

UC Berkeley

**University of California Publications in Semitic
Philology**

Title

The Supposed Hebraisms in the Grammar of the Biblical Aramaic

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7qg8b0wm>

Journal

University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, 1(1)

Author

Powell, Herbert H

Publication Date

1907

2.1.1907
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS

SEMITIC PHILOLOGY

Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1-55

February, 1907

THE SUPPOSED HEBRAISMS IN THE GRAMMAR
OF THE BIBLICAL ARAMAIC

BY

HERBERT HARRY POWELL, PH.D.



BERKELEY

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY

PRICE \$.75

**THE SUPPOSED HEBRAISMS IN THE GRAMMAR
OF THE BIBLICAL ARAMAIC**

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

BY

HERBERT HARRY POWELL, PH.D.

The following paper was written under the direction of Professor Max L. Margolis, Ph.D., and presented to the Faculty of the University of California in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, which was granted in May, 1905. Inasmuch as Dr. Margolis has since severed his connection with the University, I take this opportunity of expressing my deep sense of obligation to him not only for his wealth of suggestion, counsel, and inspiration, but also for the generous use of his own private library, without which these studies would have been impossible.

H. H. P.

SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA,
November, 1906.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AJSL*: *American Journal of Semitic Languages*.
 Baer: *Libri Danielis, Esrae et Nehemiae* (Leipzig, 1882).
 Barth, *Nomin.*: *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (Leipzig, 1889-91).
 Behrmann: *Das Buch Daniel* (Göttingen, 1894).
 Bevan: *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Cambridge, 1892).
 Brockelmann: *Syrische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1899).
BSS: *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*.
CIS: *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*.
 Cooke: *A Text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1903).
 Dalman: *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch* (Leipzig, 1894).
 Del. *Assyr. Gr.*: Delitzsch, *Assyrian Grammar* (Berlin, 1889).
 Del. *HW*: Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1896).
 Driver: *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 8th ed. (New York, 1898).
 Driver, *Tenses*: *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (Oxford, 1892).
EB: Cheyne and Black, *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.
Enc. Brit.: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.
 Graf: *Der Prophet Jeremia erklärt* (1862).
 Ginsb.: Ginsburg, *The Massoretico-Critical Text of the Hebrew Bible* (London, 1894).
 GK: Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford, 1898).
JA: *Journal Asiatique*.
JAOS: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.
 Jahn: *Das Buch Daniel* (Leipzig, 1904).
JE: *Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York).
JHU Circ.: *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* (Baltimore).
JQR: *Jewish Quarterly Review* (London).
 Kautzsch: *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (Leipzig, 1884).
 Kautzsch *Aramaismen*: *Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament*; I, Lexikalischer Teil (Halle, 1902).
 König: *Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1881).
 Lagarde: *Mittheilungen* (Göttingen, 1891).
 Lagarde: *Übersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen, und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina* (Göttingen, 1889).
 Lids.: Lidsbarski, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik* (Weimar, 1898).
 Lindberg: *Vergleichende Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Göteborg, 1897).
 Marti: "Das Buch Daniel," in *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament* (Tübingen und Leipzig, 1901).
 Marti, *Gram.*: *Kurzgefasste Grammatik der Biblisch-Aramäischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1896).
 Nestle: *Marginalien und Materialien* (Tübingen, 1893).
 Noldeke: *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*, 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1898).
 Noldeke, *Mand.*: *Mandäische Grammatik* (Halle, 1875).
 Praetorius: *Aethiopische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1886).
PRE: *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3d ed.
PS: R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus* (Oxford, 1879).
REJ: *Revue des Études Juives*.
 Riessler: *Das Buch Daniel* (Wien, 1902).
SBOT: *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament*: a critical edition of the Hebrew Text, printed in colors, with notes, under the editorial direction of Paul Haupt (Baltimore, Ezra, 1901; Dan, 1896).

- Sievers: *Grundzüge der Phonetik*, 3d ed. (Leipzig, 1885).
Spitta: *Grammatik des arabischen Vulgardialectes von Aegypten* (Leipzig, 1880).
Stade: *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1879).
Strack: *Grammatik des biblischen Aramäisch*, 4th ed. (Leipzig, 1905).
Vernier: Le P. Donat Vernier, S. J., *Grammaire Arabe* (Beyrouth, 1901).
Vollers-Burkitt: *The Modern Egyptian Dialect of Arabic* (Cambridge, 1895).
Wellhausen: *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (Berlin, 1899).
Wright: *Arabic Grammar*, 3d ed. (Cambridge, 1896).
Wright: *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Cambridge, 1890).
WZKM: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*.
ZA: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*.
ZAW: *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.
ZDMG: *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.
Zimmern: *Vergleichende Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Berlin, 1898).

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1. Definition of BA.
2. Character of Texts of BA.
3. Canons of Interpretation.
 - A. AGREEMENTS BETWEEN BA AND HEBREW, ILLUSTRATED BY OTHER ARAMAIC DIALECTS.
4. The Aramaic Group of Languages.
5. Position of BA within the Group.

I. ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONETICS

6. Use of 𐤀 and 𐤁 in BA.
7. Origin of 𐤀 and 𐤁 as endings of Feminine and Emphatic State.
8. Use of 𐤀 and 𐤁 in Aramaic Inscriptions.
- 9-11. Use of 𐤀 and 𐤁 as Prefix of Haph'el and Passive Stems in BA, Aramaic Inscriptions, and Arabic.
12. Use of 𐤆 in BA.
13. The Original Sibilants in Semitic.
- 14-18. Assimilation of 𐤆 in BA, Syriac, and Aramaic Inscriptions.
- 19-22. Consonantal Doubling.
- 23-24. Transposition of Consonants.
- 25-28. Syncope of 𐤀 in BA, Syriac, Aramaic Inscriptions, Hebrew, and Arabic.
29. Aphaeresis in BA and Syriac.
- 30-33. Peculiarities of Laryngeals.
- 34-38. Quiescent 𐤁 in BA, Hebrew, Aramaic Inscriptions, Syriac, and Arabic.
- 39-40. Peculiarities of 𐤅 and 𐤆.
- 41-43. Long Vowels in BA.
- 44-45. Syllable Formation and Length of Vowel.
46. Short Vowels in BA and Hebrew.

II. MORPHOLOGY

- 47. Preformative ׀ in Imperfect.
- 48-49. Hoph'al Forms in BA.
- 50-51. Po'lél Forms in BA.
- 52. Segolates in BA.
- 53. The Dual in BA.
- 54. B. AGREEMENTS BETWEEN BA AND HEBREW OCCASIONED BY THE
FACT OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITHIN THE CLASS OF SEMITIC
LANGUAGES.
- 55. C. AGREEMENTS BETWEEN BA AND HEBREW DUE TO ARAMAIC
INFLUENCE UPON HEBREW.
- 56. Plurals in BA in ׀׀ ׀׀.
- 57-63. Remnants of Hebrew Influence in BA.

THE SUPPOSED HEBRAISMS IN THE GRAMMAR OF
THE BIBLICAL ARAMAIC

BY

HERBERT HARRY POWELL, PH.D.

1. By Biblical Aramaic we understand the language of Gen. 31, 47 (two words); Jer. 10, 11; Dan. 2, 4b-7, 28; and Ezra 4, 8-6, 18; 7, 12-26.^a

The date of some of these documents is disputed,^b but with reference to the bulk of the records^c we may speak of BA as the vernacular speech of the Jews^d in the Persian and Greek periods of their history. While, therefore, later than the Zenjirli inscriptions, they antedate all other Aramaic records, notably the very extensive Christian literature in the Edessene commonly called Syriac.

^aThe Aramaic words and phrases in the New Testament are not treated here. For a detailed examination of them, see Kautzsch, § 5, 2, *a* and *b*; Dalman, 1894, *passim* (see Greek index).

^bAlthough found in a portion from E., Gen. 31, 47 is regarded as a gloss by Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*, 1889, 43, and Dillmann, II, 265. Jer. 10, 11, which interrupts the connection between vv. 10 and 12, is thrown out by Graf (p. 160) and others as a marginal note; its date is necessarily posterior to that of 10, 1-16, which is the work of a writer who consciously imitates the language of Deutero-Isaiah (see Giesebrecht's Commentary, 1894, 62; Cornill, *SBOT.*, 1895, 74).

^cThe Aramaic document used by the compiler of Ezra probably formed part of a narrative of the rebuilding of the Temple. It seems to have been trustworthy, although its extent is a matter of conjecture; its scope may have been more or less comprehensive. At the points where the document was inserted into the compilation, the Aramaic verses establishing the connection belong to the Chronicler; possibly they were found by him in a compilation previously made. Cf. Driver,

Introd., 549; Bertholet's Commentary, 1902, xiv f. Doubt has been cast on the authenticity of the edicts (notably by Kusters, 1895; Wellhausen, 1895), though perhaps without sufficient foundation (see E. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judenthums*, 1896); it is probable, however, that the present form was given to the edicts by the Chronicler or some previous compiler. (See, for a review of the question, J. Fischer, *Die chronologischen Fragen in den Büchern Esra-Nehemia*, 1903, 4 ff.)

As for the book of Daniel, internal evidence makes it certain that it was written in Palestine during the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, B. C. 168 or 167. See Bevan, 1-25; Behrmann, XVI-XXII; and, for a more conservative estimate, Driver's Commentary in the Cambridge Bible, 1901, Introduction, § 3.

The bilingual character of the book has been variously explained: (1) The Aramaic portion represents old Aramaic writings worked over and fitted into the framework of the book in Maccabean times (Spinosa, as cited by Kamphausen, *EB.*, col. 1004; and in a somewhat different form Meinhold, cited by Driver and Marti). (2) The whole book was originally written in Aramaic, and then certain parts which had been lost were replaced from a Hebrew translation (Huetius, cited by Kamphausen, *EB.*, *ibid.*). (3) The whole book was originally composed in Aramaic, and the beginning and the ending were subsequently translated into Hebrew in order to secure for the book a place in the sacred canon (Marti, IX f.). (4) The whole book was originally written in Hebrew, but a part was destroyed and then replaced from an Aramaic translation, which perhaps was the work of the author himself (Bevan, 27, following Lenormant; Haupt, Daniel, *SBOT.*, 16). (5) The author "evidently fell into the error of regarding 'Chaldean' as the language of Babylonia," and then continued writing in that language because "he was so familiar with both languages that he could glide from one into the other without noticing it, and could assume for a great portion of his contemporaries a knowledge of them both" (Kamphausen, *EB.*, col. 1005; so also Driver and Behrmann).

It is maintained (Riessler, § 1; Jahn, V) that the LXX translator had before him a Hebrew text of the Aramaic section. The examples enumerated by Jahn (*ibid.*, footnote 1) in support of his thesis, however, are not conclusive. With the exception of two passages (7, 8; 2, 44), the argument is based upon so-called Greek "Hebraisms." In 7, 8 ἐξήρθησαν stands for ἐξηράνθησαν; cf. Zech. 10, 2, where $\aleph^{c,b}$ have the correct reading ἐξήρθησαν for ἐξηράνθησαν, which the other codices offer, and Sir. 10, 17, where again $\aleph^{AC}$, several cursives, and the Ethiopic and Sahidic versions read ἐξήρην (Heb. הִרְפִּי , read הִרְפִּי) instead of the ἐξήρην of B and the Latin (see Nestle, *Marginalien*, 50); cf. also in Jer. 28 (51), 36, ἐξήρην AB for ἐξάρην $\aleph$. In 2, 44 LXX reads

תחבב for תחבב. The opinion that the Aramaic section goes back to a Hebrew original is rejected by Marti, p. x.

⁴The fact that the Palestinian Jews spoke Aramaic is certainly undeniable. Even before the Exile the language was understood by the princes of Judah, although it was unintelligible to the common people (II Kings 18, 26). Some of the colonists brought into Palestine to take the place of the exiled Israelites were from Aramaic regions, e. g., Hamath (*ibid.*, 17, 24). As the national life of the Jews weakened, it became increasingly difficult for them to resist the encroachments of the Aramaic language spoken by their neighbors, which steadily grew to be the language of everyday life. In the eighth and seventh centuries B. C. Aramaic was used even in Babylonia and Assyria along with the native speech. We must "not for a moment suppose that the Jews lost the use of Hebrew in the Babylonian captivity, and brought back with them into Palestine this so-called Chaldee. The Aramean dialect, which gradually got the upper hand since the fourth or fifth century B. C., did not come that long journey across the Syrian desert; it was *there*, on the spot; and it ended by taking possession of the field, side by side with the kindred dialect of the Samaritans" (Wright, *Comp. Gram.*, 16). On the displacement of Hebrew by Aramaic cf. Kautzsch, § 4; Nöldeke, *Enc. Brit.*, XXI, 648.

2. The Aramaic portions of the Old Testament have come down to us in the same square characters,^a and are furnished with the same vowel and accent symbols,^b as the Hebrew portions of the Bible. The problem at once arises: How far was the Masoretic system, developed for the Hebrew of the Old Testament, applied also to the Aramaic portions? Hebrew influence of this character would, if found, be placed to the credit of the schools of the readers and masters of the late synagogue. Quite different is the following question: To what extent was BA, as the living speech of the post-exilic Jewish community in Palestine, influenced by the Hebrew which still continued to be used in school and synagogue even after it had been supplanted in the daily life of the people?^c Here the case is much analogous to the problem of Hebraisms in Biblical Greek,^d except for the following facts: first, that Hebrew and Aramaic are cognate languages, and therefore more liable to influence each other; secondly, that the Greek texts of the Bible are mainly translations,^e while the Aramaic texts are originals.^f

* The so-called square characters in which our MSS. of the Hebrew Bible are written are not Hebrew in origin, but Aramaic. They represent the forms which the old Hebrew alphabet (= Phœnician, Western Semitic in general) assumed, through gradual transformation in the course of centuries, in the Aramaic (Egyptian and Palmyrene). The question still remains whether this transformation from old to square was gradual in the case of the Biblical text, as it was in ordinary documents, or whether the change was deliberate and was made by an authoritative body long after the new characters had established themselves in common use. Tradition (Jewish, in the Talmud, verified by references in the church fathers) ascribes the change to Ezra. Jewish coins down to the time of Bar Kokhba bear the old characters. The notice found in the church fathers that in Greek versions the Tetragrammaton was written in Hebrew and in the old characters, is now verified by the Cairene fragment of Aquila (ed. Burkitt, 1897; see the discussion on p. 15 f. [the spelling with י in place of י־יָדָה for יְהוָה—is on a line with אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים, according to Margolis]). Cf., on the whole subject, Driver, *Hebrew Text of Samuel*, 1890, XVII-XXV; Lidzbarski, 189 ff.; and art. Alphabet in *JE.*, I, 442 f., especially p. 445, col. 2, and Plates I-III.

^b On the value of the vocalization in Daniel see Bevan, 33 f.; Nöldeke, *EB.*, col. 282; and contrast Kamphausen, *EB.*, col. 1005; König, *JE.*, IV, 430 f. During the last half-century another system of vowel symbols has been brought to light. It is known as the superlinear, since the vowel signs are all written above the consonants. Two MSS. are cited by Strack (*GBA.*, 4) for Daniel: one, the Codex Jamaensis, of little value, containing chapters 1, 8-2, 49, and 4, 21-7, 7; the other, Codex Derenburgii, containing all of the Aramaic of Daniel except 2, 28-41; 4, 5-22; 6, 27-7, 4 and 7, 15-20. On this system of vocalization, see G. Margoliouth, *International Congress of Orientalists*, IX, 1893, 46-56; and cf. *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Feb. 1893, Vol. XV, part 4; Neubauer, *JQR.*, VII (1895), 361 f.; Friedländer, *ibid.*, 564 ff.; Bacher, *ZDMG.*, XLIX (1895), 15 f.; Barnstein, *Targum of Onkelos to Genesis*, 1896, 6 f. and especially 14 ff.; Levias, *AJSL.*, XV (1899), 157 ff.; Praetorius, *ZDMG.*, LIII (1899), 181 ff.; Kahle, *ZAW.*, XXI (1901), 273 ff.; GK, 39, n. 1.

^c On mixture in languages, see Whitney, *Transactions of American Philological Association*, 1881; Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, 1898, c. xxii, especially §§ 276, 283 ff.; Sweet, *History of Language*, 1900, 81-96. The general opinion is that the pronunciation and syntax, rather than the morphology, are affected by the mixture.

^d On the Hebraisms of Biblical Greek see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien* (1895); *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897); *Die sprachliche Erforschung d. griech. Bibel* (1898); his article in *PRE.*, VII (1899), 62 ff.; Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, 1901, 12 ff.;

cf. also Grenfell-Hunt-Smyly, *Tebtunis Papyri*, I (1902), 86 (n. 14). Many of the supposed Hebraisms have been found to be part of the common Hellenistic language.

*That some of the New Testament books (Gospels and Acts) bear the impress of being translations from a Semitic original was noted by Spinoza, who observes (*Tractatus theologico-politicus*, c. vii) that "quamvis aliis linguis vulgati fuerint (libri N. T.), hebraizant tamen . . . Ev. enim secundum Matt. et sine dubio etiam epistola ad Hebr. Hebraice ex communi opinione scripta sunt, quae tamen non extant." Recently the question has been reopened; see Nestle, *Philologica Sacra* (1896); Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* (1898); Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, VI (1899), 188-194.

¹ See, however, above, § 1, c.

3. The question of grammatical Hebraisms in BA has been adverted to by grammarians and commentators.* It appears that Kautzsch is isolated in his assumption of strong traces of Hebrew influence in BA; all other scholars who have expressed opinions are inclined to regard the so-called Hebraisms as remnants of an older linguistic stage in which Aramaic was still nearer to the Hebrew. A fresh investigation of the subject based upon as complete an induction as possible, especially as regards the inscriptional material, as well as upon a fuller discussion of rival opinions and, it is believed, a more adequate weighing of the evidence presented by the phenomena of general Semitic grammar, is attempted in the following pages, and built upon the following canons of elimination:

A. An agreement between BA and Hebrew found in the non-Jewish Aramaic dialects must be eliminated from the list of possible Hebraisms.

B. An agreement between BA and Hebrew occasioned by the fact of their relationship within the class of Semitic languages must be similarly eliminated.

C. An agreement between BA and Hebrew due to Aramaic influence upon Hebrew can have no place in our list.

Whatever agreements are left, not covered by these canons, may be ascribed to Hebrew influence.

*G. B. Winer, *Grammatik des biblischen und targum. Chaldaismus*, 1824, 5 f., rejects the opinion that BA was from the beginning a corrupt and mixed jargon, and maintains that it bears the character of a real Aramaic dialect. He considers the few agreements with

Hebrew as against Syriac, which are confined almost entirely to orthography and vocalization, as dialectal differences rather than mutations introduced from the Hebrew by the schools of the Jewish punctators, since the identical pronunciation of Aramaic is attested by the Greek transcription of Aramaic words in the N. T.

Renan, *Histoire générale des langues sémitiques*,⁴ 1863, 220 f., agrees with Winer on the one hand against Hupfeld, who considers the BA as a Jewish jargon, and on the other against Dietrich, who interprets the so-called Hebraisms as elements of primitive Aramaic, in maintaining that BA is an Aramaic dialect "légèrement hébraisé." He regrets the lack of non-Jewish Aramaic documents which renders a conclusive opinion difficult. As examples of Hebrew influences he cites ך for ך, the Hoph'al, and segolate forms.

S. D. Luzzatto, *Elementi grammaticali del Chaldeo Biblico*, 1865 (German trans., 1873), § 2, assumes the existence of Hebraisms. See esp. §§ 3, 16, 43, 81, 107.

E. Kautzsch, § 8, asserts that BA bears strong traces of Hebrew influence. "These Hebraisms, however," he continues, "may be attributed in large part to late copyists who either through ignorance or through design conformed their texts to the rules of Hebrew grammar." Kautzsch's views in detail will be found referred to in the course of the present work.

M. J. de Goeje, in a review of Kautzsch's *Grammar* (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, XIX (1885), 70), warns against being "te rasch met de aanname van Hebraïsmen in het Arameesch van het O. T." Cf. Noldeke, in *GGA*, 1884, No. 26, 1015.

A. A. Bevan, *Commentary*, 38 f., has the following to say on our question: "A very difficult and much debated question is how far BA was influenced by Hebrew. As a rule, philologists were formerly inclined to go very far in assuming the existence of Hebraisms, but many of the linguistic phenomena which were so regarded have been proved by recent discoveries to be genuine Aramaic." He mentions, however, some undeniable Hebraisms; his opinion will be adverted to later on.

G. Behrmann, *Commentary*, p. viii, correctly defines the so-called Hebraisms of the BA as remnants of an older stage of the language in which Aramaic was still nearer to Hebrew. He also rightly eliminates Masoretic peculiarities which have no foundation in the consonantal text.

A. AGREEMENTS BETWEEN BA AND HEBREW FOUND ALSO IN THE NON-JEWISH* ARAMAIC DIALECTS

4. Aramaic is one of the North Semitic languages, and, in the course of its history, was spoken throughout Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine.^b Upon the decay of Babylonian culture

and influence, Aramaic became the international language of commerce and diplomacy (II Kings 18, 26). The oldest specimens of Aramaic are the inscriptions from Zenjirli, Nineveh and Babylon, which belong to the eighth and seventh centuries almost all the others being from Persian times or later (cf. Lidzbarski, 121). The distribution of the inscriptions^c according to place and time appears as follows:

1. Zenjirli, eighth and seventh centuries B. C.^d
2. Nerab, seventh century B. C.
3. Babylon, about 700 B. C.
4. Tema, fifth and fourth centuries B. C.
5. Egypt, fifth century B. C. and later.
6. Nabatea, 9 B. C. to 94 A. D.
7. Palmyra, first to third centuries A. D.

