

Forgotten Books

— www.forgottenbooks.com —

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

Wilhelm GESENIUS'
"1)
HEBREW GRAMMAR

AS EDITED AND ENLARGED BY THE LATE

E. KAUTZSCH

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE

SECOND ENGLISH EDITION

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

A. E. COWLEY

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

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

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

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI CAPE TOWN IBADAN

Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University

PJ

4564

G5

1910

cop. 3

665107

18.9.57

SECOND ENGLISH EDITION 1910

REPRINTED LITHOGRAPHICALLY IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD, 1946, 1949, 1952, 1956
FROM CORRECTED SHEETS OF THE SECOND EDITION

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

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

at West Croydon. These, as well as suggestions in reviews, have all been considered, and where possible, utilized. I am also much indebted to the Press-readers for the great care which they have bestowed on the work.

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

A. C.

MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD,

Sept. 1910.

FROM THE GERMAN PREFACE

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

For full reviews of the twenty-seventh edition, which of course have been considered as carefully as possible, I have to thank Max Margolis (in *Hebraica*, 1902, p. 159 ff.), Mayer

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

Lambert (*REJ.* 1902, p. 307 ff.), and H. Oort (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1902, p. 373 ff.). For particular remarks and corrections I must thank Prof. J. Barth (Berlin), Dr. Gasser, pastor in Buchberg, Schaffhausen, B. Kirschner, of Charlottenburg, (contributions to the index of passages), Pastor Köhler, of Augst, Dr. Liebmann, of Kuczkow, Posen, Prof. Th. Nöldeke, of Strassburg, Pastor S. Preiswerk junior, of Bâle, Dr. Schwarz, of Leipzig, and Prof. B. Stade, of Giessen (died in 1906). Special mention must be made of the abundant help received from three old friends of this book, Prof. P. Haupt, of Baltimore, Prof. Knudtzon, of Kristiania, and Prof. H. Strack, of Berlin, and also, in connexion with the present edition, Prof. H. Hyvernat, of the University of Washington, who has rendered great service especially in the correction and enlargement of the indexes. I take this opportunity of thanking them all again sincerely. And I am no less grateful also to my dear colleague Prof. C. Steuernagel for the unwearying care with which he has helped me from beginning to end in correcting the proof-sheets.

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

The same answer may be made to Beer's desire (*ThLZ.* 1904,

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

.

E. KAUTZSCH.

HALLE,
July, 1909.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

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

Page 63, § 15 *p.* [See also Wickes, *Prose Accentuation*, 130 f., 87 *n.* (who, however, regards the superlinear, Babylonian system as the earlier); and Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, 76, 78. In Ginsburg's *Hebrew Bible*, ed. 2 (1908), pp. 108 f., 267 f., the two systems of division are printed *in extenso*, in parallel columns—the 10 verses of the superlinear (Babylonian) system consisting (in Exodus) of v. 2.3-6.7.8-11.12.13.14.15.16.17 (as numbered in ordinary texts), and the 12 verses of the sublinear (Palestinian) system, consisting of v. 2-3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10.11.12.13-16.17.—S. R. D.]

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

[Editions often vary in individual passages, as regards the accentuation of the first syllable: but in the 7 occurrences of נָנָן, and the 6 of נָנָן, Baer, Ginsburg, and Kittel agree in having an accent on both syllables (as נָנָן) in Gn 50¹⁷, Ex 32³¹, ψ 116¹⁶, and Metheg on the first syllable and an accent on the second syllable (as נָנָן) in 2 K 20³=Is 38³, Jon 1¹⁴, 4², ψ 116⁴, 118^{25.25}, Dn 9⁴, Ne 1^{5.11}, except that in ψ 116⁴ Ginsburg has נָנָן.—S. R. D.]

Page 79, § 22 *s*, *before* הַיְהוּדִים *insert* exceptions to *b* are. *After* Jer 39¹² *add* ψ 52⁵; *and for* Ez 9⁶ *read* Ezr 9⁶.

[So Baer (cf. his note on Jud 20¹³; also on Jer 39¹², and several of the other passages in question): but Ginsburg only in 10 of the exceptions to *b*, and Jacob ben Ḥayyim and Kittel only in 5, viz. Jer 39¹², Pr 11²¹, 15¹, ψ 52⁵, Ezr 9⁶.—S. R. D.]

Page 111, line 12, *for* הַיְהוּדִים *read* הַיְהוּדִים.

Page 123, § 45 *e*, *add*: cf. also נִהְיֶה followed by תָּא, Is 13¹⁹, Am 4¹¹ (§ 115 *d*).

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

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

Rem. According to the prevailing view, this strengthening of the first radical is merely intended to give the bi-literal stem at least

a tri-literal appearance. (Possibly aided by the analogy of verbs פ"ן, as P. Haupt has suggested to me in conversation.) But cf. Kautzsch, 'Die sog. aramaisierenden Formen der Verba y"y im Hebr.' in *Oriental. Studien zum 70. Geburtstag Th. Nöldekes*, 1906, p. 771 ff. It is there shown (1) that the sharpening of the 1st radical often serves to emphasize a particular meaning (cf. יָגַר, but יִנְרָהוּ, יַחַל and יַחַל, יִסַּב and יִסַּב, יִשָּׂם and יִשָּׂם), and elsewhere no doubt to dissimilate the vowels (as יָגַר, יָדַל, never יִגַּר, יִדַּל, &c.): (2) that the sharpening of the 1st radical often appears to be occasioned by the nature of the first letter of the stem, especially when it is a sibilant. Whether the masoretic pronunciation is based on an early tradition, or the Masora has arbitrarily adopted aramaizing forms to attain the above objects, must be left undecided.

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

Page 200, § 72 z, line 2, after Est 2¹⁸ add 4¹⁴.

Page 232, § 84^a s, add שִׁמְמָה 2 S 13²⁰.

Page 236, § 85 c, add הַנְּזִיקָה Ezz 4²².

Page 273, § 93 qq end, add מוֹסְרוֹת Jer 5⁵, רַבְעִים, שְׁלִשִׁים Ez 20⁵, שִׁמְמוֹת Is 49⁸, שִׁמְמִים La 1¹⁶ (cf. König, ii. 109).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

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

- AJSL.* = American Journal of Semitic Languages.
CIS. = Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.
Ed.Mant. = Biblia Hebraica ex recensione Sal. Norzi edidit Raphael Hayyim Basila, Mantuae 1742-4.
Jabl. = Biblia Hebraica ex recensione D. E. Jablonski, Berolini, 1699.
JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review.
*KAT.*³ = Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, 3rd ed. by H. Zimmern and H. Winckler, 2 vols., Berlin, 1902 f.
Lexicon = A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius, by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, Oxford, 1906.
NB. = J. Barth, Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. Lpz. 1889-94.
NGGW. = Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.
OLZ. = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung. Vienna, 1898 ff.
PRE. = Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3rd ed. by A. Hauck. Lpz. 1896 ff.
PSBA = Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology. London, 1879 ff.
REJ. = Revue des Études Juives. Paris, 1880 ff.
Sam. = The (Hebrew) Pentateuch of the Samaritans.
SBOT. = Sacred Books of the Old Testament, ed. by P. Haupt. Lpz. and Baltimore, 1893 ff.
ThLZ. = Theologische Literaturzeitung, ed. by E. Schürer. Lpz. 1876 ff.
VB. = Vorderasiatische Bibliothek, ed. by A. Jeremias and H. Winckler. Lpz. 1907 ff.
ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete, ed. by C. Bezold. Lpz. 1886 ff.
ZAW. = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.
ZDMG. = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.
ZDPV. = Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins, Lpz. 1878 ff., since 1903 ed. by C. Steuernagel.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	x
TABLE OF EARLY SEMITIC ALPHABETS	
SILOAM INSCRIPTION	

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. The Semitic Languages in General	1
§ 2. Sketch of the History of the Hebrew Language	8
§ 3. Grammatical Treatment of the Hebrew Language	17
§ 4. Division and Arrangement of the Grammar	22

FIRST PART

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES, OR THE SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

CHAPTER I. THE INDIVIDUAL SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

§ 5. The Consonants: their Forms and Names	24
§ 6. Pronunciation and Division of Consonants	31
§ 7. The Vowels in General, Vowel Letters and Vowel Signs	35
§ 8. The Vowel Signs in particular	39
§ 9. Character of the several Vowels	45
§ 10. The Half Vowels and the Syllable Divider (Š ^e wâ)	51
§ 11. Other Signs which affect the Reading	54
§ 12. Dageš in general, and Dageš forte in particular	55
§ 13. Dageš lene	56
§ 14. Mappîq and Rāphè	56
§ 15. The Accents	57
§ 16. Of Maqqēph and Mèthĕg	63
§ 17. Of the Q ^r ê and K ^e thîbh. Masora marginalis and finalis	65

CHAPTER II. PECULIARITIES AND CHANGES OF LETTERS: THE SYLLABLE AND THE TONE

§ 18. In general	68
§ 19. Changes of Consonants	68
§ 20. The Strengthening (Sharpening) of Consonants	70

	PAGE
§ 21. The Aspiration of the Tenues	75
§ 22. Peculiarities of the Gutturals	76
§ 23. The Feebleness of the Gutturals \aleph and η	79
§ 24. Changes of the Weak Letters $\dot{\iota}$ and $\dot{\nu}$	82
§ 25. Unchangeable Vowels	84
§ 26. Syllable-formation and its Influence on the Quantity of Vowels	85
§ 27. The Change of the Vowels, especially as regards Quantity .	88
§ 28. The Rise of New Vowels and Syllables	92
§ 29. The Tone, its Changes, and the Pause	94

SECOND PART

ETYMOLOGY, OR THE PARTS OF SPEECH

§ 30. Stems and Roots; Biliteral, Triliteral, and Quadriliteral .	99
§ 31. Grammatical Structure	103

CHAPTER I. THE PRONOUN

§ 32. The Personal Pronoun. The Separate Pronoun	105
§ 33. Pronominal Suffixes	108
§ 34. The Demonstrative Pronoun	109
§ 35. The Article	110
§ 36. The Relative Pronoun	112
§ 37. The Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns	113

CHAPTER II. THE VERR

§ 38. General View	114
§ 39. Ground-form and Derived Stems	114
§ 40. Tenses. Moods. Flexion	117
§ 41. Variations from the Ordinary Form of the Strong Verb .	118

I. The Strong Verb.

§ 42. In general.	118
---------------------------	-----

A. The Pure Stem, or Qal.

§ 43. Its Form and Meaning	118
§ 44. Flexion of the Perfect of Qal	119
§ 45. The Infinitive	122
§ 46. The Imperative	124
§ 47. The Imperfect and its Inflexion	125
§ 48. Shortening and Lengthening of the Imperfect and Imperative. The Jussive and Cohortative	129
§ 49. The Perfect and Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive	132
§ 50. The Participle	136

B. *Verba Derivativa, or Derived Conjugations.*

	PAGE
§ 51. Niph'al	137
§ 52. Pi'el and Pu'al	139
§ 53. Hiph'il and Hoph'al	144
§ 54. Hithpa'el	149
§ 55. Less Common Conjugations	151
§ 56. Quadrilaterals	153

C. *Strong Verb with Pronominal Suffixes.*

§ 57. In general	154
§ 58. The Pronominal Suffixes of the Verb	155
§ 59. The Perfect with Pronominal Suffixes	158
§ 60. Imperfect with Pronominal Suffixes	160
§ 61. Infinitive, Imperative and Participle with Pronominal Suffixes	162

Verbs with Gutturals.

§ 62. In general	164
§ 63. Verbs First Guttural	165
§ 64. Verbs Middle Guttural	169
§ 65. Verbs Third Guttural	171

II. **The Weak Verb.**

§ 66. Verbs Primae Radicalis Nûn (י"ד)	173
§ 67. Verbs י"י	175

The Weakest Verbs (Verba Quiescentia).

§ 68. Verbs נ"ד	184
§ 69. Verbs י"ד. First Class, or Verbs originally י"ד	186
§ 70. Verbs י"ד. Second Class, or Verbs properly י"ד	192
§ 71. Verbs י"ד. Third Class, or Verbs with Yôdh assimilated	193
§ 72. Verbs י"י	194
§ 73. Verbs middle <i>i</i> (vulgo י"י)	202
§ 74. Verbs נ"ל	205
§ 75. Verbs ה"ל	207
§ 76. Verbs Doubly Weak	217
§ 77. Relation of the Weak Verbs to one another	219
§ 78. Verba Defectiva	219

CHAPTER III. THE NOUN

§ 79. General View	221
§ 80. The Indication of Gender in Nouns	222
§ 81. Derivation of Nouns	225
§ 82. Primitive Nouns	225

	PAGE
§ 83. Verbal Nouns in General	226
§ 84 ^a . Nouns derived from the Simple Stem	227
§ 84 ^b . Formation of Nouns from the Intensive Stem	233
§ 85. Nouns with Preformatives and Afformatives	235
§ 86. Denominative Nouns	239
§ 87. Of the Plural	241
§ 88. Of the Dual	244
§ 89. The Genitive and the Construct State	247
§ 90. Real and supposed Remains of Early Case-endings	248
§ 91. The Noun with Pronominal Suffixes	254
§ 92. Vowel Changes in the Noun	260
§ 93. Paradigms of Masculine Nouns	262
§ 94. Formation of Feminine Nouns	275
§ 95. Paradigms of Feminine Nouns	276
§ 96. Nouns of Peculiar Formation	281
§ 97. Numerals. (a) Cardinal Numbers	286
§ 98. Numerals. (b) Ordinal Numbers	292

CHAPTER IV. THE PARTICLES

§ 99. General View	293
§ 100. Adverbs	294
§ 101. Prepositions	297
§ 102. Prefixed Prepositions	298
§ 103. Prepositions with Pronominal Suffixes and in the Plural Form	300
§ 104. Conjunctions	305
§ 105. Interjections	307

THIRD PART

SYNTAX

CHAPTER I. THE PARTS OF SPEECH

I. Syntax of the Verb.

A. Use of the Tenses and Moods.

§ 106. Use of the Perfect	309
§ 107. Use of the Imperfect	313
§ 108. Use of the Cohortative	319
§ 109. Use of the Jussive	321
§ 110. The Imperative	324
§ 111. The Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive	326
§ 112. The Perfect with Wāw Consecutive	330

B. The Infinitive and Participle.

	PAGE
§ 113. The Infinitive Absolute	339
§ 114. The Infinitive Construct	347
§ 115. Construction of the Infinitive Construct with Subject and Object	352
§ 116. The Participles	355

C. The Government of the Verb.

§ 117. The Direct Subordination of the Noun to the Verb as Accusative of the Object. The Double Accusative . .	362
§ 118. The Looser Subordination of the Accusative to the Verb .	372
§ 119. The Subordination of Nouns to the Verb by means of Prepositions	377
§ 120. Verbal Ideas under the Government of a Verb. Co-ordination of Complementary Verbal Ideas	385
§ 121. Construction of Passive Verbs	387

II. Syntax of the Noun.

§ 122. Indication of the Gender of the Noun	389
§ 123. The Representation of Plural Ideas by means of Collectives, and by the Repetition of Words	394
§ 124. The Various Uses of the Plural-Form	396
§ 125. Determination of Nouns in general. Determination of Proper Names	401
§ 126. Determination by means of the Article	404
§ 127. The Noun determined by a following Determinate Genitive .	410
§ 128. The Indication of the Genitive Relation by means of the Construct State	414
§ 129. Expression of the Genitive by Circumlocution	419
§ 130. Wider Use of the Construct State	421
§ 131. Apposition	423
§ 132. Connexion of the Substantive with the Adjective	427
§ 133. The Comparison of Adjectives. (Periphrastic expression of the Comparative and Superlative)	429
§ 134. Syntax of the Numerals	432

III. Syntax of the Pronoun.

§ 135. The Personal Pronoun	437
§ 136. The Demonstrative Pronoun	442
§ 137. The Interrogative Pronoun	443
§ 138. The Relative Pronoun	444
§ 139. Expression of Pronominal Ideas by means of Substantives .	447

CHAPTER II. THE SENTENCE

I. The Sentence in General.

	PAGE
§ 140. Noun-clauses, Verbal-clauses, and the Compound Sentence	450
§ 141. The Noun-clause	451
§ 142. The Verbal-clause	455
§ 143. The Compound Sentence	457
§ 144. Peculiarities in the Representation of the Subject (especially in the Verbal-clause)	459
§ 145. Agreement between the Members of a Sentence, especially between Subject and Predicate, in respect of Gender and Number	462
§ 146. Construction of Compound Subjects	467
§ 147. Incomplete Sentences	469

II. Special Kinds of Sentences.

§ 148. Exclamations	471
§ 149. Sentences which express an Oath or Asseveration	471
§ 150. Interrogative Sentences	473
§ 151. Desiderative Sentences	476
§ 152. Negative Sentences	478
§ 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses	483
§ 154. Sentences connected by Wāw	484
§ 155. Relative Clauses	485
§ 156. Circumstantial Clauses	489
§ 157. Object-clauses (Oratio Obliqua)	491
§ 158. Causal Clauses	492
§ 159. Conditional Sentences	493
§ 160. Concessive Clauses	498
§ 161. Comparative Clauses	499
§ 162. Disjunctive Sentences	500
§ 163. Adversative and Exceptive Clauses	500
§ 164. Temporal Clauses	501
§ 165. Final Clauses	503
§ 166. Consecutive Clauses	504
§ 167. Aposiopesis, Anacoluthon, Involved Series of Sentences	505
PARADIGMS	507
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	533
INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS	544
INDEX OF PASSAGES	565



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies



THE SILOAM INSCRIPTION. From Müller-Benzinger, *Landschaftsbilderbibel* (H. Grund : Berlin).

HEBREW GRAMMAR

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. *The Semitic Languages in General.*

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

1. The Hebrew language is one branch of a great family of languages in Western Asia which was indigenous in Palestine, Phoenicia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Assyria, and Arabia, that is to say, in the countries extending from the Mediterranean to the other side of the Euphrates and Tigris, and from the mountains of Armenia to the southern coast of Arabia. In early times, however, it spread from Arabia over Abyssinia, and by means of Phoenician colonies over many islands and sea-boards of the Mediterranean, as for instance to the Carthaginian coast. No comprehensive designation is found in early times for the languages and nations of this family; the name *Semites* or *Semitic*¹ *languages* (based upon the fact that according to Gn 10²¹ ff. almost all nations speaking these languages are descended from Shem) is, however, now generally accepted, and has accordingly been retained here.²

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

² From Shem are derived (Gn 10²¹ ff.) the Aramaean and Arab families as well as the Hebrews, but not the Canaanites (Phoenicians), who are traced back to Ham (vv. 6-15 ff.), although their language belongs decidedly to what is now called Semitic. The language of the Babylonians and Assyrians also was long ago shown to be Semitic, just as Aššur (Gn 10²²) is included among the sons of Shem.

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

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

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

c III. The North Semitic or Aramaic branch. The subdivisions of this are—(1) The Eastern Aramaic or Syriac, the literary language of the Christian Syrians. The religious books of the Mandaeans (Nasoraean, Sabians, also called the disciples of St. John) represent a very debased offshoot of this. A Jewish modification of Syriac is to be seen in the language of the Babylonian Talmud. (2) The Western or Palestinian Aramaic, incorrectly called also 'Chaldee'.² This latter dialect is represented in the Old Testament by two words in Gn 31⁴⁷, by the verse Jer 10¹¹, and the sections Dn 2⁴ to 7²⁸; Eze 4⁸ to 6¹⁸, and 7¹²⁻²⁶, as well as by a number of non-Jewish inscriptions and Jewish papyri (see below, under *m*), but especially by a considerable section of Jewish literature (Targums, Palestinian Gemara, &c.). To the same branch belongs also the Samaritan, with its admixture of Hebrew forms, and, except for the rather Arabic colouring of the proper names, the idiom of the Nabataean inscriptions in the Sinaitic peninsula, in the East of Palestine, &c.

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

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

On the importance of Assyrian for Hebrew philology especially from a lexicographical point of view cf. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen*

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

² In a wider sense *all* Jewish Aramaic is sometimes called 'Chaldee'.

hebr.-aram. Wörterbuchs zum A. T., Lpz. 1886; P. Haupt, 'Assyrian Phonology, &c.', in *Hebraica*, Chicago, Jan. 1885, vol. i. 3; Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1906.

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

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

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

3. The *grammatical structure* of the Semitic family of languages, as compared with that of other languages, especially the Indo-Germanic, exhibits numerous peculiarities which collectively constitute its distinctive character, although many of them are found singly in other languages. These are—(a) among the consonants, which in fact form the substance of these languages, occur peculiar gutturals of different grades; the vowels are subject, within the same consonantal framework, to great changes in order to express various modifications of the same stem-meaning; (b) the word-stems are almost invariably triliteral, i.e. composed of three consonants; (c) the verb is restricted to two tense-forms, with a peculiarly regulated use; (d) the noun has only two genders (masc. and fem.); and peculiar expedients are adopted for the purpose of indicating the case-relations; (e) the

¹ Hommel, *Grundriss der Geogr. und Gesch. des alten Orients*, Munich, 1904, p. 75 ff., prefers to distinguish them as Eastern and Western Semitic branches. Their geographical position, however, is of less importance than the genealogical relation of the various groups of dialects, as rightly pointed out by A. Jeremias in *Th.LZ.* 1906, col. 291.

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

oblique cases of the personal pronoun, as well as all the possessive pronouns and the pronominal object of the verb, are denoted by forms appended directly to the governing word (suffixes); (*f*) the almost complete absence of compounds both in the noun (with the exception of many proper names) and in the verb; (*g*) great simplicity in the expression of syntactical relations, e. g. the small number of particles, and the prevalence of simple co-ordination of clauses without periodic structure. Classical Arabic and Syriac, however, form a not unimportant exception as regards the last-mentioned point.

g 4. From a lexicographical point of view also the vocabulary of the Semites differs essentially from that of the Indo-Germanic languages, although there is apparently more agreement here than in the grammar. A considerable number of Semitic roots and stems agree in sound with synonyms in the Indo-Germanic family. But apart from expressions actually borrowed (see below, under *i*), the real similarity may be reduced to imitative words (onomatopoeica), and to those in which one and the same idea is represented by similar sounds in consequence of a formative instinct common to the most varied families of language. Neither of these proves any *historic* or *generic* relation, for which an agreement in grammatical structure would also be necessary.

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

h As onomatopoeic words, or as stem-sounds of a similar character, we may compare, e. g. לָקַץ, לָחַץ, λείχω, *lingo*, Skt. *lih*, Eng. *to lick*, Fr. *lécher*, Germ. *lecken*; גָּלַל (cf. אָגַל, עָגַל) κυλίω, *volvo*, Germ. *quellen*, *wallen*, Eng. *to well*; גָּרַד, חָרַט, חָרַת, χαράττω, Pers. *khâridan*, Ital. *grattare*, Fr. *gratter*, Eng. *to grate*, *to scratch*, Germ. *kratzen*; פָּרַק *frango*, Germ. *brechen*, &c.; Reuss, *Gesch. der hl. Schriften A.T.'s*, Braunsch. 1881, p. 38, draws attention moreover to the Semitic equivalents for *earth*, *six*, *seven*, *horn*, *to sound*, *to measure*, *to mix*, *to smell*, *to place*, *clear*, *to kneel*, *raven*, *goat*, *ox*, &c. An example of a somewhat different kind is *am*, *ham* (*sam*), *gam*, *kam*, in the sense of the German *samt*, *zusammen*, *together*; in Hebrew אָמַם (whence אָמַם *people*, properly *assembly*), אָמַם (with) *samt*, אָמַם also, *moreover*, Arab. أَمَمَ *to collect*; Pers. *ham*, *hamah* (*at the same time*); Skt. *samā* (*with*), Gk. ἄμα (*ἄμφω*), δμός, δμοῦ (*ὄμιλος*, *ὄμαδος*), and harder κοινός, Lat. *cum*, *cumulus*, *cunctus*; with the corresponding sibilant Skt. *sam*, Gk. σύν, ξύν, ξυνός = κοινός, Goth. *sama*, Germ. *samt*, *sammeln*; but many of these instances are doubtful.

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



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

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

l See the Table of Alphabets at the beginning of the Grammar, which shows the relations of the older varieties of Semitic writing to one another and especially the origin of the present Hebrew characters from their primitive forms. For a more complete view, see Gesenius' *Scripturae linguaeque Phoeniciae monumenta*, Lips. 1837, 4to, pt. i. p. 15 ff., and pt. iii. tab. 1-5. From numerous monuments since discovered, our knowledge of the Semitic characters, especially the Phoenician, has become considerably enlarged and more accurate. Cf. the all but exhaustive bibliography (from 1616 to 1896) in Lidzbarski's *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, i. p. 4 ff., and on the origin of the Semitic alphabet, *ibid.*, p. 173 ff., and *Ephemeris* (see the heading of § 1 a above), i. pp. 109 ff., 142, 261 ff., and his 'Altsemitische Texte', pt. i, *Kanaanäische Inschriften* (Moabite, Old-Hebrew, Phoenician, Punic), Giessen, 1907.—On the origin and development of the *Hebrew* characters and the best tables of alphabets, see § 5 a, last note, and especially § 5 e.

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

The earliest non-Jewish *Aramaic* inscriptions known to us are that of 𐤎𐤏𐤍 king of Hamath (early eighth cent. B.C.), on which see Nöldeke, *ZA.* 1908, p. 376, and that found at Teima, in N. Arabia, in 1880, probably of the fifth cent. B.C., cf. E. Littmann in the *Monist*, xiv. 4 [and Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 195]. The monuments of Kalammus of Sam'al, in the reign of Shalmanezar II, 859-829 B.C. (cf. A. Šanda, *Die Aramäer*, Lpz. 1902, p. 26), and those found in 1888-1891 at Zenzjrlî in N. Syria, including the Hadad inscription of thirty-four lines (early eighth cent. B.C.) and the Panammu inscription (740 B.C.), are not in pure Aramaic. The Jewish-Aramaic writings begin about the time of Cyrus (cf. *Ezr* 6³ ff.), specially important being the papyri from Assuan ed. by Sayce and Cowley, London, 1906 (and in a cheaper form by Staerk, Bonn, 1907), which are precisely dated from 471 to 411 B.C., and three others of 407 B.C. ed. by Sachau, Berlin, 1907.

¹ According to Hilprecht, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, i. p. 11 ff., the inscriptions found at Nippur embrace the period from about 4000 to 450 B.C.

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

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

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

Fuller proof of the above statements belongs to the comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages. It follows, however, from what has been said: (1) that the Hebrew language, as found in the sacred literature of the Jews, has, in respect

¹ Even now the language of some of the Bèdawî is much purer and more archaic than that of the town Arabs. It must, however, be admitted that the former exalted estimate of the primitiveness of Arabic has been moderated in many respects by the most recent school of Semitic philology. Much apparently original is to be regarded with Nöldeke (*Die semit. Spr.*, p. 5 [= *Encycl. Brit.*, ed. 9, art. SEMITIC LANGUAGES, p. 642]) only as a modification of the original. The assertion that the Arabs exhibit Semitic characteristics in their purest form, should, according to Nöldeke, be rather that 'the inhabitants of the desert lands of Arabia, under the influence of the extraordinarily monotonous scenery and of a life continually the same amid continual change, have developed most exclusively some of the principal traits of the Semitic race'.

to its organic structure, already suffered more considerable losses than the Arabic, which appears much later on the historical horizon; (2) that, notwithstanding this fact, we cannot at once and in all points concede priority to the latter; (3) that it is a mistake to consider with some that the Aramaic, on account of its simplicity (which is only due to the decay of its organic structure), is the oldest form of Semitic speech.

§ 2. Sketch of the History of the Hebrew Language.

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

a 1. The name *Hebrew Language* usually denotes the language of the sacred writings of the Israelites which form the canon of the *Old Testament*. It is also called *Ancient Hebrew* in contradistinction to the New Hebrew of Jewish writings of the post-biblical period (§ 3 a). The name Hebrew language (לְשׁוֹן עִבְרִית) γλωσσα τῶν Ἑβραίων, ἑβραϊστί) does not occur in the Old Testament itself. Instead of it we find in Is 19¹⁸ the term *language of Canaan*,¹ and יהוֹדֵיָא in the *Jews' language* 2 K 18^{26.28} (cf. Is 36^{11.13}) Neh 13²⁴. In the last-cited passage it already agrees with the later (post-exilic) usage, which gradually extended the name *Jews, Jewish* to the whole nation, as in Haggai, Nehemiah, and the book of Esther.

b The distinction between the names *Hebrew* (עִבְרִים 'Εβραῖοι) and *Israelites* (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) is that the latter was rather a national name of honour, with also a religious significance, employed by the people themselves, while the former appears as the less significant name by which the nation was known amongst foreigners. Hence in the Old Testament *Hebrews* are only spoken of either when the name is employed by themselves as contrasted with foreigners (Gn 40¹⁶, Ex 2^{6 f.} 3¹⁸ &c., Jon 1⁹) or when it is put in the mouth of those who are not Israelites (Gn 39^{14.17} 41¹² &c.) or, finally, when it is used in opposition to other nations (Gn 14¹³ 43³², Ex 2^{11.13} 21²). In 1 S 13^{3.7} and 14²¹ the text is clearly corrupt. In the Greek and Latin authors, as well as in Josephus, the name Ἑβραῖοι, Hebraei,² &c., alone occurs. Of the many explanations of the gentile עִבְרִי, the derivation from עֵבֶר a country on the other side with the derivative suffix י־ (§ 86 h) appears to be the only one philologically possible. The name accordingly denoted the Israelites as being those who inhabited the 'eber, i. e. the district on the other side of the Jordan (or according to others the Euphrates), and would therefore originally be only appropriate when used by the nations on this side of the Jordan or Euphrates. We must, then, suppose that after the crossing of the river in question it had been retained by the Abrahamidae as an old-established name, and within certain limits

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

² The Graeco-Roman form of the name is not directly derived from the Hebrew עִבְרִי, but from the Palestinian Aramaic 'ebrāyā, 'the Hebrew.'

(see above) had become naturalized among them. In referring this name to the patronymic Eber, the Hebrew genealogists have assigned to it a much more comprehensive signification. For since in Gn 10²¹ (Nu 24²⁴ does not apply) Shem is called the *father of all the children of Eber*, and to the latter there also belonged according to Gn 11¹⁴ ff. and 10²⁵ ff. Aramean and Arab races, the name, afterwards restricted in the form of the gentile 'ibri exclusively to the Israelites, must have originally included a considerably larger group of countries and nations. The etymological significance of the name must in that case not be insisted upon.¹

The term *ἑβραϊστί* is first used, to denote the old Hebrew, in the prologue C to Jesus the son of Sirach (about 130 B. C.), and in the New Testament, Rv 9¹¹. On the other hand it serves in Jn 5², 19¹³⁻¹⁷ perhaps also in 19²⁰ and Rv 16¹⁶ to denote what was then the (Aramaic) vernacular of Palestine as opposed to the Greek. The meaning of the expression *ἑβραῖς διάλεκτος* in Acts 21⁴⁰, 22², and 26¹⁴ is doubtful (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 19 f.). Josephus also uses the term *Hebrew* both of the old Hebrew and of the Aramaic vernacular of his time.

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

2. With the exception of the Old Testament (and apart from the *d* Phoenician inscriptions; see below, *f-h*), only very few remains of old Hebrew or old Canaanitish literature have been preserved. Of the latter—(1) an inscription, unfortunately much injured, of thirty-four lines, which was found in the ancient territory of the tribe of Reuben, about twelve miles to the east of the Dead Sea, among the ruins of the city of Dîbôn (now Dîbân), inhabited in earlier times by the Gadites, afterwards by the Moabites. In it the Moabite king Mêša' (about 850 B. C.) recounts his battles with Israel (cf. 2 K 3⁴ ff.), his buildings, and other matters.² Of old Hebrew: (2) an inscription

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

² This monument, unique of its kind, was first seen in August, 1868, on the spot, by the German missionary F. A. Klein. It was afterwards broken into pieces by the Arabs, so that only an incomplete copy of the inscription could be made. Most of the fragments are now in the Louvre in Paris. For the history of the discovery and for the earlier literature relating to the stone, see Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, i. pp. 103 f., 415 f., and in the bibliography (under Me), p. 39 ff. The useful reproduction and translation of the inscription by Smend and Socin (Freiburg in Baden, 1886) was afterwards revised and improved by Nordlander, *Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab*, Lpz. 1896; by Socin and Holzinger, 'Zur Mesainschrift' (*Berichte der K. Sächsischen Gesell. d. Wiss.*, Dec. 1897); and by Lidzbarski, 'Eine Nachprüfung der Mesainschrift' (*Ephemeris*, i. 1, p. 1 ff.; text in his *Altsemitische Texte*, pt. 1, Giessen, 1907); J. Halévy, *Revue Sémitique*, 1900, pp. 236 ff., 289 ff., 1901, p. 297 ff.; M. J. Lagrange, *Revue biblique internationale*, 1901, p. 522 ff.; F. Prætorius in *ZDMG.* 1905, p. 33 ff., 1906, p. 402. Its genuineness was attacked by A. Löwy, *Die Echtheit der Moabit. Inschr. im Louvre* (Wien, 1903), and G. Jahn in *Das Buch Daniel*, Lpz. 1904, p. 122 ff. (also in *ZDMG.* 1905, p. 723 ff.), but without justification, as shown by E. König in *ZDMG.* 1905, pp. 233 ff. and 743 ff. [Cf. also Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford, 1890, p. lxxxv ff.; Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 1 ff.]

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

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

f To this old Hebrew, the language of the Canaanitish or Phoenician⁴ stocks came the nearest of all the Semitic languages, as is evident partly from the many Canaanitish names of persons and places with a Hebrew form and meaning which occur in the Old Testament (e.g. מַלְכֵי-צָדֶק, קִרְיַת סַפֵּר, &c.;

¹ Of this inscription—unfortunately not dated, but linguistically and palaeographically very important—referring to the boring of the tunnel, a facsimile is given at the beginning of this grammar. See also Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, i. 105, 163, 439 (bibliography, p. 56 ff.; facsimile, vol. ii, plate xxi, 1); on the new drawing of it by Socin (*ZDPV.* xxii. p. 61 ff. and separately published at Freiburg i. B. 1899), see Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 53 ff. and 310 f. (text in *Altsemit. Texte*, p. 9 f.). Against the view of A. Fischer (*ZDMG.* 1902, p. 800 f.) that the six lines are the continuation of an inscription which was never executed, see Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, ii. 71. The inscription was removed in 1890, and broken into six or seven pieces in the process. It has since been well restored, and is now in the Imperial Museum at Constantinople. If, as can hardly be doubted, the name שֶׁלֶחַ (i. e. *emissio*) Is 8⁶ refers to the discharge of water from the Virgin's Spring, through the tunnel (so Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. 594), then the latter, and consequently the inscription, was already in existence about 736 B. C. [Cf. Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 15 ff.]

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

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

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

on 'Canaanite glosses'¹ to Assyrian words in the cuneiform tablets of Tell-el-Amarna [about 1400 B.C.] cf. H. Winekler, 'Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna,' in *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, vol. v, Berlin, 1896 f. [transcription and translation]; J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, Lpz. 1907 f.; H. Zimmern, *ZA.* 1891, p. 154 ff. and *KAT.*³, p. 651 ff.), and partly from the numerous remains of the Phoenician and Punic languages.

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

Phoenician (Punic) words occurring in inscriptions are, e.g. אל God, *g* אדם man, בן son, בת daughter, מלך king, עבד servant, כהן priest, זבח sacrifice, בעל lord, שמש sun, ארץ land, ים sea, אבן stone, כסף silver, ברזל iron, שמן oil, עת time, קבר grave, מצבת monument, מקום place, משכב bed, כל all, אחד one, שנים two, שלש three, ארבע four, חמש five, שש six, שבע seven, עשר ten, כן (=Hebr. היה) to be, שמע to hear, פתח to open, נדר to vow, ברך to bless, בקש to seek, &c. Proper names: צרן Sidon, צר Tyre, חנא Hanno, חנבעל Hannibal, &c. See the complete vocabulary in Lidzbarski, *Nordsem. Epigr.*, i. 204 ff.

Variations from Hebrew in Phoenician orthography and inflection are, *h* e.g. the almost invariable omission of the vowel letters (§ 7 b), as בת for בית house, קל for קול voice, צרן for צידון, כהנם for כהֲנִים priests, אלנם (in Plaut. *alonim*) gods; the fem., even in the absolute state, ending in ת (*ath*) (§ 80 b) as well as נ (*ô*), the relative ש (Hebr. אֲשֶׁר), &c. The differences in pronunciation are more remarkable, especially in Punic, where the *i* was regularly pronounced as *û*, e.g. שֹׁפֵט *sûfêt* (judge), שָׁלוֹשׁ *sâlûs* (three), רִשׁ *rûs* = ראש head; *i* and *e* often as the obscure dull sound of *y*, e.g. הַיִּנְנִי *ynnynnu* (ecce eum), אַת (*ait*) *yth*; the *ç* as *o*, e.g. מֹעַקֵר *Mocar* (cf. מֹעֲכָה LXX, Gn 22²⁴ Μωχά). See the collection of the grammatical peculiarities in Gesenius, *Monumenta Phoenicia*, p. 430 ff.; Paul Schröder, *Die phöniz. Sprache*, Halle, 1869; B. Stade, 'Erneute Prüfung des zwischen dem Phöniz. und Hebr. bestehenden Verwandtschaftsgrades,' in the *Morgenländ. Forschungen*, Lpz. 1875, p. 169 ff.

4. As the Hebrew writing on monuments and coins mentioned *i* in *d* consists only of consonants, so also the writers of the Old

¹ Cf. inter alia: *aparu*, also *haparu* (Assyr. *epru*, *ipru*) = עָפַר; *hullu* = עָל (with hard *ç*; cf. § 6 c, and Assyr. *humri* = עָמְרִי, *hazzatu* = עָזָה); *iazkur* = יִזְכֹּר, *zuruhu* = זָרַע, *abadat* = אֲבָדָה, *šahri* = שַׁעַר, gate; *batnu* = בֶּטֶן, belly; *kilûbi* = כְּלוֹב, net; *šaduk* = צָדִיק (צַדִּיק), &c. [Cf. Böhl, *Die Sprache d. Amarnabriefe*, Lpz. 1909.]

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

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

Although the systematic investigation of the linguistic development indicated above belongs to comparative Semitic philology, it is nevertheless indispensable for the scientific treatment of Hebrew to refer to the ground-forms¹ so far as they can be ascertained and to compare the corresponding forms in Arabic. Even elementary grammar which treats of the forms of the language occurring in the Old Testament frequently requires, for their explanation, a reference to these ground-forms.

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

m To the former belongs, apart from isolated traces of a later revision, the larger half of the Old Testament books, viz. (*a*) of the prose and historical writings, a large part of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; (*b*) of the poetical, perhaps

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



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

embellishments which the Hebrew poets who knew Aramaic adopted into their language.¹

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

γ On the *rhythm* of Hebrew poetry, see besides the Commentaries on the poetical books and Introductions to the O. T., J. Ley, *Grundzüge des Rhythmus*, &c., Halle, 1875; *Leitfaden der Metrik der hebr. Poesie*, Halle, 1887; 'Die metr. Beschaffenheit des B. Hiob,' in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1895, iv, 1897, i; Grimme, 'Abriss der bibl.-hebr. Metrik,' *ZDMG.* 1896, p. 529 ff., 1897, p. 683 ff.; *Psalmenprobleme, &c.*, Freiburg (Switzerland), 1902 (on which see Beer in *ThLZ.* 1903, no. 11); 'Gedanken über hebr. Metrik,' in *Altschüler's Vierteljahrschrift*, i (1903), 1 ff.; Döllner, *Rhythmus, Metrik u. Strophik in d. bibl.-hebr. Poesie*, Paderborn, 1899; Schloegl, *De re metrica veterum Hebraeorum disputatio*, Vindobonae, 1899 (on the same lines as Grimme); but especially Ed. Sievers, *Metrische Studien*: i *Studien zur hebr. Metrik*, pt. 1 *Untersuchungen*, pt. 2 *Textproben*, Lpz. 1901: ii *Die hebr. Genesis*, 1 *Texte*, 2 *Zur Quellenscheidung u. Textkritik*, Lpz. 1904 f.: iii *Samuel*, Lpz. 1907; *Amos metrisch bearbeitet* (with H. Guthe), Lpz. 1907; and his *Alttest. Miscellen* (1 *Is 24-27*, 2 *Jona*, 3 *Deutero-Zechariah*, 4 *Malachi*, 5 *Hosea*, 6 *Joel*, 7 *Obadiah*, 8 *Zephaniah*, 9 *Haggai*, 10 *Micah*), Lpz. 1904-7.—As a guide to Sievers' system (with some criticism of his principles) see Baumann, 'Die Metrik u. das A. T.,' in the *Theol. Rundschau*, viii (1905), 41 ff.; W. H. Cobb, *A criticism of systems of Hebrew Metre*, Oxford, 1905; Cornill, *Einleitung ins A. T.*⁵, Tübingen, 1905, p. 11 ff.; Rothstein, *Zeitschr. für d. ev. Rel.-Unterricht*, 1907, p. 188 ff. and his *Grundzüge des hebr. Rhythmus*, Lpz. 1909 (also separately *Psalmentexte u. der Text des Hohen Liedes*, Lpz. 1909); W. R. Arnold, 'The rhythms of the ancient Heb.,' in *O. T. and Semitic Studies in memory of W. R. Harper*, i. 165 ff., Chicago, 1907, according to whom the number of syllables between the beats is only limited by the physiological possibilities of phonetics; C. v. Orelli, 'Zur Metrik der alttest. Prophetenschriften,' in his *Kommentar zu den kl. Propheten*³, p. 236 ff., Munich, 1908.—In full agreement with Sievers is Baethgen, *Psalmen*³, p. xxvi ff., Göttingen, 1904. [Cf. Budde in *DB.* iv. 3 ff.; Duhm in *EB.* iii. 3793 ff.]

Of all views of this matter, the only one generally accepted as sound was at first Ley's and Budde's discovery of the Qina- or Lamentation-Verse (*ZAW.* 1882, 5 ff.; 1891, 234 ff.; 1892, 31 ff.). On their predecessors, Lowth, de Wette, Ewald, see Löhr, *Klagelied*², p. 9. This verse, called by Duhm 'long verse', by Sievers simply 'five-syllabled' (Fünfer), consists of two members, the second at least one beat shorter than the other. That a regular repetition of an equal number of syllables in *arsis* and *thesis* was observed by other poets, had been established by Ley, Duhm, Gunkel, Grimme, and others, especially Zimmern, who cites a Babylonian hymn in which the members are actually marked (*ZA.* x. 1 ff., xii. 382 ff.; cf. also Delitzsch, *Das babyl. Welterschöpfungsepos*, Lpz. 1896, pp. 60 ff.). Recently, however, E. Sievers, the recognized authority on metre in other branches of literature, has indicated, in the works mentioned above, a number of fresh facts and views, which have frequently been confirmed by the conclusions of Ley and others. The most important are as follows:—

Hebrew poetry, as distinguished from the quantitative Classical and Arabic

¹ That already in Isaiah's time (second half of the eighth century B. C.) educated Hebrews, or at least officers of state, understood Aramaic, while the common people in Jerusalem did not, is evident from 2 K 18²⁶ (Is 36¹¹).

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

It can no longer be doubted that in the analysis of purely poetical passages, this system often finds ready confirmation and leads to textual and literary results, such as the elimination of glosses. There are, however, various difficulties in carrying out the scheme consistently and extending it to the prophetic writings and still more to narrative: (1) not infrequently the required number of feet is only obtained by sacrificing the clearly marked parallelism, or the grammatical connexion (e. g. of the construct state with its genitive), and sometimes even by means of doubtful emendations; (2) the whole system assumes a correct transmission of the text and its pronunciation, for neither of which is there the least guarantee. To sum up, our conclusion at present is that for poetry proper some assured and final results have been already obtained, and others may be expected, from the principles laid down by Sievers, although, considering the way in which the text has been transmitted, a *faultless* arrangement of metres cannot be expected. Convincing proof of the *consistent* use of the same metrical schemes in the prophets, and *a fortiori* in narrative, can hardly be brought forward.

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

The arrangement of certain poetical passages in verse-form required by early scribal rules (Ex 15¹⁻¹⁹; Dt 32¹⁻⁴³; Ju 5; 1 S 2¹⁻¹⁰; 2 S 22, 23¹⁻⁷; ψ 18, 136; Pr. 31¹⁰⁻³¹; 1 Ch 16⁸⁻³⁶; cf. also Jo 12⁹⁻²⁴; Ec 3²⁻⁸; Est 9⁷⁻¹⁰) has nothing to do with the question of metre in the above sense.

Words are used in poetry, for which others are customary in prose, e. g. שׂאֵן *man* = אָדָם; אֶרֶץ *path* = דֶּרֶךְ; מִלָּה *word* = דְּבָר; חָזָה *to see* = רָאָה; אָתָּה *to come* = בּוֹא.

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

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

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

For particulars, see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, pp. 1-6. We may conveniently regard the relation of the languages which co-existed in this later period as similar to that of the High and Low German in North Germany, or to that of the High German and the common dialects in the south and in Switzerland. Even amongst the more educated, the common dialect prevails orally, whilst the High German serves essentially as the literary and cultured language, and is at least understood by all classes of the people. Wholly untenable is the notion, based on an erroneous interpretation of Neh 8⁸, that the Jews immediately after the exile had completely forgotten the Hebrew language, and therefore needed a translation of the Holy Scriptures.

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

v Later words (Aramaisms) are, e.g. הִתְנַחֵם declaration, דָּנָם compel, בֵּן son, צִיִּים chalk, זְמַן = תֵּן time, הִרְבֵּה raise up, רָסַח Pi. reproach, מַלְלָה Pi. roof over,

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

טָעָה stray, בָּרַח rock, מִלֵּךְ advise, סוּף = קֵץ end, קָבַל = לָקַח take, רָצַע = רָצַץ break, נִשְׁנְאוּ be many, שָׁלַט = מָלַךְ rule, תָּקַף = אָמַץ be strong.—Later meanings are, e.g. אָמַר (to say) to command; עָנָה (to answer) to begin speaking.—Orthographical and grammatical peculiarities are, the frequent *scriptio plena* of ו and י, e.g. דְּוִיָּד¹ (elsewhere דְּוִד), even קוֹדֶשׁ for קֹדֶשׁ, רוֹב for רֹב; the interchange of ה and ח final; the more frequent use of substantives in ו, י, ת, &c. Cf. Dav. Strauss, *Sprachl. Studien zu d. hebr. Sirachfragmenten*, Zürich, 1900, p. 19 ff.; for the Psalms Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 461 ff., and especially Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 276 ff.; in general, Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im A. T.* (i, Lexikal. Teil), Halle, 1902.

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

Rem. 1. Of dialectical varieties in the old Hebrew language, only one ²⁰ express mention occurs in the O. T. (Ju 12⁶), according to which the Ephraimites in certain cases pronounced the שׁ as ד. (Cf. Marquart in *ZAW.* 1888, p. 151 ff.) Whether in Neh 13²⁴ by the *speech of Ashdod* a Hebrew, or a (wholly different) Philistine dialect is intended, cannot be determined. On the other hand, many peculiarities in the North Palestinian books (Judges and Hosea) are probably to be regarded as differences in dialect, and so also some anomalies in the Moabite inscription of Mēša' (see above, d). On later developments see L. Metman, *Die hebr. Sprache, ihre Geschichte u. lexikal. Entwicklung seit Abschluss des Kanons u. ihr Bau in d. Gegenwart*, Jerusalem, 1906.

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

§ 3. Grammatical Treatment of the Hebrew Language.

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

1. At the time when the old Hebrew language was gradually *a* becoming extinct, and the formation of the O. T. canon was

¹ דְּוִיָּד in the Minor Prophets throughout (Ho 3⁵, &c.) is due merely to a caprice of the Masoretes.

² According to the calculation of the Dutch scholar Leusden, the O. T. contains 5,642 different Hebrew and Aramaic words; according to rabbinical calculations, 79,856 altogether in the Pentateuch. Cf. also E. Nestle, *ZAW.* 1906, p. 283; H. Strack, *ZAW.* 1907, p. 69 ff.; Blau, 'Neue masoret. Studien,' in *JQR.* xvi. 357 ff., treats of the number of letters and words, and the *ve* division in the O. T.

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

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

¹ On the name Masora (or Massora, as e. g. E. König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 38 ff.; *Lehrgeb. d. hebr. Sprache*, ii. 358 ff.), and the great difficulty of satisfactorily explaining it, cf. De Lagarde, *Mitteilungen*, i. 91 ff. W. Bacher's derivation of the expression (in *JQR.* 1891, p. 785 ff.; so also C. Levias in the *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Cincinnati, 1904, p. 147 ff.) from Ez 20³⁷ (מַסֹּרַת הַבְּרִית; מַסְרָה, i. e. מוֹסְרָה, being an equally legitimate form) is rightly rejected by König, l. c. The correctness of the form מַסֹּרָה (by the side of the equally well-attested form מַסְרָה) does not seem to us to be invalidated by his arguments, nor by Blau's proposal to read מַסֹּרֶת (*JQR.* xii. 241). The remark of Levias (l. c.) deserves notice, that with the earlier Masoretes מַסֹּרֶת is equivalent to orthography, i. e. *plene-* and *defective* writing, and only later came to mean *traditio*.—G. Wildboer, in *ZAW.* 1909, p. 74, contends that as מַסֹּר to hand on is not found in the O. T., it must be a late denominative in this sense.

and is still the received text of the O. T., has obtained the name of the Masoretic Text.

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

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

3. It was not until about the beginning of the tenth century that *d* the Jews, following the example of the Arabs, began their grammatical compilations. Of the numerous grammatical and lexicographical works of R. Sa'adya,¹ beyond fragments in the commentary on the Sepher Yesira (ed. Mayer-Lambert, pp. 42, 47, 75, &c.), only the explanation in Arabic of the seventy (more correctly ninety) *hapax legomena* in the O. T. has been preserved. Written likewise in Arabic, but frequently translated into Hebrew, were the still extant works of the grammarians R. Yehuda Hayyûg (also called Abu Zakarya Yahya, about the year 1000) and R. Yona (Abu 'l-Walid Merwân ibn Ganâh, about 1030). By the aid of these earlier labours, Abraham ben Ezra (commonly called Aben Ezra, ob. 1167) and R. David Qimhi (ob. c. 1235) especially gained a classical reputation by their Hebrew grammatical writings.

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

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

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

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

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

² A strong impulse was naturally given to these studies by the introduction of printing—the Psalter in 1477, the Bologna Pentateuch in 1482, the Soncino O. T. complete in 1488: see the description of the twenty-four earliest editions (down to 1528) in Ginsburg's *Introduction*, p. 779 ff.

³ Of the literature on the subject down to the year 1850, see a tolerably full account in Steinschneider's *Bibliogr. Handb. f. hebr. Sprachkunde*, Lpz. 1859.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

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

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

§ 4. *Division and Arrangement of the Grammar.*

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

The first part (the elements) comprises accordingly the treatment of *sounds* and their representation in writing. It describes the nature and relations of the sounds of the language, teaches the pronunciation

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

of the written signs (orthoepy), and the established mode of writing (orthography). It then treats of the sounds as combined in syllables and words, and specifies the laws and conditions under which this combination takes place.

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

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

FIRST PART

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OR THE SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

CHAPTER I

THE INDIVIDUAL SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

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

(Cf. the Table of Alphabets.)

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

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

a 1. The Hebrew letters now in use, in which both the manuscripts of the O. T. are written and our editions of the Bible are printed, commonly called the *square character* (פְּתֻחַ מְרֻבֵּעַ), also the *Assyrian character* (כְּשֵׁן אַשּׁוּרִי),¹ are not those originally employed.

Old Hebrew (or *Old Canaanitish*²) writing, as it was used on

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

² It is tacitly assumed here that this was the mother of all Semitic alphabets. In *ZDMG.* 1909, p. 189 ff., however, Prätorius has shown good

public monuments in the beginning of the ninth and in the second half of the eighth century B.C., is to be seen in the inscription of Mēša', as well as in that of Siloam. The characters on the Maccabean coins of the second century B.C., and also on ancient gems, still bear much resemblance to this (cf. § 2 d). With the Old Hebrew writing the Phoenician is nearly identical (see § 1 k, § 2 f, and the Table of Alphabets). From the analogy of the history of other kinds of writing, it may be assumed that out of and along with this monumental character, a less antique and in some ways more convenient, rounded style was early developed, for use on softer materials, skins, bark, papyrus, and the like. This the Samaritans retained after their separation from the Jews, while the Jews gradually¹ (between the sixth and the fourth century) exchanged it for an Aramaic character. From this gradually arose (from about the fourth to the middle of the third century) what is called the *square character*, which consequently bears great resemblance to the extant forms of Aramaic writing, such as the Egyptian-Aramaic, the Nabatean and especially the Palmyrene. Of Hebrew inscriptions in the older square character, that of 'Arâq al-Emîr (15½ miles north-east of the mouth of the Jordan) probably belongs to 183 B.C.²

The Jewish sarcophagus-inscriptions of the time of Christ, found in Jerusalem in 1905, almost without exception exhibit a pure square character. This altered little in the course of centuries, so that the age of a Hebrew MS. cannot easily be determined from the style of the writing. The oldest known biblical fragment is the Nash papyrus (found in 1902), containing the ten commandments and the beginning of Dt 6⁴¹, of the end of the first or beginning of the second century A. D.; cf. N. Peters, *Die älteste Abschr. der 10 Gebote*, Freibg. i. B. 1905. Of actual MSS. of the Bible the oldest is probably one of 820–850 A. D. described by Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 469 ff., at the head of his sixty principal MSS.; next in age is the codex of Moses ben Asher at Cairo (897 A. D., cf. the art. 'Scribes' in the *Jew. Encycl.* xi and Gottheil in *JQR.* 1905, p. 32). The date (916 A. D.) of the Codex prophetarum Babylon. Petropol. (see § 8 g, note) is quite certain.—In the synagogue-rolls a distinction is drawn between the Tam-character (said to be so called from Rabbi Tam, grandson of R. Yishâqî, in the twelfth century) with its straight strokes, square corners and 'tittles' (tâgîn), in German and Polish MSS., and the *foreign* character with rounded letters and tittles in Spanish MSS. See further E. König, *Einl. in das A. T.*, Bonn, 1893, p. 16 ff.

grounds for believing that the South Semitic alphabet is derived not from the Mēša' character, or from some kindred and hardly older script, but from some unknown and *much* earlier form of writing.

¹ On the effect of the transitional mixture of earlier and later forms on the constitution of the text, see R. Kittel, *Ueber d. Notwendigk. d. Herausg. einer neuen hebr. Bibel*, Lpz. 1901, p. 20 ff.—L. Blau, 'Wie lange stand die althebr. Schrift bei den Juden im Gebrauch?' in *Kaufmanngedenkbuch*, Breslau, 1900, p. 44 ff.

² Not 176, as formerly held. Driver and Lidzbarski now read ערביה, correctly, not טוביה.

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

FORM.	NAME.	PRONUNCIATION.	NUMERICAL VALUE.
א	' <i>Ālēph</i>	' <i>spiritus lenis</i>	1
ב	<i>Bêth</i>	<i>b</i> (<i>bh</i> , but see § 6 n)	2
ג	<i>Gimēl</i> (<i>Giml</i>)	<i>g</i> (<i>gh</i> , „ „ „)	3
ד	<i>Dālēth</i>	<i>d</i> (<i>dh</i> , „ „ „)	4
ה	<i>Hē</i>	<i>h</i>	5
ו	<i>Wāw</i> (<i>Wāu</i>)	<i>w</i> (<i>u</i>) ¹	6
ז	<i>Záyīn</i>	<i>z</i> , as in English (soft <i>s</i>)	7
ח	<i>Hêth</i>	<i>h</i> , a strong guttural	8
ט	<i>Têth</i>	<i>t</i> , emphatic <i>t</i>	9
י	<i>Yôd</i>	<i>y</i> (<i>i</i>) ¹	10
כ, final ך	<i>Kaph</i>	<i>k</i> (<i>kh</i> , but see § 6 n)	20
ל	<i>Lāmēd</i>	<i>l</i>	30
מ, final ם	<i>Mēm</i>	<i>m</i>	40
נ, final ן	<i>Nûn</i>	<i>n</i>	50
ס	<i>Sāmēkh</i>	<i>s</i>	60
ע	' <i>Ayīn</i>	' a peculiar guttural (see below)	70
פ, final ף	<i>Pê</i>	<i>p</i> (<i>f</i> , see § 6 n)	80
צ, final ץ	<i>Ṣādê</i>	<i>s</i> , emphatic <i>s</i>	90
ק	<i>Qôf</i>	<i>q</i> , a strong <i>k</i> ² formed at the back of the palate	100
ר	<i>Rêš</i>	<i>r</i>	200
שׁ שׂ	<i>Śîn</i>	<i>ś</i>	} 300
	<i>Šîn</i> ³	<i>š</i> , pronounced <i>sh</i>	
ת	<i>Tāw</i> (<i>Tāu</i>)	<i>t</i> (<i>th</i> , but see § 6 n)	400

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

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

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

3. As the Table shows, five letters have a special form at the end *C* of the word. They are called final letters, and were combined by the Jewish grammarians in the mnemonic word קַמְנֶפֶהֶס *Kamnèphäs*, or better, with A. Müller and Stade, קַמְנֶפֶהֶס i. e. *as the breaker in pieces*.¹ Of these, ך , ן , ף , ץ are distinguished from the common form by the shaft being drawn straight down, while in the usual form it is bent round towards the left.² In the case of ם the letter is completely closed.

4. Hebrew is read and written from right to left.³ Words must *d* not be divided at the end of the lines;⁴ but, in order that no empty space may be left, in MSS. and printed texts, certain letters suitable for the purpose are dilated at the end or in the middle of the line. In our printed texts these *literae dilatabiles* are the five following: ם ת ל ה נ (mnemonic word אִהַלְתֵּם 'ahaltèm). In some MSS. other letters suitable for the purpose are also employed in this way, as ך , נ , ר ; cf. Strack in the *Theol. Lehrb.*, 1882, No. 22; Nestle, *ZAW.* 1906, p. 170 f.

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

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

The usual explanation of the present names of the letters⁵ is: $\text{א ב ג ד ה ו ז ח ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת}$ *ox, f*

¹ In the Talmud, disregarding the alphabetical order, $\text{שׁוֹמְרֵי הַדָּבָר}$ of *thy* *watcher*, i. e. *prophet*. See the discussions of this mnemonic word by Nestle, *ZAW.* 1907, p. 119 ff., König, Bacher (who would read $\text{שׁוֹמְרֵי הַדָּבָר}$ = *proceeding from thy prophets*, Is 52⁸), Krauss, Marmorstein, *ibid.* p. 278 ff. All the twenty-two letters, together with the five final forms, occur in Zp 3⁸.

² Chwolson, *Corpus Inscr. Hebr.*, col. 68, rightly observes that the more original forms of these letters are preserved in the *literae finales*. Instances of them go back to the time of Christ.

³ The same was originally the practice in Greek, which only adopted the opposite direction exclusively about 400 B. C. On the *boustrophēdon* writing (alternately in each direction) in early Greek, early Sabaeon, and in the Safa-inscriptions of the first three centuries A. D., cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 116 f.

⁴ This does not apply to early inscriptions or seals. Cf. Mēša', II. 1-5, 7, 8, &c., Siloam 2, 3, 5, where the division of words appears to be customary.

⁵ We possess Greek transcriptions of the Hebrew names, dating from the fifth century B. C. The LXX give them (in almost the same form as Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 10. 5) in La 1-4, as do also many Codices of the Vulgate (e. g. the

בַּיִת *house*, גַּמֶּל *camel* (according to Lidzbarski, see below, perhaps originally גַּרְוֹן *axe or pick-axe*), דְּלָת *door* (properly *folding door*; according to Lidzbarski, perhaps רֶרֶת *the female breast*), חַלּוֹן *air-hole (?)*, *lattice-window (?)*, וָךְ *hook, nail*, יָיִן *weapon* (according to Nestle, comparing the Greek $\xi\eta\tau\alpha$, rather תַּיִן *olive-tree*), חֲבִית *fence, barrier* (but perhaps only differentiated from ה by the left-hand stroke), טֵיט *a winding (?)*, according to others a *leather bottle* or a *snake* (but perhaps only differentiated from ט by a circle round it), יָד *hand*, כַּף *bent hand*, לְמוֹךְ *ox-goad*, מַיִם *water*, נֶזֶם *fish* (Lidzbarski, 'perhaps originally שֶׁנָּקָה *snake*,' as in Ethiopic), סִמָּךְ *prop* (perhaps a modification of ו), עַיִן *eye*, פִּי *mouth*, צַדִּי *fish-hook (?)*, קוֹף *eye of a needle*, according to others *back of the head* (Lidzb., 'perhaps קִשְׁתִּי *bow*'), שֵׁי *head*, שֵׁן *tooth*, טוֹ *sign, cross*.

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

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

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

Cod. Amiatinus) in $\psi\psi$ 111, 112, 119, but with many variations from the customary forms, which rest on the traditional *Jewish* pronunciation. The forms *Deleth* (and *delth*), *Zai*, *Sen* (LXX also $\chi\sigma\epsilon\nu$, cf. Hebr. שֵׁן *tooth*) are to be noticed, amongst others, for *Daleth*, *Zain*, *Šin*. Cf. the tables in Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 126 f. In his opinion (and so Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 134) the form and meaning of the names point to Phoenicia as the original home of the alphabet, since *alf*, *bêt*, *dalt*, *wāw*, *tāw*, *pei* = *pé*, *pi*, *mouth*, and the vowel of $\beta\hat{\omega}$ = *rōš*, *head*, are all Hebraeo-Phoenician.

¹ In the excavations at Jericho in April, 1907, E. Sellin found a jar-handle with the Canaanite characters הֵי, which he dates (probably too early) about 1500 B. C.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

p. 225 ff.), Happel (*Der Ps. Nah*, Würzb. 1900) to discover further traces, has not been successful. [Cf. Gray in *Expositor*, 1898, p. 207 ff.; Driver, in the *Century Bible*, *Nahum*, p. 26.]—Bickell, *Ztschr f. Kath. Theol.*, 1882, p. 319 ff., had already deduced from the versions the alphabetical character of Ecclus 51¹³⁻³⁰, with the omission of the 1-verse and with א¹ at the end. His conjectures have been brilliantly confirmed by the discovery of the Hebrew original, although the order from א to ל is partly disturbed or obscured. If א before י is deleted, ten letters are in their right positions, and seven can be restored to their places with certainty. Cf. N. Schlögl, *ZDMG.* 53, 669 ff.; C. Taylor in the appendix to Schechter and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, Cambr. 1899, p. lxxvi ff., and in the *Journ. of Philol.*, xxx (1906), p. 95 ff.; *JQR.* 1905, p. 238 ff.; Löhr, *ZAW.* 1905, p. 183 ff.; I. Lévy, *REJ.* 1907, p. 62 ff.

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

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

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

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

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

m 4. Abbreviations of words are not found in the text of the O. T., but they occur on coins, and their use is extremely frequent amongst the later Jews.³

¹ See note 3 on p. 29.

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

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

A point, or later an oblique stroke, serves as the sign of abridgement in old MSS. and editions, e. g. 'ש' for יִשְׂרָאֵל, 'פ' for פְּלִנִי *aliquis*, 'ר' for דְּבַר *aliquid*, וְגו' for וְגוֹמֵר *et complens*, i. e. *and so on*. Also in the middle of what is apparently a word, such strokes indicate that it is an abbreviation or a *vox memorialis* (cf. e. g. § 15 d תִּנְאִ). Two such strokes are employed, from § 41 d onward, to mark the different classes of weak verbs.—Note also יִ or יְ (also הִ) for יְהוֹה.

5. Peculiarities in the tradition of the O. T. text, which are already 71 mentioned in the Talmud, are—(1) The 15 *puncta extraordinaria*, about which the tradition (from Siphri on Nu 9¹⁰ onwards) differs considerably, even as to their number; on particular consonants, Gn 16⁵, 18⁹, 19³³⁻³⁵, Nu 9¹⁰; or on whole words, Gn 33⁴, 37¹², Nu 33⁹, 21³⁰, 29¹⁵, Dt 29²⁸, 2 S 19²⁰, Is 44⁹, Ez 41²⁰, 46²², ψ 27¹³,—all no doubt critical marks; cf. Strack, *Prolegomena Critica*, p. 88 ff.; L. Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, Strassburg, 1891, p. 6 ff., and *Einleitung in die hl. Schrift*, Budapest, 1894; Königsberger, *Jüd. Lit.-Blatt*, 1891, nos. 29-31, and *Aus Masorah u. Talmudkritik*, Berlin, 1892, p. 6 ff.; Mayer-Lambert, *REJ.* 30 (1895), no. 59; and especially Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 318 ff.; also on the ten points found in the Pentateuch, see Butin (Baltimore, 1906), who considers that they are as old as the Christian era and probably mark a letter, &c., to be deleted. (2) The *litterae majusculae* (e. g. ג Gn 1¹, ו Lv 11⁴² as the middle consonant of the Pentateuch, י Nu 14¹⁷), and *minusculae* (e. g. ה Gn 2⁴). (3) The *litterae suspensae* (Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 334 ff.) נ Ju 18³⁰ (which points to the reading מִשָּׁה for מִנְשָׁה), ע ψ 80¹⁴ (the middle of the Psalms¹) and Jb 38¹³⁻¹⁵. (4) The 'mutilated' *Wāw* in שְׁלוֹם Nu 25¹², and ק Ex 32²⁵ (בְּקַמִּיהֶם), and Nu 7² (הַפְּקוּדִים). (5) *Mēm clausum* in לְסֻרְבָּה Is 9⁶, and *Mēm apertum* in הֵם פְּרוּצִים Neh 2¹³. (6) *Nūn inversum* before Nu 1c³⁵, and after ver. 36, as also before ψ 107²³⁻²⁸ and 40; according to Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 341 ff., a sort of bracket to indicate that the verses are out of place; cf. Krauss, *ZAW.* 1902, p. 57 ff., who regards the inverted *Nūns* as an imitation of the Greek obelus.

§ 6. *Pronunciation and Division of Consonants.*

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

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

*Oceano delle abbreviature e sigle*², Parma, 1883 (appendix, 1884); Ph. Lederer, *Hebr. u. Chald. Abbreviaturen*, Frankf. 1893; Händler, *Lexicon d. Abbreviaturen* (annexed to G. Dalman's *Aram.-neuhebr. WB.*, Frankf. 1897); Levias, art. 'Abbreviations,' in the *Jew. Encycl.*, i. 39 ff.; F. Perles, 'Zur Gesch. der Abbrev. im Hebr.' (*Archiv f. Stenogr.*, 1902, p. 41 ff.). On abbreviations in biblical MSS. see Ginsburg, *Introd.*, 165 ff.

¹ According to Blau, *Studien zum althebr. Buchwesen*, Strassburg, 1902, p. 167, properly a large *ν*, called *t'lyā* because suspended between the two halves of the Psalter, and then incorrectly taken for a *littera suspensa*.

of sounds on Hebrew itself (§ 19), and partly from the tradition of the Jews.¹

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

b The oldest tradition is presented in the transcription of Hebrew names in Assyrian cuneiform; a later, but yet in its way very important system is seen in the manner in which the LXX transcribe Hebrew names with Greek letters.² As, however, corresponding signs for several sounds (א, ב, ג, ד, ה) are wanting in the Greek alphabet, only an approximate representation was possible in these cases. The same applies to the Latin transcription of Hebrew words by Jerome, according to the Jewish pronunciation of his time.³

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

c 2. With regard to the pronunciation of the several gutturals and sibilants, and of א and ב, it may be remarked:—

1. Among the gutturals, the glottal stop א is the lightest, corresponding to the *spiritus lenis* of the Greeks. It may stand either at the beginning or end of a syllable, e. g. אָמַר 'āmār, יָאִשָּׁם yā'sām. Even before a vowel א is almost lost to our ear, like the *h* in *hour* and in the French *habit*, *homme*. After a vowel א generally (and at the end of a word, always) coalesces with it, e. g. אָרָא qārā for an original qārā', Arab. qārā'ā; see further, § 23 a, 27 g.

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

e ו is related to א, but is a much stronger guttural. Its strongest sound is a rattled, guttural *g*, cf. e. g. וָעַל, LXX Γάζα, וָמוֹרָא Γόμορρα; elsewhere, a weaker sound of the same kind, which the LXX reproduce by a *spiritus* (*lenis* or *asper*), e. g. וָלִי 'חלִי, וָמֹלֵךְ 'Αμαλέκ.⁴ In the mouth of the Arabs one hears in the former case a sort of guttural *r*, in the latter a sound peculiar to themselves formed in the back of the throat.—It is as incorrect to omit the ו

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

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

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

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

entirely, in reading and transcribing words (עֲלִי *Eli*, עֲמֶלֶק *Amalek*), as to pronounce it exactly like *g* or like a nasal *ng*. The stronger sound might be approximately transcribed by *gh* or 'g'; but since in Hebrew the softer sound was the more common, it is sufficient to represent it by the sign ' , as אַרְבַּע 'arba', אַד 'ad.

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

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

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

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

The original difference between the sounds שׁ and ם² sometimes marks *k* a distinction in meaning, e. g. סָכַר to close, שָׁכַר to hire, סָכַל to be foolish, שָׁכַל to be prudent, to be wise. Syriac always represents both sounds by ם, and in Hebrew also they are sometimes interchanged; as סָכַר for שָׁכַר to hire, Ezr 4^b; שְׁכָלוֹת for סְכָלוֹת *folly*, Ec 1¹⁷.

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

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

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

(בְּגִדְכֶפֶת) ב ג ד כ פ ת

have a twofold pronunciation, (1) a harder sound, as mutes, like

¹ The modern Samaritans, however, in reading their Hebrew Pentateuch pronounce שׁ invariably as שׂ.

² The original value of ם, and its relation to the original value of שׁ and שׂ, is still undetermined, despite the valuable investigations of P. Haupt, *ZDMG.* 1880, p. 762 f.; D. H. Müller, 'Zur Geschichte der semit. Zischlaute,' in the *Verhandlungen des Wiener Orient. Congresses*, Vienna, 1888, Semitic section, p. 229 ff.; De Lagarde, 'Samech,' in the *NGGW.* 1891, no. 5, esp. p. 173; Aug. Müller, *ZAW.* 1891, p. 267 ff.; Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* 1893, p. 100 f.; E. Glaser, *Zwei Wiener Publicationen über Habaschitisch-punische Dialekte in Südarabien*, Munich, 1902, pp. 19 ff.—On the phonetic value of צ see G. Hüsing, *OLZ.* 1907, p. 4⁶⁷ ff.

k, p, t, or initial *b, g* (hard), *d*; and (2) a softer sound as *spirantes*.¹ The harder sound is the original. It is retained at the beginning of syllables, when there is no vowel immediately preceding to influence the pronunciation, and is denoted by a point, *Dageš lene* (§ 13), placed in the consonants, viz. ב *b*, ג *g*, ד *d*, כ *k*, פ *p*, ת *t*. The weaker pronunciation appears as soon as a vowel sound immediately precedes. It is occasionally denoted, esp. in MSS., by *Rāphè* (§ 14 e), but in printed texts usually by the mere absence of the *Dageš*. In the case of ב, ג, פ, ת, the two sounds are clearly distinguishable even to our ear as *b* and *v*, *k* and German (weak) *ch*, *p* and *ph*, *t* and *th* (in *thin*). The Greeks too express this twofold pronunciation by special characters: ב κ, ג χ; פ π, פ φ; ת τ, ת θ. In the same way ג should be pronounced like the North German *g* in *Tage, Wagen*, and ד like *th* in *the*, as distinguished from ג and ד.

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

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

(a) Gutturals	א ה ע ח;
(b) Palatals	ג כ ק;
(c) Dentals	ד ט ת;
(d) Labials	ב פ;
(e) Sibilants	ז ש ס צ;
(f) Sonants	נ מ, ר ל, ו י.

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

On the twofold pronunciation of *r* in Tiberias, cf. Delitzsch, *Physiol. und Musik*, Lpz. 1868, p. 10 ff.; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke ha-š'amim*, Lpz. 1879, p. 5, note *a*, and § 7 of the Hebrew text, as well as p. 82.

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

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

¹ So at any rate at the time when the present punctuation arose.

ii. Mouth-sounds:

1. Mutes and Spirants:

2. Sibilants:

3. Sonants:

	w.	m.	e.	w.	m.
Palatal	ג	כ	ק	ג	כ
Dental	ד	ת	ט	ד	ת
Labial	ב	פ	—	ב	פ
...	ו	ש שׁ שׂ	צ		
...	ו׳	ר ל	מ נ		

Rem. 1. The meaning of the letters at the top is, w. = weak, m. = middle *q* hard; e. = emphatic. Consonants which are produced by the same organ of speech are called *homorganic* (e.g. ג and כ as palatals), consonants whose sound is of the same nature *homogeneous* (e.g. ו and ו׳ as semi-vowels). On their homorganic character and homogeneity depends the possibility of interchange, whether within Hebrew itself or with the kindred dialects. In such cases the soft sound generally interchanges with the soft, the hard with the hard, &c. (e.g. ד=ו, ת=שׁ, ט=צ). Further transitions are not, however, excluded, as e.g. the interchange of ת and ק (ת=כ=ק). Here it is of importance to observe whether the change takes place in an initial, medial, or final letter; since e.g. the change in a letter when medial does not always prove the possibility of the change when initial. That in certain cases the character of the consonantal sound also influences the preceding or following vowel will be noticed in the accidents as the instances occur.

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

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

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

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

In Arabic writing there are vowel signs only for *a*, *i*, *u*; the combined sounds *ay* and *aw* are therefore retained uncontracted and pronounced as diphthongs (*ai* and *au*), e.g. *سوت* Arab. *saut*, and *عينين* Arab. 'ainain. It was

¹ In proper names the LXX often use the diphthongs *ai* and *au* where the Hebrew form has *e* or *o*. It is, however, very doubtful whether the *ai* and *au* of the LXX really represent the true pronunciation of Hebrew of that time; see the instructive statistics given by Kittel in Haupt's *SBOT.*, on 1 Ch 1²⁻²⁰.

only in later Arabic that they became in pronunciation *é* and *ô*, at least after weaker or softer consonants; cf. בַּיִן Arab. *bain*, *bên*, בַּיִן Arab. *yaum*, *yôm*. The same contraction appears also in other languages, e.g. in Greek and Latin (*θαῦμα*, Ionic *θῶμα*; *plaustrum* = *plostrum*), in the French pronunciation of *ai* and *au*, and likewise in the German popular dialects (*Oge* for *Auge*, &c.). Similarly, the obscuring of the vowels plays a part in various languages (cf. e.g. the *a* in modern Persian, Swedish, English, &c.).¹

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

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

c According to § 91 *b* and *d*, the suffix of the 3rd sing. masc. in the noun (as in the verb) was originally pronounced הו. But in the places where this הו with a preceding *a* is contracted into *ô* (after the rejection of the ה), we find the ה still frequently retained as a vowel letter, e.g. עִירָהּ, סוּתָהּ Gn 49¹¹, cf. § 91 *e*; so throughout the Mēša' inscription אֲרָצָהּ, בֵּיתָהּ (also בֵּתָהּ), בְּנָהּ, בָּהּ, לָהּ, הַלְתַּחַמָּהּ; on the other hand already in the Siloam inscription רֵעוּ. 4 מֵהּ Mēša', l. 8 = יָמָיו *his days* is unusual, as also רֵשָׁהּ 1. 20 if it is for רֵשָׁיו *his chiefs*. The verbal forms with ה suffixed are to be read וַיְחַלְפָהּ (l. 6), וַאֲסַחְבָהּ (l. 12 f.) and וַיִּנְרָשָהּ (l. 19).

d As an example of the original consonant being retained, we might also include the י of the constr. state plur. masc. if its *é* (according to § 89 *d*) is

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

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

³ According to Stade, the employment of ה for *ā* probably took place first in the case of the locative accusatives which originally ended in הַ, as קְרִימָהּ, אֲרָצָהּ.

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



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

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

h 3. When the language had died out, the ambiguity of such a writing must have been found continually more troublesome; and as there was thus a danger that the correct pronunciation might be finally lost, the vowel signs or vowel points were invented in order to fix it. By means of these points everything hitherto left uncertain was most accurately settled. It is true that there is no historical account of the date of this vocalization of the O. T. text, yet we may at least infer, from a comparison of other historical facts, that it was gradually developed by Jewish grammarians in the sixth and seventh centuries A. D. under the influence of different Schools, traces of which have been preserved to the present time in various differences of tradition.² They mainly followed, though with independent regard to

¹ Thus e.g. לֹטֵף can be read *qāṭal*, *qātāl*, *qātōl*, *qētōl*, *qōtēl*, *qittēl*, *qattēl*, *quttal*, *qētel*, and several of these forms have also different senses.

² The most important of these differences are, (a) those between the Orientals, i. e. the scholars of the Babylonian Schools, and the Occidentals, i. e. the scholars of Palestine (Tiberias, &c.); cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 197 ff.; (b) amongst the Occidentals, between Ben-Naphtali and Ben-Asher, who flourished in the first half of the tenth century at Tiberias; cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 241 ff. Both sets of variants are given by Baer in the appendices

the peculiar nature of the Hebrew, the example and pattern of the older Syrian punctuation.¹

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

4. To complete the historical vocalization of the consonantal text *i* a phonetic system was devised, so exact as to show all vowel-changes occasioned by lengthening of words, by the tone, by gutturals, &c., which in other languages are seldom indicated in writing. The pronunciation followed is in the main that of the Palestinian Jews of about the sixth century A.D., as observed in the solemn reading of the sacred writings in synagogue and school, but based on a much older tradition. That the real pronunciation of early Hebrew is consistently preserved by this tradition, has recently been seriously questioned on good grounds, especially in view of the transcription of proper names in the LXX. Nevertheless in many cases, internal reasons, as well as the analogy of the kindred languages, testify in a high degree to the faithfulness of the tradition. At the same recension of the text, or soon after, the various other signs for reading (§§ 11–14, 16) were added, and the accents (§ 15).

§ 8. *The Vowel Signs in particular.*

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

to his critical editions. Our printed editions present uniformly the text of Ben-Asher, with the exception of a few isolated readings of Ben-Naphtali, and of numerous later corruptions.

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

Preliminary Remark.

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

I have therefore long shared the opinion that 'the vowel-system represented by the ordinary punctuation (of Tiberias) was primarily intended to mark only differences of quality' (Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i. 17). There is, however, of course a further question how far these 'later' grammarians were mistaken in assigning a particular quantity to the vowels represented by particular signs. In Philippi's opinion they were mistaken (excluding of course \acute{i} , \acute{e} , \acute{o} when written *plene*) in a very great number of cases, since not only does — stand, according to circumstances, for \bar{a} or \check{a} , and — for \bar{a} or \check{a} , but also — for \bar{e} or \check{e} , and — for \bar{o} or \check{o} , e. g. בְּבֵר and בְּבֵר , out of pause $k\bar{a}b\acute{e}d$; $q\check{a}'\acute{o}n$ (form בְּבֵר), but in pause $k\bar{a}b\acute{e}d$, $q\check{a}'\acute{o}n$.

I readily admit, with regard to *Qameṣ* and *Seḡol*, that the account formerly given in § 8 f. was open to misconstruction. With regard to *Sere* and *Holem*, however, I can only follow Philippi so long as his view does not conflict with the (to me inviolable) law of a long vowel in an open syllable before the tone and (except *Pathah*) in a final syllable with the tone. To me $\text{בְּבֵר} = k\bar{a}b\acute{e}d$, &c., is as impossible as e. g. $\text{עֲנַב} = 'enab$ or $\text{בְּרַח} = b\check{o}rah$, in spite of the analogy cited by Sievers (p. 18, note 1) that 'in old German e. g. original \acute{i} and \acute{u} often pass into \check{e} and \check{o} dialectically, while remaining in a closed syllable.

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

First Class. A-sound.

- A { 1. — ¹ *Qāmēṣ* denotes either \bar{a} , \acute{a} , more strictly \bar{a} (the obscure Swedish \acute{a}) and \hat{a} ,² as יָד *yād* (hand), רִשְׁמֵי *rā'shēmi* (heads), or \check{a} (in future transcribed as \check{o}), called *Qāmēṣ ḥātūph*, i. e. hurried *Qameṣ*. The latter occurs almost exclusively as a modification of \acute{u} ; cf. c and § 9 u.
2. — *Páthāh*, \check{a} , בַּת *bāth* (daughter).

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

² Instead of the no doubt more accurate transcription \bar{a} , \hat{a} we have

Also 3. ֿ *Segôl*, an open *e*, è (\bar{a} or \check{a}), as a modification of \check{a} ,¹ either in an untuned closed syllable, as in the first syllable of יָדְךָ *yädkhèm* (your hand) from *yädkhèm*—or in a tone-syllable as in פֶּסַח *pěsah*; cf. $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$, and on the really monosyllabic character of such formations, see § 28 e. But *Segôl* in an open tone-syllable with a following ׳ , as in גֵּלְנָה *gelènā* (cf. § 75 f), יָדְכָה *yādèkhā* (cf. § 91 i), is due to contraction from *ay*.

Second Class. I- and E-sounds.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| I | { | 1. ׳ — <i>Hîrëq</i> with <i>yod</i> , almost always \hat{i} , as צַדִּיק <i>šaddîq</i> (righteous). b |
| | | 2. — either \hat{i} (see below, <i>i</i>), as צַדִּיקִים <i>šaddîqîm</i> , only orthographically different from צַדִּיקִים (צַדִּיקִים),—or \check{i} , as צַדִּיקוֹ <i>šîdqô</i> (his righteousness). |
| E | { | 3. ׳ — <i>Serî</i> or <i>Sērê</i> with <i>yod</i> = \hat{e} , e. g. בֵּיתוֹ <i>bêthô</i> (his house).
— either \hat{e} , but rarely (see below, <i>i</i>), or \bar{e} as שֵׁם <i>šēm</i> (name).
<i>Sere</i> can only be \check{e} , in my opinion, in few cases, such as those mentioned in § 29 f. |
| | | 4. ֿ <i>Segôl</i> , \check{a} , a modification of \check{i} , e. g. חֲפֵזִי <i>hăfšî</i> (ground-form <i>hîfš</i>); שָׁן <i>šan</i> (ground-form <i>šîn</i>). |

Third Class. U- and O-sounds.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| U | { | 1. ׳ <i>Šûrëq</i> , usually \hat{u} , מוֹת <i>mûth</i> (to die), rarely \check{u} . c |
| | | 2. — <i>Qibbûs</i> , either \check{u} , e. g. סֻלָּם <i>süllām</i> (ladder), or \hat{u} , e. g. קִמּוּ <i>qûmû</i> (rise up), instead of the usual קָמוּ . |
| O | { | 3. ׳ and — <i>Hôlëm</i> , \hat{o} and \bar{o} , קוֹל <i>qôl</i> (voice), רֹב <i>rôbh</i> (multitude).
Often also a defective — for \hat{o} ; rarely ׳ for \bar{o} .
On the question whether — under some circumstances represents \check{o} , see § 93 r. |
| | | 4. — On <i>Qāmëš ḥatûph</i> = \check{o} , generally modified from \check{u} , as חֹק <i>höq</i> (statute), see above, a. |

retained \bar{a} , \hat{a} in this grammar, as being typographically simpler and not liable to any misunderstanding. For *Qames ḥatûph*, in the previous German edition expressed by \check{a} , we have, after careful consideration, returned to \check{o} . The use of the same sign ֿ for \bar{a} (\hat{a}) and \check{a} , shows that the Massoretes did not intend to draw a sharp distinction between them. We must not, however, regard the Jewish grammarians as making a merely idle distinction between *Qames rāḥāb*, or broad *Qames*, and *Qames ḥatûph*, or light *Qames*. It is quite impossible that in the living language an \bar{a} lengthened from \check{a} , as in *dābār*, should have been indistinguishable from e. g. the last vowel in וַיִּשְׁרַח or the first in וַיִּשְׁרַח .—The notation \hat{a} , \hat{e} , \hat{o} expresses here the vowels essentially long, either naturally or by contraction; the notation \bar{a} , \bar{e} , \bar{o} those lengthened only by the tone, and therefore changeable; \check{a} , \check{e} , \check{o} the short vowels. As regards the others, the distinction into \hat{i} and \check{i} , \hat{u} and \check{u} is sufficient; see § 9.—The mark ׳ stands in the following pages over the tone-syllable, whenever this is not the last, as is usual, but the penultimate syllable of the word, e. g. וַיִּשְׁרַח .

¹ These *Segôls*, modified from \check{a} , are very frequent in the language. The

d The names of the vowels are mostly taken from the form and action of the mouth in producing the various sounds, as פֶּתַח *opening*; צִירִי *a wide parting* (of the mouth), also שֶׁבֶר (= *ī*) *breaking, parting* (cf. the Arab. *kasr*); הִירֶק (also חִירֶק) *narrow opening*; הֶחֱלָם *closing*, according to others *fullness*, i. e. of the mouth (also מְלֵא פִּימָה ¹ *fullness of the mouth*). קָמֶץ ² also denotes a slighter, as שִׁירֶק and קְבוּץ (also קְבוּץ פִּימָה) *a firmer, compression or contraction of the mouth*. סֵגוֹל (סִגּוּל *bunch of grapes*) takes its name from its form. So שְׁלֹשׁ נִקְדוּת (three points) is another name for *Qibbúš*.

e Moreover the names were mostly so formed (but only later), that the sound of each vowel is heard in the first syllable (קָמֶץ for קִמֶץ, פֶּתַח for פִּתַח, צִירִי for צִירִי); in order to carry this out consistently some even write *Sägól, Qomeš-hatúf, Qübbúš*.

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

g No dot is used for the *Holem* when *ō* (of course without *wāw*) is pronounced after *sin* or before *šin*. Hence שֹׂנֵא *šônē* (hating), נִשָּׂא *nēšō* (to bear), מוֹשֶׁה *mōšē* (not מוֹשֶׁה); but שֹׂמֵר *šómēr* (a watchman). When *ō* precedes the *sin*, the dot is placed over its right arm, e. g. יִרְפֹּס *yirpōš* (he treads with the feet), הַנֹּשְׂאִים *hannōš'im* (those who carry).

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

Babylonian punctuation (see § 8 *g*, note 1) has only one sign for it and tone-bearing *Pathah*; see also Gaster, 'Die Unterschiedslosigkeit zwischen *Pathach* u. *Segol*,' in *ZAW*. 1894, p. 60 ff.

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

² The usual spelling קָמֶץ and פֶּתַח takes the words certainly rightly as Hebrew substantives; according to De Lagarde (*Gött. gel. Anz.* 1886, p. 873, and so previously Luzzatto), קִמֶץ and פִּתַח are rather Aram. participles, like *Dageš*, &c., and consequently to be transliterated *Qimēš* and *Páthah*.

³ Since 1846 we have become acquainted with a system of vocalization different in many respects from the common method. The vowel signs, all except ו, are there placed *above* the consonants, and differ almost throughout in form,

3. The vowels of the first class are, with the exception of 'ֿ in *h* the middle and ןֿ, םֿ, ןֿ at the end of the word (§ 9 *a-d, f*), represented *only* by vowel signs, but the long vowels of the I- and U-class largely by vowel letters. The vowel sound to which the letter

and some even as regards the sound which they denote: ֿ = *ā*, ֿ = tone-bearing *ǎ* and *è*, ֿ = *ê*, *ē*, ֿ = *i*, ֿ, ֿ = *ô*, *ō*, ֿ or ֿ = *û*. In an unsharpened syllable ֿ = toneless *ǎ* and *è*, and also Hataf Pathah; ֿ = toneless *ě* and Hataf Soghôl; ֿ = *i*, ֿ = *ü*, ֿ = *ö*, and Hataf Qames. Lastly in toneless syllables before Dagesh, ֿ = *ǎ*, ֿ = *ě*, ֿ = *i*, ֿ = *ü*, ֿ = *ǎ*. Š°wâ is ֿ

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

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

points is determined more precisely by the vowel sign standing before, above, or within it. Thus—

י may be combined with *Hîrêq*, *Šerê*, *Segôl* (יְ—, יֶ—, יִ—).

י with *Šûrêq* and *Hôlêm* (יִ and יֶ).¹

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

i 4. The omission of the vowel letters when writing *î*, *û*, *ê*, *ô* is called *scriptio defectiva* in contrast to *scriptio plena*. קול, קים are written *plene*, קלת, קם *defective*.

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

k So far as the choice of the full or defective mode of writing is concerned, there are certainly some cases in which only the one or the other is admissible. Thus the full form is necessary at the end of the word, for *û*, *ô*, *ô*, *î*, *ê*, *ê*, as well as for *è* in חנה &c. (§ 9 f), also generally with *a*, *â* (cf. however § 9 d), e.g. קטלי, קטלתי, ידי, מלבי. (But the Masora requires in Jer 26⁶, 44⁸; Ezr 6²¹; 2 Ch 32¹³ גוי instead of גויי; Zp 2⁹ גוי [perhaps an error due to the following י] for גויי; Is 40³¹ וקוי [followed by י] for וקויי; Jer 38¹¹ בלוי for בלויי.) On the other hand the defective writing is common when the letter, which would have to be employed as a vowel letter, immediately precedes as a strong consonant, e.g. גוים (*nations*) for גויים, מצות (*commandments*) for מצוות.

l That much is here arbitrary (see § 7 g), follows from the fact that sometimes the same word is written very differently, e.g. הקמתי Ez 16⁶⁰: הקמתי and also הקמותי Jer 23⁴; cf. § 25 b. Only it may be observed,

(a) That the *scriptio plena* in two successive syllables was generally avoided; cf. e.g. נביא but נבאים; צדיק, but צדקים; קול, קלות; יהושע; מצאהו.

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

m 5. In the cognate dialects, when a vowel precedes a vowel-letter which is not kindred (heterogeneous), e.g. וְ—, וֶ—, וִ—, וֶ—, וִ—, a diphthong (*au*, *ai*)² is formed if the heterogeneous vowel be *a*. This is also to be regarded as the Old Hebrew pronunciation, since it

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

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



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

a consonant, as יָד, כּוֹכַב (vulgar Arab. *yād, kaukāb*). In a closed syllable, however, it can only stand when this has the tone, עוֹלָם, דְּבָר; whereas in an open syllable it is especially frequent *before* the tone, e.g. דְּבָר, יָדָי, לָזֶם. Where the tone is moved forward or weakened (as happens most commonly in what is called the construct state of nouns, cf. § 89 a) the original short *ă* (*Pathah*) is retained in a closed syllable, while in an open syllable it becomes *Šewā* (§ 27 i): חָמָה, constr. state חֲמָה (*h^akhām*); דְּבָר, דְּבַר (*debhār*); קָטַל, קִטַּל. For examples of the retention, in the secondary tone-syllable, of *ā* lengthened from *ă*, see § 93 *xx*.

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

On וְ for *ö* see below, *f*.

e 2. *Pathah*, or short *ă*, stands in Hebrew almost exclusively in a closed syllable with or without the tone (קָטַל, קִטַּל). In places where it now appears to stand in an open syllable the syllable was originally closed, and a helping vowel (*ă, ĩ*) has been inserted after the second radical merely to make the pronunciation easier, e.g. נָחַל (ground-form *nahl*), בַּיַת (Arab. *bait*), see § 28 *d*, and with regard to two cases of a different kind, § 26 *g, h*. Otherwise *ă* in an open syllable has almost without exception passed into *ā* (וָ), see above, *c*.

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

f 3. *Segôl* (*ě, è* [*ā*]) by origin belongs sometimes to the second, but most frequently to the first vowel class (§ 27 *o, p, u*). It belongs to the first class when it is a modification of *a* (as the Germ. *Bad*, pl. *Büder*; Eng. *man*, pl. *men*), either in a toneless syllable, e.g. יָדָם (for *yadkhèm*), or with the tone, e.g. אָרָץ from *'ars*, קָרְנָה Arab. *qārn*, קָמַח Arab. *qāmḥ*. This *Segôl* is often retained even in the strongest tone-syllable, at the end of a sentence or of an important clause (in *pause*), as מַלְאֲכָי, צַדִּיק (*mālākḥ, sādāq*). As a rule, however, in such cases the *Pathah* which underlies the *Segôl* is lengthened into *Qames*, e.g. קָרְנָה, קָמַח. A *Segôl* apparently lengthened from *Šewā*, but in reality traceable to an original *ă*, stands in pausal forms, as פָּרִי (ground-form *pāry*), יָהִי (*yāhy*), &c. On the cases where a ' (originally consonantal) follows this *Segôl*, see § 75 *f*, and § 91 *k*.

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

4. The long \hat{i} is frequently even in the consonantal writing indicated g by ' (a fully written *Hireq* '—); but a naturally long \hat{i} can be also written *defectively* (§ 8 i), e. g. צְדִיקִים (righteous), plur. צְדִיקִים; אֵיירָא (he fears), plur. אֵירָא. Whether a *defectively* written *Hireq* is long may be best known from the origin of the form; often also from the nature of the syllable (§ 26), or as in אֵירָא from the *Metheg* attached to it (§ 16 f).

5. The *short Hireq* (always¹ written *defectively*) is especially frequent h in sharpened syllables (אֵפִי, קֵטֵל) and in toneless closed syllables (מִזְמוֹר *psalm*); cf. however וַיִּשְׁבַּח in a closed tone-syllable, and even וַיִּפְּן, with a helping *Segôl*, for *wayyîphn*. It has arisen very frequently by attenuation from \check{a} , as in דְּבַרֵּי from original *dābārê*, צְדִיקִי (ground-form *šādq*),² or else it is the original \check{i} , which in the tone-syllable had become \bar{e} , as in אֵיבִי (thy enemy) from אֵיבִי (ground-form 'āyīb).³ It is sometimes a simple helping vowel, as in אֵיבִי, § 28 e.

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

6. The longest \hat{e} '— (more rarely defective —, e. g. עֵינִי for עֵינִי \hat{i} Is 3^b; at the end of a word also הֵ—) is as a rule contracted from '— *ay* (*ai*), § 7 a, e. g. הַיְכָל (palace), Arab. and Syriac *haikal*.

7. The *Sere* without *Yôdh* mostly represents the tone-long \bar{e} , which, h like the tone-long \bar{a} (see c), is very rarely retained except *in* and *before* the tone-syllable, and is always lengthened from an original \check{i} . It stands in an open syllable with or before the tone, e. g. סֵפֶר (ground-form *sîphr*) *book*, שֵׁנָה (Arab. *šināt*) *sleep*, or with *Metheg* (see § 16 d, f) in the secondary tone-syllable, e. g. שְׁאֵלָתִי *my request*, נִלְכֵה *let us go*. On the other hand in a closed syllable it is almost always with the tone, as בֶּן *son*, דֹּבֵל *dumb*.

Exceptions: (a) \bar{e} is sometimes retained in a toneless closed syllable, in l monosyllabic words before *Maqqeph*, e. g. עֵינִי Nu 35¹⁸, as well as in the examples of *nāsôg 'āhôr* mentioned in § 29 f (on the quantity cf. § 8 b 3 end); (b) in a toneless open final syllable, *Sere* likewise occurs in examples of the *nāsôg 'āhôr*, as עֵינִי Ex 16²⁹; cf. Ju 9³⁹.

8. The *Segôl* of the I(E)-class is most frequently an \check{e} modified from l original \check{i} , either replacing a tone-long \bar{e} which has lost the tone, e. g.

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

² Jerome (cf. Siegfried, *ZAW.* 1884, p. 77) in these cases often gives \check{a} for \check{i} .

³ Cf. the remarks of I. Guidi, 'La pronuncia del šērē,' in the *Verhandl. d-s Hamburger Orient.-Kongr.* of 1902, Leiden, 1904, p. 208 ff., on Italian *e* for Latin *i*, as in *fede = fīdem*, *pece = pīcem*.

תָּן from תָּן (*give*), יִצְרֶךָ (*thy creator*) from יִצַר, or in the case discussed in § 93 o, חִלְקִי, עֲוֹרִי from the ground-forms *hilq*, *'izr*; cf. also § 64 f. *Segól* appears as a simple helping-vowel in cases such as סִפְרָה for *siphra*, יִגְלֵה for *yigl* (§ 28 e).

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

n 9. For the U-sound there is—

(1) the long *û*, either (a) written fully, שֹׁרֶה, e.g. גְּבוּל (*boundary*), or (b) defectively written — Qibbûs גְּבוּלוֹ, יִמְתּוֹן;

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

O Sometimes also *ũ* in a sharpened syllable is written ו, e.g. הַיְבֵהָ ψ 102^b, יִגְלֵה Jb 5⁷, בִּגְלֵם Jer. 31³⁴, מְשׁוּבָתוֹ Is 5⁵, עֲרוּמִים Gn 2²⁵ for הַיְבֵהָ, &c.

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

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

(1) The *ô* which is contracted from *aw* (= *au*), § 7 a, and accordingly is mostly written fully; ו (Holem plenum), e.g. שֹׁט (*a whip*), Arab. *saut*, עוֹלָה (*iniquity*) from עוֹלָה. More rarely defectively, as שֹׁרֶה (*thine ox*) from שֹׁר Arab. *taur*.

q (2) The long *ô* which arose in Hebrew at an early period, by a general process of obscuring, out of an original *â*,² while the latter has been retained in Arabic and Aramaic. It is usually written *fully* in the tone-syllable, *defectively* in the toneless, e.g. קָטֵל Arab. *qâtîl*. Aram. *qâtêl*, אֵלֹהִים Arab. *'ilâh*, Aram. *'êlâh*, plur. אֱלֹהִים; שֹׁק (*leg*), Arab. *sâq*; גִּבּוֹר (*hero*), Arab. *gâbbâr*; חֶתֶם (*seal*), Arab. *hâtâm*; רִמּוֹן (*pomegranate*), Arab. *rümmân*; שֹׁלְטָן (*dominion*), Aram. *šlṭn* and שֹׁלְטָן Arab. *sültân*; שָׁלוֹם (*peace*), Aram. *šlm*, Arab. *sälâm*. Sometimes the form in *â* also occurs side by side with that in *ô* as שֹׁרֶה and שֹׁרֵה (*coat of mail*; see however § 29 u). Cf. also § 68 b.

r (3) The tone-long *ô* which is lengthened from an original *ũ*, or from an *ö* arising from *ũ*, by the tone, or in general according to the

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

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

laws for the formation of syllables. It occurs not only in the tone-syllable, but also in an open syllable before the tone, e.g. קִרְיָשׁ (ground-form *qūḏš*) *sanctuary*; בִּרְךָ for *burrakh*, יִלְקֹטֶן ψ 104²⁸, as well as (with *Metheg*) in the secondary tone-syllable; אֶהְלִים, פְּעִלוּ. But the original *ō* (*ū*) is retained in a toneless closed syllable, whereas in a toneless open syllable it is weakened to *Šewā*. Cf. כָּל *all*, but כָּל־ (*kōl*), כָּלָם (*kūllām*); יִקְטֹל, יִקְטֹלָהּ and יִקְטֹלוּ, where original *ū* is weakened to *Šewā*: *yiqī'elū*, Arab. *yaqtūlū*. This tone-long *ō* is only as an exception written fully.

(4) $\overline{\text{—}}$ *Qameš-ḥaṭuph* represents *ō* (properly *ǎ*, cf. § 8 a, note 2) modified *s* from *ū* and is therefore classed here. It stands in the same relation to *Holem* as the *Segôl* of the second class to *Sere*, כָּל־ *kōl*, וַיִּקְרָא *wayyāqōm*. On the distinction between this and *Qameš*, see below, *u*.

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

First Class : A.	Second Class : I and E.	Third Class : U and O.
$\overline{\text{—}}$ original <i>ā</i> (Arabic $\aleph\overline{\text{—}}$).	$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>é</i> , from original <i>ay</i> (<i>ai</i>).	$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>ô</i> , from original <i>aw</i> (<i>au</i>). $\overline{\text{—}}$ or $\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>ô</i> obscured from <i>ā</i> . $\overline{\text{—}}$ or $\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>û</i> .
$\overline{\text{—}}$ tone-long <i>ā</i> (from original <i>ǎ</i>) chiefly in the tone-syllable but also just before it.	$\overline{\text{—}}$ tone-long <i>ē</i> (from <i>ī</i>) generally in the tone-syllable but also just before it.	$\overline{\text{—}}$ tone-long <i>ō</i> (from original <i>ū</i>) in the tone-syllable, otherwise in an open syllable.
$\overline{\text{—}}$ (as a modification of <i>ā</i>) sometimes a tone-long <i>è</i> , sometimes <i>ě</i> . $\overline{\text{—}}$ short <i>ǎ</i> . [$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>ī</i> attenuated from <i>ǎ</i> ; see <i>h</i> .] Utmost weakening to $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^a , $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^ě , $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^e .	$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>ě</i> . $\overline{\text{—}}$ short <i>ī</i> . Utmost weakening to $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^a , $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^ě , or $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^e .	$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>ō</i> , modified from <i>ū</i> . $\overline{\text{—}}$ short <i>ū</i> , especially in a sharpened syllable. Utmost weakening to $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^a , $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^ě , $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^o , or $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^e .

Rem. On the distinction between *Qameš* and *Qameš-ḥaṭuph*.¹

21

According to § 8 a, long *ā* or *ǎ* (*Qameš*) and short *ō* or *ǎ* (*Qameš-ḥaṭuph*) are in manuscripts and printed texts generally expressed by the same sign ($\overline{\text{—}}$), e.g. קָאָם *qām*, כָּל־ *kōl*. The beginner who does not yet know the grammatical

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

origin of the words in question (which is of course the surest guide), may depend meanwhile on the following principal rules:—

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

(a) When *Šewá* follows as a syllable-divider, as in חֹכְמָה *hökh-má* (wisdom), אֹכֶלֶת *'ökh-lá* (food). With *Metheg* ֿ is *ā* (*ā*) and according to the usual view stands in an open syllable with a following *Šewá* mobile, e.g. אָכְלָה *'ā-kh^elá* (she ate); but cf. § 16 i.

(b) When a closed syllable is formed by *Dageš forte*, e.g. חֲנֻנִי *hönnēnî* (have mercy upon me); but בְּתִים (with *Metheg*, § 16 f ζ) *bâtîm*.

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

In ψ 35¹⁰ and Pr 19⁷ *Maqqēph* with כֹּל is replaced by a conjunctive accent (*Merēkha*); so by *Darga*, Ju 19⁵ with סָעַר , and Ez 37⁸ with וַיִּקְרָם (so Baer after Qimḥi; ed. Mant., Ginsburg, Kittel וַיִּקְרָם).

(d) In a closed final syllable without the tone, e.g. וַיִּקְמָה *wayyáqōm* (and he stood up).—In the cases where *ā* or *ā* in the final syllable has become toneless through *Maqqēph* (§ 16 a) and yet remains, e.g. כֹּה־בִּיהָרָה Est 4⁸, שֵׁת־לִי Gn 4²⁵, it has a *Metheg* in correct manuscripts and printed texts.

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

2. The cases in which ֿ appears to stand in an open syllable and yet is to be read as *ö* require special consideration. This is the case, (a) when *Ḥateph-Qameš* follows, e.g. פְּעָלוֹ *his work*, or simple vocal *Šewá*, e.g. וַיִּרְבֵּן *ox goad*; בְּעֵבְרוֹ Jo 4⁷; שִׁמְרָה (so ed. Mant., Ginsb.) *preserve* ψ 86², cf. 16¹ and the cases mentioned in § 48 i, n., and § 61 f, n.; other examples are Ob 11, Ju 14¹⁶); *Ḥateph-Pathah* follows in לְמִשְׁחָה (so Ginsburg; Baer לְמִשְׁחָה) 1 S 15¹, לְהַרְגֵהוּ 24¹¹, and יִפְנֵשֶׁהוּ (so Baer, Gn 32¹⁸, others יִפְנֵשֶׁהוּ); (b) before another *Qameš-hatuph*, e.g. פְּעָלֶיךָ *thy work*; on אֲרָה־לִי and קָבֵה־לִי Nu 23⁷, see § 67 o; (c) in the two plural forms קְדָשִׁים *sanctuaries* and שְׂרָשִׁים *roots* (also written קְרָ and שְׂרָ). In all these cases the Jewish grammarians regard the *Metheg* accompanying the ֿ as indicating a *Qāmeš raḥabh* (broad *Qameš*) and therefore read the ֿ as *ā*; thus *pā-olō*, *dā-rēbān*, *pā-öl^ekhā*, *qā-dāšim*. But neither the origin of these forms, nor the analogous formations in Hebrew and in the cognate languages, nor the transcription of proper names in the

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

LXX, allows us to regard this view as correct. It is just possible that Qames is here used loosely for \bar{a} , as the equivalent of \bar{o} , on the analogy of עָלִי &c., § 93 q. As a matter of fact, however, we ought no doubt to divide and read $p\ddot{o}^o\text{-l}\ddot{o}$ (for $p\ddot{o}\text{-l}\ddot{o}$), $p\ddot{o}\ddot{o}\text{-l}^e k\ddot{h}\ddot{a}$, $q\ddot{o}d\ddot{a}\text{-}\check{s}im$.—Quite as inconceivable is it for *Metheg* to be a sign of the lengthening into \bar{a} in בְּחַרְיִי־נְאֻם (Ex 11⁸), although it is so in בְּנֵי־יָם $b\bar{a}\text{-}^o n\bar{i}$ (in the navy), since here the \bar{a} of the article appears under the ב .

§ 10. *The Half Vowels and the Syllable Divider* ($\check{S}ew\hat{a}$).

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

To these belongs first of all the sign ְ , which indicates an extremely short, slight, and (as regards pronunciation) indeterminate vowel sound, something like an obscure half \check{e} (ְ). It is called $\check{S}ew\hat{a}$,¹ which may be either *simple* $\check{S}ew\hat{a}$ ($\check{S}ew\hat{a}$ *simplex*) as distinguished from the compound (see *f*), or *vocal* $\check{S}ew\hat{a}$ ($\check{S}ew\hat{a}$ *mobile*) as distinguished from $\check{S}ew\hat{a}$ *quiescens*, which is silent and stands as a mere syllable divider (see *i*) under the consonant which closes the syllable.

The vocal $\check{S}ew\hat{a}$ stands under a consonant which is closely united, as *c* a kind of grace-note, with the following syllable, either (*a*) at the beginning of the word, as קָטַל $q^e t\ddot{o}l$ (to kill), מָלַא $m^e mall\ddot{e}$ (filling), or (*b*) in the middle of the word, as קוֹטְלָהּ $q\ddot{o}\text{-}t^e l\ddot{a}$, יִקְטְלוּ $yiq\text{-}t^e l\ddot{u}$.

In former editions of this Grammar $\check{S}ew\hat{a}$ was distinguished as *medium* *d* when it followed a short vowel and therefore stood in a supposed 'loosely closed' or 'wavering' syllable, as in מְלִכִּי , בְּנִפְל . According to Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i. 22, this distinction must now be abandoned. These syllables are really closed, and the original vowel is not merely shortened, but entirely elided. The fact that a following *Begadkephath* letter (§ 6 *n*) remains spirant instead of taking *Dageš lene*, is explained by Sievers on the 'supposition that the change from hard to spirant is older than the elision

¹ On נְאֻם , the older and certainly the only correct form (as in Ben Asher), see Bacher, *ZDMG*. 1895, p. 18, note 3, who compares $\check{S}ewayya$, the name of the Syriac accentual sign of similar form ְ (=Hebr. *Zaqeph*). The form נְאֻם , customary in Spain since the time of Menahem b. Saruq, is due to a supposed connexion with Aram. נְשָׁב *rest*, and hence would originally have denoted only $\check{S}ew\hat{a}$ *quiescens*, like the Arabic *sukūn* (rest). The derivation from שָׁבָה , שִׁיבָה (stem שָׁב , *Levias*, *American Journ. of Philol.*, xvi. 28 ff.) seems impossible.

of the vowel, and that the prehistoric *malakai* became *malakhai* before being shortened to *malkhē'*. In cases like *יְקָחֵ* (from *יִקְחֵ*), *יְקָחֵ* (from *יִקְחֵ*) the dropping of the *Dageš forte* shows that the original vowel is completely lost.

e The sound *ē* has been adopted as the normal transcription of simple *Š^ewā mobile*, although it is certain that it often became assimilated in sound to other vowels. The LXX express it by *ε*, or even by *η*, *כְּרִיבִים* *Χερουβίμ*, *הִלְלֵי-יְהוָה* *ἀλληλούια*, more frequently by *α*, *לְמִנְיָן* *Σαμουήλ*, but very frequently by assimilating its indeterminate sound to the following principal vowel, e.g. *דְּרִם* *Σόδομα*, *הִלְלֵי* *Σολομών* (as well as *Σαλωμών*), *תְּבִיאָה* *Σαβαώθ*, *לְנָתָן* *Ναθαναήλ*.¹ A similar account of the pronunciation of *Š^ewā* is given by Jewish grammarians of the middle ages.²

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

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

(—) *Hâṭēph-Pathāḥ*, e.g. *חַמּוֹר* *ḥ^amôr*, ass.

(—) *Hâṭēph-S^egôl*, e.g. *אָמַר* *'emôr*, to say.

(—) *Hâṭēph-Qāmēs*, e.g. *חֲלִי*, *ḥ^olî*, sickness.

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

On — the shorter *Hâṭef* as compared with — cf. § 27 v.

g Rem. A. Only — and — occur under letters which are not gutturals. *Hâṭēph-Pathāḥ* is found instead of simple *Š^ewā* (especially *Š^ewā mobile*), chiefly (a) under strengthened consonants, since this strengthening (commonly called doubling) causes a more distinct pronunciation of the *Š^ewā mobile*, *יְבִרֵי* branches, Zc 4¹². According to the rule given by Ben-Asher (which, however, appears to be unknown to good early MSS. and is therefore rejected by Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 466; cf. Foote, *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars*, June 1903,

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

² See especially *Yehuda Hayyūg*, pp. 4 f. and 130 f. in Nutt's edition (Lond. 1870), corresponding to p. 200 of the edition by Dukes (Stuttg. 1844); Ibn Ezra's *Šaḥoth*, p. 3; Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache*, p. 68. The *Manuel du lecteur*, mentioned above, § 6 b, also contains express rules for the various ways of pronouncing *Š^ewā mobile*: so too the *Dikduke ha-t'amim*, ed. by Baer and Strack, Lpz. 1879, p. 12 ff. Cf. also Schreiner, *ZAW.* vi. 236 ff.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

following guttural as well as of the preceding U-sound. (Elsewhere indeed after ה in similar cases *Ḥateph-Pathah* is preferred, see above, b; but with לְקַח cf. also סָבְלוּ Is 9³, 10²⁷, 14²⁵, where the U-sound must necessarily be admitted to have an influence on the *Šewá* immediately following.) In וְטָהַר (ú-ṭ^hör) Jb 17⁹ it is also influenced by the following O-sound. In קָסְמִי 1 S 28⁸ *Qeré*, the original form is קָסֵם, where again the *ō* represents an *ö*. It is only through the influence of a following guttural that we can explain the forms נְקַרְאָה Est 2¹⁴; נְבַהֵל Pr 28³²; נְסַרְחָה Jer 49⁷; אֲפִשְׁעָה Is 27⁴; וְאִשְׁמְעָה Dn 8¹³; שְׁמַעָה ψ 39¹³; בְּסַעְרָה 2 K 2¹ (Baer's ed. also in ver. 11); הִקְהַתִּים 2 Ch 34¹² (ed. Mant., Opitius, &c. 'הִקְ). Finally in most of the examples which have been adduced, the influence of an emphatic sound (ק, ט, cf. also אֲלֶקְטָה Ru 2^{2.7}), or of a sibilant is also to be taken into account.

i 3. The sign of the *simple Šewá* — serves also as a mere syllable divider. In this case it is disregarded in pronunciation and is called *Šewá quiescens*. In the middle of a word it stands under every consonant which closes a syllable; at the end of words on the other hand it is omitted except in *final* ך (to distinguish it better from final ך), e.g. מֶלֶךְ *king*, and in the less frequent case, where a word ends with a mute after another vowelless consonant as in נָרַךְ *nard*, אַתְּ *thou fem.* (for *'ant*), קָטַלְתְּ *thou fem. hast killed*, וַיִּשְׁקֵן *and he watered*, וַיִּשָּׁבֶן *and he took captive*, אַל־תִּשְׁתֵּה *drink thou not*; but וַיִּרְאֵה, חָטָא.¹

k However, in the examples where a mute closes the syllable, the final *Šewá* comes somewhat nearer to a vocal *Šewá*, especially as in almost all the cases a weakening of a final vowel has taken place, viz. אַתְּ *'att^e* from אַתִּי *'atti ('anti)*, קָטַלְתְּ from קָטַלְתִּי (cf. in this form, the 2nd sing. fem. perf. Qal, even בָּאתְּ, after a vowel, Gn 16⁸, Mi 4¹⁰, &c., according to the readings of Baer), וַיִּשְׁבֶּן *yisb^e* from וַיִּשְׁבֵּן, &c. The Arabic actually has a short vowel in analogous forms. In נָרַךְ borrowed from the Indian, as also in קִשְׁטֹ (qōšt) Pr 22²¹; and in אַל־תּוֹסַף *ne addas* (for which we should expect תּוֹסַף) Pr 30⁶ the final mute of itself attracts a slight vowel sound.

l Rem. The proper distinction between *simple Šewá mobile* and *quiescens* depends on a correct understanding of the formation of syllables (§ 26). The beginner may observe for the present, that (1) *Šewá* is always *mobile* (a) at the beginning of a word (except in שְׁתִּי, שְׁתִּי § 97 b, note); (b) under a consonant with *Dageš forte*, e.g. גִּדְּפָה *gid-d^ephú*; (c) after another *Šewá*, e.g. יִקְטְלוּ *yiq^tlú* (except at the end of the word, see above, i). (2) *Šewá* is *quiescens* (a) at the end of a word, also in the ך; (b) before another *Šewá*.

§ 11. *Other Signs which affect the Reading.*

Very closely connected with the vowel points are the *reading-signs*, which were probably introduced at the same time. Besides the diacritical point over ש and ש, a point is placed *within* a consonant

¹ On יִתְּ as an ending of the 2nd sing. fem. perf. Qal of verbs ה"ל, see § 75 m.

to show that it has a stronger sound. On the other hand a horizontal stroke (*Rāphè*) over a consonant is a sign that it has *not* the stronger sound. According to the different purposes for which it is used the point is either (1) *Dageš forte*, a sign of strengthening (§ 12); or (2) *Dageš lene*, a sign of the harder pronunciation of certain consonants (§ 13); or (3) *Mappîq*, a sign to bring out the full consonantal value of letters which otherwise serve as vowel letters (§ 7 b), especially in the case of ן at the end of the word (§ 14 a). The *Rāphè*, which excludes the insertion of any of these points, has almost entirely gone out of use in our printed texts (§ 14 e).

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

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

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

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

2. In grammar *Dageš forte*, the *sign of strengthening*, is the more *c* important. It may be compared to the *sicilicus* of the Latins (*Luculus* for *Lucullus*) or to the stroke over *m̄* and *n̄*. In the unpointed text it is omitted, like the vowels and other reading signs.

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

¹ Oort, *Theol. Tijdschr.* 1902, p. 376, maintains that 'the Masoretes recognized no distinction between *Dageš lene* and *forte*. They used a *Dageš* where they considered that a letter had the sharp, not the soft or aspirated sound.' This may be true; but the old-established distinction between the two kinds of *Dageš* is essential for the right understanding of the grammatical forms.

² *Wāw* with *Dageš* (וּ) cannot in our printed texts be distinguished from a *wāw* pointed as שׁוּרְעָ (וּ); in the latter case the point should stand higher up. The וּ ū is, however, easily to be recognized since it cannot take a vowel before or under it.

³ Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, Lpz. 1879, pp. 44, 103, rightly insists on the expression *strengthened pronunciation* instead of the older term *doubling*, since the consonant in question is only written once. The common expression arises from the fact that in transcription a *strengthened* consonant can only be indicated by writing it as double.

§ 13. *Dageš lene*.Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 114 ff. : Dagesh and Raphe.

- a* 1. *Dageš lene*, the sign of *hardening*, is in ordinary printed texts placed only within the בְּגִדְכֶם letters (§ 6 *n*) as a sign that they should be pronounced with their original hard sound (without aspiration), e. g. מֶלֶךְ *mèlèkh*, but מַלְכוֹ *ma!-kô*; תָּפַר *tāphár*, but יִתְפַּר *yith-pōr*; שָׂתָה *šāthā*, but יִשְׂתֶּה *yīš-tè*.
- b* 2. The cases in which a *Dageš lene* is to be inserted are stated in § 21. It occurs almost exclusively at the beginning of words and syllables. In the middle of the word it can easily be distinguished from *Dageš forte*, since the latter always has a vowel before it, whereas *Dageš lene* never has; accordingly the *Dageš* in אֲפִי *'appî*, רַבִּים *rabbîm* must be *forte*, but in יִגְדַל *yigdal* it is *lene*.
- c* A variety of the *Dageš lene* is used in many manuscripts, as well as in Baer's editions, though others (including Ginsburg in the first two cases, *Introd.*, pp. 121, 130, 603, 662) reject it together with the *Hatefs* discussed in § 10 *g*. It is inserted in consonants other than the *Begadkephath* to call attention expressly to the beginning of a new syllable: (*a*) when the same consonant precedes in close connexion, e. g. בְּבִלְבָּי *ψ 9²*, where, owing to the *Dageš*, the coalescing of the two *Lameds* is avoided; (*b*) in cases like מַחְסֵי *ψ 62⁸* = *mah-sî* (not *mäh^a-sî*); (*c*) according to some (including Baer; not in ed. *Mant.*) in לָל in the combination לָלָּ Dt 32⁵, or לָלָּ Hb 1⁶, 2⁶ &c. (so always also in Ginsburg's text, except in Gn 38⁹); see also § 20 *e* and *g*.—Delitzsch appropriately gives the name of *Dageš orthophonikum* to this variety of *Dageš* (*Bibl. Kommentar*, 1874, on *ψ 94¹²*); cf. moreover Delitzsch, *Luth. Ztschr.*, 1863, p. 413; also his *Complutensische Varianten zu dem Alttest. Texte*, Lpz. 1878, p. 12.
- d* 3. When *Dageš forte* is placed in a *Begadkephath*, the strengthening necessarily excludes its aspiration, e. g. אֲנִי, from אֲנִי.

§ 14. *Mappîq and Rāphè*.

- a* 1. *Mappîq*, like *Dageš*, also a point *within* the consonant, serves in the letters וּ הּ אֵ as a sign that they are to be regarded as full consonants and not as vowel letters. In most editions of the text it is only used in the consonantal הּ at the end of words (since הּ can never be a vowel letter in the middle of a word), e. g. גַּבְהָהּ *gābháh* (to be high), אֶרְצָהּ *'aršāh* (her land) which has a consonantal ending (shortened from *-hā*), different from אֶרְצָא *'aršā* (to the earth) which has a vowel ending.
- b* Rem. 1. Without doubt such a *Hē* was distinctly aspirated like the Arabic *Hā* at the end of a syllable. There are, however, cases in which this הּ has lost its consonantal character (the *Mappîq* of course disappearing too), so that it remains only as a vowel letter; cf. § 91 *e* on the 3rd fem. sing.
- c* The name מַפְיֵק means *proferens*, i. e. a sign which brings out the sound of the letter distinctly, as a consonant. The same sign was selected for this

and for *Dageš*, since both are intended to indicate a hard, i. e. a strong, sound. Hence *Rāphè* (see *e*) is the opposite of both.

2. In MSS. Mappiq is also found with \aleph , ι , υ , to mark them expressly as *d* consonants, e. g. \aleph (gōy), ι (qāw, qāu), for which υ is also used, as \aleph , &c. For the various statements of the Masora (where these points are treated as *Dageš*), see Ginsburg, *The Massorah*, letter \aleph , § 5 (also *Introd.*, pp. 557, 609, 637, 770), and 'The Dageshed Alephs in the Karlsruhe MS.' (where these points are extremely frequent), in the *Verhandlungen des Berliner Orientalisten-Kongresses*, Berlin, i. 1881, p. 136 ff. The great differences in the statements found in the Masora point to different schools, one of which appears to have intended that every audible \aleph should be pointed. In the printed editions the point occurs only four times with \aleph (\aleph or \aleph), Gn 43²⁶, Lv 23¹⁷, Ezr 8¹⁸ and Jb 33²¹ (\aleph ; where the point can be taken only as an orthophonetic sign, not with König as *Dageš forte*). Cf. Delitzsch, *Hiob*, 2nd ed., p. 439 ff.

2. *Rāphè* (\aleph i. e. weak, soft), a horizontal stroke over the letter, *e* is the opposite of both kinds of *Dageš* and *Mappiq*, but especially of *Dageš lene*. In exact manuscripts every \aleph letter has either *Dageš lene* or *Rāphè*, e. g. \aleph *mèlèkh*, \aleph . In modern editions (except Ginsburg's 1st ed.) *Rāphè* is used only when the absence of a *Dageš* or *Mappiq* requires to be expressly pointed out.

§ 15. The Accents.

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

1. As Prætorius (see above) has convincingly shown, the majority of *b* the Hebrew accents, especially, according to Kahle (see above), the 'Conjunctivi', were adopted by the Jews from the neums and punctuation-marks found in Greek gospel-books, and, like these, their primary purpose was to regulate minutely the public reading of the sacred

text. The complete transformation and amplification of the system (in three different forms, see § 8 g, note), which soon caused the Jews to forget its real origin, is clearly connected with the gradual change from the speaking voice in public reading to chanting or singing. The accents then served as a kind of musical notes.¹ Their value as such has, however, with the exception of a few traces, become lost in transmission. On the other hand, according to their original design they have also a twofold use which is still of the greatest importance for grammar (and syntax), viz. their value (a) as *marking the tone*, (b) as *marks of punctuation* to indicate the logical (syntactical) relation of single words to their immediate surroundings, and thus to the whole sentence.²

c 2. As a mark of the tone the accent stands almost invariably (but see below, e) with the syllable which has the principal tone in the word. This is usually the ultima, less frequently the penultima. Amongst the Jewish grammarians a word which has the tone on the ultima is called *Milra'* (Aram. מְלִרָע i.e. accented below³), e.g. קָטָל *qātál*; a word which has the tone on the penultima is *Mil'él* (Aram. מְלֵעִיל, accented above), e.g. מֶלֶךְ *mèlěkh*. Besides this, in many cases a *secondary tone* is indicated in the word by *Mèthěg* (cf. § 16). Examples such as יְהוָה נִעְמְדָה Is 50⁸ (cf. 40¹⁸, Ex 15⁸, Jb 12¹⁵, La 2¹⁶) are regarded by the Jewish grammarians as even *proparoxytone*.⁴

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

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

² At the same time it must not be forgotten that the value of the accent as a mark of punctuation is always relative; thus, e. g. 'Athnāh as regards the logical structure of the sentence may at one time indicate a very important break (as in Gn 1⁴); at another, one which is almost imperceptible (as in Gn 1¹).

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

⁴ Cf. Delitzsch on Is 40¹⁸.

I. The Common Accents.

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

A. DISJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (*Distinctivi* or *Domini*).¹

f

1. (—) סִלּוּק Sillûq (*end*) always with the tone-syllable of the last word before Sôph pāsûq (:), the verse-divider, e.g. : הַאֲרָץ.
2. (—) אֲתַנַּח 'Athnâḥ or אֲתַנַּחְתָּ 'Athnaḥtā (*rest*), the principal divider within the verse.
- 3 a. (—) סִגּוּלְתָּ Sogôltā, *postpositive*, marks the fourth or fifth subordinate division, counting backwards from 'Athnâḥ (e.g. Gn 1^{7.28}).
- 3 b. (|—) שְׁלֶשֶׁלֶת Šalšèleth (i.e. *chain*), as disjunctive, or Great Šalšèleth, distinguished by the following stroke² from the conjunctive in the poetic accentuation, is used for

¹ All the disjunctives occur in Is 39².—The earlier Jewish accentuologists already distinguish between מַלְכִים *Reges* and מַעֲרָתִים *Servi*. The division of the disjunctive accents into Imperatores, Reges, Duces, Comites, which became common amongst Christian grammarians, originated in the *Scrutinium S. S. ex accentibus* of Sam. Bohlius, Rostock, 1636, and, as the source of manifold confusion, had better be given up. The order of the accents in respect to their disjunctive power is shown in general by the above classification, following Wickes. In respect to the height of tone (in chanting) 1, 2, 5, 4, 8, which were *low* and long sustained notes, are to be distinguished from the *high* notes (7, 3^a, 6, 13, 9^a), and the highest (3^b, 11, 12, 10); cf. Wickes, א"כ' ט' p. 12 ff.—The name מַעֲרָתִים (later = *accents* in general) was originally restricted to the disjunctives, see Kahle, l. c., p. 169.

² This stroke is commonly confused with *Paseq*, which has the same form. But Pāsēq (= *restraining, dividing*, also incorrectly called P^osiq) is neither an independent accent, nor a constituent part of other accents, but is used as a mark for various purposes; see the Masoretic lists at the end of Baer's editions, and Wickes, *Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, p. 120 ff., where Pāsēq is divided into *distinctivum, emphaticum, homonymicum, and euphonicum*. The conjecture of Olshausen (*Lehrb.*, p. 86 f.), that Pāsēq served also to point out marginal glosses subsequently interpolated into the text, has been further developed by E. von Ortenberg, 'Die Bedeutung des Paseq für Quellenscheidung in den BB. d. A. T.,' in *Progr. des Domgymn. zu Verden*, 1887, and in the article, 'Paseq u. Legarmeh,' in *ZAW.* 1887, p. 301 ff. (but see Wickes, *ibid.* 1888, p. 149 ff.; also E. König, in the *Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben*, 1889, parts 5 and 6; Maas, in *Hebraica*, v. 121 ff., viii. 89 ff.). Prætorius, *ZDMG.* 1899, p. 683 ff., pointed out that *Paseq* (which is pre-masoretic and quite distinct from *L^egarmēh*) besides being a divider (used especially for the sake of greater clearness) also served as a sign of abbreviation. For further treatment of *Paseq* see H. Grimme, 'Pasekstudien,' in the *Bibl. Ztschr.*, i. 337 ff., ii. 28 ff., and *Psalmenprobleme, &c.*, Freiburg (Switzerland), 1902, p. 173, where it is argued that *Paseq* indicates variants in a difficult sentence; J. Kennedy, *The Note-line in the Heb. Scriptures*, Edinb. 1903, with an index of all the occurrences of *Paseq*, p. 117 ff. According to Kennedy the 'note-line', of which he distinguishes sixteen different kinds, is intended to draw attention to some peculiarity in the text; it existed long before the Masoretes, and was no longer understood by them. See, however, the reviews of E. König, *Theol.*

Segôltā (seven times altogether) when this would stand at the head of the sentence; cf. Gn 19¹⁶, &c.

- 4 a. (—) זָקֵף גָּדוֹל Zâqēph gādôl, and
 4 b. (—) זָקֵף קָטוֹן Zâqēph qātôn. The names refer to their musical character. As a disjunctive, Little Zâqēph is by nature stronger than Great Zâqēph; but if they stand together, the one which comes first is always the stronger.
5. (—) טִפְחָא Tiphhā or טַרְחָא Tarhā, a subordinate disjunctive before Sillûq and 'Athnâh, but very often the principal disjunctive of the whole verse instead of 'Athnâh; always so when the verse consists of only two or three words (e.g. Is 2¹⁹), but also in longer verses (Gn 3²¹).
6. (—) רְבִיעַ Rebhîa'.
7. (—) זַרְקָא Zarqā, *postpositive*.
- 8 a. (—) פַּשְׁטָא Paštā, *postpositive*,¹ and
 8 b. (—) יְתִיב Yethîbh, *prepositive*, and thus different from Mehup-pākh. Yethîbh is used in place of Paštā when the latter would stand on a monosyllable or on a foretoned word, not preceded by a conjunctive accent.
9. (—) תְּבִיר Tebhîr.
- 10 a. (—) גֵּרֶשׁ גָּדוֹל Gèrēš or טֶרֶס Tères, and
 10 b. (—) גֵּרֶשׁ יְשִׁים Gerāšáyim² or Double Gèrēš, used for Gèrēš, when the tone rests on the ultima, and 'Azlā does not precede.
- 11 a. (—) פַּזֵּר Pázēr, and
 11 b. (—) פַּזֵּר גָּדוֹל Pázēr gādôl (Great Pázēr) or קַרְנֵי פָּרָה Qarnê phārā (cow-horns), only used 16 times, for special emphasis.
12. (—) תְּלִישָׁא גָּדוֹלָה Telišā gedôlā or Great Telišā, *prepositive*.
13. (—) לְגַרְמֵה Legarmēh, i.e. Mûnah (see below) with a following stroke.

Stud. u. Krit., 1904, p. 448 ff., G. Beer, *TLZ.* 1905, no. 3, and esp. A. Klostermann, *Theol. Lit.-blatt*, 1904, no. 13, with whom Ginsburg agrees (*Verhandlungen des Hamb. Or.-kongresses von 1902*, Leiden, 1904, p. 210 ff.) in showing that the tradition with regard to the 479 or 480 uses of *Paseq* is by no means uniform. The purpose of *Paseq* is clearly recognizable in the five old rules: as a divider between identical letters at the end and beginning of two words; between identical or very similar words; between words which are absolutely contradictory (as *God* and *evil-doer*); between words which are liable to be wrongly connected; and lastly, between heterogeneous terms, as 'Eleazar the High Priest, and Joshua'. But the assumption of a far-reaching critical importance in *Paseq* is at least doubtful.—Cf. also the important article by H. Fuchs, 'Pesiq ein Glossenzeichen,' in the *Vierteljahrsschrift f. Bibelkunde*, Aug. 1908, p. 1 ff. and p. 97 ff.

¹ If the word in question has the tone on the penultima, Paštā is placed over it also, e.g. תָּהוּ Gn 1²; cf. below, l.

² Wickes requires Geršáyim (גֵּרְשִׁים).



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

10. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) Pázēr (see above, I, 11 *a*).
 11 *a*. ($| \overset{\vee}{-}$) M^ohuppākh l^ogarmēh, i.e. Mahpākh with a following stroke.
 11 *b*. ($| \overset{\vee}{-}$) 'Azlā l^ogarmēh, i.e. 'Azlā with a following stroke.

i

B. CONJUNCTIVI.

12. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) Mērekhā (see above, I. 16 *a*).
 13. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) Mūnaḥ (see above, I. 14).
 14. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) עֲלִי 'Illûy or Mūnaḥ superior.
 15. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) טַרְחָה Tarḥā (under the tone-syllable, and thus easily distinguished from No. 9).
 16. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) Galgal or Yèrah (see above, I. 20).
 17. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) M^ohuppākh or Mahpākh (see above, I. 15).
 18. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) 'Azlā (see above, I. 18).
 19. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) Šalšèleth q^oṭannā (Little Šalšèleth).

The last three are distinguished from the disjunctives of the same name by the absence of the stroke.

[20. ($\overset{\vee}{-}$) Šinnôríth, see above under No. 7.]

REMARKS ON THE ACCENTS.

I. *As Signs of the Tone.*

k 1. As in Greek and English (cf. *εμί* and *ε̄μι*, *compact* and *compáct*) so also in Hebrew, words which are written with the same consonants are occasionally distinguished by the position of the tone, e.g. בָּנִי *banú* (they built), בָּנֵנוּ *bánu* (in us); קָמָה *qáma* (she stood up), קָמָה *qamá* (standing up, *fem.*).

l 2. As a rule the accent stands on the tone-syllable, and properly on its initial consonant. In the case of prepositives and postpositives alone (see above, *e*) the tone-syllable must be ascertained independently of the accent. In many MSS. as well as in Baer's editions of the text, the postpositive sign in foretoned words stands also over the tone-syllable after the analogy of Paštā (see above, I. 8 *a*, note); e.g. וְיִשְׁכְּבוּ אֲרָם Gn 19⁴; so the prepositive sign in cases like וְיִהְיֶה Gn 8¹³.

II. *As Signs of Punctuation.*

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

n 4. In general a conjunctive (*Servus*) unites only such words as are closely connected in sense, e.g. a noun with a following genitive or a noun with an

adjective. For the closest connexion between two or more words *Maqqēph* is added (§ 16 a).

5. The consecution of the several accents (especially the correspondence of *O* disjunctives with their proper conjunctives) conforms in the most minute details to strict rules, for a further investigation of which we must refer to the above-mentioned works. Here, to avoid misunderstanding, we shall only notice further the rule that in the accentuation of the books ם"נח, the *R^ebhī^a* *mugrāš* before *Silluq*, and the *D^ehi* before *'Athnāh*, must be changed into conjunctives, unless at least two toneless syllables precede the principal disjunctive. For this purpose Š^owā *mobile* after Qames, Sere, or Holem (with Metheg) is to be regarded as forming a syllable. After 'Ôlè w^oyôred the *'Athnāh* does not necessarily act as pausal (cf. Delitzsch on ψ 45⁶). The condition of our ordinary texts is corrupt, and the system of accents can only be studied in correct editions [see Wickes' two treatises].

6. A double accentuation occurs in Gn 35²², from ויזכר onward (where *p* the later accentuation, intended for public reading, aims at uniting vv. 22 and 23 into *one*, so as to pass rapidly over the unpleasant statement in v. 22); and in the Decalogue, Ex 20^{2 ff.}; Dt 5^{6 ff.} Here also the later (mainly superlinear) accentuation which closes the first verse with ם עברים (instead of פני) is adopted simply for the purposes of public reading, in order to reduce the original twelve verses (with sublinear accentuation) to ten, the number of the Commandments. Thus ם עברים at the end of v. 2 has Silluq (to close the verse) in the lower accentuation, but in the upper, which unites vv. 2-6 (the actual words of God) into a single period, only *R^ebhī^a*. Again פני, regarded as closing v. 3, is pointed פני (pausal Qames with Silluq), but in the upper accentuation it is פני with Pathah because not in pause. (Originally there may have been a third accentuation requiring ם עברים and פני, and thus representing vv. 2 and 3 as the first commandment.) Further the upper accentuation unites vv. 8-11 into one period, while in vv. 12-15 the lower accentuation combines commandments 5-8 into one verse. Cf. Geiger, *Urschrift u. Übersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 373; Japhet, *op. cit.*, p. 158, and esp. K. J. Grimm, *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circ.* xix (May, 1900), no. 145.

§ 16. Of *Maqqēph* and *Mèthēg*.

These are both closely connected with the accents.

a

1. *Maqqēph* (מקף i.e. *binder*) is a small horizontal stroke between the upper part of two words which so connects them that in respect of tone and pointing they are regarded as one, and therefore have only one accent. Two, three, or even four words may be connected in this way, e.g. כל־אדם *every man*, את־כל־עשב *every herb*, Gn 1²⁹, לוֹ את־כל־אשר־לוֹ *all that he had*, Gn 25⁵.

Certain monosyllabic prepositions and conjunctions, such as אל־ to, עד־ *until*, על־ upon, עם־ with, נל־ ne, אם־ if, whether, מן־ from, פן־ lest, are almost always found with a following *Maqqēph*, provided they have not become independent forms by being combined with prefixes, e.g. מעל, מעם, in which case *Maqqēph* as a rule does not follow. Occasionally *Maqqēph* is replaced by a conjunctive accent (see above, § 9 u, 1 c), as, according to the Masora, in Dt 27⁹, 2 S 20²³, Jer 25³⁰, 29²⁵, Ec 9⁴ in the case of אל־ כל־; ψ 47⁵, 60², Pr 3¹² in the case of את־, the objective particle. Longer words are, however, con-

nected by Maqqēph with a following monosyllable, e.g. הַתְּהַלְּךְ-נָחַח Gn 6°, וַיְהִי-בֵן Gn 17; or two words of more than one syllable, e.g. שִׁבְעָה-עָשָׂר *seventeen*, Gn 7¹¹. Cf. the Greek proclitics ἐν, ἐκ, εἰς, εἰ, ὡς, οὐ, which are *atonic*, and lean on the following word.

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

d It is divided into: 1. The *light Mèthëg*. This is subdivided again into (a) the ordinary *Mèthëg* of the counter-tone, as a rule in the second (open) syllable before the tone, e.g. הָאָרְץ (cf. also such cases as מֶלֶךְ-צָר); but also in the third when the second is closed, e.g. הָאָרְבָּעִים (also in such cases as עֶבֶר-הַמֶּלֶךְ), and when the third is not suitable for it, even in the fourth (open) syllable before the tone. This *Mèthëg* may be repeated in the fourth syllable before the tone, when it already stands in the second, e.g. שִׁבְעַתֶּיכֶם. Finally it is always added to the vowel of an open ultima, which is joined by Maqqēph to a word beginning with a toneless syllable and so without *Mèthëg* (e.g. בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל, on the other hand רִשְׁפֵי-קֶשֶׁת, לֹא-אֶהְיָה), or to a word beginning with *Šewā* before the tone-syllable, e.g. מִי-לֶךְ, שְׁלֹמֹה-בְּנֵי, &c.; the object being to prevent the *Šewā* from becoming *quiescent*.

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

f (b) The *firm or indispensable Mèthëg*. (a) With all long vowels (except in certain cases, ו copulative, see above), which are followed by a *Šewā mobile* preceding the tone-syllable; e.g. יִשְׁנֶה, &c. (β) To emphasize a long vowel in a closed syllable immediately before Maqqēph, e.g. שֵׁת-לִי Gn 4²⁵ (not *šōth-lī*); hence also with כָּל-ψ 138², and אֶת-יְבִיבִי Jb 41²⁶ (for כָּל- and אֶת-; cf. also מֵאֶת- Jo 15¹⁸, &c.). (γ) With *Šere*, which has become toneless through retraction of the tone, in order to prevent its being pronounced as *Sēghól*, e.g. אֶהְבֶּה דַעַת Pr 12¹ (not *'ōhëbh*). (δ) With all vowels before composite *Šewā*, e.g. יַעֲמֹד, יַעֲקֹב, &c. (except when the following consonant is strengthened, e.g. יַקְבֹּבֵי Is 62², because the strengthening by *Dageš* excludes the retarding of the vowel by *Mèthëg*); so in the cases discussed in § 28 *c*, where a short vowel has taken the place of a *Ḥateph*, as יַעֲמֹדֵי, &c. (ε) In the preformative syllable of all forms of הָיָה *to be*, and תָּחִיָּה *to live*, when *Šewā quiescens* stands under the ה or ת, e.g. יִהְיֶה, תִּחְיֶה (*yih-yè, tih-yè*), &c., cf.

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

§ 63 q. (c) With the Qames of the plural forms of בַּיִת *house* (thus בַּיִתִּים *báttim*, cf. § 96 under בַּיִת), and with הֵנָּה ¹ *prithēe!* to guard against the pronunciation *böttim*, *önnā*.—Every kind of light *Mèthëg* may in certain circumstances be changed into a conjunctive accent, e. g. בַּיִתִּים 2 Ch 34¹¹, &c.

2. The *grave Mèthëg* (*Ga'yā* in the more limited sense) is especially employed ^g in the following cases in order more distinctly to emphasize a short vowel or an initial *Šewā*: (a) with the Pathah of the article or of the prefixes ב, כ, ל, when followed by *Šewā* under a consonant without *Dageš*, e. g. הַמֶּסְלָה, לַמֶּסְלָה, &c., but not before י (before which י also remains without *Mèthëg*, with the exception of וַיִּהְיֶה and וַיִּהְיֶה, when they are followed by *Maqqēph*, or accented with *Paštā*), nor before the tone-syllable of a word, and neither *before* nor *after* the common *Mèthëg*; likewise not in words which are connected by a conjunctive accent with the following word; (b) with the interrogative ה with *Pathah* (except when it precedes י, *Dageš forte* or the tone-syllable of the word), e. g. הֲלֹא־לֵךְ. When a *Šewā* follows the ה and after the *Šewā* there is an untoned syllable, Baer places the *Mèthëg* to the right of the *Pathah*, e. g. הַבְּרָכָה Gn 27³³ (but ed. Mant. and Ginsb. 'הַבְּרָכָה); (c) with the Pathah or S^gol of the article before a guttural (which cannot take *Dageš*), e. g. הַחַיִּים, הַהַרְיִים.—The *Šewā-Ga'yā* (ֵ) is especially important in the accentuation of the מ"א, for purposes of musical recitation; it stands chiefly in words whose principal tone is marked by a disjunctive without a preceding conjunctive, e. g. וְהָיָה ψ 1³.

3. The *euphonic Ga'yā*, to ensure the distinct pronunciation of those consonants which in consequence of the loss of the tone, or because they close a syllable, might easily be neglected, e. g. וַיִּשְׁבַּע לוֹ Gn 24⁹; פָּרְנָה אֲרָם (here to avoid a hiatus) 28², or in such cases as רִוַח־אֵל Jb 33⁴, &c.; תִּרְשָׁא Gn 1¹¹.

Mèthëg (especially in the cases mentioned in 1, b, a) is a guide to correct ⁱ pronunciation, since it distinguishes *ā* from *ö* (except in the case noted in § 9 v, b) and *î* from *ï*; e. g. אִכְלָה 'ā-kh^elā (she has eaten), but אִכְלָה 'ökh^elā (food), since the ֵ stands here in a toneless closed syllable, and must therefore be a short vowel; thus also יִרְאוּ yî-r^eû (they fear), but יִרְאוּ yir'û (they see), יִשְׁנוּ (they sleep), but יִשְׁנוּ (they repeat). The Jewish grammarians, however, do not consider the syllables lengthened by *Mèthëg* as open. They regard the *Šewā* as *quiescent* in cases like אִכְלָה, and belonging to the preceding vowel; cf. Baer, *Thorat 'Emeth*, p. 9, and in Merx's *Archiv*, i. p. 60, Rem. 1, and especially *Dikduke ha-š'amim*, p. 13.

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

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

1. The margin of Biblical MSS. and editions exhibits variants ^a of an early date (§ 3 c), called קִרְיָ² to be read, since, according to

¹ The common form is אִכְלָה, with an accent on both syllables, in which case, according to Qimḥi, the tone is always to be placed on the former. For the above mode of writing and position of the tone cf. Is 38³, Jon 1¹⁴, 4², ψ 116⁴.

² On the necessity of the punctuation קִרְיָ as passive participle (= *legendum*)

the opinion of the Jewish critics, they are to be preferred to the *כְּתִיב*, i.e. what is *written* in the text, and are actually to be read instead of it.

On this account the vowels of the marginal reading (the *Qerê*) are placed under the consonants of the text, and in order to understand both readings properly, the vowels in the text must be applied to the marginal reading, while for the reading of the text (the *Kethîbh*) its own vowels are to be used. Thus in Jer 42⁶ אָנֹכִי occurs in the text, in the margin אֲנַחְנוּ קָרִי. Read אָנֹכִי *we* (or according to Jewish tradition אָנֹכִי) in the text, in the margin אֲנַחְנוּ. A small circle or asterisk in the text always refers to the marginal reading.

b 2. Words or consonants which are to be passed over in reading, and are therefore left unpointed, are called *כְּתִיב וְלֹא קָרִי* (*scriptum et non legendum*), e.g. אֵת Jer 38¹⁶, אִם 39¹², יֵרֶךְ 51³. Conversely, words not contained in the text, but required by the Masora (as indicated by the insertion of their vowels), are called *קָרִי וְלֹא כְּתִיב*, e.g. 2 S 8³, Jer 31³⁸. See further Strack, *Prolegomena Critica*, p. 85; *Dikduke ha-ʿamim*, §§ 62, 64; Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 49 ff.

c 3. In the case of some very common words, which are *always* to be read otherwise than according to the *Kethîbh*, it has not been considered necessary to place the *Qerê* in the margin, but its vowels are simply attached to the word in the text. This *Qerê perpetuum* occurs in the Pentateuch in הוּא (Qerê הִיא) wherever הוּא stands for the feminine (§ 32 l), and in נֶעַר (Kethîbh נֶעֶר, Qerê נִעְרָה) always, except in Dt 22¹⁹ (but the Sam. text always has הִיא, נֶעֶרָה). The ordinary explanation of this supposed archaism, on the analogy of Greek ὁ παῖς and ἡ παῖς, our *child*, is inadequate, since there is no trace elsewhere of this epicene use; נֶעַר for נֶעֶרָה is rather a survival of a system of orthography in which a final vowel was written defectively, as in קָטַלְתָּ; cf. § 2 n.— Other instances are: יִשְׁכַּר (Q. יִשְׁכָּר) Gn 30¹⁸ &c., see the *Lexicon*, and Baer and Delitzsch, *Genesis*, p. 84, and below, note to § 47 b; יְרוּשָׁלַם (Q. יְרוּשָׁלַיִם), properly יְרוּשָׁלַם; יְהוָה (Q. יְהוָה *the Lord*), or (after יְהוָה) יְהוָה (Q. יְהוָה) properly יְהוָה *Yahwè* (cf. § 102 m, and § 135 q, note); on שְׁנַיִם, שְׁתַּיִם for שְׁנֵי, שְׁתֵּי, see § 97 d, end.

d 4. The masoretic apparatus accompanying the biblical text is divided into (a) *Masora marginalis*, consisting of (a) *Masora (marginalis) magna* on the upper and lower margins of MSS.; (β) *Masora (marginalis) parva* between and on the right and left of the columns;

instead of קָרִי *Qerî*, which was formerly common but is properly a past tense (= *lectum est*), see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 81, note.

(b) *Masora finalis* at the end of the several books, counting Samuel, Kings, Minor Prophets, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, each as one book. On all three varieties see especially Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 423 ff., and the appendices containing (p. 983 ff.) the masoretic treatise from the St. Petersburg MS. of A.D. 1009, and (p. 1000 ff.) specimens of the *Masora parva* and *magna* on two chapters.

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

אות letter. אֲלֵא nisi, except. אֶמְצַע middle. אֶס"ף = סוף פסוק = אס"ף in the formula אֶס"ף בְּלֵא without 'Athnah or Soph-pasuq i.e. although no 'Athnah or Soph-pasuq is written.

בְּ with, before names of vowels or accents, as בְּזָקֶף Qames with Zaqeph used instead of Pathah (§ 29 i).—ב' as a numeral = two, as in ב' טַעֲמִים two accents. בְּמִקְצַת, see מְקַצֵּת. בְּנִסְחָא אַחֲרִינָא (Aramaic) in another copy; pl. בְּנִסְחָן אַחֲרִינָן.—בְּסִפְרִים אַחֲרִים = בס"א in other books. בְּתַר (Aram.) after.

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

זְעִיר fem. זְעִירָא (Aram.) small.

חֹל profane, not sacred, e.g. חֹל אֱלֹהֵי Gn 19² because not referring to God. חֹלֵי except. חֹסֶר written defectively, also wanting as 'ח 'aleph is omitted.

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

יְתִיר superfluous.

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

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

מְדוּקָא accurately corrected. מְלֵא full i.e. written plene. מְלִמְטָה below = מְלַרַע (§ 15 c). מְנוּזָרוֹת separated, the name of the strangely formed Nûns before ψ 107²³ ff. (§ 5 n). מְקֻרָא that which is read, the name for all the O. T. scriptures. מְקַצֵּת part.

נְחָ fem. נְחָה quiescent, i.e. not sounded. נְעֻלָּם concealed, i.e. only retained orthographically. נִקְוֵד a point. נִקְוֵדָה pointed.

ס"א see בְּ. סִימְן σημεῖον, sign, esp. a mnemonic word or, frequently, sentence. סָךְ = סְכּוּם total. סוף פסוק = אס"ף (§ 15 f).

עַמּוּד column of a page.

פִּי בְּאֶמְצַע פְּסוּק a masoretic verse. פְּסוּקָא a space, esp. in the phrase פִּי בְּאֶמְצַע פְּסוּק a space within a verse, e.g. Gn 35²²; cf. H. Grätz, *Monatschrift für Gesch. u. Wiss. des Judentums*, 1878, p. 481 ff., and H. Strack, *ibid.* 1879, p. 26 ff.

קָרִי = קָרִי, see above, c. קָרֵם properly קָרֵם before. קָמוּצָה fem. קָמוּצָה poin'ed with Qames. קוֹרֵא reader of the sacred text.

רַבְתָּא, רַבְתָּה, רַבְתִּי (Aram., all fem. sing.) large.

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

CHAPTER II

PECULIARITIES AND CHANGES OF LETTERS: THE SYLLABLE AND THE TONE

§ 18.

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

§ 19. *Changes of Consonants.*

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

1. *Commutation*¹ may take place between consonants which are either *homorganic* or *homogeneous* (cf. § 6 *q*), e.g. עָלַץ, עָלַם, עָלַו to *exult*, לָאָה, לָהָה, Aram. נָעָל to *be weary*, חָנַץ and חָנַץ to *press*, סָנַר and סָנַר to *close*, מָלַט and פָּלַט to *escape*. In process of time, and partly under the influence of Aramaic, the harder and rougher sounds especially were changed into the softer, e.g. קָחַץ into קָחַץ to *laugh*, לָעַץ into לָעַץ to *reject*, and the sibilants into the corresponding mutes: ך into ך, שׁ into ן, צ into ט. In many cases these mutes may be regarded as a return to an earlier stage of the pronunciation.

The interchange of consonants, however, belongs rather to the lexicographical treatment of stems² than to grammatical inflexion. To the latter belong the interchange (*a*) of ן and ט in *Hithpa'el* (§ 54 *b*); (*b*) of ך and ך in verbs *primae Yôd* (§ 69), חָלַץ for חָלַץ, &c.

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

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

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



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

§ 68 b-k), e.g. in מוֹם for מָּאֹם. As a rule in such cases, however, the א is orthographically retained, e.g. לְקַרְאֵת for לְקַרְאֵת. Syncope occurs frequently in the case of ה, e.g. לְהַפְלִיךָ for לְהַפְלִיךָ (§ 23 k and § 35 n), יִקְטִיל for יְהִקְטִיל (§ 53 a).

Syncope of א with Šewâ occurs in such cases as בְּאַרְנֵי for בְּאַרְנֵי (cf. § 102 m); וְאַעֲשֶׂר Zc 11⁵.¹ On the cases in which א is wholly omitted after the article, see § 35 d.

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

l (c) At the end of a word (*apocope*), e.g. גִּלְהָה pr. name of a city (cf. גִּילְוֵי Gilonite); וַיִּרְאֵה, where א though really rejected is orthographically retained, &c. On the apocope of ו and י in verbs ל'ה, see § 24 g, and § 75 a.

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

m 4. To avoid harshness in pronunciation a helping sound, Aleph prosthetic² with its vowel, is prefixed to some words, e.g. אֵזְרוּעַ and אֵזְרוּעַ arm (cf. χθές, ἐχθές; spiritus, French esprit).—A prosthetic ע occurs probably in אֵקָרַב scorpion; cf. Arab. 'usfûr bird (stem safara).

n 5. *Transposition*³ occurs only seldom in the grammar, e.g. הַשְׁתַּמֵּר for הַתְּשַׁמֵּר (§ 54 b) for the sake of euphony; it is more frequent in the lexicon (שְׁבִיבָה and שְׁבִיבָה lamb, שְׂמֵלָה and שְׂמֵלָה garment), but is mostly confined to sibilants and sonants.

o 6. *Softening* occurs e.g. in כּוֹכַב star, from *kaukabh*=*kawkabh* for *kubhkabh* (cf. Syriac *raurab*=*rabrab*); טוֹפּוֹת phylacteries for *taph-tāphôth*; according to the common opinion, also in אִישׁ man from 'inš, cf. however § 96.

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

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

(a) when the same consonant would be written twice in succession

in בְּלָה Jos 19³ for בְּעֵלָה (as in 15²⁹). Probably, however, וּנְשָׁה and בְּלָה are only clerical errors, as is undoubtedly כְּאֵר Am 8⁸ for כְּיֵאֵר (9⁵).

¹ Frensdorff, *Ochla W'ochla*, p. 97 f., gives a list of forty-eight words with quiescent א.

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

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

without an intermediate vowel or *Šewā mobile*; thus we have נָתַנִּי for נָתַנְנִי *nāthān-nū* and שָׁתַּי for שָׁתַּיִן.

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

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

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

This coalescing of two consonants as indicated above does not take place *b* when the first has a vowel or *Šewā mobile*. In the latter case, according to the correct Masora, a compound *Šewā* should be used, preceded by *Methëg*, e.g. הוֹלִלִים, קַלְלִים, &c. (cf. §§ 10g, 16f). This pointing is not used before the suffix הַ, e.g. הַתְּבַרְכֵהּ Gn 27⁴, but the first כ has a vocal *Šewā*, otherwise the second כ would have *Dageš lene*. Also when the former of the two consonants has been already strengthened by *Dageš forte*, it can only have a vocal *Šewā*, and any further contraction is therefore impossible. This applies also to cases where *Dageš forte* has been omitted (see below, m), e.g. הִלְלוּ properly הִלְלוּ = *hal-lelû*. The form הִנְנִי ψ 9¹⁴ (not הִנְנִי) might be explained as imperat. Pi'el = הִנְנִי; if it were imperat. Qal the non-contraction of the monosyllabic root would be as strange as it is in שָׁרַדְתָּ Jer 49²⁸, and in the imperf. יִשְׁרַדְתָּ Jer 5⁶.

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

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

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

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

² לֵאמֹר alone, although having the tone on the ultima, invariably takes the *Dageš forte conj.* when מִשֶּׁה with a conjunctive accent precedes, Ex 6^{10, 29}, 15²⁴, &c.

Some limit the use of the *D^ehîq* to the closest connexion of a monosyllable with a following *B^egadk^ephath*. However, it also applies to cases like לְכֵה־נָא Nu 22⁶; לִקְהָה־זֹאת Gn 2²³; וַיִּצְיֶה־לָךְ ψ 91¹¹; and even with רֵשׁ, מַעֲנֶה־רַךְ Pr 15¹; וּמִשְׁנֵה־פֶסֶק Gn 43¹⁵. In all these examples the tone, were it not for the *Maqqēph*, would be on the ultima of the first word.

d Rem. 1. When וְהַ this has *Maqqēph* after it, a *Dageš forte conj.* always follows, even if the next word is neither a monosyllable nor has the tone on the initial syllable; thus not only in וְהַ־שְׂמוֹ Jer 23⁶, but also in וְהַ־פְּרִיָה Nu 13²⁷, 1 Ch 22¹. In הַנְּהַ־נָא Gn 19² (where *Maqqēph* is represented by a conjunctive accent, § 9 u, 1 c, and § 16 b), the *S^oghôl* coincides with the secondary tone-syllable. On the origin of *Dag. f. conj.* after מַה־ (for מָה) *what?*, see § 37 b, c.

e 2. Such cases as גִּנְאָה־גִּנְאָה Ex 15^{1.21}, the 2nd כְּמִכָּה in ver. 11, גִּנְאָלָתָּ ver. 13, כְּנִבְנָן ver. 16, do not belong here. In these the *Dageš* can only be intended for *Dag. lene*, see § 21 d.

f (2) In the first letter of a monosyllable, or of a word with the tone on the first syllable after a closely connected *mil'êl* ending in ה־ or ה־. Such a *mil'êl* is called by the Jewish grammarians אֲתִי מִרְחִיק (Aram.=Heb. אֲתָה מִרְחֹק) *veniens e longinquo* (in respect of the tone). The attraction of the following tone-syllable by *Dageš forte conj.* is here also due to the exigencies of rhythm, e.g. שְׁבִיתָ־שָׁבִי ψ 68¹⁹; הוֹשִׁיעָה־נָא ψ 118²⁵ (so ed. Mant., but Ginsburg and Kittel הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא); הִרְתִּיבָה־שְׂאוּל Is 5¹⁴; אֲרָצָה־כְּנָעַן Gn 11³¹. The *Mil'êl* may, however, also be due to a subsequent retraction of the tone (*nāsôg 'ahôr*, § 29 e), as in עֲשֵׂה־פְרִי Gn 1¹¹.—The prefixes בְּ, כִּי, לְ and וְ alone do not take a *Dageš* in this case, except in לְךָ, always, and לְלִילָהּ ψ 19³. Such forms as הִשְׁבַּעָה־לִּי Gn 21²³, מִלְּאָה־שָׁחַר ψ 26¹⁰, רָחַקָה־מִנִּי Jb 21¹⁶, and even נִעַמְדָה־יַחַד Is 50⁸ (i.e. the cases where the tone is thrown back from the ultima on to the syllable which otherwise would have *Metheg*), are likewise regarded as *mil'êl*. On the other hand, e.g. חָרָה־לָךְ Gn 4⁶, not לָךְ since the first *ā* of חָרָה could not have *Metheg*. When words are closely united by *Maqqēph* the same rules apply as above, except that in the first word *Metheg*, in the secondary tone, takes the place of the accent, cf. עֲשֵׂה־פְרִי Gn 1¹²; הִנְיָרָה־נָא Gn 32³⁰, &c. Finally, the *Dageš* is used when the attracted word does not begin with the principal tone, but with a syllable having *Metheg*, יִירָשׁוּ הַמָּה־יִירָשׁוּ ψ 37⁹; אֵלָהּ יַעֲקֹב Is 44²¹; עֲשִׂיתָ־קַעְרֹתָיו Ex 25²⁹, provided that the second word does not begin with a *B^egadk^ephath* letter (hence e.g. אֵלָהּ תּוֹלְדוֹת Gn 2⁴).

g Rem. Such cases as קִנְיָךְ Dt 32⁶, and כְּשִׂיתָ־32¹⁵, and נַעוֹת (so Baer, but not ed. Mant., &c.) 1 S 1¹³ are therefore anomalous; also, because beginning with

a B°gadk°phath, בַּאֲלֵם Ex 15¹¹ (cf. however above, e); בְּרוּעַ Jos 8²⁸; בְּרוּעַ ψ 77¹⁶; בְּנֵי־הַיָּאֵן Jb 5²⁷.—It is doubtful whether we should include here those cases in which *Dageš forte* occurs after a word ending in a toneless *û*, such as קָוְמוֹ צָאוּ Gn 19¹⁴, Ex 12³¹; Ex 12¹⁵ (שָׂאֵר), Dt 2²⁴; also לֹא Gn 19², 1 S 8¹⁹; לוֹ Ju 18¹⁹, Est 6¹³ (where P. Haupt regards the *Dageš* as due to the enclitic character of the לוֹ); מָעַט Ho 8¹⁰; נָרַו Jer 49³⁰; נָרַו 1 S 15⁶. When we explained the *Dageš* in these examples not as conjunctive, but orthophonic (see above, § 13 c, and Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, 4th ed. on ψ 94^{12 a}), we especially had in view those cases in which the consonant with *Dageš* has a *Šewâ*. The extension of the use of *Dageš* to consonants with a strong vowel, seems, however, to indicate that these are cases of the מְרַחֵק, which was required by some Masoretes but not consistently inserted. On the other hand, the *Dageš forte* in ׳ after a preceding *i* (ψ 118^{5.18}), and even after *û* (ψ 94¹²), is due to an attempt to preserve its consonantal power; see König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 54 b.

(b) When a consonant with *Šewâ* is strengthened by *Dageš forte h dirimens* to make the *Šewâ* more audible. In almost all cases the strengthening or sharpening can be easily explained from the character of the particular consonant, which is almost always a sonant, sibilant, or the emphatic *Qôph*; cf. עֲנִבִי Lv 25⁵, Dt 32³² (for עֲנִבִי); פִּנְיָתְךָ Is 33¹ (where, however, פִּנְיָתְךָ is to be read); cf. Na 3¹⁷, Jb 9¹⁸, 17², Jo 1¹⁷ (with מ); Is 57⁶ (with ל); Ju 20^{43,1}, 1 S 1⁶ (with ר); Gn 49^{10.17} (and so always in עֲקִבִי Ju 5²², Ct 1⁸ and עֲקִבוֹת ψ 77²⁰, 89⁵²); Ex 15¹⁷, Dt 23¹¹, Ju 20³², 1 S 28¹⁰ (ק)²; Ex 2³, Is 58³, Am 5²¹, ψ 141³, Pr 4¹³ (צ); Pr 27²⁵ (ש); Is 5²⁸, ψ 37¹⁵, Jer 51⁵⁶, Neh 4⁷ (ש). Also, with כ Ho 3²; with ב Is 9³, Jer 4⁷; with ת 1 S 10¹¹. In many instances of this kind the influence of the following consonant is also observable.

(c) When a vowel is to be made specially emphatic, generally in *i* the principal *pause*, by a *Dageš forte affectuosum* in the following consonant. Thus in a following sonant, Ju 5⁷ (חֲרָלִי), Jb 29²¹ (וַיַּחֲלִי), 22¹² (רַפְּוֹ); Ez 27¹⁹ (in נ); in ת Is 33¹², 41¹⁷, Jer 51⁵⁸, perhaps also Jb 21¹³ (יַחֲתִי).

(d) When the sonants ל, מ, נ are strengthened by *Dageš forte firmativum* in the pronouns הֵמָּה, הֵנָּה, אֵלֶּה, and in לָמָּה *why?* cf. also בַּמָּה, בְּמָה *whereby?* כַּמָּה *how much?* (§ 102 k, l), to give greater firmness to the preceding tone-vowel.

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

(a) almost always at the end of a word, since here a strengthened

¹ The ordinary reading הֲרַדִּיפָהוּ, where ר is without *Dageš*, is only intelligible if the ר has *Dageš*.

² Also in ψ 45¹⁰ read בִּיקְרוּתִיךָ with Baer and Ginsburg, following Ben Asher, and in Pr 30¹⁷ לִיקָהַת (Ben Naphthali בִּיקָ and לִיקָ).

consonant cannot easily be sounded.¹ In such cases the preceding vowel is frequently lengthened (§ 27 *d*), e. g. רַב *multitude*, from רבב; עַם *people*, with a distinctive accent or after the article, עַם, from עמם; but e. g. גַּן *garden*, בַּת *daughter*, with the final consonant virtually sharpened. On the exceptions הִנְּךָ *thou* (fem.) and הִנְּתִי *thou* (fem.) *hast given* Ez 16³³, see § 10 *k*.

m (b) Very frequently in certain consonants with *Šewa* mobile, since the absence of a strong vowel causes the strengthening to be less noticeable. This occurs principally in the case of ו and י (on ו and י after the article, see § 35 *b*; on י after מה, § 37 *b*); and in the consonants מ,² נ and ל; also in the sibilants, especially when a guttural follows (but note Is 62⁹, מְאַסְפִּי, as ed. Mant. and Ginsb. correctly read, while Baer has מְאַסִּי with compensatory lengthening, and others even מְאַסִּי; מְשַׁמְנֵי Gn 27^{28.39}; מְשַׁלֵּשׁ 38²⁴ for מְשַׁשׁ, הַשְּׁלֵבִים 1 K 7²⁸; מְשַׁקֵּה 1 K 19²⁰ from נִשְׁקַח, הַשְּׁפִתִים Ez 40⁴³ and לְשַׁפְּנִים ψ 104¹⁸; מְשַׁתִּים Jon 4¹¹, הַצְּפִרְדָּעִים Ex 8¹ &c.);—and finally in the emphatic ק.³

Of the *Begadkephath* letters, ב occurs without *Dageš* in מְבַצֵּר Ju 8²; ג in מְנַוְרְתָם Ez 32³⁰; ד in נְרַחֵי Is 11¹² 56⁸, ψ 147² (*not* in Jer 49⁵⁶), supposing that it is the Participle Niph'al of נָרַח; lastly, ח in הִתְחַצֵּי Is 22¹⁰. Examples, עֹרֵי, וְיָהִי (so always the preformative וְ in the *imperf.* of verbs), מְלַמְעֵלָה, לְמַנְצַח, הַנְּנִי, הַלְּלוּ, מְלֵאוּ, כְּסֵאוֹ, יִשְׂאוּ, יִקְחוּ, מְקַצֵּה, מְקַצֵּה, &c. In correct MSS. the omission of the *Dageš* is indicated by the *Rāphè* stroke (§ 14) over the consonant. However, in these cases, we must assume at least a *virtual* strengthening of the consonant (*Dageš forte implicitum*, see § 22 *c*, end).

(c) In the Gutturals, see § 22 *b*.

n Rem. 1. Contrary to rule the strengthening is omitted (especially in the later Books), owing to the lengthening of the preceding short vowel, generally *hireq* (cf. *mīle* for *mille*), e. g. יִחַיְתָן *he makes them afraid*, for יִחַיְתָן Hb 2¹⁷ (where, however, it is perhaps more correct to suppose, with König, a formation on the analogy of verbs וְיָעַ, and moreover to read יִחַיְתָן with the LXX), וְיָקוּת Is 50¹¹ for וְיָקוּת.

O 2. Very doubtful are the instances in which compensation for the strengthening is supposed to be made by the insertion of a following נ. Thus for

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

² *Dageš forte* is almost always omitted in מ when it is the prefix of the participle Pi'el or Pu'al, hence ψ 104³ הַמְקַרְהַ who layeth the beams, but הַמְקַרְהַ the roof Ec 10¹⁸ (cf. הַמְלַאכָה the work, &c.).

³ According to some also in מ in הַטְעִי Is 17¹⁰; but see Baer on the passage.

מְעוֹנִיָּהּ Is 23¹¹, read מְעוֹנִיָּהּ (or מְעוֹנִיָּהּ); and for תְּמַנִּי La 3²², read תְּמַנִּי. In Nu 23¹³ קָבְנוּ is not an instance of compensation (see § 67 o, end).

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

The *harder* sound of the six *Begadkephath* letters, indicated by *a Dageš lene*, is to be regarded, according to the general analogy of languages, as their older and original pronunciation, from which the softer sound was weakened (§ 6 n and § 13). The original hard sound is maintained when the letter is initial, and after a consonant, but when it immediately follows a vowel or *Šewā mobile* it is softened and aspirated by their influence, e. g. פָּרַץ *pāras*, יִפְרֹץ *yiphrōs*, כֹּל *kōl*, לֶכְחֹל *lekhōl*. Hence the *Begadkephath* take *Dageš lene*

(1) at the beginning of words: (a) without exception when the preceding word ends with a vowelless consonant, e. g. עַל־כֵּן *‘al-kēn* (*therefore*), עֵץ פְּרִי *‘ēs pērî* (*fruit-tree*); (b) at the beginning of a section, e. g. בְּרֵאשִׁית Gn 1¹, or at the beginning of a sentence, or even of a minor division of a sentence after a distinctive accent (§ 15 d), although the preceding word may end with a vowel. The distinctive accent in such a case prevents the vowel from influencing the following tenuis, e. g. וַיְהִי בְּאַשְׁרַי *and it was so, that when*, Ju 11⁵ (but וַיְהִי־כֵן Gn 1⁷).

