix 15; or by a cj., e.g., *'iššámer lak fen tedébbber 'im jáqob míttob 'ad rá* »take care of yourself, lest you speak with Jacob anything» xxxi 24.

b Another, originally mainly verbal element is the interrogative adv. *međdú*, e.g., *međdú fanikímma rá'em éjjom* »what does it mean that your faces are bad to-day?» Gn xi 7, originally a whole sentence, composed of the interr.pron. and an old form of n.pot. (see § 103 *r*).

§ 176. Combination by means of adverbial elements.

a The interrogative pronoun *ma* is used adverbially to introduce a sentence, e.g., in the third instance of *ma na'úmer ladénni uma nedébbber uma ništáddaq* Gn xliv 16. More often it appears in such a function combined with various prepositional elements, e.g., *bámæ 'iddæ ki 'irašinnæ* xv 8, *léma tittiræ'u* xlii 1.

b Occasionally, even the interr. adv. *a-* is used in the same function, e.g., . . . *elrá'ot aqálu émmim . . .* Gn viii 8. Negative temporal statements are sometimes introduced by *têrem*, e.g., *'ú têrem källa eldébbber . . .* Gn xxiv 15, which mostly combined with prepp. appears as a regular cj. The regular negation *la* combined with the interr. adv. also sometimes approaches the nature of a subordinative cj., e.g., *ubámæ júda . . . alú ebléktak immánu* Ex xxxiii 16.

c The rel.part. also is sometimes used adverbially in this function, e.g., *umalá'u béttek . . . 'éšar la rá'u 'abútek . . . Ex x 6*; and develops then into regular cj., e.g., *wašbíjják . . . 'éšar la úqqa 'išša . . . Gn xxiv 3*. A peculiar construction is met with in *Dt iii 24*: . . . *lerá'ot it-'ábdak it gédlak . . . 'éšar mí'el beššámem ubáreš 'éšar jéšši kamâššek . . .* Here, the rel.part. seems to stand elliptically for a whole sentence, e.g., »which are of the kind that . . . » or something else comparable to that; perhaps we could contract it into »so» or »therefore», in which case it also would be an instance of the adverbial usage.

§ 177. Combination by means of prepositional elements.

a In our text, most of the prepositional elements have already passed into fixed parts in the parts of sentences they introduce. A remarkable exception is the so-called *nota objecti*, probably because of its primary meaning, which seems to have been »being (= Wesen)», cf. § 132 l; therefore it always preserved its expegetic nature, regardless whether it was constructed with an obj., e.g., *qá 'it ellibem Nm iii 45*, or with a prdc., e.g., *wit mések fêta 'áser . . . v. 26*, or with a (grammatical) sbj., e.g., *wiš it qadêšo lu jéjji v 10*, etc.

b Clauses appearing as parts of sentences also are sometimes introduced by prepositional expressions, e.g., *elbiliti tetijju Ex xx 20*. The transition might have been formed by expressions in which it is not possible formally to distinguish an af. form from a n.act. or n.ag., e.g., *ébjom débber šéma^b 'ilikimma . . . Dt iv 15*, perhaps even by adv. usages like *biliti 'ajakimma 'ittakimma Gn xliii 3*. According to the meaning of the prep., the clauses get final (e.g., *Ex xx 20* above), causal (e.g., *ján la 'amentimma Nm xx 12*), or temporal (e.g., *'ad jigdal šilae béni Gn xxxviii 11*) nature. Through the addition of a further prepositional element or a deictic part. or rel.part. they pass into regular conjunctions.

§ 178. Combination by means of deictic elements.

a The deictic particles were originally used to call attention to what follows, thus being some kind of intermediary things between interjections proper and adverbs proper. Therefore, even when they are used to replace *cjj.*, this emphatic or affirmative nature can often still be observed. This is particularly true of *'inna*, which is not used in this way without any additional elements at all; combined with *w-* it occasionally has the sense of an emphatic »that», e.g., . . . *wjêrê wêinna^b arâbu fâni adâma* Gn viii 13.

b On the other hand, the use of *kî* is much more like that of a regular conjunction. In some cases, the original emphatic nature is still clearly to be observed, e.g., *ša'iqat sâdem wæmirra kî râbba . . .* Gn xviii 20, where it is stressed even in the present-day pronunciation in spite of the normal mechanical manner of the latter to leave practically all such non-contracted monosyllabic words unstressed. In the vast majority of cases, it is already the normal expression for our »that» or also »when», »if», etc. (see §§ 139—148).