^aWe leave out of account the Jewish and Samaritan Aramaic writings, because they are likely to show Hebraisms, and because we have as yet no reliable edition of the Targums with vowel-points (cf. Merx, *International Congress of Orientalists*, Berlin (1881), I, 142-225). The Jewish Aramaic is represented by the Targums, which, however, did not receive their present form until a comparatively late date. The Samaritan dialect is represented by the translation of the Pentateuch. The Christian Palestinian dialect, likewise, was probably affected by Hebrew influence; hence it is omitted from our discussion.

^bOn the geographical area of Aramaic see Kautzsch, § 1; Nöldeke, *EB.*, cols. 280 ff.; GK., §§ 1, 2 and the literature there mentioned. On Assyrian as an older local variety of Aramaic, see JHU. circulars, No. 114, July, 1894, 118b. On the Arameans generally, see McCurdy, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, I, 24, 71, 84, 244, 408, and III, p. 26.

^cMost of the Aramaic inscriptions are contained in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part second, Paris, 1889. Unless otherwise noted, all references to these inscriptions are to the numbers in the *Corpus*.

^dThe inscriptions from Zenjirli, a small village in northwest Syria, afford the earliest specimens extant of Aramaic. They were discovered in 1890 and 1891. Although undoubtedly Aramaic, the dialect has features which ally it to Hebrew. It is just with reference to this affinity of the Zenjirli inscriptions with Hebrew that Sachau (quoted by Behrmann, p. viii, footnote) remarks that the older the Aramaic is, the more it is like Hebrew. On these inscriptions see Lidzbarski, 440 f.; Cooke, 185; Halévy, *JA.*, XIX (1892), VIII; Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XLVIII (1893), 96 f.; D. H. Müller, *WZKM.*, VII (1893), 113 ff.; X (1896), 193 ff.; Hoffmann, *ZA.*, XI (1897).

5. Among the remnants of Aramaic^a BA belongs chronologically between Egyptian Aramaic and the language of the Nabatean inscriptions. They all belong to the Western group of dialects, the Eastern^b being represented by the Syriac,^c or dialect of Edessa, the Mandaic, and the language of the Babylonian Talmud. The Mohammedan conquest replaced Aramaic as the vernacular with Arabic, the former surviving in Syria and Persia only in certain isolated and more or less corrupt dialects.^d

^aFor a more comprehensive and detailed list of these remnants, see Kautzsch, § 5; Zimmern, § 1, c; on their comparative value for philological purposes, see Nöldeke, *EB.*, col. 284.

^bThe Western branch of Aramaic differs from the Eastern chiefly in the prefix of the 3rd sing. masc. imperf., which is *ī*. In Syriac the prefix is *n*, which is also usual in Mandaic. The Babylonian Talmud sometimes has *n*, but more commonly *l*. See Bevan, 33 f.; Behrmann, p. vi; Wright, *Comp. Gram.*, 19.

^cFrom the third to the seventh century A. D., Syriac produced an extensive ecclesiastical literature. It developed also systems of vowel symbols by which the pronunciation was more or less accurately represented. After being supplanted by Arabic as the vernacular, it remained in use for a long time in monasteries and schools as a literary and ecclesiastical language. See Nöldeke, pp. xxxi-xxxiv; and *EB.*, cols. 284, 285; Wright, *Syriac Literature*, 1894; Merx, *Historia artis grammaticae apud Syros*, 1889.

^dOn the modern Syriac dialects of Persia, see Stoddard, "Grammar of Modern Syriac as spoken in Oroomia, Persia and Koordistan," *JAOS.*, V (1856), 1-183; A. J. Maclean in *Intern. Cong. of Oriental.*, IX, London (1892), 33-45, and *Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac*, Cambridge, 1895. On the dialect of Ma'lula in Syria, see Ferrette, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (old series), XX (1863), 431 f.; Renan, *Histoire générale*, 268; Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XXI (1867), 183 f.; Merx, *ZDMG.*, XXII (1868), 271 f.; Socin, *ZDMG.*, XXIV (1870), 229 f.; Prym, *ZDMG.*, XXV (1871), 652; Merx, *JA.*, Series VII, XII (1878), 178 f., and XIII (1879), 165 f.; Parisot, *JA.*, Series IX, XI (1898), 239-312, 440-519; XII (1899), 124-176. On the dialect of Ṭur-'Abdin see Prym and Socin, *Der neu-aramäische Dialekt des Ṭur-'Abdin*, Göttingen, 1881, and the review by Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XXXV (1881), 218-235; also Parisot, *International Congress of Orientalists*, Paris, 1897, 179-198.

6. BA differs from Syriac and agrees with Hebrew orthographically in the use of 𐤁 where Syriac has ܐ (l). Similarly,

certain words are written with ש, where Syriac has ܫ (š), the letter ש not being found in Syriac.

The irregularity in the use of ה and נ appears in:

- a) The ending of the emphatic state of nouns.
- b) The ending of the absolute state of feminine nouns.
- c) The ending of infinitives.
- d) Pronouns.
- e) Pronominal suffixes.
- f) Verbs נ"ל (ל").

a) Masculine nouns and adjectives in the emphatic state are written with נ in the following examples (the asterisk * marking forms which appear with both ה and נ): אֲבִנָּה 2, 35; 5, 4. 23; אֲזִידָּה (if we accept the view of Andreas, in Marti, *Gramm.*, 51*, who derives it from Middle Persian *azd*; on the reading see note in Ginsburg's Bible) 2, 5. 8; אִלְנָה 4, 8. 11. 17. 20. 23; אֱלֹהָהּ 34 times; אֱלֹפָהּ 5, 1; אֲנוּשָׁה (k), אֲנִישָׁה (k) 4, 13. 14; אֲנִשָּׁה 2, 38 + 9 times; אֲחִירָה 6, 9. 10. 14; אֲחִיעָה 5, 4. 23; אֲרִפְנָה 5, 7. 16. 29; אֲרִיעָה 2, 35 + 19 times (in 2, 39 k has אֲרִיעָה and אֲרִיעָה; here the word is used adverbially); אֲרִיקָה Jer. 10, 11; אֲחִינָה 3, 19. 22; *בִּירְחָה Ez. 5, 3. 9. 11; 6, 3; בִּנְיָה Ez. 5, 4; בִּרְחָה 4, 9 + 6 times; בִּשְׂרָה 2, 11; 4, 9; גִּבְחָה 6, 17 + 6 times; גִּירָה 5, 5; *דִּהְבָּהּ 2, 35 + 12 times; *דִּרְחָה 7, 10. 22. 26; דִּרְחָה 2, 13. 15; Ez. 7, 12. 21. 26; דִּרְחָהּ 4, 12. 20 (in 4, 20 Ginsb. gives דִּרְחָהּ as a var.); הִדְרָהּ 5, 18; הִכְלָהּ 5, 2 + 8 times; הִמְיִנְחָה (k) הִמְיִינְחָה (k) 5, 7. 16. 29; זְמִנָּה 3, 7. 8; 4, 33; 7, 22; Ez. 5, 3; זְמִירָה 3, 5. 7. 10. 15; חִבְלָהּ Ez. 4, 22; חִיָּה 6, 21. 27; חִזָּה 2, 19; חִלְמָהּ 2, 4 + 16 times; חִמְרָהּ 5, 1. 2. 4. 23; חִסְנָה 2, 37; חִסְפָּה 2, 34. 35. 43. 45; חִשׁוּכָהּ 2, 22; חִטָּהּ 2, 45; חִטָּהּ 2, 41. 43; חִטָּהּ 6, 3; Ez. 4, 21; 5, 5; יִרְחָהּ 6, 11. 14; יִמָּה 7, 2. 3; *יִקְרָהּ 2, 37; 5, 18; יִקְרָהּ Ez. 4, 10; פִּדְחָהּ Ez. 7, 12. 21; פִּסְפָּה 2, 35 + 9 times; פִּרְזָה 3, 4; כִּשְׂדִּיָּה (k) 5, 30; *פִּתְבָּהּ 5, 8 + 7 times; לִילִיָּהּ 2, 19; 5, 30; 7, 2. 7. 13; מִאֲזִנָּה 5, 27; מִדְּרָהּ (k) 6, 1; מִדְּבָהּ Ez. 7, 17 (Ginsb. gives a var. מִדְּבָהּ); *מִלְפָּהּ 2, 4 + 155 times; מִנְדִּיעָהּ 2, 21; מִשְׁחִיָּהּ 5, 10; נִבְיָהּ (k) Ez. 5, 1; 6, 14; נִגְהָהּ 6, 20; נִדְרָהּ (k) נִדְרָהּ (k) 2, 22; נִרְחָהּ 3, 6 + 12 times; *נִדְרָהּ Ez. 4, 16; נִחְשָׁהּ 2, 35 + 4 times; נִשְׁחִיָּהּ Ez. 4, 18. 23; 5, 5; סִפְפָּה 6, 27; 7, 26. 28; סִפְרָהּ Ez. 4, 8. 9. 17. 23; עִדְנָהּ 2, 8. 9; 3, 5. 15; עִטָּהּ 2, 14; עִלִּיָּהּ (k) 3, 26 + 9 times; עִלְמָהּ 2, 20 + 5 times; *עִמָּהּ Ez. 7, 13. 16. 25 (in 7, 13 Ginsb. gives a var. עִמָּהּ); עִשְׂבָּהּ 4, 22. 29. 30; 5, 21; פִּסְפָּה 5, 24; פִּרְזָלָהּ 2, 34 + 11 times; פִּרְטָהּ (k) 6, 29; *פִּשְׂרָהּ 2, 4 + 7 times; פִּתְגְּמָהּ 4, 14. Ez.

4, 17; 5, 7. 11; 6, 11; צִלְמָא 2, 31 + 7 times; קִרְנָא 3, 5 + 7 times; רִבָּא 7, 2; Ez. 4, 10; 5, 8; רִבִּיעִיא (k) 2, 40; 3, 25; 7, 7. 23; רִדְחָא 2, 35; רִזָּא 2, 18 + 4 times; שְׂאֵרָא 7, 7. 19; שְׂבִיבָא 3, 22; שְׂלִטְנָא 7, 27; שְׂלִיטָא 2, 15; שְׂלִמָא Ez. 5, 7; שְׂמִישָׁא 6, 15; שְׂפִרְפְּרָא 6, 20; *תִּלְתָּא Ez. 6, 4; תִּלְתָּא 5, 16, 29; תִּקְפָּא 2, 37. Also the adverbs אֲדִרְדְּרָא Ez. 7, 23; אֲסַפִּינָא Ez. 5, 8 + 6 times; the not altogether certain form אֲשִׁרְנָא Ez. 5, 3. 9, and the proper name דִּרְרָא 3, 1.

Masculine nouns in the emphatic state occur with הָ as follows: *בִּיתְהָ Ez. 5, 12; 6, 15; *הִהֲבָהּ Ez. 5, 14; 6, 5; 7, 18; *הִינֵהּ Ez. 7, 26; דִּכְרוֹנֵהּ Ez. 6, 2; *יִקְרֵהּ 5, 20; כְּשִׁדְּהָא (k) 5, 30; Ez. 5, 12; *פִּתְבָּהּ 5, 7. 15; מִדְּהָא (k) 6, 1; *מִלְפָּהּ 2, 11; נְבִיאָהּ (k) Ez. 5, 1; 6, 14; *נִהֲרֵהּ Ez. 5, 3 + 12 times in Ezra; עֲלָהּ (k) 3, 26. 32; 5, 18. 21; עֲמָהּ Ez. 5, 12; פִּרְסָהּ (k) 6, 29; *פִּשְׁרֵהּ 2, 7; 5, 12; רִבִּיעָהּ (k) 2, 40; 3, 25; 7, 7. 23; רִאשָׁהּ 2, 38; *תִּלְתָּהּ 3, 24 + 5 times. Note that הָ is the rule when, as in the marginal forms (k) noted, it is preceded by אֲ. The הָ in these cases is to be regarded as purely orthographic, and presupposes spellings like כְּשִׁדְּהָא, which latter, in accordance with general Semitic usage, is for כְּשִׁדְּהָא (cf. below, § 38).

The masculine plural emphatic state ends everywhere in יָא (or אֲ—), except in the single instance טֹוִרְיָהּ Ez. 4, 16. Most probably, however, the vocalization in this instance is wrong, טֹוִרְיָהּ having been intended by the writer (so LXX, III Ez. 2, 20, Peshiṭta).

Feminine nouns in the emphatic state singular with אֲ are as follows: אֲפִרְתָּא Ez. 4, 11; 5, 6; בִּאֲשִׁתָּא Ez. 4, 12; בִּירְתָּא Ez. 6, 2; גְּבִירְתָּא 2, 20, 23; גְּלוּתָא 2, 25; 5, 13; 6, 14; Ez. 6, 16; חִיוּתָא 4, 12 + 5 times (in 4, 11 Ginsb. gives a var. הִיוּתָּא); חֲכַמְתָּא 2, 20. 21. 23; יִבְשִׁתָּא 2, 10; יִקְדָּתָא 3, 6 + 7 times; מִדִּינְתָּא Ez. 5, 8; 6, 2; *מִלְכוּתָא 2, 37 + 18 times (in 7, 24 Ginsb. gives a var. מִלְכוּתָּהּ); מִלְפְּתָא 5, 10; *מִלְתָּא 2, 8 + 11 times; מִרְדָּתָא Ez. 4, 12; מִשְׁרָקִיתָא 3, 5. 7. 10. 15; נְבִרְשִׁתָּא 5, 5; נִפְקָתָא Ez. 6, 4. 8; נִצְבָּתָא 2, 41; עֲבִידָתָא 2, 49; Ez. 5, 8; קְדִמִּיתָא 7, 4; קִרְיָתָא Ez. 4, 12 + 5 times; שְׂהוּדִיתָא 7, 19. 23; רְבוּתָא 5, 18. 19; 7, 27; רִבְחָא 4, 27; שְׂהוּדִיתָא Gen. 31, 47; שְׂאֵלָתָא 4, 14; *שְׁעָתָא 3, 6. 15; 4, 30 (in 3, 6 Ginsb. gives a var. שְׁעָתָּהּ).

Feminine nouns in the emphatic state singular are found with הָ only in the following: *מִלְכוּתָּהּ 2, 44 (here Ginsb. gives a var. מִלְכוּתָּהּ); *מִלְתָּהּ 2, 5; *שְׁעָתָּהּ 5, 5 (here Ginsb. gives a var. שְׁעָתָּהּ).

Feminine nouns in the emphatic plural are found with א as follows: אֲצַבְעָתָא 2, 41; אֲרִיּוֹתָא 6, 8, 13, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25 (twice), 28; חַיּוֹתָא 7, 7, 12, 19; מְדִינָתָא 3, 2, 3; מַלְכוּתָא 2, 44; 7, 23; מַסְתָּרָתָא 2, 22; עֲמִיקָתָא 2, 22; פְּהוֹתָא 3, 2, 3, 27; 6, 8; קְדַמִּיתָא 7, 8.

b) Feminine nouns in the absolute singular are found with א as follows: בְּטֹלָא Ez. 4, 24; חֲטִיָּא (k) Ez. 6, 17; *חַיּוֹא 4, 13 (Strack gives a var. חַיּוֹה); חֲמָא 3, 13 (Ginsb. gives a var. חַמְה); חֲמָא 3, 19; יָדָא 5, 5, 24; יֶצִיבָא 3, 24; 6, 13; 7, 16 (in the last place used adverbially, so also in 3, 24, although מִלְתָּא may be understood); *יִתְרָא 6, 4 (Ginsb. gives a var. יִתִּירָה); מְרָדָא Ez. 4, 15; מְשִׁנָּא 7, 7; מַתְּיֹהָבָא Ez. 6, 8; מַתְעַבְדָּא Ez. 5, 8; עֲבָדָא 7, 21; *קְרִיָּא Ez. 4, 15; רִבְעִיָּא (k) 2, 40; 3, 25; 7, 7, 23; שְׂבַכָּא 3, 5, 7, 10, 15; שְׁנָיָא 7, 5, 19; תְּדִירָא 6, 17, 21; תְּלִיתִיָּא (k) 2, 39; *תְּקִיפָא 7, 7.

Feminine nouns occur with ה as follows: אֲפִרָּה Ez. 4, 8 (Ginsb. gives a var. אֲגִרָּא); אֲכֹלָה 7, 7, 19; אֲיָבְעָה 3, 25; 7, 6, 17; אֲרֹכָה 4, 24 (Ginsb. gives a var. אֲרַכָּא); 7, 12; בִּינָה 2, 21; בָּוָה 4, 34; דְּהִילָה 7, 7, 19; דְּמִיָּה 7, 5; זְעִירָה 7, 8; חֲבֹלָה 6, 23 (Ginsb. gives a var. חֲבֹלָא); חֲדָה 2, 9 + 8 times (in Ez. 4, 8 Ginsb. and in Dan. 2, 35 Strack give as a var. חֲדָא); חֲדָה Ez. 6, 16; חֲטָאָה (k) Ez. 6, 17; *חַיּוֹה 7, 5, 7; חֲכָמָה 2, 30; 5, 11, 14; יִכְלָה 7, 21; יִקְרִירָה 2, 11; *יִתְרָה 3, 22 + 5 times (used adverbially in 7, 7, 19; Baer has יִתְרָה everywhere except in 6, 4, where he gives יִתְרָא; Strack cites certain MSS. which always have יִתְרָא); פְּרִבְּהָ 2, 9; פְּתַבְּהָ 5, 5 (Ginsb. gives a var. כְּתַבָּא); מְאָה 6, 2; Ez. 6, 17; 7, 22; מְגֹלָה Ez. 6, 2; מִדְּקָה 7, 7, 19; מִהֲחֻצְפָּה 2, 15; מִחֻצְפָּה 3, 22; מִלָּה 2, 9, 10; מִנְּהָ Ez. 4, 13, 20; 7, 24; מִנְּהָ 2, 46; מִתְּנַשְׂאָה Ez. 4, 19; נְבֻזָּבָה 2, 6; סִימְפִּנְיָה 3, 5, 15; סִיפִנְיָה (k) 3, 10 (Ginsb. gives a var. סִיפִנְיָא); עֲטָרָה 7, 24; עֵלָה 6, 5 (twice), 6; פְּחָה Ez. 5, 14; פְּלִיגָה 2, 41; צִדְקָה 4, 24; קִימָה 4, 23 (Ginsb. gives קִימָה only as a variant for קִימָא; Baer and Strack give קִימָה in the text and קִימָא as a variant); *קְרִיָּה Ez. 4, 10; רִפְסָה 7, 7, 19; שְׂבַכָּה 3, 19 + 4 times; שְׁחִיתָה 2, 9; 6, 5 (twice); מְשִׁנְיָה 7, 7 (Ginsb. gives a var. מְשִׁנָּא); שְׁעָה 4, 16; תְּבִירָה 2, 42; תְּנִינָה 7, 5; *תְּקִיפָה 2, 40, 42 (in 2, 42 Ginsb. gives a var. תְּקִיפָא).

c) Infinitives with א are found in *הוֹבְדָּא (Strack gives הוֹבְדָּה) 2, 12, 24; בְּטֹלָא Ez. 4, 21 (Ginsb. gives a var. בְּטֹלָה); 6, 8; יֶצֶבָא 7, 19.