Rem. 1. The vowel letters ה, י, ו, א, as such, naturally do not close a syllable. In close connexion they are therefore followed by the aspirated *Begadkephath*, e. g. וַיִּמְצָא בָהּ, &c. On the other hand, syllables are closed by the consonantal ו and י (except קִרְתָּהּ Is 34¹¹; שְׁלֹבָהּ Ez 23⁴²; אֲרָנִי בָם ψ 68¹⁸), and by ה with *Mappiq*; hence e. g. there is *Dageš lene* in עָלִי פִיהֶם and always after יְהוָה, since the *Qeré perpetuum* of this word (§ 17) assumes the reading אֲרָנִי.

2. In a number of cases *Dageš lene* is inserted, although a vowel precedes in close connexion. This almost always occurs with the prefixes בִּ and בְּ in the combinations בִּב, בְּב, בִּב (i. e. when a *Begadkephath* with *Šewā* precedes the same or a kindred aspirate) and בִּב (see Baer, *L. Psalmorum*, 1880, p. 92,² on ψ 23³); cf. e. g. 1 S 25¹, Is 10⁹, ψ 34³, Jb 19²; כִּנ is uncertain; כִּר, כְּר, and כִּכ according to David Qimḥi do not take *Dageš*, nor כִּנ, כְּכ, and כִּכ according to the *Dikduke ha-ṭ'amim*, p. 30. Sometimes the *Begadkephath* letters, even with a full vowel, take *Dageš* before a spirant (and even before ח in אֲחַמְשָׁה 1 K 12³²); cf. the instances mentioned above, § 20 e (mostly *tenues* before א). In all these cases the object is to prevent too great an accumulation of aspirates. The LXX, on the other hand, almost always represent the כ and

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

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

ם, even at the beginning of a syllable, by χ and φ; Χερούβ, Χαλδαῖοι, Φαρφάρ, &c.—The forms כִּכְרֹד (after וְשִׁמְתִּי) Is 54¹¹, and כִּכְלֹל (after וְנִלְאִיתִי) Jer 20⁹ are doubly anomalous.

e (2) In the middle of words after *Šewā quiescens*, i.e. at the beginning of a syllable immediately after a vowelless consonant,¹ e.g. יִרְפֵּא yirpā (*he heals*), יִקְטֹלֶם ye have killed; but after *Šewā mobile*, e.g. רִפֵּא rēphā (*heal thou*), כִּבְרָה she was heavy.

f On קִטְלָהּ, וְיִשָּׁב, and similar forms, see § 10 i.

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

(a) When it has arisen from the weakening of a strong vowel, e.g. רִפֵּא pursue ye (not רִפֵּי) from רִפֵּה; מִלְכֵי (not מִלְכֵי), because originally *mälākhé*, but מִלְכֵי from the ground-form *malk*.

(b) With the כ of the pronominal suffixes of the 2nd pers. הָ, מִ, כֵּ, since *Šewā mobile* is characteristic of these forms (see § 58 f; § 91 b).

Rem. Forms like שְׁלַחְתָּ thou (fem.) hast sent, in which we should expect an aspirated ח after the vowel, cf. וְיַחַד Ex 18⁹, have arisen from שְׁלַחְתָּ, יַחַד, &c.; Pathah being here simply a helping vowel has no influence on the *tenuis*; cf. § 28 e.

§ 22. *Peculiarities of the Gutturals.*

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

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

c In the former case, the short vowel before the guttural would stand in an open syllable, and must accordingly be lengthened or modified.²

¹ The exceptions יִקְטֹלֶם Jos 15³⁸ (see *Minḥat shay*, on this passage), אִכְרֹד 2 K 14⁷, and יִקְרֹעֶם Jos 15⁵⁶ may perhaps be due to the character of the ק.

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



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

final it necessarily takes Mappiq), but e. g. רִיחִי, &c., since here the rapidly uttered *ā* is no longer heard.

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

h Rem. 1. The guttural may also have an influence upon the following vowel, especially in Segholate forms, e. g. נַעַר (not *na'ēr*) a youth, פְּעַל (not *pō'el*) deed. The only exceptions are אָהֶל, בְּהֵן, לָחֶם, רָחֶם.

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

k On the other hand, the slighter and sharper *Hireq* is retained even under gutturals when the following consonant is sharpened by *Dageš forte*, e. g. הִלֵּל, הִגִּה, הִטָּה; but when this sharpening is removed, *S^eghol* is again apt to appear, e. g. הִגִּיִּן constr. הִגִּיִּן, חִיִּיִּן constr. חִיִּיִּן.

l 3. Instead of simple *Š^ewā mobile*, the gutturals take without exception a compound *Š^ewā*, e. g. שְׁחַטוּ, אֶקְטֹל, אֶמַּר, אֶנִּי, &c.

m 4. When a guttural with *quiescent Š^ewā* happens to close a syllable in the middle of a word, the strongly closed syllable (with *quiescent Š^ewā*) may remain; necessarily so with ח, ע, and ה at the end of the tone-syllable, e. g. שְׁלַחְתָּ, יִרְעַתָּ, but also before the tone (see examples under *i*), even with א.

But in the syllable before the tone and further back, the closed syllable is generally opened artificially by a *Hateph* (as being suited to the guttural) taking the place of the *quiescent Š^ewā*, and in particular that *Hateph* which repeats the sound of the preceding vowel, e. g. יְחַשֵּׁב (also יְחַשֵּׁב); יְחַזֵּק (also יְחַזֵּק); פְּעֹלוֹ (*pō'lo* for *pō'lô*). But when, owing to a flexional change, the strong vowel following the *Hateph* is weakened into *Š^ewā mobile*, then instead of the *Hateph* its full vowel is written, e. g. יַעֲמְדוּ (from יַעֲמַד), נַעֲרְמוּ, פְּעֻלְךָ (from פְּעַל). The original forms, according to § 28 *c*, were *ya'am^edhû*, *ne'remû*, *pō'lekhā*. Hence יַעֲמְדוּ, &c., are really only different orthographic forms of יַעֲמַדוּ, &c., and would be better transcribed by *ya'am^aedhû*, &c.

n Rem. 1. On the use of simple or compound *Š^ewā* in guttural verbs, see further §§ 62-65.

o 2. Respecting the choice between the three *Hatephs*, it may be remarked:
(a) ח, ה, ע at the beginning of a syllable prefer ֿֿֿ , but א prefers ֿֿֿֿ , e. g. חַמּוֹר *ass*, הִרְגַּתָּ *to kill*, אָמַר *to say*; when farther from the tone syllable, however, the ֿֿֿ even under א changes into the lighter ֿֿֿֿ , e. g. אֵלַי (poetic for אֵלַי) *to*, but אֵלַיְכֶם *to you*, אָכַל *to eat*, but אָכַלְתָּ (*'akhöl*, toneless on account

of Maqqēph). Cf. § 27 w. The 1st pers. sing. imperf. Pi'el regularly has ־ִ . Likewise ־ִ is naturally found under \aleph in cases where the *Hateph* arises from a weakening of an original \check{a} (e. g. לִי־לֵוֹן lion, ground-form 'ary), and ־ִ if there be a weakening of an original u (e. g. לִי־נַיִם a fleet, לִי־עֲנִי affliction, cf. § 93 q, z).

(b) In the middle of a word after a long vowel, a *Hateph-Pathah* takes the *p* place of a simple $\check{S}^w\check{a}$ mobile, e. g. הֶעֱלָה מֵאֲנָה (see § 63 p); but if a short vowel precedes, the choice of the *Ha'eiph* is generally regulated by it, e. g. *Perf. Hiph.* הֶעֱמִיד (see above, i), *Infin.* הֶעֱמִיד (regular form הֶקְטִיל); *Perf. Hoph.* הֶעֱמַד (regular form הֶקְטַל); but cf. שָׁחַדוּ Jb 6²² (§ 64 a).

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

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

(b) The preference for \check{a} as a preceding vowel, e. g. וַיִּרְא and he saw *r* (from וַיִּרְאֵה); וַיִּסַּר both for וַיִּסַּר and he turned back, and for וַיִּסַּר and he caused to turn back.

The exceptions to *a* are מֹרְרָת *mörräth*, Pr 14¹⁰; כְּרֹרֶת *khörräth* and שֹׁרְרֵךְ *šörrēkh*, S Ez 16⁴ (cf. Pr 3⁸); שִׁרְיָאֵשִׁי Ct 5²; הֶרְעַמָּה 1 S 16⁶; הֶרְאִיתֶם 1 S 10²⁴, 17²⁵, 2 K 6³²; הֶרְדִּיפָהוּ Ju 20⁴³ (cf. § 20 h); מְרֹדֶךָ 1 S 23²⁸, 2 S 18¹⁶; also on account of דַּחִיק (§ 20 c), Pr 15¹, 20²², 2 Ch 26¹⁰; and on account of מִרְחִיק (§ 20 f) 1 S 15⁶, Jer 39¹², Hb 3¹³, Pr 11²¹, Jb 39⁹, Ez 9⁶. A kind of virtual strengthening (after \aleph for מֶן) is found in מִרְגֹנֶךָ Is 14³. In Samaritan and Arabic this strengthening has been retained throughout, and the LXX write e. g. $\Sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\alpha$ for שָׂרָה .

§ 23. *The Feebleness of the Gutturals \aleph and ה.*

1. The \aleph , a light and scarcely audible guttural breathing, as a rule *a* entirely loses its slight consonantal power whenever it stands without a vowel at the end of a syllable. It then remains (like the German *h* in *roh*, *geh*, *nahte*) merely as a sign of the preceding long vowel, e. g. מִצָּא , מִלָּא , הוֹצִיא (but when a syllable is added with an introductory vowel, according to *b* below, we have, e. g. מִצָּאֵנִי , הוֹצִיאֵנִי , since the \aleph then stands at the beginning of the syllable, not מִצָּאֵנִי , הוֹצִיאֵנִי), מִצָּא , בְּלִיא (cf., however, § 74 a), מִצָּאָתָּה (for *māša'tā*), הִמְצָאָנָה . Similarly in cases like חִטָּא , וַיִּרְא , שָׁוֵא , &c. (§ 19 l), and even in רָשָׁע , פְּלָא (see above, § 22 e), the \aleph only retains an orthographic significance.

2. On the other hand, \aleph is in general retained as a strong con- *b* sonant whenever it begins a syllable, e. g. אֶמֶר ; מִצָּאֵסוּ , or when it is protected by a *Hateph* after a short syllable, e. g. לֵאכֹל , and finally,

when it stands in a closed syllable with quiescent *Šewā* after a preceding *Sghôl* or *Pathah*, e.g. וַיֵּאָסֶר, וַיֵּאָדָר *nä'dār*, יַאֲדִימוּ *ya'dimū*. Even in such cases the consonantal power of א may be entirely lost, viz.

c (a) when it would stand with a long vowel in the middle of a word after *Šewā mobile*. The long vowel is then occasionally thrown back into the place of the *Šewā*, and the א is only retained orthographically, as an indication of the etymology, e.g. רִאשִׁים *heads* (for *r^e'āšîm*), מֵאָתַיִם *two hundred* (for *m^e'ātháyim*), שְׁאֲטָרָה Ez 25⁶ for שְׁאֲטָרָה; בּוֹרְאֵם Neh 6⁸ for בּוֹרְאֵם; מֵאִים Jb 31⁷, Dn 1⁴ for מֵאִים; פְּאָרָה for פְּאָרָה Is 10³³; חֹטְאִים *hōtîm*, 1 S 14³³ for חֹטְאִים (cf. § 74 h, and § 75 oo); הֶרְאוּבֵנִי Nu 34¹⁴, from הֶרְאוּבֵן; so always חֲטָאָה or חֲטָאוֹת 1 K 14¹⁶, Mi 1⁵, &c., for חֲטָאוֹת. Sometimes a still more violent suppression of the א occurs at the beginning of a syllable, which then causes a further change in the preceding syllable, e.g. מְלֶאכֶה *work* for מְלֶאכֶה (as in the Babylonian punctuation), יִשְׁמְעָל for יִשְׁמְעָל; שִׁמְאֵל or שִׁמְאוֹל *the left hand*, ground form *sim'al*.

d (b) When it originally closed a syllable. In these cases א is generally (by § 22 m) pronounced with a *Hateph*, אֲ or אַ. The preceding short vowel is, however, sometimes lengthened and retains the following א only orthographically, e.g. וַיֵּאָצֵּל Nu 11²⁵ for וַיֵּאָצֵּל (cf. Ju 9⁴¹), and פְּאָרָרַר Jo 2⁶ for פְּאָרָרַר; לֵאמֹר for לֵאמֹר; לְאֱלֹהִים for לְאֱלֹהִים; but the contraction does not take place in לְאֱלֹהִים Is 10¹¹. The short vowel is retained, although the consonantal power of א is entirely lost, in וַיֵּאָרְנִי, &c. (see § 102 m), וַיֵּאָחַח Is 41²⁵, וַיֵּאָבְדָה Ez 28¹⁶ for וַיֵּאָבְדָה; cf. Dt 24¹⁰, 1 K 11³⁹, Is 10¹³.

e Instead of this א which has lost its consonantal value, one of the vowel letters ו and י is often written according to the nature of the sound, the former with *ô* and the latter with *ê* and *î*, e.g. רִאֲם *buffalo* for רִאֲם. At the end of the word ה also is written for א, יִמְלֵה *he fills* for יִמְלֵה Jb 8²¹ (see below, l).

f 3. When א is only preserved orthographically or as an indication of the etymology (quiescent), it is sometimes entirely dropped (cf. § 19 k), e.g. יֵצְתִי Jb 1²¹ for יֵצְתִי; מְלִאתִי Jb 32¹⁸ for מְלִאתִי; מְצָתִי Nu 11¹¹; וַתְּהִי 2 S 20⁹; וַיִּרְפֹּי Jer 8¹¹ for וַיִּרְפֹּי; וַתְּהִי 2 S 22⁴⁰, but וַתְּהִי 1 S 18⁴⁰; תְּהִי Gn 25²⁴ for תְּהִי; אֲחַטְּאָנָה 31³⁹ for אֲחַטְּאָנָה; שְׁלַחְךָ 1 S 17¹⁷ for שְׁלַחְךָ; רִאֲמִים ψ 22²² for רִאֲמִים; גְּאוֹה Jb 22²⁹ for גְּאוֹה; הִבְרַתִּי 1 Ch 11³⁹ for הִבְרַתִּי, and so 2 S 23³⁷; שְׁרִית 1 Ch 12³⁸ for שְׁרִית; לְהִשׁוֹת 2 K 19²⁵ *Kethîbh* for לְהִשׁוֹת (cf. Is 37²⁶); חֲמָה Jb 29⁶ for חֲמָה. In מְלֶאכֶה

¹ In Jer 22²³, גְּחִנָּה is unquestionably a corruption of גְּחִנָּה for גְּחִנָּה.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

l Rem. In connexion with \bar{o} and \bar{e} , a ה which only marks the vowel ending is occasionally changed into ו or י (וְאֵה = אֵה, חַיִּי = חַיֵּה Ho 6⁹), and with any vowel into נ in the later or Aramaic orthography, but especially with \bar{a} , e. g. נָשָׁן *sleep*, ψ 127¹ for שָׁן; נָשָׁן Jer 23³⁹ for שָׁן, &c. Thus it is evident that final ה as a vowel letter has only an orthographical importance.

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

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

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

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

The instances may be classified under two heads:

b (*a*) When either ו or י with *quiescent Šewâ* stands at the end of a syllable immediately after a *homogeneous* vowel (*u* or *i*). It then merges in the homogeneous vowel, or more accurately it assumes its vowel-character (ו as *u*, י as *i*), and is then contracted with the preceding vowel into *one* vowel, necessarily long, but is mostly retained orthographically as a (quiescent) vowel letter. Thus הוֹשֵׁב for *huwšab*; יִיָּקַשׁ for *yiyqas*; so also at the end of the word, e. g. עִבְרִי *a Hebrew*, properly 'ibrîy, fem. עִבְרִיָּה, pl. עִבְרִיִּים (and עִבְרִים); עָשׂוּ Jb 41²⁵ for עָשׂוּ (cf. עֲשׂוּת 1 S 25¹⁸ *Kethîbh*). On the other hand, if the preceding vowel be heterogeneous, ו and י are retained as full consonants (on the pronunciation see § 8 m), e. g. שָׁלוֹ quiet, וְ the month of May, גּוֹי nation, נִגְלוּ revealed. But with a preceding \bar{a} the ו and י are mostly contracted into \bar{o} and \bar{e} (see below, *f*), and at the end of a word they are sometimes rejected (see below, *g*).

Complete syncope of ו before \hat{i} occurs in אִי island for אִוִּי; י ruins for וִּי; י watering Jb 37¹¹ for וִּי; [בִּי burning Is 3²⁴ for בִּי, cf. §§ 84^a c, e, 93 y].

¹ Or as consonantal vowels (see above), and are then transcribed by P. Haupt, Philippi, and others, as \bar{u} , \bar{i} , following the practice of Indogermanic philologists. ו for ו and, alone is a standing exception, see § 26. 1 and § 104 e. On י = *i* at the beginning of a word, cf. § 47 b, note. According to § 19 a, end, *initial* ו in Hebrew almost always becomes י; always in verbs originally ו"פ, § 69 a. Apart from a few proper names, *initial* ו occurs only in וְ hook, וְלֵךְ child Gn 11³⁰, 2 S 6²³ *Kethîbh* [elsewhere וְלֵךְ], and the doubtful וְ Pr 21⁸.

Thus an initial י after the prefixes בּ, וּ, כּ, לּ, which would then be *c* pronounced with *î* (see § 28 a), and also almost always after מּ (see § 102 b), coalesces with the *î* to *î*, e. g. בִּיהוּדָה in *Judah* (for בִּי), וִיהוּדָה and *Judah*, כִּיָּאֵר as the *Nile*, לִיהוּדָה for *Judah*, מִיָּד from the *hands of*.

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

Rem. In Syriac, where the weak letters more readily become vowel sounds, *c* a simple *i* may stand even at the beginning of words instead of י or י. The LXX also, in accordance with this, write *Ioudá* for יְהוּדָה, *Iσαák* for יִצְחָק. Hence may be explained the *Syriac usage* in Hebrew of drawing back the vowel *i* to the preceding consonant, which properly had a simple *vocal Šewā*, e. g. (according to the reading of Ben-Naphtali¹) וַיִּלְלָתָּ Jer 25³⁶ for וַיִּלְלָתָּ (so Baer), כִּי־תִרְוֹן Ec 2¹³ for כִּי־תִרְוֹן, cf. also the examples in § 20 h, note 2; even וַיִּחַלְוּ Jb 29²¹ (in some editions) for וַיִּחַלְוּ. According to Qimḥi (see § 47 b) אֶקְטַל was pronounced as *iqṭōl*, and therefore the 1st pers. was pointed אֶקְטַל to avoid confusion. In fact the Babylonian punctuation always has *î* for *ā* in the 1st pers.

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

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

(b) With short *ā* they form the diphthongs *ô* and *ê* according to § 7 a, e. g. מִיָּטִיב from מִיָּטִיב; יוֹשִׁיב from יוֹשִׁיב, &c.²

Rem. The rejection of the half vowels ו and י (see above, b) occurs especially *g* at the end of words after a heterogeneous vowel (*ā*), if according to the nature of the form the contraction appears impossible. So especially in

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

² Instances in which no contraction takes place after *ā* are, מִיָּמִינִים 1 Ch 12²; אִיסִירָם Ho 7¹² (but cf. § 70 b); הַיָּשָׁר ψ 5⁹ *Qeré*; the locatives בֵּיתָהּ, מְצֻרָיָמָה, &c.—On the suffix יָכִי for יָכִי see § 91 l.—Sometimes both forms are found, as עוֹלָהּ and עוֹלָהּ; cf. חַי *living*, constr. state חַי. Analogous is the contraction of מוֹת (ground-form *mawt*) *death*, constr. מוֹת; עַיִן (ground-form 'ayn ['ain]) *eye*, constr. עַיִן.

verbs ה"ל, e. g. originally לַיְ = (י)לַיְ = הלַיְ, since *ā* after the rejection of the י stands in an open syllable, and consequently must be lengthened to *ā*. The ה is simply an orthographic sign of the long vowel. So also הלַיְ for *šālaw*.¹ On the origin of הַיְ, see § 75 e; on דַּק as perf. and part. of דִּק, see § 72 b and g; on יַלַּיְ, &c., from וַלַּיְ, see § 69 b.—On the weakening of ו and י to נ, see § 93 x.

§ 25. *Unchangeable Vowels.*

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

b 1. The essentially long and consequently, as a rule (but cf. § 26 p, § 27 n, o), unchangeable vowels of the *second* and *third* class, *î*, *ê*, *û*, *ô*, can often be recognized by means of the vowel letters which accompany them (יַ, יֵ, וַ, וֵ); e. g. יַיְטִיב *he does well*, הַיְכָל *palace*, גְּבוּל *boundary*, קוֹל *voice*. The *defective* writing (§ 8 i) is indeed common enough, e. g. יַיְטִב and יֵיטִיב for יַיְטִיב; גְּבֹל for גְּבוּל; קַל for קוֹל, but this is merely an orthographic licence and has no influence on the quantity of the vowel; the *û* in גְּבֹל is just as necessarily long, as in גְּבוּל.

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

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

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

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



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

especially common in an open syllable before the tone (pretonic vowel), e. g. לְהֵם, יְקִים, קָטַל, לֵבָב.

Short vowels in open syllables occur :

- f* (a) In apparently dissyllabic words formed by means of a helping vowel from monosyllables, as נַחַל *brook*, בַּיִת *house*, יִרְבַּ let him increase, from *nahl*, *bayt*, *yirb* ; cf. also דְּיִ the ending of the dual (§ 88). But see § 28 e.
- g* (b) In the verbal suffix of the 1st pers. sing. (נִי *me*), e. g. קָטַלְנִי (Arab. *qātālāni*). The uncommon form נִי, however (Gn 30⁶, cf. § 59f), proves that the tone-bearing *Pathah* produces a sharpening of the following sonant, and thus virtually stands in a closed syllable, even when the *Nun* is not expressly written with *Dageš*. In cases like וְנִי (§ 102 m) *Pathah* is retained in the counter-tone after the *N* has become quiescent.
- h* (c) Sometimes before the toneless הֶ local (§ 90 c), e. g. מִדְּבָרָה *towards the wilderness* ; only, however, in the constr. state (1 K 19¹⁵), since the toneless suffix הֶ does not affect the character of the form (especially when rapidly pronounced in close connexion) ; otherwise it is מִדְּבָרָה.
- In all these cases the short vowel is also supported by the tone, either the principal tone of the word, or (as in *h*) by the secondary tone in the constr. st., or by the counter-tone with *Metheg*, as in וְנִי above, *g* ; cf. the effect of the *arsis* on the short vowel in classical prosody.
- i* (d) In the combinations ׀׀׀׀, ׀׀׀׀, ׀׀׀׀, e. g. נַעֲרוֹ *his boy*, יֵאָסֶר *he will bind*, פְּעֻלוֹ *his deed*. In all these cases the syllable was at first really closed, and it was only when the guttural took a *Ḥateph* that it became in consequence open (but cf. e. g. יֵאָסֶר and יֵאָסֶר). The same vowel sequence arises wherever a preposition בְּ, כִּי, לְ, or וְ copulative is prefixed to an initial syllable which has a *Ḥateph*, since the former then takes the vowel

in the other Semitic languages, except of course in the case of *naturally* long vowels. The above examples are pronounced in Arabic *bikā*, *qātālā*, *‘ināb*. Although it is certain therefore that in Hebrew also, at an earlier period, short vowels were pronounced in open syllables, it may still be doubted whether the present pronunciation is due *merely* to an artificial practice followed in the solemn recitation of the O. T. text. On this hypothesis we should have still to explain, e. g. the undoubtedly very old lengthening of *i* and *u* in an open syllable into *ē* and *ō*.

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

contained in the *Ha'eph* (see § 102 d and § 104 d). To the same category belong also the cases where these prepositions with Hireq stand before a consonant with simple Š^ewâ mobile, e. g. בְּבֵר, בְּבֵר, &c.

(e) In forms like יְחִיָּקָה *yähā-zē-qû* (they are strong), פְּעֻלָּךְ *pö'ö l^ekhā* (thy *l* deed). These again are cases of the subsequent opening of closed syllables (hence, e. g. יְחִיָּקָה also occurs); פְּעֻלָּךְ is properly *pö'l^ekhā*; cf. generally § 22 m, end, and § 28 c.

Such cases as הַחֲדָשׁ, אַחִים (§ 96), הַחֲתָתָה (§ 67 w) do not come under this *l* head, since they all have *ä* in a virtually sharpened syllable; nor does the tone-bearing *S^eghôl* in suffixes (e. g. הַבְּרָךְ), nor *S^eghôl* for *ä* before a guttural with *Qames* (§ 22 c). On קְרָשִׁים and שְׂרָשִׁים, see § 9 v.

4. The independent syllables with a firm vowel which have been *m* described above, are frequently preceded by a single consonant with vocal Š^ewâ, simple or compound. Such a consonant with vocal Š^ewâ never has the value of an independent syllable, but rather attaches itself so closely to the following syllable that it forms practically one syllable with it, e. g. לְחִי (cheek) *l^ehî*; חֲלִי (sickness) *h^olî*; יְלִמְדוּ *yil|me^edhû*. This concerns especially the prefixes לְ, בְּ, בְּ, לְ. See § 102.

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

5. *Closed* syllables ending with one consonant, when without the *O* tone, necessarily have *short* vowels, whether at the beginning or at the end of words,¹ e. g. מַלְכָּה *queen*, הַשְׂבוּן *understanding*, חֲכָמָה *wisdom*, וָיָסַר *and he turned back*, וַיָּקַם, וַיָּקַם (*wayyāqūm*).

A *tone-bearing* closed syllable may have either a long or short vowel, *p* but if the latter, it must as a rule be either Pathah or *S^eghôl*.² The tone-bearing closed penultima admits, of the *long* vowels, only the tone-long *ā*, *ē*, *ō*, not the longest *î*, *ê*, *ô*, *û*; of the *short* vowels, only *ä*, *ě*, not *ĩ*, *ũ*, *ö* (but on *ĩ* and *ũ*, see § 29 g). Thus יְקַטְלוּ (3rd pl. masc. Imperf. Hiph.) but תְּקַטְלֶנָּה 3rd pl. fem., and קְרָמוּ (2nd pl. masc. Imperat. Qal) but קְרַמְנָה fem.

¹ In exceptions such as שֵׁת-לִי Gn 4²⁵ (where *šāt* is required by the character of the form, although the closed syllable has lost the tone owing to the following Maqqeph), Metheg is used to guard against a wrong pronunciation; similarly *ē* is sometimes retained before Maqqeph, e. g. שֵׁם Gn 2¹³; גַּעַץ Gn 2¹⁶.

² See § 9 e, f. *ĩ* occurs thus only in the particles אֵם, עַם, מֵן; but these usually (מֵן always) are rendered toneless by a following Maqqeph. Cf. also such forms as וַיִּשְׁבֵּן § 26 r and § 75 q.

q 6. A special kind of closed syllables are the *sharpened*, i. e. those which end in the same (strengthened) consonant with which the following syllable begins, e. g. אִמִּי 'im-mî, כֹּלִי kûl-lô. If without the tone, they have, like the rest, short vowels; but, if bearing the tone, either short vowels as קָלִי, הִנְנִי, or long, as שִׁפְּהָה, הִנְּהָה.

On the omission of the strengthening of a consonant at the end of a word, see § 20 l.

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

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

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

b 1. That in an open syllable the language has frequently retained only a half-vowel (*Šewâ mobile*), where there originally stood a full short vowel, e. g. עֲגָלָה (ground-form 'ägälât) a waggon, צְדָקָה (ground-form šadāqāt) righteousness, קִטְּלִי (Arab. qätälû), יִקְטִילִי (Arab. jūqattilû).

c 2. That vowels originally short have in the tone-syllable, as also in the open syllable preceding it, been generally changed into the corresponding tone-long vowels, *ă* into *ā*, *ĭ* into *ē*, *ŭ* into *ō* (see § 9, a-e, k, r). If, however, the tone be shifted or weakened, these tone-long vowels mostly revert to their original shortness, or, occasionally, are still further shortened, or reduced to mere *Šewâ mobile*, or, finally, are entirely lost through a change in the division of syllables; e. g. מִטָּר (Arab. mātār) rain, when in close dependence on a following genitive in the *construct state*, becomes מִטְרָה; עֲקִיב (Arab. 'āqīb) heel, dual עֲקִיבִים, dual *construct* (with attenuation of the original *ă* of the first syllable to *ĭ*) עֲקִיבִי [on the ק, see § 20 h]; יִקְטִיל (Arab. yāqtül), plur. יִקְטִילוּ (Arab. yāqtülû). For instances of complete loss, as in בְּסִפִּי, cf. § 93 m.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

division of syllables, be weakened to *Š^ewā mobile*, or even be entirely lost, so that its place is taken by the mere syllable-divider (*Š^ewā quiescens*). Examples of the first case are, שְׁמוֹת *name*, pl. שְׁמוֹת, but שְׁמִי *my name*, שְׁמוֹתָם *their names*, דְּבַר *word*, constr. st. דְּבַר; צְדָקָה *righteousness*, constr. st. צְדָקָת; an example of the second case is, בְּרָכָה *blessing*, constr. st. בְּרַכַּת. Whether the vowel is retained or becomes *Š^ewā* (דָּם, דָּמִי, but שָׁם, שְׁמִי), and which of the two disappears in two consecutive syllables, depends upon the character of the form in question. In general the rule is that only those vowels which stand in an open syllable can become *Š^ewā*.

Thus the change into *Š^ewā* takes place in—

- k (a) The *ā* and *ē* of the first syllable, especially in the inflexion of nouns, e. g. דְּבַר *word*, plur. דְּבָרִים; גְּדוֹלָה *great*, fem. גְּדוּלָה; לֵבָב *heart*, לִבִּי *my heart*; but also in the verb, תָּשׁוּב *she will return*, plur. תִּשְׁוֹבְנָה, and so always, when the originally short vowel of the prefixes of the Imperfect comes to stand in an open syllable which is not pretonic. On the other hand, an *ā* lengthened from *ǎ* before the tone is retained in the *Perfect consecutive* of Qal even in the secondary tone, e. g. וְקָטְלָהּ; cf. § 49 i.
- l (b) The short, or merely tone-long, vowels *a*, *e*, *o* of the ultima, especially in verbal forms, e. g. קָטַל, fem. קָטְלָה *qāt^elā*; יִקְטַל, יִקְטְלוּ *yiq^tlū*; but note also יִלְקֹטוּן, יִתְדַבְּקוּן, &c., according to § 47 m and o. The helping vowels are either entirely omitted, e. g. מֶלֶךְ *king* (ground-form *malk*), מִלְכִי *my king*; or, under the influence of a guttural, are weakened to Hataf, e. g. נֶעַר *boy*, נֶעְרוֹ *his boy*. If the tone remains unmoved, the vowel also is retained, notwithstanding the lengthening of the word, e. g. יִקְטְלוּ pausal-form for יִקְטְלוּ.
- m Where the tone moves forward two places, the former of the two vowels of a dissyllabic word may be shortened, and the second changed into *Š^ewā*. Cf. דְּבַר *word*; in the plur. דְּבָרִים; with heavy suffix דְּבָרֵיהֶם (cf. § 28 a) *their words*. On the attenuation of the *ǎ* to *i*, see further, s, t.
- n Rem. i. An *ō* arising from *aw = au*, or by an obscuring of *ā* (see § 9 b), sometimes becomes *û*, when the tone is moved forward, e. g. נְקוּמָה, נְקוּמָה (see Paradigm Perf. Niph. of קוּם); מְנוּסָה *flight*, fem. מְנוּסָה, with suffix, מְנוּסָי. The not uncommon use of *î* in a sharpened syllable, as בְּחֻגִי Ez 20¹⁸ (for בְּחֻגִי, cf. also the examples in § 9 o), is to be regarded as an orthographic licence, although sometimes in such cases *û* may really have been intended by the *Kethibh*.
- o Of the vowels of the *U*-class, *û* and tone-long *ō* stand in a tone-bearing

closed final syllable, and *ö* in a toneless syllable, e.g. יָקִים *he will arise*, יִקְם jussive, *let him arise*, וַיִּקְם and *he arose*. The only instance of *ü* in an ultima which has lost the tone is וַיִּרְם Ex 16²⁰ (see § 67 n). Similarly, of vowels of the *I*-class, *é*, *i*, and *ē* stand in a tone-bearing closed final syllable, and *ě* in a toneless syllable, e.g. יָקִים *he will raise*, יִקְם *let him raise*, וַיִּקְם and *he raised*. The only instance of *i* in an ultima which has lost the tone is וַתִּרְץ Ju 9⁵³ (see § 67 p).

2. In the place of a *Pathah* we not infrequently find (according to § 9 f) *p* a *S^eghól* (*ě*, *è*) as a modification of *ä* :

(a) In a closed antepenultima, e.g. in the proper names אַבְיָתָר and אַבְיָסָף, where LXX 'Αβι- = 'אַבִּי, which is certainly the better reading, cf. Ulmer, *Die semit. Eigennamen*, '1901' p. 12; or in a closed penultima, e.g. יְהוֹרָף, but also יָדְכֶם *your hand*, for *yad^ekhèm*. In all these cases the character of the surrounding consonants (see § 6 q) has no doubt had an influence.

(b) Regularly before a guttural with *Qames* or *Hateph Qames*, *q* where the strengthening has been dropped, provided that a lengthening of the *Pathah* into *Qames* be not necessary, e.g. אָחָיו *his brothers*, for *'ahāw*; שֶׁקֶר *false*, for *kahās'*; פֶּחָה *governor*, constr. st. פַּחַת; פֶּחָם *coal*; הַחַיִּים *the living* (with the article, הַ for הֶ); יַתְנַחֵם Nu 23¹⁹, &c., and so always before הֶ and הָ, as הַחֳרָשִׁים *the months*, see § 35 k. Before הֶ and הָ *S^eghól* generally stands only in the second syllable before the tone, e.g. הַהָרִים *the mountains*; הַעֲוֹן *the guilt*; immediately before the tone *Pathah* is lengthened into a (pretonic) *Qames*, e.g. הָהָר, הָעָם; but cf. also הַפְּתָרוֹ Nu 8⁷. Before the weak consonants א and ר (cf. § 22 c, q), the lengthening of the *Pathah* into *Qames* almost always takes place, e.g. הָאָב *the father*, pl. הָאָבוֹת; הָרֵאשׁ *the head*, pl. הָרֵאשִׁים. Exceptions, הָרָה *towards the mountain*, Gn 14¹⁰, in the tone-syllable, for *hár^rrā*; יְבִרְכֶיהוּ (pr. name) for יְבִרְכֶיהוּ. On הָ as a form of the interrogative הֶ (הֶ), see § 100 n; on מָה for מָה (מָה), § 37 e, f. Finally, אֲבָלָה Ex 33³ also comes partly under this head, in consequence of the loss of the strengthening, for אֲבָלָה, and יְחַזְקֵאל *Ezekiel* for יְחַזְקֵאל = יְחַזְקֵאל *God strengthens*.

(c) As a modification of the original *Pathah* in the first class of the *segholate* *γ* forms (§ 93 g), when a helping vowel (§ 28 e) is inserted after the second consonant. Thus the ground-form *kalb* (*dog*), after receiving a helping *S^eghól*, is modified into כָּלֵב (also in modern Arabic pronounced *kelb*),¹ *yarh* (*month*), with a helping *Pathah*, יָרַח. The same phenomenon appears also in the formation of verbs, in cases like יָגַל (jussive of the Hiph'il of גָּלָה), with a helping *S^eghól*, for *yagl*.

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

(a) In a firmly closed syllable, מְדוֹ *his measure*, for מֵדוֹ (in a sharpened syllable); יִלְדֶתיךָ *I have begotten thee*, from יִלְדֶתי with the suffix הֶ; cf. Lv 11⁴⁴, Ez 38²³, and § 44 d. Especially is this the case in a large number of *segholates*

¹ So the LXX write Μελαχισεδέκ for מִלְכִישֶׁדֶק.

from the ground-form *qatl*, when combined with singular suffixes, e.g. צְדִיקָי *my righteousness*, for *ṣadqī*.

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

u 4. *S^eghôl* arises, in addition to the cases mentioned in o and p, also from the weakening of *ā* of the final syllable in the isolated cases (הָ־ for הָ־) in 1 S 28¹⁵ (? see § 48 d), ψ 20⁴ (?), Is 59⁵, Pr 24¹⁴ (see § 48 l); for examples of Locative forms in הָ־ see § 90 i end.

v 5. Among the *Hateph*-sounds ֿֿֿ is shorter and lighter than ֿֿֿֿ, and consequently the vowel group ֿֿֿֿֿֿ is shorter than ֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿ; e.g. אֶדְוֹם *Edom*, but אֶדְוִי (Edomite), shortened at the beginning because the tone is thrown forward; אֶמֶת (*emeth*) *truth*, אֶמְתָּהּ *his truth*; נֶעְלָם *hidden*, pl. נֶעְלָמִים; הֶעֱבַרְתִּי but וְהֶעֱבַרְתִּי; but also conversely נֶעְשָׂה fem. נֶעְשָׂתָה, cf. § 63 f, 3.

w 6. To the chapter on vowel changes belongs lastly the *dissimilation* of vowels, i.e. the change of one vowel into another entirely heterogeneous, in order to prevent two similar, or closely related vowels, from following one another in the same word.² Hence לִלְא for *lū lō* (unless). Cf. also תִּצֹן from תִּצֹן; רִאשֹׁן from רִאשֹׁן; תִּיכֹן from תִּיכֹן; נִכְחוּ from נִכְחוּ; עִירֹם from עִירֹם; most probably also יְלֹד *offspring*, קַפּוֹר *porcupine*, for 'יל, 'קפ, see § 68 c, note.— On the proper names יְהוֹנָן and יִשָּׁע, which were formerly explained in the same way, see now Prætorius, *ZDMG.* 1905, p. 341 f.

§ 28. *The Rise of New Vowels and Syllables.*

a 1. According to § 26 m a half-syllable, i.e. a consonant with *Šewâ* mobile (always weakened from a short vowel), can only occur in close dependence on a full syllable. If another half-syllable with simple *Šewâ* follows, the first takes a full short vowel again.³ This vowel is almost always *Hireq*. In most cases it is probably an attenuation of an original *ā*, and never a mere helping vowel. In some instances analogy may have led to the choice of the *ī*. Thus, according to § 102 d, the prefixes בְּ, בְּ, לְ before a consonant with *Šewâ* mobile become בְּ, בְּ, לְ, e.g. בְּפָרִי, בְּפָרִי, לְפָרִי; before י they are pointed as in בְּיְהוֹרָה (from *bi-y^hūdā*, according to § 24 c); so too with *Wāw* copulative, e.g. וְיְהוֹרָה for 'י attenuated from 'י. The first half-

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

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

³ Except י *and*, which generally becomes י before a simple *Šewâ*, cf. § 104 2.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

Seghôl, but with medial or final gutturals a *Pathah*,¹ and after *ḥ* a *Hireq*, e. g. וַיִּגְלַל and he revealed, for wayyigl; יִרְבַּב let it multiply, for yirb; קִדְּוֹשׁ holiness, ground-form qudš; נַחַל brook, ground-form nahl; שְׁלַחְתָּהּ² for שְׁלַחְתָּי thou hast sent; בַּיִת house, ground-form bayt. These helping vowels are, however, to be regarded as exactly like *furtive Pathah* (§ 22 f, g); they do not alter the monosyllabic character of the forms, and they disappear before formative suffixes, e. g. קִדְּוֹשִׁי my holiness, בַּיְתָהּ home-ward.

f 5. On the rise of a full vowel in place of a simple *Šewâ*, under the influence of the *pause*, see § 29 *m*; on initial *š* for *š*, see § 23 *h*.

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

a 1. The principal tone rests, according to the Masoretic accentuation (cf. § 15 *c*), as a rule on the final syllable, e. g. קָטַל, דְּבָרָו, דְּבָרַיִם, דְּבָרַיִם, קָטַלְתָּם, קָטַלְתָּ, קָדְרֹן—in the last five examples on the formative additions to the stem. Less frequently it rests on the penultima, as in לַיְלָה night, קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ; but a closed penultima can only have the tone if the ultima is open (e. g. קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ), whilst a closed ultima can as a rule only be without the tone if the penultima is open, e. g. וַיִּקָּם, וַיִּקָּם; see also below, *e*.

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

c 2. The original tone of a word, however, frequently shifts its place in consequence either of changes in the word itself, or of its close connexion with other words. If the word is increased at the end, the tone is moved forward (*descendit*) one or two places according to the length of the addition, e. g. דְּבָרָו word, plur. דְּבָרַיִם; דְּבָרַיִם your words; קִדְּוֹשׁ holy thing, plur. קִדְּוֹשִׁים; קָטַלְתָּ with suffix קָטַלְתָּהוּ, with *Wāw* consecutive וְקָטַלְתָּ. On the consequent vowel-changes, see § 27 *d, i-m*.

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

¹ On the apparent exceptions שָׁשׁ, &c., cf. § 22 *e*; other instances in which *š* has entirely lost its consonantal value, and is only retained orthographically, are שֵׁן sin, נַיִל valley (also נַיִל), שְׁוֹא vanity (Jb 15³¹ *Kethîbh* שְׁוֹ).

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

(a) In many forms of the Imperfect, under the influence of a prefixed *Wāw consecutive* (·) see § 49 c-e), e. g. וַיֹּאמֶר he will say, וַיֹּאמֶר and he said; וַיֵּלֶךְ he will go, וַיֵּלֶךְ and he went. Cf. also § 51 n on the impf. Niph'al, and § 65 g, end, on the impf. Pi'el; on these forms in Pause, when the ו consec. does not take effect, see below, p.

(b) For rhythmical reasons (as often in other languages), when *el* a monosyllable, or a word with the tone on the first syllable, follows a word with the tone on the ultima, in order to avoid the concurrence of two tone-syllables.¹ This rhythmical retraction of the tone, however (נָסוּג אָחֹר receding, as it is called by the Jewish grammarians), is only admissible according to *a*, above, provided that the penultima, which now receives the tone, is an open syllable (with a long vowel; but see *g*), whilst the ultima, which loses the tone, must be either an open syllable with a long vowel, e. g. לֵילָה Gn 1⁵, 4¹⁷, 27²⁵, Ex 16²⁹, ψ 5¹¹, 104¹⁴, Dn 11¹³, or a closed syllable with a short vowel, e. g. הַתְּאֵבֶל לְחָם Gn 3¹⁹, Jb 3³, 22²⁸.² The *grave* suffixes בָּם-, בָּן-, הֶם-, הֶן- are exceptions, as they never lose the tone. Moreover a fair number of instances occur in which the above conditions are fulfilled, but the tone is not retracted, e. g. esp. with הֵיךְ, and before א; cf. Qimḥi, *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenberg (Lyck, 1862), p. 4^b, line 13 ff.

Although *Sere* can remain in a closed ultima which has lost the tone, it *f* is perhaps not to be regarded in this case (see § 8 b) as a long vowel. At any rate it then always has, in correct editions, a retarding *Metheg*, no doubt in order to prevent its being pronounced as *S^eghôl*, e. g. לְבַעַר קִיּוֹן Nu 24²²; cf. Nu 17²³, Ju 20², Is 66³, Jer 23²⁹, Ez 22²⁵, ψ 37⁷, and even with a following *furtive Pathah* Pr 1¹⁹, 11²⁶, &c., although there is no question here of two successive tone-syllables. In other cases the shortening into *S^eghôl* does take place, e. g. הוֹלֵם פְּעָם who smiteth the anvil, Is 41⁷, for הוֹלֵם פְּעָם; מָאֵת שָׁמַר 1 K 16²⁴.—The retraction of the tone even occurs when a half-syllable with a *Šewâ* mobile precedes the original tone-syllable, e. g. וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ Gn 19⁵, and frequently; וַיֹּרְדֵי בּוֹר ψ 28¹; טָמְנוּ לִי

¹ Even Hebrew prose proceeds, according to the accentuation, in a kind of iambic rhythm. That this was intended by the marking of the tone, can be seen from the use of *Metheg*.—Jos. Wijnkoop in *Darche hannesigah sive leges de accentus Hebraicae linguae ascensione*, Ludg. Bat. 1881, endeavours to explain, on euphonic and syntactical grounds, the numerous cases in which the usual retraction of the tone does not occur, e. g. וּבֹרָא חֲשֵׁן Is 45⁷, where the object probably is to avoid a kind of hiatus; but cf. also Am 4¹³. Prätorius, *Ueber den rückweich. Accent im Hebr.*, Halle, 1897, has fully discussed the *nasog 'ahor*.

² The reading עֲרִיִים (so even Opatius and Hahn) Ez 16⁷ for עֲרִיִים is rightly described by Baer as 'error turpis'.—That an unchangeable vowel in a closed final syllable cannot lose the tone is shown by Prätorius from the duplication of the accent (see above, § 22 f).

ψ 31⁶; מְטַעֲנֵי הָרֵב Is 14¹⁹; as also when the tone-syllable of the second word is preceded by a half-syllable, e. g. לְעִשָּׂה פְּרִי Gn 1¹¹ (on the *Dag. f.*, cf. § 20 *f*); לָחַת לְךָ Gn 15⁷ (cf. § 20 *c*).

g According to the above, it must be regarded as anomalous when the Masora throws back the tone of a closed ultima upon a *virtually* sharpened syllable with a short vowel, e. g. אַחַר בֵּן 1 S 10⁵, § 101 *a*; וְכָחֵשׁ בּוֹ Jb 8¹⁸, cf. Lv 5²², Ho 9²; לְצַחֵק בָּנוּ Gn 39¹⁴⁻¹⁷; whereas it elsewhere allows a closed penultima to bear the tone only when the ultima is open. Still more anomalous is the placing of the tone on a *really* sharpened syllable, when the ultima is closed, as in הַקָּם עַל 2 S 23¹; נִבְרַר שׁוֹעַ Jb 34¹⁹; cf. also יְקָם-קִיָּן Gn 4²⁴, with Metheg of the secondary tone. We should read either הַקָּם, or, with Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 167, Ginsb., Kittel, after Bomb., הֶקָם. Other abnormal forms are וַיִּחַוֶּק בּוֹ Ex 4⁴ (for similar instances see § 15 *c*, end) and וַיְהִי שָׁם Dt 10⁵.

h (*c*) In *pause*, see *i-v*.

The meeting of two tone-syllables (see *e, f*) is avoided also by connecting the words with Maqqēph, in which case the first word entirely loses the tone, e. g. וַיִּכְתֹּב-שָׁם and he wrote there, Jos 8³².

i 4. Very important changes of the tone and of the vowels are effected by the *pause*. By this term is meant the strong stress laid on the tone-syllable in the last word of a sentence (verse) or clause. It is marked by a great *distinctive accent*, *Sillûq*, *'Athnâh*, and in the accentuation of the books תַּא"ם, *'Ôlè w^eyôrêd* (§ 15 *h*). Apart from these principal pauses (*the great pause*), there are often pausal changes (*the lesser pause*) with the lesser distinctives, especially *Segolta*, *Zaqeph qaton*, *Rebhî^a*, and even with *Pašta*, *Tiphḥa*, *Gereš*, and (Pr 30⁴) *Pazer*.¹ The changes are as follows:

k (*a*) When the tone-syllable naturally has a short vowel, it as a rule becomes tone-long in *pause*, e. g. קָטַל, קָטַל; מַיִם, מַיִם; קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ. An *ă* which has been modified to *S^eghôl* usually becomes *ā* in *pause*, e. g. קָשָׁר (ground-form *qašr*) in *pause* קָשָׁר 2 K 11¹⁴; אָרָץ אָרָץ Jer 22²⁹;

¹ In most cases, probably on account of a following guttural or (at the end of a sentence) ׀ (cf. e. g. Ex 21³¹, Jer 3⁹ [but Ginsb. וּתְחַנֶּה], Ru 4⁴, Ec 11⁶ [but Ginsb. יִבְשֶׁר]; before ׀ Jer 17¹¹) [see also § 29 *w*]. וַאֲרָץ, וַאֲרָץ 1 S 7¹⁷, Is 65¹⁷, Pr 25³, where *ā* has *munah*, are very irregular, but the lengthening here is probably only to avoid the cacophony *šāphāt'ēt*. In the same way הַיִּצְלַח Ez 17¹⁶ (with Mahpakh before הַ) and וַיִּקְרָם Ez 37⁸ (with Darga before ׀) are to be explained. The four instances of אָנִי for אֲנִי apparently require a different explanation; see § 32 *c*.—The theory of Olshausen and others that the phenomena of the *pause* are due *entirely* to liturgical considerations, i. e. that it is 'a convenient way of developing the musical value of the final accents by means of fuller forms' in liturgical reading (Sievers, *Metr. Studien*, i. 236, also explains pausal forms like קָטַלְתָּ, יִקְטְלוּ, as 'late formations of the grammarians'), is contradicted by the fact that similar phenomena are still to be observed in modern vulgar Arabic, where they can only be attributed to rhythmical reasons of a general character.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

תִּסְפִּי with Baer and Ginsb., is to be preferred to the reading of ed. Mant., &c.

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

q Of other effects of the *pause* we have still to mention, (1) the transition of an \bar{e} (lengthened from \bar{i}) to the more distinct \bar{a} (see above, *l*), e. g. הִתּוֹ for הִתּוֹ Is 18⁵ (cf. § 67 *v*; § 72 *dd*); קָמַל Is 33⁹; אָצַל I Ch 8³⁸ (beside אָצַל [see *v*. 37. Cf. : טַבְּאֵל Is 7⁶ (טַבְּאֵל Ezr 4⁷); : שָׁשַׁר Jer 22¹⁴; סִפְרָר Ob 20; : וַיִּנְבֹּשׁ Ex 31¹⁷; : וַיִּנְבֹּשׁ 2 S 12¹⁵ (below, § 51 *m*)—S. R. D.]); הִפְצַר I S 15²³; הִפְצַר Gn 17¹⁴; הִפְצַר I S 15²³; הִפְצַר ψ 40¹⁸; הִרְחַק Jb 13²¹, mostly before liquids or sibilants (but also הִשָּׁב Is 42²², and without the *pause* הִרְחַק La 3⁴⁸). So also וַיִּלְךְ (shortened from וַיִּלְךְ) becomes in *pause* וַיִּלְךְ; cf. וַיִּלְךְ La 3²; הִלְךְ for הִלְךְ Ju 19²⁰. On *S^eghôl* in *pause* instead of *Sere*, cf. § 52 *n*, 60 *d*, and especially § 75 *n*, on וַחֲיָה Pr 4⁴ and 7².

r (2) The transition from \bar{a} to \bar{e} in the ultima; so always in the formula וְעַד לְעוֹלָם וָעַד (for וְעַד) *for ever and ever*.

s (3) The *pausal Qames* (according to § 54 *k*, lengthened from original \bar{a}) in *Hithpa'el* (but not in *Pi'el*) for *Sere*, e. g. יַתְהַלֵּךְ Jb 18⁸ for יַתְהַלֵּךְ. But *pausal* forms like סָתַר, שָׁבַט (in the *absol. st.* סָתַר, שָׁבַט) go back to a secondary form of the *abs. st.* סָתַר, שָׁבַט.

t (4) The restoration of a final *Yodh* which has been dropped from the stem, together with the preceding vowel, e. g. בְּעָיו, בְּעָיו Is 21¹², for בְּעָיו, בְּעָיו, the latter also without the *pause* Is 56^{9,12}; cf. Jb 12⁶, and the same occurrence even in the word *before the pause* Dt 32³⁷, Is 21¹².

u (5) The transition from \bar{o} or $\bar{ō}$ to \bar{a} in *pause*: as שָׂאֵלָה Is 7¹¹, if it be a locative of שָׂאֵל, and not rather imperat. Qal of שָׂאֵל; שָׂבַלְתִּי Gn 43¹⁴ for שָׂבַלְתִּי; עָו Gn 49³; יִטְרַף Gn 49²⁷; perhaps also שָׂרָן I K 22³⁴, Is 59¹⁷, and מִשְׁקָלָת Is 28¹⁷, cf. 2 K 21¹³. On the other hand the regular *pausal* form יִחַפֵּץ (ordinary imperfect יִחַפֵּץ) corresponds to a perfect חָפֵץ (see § 47 *h*).

v (6) When a *Pathah* both precedes and follows a virtually strengthened guttural, the second becomes \bar{a} in *pause*, and the first *S^eghôl*, according to § 22 *c* and § 27 *q*, e. g. אָחִי *my brothers*, in *pause* אָחִי. Similarly in cases where an original *Pathah* after a guttural has been attenuated to \bar{i} out of *pause*, and then lengthened to \bar{e} with the tone (cf. § 54 *k*), e. g. יִתְנַחֵם, but in *pause* יִתְנַחֵם Dt 32³⁶; cf. Nu 8⁷, 23¹⁹, Ez 5¹³, ψ 135¹⁴.—On *pausal Sere*, for *S^eghôl*, in *infin.*, imperat., and imperf. of verbs הִלְךְ, see § 75 *hh*.

w [Other instances of the full vowel in lesser *pause*, where the voice would naturally rest on the word, are Gn 15¹⁴ יַעֲבֹדוּ, Is 8¹⁵, 40²⁴, Ho 4¹², 8⁷, Dn 9¹⁵, and very often in such cases.]

SECOND PART

ETYMOLOGY, OR THE PARTS OF SPEECH

§ 30. *Stems and Roots*¹: *Biliteral, Triliteral, and Quadriliteral.*

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

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

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

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

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

Root : מִלַּךְ, the indeterminate idea of *ruling*.

Verb-stem, מָלַךְ *he has reigned*.

Noun-stem, מֶלֶךְ *king*.

For the historical investigation of the language, however, this hypothesis of unpronounceable roots, with indeterminate meaning, is fruitless. Moreover, the term *root*, as it is generally understood by philologists, cannot be applied to the Semitic trilateral stem (see *f*).¹

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

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

g On the other hand, a large number of trilateral stems really point to a biliteral base, which may be properly called a *root* (*radix primaria, bilitteralis*), since it forms the starting-point for several trilateral modifications of the same fundamental idea. Though in themselves unpronounceable, these roots are usually pronounced with *ā* between the two consonants, and are represented in writing by the sign √, e. g. √ כַּר as the root of כָּרַר, כָּרָה; כָּרַר, אָכַר. The reduction of a stem to the underlying root may generally be accomplished with certainty when the stem exhibits one weak consonant with two strong ones, or when the second and third consonants are identical. Thus e. g. the stems דָּכַךְ, דָּכַךְ, דָּכַךְ, דָּכַךְ may all be traced to the idea of *striking, breaking*, and the root common to them all is evidently the two strong consonants דַּךְ (*dakh*). Very frequently, however, the development of the root into a stem is effected by the addition of

¹ Cf. Philippi, 'Der Grundstamm des starken Verbums,' in *Morgenländische Forschungen*, Leipz. 1875, pp. 69-106.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

sometimes coincide with roots of a similar meaning in the Indo-Germanic family of languages (§ 1 h). Of other roots there is definite evidence that Semitic linguistic consciousness regarded them as onomatopoeic, whilst the Indo-Germanic instinct fails to recognize in them any imitation of sound.

- l* (c) Stems with the harder, stronger consonants are in general (§ 6 r) to be regarded as the older, from which a number of later stems probably arose through softening of the consonants; cf. פֹּזַר and בֹּזַר, צַחַק and שַׁחַק, צַעַק and זַעַק, עֲלֹץ and עָלַץ, עֲלֹץ and עָלַץ; רֶקַק and רִכְךָ, and the almost consistent change of initial ו to י. In other instances, however, the harder stems have only been adopted at a later period from Aramaic, e.g. טַעָה, Hebr. תַּעָה. Finally in many cases the harder and softer stems may have been in use together from the first, thus often distinguishing, by a kind of sound-painting, the intensive action from the less intensive; see above קָצַץ to cut, גָּזַז to shear, &c.
- m* (d) When two consonants are united to form a root they are usually either both emphatic or both middle-hard or both soft, e.g. קָץ, קָט, כָּם, גָּז, גָּר never כָּץ, גָּץ, גָּט, גָּם, קָז. Within (triliteral) stems the first and second consonants are never identical. The apparent exceptions are either due to reduplication of the root, e.g. דָּרָה (ψ 42⁵, Is 38¹⁵), Arabic دَرَاهِن, or result from other causes, cf. e.g. בָּבָה in the Lexicon. The first and third consonants are very seldom identical except in what are called concave stems (with middle ו or י), e.g. גָּזַז, צָוִץ; note, however, נָגַן, נָתַן, שָׁמַשׁ, שָׁרַשׁ, and on עָלַע Jb 39³⁰ see § 55 f. The second and third consonants on the other hand are very frequently identical, see § 67.¹
- n* (e) The softening mentioned under *l* is sometimes so great that strong consonants, especially in the middle of the stem, actually pass into vowels: cf. § 19 o, and עֲזָזָל Lv 16⁸ ff. if it is for עֲזָזָל.
- o* (f) Some of the cases in which triliteral stems cannot with certainty be traced back to a biliteral root, may be due to a combination of two roots—a simple method of forming expressions to correspond to more complex ideas.
- p* 3. Stems of *four*, or even (in the case of nouns) of *five* consonants² are secondary formations. They arise from an extension of the triliteral stem: (a) by addition of a fourth stem-consonant; (b) in some cases perhaps by composition and contraction of two triliteral stems, by which means even *quinquiliterals* are produced. Stems which have arisen from reduplication of the biliteral root, or from the mere repetition of one or two of the three original stem-consonants, e.g. כְּלִבֵּל from כּוּל or כִּיל, סְחַרְחַר from סַחַר, are usually not regarded as *quadriliterals* or *quinqueliterals*, but as *conjugational* forms (§ 55); so also the few words which are formed with the prefix שׁ, as שִׁלְהָבָה flame from לָהַב, correspond to the Aramaic conjugation Šaph'el, שִׁלְהַב.
- q* Rem. on (a). The letters *r* and *l*, especially, are inserted between the first and second radicals, e.g. כָּרַס, כָּרַס to eat up; שִׁרְבִיט = שִׁבֵּט sceptre (this insertion of an *r* is especially frequent in Aramaic); וְלַעֲפָה hot wind from וְעָפָה

¹ Consonants which are not found together in roots and stems are called *incompatible*. They are chiefly consonants belonging to the same class, e.g. גַּב, גָּב, כָּב, כָּט, דָּב, דָּט, בָּב, בָּט, זָב, זָט, צָב, צָט, אָב, אָט, &c., or in the reverse order.

² In Hebrew they are comparatively rare, but more numerous in the other Semitic languages, especially in Ethiopic.

to be hot. Cf. Aram. עָרַגַל to roll, expanded from עָגַל (conjugation Pa'el, corresponding to the Hebrew Pi'el). In Latin there is a similar expansion of *fid*, *scid*, *tud*, *jug* into *findo*, *scindo*, *tundo*, *jungo*. At the end of words the commonest expansion is by means of ל and ן, e. g. גִּרְוֹן axe, פִּרְמֹל garden-land (from פָּרַם), גִּבְעֹל corolla (גִּבְעָה cup); cf. § 85, xi.

Rem. on (b). Forms such as צִפְרִיָּע frog, חֲבַצְלֶת meadow-saffron, צִלְמוֹת shadow of death,¹ were long regarded as compounds, though the explanation of them all was uncertain. Many words of this class, which earlier scholars attempted to explain from Hebrew sources, have since proved to be loan-words (§ 1 i), and consequently need no longer be taken into account.

4. A special class of formations, distinct from the fully developed stems of three or four consonants, are (a) the *Interjections* (§ 105), which, as being direct imitations of natural sounds, are independent of the ordinary formative laws; (b) the *Pronouns*. Whether these are to be regarded as the mutilated remains of early developed stems, or as relics of a period of language when the formation of stems followed different laws, must remain undecided. At all events, the many peculiarities of their formation² require special treatment (§ 32 ff.). On the other hand, most of the particles (adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions) seem to have arisen in Hebrew from fully developed stems, although in many instances, in consequence of extreme shortening, the underlying stem is no longer recognizable (see § 99 ff.).

§ 31. Grammatical Structure.

P. Lörwald, 'Die Formenbildungsgesetze des Hebr.' (*Hilfsbuch für Lehrer des Hebr.*), Berlin, 1897, is recommended for occasional reference.

1. The formation of the parts of speech from the stems (derivation), *a* and their inflexion, are effected in two ways: (a) internally by changes in the stem itself, particularly in its vowels: (b) externally by the addition of formative syllables before or after it. The expression of grammatical relations (e. g. the comparative degree and some case-relations in Hebrew) periphrastically by means of separate words belongs, not to etymology, but to syntax.

The external method (b) of formation, by affixing formative syllables, *b* which occurs e. g. in Egyptian, appears on the whole to be the more ancient. Yet other families of language, and particularly the Semitic, at a very early period had recourse also to the internal method, and during their youthful vigour widely developed their power of forming derivatives. But the continuous decay of this power in the later periods of language made syntactical circumlocution more and more necessary. The same process may be seen also e. g. in Greek (including modern Greek), and in Latin with its Romance offshoots.

¹ So expressly Nöldeke in *ZAW.* 1897, p. 183 ff.; but most probably it is to be read צִלְמוֹת darkness from the stem צָלַם [Arab. *zalima*, to be dark].

² Cf. Hupfeld, 'System der semitischen Demonstrativbildung,' in the *Ztschr. f. d. Kunde des Morgenl.*, vol. ii. pp. 124 ff., 427 ff.

c 2. Both methods of formation exist together in Hebrew. The internal mode of formation by means of vowel changes is tolerably extensive (קָטַל, קָטִיל, קָטֵל; קָטִיל, קָטֵל, &c.). This is accompanied in numerous cases by external formation also (הִתְקַטֵּל, הִקְטִיל, נִקְטַל, &c.), and even these formative additions again are subject to internal change, e.g. הִתְקַטֵּל, הִקְטֵל. The addition of formative syllables occurs, as in almost all languages, chiefly in the formation of the persons of the verb, where the meaning of the affixed syllables is for the most part still perfectly clear (see §§ 44, 47). It is also employed to distinguish gender and number in the verb and noun. Of case-endings, on the contrary, only scanty traces remain in Hebrew (see § 90).



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Phoenician, Moabite, and Assyrian, but in no other of the kindred dialects;¹ from the latter the suffixes are derived (§ 33). The *ô* most probably results from an obscuring of an original *â* (cf. Aram. אָנָּן, Arab. 'ána). The pausal form אָנָּן occurs not only with small disjunctive accents, but even with conjunctives; so always in אָנָּן אֲנִי as *I live!* also Is 49¹⁸ with *Munah*, ψ 119¹²⁵ with *Merkha* (which, however, has been altered from *D^ehî*), and twice in Mal 1⁶. In all these cases there is manifestly a disagreement between the vocalization already established and the special laws regulating the system of accentuation.

d 2. The formation of the plural, in this and the other persons, exhibits a certain analogy with that of the noun, while at the same time (like the pronouns of other languages) it is characterized by many differences and peculiarities. The short form אָנָּן (אָנָּן) from which the suffix is derived occurs only in Jer 42⁶ *Kethîbh*. The form אָנָּן (cf. § 19 h) only in Ex 16^{7,8}, Nu 32³², La 3⁴²; אָנָּן in *pause*, Gn 42¹¹; in Arabic *nāhnu* is the regular form. In the *Mišna* אָנָּן (אָנָּן) has altogether supplanted the longer forms.

e 3. The pronoun of the 1st person only is, as a rule in languages, of the *common gender*, because the person who is present and speaking needs no further indication of gender, as does the 2nd person, who is addressed (in Greek, Latin, English, &c., this distinction is also lacking), and still more the 3rd person who is absent.

II. Second Person.

f 4. The forms of the 2nd person אָתָּךְ, אָתְּךָ, אָתְּכֶם, אָתְּכֶנָּה, &c., are contracted from 'antā, &c. The kindred languages have retained the *n* before the א, e. g. Arab. 'antā, fem. 'anti, thou; pl. 'antum, fem. 'antūnna, ye. In Syriac אָתָּךְ, fem. אָתְּךָ are written, but both are pronounced 'at. In Western Aramaic אָתְּךָ is usual for both genders.

g אָתְּךָ (without א) occurs five times, e. g. ψ 6⁴, always as *Kethîbh*, with אָתָּךְ as *Q^eré*. In three places אָתְּךָ appears as a masculine, Nu 11¹⁵, Dt 5²⁴, Ez 28¹⁴.

h The feminine form was originally אָתְּךָ as in Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic. This form is found seven times as *Kethîbh* (Ju 17², 1 K 14², 2 K 4^{16,28}, 8¹, Jer 4³⁰, Ez 36¹³) and appears also in the corresponding personal ending of verbs (see § 44 f), especially, and necessarily, before suffixes, as אָתְּךָ לְיָמֵי, § 59 a [c]; cf. also *i* as the ending of the 2nd fem. sing. of the imperative and imperfect. The final *i* was, however, gradually dropped in pronunciation, just as in Syriac (see above, f) it was eventually only written, not pronounced. The *'* therefore finally disappeared (cf. § 10 k), and hence the Masoretes, even in these seven passages, have pointed the word in the text as אָתְּךָ to indicate the *Q^eré* אָתְּךָ (see § 17). The same final *'* appears in the rare (Aramaic) forms of the suffix אָתְּךָ, אָתְּךָ (§§ 58, 91).

i 5. The plurals אָתְּכֶם (with the second vowel assimilated to the fem. form) and אָתְּכֶנָּה (אָתְּכֶנָּה), with the tone on the ultima, only partially correspond to the assumed ground-forms 'antumū, fem. 'antinnā, Arab. 'antūm (Aram. אָתְּכֶם, אָתְּכֶנָּה) and 'antūnna (Aram. אָתְּכֶם, אָתְּכֶנָּה). The form אָתְּכֶם is found only in Ez 34³¹ (so *Qimḥi* expressly, others אָתְּכֶם); אָתְּכֶנָּה (for which some MSS. have

¹ In Phoenician and Moabite (inscription of *Mêša'*, line 1) it is written אָנָּן, without the final *'*. In Punic it was pronounced *anec* (Plaut. *Poen.* 5, 1, 8) or *anech* (5, 2, 35). Cf. Schröder, *Phöniz. Sprache*, p. 143. In Assyrian the corresponding form is *anaku*, in old Egyptian *anek*, Coptic *anok*, *nok*.

הָאֵלֹהִים) only four times, viz. Gn 31⁶, Ez 13^{11.20}, 34¹⁷; in 13²⁰ אֵלֹהִים (before a ה) is even used as feminine.

III. Third Person.

6. (a) In אֵלֹהִים and אִיֹּהִים (*hú* and *hí*) the א (corresponding to the 'Elif of *pro-* *longation* in Arabic, cf. § 23 *i*) might be regarded only as an-orthographic... addition closing the final long vowel, as in אֵלֹהִים, אִיֹּהִים, &c. The א is, however, always written in the case of the separate pronouns,¹ and only as a toneless suffix (§ 33 *a*) does אֵלֹהִים appear as אֵלֹהִים, while אִיֹּהִים becomes אִיֹּהִים. In Arabic (as in Syriac) they are written אֵלֹהִים and אִיֹּהִים but pronounced *húwā* and *hiyā*, and in Vulgar Arabic even *húwā* and *hiyyā*. This Arabic pronunciation alone would not indeed be decisive, since the vowel complement might have arisen from the more consonantal pronunciation of the ו and י; but the Ethiopic *we'etú* (= *hu'a-tú*) for אֵלֹהִים, *ye'etí* (= *hi'a-tí*) for אִיֹּהִים (cf. also the Assyrian *ya-u-a* for אֵלֹהִים) show that the א was original and indicated an original vocalic termination of the two words. According to Philippi (*ZDMG.* xxviii. 172 and xxix. 371 ff.) אֵלֹהִים arose from a primitive Semitic *ha-ra*, אִיֹּהִים from *ha-ya*.

(b) The form אֵלֹהִים also stands in the consonantal text (*Kethibh*) of the Pentateuch² (with the exception of eleven places) for the fem. אִיֹּהִים. In all such cases the Masora, by the punctuation אֵלֹהִים, has indicated the *Qéré* אִיֹּהִים (*Qéré perpetuum*, see § 17). The old explanation regarded this phenomenon as an archaism which was incorrectly removed by the Masoretes. This assumption is, however, clearly untenable, if we consider (1) that no other Semitic language is without the quite indispensable distinction of gender in the separate pronoun of the 3rd pers.; (2) that this distinction does occur eleven times in the Pentateuch, and that in Gn 20⁵, 38²⁵, Nu 5^{13.14} אֵלֹהִים and אִיֹּהִים are found close to one another; (3) that outside the Pentateuch the distinction is found in the oldest documents, so that the אִיֹּהִים cannot be regarded as having been subsequently adopted from the Aramaic; (4) that those parts of the book of Joshua which certainly formed a constituent part of the original sources of the Pentateuch, know nothing of this epicene use of אֵלֹהִים. Consequently there only remains the hypothesis, that the writing of אֵלֹהִים for אִיֹּהִים rests on an orthographical peculiarity which in some recension of the Pentateuch-text was almost consistently followed, but was afterwards very properly rejected by the Masoretes. The orthography was, however, peculiar to the Pentateuch-text alone, since it is unnecessary to follow the Masora in writing אִיֹּהִים for אֵלֹהִים in 1 K 17¹⁵, Is 30³³, Jb 31¹¹, or אֵלֹהִים for אִיֹּהִים in ψ 73¹⁶, Ec 5⁸, 1 Ch 29¹⁶. The Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch has the correct form in the *Kethibh* throughout. Levy's explanation of this strange practice of the Masoretes is evidently right, viz. that originally אֵלֹהִים was written for both forms (see *k*, note), and was almost everywhere, irrespective of gender, expanded into אֵלֹהִים. On the whole question see Driver, *Leviticus* (in Haupt's Bible), p. 25 f. In the text Driver always reads אֵלֹהִים.

7. The plural forms אֵלֹהִים (אֵלֹהִים) and אִיֹּהִים (after prefixes הֵן, הֵן) are of doubtful origin, but אֵלֹהִים, אִיֹּהִים have probably been assimilated to אֵלֹהִים which goes back to a form *hinnā*. In Western Aram. אֵלֹהִים, אִיֹּהִים (אֵלֹהִים, אִיֹּהִים), Syr. *henūn*

¹ In the inscription of King Mēša' (see § 2 *d*), lines 6 and 27, we find אֵלֹהִים for אִיֹּהִים, and in the inscription of 'Ešmun'azar, line 22, for אִיֹּהִים, but in the Zenjirli inscriptions (see § 1 *m*) both אֵלֹהִים and אִיֹּהִים occur (Hadad i, l. 29).

² Also in twelve places in the Babylonian Codex (Prophets) of 916 A. D.; cf. Baer, *Ezekiel*, p. 108 f.; Buhl, *Canon and Text of the O. T.* (Edinb. 1892), p. 240.

(*enûn*), Arab. *humû* (archaic form of *hum*), and Ethiop. *hômû*, an *ô* or *û* is appended, which in Hebrew seems to reappear in the poetical suffixes $\text{וְ$ —, $\text{וְ$ —, $\text{וְ$ — (§ 91 l, 3).

- n* In some passages $\text{וְ$ stands for the feminine (Zc 5¹⁰, Ct 6⁸, Ru 1²²; cf. the use of the suffix of the 3rd masc. for the 3rd fem., § 135 o and § 145 t). For the quite anomalous $\text{וְ$ 2 K 9¹⁸ read $\text{וְ$ (Jb 32¹²).
- O* 8. The pronouns of the 3rd person may refer to *things* as well as persons. On their meaning as *demonstratives* see § 136.

§ 33. Pronominal Suffixes.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 100 f.; *Grundriss*, i. 306 ff. J. Barth, 'Beiträge zur Suffixlehre des Nordsemit.,' in the *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, 1901, p. 193 ff.

- a* 1. The independent principal forms of the personal pronoun (the *separate pronoun*), given in the preceding section, express only the nominative.¹ The accusative and genitive are expressed by forms, usually shorter, joined to the end of verbs, nouns, and particles (*pronominal suffixes* or simply *suffixes*); e. g. וְ (toneless) and וְ (from *āhû*) *eum* and *eius*, $\text{וְ$ *I have killed him* (also $\text{וְ$), $\text{וְ$ or (with *āhû* contracted into *ô*) $\text{וְ$ *thou hast killed him*; וְ (also וְ) *lux eius*.

The same method is employed in all the other Semitic languages, as well as in the Egyptian, Persian, Finnish, Tartar, and others; in Greek, Latin, and German we find only slight traces of the kind, e. g. German, *er gab's* for *er gab es*; Greek, *πατήρ μου* for *πατήρ ἐμοῦ*; Latin, *eccum, eccos, &c.*, in Plautus and Terence for *ecce eum, ecce eos*.

- b* 2. The case which these suffixes represent is—
- (*a*) When joined to verbs, the accusative (cf., however, § 117 x), e. g. $\text{וְ$ *I have killed him*.
- c* (*b*) When affixed to substantives, the genitive (like *πατήρ μου, pater eius*). They then serve as *possessive pronouns*, e. g. וְ ('*ābh-î*) *my father*, וְ *his horse*, which may be either *equus eius* or *equus suus*.
- d* (*c*) When joined to particles, either the genitive or accusative, according as the particles originally expressed the idea of a noun or a verb, e. g. וְ , literally *interstitium mei, between me* (cf. *mea causa*); but וְ *behold me, ecce me*.
- e* (*d*) Where, according to the Indo-Germanic case-system, the dative or ablative of the pronoun is required, the suffixes in Hebrew are joined to prepositions expressing those cases (וְ sign of the dative, וְ *in*, וְ *from*, § 102), e. g. וְ *to him (ei)* and *to himself (sibi)*, וְ *in him*, וְ (usually וְ) *from me*.

¹ On apparent exceptions see § 135 d.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

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

e Rem. 1. This pronoun takes the article (הַ, הַזֹּאת, הַהֵלֵךְ, הַיָּלֵד) according to the same rule as adjectives, see § 126 u; e. g. הַזֶּה הָאִישׁ *this man*, but זֶה הָאִישׁ *this is the man*.

f 2. Rarer secondary forms, with strengthened demonstrative force, are הַלְלוּהוּ Gn 24⁶⁵, 37¹⁹; הַלְלוּ fem. Ez 36³⁵; and shortened הַלְלוּ, sometimes *masc.*, as in Ju 6²⁰, 1 S 17²⁶, 2 K 23¹⁷, Zc 2⁸, Dn 8¹⁶, sometimes *fem.*, 2 K 4²⁵: cf. 1 S 14¹ [and 20¹⁹ LXX; see Commentaries and Kittel].

g 3. The personal pronouns of the 3rd person also often have a demonstrative sense, see § 136.

§ 35. The Article.

J. Barth, 'Der heb. u. der aram. Artikel,' in *Sprachwiss. Untersuch. zum Semit.*, Lpz. 1907, p. 47 ff.

a 1. The article, which is by nature a kind of demonstrative pronoun, never appears in Hebrew as an independent word, but always in closest connexion with the word which is defined by it. It usually takes the form הַ, with *ā* and a strengthening of the next consonant, e. g. הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ *the sun*, הַיָּאֵר *the river*, הַלְוִיִּים *the Levites* (according to § 20 m for הַיָּאֵר, הַלְוִיִּים).

b Rem. With regard to the *Dageš* in הַ after the article, the rule is, that it is inserted when a הַ or עַ follows the הַ, e. g. הַיְהוּדִים *the Jews*, הַיְעֵפִים *the weary* (פִּיעֵנִים La 4³ *Qeré* is an exception), but הַיָּאֵר, הַיְלָדִים, הַיְסוּד, &c. *Dageš forte* also stands after the article in the prefix הַ in certain nouns and in the participles *Pī'el* and *Pu'al* (see § 52 c) before הַ, עַ and רַ, except when the guttural (or רַ) has under it a short vowel in a sharpened syllable; thus הַמְהוּמָה Ez 22⁵, הַמְעָרָה *the cave*, הַמְפָרְעִים ψ 37¹ (cf. Jb 38⁴⁰, 1 Ch 4⁴¹); but הַמְהַלְלֵךְ ψ 104³ (Ec 4¹⁵, 2 Ch 23¹²; before עַ ψ 103⁴); הַמְעַשְׂקָה Is 23¹²; הַמְרַנְּלִים Jos 6²¹. Before letters other than gutturals this הַ remains without *Dageš*, according to § 20 m.

c 2. When the article stands before a guttural, which (according to § 22 b) cannot properly be strengthened, the following cases arise, according to the character of the guttural (cf. § 27 q).

(1) In the case of the weakest guttural, אַ, and also with רַ (§ 22 c and q), the strengthening is altogether omitted. Consequently, the *Pathah* of the article (since it stands in an open syllable) is always lengthened to *Qames*; e. g. הָאָב *the father*, הָאַחֵר *the other*, הָאִמָּה *the mother*, הָאִישׁ *the man*, הָאוֹר *the light*, הָאֱלֹהִים ὁ θεός, הָרֶגֶל *the foot*, הָרֵאשׁ *the head*, הָרָשָׁע *the wicked*.

d So also הַשְּׂפֹת Neh 3¹³, because syncopated from הַשְּׂפֹת (cf. verse 14 and Baer on the passage); הַאֲזִקִּים (as in Nu 11⁴, Ju 9⁴¹, 2 S 23³³, with the אַ

orthographically retained), for 'הַיָּאֵן Jer 40⁴ (cf. 'בְּאֵן verse 1); הַסִּירִים Ec 4¹⁴ for 'הַאֵם; הַרְמִים 2 Ch 22⁵ for 'הַאֵר' (cf. 2 K 8²⁸).

(2) In the case of the other gutturals either the virtual strengthening *e* takes place (§ 22 c)—especially with the stronger sounds ח and ה, less often with ע—or the strengthening is wholly omitted. In the former case, the *Pathah* of the article remains, because the syllable is still regarded as closed; in the second case, the *Pathah* is either modified to *Seghōl* or fully lengthened to *Qames*. That is to say:—

A. When the guttural has any other vowel than \bar{a} (ֶ) or \bar{o} (ֹ), *f* then

(1) before the stronger sounds ח and ה the article regularly remains הֶ; e.g. הַהוּא *that*, הַחֹדֶשׁ *the month*, הַחֵיל *the force*, הַחֲכָמָה *the wisdom*. Before ח, \bar{a} occurs only in הַחַי Gn 6¹⁹ [not elsewhere], הַחַרִּיטִים Is 3²², הַחַמְצִימִים Is 17⁸ [not elsewhere]; before ה, always in הַהֶמָּה, הֵהֱם.

(2) before ע the *Pathah* is generally lengthened to *Qames*, e.g. הַעַיִן *the eye*, הַעִיר *the city*, הַעֲבָד *the servant*, plur. הַעֲבָדִים; לְעֵגְלִים 1 K 12³²; also in Gn 10¹⁷ הַעֲרִקִי is the better reading. Exceptions are הַעֲוֹפֹתָת Ex 15¹⁰, הַעֲוִרִים 2 S 5^{6,8}, Is 42¹⁸, הַעֲבָדִים Is 24², הַעֲרִכִים Is 65¹¹, הַעֲשֵׂק Ez 22⁷, הַעֲוֹבִים Pr 2¹³ and הַעֲוֹבֹת Pr 2¹⁷, לְעֵינַיִם 1 S 16⁷, Ec 11⁷; but לְעֵינַיִם Gn 3⁶, Pr 10²⁶. Cf. Baer on Is 42¹⁸.

B. When the guttural has \bar{a} (ֶ) then

(1) immediately before a tone-bearing ה or ע the article is always הֶ, otherwise it is הֶ; e.g. הַעָם *the people*, הַהָר *the mountain*, הַעַיִן (in pause) *the eye*, הַהָרָה *towards the mountain*; but (according to § 22 c) הַהָרִים *the mountains*, הַעֲוִן *the iniquity*.

(2) before ה the article is invariably הֶ without regard to the tone; *i* e.g. הַחֲכָם *the wise man*, הַחֲגִי *the festival*.

C. When the guttural has ֶ the article is הֶ before ה; e.g. הַחֲרָשִׁים *the months*; הַחֲרָבוֹת *in the waste places* (without the article 'בְּחָרָבוֹת *bōḥ^orābhōth*) Ez 33²⁷, הַחֲרָבוֹת Ez 36^{35,38}, cf. 2 Ch 27⁴; but הֶ before ע, as הַעֲמָרִים *the sheaves* Ru 2¹⁵.

The gender and number of the noun have no influence on the form of the article.

Rem. 1. The original form of the Hebrew (and the Phoenician) article הֶ is generally considered to have been הֶל, the ל of which (owing to the proclitic nature of the article) has been invariably assimilated to the following consonant, as in יִקַּח from *yilqah*, § 19 d. This view was supported by the form of the Arabic article هَل (pronounced *hal* by some modern Beduin), the ل of which is also assimilated at least before all letters like *s* and *t* and before *l*, *n*, and *r*, e.g. 'al-Qur'ān but 'as-sānā (Beduin *has-sana*) = Hebr. הַשָּׁנָה *the year*.

But Barth (*Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, 1896, p. 7 ff.), following Hupfeld and Stade, has shown that the Hebrew article is to be connected rather with the original Semitic demonstrative *hā*,¹ cf. Arab. *hāda*, Aram. *hādēn*, &c. The sharpening of the following consonant is to be explained exactly like the sharpening after ׀ consecutive (§ 49 f; cf. also cases like בַּפֶּה, בַּפֶּה, &c., § 102 k), from the close connexion of the *ha* with the following word, and the sharpening necessarily involved the shortening of the vowel.²

m The Arabic article is supposed to occur in the Old Testament in אֱלֹהִים 1 K 10^{11.12} (also אֱלֹהֵי־גִבְיִם 2 Ch 2⁷, 9^{10.11}), *sandal-wood* (?), and in אֱלֵי־גִבְיִשׁ *hair, ice* = גִּבְיִשׁ (Arab. *gibs*) Ez 13^{11.13}, 38²², but this explanation can hardly be correct. On the other hand, in the proper name אֱלֹמוֹרָד Gn 10²⁶ the first syllable is probably אֱלֹ *God*, as suggested by D. H. Müller (see *Lexicon*, s. v.) and Nöldeke, *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.*, 1882, p. 1186. אֱלֹקִים Pr 30³¹, commonly explained as = Arab. *al-qaum*, the militia, is also quite uncertain.

n 2. When the prefixes בְּ, לְ, כִּי (§ 102) come before the article, the ה is elided, and its vowel is thrown back to the prefix, in the place of the Š^{wā} (§ 19 k, and § 23 k), e. g. בְּשָׁמַיִם *in the heaven* for בְּהַשָּׁמַיִם (so ψ 36⁶); לְעָם for לְהָעָם *to the people*, בְּהַרִּים *on the mountains*, בְּחַדְשֵׁים *in the months*; also in Is 41², read כְּעֶפְרַיִם instead of the impossible כְּעֶפְרַיִם. Exceptions to this rule occur almost exclusively in the later Books: Ez 40²⁵, 47²², Ec 8¹, Dn 8¹⁶, Neh 9¹⁹, 12³³, 2 Ch 10⁷, 25¹⁰, 29²⁷; cf., however, 1 S 13²¹, 2 S 21²⁰. Elsewhere, e. g. 2 K 7¹², the Masora requires the elision in the *Q^{eré}*. A distinction in meaning is observed between בְּהַיּוֹם *about this time* (Gn 39¹¹, 1 S 9¹³, &c.) and בְּיוֹם *first of all* (Gn 25³¹, &c.). After the copula וְ (*and*) elision of the ה does not take place, e. g. וְהָעָם.

o 3. The words אֲרֶץ *earth*, הַר *mountain*, חַג *feast*, עַם *people*, פָּר *bull*, always appear after the article with a long vowel (as in *pause*); הָאֲרֶץ, הָהָר, הַחַג, הָעָם, הָפָר; cf. also אֲרוֹן *ark* (so in the absol. st. in 2 K 12¹⁰, 2 Ch 24⁸, but to be read אֲרוֹן), with the article always הָאֲרוֹן.

§ 36. The Relative Pronoun.

The relative pronoun (cf. § 138) is usually the indeclinable אֲשֶׁר (*who, which, &c.*), originally a demonstrative pronoun; see further §§ 138 and 155. In the later books, especially Eccles. and the late Psalms, also Lam. (4 times), Jon. (1⁷), Chron. (twice), Ezra (once),—and always in the Canticle (cf. also Ju 7¹², 8²⁶, 2 K 6¹¹), ׃ is used instead; more rarely ׃ Ju 5⁷, Ct 1⁷ (Jb 19²⁹?); once ׃ before אֵל Ju 6¹⁷ (elsewhere ׃ before a guttural), before ה even ׃ Ec 3¹⁸, and according to some (e. g. Qimḥi) also in Ec 2²².³ [See *Lexicon*, s. v.]

¹ An original form *han*, proposed by Ungnad, 'Der hebr. Art.,' in *OLZ.* x (1907), col. 210 f., and *ZDMG.* 1908, p. 80 ff., is open to grave objections.

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

³ The full form אֲשֶׁר does not occur in Phoenician, but only אֲשֶׁ (= אֲשֶׁ?), pronounced *asse, esse* (also *as, es, is, ys, us*), or—especially in the later Punic



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

CHAPTER II

THE VERB

§ 38. *General View.*

a Verbal stems are either original or derived. They are usually divided into—

(*a*) Verbal stems proper (*primitive verbs*), which exhibit the stem without any addition, e. g. מָלַךְ *he has reigned*.

b (*b*) *Verbal derivatives*, i. e. *secondary* verbal stems, derived from the pure stem (letter *a*), e. g. קִדְּשׁ *to sanctify*, הִתְקַדְּשׁ *to sanctify oneself*, from קִדְּשׁ *to be holy*. These are usually called *conjugations* (§ 39).

c (*c*) *Denominatives*,¹ i. e. verbs derived from nouns (like the Latin *causari, praedari*, and Eng. *to skin, to stone*), or even from particles (see *d*, end) either in a primitive or derivative form, e. g. אָהַל, *Qal* and *Pi'el*, *to pitch a tent*, from אָהַל *tent*; שָׁרַשׁ and הִשְׁרִישׁ *to take root*, and שָׁרַשׁ *to root out*, from שָׁרַשׁ *root* (§ 52 *h*).

d This does not exclude the possibility that, for nouns, from which denominative verbs are derived, the corresponding (original) verbal stem may still be found either in Hebrew or in the dialects. The meaning, however, is sufficient to show that the denominatives have come from the noun, not from the verbal stem, e. g. לָבַן *a brick* (verbal stem לָבַן *to be white*), denomin. לָבַן *to make bricks*; דָּג *a fish* (verbal stem דָּגָה *to be prolific*), denomin. דָּגָה *to fish*; חָרַף *to winter* (from חֹרֶף *autumn, winter*, stem חָרַף *to pluck*); קָיַץ *to pass the summer* (from קַיִץ *summer*, stem קָיַץ *to be hot*).

On 'Semitic verbs derived from particles' see P. Haupt in the *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, xxii (1906), 257 ff.

§ 39. *Ground-form and Derived Stems.*

Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 119 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 504 ff.

a 1. The 3rd sing. masc. of the *Perfect* in the form of the pure stem (i. e. in *Qal*, see *e*) is generally regarded, lexicographically and grammatically, as the ground-form of the verb (§ 30 *a*), e. g. קָטַל *he has killed*, כָּבֵד *he was heavy*, קָטַן *he was little*.² From this form the other

¹ Cf. W. J. Gerber, *Die hebr. Verba denom., insbes. im theol. Sprachgebr. des A. T.*, Lpz. 1896.

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

persons of the *Perfect* are derived, and the *Participle* also is connected with it. קָטַל or קָטַל, like the Imperative and Infinitive construct in sound, may also be regarded as an alternative ground-form, with which the Imperfect (see § 47) is connected.

In verbs י"י (i.e. with י for their second radical) the stem-form, given both *b* in Lexicon and Grammar, is not the 3rd sing. masc. Perfect (consisting of two consonants), but the form with medial י, which appears in the Imperative and Infinitive; e. g. שׁוּב to return (3rd pers. perf. שָׁב): the same is the case in most stems with medial י, e. g. דָּן to judge.

2. From the pure stem, or *Qal*, the derivative stems are formed *c* according to an unvarying analogy, in which the idea of the stem assumes the most varied shades of meaning, according to the changes in its form (intensive, frequentative, privative, causative, reflexive, reciprocal; some of them with corresponding passive forms), e. g. לָמַד to learn, לָמַד to teach; שָׁב to lie, הִשָּׁבִיב to lay; שָׁפַט to judge, נִשְׁפָּט to contend. In other languages such formations are regarded as new or *derivative* verbs, e. g. Germ. *fallen* (to fall), *fällen* (to fell); *trinken* (to drink), *tränken* (to drench); Lat. *lactere* (to suck, Germ. *saugen*), *lactare* (to suckle, Germ. *säugen*); *iacere* (to throw), *iacere* (to lie down); γίνομαι, γεννάω. In Hebrew, however, these formations are incomparably more regular and systematic than (e. g.) in Greek, Latin, or English; and, since the time of Reuchlin, they have usually been called *conjugations* of the primitive form (among the Jewish grammarians בְּנֵינִים, i. e. *formations*, or more correctly *species*), and are always treated together in the grammar and lexicon.¹

3. The changes in the primitive form consist either in internal *d* modification by means of vowel-change and strengthening of the middle consonant (קָטַל, קָטַל; קוּטַל, קוּטַל; cf. *to lie, to lay; to fall, to fell*), or in the repetition of one or two of the stem-consonants (קָטַלְל, קָטַלְטַל), or finally in the introduction of formative additions (נִקְטַל), which may also be accompanied by internal change (הִתְקַטַּל, הִתְקַטַּל). Cf. § 31 b.

In Aramaic the formation of the conjugations is effected more by formative additions than by vowel-change. The vocalic distinctions have mostly become obsolete, so that, e. g. the reflexives with the prefix הִתְ, אִתְ, אִתְ have entirely usurped the place of the passives. On the other hand, Arabic has preserved great wealth in both methods of formation, while Hebrew in this, as in other respects, holds the middle place (§ 1 m).

4. Grammarians differ as to the *number* and *arrangement* of these *c* conjugations. The common practice, however, of calling them by the

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

old grammatical terms, prevents any misunderstanding. The simple form is called *Qal* (קָל *light*, because it has no formative additions); the others (פְּבִרִים *heavy*, being weighted, as it were, with the strengthening of consonants or with formative additions) take their names from the paradigm of פָּעַל *he has done*,¹ which was used in the earliest Jewish grammatical works. Several of these have passives which are distinguished from their actives by more obscure vowels. The common conjugations (including *Qal* and the passives) are the seven following, but very few verbs exhibit them all:

	<i>Active.</i>	<i>Passive.</i>
f	1. <i>Qal</i> קָטַל <i>to kill.</i>	(Cf. § 52 e.)
	2. <i>Niph'al</i> נִקְטַל <i>to kill oneself</i> (rarely passive).	
	3. <i>Pi'el</i> קָטַל <i>to kill many, to massacre.</i>	4. <i>Pu'al</i> קִטַּל.
	5. <i>Hiph'il</i> הִקְטִיל <i>to cause to kill.</i>	6. <i>Hoph'al</i> הִקְטַל.
	7. <i>Hithpa'el</i> הִתְקַטַּל <i>to kill oneself.</i> [Very rare, <i>Hothpa'al</i> הֹתְקַטַּל.]	

g There are besides several less frequent conjugations, some of which, however, are more common in the kindred languages, and even in Hebrew (in the weak verb) regularly take the place of the usual conjugations (§ 55).

In Arabic there is a greater variety of conjugations, and their arrangement is more appropriate. According to the Arabic method, the Hebrew conjugations would stand thus: 1. *Qal*; 2. *Pi'el* and *Pu'al*; 3. *Pô'el* and *Pô'al* (see § 55 b); 4. *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*; 5. *Hithpa'el* and *Hothpa'al*; 6. *Hithpô'el* (see § 55 b); 7. *Niph'al*; 8. *Hithpa'el* (see § 54 l); 9. *Pi'lal* (see § 55 d). A more satisfactory division would be into three classes: (1) The intensive *Pi'el* with the derived and analogous forms *Pu'al* and *Hithpa'el*. (2) The causative *Hiph'il* with its passive *Hoph'al*, and the analogous forms (*Šaph'el* and *Tiph'el*). (3) The reflexive or passive *Niph'al*.

¹ This paradigm was borrowed from the Arabic grammarians, and, according to Bacher, probably first adopted throughout by Abulwalid. It was, however, unsuitable on account of the guttural, and was, therefore, usually exchanged in later times for פָּקַד, after the example of Moses Qimhi. This verb has the advantage, that all its conjugations are actually found in the Old Testament. On the other hand, it has the disadvantage of indistinctness in the pronunciation of some of its forms, e. g. פָּקַדְתָּ, פָּקַדְתָּם. (The paradigm of קָטַל, commonly used since the time of Danz, avoids this defect, and is especially adapted for the comparative treatment of the Semitic dialects, inasmuch as it is found with slight change (Arab. and Ethiop. קָתַל) in all of them. It is true that in Hebrew it occurs only three times in *Qal*, and even then only in poetic style (ψ 139¹⁹, Jb 13¹⁵, 24¹⁴); yet it is worth retaining as a model which has been sanctioned by usage. More serious is the defect, that a number of forms of the paradigm of קָטַל leave the beginner in doubt as to whether or not there should be a *Dageš* in the *Begadkephath* letters, and consequently as to the correct division of the syllables.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

§ 41. *Variations from the Ordinary Form of the Strong Verb.*

- a* The same laws which are normally exhibited in stems with strong (unchangeable) consonants, hold good for all other verbs. Deviations from the model of the strong verb are only modifications due to the special character or weakness of certain consonants, viz. :—
- (*a*) When one of the stem-consonants (or *radicals*) is a guttural. In this case, however, the variations only occur in the vocalization (according to § 22), not in the consonants. The *guttural verbs* (§§ 62–65) are, therefore, only a variety of the *strong verb*.
- b* (*b*) When a stem-consonant (*radical*) disappears by assimilation (§ 19 *b-f*), or when the stem originally consisted of only two consonants (*verbs* י"ד, ו"ו, and ו"ו, as שָׁנָה, לָקַח, דָּבַר, §§ 66, 67, 72).
- c* (*c*) When one of the stem-consonants (*radicals*) is a weak letter. In this case, through aphaeresis, elision, &c., of the weak consonant, various important deviations from the regular form occur. Cf. § 68 ff. for these verbs, such as יָשַׁב, נָצַח, הִלָּח.
- d* Taking the old paradigm לָעָם as a model, it is usual, following the example of the Jewish grammarians, to call the first radical of any stem ד, the second ו, and the third ל. Hence the expressions, *verb* נ"ד for a verb whose first radical is נ (*primae radicalis* [*sc. literae*] נ); ו"ו for *mediae radicalis* ו; ו"ו for a verb whose second radical is repeated to form a third.

I. The Strong Verb.

§ 42.

As the formation of the strong verb is the model also for the weak verb, a statement of the general formative laws should precede the treatment of special cases.

Paradigm B, together with the Table of the personal preformatives and affirmatives given in § 40 *c*, offers a complete survey of the normal forms. A full explanation of them is given in the following sections (§§ 43–55), where each point is elucidated on its first occurrence; thus e. g. the inflexion of the Perfect, the Imperfect and its modifications, will be found under Qal, &c.

A. THE PURE STEM, OR QAL.

§ 43. *Its Form and Meaning.*

- a* The common form of the 3rd sing. masc. of the *Perfect Qal* is לָטַח, with *ā* (*Pathah*) in the second syllable, especially in *transitive* verbs (but see § 44 *c*). There is also a form with *ē* (*Ṣere*, originally *i*), and another with *ō* (*Holem*, originally *ū*) in the second syllable, both of which, however, have almost always an *intransitive*¹ meaning,

¹ But cf. such instances as Jer 48⁵. In Arabic also, transitive verbs are found with middle *i*, corresponding to Hebrew verbs with *ē* in the second

and serve to express states and qualities, e.g. קָבֵר to be heavy, קָטַן to be small.

In Paradigm B a verb *middle a*, a verb *middle ē*, and a verb *middle ō* are accordingly given side by side. The second example קָבֵר is chosen as showing, at the same time, when the *Dageš lene* is to be inserted or omitted.

Rem. 1. The vowel of the second syllable is the principal vowel, and hence on it depends the distinction between the transitive and intransitive meaning. The *Qameš* of the first syllable is lengthened from an original *ā* (cf. Arabic *qātālā*), but it can be retained in Hebrew only immediately before the tone, or at the most (with an open ultima) in the counter-tone with *Metheg*; otherwise, like all the pretonic vowels (*ā, ē*), it becomes *Šewā*, e. g. קָטַלְתָּם and plur. masc. In the Aramaic dialects the vowel of the first syllable is always reduced to *Šewā*, as קָטַל = Hebr. קָטַל. The intransitive forms in Arabic are *qātīlā, qātūlā*; in Hebrew (after the rejection of the final vowel) *i* being in the tone-syllable has been regularly lengthened to *ē*, and *ū* to *ō*.

2. Examples of *denominatives* in Qal are: קָבַר to cover with pitch, from קָבַר pitch; מָלַח to salt, from מָלַח salt; שָׁבַר (usually *Hiph.*) to buy or sell corn, from שָׁבַר corn; see above, § 38 c.

§ 44. Flexion of the Perfect of Qal.¹

1. The formation of the persons of the Perfect is effected by the addition of certain forms of the personal pronoun, and marks of the 3rd fem. sing. and 3rd pl. (as *affirmatives*) to the end of the verbal-stem, which contains the idea of a predicate, and may be regarded, in meaning if not in form, as a *Participle* or *verbal adjective*. For the 3rd pers. sing. masc. Perfect, the pronominal or subject idea inherent in the finite verb is sufficient: thus, קָטַל he has killed, קָטַלְתָּ thou hast killed (as it were, *killing thou*, or *a killer thou*), a killer wast thou = קָטַלְתָּ אַתָּה; יָרָא he was fearing, יָרָאְתֶם ye were fearing = יָרָאְתֶם אַתֶּם. The ending of the 1st pers. plur. (נִי—) is also certainly connected with the termination of אֲנִי, אֲנוּ we (§ 32 b, d). The affirmative of the 1st pers. sing. (נִי) is to be referred, by an interchange of נ and ת (cf. § 33 f), to that form of the pronoun which also underlies אֲנִי, I.² In the third person הִיא (originally הִיא, cf. below, f) is the mark of the feminine, as in a great number of nouns (§ 80 c), and הֵן is the termination of the plural; cf., for the latter, the termination of the 3rd and 2nd pers. plur. Imperf. *ūna* in Arabic and *ū* (often also *ū*)

syllable. Hence P. Haupt (*Proc. Amer. Or. Soc.*, 1894, p. ci f.) prefers to distinguish them as *verba voluntaria* (actions which depend on the will of the subject) and *involuntaria* (actions or states independent of the will of the subject).

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, 'Die Endungen des Perfects' (*Untersuchungen zur semit. Gram.* ii.), in *ZDMG.* vol. 38, p. 407 ff., and more fully in *Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb. 1904, p. 15 ff.

² According to Nöldeke, *l.c.*, p. 419, the original Semitic termination of the 1st sing. Perf. was most probably *kū*; cf. the Ethiopic *qatalku*, Arabic *qataltu*.

in Hebrew, also *ûna* (in the construct state *û*) as the plural termination of masc. nouns in literary Arabic.

b 2. The characteristic *Pathah* of the second syllable becomes *Šewâ* before an affirmative beginning with a vowel, where it would otherwise stand in an open syllable (as קִטְלוּ, קִטְלוּ; but in pause קִטְלוּ, קִטְלוּ). Before an affirmative beginning with a consonant the *Pathah* remains, whether in the tone-syllable (קִטְלוּ, קִטְלוּ, קִטְלוּ; in pause קִטְלוּ &c.) or before it. In the latter case, however, the *Qames* of the first syllable, being no longer a pretonic vowel, becomes vocal *Šewâ*; as קִטְלוּ, קִטְלוּ; cf. § 27 *i* and § 43 *b*. On the retention of *ā* with *Metheg* of the counter-tone in the *Perf. consecutive*, cf. § 49 *i*.

c Rem. 1. Verbs *middle ē* in Hebrew (as in Ethiopic, but not in Arabic or Aramaic) generally change the *E*-sound in their inflexion into *Pathah* (frequently so even in the 3rd sing. masc. *Perf.*). This tendency to assimilate to the more common verbs *middle a* may also be explained from the laws of vocalization of the tone-bearing closed penultima, which does not readily admit of *Šere*, and never of *Hireq*, of which the *Šere* is a lengthening (cf. § 26 *p*). On the other hand, *Šere* is retained in an open syllable; regularly so in the weak stems נ"ל (§ 74 *g*), before suffixes (§ 59 *i*), and in the pausal forms of the strong stem in an open tone-syllable, e. g. קִטְלוּ it cleaveth, Jb 29¹⁰ (not קִטְלוּ), cf. 2 S 1²³, Jb 41¹⁵; even (contrary to § 29 *q*) in a closed pausal syllable, e. g. שָׁבַן, Dt 33¹² (out of pause שָׁבַן, Is 32¹⁶); but קִטְלוּ Is 33⁹, &c., according to § 29 *q*.

d 2. In some weak stems *middle a*, the *Pathah* under the second radical sometimes, in a closed toneless syllable, becomes *—*, and, in one example, *—*. Thus from יִרְשָׁתָהּ: וְיִרְשָׁתָהּ and thou shalt possess it, Dt 17¹⁴; וְיִרְשָׁתָם Dt 19¹; וְיִרְשָׁתָם Dt 4¹, and frequently; from יִלְדָּהּ to bring forth, to beget; וְיִלְדָּתֶיךָ ψ 27 (cf. Nu 11¹², Jer 2²⁷, 15¹⁰); from פִּישׁ; וּפִישָׁתָם Mal 3²⁰; from שָׁאַל; שָׁאַלְתִּיו I have asked him, 1 S 1²⁰ (Ju 13⁶), and three times שָׁאַלְתָם 1 S 12¹³, 25⁵, Jb 21²⁹. Qimhi already suggests the explanation, that the *î* (*ē*) of these forms of שָׁאַל and יִרְשָׁ is the original vowel, since along with שָׁאַל and יִרְשָׁ are also found שָׁאַל and יִרְשָׁ (see the Lexicon). The possibility of this explanation cannot be denied (especially in the case of יִרְשָׁ, see § 69 *s*); the *î* in these forms might, however, equally well have arisen from an attenuation of *ā* (§ 27 *s*), such as must in any case be assumed in the other instances. Moreover, it is worthy of notice that in all the above cases the *î* is favoured by the character of the following consonant (a sibilant or dental), and in most of them also by the tendency towards assimilation of the vowels (cf. § 54 *k* and § 64 *f*).

e 3. In verbs *middle ô*, the *Holem* is retained in the tone-syllable, e. g. יִגְרָתָּהּ thou didst tremble; יִכְלוּ in pause for יִכְלוּ they were able; but in a toneless closed syllable the original short vowel appears in the form of a *Qames hatuph*; יִכְלוּ I have prevailed against him, ψ 13⁵; וְיִכְלוּ (see § 49 *h*) then shalt thou be able, Ex 18²³; in a toneless open syllable it becomes vocal *Šewâ*, e. g. יִכְלוּ, יִכְלוּ.

f 4. Rarer forms¹ are: *Sing. 3rd fem.* in תִּ— (as in Arabic, Ethiopic, and

¹ Many of these forms, which are uncommon in Hebrew, are usual in the



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

plur. by the termination הַֿ, as in Biblical Aramaic. Nöldeke (*ZDMG.* 38 [1884], p. 411) referred doubtfully to the textual readings in Dt 21⁷, Jos 15⁴, 18^{12.14.19}, Jer 2¹⁵, 22⁶, where the Masora uniformly inserts the termination הַֿ, and to Gn 48¹⁰ in the Samaritan Pentateuch, Gn 49²², 1 S 4¹⁵, ψ 18³⁵, Neh 13¹⁰. In his *Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 19, however, he observes that the construction of a fem. plural with the 3rd sing. fem. is not unexampled, and also that הַֿ is often found as a mistake for ךַּ. On the other hand Mayer Lambert (*Une série de Qeré ketib*, Paris, 1891, p. 6 ff.) explains all these K^othîbh, as well as ψ 73², Jer 50⁶ (?), and (against Nöldeke) 1 K 22⁴⁹ (where הַֿ is undoubtedly the article belonging to the next word), Jb 16¹⁶ (where the *masc.* הַֿ requires the marginal reading), also Jer 48⁴¹, 51⁵⁶, Ez 26², ψ 68¹⁴, as remains of the 3rd *fem. plur.* in הַֿ. The form was abandoned as being indistinguishable from the (later) form of the 3rd *fem. sing.*, but tended to be retained in the perfect of verbs הַֿ, as היה *Kethibh* six times in the above examples.

n 5. The affirmatives הַֿ, (הַֿ), הַֿ, הַֿ are generally toneless, and the forms with these inflexions are consequently *Mil'el* (הַֿ, &c.); with all the other affirmatives they are *Milra'* (§ 15 c). The place of the tone may, however, be shifted: (a) by the *pause* (§ 29 i-v), whenever a vowel which has become vocal Š^owâ under the second stem-consonant is restored by the *pause*; as הַֿ for הַֿ (הַֿ for הַֿ), and הַֿ for הַֿ (הַֿ for הַֿ); (b) in certain cases after *wāw consecutive* of the *Perfect* (see § 49 h).

o 6. Contraction of a final ךַּ with the ךַּ of the affirmative occurs e. g. in הַֿ Hag 2⁵, &c.; cf. Is 14²⁰, &c., in the *Perf. Po'el*; Dt 4²⁵ in the *Hiph'il* of הַֿ; Is 21², &c., in the *Hiph'il* of הַֿ. Contraction of a final ךַּ with the affirmative הַֿ occurs in הַֿ Gn 34¹⁸; in *Niph.* Ezr 9⁷, cf. 2 Ch 14¹⁰; in *Hiph.* 2 Ch 29¹⁹; with the affirmative הַֿ in the *Imperfect Qal* Ez 17²³; *Pi'el* ψ 71²³, where with Baer and Ginsburg הַֿ is to be read, according to others הַֿ (cf. in *Po'el* הַֿ Ez 32¹⁶), but certainly not הַֿ with the Mantua ed., Opitius and Hahn; with הַֿ in the *Imperat. Hiph.* Gn 4²³, Is 32⁹.

§ 45. The Infinitive.

F. Prätorius, 'Ueber den sog. Inf. absol. des Hebr.,' in *ZDMG.* 1902, p. 546 ff.

u 1. The Infinitive is represented in Hebrew by two forms, a shorter and a longer; both are, however, strictly speaking, independent *nouns* (*verbal substantives*). The shorter form, the *Infinitive construct* (in Qal הַֿ,¹ sometimes incorrectly הַֿ), is used in very various ways, sometimes in connexion with pronominal suffixes, or governing a substantive in the genitive, or with an accusative of the object (§ 115), sometimes in connexion with prepositions (הַֿ *to kill*, § 114 f), and sometimes in dependence upon substantives as genitive, or upon verbs as accusative of the object. On the other hand, the use of the longer form, the *Infinitive absolute* (in Qal הַֿ, sometimes also הַֿ, obscured from original *qāṭal*), is restricted to those cases in which it emphasizes

¹ Cf. the analogous forms of the noun, § 93 t.

the abstract verbal idea, without regard to the subject or object of the action. It stands most frequently as an adverbial accusative with a finite verb of the same stem (§ 113 h-s).¹

The flexibility and versatility of the Inf. constr. and the rigidity *b* and inflexibility of the Inf. absol. are reflected in their vocalization. The latter has unchangeable vowels, while the *ō* of the Inf. constr. may be lost. For קָטַל, according to § 84^a, *e*, goes back to the ground-form *qūṭūl*.

Other forms of the Inf. constr. Qal of the strong verb are—

c

(a) קָטַל, e. g. שָׁכַב to lie, Gn 34⁷; שָׁפַל to sink, Ec 12⁴; especially with verbs which have *ā* in the second syllable of the Imperf.: hence sometimes also with those, whose second or third radical is a guttural (frequently besides the ordinary form). All the examples (except שָׁכַב, see above) occur in the closest connexion with the following word, or with suffixes (see § 61 c). In Ez 21³³ the Masora seems to treat לְטַבַּח (verse 20, in *pause* לְטַבַּח) as an Infinitive = לְטַבַּח; probably לְטַבַּח should be read.

(b) קָטַלָּה and, attenuated from it, קָטַלְהָ; קָטַלְהָ and קָטַלְהָ (which are *d* feminine forms² of קָטַל and קָטַל, mostly from intransitive verbs, and sometimes found along with forms having no feminine ending in use), e. g. לְאַשְׁמָה to be guilty, Lv 5²⁶, אֶהְבֵּה to love, שִׂנְאָה to hate; לְיִרְאָה, often in Dt., to fear; וְקָנָה to be old; קָרְאָה to meet (in לְקָרְאת § 19 k); לְרַבְעָה to lie down, Lv 20¹⁶; לְמַשְׁחָה to anoint, Ex 29²⁹; לְרַחֲצָה to wash, Ex 30¹⁸, &c.; לְטַמְאָה (also a subst. = uncleanness, like טַמְאָה) to be unclean, Lv 15³²; לְקָרְבָה to approach, Ex 36², &c.; cf. Lv 12⁴⁻⁵, Dt 11²², Is 30¹⁹, Ez 21¹⁶, Hag 1⁶; also רַחֲקָה to be far off, Ez 8⁶; חָמְלָה to pity, Ez 16⁵; cf. Ho 7⁴. On the other hand in חָמְלָה Gn 19¹⁶, the original *ā* has been modified to *ē*; cf. חֻזְקָה Is 8¹¹, &c.

(c) In the Aramaic manner (מְקַטַּל but cf. also Arab. *maqtal*) there occur as *e* Inf. Qal: מְשַׁלֵּחַ to send, Est 9¹⁹; מְקַרְא to call and מְסַפֵּעַ to depart, Nu 10² (Dt 10¹¹); מְקַח to take, 2 Ch 19⁷, &c.; מְשָׂא to carry, Nu 4²⁴, &c. (cf. even לְמַשְׁאוֹת Ez 17⁹); also with a feminine ending מְעַלָּה to go up, Ezr 7⁹, &c.; cf. for these forms (almost all very late) Ryssel, *De Elohistae Pentateuchici sermone*, p. 50, and Strack on Nu 4²⁴.

(a) קָטַלְתָּ in יִבְנֶשֶׁת Gn 8⁷; יִכְלָתָּ Nu 14¹⁶; probably also חָרְשֶׁת Ex 31⁵, 35³³.

2. A kind of *Gerund* is formed by the Inf. constr. with the preposition *ל*; as לְקָטַל *ad interficiendum*, לְנַפֵּל *ad cadendum* (see § 28 a).

¹ The terms *absolute* and *construct* are of course not to be understood as implying that the Inf. constr. קָטַל forms the *construct state* (see § 89) of the Inf. absol. (קָטַל ground-form *qā!āl*). In the Paradigms the Inf. constr., as the principal form, is placed before the other, under the name of Infinitive simply.

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

g The blending of the ל with the *Infin. constr.* into a single grammatical form seems to be indicated by the firmly closed syllable, cf. לִשְׁבֹּב Gn 34⁷; לִנְפֹל ψ 118¹³, with *Dageš lene* in the פ = *lin-pōl*; hence, also *liq-tōl*, &c.; but בִּנְפֹל *bin^ephōl*, Jb 4¹³; בְּנִפְל 2 S 3³⁴. Exceptions לְצַבָּא Nu 4²³, 8²⁴; לִנְתוּשׁ וְלִנְתוּץ Jer 1¹⁰, 18⁷, 31²⁸; לְשָׂרוּר Jer 47⁴; לְטַבּוּחַ Jer 11¹⁹, &c., ψ 37¹⁴; לְבָרוּק 2 Ch 34¹⁰; according to some also לְסַבֵּב Nu 21⁴ and לְכַבֵּשׁ 2 Ch 28¹⁰ (Baer לְכַבֵּשׁ); on the other hand בְּשָׂפָן Gn 35²²; בְּפוֹכַר Jer 17². For the meaningless לְרִיּוֹשׁ Ezr 10¹⁶ read לְרִישׁ.

§ 46. The Imperative.

- a** 1. The ground-forms of the Imperative, קָטַל (properly *q^etūl*, which is for an original *qūtūl*), and קִטַּל (see below, *c*), the same in pronunciation as the forms of the *Infin. constr.* (§ 45), are also the basis for the formation of the Imperfect (§ 47).¹ They represent the *second* person, and have both *fem.* and *plur.* forms. The third person is supplied by the Imperfect in the Jussive (§ 109 *b*); and even the second person must always be expressed by the Jussive, if it be used with a negative, e. g. אַל-תִּקְטַל *ne occidas* (not אֵל-קִטַּל). The passives have no Imperative, but it occurs in the reflexives, as *Niph'al* and *Hithpa'el*.²
- b** 2. The Afformatives of the *2nd sing. fem.* and the *2nd plur. masc.* and *fem.* are identical in every case with those of the Imperfect (§ 47 *c*). In the same way, the Imperative of the *2nd sing. masc.*, in common with the Imperfect, admits of the lengthening by the ה־ paragogicum (§ 48 *i*), as, on the other hand, there are certain shortened forms of this person analogous to the Jussive (§ 48. 5).
- c** Rem. 1. Instead of the form קָטַל (sometimes also *plene*, e. g. שָׁמוּר Ec 12¹³; before *Maqqeph* קָטַל־ with *Qames hatuph*), those verbs which have an *a* in the final syllable of the *Imperf.* (i. e. especially verbs middle *e*) make their Imperative of the form קִטַּל, e. g. לְבַשׁ *dress!* (Perf. לָבַשׁ and לְבַשׁ); שָׁבֵב *lie down!* in *pause* שָׁבֵב 1 S 3^{5.6.9}.
- d** 2. The first syllable of the *sing. fem.* and *plur. masc.* are usually to be pronounced with *Šewā mobile* (*qit^elî, qit^elû*, and so שָׁפְכִי, &c., without *Dageš lene*, and even מִשְׁכִּי with *Metheg*, Ex 12²¹; but cf. אֶסְפִּי Jer 10¹⁷, and with the same phonetic combination חִשְׁפִּי Is 47²; see analogous cases in § 93 *m*); less frequently we find an *ō* instead of the *i*, e. g. מִלְכִי *rule*, Ju 9¹⁰; מִשְׁכִּי *draw*; Ez 32²⁰; חָרְבִי Jer 2¹² (cf. חָרְבִי Is 44²⁷); on קִסְמִי 1 S 28⁸ *Qerê*, צָעֲקִי Jer. 22²⁰ (cf. 1 K 13⁷), see § 10 *h*. This *ō* arises (see above, *a*) from a singular ground-form *qūtūl*, not from a retraction of the original *ū* of the second syllable. We must abandon the view that the forms with *i* in the first syllable (cf. also

¹ The *Infin. absol.*, like the Greek *Infin.*, is also sometimes used for the Imperative (§ 113 *bb*). Cf. in general, Koch, *Der semitische Inf.* (Schaffhausen, 1874).

² In *Hoph'al* an Imperative is found only twice (Ez 32¹⁹, Jer. 49⁸), and closely approximating in meaning to the reflexive.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

stem-form was not always sufficient to express at the same time differences both of gender and number, the distinction had to be further indicated, in several cases, by special *affirmatives*. Cf. the table, § 40 c.

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

In the *first* pers. אֶקְטַל, plur. נִקְטַל, א is probably connected with אֵ, and נ with נָהֲנוּ; here no indication of gender or number by a special ending was necessary. As regards the vocalization, the Arabic points to the ground-forms 'äqtül and näqtül: the ä of the 1st plur. is, therefore, as in the other preformatives, attenuated from a. The *Seghöl* of the 1st sing. is probably to be explained by the preference of the א for this sound (cf. § 22 o, but also § 51 p); according to Qimhi, it arises from an endeavour to avoid the similarity of sound between אֶקְטַל (which is the Babylonian punctuation) and אֶקְטַל, which, according to this view, was likewise pronounced *iqtöl*.¹

c The preformative ת of the *second* persons (תִּקְטַל, ground-form *täqtül*, &c.) is, without doubt, connected with the ת of אָתָּה, אַתָּם, &c., and the *affirmative* ׀ of the 2nd fem. sing. תִּקְטַלִּי with the i of the original feminine form אָתִי (see § 32 h). The *affirmative* ׀ of the 2nd masc. plur. תִּקְטַלְיָ (in its more complete form, תִּי, see m) is the sign of the plural, as in the 3rd pers., and also in the Perfect (§ 44 a). In the Imperfect, however, it is restricted in both persons to the masculine,² while the affirmative תָּ (also תִּ) of the 3rd and 2nd plur. fem. is probably connected with תִּנֶּה *eae* and תִּנֶּה *vos* (fem.).

d The preformatives of the *third* persons (י in the masc. יִקְטַל, ground-form *yäqtül*, plur. יִקְטַלוּ, ground-form *yäqtülû*; ת in the fem. תִּקְטַל, plur. תִּקְטַלְנָה) have not yet met with any satisfactory explanation. With ת might most obviously be compared the original feminine

¹ Cf. § 24 e. In favour of the above view of Qimhi may be urged the phonetic orthography אֶשׁ (in Pr 18²⁴ אֶשׁ), 2 S 14¹⁹ (unless, with Perles, אֶשׁ is to be read), Mi 6¹⁰, for אֶשׁ, and אֶשׁ 1 Ch 2¹³ for אֶשׁ (as verse 12). Also אֶשׁ Mi 6¹¹ is probably for אֶשׁ = אֶשׁ, אֶשׁ Is 10¹² for אֶשׁ; אֶשׁ Is 51¹⁹ for אֶשׁ; and conversely אֶשׁ is for אֶשׁ = אֶשׁ. Similarly, אֶשׁ 1 S 14⁴⁹ is probably for אֶשׁ or אֶשׁ; in 2 S 23⁸ אֶשׁ is, according to the LXX, an error for אֶשׁ = אֶשׁ. In Assyrian also the simple i corresponds to the Hebrew י as the preformative of the Impf. Qal.

² This is also the proper gender of the plural syllable *û, ûn*. In Hebrew, indeed, it is used in the 3rd plur. *Perfect* for both genders, but in the kindred languages even there only for the masculine, e.g. in Syriac *qätälû, qätälûn*, with the feminine form *qätälên*, in Western Aram. *qätälû*, fem. *qätälâ*; in Arab. *qätälû*, fem. *qätälnä*, Eth. *qätälû, qätälâ*.

ending η of nouns, and of the 3rd fem. sing. perfect. For the affirmatives ו (וּ) and נָה, see c.

3. The characteristic vowel of the second syllable becomes $\check{S}ewā e$ before tone-bearing affirmatives which begin with a vowel, but is retained (as being in the tone-syllable) before the toneless affirmative נָה. Thus: וַיִּקְטְלוּ, וַיִּקְטְלוּ, וַיִּקְטְלוּ (but in pause וַיִּקְטְלוּ, &c.), וַיִּקְטְלוּ.

Rem. 1. The \bar{o} of the second syllable (as in the inf. constr. and imperat.), being lengthened from an original \check{u} in the tone-syllable, is only tone-long (§ 9 r). Hence it follows that: (a) it is incorrectly, although somewhat frequently, written *plene*; (b) before *Maqqeph* the short vowel appears as *Qames hatuph*, e.g. וַיִּכְתֹּב שָׁם and he wrote there, Jos 8³² (but cf. also Ex 21³⁷, Jos 18²⁰); (c) it becomes $\check{S}ewā$ before the tone-bearing affirmatives ו and וּ (see above, e; but Jerome still heard e.g. *iezbuleni* for וַיִּבְלֵנוּ; cf. ZAW. iv. 83).

Quite anomalous are the three examples which, instead of a shortening to $\check{S}ewā$, exhibit a long \acute{u} : וַיִּשְׁפֹּטוּ הֵם Ex 18²⁶, immediately before the principal pause, but according to Qimḥi (ed. Rittenb. p. 18^b), ed. Mant., Ginsb., Kittel against the other editions, with the tone on the ultima; likewise וַיִּתְעַבְּרוּ מוֹהָה Ru 2⁸; וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ (in principal pause) Pr 14³. In the first two cases perhaps וַיִּשְׁפֹּטוּ and וַיִּתְעַבְּרוּ (for וַיִּשְׁפֹּטוּ, &c.) are intended, in virtue of a retrogressive effect of the pause; in Pr 14³ וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ is to be read, with August Müller.

2. The \bar{o} of the second syllable is to be found almost exclusively with transitive verbs middle *a*, like וַיִּקְטֹל. Intransitives middle *a* and \bar{e} almost always take \check{a} (*Pathah*)¹ in the impf., e.g. וַיִּרְבֵּץ, וַיִּרְבֵּץ to couch, וַיִּשְׁבַּב, וַיִּשְׁבַּב to lie down (וַיִּלְמַד, וַיִּלְמַד to learn is also originally intransitive = to accustom oneself); וַיִּגְדַּל, וַיִּגְדַּל to become great (but cf. וַיִּשְׁבַּן and וַיִּשְׁבַּן imperf. וַיִּשְׁבַּן to dwell and to inhabit, וַיִּבֹל imperf. וַיִּבֹל to wither); also from verbs middle \bar{o} , as וַיִּקְטַן to be small, the impf. has the form וַיִּקְטַן.

Sometimes both forms occur together; those with \bar{o} having a transitive, \acute{i} and those with \check{a} an intransitive meaning, e.g. וַיִּקְצַר he cuts off, וַיִּקְצַר he is cut off, i.e. is short; וַיִּתְּלַם impf. \bar{o} , to overcome, Ex 17¹³; impf. \check{a} , to be overcome, Jb 14¹⁰. More rarely both forms are used without any distinction, e.g. וַיִּשֶׁךְ and וַיִּשֶׁךְ he bites, וַיִּחַפֵּץ and וַיִּחַפֵּץ he is inclined (but only the latter with a transitive meaning = he bends, in Jb 40¹⁷). On the *a* of the impf. of verbs middle and third guttural, cf. § 64 b; § 65 b. In some verbs first guttural (§ 63 n), וַיִּעַן (§ 67 p), וַיִּפֹּן (§ 69 b), and וַיִּתֵּן (§ 68 c), and in וַיִּתֵּן for *yintēn* from וַיִּתֵּן to give, instead of \check{a} or \bar{o} a movable *Sere* (originally \acute{i}) is found in the second syllable. A trace of these *i*-imperfects² in the ordinary strong verb is probably to be found in וַיִּטְמְנוּ 2 K 7⁸, since וַיִּטְמְנוּ otherwise only occurs in Qal. We call these three forms of the imperfect after their characteristic vowel impf. *o*, impf. *a*, impf. *e*.

3. For the 3rd sing. fem. וַיִּקְטֹל (= *tiq-tōl*), Baer requires in 1 S 25²⁰ וַיִּתְּנֵהָ (but read with ed. Mant., &c. וַיִּתְּנֵהָ). For the 2nd sing. fem. (וַיִּקְטְלִי) the form

¹ This \check{a} is, however, by no means restricted to intransitive *strong* verbs; apart from verbs third guttural (§ 65 b), it is to be found in וַיִּפֹּן and וַיִּעַן, and in many verbs וַיִּפֹּן and וַיִּפֹּן (§§ 69-71).

² Cf. Barth, 'Das *i*-Imperfekt im Nordsemitischen,' ZDMG. 1889, p. 177 ff.

תִּקְטַל is found in Is 57⁸, Jer 3⁵, Ez 22⁴, 23³², in every case after the regular form; but cf. also Ez 26¹⁴. In Is 17¹⁰, where the 2nd fem. precedes and follows, probably 'תִּתְרַעֵין וּב' is to be read with Marti for תִּתְרַעֵנִי.—For the 3rd plur. fem. תִּקְטַלְנָה we find in Jer 49¹¹, in pause תִּבְטַחְנָה (for תִּבְטַחְנָה), and thrice (as if to distinguish it from the 2nd pers.) the form יִקְטַלְנָה with the preformative י' (as always in Western Aram., Arab., Eth., and Assy.), in Gn 30³⁸, 1 S 6¹², Dn 8²². On the other hand, תִּקְטַלְנָה appears in some cases to be incorrectly used even for the fem. of the 3rd pers. or for the masc. of the 2nd pers. sing. as תִּשְׁלַחְנָה Ju 5²⁶ (where, however, perhaps תִּשְׁלַחְנָה is to be read), and Ob¹³, for 2nd sing. masc., according to Olshausen a corruption of תִּשְׁלַח יָד; in Pr 1²⁰, 8³ for תִּרְנָה read תִּרְנָה as in Jb 39²³; in Ex 1¹⁰ read תִּקְרֹאֲנִי with the Samaritan.—In Is 27¹¹, 28³, as also in Jb 17¹⁶ (if we read יִטּוֹבְתִי with LXX for the 2nd תִּקְוֹתִי), it is equally possible to explain the form as a plural. This small number of examples hardly justifies our finding in the above-mentioned passages the remains of an emphatic form of the Impf., analogous to the Arab. *Modus energicus I*, with the termination *ännä*.

l For נָה we frequently find, especially in the Pentateuch and mostly after *wāw* consecutive, simply נָה, e.g. Gn 19^{33.36}, 37⁷, Ex 1^{16.19}, 15²⁰, Nu 2^{5.2}, Ez 3²⁰, 16⁵⁵; in Arab. always *nā*. According to Elias Levita תִּלְבַּשְׁנָה (2 S 13¹⁸) is the only example of this kind in the strong verb. The form וַתִּגְבְּהֶינָה (so also Qimḥi and ed. Mant.; but Baer, Ginsb. וַתִּגְבְּהֶנָה) for וַתִּגְבְּהֶנָה they were high, Ez 16⁵⁰, is irregular, with י' inserted after the manner of verbs ע"ע and ע"ע, § 67 *d*; § 72 *i*; according to Olshausen it is an error caused by the following form.

m 4. Instead of the plural forms in נָ there are, especially in the older books, over 300 forms¹ with the fuller ending נָה (with *Nūn paragogicum*), always bearing the tone; cf. § 29 *m* and § 44 *l*; on its retention before suffixes, see § 60 *e*; also defectively יִרְבֵּן Ex 21¹⁸, 22⁸, &c. This usually expresses marked emphasis, and consequently occurs most commonly at the end of sentences (in the principal pause), in which case also the (pausal) vowel of the second syllable is generally retained. Thus there arise full-sounding forms such as יִלְקַטְנָה they collect, ψ 104²⁸; יִרְגְּזוּנָה they tremble, Ex 15¹⁴; תִּשְׁמַעֲנָה ye shall hear, Dt 1¹⁷; cf. Ex 34¹³, with Zaqeph qaton, Athnah, and Silluq; Jos 24¹⁵, with Segolta; Is 13⁸ and 17¹³ with Zaqeph qaton, 17¹² with Athnah and Silluq, 41⁵ after *wāw* consec. Without the pause, e.g. ψ 11² יִדְרֹכֵן קִשָּׁת, cf. 4³, Gn 18^{28.29.30} ff., 44¹, Nu 32²³, Jos 4⁶ (יִשְׁאַלְנָה); Is 8¹², 1 S 9¹³, Ru 2⁹ (יִקְצֹרֵן and יִשְׁאַבֵּן); Ju 11¹⁸ after *wāw* consec.

Some of these examples may be partly due to euphonic reasons, e.g. certainly Ex 17², Nu 16²⁹, 32²⁰, 1 S 9¹³, 1 K 9⁶, and often, to avoid a hiatus before נ or ע. It was, however, the pause especially which exerted an influence on the restoration of this older and fuller termination (cf. § 159 *c*, note), as is manifest from Is 26¹¹: בִּלְיִחוּזֵיהֶן יִחוּזוּ וַיִּבְשׁוּ they see not; may they see and become

¹ [See details in F. Böttcher, *Lehrb.*, § 930; and cf. Driver on 1 S 2¹⁵.]



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

jussive, *yăqtûl*; (c) a double 'energetic' mood of the impf., *yăqtûlännä* and *yăqtûläñ*, in pause *yăqtûlā*, the last form thus corresponding to the Hebrew cohortative.

c 3. The characteristic of the cohortative form is an \bar{a} (הַֿ) affixed to the 1st pers. sing. or plur., e. g. אֶקְטֹל from אֶקְטַל.¹ It occurs in almost all conjugations and classes of the strong and weak verb (except of course in the passives), and this final הַֿ has the tone wherever the affirmatives הִ and יִ would have it. As before these endings, so also before the הַֿ cohortative, the movable vowel of the last syllable of the verbal form becomes $\check{S}ewā$, e. g. in Qal אֶשְׁמְרָה *I will observe*, in Pi'el נִנְתְּקָה *let us break asunder*, ψ 2³; on אֶשְׁקֹטָה Is 18⁴ *Qerê* (cf. also 27⁴, Ezr 8²⁵, &c.), see § 10 h; with the *Kethîbh* of these passages, compare the analogous cases יִשְׁפוֹטוּ, &c., § 47 g.—On the other hand, an unchangeable vowel in the final syllable is retained as tone-vowel before the הַֿ, as (e. g.) in Hiph. אֶזְבְּרָה *I will praise*. In pause (as before \hat{u} and \hat{i}), the vowel which became $\check{S}ewā$ is restored as tone-vowel; thus for the cohortative אֶשְׁמְרָה the pausal form is אֶשְׁמְרָה ψ 59¹⁰; cf. Gn 18²¹, Is 41²⁶.

d The change of הַֿ into the obtuse הַֿ seems to occur in 1 S 28¹⁵, unless, with Nestle, we are to assume a conflate reading, וְאֶקְרָא and וְאֶקְרָה; and with the 3rd pers. ψ 20⁴, in a syllable sharpened by a following *Dageš forte conjunct.*; cf. similar cases of the change of הַֿ into the obtuse הַֿ in *l* and in §§ 73 d, 80 i, 90 i. In ψ 20⁴, however, וְיִשְׁנֶה—with suffix—is probably intended. An הַֿ cohort. is also found with the 3rd pers. in Is 5¹⁹ (twice); Ez 23²⁰, and again in verse 16 according to the *Qerê*, but in both these cases without any effect on the meaning. Probably another instance occurs in Jb 11¹⁷, although there הִתְעַפָּה might also, with Qimḥi, be regarded as 2nd masc. For the doubly irregular form הִבֹּאֲתָה Dt 33¹⁶ (explained by Olshausen and König as a scribal error, due to a confusion with הִבֹּאֲתָה in verse 14), read הִבֹּאֲתָה. For הִבֹּאֲתָה Jb 22²¹ the noun הִבֹּאֲתָה *thine increase*, might be meant, but the Masora has evidently intended an imperfect with the ending *ath*, instead of הַֿ, before the suffix, on the analogy of the 3rd sing. fem. perfect, see § 59 a; on וְתִבְאֲתִי 1 S 25³⁴, see § 76 h.

e The *cohortative* expresses the direction of the will to an action and thus denotes especially self-encouragement (in the 1st plur. an exhortation to others at the same time), a resolution or a wish, as an *optative*, &c., see § 108.

f 4. The general characteristic of the *jussive* form of the imperfect is rapidity of pronunciation, combined with a tendency to retract

¹ Probably this \bar{a} goes back to the syllable *an*, which in Arabic (see above, Rem. to b) is used for the formation of the 'energetic' mood, and in Hebrew (see the footnote to § 58 i) often stands before suffixes.

the tone from the final syllable, in order by that means to express the urgency of the command in the very first syllable. This tendency has, in certain forms, even caused a material shortening of the termination of the word, so that the expression of the command appears to be concentrated on a single syllable. In other cases, however, the jussive is simply marked by a shortening of the vowel of the second syllable, without its losing the tone, and very frequently (see above, *b*) the nature of the form does not admit of any alteration. It is not impossible, however, that even in such cases the jussive in the living language was distinguished from the indicative by a change in the place of the tone.

In the strong verb the jussive differs in *form* from the indicative *g* only in *Hiph'el* (juss. יִקְטֹל, ind. יִקְטִיל), and similarly in the weak verb, wherever the imperfect indicative has *î* in the second syllable, e. g. from יִשָּׁב impf. *Hiph.* יוֹשִׁיב, juss. יוֹשֵׁב; from מוֹת, יָמִית and יָמַת; also in *Qal* of the verbs ע"ו and ע"י, as יָמַת, ind. יָמוֹת; יָגַל, ind. יָגִיל; in all conjugations of verbs ל"ה, so that the rejection (*apocope*) of the ending ה־ in *Qal* and *Hiph.* gives rise to monosyllabic forms, with or without a helping vowel under the second radical, e. g. *Qal* ind. יָגַל, juss. יָגַל; *Hiph.* ind. יָגַלְה, juss. יָגַלְה; and in the *Pi'el* יָצוּ from the indic. יִצְוֶה (called *apocopated imperfects*). But almost all¹ the plural forms of the jussive coincide with those of the indicative, except that the jussive excludes the fuller ending ה־. Neither do the forms of the 2nd sing. fem., as תִּקְטְלִי, תִּמּוֹתִי, תִּגְלִי, &c., admit of any change in the jussive, nor any forms, whether singular or plural, to which suffixes are attached, e. g. תִּמְיִתִּנִּי as ind. Jer 38¹⁵, as jussive Jer 41⁸.

The meaning of the jussive is similar to that of the cohortative, *h* except that in the jussive the command or wish is limited almost exclusively to the 2nd or 3rd pers. On special uses of the jussive, e. g. in hypothetical sentences (even in the 1st pers.), see § 109 *h*.

5. The imperative, in accordance with its other points of connexion *i* with the imperfect in form and meaning, admits of a similar lengthening (by ה־, Arab. *imper. energicus*, with the ending -*ännä* or -*än*, in pause -*ā*) and shortening. Thus in *Qal* of the strong verb, the lengthened form of שָׁמַר *guard* is שָׁמְרָה² (*šöm'era*, cf. קִטְלִי *qit'li*, § 46 *d*); עֹזֵב, עֹזְבָה Jer 49¹¹; שֹׁכֵב, שֹׁכְבָה *lie down*; שֹׁמֵעַ, שֹׁמְעָה *hear*, in lesser pause שֹׁמְעָה

¹ Only in 1st plur. do we find a few shortened forms, as נִשְׁאָר 1 S 14³⁶, parallel with cohortatives; and נָרָא Is 41²³ *Keth.*

² On the reading שָׁמְרָה (i. e. *šām'era*, according to the Jewish grammarians), required by the Masora in ψ 86², 119¹⁶⁷ (cf. also Is 38¹⁴, and שָׁמְרָנִי ψ 16¹), see § 9 *v*; on מְלוֹכָה, Ju 9⁸ *Keth.*, see § 46 *e*.

Dn 9¹⁹; in Niph'al הִשָּׁבַעַה Gn 21²³. Cf., however, also מָכַרָה *sell*, Gn 25³¹, notwithstanding the impf. יִמְכַר; עָרְבָה Jb 33⁵ (cf. עָרְכוּ Jer 46³), but impf. יַעֲרֹךְ; אִסְפָּה *collect*, Nu 11¹⁶ (for 'אס cf. § 63 l and the plural אִסְפוּ), but 2nd masc. אִסֵּף; נָצְרָה ψ 141³. Barth (see above, § 47 i note) finds in these forms a trace of old imperfects in *i*, cf. § 63 n. On the other hand, קָרְבָה ψ 69¹⁹ (also Imperat. קָרַב Lv 9⁷, &c.), but impf. יִקְרַב. Without ה, we have the form לֵךְ *go*, Nu 23¹³, Ju 19¹³, 2 Ch 25¹⁷. The form קָטַל in pause becomes קָטַלָה, the form קָטַל becomes קָטַלָה, e. g. יִרְשָׁה Dt 33²³. But also without the pause we find מְלוֹכָה Ju 9⁸ *Keth.* and צָרוּפָה ψ 26² *Keth.*, on which see § 46 e. On the other hand רָגְזָה, פָּשְׁטָה, עָרָה, חָגְזָה Is 32¹¹ are to be explained as aramaizing forms of the 2nd plur. fem.; also for חָרְרוּ v. 11 read חָרְרָה, and for סָפְרִים v. 12 read סָפְרָה.

k The shortened imperative is found only in verbs ל"ה, e. g. in *Pi'el* לֵל from נָלָה. The shade of meaning conveyed by the imperatives with ה־ is not always so perceptible as in the cohortative forms of the imperfect, but the longer form is frequently emphatic, e. g. קוּמָה *rise up*, קוּמָה *up!* הֵן *give*, הֵנָּה *give up!*

l Rem. The form דָּעָה for דָּעָה, best attested in Pr 24¹⁴ (where it is taken by the Masora as imperat., not as infin., דָּעָה) is evidently due to the influence of the ה which follows it in close connexion (so Strack, on the analogy of Jb 31²); for other examples of this change of *a* to S^cghol, see above, under *d*, § 73 *d*, and § 80 *i*. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether רָבָה Ju 9²⁹ (from רָבָה) is intended for רָבָה, and not rather for the common form of the imperative *Pi'el* רָבֵה. In favour of the former explanation it may be urged that the imperative יִצָּאָה (from יָצָא) follows immediately after; in favour of the latter, that the ending ה־, with imperatives of verbs ל"ה, is not found elsewhere, and also that here no guttural follows (as in Pr 24¹⁴).

§ 49. The Perfect and Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive.

a 1. The use of the two tense-forms, as is shown more fully in the Syntax (§§ 106, 107, cf. above, § 47, note on *a*), is by no means restricted to the expression of the past or future. One of the most striking peculiarities in the Hebrew *consecution* of tenses¹ is the phenomenon that, in representing a series of past events, only the first

¹ The other Semitic languages do not exhibit this peculiarity, excepting the Phoenician, the most closely related to Hebrew, and of course the Moabitish dialect of the *Méša'* inscription, which is practically identical with Old Hebrew. It also appears in the inscription of זכר of Hamāth (cf. Nöldeke, *ZA.* 1908, p. 379) where we find וַאֲשַׁא יָרִי and *I lifted up my hand*, וַיַּעֲנֵנִי and *he answered me*, after a perfect of narration.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

םָקָי, with *wāw* consec. םָקָיִ and he arose (§ 67 n and x, § 68 d, § 69 p, § 71, § 72 t and aa, § 73 e).¹

e In the *first* pers. sing. alone the retraction of the tone and even the reducing of the long vowel in the final syllable (*ā* to *ō*, *î* to *ē*, and then to *ǒ* and *ě*) are not usual,² at least according to the Masoretic punctuation, and the apocope in verbs הָל" occurs more rarely; e.g. always םָקָיִ (or םָקָי, a merely orthographic difference) and *I arose*; *Hiph.* םָקָיִ (but generally written םָקָי, implying the pronunciation *wā'āqem*, as םָקָי implies *wā'āqōm*); הָרָאִי and *I saw*, more frequently than הָרָאִי, § 75 t. On the other hand, the form with final ה־ is often used in the 1st pers. both sing. and plur., especially in the later books, e.g. הָשַׁלְחָה and *I sent*, Gn 32⁶, 41¹¹, 43²¹, Nu 8¹⁹ (הָשַׁלְחָה, as in Ju 6⁹, 1 S 2²⁸, and often, probably a sort of compensation for the lost ה); Ju 6¹⁰, 12³, 2 S 22²⁴, ψ 3⁶, 7⁵, 90¹⁰, 119⁵⁵, Jb 1^{15ff.}, 19²⁰, Ez 7²⁸, 8²⁵, 9³, Neh 2¹³, 5^{7.8.13}, 6¹¹, 13^{7-11.21} f., &c.—Sometimes, as in ψ 3⁶, with a certain emphasis of expression, and probably often, as in Ju 10¹², הָשַׁלְחָה before ה, for euphonic reasons. In Is 8² הָשַׁלְחָה may have been originally intended; in ψ 73¹⁶ הָשַׁלְחָה and in Jb 30²⁶ הָשַׁלְחָה. In Ez 3³ read הָשַׁלְחָה or הָשַׁלְחָה.

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

g The retraction of the tone also occurs in such combinations, as in בְּמָה (for בְּמָה § 102 l).—The identity of many consecutive forms with jussives of the same conjugation must not mislead us into supposing an intimate relation between the moods. In the consecutive forms the shortening of the vowel (and the retraction of the tone) seems rather to be occasioned solely by the strengthening of the preformative syllable, while in the jussives the shortening (and retraction) belongs to the character of the form.

h 3. The counterpart of *wāw* consecutive of the imperfect is *wāw* consecutive of the perfect, by means of which perfects are placed as

¹ The plural forms in הָ also occur less frequently after *wāw* consecutive; cf., however, הָרָאִיִּם Ju 8¹, 11¹⁸, Am 6³, Ez 44⁸, Dt 4¹¹, 5²⁰. The 2nd fem. sing. in הָ never occurs after *wāw* consecutive.

² In the 1st plur. וְנִשְׁבַּח Neh 4³ is the only instance in which the vowel remains unreduced (cf. וְנִשְׁבַּח, i. e. וְנִשְׁבַּח, 4⁹ *Keth.*; *Qeré* וְנִשְׁבַּח). On the treatment of the tone in the imperfect, imperative, and infinitive *Niph'al*, see § 51 n.

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

the sequels in the future to preceding actions or events regarded as incomplete at the time of speaking, and therefore in the imperfect, imperative, or even participle. This *wāw* is in form an ordinary *wāw copulative*, and therefore shares its various vocalization (וְ, וִ, וּ, as 2 K 7⁴, and וּ); e. g. וְהָיָה, after an imperfect, &c., *and so it happens = and it will happen*. It has, however, the effect, in certain verbal forms, of shifting the tone from the penultima, generally on to the ultima, e. g. וָלֵכְתִּי *I went*, consecutive form וְלֵכְתִּי *and I will go*, Ju 1³, where it is co-ordinated with another *perfect consecutive*, which again is the consecutive to an *imperative*. See further on this usage in § 112.

As innumerable examples show, the *Qames* of the first syllable is retained וְ in the strong perf. consec. Qal, as formerly before the tone, so now in the secondary tone, and therefore necessarily takes *Metheg*. On the other hand, the *ō* of the second syllable in verbs *middle ō* upon losing the tone necessarily becomes *ö*, e. g. וְיִכְלְתָּ Ex 18²³.

The shifting forward of the tone after the *wāw consecutive* of the *perfect* is, *k* however, not consistently carried out. It is omitted—(a) always in the 1st pers. pl., e. g. וְיִשְׁבְּנִי Gn 34¹⁶; (b) regularly in Hiph'il before the affirmatives הָ and וְ, see § 53 r; and (c) in many cases in verbs נ"ל and ה"ל, almost always in the 1st sing. of נ"ל (Jer 29¹⁴), and in ה"ל if the vowel of the 2nd syllable is *i*, Ex 17⁶, 26^{4.6.7.10} ff., Ju 6²⁶, &c., except in *Qal* (only Lv 24⁵, before נ) and the 2nd sing. masc. of Hiph'il-forms before נ, Nu 20⁸, Dt 20¹³, 1 S 15³, 2 K 13¹⁷; similarly in Pi'el before נ, Ex 25²⁴, Jer 27⁴. On the other hand the tone is generally moved forward if the second syllable has *é* (in נ"ל Gn 27¹⁰ &c., in ה"ל Ex 40⁴, Jer 33⁶, Ez 32⁷); but cf. also וְיִרְאֶתָּה Lv 19^{14.32} and frequently, always before the counter-tone, Jo 4²¹, ψ 19¹⁴.¹ With *ā* in the penultima the form is וְנִשְׁאָתָּה Is 14⁴, and probably also וְקִרְאֶתָּה Jer 2², 3¹², 1 S 10² with little T^olîṣā, a postpositive accent.

But before a following נ the ultima mostly bears the tone on phonetic *l* grounds, e. g. וְבָאָתָּה אל- Gn 6¹³, Ex 3¹⁸, Zc 6¹⁰ (by the side of וְבָאָתָּה), &c. (cf., however, וְקִרְאֶתָּה, before נ, Gn 17¹⁹, Jer 7²⁷, Ez 36²⁹); וְהִכִּיתָּ אֶת- Ju 6¹⁶, cf. Ex 25¹¹, Lv 24⁵ (but also וְצִוִּיתִי אֶת- Lv 25²¹). Likewise, before ה, Am 8⁹, and ע, e. g. Gn 26¹⁰, 27¹², Lv 26²⁵ (cf., however, וְקִרְאֶתָּה עָלַי, Ez 38²¹); on verbs ע"ע, see § 67 *k* and *ee*.

(d) The tone always keeps its place when such a perfect stands in *pause*, *m* e. g. וְשָׁבַעְתָּ Dt 6¹¹, 11¹⁵; וְאָמַרְתָּ Is 14⁴, Ju 4⁸; sometimes even in the lesser pause, as Dt 2²⁸, Ez 3²⁶, 1 S 29⁸ (where see Driver), with *Zaqeph qaton*; and frequently also immediately before a tone-syllable (according to § 29 *e*), as in וְיִשְׁבְּתָה בָהּ Dt 17¹⁴, Ez 14¹³, 17²², Am 1^{4.7.10.12}—but also וְחִשְׁקֶתָּ בָהּ Dt 21¹¹, 23¹⁴. 24¹⁹, 1 K 8⁴⁶.

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

§ 50. The Participle.

a 1. Qal has both an active participle, called *Pô'el* from its form (פֹּעֵל), and a passive, *Pā'ul* (פְּעוּל).¹

Pā'ul is generally regarded as a survival of a passive of Qal, which still exists throughout in Arabic, but has been lost in Hebrew (see, however, § 52 *e*), just as in Aramaic the passives of *Pi'el* and *Hiph'il* are lost, except in the participles. But instances of the form *qutāl* are better regarded as remnants of the passive participle Qal (see § 52 *s*), so that פְּעוּל must be considered as an original verbal noun; cf. Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 173 ff.

b 2. In the intransitive verbs *mid. e* and *mid. o*, the form of the participle active of Qal coincides in form with the 3rd sing. of the perfect, e. g. שֹׁנֵן *sleeping*, from שָׁן; יָגוֹר (only orthographically different from the perf. יָגַר) *fearing*; cf. the formation of the participle in *Niph'al*, § 51 *a*. On the other hand, the participle of verbs *mid. a* takes the form קָטַל (so even from the transitive שָׂנֵא *to hate*, part. שֹׂנֵא). The *ô* of these forms has arisen through an obscuring of the *á*, and is therefore unchangeable, cf. § 9 *q*. The form קָטַל (with a changeable *Qames* in both syllables), which would correspond to the forms שֹׁנֵן and יָגַר, is only in use as a noun, cf. § 84^a *f*. The formation of the participle in *Pi'el*, *Hiph'il*, and *Hithpa'el* follows a different method.

c 3. Participles form their feminine (קָטְלָה or קָטְלָת) and their plural like other nouns (§ 80 *e*, § 84^a *r, s*, § 94).

d Rem. 1. From the above it follows, that the *ā* of the form שֹׁנֵן is lengthened from *ǎ*, and consequently changeable (e. g. fem. שֹׁנְנָה); and that the *ô* of קָטַל on the other hand is obscured from an unchangeable *á*.¹ In Arabic the verbal adjective of the form *qātīl* corresponds to the form *qātēl*, and the part. *qātīl* to *qōtēl*. In both cases, therefore, the *ē* of the second syllable is lengthened from *ī*, and is consequently changeable (e. g. קָטַל, plur. קָטְלִים; כָּבַד, constr. pl. כְּבֹדִי).

e הוֹמִיךָ ψ 16⁵, instead of the form *qōtēl*, is an anomaly; it is possible, however, that הוֹמִיךָ (incorrectly written fully) is intended (cf. סְבִיב 2 K 8²¹), or even the imperfect *Hiph'il* of הוֹמִיךָ. The form הוֹמִיךָ in Is 29¹⁴, 38⁵ appears to stand for הוֹמִיךָ, but most probably the Masora here (as certainly in הוֹמִיךָ Ec 1¹⁸) intends the 3rd sing. imperf. *Hiph.*, for which the better form would be הוֹמִיךָ; אֹבִיב 1 Ch 27³⁰, being a proper name and a foreign word, need not be considered.—אֹבִב (constr. state of אֹבִב), with *ǎ* in the second syllable, occurs in Dt 32²⁸ (cf. moreover, § 65 *d*). On הוֹלִים Is 41⁷ (for הוֹלִים), see § 29 *f*.

f 2. A form like the pass. ptep. *Pā'ul*, but not to be confused with it, is sometimes found from *intransitive verbs*, to denote an inherent quality, e. g. נֶאֱמָן *faithful*; אֲנִיִּשׁ *desperate*, Jer 15¹⁸, &c.; בְּטוּחַ *trustful*, Is 26³, ψ 112⁷; עֲצוּם *strong*; שֹׁכָר *drunken*, Is 51²¹; and even from transitive verbs, אֲחַז *handling*, Ct 3⁵; זָכוֹר *mindful*, ψ 103¹⁴; יָדַע *knowing*, Is 53³; cf. § 84^a *m*.

¹ The constr. st. נִנְיָה in the formula נִנְיָה יְהוָה, *the word* (properly *the whispering*) *of the Lord*, &c., is always written defectively.

² Cf. Vollers, 'Das Qātīl-partizipium,' in ZA. 1903, p. 312 ff.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

self, e. g. **נִשְׁאַל** to ask (something) for oneself (1 S 20^{6.28}, Neh 13⁶), cf. *αἰρούμαι σε τοῦτο, ἐνδύσασθαι χιτῶνα*, to put on (oneself) a tunic.

f (d) In consequence of a looseness of thought at an early period of the language, *Niph'al* comes finally in many cases to represent the passive¹ of *Qal*, e. g. **יָלַד** to bear, *Niph.* to be born; **קָבַר** to bury, *Niph.* to be buried. In cases where *Qal* is intransitive in meaning, or is not used, *Niph'al* appears also as the passive of *Pi'el* and *Hiph'il*, e. g. **כָּבַד** to be in honour, *Pi'el* to honour, *Niph.* to be honoured (as well as *Pu'al* **כִּבְד**); **כָּחַד** *Pi'el* to conceal, *Hiph.* to destroy, *Niph.* passive of either. In such cases *Niph'al* may again coincide in meaning with *Qal* (**קָלָה** *Qal* and *Niph.* to be ill) and even take an accusative.

g Examples of denominatives are, **נִזְכָּר** to be born a male, Ex 34¹⁹ (from **זָכַר**; but probably **הִזְכָּר** should here be read); **נִלְבַּב** *cordatum fieri*, Jb 11¹² (from **לָבַב** *cor*); doubtless also **נִבְנָה** to obtain children, Gn 16², 30³.

h The older grammarians were decidedly wrong in representing *Niph'al* simply as the passive of *Qal*; for *Niph'al* has (as the frequent use of its imperat. shows), in no respect the character of the other passives, and in Arabic a special conjugation (*inqātālā*) corresponds to it with a passive of its own. Moreover, the forms mentioned in § 52 e point to a differently formed passive of *Qal*.—The form **נִנְאָלִי** Is 59³, La 4¹⁴, is not to be regarded as a passive of *Niph'al*, but with König and Cheyne as a *forma mixta*, in the sense that the punctuators intended to combine two optional readings, **נִנְאָלִי**, perf. *Niph.*, and **נִנְאָלִי**, perf. *Pu'al* [cf. also Wright, *Compar. Gramm.*, p. 224]. Although the passive use of *Niph'al* was introduced at an early period, and became tolerably common, it is nevertheless quite secondary to the reflexive use.

i Rem. 1. The *infin. absol.* **נִקְטֹל** is connected in form with the perfect, to which it bears the same relation as **קָטַל** to **קָטַל** in *Qal*, the *ō* in the second syllable being obscured from an original *ā*. Examples are, **נִבְסַף** Gn 31³⁰; **נִלְהָם** Ju 11²⁵; **נִשְׁאַל** 1 S 20^{6.28}, all in connexion with the perfect.

k Examples of the form **הִקְטֹל** (in connexion with imperfects) are, **הִקְטֹלֵנִי** Jer 32⁴; **הִאָּכַל** Lv 7¹⁸; once **אִדְרֹשׁ** Ez 14³, where, perhaps, the subsequent **אִדְרֹשׁ** has led to the substitution of **א** for **ה**.—Moreover, the form **הִקְטֹל** is not infrequently used also for the *infin. absol.*,² e. g. Ex 22³, Nu 15³¹, Dt 4²⁶, 1 K 20³⁹. On the other hand, **כָּהֲנָרָף** should simply be read for the wholly abnormal **כָּהֲנָרָף** ψ 68³ (commonly explained as being intended to correspond in sound with the subsequent **כָּהֲנָרָף**, but probably a 'forma mixta', combining the readings **כָּהֲנָרָף** and **כָּהֲנָרָף**).

¹ Cf. Halfmann, *Beiträge zur Syntax der hebräischen Sprache*, 1. Stück, Wittenb., 1888, 2. St. 1892 (Gymn.-Programm), statistics of the *Niph'al* (*Pu'al*, *Hoph'al*, and *qātûl*) forms at different periods of the language, for the purpose of ascertaining the meaning of *Niph.* and its relation to the passive; the selection of periods is, however, very questionable from the standpoint of literary criticism.

² But, like **הִקְטֹל**, only in connexion with imperfects, except Jer 7⁹. Barth is therefore right in describing (*Nominalbildung*, p. 74) both forms as later analogous formations (in addition to the original Semitic **נִקְטֹל**), intended to assimilate the infinitive to the imperfect which it strengthens.

Elision of the ה after prepositions is required by the Masora in בְּפִשְׁלוֹ Pr l 24¹⁷ (for בְּהֶכֶּה), בְּהִרְגַּב Ez 26¹⁵ and בְּעֵטָף La 2¹¹; also in verbs הִלַּח Ex 10³ (לְעֵנֹת); 34²⁴, Dt 31¹¹, Is 1¹² (לְרֵאוֹת); in verbs עָוַן Jb 33³⁰ (לְאוֹר). It is, however, extremely doubtful whether the *infin. Qal* of the *Kethîbh* is not rather intended in all these examples; it certainly is so in La 2¹¹, cf. ψ 61³.

2. Instead of the *Sere* in the ultima of the imperfect, *Pathah* often occurs *m* in pause, e.g. וַיִּנְמַל Gn 21⁸; cf. Ex 31¹⁷, 2 S 12¹⁵ (with final שׁ); 17²³ (with ק); Jon 1⁵ (with ט); see § 29 q. In the 2nd and 3rd plur. fem. *Pathah* predominates, e.g. תִּזְכְּרֶנָּה Is 65¹⁷; *Sere* occurs only in תִּעַנְנָה Ru 1¹³, from עָנַן, and hence, with loss of the doubling, for תִּעַנְנָה; cf. even תִּאֲמַנָּה Is 60⁴.—With *Nûn paragogicum* (see § 47 m) in the 2nd and 3rd plur. masc. are found, יִלְכְּדוּן, תִּלְחַמוּן, &c., in pause יִבְהִלּוּן, תִּשְׂמְרוּן, &c.; but Jb 19²¹ (cf. 24²⁴) יַחְצִבוּן.

3. When the imperfect, the infinitive (in *e*), or the imperative is followed *n* in close connexion by a monosyllable, or by a word with the tone on the first syllable, the tone is, as a rule (but cf. וַיֵּאבֶק אִישׁ Gn 32²⁵), shifted back from the ultima to the penultima, while the ultima, which thus loses the tone, takes *S'ghôl* instead of *Sere*; e.g. יִפְשֵׁל בָּהּ Ez 33¹²; וַיַּעֲתֶר לוֹ Gn 25²¹; in the imperative, 13⁹.—So always הִשְׁמֵר לְךָ (since לְךָ counts as *one* syllable) Gn 24⁶, &c., cf. 1 S 19²; and even with *Pathah* in the ultima, תִּעֲזֹב אֶרֶץ Jb 18⁴ (but cf. וַיַּעֲתֶר אֱלֹהִים 2 S 21¹⁴). Although in isolated cases (e.g. Gn 32²⁵, Ezr 8²³) the tone is not thrown back, in spite of a tone-syllable following, the retraction has become usual in certain forms, even when the next word begins with a toneless syllable; especially after *consec.*, e.g. וַיִּשְׁפָּאֵר Gn 7²³; וַיִּלְחָם Nu 21¹ and frequently, וַיִּצְמָד 25³; and always so in the imperative הִשְׁמֵר Ex 23²¹, Jb 36²¹, and (before *Metheg* of the counter-tone) Dt 24⁸, 2 K 6⁹. On the avoidance of pausal-forms in the imperative (Am 2¹² with *Silluq*, Zc 2¹¹ with *Athnah*), and imperfect (Pr 24⁴, &c.), see § 29 o, and note; on the other hand, always הִפְלִיט, יִפְלִיט, &c.

In the *imperative*, נִקְבְּצוּ, for הִקְבְּצוּ, with the rejection of the initial ה, O occurs in Is 43⁹, and in Joel 4¹¹ in pause נִקְבְּצוּ (cf. נִלְוֶה Jer 50⁵); but in these examples either the reading or the explanation is doubtful. The 2nd sing. imperat. of נִשְׁבַּע is always (with ה־ paragogicum) לִי הִשְׁבַּעָה swear to me, Gn 21²³, &c. (also לִי הִשְׁבַּעָה Gn 47³¹, 1 S 30¹⁵).

4. For the 1st sing. of the *imperfect*, the form אֶקְטַל is as frequent as אֶקְטִיל, p e.g. אֶדְרִישׁ I shall be inquired of, Ez 14³; אֶשְׁבַּע I will swear, Gn 21²⁴; cf. 16², Nu 23¹⁵, Ez 2c³⁶, and so always in the cohortative, e.g. אֶנְקַמָּה I will avenge me, Is 1²⁴; cf. 1 S 12⁷, Ez 26², and in the impf. Niph. of פִּו'ו' (§ 69 t). The Babylonian punctuation admits only ם under the preformative of the 1st person.

§ 52. *Pi'el and Pu'al.*

1. The *characteristic* of this conjugation consists in the strengthening *a* of the middle radical. From the simple stem *qatal* (cf. § 43 b) the form קָטַל (cf. the Arabic conj. II. *qättälä*) would naturally follow as

the *perfect* of the active (*Pi'el*). The *Pathah* of the first syllable is, however, with one exception (see *m*), always attenuated to *ī* in the *perfect*. In the second syllable, *ā* has been retained in the majority of cases, so that the conjugation should more correctly be called *Pi'al*; but very frequently ¹ this *ā* also is attenuated to *ī*, which is then regularly lengthened to *ē*, under the influence of the tone. Cf. in Aram. קָטַל; but in Biblical Aramaic almost always קָטַל. On the three cases in which *ā* before a final *ר* or *ד* has passed into *Seghōl*, see below, *l*.—Hence, for the 3rd sing. masc. perfect, there arise forms like קָטַל, קָטַל, קָטַל; קָטַל, קָטַל, &c.—Before affirmatives beginning with a consonant, however, *ā* is always retained, thus קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתֶּם, קָטַלְנוּ, &c. In the *infinitives* (absol. קָטַל, obscured from *qattāl*; constr. קָטַל), *imperfect* (קָטַלְתָּ), *imperative* (קָטַל), and *participle* (מְקַטֵּל) the original *ā* of the first syllable reappears throughout. The vocal *Šewā* of the preformatives is weakened from a short vowel; cf. the Arabic imperfect *yūqāttīl*, participle *mūqāttīl*.

b The *passive* (*Pu'al*) is distinguished by the obscure vowel *ū*, or very rarely *ō*, in the first syllable, and *ā* (in pause *ā*) always in the second. In Arabic, also, the passives are formed throughout with *ū* in the first syllable. The inflexion of both these conjugations is analogous to that of *Qal*.

c Rem. 1. The preformative *וּ*, which in the remaining conjugations also is the prefix of the participle, is probably connected with the interrogative or indefinite (cf. § 37) pronoun *וּ* *quis? quicumque* (fem. i. e. neuter, *וּהָ*); cf. § 85 e.

d 2. The *Dageš forte*, which according to the above is characteristic of the whole of *Pi'el* and *Pu'al*, is often omitted (independently of verbs *middle guttural*, § 64 *d*) when the middle radical has *Šewā* under it (cf. § 20 *m*), e. g. *שְׁלַחְהוּ* for *שְׁלַחְהוּ* Ez 17¹⁷; *בְּקִשְׁהוּ* 2 Ch 15¹⁵ (but in the *imperative* always *בְּקִשְׁהוּ* 1 S 28⁷, &c.), and so always in *הַלְלֵהוּ* *praise*. The vocal character of the *Šewā* under the *litera dagessanda* is sometimes in such cases (according to § 10 *h*) expressly emphasized by its taking the form of a *Haṭeph*, as in *לְקַחְהוּ* Gn 2²³, with *וּ* owing to the influence of the preceding *u*, cf. *פְּעִלוּ* for *פְּעִלוּ*, &c.; Gn 9¹⁴, Ju 16¹⁶. In the *imperfect* and *participle* the *Šewā* under the preformatives (*Haṭeph-Pathah* under *נ* in the 1st sing. imperfect) serves at the same time as a characteristic of both conjugations (Gn 26^{14 f.}).

e 3. According to the convincing suggestion of Böttcher² (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, § 904 ff. and § 1022), many supposed perfects of *Pu'al* are in reality

¹ So in all verbs which end in *Nūn*, and in almost all which end in *Lamed* (Olsh. p. 538). Barth is probably right in supposing (*ZDMG*. 1894, p. 1 ff.) that the vowels of the strengthened perfects have been influenced by the *imperfect*.

² As Mayer Lambert observes, the same view was already expressed by Ibn Ganāḥ (see above, § 3 *d*) in the *Kitāb el-luma'*, p. 161. Cf. especially Barth, 'Das passive Qal und seine Participien,' in the *Festschrift zum Jubiläum Hildesheimer* (Berlin, 1890), p. 145 ff.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

עָנָן to gather the clouds together (from עָנָן), שָׁלַשׁ to divide in three parts, or to do a thing for the third time (from שָׁלַשׁ); probably also דָּבַר to speak, from דָּבָר a word. Or again, the denominative may express taking away, injuring, &c., the object denoted by the noun (*privative Pi'el*, cf. our to skin, to behead, to bone), e.g. שָׁרַשׁ, from שָׁרַשׁ to root out, to extirpate, וָנָב prop. to injure the tail (וָנָב), hence to rout the rear of an army, to attack it; לָבַב to ravish the heart; דָּשָׁן to remove the ashes (דָּשָׁן), חָטָא to free from sin (חָטָא), עָצַם to break any one's bones (עָצַם; cf., in the same sense, גָּרַם from גָּרַם); סָעַף to lop the boughs, Is 10³³ (from סָעַף a bough). Some words are clearly denominatives, although the noun from which they are derived is no longer found, e.g. סָקַל to stone, to pelt with stones (also used in this sense in *Qal*), and to remove stones (from a field), to clear away stones; cf. our to stone, used also in the sense of taking out the stones from fruit.

The meaning of the *passive (Pu'al)* follows naturally from the above, e.g. בִּקֵּשׁ *Pi'el* to seek, *Pu'al* to be sought.

- i* In *Pi'el* the literal, concrete meaning of the verb has sometimes been retained, when *Qal* has acquired a figurative sense, e.g. גָּלָה, *Pi'el* to uncover, *Qal* to reveal, also to emigrate, i. e. to make the land bare.
- k* Also with an intransitive sense *Pi'el* occurs as an intensive form, but only in poetic language, e.g. חָתַח in *Pi'el* to be broken in pieces, Jer 51⁵⁶; פָּתַח to tremble, Is 51¹³, Pr 28¹⁴; רָוַח to be drunken, Is 34^{5.7}; [מָעַט to be few, Ec 12⁹]; but in Is 48⁸, 60¹¹ instead of the *Pi'el* of פָּתַח the *Niph'al* is certainly to be read, with Cheyne.
- l* Rem. 1. The (more frequent) form of the perfect with *Pathah* in the second syllable appears especially before *Maqqeph* (Ec 9¹⁵, 12⁹) and in the middle of sentences in continuous discourse, but at the end of the sentence (in *pause*) the form with *Sere* is more common. Cf. גָּדַל Is 49²¹ with גָּדַל Jos 4¹⁴, Est 3¹; מָלַט Ez 33⁵ with מָלַט Ec 9¹⁶; קָצַץ 2 K 8¹⁶ with קָצַץ ψ 129⁴; but *Qames* never appears in this pausal form. The 3rd sing. fem. in *pause* is always of the form קָטְלָה, except קָבְצָה Mi 1⁷; the 3rd plur. always as קָטְלוּ; the 2nd and 1st sing. and 1st plur. of course as קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתִּי, קָטַלְתִּי (but always דָּבַרְתִּי and לָבַדְתִּי), קָטְלָנוּ. In the 3rd sing. perf. דָּבַר to speak, כָּפַר to pardon, and כָּבַס to wash clothes (also כָּבַס Gn 49¹¹) take *S'ghól*, but become in *pause* דָּבַר, כָּבַס (2 S 19²⁵); the pausal form of כָּפַר does not occur.
- m* *Pathah* in the first syllable (as in Aramaic and Arabic) occurs only once, Gn 41⁵¹, מִנְשָׁה he made me forget, to emphasize more clearly the play on the name מִנְשָׁה.
- n* 2. In the imperfect (and *jussive* Ju 16²⁵), infinitive, and imperative *Pi'el* (as also in *Hithpa'el*) the *Sere* in the final syllable, when followed by *Maqqeph*, is usually shortened into *S'ghól*, e.g. יִבְקֹשׁ-לוֹ he seeks for himself, Is 40²⁰; קִדְּשָׁ-לִי sanctify unto me, Ex 13². Pausal-forms with *S'ghól* instead of *Sere*, as יִרְחַף Dt 32¹¹, אִרְחַף Ho 2⁶ (cf. Ex 32⁶ in the infinitive, and Gn 21⁹ in the participle), owe their origin to some particular school of Masoretes, and are wrongly accepted by Baer; cf. the analogous cases in § 75 *n* and *hh*. If the final syllable of the imperfect *Pi'el* has *Pathah* (before a guttural or ר), it remains

even in *pause*; cf. § 29 s and 65 e. In the 1st sing. imperfect the *e*-sound occurs in two words for *Hateph-Pathah*, under the preformative א; אָזְרָה Lv 26³³, Ez 5¹², 12¹⁴ and וְאִסְעַרְםִּי Zc 7¹⁴ (in accordance with § 23 h).—Before the full plural ending וִן (see § 47 m) the *Sere* is retained in *pause*, e. g. תִּרְבְּרוּן ψ 58² (but Gn 32²⁰ תִּרְבְּרוּן), cf. 2 K 6¹⁹, Dt 12³; so before *Silluq* ψ 58³, Jb 21¹¹ and even before *Zaqeph qaton* Dt 7⁵. Instead of תִּקְטְלוּנָה, forms like הִקְטְלוּנָה are also found, e. g. Is 3¹⁶, 13¹⁸, in both cases before a sibilant and in *pause*. Also פִּלְגַּי ψ 55¹⁰ occurs as the 2nd sing. imperative (probably an intentional imitation of the sound of the preceding בִּלְע) and קָרַב (for *qarrabh*) Ez 37¹⁷.