C. INTERMEDIATE METHOD OF COMBINATION.

§ 179. General remarks.

a The intermediate combination of sentences and parts of sentences takes place normally by means of conjunctions, after the use of *prepp.* was referred to the transitory phenomena, where the *prepp.* have not already become fixed parts of the parts of sentences they introduce. An exception is the use of *rel.part.* in this function, even if this statistically is rather large. This exception being direct continuation of a transitory phenomenon (cf. § 176 *c*), we find it most convenient to begin with it.

§ 180. Combination by means of the relative particle.

a This usage of the rel.part. should not be confused with the one in which it appears as a part of the sentence it introduces (cf. § 150 *c*), which indeed may be the more primitive one and can in numerous instances of this group be seen as a background. In the first place this is true of the cases which — because of that background quality of the rel.part. — are usually regarded as the shortest kind of rel. clauses, but which actually are nothing but parts of sentences introduced by the rel.part., e.g., a local adv. in . . . *ēlēbbor ézzē^h 'āšar bēmmēdbar* Gn xxxvii 22 (cf. an analogous expression without the rel.part. in xvi 7).

b However, if in the example above the rel.part. is regarded as the subj. of *bēmmēdbar*, then the way is open to its larger use to introduce attr. clauses, and possibly this is the very thing that took place. It could conveniently be used, e.g., to convert substitutes of sentences into verbal clauses, as in . . . *bāni jāqob 'āšar jeliḏu lu bafāddan āram* Gn xxxv 26 (for **annuwalēden*). However, on the strength of the adverbial usage, the part. was also able occasionally to obtain an appositional character in cases like . . . *hammāqom 'āšar dēbber ittu* v. 13.14, but mostly the attributive character was restituted by means of an additional adverbial or pronominal element, e.g., in this case, . . . *šēm ammāqom 'āšar dēbber ittu šēmā* . . . v. 15.

§ 181. Combination by means of conjunctions

a Conjunctions are rather infrequently used to combine parts of sentences consisting of expressions which do not even partly have character of a sentence. An exception is the common co-ordinative *w-*, which is used, e.g., in lists which can have any position in the sentence, as that of *prdc.* in *bāni lījje bākor jāqob re'ūben wšēmūn wliḏi wje'ūde wjašišākar usebūlen* Gn xxxv 23. Another *cj.* showing this kind of usage is 'u »or», e.g., . . . *tāšab ennēre' ittānu jāmem u*

šadeš xxiv 55, a third *gəm* »also, even» (essentially a confirmative variant of *w-*), e.g., . . . *la 'iš debârem 'anâki gəm millâmol gəm miššélšom gəm mîjjaz* . . . Ex iv 10. Needless to say, all of the *cjj.* thus used are co-ordinative in character.

b However, *w-* also appears in subordinative functions. Such are many instances of the so-called *w consec.*, e.g., . . . *wêšši li maṭâm-mem wə'ukêla weberrêkak* . . . Gn xxvii 7. Primarily this *w* seems to have denoted sequence in time in the adv. sense: »then», but when some kind of bye-sense is attached to it (as in this example first final and then causal), the total sense is made subordinative. Even elsewhere, the co-ordinative and subordinative sense are not always clearly distinguished, e.g., the originally deictic particle *ki* can, beside its subordinative usages (see §§ 139—148), also introduce the resultative main sentence of a conditional clause, e.g., *lû-la 'elûwwi 'âbi . . . éjja li kî 'atta riqem šallâtâni* xxxi 42. These two — as it seems — oldest conjunctions do not seem to have attained to a clear distinction in this respect at the time our text was formed (cf. even *wâzzab abîjju umét* xliv 22, where *w-* has both co- and subordinative sense: »for if»), which also bears witness to the fluctuating character of Biblical Hebrew. On the other hand, the younger, mostly composite conjunctions do not show any vacillation in this respect (cf. §§ 139—149), thus indicating the direction of the development.

c *Note.* For the combination of the parts of sentence by means of a copula see § 124 *i.*

Appendix I

Internal classification of sentences.