Infinitives with ה are found as follows: *הוֹבְדָּה 7, 26; הִיתְיָה 3, 13; 5, 2; הִתְבַּהֲלָה 2, 25; 3, 24; 6, 20; מִבְּנִיָּה Ez. 7, 15; הִזְדָּה 5,

20; הַבִּלָּה Ez. 6, 12; הַחֲרִירָה 2, 10. 16. 27; 3, 32; 5, 15 (in 2, 10 Ginsb. gives a var. הַחֲרִירָה); הַיִּבְלָה Ez. 7, 15; הַיִּדְעָה 5, 8; שְׁכַלְלָה Ez. 5, 3. 9; נִפְתָּחָה 3, 20; נִפְתָּחָה 2, 46; הִנְסָקָה 6, 24; הִצְלָה 3, 29; הִעֲלָה 5, 7; הִנְעֲלָה 4, 3; קִשְׁלָה 2, 14; הִחְקִטְלָה 2, 13; קִיבָה 6, 8; הִשְׁפִּיחָה 6, 5 (twice); הִשְׁמִדָה 7, 26; הִשְׁנִיָּה 6, 9. 16; 7, 25; Ez. 6, 12 (in the last passage Ginsb. gives a var. הִשְׁנִיָּה); הִשְׁפִּילָה 4, 34; תִּקְפָּה 6, 8.

d) The pronoun אֲנִיָּהּ occurs only in 3, 16. 17; Ez. 5, 11 (here Ginsb. gives a var. אֲנִיָּהּ); while אֲנִיָּהּ is found in Ez. 4, 16. אֲנִיָּהּ appears as k in 2, 29+14 times; אֲנִיָּהּ occurs 13 times and אֲנִי never (in 2, 8 and Ez. 6, 12 Ginsb. gives a var. אֲנִי); הִנֵּה also is uniform, being found 23 times in Ezra, 31 in Daniel and once in Jer. 10, 11 (in 2, 18 Ginsb. gives a var. רִנָּה).

e) הֵּ is found in the 2d pers. masc. sing. in הִזִּיתָה 2, 41 (twice). 42; on the other hand אֵ appears in תִּקְלָתָה 5, 27 (Strack gives a var. תִּקְלָתָה). Elsewhere the otiose letter is missing.

f) Verbs ל"א (ל") are found ending in א as follows: Perfect—*אָתָא Ez. 5, 16; בָּעָא 2, 49; *הָוָא 5, 19+5 times (in 6, 4 Ginsb. and Strack give a var. הָוָה); *מָטָא 4, 25; נָשָׂא 2, 35 (in שִׁיעִיָּא Ez. 6, 15 the א is otiose). Imperfect—יִתְבַּנָּא Ez. 5, 15; 6, 3; תִּתְבַּנָּא Ez. 4, 13. 16. 21 (in Ez. 4, 16 Ginsb. gives a var. תִּתְבַּנָּה); יִבְעָא 6, 8, 13; אִבְעָא 7, 16; *לָהּוָא 2, 28+15 times; *תִּהְוָא 2, 40+3 times; אִהְוָא 2, 24 (Baer has אִהְוָה; Strack and Ginsb. give variants אִהְוָה and אִהְוָה); נִהְוָא 2, 4 (so Strack; Baer and Ginsb. have נִהְוָה); יִמְהָא 4, 32; יִתְמַהָא Ez. 6, 11; יִבְמַהָא 4, 8. 17; תִּעְדָּא 6, 9. 13 (in both cases Ginsb. gives a var. תִּעְדָּה, while Baer has תִּעְדָּה in the text); יִצְבָּא 4, 14. 22. 29; תִּקְנָא Ez. 7, 17; אִקְרָא 5, 17 (Strack gives a var. אִקְרָה); יִחְרַמָּא 3, 6. 11; 6, 8. 13; יִשְׁנָא 3, 31; 6, 26; Ez. 4, 22; יִשְׁנָא 7, 24; תִּשְׁנָא 6, 8; 7, 23; יִשְׁתַּנָּא 2, 9; יִהְשַׁנָּא Ez. 6, 11. Imperative—שֵׂא Ez. 5, 15. Participle—*בָּעָא 6, 14; *נָלָא 2, 22. 28. 29; מִדָּא 5, 19; מִדְּוָדָא 2, 23; מִדָּא 6, 11; מִנָּא 5, 25 (twice). 26; צָבָא 5, 19; מִצְלָא 6, 11; קָרָא 3, 4; 4, 11; 5, 7; מִדְּהִשְׁנָא 2, 21; שָׂרָא 2, 22; מִשְׁרָא 5, 12. Infinitive—מִזָּא 3, 19; מִתָּא 3, 2; מִבְּנָא Ez. 5, 2. 17; 6, 8; לִבְנָא Ez. 5, 3. 13; מִבְּעָא 2, 18; מִגְּלָא 2, 47; מִחִזָּא Ez. 4, 14; מִקְרָא 5, 8. 16; מִרְמָא 3, 20; מִשְׁרָא 5, 16.

Verbs ל"א (ל") are found with final ה as follows: Perfect—*אָתָה 7, 22; Ez. 5, 3; *בָּעָה 2, 16 (Baer בָּעָא); *הָוָה 4, 26+6 times; חָוָה 4, 20; 7, 1 (in 4, 20 Ginsb. gives a var. חָוָא); *מָטָה 7, 13. 22; מָנָה 5, 26; רָבָה 4, 8. 17. 30. Imperfect—*לָהּוָה 4, 22; *תִּהְוָה 2,

41. 42; 4, 24; יִהְיֶה 5, 12; נִהְיֶה 2, 7; יַעֲבֹד 7, 14; יִקְרָה 5, 7; יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה 3, 29. Participles—אֹחֶה 7, 13; אֹהֶה 3, 22; *בֹּעֵה 6, 12; *גֹּלֶה 2, 47; דֹּמֶה 3, 25; הֹוֶה 2, 31+14 times; הֹוֶה 3, 19; מִהְעֵדָה 2, 21 (Ginsb. gives a var. מִהְעֵדָה); עֹנֶה 2, 5+21 times; שֹׁלֶה 4, 1; שֹׁתֶה 5, 1.

7. A similar fluctuation appears in the early Aramaic inscriptions, so much so that Lidzbarski remarks (p. 20): "In verbs third ה (א) and in the *st. abs. fem. sing.* as well as the *st. emph.* the use of ה and א fluctuates down to the latest times, but the oldest texts show a preference for ה." Examples are as follows (as noted above, references, unless otherwise specified, are to the *CIS.*; for abbreviations see Lidzbarski, pp. 4, 507):

a) In the masc. sing. emph. st., ה occurs for א only in זנה (רנה) (BA רנה) and in the following forms, which, however, are not entirely certain: אבה proper name 122, 1. 2; הקלה 53, 1 (also הקלא, e. g., 113, 18; Syr. سَمَلَا): כרמה Si., Eut. 99, 2 (Syr. كَرْمَا); קישה name of a deity (cf. Baethgen, *Beiträge z. semit. Religionsgeschichte*, 1888, 108) Na., 197, 5; 198, 4 (also קישה Na., 209, 9); שאה (*grain?*) Pan. 6, 9. In the fem. emph. st. ה appears only in the doubtful form נפקחה (which could be taken as with suff. 3 sing.; BA נפקחא, Syr. نَفَكَحَا) 146 A, 1. In Christian Palestinian final ā is represented by ה instead of א only in a few evidently uncertain cases, viz. *ܥܠܡܝܢ*, *eternal life*, John 5, 24 (elsewhere always *ܥܠܡܐ*), and *ܐܠܡܢܝܢ*, *the rulers of the people*, Luke 24, 20; cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, 22 (1868), 448 (the forms may, of course, be taken as with suffix 3 sing., after the type *ܐܠܡܢܝܢ*, Nöldeke, § 205, C).

b) In the feminine ending of nouns ה appears as follows: אבה Na. proper name 204, 2; 271, 3 (Eut. 18, 1?); הדה Had. 28; Na., 218, 4; 221, 6 (also הדא Pa., T II b, 10; BA הדא, Syr. هَدَا); הטה Pan., 6. 9 (also חטא Pa., T II b, 9 = Arab. حَطَا); חטיאה Na., 224, 11 (= Arab. حَطِيَّاء to which Syr. (ܠ)ܫܬܝܬܐ — by analogy — corresponds); מוהבה Na., 209, 6; 219, 5 (= Arabic مَوْهَبَة); מאה Na., 205, 9; Si., Eut. 457, 1 (BA מאה, Syr. مَلَا); cf. חלחמאה Pa., Vog. 6, 4, and חמשמאה Na., 200, 9; צדקה 145 A, 5 (BA צדקה, Syr. ܥܕܩܐ); שנה 113, 20 (Syr. ܫܢܐ); שורה and שעה Pan. 6. 9 (cf. Cooke, p. 176); also in the following participles, פלחה 141, 3; בריכה 141, 1. 3; Si., Eut. 393; 394, 1.

c) No instance occurs with ה in the ending of infinitives.

d) In verbs ל"א (ל"): Perfect—אחה Zenj. C, 2 (Lidzb., p. 444)?; בנה Na., 162; 163, C; 164, 3; 182, 1, also in the Na. proper name בנהבל 158, 5; הרה Na., 224, 4; ענה 145 B, 2; Pa., Vog. 83 b, 3; 105, 3. Imperfect—תהרה Pa., T II c, 28; ירה 149 B C (uncertain); ישרה 145 A, 7. Participles—הרה (act.) Ner. 2, 5; מתקרה Pa., Vog. 34, 6; Chediac 1, 5 (also מתקרא Na., 158, 2 and elsewhere); משרה line 2 of the hunting inscription in Cilicia (Lidzb., p. 446; Cooke, No. 68).

8. Thus it will be seen that, while in Syriac feminine nouns as well as masculine nouns in the emphatic state regularly end in נ (Nöldeke, § 70; Brockelmann, §§ 98, 99), in BA, on the other hand, feminine nouns in a majority of cases end in ה,^a while the emphatic state usually has נ.^b

^aIn Arabic it is the rule that feminine nouns with the formative suffix -at should be written with ة in the absolute and construct states, as, e. g., مَدِينَةٌ and مَدِينَةُ النَّبِيِّ. The orthographic principle underlying this method is, as Nöldeke (*Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, 1904, 7) tells us, that in Arabic the consonants are written as the words were spoken when isolated, each by itself, i. e., unconnected with the preceding word, and in the pausal form with reference to the following word. Now, the pausal form (وَقْفٌ) of the feminine ends in -ah (for -at), the h being sounded, and not otiose (Vernier, I, 115; see Wright, I, 7 footnote, 184A). In Hebrew and Aramaic the absolute state of nouns is properly a pausal form (see Margolis, *AJSL.*, XII (1896), 203). Hence the spelling with ה in BA, referred to in the text, agrees with the history of the form; in other words, the orthography here is historical. Where feminine nouns are written in BA with נ at the end, the historical orthography is given up in favor of phonetic spelling under the analogical influence, it would appear, of the emphatic state (see under ^b); in Syriac the analogy is there regular.

^bOne of the theories as to the origin of the emphatic state in Aramaic is that it is a development from the old Semitic accusative (cf. Barth, *AJSL.*, 1901, 50). If this be so, נ corresponds to the ة in the pausal form in Arabic (Vernier, I, 113). Thus: مَنَّكَ, pause مَنَّكَ = مَنَّكَ. The use of ה in certain instances may be due to analogy with the feminine (see under ^a).

9. In BA, as in Hebrew, ה is used in the prefix of the perfect, imperfect, and infinitive of the causative stem (add the

examples of the imperfect and participle with ה not syncopated, given below, § 26, and the participle of the Hoph'al, given in § 48), as well as in the prefix of the perfect and infinitive of the passive (reflexive) stems, א appearing only occasionally. This is regarded by Kautzsch as an Hebraism (*GBA.*, § 23, 1, rem. 1).

The examples with ה are as follows: Haph'el perfect: 3d sing. masc. הִימָן 6, 24; הִיחַי 5, 13; הִגְלִי Ez. 4, 10; 5, 12; הִיבֵל Ez. 5, 14; 6, 5; הִוִּדַע 2, 15. 17. 28. 45; הִוִּדְעָהּ 2, 29; הִוִּחַב Ez. 4, 10; הִנָּפֶס 5, 2; Ez. 5, 14 (twice); 6, 5; הִנָּעַל 2, 25; 6, 19; הִצֵּלָה 3, 30; 6, 29; הִקִּים 3, 2. 3. 5; הִקִּים 6, 2; *הִקִּימָהּ 5, 11; הִשְׁלִטָהּ 2, 48; הִשְׁלִטָהּ 2, 38; הִשְׁלִימָהּ 5, 26; הִחִיב 2, 14; 3d fem. sing. הִדְקַח 2, 34. 45; הִקְמַח 7, 5; 2d masc. sing. הִוִּדְעֵנִי 2, 23; הִוִּדְעֵנָא 2, 23; הִקְמִיחַ 3, 12. 18; הִשְׁפִּילָהּ 5, 22; 1st sing. הִקְמִיחַ 3, 14; הִשְׁפִּילָהּ 2, 25; 3d plural. הִיחִי 5, 3. 23; 6, 17. 25; הִדְקִי 6, 25; הִחֲסִנוּ 7, 22; הִכְרִזוּ 5, 29; הִלְבִּשְׁנוּ 5, 29; הִנָּפְקוּ 5, 3; הִסְקִי 3, 22; הִעֲדִי 5, 20; 7, 12; הִקְיָנוּ Ez. 6, 18; הִקְרִבוּ Ez. 6, 17; הִקְרִיבוּ 7, 13; הִרְגִּנוּ Ez. 5, 12; הִרְגִּשְׁנוּ 6, 7. 12. 16; הִשְׁפַּחוּ 6, 12; Ez. 4, 19; הִחִיבֵנָא Ez. 5, 11; 1st plural. הִוִּדְעֵנָא Ez. 4, 14; הִשְׁפַּחְנָא 6, 6; imperative הִעֲלֵנִי 2, 24; הִשְׁלֵם Ez. 7, 19; הִחֲוִי 2, 6. Hithpe'el perfect: 3d masc. sing. הִשְׁתַּכַּח 2, 35; 6, 24; Ez. 6, 2; הִחְמִילִי 3, 19; 3d fem. sing. *הִתְנַזְּרַת 2, 34; הִשְׁתַּכַּחַת 5, 11. 12. 14; 6, 5. 23; 2d masc. sing. הִשְׁתַּכַּחַת 5, 27; 3d plural. הִתְחַדְּצוּ 3, 28. Hithpa'el perfect, 3d masc. sing. הִתְחַדְּרָהּ 3, 27; הִתְנַבֵּי Ez. 5, 1; 3d plural. הִתְנַבְּדוּ Ez. 7, 15; 2d plural. הִוִּדְמַנְתִּין (k) 2, 9. Hithpo'el perfect, 2d masc. sing. הִתְרוֹמַמִּית 5, 23. To the infinitives given above (§ 6) add the following: הִוִּדְעָהּ Ez. 5, 10; הִוִּדְעֵנִי 2, 26; 4, 15; 5, 15. 16; הִנָּזַח Ez. 4, 22; הִצִּלֹתָהּ 6, 15; הִקְמִיחָהּ 6, 4; הִתְבַּיְתָהּ 3, 16; הִתְנַדְּבוּת Ez. 7, 16.

Following are the examples with א: Haph'el perfect, *אִקְיָמָהּ 3, 1; imperative, אִיחַת Ez. 5, 15; אִחֲרוּ 4, 11; infinitive, אִיִּיחַת 5, 12. Hithpe'el, *אִתְנַזְּרַת 2, 45; אִתְפַּרִּית 7, 15; אִתְעַקְרוּ (k), אִתְעַקְרָהּ (k), 7, 8. Hithpa'al, אִשְׁחַנוּ (k), אִשְׁחַנִּי 3, 19; אִתְעַטְנוּ 6, 8. Ethpo'al, אִשְׁתַּחֲוִי 4, 16.

10. In the inscriptions a similar fluctuation appears in the use of ה and א, the older inscriptions having more frequently ה. Following are the examples taken from Lidzbarski:

With ה. Haph'el, 3d masc. sing. הִאֲרַךְ Ner. 2, 3; הִכְבֵּר Pan. 4; הִעֲבֵר Pan. 18; הִקֵּם Pan. 18; *הִקִּים Na., 161, I, 1; הִקְרִב 75, 4;

הרפי Pan. 7 (twice); השהח Had. 29; with suff. 3d sing. masc. הושיבה Pan. 9; with suff. 1st sing. הושבני Pan. 19; Bauin. 5; 1st sing. הושבת Had. 19; הקמת Had. 1; with suff. 3d sing. masc. הושבתה Bauin. 12; Hithnaph'al (root אבה or יאב, cf. Lidzbarski, 205) התנאבו Bauin. 14.

With א. 'Aph'el, אחי (for אחתי, cf. Arabic آتی) Pa., Vog. 15, 4; אחי in the proper name אחיבל 196, 3; אחבר Pa., Nöldeke 2; אחי Na., 183, 3; אפק Pa., T. II b, 43; אסק Pa., Vog. 3, 1; *אקים Pa., Vog. 13, 2; B 1, 3; Vog. 4, 3; Eut. 103, 2; אשר (rt. שרר) Pa., T. II c, 21; 3d fem. sing. אקימה Pa., Vog. 7, 3; 11, 2; אשרה Pa., T. I, 3; 1st sing. אקימת Pa., T. II c, 10; with suff. 3d masc. sing. אחברתה Pa., Nöldeke 6; 3d pl. אקימו Na., 164, 1; Vog. 5, 3 (B 2, 3); אחרבו Si., Eut. 463, 3; אסקו Pa., T. I, 5; infinitive, אחרבורא Pa., Vog. 71; Ethpa'al, perfect 3d sing. fem. אשלמת (with ש doubled for אשתלמת) Pa., Vog. 95, 4.

11. While in Arabic the usual preformative of the IV is أ there are certain rare forms with ه , as هَرَادَ , أَرَاَحَ for هَرَاَحَ for هَاتَ , أَنَارَ for هَنَارَ (Heb. הָרִיק), أَرَأَفَ for هَرَأَفَ , أَرَادَ for هَاتَ , هִימֵן (Heb. הִימֵן), هَنْدَسَ (Aramaic הַנְדָּה , root אָנִי) (Wright, *Arab. Gram.*, I, § 45, rem. d. With reference to the last example it must be said that it is a loan-word ultimately from the Hebrew; cf. Syriac ܡܢܥܝܬܐ (Nöldeke, *Mand.*, § 163). In the Sabæan dialect ה regularly occurs as the preformative, whereas in the corresponding Minæan dialect ש is employed, ההדתו , etc. (Hommel, *Süd-arab. Chrestomathie*, 1893, § 23). In Mandaic also ה is found occasionally, e. g., האוליל (Syr. ܐܘܠܝܠܐ , Heb. הַיִּלִּיל), האנפיק (also אנפיק), האנסיק (also אנסיק); as a loan-word (see above) האימאן ; cf. also the inf. האנדודיא (by the side of the *nomen actionis* אנדודתא); cf. Arabic هَنْدَسَ (Nöldeke, *Mand.*, § 163).

Thus, although BA and Hebrew agree in the use of ה in the preformative of the Haph'el (Hiph'il), in view of the fact that ה is found in the inscriptions and in Sabæan, and sporadically in Arabic and Mandaic, we need not assume Hebrew influence to account for its use in BA.

12. The following words are written in BA with ש :

בִּשְׂרָא (Syr. ܒܫܪܐ) 7, 5; ܒִּשְׂרָא 2, 11; 4, 9; נִשְׂא 2, 35; שִׂא Ez. 5, 15; מִתְּנִשְׂאָה Ez. 4, 19; עֲשׂוֹב (Syr. ܥܫܒ) 4, 12; עֲשׂוֹבָא 4, 22. 29. 30; 5, 21; עֲשֵׂר (Syr. ܥܫܪ) 4, 26; 7, 7. 20. 24; Ez. 6, 17; עֲשֵׂרָה 7, 24; עֲשִׂירִין 6, 2; מִשְׁבִּי (Syr. ܡܫܒ) Ez. 5, 5; 6, 7. 8. 14; שְׂבִיָּא Ez. 5, 9; יִשְׁבָּא (root שׁוּב, Syr. ܫܒ) 3, 31; 6, 26; Ez. 4, 22; שְׂבִיָּא 2, 6 + 10 times; שְׂבִיָּא 2, 48; Ez. 5, 11; מְדֻדָּחָא (Syr. ܡܕܕܚܐ) Gen. 31, 47; שְׂמִיָּת (root שׁוּם, Syr. ܫܡܐ) 3, 10; שְׂמִיָּת Ez. 6, 12; שָׁם Ez. 5, 3 + 7 times; שְׂמִיָּה Ez. 5, 14; שְׂמִי 3, 12; שְׂמִיָּה Ez. 4, 21; מֵיִם 3, 29 + 6 times; שְׂמִיָּת 6, 18; יִתְּשֻׁם Ez. 4, 21; יִתְּשֻׁמִּין 2, 5; מִתְּשֻׁם Ez. 5, 8; שְׂטֵר (Syr. ܫܬܪ) 7, 5; שְׂטֵר (Syr. ܫܬܪ) 4, 16; שְׂטֵר (Syr. ܫܬܪ) 3, 27; 7, 9; שְׂטֵרָה 4, 30; also שְׂבִכָּא (Greek *σαμβύκη*) 3, 5. 7. 10. 15 (in 3, 5 Ginsb. gives a var. *סבכא*); and the following proper names: אֲרִתְּהִשְׂתָּא Ez. 4, 7 (twice). 8. 11. 23; 7, 15; cf. אֲרִתְּהִשְׂתָּא Ez. 7, 12. 21; יִשְׂרָאֵל (Syr. ܝܫܪܐܝܝܠ Matt. 2, 6) Ez. 6, 14 + 5 times; כְּשָׂדִי 2, 10; כְּשָׂדִיָּא (k) 2, 5; 4, 4; 5, 7, 30; כְּשָׂדִיָּין 3, 8.

Kautzsch, though referring to certain instances where ש is used in the inscriptions, regards the use of ש in BA as an Hebraism.

13. There seem to have been originally three sibilants in Semitic, the exact pronunciation of which cannot now be determined. They were not, however, given a uniform pronunciation throughout the Semitic area. There existed dialectic variations; cf. Judges 12, 6 for an instance among the Hebrews. This irregularity in pronunciation explains the absence of a fixed method for distinguishing the sibilants in writing. Only with the growth of a literature was the usage crystallized, one custom coming to be regarded as the standard. The BA dates from the period of uncertainty, and the promiscuous use of ש and ס, so far from being due to Hebrew influence, is rather an evidence of conformity to the usage of early Aramaic. The inscriptions, especially the earlier ones, show a similar irregularity in writing the sibilants.

Thus: עֲשִׂתִּיר Pa. proper name, Vog. 4, 2 (Cooke, 113, 2) transcribed *Ασθίρων*; cf. עֲשִׂתִּירָנָא Pa. proper name, Müller, 46, 2

(Cooke, 143, 2), and עבר-עסחור, Scheil, 2, 1; 3, 1; פרש, CIS., II, 10, explained in the Assyrian section as meaning "a half mina;" cf. פרס Pan. 6; cf. also Dan. 5, 25 (cf. Bevan, p. 106). שניאן "great," Pa., Vog., 15, 5 (Cooke, 121, 5); cf. סניאן in the same line and שנין Pa., T. I, 6; שניאל Bauin. 2f., 17; Sam'al name of a country, perhaps = Hebrew שניאל "the left," i. e., "the north;" cf. Pa. סמלך "thy left hand," Nöldeke, ZA., 14 (1894), 264-267; שריכו proper name transcribed σφαρχον (= Arab. شريك) Vog. 11, 1; 12, 1; Afr. 1, 2; also probably 13, 2; cf. סריכו Vog. 26, 4; 101, 3. Lidzbarski (p. 372) mentions also שבע "to satisfy" and refers to Cl. Ganneau's Pa. I, 7, also שבען proper name 115.