3. The *infinite absolute* of Pi'el has sometimes the special form קָטַל given in O the paradigm, e. g. יִסְרֵי castigando, ψ 118¹⁸; cf. Ex 21¹⁹, 1 K 19¹⁰ (from a verb אִ"ל); ψ 40² (from a verb הִ"ל); but much more frequently the form of the *infinitive construct* (קַטֵּל) is used instead. The latter has also, in exceptional cases, the form קִטַּל (with *ā* attenuated to *ī* as in the *perfect*), e. g. in 1 Ch 8⁸ שְׁלַחוּ; perhaps also (if not a substantive) קִטַּר Jer 44²¹; and for the sake of assonance even for *infinitive absolute* in 2 S 12¹⁴ (נִיִּין נִאֲצֵתָ). On the other hand, שִׁלַּם Dt 32³⁵ and דִּבֶּר Jer 5¹³ are better regarded as substantives, while דִּבֶּר Ex 6²⁸, Nu 3¹, Dt 4¹⁵ (in each case after גִּיּוֹם), Ho 1² (after תִּחַלַּת), in all of which places it is considered by König (after Qimḥi) to be *infinitive construct*, is really *perfect* of Pi'el.

The *infinitive construct* Pi'el, with the *fem.* ending (cf. § 45 d), occurs in p אִסְרָה Lv 26¹⁸; אִסְרָה ψ 147¹; with ׀ of the *fem.* before a suffix צִדְקָתֶךָ Ez 16⁵². On the verbal nouns after the form of the Aram. inf. Pa'il (קַטְלָה), see § 84^b e.

Instead of the abnormal מִאֲסִיּוֹ (so Baer, Is 62⁹) as ptc. Pi'el, read מִאֲסִי with ed. Mant. and Ginsburg.

4. In Pu'al *ō* is sometimes found instead of *ū* in the initial syllable, e. g. q מִאֲדָם dyed red, Ex 25⁵, &c., Na 2⁴, cf. 3⁷ שִׁדְדָה; Ez 16⁴, ψ 72²⁰, 80¹¹. According to Baer's reading also in תִּרְצָחוּ ψ 62⁴, and so also Ben Ašer; but Ben Naphtali תִּרְצָחוּ. It is merely an orthographic licence when *ū* is written fully, e. g. יוֹלָר Ju 18²⁹.

5. As *infinitive absolute* of Pu'al we find גָּלַב Gn 40¹⁵.—No instance of the *inf. constr.* occurs in the strong verb in Pu'al; from ל"ה with suffix עָנֹתוֹ ψ 132¹.

6. A few examples occur of the *participle Pu'al* without the preformative (מִ), S e. g. אָפַל Ex 3²; יוֹלָר (for מִיֹּלָר) Ju 13⁸; לָקַח 2 K 2¹⁰; סֵעָרָה Is 54¹¹. These *participles* are distinguished from the *perfect* (as in *Niph'al*) by the *ā* of the final syllable. For other examples, see Is 30²⁴, Ec 9¹² (where יוֹקְשִׁים, according to § 20 n, stands for יֹקֵן = מִיֹּקֵן); but, according to the Masora, not Ez 26¹⁷, since הִהֲלָלָה as *Mil'el* can only be the *perfect*. The rejection of the מִ may be favoured by an initial מ, as in Is 18^{2.7} (but also מִיֹּשֶׁף); Pr 25¹⁹ (where, however, read מוֹעֲרָת); so also in the *participle Pi'el* מִאֵן Ex 7²⁷, 9² (always after אֵן, but cf. also הִמְאֲנִים Jer 13¹⁰, where, however, הִמְאֲנִים = הִמְאֲנִים is to be read, with Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 264 f.) and מִהָר Zp 1¹⁴ (and Is 8^{1.3}?). Notice, however, Barth's suggestion (*Nominalbildung*, p. 273) that, as the active of forms like אָפַל only occurs in *Qal*, they are *perfect participles* of former *passives* of *Qal* (see e), and in Jer 13¹⁰, 23³², *perfect participles* of Pi'el.—On מִרְבַּע Ez 45², see § 65 d.

§ 53. *Hiph'îl and Hoph'al.*

a 1. The characteristic of the active (*Hiph'îl*) is a prefixed ה (on its origin see § 55 *i*) in the perfect ה (with the *ă* attenuated to *î*, as in *Pi'êl*); which forms a closed syllable with the first consonant of the stem. The second syllable of the perfect had also originally an *ă*; cf. the Arabic conj. IV. 'aqtālă, and in Hebrew the return of the *Pathah* in the 2nd and 1st pers. הַקְטִילָהּ, &c. After the attenuation of this *ă* to *î*, it ought by rule to have been lengthened to *ē* in the tone-syllable, as in Aramaic אִקְטִיל, beside הַקְטִיל in Biblical Aramaic. Instead of this, however, it is always replaced in the strong verb by *î*,¹ but sometimes written defectively —; cf. § 9 *g*. Similarly in the infinitive construct הַקְטִיל, and in the imperfect and participle יִקְטִיל and מִקְטִיל, which are syncopated from יִהַקְטִיל and מִיִּהַקְטִיל; § 23 *k*. The corresponding Arabic forms (*juqtîl* and *muqtîl*) point to an original *î* in the second syllable of these forms. In Hebrew the regular lengthening of this *î* to *ē* appears in the strong verb at least in the *jussive* and in the *imperfect consecutive* (see *n*), as also in the *imperative* of the 2nd sing. masc. (see *m*); on הַקְטִילָנָה, הַקְטִילְנָה cf. § 26 *p*. On the return of the original *ă* in the second syllable of the *Imperat.*, *Jussive*, &c, under the influence of a guttural, cf. § 65 *f*.

b In the *passive* (*Hoph'al*) the preformative is pronounced with an obscure vowel, whilst the second syllable has *ă* (in pause *ā*), as its characteristic, thus:—*Perf.* הִקְטַל or הִקְטַל, *Imperf.* יִקְטַל (syncopated from יִהִקְטַל) or יִקְטַל, *Part.* מִקְטַל or מִקְטַל (from מִיִּהִקְטַל); but the *infinitive absolute* has the form הִקְטַל.

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

c 2. The *meaning* of *Hiph'îl* is primarily, and even more frequently than in *Pi'êl* (§ 52 *g*), *causative* of *Qal*, e. g. אָצַף to go forth, *Hiph.* to bring forth, to lead forth, to draw forth; שִׁבַּח to be holy, *Hiph.* to sanctify. Under the *causative* is also included (as in *Pi'êl*) the *declarative* sense, e. g. הִצְרִיף to pronounce just; הִרְשִׁיעַ to make one an evil doer (to pronounce guilty); cf. שָׁקַע, in *Hiph'îl*, Jb 9²⁰, to represent as perverse. If *Qal* has already a transitive meaning, *Hiph'îl* then takes two accusatives (see § 117 *cc*). In some verbs, *Pi'êl* and *Hiph'îl* occur side by side in the same sense, e. g. פָּרַט *perit*, *Pi'êl* and *Hiph'îl*, *perdidit*; as a rule,

¹ This *î* may have been transferred originally from the imperfects of verbs י"ץ, as a convenient means of distinction between the indicative and jussive, to the *imperfect* of the strong verb and afterwards to the whole of *Hiph'îl*; so Stade, Philippi, Praetorius, ZAW. 1883, p. 52 f.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Of a different kind are the *denominatives* from: אָן (scarcely to prick up the ears, but) to act with the ears, to hear; cf. לָשׁן to move the tongue, to slander, and the German *äugeln* (to make eyes), *füsseln*, *näseln*, *schwänzeln*; שָׁבַר to sell corn; שָׂם to set out early (to load the back [of the camel, &c.]?); opposed to הָעָרִיב.

h 3. The meaning of *Hoph'al* is (a) primarily that of a *passive* of *Hiph'il*, e. g. הִשְׁלִיךְ *proiecit*, הִשְׁלַךְ or הִשְׁלָךְ *proiectus est*; (b) sometimes equivalent to a *passive* of *Qal*, as נָקַם to *avenge*, *Hoph.* to be avenged (but see below, *u*).

i Rem. 1. The *i* of the 3rd sing. masc. perf. *Hiph'il* remains, without exception, in the 3rd fem. (in the tone-syllable). That it was, however, only lengthened from a short vowel, and consequently is changeable, is proved by the forms of the *imperative* and *imperfect* where *ē* (or, under the influence of gutturals, *ā*) takes its place. In an open syllable the *i* is retained almost throughout; only in very isolated instances has it been weakened to *šewā* (see *n* and *o*).

k 2. The *infinitive absolute* commonly has *Sere* without *Yodh*, e. g. הִקְדֵּשׁ Ju 17³; less frequently it takes *Yodh*, e. g. הִשְׁמִיד Am 9⁸; cf. Dt 15¹⁴, Is 59⁴, Jer 3¹⁵, 23³², 44²⁵, Jb 34³⁵, Ec 10¹⁰. With אָ instead of הָ (probably a mere scribal error, not an Aramaism) we find אֲשַׁמֵּד Jer 25³. Rare exceptions, where the form with *Sere* stands for the *infinitive construct*, are, e. g. Dt 32⁸ (Sam. בְּהִנְחִיל; read perhaps בְּהִנְחַל), Jer 44^{19,25}, Pr 25², Jb 13³ (?); on the other hand, for לְעֵשֶׂר Dt 26¹² (which looks like an *infinitive Hiph'il* with elision of the הָ, for לְהַעֲשִׂיר) the right reading is simply לְעֵשֶׂר, since elsewhere the *Pi'el* alone occurs with the meaning *to tithe*; for בְּעֵשֶׂר Neh 10³⁹ perhaps the inf. *Qal* (בְּעֵשֶׂר) was intended, as in 1 S 15¹⁷ (= *to take the tithe*). At the same time it is doubtful whether the present punctuation does not arise from a conflation of two different readings, the *Qal* and the *Pi'el*.

l Instead of the ordinary form of the *infinitive construct* הִקְטִיל the form הִקְטִיל sometimes occurs, e. g. הִשְׁמִיד to *destroy*, Dt 7²⁴, 28⁴⁸; cf. Lv 14⁴⁶, Jos 11¹⁴, Jer 50³⁴, 51³³ and הִקְצוּת for הִקְצוּת Lv 14⁴³ from קָצָה; scarcely, however, Lv 7³⁵ (see § 155 l), 2 S 22¹ (ψ 18¹), 1 K 11¹⁶ (after עָר), and in the passages so explained by König (i. 276) where הִשְׁאִיר appears after prepositions¹; [cf. Driver on Dt 3³, 4¹⁵, 7²⁴, 28⁵⁵].

With *ā* in the second syllable there occurs הִזְבַּרְכֶּם Ez 21²⁹ (cf. the substantival infin. הִפְצַר 1 S 15²³).—In the *Aram. manner* לְהִשְׁמָעוֹת is found in Ez 24²⁶ (as a *construct form*) for the *infinitive Hiph'il* (cf. the *infinitive Hithpa'el*, Dn 11²³). On the elision of the הָ after prefixes, see *q*.

m 3. In the *imperative* the *i* is retained throughout in the open syllable, according to *i*, and consequently also before suffixes (see § 61 g) and הָ—*paragogic*, e. g. הִקְשִׁיבָה attend to, ψ 118²⁵, as in ed. Mant., Jabl., Baer, not הִקְשִׁיבָה as Ginsb. and Kittel; with the tone at the end only הִצְלִיחָה ibid. v. 25^b. On the other hand, in the 2nd sing. masc. the original *i* (cf. Arabic *'āqtīl*) is lengthened to *ē*, e. g. הִשְׂמֵן make fat, and becomes *S'ghól* before *Maqqeph*, e. g. הִסְכֵּן-נָא Jb 22²¹.—The form הִקְטִיל for הִקְטִיל appears anomalously a few times: ψ 94¹, Is 43⁸, Jer 17¹⁸ (cf. § 69 v and § 72 y); elsewhere the *Masora* has preferred the punctuation הִקְטִיל, e. g. 2 K 8⁶; cf. ψ 142⁵.—In La 5¹ הִבִּיטָה is required by the *Qeré* for הִבִּיט.

¹ As to the doubtfulness, on general grounds, of this form of the Inf. *Hiph.*, see Robertson Smith in the *Journ. of Philol.*, xvi. p. 72 f.

4. In the imperfect *Hiph'il* the shorter form with *Ṣere* prevails for the jussive *ṭ* in the 3rd masc. and fem. and 2nd masc. sing., e. g. אַל-תַּגְדִּיל make not great, Ob 12; יַכֵּרֵת let Him cut off! ψ 124; even incorrectly תַּיִדֵר Ex 193 and יַיִדֵר Ec 1c20; cf. also יַבְעֵרֵר Ex 224, where the jussive form is to be explained according to § 109 h, and יַאֲבֵרֵר Jb 3926 before the principal pause. Similarly, after ׀ consec., e. g. וַיִּבְדֵּל and He divided, Gn 14. On the other hand, *i* is almost always retained in the 1st sing., e. g. וַאֲשַׁמֵּד Am 29 (but generally without *i*, as וַאֲסַתֵּר Ez 3923^f, &c.); cf. § 49 e and § 74 l, but also § 72 aa; in 1st plur. only in Neh 43; in the 3rd sing. ψ 10528. With *ā* in the principal pause וַתֹּוֹתֵר Ru 214, and in the lesser pause, Gn 494; before a sibilant (see § 29 q) וַיִּגִּשׁ Ju 619; in the lesser pause וַיִּקָּף La 35. Before *Maqqeph* the *Ṣere* becomes *S'ghól*, e. g. וַיַּחֲזֵק-בּוֹ Ju 194. In the plural again, and before suffixes, *i* remains in the forms וַיִּקְטִילוּ, וַתִּקְטִילוּ, even in the jussive and after ׀ consecutive, e. g. וַיִּדְבְּקוּ Ju 1822. The only exceptions, where the *i* is weakened to *Ṣewá*, are וַיִּדְרְכוּ Jer 92; וַיִּדְבְּקוּ 1 S 1422, 312, 1 Ch 102; יַעֲבְרוּ Jer 1115; וַאֲוֹצְרָה Neh 1313, if it is *Hiph'il* of אַצַּר, but probably וַאֲצִינָה is to be read, as in 72; perhaps also וַתִּהְבְּרוּ Jb 193 (according to others, *imperfect Qal*). The same weakening occurs also in the imperfect in 3rd and 2nd masc. sing. before suffixes, 1 S 1725, 1 K 2033, ψ 6510, and in Jb 920, unless the form be *Pi'el* = וַיַּעֲקֹשְׁנִי, since the *Hiph'il* is not found elsewhere. It is hardly likely that in these isolated examples we have a trace of the ground-form, *yaqtíl*, or an Aramaism. More probably they are due partly to a misunderstanding of the defective writing, which is found, by a purely orthographic licence, in numerous other cases (even in 3rd sing. וַיִּשְׁלֵם Is 4428), and partly are intended, as *formae mixtae*, to combine the forms of *Qal* and *Hiph'il*. Instead of the firmly closed syllable, the Masora requires in Gn 111 תַּרְשֵׁא, with euphonic Ga'ya (see § 16 h).

5. In the participle, מֹוֹצֵא ψ 1357 appears to be traceable to the ground-form, *O maqtíl*; yet the *Ṣere* may also possibly be explained by the retraction of the tone. The Masora appears to require the weakening of the vowel to *Ṣewá* (see above, *n*) in מַהֲלָכִים Zc 37 (probably, however, מַהֲלָכִים should be read), also in מַחֲלָמִים Jer 298, מַעֲוָרִים 2 Ch 2823 (but as ׀ precedes, and accordingly dittography may well have taken place, the participle *Qal* is probably to be read in both places; the reading of the text is perhaps again intended to combine *Qal* and *Hiph'il*, see above, *n*), and in the *Q'ré* מַחֲצֵרִים 1 Ch 1524 &c. (where the *Kethíb* מַחֲצֵרִים is better).—The fem. is ordinarily pointed as מִפְּרָת Nu 515, מִשְׁנָת Lv 1421; in pause מִשְׁבֵּלַת Pr 1914.

6. In the perfect there occur occasionally such forms as הִכְלַמְנִי 1 S 257; *p* cf. Gn 4128, 2 K 1711, Jer 291, Mi 63, Jb 167; with the original *ā* in the first syllable וְהִרְאִיתִי Na 35.—In אֲנִאֲלִתִּי¹ I have stained, Is 633, א stands at the beginning instead of ה, cf. above, *k*, on אֲשַׁבֵּימִי. On the other hand, וְהִאֲזַנְיָחוּ

¹ Most probably, however, גִּאֲלִתִּי (*perfect Pi'el*) is to be read, and the א is only an indication of the change of the perfect into the imperfect, as also previously, by a change of punctuation, וְאֲדַרְכֵם and וַיִּזוּ (instead of וְאֲדַרְ and וַיִּזוּ) are made future instead of past. Jewish exegesis applied these Edom-oracles to the Roman (i. e. Christian) empire. So G. Moore in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1887, col. 292.

Is 19⁶ (see above, *g*) is a mere error of the scribe, who had the Aramaic form in mind and corrected it by prefixing ה.

Q 7. In the *imperfect* and *participle* the characteristic ה is regularly elided after the preformatives, thus מִקְטִיל, יִקְטִיל; but it is retained in the *infinitive* after prepositions, e.g. לְהִקְטִיל. The exceptions are in the imperfect, יְהוֹשִׁיעַ *He will save* for יוֹשִׁיעַ 1 S 17⁴⁷, ψ 116⁶ (in *pause*); יְהוֹדָה *He will praise* for יוֹדָה Neh 11¹⁷, ψ 28⁷, 45¹⁸ (cf. the proper name יְהוֹזָבָב Jer 37³, for which יוֹזָבָב [and יְהוֹסֵף ψ 81⁶]); [יְהוֹלִילוּ (§ 70 *d*) Is 52⁵, יְהוֹתִילוּ Jer 9⁴, יְהוֹתִילוּ Jb 13⁹] and in the *infinitive* (where, however, as in *Niph'al*, § 51 *l*, the *infinitive Qal* is generally to be read) לְסַתֵּר Is 29¹⁵ for לְהַסְתִּיר; לְנַפֵּל and לְצַבּוֹת Nu 5²²; לְעֵבִיר 2 S 19¹⁹; לְהִלָּק Jer 37¹²; לְחַטִּיא Ec 5⁵; לְלַבֵּן (doubly anomalous for לְהַלְבִּין) Dn 11³⁵; לְשַׁמֵּעַ ψ 26⁷; לְאַדְרִיב 1 S 23³³; לְשַׁמֵּד Is 23¹¹; וּלְשִׁבִית Am 8⁴ (certainly corrupt); לְבָעִיר for לְבַהֲעִיר ψ 73²⁰ (but *in the city* is probably meant); לְבִיא Jer 39⁷ (2 Ch 31¹⁰); לְמָרוֹת Is 3⁸, ψ 78¹⁷; לְנַחֲוֹתָם Ex 13²¹; בְּנִלּוֹת (see, however, § 20 *h*) Is 33¹; לְרִאֲתָכֶם Dt 1³³: cf. further, from verbs ל"ה, Nu 5²², Jer 27²⁰; on Dt 26¹² and Neh 10³⁹, see above, *k*; for לְמַחֲוֹת Pr 31³ read לְמַחֲוֹת or לְמַמְחֹת.

r 8. With regard to the tone it is to be observed that the affirmatives ה and ה־ in *Hiph'il* have *not* the tone, even in the *perfect* with *waw* consecutive (except in Ex 26³³ before ה, Lv 15²⁹ before א, to avoid a hiatus); but the plural ending וֹן (see § 47 *m*) always has the tone, e.g. תִּקְרְבוּן Dt 1¹⁷.

S 9. The passive (*Hoph'al*) has *u* instead of *Qames hatuph* in the first syllable (הִקְטַל), in the strong verb less frequently in the *perfect* and *infinitive*, but generally in the *participle*, through the influence of the initial כ (but cf. מְשַׁחַת Pr 25²⁶); e.g. הִשְׁכַּב Ez 32³² (beside הִשְׁכַּבָּה 32¹⁹); יִשְׁלַךְ *impf.* הִשְׁלַךְ, *part.* מְשַׁלַּךְ 2 S 20²¹ (beside הִשְׁלַכְתָּ Is 14¹⁹); הִמְלַחַת Ez 16⁴; in the *partic. Hoph.* without elision of the ה: מְהַקְצְעוֹת Ez 46²²; on the other hand, verbs פ"ן always have *u* (in a sharpened syllable): הִגֵּד, יִגֵּד (cf. § 9 *n*).

t 10. The *infinitive absolute* has in *Hoph'al* (as in *Hiph'il*) *Sere* in the last syllable, e.g. הִחַתֵּל and הִמְלִיחַ Ez 16⁴; הִגֵּד Jos 9²⁴. An *infinitive construct* does not occur in the strong verb.

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

u 12. According to Böttcher (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, § 906) and Barth (see above, § 52 *e*) a number of supposed imperfects *Hoph'al* are, in fact, imperfects of the passive of *Qal*. As in the case of the perfects passive of *Qal* (see above, § 52 *e*) the question is again of verbs of which neither the corresponding causative (i. e. here the *Hiph'il*), nor the other tense of the same conjugation (i. e. here the *perfect Hoph'al*) is found; so with יִקַּם (for יִנְקַם, cf. *yuqtālū* as imperfect *Qal* in Arabic) and יִתֵּן, from נָקַם and נָתַן; יִקַּח from לָקַח (cf. § 66 *g*); יוֹאֵר Nu 22⁶ from אָרַר; יִחַן from חָנַן; יוֹשֵׁד Ho 10¹⁴ (cf. Is 33¹) from שָׁדַד; Barth adds the verbs פִּתַּח Ez 19¹² from פָּתַח; יִתֵּן Lev 11³⁵ from נָתַן; the verbs עָרַץ: יִחַקֵּן Jb 19²³ from חָקַק; יִבַּח &c. from בָּחַח; the verb עָרַץ: יִרְשַׁע from רָשַׁע; the verbs עָרַץ: יִרְשַׁע, יִשְׁרַח, יִשְׁרַח from חָלַח, יִשְׁרַח and יִשְׁרַח. On וַיִּשְׁיֵם &c., § 73 *f*. In point of fact it would be very strange, especially in the case of יִתֵּן and יִקַּח, that of these frequently used verbs,



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

affect to be of a certain character. E. g. הַתְּגַדֵּל to make oneself great, to act proudly; הַתְּחַכֵּם to show oneself wise, crafty; הַתְּחַלֵּף to pretend to be ill; הַתְּעַשֵּׂר to make, i. e. to feign oneself rich; הַשְׁתַּרֵּר Nu 16¹³, to make oneself a prince; הַתְּנַבֵּא 1 S 18¹⁰, to act in an excited manner like a prophet, to rave. The meaning of *Hithpa'el* sometimes coincides with that of *Qal*, both forms being in use together, e. g. אָבַל to mourn, in *Qal* only in poetic style, in *Hithpa'el* in prose. On the accusative after *Hithpa'el* (regarded as a transitive verb), see § 117 w.

f (b) It expresses *reciprocal* action, like *Niph'al*, § 51 d, e. g. הִתְרָאָה to look upon one another, Gn 42¹; cf. ψ 41⁸;—but

(c) It more often indicates an action less directly affecting the subject, and describes it as performed *with regard to* or *for* oneself, in one's own special interest (cf. *Niph'al*, § 51 e). *Hithpa'el* in such cases readily takes an accusative, e. g. הִתְפָּרַק Ex 32³ and הִתְנַצַּל Ex 33⁶ to tear off from oneself; הִתְפַּשֵּׁט exuit sibi (vestem), הִתְפַּתַּח solvit sibi (vincula); הִצִּיטֵיךְ Jos 9¹², to take (something) as one's provision; without an accusative, הִתְהַלֵּךְ to walk about for oneself (ambulare); הִתְפַּלֵּל sibi intercedere (see Delitzsch on Is 1¹⁵); הִתְחַקֶּה to draw a line for oneself, Job 13²⁷; on Is 14², see § 57, note.

g (d) Only seldom is it *passive*, e. g. הִיא תִּתְהַלֵּל Pr 31³⁰ she shall be praised; הִשְׁתַּפַּח to be forgotten, Ec 8¹⁰, where the reflexive sense (to bring oneself into oblivion) has altogether disappeared. Cf. *Niph'al*, § 51 f.

h The passive form *Hothpa'al* is found only in the few following examples: הִטְפָּא to be defiled, Dt 24⁴; infinitive הִכְבַּם to be washed, Lv 13^{55,56}; הִרְשְׁנָה (for הִתְרִשְׁנָה, the נָה being treated as if it were the affirmative of the fem. plur.) it is made fut, Is 34⁶. On הִתְפָּקְרוּ, see l.

i Denominatives with a reflexive meaning are הִתְיַהַר to embrace Judaism, from יְהוּדָה (יהודה) Judah; הִצִּיטֵיךְ to provision oneself for a journey, from צִדָּה provision for a journey (see § 72 m).

h Rem. 1. As in *Pi'el*, so in *Hithpa'el*, the perfect very frequently (in stems ending in ג, ק, ט, פ) has retained the original *Pathah* in the final syllable (while in the ordinary form it is attenuated, as in *Pi'el*, to *i* and then lengthened to *e*), e. g. הִתְאַנַּף Dt 4²¹, &c.; cf. 2 Ch 13⁷, 15⁸; with *י* consecutive Is 8²¹; so also in the imperfect and imperative, e. g. הִתְחַכַּם Ec 7¹⁶; cf. Dt 9^{8,18}, 1 S 3¹⁰, 2 S 10¹², 1 K 11⁹, Is 55², 58¹⁴, 64¹¹, ψ 55²; הִתְחַנֵּן 1 K 20²², ψ 37⁴, Est 5¹⁰; וַאֲתַאֲפֵק 1 S 13¹².—In Lv 11⁴⁴, 20⁷ and Ez 38²³, *i* takes the place of *a* in the final syllable of the stem before שׁ (cf. § 44 d), and in the last passage before ל. In the perfect, imperfect (with the exception of Ec 7¹⁶), and imperative of *Hithpa'el* (as well as of *Hithpō'el*, *Hithpa'lēl*, *Hithpalpēl*, § 55) the original *ā* always returns in pause as *Qamez*, e. g. הִתְאַוָּר ψ 93¹; יִתְאַבֵּל Ez 7²⁷; יִתְהַלֵּךְ Jb 18⁸; יִתְלַבְּרוּ 3 S³³; הִתְקַוֵּשׁוּ Jos 3⁵; cf. Jb 33⁵ and § 74 b.—The *ā* also appears before the fuller ending *ין* in the plural of the imperfect (cf. § 47 m) in ψ 12⁹, Jb

9⁶, 16¹⁰.—Like the *Pi'el* הִקְטִילָנָה (§ 52 n), forms occur in *Hithpa'el* like תִּתְהַלֵּכְנָה Zc 6⁷; cf. Am 8¹³, and so in *Hithpo'el*, Jer 49³, Am 9¹³; with ē only in La 4¹.—In the Aramaic manner an *infinitive Hithpa'el* הִתְחַבְּרוּת occurs in Dn 11²³ (cf. the *Hiph'il* inf. הִשְׁמָעוּת in Ez 24²⁶).

2. As instances of the *reflexive* הִתְקַטֵּל (connected with *Pi'el*) a few reflexive *l* forms of the verb פָּקַד (to examine) are also probably to be reckoned. Instead of a *Pathah* in a sharpened syllable after the first radical, these take *Qames* in an open syllable, e. g. הִתְפַּקְדוּ Ju 20^{16,17}, *imperfect* יִתְפַּקְדוּ 20¹⁶, 21⁹. The corresponding passive form הִתְפַּקְדוּ also occurs four times, Nu 1⁴⁷, 2³³, 26⁶², 1 K 20²⁷. According to others, these forms are rather reflexives of *Qal*, in the sense of *to present oneself for review, to be reviewed*, like the Aramaic 'Ithpe'el (Western Aramaic אִתְּקַטֵּל, Syr. אִתְּקַטֵּל) and the Ethiopic *taqat'ela*, Arab. 'iqtatata, the last with the *t* always placed after the first radical (cf. above, b); but they are more correctly explained, with König, as *Hithpa'el* forms, the doubling of the *q* being abnormally omitted.—Such a reflexive of *Qal*, with the *l* transposed, occurs in הִלְתַּחֵם (on the analogy of O. T. Hebrew to be pronounced הִלְתַּחֵם) in the inscription of the Moabite king Méša', with the meaning of the O. T. *Niph'al* נִלְחַם to fight, to wage war: see the inscription, lines 11, 15, 19, and 32; in the first two places in the *imperfect* with *wāw* consecutive וַיִּלְתַּחֵם; in line 19 in the *infinitive* with suffix, בְּהִלְתַּחֵמָה בִּי in his fighting against me.

§ 55. Less Common Conjugations.

Of the less common conjugations (§ 39 g) some may be classed with *a* *Pi'el*, others with *Hiph'il*. To the former belong those which arise from the lengthening of the vowel or the repetition of one or even two radicals, in fact, from an internal modification or development of the stem; to the latter belong those which are formed by prefixing a consonant, like the *h* of *Hiph'il*. Amongst the conjugations analogous to *Pi'el* are included the *passive* forms distinguished by their vowels, as well as the reflexives with the prefix הִתְ, on the analogy of *Hithpa'el*.

The following conjugations are related to *Pi'el*, as regards their *b* inflexion and partly in their meaning:

1. *Pō'el* קוּטַל, passive *Pō'al* קוּטַל, reflexive *Hithpō'el* הִתְקוּטַל, corresponding to the Arabic conj. III. *qātālā*, pass. *qūtālā*, and conj. VI. reflexive *tāqātālā*; *imperfect* יְקוּטַל, *participle* מְקוּטַל, *imperfect passive* יְקוּטַל &c. Hence it appears that in Hebrew the *ó* of the first syllable is in all the forms obscured from *á*, while the passive form is distinguished simply by the *a*-sound in the second syllable. In the strong verb these conjugations are rather rare. Examples: *participle* מְשַׁפְּטִי mine adversary, who would contend with me, Jb 9¹⁵; מְלוֹשְׁנִי (denominative from לִשׁוֹן the tongue) slandering (as if intent on injuring with the tongue) ψ 101⁵ *Keth.* (The *Qeré* requires מְלוֹשְׁנִי *melošni* as Na 1³ וַיִּזְרוּ; וְזָרְמוּ they have poured out, ψ 77¹⁸ (if not rather *Pu'al*); יוֹדְעָתִי I have appointed, 1 S 21³ (unless הוֹדְעָתִי should be read); יִסְעַר Ho 13³; שָׁרַשׁ to take root, passive

שָׁרֵשׁ, denominative from שָׁרַשׁ root (but שָׁרַשׁ to root out); in Hithpô'el הִתְעַשְׂרוּ they shall be moved, Jer 25¹⁶; imperf. 46⁸; from a verb לָהֵאֵר, שִׁשְׁתִּי Is 10¹³. The participle מְנַאֵץ Is 52⁶ is probably a *forma mixta* combining the readings מְנַאֵץ and מְתַנְאֵץ.

c Po'el proper (as distinguished from the corresponding conjugations of verbs ע"ע § 67 l and ע"ע § 72 m, which take the place of the ordinary causative Pi'el) expresses an aim or endeavour to perform the action, especially with hostile intent, and is hence called, by Ewald, the stem expressing *aim* (Ziel-stamm), *endeavour* (Suche-stamm) or *attack* (Angriffs-stamm); cf. the examples given above from Jb 9¹⁵, ψ 101⁵, and עוֹיֵן I S 18⁹ Qerê (probably for מְעוֹיֵן, cf. § 52 s; § 55 f: *seeking to cast an evil eye*).

With קוּטַל is connected the formation of quadrilaterals by the insertion of a consonant between the first and second radicals (§ 30 p, § 56).

d 2. Pa'lēl, generally with the *ä* attenuated to *ĩ* = Pi'lēl¹ (Pi'lal), קָטַל and קָטַל; the *ē* in the final syllable also arises from *ĩ*, and this again from *ä*; passive Pu'lal קָטַל, reflexive Hithpa'lēl הִתְקַטַּל, like the Arabic conjugations ix. 'iqtāllā and xi. 'iqtāllā, the former used of permanent, the latter of accidental or changing conditions, e. g. of colours; cf. שָׁאֵן to be at rest, רַעֵן to be green, passive אִמַּל to be withered, all of them found only in the *perfect* and with no corresponding Qal form. (For the barbarous form צִמְתַּחֲנִי ψ 88¹⁷ read צִמְתַּחֲנִי; for נִפְלַל Ez 28²³, which has manifestly arisen only from confusion with the following חָלַל, read נִפְלַל). These forms are more common in verbs ע"ע, where they take the place of Pi'el and Hithpa'el (§ 72 m). Cf. also § 75 kk.

e 3. P^eal'al: קָטַטַּל with repetition of the last two radicals, used of movements repeated in quick succession; e. g. סָחַרְחַר to go about quickly, to palpitate (of the heart) ψ 38¹¹, from סָחַר to go about; passive חָמַרְמַר to be in a ferment, to be heated, to be red, Jb 16¹⁶, La 1²⁰, 2¹¹. Probably this is also the explanation of חָצוּצַר (denom. from חָצוּצְרָה a trumpet, but only in the *participle*, I Ch 15²⁴ &c. K^{eth}.) for חָצַרְצַר, by absorption of the first ח, lengthening of *ä* in the open syllable, and subsequent obscuring of *ā* to *ô*. On the other hand, for the meaningless אָהַבּוּ הָבּוּ Ho 4¹⁸ (which could only be referred to this conjugation if it stood for אָהַבּוּ הָבּוּ) read אָהַבּוּ; and for the equally meaningless יִפְיִיִּת ψ 45³ read יִפְיִת. In both these cases a scribal error (*dittography*) has been perpetuated by the punctuation, which did not venture to alter the K^{ethibh}. On the employment of P^eal'al in the formation of nouns, cf. § 84^b n. Closely related to this form is—

f 4. Pilpēl (pass. Pōlpal), with a strengthening of the two essential radicals in stems ע"ע, ע"י, and ע"י, e. g. גָּלַל to roll, from גָּל = לָל; reflexive הִתְגַּלְגַּל to roll oneself down; בָּלַל from בּוּל, passive בָּלַל; cf. also טָאֵטַט (so Baer and Ginsb. after Qimḥi; others טָאֵטַט) Is 14²³, and with *ä* in both syllables owing to the influence of ר, קָרַקַר from קוּר Nu 24¹⁷ (cf. however, in the parallel passage, Jer 48⁴⁵ קָרַקַר) and Is 22⁶, in the *participle*; שָׁשַׁג Is 17¹¹ to hedge in, acc. to others make to grow. Probably to this form also belongs יִלְעָלַע, the emended reading of Jb 39³⁰ instead of the impossible יִלְעָלַע; also

¹ Cf. Wolfensohn, 'The Pi'el in Hebrew,' *Amer. Journ. of Or. Studies*, xxvii (1907), p. 303 ff.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

(a) On the analogy of Pi'el: פָּרַסָם, imperfect יִכְרַסְמֶנָּה he doth ravage it, ψ 80¹⁴ from פָּסַם, cf. גָּזַם. Passive רָטַפַּשׁ to grow fresh again, Jb 33²⁵. Participle מְכַרְבֵּל girt, clothed (cf. Aramaic כַּבַּל to bind), 1 Ch 15²⁷. It is usual also to include among the quadrilaterals פָּרַשׁוּ Jb 26⁹, as a perfect of Aramaic form with *Pathah* not attenuated. It is more correctly, however, regarded, with Delitzsch, as the infinitive absolute of a Pi'el formation, from פָּרַשׁ to spread out, with euphonic change of the first פ to ש, and the second to ו. Moreover, the reading פָּרַשׁוּ also is very well attested, and is adopted by Baer in the text of Job; cf. the Rem. on p. 48 of his edition.

(b) On the analogy of Hiph'il: הִשְׁמְאִיל, by syncope הִשְׁמְאִיל and הִשְׁמִיל to turn to the left (denom. from שָׂמַל) Gn 13⁹, Is 30²¹, &c. On הִאֲנִיחוּ cf. § 53 p.

C. STRONG VERB WITH PRONOMINAL SUFFIXES.¹

§ 57.

The accusative of the personal pronoun, depending on an active verb,² may be expressed (1) by a separate word, אֵת the accusative sign (before a suffix אֵת, אֵת) with the pronominal suffix, e. g. קָטַל אֵתוֹ he has killed him; or (2) by a mere suffix, קָטַלְהוּ or קָטַלוֹ he has killed him. The latter is the usual method (§ 33), and we are here concerned with it alone.³ Neither of these methods, however, is employed when the accusative of the pronoun is reflexive. In that case a reflexive verb is used, viz. Niph'al or Hithpa'el (§§ 51 and 54), e. g. הִתְקַדַּשׁ he sanctified himself, not קָדַשׁוּ, which could only mean he sanctified him.⁴

Two points must be specially considered here: the form of the suffix itself (§ 58), and the form which the verb takes when suffixes are added to it (§§ 59–61).

¹ This subject of the verbal suffixes is treated here in connexion with the strong verb, in order that both the forms of the suffixes and the general laws which regulate their union with verbal forms may be clearly seen. The rules which relate to the union of the suffixes with weak verbs will be given under the several classes of those verbs.

² An accusative suffix occurs with *Niph'al* in ψ 109³ (since נִלְחַם is used in the sense of *to attack*), and according to some, in Is 44²¹; with *Hithpa'el* Is 14² (הִתְנַחֵל to appropriate somebody to oneself as a possession); cf. above, § 54 f, and § 117 w.

³ On the cases where אֵת is necessary, see § 117 e.

⁴ The exceptions in Jer 7¹⁹, Ez 34^{2,8,10} are only apparent. In all these instances the sharp antithesis between אֵתָם (themselves) and another object could only be expressed by retaining the same verb; also in Ex 5¹⁹ אֵתָם after an active verb serves to emphasize the idea of themselves.

§ 58. *The Pronominal Suffixes of the Verb.*

Cf. the statistics collected by H. Petri, *Das Verbum mit Suffixen im Hebr.*, part ii, in the *נביאים ראשונים*, Leipzig, 1890. W. Diehl, *Das Pronomen pers. suff. . . . des Hebr.*, Giessen, 1895. J. Barth, 'Beiträge zur Suffixlehre des Nordsem.,' *AJSL.* xvii (1901), p. 205 f. Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, i. 159 f.; *Grundriss*, p. 638 ff.

1. The *pronominal suffixes* appended to the verb express the *a* accusative of the *personal pronoun*. They are the following:—

A.	B.	C.
To a form ending in a Vowel.	To a form in the perf. ending in a Consonant.	To a form in the Imperf. ending in a Consonant.
Sing. 1. com. נִיְ	נִיְ (in pause נִיְ)	נִיְ me.
2. m. ךְ	ךְ (in pause ךְ, also ךְ)	ךְ thee.
f. ךְ	ךְ ךְ, rarely ךְ	ךְ
3. m. הִיְ, יְ	הִיְ, יְ (הִיְ)	הִיְ him.
f. הִיְ	הִיְ	הִיְ her.
Plur. 1. com. נוְ	נוְ	נוְ us.
2. m. כְּ	כְּ	כְּ you (vos).
f. ¹		
3. m. הִיְ, יְ	הִיְ (from הִיְ), יְ	הִיְ (from הִיְ) eos.
poet. מוְ	מוְ	מוְ
f. יְ	יְ, יְ ¹ eas.

2. That these suffixes are connected with the corresponding forms *b* of the personal pronoun (§ 32) is for the most part self-evident, and only a few of them require elucidation.

The suffixes נִיְ, נוְ, הִיְ, ךְ (and ךְ, when a long vowel in an open *C* syllable precedes) never have the tone, which always rests on the preceding syllable; on the other hand, כְּ and הִיְ always take the tone.

In the 3rd pers. masc. הִיְ, by contraction of *a* and *u* after the *d* rejection of the weak ה, frequently gives rise to *ô* (§ 23 *k*), ordinarily written *î*, much less frequently *î̄* (see § 7 *c*). In the *feminine*, the suffix ךְ should be pronounced with a preceding *a* (cf. below, *f*, note), as ךְ or ךְ, on the analogy of *āhū*; instead of ךְ, however, it was simply pronounced ךְ, with the rejection of the final vowel,

¹ According to Diehl (see above), p. 61, כְּ occurs only once with the perfect (see § 59 *e*), 7 times with the imperfect, but never in pre-exilic passages, whereas the accus. כְּ occurs 40 times in Jer. and 36 times in Ezek.—הִיְ occurs only once as a verbal suffix (Dt 32²⁶, unless, with Kahan, *Infinitive u. Participien*, p. 13, הִיְ from הִיְ is to be read), while the forms כְּ (2nd *f. pl.*) and יְ and יְ (3rd *f. pl.*), added by Qimḥi, never occur.

and with *Mappiq*, since the ה is consonantal; but the weakening to הֿ is also found, see below, *g*.

e 3. The *variety* of the suffix-forms is occasioned chiefly by the fact that they are modified differently according to the form and tense of the verb to which they are attached. For almost every suffix three forms may be distinguished:

(*a*) One beginning with a consonant, as הָיָה, הָיָה, ו (only after *i*), וָיָה, (הָיָה) הָיָה, &c. These are attached to verbal forms which end with a vowel, e. g. יִקְטְלוּנִי; קִטְלֵהוּ, for which by absorption of the ה we also get קִטְלֵהוּ, pronounced *qetaltû*; cf. § 8 *m*.

f (*b*) A second and third with what are called *connecting vowels*¹ (וָיָה, וָיָה), used with verbal forms ending with a consonant (for exceptions, see § 59 *g* and § 60 *e*). This *connecting vowel* is *a* with the forms of the perfect, e. g. קִטְלֵנִי, קִטְלֵנִי, קִטְלֵנִי (on קִטְלֵנִי, the ordinary form of the 3rd masc. perf. with the 2nd fem. suffix, cf. below, *g*); and *e* (less frequently *a*) with the forms of the imperfect and imperative, e. g. יִקְטְלֵהוּ, קִטְלֵהוּ; also with the infinitive and participles, when these do not take noun-suffixes (cf. § 61 *a* and *h*). The form *i* also belongs to the suffixes of the perfect, since it has arisen from הָיָה (cf., however, § 60 *d*). With הָ, הָ, the connecting sound is only a vocal *Šewâ*, which has arisen from an original short vowel, thus הָ, הָ, e. g. קִטְלֵהוּ (*qetālêkhâ*), or when the final consonant of the verb is a guttural, הָ, e. g. קִטְלֵהוּ. In *pause*, the original short vowel (*ă*) reappears as *Seghōl* with the tone הָ (also הָ, see *g*). On the appending of suffixes to the final ה of the imperfect (§ 47 *m*), see § 60 *e*.

g Rem. 1. As rare forms may be mentioned *sing.* 2nd pers. *masc.* הָיָה Gn 27⁷, 1 K 18⁴⁴, &c., in *pause* also הָיָה (see below, *i*); *fem.* הָיָה, הָיָה ψ 103⁴, 137⁶. Instead of the form הָ, which is usual even in the perfect (e. g. Ju 4²⁰, Ez 27²⁶), הָ occurs as *fem.* Is 60⁹ (as *masc.* Dt 6¹⁷, 28⁴⁵, Is 30¹⁹, 55⁵ always in *pause*); with *Munah* Is 54⁶, Jer 23³⁷.—In the 3rd *masc.* הָ Ex 32²⁵, Nu 23⁸; in the 3rd *fem.* הָ without *Mappiq* (cf. § 91 *e*) Ex 2³, Jer 44¹⁹; Am 1¹¹, with

¹ We have kept the term *connecting vowel*, although it is rather a superficial description, and moreover these vowels are of various origin. The connective *a* is most probably the remains of the old verbal termination, like the *i* in the 2nd pers. *fem.* sing. קִטְלֵהוּ. Observe e. g. the Hebrew form *qetāl-ani* in connexion with the Arabic *qatala-ni*, contrasted with Hebrew *qetālat-ni* and Arabic *qatalat-ni*. König accordingly prefers the expression 'vocalic ending of the stem', instead of 'connecting syllable'. The connective *ē*, *ā*, as Prātorius (*ZDMG.* 55, 267 ff.) and Barth (*ibid.* p. 205 f.) show by reference to the Syriac connective *ai* in the imperf. of the strong verb, is originally due to the analogy of verbs לָ (מִחֵינִי = מִחֵינִי from *mehaini*), in which the final *ē* was used as a connecting vowel first of the imperat., then of the impf. (besides many forms with *a*, § 60 *d*), and of the infin. and participle.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

1st pers. נִּנְּ- (even in pause, Jb 7¹⁴, &c.), נִּנְּ- (for נִּנְּ-, נִּנְּ-).

2nd pers. נִּנְּ- (Jer 22²⁴ in pause נִּנְּ-) and, only orthographically different,

נִּנְּ- (Is 10²⁴, Pr 2¹¹ in *pause*).

3rd pers. נִּנְּ- (for נִּנְּ-),¹ fem. נִּנְּ- for נִּנְּ-.

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

In the other persons Nûn energetic does not occur.

k Rem. The uncontracted forms with *Nûn* are rare, and occur only in poetic or elevated style (Ex 15², Dt 32¹⁰ [*bis*], Jer 5²², 22²⁴); they are never found in the 3rd fem. sing. and 1st plur. On the other hand, the contracted forms are tolerably frequent, even in prose. An example of נִּנְּ- as 1st plur. occurs perhaps in Jb 31¹⁵ [but read נִּנְּ- and cf. § 72 cc], hardly in Ho 12⁵; cf. הִנֵּנוּ behold us, Gn 44¹⁶, 50¹⁸, Nu 14⁴⁰ for הִנֵּנוּ (instead of הִנֵּנוּ; see § 20 m).— In Ez 4¹² the Masora requires הִנֵּנוּ, without Dageš in the Nûn.

l That the forms with *Nûn energeticum* are intended to give greater emphasis to the verbal form is seen from their special frequency in *pause*. Apart from the verb, however, *Nûn energeticum* occurs also in the union of suffixes with certain particles (§ 100 o).

This Nûn is frequent in Western Aramaic. In Arabic the corresponding forms are the two *energetic moods* (see § 48 b) ending in *an* and *anna*, which are used in connexion with suffixes (e.g. *yaqtulan-ka* or *yaqtulanna-ka*) as well as without them.

§ 59. The Perfect with Pronominal Suffixes.

a 1. The endings (*affirmatives*) of the perfect occasionally vary somewhat from the ordinary form, when connected with pronominal suffixes; viz.:—

(a) In the 3rd sing. fem. the original feminine ending נִּנְּ- or נִּנְּ- is used for נִּנְּ-.

(b) In the 2nd sing. masc. besides נִּנְּ- we find נִּנְּ-, to which the connecting vowel is directly attached, but the only clear instances of this are with נִּנְּ-.²

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

(d) 2nd plur. masc. נִּנְּ- for נִּנְּ-. The only examples are Nu 20⁵, 21⁵, Zc 7⁵. The fem. נִּנְּ- never occurs with suffixes; probably it had the same form as the masculine.

b We exhibit first the forms of the perfect *Hiph'ûl*, as used in connexion with suffixes, since here no further changes take place in the stem itself, except as regards the tone (see c).

¹ On נִּנְּ- = נִּנְּ- Nu 23¹³, see § 67 o.

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

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3. m. הַקָּטִיל	3. c. הַקָּטִילוּ
3. f. הַקָּטִילַת	
2. m. הַקָּטִילְתָּ, הַקָּטִילְתָּ	2. m. הַקָּטִילְתִּי
2. f. הַקָּטִילְתִּי, הַקָּטִילְתִּי	
1. c. הַקָּטִילְתִּי	1. c. הַקָּטִילְנוּ

The beginner should first practise connecting the suffixes with these *Hiph'il* forms and then go on to unite them to the *Perfect Qal* (see *d*).

2. The addition of the suffix generally causes the tone to be thrown *c* forward towards the end of the word, since it would otherwise fall, in some cases, on the ante-penultima; with the *heavy* suffixes (see *e*) the tone is even transferred to the suffix itself. Considerations of tone, especially in the *Perfect Qal*, occasion certain vowel changes: (*a*) the *Qames* of the first syllable, no longer standing *before* the tone, always becomes vocal *Šewâ*; (*b*) the original *Pathah* of the second syllable, which in the *3rd sing. fem.* and *3rd plur.* had become *Šewâ*, reappears before the suffix, and, in an open syllable before the tone, is lengthened to *Qames*; similarly original *i* (as in the *3rd sing. masc.* without a suffix) is lengthened to *e*, e. g. אֶהְבֵּיךָ I S 18²², Pr 19⁷.

The forms of the perfect of *Qal* consequently appear as follows:— *d*

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3. m. קָטַל	3. c. קָטְלוּ
3. f. קָטַלְתָּ (קָטַלְתָּ, see <i>g</i>)	
2. m. קָטַלְתָּ (קָטַלְתָּ, see <i>h</i>)	2. m. קָטַלְתִּי
2. f. קָטַלְתִּי (קָטַלְתִּי, see <i>h</i>)	
1. c. קָטַלְתִּי	1. c. קָטַלְנוּ

The connexion of these forms with all the suffixes is shown in *Paradigm C*. It will be seen there also, how the *Sere* in the *Perfect Pi'el* changes sometimes into *Seghâl*, and sometimes into vocal *Šewâ*.

Rem. 1. The suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd pers. plur. כֹּם and הֵם, since they *c* end in a consonant and also always have the tone, are distinguished as *heavy* suffixes (*suffixa gravia*) from the rest, which are called *light* suffixes. Compare the connexion of these (and of the corresponding feminine forms כֵּן and הֵן) with the *noun*, § 91. With a perfect כֹּם alone occurs, ψ 118²⁶. The form קָטַלְתָּ which is usually given as the connective form of the 3rd sing. masc. before כֹּם and כֵּן is only formed by analogy, and is without example in the O. T.

2. In the *3rd sing. masc.* קָטַלְתָּ (especially in verbs ה"ל; in the strong verb *f* only in Jer 20¹⁵ in *Pi'el*) is mostly contracted to קָטְלוּ, according to § 23 *k*; likewise in the 2nd sing. masc. קָטַלְתָּ to קָטַלְתִּי.—As a suffix of the 1st sing. קָטַלְתִּי occurs several times with the 3rd sing. masc. perf. *Qal* of verbs ה"ל, not only in *pause* (as עָנְנִי ψ 118⁵; קָנְנִי Pr 8²² with *D'hi*), but even with a con-

conjunctive accent, as הִרְנִי Jb 30¹⁹; עָנִי 1 S 28¹⁶. (where, however, the reading עָנִי is also found). With a sharpened נ : הִרְנִי Gn 30⁶, וַיִּסְרְנִי ψ 118¹⁸.

g 3. The 3rd sing. fem. קָטַלְתָּ (= קָטַלְתָּהּ) has the twofold peculiarity that (a) the ending *ath* always takes the tone,¹ and consequently is joined to those suffixes which form a syllable of themselves (נִי, הִי, הָ, נָ), without a connecting vowel, contrary to the general rule, § 58 f; (b) before the other suffixes the connecting vowel is indeed employed, but the tone is drawn back to the penultima, so that they are pronounced with shortened vowels, viz. הִיְ־, הָ־, e. g. אֲהַבְתְּךָ she loves thee, Ru 4¹⁶, cf. Is 47¹⁰; גָּנַבְתָּם she has stolen them, Gn 31³²; שָׂרַפְתָּם it burns them, Is 47¹⁴, Jos 2⁶, Ho 2¹⁴, ψ 48⁷. For תְּנִיְ־, תְּךָ־ &c., in pause תְּנִיְ־ is found, Jer 8²¹, ψ 69¹⁰, and תְּךָ־ Ct 8⁵; and also without the pause for the sake of the assonance חַבַּלְתְּךָ she was in travail with thee, ibid. The form קָטַלְתְּךָ (e. g. Ru 4¹⁶) has arisen, through the loss of the ה and the consequent sharpening of the ך (as in נָיְ־ and נָהְ־ for נִיְ־ and נִהְ־, cf. § 58 i), from the form קָטַלְתְּהוּ, which is also found even in pause (אֲהַבְתְּהוּ 1 S 18²⁸; elsewhere it takes in pause the form סָמַכְתְּהוּ Is 59¹⁶); so קָטַלְתְּךָ from קָטַלְתְּהוּ; cf. 1 S 1⁶, Is 34¹⁷, Jer 49²⁴, Ru 3⁶; in pause Ez 14¹⁵, always, on the authority of Qimhi, without *Mappiq* in the ה, which is consequently always a mere vowel-letter.

h 4. In the 2nd sing. masc. the form קָטַלְתָּ is mostly used, and the suffixes have, therefore, no connecting vowel, e. g. פָּרַצְתָּנוּ וְנָחַתָּנוּ thou hast cast us off, thou hast broken us down, ψ 60⁸; but with the suff. of the 1st sing. the form קָטַלְתָּנִי is used, e. g. חָקַרְתָּנִי ψ 139¹; in pause, however, with *Qames*, e. g. עֹבַדְתָּנִי ψ 22²; Ju 1¹⁶ (with *Zaqeph qaton*); but cf. also צָרַפְתָּנִי ψ 17³ with *Mer'kha*.—In the 2nd sing. fem. הִיְ־ is also written defectively, רַפִּיִּתְּנִי 1 S 19¹⁷, Ju 11³⁶, Jer 15¹⁰, Ct 4⁹. Occasionally the suffix is appended to the ordinary form הִיְ־, viz. הִשְׁבַּעְתָּנוּ thou (fem.) dost adjure us, Ct 5⁹, Jos 2^{17.20}; cf. Jer 2²⁷, and, quite abnormally, with *Sere* הִרְדִּיתָנוּ thou (fem.) didst let us down, Jos 2¹⁸, where הִרְדִּיתָנוּ would be expected. In Is 8¹¹ וַיִּסְרְנִי is probably intended as an imperfect.

i 5. In verbs *middle ē*, the ē remains even before suffixes (see above, c), e. g. אֲהַבְתְּךָ Dt 15¹⁶, אֲהַבְתְּהוּ 1 S 18²⁸, cf. 18²²; יִרְאוּהוּ Jb 37²⁴. From a verb *middle ō* there occurs יִכְלִיתִיו I have prevailed against him, ψ 13⁵, from יָכַל with ō instead of ō in a syllable which has lost the tone (§ 44 e).

§ 60. Imperfect with Pronominal Suffixes.

a In those forms of the imperfect Qal, which have no affirmatives, the vowel *ō* of the second syllable mostly becomes ם־ (simple *Šewā mobile*), sometimes ם־; thus in the principal pause, Nu 35²⁰, Is 27³, 62², Jer 31³³, Ez 35⁶, Ho 10¹⁰; before the principal pause, ψ 119³³; before a secondary pause, Ez 17²³; even before a conjunctive accent, Jos 23⁵. Before הִיְ־,

¹ חַבַּלְתְּךָ Ct 8⁵ is an exception. כָּם would probably even here have the tone (see e); but no example of the kind occurs in the O. T. In Is 51² the imperfect is used instead of the perfect with a suffix.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

retained in the tone-syllable; an analogous case in *Hiph'il* is וַיִּגְדֵּךְ Dt 32⁷. Less frequently *Sere* is sharpened to *Hireq*, e.g. אֲמַצְכֶם Jb 16⁵, cf. Ex 31¹³, Is 1¹⁵, 52¹²; so in *Po'lel*, Is 25¹, ψ 30², 37³⁴, 145¹, and probably also in *Qal* אֲדַסְפֶּךָ 1 S 15⁶; cf. § 68 h.

g 5. In *Hiph'il* the *i* remains, e.g. תִּלְבִּישֵׁנִי Jb 10¹¹ (after *wāw* consecutive it is often written defectively, e.g. וַיִּלְבֹּשֶׁם Gn 3²¹ and often); but cf. above, *f*, Dt 32⁷. Forms like תַּעֲשִׂירָנָה thou enrichest it, ψ 65¹⁰, 1 S 17²⁵, are rare. Cf. § 53 n.

h 6. Instead of the suffix of the 3rd plur. fem. (ן), the suffix of the 3rd plur. masc. (ם) is affixed to the affirmative ו, to avoid a confusion with the personal ending ון; cf. וַיִּמְלֹאוּם Gn 26¹⁵ (previously also with a perf. סִתְּמוּם); Gn 26¹⁸, 33¹³, Ex 2¹⁷ (where וַיִּשְׁעֶן occurs immediately after); 39^{18,20}, 1 S 6¹⁰ (where also בְּנִיָּהֶם is for בְּנִיָּהֶן, a neglect of gender which can only be explained by § 135 o).—For יִהְרֹגֶן Ze 11⁵ read perhaps יִהְרֹגֶן with M. Lambert.

§ 61. Infinitive, Imperative and Participle with Pronominal Suffixes.

a 1. The *infinitive construct* of an *active verb* may be construed with an accusative, and therefore can also take a *verbal suffix*, i.e. the *accusative* of the personal pronoun. The only undoubted instances of the kind, however, in the O. T. are infinitives with the verbal suffix of the 1st pers. sing., e.g. לְדַרְשֵׁנִי to inquire of me, Jer 37⁷. As a rule the infinitive (as a *noun*) takes *noun-suffixes* (in the *genitive*, which may be either subjective or objective, cf. § 115 c), e.g. עָבְרִי my passing by; מְלִכּוֹ his reigning, see § 115 a and e. The infinitive *Qal*, then, usually has the form *qōtl*, retaining the original short vowel under the first radical (on the probable ground-form *qūtūl*, see § 46 a). The resulting syllable as a rule allows a following *Begadkephath* to be spirant, e.g. בְּכַתְּבוֹ in his writing, Jer 45¹; cf., however, הִפְכִּי Gn 19²¹; נָגְפוֹ (so ed. Mant.; others נָגְפוּ) Ex 12²⁷; עָצְבִּי 1 Ch 4¹⁰; before ׀ and ׀־ also the syllable is completely closed, e.g. בְּאֲסַפֶּךָ Ex 23¹⁶, Lv 23³⁹ (but in pause לְהִרְגֶךָ Gn 27⁴²), unless the vowel be retained in the second syllable; see *d*. With the form קָטַל generally, compare the closely allied nouns of the form קָטַל (before a suffix קָטַל or קָטַל), § 84^a a; § 93 q.

b Rem. 1. The infin. of verbs which have *ō* in the last syllable of the *imperfect* of *Qal*, sometimes takes the form *qitl* before suffixes, e.g. בְּבַגְדוֹ Ex 21⁸; מְכַרְם Am 2⁶ (but מְכַרָּה Ex 21⁸), נָפְלוֹ 2 S 1¹⁰ (but נָפְלוּ 1 S 29³), לְשִׁטְנוֹ Zc 3¹, שְׂבָרִי Lv 26²⁶, Ez 30¹⁸ &c. According to Barth (see above, § 47 *i* with the note) these forms with *i* in the first syllable point to former *i*-imperfects.

c Infinitives of the form קָטַל (§ 45 c) in verbs middle or third guttural (but cf. also שְׂכַבָּה Gn 19^{33,35}—elsewhere שְׂכַבְּךָ and שְׂכַבּוּ) before suffixes sometimes take the form *qatl*, as וַעֲפוּ Jon 1¹⁶ (and, with the syllable loosely closed.

פַּעְמוֹ Ju 13²⁵), מַחֲאֶה and רַקְעָה Ez 25⁶; sometimes *qill*, with the *a* attenuated to *i*, especially in verbs third guttural; as בַּטָּחָה, בִּלְעִי, בִּקְעָם, פִּנְעוּ, פִּתְחִי, פִּנְעוּ, פִּנְעוּ, פִּנְעוּ.—Contrary to § 58 f גִּי (1 Ch 12¹⁷) and נָנִי (Ex 14¹¹) are sometimes found with the *infinitive* instead of גִּי and נָנִי. On רַדּוּפִי *my following* ψ 38²¹ (but *Q^{re} rē* רַדּוּפִי), cf. the analogous examples in § 46 e.

2. With the suffixes הֶ— and כֶּ—, contrary to the analogy of the corresponding nouns, forms occur like אֲכָלְךָ *thy eating*, Gn 2¹⁷; אֲכָלְכֶם Gn 3⁵; עֲמָרְךָ (others עֲמָרְךָ) Ob 11, i. e. with *ō* shortened in the same way as in the *imperfect*, see § 60. But the analogy of the nouns is followed in such forms as קִצְרְכֶם *your harvesting*, Lv 19⁹, 23²² (with retention of the original *ū*), and מֵאֲסַחְכֶם (read *mō'ōs^ekhēm*) *your despising*, Is 30¹²; cf. Dt 20²; on בְּמִצְאֲכֶם Gn 32²⁰ (for בְּמִצְאֲךָ), see § 74 h.—Very unusual are the infinitive suffixes of the 2nd sing. masc. with *energicum* (on the analogy of suffixes with the *imperfect*, § 58 i), as יִסְרְךָ Dt 4³⁶, cf. 23⁵, Jb 33³², all in principal pause.

Examples of the *infinitive Niph'al* with suffixes are, הַשְׁמָרְךָ Ex 14¹⁸; הַשְׁמָרְךָ Dt 28²⁰ (in *pause*, הַשְׁמָרְךָ verse 24); הַשְׁפִּטּוּ ψ 37³³; הַזְכֵּרְכֶם Ez 21²⁹; הַשְׁמָרְךָ Dt 7²³. In the *infinitive* of *Pi'el* (as also in the *imperfect*, see § 60 f) the *ē* before the suff. הֶ—, כֶּ— becomes *S^eghōl*, e. g. הַבְּרָךְ Ex 4¹⁰, and with a sharpening to *i* פִּרְשִׁיכֶם Is 1¹⁶ (see § 60 f). In the *infinitive Pō'el*, בּוֹשִׁיכֶם occurs (with *a* for *ē* or *i*) Am 5¹¹, but probably בּוֹסִיכֶם, with Wellhausen, is the right reading; the correction *Q* has crept into the text alongside of the *corrigendum* *ψ*.

2. The leading form of the *imperative Qal* before *suffixes* (קָטַל) is *f* due probably (see § 46 d) to the retention of the original short vowel of the first syllable (ground-form *qūtūl*). In the *imperative* also *ō* is not followed by *Dageš lene*, e. g. כֹּתְבֵם *kōthbhēm* (not *kōthbēm*), &c.¹ As in the *imperfect* (§ 60 d) and *infinitive* (see above, c), so also in the *imperative*, suffixes are found united to the stem by an *a*-sound; e. g. כֹּתְבָה Is 30⁸; cf. 2 S 12²⁸.—The forms קָטַלְךָ, קָטַלְךָ, which are not exhibited in Paradigm C, undergo no change. Instead of קָטַלְךָ, the masc. form (קָטַלְךָ) is used, as in the *imperfect*.

In verbs which form the *imperative* with *a*, like שְׁלַח (to which class *g* belong especially verbs *middle* and *third guttural*, §§ 64 and 65), this *a* retains its place when pronominal suffixes are added, but, since it then stands in an open syllable, is, as a matter of course, lengthened to *Qames* (just as in *imperfects Qal* in *a*, § 60 c), e. g. שְׁלַחֲנִי *send me*, Is 6⁸, בְּחַגִּנִי ψ 26², קְרֵאֲנִי ψ 50¹⁵, שְׁמַעֲנִי Gn 23⁸. In Am 9¹, בְּצַעֲם (so ed. Mant., Baer, Ginsb., instead of the ordinary reading בְּצַעֲם) is to be explained, with Margolis, *AJSL*. xix, p. 45 ff., from an original בְּצַעְמוֹ, as וְהִרְגַתְמוֹ Am 9⁴ from original וְהִרְגַתְמוֹ.—In the *imperative Hiph'il*, the form used in conjunction with suffixes is not the 2nd *sing. masc.*

¹ שְׁמַרְנִי *šam^ereni* required by the Masora in ψ 16¹ (also שְׁמַרְךָ ψ 86², 119¹⁶⁷; cf. Is 38¹⁴ and עֲמָרְךָ Ob 11), belongs to the disputed cases discussed in § 9 *a* and § 48 i note.

הִקְטִיל, but הִקְטִיל (with *i* on account of the open syllable, cf. § 60 g), e. g. הִקְרִיבָהּ present it, Mal 1⁸.

h 3. Like the infinitives, the participles can also be united with either verbal or noun-suffixes; see § 116 *f*. In both cases the vowel of the participles is shortened or becomes *Šewa* before the suffix, as in the corresponding noun-forms, e. g. from the form קָטַל : קָטַל, &c.; but before *Šewa mobile* יִצְרָךְ, &c., or with the original *i*, אִיבָךְ Ex 23⁴, &c., אִסְפָּךְ 2 K 22²⁰ (coinciding in form with the 1st sing. imperfect *Qal*, 1 S 15⁶; cf. § 68 *h*); with a middle guttural (נִצַּלְךְ), נִצַּלְךְ; with a third guttural, בִּרְאָךְ Is 43¹, but מְשַׁלַּחְךְ, שְׁלַחְךְ Jer 28¹⁶, cf. § 65 *d*. The form מְקַטֵּל, with suffix מְקַטֵּלִי; before *Šewa* sometimes like מְלַמְדְךָ Is 48¹⁷, מְנַחֵמְךָ 51¹², sometimes like מְאַסְפֶּךָ 52¹². In Is 47¹⁰ רִאֲנִי is irregular for רִאֲנִי; instead of the meaningless מְקַלְלוֹנִי Jer 15¹⁰ read קְלָלוּנִי.

Also unusual (see above, *d*) with participles are the suffixes of the 2nd sing. masc. with *energeticum*, as עוֹנֶךָ Jb 5¹; cf. Dt 8⁵, 12^{14.28}.

§ 62. Verbs with Gutturals.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 584 ff.

Verbs which have a guttural for one of the three radicals differ in their inflexion from the ordinary strong verb, according to the general rules in § 22. These differences do not affect the consonantal part of the stem, and it is, therefore, more correct to regard the guttural verbs as a subdivision of the strong verb. At the most, only the entire omission of the strengthening in some of the verbs *middle guttural* (as well as in the *imperfect Niph'al* of verbs *first guttural*) can be regarded as a real weakness (§§ 63 *h*, 64 *e*). On the other hand, some original elements have been preserved in guttural stems, which have degenerated in the ordinary strong verb; e. g. the *ā* of the initial syllable in the *imperfect Qal*, as in יִהַמֵּר, which elsewhere is attenuated to *i*, יִקְטֵל.—In guttural verbs *א* and *ה* are only taken into consideration when they are actual consonants, and not vowel-letters like the *א* in some verbs *א"פ* (§ 68), in a few *א"ע* (§ 73 *g*), and in most *א"ל* (§ 74). In all these cases, however, the *א* was at least originally a full consonant, while the *ה* in verbs *ה"ל* was never anything but a vowel letter, cf. § 75. The really consonantal *ה* at the end of the word is marked by *Mappîq*.—Verbs containing a *ך* also, according to § 22 *q, r*, share some of the peculiarities of the guttural verbs. For more convenient treatment, the cases will be distinguished, according as the guttural is the first, second, or third radical. (Cf. the Paradigms D, E, F, in which only those conjugations are omitted which are wholly regular.)



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

with original *ī* in the first and *ā* in the second syllable, § 67 *n*, and also to the imperfects of verbs י'ע, § 72 *h*; but cf. also יִאָסֵר, יִאָפֵד, and יִהְיֶה; in *Niph.*, e. g. נִהַפֵּךְ; נִחְלִי Am 6⁶, &c.; in *Hiph.* הֶחְסִיר, הֶעֱלִים 2 K 4⁷, &c.: sometimes

(*d*) followed by *Ḥateph-Seghōl*, e. g. יִחְזֹק, יִאָסֵף, יִחַשֵּׁף, יִעַרֵב in *imperfect Qal*; הֶעֱמִיר *Hiph'ûl*; וַעֲנֵשׁ *Niph'al*.

f Rem. With regard to the above examples the following points may also be noted: (1) The forms with a firmly closed syllable (called the hard combination) frequently occur in the same verb with forms containing a loosely closed syllable (the soft combination). (2) In the 1st *sing. imperfect Qal* the preformative *א* invariably takes *Seghōl*, whether in a firmly or loosely closed syllable, e. g. אֶחָבֵשׁ (with the cohortative אֶחָבֵשָׁה), אֶחָסֵר (in *pause*), &c. In Jb 32¹⁷ אֶעֱנֶה must unquestionably be *Hiph'ûl*, since elsewhere the pointing is always אֶעֱ. Cohortatives like אֶהַרְגֵה Gn 27⁴¹ and אֶחָדְלָה Jb 16⁶, are explained by the next remark. (3) The shifting of the tone towards the end frequently causes the *Pathah* of the preformative to change into *Seghōl*, and vice versa, e. g. וַעֲשֵׂה, but נַעֲשֵׂתָה 3rd *sing. fem.*; יִאָסֵף, but תִּאָסְפִי; הֶעֱמִיר, but with *wāw consecutive* וְהֶעֱמִירָה, &c.; so וַיִּחְסְרוּ Gn 8⁸ the plur. of וַיִּחְסֵר, cf. Gn 11⁸; and thus generally a change of the stronger *Ḥateph-Seghōl* group (אֶ) into the lighter *Ḥateph-Pathah* group (אֶ) takes place whenever the tone is moved one place toward the end (cf. § 27 *v*).

g 3. When in forms like יַעֲמֹד, נַעֲמֹד, the vowel of the final syllable becomes a *vocal Šewā* in consequence of the addition of an affirmative (א, י, ה) or suffix, the *compound Šewā* of the guttural is changed into the corresponding short vowel, e. g. יַעֲמֹד, plur. יַעֲמֹדוּ (*ya'-a-me-dhû* as an equivalent for *ya'-me-dhû*); נַעֲזָבָה *she is forsaken*. But even in these forms the hard combination frequently occurs, e. g. יִחַבְלוּ *they take as a pledge* (cf. in the *sing.* תִּחַבֵּל, also יִחַבֵּל); יִחַזְקוּ (also יִחַזְקוּ) *they are strong*. Cf. *m* and, in general, § 22 *m*, § 28 *c*.

h 4. In the *infinitive, imperative, and imperfect Niph'al*, where the first radical should by rule be strengthened (יִקְטֹל, יִקְטֹל), the strengthening is always omitted, and the vowel of the preformative lengthened to *Sere*; יַעֲמֹד for *yi"āmēd*,¹ &c. Cf. § 22 *c*.—For תִּיעֲשֶׂה Ex 25³¹ (according to Dillmann, to prevent the pronunciation תִּעֲשֶׂה, which the LXX and Samaritan follow) read תִּיעֲשֶׂה.

REMARKS.

I. On *Qal*.

i 1. In verbs א"פ the *infinitive construct* and *imperative* take *Ḥateph-Seghōl* in the first syllable (according to § 22 *o*), e. g. אָזַר *gird thou*, Jb 38³, אָהַב *love thou*,

¹ יַעֲמֹד Jb 19⁷ (so even the Mantua ed.) is altogether abnormal: read יַעֲמֹד, with Baer, Ginsb.

Ho 3¹, אָחַז seize thou, Ex 4⁴ (on אָפּוּ bake ye, Ex 16²³, see § 76 d); אָכַל to eat; infinitive with a prefix לֵאחֹז, לֵאכַל, כֵּאכַל Is 5²⁴; לֵאחֹב Ec 3⁸. Sometimes, however, *Hateph-Pathah* is found as well, e. g. infinitive אָחֹז 1 K 6⁶; בֵּאכַל הָאִישׁ Nu 26¹⁰ (before a suffix אֲכַלְךָ, אֲמַרְךָ, אֲכַלְכֶם, אֲמַרְכֶם § 61 d); cf. Dt 7²⁰, 12²³, Ez 25⁸, ψ 102⁵, Pr 25⁷ (אֲמַרְלֶךָ), Jb 34¹⁸, always in close connexion with the following word. With a firmly closed syllable after ל cf. לַחֲסוֹת Is 30²; לַחֲפֹר Jos 2^{2 f.} (on Is 2²⁰, cf. § 84^{b n}); לַחֲתוֹת Is 30¹⁴, Hag 2¹⁶; קָחֶשֶׁב Ex 31⁴, &c.; לְעוֹר 2 S 18³ *Qeré*, but also בְּעוֹר 1 Ch 15²⁶.

הַחֲרַלְתִּי Ju 9^{9.11.13} is altogether anomalous, and only a few authorities give *h* (Hiph'il), adopted by Moore in Haupt's Bible. According to Qimhi, Olshausen, and others, the Masora intended a *perfect Hoph'al* with syncope of the preformative after the ה interrogative = הַחֲרַלְתִּי, or (according to Olshausen) with the omission of the ה interrogative. But since the *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* of חַרַל nowhere occur, it is difficult to believe that such was the intention of the Masora. We should expect the *perfect Qal*, הַחֲרַלְתִּי. But the *Qames* under the ח, falling between the tone and counter-tone, was naturally less emphasized than in חַרַלְתִּי, without the ה interrogative. Consequently it was weakened, not to simple *Šewā*, but to $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$, in order to represent the sound of the *Qames* (likewise pronounced as *ā*) at least in a shortened form. The *Seghól* of the ה interrogative is explained, in any case, from § 100 n (cf. the similar pointing of the article, e. g. in הַחֲרַשִּׁים, § 35 k). For the accusative after חַרַל, instead of the usual מִן, Jb 3¹⁷ affords sufficient evidence.

Also in the other forms of the *imperative* the guttural not infrequently influences the vowel, causing a change of *i* (on this *i* cf. § 48 i) into *Seghól*, e. g. אֶסְפָּה gather thou, Nu 11¹⁶; עֲרְבָה set in order, Jb 33⁵; חֲשֹׁף strip off, Is 47² (on this irregular *Dageš* cf. § 46 d), especially when the second radical is also a guttural, e. g. אֶהְבֵּנו Am 5¹⁶, ψ 31²⁴; cf. Zc 8¹⁹; אֶחֱזֶה Ct 2¹⁵; cf. also in verbs לִהַלּוּ sing ye, Nu 21¹⁷, ψ 147⁷ (compared with עֲנֵנו answer ye, 1 S 12³) and אֶלִּי Jo 1⁸.—*Pathah* occurs in חַבְלֵהוּ hold him in pledge, Pr 20¹⁶, and probably also in ψ 9¹⁴ (חַנְנִי).—As a pausal form for חַרְבִּי (cf. the plur. Jer 2¹²) we find in Is 44²⁷ חַרְבִּי (cf. the imperf. יַחַרְבֵּ) with the *ō* repeated in the form of a *Hateph-Qames*. For other examples of this kind, see § 10 h and § 46 e.

2. The pronunciation (mentioned above, No. 2) of the imperfects in *ā* with *Seghól* under the preformative in a firmly closed syllable (e. g. יַחַבְּ, יַחַבֵּם) regularly gives way to the soft combination in verbs which are at the same time ל"ה, e. g. יַחֲוֶה, יַחֲצֶה &c. (but cf. יַהֲוֶה &c., יַחֲתֶה Pr 6²⁷, יַעֲשֶׂה ed. Mant., Ex 3²⁰). Even in the strong verb יַחֲזֹק is found along with יַחֲזֹק. Cf. also יַתְעַנֵּב Ez 23⁵; יַעֲקֹבֵנִי Gn 27³⁶ (so Ben-Asher; but Ben-Naphtali יַעֲקֹבֵנִי); יַתְחַלְקֶם Neh 9²², and so always in the *imperfect Qal* of עוֹר with suffixes, Gn 49²⁵, &c.—תַּאֲרֵבֵנִי Pr 1²² is to be explained from the endeavour to avoid too great an accumulation of short sounds by the insertion of a long vowel, but it is a question whether we should not simply read תַּאֲרֵבֵנִי with Haupt in his Bible, *Proverbs*, p. 34, l. 44 ff.; cf. the analogous instances under *p*, and

such nouns as בָּאֵר, וְיָאֵב, § 93 t.—On יִחְבְּרֶהָ ψ 94²⁰ for יִחְבְּרֶהָ (according to Qimḥi, and others, rather *Pu'al*) cf. § 60 b.

n אֲמַטִּים ψ 58⁵ and יַעֲרִים to deal subtilly, 1 S 23²², Pr 15⁵, 19²⁵, may be explained with Barth (ZDMG. 1889, p. 179) as *i*-imperfects (see above, § 47 i),—the latter for the purpose of distinction from the causative יַעֲרִים ψ 83⁴.—Instead of the unintelligible form וַיַּחֲלֶקְם (so ed. Mant.; Baer and Ginsb. as in 24⁹) 1 Ch 23⁶ and וַיַּחֲ' 24³ (partly analogous to הַתְּעַבְּרֶם § 60 b) the Qal וַיַּחֲלֶקְם is to be read. The form יִרְדֶּהָ ψ 7⁶ which is, according to Qimḥi (in *Mikhlol*; but in his Lexicon he explains it as *Hithpa'el*), a composite form of Qal (יִרְדֶּהָ) and *Pi'el* (יִרְדֶּהָ), can only be understood as a development of יִרְדֶּהָ (cf. § 64 h on יַצַּחֵק, and § 69 x on תַּהַלֵּךְ Ex 9²³, ψ 73⁹). Pathah has taken the place of *Hateph-Pathah*, but as a mere helping-vowel (as in שִׁמְעֵתָ § 28 e, note 2) and without preventing the closing of the syllable. It is much simpler, however, to take it as a *forma mixta*, combining the readings יִרְדֶּהָ (impf. Qal) and יִרְדֶּהָ (impf. *Pi'el*).

II. On *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*.

O 3. The above-mentioned (*f*, 3) change of $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ to $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ occurs in the perfect *Hiph'il*, especially when *wāw* consecutive precedes, and the tone is in consequence thrown forward upon the affirmative, e. g. הֶעֱמַרְתָּ, but וְהֶעֱמַרְתָּ Nu 3⁶, 8¹³, 27¹⁹; הֶעֱבַרְתִּי, but וְהֶעֱבַרְתִּי Jer 15¹⁴, Ez 2c³⁷; even in the 3rd sing. וְהֶאֱוִין ψ 77².—On the contrary $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ occurs instead of $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ in the imperative *Hiph'il*, Jer 49^{8,30}; and in the infinitive Jer 31³². The preformative of עָתָר in *Hiph'il* always takes *a* in a closed syllable: Ex 8⁴ הֶעֱתִירוּ; verse 5 אֶעֱתִיר; also verse 25 and Jb 22²⁷.

p 4. In the perfect *Hiph'il* $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ is sometimes changed into $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$, and in *Hoph'al* $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ into $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ (cf. § 23 h); הֶעֱבַרְתָּ Jos 7⁷, הֶעֱלָה Hb 1¹⁵, הֶעֱלָה Ju 6²⁸, 2 Ch 2c³⁴, Na 2⁸, always before *y*, and hence evidently with the intention of strengthening the countertone-syllable (הֶ or הֶ) before the guttural. On a further case of this kind (זֶעֱמָה) see § 64 c. Something similar occurs in the formation of segholate nouns of the form *qōtl*; cf. § 93 q, and (on אֲמוֹן &c. for אֲמוֹן) § 84^a q.—In the imperfect consecutive בּוֹ וַיַּחֲזֶק the tone is thrown back on to the first syllable. On the *Hoph'al* הַתְּעַבְּרֶם Ex 20⁶, &c., see § 60 b.

III. הִיָּה and חִיָּה.

q 5. In the verbs הִיָּה to be, and חִיָּה to live, the guttural hardly ever affects the addition of preformatives; thus imperfect Qal יִהְיֶה and יַחֲיֶה, *Niph'al* נִהְיֶה; but in the perfect *Hiph'il* הִחִיָּה (2nd plur. וְהִחִיָּתֶם Jos 2¹³, and even without *wāw* consecutive, Ju 8¹⁹). Initial ה always has *Hateph-Seghol* instead of vocal *Šewā*; הִיָּה, הִיָּוֹת, הִיָּוֹתֶם 1 S 25⁷, הִיָּיִתֶם (except הִיָּי be thou! fem. Gn 24⁶⁰). The 2nd sing. fem. imperative of חִיָּה is חִיִּי live thou, Ez 16⁶; the infinitive, with suffix, חִיֹּתֶם Jos 5⁸. After the prefixes וּ, בְּ, כִּ, לְ, מְ (= מִן) both ה and ח retain the simple *Šewā* (§ 28 b) and the prefix takes *i*, as elsewhere before strong consonants with *Šewā*; hence in the perfect Qal וְהִיָּתֶם, imperative וְהִיָּה, infinitive לְהִיָּוֹת, בְּהִיָּוֹת &c. (cf. § 16 f, ε). The only exception is the 2nd sing. masc. of the imperative after *wāw*; וְהִיָּה Gn 12², &c., וְחִיָּה Gn 20⁷.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

but \aleph and γ always have \bar{e} in 3rd *sing.*—On the *infinitive* with suffixes, cf. § 61 b.

d 3. In *Pi'el*, *Pu'al*, and *Hithpa'el*, the *Dageš forte* being inadmissible in the middle radical, the preceding vowel, especially before ה, ח, and γ , nevertheless, generally remains short, and the guttural is consequently to be regarded as, at least, *virtually* strengthened, cf. § 22 c; e. g. *Pi'el* שִׁחַק, נָחַל, Jos 14¹, וּבְעָרְתִּי 1 K 14¹⁰, נָהַג Ex 10¹³ (cf., however, אָחַר Gn 34¹⁹; גִּהְלִיתָ Ex 15¹³, but in the *imperfect* and *participle* יִנְהַל, &c.; in verbs ה"ל, e. g. רָעָה), *infinitive* שִׁחַק, *Pu'al* רָחַץ (but cf. דָּחוּ ψ 36¹³ from דָּחָה, also the unusual position of the tone in בָּחַן¹ Ez 21¹⁸, and in the *perfect* *Hithpa'el* הִתְרַחֵצְתִּי Jb 9³⁰); *Hithpa'el* *perfect* and *imperative* הִטְהַרְרִי, &c.; in *pause* (see §§ 22 c, 27 q, 29 v, 54 k) הִטְהַרְרִי Nu 8⁷, 2 Ch 30¹⁸; יִתְנַחֵם Nu 23¹⁹, &c.

e The complete omission of the strengthening, and a consequent lengthening of the preceding vowel, occurs invariably only with ר (Ez 16⁴ is an exception; פָּרַתָּה also occurs, Ju 6²⁸), e. g. בָּרַךְ (in *pause* בָּרַךְ), *imperfect* יִבְרַךְ, *Pu'al* בִּרַךְ. Before \aleph it occurs regularly in the stems בָּאֵר, גָּאֵל, מָאֵן, פָּאֵר, and in the *Hithpa'el* of בָּאֵשׁ, רָאָה, שָׂאָה; on the other hand, \aleph is *virtually* strengthened in the *perfects*, נִאָּר (once in the *imperfect*, Jer 29²³) *to commit adultery*, נִאָּץ *to despise* (in the *participle*, Nu 14²³, Is 60¹⁴, Jer 23¹⁷; according to Baer, but not ed. Mant., or Ginsb., even in the *imperfect* יִנְאָץ ψ 74¹⁰), נִאָּר *to abhor* La 2⁷ (also נִאָּרְתָּה ψ 89⁴⁰) and שָׂאֵל ψ 109¹⁰; moreover, in the *infinitive* יִאָּשׁ Ec 2²⁰, according to the best reading. On the *Mappiq* in the *Pu'al* רָאִי Jb 33²¹, cf. § 14 d.

f Rem. 1. In the verb שָׂאֵל *to ask, to beg*, some forms of the *perfect* *Qal* appear to be based upon a secondary form *middle e*, which is *Sere* when the vowel of the \aleph stands in an open syllable, cf. שָׂאֵלְךָ Gn 32¹⁸, Ju 4²⁰; שָׂאֵלוֹנִי ψ 137³; but in a closed syllable, even without a suffix, שָׂאֵלְתָם 1 S 12¹³, 25⁵, Jb 21²⁹; שָׂאֵלְתִּיהוּ Ju 13⁶, 1 S 1²⁰. Cf., however, similar cases of attenuation of an original \bar{a} , § 69 s, and especially § 44 d. In the first three examples, if explained on that analogy, the \bar{i} attenuated from \bar{a} would have been lengthened to \bar{e} (before the tone); in the next three \bar{i} would have been modified to \bar{e} . Also in the *Hiph'il*-form הִשָּׂאֵלְתִּיהוּ 1 S 1²⁸ the \aleph is merely attenuated from \aleph .

g 2. In *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el* the lengthening of the vowel before the guttural causes the tone to be thrown back upon the penultima, and consequently the *Sere* of the ultima to be shortened to *S^eghól*. Thus (a) before monosyllables, according to § 29 e, e. g. לְשָׂרְתָּ שָׁם *to minister there*, Dt 17¹², even in the case of a guttural which is *virtually* strengthened, Gn 39¹⁴, Jb 8¹⁸ (see § 29 g). (b) after *wāw* consecutive, e. g. וַיְבָרֶךְ and he blessed, Gn 1²² and frequently, וַיִּגְרֶשׁ and he drove out, Ex 10¹¹, וַיִּתְחַפְּעוּ Dn 2¹.

¹ בָּחַן is explained by Abulwalid as the 3rd pers. *perfect* *Pu'al*, but by Qimhi as a noun.

3. The following are a few rarer anomalies; in the *imperfect Qal* יִצְחָק Gn 21⁶ *h* (elsewhere קִצְחָק, &c., in *pause* קִצְחָק, cf. § 10 g (c) and § 63 n); וַיִּצְחָק Gn 32⁵ (for וַיִּצְחָק); in the *perfect Pi'el* אֶחָרָו Ju 5²⁸ (perhaps primarily for אֶחָרָו; according to Gn 34¹⁹ אֶחָרָו would be expected), and similarly יִחַמְתָּנִי ψ 51⁷ for יִחַמְתָּנִי; in the *imperative Pi'el* קָרַב Ez 37¹⁷ (cf. above, § 52 n); finally, in the *imperative Hiph'il* הִרְחַק Jb 13²¹ and הִמְעַר ψ 69²⁴, in both cases probably influenced by the closing conso. ant, and by the preference for *Pathah* in *pause* (according to § 29 q); without the *pause* הִרְחַק Pr 4²⁴, &c.; but also הִנְחַח Jo 4¹¹.

4. As *infinitive Hithpa'el* with a suffix we find הִתְיַחֲשָׁם Ezr 8¹, &c., with *i* a firmly closed syllable, also the *participle* מְתִיחָשִׁים Neh 7⁶⁴; Baer, however, reads in all these cases, on good authority, הִתְיַחֲשָׁם &c.—The quite meaningless *Kethibh* וַנִּשְׂאָר Ez 9⁸ (for which the *Qere* requires the equally unintelligible וַנִּשְׂאָר) evidently combines two different readings, viz. וַנִּשְׂאָר (*part. Niph.*) and וַנִּשְׂאָר (*imperf. consec.*); cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, i. p. 266 f.—In יִתְאַרְהוּ Is 44¹³ (also יִתְאַרְהוּ in the same verse) an *imperfect Pô'el* appears to be intended by the Masora with an irregular shortening of the *ô* for 'יִתְאַרְ; cf. § 55 b מִלְשָׁנִי ψ 101⁵ *Qere*; on the other hand Qimhi, with whom Delitzsch agrees, explains the form as *Pi'el*, with an irregular ־ for ־ , as in the reading אֶלְקָטָה Ru 2²⁷; cf. § 10 h.

5. A few examples in which *Ṣ*, as middle radical, entirely loses its consonantal value and quiesces in a vowel, will be found in § 73 g.

§ 65. *Verbs Third Guttural*, e.g. שָׁלַח to send.¹

1. According to § 22 d, when the last syllable has a vowel incompatible with the guttural (i.e. *not* an *a*-sound), two possibilities present themselves, viz. either the regular vowel *remains*, and the guttural then takes *furtive Pathah*, or *Pathah* (in *pause Qames*) takes its place. More particularly it is to be remarked that—

(a) The unchangeable vowels ־ , ־ , ־ (§ 25 b) are always retained, even under such circumstances; hence *inf. abs. Qal* שָׁלוּחַ, *part. pass.* שָׁלוּחַ, *Hiph.* הִשְׁלִיחַ, *imperf.* יִשְׁלִיחַ, *part.* מִשְׁלִיחַ. So also the less firm ־ in the *inf. constr.* שָׁלַח is almost always retained: cf., however, שָׁלַח, in close connexion with a substantive, Is 58⁹, and שָׁלַח Nu 20³. Examples of the *infinitive* with suffixes are שָׁלַחְךָ Gn 35¹; שָׁלַחְנוּ Nu 35¹⁹; לְרַבְעָה Lv 18²³, &c.

(b) The *imperfect* and *imperative Qal* almost always have ־ in the *second* syllable, sometimes, no doubt, due simply to the influence of the guttural (for a tone-long ־ , originally ־), but sometimes as being the original vowel, thus שָׁלַח, שָׁלַח, &c.; with suffixes שָׁלַחְנִי, שָׁלַחְנִי, see § 60 c.

¹ Verbs הִלֵּךְ in which the ה is *consonantal* obviously belong also to this class; e.g. הִלֵּךְ to be high, הִלֵּךְ to be astonished, הִלֵּךְ (only in *Hithpa'el*) to delay.

Exceptions, in the *imperfect* אסלוח Jer 5⁷, *Keth.* (חלח Q^{eré}); in the *imperative* טבח Gn 43¹⁶. On such cases as אפשע Is 27⁴, cf. § 10 h.

c (c) Where *Sere* would be the regular vowel of the final syllable, both forms (with \bar{e}^a and \bar{a}) are sometimes in use; the choice of one or the other is decided by the special circumstances of the tone, i. e. :—

d Rem. 1. In the *absolute state* of the *participle Qal*, *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el*, the forms שלח (with suff. שלחי, but שלחך), משלח (with suff. משלחך), and משתיע are used exclusively; except in verbs ע"ל where we find, in close connexion, also נטע ψ 94⁹, רגע Is 51¹⁵, Jer 31³⁵, רקע Is 42⁵, 44²⁴, רוקע ψ 136⁶, שצע Lv 11⁷, all with the tone on the last syllable.—The part. Pu'al is מרבע Ez 45² according to the best authorities (Kittel מרבע).

e 2. Similarly, in the *imperf.* and *inf. Niph'al*, and in the *perf. inf.* and *imperf. Pi'el* the (probably more original) form with \bar{a} commonly occurs in the body of the sentence, and the fuller form with \bar{e}^a in *pause* (and even with the lesser distinctives, e. g. with *D^ehi* ψ 86⁴ in the *imperative Pi'el*; with *Tiphha* 1 K 12³² in the *infinitive Pi'el*; Jer 4³¹ *imperfect Hithpa'el*; Jer 16⁶ *imperfect Niph'al*), cf. e. g. יגרע Nu 27⁴, with יגרע 36³; וישבע Dt 1³⁴, even with retraction of the tone in the *inf. abs. Niph'al* השבע Nu 30³ (elsewhere השבע Jer 7⁹, 12¹⁶ twice, in each case without the pause); התבקע Hb 3⁹, with התבקע Ez 13¹¹; בלע to devour Hb 1¹³, Nu 4²⁰ with בלע La 2⁸; for *infinitive Hithpa'el*, cf. Is 28²⁰. The *infinitive absolute Pi'el* has the form שלח Dt 22⁷, 1 K 11²²; the *infinitive construct*, on the other hand, when without the pause is always as שלח except לשלח Ex 10⁴.— ינבח Hb 1¹⁶ has \bar{e} , though not in *pause*, and even וינבח 2 K 16⁴, 2 Ch 28⁴; but *a* in *pause* in the *imperative Niph'al* האנח Ez 21¹¹; *jussive Pi'el* תאחר ψ 40¹⁸; cf. § 52 n. An example of \bar{a} in the *imperative Pi'el* under the influence of a final ר is כתר Jb 36², in the *imperfect Niph'al* ותעצר Nu 17¹³, &c.—In יפרח Jb 14⁹ (cf. ψ 92¹⁴, Pr 14¹¹), Barth (see above, § 63 n) finds an *i-imperfect* of *Qal*, since the intransitive meaning is only found in *Qal*.

f 3. In the 2nd *sing. masc.* of the *imperative*, and in the forms of the *jussive* and *imperfect consecutive* of *Hiph'il* which end in gutturals, *a* alone occurs, e. g. הצלח prosper thou, יבטח let him make to trust, ויצמח and he made to grow (so in *Hithpalpel* יתמהמה, &c., Hb 2³); even in *pause* ויצלח 1 Ch 29²³, and, with the best authorities, ויזבח 1 Ch 12¹⁷; וישע Is 35⁴ is perhaps to be emended into וישע (= וישע).—In the *infinitive absolute Sere* remains, e. g. הגבה to make high; as *infinitive construct* הזבח also occurs in close connexion (Jb 6²⁶); on הזע as *infinitive construct* (1 S 25^{26.33}), cf. § 53 k.

g 2. When the guttural with *quiescent S^ewa* stands at the end of a syllable, the ordinary strong form remains when not connected with suffixes, e. g. שלחתי, שלחתי. But in the 2nd *sing. fem. perfect* a *helping-Pathah* takes the place of the *S^ewa*, שכתה Jer 13²⁵ (§ 28 e); also in 1 K 14³, לקחת is to be read, not לקחת.

h Rem. The soft combination with *compound S^ewa* occurs only in the 1st *plur. perfect* with suffixes, since in these forms the tone is thrown one place farther forward, e. g. ידענוך we know thee, Ho 8² (cf. Gn 26²⁹, ψ 44¹⁸, 132⁶). Before the suffixes ח and כם, the guttural must have \bar{a} , e. g. אשלחך I will send thee, 1 S 16¹; ואשלחך Gn 31²⁷; אשמיעך Jer 18².

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



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

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

The other forms are all quite regular, e. g. the *perfect, infinitive absolute* and *participle Qal*, all *Pi'el*, *Pu'al*, &c.

In Paradigm H, only those conjugations are given which differ from the regular form.

e The *characteristic* of these verbs in all forms with a *preformative* is *Dageš* following it in the second radical. Such forms, however, are also found in certain verbs י"פ (§ 71), and even in verbs ע"ע (§ 67). The *infinitive* תִּשָּׁא and the *imperative* שִׂא, also שִׂא (Gn 19⁹) and תִּן, resemble the corresponding forms of verbs פ"ו (§ 69).—On יִקַּח, קַח, and קַחַח, from לָקַח *to take*, see *g*.—In יִקוּם (*imperfect Niph'al* of קוּם), and in similar forms of verbs ע"ע (§ 72), the *full* writing of the *ô* indicates, as a rule, that they are not to be regarded as *imperfects Qal* of נִקַּם, &c.—Also אֲסַק (ψ 139⁸) is not to be derived from נִסַּק, but stands for אֲסַלֵּק (with a sharpening of the *ס* as compensation for the loss of the *ל*), from אֲסַלֵּק *to ascend*, see § 19 *f*, and Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 44. Similarly the *Hiph'il*-forms הִשִּׁיקוּ Ez 39⁹, הִשִּׁיק Is 44¹⁵, and the *Niph'al* נִשְׁקָה ψ 78²¹ are most probably from a stem שִׁלַּק, not נִשְׁקַ.

f Rem. 1. The instances are comparatively few in which the forms retain their *Nûn* before a firm consonant, e. g. יִנָּטַר, *imperfect* יִנָּטַר Jer 3⁵ (elsewhere יִפֹּר); also from נָצַר the *pausal* form is *always* יִנָּצַר (without the *pause* יִצַּר Pr 20²⁸); similarly in Is 29¹, 58³, ψ 61⁸, 68³ (where, however, הִתְנַדֵּר is intended), 140^{2,5}, Pr 2¹¹, Jb 40²¹, the retention of the *Nûn* is always connected with the *pause*. In *Niph'al* this never occurs (except in the irregular *inf.* פָּהֲנֵדָה ψ 68³, cf. § 51 *k*), in *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* very seldom; e. g. לְהִתְנַדֵּר Ez 22²⁰, הִתְנַדֵּרוּ Ju 20³¹; for לְנַפֵּל Nu 5²² read לְנַפֵּל, according to § 53 *q*. On the other hand, the *Nûn* is regularly retained in all verbs, of which the second radical is a guttural, e. g. יִנָּחַל *he will possess*, although there are rare cases like יִחַת (also יִנָּחַת) *he will descend*, Jer 21¹³ (even יִחַת Pr 17¹⁰; without apparent reason accented as *Mil'el*), plur. יִחַתוּ Jb 21¹³ (cf. § 20 *i*; the Masora, however, probably regards יִחַת and יִחַתוּ as *imperfect Niph'al* from יִחַת); *Niph'al* נָחַם for נִנָּחַם *he has grieved*.

g 2. The *ל* of לָקַח *to take* is treated like the *Nûn* of verbs פ"ו (§ 19 *d*). Hence *imperfect Qal* יִקַּח, *cohortative* (§ 20 *m*) אֲקַח, *imperative* קַח, in *pause* and

¹ Cf. Mayer Lambert, 'Le futur qal des verbes פ"ו, פ"ו, פ"פ,' in the *REJ.* xxvii. 136 ff.

² An *imperfect* in *a* (יִינָאֵשׁ) is given in the Paradigm, simply because it is the actual form in use in this verb.

before suffixes קָרַ (on קָרַם־נָרַ Gn 48⁹, see § 61 g), *paragogic* form קָרַה; קָרַי, &c. (but cf. also לָקַח Ex 29¹, Ez 37¹⁶, Pr 20¹⁶, לָקַחְי 1 K 17¹¹, perhaps a mistake for קָרַי לָהּ, cf. LXX and Lucian); *infinitive construct* קָרַח (once קָרַח 2 K 12⁹, cf. § 93 h); with לָ, לָקַחְתָּ; with suffix קָרַחְי; *Hoph'al* (cf., however, § 53 u) *imperfect* יִקְרַח; *Niph'al*, however, is always נִלְקַח.—The meaningless form קָרַ Ez 17⁵ is a mistake; for the equally meaningless קָרַח Ho 11³ read וַיִּקְרַחְם.

3. The verb נָתַן *to give*, mentioned above in d, is the only example of a *lu* verb נ"ד with *imperfect* in ē (יִתֵּן for *yintēn*; נָתַן¹ only in Ju 16⁵, elsewhere before *Maqqeph* יִתֵּן, &c.), and a corresponding *imperative* יֵתֵן or (very frequently) יִתֵּן (but in ψ 8² the very strange reading יִתֵּן is no doubt simply meant by the Masora to suggest יִתֵּן); before *Maqqeph* יִתֵּן, *fem.* יִתֵּן, &c. Moreover, this very common verb has the peculiarity that its final *Nûn*, as a weak nasal, is also assimilated; נָתַתִּי for *nāthāntī*, נָתַתָּ or, very frequently, נָתַתָּה, with a kind of orthographic compensation for the assimilated *Nûn* (cf. § 44 g); *Niph'al perfect* נָתַתָּ Lv 26²⁵, Ezr 9⁷.

In the *infinitive construct Qal* the ground-form *tint* is not lengthened to *tēneth i* (as תִּתְּנֵנִי from נָתַתָּ), but contracted to *titt*, which is then correctly lengthened to תִּתֵּן, with the omission of *Dageš forte* in the final consonant, see § 20 l; but with suffixes יִתֵּן, יִתֵּנוּ, &c.; before *Maqqeph* with the prefix לָ = לָתַתְּ, e. g. Ex 5²¹, and even when closely connected by other means, e. g. Gn 15⁷. However, the strong formation of the *infinitive construct* also occurs in נָתַן Nu 20²¹ and נָתַן־ Gn 38⁹; cf. § 69 m, note 2. On the other hand, for לָתַתְּ 1 K 6¹⁹ read either לָתַתְּ or simply תַּתְּ, just as the *Qeré*, 1 K 17¹⁴, requires תַּתְּ for תַּתְּ.

In other stems, the נ is retained as the third radical, e. g. שָׁבַתְּ, cf. *lu* § 19 c and § 44 o. On the entirely anomalous aphaeresis of the *Nûn* with a strong vowel in תַּתְּ (for תַּתְּ) 2 S 22⁴¹, cf. § 19 i.—On the *passive imperfect* יִתֵּן, cf. § 53 u.

§ 67. *Verbs y"y*, e. g. סָבַב *to surround*.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 155 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 632 ff.

1. A large number of Semitic stems have verbal forms with only *a* two radicals, as well as forms in which the stem has been made trilateral by a *repetition of the second radical*, hence called verbs *y"y*. Forms with two radicals were formerly explained as being due to contraction from original forms with three radicals. It is more correct

¹ P. Haupt on Ju 16⁵ in his Bible, compares the form of the Assyrian imperfect *iddan* or *ittan* (besides *inādin*, *ināmdin*) from *nadānu* = יִתֵּן. But could this one passage be the only trace left in Hebrew of an imperf. in a from יִתֵּן?

to regard them as representing the original stem (with two radicals), and the forms with the second radical repeated as subsequently developed from the monosyllabic stem.¹ The appearance of a general contraction of trilateral stems is due to the fact that in biliteral forms the second radical regularly receives *Dageš forte* before affirmatives, except in the cases noted in § 22 b and q. This points, however, not to an actual doubling, but merely to a strengthening of the consonant, giving more body to the monosyllabic stem, and making it approximate more to the character of trilateral forms.

The development of biliteral to trilateral stems (y"ע) generally takes place in the 3rd *sing. masc. and fem.* and 3rd *plur. perfect Qal* of *transitive* verbs, or at any rate of verbs expressing an activity, e. g. סָבַב, סָבְבָה, סָבְבוּ : סָבְבוּ Gn 33⁵ (but with suffix סָבְבוּנִי, ver. 11); sometimes with an evident distinction between transitive and intransitive forms, as צָרַר to *make strait*, צָר to *be in a strait*; see further details, including the exceptions, in aa. The development of the stem takes place (a) necessarily whenever the strengthening of the 2nd radical is required by the character of the form (e. g. שָׁרַר, חָלַל), and (b) as a rule, whenever the 2nd radical is followed or preceded by an essentially long vowel, as, in Qal, סָבַב, סָבְבוּ, in Pô'el and Pô'al, סוּבַב, סוּבְבוּ.

b 2. The biliteral stem always (except in *Hiph'il* and the *imperfect Niph'al*, see below) takes the vowel which would have been required between the *second* and *third* radical of the ordinary strong form, or which stood in the ground-form, since that vowel is characteristic of the form (§ 43 b), e. g. תָּם answering to קָטַל, תָּמָה to the ground-form *qātālāt*, תָּמוּ to the ground-form *qātālû*; *infinitive*, טַב to קָטַל.

c 3. The insertion of *Dageš forte* (mentioned under a), for the purpose of strengthening the second radical, never takes place (see § 20 l) in the final consonant of the word, e. g. תָּם, טַב, not תָּמ, טָב; but it appears again on the addition of affirmatives or suffixes, e. g. תָּמוּ, טָבוּ, &c.

d 4. When the affirmative begins with a consonant (ג, ח), and hence the strongly pronounced second radical would properly come at the end of a closed syllable, a *separating vowel* is inserted between the stem-syllable and the affirmative. In the *perfect* this vowel is ו, in the *imperative* and *imperfect* 'ֿ, e. g. סָבְבוּ, סָבְבוּ, *imperfect* תָּסְבְּבוּ (for *sabb-tā, sabb-nû, tasōbb-nā*). The artificial opening of the syllable

¹ So (partly following Ewald and Böttcher) A. Müller, *ZDMG.* xxxiii. p. 698 ff.; Stade, *Lehrbuch*, § 385 b, c; Nöldeke, and more recently Wellhausen, 'Ueber einige Arten schwacher Verba im Hebr.' (*Skizzen u. Vorarb.* vi. 250 ff.). Against Böttcher see M. Lambert, *REJ.* xxxv. 330 ff., and Brockelmann, as above.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

h 6. The original vowel is retained, see *f*, (a) in the preformative of the *imperfect Qal* יָסַב for *yă-sōb* (cf. §§ 47 *b*, 63 *b*, and for verbs י"ע § 72); (b) in the *perfect Niph'al* נָסַב for *nă-sāb* (§ 51 *a*); (c) in *Hoph'al* הוּסַב, with irregular lengthening (no doubt on the analogy of verbs הו"ו) for *hōsāb* from *hū-sab*, imperfect יוּסַב from *yū-sab*, &c.

i On the other hand, an already attenuated vowel (*i*) underlies the intransitive *imperfects Qal* with *ă* in the second syllable (probably for the sake of dissimilating the two vowels), e. g. יָמַר for *yĭ-mār* (see *p*); and in the preformative of *Hiph'il* הִסִּיב from *hĭ-sēb* (ground-form הִקְטִיל, § 53 *a*), as well as of the participle מְסִיב (ground-form מְקִטִּיל), on the analogy of the perfect. In the second syllable of the Perf. the underlying vowel is *ĭ*, attenuated from an original *ă*, which in the strong verb is abnormally lengthened to *î* (§ 53 *a*). The *ē* lengthened from *ĭ* is, of course, only tone-long, and hence when without the tone and before *Dageš forte* we have e. g. הִסְבֹּת. On the retention of the original *ă* in the second syllable, cf. *v*.

k 7. The *tone*, as a general rule, tends to keep to the stem-syllable, and does not (as in the strong verb) pass to the affirmatives הָ—, י and י— (2nd *sing. fem. imperfect*); e. g. 3rd *sing. fem. perfect* הִתְהַיְתָה, in *pause* הִתְהַיְתָה; with *ר* and gutturals מָרָה (for מַרָה), שָׁחָה ψ 44²⁶; on the other hand, with *wāw* consecutive וּרְבָה Is 6¹² (but וַחֲתִיָּה Ex 1¹⁶). In the 3rd *plur. perfect* the tone-syllable varies; along with קָלוּ, רָלוּ, we also find קָלוּ and קָלוּ, רָבוּ Is 59¹², שָׁחוּ Hb 3⁶, &c.; but in *pause* always הָתָמוּ, הָתָמוּ, &c. The tone likewise remains on the stem-syllable in the *imperfect Qal* in תָּסַב, יָסַב; *perfect Hiph'il* הִסְבָּה, הִסְבִּי; *imperfect* תָּסַב, יָסַב, &c. In the forms with separating vowels, the tone is moved forward to these vowels (or to the final syllable, cf. *ee*), e. g. סִבֹּת, תָּסַבְיָה, &c.; except before the endings תָּם and תָּן in the *perfect*, which always bear the tone. This shifting of the tone naturally causes the shortening of the merely tone-long vowels *ē* and *ō* to *ĭ* and *ŭ* (or *ö*, see *n*), hence הִסְבֹּת from הִסִּיב, תָּסַבְיָה from יָסַב; on cases in which the vowel of the preformative becomes *Šewā*, see above, *f*.

l 8. In several verbs *y"y*, instead of *Pi'el*, *Pu'al* and *Hithpa'el*, the less frequent conjugation *Pō'el*, with its passive and reflexive, occurs (most probably on the analogy of the corresponding forms of verbs י"ע, cf. § 72 *m*), generally with the same meaning,¹ e. g. עוֹלֵל to *ill-treat*, passive עוֹלָל, reflexive הִתְעוֹלֵל (from עָלַל; cf. the *Hithpō'el* from רָעַע

¹ Sometimes both *Pi'el* and *Pō'el* are formed from the same stem, though with a difference of meaning, e. g. רָצַץ to *break in pieces*, רָצַץ to *oppress*; חָנַן to *make pleasing*, חָנַן to *have pity*; סָבַב to *turn, to change*, סוּבַב to *go round, to encompass*.

and פָּרַר Is 24^{19 f.}); in a few verbs also *Pilpēl* (§ 55 *f*) is found, e. g. גָּלַל *to roll*, *Hithpalpēl* הִתְגַּלְגַּל *to roll oneself* (from גָּלַל); imperative with suffix סִלְסְלָהּ *exalt her*, Pr 4⁸; שִׁעֲשַׁע *to comfort, to delight in*; passive שִׁעֲשַׁע *to be caressed* (from שִׁעַע). These forms cannot appear in a biliteral form any more than *Pi'ēl*, *Pu'al*, and *Hithpa'ēl*; cf. עֹעִים (Is 19¹⁴) and קִוְּו (Is 18^{2,7}).—For תִּתְבַּר 2 S 22²⁷ read, according to ψ 18²⁷, תִּתְבַּר.

REMARKS.

I. On Qal.

1. In the *perfect*, isolated examples are found with \bar{o} in the first syllable, *III* which it is customary to refer to trilateral stems with middle \bar{o} (like יָכַל, § 43 *a*); viz. רָמוּ they are exalted, Jb 24²⁴ to רָמוּם; רָבוּ they shot, Gn 49²³ to רָבַב; אָרוּ Is 1⁶ to אָרוּר. But this explanation is very doubtful: אָרוּ especially is rather to be classed among the passives of Qal mentioned in § 52 *e*.

2. *Imperfects Qal* with \bar{o} in the second syllable keep the original *a* in the *II* preformative, but lengthen it to \bar{a} , as being in an open syllable, hence יֶחַן, יָמַר, יַעֲזֶה, יָרַן, יֶרַע (trans. *he breaks in pieces*, but יֶרַע intrans. = *he is evil*); imperfects with \bar{a} have, in the preformative, an \bar{e} , lengthened from \bar{i} . See the examples below, under *p*, § 63 *c* and *e*, § 72 *h*, and specially Barth in ZDMG. 1894, p. 5 *f*.

The *Hölēm* of the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect* (סֹב, יֹסֵב) is only tone-long, and therefore, as a rule, is written defectively (with a few exceptions, chiefly in the later orthography, e. g. צוּר *bind up*, Is 8¹⁶; גּוּל ψ 37⁵; דָּוָה ver. 7; לָבוּז for לָבוּז *to plunder*, Est 3¹³, 8¹¹). When this \bar{o} loses the tone, it becomes in the final syllable \bar{o} , in a sharpened syllable \bar{u} , or not infrequently even \bar{o} (see above, *k*). Examples of \bar{o} are: (*a*) in a toneless final syllable, i. e. before *Maqqeph* or in the *imperfect consecutive*, רֶן (rōn) *to rejoice*, Jb 38⁷; וְיֹסֵב Ju 11¹⁸ (once even with \bar{u} in a toneless final syllable, וְיֹרֵם Ex 16²⁰); on the other hand, in the *plur.* וְיֹסֵבוּ, *fem.* וְיֹתַסְבֵּינָהּ; (*b*) before a tone-bearing *affirmative* or *suffix*, e. g. *imperative 2nd sing. fem.* גִּנִּי, רַגְנִי (cf. *f*); חַנְּנִי *pity me*; סִלְּהָהּ Jer 50²⁶; יִשְׁרָם Pr 11³ *Qerē*; תִּחַנְּהוּ Ex 12¹⁴ (for the defective writing, cf. יִסְפְּהוּ Jb 40²²). In יִחַנְּךָ Gn 43²⁹, Is 30¹⁹ (for יִחַנְּךָ) this \bar{o} is thrown back to the preformative.

On the 2nd plur.-*fem.* imperat. עֲרֶה *make yourselves naked* Is 32¹¹, cf. the *O* analogous forms in § 48 *i*.—Quite abnormal is the *infinitive absolute* רָעָה Is 24¹⁹ (as ה follows, probably only a case of dittography for רָע, cf. קָב Nu 23²⁵ and שָׁל Ru 2¹⁶); so also are the *imperatives* קַבְּה־לִּי Nu 22^{11,17}, and אַרְה־לִּי 22^{6, 23⁷}, with ה *paragogic*. We should expect קַבְּה, אַרְה. If these forms are to be read *qōballi*, 'ōralli, they would be analogous to such cases as מְדַבְּרָה (§ 90 *i*), the addition of the *paragogic* ה causing no change in the form of the word (קַבְּ like רֶן above). If, however, as Jewish tradition requires, they are to be read *qāballi*, 'āralli, then in both cases the *Qames* must be explained, with

Stade, as the equivalent of \bar{o} (קָבַה-לִּי, &c.; cf. § 9 v). Still more surprising is קִבְּנוּ curse him, Nu 23¹³, for קִבְּנוּ or 'קב'.¹

ρ 3. Examples with *Pathah* in the infinitive, imperative, and imperfect are בַּר (in לְבָרָם to prove them, Ec 3¹⁸); רַר Is 45¹; שֵׁר Jer 5²⁶; בְּשִׁשָּׁם in their error, Gn 6³ (so ed. Mant., but there is also good authority for בְּשִׁשָּׁם, from ·שֵׁ = ·שֵׁ = אִשָּׁר and שֵׁ also; so Baer and Ginsburg). Also גַּל take away, ψ 119²²; and the imperfects חַם it is hot, Dt 19⁶, &c. (on the \bar{e} of the preformative cf. n); יַמַּר it is bitter, Is 24⁹; יַצַּר it is straitened; יַרַךְ it is soft, Is 7⁴; תִּשָּׁם it is desolate, Ez 12¹⁹ (in pause תִּשָּׁם Gn 47¹⁹); וַתִּקַּל she was despised, Gn 16⁴ (but elsewhere in the *impf. consec.* with the tone on the penultima, e. g. וַיִּצַּר Gn 32⁸, &c.; וַיִּרָע Gn 21¹¹, &c., cf. Ez 19⁷); in the 1st sing. imperfect אִתָּם² ψ 19¹⁴, abnormally written fully for אִתָּם, unless אִתָּם is to be read, as in some MSS., on the analogy of the 3rd sing. יָתָם.—In the *impf. Qal* of שָׁלַל the reading of Hb 2⁸ varies between יִשְׁלֹוּךָ (Baer, Ginsb.) and יִשְׁלֹוּךָ (ed. Mant., Jabl.).—The following forms are to be explained with Barth (ZDMG. xliii. p. 178) as imperfects Qal with original \bar{i} in the second syllable, there being no instances of their Hiph'il in the same sense: וַיִּגַּל Gn 29¹⁰; יִגַּן Is 31⁵, &c.; וַיִּסְּךָ Ex 4c²¹, ψ 91⁴, &c.; perhaps also תִּצְלִינָה 1 S 3¹¹ and יִהַל Jb 31²⁶, &c.; in accordance with this last form, הִלּוּ (בְּ) Jb 29³ would also be an *infinitive Qal*, not Hiph'il (for בְּהִלּוּ), as formerly explained below, under *w*. Finally the very peculiar form וַתִּרְץ Ju 9⁵³ may probably be added to the list.

γ Imperfects, with an original *u* in the second syllable, are also found with this \bar{u} lengthened to \bar{u} (instead of \bar{o}), e. g. יִרוּן, if the text is correct, in Pr 29⁶; יִשׁוּר ψ 91⁶ (unless it be simply an imperfect from שׁוּר to be powerful, to prevail); יִרוּן (if from רִצִּין) Is 42⁴, &c. (also defectively אִרְץ ψ 18³⁰; but in Ec 12⁶, according to Baer, וַתִּרְוּן); תִּתָּם Ez 24¹¹ (on the sharpening of the ת cf. *g* above).³

γ A similar analogy with verbs ע"ו is seen in the infinitives לְבֹר (for בַּר) Ec 9¹; בַּחֲקוּ Pr 8²⁷ (cf. בַּחֲקוּ Pr 8²⁹) for בַּחֲקוּ, and in the *imperfect* אִמְשִׁךָ Gn 27²¹. (The forms חֲנֹת in ψ 77¹⁰, שְׁמוֹת Ez 36³, חֲלוֹתִי ψ 77¹¹, formerly treated here as infinitives from ע"ע stems, are rather to be referred to ל"ה stems, with Barth, *Wurzeluntersuchungen*, Lpz. 1902, p. 21.) On other similar cases, see below, under *ee*. For examples of the *aramaizing imperfect*, see above, *g*.

δ 4. In the *participle*, the aramaizing form שִׁסְסִיךָ for שִׁסְסִיךָ occurs in K^ethibh, Jer 30¹⁶ (the *Q^{er}e* indicates a *participle* from שָׁסַה); רָעָה Pr 25¹⁹ appears to be a contraction from רָעָעָה, *part. fem.* = breaking in pieces.

¹ For נו as suffix of the 3rd person a parallel might be found in יִשְׁנוּ, § 100 o, and probably also in the *Nún* of the Phoenician suffix נם: cf. Barth, ZDMG. xli. p. 643, and the note on § 100 o.

² Also in Ez 6⁶, instead of תִּשְׁמְנָה, which could only come from שִׁמַּן, יִשְׁמִי is intended, and יִשְׁמִי in the same verse is probably only an error for יִשְׁמִי.

³ According to Stade, *Grammatik*, § 95, Rem., the pronunciation with \bar{u} , since it also appears in Neo-Punic [and in Western Syriac, see Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.*, § 48], was that of everyday life.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

S'ghôl is found under the preformative in הִקְלַתְנִי 2 S 19⁴⁴, and a *Pathah* occurs before ה (with a virtual sharpening of the ה) in such forms as הִחַתְתָּ Is 9³; cf. Gn 11⁶, Dt 2³¹, 3²⁴, 1 S 22¹⁵, Est 6¹³—in all these cases before ה.—On בִּהְלוֹ Jb 29³, see above, *p*: on וְהִחַתְתִּי Jer 49³⁷, see below, *dd*.

a' 7. In the *imperfect consecutive* of verbs whose second radical is a guttural, *a* is retained (§ 22 *d*) in the second syllable instead of *ê*, e.g. וַיִּרַע 1 K 16²⁵: so also with *g*, as וַיִּצַר 2 Ch 28²⁰, Dt 2⁹—but cf. also וַיִּפַּר Neh 4⁹.

y 8. Aramaizing forms (but cf. Rem. *i*: § 67 *g*) in *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* are, וַיִּסַּב Ex 13¹⁸, &c.; cf. Ju. 18²³; אֶל-תִּמְרָא Ex 23²¹, but read אֶל-תִּמְרָא from מְרָא: וַיִּכְתּוּ Dt 1⁴⁴ (cf. Nu 14⁴⁵), but וַיִּסְבּוּ Ju 18²³, 1 S 5⁸, 2 Ch 29⁶; אֶחָל *profanabo*, Ez 39⁷; תִּתֵּם Jb 22³; without elision of the ה (cf. § 53 *q*), וַיִּהְיֶה 1 K 18²⁷, but Jer 9⁴ יִהְיֶה, Jb 13⁹ תִּהְיֶה; with *i* in the second syllable יִשִּׁים Jer 49²⁰, 5c⁴⁵; cf. וַיִּשִּׂים Nu 21³⁰; in the *perfect* הֵיילָהּ La 1⁸. In *Hoph'al*, הֵפְכוּ they are brought low, Jb 24²¹; יִפֹּת he is smitten, Is 24¹² (*plur.* יִפְתּוּ Jer 46⁵, Mi 1⁷); in *pause*, יִחַקּוּ Jb 19²³, but also יִפְתּוּ Jb 4²⁰ (so Baer, Ginsb., but ed. Mant., Jabl. (יִפְתּוּ)); with *ô* in the initial syllable, הִשְׁפִּיחַ (*infinitive with suffix* = הִשְׁפִּיחָהּ, cf. § 91 *e*) Lv 26³⁴ f., cf. 2 Ch 36²¹; בִּהְשִׁיחָהּ, with irregular syncope for בִּהְשִׁיחַ, Lv 26⁴³.

IV. In General.

z 9. Verbs *ע"ע* are most closely related as regards inflexion to verbs *ו"ו* (§ 72). The form of verbs *ע"ע* is generally the shorter (cf. e.g. יָסַב and יָקוּם, הָסַב and הָקוּם); in a few cases, however, the two classes exactly coincide, e.g. in the *imperfect Qal* and *Hiph'il* with *wāw consecutive*, in *Hoph'al* and in the less common conjugations (see above, *l*).

aa 10. The developed forms (with three radicals), as mentioned in *a*, are especially frequent in the 3rd *sing. masc.* and *fem.*, and the 3rd *plur. perf. Qal* (i.e. in forms without an affirmative or with an affirmative beginning with a vowel) of transitive verbs, or verbs, at any rate, expressing action, e.g. סָבַב, סָבְבוּ (but before a suffix also סָבְבִינִי, as well as סָבְבִינִי, &c.); אָמַם, אָמְמוּ, &c. Sometimes the contracted, as well as the uncontracted form, is found, e.g. בָּזַז to plunder, *plur.* בָּזְזוּ; in other parts, only בָּזְזוּ Dt 2³⁵, as well as בָּזְזוּ Dt 3⁷; וְזָמְמוּ Zc 8^{14.15} and וְזָמְמוּ Jer 4²⁸. Other examples of biliteral forms in 2nd *sing. masc.* are Dt 25¹², Pr 30³²; in 1st *sing.*, Jos 5⁹. Apart from *Qal* the only example of a developed form is וְהִחַתְתִּי Jer 49³⁷.

bb On the other hand, the biliteral forms are the more common in the 3rd *sing.* and *plur.* of perfects which are *intransitive*, and express a state; cf. דָּק Dt 9²¹ (Ex 32²⁰ דָּק; elsewhere always a transitive verb); חָתָה, *fem.* חָתָה; מָרָה, *fem.* מָרָה (for *marrā*); צָרָה, *fem.* צָרָה (cf. וְחָרָה Ez 24¹¹); שָׁח, *fem.* שָׁח; חָתָה, &c.; *plur.* חָתְמוּ, חָתְמוּ, &c. (but on the tone, cf. *ee* below). Exception, עָשְׂשָׂה ψ 6⁸.

cc The intransitive but developed perfects הִלָּלוּ (also הִלְלוּ), נִדְרָה, נִדְרָה, נִדְרָה (in *pause* נִדְרָה), עָשְׂשָׂה, עָשְׂשָׂה (*plur.* in *pause* עָשְׂשָׂה ψ 31¹¹), שָׁחָה, שָׁחָה (also שָׁחָה), almost all have, as Mayer Lambert observes, at least an active, not a stative meaning. Triliteral forms of the *infinitive* after ל are לִסְבֹּב Nu 21⁴; לְשָׂדוֹר Jer 47⁴; לְגַזּוּ Gn 31¹⁹ (also לְגַזּוּ Gn 38¹³); cf. also לְחַמֵּם Is 47¹⁴, in *subordinate pause*, for לְחַמֵּם; with *suffix* לְחַנְנֵכֶם Is 30¹³, and, from the same

form חָנַן , with retraction and modification of the vowel, ψ 102¹⁴; also שָׁחוּחַ Is 60¹⁴, בָּגְזוּ 1 S 25², כְּמַלְכִים Is 10¹⁸, בְּעֵוֹן Pr 8²⁸, כְּצָרוֹר Pr 26⁸.—*Imperative* שָׁדְדוּ Jer 49²⁸ (cf. § 20 *b*, and *ibid.* also on חָנַנְנִי ψ 9¹⁴); in the *imperfect*, יָדוֹר Na 3⁷ (ψ 68¹³; cf. Gn 31⁴⁰) from נָדַר ; the strong form here, after the assimilation of the *Nún*, was unavoidable. On the other hand, יִשְׁדְּדֶם Jer 5⁶ is anomalous for יִשְׁדְּדוּ (Pr 11³ *Qéré*; the eastern school read the Po'el יִשְׁוֹרְדֶם in the *Kethibh*); the strengthening of the second radical has been afterwards resolved by the insertion of a vocal *Šewá*. Cf. also יִחַנֵּן Am 5¹⁵ (elsewhere יָחַן). In *Niph'al*, the trilateral form יִלְבַּב is found, Jb 11¹²; in *Hiph'il*, all the forms of רָנַן , thus *imperative* הִרְנִינִי , *imperfect* תִּרְנִין ; *infinitive* הִשְׂמִים Mi 6¹³; *participle* מִשְׂמִים Ez 3¹⁵. That the developed (trilateral) forms possess a certain emphasis is seen from their frequent use in *pause*, as in ψ 118¹¹ after a biliteral form ($\text{סִבּוּי גַם-סִבּוּי}$).

11. The above-mentioned (see *g*) neglect of the strengthening in aramaizing forms, such as יָדְמוּ and the like, occurs elsewhere tolerably often; in the *perfect Qal* תָּמְנוּ for תִּמְנוּ Nu 17²⁸ (Jer 44¹⁸; cf. above, *e*); *imperfect* נָבְזָה 1 S 14³⁶ (הָ *parag.* without any influence on the form, cf. *o*); even with the firm vowel reduced to vocal *Šewá*; יִבְלָה Gn 11⁷ for נִבְלָה (cohortative from בָּלַל); יִזְמוּ for יִזְמוּ *ibid.* ver. 6, *they purpose*; following the analogy of verbs עָוָה , אִמְשָׁךְ (see above, *r*); from *intransitive imperfects Qal*, תִּצְרִי Is 49¹⁹ (*plur. masc.* Jb 18⁷); יִרְעוּ Neh 2³; also תִּישְׁמְנָה Ez 6⁶ (for which read $\text{תִּישׁ} = \text{תִּישׁ}$) might be explained in the same way.—*Perfect Niph'al* נִסְבָּה for נִסְבָּה Ez 41⁷; נִזְלוּ Ju 5⁵ for נִזְלוּ ; נִמְלְתָם for נִמְלְתָם Gn 17¹¹ (as if from מָלַל not מָלַל to *circumcise*), cf. Is 19³, Jer 8¹⁴; *imperfect* תִּפְמְקְנָה Zc 14¹²; *participle* נִחְמִים , cf. *u*. So also נִפְצָה 1 S 13¹¹, נִפְצָה Gn 9¹⁹ (cf. Is 33³), are *perfects Niph'al* from פָּצַח (= פָּוַח), not *Qal* from נִפְצָה .—In *Hiph'il* הִתְלַחַת (for הִתְלַחַת) Ju 16¹⁰ (2 S 15³⁴); הִעֲזָה for הִעֲזָה Pr 7¹³ (cf. Ct 6¹¹, 7¹³).

No less irregular is the suppression of the vowel of the stem-syllable in לְהַפְרֹכֶם Lv 26¹⁵.—On the perfect דָּלִיּוּ Pr 26⁷, cf. § 75 *u*.

12. Cases in which the tone is thrown forward on the affirmatives (see *cc k*) are (*a*) in the *perfect*, the 1st *sing.* regularly (but cf. וְהִצְרִיתִי Jer 10¹⁸ before לָהֶם) after 1 *consec.*, Ex 33^{19,22}, 2 K 19³⁴, &c., also Is 44¹⁶ (חַמּוֹתֵי before ר); ψ 92¹¹ (but the text is certainly corrupt; see the Lexicon), 116⁶, perhaps also Jb 19¹⁷, וְחִנַּתִּי (though in this passage, and in ψ 17³, the form might be an *infinitive* in *ôth*; see Delitzsch on Jb 19¹⁷); in the 2nd *sing.* וְקִצְתָהּ (before א) Dt 25¹²; in the 3rd *plural*, רַבּוּ *multi sunt*, ψ 3², 104²⁴, Jer 5⁶, 1 S 25¹⁰; רַבּוּ *they are soft*, ψ 55²² קָלוּ *they are swift*, Jer 4¹³, Hb 1⁸; וְכָּוִי *they are pure*, Jb 15¹⁵, 25⁵, La 4⁷; שָׁחוּ *they did bow*, Hb 3⁶; וְרָרוּ *they are burned*, Is 24⁶. A by-form of שָׁחוּ (ע"ו , cf. § 72 *dd*) is שָׁחוּ ψ 49¹⁵, 73⁹.

(*b*) In the *imperative* (a command in an emphatic tone) רָנִי *sing.*, Is 54¹, Zp 3¹⁴, Zc 2¹⁴; רָנִי Is 44²³, 49¹³, Jer 31⁷ (but רָנִי *lament*, La 2¹⁹), קִיֵּי *keep (thy feasts)*, Na 2¹, Jer 7²⁹; עֲזָה (= עֲזָה) before א , ψ 68²⁹. On the retention of the short vowels \ddot{u} (\ddot{o}) and \ddot{i} before *Dageš forte*, in place of the tone-long \bar{o} and \bar{e} , see above, *k*; on the change of the vowel of the preformative into *Šewá*, when it no longer stands before the tone, see *g*.

THE WEAKEST VERBS (*Verba Quiescentia*).

§ 68. Verbs נ"ד e.g. אָכַל to eat.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 140 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 589 ff.

a So far as נ retains its full consonantal value as a guttural, these verbs share all the peculiarities of verbs *primae gutturalis*, mentioned in § 63. They are, however, to be treated as *weak* verbs, when the נ loses its value as a consonant, and coalesces with the preceding vowel (originally short) to form one long syllable. This takes place only in the following very common verbs and forms, as if through phonetic decay:—

b 1. In the *imperfect Qal*, five verbs (viz. אָבַד to perish, אָבַד to be willing, אָכַל to eat, אָמַר to say, אָפַק to bake) regularly make the נ quiesce in a long *ô*, e.g. אָכַל.¹ In a few others the ordinary (strong) form is also in use, as אָחַז (18 times) and אָחַז (3 times) *he takes hold*; אָסַף (see *h*), also אָסַף, *he collects*. This *ô* has primarily arisen from an obscuring of *â* (§ 9 *q*), and the *â* from נ—, the weak consonant נ coalescing with *ă* to *â*; cf. § 23 *a*.

c In the second syllable *ô* (for original *ũ*) never appears, but either *ē*² or *ă*; and in *pause* almost always *ē*, even before the tone-bearing *heavy* affirmative ו, e.g. אָכַלְוּ Dt 18¹, without the *pause* אָכַלוּ Dt 4²⁸. In the 3rd *sing. masc.* and 1st *sing.* of אָמַר, however, *ă* is always retained in *pause*, אָמַר and אָמַר; but in the 2nd *masc.* אָמַר I K 5²⁰, in the 3rd *fem.* אָמַר Pr 1²¹; in the *plural* אָמַרו Jer 5², ψ 145^{6,11}, אָמַרו Jer 23³⁸, with *Segolta*; cf. also אָכַל I S 1⁷, &c. But with conjunctive accents in the body of the sentence, *ă* (as being a lighter vowel) is used, e.g. אָכַלְוּ לְעַד ψ 9¹⁹, but in *pause* אָכַלוּ ψ 1⁶; cf. a similar interchange of *ē* and *ă* in § 65 *c*. The 3rd *fem. plur. impf.* always has the form אָכַלְנָה Zc 11⁹.

d When the tone moves back, the final syllable of the *imperfects* of אָבַד and אָכַל, with a conjunctive accent, also always takes *Pathah*, e.g. אָבַד יוֹם Jb 3³, אָכַל and *he did eat*; in אָמַר the loss of the tone from the final syllable only occurs in the form with *wāw* consecutive

¹ So in the modern vulgar Arabic of South Palestine, *ya'kul* (*he eats*) becomes *yôkul*.

² On this *ē* (originally *î*) as a dissimilation from *ô* (originally *ũ*), cf. § 27 *w*, and F. Philippi, in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, xiv. 178. The latter rightly observes that the existence of an original *u* in the *imperfect* of אָכַל is indicated by the form of the *imperative* אָכַל, the Arabic *ya'kul* and the Aramaic אָכַל, as well as by the fact that אָחַז and אָסַף are found along with אָחַז and אָסַף.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

the 1st pers. Mi 4⁶ and אִסְפַּף I S 15⁶, which is apparently (from the *Metheg* with the *i*), intended for an *imperfect Hiph'il*: instead of it, however, read, with the Mantua edition, אִסְפַּף (with *i*, according to § 60 *f*). But תִּאֲסַפּוּן Ex 5⁷ (for 'תֹּס'), וַיִּאֲסַף I S 18²⁹ (for וַיִּוֹסֶף), and אִסַּף Jb 27¹⁹ (see above) are due to a mistake, since all three forms must be derived from the stem יִסַּף. Furthermore, יִמְרוּךְ ψ 139²⁰ (where certainly 'יִמַּר' is to be read); תִּבֵּא Pr 1¹⁰ (cf. § 75 *hh*); וַתִּפְּהוּ I S 28²⁴; יוֹכְלוּ Ez 42⁶; תִּמְרוּ 2 S 19¹⁴; וַתִּחַזּוּ 2 S 20⁹; תִּחַזְּכֵנִי thou gaddest about (from חַזַּק), Jer 2³⁶; וַיִּתְּאֵר Dt 33²¹ (for וַיִּתְּאֵר), according to other readings (on the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 75 *p*) וַיִּתְּאֵר, וַיִּתְּאֵר or וַיִּתְּאֵר.

Paradigm I shows the weak forms of the *imperfect Qal*, and merely indicates the other conjugations, which are regular.

i Rem. 1. In the derived conjugations only isolated weak forms occur: *Perfect Niphal* נִחַחוּ Nu 32³⁰, Jos 22⁹; *Hiph.* וַיִּאֲצֵל Nu 11²⁵ (but the statement in verse 17 is וַיִּאֲצֵלְתִּי, therefore *Qal*); equally doubtful is the punctuation of וַיִּרְבּוּ (for וַיִּאֲרֹבוּ?) and he laid wait, I S 15⁵, and אֲזַיֵּן I listen, Jb 32¹¹ (on the analogy of verbs וִעַן); cf. also אוֹכִיל (ô from â) I give to eat, Hos 11⁴; אֲבִירָה (ô from â) I will destroy, Jer 46⁸; וַיִּוָּחֶר 2 S 20⁵ *Qerê* (for וַיִּוָּחַר); the *Kethîbh* appears to require the *Pi'el* וַיִּיחַר, from יַחַר as a secondary form of אַחַר; but וַיִּיחַר = וַיִּאֲחַר for וַיִּאֲחַר as *imperfect Qal* is not impossible. On וַאֲזַרְהָה Neh 13¹³, cf. § 53 *n*.—*Infinitive* לְהַכִּיל Ez 21³³ (= לְהַאֲכִיל unless it is rather *infin. Hiph.* from כָּוִל); *Participle* מִזֵּין giveth ear, Pr 17⁴ (clearly by false analogy of verbs וִעַן, for מִזֵּינִי); *Imperative* הִתְּיֵאֵר bring (from אָתָּה) Jer 12⁹. (On the same form used for the *perfect* in Is 21¹⁴, cf. § 76 *d*.)

k 2. In the *Pi'el* the א is sometimes elided (like ה in יִהְיֶה, יִקְטִיל), thus מִלֵּךְ (as in Aramaic and Samaritan) teaching, for מִמַּלֵּךְ Jb 35¹¹; יִהֵל (if not a mere scribal error) for יִהַל Is 13²⁰; וַתִּזְרְנֵנִי thou hast girded me, 2 S 22⁴⁰, for וַתִּזְרְנֵנִי, as ψ 18⁴⁰; וַאֲבַרְךָ Ez 28¹⁶; cf. § 23 *c*.

§ 69. Verbs פ"י. First Class, or Verbs originally פ"ו,
e. g. יָשַׁב to dwell.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 141 f.; *Grundriss*, p. 596 ff.

a Verbs which at present begin with *Yôdh* when without preformatives are divided into two classes according to their origin and consequent inflexion: (*a*) Verbs which (as still in Arabic and Ethiopic) originally began with *Wāw*, e. g. יָלַד to give birth to, Arab. and Eth. *wāladā*. In consequence of a phonetic change which prevails also with few exceptions in the noun, this *Wāw* in Hebrew and Aramaic always becomes a *Yôdh*, at least when it is the initial consonant; but after preformatives it either reappears, or is again changed into

Yôdh, or, lastly, is altogether elided; (b) Verbs which (as in Arabic) originally began with *Yôdh* (called *Verba cum Iod originario*, see § 70). A few verbs again (some with original *Yôdh*, and some with original *Wāw*) form a special class, which in certain forms assimilates the *Wāw* or *Yôdh* to the following consonant on the analogy of the *Nûn* in verbs ו"ב (see § 71).

With regard to verbs ו"ב (i. e. ו"ב with original *Wāw*) it is to be noticed that—

1. In the *imperfect*, *imperative* and *infinitive construct Qal* there is a twofold inflexion, according as the *Wāw* is wholly rejected or only changed into *Yôdh*. The complete rejection (or *elision*) takes place regularly in eight verbs (see *h*) in the following manner:

A. *Imperfect* יִשָּׁב, יִרַע with an unchangeable¹ *Sere* in the first syllable and original *š* in the second, which in the tone-syllable (according to § 27 c) becomes *ē* (thus יִלֵּךְ, יִצֵּא, יִרֵד; יִלְךְ, see *x*), or, under the influence of a guttural, with *ā* in the second (יִחַר, יִקַּע, יִרַע).

The tone-long *ē* of the second syllable is of course liable to be shortened or to become *šewā*, e. g. יִשְׁבּוּ, יִשְׁבוּ, &c.; in the same way *ā* becomes *šewā* in such cases as יִרְעוּ, &c., but is lengthened to *Qames* in *pause* (יִרְעוּ) and before suffixes (יִרְעוּם).

B. *Imperative* שִׁבּ with *aphaeresis* of the *Wāw* and with tone-long *ē*, from *š*, as in the *imperfect*.

C. *Infinitive* שִׁבָּת from original *šibh*, by addition of the feminine ending (ת) lengthened to a *segholate* form; as in verbs ו"ב (cf. § 66 b) this lengthening affords a certain compensation for loss of the initial consonant.

Rem. Since the infinitives יִרְעוּ, יִלְךְ (see below, *m*) point to a ground-form *dī'at*, *lidat*, we must, with Philippi (*ZDMG.* xxxii. 42) and Barth (*ibid.* xli. 606), assign to שִׁבָּת, &c., the ground-form *šibt* (which, therefore, reappears in שִׁבְתִּי, &c.); the apparent ground-form *šabt* rests upon the law that the *š* of the stem-syllable is changed into *ā* whenever the syllable becomes doubly closed by the addition of the vowelless feminine ending.

¹ The *e* of the first syllable is really *ē*, not tone-long *ē*, since it is retained not merely before the tone, and in the counter-tone (e. g. וִירְעוּ Ho 14¹⁰), but also in וִירְעוּ Ex 33^{13, 17}. It is no objection to this view that the *scriptio plena* of this *ē* occurs (with the exception of וִירְעוּ ψ 72¹⁴, elsewhere pointed וִירְעוּ) only in Mi 1⁸ and Ez 35⁹ *Keth.*; in ψ 138⁶ the Masora prefers to point וִירְעוּ.—Of the various explanations of the *ē* the most satisfactory is that of Philippi (*ZDMG.* xl. p. 653) that an original *yālid*, for example (see above), became *yilid* by assimilation of the vowel of the first syllable to that of the second; this then became *yēlēd* instead of *yēlēd*, in an attempt to raise the word again in this way (by writing *ē* instead of *ē*) to a trilateral form.

d In more than half the number of verbs ו"פ the original *Wāw* in the above-mentioned forms gives place to *Yôdh*, which, unless it suffers aphaeresis (see *f*), appears:—

· in the *imperatives* יִצַק, יִרַשׁ and *infinitives* יִסַד, יִרַא, as a strong consonant, but

in the *imperfect* יִירַשׁ, properly *yiyrašš*, merges with the preceding *š* into *š*.

In the second syllable *imperfects* of this form regularly have *ă*.

e (a) That the latter forms are derived from verbs with an original *Wāw* (not *Yôdh*) is shown partly by the inflexion of these verbs in *Niph'al*, *Hiph'il*, and *Hoph'al* (where the original *Wāw* reappears throughout), and partly by the Arabic, in which verbs ו"פ likewise exhibit a twofold formation; cf. *wälädä*, imperf. *yälidu*, with elision of the *Wāw*, and *wägîlä*, *yauǧalu*, with retention of the *Wāw*.

f (b) Sometimes both forms, the weaker and the stronger, occur in the same verb; cf. קַץ 2 K 4⁴¹ and יִצַק *pour*, Ez 24³ (cf. יִצַקוּ 1 K 18³⁴ and the *infin.* יִצַקוּ Ex 38²⁷); יִרַשׁ *take possession*, Dt 1²¹, 1 K 21¹⁵ (but cf. *s*), יִרַשׁ (in pause for יִרַשׁ) Dt 2^{24.31}; plur. יִרַשׁוּ Dt 1⁸, 9²³, but also, with הַּ paragogic, יִרַשׁוּהָ Dt 33²³. In the *imperfect* יִיקַר Dt 32²² and יִיקַר Is 10¹⁶ *it shall be kindled*; וַיִּיקַר *it was precious*, 1 S 18³⁰ and יִיקַר ψ 49⁹ (cf. יִיקַר ψ 72¹⁴).—The form וַיִּיקַמוּ Gn 30³⁹, for וַיִּיקַמוּ, beside וַיִּיקַמְנָה verse 38, is remarkable; cf. § 47 *k*.

g (c) On יִרַד Ju 19¹¹ for יִרַד and יִשׁוּב Jer 42¹⁰ for the *infinitive absolute* יִשׁוּב, cf. § 19 *i*.—But יִרַד Ju 5¹³ (twice) is not intended by the Masora either as *perfect* (for יִרַד, which really should be restored) or as *imperative* of יִרַד, but as an apocopated *imperfect Pi'el* from יִרְדָּה (= יִרְדָּה) *to have dominion*.

h (d) The eight verbs,¹ of which the initial consonant in the above-mentioned forms always suffers elision or aphaeresis, are יִלַד *to bring forth*, יִצַא *to go forth*, יִשַׁב *to sit, to dwell*, יִרַד *to descend*, also הִלַךְ *to go* (cf. below, *x*); and with *ă* in the second syllable of the *imperfect*, יִדַע *to know*, יִחַד *to be united*, יִקַע *to be dislocated*. Examples of the other formation (יִירַשׁ, &c.) are יִיעַף *to be wearied*, יִעַץ *to counsel*, יִישׁן *to sleep*, יִירַא (*imperfect* יִירַא, *imperative* יִירַא) *to fear*.

i 2. The original *Wāw* is retained as a firm consonant: (a) in the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect Niph'al*, being protected by the strengthening, e. g. הִוָּשֵׁב, הִוָּשֵׁב, which are consequently strong forms like הִקָּטַל, הִקָּטַל; (b) in the *Hithpa'el* of some verbs, e. g. הִתְוַדַע from יִדַע, הִתְוַפַח from יִפַח; otherwise a radical *Wāw* at the beginning of a word is now found only in a few nouns, e. g. וְלָרֶ offspring from יִלַר *to bear*. At the end of a syllable *Wāw* with the homogeneous

¹ A ninth יִסַד *to add*, is also to be included. In the Mēša'-inscription, l. 21, the *infinitive* is written לִסַפַת (cf. יִסַפַתִי, l. 29); hence read in Is 30¹ (Nu 32¹⁴, Dt 29¹⁸) סַפַת for סַפַת. The 2nd plur. masc. *imperative* סַפּוּ Is 29¹, Jer 7²¹ corresponds to שִׁבּוּ; thus in proof of a supposed סַפָּה *addere*, there remains only אִסַפָּה Dt 32²³, for which, according to 2 S 12⁸, read אִסַפָּה.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

- o 2. The *imperative Qal* frequently has the lengthening by הַ, e.g. שִׁבָּהּ sit thou, ירדה descend thou. From יִתֵּן to give, Arab. wāhābā, only the *imperative* is used in Hebrew; it has the form יִתֵּן give, lengthened יִתְּנֶה generally with the meaning *age, go to*, hence in Gn 11^{3,4} even addressed to several persons (Gn 29²¹ יִתְּנֶה before נ to avoid the hiatus); *fem.* יִתְּנֶה Ru 3¹⁵, *Mitra'* on the analogy of the plural יִתְּנוּ (once in Jb 6²² יִתְּנוּ before the tone-syllable; but cf. Dt 32³), whilst, on the analogy of other *imperatives Qal* of verbs פִּי, הִבִּי, הִבִּי would be expected.—On יִתְּנֶה Pr 24¹⁴, cf. § 48 l.
- p 3. The *imperfect* with ו elided takes ä in the second syllable, besides the cases mentioned above (under f), also in יִתְּנֶה Jer 13¹⁷ (cf. La 3⁴⁸) and in the pausal form יִתְּנֶה Jb 27²¹, &c. (from יִתְּנֶה, see x); on יִתְּנֶה Is 10¹⁶ see above, f. The ä in the second syllable, when followed by the affirmative נָה (תִּתְּנֶה &c.), is in accordance with the law mentioned above (under c), by which ä takes the place of ĩ in a doubly closed syllable. Forms with ē in the second syllable shorten the ē to *S^eghôl*, when the tone is drawn back (before a tone-syllable or after wāw consecutive), e.g. יִתְּנֶה Gn 44³³; וִיִּשָׁב, וִיִּרָד; but ē is retained in an open syllable, even with *Mil'el*-tone, in יִצֵּא Ex 16²⁹, Ju 9³⁹, in both cases with *nasog 'ahor*, § 29 e. The *pausal* is either of the form וִיִּשָׁב Ru 4¹ or וִיִּרָד ψ 18¹⁰; the 1st pers. sing., whether in or out of pause, is וִיאֲרֶד, וִיאֲלֶד, &c., except וִיאֲלֶד Jb 19¹⁰, see x.—For וִידַע ψ 138⁶ (cf. the note above, on b and the analogous cases in § 70 d) וִידַע is intended.
- q The *imperfect* of the form יִירָשׁ is frequently (especially before affirmatives) written defectively, in which case the ĩ can always be recognized as a long vowel by the *Metheg* (see § 16 f), e.g. יִעֲפוּ Is 40³⁰, יִגְעוּ Is 65²³; and so always יִירָאוּ they fear, as distinguished from יִרְאוּ they see (*imperf. Qal* of יִרָא).—On וִיִּשְׂמוּ Gn 50²⁶, 24³³ *Keth.*, and וִיִּסְּרוּ Ex 30³², see § 73 f.
- r From יִכַּל to prevail, to be able, the *imperfect Qal* is יִיכַל, which can only have arisen through a depression of the vowel from יִוּכַל (ground-form *yaukhal* = *yawkhal*), to distinguish it, according to *Qimḥi*, from אוּכַל, just as, according to § 47 b, אִקְטַל is differentiated from יִקְטַל. Cf. the Arabic *yauru'u* (*yôru'u*) from *waru'a*, *yauǧalu* (*yôǧalu*) from *waǧila*, as also the vulgar Arabic (among towns-people) *yūṣal*, &c., from *waṣala*. Others regard יִיכַל as an *imperfect Hoph'al* (*he is enabled* = *he can*), always used instead of the *imperfect Qal*; cf., however, § 53 u.—וּתְיַכַּל occurs in Jer 3⁵ as 2nd *sing. fem.* for וּתְיַכַּלִּי, according to König because the 2nd *fem.* had been sufficiently indicated previously.—Further יִוּרֶה or יִרֶה is to be regarded with M. Lambert (*REJ.* xxxvii, no. 73) as *imperf. Qal* (not *Hiph'il*) of יִרֶה to throw, shoot (the supposed *imperf. Qal* וּנְיַרֶם Nu 21³⁰ is critically very doubtful). This is shown especially by the passages in which the *imperf. Qal* יִוּרֶה is immediately preceded by the *imperat. Qal* (2 K 13¹⁷) or *infin. Qal* (ψ 64⁵), or is followed by the *participle Qal* (2 Ch 35²³; but in 2 S 11²⁴ by the *participle Hiph'il*).
- s 4. The attenuation of ä to ĩ in the *perfect* (in a toneless, closed syllable) which is discussed in § 44 d (cf. § 64 f) occurs in verbs פִּי in a few forms of יִלֵּךְ Nu 11¹², Jer 2²⁷, ψ 2⁷, &c. (always after י), as well as of יִרָשׁ, e.g. וּנְיַרְשָׁם, &c., Dt 4¹, 8¹, 17¹⁴, 19¹, 26¹, 31³ (always after וּי for וּי). In both cases the attenuation might be explained from the tendency to assimilate the vowels, especially if the initial י was pronounced, as in Syriac, like *i* (§ 47 b). In the case of יִרָשׁ, however, a secondary form יִרָשׁ (cf. § 44 d) is probably to be assumed, since in Arabic also the verb is *wārīṭā*. The forms

וַיִּרְשָׁוּ Ez 36¹² and וַיִּרְשָׁוָּּ ψ 69³⁶, &c., are most simply explained from the return of this *i*.

5. As an exception, the *imperfect Niph'al* sometimes has a *i* instead of the *t*, e.g. וַיִּנְחַל and he stayed, Gn 8¹² (unless the *Pi'el* or וַיִּחַל, as in ver. 10, is to be read), cf. Ex 19¹³; 1 S 13⁸ *Kethibh*.—The first person always has the form אֶנְשֵׁב, not אֶנְשֵׁב, cf. § 51 p.—In the *participle* the plural נִנְי (from יָנָה, with depression of *o* to *u*, cf. § 27 n) is found in Zp 3¹⁸; cf. La 1⁴. While in these cases some doubt may be felt as to the correctness of the Masoretic pointing, much more is this so in the perfect נִלְדָּה *null'dhú*, 1 Ch 3⁵, 20⁸, for נִלְדָּה which appears to be required by the *wāw* in the initial syllable.

6. In the *imperfect Pi'el* elision of the first radical (*i*) sometimes takes place *u* after *wāw* consec. (as in the case of א, § 68 k), e.g. וַיִּגַּה for וַיִּגָּה and he has grieved, La 3³³, וַיִּדְּרוּ for וַיִּדְרוּ and they have cast, verse 53, from יָדָה, which may also be a true verb פ"י (on the other hand, in יָדְרוּ גֹרָל they have cast lots, Jo 4³, Ob 11, Na 3¹⁰, a perfect *Qal* of יָדַר is required by the context; but as this, being a *transitive* perfect, ought to have the form יָדְרוּ according to § 67 a, perhaps we should read יָדְרוּ). So from a verb פ"י, of the second class, וַיִּבְשָׁהוּ for וַיִּבְשָׁהוּ and he made it dry, Na 1⁴; cf. וַיִּשְׂרַם 2 Ch 32³⁰ *Qere* (the *Keth.* points either to *Pi'el* וַיִּשְׂרַם or *Hiph'il* וַיִּשְׂרַם).

7. The *imperative Hiph'il*, instead of the usual form הוֹשֵׁב, sometimes has *i* in the second syllable; הוֹצִיא Is 43⁸; הוֹפִיעַ ψ 94¹ (before ה, hence probably a mere mistake for הוֹפִיעָה). On the uncertainty of the tone in הוֹשִׁיעָה־נָּא see § 53 m. When closed by a guttural the second syllable generally has *ā*, as הוֹרַע, הוֹשַׁע, cf. also הִקַּר Pr 25¹⁷ (as in the *infin. constr.* הוֹכַח Jb 6²⁶; see § 65 f). On the other hand, *i* always appears when the syllable is open, thus הוֹשִׁיבָה, הוֹשִׁיבִי, and so also before suffixes (§ 61 g). הוֹצִיא Gn 8¹⁷ *Qere* (*Keth.* הוֹצִיא, see § 70 b) is irregular.—The *jussive* and the *imperfect consecutive Hiph'il* when the tone is drawn back take *S'eghól* in the second syllable, as in *Qal*, e.g. יוֹסֶף that he may increase, Pr 1⁵, before לָקַח; cf. Ex 10²⁸ and Dt 3²⁶ after אֶל; יוֹסֶף (תוֹסֶף Pr 30⁶ is anomalous); in *pause*, however, also תוֹסֶף as *jussive*, Jb 40³² (usual *jussive* in *pause* יוֹשֵׁב, &c., which occurs even without the *pause* after *wāw* consecutive, Gn 47¹¹, Jos 24³, 2 S 8⁴, &c.). With a final guttural יִרַע and יוֹכַח (*jussive*) and יוֹיכַח, &c.; with a final ר in *pause* וַחֲתַר Ru 2¹⁴: on וַיִּשְׁעֶכֶם Is 35⁴, cf. § 65 f).—On forms like יוֹשִׁיעַ, see § 53 q.

In *Hoph'al* *o* stands instead of *i*, in הוֹרַע (for הוֹרַע) Lv 4^{23.28}, הוֹגָה 2 S 20¹³, and perhaps in יוֹרַא (for יוֹרָה) Pr 11²⁵; but cf. Delitzsch on the passage.—*Ptcp.* מוֹרַעַת Is 12⁵ *Qere* (מִיִּרַעַת *Keth.*).—An *infinitive Hoph'al* with feminine ending occurs in הוֹלְרַת Gn 40²⁰, for הוֹלְרַת = הוֹלְרַת; cf. above, *t*, on נוֹלְדָּה, and § 71 at the end.

8. The verb הוֹלַךְ to go, also belongs in some respects to the פ"י class, since it forms (as if from וַלַךְ) *imperfect* וַלֵּךְ, with *wāw* consecutive וַלֵּךְ (in *pause* וַלֵּךְ Gn 24⁶¹, &c.), 1st sing. וַלֵּךְ (but in Jb 19¹⁰ וַלֵּךְ); *infinitive construct* לֵּךְ with suff. לֵּכְתִי (*S'eghól* under the influence of the following palatal, as in נִכְרִי, cf. also נִגְרִי); *imperative* לֵּךְ, לֵּךְ, in the lengthened form לֵּכָה (as an interjection referring even to a *feminine*, Gn 19³², or a *plural*, Gn 31⁴⁴) and לֵּךְ (Nu 23¹³, Ju 19¹³, 2 Ch 25¹⁷); *Hiph.* הוֹלִיכִי (also in Ex 2⁹ הוֹלִיכִי 2nd *fem. imperative* is to be read for הוֹלִיכִי, which probably arose merely through

confusion with the following הִינָקְהוּ ; *imperfect* יֹלִיף , but in the 1st sing. of the *imperfect consecutive* always וְיֹלִיף Lv 26¹³, Am 2¹⁰, &c. Rarely, and almost exclusively late or in poetry, the regular inflexions of הִלֵּךְ are also found: *imperf.* יִהְלֶךְ (ψ 58⁹, &c.; but תִּהְלֶךְ Ex 9²³, ψ 73⁹; cf. § 64 a and h); אֶהְלֶךְ Jb 16²², also Mēša' inscription, line 14, אֶהֲלֶךְ ; *infinitive absolute* הִלֹּךְ , *Niph'al* נִהְלֶךְ , *Pi'el* הִלֵּךְ , *Hithpa'el* הִתְהַלֵּךְ , so that a י never appears unmistakably as the first radical. The usual explanation of the above forms is nevertheless based on a supposed obsolete יִלֵּךְ . It is, however, more correct to regard the apparent פ"ו forms of הִלֵּךְ with Praetorius (ZAW. ii. 310 ff.) as originating with the Hiph'il, of which the ground-form *hahlīkh* became *hālīkh*, and this again, on the analogy of the *imperfect Qal* of verbs פ"ו, *hólīkh*. This *hólīkh* being referred to a supposed *haulīkh* (properly *hawlīkh*) gave rise to new formations after the manner of verbs פ"ו.

§ 70. Verbs פ"י. Second Class, or Verbs properly פ"י,
e. g. יָטַב to be good. Paradigm L.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 143 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 603 ff.

Verbs properly פ"י differ from verbs פ"ו in the following points:

- a 1. In *Qal* the initial Yôdh never suffers aphaeresis or elision; hence the *infinitive* has the form יָבֹשׁ ,² the *imperfect* יִיָּבֹשׁ , יִיָּבֹשׁ , יִיָּבֹשׁ (in *pause* יִיָּבֹשׁ), also written יָטַב , &c.; and so always with a tone-bearing \check{a} in the second syllable. even after *wāw consec.*, e. g. וַיִּיָּבֹשׁ , except וַיִּיָּבֹשׁ Gn 9²⁴, and וַיִּיָּבֹשׁ Gn 2^{7.19}, unless יָצַר is to be included among verbs פ"ו (cf. נוֹצַר Is 43¹⁰).
- b 2. In *Hiph'il* the original form הִיָּטַב is regularly contracted to הִיָּטַב (rarely written הִיָּטַב , הִיָּטַב , &c.); *imperfect* יִיָּטַב , וַיִּיָּטַב . Instances of the uncontracted form are וַיִּשְׂרֶה Pr 4²⁵, according to Barth (see above, § 67 p), an example of an *i-imperfect* of *Qal*, since the *Hiph'il* is otherwise always *causative*; הִיָּשֶׁר (*imperative*) ψ 5⁹ *Qerê* (the *Keth.* requires הוֹשֶׁר according to the form of verbs פ"ו; cf. Is 45², אִישֶׁר *Keth.*, אִישֶׁר *Qerê*), cf. Gn 8¹⁷ *Qerê*; מִיָּמִינִים 1 Ch 12², to be explained as a denominative from יָמִין ; אִיָּסִירִם Ho 7¹² (§ 24 f, note), but perhaps the punctuation here is only intended to suggest another reading אִיָּסִירִם .

¹ Cf. above, m, note 2.

² This may be inferred from בִּיבֹשׁ (= בִּי) Is 27¹¹, which with its fem. יָבֹשׁת Gn 8⁷, is the only example of an *infinitive construct Qal* of these verbs. No example of the *imperative Qal* is found: consequently the forms יָטַב , &c. (in Paradigm L of the earlier editions of this Grammar), are only inferred from the *imperfect*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

consecutive has the form וַיִּצַק Gn 28¹⁸, 35¹⁴, &c., cf. § 69 *f*, where also other forms of צַק are given; וַיִּצַק and צַק (Is 44¹², 49⁸, Jer 1⁵ *Qerê*), from צַק to *form*, are, however, used in the same sense. Cf. also אֶסְרָם Ho 10¹⁰; וַיִּשְׁרַנָּה (for וַיִּשְׁרַן according to § 47 *k*) 1 S 6¹²; לְיִסֵּר 2 Ch 31⁷ (cf. § 69 *n*) and מִיִּסֵּר Is 28¹⁶. This assimilation is found always with sibilants (most frequently with צ) except in the case of וַיִּצַק 1 K 3¹⁵ (so ed. Mant., Ginsb., Kittel; but Jabl., Baer וַיִּצַק) and in הִלְפָתָהּ Gn 40²⁰, Ez 16⁵ (cf. הִלְפָתָהּ verse 4), *infinitive Hoph'al* of יָלַץ (cf. וַיִּלְצֵר § 69 *t*).

§ 72. Verbs ע"ו (*vulgo* ע"ו), e. g. קוּם to rise up. *Paradigm M.*

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 144 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 605 ff.

a 1. According to § 67 *a* a large number of monosyllabic stems were brought into agreement with the triliteral form by a strengthening, or repetition, of the second radical, i. e. of the *consonantal* element in the stem. In another large class of stems the same object has been attained by strengthening the *vocalic* element. The ground-form used for these verbs is not, as in other cases (§ 39 *a*), the 3rd sing. masc. perfect, but always the *infinitive construct* form (§ 39 *b*), the *û* of which is characteristic also of the *imperative* and of the *imperfect indicative Qal*. These stems are consequently termed verbs ע"ו or more correctly (see below) ע"ו .¹

¹ The term ע"ו was consequent on the view that the *Wāw* (or ו in the case of verbs ע"ו) in these stems was originally consonantal. This view seemed especially to be supported by the return of the *Wāw* in *Pi'el* (וַיִּעַר , the ו usually passing into י as in דָּקַי , cf. Arabic *qāwāmā*), and by certain forms of the *absolute state* of the nouns of such stems, e. g. מָוֶת death, compared with מָוַת to die. Hence in explaining the verbal forms a supposed stem *qawam* (in verbs ע"ו e. g. *šayat*) was always assumed, and דָּקַי was referred to an original *yaqwūm*, the *infinitive absolute* דָּקַי to original *qawôm*, the *participle passive* דָּקַי to original *qawūm*. It must, however, be admitted: (1) that forms like עַיִר , דָּקַי (see *m*) are only to be found in the latest books, and are hence evidently secondary as compared with the pure Hebrew forms דָּקַי , &c.; (2) that to refer the verbal forms invariably to the stem דָּקַי , leads in many cases to phonetic combinations which are essentially improbable, whereas the assumption of original *middle-vowel* stems renders a simple and natural explanation almost always possible. These ע"ו stems are therefore to be rigidly distinguished from the real ע"ו stems of the strong forms, such as וַיִּעַר , וַיִּעַר , &c. (see below, *gg*).—As early as the eleventh century the right view with regard to ע"ו stems was taken by Samuel Hannagid (cf. Bacher, *Leben und Werke des Abulwa'îd*, p. 16); recently by Böttcher (*Lehrbuch*, § 1112), and (also as to ע"ו stems) especially by Müller, Stade, and Wellhausen (see above, § 67 *a*, note). On the other hand, the old view of ו and י as consonants has been recently revived by Philippi, Barth, M. Lambert, and especially Brockelmann (*op. cit.*).

2. As in the case of verbs י"ע, the monosyllabic stem of verbs י"ע *b* generally takes the vowel which would have been required in the *second* syllable of the ordinary strong form, or which belonged to the ground-form, since this is essentially characteristic of the verbal form (§ 43 *b*; § 67 *b*). However, it is to be remarked: (a) that the vowel, short in itself, becomes of necessity long in an open syllable as well as in a tone-bearing closed *ultima* (except in *Hoph'al*, see *d*), e. g. 3rd *sing. masc. perf.* דָּקַ, *fem.* דָּקְתָּ, *plur.* דָּקְתֶּם, but in a closed *penultima* דָּקְתָּ, &c.¹; (b) that in the forms as we now have them the lengthening of the original short vowel sometimes takes place irregularly. Cf. *f*.

Intransitive verbs *middle e* in the *perfect Qal* have the form מָת *he C is dead*; verbs *middle o* have the form אֹר *he shone*, בָּשׁ *he was ashamed*, טוֹב *he was good*.² Cf. *n-r*.

3. In the *imperfect Qal*, *perfect Niph'al*, and throughout *Hiph'il* and *d Hoph'al* the short vowel of the preformatives in an open syllable before the tone is changed into the corresponding tone-long vowel. In *Qal* and *Niph'al* the original *ā* is the basis of the form and not the *ī* attenuated from *ā* (§ 67 *h*; but cf. also *h* below, on יְבוֹשׁ), hence יְקִים, for *yāqûm*; נְקִום for *nāqôm*; on the other hand, in the *perfect Hiph'il* הִקִּים for *hīqîm*; *participle* מְקִים (on the *Şere* cf. *z*); *perfect Hoph'al* הִקֵּם for *hūqam*.

A vowel thus lengthened before the tone is naturally changeable and *e* becomes *vocal Šewā* when the tone is moved forward, e. g. יְמִיתֵנּוּ *he will kill him*; so also in the 3rd *plur. imperfect Qal* with *Nún paragogic*; יְמִיתֶנּוּ (without *Nún* יְמִיתוּ). The wholly abnormal *scriptio plena* of *ē* in הִימִיר Jer 2¹¹ (beside הִמִּיר in the same verse) should, with König, be emended to הִמִּיר; the incorrect repetition of the interrogative necessarily led to the pointing of the form as *perfect* instead of *imperfect*.—But in *Hoph'al* the *ū* is retained throughout as an unchangeable vowel, when it has been introduced by an abnormal lengthening for the tone-long *ō* (as in the *Hoph'al* of verbs י"ע).

¹ In Aramaic, however, always דָּקְתָּ; also in Hebrew grammars before Qimḥi דָּקְתָּ, דָּקְתִּי, &c., are found, but in our editions of the Bible this occurs only in *pause*, e. g. קָמְתִּי Mi 7⁸, קָמְתֶנּוּ 2 K 7^{3.4}.

² According to Stade (*Grammatik*, § 385 *e* and *f*) the *e* in מָת is of the nature of a diphthong (from *ai*, which arose from the union of the vowel *i*, the sign of the intransitive, with the *ā* of the root), and likewise the *o* in אֹר, &c. (from *au*). But *ō* (from *au*) could not, by § 26 *p*, remain in a closed *penultima* (בָּשָׁת, &c.); consequently the *o* of these forms can only be tone-long, i. e. due to lengthening of an original *ū*, and similarly the *ē* of מָת to lengthening of an original *ī*. This is confirmed by the fact that the *ō* in בָּשָׁת, בָּשָׁתִּי, בָּשְׁתֶּם is always, and in בָּשָׁו, 3rd *plur. perfect*, nearly always (the instances are 11 to 2), written defectively. Forms like בָּוֶשָׁה, בָּוֶשׁוּ, &c., are therefore due to orthographic licence.

f 4. The cases of unusual vowel lengthening mentioned in *b* are: *imperfect Qal* $\text{קָמַ$ (also in Arabic *yāqūmu*), but *jussive* with normal lengthening (§ 48 *g*), $\text{קָמְ$, with retraction of the tone $\text{קָמֹ$ (*yāqōm*), קָמִי (in *pause* קָמִי); *imperative* קָמִי , with normal lengthening of the *ū* in the 2nd *plur. fem.* קָמִינָה , since, according to § 26 *p*, the *ū* cannot be retained in a closed penultima; *infinitive construct* קָמִי . In *Hiph'îl* the original *î* is naturally lengthened to *î* (קָמִי , *imperfect* קָמִי , *jussive* קָמִי , with retraction of the tone קָמֹי , קָמִי); on the transference of this *î* to the *Hiph'îl* of the strong verb, cf. § 53 *a*.

g The following forms require special consideration: the *participle Qal* קָמִי is to be traced to the ground-form with *â* unobscured, Arab. *qâim*, § 9 *q*, and § 50 *b*. On this analogy the form would be *qâim*,¹ which after absorption of the *î* became קָמִי , owing to the predominating character of the *â*. The unchangeableness of the *â* (*plur.* קָמִימִי , *constr.* קָמִי , &c.) favours this explanation.

h In the *imperfect Qal*, besides the forms with original *û* (now *û*) there are also forms with original *ǎ*. This *ǎ* was lengthened to *ā*, and then further obscured to *ô*; hence especially יָבֹא (יָבֹא), וַיָּבֹא , &c., from the *perfect* בָּא *he has come*. In the *imperfects* יָבֹא (but cf. וַתֵּאָרְנָה 1 S 14²⁷) and יָבֹשׁ from the *intransitive perfects* אָרַח , בָּשׂ (see above, *c*), most probably also in יָאָתַי 2 K 12⁹, יָאָחַח Gn 34¹⁵ from an unused אָחַח *to consent*, and perhaps in וַיִּהְיֶה 1 S 4⁵, &c., as in the cases noticed in § 63 *e* and especially § 67 *n*, the *ē* of the preformative is lengthened from *î* (which is attenuated from original *ǎ*) and thus *yî-bāš* became *yî-bāš*, and finally *yē-bôš*. Finally the *Niph.* נָקַמַי (*nā-qām*), *imperfect* יָקַמִי from *yiqqām*, originally (§ 51 *m*) *yinqām*, arises in the same way from the obscuring of *ā* lengthened from *ǎ*.

i 5. In the *perfect Niph'al* and *Hiph'îl* a *î* is inserted before the affirmatives beginning with a consonant in the 1st and 2nd persons, and יְ regularly (but see Rem.) in the *imperfect Qal*, sometimes also in the *imperfect Hiph'îl* (as in יְתִבֵּי־אֵינָהּ Lv 7³⁰, cf. יְתִבֵּי־מִנָּהּ Mi 2¹²), before the termination of נָהּ . As in verbs עָ"ע (§ 67 *d* and note) these *separating vowels* serve as an artificial opening of the preceding syllable, in order to preserve the long vowel; in the *perfect Hiph'îl*, however, before the *î*, instead of the *î* an *ē* is somewhat often found² (as a normal lengthening of the original *î*), especially after *wāw con-*

¹ So in Arabic, prop. *qâ'im*, since the two vowels are kept apart by the insertion of an *N*, cf. Aram. קָמִי ; but also contracted, as *šāk*, *hār*, for *šā'ik*, &c. (cf. Wright's *Gramm. of the Arabic Language*, 2nd ed. vol. i. p. 164).