§ 182. G E N E R A L R E M A R K S.

a It is customary to divide sentences into classes even according to their general internal nature, viz., into a) interjectional or exclamatory, b) affirmative or simply stating, and c) interrogative sentences; sometimes even d) negative sentences are separated as a fourth group. Moreover, this classification is mostly regarded as the main one, to which all the other groupings or divisions are to be subordinated. We, however, have not been able to pay any attention to it in the main body of the syntax, since our basic principle has been to follow external, formal characteristics throughout the grammar because of the subjective nature of the internal ones. True, the interrogative sentences are usually stated to have even a remarkable formal characteristic, viz. the reverse word order, but actually this is only a case of the leading principle of the entire Hebrew syntax, viz. that the most stressed part of the sentence is mentioned first. On the other hand, it would also have been too monotonous to introduce this kind of classification as a sub-division into every paragraph; therefore it seems most convenient to deal with it in an appendix.

b Since even this classification, however, is largely comparable to those performed in the main body of the syntax, we — deviating from the practice in the first volume — divide this appendix into paragraphs which continue the numbering in the main body of the grammar.

A. EXCLAMATORY SENTENCES.

§ 183. General remarks.

a According to our definition of a sentence (see § 114 *b*), mere interjections cannot be real sentences, since they neither convey any clear idea nor are capable of being understood without any additions (such as gestures or mimic expressions); we therefore omit them in this connection and will deal with them in another appendix.

§ 184. Emotional expressions.

a Interjections as spontaneous expressions being excluded, the emotional ones seem to be most primitive in character and therefore best to begin with. Often they still partially consist of an intj., which gives to them more psychical expressiveness and stress, e.g., 'ú'j lak múwɛab Nm xxi 29; sometimes, again, a noun is used in them in an interjectional way, e.g., ráb Gn xlv 28.

b Often, however, even this kind of expression has found a more elaborate form, outwardly resembling an interr. sentence, e.g., ma nûra 'ammâqom ézze Gn xxviii 17; occasionally it can have even an affirmative form, if the main word has an interjectional character, e.g., ješ šêma^b bammâqom ézze in the preceding verse (quite parallel to the other example).

§ 185. Voluntative expressions.

a Even the expressions of will rather often make use of intjj. to get more stress, e.g., 'alila lak mijjâšot kaeddêbar ézze Gn xviii 25; the form of n.act. used in an imperative sense (see § 120 *a*) as well as imp. itself (§ 121 *a*) are closely related to that kind of »interpreted interjections».

b More elaborate are already the so-called jussive expressions, however short they may be, e.g., já'i or Gn i 3. They also serve as negations of imp. forms, which cannot be constructed with a neg.

e.g., *æl tábbet 'a'árek* xix 17. When the exhortation is addressed to one's own person, the so-called cohortative ending *-a* is added to the verbal form, but the syntactical sense remains the same, e.g., *'ába^h nilbána^h libnīm* xi 3, where an interjectional imp. form provided with the same ending precedes to it, as often

c Once the voluntative sense has been indicated, there is no necessity to repeat it, which is why even *af.* can be used in an imperative sense after a formal imp., e.g., *lik wasifta 'it zaqīni bāni jīšrā'el* Ex iii 16; occasionally even without such an introductory imp., e.g., *"maltimmæ it 'arēllat lēbabkimmæ* Dt x 16. Actually, such an expression is stronger than imp., in so far as it contains the idea that from what has been said in the preceding sentence follows automatically the execution of the statement (cf. the negation in the latter part of the verse: *la*).

d The particle *na* often appears modifying voluntative expressions, usually in a precative sense, e.g., *æl-na tabbāru . . .* Gn xviii 3; or also condescending, e.g., *qā-na it bēnak . . .* xxii 2 (cf. xviii 21).

e Another modest voluntative expression is that of a wish, which also at times is expressed by means of a particular particle, e.g., *lēbi jīšmā'el jījæ 'elfānek* Gn xvii 18; also of wishes incapable of realization, e.g., *lu mētnu* Nm xiv 2. This leads easily over to rhetoric questions, such as *mī jakkilānu bāšar* xi 4, and the combination *mī jitten* (frequently pronounced as one word) is apparently no longer understood in its verbal sense at all, since it is used even in connection with impersonal events, such as *mī jitten ēreb* Dt xxviii 67.