The inscriptions seem to be irregular also in their transcription of the sibilants in Assyrian and Babylonian proper names (Lidzbarski, p. 392). Thus:

Assyrian s = ש, in שרכן, שנשרצר, שנמרבן, נשך, חבשו

" s = ס, in סנצר, אחרמסין

" š = ס, in סג, ארבלסר, אסר

" š elsewhere = ש

Babylonian s = ס, in מרסגלמר

14. The traditional^a pronunciation of Hebrew ש and the uncertainty of orthography which permits ש and ס to be used promiscuously for each other^b notwithstanding, we possess sufficient evidence that originally ש and ס represented distinct sounds. The proof is, first, that in the South Arabic alphabet the sounds corresponding to the Hebrew ש, ש, and ס are represented by three distinct symbols, ה, ז, and ח;^c secondly, that the graphic differentiation of ש and ש by means of a diacritic point comes from late Masoretic times,^d thus showing that in an older period the two sounds for which the symbol ש was used were nearer to each other than either was to ס. The consensus of opinion among scholars is that primitive Semitic possessed three s-sounds, the exact pronunciation of which cannot now be determined, and which, although more or less similar, were sufficiently distinct to warrant the creation of three distinct symbols in Southern Arabic. The following table shows these three s-sounds and their permutations in the various Semitic dialects:

Ass.	Aram.	Heb.	Arab.	Sabæan	Ethiopic
<i>s</i>	ש	ס	[س]	ṣ	ሰ
<i>š</i> ₁ ^f	שׁ	שׁ	س	ḥ	ሰ
<i>š</i> ₂ ^f	[שׂ]	שׂ	ش	ṣ	ሠ

*We are in the habit of pronouncing ש *š* like English *sh* and שׁ like English *s*. However, among certain sections of the Jews the pronunciation is just the reverse. Cf. Schreiner, "Zur Gesch. der Aussprache des Hebräischen," *ZAW.*, VI (1886), 258, 3; D. H. Müller, "Zur Gesch. der semitischen Zischlaute," *Intern. Congr. of Orientalists*, VII (Vienna, 1889), 233, 2; Lagarde, *Mitt.*, IV (1891), 374 ff.; Lambert, *RE-J.*, XLIX (1904), 146 f.

אכלה ואכלה, ed. Frensdorff, 1864, No. 191, contains a list of eighteen words with שׁ in the place of ס. On the other hand, we sometimes find ס for שׁ = Arabic ش; e. g., סָרַר Cant. 2, 11 = Arabic سَرَّار (Hommel, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, I [1892], 105).

*Cf. Hommel, *op. cit.*, 104; "Das Samech in den minäo-sabäischen Inschriften," *ZDMG.*, XLVI (1892), 528-538; *Süd-arabische Chrestomathie*, 1893, § 12.

*Cf. Haupt, *ZDMG.*, XXXIV (1886), 763 (under the date of November, 1879): "The Hebrew שׁ I regard only as a product of the authors of the punctuation. Thus, e. g., there can be no doubt that כְּסָדִים was originally pronounced *kašdim*, although the *š* may have been different from that in שׁוּר 'ox' and in שֵׁם 'name.' Subsequently this *š* came to be sounded like *s*, as in Ass., Eth., and Aram. The punctators accordingly marked the שׁ in those words in which it was pronounced ס with the point on the left, and the שׁ which even in later times continued to be pronounced as *š*, with the point on the right." Similarly Stade, *Gramm.*, 1879, § 68 b; König, *Lehrgebäude*, I, 1881, 35.

*Haupt, *loc. cit.*, 762: "ס appears in all Semitic languages as ס, and therefore may be supposed to have existed as ס in primitive Semitic; שׁ, on the other hand, appears in Ass., Heb., and Aram. as *š*, in Eth. and Arabic, however, as *s*. I believe that here the Eth. and Arabic approach the phonetic conditions of primitive Semitic most closely. In primitive Semitic שׁ represented an *s* which originally was distinct from the *s* which appears in Hebrew as ס; in Eth. and Arabic, however, they became identified, while in Ass., Heb., and Aram. the first *s*-sound came to be pronounced *š*. As for ש, it appears in Ass., Eth., and Arabic as *š*—which probably was also its original pronunciation—while in Hebrew it is found as שׁ and in Aram. as ס. In Ass. and Eth. likewise this *š* in course of time became *s*." D. H. Müller, *loc. cit.*, 246: "The original Semitic possessed three sibilants, the exact pronunciation of which cannot now

be determined. We will represent them by *š*, *s*, and *ś* (i. e., ש, ש, ס). Of these three consonants *š* and *s* stand closer to each other than either does to *ś*." Cf. also Zimmern, 11; 14 f.; Lindberg, 73 f.

¹Cf. Delitzsch, *Assyrian Grammar*, § 46.

15. The absence of a special symbol in Syriac for the sound represented in BA by ש as little disproves the existence of such a sound in Aramaic as the absence of a symbol in Arabic for *ṣ* proves that the sound was originally wanting in Arabic. The truth is that both in Hebrew and in Aramaic the ש sound, originally nearer to ש than to ס, in course of time came to be sounded like ס. The Masoretes, both in the Hebrew and Aramaic texts of the Bible, endeavored, as a rule, to retain the historical spelling with ש, preferring to indicate the modern pronunciation by a diacritic point. In Syriac the identification of the ש and ס sounds led to the phonetic spelling with ש uniformly. The use of ש for ש in BA, in view of the orthography of early Aramaic inscriptions, as well as of the considerations derived from a comparison with the other Semitic languages, can by no means be considered a Hebraism, but is rather a part of early Aramaic orthography. Of course, the diacritic point indicating the ס pronunciation of one of the two cognate sounds represented by ש is a Masoretic device common to the Hebrew and Aramaic portions of the Old Testament.

²Cf. Nöldeke (he is treating of the Palmyrene inscriptions), *ZDMG.*, XXIV (1870), 95: "As far as the sibilants are concerned, we find ש several times where we should expect to find ס; thus in שגראן, שרשא and שרן. In all these cases Hebrew has ש and we must read ש. However, I regard this manner of writing only as a reminiscence of an older form of language, because the fact that the specific consonant ש (differing as well from ש as from ס) does not occur elsewhere, but, as usual in Aramaic, had become ס, is proved by the use of סגראן in close proximity to שגראן and by סהר 'to witness,' which etymologically should also have ש."

16. The doubling of a consonant in BA, as in Hebrew, is organic in the Pa'el (Pi'el); e. g., תַּקְבִּלְךָ 2, 6, etc.; and the Hithpa'al (Hithpa'el); e. g., תַּחֲבִלְךָ 2, 44, etc. This, of course, is a part of general Semitic grammar. The intensified meaning is expressed by an increase of volume within the stem

(Stade, § 154 *a*; König, II, 379). In Syriac, with regard to doubling in general, it must be remarked that only the Eastern Syrians continued to pay attention to it, while the Western Syrians gave it up at a very early date. The vocalization, however, unmistakably points to the general prevalence of doubling in the earlier stages of Aramaic; in other words, BA is proved to be more primitive than Syriac in this respect.

17. Equally a common Semitic feature is the doubling of the middle (forms fa"al, fa"il, etc.; Kautzsch, § 59; Barth, *Nomen*. xi) or third (forms fi'll, fu'll; so at least according to Barth, §§ 95 ff.; usually the doubling in these forms is regarded as artificial; see below 24) radical in certain formations expressing intensity, although not derived from the so-called Intensive stem.

18. Assimilation of vowelless נ takes place in BA as in Hebrew (GK, § 19, 2 *a*):

a) With מִשָּׁל 4, 22. 30; 5. 21; מִשָּׁעַם Ez. 6, 14; מִנְכָּסִי Ez. 6, 8. In all other cases the נ is retained, not only before laryngeals, as מִן-אֲדָן (cf. Heb. מֵאֵז) Ez. 5, 16; מִן-הִכְלָא 5, 2; Ez. 6, 5; מִן-חֲבֵרְתָּהּ 7, 20; מִן-עֲלֵמָה (cf. Heb. מֵעֵלָם) 2, 20; but also before other consonants, as מִן-בֵּית (Heb. מִבֵּית) Ez. 6, 5, etc.; מִן-נָבֶא 6, 24, etc.; מִן-דָּא 7, 4; מִן-טַעַם Ez. 6, 14; מִן-יָד (מִיד) 6, 29; מִן-פֶּלֶה (Heb. מִפְּלֶה) 7, 7, etc.; מִן-נִצְבָּחָא (cf. Heb. מִמְּלָךְ) 2, 16, etc.; מִן-נִצְבָּחָא 2, 41; מִן-קִאֲמִיָּא 7, 16; מִן-רִבּוּתָא 5, 19; מִן-שְׂמִיָּא (cf. Heb. מִשְׁמִים) 4, 20, etc.; מִן-תַּחֲוֹת (cf. Heb. מִתַּחַת) Jer. 10, 11. It will thus be seen that the assimilation of the נ of מִן is rather rare in BA as compared with Hebrew, where the rule is that while the נ remains in the majority of cases before the article (i. e., before the laryngeal ה) it is otherwise usually assimilated.

b) In verbs פָּחַח (Syr. ܦܚܚ) Ez. 5, 15; תַּחַח Ez. 6, 5; מִהֲחִיךְ Ez. 6, 1; יִפֹּל (Syr. ܢܦܠ) 3, 6. 10. 11; תִּפְּלִיךְ 3, 15; הִצְלָה 3, 29; הִצְלִיתָהּ 6, 15; מִצֵּל 6, 28; מִתַּנֵּן 2, 6. 48; מִתַּנֶּחֶךְ 5, 17; אֲחִירִי (Syr. ܐܚܝܪܝ) 4, 11.

19. נ remains unassimilated in BA:

a) As in Hebrew before laryngeals, הִנְחָח (cf. Heb. הִנְחִיחַ Joel 4, 11) 5, 20; מִנְחָה Heb. (מִנְחָה) 2, 46; שְׁלִטְנִהוּךְ 7, 12.

and מְחִינָא (cf. מְחִינָא), שְׁמֵטָא (cf. Heb. שְׁפִיטָה), מְבִטָא (cf. שִׁטָּה, Targum, שֶׁטַח Mesha stone, 2, 8, and elsewhere; see below, § 17).

21. In the early Aramaic inscriptions there is irregularity as to the assimilation or non-assimilation of נ. Sometimes the same word is written in both ways.

Following are the examples collected from Lidzbarski's glossary: יִהְיֶה (root נָהַת; observe that the נ is assimilated before ה as in Syriac and BA, 145 B, 6; יִהְיֶה (root נָהַת) Ner. 1, 9; יִנְסִיחֶיהָ 113, 14; נָפֶק, with assimilation always in the Palmyrene Tarif, as אָפֶק II b, 43; בִּפֶק II a, 31; b, 31 ff.; בִּפְקָא II b, 47; בִּיאָפֶק II c, 12; בִּפְקָן II b, 16; בִּפְקָנָא II a, 11 ff.; בִּמְפִקָנָא II c, 44; without assimilation, יִהְנֶפֶק 113, 21; יִנְפֶק Na. 197, 2; 198, 5. 9; 206, 5; 207, 3; בִּינְצָבָא (root נָצַב) Pa., Müller, C, 1; inf. לִנְצַב Had., 10 (twice); נָצַר always without assimilation, יִנְצַר Ner. 1, 13; חֲנָצַר Ner. 1, 12 (in Hebrew this word is always יִצַּר in non-pausal forms, cf. Prov. 20, 28, but יִנְצַר when in pause, cf. Deut. 33, 9; GK, § 66, 2 Rem. 1. On לִנְצַר Prov. 2, 8 cf. Haupt, *SBOT.*, p. 35, l. 30: "For the non-assimilation of the נ in לִנְצַר cf. the Ass. Šaf'el ušaušir [Del., *HW.*, 477 b; *Assyr. Gr.*, § 496]. In Assyrian antedental *n* is, as a rule, not assimilated in cases where the assimilation would produce ambiguity; e. g., *enzu* "goat" in distinction from *ezzu* "strong;" *enšu* "weak" in distinction from *eššu* (-*edšu*, *hadšu*) "new," etc.); יִתֶן (root נָתַן) Had., 23; 149 BC, 12; Pa., T., II a, 5; b, 20; יִתְנוּ Had., 4; and the doubtful case יִתְנוּ (י) 138 B, 2; cf. also יִתְנוּ 145 D, 1; Na. 197, 3. 6; 198. 5.

22. This irregularity is a mark of the growth of the language. It points back to a period when נ was pronounced as well as written; the next step was to assimilate it to the following consonant, but to retain it in writing, as was done in Syriac;* the final step was to eliminate the נ in writing, since it was no longer pronounced. This process did not take place in all the words of any one language simultaneously, and some words reached the final stage while in others the נ was still pronounced. The comparative infrequency of assimilation in BA shows this to be an early stage in the development of the language, yet one which was considerably advanced beyond the earliest form of Aramaic.

*See above, § 16.

23. Doubling results in BA, as in Hebrew, from the suppression of **א** or **ה** after a vowelless consonant. Hebrew forms like **אִדְנֶה** Ps. 42, 6, cf. **יִבְרַכְנֶה** Ps. 72, 15, are due to this process. The Hithpe'el of verbs **ע"ו** is an example in BA; e. g., **יִתְדִין** 4, 9 is to be explained as being really a Hit'aph'al form, of which no example is extant in roots other than **ע"ו** (cf. Nöldeke, § 36; contrast Haupt, *SBOT.*, Ezra, p. 62). The Syriac form **ܐܬܡܥܪܐ** (**ܐܡܥܪܐ**), however, proves that we are dealing with a phonetic principle which existed in Aramaic independently of Hebrew. Talmudic **אִתְמַר**, i. e., **אִתְמַר** for **אִתְמַר**, is another illustration of the same principle; cf. Syriac **ܐܬܡܥܪܐ** (**ܐܡܥܪܐ**). In Arabic **اِتَّخَذَ** and similar forms (Wright, I, § 139) the doubling of the consonant compensates for the suppression of a preceding **ا**.

BA **יִתְנַבֵּה** 4, 14 is not analogous to **יִתְנַבֵּה** Gen. 23, 9 for **יִתְנַבֵּה***, as proved by the position of the accent and by the mappik in the **ה**. In BA, as in Targumic and other Aramaic dialects (also occasionally in the inscriptions, cf. Lidzbarski, 404), the suffixes are joined in the imperfect to a form which corresponds to the Arabic second energetic (but with **ת** in the place of **ل**). The suffix **כֹּן**, however, is joined, as **כֹּם** occasionally in Hebrew, to the form corresponding to the first energetic.

24. BA shares with Hebrew the peculiarity of unorganic doubling of consonants for the purpose of protecting a Semitic short vowel in an open unaccented syllable.^a An older period in both languages is to be distinguished in which the doubling served the additional purpose of increasing the volume of the form.^b There is, however, no reason to suspect a Hebraism, as the phenomenon is met with also in Syriac.^c

^aThe examples in BA are **הִנֵּכָה** 3, 2, etc. (= Heb.); **הִרְטִמִּיא** 2, 10, etc. (Heb. **הִרְטִמִּים**); **לִשְׁנִיא** 3, 4, etc. (cf. Syr. **ܠܫܢܐ**); **פִּלְגַתְהוּן** Ez. 6, 18 (cf. Heb. **פִּלְגוֹת**), **אַרְכַּבְתָּה** 5, 6. The words **הִנֵּכָה** and **פִּלְגַתְהוּ**, however, may represent lexical Hebraisms, technical words from the temple liturgy and service; cf. also above, § 20, for another view.

^bFrom this older period date the imperfect forms **יִכַּל** 3, 29 and **יִתַּב** 7, 26; cf. in Hebrew regularly the forms of the imperfect of **כ"ו**

verbs, the second radical of which is a sibilant; e. g., *הִצִּית* (rt. *יצת*); GK., § 93, 2, Rem. 1 and § 71). Elsewhere (the noun *בִּדְעָה*, which is perhaps an Aramaism [Kautzsch, *Aramaismen*, 51], excepted) in Hebrew, instead of the doubling of the second radical, the vowel of the prefix is modified in accordance with the usual rules applying to open unaccented syllables immediately preceding the accented syllable, and is treated as permanent even though the accent shifts; hence *יִדְעָה*, *יִשָּׁב*, *יִדְעָה* Jer. 17, 9.

Margolis (*AJSL.*, XIX [1903], 168) regards *יָחַב* and *יָשַׁב* as parallel forms exactly as are *הִבְרִים* and *הִבְלִים*; the permanency of the vowel of the prefix and the 'doubling' of the first radical serve, each in its way, to increase the volume of the biconsonantal basis of the imperfect stem." So also Brockelmann: "Das Streben, diese Formen den dreikonsonantigen anzugleichen, bewirkte in Syr. bei *נָחַ* und *נָשַׁ* Verdoppelung des 2 Radikals: *נָחַ*, *נָשַׁ*" (*Syr. Gram.*, § 192). In Syriac the doubling is found in these two verbs only, the other first *נ* verbs following the analogy of first *ה* verbs (Nöldeke, § 175). The principle thus belongs clearly to Aramaic in general (cf. also the Christian-Palestinian example referred to by Kautzsch, *Aramaismen*, 51; the rebuke which Kautzsch administers to Jacob in this work shows that he has here arrived at a clearer conception of the term "Hebraism" so freely used by him in his grammar of BA).

*Cf. in addition to *חָמַ* referred to above, Syr. *חָמַ* by the side of Targ. *חָמַ*. Lagarde's view (*Übersicht*, 11) that the unorganic doubling in *חָמַ*, etc., is a mere device of the Masoretes for the purpose of squaring their system with the still living pronunciation, will hardly commend itself. He is also in the wrong in his explanation of *Μεσσίας* = *מְשִׁיחָא* * as a fi'il form with organic doubling (*Übersicht*, 93 ff.). The doubling, of course, is unorganic; note again that the consonant doubled is a sibilant; *Μεσσίας* by the side of *מְשִׁיחָא* is no more strange than *חָמַ* by the side of *חָמַ* or *חָמַ* by the side of *חָמַ*; *Μεσσίας*, therefore, merely represents the Aramaic—i. e., popular—form; Kautzsch, art. "Messiah," *EB.*, col. 3057, correctly compares the Greek transcription.

25. In BA as in Hebrew the plural of *בֵּית* takes *dagesh* in the *ת*; e. g., *בְּתֵיכֹן* 2, 5; cf. *בְּתֵימ* Ex. 1, 21; *בְּתֵיכֶם* Gen. 42, 19, etc. Kautzsch at first regarded this as a pure Hebraism (*GBA.*, 12 c). His later opinion, however, is that, in view of the fact that Syriac also has *ܬ* after the vowel (Nöldeke, § 146;

XIX (1889), 180; Batten, *SBOT.*, Ezra, p. 62); מִחָא 5, 19; יְהִסְנִי 7, 18; מְהַצֵּפָה 3, 22; תַּטְלִל 4, 9; מוֹדָא 6, 11; תַּחַת Ez. 6, 5; מִצָּל 6, 28; תַּסָּה 2, 44; מִצְלָח Ez. 5, 8; מִצְלָחִין Ez. 6, 14; יָקִים 2, 44; 4, 14; תַּקִּים 6, 9; מָרִים 5, 19; מִשְׁפֵּל 5, 19; יְחִיבִין 5, 5.

29. The ה is retained, however, in the following examples:

Haph'el, imperfect: 3d masc. sing., יִהְיֶה 5, 12; יִהְיֶדַע 2, 25; יִהְיֶעֱנֵי 7, 16; יִהְיֶקִים 5, 21; 6, 16; יִהְשִׁנָּא Ez. 6, 11; יִהְשַׁפֵּל 7, 24; 3d fem. sing., תִּהְיֶזֶק Ez. 4, 13; 2d masc. sing., תִּהְיֶבֶר 2, 24; תִּהְשַׁפָּה Ez. 4, 15; 7, 16; 1st sing. אֶהְיֶדַעַה 5, 17; 3d pl. masc., יִהְיֶבֶרִין 2, 18; יִהְיֶדַעִין 2, 30; יִהְיֶעֱנֵי 4, 3; יִהְיֶעֱדִין 7, 26; יִהְיֶבֶרִין Ez. 6, 5; 2d masc. pl., תִּהְיֶחֱזִין 2, 6; תִּהְיֶחֱפֵי 2, 9; תִּהְיֶדַעִין Ez. 7, 25; תִּהְיֶעֱנֵי 2, 5, 9; 1st pl. נֶהְיֶה 2, 7; נֶהְשַׁפָּה 6, 6. Haph'el participle: masc. מְהִימֵן 2, 45; 6, 5; מְהִידֵן 2, 40; מְהִידָא 2, 23; מְהִידָה 2, 21; מְהִידֵן 2, 21; מְהִשִּׁנָּא 2, 21; fem. מְהִצֵּפָה 2, 15; מְהִזְקַת Ez. 4, 15; pl. מְהִידֵין 4, 4; Ez. 4, 16; 7, 24; מְהִיחֵין Ez. 6, 1; מְהִיבִין Ez. 6, 10.