² וַיְהִי־שִׁבְתֶּם 1 S 6⁷ (cf. 2 Ch 6²⁵) could only be an orthographic licence for וַיְהִי־שִׁבְתֶּם ; perhaps, however, וַיְהִי־שִׁבְתֶּם was originally intended.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

employed in the sense of *Pi'el* and as a substitute for it, e. g. קוּמִים to set up from קוּם; מוֹחֶת to slaughter, 1 S 14¹³, 17⁵¹, 2 S 1⁹, from מוּחַ; רוּמִים to exalt, passive רוּמָם, from רוּם; reflexive הִתְעוֹרֵר to stir up oneself (cf. יִתְעַרֵּר Jb 17⁸ in pause) from עוּר; reciprocal הִתְבַּשְׁשׁוּ to be ashamed before one another, Gn 2²⁵. The conjugation *Pilpēl* (§ 55 f), on the analogy of verbs ע"ע" is less common, e. g. טָלַטַל to hurl away from טוּל; כָּלַל to contain from כוּל; קָרַר to destroy from קוּר.

REMARKS.

I. On Qal.

n 1. Of verbs *middle e* and *o*, in which, as in the strong verb, the *perfect* and *participle* have the same form (§ 50. 2), the following are the only examples: כָּת he is dead, fem. כָּתָה, 2nd masc. כָּתָה (cf. § 44 g; § 66 h); 1st sing. כָּתִי, plur. כָּתִי (even in pause, Gn 19¹⁹); plur. כָּתִי, 1st pers. כָּתָנוּ, in pause כָּתָנוּ; בָּשׁ he was ashamed, plur. בָּשָׁה, בָּשָׁה, בָּשָׁה; אֹר it has shone, plur. אֹרוֹ; טוֹב to be good, plur. טוֹבוֹ. Participles כָּת a dead man (plur. כָּתִים, כָּתִי); בָּשָׁה ashamed, Ez 32³⁰. For נָר Is 27¹¹ read נָר, or, with LXX, עָר.

o Isolated anomalies in the *perfect* are: וּשְׁבַת (with the original ending of the fem. for וּשְׁבָה) Ez 46¹⁷ (see § 44 f); צָקוֹן Is 26¹⁶ (see § 44 l).—In בָּנָו 1 S 25⁸ (for בָּנָו from בּוֹא) the *N* has been dropped contrary to custom. In יבֵּאוֹ Jer 27¹⁸ (instead of יבֵּאוּ) the Masora seems to point to the *imperfect* יבֵּאוּ which is what would be expected; as *Yôdh* precedes, it is perhaps simply a scribal error.

p The form קָם occurs (cf. § 9 b) with *N* in the *perfect*, קָם Ho 10¹⁴, also in the *participles* לָמַט softly, Ju 4²¹, רָאשׁ poor, 2 S 12^{1.4}, Pr 10⁴, plur. 13²³; שָׁמַט doing despite unto (unless שָׁמַטִּים is to be read, from a stem שָׁמַט whence שָׁמַט Ez 25¹⁵, 36⁵), Ez 28^{24.26}; fem. 16⁵⁷; also in Zc 14¹⁰ רָאמָה is to be read with Ben-Naphtali for רָאמָה. On the analogy of participles of verbs *middle o* (like בָּשָׁה, see above) קוּמִים occurs for קוּמִים 2 K 16⁷ and even with a transitive meaning לוֹט occultans, Is 25⁷; בּוֹסִים Zc 1⁵.—Participle passive, מוּל circumcised; but סוֹג a backslider, Pr 14¹⁴, and סוֹרָה put aside, Is 49²¹ (cf. Jer 17¹³ Q^{eré}), are verbal adjectives of the form *qātûl* (§ 50 f), not passive participles. For חָשִׁים hastening, Nu 32¹⁷, read חָשִׁים as in Ex 13¹⁸; for שׁוֹבֵי Mi 2⁸ read שׁוֹבֵי.

q 2. Imperfects in *û* almost always have the corresponding *imperative* and *infinitive construct* in *û*, as יִקוּם, *imperative* and *infinitive* קוּם (also defectively written קוּם, קוּם); but יִדוּשׁ he threshes (*infin.* דוּשׁ), has *imperative* דוּשׁ (*fem.*), Mi 4¹³; יִמוּט it slippeth, *infinitive* מוּט (ψ 38¹⁷, 46³); cf. נוּחַ (also נוּחַ) Nu 11²⁵ and נוּע Is 7² (elsewhere נוּע) with the *imperfects* יִנוּחַ and יִנוּע; לָעוֹז Is 30²; שׁוֹב Jos 2¹⁶; רוּם Ez 10¹⁷ (verse 16 רוּם).

r Where the *imperfect* (always intransitive in meaning) has *ô* the *imperative* and *infinitive* also have it; thus *imperfect* יבּוֹא (*יבּוֹא*), *infin.* and *imper.* בּוֹא or בּוֹא¹; וַיֵּאָר 2 S 2³², אֹרוֹ, אֹרוֹ; יבּוֹשׁ, בּוֹשׁ, &c.—יָקוּם Jb 8¹⁴ (if it be a verb at all and not rather a substantive) is formed on the analogy of verbs ע"ע,

¹ In 1 K 14¹² (בְּבִאָה before a genitive), the text is evidently corrupt: read with Klostermann after the LXX בְּבִאָה.

since the *imperfect* of קוּם appears as אָקוּם in ψ 95¹⁰. On the other hand יִקְשׁוּן (as if from קוּשׁ, on the analogy of יִבּוּא, &c.) occurs as *imperfect* of יִקְשׁ (פ"י). The *imperfect* יִרְוֹן, with \acute{o} , Gn 6³, probably in the sense of *to rule*, has no corresponding *perfect*, and is perhaps intentionally differentiated from the common verb יִרְיִן *to judge* (from יִרְיִן, ע"י). Or can יִרְוֹן be a *jussive* after לֹא (cf. § 109 d)? Similarly לֹא תַחֲוֹם עֵינֵי (עֵינֵךְ) might be taken as a case of a *jussive* after לֹא, with irregular *scriptio plena* (as in Ju 16³⁰), in Dt 7¹⁶, 13⁹, 19^{13.21}, 25¹², Ez 5¹¹, 7^{4.9}, 8¹⁸, 9¹⁰. But perhaps in all these cases לֹא תַחֲוֹם was originally intended, as in Is 13¹⁸, Jer 21⁷, while cases like יַחֲוֹם ψ 72¹³ are to be explained as in § 109 k.—The *infinitive absolute* always has \acute{o} , e.g. יִקְוֹמוּ קוּם Jer 44²⁹.

3. In the *imperative* with affirmatives (קְוֹמוּ, קְוֹמֵי) the tone is on the stem \acute{s} syllable (cf., however, עוּרֵי Ju 5¹² intentionally varied from עוּרֵי; also עוּרֵי Zc 13⁷ and Is 51⁹ beside עוּרֵי בְיָמֵי; עוּרֵי גִילֵי Zc 9⁹; צוּרֵי Is 21², שׁוּבֵי ψ 116⁷, likewise for rhythmical reasons). So also the lengthened form, as שׁוּבָה Jer 3¹², ψ 7⁸, and עוּרָה verse 7. But if an א follows in close connexion, the lengthened *imperative* usually has the form קוּמָה, &c.,¹ in order to avoid a hiatus, e.g. Ju 4¹⁸, ψ 82⁸; hence also before יְהוָה, Q^{eré} *perpetuum* אֲדַנִּי (§ 17 c), e.g. ψ 3⁸, 7⁷ קוּמָה (cf., however, in the same verse עוּרָה and in Jer 40⁵, שׁוּבָה before א), and so even before ר ψ 43¹, 74²², &c. (רִיבָה).

4. In the *jussive*, besides the form יִקֹּם (see above, f), יִקוּם also occurs t (as subjunctive, Ec 12⁴; ψ 80¹⁹ may also, with Delitzsch, be regarded as a voluntative), incorrectly written *plene*, and יִקָּם (Gn 27³¹; cf. Ju 6¹⁸, Pr 9^{4.16}), which, however, is only orthographically different from יִקוּם (cf. Jer 46⁶). In the *imperfect consecutive* (וַיִּקָּם, in *pause* וַיִּקֹּם, see above, f) if there be a guttural or ר in the last syllable, \check{a} often takes the place of \acute{o} , e.g. וַיִּנַּח and he rested; וַיִּנְעַע and it was moved; וַיִּסַּר and he turned aside, Ju 4¹⁸, Ru 4¹ (distinguished only by the sense from Hiph'il וַיִּסַּר and he removed, Gn 8¹³); וַיִּצַּר Ex 21⁴, 2 K 5²³, 17⁵ (but also וַיִּגַּר from both גָּוַר to sojourn, and גָּוַר to fear); וַיִּעַף (to be distinguished from וַיִּעָף and he flew, Is 6⁶) and he was weary, Ju 4²¹, 1 S 14^{28.31}, 2 S 21¹⁵, but probably in all these cases וַיִּעַף for וַיִּיעַף from יַעַף is intended. For ותלוש 2 S 13⁸ K^{eth.}, the Q^{eré} rightly requires וַתִּלְשׁ. On the other hand, in an open syllable always וַיִּקְוֹמוּ, וַיִּסְוֹרוּ, &c. On וַאֲקוּמוּ (וַאֲקָמוּ), see § 49 e.

Examples of the full plural ending וֹן with the tone (see above, l) are וֹן תִּמְתָּוּ Gn 3^{3.4}; וֹן יִנּוּסוּן ψ 104⁷; וֹן יִרְוּצוּן Jo 2^{4.7.9}.

II. On Niph'al.

5. The form of the 1st *sing. perf.* נִקְוֹמֹתִי, which frequently occurs (נִסְוֹגְתִי, ψ נִפְוֹגְתִי, cf. also the *ptcp. plur.* נִבְוִכִים Ex 14³), serves as a model for the 2nd *sing.* נִקְוֹמֹת, נִקְוֹמוֹת, and the 1st *plur.* נִקְוֹמוֹנֵנוּ given in the paradigm, although no instances of these forms are found; but of the 2nd *plur.* the

¹ Cf. Delitzsch's commentary on ψ 3⁸.

only examples found have *ô* (not *û*), viz. נְפוּצֹתֶם *ye have been scattered*, Ez 11¹⁷, 2c^{34.41}, and וּנְקַטְתֶּם *and ye shall loathe yourselves*, Ez 20⁴³, 36³¹.—To the *î* (instead of *ä*) of the preformative may be traced the *perfect* נָעוּר Zc 2¹⁷ (analogous to the *perfect* and *participle* נָמוּל, see below, *ee*), *imperfect* יַעוּר for *yi"ôr*.—The *infinitive construct* הַדְּוִישׁ occurs in Is 25¹⁰; in לְאֹר Jb 33³⁰, the Masora assumes the elision of the ה (for לְהֹאֹר); but probably לְאֹר (*Qal*) is intended (see § 51 l).—נִמוּג Is 14³¹, נָסוּג Is 59¹³ are to be regarded as *infinitives absolute*.

III. On Hiph'il, Hoph'al, and Pi'lél.

- 70 6. Examples of the *perfect* without a separating vowel (see above, k) are: הִבֵּאתָ, &c. (see further, § 76 g); הִמָּתָה (from מוֹת) for *hēmáth-tā* (cf. § 20 a); הִכֵּנִי 1st plur. *perfect Hiph'il* from בּוֹן 2 Ch 29¹⁹, even הִמָּתָם (§ 27 s) Nu 17⁶, &c.; cf. 1 S 17³⁵, 2 S 13²⁸, also וְהִמָּתַן Ex 1¹⁶, and וְהִמָּתִיהָ Ho 2⁵; but elsewhere, with *wāw consecutive* וְהִמָּתִי Is 14³⁰; cf. וְהִטַּלְתִּי Jer 16¹³, and וְהִנְפַּתָּ Ex 29²⁴, &c.—In these cases the *ē* of the first syllable is retained in the secondary tone; elsewhere in the second syllable before the tone it becomes $\bar{\text{—}}$ (1 Ch 15¹², &c.) or more frequently $\bar{\text{—}}$, and in the syllable before the antepenultima it is necessarily $\bar{\text{—}}$ (e.g. וְהִקְמַתִּי Gn 6¹⁸). Before a suffix in the 3rd *sing. masc.* (except Gn 40¹³) and *fem.*, and in the 3rd *plur.*, the vowel of the initial syllable is *Hateph-Seghöl*, in the other persons always *Hateph-Pathah* (König); on הִקְמַתוּ 2 K 9², ψ 89⁴⁴, cf. Ex 19²³, Nu 31²⁸, Dt 4³⁹, 22², 27², 30¹, Ez 34⁴, and above, *i*. The 3rd *fem. perf. Hiph.* הִמָּתָה 1 K 21²⁵ is quite abnormal for הִסִּיתָה from סוֹת or סִית.
- α As in verbs ע"ע with ה for their first radical (§ 67 w), all the forms of עוּר Ex 19²³ (where against the rule given under *i* we find הִעֲרַתָּה with *ē* instead of *î*), Dt 8¹⁹, Neh 9³⁴, Jer 42¹⁹, and עוּר Is 41²⁵, 45¹³, take *Pathah* in these conjugations instead of $\bar{\text{—}}$. The irregular וְהוֹשְׁבוּתִים Zc 10⁶ has evidently arisen from a combination of two different readings, viz. וְהוֹשְׁבֹתִים (from יוֹשֵׁב) and וְהוֹשְׁבוּתִים (from שׁוֹב): the latter is to be preferred.—On הִבִּישׁ and הוֹבִישׁ as a (metaplastic) *perfect Hiph'il* of בּוֹשׁ, cf. § 78 b.
- γ 7. In the *imperative*, besides the short form הִקֵּם (on הִשָּׁב Is 42²² with *Silluq*, cf. § 29 q; but in Ez 21³⁵ for הִשָּׁב read the *infinitive* הִשָּׁב) the lengthened form הִקְיָמָה is also found. With suffix הִקְיָמֵנִי, &c. The *imperative* הִבִּיָא Jer 17¹⁸ is irregular (for הִבִּיָא Gn 43¹⁶); perhaps הִבִּיָא (as in 1 S 2c⁴⁰; cf. 2 K 8⁶) is intended, or it was originally הִבִּיָאָה.
- ζ In the *infinitive*, elision of the ה occurs in לְבִיָא Jer 39⁷, 2 Ch 31¹⁰ (for לְהִבִּיָא); ה־ *fem.* is added in לְהִנְפִּיָה Is 30²⁸; cf. Est 2¹⁸ and the analogous *infinitive Haph'el* in biblical Aramaic, Dn 5²⁰.—As *infinitive absolute* הִבִּין occurs in Ez 7¹⁴ (perh. also Jos 4³, Jer 1c²³).—The *participles* have *ē*, on the analogy of the *perfect*, as the vowel of the preformative, like verbs ע"ע (§ 67 i). On מְבִי 2 S 5², &c. (in *Kethibh*), see § 74 k.
- αα On the shortened forms of the *imperfect* (יִקֵּם, וְיִקֵּם, but always וְיִבִּיָא; in the *jussive* also with retraction of the tone אֶל-תִּשָּׁב 1 K 2²⁰) see above, *f*. With a guttural or ר the last syllable generally has *Pathah* (as in *Qal*), e.g. וְיִעֲרַךְ *and he testified*, 2 K 17¹³; יִרַח *let him smell*, 1 S 26¹⁹; וְיִרַח Gn 8²¹; וְיִסַּר



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Klostermann after the LXX. In Dn 8¹¹ the *Kethibh* הרים is intended for a perfect *Hiph'il*. There is also a distinction in meaning between יָלַן to spend the night, to remain, and יָלַן Ex 16⁷ *Qeré* (*Kethibh* תִּלְוֹנִי; conversely, verse 2 *Kethibh* יִלְוִנוּ, *Qeré* יִלְוֹנוּ), participle מְלַיֵן Ex 16⁸, Nu 14²⁷, 17²⁰, to be stubborn, obstinate: in the latter sense from the form יָלַן only וַיִּלְלָן is found, Ex 17³. Other examples are *Niph'al* נִמְּוֹל he was circumcised, Gn 17^{26 f.}; participle 34²² (from מוּל, not נִמְּוֹל); נִעְוֹר he is waked up, Zc 2¹⁷ (see above, v); *Hiph'il* הִיִּלְוֶה La 1⁸; יִלְיוּ Pr 4²¹.

ff Perhaps the same explanation applies to some forms of verbs *first guttural* with *Dageš forte implicitum*, which others derive differently or would emend, e. g. וַתַּחַשׁ for וַתַּחֲשֵׁשׁ and she hastened (from חוּשׁ) Jb 31⁵; וַיַּעַט (another reading is וַיִּעַט), וַתַּעַט 1 S 15¹⁹, 25¹⁴ (14³² *Qeré*) from עוּט or עֵיט to fly at anything. Both, as far as the form is concerned, would be correct *apocopated imperfects* from חָשַׁח and עָטָה (ל"ה), but these stems only occur with a wholly different meaning.

gg 10. Verbs with a consonantal *Wāw* for their second radical, are inflected throughout like the strong form, provided the first or third radical is not a weak letter, e. g. הָוֵר, imperfect יִהְיוּר to be white; גָּוַע, imperfect יִגְוַע to expire; רוּחַ to be wide; צָוַח to cry; *Pi'el* עוּל, imperfect יַעוּל to act wickedly; עוּת to bend, *Hithpa'el* הִתְעוּת to bend oneself; and this is especially the case with verbs which are at the same time ל"ה, e. g. צָוָה, *Pi'el* צִוָּה to command, קָנָה to wait, רָוַח to drink, *Pi'el* רָוַח (on אֲרִיָּוֶה Is 16⁹, see § 75 *dd*) and *Hiph'il* הִרְוֶה to give to drink, &c.

§ 73. Verbs middle *i* (*vulgo* י"ע), e. g. בִּיַּן to discern.

Paradigm N.

a 1. These verbs agree, as regards their structure, exactly with verbs י"ע, and in contrast to them may be termed י"ע, or more correctly, 'ayin-î verbs, from the characteristic vowel of the *impf.*, *imper.*, and *inf. constr.* This distinction is justified in so far as it refers to a difference in the pronunciation of the *imperfect* and its kindred forms, the *imperative* and *inf. constr.*—the י"ע verbs having *û* lengthened from original *ũ* and י"ע having *î* lengthened from original *ĭ*. In other respects verbs י"ע simply belong to the class of really monosyllabic stems, which, by a strengthening of their *vocalic* element, have been assimilated to the trilateral form¹ (§ 67 *a*). In the *perfect Qal* the monosyllabic stem, as in י"ע, has *ā* lengthened from *ǎ*, thus: שָׁת he has set; *infinitive* שֵׁת, *infinitive absolute* שוּת, *imperative* שִׁת, *imperfect* יִשִּׁת, *jussive* יִשְׁת (§ 48 *g*), *imperfect consecutive* וַיִּשִּׁת.—The *perfect Qal* of some verbs

¹ That verbs י"ע and י"ע are developed from biliteral roots at a period before the differentiation of the Semitic languages is admitted even by Nöldeke (*Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassburg, 1904, p. 34 ff.), although he contests the view that בִּינָתִי and רִיבֹתָ are to be referred to *Hiph'il* with the preformative dropped.

used to be treated as having a double set of forms, a regular series, and others like *Hiph'il* without the preformative, e. g. בִּין Dn 10¹; בִּינָתִי Dn 9², also בִּנְתָּ ψ 139²; רִיבֹתְךָ *thou strivest*, Jb 33¹³, also רִבְתָּ La 3⁵⁸. The above *perfects* (בִּין, רִיב, &c.) might no doubt be taken as forms *middle ē* (properly *ǐ*), the *ǐ* of which has been lengthened to *î* (like the *ũ* lengthened to *û* in the *imperfect Qal* of קָיַם). It is more probable, however, that they are really shortened forms of *Hiph'il*. This is supported by the fact that, especially in the case of בִּין, the shortened forms are few and probably all late, while the corresponding unshortened forms with the same meaning are very numerous, e. g. *perfect* הִבִּין (but בִּין only in Dn 10¹), הִבְיִנוּתָם, *infinitive* הִבִּין (but *infin. abs.* בִּין only in Pr 23¹), *imperative* הִבֵּן (only in Dn 9²³ בִּין immediately before וְהִבֵּן, also בִּינֵי three times, and בִּינָה ψ 5²), *participle* מִבִּין.¹ Elsewhere *Hiph'il*-forms are in use along with actual *Qal*-forms with the same meaning, thus: מְרִיב (also רִב), מְשִׂים *placing* (but only in Jb 4²⁰, which, with the critically untenable הִשְׂיִמְתִּי Ez 21²¹, is the only instance of שִׂים in *Hiph'il*), מְגִיחַ *breaking forth* Ju 20³³, with *infin. Qal* גִּיחוּ; הִחִישׁוּ *they rushed forth* Ju 20³⁷, with הִשְׂתִּי; מְצִיץ *glancing*, also in *perfect* צָץ; הִקִּיא *he spat out*, with *imperat. Qal* קִי. As *passives* we find a few apparent *imperfects Hoph'al*, which are really (according to § 53 u) *imperfects passive of Qal*, e. g. יִחַל Is 66⁸ from הִיל *to turn round*, יִשָּׁר from שָׁר *to sing*, יִשֵּׁת from שֵׁת *to set*.

2. The above-mentioned *Hiph'il*-forms might equally well be derived *b* from verbs ע"י; and the influence of the analogy of verbs ע"י is distinctly seen in the *Niph'al* נָבַן (*ground-form nabān*), *Pôlêl* בִּוּן, and *Hithpôlêl* הִתְבִּוּן. The very close relation existing between verbs ע"י and ע"י is evident also from the fact that from some stems both forms occur side by side in *Qal*, thus from הִיל *to turn round*, *imperative* also הִילֵּי Mi 4¹⁰; שִׂים *to place*, *infinitive construct* commonly שִׂים (2 S 14⁷ שִׂים *Qere*), *imperfect* יִשֵּׁי, but Ex 4¹¹ יִשֵּׂים. In other verbs one form is, at any rate, the more common, e. g. גִּיל *to exult* (גִּיל only Pr 23²⁴ *Kethîbh*); from לָלַי (perhaps denominative from לָלַי) *to spend the night*, לָלַי occurs six times as *infinitive construct*, לָלַי only in Gn 24²³; but the *imperative* is always לָלַי, &c.—Of verbs ע"י the most common are שֵׁת *to set*, רִיב *to strive*, דָּן *to judge*, שִׂישׁ *to rejoice*; cf. also *perfect* בָּל (*middle*

¹ Since בִּנְתָּ ψ 139² might be intended for בִּנְתָּ, there remains really no form of בִּין which must necessarily be explained as a *Qal*, except the *ptcp. plur.* בִּינִים Jer 49⁷. Nevertheless it is highly probable that all the above instances of *Hiph'il*-forms, parallel with *Qal*-forms of the same meaning, are merely due to a secondary formation from the *imperfects Qal* יִבִּין, יִשֵּׁי, &c., which were wrongly regarded as *imperfects Hiph'il*: so Barth, *ZDMG.* xliii. p. 190 f., and *Nominalbildung*, p. 119 f.

Yôdh in Arabic) to comprehend, to measure, Is 40¹²; עֵיט (as in Arabic and Syriac) to rush upon, and the denominative perfect קָץ (from קָץ) to pass the summer, Is 18⁶. On the other hand, וְרִיגוּם and they shall fish them, Jer 16¹⁶, generally explained as perfect *Qal*, denominative from רִיג fish, probably represents a denominative *Pi'el*, וְרִיגוּ.

c Corresponding to verbs properly ו"ע, mentioned in § 72 gg, there are certain verbs ו"ע with consonantal *Yôdh*, as אִבַּי to hate, עָיַף to faint, הָיָה to become, to be, חָיָה to live.

d Rem. 1. In the perfect *Qal* 3rd fem. sing. וְלָנָה occurs once, Zc 5⁴, for וְלָנָה, with the weakening of the toneless *ā* to *ē* (as in the fem. participle וּזְרָה Is 59⁵); cf. the analogous examples in § 48 l and § 80 i.—2nd sing. masc. שָׁתָה ψ 90⁸, *Qeré* (before ע; cf. § 72 s); 1st sing. once שָׁתִּי ψ 73²⁸, *milra'*, without any apparent reason; 1st plur. וְלָנוּ Ju 19¹³ for *lân-nû*. The lengthened imperative has the tone on the ultima before gutturals, רִיבָה יְהוּה ψ 35¹; see further, § 72 s.—Examples of the infinitive absolute are: רַב *litigando*, Ju 11²⁵, Jb 4c²; שׁוּם Jer 42¹⁵; שׁוּת *ponendo*, Is 22⁷. On the other hand, רִיב יְרִיב (for רַב) Jer 50³⁴, בֵּין תְּבִין Pr 23¹, חוּל תְּחִיל Ez 30¹⁶ *Keth.*, are irregular and perhaps due to incorrect *scriptio plena*; for the last the *Qeré* requires חוּל תְּחִיל, but read חוּל; cf. § 113 x.

e 2. The shortened imperfect usually has the form יִשַׁח, יִשַׁח; more rarely, with the tone moved back, e.g. יָרַב לוֹ Ju 6³¹, cf. Ex 23¹, אֶל-תִּשַׁח I S 9²⁰. So with *wāw* consecutive וַיִּשַׁח and he placed, וַיִּכַּח and he perceived; with a middle guttural וַיִּעַט בְּהֶם I S 25¹⁴ (see § 72 ee); with ר as 3rd radical, וַתִּשַׁח Ju 5¹. As jussive of לִין, תִּלֵּן is found in Ju 19²⁰ (in pause) and Jb 17², for תִּלֵּן.—For אֶל-תִּרֹב Pr 3³⁰ *Keth.* (*Qeré* תִּרִיב) read תִּרַב.

f 3. As participle active *Qal* לֵן spending the night, occurs once, Neh 13²¹; participle passive שִׁים Nu 24²¹, I S 9²⁴, Ob⁴; feminine שׁוּמָה 2 S 13³², in the *Qeré*, even according to the reading of the Oriental schools (see p. 38, note 2): the *Kethibh* has שִׁימָה. A passive of *Qal* (cf. above, § 52 e and s, and § 53 u) from שִׁים may perhaps be seen in וַיִּשַׁם Gn 5c²⁶ (also Gn 24³³ *Kethibh* וַיִּשַׁם, *Qeré* וַיִּשַׁם; the Samaritan in both places has וַיִּשַׁם), and also in וַיִּסַּח Ex 3c³², Samaritan וַיִּסַּח. Against the explanation of וַיִּסַּח as a *Hoph'al*-form from וַיִּסַּח, Barth (*Jubelschrift* . . . Hildesheimer, Berlin, 1890, p. 151) rightly urges that the only example of a *Hiph'il* of וַיִּסַּח is the doubtful וַיִּסַּח, which is probably an *ī*-imperfect of *Qal*.—The explanation of וַיִּשַׁם, &c., as a passive of *Qal* arising from *yiysam*, &c. = *yuysam* (so Barth, *ibid.*, note 1), is certainly also unconvincing, so that the correctness of the traditional reading is open to question.

* * * * *

g 4. In verbs נ"ע the נ always retains its consonantal value; these stems are, therefore, to be regarded as verbs *middle Guttural* (§ 64). An exception is נָאָץ Ec 12⁵ if it be imperfect *Hiph'il* of נָאָץ (for נָאָץ); but if the form has really been correctly transmitted, it should rather be referred to נָאָץ, and regarded as incorrectly written for נָאָץ. On נָאָץ (from נָאָץ), which was formerly treated here as נ"ע, see now § 75 x.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

f 3. When **א** begins a syllable (consequently before affirmatives which consist of or begin with a vowel, as well as before suffixes) it is necessarily a firm consonant, and the form then follows the analogy of the strong verb, e. g. **מִצְאָה** *māšā*, **מִצְאוֹ**, &c. (in *pause* **מִצְאָה**, **מִצְאוֹ**).

REMARKS.

g 1. Verbs *middle e*, like **מָלֵא** *to be full*, retain the *Sere* also in the other persons of the *perfect*, e. g. **מָלֵאתִי** (**מָלֵאוּ** Est 7⁵ has — owing to its transitive use; for **יִרְאֶתֶם** Jos 4²⁴ read with Ewald **יִרְאֶתֶם**). Instead of **מִצְאָה** the form **קָרְאת** *she names*, on the analogy of the *ל*-forms noticed in § 75 *m*, occurs in Is 7¹⁴ (from **קָרְאת**, cf. § 44 *f*), and with a different meaning (*it befalls*) in Dt 31²⁹, Jer 44²³, in both places before **א**, and hence, probably, to avoid a hiatus (on the other hand, **וְחִטָּאת** Ex 5¹⁶, could only be the 2nd *sing. masc.*; the text which is evidently corrupt should probably be emended to **לְעִמָּךְ וְחִטָּאת** with the LXX); in *Niph'al* **נִפְלְאת** ψ 118²³; in *Hoph'al* **הִבְרָאת** Gn 33¹¹.—The 2nd *fem. sing.* is written **קָרְאת** by Baer, Gen 16¹¹, &c., according to early MSS.

h 2. The *inf. Qal* occurs sometimes on the analogy of verbs *ל* (**גִּלּוֹת**, &c., see § 75 *nn*) in the feminine form; so always **מִלְאָת** *to fill* (as distinguished from **מָלֵא** *fullness*), Lv 8³³, 12^{4,6}, 25³⁰, Jer 29¹⁰, Ez 5², also written **מִלְאוֹת** Jer 25¹², Jb 20²², &c., and **מְלוֹאת** Est 1⁵. Cf. further, **קָרְאת** Ju 8¹; **שָׁנְאת** Pr 8¹³; before suffixes, Ez 33¹², and likewise in *Niph.* Zc 13⁴; also in *Pi'el* **לְמִלְאָת** Ex 31⁵, 35³³, or **לְמִלְאוֹת** Dn 9², &c. *Kethibh*; with suffix 2 S 21².—On the (*aramaizing*) *infinitives* **מִשְׁאָה** and **מִשְׁאוֹת**, see § 45 *e*; on **לְקָרְאת** *obviam*, § 19 *k*.—**בְּמִצְאֵכֶם** *when ye find*, Gn 32²⁰, stands, according to § 93 *g*, for **מִצְאֵכֶם**. The tone of the lengthened *imperative* **רַפְּאֵה** Ps 41⁵ as *Mil'ra'* (before **נִפְשִׁי**) is to be explained on rhythmical grounds; cf. the analogous cases in § 72 *s*.—The 2nd *fem. plur. imperative* in Ru 1⁹ has, according to Qimḥi, the form **מִצְאֵנִי** and in verse 20 **קָרְאֵנִי**; on the other hand, the Mantua edition and Ginsburg, on good authority, read **מִצְאֵנִי**, **קָרְאֵנִי**.

i 3. The *participle fem.* is commonly contracted, e. g. **מִצְאָת** (for **מִצְאָת**) 2 S 18²², cf. Est 2¹⁵; so *Niph'al* **נִפְלְאת** Dt 30¹¹, Zc 5⁷ (but **נִשְׁאָה** Is 30²⁵), and *Hoph'al*, Gn 38²⁵; less frequent forms are **מוֹצְאָת** Ct 8¹⁰; **נִשְׁאָת** 1 K 10²² (cf. § 76 *b*, **שָׁאָת** beside **לְשָׁאָת** as *infinitive construct* from **נִשְׁאָה**) and without **א** (see *k*) **יוֹצָת** (from **יוֹצָא**) Dt 28⁵⁷. In the forms **חַטָּאִים** *sinning*, 1 S 14³³, cf. ψ 99⁶; **בִּזְאָה** *feigning them*, Neh 6⁸, the **א** is elided, and is only retained orthographically (§ 23 *c*) after the retraction of its vowel; see the analogous cases in § 75 *oo*.—On the *plur. masc. ptcp. Niph.* cf. § 93 *oo*.

k 4. Frequently an **א** which is quiescent is omitted in writing (§ 23 *f*): (a) in the middle of the word, e. g. **בָּנִי** 1 S 25⁸; **מִצְתִּי** Nu 11¹¹, cf. Jb 1²¹; **צִמְתִּי** Ju 4¹⁹, cf. Jb 32¹⁸. In the *imperfect* **תִּשְׁנָה** Jer 9¹⁷, Zc 5⁹, Ru 1¹⁴ (but the same form occurs with *Yôdh* pleonastic after the manner of verbs *ל* in Ez 23⁴⁹, according to the common reading; cf. § 76 *b* and Jer 50²⁰); in *Pi'el* **אֲחַטְנָה** (after elision of the **א**, cf. § 75 *oo*) Gn 31³⁹; and also in *Niph'al* **נִטְמַתֶּם** Lv 11⁴³; cf. Jos 2¹⁶. (b) at the end of the word; **וַיְבֹ** 1 K 12¹² *Kethibh*; *Hiph'il* **הִחְטִי** 2 K 13⁶, cf. Is 53¹⁰ (**הִחְלִי** for **הִחְלִיא** *perfect Hiph'il* of **חָלָה** formed

after the manner of verbs נ"ל); in the *imperfect Hiph'il* יִשֵּׁי ψ 55¹⁶ *Kethibh*; יִנִּי ψ 141⁵; אָבִי 1 K 21¹⁹, Mi 1¹⁵; in the *infinitive*, Jcr 32³⁵; in the *participle*, 2 S 5², 1 K 21²¹, Jer 19¹⁵, 39⁶, all in *Kethibh* (אָבִי, always before נ, hence perhaps only a scribal error).

5. In the *jussive, imperfect consecutive, and imperative Hiph'il* a number of cases *l* occur with *i* in the final syllable; cf. נִשֵּׂי Is 36¹⁴ (in the parallel passages 2 K 18²⁹, 2 Ch 32¹⁵ יִשֵּׂי); וַיְבִיא Neh 8² (before ע); וַיִּחַטּא 2 K 21¹¹ (cf. 1 K 16², 21²²); וַיִּתְחַבֵּא 2 K 6²⁹; וַיּוֹצֵא Dt 4²⁰, 2 K 11¹², ψ 78¹⁶, 105⁴³; *imperative* הִבִּיא Jer 17¹⁸; הוֹצֵיא Is 43⁸ (in both cases before ע). If the tradition be correct (which at least in the defectively written forms appears very doubtful) the retention of the *i* is to be attributed to the open syllable; while in the closed syllable of the 3rd *sing. masc. and fem.*, and the 2nd *sing. masc. after ו consecutive*, the *i* is always reduced to *e*. In the examples before ע considerations of euphony may also have had some influence (cf. § 75 *hh*).—In Ez 40³, Baer reads with the Western school וַיְבִיא, while the Orientals read in the *Kethibh* וַיְבִיא, and in the *Qerê* וַיְבִיא.

On the transition of verbs נ"ל to forms of ה"ל see § 75 *nn*.

§ 75. Verbs ה"ל, e. g. גָּלָה to reveal. Paradigm P.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 149 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 618 ff.—G. R. Berry, 'Original Waw in ה"ל verbs' in *AJSL*. xx. 256 f.

These verbs, like the verbs פ"י (§§ 69, 70), belong to two different *a* classes, viz. those originally ל"ו and those originally ל"י,¹ which in Arabic, and even more in Ethiopic, are still clearly distinguished. In Hebrew, instead of the original ו or י at the end of the word, a ה always appears (except in the *ptcp. pass. Qal*) as a purely orthographic indication of a final vowel (§ 23 *k*); hence both classes are called ה"ל, e. g. גָּלָה for גָּלַי *he has revealed*; שָׁלַח for שָׁלַי *he has rested*. By far the greater number of these verbs are, however, treated as originally ל"י; only isolated forms occur of verbs ל"ו.

שָׁלַח to be at rest may be recognized as originally ל"ו, in the forms in which *l* the *Wāw* appears as a strong consonant, cf. 1st *sing. perfect Qal* שָׁלַחְתִּי Jb 3²⁶, the *participle* שָׁלַח and the derivative שָׁלַח rest; on the other hand the *imperfect* is יִשְׁלַח (with *Yôdh*). In עָנָה (Arab. عني) to answer, and עָנָה (Arab. عنو)² to be afflicted, are to be seen two verbs originally distinct, which have been assimilated in Hebrew (see the *Lexicon*, s. v. עָנָה).

¹ According to Wellhausen, 'Ueber einige Arten schwacher Verba' in his *Skizzen*, vi. p. 255 ff., the ה"ל verbs, apart from some true ל"ו and some probable ל"י, are to be regarded as originally biliteral. To compensate for their arrested development they lengthened the vowel after the 2nd radical, as the ל"ו verbs did after the 1st radical. But although there is much to be said for this view, it fails to explain pausal forms like הָלַח (see *u*). It seems impossible that these should all be *late* formations.

² In the *Mêša'* inscription, line 5, ויענו and he oppressed occurs as 3rd *sing. masc. imperfect Pi'el*, and in line 6, ויענו I will oppress as 1st *sing.*

Of quite a different class are those verbs of which the third radical is a consonantal ה (distinguished by *Mappiq*). These are inflected throughout like verbs *tertiaе gutturalis*. Cf. § 65 note on the heading.

C The grammatical structure of verbs ה"ל (see Paradigm *P*) is based on the following laws:—

1. In all forms in which the original *Yôdh* or *Wāw* would stand at the end of the word, it is dropped (cf. § 24 *g*) and ה takes its place as an orthographic indication of the preceding long vowel. Such an indication would have been indispensable, on practical grounds, in the still unvocalized consonantal text. But even after the addition of the vowel signs, the orthographic rule remained, with insignificant exceptions (see § 8 *k*, and *ā* in הַלְיָהוּ, &c.), that a final vowel must be indicated by a vowel letter. In verbs ה"ל the ה which is here employed as a vowel letter is preceded by the same vowel in the same part of the verb throughout all the conjugations. Thus the endings are—

הַ־ in all perfects, הַלְיָהוּ, הַלְיָהוּ, הַלְיָהוּ, &c.

הֲ־ in all imperfects and participles, הַלְיָהוּ, הַלְיָהוּ, &c.

הִ־ in all imperatives, הַלְיָהוּ, הַלְיָהוּ, &c.

ה־ in the infinitive absolute (הַלְיָהוּ, &c.), except in *Hiph'îl*, *Hoph'al*, and generally also *Pi'el*, see *aa* and *ff*.

The *participle passive Qal* alone forms an exception, the original י (or ו, see *v*) reappearing at the end, הַלְיָהוּ; and so also some derived nouns (§ 84^a, *c*, *e*, &c.).

The *infinitive construct* always has the ending הוּ (with ה feminine); *Qal* הוּלְיָהוּ, *Pi'el* הוּלְיָהוּ, &c.; for exceptions, see *n* and *y*.

d These forms may be explained as follows:—in the *perfect Qal* הַלְיָהוּ stands, according to the above, for (י)הַלְיָהוּ, and, similarly, in *Niph'al*, *Pu'al*, and *Hoph'al*. The *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el* may be based on the forms הַלְיָהוּ, הַלְיָהוּ (§ 52 *l*; and § 54 *k*), and *Hiph'îl* on the form הַלְיָהוּ, on the analogy of the *ā* in the second syllable of the Arabic *'áqtälä* (§ 53 *a*). Perhaps, however, the final *ā* of these conjugations simply follows the analogy of the other conjugations.

e The explanation of the final tone-bearing הֲ־ of the *imperfect* is still a matter of dispute. As to the various treatments of it, see Barth, *Nominalbildung*, i. p. xxx ff, with § 136, Rem., and *ZDMG*. xlv. 695 f., against Philippi's objections in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, 1890, p. 356 f.; also *ZDMG*. lvi. 244, where Barth appeals to the rule that, in the period before the differentiation of the North Semitic dialects, final *iy* becomes הֲ־ (*constr.* הֲ־), not *i*; M. Lambert, *Journ. Asiat.* 1893, p. 285; Prätorius, *ZDMG*. lv. 365. The most probable explanation now seems to be, first, that the uniform pronunciation of all imperfects and participles with *S^eghôl* in the last syllable merely follows the analogy of the *impf. Qal*, and secondly, that the *S^eghôl* of the *impf. Qal* does perhaps ultimately represent a contraction of the original termination י־ (= *ai*), although elsewhere (e.g. in the *imperative* of ה"ל) *ai* is usually contracted to *é*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

k 5. Finally, a strongly-marked peculiarity of verbs ה"ל is the rejection of the ending ה־ in forming the *jussive* and the *imperfect consecutive*. This shortening occurs in all the conjugations, and sometimes also involves further changes in the vocalization (see *o, y, bb, gg*). Similarly, in some conjugations a *shortened imperative* (cf. § 48 *k*) is formed by *apocope* of the final ה־ (see *cc, gg*).

l 6. The ordinary form of the *imperfect* with the ending ה־ serves in verbs ה"ל to express the *cohortative* also (§ 48 *c*); cf. Gn 1²⁶, 2¹⁸, 2 Ch 25¹⁷, &c. With a final ה־ there occur only: in *Qal*, אֲשַׁעֲךָ ψ 119¹⁷, אֲהַמְיָה (with the ' retained, see below, *u*) ψ 77⁴; and in *Hithpa'el* וְנִשְׁתַּעֲרָה Is 41²³ (with *Tiphḥa*, therefore in lesser pause).

REMARKS.

I. On *Qal*.

m 1. The older form of the *fem.* of the 3rd *sing. perf.* תִּלְתֵּן, mentioned above, under *i* (cf. § 74 *g*), is preserved in עֲשֵׂת (before א) Lv 25²¹ (cf. 2 K 9³⁷ *Kethîbh*)¹; likewise in *Hiph'el* הִרְצֵת (before א) Lv 26³⁴; הִלְאֵת Ez 24¹²; and in *Hoph'al* הִנְלֵת (before י) Jer 13¹⁹.—The 2nd *sing. fem.* is also written תִּי־; thus in the *textus receptus* וְהִיִּיתְ 2 S 14², and always in Baer's editions (since 1872), as in most other verbs; וְהִוְצֵאתְ 1 K 17¹³ from יִצֵּא. In the 3rd *pers. plur.* the tone, instead of keeping its usual place (תִּלְתֵּן, &c.), is retracted in ψ 37²⁰, תִּלְתֵּן, both on account of the *paize* and also in *rhythmical antithesis* to the preceding תִּלְתֵּן; also in Is 16⁸ תִּלְתֵּן (according to Delitzsch for the sake of the *assonance* with תִּלְתֵּן); and in Jb 24¹ תִּלְתֵּן.—On the tone of the *perfect consecutive* see § 49 *k*.

n 2. The *inf. absol.* frequently has ו (probably a survival of the older orthography) for ה־, e. g. הִוּוּ Gn 18¹⁸; עֲשֵׂוּ Jer 4¹⁸, &c., Ez 31¹¹; קִנְוּ 2 S 24²⁴; רִאוּ Gn 26²⁸, Is 6⁹ (cf. 1 S 6¹²), &c., beside רִאֵה. The form שְׂתוּת Is 22¹³ (beside שְׂתוּ in the same verse) appears to have been chosen on account of its similarity in sound to שְׂחַט; so in Is 42²⁰ *Qerê* and Ho 10⁴, אֲלוּת (unless it is a substantive, *oaths*) and בְּרִית; cf. also עָרוּת Hb 3¹³.—Conversely, instead of the *infinitive construct* גִּלּוּת such forms are occasionally found as גִּלּוּהָ or גִּלּוּ, cf. רִאֵה Gn 48¹¹; קִנְהָ Pr 16¹⁶; עֲשֵׂהָ Gn 50²⁰, ψ 101³, also עֲשֵׂוּ Gn 31²⁸ (cf. Pr 31⁴), and even with the *suffix* הִי the very remarkable form עֲשֵׂהָ Ex 18¹⁸.²—The feminine form רִאוּהָ (for רִאוּת) Ez 28¹⁷, analogous to nouns like גִּאוּהָ (cf. § 45 *d*), is strange, but הִיָּה as *inf.* Ez 21¹⁵ is quite inexplicable.—The forms הִגּוּ and הִרּוּ Is 59¹³ are perhaps to be regarded with Barth, *Nominalbildung*, § 51 *a*, as *infinitives absolute* of the *passive* of *Qal* (see above, § 53 *u*), not of *Pô'el*.—The 2nd *sing. masc. imperative* וְחִיָּה occurs in the principal pause in Pr 4⁴ and 7²; but

¹ In the Siloam inscription also (see above, § 2 *d*), line 3, הִיָּת may be read הִיָּת quite as well as [הִיָּת].

² All these infinitives construct in *ô*, in the Pentateuch, belong to the document called E; cf. § 69 *m*, second note.

probably these forms are simply to be attributed to a Masoretic school, which in general marked the difference between certain forms by the use of *è* for *ē*, and conversely *ē* for *è*; cf. the analogous examples in § 52 n, and especially § 75 hh, also Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 17, 2, Rem. 1.—On the reading וַיִּרְאֵינָה Ct 3¹¹ (for וַיִּרְאֵינָה, on the analogy of the reading מִצְאָנָה &c., § 74 h), see Baer's note on the passage.

3. The shortening of the imperfect (see above, k, and the note on hh) occasions O in Qal the following changes:

(a) As a rule the first radical takes a helping *S^eghôl*, or, if the second radical is a guttural, a helping *Pathah* (according to § 28 e). Thus יִגְלֹ for יִגְלֹ; וַיִּבּוּ and he despised, Gn 25³⁴; וַיִּבְנוּ and he built; יִשַׁע he looks; וַיִּמַח and he destroyed, Gn 7²³.

(b) The *i* of the preformative is then sometimes lengthened to *ē*, e.g. יִרְא *p* he sees. This, however, mostly happens only after the preformative ת, whilst after י the homogeneous *i* remains, e.g. וַיִּתְּבַל (but וַיִּתְּבַל), וַיִּתְּפַן (but וַיִּתְּפַן), וַיִּתְּרַב (but וַיִּתְּרַב); with middle guttural וַיִּתְּחַע, וַיִּתְּכַה Jb 17⁷ (from כָּהָה). The unusual position of the tone in וַיִּתְּרַא Zc 9⁸, וַיִּתְּרַא Mi 7¹⁰ (so Baer and Ginsb.; ed. Mant. וַיִּתְּרַא, וַיִּתְּרַא) is best explained (except in וַיִּתְּרַא Gn 41³³, before פ) on the analogy of וַיִּתְּמַה, &c., § 72 s, as due to the following נ. But cf. also hh.

(c) The helping vowel is elsewhere not used under the circumstances mentioned in § 28 d; וַיִּשְׁבּוּ Nu 21¹, Jer 41¹⁰, cf. וַיִּשְׁפַּתּוּ Jb 31²⁷; on the other hand, with *i* lengthened into *ē* (see p) וַיִּשְׁתָּהּ, וַיִּשְׁבְּךָ, וַיִּשְׁרַךְ, יִשְׁטָ. The form יִרְא he sees, occurs parallel with וַיִּרְא and he saw (but 3rd fem. always וַיִּתְּרַא), the latter with the original *Pathah* on account of the following ר, and identical with the 3rd sing. masc. of the imperf. consec. *Hiph'il*, 2 K 11⁴.

(d) Examples of verbs *primae gutturalis* (§ 63), and at the same time ל"ה, ר are וַיַּעֲשֶׂה, in pause וַיַּעֲשֶׂה and he made, from עָשָׂה; וַיַּעֲנֶה and he answered, from עָנָה (always identical with the corresponding forms in *Hiph'il*), וַיַּחֲצֵץ and he divided, from חָצַע. On some similar forms of נ"פ see § 76 d.—In the following cases the initial (hard) guttural does not affect the form: וַיִּתְּחַר and he was wroth, וַיִּתְּחַן and he encamped (3rd plur. וַיִּתְּחַנו), יִתְּחַר (with *Dageš lene* and *Šewá*) let it rejoice, Jb 3⁶; cf. Ex 18⁹.—On וַיִּזּוּ, וַיִּזּוּ, וַיִּזּוּ (ל"ה as well as נ"פ), &c., see § 76 b, c, f.

(e) The verbs וַיְהִי to be, and וַיִּחַי to live, of which the shortened imperfects S ought to be *yihy* and *yihy*, change these forms to יְהִי and יִחַי, the second *Yôdh* being resolved into *i* at the end of the word; but in pause (§ 29 n) יְהִי, יִחַי, with the original *ā* modified to *S^eghôl* with the tone (cf. also nouns like בְּכִי for *bakhy*. in pause בְּכִי; עֹנִי for 'ony, &c., § 84^a c, and § 93 x). For וַיִּשְׁחַח, however, in Dt 32¹⁸, since no verb וַיִּשְׁחַח exists, we must read either וַיִּשְׁחַח, or better וַיִּשְׁחַח (Samaritan וַיִּשְׁחַח), as imperfect Qal of וַיִּשְׁחַח to forget.—Analogous to יְהִי from וַיְהִי, there occurs once, from וַיְהִי to be, the form וַיְהִי for וַיְהִי he will be, Ec 11³, but no doubt וַיְהִי is the right reading.

The full forms (without apocope of the ה, cf. § 49 c) not infrequently t occur after *wāw* consecutive, especially in the 1st pers. and in the later books, e.g. וַיִּרְאֵינָה and I saw, twenty times, and Jos 7²¹ in *Kethibh*, but never in the Pentateuch (וַיִּרְאֵינָה fifteen times, of which three are in the Pent.); also in the

3rd pers. וַיִּרְאֶה Ez 18²⁸, Jb 42¹⁶ *Qere*; וַיַּעַשׂ and he made, four times (but וַיַּעַשׂ over 200 times); cf. also Ju 19² (וַתִּוְנֶה); 1 K 10²⁹ (וַתַּעֲלֶה); Dt 1¹⁶ (וַאֲצַיְה), and Gn 24⁴⁸. So also occasionally for the *jussive*, cf. Gn 1⁹, 41³⁴, Jer 28⁶.—For the well attested, but meaningless וַתִּירָא Jb 6²¹ (doubtless caused by the following וַתִּירָא), read וַתִּרְאֶה *ye see*, with Ginsburg.

u 4. The original *y* sometimes appears even before affirmatives beginning with a vowel (cf. above, *h* and *l*), especially in and before the *pause*, and before the full plural ending ׀—, or where for any reason an emphasis rests on the word. *Perfect* הָסִיּוּ ψ 57², הָסִיּוּ Dt 32³⁷, cf. ψ 73² *Qere*; *imperative* בְּעָיִי Is 21¹². *Imperfect* יֵאָתִי Jb 16²², 30¹⁴ (without the *pause*, ψ 68³²); יִשְׁלִי ψ 122⁶, Jb 12⁶, cf. ψ 77⁴; יִרְבִּין Dt 8¹³; ψ 36⁹: more frequently like יִשְׁתַּיִן ψ 78⁴⁴; Is 17¹², 21¹², 26¹¹, 31³, 33⁷, 41⁵, ψ 36⁸, 39⁷, 83³; before a suffix, Jb 3²⁵. Also in Pr 26⁷ הִלְיִי, as *perf. Qal* from הִלַּךְ, was perhaps originally intended, but hardly הִלְיִי, since these full forms, though they may stand out of *pause*, do not begin sentences; הִלְיִי probably points to הִלְיִי from הִלַּךְ as the right reading, since the sense requires an intransitive verb. Cf. further, *v*, *x*, *dd*, *gg*.

u 5. The *participle active* (cf. Vollers, 'Das Qâtil-Partizipium,' ZA. 1903, p. 312 ff., and on the participles of ה"ל, *ibid.*, p. 316 ff.), besides feminine forms like עֹלָה Ju 20⁸¹, &c., רֹאָה Pr 20¹², has also a *feminine* which retains the 3rd radical *y*, viz. בּוֹכְיָה (= בָּכָה) weeping, La 1¹⁶; הוֹמְיָה tumultuous, Is 22² (*plur.* Pr 1²¹); צוֹפְיָה spying, Pr 31²⁷, פְּרִיָה fruitful, ψ 128³, *plur.* אֲתִיּוֹת the things that are to come, Is 41²³. With the ordinary strong inflexion *y* appears in עֹמְיָה Ct 1⁷, but perhaps there also עֹמְיָה was intended, unless it should be טֹעְיָה a wanderer. For רֹאָנִי Is 47¹⁰, רֹאָנִי is to be read.—On עֹשֶׂה 1 K 20⁴⁰ for עֹשֶׂה, cf. § 116 *g*, note.—In the *participle passive* the 3rd radical still sometimes appears as ו (§ 24 *b*), cf. עָשׂוּ made, Jb 41²⁵, צָפּוּ Jb 15²², contracted from עָשׂוּ, עָפּוּ; and before a formative ending, it even has its consonantal sound, הַעֲשׂוּם (read הַעֲשׂוּם) 2 K 23⁴; עֲשׂוּת (read 'asúwôth) 1 S 25¹⁸ *Kethibh*, נִטּוּת (read n'etúwôth) Is 3¹⁶ *Kethibh*. The shortening of the *ú* in רֹאִיּוֹת Est 2⁹ is irregular.

u 6. The defective writing is rare in such forms as וְהָיָה 2 S 15³³; בְּנָתִי 1 K 8⁴⁴, cf. 1 K 9³; וַתִּרְלָנָה Ex 2¹⁶ (cf. Jer 18²¹, 48⁶, 1 Ch 7¹⁵, Jb 17⁵, &c.), and the pronunciation הַתִּרְלָנָה Mi 7¹⁰, cf. הַתִּעַנְנָה Ju 5²⁹ (unless they are *sing.* with *suff.* of the 3rd *sing. fem.*). Both cases are probably to be explained according to § 20 *i*.

II. On Niph'al.

x 7. Here the forms with *y* in the 1st and 2nd *pers. sing.* of the *perfect* predominate (*y* only in נִקְיִתָּה Gn 24⁸); on the other hand in the 1st *plur.* always *y*, as נִגְלִינוּ 1 S 14⁸. No examples of the 2nd *plur.* occur.—With *y* retained in *pause* נִפְיִי Nu 24⁶; once with an initial guttural נִחְרִי Ct 1⁶ for נִחְרִי, probably arising from the ordinary strong form *nihru*, but the harshness of *n* immediately followed by *r* is avoided by pronouncing the *n* with *Hateph-Pathah*.—In the 3rd *sing. fem.* נִשְׁתַּוָּה Pr 27¹⁵ (in *pause* for נִשְׁתַּוָּה) ו and ת may be transposed for euphonic reasons; but probably we should simply read נִשְׁתַּוָּה.—Among Niph'al forms of ה"ל must be classed, with Buxtorf and



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

on יָרַר Ju 5¹³, see § 69 g. Finally, on יָרַר, which is referred to *Pi'el* by some, as a supposed *imperative*, see above, *u*.

CC 12. Examples of apocopated *imperatives* in *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el* are: צַו, also צִוֵּה *command thou*, גַּל *open thou*, ψ 119^{18.22}; מִן *prepare thou*, ψ 61⁸; נִס for נִסֵּה *prove thou*, Dn 1¹²; הִתְחַל *feign thyself sick*, 2 S 13⁵; cf. Dt 2²⁴.—On רָבָה Ju 9²⁹, cf. § 48 l.—In ψ 137⁷ עָרַר *raise it*, is found twice instead of עָרַר (for 'arrû) for rhythmical reasons (cf., however, וַיְעָרַר in the *imperfect*, 2 Ch 24¹¹).

dd 13. Examples of forms in which the *Yôdh* is retained are the *imperfects* וַיִּתְרַמְּיוּ Is 40¹⁸, cf. verse 25 and 46⁵; וַיִּכְסּוּ יְכֻסּוּ *they cover them*, Ex 15⁵; *participle Pu'al* מְחַיֵּם Is 25⁶; for אֲרִיִּן Is 16⁹ (from רָוָה) read with Margolis, אֲרִיִּן.

IV. On *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*.

ee 14. The 3rd *sing. perfect Hiph'il* sometimes has *S^eghôl* in the first syllable instead of *i* (§ 53 p), especially in הִגְלָה (but *perfect consecutive* וְהִגְלָה 2 K 24¹⁴), הִרְאָה, הִלְאָה; also with *suffixes*, e. g. הִגְלָם 1 Ch 8⁷, הִלְאָנִי Jb 16⁷, וְהִפְדָּה Ex 21⁸. The *S^eghôl* also occurs in the 1st *sing.*, e. g. הִלְאֵיתִי Mi 6³. On וְהִרְאֵיתִי Na 3⁵, cf. § 53 p. The forms with *é* in the second syllable (also written defectively, as וְהִבְתִּי Jer 21⁶) are found throughout in the 1st *sing.* (except Pr 5¹³), rarely in the 2nd *sing. masc.*, and never in the 1st *plur.* In the other persons they are about equally common with *i*, except in the 2nd *plur.*, where *i* predominates. Before *suffixes* the forms with *i* predominate throughout; cf., however, *é* in Ex 4¹², Mi 6³, Pr 4¹¹. On the tone of the *perf. consec. Hiph.* of ה"ל, see § 49 k. In *Hoph'al* only *i* occurs in the 2nd syllable.

ff 15. In the *infinitive Hiph'il* of רָבָה *to be abundant*, besides the *construct* הַרְבוֹת we find the *absolute* הִרְבָּה taking the place of the common form הַרְבֵּה, which had come to be used invariably (but König calls attention to its use as *infinitive construct* in Ez 21²⁰) as an adverb, in the sense of *much*; in 2 S 14¹¹ the *Q^eré* requires הִרְבַּת for the *Kethibh* הִרְבִּית, an evident scribal error for הַרְבוֹת. Cf. Gn 41⁴⁹, 22¹⁷, Dt 28⁶³; the pointing הִרְבָּה Jer 42² probably arises from regarding this form as a noun.—On הִמְרוֹת Jb 17² (with *Dageš f. dirimens*) see § 20 h.—In 2 K 3²⁴ הִבּוֹת (before נ) is probably *infinitive absolute*, used in order to avoid the hiatus, cf. § 113 x, and on a similar case in *Qal*, see above, *n*.—On the *infinitives* with elision of the ה, cf. § 53 q.

gg 16. The *shortened imperfect Hiph'il* either takes no helping vowel, as יִפֹּת *let him enlarge*, Gn 9²⁷; יִרֶךְ *he shall subdue*, Is 41²; וַיִּשְׁקַן *and he watered*, Gn 29¹⁰, &c.; וַיִּרְא *and he showed*, 2 K 11⁴ (see § 28 d): or else has a helping vowel, as יִגְלֶה (for יִגְלֵה, see § 27 r), e. g. 2 K 18¹¹; וַיִּפְּרֶה ψ 105²⁴; וַתִּמָּר Ez 5⁶; וַיִּתַּע 2 Ch 33⁹; וַאֲרַב i. e. probably וַאֲרַב Jos 24⁹ *Kethibh* (וַאֲרַבָּה *Q^eré*).—Examples of verbs *first guttural*: וַיַּעַל Nu 23², וַאֲעַל, &c., which can be distinguished as *Hiph'il* from the similar forms in *Qal* only by the sense.—The *apocopated imperative Hiph'il* always (except in verbs פ"ן, e. g. הֵךְ, הֵט, § 76 c) has a helping vowel, *S^eghôl* or *Pathah*, e. g. הִרְבֵּה *increase thou* (for *harb*, הִרְבָּה) ψ 51⁴ *Q^eré*, also Ju 20³⁸; where, however, it cannot be explained the text stands; הִרְבֵּה *let alone* (for הִרְבֵּה, הִרְבָּה Dt 9¹⁴, &c.; הִעַל (for הִעֲלֵה) Ex 8¹, 33¹²; but for הִשַׁע ψ 39¹⁴, which could only be *imperative Hiph'il* of שָׁעַע (= *smear over*, as in Is 6¹⁰), read with Baethgen שָׁעָה *look away*.—The *imperfect Hiph'il* with *Yôdh* retained occurs only in הוֹגִיֵן Jb 19², from יָגָה. Cf. *u*.

V. In General.

17. In Aramaic the *imperfect* and *participle* of all the conjugations terminate *llh* in $\text{h} _ _$ or $\text{h} _ _ _$. The Hebrew *infinitives*, *imperatives*, and *imperfects* in $\text{h} _ _$, less frequently $\text{h} _ _ _$ or $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, may be due to imitation of these forms. On the *infinitive construct* *Pi'el* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, see above, *aa*; *imperative Qal* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Jb 37⁶ (in the sense of *fall*); *imperfect* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ let him look out, Gn 41³³ (but see above, *p*); $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ he will do, Is 64⁹; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Jer 17¹⁷; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ consent thou not, Pr 1¹⁰; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ do thou not, 2 S 13¹² (the same form in Gn 26²⁹, Jos 7⁹, Jer 40¹⁶ *Qeré*); $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ (so Baer and Ginsburg, after cod. Hillel, &c.) *I will te*, Jer 31¹; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Jos 9²⁴; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Dn 1¹³. Cf. also in *Niph'al* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Lv 5⁹; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ (according to Qimḥi) Nu 21²⁷; in *Pi'el* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Lv 18^{7.8.12-17}, 20¹⁹, in each case $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, beside $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ with a minor distinctive; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ (Baer $\text{h} _ _ _ _$) Na 1⁹; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Ez 5¹² (with *Zaqeph*; Baer $\text{h} _ _ _ _$). The fact, however, that a great number of these forms occur in *pause* and represent at the same time a *jussive* or *voluntative* (Jos 7⁹), suggests the view that the *Sere* is used merely to increase the emphasis of the pausal form, and at the same time to make a distinction in sound between the *jussive* or *voluntative* and the ordinary *imperfect*.¹ Elsewhere (Gn 26²⁹, Lv 5⁹, Jer 40¹⁶, Dn 1¹³; according to Baer also Mi 7¹⁰, Zc 9⁶) the pronunciation with *ê* is probably intended to soften the hiatus caused by a following h or y ; cf. the analogous cases above, § 74 *l*.

The ending $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ appears to stand for $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ in the *imperfect Qal* in $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ *ii* and there hath she played the harlot, Jer 3⁶; perhaps, however, the 2nd *sing. fem.* is intended, or it may have been introduced into the text of Jeremiah from Ez 16¹⁵, &c. Still more strange is it in the *imperfect Hiph'il* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Jer 18²³; but the *Mil'el*-tone probably points to $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ as the correct reading (cf. Neh 13¹⁴). The $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ stands for $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ in the *perfect Hiph'il* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ he made sick, Is 53¹⁰, which is probably for $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ from $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, a secondary form of $\text{h} _ _ _ _$; see *rr*. The *plur.* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ (Baer $\text{h} _ _ _ _$) they made to melt, Jos 14⁸, is a purely Aramaic form.

18. In two verbs the rare conjugation *Pa'lél* or its reflexive (§ 55 *d*) occurs: *kk* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ archers, Gn 21¹⁶ (from $\text{h} _ _ _ _$); but most frequently in $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ to bend, *Pa'lél* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ not in use, whence reflexive $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ to bow oneself, to prostrate oneself, 2nd *pers.* in $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ and 1st *pers.* in $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, *imperfect* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, consecutive 3rd *sing. masc.* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ for *wayyištahw* (analogous to the noun-forms, like $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ for *sahw*); 3rd *plur.* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$.—Instead of the aramaizing *infinitive* with *suffix* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ 2 K 5¹⁸ read with König $\text{h} _ _ _ _$; in Ez 8¹⁶ $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ is still more certainly a scribal error for $\text{h} _ _ _ _$.

19. Before *suffixes* in all forms ending in h , a connecting vowel is employed *ll* instead of the h and the connecting vowel which precedes it (§ 58 *f*), e. g. $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Gn 24²⁷; in *pause* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ 1 K 2³⁰, &c., even with lesser disjunctives, $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Pr 8²², or with a conjunctive accent, 1 S 28¹⁵ (but Baer $\text{h} _ _ _ _$), Jb 30¹⁹; cf. § 59 *h*; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, in *pause* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, Is 30¹⁹ (and even when not in *pause* Jer 23³⁷) or like $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Dt 32⁶; $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ Gn 28³; cf. also $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, *imperfect* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, *Hiph'il* $\text{h} _ _ _ _$, $\text{h} _ _ _ _$.

Only very seldom does the *imperat.* or *impf.* end in $\text{h} _ _ _ _$ before *suffixes*, e. g. *mmm*

¹ Possibly these examples (like the cases of *S'ghôl* in *pause*, see *n*) represent the view of a particular Masoretic school, which was intended to be consistently carried out.

אֶפְיָהֶם Dt 32²⁶; יִבְפִּימוּ ψ 140¹⁰ *Q^{eré}*; הִכֵּינִי smite me, 1 K 20^{35.37}; cf. Hb 3², Is 38¹⁶. Even in these examples a return to the original ending *ay* might be assumed; but perhaps they are merely due to a less correct *plene* writing. In the 3rd sing. *perf. fem.* the older form נָלַח (see *i*) is always used before a suffix, e. g. כָּלְתָהּ (for כָּלְתָהּוּ) Zc 5⁴; in *pause* עֲשֵׂתִנִּי Jb 33⁴; רָאִתְךָ 42⁵.

VI. The Relation between Verbs ה"ל and א"ל.

nn 20. The close relation existing between verbs א"ל and ה"ל is shown in Hebrew by the fact that the verbs of one class often borrow forms from the other, especially in the later writers and the poets.

oo 21. Thus there are forms of verbs א"ל—

(a) Which have adopted the vowels of verbs ה"ל, e. g. *perfect Qal* בָּלַאתִי I have refrained, ψ 119¹⁰¹; *participle* חוֹטֵא (חָטָא) sinning, Ec 2²⁶, 8¹², 9^{2.18}; cf. Is 65²⁰; מוֹצֵא Ec 7²⁶; נוֹשֵׂא lending, 1 S 22²; *Pi'el perfect* מָלֵא he has filled, Jer 51³⁴; cf. 1 K 9¹¹, Am 4² (where, however, the *perfect Niph.* is perhaps intended), ψ 89¹¹, 143³; רָפְאֵתוּ I heal, 2 K 22¹; cf. Jer 51⁹; *imperfect* יִגְמֹא Jb 39²⁴; *Niph'al perfect* נִפְלְאָתָהּ (like נִגְלְלָתָהּ) it was wonderful, 2 S 1²⁶; *Hiph'il perfect* הִפְלֵא Dt 28⁵⁹; הִחְבְּאָתָהּ (not חָתָה—, cf. above, 2 S 1²⁶) she hid, Jos 6¹⁷. On the other hand, forms like חָטְאִים 1 S 14³³, קָרְאִים ψ 99⁶, נִרְפְּאוּ Ez 47⁸, הִתְרַבְּאוּנִי, according to the correct reading, Jb 19² (cf. Gn 31³⁹ אֲחַטְנָה), and יִרְאֵי *imperative plur. masc.* from יָרָא Jos 24¹⁴, 1 S 12²⁴, ψ 34¹⁰, are due to the elision of the א, see § 74 *i*. On יִנְשִׂיאַ Jer 10⁵ and נִשְׂוֵא ψ 139²⁰, see § 23 *i*.

pp (b) Forms in ה, but keeping their א"ל vowels, e. g. *imperfect Qal* אִרְפָּה Jer 3²²; *imperative* רַפֵּה heal thou, ψ 60⁴; *Niph'al* נִחַבְהָ Jer 49¹⁰ (which must evidently be a *perfect*; read with Ewald the *infinitive absolute* נִחַבְהָ as in verse 23), and הִחַבְהָ to hide oneself, 1 K 22²⁵, cf. Jer 19¹¹; *Pi'el imperfect* יִמְלֵא he will fill, Jb 8²¹.

qq (c) Forms entirely of a ה"ל character, e. g. *perfect Qal* וְצָמְתָּ and when thou art athirst, Ru 2⁹, cf. 2 S 3⁸; כָּלוּ they shut up, 1 S 6¹⁰; cf. 25³³; מָלוּ they are full, Ez 28¹⁶, cf. 39²⁶; *infinitive* חָטָו (see above, *n*) to sin, Gn 20⁶ (on מְלֵאת see above, § 74 *h*); *imperative sing. fem.* חֲבִי Is 26²⁰; *imperfect* יִכְלֵה (for יִכְלֵא) he will keep back, Gn 23⁶; תִּרְפְּינָהּ they heal, Jb 5¹⁸; *participle* בּוֹטֵא Pr 12¹⁸; *fem.* יָצָא Ec 10⁵; *plur.* צָבִיָּה Is 29⁷; *participle passive* נִשְׂוֵי ψ 32¹; *Niph'al* נִרְפְּתָהּ Jer 51⁹; נִבִּיתָּ thou hast prophesied, Jer 26⁹ (cf. ψ 139¹⁴, Jb 18³); *imperfect* וַיִּרְפּוּ 2 K 22²² (*infinitive* Jer 19¹¹); *Pi'el imperfect* וַיִּרְפוּ Jer 8¹¹, cf. Gn 31³⁹; *Hiph'il participle* מְקַנֵּה Ez 8³; *Hithpa'el* הִתְנַבִּיתָּ 1 S 10⁶; *infinitive* הִתְנַבּוּת 1 S 10¹³. For the *Kethibh* לְהִשּׂוֹת 2 K 19²⁵, Jablonski and others require as *Q^{eré}* the form לְהִשְׂאוֹת (so Is 37²⁶); the *Kethibh* would have to be read לְהִשּׂוֹת, with elision of the א and retraction of the vowel.

rr 22. On the other hand, there are forms of verbs ה"ל, which wholly or in part follow the analogy of verbs א"ל, e. g. in their consonants אָתָא he comes, Is 21¹²; בָּרָא 2 S 12¹⁷ (*textus receptus* בָּרָה); וַרְצֵאתִי Ez 43²⁷; יִשְׂנֵא Jb 8¹¹; יִשְׂנֵא La 4¹; וַיִּחְלֵא 2 Ch 16¹²; תִּקְרָאנָה Ex 1¹⁰, Lv 10¹⁹; תִּלְאִים Dt 28⁶⁶ (cf. Ho 11⁷); נִקְרָא (*infin. absol. Niph'al* beside נִקְרִיתִי) 2 S 1⁶; שָׂנֵא 2 K 25²⁹; מִרְפֵּא



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

quiescent, is made audible again by the helping *S^eghôl* (unless perhaps there is a confusion with the *imperfect consecutive Hiph'il* of יאל).

- e (d) Verbs פ"ו and ל"ל (cf. § 69, § 70, and § 74), as יצַץ to go forth, imperative יצַץ go forth, with הַ— paragogic יצַץ Ju 9²⁹ in principal pause for יצַץ; 2nd fem. plur. יצַץ Ct 3¹¹; infinitive יצַץ; *Hiph'il* הוֹצִיא to bring forth.—יִירָא to fear, imperfect יִירָא and יִירָא (or יִירָא), imperative יִירָא; imperfect *Niph'al* יִירָא ψ 130⁴, participle יִירָא.
- f (e) Verbs פ"ו and ל"ל (cf. § 69, § 70, and § 75), e.g. יָרָה to throw, *Hiph'il* to confess, to praise, and יָרָה to throw (both properly verbs פ"ו), and יָפָה to be beautiful. Infinitive יָרָה, יָרוּת; imperative יָרָה; imperfect consecutive יָרָה Ez 31⁷ (cf. also וְתִיפִי 16¹³); with suffixes וְנִירָם we have shot at them (from יָרָה) Nu 21³⁰; perhaps, however, it should be read with the LXX וְנִירָם and their race (also in the very corrupt passage ψ 74⁸ נִירָם is probably a substantive, and not the imperfect *Qal* with suffix from יָרָה); *Pi'el* וַיִּירָה for וַיִּירָה (§ 69 u). *Hiph'il* הוֹרָה, הוֹרָה; infinitive הוֹרָה (as infinitive absolute 2 Ch 7³); imperfect יוֹרָה, cf. אֶל-תָּנוּ Jer 22³; apocopated וַיִּוֹר 2 K 13¹⁷.
- g (f) Verbs ע"ו and ל"ל, particularly בוא to come. Perfect בָּאָה, בָּאָה, בָּאָה or בָּאָה (Gn 16⁸, 2 S 14³, Mi 4¹⁰; cf. § 75 m), once בָּאָה for בָּאָה 1 S 25⁸; for בָּאָה Jer 27¹⁸, which is apparently the perfect, read יָבֵא. In the imperfect *Qal* the separating vowel occurs (תִּבְאִינָה instead of the more common תִּבְאִנָה, cf. also תִּבְאִן Gn 30³⁸) only in Jer 9¹⁶, ψ 45¹⁶, and 1 S 10⁷ *Kethibh*.
- h For וַתִּבְאֵת 1 S 25³⁴ *Qerê* (the *Kethibh* וַתִּבְאֵת evidently combines the two readings וַתִּבְאֵת and וַתִּבְאֵי; cf. Nestle, ZAW. xiv. 319), read וַתִּבְאֵי; on the impossible forms Dt 33¹⁶ and Jb 22²¹ cf. § 48 d.—In the perfect *Hiph'il* הִבִּיאַה, הִבִּיאַה and (only before a suffix) הִבִּיאַת; the latter form is also certainly intended in Nu 14³¹, where the Masora requires וַהֲבִיאַתִּי, cf. 2 K 9², 19²⁵, Is 43²³, Jer 25¹³, Ct 3⁴. Before suffixes the *e* of the first syllable in the 3rd sing. always becomes *Hateph-S^eghôl*, e.g. הִבִּיאַנִי, הִבִּיאַך; elsewhere invariably *Hateph-Pathah*, e.g. הִבִּיאַתָּנוּ or הִבִּיאַתָּנוּ. On the other hand, *e* is retained in the secondary tone in the perfect consecutive when without suffixes, e.g. וַהֲבִיאַתָּ. Cf. moreover, וַהֲקִאֲתוּ (וַהֲקִאֲתוּ in Opatius and Hahn is altogether incorrect), Pr 25¹⁶, from קִיא; but קִיא *spue ye*, Jer 25²⁷ (perhaps only a mistake for קִיא), is not to be referred to קִיא but to a secondary stem קִיא. In the imperfect וַתִּקֵּא is found once, Lv 18²⁵, besides וַתִּקֵּא (analogous to וַתִּבְאֵא).—On אָבִי (for אָבִיא), יָנִי, מִבִּי, see § 74 k.
- i (g) The form חָיִי to live, in the perfect *Qal*, besides the ordinary development to חָיָה (fem. חָיָה), is also treated as a verb ע"ו, and then becomes חָי in the 3rd pers. perfect, in pause חָי, and with *wāw* consecutive וַחָי Gn 3²², and frequently. In Lv 25³⁶ the contracted form וַחָיִי is perhaps *st. constr.* of חָי life, but in any case read וַחָיִי perfect consecutive as in verse 35. The form וַחָיָה occurs in Ex 1¹⁶ in pause for וַחָיָה (3rd fem.) with *Dageš* omitted in the *y* on account of the pausal lengthening of *ä* to *ā*.

§ 77. *Relation of the Weak Verbs to one another.*

The close relation which exists between some classes of the weak *a* verbs (e. g. between פ"ו and פ"י, ל"א and ל"ה, ע"ע and ע"י, ע"ע and ל"ה) appears not only in their similarity or identity of inflexion, or their mutual interchange of certain forms, but especially from the fact that frequently the same root (*radix bilittera*, see § 30 g) recurs in various weak stems of similar meaning. The meaning accordingly is inherent in the two constant root-consonants, while the third consonant, which is weak (and the particular class of weak verbs with it), does not establish any difference in the meaning. Thus from the root רך there occur with the same meaning רָכַח, רָחַח, רָכָא *to strike, to crush*; and from the root נר there are נָרַח, נָרַד, נָרָה *to flee*.

In this manner the following classes are related in form and *b* meaning:

1. Verbs ע"י and ע"ע in which the first and third consonants are the same in both, as being essential to the meaning; e. g. מוּך and מָכַח *to become poor*; מוּש and מָשַׁשׁ *to feel*; נוּר and נָרַד *to flee*.

2. Verbs פ"י and פ"ן; e. g. יָצַח and נָצַח *to place*, נָקַשׁ and יָקַשׁ (*yāqōš*) *to lay snares*. Moreover, stems belonging to the classes mentioned in 1 (especially ע"י) are frequently related also to verbs פ"י and פ"ן, e. g. גוּר and יָגַר *to fear*; טוּב and יָטַב *to be good*; נָפַח and פִּיַח *to blow*; נָפַץ and פּוּץ *to dash to pieces*. Verbs פ"א are less frequently connected with these classes, e. g. אָרַשׁ and רוּשׁ *to thresh*, &c.

3. Verbs ל"א and ל"ה (in which the first two consonants form the real *d* body of the stem) are sometimes related to each other, and sometimes to the above classes. To each other, in רָכַח and רָכָה *to crush*, קָרַח and קָרָה *to meet* (cf. § 75 nn); to verbs of the other classes, in מָצַח and מָצַץ *to suck*, דוּחַ and דוּחַ *to thrust*, &c.

4. Verbs ע"ע and ל"ה, on which cf. Grimm, *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, 1903, p. 196; e. g. אָנַח and אָנַח *to sigh*, דָּמַח and דָּמַח *to be quiet*, חָנַח and חָנַח *to incline*, כָּלַח and כָּלַח *to end*, קָלַח and קָלַח *to despise*, שָׁגַח and שָׁגַח *to err*, שָׁחַח and שָׁחַח *to bend down*, שָׁסַח and שָׁסַח *to plunder*.

5. Verbs ע"י and ע"ה; e. g. מוּל and מָהַל (New Hebrew; in O. T. only מָהוּל *f* Is 1²²) *to circumcise*, מוּר and מָהַר *to exchange*, נוּר (in מְנוּרָה *a light*) and נָהַר *to shine*; cf. also לְהַטִּים *secret arts*, Ex 7¹¹ with לָט *secret*, from לוּט.

§ 78. *Verba Defectiva.*

It often happens, when two kindred weak verbs are in use with *a* the same meaning, that both are *defective*, i. e. do not occur in all the forms. Since, however, those tenses and forms which are not in use in the one verb are generally supplied by the other, they mutually complete one another, and thus form together, as it were, an entire

verb, as in Greek ἔρχομαι, aor. ἦλθον, fut. ἐλεύσομαι, and in Latin *fero, tuli, latum, ferre, &c.*, but with this difference, that in Hebrew the roots of these verbs are almost always closely related.

b The most common verbs of this kind are—

בשׁ *to be ashamed.* *Hiph'íl* הִבִּישׁ (inferred from הִבִּישׁוֹת), but also הִבִּישׁ, הוֹבִישׁ, as if from יִבֵּשׁ, on the analogy of verbs פִּי; also in Is 30⁵ the *Q^{eré}* requires הִבִּישׁ, where the *Kethíb* has הִבִּישׁ from בָּאֵשׁ.

טוב *to be good.* *Perfect* טוֹב; but *imperfect* יִטַּב and *Hiph'íl* הִיטִיב from יִטַּב (but cf. הִטִּיבָה 2 K 10³⁰).

יָנַר *to be afraid.* *Imperfect* יִנָּר (from יָנַר).

יָקַץ *to awake, only in the imperf.* יִיקַץ; for the *perfect*, the *Hiph'íl* הִקִּיץ is used (from קוֹץ).

נָפַץ *to break in pieces.* *Imperfect* יִפּוֹץ (from פּוֹץ). *Imperative* פּוֹץ. *Niph'al* נִפּוֹץ. *Pi'el* נִפֵּץ (from נָפַץ). *Pólél* פּוֹצֵץ (from פּוֹץ). *Reflexive* הִתְפּוֹצֵץ. *Hiph'íl* הִפִּיץ. Also פִּצְפִּץ Jb 16¹².

נָצַב (*Qal* in post-biblical Hebrew, in Aramaic and Arabic) *to place*, whence (possibly) *Niph'al* נִצַּב and *Hiph'íl* הִצִּיב (see above, § 71); but *Hithpa'él* הִתְצַב.

שָׁתָה *to drink*, used in *Qal*; but in *Hiph.* הִשְׁקָה *to give to drink*, from a *Qal* שָׁקָה which is not used in Hebrew.

On הָלַךְ (יָלַךְ) *to go*, see above, § 69 x.

c Rem. 1. To the same category belong also, to a certain extent, those cases where the *tenses* or *moods* not in use in one conjugation, are supplied by forms having the same meaning in other conjugations of the same verb. Thus:

יָסַף *to add.* The *infinitive* (but cf. § 69 h, note) and *imperfect*, unused in *Qal*, are supplied by the *Hiph'íl* הוֹסִיף, יוֹסִיף (on יוֹסִף as *imperfect indicative*, see § 109 d, cf. also § 109 i).

כָּשַׁל *to stumble.* *Perfect* from *Qal*, *imperfect* from *Niph'al*.

נָגַשׁ *to approach*, unused in *perf. Qal*, instead of which *Niph'al* נִגַּשׁ is used; but *imperfect* יִנָּשׂ, *imperative* נִשֵּׂ, and *infinitive* נִשֵּׂת from *Qal* only are in use.

נָחָה *to lead.* *Perfect* usually נָחָה in *Qal*, so *imperative* נַחֵה, but *imperfect* and *infinitive* always in *Hiph'íl*.

נָתַךְ *to be poured out.* *Perfect* *Niph'al* נִתַּךְ with *imperfect* *Qal* יִתַּךְ, but the *perfect* *Qal* and *imperfect* *Niph'al* are not in use.

2. The early grammarians often speak of *mixed forms* (*formae mixtae*), i. e. forms which unite the supposed character and meaning of two different tenses, genders, or conjugations. Most of the examples adduced are at once set aside by accurate grammatical analysis; some others appear to have arisen from misapprehension and inaccuracy, especially from erroneous views of unusual *plene* forms. Others, again, are either merely wrong readings or represent an intentional conflation of two different readings.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

state, § 89), and the representation of case-relations belongs therefore almost exclusively to the syntax (§ 117 ff.). The comparative and superlative of adjectives also can be expressed only by a syntactical combination (§ 133). On the other hand, several changes in the forms of nouns are occasioned by the additions of the plural, dual, and feminine terminations, as well as of the pronominal suffixes, and also by the close connexion of two nouns, by means of the *construct state*.¹

§ 80. The Indication of Gender in Nouns.

Brockelmann; *Grundriss*, p. 404 ff.; 'Ueber die Femininendung *at, ah, ā*' in *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 106 f.; *Grundriss*, pp. 105, 405 ff.; 'Die Femininendung *T* im Semit.' (*Sitzung d. orient.-sprachwiss. Sektion d. schlesischen Gesellschaft*, Feb. 26, 1903); against him J. Barth, *ZDMG.* 1903, p. 628 ff.; Brockelmann's reply, *ibid.*, p. 795 ff.; and Barth again, *ibid.*, p. 798 ff.

a 1. The Hebrew, like all Semitic languages, recognizes only two genders in the noun, a *masculine* and a *feminine*. Inanimate objects and abstract ideas, which other languages sometimes indicate by the *neuter*, are regarded in Hebrew either as masculine or feminine, more often the latter (see the Syntax, § 122 *q*).

b 2. The *masculine*, as being the more common and important gender, has no special indication.

Feminine nouns are also without an indication of gender when the meaning of the word naturally denotes a feminine, as אִמָּה *mother*, אִתָּן *a she-ass*, יֵזָה *a she-goat*, אֵזָה *an ewe* (cf. § 122 *b*). As a rule, however, the *feminine* had originally the ending נ־, as in the 3rd *sing. perfect* of verbs (§ 44 *a*). This נ־, however, is regularly retained in Hebrew only in close connexion with a following genitive or suffix (cf. § 89 *e* and § 91 *o*), except where the form has arisen through the addition of a simple ת² (see below, *d*). Otherwise, the feminine ending of the independent form (the *absolute state*, § 89 *a*) is—

c (*a*) Most commonly a tone-bearing ה־, e. g. סוּסִים *equus*, סוּסָה *equa*. Of nouns ending in —, like עֲבָרִי, the feminine (by § 24 *b*) is עֲבָרִיהַ, cf. § 86 *h*. As in the 3rd *sing. fem. perfect* (קִטְלָהּ, &c.), this ה־ seems to have arisen by the rejection of the final ת, and the lengthening of the *ā* in the open syllable, whereupon the ה was added as an orthographic indication of the final long vowel: cf. the exactly similar origin of such forms as גִּלְהַ for גִּלְיַ, § 75 *c*. It must, however, be

¹ To speak of these changes as a declension of the Hebrew noun, as is usually done, is accordingly incorrect.

² In Mal 1¹⁴ מִשְׁחָתַת (so e. g. ed. Mant.) would stand for מִשְׁחָתַתַּת, the ptc. fem. Hoph'al; but מִשְׁחָתַת (so Baer and Ginsb.) is also supported by good authority.

noticed that in Arabic (see *m* and note) the pausal form of *at* is *ah*, of which a trace may be preserved in the Hebrew הַ־.

(b) Simple ן with nouns ending in a vowel, e. g. יהוּדִי *Jew*, יהוּדִית *d Jewess*. The same ending ן is very frequently added to stems ending in a consonant; but only (except before suffixes) by means of a helping vowel, which, as a rule, is *Seghōl*, but after gutturals *Pathah*, e. g. קָטַל, *fem.* קָטַלְתְּ, *killing*; before suffixes, e. g. קָטַלְתִּי, according to the rule given in § 69 c, cf. also § 84^a s; מוֹרֵעַ *an acquaintance*, *fem.* מוֹרַעַת. The forms which arise in this way follow in every respect the analogy of the *segholate* forms (§ 94 f). The forms which have been developed by means of a helping vowel are retained even in the connective form (*construct state*); except וְיִלְרֹת (for וְיִלְרֹת, which is used elsewhere) Gn 16¹¹, Ju 13^{5.7}; cf. Jer 22²³ and 51¹³ *Qerê*, also מְשַׁרְתַּת 1 K 1¹⁵, *participle fem. Pi'el*, properly *m^esāratt* = מְשַׁרְתַּת; also מְבַעֲרָךְ (*participle fem. Pi'el* with suffix) arises from the form מְבַעֲרָתָּ which was developed into מְבַעֲרָתָּ.

Rem. 1. The *fem.* form in ת־־־ is in general less frequent, and occurs *e* almost exclusively when the form in הַ־ is also in use. It is only in the participles and infinitives that it is the commoner, e. g. קָטַלְתְּ more common than קָטַלְתְּ, לָרַת than לָרַת.

2. Rarer feminine endings are—(a) ת־ with the tone, e. g. בְּרִקְתָּ *emerald*, *f* Ez 28¹³ (also בְּרִקְתָּ Ex 28¹⁷); שְׂפָעַתָּ *a company*, 2 K 9¹⁷, unless the reading is wrong; more frequently in proper names, especially of places among the Canaanites or Phoenicians (in whose language ת־ was the usual *fem.* ending, § 2 d) and other neighbouring tribes,¹ e. g. צִרְפָּתָּ *Zarephath*, גִּבְעָתָּ *Gibeath*, קִרְיָתָּ *Kiriath*, אֵילָנָתָּ *Greek Ailana* in Idumea; אֲחֻזָּתָּ Gn 26²⁶: on the reading גְּלִיָּתָּ cf. g. Cf., moreover, נְגִינָתָּ ψ 61¹ (prob. originally נְגִינָתָּ); חַיִּיתָּ (LXX חַיִּוֹתָּ) 74^{19a}; פּוֹנֵתָּ La 2¹⁸; [רַבַּתָּ *much*, in ψ 65¹⁰, 120⁶, 123⁴, 129^{1.2}, is a form borrowed from the Aramaic (Syriac *rabbath*) in which the original *t* of the *fem.* is often retained to form *adverbs*, see Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 135.]

(b) ת־־, which likewise occurs in some names of places, e. g. חֶלְקָתָּ, בְּעֵלְתָּ, *g* as well as in the *masc.* proper name גְּלִיָּתָּ 1 S 17⁴, &c. (in 17²³, and 21¹⁰, ed. Mant. has גְּלִיָּתָּ), and in the *fem.* proper name שְׂמַעָתָּ; otherwise, almost only in poetry, viz. זְמֵרָתָּ Ex 15², Is 12², ψ 118¹⁴ (really for זְמֵרָתִי *my song*; the absorption of the *i*, however, can scarcely have 'taken place in the Aramaic manner', as suggested by Duhm on Is 12², nor is it due merely to the following *Yódh*, but is intended 'to facilitate the absorption of יה'; so Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 277 f.); נַחֲלָתָּ *heritage*, ψ 16⁶ (either again for נַחֲלָתִי *my heritage*, or for נַחֲלָתָּ, cf. § 90 g, as probably also עֲזָרָתָּ *help*, ψ 60¹³, 108¹³ for עֲזָרָתָּ). These forms are possibly

¹ In the list of Palestinian towns taken by Pharaoh Shoshenq, the feminine town-names all end in *t*. Cf. also the Mēša' inscription, line 3, הַבְּמַת זֹאת *this high place*; line 26, הַמַּסְלָתָּ *the highway* [see also Driver, *Tenses*, § 181, note].

survivals from a period when even final vowels were not supported by a vowel-letter. Cf. also פֶּרֶת *fecunda* (a fruitful tree) Gn 49²²; יְתָרָה *abundance*, Jer 48³⁶ (before ע ; but in Is 15⁷ יְתָרָה); שָׁנָה *sleep* (for שָׁנָה) ψ 132⁴; and (unless the ה is radical) in prose קָנָתָה *pelican* (which reading is also preferable, in Is 34¹¹, to the form קָנָתָה), also מִחָרָת *the morrow*, but in *construct state* always מִמְחָרָת. 1.—תְּהִלָּתָה Jer 45²⁵ *Q^eré* is no doubt intended to indicate the reading תְּהִלָּתָה, parallel to מְשֹׁשֵׁי; cf. above, on וְמָרָת, &c.

h (c) אָ, the Aramaic orthography for הָ, chiefly in the later writers; אָרָא *loathing*, Nu 11²⁰; אָנָא *a terror*, Is 19¹⁷; אָנָא *sleep*, ψ 127²; אָבִיָא *a lioness*, Ez 19² (unless אָבִיָא is intended); אָמָרָא *a mark*, La 3¹²; cf. also אָשָׁרָא *threshing* (*participle Qal* from אָשָׁר) Jer 50¹¹; אָמָרָא *bitter*, Ru 1²⁰. On the other hand, according to the western Masora, קָרָחָה *baldness* is to be read in Ez 27³¹; see Baer on the passage.

i (d) הָ, an obtuse form of הָ (§ 27 *u*), only in הַוְיָרָה for הוֹיָרָה Is 59⁶ (unless it is again a *forma mixta* combining the *active ptc. masc.* הוֹיָרָה and the *passive ptc. fem.* הַוְיָרָה); cf. לָנָה for לָנָה Zc 5⁴; אָנָה 1 K 2^{36.42} (§ 90 *i*, and § 48 *d*).

k (e) הָ without the tone, e. g. רָחָמָה Dt 14¹⁷ [Lv 11¹⁸ רָחַם]; תְּנִינָה בְעֵרָה *an oven heated*, Ho 7⁴; cf. Ez. 40¹⁹, 2 K 15²⁹, 16¹⁸. In all these examples the usual tone-bearing הָ is perhaps intended, but the Punctuators, who considered the feminine ending inappropriate, produced a kind of *locative* form. (see § 90 *c*) by the retraction of the tone. [In 2 K 16¹⁸, Is 24¹⁹, Ez 21³¹ (note in each case the following ה), and in Jb 42¹³, Ho 7⁴, the text is probably in error.]

l (f) יָ, as an old feminine termination, preserved also in Syriac (*ai*; see examples in Nöldeke's *Syrische Gram*, § 83), in Arabic and (contracted to *ê*) in Ethiopic, very probably occurs in the proper name שָׂרַי *Sarai*, cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xl. 183, and xlii. 484; also עֵשְׂרָה *ten (fem.)* undoubtedly arises from an original 'esray; so Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 138; König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 427.

m 3. It is wholly incorrect to regard the *vowel-ending* הָ² as the original termination of the feminine, and the *consonantal ending* הָ as derived from it. The Ethiopic still has the הָ throughout, so too the Assyrian (*at, it*); in Phoenician also the feminines end for the most part in הָ, which is pronounced *at* in the words found in Greek and Latin authors; less frequently in אָ (see Gesenius, *Monumm. Phoen.*, pp. 439, 440; Schröder, *Phön. Sprache*, p. 169 ff.). The ancient Arabic has the obtuse ending (*ah*) almost exclusively in *pause*; in modern Arabic the relation between the two endings is very much as in Hebrew.

¹ In 1 S 2c²⁷ also, where the Masora (see Baer on Jos 5¹¹) for some unknown reason requires מִמְחָרָת, read with ed. Mant., Jablonski, Opitius, and Ginsburg, מִמְחָרָת.

² In this ending the הָ *h* can only be considered consonantal in the sense that the הָ was originally aspirated, and afterwards 'the mute הָ was dropped before *h*, just as the old Persian *mithra* became in modern Persian *mihra*'; so Socin, who also points to the Arabic pausal form in *ah*, and observes that among some of the modern Beduin an *h* is still heard as a fem. ending, cf. Socin, *Diwan aus Centralarabien*, iii. 98, ed. by H. Stumme, Lpz. 1901. In Hebrew this consonantal termination was entirely abandoned, at any rate in later times.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

§ 83. *Verbal Nouns in General.*

a 1. In Hebrew, as in Greek and Latin, the *verbal nouns* are connected in form and meaning primarily with certain forms of the verb, especially the participles and infinitives, which are themselves, even in their ordinary form, frequently used precisely like nouns, e. g. אֹיֵב *enemy*, יְדָעָה *to know, knowledge*. Still oftener, however, certain forms of the infinitive and participle, which are seldom or never found as such in the strong verb, though in use in the weak verb and in the kindred dialects, came to be commonly used for the verbal noun; e. g. the participial form קָטַל, the infinitives of the (Aramaic) form מְקַטֵּל (as a *noun* also מְקַטֵּל), further קְטִילָה, קְטִילָה, קְטִילָה, קְטִילָה (§ 45 *d*), &c. Others (as the Arabic shows) are properly intensive forms of the participle.

b 2. As regards their meaning, it follows from the nature of the case that nouns which have the form of the infinitive regularly denote the *action* or *state*, with other closely related ideas, and are therefore mostly *abstract*; while the participial nouns, on the contrary, denote for the most part the *subject* of the action or state, and are therefore *concrete*. Moreover, it is to be noticed, that a particular meaning is attached to many of the special forms of derivative nouns, although it does not appear equally in them all.

c Rem. It need not appear strange, when we consider the analogy of other languages, that a noun which in form is properly *abstract* afterwards acquired a *concrete* sense, and vice versa. So in English, we say *his acquaintance*, for the *persons* with whom he is *acquainted*; the *Godhead* for *God* himself; in Hebrew מוֹרֵךְ *acquaintance* and *an acquaintance*.

d The inner connexion in thought between Semitic noun-forms and the corresponding verbal forms is investigated in the works of De Lagarde and Barth (see the titles at the head of § 79) on very different lines, but with many points of agreement. De Lagarde starts from the fact that language consists of sentences. A sentence which consists of only *one* word is called a verb, and anything which serves as a complement to it is a noun. The oldest form of the sentence is the imperative. Closely related to it are three kinds of sentences of the nature of verbal forms, differing according as the property of the particular object of sense is to be represented as invariable (form *qatula*), or as liable to change (form *qatila*), or, finally, as a circumstance which takes place before our eyes (form *qatala*). Like the imperative, these three forms of sentences have also been transformed into nouns, by means of certain phonetic changes,—especially by the omission of the final vowels and the addition of different terminations to the last consonant of the stem. But just as the forms of the verbal sentence undergo numerous modifications (in the tenses, moods, and conjugations), so also do the nouns, sometimes by assimilation of the unessential to the characteristic vowel (*qutul, qitil*), sometimes by the lengthening of the characteristic vowel (*qatûl, qatîl, qatâl*), or else through the displacement of the accent and the consequent reduction of the noun to a monosyllabic form (*qatl, qull, qitl*), or, finally, by their being formed from the derived stems (or conjugations), e. g. *qattal, qattâl; qitil, qittâl*, &c. Further modifications arise from the use of the various imperfect

and infinitive forms, and also from the employment of the prefix *m*. Lastly, *denominalia* are formed from *deverbalia* by appending certain suffixes.

De Lagarde does not, however, claim to be able to show in the case of each particular noun the sense it conveyed in primitive times; the origin of a number of nouns can now no longer be detected. In those, however, which are clearly derived from verbs, the original meaning is chiefly determined by the characteristic vowel.

Barth's system is based on the thesis that 'all Semitic nouns, adjectives, and participles are derived from either the perfect or the imperfect stem'. Thus, e. g. קָטַל is the infinitive of the perfect stem, קָטַל the infinitive of the imperfect stem, שָׁכַב infinitive of יָשַׁב, &c. In dissyllabic noun-forms the second vowel is always alone characteristic and essential, the first vowel unessential, and therefore variable. Further modifications of the simple form are effected by strengthening (sharpening) the second or third consonant, by lengthening the characteristic vowel (instead of which, however, the feminine termination may also be used), or by 'metaplasm', i. e. by the use of noun-forms derived from one of the two intransitive stems for the other, e. g. *qutl* for *qitl*, and vice versa.

In nouns of the perfect stem, the vowels *i* and *u* indicate intransitive formations, the vowel *a* a transitive sense. In nouns of the imperfect stem on the contrary, *u* and *i*, being characteristic vowels, indicate a transitive and *a* an intransitive sense: for *yaqtülū* is imperfect of the transitive perfect *qatala*, and *yaqtälū* imperfect of the intransitive perfects *qatila* and *qatula*, &c. This explains how nouns, apparently identical in form, may yet in sense belong to different classes: a *qutl*-form from a *u*-imperfect has a transitive meaning, but the same form from a *u*-perfect has an intransitive meaning. This double system of perfect and imperfect forms runs through the whole scheme of noun-formation, not only the forms connected with the conjugations, but also the forms with prefixes and suffixes.

Against the whole theory it has been urged that it postulates for the development of the language a much too abstract mechanism, and further, that the meanings of words as we find them may in many cases be due to a modification of the original sense. But though many of the details (e. g. the alleged unessential character of the vowel of the first syllable) remain doubtful, yet the agreement between the characteristic vowel of certain noun formations and that of the perfect or imperfect stem, is supported by such a number of incontestable instances, that there can be no doubt as to a systematic, intimate connexion between the two. At the same time it must be admitted that De Lagarde has put forward many important and suggestive points, and both scholars agree in laying stress on *one* characteristic vowel as indicative of the meaning.

§ 84^a. Nouns derived from the Simple Stem.

Preliminary remark.—From the statement made above, § 83 *d*, it follows that *a* an external similarity between forms is no proof of their similar origin, and, vice versa, external difference does not exclude the possibility of their being closely related both in origin and meaning.

I. Nouns with One Vowel, originally Short.

R. Růžička, 'Beiträge zur Erklärung der nomina segolata,' in *Sitz.-ber. d. böhmischen Ges. d. Wiss.*, Prag, 1904.

1. Nouns with one of the three short vowels after the first radical: *present* ground-form *qätl*, *qitl*, *qütl*.

The supposition of *monosyllabic* ground-forms appeared to be required by the character of forms now existing in Hebrew, as well as in Arabic, &c. But there are strong reasons for believing that at least a large proportion of these forms go back to original dissyllabic bases with a short vowel in each syllable. When formative additions were made, the vowel of the 2nd syllable

was dropped, i.e. before case-endings in Assyrian and early Arabic, and before pronominal suffixes in Hebrew. From the forms thus produced, the bases *qatl*, *qitl*, *qutl* have been assumed, although they never appear in Hebrew except in the singular and then in connexion with suffixes.

In support of this view of a large number of original dissyllabic bases, we must not, however, appeal to the S^{egh}ôl or Pathah under the 2nd consonant of the existing developed forms, **קָפַר**, **יָרַע**, &c. These are in no sense survivals or modifications of an original full vowel in the 2nd syllable, but are mere helping-vowels (§ 28 e) to make the monosyllabic forms pronounceable,¹ and consequently disappear when no longer needed. Under certain circumstances even (e.g. in **קִשְׁטָה**) they are not used at all. Actual proofs of such original toneless full vowels in the 2nd syllable of existing Segholates are—

1. Forms like Arab. *mālik*, for which rarely *malk*, corresponding to the Hebrew ground-form; cf. De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, p. 72 ff.

2. In Hebrew **גָּדַר**, **יָרַךְ**, **כָּבַד**, **כָּתַף**, the connective forms of **גָּדַר**, **יָרַךְ**, &c., which latter can only come from ground-forms *gādīr*, *yārīk*, *kābīd*, *kātīp*.

3. The forms treated under e, which are in many ways related to the Segholates proper, in so far as they are to be referred to original dissyllabic bases.

4. The plurals of Hebrew Segholates, since, with very rare exceptions, they take *Qames* under the 2nd radical before the termination **ים**—, fem. **ות**—, of the *absolute state*, as **מְלָכִים**, **מְלָכוֹת**, **סְפָרִים**, &c. This *Qames* (see note 1 on § 26 e) can only be due to a lengthening of an original short vowel in the 2nd syllable, and hence it would seem as though the vowel were always *ā*. This is impossible from what has been said, especially under 1 and 2. Hence the explanation of the consistent occurrence of *Qames* in the plurals of *all* Segholates can only be that the regularly formed plurals (i.e. from singulars with original *ā* in the 2nd syllable) became the models for all the others, and ultimately even for some really monosyllabic forms.²

(a) From the strong stem the above three ground-forms are further developed to **קָטַל**,³ **קִטַּל**, **קִטְל** (cf. § 27 r and in § 93 the explanations of Paradigm I, a-c); without a helping vowel (§ 28 d) **קִשְׁטָה** *truth*. If the second

¹ According to Delitzsch (*Assyr. Gram.*, p. 157 f.) the same is true in Assyrian of the corresponding *qatl*-forms. Without case-endings they are *kalab*, *šamas*, *aban* (= **כָּלַב**, **שָׁמַשׁ**, **אַבְנֵן**), with case-endings *kalbu*, *šamsu*, *abnu*. On the other hand, acc. to Sievers, *Metrik*, i. 261, Hebrew ground-forms probably have a twofold origin: they are shortened according to Hebrew rules partly from old absolute forms like *kālbū*, *sīfru*, *qudšu*, and partly from old construct-forms like the Assyrian types *kalab*, *sifir*, *quduš*.

² On the other hand, Ungnad, *ZA.* 1903, p. 333 ff., rejecting all previous explanations, maintains that the *a* in *m^elākhīm*, *m^elākhōth* is inserted merely to facilitate the pronunciation. From *qatlim* arose *qat^alim*, then *qatalim* and finally *q^etālīm*. See, however, Nöldeke, 'Zur semit. Pluralendung,' *ZA.* 1904, p. 68 ff., who points out that the Semitic nouns *fa'l*, *fi'l*, *fu'l* with their corresponding feminines *fa'la*, &c., on assuming the plural termination commonly take an *a* before the 3rd radical, but that no satisfactory account can be given for it. M. Margolis, 'The plural of Segolates' (*Proc. of the Philol. Assoc. of the Pacific Coast*, San Francisco, 1903, p. 4 ff.), and S. Brooks, *Vestiges of the broken plural in Hebrew*, Dublin, 1883, explain *m^elākhīm* as a *pluralis fractus*.

³ It is worthy of notice that St. Jerome also (cf. Siegfried, *ZAW.* iv. 76) frequently represents the vowel of the first syllable by *a*, e.g. *gader*, *aben*, *ader*, *areb*, for **גָּדַר**, **אַבְנֵן**, **אָדַר**, **אָרַב**, but *cedem*, *secel*, *deber*, &c., for **קָדַם**, **שָׁקַל**, **דָּבַר**, &c.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

e 2. Nouns with one of the three short vowels under the second radical (present ground-form *qätäl*, *qätül*, *qätül*), e. g. שֶׁבֶט *honey*, רִיב *sickness*, תַּחַת *terror*; and so always with middle א, בַּיַר *a well*, זֶבֶד *a wolf*, שֶׁבֶט *stench*. In reality these forms, like the segholates mentioned in No. 1 (see above, a), are, probably, for the most part to be referred to original *dissyllabic* forms, but the tone has been shifted from its original place (the penultima) on to the ultima. Thus *dibás* (originally *dibaš*) as ground-form of שֶׁבֶט is supported both by the Hebrew דְּבַשׁ (with suffix of the first person), and by the Arabic *dibs*, the principal form; *bi'ir* (according to Philippi with assimilation of the vowel of the second syllable to that of the first) as ground-form of בַּיַר is attested by the Arabic *bi'r*; for שֶׁבֶט (Arabic *bu's*) similarly a ground-form *bu'ús* may be inferred, just as a ground-form *qätül* underlies the infinitives of the form קָטַל.¹

II. Nouns with an original Short Vowel in both Syllables.

f 3. The ground-form *qätäl*, fem. *qätälät*, developed in Hebrew to קָטַל (§ 93, Paradigm II, a, b) and קָטְלָה (§§ 94, 95, Paradigm II, a, b), mostly forms intransitive adjectives, as חָכָם *wise*, חָדָשׁ *new*, יָשָׁר *upright*; but also substantives, as דְּבַר *a word*, and even abstracts, as אֲשָׁם *guilt*, רָעָב *hunger*, שֶׂבַע *satiety*; in the fem. frequently abstract, as צְדָקָה² *righteousness*; with an initial guttural אֶרֶץ *earth*.—Of the same formation from verbs ע"ע are בָּרָד *alone*, עָנָן *cloud*; passive חָלַל *pierced*.—In verbs ה"ל a final *Yôdh* is almost always rejected, and the *ä* of the second syllable lengthened to *è*. Thus שָׂדֵי *field*, after rejection of the *y* and addition of ה as a vowel-letter, becomes שָׂדֶה (cf. § 93, Paradigm II, f); fem. e. g. שָׁנָה *year*; cf. § 95, Paradigm II, c. From a verb ל"ל the strong form עָנָו *afflicted* occurs.

g 4. The ground-form *qätül*, fem. *qätülät*, developed to קָטַל (§ 93, Paradigm II, c-e) and קָטְלָה, is frequently used as participle of verbs middle e (§ 50 b), and hence mostly with an intransitive meaning; cf. זָקֵן *old, an old man*; כָּבֵד *heavy*; fem. בְּהֵמָה *cattle*, אֲפֵלָה and חֹשֶׁכָה *darkness*.—From verbs פ"י: irregularly, דְּלִיּוֹתָיו *the branches of it*, Jer 11¹⁶, &c., generally referred to a sing. דְּלִיּוֹת (stem ה"ת), and הִרְיוֹתָיו Ho 14¹ *their women with child* (from הִרָה, st. constr. הִרְתָּ, plur. st. absol. and constr. הִרוּת).—From a verb ל"ו with consonantal Wāw: שָׁלוֹ *at ease*, incorrectly written *plene* שָׁלִיו Jb 21²³.

h 5. The ground-form *qätül*, developed to קָטַל (also written קָטִיל), generally forms adjectives, e. g. אִים *terrible*, בָּרָד *piebald*, מְתוּק *sweet*, נֶקֶד *speckled*, עֵבֶת *interwoven*, עָגֹל *round*, עָמֹק *deep*, עֵקֵב *hilly*, צָהָב *golden*; קָטַן *small*, only in sing. masc., with a parallel form קָטָן of the class treated under f, fem. קָטְנָה, plur. קָטְנִים. These forms are not to be confounded with those in No. III, from

¹ On this theory cf. Stade, *Hebräische Grammatik*, § 199 b; De Lagarde, *Übersicht*, p. 57 f.; A. Müller, *ZDMG*. xlv, p. 226, and especially Philippi, *ZDMG*. xlix, p. 208.

² In St. Jerome's time these forms were still pronounced *šadaca* (צְדָקָה), *šaaca* (צְעָקָה), *nabala* (נִבְלָה), &c., see Siegfried, *ZAW*. iv. 79. Moreover, the numerous abstracts of this form (e. g. even קִצְפָה *a splintering*, צִוּחָה *a crying*, &c.) are undoubtedly to be regarded (with Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 87) as feminines of infinitives of the form *qätäl*, the lengthening of the second syllable being balanced, as in other cases, by the addition of the feminine termination.

the ground-form *qātāl*.—Fem. אִיפָה, כְּבוֹדָה (glorious), עֲבֹתָה, עֲנָנָה (delicate), עֲנָלָה, עֲמָקָה, with sharpening of the third radical, in order to keep the original *ā* short, and similarly in the plurals בְּרָדִים, נְקָדִים, עֲנָלִים, אֲסָפִים stores, &c.

6. The ground-form *qītāl* develops to קָטַל (cf. § 93, Paradigm II, Rem. 1), *i* e. g. לֵבָב heart, עֲנַב a bunch of grapes, שֵׁכָר strong drink; from a verb ל"ה, probably of this class is רֵעָה, generally contracted to רֵעַ friend, ground-form *ri'ay*: the full form is preserved in רֵעֵהוּ his friend, for רֵעֵיהוּ.

III. *Nouns with an original Short Vowel in the First and a Long Vowel in the Second Syllable.*

7. The ground-form *qātāl* in Hebrew always develops to the form קָטוּל, the *k* *ā* becoming an obscure *ô*. The fact that this form is also written קָטַל must not lead to the confusion of these forms with those mentioned in No. 5, from the ground-form *qātūl*.¹ Moreover the *qatōl*-class includes forms of various origin, and therefore of various meaning, as (a) intransitive adjectives like גָּדוּל great, קָדוֹשׁ holy, fem. גְּדוּלָה, the short vowel becoming Š^ewā, whereas in גָּדוּל, &c., before the tone it is lengthened to *ā*; (b) the infinitives absolute of the form קָטַל (§ 45 a) as representing the abstract idea of the verb, and abstract substantives like כְּבוֹד honour, שְׁלוֹם peace (Arab. *sālām*); (c) substantives and adjectives in an active sense, as בַּחוֹן assayer (of metals), עֹשֶׂה an oppressor, מְעוֹרֵר oppressing; in the feminine בְּגוֹדָה treacherous Jer 3^{7.10}, the irregular retention of the *ā* in the third syllable from the end is no doubt to be explained, with Brockelmann, from Aramaic influence, the punctuator having in mind the Aramaic nomen agentis *qātōl*.

8. The ground-form *qāṭil* develops to קָטִיל (cf. § 93, Paradigm IV, a and b). *l* Here also forms of various origin and meaning are to be distinguished: (a) adjectives used substantivally with a passive meaning to denote duration in a state, as אֲסִיר a prisoner, מְשִׁיחַ an anointed one. These proper *qāṭil*-forms are parallel to the purely passive *qatūl*-forms (see *m*), but others are due to a strengthening of original *qatīl*-forms. These are either (b) intransitive in meaning, as צָעִיר small, and, from ל"י stems, נָקִי pure, עָנִי poor (see § 93 *vv*), or (c) active, as נְבִיא a speaker (prophet), פְּקִיד an overseer.—Of a different kind again (according to De Lagarde, infinitives) are (d) forms like אֲסִיף the ingathering, בְּצִיר vintage, חֲרִישׁ ploughing time, קְצִיר harvest. On *qātīl*-forms with a kindred meaning, cf. § 84^b *f*.

9. The ground-form *qātūl* develops to קָטוּל. As in the *qatāl* and *qatīl*-forms *ll* (see *k* and *l*), so here forms of various kinds are to be distinguished: (a) *qatūl*-forms proper, with passive meaning, especially all the passive participles of Qal; fem. e. g. בְּתוּלָה virgin (properly secluded). On the other hand, by strengthening an original *qatūl*-form we get (b) certain stative adjectives (§ 50 *f*), as אֲנִישׁ incurable, עָצוּם strong, עָרֹם subtil, or even transitive, as אֲחִזָּה holding; (c) active substantives, as יָקִישׁ a Fowler. Further, some of the forms mentioned in § 84^b *g* belong to this class; see above, the remark on *l*.

10. The ground-form *qītāl* or *qūtāl*² in Hebrew changes the *i* to vocal Š^ewā, *ll*

¹ In Na 1³ only the Qeré requires נְדָל (in the constr. state) for the Kethibh גְּדוּל.

² On the *fu'āl*-forms (regarded by Wellhausen as original diminutives) see Nöldeke, *Beiträge* (Strassb. 1904), p. 30 ff. He includes among them נְעָרָה *toro*, and טוֹחָרִים *hemorrhoids*.

and develops to קָטַל (cf. § 93, Paradigm IV, c) or קָטוּל, with *á* obscured to *ó* (as above, k). Cf. שְׂאֵר remnant, יָקָר honour, כְּתָב book (Arab. *kítáb*), מָרָב war (the last three probably loan-words from the Aramaic); of the other form, חֲלוֹם a dream, חֲמֹר an ass (Arab. *hímár*), אֱלֹהִים God (Arab. *'iláh*); with *ℵ* prosthetic (§ 19 m), אֲרֹעַ arm (twice: usually אֲרֹעַ); fem. בְּשׂוֹרָה good news (Arab. *bšárät*); עֲבוּרָה service, כְּתָבָה (Arab. *kítábät*) tattooing.

O 11. The ground-form *qitil* seems to occur e. g. in Hebrew אֵוִיל foolish, אֵלִיל vanity, בְּדִיל lead, כְּסִיל a fool, חֲזִיר a swine (the prop. name חֲזִיר points to the ground-form *qitil*, cf. Arab. *hinzir*).

p 12. The ground-form *qitül* or *qütül*, Hebr. קָטוּל, e. g. גְּבוּל a boundary, לְבוּשׁ a garment; fem. גְּבוּרָה strength, אֲמוּנָה faithfulness.

q Rem. When the forms *q'itül* and *q'itól* begin with *ℵ*, they almost invariably take in the singular a *Ṣere* under the *ℵ* instead of the ordinary *Ḥaṭeph-Seghól*; cf. אֲבוּס a crib, אֲטוּן thread, אֲמוּן faithful, אֲזוּב hyssop, אֲזוּר a waist-band, אֲסוּר a bond, אֲפוּד an 'ephod'; cf. § 23 h, and the analogous cases of *Ṣere* for *Ḥaṭeph-Seghól* in verbal forms § 52 n, § 63 p, § 76 d.

IV. Nouns with a Long Vocal in the First Syllable and originally a Short Vowel in the Second Syllable.

r 13. The ground-form *qätäl*, in Hebrew, always changes the *á* into an obscure *ó*, קוֹטַל (קָטַל), e. g. עוֹלָם (§ 93, Paradigm III, a), Arab. *'älám*, eternity; חוֹתָם (Arab. *hätäm*) a seal (according to Barth a loan-word of Egyptian origin), fem. חוֹתָמָה (from *hótämt*); חוֹלֵעַ worm (unless from a stem חוּלַע, like תוֹשֵׁב from חוּשַׁב; see the analogous cases in § 85 b). On the participles *Qal* of verbs חוּלַע (cf. § 93, Paradigm III, c), cf. § 75 e; on the feminines of the participles *Qal*, which are formed with the termination *ת*, see below, s.

Rem. Of a different kind (probably from a ground-form *qautal*) are such forms as אֲפוּן (or אֲפוּן Ez 10⁹ in the same verse) a wheel; גּוֹזֵל a young bird, דּוֹנֵג wax, &c.

s 14. The ground-form *qätil* also becomes in Hebrew almost invariably קוֹטִיל (קָטַל). Besides participles active masc. *Qal* this class includes also feminines of the form קוֹטִילָה, if their ground-form *qötält* (§ 69 c) goes back to an original *qätilt*. The substantives of this form, such as כֹּהֵן priest (Arab. *káhin*), were also originally participles *Qal*. The fem. of the substantives has *ē* (lengthened from *i*) retained before the tone, e. g. אֵלִירָה a woman in travail (cf. also בְּגֵרָה the treacherous woman, Jer 3⁸; הַצֵּלְעָה her that halteth, Mi 4⁶ l., Zp 3¹⁹; סִחְרָה a buckler, ψ 91⁴); the participles as a rule have the form אֵלִירָה, &c., the original *i* having become *Ṣewá*; however, the form with *Ṣere* occurs also in the latter, Is 29^{8,8}, 34⁹, ψ 68²⁶, 118¹⁶ (all in principal pause; in subordinate pause 2 S 13²⁰, Is 33¹⁴; with a conjunctive accent, Ct 1⁶).

t 15. The ground-form *qütäl*, Hebrew קוֹטַל (as יוֹבֵל river, Jer 17⁸) or קוֹטָל e. g. עוּגָב a pipe, commonly עוּגָב, and to be so read, with Baer, also in ψ 150⁴, not עוּגָב.

V. Nouns with a Long Vowel in each Syllable.

u 16. קִיטוּל, e. g. קִיטוּר smoke. The few forms of this kind are probably derived from the ground-form *qitäl* (*qitäl* ?), i. e. the original *á* has become an obscure *ó*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

r); cf. גְּבוֹר hero (Arab. gābbār), יְסוֹר caviller, צְפוֹר (piper or chirper) a bird, שְׂכוֹר drunkard. On the other hand, יְלוֹר born probably arises from yullōd, an old participle passive of Qal, the ũ being dissimilated in the sharpened syllable before ô: so Barth, *ibid.*, p. 41 f.

f 25. The ground-form qāṭṭūl, קָטִיל, almost exclusively of persons, who possess some quality in an intensive manner, e. g. אֲבִיר strong, צַדִּיק righteous, בְּרִיחַ fugitive (for barrī^{ah}), עָרִיץ violent (for 'arrīš).

That some of these are only by-forms of the qāṭṭūl-class (see above, remark on a), appears from the constr. st. פְּרִיץ ravenous, Is 35⁹ (but פְּרִיץ, פְּרִיץ always), and according to Barth (*ibid.*, 35 a) also from the constr. st. אֲבִיר (but also אֲבִיר 1 S 21⁸) of אֲבִיר. However, the form אֲבִיר, as a name of God, may be intentionally differentiated from אֲבִיר, a poetic term for the bull.

In the same way אֲסִיר prisoner, סָרִיס eunuch (constr. st. always סָרִיס, plur. סָרִיסִים, constr. st. סָרִיסִי Gn 40⁷, but in the book of Esther always סָרִיסִי, with suffix סָרִיסִין, &c.), and עָתִיק weaned, may be regarded as by-forms of the qāṭṭūl-class with passive meaning, see § 84^a l.

g 26. The ground-form qāṭṭūl, קָטִיל, e. g. חַנוּן gracious, רַחוּם compassionate (with virtual strengthening of the ח), דִּלִּיגְרָא diligent (for ḥarrūs), probably, again, to a large extent by-forms of the qāṭṭūl-class, § 84^a m. The same applies to substantives like אֲשֶׁר a step (in אֲשֶׁרִי, as well as אֲשֶׁרוֹ, &c.), עַמּוּד pillar; fem. חֲבוּרָה a stripe (also חֲבֻרָתוֹ), בְּטָחוֹת security: cf. Barth, *ibid.*, § 84.

h 27. The ground-form qāṭṭōl; besides the infinitives absolute Pi'el of the form קָטַל, also קָנֹא jealous (as well as קָנָא, an obscured form of qāṭṭāl, see e).

i 28. The ground-form qāṭṭūl, קָטִיל, e. g. צָפוּי a coating of metal, שְׂלוּם requital, שָׁקוּי drink, שְׂקוּי detestable thing; with concrete meaning לְמוֹד a disciple, עוֹז strong; frequently in the plural in an abstract sense, as גְּדוּפִים reproach, מְלֵאִים filling (the induction of a priest), נְחֻמִּים consolations, compassion, שְׂבֻלִים bereavement, שְׁלָחִים dismissal, שְׂמֵרִים observance.

VII. Nouns with the Third Consonant repeated.

h 29. The ground-form qāṭṭāl, e. g. שָׁאֲנָן quiet, fem. שָׁאֲנָנָה (with sharpening of the second Nún, in order to keep the preceding vowel short); רֵעֵנָן green, plur. רֵעֵנָנִים.

l 30. The ground-form qāṭṭāl, in Hebrew קָטַל; of this form are e. g. the infinitives Pi'lēl (prop. Pa'lēl), cf. § 55 d.

m 31. The ground-form qāṭṭūl; so the plur. גְּבֻנָּים ridges (with sharpening of the Nún, as in No. 29).

32. The ground-form qāṭṭāl, in פְּרָחָח a brood.

33. The ground-form qāṭṭāl, in אֲמָלָל faint.

34. The ground-form qāṭṭāl, e. g. עֲבָטִים plunder, סְגֻרִיר rain-storm, שְׂפָרִיר glittering tapestry, Jer 43¹⁰ Qeré; with attenuation of the ā to i בְּמַרְרִים all that maketh black, Jb 5⁵ (but the better reading is בְּמַרְרִי).

35. The ground-form qāṭṭūl, e. g. שְׂפָרוֹר Jer 43¹⁰ Keth.; נְאֻפִים adulteries.

VIII. Nouns with the Second and Third Consonants repeated.

n 36-39. Q^etāṭṭāl, q^eṭāṭṭāl, q^etāṭṭūl; q^etāṭṭūl, q^etāṭṭōl (in fem. and plur. often with the last consonant sharpened for the reason given in a above); cf. הַפְּכָפֶךְ.

crooked, חֲלָקְלוֹת *slippery places*, עֲקָלְקָלוֹת *crooked (ways)*; פְּחֻלְחָל *tortuous*; also words denoting colours, אֲדָמָה (Lv 13^{42.49} in pause) *reddish*, fem. אֲדָמָת, plur. אֲדָמֹת; יִרְקָק *greenish*, plur. fem. יִרְקָקָת; *q^etallil*, יִפִּיפִיָּה *very fair* (to be read in Jer 46²⁰ for יִפְהִיפִיָּה); *q^etaltül*, שְׁחֻחֻחָת (fem.) *blackish*; אֲסַפְסָף *a rabble* (augmented from אָסַף *collected*). From a verb פ"י with aphaeresis of the initial syllable צִאצָּאִים *offspring*. Moreover, of the same form, probably, is חֲצוּצָרָה *a trumpet* (for חֲצֻצָרָה, cf. § 55 e). Also in Is 2²⁰ לַחֲפָרֹת is to be read instead of לַחֲפָר פִּרְוֹת (from the sing. חֲפָרָה *a digging or burrowing animal, perhaps the mole*). But פְּקֻחֹת *opening*, Is 61¹ (ed. Mant., Baer, Ginsb. פְּקֻחֹת), is an evident mistake due to dittography; read פְּקַח as in 42⁷.

IX. *Nouns in which the Whole (Biliteral) Stem is repeated.*

Naturally this class includes only isolated forms of the stems ע"ו and ע"ע 0 (on פִּיפִיּוֹת see § 96 under פִּה). Thus:—

40. גִּלְגָּל *a wheel*, and, with attenuation of the first *ä* to *i*, גִּלְגִּל (from גלל); fem. חֲלָחְלָה *anguish* (from חוּל or חִיל); כֶּכֶר (for *kirkar*) *a talent*; cf. also כּוֹכַב *a star* (from *käwkäb*, Arabic *kaukäb*, for כֶּכֶב), טוֹטְפֹת *bands*, for טַפְטַפֹּת; צִלְצַל probably *a whirring locust*.

41. פִּלְפֵּל infin. *Filpēl* (prop. *Palpīl*) from פוּל; fem. טִלְטִלָּה *a hurling* (from טול).

42. כֶּכֶד perhaps *a ruby* (for *kädküd*), from כרד.

43. קִדְקִד *the crown of the head* (for *qūdqud*), from קרד; fem. גִּלְגִּלָּת *a skull* (for *gūlgūlt*), from גלל.

44. וְרִיר *girded*, from ורר; בִּקְבִיב *a bottle*, from בקק; בְּרִבְרִים *fattened birds* (?).

§ 85. *Nouns with Preformatives and Afformatives.*

These include nouns which are directly derived from verbal forms *a* having preformatives (*Hiph'äl, Hoph'al, Hithpa'äl, Niph'al, &c.*), as well as those which are formed with other preformatives (א, י, ט, נ, ח), and finally those which are formed with afformatives. The quadrilaterals and quinqueliterals also are taken in connexion with these formations, inasmuch as they arise almost always by the addition or insertion of one or two consonants to the trilateral stem.

X. *Nouns with Preformatives.*

45. Nouns with א prefixed. Cf. the substantives with א *prosthetic* (§ 19 m), *b* such as אֲרֹעַ *arm* (Jer 32²¹, Jb 31²²; elsewhere always וְרֹעַ); אֲצַפַּע *a finger*, אֲרִבָּה *a locust*, אֲנִרוֹף *fist* (others *maillock*, or *clod*), אֲשִׁמְרָה or אֲשִׁמְרָת *a watch*. In these examples the א is a 'euphonic' prefix (Barth, *ibid.*, § 150 b); in other cases it is 'essential'; cf. especially the adjectives, אֲכֹזֵב *deceitful*, אֲכֹזֵר *cruel*, אֲיָתָן *perennial* (for 'aitan) [=the Arab. 'elative', used for expressing the compar. and superl. degrees]. The fem. אֲוִפְרָה *fragrant part*¹ (of the meal-

¹ Or perhaps more correctly with Jacob, ZAW. 1897, p. 79, 'declaration,' i. e. the part of the meal-offering which 'announces the sacrifice and its object'.

offering) is a *nomen verbale* of *Hiph'il*, answering to the Aramaic infinitive of the causal stem ('*Aph'el*), hence with suff. **אֲזַכְּרָתָהּ** Lv 2², &c.

c 46. Nouns with ה prefixed. Besides the ordinary infinitives of *Hiph'il* **הַקָּטִיל** and **הַקָּטִיל**, of *Niph'al* **הַקָּטִיל**, **הַקָּטִיל** (for *hinq.*), and of the conjugations formed with the prefix הַת, this class also includes some rare *nomina verbalia* derived from *Hiph'il* (cf. § 72 z), viz. **הַפָּרָה** appearance (from **נָכַר**), Is 3⁹; **הַנִּפָּה** a swinging (from **נָוָה**), [Is 30²⁸; **הַנִּנְחָה** a rest-giving, Est 2¹⁸]; **הַצָּלָה** deliverance (from **נָצַל**), [Est 4¹⁴ an Aram. form: cf. **הַזָּרָה** Dn 5²⁰]; perhaps also **הַיֵּבֶל** palace, from *haikäl*, unless it is borrowed from the Assyrian; see the Lexicon.

d 47. Nouns with י prefixed, as **יֶצֶרֶר** oil, **יֶלְקִיט** wallet, **יֶנְשִׁוּף** owl(?); from verbs י"ע, e. g. **יֶקִים** a living thing, **יֶתוֹר** a range; from a verb י"ע, **יֶרִיב** an adversary. Of a different character are the many proper names which have simply adopted the imperfect form, as **יֶעֱקֹב**, **יֶצְחָק**, &c.

e 48. Nouns with מ prefixed. This *preformative Mém*, which is no doubt connected with **מִי** who, and **מָה** what (see § 37 and § 52 c), appears in a very large number of nouns, and serves to express the most varied modifications of the idea of the stem: (1) **מ** subjective, when preformative of the participles *Př'el*, *Hiph'il*, *Hithpa'el*, and other active conjugations. (2) **מ** objective, when preformative of the participles *Pu'al*, *Hoph'al*, and other passive conjugations, as well as of numerous nouns. (3) **מ** instrumental, as in **מִפֶּתַח** a key, &c. (4) **מ** local, as in **מִדְּבַר** a drive for cattle, &c.

f As regards the formation of these nouns, it is to be remarked that the preformative **מ** was originally in most cases followed by a short *ä*. This *ä*, however, in a closed syllable is frequently attenuated to *ĩ*; in an open syllable before the tone it is lengthened to *ā* (so also the *ĩ*, attenuated from *ä*, is lengthened to *ē*), and in **מִגֶּן** shield (with suff. **מִגֶּנִי**) it even becomes unchangeable *ā*. But in an open syllable which does not stand before the tone, the *a* necessarily becomes *Šewā*.

g The following forms are especially to be noticed: (a) ground-form *māqtāl*, in Hebrew **מִקְטָל**,¹ e. g. **מִאֲכָל** food; fem. **מִמְלָכָה** kingdom, **מִמַּכְלָת** a knife, **מִלְאָכָה** (for **מִלְאָכָה** by § 23 c) business; from a verb **פָּתַן** a gift; from verbs **פָּו**, **פָּוֹצָא** a going forth, **פָּוֶשֶׁב** a seat; from verbs **פָּיטב** the best (from *maītāb*); with י (or ו) assimilated, **מִצֵּע** a bed; from verbs **עָסַךְ** a screen, and with the shortening of the *ä* under the preformative, **מִמָּר** bitterness (from *māmar* developed to a segholate), fem. **מִשְׁמָה** desolation; from a verb י"ע, probably of this class is **מִקוֹם** place, the *ä* lengthened to *ā* and obscured to *ô* (Arabic *māqām*); from verbs **לָה**, **מִרְאָה** appearance, **מִעֵן** (for **מִעֵנָה**) prop. intention, only in **לְמַעַן** on account of, in order that.

h (b) Ground-form *miqtāl* (the usual form of the infin. *Qal* in Aramaic), Hebr. **מִקְטָל**, e. g. **מִדְּבַר** (in Jer 2³¹ also, where Baer requires **הַמְדְּבַר**, read with ed. Mant., Ginsburg, &c. **הַמְדְּבַר**) a cattle-drive, fem. **מִלְחָמָה** war, **מִרְפָּבָה** a chariot (with *S'ghól* instead of *ĩ*, but in constr. st. **מִרְפָּבָת** Gn 4¹⁴³; cf. **מִרְחָק** distance), **מִשְׁמָרָת** a watch; from verbs י"ע, e. g. **מִסָּב** surroundings (from *mī-sāb*; *ĩ* in the open syllable being lengthened to *ē*; but cf. also **מִשְׁק** Is 33⁴ as constr. state from **שָׁקַק** with sharpening of the first radical; cf. § 67 g); from verbs **לָה**, **מִקְנָה** a possession, fem. **מִקְנָה**.

¹ In **מִמְתָּקִים** Ct 5¹⁶, Neh 8¹⁰, the first syllable is artificially opened to avoid the cacophony; on the *ä* of the second syllable cf. § 93 es.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

7 With a long vowel in the second syllable: (d) *tīqtāl*, as תְּהוֹם *the ocean, the deep* (for *tihām*; in Assyrian the fem. *tiāmtu*, constr. st. *tiāmat*, is the usual word for *sea*), unless it is to be derived with Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, p. 113, from the stem תהם; (e) *tāqtīl* (in Arabic the usual form of the infinitive of conjugation II. which corresponds to the Hebrew *Pi'el*), e.g. from a verb ל"ה, fem. תְּכִלִּית *completeness*; תְּרִבִּית *increase, usury*, with a parallel form מְרִבִּית; in a passive sense, תַּלְמִיד *a disciple*; (f) תְּקַטִּיל, e.g. תְּפֹוח *an apple* (for *tānpū^{ah}*); very frequently used to form abstracts, e.g. תְּגִמּוּל *a benefit* (also גִּמּוּל); from verbs ע"ו תְּבוּסָה *a treading down*, תְּנוּפָה *a waving* (like תְּרוּמָה *a lifting up*, from the *Hiph'il* stem), תְּשׁוּקָה *a longing*, &c.; very frequently also as an abstract plural, e.g. תְּהַפְכוּת *perverseness*, תְּחַבְלוֹת *guidance*, תְּמַרוּרִים *bitterness*, תְּנַחֲמִים and תְּנַחֲמוֹת *consolation*; from a verb ע"ו תְּאָנִים *toil*.

XI. Nouns with Affirmatives.

- 8 52. Nouns with ל affixed. Perhaps חֲשֵׁמֶל *amber* (?), and probably בְּרוֹן *iron*, בְּרִמָּל *garden-land* (*S^{egh}ôl* in both cases is probably a modification of the original *ā* in the tone-syllable), גְּבֵעַל *bloom*, cf. § 30 g.—According to Prätorius, *ZDMG*. 1903, p. 530 ff., *al* is an affix of endearment in the proper names מִיכָל, חֲמוּטַל (*little lizard* ?) אֲבִיגַיִל (also אֲבִיגַיִל).
- t 53. Nouns with ם affixed. With an original *ām* as affirmative, אֹלָם *vestibule* (although the *ā* in the *sing.* remains unchangeable), plur. אֲלָמִים; but in כְּנָם *a swarm of gnats*, the ם is radical. With original affirmative *ūm*, עִירָם (also עָרָם) *naked* (from עור), plur. עִירְמִים Gn 3⁷, parallel form עָרוֹם, plur. עָרוּמִים Gn 2²⁵.—To this class also belong the adverbs in *ām* and *ōm*, mentioned in § 100 g, and many proper names, as גְּרִשָׁם, also גְּרִשׁוֹם, and גְּרִשׁוֹן (*patronymic גְּרִישָׁנִי*), מְלָכָם, עֲמָרָם, &c.; but for פְּרִיוֹם *ransom* (?), Nu 3⁴⁹, probably פְּרוּיָם is to be read.
- u 54. Nouns with ך affixed. The ך is added by means of a simple helping vowel in כְּנַעַן *Canaan*, and צַפְרָךְ *a finger nail*; more frequently the addition is made by means of a tone-bearing *ā*, which in Hebrew is modified to *S^{egh}ôl* (as גְּרִיזֶן *axe*) or lengthened to *ā* (but cf. also אַחֲרַנִּית and קְדֻרַנִּית); e.g. קְנִיזֶן *a possession*, שְׁלַחָן *a table*, קְרָבָן *an offering*. From an original *ā* being changed into an obscure *ô* we may probably explain such forms as דְּאָבוֹן *a pining away*; דְּרָבוֹן (also דְּרָבָן) *a goad*; רָעָבוֹן *hunger*; from verbs ל"ה גָּאוֹן *pride*, הָמוֹן *noise*, חָזוֹן *a vision*; מְשָׂאוֹן *a coat of mail*; from a verb פ"ן מְשָׂאוֹן *guile* (the only instance with both ם preformative and *ôn* affirmative)¹; very frequently from the simple stem with an unorganic sharpening of the second radical, e.g. זְכָרוֹן *memorial*, כְּלִיוֹן *destruction* (constr. st. וְכָרוֹן and כְּלִיוֹן), &c.; cf. also הָרִיוֹן *pregnancy* (for 'הָרָ') and § 93 *uu*; קִיָּקְלוֹן *shame*, for קְלָקְלוֹן. Proper names occur with the termination *ūn*, as יִשְׂרוּן, § 86 g, and others.

¹ The plurals נִצְנִים *flowers*, Ct 2¹², and קִשְׁשָׁנִים *thorns* appear to be formed directly from the singulars נִץ (cf. נִצָּה) and קִשׁוֹשׁ with the insertion of *ân* (which in 'קִשׁ' is obscured to *ôn*). See Nöldeke, *Mand. Gr.*, p. 169, Rem. 3; similarly, according to Hoffmann, 'Einige phöniz. Inschriften,' p. 15 (*Abh. der Gött. Ges. der Wiss.*, xxxvi), עֲבוּנִים *wares*, Ez 27^{14.16} from עֲבוּ = עֲבוּב.

Rem. A large number of proper names now ending in ה־ or ו־ used to be classed as nouns originally formed with the affix ו־. The subsequent rejection of the final *Nûn* seemed to be confirmed by the form מַגְדוֹן, once used (Zc 12¹¹) for מַגְדוֹ (and conversely in Pr 27²⁰ *Kethîbh* נֶבֶה, *Qerê* נֶבֶה for נֶבֶה destruction), also by the fact that for שְׁלֹמֶה the LXX give the form Σολωμών or Σαλωμών, and especially that in patronymics and tribal names (§ 86 h) a *Nûn* appears before the termination *i*, as גִּילְנִי *Gilonite* from גִּלְה and שִׁילְנִי from שִׁילְה (modern name *Sailûn*). Wetzstein, however (in Delitzsch's *Commentary on Job*, 1st ed., p. 599), explained the *Nûn* in מַגְדוֹן as a secondary addition to the common old-Palestinian termination *ô* (יְרִיחוֹ, עֵבֹ, רְמוֹנוֹ, &c.), and Barth (*Nominalbildung*, § 224 b) has since shown the unsoundness of the prevailing view on other grounds: the rejection of the *Nûn* would be much more likely to occur in the numerous appellatives in *ôn* than in proper names, and גִּילְנִי and שִׁילְנִי are due to the necessity of avoiding, for euphonic reasons, such forms as *gîlô-i*, *šîlô-i*, &c.; cf. also שִׁילְנִי from שִׁילְה.

On the affirmatives י־, י־, ו־, ו־, see below, § 86 h-l.

XII. *Quadrilaterals and Quinqueliterals.*

55. גִּלְמוֹר *barren*, חֲלָמִישׁ *a flint*, and the fem וְלַעֲפָה *heat*, &c., have probably arisen from the insertion of a ל; חֲרָגַל *a locust*, קַרְדֵּם *an axe*, סַרְעֶפָה *a branch*, Ez 31⁶ (verses 6, 8 סַעֲפָה), שִׁרְעָפִים (also שְׁעָפִים) *anxious thoughts*, שִׁרְבִיט *sceptre*, from insertion of a ר, which is common in Aramaic. Cf., moreover, חֲרָמִשׁ *a sickle*, סַמְרָר *vine-blossom*; with an initial ע, עַטְלֵף *a bat*, עַפְבִּישׁ *a spider*, עַכְבָּר *a mouse*, עַקְרָב *a scorpion*,¹ &c.—Quinqueliteral, צַפְרִידַע *a frog*.

§ 86. *Denominative Nouns.*

1. Such are all nouns formed *immediately* from another noun, whether the latter be primitive or derived from a verb, e.g. קִרְמוֹן *eastern*, immediately from קָרַם *the east* (verbal stem קָרַם *to be in front*).

2. Most of the forms which nouns of this class assume have already been given in §§ 84 and 85, since the denominatives, as secondary (although in some cases very old) forms, invariably follow the analogy of the verbal derivatives. As, for instance, the verbals with a prefixed מ (§ 85 e to m) express the place, &c., of an action, so the denominatives with מ *local* represent the place where a thing is found or its neighbourhood (see e).

The most common forms of denominatives are—

1. Those like the *participle Qal* (§ 84^a s), e.g. שְׁעָר *a porter*, from שַׁעַר *a gate*; בִּקְרָן *a herdsman*, from בִּקְרָן *a herd*; בִּרְמָן *a vinedresser*, from בִּרְמָן *a vineyard*.
2. Those like the form *qättâl* (§ 84^b b), e.g. קִשְׁתָּן *an archer*, from קִשְׁתָּן *a bow*.

¹ Derenbourg (*REJ.*, 1883, p. 165) infers from the above examples and a comparison of the Arabic *'usfûr*, *sparrow* (from *šafara*, *to chirp*), that *y* was especially employed to form quadrilateral names of animals.

Both these forms (c and d) indicate customary occupations, inhering in the subject, like Greek nouns in *της, τεύς*, e. g. *πολίτης, γραμματεύς*.

e 3. Nouns with **מ** prefixed, denoting the place where a thing is (cf. § 85 e), or its neighbourhood, e. g. *מַעְיָן* a place of fountains, from *עָיַן*; *מִרְגְּלוֹת* the place about the feet, *מִרְאֲשׁוֹת* the place about the head, from *רָגַל*, *רֵאשׁ*; *מִקְשָׁה* (for *מִקְשָׁה*) a cucumber field, from *קִישָׁא* cucumber. Cf. *ἀμπελών* from *ἀμπελος*.

f 4. Nouns with the termination **וֹן** or **וֹי** expressing adjectival ideas: *קֶדְמוֹן* eastern, from *קָדַם*; *אַחֲרוֹן* posterior, from *אַחַר*; *חוּצוֹן* exterior, from *חוּץ*; probably also *לְוִיָּתָן* coiled, hence coiled animal, serpent, from *לְוִיָּה* a winding; *נְחֹשֶׁתָן* brazen, from *נְחֹשֶׁת* brass. Also abstracts, e. g. *עֵצוֹן* blindness, from *עָיַר*. Cf. § 85 u.—With a double termination (*ôn* or *ân* with *i*) *אַדְמֹנִי* reddish, *יִדְעֹנִי* a knowing (spirit); *צַפְעֹנִי* basilisk; *רַחֲמַנִיּוֹת* merciful [fem. plur.].

g **וֹן** appears to be used as a diminutive ending (cf. the Syriac **וֹן**) in *אִישׁוֹן* little man (in the eye), apple of the eye, from *אִישׁ*¹; on the other hand *שְׂפִיפָן* adder, which was formerly regarded as a diminutive, is properly an adjectival form from *שָׁפַף* to rub (hence, as it were, a rubbing creature); in the same way *יִשְׂרָוֶן* is a denominative from *יִשָּׁר* (= *יִשָּׁר*), properly upright (righteous people), and not a diminutive (pious little people, and the like); finally, *שְׁהָרוֹן* is not lunula, but an artificial moon (used as an ornament), and *צַוְרָנִים* not little neck, but necklace (from *צַוְאָר* neck). Cf. Delitzsch on Ct 4⁹.

h 5. Peculiar to denominatives is the termination **י**, which converts a substantive into an adjective, and is added especially to numerals and names of persons and countries, in order to form ordinals, patronymics, and tribal names; e. g. *רַגְלִי* footman, plur. *רַגְלִים*, from *רָגַל* foot; *נְכָרִי* strange, from *נְכָר* strangeness, *תַּחְתִּי* lower, from *תַּחַת* below, fem. *תַּחְתִּית* and *תַּחְתִּיָּה*, plur. *תַּחְתִּיּוֹת*; *שֵׁשִׁי* the sixth, from *שֵׁשׁ* six; *מוֹאָבִי* Moabite, from *מוֹאָב*, plur. *מוֹאָבִים*, fem. *מוֹאָבִיָּה* and *מוֹאָבִית*, plur. *מוֹאָבִיּוֹת*; *עִבְרִי* Hebrew, plur. *עִבְרִים* and *עִבְרִיִּים*, fem. *עִבְרִיָּה*, plur. *עִבְרִיּוֹת*; *יִשְׂרָאֵלִי* Israelite, from *יִשְׂרָאֵל*. When the original substantive is a compound, it is resolved again into two words, e. g. *בְּנֵי־יְמִינִי* Benjamite, from *בְּנֵי־יָמִין* (cf. on the use of the article in such cases, § 127 d).

i Instead of **י** we find in a few cases (a) the ending **י** (as in Aram.), e. g. *כְּבִילִי* (crafty, or, according to others, churlish) if it stands for *כְּבִילִי* and is not rather from a stem *כלא* or *כלה*; *חוּרִי* white cloth, Is 19⁹ in pause; perhaps also *גְּבִי* a swarm of locusts, Am 7¹ (*גֹּבִי* Na 3¹⁷); hardly *גְּבִינֹתִי* Is 38²⁰, Hb 3¹⁹; but certainly in proper names as *בְּרִזְלִי* (*ferreus*) Barzillai;² and (b) **ה**,

[¹ Cf. Barth, § 212; König, ii. 1, 413. Diminutives in Semitic languages are, however, most commonly formed by inserting a *y* after the second radical, e. g. Aram. *עוּלִימָא*, Syr. *حُلَيْمًا*, Arab. *عُلَيْمٌ* a very young man, *kulaib*, a little dog, &c. Since Olshausen (§ 180), *זְעִיר* a little (Is 28^{10,13}, Jb 36²) has commonly been regarded as an example of the same form, to which others have added *שְׁבִיטִים* Is 3¹⁸ (as though a foreign dialectical form for *šumais*, little sun), and *אַמְיָנוֹן* 2 S 13²⁰, as a contemptuous diminutive form of *אַמְנוֹן*; cf. Ewald, § 167, W. Wright, *Arab. Gramm.*² i. § 269, De Lagarde, *Nominalbildung*, pp. 85–87, König, ii. 1, p. 143 f. The existence of the form in Hebrew is disputed by Barth, § 192 d.]

² On **י** as an old fem. ending, see above, § 80 l.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

d The ending *im* is also common in Phoenician, e. g. צִרְנִים *Sidonii*; Assyrian has *âni* (acc. to P. Haupt originally *âmi*, cf. § 88 *d*); Aramaic has *in*; Arabic *ûna* (nominative) and *ina* (in the oblique cases, but in vulgar Arabic *in* is also used for the nominative); Ethiopic *ân*. Cf. also the verbal ending ין in the 3rd plur. perf. (§ 44 *l*) and in the 3rd and 2nd plur. impf. (§ 47 *m*).¹

e Less frequent, or only apparent terminations of the plur. masc. are—

(a) ין, as in Aramaic,² found almost exclusively in the later books of the O. T. (apart from the poetical use in some of the older and even the oldest portions), viz. מְלָכִין *kings*, Pr 31³, צְדָנִין 1 K 11³³, רָצִין *the guard*, 2 K 11¹³, חֲטָיִן *wheat*, Ez 4⁹; defectively אִיִּן *islands*, Ez 26¹⁸; יָמִין *days*, Dn 12¹³. Cf. also מְרִיִן *carpets*, Ju 5¹⁰, in the North-Palestinian song of Deborah, which also has other linguistic peculiarities; עֵיִן *heaps*, Mi 3¹² (before ת; cf. § 44 *k*); מְלִיִן *words* (from the really Aram. מְלָה), Jb 4², and twelve other places in Job (beside מְלִים, ten times in Job); further, חֵיִן Jb 24²², אֲחָרִין 31¹⁰, and שׁוֹמְמִין La 1⁴, תְּנִיִן 4³.—The following forms are doubtful:

f (b) י (with the ך rejected, as, according to some, in the *dual* יְרִי for יְרִים Ez 13¹⁸, cf. § 88 *c*), e. g. מְנִיִּי *stringed instruments*, ψ 45⁹ for מְנִים (unless it is to be so written)³; עַמֵּי *peoples*, ψ 144², and, probably, also La 3¹⁴ (in 2 S 22⁴⁴ it may be taken as עַמִּי *my people*; cf. in the parallel passage ψ 18⁴⁴ עַם; also in Ct 8² the *i* of רְמִיִּי is better regarded as a *suffix*); see also 2 S 23⁸ as compared with 1 Ch 11¹¹, and on the whole question Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude*, p. 524 ff. More doubtful still is—

g (c) י (like the constr. state in Syriac), which is supposed to appear in e. g. שָׂרִי *princes*, Ju 5¹⁵ (perhaps *my princes* is intended: read either the constr. st. שָׂרִי, which also has good authority, or with LXX שָׂרִים); for חֲלוֹנֵי וּס' Jer 22¹⁴ (according to others *dual*, see § 88 *c*, or a loan word, cf. ZA. iii. 93) read חֲלוֹנֵי סָפֹן. On גֹּבֵי and חֹרֵי, which have also been so explained, see above, § 86 *i*.—חֲשׁוּפֵי Is 20⁴ (where the right reading is certainly חֲשׁוּפֵי) must be intended by the Masora either as a singular with the formative syllable י = *bareness* or, more probably, as a constr. st. with the original termination *ay* (cf. § 89 *d*) to avoid the harsh combination *h^asûfê šâl⁴*; in אֲרָנֵי *the Lord* (prop. *my lord*, from the plur. *majestatis*, אֲרָנִים *lord*), the *ay* was originally a *suffix*, § 135 *q*.

h (d) ך a supposed *plural* ending in כְּנָם = כְּנָיִם *gnats* (or *lice*), and סֻלָּם *ladder* (supposed by some to be a plur. like our *stairs*); but cf. on the former, § 85 *t*.

i 2. The plural termination of the *feminine gender* is generally indicated by the termination ות (often written defectively ת—, e. g. תְּהִלָּה *song of praise, psalm*, plur. תְּהִלוֹת (only in post-biblical Hebrew

¹ On the connexion between all these endings see Dietrich's *Abhandl. zur hebr. Grammm.*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 51 ff.; Halévy, *REJ.* 1888, p. 138 ff. [cf. also Driver, *Tenses*, § 6, *Obs.* 2].

² So also always in the Mēša' inscription, e. g. line 2 שלשן *thirty*; line 4 מלכן *kings*; line 5 ימן רבן *many days*, &c.

³ According to some this *i* is simply due to a neglect of the point (§ 5 *m*), which in MSS. and elsewhere marked the abbreviation of the plur. ending.

⁴ Prätorius, *ZDMG.* 1903, p. 525, regards חֲשׁוּפֵי as an instance of the affix of endearment (cf. אֲחוּמֵי, כְּלוּבֵי) transferred to an appellative, but such an explanation is rendered unlikely by the meaning of this isolated instance.

סֵפֶר תְּהִלֹּת, as in the headings of the printed editions, as well as תְּהִלֹּת (the Book of Psalms); אֵיזֶר a letter, plur. אֵיזָרוֹת; בְּאֵר a well, plur. בְּאֵרוֹת. Feminines in יָת form their plural in יוֹת, e.g. מִצְרַיִת an Egyptian woman, plur. מִצְרַיִוֹת; and those in ית either make יוֹת, as מַלְכוּת kingdom, plur. מַלְכוּוֹת, Dn 8²² (cf. חַנּוּיֹת cells, Jer 37¹⁶), or are inflected like עֲדוּת testimonies (pronounced 'ēdh^ewôth for 'ēdhūwôth).

It is only from a mistake or disregard of these feminine endings יָת and ית that some words ending with them form their plural by the addition of יָם or יוֹת, e.g. חֲנִיָּת spear, plur. חֲנִיָּתוֹת and חֲנִיָּתִים; זִנוּת whoredom, plur. זִנוּתִים (by the side of זִנוּיָם); אֶלְמָנוּת widowhood; שְׁחִיתוֹת pits, כְּפָתוֹת amulets (if connected with Assyr. *kâsu*, to bind), &c.

The termination -ôth stands primarily for -âth (which is the form it has in Arab., Eth., in the constr. st. of Western Aramaic, in Eastern Syriac, and also in Assyrian; on the change of *â* into an obscure *ô*, see § 9 q). On the other hand, it is doubtful whether this *âth* is to be regarded as a lengthened and stronger form of the singular fem. ending *âth* (cf. § 80 b).

How the changeable vowels of a noun are shortened or become *šewâ* in consequence of the addition of the plural endings is explained in §§ 92-5.

3. Words which in the singular are used both as masculine and feminine (§ 122 d), often have in the plural parallel forms with the masculine and feminine terminations, e.g. עָבַ cloud, plur. עָבִים and עָבוֹת; and each form may be treated either as masculine or feminine, according to the usage of the particular word.—But even those words, of which the gender is invariable, sometimes have both plural forms, e.g. דּוֹר masc. a generation, plur. דּוֹרִים and דּוֹרוֹת; שָׁנָה fem. a year, plur. שָׁנִים and שָׁנוֹת (see the Rem.). In these words the gender of both plural forms remains the same as in the singular, e.g. אֲרִי masc. a lion, plur. אֲרִיֹּת masc., Zp 3³, דּוֹרוֹת masc., Jb 42¹⁶.

Sometimes usage makes a distinction between the two plural forms of the same word. Thus, יָמִים days, שָׁנִים years are the usual, but יָמוֹת (only twice, in the constr. st. Dt 32⁷, ψ 90¹⁵) and שָׁנוֹת (also only in the constr. st. and before suffixes) are rarer poetic forms.

A difference of meaning appears in several names of members of the body, the dual (see § 88) denoting the living members themselves, while the plur. in יָת expresses something like them, but without life (§ 122 u), e.g. יָדַי hands, יָדוֹת artificial hands, also e.g. the arms of a throne; כַּפָּי hands, כַּפוֹת handles (Lat. *manubria*); פֶּעַם foot, פֶּעָמוֹת artificial feet (of the ark), קַרְנֵי horns, קַרְנוֹת horns (of the altar); עֵינַי eyes, עֵינֹת fountains; cf. also אֲרִיִּים lions, אֲרִיֹּת the figures of lions on Solomon's throne, תְּמָר palm, תְּמָרָה a palm-like column, plur. תְּמָרִים and תְּמָרוֹת.

4. A considerable number of masculines form their plural in יוֹת, while many feminines have a plural in יָם. The gender of the singular, however, is as a rule retained in the plural.

Undoubted instances of masculines with (masculine) plural in **ות**— are : **אב** *father*, **אוצר** *treasure*, **באר** and **בור** *cistern*, **זנב** *tail*, **חלום** *dream*, **כסא** *throne*, **לב** and **לֵבָב** *heart*, **לוח** *tablet*, **לַיִל** and **לַיְלָה** *night*, **מזבח** *altar*, **מקום** *place*, **נאר** *skin-bottle*, **נר** *lamp*, **עור** *skin*, **קול** *voice*, **שֻׁלְחָן** *table*, **שֵׁם** *name*, **שופר** *trumpet*.

q Feminines ending in **ה**— which take in the plural the termination **ים**— are **אלה** *terebinth*, **אימה** *terror* (but also **אימות**), **דבילה** *a cake of figs*, **חטה** *wheat*, **לבנה** *a brick*, **מלה** (only in poetry) *a word*, **סאה** *seā, a dry measure*, **שעורה** *barley*, and the following names of animals **דבורה** *a bee* and **יונה** *a dove*; also, for **ביצים** *fem. eggs*, a singular **ביצה** is to be assumed. **אלמה** *sheaf* and **שנה** *year* (see above, n) take both **ים**— and **ות**; cf. finally **שבֹּלֶת** *an ear of corn*, plur. **שבֹּלֵים**, and without the fem. termination in the singular **פילגוש** *concubine*, plur. **פילגושים**.

7 5. A strict distinction in gender between the two plural endings is found, in fact, only in adjectives and participles, e. g. **טובים** *boni*, **טובות** *bonae*, **קטלים** *masc.*, **קטלות** *fem.* So also in substantives of the same stem, where there is an express distinction of sex, as **בנים** *fili*, **בנות** *filiae*; **מלכים** *reges*, **מלכות** *reginae*.

s Rem. 1. In some few words there is added to the plural ending **ות** a second (masculine) plural termination (in the form of the *constr. st.* **ים**—, cf. § 89 c), or a dual ending **ים**—, e. g. **במה** *a high place*, plur. **במות**, *constr. s'* **במותי** (also **במתתי** *bām^othé*, Is 14¹⁴, Jb 9⁸, &c., sometimes as *Q^{eré}* to the *K^{ethîbh}* **במותי**; see § 95 o); **מראשתי שאול** *from Saul's head*, 1 S 26¹²; **חומה** *wall*, plur. **חומות** *moenia*, whence dual **חומתי** *double walls*. This double indication of the plural appears also in the connexion of suffixes with the plural ending **ות** (§ 91 m).

t 2. Some nouns are only used in the singular (e. g. **אדם** *man*, and collectively *men*); a number of other nouns only in the plural, e. g. **מתי** *men* (the old *sing.* **מתו** is only preserved in proper names, see § 90 o; in Eth. the *sing.* is *mēt*, *man*); some of these have, moreover, a singular meaning (§ 124 a), as **פנים** *face*. In such cases, however, the same form can also express plurality, e. g. **פנים** means also *faces*, Gn 40⁷, Ez 1⁶; cf. **אלהים** *God*, and also *gods* (the *sing.* **אלה**, a later formation from it, occurs only ten times, except in Job forty-one and in Daniel four times).

§ 88. Of the Dual.

Cf. the literature on the Semitic dual in Grünert, *Die Begriffs-Präponderanz und die Duale a potiori im Altarab.* (Wien, 1886), p. 21; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 455 ff.

a 1. The *dual* is a further indication of number, which originated in early times. In Hebrew, however, it is almost exclusively used to denote those objects which naturally occur in pairs (see e). The dual termination is never found in adjectives, verbs, or pronouns. In the noun it is indicated in both genders by the termination **ים**—



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

the Aramaic שְׁמָרִין = שְׁמָרִין for the Hebrew שְׁמָרוֹן *Samaria*.—We may add to this list אֶפְרַיִם, נְהַרְיִים *the river country* (in the Tel-el-Amarna letters *nârima*, *na'rima*), מִצְרַיִם *Egypt*, Phoenician מִצְרִם; also the words denoting time, צַהֲרַיִם *midday* (Mêša' inscription, line 15 צַהֲרִים), and perhaps עֶרְבַיִם *in the evening*, if the regular expression בֵּין־הָעֶרְבַיִם Ex 12⁶, 16¹², &c., is only due to mistaking עֶרְבַיִם for a dual: LXX πρὸς ἑσπέραν, τὸ δειλινόν, ὄψέ, and only in Lv 23⁵ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν. The Arabs also say *el 'iṣā'ân*, *the two evenings*, cf. Kuhn's *Literaturblatt*, iii. 48.

Instead of the supposed dual יְדֵי Ez 13¹⁸ read יְדֵים. On חַלּוֹנַי (generally taken to be a double window) Jer 22¹⁴, see above, § 87 g.

d 2. Only apparently dual-forms (but really plural) are the words מַיִם *water* and שָׁמַיִם *heaven*. According to P. Haupt in *SBOT*. (critical notes on Isaiah, p. 157, line 18 ff.), they are to be derived from the old plural forms (found in Assyrian) *mâmi*, *šamâmi*, whence the Hebr. מַיִם, שָׁמַיִם arose by inversion of the *i*, *mâmi*, *mâimi*, *maim*. It is simpler, however, to suppose that the primitive singulars *may* and *šamay*, when they took the plural of extension (§ 124 b), kept the tone on the *ay*, thus causing the *im* (which otherwise always has the tone, § 87 a) to be shortened to *im*. Cf. the analogous formations, Arab. *tardaina*, 2nd fem. sing. imperf. of a verb ل"י, for *tarday + ina*, corresponding to *taqtulina* in the strong verb; also bibl.-Aram. בְּנִין the abs. st. plur. of the p'tcp. Qal of בָּנָה (ל"י), which otherwise always ends in *in* with the tone, e.g. in the p'cp. Qal of the strong verb, דָּבַחִין *sacrificing*.

e 2. The use of the dual in Hebrew is confined, except in the numerals 2, 12, 200, &c. (see § 97), practically to those objects which are by nature or art always found in *pairs*, especially to the double members of the body (but not necessarily so, cf. יָרְעִים and יָרְעוֹת *arms*, never in the dual), e.g. יְדַיִם *both hands*, אָזְנַיִם *both ears*, שִׁנַּיִם *teeth* (of both rows), also נַעֲלָיִם *a pair of sandals*, מְאֻזְנַיִם *a pair of scales*, Lat. *bilanx*, &c.; or things which are at least thought of as forming a pair, e.g. יוֹמַיִם *two* (successive) *days*, Lat. *biduum*; שָׁבָעַיִם *two weeks*; שְׁנַתַּיִם *two years* (in succession), Lat. *biennium*; אַמְתַּיִם *two cubits*.¹

f In the former case the dual may be used for a plural, either indefinite or defined by a numeral, where it is thought of in a double arrangement, e.g. אַרְבַּע רַגְלָיִם *four feet*, Lv 11²³; שֵׁשׁ בְּנַפְּיִם *six wings* (i. e. three pairs), Is 6², Ez 1⁶; even שִׁבְעָה עֵינָיִם *seven eyes*, Zc 3⁹, כָּל־בְּרַכְּיִים *all knees*, Ez 7¹⁷; כָּל־יְדַיִם *all hands*, Ez 21¹²; מְצַלְתַּיִם *cymbals*, Ezr 3¹⁰; שְׁפָתַיִם *double-hooks*, Ez 40⁴³.—To express a certain emphasis the numeral *two* is used with the dual, as in Ju 16²⁸, Am 3¹².—See some other remarks on the use of the dual in § 87 o and s.

g It is not impossible that Hebrew at an earlier period made a more extensive and freer use of the dual, and that the restrictions and limitations of its use, mentioned above, belong to a relatively later phase of development. The

¹ But for דְּרָכַיִם Pr 28^{0.18} (which the Masora takes as two roads leading from the cross-ways) דְּרָכַיִם is to be read.

Arabic literary language forms the dual in the noun, pronoun, and verb, almost as extensively as the Sanskrit or Greek; but in modern Arabic it has almost entirely disappeared in the verb, pronoun, and adjective. The Syriac has preserved it only in a few stereotyped forms, with which such duals as the Latin *duo, ambo, octo* may be compared. In the same way, the dual of the Sanskrit is lost in the modern Indian languages, and its full use in Old Slavonic has been restricted later, e.g. in Bohemian, just as in Hebrew, to *pairs*, such as hands, feet, eyes, ears. On the Germanic dual, see Grimm's *Gramm.*, 2nd ed., i. p. 814.

§ 89. *The Genitive and the Construct State.*

Philippi, *Wesen und Ursprung des Stat. Constr. im Hebr. . . .*, Weimar, 1871, p. 98 ff: on which cf. Nöldeke in the *Gött. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1871, p. 23.—Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 459 ff.

1. The Hebrew language no longer makes a living use of *case-endings*,¹ but either has no external indication of case (this is so for the *nominative*, generally also for the *accusative*) or expresses the relation by means of prepositions (§ 119), while the *genitive* is mostly indicated by a close connexion (or interdependence) of the *Nomen regens* and the *Nomen rectum*. That is to say, the noun which as genitive serves to define more particularly an immediately preceding *Nomen regens*, remains entirely unchanged in its form. The close combination, however, of the governing with the governed noun causes the tone first of all to be forced on to the latter,² and the consequently weakened tone of the former word then usually involves further changes in it. These changes to some extent affect the consonants, but more especially the vocalization, since vowels which had been lengthened by their position *in* or *before* the tone-syllable necessarily become shortened, or are reduced to *Šewá* (cf. § 9 a, c, k; § 27 e-m); e.g. דְּבַר word, אֱלֹהִים דְּבַר word of God (a sort of compound, as with us in inverted order, *God's-word, house-top, landlord*); יָד hand, יָד הַמֶּלֶךְ the hand of the king; דְּבָרִים words, הָעָם דְּבָרֵי the words of the people. Thus in Hebrew only the noun which stands *before* a genitive suffers a change, and in grammatical language is said to be dependent, or in the *construct state*, while a noun which has not a genitive after it is said to be in the *absolute state*. It is sufficiently evident from the above that the *construct state* is not strictly to be regarded as a *syntactical* and *logical* phenomenon, but rather as simply *phonetic* and *rhythmical*, depending on the circumstances of the tone.

¹ On some remains of obsolete case-endings see § 90.

² The same phenomenon of the tone may also be easily seen in other languages, when two words are closely connected in a similar way. Observe, for example, in German the natural stress on the last word in '*der Thron des Königs*'; though here the other order of the words (inadmissible in Hebrew) '*des Königs Thron*' exhibits the same peculiarity.

- b* Very frequently such interdependent words are also united by *Maqqeph* (§ 16 a); this, however, is not necessary, but depends on the accentuation in the particular case. On the wider uses of the *constr. st.* see the Syntax, § 130.
- c* 2. The *vowel* changes which are occasioned in many nouns by the *construct state* are more fully described in §§ 92-5. But besides these, the *terminations* of the noun in the *construct state* sometimes assume a special form. Thus:
- (a) In the *construct state*, plural and dual, the termination is 'ֿֿֿ, e. g. סוּסִים *horses*, פֶּרְעָה סוּסֵי הַפֶּרְעָה *the horses of Pharaoh*; עֵינַי עֵינַי הַמֶּלֶךְ *the eyes of the king*.
- d* Rem. The 'ֿֿֿ of the dual has evidently arisen from 'ֿֿֿ (cf. יָדַיִם), but the origin of the termination 'ֿֿֿ in the *constr. st. plur.* is disputed. The Syriac *constr. st.* in *ay* and the form of the plural noun before suffixes (סוּסֵיךָ, סוּסֵי, &c., § 91 h) would point to a contraction of an original 'ֿֿֿ, as in the dual. But whether this *ay* was only transferred from the dual to the plural (so Olshausen, and Nöldeke, *Beitr. zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb. 1904, p. 48 ff.), or is to be regarded as the *abstract, collective* termination, as in אֲשֶׁה (see *f*) and חוֹרֵי (so Philippi, *ThLZ.* 1890, col. 419; Barth, *ZDMG.* 1904, p. 431 ff.), must be left undecided.
- e* (b) The original תֿֿֿ is regularly retained as the feminine termination in the *construct state* sing. of those nouns which in the *absolute state* end in תֿֿֿ, e. g. מַלְכָּה מַלְכַּת שֶׁבַע *the queen of Sheba*. But the feminine endings תֿֿֿֿ, תֿֿֿֿ, and also the plural תֿֿֿֿ, remain unchanged in the *construct state*.
- f* (c) Nouns in תֿֿֿ (cf. § 75 e) from verbs ל"ה (§ 93, Paradigm III c) form their *constr. st.* in תֿֿֿ, e. g. רֹאֵה רֹאֵה. If this תֿֿֿ is due to contraction of the original 'ֿֿֿ, with ה added as a vowel letter, we may compare יִי, constr. יִי *sufficiency*; חַי, constr. חַי *life*; גַּי (גַּי), constr. גַּי (גַּי) *valley*.
- On the terminations י and 'ֿֿֿ in the *constr. st.* see § 90.

§ 90. Real and Supposed Remains of Early Case-endings.

תֿֿֿ *local*, י *in compound proper names*, 'ֿֿֿ and י *in the Construct State*.

K. U. Nylander, *Om Kasusändelserna i Hebräiskan*, Upsala, 1882; J. Barth, 'Die Casusreste im Hebr.,' *ZDMG.* liii. 593 ff.