§ 186. Vocative sentences.

a A third kind of exclamatory sentences is formed by the use of vocative expressions. They are sometimes co-ordinated with interjections as no real sentences, but according to our definition of sentence (§ 114 *b*) there is no reason for their exclusion. The idea they convey is that of calling the attention of the one addressed, and in this function they are perfectly capable of being understood without any additions. They are, so-to-say, sentences consisting of

sbj. alone, e.g., *múši múši* Ex iii 4 (repeated to give additional stress to the call). The call being addressed always to a particular being, it is natural that this always appears determined, e.g., *'azínu eššámem* Dt xxxii 1.

b The answer to such a call is mostly formally close to it, consisting of a deictic particle which replaces the grammatical sbj. and prdc., and of a pron. sf. as the natural obj., e.g., *'innáni* Ex iii 4.

B. DECLARATIVE SENTENCES.

§ 187. General remarks.

a The main division of this group of sentences is into those dealt with in Part two, the declarative ones forming the large bulk of all the sentences. Therefore we have no need to repeat it here. On the other hand, we can divide them into affirmative sentences and plain statements, and of the latter we still can separate negative sentences into their own group. The answers to vocative sentences forming a kind of transition from the voluntative to the affirmative sentences, it is best to begin with this sub-class.

§ 188. Affirmative sentences.

a These have still some affinity with *intjj.*, which can be used as affirmative elements in them, e.g., *kí ša'iqti* Gn xviii 15 (not, however, the primitive interjections); whether the «emphatic» *l* should be included in them or in the affirmative adverbs is debated, but most instances of its use seem to point to the latter direction, e.g., *weššíta . . . élkæl kíló téšji nêššet* Ex xxvii 3.

b In most cases, special adverbs are used to indicate the emphasis, e.g., *'ábal 'ašámem anánnu* Gn xlii 21, *'ákén núda eđdâbar* Ex ii 14. Sometimes, when the essential contents of the sentence have been expressed immediately before, it is enough to use the adverb alone, which then again resembles an *intj.*, e.g., *'áror mékki ré'o 'ešsêtar wamâru kæl 'ám 'ámen* Dt xxvii 24.

§ 189. P o s i t i v e s t a t e m e n t s .

a The first sentence of § 187 applies particularly to this subclass. Here, we take up only the internal characteristic difference justifying the division of this group into nominal and verbal sentences.

b The central idea of nominal sentence is to express a state or condition in the largest sense of these words, which includes even quality and continuous action of unaltering nature, e.g., *wzâb ârêš a'î tob mē'od* Gn ii 12, *u-éssûbab it-kæl ârêš kuš* v. 13.

c On the other hand, the central idea of verbal sentence seems to be the description of something moving or changing, again in the largest sense of the words. In some cases this does not seem to hold good, e.g., when qualities or other permanent states are mentioned, as in *ma řábu 'a'ûlek jáqob* Nm xxiv 5, . . . 'âšar 'a'ibta . . . Gn xxii 2, but even in them, apparently, it is the difference against the general background that is stressed. Not the objective contents of a given occurrence or state etc., then, determine whether a nominal or a verbal sentence is more fitting to describe it, but the view-point from which it is being considered.