30. In the Aramaic inscriptions ה is usually syncopated in the imperfect and participles of the Haph'el,* although in a few places it is retained.^b

*With syncope of ה, יֶאֱנֵר Na., 220, 4; 224, 9; יֶגֶר Na., 197, 6; 199, 6; 206, 4; 214, 5; 217, 6; יֶגֶרִין Na., 212, 3; מְחַרֵם Na., 206, 3; מוֹדָא Pa., Vog. 79, 2; 80, 2; and frequently fem. מוֹדִיא Pa., Vog. 83 a, 2; b, 2; pl. מוֹדִין Pa., Vog. 93, 1; impf. with suff. יִכִּלְנָה Pa., T., II, b, 23; יִנְפֵךְ Na., 197, 2; 198, 5, 9; 206, 5; 207, 3; part. act. מִפֵּךְ Pa., T., II, a, 31; b, 31 ff.; part. act. pl. מִפְּקָא *ibid.*, II, b, 47; part. act. מִפֵּל *ibid.*, II, b, 30; part. pl. st. c. מִפְּלִי *ibid.*, II, a, 1; part. act. fem. s. מִקְבִּלָא Pa., Nöldeke, 6; יָקֵם Had., 28; יִשְׁאֵל Na. 206, 4.

^bWith ה or א retained: יֶהֱאֲבֵרִי Nerāb 1, 11; יֶהֱבֹאֲשֻׁוֹ Nerāb 2, 9; part. pass. מִאֲפֵךְ Pa., T., II, c, 12; [פֵּךְ] יֶהֱנֵן 113, 21.

31. In Hebrew the ה is regularly syncopated in the imperfect and participle. Occasionally, however, the ה is retained in the imperfect, as יִהְיֶעֱנֵי for יִשְׁעֵי, I Sam. 17, 47 (GK., § 53 q). In Syriac, likewise, the ה of the prefix disappears after prefixes in the imperfect, participle, and infinitive (Nöldeke, § 164). Similarly, א disappears in forms of the verb ܐܬܝܢ (Nöldeke, § 183). In Arabic, when ا is used as the preformative of the IV perfect, it is syncopated in the imperfect

and participle, but, when **ⲥ** is used, it is retained and the verb is treated as a quadriliteral. Thus **ⲙⲉⲣⲁⲓ** impf. **ⲙⲉⲣⲏⲓ**, etc. (cf. Wright, I, § 118, Rem. b; *Comp. Gram.*, 205; Zimmermann, 20; also above, § 11).

32. In BA **ⲛ** is syncopated when preceded by a reduced vowel or by a closed syllable.^a The same phenomenon occurs in Hebrew,^b and is very frequent in Syriac.^c Caution is necessary, since forms with quiescent **ⲛ** may be the original ones, while those with the **ⲛ** sounded and a preceding **ⲉ** may be resolutions.^d

^aE. g., **ⲃⲁⲓⲥⲏⲁ** Ez. 4, 12 (for **ⲃⲁⲓⲥⲏⲁ**); **ⲃⲏⲁ** 4, 34 (for **ⲃⲏⲁ**); **ⲃⲏⲁ** 4, 16 (for **ⲃⲏⲁ**); **ⲃⲏⲁ** 2, 35 (for **ⲃⲏⲁ**).

^bE. g., **ⲃⲁⲓⲥⲏⲁ** Gen. 11, 23 (for **ⲃⲁⲓⲥⲏⲁ**); **ⲃⲏⲁ** Gen. 31, 39 (for **ⲃⲏⲁ**), etc. (Stade, § 111.)

^c**ⲃⲏⲁ** for **ⲃⲏⲁ**; **ⲃⲏⲁ** for **ⲃⲏⲁ**; with the **ⲓ** omitted in writing: **ⲃⲏⲁ**, cf. Heb. **ⲃⲏⲁ** Job 35, 11 (Nöldeke, § 33). Note, however, the practice of the Eastern Syrians (*ibid.*).

^dE. g., **ⲃⲏⲁ** in **ⲃⲏⲁ** is certainly more original than **ⲃⲏⲁ**. On **ⲃⲏⲁ**, etc., cf. below, § 58.

33. As in Hebrew, so in BA the laryngeals (**ⲁ**, **ⲏ**, **ⲏ**, **ⲏ**) and **ⲏ** may cause modifications in the vowels preceding or following them. Thus, since they cannot be doubled, in certain cases a preceding vowel comes to stand in an open syllable and may be modified;^a sometimes, however, it is not so modified.^b

^aCf. below, § 46, 15.

^bSo-called virtual doubling, the frequency of which decreases, while the frequency of vowel modification increases, in the order **ⲏ**, **ⲏ**, **ⲏ**, **ⲏ**, **ⲏ**. Thus we have virtual doubling with **ⲏ** always; with **ⲏ** in eight out of nine cases (contrast **ⲃⲏⲁ** 5, 9 with **ⲃⲏⲁ** 4, 16, etc.); with **ⲏ** in seven out of nine cases; with **ⲏ** in only one (**ⲃⲏⲁ** Ez. 4, 14) out of twenty-two cases. No examples with **ⲁ** are available.

For the Hebrew see GK., § 22 c. The tendency in Hebrew is for **ⲏ** to reject the doubling altogether. On **ⲏ** cf. GK., § 22 g, and particularly s; add **ⲃⲏⲁ** Gen. 14, 10 (for **ⲃⲏⲁ**). In Syriac it is questionable how far **ⲁ** and **ⲏ** undergo a true

doubling. The vocalization, however, is as though such took place (e. g., שָׁהָ). The Eastern Syrians very early ceased to double ה, and in consequence frequently modified a preceding *a* to *ā* (Nöldeke, § 21 A).

34. As in Hebrew, *i* and *u* preceding a laryngeal or ה are often changed to *a*. While in Hebrew, however, the phonetic change is confined to closed syllables, BA goes a step further in permitting it also in open accented syllables.

The examples are found in the perf. of *فَعَلَ* verbs (e. g., הִנְהָה 3, 24, תִּבְדֵּעַ 6, 15 [Arabic سَمِعَ], שָׁפַר 3, 32); in the part-act. Pe'al (e. g., יָדַע 2, 8; cf. Heb. יָדַע Ps. 94, 9; the corresponding Hebrew form here as in all nouns is to be looked for in the cstr. state with which the cstr. and absol. states in BA coincide, while in the absol. state Hebrew goes its own way in producing pausal forms which BA does not recognize); and in the (perf., imperf., imper., and—differing from the Hebrew—participle active of the) Pa'el, Haph'el (for the corresponding Hebrew forms use the jussive), and Hithpe'el (e. g., בָּדַד 4, 11; יָבַקַר Ez. 4, 15; שָׁבַח 5, 4; מִפְּשָׁר 5, 12; הִצְלַח 3, 30; יְהוֹדַע 2, 23; אֶתְרַד 4, 11; מִצְלַח Ez. 5, 8; הִשְׁתַּכַּח 2, 35). The Hithpa'al forms are purposely ignored, as Hithpa'el forms are an anomaly peculiar to Hebrew only (cf. Arabic يَتَقَتَّلُ, تَقَتَّلَ, and Hebrew pausal forms, GK, § 54). In the prefix of the impf. Pe'al (e. g., תִּבְדֵּעַ Ez. 6, 8, cf. Heb. יִבְדֹּד Dt. 12, 30) the original vowel is apparently preserved (cf. Arabic يَقْتُلُ). Equally to be ignored is the *a* in the imperf. Pe'al of *فَعَلَ* verbs with a laryngeal as third radical (cf. הִנְהָה 2, 30 [Heb. הִנְהָה]; יִתְלַח Ez. 5, 17 [Heb. יִתְלַח]), which as a possibility comes from common Semitic times (cf. Syr. تَبَّ, Arabic يَسْأَلُ, يَقْتَحُ, etc.; cf. Vernier, I, § 146, 20; Wright, I, § 91, Rem. a). In יִתְבְּדֵעַ 3. 10 the = is, of course, original and not the result of the influence of the laryngeal ה; cf. Arabic يَسْمَعُ (cf. Wright, I, § 92).

35. The same phonetic changes occur in Syriac; cf. perf. of the type *فَعَلَ*, *مَضَ*, etc.; part. *مُضٍ*, Pa'el *مُضِب*, *مُضِب*, *مُضِب*, corresponding to *مَضَى*, *مَضَى*, *مَضَى*, etc.; 'Aph'el *أَمَض*, *أَمَض*, etc., corresponding to *أَمَض*, etc.;

Ethpe'el ܐܬܦܥܠ. There are no traces of the vowel *a* in the prefix of the impf. Pe'al in Syriac (Brockelmann, § 182'). With regard to the imperf of ܦܥܠ verbs with a laryngeal as third radical, Syriac agrees with Arabic, rather than with Hebrew and BA, in allowing the vowel *u* to remain quite frequently (Brockelmann, § 186).

36. In BA as in Hebrew **℣** is subject to quiescence when closing a syllable. This occurs in (1) nouns of the type of roots ܦܥܠ;*, (2) nouns with a formative prefix, e. g., ܡܢ (hence in BA infinitives) and verbal forms with a prefix (impf. ܕܦܥܠ [Pe'al]; in Hebrew also the Niph'al and Hiph'il) of ܦܥܠ roots;*, (3) nouns or verbs of ܦܥܠ roots with proclitic prefixes.*

*E. g., ܪܐܫ (Heb. רֹאשׁ) 7, 1; ܡܢܐܢܝܐ Ez. 5, 15. ܡܢܐ * is probably only a secondary ܦܥܠ form = ܡܢܐ = ܡܢܐܢܝܐ; cf. Lagarde, *Übersicht*, 184. We eliminate proper names like ܒܠܬܐܡܥܐܪ 5, 1, etc., which are borrowed from Assyrian.

*E. g., ܡܢܐܡܪ 4, 14; ܡܢܐܢܝܐ 5, 27 (Heb. מְאֲזִיזִים Is. 40, 15); ܡܢܐܡܪ 2, 9, hence also with the **℣** lost in writing ܡܢܐܡܪ Ez. 5, 11; cf. also ܡܢܐܡܐ 3, 19 and ܡܢܐܡܐ 3, 2; ܝܐܒܪܐ Jer. 10, 11 (Heb. יְאֹבָב Jud. 5, 31); ܝܐܠܠ 4, 30 (Heb. יֶאֱכֹל Gen. 49, 27); ܝܐܡܪ 2, 7 (Heb. יֹאמֵר Gen. 31, 8). For Hebrew examples in the Niph'al and Hiph'il cf. GK., § 68 *i*. BA ܦܪܘܒܪ 2, 14, however, as may be seen from Syriac, ܦܪܘܒܐ, etc., is to be explained as an analogical formation induced by the ܦܥܠ class.

*E. g., ܦܐܢܐܢ 2, 14; ܦܐܠܐܢܐ 6, 24; ܦܐܠܐܢܐ 5, 23; ܦܐܠܐܢܐ Ez. 6, 12 (for Hebrew examples cf. GK., §§ 102 *d*, 104 *d*). On the other hand, cf. ܦܐܠܐܢ 4, 12; ܦܐܠܐܢ 7, 4; ܦܐܠܐܢ 2, 19; ܦܐܠܐܢ Ez. 5, 7 for ܦܐܠܐܢ*, ܦܐܠܐܢ*, ܦܐܠܐܢ* and ܦܐܠܐܢ*. It is incorrect to derive forms like ܦܐܠܐܢ and the like (as does Kautzsch, § 11, 3 *b*) from ܦܐܠܐܢ, etc. The truth is that we are dealing with two sets of forms, those with quiescent **℣** and those with **℣** retaining its consonantal force. When once the **℣** quiesced, the syllable which it closed became opened, and its vowel was treated accordingly (cf. below, § 46). Where **℣** retained its consonantal force, it is self-evident that forms like ܦܐܠܐܢ preceded those like ܦܐܠܐܢ. To say that ܦܐܠܐܢ comes from ܦܐܠܐܢ is to say that the **℣** retains its consonantal force and at the same time quiesces.

37. In the Aramaic inscriptions it is difficult to tell whether the **א** which is written is also meant to be sounded. Since, however, we find (just in one example) the **א** omitted (after the prefix **א**), the inference is legitimate that elsewhere the **א** is meant to be pronounced.

The examples are: **אחבר** Ner. 2, 10; **אחז** Hadad 15. 20. 25; **אחז** (first per. sing.) *ibid.* 3; **אכל** 145 A, 4; **אכל** Hadad 21; **אכל** 137 B, 3; inf. **לאכל** Hadad 23; **אכלב** *ibid.*, 34; **אמר** *ibid.*, 17. 21. 29 (twice); **אמרר** 45 D, 8; **אחא** Na., 217, 2 (219, 4).

38. In Syriac we unquestionably meet with the same phenomenon as in BA.

Examples: **חנא** (Heb. **חנן**, Arabic **حَنَّان**); **حان** = *bi'r-ā (on Heb. **באר**, etc., cf. below, § 58); **חנא** (observe the phonetic spelling; next step **חנא**); **חנא**; **חנא**; **חנא**; **חנא** (Brockelmann, §§ 68. 191 b); **חנא** (Nöldeke, § 33, who unnecessarily confounds it with **حان** and similar cases).

39. In Arabic likewise the *hamzah* is subject to quiescence; e. g., **رأس** for **رأس**, **بشر** for **بشر**. Quiescence necessarily takes place after the prefix **أ**, as **أامن** or **آمن** (i. e., the quiescent **ا** is lost also in writing), etc. The Arab grammarians refer to the loss of the consonantal force of **ا** as “lightening of the *hamzah*” (**تخفيف الهمزة**): Wright, I, 18 D; cf. *Mufaṣṣal*, 198 ff.). In the dialect of Hijaz in the time of Mohammed the *tahfif* was quite general even when other consonants than **ا** preceded the *hamzah* (cf. footnote in Wright, I, 72 D; also Nöldeke, *Geschichte des Qorans*, 1860, 345 ff.).

40. It is thus clear that the loss of the consonantal force of **א** began in the common Semitic period. Excepting in the dialect of Hijaz, it is rather rare in Arabic; Hebrew comes next with its examples of the quiescent **א**; then BA; and last of all Syriac, in which, when reference is had to the examples of syncope (cf. above, § 32), the loss of **א** in sound is the rule. With Syriac go the modern dialects of Arabic (Spitta, § 5; Vollers-Burkitt, §§ 91 ff.).

41. ו and י, when closing a syllable, represent in BA as well as in Hebrew consonantal *u* and *i* (corresponding to the sonants *u* and *i*; for the term "consonantal" and "sonant" cf. Brugmann, I, 35; Philippi, "Die Aussprache der semit. Konsonanten ו und י," *ZDMG.*, XL [1886], 639 ff.; Haupt, "Über die beiden Halbvocale *u* and *i*," *BSS.*, I [1889], 255-293 ff.; Philippi, "Nochmals die Aussprache d. semit. Consonanten ו und י," *ZDMG.*, LI [1897], 66 ff.), and coalesce with a homogeneous vowel into the corresponding sonants *ū* and *ī*,^a while with a heterogeneous vowel they form a diphthong. The diphthong thus formed may remain uncontracted or be contracted into a monophthong.^b

^aEg., ויבֹל 2, 20 (Heb. יִבֹּל Gen. 31, 16; cf. below, § 65); הוֹכֵחַ 4, 33 (cf. Heb. הוֹדֵד Gen. 39, 1), etc. No examples for *ī* (cf. Heb. יִירֵשׁ Gen. 21, 10, etc.) are found in BA, וִיקָר 2, 6; לִיקָר 4, 33; וִיהַב 3, 38; בִּידֵן 2, 34, etc., originating in וִיקָר+ו, etc., i. e., initial ו was pronounced *ī*.

^bWe meet with a diphthong always after a (Semitic) long vowel, e. g., שִׁנִּי 3, 28 (cf. Heb. שִׁנִּי I Kings 6, 1), or a long vowel which is the resultant of a Semitic diphthong, e. g., הוֹחַתָּה 7, 6; and after ו originating in Semitic *i*, e. g., לְשִׁלֹּחָהּ 4, 24 (cf. Heb. שִׁלִּי Job 16, 12); also after a parasitic ו e. g., לְהוֹרִי 5, 17. The vowel *a* combines into a diphthong with ו as well as with י. In Hebrew *au* and *ai* may and may not be contracted when followed by no vowelless consonant, hence עוֹלָה Job 26, 30 by the side of עֹלָתָהּ Job 5, 16; מִיָּמִינִים I Chron. 12, 2 by the side of הַיָּמִינִי Ezek. 21, 21. The contraction, however, is uniformly avoided in Hebrew (as in BA and Syriac, and also in modern Arabic) when the *u* or *i* is doubled, e. g., הִיָּה Gen. 2, 7 (hence also in הִיָּהֶוָה for הִיָּהוָה; Sievers, I, 296, footnote), etc. While הִי is the correct form for the absolute state, הִיָּה Gen. 3, 22 is a (semi-) pausal and הִיָּה Lev. 25, 36 is a construct state (not in the sense of GK., § 76 *i*, but in that given to the term by Margolis, *AJSL.*, XIX [1902], 169). יָדִי II Sam. 22, 21 = יָדִי (Wright, I, § 317) is prevented from becoming יָדִי* by the impetus of the original doubling, or, as it may be said in the usual parlance of our grammars, the י is *virtually doubled*; contrast יָדִי Gen. 24, 30 = יָדִי. Cf. BA בָּרָה 4, 15, contrast בָּרָא (with otiose א) cstr. state 3, 25; סָא Nöldeke, § 102; cf. Spitta, § 17 b). When fol-

lowed by a vowelless consonant, hence when in a doubly closed syllable (GK., § 26 *d*), contraction is the rule if the loss of the (Semitic) vowel following the closing consonant occurs in the middle of a word (the construct state properly not counting as a separate word), as in **צִנְחָם** Is. 58, 3, **בִּיתָם** Num. 18, 31, **בֵּית** (cstr. state) Gen. 25, 11, **בֵּית** (cstr. state) *ibid.*, 12, 15. If, on the other hand, the loss of the vowel occurs in pause (Vernier, I, § 126)—hence in the absolute state (cf. Margolis, *AJSL.*, XII [1896], 203)—the proper Hebrew method requires an uncontracted diphthong, which is made possible by the insertion of a parasitic vowel; hence **בֵּית** Deut. 19, 6, **בֵּית** Ez. 12, 30, **רַגְלִים** Is. 28, 3 = *maut*, *baît*, *raglaïm*, = *maut-a* (accus.), *baît-a* (accus.), *ragl-ai-mi* (or *-ma*, cf. the dialectal form *-ai-na*, Wright, I, 235 n.). Contracted forms in the absolute state, e. g., **צִיִּים** II Sam. 12, 6, do not violate the principle just stated, as in such cases the construct state has been made to do service for the absolute (as is the case in Aramaic always—an “Aramaism” in Hebrew). In BA no example is available of uncontracted *ay*. When not followed by a vowelless consonant the diphthong *ay* appears uncontracted more frequently in BA than in Hebrew, e. g., **בֵּיתָה** 3, 29; **הָיִיתָ** 2, 41, **הָיִיתִי** 5, 13, etc.; but cf. **בַּעֲיָנָא** 2, 23; **דְּמִינָא** 3, 24, **בִּינְיָהוֹן** 7, 8, **הִיבֵל** Ez. 5, 14, etc. When followed by a vowelless consonant not in pause, contraction is the rule as in Hebrew, e. g., **לִילִיָא** 5, 30; **סֹן** (cstr. state) 4, 8; **בֵּית** (cstr. state) 4, 27, **הָיִיתָ** 4, 1, etc. In pause, we find on the one hand, as in Hebrew, **הֵיל** 3, 20 **קֵיס** 2, 35; **רַגְלִין** 7, 4, **קְרִינִין** 7, 7 (cf., however, **פְּנִין** Ez. 4, 12 [plural of the participle = **bānai-in*]; Kautzsch, § 47 *g*, *e* rightly compares the Heb. plurals **בָּנִים** and **שָׂבָיִים**, to which add the traditional **בְּעֵיִם**, in the texts **(בְּעֵיִם)**; on the other, **יִום** (absol. st.) Ez. 6, 9, that is, the constr. state replaces the proper absolute state form. Philippi, *ZDMG.*, LI (1897), 83, n. 3, neglects to account for **הֵיל**, **קְרִינִין**, etc. The **י** in the examples just referred to is correctly explained by Brockelmann, *ZDMG.*, 58 (1904), 523, against Foote, *J. H. U. Circulars*, No. 163, June, 1903, 70 ff., who looks upon the point as an equivalent to **שָׁנָא**. The forms of the *Kethibh* **לְעַבְדִּין** (לְעַבְדִּין) 2, 4, etc., are to be read accordingly **לְעַבְדִּין**, etc. The contraction is analogous to Heb. **דָּתָן** Gen. 37, 17 by the side of **דָּתִינָה** *ibid.* The loss of the final vowel in **לְעַבְדִּין** occurred, however, in late Aramaic.