- a* 1. As the Assyrian and old Arabic distinguish three cases by special endings, so also in the Hebrew noun there are three endings which, in the main, correspond to those of the Arabic. It is, however, a question whether they are all to be regarded as real remnants of former case-endings, or are in some instances to be explained other-



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Rem. The above examples are mostly rendered definite by the article, or by a following genitive of definition, or are proper names. But cases like יָמָה , הָרָה , בֵּיתָה show that the locative form of *itself* possessed a defining power.

d (b) In a somewhat weakened sense, indicating the place *where* something is or happens (cf. § 118 d), e.g. מַחֲנֵימָה in *Mahanaim*, 1 K 4¹⁴; שָׁמָּה *there* (usually *thither*, see c), Jer 18², cf. 2 K 23⁸, and the expression *to offer a sacrifice* הַמִּזְבֵּחַ , properly *towards the altar* for *on the altar*. On the other hand, בְּבָבֶלָה Jer 29¹⁵, and וּבְלָהָה Hb 3¹¹, are to be regarded as ordinary accusatives of direction, *to Babylon, into the habitation*; also expressions like פָּאֵת צְפוֹנָה *the quarter towards the north*, Jos 15⁵ (at the beginning of the verse, גְּבוּל קְדֻמָּה *the border toward the east*), cf. 18^{15.20}, Ex 26¹⁸, Jer 23⁸.

e (c) The original force of the ending ָה is also disregarded when it is added to a substantive with a preposition prefixed (cf. also עַד-אֲנָהּ *how long?*), and this not only after לְ , אֶל- or עַד- (which are easily explained), e.g. לְמַעַלָּה *upwards*, לְמַטָּה *downwards*, לְשֵׁאוֹלָה *to Sheol*, ψ 9¹⁸; עַד-אַפְקָה *unto Aphek*, Jos 13⁴, אֶל-הַצְּפוֹנָה *toward the north*, Ez 8¹⁴, cf. Ju 20¹⁶; but also after בְּ , and even after מִן , e.g. בְּפְנֵיבָה *in the south*, Jos 15²¹, cf. Ju 14², 1 S 23^{15.19}, 31¹³, 2 S 20¹⁵, Jer 52¹⁰; מִבְּבָלָה *from Babylon*, Jer 27¹⁶; cf. 1¹³, Jos 10³⁶, 15¹⁰, Ju 21¹⁹, Is. 45⁶.

f Rem. Old locative forms (or original accusatives) are, according to the Masora, still to be found in

(a) לַיְלָה , in *pause* לַיְלָה , the usual word in prose for *night*, which is always construed as masculine. The nominative of this supposed old accusative¹ appeared to be preserved in the form לַיִל , only used in poetry, Is 16³, *constr. st. לַיִל* (even used for the *absol. st.* in *pause* Is 21¹¹). Most probably, however, לַיְלָה is to be referred, with Nöldeke and others, to a reduplicated form לַיְלִי ; cf. especially the western Aramaic לַיְלִיָּא , Syr. *lilya*, &c.—Another instance is מֵאֲוִמָה *something*, probably from מֵאִוִּם , מֵאִוִּם *spot, point*, generally with a negative = *nothing*. Similarly אֶרְצָה Is 8²³ and (in *pause*) Jb 34¹³, סוּפָתָה Ho 8⁷, and the place-name הַצָּהָה 1 Ch 6⁶³, might be explained as accusatives. Elsewhere, however, the toneless ָה can be regarded only as a meaningless appendage, or at the most as expressing poetic emphasis; thus אֶרְצָה (in *pause*) Jb 37¹²; הַמָּוֶתָה *death*, ψ 116¹⁵; נְגִידָה-נָא ψ 116^{14.18}; נַחְלָה *stream*, ψ 124⁴; הַחֲשֵׁמְלָה *amber*, Ez 8² [in 1⁴ הַחֲשֵׁמֶל , cf. § 80 k], &c. In Jos 15¹² הַיָּמָה is probably only a scribal error (dittography). In Ju 14¹⁸ instead of the quite unsuitable poetic word הַחֲרָסָה (towards the sun??) read as in 15¹ הַחֲרָרָה *to the bride-chamber*.

¹ Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 113, also takes it as such, *lāylā* being properly *at night*, then *night* simply. Barth, however (*Sprachwiss. Abhandlungen*, p. 16, note 1), refers it to an original לַיְלָה , like אֲנָה from אָנָה .

(b) In the termination הָֿ often used in poetry with feminines, viz. $\text{גִּ$ הַיִּשׁוּעָה *terror* (= אִימָה), Ex 15¹⁶; עֲזָרָה *help* (= עֲזָרָה), ψ 44²⁷, 63⁸, 94¹⁷; יְשׁוּעָה *salvation* (= יְשׁוּעָה), ψ 3³, 80³, Jon 2¹⁰; עוֹלָה *unrighteousness* (= עוֹלָה), Ez 28¹⁵, Ho 10¹³, ψ 125³; עֲלָה ψ 92¹⁶ *Keth.* Jb 5¹⁶; צָרָה ψ 120¹; עִפְתָּה *darkness*, Jb 10²²; הַמִּזְמָרָה Jer 11¹⁵ is corrupt, see the LXX and Commentaries. These cases are not to be taken as double feminine endings, since the loss of the tone on the final syllable could then hardly be explained, but they are further instances of an old accusative of direction or intention. In examples like עֲזָרָה *for help* (ψ 44²⁷) this is still quite apparent, but elsewhere it has become meaningless and is used merely for the sake of poetical emphasis.¹

This termination הָֿ usually has reference to *place* (hence called *h locale*²); sometimes, however, its use is extended to time, as in מִיָּמָה מִיָּמָה *from year to year*. Its use in הָלֵילָה , properly *ad profanum* != *absit!* is peculiar.

As the termination הָֿ is almost always toneless (except in מִזְרָחָה *constr. st. i* Dt 4⁴¹; גָּתָה and עָתָה Jos 19¹³) it generally, as the above examples show, exercises no influence whatever upon the vowels of the word; in the *constr. st.* מִדְּבָרָה Jos 18¹², 1 K 19¹⁵, and in the proper names גָּתָה 1 K 2⁴⁰, רֵנָה 2 S 24⁶ (so Baer; ed. Mant. and Ginsb. רֵנָה), צַפְתָּה 2 Ch 14⁹, צַרְפָּתָה 1 K 17⁹, צַרְתָּנָה 1 K 4¹², an *ä* is retained even in an open tone-syllable (cf., however, הָרָה Gn 14¹⁰, פְּרָנָה Gn 28² from פְּרָן , with modification of the *a* to *è*; also בְּרָמְלָה 1 S 25⁵ from בְּרָמֶל). In segholate forms, as a general rule, the הָֿ *local* is joined to the already developed form of the *absol. st.*, except that the helping-vowel before הָֿ naturally becomes *Šewa*, e.g. בְּיָתָה , הָאֵהָלָה Gn 18⁶, &c.; הַיְעָרָה Jos 17¹⁵, הַשְּׁעָרָה Ju 20¹⁶, &c., but also נְחָלָה Nu 34⁵ (*constr. st.*; likewise to be read in the *absolute* in Ez 47¹⁹, 48²⁸) and שְׁעָרָה Is 28⁶ (with *Silluq*); cf. נְגַבָה Ez 47¹⁹ and גְּרָנָה (Baer, incorrectly, גְּרָנָה) Mi 4¹² (both in *pause*).—In the case of feminines ending in הָֿ the הָֿ *local* is added to the original feminine ending תָֿ (§ 80 b), the *ä* of which (since it then stands in an open tone-syllable) is lengthened to *ā*, e.g. הַתְּצָתָה .—Moreover the termination הָֿ is even weakened to הָֿ in נֹבָה *to Nob*, 1 S 21², 22⁹; אֲנָה *whither*, 1 K 2^{36.42} and דִּדְנָה *to Dedan*, Ez 25¹³.

3. Of the three other terminations ָֿ may still be regarded as a *h* survival of the old nominative ending. It occurs only in the middle

[¹ The form clings also to a few place-names, as גְּרָדָה Dt 10⁷; שְׁלֵשָׁה 1 S 9⁴, 2 K 4⁴²; קֵהֶלְתָּה Nu 33²²; יִטְבַּתָּה *verso* 33 f.; תִּמְנַתָּה Jos 19⁴³, &c.; אִפְרָתָה Mi 5¹, &c.]

² Cf. Sarauw, 'Der hebr. Lokativ,' ZA. 1907, p. 183 ff. He derives the הָֿ from the adverbs שָׁמָּה , אֲנָה and holds that it has nothing whatever to do with the old accusative.

³ So Qimhi, and the Mant. ed. (Baer הַשְּׁעָרָה), i. e. locative from שְׁעָר (Is 7²⁰). The reading הַשְּׁעָרָה (Opit., Ginsb.) implies a feminine in הָֿ .

of a few (often undoubtedly very old) proper names,¹ viz. אַחִימִי (if compounded of אָחוּ and מִי), חַמְיִטַּל (for which in Jer 52¹ *Keth.* חַמְיִטַּל), מְחִישָׁאָה and מְחִישָׁלַח (otherwise in Hebrew only in the plur. מְחִישִׁים *men*; to מְחִי corresponds most probably בְּחִי in בְּחִיָּאל), פְּנִיָּאל Gn 32³¹ (but in ver. 32 פְּנִיָּאל) *face of God* (otherwise only in the plur. פְּנִים *constr. st.* פְּנִי).²—נִשְׁמוֹ Neh 6⁶ (elsewhere נִשְׁמָה), is the name of an Arab, cf. 6¹. On the other hand the terminations ׀ and ׀ are most probably to be regarded (with Barth, l. c., p. 597) as having originated on Hebrew soil in order to emphasize the *constr. st.*, on the analogy of the *constr. st.* of terms expressing relationship.

In view of the analogies in other languages (see *b*) there is nothing impossible in the view formerly taken here that the *litterae compaginis* ׀ and ׀ are obsolete (and hence no longer understood) case-endings, *i* being the old genitive and *o* for the nominative sign *u*. Barth objects that the *i* and *o* almost invariably have the tone, whereas the accusative ׀ is toneless, and that they are long, where the Arab. *i* and *u* are short. Both these objections, however, lose their force if we consider the special laws of the tone and syllable in Hebrew. The language does not admit a final *i* or *u*, and the necessarily lengthened vowel might easily attract the tone to itself. On the other hand a strong argument for Barth's theory is the fact that these *litterae compaginis* are almost exclusively used to emphasize the close connexion of one noun with another, hence especially in the *constr. st.* Consequently it seems in the highest degree probable that all these uses are based upon forms in which the *constr. st.* is expressly emphasized by a special termination, i. e. the *constr. st.* of terms of relationship, אָבִי, אָחִי, חָמִי from אָב *father*, אָח *brother*, אָבִי־אִמִּי *father-in-law* (cf. § 96). The instances given under *l* and *m* followed this analogy.

Like *i*, ׀ is also used only to emphasize the *constr. st.* (see *o*), and must therefore have a similar origin, but its exact explanation is difficult. According to Barth, this ׀ corresponds to a primitive Semitic *á* (cf. § 9 *q*) and is traceable to 'abá, 'ahá, the accusatives of terms of relationship in the *constr. st.*, which have *á* only before a genitive. Against this explanation it may be objected that there is no trace of the supposed Hebrew accusatives אָבִי, אָחוּ, חָמִי, and only of the analogous אָבִי. It is also remarkable that so archaic a form should have been preserved (except in אָבִי) only in two words and those in quite late passages. However we have no better explanation to offer in place of Barth's.

Finally we cannot deny the possibility, in some cases, of Barth's explanation of the ׀ in compound proper names like בְּחִיָּאל, &c. (see above), as due to the analogy of terms of relationship with nominative in ׀. But this in no way militates against the view expressed above, that in some very old names, like פְּנִיָּאל, בְּחִיָּאל, &c., the original common nominative sign has simply been preserved.

¹ Cf. the list in L. Kaila, *Zur Syntax des in verbaler Abhängigkeit stehenden Nomens im alttest. Hebr.*, Helsingfors, 1906, p. 54.

² The name פְּנִיָּאל formerly regarded as a compound of נִשְׁמוֹ = שֵׁם *name* and אָל, is better explained with Prätorius, *ZDMG.* 1903, p. 777, as a name of affection, for שֵׁם אָל = שֵׁם אָל [but see Driver on 1 S 1²⁰]; similarly, according to Prätorius, פְּתוּיָּאל = פְּתוּחַ אָל and many others.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

requires for it יושֶׁבֶת (or ישׁ), except in Jer 22²³ יושֶׁבֶת; cf. *ibid.* מקננתי *Keth.*, מקננת *Qere*, and finally Jer 51¹³ שכנתי *Keth.*, שכנת *Qere*. Perhaps ישֶׁבֶתִי and שכנתי are *formae mixtae*, combining the readings ישֶׁבֶת, &c. and ישֶׁבֶת (2nd fem. perf.), &c., but מקננתי may be merely assimilated to ישֶׁבֶתִי which immediately precedes it.

The following are simply textual errors: 2 K 4²³ ההלכתי *Keth.*, due to the preceding אתי, and to be read ההלכת as in the *Qere*; ψ 30⁸ (read הַרְרִי), 113⁸ (read לְהוֹשִׁיבוּ), 116¹ (read קוֹל תַּחַ' as in five other places). On בְּרִיתִי, thrice, in Lv 26⁴², cf. § 128 d.

- o (b) Of the ending י¹ (always with the tone): in prose only in the Pentateuch, but in elevated style, Gn 1²⁴ חִיתוֹ-אֲרֶץ *the beast of the earth* (= חִית הָאָרֶץ ver. 25); similarly in ψ 50¹⁰, 79², 104^{11.20}, Is 56⁹ (twice), Zp 2¹⁴; otherwise only in בְּנוֹ צִפּוֹר *son of Zippor*, Nu 23¹⁸; בְּנוֹ בְּעוֹר *son of Beor*, Nu 24^{3.15}; and מַעְיִנוּ מַיִם *a fountain of waters*, ψ 114⁸.

§ 91. The Noun with Pronominal Suffixes.

W. Diehl, *Das Pronomen pers. suffixum 2 u. 3 pers. plur. des Hebr.*, Giessen, 1895; A. Ungnad, 'Das Nomen mit Suffixen im Semit.,' *Vienna Oriental Journal*, xx, p. 167 ff.

- a With regard to the connexion of the noun with pronominal suffixes, which then stand in a genitive relation (§ 33 c) and are, therefore, necessarily appended to the *construct state* of the noun, we shall first consider, as in the verb (§ 57 ff.), the forms of the suffixes themselves, and then the various changes in the form of the noun to which they are attached. The nouns are also tabulated in the Paradigms of the flexion of the noun in § 92 ff. Cf. also Paradigm A in the Appendix. We are here primarily concerned with the different forms of the suffixes when added to the singular, plural, and dual.

- b 1. The Suffixes of the singular are—

With nouns ending in a—

Vowel.		Consonant.	
Sing. 1.	c. י	יְ	<i>my.</i>
2.	{ m. ך	ךְ (pause ךְּ)	} <i>thy.</i>
	{ f. ך		
3.	{ m. הוּ, ו	וּ (הוּ), הוּ	<i>his.</i>
	{ f. ך	הוּ, הוּ	<i>her.</i>

¹ Cf. Kaila, l.c., p. 59 ff.

Vowel.			Consonant.	
Plur. 1.	c.	נו	נו	our.
	2. {	m. כֶּם	} כֶּם	your.
	f.	כֶּן		
	3. {	m. הֶם	} הֶם	eorum.
		מו		
	f.	הֵן (הֵן)		
			מו	(poet. מו)
			הֵן	earum.

Rem. 1. There is less variety of forms in these than in the verbal suffixes; C the particular forms are used as follows:—

(a) Those without a connecting vowel (on the derivation of these ‘connecting vowels’ from original stem-vowels, see note on § 58 f) are generally joined to nouns of a peculiar form (see § 96), the *constr. st.* of which ends in a vowel, as אֲבִיָּהּ, אֲבִיהוּ and אֲבִיו, אֲבִיָּהּ, אֲבִינוּ, אֲבִיכֶם, אֲבִיכֶן, אֲבִיהֶם, אֲבִיהֶן, sometimes also to segholate forms ending in *i* from ל”ה stems (see § 93 x, y), e. g. פְּרִיָּהֶם *the fruit of them*, Am 9¹⁴ (also פְּרִים Is 37³⁰, &c.), פְּרִיָּהֶן Jer 29²⁸ (also פְּרִין verse 5); cf., moreover, הַלְּבָבָהּ Lv 8^{16.25} and similar examples with הֵן (Is 3¹⁷ הֵן) Gn 21²⁸, Ez 13¹⁷, 16⁵³.¹ Also in Gn 1²¹, 4⁴, Ez 10¹², Nah 2⁸, &c., the *K^{et.}* perhaps intends the singular, לְמִינָהֶם, &c., but the Masora requires the plural with defective *e*.

(b) The forms with connecting vowels (§ 58 f) are joined to nouns ending in a consonant. The connecting vowel is regularly *a* in the 3rd *sing. fem.* הֵּ (for *aha*) and 3rd *plur.* הֶּ, מוּ, הֵּ, also in the 3rd *sing. masc.* הוּ (הוּ), since the *ô* is contracted from *a[h]û*, and in the pausal form of the 2nd *masc.* הֶּ (a modification of original הֶּ).

The forms with *e* in the above-mentioned persons are common only with nouns in הֵּ (from stems הֵּ), *constr. st.* הֵּ (cf. § 89 f), e. g. שָׂדֵהוּ (from *sadaihû*) *his field*; עֵלְהָּ *its leaf*, Is 1³⁰; מְרִאָּהּ *the appearance thereof*, Lv 13⁴ (from *mar’aihā*; on the *S^eghól* see k); but שָׂדֵהָ *her field*. The orthographic retention of the *i*, e. g. מְעֵשִׂיוּ, מְעֵשִׂיהָ, gives to many forms the appearance of plurals; see the instances in § 93 ss.

Apart from these הֵּ forms the connecting vowel *e* in the 3rd pers. occurs only in isolated cases; אִזְרָהוּ *his light*, Jb 25³; לְמִינָהּ *after its kind*, Gn 1^{12.25} [+ 12 times]; Na 1¹³; in Ju 19²⁴ read פִּילְגִישׁוּ as in vv. 2, 25. On the other hand הֵּ in the 2nd *sing. fem.* and נוּ in the 1st *plur.* are by far the more common forms, while הֶּ, נוּ are of rare occurrence; see e.—Instead of הֶּ (כֶּה in Gn 10¹⁹, Ex 13¹⁶, Jer 29²⁵, &c., cf. בְּכָה, לְכָה § 103 g), כֶּן, כֶּם (with *S^euá mobile*), if the last consonant of the noun is a guttural, the forms are הֶּ, כֶּם, כֶּן, e. g. רוּחְךָ *thy spirit*, בְּרֵאֲךָ *thy creator*, Is 43¹, הֵיְעֵכֶם *your friend*, Jb 6²⁷ (on such cases as בְּחֻכְכֶם Hag 2⁵, see § 10 g).—With *Nun energicum* (cf. § 58 i, and on עֹנֶךָ Jb 5¹, &c., cf. § 61 h) הֵּ occurs in Pr 25¹⁶, in principal pause.

2. Rare or incorrect forms are—

Sing. 1st pers. נִי in בְּשׁוֹבְנִי Ez 47⁷ (certainly only a scribal error, caused by וַיִּשְׁבְּנִי in verse 6).

¹ Also in Jer 15¹⁰ read (according to § 61 h, end) בְּלֵהֶם קְלִלֹנִי; in Ho 7⁶ probably אֲפָהֶם for אֲפָהֶם.

2nd pers. *m.* in pause כָּחֶ֑, e. g. כַּפְּכָה (thy hand), ψ 139⁵, cf. Pr 24¹⁰; once חֲנֹךְ ψ 53⁶ (cf. the analogous cases in the verbal suffix § 75 *ll*); *fem.* יָיִ֑ Ez 5¹² (in 16⁵³ also for שְׁבִיתֶיךָ probably שְׁבִיתֶיךָ is intended), כִּי־֑ Jer 11¹⁵, ψ 103³, 116¹⁹, 135⁹ (corresponding to the Aramaic suffix of the 2nd *fem. sing.*; on the wholly abnormal כָּחֶ֑ Na 2¹⁴, cf. *l*), לְכִי־֑ *Keth.* 2 K 4², Ct 2¹³. Also יָ֑ Is 22¹, Ez 23²⁸, 25⁴.

3rd pers. הָ֑ (cf. § 7 *c*), e. g. אֶהְלֶה Gn 9²¹, 12⁸, 13³, 35²¹ (always with *Qéré* אֶהְלֶה); נָחָה Nu 10³⁶; לָחָה Dt 34⁷; כָּלָה Jer 20⁷, Na 2¹ *Qéré*; קָצָה 2 K 19²³ *Keth.*, for which קָצוּ is read in Is 37²⁴; עִירָה and סוּתָה Gn 49¹¹, cf. Ex 22²⁶ (*Qéré* עִירוּ, סוּתוּ); סָפָה ψ 10⁹, 27⁵ *Keth.*; הִמּוֹנָה Ez 31¹⁸, &c., *Keth.*; תְּבוּאָתָה Ez 48⁸ [altogether fourteen times in the Pentateuch, and some forty times in other books: see Driver, *Samuel*, p. xxxv, and on 2 S 2⁹, 21¹].

3rd *fem.* הָ֑ for הָ֑ (with the softening of the *Mappiq*, cf. § 23 *k*, and the analogous cases in § 58 *g*) occurs repeatedly before *B^gghadhk^ephath* and other soft consonants, Ex 9¹⁸ (before י, if the text is right), Lv 13⁴ (before ל), Nu 15^{28.31}, 1 S 1⁹ (unless אֶכְלֶה, the infin. with *fem.* termination, is intended; שְׁתָּה follows), Ez 16⁴⁴, 24⁶ (before ב), 1 S 20²⁰, 2 K 8⁶, Pr 12²⁸ (before נ), Na 3⁹ (before ו), ψ 48¹⁴ (before פ), Ez 47¹⁰, Jb 31²² twice (before ת), Is 21², Jer 20¹⁷ (before ה), Nu 32⁴², Am 1¹¹ (before נ), Lv 6² (before ע); even in *pause*, Lv 12^{4 a} and 5^b; Is 23¹⁷, Pr 21²², also with *Zaqeph*, Is 45⁶, Jer 6⁶ (probably), 44¹⁹; on הַשְׁמָה Lv 26³⁴, &c., see § 67 *y*. Cf. also נָ֑ Ez 36⁵.—Sometimes the Masora appears (but this is very doubtful) to regard the הָ֑ with feminines as a shortening of הָ֑, e. g. נָצָה Gn 40¹⁰ for נָצָתָה, פָּנָה Pr 7⁸ for פָּנָתָה; also דָ֑ for דָ֑ in פְּתוּבֹנִים Ho 13², and עֲרָמִים Jb 5¹³. The examples, however, are for the most part uncertain, e. g. in Is 28⁴ the reading is simply to be emended to בְּפוּרָה, and in Zc 4² to גִּלְיָה, Jb 11⁹ to מְדָה, Neh 5¹⁴ to פְּחָה. [See also, after prepositions, § 103 *g*.]

f *Plur.* 1st pers. נִי־֑, in *pause* קִימָנוּ Jb 22²⁰ (where, however, קִימָנוּ is certainly to be read); cf. Ru 3² [Is 47¹⁰, cf. § 61 *c, h*], and so always בְּלָנוּ *all of us*, Gn 42¹¹, &c [cf. בָּנוּ, לָנוּ, אֶתָנוּ, עִמָּנוּ].

2nd pers. *fem.* כָּנָה Ez 23^{48.49}.

3rd pers. *masc.* מוֹ־֑ ψ 17¹⁰ (on מוֹ in פִּימוֹ in the same verse, and in ψ 58⁷ see *l*); הָ֑ 2 S 23⁶, according to Sievers probably to call attention to the reading כָּלָהֶם. *Fem.* הָ֑ 1 K 7³⁷, Ez 16⁵³ (in *pause*); נָ֑ Gn 41²¹; נָ֑ Gn 30⁴¹; נָ֑ Ru 1¹⁹; elsewhere generally in *pause* (Gn 21²⁹, 42³⁶, Jer 8⁷, Pr 31²⁹, Jb 39²); finally הָ֑ as suffix to a noun, only in Is 3¹⁷.

For examples of singulars with plural suffixes see *l*.

g 2. In the *plural masc.* and in the *dual* the suffixes are to be regarded primarily as affixed to the original ending of the *construct state* (׳־֑, cf. § 89 *d*). This ending, however, has been preserved unchanged only in the 2nd *fem.* In most cases it is contracted to ׳־֑, as in the *constr. st.* without suffixes (so throughout the plur. and in the poetical suffix יְהִי־֑ of the 3rd *sing. masc.*); in the 2nd *masc.* and 3rd *fem. sing.* it is ׳־֑ (cf. *k*). On the 1st *pers.* and 3rd *masc. sing.* see *i*.—Thus there arise the following



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

defective writing is especially frequent in the 3rd masc. sing. $\text{וְ} \text{---}$, which in *Q^{eré}* is almost always changed to $\text{וִ} \text{---}$, e. g. $\text{וְ} \text{חֲצֵי}$ his arrows, ψ 58⁸, *Q^{eré}* $\text{וְ} \text{חֲצֵי}$. On $\text{וְ} \text{חֲצֵי}$, only three times $\text{וְ} \text{חֲצֵי}$, cf. § 135 r.

l 2. Unusual forms (but for the most part probably only scribal errors) are—
Sing. 2nd pers. fem $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ (after אַשְׁרֵי happy! Ec 10¹⁷, which has become stereotyped as an interjection, and is therefore unchangeable; cf. Delitzsch on the passage); $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ (cf. Syr. כִּי) 2 K 4³, and ⁷ in *Keth.*, ψ 103³⁻⁵, 116⁷ ($\text{וְ} \text{---}$ in pause).—In Ez 16³¹ $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ (so יָבֵם in 6⁸) occurs with an *infin.* ending in וְ , the וְ being therefore treated as a plural ending; similarly, the plural suffix is sometimes found with the feminine ending וְ (Nu 14³³, Is 54⁴, Jer 3⁸, Ez 16¹⁵, 23⁷, as well as in 16²⁰ *Q^{eré}*, and Zp 3²⁰), with the ending *ith* (Lv 5²⁴, reading $\text{וְ} \text{חֲצֵי}$), and even with the ordinary feminine ending *ath*; Is 47¹³, Ez 35¹¹, ψ 9¹⁵, Ezr 9¹⁵.—Wholly abnormal is מְלַאֲכֵיכָה thy messengers, Na 2¹⁴, evidently a case of dittography of the following ה : read מְלַאֲכֵיךָ .

3rd masc. $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ Hb 3¹⁰, Jb 24²³; $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ 1 S 30²⁶, Ez 43¹⁷, Na 2⁴; $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ (a purely Aramaic form) ψ 116¹².—3rd fem. $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ Ez 41¹⁵.

Plur. The strange 2nd pers. masc. $\text{וְ} \text{פְּוֹצוֹתֵיכֶם}$ (with וְ , so Qimḥi; cf. Norzi) Jer 25³⁴, is probably a mixed form combining $\text{וְ} \text{פְּוֹצוֹ}$ and $\text{וְ} \text{פְּוֹצוֹתֵיכֶם}$; *fem.* $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ Ez 13²⁰.

3rd masc. $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ Ez 40¹⁶; *fem.* $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ Ez 1¹¹.

3. The termination $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ (also with the *dual*, e. g. ψ 58⁷, 59¹³), like $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ and $\text{וְ} \text{---}$, occurs with the noun (as with the verb, § 58 g) almost exclusively in the later poets [viz. with a substantive in the singular, ψ 21¹¹, 17^{10.10}, 58⁷, 59¹³, 89¹⁸; with a dual or plural, Dt 32^{27.32.37.38}, 33²⁹, ψ 2^{3.3}, 11⁷, 35¹⁶, 49¹², 58⁷, 59¹⁴, 73^{5.7}, 83^{12.12}, 140^{4.10}, Jb 27²³; after prepositions, see § 103 f, o, notes], and cannot, therefore, by itself be taken as an indication of archaic language. On the other hand there can be no doubt that these are revivals of really old forms. That they are consciously and artificially used is shown by the evidently intentional accumulation of them, e. g. in Ex 15^{5.7.9}, ψ 2^{3.5}, and 140^{4.10}, and also by the fact observed by Diehl (see the heading of this section) that in Ex 15 they occur *only* as verbal suffixes, in Dt 32 *only* as noun suffixes.

m 3. It is clear and beyond doubt that the *Yôdh* in these suffixes with the plural noun belongs, in reality, to the ending of the *construct state* of the masculine plural. Yet the consciousness of this fact became so completely lost as to admit of the striking peculiarity (or rather inaccuracy) of appending those *suffix*-forms which include the plural ending $\text{וְ} \text{---}$, even to the feminine plural in $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ ($\text{וְ} \text{---}$, $\text{וְ} \text{---}$, &c.), so that in reality the result is a double indication of the plural.¹

n Such is the rule: the singular suffix, however (see b), also occurs with the ending $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ (probably through the influence of Aramaic), e. g. $\text{וְ} \text{---}$ ψ 132¹² (unless it be *sing.* for $\text{וְ} \text{---}$, as, according to Qimḥi in his Lexicon, 2 K 6⁸ is for $\text{וְ} \text{---}$); Dt 28⁵⁹ (treated on the analogy of an *infin.* $\text{וְ} \text{---}$);

¹ See an analogous case in § 87 s. Cf. also the double feminine ending in the 3rd sing. *perf.* of verbs $\text{וְ} \text{---}$, § 75 i.

אֲחֵיוֹתָיָךְ Ez 16⁵². On the other hand מְצֻוֹתָךְ (so Baer, Ginsb. ; but Opit. מְצֻוֹתָיָךְ) ψ 119⁹⁸, Dn 9⁵ is merely written defectively, like גִּרְיָרְתָךְ according to Baer (not Ginsb.) in Pr 1⁹, &c. In the 3rd plur. the use of the singular suffix is even the rule in the earlier Books (see the instances in Diehl, l. c., p. 8), e. g. אֲבוֹתָם (their fathers) oftener than אֲבֹתֵיהֶם (this only in 1 K 14¹⁵, and in Jer, Ezr, Neh, and Ch [in 1 K, Jer, Ezr, however, אֲבוֹתָם is more common]); so always שְׁמוֹתָם, שְׁמוֹתָיָם their names, דְּוֵרוֹתָם their generations. From parallel passages like 2 S 22⁴⁶ compared with ψ 18⁴⁶, Is 2⁴ with Mi 4³, it appears that in many cases the longer form in אֲבֹתֵיהֶם can only subsequently have taken the place of אֲבוֹתָם.

4. The following Paradigm of a masculine and feminine noun O with suffixes is based upon a monosyllabic noun with one unchangeable vowel. With regard to the ending תָּ— in the *constr. st.* of the fem. it should be further remarked that the short *ā* of this ending is only retained before the *grave* suffixes כֶּם and כֶּן; before all the others (the *light* suffixes) it is lengthened to *ā*.

Singular.

p

	Masculine.	Feminine.
	סוּס a horse.	סוּסָה a mare.
Sing. 1. com.	סוּסַי my horse.	סוּסַתִּי my mare.
2. {	m. סוּסֶיךָ thy horse.	סוּסֶתְךָ thy mare.
f. סוּסֶיךָ thy horse.	סוּסֶתְךָ thy mare.	
3. {	m. סוּסוֹ equus eius (suus).	סוּסֹתָו equa eius (sua).
f. סוּסֶיהָ equus eius (suus).	סוּסֶתֶיהָ equa eius (sua).	
Plur. 1. com.	סוּסֵינוּ our horse.	סוּסֵיתָנוּ our mare.
2. {	m. סוּסֵיכֶם your horse.	סוּסֵיתֶכֶם your mare.
f. סוּסֵיכֶן your horse.	סוּסֵיתֶכֶן your mare.	
3. {	m. סוּסֵיהֶם equus eorum (suus).	סוּסֵיתֵיהֶם equa eorum (sua).
f. סוּסֵיהֶן equus earum (suus).	סוּסֵיתֵיהֶן equa earum (sua).	

Plural.

q

	Masculine.	Feminine.
	סוּסִים horses.	סוּסוֹת mares.
Sing. 1. com.	סוּסַי my horses.	סוּסוֹתַי my mares.
2. {	m. סוּסֵיךָ thy horses.	סוּסוֹתֶיךָ thy mares.
f. סוּסֵיךָ thy horses.	סוּסוֹתֶיךָ thy mares.	
3. {	m. סוּסֵיוֹ equi eius (sui).	סוּסוֹתֵיוֹ equae eius (suae).
f. סוּסֵיהֶן equi eius (sui).	סוּסוֹתֵיהֶן equae eius (suae).	
Plur. 1. com.	סוּסֵינוּ our horses.	סוּסוֹתֵינוּ our mares.
2. {	m. סוּסֵיכֶם your horses.	סוּסוֹתֵיכֶם your mares.
f. סוּסֵיכֶן your horses.	סוּסוֹתֵיכֶן your mares.	
3. {	m. סוּסֵיהֶם equi eorum (sui).	סוּסוֹתֵיהֶם equae eorum (suae).
f. סוּסֵיהֶן equi earum (sui).	סוּסוֹתֵיהֶן equae earum (suae).	

§ 92. *Vowel Changes in the Noun.*

a 1. Vowel changes in the noun may be caused (*a*) by dependence on a following genitive, (*b*) by connexion with pronominal suffixes, (*c*) by the plural and dual terminations, whether in the form of the absolute state or of the construct (before a following genitive of a noun or suffix).

b 2. In all these cases, the tone of the noun is moved forward either one or two syllables, while the tone of the *construct state* may even be thrown upon the following word. In this way the following changes may arise:—

(*a*) When the tone is moved forward only one place, as is the case when the plural and dual endings ם־, וֹת and ם־־ are affixed, as well as with all monosyllabic or paroxytone suffixes, then in dissyllabic nouns the originally short vowel of the first syllable (which was lengthened as being in an open syllable before the tone) becomes *Šewā*, since it no longer stands before the tone. On the other hand, the originally short, but tone-lengthened vowel, of the second syllable is retained as being now the pretonic vowel; e. g. דָּבָר *word* (ground-form *dābār*), plur. דְּבָרִים; with a light suffix beginning with a vowel, דְּבָרִי, דְּבָרָנוּ; plur. דְּבָרַי, דְּבָרַיְךָ, &c.; כַּנָּף *wing*, dual כַּנְפָּיִם. With an unchangeable vowel in the second syllable: פֶּקִיד *overseer*, plur. פֶּקִידִים; with the *suffix* of the sing. פֶּקִידִי, פֶּקִידָנוּ, &c.; with the *suffix* of the plur. פֶּקִידַי, פֶּקִידַיְךָ, &c. With an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable: עוֹלָם *eternity*, plur. עוֹלָמִים, with *suffix* עוֹלָמִי, &c.¹

c But in participles of the form קָטַל, with tone-lengthened *ē* (originally *ǝ*) in the second syllable, the *ē* regularly becomes *Šewā mobile* before a tone-bearing affix, e. g. אֵיב *enemy*, plur. אֵיבִים, with *suffix* אֵיבִי, &c. Likewise in words of the form קָטַל, קָטַל, &c. (with *ē* in the second syllable; § 84^b *d, l, p*; § 85 *i* and *k*), e. g. אֵלֵם *dumb*, plur. אֵלָטִים.

d (*b*) When the tone of the *construct state*, plural or dual, is carried over to the following word, or, in consequence of the addition of the *grave suffixes* to the *constr. st.* plur. or dual, is moved forward two places within the word itself, in such cases the originally short vowel of the second syllable becomes *Šewā*, while the vowel of the first syllable reverts to its original shortness, e. g. דְּבָרֵי הָעָם *the words of the people*, דְּבָרֵיכֶם *your words*, דְּבָרֵיהֶם *their words* (in all which instances the *ǝ* of the first syllable is attenuated from an original *ā*).

¹ The participles *Niph'al* נִדְּחָה Dt 30⁴, נִדְּחָהוּ 2 S 14¹⁸, and some plurals of the participle *Niph.* of verbs נ"ל form an exception; cf. § 93 00.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

§ 93. *Paradigms of Masculine Nouns.*¹

a Masculine nouns from the simple stem may, as regards their form and the vowel changes connected with it, be divided into *four* classes. A synopsis of them is given on pp. 264, 265, and they are further explained below. Two general remarks may be premised:

(*a*) That all feminines without a distinctive termination (§ 122 *h*) are treated like these masculine nouns, e. g. חֶרֶב *f.* sword, like מֶלֶךְ *m.* king, except that in the *plural* they usually take the termination וֹת—; thus חֶרְבוֹת, *constr.* חֶרְבוֹת (and so always before *suffixes*, see § 95).

b (*b*) That in the plural of the first three classes a changeable vowel is always retained even before the light suffixes as a lengthened pretonic vowel, whenever it also stands before the plural ending ם׃—. All suffixes, except כֶּם, בֶּן, הֶם, הֵן (יָכֶם, יָבֶן, יָהֶם, יָהֵן), are called *light*. Cf. § 92 *e*.

Explanations of the Paradigms (see pp. 264, 265).

c 1. Paradigm I comprises the large class of *segholate* nouns (§ 84^a *a-e*). In the first three examples, from a strong stem, the ground-forms, *mālk*, *sīphr*, *quḏš* have been developed by the adoption of a helping *Seghôl* to מֶלֶךְ (with *ă* modified to *è*), מֶפָר (i lengthened to *ē*), מֶרֶשׁ (ü lengthened to *ō*).² The next three examples, instead of the helping *Seghôl*, have a helping *Pathah*, on account of the middle (*d, f*) or final guttural (*e*). In all these cases the *constr. st. sing.* coincides exactly with the *absolute*. The singular suffixes are added to the ground-form; but in *c* and *f* an *ō* takes the place of the original *ü*, and in *d* and *f* the guttural requires a repetition of the *ă* and *ō* in the form of a *Hateph* (מֶפָּעֵלִי, מֶפָּעֵרִי); before a following *Šewā* this *Hateph* passes into a simple helping vowel (*ă, ð*), according to § 28 *c*; hence מֶפָּעֵרִי, &c.

d In the plural an *a*-sound almost always appears before the tone-bearing affix ם׃— (on the analogy of forms with original *a* in the

¹ A sort of detailed commentary on the following scheme of Hebrew declensions is supplied by E. König in his *Hist.-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Spr.*, ii. 1, p. 1 ff.

² According to P. Haupt, 'The book of Nahum' in the *Journ. of bibl. Lit.*, 1907, p. 29, the *e* in מֶפָּר and the *o* in מֶרֶשׁ are not long but accented, and hence to be pronounced σέφρ, ὄζν (וֹרֶשׁ), a theory unknown at any rate to the Jewish grammarians.

second syllable; cf. § 84^a a), in the form of a pretonic *Qames*, whilst the short vowel of the first syllable becomes vocal *Šewā*. The original *a* of the 2nd syllable is elided in the *construct state*, so that the short vowel under the first radical then stands in a closed syllable. The omission of *Dageš* in a following *Begadkephath* (מְלִכִּי, not מַלְכִּי, &c.) is due to the loss of a vowel between ל and כ. On the other hand, the pretonic *Qames* of the *absolute state* is retained before the light plural suffixes, whilst the grave suffixes are added to the form of the *construct state*.—The ending of the *absolute state* of the dual is added, as a rule, to the ground-form (so in *a-d* and *h*, but cf. *k*). The *construct state* of the dual is generally the same as that of the plural, except, of course, in cases like *m*.

Paradigms *g* and *h* exhibit forms with middle *u* and *i* (§ 84^a c, γ e and δ); the ground forms *maut* and *zait* are always contracted to *môth*, *zêth*, except in the *absol. sing.*, where *u* and *i* are changed into the corresponding consonants ו and י.

Paradigm *i* exhibits one of the numerous forms in which the contraction of a middle *u* or *i* has already taken place in the *absol. sing.* (ground-form *šaut*).

Paradigm *k* is a formation from a stem ה"ל (§ 84^a c, ε).

Paradigms *l*, *m*, *n* are forms from stems י"ע, and hence (see § 67 a) *f* originally biliteral, *yam*, 'im, *huq*, with the regular lengthening to יַ, יָ, קִי. Before formative additions a sharpening, as in the inflexion of verbs י"ע, takes place in the second radical, e.g. יָמִי, יָמִי, &c. (see § 84^a c, β).

REMARKS.

I. A. On I. *a* and *d* (ground-form *qatl*). In *pause* the full lengthening to *ā* *g* generally takes place, thus כָּרְם *vineyard*, נֶעֱרַ, וְרַע *seed* (from וְרַע), and so always (except ψ 48¹¹), in אֶרֶץ *earth* with the article, אֶרֶץ, according to § 35 0 (cf. also in the LXX the forms 'Αβέλ, 'Ιαφέθ for הֶבֶל, יֶפֶת). However, the form with *è* is also sometimes found in *pause*, along with that in *ā*, e.g. חֶסֶד together with חָסֶד; and very frequently only the form with *S^eghôl*, e.g. מְלִכִּי, אֶשְׁרָ *grass*, נְצַח *perpetuity*, פֶּלֶא *a wonder*, צְדָקָה *righteousness*, קֶדְמָה *the East*, יִשְׁעֵי *help*, &c.—With two *S^eghôls*, although with a middle guttural, we find חֶמֶת *bread* (in *pause* חָמֶת) and רֶחֶם *womb* (in *pause* רָחֶם), besides רַחֵם Ju 5³⁰ (in *pause* רָחֶם). A helping *S^eghôl* always stands before a final א, as אֶשְׁרָ, טָנָא (with *suff.* טָנָא), פֶּלֶא, פֶּרָא (also written פֶּרָה), except in גִּיָּא, see *v*.

B. The *constr. st.* is almost always the same as the *absolute*. Sometimes, *h* however, under the influence of a final guttural or ר, *Pathah* appears in the second syllable as the principal vowel (see below, *s*), e.g. נֶבֶר ψ 18²⁶; וְרַע

Paradigms of

I.

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	מֶלֶךְ	סֵפֶר	קֹדֶשׁ	נָעַר	נֶצַח	פְּעַל
	(king)	(book)	(sanctuary)	(a youth)	(perpetuity)	(work)
„ <i>construct</i>	מֶלֶךְ	סֵפֶר	קֹדֶשׁ	נָעַר	נֶצַח	פְּעַל
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	מֶלְכִי	סֵפְרִי	קֹדְשִׁי	נְעָרִי	נֶצְחִי	פְּעָלִי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	מֶלְכֶךָ	סֵפְרֶךָ	קֹדְשֶׁךָ	נְעָרֶךָ	נֶצְחֶךָ	פְּעָלֶךָ
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מַלְכִּים	סִפְרִים	[קֹדְשִׁים]	נְעָרִים	נֶצְחִים	פְּעָלִים
„ <i>construct</i>	מַלְכֵי	סִפְרֵי	קֹדְשֵׁי	נְעָרֵי	נֶצְחֵי	פְּעָלֵי
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	מַלְכֵי	סִפְרֵי	[קֹדְשֵׁי]	נְעָרֵי	נֶצְחֵי	פְּעָלֵי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	מַלְכֵיכֶם	סִפְרֵיכֶם	קֹדְשֵׁיכֶם	נְעָרֵיכֶם	נֶצְחֵיכֶם	פְּעָלֵיכֶם
<i>Dual absolute</i>	רַגְלַיִם	קַבְצָיִם	מַתְנַיִם	נְעָלַיִם		
	(feet)	(two heaps)	(loins)	(sandals)		
		[proper name.]				
„ <i>construct</i>	רַגְלָי		מַתְנֵי	נְעָלֵי		

II.

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	דָּבָר	חָכָם	זָקֵן	כַּתֵּף	חֲצַר	שָׂדֶה
	(word)	(wise)	(an old man)	(shoulder)	(court)	(field)
„ <i>construct</i>	דָּבָר	חָכָם	זָקֵן	כַּתֵּף	חֲצַר	שָׂדֶה
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	דְּבָרִי	חֲכָמִי	זָקֵנִי	כַּתְּפִי	חֲצָרִי	שָׂדֵי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	דְּבָרְךָ	חֲכָמְךָ				שָׂדֶךָ
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	דְּבָרִים	חֲכָמִים	זָקֵנִים		חֲצָרִים	פְּנִים
„ <i>construct</i>	דְּבָרֵי	חֲכָמֵי	זָקֵנֵי		חֲצָרֵי	פְּנֵי
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	דְּבָרֵי	חֲכָמֵי	זָקֵנֵי		חֲצָרֵי	פְּנֵי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	דְּבָרֵיכֶם	חֲכָמֵיכֶם	זָקֵנֵיכֶם		חֲצָרֵיכֶם	פְּנֵיכֶם
<i>Dual absolute</i>	כַּנְפָּיִם	חֲלָצִים	יָרְכָיִם			
	(wings)	(loins)	(thighs)			(face)
„ <i>construct</i>	כַּנְפָּי					



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

(only in Nu 11⁷, before Maqqeph), חָרַר Ju 3²⁴ (but Ct 3⁴ חָרַר), נָטַע, סָחַר as well as וָרַע, &c. ; cf., moreover, קָחַת 2 K 12⁹ (for קָחַת, *infin. constr.* from לָקַח).

i C. The הָ־ locale is, according to § 90 i, regularly added to the already developed form, e.g. נָנְדָה ψ 116^{14.18}: הַפֶּתַחַה Gn 19⁶, to the door ; but also with a firmly closed syllable נָנְבָה Ex 4c²⁴ ; under the influence of a guttural or ר, חָרַרָה, אָרְצָה, in *pause* אָרְצָה (cf. אָרְרָה 1 Ch 14¹⁶, from אָרַר).

k D. The suffixes of the singular are likewise added to the ground-form, but forms with middle guttural take *Ḥateph-Pathah* instead of the *Šewā quiescens* ; נַעְרִי, &c. (but also לַחֲמִי, וְעָמִי, &c.). In a rather large number of *qāṭl*-forms, however, before suffixes in the sing., as well as in the *constr. st. plur.* and dual, the *ā* of the first syllable is attenuated to *ī*,¹ thus בְּטֹנִי *my womb*, יִתְרוֹ ; so in בָּנָד, בָּצַע, בָּוַע, אֹבַח, טָבַח, פָּשַׁע, פָּחַח, צָרַק, קָבַר, קָרַב, רָשַׁע, שָׁמַשׁ, and many others. In some cases of this kind besides the form with *ā* there most probably existed another with original *ī* in the first syllable ; thus certainly with יִשַׁע beside יִשַׁע, נִצַּח beside נִצַּח, &c. (According to the *Diqduq ha-ṭ'amim*, § 36, the *absolute st.* in such cases takes *ē*, the *constr. ē* ; cf. נָרַר Nu 30⁴ (*absol.*) and נָרַר 30¹⁰ (*constr.*) ; שָׁבַר Lv 24²⁰ (*absol.*) and שָׁבַר Am 6⁶ (*constr.*). According to this theory² פָּלַא (so the best authorities) Is 9⁵ would be the *constr. st.*, although the accentuation requires an *absol. st.*)—A weakening of the firmly closed syllable occurs in בְּנָדִי, &c. from בָּנָד and יִקְבְּךָ Dt 15¹⁴, 16¹³, in both cases evidently owing to the influence of the palatal in the middle of the stem. With *Seghôl* for *ī* : הַבְּלִי, יִשְׁעֶךָ, נְגִדִי, &c.

l E. In the plural the termination וֹת is found as well as יִם־, e.g. נַפְשׁוֹת, עַצְמוֹת together with נַפְשִׁים (Ez 13²⁰ [but read חַפְשִׁים ; see comm.]), &c., *constr. st.* נַפְשׁוֹת. Other nouns have only the ending וֹת, e.g. אַרְצוֹת, *constr.* אַרְצוֹת from אָרֶץ. Without *Qames* before the ending יִם־ we find רַחֲמִים (*bowels*) *mercy*. On the numerals עֶשְׂרִים *twenty*, &c., cf. § 97 f, note 2. Moreover *a* is not inserted before plural suffixes with the tone on the penultima in אֲשֶׁרֶיךָ, &c., properly *thy happiness!* (a word which is only used in the *constr. st. pl.* and at an early period became stereotyped as a kind of interjection).

m F. In the *constr. st. plural* a firmly closed syllable is sometimes found, contrary to the rule, e.g. בְּסִפִּיהֶם Gn 42^{25.35} ; רִשְׁפֵי Ct 8⁶ (ψ 76⁴) ; טְרַפֵּי Ez 17⁹ ; צְמֵרֵי Is 5¹⁰, and so always in נְסִפֵיכֶם Nu 29³⁹, נְסִפִּיהֶם ψ 16⁴, &c. (on the other hand, according to the best authorities *not* in חֲסִדֵי Is 55³, &c., though in ψ 107⁴⁹ Ginsburg reads חֲסִדֵי) ; cf. § 46 d. Even with a middle guttural בְּעֵלְיָהֶן Est 1^{17.20}.—The attenuation of *ā* to *ī* also occurs sometimes in this form (see above, k), e.g. וְזִבְחֵי, &c., even יִלְרֵי Is 57⁴ beside יִלְרֵי Ho 1², &c.

n G. In the *dual absol.* beside forms like רַגְלָיִם *feet*, with suff. רַגְלָיִךְ, &c. בְּרַפְיָיִם *two thousand*, נַעְלָיִם *sandals*, בְּרַפְיָיִם *knees* (*ā* attenuated to *ī*, *constr. st.* בְּרַפְיָיִם with a firmly closed syllable), with suffixes בְּרַפְיָיִם, &c. (cf., however, בְּרַפְיָיִם Ju 7⁶), forms with pretonic *Qames* are also found (in consequence of the

¹ According to M. Lambert, *REJ.* 1896, p. 21, *a* tends to remain with labials ; so in 14 cases out of 22 masculines, and in 3 out of 6 feminines.

² Probably only a theory of one particular school and not generally accepted, or at any rate not consistently carried out ; cf. König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 22.

tendency to assimilate the dual to the plural in form: so König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 17), as קַרְנַיִם horns, with suff. קַרְנָיו (Dn 8³ α .; elsewhere always קַרְנִים, קַרְנָיו, &c.), and so always דְּלָתַיִם, constr. st. דְּלָתַי folding-doors, דְּרָכַי (?) double way.

2. On Paradigms *b* and *e*. With a final \aleph rejected (but retained orthographically) we find חַטָּא *sin*. An initial guttural before suffixes generally receives *S^eghôl* instead of the original \imath , e.g. חֲלָקִי, עֲוֹרִי, &c., so in the *constr. st. plur.* עֲוֹלָי, &c.; חַטָּא forms חַטָּאִי 2 K 10²⁹, &c., retaining the *Qames* of חַטָּאִים before the weak \aleph .—The pausal forms סָתַר and שָׁבַט (out of pause always סָתַר, שָׁבַט) go back to by-forms סָתַר, שָׁבַט.—On עֲשָׂבוֹת (*constr. st. plur.* of עֲשָׂב) Pr 27²⁵, cf. § 20 *h*; שִׁקְמוֹת *sycamores*, without *Qames* before the termination ם (see above, *l*), is probably from the sing. שִׁקְמָה found in the *Mišna*.

3. On Paradigms *c* and *f*. קָשֶׁט occurs in Pr 22²¹ without a helping vowel; *p* with a middle guttural פָּעַל, &c., but with ה also אָהַל, בָּהֶן; with a final guttural גָּבַה, רָבַע, &c., but with א, גָּמָא; with a firmly closed syllable אֶסְפִּי Mi 7¹.

Before suffixes the original \imath sometimes reappears in the sing., e.g. גִּדְּלוּ (*ψ* 150²) beside גִּדְּלוּ, from גִּדְּלוּ greatness; סִבְּלוּ (with *Dageš forte dirimens*, and the \imath repeated in the form of a *Hateph-Qames*, cf. § 10 *h*) Is 9³, &c.; גִּשְׁמָה Ez 22²⁴.—Corresponding to the form פְּעַלְכֶם *pö'olekhèm* we find קִטְבֶּךָ Ho 13¹⁴, even without a middle guttural; similarly קִטְנִי (so Jablonski and Opitius) 1 K 12¹⁰, 2 Ch 10¹⁰, from קִטְנִי little finger; but the better reading is, no doubt, קִטְנִי (so ed. *Mant.*, 'the \aleph proleptically assuming the vowel of the following syllable'; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 69), and the form is to be derived, with König, from קִטְנִי, not *qütün*, as Brockelmann quotes him, in *Grundriss*, p. 103. The reading קִטְנִי (Baer and Ginsburg) is probably not due to a confusion of the above two readings, but _____ is merely intended to mark the vowel expressly as δ . In the forms פָּעַלוּ Is 1³¹ (for פְּעַלוּ) and תִּאָּרוּ Is 52¹⁴ (for תִּאָּרוּ 1 S 28¹⁴), the lengthening of the original \imath to δ has been retained even before the suffix; cf. § 63 *p* and § 74 *h* (בְּמִצְאֵכֶם Gn 32²⁰).—In the same way δ remains before ה_____ *locale*, e.g. גִּרְנָה, גִּרְנָה Gn 18⁶, 24⁶⁷, &c. Dissimilation of the vowel (or a by-form נִכְחוּ?) seems to occur in נִכְחוּ Ex 14², Ez 46⁹, for נִכְחוּ.

In the *absol. st. plur.* the original \imath generally becomes *S^ewá* before the *Qames*, *r* e.g. בְּקָרִים from בֶּקָר morning, פְּעָלִים works, רִמְחִים lances, שְׁעָלִים handfuls (*constr. st.* שְׁעָלֵי Ez 13¹⁹); on the other hand, with an initial guttural the \imath -sound reappears as *Hateph-Qames*, e.g. חֲרָשִׁים months, עֲפָרִים gazelles, אֲרָחוֹת ways; and so even without an initial guttural, הַגִּרְנוֹת the threshing-floors, 1 S 23¹, Jo 2²⁴; קִדְּשִׁים sanctuaries, and שְׁרָשִׁים roots (*qōdhāšim*, &c., with δ for _____); also קִדְּשֵׁי [but קִדְּשֵׁי, קִדְּשֵׁי, once 'קִדְּשֵׁי], where, however, the reading frequently fluctuates between 'קִדְּשֵׁי and 'קִדְּשֵׁי; with the article הַקִּדְּשֵׁי, בְּקִדְּשֵׁי, לְקִדְּשֵׁי, according to Baer and Ginsburg. On these forms cf. especially § 9 *v*. From אָהַל tent, both בְּאֵהָלִים and אֵהָלִים (cf. § 23 *h* and פָּעַלוּ above) are found; with light suffixes אֵהָלֵי, &c.; so from אֵרַח way, אֵרַחְתִּי (also אֵרַחְתִּי)—hence only with initial א, 'on account of its weak articulation' (König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 45). It seems that by these different ways of writing a distinction was intended between the

plural of אַרְחָה *caravan*, and of אַרְחַ way; however, אַרְחֹת is also found in the former sense (in *constr. st.* Jb 6¹⁹) and אַרְחֹת in the latter (e.g. Jb 13²⁷ according to the reading of Ben Naphtali and Qimḥi); cf. also אַרְחֵי 2 Ch 8¹⁸ *Keth.* (אַרְחֵי *Qerê*).—The *constr. st.* plural of בֶּהֶן *thumb* is בְּהֵנוֹת Ju 16¹, as if from a sing. בֶּהֶן: of נִגְיָה *brightness*, Is 59⁹ נִגְיָהוֹת (on these *q^ol*-forms, cf. *t*).—If אַפְּנֵי Pr 25¹¹ is not dual but plural (see the Lexicon) it is then analogous to the examples, given in *l* and *o*, of plurals without a pretonic *Qames*; cf. בִּטְנֵים *pistachio nuts*, probably from a sing. בִּטְנָה. According to Barth, *ZDMG.* xlii, 345 f. אַפְּנֵי is a sing. (אַפְּנֵי, the ground-form of אַפְּנָה, with suffix).

In the *constr. st. plur.* the only example with original *ũ* is רַכְּסֵי ψ 31²¹; otherwise like קִרְשֵׁי, אֲהֵלֵי, &c.

§ 4. Besides the forms treated hitherto we have to consider also a series of formations, which have their characteristic vowel under the *second* radical, as is ordinarily the case in Aramaic (on the origin of these forms see further, § 84^a *e*). Thus (*a*) of the form קָטַל; רִבֵּשׁ *honey*, מְעַט *little*; in *pause*, רִבֵּשׁ, מְעַט; גִּבֹּר *man* (as *constr. st.*, see above, *h*), ψ 18²⁶ (elsewhere always גִּבֹּר), and *infinitives* like שָׁכַב (§ 45 *c*; on קָחַת, see above, *h*); שָׁכַם *shoulder*, *ã* being modified to *è* (but in *pause* שָׁכַם); locative שָׁכַמָּה, also שָׁכַמָּה Ho 6⁹. With suffixes in the usual manner שָׁכַמִּי, שָׁכַמָּה Gn 19^{33.35} (an *infin.* with suffix, therefore not שָׁכַמָּה). On the other hand, the *ã* is retained in the *plur. absol.* by sharpening the final consonant: אֲנָמִים (*constr.* אֲנָמֵי) *marshes*, הַרְפִּים *myrtles*, מְעַטִּים *few*.

t (*b*) Of the form קָטַל: בְּאֵר *a well*, זֶבֶב *wolf*, &c.¹; locative בְּאֵרָה, with *suff.* בְּאֵרֵי, *plur.* זֶבֶבִים, זֶבֶבֵי; but בְּאֵרוֹת, *constr.* בְּאֵרוֹת; on the *infin. constr.* שָׁאֵת, cf. § 76 *b*.

(*c*) of the form קָטַל: בְּאֵשׁ *stench* (with *suff.* בְּאֵשׁוֹ, just as סִבְכוֹ occurs in Jer 4⁷ along with the *constr. st.* סִבְכָה ψ 74⁵; cf. for the Dageš, § 20 *h*), perhaps also לְאֵם *nation*, *pl.* לְאֵמִים.

¶ 5. Paradigms *g-i* comprise the *segholate* forms with middle ו or י: (*a*) of the form *qātl* with *Wāw* as a strong consonant, in which cases the original *ã* is almost always lengthened to *ā* (Paradigm *g*), thus מְאוֹת, אֲוֹן *vanity*, עֲוֹל *iniquity*, מִתְּוֶה *midst*; with final א, שְׁוֹא *falsehood*; cf. however, also רֵוַח *space*. In the *constr. st.* contraction always occurs, מוֹת, &c. (from original *maut*), and likewise before suffixes מוֹתוֹ, &c. Exception, עֲוֹל as *constr. st.* Ez 28¹⁸ (according to Qimḥi) and with *suff.* עוֹלוֹ. The contraction remains also in all cases in the plural (but see below, *w*).

v (*b*) Of the form *qātl* with consonantal *Yōdh* (Paradigm *h*). With final א, גֵּיָא (also גֵּי), in Is 40⁴ גֵּיָא, in the *constr. st.* (also *absol.* Zc 14⁴) גֵּיָא (also גֵּי); *plur.* 2 K 2¹⁶ and Ez 6³ *Keth.* according to Baer גֵּאוֹת, i. e. doubtless גֵּאוֹת (cf. גֵּאוֹתֶיךָ Ez 35⁸; according to another reading [and so Ginsburg] גֵּאוֹת,

¹ The proposal of Haupt (*SBOT.* 'Proverbs', p. 34, l. 44 ff.) to read בְּאֵר, זֶבֶב, &c., does not seem to be warranted. The case here is quite different from that in Pr 1²² where the Masora requires תִּתְאַהֲבוּ, no doubt on the analogy of בְּאֵר, &c., for תִּתְאַהֲבוּ, which was probably intended, see § 63 *m*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

צָרִי (also דָּמִי, יָפִי, צָרִי), רָאִי, &c; in *pause* הָלִי, &c., with suff. הָלִיּוֹ, plur. הָלִיִּים. From עָפִי *branch*, there occurs in ψ 104¹² the plur. עָפָאִים (analogous to פָּתָאִים, &c., see above, x); the *Keth.* evidently intends עָפָאִים (so Opitius and others). Dual, with suff. הָלִיּוֹ Nu 24⁷, *bucket* (from הָלִי, for הָלִי), more correctly, with the Masora, הָלִיּוֹ with Munah for Metheg. This unusual Metheg is to be treated as following the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 9 v.

aa 7. On Paradigms l-n: segholate forms from stems ע"ע (see § 84^a c, β).

(a) In the *qatl*-form the \check{a} of the contracted formation is sometimes lengthened in the *absol. st.*, sing. as in דָּ (so also in the *constr. st.*, except in the combination יַם־סוּף *the Red sea*; and even before *Maqqeph*, יַם־הַמֶּלַח *the salt sea*), sometimes it remains short, e.g. פַּת *morsel*, עַם *people*, but even these formations generally have *Qames* in *pause*, as well as after the article (e.g. הָעַם). Adjectives under the influence of a guttural either have forms like לַחִים, צַחִים or, with *compensatory lengthening*, רַעִי, רַעִים. In the *constr. st.* חַי *living* (in the plural חַיִּים also a substantive, *life*), and יָ *sufficiency*, are contracted to חַי¹ and יָ. As a locative form notice הָרָה *to the mountain*, Gn 14¹⁰ (see § 27 q) beside הָרָה. The stem is expanded to a trilateral form in הָרָרִי (unless it is simply derived from a by-form הָרָרִי on the analogy of *qätäl*-forms) Jer 17³ (but in ψ 30⁸ for הָרָרִי read הָרָרִי) and הָרָרִים Gn 14⁶; plur. *constr.* הָרָרִי Nu 23⁷, &c. (but only in poetical passages), with suffix, הָרָרִיָּה Dt 8⁹; עַמְמִים Ju 5¹⁴ (where, however, read probably בְּעַמְמֵךְ), Neh 9²²; עַמְמֵי Neh 9²⁴: elsewhere עַמִּים, עַמִּי.—Before *suffixes* and in the plur. \check{a} is sometimes attenuated to \check{i} , e.g. פַּתִּי, פַּתִּים, from פַּת; סַפִּים and סַפּוֹת (also סַפּוֹת 2 S 17²⁸) from סַף. Before ח \check{a} is retained in a virtually sharpened syllable, e.g. פַּחִים *traps*.

bb (b) *Qitl*-forms: אֵשׁ, אֵשִׁי *fire* (with suff. אֵשִׁי, but cf. also אֵשְׁכֶם Is 50¹¹), חַן *favour*, &c.; of a trilateral form, the plur. חַנְצִיָּךְ ψ 77¹⁸.

(c) *Qütll*-forms: חֶקֶל, כָּל *totality*, before *Maqqeph* חֶקֶל־כָּל, with suff. חֶקְלִי, &c., with omission of *Dageš forte* (according to § 20 m) always חֶקְלִי, חֶקְלֵכֶם, but from עוֹ, עוֹי, עוֹךְ, עוֹכֶם, for which עוֹי and עוֹךְ are also found. חֶקְלִי, expanded to a trilateral form, Ju 5¹⁵ and Is 10¹, generally explained as a secondary form of חֶקְלִי with abnormal weakening of the \check{u} to \check{i} , is more probably to be referred to a *qitl*-form = Arabic *hiqq*.

cc The forms with assimilated middle *Nún* likewise follow the analogy of Paradigms l-n, e.g. אַף *nose, anger* (אַפִּי, dual אַפָּיִם, also *face*) for 'anp; חֶקֶל *palate* for *hink*, אֶקֶי *fetters*, אֶי *goat*, plur. אֶיִם, for 'inz, probably also אֶי *green herb*, for 'inb.

dd 2. Paradigm II comprises all formations with original short vowels, whether in the first or second syllable; cf. § 84^a f-i, and the general laws of formation, § 92 b-g.

¹ חַי only in Dn 12⁷ as *constr. st.*, since in the asseverative formulae (cf. § 149) חַי פְּרַעַר, חַי נַפְשֶׁךְ (otherwise only in 2 S 15²¹, after חַי יְהוָה, and Amos 8¹⁴), חַי is a contracted form of the *absol. st.* (prop. *living is Pharaoh!* &c.). It is evidently only a rabbinical refinement which makes the pronunciation חַי distinctive of an oath by God (or of God by himself), as in the regular formulae חַי אֲנִי (חַי אֲנִי Dt 32⁴⁰) and חַי יְהוָה (= חַי אֲנִי).

Rem. 1. On Paradigms *a* and *b*: ground-form *qātāl*. The lengthening of the second *ä* to *ā* is maintained in the *constr. st. sing.* only in *א"ל*-forms, e.g. **צָבָא** army, **צָבָא**. For the construct forms **חֵלֶב** milk, **לָבֵן** white, Gn 49¹², instead of the ordinary *absolutes* **חֵלֶב**, **לָבֵן**, a secondary form **חֵלֶב**, **לָבֵן** must be assumed; from **עָשָׁן** smoke, the *constr. st.* **עָשָׁן** occurs once, Ex 19¹⁸, beside **עֵשָׁן**, from **הָרָר** ornament the *constr. st.* **הָרָר** Dn 11²⁰, beside the common form **הָרָר**.—The plur. **פָּרָשִׁים** horses, Is 21⁷ (instead of **פָּרָשִׁים**, ground-form *pārāš*) is no doubt due to a confusion with the *qattāl*-form **פָּרָשׁ** horseman.

A. Sometimes a sharpening of the third radical takes place, in order to *ee* keep the preceding vowel short, e.g. **נְמָלִים** camels, **קְטַנִּים** small ones, **פְּלִגּוֹת** brooks (see § 20 *a*).—The attenuation of the *ä* of the first syllable to *i* does not take place in the *constr. st. plur.* as a rule after an initial guttural, as **חֲכָמִי**, **עֲנִי**, but **חֲזָקִי**, and never before a middle guttural, e.g. **נְהַרִי**; nor (according to König, owing to the influence of the nasal) in the non-guttural forms **זַנְבוֹת** tails, **כַּנְפוֹת**, and (in the dual) **כַּנְפֵי** wings, from **זָנַב**, **כָּנַף**.—The dual **נְהַרִים** from **נָהַר** river, shows an abnormal omission of the lengthening of the *ä* before a tone-bearing termination, but cf. § 88 *c*.

B. From *ע"ע* stems, forms like **חֲלָל**, **עָנָן**, &c., belong to this class. *ff*

C. The few nouns of the ground-form *qītāl* follow the same analogy, such as **לֵב** heart, **שֵׁכָר** strong drink, **עֵנַב** grape, &c. From **שֵׁעַר** hair, in the *constr. st.* besides **שֵׁעַר** the form **שֵׁעַר** is also found (perhaps a survival of a secondary form like those in Paradigm I, *d*); so from **צִלְעָה** rib, **צִלְעָה** and even **צִלְעָה** 2 S 16¹³ (so ed. Mant., Ginsb.; but Baer **צִלְעָה**), both, probably, old secondary forms (also used for the *absol. st.*) of **צִלְעָה**; cf. also **צִלְעִי** and **צִלְעוֹ**, as well as the *constr. st. plur.* **צִלְעוֹת**; also from **נֶכֶר** strangeness, the *constr. st.* **נֶכֶר־** is found, Dt 31¹⁶. *gg*

2. On Paradigms *c-e*: ground-form *qātīl*, developed to *qātēl*; with a final *hh* guttural, e.g. **שָׂבַע** satisfied. In the *constr. st.* the original *i* of the second syllable, probably on the analogy of the forms discussed in § 69 *c*, becomes *ä*, e.g. **זָקֵן**, **חָדַל**, **חָסַר**, &c., but not before suffixes, **כַּתְּפֵי**, &c., nor in forms from *א"ל* stems, e.g. **מָלֵא** full, **מָלֵא**; cf., moreover, **עֵקֶב** Gn 25²⁶ from **עָקַב** heel, and **אֲבֵל־** ψ 35¹⁴, mourning. Paradigm *d* represents forms which in the *constr. st.* instead of the ordinary **כַּתְּף**, &c., have a segholate form, as **אֲרָף**, **גִּדְרָה**, **יָרֵף**, **גִּזְלָה** (Ez 44⁹), *constr. st.* of **אֲרָף** long, **גִּדְרָה** wall, **יָרֵף** thigh, **גִּזְלָה** robbery, **עֲרֵל** uncircumcised. In Is 11¹⁴ **בְּכַתְּףֵהוּ** would be altogether without precedent as a *constr. st.* (for **בְּכַתְּףֵהוּ**); most probably the *absol. st.* is intended by the Masora (according to Nöldeke, *Gött. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1871, No. 23 [p. 896] for **אֶחָד** בכ' with one shoulder, i. e. shoulder to shoulder); [cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 190, *Obs.*].

In the *plur. constr.* the *ē* lengthened from *i* is frequently retained in verbal *ii* adjectives of this formation, e.g. **שְׂבַחִי**, **שְׂמַחִי**, **אֲבֵלִי**, **יִשְׁנִי**, **חֲפִצִי**; cf. also **יְחֻרְתִּי** (with *ē* under the protection of the secondary tone) from **יָתַר** tent-peg. On the other hand from **יָרָא** fearing, always **יָרָאִי**; cf. also **רִגְעִי** ψ 35²⁰ from **רִגַע**.—With *ä* retained in the initial syllable cf. **אַחַר** *alius* (with a virtual sharpening of the *ח*).—From *י"ע* stems come forms like **מֵת** dead person, **נָר** resident stranger, **עֵד** witness, with unchangeable *Sērē*; hence **מֵתִים**, **מֵתִי**, &c.

Kindred in character are the formations from the ground-form *qātūl*. This *kk*

ground-form is regularly lengthened to *qātōl*, e. g. עָגוּל *round*, עֵמֶק *deep*, אָדָם *red*; but before formative additions the short *ū* returns, protected by the sharpening of the following consonant (see *ee* above), as עֵגְלִים, &c. (but in stems with a third guttural or ר, גְּבָהָה, שְׁחָרִים). The form עָגוּל, 1 K 10¹⁹, is abnormal; likewise עֵמוּקָה Pr 23²⁷, Jablonski (ed. Mant. עֵמֶקָה, Baer and Ginsburg עֵמוּקָה).

ll 3. On Paradigm *f*: ground-form *qātāl* from ל"ה stems. As in verbs ל"ה § 75 *h*, the general rule is that before the terminations of the plur. and dual and before suffixes beginning with a vowel, the third radical is usually elided altogether. But besides שָׂדֵה the form שְׂדֵי, with the final *Yódh* retained, is also found in poetry (cf. also the singulars with suffixes, like מִשְׁתֵּיהֶם, in *ss*); in the same way final *l* is retained in עֲנָוִים *the poor*, constr. עֲנָוֵי. The plur. of שָׂדֵה is שְׂדוֹת, constr. שְׂדוֹת (also שְׂדֵי, unless this is a *sing.*, contracted from שְׂדֵי; so Barth, *ZDMG.* xlii, p. 351). The *qātāl*-form (see § 84^a *i*) רָעָה 2 S 15³⁷, 16¹⁶, 1 K 4⁵ is remarkable as a *constr. st.* (the reading רָעָה of Opitius and others is opposed to the express statement of the Masora). To the category of these forms also belongs without doubt פָּנִים *face* (only in *plur.*), פָּנִי, פָּנֶיךָ, &c.

mm In a few formations of this kind the vowel of the second syllable appears to have been already lost in the *absol. st. sing.*; so according to the ordinary view, in יָד *hand*, constr. יַד, with *suff.* יָדוֹ, but יָדְכֶם; plur. יָדוֹת, constr. יָדוֹת, dual יָדַי, יָדֶיךָ, with *suff.* יָדֶיךָ, יָדֶיךָ, &c., and in דָּם *blood*, constr. דָּם, with *suff.* דָּמִי, but דָּמְכֶם (*ā* attenuated to *ī*), plur. דָּמִים, דָּמֵיךָ. But perhaps both these nouns are to be regarded as primitive (§ 81), and as original monosyllabic formations.

nn 3. Paradigm III comprises forms with an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable, whilst the vowel of the second syllable has been lengthened from an original short vowel, and is therefore changeable. The special cases are to be distinguished in which the original short vowel is lengthened both *in* and *before* the tone, but in an open syllable becomes *Šewā* (Paradigm *a*, but cf. also examples like אֹפְנִים *wheels*, for אֹפְנִים, and אֹלְמִים *porches*), secondly, the cases in which the vowel becomes *Šewā* even *before* the tone (Paradigm *b*), and finally, those in which the termination of ל"ה formations is entirely lost (Paradigm *c*).

oo Rem. 1. On the model of עוֹלָם (which, moreover, is obscured from 'ālām), the following forms also are inflected: מִקְטָל (§ 85 *h*), in some cases with virtual sharpening of the third radical (see § 20 *a*), as מִבְּטָחוֹ Jer 17⁷, ψ 40⁶, Jb 8¹⁴, &c.; נ"ל nouns of this form maintain the *Qames* in the *constr. st. plur.*, e. g. מִקְרָאֵי from מִקְרָא¹; on the other hand, in the plur. of the *participles Niph.* (§ 85 *n*) of verbs נ"ל (which likewise belong to this class), are found not only regular forms like נִקְרָאִים but also נִתְבְּאִים Jos 10¹⁷, נִטְמָאִים Ez 20^{30f.},

¹ מִקְרָשֵׁיהֶם Ez 7²⁴ for מִקְרָשׁ (from מִקְרָשׁ) is wholly irregular; perhaps, however, the *part. Pi'el* is intended, without *Dageš* in the ק (according to § 20 *m*).



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

מִקְנֵיךָ *thy cattle*, Is 30²³ (probably also שְׂרֵיךָ 1 K 2²⁶), מִרְאֵיךָ Ct 2¹⁴, and מִרְאֵי הַיָּם *the sight of him*, Jb 41¹ (with the י here retained orthographically), מִעֲלֵי עֵץ Ez 40³¹, &c., are still to be explained as singulars.—On a few other examples which may perhaps be thus explained, see § 124 *k*. Before the plural ending the original termination *ay* reappears in מִמְחֵימָה Is 25⁶ (*part. Pu.* from מְחָה).

tt 4. Paradigm IV comprises the forms with a changeable vowel (*a, b*), or a vowel which has already become *Šewā* (*c*), in the first syllable, and an unchangeable vowel in the second. With Paradigm *c* (which, however, for the most part consists merely of forms based on analogy, without biblical parallels) are also connected all the forms which have unchangeable vowels in both syllables, and therefore (like פְּתָב) cannot undergo any vowel changes.

uu Rem. 1. Analogous to פְּקִיר (ground-form *pāqîd*) are § 84^a *k*, גְּרוֹל, &c. (with *ô*, not changeable *ō* for *ū*); in substantives like שְׁלוֹם, this *ô* is demonstrably obscured from *â* (Arab. *sālām*); *ibid.* *l, m*, אֶסֶר, אֶסֶר, &c.; § 85 *u*, וְכָרוֹן, *constr.* וְכָרוֹן; חֲזִיוֹן, *constr.* חֲזִיוֹן; בְּלִיוֹן, *constr.* בְּלִיוֹן (cf., however, the forms in the *constr. st.* עֲצָבוֹן, קִנְמוֹן, and with the plural suffix עֲבוּרֵיךָ Ez 27^{12 ff.}); § 85 *w*, חֲלָמִישׁ, *constr.* חֲלָמִישׁ; § 85 *l*, מְקוֹם, &c.

uu 2. עָנִי (ground-form *‘ānīy*, stem עָנָה) represents forms in which a final *Yōdh* has been resolved into *i*; before formative additions the original *Yōdh* under the protection of a *Dageš forte* again becomes audible as a firm consonant, whilst the (originally short) vowel of the first syllable becomes *Šewā*; cf. § 84^a *l*, נְקִי, plur. נְקִיִּים, and § 87 *a*.

ww 3. פְּתָב with unchangeable *ā* in the second syllable, whilst the *Šewā* is weakened from a short vowel (Arab. *kūtāb*); *constr. st.* פְּתָב־ Est 4⁸ (readings like פְּתָב 2 Ch 35⁴ are incorrect, although יִקָּר Est 1⁴ and פְּתָב־ 4⁸ are supported by fairly good authority; however, these *q^etāl*-forms in Hebrew are probably all loan-words from the Aramaic). The only plural form found in the O. T. is עֲבֵרֵיהֶם *their deeds*, Ec 9¹. In a narrower sense the forms enumerated in § 84^a *n-p* belong to this class; in a wider sense all those which have unchangeable vowels throughout, thus § 84^a *u*, § 84^b *e* (קָטָל, cf., however, the anomalous forms mentioned there), *ibid.* *f-i, m* (No. 34 *f.*), *n* (No. 39), *p* (No. 44), also partly § 85 *b-w* (especially *l* and *r*).

xx In opposition to the anomalous shortening of the form קָטָל (see above), cases are also found where pretonic vowels are retained even in the antepenultima (with the secondary tone); cf. above, *ii* and *pp*, also of the form קָטִיל (properly *qātīl*) the examples סְרִיסִים, פְּרִיצִים, שְׁלִישִׁים, whilst the *constr. st. sing.* according to the rule, changes the *ā* into *Šewā* (סְרִיץ, פְּרִיץ). (These are not to be confounded with forms like עֲרִיץ *tyrant*, which is for עָרִיץ, and consequently has an unchangeable *Qameṣ*.) Of the form קָטִיל (*qātīl*) in this class are שְׁבוּעַ *week*, plur. שְׁבָעִים and שְׁבָעוֹת, *constr.* שְׁבָעוֹת, but with *Metheg* of the secondary tone in the fifth syllable from the end, שְׁבָעֵתֵיכֶם.—On מְעוֹן, מְעוֹנִי, &c., cf. § 85 *k*.

§ 94. Formation of Feminine Nouns.

1. The feminine ending הַ־, when appended to the masculine *a* forms treated in § 93, effects in almost all cases the same changes as are produced in the masculine forms by the addition of a light suffix, since in both cases the tone is moved one place farther forward (see § 92 *b*). The following scheme is based on the same division into four classes, with their subdivisions, as in § 93; a few special forms will be treated in § 95 in connexion with the paradigms of feminine nouns.

Paradigm I: segholate forms, with the feminine ending always *b* added to the ground-form, (a) מַלְכָּה *queen*, פִּבְּשָׁה and with attenuation of *ā* to *ī* פִּבְּשָׁה *lamb*, רִצְפָּה *hot stone*, Is 6⁶ (from another root רִצְפָּה; see Baer on Ez 40¹⁷), חֲזִקָּה *strength* (unless belonging to Paradigm *b*); (b) סִתְרָה *covering* (masc. סִתֵּר); עֲדָנָה *pleasure* (עֲדָן), not to be confounded with the unchangeable forms with a prefixed מ, derived from ל"ה stems, as מִצְוָה *command*, plur. מִצְוֹת; (c) חֲלָדָה, proper name (חֲלָד *mole*), אֲכָלָה *food* (אָכַל); (d) גַּעְרָה *girl* (גָּעַר); (f) בְּאַשָּׁה *weed*, טְהִרָה *purity* (טָהַר); (g) עוֹלָה *wrong* (also עוֹלָה, Paradigm *i*); (i) צִידָה *victuals* (masc. צִיד, cf. Paradigm *h*); from *qitl* and *qutl*-forms, בִּינָה *understanding*, סוּפָה *tempest*; (k) אֲלִיָּה *fat tail* (as if from אָלַי), שְׁבִיָּה (*ā* attenuated to *ī*) *captivity* (שָׁבַי), לוֹיָה *wreath* (probably an original *qitl*-form); (l) חַיָּה *life*, מִדָּה *measure* (attenuated from מָדָה). Adjectives derived from ע"ע stems also belong in flexion to this class, as רַבָּה *multa*, with middle guttural רַעָה *mala*; (m) זְמָה *plan*; (n) חֲקָה *statute* (חָק).

Paradigm II: ground-form *qātālāt*, &c., (a) נִקְמָה *vengeance* (נִקַּם); (b) אֲדָמָה *earth*; (c) נִבְלָה *corpse*; (d) עֵיפָה *languida*; (f) יָפָה *beautiful*, קִצָּה *end* (from יָפָה, קִצָּה). From stems ע"י arise such forms as עֲרָה (masc. עָר, properly *part. Qal* from עוֹר) *female witness*. From the ground-form *qātūl*, עֲמֻקָּה *profunda* (masc. עֲמוּק), עֲבָרָה *servitude*, &c.

Paradigm III: unchangeable vowel in the first, changeable in the *d* second syllable, (a) יִלְדָּה, *a woman with child* (cf. the examples in § 84^a *s*, and the retention of the *ē* in the *part. Pi'el*, Ex 22¹⁷, 23²⁶; in the *Hithpa'el* 1 K 14^{5f.}), but also with the change of the *ē* (originally *ī*) into *šewā*, יִשְׁבָּה, *dwelling*, Na 3⁸. However, in these participial forms the feminine is mostly indicated by הַ־ (see below, *h*); (c) גּוֹלָה *those of the captivity* (masc. גּוֹלָה), but also with a return of the final *Yôdh*, הַמְיָה *clamorous*, Pr 7¹¹, and the examples in § 75 *v*. On the *d* of the participles of verbs ע"י, which also belong to this class, such as נִרְהָה *peregrina*, cf. § 72 *g*.

- e* Paradigm IV: originally changeable vowel in the first syllable, unchangeable in the second, (a) גְּדֹלָה *magna*, חֲסִידָה *stork*, properly *pia*; בְּתוּלָה *virgin*, properly *seiuncta*; (b) עֲנִיָּה *misera*.
- f* 2. A simple ת is added as feminine ending in forms like בְּכִית *weeping* (masc. בְּכִי, § 93 x, a), בְּרִית *covenant*; but feminine participles of verbs א"ל, as יִצְאָת, מִצְאָת, may be due to contraction from *yôšè'et*, &c. (hardly to lengthening of the *š* in the ground-form *môši*), whilst forms like מוֹצֵאָת, נִשְׂאָת (see § 74 i) are to be explained on the analogy of the forms treated in § 93 t. Apart from the א"ל formations, we find the simple ת in the participle מְשַׁרְתָּ I K 1¹⁵, contracted from מְשַׁרְחָתָּ. But וַיִּלְרֹתָ Gn 16¹¹, Ju 13^{5.7} is the ground-form of the ptcp. וַיִּלְרֹתָ (as in the same connexion in Gn 17¹⁹, Is 7¹⁴), cf. § 80 d and the *Qere* שִׁבְתָּ, &c., discussed in § 90 n.
- g* The forms which arise by appending the ת feminine to masculine nouns with a changeable vowel in a closed final syllable are, as a rule, developed exactly in the same way as masculine segholate forms. Thus there arise in Paradigm I (a) from גְּבִירָתָּ (for original *g^ebirt*; § 69 c), the form גְּבִירָתָּ *mistress* (but only in *construct st.*; in Is 47⁷ also עַד גְּבִירָתָּ are to be taken together; the *absolute st.* is גְּבִירָה); from מַלְכָּתָּ, מַלְכָּתָּ *queen* (in Paradigm II, a); פְּחָתָּ (פָּחַת = פִּחַת *pit*) Lv 13⁵⁵; (c) גְּדִירָתָּ *wall*, גְּדִירָתָּ (from גְּדִירָתָּ = *g^edirt*; cf. וְזֶן as *construct st.* of וְזֶן); on the other hand, חֲמִשָּׁתָּ is *construct st.* of חֲמִשָּׁה *five*, with lengthening of the original *š* of חֲמִשָּׁתָּ.
- h* Formations with a changeable *ō* in the second syllable belonging to this class are נְחֹשֶׁתָּ *bronze* (from נְחֹשֶׁתָּ), כְּתָנֶתָּ the *constr. st.* of כְּתָנֶתָּ *coat*, perhaps also כְּתָבָתָּ *writing* (unless it be obscured from כְּתָבָתָּ, § 93, Paradigm IV, c).—Paradigm III, (a) חֲתָמָתָּ (from חֲתָמָתָּ), masc. חֲתָמָתָּ *seal*; (b) יוֹנְקָתָּ (properly *sucking*) *sprout* (in *pause*, e.g. חֲבִירָתָּ Ex 26⁴, &c.), and so most feminines of participles קָטַל. On this transition of the ground-form *qôtilt* to קָטַלְתָּ (regularly before suffixes in יוֹנְקָתָּ, יוֹנְקָתָּ, &c.), cf. § 69 c; *qôfalt* serves as the ground-form under the influence of a guttural as well as before suffixes, e.g. יוֹדְעָתָּ, feminine of יוֹדֵעַ *knowing*; in a wider sense, גִּלְגָּלָתָּ *skull* may also be included here, see § 95, Paradigm IV, c.
- On the endings תָּ and תִּ—, see § 86 k, l, § 95 at the end.

§ 95. Paradigms of Feminine Nouns.

- a* In accordance with the general formative laws, stated in § 92 b-k, the following cases have chiefly to be considered in the flexion of



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

	II.			III.	
	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	צְדָקָה (righteousness)	זַעֲקָה (outcry)	שָׁנָה (year)	יוֹנְקָת (sprout)	גִּלְגָּלֶת (skull)
„ <i>construct</i>	צְדָקֶת	זַעֲקַת	שָׁנַת	יוֹנְקַת	גִּלְגָּלֶת
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	צְדָקָתִי	זַעֲקָתִי	שָׁנָתִי	יוֹנְקָתִי	גִּלְגָּלֶתִי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	צְדָקְתְּכֶם	זַעֲקְתְּכֶם	שָׁנַתְּכֶם	יוֹנְקְתְּכֶם	גִּלְגָּלֶתְּכֶם
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	צְדָקוֹת		שָׁנוֹת ¹	[יוֹנְקוֹת]	
„ <i>construct</i>	צְדָקוֹת		שָׁנוֹת	יוֹנְקוֹת	גִּלְגָּלוֹת
„ <i>with suff.</i>	צְדָקוֹתִי		שָׁנוֹתִי	יוֹנְקוֹתִי	גִּלְגָּלוֹתִי
<i>Dual absolute</i>	[נְחֻשְׁתַּיִם]		שִׁפְתַּיִם (lips)		
„ <i>construct</i>	(fetters of brass)		שִׁפְתַּי		

REMARKS.

d 1. Paradigm I: feminines of segholate forms. (a) The locative of this class has the form גִּבְעָתָה towards Gibeah (masc. גִּבְעָה). In some cases, especially with an initial guttural, there is no means of deciding whether the form in question is to be referred to a *qātl* or a *qīl* base, e. g. חֲזָקָה strength (cf. חֲרָפָה under b). A dual of this form occurs in שִׁבְעָתַיִם seven times (cf. שִׁבְעַת seven, fem.).

Analogous to masculine forms like דְּבִישׁ (§ 93 s) is הֲדַסָּה myrtle.—From masculines of the form פָּרִי (ל"ה, cf. § 93 I, k) arise feminines sometimes like נְאוּה, שְׁלוּה, אֲלִיָּה (see above, § 94 b), sometimes like בְּבִית (§ 94 f); occasionally the final ת is retained before the plural ending, as if it belonged to the stem (cf. § 87 k), e. g. חַנִּיתוֹת spears. Forms like גְּדִיָּה (cf. אֲנִיָּה, a *qūtl* form) are derived directly from the masculine forms גְּדִי kid, אֲנִי a fleet.—(b) From a stem ע"ן, חֲטָה wheat (for חֲנֻטָּה), plur. חֲטָיִם.—(c) From עֲרָלָה foreskin, the plur. absol. is עֲרָלוֹת (cf. פְּעָלִים, § 93, Paradigm I, f), constr. עֲרָלוֹת.—(d) Example of a feminine segholate form from a stem ע"ע (ground-form *qūtl*, like חֲיָה of the form *qātl*, וְזָה of the form *qīl*), with ö for ü, חֲזָה terror, Is 19¹⁷ (Aramaic orthography for חֲזָה).

e (e) To the list of segholate forms with ת fem. belong also the infinitives of verbs פ"ו and פ"ן, which have rejected the weak consonant at the beginning, as שָׁבַת (from יָשַׁב), יָדַעַת (from יָדַע), גָּשַׁת (from נָגַשׁ), as well as קָחַת (from לָקַח); cf. § 69 m and § 66 b and g. The infinitives of verbs פ"ו are, however, also found in the form דַּעַה, לָרָה, צָאָה, and of the same origin also are עָרָה congregation (from יָעַר), עֲצָה counsel (from יָעַץ), שָׁנָה sleep (from יָשַׁן), constr. עֲרַת, שָׁנַת, while in the constr. forms זַעַת sweat, Gn 3¹⁹ (from יָזַע to flow), and צָאָת excrement, Ez 4¹², the Şere has remained firm.

f From a stem ע"ו (cf. בּוֹשׁ to be ashamed) is בְּשָׁתָה shame, with suffix בְּשָׁתִי.

¹ On שָׁנוֹת as a less frequent (poetic) form for שָׁנַיִם see § 87 n.

From a stem ל"ה (דָּלָה, cf., however, Barth, *ZDMG.* 1887, p. 607, who assumes a stem ידל) the masculine דָּל appears to have been formed after the rejection of the final *Yódh*, and afterwards the feminine דָּלָה *door*; but in the plural דָּלָתוֹת, constr. דָּלָתוֹת, the ת of the termination is retained (see above, *d*, חֲנִיתוֹת). In a similar way רֶפְתִּים *stalls*, Hb 3¹⁷, has arisen, if it is from the stem רפה, and שֶׁקֶת *trough* (from שָׁקָה), of which the masc. must have been שֶׁקֶ = שָׁקִי; on the other hand, the plur. constr. שֶׁקֶתוֹת Gn 30³⁸ (again retaining the feminine ת as an apparent radical) can only be an abnormal formation from the singular שֶׁקֶת, not from a kindred form שֶׁקֶת or שֶׁקֶת.

2. Paradigm II: ground-form *qätälät*, &c., cf. § 94 c, Paradigm II, *a* and *b*. Analogous to the masculine forms like קָטָן, plur. קִטְנִים, we find קִטְנָה *parva*, &c.—The constr. forms, like צִדְקָת (šidh^eqäth), are distinguished by the vocal Š^ewá (§ 10 *d*) from the segholate forms, like כִּבְשֵׁת (kibh-säth). Consequently the constr. st. בְּרַבַּת Gn 28⁴, &c. (from בִּרְכָה *blessing*), and חֲרָדַת I S 14¹⁵, &c. (from חָרַד *a trembling*), are abnormal.—Under the influence of a guttural (see Paradigm *b*) the original *ä* is retained in the first syllable in the constr. st. (cf. also אֲדָמָה *earth*, אֲדָמַת); in other cases it is modified to *S^eghól*, e.g. עֲנָלָה *wagon*, עֲנָלָתוֹ. Frequently from an absol. st. in הֶ the constr. is formed with the termination ת, e.g. עֲטָרָה *crown*, constr. עֲטָרַת (from עֲטָרַת); along with עֲצָרָה *assembly*, עֲצָרַת is found usually, even in the absol. st.; יִבְמַת (from יָבַם *levir*) before suffixes is pointed as in יִבְמַתִּי, and thus entirely agrees with גִּבְרַת (Paradigm I *e*). From a stem ל"ן (אָמֵן) is formed אֲמָת *truth* (from 'ämant, and this no doubt for an original 'ämint, § 69 *c*) before suffixes אֲמַתִּי, &c.

From the masc. form קָטִיל (*qät'il*) are formed, according to rule, גִּדְרָה *wall*, נִבְלָה *corpse*, constr. נִבְלַת; בְּהֵמָה *cattle*, constr. בְּהֵמַת (for בְּהֵמַת), with suffix בְּהֵמַתְךָ Lv 19¹⁹. More frequently, however, the *e* of the second syllable is retained before the termination *ath* of the constr. st.; thus from נִבְלָה once נִבְלַתִּי Is 26¹⁹, and always בְּרִיכַת *pool*, גִּזְלַת *prey*, טִמְאָת *unclean*, מְלֵאֲתִי *full*, Is 1²¹ (with *Hireq compaginis*, see § 90 *l*), מְרַרְתִּי Jb 16¹³; שְׂאֵלַתִּי I S 1²⁷, &c. (with elision of the א, שְׂלַתְךָ I S 1¹⁷), also שְׂאֵלַתִּי Jb 6⁸. Cf. the analogous forms of the constr. st. מִגַּפַּת *plague*, תְּרִדְמַת *deep sleep*, from מִגַּפָּה, תְּרִדְמָה.

As dual we find יְרִכְתֵּי *sides* (cf. יְרִכְתוֹ Gn 49¹³, from the obsolete יְרִכָה, feminine of יָרַךְ); the constr. st. יְרִכְתֵּי is perhaps to be referred to a segholate form (יְרִכָה, cf. יָרַךְ as constr. st. of יָרַךְ), unless the closed syllable be due to the analogy of בְּרִיכַת and חֲרָדַת (see *g*).

In the forms with simple ת feminine the ground-form *qät'ilt* is developed (§ 69 *c*) to *q^etält*, and this again regularly to קָטְלַת. Thus the feminine of חֶבֶר *companion* is חֶבְרַת (with suffix חֶבְרַתָּה Mal 2¹⁴, cf. שְׁכֵנְתָּה Ex 3²²), of גִּדְרָה fem. גִּדְרַת besides גִּדְרָה.—Of ע"ו stems the segholate forms נַחַת *rest* and שַׁחַת *pit* (from נוּחַ, שוּחַ) belong to this class; Böttcher (*Gram.* i. 411) rightly distinguished the latter from שַׁחַת *corruption* (stem שַׁחַת); in the same way also נַחַת *rest* is distinct from נַחַת *a lighting down* (stem נַחַת).

The feminines of the form *qät'il* from stems ע"ו, as מְתָה *mortua*, עָרָה fem. *l*

witness (from מוֹת, עוֹד), have likewise an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable. Cf., on the other hand, the forms from י"פ stems mentioned above, under e, such as שָׁנָה sleep, constr. st. שָׁנָה; moreover, חָמָה anger, constr. st. חָמָה (but חָמָה a leathern bottle, in pause חָמָה [so Baer, Ginsb., but Kittel 'ח] Gn 21¹⁵, constr. st. חָמָה מַיִם Gn 21¹⁴, perhaps from a stem חממת).

m The feminines of the form qätül, like עֲמָקָה (masc. עֲמָק), maintain the original ü by sharpening the following consonant (cf. § 93 lk); on the other hand, by appending the fem. ת, segholate forms arise like נִחְשָׁת, before suff. נִחְשָׁתָם, &c. Dual נִחְשָׁתַיִם (see Paradigm II, a); but cf. נִחְשָׁתַי La 3⁷.

n A few (aramaising) feminines from ה"ל stems (Paradigm II, c) are found with the ending äth, due to the rejection of the final Wāw or Yôdh and contraction of the preceding ä with the ä of the termination äth; thus מְנָת portion (for mänäyäth or mänäwäth), קֶצֶת end (also קֶצֶה and קֶצֶה), plur. מְנָתוֹת (constr. st. Neh 12⁴⁷, 13¹⁰) and מְנָאוֹת (Neh 12⁴⁴); קֶצוֹת Ex 38⁵; cf. 37⁸ and 39⁴ Keth.; on נְאִיִּים valleys, see § 93 v.—אוֹת sign (stem אוה) is obscured from אָת, and this is contracted from 'äyäth = 'äwäyäth; plur. אָתוֹת, with the double feminine ending; cf. above, f, and § 87 k.—The retention of the ä in the first syllable in אָלְתַי, &c., Gn 24⁴¹, &c., is abnormal.

o 3. Paradigm III, cf. the various forms in § 94 d and f-h. The dual חוֹמָתַיִם two walls, Is 22¹¹, &c., taken directly from the plur. חוֹמוֹת, for חוֹמָתַיִם, is abnormal (cf. § 87 s, and the proper name גִּדְרֵיִם Jos 15³⁶).—Among the forms resembling participles Qal of verbs י"ע, such as זָרָה (masc. זָר from zâir, hence with unchangeable ä), must be reckoned also בְּמָה high place (from בּוֹם), which has for its constr. st. plur. the pleonastic form בְּמוֹתַי, or written defectively בְּמַתַי (see § 87 s); for this the Masora everywhere requires בְּמַתַי, which is to be read bām^othê (not böm^othê), with an anomalous shortening of the ô to ; but with suffixes בְּמוֹתַי, &c.

p In a wider sense the feminines of the form קָטַל (§ 84^b e) belong to this class, in so far as they shorten the ä of the second syllable before the termination ת, e.g. דִּלְקָת inflammation (from dalläqt), with suff. צִדְקָתָהּ Ez 16⁵²; טַבַּעַת signet; also fem. of the forms קָטַל and קָטַל (§ 84^b c and d), as אִילָּת folly (for 'iwwält), and of all the forms which have a changeable vowel in the second syllable, and are formed with the prefix מ (§ 85 g-k), e.g. מַמְלָכָה kingdom, constr. always מַמְלָכָת; מוֹמְרָה (not used in the sing.) pruning-hook, plur. מוֹמְרוֹת; מִשְׁכָּרַת reward, with suff. מִשְׁכָּרַתַי; cf. also the examples given in § 85 g and p, like מוֹלְדָת birth (but from ל"א, מוֹצֵאָה outgoing), תוֹלְדָת generation, תוֹעֵבָה abomination, constr. תוֹעֵבַת, &c.

q Sometimes the plural of these forms is to be traced to a secondary form, e.g. אִגְרָת a letter, plur. אִגְרוֹת (as if from אִגְרָה); also יוֹנְקוֹת, which is merely formed on the analogy of the other plur. fem. of participles Qal, is to be referred to a sing. יוֹנְקָה. Cf., moreover, מַחְרָשֶׁת ploughshare, plur. מַחְרָשׁוֹת (as if from מַחְרָשָׁה)¹; on the other hand, כְּתָרוֹת capitals (of columns), and תוֹכְחוֹת reproofs, are the regular plurals of כְּתָרַת and תוֹכַחַת.

¹ עֲשֵׂתָרֶת Astarte (plur. עֲשֵׂתָרוֹת), which was formerly included among these examples, is most probably due to an intentional alteration of the



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

<i>Sing. absolute</i>	אָב	אָח	אָחוֹת	אִישׁ	אִשָּׁה
	(father)	(brother)	(sister)	(man)	(woman)
,, <i>construct</i>	אָבִי	אָחִי	אָחוֹתִי	אִישׁ	אִשָּׁתִּי
,, <i>with suff. of I sing.</i>	אָבִי	אָחִי	אָחוֹתִי	אִישִׁי	אִשְׁתִּי
, 2 <i>masc.</i>	אָבִיךָ	אָחִיךָ	אָחוֹתְךָ		אִשְׁתְּךָ
,, 2 <i>fem.</i>	אָבִיךָ	אָחִיךָ	אָחוֹתְךָ	אִישְׁךָ	
,, 3 <i>masc.</i>	אָבִיו (אָבִיהוּ)	אָחָיו (אָחִיהוּ)	אָחוֹתוֹ	אִישׁוֹ	אִשְׁתּוֹ
,, 3 <i>fem.</i>	אָבִיהָ	אָחִיהָ	אָחוֹתָהּ	אִשָּׁהּ	
, 1 <i>Pl.</i>	אָבֵינוּ	אָחֵינוּ	אָחוֹתֵנוּ		
,, 2 <i>masc.</i>	אָבֵיכֶם	אָחֵיכֶם	[אָחוֹתְכֶם]		
,, 2 <i>fem.</i>	אָבֵיכֶן				
,, 3 <i>masc.</i>	אָבֵיהֶם	אָחֵיהֶם	אָחוֹתָם		
,, 3 <i>fem.</i>	אָבֵיהֶן				
<i>Plur. absolute .</i>	אָבוֹת	אָחִים		אֲנָשִׁים	נָשִׁים
,, <i>construct</i>	אָבוֹת	אָחִי		אֲנָשִׁי	נָשִׁי
,, <i>with suff. of I sing.</i>	אָבוֹתַי	אָחִי, pause	אָחוֹתַי	אֲנָשִׁי	נָשִׁי
, 2 <i>masc.</i>	אָבוֹתֶיךָ	אָחֶיךָ		אֲנָשֶׁיךָ	נָשֶׁיךָ
, 2 <i>fem.</i>		אָחֶיךָ	אָחוֹתֶיךָ		
, 3 <i>masc.</i>	אָבוֹתָיו	אָחָיו	אָחוֹתָיו	אֲנָשָׁיו	נָשָׁיו
, 3 <i>fem.</i>		אָחֵיהָ		אֲנָשֶׁיהָ	
, 1 <i>Pl.</i>	אָבוֹתֵינוּ	אָחֵינוּ		אֲנָשֵׁינוּ	נָשֵׁינוּ
,, 2 <i>masc.</i>	אָבוֹתֵיכֶם	אָחֵיכֶם	אָחוֹתֵיכֶם		נָשֵׁיכֶם
,, 3 <i>masc.</i>	אָבוֹתֵיהֶם (אָבוֹתֵיהֶם)	אָחֵיהֶם	אָחוֹתֵיהֶם	אֲנָשֵׁיהֶם	נָשֵׁיהֶם
,, 3 <i>fem.</i>				אֲנָשֵׁיהֶן	

REMARKS.

אָב father; the *constr.* אָבִי, like אָחִי and בְּנִי (which occurs once), belongs to the connective forms discussed in § 90 *k*, which serve as the model for the *Hireq compaginis*. However, אָב also occurs in compound proper names, e.g. אֲבִישָׁלוֹם, beside אָבִישָׁלוֹם, &c.; also Gn 17⁴ אֲבִיהֶמוֹן for the purpose of explaining the name אֲבִירָהֶם. On the plur. אָבוֹת see § 87 *p*.

אָח brother. The plur. *absol.* אָחִים has *Dageš forte implicitum* (§ 22 *c*); אָחָיו stands for אָחֵיו according to the phonetic law stated in § 27 *q*, and so also אָחִי in *pause* for אָחֵי. The sharpening of the א merely serves to keep the preceding *Pathah* short, as in גַּמְלִים, &c. (§ 93 *ee*).

אָחָד one (for אָחָד, likewise with *Dageš forte implicitum*, § 22 *c*, cf. § 27 *q*), *constr.* and otherwise in close connexion, אָחָד, Gn 48²², 2 S 17²², Is 27¹²,

אָמָה (handmaid)	בֵּית (house)	בֵּן (son)	בַּת (daughter)	יוֹם (day)	כֵּלִי (vessel)
	בֵּית	בֶּן	בַּת	יוֹם	כֵּלִי
אִמָּתִי	בֵּיתִי	בְּנֵי	בָּתִּי		
אִמְתְּךָ	בֵּיתְךָ	בְּנֶךָ, <i>pause</i>	בָּתְךָ, <i>pause</i>		כֵּלְיְךָ
	בֵּיתְךָ	בְּנֶךָ			
אִמְתּוֹ	בֵּיתוֹ	בְּנוֹ	בָּתּוֹ	יוֹמוֹ	
אִמְתָּהּ	בֵּיתָהּ	בְּנָהּ	בָּתָהּ		
		בְּנָנּוּ			
	בֵּיתְכֶם		בָּתְכֶם		
	בֵּיתָם			יוֹמָם	
אִמְהוֹת	בָּתִּים	בְּנִים	בָּנוֹת	יָמִים	כֵּלִים
אִמְהוֹת	בָּתֵּי	בְּנֵי	בָּנוֹת	יָמֵי	כֵּלֵי
אִמְהַתִּי		בְּנֵי	בָּנֹתִי	יָמֵי	כֵּלֵי
	בָּתְיֶךָ	בְּנֶיךָ	בָּנֹתֶיךָ	יָמֶיךָ	כֵּלְיֶךָ
	בָּתְיֶיךָ	בְּנֶיךָ	בָּנֹתֶיךָ	יָמֶיךָ	
אִמְהַתּוֹ		בְּנָיו	בָּנֹתָיו	יָמָיו	כֵּלָיו
אִמְהַתְּיָהּ		בְּנֶיהָ	בָּנֹתֶיהָ	יָמֶיהָ	כֵּלֶיהָ
	בָּתֵּינוּ	בְּנֵינוּ	בָּנֹתֵינוּ	יָמֵינוּ	כֵּלֵינוּ
אִמְהַתְּיֶכֶם	בָּתֵּיכֶם	בְּנֵיכֶם	בָּנֹתֵיכֶם	יָמֵיכֶם	כֵּלֵיכֶם
	בָּתֵּיהֶם	בְּנֵיהֶם	בָּנֹתֵיהֶם	יָמֵיהֶם	כֵּלֵיהֶם
אִמְהַתְּיָהוּ	בָּתֵּיהֶן	בְּנֵיהֶן			

Zc 11⁷; and especially before כֹּן (כּוּ) Gn 3²², Ex 30¹⁴, Nu 16¹⁵, Ju 17⁵, 1 S 9³, Ez 18¹⁰; fem. אִחָה *una* (for אִחָהּ, according to § 19 d), in *pause* אִחָהּ. Once אִחָהּ masc. (by aphaeresis, § 19 h), Ez 33³⁰, as in Aramaic; plur. אִחָהּ *some*, but also *iidem*.

אִחָהּ *sister*, from 'āḥāwāt or 'āḥāyāt, with elision of the ו or י, and with the á, which has arisen from ää, obscured to ó.¹ In Nu 6⁷ אִחָתוֹ stands for אִחָתוֹ (with virtual sharpening of the ח). The plur. *absol.* (אִחָיוֹת) does not happen

¹ This explanation of אִחָהּ (and אִחָהּ q. v.) still seems to us more probable than the assumption that the fem. ending äth is lengthened to compensate for the loss of the 3rd radical (so Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, vi. 258), or that the form is derived from 'ahā, the old-semitic *constr. st.* of the accusative, with ח feminine (so Barth, *ZDMG*. 1899, p. 598).

<i>Sing. absolute</i>	[מִי]	עִיר	פֶּה	רֹאשׁ	שֵׁם [שָׁמַי]
	(water)	(city)	(mouth)	(head)	(name) (heaven)
„ <i>construct</i>		עִיר	פִּי	רֹאשׁ	שֵׁם, שָׁמַי
„ <i>with suff. of 1 sing.</i>		עִירִי	פִּי	רֹאשִׁי	שָׁמַי
„ <i>2 masc.</i>		עִירְךָ	פִּיךָ	רֹאשְׁךָ	שָׁמַיךָ, pause
„ <i>2 fem.</i>				רֹאשֶׁךָ	שָׁמַיךָ
„ <i>3 masc.</i>		עִירוֹ	פִּיהוּ, פִּיו	רֹאשׁוֹ	שָׁמַיֹו
„ <i>3 fem.</i>		עִירָהּ	פִּיהָ	רֹאשָׁהּ	שָׁמַיָּהּ
„ <i>1 Pl.</i>			פִּינוּ	רֹאשֵׁנוּ	שָׁמַיֵנוּ
„ <i>2 masc.</i>			פִּיכֶם	רֹאשֵׁכֶם	שָׁמַיְכֶם
„ <i>3 masc.</i>		עִירָם	פִּיהֶם	רֹאשָׁם	שָׁמַיָם
„ <i>3 fem.</i>			פִּיהֶן	רֹאשֵׁן	
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מַיִם	עָרִים	פִּיּוֹת	רֹאשִׁים	שָׁמַיִם
„ <i>construct</i>	מֵי, מֵי	עָרֵי		רֹאשֵׁי	שָׁמַיִם
„ <i>with suff. of 1 sing.</i>	מֵי	עָרַי			
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	מֵיכֶם	עָרֵיכֶם			שָׁמַיְכֶם
„ <i>2 fem.</i>		עָרֵיכֶן			
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	מֵינוּ	עָרֵינוּ		רֹאשֵׁינוּ	שָׁמַיֵנוּ
„ <i>3 fem.</i>	מֵיהֶן	עָרֵיהֶן		רֹאשֵׁיהֶן	
„ <i>1 Pl.</i>	מֵינוּ	עָרֵינוּ		רֹאשֵׁינוּ	
„ <i>2 masc.</i>		עָרֵיכֶם		רֹאשֵׁיכֶם	שָׁמַיְכֶם
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	מֵיהֶם	עָרֵיהֶם		רֹאשֵׁיהֶם	שָׁמַיֵיהֶם
„ <i>3 fem.</i>				רֹאשֵׁיהֶן	שָׁמַיֵיהֶן

to occur. In Ez 16⁵² אַחֲיוֹתֶיךָ occurs (for אַחֲתֵיךָ). In the forms אַחֲוֵי Jos 2¹³ *Keth.*, אַחֲוֵיךָ Ez 16^{51, 55, 61} (to be read also in verse 45 for אַחֲוֵיךָ, which has been erroneously assimilated to the singular occurring in vv. 48, 49, 56), and אַחֲוֵיכֶם Ho 2³ (for which, however, read אַחֲוֵיכֶם), the third radical has been entirely lost.

אִישׁ *man*, according to the common opinion either incorrectly lengthened for אִישׁ (from 'iš, with assimilation of the *Nún* of the ground-form 'inš, which again has been attenuated from 'anš from the stem אִנִּישׁ), or softened directly from 'inš. It is, however, probable that a separate stem (אִישׁ *to be strong?*) is to be assumed for the singular¹; consequently the stem אִנִּישׁ *to be sociable*,

¹ So already Gesenius in his *Thes. linguae Hebr.*, i. 83 f., and recently again Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolegg.*, p. 160 ff., Praetorius in Kuhn's *Orient. L.-B.*, 1884, p. 196; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 38; while Nöldeke (*ZDMG.* 1886, p. 739 f.), against Delitzsch, would connect both אִישׁ and אִנִּישׁ with the stem אִנִּישׁ.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

בַּת *daughter* (from *bant*, and this again, according to the law stated in § 69 c, for *bint*, fem. of בֵּן), with suff. בְּתִי for בְּנָתִי. Plur. בָּנוֹת, from the sing. בְּנָה, comp. בְּנָיִם *sons*.

חָם *husband's father*, only with suff. חָמִיךָ, חָמִיָּה; and חַמּוֹת *husband's mother*, only with suff. חַמּוֹתֶךָ, חַמּוֹתָהּ. Cf. אָב, אָח, and especially אחות.

יוֹם *day* (Arab. *yaum*),¹ dual יוֹמַיִם; the plur. יָמִים is probably from a different sing. (יָם *yām*), constr. יָמִי and (poetically) יָמוֹת, Dt 32⁷, ψ 90¹⁵.

כֶּלִי *vessel*, in pause כְּלִי (with suff. כְּלִיךָ Dt 23²⁵) from כָּלָה *to contain*, plur. כְּלָיִם (as if from כָּל, כָּלָה; according to König, ii. 63, shortened from *kilyim*).

מַיִם *water*; on the plur. cf. § 88 d.

עִיר *city*. The plur. עָרִים is scarcely syncopated from עִירִים, as it is pointed in Ju 10⁴ (no doubt erroneously, in imitation of the preceding עִירִים *ass colts*), but from a kindred sing. עָר, which still occurs in proper names.

פֶּה *mouth*, constr. st. פִּי (for original פִּי = פֶּה?). Its origin is still disputed. According to Gesenius and König (ii. 103), פֶּה stands for פִּיאָה (ground-form *pi'ay*) from פִּיאָה *to breathe, to blow*; according to Olshausen, for פִּי, from a stem פִּיהָ or פִּוּהָ. But parallel with the Hebrew פֶּה are Assy. *pú*, Arab. *fú*, *fam*, *famm*, *fumm*, bibl. Aram. פִּם, פִּפּוּ, Syr. *púm*, *púmā*, so that Barth, ZDMG. xli, p. 634, assumes two forms of development from the same stem (פִּמוּ), viz. *fm* and *fw*. פִּי *my mouth*, from *pi-y*; for פִּיהֶם we find in ψ 17¹⁰, 58⁷, 59¹³ פִּימֹו. The supposed plur. פִּיִּם 1 S 13²¹ is generally explained as a contraction from פִּיִּים, but the text is altogether corrupt. The plur. פִּיּוֹת, for the *edges* of a sword, occurs in Pr 5⁴; reduplicated פִּיפִּיּוֹת Is 41¹⁵, ψ 149⁶.

רֹאשׁ *head* (obscured from ראשׁ = *rā's*); plur. רֹאשִׁים (for ראשׁים, § 23 c); ראשׁוֹ only in Is 15².

שֵׂה *a head of small cattle (sheep or goat)*, constr. st. שֵׂה, with suff. שֵׂהוּ 1 S 14³⁴ and שֵׂיוֹ Dt 22¹, according to König, ii. 131, from a ground-form *si'ay*, but according to De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, 81 f., from a stem וְשֵׂה (= *say = wisay*).

שֵׁם *name*, constr. generally שֵׁם (only six times שְׁמִים); cf. בֵּן.

שָׁמַיִם *heaven* (§ 88 d).

§ 97. Numerals. (a) Cardinal Numbers.

Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 116 ff.; *Grundriss*, i. 484 ff.

a 1. The formation of the cardinal numbers from 3 to 10 (on 1 and 2 see below) has this peculiarity, that numerals connected with a mascu-

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, *Beiträge*, p. 58, *yaum*, probably an extension of a biliteral word which has survived in יָמִי, יָמִים. Barth, however, *Orient. Studien*, p. 791 (see above on אִשָּׁה), sees in יָמִי, יָמִים, יָמוֹת new formations in Hebrew, caused by the naturally close connexion and association of these plurals with שָׁנָיִם, שָׁנָיִ, שָׁנוֹת *years*, to which they became assimilated in form. The view that יוֹם is merely an incorrect obscuring of יָם, and therefore distinct from the Arab. *yaum*, is contradicted by the invariable spelling יוֹם, &c., notwithstanding the spelling וּבַיִם (= וּבָיִם?) in the Siloam inscription, line 3 (cf. § 7 f), and מִיָּמַיִם Ho 6². Cf. also the note on § 100 g.

line substantive take the feminine form, and those with a feminine substantive take the masculine form. The common explanation of this strange phenomenon used to be that the primary form of the numeral was an abstract noun in the feminine (cf. § 122 p). This was originally attached in the *constr. st.* to the word qualified, then came to be also used in apposition to it, and finally was placed after it like an adjective. The consequence of the appositional, and finally adjectival, construction was, that for numerals connected with feminine nouns a special shorter form came to be used, whilst the original forms, with the abstract feminine ending, were used in connexion with masculine nouns, after as well as before them.

On this view the historical process would have been that originally the abstract numerals (like Latin *trias, decas*, Greek *πεντάς, δεκάς*, &c.) were placed in the *constr. st.* before masculines and feminines alike, e. g. *שְׁלֹשֶׁת בָּנִים trias filiorum*, *עֶשְׂרֵת נָשִׁים decas mulierum*. A trace of this earlier usage was seen in the examples mentioned under c, like *שְׁלֹשֶׁת נָשִׁים*.—Further, it was possible to say *שְׁלֹשָׁה בָּנִים trias, sc. filii*, as well as *שְׁלֹשָׁה בָּנִים filii, trias*. From this second appositional construction it was only a step to the treatment of the abstract numeral as an adjective, *filii tres*. Similarly the subsequently shortened forms of the abstract numeral, which were used in connexion with feminines, might stand either in the *constr. st.* before, or in apposition before or after the word numbered, thus *שְׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת trias filiarum*, or *שְׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת trias, sc. filiae*, or *שְׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת filiae, trias*, or adjectivally *filiae tres*.

A different and much more intelligible explanation of the striking disagreement between the gender of the numeral and that of the word numbered has recently been given by Reckendorf, *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen*, pt. ii, Leiden, 1898, p. 265 ff. He also considers that the earliest forms were abstract numerals which were placed in the *constr. st.* before the noun numbered, the latter depending on them in the genitive. The original form, however, of the abstract numerals from 3 to 9 is not the feminine, but the masculine, used for both genders, as it still is in the tens, 20, 30, &c. The feminine abstract numeral was first distinguished by a special form in the numbers from 13 to 19 (see further, below) when connected with masculines, and this distinction was afterwards extended to the numbers from 3 to 10. This explanation does not affect the view stated above that the appositional and adjectival use of the abstract numerals was only adopted later in addition to their use in the genitive construction.

The differentiation of the numerals (originally of common gender) into masculine and feminine forms in the second decade, was occasioned, according to Reckendorf, by the use of the abstract feminine *עֶשְׂרִיה* in compounds.

So long as it was felt that *שְׁלֹשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה* simply meant *the three of the decade*, the gender of the noun numbered made no difference. When, however, the consciousness of this meaning became weakened and the combination of units and tens came to be felt as a copulative rather than a genitive relation, it seemed suitable to connect only feminine nouns with the feminine form *עֶשְׂרֵה*. New forms were therefore invented, both of the units and the tens, for use with masculine nouns. The former, however, no longer had the form of the *constr.* but of the absolute state, clearly showing that the consciousness of the original syntactical relation in *שְׁלֹשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה*, &c., was lost. On the other hand, after the extension of these new formations to the first decade, the new feminine forms readily came to be used also in the genitive construction (and therefore in the *constr. st.*) on the analogy of the earlier masculine forms.

Of the first two numerals, *אֶחָד* *one*, with its fem. *אֶחָת* (see § 96), may be recognized, from its form and use, as an adjective, although even so it admits of such combinations as *אֶחָד הַהָרִים* *unus e montibus*. The numeral two, as would be expected, appears as an abstract in the *dual*, but, like the other numerals, can also stand in apposition to the noun numbered. In form it always agrees with the gender of its noun. Accordingly, the numerals from 1 to 10 are as follows :

b	With the Masculine.		With the Feminine.	
	Absol.	Constr.	Absol.	Constr.
1.	אֶחָד	אֶחָד	אֶחָת	אֶחָת
2.	שְׁנַיִם	שְׁנַיִ	שְׁנַתַּיִם ¹	שְׁנַתַּי
3.	שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשָׁת	שְׁלֹשׁ	שְׁלֹשׁ
4.	אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבַּעַת	אַרְבַּע	אַרְבַּע
5.	חַמֵּשָׁה ²	חַמֵּשָׁת	חַמֵּשׁ	חַמֵּשׁ
6.	שֵׁשׁ	שֵׁשָׁת	שֵׁשׁ	שֵׁשׁ
7.	שִׁבְעָה	שִׁבְעַת	שִׁבַּע	שִׁבַּע ³ [שִׁבַּע]
8.	שְׁמֹנֶה	שְׁמֹנַת	שְׁמֹנֶה	שְׁמֹנֶה
9.	תִּשְׁעָה	תִּשְׁעַת	תִּשַׁע	תִּשַׁע ³ [תִּשַׁע]
10.	עֶשְׂרֵה	עֶשְׂרֵת	עֶשְׂרִי	עֶשְׂרִי

¹ Shortened from *שְׁנַתַּיִם*, which would be the regular feminine form of *שְׁנַיִם*. Nevertheless, the *Dageš* in *שְׁנַתַּיִם*, &c. (even after *מִן*; *Jon* 4¹¹; cf., however, *מִשְׁתַּי* *Ju* 16²⁸), can by no means be regarded as a *Dageš forte* arising from assimilation of the *Nún*, for in that case the word could only be *שְׁנַתַּיִם* (cf. Arab. *tintāni*). This form does occur in the Codex Babylonicus of A. D. 916, but it is only a later correction for *שְׁנַתַּיִם*, while in the Berlin MS. or. qu. 680 described by Kahle (Lpz. 1902) there is no trace of the *Dageš*. It is rather to be read *štayim*, *šté* (with *Dageš lene*), cf. *אַשְׁתַּיִם*, representing the later Palestinian pronunciation (Philippi, *ZDMG.* xlix, p. 206), and Arab. *'itnātāni* (with a kind of prosthetic *š*; cf. § 19 m), as a further feminine form of



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

connected with עָשָׂר and עֶשְׂרִים; and that the contraction is founded on an early and correct tradition. The second explanation is supported by the large number of examples of שְׁנַיִם (66) and שְׁתַּיִם (34). It would be strange if the Masora required the alteration of the far commoner forms on account of isolated instances of שְׁנַיִ and שְׁתַּיִ. As a matter of fact even in regard to the latter forms the tradition often varies between שְׁנַיִ and שְׁנַיִם, &c., cf. e. g. Ginsburg on Jos 3¹². We cannot therefore assume a *Qerê perpetuum*.

e Accordingly the numbers from 11 upwards are—

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
11.	{ אַחַד עָשָׂר עֶשְׂרִים	{ אַחַת עָשָׂר עֶשְׂרִים
12.	{ שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר שְׁנַיִ עָשָׂר	{ שְׁתַּיִם עָשָׂר שְׁתַּיִ עָשָׂר
13.	שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר	שְׁלֹשׁ עָשָׂר

&c., on the analogy of the last. These numerals regularly have only the above form. In regard to their syntax, cf. § 134 f.

Very rarely the units appear in the *masc.* in the *constr. st.*, as חֲמֵשֶׁת עָשָׂר *fifteen*, Ju 8¹⁰, 2 S 19¹⁸; שְׁמוֹנֶת עָשָׂר *eighteen*, Ju 20²⁵.—Connected by וְ we find עֶשְׂרִים וְחֲמֵשֶׁה in Ex 45¹².

f 3. The tens from 30 to 90 are expressed by the plural forms of the units (so that the plural here always stands for *ten times* the unit), thus, 30 שְׁלֹשִׁים, 40 אַרְבָּעִים, 50 חֲמֵשִׁים, 60 שֵׁשִׁים, 70 שִׁבְעִים, 80 שְׁמֹנִים, 90 תִּשְׁעִים. But *twenty* is expressed by עֶשְׂרִים, plur. of עָשָׂר *ten*.² These numerals are all of common gender, and do not admit of the *construct state*.—In compound numerals, like 22, 23, 44, &c., the units

¹ עֶשְׂרִים, which remained for a long time unexplained, was recognized (first by J. Oppert) in the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions in the form *istin* or *istén*; cf. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 203, and P. Haupt, in the *American Journal of Philology*, viii. 279. Accordingly, עֶשְׂרִים עֶשְׂרִים is a compound, like the Sansk. *ékādaśan*, *ἑνδεκα*, *undecim* (analogous to the combination of units and tens in the numerals from 12 to 19), and is used at the same time in the composition of the feminine numeral eleven. On the gradual substitution of עֶשְׂרִים עֶשְׂרִים for אַחַד עָשָׂר and אַחַת עָשָׂר see Giesebrecht in *ZAW*. 1881, p. 226; עֶשְׂרִים עֶשְׂרִים occurs only in Jer., Ez., in the prologue to Deuteronomy (1³), in the Priestly Code, and in passages undoubtedly post-exilic, so that it may very well be a loan-word from the Babylonian.

² For עֶשְׂרִים, שִׁבְעִים, תִּשְׁעִים (from the *segholates* עָשָׂר, שִׁבְעַ, תִּשְׁעַ), we should expect *‘asārīm*, *šebhā’im*, *tešā’im*. Is this very unusual deviation from the common formation (see above, § 93 l, o, r) connected with the special meaning of these plurals, or are these survivals of an older form of the plural of *segholates*?

may precede (*two and twenty*, as in Arabic and English), e. g. Nu 3³⁹, 26¹⁴. Very frequently, however, the reverse order is found (*twenty and two*, as in Syriac, cf. French and English *twenty-two*), e. g. 1 Ch 12²⁸, 18⁵.¹ In all cases the units and tens are connected by the *copula*, ordinarily וְ, but וְ before numerals with the tone on the penultima, וְ before וְ, וְ before *Šewá*; see § 104 d, e, g.

The remaining numerals are the substantives—

g

100 מֵאָה fem., constr. מֵאָת.

200 מֵאָתַיִם dual (contracted from מֵאָתַיִם; cf. § 23 c).

300 שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת plur. (but in 2 K 11^{4.9.10.15}, *Keth.* הַמֵּאוֹת).

1000 אֶלֶף masc.

2000 אֶלְפַיִם dual.

3000 שְׁלֹשֶׁת אֶלְפִים plur., and so on (except עֶשְׂרֵה אֶלְפִים in 2 S 18³, 2 K 24¹⁴ *Keth.*; elsewhere always עֶשְׂרֵת אֶלְפִים).

10000 רַבְבָּה, in the later books the aramaising² forms רַבּוֹ, רַבּוֹת, (properly *multitude*, cf. *μυριάς*).

20000 רַבְתַּיִם dual (see below, h); but שְׁתֵּי רַבּוֹת Neh 7⁷⁰ (also שְׁתֵּי רַבּוֹ Neh 7⁷¹).

40000 אַרְבַּע רַבּוֹ Neh 7⁶⁶.

60000 שֵׁשׁ-רַבּוֹת Ezr 2⁶⁹ (Baer and Ginsburg רַבּוֹת, as in Dn 11¹²).
אֶלְפֵי רַבְבָּה *thousands of myriads*, Gn 24⁶⁰.

Rem. 1. The dual form which occurs in some of the units has the meaning *h* of our ending *-fold*, e. g. אַרְבַּעַתַּיִם *fourfold*, 2 S 12⁶; שִׁבְעַתַּיִם *sevenfold*, Gn 4^{15.24}, Is 30²⁶, ψ 12⁷, 79¹² (cf. § 134 r). The dual רַבְתַּיִם ψ 68¹⁸ (explained by אֶלְפֵי שְׁנַאן *thousands of duplication*) is not meant to be taken in the sense of *two myriads* or *twice the number of myriads*, but in a multiplicative sense.³—Besides the plural which denotes the tens, there are also the plurals אַחַרַּיִם *some*, also *iidem*, and עֶשְׂרוֹת *decades* (not *decem*) Ex 18^{21.25}.

2. The *suffixes* to numerals are, as with other nouns, properly genitives, *i* although they are translated in English as nominatives, e. g. שְׁלֹשָׁתְּכֶם *your triad*, i. e. *you three*, Nu 12⁴; חֲמִשִּׁי *his fifty* (i. e. the 50 belonging to him) 2 K 1⁹⁻¹³, and חֲמִשִּׁיךָ 2 K 1^{10.12}.

¹ According to the conclusions of König (*De Criticæ Sacrae Argumento*, p. 61, and *Lehrgeb.*, ii. p. 215 ff.), the smaller number more commonly precedes in Ezek. and the Priestly Code, but the larger always elsewhere. S. Herzer (*Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.*, Lund, 1893, p. 71 ff.) arrives at the same conclusion by a full examination of the statistics; cf. also his remarks on König in *ZAW.* 1896, p. 123, and König's reply, *ibid.*, p. 328 f.

² Cf. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im A. T.* (Halle, 1902), p. 79 f.

³ Cf. D. H. Müller, 'Die numeralia multiplicativa in den Amarnatafeln u. im Hebr.,' *Semitica*, i, Wien, 1906, p. 13 ff.

§ 98. Numerals. (b) Ordinal Numbers.

a The ordinal numbers from 2 to 10 are formed from the corresponding cardinals by adding the termination יָ (§ 86 *h*), before which another יָ also is generally inserted between the second and third radicals. They are as follows: שְׁנִי *second*, רְבִיעִי, שְׁלִישִׁי (like רְבַע, רְבַע, רְבַעִים, without the prosthetic א, which appears in אַרְבַּע, &c.), חֲמִישִׁי or חֲמִשִּׁי (which, according to Strack, is always to be read for חֲמִשִּׁי), שְׁבִיעִי, שְׁמִינִי, תְּשִׁיעִי, עֲשָׂרִי. The ordinal *first* is expressed by ראשון (cf. § 27 *w*), from ראש *head, beginning*, with the termination ון (§ 86 *f*). On the use of אָחָד as an ordinal in numbering the days of the month, cf. § 134 *p*; in such cases as Gn 1⁵, 2¹¹, the meaning of *first* is derived solely from the context.

b The feminine forms have the termination יָת, more rarely (and only in the case of 3 and 10) יָתֵה. They are employed also to express fractions, e. g. חֲמִישִׁית *fifth* or *fifth part*, עֲשָׂרִית and עֲשָׂרִיתֵה *tenth part*. Side by side with these, in the same sense, there are also forms like רְבַע and רְבַעָה *a quarter*, חֲמִשָּׁה *a fifth part*, and with the affirmative ון, עֲשָׂרוֹן (plur. עֲשָׂרוֹנִים) *a tenth part*; these are to be regarded as abstracts, and are denominatives from the cardinal numbers. Cf. finally שְׁבוּעָה *εβδομάς, a week*; עֲשָׂוֹר *a decade* (of days), and also the *tenth day*.

On the expression of the other relations of number, for which the Hebrew has no special forms, see the Syntax, § 134 *q* and *r*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

such particles cannot stand by themselves, but are united, as prefixes, with the following word (§ 102), very much like the preformatives of the imperfect (§ 47 a-d).

d The view that this shortening of whole words to single letters has actually taken place in the gradual course of linguistic development is rendered highly probable by the fact that similar abbreviations in later Hebrew and in Aramaic, i.e. as the development of the original Semitic speech progresses, become more and more striking and frequent. Thus the Biblical Aramaic **ד** becomes at a later period **ד**; in modern Arabic, e.g. *hallaq* (now) is from *halwaqt*; *léš* (why?) from *li-ayyi-šaiin*, &c. Cf. also the analogous cases mentioned above from the Western languages. Nevertheless, the use of the simplest particles is found already in the earliest periods of the Hebrew language, or, at any rate, in the earliest documents which have come down to us.

e 3. Less frequently particles are formed by *composition*; as **מִדָּוַע** *wherefore?* for **מִה־יָדָוַע** *quid edoctus?* (*τί μαθών*;) or *quid cognitum?*; **בְּלַעְרֵי** (from **בַּל** and **עַרֵי**) *besides*; **מִלְּמַעְלָה** (from **מִן**, **לְ**, **מִלְּמַעְלָה**) *from above, above*.

More frequent is the combination of two words into one without contraction, e.g. **אֲחֵרֵי-כֵן**, **אֲחֵרֵי-כֵן**, **בֵּי-עַלְ-כֵּן**; cf. also the compounds of **אֵי** with demonstrative pronouns, as **אֵי-מִנָּה** *from what?*; **אֵי לָזֶאת** *wherefore?* [R.V. *how*]. See the lexicon under **אֵי**.

§ 100. Adverbs.

On demonstrative adverbs cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 323; on interrogative adverbs, *ibid.*, i. 328; on adverbs in general, i. 492 ff.

a 1. The negative **לֹא** *not*, and a few particles of place and time, as **שָׁם** *there*, are of obscure origin.

b 2. Forms of other parts of speech, which are used adverbially without further change, are—

(*a*) Substantives with prepositions, e.g. **בְּמַאֲד** (with might) *very*; **לְבַד** *alone* (prop. *in separation*, Fr. *à part*), with suffix **לְבַדִּי** *I alone*; **מִמֶּנִּי** *from within, within*; cf. also **בְּאַחַד** (as one) *together*, **לְעִמָּת** and **מִלְּעִמָּת** (originally *in connexion with*) *near to, corresponding to, like, &c.*, cf. § 161 *b*.

c (*b*) Substantives in the accusative (the adverbial case of the Semites, § 118 *m*), cf. *τὴν ἀρχήν, δωρεάν*, e.g. **מַאֲד** (might) *very*, **אֵפֶס** (cessation) *no more*, **הַיּוֹם** (the day) *to-day* (cf. § 126 *b*), **מָחָר**¹ *to-morrow*, **יַחַד** (union) *together*. Several of these continued to be used, though rarely, as substantives, e.g. **סְבִיב**, plur. **סְבִיבִים** and **סְבִיבוֹת**, *circuit*, as adverb

¹ Generally derived from the *ptcp.* **מִאֲחָר** *m'öħär* (= *m'ohħär*) and hence to be read *möħär* (cf. **מִחָרָת** *morning*); but according to P. Haupt (notes to Esther, p. 159) from **אֲחָר** *יום*.

circum, around; others have quite ceased to be so used, e. g. כְּבֶר (length) *long ago* [Aram.: only in Ec.]; עוֹד (repetition, duration) *again or further*.

(c) Adjectives, especially in the feminine (corresponding to the *d* Indo-Germanic neuter), e. g. רִאשׁוֹנָה *primum, formerly* (more frequently בְּרִאשׁוֹנָה, also לְרִאשׁוֹנָה); רַבָּה and רַבַּת [both rare] *multum, much, enough*; נִפְלְאוֹת *wonderfully* (properly *mirabilibus, sc. modis*), יְהוּדִית *Jewish*, i. e. in the Jewish language.

(d) Verbs in the infinitive absolute, especially in *Hiph'ûl*, which *e* are likewise to be regarded as accusatives (§ 113 *h*), e. g. הִרְבֵּה (prop. *a multiplying*) *much* [frequent], לְהִרְבֵּה [rare and late] *in multitude*; הִשְׁבִּים (*mane faciendo*) *early*; הִעֲרַב (*vespere faciendo*) *in the evening*.

(e) Pronouns and numerals, e. g. זֶה (prop. *there = at this place*) *here*, הֵנָּה *here, hither* (also of time, עַד-הֵנָּה *till now*, cf. the late and rare עָדָן and עָדָנָה = עַד-הֵן); אַחַת, שְׁתַּיִם, שֶׁבַע, מֵאָה *once, twice, seven times, a hundred times*; שְׁנַיִת *for the second time*.

3. Some adverbs are formed by the addition of formative syllables *g* (most frequently אֲמַ) to substantives or adjectives, e. g. אֲמָנָה and אֲמָנָה *truly* (from אֱמֶן *truth*); חִנָּם (by favour) *gratis* (from חֵן *gratia*); רִיקָם *in vain, frustra*, but also *empty* (from רִיק *empty, emptiness, vanum*), Ru 1²¹, parallel with the fem. מְלֵאָה *full*; יוֹמָם *by day* (from יוֹם)¹; with *ô* in the last syllable, פִּתְאֹם, for פִּתְעֹם, *in a twinkling, suddenly* (from פִּתְעָה *a twinkling*, the *ô* being probably obscured from an original *â*).²—Moreover, cf. אֶחָרְכָּה *backward*, and קִרְכָּה *darkly attired*, Mal 3¹⁴. In both these cases, the formative syllable *an* has been first attached to the stem, and then the feminine ending *îth*, which is elsewhere used to form adverbs, has been added to it.

The termination אֲמַ occurs also in the formation of substantives, e. g. אֵילָם *porch*, and hence the above adverbs may equally well be regarded as nouns used adverbially, so that אֲמַ, אֲמַ, would correspond to אֲמַ, אֲמַ (§ 85, Nos. 53, 54), cf. בְּפִתְאֹם (with prep.) *suddenly*, 2 Ch 29³⁶. According to others, this *am* is an obsolete accusative ending, to be compared with the indeterminate accusative sing. in *ân* in Arabic.

¹ Is this אֲמַ an instance of the locative or temporal termination (cf. especially אֲמַ) mentioned in § 88 *c*? Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* xl. p. 721, considers אֲמַ a secondary substantival form (used adverbially like לַיְלָה *noctu*), corresponding to the Phoenician and Aramaic אֲמַ, Syr. 'imāmā; cf. on the other hand, König, ii. 255, who follows Olshausen in maintaining that the *ām* is an adverbial termination.

² דוֹמָם *silent* (an adjective in Is 47⁵, La 3²⁶; a substantive in Hb 2¹⁹), which was formerly included under this head, is better taken, with Barth (*Nominalbildung*, p. 352, Rem. 2), as a participle formed like שׁוֹבֵב, עוֹלֵל, so that דוֹמָם (perhaps assimilated to דוֹמָה) stands for original דוֹמָם.

i 4. A number of forms standing in very close relation to the demonstrative pronoun may be regarded as primitive adverbs, since they arise directly from a combination of demonstrative sounds. Some of these have subsequently suffered great mutilation, the extent of which, however, can now very rarely be ascertained with certainty. Such are e.g. *אָ* *then*, *הֵנָּה* *here* (according to Barth, *Sprachwiss. Abhandlungen*, p. 16, formed from the two demonstrative elements *hin* and *na*), *כֵּן*, *כֵּן* *thus* (cf. *איִכָּנָה*, *איִכָּנָה* *how?*), *אֲנִי* *only*, *אֲנִי* *truly* (on all these adverbs, see the Lexicon), and especially the interrogative *הֵ* (*Hē interrogativum*), e.g. *הֲלֹא* (Dt 3¹¹ *הֲלֹא*) *nonne?*, *הֲגַם* *num etiam?* This *Hē interrogativum* is perhaps shortened from *הֵל*, which is still used in Arabic, and, according to the view of a certain school of Masoretes, occurs also in Hebrew in Dt 32⁶.¹

k The *ה* interrogative takes—(1) *Hateph-Pathah* generally before non-gutturals (even before *ר*), with a firm vowel, e.g. *הֲשִׁמָּתָּ* *hast thou set?* see the interrogative clause, § 150 c (*הֲיִיטֵב* Lv 10¹⁹ is an exception).

l (2) Before a consonant with *Š^ewā*, usually *Pathah* without a following *Dageš forte*, e.g. *הֲבִרְכָה* Gn 27³⁸, cf. 18¹⁷, 29⁵, 30¹⁵, 34³¹; less frequently (in about ten passages), *Pathah* with a following *Dageš forte*, e.g. *הֲבִרְרָךְ* *num in via*, Ez 20³⁰, *הֲלֵבֶן* Gn 17¹⁷, 18²¹, 37³², Nu 13¹⁹, Jb 23⁶; even in *ר*, 1 S 10²⁴, 17²⁵, 2 K 6³².

m (3) Before gutturals, not pointed with either *Qames* or *Hateph-Qames*, it takes *Pathah*, e.g. *הֲאֵלֶיךָ* *shall I go?*, *הֲאֵתָהּ* *num tu?*, *הֲאֵם* *num si*; *הֲאֵרְצָה* Mal 1¹³; also in Ju 6³¹ read *הֲאֵתָם* (not *הֵאֵ*), likewise *הֵ* in Ju 12⁵, Jer 8¹⁹, Neh 6¹¹.—In *הֲאֵשׁ* Nu 16²², the Masora intends the article; read *הֵאֵשׁ*, and cf. Dt 20¹⁹; in Ec 3²¹ read *הֲעֵלָה* and *הֲיִרְדָת*; the article is a correction due to doctrinal considerations.

n (4) The *ה* takes *S^eghôl* before gutturals pointed with *Qames* or (as in Ju 9^{9ff.}) *Hateph-Qames*, e.g. *הֲאֵמֹר* Mi 2⁷; *הֲאֵנֹכִי* Jb 21⁴; *הֲהֵייתָהּ* Jo 1²; *הֲהֵשֵׁב* Gn 24⁵ (cf. the analogous instances in § 22 c, § 35 k, § 63 k). The place of this interrogative particle is always at the beginning of the clause [but see Jb 34³¹, Neh 13²⁷, Jer 22¹⁵, where one or more words are prefixed for emphasis].

o 5. Some adverbs occur also in connexion with suffixes, thus *יִשְׁךָ* *thou art there*, 3rd sing. masc. *יִשְׁנֹו*² (but see note below), 2nd plur. masc. *יִשְׁכֶם*; *אֵינִי* *I am not*, 2nd sing. *אֵינִיךָ*, fem. *אֵינִיךָ*, 3rd sing. *אֵינִיךָ*, fem. *אֵינִיךָ*, 2nd plur. *אֵינִיכֶם*, 3rd plur. masc. *אֵינִיכֶם*.—Also *עוֹדִי* *I am yet* (*עוֹדִי* only in *בְּעוֹדִי* and *מֵעוֹדִי*), *עוֹדֶיךָ*, *עוֹדֶיךָ*, *עוֹדֵינוּ* (La 4¹⁷ *Q^ere*; *עוֹדֵינָהּ*

¹ The separation of the *ה* at the beginning of Dt 32⁶, expressly noticed by Qimḥi (ed. Rittenb., p. 40 b) as an unique instance, is perhaps a protest against admitting a particle *הֵל*.

² This form, which occurs in Dt 29¹⁴, 1 S 14³⁹, 23²³, Est 3⁶, is textually very doubtful, and cannot be supported by the equally doubtful *קִבְּנֹו* (for *קִבְּנֵנוּ*) Nu 23¹³. Most probably, with Stade, *Gramm.*, § 370 b, and P. Haupt, *SBOT Numbers*, p. 57, line 37, we should read *יִשְׁנֵנוּ*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

i. e. the command of *) *according to*; בְּגִלְלָל (in the concern of) *on account of*; לְמַעַן (for the purpose of) *on account of*.

c 2. Substantives used adverbially very frequently become prepositions in this way, e.g. בְּלֵי, בְּבֵלֵי, מְבֵלֵי, בְּלֵתֵי, בְּיֵאִין, בְּאָפֶס (with cessation) *without*, בְּעוֹר (in the duration of) *during*; בְּרֵי, פְּרֵי (according to the requirement of) *for, according to*.

§ 102. Prefixed Prepositions.

a 1. Of the words mentioned in § 101, מִן *from, out of*, frequently occurs as a prefix (§ 99 c), with its *Nûn* assimilated to the following consonant (by means of *Dageš forte*), e.g. מִיַּעַר *out of a forest*.

b Rem. The separate מִן (always with a following *Maqqeph*) is usual (but not necessary, cf. Ju 20¹⁴ with verse 15, Ez 43⁶, &c.) only before the article, e.g. מִן־הָאֲרָץ, and sometimes occurs before the softer consonants, e.g. מִן־אֵן Jer 44¹⁸, מִן־בְּנֵי Jo 1¹², 1 Ch 5¹⁸; cf. Ex 18¹⁴, Lv 1¹⁴, 14³⁰, Ju 7²³, 10¹¹, 19¹⁶, ψ 104⁷ (2 K 23³⁶ before ך; also before ך in ψ 18⁴⁹), and elsewhere in the later books (as in Aramaic)¹; there is besides a poetic by-form מִנִּי (cf. § 90 m) and מִנִּי Is 30¹¹. Its form is most commonly מִ with a following *Dageš*, which may, however, be omitted in letters which have *Šewâ* (cf. § 20 m). With a following ך the מ is, as a rule, contracted to מִי, e.g. מִיָּרֵי = מִיָּרֵי or מִיָּרֵי (but cf. מִיָּשְׁנֵי Dn 12²; מִיָּרֵשֶׁתְךָ 2 Ch 20¹¹); before gutturals it becomes מִ (according to § 22 c), e.g. מִאֲרָם, מִעָם; before ן the מ occurs with the guttural virtually sharpened in מִחוּץ *on the outside*, and in מִחוּט Gn 14²³; before ה in מִהֵיֹת (cf. § 28 b and § 63 q. The closed syllable here is inconsistent with the required virtual sharpening of the ה; probably מִהֵיֹת is merely due to the analogy of (לְהֵיֹת); similarly Is 14³ before ך; but in 1 S 23²⁸, 2 S 18¹⁶ מִיָּרֵךְ is to be read, according to § 22 s.

c 2. There are also three other particles, the most commonly used prepositions and the particle of comparison, which have been reduced by abbreviation (§ 99 c) to a single prefixed consonant with *Šewâ* (but see below, and § 103 e), viz.:

בְּ [poet. בְּמוֹ] *in, at, with*.

לְ [poet. לְמוֹ] *towards, (belonging) to, for, Lat. ad*.

כְּ [poet. כְּמוֹ] *like, as, according to* (no doubt the remnant of a substantive with the meaning of *matter, kind, instar*).

d With regard to the pointing it is to be observed that—

(a) The *Šewâ mobile*, with which the above prefixes are usually pronounced, has resulted from the weakening of a short vowel (an original *ă*, according to f)²; the short vowel is regularly retained before *Šewâ*: before *Šewâ simplex*

¹ König, *Einleitung ins A. T.*, p. 393 (cf. also the almost exhaustive statistics in his *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 292 ff.), enumerates eight instances of מִן before a word without the article in 2 Samuel and Kings, and forty-five in Chronicles.

² Jerome (see Siegfried, *ZAW*. iv. 79) almost always represents בְּ by *ba*.

in the form of an *i*, attenuated from *ä*: before a *Ḥateph* the prefix takes the vowel of the *Ḥateph*, e. g. לְפָרִי for *fruit*, בְּאַרְיִ as a *lion*, בְּעֹנִי *bō'oni*, in *affliction* (sometimes with the syllable subsequently closed, cf. § 28 *b*, and the infinitives with לְ § 63 *i*): before weak consonants it follows the rule given in § 24 *c*, e. g. לְיְהוּדָה for *יהוּדָה*. When the prefixes בְּ, וְ, כְּ, לְ precede אֱלֹהִים *God*, the *Šewā* and *Ḥateph Šeghōl* regularly coalesce in *Šērē*, e. g. בְּאֱלֹהִים, &c., for בְּאֵל; so with suffixes וְאֱלֹהֵיו, &c. (once also in the sing. לְאֱלֹהֵו Hb 1¹¹); also regularly לְאָמַר to *say*, for לְאָמַר, see § 23 *d*.

(b) When the prefixes precede the article, the ה is almost always dropped, *e* and they take its vowel. See further in § 35 *n*.

(c) Immediately before the tone-syllable, i. e. before monosyllables and disyllables with the tone on the penultima (in the fore-tone), they take *Qames* *f* (undoubtedly a lengthening of an original *ä*, cf. § 26 *e*, § 28 *a*), but only in the following cases:

(aa) לְ before infinitives of the above-mentioned forms, as לְתַתּוּ to *give*, לְרִיז to *judge*, לְבוּז to *plunder*, לְגֹז to *shear*, לְחַג to *keep a festival*, לְלָרֶת to *bring forth*, לְלָכַת to *go*, לְקַחַת to *take*, except when the infinitive (as a *nomen regens*) is closely connected with another word (especially its subject, § 115 *e*), and consequently, as being in a sort of *constr. state*, loses the principal tone, e. g. לְצֵאת Ex 19¹, לְשֹׁבֵת Gn 16³, and so always לְבֹא חַמַּת Nu 13²¹, &c. (in such cases as לְתַתּוּ-חֶרֶב Ex 5²¹ the *ā* is protected by the secondary tone; before infinitives of verbs וְעָו, the לְ is retained even in close connexion; cf. Ez 21^{20.25}, 22³);

(bb) before many pronominal forms, e. g. בְּוָה (so also in 1 S 21¹⁰; not בְּוָה), גְּוָה לְוָה, לְוָה, לְוָה (in close connexion, however, לְוָה Gn 2²³; לְוָה Gn 45²³); בְּאֵלָה as *these*; and especially בְּכֶם, לְכֶם, כְּכֶם (כְּכֶם) and בְּהֶם, לְהֶם, כְּהֶם (כְּהֶם), see § 103 *e*;

(cc) לְ before monosyllables or fore-toned nouns in such combinations as לְפִה לְפִה *mouth to mouth*, 2 K 10²¹, בֵּין מַיִם לְמַיִם *between waters and waters*, Gn 1⁶; לְטָרַח for *a trouble*, Is 1¹⁴, but always before the principal pause. The instructive example in Dt 17⁸ also shows that the punctuation לְ is only possible with at least the lesser pause after it; in Is 28^{10.13} the לְ is twice repeated, even before the small and smallest disjunctives;

(dd) in certain standing expressions, which have become stereotyped almost *i* as adverbs, e. g. לְעַד to *eternity*, לְרַב in *multitude*, לְבִטְחָה in *security*, לְנֶצַח to *eternity*, but לְנֶצַח נְצָחִים to *all eternity*, Is 34¹⁰. Cf. also לְנַפְשׁ for *the dead*, Lv 19²⁸, Nu 5², 9¹⁰.

(d) With the interrogative מָה they are pointed as in בְּמָה; in *pause* and *k* before א as in בְּמָה *by what?* (before a following relative clause, as in Ec 3²³, בְּמָה; cf. Delitzsch, *Jesaja*, 4th ed., on Is 2²²); בְּמָה *how much?* but also בְּמָה 1 K 22¹⁶, in close connexion, and at a greater distance from the *pause*. The *Šeghōl* in these forms arises from a modification of the original *ä*, while the מ is sharpened in order to maintain the original *ä* of the prefixes.

When לְ (prop. *la*) is united to מָה, it takes, according to § 49 *f, g*, the form לְמָה (Jb 7²⁰ לְמָה, 1 S 1⁸ לְמָה, all *Mil'el*, and hence the *ä* in the tone is lengthened to *ā*) for *what? why?* Before the gutturals א, ה, ע, לְמָה is used for euphonic reasons (exceptions 1 S 28¹⁵, 2 S 14³¹, Jer 15¹⁸, before ה; 2 S 2²²,

ψ 49⁶, before א); לָמָּהּ, however, remains before ה. Before letters which are not gutturals, לָמָּהּ is found in ψ 42¹⁰, 43² (immediately after a tone-syllable).

III Rem. The divine name יְהוָה, which has not its original vowels (יְהוֹה) but those of אֲדֹנָי (see § 17 c), except that the ו has simple not compound *S^ewa*, takes the prefixes also, after the manner of אֲדֹנָי, thus וַיְהוֹה, לַיְהוֹה, בַּיְהוֹה, מִיְהוֹה (since they are to be read וַאֲדֹנָי, לְאֲדֹנָי, בְּאֲדֹנָי, מִאֲדֹנָי); for the א of אֲדֹנָי, as of אֲדֹנָי, אֲדֹנִים, &c. (see below), quiesces after the prefixes ב, פ, ל, ו, but is audible after מ (for מן), ש (no instance in the O. T.), and ה (in הַאֲדֹנִים Dt 10¹⁷, ψ 136³, the article, not ה interrog., is intended; the only example with ה interrog., Jer 8¹⁹, is to be pointed הַיְהוֹה, i.e. הַאֲדֹנָי, not הַיְהוֹה). Hence the rule, מֹשֶׁה מוֹצִיא מֹשֶׁה מוֹצִיא (i.e. מ, ש, ה make the א audible), וְכַלֵּב מְבִיא וְכַלֵּב מְבִיא (i.e. ו, כ, ל, ב allow it to quiesce).¹—As regards the other plural forms of אֲדֹנָי, elision of the א always takes place after ב, ו, פ, ל, except in the form אֲדֹנָי, thus לְאֲדֹנָיו, לְאֲדֹנָיֶךָ, &c.; but לְאֲדֹנָיהֶם, &c., לְאֲדֹנָיֶינוּ, &c., לְאֲדֹנָיהֶם.

§ 103. Prepositions with Pronominal Suffixes and in the Plural Form.

a 1. As all prepositions were originally nouns (§ 101) in the accusative, they may be united with the noun-suffixes (§ 91 b-l), e.g. אִצְלִי (prop. at my side) *by me*, אִתִּי (in my proximity) *with me*, תַּחְתָּם (in their place) *instead of them*, like the Latin *mea causa, for my sake*.

b Rem. 1. The preposition אֵת (usually אֵת) *near, with*, is distinguished from אֵת (see below, and § 117 a, note 4), the sign of the definite accusative (§ 117 a), in its connexion with suffixes, by a difference of pointing, the former making אִתִּי, אִתְּךָ, in *pause* אִתְּךָ, 2nd fem. אִתְּךָ (Is 54¹⁰ אִתְּךָ), אִתּוֹ, אִתְּנוּ, אִתְּכֶם, אִתְּם (also in the later books, especially in Kings, and always in Jer. and Ezek., incorrectly אִתִּי *with me*; מִמֶּנִּי *from thee*, 1 K 20²⁵; מִמֶּנִּי *from him*, 1 K 22⁷; אִתְּם *with them*), while the latter retains its *ô* (obscured from *â*) before the light suffixes, but before grave suffixes is pointed with *S^eghôl*. This *S^eghôl* is to be explained, with Praetorius, *ZDMG*. lv. 369 f., as the modification of an *ä* which again was shortened from original *â* (in 'âthî, 'âthô, &c.) in a closed syllable ('âth-hem, &c.). The same shortening and modification of the original *â* takes place before words in close connexion, hence אֵת-כָּל, &c. When not in close connexion, the toneless אֵת becomes tone-long אֵת, e.g. אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם Gn 1¹. Hence the following forms arise:—

	Sing.		Plur.
1.	אִתִּי <i>me</i> .		אִתְּנוּ <i>us</i> .
2.	{ m. אִתְּךָ, <i>pause</i> אִתְּךָ } <i>thee</i> .		אִתְּכֶם <i>you</i> .
	{ f. אִתְּךָ }	
3.	{ m. אִתּוֹ <i>him</i> .		אִתְּהֶם, rarely אִתְּהֶם } <i>them</i> .
	{ f. אִתְּהָ <i>her</i> .		אִתְּהֶן, rarely אִתְּהֶן }

¹ Another *vox memor.* is כָּל-בוֹ נֶעְלָם *all is hidden in him*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

g ךָ takes suffixes in the same manner: בִּי , בְּךָ (Ex 7²⁹, 2 S 22³⁰, ψ 141⁸ בְּכָה , as in Gn 27³⁷, 2 S 18²², Is 3⁶ לְכָה [for 2nd fem. לְךָ the *Kethîbh* לְכִי occurs in 2 K 4², Ct 2¹³, cf. § 91 e]), בּוֹ , &c.; except that for the 3rd plur., besides בְּכֶם (especially in the later books) and בְּהֶמָּה (only in Ex 30⁴, 36¹, Hb 1¹⁶; לְהֶמָּה only in Jer 14¹⁶), the form בְּכֶם is also used; and for the feminine, besides בְּהֶנָּה (three times), בְּהֵן is found fifteen times, and בְּהֵן only in 1 S 31⁷, Is 38¹⁶, Ez 42¹⁴.—According to the Masora, לֵךְ is found fifteen times for לְךָ (as conversely in 1 S 2¹⁶, 20² לְךָ for לֵךְ), e. g. Ex 21⁸, 1 S 2³, Is 9², ψ 100³ (and, as has been conjectured, also Jb 41⁴); cf. Delitzsch on ψ 100³.—In Nu 32⁴², Zc 5¹¹, Ru 2¹⁴, the Masora requires לְךָ instead of לָהּ (in all three places before a following tone-syllable; cf. § 23 k, and the analogous cases of the loss of *Mappîq* in § 58 g, § 91 e).

h(b) ךָ with Pronominal Suffixes.

	Sing.	Plur.	
1.	בְּמוֹנִי ⁵ as I.	בְּמוֹנֵינוּ as we.	
2.	$\left. \begin{array}{l} m. \text{בְּמוֹךָ} \\ f. \dots \end{array} \right\}$ as thou.	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{בְּכֶם}, \text{בְּכֵם}, \text{rarely } \text{בְּמוֹכֶם} \\ \dots \end{array} \right\}$ as ye.	
3.	$\left. \begin{array}{l} m. \text{בְּמוֹהוּ} \\ f. \text{בְּמוֹהָ} \end{array} \right\}$ as he. as she.	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{בְּהֶם}, [\text{בְּהֶם}, \text{בְּהֶמָּה}], \text{בְּמוֹהֶם} \\ [\text{בְּהֵן}], \text{בְּהֶנָּה} \end{array} \right\}$ as they.	

³ The question whether לְמוֹ can also stand for the sing. לְךָ , which Rödiger and recently W. Diehl (*Das Pronomen pers. suff. . . . des Hebr.*, p. 20 f.) and P. Haupt (*SBOT.* on Pr 23²⁰, a contraction of *la-humû*) have altogether denied, must be answered in the affirmative unless we conclude with Diehl and Haupt that *all* the instances concerned are due to corruptions of the text. It is true that in such places as Gn 9^{26,27}, Dt 33², Is 30⁵, ψ 73¹⁰ (all *in* or immediately before the principal pause; in Dt 33² with *Zaqeph qatôn* at least) לְמוֹ can be better explained as plural (in reference to collective nouns); and in Is 53⁸ for לְמוֹ $\text{נִגַּעַ$ we should read with the LXX לְמוֹת $\text{נִגַּעַ$. On the other hand, in Is 44¹⁵ its explanation as plural would be extremely forced. Even then there would remain—presuming the traditional text to be correct— פְּנִימוֹ ψ 11⁷ and בְּפִימוֹ Jb 27²³, as well as עֲלִימוֹ , three times, Jb 20²³, 27²³ (beside עֲלִי), and especially Jb 22². In all these places the most extreme exegetical artifices can only be avoided by simply admitting a singular suffix (= פְּנִי , בְּפִי , עֲלִי).—On the question of the antiquity of the suffixes in מוֹ see § 91 l.

⁴ The form לְהֵן in Ru 1¹³ is Aramaic (= *therefore*).

⁵ The use of נִי here for '— (cf. above, *d*) might be due to euphonic reasons.— בְּמוֹנִי (defectively) only in the Pentateuch, בְּמוֹנִי Ex 15¹¹.

(c) מִן with Pronominal Suffixes.

i

	Sing.		Plur.
1.	מִמֶּנִּי, poet. מִנִּי [4 times], in pause also מִנִּי [6 times] from me.		מִמֶּנּוּ from us.
2.	{ m. מִמֶּךָ, in pause } { f. מִמְּךָ }	מִמֶּךָ } מִמֶּנּוּ }	from thee.
3.	{ m. מִמֶּנּוּ, Jb 4 ¹² in pause } { or מִנֶּהוּ: see below } { f. מִמֶּנָּה from her. }	מִמֶּהם, מִהֶמָּה [twice], Jb 11 ²⁰ מִנֶּהֶם } מִמֶּהֶן, מִהֶנָּה [7 times] }	from them.

The syllable מו (in Arabic *mā* مَا = Heb. מָה *what*) in מִמֶּנִּי (probably from *ל* מִמֶּנִּי, prop. *according to what I, for as I*) is, in poetry, appended to the three simple prefixes מִ, מִ, מִ, even without suffixes, so that מִמוּ, מִמוּ, מִמוּ appear as independent words, equivalent in meaning to מִ, מִ, מִ. Poetry is here distinguished from prose by the use of longer forms; in the case of מִן, on the other hand, it prefers the shorter, which resemble the Syriac and Arabic.

The form מִמֶּהֶם, enclosed in brackets above, occurs only in 2 K 17¹⁵ (in *pause*), מִמֶּהָּ only in Jer 36³² (in *pause*); מִמֶּהֶן (Baer following Qimḥi מִמֶּהֶן) only in Ez 18¹⁴. Cf. Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 234 ff.—For מִמֶּכָּם as *ye*, Qimḥi requires מִמֶּכָּם (invariably or only in Jb 16⁴ ?); in Jos 1¹⁵, Ju 8², Ezr 4² Baer gives מִמֶּכָּם.

With regard to מִן with suffixes, מִמֶּנִּי *from me* is usually explained as arising, *ml* by a reduplication of מִן, from an original מִנִּי, just as מִמֶּנּוּ *from him*, from מִנִּי-הוּ, identical in form with מִמֶּנּוּ¹ *from us*, from מִנִּי-נוּ, while מִמֶּנָּה *from her*, goes back to מִנִּי-הָ. Far simpler, however, is Mayer Lambert's explanation (*REJ.* xxiii. 302 ff.), that מִמֶּנִּי, &c., have arisen from מִנִּי, &c., and that the forms of the suffixes are to be explained on the analogy of מִנִּי, עוֹרְנִי, תַּחֲתָנִי, § 100 o.—The bracketed form מִנֶּהוּ, for which Baer, following Qimḥi and others, writes מִנֶּהוּ, occurs only in ψ 68²⁴, and is there regarded by Delitzsch, Hupfeld, and others (following Simonis) as a substantive (מִן = portion). The expression מִן-הוּ (for מִמֶּנּוּ ?) Is 18^{2.7} is very strange.—מִמֶּהָּ occurs only in Jer 10², Ec 12¹² (Jb 11²⁰ מִמֶּהֶם); מִמֶּהֶן (so Baer and Ginsburg, following the best authorities, instead of the ordinary reading מִמֶּהֶן) only in Ez 16^{47.52}.

¹ The Babylonian Masora writes מִמֶּנִּי (to distinguish it from the 3rd sing.), which is justly blamed by Ibn Ezra.

n 3. Several prepositions, especially those which express relations of space and time, are (like the German *wegen*) properly plural nouns (for the reason, see § 124 a), and are, therefore, joined with the pronominal suffixes in the form of the plural *construct state*, just like other plural nouns (§ 91 g). On the other hand, the apparent connexion of -אֵל , -עַר , -עַל with plural suffixes is explained from the ground-forms of those prepositions (from stems ל"ה) אֵלִי (אֵלִי), עָרִי, עַלִי (contracted to אֵלִי, אֵלִי, &c.).¹

o Without suffixes these prepositions are—

אַחֲרַי, more frequently אַחֲרֵי (prop. *hinder parts*) *behind, after*.

אֵלַי,² poet. [4 times in Job] also אֵלַי (region, direction), *towards, to, according to*.

בֵּינֵי (*interval*) *between*; the suffixes indicating the singular are added to the singular בֵּין, thus בֵּינִי, בֵּינֶךָ, &c. (Gn 16⁵ בֵּינֵיךָ, the second *Yôdh* is, however, marked with a point as critically doubtful; בֵּינָיו, which occurs three times, is only the Masoretic *Qerê* for בֵּינוּ, which is found e.g. in Gn 30³⁶). On the other hand, the suffixes indicating a plural are attached to the plural forms בֵּינֵי or בֵּינֹת.

סָבִיב (*circuit*) *around*, as a preposition, always has the plural form, sometimes masc. סָבִיבֵיךָ, &c. [10 times], but much more frequently in the fem. סָבִיבוֹת (*surroundings*). In Ez 43¹⁷ סָבִיב אֹתָהּ is a corruption of סָבִיבֹתֶיהָ; [in 1 K 6⁵ סָבִיב אֶת אֵת also is so contrary to usage, that it must be due to some textual error].

עָרִי (*continuation, duration*, from עָרָה) *as far as, unto*, poet. עָרִי [12 times]. In Jb 32¹² עָרִיכֶם, with the *ā* retained in the secondary tone, is abnormal. Also in 2 K 9¹⁸ for עָרִיָהֶם read עָרִיָהֶם.

עָלַי *upon, over* (cf. the rare subst. עָלַי *height* [see Lexicon], from עָלָה *to ascend*), poet. עָלַי [40 times, and 2 *Qerê*].

תַּחְתָּי *under* (prop. *what is beneath*). On תַּחְתָּי, &c.; cf. above, d.

¹ The reference of these forms to original plurals has been again expressly supported by De Lagarde, *Symmicta*, ii. 101 ff.; *Nachrichten der G. g. G.*, 1881, p. 376, cf. *Mittheilungen*, 1884, p. 63; also *GGA.* 1884, p. 280 f. According to Barth, *ZDMG.* xlii. p. 348 ff., and *Nominalbildung*, p. 375 ff., תַּחְתָּיךָ, &c., was only formed on the analogy of עָלַיךָ, &c., and אַחֲרֵיךָ, &c., only on the analogy of לִפְנֵי, &c., since the real plural forms ought to be תַּחְתָּיךָ, אַחֲרֵיךָ, &c.; cf., however, König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 305 f.

² On the use of this particle see § 119 g.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

(in the not yet) earlier, before, for which מִפְּרָם is also used. On the combination of two particles to express complex ideas (e.g. אַף-כִּי added to this, that=*much more*), see the Syntax, § 163 f.

b (c) Prepositions, which with the addition of the conjunction אֲשֶׁר or כִּי together form one single conjunction, e.g. עַל אֲשֶׁר *because*, prop. *on account of the fact that*; אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר, and more frequently אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר, *after that*; כַּאֲשֶׁר *according as* (with כִּי); עַל-כֵּן אֲשֶׁר and עַל-כֵּן אֲשֶׁר *in consequence of the fact that, for the reason that, because*. Sometimes, however, the conjunction in such cases is omitted, and the preposition itself used as a conjunction, e.g. עַל- (for עַל-אֲשֶׁר) *although*, Jb 16¹⁷.

So, at any rate, according to our linguistic principles. It would, however, be more correct to say, that instead of the intermediary אֲשֶׁר the whole of the succeeding sentence is regarded as *one* substantival idea, under the immediate government of the preposition. In the same way, all prepositions governing the gerund in English may be paraphrased by conjunctions with the finite verb, see §§ 114 and 115, *passim*.

c 2. Besides those already mentioned, there are certain other small words now used as conjunctions, of which the derivation or original meaning is altogether obscure, thus או *or*, אם *if* (also *or* before the second member of a double question), אֲף *also*, וְ *and*, and others.

d Rem. The pointing of the וְ (originally וּ, as still before *Hateph Pathah* and—with a following *Dageš forte*—in *wāw* consecutive of the imperfect; cf. § 49 f) is in many respects analogous to that of the prefixes בְּ, כִּי, לְ (§ 102 d-i), but as being a weak consonant, the *wāw* copulative has some further peculiarities:

(a) Usually it takes simple *Šewā* (וְ).

(b) Before words which begin with a guttural having a *compound Šewā*, it takes the vowel with which the *Šewā* is compounded (according to § 28 b), e.g. וְחָכַם *and be thou wise*, וְעַבְדִּים *and servants*, וְעוֹז *and strength*, וְאָכַל *and eat thou*, וְחָלִי *and sickness*. On וְאֱלֹהִים, וְאֱלֹהֵי &c., see § 102 d; on וְאֲדָנִי, &c., see § 102 m; on such cases as וְעֶצֶר Jb 4², cf. § 28 b.

e (c) Before words with simple *Šewā* under the first consonant (except in the cases under f), the *Wāw* becomes the vowel *û* (cf. § 26 a), e.g. וְלִכְלֹל *and to all*, so also (except in the case under g) before the cognate labials ב, מ, פ, hence וְמִלְּךָ. On the cases in which simple *Šewā* has become a *Hateph* after וְ copulative (e.g. וְזָהב Gn 2¹²), cf. § 10 g.

f (d) With a following וְ the וְ coalesces to form וְ according to § 24 b, as וְהִיא *and let him be*. On the peculiar punctuation of the *wāw* copulative before forms with initial *Šewā* from הִיא *to be* and הִיא *to live* (e.g. וְהִיא Jos 8⁴, וְהִיא Gn 20⁷), cf. § 63 q.

g (e) Immediately before the tone-syllable it frequently takes *Qames*, like בְּ, כִּי, לְ (see § 102 f), but in most cases only at the end of a sentence or clause (but cf. also וְבֵן 2 K 22³⁰), e.g. וְמֵת Ex 21¹² (on the other hand, in verse 20

וּמַתְנִי is in closer logical connexion with what follows) ; 2 K 7⁴ וּמַתְנִי שָׁם ; Ru 3³ וּמַתְנִי ; ψ 10¹⁵ וּמַתְנִי ; 1 S 9⁴ וּמַתְנִי ; 2 S 13²⁶ וּמַתְנִי ; Ez 47⁹ וּמַתְנִי ; cf. also (with *Tiphha*) Gn 33¹³, 2 S 15¹². The very frequent connexion of nouns expressing kindred ideas, by means of וּ, is due simply to considerations of rhythm, for even in such cases the *Wāw* must immediately precede the tone-syllable, which must be marked by a disjunctive accent, e. g. וְכָהוּ וְכָהוּ Gn 1², וְלֵילָה Gn 8²² (see also the previous examples) ; Gn 13¹⁴ (thrice) ; Ex 25³ וְכָהוּ ; ψ 96⁷ וְכָהוּ ; ψ 76⁷ וְכָהוּ ; Gn 7¹³ וְכָהוּ ; 1 K 21¹⁰ וְכָהוּ ; Est 1⁸ וְכָהוּ at the end of the verse, but in ψ 87⁵ וְכָהוּ in spite of the *D'hi* with the second וְכָהוּ, because it is closely connected with the following predicate. Also with three words פָּחַד Is 24¹⁷. On the other hand, the rapid pronunciation וְ occurs before a conjunctive accent (and, when farther removed from the principal pause, even with the smaller disjunctives, in spite of a following tone-syllable), e. g. וְצֵן Gn 32⁶ ; cf. Gn 31⁴⁰, Lv 7²³, Dt 2²¹, and among the examples given above, Gn 7¹³ and ψ 76⁷. (Exceptions : וְקִרְמָה Gn 13¹⁴, where evidently the וְ is intended to ensure the slow and solemn recitation of the promise, but also וְיוֹף Jos 15⁵⁵, וְעֵתָר 19⁷, וְבִטָן 19²⁵, all immediately before the pause.) For the same rhythmical reason וְ (not וּ) is used regularly with certain monosyllables which, by their nature, lean more closely upon the following word, thus וְוָה, וְוָת, וְוָם, וְוָלָא (to be distinguished from וְלֹא *if not*, with *Zaqeph gadol*, 2 K 5¹⁷), and others.