§ 190. N e g a t i v e s t a t e m e n t s .

a A statement is normally turned into its opposite by means of a part. the nature of which depends on the nature of the sentence. A nominal sentence is mostly negated by means of the existential part. 'în »there is not«, which has its origin in a rhetorical question »where?«. Examples: . . . *wâdam in lâbbad ét adâma* Gn ii 5, . . . 'în *júsêf bêbbor* xxxvii 29. A n.act. is usually negated by means of a prep., e.g., . . . *êbilti ákal mimminnu* . . . iii 11; the negative adverb *la* also occurs in nominal sentences, e.g., . . . *la 'æmræggêlem attimmæ* xlii 34, and even as a negation of a single word, e.g., . . . 'ælšîdem *la 'êlæ* Dt xxxii 17. The negations can also appear doubled, strengthening the negative sense, e.g., 'amibbâli 'în *qabârem bamîšrem* . . . Ex xiv 11.

b In the verbal sentences, the plain negation takes place regularly by means of *la*, e.g., *wla jâkal jûsêf letâbbaq* Gn xlv 1; often in a binding sense overbidding the force of the usual prohibition (cf. § 185 *c*, positive counterpart), e.g., *la tîrša* Ex xx 13. The subordinative negative *cjj.* are dealt with together with the positive ones; for the prohibitive adverb 'æl see § 185 *b*.

C. INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES.

§ 191. Questions intended to remove an uncertainty.

a In this group we include the questions the intention of which is to ascertain whether the thing is as the speaker assumes or not. The interrogative sense can be indicated by the mere word order, e.g., 'a'ôri balîti 'ajjâtâ-li 'idna Gn xviii 12, but more often a part. is used, mostly a prefixed vowel of the *a* colour, e.g., *ašômêr 'â'i 'ânâki* iv 9, *'atêlâki 'em 'a'îš êzze* xxiv 58.

b The alternative is normally introduced by 'æm, e.g., 'âtta zê bēni 'îšab 'ém-la Gn xxvii 21; occasionally more complicated constructions also occur, e.g., *âlben mât šêna 'âled wæm šârra 'âbat tiššîm šêna têlad* xvii 17, where the rare prefixed part. *âl-* occurs introducing the first sentence.

c The negative question is introduced by the combination of the interr. and neg. particles, which latter is then stressed and therefore has a different colour of vowel (cf. § 103 *z*), e.g., 'alû kæl âreš êlfânek Gn xiii 9; they can also appear separated, and then the neg. naturally has its normal form, e.g., 'ašûfaṭ kæl âreš la jêšši mēšfaṭ xviii 25.

§ 192. Questions intended to obtain information.

a This kind of questions is introduced by interr.pron. or an adv., between which no sharp difference can be made. Examples: *mî 'a'îš âllaz âlek beššâdi* Gn xxiv 65, *ma-zê'ot 'ašîti* iii 13, 'îfa^h 'îmma

ra'im xxxvii 16. As it appears from these sentences, an interr. sentence can be subordinated to another sentence without its changing its form (see the last example), and the interr. element can be strengthened by means of a demonstrative or comparable element, which is the only function the adv. *'afu* does have, e.g., *mî 'afu aššod šed . . .* xxvii 33.

Appendix II

The syntactical character of interjections.

Interjections do appear in connection with sentences (see, e.g., §§ 184 *a*, 185 *a*) but in such cases they are not used in their natural, spontaneous way, but in a sense have become substantivized. Again, the kind called also deictic particles can introduce sentences and in a way even replace its main parts (cf. §§ 188 *a*, 186 *b*, a.e.), but even in such cases they are rather detached from sentences they introduce and, when replacing the main parts of the sentence, cannot be properly called substitutes of sentences, since they rather are primitive expressions which sentences replace in ordinary languages. And since the idea they contain is rather vague, viz. that of calling general attention or not even that, but only to give expression to a spontaneous feeling, they cannot be regarded as real sentences, either. Therefore their treatment cannot be regarded as a real part of the syntax.

As already indicated, the division into primitive interjections and deictic particles holds good for the syntax also. The first group, when used in the natural way, is wholly detached from its context, apart from that the following sentence may contain its interpretation, as e.g. in 'áwci mî jéjji miššému . . . Nm xxiv 23.

On the other hand, the deictic particles regularly call attention to what follows, e.g., *inna ištak qá wlik* Gn xii 19; their tone can also be modified by means of another particle, e.g., *inna na jadâtti ki išša jêfêt marî étti* v. 11.