42. In Syriac we meet with the same phenomenon.

E. g., **ܥܡܠܬܐ** for **ܥܡܠܬܐ**, **ܬܢܒ**, written also **ܬܢܒܐ**, hence **ܬܢܒܐ** (ܬܢܒܐ), etc.; also in the middle of a word **ܬܢܒܐܬܐ**, **ܬܢܒܐܬܐ**. With

regard to *ay* and *ai*, Syriac presents the contraction in doubly closed syllables, no account being taken of pause (i. e., the cstr. state (sing.) is used also for the absolute), e. g., ܐܝܬܐ, ܡܢܐ, ܡܢܐ, ܡܢܐ, ܡܢܐ, etc. In the middle of a word, when followed by no vowelless consonant, the diphthong remains uncontracted, e. g., ܡܢܐܐ, ܡܢܐܐ, etc., although here likewise the contraction occurs in Eastern Syriac and in Mandaic, not, however, to the exclusion of the uncontracted diphthongs (cf. Nöldeke, § 49 A; *Mand.*, 21 f., 258, 246 f.; note the fluctuating orthography ܡܢܐܐܐ and ܡܢܐܐܐ and cf. for the principle of orthography, p. 7). ܡܢܐܐ is correctly interpreted by Nöldeke (§ 49 A) as a late form in Syriac; ܡܢܐܐ, ܡܢܐܐ, ܡܢܐܐ likewise were probably late; ܡܢܐܐ, however, is on a line with BA ܡܢܐܐ k. In ܡܢܐܐܐ, however, Syriac goes its own way. The form is due probably to analogy with ܡܢܐܐܐ, etc. (so correctly Philippi, *loc. cit.*).

43. In modern Arabic the contraction of the diphthongs *ay* and *ai* into *ō* and *ē* is the rule in some regions, e. g., *iōm* ܝܝܡ, *ēn* ܝܝܢ, *idēn* ܝܝܕܝܢ, etc., although examples occur with the diphthongs kept uncontracted (Spitta, § 17).

44. Semitic *ā* appears in BA as ܐ, whereas in Hebrew it is represented by ܐ, as, e. g., ܐܡܪ 2, 5 (Heb. ܐܡܪ Gen. 32, 10, Arab. ܐܡܪ). In a few instances, however, we meet in BA with the Hebrew ܐ. The examples are:

ܐܢܝܢ (k) 4, 13. 14 (ܐܢܝܢ k), cf. Heb. ܐܢܝܢ Is. 8, 1; ܐܢܝܢ 4, 2 (contrast Syriac ܐܢܝܢ *mirage* PS, col. 1047; Baer, *עבודת ישראל* 1868, 573, incorrectly introduces the Aramaic ܐܢܝܢ for Heb. ܐܢܝܢ); ܐܢܝܢ 4, 22, 29, ܐܢܝܢ 5, 21 (contrast ܐܢܝܢ 2, 11); ܐܢܝܢ Ez. 6, 2, cf. Heb. ܐܢܝܢ Josh. 4, 7, and contrast ܐܢܝܢ Ez. 4, 15; ܐܢܝܢ 4, 9, 18, cf. Heb. ܐܢܝܢ Gen. 45, 23; II Chron. 11, 23 (Dillmann, II, 409 regards ܐܢܝܢ in Genesis as a gloss and the word as an Aramaic loan-word; it is frequent in Mishnaic Hebrew; cf. also below, § 45, n. 12); ܐܢܝܢ 7, 18, etc., cf. Heb. ܐܢܝܢ Gen. 14, 18; ܐܢܝܢ 2, 30; ܐܢܝܢ 7, 28; ܐܢܝܢ 2, 29; 5, 10; ܐܢܝܢ 4, 16; 5, 6; cf. Heb. ܐܢܝܢ Ecc. 1, 17 (an Aramaic loan-word; Kautzsch, *Aramaismen*, 82 f., contrasts ܐܢܝܢ); ܐܢܝܢ 3, 2, etc., cf. Heb. ܐܢܝܢ Ecc. 8, 4 (Aramaic loan-word, Kautzsch, *loc. cit.*, 88 ff.; contrast ܐܢܝܢ 7, 27); ܐܢܝܢ 5, 27 cf. Heb. ܐܢܝܢ Is. 40, 15 (from original *ma'zin* cf. above, § 36, a). Doubtful cases have been omitted.

45. There is no reason, however, to speak of this as a Hebraism. According to Lagarde (*Mittheil.*, I, § 80; *Übersicht*, 84, footnote **, 199, 200), Syriac ܫܡܝܢ (Heb. ִשְׁמִינִי); ܫܡܝܢ (Heb. ִשְׁמִינִי Is. 8, 1); ܫܡܝܢ (Heb. ִשְׁמִינִי II Sam. 7, 17); ܫܡܝܢ (cf. ܫܡܝܢ Sir. 13, 11 c) are loan-words from the Hebrew, recognized by the Hebrew *ō*. If so, Hebrew ִשְׁמִינִי and ִשְׁמִינִי, which are said to be Aramaic loan-words, were Hebraized in pronunciation after the Aramaic word had been introduced into the Hebrew. The fact, however, that we meet with ܫܡܝܢ Na., 163 A; 169, 1; 338; ܫܡܝܢ Na., 196, 5, and other examples in Christian Palestinian (*ZDMG.*, XXII [1868], 474), Samaritan (Barth, § 194 c), Syriac, and Mandaic in words which are not loan-words (Nöldeke, *Mand.*, § 21) indicates that in a definite area shared both by Hebrew and certain Aramaic dialects Semitic *ā* was sounded as *ō* (so Barth, *loc. cit.*).

46. The following table illustrates the treatment of Semitic short vowels in BA and Hebrew. Each language, however, seems to go its own way in several cases; and there is no occasion to speak of Hebrew influence where they agree.*

ARABIC VOWEL	CLOSED			OPEN			
	Unaccented		Accented	Unaccented			Accented or Opened
	Through Doubling ¹	By Simple Consonant		Near the Tone	Distant		
					After 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.	After Other Consonants	
u/o َ (َ o)	َ u ² (َ o)	َ o ³ (َ u)	َ ̄o ⁴	َ ̄o ¹²	َ ̄o ¹³	َ ̄ ¹⁴	َ ̄o ^(̄ u) ¹⁵ (̄ o)
i/e ِ (ِ e)	ِ i ⁵ (ِ e)	ِ e (ِ i) ⁶ (ِ a) ⁷	ِ ̄e (ِ e) ⁸ (ِ a) ⁷	ِ ̄e ¹²	ِ ̄e ¹³ ِ ̄ā	ِ ̄ ¹⁴	ِ ̄e (ِ i) ¹⁵ (ِ e)
a َ (َ a)	َ a ⁹	َ a ¹⁰	َ ā ¹¹ َ a	َ ā ¹² َ a	َ ā ¹³	َ ̄ ¹⁴	َ ā (َ a) ¹⁵ (َ a)

* The table, enlarged so as to include Aramaic, follows the table prepared for Hebrew by Margolis and printed *AJS.*, XIX (1903), 164; consult the footnotes (on the

¹The doubling may be organic, or artificial to preserve an exceptional vowel.

²E. g., גָּפָא 6, 17; אֲשִׁיא Ez. 4, 12; אֲמָה 3, 29; אֲמִיא 3, 4; הִנֵּפֶת 3, 31; הִסֵּק 6, 24. Cf., however, פִּלְהוֹן 2, 38 and פִּלְהוֹן 7, 19. Cf. Hebrew הָקִים Deut. 4, 5; תִּכְבִּינָה Gen. 37, 7; נִתַּץ Jud. 6, 28; רִבְזִים Ruth 2, 11; אֲהִיָּה Lev. 13, 34. On the other hand, יִבְזִים Zeph. 2, 9; הִפָּא Is. 19, 17; עָזִי Ex. 15, 2; עִזָּה Ps. 21, 2; (by the side of עִזָּה Ps. 66, 3); יִהְיֶנּוּ Ps. 67, 2 (by the side of יִהְיֶנּוּ Is. 27, 11); מִרְחַ Prov. 14, 10; שִׁדְדָה Na. 3, 7 (by the side of שִׁדְדָה Jer. 4, 20); פָּלוּ Ps. 72, 20 (cf. וַיִּכְלֹו Gen. 2, 1); פָּרַח Ezek. 16, 4. Cf. in Syriac such examples as ܕܥܠܐ, ܕܥܠܐ (Nöldeke, § 104), ܕܥܠܐ (§ 121), ܕܥܠܐ (§ 104).

³E. g., הִנֵּחַ 5, 20; הִתְקַנֵּת 4, 33; נִגְדָא 6, 20; שְׂרִשׁוֹרִי 4, 12; תִּקְפֵּא 2, 37; אֲרִחְתָּהּ 5, 23; הִכְבִּית 5, 11; הִכְבִּית 5, 11; הִכְבִּיתָא 2, 20; כָּל- 2, 10. Cf., however, פִּתְלִיא Ez. 5, 8; גִּבְרִיָּא 3, 8; גִּבְרִיא 3, 12 (in the last two cases the ־ is due to the following labial). Cf. Hebrew אֲזַנִּי I Sam. 20, 2; מִלְכִּי Jud. 9, 10; הִפְקֵד Lev. 5, 23; תִּקְטֵר Lev. 6, 15; חֵק Lev. 6, 15; וַיִּקֶּם Gen. 4, 8. On the other hand קִבְצוֹ Lev. 2, 2; קִצְרֵם Lev. 19, 9; מִשְׁלָהּ II Sam. 20, 21; אֲמִנֵם Gen. 18, 13 (by the side of אֲמִנֵם Ruth 3, 12). Cf. such Syriac forms as ܕܥܠܐ, ܕܥܠܐ, etc. (Nöldeke, § 103); ܕܥܠܐ (§ 104) but also ܕܥܠܐ = kol (§ 48).

⁴E. g., גָּב 6, 8; פִּל 6, 8; דָּב 7, 5; קֶשֶׁט 4, 34; חֲרִטִם 2, 10; פִּלָּא 2, 40 shows that it matters not whether the syllable be closed with a simple or double consonant. Cf. Hebrew פִּל Gen. 2, 5; קִטְנִתִּי Gen. 32, 11; יִקְצֶה Lev. 10, 6; יִבְזִי Is. 10, 2. Cf. Syriac ܕܥܠܐ (§ 104); ܕܥܠܐ (§ 103); ܕܥܠܐ (§ 160). Cf., however, יִסְבֵּד 3, 6; תִּרְשֵׁם 6, 9; פָּרַק 4, 24; יֵאֱכַל 4, 30; תֵּאֱכַל 7, 23; יִכֵּל 3, 29 and contrast Syriac ܕܥܠܐ (Nöldeke, § 48, is uncertain as to the value of the ܥ; cf. also Brockelmann, § 46).

⁵E. g., מִלְתָּה 2, 25; עִדְנָא 2, 9; יִפֵּל 3, 6; יִתְנַפֵּה 4, 14; הַמּוֹן 2, 34; הַמּוֹ Ez. 5, 11; אֲנֹן Ez. 5, 4; יִהְיֶנּוּ 2, 11; יִתְזוֹן 4, 9; יִתְשׁוּבּוֹן 2, 5; לְשׁוֹנִיא 3, 7. Cf., however, אֲשִׁא 7, 11. Cf. Hebrew אֲמִי Gen.

page referred to) for an explanation of the terms used. The forms in parentheses occur less frequently.

20, 12; יָתָן Gen. 43, 14; אָמַתּוֹ Ps. 91, 4; מִבְּעֵתָהּ I Sam. 16, 15; חֲמִשָּׁה Gen. 18, 28; פָּדַל Jos. 4, 14. But cf. אָקַח Gen. 12, 19; אֲשֶׁר־ Jud. 16, 26; אָנְחָם Is. 1, 24 but אֲנַקְמָה Is. 1, 24; אֲמַלְטָה Gen. 19, 20; אָרִישׁ Ezek. 14, 3, etc. In Syriac ܐ is invariably used before doubling.

⁶There is in BA, as little as in Hebrew, a fixed rule as to when to use ܐ and when ܐ to represent an Arabic ܐ in an unaccented closed syllable. Thus in BA תְּמַדְתָּ 3, 22 (فَعَلَ, cf. Heb. תָּמַדָה, i. e., תָּמַדָה Si. 16, 11, the form inferred from תְּמַדְתָּן Zech. 12, 4, cf. *AJSL.*, XII (1896), 215) בְּשָׂרָא 2, 11 (فَعَلَ, cf. Heb. בָּשָׂר Gen. 2, 24); פְּדִינָה 2, 10 (= *ka-din-ā); יִקְדָּתָא 3, 6; מִשְׁפָּבִי 4, 2; מִבְּעָא 2, 18; נִדְבָכִין Ez. 6, 4; סְלִכְתָּ 7, 20; שְׁמִיעַת 5, 14; יִסְגֵּד 3, 6; תְּשִׁילַת 2, 39; יִתְתָּן 2, 16; יִשְׁזַבְנִכֹּן 3, 15; הִזְדַּמְנִיתִין 2, 9; but יִבְשָׁתָא 2, 10 (= יִבְשָׁתָא = יִבְשָׁתָא, cf. Syriac ܝܒܫܬܐ; ܝܒܫܬܐ is a by-form of ܝܒܫܬܐ [from which ܝܒܫܬܐ Gen. 1, 9] is an intensive [nominal] form; just as ܦܢܒ Ex. 22, 1 is the intensive of ܦܢܒ Ex. 21, 16; another by-form of ܝܒܫܬܐ is ܝܒܫܬܐ Na. 1, 10); ܢܒܪܫܬܐ 5, 5; ܝܕܗܝ Ez. 5, 8; ܢܦܩܬ 2, 13; ܝܫܐܠܢܚܐ Ez. 7, 21; ܡܚܬܥܒܪ Ez. 4, 19; ܦܠܐ Ez. 7, 20. ܐ, however, seems to be the rule, and ܐ the exception.

Before and after the gutturals, א, ה, ח, and ע, ܐ is more common, but there are examples with ܐ, the fluctuation being greatest in the case of א: אֲרִישׁ 4, 23; אֲצַבְעָתָא 2, 21; אֲשִׁחֲדִיר Ez. 4, 15; אֲנִיעַ 7, 16; אֲקִרָא 5, 17; אֲשִׁחֲזִים 4, 16; but אֲנִיבָה 4, 18; אֲנִיעַ 2, 9; אֲחִיעֲטֹ 6, 8; אֲחַפְרִית 7, 15; אֲחַעֲקֶרָה 7, 8; אֲשִׁחֲפִי 3, 19;—אֲחִיעֲטֹ 2, 13; אֲחַמְלִי 3, 19; אֲחַתְכָּה 2, 35;—אֲחִיעֲטֹ Ez. 6, 16; אֲחִיעֲטֹ 2, 19; אֲחַמְלִי 2, 4; but אֲחַסְנָא 2, 37; אֲחַסְטִיר Ez. 6, 9;—אֲחִיעֲטֹ 7, 18; אֲחַעֲבֵר Ez. 4, 22; אֲחַעֲדָה 7, 14; אֲחַעֲדִיר 5, 20; but אֲחַעֲבֵר 4, 30; אֲחַעֲדִיר 7, 5. The same obtains in Hebrew, i. e., with ordinary consonants ܐ is the rule, although ܐ will be found occasionally, as (the forms marked with † are isolated examples standing for themselves only, while the others represent types) זָכַרְיָא Ex. 3, 15; דְּבִרִיבָם Deut. 5, 25; דְּבִרְתִּי Ps. 110, 4 (cf. below, § 59); בְּדִבְרִי I Ki. 13, 1; בְּנִקְתָּהּ † Gen. 24, 59; מִזְבֵּחַ II Ki. 18, 22; יִרְשָׁתָהּ † Deut. 17, 14; חֲצִפֹּן Prov. 2, 1; יִדְבֹק Deut. 13, 18; יִגְרַע Job 34, 15; זָכַרְיָא Mal. 3, 22; לְמַדּוֹ Is. 1, 17; מִקְדָּשְׁכֶם † Ex. 31, 13; וְהִתְקַדְּשִׁיתִי † Ezek.

28, 23; וְהִתְקַדְּשָׁתָם † Lev. 11, 44; but מִלְמַדָּה Is. 48, 17; יָדְכֶם Gen. 9, 2; שְׂכֵנֶיךָ Ex. 3, 22; יִסְבְּבֶנְהוּ Deut. 32, 10; וְחָלָד Gen. 4, 1; יְהוֹלֵל־פִּי Ps. 63, 6; נִגְדִי Ps. 38, 11; נִגְדִי Gen. 21, 23; לִכְתֹּי I Kings 2, 8. Before and after א, ה, ח, ע, ך is more common, although there are examples with ך, which in certain types is the rule: בְּאֵרוֹת* inferred from בְּאֵרוֹת Gen. 14, 10; אֶצְלוֹ I Sam. 17, 30; אֲזָרָה Lev. 19, 34; אֲשַׁפֵּט Ps. 75, 3; אֲשַׁקֹּטָה Is. 18, 4; אֲשַׁבֵּעַ Prov. 30, 9; אֲשַׁחֲדָה Ps. 50, 13; אֲחַחֲבֶר † II Chron. 20, 35; but אֲמַרְי † Job 20, 29; אֲמַרְי Is. 3, 10; — יִהְיֶה Prov. 10, 3; תִּהְיֶה Ex. 23, 3; בְּהִמְתָּקָה Lev. 19, 19; but יִהְיֶה and יִהְיֶה and their like; הִרְגֵנִי Num. 25, 5; so always in the prefix הִחֲ—; יִחַשְׁבוּ Ps. 68, 31; נִחַשְׁבָּה Num. 18, 27; הִחֲסִיר Ex. 16, 18; חָלַקְרִי Hab. 1, 16; but חָנַם Prov. 1, 11; חָנָה Gen. 24, 13; חָדַל Is. 2, 22; — נִעְבֶּד Ecc. 5, 8; הִעֲדִיָּה Ex. 16, 18; עָרִיר Ex. 18, 4; but עָבַד Ex. 5, 18; עָמַר Gen. 31, 31. Note הִרְאָה Deut. 4, 36, but הִרְאָה Amos 7, 1. In Syriac nothing but ܐ is found.

Sometimes in BA an original ܐ may become ܐ, e. g., גְּשִׁמִּיּוֹן 3, 28 (Syr. ܓܝܡܝܐ, Nöldeke, § 103); the Arabic جَسْمٌ, however, proves that the modification of the vowel occurred outside of Hebrew and is, therefore, not due in Aramaic to Hebrew influence. A similar example in Hebrew is אָתָם (BA אֲתָם).

* *a* improper, i. e., the *a* which takes the place of a Semitic *i*, is the rule in BA before laryngeals and ר, e. g., פָּלַח 6, 17; הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה 2, 35; מִתְנַצֵּחַ 6, 4; הוֹדֵעַ 2, 15; הִדְרִיתָ 5, 23; יִמְעִיר 6, 12; it then remains also in an open accented syllable, e. g., טִבְּהוּ 5, 4; הִשְׁפִּירוּ 6, 12; אֲתָרוּ 4, 11. Before other consonants there are no examples of *a* improper; the participles מִתְנַדֵּב Ez. 7, 13; מִתְעַרֵּב 2, 43; מִשְׁתַּפֵּל 7, 8 seem to be due to the influence of the imperfect (contrast Arabic يَتَقَطَّلُ but مَتَقَطَّلٌ). In Hebrew *a* improper is very frequent, both when the neighbor of a laryngeal and in the environment of other consonants, e. g., גָּאֻלָּה Is. 48, 17; מִזְבֵּחַ I Ki. 8, 31 (for מִזְבֵּחַ); טָבִיעַ Gen. 16, 11 (Arabic سَمِعَ); יִשְׁמַע Ex. 23, 13; תִּשְׁלַח Ps. 104, 30; הִנֵּטָה Ps. 94, 9; רָגַע הַיָּם Is. 51, 15; גָּבַר Ps. 103, 11; גָּדַל Jos. 4, 14, etc. *a* improper in Hebrew is never found in an open syllable and very rarely in a closed accented syllable in pause (the absolute state of nouns being regarded as a semi-pausal form).

* E. g., נִגַּד 7, 10; קָבַל 6, 1; מְהִלָּה 4, 26; הִנָּפֵק 5, 2; הִשְׁלַם Ez. 7, 19; יִתְהַב 4, 13, etc.; עָלָה 6, 3; יָכַלָּה 2, 47. In Hebrew ܐ is the rule in pausal verbal forms and in the absolute state of nouns in

the singular. ֿ in the place of ֿֿ is found occasionally both in BA and Hebrew, especially before ל , e. g., פֿרָזֶל 2, 33, Heb. פֿרָזֶל Deut. 33, 25. ֿ is retained in BA in the accented closed syllable in forms like יֶכֶל 6, 21; מִלֶּל 6, 22; יִמְלֶל 7, 25, etc. No example is available in Hebrew. According to Nöldeke (§ 47) a short *e* may have been lengthened by the tone in Syriac in final syllables, so perhaps in ܩܡܝܬܐ , ܩܡܝܬܐ , in which words the Eastern Syrians represent the second vowel by ֿ . The lengthening is nevertheless uncertain, nor do we know whether it was general. Cf. also Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, 84; Zimmermann, § 21.

⁹ E. g., קִבֵּל 6, 1; עֲמָא Ez. 7, 13, etc. Cf. Hebrew עָמַר Micah 6, 5, etc. חָפָא (Nöldeke, § 102), etc.

¹⁰ E. g., אַחֲרֵיהּ Ez. 5, 15, etc. Cf. Hebrew עֲבָדָהּ I Ki. 2, 38., etc. Cf. Syriac ܬܥܡܐ (Nöldeke, § 94).

¹¹ Here BA and Hebrew separate. In BA ֿ remains (ֿ occurs occasionally in pause, as קִדְמֵי Ez. 4, 18; הִיל Ez. 4, 23; שִׁמְרֵי Ez. 4, 17), e. g., נָפֶל 4, 28; אֶזֶל , 2, 17, etc., while in Hebrew ֿ is the rule in pausal forms and in the absolute singular of nouns, e. g., פֶּתַח Ps. 78, 23; בֶּשֶׁר Gen. 6, 12, etc.