§ 105. Interjections.

1. Among the interjections some (as in all languages) are simply *a* natural sounds, or, as it were, vocal gestures, called forth involuntarily by certain impressions or sensations, e. g. אָהָה (Ez 30² אָהָה), אָהָה *ah!* אָהָה *aha!* (cf. this אָהָה also in אָהָלִי and אָהָלִי *utinam!*), אָהָה Ex 32³¹. &c. (Gn 50¹⁷ אָהָה) *ah!* (from אָהָה and אָהָה), otherwise written אָהָה 2 K 20³, Jn 1¹⁴, ψ 116⁴ ; also אָהָה (in pause אָהָה, even in the plural אָהָה *hold your peace!* Neh 8¹¹) *hush!* אָהָה (Am 5¹⁶ אָהָה) *ha! woe!* אָהָה (ψ 120⁵), אָהָה (in אָהָלִי Ec 4¹⁰ ; אָהָלִי 10¹⁶) *woe!*

2. Others, however, originally expressed independent ideas, and *b* become interjections only by rapid pronunciation and by usage, e. g. הִנֵּה (הִנֵּה) or הִנֵּה *behold!* (prop. *here*) ; הִנֵּה *behold!* (prop. imperative) ; הִנֵּה, plur. הִנֵּה (prop. *give*, imperative of הִנֵּה ; as to the tone, cf. § 690), *come*, the Latin *age, agite!* לָכֵה (also לָהֵה), לָכֵה (prop. *go*, imperative of הִנֵּה) with the same meaning¹ ; הִנֵּה *far be it!* (prop. *ad profanum!*)

¹ הִנֵּה (Dt 1⁸), הִנֵּה and לָכֵה are also used in connexion with the feminine and the plural, which proves that they have become quite stereotyped as interjections.

יָ (see the Lexicon) *I beseech, hear me!* נָּ pray!¹ used to emphasize a demand, warning, or entreaty, and always placed after the expression to which it belongs.²

¹ נָּ serves to express the most various shades of expression, which are discussed in the various parts of the syntax. It is used especially (a) after the *imperative*, either in commands or entreaty, see § 110 d; (b) with the *imperfect*, either in the cohortative (§ 108 b) or jussive (§ 109 b); (c) once with *perfect*, Gn 40¹⁴; (d) after various particles: נָּ הִנֵּה־הִנֵּה *behold now*; particularly after the conjunctions לְ and אִם: נָּ לְ ne quaeso and נָּ אִם if now, εἴπερ, εἴποτε, *if*, in a deprecatory sense, expressive of politeness or modesty. In Nu 12¹³ נָּ stands after a noun; but we ought certainly to read נָּ לְ.— In polite language this particle is used constantly in all these ways, Gn 18^{3,4}, 19^{7,8,19}, and 50¹⁷.

² Against the usual view which regards נָּ as a hortatory particle (= *up! come!* analogous to the original imperatives הִנֵּה and לְכֵה and the Ethiopic *nā'ā*, properly *hither*, also *come!*), P. Haupt, in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, xiii, no. 114, p. 109, justly observes that we should then expect the particle to be *prefixed* to the imperative, &c. He proposes to describe נָּ as an emphatic particle. Haupt's suggested identification of this נָּ with the Assyrian, Arabic, and Ethiopic particle *mā* (which is also an enclitic of emphasis), and ultimately with the interrogative *mā*, we shall not discuss here.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

or longer duration, were terminated in the past, and hence are finally concluded, viz.:

(a) Corresponding to the perfect proper in Latin and the English perfect definite, in assertions, negations, confirmations, interrogations, &c., e.g. Gn 18¹⁵ *then Sarah denied, saying, I laughed not* (לֹא צִחֲקֵתִי); *and he said, Nay, but thou didst laugh* (צִחֲקֵתָּ); Gn 3¹¹ *who told thee ?* Cf. 3^{13.14.17.22}. Also pointing to some undefined time in the past, e.g. Is 66⁸ *who hath (ever yet) heard such a thing?*

c Rem. In opposition to this express use of the perfect to emphasize the completion of an event, the imperfect is not infrequently used to emphasize that which is still future, e.g. Jos 1⁵ *as I was* (הָיִיתִי) *with Moses, so will I be* (אֶהְיֶה) *with thee*; Jos 1¹⁷, Ex 10¹⁴, Dt 32²¹, 1 K 2³⁸, Is 46^{4.11}, Jo 2², Ec 1⁹.

d (b) As a simple *tempus historicum* (corresponding to the Greek aorist) in narrating past events, e.g. Gn 4⁴ *and Abel, he also brought* (וַהֲבִיֵא), &c.; Gn 7¹⁹ *the waters did prevail* (וַיִּבְרֹךְ), &c.; Jb 1¹ *there was a man* (אִישׁ הָיָה) *in the land of Uz, &c.*; even in relating repeated actions, 1 S 18³⁰.

e Rem. As the above examples indicate, the perfect of *narration* occurs especially at the head of an entire narrative (Jb 1¹; cf. Dn 2¹) or an independent sentence (e.g. Gn 7^{11.13}), but in co-ordinate sentences, as a rule, only when the verb is separated from the copulative ו by one or more words (cf. above Gn 4⁴ and 7¹⁹). In other cases, the narrative is continued in the imperfect consecutive, according to § 111 a. The direct connexion of the narrative perfect with ו copulative (not to be confounded with the perfect consecutive proper, § 112) agrees rather with Aramaic syntax (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aram.*, § 71, 1 b). On the examples (which are in many respects doubtful) in the earlier texts, see § 112 pp-uu.

f (c) To represent actions, &c., which were already completed in the past, at the time when other actions or conditions took place (pluperfect),¹ e.g. 1 S 28³ *now Samuel was (long since) dead*² . . . *and Saul had put away* (וַהֲסִיר) *those that had familiar spirits . . . out of the land.* Both these statements, being as it were in parentheses, merely assign a reason for the narrative beginning at verse 6. Cf. 1 S 9¹⁵, 25²¹, 2 S 18¹⁸.—Gn 20¹⁸ (*for the Lord had fast closed up, &c.*); 27³⁰, 31^{19.34}, Dt 2¹⁰; and in a negative statement, Gn 2⁵ *for the Lord God had not (up to that time) caused it to rain, &c.* This is especially frequent, from the nature of the case, in relative, causal, and temporal clauses, when the main clause contains a tense referring to the past, e.g. Gn 2² *and he rested . . . from all his work which he had made* (וַעֲשָׂה); Gn 7⁹,

¹ Cf. P. Haupt in the *Notes on Esther*, 9².

² Incorrectly, e.g. in the Vulgate, *Samuel autem mortuus est . . . et Saul abstulit magos, &c.*

19²⁷, &c.; 29¹⁰ *now when Jacob had seen Rachel* (בַּאֲשֶׁר רָאָה) . . . , *Jacob went near*, &c.; so also in clauses which express the completion or incompleteness of one action, &c., on the occurrence of another, as in Gn 24¹⁵, 27³⁰, &c.; cf. § 164 b, with the note, and c.

2. To represent actions, events, or states, which, although completed *g* in the past, nevertheless extend their influence into the present (in English generally rendered by the present):

(a) Expressing facts which were accomplished long before, or conditions and attributes which were acquired long before, but of which the effects still remain in the present (present perfect), e. g. ψ 10¹¹ הִסְתִּיר פָּנָיו *he hath hidden his face (and still keeps it hidden)*; ψ 143⁶ פָּרַשְׁתִּי אֶשְׁתִּי *I have spread forth my hands (and still keep them spread forth)*. This applies particularly to a large number of perfects (almost exclusively of intransitive¹ verbs, denoting affections or states of the mind) which in English can be rendered only by the present, or, in the case mentioned above under *f*, by the imperfect.² Thus, יָדַעְתִּי *I know* (prop. *I have perceived, have experienced*) Jb 9², 10¹³, לֹא יָדַעְתִּי *I know not* Gn 4⁹, &c.; on the other hand, e. g. in Gn 28¹⁶, Nu 22³⁴, the context requires *I knew not*; זָכַרְנוּ *we remember* Nu 11⁵; מִאָּנָה *she refuseth* Jb 6⁷; עָלָץ *it exulteth*; שָׂמְחָתִי *I rejoice* 1 S 2¹; בִּקֵּשׁ *he requireth* Is 1¹²; קָוִיתִי *I wait* Gn 49¹⁸, ψ 130⁵ (parallel with הוֹחֵלֵתִי); הִפְצֵתִי *I delight* ψ 40⁹ (mostly negative, Is 11¹¹, &c.); אָהַבְתִּי *I love* Gn 27⁴; שָׂנֵאתִי *I hate* ψ 31⁷; מָאָסְתִי *I despise* Am 5²¹; תִּעְבְּבוּנִי *they abhor me* Jb 30¹⁰; בָּטַחְתִּי *I trust* ψ 25²; הִסֵּיתִי *I put my trust* ψ 31²; צַדִּיקְתִּי *I am righteous* Jb 34⁵; פָּקַדְתִּי *I have decided to requite* 1 S 15².—We may further include a number of verbs which express bodily characteristics or states, such as גָּדַלְתָּ *thou art great* ψ 104¹; קָטַנְתִּי *I am little* Gn 32¹¹; גָּבְהוּ *they are high* Is 55⁹; רָחֲקוּ *they stand aloof* Jb 30¹⁰; טָבוּ *they are goodly* Nu 24⁵; נָאוּ *they are beautiful* Is 52⁷; זָקַנְתִּי *I am old* Gn 18¹³; יָגַעְתִּי *I am weary* ψ 6⁷; שָׂבַעְתִּי *I am full* Is 1¹¹, &c.

Rem. To the same category probably belong also the perfects after עָרַמְתִּי *h* Ex 10³ *how long hast thou already been refusing* (and refusest still . . . ? which really amounts to *how long wilt thou refuse?*), ψ 80⁵, Pr 1²² (co-ordinate with the imperf.), and after עָרַמְתָּ Ex 16²⁸, Hb 1².

(b) In direct narration to express actions which, although really *i* only in process of accomplishment, are nevertheless meant to be repre-

¹ With regard to the great but very natural preponderance of intransitive verbs (expressing an existing state), cf. the lists in Knudtzon (see above, p. 309, note 2), pp. 117 and 122 in the Danish text.

² Cf. *novi, odi, memini; οἶδα, μέμνημαι, εἶκα, δέδορκα, κέκραγα*; in the New Testament, ἤλπικα, ἠγάπηκα.

sented as already accomplished in the conception of the speaker, e. g. *הִרְמַתִּי* *I lift up* (my hand in ratifying an oath) Gn 14²²; *נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי* *I swear* Jer 22⁵; *הִעֲדֹתִי* *I testify* Dt 8¹⁹; *יְעַצְרֵי* *I counsel* 2 S 17¹¹ (but in a different context in ver. 15, *I have counselled*); *אָמַרְתִּי* (prop. *I say*) *I decide* (*I consider as hereby settled*) 2 S 19³⁰; *I declare* Jb 9²², 32¹⁰.

k (c) To express facts which have formerly taken place, and are still of constant recurrence, and hence are matters of common experience (the Greek *gnomic aorist*), e. g. *ψ* 9¹¹ *for thou, Lord, hast not forsaken* (*לֹא-עָזַבְתָּ*) *them that seek thee*. Cf. ver. 13, also *ψ* 10³, 119⁴⁰ and Gn 49¹¹ (*כָּבִים*).

l Rem. In almost all the cases discussed in No. 2 (included under the English present) the imperfect can be used instead of the perfect, wherever the action or state in question is regarded, not as already completed, but as still continuing or just taking place (see § 107 a). Thus, *לֹא יָכֹלְתִי* *I am not able* *ψ* 40¹³ and *לֹא אֵיכָל* Gn 31³⁵ have practically the same meaning. Hence also it very frequently happens that the imperfect corresponds to such perfects in poetic or prophetic parallelism, e. g. Is 5¹², *ψ* 2^{1f.}, Pr 1²², Jb 3¹⁷.

m 3. To express *future* actions, when the speaker intends by an express assurance to represent them as finished, or as equivalent to accomplished facts:

(a) In contracts or other express stipulations (again corresponding to the English present, and therefore closely related to the instances noted under *i*), e. g. Gn 23¹¹ *the field I give* (*נָתַתִּי*) *thee*; cf. ver. 13 and 48²², 2 S 14²¹, 24²³, Jer 40⁴; in a threat, 1 S 2¹⁶, 2 S 5⁶ (unless, with Wellhausen, *יִסְיִי* is to be read).—Especially in promises made by God, Gn 1²⁹, 15¹⁸, 17²⁰, Ju 1².

n (b) To express facts which are undoubtedly imminent, and, therefore, in the imagination of the speaker, already accomplished (*perfectum confidentiae*), e. g. Nu 17²⁷ *behold, we perish, we are undone, we are all undone*. Gn 30¹³, Is 6⁵ (*נִדְמִיתִי* *I am undone*¹), Pr 4². Even in interrogative sentences, Gn 18¹², Nu 17²⁸, 23¹⁰, Ju 9^{9,11}, Zc 4¹⁰ (?), Pr 22²⁰.² This use of the perfect occurs most frequently in prophetic language (*perfectum propheticum*). The prophet so trans-

¹ Cf. the similar use of *ὄλωλα* (*διέφθορας*, II. 15. 128) and *perii!* On the kindred use of the perfect in conditional sentences, cf. below, *p*.

² In Gn 40¹⁴ a *perf. confidentiae* (after *כִּי אֶזְכְּרֶנּוּ*; but cf. § 163 *d*) appears to be used in the expression of an earnest desire that something may happen (*but have me in thy remembrance, &c.*). Neither this passage, however, nor the use of the perfect in Arabic to express a wish or imprecation, justifies us in assuming the existence of a *precativae* perfect in Hebrew. In Jb 21¹⁶, 22¹⁸, also, translate *the counsel of the wicked is far from me*. Cf. Driver, *Tenses*³, p. 25 f. In Is 43⁹ either *נִקְבְּצִי* is *imperative* (see § 510) or we must read *יִקְבְּצִי*, corresponding to *יִפְדֶּנּוּ* which follows.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Knudtson (see above, Rem. on § 106 a), comparing the Ass.-Bab. usage, would prefer the term *present* rather than *imperfect*, on the ground that the tense expresses what is either actually or mentally present. In any case, the essential difference between the perfect and imperfect consists, he argues, in this, that the perfect simply indicates what is actually complete, while the imperfect places the action, &c., in a more direct relation to the judgement or feeling of the speaker.

More precisely the imperfect serves—

1. In the sphere of *past time*:

b (a) To express actions, &c., which *continued* throughout a longer or shorter period,¹ e.g. Gn 2⁶ *a mist went up* continually (יַעֲלֶה), 2²⁵, 37⁷, 48¹⁰, Ex 1¹², 8²⁰, 13²², 15^{6.12.14.15}, Nu 9^{15 f. 20 f.}, 23⁷, Ju 2¹, 5⁸, 1 S 3², 13^{17 f.}, 2 S 2²⁸, 23¹⁰, 1 K 3⁴, 7⁸, 21⁶, Is 1²¹, 6⁴ (יִמְלֵא), 17^{10 f.}, 51^{2 2}, Jer 13⁷, 36¹⁸, ψ 18^{7.14.17 ff. 38 ff.}, 24², 32^{4.5} (אֲוִרְיַעַךְ), 47⁵, 68^{10.12}, 104^{6 ff.}, 106¹⁹, 107^{18.29}, 139¹³, Jb 3¹¹, 4^{12.15 f.}, 10^{10 f.}, 15^{7 f.}—very frequently alternating with a perfect (especially with a frequentative perfect; cf. Nu 9¹⁵⁻²³ and § 112 e), or when the narration is continued by means of an imperfect consecutive.²

c Rem. 1. The imperfect is frequently used in this way after the particles אֵן *then*, טָרָם *not yet*, בְּטָרָם *before*, עַד *until*, e.g. Ex 15¹ אֵן יִשִּׁיר מֹשֶׁה *then sang* Moses, &c.; Nu 21¹⁷, Dt 4⁴¹, Jos 10¹², 1 K 3¹⁶, 8¹, ψ 126², Jb 38²¹. (The perfect is used after אֵן when stress is to be laid on the fact that the action has really taken place, and not upon its gradual accomplishment or duration in the past, e.g. Gn 4²⁶ אֵן הוֹחֵל *then began*, &c.; Gn 49⁴, Ex 15¹⁵, Jos 22³¹, Ju 5¹¹, ψ 89²⁰.)³ After טָרָם e.g. Gn 19⁴ יִשְׁכְּבוּ *before they lay down*; Gn 2⁵, 24⁴⁵, 1 S 3^{3.7}, always in the sense of our *pluperfect*. (In Gn 24¹⁵ instead of the perf. בָּלָה, the imperf. should be read, as in verse 45; so also in 1 S 3⁷ [יִגְלֶה] an imperf. is co-ordinated with יִדַע). After בְּטָרָם (sometimes also simply טָרָם Ex 12³⁴, Jos 3¹), e.g. Jer 1⁵ בְּטָרָם הֵצֵא *before thou camest forth*; Gn 27³³, 37¹⁸, 41⁵⁰, Ru 3¹⁴ (perhaps also in ψ 90² an imperf. was intended instead of יִלְרֵוּ; cf. Wellhausen on 2 S 3²; but note also Pr 8²⁵, in a similar context, *before the mountains were settled*, הִטְבְּעוּ, the predicate being separated from בְּטָרָם by הָרִים, as in ψ 90²). After עַד Jos 10¹³, ψ 73¹⁷ (*until I went*), 2 Ch 29³⁴; on the other

¹ Cf. the Mēša' inscription, l. 5, כִּי יֵאָנֶף כִּמְשׁ בְּאַרְצָה *for Chemosh was angry with his land*. As Driver, *Tenses*, 3rd ed., § 27, 1 a, remarks, this vivid realization of the accomplishment of the action is especially frequent in poetic and prophetic style.

² According to the Masora such imperfects occur in Is 10¹³ *bis* (where, however, וְאֲסִיר might also mean *I am wont to remove*, &c.), Is 48³, 57¹⁷, ψ 18^{38 a}, also (according to § 49 c) in 2 S 1¹⁰ and Ez 16¹⁰. In some other cases וְ is no doubt a dogmatic emendation for וְ (imperf. consec.) in order to represent historical statements as promises; cf. Is 42⁶, 43²⁸ [contrasted with 42²⁵], 51² *bis*, 63³ ff. and the note on § 53 p.

³ After אֵן *then* (to announce future events) the imperf. is naturally used in the sense of a future, Gn 24⁴¹, Ex 12⁴⁸, Mi 3⁴, Zp 3⁹, ψ 51²¹.

hand, with the perf., e.g. Jos 2²². As after אָן , so also after טָרַם , פָּטְרַם , and עָרַע the imperf. may be used, according to the context, in the sense of our *future*, e.g. 2 K 2⁹, Is 65²⁴, Jb 10²¹; after עָרַע e.g. Is 22¹⁴. The imperf. is used in the sense of our *present* after טָרַם in Ex 9³⁰, 10⁷.

2. Driver (*Tenses*³, p. 35 f.) rightly lays stress upon the inherent distinction *d* between the *participle* as expressing *mere duration*, and the *imperfect* as expressing *progressive duration* (in the present, past, or future). Thus the words $\text{אֲצִיָּהוּ וְנָהָר}$ Gn 2¹⁰ represent the river of Paradise as going out of Eden in a continuous, uninterrupted stream, but וַיִּפְרָר , which immediately follows, describes how the parting of its waters is always taking place afresh. In the same way וַיֵּעָלֶה Gn 2⁶ represents new mists as constantly arising, and וַיִּמְלֵא Is 6⁴ new clouds of smoke. Also those actions, &c., which might be regarded in themselves as single or even momentary, are, as it were, broken up by the imperfect into their component parts, and so pictured as gradually completing themselves. Hence $\text{וַתִּבְלַעַמוּ$ Ex 15¹² (after a *perf.* as in verse 14) represents the Egyptians, in a vivid, poetic description, as being swallowed up one after another, and $\text{וַיִּנְהַיֵּי$ Nu 23⁷ the leading on by stages, &c.

(b) To express actions, &c., which were *repeated* in the past, either *e* at fixed intervals or occasionally (the *modus rei repetitae*), e.g. Jb 1⁵ *thus did* (וַיַּעֲשֶׂה) *Job continually* (after each occasion of his sons' festivities); 4^{3f.}, 22^{6f.}, 23¹¹, 29^{7.9.12f.}, Gn 6⁴, 29², 30^{7.8}, 42^{31.39} (*I used to bear the loss of it*), Ex 1¹², 19¹⁹, 33^{7ff.} (וַיִּקַּח *used to take every time*), 40^{36ff.}, Nu 9^{17f. 20ff.}, 11^{5.9}, Ju 6⁴, 14¹⁰, 21²⁵, 1 S 1⁷, 2²², 9⁹, 13¹⁹, 18⁵, 27⁹, 2 S 1²², 12³, 13¹⁸, 1 K 5²⁵ (of tribute repeated year by year), 10⁵, 13³³, 14²⁸, 2 K 4⁸, 8²⁹, 13²⁰, 25¹⁴, Jer 36²³, ψ 42⁵, 44³, 78^{15.40}, 103⁷, Est 2¹⁴; even in a negative dependent clause, 1 K 18¹⁰.

2. In the sphere of *present time*, again

(a) To express actions, events, or states, which are *continued* for a shorter or longer time,¹ e.g. Gn 37¹⁵ מַה־תִּבְקֶשׁ *what seekest thou?* 19¹⁹ לֹא־אֶבְיֵל *I cannot*; 24⁵⁰, 31³⁵, Is 1¹³. Other examples are Gn 2¹⁰, 24³¹, 1 S 1⁸, 11⁵, 1 K 3⁷, ψ 2², and in the prophetic formula יְאָמַר יְהוָה *saieth the Lord*, Is 1^{11.18}, &c., cf. 40¹. So especially to express facts known by experience, which occur at all times, and consequently hold good at any moment, e.g. Pr 15²⁰ *a wise son maketh a glad father*; hence especially frequent in Job and Proverbs. In an interrogative sentence, e.g. Jb 4¹⁷ *is mortal man just before God?* In a negative sentence, Jb 4¹⁸, &c.

(b) To express actions, &c., which may be *repeated* at any time, *g* including therefore the present, or are *customarily* repeated on a given occasion (cf. above, e), e.g. Dt 1⁴⁴ *as bees do* (are accustomed to

¹ It is not always possible to carry out with certainty the distinction between *continued* and *repeated* actions. Some of the examples given under *f* might equally be referred to *g*.

do); Gn 6²¹, 32³³, 43³², Ju 11⁴⁰, 1 S 2⁸, 5⁵, 20², 2 S 15³², Is 1²³, 3¹⁶, ψ 1³. So again (see *f*) especially to express facts known by experience which may at any time come into effect again, e. g. Ex 23⁸ *a gift blindeth* (יְעִיֵר), &c.; Gn 2²⁴, 22¹⁴, Is 32⁶, Am 3⁷, Mal 1⁶, Jb 2⁴, &c. Of the same kind also is the imperfect in such relative clauses (see § 155), as Gn 49²⁷ *Benjamin is* יִטְרֵף אֶבְרָהָם *a wolf that ravineth* (properly, is accustomed to ravin). Finally, compare also the formulae יֹאמַר *it is* (wont to be) *said* (to introduce proverbial expressions) Gn 10⁹, 22¹⁴, &c.; לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה כֵן *it is not* (wont to be) *so done* (and hence *may not, shall not be*, see *u*), Gn 29²⁶, 20⁹, 34⁷, 2 S 13¹².

h (c) To express actions, &c., which although, strictly speaking, they are already finished, are regarded as still lasting on into the present time, or continuing to operate in it, e. g. Gn 32³⁰ *wherefore is it that thou dost ask* (תִּשְׁאַל) *after my name?* 24³¹, 44⁷, Ex 5¹⁵, 2 S 16⁹. In such cases, naturally, the perfect is also admissible, and is sometimes found in the same formula as the imperfect, e. g. Jb 1⁷ (2²) מֵאַיִן תָּבֵא *whence comest thou* (just now)? but Gn 16⁸ (cf. 42⁷) אֵי-מָהָה בָּאת *whence camest thou?* The imperfect represents the coming as still in its last stage, whereas the perfect represents it as an accomplished fact.

i 3. In the sphere of *future time*. To express actions, &c., which are to be represented as about to take place, and as continuing a shorter or longer time in the future, or as being repeated; thus:

(a) From the standpoint of the speaker's present time, e. g. Ex 4¹ *they will not believe* (יֹאמְרוּ) *me, nor hearken* (יִשְׁמְעוּ) *unto my voice: for they will say* (יֹאמְרוּ), &c., 6¹, 9⁵, &c.

k (b) In dependent clauses to represent actions, &c., which from some point of time in the past are to be represented as future, e. g. Gn 43⁷ *could we in any wise know that he would say* (יֹאמַר)? 2¹⁹, 43²⁵, Ex 2⁴, 2 K 3²⁷ אֲשֶׁר-יִמְלֹךְ *qui regnaturus erat*; 13¹⁴, Jon 4⁵, Jb 3³, Ec 2³, ψ 78⁶ *that the generation to come might know*, בְּנִים יוֹלְדוּ *the children which should be born* (*qui nascituri essent*; the imperfect here with the collateral idea of the occurrence being repeated in the future).

l (c) To represent a *futurum exactum*; cf. Is 4⁴, 6¹¹ (co-ordinated with a perfect used in the same sense, see § 106 o); so also sometimes after the temporal particles עַד, ψ 132⁵, and אֲשֶׁר עַד *until*, Gn 29⁸, Nu 20¹⁷, &c.

m 4. Finally to the sphere of future time belong also those cases in which the (modal) imperfect serves to express actions, events, or states, the occurrence of which is to be represented as willed (or not



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

- q (3) In dependent clauses after final conjunctions (§ 165 b), as אֲשֶׁר, Gn 11⁷ (לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ) *that they may not understand*; בְּעֵבֹר Gn 21³⁰, 27^{4,19}, Ex 9¹⁴, &c.; לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר Nu 17⁵; לְמַעַן Dt 4¹, ψ 51⁶, 78⁶, and יַעַן אֲשֶׁר¹ Ez 12¹², *in order that*²; לְבִלְתִּי *that . . . not*, Ex 20²⁰, 2 S 14¹⁴; also after פֶּן *that not, lest*, Gn 3²², 11⁴, 19¹⁵, &c.³; cf. also the instances introduced by וְלֹא in § 109 g.—In Lv 9⁶ such an imperfect (or jussive? see the examples in § 109 f) is added to the expression of the command by an asyndeton, and in La 1¹⁹ to the principal clause simply by !: *while they sought them food וַיִּשְׁיבוּ אֶת-נַפְשָׁם to refresh their souls* (cf. also La 3²⁶, *it is good and let him hope, i. e. that he should hope*); so after an interrogative clause, Ex 2⁷. Finally also in a relative clause, ψ 32⁸ בְּדֶרֶךְ-זוֹ תֵלֶךְ *in the way which thou shouldst go*.
- r (b) To express actions, &c., which are to be represented as possibly taking place or not taking place (sometimes corresponding to the *potential* of the classical languages, as also to our periphrases with *can, may, should*⁴). More particularly such imperfects are used—
- s (1) In a permissive sense, e. g. Gn 2¹⁶ *of every tree of the garden (אֲכַל תֹּאכַל) thou mayest freely eat* (the opposite in verse 17); 3², 42³⁷, Lv 21^{3,22}, Jb 21³. In the 1st pers. ψ 5⁸, 22¹⁸ (*I may, or can, tell*); in a negative sentence, e. g. ψ 5⁵.
- t (2) In interrogative sentences, e. g. Pr 20⁹ מִי יֹאמֵר *quis dixerit?* Cf. Gn 17¹⁷, 18¹⁴, 31⁴³, 1 S 11¹², 2 K 5¹² הֲלֹא-אֶרְחֹץ בָּהֶם *may I not wash in them?* Is 33¹⁴, ψ 15¹, 24³, Ec 5⁵. So especially in a question expressing surprise after אֵיךְ, e. g. Gn 39⁹ *how then can I . . .?* 44³⁴, Is 19¹¹, ψ 137⁴, and even with regard to some point of time in the past, looking forward from which an event might have been expected to take place, e. g. Gn 43⁷ הֲיָדוּעַ נִדְרַע *could we in any wise know . . .?* Cf. 2 S 3³³ (יָמוּת) *was Abner to die as a fool, i. e. was he destined to die . . .?*), and so probably also Gn 34³¹ (*should he deal . . .?*). Very closely connected with this is the use of the imperfect—
- u (3) In a consecutive clause depending on an interrogative clause, e. g. Ex 3¹¹, *who am I (כִּי אֲלֶיךָ) that I should (ought, could) go?* 16⁷, Nu 11¹², Ju 9²³, 1 S 18¹⁸, 2 K 8¹³, Is 29¹⁶, Jb 6¹¹, 21¹⁵, similarly after אֲשֶׁר Gn 38¹⁸, Ex 5².

¹ But יַעַן אֲשֶׁר in a causal sense (*because, since*), e. g. Ju 2²⁰ (as אֲשֶׁר Gn 34²⁷) is followed by the perfect. On Jos 4²⁴ see above, § 74 g.

[² R. V. *because he shall not see.*]

³ In 2 K 2¹⁶ פֶּן occurs with the perf. in a vivid presentment of the time when the fear is realized and the remedy comes too late. (In 2 S 2c⁶, since a *perfect consec.* follows, read with Driver יָמִינִי.)

⁴ By this, of course, is not meant that these finer distinctions were consciously present to the Hebrew mind. They are rather mere expedients for making intelligible to ourselves the full significance of the Semitic imperfect.

Rem. In passages like 1 S 11⁵, ψ 8⁵, 114⁵, the context shows that the *U* imperfect corresponds rather to our present. In such sentences the perfect also is naturally used in referring to completed actions, e. g. Gn 20¹⁰, Ju 18²³, 2 S 7¹⁸, Is 22¹.

(4) In *negative sentences* to express actions, &c., which cannot or *w* should not happen, e. g. Gn 32¹³ לְאִי־יִסְפָּר מִרֹב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִעָשׂוּ *which cannot be numbered for multitude*; 20⁹ *deeds* (אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִעָשׂוּ) *that ought not to be done* (cf. above, g); ψ 5⁵.

(5) In *conditional clauses* (the *modus conditionalis* corresponding *x* to the Latin present or imperfect conjunctive) both in the protasis and apodosis, or only in the latter, ψ 23⁴ גַּם כִּי־אֵלֶּךְ . . . לֹא־אִירָא רָע *yea, though I walk (or had to walk) . . . I fear (or I would fear) no evil*; Jb 9²⁰ *though I be righteous, mine own mouth shall condemn me*. After a perfect in the protasis, e. g. Jb 23¹⁰. Very frequently also in an apodosis, the protasis to which must be supplied from the context, e. g. Jb 5⁸ *but as for me, I would seek unto God (were I in thy place)*; 3^{13.16}, 14^{14f.}, ψ 55¹³, Ru 1¹². However, some of the imperfects in these examples are probably intended as jussive forms. Cf. § 109 h.

§ 108. *Use of the Cohortative.*

The cohortative, i. e. according to § 48 c, the 1st pers.¹ sing. or *a* plur. of the imperfect lengthened by the ending ה־ָ, ² represents in general an endeavour directed expressly towards a definite object. While the corresponding forms of the indicative rather express the mere announcement that an action will be undertaken, the cohortative lays stress on the determination underlying the action, and the personal interest in it.

Its uses may be divided into—

1. The cohortative standing alone, or co-ordinated with another *b* cohortative, and frequently strengthened by the addition of the particle אֲנִי:

(a) To express self-encouragement, e. g. Ex 3³ אֲסֹרָה־נָּא וְגַ' *I will turn aside now, and see . . .!* So especially as the result of inward deliberation (in soliloquies), e. g. Gn 18²¹, 32²¹ (rarely so used after לֹא־, Gn 21¹⁶ *let me not look . . .!* Jer 18¹⁸), and also as a more or less emphatic statement of a fixed determination, e. g. Is 5¹ *I will sing* ³ . . .! 5⁶, 31⁸. Cf. also Gn 46³⁰ *now let me die (I am willing to die)*,

¹ For the few examples of cohortatives in the 3rd sing., see § 48 d.

² But verbs ה־ָ, according to § 75 l, even in the cohortative, almost always have the ending ה־ָ; cf. e. g. in Dt 32²⁰ אֲרָאָה after אֲסִתִּירָה.

[³ R. V. *let me sing*.]

since *I have seen thy face*; and ψ 31⁸. In the 1st pers. plur. the cohortative includes a summons to others to help in doing something, e. g. ψ 2³ בָּרִיבְרִיבָהּ *come! let us break asunder!* &c., and Gn 11³.

c (b) To express a wish, or a request for permission, that one should be allowed to do something, e. g. Dt 2²⁷ אֶעְבְּרָה *may I be allowed to pass through (let me pass through)!* Nu 20¹⁷ נִעְבְּרָה־נָא *may we be allowed to pass through!* Jer 40¹⁵ *let me go, I pray thee!* &c.; 2 S 16⁹; so after לֹא 2 S 18¹⁴; after לֹא־לִי 2 S 24¹⁴, Jer 17¹⁸, ψ 25² (לֹא־אֶבְוֹשָׁה) *let me not be ashamed*; cf. ψ 31^{2,18}, 71¹; 69¹⁵. After לֹא־נָא Jon 1¹⁴.

d 2. The cohortative in dependence on other moods, as well as in conditional sentences: (a) In dependence (with *wāw* copulative; ψ 9¹⁵ after לְמַעַן) on an imperative or jussive to express an intention or intended consequence, e. g. Gn 27⁴ *bring it to me, וְאֹכְלָהּ that I may eat, prop. then will I eat*; Gn 19⁵, 23⁴, 24⁵⁶, 27²⁵, 29²¹, 30^{25f.}, 42³⁴, 49¹, Dt 32¹, Ho 6¹, ψ 2⁸, 39¹⁴, Jb 10²⁰ *Q^{er}ê*; Is 5¹⁹ *and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come, וְנִרְעָה that we may know (it)!* Gn 26²⁸, 1 S 27⁵. Also after negative sentences, Gn 18^{30,32}, Ju 6³⁹, and after interrogative sentences, 1 K 22⁷, Is 40²⁵, 41²⁶, Am 8⁵.

e (b) In conditional sentences (with or without אִם) to express a contingent intention, e. g. Jb 16⁶ אִם־אֶרְבְּרָה *should I determine to speak, my grief is not assuaged, וְאֶחְרַלָּהּ and should I forbear, what am I eased?* without אִם Jb 19¹⁸, 30²⁶ (where, however, וְאֶחְרַלָּהּ is probably intended); ψ 73¹⁶ (unless וְאֶחְרַלָּהּ should be read), 139^{8f.}. After the 3rd person, Jb 11¹⁷ *though it be dark, &c.* So perhaps also 2 S 22³⁸ אֶרְדְּפָה *if I determined to pursue, then . . .*, but cf. ψ 18³⁸.

f (c) Likewise in the apodosis of conditional sentences, e. g. Jb 31^{7f.} *if my step hath turned out of the way . . . , אֶזְרָעָה then let me sow*; cf. 16^{4f.} *I also could speak as ye do, if . . . !* So even when the condition must be supplied from the context, e. g. ψ 40⁶ *else would I declare and speak of them*; 51¹⁸ *else would I (gladly) give it, i. e. if thou didst require it* (cf. the precisely similar וְאֶשָּׂא ψ 55¹³); Jb 6¹⁰. In the 1st plur. Jer 20¹⁰. To the same category belong the cohortatives after the formula expressing a wish כִּי־יִתְּנֵי , כִּי־יִתְּנֵי , e. g. Jer 9¹ *oh, that I had . . . , וְאֶעֱזָבָה then* (i. e. if I had) *should I (or would I) leave my people, &c.*; Ju 9²⁹; without *Wāw* Is 27⁴, ψ 55⁷, Jb 23⁴ (cf. also verse 7).

g Rem. 1. The question, whether a resolution formed under compulsion (a *necessity*) is also expressed by the cohortative (so, according to the prevailing opinion, in Is 38¹⁰ אֶלְכָּה ; Jer 3²⁵, 4^{19,21}, 6¹⁰, ψ 55^{3,18} (?); 57⁵, where, however, with Hupfeld, שְׂכַבָּה should be read; 77⁷, 88¹⁶, and in the 1st plur. Is 59¹⁰), is to be answered in the sense that in these examples the cohortative *form* is used after its meaning has become entirely lost, merely for the sake of its fuller sound, instead of the ordinary imperfect. This view is strongly



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

אֲלֵ-נָא); e. g. Ex 34³ אֲלֵ-יָדָא שִׁי אֵי *neither let any man be seen!* Pr 3⁷ *be not* (אֲלֵ-תְהִי) *wise in thine own eyes!* Jb 15³¹ אֲלֵ-יֶאֱמֵן *ne confidat.* In the form of a request (prayer), Dt 9²⁶ אֲלֵ-תִשְׁחַח *destroy not!* 1 K 2²⁰, ψ 27⁹, 69¹⁸.

d Rem. 1. The few examples of אֲלֵ with the jussive could at most have arisen from the attempt to moderate subsequently by means of the jussive (voluntative) form what was at first intended to be a strict command (אֲלֵ with imperf. indic.); probably, however, they are either cases in which the defective writing has been misunderstood (as in 1 K 2⁶, Ez 48¹⁴), or (as in Gn 24⁸) instances of the purely rhythmical jussive form treated below, under *k*. Moreover, cf. אֲלֵ יוֹסֵף Jo 2² and from the same verb Gn 4¹² (unless it is to be referred to *h*) and Dt 13¹. The same form, however, appears also to stand three times for the cohortative (see below), and in Nu 22¹⁹ for the ordinary imperfect (but see below, *i*). Thus it is doubtful whether an imaginary by-form of the ordinary imperf. is not intended by the Masora in all these cases, and whether consequently יוֹסֵף, &c., should not be restored.— On אֲלֵ-תַחֲוִים עֵינֶיךָ, &c., Dt 7¹⁶, 13⁹, &c., Ez 5¹¹, &c., cf. § 72 r, according to which תַחֲוִים should probably be read in every case.—The jussive appears in the place of the cohortative after אֲלֵ 1 S 14³⁶ (אֲלֵ-נִשְׁאַר) co-ordinated with two cohortatives), 2 S 17¹²; cf. Is 41²³ *Keth.* (וְנָרָא, i. e. וְנִרְאָה, after another cohortative); also (see above) אֲלֵ אֶסְפֶּךָ Dt 18¹⁶, Ho 9¹⁵, and even without אֲלֵ Ez 5¹⁶.

e 2. אֲלֵ with the jussive (or imperf., cf. § 107 *p*) is used sometimes to express the conviction that something cannot or should not happen; cf. Is 2⁹ (where, however, the text is very doubtful) וְאֲלֵ-תִשָּׂא לָהֶם *and thou canst not possibly forgive them* [R.V. *therefore forgive them not*]; ψ 34⁶, 41³, 50³, 121³ (אֲלֵ-יִתֵּן); Pr 3²⁵, Jb 5²² אֲלֵ-תִירָא *neither needest thou be afraid*; 20¹⁷, 40³².

f 2. The jussive depending on other moods, or in conditional sentences:

(a) Depending¹ (with *Wāw*) on an imperative or cohortative to express an intention or an assurance of a contingent occurrence, e. g. Gn 24⁵¹ *take her and go, and let her be* (וְתִהְיֶה prop. *and she will be*) . . . ; 30³, 31³⁷, 38²⁴, Ex 8⁴, 9¹³, 10¹⁷, 14², Jos 4¹⁶, Ju 6³⁰, 1 S 5¹¹, 7³, 1 K 21¹⁰, ψ 144⁵, Pr 20²², Jb 14⁶. Also after interrogative sentences, which include a demand, Est 7² (say) *what is thy desire . . . , וְתַעֲשֶׂה and it shall* (i. e. in order that it may) *be granted!* 1 K 22²⁰, Is 19¹², Jb 38^{34f}. Depending on a cohortative, e. g. Gn 19²⁰ אֲמַלְטָה נָא שְׂפָתַי *oh, let me escape thither . . .* וְתָחִי נַפְשִׁי *that my soul may live*; even after a simple imperf. (cf. below, *g*), 1 K 13³³ *whosoever would, he consecrated him . . . וְיִהְיֶה that he might be a priest* (read כִּהְיֶה) *of the high places*, but probably the LXX reading וְיִהְיֶה is to be preferred.

¹ This does not include the cases in which the jussive is not logically dependent on a preceding imperat., but is merely co-ordinated, e. g. Gn 20⁷, ψ 27¹⁴, &c.

Rem. In 2 Ch 35²¹ a negative final clause with לֹא־יִשְׁחָדֶךָ is dependent on an *g* imperative, *forbear from (meddling with) God . . . that he destroy thee not*. As a rule, however, negative final clauses are attached to the principal sentence by means of לֹא־יִשְׁחָדֶךָ and a following imperfect; so after an imperative, Gn 42², 1 K 14², 18⁴⁴; after a jussive, Ex 30²⁰, Neh 6⁹; after a perfect consec., Ex 28^{35.43}, 30¹², Nu 18⁵; after לֹא with an imperfect, Lv 10⁶, Nu 18³, Dt 17¹⁷ *neither shall he multiply wives unto himself* ($\text{וְלֹא יִסְוֹר לְבָבוֹ}$) *that his heart turn not away*; 1 S 20¹⁴, 2 S 21¹⁷, Jer 11²¹; after לֹא־יִשְׁחָדֶךָ with jussive, Lv 10⁹, 11⁴⁸, 16², 2 S 13²⁵, Jer 25⁶, 37²⁰, 38^{24 f.}; after the asseverative דִּמְעָה with the impft., Gn 14²³; even after a simple imperfect, Jer 10⁴ *with nails . . . they fasten it* (וְלֹא יִפְּיֵק) *that it move not*; after a participle, Jb 9⁷.

(b) Frequently in conditional sentences (as in Arabic), either in the *h* protasis or in the apodosis, cf. ψ 45¹² יִתְאוּ *should he desire . . . then . . .*; 104²⁰ וְיִהְיֶה . . . תְּשֶׁחַת *if thou makest darkness, then it is night*; so also in the protasis, Ex 22⁴, Lv 15²⁴, Is 41²⁸, Ez 14⁷ (וְיִעַל), Jb 34²⁹; in the apodosis, Ex 7⁹ *then will it (not, then shall it) become a serpent*; Pr 9⁹ after an imperat. in the protasis; Jb 10¹⁶, 13⁵, 22²⁸. In a negative apodosis, Gn 4¹² (לֹא־תִסְּרָה , but see above, *d*). In 2 K 6²⁷ אֶל־יִשְׁעֶךָ (*if the Lord do not help thee, &c.*) is to be explained as a jussive in a negative protasis.

Rem. Undoubtedly this use of the jussive (in conditional sentences) is based *l* on its original *voluntative* meaning; let something be so and so, then this or that must happen as a consequence. Certain other examples of the *jussive*, however, show that in the consciousness of the language the *voluntative* has in such cases become weakened almost to a *potential* mood, and hence the *jussive* serves to express facts which may happen *contingently*, or may be expected, e. g. Nu 22¹⁹ (מִה־יִסְּרָה , but cf. above, *d*); Jb 9³³ *there is no daysman betwixt us, that might lay* (יִשְׁתַּחַח , hence plainly a *subjunctive* = *qui ponat*; also in Nu 23¹⁹ וְיִכְזֹב *that he should lie* is probably intended as a jussive); Ec 5¹⁴; so after interrogative sentences, Jer 9¹¹ *who is the wise man*, וְיִבֵּן *qui intelligat hoc?*; Ho 14¹⁰.

Moreover, in not a few cases, the jussive is used, without any collateral *k* sense, for the ordinary imperfect form. and this occurs not alone in forms, which may arise from a misunderstanding of the defective writing, as Dt 28^{21.36}, 32⁸, 1 K 8¹, Is 12¹, Mi 3⁴, 5⁸, ψ 11⁶, 18¹², 21² *Qerê* (מִה־יִגְּלַל , *Keth. וְיִגְּלַל*), 25⁹, 47⁴, 90³, 91⁴, 107²⁹, Pr 15²⁵, Jb 13²⁷, 15³³, 18⁹, 20² . 27²², 33¹¹, 36¹⁴, 38²⁴, Ec 12⁶ (verse 7 יִשָּׁב , but immediately afterwards תִּשְׁבֶּה), Dn 5¹²,—but also in shortened forms, such as יִהְיֶה Gu 49¹⁷ (*Sam. וְיִהְיֶה*), Dt 28⁸, 1 S 10⁵, 2 S 5²⁴, Ho 6¹, 11⁴, Am 5¹⁴, Mi 1², Zp 2¹³, Zc 9⁵, ψ 72^{16 f.} (after other jussives), 104³¹, Jb 18¹², 20^{23.26.28}, 27⁸, 33²¹, 34³⁷, Ru 3⁴. This use of the jussive can hardly be due merely to poetic licence, but is rather to be explained on rhythmical grounds. In all the above-cited examples, in fact, the jussive stands at the beginning of the sentence (and hence removed as far as possible from the principal tone), in others it is immediately before the principal pause (Is 42⁶, 50², ψ 68¹⁵, Pr 23²⁵, Jb 24¹⁴, 29³, 40¹⁹), or actually *in* pause (Dt 32¹⁸, Jb 23^{9.11}, La 3⁵⁰), and is then a simply rhythmical shortening due to the strong influence of the tone. Moreover, since the jussive in numerous cases is not distinguished in form from the imperfect (§ 48 g), it is frequently doubtful which of the two the writer intended. This especially applies to those cases, in which a *subjunctive* is to be expressed by one or other of the forms (cf. § 107 k and m-x).

§ 110. The Imperative.

Mayer Lambert, 'Sur la syntaxe de l'impératif en hébreu,' in *REJ.* 1897, p. 106 ff.

- a* 1. The imperative,¹ which, according to § 46, is restricted to the 2nd pers. sing. and plur., and to *positive* commands, &c., may stand either alone, or in simple co-ordination (as in 1 K 18⁴⁴, Is 56¹, 65¹⁸) with other imperatives:
- (*a*) To express real commands, e. g. Gn 12¹ *get thee out of thy country*; or (like the jussive) mere admonitions (Ho 10¹²) and requests, 2 K 5²², Is 5³; on the addition of נָּ see below, Rem. 1. The imperative is used in the sense of an ironical challenge (often including a threat) in 1 K 2²² *ask for him the kingdom also*; 22¹⁵, Ju 10¹⁴, Is 47¹² (with נָּ), Jer 7²¹, Ez 20³⁹, Am 4⁴, Jb 38^{3f.}, 40^{10ff.}, La 4²¹. The imperative has a concessive sense in Na 3¹⁵ (though thou *make thyself many*, &c.), and in the cases discussed under *f*, e. g. Is 8^{9f.}, 29⁹.
- b* (*b*) To express permission, e. g. 2 S 18²³ after previous dissuasion, (then) *run* (as far as I am concerned)! Is 21¹², 45¹¹.
- c* (*c*) To express a distinct assurance (like our expression, *thou shalt have it*)² or promise, e. g. Is 65¹⁸ *but be ye glad*, &c. (i. e. ye will have continually occasion to be glad); and Is 37³⁰, ψ 110²; in a threat, Jer 2¹⁹. So especially in commands, the fulfilment of which is altogether out of the power of the person addressed, e. g. Is 54¹⁴ *be far from anxiety* (meaning, thou needst not fear any more); Gn 1²⁸, &c. (for other examples, such as 1 K 22¹², 2 K 5¹³, see below, *f*). Most clearly in the case of the *imperative Niph'al* with a passive meaning, e. g. Gn 42¹⁶ וַיִּבְרְחוּ וַיִּבְרְחוּ וַיִּבְרְחוּ *and ye shall be bound*; Dt 32⁵⁰, Is 49⁹ (Is 45²², see below, *f*).
- d* Rem. 1. The particle נָּ *age!* (§ 105) is frequently added to the imperative, as to the jussive, sometimes to soften down a command, or to make a request in a more courteous form (see above, *a*), Gn 12¹³, 24², sometimes to strengthen an exhortation uttered as a rebuke or threat (Nu 16²⁶, 20¹⁰) or in ridicule (Is 47¹²).
- e* 2. The imperative after the desiderative particle וַיִּ Gn 23¹³ (at the end of verses 5 and 14 also read וַיִּ for וַיִּ and join it to the following imperative) is due to an anacoluthon. Instead of the imperfect which would be expected here after וַיִּ, the more forcible imperative is used in a new sentence.
- f* 2. The imperative in logical dependence upon a preceding imperative, jussive (or cohortative), or an interrogative sentence, serves to

¹ On the close relation between the imperative and jussive (both in meaning and form), cf. § 46 and § 48 *i*.

² Like the threatening formulae in the Latin comic writers, e. g. *vapula*, Ter. Phorm. v. 6, 10 = *vapulare te iubeo*, Plaut. Curc. vi. 4, 12.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

the four forms of the 2nd fem. plur. imperative in Is 32¹¹, erroneously explained here in former editions, see now § 48 i). In Na 3¹⁵ the interchange of masc. and fem. serves to express totality (the nation in all its aspects). Cf., moreover, § 145 p on other noticeable attempts to substitute the corresponding masculine forms for the feminine.

§ 111. The Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive.

a 1. The imperfect with *wāw* consecutive (§ 49 a-g) serves to express actions, events, or states, which are to be regarded as the temporal or logical sequel of actions, events, or states mentioned immediately¹ before. The imperfect consecutive is used in this way most frequently as the *narrative tense*, corresponding to the Greek *aorist* or the Latin *historic perfect*. As a rule the narrative is introduced by a perfect, and then continued by means of imperfects with *wāw* consecutive (on this interchange of tenses cf. § 49 a, and especially § 11.2 a), e. g. Gn 3¹ *now the serpent was* (וַיְהִי) *more subtil . . . and he said* (וַיֹּאמֶר) *unto the woman*; 4¹, 6^{9ff.}, 10^{9f.}, 15¹⁹, 11^{12ff. 27ff.}, 14^{5f.}, 15^{1f.}, 16^{1f.}, 21^{1ff.}, 24^{1f.}, 25^{19ff.}, 36^{2ff.}, 37².

b Rem. 1. To this class belong some of the numerous *imperfects consec.* after various expressions of time, whenever such expressions are equivalent in meaning to a perfect² (viz. הָיָה *it came to pass*), e. g. Is 6¹ *in the year that king Uzziah died, I saw* (וַיֵּרָא), &c.; Gn 22⁴, 27³⁴, Ju 11¹⁶, 1 S 4^{19'}, 17⁵⁷, 21⁶, Ho 11¹: on the use of וַיְהִי to connect expressions of time, see below, *g.*—It is only in late books or passages that we find the simple *perfect* in a clause following an expression of time, as 1 S 17⁶⁵ (cf. Driver on the passage), 2 Ch 12⁷, 15⁸, &c., Dn 10¹¹, 15¹⁹; the *Perfect* after ׀ and the subject, 2 Ch 7¹.

c 2. The continuation of the narrative by means of the imperfect consec. may result in a series of any number of such imperfects, e. g. there are forty-nine in Gn. 1. As soon, however, as the connecting *Wāw* becomes separated from the verb to which it belongs, by the insertion of any word, the perfect necessarily takes the place of the imperfect, e. g. Gn 1⁵ *and God called* (וַיִּקְרָא) *the light Day, and the darkness he called* (וַיִּקְרָא לַלַּיְלָה לַיְלָה) *Night*; verse 10, 2²⁰, 11³ and frequently.

d 3. Of two co-ordinate *imperfects consecutive* the former (as equivalent to a temporal clause) is most frequently subordinate in sense to the latter, e. g. Gn 28^{8f.} וַיֵּלֶךְ . . . וַיֵּרָא עֵשָׂו *when Esau saw that . . . , he went, &c.*; so also, frequently וַיִּשְׁמַע, &c., Gn 37²¹, &c. On the other hand, a second *imperfect consecutive* is seldom used in an explanatory sense, e. g. Ex 2¹⁰ (וַתֹּאמֶר *for she said*); cf. 1 S 7¹². Other examples of the imperfect consecutive, which apparently represent a progress in the narrative, in reality only refer to the same time, or explain what precedes, see Gn 2²⁵ (וַיְהִי *they were*; but Jos 4⁹, 1 K 8⁸ *they are*); Gn 36¹⁴ (וַתֵּלֶךְ), 36³² (וַיִּמְלֵךְ), 1 K 1⁴⁴.

¹ On an apparent exception (the *imperf. consec.* at the beginning of whole books) see § 49 b note.

² Cf. Is 45⁴, where the *imperf. consec.* is joined to an abrupt statement of the cause, and Jb 36⁷, where it is joined to an abrupt statement of the place.

4. The imperfect consecutive sometimes has such a merely external connexion with an immediately preceding perfect, that in reality it represents an antithesis to it, e.g. Gn 32³¹ *and (yet) my life is preserved*; 2 S 3⁸ *and yet thou chargest me*; Jb 10⁸, 32³; similarly in dependence on noun-clauses, Pr 30²⁵ ff.

2. The introduction of independent narratives, or of a new section *f* of the narrative, by means of an *imperfect consecutive*, likewise aims at a connexion, though again loose and external, with that which has been narrated previously. Such a connexion is especially often established by means of וַיְהִי (καὶ ἐγένετο) *and it came to pass*, after which there then follows either (most commonly) an *imperfect consecutive* (Gn 4^{3,8}, 8⁶, 11², Ex 12²⁹, 13¹⁷, &c.), or *Wāw* with the perfect (separated from it), Gn 7¹⁰, 15¹², 22¹, 27³⁰, or even a perfect without *Wāw* (Gn 8¹³, 14^{1f.}, 40¹, Ex 12⁴¹, 16²², Nu 10¹¹, Dt 1³, 1 S 18³⁰, 2 K 8²¹, &c.), or finally a noun-clause introduced by *Wāw*, Gn 41¹.

Rem. 1. This loose connexion by means of וַיְהִי¹ is especially common, *g* when the narrative or a new section of it begins with any expression of time, see above, *b*; cf., in addition to the above-mentioned examples (e.g. Gn 22¹ *and it came to pass after these things, that God did prove Abraham*), the similar cases in Gn 19³⁴, 21²², 1 S 11¹¹, Ru 1¹. Elsewhere the statement of time is expressed by וְ or וְ with an infinitive (Gn 12¹⁴, 19^{17,29} 39¹³, 15^{18f.}, Ju 16²⁵) or by an independent sentence with the perfect (equivalent to a pluperfect, cf. § 106 *f*), e.g. Gn 15¹⁷, 24¹⁵, 27³⁰, or by a temporal clause introduced by כִּי *when*, Gn 26⁸, 27¹, Ju 16¹⁶, כִּי אֲשַׁר *when*, Gn 12¹¹, 20¹³, מֵאָז *from the time that*, Gn 39⁵; or, finally, by a noun-clause (cf. § 116 *u*), e.g. 2 K 13²¹ וַיְהִי יָהֵם קִבְּרִים אִישׁ *and it came to pass, as they were (just) burying a man (prop. they burying), that . . .*; Gn 42³⁵, 2 K 2¹¹ (the apodosis in both these cases being introduced by וַיְהִי); 1 S 7¹⁰, 2 S 13³⁰, 2 K 6^{5,26}, 19³⁷ (= Is 37³⁸).—In 1 S 10¹¹, 11¹¹, 2 S 2²³, 15² a noun standing absolutely follows וַיְהִי (as the equivalent of a complete sentence; see below, *h*), and then an *imperfect consecutive* follows.

2. Closely related to the cases noticed in *g* are those in which the *imperfect consecutive*, even without a preceding וַיְהִי, introduces the apodosis either—*h* (a) to whole sentences, or (b) to what are equivalent to whole sentences, especially to nouns standing absolutely. As in certain cases of the *perfect consecutive* (see § 112 *x*), so the *imperfect consecutive* has here acquired a sort of independent force. Cf. for (a) 1 S 15²³ *because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord*, וַיִּמְאַסֶּךָ *he hath rejected thee* (cf. Nu 14¹⁶, Is 48⁴, where the causal clause precedes in the form of an infinitive with preposition), Ex 9²¹; for (b) Gn 22²⁴ וּפְלִגְשׁוֹ *and (as to) his concubine . . .*, וַתִּלְבָּד *she bare*, &c.; Ex 38²⁴, Nu 14^{36f.}, 1 S 14¹⁹, 17²⁴, 2 S 4¹⁰, 19⁴¹ *Keth.*, 21¹⁶, 1 K 9^{20f.}, 12¹⁷, 2 K 25²², Jer 6¹⁹, 28⁸, 33²⁴, 44²⁵.²—In 1 K 15¹³, 2 K 16¹⁴ the preceding noun, used absolutely, is even regarded as the object of the following imperfect consecutive, and is therefore introduced by אֲשֶׁר.

¹ Exhaustive statistics of the use of וַיְהִי in its many and various connexions are given by König in *ZAW*. 1899, p. 260 ff.

² Cf. the Mēša' inscription, l. 5 (*Omri*) *the king of Israel*, וַיַּעֲנוּ *he oppressed Moab*, &c.—The peculiar imperfect consecutive in Gn 30^{27b} (in the earlier editions explained as equivalent to an object-clause) arises rather from a pregnant brevity of expression: *I have observed and have come to the conclusion, the Lord hath blessed me*, &c.—In Gn 27³⁴ read, with LXX, וַיְהִי before בְּשִׁמְעֵי.

- i* 3. The *imperfect consecutive* serves, in the cases treated under *a-h*, to represent either expressly, or at least to a great extent, a *chronological* succession of actions or events; elsewhere it expresses those actions, &c., which represent the logical consequence of what preceded, or a result arising from it by an inherent necessity. Thus the *imperfect consecutive* is used—
- k* (a) As a final summing up of the preceding narrative, e.g. Gn 2¹, 23²⁰ וְהָיָה הַשָּׂדֶה וְהָאֵלֶּם וְהָאֵלֶּם וְהָאֵלֶּם so (in this way) *the field became* (legally) *the property of Abraham*, &c.; 1 S 17⁵⁰, 31⁶.
- l* (b) To express a logical or necessary consequence of that which immediately precedes, e.g. Gn 39², Jb 2³ and *he still holdeth fast his integrity*, וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ so that thou thus (as it now appears) *groundlessly movedst me against him*; ψ 65⁹ so that they are afraid . . .; even a consequence which happens conditionally, Jer 20¹⁷ וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ so that my mother should have been . . . Another instance of the kind perhaps (if the text be correct) is Jer 38⁹ וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ so that he dies (must die).
- m* Rem. Such consecutive clauses frequently occur after interrogative sentences, e.g. Is 51¹² who art thou (i.e. art thou so helpless), וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ that thou art (must needs be) afraid? ψ 144⁹ (cf. ψ 8⁵, where in a very similar context כִּי that is used with the imperfect); Gn 12¹⁹ (וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ); 31²⁷ וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ so that I might have sent thee away.
4. As regards the range of time it is to be carefully noticed—
- n* (a) That the *imperfect consecutive* may represent all varieties in the relations of tense and mood, which, according to § 107 *a*, follow from the idea of the imperfect;
- o* (b) That the more precise determination of the range of time to which an *imperfect consecutive* relates must be inferred in each case from the character of the preceding tense (or tense-equivalent), to which it is attached, in a more or less close relation, as temporal or logical sequence. Thus the *imperfect consecutive* serves—
- p* (1) To represent actions, events, or states, which are *past* (or were repeated in past time), when it is united with tenses, or their equivalents, which refer to an actual past.
- q* Cf. the examples given above, under *a* and *f*, of the imperfect consecutive as an historic tense. The imperfect consecutive also frequently occurs as the continuation of a perfect (*preterite*) in a subordinate clause; e.g. Gn 27¹, Nu 11²⁰, Dt 4³⁷, 1 S 8⁸, 1 K 2⁵, 11³³, 18¹³, &c.; also in Is 49⁷ וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ is the continuation of a preterite, contained, according to the sense, in the preceding וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ.—In Jb 31^{26.34} the imperfect consecutive is joined to an imperfect denoting the past in a conditional sentence. An imperfect consecutive occurs in dependence on a perfect which has the sense of a pluperfect (§ 106 *f*), e.g. in Gn 26¹⁸, 28^{6 f.}, 31^{19.34} (now Rachel had taken the teraphim, וְהָיָה כִּי תִּבְרָךְ אֶתְּחַלְּלֶנּוּ and had



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

13^{15,17 ff.}, 22^{7 ff.}, Jo 2²³, Mi 2¹³, Ez 33^{4,6}, ψ 7¹³, 64^{8 ff.};—(γ) a future participle, Jer 4¹⁶.¹

α Rem. An imperfect consecutive in dependence on a perfect or imperfect, which represents an action occurring only conditionally, is likewise used only in a hypothetical sense, e. g. Jb 9¹⁶ וְיַעֲנֵנִי אִם־קָרָאתִי אֵלַי if I had called, and he had answered me, yet . . .; ψ 139¹¹ אִם־אֶמַּר if I should say (previously, in verse 8 f., hypothetical imperfects are used).—In Is 48^{18 f.} an imperfect consecutive occurs in dependence on a sentence expressing a wish introduced by אִלֵּן *utinam* (וְיִהְיֶה and it, or so that it were, equivalent to *then should it be*). Cf. also the examples mentioned above, under *l* (Jer 20¹⁷) and *m* (Gn 31²⁷), where the imperfect consecutive expresses facts occurring *contingently*.

§ 112. The Perfect with Wāw Consecutive.

G. R. Berry, 'Waw consecutive with the perfect in Hebrew,' in *Bibl. Lit.*, xxii. (1903), pp. 60-69.

a 1. The perfect, like the imperfect (§ 111), is used with *wāw consecutive* (cf. § 49 a; on the external differentiation of the perfect consecutive by a change in the position of the tone, see § 49 h) to express actions, events, or states, which are to be attached to what precedes, in a more or less close relation, as its *temporal* or *logical* consequence. And as, according to § 111 a, the narrative which begins with a perfect, or its equivalent, is continued in the imperfect consecutive, so, vice versa, the perfect consecutive forms the regular continuation to a preceding imperfect, or its equivalent.

b Rem. 1. This alternation of perfect and imperfect or their equivalents is a striking peculiarity of the *consecutio temporum* in Hebrew. It not only affords a certain compensation for the lack of forms for tenses and moods, but also gives to Hebrew style the charm of an expressive variety, an action conceived as being still in progress (*imperfect, &c.*), reaching afterwards in the *perfect* a calm and settled conclusion, in order to be again exhibited in movement in the imperfect, and vice versa.² The strict regularity of this

¹ Also in Jer 51²⁹ the imperfects consecutive are attached to the threat virtually contained in the preceding imperatives. On the other hand וְיִהְיֶה Ho 8¹⁰ would be very remarkable as expressing a future; the text is, however, certainly corrupt, and hence the Cod. Babyl. and the Erfurt MS. 3 endeavour to remedy it by וְיִהְיֶה, and Ewald reads וְיִהְיֶה.—In Ez 28¹⁶ (cf. Jer 15^{6 f.}) וְיִהְיֶה appears to announce an action irrevocably determined upon, and therefore represented as already accomplished; cf. the prophetic perfects in verse 17 ff.

² It is difficult to give a proper explanation of this phenomenon (according to § 49 a, note, to be found only in the Canaanitish group of languages), when we have given up the theory of a special *wāw conversivum* in the unscientific sense mentioned in § 49 b, note, at the end, and if we accept the fact that the *perfect* and *imperfect consecutive* cannot possibly be used in a way which contradicts their fundamental character as described in §§ 106 and 107. In other words, even the *perfect consecutive* originally represents a finally completed action, &c., just as the *imperfect consecutive* represents an action which

alternation belongs indeed rather to the higher style, and even then it depends upon the view and intention of the speaker, whether he wishes the action, &c., to be regarded as the logical consequence of what has preceded, or as simply co-ordinate with it, and so in the same tense.

2. A succession of any number of other *perfects consecutive* may be co-ordinated with a *perfect consecutive* (cf. e. g. Ez 14¹³, Am 5¹⁹, Ru 3³, four perfects in each case, Is 8⁷ five, Ex 6^{6f.} eight). It is true, however, of the perfect (as conversely of the *imperfect*, § 111 c), that as soon as the *Wāw* is separated by any intervening word from the verb to which it belongs, an *imperfect* necessarily takes the place of the *perfect*, e. g. Gn 12¹² when the Egyptians shall see thee, they shall say (וַאֲמַרְוּ), This is his wife: and they will kill me (וַיְהַרְגוּ אֹתִי) but thee they will save alive (וַיַּחְיֶיךָ).

2. The perfect consecutive, like the imperfect consecutive, always *d* belongs to the period of time expressed by the preceding tense, or its equivalent, with which it is connected as the temporal or logical consequence. The particular cases may be classed under three heads: (a) the perfect consecutive in *immediate* dependence (see *e*), (b) in loose connexion (see *x*) with the preceding, and (c) the perfect consecutive at the beginning of the apodosis to other sentences, or their equivalents (see *f*).

3. The perfect consecutive in immediate dependence on the preceding tense, or its equivalent, serves

(a) As a frequentative tense to express *past* actions, &c., i. e. actions repeatedly brought to a conclusion in the past, and follows tenses, or their equivalents, representing actions which have *continued* or been *repeated in the past*:

(a) After a simple imperfect, e. g. Gn 2⁶ וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶרֶץ there went up a mist (again and again) from the earth, וַיִּשְׁקֶה and watered (as it were, and ever watered afresh), &c. This frequentative use of the perfect consecutive is equally evident after frequentative imperfects, Gn 2¹⁰ (וַיְהִי וַיִּהְיֶה and it became again every time; וַיְהִי would mean, and it became so once for all); 29^{2f.} (four perfects consecutive referring to actions repeated daily); Ex 33⁷⁻¹¹ וַיִּקַּח he used to take at each new encampment the tent, וַיִּנָּח and to pitch it again every time without the camp; notice, amongst the numerous frequent. perff. consec., the imperf. in vv. 7, 8, 9, 11, always in a frequentative sense; 34^{34f.}, Nu 9^{19.21} (among several simple imperfects), 10¹⁷, Ju 2¹⁹, 1 S 2¹⁹ וַיַּעֲשֶׂה

is only beginning, becoming or still continuing, and hence in any case incomplete. The simplest view is to suppose, that the use of the *perfect consecutive* originated from those cases, in which it had to express the conclusion (or final consequence) of an action which was continued (or repeated) *in past time* (see the examples above), and that this use was afterwards extended to other cases, in which it had to represent the temporal or logical consequence of actions, &c., still in progress, and thus in the end a regular interchange of the two tenses became recognized.

she used to make . . . וְהֵעֲלָתָהּ and brought it to him from year to year ; 27⁹ (וְלִקְחָהּ), 1 K 14²⁸, 2 K 3²⁵, 12¹⁵ (in verses 16¹ imperfects occur again). So also in dependent sentences, Gn 6⁴ (וַיִּלְדְּוּ as a continuation of וַיִּבְאֵוּ), Jb 31²⁹.¹

f (β) After an imperfect consecutive, e. g. Ex 39³ (Samaritan וְקִצְצוּ), 1 S 5⁷ (? see § 112 rr), 7¹⁶, 2 S 15^{2.5}, 16¹³ and he threw stones at him, וְעָפַר and cast dust continually ; 12^{16.31}, 2 K 6¹⁰, 12^{11 ff. 15}, Jer 37¹⁵, Jb 1⁵.

g Rem. The frequentative perfect consecutive is sometimes joined even with imperfects consecutive which simply express one *single* action or occurrence in the past ; thus Ex 18²⁶, 4c^{31f.}, 1 S 1⁴, 2 S 15^{1f.}, 1 K 14²⁷ (cf. verse 28) ; 1 K 18⁴, 2 K 12¹⁰. For other examples of a loosely connected frequentative perfect consecutive, see below, *dd*.

h (γ) After a perfect, Gn 37³ (וְעָשָׂה לוֹ, i. e. as often as he needed a new garment)² ; Gn 31⁷, Nu 11⁸, 1 S 16¹⁴, 2 K 3⁴, ψ 22⁶ ;³ in interrogative sentences, 1 S 26⁹ *who has ever*, &c. ; ψ 80¹³, Jb 1^{1.4}, Ru 4⁷.

i (δ) After an infinitive, Am 1¹¹ עַל-רָדְפוֹ because he did pursue his brother, וְשָׁחַת and (on each occasion) did cast off all pity (then an imperfect consecutive) ; after an infinitive absolute, Jos 6¹³, 2 S 13¹⁹, Jer 23¹⁴.

k (ε) After a participle, Is 6³ (וְקָרָא), &c., frequentative, as a continuation of עֲמָרִים, verse 2) ; 1 S 2²², 2 S 17¹⁷.⁴

l (ζ) After other equivalents of tenses, e. g. Gn 47²² the priests had a portion from Pharaoh, וַיֹּאכְלוּ and did eat (year by year), &c. ; 1 K 4⁷.

m (b) To express *present* actions, &c., as the temporal or logical consequence of actions or events which continue or are repeated in the present, especially such as have, according to experience, been at all times frequently repeated, and may be repeated at any time :

(a) After a simple imperfect, e. g. Gn 2²⁴ therefore a man leaves (וַיֵּצֵא is accustomed to leave) . . . וְרִבֵּק and cleaves, &c., here, as frequently elsewhere, clearly with the secondary idea of purpose, i. e. in order to cleave ; Is 5¹¹ (if וְהָיָה is to be taken as a continuation

¹ Also in Ez 44¹² (where Stade, *ZAW.* v. 293, would read שָׂרְתוּ and וַיִּהְיוּ) the unusual tenses may have been intentionally chosen : *because they continually ministered and so always became afresh . . .*

² Driver, on this passage, rightly refers to 1 S 2¹⁹.

³ Am 4⁷ would also come under this head, if וְהִמְטַרְתִּי is really intended, and the statement refers to the past ; מִנְעָתִי might, however, also be a perfect expressing positive assurance (§ 106 m), and the passage would then come under s.

⁴ That וְהִלְכָהּ, &c., are frequentatives (*the maidservant used to go repeatedly and tell them*) may be seen from וַיִּלְכוּ (necessarily an imperfect, since it is separated from וְ by הֵם) and וַיִּנְכְּלוּ ; on the other hand in verse 18 וַיִּרְא וַיִּלְכוּ of actions which happened only once.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

maiden which cometh forth (הַיְצֵאתָ) . . . , וְאָמַרְתִּי אֵלֶיָּהּ, to whom I shall say . . . , וְאָמַרָהּ and she (then) shall say, &c. This use of the perfect consecutive is especially frequent after a participle introduced by הִנֵּה, e.g. Gn 6^{17 f.}; with a different subject 1 K 20³⁶, Am 6¹⁴; after a complete noun-clause introduced by הִנֵּה (cf. § 140), Ex 3¹³ behold, I come (i.e. if I shall come) . . . וְאָמַרְתִּי לָהֶם and shall say unto them . . . , וְאָמְרוּ and they (then) shall say, &c.; 1 S 14^{8 ff.}, Is 7¹⁴, 8^{7 f.}, 39⁶.

u (ז) After an infinitive absolute, whether the infinitive absolute serves to strengthen the finite verb (see § 113 t), e.g. Is 31⁵, or is used as an emphatic substitute for a cohortative or imperfect (§ 113 dd and ee), e.g. Lv 2⁶, Dt 1¹⁶, Is 5⁵, Ez 23^{46 f.}

v (ח) After an infinitive construct governed by a preposition (for this change from the infinitive construction to the finite verb, cf. § 114 r), e.g. 1 S 10⁸ לְךָ וְהוֹדַעְתִּי לְךָ עַד-בּוֹאִי אֵלֶיךָ till I come unto thee (prop. until my coming) and show thee, &c.; Gn 18²⁵, 27⁴⁵, Ju 6¹⁸, Ez 39²⁷; cf. 1 K 2^{37.42}.

w Rem. To the same class belong 1 S 14²⁴, where the idea of time precedes, until it be evening and until I be avenged, &c., and Is 5⁸, where the idea of place precedes, in both cases governed by עַד.

x 4. The very frequent use of the perfect consecutive in direct dependence upon other tenses (see above, d-v) explains how it finally obtained a kind of independent force—especially for the purpose of announcing future events—and might depend loosely on sentences to which it stood only in a wider sense in the relation of a temporal or logical consequence. Thus the perfect consecutive is used—

(a) To announce *future* events, &c., in loose connexion with a further announcement, e.g. Gn 41³⁰ וְקָמוּ and two co-ordinate perfects consecutive, equivalent to *but then shall arise*, &c.; frequently so after הִנֵּה with a following substantive (1 S 9⁸), or a participial clause (cf. the analogous instances above, under t), e.g. 1 S 2³¹ behold, the days come, וְגִדַעְתִּי that I will cut off, &c.; Is 39⁶, Am 4², 8¹¹, 9¹³, and very often in Jeremiah; after an expression of time, Ex 17⁴, Is 10²⁵, 29¹⁷, Jer 51³³, Ho 1⁴. Further, when joined to a statement concerning present or past facts, especially when these contain the reason for the action, &c., expressed in the perfect consecutive; cf. Is 6⁷ lo, this hath touched thy lips, וְסָר therefore thine iniquity shall be taken away, &c. (not copulative and it is taken away, since it is parallel with a simple imperfect), Gn 20¹¹, 26²², Ju 13³ (here in an adversative sense); Ho 8¹⁴. In loose connexion with a noun-clause, a long succession of perfects consecutive occurs in Ex 6^{6 ff.}. Also in Amos 5²⁶ וְנִשְׂאָתֶם may be an announcement *yea, ye shall take up*; but cf. below, rr.

Rem. 1. Very frequently the announcement of a future event is attached *y* by means of וְהָיָה¹ and it shall come to pass (cf. the analogous continuation in the past by means of וַיְהִי, § 111, 2), after which the event announced (sometimes after a long parenthesis) follows in one or more (co-ordinate) perfects consecutive, Gn 9¹⁴, 12¹² (וְהָיָה כִּי = *if*, as in 46³³, Ex 1¹⁰, 22²⁶ and frequently), 1 K 18¹², Is 14^{3 f.}, Am 8⁹; or in the imperfect, Gn 4¹⁴, Is 2², 3²⁴, 4³, 7^{18.21 f.} (cf. 29⁸); or in the jussive, Lv 14⁹. It very rarely happens that the verb which is thus loosely added, agrees in gender and number with the following subject, as in Nu 5²⁷, Jer 42¹⁶ וְהָיָתָה (before הַחֶרֶב), and in Jer 42¹⁷ וַיְהִי (before כָּל-הָאֲנָשִׁים).

2. The jussive form וַיְהִי occurs (in the sense described in *y*) instead of וְהָיָה *z* in 1 S 10⁵, 2 S 5²⁴ (1 Ch 14¹⁵), 1 K 14⁵, Ru 3⁴, although in the first three places a jussive is wholly inadmissible in the context, and even in Ru 3⁴ (where an admonition follows) וְהָיָה would be expected (see below, *bb*). In 1 K 14⁵ the form is a textual error, and the pointing should simply be וַיְהִי. In the other passages וַיְהִי (always before an infinitive with a preposition) stands at the beginning of the sentence at an unusually long distance from the principal tone, and hence is certainly to be explained according to § 109 *k*, except that in 1 S 10⁵, &c., the simply rhythmical jussive form takes the place, not of the full imperfect form, but (exceptionally) of the perfect consecutive.

(*b*) To introduce a command or wish: Dt 10¹⁹ *love ye therefore the aa stranger*; 1 S 6⁵, 24¹⁶, 1 K 2⁶ (in Gn 40¹⁴ the precative perfect consecutive, as elsewhere the cohortative, jussive, and imperative, is strengthened by means of נָּ). So, also, in loose connexion with participial and other noun-clauses (see above, *x*), Gn 45^{12 f.}, 1 K 2^{2 f.}, Ru 3^{3 f.}, 3⁹.—In Gn 17¹¹ the perfect consecutive (וְנִמְלְתֶם and *ye shall be circumcised*, &c.) is used to explain a preceding command.

Rem. As in the cases mentioned above under *y*, the connexion may be *bb* made by means of וְהָיָה. Thus with a following perfect consecutive, e.g. Gn 46³³, 47²⁴, Ju 4²⁰. Cf. also Gn 24¹⁴, where the real wish, at least as regards the sense, is contained in the next sentence.

(*c*) To introduce a question, whether in loose connexion with *cc* another interrogative sentence (see above, *p*), e.g. Gn 29¹⁵ *art thou my brother* (equivalent to, *Surely thou art*), וְעַבְדְּתָנִי and *shouldest thou then serve me for naught?* or with a positive statement, e.g. Ex 5⁵ (וְהִשְׁבַּתֶּם will *ye then make them rest?*); Nu 16¹⁰, 1 S 25¹¹, and (if it is *Mil'ra'*) ψ 50²¹ (וְהִחַרְשֵׁתִי).

(*d*) To introduce actions frequently repeated (hence analogous to *dd* the numerous examples of a frequentative perfect consecutive, above, under *e*), e.g. 1 S 1³ (וְעָלָה of annual festival journeys); 13²¹ (where, however, the text appears radically corrupt); 27⁹ (וְהָפָה, i.e. every time, therefore continued by means of וְלֹא יִחַיָּה); 1 K 5⁷ (וְכִלְכְּלוּ,

¹ On the various combinations with וְהָיָה see König's statistics in *ZAW*. xix. 272 ff.

parallel with a simple imperfect); 9²⁵, Jer 25⁴, Ho 12¹¹, Dn 8⁴.—In Jb 1^{4f} a series of frequentative perfects consecutive is interrupted by an imperfect consecutive, while a simple imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae*) forms the conclusion. In Jer 6¹⁷ a similar perfect is expressly marked, by placing the tone on the final syllable (according to § 49 h), as parallel with the real perfects consecutive.

ee Rem. The loose connexion of *tempora frequentativa* by וְהָיָה (cf. the Rem. on y and bb) is also very common in this sense; thus with a following perfect consecutive, Gn 30^{41f}. (but in verse 42^a, where the verb is separated from the *Wāw* by an insertion, we find לֹא יָשָׂם he used not to put them in, according to § 107 e); Gn 38⁹, Ex 17¹¹, 33^{7ff}. (see above, e), Nu 21⁹, Ju 6³, 19³⁰, 1 S 16²³ (followed by five perfects consecutive); 2 S 15⁵; with a following imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae*), Ju 2¹⁹, 2 S 14²⁶.—In Ju 12^{5f}. וְהָיָה, contrary to what would be expected, is continued by means of the imperfect consecutive, and in 1 S 13²² by וְהָיָה with the perfect (instead of the imperfect).

ff 5. Further, the perfect consecutive is very frequently employed with a certain emphasis to introduce the apodosis after sentences (or their equivalents) which contain a condition, a reason, or a statement of time. Such an apodosis, as in the cases already treated, may represent either future events, or commands and wishes, or even events which have been often repeated in the past. Thus—

(a) The perfect consecutive occurs in the apodosis to conditional sentences¹ (§ 159 g, o, s):

(a) After וְהָיָה with the imperfect, e. g. 2 K 7^{4b} וְהָיָה אִם יָמִיתֵנוּ וְנָמִיתֵנוּ if they kill us, (well then) we shall but die; here the perfect consecutive is used obviously with greater emphasis than the imperfect (וְהָיָה) which immediately precedes; Gn 18²⁶, 24^{8.41}, 32⁹, Nu 30¹⁵, Ju 4²⁰, 1 S 1¹¹, 20⁶, 1 K 3¹⁴, Na 3¹², Ec 4¹¹.

gg (β) After וְהָיָה with the perfect (in the sense of a *futurum exactum*), Nu 5²⁷, 2 K 5²⁰, 7^{4a}, Is 4^{4f}; as precativ apodosis after אִם־וְהָיָה with the *perf. preteritum*, Gn 33¹⁰; as a frequentative perfect consecutive, to represent past events in the apodosis after וְהָיָה with a perfect, Gn 38⁹, Nu 21⁹, Ju 6³, Jb 7⁴; after וְהָיָה with imperfect, Gn 31⁸.

hh (γ) After וְ (in case, suppose that) with the imperfect, Gn 12¹², Ex 18¹⁶, Ju 13¹⁷, Is 58⁷, Ez 14¹³.² Frequentative with reference to the past, after וְ with frequentative perfect, Ju 2¹⁸, Jb 7^{13f}.

¹ In a number of the examples of this kind the protasis is already loosely connected by means of וְהָיָה, and hence some of them had to be already mentioned above, under y, bb, ee.

² In 1 S 24¹⁹ a question appears to be expressed by the perfect consecutive, for if a man find his enemy, will he let him go well away? Probably, however, with Klostermann, וְהָיָה should be read for וְהָיָה.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

&c. (so Ju 19³⁰, 2 S 20¹²), with a frequentative perfect consecutive. The perfect consecutive is very frequently used to announce future actions or events after simple expressions of time of any kind; thus Gn 3⁵, Ex 32³⁴ (after בְּיָמָיו with the infinitive), cf. also such examples as Gn 44³¹, Ju 16², Jos 6¹⁰, 1 S 1²², 16²³ (numerous frequentative perfects consecutive after the infinitive with a preposition; so 2 S 15⁵, see above, *ee*); 1 S 20¹⁸, 2 S 14²⁶, 15¹⁰, Is 18⁵; moreover, Ex 17⁴, Is 10²⁵, 29¹⁷, 37²⁶; even after single disconnected words, e. g. Ex 16⁶ $\text{עָרַב עַם יִרְעָמוּ}$ at even (when it becomes evening) then ye shall know; cf. verse 7, Lv 7¹⁶, 1 K 13³¹, Pr 24²⁷.

pp 6. Finally there still remains a number of passages which cannot be classed with any of those hitherto mentioned. Of these, some are due to the influence of Aramaic modes of expression, while in others the text is evidently corrupt.¹ In a few instances we can do no more than merely call attention to the incorrectness of the expression. (We are not of course concerned here with the cases—usually occurring in dependent clauses—in which a 2nd pers. *perf.* with Wāw copulative is simply co-ordinate with what precedes, as in Gn 28⁶, and probably Nu 21¹⁵, Dt 33².)

(a) The influence of the Aramaic construction of the perfect with וַי as the narrative tense, instead of the Hebrew imperfect consecutive (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 71 b), is certainly to be traced in *Qoheleth*, and sporadically in other very late books,² perhaps also in a few passages in the books of Kings, which are open to the suspicion of being due to later interpolation; so probably 1 K 12³² וַיְהִי עִמֵּיךְ ; 2 K 11¹ *Keth.* וּרְאֵתָה ; 14¹⁴ וַיִּלְקַח (in the parallel passage, 2 Ch 25²⁴, the word is wanting); 2 K 23⁴ וַיִּשְׁפֹּא , &c.; verse 10 וַיִּטְמֵא , &c.; verse 12 וַיְהִי שְׁלֵיךְ , &c.; verse 15 וַיִּשְׁרַף , &c.³ Cf. also Ez 37^{2.7.10}.

qq (b) The text is certainly corrupt in Is 40⁶ (read with the LXX and Vulgate

¹ Mayer Lambert, *REJ.* xxvi. 55, is probably right in pointing some of these forms as *infin. abs.* instead of *perfects*.

² In the whole of *Qoheleth* the imperfect consecutive occurs only in 1¹⁷ and 4^{1.7}. Several of the perfects with וַי can no doubt be explained as frequentatives, e. g. 1¹³, 2^{5.9.11.13.15}, 5¹⁸, compared with 6²; but this is impossible in such passages as 9¹⁴ ff. In *Ezra*, Driver reckons only six examples of the historical perfect with וַי , in *Nehemiah* only six, and in *Esther* six or seven.

³ Stade in *ZAW.* v. 291 ff. and in *Ausgewählte akad. Reden*, Giessen, 1899, p. 194 ff. and appendix p. 199, discusses, in connexion with 2 K 12¹², a number of critically questionable perfects with וַי . He considers that the whole section, 2 K 23⁴ from וַיִּשְׁפֹּא to verse 5 inclusive, is to be regarded as a gloss, since the continuation of an imperfect consecutive by means of a perfect with וַי never occurs in pre-exilic documents, except in places where it is due to corruption of the original text. The theory of frequentative perfects consecutive (even immediately after imperfects consecutive), which has been supported above, under *f* and *g*, by a large number of examples, is quite inconsistent with the character of the action in 2 K 23⁵ וַיְהִי שְׁבִית , verse 8 וַיִּתֵּן , and verse 14 וַיִּשְׁבֵּר .

וְאָמַר); Jer 38²⁸, where the narrative breaks off in the middle of the sentence; 40³ (וְהָיָה, &c., wanting in the LXX); also in Ju 7¹³ וְנִפְלַח הָאֵהָל is altogether redundant; in 1 S 3¹³ read, with Klostermann, the 2nd sing. masc. instead of וְהִגְדַּתִּי; in 1 K 21¹² וְהִשְׁבִּיבוּ is, no doubt, incorrectly repeated from verse 9, where it is an imperative.

Of other questionable instances, (α) the following, at any rate, may also be *rr* explained as frequentatives, Gn 21²⁵, 49²³, Ex 36³⁸, 38²⁸, 39³, 1 S 5⁷, 17²⁰, 24¹¹ (but even so וְאָמַר would be expected); 2 K 23¹², Is 28²⁶ (parallel with an imperfect); Am 5²⁶ (unless it is rather, *yea, ye shall take up*; see above, x); ψ 26³, Ez 8³⁶.

(β) A longer or constant continuance in a past state is perhaps represented *ss* by the perfect with ו (as a variety of the frequentative perfect with ו), in Gn 15⁶, 34⁵, Nu 21²⁰, Jos 9¹², 22^{3b}, Is 22¹⁴, Jer 3⁹. But the unusual *perfects consec.* in Jos 15³⁻¹¹, 16²⁻⁸ (ultimately parallel with an imperf. as in 17⁹, 18²⁰), 18¹²⁻²¹, 19^{11-14.22.26-29.34}, are without doubt rightly explained by Bennett (*SBOT.*, Joshua, p. 23) as originally containing the directions either of God to Joshua or of Joshua to the people; cf. the evident trace of this in 15^{4b}. A redactor transformed the directions into a description but left the *perfects consec.*, which are to be explained as in *aa*. In the same way וְהָיָה Ex 36²⁹ is most simply explained as repeated from 26²⁵.

(γ) The following are due to errors in the text, or to incorrect modes of *tt* expression: Ex 36^{29 f.}, Ju 3²³, 1 I 6¹⁸ (read וַיַּעֲלֵנוּ), 1 S 4¹⁹, 17³⁸, 2 S 16⁵, 19^{18 f.} (read וַיַּעֲבְרוּ and וַיַּלְחֹצוּ), 1 K 3¹¹ (where וְשָׂאֵלֶת is, no doubt intentionally, assimilated to the four other perfects); 13³, 20²¹; 2 K 14⁷ (where, with Stade, וְאֶת-הַפֶּלֶעַתִּים should be read); 14¹⁴, 18⁴ (where, at any rate, וְשָׁבַר might be taken as a frequentative, but not וּכְרַת, &c.; evidently the perfects are co-ordinated only in form with הוּא הַסִּיר); 18³⁶, 21¹⁵, 24¹⁴, Jer 37¹⁵ (where וְהָבֵנוּ, but not וְנִתְּנוּ, might be frequentative); Ez 9⁷ (omit וַיֵּצְאוּ with Stade, and read וְהָבֵנוּ); 20²² (וְהִשְׁבַּתִּי *Mil'él* before an imperfect consecutive); Am 7⁴ (וְאֶכְלָה after an imperfect consecutive); Jb 16¹².

Finally, in 1 S 1¹², 10⁹, 17⁴⁸, 25²⁰, 2 S 6¹⁶, 2 K 3¹⁵, Jer 37¹¹, Am 7² וְהָיָה is to be *uu* read throughout instead of וְהָיָה, but in Gn 38⁵ וְהָיָה with the LXX.

B. THE INFINITIVE AND PARTICIPLE.

§ 113. *The Infinitive Absolute.*

Cf. the dissertation of J. Kahan, and, especially, the thorough investigation by E. Sellin, both entitled, *Ueber die verbal-nominale Doppelnatur der hebräischen Participien und Infinitive*, &c., Lpz. 1889; F. Prätorius, 'Ueber die sogen. Infin. absol. des Hebr.' in *ZDMG.* 1902, pp. 546 ff.

1. The infinitive absolute is employed according to § 45 to emphasize *a* the idea of the verb *in the abstract*, i. e. it speaks of an action (or state) without any regard to the agent or to the circumstances of time and mood under which it takes place. As the *name* of an action the infinitive absolute, like other nouns in the stricter sense,

¹ Or does וַיַּעֲלֵנוּ, as a frequentative, imply fastening with several bolts? It is, at all events, to be noticed, that in 2 S 13¹⁸ also וַיַּעֲלֵנוּ follows an imperfect consecutive.

may form part of certain combinations (as a subject, predicate, or object, or even as a genitive,¹ see below); but such a use of the infinitive absolute (instead of the infinitive construct with or without a preposition) is, on the whole, rare, and, moreover, open to question on critical grounds. On the other hand, the infinitive absolute frequently exhibits its character as an expression of the *verbal idea* by taking an object, either in the accusative or even with a preposition.

b Examples of the use of the infinitive absolute:—

(a) As subject, Pr 25²⁷ אֹכֵל דְּבֶשׂ הַרְבוֹת לֹא טוֹב *it is not good to eat much honey*; Jer 10⁵, Jb 6²⁵, Ec 4¹⁷; epexegetically, after a demonstrative pronoun, Is 58^{5f.}, Zc 14¹².

c (b) As predicate, Is 32¹⁷ and the effect of righteousness (is) הַשְׁקֵט וְנָבֵטָח *quietness* (prop. *to find rest*) and confidence.

d (c) As object, Is 1¹⁷ לִמְדוּ הַיָּטִיב *learn to do well*; Is 7¹⁵, Pr 15¹², Jb 9¹⁸; according to the sense also Jer 9²³ 23¹⁴, as well as Is 5⁵ (הִסֵּר and פָּרַץ virtually depend on the idea of the wish contained in עֲשֵׂה); Is 22¹³, where a long series of infinitives absolute is governed by הִנֵּה, and 59¹³ (six infinitives governed by יִרְעֵנִים in verse 12); Dt 28⁵⁶ is strange since the object precedes the infinitive absolute which governs it,² also Is 42²⁴, where the statement of place precedes the infinitive absolute.—In Jer 9⁴, Jb 13³ the infinitive absolute as the object of the verb is placed before it for the sake of emphasis (with the verb negatived by לֹא in Is 57²⁰, Jer 49²³), so also in La 3⁴⁵ where it is the remoter object and co-ordinated with a substantive.

e (d) As genitive, Is 14²³ בְּמַטְאֵטָא הַשְׂמֵר *with the besom of destruction*; so perhaps also 4⁴ בְּרוּחַ בְּעֵר *in that thou hast given him bread . . . and hast enquired of God for him*; Ez 36³; 1 S 25^{26.33} (after מִן); after לְ Ex 32⁶, Jer 7¹⁸, 44¹⁷.

f (e) Governing an accusative of the object, e. g. Is 22¹³ הָרַג בְּקָר וּשְׁחַט צֹאן *slaying oxen and killing sheep*; cf. Ex 20⁸, 23³⁰, Dt 5¹², Is 37¹⁹, Ez 23³⁰, and of the examples in *a-d*, Dt 28⁵⁶, Is 5⁵, 58^{5f.}, Pr 25²⁷, &c.; followed by a preposition, e. g. Is 7¹⁵ מָאֹס בָּרַע וּבָחַר בְּטוֹב *to refuse the evil and choose the good*; Pr 15¹² (הוֹכֵחַ לוֹ).

g If the object be a personal pronoun, then, since the infinitive absolute can never be united with a suffix (see the note on *a*), it is affixed by means of the accusative-sign אֶת (אֵת), e. g. Jer 9²³ וַיְדוּעַ אֶתִּי *and knoweth me*; Ez 36³.

¹ The infinitive absolute can never be joined with a genitive or a pronominal suffix.

² Perhaps הִצִּיג according to § 53 *k* should be explained as an infinitive construct, or should be written הִצִּיג.

³ וְאַחֲרֵי שָׂתָה 1 S 1⁹ is impossible Hebrew, and as the LXX shows, a late addition.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

l 3. The infinitive absolute occurs most frequently in immediate connexion with the finite verb of the same stem, in order in various ways *to define more accurately or to strengthen the idea of the verb.*¹

m These infinitives absolute joined immediately to the finite verb belong in a sense to the *schema etymologicum* treated in § 117 p, i. e. they are objects of the finite verb in question, except that the infinitive absolute (as a *nomen abstractum*) lays stress rather on the actual occurrence or the energy of the action (see the examples below), while the noun proper emphasizes the result or extent of the action; cf. e. g. Ex 22²² אִם-צָעַק יִצְעַק אֵלַי if it actually happens that *he cries to me*, with Gn 27³⁴ (as it were, *he cried*, so that a great cry was heard).

We must further distinguish—

n (a) The infinitive absolute used *before* the verb to *strengthen* the verbal idea, i. e. to emphasize in this way either the certainty (especially in the case of threats) or the forcibleness and completeness of an occurrence. In English, such an infinitive is mostly expressed by a corresponding adverb, but sometimes merely by putting greater stress on the verb; e. g. Gn 2¹⁷ מוֹת תָּמוּת *thou shalt surely die*, cf. 18^{10,18}, 22¹⁷, 28²², 1 S 9⁶ (*cometh surely to pass*); 24²¹, Am 5⁵, 7¹⁷, Hb 2³, Zc 11¹⁷; with the infinitive strengthened by אֵךְ Gn 44²⁸ (but 27³⁰ and *Jacob was yet scarce gone out, &c.*); Gn 43³ הָעַר הָעַר בְּנֹי הָעַר *he did solemnly protest unto us*; 1 S 20⁶ נִשְׂאֵל נִשְׂאֵל *David earnestly asked leave of me*; Jos 17¹³, Ju 1²³ וְהוֹרִישׁ לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ *and did not utterly drive them out*; especially typical instances are Am 9⁸ *I will destroy it from off the face of the earth* לֹא הַשְׁמִיד אֶשְׁמִיד וְג' *saving that I will not utterly destroy, &c.*; Jer 30¹¹ *and will in no wise leave thee unpunished*; cf. further Gn 20¹⁸, 1 K 3²⁶, Jo 1⁷, Jb 13⁵.

o The infinitive absolute is used before the verb with less emphasis:

(1) Frequently at the beginning of the statement; cf. Driver on 1 S 20⁶. However, in these cases a special emphasis on the following verb is sometimes intended; cf. above, n, on Gn 43³, 1 S 20⁶; also Gn 3¹⁶, 26²⁸, 32¹⁷, 1 S 14²⁸, 20³. Elsewhere the infinitive absolute is evidently used only as possessing a certain fullness of sound (hence for rhythmical reasons, like some uses of the separate pronoun, § 135 a), as in Gn 15¹³, 43^{7,20}, Ju 9⁸, 1 S 10¹⁶, 23¹⁰, 2 S 1⁶, 20¹⁸.

(2) Very frequently in conditional sentences after אִם, &c. The infinitive absolute in this case emphasizes the importance of the con-

¹ Cf. A. Rieder, *Die Verbindung des Inf. abs. mit dem Verb. fin . . . im Hebr.*, Lpz., 1872; also his *Quae ad syntaxin Hebraicam . . . planiorem faciendam ex lingua Graeca et Latina afferantur*, Gumbinnen (Programm des Gymnasiums), 1884. G. R. Hauschild, *Die Verbindung finiter und infiniter Verbalformen desselben Stammes in einigen Bibelsprachen*, Frankfurt a. M., 1893, discussing especially the rendering of such constructions in the Greek and Latin versions.

dition on which some consequence depends, e. g. Ex 15²⁶ *if thou wilt diligently hearken, &c.*, Ex 19⁵, 21⁵, 22^{3.11^f. 16.22} (see above, *m*); 23²², Nu 21², Ju 16¹¹, 1 S 11¹¹, 12²⁵; after לֵּ 1 S 14³⁰.

The infinitive absolute is used to give emphasis to an antithesis, e. g. p 2 S 24²⁴ *nay; but I will verily buy* (קָנִי אֶקְנֶה) *it of thee, &c.* (not receive it as a gift); Ju 15¹³ *no; but we will bind thee fast . . . but surely we will not kill thee*; cf. further Gn 31³⁰ (thou art indeed gone=) *though thou wouldst needs be gone* (Vulg. *esto*), *because thou sore longedst, &c.*; ψ 118^{13.18}, 126⁶ (the second infinitive absolute as a supplement to the first—see below, *r*—comes *after* the verb).—Hence also, as permissive, Gn 2^{16^f}. תֹּאמַרְךָ אֲכַלְתָּ תֹאמַרְךָ *thou mayest freely eat, but, &c.* (so that verse 16 is in antithesis to verse 17); or concessive, 1 S 2³⁰ *I said indeed . . .*, 14⁴³.

The infinitive absolute is used to strengthen a question, and especially in impassioned or indignant questions, e. g. Gn 37⁸ הֲמִלְכָהּ יְעֹלְיָנוּ *shalt thou indeed reign over us?* Gn 37¹⁰, 43⁷, Ju 11²⁵, 1 S 2²⁷, 2 S 19⁴³, Jer 3¹, 13¹², Ez 28⁹, Am 3⁵, Zc 7⁵; but cf. also Gn 24⁵ *must I needs bring again?*

(b) The infinitive absolute *after the verb*, sometimes (as in *n*) to *r* intensify¹ the idea of the verb (especially after imperatives and participles, since the infinitive absolute can never precede either, e. g. Nu 11¹⁵, Jb 13¹⁷, 21², 37² שְׁמַעוּ שְׁמַעוּ שְׁמוֹעַ *hearken ye attentively*; Jer 22¹⁰; after participles, e. g. Is 22¹⁷, also elsewhere, e. g. Nu 23¹¹, 24¹⁰ *thou hast altogether blessed them*; Jos 24¹⁰, 2 K 5¹¹, Dn 11¹⁰, and with the infinitive absolute strengthened by means of ׀ Gn 31¹⁵, 46⁴, Nu 16¹³); sometimes to express the long *continuance* of an action; here again after an imperative, Is 6⁹ שְׁמַעוּ שְׁמוֹעַ *hear ye continually*; after a perfect, Jer 6²⁹; after a participle, Jer 23¹⁷; after an imperfect consecutive, Gn 19⁹, Nu 11³².

To this class belong especially those cases in which a second infinitive absolute is co-ordinated with the first; the latter then expresses either an accompanying or antithetical action or the aim to which the principal action is directed; e. g. 1 S 6¹² הֲלִכּוּ הֲלִכּוּ וְנָעוּ *lowing as they went* (lowing continually; so after a participle, Jos 6^{13^b} *Qerê*); Gn 8⁷ *it went forth to and fro*²; Is 19²² *smiting and* (i. e. but also) *healing again*; Jo 2²⁶ (see above, *m*).

Rem. 1. Instead of a second infinitive absolute (see above) there is sometimes found a perfect consecutive (Jos. 6^{13^a} and 2 S 13¹⁹ [but Stade's וְנָעוּ is

¹ In Arabic also, the intensifying infinitive regularly stands *after* the verb, but in Syriac *before* the verb.

² Also in Ez 1¹⁴ for the distorted form נִצְוֹן reads simply נִצְוֹן וְנָעוּ.

is preferable], in both places as perfect frequentative; Is 31^b referring to the future, unless with Stade, *ZAW.* vi. 189, we read וְהֵצִיל and וְהִמְלִיט), or an imperfect consecutive (1 S 19²³, 2 S 16¹⁴) or participle (2 S 16⁶); cf. also *u.*

2. The idea of long *continuance* is very frequently expressed by the verb הִלֵּךְ to go, along with its infinitive absolute, or even by the latter alone, and this occurs not only when it can be taken in its literal sense (*to go, to walk*, as in the examples given above, Jos 6^{9,13}, 1 S 6¹², 2 S 3¹⁶, 13¹⁹; cf. also, Is 3¹⁶, where both infinitives stand *before* the verb, and ψ 126⁶, where הִלֵּךְ precedes), but also in cases where הִלֵּךְ in the sense of *to go on, to continue*, merely performs the function of an adverb. The action itself is added in a second infinitive absolute, or sometimes (see above, *t*) in a participle or verbal adjective. Examples, Gn 8³ וַיֵּשְׁבוּ הַמַּיִם . . . הַלֹּךְ וְשׁוֹב and the waters returned . . . continually; Gn 8⁵, 12⁹, Ju 14⁹, 2 K 2¹¹; with a participle following, Jer 41⁶ (unless we read וְנִבְכָּה, as in 2 S 3¹⁶); with an adjective following, Gen 26¹³, Ju 4²⁴, 1 S 14¹⁹, 2 S 5¹⁰ (1 Ch 11⁹), 2 S 18²⁵.¹

On the other hand, in 1 S 17⁴¹ the participle הִלֵּךְ is used instead of the infinitive absolute. Of a different kind are the instances in which the participle הִלֵּךְ is used as predicate along with the co-ordinate adjective (Ex 19¹⁹, 1 S 2²⁶, 2 S 3¹, 15¹², Est 9⁴, 2 Ch 17¹²) or participle (1 S 17¹⁵, Jon 1¹¹, Pr 4¹⁸, Ec 1⁶).

3. The regular place of the negative is between the intensifying infinitive absolute and the finite verb,² e.g. Ex 5²³ וְהֵצִל לֹא-הֵצִילָהּ neither hast thou delivered at all, Ju 15¹³, Jer 13¹², 30¹¹; cf. Mi 1¹⁰ (לֹא). Exceptions are Gn 3⁴ (where the negation of the threat pronounced in 2¹⁷ is expressed in the same form of words); Am 9⁸, ψ 49⁸.

4. With a finite verb of one of the derived conjugations, not only the infinitive absolute of the *same* conjugation may be connected (Gn 28²² Pi'el; 17¹³, Ex 22³, Ez 14³ Niph'al; Gn 40¹⁵ Pu'al; Ho 4¹⁸ Hiph'il; Ez 16⁴ Hoph'al), but also (especially with Niph'al, rarely with Pi'el and Hiph'il; see Driver on 2 S 20¹⁸) that of *Qal* as the simplest and most general representative of the verbal idea, 2 S 20¹⁸ (with Pi'el; but in Gn 37³³, 44²⁸ טָרַף is a passive of *Qal*, § 52 *e*); 46⁴ (with Hiph'il); Ex 19¹³, 21²⁰, 2 S 23⁷, Is 40³⁰, Jer 10⁵, Jb 6² (with Niph'al); Is 24¹⁹ (with Hithpo'el; רָעָה in the same verse must also, according to the Masora, certainly be the infinitive absolute *Qal*; see § 67 *o*), and so always מוֹת יָמָת he shall surely be put to death. Elsewhere the infinitive absolute of a conjugation with kindred meaning is found, Lv 19²⁰, 2 K 3²³ Hoph'al for Niph'al (but most probably we should read, with Driver, the *infin. Niph.* in both places, הִפְרָה and הִתְרַב); 1 S 2¹⁶ (Pi'el for Hiph'il, unless יִקְטְרוּן is to be read); Ez 16⁴ (Hoph'al for Pu'al).³ Finally, the infinitive absolute may

¹ Cf. in French, *Le mal va toujours croissant, la maladie va toujours en augmentant et en empirant*, 'continually increases and becomes worse and worse.'

² Cf. Rieder, *Quo loco ponantur negationes לֹא et לֹא . . .* (*Zeitschrift für Gymn.-Wesen*, 1879, p. 395 ff.).

³ In three passages even the infinitive absolute of another stem of like sound occurs; but in Is 28²⁸ שָׁרְשָׁר is no doubt a mere textual error for שָׁרַר, and in Jer 8¹³, according to § 72 *aa*, we should read שָׁרְשָׁר, and in Zp 1² שָׁרְשָׁר. Barth, *Nom.-bildung*, § 49 *b*, sees in שָׁרְשָׁר and שָׁרְשָׁר infinitives *Hiph'il*, exactly corresponding in form to 'a *qām*[ā] the Aram. *infin.* 'Aph'el of קָיַם; but there is no more evidence for a *Hiph.* of שָׁרַר in Hebrew than for a stem שָׁרְשָׁר.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

absolute is most frequently used in this way, corresponding to the infinitive of command in Greek, &c.¹:—

bb (α) For an emphatic imperative,² e. g. שָׁמֹר (thou shalt, ye shall), *observe* Dt 5¹²; זָכוֹר (thou shalt) *remember*, Ex 13³, 20⁸ (the full form occurs in Dt 6¹⁷ תִּשְׁמְרוּן תִּשְׁמְרוּן ; זָכוֹר תִּזְכֹּר 7¹⁸); Lv 2⁶, Nu 4², 25¹⁷, Dt 1¹⁶, 2 K 5¹⁰, Is 38⁵, Jer 2², followed by a *perfect consecutive*; Jos 1¹³, 2 K 3¹⁶, Is 7⁴, 14³¹ (parallel with an *imperative*; in Na 2² three imperatives follow). But ψ 142⁵ הַבַּיִט may be only an incorrect spelling of הַבַּיִט imperative.³

cc (β) For the jussive, Lv 6⁷, Nu 6⁵, 2 K 11¹⁵, Ez 23⁴⁶; cf. also Pr 17¹² (*let it rather meet*).

dd (γ) For the cohortative, Is 22^{13b} אָכֹל וְשָׂתוּ (the exclamation of the mocker); Ez 21³¹, 23^{30.46}; perhaps also Jer 31² (הִלֹּךְ).⁴

ee (δ) For the imperfect in emphatic promises, e. g. 2 K 4⁴³ ye shall eat and leave thereof; 19²⁹ (Is 37³⁰), 2 Ch 31¹⁰; also in indignant questions, Jb 40² shall he that cavilleth contend with the Almighty? ⁵ (on the addition of the subject cf. the Rem. below); Jer 3¹ and thinkest thou to return again to me? Jer 7^{9ff.} (six infinitives, continued by means of the *perfect consecutive*; cf. § 112 o).

ff (ε) For any historical tense (like the Latin *historic* infinitive) in lively narration (or enumeration) and description, even of what is still taking place in present time, e. g. Hos 4² swearing and breaking faith, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery (in these they are busied); 10⁴ (after a *perfect*); Is 21⁵, 59⁴, Jer 8¹⁵, 14¹⁹, Jb 15³⁵; cf. further Jer 32³³, Ec 4².—In Ez 23³⁰, Pr 12⁷, 15²², and 25⁴, the infinitive absolute is best rendered by the passive.

¹ Cf. also such infinitives in French as *voir* (page so and so, &c.), *s'adresser* . . . , *se méfier des voleurs*!

² Prætorius, *op. cit.*, p. 547: the extraordinarily common use of the infinitive form *qātōl* in the sense of an imperative, jussive, or cohortative has long since caused it to be compared with the Arab. *fa'āli*. It thus appears that the infin. *qātōl* in Hebrew could be used from early times as a kind of fixed, invariable word of command.

³ In Ez 21³¹, for the infinitives construct הִסִּיר, הָרִים, הִשְׁפִּיל (beside הִגִּבָּה) read with Cornill the infinitives absolute הִסֵּר, &c. The K^ethibh probably intends הִסִּיר, &c.

⁴ In 2 S 3¹⁸ the infinitive construct appears to be used instead of the cohortative, but הוֹשִׁיעַ should certainly be read for הוֹשִׁיעַ. Also in 1 K 22³⁰ (2 Ch 18²⁹), which was formerly included under this head (I will disguise myself and go into the battle), read אֶתְחַפֵּשׂ וְאָבִיא.

⁵ In Jb 34¹⁸ in a similar question instead of the infinitive constr. we should rather expect the infinitive absolute (הִתְאַמֵּר), unless with the LXX and Vulg. the participle with the article (הִתְאַמֵּר) is to be read.

Rem. The subject is sometimes added to the infinitive absolute when it *gg* takes the place of the finite verb, e. g. Lv 6⁷, Nu 15³⁵, Dt 15², ψ 17⁵, Pr 17¹², Jb 40², Ec 4², Est 9¹. So, probably, also in Gn 17¹⁰, Ex 12⁴⁸, although here כִּלְיֹכַר according to § 121 a might also be taken as *an object* with a passive verb; cf. Est 3¹³. In 1 S 25^{26.33} the subject follows an infinitive absolute which is co-ordinated with an infinitive construct, see above, e.

§ 114. The Infinitive Construct.

1. The infinitive construct, like the infinitive absolute, may also *a* represent a *nomen verbale* (§ 45 a), but of a much more flexible character than the infinitive absolute (cf. § 113 a). Its close relation with nouns properly so called is especially seen in the readiness with which the infinitive construct may be used for any case whatever; thus,

(a) As the nominative of the subject, e. g. Gn 2¹⁸ $\text{לֹא-טוֹב הָיְיֹתָ לְבָדּוֹ}$, literally, *not good is the being of man in his separation*; Gn 30¹⁵, 1 S 23²⁰, Is 7¹³, Pr 17²⁶, 25^{7.24} (but cf. 21⁹ לְטוֹב לְשֹׁבֶת in the same statement); ψ 32⁹ prop. *there is not a coming near unto thee*, but the text is probably corrupt. With a *feminine* predicate, 1 S 18²³, Jer 2¹⁷.

(b) As genitive, e. g. Ec 3⁴ $\text{עַתַּ סְפֹר וְעַתַּ רְקוֹד}$ *a time of mourning b and a time of dancing*; Gn 2¹⁷, 29⁷, Neh 12⁴⁶, 2 Ch 24¹⁴. This equally includes, according to § 101 a, all those cases in which the infinitive construct depends on a preposition (see below, d) [and Driver, *Tenses*, § 206].

(c) As accusative of the object, e. g. 1 K 3⁷ $\text{לֹא אֵדָע צֵאת וְבֵא}$ *I know c not the going out or the coming in (I know not how to go out and come in)*; Gn 21⁶, 31²⁸, Nu 20²¹, Is 1¹⁴, 37²⁸ (even with אֵת), Jer 6¹⁵, Jb 15²² (cf. for the use of the infinitive absolute as object, § 113 f); as accusative with a verb expressing fullness, Is 11⁹.

2. The construction of the infinitive with prepositions (as in Greek, *d* $\text{ἐν τῷ εἶναι, διὰ τὸ εἶναι, \&c.}$) may usually be resolved in English into the finite verb with a conjunction, e. g. Nu 35¹⁹ בְּפִגְעוֹ-בּוֹ *in his meeting him*, i. e. if (as soon as) he meets him; Gn 27⁴⁵ (עַד-שׁוֹב); Is 30¹² $\text{כִּי אֲבִיזְכְּרֶם עַל-אֲמַרְךָ}$ *because ye despise*; Jer 2³⁵ עַל-אֲמַרְךָ *because thou sayest*; Gn 27¹ *and his eyes were dim מִרְאֵת from seeing*, i. e. so that he could not see.

This use of the infinitive construct is especially frequent in con- *c* nexion with כִּי or כַּשְׁכֵּשֶׁת to express time-determinations (in English resolved into a temporal clause, as above the combination of the infinitive with עַל or עַל-לְ is resolved into a causal clause), especially after וַיְהִי (see the

examples, § 111 g), e.g. 1 S 2²⁷ בְּהִיוֹתָם בְּמִצְרַיִם *when they were in Egypt*; Gn 24³⁰ וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וְגו' . . . וַיֵּרָא אֶת-הַחֶטֶם . . . *and it came to pass, when he saw (prop. in the seeing) the ring . . . , and when he heard (prop. in his hearing), &c.*

f But by far the most frequent is the connexion of the infinitive construct with לְ.¹ Starting from the fundamental meaning of לְ, i. e. *direction towards something*, infinitives with לְ serve to express the most varied ideas of purpose or aim, and very commonly also (with a weakening or a complete disregard of the original meaning of the לְ) to introduce the object of an action, or finally even (like the infinitive absolute used adverbially, § 113 h, and the Latin gerund in *-ndo*) to state motives or attendant circumstances. See the instances in the Remarks.

g Rem. 1. The original meaning of the לְ is most plainly seen in those infinitives with לְ which expressly state a purpose (hence as the equivalent of a final clause), e.g. Gn 11⁵ *and the Lord came down, לְרִאֵת אֶת-הָעִיר* *to see the city*; also with a change of subject, e.g. 2 S 12¹⁰ *and thou hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite לְהִיֹּת לָךְ לְאִשָּׁה* *to be (i. e. that she may be) thy wife*; cf. Gn 28⁴, Jer 38²⁶ (לְמוֹת).—If there is a special emphasis on the infinitive with לְ, it is placed, with its complement, before the governing verb, e.g. Gn 42⁹, 47⁴, Nu 22²⁰, Jos 2³, 1 S 16² with בּוֹא; Ju 15¹⁰, 1 S 17²⁵ with עָלָה.

h 2. Just as clearly the idea of aiming at a definite purpose or turning towards an object may be seen in the combination of the verb הָיָה *to be*, with לְ and an infinitive. In fact הָיָה לַעֲשׂוֹת may mean, either (a) *he was in the act of, he was about to* (as it were, he set himself), *he was ready, to do something*, or (b) *he or it was appointed or compelled, &c., to do the action in question*. In the latter case הָיָה לַעֲשׂוֹת corresponds to the Latin *faciendum erat*, cf. also the English *I am to go*. In both cases הָיָה (as elsewhere when copula) is often omitted.

i Examples of (a) Gn 15¹² וַיְהִי הַשָּׁמֶשׁ לְבוֹא *and when the sun was going down (just about to set)*; 2 Ch 26⁵ וַיְהִי לְרַשׁ אֱלֹהִים *and he set himself to seek God (here with the secondary idea of a continuous action)*; with the omission of הָיָה Is 38²⁰, יְהוָה לְהוֹשִׁיעַנִי *the Lord is ready to save me*; 1 S 14²¹ (?), Jer 51⁴⁹, ψ 25¹⁴ (*et foedus suum manifestaturus est eis*); Pr 18²⁴ (?), 19⁸ (לְמַצֵּא *consecuturus*

¹ Cf. § 45 g, according to which the close union of the לְ with the first consonant of the infinitive (לְכַתֵּב with a firmly closed syllable, as opposed to כְּכַתֵּב, בְּכַתֵּב, &c.) seems to point to the formation of a special new verbal form. Quite distinct are the few examples where the infinitive with לְ serves to express time, as Gn 24⁶³ לְפָנֹת עֶרֶב *at the eventide* (prop. at the time of the return of evening); cf. Dt 23¹², Ex 14²⁷, Ju 19²⁶; 2 S 18²⁹ *when Joab sent the king's servant*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

m 3. A further class comprises the very numerous cases, in which the infinitive with לְ is used as the object¹ of a governing verb, hence, again, for the direction which an action takes. The verbs (or conjugations) which occur most frequently in this combination with לְ and an infinitive are: הֵחֵל (with an infinitive without לְ, e.g. Dt 2^{25.31}, Jos 3⁷), הוֹסִיף, הוֹסִיף (prop. to add) to continue, very frequently, even in prose, with an infinitive without לְ, as Gn 4¹², 8^{10.12}, 37⁵, 1 S 3⁸, Jb 27¹, &c.; חָרַל to cease from, to desist; כָּלַה to complete, to make an end of; תָּמַם to be finished; הִקְרִיב to come near to, Gn 12¹¹; מָהַר to hasten (with an infinitive without לְ Ex 2¹⁸); אָבָה to be willing (with an infinitive without לְ Is 28¹², 30⁹, Jb 39⁹); חָפֵץ to will, to desire; כִּמֵּן to refuse (to be unwilling); בִּקֵּשׁ to seek; יָכַל to be able (with an infinitive without לְ, e.g. Gn 24⁵⁰, 37⁴, Ex 2³, 18²³, Nu 22³⁸, Jb 4²); נָתַן with an accusative of the person in the sense of to give up to some one, to cause, or permit him to do something, e.g. Gn 20⁶, ψ 16¹¹ (with an infinitive abs. Jb 9¹⁸, see § 113 d), יָדַע to understand how to do something (in Jb 3⁸ הֵעֵתִידֶם עֲרַר is analogous); לָמַד to learn; קָוָה to wait, expect (with a change of subject, e.g. Is 5² and he waited for it to bring forth grapes).

n We must further mention here a number of verbs in Hiph'il (partly denominatives), which express an action in some definite direction (cf. § 53 f), as הִגְדִּיל to do greatly, הִשְׁפִּיל to make (it) low, הִגְבִּיחַ to make (it) high, הִעֲמִיק to make (it) deep, הִרְחִיק to make (it) far, distant, הִיטִיב to make (it) good (with an infinitive without לְ ψ 33³, but 1 S 16¹⁷, in the same combination, with לְ); הִשְׁפִּיעַ to do anything early (ψ 127², along with its opposite אָחַר to do something late, with an infinitive without לְ); הִרְבָּה to make (it) much, הִפְלִא to make (it) wonderful (even with a passive infinitive 2 Ch 26¹⁵),² &c.

¹ This view is based upon the fact, that in numerous expressions of this kind (see the examples above) the לְ may be omitted, and the infinitive consequently stand as an actual accusative of the object (see above, c). However, the connexion of the verb with the object is in the latter case closer and more emphatic (hence especially adapted to poetic or prophetic diction), than the looser addition of the infinitive with לְ; thus לֹא אָבִי שָׁמוֹעַ Is 28¹² is equivalent to they desired not obeying (לֹא אָבִי) also with the infin. abs. in Is 42²⁴; cf. § 113 d); but לֹא אָבִי לְשָׁמוֹעַ Ez 20⁸ rather expresses they could not make up their mind as to hearkening. When connected with לְ, the governing verb has a more independent sense than when it directly governs the accusative of the object.

² In almost all these examples the principal idea is properly contained in the infinitive, whilst the governing verb strictly speaking contains only a subordinate adverbial statement, and is therefore best rendered in English by an adverb; e.g. Gn 27²⁰ how is it that thou hast found it so quickly? (prop. how thou hast hastened to find!), Gn 31²⁷ wherefore didst thou flee secretly? So frequently with הִרְבָּה (=often, abundantly), Ex 36⁵, 1 S 1¹², 2 K 21⁶, Is 55⁷, Am 4⁴, ψ 78³⁸, &c.; with שׁוּב (=again), Dt 30⁹, 1 K 13¹⁷, Ho 11⁹, Ezr 9¹⁴; cf. also 2 S 19⁴, Jer 1¹², Jn 4², and the analogous instances in § 120 g; also 2 K 2¹ thou hast asked a hard thing.

4. Finally, the infinitive with $\dot{\text{ל}}$ is very frequently used in a much looser *O* connexion to state motives, attendant circumstances, or otherwise to define more exactly. In English, such infinitive constructions (like the Latin gerund in *-do*; cf. *f*) must frequently be turned by *that* or a gerund; e.g. 1 S 12¹⁷ $\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{ש}}\dot{\text{אַל}}\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{כֶּם}}\dot{\text{מִלְךָ}}$ in asking you a king; 14³³, 19⁵, 20³⁶, Gn 3²², 18¹⁹, 34^{7.15}, Ex 23², Lv 5^{4.22.26}, 8¹⁵, Nu 14³⁶, 2 S 3¹⁰, 1 K 2^{3f.}, 14⁸, Jer 44^{7f.}, ψ 63³, 78¹⁸, 101⁸, 103²⁰, 104^{14f.}, 111⁶, Pr 2⁸, 8³⁴, 18⁵, Neh 13¹⁸. Sometimes the infinitive with $\dot{\text{ל}}$ is used in this way simply by itself, e.g. 1 Ch 12⁸ as the roes upon the mountains $\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{מַהֵר}}$ (as regards hasting) in swiftness; Gn 2³, 2 S 14²⁵ ($\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{הֵלֵל}}$); Is 21¹ ($\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{חֲלוֹף}}$); Jo 2²⁶, Pr 2², 26² and so very frequently the infinitive $\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{אֵמַר}}$ *dicendo* which has become stereotyped as an adverb to introduce direct narration (in the sense of *thus, as follows*).¹

5. In a number of instances—especially in the later books—the infin. *P* constr. with $\dot{\text{ל}}$ appears to be attached by *Wāw* (like the infinitive absolute, § 113 z), as the continuation of a previous finite verb. In most examples of this kind it is, however, evident that the infinitive with $\dot{\text{ל}}$ virtually depends on an idea of intention, effort, or being in the act of, which, according to the sense, is contained in what has preceded, whilst the copula, as sometimes also elsewhere, is used in an emphatic sense (*and that too*); thus e.g. Ex 32²⁹ (if the text be right) fill your hand to-day (sc. with an offering) for the Lord . . . and that to bring a blessing upon you, i. e. that ye may be blessed; cf. 1 S 25³¹ (otherwise in verses 26 and 33 where the infinitive absolute is used, see § 113 e); ψ 104²¹,² Jb 34⁸, Ec 9¹, Neh 8¹³, 2 Ch 7¹⁷.—In Lv 10^{10f.} $\dot{\text{ו}}\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{הִבְרִיִל}}$ might be regarded as an explanatory addition to the command contained in verse 9 b (=this prohibition of wine before the service shall ye observe, and that in order to put a difference, &c.); but probably the text has been disturbed by a redactor.—In 2 Ch 30⁹ $\dot{\text{ו}}\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{שִׁיב}}$ depends on the idea of receiving a favour which lies in $\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{רַחֲמִים}}$. On the other hand, in 1 S 8¹² it is sufficient to explain *and in order to appoint them unto him for captains of thousands* (sc. he will take them). In Is 44²⁸ translate *and he (Cyrus) shall perform all my pleasure, and that in saying of Jerusalem, &c.*

3. The period of time to which an action or occurrence represented *Q* by the infinitive construct belongs, must sometimes be inferred from the context, or from the character of the principal tenses; cf. e.g. Gn 2⁴ *these are the generations of the heaven and of the earth*, $\dot{\text{בְּהִבְרָאם}}$ when they were created (prop. in their being created); Ju 6¹⁸ $\dot{\text{עַד־בָּאִי וְג'}}$ until

¹ $\dot{\text{ל}}\dot{\text{אֵמַר}}$ is very often so used after $\dot{\text{ו}}\dot{\text{יִדְבַר}}$ in the Priestly document (Gn 8¹⁵, 17³, &c., and numberless times in the legal parts of Exod., Lev., and Num.)—a pleonasm which is not surprising considering the admittedly prolix and formal style of the document.

² When Delitzsch on ψ 104²¹, referring to Hb 1¹⁷, explains the infinitive with $\dot{\text{ל}}$ as an elliptical mode of expressing the *coniugatio periphrastica* (equivalent to *flagitaturi sunt a deo cibum suum*), this is, in point of fact, certainly applicable to this and a few other places mentioned above; but all these passages, in which the infinitive with $\dot{\text{ל}}$ follows, are to be distinguished from the cases treated above under *h*, where the infinitive with $\dot{\text{ל}}$ without *Wāw* corresponds to a Latin gerundive, or is actually used to express the *coniugatio periphrastica*.

I come unto thee, and bring forth, &c. Cf. 1 S 18¹⁹ (=when she should have been given); 2 K 2¹, Ho 7¹.

ר Rem. 1. The constructions of the infinitive with a preposition, described above under *d*, are almost always continued in the further course of the narrative by means of the *finite verb*, i. e. by an independent sentence, not by a co-ordinate infinitive. Such a finite verb we regard as governed by a conjunction, which corresponds to the preposition standing before the infinitive. Thus the infinitival construction (frequently even with a change of subject) is continued by a perfect (with לָ), Jer 9¹² *because they have forsaken* (עַל-עֲזָבָם) *my law . . .* וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ and have not obeyed my voice; Gn 39¹⁰, 1 S 24¹², Am 1⁹; without לָ Jb 28²⁵ (perf. after לָ and infin.); by a perfect with וְ (cf. § 112 *i* and *v*) Am 1¹¹ וְגַם עָלְ-רַדְפוֹ וְגַם שָׁחַת *because he did pursue his brother with the sword, and did cast off continually all pity* (a frequentative perfect; for examples of the perfect consecutive proper see Gn 27⁴⁵, Ju 6¹⁸, 1 S 10⁸, 2 K 18³² [Is 36¹⁷], always after עַד-בֹּאִי *until I come*); by a simple imperfect, e. g. Pr 1²⁷ (after עַד); Is 30²⁶ (after בַּיּוֹם *in the day*, a temporal phrase which has here become equivalent to a preposition); Is 5²⁴ (after עַד), 10², 13⁹, 14²⁵, 45¹, 49⁵, 1 S 2⁸, Pr 2⁸, 5², 8²¹ (always after לָ)¹; by an imperfect consecutive, e. g. Gn 39¹⁸ *and it came to pass*, וְאָקְרָא וְקוּלִי בְהִרְיָמִי *as I lifted up my voice and cried, that . . .*; 1 K 10⁹, Jb 38¹³ (after לָ); 1 K 18¹⁸, Is 38⁹, Jb 38^{7.9} ff. (after עַד); Is 30¹², Jer 7¹³, Ez 34⁸ (after עַל).

ס 2. The negation of an infinitive construct, on account of the predominance of the noun-element in its character, is effected not by the verbal negative לֹא (except in the compound בְּלֹא, which has come to be used as a preposition, *without*, Nu 35²³, Pr 19²), but by בְּלֹאִי, originally a substantive (see the *Lexicon*), with לָ prefixed (but also Nu 14¹⁶ מִבְּלֹאִי), e. g. Gn 3¹¹ לֹא-אֶכְלֶם מִן-פִּי *not to eat of it*; in a final sense, 4¹⁵ *lest any finding him should smite him*; only in 2 K 23¹⁰ is לָ repeated before the infinitive. In ψ 32⁹ (if the text be right) בְּלֹא negatives, not the infinitive, but the predicate which is understood.

§ 115. Construction of the Infinitive Construct with Subject and Object.

a 1. Like the infinitive absolute (see § 113 *a*), the character of the infinitive construct as a *verbal noun* is shown by its power of taking the case proper to its verb, and hence in transitive verbs² *the accusative of the object*, e. g. Nu 9¹⁵ בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא אֶת-הַמִּשְׁכָּן *on the day the*

¹ The great frequency of examples of this kind, especially in the poetical books, is due to a striving after what is called *chiasmus* in the arrangement of the parallel members in the two halves of the verse, i. e. in the instances given, the finite verb at the end of the second (co-ordinate) clause is parallel with the infinitive at the beginning of the first. In this way the verbal form necessarily became separated from the וְ, and consequently the imperfect had to be used instead of the perfect consecutive. Such a parallelism of the *external* and *internal* members of a verse is frequent also in other cases, and was evidently felt to be an elegance of elevated—poetic or prophetic—style.

² For examples of the accus. of the object with a pass. infin., see § 121 *c*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

was so fully established, that it could be used not only in such strange cases, as Gn 37⁴ לֹא יִכְלוּ דַבֵּרוּ לְשָׁלֹם they could not speak to him peaceably, cf. Zc 3¹ לְשֹׁטְנוֹ to be an adversary to him, but ultimately even in the 1st sing., as in Nu 22¹³ לְתַתִּי to give me leave [Dt 25⁷ לֹא אֲבִה יַבְמִי he will not perform the duty of a husband's brother unto me; 1 Ch 4¹⁰ לְבַלְתִּי עֲצִבִי that it may not grieve me!]

d 3. The power of governing like a verb is also retained in those verbal nouns which, although originally secondary forms of the infinitive, have fully acquired the value of nouns, e. g. Is 11⁹ דַּעַת אֶת־יְהוָה (prop. to know the Lord) the knowledge of the Lord; לִירְאָה אֹתִי to fear me, Dt 4¹⁰, 5²⁶, 10¹²; an accusative follows לְאֲהַבָה Dt 10^{12,15}, Is 56⁶ (cf. also 1 K 10⁹, Ho 3¹); לְהִנָּפֵחַ Is 30²⁸; בְּשִׂנְאֵת יְהוָה אֲתָנוּ Dt 1²⁷; after verbal nouns formed with the prefix כּ (cf. § 45 e), Nu 10², Is 13¹⁹, Am 4¹¹, Ez 17⁹. The accusative of the object likewise remains after infinitives (or their secondary forms) which have the article, e. g. Gn 2⁹, Jer 22¹⁶, or a suffix, e. g. Gn 5⁴, &c., 28^{4,6}, 29^{19 f.}, 30¹⁵, 38⁵, 2 S 3¹¹, Is 29¹³.

e 2. The subject of the action represented by the infinitive is mostly placed immediately¹ after it, either in the *genitive* or *nominative*. The subject is in the genitive (§ 33 c) whenever it has the form of a noun-suffix, and also when the infinitive has the termination of the constr. st. fem. sing. (see *f*); probably also in many other cases, where the infinitive in form and meaning is used more like a substantive, and accordingly governs like a noun. On the other hand, the subject of the infinitive is certainly to be regarded as a nominative, when it is separated from the infinitive by any insertion, and according to certain indications (see *g*) very probably in many other instances.

f Rem. 1. Examples of genitives of the subject after infinitives in the connective form are Dt 1²⁷ בְּשִׂנְאֵת יְהוָה אֲתָנוּ prop. in the Lord's hating us; cf. 7⁸, Gn 19¹⁶, 1 K 10⁹, Is 13¹⁹, 47⁹, Ho 3¹, Am 4¹¹. The subject of the infinitive is probably also to be regarded as genitive in such cases as Ex 17¹ and there was no water לְשִׁתּוֹת הָעָם for the people to drink (prop. for the drinking of the people), and in cases like Gn 16¹⁶ (בְּלֶרֶת הָרָר); Gn 16⁹, Ex 19¹, Nu 20^{3,4}, 33³⁸, 1 K 6¹, ψ 133¹, 2 Ch 7³, &c.

g 2. Examples in which the subject is separated from the infinitive by an insertion, and hence must certainly be regarded as a nominative, are Jb 34²² לְהִפָּתֵר שָׁם פְּעָלֵי אֲוֵן that the workers of iniquity may hide themselves there (prop. for the hiding themselves there the workers of iniquity); cf. Gn 34¹⁵, Nu 35⁶, Dt 19³, Ju 9², 2 S 24¹³, ψ 76¹⁰, and below, *i*. The subject is likewise to be regarded as a *nominative*, whenever the *Lamedh* is prefixed to the infinitive by means of a pretonic Qames (cf. *b* above), e. g. 2 S 19²⁰ לְשׁוֹם הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל־לְבָבוֹ,

¹ In Gn 24³⁰ the subject of כָּרְאֵת is wanting (but כְּשָׁמְעוּ follows); the original reading was undoubtedly כָּרְאֵתוֹ, and the text is now in a state of confusion; verse 30a should come before verse 29b. In Gn 19²⁹, 25²⁶, Ex 9¹⁶, 13²¹, 1 S 18¹⁹, Jer 41⁶, ψ 42⁴ the subject, although not indicated, is easily supplied from the context. The infinitive in such cases is best rendered in English by a passive.

since, if the infinitive were used as a *nomen regens*, we should rather expect לְשׁוֹם according to § 102 f. That the subject of the infinitive is regarded elsewhere also as nominative is again (see above, b) probable, since in such forms as הַנִּיחַ Dt 25¹⁹, Is 14³, הַמִּיר ψ 46³, &c., the pretonic Qames is retained without exception, whereas on the analogy of הַנִּיחַי Ez 24¹³, הַקִּימוֹ Jer 23²⁰, &c., we should expect הַנִּיחַ, הַמִּיר, &c., if the infinitive were regarded as a *nomen regens*. Or was the retention of the Qames (assuming the thorough correctness of the Masoretic punctuation) rendered possible even before a following genitive, because that vowel was characteristic of the form? It is at all events certain that owing to the lack of case-endings,¹ a distinction between the genitival and nominative constructions could not have been consciously made in the case of most infinitives, e. g. in unchangeable forms like קָטַל, קוּם, &c.

3. When both a *subject* and an *object* are connected with the *h* infinitive, the rule is, that the subject should immediately follow the infinitive, and then the object. The latter, in such a case, is necessarily in the accusative, but the subject (as in *e*) may be either in the genitive or in the nominative. The noun-suffixes again are, of course, to be regarded as genitives, e. g. Gn 39¹⁸ בְּהִרְמִי קוֹלִי as *I lifted up my voice* (cf. 1 K 13²¹, and the examples, Gn 5⁴, &c., enumerated above, under *d*), and so also substantives which follow a connective form, Dt 1²⁷, &c.; see above, *d* and *f*.

On the other hand, the subject appears necessarily to be in the *i* nominative in such cases as Is 10¹⁵ בְּהִנִּיף שִׁבְטֵי אֶת־מְרִימוֹ as *if a rod should shake them that lift it up* (for the plur. מְרִימוֹ cf. § 124 *k*), not בְּהִנִּיף, as would be expected (see *g* above), if שִׁבְטֵי were in the genitive; cf. 2 S 14¹³, Jb 33¹⁷. And so probably also in other cases, as Gn 5¹, 13¹⁰, Jos 14⁷, 1 K 13⁴, 2 K 23¹⁰, Is 32⁷. The subject is separated from the infinitive by an insertion (and consequently must necessarily be in the nominative; see *g* above), e. g. in Jer 21¹.

Rem. Less frequently the object is placed immediately after the infinitive, *k* and then the nominative of the subject, as a subsequent complement, e. g. Is 20¹ בְּשִׁלַּח אֹתוֹ סָרְגוֹן when *Sargon sent him*; Gn 4¹⁵, Jos 14¹¹, 2 S 18²⁹, Is 5²⁴, ψ 56¹, Pr 25⁸. In Nu 24²³ the subject follows an infinitive which has a noun-suffix in place of the object.

§ 116. *The Participles.*

Cf. Sellin (see above at the head of § 113), p. 6 ff., and Kahan, p. 11 ff.

1. Like the two infinitives, the participles also occupy a middle *a* place between the noun and the verb. In form they are simple nouns,

¹ In Arabic, where the case-endings leave no doubt as to the construction, it is equally possible to say either *qatlu Zaidin* (gen. of subj.) '*Amran* (acc.), literally *Zaid's killing 'Amr*, or *qatlu 'Amrin* (gen. of obj.) *Zaidun* (nom. of subj.), or even *el-qatlu* (with article) *Zaidun* (nom. of subj.) '*Amran* (acc. of obj.).

and most nearly related to the adjective; consequently they cannot in themselves be employed to represent definite relations of tense or mood. On the other hand, their verbal character is shown by their not representing, like the adjectives, a fixed and permanent quality (or state), but one which is in some way connected with an *action* or *activity*. The *participle active* indicates a person or thing conceived as being in the continual uninterrupted *exercise* of an activity. The *participle passive*, on the other hand, indicates the person or thing in a state which has been brought about by external *actions*.

b Rem. That the language was fully conscious of the difference between a state implying action (or effected by external action) and mere passivity, is seen from the fact, that participles proper cannot be formed from the purely stative Qal, but only verbal adjectives of the form *qātēl* (מֹלֵךְ, מְבַרֵךְ &c.) or *qātōl* (מְבַרֵךְ, &c.), whereas the *transitive* Qal שָׂנֵא *to hate*, although it coincides in form with the intransitive Qal (as a verb middle *e*), nevertheless forms a participle active שֹׂנֵא, and participle passive שְׂנוּאָה (cf. the feminine שְׂנוּאָה).—In cases where the participle proper and the verbal adjective both occur, they are by no means synonymous. When the Assyrians are called in Is 28¹¹ לְעֵגְי שֹׁפֵה *men of stammering lips*, a character is ascribed to them which is inseparably connected with their personality. On the other hand בְּלֵה לְעֵג לִי Jer 20⁷, describes those about the prophet as continually engaged in casting ridicule upon him. Cf. also ψ 9¹⁸ (שֹׂכְחִי) with 50²² (שֹׂכְחִי).

c On the difference between the participle as expressing *simple* duration and the imperfect as expressing *progressive* duration, cf. what has been stated above in § 107 *d*. Nevertheless the participle is sometimes used—especially in the later books, cf. e.g. Neh 6¹⁷, 2 Ch 17¹¹—where we should expect the action to be divided up into its several parts, and consequently should expect the finite verb. But the substitution of the participle for the *tempus historicum*, which becomes customary in Aramaic (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 76. 2, *d* and *e*), is nevertheless quite foreign to Hebrew.

d 2. The period of time indicated by (*a*) a participle active, either as an attribute or predicate, must be inferred from the particular context. Thus מֵת may mean either *moriens* (Zc 11⁹), or *mortuus* (so commonly; with the article הַמֵּת regularly = *the dead man*), or *moriturus* (Dt 4²²); אָרֵב *coming, come* Gn 18¹¹, &c., *venturus* 1 S 2³¹, &c.; נָפֵל *falling*, but also *fallen*, Ju 3²⁵, 1 S 5³, and *ready to fall* (threatening ruin, Is 30¹³, Am 9¹¹). For other examples of perfect participles see Gn 27³³, 43¹⁸ (הַשָּׁב that was returned; cf. Ezr 6²¹, &c., הַשָּׁבִים which were come again from the captivity); Gn 35³, Ex 11⁵, Zc 12¹, ψ 137⁷, Pr 8⁹, Jb 12⁴ (קָרָא), and see *m* below. For future participles see Gn 41²⁵, 1 K 18⁹, Is 5⁵, Jon 1³, &c., probably also לְקַחִי Gn 19¹⁴. On the *futurum instans* (esp. after הֵינִי) see *p* below.

e (*b*) Of the passive participles, that of Qal (e.g. כְּתוּב *scriptus*) always corresponds to a Latin or Greek perfect participle passive, those of the other conjugations, especially *Niph'al*, sometimes to



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

God; Hb 2¹⁵; with an infinitive, ψ 127²; with a noun-suffix (which, according to § 33 c, also represents a genitive), e. g. Gn 4¹⁴ **כָּל־מֹצְאִי** *whosoever findeth me* (prop. my finder; cf. עֹשֵׂי *my maker*); 12³ **מְבַרְכֶיךָ** *that bless thee*, **מְקַלְלֶיךָ** *that curseth thee* (but read either **מְקַלְלֶיךָ**, or **מְבַרְכֶיךָ** in the preceding clause); 27²⁹, 1 S 2³⁰, Is 63¹³, ψ 18⁴⁹. In Jer 33²² read **מִשְׁרָתִים אֲתִי**.¹

h Rem. To the class of objective genitives belong also specifications of place after the participles **בָּא** *iniens* and **יָצָא** *egrediens*, since the verbs **בָּא** and **יָצָא**, in the sense of *ingredi*, *egredi*, can be directly connected with an accusative; e. g. Gn 23^{10.18} **בָּאִי שְׁעַר עִירוֹ** *that went in at the gate of his city*; La 1⁴; after **יָצָאִי**, Gn 9¹⁰, 34²⁴, 46²⁶, &c.—In poetic language the participle in the construct state may be connected not only with a genitive of the object, but also with any other specifications (especially of space) which otherwise can only be made to depend on the verb in question by means of a preposition; cf. Is 38¹⁸, and frequently, **יֹרְדֵי־בוֹר** *they that go down into the pit* (the grave); ψ 88⁶ **שֹׁכְבֵי קֶבֶר** *that lie in the grave*; Dt 32²⁴ (Mi 7¹⁷); 1 K 2⁷, 2 K 11^{5.7.9} *those that came in* (or went out) *on the sabbath*, Pr 2⁷, 1 Ch 5¹⁸, &c.; instead of the construction with **מִן־**, e. g. Is 59²⁰ (*those who turn from transgression*), Mi 2⁸ (cf. § 72 p).

i These genitives of nearer definition appear also in the form of a noun-suffix, e. g. ψ 18^{40.49} **קָמִי** (for **קָמִים עָלַי**) *that rise up against me*; cf. Ex 15⁷, Dt 33¹¹, ψ 44⁶, Ex 32²⁵, Is 1²⁷ **שֹׁבְתֶיהָ** *her converts*; ψ 53⁶ (**חֲנֻךְ**); Pr 2¹⁹ **כָּל־בָּאֵיהָ** *all that go unto her*; the construction is especially bold in Is 29⁷ **כָּל־צִבְיָהּ וּמְצֻרֹתֶיהָ** *all that fight against her and her stronghold* (for **כָּל־הַצְּבָאִים עָלֶיהָ וְעַל־מִן**); ψ 102⁹ even with a participle Po'al, **מְהוֹלְלֵי** *they that are mad against me* (?), but read perhaps with Olshausen **מְחוֹלְלֵי** *who pierce me*.—In Is 1³⁰ *as a terebinth* **נִבְלַת עֵלֶף** *fading as regards its leaf*, it remains doubtful whether **נִבְלַת** is in the absolute state, and consequently **עֵלֶף** in the accusative, or whether it is to be regarded as construct state, and **עֵלֶף** as the genitive. In the latter case it would be analogous to Pr 14² (see k).

k 4. The passive participles also may either be in the absolute state, and take the determining word in the accusative,² or may be connected

¹ When, as in Jb 40¹⁹, the participle with the noun-suffix **הַעֹשֵׂוֹ** *he that made him*, also has the article (cf. § 127 i), the anomaly is difficult to understand, since a word determined by a genitive does not admit of being determined by the article.—No less remarkable is the use of the constr. st. of the participle before the accusative in Jer 33²² **מִשְׁרָתִי אֲתִי** *that minister unto me* (for which there is **מִשְׁרָתִי** in verse 21). In Am 413 an accusative of the product follows the genitive of the object, **עֹשֵׂה שַׁחַר עֵיפָה** *maker of the morning into darkness*. In Jer 2¹⁷ **בְּעֵת כּוֹלְכֶךָ** is supposed to mean *at the time when he led thee*; perhaps the perfect (**הוֹלֵךְ**) should be read as in 6¹⁵. In Ez 27³⁴, the ancient versions read **נִשְׁבַּרְתָּ** (**עַתָּה**) *now thou art broken*, instead of the difficult **עַתָּה נִשְׁבַּרְתָּ**. In 1 K 20⁴⁰ read **עֹשֵׂה** before **וְהִנֵּה וְהִנֵּה**.

² On the proper force of this accusative when retained in the passive con-

with it in the construct state, e. g. Ju 18¹¹, 1 S 2¹⁹, Ez 9² לְבוּשׁ בְּרִים קָרוֹעַ *clothed in linen*, cf. verse 3 הַלְּבֹשׁ הַבְּרִים; (even with a suffix בְּתַנְתּוֹ *rent as regards his coat* 2 S 15³²; with the participle following Ju 1⁷); but Ez 9¹¹ לְבוּשׁ הַבְּרִים *the one clothed with linen*; 2 S 13³¹ קָרְעֵי בְּגָדִים *rent in respect of clothes*, equivalent to *with their clothes rent* (cf. Jer 41⁵); Nu 24⁴, Dt 25¹⁰, Is 3³, 33²⁴, Jo 1⁸, ψ 32¹ (נְשׂוּי־פָשַׁע *forgiven in respect of transgression*, חֲטָאָה *covered in respect of sin*); with a suffix to the noun, Pr 14² נָלוֹז דְּרָכָיו *he that is perverse in his ways*.

Rem. The passive participle occurs in the construct state before a genitive of the cause, e. g. in Is 1⁷ שָׂרְפוֹת אֵשׁ *burnt with fire*; cf. Gn 41⁶, Ex 28¹¹, Dt 32²⁴; before a genitive denoting the author, e. g. Gn 24³¹ בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה *blessed of the Lord* (but ψ 115¹⁵ לִיהוָה בְּרוּכִים, see § 121 f); cf. Is 53⁴, ψ 22⁷, Jb 14¹ (15¹⁴, 25⁴); hence also with noun-suffixes (which are accordingly genitive) Pr 9¹⁸ קָרְאֵיהָ *her invited ones*, i. e. those invited by her; cf. 7²⁶, ψ 37²⁴.

5. The use of the participle as predicate is very frequent in noun-clauses (which, according to § 140 e, describe established facts and states), in which the period of time intended by the description must again (see above, d) be inferred from the context. Thus:

(a) As present, in speaking of truths which hold good at all times, e. g. Ec 1⁴ נֶאֱבָדָה הָאֶרֶץ וְדוֹר הָלֵךְ וְדוֹר בָּא *one generation goeth, and another generation cometh; and the earth abideth* (עֹמְדָת) *for ever*; cf. verse 7; also to represent incidental (continuous) occurrences which are just happening, Gn 3⁵, 16⁸ (I am fleeing); 32¹², Ex 9¹⁷, 1 S 16¹⁵, 23¹, 2 K 7⁹, Is 1⁷; when the subject is introduced by the emphatic demonstrative הִנֵּה *behold!* (§ 100 o and § 105 b), e. g. Gn 16¹¹ הִנֵּה הָרָה *behold, thou art with child*, &c.; 27⁴²; frequently also in circumstantial clauses (connected by Wāw), cf. § 141 e, e. g. Gn 15², &c.

(b) To represent past actions or states, sometimes in independent noun-clauses, e. g. Ex 20¹⁸ וְכָל־הָעָם רָאוּ אֶת־הַקּוֹלֹת *and all the people saw the thunders*, &c.; 1 K 1⁵; in negative statements, e. g. Gn 39^{23 a}; sometimes in relative clauses, e. g. Gn 39^{23 b}, Dt 3² (cf. also the frequent combination of the participle with the article as the equivalent of a relative clause, e. g. Gn 32¹⁰ הָאָמַר *which saidst*; 12⁷, 16¹³, 35^{1.3}, 36³⁵, 48¹⁶, 2 S 15³¹, &c.); sometimes again (see n) in circumstantial clauses, especially those representing actions or states which occurred simultaneously with other past actions, &c., e. g. Gn 19¹ *and the two angels came to Sodom* וְלוֹט יָשָׁב *and (i. e. while) Lot sat*, &c.; 18^{1.8.16.22}, 25²⁶, Ju 13⁹, 2 Ch 22⁹; also with the subject introduced by הִנֵּה 37⁷, 41¹⁷. (On הָלֵךְ with a following adjective or participle to express an action constantly or occasionally recurring, cf. § 113 u.)

(c) To announce future actions or events, e. g. 1 K 2², 2 K 4¹⁶ *at this season when the time cometh round*, אַתָּה חֲבִיבִי בֵן *thou shalt embrace a son*; so after a specification of time, Gn 7⁴, 15¹⁴, 17¹⁹, 19¹³, Hag 2⁶ (but in Is 23¹⁵, where, after וְהָיָה we should rather expect a perfect consecutive, it is better to explain

struction cf. below, § 117 cc, &c., and § 121 c, d. So also Neh 4¹² is to be understood, *and the builders were girded every one with his sword on his side, and building*.

וּנְשַׁחַח, with Qimḥi, as the 3rd sing. fem. of the perfect; on the form, cf. § 44 f); or in relative clauses, Gn 41²⁵, Is 5⁵ *what I am doing*, i. e. am in the act of doing; in a deliberative question, Gn 37³⁰; but especially often when the subject is introduced by הִנֵּה (especially also if the subject be attached as a suffix to הִנֵּה as הִנְנִי, הִנֵּךְ, &c.), if it is intended to announce the event as imminent, or at least near at hand (and sure to happen), when it is called *futurum instans*, e. g. Gn 6¹⁷, 15³, 20³, 24^{13f.}, 48²¹, 50⁵, Ex 3¹³, 8²⁵, 9³, 34¹⁰, Jos 2¹⁸, Ju 7¹⁷, 9³³, 1 S 3¹¹, 2 K 7², Is 3¹, 7¹⁴, 17¹, Jer 30¹⁰, Zc 2¹³, 3⁸; with a participle passive, 2 S 20²¹: cf. also § 112 t.

q Rem. 1. As the above examples show, a noun-clause with a participle as predicate may have for its subject either a substantive or a personal pronoun; in both cases the participle, especially if there be a certain emphasis upon it, may precede the subject. Also in noun-clauses introduced by הִנֵּה the subject may be either a substantive, or (e. g. Gn 37⁷) a separate personal pronoun, or a suffix attached to הִנֵּה. In the same way, the subject may also be introduced by יֵשׁ (*est*, see the Lexicon) with a suffix, and in negative sentences by אֵין (*non est*) with a suffix, e. g. Ju 6³⁶ אִם-יִשָּׁע מוֹשִׁיעַ if thou wilt save; Gn 43⁵ אִם-אֵינְךָ מְשַׁלַּח if thou wilt not send; 1 S 19¹¹.—In such cases as Is 14²⁷ יָדוֹ הִנְטוּיָהּ the stretched out hand is his, הִנְטוּיָהּ is not, like נְטוּיָהּ in 9^{11.16}, &c., the predicate (in which case the participle could not take the article), but the subject; cf. Gn 2¹¹, 45¹², Is 66⁹, Ez 20²⁹, Zc 7⁶ (cf. § 126 k), where the participle with the article likewise refers to the present, also Nu 7², Dt 3²¹, 4³, &c., 1 S 4¹⁶, where it refers to the past. In 1 K 12⁸ and 21¹¹ even in relative clauses after אֲשֶׁר.

r 2. To give express emphasis to an action continuing in the *past*, the perfect הִיָּה in the corresponding person is sometimes added to the participle, and similarly the imperfect יִהְיֶה (or the jussive יִהְיֶה, or the imperfect consecutive) is used to emphasize an action continuing in the *future*, e. g. Jb 1⁴ הַבָּקָר הָיָה הֹרְשֹׁת the oxen (cows) were plowing; Gn 37², 39²², Ex 3¹, Dt 9²⁴, Ju 1⁷, 1 S 2¹¹, 2 S 3⁶; the same occurs with a passive participle, e. g. Jos 5⁵, Zc 3³; יִהְיֶה with a participle is found e. g. in Is 2²; the jussive in Gn 1⁶, ψ 109¹²;¹ and וִיִּהְיֶה with a participle in Ju 16²¹, Neh 1⁴.

s 3. The *personal pronoun* which would be expected as the subject of a participial clause is frequently omitted, or at least (as elsewhere in noun-clauses, cf. Is 26³, ψ 16⁸, Jb 9³²) the pronoun of the 3rd pers. הוּא, e. g. Gn 24³⁰, 37¹⁵, 38²⁴, 41¹, 1 S 10¹¹, 15¹², Is 29⁸ (the participle always after הִנֵּה); cf., moreover, Gn 32⁷, Dt 33³, 1 S 17²⁵, 20¹, Is 33⁵, 40¹⁹, ψ 22²⁹, 33⁵, 55²⁰, Jb 12^{17.19 ff.}, 25², 26⁷.—הוּא is omitted in Lv 18²⁸; הִמָּה in Is 32¹², Ez 8¹², Neh 9³; in a relative clause, Gn 39²², Is 24².—The personal pronoun of the 2nd pers. masc. (אַתָּה) is omitted in Hb 2¹⁰; the 2nd fem. (אַתְּ) in Gn 20¹⁶ (where, however, for the participle וּנְכַחַח the 2nd fem. perf. וּנְכַחַחַת is to be read); the pronoun of the 1st sing. in Hb 1⁵ (?), Zc 9¹², Mal 2¹⁶; the 2nd plur. (אַתֶּם) 1 S 2²⁴ (if the text be right), 6³, Ez 13⁷ (?). But these passages are all more or less doubtful.

t Of a different kind are the cases in which some undefined subject is to be supplied with the participle; e. g. Is 21¹¹ אֵלַי קֹרֵא there is one calling unto me (= one calleth; § 144 d); cf. Is 30²⁴, 33⁴.—So with participles in the plur., e. g. Ex 5¹⁶ (אֲמָרִים sc. the taskmasters); Jer 38²³ (in 33⁵ the text is corrupt), Ez 13⁷ (?), 36¹³, 37¹¹ (equivalent to *sunt qui dicant*).

¹ A jussive is practically to be supplied also in the formulae of blessing and cursing, בְּרִיךְ blessed be . . . Gn 9²⁶, &c.; אָרְרֶךָ cursed art thou . . . 3¹⁴, &c.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

continued by means of a perfect, Is 14¹⁷ שָׁם תִּבְלַח בְּמִדְבָּר וְעָרָיו הָרָס that made the world as a wilderness, and overthrew the cities thereof¹; 43⁷, Ez 22³, ψ 136¹³ ff., Pr 2¹⁷; by a perfect without *Wāw*, Gn 49¹¹; by a simple imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae* in the present), Is 5²³, 46⁶, Pr 7⁸, Jb 12^{17.19} ff., 24²¹; by an imperfect without *Wāw*, e. g. 1 S 2⁸, Is 5⁸, Pr 2¹⁴, 19²⁶; by an imperfect consecutive, Gn 27³³, 35³, 1 S 2⁶, Jer 13¹⁰ (after several participles), ψ 18³³, 136^{10f.}

C. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE VERB.

§ 117. The Direct Subordination of the Noun to the Verb as Accusative of the Object. The Double Accusative.

L. Kaila, *Zur Syntax des in verbaler Abhängigkeit stehenden Nomens im alttest. Hebr.*, Helsingfors, 1906.

a 1. The simplest way in which a noun is subordinated to a verbal form is by the addition of an accusative of the object to a transitive verb.² In the absence of case-endings,³ this accusative can now be recognized only from the context, or by the particle אֵת (את, before suffixes also אֵת, אֹת)⁴ prefixed to it. The use of this *nota accusativi*

¹ On the parallelism between the *external* and *internal* members, which appears here and in many other examples of this kind, see the note on § 114 r.

² The verb in question may either have been originally transitive, or only have become transitive by a modification of its original meaning. Thus the vocalization shows that פָּנַח (to have pleasure, usually with בְּ) to desire, מָלַא (to be full of something, also transitive) to fill, were originally intransitive. Cf. also such cases as בָּכָה to weep (generally with עַל, אֵל or לְ), but also to bewail with an accusative; יָשַׁב to dwell (usually with בְּ), but also to inhabit with an accusative (cf. further, under *u*).—The examples are different in which verbs of motion such as בָּוֵא intrare, also aggredi, יָצַא egredi (cf. § 116 h above), שׁוּב redire, Is 52⁸, take an accusative of the aim of the motion, while בָּוֵא according to the Old Semitic usage, even takes an accusative of the person (at least in poetry, equivalent to בָּוֵא אֵל in prose).

³ On traces of these endings, especially the remains of a former accusative ending in *a*, cf. § 90 c.

⁴ אֵת (toneless owing to the following Maqqeph), and אֹת (with a tone-long ē, אֵת only in Jb 41²⁶), אֵת or אֹת before the light suffixes (on all these forms cf. § 103 b: the underlying form *āth* was obscured in Hebrew to *ôth*, shortened to *āth* before suffixes beginning with a consonant and then modified to אֵת, whence finally the secondary form אֹת with the tone), Phoenician אֵת i. e. probably *iyyāth* (for the Phoenician form, cf. G. Hoffmann, *Einige phönik. Inschriften*, Göttingen, 1889, p. 39 f.), Punic *yth* or (according to Euting) pronounced even as a mere prefixed *t*, Arabic, before suffixes, *'iyyā*, Aram. אֵת, אֹת. It was no doubt originally a substantive, meaning *essence, substance, self* (like the Syriac *yāth*; on the other hand, any connexion with the Hebrew אֵת, Syriac *'ātā*, Arabic *'āyat*, a sign, must, with Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* xl. 738, be rejected), but now united in the construct state with a following noun or suffix stands for the pronoun *ipse, αὐτός*. In common use, however (cf. Wilson, 'The particle אֵת in Hebrew,' *Hebraica*, vi. 2, 3, and the precise statistics of the use

is, however, somewhat rare in poetry, and even in prose it is not invariably necessary but is restricted to those cases in which the accusative of the object is more closely determined by being a proper name, or by having the article, or by a following determinate genitive (hence also by the suffixes), or in some other way (see below, c), e. g. Gn 4¹ and she bare אֶת־לֵוֹי Cain; 6¹⁰, 1¹ God created אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ the heaven and the earth (but 2⁴ אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ); 1²⁵ and God made אֶת־חַיֵּי הָאָרֶץ the beast of the earth; 2²⁴.

Rem. 1. The rare occurrence of the *nota accusativi* in poetic style (e. g. it b never occurs in Ex 15²⁻¹⁸, Dt 32, Ju 5' 1 S 2, &c., though it is frequent in the late Psalms) may be explained from the fact that in this as in other respects (cf. § 2 q) poetry represents a somewhat more archaic stage of the language than prose. The need of some external means of indicating the accusative could only have been felt after the case-endings had become wholly extinct. Even then the אֶת would probably have been used at first to indicate only an object placed *before* the verb (when it followed, it was already sufficiently characterized by its position as depending on the verb), or proper names.¹ Finally, however, the *nota accusativi* became so customary everywhere in prose, that even the pronominal object was expressed rather by אֶת with suffixes than by verbal suffixes, even when none of the reasons mentioned under e can be assigned for it; cf. Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 258 ff., and the statistics of H. Petri, cited above at the head of § 58. Such examples as כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־צָוָהוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים Gn 6²² in the *Priestly Code*, beside כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־צָוָהוּ יְהוָה 7⁵ in the *Jahvist*, are especially instructive.

2. As accusatives determined in other ways, we have in the first place to c consider the collectives introduced by כָּל *entirety*, without a following article or determinate genitive, inasmuch as the meaning of כָּל includes a determinative sense, cf. e. g. Gn 1²¹⁻³⁰, 8²¹, Dt 2³⁴, 2 K 25⁹. אֶת־כָּל is used absolutely in Gn 9³, cf. 39²³; similarly, מִי is determinate of itself, since it always denotes a person, hence אֶת־מִי *quem?* e. g. Is 6⁸, 37²³, &c., but never אֶת־מָה *quid?* So also the relative אֲשֶׁר in the sense of *eum qui* or *quem*, &c., e. g. 1 S 16³, or *id quod*, Gn 9²⁴, &c. Cf. also such examples as Jos 2¹⁰, 1 S 24¹⁹, where אֶת־אֲשֶׁר is equivalent to *the circumstance, that*, &c.—Elsewhere אֶת stands before nouns which are determinate in sense, although the article is omitted, which according to § 126 h is very frequently the case in poetic or otherwise elevated style; thus Lv 26⁵, Jos 24^{14,15}, Is 41⁷ (to distinguish the object from the subject); 50⁴ (with the first of two accusatives, also for the sake of clearness); Ez 13²⁰, 43¹⁰, Pr 13²¹ (where the צַדִּיקִים are to be regarded as a distinct class); Jb 13²⁵

of אֶת on p. 140 ff.), it has so little force (like the oblique cases *αὐτοῦ, αὐτῶ, αὐτόν*, sometimes also *ipsius, ipsum*, and the Germ. *desselben*, &c.) that it merely serves to introduce a determinate object; אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם prop. *αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν* (cf. *αὐτὴν Χρυσήϊδα*, *Iliad* i. 143) is no stronger than the simple הַשָּׁמַיִם τὸν οὐρανόν. Cf., further, P. Haupt on Pr 18²⁴ in his *Rainbow Bible*, and also in the *Notes on Esther*, p. 191.

¹ Thus, in Dt 33, אֶת occurs only in verse 9 (twice, with an object preceding the verb), in Gn 49 in the blessing of Jacob only in verse 15 with a co-ordinate second object (consequently farther removed from the verb). Of the thirteen instances of אֶת in the Mésa' inscription, seven stand directly and four indirectly before proper names.

(unless, with Beer and others, we read וְאִם for וְאֵת); also Ec 7⁷ may be a quotation of an ancient maxim.

d On the other hand אֵת occurs very seldom in prose before a noun actually or apparently undetermined. In 1 S 24⁶ בְּנֶפֶךְ is more closely defined by means of the following relative clause; in 2 S 4¹¹ אִישׁ צְדִיק refers to Ishbo-sheth (as if it were *him, who was an innocent man*); in 1 K 6¹⁶ עֲשָׂרִים אַמָּה refers to the particular twenty cubits. In Ex 21²⁸ (otherwise in verse 29) perhaps the אֵת is used in order to avoid the combination שׁוֹר אִישׁ (as in Nu 21⁹ to avoid the cacophony אִישׁ הַנְּחָשׁ אִישׁ (?)); in Lv 7⁸ and 20¹⁰ the accusatives are at any rate defined by the context.—In Nu 16¹⁵ אֶת-אֶחָד מֵהֶם probably means *even a single one* (and then *ipso facto* a definite one) of *them*, as also in 1 S 9³ אֶת-אֶחָד מֵהַנְּעָרִים may refer to some definite one of the men-servants. In Gn 21³⁰ we should read אֶת-שֶׁבַע הַבְּבָשִׁת with the Samaritan, since the seven lambs have been already mentioned; in Ex 2¹ translate with Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 79, אֶת-בֵּת-לֵוִי the daughter of Levi; in Ex 28⁹ read הַשֶּׁהָם with the Samaritan; in Lv 20¹⁴ אֶת-אִשָּׁה is probably a scribal error due to וְאֶת-אִמָּה; in 1 S 26²⁰ read נִפְשִׁי with the LXX for אֶחָד; in 2 S 5²⁴ read הַצְּעָרָה as in 1 Ch 14¹⁵; in 2 S 15¹⁶ the אֵת is incorrectly inserted from 20³, where it refers to the women already mentioned; in 2 S 18¹⁸ read הַמְּצַבֶּת, or omit both אֵת and אֲשֶׁר with the LXX and Lucian; in 1 K 12³¹ omit אֵת; in 2 K 23²⁰ probably אֶת-עַצְמוֹתָם is to be read; in 2 K 25⁹ the text is corrupt. In Ez 16³² אֶת-זָרִים might refer to *the strangers in question*; but see Smend on the passage.

e 3. The pronominal object *must* be represented by אֵת with a suffix (instead of a verbal suffix), when (a) it precedes the verb, e.g. Nu 22³³ אֶתְכָּה הִרְגֹתִי וְאוֹתָהּ הִחַיִּיתִי *I had slain thee and saved her alive*; Gn 7¹, Lv 22²⁸, 1 S 8⁷, Is 43²², 57¹¹, Jer 4^{17, 22}, 7¹⁹; (b) when a suffix is already attached to the verb, and as a rule when a second accusative with ו follows, e.g. 2 S 15²⁵ וְהִרְאֵנִי אֹתוֹ *and he will show me it*; Ex 17³ לְהַמִּית אֹתִי וְאֶת-בְּנֵי לְהַמִּית אֹתִי *to kill us and our children*; Nu 16³², 1 S 5¹¹, 2 S 14¹⁶ (but cf. also Dt 11⁶, 15¹⁶, &c., and Driver on 1 S 5¹⁰); (c) after an infinitive absolute, see above § 113 *a* note; (d) after an infinitive construct, when it is immediately followed by the subject, e.g. Gn 41³⁹, or when the combination of a suffix with the infinitive might lead to a misunderstanding, e.g. Gn 4¹⁵ לְבַלְתִּי הַבּוֹת-אֹתוֹ *lest one should smite him, &c.*, where לְבַלְתִּי הַבּוֹתוֹ might also mean *lest he should smite*.

f 4. The pronominal object is very frequently omitted, when it can be easily supplied from the context; so especially the neuter accusative referring to something previously mentioned (the English *it*) after *verba sentiendi* (שָׁמַע) and *dicendi*, e.g. Gn 9²², &c., וַיֹּדֵעַ *and he told (it)*; also after נָתַן *to give*, Gn 18⁷, 24⁴¹, &c., לָקַח *to take*, הֵבִיא *to bring*, שָׁם *to lay*, Gn 9²³, &c., מָצָא *to find*, Gn 31³³, &c. A personal object is omitted, e.g. in Gn 12¹⁹, 24⁵¹ (after לָקַח).—The omission of the plural object is remarkable, because it leaves an opportunity for a misunderstanding, in Gn 37¹⁷ שָׁמַעְתִּי אִמְרֵיהֶם ¹ *I heard them saying*; perhaps, however, we should read שָׁמַעְתִּים with the Samaritan.

g 5. In common formulae the substantival object is also sometimes omitted

¹ According to the ordinary rules of syntax (cf. § 116 *t*) we should translate, *I heard men who said, &c.*



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

following examples, in which אַתָּה in the later Hebrew manner (almost in the sense of the Latin *quod attinet ad*) introduces a noun with more or less emphasis, Nu 3⁴⁶, 5¹⁰, 35⁶, Ju 20^{44.46}, Ez 17²¹, 20¹⁶, 35¹⁰, 44³, Neh 9^{19.34}, Dn 9¹³, 2 Ch 31¹⁷.—In Ez 47¹⁷⁻¹⁹ (cf. also 43⁷) it is simplest to emend וְאַתָּה for אַתָּה, according to verse 20. However, even the LXX, who have ταῦτα only in verse 18, can hardly have known any other reading than אַתָּה; consequently in all these passages אַתָּה must be regarded as virtually dependent on some governing word, such as ecce (LXX 43⁷ ἐώρακας), and 47^{17 ff.} as equivalent to *thou shalt have as a border, &c.*

7b 8. Another solecism of the later period is finally the introduction of the object by the preposition לְ (prop. *in relation to, in the direction of*), as sometimes in Ethiopic¹ and very commonly in Aramaic.² Less remarkable is this looser connexion of the object with a participle, as with אֲכַל La 4⁵, אֲסַף Nu 10²⁵, וְזָקַף ψ 145¹⁴ (but cf. 146⁸), צָרַר Nu 25¹⁸, הִשְׁגִּיֵּא and שָׁטַח Jb 12²³; before the participle Is 11⁹.—To introduce an object *preceding* the finite verb לְ is employed in Jb 5² (cf. also Dn 11³³); also *after* אָהַב Lv 19^{18.34}; הִאָּרִיךְ ψ 129³; הִבְדִּיל Ezr 8²⁴, 2 Ch 25¹⁰; Jb 9¹¹; בִּירָךְ 1 Ch 29²⁰ (immediately before with an accusative); הִגִּלָּה 1 Ch 5²⁶; הִרְשָׁה Ezr 6²¹, 1 Ch 22¹⁹, 2 Ch 17¹³; הִחִיָּה Gn 45⁷, where, however, read פְּלִיטָה with the LXX for לפליטה and take לָכֶם as a *dativus commodi*; הִלֵּל 1 Ch 16³⁶, 2 Ch 5¹³; הִרְגָה 2 S 3³⁰, ψ 135¹¹ (verse 10 with accusative), 136^{19 ff.}; הִבִּישׁ (to bind up) Is 61¹ (Ez 34⁴ before the verb); יָדַע ψ 69⁶; כִּבֵּד ψ 86⁹; לָקַח Jer 40², 2 Ch 23¹; הִמְלִיךְ and מָשַׁח 1 Ch 29²²; נָהַל 2 Ch 28¹⁵; סָמַךְ ψ 145¹⁴; עֹבַד 1 Ch 16³⁷; הִעֲלָה Ez 26³; פָּתַח ψ 116¹⁶; רָדַף Jb 19²⁸; הִצְדִּיק Is 53¹¹; שָׁכַר 2 Ch 24¹² (previously accusatives); שָׁם 1 S 22⁷ (but probably וּבְלִבְכֶם is to be read); הִשִּׁיב (in the connexion לְ) 2 Ch 10⁶ (but verse 9 and 1 K 12⁹ with an accusative); שָׁחַת Nu 32¹⁵, 1 S 23¹⁰; שִׁית ψ 73¹⁸; שָׁלַח Ezr 8¹⁶, 2 Ch 2¹², 17⁷; שָׁמַר 1 Ch 29¹⁸, 2 Ch 5¹¹.