Table of contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
§ 112. Method	1
§ 113. The division of the text by the Samaritans	2
PART ONE. The division of the text into sentences.	
§ 114. General remarks	5
§ 115. First-rate sentences	5
§ 116. Second-rate sentences	8
§ 117. Elementary sentences	8
PART TWO. Analysis of single sentences.	
§ 118. General remarks	10
A. Elementary sentences.	
§ 119. General remarks	10
I. Sentences consisting of only one member.	
§ 120. Primitive sentences	11
§ 121. Immediate modifications of primitive sentences	12
II. Sentences consisting of two members.	
§ 122. General remarks	13
§ 123. Elementary nominal sentences	14
§ 124. Transitional forms of sentences	23
§ 125. Elementary verbal sentences	28
§ 126. Border cases	38
B. Simple first- and second-rate sentences.	
§ 127. General remarks	39
§ 128. Sentences with one or more objects	40
§ 129. Sentences with an objective	41
§ 130. Sentences with supplemented predicate	41
§ 131. Sentences with non-prepositional adverbial elements	43
§ 132. Sentences with prepositional adverbial elements	45
C. Compound sentences.	
§ 133. General remarks	50
§ 134. Sentences with object clauses	51

§ 135. Sentences with predicate clauses	52
§ 136. Sentences with predicative supplement clauses	53
§ 137. Sentences with adverbial clauses	54
D. Complex sentences.	
§ 138. General remarks	55
§ 139. Sentences containing subject clauses	56
§ 140. Sentences containing object clauses	57
§ 141. Sentences containing objective clauses	57
§ 142. Sentences containing predicate clauses	58
§ 143. Sentences containing predicative supplement clauses	58
§ 144. Sentences containing causal clauses	59
§ 145. Sentences containing conditional clauses	59
§ 146. Sentences containing concessive clauses	61
§ 147. Sentences containing temporal clauses	61
§ 148. Sentences containing circumstantial clauses	61
§ 149. Sentences containing final clauses	63
§ 150. Relative sentences	64
E. Gravid sentences.	
§ 151. General remarks	66
§ 152. Sentences containing substitutes based on nomina actionis	66
§ 153. Sentences containing substitutes based on other verbal nouns	67
§ 154. The relation of the substitute of sentence to the predicative supplement	68
PART THREE. Description of the single parts of the sentence.	
§ 155. General remarks	69
A. Subjective parts of the sentence.	
§ 156. General remarks	69
§ 157. Natural subject	70
§ 158. Different kinds of grammatical subject	71
§ 159. The determination of the subject (and of noun in general) ..	73
§ 160. Co-ordinate precision of the subject: apposition	76
§ 161. Subordinate precision of the subject in the construct state ..	77
§ 162. Co-ordinate qualification of the subject: adjective attribute	81
§ 163. An appendix to Part III: A: the syntax of the numerals ..	82
B. Predicative parts of the sentence.	
§ 164. General remarks	86
§ 165. Predicate	87
§ 166. Object	89
§ 167. Objective	90

§ 168. Predicative supplement	91
§ 169. Free adverbial elements	91
PART FOUR. Combination of sentences and parts of sentences.	
§ 170. General remarks	94
A. Immediate method of combination.	
§ 171. General remarks	95
§ 172. The immediate combination of the parts of the sentence ..	95
§ 173. The immediate combination of sentences	96
B. Transitory forms of combination.	
§ 174. General remarks	97
§ 175. Combination by means of verbal elements	98
§ 176. Combination by means of adverbial elements	98
§ 177. Combination by means of prepositional elements	99
§ 178. Combination by means of deictic elements	100
C. Intermediate method of combination.	
§ 179. General remarks	100
§ 180. Combination by means of the relative particle	101
§ 181. Combination by means of conjunctions	101
APPENDIX I. Internal classification of sentences.	
§ 182. General remarks	103
A. Exclamatory sentences.	
§ 183. General remarks	104
§ 184. Emotional expressions	104
§ 185. Voluntative expressions	104
§ 186. Vocative sentences	105
B. Declarative sentences.	
§ 187. General remarks	106
§ 188. Affirmative sentences	106
§ 189. Positive statements	107
§ 190. Negative statements	107
C. Interrogative sentences.	
§ 191. Questions intended to remove an uncertainty	108
§ 192. Questions intended to obtain information	108
APPENDIX II. The syntactical character of interjections	
	110