¹² The column "near" exists really only for the Hebrew, since it is a peculiarity of Aramaic that it treats "near" syllables as "distant," so much so that similar treatment in Hebrew is spoken of as an Aramaism (cf. below, § 60). Nevertheless, there are certain types of forms in BA which retain the vowel in an open unaccented syllable immediately before the accent, e. g., فَعَلَةٌ forms, which Barth (§ 92) regards as developed from the فَعِيل infinitive in accordance with his law of compensation, as עֲטָא 2, 14. The ֿֿ becomes then stationary even in "distant" syllables; hence גִּזְרַת 4, 14; יִקְדַּת 7, 11; לְהַנְתֵּךְ 5, 23; לְהַנְתֵּהּ 5, 2; (שְׁאַלְתֵּהּ 4, 14; שְׁלֹחְךָ 4, 24 in an unaccented closed syllable with *metheg*). In Hebrew these forms often retain the ֿֿ , though the accent be shifted, as אֲבִירַת Deut. 22, 3; בִּירְכֵהּ II Sam. 2, 13; נִבְלָתִי Is. 26, 19. No examples are available in Syriac. Other cases are also to be accounted for; firstly, מִזְוֹךְ 4, 9 (cf. Heb. מִזְוֹךְ ; cf. above, § 45). Similar forms are found in O. T. Hebrew mostly from verbs ע"ע , e. g., מִגִּנֵּי I Ki. 10, 17 (from מִגֵּן); cstr. st. מִסֵּךְ Is. 22, 8 (from מִסָּךְ); מִעֲזִים Dan. 11, 38 (from מִעֵז ; while מִעֵז , cf. Arabic مَعَاذ Sūra 12, 33, really comes from عَز , the Masora seems to derive it from עוּז . See GK., § 85). In Syriac we have

ܡܚܙܐ (cf. Heb. מְחֹרֵר); ܡܚܙܐ regarded by Nöldeke (§ 126 G) as borrowed from the Assyrian (*maḥāzu*, e. g., *ma-ḥa-ze rabūti*, Shalm. Obel. 81); Hebrew מְחֹרֵר Ps. 107, 30 is likewise a loan-word, and the Syriac word is probably borrowed from the Hebrew and only indirectly from the Assyrian). ܡܚܙܐ, although not in O. T. Hebrew, is found in Sirach 31, 8. Nöldeke, *ZAW.*, XXII (1902), 84, doubts the genuineness of the word; LXX has *χρυσίου*; it is very frequent in Mishnaic Hebrew, e. g., Sanhedrin 1, 1). The word occurs also in the N. T. (Mt. 6, 24; 16, 9. 11. 13); while the uncial MSS. all have *μαμμων*, the other spelling (with one *μ*) is attested by versions and patristic citations. ܡܚܙܐ would be parallel to ܡܚܙܐ, just as Syr. ܡܚܙܐ (part. of Aph'el) is parallel to Hebrew מְחֹרֵר (see Nestle, *EB.*, col. 2914, § 3; cf. also Lagarde, *Übersicht*, 185). Nöldeke (*Mand.* 130, n. 4) is inclined to regard *mā-* as a very ancient form of the prefix; but his grounds are insufficient. ܡܚܙܐ and its like are rather Hebrew loan-words in Aramaic, and the Hebrew ׀ is retained as stationary (cf., on the other hand, מְחֹרֵר 4, 22). The other cases are the Haph'el forms ܡܚܙܐ 5, 21; 6, 16 (contrast ܡܚܙܐ 2, 44); ܡܚܙܐ 2, 21; ܡܚܙܐ 5, 9; and ܡܚܙܐ 2, 44. Baer (*Dan.*, p. xxxvi) derives ܡܚܙܐ from the root ܡܚܙܐ; Kautzsch, though deriving it correctly from ܡܚܙܐ, is doubtful as to the certainty of the derivation. It may be questioned, however, whether these are examples of the so-called "lengthening" of a vowel before the tone as in Hebrew, or whether the "lengthening" is not an attempt to increase the volume of the biconsonantal (so-called "ע"י) stem, just as doubling increases the volume of the biconsonantal (so-called "ע"ע) stem in ܡܚܙܐ and ܡܚܙܐ. These forms would then be parallel, as ܡܚܙܐ and ܡܚܙܐ are parallel. In the treatment of verbs ע"י the Syriac is not always uniform; in some verbs the first radical is doubled after the preformative, e. g., ܡܚܙܐ, ܡܚܙܐ, etc., while in others the syllable remains open, e. g., ܡܚܙܐ, ܡܚܙܐ, etc. The general principle in Syriac is that short vowels in open syllables are reduced, but before a consonant originally doubled the short vowel remains even when the doubling is lost and the syllable becomes opened. Occasionally the lost doubling is compensated for in pronunciation by lengthening the vowel. The Eastern Syrians also lengthen short vowels when they remain by way of exception in open syllables, e. g., ܡܚܙܐ for ܡܚܙܐ (see Nöldeke, §§ 117 D, and 42).

¹³ E. g., ܡܚܙܐ 7, 4 (cf. Arab. أَقْبَمَ); ܡܚܙܐ 2, 18 (cf. Arab. أَقْبَمَ); ܡܚܙܐ 5, 11 (cf. Hebrew מְחֹרֵר Jer. 31, 26 (25); ܡܚܙܐ 5, 1 cf. Heb. מְחֹרֵר Job 39, 5). In Hebrew: ܡܚܙܐ Job 14, 5; ܡܚܙܐ

Gen. 1, 1; עֲבָרִי I Ki. 5, 4 (sing. עָבַר); הִרְרִיחַ Deut. 8, 9. In Syriac we meet with אַבְּ, אַעְּ, אַבְּ, אַעְּ (Nöldeke, § 34); the vowels very probably correspond to the חֲטָפִי in BA and Hebrew.

¹⁴ E. g., פָּחַב Ez. 7, 22 (Arabic كَتَابَ); שָׁלַם Ez. 4, 17 (Arabic سَلَّمَ). In Hebrew: שָׁלַם Gen. 37, 14, etc. Syriac: שָׁלַם, etc.

¹⁵ E. g., חָלַם 4, 2; מָלַךְ 2, 10; אָבְלִי 7, 5; סָלַקוּ 2, 29; פָּחַב Ez. 4, 8; הָעַל 5, 13; מָחַן 4, 24; פָּחַח Ez. 6, 5; אָחִיךָ Ez. 7, 18; בָּרַךְ 2, 19. In Hebrew: קָדַשׁ Jer. 2, 3; רָחַץ Prov. 30, 12; חָלַק Gen. 31, 14; נָחַל Ezek. 25, 3; מָוֶה Ex. 10, 17; בָּיַח Deut. 8, 12; אָבֶן Gen. 29, 2; אָחַל Ezek. 39, 7. In Syriac: מִנְכֵּה, מִנְכֵּה, מִנְכֵּה, etc., prove earlier מִנְכֵּה, מִנְכֵּה, מִנְכֵּה, etc.

47. In BA, as in Hebrew, the consonant of the prefix of the imperf. 3d pers. is ך, whereas in Syriac it is ܢ. The BA ך, however, is not due to Hebrew influence, as it appears also in the inscriptions.* Of course, it is not confined to Hebrew and Aramaic, but is common Semitic, the Syriac standing alone with its ܢ.^b

*Cf. Lidzbarski, 400 ff. It is worthy of note that in the Zenjirli-Hadad inscription three forms occur with ܠ, viz., ܠܡܢܥ line 24, ܠܡܢܥܐ and ܠܡܢܥܐ line 31, with which compare BA ܠܡܢܥ 2, 20, etc., ܠܡܢܥ 2, 43, etc., ܠܡܢܥ 5, 17. On the origin of the ܠ-prefix and its relation to Arabic ܠ expressing purpose, as well as to Syriac ܢ, see König, "Das ܠ Jaqtul in Semitischen," *ZDMG.*, LI (1897), 330 ff., where he reviews the question with due attention to the opinion of his predecessors.

^bSee Driver, *Tenses*, 7 ff.

48. Since the Syriac does not show the development of internal passives, at least not to the same extent as Hebrew, but uses regularly instead the reflexives with the prefixed ܐܐ, it has been claimed that the Hoph'al forms occurring in BA are due to Hebrew influence (Luzzatto, § 43; Kautzsch, § 34, and contrast § 45, 1, *e*; Blake, *JAOS.*, XXII [1901], 46; Duval, *REJ.*, VIII [1884], 58; on the other side are found Nöldeke, *GGA*, 1867, No. 45, p. 1784; 1884, No. 26, p. 1015; Bevan, 37, note; Behrmann, p. vii).

By the term Hoph'al we mean the internal passive of the Haph'el, corresponding to the Arabic IV. and to the Hebrew Hiph'il. The forms found in BA are as follows: הִנָּחַת 5, 20; הִתְחַקְּתָּ 4, 33; הִוְבַּד 7, 11; הִוְסַפַּת 4, 33; הִקְיַמַת 7, 4; הִעֵל 5, 13; הִעֲלֵי 5, 15; הִפֵּס 6, 24; הִהֲרִיב Ez. 4, 15; to which must be added הִיִּתִּית 6, 18 and הִיִּתִּי 3, 13, and the participle מְהִיִּיץ 2 A, 45; 6, 5.

There is nothing inherently impossible in the development of an internal passive in BA; and although it has disappeared from the later Aramaic dialects (except perhaps in Palmyrene, cf. Sachau, *ZDMG.*, XXXVII [1883]; 563 f., his vocalization, however, is wrong in the imperf. and participial forms; see below, § 49, n. 2; the readings proposed by Duval, *loc. cit.*, 60 ff., are not convincing; with Sachau agrees D. H. Müller, quoted by Duval in the article referred to, p. 63), traces of it still remain in the so-called passive participles in all Aramaic dialects (including Syriac). The first vowel in the forms quoted above ought certainly to present no difficulties, as it is in agreement with Arabic.

49. The difficulty in these forms seems to be in the $\bar{a}$ as the stem-vowel of the perfect, e. g., הִוְבַּד. Contrast the Arabic أَقْتَلَ, and on the other hand cf. Hebrew הִקְטִיל. Hence, where this agreement with Hebrew is wanting, as in the form הִקְיַמַת Arab. أَقَامَت against Hebrew הִקִּים Jer. 35, 14, even those scholars who, like Kautzsch, look upon the other Hoph'al forms in BA as Hebraisms, admit that we have genuine Aramaic forms ("eine sicher altaramäische Bildung," *GBA.*, § 45, 1, e; cf. Bevan, 121). The discrepancy between Arabic, on the one hand, and Hebrew and Aramaic, on the other, with reference to the stem-vowel of the perfect is found, however, also in the active of the Haph'el and Pa'el. The vowel $\bar{e}$ in these forms is certainly not due to Hebrew influence, as the same vowel is used in the Syriac. It seems therefore that in Aramaic, independently of Hebrew, during a later period of its history the stem-vowels of the perfect were made to conform to those of the imperfect. The same analogical force was operative in the passive of the causative, i. e., the $\bar{a}$ in הִוְבַּד was introduced from the imperfect הִוְבִּיד*. The following table may serve to illustrate the development:

	Arabic	*Early Aramaic	BA	Syriac	Hebrew
II OR PA'EL STEM					
Perf.	قَتَلَ	קָטַל	קָטַל	ܩܬܠ	קָטַל
Impf. ...	يَقْتُلُ	יִקְטֹל	יִקְטֹל	ܩܬܠ	יִקְטֹל
IV OR HAPH'EL STEM					
Perf.	أَقْتَلَ	הִקְטִיל	הִקְטִיל	ܐܩܬܠ	הִקְטִיל
Impf. ...	يُقْتَلُ for يَفْتُلُ	יִהְיֶה	יִהְיֶה	ܐܩܬܠ	יִהְיֶה
IV PASSIVE OR HOPH'AL					
Perf.	أُقْتِلَ	הִקְטִיל	הִקְטִיל		הִקְטִיל
Impf. ...	يُقْتَلُ	יִהְיֶה	יִהְיֶה		יִהְיֶה
Part.	مُقْتَلٌ	מִהִקְטִיל	מִהִקְטִיל	ܡܩܬܠ	מִהִקְטִיל

(1) In the case of הִיִּתִּי and הִיִּתִּי the influence of the imperfect upon the perfect may have gone a step farther and changed the first vowel as well as the second. Or else הִיִּתִּי was regarded by the language as a فَعِيل; cf. the passive of فَوَعَلَ forms in Hebrew בִּוְנֶנּוּ Ps. 67, 23, with the active בִּוְנֵן Ps. 9, 8. The vocalization הִיִּתִּי (for הִיִּתִּי) goes with that of Hebrew forms like חֲסִיד Deut. 32, 37 (for חֲסִיד Ps. 37, 40).

(2) Sachau, *loc. cit.*, although probably right in considering the Palmyrene forms adduced there as passives, errs in their vocalization. He is misled by Arabic يُقْتَلُ, مُقْتَلٌ and Hebrew יִקְטֹל, מִקְטֹל. In these forms, however, the $\frac{2}{-}$ represent the vowel of the prefix which remained, while the vowel following the syncopated $\frac{1}{-}$ (ה; cf. above, § 28) was dropped. That vowel was $\frac{2}{-}$, as may be proved from the analogy of the passive of the II (Aram. Pa'el). Thus we have يُقْتَلُ, مُقْتَلٌ, cf. Syr. ܡܩܬܠ (Nöldeke, § 165). Hence, the impf. passive of the Pa'el had the form יִקְטֹל (active יִקְטֹל). Its perf. was originally קָטַל and later (through the influence of the impf.) it became קָטַל.

In the same manner, from the part. caus. pass. we are able to reconstruct the imperf., from מִקְטֵל (مَقْتُل Nöld., *loc. cit.*)— יִקְטֵל , יִקְטֵל . On the subject of internal passives in the Semitic languages and their gradual disappearance, cf. Nöldeke, *Mand.*, § 162; Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, 226, 253; König, *Lehrgeb.*, II, 384 f.; Vollers-Burkitt, § 42.

50. The forms אִשְׁתּוּמִים Dan. 4, 16 and מִסְבִּלֵּין Ez. 6, 3 are also in apparent agreement with the Hebrew. On אִשְׁתּוּמִים Bevan (p. 93) says it "is a hybrid form based on the Hebrew הִשְׁתּוּמִים (cf. וְאִשְׁתּוּמִים Dan. 8, 27), with change of the ה to א after the analogy of the later Jewish Aramaic." With respect to מִסְבִּלֵּין Driver and Cheyne (*Variorum Bible*) regard the text as doubtful. Kautzsch (§ 36) says that both forms are probably Hebraisms.

Wright explains מִסְבִּלֵּין on the analogy of the Arabic III. فَاعَل , $\bar{a}$ becoming $\bar{o}$. This form "is in general use in Arabic only, but examples occur in Ethiopic, too The inflexion runs entirely parallel to that of the intensive form" (*Comp. Gr.*, pp. 202 f.).

We cannot, however, regard these forms as clear examples of the Arabic III فَاعَل , for that stem always carries with it the reciprocal idea. As Wright declares, it "expresses an effort, with the implied idea of a counter-effort" (*Comp. Gr.*, p. 202), and "the ideas of effort and reciprocity are always more or less clearly implied" (*Arab. Gr.*, I, 33 D). Since the meaning peculiar to the Arabic III is absent from these words, we must regard them as examples of the فَوَعَلَ form, which appears in Ethiopic and Syriac, although it is rare in Arabic. Thus Duval (*Syr. Gram.*, § 197) cites several examples in Syriac, as: مَصْر more frequently مَصْر , مَدَف , مَدَف , مَدَف , and مَصْر . These verbs are also used in the passives. Cf. Payne Smith, who regards مَصْر mentioned by Duval as a Shaph'el form of مَص , together with its passive as an Eshtaph'al. Cf. also Praetorius, *Aeth. Gram.*, 37, where he adds examples in Arabic, as فَصِغ and فَيَصَل .

In these forms, as in רִמֵּם , the $\bar{o}$ represents an original ay , and not $\bar{a}$, as Wright has it. The true character of the forms was recognized, as far back as 1876, by Nöldeke who says (*ZDMG.*, XXIX

[1876], 326): "Bildungen wie *החנולל* sind auch aramäisch, vergl. *ܐܬܚܢܐ* Athan. 29, 3; Efr. 1, 439 D, u. s. w., *ܐܬܚܢܐ* BA 7323. Demnach brauchen wir *אשרומם* in Daniel ebensowenig als Hebraismus anzusehen wie so manche andere Bildung im Biblisch-Aram., bei der eine solche Annahme nahe zu liegen scheint." Haupt, in *SBOT.*, Ezra, pp. 36 f., derives *מְסֻבִּין* from *סבל* ("to carry") a synonym of *הובל*.

51. Verbal forms in BA which agree with Hebrew are *מְרֻמִּים* 4, 34, and *הַתְרוֹמְמִית* 5, 23. Kautzsch (§ 45, 6) regards these as Hebraized forms, and Bevan (p. 97) says that the forms "are, of course, borrowed from the Hebrew; the verb *רומם* 'to exalt' occurs again in the Targums and in Christian Palestinian, which shows that it had really passed into common use." Kautzsch, however, classifies the forms correctly, calling them "Pa'lel and Hithpa'lel" (Hithpa'lal?) respectively. Stade (*Heb. Gram.*, § 155, c) likewise correctly explains such forms in Hebrew by placing *קומם* forms by the side of *שָׁאֵן* and *נָאֵר*; but he then claims that the *ō* represents *ā* (similarly GK., § 72, 7), thus being guilty of a contradiction, for *שָׁאֵן*, *נָאֵר*; i. e., **שָׁאֵן*, **נָאֵר* are clearly *פִּעֵל* forms, while *קומם* *kāmim(a)*, i. e., *kām-am(a)* would have to be designated as a *فَعَّلَ* form—which, of course, is an impossibility. In a footnote, Stade says that the Syriac *ay* in these forms is probably a resolution of *ō*. Syriac *ay* is rather the original, which in BA and Hebrew in accordance with rule becomes contracted into *ō*.

Similar forms appear in Syriac, as *ܐܬܚܢܐ* "to chew the cud, to meditate," *ܐܬܚܢܐ* "to be amazed," *ܦܬܚܐ* "to break in pieces," *ܐܬܚܢܐ* "to be crumbled in pieces," *ܦܬܚܐ*, *ܦܬܚܐ* with similar meanings, and *ܐܬܚܢܐ* "to be amazed" (from *ܚܕ*; Nöldeke, § 180). In Arabic there is a form *فَعْلَلَة* in verbs middle *و* and *ي* in which the second radical always becomes *ي*. Thus *دَيُّومَة* from *دوم*, *كَيُّونَة* from *كون*. Wright says that "the rare substantive forms *سُودِد* from *ساد* 'to be chief or ruler,' and *عُوطَط* from *عاط* 'to desire the male of a camel;'" certain cognate forms; "and the analogy of the Aramaic verbal

form פִּעֵלֵל (as פִּעֵץ, פִּעֵץ) and the Hebrew פִּעֵלֵל (as בִּינָן, קוֹמִים, etc.) all combine to prove that פִּעֵלֵל comes directly from a quadriliteral فَعْلَل (Arab. Gram., I, 120 D; Comp. Gram., 203 f.).

These forms are all analogous:

Arabic	Syriac	BA	Hebrew
فَعْلَل	פִּעֵץ	רוֹמִים (רוֹמִים)	רוֹמִים
	أَعْدَدَ	הַחֲרוֹמִמִּת	

52. We have in BA forms like אֶבֶן, חֵלֶם, etc., which are found also in Hebrew. In BA they are found by the side of forms which are rare in Hebrew, such as לָחֶם, צָלֶם, etc. It is customary to speak of לָחֶם forms in Hebrew as Aramaisms, and of אֶבֶן forms in BA as Hebraisms. (So, e. g., Kautzsch, *GBA.*, § 54, 1; Merx, *Trans. Orient. Cong. Berlin*, I, p. 159.)

These so-called "segolate" forms found in BA are as follows:

אֶבֶן 2, 34; 6. 18; Ez. 5, 8; 6, 4; אֶלֶה 7, 10; חֵלֶם 3, 4. 20; חֵלֶם 7, 1; טָעַם Ez. 6, 14; בָּלַךְ 2, 10. 37; 4, 34; 7, 1; Ez. 5, 11. 12; 6, 12. 14; 7, 11. 12; נָגַד 6, 11; צָלֶם 3, 5. 7. 10. 12. 14. 18; קָרַט 2, 35; קָרַן 7. 8. Cf. also the following, אֶתְגִּירָה 2, 45; הֶתְגִּירָה 2, 34; בָּעַתַּח Ez. 4, 10. 11; 7, 12 parallel to בָּעַתַּח Ez. 4, 17; פִּרְשָׁנָן Ez. 4, 11. 23, 5, 6; 7, 11; הִשְׁפִּיחַח 2, 25; הִשְׁתַּכַּחַח 5, 27; (cf. also perf. 3 f. s. הִשְׁתַּכַּחַח 5, 11. 12. 14; 6, 5. 23).

It is necessary for us to know something of the origin of "segolate" forms in order to decide whether they are common to several of the Semitic languages, and also whether they are to be classified on statistic grounds or on grounds of internal grammatical growth. (The term "segolate" is usually restricted to nouns, but it may be applied likewise to verbal formations.) A "segolate" noun may be defined as a noun with a vowel between the first and second radicals of the basic forms, and none between the second and third; i. e., it is of

the form *cvcc* —. When we speak of “segolates,” we refer to Semitic nouns, and not to Hebrew or Aramaic formations, because the absence of a vowel between the second and third radicals in Aramaic is no guarantee of its absence in Semitic times. (Thus צִדְקָה Dan. 4, 24 could not be determined to be a non-“segolate” without the aid of Hebrew צִדְקָה.) Hence, if we had only Aramaic, we should not know in any given case whether we had “segolate” formations or not. We determine Aramaic “segolates,” therefore, by the aid of Hebrew or Arabic.