O 9. Sometimes the verb, on which an accusative of the object really depends, is contained only in sense in the verb which apparently governs, e.g. Is 14¹⁷ אֲסִירֵיוֹ לֹא־פָתַח בֵּיתָהּ *his prisoners he let not loose nor sent them back to their home*. On this *constructio praegnans* in general, see § 119 ff.

p 2. With the proper accusatives of the object may also be classed what is called the *internal* or *absolute object* (also named *schema etymologicum* or *figura etymologica*), i.e. the addition of an object in the form

derived from a text which read the Hiph'il instead of נִפְּלָה. In Jer 23³⁸ instead of the artificial explanation *what a burden* (is, do ye ask?) we should read with the LXX and Vulg. אַתֶּם הַמְּשָׂא *ye are the burden*. In Ez 10²² מְרִאֵיהֶם וְאוֹתָם is unintelligible; in 37¹⁹ read with Hitzig אֶל־ for אַתָּה; in Hag 2¹⁷ for אַתְּכֶם read with the LXX שְׂבִכְכֶם [or אֵינְכֶם; for the אֶל cf. 2 K 6¹¹, Jer 15¹, Ez 36⁹].

¹ Dillmann, *Grammatik der äthiopischen Sprache*, p. 349.

² With regard to Biblical Aramaic, see Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 151 f. In other ways, also, a tendency may be observed in later Hebrew to make use of the looser connexion by means of prepositions instead of the closer subordination of the noun in the accusative.

of a noun derived from the same stem,¹ e.g. ψ 14⁵ פָּחַדוּ בְּחַדוֹ they feared a fear (i. e. they were in great fear), Pr 15²⁷; also with the object preceding, e.g. La 1⁸ יְרוּשָׁלַם הָטָא קְטָא הָטָא Jerusalem hath sinned a sin; with a double accusative (see below, cc), e.g. 1 K 1¹² אֵינְיָנִי נָא עֲצֵה let me, I pray thee, give thee counsel; 1 K 1^{12.2}

Rem. (a) Strictly speaking the only cases of this kind are those in which the verbal idea is supplemented by means of an *indeterminate* substantive (see the examples above). Such a substantive, except in the case of the addition of the internal object to denominative verbs (see below), is, like the infinitive absolute, never altogether without force, but rather serves like it to strengthen the verbal idea. This strengthening is implied in the indeterminateness of the internal object, analogous to such exclamations as, *this was a man!*³ Hence it is intelligible that some intensifying attribute is very frequently (as in Greek usually) added to the internal object, e.g. Gn 27³⁴ וַיִּצְעַק צְעָקָה גְּדֹלָה וַיִּמְרָה עַד-מְאֹד he cried (with) an exceeding great and bitter cry; cf. the Greek νοσεῖν νόσον κακὴν, ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην (Matt. 2¹⁰); *magnam pugnare pugnam, tutiorem vitam vivere, &c.*

Examples of an internal object *after* the verb, and without further addition, are Ex 22⁵, 2 S 12¹⁶, Is 24²², 35², 42¹⁷, Ez 25¹⁵, 26¹⁵, 27³⁵, Mic 4⁹, Zc 1², Pr 21²⁶; with an intensifying attribute, Gn 27³³, Ex 32³¹, Ju 15⁸, 2 S 13³⁶, 1 K 1⁴⁰ (cf. Jon 4⁶, 1 Ch 29⁹); Is 21⁷, 45¹⁷, Jon 1¹⁰, Zc 1¹⁴, 8^{2a}, Dn 11³; along with an object proper the internal object occurs with an attribute in Gn 12¹⁷, 2 S 13¹⁵; cf. also Is 14⁶, Jon 4¹.—An internal object without an attribute *before* the verb: Is 24¹⁶, Jer 46⁵, Hb 3⁹, Jb 27¹²; with an attribute *before* the verb: Jer 14¹⁷, Zc 1¹⁵ (cf. also Gn 30⁸, Jer 22¹⁹, 30¹⁴, ψ 139²²). Instead of the substantive which would naturally be expected, another of kindred meaning is used in Zc 8².

(b) Only in a wider sense can the *schema etymologicum* be made to include cases in which the denominative verb is used in connexion with the noun from which it is derived, e.g. Gn 1¹¹, 9¹⁴, 11³, 37⁷, Ez 18², ψ 144⁶, probably also Mi 2⁴, or where this substantive, made determinate in some way, follows its verb, e.g. Gn 30³⁷, Nu 25¹¹, 2 K 4¹³, 13¹⁴, Is 45¹⁷, La 3⁵⁸, ⁴ and, determinate at least in sense, Jer 22¹⁶; or precedes it, as in 2 K 2¹⁶, Is 8¹², 62⁵, Zc 3⁷; cf. also Ex 3⁹. In both cases the substantive is used, without any special emphasis, merely for clearness or as a more convenient way of connecting the verb with other members of the sentence.

3. Verbs which denote *speaking* (*crying out, weeping*), or any *s* external act, frequently take a direct accusative of the organ or means by which the action is performed. In this case, however, the accusative must be more closely determined by an attributive adjective or a noun in the genitive. This fact shows the close relation between these accusatives and the *internal objects* treated under *q*, which also,

¹ On a kindred use of the infinitive absolute as an *internal object*, see above, § 113 *w*.

² Cf. βουλὰς βουλεύειν, Iliad x. 147.

³ The Arab grammarians assign to the indeterminate cases generally an intensive sense in many instances; hence the commentators on the Qorân usually explain such cases by adding *and what . . .!* see § 125 *b*.

⁴ Also in ψ 13⁴ *lest I sleep the sleep of death*, הַמָּוֹת is only used pregnantly for שְׁנַת הַמָּוֹת (cf. Jer 51³⁹), as צַדִּיקוֹת Is 33¹⁵ for צַדִּיקוֹת דְּרָךְ. On the similar use of הַלֵּךְ תָּמִים in ψ 15², see § 118 *n*.

according to *q*, mostly take an intensifying attribute. On the other hand, they must not be regarded as adverbial (instrumental) accusatives, nor are they to be classed with the second (neuter) subjects treated below in § 144 l.

t Examples of the accusative following the verb are וַאֲזַעַק קוֹל-גָּדוֹל and I cried a loud voice, i. e. with a loud voice, Ez 11¹³, 2 S 15²³ (after the proper object, Dt 5¹⁹, 1 K 8⁵⁵); וְשׁוֹן שֶׁקֶר לְשׁוֹן a tongue of deceit, i. e. with a lying tongue; Pr 10⁴ he becometh poor בְּהִרְמִיָּה עֵשָׂה dealing a slack hand, i. e. who dealeth with a slack hand; cf. the German *eine schöne Stimme singen*, to sing a fine voice, *eine tüchtige Klinge schlagen*, to smite a trusty sword, *Schlittschuhe laufen*, to run skates (i. e. to skate), and our *to write a good hand*, *to play ball*, &c.—Examples of the accusative preceding are שְׂפָתַי רְנְנוֹת יְהִלְלֵ-פִי my mouth shall praise with joyful lips, ψ 63⁶; cf. ψ 12³, where a *casus instrumenti* with *בְּ* follows the accusative.

u 4. Many verbs originally intransitive (sometimes even in form; see *a*, note 2) may be used also as transitives, in consequence of a certain modification of their original meaning, which has gradually become established by usage; cf. e. g. רִיב to strive, but also with an accusative *causam alicuius agere* (so even in Is 1¹⁷, &c.; elsewhere with *לְ* of the person for whom one strives); יָכַל absolutely to be able, with an accusative to prevail over any one; נָחַץ to be inclined and רָצָה to have pleasure (usually with *בְּ*), with an accusative to wish for some one or something; שָׁכַב cubare, then in the sense of *concumbere*, originally joined with *עִם* cum, but quite early also with the accusative, equivalent to *comprimere (feminam)*, &c. So in 2 S 13¹⁴, &c., unless in all or some of the passages the preposition אֶת is intended, e. g. אֶת־הָאִתָּהּ for אִתָּהּ; in the earlier passages *עִם* is the more usual.

v Rem. 1. It is certainly difficult to decide whether some verbs, which were afterwards used absolutely or joined with prepositions, were not nevertheless originally *transitive*, and consequently it is only the supposed original meaning, usually assigned to them in English, which causes them to appear *intransitive*.¹ In that case there is of course no syntactical peculiarity to be considered, and a list of such verbs would at the most be requisite only for practical purposes. Moreover, it is also possible that certain verbs were originally in use at the same time both as transitive and intransitive, e. g. perhaps לָבַשׁ to be clothed along with לָבַשׁ לְ to put on (a garment). Finally the analogy of certain transitives in constant use may have led to intransitives of kindred meaning being also united directly with the accusative, so that, in other words, whole classes of verbs came to be regarded in a particular aspect as transitives. See below, *y*.

¹ Thus e. g. עָנָה to reply to (ἀμείβεσθαι τινα), to answer any one; צִוָּה to command (iubere aliquem); זָכַר to remember; קָנָה (also with *לְ*) to wait for any one (to expect any one); בָּשַׂר to bring glad tidings to any one (see the Lexicon); נָאֵף and נָאָף to commit adultery (adulterare matronam); עָבַר to serre (colere); עָרַב to become surety for . . . , and many others.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

down (with) rivers of water; 1¹⁶, Jer 9¹⁷, 13¹⁷, ψ 119¹³⁶; so also הִלָּךְ to run over with, to flow with, Jo 4¹⁸; נוּל to gush out with, Jer 9¹⁷; נָטַף to drop, to overflow with, Ju 5⁴, Jo 4^{18a}; פָּרַח to break forth, Ex 9⁹; שָׁטַף to overflow, but also (transitively) to overflow with, probably in Is 10²²; נִבַּח to bud with, Pr 10³¹; so perhaps also עָבַר to pass over, to overflow with, Jer 5²⁸; יָצָא to go forth with, Am 5³.—Especially bold, but still on the analogy of the above examples, is Is 5⁶, where it is said of a vineyard וְעָלָה שָׁמִיר וְשִׁית but it shall come up (it shall be overgrown) with briars and thorns; cf. Pr 24³¹, and still more boldly, Is 34¹³.

aa With the opposite idea, חָסַר to be in want of, to lack, Gn 18²⁸; שָׁבַל to be bereaved of (as though it were to lose), Gn 27⁴⁵.—In Jos 22¹⁷ even הַמַּעַט-לָנוּ (prop. was there too little for us of . . . ?) as being equivalent to a verbum inopiae (= had we too little of . . . ?) is construed with an accusative; cf. Neh 9³².

bb (c) Several verbs of dwelling; the accusative in this case expresses either the place or the thing at which or with which any one tarries; thus Gn 4²⁰, ψ 22⁴ after יָשַׁב, cf. § 118 g; Ju 5¹⁷, Is 33¹⁴ after גִּיר; ψ 57⁵ after שָׁכַב; ψ 68⁷, Pr 8¹², Is 33¹⁶ with שָׁכַן; or even the person (the people) with whom any one dwells or is a guest, as ψ 5⁵, 120⁵ after גִּיר, Gn 30²⁰ after וָבַל, ψ 68¹⁹ with שָׁכַן.

cc 5. Two accusatives (usually one of the person and one of the thing) are governed by—

(a) The causative conjugations (*Pi'el*, *Hiph'il*, sometimes also *Pilpel*, e. g. פָּלַל Gn 47¹², &c.) of verbs which are simply transitive in *Qal*, and hence also of *verba induendi* and *exuendi*, &c. (cf. above a and u, and also y, z), e. g. Ex 33¹⁸ הֲרִאֲנִי נָא אֶת-כְּבוֹדְךָ show me, I pray thee, thy glory. Thus very frequently הוֹרִיעַ to cause some one to know something; לָמַד docere aliquem aliquid, &c.; cf. further, Gn 41⁴² וַיִּלְבַּשׂ אֹתוֹ וַיְבַשְׂ אֹתוֹ and he caused him to put on vestures of fine linen (he arrayed him in vestures, &c.); cf. in the opposite sense, Gn 37²³ (both accusatives after הַפְּשִׁיט introduced by אֶת); so with מָלֵא to fill, to fill up with something, Gn 21¹⁹, 26¹⁵, Ex 28³; אָוַר to gird some one with something, ψ 18³³; עָטַר to crown, ψ 8⁶, &c.; חָסַר to cause some one to lack something, ψ 8⁶; הֵאָכִיל to feed some one with something, Ex 16³²; הִשְׁקָה to make some one drink something, Gn 19^{32ff}.

dd (b) Many verbs (even in *Qal*) which express an influence upon the object through some external means. The latter, in this case, is attached as a second object. They are especially—

ee (a) Verbs which express covering, clothing, overlaying, חָגַר Ex 29⁹, צָפָה Ex 26²⁹, &c., טָוַח Ez 13^{10ff}, עָטַר ψ 5¹³; cf. also אָבַן Jos 7²⁵, &c.; hence also verbs which express sowing (זָרַע Jud 9⁴⁵, Is 17¹⁰, 30²³), planting (Is 5²), anointing (ψ 45⁸) with anything.

ff (β) Expressions of giving, thus נָתַן Jos 15¹⁹ where the accusative of the thing precedes; endowing, זָבַר Gn 30²⁰; and its opposite taking away, as קָבַע Pr 22²³; בֵּרַךְ to bless some one with something, Gn 49²⁵, Dt 15¹⁴; to give graciously, הִנֵּן Gn 33⁵; to sustain (i. e. to support, to maintain, to furnish) with anything,

e.g. Gn 27³⁷, ψ 51¹⁴ (סָמַד); Ju 19⁵ (סָעַר); to do something to one, גָּמַל Gn 50^{15.17}, 1 S 24¹⁸; cf. also קָרַם to come to meet any one with something, ψ 21⁴, שָׁלַם to repay some one with something (with two accusatives, ψ 35¹², Pr 13²¹), and for the accusative of the person cf. εὔ, κακῶς πράττειν τινά. In a wider sense we may also include such phrases as they hunt every man his brother with a net, Mi 7²; to shoot at one with arrows, ψ 64⁸ (though this is against the accents); Pr 13²⁴ seeks him early (with) discipline, i. e. chastises him betimes, &c.

(γ) Expressions of asking some one for something, desiring something from some one (שָׁאַל Dt 14²⁶, ψ 137³); answering any one anything (עָנָה Mi 6⁵, &c.; cf. in the other conjugations הָשִׁיב דְּבַר prop. verbum reddere, with an accusative of the person, 1 K 12⁶, &c., also in the sense of announcing; sometimes also הִגִּיד to declare something to some one, Jb 26⁴, &c., for הִגִּיד לְ; צָוָה to enjoin a person something, Ex 34³², Dt 1¹⁸, 32⁴⁶, Jer 7²³.

(δ) Expressions which mean to make, to form, to build something out of something; in such cases, besides the accusative of the object proper, another accusative is used for the material of which the thing is made, e.g. Gn 2⁷ וַיִּצַר יְהוָה אֶת־הָאָדָם עֹפָר מִן־הָאָדָמָה and the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground; so with יָצַר also in 1 K 7¹⁵; further Ex 38³ כָּל־כֵּלָיו עָשָׂה נְחֹשֶׁת כָּל־כֵּלָיו עָשָׂה נְחֹשֶׁת [into brass], linguistically possible but excluded by the context, see below, ii with kk); cf. Ex 25^{18.28}, 26^{1.14f.29}, 27¹, 36⁸, 1 K 7²⁷; with a preceding accusative of the material, Ex 25²⁹, 29², Dt 27⁶ אֲבָנִים שְׁלֵמוֹת תִּבְנֶה אֶת־מִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה of unhewn stones shalt thou build the altar of the Lord.

(c) Verbs which express making, preparing, forming into anything, ii along with the object proper, take a second accusative of the product, e.g. Gn 27⁹ אֶעֱשֶׂה אֹתָם מִטְעָמִים I will make them (the kids) into savoury meat; cf. Gn 6^{14.16}, Ex 26^{1b}, 30²⁵, 32⁴, Is 44¹⁵, Ho 8⁴, 1 K 18³² וַיִּבְנֶה אֶת־הָאֲבָנִים מִזְבֵּחַ and he built the stones (into) an altar; cf. 10¹². So also אָפָה, with two accusatives, to bake something into something, Ex 12³⁹, Lv 24⁵; שָׂם (prop. to set up for something, cf. Gn 27³⁷, 28¹⁸, ψ 39⁹, and similarly הָרִים Gn 31⁴⁵) to change into something, Jos 8²⁸, Is 50², 51¹⁰, Mi 1⁷, 4¹³; with two accusatives of the person (to appoint, promote any one to the position of a . . .), Is 3⁷; נָתַן is also used in the same sense with two accusatives, Gn 17⁵, and שָׂת 1 K 11³⁴; as a rule, however, the description of the office, and also frequently of the product, is introduced by לְ to, § 119 t; also שָׂת to make a thing so and so (Is 5⁶, 26¹; with a personal object, ψ 21⁷, 191⁹); הִחְשִׁיךְ to make dark, Am 5⁸. Of the same class also are instances like Jb 28² וַיִּקְרַעְהָ שָׁנִים עֹשֶׂר a stone they smelt into brass; 1 K 11³⁰ וַיִּקְרַעְהָ וַיִּשְׂרֶם and rent it (the garment) into twelve pieces; cf. Is 37²⁶, accusative of the product before the object proper, after לְהַשְׂאוֹת to lay waste.

¹ Cf. a very pregnant expression of this kind in ψ 21¹³ כִּי תִשְׂתַּמּוּ שְׁכָם for thou shalt make them (as) a neck, i. e. thou shalt cause them to turn their necks (backs) to me; similarly ψ 18⁴¹ (2 S 22⁴¹, Ex 23²⁷); אֵיבִי נָתַתָּה לִּי עֶרְפָּה thou hast given mine enemies unto me as a back; cf. Jer 18¹⁷.

On a second object with *verba sentiendi* (as יָדַע to know something to be something, Ec 7²⁵; רָאָה to see, find to be, Gn 7¹; כִּשְׁבָה to esteem one to be something, Is 53⁴, elsewhere always construed with לְ or בְ), cf. *h*.

kk Rem. At first sight some of the examples given above appear to be identical in character with those treated under *hh*; thus it is possible, e. g. in 1 K 18³², by a translation which equally suits the sense, *he built from the stones an altar*, to explain מִבְּנֵי אֲבִיבִים as the nearer object and אֶת־הָאֲבִיבִים as an accusative of the material, and the construction would then be exactly the same as in Dt 27⁶. In reality, however, the fundamental idea is by no means the same. Not that in the living language an accusative of the material in the one case, and in the other an accusative of the product were consciously distinguished. As Driver (*Tenses*, § 195) rightly observes, the remoter accusative in both cases is, strictly speaking, in apposition to the nearer. This is especially evident in such examples as Ex 20²⁵ *thou shalt not build them* (the stones of the altar) אֲבִיבֵי as *hewn stones*, cf. also Gn 1²⁷. The main point is, which of the two accusatives, as being primarily affected (or aimed at) by the action, is to be made the more prominent; and on this point neither the position of the words (the nearer object, mostly determinate, as a rule follows immediately after the verb), nor even the context admits of much doubt. Thus in 1 K 18³² the treatment of the stones is the primary object in view, the erection of the altar for which they were intended is the secondary; in Dt 27⁶ the case is reversed.

ll (*d*) Finally, the second accusative sometimes more closely determines the nearer object by indicating the part or member specially affected by the action,¹ e. g. ψ 3⁸ *for thou hast smitten all mine enemies* אֶת־לְחִי (as to) *the cheek bone*, equivalent to *upon the cheek bone*; cf. Gn 37²¹ *let us not smite him* שְׁבִיבֵי in *the life*, i. e. let us not kill him; Dt 22²⁶, 2 S 3²⁷; also with שִׁוּי Gn 3¹⁵; with רָעָה Jer 2¹⁶; in poetry the object specially concerned is, by a bold construction, even placed first, Dt 33¹¹ (with יָחַד).

§ 118. The Looser Subordination of the Accusative to the Verb.

a 1. The various forms of the looser subordination of a noun to the verb are distinguished from the different kinds of the accusative of the object (§ 117) by their specifying not the persons or things directly affected by the action, but some *more immediate circumstance* under which an action or an event takes place. Of such circumstances the most common are those of *place*, *time*, *measure*, *cause*, and finally the *manner* of performing the action. These nearer definitions are, as a rule, placed *after* the verb; they may, however, also precede it.

b Rem. That the cases thus loosely subordinated to the verb are to be regarded as *accusatives* is seen first from the fact that in certain instances the *nota accusativi* (אֶת) is prefixed; secondly from the fact that in one form of

¹ Analogous to this is the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ κατὰ μέρος in Greek epic poetry, e. g. ποιὸν σε ἔπος φύγε ἕρκος ὀδόντων.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

Ex 29¹³, &c.); Dt 1^{2.19}, 1 2 S 17²⁶, 1 K 7⁸, Pr 8³, 9¹⁴. On Is 1³⁰ see § 116 i; on **בְּשֵׁר**, with the *accus. loci*, see § 117 bb. On the other hand, in Dt 6³, according to the LXX, a verb of *giving* has dropped out before **אֶרְץ**.

h Examples of (c): Gn 7²⁰ *fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail*; Gn 31²³, 41⁴⁰ **רַק הַכִּסֵּא אֲנִי לְמִנְיָן** *only in the throne will I be greater than thou*; Dt 1¹⁹ *we went (through) all that great and terrible wilderness*; cf. Jb 29³. Of the same kind also are such cases as Ex 16¹⁶ (*according to the number of your persons, for which elsewhere לְמִסְפַּר- is used); 1 S 6⁴ (with the *accus. preceding*); 6¹⁸, 2 S 21²⁰, Jb 1⁵.—A statement of weight is put in the accusative in 2 S 14²⁶.*

i 3. The accusative is employed to determine more precisely the *time* (*accus. temporis*), (a) in answer to the question *when?* e. g. הַיּוֹם *the day*, i. e. *on the day* (in question), *at that time*, but also *on this day*, i. e. *to-day*, or finally *by day*, equivalent to יוֹמָם, like עֶרֶב *at evening*, לַיְלָה *noctu*, בֶּקֶר *in the morning, early*, ψ 5⁴, &c., צַהֲרַיִם *at noonday*, ψ 91⁶; יוֹם אֶחָד *on one and the same day*, Gn 27⁴⁵; שְׁנָא *in sleep*, ψ 127²; תְּחִלַּת קְצִיר שְׁעָרִים (*Qerê 'Bêt*) *at the beginning of barley harvest*, 2 S 21⁹; in stating a date, Gn 11¹⁰, 14⁴ *in the thirteenth year*.

k (b) In answer to the question *how long?* e. g. Gn 3¹⁴, &c., כָּל-יְמֵי *all the days of thy life*; 7⁴ *forty days and forty nights*; 7²¹, 14⁴, 15¹³, 21³⁴, 29¹⁸, Ex 20⁹ (*for six days*); 23¹⁵, 31¹⁷; עוֹלָמִים *for ever*, 1 K 8¹³; also with the accusative made determinate, Ex 13⁷ אֵת שִׁבְעַת *throughout the seven days* in question, mentioned immediately before; cf. Ju 14¹⁷, Dt 9²⁵.

l 4. The accusative is sometimes used of abstract ideas to state the reason (*accus. causae*), e. g. Is 7²⁵ *thou shalt not come thither* יִרְאַת שָׁמִיר *for fear of briars*.

m 5. Finally the accusative is used very variously (as an *accus. adverbialis* in the narrower sense), in order to describe more precisely the *manner* in which an action or state takes place. In English such accusatives are mostly rendered by *in, with, as, in the form or manner of . . ., according to, in relation to, with regard to*. For more convenient classification we may distinguish them as—

n (a) Adjectives expressing *state*, placed *after* the verb to describe more accurately some bodily or other external condition, e. g. Is 20² *walking* עָרוֹם וְיָחָף *naked and barefoot*; cf. verse 3, 8²¹, Gn 15², 33¹⁸ (שָׁלֵם), Ju 8⁴, Mi 1⁸, ψ 107⁶ (but in 15² תָּמִים is rather a substantive directly dependent on הוֹלֵךְ = *he that walketh in uprightness*; cf. § 117 r, note); Jb 30²⁸. After an accusative, e. g. Dt 15¹⁸; to specify some mental state, e. g. Gn 37³⁵ (אֲבֵל).—Before the verb (and then with a certain emphasis), Am 2¹⁶, Jb 1²¹, Ec 5¹⁴; Lv 20²⁰, Jb 19²⁵, 27¹⁹, 31²⁶

¹ In ψ 2¹² דֶּרֶךְ is not to be taken as an *accus. loci* (*on the way*), but as an *accus. of respect* (*with regard to the way*); see below, m.

(unless יקר be a substantive); Ru 1²¹ (מלאה) parallel with the adverb (ריקם). In Mi 2⁷ the text is clearly corrupt.

Those examples are especially instructive in which the adjective expressing *O* a state, although referring to several, is nevertheless used in the singular, e.g. Jb 24¹⁰ ערום הלכו naked, i.e. in the condition of one naked, they go about; cf. verse 7 and 12¹⁷. In Is 20⁴ the singular occurs after a plural object, and in Is 47⁵ the *masc.* after the 2nd sing. *fem.* imperative, which clearly proves that the term expressing the state is not conceived as being in apposition, but as an indeclinable adverb.

(b) Participles, again either after the verb, Nu 16²⁷, Jer 2²⁷, 43², ψ 7³, Jb 24⁵, P Ct 2⁸, or before it, Gn 49¹¹, Is 57¹⁹, Ez 36³⁵, ψ 56², 92¹⁴, Pr 20¹⁴; cf. also the substantival use of the participles Niph'al נוראות in a fearful manner (ψ 139¹⁴) and נפלאות in a wonderful manner, Jb 37⁵, Dn 8²⁴.—Also participles in connexion with genitives, as מתהלך Gn 3⁸ (cf. also באה 1 K 14⁶), are to be regarded as expressing a state and not as being in apposition, since in the latter case they would have to take the article.—In 2 S 13²⁰, 1 K 7⁷ and Hb 2¹⁰ the explicative *Wāw* (equivalent to *and that too*) is also prefixed to the participle. In ψ 69⁴ for מִיחַל read מִיחַל.—On 1 K 11⁸, 2 K 10⁶, 19², Hag 1⁴, cf. the note on § 131 *h*.

(c) Substantives¹ in the most varied relations: thus, as describing an external state, e.g. Mi 2³ ולא תלכו רומה neither shall ye walk haughtily (as opposed to שחנה Is 60¹⁴); Lv 6⁹ (accus. before the verb = as unleavened cakes), Dt 2⁹, 4¹¹, Ju 5²¹, Is 57², Pr 7¹⁰, Jb 31²⁶, La 1⁹; as stating the position of a disease, 1 K 15²³ he was diseased אֶת-רַגְלָיו in his feet (2 Ch 16¹² בְּרַגְלָיו), analogous to the cases discussed in § 117 *ll* and § 121 *d* (*d*); as describing a spiritual, mental, or moral state, e.g. Nu 32¹⁴, Jos 9² (פֶּה אֶחָד with one accord, 1 K 22¹³; cf. Ex 24³, Zp 3⁹), 1 S 15³², 2 S 23³, Is 41³ (unless שְׁלוֹם is adjectival, and the passage is to be explained as in *n*); Jer 31⁷, Ho 12¹⁵, 14⁵, ψ 56³, 58², 75³, Pr 31⁹, Jb 16⁹, La 1⁹; Lv 19¹⁶, &c., in the expression הֵלַךְ רָבִיל to go up and down as a tale-bearer; also בְּטָח unawares, Gn 34²⁵, Ez 30⁹; מִישָׁרִים uprightly, ψ 58², 75³ (in both places before the verb); as stating the age, e.g. 1 S 2³³ (if the text be right) יָמוֹתוֹ אֲנָשִׁים they shall die as men, i.e. in the prime of life; cf. 1 S 2¹⁸ (נָעַר), Is 65²⁰, and Gn 15¹⁶; as specifying a number more accurately, Dt 4²⁷, 1 S 13¹⁷, 2 K 5², Jer 31⁸ [in Jer 13¹⁰ שְׁלוֹמִים wholly (?) is corrupt; read גְּלוֹת שְׁלֵמָה with LXX for 'הַגְּלוֹת ש']; as stating the consequence of the action, Lv 15¹⁸, &c.

The description of the external or internal state may follow, in poetry, in *7* the form of a comparison with some well-known class, e.g. Is 21⁸ וַיִּקְרָא אַרְיָה and he cried as a lion; cf. ψ 22¹⁴, Is 22¹⁸ (כַּדָּוָד like a ball); Is 24²², Zc 2⁸, ψ 11¹ (unless צִפּוֹר be vocative); 58^{9b} (unless the force of the preceding ׀ is carried on, as in ψ 90⁴); ψ 144¹², Jb 24⁵ (פְּרָאִים, before the verb); 41⁷ shut up together as with a close seal.²

6. To the expressions describing a state belong finally those nouns *S* which are introduced by the comparative particle ׀,³ since the ׀ is to

¹ Cf. above, § 100 *c*, on certain substantives which have completely become adverbs; and § 113 *h* and *k* on the adverbial use of the infinitive absolute.

² It is, as a matter of fact, permissible to speak of the above examples as *comparatio decurtata*, but it must not be assumed that the comparative particle ׀, which is otherwise regularly prefixed (see *s*), has actually dropped out.

³ On the use of ׀ as a prefix, cf. § 102 *c*.

be regarded as originally a substantive¹ in the sense of *amount, kind (instar)*, standing in the accusative (so that כִּי is equivalent to *as a kind of, after the manner of, according to*), while the following noun represents a genitive governed by the כִּי. From this, which is the proper meaning of the כִּי, may be explained its power of representing a great many pregnant relations, which in English can only be rendered by the help of prepositions.² Thus the comparison may refer to—

- t (a) The *place*, e.g. Is. 5¹⁷ כִּי־בָרָם *after the manner of*, i. e. *as in their pasture*; 23¹⁵ *as (it is said) in the song of the harlot*; 28²¹, 29⁷ כִּי־חִלּוֹם *as in a dream*.
- u (b) The *time*, especially in the combination כִּי־יוֹם *after the manner of the day*, equivalent to *as in the day*, Is 9³, Ho 2⁵; כִּי־יָמֵי *as in the days of . . .*, Is 51⁹, Ho 2¹⁷, 9⁹, 12¹⁰, Am 9¹¹; cf. moreover, Lv 22¹³, Ju 20³⁹, Is 17⁶, Jb 5¹⁴, 29², and the expressions כִּי־יוֹם כִּי־יוֹם *as day by day = as in the former days*, 1 S 18¹⁰; כִּי־פַעַם כִּי־פַעַם *as at other times*, 1 S 3¹⁰, &c.; כִּי־שָׁנָה כִּי־שָׁנָה *as in former years*, 2 K 17⁴; cf. § 123 c. Of a different character is the use of כִּי as a simple particle of time, e.g. Gn 18¹⁰ כִּי־עַתָּה *at this time (not about the time)*, when it lives again, i. e. at the end of a year; כִּי־מָחָר *to-morrow at this time*; cf. Is 23⁵, and the frequent connexion of כִּי with the infinitive construct to express a definite time (in the sense of a pluperfect), Gn 12¹⁴, 27³⁴, Ex 9²⁹, &c.
- u (c) The *person*, e.g. Gn 34³¹ *should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?*
- w (d) The *thing*, e.g. Is 10¹⁴, ψ 33⁷, Jb 28⁵ כִּי־אֵשׁ *as a fire*, i. e. *as it were by fire* (cf. Is 1²⁵ כִּי־בַיִר *as with lye*); Jb 29²³ כִּי־מָטָר *as for the rain (they waited for me)*; Jb 38¹⁴ (as in a garment); 38³⁰ כִּי־אֶבֶן *as to stone (the waters are solidified in freezing)*.
- x Rem. According to the earlier grammarians, כִּי is sometimes used pleonastically, i. e. not to indicate a similarity (as in Lv 14³⁵ *as it were*, i. e. *something like*), but simply to introduce the predicate (*Kaph veritatis*), e.g. Neh 7² *for he was כִּי־אִישׁ אֱמֶת a faithful man*; cf. 1 S 20³ כִּי־פֶשַׁע, La 1²⁰ כִּי־פְּפוֹת. Such a pleonasm is of course out of the question. At the most a *Kaph veritatis* can only be admitted in the sense that the comparison is sometimes introduced by כִּי with a certain emphasis (equivalent to *in every respect like*); thus כִּי־אִישׁ אֱמֶת in Neh 7² means simply *of the nature of a faithful man*, i. e. *as only a faithful man can be*; cf. Nu 11¹, Is 1⁷, 13⁶, Ho 4⁴, 5¹⁰, Ob 11, Jb 24¹⁴, 27⁷, La 1²⁰, 2⁴; also כִּי־מְעַט in such passages as ψ 105¹² *yea, very few*; but e.g. in Is 1⁹ *only just, a very small . . .*

¹ Schwabe (כִּי *nach seinem Wesen und Gebrauch im alttestam. Kanon gewürdigt*, Halle, 1883) contests this explanation (which is defended especially by Fleischer and is certainly indisputable). He, with Gesenius and Ewald, places כִּי as a preposition on the same footing as כִּי and כִּי, and believes it to be probably connected with the stem כִּי as well as with כִּי and כִּי. The above view of כִּי as a substantive of course does not imply that the language as we have it is still in every case conscious of the substantival meaning.—On כִּי in numerical statements, in the sense of *about, nearly*, see the Lexicon.

² It would be altogether unsuitable here also (see above, note 2 on r) to assume a loss of the preposition. Such examples as Is 1²⁶ (כִּי־בָרָאֵשׁנָה and כִּי־בָרָאֵשׁנָה), Lv 26³⁷ (כִּי־מֵאֲנִי) are to be explained from the fact that here the



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

above (so also in Gn 27³⁹, 49²⁵, not from above). These adverbs of place, however, may become prepositions by the addition of לְ, e. g. מִחוּץ לְ outside as regards . . . , i. e. outside of something, in 1 K 21¹³ even after a transitive verb of motion; עַד-מִתַּחַת לְ below as regards . . . , i. e. under something (cf. לְ עַד-מִתַּחַת לְ until they came under . . . , 1 S 7¹¹), מֵעַל לְ over something, &c.; לְבַד prop. in separation; לְבַד מִן- in separation from, i. e. apart from, besides. Only rarely in such a case is the לְ omitted for the sake of brevity, e. g. Jb 26⁶ מִתַּחַת מַיִם beneath the waters; Neh 3²⁸ (מֵעַל-).

d 2. Real combinations of prepositions (each retaining its full force) occur—
 (a) With מִן-, in מֵאַחֲרַי, מֵאַחֲרַי (see above) from behind something; מֵאַחַת and מֵעִם from with (see above); מִבֵּין or מִבֵּינֹת from between something (with motion in either direction, see e. g. Gn 49¹⁰); מִלְפָּנַי from before (see above); sometimes also מִמּוּל Lv 5⁸, &c.; מֵעַל- from upon, i. e. off from; מִתַּחַת away from under (see footnote 2 on p. 377).

e (b) With אֶל-, in אֶל-אַחֲרַי to behind, אֶל-בֵּינֹת to between; אֶל-מִבֵּית לְ forth between 2 K 11¹⁵; אֶל-מִחוּץ לְ forth without, i. e. out in front of, Nu 5³; אֶל-תַּחַת down under.¹—In Jb 5⁵ the two prepositions of motion are combined in a peculiarly pregnant construction, אֶל-מִצְנַיִם (he goes thither and takes it) out of the thorns, i. e. he taketh it even out of the thorns, but the text is hardly correct.

f 3. A general view of the union of certain verbs, or whole classes of verbs, with particular prepositions, especially in explanation of certain idioms and pregnant expressions.²

g (a) אֶל- (אֵלַי)³ towards, properly an expression of motion or at least direction towards something (either in the sense of up to = עַד, or into = אֶל-תּוֹךְ), is used after verbs not only in answer to the question *whither?* but by a specially pregnant construction, in answer to the question *where?* e. g. Jer 41¹² they

without, cf. also such examples as מִבְּלַי, מִמּוּל, מִפְּנֵי, מִשָּׁם (there), &c. Since a מִן- is not usually repeated after מִלְבַּד, it appears as if מִלְבַּד by a transposition of the מִן- stood for the usual לְבַד מִן-. In reality, however, the preposition which forms the adverb into a preposition is omitted here, as in מֵעַל, מִתַּחַת, without a following לְ (see above). Properly מִלְבַּד has a purely adverbial meaning = taken by itself, like מִלְמַעְלָה מִפְּעַל (Syriac *men le'el*) above (adv.), as distinguished from מִפְּעַל לְ or מֵעַל-לְ (Syriac *le'el men*), over, upon something.—Also לְמִן- from . . . onward is not for מִן-לְ, but the לְ serves merely (just like the Latin *usque* in *usque a*, *usque ad*, *usque ex*) to indicate expressly the starting-point, as an exact *terminus a quo* (of place or time).

¹ Also in 1 S 21⁵ אֶל-תַּחַת by a pregnant construction is virtually dependent on the idea of *coming into*, contained in the preceding אֵין-.

² A summary of all the relations and senses in which a preposition may be used, belongs not to the Grammar but to the Lexicon.

³ Cf. Mitchell, 'The preposition *el*,' in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1888, p. 143 ff., and especially A. Noordtzij, *Het hebreuwsche voorzetsel אל*, Leiden, 1896, a thorough examination of its uses, and especially of the relation between אֶל- and עַל-.

found him אֶל-מַיִם רַבִּים by the great waters; cf. Dt 16⁶, 1 K 13²⁰, and a still more remarkable instance in 8³⁰ אֶל-מְקוֹם שְׁבִתְךָ אֶל-הַשָּׂמַיִם. This combination of two different ideas, of motion to a place and being or acting in the place (very plainly seen in Dt 16⁶ but to the place which the Lord thy God shall choose . . . shalt thou bring thine offering and there shalt thou sacrifice, &c.), is the same as the Greek use of eis, ἐς for ἐν, the Latin in potestatem, in amicitiam ditionemque esse, manere (Cic. Verr. 5, 38; Div. 2, 14, &c.); cf. also the common German expressions zu Hause, zu Leipzig sein, zu Bette liegen, &c.

(b) **ב**.¹ Underlying the very various uses of this preposition is either the idea of being or moving within some definite region, or some sphere of space or time (with the infinitive, a simultaneous action, &c.), or else the idea of fastening on something, close connexion with something (also in a metaphorical sense, following some kind of pattern, e.g. the advice or command of some one בְּרַבֵּר פ', בְּעֵצַת פ', or in a comparison, as in Gn 1²⁶ בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ in our image, after our likeness; cf. 1²⁷, 5¹⁻³), or finally the idea of relying or depending upon . . ., or even of merely striking or touching something.

Thus the use of **ב** is explained—

(1) In the sense of among (in the domain of), e.g. Mi 7² יֵשֶׁר בְּאָדָם אֵין there is none upright among men; in the sense of consisting of, in specifying the constituents of a collective idea, e.g. Gn 7²¹ and all flesh died . . . in (= consisting of) fowl, &c. 8¹⁷, 9¹⁰, Ho 4³. Also after ideas of appearing, manifesting oneself, representing, being, in the sense of as, in the capacity of (prop. in the sphere, after the manner of, see above), consisting of . . ., tanquam, the **ב** *essentiae* of the earlier grammarians, corresponding to the Greek ἐν, the Latin in,² and the French en, e.g. Ex 6³ I appeared unto Abraham . . . בְּאֵל שֵׁרִי as El Shaddai; Jb 23¹³ וְהוּא בְּאָחָד but he is (manifests himself as) one, i.e. he remains always the same; Dt 26⁵, 28⁶² בְּמִחֵי מַעַט in the condition of being few, cf. 10²² to the number of seventy; Is 40¹⁰, ψ 39⁷.—Cf. also such examples as Ex 18⁴ (ψ 35², 146⁵) בְּעֻזִי as my help; Dt 26¹⁴ being unclean; Is 28¹⁶ in Sion (i.e. I make Sion a foundation); Ez 20⁴¹ as a sweet savour; Pr 3²⁶, perhaps also Ex 3² in (i.e. as) a flame of fire; Is 66¹⁵ with (i.e. like) fire; ψ 31²², 37²⁰ (102⁴). For the origin of all these forms of expression ψ 54⁶ is especially instructive, since אֲדָנִי בְּכַמְבֵי נַפְשִׁי is not meant to refer to the Lord as belonging to the כַּמְבֵי, but only to ascribe to him a similar character, i.e. the Lord is one who upholds my soul; so also ψ 99⁶, 118⁷, Ju 11³⁵ [the plur. as in § 124 g-i].³—Cf. Gesenius, *Thes. Linguae Hebr.*, i. 174 f., and Delitzsch on ψ 35².

(2) To introduce the object after transitive verbs, which denote touching, striking, reaching to (thus to some extent a fastening on, see above) something, in English sometimes rendered by at, on, &c., and in German generally by compounds with an, e.g. anfassen = בְּ אָחַז, anrühren = בְּ נָנַע, &c. To the same category belongs also the construction of verbs denoting authority (מָשַׁל, מָלַךְ, נָנַשׁ, נָרַה, the last prop. to tread on . . .) with **ב**, inasmuch as the exercise of the authority is regarded as a laying hold of the person ruled; so also, the introduction of the object by **ב** after certain *verba dicendi*, or when the mental action is to be represented as extending to some one or something: e.g.

¹ Cf. Wandel, *De particulae Hebr. ב indole, vi, usu*, Jena, 1875.

² e.g. *res in praeda captae*, i.e. things taken as spoil; see Nägelsbach, *Lat. Stilistik*, § 123⁴. On the Hebrew **ב** *essentiae*, see Hauschild in the *Festschrift zur Einweihung des Goethegymn.* Frankf. a. M. 1897, p. 163.

³ Other instances formerly cited here (Is 26⁴, ψ 55¹⁹, where **ב** is used before the subject) as well as ψ 68⁵ בִּיהַ שְׁמוֹ Jah is his name, are textually very uncertain. Cf. Cheyne, *SBOT. Isaiah*, p. 173, on Is 26⁴.

קָרָא בְּ to call on some one, נִשְׁבַּע בְּ iurare per aliquem, שָׁאַל בְּ to enquire of some one. Again, רָאָה בְּ to look upon, שָׁמַע בְּ to hearken to (but cf. also *m*), generally with the secondary idea of participation, or of the pleasure with which one sees or hears anything, especially pleasure at the misfortunes of others, hence רָאָה בְּ to see his desire on any one or anything; cf. however, Gn 21¹⁶ let me not look upon the death of the child; 1 S 6¹⁹ because they had looked [irreverently] at the ark of the Lord.

Closely related to this is the use of בְּ:

- l* (3) To introduce the person or thing, which is the object of a *mental* act, e. g. הֵאמִין בְּ to trust in (to cleave trustingly to) somebody or something; בָּטַח בְּ to have confidence in . . . ; שָׂמַח בְּ to rejoice in or at something, &c.; דִּבֶּר בְּ to speak of (about) some one or something, Dt 6⁷, 1 S 19^{3 f.}, &c.
- m* (4) The idea of an action as extending to something, with at the same time the secondary idea of participation in something, underlies finally the *partitive* use of בְּ, e. g. אָכַל בְּ to share in eating something, Ex 12^{43 ff.}, Lv 22¹¹; also simply to eat, to taste of something, Ju 13¹⁶, Jb 21²⁵; so also לָחַם בְּ to eat of, and שָׁתָה בְּ¹ to drink of something, Pr 9⁵; שָׁמַע בְּ to hear a whisper of something, Jb 26¹⁴; מָצְאָה בְּ they found remaining of her only . . . , 2 K 9³⁵; נָשָׂא בְּ to bear a share of something, Nu 11¹⁷, Ez 18²⁰, Jb 7¹³. Cf. also הָלַק בְּ to give a share of something, Jb 39¹⁷; בָּנָה בְּ to do building to, Neh 4⁴.
- n* (5) With the idea of touching, striking against anything is naturally connected that of proximity and vicinity near, and further that of association with something; cf. Gn 9⁴ בְּנַפְשׁוֹ with the life thereof; 15¹⁴, 32¹¹ בְּמִקְלִי with my staff. Sometimes בְּ combined with a verb of motion (to come with something), expresses the idea of bringing, e. g. Ju 15¹ Samson visited his wife with a kid, i. e. he brought her a kid; Dt 23⁵, ψ 66¹³, 1 Ch 15^{19 ff.}, 16⁶.
- O* (6) From the idea of connexion with something, being accompanied by something (see *n*), is developed, finally, the *instrumental* use of בְּ, which represents the means or instrument (or even the personal agent), as something with which one has associated himself in order to perform an action; cf. Mi 4¹⁴ בְּשִׁבְטָם they smite with the rod; Is 10²⁴; ψ 18³⁰ בְּךָ by thee (so also 44⁶, parallel with בְּשִׁמְךָ); Is 10³⁴, Ho 1⁷, 12¹⁴; cf. also עָבַד בְּ to labour by means of some one, i. e. to cause him to labour at it, Ex 1¹⁴, &c. On בְּ with the passive to introduce the means or the author, see § 121 *f*.
- p* A variety of the בְּ *instrumenti* is בְּ *pretii* (the price being considered as the means of acquiring a thing), cf. Gn 23⁹, 29¹⁸ (בְּרַחֵל); 30¹⁶, 33¹⁹, 34¹⁵ (בְּזֹאת on this condition); 37²⁸; also, in a wider sense, Gn 18²⁸ בְּ for the sake of; 1 S 3¹³.
- q* Rem. The use of בְּ *instrumenti* to introduce the object is peculiar in such expressions as ψ 44²⁰ and thou coveredst over us בְּצִלְמוֹת with the shadow of death; Jb 16¹⁰ פָּעְרוּ עָלַי בְּפִיהֶם they have opened wide their mouth against me (prop. have made an opening with their mouth); cp. ψ 22⁸, Ex 7²⁰ he lifted up בַּמֶּטֶה the rod; Lv 16⁴ הִגֵּר וְצָנָף followed by בְּ; Jos 8¹⁸, La 1¹⁷. Analogous to some English expressions we find both to gnash the teeth, ψ 35¹⁶, and to gnash with the teeth, Jb 16⁹; to wink the eye, Pr 10¹⁰, and to wink with the eye, Pr 6¹³; shake the head, ψ 22⁸, and to shake with the head, Jer 18¹⁸, Jb 16⁴.—In all these instances

¹ To be distinguished from שָׁתָה בְּ = to drink from (a cup, &c., Gn 44⁵, Am 6⁶), as in Arabic and Aramaic (Dn 5²). Cf. also ἐν ποτηρίοις (Xen. Anab. vi. 1, 4), ἐν χρυσώμασι πίνευ (3 Ezr 3⁶), venenum in auro bibitur, Seneca, Thyestes 453, and the French boire dans une tasse.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

Is 36⁹; even before the verb, Jer 9².—To the same class belongs also the *Lamedh inscriptionis* (untranslatable in English, and hardly more than a mere quotation-mark) which introduces the exact wording of an inscription or title; thus Is 8¹ *write upon it . . .* (the words) מִהָרָשָׁלַל וְגוֹי (cf. verse 3, where the ל naturally is not used); Ez 37¹⁶.

ו (d) מִן, originally (according to § 101 a) *separation*,¹ represents both the idea of *distance, separation or remoteness from something*, and that of *motion away from something*, hence also *descent, origin from a place*, Am 1¹.

זו (1) From the idea of *separation* is naturally derived on the one hand the sense of (taken) *from among . . ., e numero*, e. g. Gn 3¹ *subtil as none other of the beasts, &c.*; cf. 3¹⁴, Dt 33²⁴, 1 S 15³³, Ju 5²⁴ (so especially after the idea of *choosing out of*² a larger class, 1 S 2²⁸; cf. Ex 19⁵, &c.), and on the other hand, the sense of *without* (separated, free from . . .), e. g. Is 22³ מִקֶּשֶׁת אֶפְרוֹ without the bow (i. e. without one needing to bend a bow against them) *they were made prisoners*; cf. Jer 48⁴⁵ מִכֹּחַ without strength; Ho 6⁶, as the first half-verse shows, *not more than burnt offerings* (as R. V.), but *and not burnt offerings*; Mi 3⁶, ψ 52⁵, Jb 11¹⁵, 19²⁶, 21⁹, also such examples as Nu 15²⁴ *far from the eyes*, i. e. unobserved by the congregation; Pr 20³.

א Here also belongs the use of מִן after the ideas of *restraining, withholding from, refusing to any one*, frequently in pregnant expressions, which we can render only by complete final or consecutive clauses, e. g. 1 S 15²³ *he hath rejected thee* מִמְּלֹךְךָ away from (being) king, instead of מֵהָיִוֹת כֹּהֵן (as in verse 26), *that thou be no longer king*; cf. 1 K 15¹³, Is 17¹ מֵעִיר so that it is no longer a city; Jer 17¹⁶, Jb 28¹¹ *he bindeth the streams* מִבְּכֵי that they trickle not; Gn 16², 23⁶ מִקְבֹּר that thou shouldst not bury thy dead; Is 24¹⁰.

י The מִן has a still more pregnant force in those examples in which the idea of *precluding from anything* is only indirectly contained in the preceding verb, e. g. Gn 27¹ *his eyes were dim* מִרְאֵת away from seeing, i. e. so that he could not see; Is 7⁸ *Ephraim shall be broken in pieces* מֵעַם that it be not a people (just as in Is 23¹, Jer 48^{2,42}, ψ 83⁵); Lv 26¹³, Is 5⁶, 49¹⁵, 54⁹, Ezr 2⁶² (for other pregnant constructions with מִן see below, f)³; on מִבְּלֵי and מֵאֵין without, cf. § 152 y.

¹ Cf. O. Molin, *Om prepositionen min i Bibellebreisken*, Upsala, 1893, and especially N. Zerweck, *Die hebr. Praep. min*, Leipzig, 1893, who, instead of the partitive meaning (formerly accepted by us also), more correctly takes 'separation' as the starting-point of its various uses.

² All the *partitive* uses of מִן also come most naturally under this idea of *separation out of a larger class*. Thus מִן is used in the sense of *some, something, and even one*, in such expressions as *and he slew . . . also* מִשָּׂרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (divers) of the princes of Israel, 2 Ch 21⁴; מִכָּל־ Lv 4²; 1 K 18⁵; מִדַּם הַפָּר some of the blood of the bullock, Ex 29¹², &c.; Jb 27⁶ *my heart doth not reproach me* מִיָּמִי for any, i. e. for one, of my days; 38¹² מִיָּמַי one of thy days, i. e. ever in thy life (this explanation is confirmed by 1 K 1⁶; cf. also 1 S 14⁴⁵, 25²⁸). In this way also, the frequently misunderstood Hebrew (and Arabic) idiom is to be explained, by which מִן before אֶחָד, אֶחָת is equivalent to *ullus*; e. g. Lv 4² *and shall do* מֵאַחַת מֵהֵנָּה any one of these things; 5¹³, Dt 15⁷, Ez 18¹⁰; so before a *nomen unitatis* (see § 122 t), 1 S 14⁴⁵ (2 S 14¹¹, 1 K 1⁵²) מִשְׁעַרְתֵּי רֵאשִׁיו not one hair of his head.—מִן is used in the sense of the Arabic *min el-beyān* or explicative *min* (often to be simply translated by *namely*), e. g. in Gn 7²² of all that was, i. e. so far as it was, probably also Gn 6² (= *whomsoever they chose*).

³ On the use of מִן to express the comparative, which likewise depends on the idea of *distance from . . .*, cf. below, § 133 a; on מִן as expressing the

(2) On the sense of *motion away from* anything depends the use of מן after א such ideas as *to take away from, to beware, to be afraid of, to flee, to escape, to hide oneself from* (cf. καλύπτω ἀπό, *custodire ab*), sometimes again in pregnant expressions, e. g. Is 33¹⁵. On the idea of *starting from* anything depends finally the very frequent *causative* use of מן *on account of, in consequence of* (cf. our *that comes from . . .*), *prae*, e. g. מרב for *multitude*, 1 K 8⁵.

(e) על.¹ The two original local meanings of this preposition are *upon* אα (*ἐπι*)² and *over* (ὐπέρ, *super*).

(1) From the original meaning *upon* is explained the use of על after ideas of *commanding, commissioning* (פקד על), &c., inasmuch as the command, obligation, &c., is *laid upon* the object. The construction is self-evident in the case of *to lie, rest, lean, rely, press upon* something; cf. also, for the last, such examples as Is 1¹⁴, Jb 7²⁰, 23², and especially 2 S 18¹¹ ועלי prop. *upon me* would it have been, it would have been incumbent *upon me*, &c.

(2) From the original meaning *over* is explained the use of על after ideas of *covering, protecting, guarding* פסה על, גנן על; also the combinations רחם על *to have compassion upon . . .*, חוס על, חמל על *to spare* some one, arise from the idea of a compassionate or protective *bending over* something. Cf. also נלחם על Ju 9¹⁷ = *to fight for* some one, i. e. in his defence.

(3) Moreover על is used after verbs of *standing* and *going*, to express a *towering over* some one or something, sometimes in phrases, in which the original local idea has altogether fallen into the background, and which are therefore to be rendered in English by means of other prepositions (*by, with, before, near*), e. g. Gn 41¹, &c., *Pharaoh . . . stood על-הניאר by the Nile* (above the water level; cf. ψ 1³), and so especially עמד על in the pregnant sense *to stand serving before* some one (prop. *over* one who sits or reclines at table) Zc 4¹⁴ (cf. Is 6², where מַעַל לְ is used for על); התייצב על *to present oneself by command before* some one, Jb 1⁶, &c. Cf. also על-ידי, על-יד (Jb 1¹⁴) *near, at (on) the side* of some one or something.

(4) From the original meaning *above* (not, as formerly explained, *on to something, at something*) there arise finally all the various constructions with על in the sense of *towards, against*. The original idea (which in many of these constructions has become wholly unrecognizable) starts from the view that the assailant endeavours to take up his position *over* the person attacked, so as to reach him from above, or to *overpower* him; cf. especially קים על *to rise up over, i. e. against* some one, then with a transference of

distance of time from a fixed limit, in the sense of *after*, e. g. ψ 73²⁰ מִתְקִיץ אַחֲרֵי אֲרִיסוֹן (cf. ἐξ ἀρίστου, *ab itinere*), or *after the lapse of . . .*, e. g. Gn 38²⁴, Ho 6², and very frequently מִן מֵאֲחֵרֵי *from the end of, i. e. after the lapse of . . .*, see the Lexicon; also for the use of מן to represent *resting beside* anything, like the Latin *prope abesse ab . . .*

¹ Cf. Budie, *Die hebr. Präpos. 'Al (על)*, Halle, 1882.

² Since the placing *upon* anything is an addition to it, על also implies *in addition to* something, cf. Gn 28⁹ (31⁵⁰); 30⁴⁰, 32¹² (probably a proverbial saying = *mother and children*); Dt 22⁶. Also על *notwithstanding* is no doubt properly *in addition to*, e. g. Jb 10⁷ *although thou knowest*, prop. *in addition to thy knowing*.—From the original meaning *upon* is also derived that of *on account of* (prop. *upon the ground of*) and *in agreement with, according to*, since the pattern is regarded as the foundation *upon* which a thing stands or rests.

thought applied to any kind of hostile approach, *נִלְחָם עַל־* to fight against . . . , *הִנָּה עַל־* to encamp against . . . , *נִאָסַף עַל־* to be gathered together, to assemble against (Mi 4¹¹; cf. ψ 2²), &c. ; even after verbs which express a mental action, e. g. *הִשָּׁב רָעָה עַל־* to imagine evil against any one, &c.

ee 4. Sometimes a preposition appears to be under the immediate government of a verb, which, by its meaning, excludes such a union. In reality the preposition is dependent on a verb (generally a verb of motion), which, for the sake of brevity, is not expressed, but in sense is contained in what is apparently the governing verb.

ff Various examples of this *constructio praegnans* have been already noticed above in *x* and *y* under *מִן־*; for *מִן־* cf. also ψ 22²² *וּמִקֶּרְנֵי רַמִּים עֲנִיתָנִי* and thou hast answered and saved me from the horns of the wild oxen (in Is 38¹⁷, which Delitzsch translates by *thou hast loved and delivered my soul from the pit*, read *הִשָּׁבָתָה* with the LXX); Gn 25²³, 2 S 18¹⁹, Jb 28¹²; cf. also *וְנָה מִן־* ψ 73²⁷ to go a whoring from any one i. e. to be unfaithful to him; *וְרָשַׁע מִן־* ψ 18²² = to depart wickedly from God; *וְחָרַשׁ מִן־* ψ 28¹ to be silent from one (to turn away in silence); cf. Jb 13¹³ [; so with *מֵעַל* Jb 30^{17.30}].

gg Pregnant constructions with *אַחֲרַי*: Nu 14²⁴ equivalent to *וַיִּמְלֵא לְלֶכֶת אַחֲרַי* and he made full to walk i. e. walked fully after me; in 1 S 13⁷ read with the LXX *וַיִּחַרְרוּ מֵאַחֲרָיו* they trembled, i. e. went trembling away from him; with *וְדָרַשׁ אֶל־* Gn 43³³ *וְחָתְמָה אֶל־* to turn in astonishment to some one (cf. Is 13⁸); *וְדָרַשׁ אֶל־* Is 11¹⁰, &c., to turn inquiringly to some one; *וְחָרַשׁ אֶל־* Is 41¹ to turn in silence to some one; *וְחָרַד אֶל־* Gn 42²⁸ to turn trembling to some one (cf. *וְחָרַד לְקִרְאתָהּ* to come trembling to meet, 1 S 21² [also with *שָׂאג*, *הֲרִיץ*, *שָׂמַח* and other verbs, Ju 14⁵, 15¹⁴, 19⁸; see Lexicon]); cf. further Jer 41⁷, ψ 7⁷, 2 Ch 32¹; with *בְּ* ψ 55¹⁹ he hath redeemed and hath put my soul in peace, exactly like ψ 118⁶; with *לְ* ψ 74⁷ they have profaned and cast . . . even to the ground; cf. 89⁴⁰.

hh 5. In poetic parallelism the governing power of a preposition is sometimes extended to the corresponding substantive of the second member; ¹ e. g. *בְּ* Is 40¹⁹, 48¹⁴ he shall perform his pleasure *בְּבַבְלֹן* on Babylon, and his arm shall be *בְּשָׂדִים* (for *בְּבַבְלֹן*) on the Chaldeans; Jb 15³; *לְ* Is 28⁶, 42²² (but probably *לְ* has fallen out after another *לְ*), Ez 39⁴, Jb 34¹⁰ (perhaps also Gn 45⁸; *מִשָּׁל* may, however, be taken here as a second accusative according to § 117 ii); *מִן־* Is 48⁹; *מִן־* Is 58¹³, ψ 141⁹ (unless *וּמִמְקִישׁוֹת* is to be read); *עַד־* Is 15⁸; *תַּחַת* Is 61⁷.

ii 6. Adverbs which have acquired a substantival value are sometimes governed by prepositions, e. g. *אֶל־חִנָּם* in vain, Ez 6¹⁰; *אַחֲרַי־כֵּן* after this; *כֵּן* (Ec 8¹⁰, Est 4¹⁶) then, on this condition; *לְכֵן* and *עַל־כֵּן* therefore; *עַד־כֵּן* hitherto.

¹ Similarly the force of a negative is sometimes extended to the parallel member; see § 152 z.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

2 S 21⁴.—A perfect is possibly subordinated in Ia 1¹⁰; but the explanation of וַיָּשָׁב as a relative clause is preferable.

d 2. Instead of subordination (as in the cases mentioned in *a-c*), the co-ordination of the complementary verbal idea in the finite verb (cf. above, *c*) frequently occurs, either—

(*a*) With the second verb co-ordinated in a form exactly corresponding to the first (but see below, *e*) by means of וְ (וְ , וְ).¹ As a rule, here also (see above, *a*) the principal idea is introduced only by the second verb, while the first (especially וַיָּשָׁב , וַיִּסַּף ,² הוֹסִיף) contains the definition of the manner of the action, e. g. Gn 26¹⁸ $\text{וַיָּשָׁב וַיַּחְפֹּר}$ and he returned and digged, i. e. he digged again; 2 K 1^{11.13}; in the perfect consecutive, Is 6¹³; with הוֹסִיף , e. g. Gn 25¹ and Abraham added and took a wife, i. e. again took a wife; Gn 38⁵ and frequently; with הוֹאִיל in the jussive, Jb 6⁹; in the imperative (cf. § 110 *h*), Ju 1⁶ הוֹאִיל-נָא וְלִי be content, I pray thee, and tarry all night (cf. the English *he was persuaded and remained*, for *to remain*); 2 S 7²⁹; with מָהַר Gn 24^{18.20}, &c.; with הִמַּר Ct 2³.

e Rem. 1. Instead of an exact agreement between co-ordinate verbal forms, other combinations sometimes occur, viz. imperfect and perfect consecutive (cf. § 112 *d*), e. g. Dt 31¹² that they $\text{וַיִּרְאוּ וַיִּלְמְדוּ$ may learn, and fear the Lord, i. e. to fear the Lord; Is 1¹⁹, Ho 2¹¹, Est 8⁶, Dn 9^{25^b}; perfect and imperfect, Jb 23³ (*O that I knew how I might find him*); perfect and imperfect consecutive, Jos 7⁷, Ec 4^{1.7}; jussive and imperative, Jb 17¹⁰; cf., finally, Gn 47⁶ $\text{וְאִם-יָדַעְתָּ וְיִשְׁבְּעוּם}$ and if thou knowest and there are among them, &c., i. e. that there are among them.

f 2. Special mention must be made of the instances in which the natural complement of the first verb is suppressed, or is added immediately after in the form of an historical statement, e. g. Gn 42²⁵ then Joseph commanded and they filled³ (prop. that they should fill, and they filled . . . ; cf. the full form of expression in Gn 50²); a further command is then added by means of וְ and the infinitive; Ex 36⁶; another instance of the same kind is Gn 30²⁷ *I have divined and the Lord hath blessed me*, &c., i. e. that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake.

g (*b*) With the second verb (which, according to the above, represents the principal idea) attached *without the copula*⁴ in the same mood, &c. In this construction (cf. § 110 *h*) the imperatives קִימִי (קִימָה), קִימֵם ,

¹ Cf. the English colloquial expression *I will try and do it*.

² Of a different kind are the cases in which וַיִּסַּף with a negative is co-ordinated with a verb to emphasize the non-recurrence of the action; cf. Nu 11²⁵ *they prophesied and added not*, sc. to prophesy, i. e. but they did so no more; Dt 5¹⁹, Jb 27¹⁹ (reading וְלֹא יִסַּף).

³ Cf. the analogous examples in Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 102.

⁴ To be distinguished, of course, from the cases in which two equally important and independent verbs are used together without the copula in vigorous poetic imagery, e. g. Ex 15⁹, Jb 29⁸, &c.

&c.) and לָךְ (לָכָה, לָכִי, &c.) are exceedingly common with the sense of interjections, before verbs which express a movement or other action, e. g. קוּם הִתְהַלֵּךְ *arise, walk*, Gn 13¹⁷, 19¹⁵, 27⁴³; in the plural, Gn 19¹⁴; Ex 19²⁴ לֵךְ-יֵרֵד *go, get thee down*; 1 S 3⁹; with a following cohortative, 1 S 9¹⁰ נֵלְכָה נֵלְכָה *come, let us go*; Gn 31⁴⁴ and frequently.—Also with שׁוּב (a periphrasis for *again*) in the perfect, Zc 8¹⁵; in the imperfect, Mi 7¹⁹, ψ 7¹³, 59⁷, 71²⁰; in the jussive, Jb 10¹⁶; in the cohortative, Gn 30³¹; in the imperative, Jos 5², 1 S 3⁵ *lie down again*; הוֹאִיל (sometimes to express the idea of *willingly* or *gladly*) in the perfect, Dt 1⁵, Ho 5¹¹; in the imperative, Jb 6²⁸; אַל-תִּרְבוּ תִרְבּוּ הַרְבֵּה = *much*, 1 S 2³ אַל-תִּרְבוּ תִרְבּוּ הַרְבֵּה *do not multiply and talk*, i. e. talk not so much *arrogancy*; in the imperative, ψ 51⁴; הִחַל, Dt 2²⁴ רֵשׁ הִחַל *begin, possess*; יָכַל, La 4¹⁴ בְּלֹא יָכַל *without men's being able to touch*, &c.; מְהֵרָה = *quickly*, in the perfect, ψ 106¹³; in the imperative, Gn 19²², Ju 9⁴⁸, Est 6¹⁰.—Other examples are: Ho 9⁹ הַעֲמִיק = *deeply, radically*; Zp 3⁷ הַשְׁפִּים = *early* (even in the participle, Ho 6⁴, 13³); Is 29⁴ שָׁפַל = *low*, cf. Jer 13¹⁸; Jos 3¹⁶ הַמָּוֶם = *wholly*; ψ 112⁹ פָּזַר = *plentifully*.

Rem. This co-ordination without the copula belongs (as being more *h* vigorous and bolder) rather to poetic or otherwise elevated style (cf. e. g. Is 52¹, Ho 1⁶, 9⁹ with Gn 25¹, &c.). Asyndeton, however, is not wanting even in prose; besides the above examples (especially the imperatives of קוּם and הִלֵּךְ Gn 30³¹, Dt 1⁵, 2²⁴, Jos 3¹⁶, 1 S 3⁵) cf. also Neh 3²⁰, 1 Ch 13². For special reasons the verb representing the principal idea may even come first; thus Is 53¹¹ יִרְאֶה יִשְׁבַּע *he shall see, he shall be satisfied* (sc. with the sight), for the satisfaction does not come until after the enjoyment of the sight; Jer 4⁵ קָרָא מְלֵא *cry, fill*, i. e. cry with a full (loud) voice.

§ 121. Construction of Passive Verbs.

Blake, 'The internal passive in Semitic,' *JAOS.* xxii.

1. Verbs which in the active take *one* accusative (either of the *a* proper object, or of the *internal* object, or of some other nearer definition; cf. § 117 a, p, u) may in the passive, according to our mode of expression, be construed *personally*, the object of the active sentence now becoming the subject, e. g. Gn 35¹⁹ וַתָּמָת רָחֵל וַתִּקָּבֵר *and Rachel died, and was buried*, &c. The passive, however, is also used *impersonally* (in the 3rd sing. masc.), either absolutely, as Dt 21³⁴, Is 16¹⁰, Ez 16³⁴ (with a dative added, 2 S 17¹⁶, Is 53⁵, La 5⁵), or, more frequently, with the object of the active construction still subordinated in the accusative,¹ e. g. Gn 27⁴² וַיִּגַּד לְרִבְקָה אֶת-דְּבָרֵי עֵשָׂו *and there were told* (i. e. one told) *to Rebekah the words of Esau*; 2 S 21¹¹, 1 K 18¹³.

¹ When this is not recognizable either by the *nota accusativi*, or by its disagreement with the passive form in gender, number, and person, it

b Other examples are: after Niph., Gn 4¹⁸ וַיִּוָּלַד לְחֵנוֹךְ אֶת־עֵינָר and unto Enoch was born Irad (cf. Nu 26⁶⁰, and after an infinitive, Gn 21⁵); Gn 17⁵, 21⁸ (after an infinitive); 29²⁷ (unless וַיִּתְּנָה is 1st plur. cohortative); Ex 21²⁸, 25²⁸, Lv 6¹³, Nu 7¹⁰ (after an infinitive); 26⁵⁵ (cf. verse 53); Dt 20⁸ (where, however, for יָמֹם the Hiph. יָמֵם should be read, according to 1²⁸); Jos 7¹⁵, Is 16¹⁰; with the object preceding, Ex 13⁷, Lv 2⁸, 19²⁰, Nu 16²⁹, Dan 9²⁴.¹—Also after Pu'al, Jer 50²⁰; before Pu'al, Is 14³ (אֲשֶׁר equivalent to the internal object עֲבָרָה = which they have caused to be served by thee); Jb 22⁹; according to the Masoretic text also Gn 46²², where, however, the Samaritan and LXX read יִלְרָה for יִלְרָ; the Samaritan in Gn 35²⁶ and 46²⁷ also reads יִלְרָ, and this (or יִלְרָ) should certainly be read instead of יִלְרָ in 2 S 21²².—After Hoph., Ex 10⁸, 27⁷, Lv 10¹⁸, 16²⁷, Nu 32⁵, 1 K 2²¹, Pr 16³³, Jb 30¹⁵; after the infinitive Hoph., Gn 40²⁰, Ez 16^{4f.}, 27⁷; before Hoph., Is 17¹, 21², Ho 10⁶, Zc 13⁶; after the infinitive Hothpa'el, Lv 13^{55f.}

c 2. Verbs which in the active take two accusatives (§ 117 cc) retain in the passive construction at least *one* accusative, namely that of the second or remoter object, whilst the nearer object now becomes the subject. Thus, corresponding to אֲשֶׁר אֶרְאֶךָ which I will show thee (Gn 12¹) the passive is אֲשֶׁר אֶתָּה מְרָאָה (Ex 25⁴⁰) which thou hast been shown, i. e. which has been shown to thee; cf. Ex 26³⁰ (but in Lv 13⁴⁹ with an accusative of the person); Jb 7³. In ψ 22¹⁶ מְדַבֵּק מִלְּקוֹחַי depends on an assumed transitive הִרְבִּיק governing two accusatives (= my tongue is made to cleave to my jaws); also in Is 1²⁰, חָרַב תֹּאכְלוּ ye shall be devoured with the sword, חָרַב is not an *accus. instrumenti*, but most probably an accusative of the object retained from the active construction.²

d Rem. 1. Examples of the retention of the second accusative are—(a) with *verba induendi* and *exuendi* (§ 117 cc), ψ 80¹¹, כַּסּוֹ הַרִים צִלָּה the mountains were covered with the shadow of it (the vine); Pr 19²³. So also some of the examples in § 116 k of passive participles of these verbs, Ju 18¹¹, 1 S 2¹⁸, 17⁵, 1 K 22¹⁰,

naturally cannot be determined whether the construction is really impersonal. The construction itself can only be explained by supposing that while using the passive form the speaker at the same time thinks of some author or authors of the action in question, just as on the theory of the Arab grammarians a *concealed agent* is included in every passive. This accounts for the possibility (cf. § 144 g) of using the active without a specified subject as a periphrasis for the passive.

¹ In 2 K 18³⁰ יִתָּן is to be read or אֶת־ is to be omitted, as in the parallel passage Is 36¹⁵.

² In the active, the sentence would be *I will cause the sword to devour you*; by the rule stated above, under *c*, this would become in the passive, *the sword* (nom.) *shall be made to devour you* (acc.). Instead of this, the remoter object is here made the subject, and the nearer object is retained in the accusative. Otherwise, the only possible explanation would be, according to the Arabic idiom, *to cause one to devour the sword* (remoter object), i. e. to give him over to it. It would then be simplest to read תֹּאכְלוּ.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

latter a special feminine ending is generally used (§ 80 b and § 87 i) both in the singular and plural (see, however, § 87 p), its use being most consistent in adjectives and participles; cf. § 87 r. The employment of these special endings is most natural when by means of them the feminine names of persons or animals are distinguished from the masculine of the same stem and the same formation, e. g. אָבִיבִי brother, אָחִיבִי sister; עֶלְמָם a young man, עֶלְמָה a young woman, maid; פֶּרִי iuvencus, פֶּרְיָה iuvenca; עֵגֶל vitulus, עֵגְלָה vitula. On the other hand, the feminine plays an important part in denoting the gender of whole classes of ideas (see below, p, &c.), which the Hebrew regards as feminine. The language, however, is not obliged to use the feminine ending either for the purpose of distinguishing the *sex* of animate objects (see b), or as an indication of the (*figurative*) gender of inanimate things which are regarded as feminine (see h).

b 2. The distinction of *sex* may be effected even without the feminine ending, (a) by the employment of words of different stems for the masculine and feminine; (b) by the different construction (either as masculine or feminine) of the same word (*communia*). But the distinction may also, (c) in the case of names of animals, be entirely neglected, all examples of a species being included under one particular gender, either masculine or feminine (*epicoena*).

c Examples of (a) are: אָבִי father, אִמִּי mother; אֵילִי ram, רֵחֶלִי ewe; הַתֵּישׁ he-goat, הַתֵּישָׁה she-goat; חֲמֹרִי he-ass, חֲמֹרָה she-ass; אַרְיֵיהּ lion, לְבִיָּא lioness. Sometimes with the feminine ending as well, e. g. עֶבֶד־אָדָם male slave, man-servant, אִמָּה or שִׁפְחָה female slave, maid; חָתָן bridegroom, כַּלָּה bride.

d Of (b): גַּמְלִי camel. Plur. גַּמְלִים construed as masculine, Gn 24⁶³; as feminine, Gn 32¹⁶; בָּקָר collect. oxen, Ex 21³⁷, construed as masculine, but in Gn 33¹³, Jb 1¹⁴ as feminine. In Jer 2²⁴ the construction of פֶּרְיָה wild ass, changes directly from the masculine (intended as epicene) to the feminine. Cf. the Greek ὁ, ἡ παῖς ὁ, ἡ βοῦς.

e Of (c): analogous to the epicene nouns of other languages, many species of animals which are strong and courageous, are regarded in Hebrew as always masculine, while the weak and timid are feminine; cf. ὁ λύκος, ἡ χελιδὼν, and the German *der Löwe*, *der Adler*, &c., but *die Katze*, *die Taube*, &c. Similarly in Hebrew, e. g. אֶלְנָה ox (ψ 144¹⁴ even referring to cows when pregnant), דִּבִּי bear, Ho 13⁸ דִּבִּי שִׁכְוֹל (a bear that is bereaved of her whelps; cf., however, 2 K 2²⁴, Is 11⁷), זֶבֶב wolf, כֶּלֶב dog, all masculine; but אַרְנָבֶת hare, יוֹנָה dove, חֲסִידָה stork, דְּבוּרָה bee, נְמִלָּה ant, &c., feminine.

f Rem. 1. Masculine nouns which either have a separate feminine form or might easily form one, are but seldom used as epicene; such are, חֲמֹר ass, 2 S 19²⁷ for חֲמֹרָה; אֵילִי hart, ψ 42² for אֵילָה. In Gn 23^{9a} מֵת a dead body, refers more especially to the body of a woman; אֲמֹן a master workman, in Pr 8³⁰ refers to wisdom (חֲכָמָה feminine, cf. Plin. 2, 1 *natura omnium artifex*; and our

use of *friend, teacher, servant, neighbour*, either as masculine or feminine; in German, *Gemahl*¹ spouse, also for fem. *Gemahlin*, &c.).

2. Of words denoting persons נַעֲרַיְם *na'îs*, according to the formerly common *g* opinion, was in early times used as epicene (see, however, above, § 2 n). The use of the plural נַעֲרַיְם in Jb 1¹⁹ and Ru 2²¹ in the sense of *young people* (of both genders) does not, however, prove this. In this and in similar cases (cf. e.g. אֲתָם Gn 1²⁷ and אֲתָהֶם 32¹) the masculine as *prior gender* includes the feminine.²

3. The following classes of ideas are usually regarded as feminine,³ *h* although the substantives which express them are mostly without the feminine ending:⁴

(a) Names of *countries* and *towns*, since they are regarded as the mothers⁵ and nurses of the inhabitants; e.g. אֲשׁוּר *Assyria*, אֲדוּמָא *Idumaea*, צֵר *Tyre*; cf. also such expressions as בַּת בָּבֶל, בַּת צִיּוֹן, *daughter of Babylon, daughter of Zion*, &c. On the other hand appellatives which are originally masculine, remain so when used as place-names, e.g. Am 5⁵ הַגְּלִיל, בֵּית-אֵל, &c.

Rem. The same proper nouns, which as names of countries are regarded *z* as feminine, are frequently used also as names of the people, and may then, like national names in other languages, be construed as masculine (the national name almost always being used also as the personal name of the supposed ancestor of the people); thus יהוּדָיִם masc. Is 3⁸, &c., *Judaei*; but

¹ So in early Arabic, *ba'l* (lord) and *zauġ* (conjux) are used both for *maritus* and *uxor*; 'arūs for *bridegroom* and *bride*; the later language, however, distinguishes the feminine from the masculine in all these cases generally by the ending *a* (*at*). In early Arabic also the feminine ending is commonly omitted in such participles as *hāmīl*, *bātin* (*gravidā*), and the like, which from the nature of the case can only be used of females. Thus also אֲמִן, at least in Nu 11¹² (Is 49²³?), probably means *nurse* (for אֲמִנָּה 2 S 4⁴, &c.), not *nursing-father*.

² The Arab grammarians call this use of the masculine plural and dual (e.g. *el-abawāni*, the two fathers, i.e. *parentes*) *taghlīb* or *the making* (the masculine) *prevail* (over the feminine).—Cf. M. Grünert, *Die Begriffs-Präponderanz und die Duale a potiori im Altarab.*, Vienna, 1886.

³ The masculine gender is attributed 'by the Hebrews and the Semites generally to whatever is dangerous, savage, courageous, respected, great, strong, powerful...; the feminine to whatever is motherly, productive, sustaining, nourishing, gentle, weak, ... subject, &c.' (Albrecht, *ZAW.* 1896, p. 120 f.).

⁴ When, on the other hand, words *with* a feminine-ending, such as קֶשֶׁת *a bow* (stem קוּשׁ), זֶמַן *time* (see the *Lexicon*), are sometimes construed as masculine, this is owing probably in some cases to a misunderstanding of the formation of the word, the ך of the feminine being regarded as a radical.

⁵ Cf. *a city and a mother* (אֵם) in Israel, 2 S 20¹⁹. In the same way אֵם (like μήτηρ, *mater*) on Phoenician coins stands for *mother-city*, *μητρόπολις*. The same figure is used in such expressions as *sons of Zion*, ψ 149²; *sons of Babylon*, Ez 23¹⁵, &c., as also in speaking of the suburbs of a city as its *daughters*, e.g. Jos 15⁴⁵ ff., &c.—The comparison of Jerusalem to a woman is especially frequent in allegorical descriptions, e.g. Ez 16²³, La 1¹, &c.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

§ Abstract ideas include also—

(c) *Collectives* in the fem. form,¹ generally fem. participles used substantively, especially as the comprehensive designation of a number of *persons*, e. g. אֲרָחָה (fem. of travelling), prop. *the travelling* (company), i. e. travelling persons (a caravan); גּוֹלָה (fem. of גָּלָה *one going into exile*) *the company of exiles* (also frequently used of those who had returned home again); יוֹשְׁבֵת (that which inhabits) i. e. *the population*, Is 12⁶, Mi 11¹; אֹיֵבֶת (prop. that which is hostile) *the enemy*, Mi 7^{8.10} (cf. Mi 4⁶ *the halting, cast off, driven away*, i. e. those who halt, &c.); דָּלָה (the abject) *the poorest sort*; of living beings which are not persons, cf. חַיָּה (that which lives) in the sense of *cattle, beasts*; דָּגָה *a shoal of fish*, Gn 1²⁶ (but in Jon 2² as a *nomen unitatis*, cf. *t*, for דָּג *a fish*, which in verses 1 and 11 is used as the *nomen unitatis*). Cf., moreover, נִבְלָה *dead body*, Is 26¹⁹, &c. (construed as masculine), for *a heap of dead bodies*.—On the collective poetic personification of a nation, by means of בַּת *daughter*, in בַּת בְּבַל, בַּת עַמִּי (equivalent to בְּנֵי עַמִּי) *my countrymen*, see above, *i*.

† (d) Conversely the feminine form of substantives is sometimes used (as in Arabic) as a *nomen unitatis*, i. e. to indicate a *single* example of a class which is denoted by the masculine form; cf. אֲנִיָּה *a fleet* (1 K 9²⁶), אֲנִיָּה *a single ship* (Jon 1³); צִיד *hunting, game*, צִידָה Gn 27³ *Keth.* (צִידָה *Qéré*) *a piece of venison*; שֵׁעַר *hair* (coll.), שֵׁעַרָה *a single hair* (Ju 20¹⁶; in the plural, ψ 40¹³, 69⁵); שִׁיר *a poem*, frequently collective, שִׁירָה *a single song*; so probably also תֵּימָנָה *a fig* (the corresponding masculine *tin* is collective in Arabic); שׁוֹשַׁנָּה *a lily* (also שׁוֹשַׁן); לִבְנָה *a brick* (Arab. *libina*, but *libin* collective), &c.

u (e) The feminine is also used for things *without life* (as being weaker or less important), which are named from their resemblance to *organic* things expressed by the corresponding masculine form; cf. יָרֵךְ *side* (of the body), *thigh*, יָרֵכָה or יָרְכָה *back part, border* (of a country, house, &c.); מִצְחָה *forehead*, מִצְחָה *greaves*. On a similar distinction between the masculine for natural, and the feminine for artificial objects, see § 87 a.

v Rem. The juxtaposition of the masculine and feminine from the same stem serves sometimes to express *entirety*; e. g. Is 3¹ מְשַׁעֲנָה וּמְשַׁעֲנָה *stay and staff*, i. e. every kind of support (unless we omit verse 1^b as a gloss and take *staff* as = *staff-bearer, official*; the list of officials begins in verse 2); cf. Is 16⁶, Pr 8¹³. For similar groupings in the case of persons, see Is 43⁶, 49²², 60⁴ (*sons and daughters*); 49²³, Ec 2⁸.

§ 123. The Representation of Plural Ideas by Means of Collectives, and by the Repetition of Words.

a Besides the plural endings treated in § 87 a-i, the language employs other means to express a plurality of living beings or things:

(a) Certain words employed exclusively in a collective sense, while the individual members of the class are denoted by special words (*nomina unitatis*, but not in the same sense as in § 122 t).

¹ Cf. in Greek ἡ ἵππος, *the cavalry* (as well as τὸ ἵππικόν), ἡ κάμηλος, Hdt. 1, 80, &c., *the camel corps*.

Thus בָּקָר *cattle, oxen*¹ (even joined with numerals, e.g. Ex 21³⁷ חֲמִשָּׁה בָּקָר *five head of cattle*), but שׂוֹר *an ox*; צֹאן *small cattle, i. e. sheep and goats* (μῆλα), cf. Jb 1³ שִׁבְעַת אֲלֵפֵי-צֹאן *seven thousand sheep*; but שֶׂה *a single head of small cattle* (a sheep or a goat). Other more or less common collectives are: יָוִי (prop. that which prowls or roams) *wild beasts*, טָף (perhaps prop. tripping) *a number of little children*; יִשְׁשָׁן *fresh green herb, i. e. young plants*, יֶרֶק *green, i. e. vegetation in general*; עוֹף *birds, fowl*; רֶכֶב *chariots or cavalcade*, רֶמָה *worms*, רֶמֶשׂ *creeping things* (of small creatures), שְׂרָץ *swarming things*.

(b) The collective use of substantives which at the same time serve *b* as *nomina unitatis*; thus, אָדָם (never in plur.) means both *man* (homo) and *men* (homines); אִישׁ *a man* (vir) and *men* (viri); אִשָּׁה *woman* and *women* (Ju 21¹⁶, 1 S 21⁶); אַרְבֵּה *a locust*, but usually *a swarm of locusts*; נַפְשׁ *soul* and *souls* (persons); מַגֵּל *staff* and *staves* (Gn 30³⁷); עֵיט *a bird of prey* and *birds of prey*; עֵלֶף *a leaf* and *foliage*; עֵשֶׂב *a plant* and *plants, herbs*; עֵץ *a tree* and *trees* (as it were *foliage*); פֵּרִי *fruit* and *fruits*; שִׁיחַ *a shrub* and *shrubs*; in isolated instances also nouns like עֶבֶד *man-servant*, שִׁפְחָה *maid-servant*, חֲמֹר *ass*, שׂוֹר *ox* (cf. Gn 32⁶).—On the singular (especially of gentilic names) with the article (which may, however, be omitted in poetry, cf. e. g. ψ 12² הַסִּיד, Pr 11¹⁴ יוֹעֵץ) to include all individuals of the same species, cf. § 126 l. On the special meaning of the plurals formed from certain collectives, see § 124 l.

(c) The feminine ending; see § 122 s.

(d) The repetition of single words, and even of whole groups of *C* words, especially to express entirety, or in a distributive sense. The following cases are more particularly to be noticed:

1. The repetition of one or more words to express the idea of *every, all*, as יוֹם יוֹם Gn 39¹⁰, &c., *day by day, every day*; שָׁנָה שָׁנָה Dt 14²²; אִישׁ אִישׁ *every man*, Ex 36⁴; with בְּ before each, as בִּבְקָר בִּבְקָר Ex 16²¹ *every morning* (and similarly before a group of words, Lv 24⁸), for which the distributive לְ is also used, לְבִקְרָ לְבִקְרָ 1 Ch 9²⁷, and with one plural לְבִקְרָיִם ψ 73¹⁴, לְבִקְרָיִם Jb 7¹⁸ parallel with לְרִגְעָיִם *every moment*. Somewhat different are the instances with בְּ before the second word only, e. g. יוֹם בְּיוֹם *day by day*, 1 Ch 12²²; שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה *year by year*, Dt 15²⁰, 1 S 1⁷ (but in verse 3 (מִיָּמִים יָמִימָה), מִיָּמִים בְּפַעַם, Nu 24¹, Ju 16²⁰, 20³⁰ l., 1 S 3¹⁰ *as at other times*). Also with the two words united by means of *wāw copulative*, אִישׁ וְאִישׁ ψ 87⁵, or אִישׁ וְאִישׁ Est 1⁸; דּוֹר וְדוֹר *all generations*, Dt 32⁷; יוֹם וְיוֹם Est 3⁴; cf. Est 8⁹,

¹ The plural form בִּקְרָיִם from בָּקָר is found only in very late Hebrew, Neh 10³⁷ (where according to the Mantua edition, Ginsburg, &c., even צֹאֲנֵינוּ *our sheep*, is also to be read; Baer, however, has צֹאֲנָנוּ), and 2 Ch 4³. In Am 6¹² read, with Hitzig, בִּבְקָרָיִם.

Ezr 10¹⁴, 1 Ch 26¹³ and often (cf. Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, 1889, p. 479, according to whom the use of the ׀ copulative with the second word is especially common in Ch and Est, and therefore belongs to the later language; Driver, *Introd.*⁶, p. 538, No. 35); sometimes (but with the exception of ψ 45¹⁸ only in very late passages) with a pleonastic ^ל preceding, ψ 145¹³, Est 2¹¹, 9²⁸, 2 Ch 11¹², &c.

d 2. Repetition of words in an expressly *distributive* sense¹ (which may to some extent be noticed in the examples under *c*) equivalent to *one each*, &c., e. g. Nu 14³⁴ *forty days* לְשָׁנָה יוֹם לְשָׁנָה יוֹם *counting for every day a year*; cf. Ez 24⁶, Ex 28³⁴ (three words repeated); also with the addition of לְבַד *apart*, לְבַדּוֹ עָרָר עָרָר *every drove by itself*, Gn 32¹⁷; cf. Zc 12¹². Most frequently with the addition of a numeral (for the simple repetition of numerals for the same purpose, cf. § 134 *g*), and with the words not only in groups of two (Lv 24⁸, Nu 13², 31⁴) or three (Nu 7¹¹, 17²¹), but even of six (Ex 26³) or seven (Ex 25³³, 26^{19.21.25}); in Ex 25³⁵ five words even three times repeated.²

e 3. Repetition to express an exceptional or at least superfine quality; e. g. 2 K 25¹⁵ *which were of gold, gold, of silver, silver*, i. e. made of pure gold and pure silver; Dt 2²⁷ בְּדֶרֶךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ *only along by the high way*; cf. Nu 3⁸, 8¹⁶ *they are given, given to him*, i. e. given exclusively for his service, for his very own. Also with a certain hyperbole in such examples as 2 K 3¹⁶ גְּבִים גְּבִים *nothing but trenches*; Gn 14¹⁰ בְּאֵרוֹת בְּאֵרוֹת חֶמֶר *all asphalt-pits*.—Repetition serves to intensify the expression to the highest degree in Ju 5²² *by reason of the violent pransings of his strong ones*, Ex 8¹⁰ (*countless heaps*), and Jo 4¹⁴ (*countless multitudes*); cf. also מְעַט מְעַט Ex 23³⁰ *by little and little, very gradually*; cf. § 133 *k*.

f 4. Repetition with the copula to express *of more than one kind*; thus Dt 25¹³ (Pr 20¹⁰) וְאֶבֶן וְאֶבֶן *a weight and a weight*, i. e. two kinds of weight (hence the addition *great and small*); ψ 12³ בְּלֵב וְלֵב *with two kinds of heart*, i. e. *with a double-dealing heart*; cf. the opposite בְּלֵא לֵב וְלֵב 1 Ch 12³³.

§ 124. The Various Uses of the Plural-form.³

a 1. The plural is by no means used in Hebrew solely to express a number of individuals or separate objects, but may also denote them collectively. This use of the plural expresses either (*a*) a combination of various external constituent parts (plurals of *local extension*), or (*b*) a more or less intensive focusing of the characteristics inherent in the idea of the stem (*abstract plurals*, usually rendered in English by forms in *-hood*, *-ness*, *-ship*). A variety of the plurals described under (*b*), in which the secondary idea of *intensity* or of an *internal*

¹ Cf. in the New Testament St. Mark 6³⁹ τ. συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιαὶ πρασιαί (Weizsäcker, *tischweise*, *beetweise*).

² These repetitions of larger groups of words belong entirely to the *Priestly Code* in the Pentateuch, and are unquestionably indications of a late period of the language. Of quite a different kind are such examples as Ez 16⁶, where the repetition of four words serves to give greater solemnity to the promise, unless here, as certainly in 1²⁰, it is a mere *ditlography*; the LXX omit the repetition in both passages.

³ Cf. Dietrich, 'Über Begriff und Form des hebr. Plurals,' in the *Abhandl. zur hebr. Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 2 ff.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

י S 2³ (thorough) *knowledge*; בַּטְחוֹת Jb 12⁶ and מְבַטְחִים Is 32¹⁸ (full) *confidence*; בְּרָכוֹת (abundant) *blessing*, ψ 21⁷; גְּבוּרוֹת (exceptional) *strength*, Jb 41⁴; הַזֹּאת ψ 5¹⁰ (very) *wickedness*; חַמּוּדוֹת Dn 9²³ (greatly) *beloved*; חַמּוֹת ψ 76¹¹, &c. (fierce) *wrath*; חַרְפוֹת Dn 12² (utter) *contempt*; יִשְׁעוֹת (real) *help*, Is 26¹⁸, &c.; מַרְאֵת Gn 46² (an important) *vision*; מִישָׁרִים *uprightness*; תְּהַפְּכוֹת *perversity*; נִקְמוֹת (complete) *vengeance*, Ju 11³⁶, &c.; חֲשֵׁכִים and מַחְשָׁכִים (thick) *darkness*; מְסֻתָּרִים a (close) *hiding-place*; נְגִידִים *nobility*; שְׁמָנִים Is 28¹ *fatness*; צַחְצְחוֹת (complete) *aridity*; מְמַתְקִים *sweetness*; מַחְמָדִים *preciousness*; שְׂעֵשְׂעִים *delight*; עֲדָנִים and תַּעֲנַנִּים *pleasure*; רַחֲמִים *compassion*; מְנוּחַת ψ 23² *rest, refreshment*; מְהוּמַת Am 3⁹ *tumult*. Probably also יְדִירַת (heartfelt) *love*, ψ 45¹; מְרוֹת (extreme) *bitterness*, Jb 13²⁶; מְרֻמוֹת (base) *deceit*, ψ 38¹³; צְדָקוֹת (true) *righteousness*, Is 33¹⁵, &c.; שְׂמָחוֹת (the highest) *joy*, ψ 16¹¹. On the other hand, חֲכָמוֹת *wisdom* (Pr 1²⁰, &c.) can hardly be a *plural* (=the essence of wisdom, or wisdom personified), but is a singular (see § 86 l).

A further extension of this plural of amplification occurs according to P. Haupt's very probable suggestion (*SBOT. Proverbs*, p. 40, line 50, &c.) in יְאֵרִים *the great river* (of the Nile, generally יְאֵר) Is 7¹⁸, 19⁶ (though with the predicate in the plural), Ez 30¹², ψ 78⁴⁴, but in Is 37²⁵, Ez 29³ the usual explanation, *arms or channels of the Nile*, can hardly be avoided; also in נְהַרוֹת ψ 24² of the ocean, which encircles the earth, 137¹ of the *great river*, i. e. the Euphrates, but in Is 18¹ נְהַרֵי כּוּשׁ is evidently a numerical plural.—In Pr 16¹³ מְלָכִים (acc. to P. Haupt=*the great king*) is very doubtful. In נְשִׂאֵי Ez 19¹ the second *yôdh* is evidently due to dittography, since יִשְׂרָאֵל follows.

f The summing up of the several parts of an action is expressed in חֲנֻטִים *embalming*, כְּפָרִים *atonement*, מְלֵאִים (prop. *filling*, sc. of the hand) *ordination to the priesthood*, שְׁלָחִים *dismissal*, שְׁלֵמִים *retribution*, פְּתָחִים *engraving* (of a seal, &c.); אֶהָבִים *fornication*, זְנוּנִים *whoredom*, נְאֻפִים *adultery*; נַחֲמִים (prop. no doubt, warm compassion) *consolation*, תַּחֲנוּנִים *supplication*, נִדְדִים Jb 7⁴ (restless) *tossing to and fro*, פְּלָאִים *wonder* La 1⁹, עֲלִילוֹת *gleaning*; perhaps also נְגִינוֹת ψ 4¹, 6¹, &c., if it means *the playing on stringed instruments*, and שְׁלֵמָנִים Is 1²³ *bribery*, unless it be a plural of number.¹

g Of (c): the *pluralis excellentiae* or *maiestatis*, as has been remarked above, is properly a variety of the abstract plural, since it sums up the several characteristics² belonging to the idea, besides possessing the secondary sense of an *intensification* of the original idea. It is thus closely related to the plurals of amplification, treated under e, which are mostly found in poetry.

¹ Mayer Lambert in *REJ.* xxiv. 106 ff., enumerates no less than ninety-five words ending in *im*, which in his opinion are to be regarded as *pluralia tantum*.

² The Jewish grammarians call such plurals רְבֵי הַכְּחוֹת *plur. virium* or *virtutum*; later grammarians call them *plur. excellentiae*, *magnitudinis*, or *plur. maiestaticus*. This last name may have been suggested by the *we* used by kings when speaking of themselves (cf. already 1 Macc. 10¹⁹, 11³¹); and the plural used by God in Gn 1²⁶, 11⁷, Is 6⁸ has been incorrectly explained in this way. It is, however, either *communicative* (including the attendant angels; so at all events in Is 6⁸, cf. also Gn 3²²), or according to others, an indication of the *fullness of power and might* implied in אֱלֹהִים (see Dillmann on Gn 1²⁶); but it is best explained as a plural of *self-deliberation*. The use of the plural as a form of respectful address is quite foreign to Hebrew.

So especially אֱלֹהִים *Godhead, God* (to be distinguished from the numerical plural *gods*, Ex 12¹², &c.). The supposition that אֱלֹהִים is to be regarded as merely a remnant of earlier polytheistic views (i. e. as originally only a numerical plural) is at least highly improbable, and, moreover, would not explain the analogous plurals (see below). That the language has entirely rejected the idea of numerical plurality in אֱלֹהִים (whenever it denotes *one* God), is proved especially by its being almost invariably joined with a singular attribute (cf. § 132 h), e. g. אֱלֹהִים צָרִיק ψ 7¹⁰, &c. Hence אֱלֹהִים may have been used originally not only as a numerical but also as an abstract plural (corresponding to the Latin *numen*, and our *Godhead*), and, like other abstracts of the same kind, have been transferred to a concrete single god (even of the heathen).

To the same class (and probably formed on the analogy of אֱלֹהִים) belong *h* the plurals קְדוֹשִׁים *the Most Holy* (only of Yahweh), Ho 12¹, Pr 9¹⁰, 30³ (cf. אֱלֹהִים קְדוֹשִׁים Jos 24¹⁹, and the Aram. עֲלִיוֹנִין *the Most High*, Dn 7^{18.22.25}); and probably תַּרְפִּים (usually taken in the sense of *penates*) the image of a god, used especially for obtaining oracles. Certainly in 1 S 19^{13.16} only *one* image is intended; in most other places a single image *may* be intended¹; in Zc 10² alone is it most naturally taken as a numerical plural. In Ec 5⁷ גְּבוּהִים *supremus* (of God) is doubtful; according to others it is a numerical plural, *superiores*.

Further, אֲדָנִים, as well as the singular אֲדֹנָי, (lordship) *lord*, e. g. אֲדָנִים קָשָׁה *a cruel lord*, Is 19⁴; אֲדָנִי הָאָרֶץ *the lord of the land*, Gn 42³⁰, cf. Gn 32¹⁹; so especially with the suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd persons אֲדָנֶיךָ, אֲדָנָיָךְ, ψ 45¹², אֲדָנָיו, &c., also אֲדָנֵינוּ (except 1 S 16¹⁶); but in 1st sing. always אֲדָנִי.² So also בְּעָלִים (with suffixes) *lord, master* (of slaves, cattle, or inanimate things; but in the sense of *maritus*, always in the singular), e. g. בְּעָלָיו Ex 21²⁹, Is 1³, &c.³

On the other hand, we must regard as doubtful a number of participles in *h* the plural, which, being used as attributes of God, resemble *plurales excellentiae*; thus, עֹשֵׂי *my Maker*, Jb 35¹⁰; עֹשֵׂיךָ Is 54⁶; עֹשֵׂי ψ 149²; עֹשֵׂיךָ Is 22¹¹; נוֹטְיָהֶם *stretching them out*, Is 42⁶; for all these forms may also be explained as singular, according to § 93 ss.⁴—נֹגְשֵׁיוֹ Is 3¹² might also be regarded as another instance, unless it be a numerical plural, *their oppressors*; moreover, מְרִימוֹ *him who lifteth it up*, Is 10¹⁵ (but read probably מְרִימוֹ); שְׁלַחָיו *him who sendeth him*, Pr 10²⁶, 22²¹ (so Baer, but Ginsburg שְׁלַחָךְ), 25¹³ (in parallelism with אֲדָנָיו). These latter plurals, however (including מְרִימוֹ), may probably be more simply explained as indicating an indefinite individual, cf. *o* below.—For שְׁמָרְיָךְ ψ 121⁵ (*textus receptus*) and בּוֹרְאֵיךְ Ec 12¹ (*textus receptus*) the singular should be read, with Baer.

¹ Even in Gn 31³⁴, notwithstanding the plural suffix in וַתִּשְׁמַם and עֲלֵיהֶם, since the construction of these abstracts as numerical plurals is one of the peculiarities of the E-document of the Hexateuch; cf. Gn 20¹³, 35⁷, and § 145 i.

² On אֲדָנִי (for אֲדָנִי) as a name of God, cf. § 135 g.

³ Euting, *Reise in Arabien*, p. 61, mentions the interesting fact that the subjects of the Emir of Hâyel commonly speak of their ruler as *šiyúkh*, a plur. majestatis = *the great sheikh*.

⁴ בְּעָלֶיךָ, which in Is 54⁶ is in parallelism with עֹשֵׂיךָ, must then be explained as merely formed on analogy.

- l Rem. 1. (a) Coherent substances, &c., are mostly regarded as *single*, and are, accordingly, almost always represented by nouns in the singular, cf. אֲפָרָה *fine dust*, אֲפָרָה *ashes*, בֵּן לִנְיָן *linen*, בְּרִיל *lead*, זָהָב *gold*, כֶּסֶף *silver*, נְחֹשֶׁת *brass*, חֶלֶב *milk*, יַיִן *wine*, עֶפְרָה *dust*, הָאָרֶץ *the ground*, עֵץ *wood*. Plurals are, however, formed from some of these words expressing materials in order to denote separate portions taken from the whole in manufacture (*plurals of the result*) or parts otherwise detached from it; thus, בְּרִים *linen garments*; כֶּסֶפִּים *silver pieces*, Gn 42^{25.35}; נְחֹשֶׁתִים (dual) *fetters of brass*; עֵצִים *ligna* (*timber for building or sticks for burning*); also in a wider sense, בְּרִילִים particles of *alloy* to be separated by smelting, Is 1²⁶; עֲפָרוֹת *fragments of earth*, Pr 8²⁶, cf. Jb 28⁶ עֲפָרֹת זָהָב *dust of gold*.
- m (b) To the class of *plurals of the result* belong also a few names of natural products, when represented in an artificial condition; thus, חִטִּים *wheat in grain* (threshed wheat), as distinguished from חֵטָה *wheat* (used collectively) in the ear; cf. the same distinction between בְּפִמִּים and בְּפִמָּת *spelt*; עֲרָשִׁים and עֲרָשָׁה (the singular preserved only in the Mishna) *lentils*; שְׁעָרִים and שְׁעָרָה *barley*; also פִּשְׁתִּים *linen*, פִּשְׁתָּה (to be inferred from פִּשְׁתִּי) *flax*.
- n (c) Finally, the distinction between דָּם *blood* and דָּמִים requires to be specially noticed. The singular is always used when the blood is regarded as an organic unity, hence also of menstrual blood, and the blood of sacrifices (collected in the basin and then sprinkled), and in Nu 23²⁴ of the blood gushing from wounds. On the other hand, דָּמִים as a sort of plural of the result and at the same time of local extension, denotes *blood which is shed*, when it appears as blood-stains (Is 1¹⁵) or as blood-marks (so evidently in Is 9⁴). But since blood-stains or blood-marks, as a rule, suggest blood shed in murder (although דָּמִים also denotes the blood which flows at child-birth or in circumcision), דָּמִים acquired (even in very early passages) simply the sense of a *bloody deed*, and especially of *bloodguiltiness*, Ex 22^{1f.}, &c.
- o In some few cases the plural is used to denote an indefinite singular; certainly so in Dt 17⁵ אֶל-שַׁעֲרֶיךָ *unto one of thy gates*; Zc 9⁹ בֵּן-אֶתְנֹנֹת (cf. Ct 2⁹); Ex 21²² יִלְדָּהּ (where evidently only *one* child is thought of, though certainly in connexion with a contingency which may be repeated); cf. also Ec 4¹⁰ (*if one of them fall*).—So probably also Gn 8⁴, 1 S 17⁴³, Dn 2¹, Neh 3^{8, 62}; but not Gn 19²⁹, since the same document (Gn 13¹²) makes Lot dwell *in the cities* of the Jordan valley; in Gn 21⁷ בְּנֵים denotes the class with which the action is concerned. In Ju 12⁷ instead of the unusual בְּעָרֵי גִלְעָד *in the cities of Gilead* (formerly explained here as *in one of the cities of Gilead*) we should most probably read, with Moore (SBOT. Judges, p. 52), בְּעָירוֹ בְּמִצְפֵּה גִלְעָד *in his city, in Mizpeh (in) Gilead*.
- p 2. When a substantive is followed by a genitive, and the compound idea thus formed is to be expressed in the plural, this is done—
- (a) Most naturally by using the plural of the *nomen regens*, e. g. גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִּל *mighty men of valour* (prop. heroes of strength), 1 Ch 7^{2.9}; so also in compounds, e. g. בְּנֵי יְמִינִי 1 S 22⁷, as the plur. of בְּנֵי-יְמִינִי *Benjamite*; but also
- q (b) By using the plural of *both* nouns,¹ e. g. גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִּלִּים 1 Ch 7⁵;

¹ Cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 438 f., according to whom the plural of the principal word exercises an influence on the determining genitive.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Am 6¹⁴ גוֹי ; ψ 77¹⁶ בְּזוֹרְעַי ; Pr 21¹² צְדִיק, if with Delitzsch it is to be referred to God ; Jb 8¹⁰ מְלִים meaning *important words*, but in 15¹³ מְלִין *reproachful words*. Cf. on this point, § 117 g, note 3, and Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, ed. 4, p. 79.

d 2. Real *proper nouns*, as being the names of things (or persons) only *once* met with, are sufficiently determinate in themselves. Such names, therefore, as יהוה, דָּוִד, יַעֲקֹב, כְּנָעַן, סָרַם do not admit of the article,¹ nor can they be in the construct state. On the other hand, not only *gentilic* names (as denoting the *various* individuals belonging to the same class), but also all those proper names, of which the appellative sense is still sufficiently evident to the mind, or at least has been handed down from an earlier period of the language, frequently (often even as a rule) take the article (according to § 126 e), and may even be followed by a genitive.

e Examples. Like the above-mentioned proper names of individuals, countries, and cities, so also national names, which are identical in form with the name of the founder of the race (e.g. יִשְׂרָאֵל, אָדָם, מוֹאָב), are always determinate in themselves. Of gentilic names (e.g. הָעִבְרִי *the Hebrew*, הָעִבְרִים *the Hebrews*, Gn 40¹⁵; הַכְּנַעֲנִי *the Canaanite*) the plural פְּלִשְׁתִּים, even when meaning *the Philistines*, is generally used without the article (but in 1 S 4⁷, &c., הַפִּי); so always כְּפַתְרִים.—Evident appellatives (like such modern names as *the Hague*, *le Havre*) are הַגִּבְעָה *the hill*, in the construct state גִּבְעַת שָׁאוּל, i. e. *the Gibeah named after Saul* to distinguish it from others; הַרְרָמָה *the height*; הֵעַי *the heap*; הַלְבָנוֹן (prop. *the white mountain*) *the Lebanon*; הַיַּאֲר (prop. *the river*) *the Nile*, cf. Am 8⁸ כִּי־אֹר מִצְרַיִם *like the river of Egypt*; הַיַּרְדֵּן *the Jordan* (according to Seybold, *Mittheil. und Nachr. des DPV.*, 1896, p. 11, probably *the drinking-place* [יַרְדֵּן, Arab. *warada*, meaning orig. *to go down to drink*]).

f Rem. 1. In a few instances original appellatives have completely assumed the character of real proper names, and are therefore used without the article; thus אֱלֹהִים *God*, to denote the one true God (as elsewhere יהוה) Gn 1¹ and so generally in this document of the Pentateuch up to Ex 6, elsewhere sometimes הָאֱלֹהִים ὁ θεός (cf. § 126 e); also the sing. אֱלֹהֵי *God*, עֲלִיּוֹן *the Most High*, and שַׁדַּי *the Almighty* never take the article.—Moreover, אָדָם *Adam* from Gn 5¹ onwards (previously in 2⁷, &c., הָאָדָם *the first man*); שָׂטָן *Satan*, 1 Ch 21¹ (but Zc 3¹, Jb 1⁶, &c., הַשָּׂטָן *the adversary*); cf. אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד *the tent of revelation* (i. e. *the tabernacle*), always without the article.

g To the class of nouns originally appellative, which the language regards

¹ Consequently, הַמְּנַשֶּׁה Dt 3¹³, Jos 1¹², &c. (in the Deuteronomist) in the combination הַמְּנַשֶּׁה שֵׁבֶט (for which elsewhere מְנַשֶּׁה שֵׁבֶט) is to be regarded *not* as a proper name but as a gentilic name (= *the tribe of the Manassites*), for which in Dt 29⁷ הַמְּנַשִּׁי שׁ is used, as in 10⁸ הַלְוִי שׁ *the tribe of the Levites*, and in Ju 18¹ הַדָּנִי שׁ *the tribe of the Danites*.—In Jos 13⁷ הַמְּנַשֶּׁה (like gentilic names in שׁ) is even used adjectivally.

as proper names, and which consequently never take the article, belong also certain archaic words mostly used only by poets, such as שְׂאוֹל *Hades*, תְּבֵל *world*, תְּהוֹם *ocean*, of the body of water which encircles the earth, Gn 1², &c.; but Is 63¹³, ψ 106⁹ בְּתֵהוֹמוֹת *through the depths*, viz. of the Red Sea.¹

2. When nouns which the usage of the language always treats as proper names occasionally appear to be connected with a following genitive, this is really owing to an ellipse whereby the noun which really governs the genitive, i. e. the appellative idea contained in the proper name, is suppressed. So evidently in the case of יְהוָה יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת *Yahweh (the God) of hosts*; the fuller form יהוה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת 2 S 5¹⁰, &c., or יהוה אֱלֹהֵי הַצְבָּאוֹת Am 3¹³, &c., is a secondary expansion of the original יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת; אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת in ψ 59⁶, 80^{15.20}, 84⁹ is due to the mechanical substitution of אֱלֹהִים for יהוה affected in the 2nd and part of the 3rd book of the Psalms. So also in geographical names such as אֲרָם נְהַרָיִם *Aram (the region) of the two rivers*; אֲבֵל בְּיַם אֲבֵל *Abel by the water*, 2 Ch 16⁴; יְבִישׁ גִּלְעָד 1 S 11¹, &c.; יְרֵדֵן יְרֵחוֹ Nu 22¹, 26^{3.63}, &c.; on Ju 8³² cf. § 128 c; צִיּוֹן קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל *the Zion of the Holy One of Israel*, Is 60¹⁴; but in 1 S 1¹ for צוּפִים read צוּפֵי *a Zuphite*. Some of these examples (cf. also Am 6²) come very near to the actual construct state (cf. above, שְׂאוֹל), since e. g. the addition of the genitive serves to distinguish the place from four others called Aram (see the Lexicon), or from another Bethlehem. Aram, Bethlehem, &c., are accordingly no longer names found only in one special sense, and therefore also are no longer proper names in the strictest sense.

3. Of the pronouns, the personal pronouns proper (the separate *i* pronouns, § 32) are always determinate in themselves, since they can denote only definite individuals (the 3rd person, also definite things). For the same reason the demonstrative pronouns (§ 34) are also determinate in themselves, when they stand *alone* (as equivalent to substantives), either as subject (Gn 5²⁹) or as predicate (e. g. זֶה הַיּוֹם *this is the day*, Ju 4¹⁴; אֵלֶּה חַיְבָרִים *these are the words*, Dt 1¹), or as object (e. g. אֶת-זֹאת 2 S 13¹⁷), or as genitive (מִתְחִיר זֶה 1 K 21²), or finally when joined to a preposition (לְזֹאת Gn 2²³; בְּזֶה 1 S 16⁸, see § 102 g).

So also the personal pronouns הוּא, הִיא, הֵם, הֵנָּה, הֵנָּה when they *k* are used as demonstratives (= *is, ea, id, ille, &c.*) are always determinate in themselves, e. g. הוּא הַדָּבָר *that is the thing*, Gn 41²⁸. They

¹ That various other words, such as אִנוּשׁ *man*, צְלֻמוֹת *deep darkness*, רֹן *prince*, שָׂדֵי *field*, תּוֹשִׁיָה *effectual working*, are always found without the article is not to be attributed to any special archaism, but is to be explained from the fact that they belong solely to poetic language, which avoids the article; in other cases, such as תְּרֵדְמָה *deep sleep*, there is no occasion for the article in the passages we possess.

are made determinate by the article, when they are joined like adjectives (see § 126 *u*) with a determinate substantive, e. g. הַזֶּה הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה *this man*; הָאֵלֶּה הָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה *these men*; בַּיָּמִים הַהֵמָּה וּבַעֲתָה הַהִיא *in those days, and in that time*, Jo 4¹. The demonstrative, however, even in this case, is frequently used *without* the article, as being sufficiently determinate in itself (cf. § 126 *γ*).

§ 126. Determination by Means of the Article.

a 1. The article (הַ, הָ, הֵּ, § 35) was originally, as in other languages (clearly in the Romance; cf. also ὁ, ἡ, τό in Homer), a demonstrative pronoun. The demonstrative force of the article, apart from its occasional use as a relative pronoun (see § 138 *i*), appears now, however, only (*a*) in a few standing phrases, and (*b*) in a certain class of statements or exclamations.

b (*a*) Cf. הַיּוֹם *this day, hodie* (§ 100 *c*); הַלַּיְלָה *this night*, Gn 19³⁴; הַפֶּעַם *this time*, Gn 2²³; הַשָּׁנָה *this year* (=in this year) Is 37³⁰, Jer 28¹⁶.

(*b*) includes those instances in which the article, mostly when prefixed to a participle, joins on a new statement concerning a preceding noun. Although such participles, &c., are no doubt primarily regarded always as in apposition to a preceding substantive, the article nevertheless has in some of these examples almost the force of הַיּוֹם (הַיּוֹם, הַיּוֹם) as the subject of a noun-clause; e. g. *ψ* 19¹⁰ *the judgements of the Lord are true . . .*, verse 11 הַנְּחֻמָּדִים וְגו' prop. *the more to be desired than gold*, i. e. *they are more to be desired, or even they, that are more to be desired*,¹ &c.; cf. Gn 49²¹, Is 40²² f., 44²⁷ f., 46⁶, Am 2⁷, 5⁷, *ψ* 33¹⁵, 49⁷ (הַבְּטָחִים) in the parallel half of the verse continued by a finite verb); *ψ* 104³, Jb 6¹⁶, 28⁴, 30³, 41²⁵ and frequently. When such a participle has another co-ordinate with it, the latter is used *without* the article, since according to the above it strictly speaking represents a second predicate, and as such, according to *i*, remains indeterminate; e. g. Jb 5¹⁰ *who giveth* (הַנֹּתֵן) *rain, &c., and sendeth* (וְשֵׁלַח), &c.

C The article is sometimes used with similar emphasis before a substantive, which serves as the subject of a compound sentence (§ 140 *d*); e. g. Dt 32⁴ הַצֵּיִר הַתָּמִים פֶּעֻלוֹ i. e. as a fresh statement (not in apposition to the preceding dative), really equivalent to *he is a rock, perfect in his work* (i. e. *whose work is perfect*); cf. *ψ* 18³¹.

d 2. The article is, generally speaking, employed to determine a substantive wherever it is required by Greek and English; thus:

(*a*) When a person or thing already spoken of is mentioned again, and is consequently more definite to the mind of the hearer or reader; e. g. Gn 1³ *and God said, Let there be light: verse 4 and God saw the light* (אֶת־הָאוֹר); 1 K 3²⁴ *fetch me a sword: and they brought the sword*; Ec 9¹⁵. (In 2 S 12² therefore לְעֵשֶׂר must be read.)

¹ On the analogous use of the article before participles which have a verbal suffix, as in *ψ* 18³³, &c., cf. above, § 116 *f*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

i (i) On the other hand, the article is always omitted when a person or thing is to be represented as indefinite (or indefinable) or as yet unknown; consequently also before the predicate, since this is from its nature always a general term, under which the subject is included, e.g. Gn 29⁷ עוֹר הַיּוֹם גָּדוֹל *as yet the day is great*, i.e. it is yet high day; 33¹³, 40¹⁸, 41²⁶, Is 66³.

k Rem. 1. As exceptions to the above rule it is usual to regard those examples in which a determinate adjective or participle (equivalent to a relative clause) is used apparently as a predicate, e.g. Gn 2¹¹ הוּא הַפֶּכֶב *it is the compassing*, i. e. *that is it which compasseth*; 42⁶, 45¹², Ex 9²⁷, Dt 3²¹, 8¹⁸, 11⁷, 1 S 4¹⁶, Is 14²⁷, Mal 3² (cf. in Greek, e.g. St. Mat. 10²⁰, where Winer, *Gram. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, § 58, 2, Rem., explains *οἱ λαλοῦντες* as a predicate with the article). In reality, however, these supposed predicates are rather subjects (acc. to § 116 *q*), and the only peculiarity of these cases is that the subject is not included under a general idea, but is equated with the predicate.

2. Sometimes the article is used with only one of two parallel words, as Na 1⁵ הָרִים and הַגְּבְעוֹת, 2 Ch 3¹⁷ מִיָּמִין and מִהַשְּׂמֹאל.

l 3. The use of the article to determine the *class* is more extensive in Hebrew than in most other languages. In this case the article indicates universally known, closely circumscribed, and therefore well defined classes of persons or things. The special cases to be considered are—

m (a) The employment of general names as collectives in the singular, to denote the *sum total* of individuals belonging to the class (which may, however, be done just as well by the plural); e.g. *the righteous, the wicked man*, Ec 3¹⁷; *the woman*, i. e. *the female sex*, 7²⁶; הָאֵיִב *the enemy*, i. e. *the enemies* (?) ψ 9⁷; הָאֲרִיב *the liar in wait*, i. e. *the liars in wait*; הַחֲלוּץ *the armed man*, i. e. *soldiers*; הַמְּאַסֵּף *the rearguard*; הַפּוֹשֵׁחִית *the spoiler*, 1 S 13¹⁷;¹ so also (as in English) with names of animals, when something is asserted of them, which applies to the whole species, e.g. 2 S 17¹⁰ *as the courage of the lion*. Especially also with gentile names, e.g. *the Canaanite*, Gn 13⁷ (cf. 15^{19f.}); so in English *the Russian, the Turk*, &c., in Attic writers *ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, ὁ Συρακόσιος*, &c.

n (b) Names of materials known everywhere, the elements and other words denoting classes, even though only a part and not the whole of them is considered, in which case in other languages, as e.g. in English, the article is usually omitted (cf., however, *our to fall into the water, into the fire*, &c.), e.g. Gn 13² *and Abram was very rich in cattle, in silver and in gold*; Jds 11⁹ *and he burnt their chariots with fire*; cf. Gn 6¹⁴, 41⁴² (unless this means, *the chain necessarily belonging to the official dress*); Ex 2³, 31⁴ (35³²), Is 1²², &c, and בַּשָּׁמֶן *with oil*² very commonly in the sacrificial laws, Ex 29²,

¹ But in Ex 12²³ הַמֹּרֶס is either to be explained as *the destroyer* (now mentioned for the first time) according to *q*, or a particular angel is meant whose regular function it was to inflict punishments. Others again take הַמֹּרֶס even in Ex 12²³ impersonally = *destruction*.

² In nearly all the above examples the presence of the article is only indicated by the vowel of the prefix (בִּ, בְּ, לִ) and might therefore be merely

&c., and also Dt 33²⁴, 2 S 1²¹, Is 1⁶, ψ 23⁵, &c. Similarly the article is used with terms of measurement, as הַאֲפָה Ex 16³⁶, &c.: הַחֶמֶר and הַבֵּת Ez 45¹¹; הָעֵמֶר Ex 16²²; בְּחֶבֶל 2 S 8².

(c) The expression of abstract ideas of every kind, since they are likewise used to represent whole classes of attributes or states, physical or moral defects, &c.; e.g. Pr 25⁵ (בְּצִרְקָה); Gn 19¹¹ *and they smote the men . . .* בַּפִּנּוּיִם *with blindness*; Am 4⁹, &c.; but in הַחֲשֵׁן Is 60² the article is no doubt due to dittography of the ה, and the parallel וְעַרְפָּל has no article.

(d) *Comparisons*, since the object compared is treated not (as usually in English) individually but as a general term, e.g. Is 1¹⁸ *white* בְּשֵׁלֶג *as snow*, בְּצֹמֶר *as wool*; *red* כְּתוֹלֵעַ *like crimson*; Is 34⁴ *and the heavens shall be rolled together* כְּפִסְפָּר *as a scroll*; cf. Nu 11¹², Ju 8¹⁸, 16⁹ *as* פְּתִיל־הַנְּעֵרֶת *a string of tow is broken*; 1 S 26²⁰, 1 K 14¹⁵, Is 10¹⁴, 24²⁰, 27¹⁰, 29⁸, 53⁶, Na 3¹⁵, ψ 33⁷, 49¹⁵; cf. also such examples as Gn 19²⁸, Ju 14⁶, where the object compared is determined by a determinate genitive which follows (according to § 127 a).

Examples of indeterminate comparisons are rare, and perhaps due only to *p* the Masora,—so at least in the case of singulars, while in such plurals as those in Gn 42³⁰, 1 K 10²⁷, Jo 2^{4.7}, the omission of the article may be explained by the ordinary rules. On the other hand, the article is regularly omitted when the object compared is already defined by means of an attribute (or relative clause, Jer 23⁹, ψ 17¹²), e.g. Is 16² *as wandering birds, (as) a scattered nest* (but cf. 10¹⁴ בְּיָקֵן); 14¹⁹, 29⁵ *כְּמִין עֵבֶר* (but ψ 1⁴ בְּפִיץ); Jer 2³⁰, Pr 27⁸, Jb 29²⁵, 30¹⁴.—In comparisons with persons also the Masora seems to avoid the use of the article, as in *בְּגִבּוֹר* Jb 16¹⁴ and seven other places (*בְּגִבּוֹר* only in Is 42¹³), *בְּאָב* Jb 31¹⁸, *בְּגִבּוֹר* Jb 38³, 40⁷.

4. Peculiar to Hebrew¹ is the employment of the article to denote *q* a single person or thing (primarily one which is as yet unknown, and therefore not capable of being defined) as being present to the mind under given circumstances. In such cases in English the indefinite article is mostly used.

Thus Am 5¹⁹ *as if a man did flee from a lion* (הַאֲרִי, i.e. the particular lion *r* pursuing him at the time), and a bear (הַדָּב) *met him*, &c., cf. 3¹², 1 K 20³⁶ (John 10¹²); also Gn 8⁷¹, 14¹³ (הַפְּלִיט, i.e. *one that had escaped*, the particular one who came just then; so also Ez 24²⁶, 33²¹; cf. 2 S 15¹³); Gn 15^{1.11}, 18⁷ *the servant*, who is regarded as being constantly at hand and awaiting his commands; cf. 2 S 17¹⁷ (but הַנְּעֵר Nu 11²⁷ is used like הַפְּלִיט above); Gn 19³⁰, unless בְּמַעְרָה means *in the well-known cave*; בְּמָקוֹם Gn 28¹¹, according to Dillmann, upon *the place suitable for passing the night, or the right place*, but it may possibly also refer to *the sanctuary of Bethel afterwards so sacred and celebrated*; Gn 42²³, 46², 50²⁶, Ex 2¹⁵, 3², 4²⁰, 21²⁰ (2 S 23²¹), Lv 23⁴², 24¹⁰ (Samaritan *ישׂראֵלִי* without the article); Nu 17¹¹, 21^{6.9}, 25⁶, Dt 19⁵, Jos 2¹⁵, Ju 4¹⁸, 8²⁵, 13¹⁹, 16¹⁹, 19²⁹, 20¹⁶, 1 S 17³⁴, 19¹³, 21¹⁰, 2 S 17¹⁷, 1 K 6⁸, 13¹⁴ (? most

due to the masoretic punctuation. There is, however, no reason to doubt the correctness of the tradition. The same is true of the examples under *n* and *o*.

¹ Cf., however, analogous examples in biblical Aramaic in Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 79 *f*, e.g. Dn 2¹⁴, 3², &c.

probably a particular tree is meant); 19⁹, Is 7¹⁴ (הַעֲלָמָה, i. e. *the particular maiden*, through whom the prophet's announcement shall be fulfilled; we should say *a maiden* [cf. Driver on 1 S 1⁴, 6⁸, 19¹³]; Jb 9³¹).

§ So always to write in the book (or on the scroll, Nu 5²³, Jer 32¹⁰), i. e. not in the book already in use, but in the book which is to be devoted to that purpose, equivalent to *in a book, on a scroll*, Ex 17¹⁴, 1 S 10²⁵, Jb 19²³. Especially instructive for this use of the article is the phrase וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם, which does not simply refer back to the previous narrative in the sense of *the same day*, but is used exactly like our *one day* (properly meaning on the particular day when it happened, i. e. *on a certain day*), 1 S 1⁴, 14¹, 2 K 4⁸, 11¹⁸, Jb 16¹³. In Gn 39¹¹ even כַּהַיּוֹם הַזֶּה.

t The article is sometimes used in this way before collectives in the singular, which are not meant to denote (like the examples given under l) a whole class, but only that part of it which applies to the given case; thus הָעָרִב, הַיּוֹנָה Gn 8⁷, הַצִּרְעָה Ex 23²⁸.

u 5. When a substantive is defined by the article, or by a suffix, or by a following genitive determinate in any way (see the examples below), the attribute belonging to it (whether adjective, participle, ordinal, or demonstrative pronoun) necessarily takes the article (see, however, the Rem.), e. g. Gn 10¹² הַגְּדוֹלָה הָעִיר הַגְּדוֹלָה *the great city*; Dt 3²⁴ יָדְךָ הַחֲזָקָה *thy strong hand*. A genitive following the substantive may, according to § 127 a, be determined either by the article, e. g. 1 S 25²⁵ אִישׁ הַבְּלִיעַל הַזֶּה *this worthless man* (prop. *man of worthlessness*; cf. also such examples as 2 Ch 36¹⁸, where the article is prefixed only to a second genitive following the noun); or as a proper name, e. g. Dt 11⁷ מַעֲשֵׂה יְהוָה הַגָּדוֹל *the great work of the Lord*; or by a suffix, e. g. Is 36⁹ עַבְדֵי אֲדֹנָי הַקְּטַנִּים *the least of my master's servants*.

v When several attributes (whether connected by *Wāw* or not) follow a determinate substantive, each of them takes the article, e. g. Dt 10¹⁷ הַגָּדוֹל הַמְּאִיץ הַגִּבּוֹר וְהַנּוֹרָא *the great God, the mighty, and the terrible*. Cf. also Ex 3³, Dt 1¹⁹, in both of which places a demonstrative with the article also follows the adjective,¹

Rem. 1. The article is, however, not infrequently used also—

w (a) With the attribute alone, when it is added to an originally indefinite substantive as a subsequent limitation; so always with ordinal numbers after יוֹם,² e. g. Gn 1³¹ (cf. 2³, Ex 20¹⁰, &c.) יוֹם הַשֵּׁשִׁי *the sixth day* (prop. *a day* namely

¹ The demonstrative used adjectivally is generally placed *after* the adjective proper; in such cases as עֲמֶךָ הַזֶּה הַגָּדוֹל 2 Ch 1¹⁰ the adjective forms a further (fresh) addition to עֲמֶךָ הַזֶּה.

² Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, 3rd ed., § 209; M. Lambert, *REJ.* 31, 279 f.—The omission of the article from the substantive is not to be regarded in *this* instance as an indication of late style, and consequently cannot be put forward as a proof of the late origin of the 'Priestly Code' (cf. Dillmann on Gn 1³¹, Holzinger, *Einl. in d. Hexateuch*, p. 465, and especially Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, xi. 229 f., against Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 265 f.). On the other hand, the common omission of the article from the substantive before a determinate adjective (e. g. בְּנֵי־הַגְּדוֹלָה *the great synagogue*, in the Mishna; cf. Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, p. 19 ff.) is certainly a later idiom.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

God and אֱלֹהִים חַי the living God. In Ju 1¹⁵ גַּלְתָּ עִלְיָתָא and גַּ' תַּחֲתִיּוֹת are strange; Jos 15¹⁹ has עִלְיֹתָא and תַּחֲתִיּוֹת.

z Of the remaining examples Is 11⁹ explains itself; the direct connexion of the attribute with its substantive is broken by the insertion of לִים. In Ez 34¹², Hag. 1⁴ (as Wellhausen says, a good instance of a Hebrew adjective in the stative form = וְהֵם סְפוּנִים), ψ 143¹⁰, Ct 6¹² (?) the substantive is also (see above) determined by a suffix, and consequently the attribute is less closely attached; the same applies to Gn 37², 42¹⁹, 43¹⁴, ψ 18¹⁸, except that in these passages the omission of the article before ר, נ, ע may at the same time be due to considerations of euphony (as also in Jos 16¹ before ע, Nu 14³⁷ before ר, 28⁴, Ez 10⁹ before נ, 21¹⁹ before ח).¹ In 1 S 13¹⁷ (אַחַר) and 2 K 25¹⁶ (שָׁנִים) after a determinate substantive), the attribute again, being a numeral, is determinate in itself (see above, x); in Is 65² the ל prevents the use of the article; finally, in 2 Ch 26¹⁵ בְּחָצִים and בְּאַבְנִים are to be read, as in Jer 2²¹ גִּפְנֵי for הַגִּפְנֵי, in 22²⁶ אֶרֶץ for הָאֶרֶץ; in 2 S 6³ omit חֲרָשָׁה, and in Ez 39²⁷ omit רְבִים. Without any apparent reason the article is omitted in Dn 8¹³ and 11³¹.

aa 2. When, as in Mi 7¹² (יֹם הַיּוֹם in that day?), the article is omitted from both substantive and demonstrative, and in Ezr 3¹², the demonstrative even precedes (הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה = הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה), this is obviously due in both cases to a radical corruption of the text (not only in the words quoted). In Jos 9¹² לַחֲמֵנוּ is either in apposition to the independent demonstrative זֶה (= this our bread, &c.), as in verse 13 נֹאדוֹת is to אֲלֵהָ, or they are complete sentences, this is our bread, &c. So also in Ex 32¹ כֹּזֵב (= that [iste] Moses, &c.), and in ψ 48¹⁵ אֱלֹהִים are to be taken in apposition to זֶה. On ψ 68⁸ and Is 23¹³ cf. § 136 d.

§ 127. The Noun determined by a following Determinate Genitive.

Brockelmann, Grundriss. i. 475.

a When a genitive, determined in any way, follows a *nomen regens*, it also determines the *nomen regens*, which, according to § 89 a, is always in the construct state. Moreover, every pronominal suffix attached to a substantive is, according to § 33 c, to be considered as a genitive determinate by nature. An independent genitive may be determinate—

(a) By its character as a *proper name* (according to § 125 a), e. g. דְּבַר יְהוָה the word of the Lord.

(b) By having the article, e. g. אִישׁ הַמִּלְחָמָה (prop. the man of the war) the soldier (but אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה Jos 17¹, a soldier); אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה

¹ The same reason no doubt also favoured the omission of the article before הַיּוֹם and אֲלֵהָ, see above, under y. Also in Is 23⁷ (is this your joyous . . . ?) the article is omitted before עֲלִיָּה probably only for euphony.

Nu 31⁴⁹, *the soldiers*; דְּבַר הַנְּבִיא *the word of the prophet*, Jer 28⁹ (but e. g., on the other hand, מִצְוַת אֲנָשִׁים מְלֻמָּדָה *a commandment of men which hath been taught*, Is 29¹³; דְּבַר-שָׁקֶר *word of falsehood*, Pr 29¹²).

(c) By the addition of a pronominal suffix (see above), e. g. בֵּית-אָבִי *my father's house*.

(d) By construction with another genitive determined in some way, e. g. Gn 3² עֵץ-הַגֶּן מִפְּרֵי *of the fruit of the trees of the garden*. Thus in Is 10¹² four, and in 21¹⁷ even five, members of a series are determined by a concluding determinate genitive.

Rem. 1. The above explains also the various meanings of כָּל (prop. a substantive in the sense of *aggregate, whole*), according as it is followed by a determinate or indeterminate genitive. In the former case כָּל has the meaning of *the entirety*, i. e. *all, the whole* (like the French *tous les hommes, toute la ville*), e. g. כָּל-הָאָרֶץ *the whole* (prop. the entirety of the) *earth*, כָּל-הָאָדָם *all men*;¹ Ex 18²², Nu 15¹³, Jer 4²⁹, and cases like Nu 4^{23,47}, 21⁸ where כָּל is followed by a singular participle with the article. On the other hand, before an indeterminate genitive כָּל is used in the more indefinite (individualizing) sense of *of all kinds, any* (cf. *tout homme, à tout prix*), or distributively *each, every*, e. g. כָּל-עֵץ *every* (kind of) *tree*, Gn 2⁹; cf. 4²², 24¹⁰, 1 Ch 29²; כָּל-דָּבָר *any thing*, Ju 19¹⁹; כָּל-יּוֹם *every day, every time*, ψ 7¹².

It is, however, to be observed—

(a) That the article may in this case also (see § 126 h) be omitted in poetic style, although the substantive is to be regarded as determinate, e. g. כָּל-שִׁלְחָנוֹת *all* (the) *tables*, Is 28⁸.

(b) That the meaning *every* is frequent even before singulars used collectively; afterwards the idea of *quisque* passes naturally into that of *totality*, e. g. כָּל-חַי *each living thing*, i. e. *every* (not every kind of) *living thing*; כָּל-בְּשָׂר *all flesh*, i. e. *all men or all living creatures* (with the article only in Gn 7¹⁵ before a relative clause, and in Is 40⁶); sometimes also כָּל-עֵץ *all trees*, כָּל-עוֹף *all birds*; finally—

(c) That before the names of members of the human body, כָּל frequently (as being determinate in itself) denotes the entirety, e. g. Is 1⁵ *the whole head, the whole heart* (the sense required by the context, not *every head, &c.*, which the expression *in itself* might also mean); 9¹¹, 2 K 23³, Ez 29⁷ *all* (i. e. *the whole of*) *their shoulders . . . all* (the whole of) *their loins*; 36⁵.—On כָּל with a suffix when it follows a noun in apposition (e. g. Is 9⁸ הָעָם כָּלּוֹ *the people, all of it*, i. e. *the whole nation*, more emphatic than כָּל-הָעָם, cf. Driver on 2 S 2⁹), as well as when it follows absolutely in the genitive (= *all men, every one*, e. g. Gn 16¹²),² see the Lexicon, pp. 481^b, 482^b.

2. Gentilic names (or patronymics), derived from compound proper names (consisting of a nomen regens and genitive), are determined by inserting the article before the second part of the compound (since it contains the original

¹ כָּל-הָאָדָם being a collective, cf. כָּל-הָאִישׁ 2 S 15², *all men*, כָּל-הַבָּנִים Ex 1²² *all sons*, כָּל-הַבָּתּוֹת *all daughters*; in itself כָּל-הָאָדָם could also mean *the whole man*.

² In Ezr 10¹⁷ instead of כָּל-הָאֲנָשִׁים read simply כָּל-הָאֲנָשִׁים.

genitive), e.g. בְּנֵי-יְמִינִי (see § 86 h) a Benjamite; בְּנֵי-הַיְמִינִי Ju 3¹⁵, &c., the Benjamite; בֵּית-הַלְּחָמִי the Bethlehemite, 1 S 16¹, &c. (cf., however, 1 Ch 27¹² *Qeré* לְבֵן יְמִינִי); בֵּית-הַשֶּׁמֶשִׁי (לְבֵן יְמִינִי); אָבִי הָעֶזְרִי the Abiezrite, Ju 6¹¹, &c., cf. 1 K 16³⁴.

e 3. In a few instances the nomen regens appears to be used indefinitely notwithstanding a following determinate genitive; it is not so, however, in Gn 16⁷, where the reference is to a well-known fountain; 21²⁸, where in the original context there must have been some reason for *the seven ewe lambs of the flock*; 2 S 12³⁰ *the spoil found in the city*; but it often is so before a proper name, as in Ex 10⁹ חַג יְהוָה a feast of the Lord (unless it is *the spring festival*), Dt 7²⁵, and frequently הוֹעֵבֶת יְהוָה an abomination unto the Lord; cf. also Gn 46³⁴, Dt 22¹⁹ a virgin of Israel; 1 S 4¹² a man of Benjamin; Pr 25¹, Ct 2¹, 3⁹; similarly before appellatives with the article (or before a genitive determined by a suffix, as in Lv 14³⁴), 1 S 20²⁰ three arrows; 2 S 23¹¹ חֶלְקֵת הַשָּׂדֶה a plot of the ground (but see Gn 33¹⁹, Jos 24³²); Ju 13⁶, Jer 13⁴, 41¹⁶, Ct 11.13^f, 5¹³, 7³, 8². On the other hand, שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת in the titles of Psalms 120 to 134 (except 121¹, שִׁיר לַמַּעֲלוֹת) was most probably originally the title of a collection, in the sense of 'the pilgrimage-songs' (according to § 124 r), and was subsequently added to these Psalms severally.—In Ex 20²⁴ בְּכָל-הַמְּקוֹם in all the place, sc. of the sanctuary, is a dogmatic correction of בְּכָל-מְקוֹם, in every place, to avoid the difficulty that several holy-places are here authorized, instead of the one central sanctuary. In Gn 20¹³ also כָּל-הַמְּקוֹם (unless it means *in the whole place*) is remarkable, since elsewhere every place is always (8 times) כָּל-מְקוֹם.

f 4. The deviations mentioned under e, from a fundamental rule of syntax, are in some cases open to suspicion on textual grounds, but much more doubtful are the instances in which the article is found before a noun already determined in some other way, as—

(a) Before a noun which appears to be determined by a following independent determinate genitive. The least questionable are the instances in which the genitive is a *proper name*, since these may be elliptical forms of expression like the apparent construction of proper names with a genitive, noticed in § 125 h, e.g. Nu 21¹⁴ הַנְּחָלִים אֲרֹנוֹן the valleys, namely the valleys of Arnon; 2 K 23¹⁷ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ בֵּית-אֵל the altar, namely the altar of Bethel (i.e. with the suppression of the real nomen regens, מִזְבֵּחַ without the article; by the pointing הַמִּזְבֵּחַ the Masora evidently intends to allow the choice either of reading הַמִּזְבֵּחַ or correcting it to מִזְבֵּחַ); הָאֵל בֵּית-אֵל the God of Beth-el¹ (equivalent to הָאֵל בְּ), Gn 31¹³ (the LXX read הָאֵל הַנִּרְאָה בַּמְּקוֹם the God who appeared to thee in the holy place); הַמֶּלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר the king of Assyria, Is 36¹⁶ (probably a scribal error due to verse 13; it does not occur in the parallel passage, 2 K 18³¹), cf. Jos 13⁶, 2 K 25¹¹, Jer 38⁶, Ez 47¹⁵; in the vocative, Jer 48³², La 2¹³. On the other hand, שָׂרָה אִמּוֹ Gn 24⁶⁷ is no doubt

¹ According to Philippi (*St. Constr.*, p. 38) בֵּית-אֵל is rather a case of 'subposition' in the accusative, as also הַדֶּרֶךְ הַתְּלוּן Ez 47¹⁵ (for which, however, in 48¹ there is the correct reading הַדֶּרֶךְ הַתְּלוּן) *by the way to Helthlon*; and in fact, Ez 47¹⁵ may without difficulty be explained in this way; so שֵׁשׁ Ex 39²⁷ as an accusative of the material.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

§ 128. *The Indication of the Genitive Relation by means of the Construct State.*

Cf. especially Philippi's work cited at the head of § 89.

a 1. The genitive relation is regularly expressed (see § 89) by the close connexion of the *nomen regens* (in the construct state) with the *nomen rectum* (in the genitive). Since only *one* *nomen regens* can be immediately connected with a *nomen rectum*, it follows that the same genitive cannot depend on two or more *co-ordinate* nouns, but a second (sometimes even a third, &c.) *regens* must be added with a suffix referring to the *nomen rectum*, e. g. בְּנֵי דָוִד וּבָנוֹתָיו *the sons of David and his daughters* (not בְּנֵי וּבָנוֹת דָּוִד); cf. 1 K 8²⁸.¹ The language also prefers to avoid a series of several *co-ordinate*² genitives depending upon one and the same *nomen regens* (such as occur in Gn 14¹⁹, Nu 20⁵, 31⁵⁴ [1 Ch 13¹], 1 S 23⁷, 2 S 19⁶, Is 22⁵, ψ 5⁷, 8³),³ and rather tends to repeat the *nomen regens*, e. g. Gn 24³ אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ *the God of heaven and the God of the earth* (so in Jer 8¹ the *regens* is five times repeated). A lengthened series of genitives may, however, be formed by a *nomen rectum* serving at the same time as *regens* to a genitive depending on it (cf. § 127 a [d]); e. g. Gn 47⁹ יְמֵי שָׁנַי חַיֵּי אֲבוֹתַי *the days of the years of the life of my fathers*; cf. Jb 12²⁴, where there are three genitives, Is 10¹² *four*, and 21¹⁷ *five* (unless the last three are in apposition). As a rule, indeed, such an inconvenient accumulation of genitives is avoided by means of a circumlocution in the case of one of them (see § 129 d).

b Rem. As the fundamental rules stated above are the necessary consequence not merely of *logical* but more especially of *rhythmical* relations (see § 89 a), we must feel the more hesitation in admitting examples in which genitives are supposed to be loosely attached to forms other than the construct state. Some of these examples (the supposed genitives following a *regens* which is determined by the article) have been already discussed in § 127 f-h. Compare, moreover :

c (a) Genitives after the absolute state, e. g. Is 28¹ גִּיא־שְׁמָנִים הַלְּוִמִּי יַיִן *the fat valley of them that are overcome with wine*. The usual explanation that גִּיא־שְׁמָנִים forms *one* single idea (in German *Fettigkeitstal*), on which the

¹ Very rare, and only possible in very rapid utterance, are such exceptions as Ez 31¹⁶ (מְבַחַר וְטוֹב-לְבָנוֹן); Pr 16¹¹.—In Is 11² *the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord*, רֵעַת may at any rate also be taken as an absolute genitive, so also סֶפֶר Dn 1⁴.

² In ψ 114¹ a second genitive is added even without the copula, but the parallelism of the members renders any misunderstanding impossible.

³ In almost all these instances the two (or three) genitives form one closely connected whole, as *heaven and earth, sons and daughters*.

genitive הַלְלוּמֵי יֵיִן then depends, in reality explains nothing; the text is almost certainly corrupt. In Dt 15¹⁸ מִשְׁנֵה would be expected; in Jos 3¹¹ הַבְּרִית is a later addition; in Is 32¹³ (מְשׁוֹשׁ), and ψ 68²² (שֵׁעַר), the absolute for the construct state probably rests only on the authority of the Masoretes. In Ju 6²⁵ ^{fr.} the text is obviously in confusion. In Ju 8³² (cf. 6²⁴) בְּעֶפְרָה should come either after וַיִּקְבֹּר or at the end of the verse, unless, with Moore, we omit אָבִי הָעֵר as a gloss (from 6²⁴); in Is 63¹¹ מִשָּׁה is probably a gloss on יְמֵי-עוֹלָם which has crept into the text; in 2 S 4² לְאִישׁ-בְּשֵׁת, according to the LXX, has dropped out before בֵּן; in Ez 6¹¹ רְעוֹת is to be omitted with the LXX; if originally in the text, it could only be genitive (= *all abominations of evils*), not an adjective; Pr 21⁶ the text is altogether uncertain (the LXX read מִבְּקָשִׁי for מִבְּקָשִׁי); in 1 Ch 9¹³ the preposition לְ (after a ל) has dropped out before מְלֹאכֶת (cf. 12²⁵).—Elsewhere (Dt 3⁵, 1 K 4¹³, 2 Ch 8⁵) the supposed genitives are to be taken rather as words of nearer definition standing in apposition, i. e. *with high walls, gates, and bars*. In Jer 8⁵ יְרוּשָׁלַיִם is either in apposition to הָעַם הַזֶּה or is better (since not in the LXX) omitted as a gloss.

(b) Genitives after a noun with a suffix (where the suffix prevents the direct government by the *nomen regens*). Thus in Lv 27^{3.5.6}, where עֲרֶכְבְּךָ after הַזָּכָר might be taken, contrary to the accents, as subject of the following clause; in Lv 5^{15.25} the suffix may refer to Moses. In Lv 6³ מְדוּ בָרְדוֹ *his garment*, namely the garment of *linen*, unless simply in apposition, cf. § 131 d (or read מְדוּי?); Lv 26⁴², where בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב וְגו' could at most be explained as an ellipse for בְּרִיתִי בְּרִית יַעֲקֹב, cf. § 125 h (probably, however, it is a case of dittography of the י, which was repeated also before אַבְרָהָם; so Valeton, *ZAW*. xii. 3); equally strange is בְּרִיתִי הַיּוֹם Jer 33²⁰, &c. On the other hand, אִם יִהְיֶה נְבִיאָךְ נְבִיאֲכֶם יְהוָה Nu 12⁶ could not possibly mean *if your prophet be a prophet of the Lord*; the text is manifestly corrupt (probably מִיְהוָה נְבִיאָךְ is to be read, with Marti). In ψ 45⁷ כִּסֵּאֲךָ אֱלֹהִים (usually explained as *thy divine throne*), אֱלֹהִים is most probably a later addition [another suggestion is to read בְּאֱלֹהִים *like God*(*'s throne*): cf. § 141 d, note]. In Jer 52²⁰ two readings are probably combined, לְנַחֲשֶׁתָם without any addition, and לְנַחֲשֶׁת כָּל-הַכְּלִיִּים. In Nu 25¹² שְׁלוֹם is in apposition to בְּרִיתִי. On Ez 16²⁷, cf. § 131 r.

(c) The interposition of a word is assumed between כָּל- (the whole; cf. § 127 b) and the genitive governed by it in 2 S 1⁹, Jb 27⁹ (עוֹר), and, if the text is correct, in Hos 14³ (תִּשָּׂא). In reality, however, in all three places the genitive relation is destroyed by the transposition of the words (instead of עוֹר כָּל- &c.), and כָּל- is rather to be taken adverbially (equivalent to *wholly*), e. g. 2 S 1⁹ *because my life is yet wholly in me*, i. e. my whole life; cf. Philippi, *Stat. Constr.*, p. 10.—On the instances in which the original construct state אֵין *non-existence* is used without a following genitive, see the negative sentences, § 152 o.

2. The dependence of the *nomen rectum* on the *nomen regens* by no means represents merely what is, properly speaking, the genitive relation (see the examples under g-i). Very frequently the *nomen*

¹ Halévy, *J. A.* xiv. 548, removes the difficulty by pointing עֲרֶכְבְּךָ.

rectum only adds a nearer definition of the nomen regens, whether by giving the name, the genus or species, the measure, the material, or finally an attribute of it (*genit. epexegeticus* or *appositionis*,¹ see the examples under *k-q*).

Examples. The *nomen rectum* represents—

- g** (a) A subjective genitive, specifying the possessor, author, &c., e. g. בֵּית־הַמֶּלֶךְ the king's house; הַדְּבַר יְהוָה the word of the Lord.
- h** (b) An objective genitive, e. g. Ob¹⁰ מִחַמַּם אָחִיךָ for the violence done to thy brother² (but in Ez 12¹⁹ מִחַמַּם is followed by a subjective genitive); Pr 20² מֶלֶךְ אֵימַת מֶלֶךְ the terror of a king; Gn 18²⁰ זַעַקַת סֹדֶם the cry concerning Sodom; Is 23⁶ צֶרֶר שִׁמְעֵ צֶר the report of (about) Tyre, cf. 2 S 4⁴; Am 8¹⁰ אֲבֵל יָחִיד the mourning for an only son; Dt 20¹⁴ שְׁלַל אֵיבֶיךָ praeda hostibus tuis erepta; cf. Is 3¹⁴. In a wider sense this includes such examples as עֵץ הַחַיִּים הַדֶּרֶךְ the way of (i. e. to) the tree of life, Gn 3²⁴; cf. Pr 7²⁷, Jb 38²⁰; הַיָּם הַדֶּרֶךְ the way of (by) the sea, Is 8²³; זְבָחֵי אֱלֹהִים the sacrifices of (i. e. pleasing to) God, ψ 51¹⁹; שְׁבַעַת יְהוָה the oath of (i. e. sworn before) the Lord, 1 K 2⁴⁸; דְּבָרַי לְמוֹאֵל the words of (i. e. addressed to) L., Pr 31¹.
- i** (c) A partitive genitive; this includes especially the cases in which an adjective in the construct state is followed by a general term, e. g. חַכְמוֹת שְׂרוּתֶיהָ the wisest of her ladies, Ju 5²⁹; cf. for this way of expressing the superlative, § 133 *h*, and also *r* below.
- k** Merely formal genitives (*genit. explicativus* or *epexegeticus*, *genit. appositionis*) are those added to the construct state as nearer definitions—
- (d) Of the name, e. g. נְהַר פְּרָת the river Euphrates; אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן the land of Canaan; בְּתוּלַת יִשְׂרָאֵל the virgin Israel (not of Israel), Am 5².
- l** (e) Of the genus, e. g. Pr 15²⁰ (21²⁰) בְּסִיל אָדָם a fool of a man (= a foolish man); cf. Gn 16¹², Is 1⁴, 29¹⁹, Ho 13², Mi 5⁴, &c.
- m** (f) Of the species, e. g. אֲחֻזַּת קֶבֶר a possession of a burying-place, i. e. hereditary sepulchre, Gn 23⁴, &c.; תְּאֵנֵי הַבְּבֵרוֹת the early figs, Jer 24²; אֹהֶל בֵּיתִי the tabernacle of my house, i. e. my dwelling-place, ψ 132³.
- n** (g) Of the measure, weight, extent, number, e. g. מְתֵי מִסְפָּר people of number, i. e. few in number, Gn 34³⁰, Dt 26⁵; cf. also Ez 47³⁻⁵ waters of the ankles, waters of the loins, waters of swimming, i. e. which reached up to the ankles, or loins, or necessitated swimming; but in verse 4 in apposition (?) מַיִם בְּרַבָּיִם.
- o** (h) Of the material³ of which something consists, e. g. כֶּלִי חַרְשׁ a vessel of earthenware, Nu 5¹⁷; כְּסָף כֶּלִי vessels of silver (cf. the French *des vases d'or*); עֵץ אֲרוֹן an ark of wood, שֵׁבֶט בְּרֹזֶל a rod of iron, ψ 2⁹; cf. Gn 3²¹, 6¹⁴, Ju 7¹³, &c.

¹ The latter term is preferred especially by König, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1898, p. 528 ff.

² Cf. in Latin a similar use of the genitive after *iniuria* (Caes. *B. G.* 1, 30), *metus* (*hostium*, *Pompeii*, &c.), *spes*, and other words. In Greek, cf. *εὐνοια τῶν φίλων*, *πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ*, *ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ*, 1 Cor. 1¹⁸.

³ In the almost entire absence of corresponding adjectives (אֲרוֹן *made of cedar*, a denominative from אֲרוֹן, and נְחֹשֶׁת *brazen* are the only examples), the language regularly has recourse to the above periphrasis. On the form *qātūl*, as expressing an inherent property, cf. § 50 *f*; cf. also the proper name, בְּרֹזֶל *ferreus*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

בַּעֲלַת-אוֹב *a woman that hath a soothsaying spirit*, 1 S 28⁷; cf. Na 3⁴; in the plural, e. g. בַּעֲלֵי חַצִּים *archers*, Gn 49²³, בַּעֲלֵי בְרִית *confederates*, Gn 14¹³; בַּעֲלֵי שְׂבוּעָה *sworn supporters*, Neh 6¹⁸.

U (c) Of בֶּן, &c. : בֶּן-חַיִל *a hero, warrior*, 1 K 1⁵²; בֶּן-מִשְׁקָה *heir*, Gn 15²; בֶּן-שָׁנָה *yearling*, Ex 12⁵, &c. ; בֶּן-מֵאָת שָׁנָה *centum annos natus*, Gn 21⁵; בֶּן-מָוֶת *worthy to die*, 1 S 2c³¹ (Luther, 2 S 12⁵ *ein Kind des Todes*); cf. Dt 25² בֶּן-הַכּוֹת *worthy to be beaten*. Feminine, e. g. בַּת-בְּלִיעַל *a wicked woman*, 1 S 1¹⁶; frequently also בְּלִיעַל, *אִישׁ בְּלִיעַל*, *בְּנֵי ב'*, *אֲנָשֵׁי ב'*, and even simply בְּלִיעַל, like the Latin *scelus* for *sceltestissimus*, 2 S 23⁶, Jb 34¹⁸. Plural masculine, e. g. בְּנֵי מַרִּי *children of rebellion*, Nu 17²⁵. בֶּן is used poetically of things without life, e. g. Is 5¹ בֶּן-שֶׁמֶן *a fat*, i. e. a fruitful (hill); Jon 4¹⁰ בֶּן-לַיְלָה *i. e. grown in a night*; Jb 41²⁰ *son of the bow* (i. e. an arrow); so also בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף = *sparks*, Jb 5⁷; La 3¹³; בְּנוֹת Ec 12⁴ *the daughters of song*, probably meaning the individual notes.

There is another use of בֶּן or בְּנֵי to denote membership of a guild or society (or of a tribe, or any definite class). Thus בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים or בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים Gn 6^{2,4}, Jb 1⁶, 2¹, 38⁷ (cf. also בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים ψ 29¹, 89⁷) properly means not *sons of god(s)*, but beings of the class of אֱלֹהִים or אֱלִים; בְּנֵי-הַנְּבִיאִים 1 K 20³⁵ (singular in Am 7¹⁴) *persons belonging to the guild of prophets*; בֶּן-הַרְקָחִים Neh 3⁸ *one of the guild of apothecaries*, cf. 3³¹ where בֶּן-הַצֹּרְפִים is to be read. Similarly בְּנֵי שְׁלֵשִׁים Gn 50²³ are most probably not *great-grandsons* but *grandsons*, i. e. those belonging to the third generation. Cf. also בְּנֵי הַגֵּרְשֹׁנִי Nu 4^{27 f.} *Gershonites*, בְּנֵי הַקָּהָתִים 2 Ch 20¹⁹, &c., *Kohathites*; בְּנֵי קָדֵם *dwellers in the East*.

70 3. Special mention must be made of the not infrequent idiom by which adjectives (sometimes also ordinals, see § 134 o) are added in the genitive, like substantives, rather than as attributes in the same state, gender, and number as the noun which they qualify; thus, Is 28⁴ צִיצֵת נֹבֵל *the flower of that which fades*, for which verse 1 has צִיץ נֹבֵל *the fading flower*; cf. further, Is 22²⁴, Jer 22¹⁷ (?), 52¹³, ψ 73¹⁰, 74¹⁵ (but אֵיתָן may be a substantive), 78⁴⁹; also the use of רַע as a substantive, e. g. in Pr 2^{14 b}, 6²⁴ (אִשֶׁת רַע), &c., analogous to the New Testament phrase *ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας*, Luke 16⁸, and the French *un homme de bien*.¹—Finally, an adverb (treated as a substantive) may likewise be used as an epexegetical genitive; cf. חָנָם דְּמִי חָנָם *blood shed without cause*, 1 K 2³¹; Pr 24²⁸, 26²; Ez 30¹⁶ (יוֹמָם).

x 3. The epexegetical genitives include finally the numerous nearer definitions which follow the construct state of adjectives (and of active and passive participles, or verbal adjectives, cf. § 116 f-l). For, while the word of nearer definition is added to the verb in the accusative (e. g. חָלָה אֶת-רַגְלָיו *he was diseased in his feet*, 1 K 15²³), it may, with participles and verbal adjectives, be either in the accusative

¹ On the other hand, in such passages as Is 36² (2 K 18¹⁷), Zc 14⁴, Ec 8¹⁰, &c., there is no apparent reason why the Masora requires the construct state instead of the absolute; hence חַיִל Is 36² and גַּיָּא Zc 14⁴ must be intended as forms of the absolute state, shortened in consequence of their close connexion.

(§ 116 f and k) or in the genitive, the case of a word depending on a noun. Such a genitive relation is usually termed an *improper annexion*. The nearer definition contains a statement either of the *material*, e. g. Ex 3⁸, &c., אֶרֶץ זָבַת חֶלֶב וְיִדְבֵּשׁ a land flowing with milk and honey; or of the *means*, e. g. חָלַלְתָּ לְיָד הַחֶרֶב slain with the sword, Is 22²; or the *cause*, Ct 2⁵ sick of love; or of the *scope* of the attribute,¹ e. g. Gn 39⁶ יָפֵה-תָאֵר fair of form; cf. Gn 41²⁻⁴, Ex 34⁶, Is 1⁴, Jer 32¹⁹, Na 1³, ψ 119¹, Jb 37¹⁶; or of the *manner*, e. g. ψ 59⁶ אֲנֹן בְּגִרֵי אֲנֹן faithless ones of wickedness (wickedly faithless).

Especially frequent is the use of this genitive to name the part of *y* the body described as being affected by some physical or mental condition, e. g. ψ 24⁴ נְקִי כַפַּיִם כְּנֵי clean as regards hands, &c.; 2 S 9³, Is 6⁵, Jb 17⁹; Is 19¹⁰ אֲנִי-נִפְשׁוֹ grieved in soul; 1 S 1¹⁰, Jb 3²⁰. Also such examples as Am 2¹⁶, Pr 19¹, where a suffix is attached to the substantive, must be regarded as instances of the genitive construction, on the analogy of Pr 14², see § 116 k.

§ 129. *Expression of the Genitive by Circumlocution.*

Besides the construction of a nomen rectum dependent upon a nomen *a* regens in the construct state (§§ 89 and 128), the connexion of two nouns may also be effected otherwise, either by simply attaching the dependent noun by means of the preposition לְ, which, according to § 119 r, expresses, besides other ideas, like that of *belonging to*,² or by the addition of a relative clause (לְאִשְׁרָא, see *h* below).

1. The introduction of a genitive by לְ sometimes occurs even when the *b* construction with the construct state would be equally possible, e. g. 1 S 14¹⁶ הַצִּפִּים לְשָׂאוֹל the watchmen of Saul; ψ 37¹⁶, 2 Ch 28¹⁸ (where indeed the circumlocution makes the sense much plainer); as a rule, however, this use is restricted to the following cases:—

(a) To prevent a nomen regens being determined by a following determinate *C* genitive, e. g. 1 S 16¹⁸ בֶּן לְיִשַׁי a son of Jesse (בֶּן-יִשַׁי would be, according to § 127 a, the son of Jesse); cf. Gn 14¹⁸, 36¹², 41¹², Nu 16²² (27¹⁶), 1 S 17⁸, 2 S 19²¹, ψ 122⁵. Hence, regularly מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד (ψ 3¹, &c.) a psalm of David (properly belonging to David as the author), for which לְדָוִד of David is used alone elliptically in ψ 11¹, 14¹, &c. Such a case as מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד (ψ 24¹, &c.) is not to

¹ Cf. the Latin *integer vitae scelerisque purus*; *tristes animi*, &c.

² Cf. the *σχήμα Κολοφώνιον* in Greek, e. g. ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ for τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Bernhardy's *Syntax*, p. 88). The Arab grammarians distinguish a twofold genitive, one of which may be resolved by לְ, and the other by מִן [see Wright's *Arabic Grammar*, vol. ii, § 75 ff.]. The *de* of the Romance languages is a development of the latter idea; the Gascon, however, says e. g. *la fille à Mr. N.* laying stress upon the idea of *belonging to* and not that of *origin*, as in *la fille de . . .* of the literary language.

- be regarded as a transposition, but **מוֹמֹר** is used epexegetically for the general term omitted before **לְדָוִד** (as it were, a poem of David, a psalm). Moreover, the introduction of the author, poet, &c., by this *Lamed auctoris* is the customary idiom also in the other Semitic dialects, especially in Arabic.
- d** (b) When a genitive is to be made dependent on a nomen regens, which is itself composed of a nomen regens and rectum, and represents, as a compound, one united idea, e. g. Ru 2³ **חֶלֶקֶת הַשָּׂדֶה לְבִעֹן** *the portion of field belonging to Boaz* (**חֶ' שָׂדֶה בִּעֹן** would be *the portion of the field of Boaz*); 2 K 5⁹ *at the house-door of Elisha*. This especially applies to the cases in which the compound regens represents a term in very common use, the fixed form of which cannot be altered, e. g. 1 K 14¹⁹ **עַל-סֵפֶר דְּבַרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** *in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel*; 15²³, &c.; cf. also Jos 19⁵¹.
- e** (c) When for any other reason the construction with the nomen regens in the construct state is inadmissible; cf. e. g. Lv 18²⁰, where **שְׂכַבְתָּךְ**, on account of the suffix, cannot be used in the construct state; but Lv 15¹⁶ ff., &c., **שְׂכַבְת־וֹרֵעַ**; Ju 3²⁸ *the Jordan fords of Moab* (**יַרְדֵּן** as a proper name cannot be used in the construct state); Ex 20⁵ *upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me*; **וְעַל-רִבְעִים** must be kept in the absolute state for the sake of conformity with **עַל-שְׁלֹשִׁים**, and for the same reason also **לְאַלְפִים לְאַהֲבֵי**.
- f** (d) After statements of number in such cases as Gn 8¹⁴ **בְּשִׁבְעָה וְעֶשְׂרִים יוֹם** *on the seven and twentieth day of the month*; cf. 7¹¹, 16³ and frequently, or as in Hag 1¹ **בְּשֵׁנִית שְׁתַּיִם לְדַרְיוֹשׁ** *in the second year of Darius*; the numeral here is always one compound idea with the substantive numbered, and consequently (as in the examples under b) does not admit of being in the constr. st. with a genitive. The same naturally applies also to such examples as 1 K 3¹⁸ **בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לְלִדְתִי** *on the third day of my giving birth* (i. e. after my giving birth). Cf. also the standing phrase **בַּאֲחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ** *on the first (day) of the month*, Gn 8⁵ and frequently.
- g** Rem. In cases like 2 S 3² *and his firstborn was Amnon* **לְאַחִינֹעַם** of Ahinoam, the genitive expressed by circumlocution with **לְ** is in reality dependent on a regens which is omitted (**בֶּן לְאַחִינֹעַם** *a son of Ahinoam*); cf. 2 S 3^{3,5}, 1 K 14¹³, Am 5³ (unless **לְבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל** originally depended on *thus spake the Lord*), and the remarks on **מוֹמֹר לְדָוִד** under c above.
- h** 2. The periphrastic expression of the genitive by means of **אֲשֶׁר לְ** is used principally to state the possessor, e. g. Gn 29⁹ **הַצֹּאֵן אֲשֶׁר לְאָבִיהָ** *her father's sheep* (prop. *the sheep which belonged to her father*); Gn 47⁴ and frequently. So also (according to § 128 a) when a genitive depends on more than one substantive, e. g. Gn 40⁵ *the butler and the baker who (belonged) to the king of Egypt* (**וְאִפֹּה מֶלֶךְ** would indicate only the baker as belonging to the king); or when a genitive (as in the examples under d above) is added to a compound, which expresses one united idea (Ru 4³); or when, as a fixed term (e. g. a title), it appears always in the same form, e. g. Ct 1¹ **שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים אֲשֶׁר לְשֹׁלֹמֹה** *the Song of songs, of Solomon*; 1 S 21⁸, 2 S 2⁸, 1 Ch 11¹⁰; cf. also Gn 41^{43,1}.

¹ In New Hebrew **שֶׁל** (derived from **שָׁלַל** = **אֲשֶׁר לְ**, see § 36, and cf. Ct 1⁶, 3⁷ **שֶׁלִּי**, **שֶׁלִּי שֶׁלִּי**) is used like the simple relative **דֵּי**, **דִּי** in Aramaic, as an independent sign of the genitive.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

Cf. also מִיּוֹם א' followed by a *perfect* in 1 S 29⁸, and יְמֵי א' Lv 13⁴⁶, Nu 9¹⁸.¹

d (4) When it governs independent sentences (cf. § 155), which virtually stand to the construct state (as *nomen regens*) in a sort of genitive relation, e. g. Ex 4¹³ בְּיַד־הַשְּׁלָח prop. *by the hand of him whom thou wilt send*; Nu 23³ מַה־יִּרְאֵנִי דָבָר the *matter of that which he shall show me*, i. e. whatever he shall; Is 29¹ קְרִית הָנָה דָּוִד the *city where David encamped*; Jer 48³⁶, ψ 16³ (if the text be right), 65⁵ (Pr 8³²), ψ 81⁶, Jb 18²¹ the *place of him that knoweth not God*; Jb 29¹⁶, La 1¹⁴ (if the text be right) *into the hands of those against whom I cannot stand*.² In Gn 39⁴ (כָּל־יְשׁ-לוֹ) the כָּל־ takes after it a noun-clause, and in Ex 9⁴, still more boldly, a subst. with לְ.—Very often a *time-determination* governs the following sentence in this way; thus אַחֲרַי followed by a *perfect*, Lv 25⁴⁸, 1 S 5⁹; ψ 102³ (before a noun-clause), Ex 6²⁸, Nu 3¹, Dt 4¹⁵, 2 S 22¹, ψ 18¹, 59¹⁷, 138³ (in every case before a following *perfect*), ψ 56¹⁰ (before an *imperfect*); מִיּוֹם followed by the *perfect*, Jer 36²; כָּל־יְמֵי Lv 14⁴⁶, 1 S 25¹⁵, Jb 29² (כִּי־יָמֵי) *as in the days when . . .*³; cf. כִּי־יָמֵי and שָׁנֹת before a *perfect*, ψ 90¹⁵; בְּעֵת before a *perfect*, Jer 6¹⁵ (cf. 49⁸, 50³¹); before an *imperfect*, Jb 6¹⁷; הַחַלֵּת before a *perfect*, Ho 1².

e (5) Connected with a following word in apposition; certainly so in such cases as בְּתוּלַת בַּת־צִיּוֹן the *virgin, the daughter of Zion*, Is 37²²; cf. 23¹², Jer 14¹⁷; also 1 S 28⁷ אִשָּׁת בַּעֲלַת־אֹב a *woman, possessor of a soothsaying spirit*; cf. Dt 21¹¹.—Gn 14¹⁰, Ju 19²² (but read probably אִנְשֵׁים with Moore, as in Dt 13¹⁴, Ju 20¹³, 1 K 21¹⁰); 2 K 10⁶, 17¹³ Qerê; Jer 46⁹, ψ 35¹⁶ (?), 78⁹, Jb 20¹⁷^b (unless נְהַרֵי or נְהַלֵי be a gloss).

f Rem. Some of the above passages may also be explained by supposing that there exists a real genitive relation towards the preceding construct state, which has been, as it were, provisionally left *in suspensio*, in consequence of the insertion of some interrupting word, e. g. Is 37²², &c.; Jb 20¹⁷^a. Elsewhere (Dt 33¹⁹, ψ 68³⁴) the *nomen regens* probably governs the following construct state directly.⁴

¹ In Dt 23⁵ the construct state governs a sentence introduced by the conjunction אֲשֶׁר (עַל־דָּבָר אֲשֶׁר by reason of the fact that, i. e. because); so also in 1 S 3¹³.