It is to be observed (1) that the various nominal forms in the several Semitic languages do not necessarily correspond; (2) that in Hebrew itself “segolate” and non-“segolate” forms interchange; e. g., פֶּתַח Zech. 7, 11; פֶּתַח I Ki. 6, 8; יִרְדָּה Jud. 15, 8; יִרְדָּה Gen. 24, 9; פָּרָר Num. 22, 24; פָּרָר Prov. 24, 31, etc. Lagarde, therefore, seems to be right when he claims that in Hebrew there are proper and improper “segolates.” The former come from Semitic times; the latter were developed within Hebrew itself. Therefore with each “segolate” form the question must be asked: Is it a proper or an improper form? Moreover, while it is true that there were proper “segolates” in Semitic times, it is plain that they also go back to fuller dissyllabic forms, the second stem-vowel being lost in accordance with early Semitic accentuation.

So much for the basis in forms like אֲבִנִי, מִלְכִי, etc. But in forms like אֲבִנְכוֹן, no matter whether in its origin it be a proper or improper “segolate,” the question is whether it is not possible that there was another pronunciation, i. e., אֲבִנְכוֹן, in which ם might have been simply a parasitic vowel. (This depends, however, upon the collocation of consonants. No parasitic vowel would intrude in a form like מִלְכְּכוֹן, because the latter is pronounceable, while in אֲבִנְכוֹן the vowel would be necessary.) By dropping the suffix from this form we have the construct state of the noun אֲבִן or אֵבֶן.

The form אֲבִן in Hebrew is the construct state of “segolates.” It presupposes אֲבִנְכוֹן, which is not found in Hebrew, but is a legitimate form in Syriac, produced by reading with

מַחֲמִיָּה (on מַחֲמִיָּה see Nöldeke, §§ 17, 34, 52 C; Brockelmann, § 12). Hence for their existence in BA no Hebrew influence whatever need be assumed.

A "segolate" therefore is a form which, in the basic form, has a silent *shewa* under the second radical, if that *shewa* be Semitic. When in the course of inflection that *shewa* is followed by a so-called vocal *shewa*, then it may be pronounced hurriedly (*marheṭānā*) or slowly (*mehaggiānā*), and the latter pronunciation yields a "segolate" formation.

The following table of forms will illustrate the development:

	מַחֲמִיָּה	פַּעֲלִי	נַעֲרִי	יִגְלִי	אֲבִי
Marheṭana	מַחֲמִיָּה	פַּעֲלִי	נַעֲרִי	יִגְלִי	אֲבִי
Mehaggiāna	מַחֲמִיָּה ^b	פַּעֲלִי	נַעֲרִי	יִגְלִי	אֲבִי
		פַּעֲלִי	נַעֲרִי	יִגְלִי	אֲבִי
		פַּעֲלִי	נַעֲרִי	יִגְלִי	אֲבִי

^aSo in Jewish Aramaic מַחֲמִיָּה.

^bJewish Aramaic.

In the light of these forms it is not astonishing to find that so-called "segolate" formations are found in Christian Palestinian; e. g., מִלֶּךְ (pronounced מִלֶּךְ or מִלֶּךְ). So also in the Peshiṭta 'urāh (from primitive 'urh). See Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XXII (1868), p. 475. On the ground of these forms Bevan (*Commentary*, p. 71) and Behrmann (*Commentary*, p. viii) consider it doubtful whether אֲבִי forms in BA are to be regarded as Hebraisms. Behrmann, however, while admitting that the noun forms may be original, regards the "segolate" verb formations as Hebraisms of the Masora. The same pronunciation, however, which produced the segolate noun-formation would also operate in verb-forms; e. g., קַטְלָכוֹן or קַטְלָכוֹן (cf. בְּנִיתָה Dan. 4, 27) קַטְלָכוֹן, similarly אֲמַרְתָּ. It need not be supposed that the forms are made anew in each case. When once the type is introduced, other forms are made by analogy. (On the general subject of segolates cf. GK., 84, a; König, *Lehrgeb.*, II; Lambert, *RÉJ.*, 1896, pp. 18 ff.; Lagarde, *Übersicht*, pp. 72 f. and 80 f.; *Mittheil.*, I, p. 150; Philippi, *Beiträge z. Assyr.*, II, pp. 359-389; Ungnad, *ZA.*, XVII [1903], pp. 333 f.)

53. In BA the dual appears in certain forms, יָדִין (in בִּידִין) 2, 34; מַחֲמִיָּה Ez. 6, 17; קַרְנֵיךְ 7, 7; רִגְלֵיךְ 7, 4; שְׁנֵיךְ 7, 7.

Marti (*GBA.*, p. 73) cites also the following: תַּרְתִּין, תַּרְתִּין and עִינִין 7, 8; עִינִין 7, 25, and פִּרְסִין 5, 25. In the use of the dual, BA represents an older stage of language than does the Syriac. In the latter, while a few traces of the dual still exist (in two or three words, viz.: זֶז, f. זֶזַּז [cf. BA תַּרְתִּין above]; מַזְזַז [cf. BA מִזְזִין]; and עֶזְזַז), yet it had disappeared as a component part of the language (cf. Noldeke, § 70, n.). Indeed, the tendency in all the Semitic languages seems to be to discard the dual. Traces of it are found also in Ethiopic and Assyrian; and it survives to a limited extent in Modern Arabic (cf. Vollers and Burkitt, p. 106; Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, 149 f.; Zimmern, 173; König, *Heb. und Sem.*, 49).

In the inscriptions, Lidzbarski (p. 397) is able to identify as duals only the Nabatean forms תַּרְתִּין, תַּרְתִּין and מִזְזִין, and the Palmyrene תַּרְתִּין.

B. AGREEMENTS BETWEEN BA AND HEBREW OCCASIONED BY THE FACT OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITHIN THE CLASS OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES

54. Most of these agreements have been discussed in connection with the preceding sections. Cf. especially, §§ 8–11, on the origin of ה and נ in the ending of feminine nouns and of nouns in the emphatic state, and in the prefix of verbal forms; 16–25, on consonantal doubling and the assimilation of נ; 26–27, on transposition of consonants; 28–31, on syncope of ה; 35, on the peculiarities of the laryngeals; 36–40, on quiescent נ; 43, on the treatment of ל and ך; 44–46, on the vocalization; 48, on the prefix ך in the imperfect; 48–51, on the Hoph'al and other verb forms; 52, on segolates; 53, on the dual.

C. AGREEMENTS BETWEEN BA AND HEBREW DUE TO ARAMAIC INFLUENCE UPON HEBREW

55. The BA doubles the first radical in forms from ע"ו roots after a formative prefix;* when there is no prefix, the second radical receives the doubling;† occasionally the latter method is also used in the former case. The first method is so peculiarly Aramaic that, wherever it occurs in Hebrew, we speak of it there as an Aramaism (GK., § 67 g; Margolis, *AJSL.*, XII [1896], 213). The examples are:

a) Pe'al, imperf. **הִרְעַ** 2, 40 with rejection of *d. forte* from **ר**; inf. **מִרְחַ** (Syr. **ܡܪܚܐ**) 4, 24; Haph'el, perf. 3 m. s. **הִרְעַל** (Syr. **ܐܪܚܐ**) 2, 25; 6, 19, with resolution of doubling by insertion of Nun; 3 f. s. **הִרְעַת** (Syr. **ܐܪܚܐ**) 2, 34, 45; 3 m. pl. **הִרְעֻקוּ** (Syr. **ܐܪܚܐ**) 6, 25; imperf. 3 f. s. **הִרְעֻקִי** (Syr. **ܐܪܚܐ**) 2, 40, 44; 2 f. s. with suff. **הִרְעֻקְנָה** 7, 23; imperative 2. m. s. with suff. **הִרְעֻלִי** (for an explanation of the form cf. Margolis, *AJSL*, XIX [1902], 45-48) 2, 24; inf. **הִרְעֻלָּה** 5, 7 and with resolution of doubling by insertion of Nun **הִרְעֻלְהָ** 4, 3; part. m. **מִרְחֻק** (Syr. **ܡܪܚܐ**) 2, 40; f. **מִרְחֻקָּה** 7, 7, 19; Hoph'al, **הִרְעַל** 5, 13; **הִרְעֻלָּה** 5, 15 (with virtual doubling of the **ע**; the *d. forte* in **ל** is similar to that in **הִרְעֻלָּה** Jud. 5, 7; **יִרְעֻלָּה** Job 29, 21, etc. In Hebrew, however, all these examples are in pause; but the regular Aramaic forms in the 3. plural correspond to the pausal forms in Hebrew; cf. GK., § 20, 2, c.). Example of a noun: **מִרְעֻלִּי** 6, 15. Kautzsch, § 60, 3, *b*, followed by others, fails to understand the form; **מִרְעֻלִּי** however, = **מִרְעֻלִּי** * = **מִרְעֻלִּי**; the variant **מִרְעֻלִּי**, on the other hand, = Syr. **ܡܪܚܐ** (cf. Behrmann *ad locum*).

b) Pe'al perfect, 3 m. s. **עַל** (Syr. **ܥܠ**) 2, 16, 24; 4, 5; 6, 11; 3 f. s. **עֻלָּה** (Syr. **ܥܠܐ** 5, 10 *k* (**עֻלָּה** *k*); **עֻלָּה** 6, 19; but contrast 3 m. pl. **עֻלָּה** (Syr. **ܥܠܐ**) 2, 35; probably for **עֻלָּה** after **עֻלָּה** analogy; impv. pl. m. **עֻלָּה** 4, 11, 20; part. pl. **עֻלָּה** (*k*) (**עֻלָּה** (*k*)) (Syr. **ܥܠܐ** or **ܥܠܐ**, see Nöldeke, § 178, B) 4, 4; 5, 8. We miss, however, a metheg: **עֻלָּה** cf. **בִּרְחֻק** above, § 25. Example of a noun: **מִרְעֻלָּה** Ez. 6, 2; cf. Syr. **ܡܪܚܐ** (Nöldeke, § 126 B).

56. Aphæresis, or loss of an initial consonant, takes place in BA in the case of **א** in the words **הָרָה** 3, 19; **הָרָה** Ez. 5, 13. In Hebrew the only regular instance appears to be **נִחְנִי** for **אִנְחִי** (cf. *ZDMG.*, 1876, 707); **הָרָה**, Ezek. 33, 30 (see, however, Cornill, 398), may be regarded as an Aramaism. In Syriac **א** loses its consonantal value in many words, and although written in the text it has the "linea occultans" and is not pronounced; e. g., **אִנְחִי**, or **אִנְחִי**. In certain words, however, **א** is always omitted in writing, e. g., **אִנְחִי**, exactly as in BA (Nöldeke, § 32). The examples which Kautzsch cites (§ 11, 3, *a*) of the first radical in the imperative of verbs **פֹּרֵץ**, e. g., **פֹּרֵץ** 5, 17; **פֹּרֵץ** 6, 16, and of verbs **פֹּרֵץ**, e. g., **פֹּרֵץ** Ez. 5, 15; **פֹּרֵץ** 3, 26 are not really examples of aphæresis, if thereby is meant "a

psycho-physiological process, not merely the absence of a letter in front. The imperative being the prefixless 'apocopatus,' the forms mentioned are direct descendants of יִשָּׂא, יִדַּע, יִהְיֶה, יִפְקֹד" (Margolis, *AJSL.*, XIX [1902], 162). This is true of verbs פ" in Syriac and in Arabic, and of verbs פ" in Syriac, as well as in Hebrew (cf. Wright, I, § 144; Nöldeke, §§ 173, 175; GK., §§ 66 *a*, *c*, 69 *b*, *h*).

57. The regular plural ending of masculine nouns in BA is יָ - . This is also the regular plural in Syriac (cf. Nöldeke, § 70). The Hebrew form מִלְכֵּי Prov. 31, 3, etc., is called an Aramaism. It illustrates the care necessary in using the term "Hebraism," "Aramaism," etc., which should indicate a form or word or grammatical peculiarity borrowed from one language by the other, but is usually applied in the grammars to a development and use in a less frequent manner of phenomena that are the rule in related languages. Thus, in this case, Kautzsch believes that the use of the plural ending יָ - in Hebrew is not to be regarded as a pure Aramaism, but as a late weakening ("Abschwächung") of the original יָ - , and cites as proof the form חֲמִשָּׁן "fifty" in l. 28 of the Mesha inscription.

The two instances of the plural ending in יָ - viz., אֲנָשִׁים 4, 14 and אֲלָפִים 7, 10 (k) (אֲלָפִין k) are not Hebraisms of the author, but are probably due to the thoughtlessness of some copyist (so Kautzsch, § 51, 2; Behrmann, 28; Kamphausen, *SBOT.*, Daniel, p. 25). So also is the form מִלְכִּים, for מִלְכֵּי Ez. 4, 13, probably a scribal error. It is possible, however, that מ here represents a dialectal variant in Aramaic. It would then be analogous to the use of לָהֶם and לָנֶם Ez. 5, 3 for לָהֶוּי 2, 35, and לָבֹוּי 3, 4 (cf. also לָהֶוּי Jer. 10, 11). The suffix הֶם occurs frequently in the inscriptions, e. g., לָהֶם Zenjirli, Bauin., 18; בִּטְנָהֶם *CIS.*, II, 145, 1; אֲלֹהֵיהֶם *ibid.*, 2; קִימִיָּהֶם *ibid.*, 3; Nabatean, נַפְשָׁהֶם וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם *CIS.*, II, 198, 2; לָהֶם *CIS.*, II, 205, 2; בְּנֵיהֶם אֲחֵרֵיהֶם *CIS.*, II, 209, ll. 2 and 5, מִנְהֶם l. 6; בְּנֵיהֶם *CIS.*, II, 158, 4 (see Haupt, *SBOT.*, Ezra 4, 13, where he refers to *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circ.* No. 114, July, 1894, p. 118, *b*).

58. BA בְּאֲדָן 2, 14; רֵאשׁ 2, 38, etc. (cf. Syriac ܪܝܫܐ) have their parallels in Hebrew רֵאשׁ inferred from רֵאשִׁית Gen. 1, 1, which one is tempted to regard as an Aramaism by the side

of the genuine Hebrew רִאשׁוֹ (cf. Arabic رَأْسُ), יִאמֵר Gen. 31, 8, etc., provided the ׀ is explained with Haupt, "The Assyrian E-Vowel," *American Journal of Philology*, October, 1887, pp. 265-291, as *imālah*. Ethiopic *re'(e)s* (*ra's* would have yielded *rō's*; Praetorius, *Athiop. Gram.*, § 16, 1), as well as Arabic رِئِيسٌ and the like, corresponding to Hebrew בִּיָּאֵר Gen. 21, 30; זִיָּאֵר Gen. 49, 27; רִיָּאֵם Num. 23, 22, etc., which Haupt regards as resolutions from בִּיָּאֵר, etc., seem to indicate that *ra's* and *ri's*, etc., represent from the beginning parallel Semitic forms (cf. also Nöldeke, *Mand.*, 16; Margolis, *AJSL.*, XII [1896], 225; XIV [1903], 162 f.; Sievers, I, 280, n. 2; Haupt, *SBOT.*, Proverbs, p. 34; *ibid.*, Isaiah, p. 88; Jäger, *BSS.*, I, 472).

59. The modification in Hebrew of Semitic *a* to *i(e)* in closed (unaccented) syllables, which is common to all Aramaic dialects (cf. above, § 46, n. 6, for BA and Syriac), is considered by Nöldeke (*Mand.*, § 16; cf. *ZDMG.*, XXII [1868], 454) as due to Aramaic influence.

This modification of *a* to *i* and *e* is, however, common to all Semitic languages, although it is most apparent in Hebrew (and therefore in the BA) because of the more exact system of vowel symbols developed by the Masoretes. It is probable that each of the three short vowels varied considerably in pronunciation, from the scarcely audible *shewa* to the so-called tone-long vowels, and that only the paucity of vowel symbols prevented these variations from being represented in writing other Semitic languages. That it is not solely Aramaic or Hebrew is proved by similar variations which occur in the spoken dialects of Modern Arabic (cf. Vollers and Burkitt, 18 ff.; and Zimmern, 39).

60. On what Margolis terms the Aramaic method in Hebrew nominal inflection, cf. *AJSL.*, XII (1896), 213 ff., where the implication is, not that this method was applied to the Hebrew of the Old Testament by the Masoretes who spoke as their vernacular an Aramaic dialect, and were therefore more or less influenced by it in their reading of the Hebrew, but that the Aramaic method is merely the one which is uniformly used in Aramaic, being ultimately based, however, on a phonetic development which had its beginning in Semitic times and

entered Hebrew at a late period, when it crossed with another phonetic development likewise originating in Semitic times (cf. above, § 57).

61. There remain a few cases of agreement between BA and Hebrew which cannot be eliminated by the process employed in our investigation. Most of these, however, are due to mechanical features of the Masora, while some are simply errors.

The BA agrees with Hebrew in the form of the demonstrative pronoun אֵלֶּה, Jer. 10, 11, and אֵלֶּה (k) אֵל (k) Ez. 5, 15. Both of these may be errors by the copyists, though not necessarily so, for the demonstrative appears in this form in some of the inscriptions; e. g., אֵל Hadad I, 29; אֵלֶּה Na., 207, 3 (cf. Lidzbarski, 264).

62. In Hebrew there is no distinction in form between the masc. and fem. of the perf. 3d pl. Similarly, in BA the *kethibh* makes no distinction, but the *kere* everywhere requires קִטְלָה for קטלו; e. g., נִפְקָה, נִפְקָה 5, 5; אֲחֻזְקָה, אֲחֻזְקָה 7, 8; and נִפְלָה, נִפְלָה 7, 20.

The question here is as to which represents the original. Kautzsch (p. 46) suggests that the original did actually distinguish between the genders in the perf. 3d pl., but that this distinction was lost through an Hebraizing textual revision, in which case the *kere* is a restitution of the original. He inclines to the supposition that the non-distinction of gender (due to Hebrew influence) is the original, and that the Masora was the first to introduce the distinction into its system of vocalization, as that distinction was familiar to it from the Targums. Bevan (p. 99 f.) also regards the *kethibh* as the original, but, unlike Kautzsch, he holds that the use of the same form for both genders is not necessarily a Hebraism, but may be due to grammatical laxity, for the same phenomenon appears in Nabatean and Modern Arabic. (Cf. Vollers and Burkitt, 36; CIS., II, 205, 1; Cooke, 221; Wright, *Comp. Gram.*, 169.)

In Ruth 1, 13 הֵלֶּהֱם may stand for הֵלֶּהם and is an instance of the same textual laxity, although most commentators take לֵהֶם here to mean "therefore" as in BA.

63. In the use of *d. lene* the Masoretes treated BA precisely like Hebrew. The spirants take *d. lene* at the beginning of a syllable unless preceded by a vowel; e. g., **בְּבֵל** 2, 18. Even this, however, may not be due to Hebrew influence, for Syriac has similar phenomena (cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gram.*, § 24). The so-called *daghesh lene orthophonum* is another instance which is simply a mechanical device to secure orthoepy. It was used no doubt to indicate the accurate pronunciation of a word, but was no part of the spoken language. It occurs in **קָדֶם-מֶלֶכָּא** 2, 10, and **טַעֲמָא** 6, 3 (cf. Kautzsch, § 9, Rem. 3; GK., § 13, 2 n.).

64. The use of the so-called *pathah-furtive* is a further instance. It is found in BA in **יֵרֶעַ** 2, 40; **יֵרֶה** 3, 27; **יֵרֶה** 4, 5. 6. 15; 5, 11. 12. 14; **שִׁלֵּה** 5, 24; Ez. 7, 14; **יֵדֵעַ** 3, 18; Ez. 4, 12. 13; 5. 8. This phonetic phenomenon most probably existed in Syriac and the other Aramaic dialects, but cannot now be discerned because of their less exact system of vowel representation.

65. The forms **יֹכֵל** 2, 10 and **חֹכֵל** (k) 5, 16, which are regarded by Kautzsch (§ 43, b) and Bevan (p. 39) as Hebraisms, are perhaps scribal errors for **יָכֵל** (as in 3, 29), **חָכֵל** (so Behrmann). Cf. the Targumic **יָכֹל**; also the Christian Palestinian dialect, in which verbs "פ" often take *ō* in the second syllable of the imperfect (cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XXII [1868], 500). Cf. also above, § 41, for **יֹכֵל** as a possible Aramaic form.

66. The use of **ִּ** for **ִּ** in pausal imperfect forms of verbs **לִּהְיוֹת** may be a Hebraism; e. g., **אֶחָדָה** 2, 24; **נִחָדָה** 2, 4; **נִהְיָה** 2, 7; **יִהְיָה** 5, 12. Kautzsch (§ 47, f) thinks that it rests upon a theory of the Masora which is just as questionable in Hebrew; cf. **וְחָיָה** Prov. 7, 2 (cf. above, § 6 e).

The few instances of **ִּ** for **ִּ** in pause may be part of the Hebraization of the text which we must assume began in late Masoretic times and has crept into certain MSS. and the ordinary editions of our OT. text. Most of these late corruptions

have been removed through the efforts of Baer, Ginsburg, and Strack. A few, however, have undoubtedly remained, and are not to be placed to the credit of the early Masora, much less to the living speech in Palestine.

Thus, the supposed Hebraisms in the grammar of the BA are reduced to a minimum which, at best, originates in a certain dialectal variety of Aramaic.