² Probably Gn 22¹⁴ is also to be so explained (contrary to the accents), and certainly (contrary to the very unnatural division of the verses) 2 Ch 30¹⁸, which should read on thus: יְהוָה הַטּוֹב יִכַּפֵּר בְּעַר כָּל־לִבָּבוֹ הַכֵּין the good Lord pardon every one that setteth his heart to seek God. [See Wickes' *Accentuation of the Twenty-one Prose Books of the Old Testament*, p. 140.]

³ Cf. Na 2⁹ מִיְמֵי הִיא, usually explained to mean *from the days that she hath been*, but the text is evidently very corrupt.

⁴ So also Is 28¹⁶ a corner stone of the preciousness (יְקָרֶת is a substantive not an adjective) of a fixed foundation, i. e. a precious corner stone of surest foundation.—In 2 S 20¹⁹ the text is wholly corrupt; in ψ 119¹⁸⁸ read כָּל־פְּקוּדֵיךָ.

(6) The numeral **אֶחָד** *one* for **אֶחָדְךָ** in close connexion, and even with *g* small disjunctives, e. g. Gn 3²², 48²², 1 S 9³, 2 S 17²², Is 27¹², Zc 11⁷.

The character of these passages shows that the numeral here cannot be in the construct state, but is merely a rhythmical shortening of the usual (tone-lengthened) form.

§ 131. *Apposition.*

1. Apposition in the stricter sense is the collocation of two sub-*a*stantives in the same case in order to define more exactly (or to complete) the one by the other, and, as a rule (see, however, below, under *g*), the former by the latter. Apposition in Hebrew (as in the other Semitic languages¹) is by no means confined to those cases in which it is used in English or in the classical languages. It is not infrequently found when either the *subordination* of one substantive to the other or some more circumstantial kind of epexegetical addition would be expected.

2. The principal kinds of apposition in Hebrew are:—

(*a*) The collocation of *genus* and *species*, e. g. **אִשָּׁה אֶלְמָנָה** *a woman* *b* (who was) *a widow*, 1 K 7¹⁴; **נַעֲרָה בְּתוּלָה** *a damsel* (that is) *a virgin*, Dt 22^{23,28}, Ju 4⁴, 19¹, 21¹², 1 S 30¹⁷, 1 K 1²; cf. Gn 13⁸, 21²⁰ (where, however, **בְּתוּלָה** is probably an explanatory gloss); Ex 24⁵ (1 S 11¹⁵), 2 S 15¹⁶, 1 K 3¹⁶, 5²⁹ (but probably **סִבְלָה** should be read instead of **סִבְלָה**); Is 3²⁴ (unless **מַעֲשֵׂה** is to be read), Jer 20¹. Perhaps also **כֹּהֵן הָרִאשׁוֹן** *the priest* (who is) *the chief man*, 2 K 25¹⁸, &c.; others take **כֹּהֵן** as constr. st.—In 2 S 10⁷ read **כָּל-צָבָא הַגָּבֹהַ** with the LXX, as in the parallel passage 1 Ch 19⁹ for **כָּל-צָבָא הַגָּבֹהַ**, which is evidently meant to refer to the reading in 2 S.

(*b*) Collocation of the *person* or *thing* and the *attribute*, e. g. Jb 20²⁹ *c* (27¹³) **זֶה חֵלֶק-אָדָם רָשָׁע** *this is the portion of a man*, (who is) *a wicked man* (but **רָשָׁע** might also be an adjunct.); cf. Pr 6¹².—Lv 6¹³, 16⁴ (where, however, **קִרְשׁ** is probably a gloss); Pr 22²¹ **אִמְרֵי אֱמֶת** *words* (which are) *truth*; (immediately after **אִמְרֵי אֱמֶת**) cf. 1 S 2¹³, Mi 1¹¹ (where, however, **בְּשֵׁת** is most probably a gloss on **עֲרִיָּה**); Zc 1¹³ (= *comfortable words*); ψ 45⁵ (?), 68¹⁷ (cf. verse 16). In a wider sense this includes also such cases as ψ 60⁵ **יַיִן תַּרְעִילָהּ** *wine* which is *staggering* (intoxicating drink), which causes staggering²; 1 K 22²⁷, 2 Ch 18²⁶ **מַיִם לְחֵץ** (in

¹ On certain uses of apposition peculiar to the Semitic languages, cf. the exhaustive discussion by Fleischer, 'Ueber einige Arten der Nominalapposition im Arab.' (*Kleine Schriften*, ii. 16); [and see also Driver, *Tenses*, Appendix IV.]

² Unless it is to be translated *thou gavest us intoxication to drink as wine* (and so in 1 K 22²⁷ *give him affliction to eat as bread*, &c.); cf. ψ 80⁶ and the analogous examples of apposition in the form of a second accusative in § 117 *kk*. More-

Is 30²⁰ parallel with צָר (לָהֶם) *water* which is *affliction*, drunk in trouble (imprisonment). Still more boldly, 1 K 5³ בָּקָר רָעִי *oxen* which were taken out of the *pastures*, and 1 K 6⁷ *undressed stones* which come from the *quarry*, probably a corruption of מִמַּסָּע. A person and a condition are in apposition in Ez 18⁶ (unless בְּנִדְתָהּ is to be read).—In 1 S 4¹ read אֶבְנֵי הָעֵץ, as in 5¹, 7¹².

d (c) Collocation of the *person* (Dt 28³⁶) or *thing* (form) and *material*,¹ or of the *place* or *measure* and its *contents*, e.g. 1 Ch 15¹⁹ בְּמַצְלֵתַיִם with *cymbals* which were *brass*, i. e. of *brass*; cf. Ex 26²⁵, Dn 11⁸, 1 Ch 28^{15.18} (?); Ex 28¹⁷ *four rows*, namely *stones* (for which 39¹⁰ has טוֹרֵי אֲבָנִים); cf. 2 Ch 4¹³, Lv 6³ (see, however, § 128 d); 2 K 7¹ סֵאֶה סֵלֶת *a seah of fine flour*; cf. 2 K 7^{16.18}, Gn 18⁶, Ex 16³³, Lv 5¹¹, Ru 2¹⁷, 1 K 16²⁴, 2 K 5²³ כֶּסֶף בְּכַרְיִים *two talents of silver*;² cf. 5¹⁷, Ex 39¹⁷, Ez 22¹⁸ (if the text be right). With the *material* placed before the *measure*, Ex 30^{23f}.—A *period of time* and its *contents* are placed in apposition חֹדֶשׁ יָמִים *a month of days*, i. e. a month's time=for a whole month, Gn 29¹⁴, Nu 11^{20.21}, cf. Dt 21¹³, 2 K 15¹³, and שְׁנַתַּיִם יָמִים *two years' time*, i. e. two full years, Gn 41¹, 2 S 13²³, 14²⁸, Jer 28^{3.11}, Dn 10^{2f}.

Finally, under this head may be included all the cases in which a numeral (regarded as a substantive) is followed by the object numbered in apposition, e.g. שְׁלֹשָׁה בָנִים *trias sc. filii*, § 97 a and § 134 b.

e (d) Collocation of the *thing* and the *measure* or *extent*, *number*, &c., e.g. Nu 9²⁰ כּוֹסֵף יָמִים *days*, (a small) *number*, i. e. only a few days; כּוֹסֵף מְשֻׁנָּה *money, repetition*, i. e. twice as much money, Gn 43¹² (unless כּוֹסֵף be constr. st.); מַיִם בְּרַכְבָּיִם *water* which was of the measure of the *knees*, which reached to the *knees*, Ez 47⁴ (also מַיִם מִתַּנְיִים *water that was to the loins*, in the same verse). This likewise includes the cases in which a noun is followed in apposition by a numeral (see § 134 c) or an adverb, originally conceived as a substantive, e.g. נְאֻשִׁים מְעַט *men, a few*, i. e. some few men; 1 K 5⁹ תְּבוּנָה הַרְבֵּה *understanding, much-making*, i. e. much understanding, unless הַרְבֵּה is to be taken as an adverb with וַיִּתֵּן, as in 2 S 8⁸ with לָקַח.

over, having regard to יַיִן הַרְקָח *spiced wine*, Ct 8², and עֵיִר פָּרָא *a wild ass's colt*, Jb 11¹² (in which passages יַיִן and עֵיִר must certainly be in the construct state) we cannot but ask whether the Masora does not intend the יַיִן in ψ 60⁵ to be taken as construct state (for which elsewhere יַיִן).

¹ Cf. also the examples treated above in § 127 h.

² On the anomalous form כְּכַרְיִים (instead of כְּכַרְיִים; cf. כְּכַרְיִים immediately before), see § 88 b.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Ez 42⁵ (?), Dn 11¹¹, 1 Ch 4⁴², 2 Ch 26¹⁴.¹—Cf. finally, Ct 3⁷, where the suffix precedes the genitive periphrastically expressed by 'שָׁלֵל', as in Ez 9¹, where the genitive is expressed by לֵל.²

O Of a different kind are the cases in which the permutative with its proper suffix follows as a kind of correction of the preceding suffix, e. g. Is 29²³ *when he* (or rather) *his children see*, &c. (but יִלְרִי is clearly a gloss); cf. ψ 83¹²; in Jb 29³ read בְּהִלּוֹ (infin. Hiph.) or at least its syncopated form בְּהִלוֹ.

P 5. Cases of apposition in a *wider sense* are those in which the nearer definition added to the noun was originally regarded as an *adverbial accusative*; on its use with the verb and on the relative correctness of speaking of such an accusative in Hebrew, cf. § 118 a and m. Owing to the lack of case-endings, indeed, it is in many instances only by analogies elsewhere (especially in Arabic) that we can decide whether the case is one of apposition in the narrower or in the wider sense; in other instances this must remain quite uncertain. However, the following are probably cases of apposition in the wider sense:—

Q (a) Such phrases as מִשְׁנֵה כֶּסֶף a double amount in money, Gn 43¹⁵; cf. Jer 17¹⁸; 1 S 17⁵ five thousand shekels in brass, but this might also be taken (as in d) shekels which were brass; certainly such cases as Jb 15¹⁰ older than thy father in days, and the expression of the superlative by means of מְאֹד (originally a substantive), e. g. מְאֹד טוֹב very good, Gn 1³¹ (cf. also Ec 7¹⁶ צַדִּיק הַרְבֵּה righteous over much), and the very frequent מְאֹד הַרְבֵּה prop. a much-making exceedingly, i. e. exceedingly great, Gn 15¹, 41⁴⁹, also Pr ²³29 פְּצָעִים חֲנָם wounds without cause,³ perhaps also Gn 34²⁵ (בְּטַח).

r (b) A few examples, in which an epexegetical substantive is added to a substantive with a suffix; thus, Ez 16²⁷ מְדַרְבֵּן וּמָה of thy conduct in lewdness (but it is also possible to explain it (as in c) of thy conduct, which is lewdness); cf. Ez 24¹³, 2 S 22³³ מְעוֹנֵי חֵיל my fortress in strength, i. e. my strong fortress (cf., however, ψ 18³³); Hb 3⁸, ψ 71⁷. While even in these examples the deviation from the ordinary usage of the language (cf. § 135 n) is strange, it is much more so in חֹב חִבְלָתוֹ חוֹב Ez 18⁷, i. e. according to the context his pledge for a debt; Ezr 2⁶² בְּתַבְּתָם הַמְּתִיחִים i. e. their register, namely of those that were reckoned by genealogy (but perhaps הַמְּתִי is in apposition to the suffix in בְּתַבְּתָם), also the curious combinations (mentioned in § 128 d) of בְּרִיתִי with a proper name (Lv 26⁴²), and in Jer 33²⁰ with הַיּוֹם.⁴

¹ But in Is 17⁶ we should certainly divide the words differently and read בְּסַעְפֵי הַפְּרִיָה, in Jer 48⁴⁴ read אֵלָה for אֵלִיָה, and in Pr 14¹³ אֲחֵרִית הַשְּׂמֵחָה; in Gn 2¹⁹ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה is a late gloss upon לוֹ, and in Ez 41²⁵ אֶל-דְּלָתוֹת הַהֵיכָל a gloss on אֵלִיָהוּ.

² Some of the examples given above are textually (or exegetically) doubtful, whilst in the case of others, especially those from the later Books, we cannot help asking whether such a prolepsis of the genitive by means of a suffix (as e. g. Ez 10³) is not due to the influence of Aramaic, in which it is the customary idiom; cf. Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aram.*, § 81 e and § 88.

³ In ψ 69⁵ חֲנָם (like שֶׁקֶר in a false way, falsely, ψ 35¹⁹ and 38²⁰) is used as an *adverbial accusative* with a participle; cf. § 118 q.

⁴ But in Nu 25¹² שְׁלוֹם may also be explained, according to c, as really in apposition. Cf. on the whole question Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, 4th ed., p. 203, note 1.

6. In Dt 33⁴ (מִוֶּרְשָׁה), perhaps לְקַהֲלֹת מוֹר is to be read), 33²⁷ (מִעֲנָה), Ju 7⁸ S (צִדָּה), the absolute state appears to be used instead of the construct to govern a following logical genitive; this, however, cannot be explained either as a special kind of apposition, or (with Hitzig) as a peculiarity of the dialect of Northern Palestine, but is merely a textual corruption. On the other hand, in Jb 31¹¹ עֵוֹן פְּלִילִים is evidently intended to combine the readings עֵוֹן פְּלִילִים and עֵוֹן פְּלִילִי (as in verse 28).—The remarkable combination אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת in ψ 80^{8.15} is due to the fact that in ψψ 42–83 אֱלֹהִים has almost throughout been subsequently substituted by some redactor for the divine name יְהוָה; on אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת cf. § 125 h. In ψ 59⁶, 80^{5.20}, and 84⁹ יְהוָה has been reinstated in the text before אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת.¹

7. Lastly, the nearer definition (qualification) of a noun may be effected by *t* means of a preposition (either with a suffix or with an independent noun), but must then be distinguished from the cases in which the preposition is dependent on a verb or verbal idea, e. g. Gn 3⁶ and she gave also לְאִשָּׁה עִמָּה unto her husband with her (= her husband who was with her); in Gn 9¹⁶ (that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh) and other places, the qualification of the noun is itself also qualified.

§ 132. Connexion of the Substantive with the Adjective.²

1. The adjective (like the participle used adjectivally), which serves *a* as an *attribute* of a substantive, stands *after* the substantive, and agrees with it in *gender* and *number*, e. g. אִישׁ גָּדוֹל a great man, אִשָּׁה יָפָה a beautiful woman. If the substantive is immediately connected with a genitive, the attribute follows the latter, since, according to § 89 and § 128 a, the construct state and the genitive belonging to it are inseparably united, e. g. Est 8¹⁵ עֲטָרֹת זָהָב גְּדוֹלָה a great crown of gold.—On the attribute when attached to a *determinate* substantive, see above, § 126 u.

¹ Without this assumption it would be inconceivable that יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת should not have been written; that the author of these Psalms regarded אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת already as an independent name of God (so Gesenius and Olshausen) is out of the question.

² On the expression of attributive ideas by substantives, cf. above, § 127 h, and § 128 o, with the note; § 135 n and § 141 c (substantives for adjectives as predicates of noun-clauses) and § 152 u (periphrases for negative qualities). On the use of the feminine of adjectives (and participles) to express abstract ideas, see § 122 q. It remains to mention further the employment (mostly only in poetry) of certain epithets in place of the substantives to which the quality in question belongs; e. g. אֲבִיר the strong one, i. e. God; אֲבִיר the strong one, i. e. the bull (in Jer 8¹⁶, &c., the horse); קָל swift = the runner (of the horse, Is 30¹⁶); לְבָנָה alba, i. e. luna; פְּרִיָּה (fructifera) a fruitful tree, Is 17⁶ (so פְּרִית Gn 49²⁹); רֹבֵץ a croucher, i. e. a crouching beast of prey, Gn 4⁷. Cf. also רֹוֹן (gravis, augustus) and נְשִׂיאַ (elatus?), i. e. a prince. The use of adjectives and participles for substantives is much more extensive in Arabic. In Greek and Latin poetical language cf. such examples as ὑγρή = the sea; merum for vinum, &c.

b Rem. 1. Where an adjectival attribute appears to stand *before* its substantive (according to the usual explanation, for the sake of special emphasis) the relation is really appositional in character; thus, Is 10³⁰ עֲנִיָּה עֲנָתוֹת *O thou poor one, Anathoth!* (but probably עֲנִיָּה answer her, is to be read); cf. 23¹², 53¹¹ (a righteous man, my servant; but in 28²¹ וְרַב־וְרַב־וְרַב and נְכַר־י are predicates preceding the substantives); Jer 3^{6.10}¹, ψ 18⁴ him who is worthy to be praised will I call upon, the Lord; 92¹² (apposition after participles).—But רַב־יָמִים and רַבּוֹת many, are sometimes placed, like numerals, before the substantive, Jer 16¹⁶, Neh 9²⁸ (in ψ 145⁷ רַב is a subst. regens, in 89⁵¹ the text is corrupt); an appositional relation can scarcely be intended in these instances.

c 2. In a few expressions (mostly poetic) the adjective appears not as an attribute *after* the substantive, but in the construct state governing it; so in the singular, Ex 15¹⁶ (unless גִּדְלֵל should be read); 1 S 16⁷ (the height of his stature); in the plural, 1 S 17⁴⁰ חֲלָקֵי אֲבָנִים smooth ones of (among) stones, i. e. smooth stones; Is 35⁹, Ez 7²⁴, ψ 46⁵, and with a following collective instead of a plural, e. g. Is 29¹⁹ אֲבִיּוֹנֵי אָדָם the poor among men, i. e. poor men; Jer 49²⁰, Zc 11⁷; cf. in Latin *canum degeneres*. However, in almost all these cases the adjective which is made into a *regens* is strongly emphatic, and is frequently equivalent to a superlative (see below, § 133 g).

d 3. When *two* adjectives follow a feminine, sometimes only that standing next to the noun takes the feminine termination, e. g. 1 K 19¹¹ רִוַח גְּדֻלָּה (but read גְּדֻלָּה); 1 S 15⁹ (but cf. § 75 y); Jer 20⁹, ψ 63². A similar dislike of the feminine form may also be observed in the case of verbal predicates referring to feminine subjects, cf. § 145 p and t.

When an attribute qualifies several substantives of different genders, it agrees with the masculine, as being the *prior gender* (cf. § 146 d), e. g. Neh 9¹³ חֲקִים וּמְצוֹת טוֹבִים; Jer 34⁹, Zc 8⁵.

When *three* attributes follow a substantive, the first two may stand without a conjunction, and the last be attached by *wāw copulative*, cf. Zc 1⁸.

e 4. After feminines plural ending in יָ— (§ 87 p) the adjectival attribute (in accordance with the fundamental rule stated above, under a) takes the ending וֹת, e. g. Is 10¹⁴ עֲזוּבוֹת בְּיָצִים forsaken eggs; Gn 32¹⁶. For a strange exception see Jer 29¹⁷ (differently in 24²).

f 5. With regard to *number* it is to be remarked that—

(a) Substantives in the *dual* are followed by adjectives (or participles) in the *plural*, e. g. ψ 18²⁸ (Pr 6¹⁷) רַמּוֹת עֵינָיִם haughty eyes; Is 35³, Jb 4³¹, cf. § 88 a.

g (b) *Collective* ideas are not infrequently joined with the *plural* of the adjective or participle (*constructio ad sensum*); thus, e. g. צֹאן sheep [with fem. plur.], Gn 30⁴³, 1 S 25¹⁸; עַם = men, 1 S 13¹⁵, Is 9¹; כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל = all the Israelites, 1 S 2¹⁴; גְּלוֹת = the exiles, Jer 28⁴; cf. also שְׁנַיִם נַפְשֵׁי two souls, Gn 46^{27.1}. Cf. similar phenomena in the connexion of collectives with plural predicates in § 145 c.

h (c) The *pluralis excellentiae* or *pluralis maiestatis* is joined, as a rule, to the singular of the attribute, e. g. ψ 7¹⁰ אֱלֹהִים צָרִיק; 2 K 19^{4.16} (= Is 37^{4.17}); Is 19⁴; but cf. אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים² Dt 5²³, 1 S 17^{26.36}, Jer 10¹⁰, 23³⁶, perhaps also

¹ But it is impossible to take תַּמִּימִם in Ez 46⁶ as an attribute of בָּקָר; probably it is a correction intended to harmonize the passage with Nu 28¹¹, where *two* young bullocks are required.

² Cf. 1 S 28¹³, where אֱלֹהִים (in the sense of a spirit) is followed by עֲלִים as a second accusative; conversely in 1 S 19^{13.16}, a singular suffix refers back



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

of a separation, distinction or superiority of one person or thing from or over others.¹ This is evident in such cases as בָּחַר מִן to choose something (to prefer it) before something else, e. g. Jb 7¹⁵, cf. Dt 14² (also מִן . . . יִתְרוֹן the excellence of . . . over . . . , Ec 2¹³); it is also seen in examples like Gn 37⁸ וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל אֶהָב אֶת-יוֹסֵף מִכָּל-בָּנָיו now Israel loved Joseph more than all his (other) children; 29³⁰, 1 S 2²⁹, Ho 6⁶.²

- C 2. A somewhat different idea underlies the use of מִן after adjectives, or intransitive verbs possessing an attributive sense, when the thought to be expressed is that the quality is *too little* or *too much* in force for the attainment of a particular aim or object, e. g. Is 7¹³ הַמַּעַט מִכֶּם is it a small thing (i. e. too little) for you to . . . ? Jb 15¹¹; after an intransitive verb, e. g. Gn 32¹¹ I am too insignificant (קִטְנֹתִי) for all the mercies (I am not worthy of . . .), &c.; cf. also the expressions קָשָׁה מִן to be too heavy for one, Ex 18¹⁸, Nu 11¹⁴, ψ 38⁵; קָשָׁה מִן to be too hard for one, Dt 1¹⁷; מְעַט מִן to be too few for something, Ex 12⁴; גָּבַר מִן to be too strong for one, ψ 65⁴; עֲצָם מִן to be too mighty for one, Gn 26¹⁶; גָּבַר מִן to be too high for one, ψ 61³; צָר מִן to be too narrow for one, Is 49¹⁹; קָצָר מִן to be too short for something, Is 50², and very frequently נִפְלְאָה מִן to be too wonderful for one (and, consequently, inconceivable or unattainable), Gn 18¹⁴, Dt 17⁸, 30¹¹, Jer 37¹⁷, Pr 30¹⁸; in ψ 139⁶ פְּלִיאָה in the same sense is followed by מִן.—This use is especially seen in the numerous instances in which the attribute is followed by מִן with an infinitive, e. g. 1 K 8⁶⁴ the brazen altar . . . was קָטַן מְהֵבִיל too little to receive (to be able to receive) the burnt offering, cf. Gn 4¹³, 36⁷ too great for them to dwell together; after verbs, e. g. Ex 12⁴, Is 28²⁰, ψ 40⁶. Finally, cf. רַב לָכֶם מִן, followed by the infinitive, it is enough (prop. too much) for you to . . . , meaning ye have . . . long enough, 1 K 12²⁸; cf. Ex 9²⁸ and Ez 44⁶ (מִן followed by a substantive).³

- d In all these instances מִן expresses either the removal of a thing from a person, or the severance of the person from some aim or object; cf. also the expression לֹא-יִבְצֵר מֵהֶם כֹּל וגו' nothing will be unattainable for them (prop. there shall not be cut off from them anything which, &c.), Gn 11⁶, Jb 42³.

- e 3. The attributive idea, on which מִן logically depends, must sometimes, in consequence of a pregnant use of the מִן (see the analogous examples in § 119 ff), be supplied from the context, e. g. Is 10¹⁰ וּפְסִלֵיהֶם מִירוּשָׁלַיִם whose graven images were more numerous than those at Jerusalem, &c.;⁴ Mi 7⁴ worse than a thorn hedge; ψ 62¹⁰ lighter than a breath; Jb 11¹⁷ clearer than the noonday; Ec 4¹⁷ better than, &c.

¹ Cf. the Latin ablative with the comparative; also the etymology of such words as *eximius*, *egregius*, and the Homeric ἐκ πάντων μάλιστα, Il. 4, 96; ἐκ πασέων, 18, 431.

² On the other hand, the phrase צָדַק מִן expresses not a comparison, but only a relation existing between one person and another; thus, in Gn 38²⁶ צָדַקָה מִמֶּנִּי means, she is in the right as against me; cf. ψ 139¹², Jb 4¹⁷, 32².—In Pr 17¹² rather (to meet with so and so) than . . . is expressed by וְאַל before the second member.

³ Cf. also 2 K 4³, where the idea of doing something too little is paraphrased by the Hiph. הִמְעִיט = do not too little, sc. לְשָׂאֵל in borrowing empty vessels.

⁴ With this *comparatio decurtata*, cf. the still bolder pregnant construction in ψ 4⁸, מֵעַתָּה greater gladness than at the time, &c.

2. The correlative comparatives *greater—less* (*older—younger*) are *f* expressed by the simple adjective with the article (*the great*, equivalent to *the greater*, &c.); Gn 1¹⁶, 19^{31.34}, 27¹⁵, 29^{16.18.26}.

3. To express the *superlative* it is also sufficient (see above, *f*) to *g* make the adjective determinate, either by means of the article or a following partitive genitive (or suffix); in this case the article or genitive indicates that the attribute in question belongs especially to one or more definite individuals; ¹ e. g. 1 S 9²¹ הַצֵּעָרָה *the least*; 16¹¹ הַקָּטָן *the little one*, i. e. the *youngest* of eight sons; 17¹⁴ David was הַקָּטָן *the youngest*, and the three great, i. e. elder, &c.; Gn 42¹³, 44², Ct 1⁸.—So also with a qualifying adjective, e. g. Gn 9²⁴ בְּנוֹ הַקָּטָן *his youngest son*; cf. Jos 14¹⁵; also with a following genitive, 2 Ch 21¹⁷ קָטָן בְּנָיו *the youngest of his sons*: Pr 30²⁴ *the least upon the earth*; with suffix, Mi 7⁴ טוֹבָם *their good one*, i. e. the best of them; Jon 3⁵ מִגְּדוֹלָם *from the greatest of them even to the least of them*; cf. the inverse order in Jer 6¹³, 31³⁴.

Rem. 1. The above examples apply only to the most common *relative h* attributes (*great, small, good*), and to expressions which by usage easily came to be recognized as periphrases for the superlative. Other adjectives, however, when followed by a partitive genitive, also acquire the sense of a superlative; this appears from the context, e. g. Dt 33¹⁹ *the most hidden treasures of the sand*; Ju 5²⁹ *the wisest amongst her ladies*; Is 14³⁰, 19¹¹, 23^{8f.}, 29¹⁹, Jer 49²⁰, Ez 28⁷, Zc 11⁷, ψ 45¹³, Jb 30⁶ (*in the most horrible of valleys*), 41²²; probably also ψ 35¹⁶. On this government by the adjective generally, cf. § 132 c.—Moreover, the combination of a substantive in the construct state with an adjective used substantivally (§ 128 w) sometimes serves as a periphrasis for the superlative, e. g. Is 22²⁴ כָּל כְּלֵי הַקָּטָן *all the smallest vessels*. On Ct 7¹⁰ see § 126 x.

2. Other periphrases for the superlative are the use of a substantive in the *i* construct state before the plural of the same word (which is naturally to be regarded as a partitive genitive; cf. our *book of books*), e. g. Ex 26³³ קֹדֶשׁ הַקְּדוֹשִׁים *the most holy place*; שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים (Ct 1¹) *the most excellent song*; cf. Gn 9²⁵ (= *servus servorum, the lowest servant*); Nu 3³², Dt 10¹⁷ (ψ 136^{2.3})²; 1 K 8²⁷, Is 34¹⁰ (cf. Gal 1⁵, Rev 22⁵); Jer 3¹⁹, Ez 16⁷, 26⁷ (*king of kings, of Nebuchadrezzar*; cf. 1 Tim 6¹⁵, Rev 17¹⁴, 19¹⁶, and another kind of periphrasis in ψ 95³); Ec 1². Similarly in Jer 6²⁸ two participles are combined, and in Ho 10¹⁵ two substantives in the singular. Finally, the same object is attained by connecting one substantive in the construct state with another of the same stem (שַׁבַּת שַׁבְּתוֹן) *a sabbath of solemn rest*, i. e. an obligatory day of rest, Ex 31¹⁵, &c.) or of the same meaning (e. g. חֵשֶׁךְ אַפְלָה *a thick darkness*, Ex 10²²).

3. The intensification of attributes by means of repetition belongs rather *k* to rhetoric than to syntax, e. g. Ec 7²⁴ עֲמֹק עֲמֹק *exceeding deep*; 1 S 2³, Pr 20¹⁴; the adjective is even used three times in Is 6³.—Cf. the repetition of adverbs for the same purpose in Gn 7¹⁹, Nu 14⁷ (מְאֹד מְאֹד *exceedingly*, also מְאֹד מְאֹד Ex 1⁷, &c.); Ez 42¹⁵.—On the other hand, in Dt 28⁴³ the repetition expresses

¹ Cf. also עֲלִיּוֹן *the one above*, i. e. *the Most High*.

² *God of gods, and Lord of lords*, just as the supreme god of the Babylonians is called *bēl bēlī* (Tiele, *Compend. der Rel.-Gesch.*, p. 87).

a continuous progress, *higher and higher . . . lower and lower*; in Dt 2²⁷ (see § 123 e) and 16²⁰ (*nothing but justice*) the constancy of the action. Cf. Ex 23³⁰ מְעַט מְעַט *little by little, very gradually*.¹

l The repetition of substantives serves also as a periphrasis for the superlative in such cases as לָרֶרֶר הָרָר (Ex 3¹⁵) = *to the remotest generations*; cf. 17¹⁶, Jer 6¹⁴, 8¹¹ (*perfect peace*); Ez 21³² (עָנָה three times);² 35⁷, Na 1²; cf. also Ho 2²¹ l. and the emphatic combination of synonymous verbs in Is 33¹⁰. Sometimes the completeness of an action or state is expressed by placing together two or even three substantives of the same stem and of similar sound, cf. Is 22⁵, Ez 6¹⁴ (33²⁸ l., 35⁸); 32¹⁵, Na 2¹¹, Zp 1¹⁵ (Jb 30³, 38²⁷).

§ 134. Syntax of the Numerals.

Cf. the exhaustive statistics collected by Sven Herner, *Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.*, Lund, 1893. E. König, 'Zur Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.', *AJSL*. xviii. 129 ff.

a 1. The numerals from 2 to 10, as being originally abstract substantives,³ may be connected with their substantives in three different ways. They may stand either—

(a) In the construct state *before* the substantive (the object numbered being consequently in the genitive), e. g. שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים *a triad of days*, i. e. three days; שְׁנֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים *the two men*; or

b (b) In the absolute state *before* it (the object numbered being in apposition, § 131 d), e. g. שְׁלֹשָׁה בָּנִים *a triad, viz. sons*, i. e. three sons; שְׁנַיִם אֲנָשִׁים *two men*; or

c (c) In the absolute state (likewise in apposition) *after* the object numbered, e. g. בָּנוֹת שְׁלוֹשׁ. So especially in long lists, since in these the substantives naturally come first, e. g. Gn 32¹⁵. Nu 7¹⁷, 28¹⁹. Apart from such cases, the frequency of this order in the later Books is due to the fact that the character of the numeral tended more and more to become adjectival rather than substantival.⁴

¹ Adverbs of the same stem are connected in this way in Nu 6⁹, Is 29⁵, 30¹³; of different stems in Is 5²⁶ and Jo 4⁴. In Nu 12² the particles הֵן וְאֵלֶּיךָ appear to be placed together for a similar purpose, equivalent to *simply and solely*.

² Different in kind from the triple utterance of the same words in 2 S 18³³, Jer 7⁴ and 22²⁹, and the double exclamation in Jer 4¹⁹ and La 1¹⁶ (?).

³ Cf. § 97 a, where it is shown that the masculine is the original form of the numerals (used for both genders), and that the feminine was afterwards differentiated and used with masc. nouns, primarily in the second decade and then in the first as well.

⁴ From Herner's tables (op. cit., pp. 55-66) it appears, according to p. 68, that in the documents J, E, D of the Pentateuch, and in Jos 1-12, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Minor Prophets, Psalms, Megilloth, and Job, the numeral never, or very rarely, stands *after* its noun; in Kings and Ezekiel it stands several times *after*; in the Priestly Code nearly always *after*; in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, nearly as often *after* as *before* the noun. In Ex 28¹⁰ the Masora makes the numeral in the genitive follow the construct state of the substantive numbered; we should, however, read וְאֵת-שְׁמוֹת הַשָּׁשָׁה; for the omission of the article before 'ש', cf. § 126 w.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Ez 42¹⁷; after מֵאָתַיִם 1 S 25¹⁸, 1 K 7²⁰; after אֶלֶף 1 S 25², 1 K 3⁴, 5⁶, 2 K 3⁴, ψ 90⁴; after אֶלְפִים 1 S 17⁵, Jb 42¹²; after אֶלְפֵי Mi 6⁷; after אֶלְפִים Is 36⁸.— In Dn 12¹¹ the plural יָמִים precedes the numeral *twelve hundred*.

h 3. Numerals compounded of tens and units (like 21, 62) take the object numbered either *after* them in the singular (in the accusative), e. g. Gn 5²⁰ שְׁנַיִם וְשִׁשִּׁים שָׁנָה *two and sixty years* (שָׁנָה in the singular, according to *e*, since it conforms to the ten immediately preceding; but also שְׁנַיִם וְשִׁשִּׁים שָׁנָה Dt 2¹⁴), or *before* them in the plural, especially in the later Books, Dn 9²⁶, &c.; or the object is repeated (but only in 1 K 6¹, and the Priestly Code; sometimes even several times, e. g. Gn 23¹, 25^{7.17} thrice) in the plural with the units, and in the singular with the tens and hundreds, e. g. Gn 12⁴ חֲמִשׁ שָׁנִים וְשִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה *seventy and five years*; Gn 23¹ מֵאָה שָׁנָה וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה וְשִׁבְעִים שָׁנִים *an hundred and twenty and seven years*. Cf. Gn 5^{6 ff.}

i Rem. 1. It may further be remarked with regard to the order, that the thousand or thousands always precede the hundreds, &c., and the hundreds almost always come before the smaller numbers (in Kings and Ezekiel sometimes, and in the Priestly Code usually, after the smaller numbers), the tens in the earlier Books (documents J and D of the Pentateuch, in Joshua 1–12, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, and also in Ezra and Nehemiah) *before* the units, but in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Priestly Code, Joshua 13–24 *after* the units (see Herner, *op. cit.*, p. 73). After the hundreds the smaller number is very frequently added without ׀, especially in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel.

On the syntax of the cardinals in general:—

k 2. The cardinals are determined by the article, when they refer back (without being connected with the object numbered; cf., however, Lv 25^{10 f.}, Nu 16³⁵, Jos 4⁴, 2 S 23¹³) to a number or list already mentioned, e. g. Gn 2¹¹ שֵׁם הָאֶחָד פִּישׁוֹן *the name of the one (the first) is Pishon*; Gn 14⁹ *four kings against the five* (enumerated in verse 2); cf. 1 Ch 11^{20 f.}, and the determinate tens in Gn 18^{29.31 f.} A demonstrative with the article may also be added to a numeral determined in this way, e. g. Dt 19⁹ (but cf. also Gn 9¹⁹, 22²³, where the numeral and demonstrative are practically determinate in themselves). In the case of the numerals from 11 to 19 the article may stand either before the unit (1 Ch 25¹⁹, 27¹⁵) or before עָשָׂר (Jos 4⁴); it is used before all three members of a compound number (273) in Nu 3⁴⁶.

l In apposition with any determinate substantive the cardinal number is used *without* the article, not only when it precedes the substantive, as in Jos 15¹⁴ אֶת־שְׁלוֹשָׁה בְנֵי הָעֵנָק, where שְׁלוֹשָׁה is equivalent to a substantive determinate in itself; cf. Gn 18²⁸, Jos 6^{8.22}, 1 S 17¹⁴, 1 K 11³¹, and the passages discussed above in § 126 x, Gn 21²⁹, &c.), but also when it follows the substantive, e. g. 1 K 7^{27.43 f.} עָשָׂר and עֶשְׂרֵה; the omission of the article may here, as in the cases noticed in § 126 z, be also due to the dislike of a hiatus, but cf. also שְׁנַיִם 2 K 25¹⁶ after a determinate substantive. The fact that it is by nature determinate would also be a very simple explanation of אֶחָד Nu 28⁴, 1 S 13^{17 f.}, Jer 24², Ez 10⁹, instead of the more usual הָאֶחָד, and of אֶחָת 1 S 1² for הָאֶחָת.

Such cases as שְׁבַעַת הַיָּמִים Ju 14¹⁷ (which is determined by a following *m* determinate genitive) are explained from § 127 b; 1 Ch 9²⁵ perhaps from § 126 q; in Is 30²⁶ probably the light of all the seven days of the week is meant; on the other hand, in 1 S 9²⁰ and 25³⁸ the article is, with Wellhausen, to be omitted.

3. Certain specifications of *measure, weight, or time*, are commonly omitted *n* after numerals, e.g. Gn 20¹⁶ אֶלֶף כֶּסֶף a thousand (shekels) of silver; so also before וְהָב Gn 24²², 1 K 10¹⁶, Is 7²³, cf. ψ 119⁷². Moreover, Ru 3¹⁵ שֵׁשׁ שְׁעָרִים six (ephahs) of barley; 1 S 10⁴ שְׁתֵּי-לֶחֶם two (sc. loaves, see verse 3) of bread, cf. 17¹⁷ עֶשְׂרֵה לֶחֶם; 2 S 16¹, where before קָיִץ a measure, or perhaps some term like *cakes*, is to be supplied.—The number of cubits is stated in the Priestly Code (Ex 26², &c.) and in 1 K 6 and 7 (otherwise only in Ez 40^{5,21}, 47⁸. Zc 5², 1 Ch 11²³, 2 Ch 4^{2 f.}) by the addition of בְּאַמָּה prop. *by the cubit*. Also in Ex 27¹¹ the Samaritan and LXX read בְּאַמָּה after אַרְבֵּי, and in 27¹⁵ אַמָּה after עֶשְׂרֵה.

4. The *ordinals* above 10 have no special forms, but are expressed *o* by the corresponding cardinals, which may then stand either before or after the object numbered, e.g. Gn 7¹¹ בְּשִׁבְעָה עָשָׂר יוֹם on the seventeenth day; Dt 1³ בְּאַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה in the fortieth year; cf. Gn 14⁵, 2 K 25²⁷, and, with repetition of שָׁנָה in a compound number, 1 K 6¹; such a cardinal occurs without בְּ (and therefore in the *accus. temporis*, according to § 118 k) in Gn 14⁴ (the Samaritan, however, has וּבְשָׁלֹשׁ); with the article (but without a numbered object, see under k), 1 K 19¹⁹.¹—On the position of the numeral as a genitive following its noun, cf. e.g. 1 K 16¹⁰ וּשְׁבַע עָשָׂרִים בְּשָׁנַת עָשָׂרִים in the twenty and seventh year, and with a determinate numeral, Ex 12¹⁸, Nu 33³⁸, Dt 15⁹. In this case, however, שָׁנָה is very frequently repeated, e.g. Gn 7¹¹, 2 K 13¹⁰; after a determinate numeral, Lv 25¹⁰.²

Rem. In numbering days of the month and years, the cardinals are very *p* frequently used instead of the ordinals even for the numbers from 1 to 10, e.g. בְּשָׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם 1 K 15²⁵; בְּשָׁנַת שָׁלֹשׁ 2 K 18¹, &c., cf. Dt 15⁹. The months themselves are always numbered by the ordinals (בְּרֵאשִׁי, בְּשֵׁנִי, &c., up to בְּעֶשְׂרִי), but not the days of the month, e.g. בְּאַחַד לַחֹדֶשׁ Gn 8⁵, &c., בְּאַרְבָּעָה בְּחֹדֶשׁ Zc 7¹; בְּשִׁבְעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ 2 K 25⁸, בְּחֹדֶשׁ לַחֹדֶשׁ Lv 23³² (always, however, בְּעָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ on the tenth day of the month). On the

¹ Somewhat different from this is Ex 19¹⁵ be ready לְשָׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים prop. *after three days*, i. e. *on the third day* (in verses 11 and 16 and in Ezr 10⁸ the ordinal is used), also 1 S 30¹³ בִּי חָלִיתִי הַיּוֹם שְׁלֹשָׁה בְּיָמֵי הַיּוֹם because three days ago I fell sick, prop. *to-day three (days)*.

² All these expressions may indeed be explained by supposing that, e.g. in Lv 25¹⁰, the proper meaning is *the year of the fifty years which it completed*, i. e. the fiftieth year; but it is more correct to regard שָׁנָה or בְּשָׁנַת in such cases not as a real *nomen regens*, but simply as a connective form to be explained on the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 128 k.

omission of יום in all these cases see under *n*; only in late passages is יום added, e. g. 2 Ch 29¹⁷ בְּיוֹם שְׁמוֹנֶה לַחֹדֶשׁ; Ezr 3⁶ מִיּוֹם אֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ.—Finally, when the year is stated by בְּשָׁנָה governing a determinate ordinal, viz. 2 K 17⁶ בְּשָׁנָה הַתְּשִׁיעִית *in the ninth year*; 2 K 25¹ (in Jer 52⁴ בְּשָׁנָה), Jer 28¹ *Keth.*, 32¹ *Keth.*, 46², 51⁵⁹, Ezr 7⁸; בְּשָׁנָה in such cases is again (see note 2 on *o*) to be explained according to § 128 *k*. This is supported by the fact that the Masora on Jer 28¹, 32¹ requires in the *Q^{eré}* בְּשָׁנָה for בִּשְׁנַת.

Q 5. *Distributives* are expressed either by repetition of the cardinal number, e. g. Gn 7^{9.15} שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם *two and two*; 2 S 21²⁰ שֵׁשׁ וְשֵׁשׁ *six each*; with the numbered object also repeated, e. g. Jos 3¹² אִישׁ אֶחָד אִישׁ אֶחָד לְשִׁבְטָא *for every tribe a man*; Nu 13², 34¹⁸ (אֶחָד מִן), as in Neh 11¹, *one out of every ten*; cf. § 123 *d*; or a periphrasis with אֶחָד is used, Nu 17¹⁸, Dt 1²³, cf. Is 6² לְאַחַד after *six wings* twice repeated; the simple distributive לְ is, however, sufficient (as in לְבָקָרִים, § 123 *c*), e. g. לְמֵאוֹת וְלָאֲלָפִים *by hundreds and by thousands*.

r 6. The *multiplicatives* are expressed either (like the ordinals above 10, see under *o*) by the cardinals (in the feminine, probably owing to the omission of פְּעַם, פְּעָמִים; so König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 228), as שְׁתַּיִם *twice*, Jb 40⁵; שִׁבְעַת *seven times*, Lv 26^{21.24}, Pr 24¹⁶; cf. also אַחַת *once*, 2 K 6¹⁰, Jb 40⁵, for which in Jb 33¹⁴ בְּאַחַת¹ along with שְׁתַּיִם (the latter also in 1 S 18²¹); or by the *dual* of the numeral, thus שִׁבְעָתַיִם Gn 4¹⁵ (in verse 24 along with the cardinal 77 for 77 times); Is 30²⁶, ψ 12⁷, 79¹²; אַרְבַּעָתַיִם 2 S 12⁶;² or periphrastically by פְּעַם *a time* (prop. *a step*, with the article, הַפְּעַם *this time*; cf. also בַּפְּעַם הַזֶּה, with בְּ, like בְּאַחַת above), as פְּעַם אַחַת *once* (Neh 13²⁰ וּשְׁתַּיִם *once and twice*), פְּעַם שְׁתַּיִם *twice*, שְׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים (for which in Ex 23¹⁴, Nu 22^{28.32} שְׁלֹשׁ רִגְלִים *three times*; cf. Ez 41⁶ *thirty-three times*; 2 S 24³ *an hundred times*; Dt 1¹¹ *a thousand times*; 1 K 22¹⁶ עַד-כַּמָּה פְּעָמִים *until how many times*, i. e. how often. Cf. also עֶשְׂרֵת מֵנִים *ten times*, Gn 31^{7.14}, and רַבּוֹת עֵתִים *many times*, Neh 9²⁸.—In Gn 43³⁴, *five times* is expressed by חַמֵּשׁ יָדוֹת³ (prop. *five hands*), and in Ex 16⁵ the *double* is expressed by מְשִׁנָּה עַל- (prop. *a repetition over and above that which, &c.*).—Of the ordinals שְׁנִי is used as a numeral adverb, Gn 22¹⁵, &c., *a second time*, cf. the Latin *tertium consul*; בְּשִׁלִּישִׁתָּא *the third time*, 1 S 3⁸; פְּעַם חַמִּישִׁית *a fifth time*, Neh 6⁵; בְּשִׁבְעִית *at the seventh (time)*, 1 K 18⁴⁴, and בַּפְּעַם הַשֵּׁשִׁי Jos 6¹⁶.

¹ But בְּאַחַת Nu 10⁴ is to be translated *on one* (trumpet).

² Probably also כַּפְּלָיִם Jb 11⁶ (from כָּפַל *doubling*) does not mean *doubled* but *manifold*.

³ But אַרְבַּע הַיָּדוֹת Gn 47²⁴ means *the (other) four parts*; cf. 2 K 11⁷, Neh 11¹.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

a trace of popular language), e. g. 1 S 23²² (?), Ct 5⁵, and (like other indications of the very late origin of the book) very frequently in Ecclesiastes, e. g. 1¹⁶, 2^{1.11.15}, 3^{17f.} and thirteen other places; in Aramaic, Dn 5¹⁶.

c 2. Substantival subjects also are somewhat frequently resumed, and thus expressly emphasized, by the insertion of the corresponding separate pronoun of the 3rd person before the predicate is stated, e. g. Gn 3¹² *the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she* (הִיא) *gave me*, &c.; 14²⁴ (הֵם); 15⁴, 24⁷, &c.; but הוּא in Is 7¹⁴ after the predicate and subject is equivalent to *he himself*.¹

d 2. Not infrequently the separate pronoun serves to give strong emphasis to a suffix of the same person which precedes (or sometimes even to one which follows), whether the suffix be attached to a verb (as accusative) or to a noun or preposition (as genitive). In English such an emphasis on the pronoun can generally be rendered only by laying greater stress upon it, or sometimes by repeating it; cf., on the contrary, the French *mon livre à moi*. The separate pronoun in such instances is not to be regarded as a *casus obliquus* (accusative or genitive), but as the subject of an independent sentence, the predicate of which must in each case be supplied according to the context.

e Examples of emphasis:—

(*a*) On a verbal suffix by means of אֲנִי (אֲנִי), Gn 27³⁴ בְּרַכְנִי גַם-אֲנִי *bless me, even me also* (prop. *bless me, I also would be blessed*); Zc 7⁵; cf. also Ez 6³, 34^{11.20} הֲנִי אֲנִי; by אַתָּה (אַתָּה) Pr 22¹⁹ (but the text is most probably corrupt).—The separate pronoun *precedes* in Gn 24²⁷ (אֲנִי); 49⁸ (אַתָּה, not *Judah, thou art he whom*, but *Judah thee, thee thy brethren shall praise!*), and Ec 2¹⁵ אֲנִי גַם.

f (*b*) On a noun-suffix with a substantive, by means of אֲנִי 2 S 19¹, Pr 23¹⁵; by אַתָּה 1 K 21¹⁹ אַתָּה-גַּם אֲתָּה *thy blood, even thine*; by הוּא 2 S 17⁵, Jer 27⁷, Mi 7³; by אֲנַחְנוּ 1 S 20⁴², after שְׁלֵינוּ, but without special stress; Neh 5² (?); by אַתָּם Nu 14³²; by הֵם ψ 38¹¹ (without special stress), ψ 9⁷.—The separate pronoun *precedes* in Jb 21⁴ (אֲנִי); Gn 40¹⁶, Is 45¹², 1 Ch 28² (אֲנִי); Zc 9¹¹ (אַתָּה); Jos 23⁹ (אַתָּם); Ez 33¹⁷ (הֵמָּה).—In ψ 89⁴⁸, where אֲנִי might be taken as strengthening חִלָּה (equivalent in sense to חִלָּתִי), we should read אֲדָנִי for אֲנִי, as in verse 51.

g (*c*) On a suffix united with a preposition, 1 S 25²⁴ בִּי אֲנִי *upon me, upon me*; 1 K 1²⁶ אֲנִי . . . לִי; 2 Ch 35²¹ לֹא-עָלְיָה אַתָּה *not against thee*; 1 S 19²³ גַּם עָלָיו *upon him also*; Dt 5³ אֲנַחְנוּ בִּי אַתָּה *but with us, even us*; Hag 1⁴ לְכֶם אַתָּם *for you yourselves*; Jer 25¹⁴ בְּכֶם גַּם-הֵמָּה.—The separate pronoun *precedes* in 1 S 12²³ לִי . . . אֲנִי; 1 K 1²⁰ עָלְיָה . . . אַתָּה; Mi 5¹ אַתָּה . . . מִמֶּךָ, and 2 Ch 28¹⁰ אַתָּם עִמָּכֶם.

h The same principle also explains Gn 4²⁶ לְשֵׁת גַּם-הוּא *to Seth, to him also* (not לְגַם-לוֹ); cf. 10²¹, and Ex 35³⁴, Nu 4²².

¹ Analogous to this is the resumption of a noun dependent on a preposition, by means of a pronominal suffix united with the same preposition, e. g. Gn 2¹⁷, 2 S 6²², 2 K 22¹⁸, or of an object by means of the *nota accusativi* אֵל with suffix, e. g. 1 S 15⁹ (where וְנִמְאַסְתָּ is certainly to be read), Is 8¹³.

3. The *oblique* cases of the personal pronouns expressed by means of *i* a preposition (or the *nota accus.* תא) with a suffix may be used either in a demonstrative or reflexive sense,¹ as לו *to him*, but also *to himself*, e. g. Ju 3¹⁶ and *Ehud made לו for himself a sword*, cf. Gn 33¹⁷; so also הםָּלִי sibi, Is 3⁹; אֵלָיו unto him, and Gn 8⁹ unto himself; אִתּוֹ with him, and Gn 22³ with himself; עִמָּהּ with her, and 1 S 1²⁴ with herself; also apparently as a pleonastic *dativus ethicus* (see § 119 s), Jb 12¹¹, 13¹.

Rarely, and only when marked emphasis is intended, is the *accusative k* of the reflexive pronoun represented by the *nota accusativi* תא with a suffix (this being ordinarily expressed by the reflexive conjugations *Niph'al* and *Hithpa'el*²); thus, הםָּלִי se ipsos, Ex 5¹⁹, Jer 7¹⁹ in sharp antithesis to הִיאָתִי; Ez 34^{2.8.10}. Cf. § 57 at the end, together with note 2.

Rem. There is a similar emphasis in Is 49²⁶ on בְּשָׂרָם and דָּמָם in the *l* sense of *their own flesh, their own blood*. On the sometimes demonstrative, sometimes reflexive meaning of noun-suffixes of the 3rd person singular and plural, cf. § 91, p and q. For other circumlocutions to express the idea of *self*, see § 139 f.

4. The *possessive pronouns* are, according to § 33 c, expressed by *m* the *suffixes of the noun* (in the genitive),³ which may represent either a *subjective genitive*, or (like the genitives proper, § 128 h) an *objective genitive*, e. g. חַמְסֵי the wrong done against me, Gn 16⁵, Jer 51³⁵; cf. Gn 9², 18²¹, 27¹³ (2 S 16¹² *Keth.*); Gn 30²³, 39²¹ (cf. Ex 3²¹, &c.); 50⁴, Ex 20²⁰, 21³⁵, Ju 4⁹, 13¹² (מַעֲשֵׂיהֶן the treatment of him); Is 56⁷, Jer 9⁷, Na 3¹⁹, Pr 1²⁷, 24²², Jb 20²⁹, 23¹⁴, 34⁶. Cf. also such pregnant expressions as ψ 20³ יְשַׁלַּח עֲזָרָהּ he will send thy help (*help for thee*), i. e. he will send thee help; Gn 30¹⁸, 39²¹, Ex 2⁹, Is 1²⁶ (*and I will restore judges for thee*); Ez 37¹⁵.

When several substantives are co-ordinated, the pronominal suffix must be attached to each singly, e. g. Gn 36⁶ and *Esau took אֶת-נָשָׁיו וְאֶת-בָּנָיו וְאֶת-בָּתָּו* his wives and his sons and his daughters, &c.; 38¹⁸, &c. In 2 S 23⁵ the text is hardly correct.

¹ As in Luther's Bible *jm* (*ihm*), *jr* (*ihr*) for *sich*, and in our version *him*, *her* for *himself*, *herself*.

² *Niph'al* according to § 51 e (like *Hithpa'el* according to § 54 f) may also include the *dative* of the reflexive pronoun.

³ Like the substantival genitive, according to § 129 h, the possessive pronoun may also be paraphrased by a relative clause, e. g. Ru 2²¹ הַנְּעָרִים הַלְּאֵי the young men, which are to me, i. e. *my young men*; so especially, when the substantive, which should take a genitive suffix, is already followed by a genitive, e. g. 1 S 17⁴⁰. In this case, however, the suffix also is sometimes attached pleonastically, e. g. Ct 1⁶ בְּרָמִי שְׁלִי my vineyard, which belongs to me. Cf. Ct 3⁷, and the analogous pleonasms in 2 S 22² (but see ψ 18²) and ψ 27².

n 5. When the genitive, following a construct state, is used periphrastically to express the idea of a material or attribute (§ 128 o and p), the pronominal suffix, which properly belongs to the compound idea (represented by the *nomen regens* and genitive), is, like the article (§ 127), attached to the second substantive (the genitive), e. g. הַר־קֹדֶשׁי prop. *the hill of my holiness*, i. e. my holy hill, ψ 2⁶, &c.; עִיר קֹדֶשׁךָ thy holy city, Dn 9²⁴; אֱלֹהֵי כֶסֶפּוֹ his idols of silver, Is 2²⁰, 30²², 31⁷;¹ cf. Dt 1⁴¹, Is 9³, 28⁴, 41¹¹, Ez 9¹⁴, ψ 41¹⁰, 150¹, Jb 18⁷ אֲנֹנֵי צַעְרֵי אֹנֹנֵי his steps of strength; 38⁶; after an adjective as *nomen regens*, Is 13³ (Zp 3¹¹) עֲלֵיוֹי גִּאֲוֹתַי my proudly exulting ones.—On the same analogy is the use of e. g. כְּלֵי מִלְחָמָתוֹ Dt 1⁴¹ his weapons of war [cf. Is 41¹²]; Is 56⁷ בֵּית תְּפִלָּתִי my house of prayer, although the genitive here does not convey the idea of an attribute.

O Rem. 1. Through a weakening in the distinction of gender, which is noticeable elsewhere (cf. § 110 k, 144 a, 145 p, t, u) and which probably passed from the colloquial language² into that of literature, masculine suffixes (especially in the plural) are not infrequently used to refer to feminine substantives; thus a noun-suffix in the singular, Ex 11⁶, 25¹⁹, Ju 11³⁴;³ in the plural, Gn 31⁹, 32¹⁶, 41²³, Ex 1²¹, 2¹⁷, Nu 27⁷ (but the feminine suffix twice immediately after, and so the Samaritan also in verse 7); 36⁶ (Samaritan אֲבִיהֶן, but also בְּעֵינֵיהֶם); Ju 19²⁴, 21²², 1 S 67.10^b (בְּנֵיהֶם); 9²⁰, Is 3¹⁶, Ez 23^{45 ff.} (alternating with הֶן); Am 4^{1 f.} (but afterwards a feminine suffix); Jb 1¹⁴, 39³ (חֲבֵלֵיהֶם in parallelism with יִלְדֵיהֶן); 4^{2 15}, Ct 4², 6⁶, Ru 1^{8 ff.} (along with feminine suffixes); Dn 1⁵, 8⁹. Verbal suffixes in the singular, Ex 22²⁵; in the plural, Ju 16³, Pr 6²¹, Jb 1¹⁵. But Gn 26^{15.18}, 33¹³, Ex 2¹⁷, 1 S 6^{10 a} are to be explained according to § 60 h. On הִמָּה as feminine, see § 32 n. On the use of the masculine in general as the *prior gender*, see § 122 g.

p 2. The suffix of the 3rd person singular feminine (as also the separate pronoun הִיא Nu 14⁴¹, Jos 1c¹³, Ju 14⁴) sometimes refers in a general sense to the verbal idea contained in a preceding sentence (corresponding to our *it*); thus the verbal suffix, Gn 15⁶, Nu 23¹⁹, 1 S 11², 1 K 11¹², Is 30⁸, Am 8¹⁰; cf. Gn 24¹⁴ (בָּהּ thereby), 42³⁶, 47²⁶, Ex 10¹¹ (אֵתָהּ that), Is 47⁷. Elsewhere the suffix of the 3rd singular feminine refers to the plurals of things, e. g. 2 K 3³

¹ On the other hand, more explicitly in prose, Gn 44² אֶת־גְּבִיעֵי גְבִיעַ הַכֶּסֶף my cup, the silver cup.

² According to Diehl (see the title at the head of § 91 a), who adduces numerous instances on pp. 44 ff., 54 ff., 67 f., many of these cases may be set down to corruption of the traditional text, while the sudden (and sometimes repeated) change of gender in suffixes is mainly due to the influence exercised on the copyists by the Mishnic and popular Aramaic dialects, neither of which recognizes such distinctions. Such influence, however, is insufficient to explain the large number of instances of this weakening, occurring even in the earlier documents.

³ The Masora reckons six instances of מִפְּנֵי, where מִפְּנֵה would be expected (Ju 11³⁴, where, however, the text is most probably corrupt), Ex 25¹⁵ (?), Lv 6⁸, 7¹⁸, 27⁹, Jos 1⁷; almost all these passages can, however, be easily explained in other ways.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

§ 136. The Demonstrative Pronoun.

- a* The demonstrative pronouns are **זֶה**, fem. **זֹאת**, plur. **אֵלֶּה** (§ 34), *hic, haec (hoc), hi, &c.*, and the personal pronoun **הוּא**, likewise used as a demonstrative, fem. **הִיא**, plur. masc. **הֵמָּה**, fem. **הֵנָּה** (§ 32 *b*), *is, ea (id), or ille, &c., ii, eae or illi, &c.* The distinction between them in usage is that **זֶה** (like *hic, ὁδε*) almost always points out a (new) person or thing present, while **הוּא** (like *is, ille, αὐτός, ἐκεῖνος*) refers to a person or thing already mentioned or known (see the examples below).¹
- b* Rem. 1. Compare the instructive examples in Gn 32^s, Ju 7⁴ of whom I say unto thee, this (**זֶה**) shall go with thee, he (**הוּא**) shall go with thee (so afterwards with negatives). Moreover, **הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** *this day*, i.e. the actual day on which one is speaking or writing (Gn 26³³, &c.), but **הַיּוֹם הַהוּא** the day or period of which the historian has just been speaking (Gn 15¹⁸, 26³²) or of which the prophet has just been foretelling (Is 5³⁰, 7^{18.20 ff.}) and of which he continues to speak or foretell. Nevertheless **זֶה** and **אֵלֶּה** are also found in certain common combinations where **הוּא** and **הֵמָּה** would be expected, and vice versa; thus almost always **הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**, plur. **הַיָּמִים הָאֵלֶּה**, but **בַּיָּמִים הַהֵמָּה** or **בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם**.—With a secondary sense of contempt (like Latin *iste*) **זֶה** occurs, e.g. in 1 S 10²⁷, 21¹⁶, 1 K 22²⁷, Is 6¹⁰, &c. In the sense of the neuter, *this*, **זֹאת** is more common than **זֶה**, as Is 5²⁵, 43⁹, &c., but **הוּא** more common than **הִיא**.
- c* 2. Both **זֶה** and **הוּא** are sometimes used almost as enclitics to emphasize interrogative words (like the Latin *nam* in *quisnam*; cf. also *quis tandem*); e.g. Jb 38² **מִי זֶה** *who now* (darkeneth, &c.) . . . ? 1 S 17^{55 f.}, Is 63¹, Jer 49¹⁹, ψ 24⁸, 25¹², &c; **מָה-זֶּה** *what now?* 1 S 10¹¹; *how now?* Gn 27²⁰; *why now?* Ju 18²⁴; but before the verb **עָשָׂה** it is usually **מָה-זֹאת** Gn 3¹³, 12¹⁸, Ex 14⁶, Ju 15¹¹; **לְמָה-זֶּה** *wherefore now?* Gn 18¹³, 25²², 1 S 17²⁸, 2 S 12²³, &c.—So also **מִי-הוּא** Is 50⁹, Jb 4^{7 ff.}; and still more emphatically **מִי הוּא-זֶה** ψ 24¹⁰, Jer 30²¹.
- d* 3. **זֶה** is likewise used as an enclitic (see *c* above): (*a*) of place, in such passages as Gn 27²¹ **הֲאִתָּה זֶה וְגו'** *whether thou (that art here) be my son Esau?* 2 S 2²⁰ *is it thou?* **הִנֵּה-זֶה** *behold, here*, 1 K 19⁶, Is 21⁹;² cf. also the strengthen-

¹ On **זֶה** and **הוּא** standing separately as determinate in themselves, see § 125 *i*. On the use of determinate demonstratives as adjectives, see § 126 *u*.

² On the other hand, it is very questionable whether **זֶה** in ψ 104²⁵ (**זֶה הַיָּם**), Is 23¹³ (**זֶה הַיָּם**), Ju 5⁶, ψ 68⁹ (**זֶה סִינַי**) can be taken, according to the common explanation, simply as a prefixed demonstrative particle (*the sea yonder, &c.*). In ψ 104²⁵ **הַיָּם** may be in apposition to **זֶה**; cf. § 126 *aa*, on Ex 32¹, and Zc 5⁷, where **אֲשֶׁה אֲחַת** is in apposition to **זֹאת** depending on **הִנֵּה**, and also Ez 40⁴⁵, where **הַלְשָׁבָה** is in apposition to **זֶה**; otherwise it is most naturally taken as the subject, *this is the sea*. Is 23¹³, Ju 5⁶, 1 K 14¹⁴, and ψ 68⁹ might also be explained in the same way; but in these passages the text is almost certainly

ing of the separate pronoun by הוּא Is 43²⁵ (אֲנִי), 1 S 7²⁸, Is 37¹⁶, ψ 44⁶ (אֲתָה), and הֵם אֵלֶּה these are, Gn 25¹⁶, 1 S 4⁸; (b) of time: עַתָּה זֶה now, 1 K 17²⁴; just now, 2 K 5²²; and rather frequently before words denoting number, e. g. Gn 27³⁶ זֶה בַּעֲמַיִם twice, now; cf. 31⁸⁸, 2 S 14², Jb 1¹², 7³, 19³; separated from the numeral in Gn 31⁴¹ זֶה-לִּי elliptically for *this*, i. e. this present period, is to me, i. e. makes altogether, twenty years, &c. The other examples are similarly elliptical.

§ 137. The Interrogative Pronoun.

The interrogative pronoun מִי *who* may refer either to a masculine *a* or feminine person (Ct 3⁶), or even to a plural, e. g. מִי אַתֶּם *who are ye?* Jos 9⁸; מִי-אֵלֶּה Gn 33⁵, Nu 22⁹ (more minutely, מִי וְמִי Ex 10⁸, i. e. *who exactly, who in particular?*). It is used of the neuter only when the idea of a person is implied, e. g. מִי-שָׁבָם *who are the Shechemites?* Ju 9²⁸, 13¹⁷, Gn 33⁸, Mi 1⁵; even more boldly, with the repetition of a מִי used personally, in 1 S 18¹⁸, 2 S 7¹⁸.—Another interrogative is אֵי-זֶה *which, what?*; of persons only in Est 7⁵.

Moreover, מִי may also be used in the sense of a genitive, e. g. *b* אַתָּה בַת-מִי אַתָּה *whose daughter art thou?* Gn 24²³, 1 S 17^{55.56.58}; מִי דְבַר קִי *whose word?* Jer 44²⁸, 1 S 12³; in the accusative, אֶת-מִי *quemnam?* 1 S 28¹¹, Is 6⁸; with prepositions, e. g. בְּמִי 1 K 20¹⁴ (in an abrupt question *by whom?*); לְמִי Gn 32¹⁸; אַחֲרֵי מִי 1 S 24¹⁵.—Similarly מָה, מֵה, מֶה *what?* is used for the nominative, or accusative, or genitive (Jer 8⁹), or with prepositions, e. g. עַל-מָה *whereupon?* Is 1⁵, Jb 38⁶; *why?* Nu 22³², &c.; עַד-מָה *quousque?* ψ 74^{9.1}.

Rem. Both מִי and מָה are used also in indirect questions (on the merely *C* relative distinction between direct and indirect questions in Hebrew, see the *Interrogative Sentences*), e. g. Gn 39⁸ (but read מֵאֲזַמָּה with Samar. and LXX), 43²², Ex 32¹.—On the meaning of מִי and מָה as interrogatives is based also their use as *indefinite pronouns* (equivalent to *quisquis, quodcunque* or *quicquam*), e. g. Ex 32²⁶, Ju 7⁸, 1 S 20⁴, Is 50¹⁰ (read יִשְׁמַע in the apodosis), 54¹⁵, Pr 9^{4.16}, 2 Ch 36²³; even שְׂמַרְדֵּי מִי *have a care, whosoever ye be*, 2 S 18¹² (unless לִי is to be read, with the LXX, for מִי); so also מָה (whatever it be) Jb 13¹³, 1 S 19³, 2 S 18^{22.23}; cf. Nu 23³ וְדַבֵּר מֵה-יִרְאֵנִי *and whatsoever he showeth me*. Cf. also מִי אִישׁ *whosoever* Ex 32³³, 2 S 20¹¹, and מִי-הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר *any man who* Dt 2c^{5ff.},

corrupt. In Ju 5⁵ in fact זֶה סִינִי is most probably to be regarded with Moore as a very early gloss, which subsequently found its way from this passage into ψ 68.

¹ A quite different use of מָה was pointed out (privately) by P. Haupt in Ct 5⁸ *will ye not tell him?* i. e. *I charge you that ye tell him*, and 7¹ = *look now at the Shulamite*, corresponding to the late Arabic *mā tarā, just see! mā taqūlu, say now!* It has long been recognized that מָה is used as a negative in Ct 8⁴.

Ju 10¹⁸. A still further weakening of the *indefinite* use of כִּי is the combination כִּי־שֶׁ *that which*, Ec 1⁹, 3¹⁵ (just like the Syriac ܟܝܢܐ); cf. Est 8¹, and כִּי . . . בְּלֹא Pr 9¹³, כִּי . . . לֹא Neh 2¹², *nothing whatever*.—On כִּי־אִי־מָה *quicquam, anything at all* (usually with a negative), and as an adverb *in any way*, 1 S 21³, see the Lexicon.

§ 138. The Relative Pronoun.

Cf. Philippi, *Stat. constr.* (see heading of § 89), p. 71 f., and especially V. Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894.

a Relative clauses are most frequently (but not necessarily; cf. § 155 *b*) introduced by the indeclinable אֲשֶׁר (see § 36).¹ This is not, however, a relative pronoun in the Greek, Latin, or English sense, nor is it a mere *nota relationis*,² but an original *demonstrative* pronoun [as though *iste, istius, &c.*].³ Hence it is used—

(1) In immediate dependence on the substantival idea to be defined, and virtually in the same case as it (hence belonging syntactically to the main clause); e. g. Gn 24⁷ . . . $\text{וְהוּא יִשְׁלַח . . . הַיְהוָה אֲשֶׁר לָקַחְנִי}$ *the Lord, iste, he took me . . . he shall send, &c. (= who took me)*; Gn 2² *and God finished* $\text{מְלֵאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה}$ *his work, istud, he had made (it)*. Such qualifying clauses may be called *dependent relative clauses*.

b Rem. 1. In the above examples אֲשֶׁר in Gn 24⁷ is virtually in the nominative, in Gn 2² in the accusative. A further distinction between the examples is that in Gn 24⁷ the main idea (יְהוָה), to which אֲשֶׁר is added in apposition, is only resumed in the qualifying clause by the subject (*he*) inherent in

¹ The etymology of the word is still a matter of dispute. Against the identification of אֲשֶׁר , as an original substantive, with the Arabic *'atar, trace*, Aram. אַתַּר *place, trace*, Nöldeke urges (*ZDMG.* xl. 738) that the expression *trace of . . .* could hardly have developed into the relative conjunction, while the meaning of *place* has been evolved only in Aramaic, where the word is never used as a relative. According to others, אֲשֶׁר is really a compound of several pronominal roots; cf. Sperling, *Die Nota relationis im Hebräischen*, Leipzig, 1876, and König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 323 ff., who follows Ewald and Böttcher in referring it to an original אֲשַׁל . According to Hommel (*ZDMG.* xxxii. 708 ff.) אֲשֶׁר is an original substantive, to be distinguished from שֶׁ and שֵׁ (an original pronominal stem), but used in Hebrew as a *nota relationis*, or (as וְהוּא and וְהוּא are also sometimes used, see below, *g* and *h*) simply for the *relative pronoun*. Baumann (*op. cit.*, p. 44) sees in the Assyrian *ša*, Phoenician, Punic, and Hebrew שֶׁ , the ground-forms, of which the Phoenician and Punic שֶׁ (see above, § 36 note) and the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר are developments.

² E. g. like Luther's use of *so*, in *die fremden Götter, so unter euch sind*, Gn 35².

³ This is the necessary conclusion both from the analogy of the Arabic *'alladi*, which is clearly a demonstrative (like the Hebr. הַלְלוּהוּ , הַלְלוּ), and from the use of וְהוּא and וְהוּא as relatives.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

49¹, 1 S 16^{3ff.}, Mi 6¹ (אֵת אֲשֶׁר); and even preceding the verb, e. g. Is 52¹⁵, ψ 69⁵; אֲשֶׁר as genitive, Ez 23²⁸ *I will deliver thee בְּיַד אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד שְׂנֵאִתָּה into the hand of those—thou hatest (them)*; depending on a preposition, e. g. לְאֲשֶׁר Gn 44⁴, 2 K 10²²; בְּאֲשֶׁר Gn 21¹⁷, הוּא שָׁם בְּאֲשֶׁר in that (place)—*he is there, i. e. where he is*; cf. Ju 17⁸ and Ru 1¹⁶ אֶל-אֲשֶׁר-לְאֵל-אֲשֶׁר whither; ¹ 1 K 18¹² עַל-אֲשֶׁר whither; מֵאֲשֶׁר Ex 5¹¹.

f From these examples it follows that in independent relative clauses the retrospective suffix, or adverb of place, may be, and in fact generally is, omitted. As a rule, however (as in the dependent relative clause), this does not apply to cases in which the retrospective pronoun, by the construction of the sentence, depends on a preposition,² e. g. Gn 44^{9f.} אֲשֶׁר יִמְצָא אִתּוֹ . . . וְיָמָת . . . *he—it (the cup) is found with him,—shall die* (for the *Wāw* of the apodosis in וְיָמָת cf. § 143 d). In such cases אֲשֶׁר preceded by the preposition is quite anomalous, as in Gn 31³² אֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָא עִמָּךְ *with whomsoever thou findest*, where אֲשֶׁר is a relative pronoun in the English sense; on the other hand, in Is 47¹² (and probably also 56⁴) בְּאֲשֶׁר is to be explained (with Baumann, op. cit., p. 37) by reference to 47¹⁵, as a demonstrative pronoun, *stand now with thine enchantments . . . , with those—thou hast laboured (with them)*.

[With regard to the preceding explanation of אֲשֶׁר, the student will of course understand that, in Hebrew as we know it, אֲשֶׁר never occurs as a mere demonstrative. A particle which, whatever its origin, is uniformly used with reference to something in another, contiguous clause, will naturally have acquired in practice that force which we denote by the term 'relative'.]

g Like the original demonstrative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, the demonstratives proper זֶה, זֹה, הַזֶּה (the last commonly),³ and sometimes the article, are used somewhat frequently in poetic language to introduce both dependent and independent relative clauses. With regard to the construction of זֶה, &c., the remarks on אֲשֶׁר, under *a* and *e*, also hold good.

Examples:—

(a) זֶה in apposition to a governing substantive in the nominative, ψ 104²⁶ לְוִיתָן זֶה-יִצְרָתָהּ (there is) *leviathan, he—thou hast formed (him), i. e. whom thou hast formed*; Is 42²⁴ (זֶה); in the accusative, Is 25⁹, ψ 74² (in both cases with a retrospective pronoun; זֶה is used without it in ψ 132¹²); in apposition to a genitive dependent on a preposition, Pr 23²² שָׁמַע לְאָבִיךָ זֶה יִלְדֶךָ *hearken unto thy father, him—he begat thee, i. e. who begat thee*; ψ 17⁹ (זֶה).—In ψ 104⁸ אֶל-מְקוֹם זֶה יִסְדָּתָהּ לָהֶם *unto the place which thou hadst founded for them* (cf. § 130 c), זֶה is in the genitive after the construct state מְקוֹם to the place of that, thou hadst

¹ In Zc 12¹⁰ also, instead of the unintelligible אֵלֵי אֵת אֲשֶׁר, we should probably read אֶל-אֲשֶׁר, and refer the passage to this class.

² Such a strong ellipse as in Is 31⁶, where מְסֻפָּנִי would be expected after הַעֲמִיקוּ, is only possible in elevated poetic or prophetic language.

³ The etymological equivalent זֶה, זֹה in Aramaic is always a relative.

founded (it) for them; on the same analogy we may also take, with Baumann (op. cit., p. 48), ψ 78⁵⁴ (חַר וְהָ) and Ex 15¹³ (עַם-זֵי גֵּאֲלֵתָ), 15¹⁶, Is 43²¹, ψ 9¹⁶, 10², 31⁵, 32⁸, 62¹², 142⁴, 143⁸ (all examples of וְהָ).

To introduce independent relative clauses וְהָ is used as a nominative in *h* Jb 19¹⁹; as accusative, Jb 15¹⁷ and וְהָ Hb 1¹¹, ψ 68²⁹ (after a preposition, וְהָ Ex 13⁸; but the text is evidently corrupt).

(b) More certain examples of the use of the article as a relative pronoun *i* (more correctly, perhaps, of the demonstrative which is otherwise used as article) are 1 Ch 26²⁸ כָּל הַהִקְדִּישׁ שְׁמוּאֵל *all that Samuel had dedicated*, &c.; 1 Ch 29⁸ (where נִמְצָא can only be *perfect Niph'al*); 2 Ch 29³⁶, Ezr 10¹⁴. In connexion with a plural, Jos 10²⁴ הַהֹלְכֵי אִתּוֹ *the chiefs of the men of war who went with him*; Ezr 8²⁵, 10¹⁷, 1 Ch 29¹⁷. Finally, in the sense of *id quod*, Jer 5¹³ (where, however, we should read with the LXX הַדָּבָר). Cf. moreover, 1 S 9²⁴ הַיָּד הַיְּמִינִית וְהָעֲלִיָּה *the thigh and that which was upon it* (but see *k* below); 2 Ch 1⁴ בְּהַכִּין בְּהַכִּין equivalent to בְּהַכִּין בְּהַכִּין *to the place, that he had prepared*.

In all the examples adduced except 1 S 9²⁴ (where וְהָאֲלִיָּה should probably *k* be read for וְהָעֲלִיָּה) the הָ is followed by undoubted perfects; almost all the examples, moreover, belong to the latest Books (Ezra and Chronicles). On the other hand, another series of instances (even in the older texts) is extremely doubtful, in which the Masora likewise requires perfects, either by placing the tone on the penultima, as in Gn 18²¹, 46²⁷, Jb 2¹¹ הַבָּאָה; Is 51¹⁰ הַשָּׂמָה; Ez 26¹⁷ הַהִלְלָה Ru 1²², 2⁶ and 4³ הַשָּׂבָה, or by the punctuation, Gn 21³ הַנוֹלָד; 1 K 11⁹, Dn 8¹ הַנִּרְאָה; Is 56³ הַנְּלוֹה, while no doubt the authors in all these cases intended participles (and in fact perfect participles, cf. § 116 *d*) with the article, thus הַבָּאָה, &c., Ez 26¹⁷ הַהִלְלָה for הַמְהִלְלָה according to § 52 *s*, and in the other examples הַנוֹלָד, הַנִּרְאָה, הַנְּלוֹה.

§ 139. *Expression of Pronominal Ideas by means of Substantives.*

Analogous to the periphrases for expressing materials and attributes *a* by means of substantives (§ 128 *o* and *p*), is the use of substantives to represent certain kinds of pronominal ideas, for which no special expressions exist. Thus—

1. אִישׁ, אִשָּׁה *man, woman*, are used to express—

(a) The idea of *each, every* (in the sense of each severally) with reference to persons,¹ and even animals (Gn 15¹⁰), e.g. Gn 10⁵, feminine Ex 3²²; אִישׁ is the object, e.g. in Jer 12¹⁵. On אִישׁ—אִישׁ cf. § 123 *c*.

In a few passages אִישׁ in the above sense is placed for the sake of emphasis *c* before the governing noun (always a substantive with a suffix), thus מִיֵּד אִישׁ אִתּוֹ Gn 9⁵, according to the usual explanation, stands for מִיֵּד אִתּוֹ אִישׁ *at the hand of the brother of every man*. But although the explanation seems to be

¹ As a rule אִישׁ is used in the particularizing sense of *each man*, with the plural of the verb, e.g. Gn 44¹¹; sometimes, however, as subject to a verb in the singular, e.g. Gn 44¹³.

supported by Gn 42²⁵ and Nu 17¹⁷, it is inconceivable that such an inversion of *nomen regens* and *rectum* should occur. It is more likely, either that the second substantive is in apposition to אִישׁ (thus Gn 9⁵ *at the hand of every man, his brother*, [unless it is a combination of the two readings אִישׁ מִיָּד and מִיָּד הָאָדָם]; similarly 15¹⁰ *and he laid each or, more exactly, one piece of it, &c.*, and so probably also Nu 17¹⁷ *every one, sc. his name*), or אִישׁ precedes as a kind of *casus pendens*, and only receives its nearer definition from the following substantive with suffix; thus Gn 41¹², 42²⁵ (according to the context = *to every one in his sack*); 42³⁵, where צָרוּר־בְּסָפוֹ בְּשִׁקּוֹ is virtually the predicate of אִישׁ; Ex 12⁴, 28²¹, Nu 5¹⁰, 26⁵⁴, 2 K 23³⁵, and especially Zc 7¹⁰.¹

d (b) *Any one, some one*, e.g. Gn 13¹⁶, Ct 8⁷, with a negative *no one*;² so after אֵל־ Ex 16^{19.29}; before לֹא Gn 23⁶ and frequently.—Instead of אִישׁ we sometimes find in a similar sense אָדָם *man, homo*, e.g. Lv 1² (cf. כָּאֶחֶר הָאָדָם *as any one else*, Ju 16^{7.11}), נַפְשׁ (soul) *person*, Lv 2¹, 5¹, &c., and in a neuter sense דְּבָר (prop. word, thing) for *anything*, Gn 18¹⁴, or כֹּל־דְּבָר Lv 5², Nu 31²³. With a negative דְּבָר means *nothing*; thus after אֵל־ Gn 19⁸; after לֹא Ec 8⁵.—Cf. finally, כִּי־אֶחָד *any one*, Dt 15⁷; *anything*, Ez 18¹⁰ (but in Lv 4², 5¹³ מִי־אֶחָד) and the expressions noticed in § 144 e. The latter include also instances like Ez 18³² *I have no pleasure בְּמוֹת הַיּוֹם in the death of him that dieth, i.e. of any man.*

e (c) In connexion with אָחִיו *his brother* or רֵעֵהוּ *his neighbour*, אִישׁ *one, masc.* (as אִשָּׁה *one, fem.*, in connexion with אֲחֹתָהּ *her sister* or רֵעֹנָתָהּ *her neighbour*) is used to represent the ideas of *alter—alter, the one—the other*³ (in reference to persons, animals, or things without life; see the Lexicon) or the idea of *one another*, e.g. Gn 13¹¹ *and they separated themselves אִישׁ מֵעַל אָחִיו the one from the other*; Ex 26³ *five curtains (יְרִיעוֹת fem.) shall be coupled together אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ one to another.*

f 2. נַפְשׁ *soul, person* expresses the idea of *self*,⁴ both in the singular, Pr 19^{8.16}, 29²⁴, Jb 18⁴ (in all cases נַפְשׁוֹ equivalent to *himself*) and in the plural, Jer 37⁹, &c. Similar to this is the use of בְּקִרְבָּהּ Gn 18¹² (prop. *in her inward part*) in the sense of *within herself*.⁵

¹ Cf. on the whole question the thorough discussion by Budde, *Die bibl. Urgeschichte*, p. 283 ff.: according to him, the words in Gn 9⁵ are to be rendered *at the hand of one another* (from men mutually) *will I require it*. [In support of this view, Budde points to Zc 7¹⁰ וְרַעַת אִישׁ אָחִיו אֶל־תִּחְשְׁבוּ, which in the light of 8¹⁷, וְאִישׁ אֶת־רַעַת רֵעֵהוּ אֶל־תִּחְשְׁבוּ בְּלִבְבְּכֶם, can only, he observes, be rendered ‘and devise not the hurt of one another in your heart’. So also König, *Syntax*, § 33.]

² Cf. also אִין־אִישׁ Gn 39¹¹. On the expression of the idea of *no one* by means of אִין with a following participle, see the *Negative Sentences*, § 152 l.

³ Elsewhere וְהָ . . . וְהָ are used in a similar sense, Ex 14²⁰, Is 6³; also הָאֶחָד . . . הָאֶחָד 2 S 14⁶, or the substantive is repeated, e.g. Gn 47²¹ (*from one end . . . to the other end*).

⁴ On the representation of this idea by pronouns, separate and suffixed, see § 135 a, i and k.

⁵ In a similar way the idea of *self* in Arabic, as in Sanskrit (*âtman*), is paraphrased by *soul, spirit*; in Arabic also by *eye*; in Rabbinic by גּוּף *body*,



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

CHAPTER II

THE SENTENCE

I. The Sentence in General.

§ 140. *Noun-clauses, Verbal-clauses, and the Compound Sentence.*

- a* 1. Every sentence, the subject and predicate of which are nouns or their equivalents (esp. participles), is called a *noun-clause*, e. g. יהוה מלכנו *the Lord is our king*, Is 33²²; וְאֲנָשֵׁי סֹדֹם רָעִים וְחַטָּאִים *now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners*, Gn 13¹³; פֶּה לָהֶם *a mouth is theirs*, ψ 115⁵; see further, § 141.
- b* 2. Every sentence, the subject of which is a noun (or pronoun included in a verbal-form) and its predicate a finite verb, is called a *verbal-clause*, e. g. וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים *and God said*, Gn 1³; וַיִּבְדֵּל *and he divided*, 1⁷; see further, § 142.
- c* Rem. In the last example the pronominal subject is at least indicated by the preformative (י), and in almost all forms of the perfect by affirmatives. The 3rd pers. sing. perf. however, which contains no indication of the subject, must also be regarded as a full verbal-clause.
- d* 3. Every sentence, the subject or predicate of which is itself a full clause, is called a *compound sentence*, e. g. ψ 18³¹ הָאֵל תָּמִים דְּרָבּוֹ *God—his way is perfect*, equivalent to *God's way is perfect*; Gn 34⁸ שָׁכַם בְּנֵי שִׁכְמָה *my son Shechem—his soul longeth for your daughter*; see further, § 143.
- e* 4. The above distinction between different kinds of sentences—especially between noun- and verbal-clauses—is indispensable to the more delicate appreciation of Hebrew syntax (and that of the Semitic languages generally), since it is by no means merely external or formal, but involves fundamental differences of meaning. Noun-clauses with a substantive as predicate, represent something *fixed*, a *state* or in short, a *being* so and so; verbal-clauses on the other hand, something *moveable* and *in progress*, an *event* or *action*. The latter description is indeed true in a certain sense also of noun-clauses

with a participial predicate, except that in their case the event or action (as distinguished from that expressed by the verbal-clause) is of a fixed and abiding character.

Rem. By the Arab grammarians every clause beginning with an independent subject is regarded as a noun-clause, and every clause beginning with a finite verb as verbal. If a finite verb follows the noun-subject the two together (since the verb comprises its own subject and is thus a complete verbal-clause) form a compound noun-sentence, just as when the predicate consists of an independent noun-clause. Though this definition of the different kinds of sentence, which we formerly accepted (in § 144 *a* of the 22nd to the 24th German editions of this Grammar), is rejected above, *a-d*, we must, nevertheless, mention here the point in which this more complicated view of the Arab grammarians may be regarded as at least relatively correct, namely, in classifying verbal-clauses according as the subject precedes or follows the verb, a distinction which is often of great importance in Hebrew also; see further, in § 142 *a*.

§ 141. *The Noun-clause.*

1. The *subject* of a noun-clause (see § 140 *a*) may be—

a

(*a*) A substantive, e. g. וְנָהָר יֵצֵא מֵעֵדֶן and a river went out (was going out) of Eden, Gn 2¹⁰.

(*b*) A pronoun, e. g. Gn 7⁴ אֲנִי מְמַטֵּר I will cause it to rain; 14¹⁸ וְהוּא כֹהֵן and he was priest; 2²³ (זאת before a feminine predicate, as אֵלֶּה before a plural in Ex 32⁴); מי חָכֵם who is wise? Ho 14¹⁰.—In 1 Ch 5² וּלְגִיד מִפָּנָיו and of him one became a prince, the subject is contained in מִפָּנָיו.¹

2. The *predicate* of a noun-clause may be—

b

(*a*) A substantive, e. g. Dt 14¹ אַתֶּם וְגו' בְּנִים אֲתֵם ye are children of the Lord your God; Gn 42¹³. Specially characteristic of the Semitic mode of expression are the cases in which both subject and predicate are substantives, thus emphasizing their identity ('the thing is its measure, material, or equivalent'), e. g. Ez 41²² הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עֵץ . . . וְקִירָתוֹ עֵץ the altar (was) wood . . . , and the walls thereof (were) wood, i. e. of wood. Cf. below, *c*.

(*b*) An adjective or participle, e. g. Gn 2¹² וְזָהָב הָאָרֶץ הַהִיא טוֹב and the gold of that land is good; וְעַפְרוֹן יָשָׁב now Ephron was sitting, &c., Gn 23¹⁰.² Very frequently such noun-clauses, attached by *Wāw* to a verbal-clause, are used to represent a state *contemporaneous* with the principal action; cf. *e* below.

(*c*) A numeral, e. g. Gn 42¹³ שְׁנָיִם עָשָׂר עַבְדָּיִךְ the twelve (of us) are thy servants.

¹ For other remarkable instances of ellipse in the Chronicler, see Driver, *Introduction*, ed. 8, p. 537, no. 27.

² Cf. the numerous examples in § 116 *n-p*.

(d) A pronoun, e. g. Gn 10¹² (היא), Ex 9²⁷ (אני), Gn 24⁶⁵ (מי), 1 K 9¹³ (מה).¹

(e) An adverb or (esp. if formed with a preposition) any specification of time, place, quality, possessor, &c., which may be regarded as the equivalent of a noun-idea, e. g. שם הברלח there is the bdellium, Gn 2¹²; אי הבל where is Abel? 4⁹; לעולם חסדו his mercy endureth for ever, ψ 136^{1f.}; עשר בביתו riches are in his house, ψ 112³; לו אנחנו we are his, ψ 100³ Qerê.

C Rem. 1. The employment of a substantive as predicate of a noun-clause is especially frequent, either when no corresponding adjective exists (so mostly with words expressing the material; cf. § 128 o) or when the attribute is intended to receive a certain emphasis. For in all cases there is a much greater stress upon a substantival predicate,² since it represents something as identical with the subject (see above, b [a]), than upon an adjectival or verbal predicate; cf. Ct 1¹⁰; ψ 25¹⁰ all the paths of the Lord are חסד ואמת lovingkindness and truth (i. e. wholly lovingkindness, &c.; cf. Jer 10¹⁰); Ez 38⁵, ψ 10⁵, 19¹⁰, 23⁵, 88¹⁹, Pr 3^{17,3} Jb 22¹², 23², 26¹³, Ru 3². Sometimes the emphasis on the predicate is obtained by the use of the plural form (according to § 124 e), e. g. ψ 110³ thy people are נרבת altogether willingness; Ct 5¹⁶, Dn 9²³.

d Sometimes the boldness of such combinations is modified by the repetition of the subject, as regens of the predicate, e. g. Jb 6¹² א-מ-כ-פ-ה א-ב-נ-י-ם פ-ח-י is my strength the strength of stones? Pr 3¹⁷. That the language, however—especially in poetry—is not averse even to the boldest combinations in order to emphasize very strongly the unconditional relation between the subject and predicate, is shown by such examples as ψ 45⁹ myrrh and aloes and cassia are all thy garments (i. e. so perfumed with them that they seem to be composed of them); Ct 1¹⁵ thine eyes are doves, i. e. dove's eyes (but כיונים);⁴ ψ 23⁵, 109⁴, Jb 8⁹, 12¹², Ct 2¹³. In prose, e. g. Ex 9³¹, Ezr 10¹³ העת גשמים the season is rain showers, i. e. the rainy season; with a bold enallage of the number, Gn 34³⁰ ואני מתי מספר and I (with my family) am persons few in number. For similarly bold expressions with היה cf. Gn 11¹, 12², Ex 17¹², Is 5¹², Jer 2²⁸, and again with a bold enallage of the number, Jb 29¹⁵ I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame, but in prose, Nu 10³¹ and thou shalt be to us לעינים.

¹ Why in these examples the pronouns, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, are to be considered as predicates and not as subjects, may be seen from what has been remarked above, § 126 k.

² The same naturally applies to most of those cases which are not pure noun-clauses, but have the substantival predicate connected with the subject by היה (e. g. Gn 1² and the earth was a waste and emptiness; cf. ψ 35⁶, Pr 8³⁰, Jb 3⁴) or where a preposition precedes the substantival predicate, as ψ 29⁴ the voice of the Lord is with power, i. e. powerful.

³ שלום here, as in Jb 21⁹, is evidently a substantive after a plural subject; on the other hand, it is doubtful whether שלום in such passages as Gn 43²⁷, 2 S 20⁹, ψ 120⁷, &c., is not rather to be regarded as an adjective.

⁴ As a rule, in such comparisons כ (which is then to be regarded as nominative) stands before the predicate, e. g. Is 63² wherefore are thy garments כדרך גנת like those of one that treadeth in the wine-press? (prop. the like of one that treadeth, instar calcantis); Jer 50⁹. The comparison is then much less emphatic than in the noun-clauses cited above.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

i Of (b): naturally this does not apply to the examples, in which הִיָּה, in the sense of *to become, to fare, to exist*, still retains its full force as a verb, and where accordingly the sentence is verbal, and not a noun-clause; especially when the predicate precedes the subject. On the other hand, such examples as Gn 1² *and the earth was* (הִיָּתָה) *waste and emptiness*, can scarcely be regarded as properly verbal clauses; הִיָּתָה is used here really only for the purpose of referring to past time a statement which, as the description of a state, might also appear in the form of a pure noun-clause; cf. Gn 3¹. This is especially true of the somewhat numerous instances in which הִיָּה occurs as a connecting word between the subject and the participial predicate; e. g. Ju 1⁷, Jb 1¹⁴ (immediately afterwards a pure noun-clause). The imperfect of הִיָּה announces what is future in Nu 14³³, &c.; cf. § 116 r. However, especially in the latter case, הִיָּה is not wholly without verbal force, but comes very near to being a mere copula, and this use is more frequent in the later books¹ than in the earlier.

k Rem. On the employment of שׁי existence, and יֵשׁ non-existence, which were originally substantives (on their tendency to be used as verbs, equivalent to *est*, and *non est*, cf. § 100 o, and the *Negative Sentences*, § 152) as a connecting link between a pronominal subject and a participial predicate (especially in conditional and interrogative sentences, Gn 24^{42.49}, 43⁴, &c.), see above, § 116 q, and the various kinds of subordinate clauses mentioned in §§ 150, 159.

l 4. The natural arrangement of words in the noun-clause, as describing a state, is *subject—predicate*; the principal stress falls on the former since it is the object of the description. Very frequently, however (and not merely in poetry, where greater freedom is naturally allowed in the arrangement of words), the reverse order is found, i. e. *predicate—subject*. The latter order *must* be used when special emphasis is laid on the predicate,² or when it consists of an interrogative word; thus with a substantival predicate, e. g. Gn 3¹⁹ עָפָר הָאָרֶץ *dust thou art*; 4⁹, 12¹³ (*my sister, not my wife*); 20^{2.12}, 29¹⁴, Is 6^{3b}, Jb 5²⁴, 6¹²; with an adjectival predicate, e. g. Is 6^{3a}, 28²¹, Jer 10⁶; with a participle, Gn 30¹, 32¹²; with an interrogative pronoun, e. g. Gn 24⁶⁵;³ with an adverbial interrogative, e. g. Gn 4⁹.

m Rem. On the above cf. the exhaustive investigations of C. Albrecht, 'Die Wortstellung im hebr. Nominalsatze,' ZAW. vii. 218 ff. and viii. 249 ff.; with a complete list of the exceptions to the order *subject—predicate*, p. 254 ff. The predicate *must* precede for the reasons stated (an *adjectival predicate* is particularly emphatic when it has the force of a comparative, e. g. Gn 4¹³; the predicate expressed by means of a preposition precedes most frequently when it serves to convey the ideas of *having, possessing*, e. g. Gn 18¹⁴, 29¹⁶, &c.; cf. also 26²⁰, 31^{16.43}).

n The predicate *may* precede: (a) when the subject is a pronoun, for 'the person assumed to be generally known, does not excite the same interest as

¹ According to Albrecht, ZAW. viii. 252, especially in Deuteronomy and in the Priestly Code.

² For the same reason specifications of place (e. g. Gn 4⁷) or other adverbial qualifications may stand at the beginning of the sentence.

³ The only exceptions, according to Albrecht (see the Rem. above), are Ex 16^{7.8}.

that which is stated about him ;' (b) 'in order not to be a mere appendage to a subject which consists of several words,' e.g. 2 K 20¹⁹; (c) in interrogative sentences (with a substantival or adjectival predicate or one compounded with a preposition), e.g. 1 S 16⁴; finally (d) in a relative clause, when the predicate is adverbial or compounded with a preposition, as a rule closely united (by Maqqeph) with אֲשֶׁר, e.g. Gn 2¹¹ אֲשֶׁר-שָׂם; 1^{29f.} אֲשֶׁר-בּוֹ.

§ 142. The Verbal-clause.

1. By § 140 *f* there is an essential distinction between verbal-*a* clauses, according as the subject stands before or after the verb. In the verbal-clause proper the principal emphasis rests upon the action which proceeds from (or is experienced by) the subject, and accordingly the verb naturally precedes (*necessarily* so when it is in the perf. consec. or imperf. consec.). Nevertheless, the subject does sometimes precede even in the verbal-clause proper, in the continuation of the narrative, e.g. Gn 7¹⁹, 1 S 18¹, 2 S 19¹²; especially so if there is special emphasis upon it, e.g. Gn 3¹³ (it is not I who am to blame, but) *the serpent beguiled me*, cf. Gn 2⁵, &c.¹ In the great majority of instances, however, the position of the subject at the beginning of a verbal-clause is to be explained from the fact that the clause is not intended to introduce a new fact carrying on the narrative, but rather to describe a *state*. Verbal-clauses of this kind approximate closely in character to noun-clauses, and not infrequently (*viz.* when the verbal form might just as well be read as a participle) it is doubtful whether the writer did not in fact intend a noun-clause.

The particular *state* represented in the verb may consist—

(a) Of an act completed long before, to which reference is made only because it is necessary for understanding the sequel of the principal action. If the predicate be a perfect (as it almost always is in these cases), it is generally to be rendered in English by a pluperfect; cf. the examples discussed above in § 106 *f* (1 S 28³, &c.); also Gn 6⁸ (not *Noah found grace*); 16¹, 18¹⁷, 20⁴, 24¹, 39¹ (*and Joseph in the meanwhile had been brought down to Egypt*); 41¹⁰, Ju 1¹⁶, 1 S 9¹⁵, 14²⁷, 25²¹, 1 K 1¹, &c.—In a wider sense this applies also to such verbal-clauses as Gn 2⁶ (see further, § 112 *e*), since when they serve to represent an action continuing for a long period in the past, and thus to some extent a *state*.

(b) Of a fact, contemporaneous with the principal events or continuing as the result of them. To the former class belong all those instances in which the predicate is combined with הִיָּה (provided that הִיָּה has not, as in Gn 1², 3¹, &c., been weakened to a mere copula, in which case the precedence of the subject is fully explained from the character of the clause as a noun-clause; cf. § 141 *i*, and the examples of הִיָּה, &c., with a participle, § 116 *r*); as an example of the second class, cf. e.g. Gn 13¹² אַבְרָם יָשַׁב בְּאֶרֶץ-כְּנָעַן וְגו' *Abraham accordingly continued to dwell in the land of Canaan, but Lot dwelt, &c.*

¹ This of course applies also to the cases, in which the subject consists of a strongly emphasized personal pronoun, e.g. Gn 32¹³ אַתָּה *thou thyself*; 33³ הוּא *he himself*.

d Rem. 1. The close relation between verbal-clauses beginning with the subject and actual noun-clauses, is seen finally from the fact that the former also are somewhat frequently added with וְ (or subordinated) to a preceding sentence in order to lay stress upon some accompanying circumstance; on such noun-clauses describing a *state* or *circumstance*, cf. § 141 *e*. This is especially the case, again, when the circumstantial appendage involves an antithesis; cf. Gn 18¹⁸ *seeing that nevertheless Abraham shall surely become, &c.*; 24⁵⁶, 26²⁷, Is 29¹³, Jer 14¹⁵, ψ 50¹⁷, Jb 21²², and such examples as Gn 4^{2.4}, 29¹⁷, where by means of וְ a new subject is introduced in express antithesis to one just mentioned. Moreover, in the examples treated above, under *b* and *c* (1 S 28³, &c.), the subject is frequently introduced by וְ, which then corresponds to the Greek δέ, used to interpose an explanation, &c., see Winer, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, § 53. 7 *b*.

e 2. By a peculiar construction verbal-clauses may be joined by means of וְ and a following subject to participial clauses, e.g. Gn 38²⁵ הָיָא מוֹצֵאת וְהָיָא שְׁלֵמָה she was already brought forth, when she sent, &c.; 44^{3.4}, Ju 18³, 19¹¹, 2 S 20⁸; for other examples, see § 116 *u* (where it is pointed out, note 1, that the apodosis also frequently appears in the form of a *noun*-clause, a further proof of the close relation between verbal-clauses beginning with the subject and noun-clauses proper). Without doubt there is in all these cases a kind of inversion of the principal clause and the temporal subordinate clause; the latter for the sake of greater emphasis being raised to an independent noun-clause, while the real principal action is added as though it were an accompanying circumstance, and hence in the form of an ordinary circumstantial clause. [Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 166 ff.]

f 2. According to what has been remarked above, under *a*, the natural order of words within the verbal sentence is: *Verb—Subject*, or *Verb—Subject—Object*. But as in the noun-clause (§ 141 *l*) so also in the verbal-clause, a variation of the usual order of words frequently occurs when any member of the sentence is to be specially emphasized by priority of position.¹ Thus the order may be:—

(*a*) *Object—Verb—Subject*: Gn 30⁴⁰, 37⁴, 1 S 15¹, 2 K 23¹⁹ and frequently. Naturally the examples are far more numerous, in which the object precedes a verbal form which includes the subject in itself, e.g. Gn 3^{10.14.18}, 6¹⁶, 8¹⁷, 9¹³, Ex 18²³, Ju 14³, 1 S 18¹⁷, 20⁹, 21¹⁰, 2 K 22⁸, Pr 13⁵, &c.

(*b*) *Verb—Object—Subject*: Gn 21⁷, Nu 5²³, 1 S 15³³, 2 S 24¹⁶ (but הַמְלֵאךְ is probably only a subsequent addition); Is 19¹³, ψ 34²², Jb 11¹⁹, &c.

(*c*) *Subject—Object—Verb*: Is 3¹⁷, 11⁸, 13¹⁸, Ho 12¹¹, ψ 6¹⁰, 11⁵, Jb 29²⁵.²

¹ Not infrequently also the striving after *chiasmus* mentioned in § 114 *r*, note, occasions a departure from the usual arrangement of words.

² This sequence occurs even in prose (Gn 17⁹, 23⁶, &c.); it is, however, more doubtful here than in the above prophetic and poetical passages, whether the preceding subject should not be regarded rather as the subject of a compound sentence (§ 143), the predicate of which is an independent verbal-clause; this would explain why the verbal-clause is usually separated from the subject by one of the greater disjunctives.—On the other hand, the sequence *Subject—Object—Verb* is quite common in Aramaic (e.g. Dn 2^{7.10}); cf.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

b (b) An independent verbal-clause: (a) with a retrospective suffix,¹ e.g. Gn 9⁶ (cf. § 116 *w*); 17¹⁵ *as for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai*; 26¹⁵, 28¹³, 34⁸, Ex 30³⁷, 32¹, 1 S 2¹⁰, 2 K 10²⁹, Is 9¹, 11¹⁰, Ez 33², Ho 9¹¹, ψ 11⁴, 46⁵, 65⁴, 74¹⁷, Dn 1¹⁷; with a pronoun as the principal subject, Gn 24²⁷; (β) without a retrospective suffix, Is 19¹⁷ *every one that mentions it (Judah) to it (Egypt), it (Egypt) is afraid*.

c Rem. 1. In all the above examples prominence is given to the principal subject (by its mere separation from the context by means of a greater disjunctive, as a *casus pendens*²) in a manner which would be quite impossible in a simple noun or verbal-clause (e.g. Na 1³ if it were יהוה בסיפה); cf. the French *c'est moi qu'on a accusé*. But the statement or question contained in the clause which forms the predicate also receives greater weight. For the same purpose other members of the sentence also are sometimes placed at the beginning and resumed again by a following suffix; thus the object, Gn 13¹⁵, 21¹³, 35¹², 47²¹ (with the Samaritan and LXX read perhaps יהעביר); 1 S 25²⁹; a specification of place, Gn 2¹⁷, 2 K 22¹⁸, &c.; a substantive with ל, 1 S 9²⁰, 2 S 6²³; cf. the examples in § 135 *a*.—In Nu 15²⁹ a dative is co-ordinated with the *casus pendens*, i. e. there is a transition to a different construction.

d 2. To compound sentences belong also the numerous examples already treated in the account of the tenses, where the predicate of a *casus pendens* is introduced by the *wāw apodosis*. The isolation and prominence of the principal subject is in this case still more marked than in the instances treated above; on the *casus pendens* with a following imperfect consecutive (e.g. Jer 6¹⁹, 33²⁴), cf. § 111 *h*; with a following perfect consecutive (e.g. Ex 4²¹, 12⁴⁴, Nu 23³, 1 S 25²⁷, 2 S 14¹⁰, Is 9⁴, 56^{6 f.}), § 112 *t* and *mm*; on the participle as *casus pendens*, § 112 *oo* and § 116 *w*.—In Jb 15¹⁷ *wāw apodosis* follows with the cohortative; in Jb 23¹², ψ 115⁷, the imperfect is separated by ל from the *wāw apodosis*; in Jb 4⁶ *as for thy hope, it is the integrity of thy ways*, 36²⁶, Ec 5⁶, an incomplete noun-clause is appended by *wāw apodosis*. On *wāw apodosis* after disconnected specifications of time, cf. § 112 *oo* at the end, and Gn 40⁹, 2 S 15³⁴ ועתה ואני עבדך *and now* (so far as the present is concerned) *I will be thy servant*, Nu 12¹², Jer 4¹ (*me thou needest not fear*).

e 3. Sometimes a substantive introduced by ל (in respect to; cf. § 119 *u*) serves the same purpose as the *casus pendens* beginning the sentence, as Nu 18⁸ (unless the ל here serves to introduce the object, according to § 117 *n*); Is 32¹ (where, however, ושרים should most probably be read); Ec 9⁴, 1 Ch 7¹, 24^{20 ff.}, 2 Ch 7²¹. On the other hand, ψ 16³, 17⁴, 32⁶, 89¹⁹, 119⁹¹, are very doubtful. The suggestion of P. Haupt (*Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, xiii. no. 114; Baltimore, 1894) also deserves attention, that in passages like Ec 9⁴, and in לל Gn 9¹⁰, 23¹⁰, Ex 27^{3.19}, Ez 44⁹, &c., ל is not the preposition, but an emphasizing particle, answering to the Arab. *lā*, *surely*; Assyrian *lū*; with ל it is equivalent to *in short*. Cf. also ל-ל *sive—sive, et—et*, Jos 17¹⁶, Ezr 1¹¹, Assyrian *lū—lū*.

¹ Cf. the Mēša' inscription, l. 31, and *Horonain, therein dwelt*, &c.

² But this term must not (any more than that formerly used 'the subject preceding *absolutely*') be misunderstood to mean that the principal subject is, as it were, floating in the air, and that the whole sentence results in an anacoluthon. On the contrary, to the Semitic mind, such sentences appear quite as correctly formed as ordinary noun- and verbal-clauses.

§ 144. *Peculiarities in the Representation of the Subject*
(especially in the Verbal-clause).

1. According to § 40 ff. most forms of the finite verb include a *a* specification of the subject in the form of *personal affirmatives* (in the imperfect also in the form of *preformatives*). Not infrequently, however, masculine forms are used in referring to feminines, e.g. וַיְרַעְתֶּם Ez 23⁴⁹; וַעֲשִׂיתֶם Ru 1⁸; in the imperfect, Jo 2²², Ct 2⁷; in the imperative, Am 4¹, Zc 13⁷ (for other examples, see § 110 *k*). On emphasizing the pronominal subject by the addition of the separate pronoun, see § 135 *a* and *b*.

On the masculine as *prior gender*, cf. § 122 *g*; on similar anomalies in the use of the personal pronoun, § 135 *o*, in the connexion between substantive and adjective, § 132 *d*, between subject and predicate, § 145 *p*, *t*, *u*.

2. The third person singular is often used impersonally, especially *b* in the masculine, e.g. וַיְהִי and *it came to pass*, וְהָיָה and *it shall come to pass*; הָרָה followed by לוֹ, &c., *it became hot to him*, i.e. *he became angry*, Gn 4⁶, &c.; וַיֵּצֵר לוֹ lit. *and it became strait to him*, *he was distressed*, Gn 32⁸;¹ also in the feminine, e.g. וַתֵּצֵר וַתֵּרָד Ju 11³⁹, Jer 7³¹, Ez 12²⁵, Jb 15³² (unless תִּמְוָרְתוּ in verse 31 be the subject); cf. also the impersonal passives, Is 1⁶ (רִכְכָּה), 29⁶ (תִּפְקֹר). Somewhat different are the instances in which the 3rd singular feminine occurs as the predicate of a feminine subject which is not mentioned, but is before the mind of the speaker, e.g. Is 7⁷, 14²⁴, Jer 10⁷, Jb 4⁵, 18¹⁵ (in 2 K 24⁷ כָּל-אִשָּׁרָה is used in this way with a feminine predicate, and in Jer 19⁵ אִשָּׁרָה alone); different, too, are the instances in which the 3rd singular masculine refers to an act just mentioned, e.g. Gn 17¹¹ וְהָיָה and *this* (the circumcision) *shall be a token of a covenant*, &c.

Rem. The expressions for natural phenomena may be either in the 3rd *c* sing. masculine or feminine, e.g. אֵוַר *it becomes light*, 1 S 29¹⁰ (but with an explicit subject, Gn 44³); וַיֵּאֲרָר and *it became light*; so also יִחְשֶׁךְ *it grows dark*, Jer 13¹⁶; but וַחֲשֶׁכָה Mi 3⁶; הֲתֵעָפָה though *there be darkness*, Jb 11¹⁷; תִּמְטֵר *it rains*, Am 4⁷ (where, however, the context requires the reading אִמְטֵר); ψ 50³ נִשְׁעָרָה *it is tempestuous*.

¹ In Arabic and Ethiopic the masculine is commonly used in this case, in Syriac the feminine.—The forms חַם *hot*, טוֹב *good*, וֵאל *bitter*, צָר *narrow*, עָר *evil* (frequently joined by לִי, לוֹ, &c.), which many regard as impersonal, are no doubt to be regarded in most cases not as forms of the 3rd pers. sing. perf., but, with Hupfeld on ψ 18⁷, as adjectives.

d 3. The indefinite personal subject (our *they*, *one*, the French *on*, and the German *man*¹) is expressed—

(a) By the 3rd person singular masculine, e. g. קָרָא *one* (sc. any *one* who named it, see the Rem.) *called* (or *calls*) it, Gn 11⁹, 16¹⁴, 19²², Ex 15²³; וַיִּקְרָא Gn 35^{8,10}, 2 S 2¹⁶, Is 9⁵; וַיֹּאמֶר *one said*, Gn 48¹, 1 S 16⁴;² other examples are Gn 38²⁸ *one put out a hand*; Nu 23²¹, 1 K 22³⁸, Is 6¹⁰ וַיִּרְפָּא לָהֶם *and one heals them*; 8⁴ (וַיִּשָּׂא); 46⁷ (וַיִּצְעַק); Am 6¹², Mi 2⁴, Jb 27²³; by the 3rd singular feminine (וַיִּלְדָּה) Nu 26⁵⁹.

e Rem. The Jewish commentators, following the Arab grammarians, usually explain these singulars by the addition of the participle (generally determinate) of the same stem, e. g. קָרָא וְקֹרֵא. This view is supported by the fact that such a complement sometimes occurs, e. g. Is 16¹⁰ יִרְרֵךְ הַיָּרֵךְ *the treader treads out*, for *one treads out*; 28^{4,24} (דוֹחַ הַשָּׂדֶה *doth one plow continually?*); Dt 17⁶ (Ez 18³²), Dt 22⁸, 2 S 17⁹ (Ez 33⁴), Jer 9²³; with an indeterminate participle (as in Arabic, e. g. *qāla qā'ilun, a sayer says, i. e. some one says*), e. g. Nu 6⁹, Am 9¹; cf. above, § 116 *t*, and, on the whole question, Driver on 1 S 16⁴.

f (b) Very frequently by the 3rd plural masculine, e. g. Gn 29² *for out of that well* וַיִּשְׁקוּ *they* (i. e. people generally) *watered the flocks*; 26¹⁸, 35⁵, 41¹⁴, 49³¹, 1 K 1², Is 38¹⁶, Ho 12⁹, Jb 18¹⁸, 34²⁰, Est 2², Neh 2⁷.

g Rem. The 3rd plur. also is sometimes used to express an indefinite subject, where the context does not admit of a human agent or at least not of several, e. g. Gn 34²⁷. In such a case the 3rd plur. comes to be equivalent to a passive, as very commonly in Aramaic (see Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 96. 1 *c*); e. g. Jb 7³ *wearisome nights* מְנוּחֵי לִי *have they allotted to me* (equivalent to *were allotted to me*; to make 'invisible powers' the subject is a merely artificial device); Jb 4^{19,62}, 18¹⁸, 19²⁶, 34²⁰, Ez 32²⁵, ψ 63¹¹, Pr 2²² (in parallelism with a passive); 9¹¹.

h (c) By the 2nd singular masculine, e. g. Is 7²⁵ לֹא-תָבוֹא שָׁמָּה *one will* (or *can*) *not come thither* (prop. *thou wilt . . .*); Jer 23³⁷, Pr 19²⁵, 30²⁸ (unless the reading should be תִּתְחַפֵּשׂ). Cf. also עַד-בֹּאֲךָ or simply בֹּאֲךָ (Gn 10^{19,30}, 13¹⁰ בֹּאֲךָ) prop. *until thy coming*, i. e. *until one comes*.

i (d) By the plural of the participle, e. g. Jer 38²³ *and all thy wives and thy children* מוֹצֵאִים (prop. *are they bringing out* =) *they will bring out, &c.*; cf. Is 32¹², Ez 13⁷, Neh 6¹⁰ (*for some are coming to slay thee*)

¹ In 1 S 9⁹ הָאִישׁ (prop. *the man*) is used in exactly the same sense as our *one*.

² Elsewhere in such cases וַיֹּאמֶר usually occurs (but not in the perfect, e. g. 1 S 23²²), so that it is doubtful whether the present reading of Gn 48¹, &c., would not be better explained according to § 7 *d*, note. In Gn 48² for the extraordinary וַיִּגַּד the common form וַיִּגְדַּר is to be read; so in 50²⁶ for וַיִּשָּׂא (after a plural) either וַיִּשְׂאוּ or the 3rd plur.; in 2 K 21²³ וַיִּקְבְּרוּ.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

person; cf. e.g. Gn 40²² (41¹³), 41¹⁴, 43³⁴ (*and he commanded to set before them, &c.*); 46²⁹, 2 S 12⁹.

O 2. Supposed ellipses of a definite subject are due either to a misunderstanding of the passage, or to a corruption of the text. Thus in 1 S 24¹¹ after **וַתִּקַּח** either **עֵינַי** has dropped out (through confusion with **עָלַי**) or we should read with the LXX **וַתִּקַּח**. In 2 S 13³⁹ (**וַתִּבְלַע דָּוִד**) the text is obviously corrupt.

p 3. In poetic (or prophetic) language¹ there sometimes occurs (supposing the text to be correct) a more or less abrupt transition from one person to another. Thus from the 2nd to the 3rd (i.e. from an address to a statement), Gn 49⁴ (?), Is 31⁶ (?), 42²⁰, 52¹⁴, 61⁷, Mal 2¹⁵ (where, however, for **וַיִּבְרַךְ** we should undoubtedly read **וַתִּבְרַךְ**); **ψ** 22⁹ [and regularly after a vocative, Is 22¹⁶, 47⁸, 48¹, 54^{1.11}, Jer 22¹⁶, 49^{4.16}, Am 5^{6f.}, Mic 1² (= 1 K 22²⁸), Mal 3⁹, 2 K 9³¹; and after **הוּא** Is 5⁸, 29¹⁵, Jer 22¹³]. From the 3rd to the 2nd pers., Dt 32¹⁵, Is 1²⁹ (but read probably **חֲמַדְתֶּם** for **חֲמַדְתִּי**, which has caused the insertion of **אֲנִי**), 5⁸, Jer 29¹⁹, Jb 16⁷, cf. also Dt 32¹⁷. From the 1st to the 3rd pers., La 3¹ (in a relative clause). In Jb 13²⁸ the 3rd pers. **וְהוּא** is probably employed *δεικτικῶς* for the 1st.

§ 145. Agreement between the Members of a Sentence, especially between Subject and Predicate, in respect of Gender and Number.

a 1. As in other languages, so also in Hebrew, the predicate in general conforms to the subject in gender and number (even when it is a pronoun, e.g. **זֶה אֲבִירַתִּי** *this is my covenant*, Gn 17¹⁰). There are, however, numerous exceptions to this fundamental rule. These are due partly to the *constructio ad sensum* (where attention is paid to the meaning rather than to the grammatical form; see *b-l* below), partly to the position of the predicate (regarded as being without gender) *before* the subject.

b 2. Singular nouns which include in themselves a collective idea (§ 123 *a*), or which occasionally have a collective sense (§ 123 *b*), may readily, in accordance with their meaning, be construed with the plural of the predicate, whether it precedes or follows. This is also the case, when the collective is itself feminine but represents, exclusively or at least generally, masculine persons.

Examples:—

C (*a*) Of collectives proper (cf. § 132 *g*): (*a*) with the predicate preceding, Gn 30³⁸ **וַתִּבְרַן הַצֹּאן** (cf. 30³⁹, 31⁸ and 33¹³); Ju 1^{22f.} **בְּיַת** representing persons belonging to the tribe; Mi 4³ **גִּוֵי**; 2 K 25⁵ **הָיִל** *army*; Pr 11²⁶ **לְאִוִם**

¹ In prose, Lv 2⁸; but **וְהִקְרִיבָהּ** here is hardly the original reading. Different from this is Gn 26⁷, where there is a transition to direct narration.

the people; Nu 10³ כָּל־הָעֵדָוָה all the congregation (cf. 1 K 8⁵); 1 K 1⁴⁰, Is 9⁸, 25³, Am 1⁵ עַם; 1 S 17⁴⁷, Ezr 10¹² קָהָל assembly. Cf. also the construction of national names, as אַרְם (§ 122 i), e. g. 1 K 20²⁰ וַיִּנָּסוּ אַרְם and the Syrians fled; 1 S 4⁵.—(β) with the predicate following, 1 K 8⁶ צֹאן וּבָקָר sheep and oxen, construed with the plural in the following relative clause; Jb 1¹⁴ הַבָּקָר הָיוּ הַרְשֹׁת הַרְשֹׁת the cattle (cows) were ploughing; 2 S 3¹ and 1 Ch 10⁶ בַּיִת = family (in 1 S 6¹³ בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ on the analogy of names of countries, is used for the inhabitants of Bethshemesh); Ho 11⁷, Ezr 4⁴ עַם; ψ 68¹¹ חֵיהַּ herd [if correct, figuratively for people]; Is 26¹⁹ נַבְלָה dead bodies; Is 27¹¹ קַצִּיר בֹּגְדֵי שָׂרָיִל preceded by a predicate in the singular.

(b) Of substantives occasionally used as collectives: (a) with the predicate preceding, Gn 34²⁴ זָכָר; Ju 9⁵⁵, 15¹⁰ אִישׁ; Is 16⁴ רָמַס the treacher down.—(β) with the predicate following, Jb 8¹⁹ אַחֵר = others; Ez 28³ סֵתוּם a secret; [ψ 9⁷, and even after וְהָ Jb 19¹⁹.]

(c) Of feminines as collective terms denoting masculine persons: (a) with the predicate preceding, 1 S 17⁴⁶ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ that all the earth may know, i. e. all the inhabitants of the earth; cf. Dt 9²⁸, ψ 66¹, 96^{1.9}, &c.; Am 1⁸ שְׂאִרִית remnant; (ψ 33⁸ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ).—(β) with the predicate following, Gn 41⁵⁷, 2 S 15²³, 1 K 10²⁴, Gn 48⁶ מוֹלְדָת issue; 1 S 2³⁸ כָּל־מִרְבֵּית all the increase; Jb 30¹² פְּרָחָה rabble. In Hag 2⁷ read חֲמֹרֶת with the LXX.

Examples of predicates in the singular, notwithstanding the collective meaning of the subject, occur in Gn 35¹¹, Ex 10²⁴, 14¹⁰, Dt 1³⁹, &c.—For examples of bold enallage of the number in noun-clauses with a substantival predicate, see above, § 141 c.

Rem. Not infrequently the construction begins in the singular (especially when the predicate precedes; see o. below), but is carried on, after the collective subject has been mentioned, in the plural; e. g. Ex 1²⁰ וַיִּרְבּוּ הָעָם וַיַּעֲצְמוּ מְאֹד and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty; 33⁴.

3. On the other hand, plurals which have a singular meaning (§ 124 a) are frequently construed with the singular, especially the *pluralis excellentiae* or *maiestatis* (§ 124 g-i; on the union of these plurals with attributes, cf. § 132 h), as אֱלֹהִים Gn 1^{1.3}, &c. (but see the Rem.), מַלְאָכִים master, Ex 21⁴ בֹּעֲלִים master, owner, Ex 21²⁹; cf., moreover, פְּנִים with the singular, Jb 16¹⁶ *Keth.*, רַחֲמִים Pr 12¹⁰.—So feminine forms with a masculine meaning are construed with a masculine predicate, e. g. Ec 12⁹ הָיָה קַהֲלָת חָכָם the preacher was wise.

Rem. The construction of אֱלֹהִים God with the plural of the predicate may be explained (apart of course from such passages as 1 K 19², 20¹⁰, where the speakers are heathen, and אֱלֹהִים may, therefore, be a numerical plural) partly as an acquiescence in a polytheistic form of expression, partly from the peculiar usage of one of the early documents of the Hexateuch, called *E* by Wellhausen, &c., *B* by Dillmann; cf. his commentary on Numbers—Joshua, p. 618, and above, § 124 g, note 2. So Gn 20¹³ (but in conversation with a heathen); 31⁵³, 35⁷, cf. also Jos 24¹⁹. That this construction was afterwards studiously avoided from fear of misconception, is shown by such passages as Neh 9¹⁸ compared with Ex 32^{4.8}, and 1 Ch 17²¹ compared with 2 S 7²³. Cf. Strack's excursus on Gen 20¹³ in *Die Genesis*, Munich, 1905, p. 77.

- k* 4. Plurals of names of animals or things, and of abstracts, whether they be masculine or feminine, are frequently construed with the feminine singular of the verbal predicate¹ (on the collective sense of the feminine form, cf. § 122 s); thus Jo 1²⁰ שָׂרָה תַעֲרֹג בְּהֵמוֹת שָׂרָה תַעֲרֹג *the beasts of the field long*; Jer 12⁴ (where the predicate precedes), cf. also Jb 12⁷; names of things with the predicate preceding occur in 2 S 24¹³, Is 34¹³, Jer 4¹⁴, 51²⁹, ψ 18³⁵, 37³¹, 73² *Keth.*, 103⁵ (unless הַמְחִיֵּשׁ is to be read for הַתְּחִיֵּשׁ), Jb 14¹⁹, 27²⁰; with the predicate following, Gn 49²² (בְּנֹחַ = *branches*); Dt 21⁷, 1 S 4¹⁵ (וְעֵינָיו קָמָה),² 2 S 10⁹, Is 59¹², Jer 2¹⁵ *Keth.*, 48⁴¹, 49²⁴, Pr 15²³, 20¹⁸, Jb 41¹⁰.³
- l* 5. Moreover, the plural of persons (especially in the participle) is sometimes construed with the singular of the predicate, when instead of the whole class of individuals, each severally is to be represented as affected by the statement. Undoubted examples of this *distributive singular* are Gn 27²⁹ (Nu 24⁹) אֲבָרְכֶיךָ וְמְבָרְכֶיךָ בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה אֲבָרְכֶיךָ אֲבָרְכֶיךָ *those that curse thee, cursed be every one of them, and those that bless thee, blessed be every one of them*; Ex 31¹⁴, Lv 17¹⁴ and 19⁸ (in both places the Samaritan has אֲבָלָה); Is 3¹² unless נְנִישִׁי is to be regarded as a *pluralis maiestatis* according to § 124 *k*; Pr 3^{18.35} (?), 18²¹ (?), 21^{27^b}, 27¹⁶, 28^{1^b}, 28¹⁶ *Keth.*
- m* Rem. Analogous to the examples above mentioned is the somewhat frequent⁴ use of suffixes in the singular (distributively) referring to plurals; cf. the *verbal-suffixes* in Dt 21¹⁰, 28⁴⁸, Am 6¹⁰; and the *noun-suffixes* in Is 2⁸, 30²², Jer 31¹⁴, Ho 4⁸ (but since ם follows, נִפְשׁוֹ is undoubtedly a dittography for נִפְשֵׁי), Zc 14¹², ψ 5¹⁰ (where, however, פִּימוֹ is clearly to be read with all the early versions); 62⁵, 141¹⁰ (?), Jb 38³², Ec 10¹⁵ [but LXX הַבְּסִיל]; finally, the suffixes with prepositions in Is 2²⁰ אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ-לוֹ *which they made each one for himself* (according to others, *which they (the makers) made for him*); 5²⁶, 8²⁰, Jb 24⁵, in each case לוֹ; in Gn 2¹⁹ לוֹ refers to the collectives חַיָּה and עוֹף; cf. further, Jos 24⁷, Is 5²³ מִפְּנֵי after צְרִיקִים (but read probably צְרִיק with the LXX, &c.). Conversely in Mi 1¹¹ עֲבָרֵי לַכֶּם [cf. Jer 13²⁰ *Keth.*], but the text is undoubtedly corrupt.

¹ Cf. in Greek the construction of the neuter plural with the singular of the predicate τὰ πρόβατα βάλει; in Attic Greek the plural of the predicate is allowed only when the neuter denotes actual persons, as τὰ ἀνδράποδα ἔλαβον. In Arabic also the *pluralis inhumanus* (i. e. not denoting persons) is regularly construed with the feminine singular of the attribute or predicate, as are all the *plurales fracti* (properly collective forms).

² On the possibility of explaining forms like קָמָה as 3rd plural feminine, cf. above, § 44 *m*; but this explanation would not apply to all the cases under this head, cf. Jo 1²⁰, ψ 37³¹, 103⁵.

³ In Pr 14¹ an abstract plural חֲכָמוֹת (to be read thus with 9¹, &c., instead of חֲכָמוֹת) is construed with the singular; but cf. § 86 *l*, § 124 *e*, end.

⁴ In several of the above examples the text is doubtful, and hence Mayer Lambert (*REJ.* xxiv. 110) rejects the theory of distributive singulars generally. [Cf. Driver, *Jeremiah*, p. 362, on 16⁷.]



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Dt 21³ (according to the accents); 22²³, Is 18⁵ וּבֹסֵר זָמַל יִהְיֶה נֹצֵה *and a ripening grape the flower becometh*.

r (b) The adjective in a noun-clause, e.g. ψ 119¹³⁷ יִשָּׂר מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ *upright are thy judgements*; cf. verse 155.¹—On the other hand, רָעָה in רָעָה צֹאן עֲבָדֶיךָ *thy servants are shepherds*, Gn 47³, is either an unusual orthography or simply a misspelling for רָעִי.

S Rem. 1. As soon as a sentence which begins with an uninflected predicate is carried on after the mention of the subject, the gender and number of the subsequent (co-ordinate) predicates must coincide with those of the subject, e.g. Gn 1¹⁴ וְהָיוּ . . . יְהִי מְאֹרֶת (see o above); Nu 9⁶, Ez 14¹; cf. also Gn 30³⁹ (see p above).

t 2. The dislike mentioned in p above, of using the feminine form (cf., further, § 144 a, with the sections of the Grammar referred to there, and below, under u), is exemplified sometimes by the fact that of several predicates only that which stands next to the feminine substantive is inflected as feminine (cf. the treatment of several attributes following a feminine substantive, § 132 d); thus in Is 14⁹ רִגְזָה, and afterwards עוֹרֵר (but עוֹרֵר is better taken as an infin. abs. = *excitando*, reading הִקֵּם for הִקִּים); 33⁹ אֲבַל אֶרֶץ אֲמַלְלָה *mourneth, languisheth the land*. Cf. Jer 4³⁰, Jb 1¹⁹, and the examples (§ 47 k) where only the first of several consecutive forms of the 2nd sing. fem. imperf. has the affirmative *i*, Is 57⁸, Jer 3⁵, Ez 22⁴, 23³² (תִּהְיֶה after תִּשְׁתִּי); on the converse sequence of genders in imperatives, Na 3¹⁵, cf. § 110 k.—Of a different kind are instances like Lv 2¹, 5¹, 20⁶, where נֶפֶשׁ *person* (fem.) as the narrative continues, assumes (in agreement with the context) the sense of a masculine person.

u 3. The instances in which the gender or number of the *following* predicate appears to differ from that of the subject are due partly to manifest errors in the text, e.g. Gn 32⁹ read with the Samaritan הִאֲחַת instead of הִאֲחַת; וְהָיָה then follows correctly; 1 S 2²⁰ read with Wellhausen שָׁאֵל, according to 1²⁸, instead of שָׁאֵל; 1 S 16⁴ read וַיֹּאמְרוּ; Ez 18²⁹ instead of יִתְבֵּן read the plural as in verse 25; so also Ez 20³⁸ for יִבֹּא,² and in Jb 6²⁰ for בָּטַח; in La 5¹⁰ read וַיִּבְכְּ, and cf. in general, § 7 d, note; 1 Ch 2⁴⁸ read יִלְדָה; in Jer 48¹⁵ also the text is certainly corrupt. Other instances are due to special reasons. The anomalies in Is 49¹¹, Ho 14¹, Pr 1¹⁶ (after רִגְלָיו), ψ 11⁴ (after עֵינָיו), 63⁴, Pr 5², 10^{21.32} 18⁶, 26²³, Jb 15⁶ (all after שְׂפָתַיִם), Pr 3² (after מְצוֹתַי), ψ 102²⁸, Jb 16²² (after שָׁנוֹת), Dn 11⁴¹ (read וְרִבִּית), and perhaps Gn 20¹⁷ are also to be explained (see p) from the dislike of the 3rd plur. fem. imperf.; moreover, in Jer 44¹⁹, Pr 26²³ the plur. masc. even of a participle occurs instead of the plur. fem.—In Gn 31⁸ יִהְיֶה, after a plural subject, is explained as a case of attraction to the following singular predicate.³—In Gn 4⁷ רִבֵּץ

¹ This does not include such cases as Jb 24^{7.10}, where עָרוֹם is rather to be explained as an accusative denoting a state, § 118 n.

² יִבֹּא probably an error for יִבֵּאוּ. The Masora on Lv 11³⁴ reckons fourteen instances of יִבֵּאוּ, where we should expect the plural.

³ So also the pronoun הִוא emphatically resuming the subject (see § 141 h) is attracted to the predicate in number in Jos 13¹⁴ הִוא נַחֲלָתוֹ . . . אֲשֵׁי יְהוָה *the offerings of the Lord . . . that is his inheritance*; in number and gender, Lv 25³⁹ Q^{eré}; Jer 10³.

is a substantival participle (*a lurker, a coucher*). In Gn 47²⁴ יְהִי־הוּ remains undefined in gender (masc.), although the noun precedes for the sake of emphasis; so also in Gn 28²², Ex 12⁴⁹, 28^{7.32}, Nu 9¹⁴, 15²⁹, Jer 50⁴⁶, Ec 2⁷ (לִי הָיָה אֲשֶׁר לִי as if the sentence began afresh, *and servants born in my house . . . there fell to my lot this possession also*). In Jb 20²⁶ לֹא־נִפְחָה אֵשׁ may (unless אֵשׁ is regarded as masculine, § 122 o) be taken impersonally, *fire, without its being blown upon*.—In Is 16⁸ and Hb 3¹⁷ the predicate in the singular is explained from the collective character of שְׂרָמֹת (see *h* above); on the other hand, the masculine form of the predicate is abnormal in ψ 87³, Pr 2¹⁰, 12²⁵, 29²⁵, Jb 8⁷, 36¹⁸.

§ 146. *Construction of Compound Subjects.*

1. When the subject is composed of a nomen regens (in the construct *a* state) with a following genitive, the predicate sometimes agrees in gender and number not with the nomen regens, but with the genitive, when this represents the principal idea of the compound subject.¹ Thus 1 S 2⁴ קִשְׁתַּת גְּבִרִים חֲתִים *the bow of the mighty men is broken*, as if it were *the mighty men with their bow are broken*; Ex 26¹², Lv 13⁹, 1 K 1⁴¹ (but the text is clearly very corrupt), 17¹⁶, Is 2¹¹, 21¹⁷, Zc 8¹⁰, Jb 15²⁰, 21²¹, 29¹⁰, 32⁷ (רַב שָׁנִים equivalent to *many years*); 38²¹; with the predicate preceding, 2 S 10⁹, unless it is to be explained according to § 145 *k*.

Rem. 1. The cases in which קוֹל (*voice, sound*) with a following genitive *b* stands at the beginning of a sentence, apparently in this construction, are really of a different kind. The קוֹל is there to be taken as an exclamation, and the supposed predicate as in apposition to the genitive, e.g. Gn 4¹⁰ *the voice of thy brother's blood, which crieth (prop. as one crying) . . . ! = hark! thy brother's blood is crying, &c.*; Is 13⁴, 66⁶. In Is 52⁸ an independent verbal-clause follows the exclamation *the voice of thy watchmen!*; in Jer 10²² and Ct 2⁸ an independent noun-clause; in Is 40³ קוֹל קָרָא *the voice of one that crieth!* i.e. *hark! there is one crying* is followed immediately by direct speech; in Mi 6⁹ קוֹל *hark!* may be used disconnectedly (cf. the almost adverbial use of קוֹל in § 144 *m*) and יְהוָה be taken as the subject to יִקְרָא.

2. When the substantive כָּל (כָּל־) *entirety* is used in connexion with a *c* genitive as subject of the sentence, the predicate usually agrees in gender and number with the genitive, since כָּל is equivalent in sense to an attribute (*whole, all*) of the genitive; hence, e.g. with the predicate preceding, Gn 5⁵ וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי אָדָם *and all the days of Adam were, &c.* (in 5²³, 9²⁹ וַיְהִי; but the Samaritan reads וַיְהִי here also); Ex 15²⁰; with the predicate following, ψ 150⁶, &c. Exceptions are, e.g. Lv 17¹⁴ (but cf. § 145 *l*), Jos 8²⁵, Is 64¹⁰, Pr 16², Na 3⁷. On the other hand, in such cases as Ex 12¹⁶ the agreement of the

¹ Sometimes, however, the attraction of the predicate to the genitive may be merely due to juxtaposition.

predicate with כָּל־מְלָאכָה is explained from the stress laid upon the latter, כָּל־מְלָאכָה being equivalent to *the whole of work* (is forbidden).

d 2. When the subject of the sentence consists of several nouns connected by *wāw copulative*, usually

(a) The predicate *following* is put in the plural, e.g. Gn 8²² *seed time and harvest, and cold and heat . . . shall not cease* (לֹא יִשְׁבְּחוּ); after subjects of different genders it is in the masculine (as the *prior gender*, cf. § 132 d), e.g. Gn 18¹¹ אַבְרָהָם וְשָׂרָה וְקָנִים *Abraham and Sarah were old*; Dt 28³², 1 K 1²¹.

e Rem. Rare exceptions are Pr 27⁹ שֶׁמֶן וְקֹטֹרֶת יִשְׂמַח־לֵב *ointment and perfume rejoice the heart*, where the predicate agrees in gender with the masculine שֶׁמֶן (as in Is 51³ with שִׂשׁוֹן); on the other hand, in Ex 21⁴ (where הָאִשָּׁה וְיִלְדֶיהָ are the subjects) it agrees with הָאִשָּׁה as being the principal person; in the compound sentence, Is 9⁴, it agrees with the feminine subject immediately preceding.¹

f (b) The predicate *preceding* two or more subjects may likewise be used in the plural (Gn 40¹, Jb 3⁵, &c.); not infrequently, however, it agrees in gender and number with the first, as being the subject nearest to it. Thus the predicate is put in the singular masculine before several masculines singular in Gn 9²³, 11²⁹, 21³², 24⁵⁰, 34²⁰, Ju 14⁵; before a masculine and a feminine singular, e.g. Gn 3⁸, 24⁵⁵ *then said* (וַיֹּאמֶר) *her brother and her mother*; 33⁷; before a masculine singular and a plural, e.g. Gn 7⁷ וַיָּבֹא נֹחַ וּבָנָיו *and Noah went in, and his sons, &c.*; Gn 8¹⁸ (where feminines plural also follow); 44¹⁴, Ex 15¹, 2 S 5²¹; before collectives feminine and masculine, 2 S 12².

g Similarly, the feminine singular occurs before several feminines singular, e.g. Gn 31¹⁴ וְלֵאָה וְרָחֵל *then answered Rachel and Leah*; before a feminine singular and a feminine plural, e.g. Gn 24⁶¹; before a feminine singular and a masculine singular, Nu 12¹ וַתִּדְבַר מִרְיָם וְאַהֲרֹן *then spake Miriam and Aaron*; Ju 5¹; before a feminine singular and a masculine plural, e.g. Gn 33⁷ (cf., on the other hand, ψ 75⁴ וְכָל־יֹשְׁבֵיהָ *dissolved are the earth and all the inhabitants thereof*). The plural feminine occurs before a plural feminine and a plural masculine in Am 8¹³.—In Jer 44²⁵ for אַתֶּם וְנָשֵׁיכֶם read אַתֶּם הַנָּשִׁים with the LXX, and cf. verse 19.

h (c) When other predicates follow after the subjects have been mentioned, they are necessarily put in the plural; cf. Gn 21³², 24⁶¹, 31¹⁴, 33⁷, &c., and § 145 s.

¹. Similarly with a mixed object, Gn 33² *he put . . . Leah and her children* אַחֲרָנִים *after*; אַחֲרָנִים agrees with the masculine immediately preceding.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

subject and copula (as Gn 18⁹ בְּאֵהָלָהּ הִנֵּה *behold she is in the tent*; 42²⁸), or there is no indication whatever of the predicate, so that the sentence is limited to הִנֵּה with the suffix, as in the frequent use of הִנְנִי, הִנֵּנִי *here am I*, in answer to an address. Elsewhere a substantive follows הִנֵּה (or הִן Gn 11⁶, Jb 31³⁵), and הִנֵּה then includes the meaning of a demonstrative pronoun and the copula, e.g. Gn 22⁷ הִנֵּה הָאֵשׁ וְהָעֵצִים *here is the fire and the wood, &c.*; 12¹⁹ *behold thou hast thy wife!* Ex 24⁸; with reference to the past, e.g. Am 7¹ וְהִנֵּה לְקִישׁ וְגו' *and lo, it was the latter growth, &c.* By a very pregnant construction the simple הִנֵּה is used as the equivalent of a sentence in Jb 9¹⁹, *lo, here am I!*

C 3. Examples of exclamations (threatening, complaining, triumphing, especially warlike or seditious) in which, owing to the excitement of the speaker, some indispensable member of the sentence is suppressed, are—(a) with suppression of the predicate (which has frequently to be supplied in the form of a jussive), e.g. Ju 7²⁰ *a sword for the Lord and for Gideon!* (verse 18 without הָיָה); 2 S 20¹ and 2 Ch 10¹⁶ (cf. also 1 K 22³⁶) *every man to his tents, O Israel!* (i. e. *let every man go to or remain in his tent*); without אֵשׁ 1 K 12¹⁶; moreover, Is 1²⁸, 13⁴ (on the exclamatory קוֹל equivalent to *hark!* cf. § 146 b); 28¹⁰, 29¹⁶ (הַפְּכֵכִים *O your perversity!* i. e. *how great it is!*); Jer 49¹⁶ (if תִּפְלֶצֶתָּךְ be equivalent to *terror be upon thee!*); Jo 4¹⁴, Mal 1¹³ (הִנֵּה מַתְלַאֲהָ *behold what a weariness!*); Jb 22²⁹; perhaps also Gn 49⁴ פָּחוּ כַּמַּיִם *a bubbling over as water* (sc. *happened*), unless it is better to supply a subject אַתָּה (*thou wast*).—(b) With suppression of the subject, Ju 4²⁰, cf. § 152 k; Jb 15²³ הַיֵּה *where sc. is bread?*—(c) With suppression of both subject and predicate, Ju 7¹⁸ (see above); 1 K 12¹⁶ (see above); 2 K 9²⁷ אֵתוּ נִם *him also!* explained immediately afterwards by הִכֵּהוּ *smite him!* Ho 5⁸ *after thee, Benjamin!* sc. *is the enemy* (differently in Ju 5¹⁴); ψ 6⁴, 90¹³, Hb 2⁶ עַרְמָתִי; ψ 74⁹ עַרְמָה.—On וְלֹא *and if not* (unless וְלִי is to be read), 2 S 13²⁶, 2 K 5¹⁷, see § 159 dd.

d Rem. 1. To the class of incomplete sentences naturally belong exclamations introduced by interjections הִנֵּה, אֵי, הוּי, הֵם;¹ cf. § 105. After the first two the object of the *threat* or *imprecation* follows regularly with לְ (cf. *vae tibi*) or לְ-אֵל or לְ-עַל, e.g. אֵי לָנוּ *woe unto us!* 1 S 4⁸, Is 6⁵; cf. also הִנֵּה לַיּוֹם *alas for the day!* Jo 1¹¹; on the other hand, the object of *commiseration* (after הוּי) follows mostly in the vocative, or rather in the accusative of exclamation (cf. *vae te* in Plautus); so in lamentation for the dead, הוּי אָחִי *alas, my brother!* 1 K 13³⁰,

¹ We do not consider here the cases in which these interjections (e.g. הֵם Ju 3¹⁹, Am 6⁰) stand quite disconnectedly (so always אָחִי and אָחִי).

Jer 22¹⁸; אֲחֵי הַמָּטָא ah, sinful nation! Is 1⁴, 5^{8.11.18.20.22} (ah! they that . . .).—
For אֲחֵי cf. Hb 2²⁰, Zp 1⁷, Zc 2¹⁷.

2. Finally, instances of noun-clauses shortened in an unusual manner *c* may perhaps occur in יְרִיחֵם and רַגְלֵיהֶם ψ 115⁷, for יָרִים לָהֶם they have hands, &c.; cf. verses 5 and 6 פָּה-לָהֶם, &c. Perhaps also וּפִילִגְשׁוֹ Gn 22²⁴, and וְחָלִיו Ec 5¹⁶ are to be regarded in the same way, but hardly נְבִיאֵכֶם Nu 12⁶; cf. § 128 d above.

II. Special Kinds of Sentences.

§ 148. Exclamations.

The originally interrogative מָה is used to introduce exclamations *a* of wonder or indignation = *O how!* or ridicule, *why! how!* sometimes strengthened by וְהִי or וְאֵת according to § 136 c.—Astonishment or indignation at something which has happened is introduced by אֵיךְ *how* (likewise originally interrogative) with the perfect; the indignant refusal of a demand by אֵיךְ (but also by מָה Jb 31¹) with the imperfect; an exclamation of lamentation by אֵיכָה, less frequently אֵיךְ *how!*; in Jo 1¹⁸ by מָה.

Examples:—

מָה (or מַה with a following *Dageš*, see § 37) expressing admiration (or *b* astonishment) before verbal-clauses, e.g. Gn 27²⁰ (מַה-זֶּה); 38²⁹, Nu 24⁵ (*how goodly are . . .!*); ψ 21², Ct 7²; before the predicate of noun-clauses, e.g. Gn 28¹⁷, ψ 8²; mockingly before the verb, 2 S 6²⁰ (*how glorious was . . .!*); Jer 22²³, Jb 26^{2 f.}; indignantly, Gn 3¹³ מַה-זֵּאת; 4¹⁰, 20⁹, 31²⁶ *what hast thou done!*

אֵיךְ with the perfect, e.g. Gn 26⁹, ψ 73¹⁹; in scornful exclamation, Is 14^{4.12}; in a lament (usually אֵיכָה), 2 S 1^{25.27}; with the imperfect, in a reproachful question, Gn 39⁹, 44⁸, ψ 11¹, 137⁴; in a mocking imitation of lament, Mi 2⁴.

אֵיכָה with the perfect, Is 1²¹, La 1¹; with the imperfect, La 2¹, 4¹.

Rem. 1. The close relation between a question and an exclamation appears *c* also in the interrogative personal pronoun מִי in such cases as Mi 7¹⁸ מִי-אֵל כְּמֹדֶךָ *who is a God like unto thee?* and so in general in *rhetorical* questions as the expression of a forcible denial; similarly in the use of an interrogative sentence to express a wish, see §§ 150 d, 151 a.

2. A weaker form of exclamation is sometimes produced by the insertion *d* of a corroborative כִּי *verily, surely*, before the predicate, Gn 18²⁰; cf. 33¹¹, Is 7⁹, and the analogous cases in the apodoses of conditional sentences, § 159 ee.

§ 149. Sentences which express an Oath or Asseveration.

The particle אִם, in the sense of *certainly not*, and אִם-לֹא (rarely כִּי *a* Gn 22¹⁶) in the sense of *certainly*, are used to introduce promises or threats confirmed by an oath (especially after such formulae as חִי-יְהוֹה,

חִי-נִפְשֶׁךָ, חִי אָנִי, בִּי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי, &c., as well as after imprecations, see below), and also simple asseverations, e.g. 1 S 2³⁰, 2 S 20²⁰, Jb 27⁵ after חָלִילָה לִי *far be it from me*, but mostly without any introductory formula.

b Rem. No certain explanation of these particles has yet been given. According to the usual view, phrases expressing an oath depend on the suppression of an imprecation upon oneself, e.g. *the Lord do so unto me, if I do it* equivalent to *I certainly will not do it*; then naturally אִם-לֹא properly *if I do it not* equivalent to *I certainly will do it*. It is indeed difficult to understand such self-imprecations, put into the mouth of God, as in Dt 1^{34 f.}, Is 14²⁴, 22¹⁴, Jer 22⁶, Ez 3⁶, 35⁶, ψ 95¹¹. Possibly, however, the consciousness of the real meaning of the formula was lost at an early period, and אִם-לֹא simply came to express *verily*, אִם *verily not*.—In 1 S 25²², where, instead of a self-imprecation, a curse is pronounced upon others, read לְדָוִד with the LXX for לְאִבֵי דָוִד.

Examples:—

- c* (a) The particles אִם and אִם-לֹא used after the utterance of an oath and after formulae of swearing, e.g. 2 S 11¹¹ (see note on *a*) חִי-יְהוָה וְחִי נַפְשֶׁךָ אִם-אֶעֱשֶׂה אֶת-הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה *as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not do this thing*; 1 S 14⁴⁵, 2 K 5¹⁶ (after חִי יְהוָה; in 1 S 14³⁹ and 29⁶ חִי-י' is followed by a simple כִּי); Ct 2⁷, 3⁵ (after הִשְׁבַּעְתִּי *I adjure you*); cf. also Gn 14²³, 21²³, 26²⁹; spoken by God, Dt 1^{34 f.}, 1 S 3¹⁴, ψ 95¹¹; similarly אִם-לֹא Gn 24^{37 f.}; spoken by God, Is 14²⁴, where אִם-לֹא occurs first with the perfect in the sense of a prophetic perfect, § 106 *n*, but in the parallel clause with the imperfect; Jer 22⁶; in Gn 31⁵² the negative oath introduced by אִם-אָנִי, אִם-אֶתָּה is immediately afterwards continued by לֹא with the imperfect.—In Ez 34¹⁰ the threat introduced in verse 8 by אִם-לֹא is, after a long parenthesis, resumed with הֲנִנִּי.
- d* (b) אִם and אִם-לֹא after formulae of cursing, e.g. 1 S 3¹⁷ כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה-לְךָ אֱלֹהִים וְכֹה יוֹסִיף אִם-תִּכְחַד מִפְּנֵי דָבָר וּג' *God do so to thee, and more also! thou shalt not hide anything from me, &c.*; cf. 1 S 25²². On the other hand, כִּי follows the curse, in 1 S 14⁴⁴, 1 K 2²³ (here with a perfect), and in 2 S 3³⁵ כִּי אִם; in 1 S 25³⁴ the preceding כִּי is repeated before אִם; in 1 S 20¹³ the purport of the asseveration is repeated (after the insertion of a conditional sentence) in the perfect consecutive.
- e* (c) אִם and אִם-לֹא as simple particles of asseveration, e.g. Ju 5⁸ מִיָּגוֹן אִם-יִרְאָה וְרִמַּח וּג' *truly, there was not a shield and spear seen, &c.*; Is 22¹⁴, Jb 6²⁸ (in the middle of the sentence); after חָלִילָה חָלִילָה *absit*, 2 S 20²⁰; אִם-לֹא with the imperf. Is 5⁹, with the perfect, Jb 22²⁰.

¹ Also combined חִי-יְהוָה וְחִי נַפְשֶׁךָ 1 S 20³, 25²⁶ *as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul (i.e. thou) liveth!* (Also in 2 S 11¹¹ read חִי-יְהוָה instead of the impossible חִיִּךְ). On חִי and חִי in these noun-clauses (prop. *living is the Lord, &c.*), cf. § 93 *aa*, note.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

נְהַלֵּל¹ אִם shall we go . . . or shall we forbear? Cf. also אֵן where? whither? אָנָּה whither, and J. Barth, *Sprachwiss. Untersuchungen*, i. 13 ff.

d The particular uses are as follows:—

(a) The particle הֲ stands primarily before the simple question, when the questioner is wholly uncertain as to the answer to be expected, and may be used either before noun-clauses, e.g. Gn 43⁷ הָעוֹד אֲבִיכֶם חַי הַיֵּשׁ לָכֶם אָח is your father yet alive? have ye another brother? for הַיֵּשׁ cf. Gn 24²³, 1 S 9¹¹; for הֲ הַיֵּשׁ is it that? Jb 6²²; for הֲ הַיֵּשׁ יֵשׁ is there yet? 2 S 9¹ (but in 2 S 23¹⁹ for הַיֵּשׁ read הֲ הַיֵּשׁ with 1 Ch 11²⁵); for הֲ אֵין is there not? 1 K 22⁷, &c.; or before verbal-clauses, e.g. Jb 2³ הֲ שָׁמַתָּ לְבַרְךָ hast thou considered my servant Job? In other cases הֲ (= num?) is used before questions, to which, from their tone and contents, a negative answer is expected, e.g. Jb 14¹⁴ הֲ יִחְיֶה shall he indeed live again? Sometimes a question is so used only as a rhetorical form instead of a negative assertion, or of a surprised or indignant refusal,² e.g. 2 S 7⁵ הֲ תִבְנֶה לִּי בַיִת shalt thou build me an house? (in the parallel passage 1 Ch 17⁴ לֹא תִבְנֶה וְגו' thou shalt not, &c.); Gn 4⁹ הֲ אֲנִי אֶחָיוֹ am I my brother's keeper? cf. 2 K 5⁷, and the two passages where הֲ is used before the infinitive (constr. Jb 34¹⁸, absol. Jb 40²; on both, see § 113 ee, with the note). —On the other hand, in 1 K 16³¹ for הֲ הַנֶּקֶל (after וַיְהִי) read הַנֶּקֶל.

e Rem. 1. A few passages deserve special mention, in which the use of the interrogative is altogether different from our idiom, since it serves merely to express the conviction that the contents of the statement are well known to the hearer, and are unconditionally admitted by him. Thus, Gn 3¹¹ surely thou hast eaten; Gn 27³⁶ הֲ כִּי קָרָא prop. is it so that one names? &c., i. e. of a truth he is rightly named Jacob; Gn 29¹⁵ verily thou art my brother; Dt 11³⁰, Ju 4⁶, 1 S 2²⁷ I did indeed, &c.; 20³⁷, 1 K 22³ ye know surely . . .; Mi 3¹, Jb 20⁴.— In 1 S 23¹⁹ (cf. ψ 54²) a surprising communication is introduced in this way (by הֲלֹא) in order to show it to be absolutely true, and in Am 9⁷ a concession is expressed by הֲלוֹא I have, it is true, &c. Finally, we may include the formula of quotation הֲלֹא הִיא כְּתוּבָה Jos 10¹³ or הֲלֹא הֵם כְּתוּבִים equivalent to surely it is, they are written (the latter in 1 K 11⁴¹, 14²⁹, and very often elsewhere in the books of Kings and Chronicles), synonymous with the simple formula of assertion הִנֵּה כְּתוּבָה 2 S 1¹⁸, and הִנֵּם כְּתוּבִים 1 K 14¹⁹, 2 K 15¹¹, 2 Ch 27⁷, 32³².

Of very frequent occurrence also are questions introduced by לָמָּה, which really contain an affirmation and are used to state the reason for a request or warning, e.g. 2 S 2²² turn thee aside . . . wherefore should I smite thee to the ground? i. e. otherwise I will (or must) smite, &c.; cf. 1 S 19¹⁷, and Driver on the passage; 2 Ch 25¹⁶; also Gn 27⁴⁵, Ex 32¹² (Jo 2¹⁷, ψ 79¹⁰, 115²); Ct 1⁷, Ec 5⁵, 7¹⁷, Dn 1¹⁰.

pronouns and adverbs into interrogative words by means of a prefixed אֵי, see the Lexicon.

¹ On the use of the *imperfect* in deliberative questions, see § 107 t; on the *perfectum confidentiae* in interrogative sentences, see § 106 n.

² Analogous to this is the use of the interrogative מָה in the sense of a reproachful remonstrance instead of a prohibition, as Ct 8⁴ מָה תַעֲרִירוּ why should ye stir up? i. e. pray, stir not up; cf. also Jb 31¹; see above, § 148.

2. The rare cases in which a *simple* question is introduced by אָן (as sometimes in Latin by *an? is it?*) are really due to the suppression of the first member of a double question; thus 1 K 1²⁷, Is 29¹⁶, Jb 6¹², 39¹³.

(b) Disjunctive questions are, as a rule, introduced by אָן—וְ (*utrum—an?*) *g* or sometimes by $\text{אָן}^1\text{—וְ}$, e. g. Jo 1², Jb 21⁴ (even with וְ repeated after אָן in a question which implies disbelief, Gn 17¹⁷). In Jb 34¹⁷, 40^{8 f.} special emphasis is given to the first member by אֲנִי־וְ prop. *is it even?* The second member is introduced by וְ or in 2 K 6²⁷, Jb 16³, 38²⁸, 31³⁶ (Mal 1⁸ וְ אִנִּי), in each case before ו , and hence no doubt for euphonic reasons, to avoid the combination וְ אָן ; cf. also Ju 18¹⁹, Ec 2¹⁹.

Double questions with $(\text{אָן})\text{ אָן—וְ}$ need not always be mutually exclusive; *h* frequently the disjunctive form serves (especially in poetic parallelism; but cf. also e. g. Gn 37⁸) merely to repeat the same question in different words, and thus to express it more emphatically. So Jb 4¹⁷ *shall mortal man be just before God? or (אָן) shall a man be pure before his Maker?* Jb 6^{5 f.}, 8³, 10^{4 f.}, 11^{2,7}, 22³, Is 10¹⁵, Jer 5²⁹. The second member may, therefore, just as well be connected by a simple וְ , e. g. Jb 13⁷, 15^{7 f.}, 38^{16 f. 22.32.39}; cf. also ψ 8⁵ after מָה ; Jb 21^{17 f.} after כִּי־מָה ; or even without a conjunction, Jb 8¹¹, 22⁴; after $\text{מָה } \psi$ 144³.

(c) With regard to *indirect* questions² after verbs of inquiring, doubting, *i* examining,³ &c., simple questions of this kind take either וְ *whether*, Gn 8^{8,4} or אָן Gn 15⁵, 2 K 1², Ct 7¹³; even before a noun-clause, Jer 5¹; in 1 S 20¹⁰ the indirect question is introduced by אִם , i. e. probably *if perchance*. In disjunctives (*whether—or*) אָן—וְ Nu 13¹⁸ at the end (or אִם־לֹא—וְ Gn 24^{21, 27²¹, 37³²}, Ex 16⁴), and וְ—וְ Nu 13¹⁸, which is followed by אָן—וְ ; also אִם—וְ Ec 2¹⁹. The formula אִם יוֹדֵעַ מִי has an affirmative force, *who knows whether . . . not*, like the Latin *nescio an*, Est 4¹⁴.

In Jon 1^{7,8} the relative pronouns שֶׁ and שֶׁר־אֲנִי owing to the following *k* לְמִי have become also interrogative, *for whose cause?*

(d) וְ and הֲוֵא (cf. § 136 c) immediately after the interrogative serve to *l* give vividness to the question; so also אָפֹא (for which אָפֹא five times in Job) *then, now*, Gn 27³³ מִי־אָפֹא הוּא *who then is he?* Ju 9⁸⁸, Is 19¹², Jb 17¹⁵; אִי־אָפֹא

¹ אָן occurs in Pr 27²⁴ after a negative statement; we should, however, with Dyserinck read וְאִין . Not less irregular is אִלֵּן instead of אִלֵּן אָן in the second clause of Ju 14¹⁵, but the text can hardly be correct (cf. Moore, *Judges*, New York, 1895, p. 337); in 1 S 23¹¹ the second וְ introduces a fresh question which is only loosely connected with the first.—In Nu 17²⁸ and in the third clause of Jb 6¹³, אָן־וְ is best taken with Ewald in the sense of אִלֵּן־וְ , since אָן from its use in oaths (see above, § 149 b) may simply mean *verily not*.

² It should here be remarked that the distinction between direct and indirect questions cannot have been recognized by the Hebrew mind to the same extent as it is in Latin or English. In Hebrew there is no difference between the two kinds of sentence, either as regards mood (as in Latin) or in tense and position of the words (as in English). Cf. also § 137 c.

³ In Gn 43⁶ the וְ after לְהַגִּיד is explained from the fact that the latter, according to the context, implies *to give information upon a question*.

⁴ Also in Ec 3²¹ we should read הֲוֵא־וְ and הֲוֵא־וְ (*whether—whether*) instead of the article which is assumed by the Masora.

where then is . . . ? However, **אִי־בֵּן** may also be placed at the end of the entire question (Ex 33¹⁶, Is 22¹; also Ho 13¹⁰, since either **הִי־אֵל** is a dialectical form of **הֵאֵל**, or **הֵאֵל** should be read instead of it) or at the beginning of the question proper, after a strongly emphasized word, as in Gn 27^{37.1}

m (e) Sometimes one interrogative governs two co-ordinate clauses, the first of which should rather be subordinated to the second, so that the interrogative word strictly speaking affects only the second; thus Is 5⁴ after **מִדָּרְיָן** *wherefore looked I . . . and it brought forth?* i. e. wherefore brought it forth, while I looked, &c.; Is 50²; after **הֵן** Nu 32⁶, Jer 8⁴, also Nu 16²² (read **שִׂאֵי־הֵן**); after **לֵלֵהָלֵל** Jos 22²⁰; after **לִפְתָּח** Is 58³, 2 Ch 32⁴; after **אֶל־כֹּחַ** Is 40²⁵.² But **הֵן** Jb 4² and **לֵלֵהָלֵל** 4²¹ are separated from the verb to which they belong by the insertion of a conditional clause.

n 3. The affirmative answer is generally expressed, as in Latin, by repeating the emphatic word in the question (or with the second person changed to the first, Gn 24⁵⁹, 27²⁴, 29⁵, Ju 13¹¹), Gn 29⁶, 37^{32 f.}, 1 S 23¹¹, 26¹⁷, 1 K 21¹⁰, Jer 37¹⁷. (On **וַיִּי** *if it be so* in the corrected text of 2 K 10¹⁵, see § 159 *dd.*) As a negative answer the simple **אֵל** is sometimes sufficient, as in Gn 19², 1 K 3²², &c.; cf. § 152 c; and in Ju 4²⁰ the simple **אֵין** equivalent to *no* or *no one*.

§ 151. Desiderative Sentences.

a A wish may be expressed not only by the simple imperfect (§ 107 n), cohortative (§ 108, especially with **אֲנִי** § 108 c), jussive (§ 109; with **אֲנִי** § 109 b), imperative (§ 110 a), perfect consecutive (§ 112 aa) or by a simple noun-clause (§ 116 r, note, and § 141 g) but also in the following ways:—

1. By exclamations in the form of *interrogative* clauses:³ especially sentences with **וַ** followed by the imperfect as being the mood of that which is still unfulfilled but possible, and hence also of that which is desired, e. g. 2 S 15⁴ **מִי־יִשְׁפֹּטֵנִי שֹׁפֵט** *who maketh me judge? i. e. O that I were made judge!* 1 S 20¹⁰, 2 S 23¹⁵. On the other hand, **וַ** with the perfect (Gn 21⁷, Nu 23¹⁰, 1 S 26⁹, Is 53¹, &c.) or participle (**וַ** 59⁸, Pr 24²², &c.), rather expresses a rhetorical question, i. e. a denial, cf. § 150 d. Especially frequent is the use of **מִי־יִתֵּן** (prop. *who gives?*) to introduce all kinds of desiderative clauses (see under b).—In Mal 1¹⁰ the desiderative clause proper is co-ordinated with an interrogative clause,

¹ On the other hand, in Jb 9²⁴ and 24²⁵ **אִי־בֵּן** is not prefixed to the **וַ**, but appended to the conditional sentence.

² Cf. the analogous sentences after **וַ** *because*, Is 65¹², Jer 35¹⁷; after causal **וַ** 1 S 26²³; after **וַ** Is 12¹; likewise after **וַ** § 153 at the end; after **וַ** Dt 8¹²⁻¹⁴, 25³, Jos 6¹⁸, 2 S 12²⁸.

³ The transition from a question to a wish may be seen, e. g. in Nu 11⁴ *who shall give us flesh to eat? i. e. O that we had flesh to eat!*



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

§ 152. Negative Sentences.

a 1. Besides the use of rhetorical questions (§§ 150 *d*, 151 *a*), independent sentences are made negative by the adverbs לֹא (Jb 6²¹, where instead of the *Keth.* לוֹ we must evidently read לֹא; perhaps preserved as a substantive)=the Greek οὐ, *not*, -לֹא=μή (Jb 24²⁵ as a substantive), אֵין (*it is*) *not*; טַרְטָרָם *not yet*, אֵפְסָם *not*, אֵפְסִי (cf. § 90 *m*) *not*. The forms בַּל, בְּלִי, בְּלִיתִי *not* belong almost entirely to poetry.—With regard to לֹא and אֵין the main distinction is that verbal-clauses (rarely noun-clauses, see *e*) are regularly negated by לֹא (besides its use as negating *single words*¹), while אֵין is used exclusively with noun-clauses (see the examples below).

b The conjunctions פֶּן and לְבִלְתִּי *that not*, serve to negative dependent clauses. The particular uses of these particles are as follows:—

(*a*) לֹא (less frequently לוֹא), like οὐ, οὐκ, is used regularly for the *objective, unconditional* negation, and hence is usually connected with the perfect or imperfect (as indicative); on לֹא with the imperfect to express an unconditional prohibition, see § 107 *o*; on its use with the jussive, see § 109 *d*.—On לֹא for הֲלֹא *nonne*, in interrogative sentences, cf. § 150 *a*. In connexion with כָּל, כָּל- (=*any*), לֹא is used to express an *absolute* negation, *nullus, none whatever* (cf. the French *ne . . . personne, ne . . . rien*), usually in the order כָּל . . . לֹא, e.g. Gn 3¹ לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִכָּל עֵץ הַגֶּן ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden; 9¹¹, Ex 10¹⁵, 20¹⁰, Lv 7²³, Dt 8⁹, Jer 13⁷, 32¹⁷ (כָּל-דָּבָר . . . לֹא *nothing at all*; cf. the same statement in the form of a rhetorical question, Jer 32²⁷); Pr 12²¹, 30³⁰

¹ Especially in compounds, e.g. לֹא-אֱלֹהִים lit. *a no-God* (Germ. *Ungott*) who is indeed called a god, but is not really a god, Dt 32²¹; לֹא אֱלֹהִים verse 17, cf. Jer 5⁷, 2 Ch 13⁹; לֹא-עַם lit. *a not-people* (Germ. *Unvolk*), Dt 32²¹; לֹא דָבָר *a nothing*, Am 6¹³; לֹא עֵץ lit. *not-wood*, Is 10¹⁵; לֹא-אִישׁ, לֹא-אָדָם lit. *not-man, superhuman* (of God), Is 31⁸; לֹא-צַדִּיק *unrighteousness*, Jer 22¹³, cf. Ez 22²⁹; לֹא-סִדְרִים *disorder*, Jb 10²²; לֹא-חֲמָם *not-violence*, 16¹⁷; after לֹא Jb 26²¹. (לֹא-כֹחַ, לֹא-עֵז *helplessness*, לֹא חֲכָמָה *insipientia*); cf. also Is 55² לֹא לְשִׁבְעָה *for what is unsatisfying*; ψ 44¹³, Jb 8¹¹, 15³², 1 Ch 12³³.—In Nu 20⁵ a construct state with several genitives is negated by לֹא.—Also לֹא is used with an infinitive, Nu 35²³; with an adjective, לֹא חָכָם *unwise*, Dt 32⁶, Ho 13¹³; לֹא-חַסִּיד *impious*, ψ 43¹; לֹא-עֲצוּם and לֹא-עֲצוּמוֹת *not strong*, Pr 30^{25f.}; לֹא-בֵן *unsuitably*, 2 K 7⁹; לֹא-טוֹב *not-good*, Is 65², Ez 20²⁵, &c.; לֹא טָהוֹר *not-clean*, 2 Ch 30¹⁷; with a participle, e.g. Jer 2² (*unsown*); 6⁸, Ez 4¹⁴, 22²⁴, Zp 2¹, 3⁵; the Masora, however, requires נִחְמָה in Is 54¹¹, נִעְזְבָה in 62¹², נִוְשְׁבָה in Jer 6⁸, נִחְמָה in Ho 1⁶, i.e. always 3rd sing. fem. perf. in pause=*she was not comforted*, &c., and consequently not compounds, but either relative clauses or (Is 54¹¹, Ho 1⁶, and especially 2²⁵) main clauses instead of proper names.—On the abc7e compounds generally, cf. the dissertation mentioned in § 81 *d*, note 2; on their use in sentences expressing a state, to convey attributive ideas, see *u* below.

לֹא . . . מִפְּנֵי-כָל and turneth *not* away for any; 2 Ch 32¹⁵; but cf. also the inverted order, Ex 12¹⁶ כָּל-מְלָאכָה לֹא-יַעֲשֶׂה no manner of work shall be done; 12⁴³, 15²⁶, 22²¹, Lv 16¹⁷, Jb 33¹³, Dn 11³⁷. The meaning is different when כָּל by being determinate is used in the sense of *whole*, e. g. Nu 23¹³ כָּלֹּא לֹא תִרְאֶה thou shalt not see them all, but only a part.

Analogous to לֹא . . . כָּל is the use of לֹא . . . אִישׁ Gn 23⁶, &c., in verbal-clauses in the sense of *no one at all, not a single one*. On אִין-כָּל nothing at all, see under *p*.

Rem. 1. The examples in which לֹא is used absolutely as a negative answer, *c* equivalent to *certainly not! no!* must be regarded as extremely short verbal-clauses, e. g. Gn 19² (לֹא according to the context for לֹא נִסְוֹר &c.); 23¹¹, 42¹⁰, Hag 2¹², Jb 23⁶, sometimes with a following כִּי but, Gn 19² (see above); Jos 5¹⁴, 1 K 3²².

2. The negation of *noun-clauses* by לֹא (as opposed to the regular negation *d* by אִין) always includes a certain emphasis, since the force of the negation falls rather upon a particular word (cf. e. g. Ez 36³²), than upon the whole clause. In 2 S 3³⁴ לֹא-אִסְרוֹת יָדֶיךָ thy hands were not bound, a participle is thus specially negated by לֹא; cf. ψ 74⁹, where, however, לֹא is separated from the participle by אֶתְּנִי, and Jb 12³. As a rule, noun-clauses with a pronominal subject are thus negated by לֹא, Gn 20¹², Nu 35²³ (Dt 4⁴², 19⁴); 1 S 15²⁹, 2 S 21², Jer 4²², ψ 22⁷, Jb 28¹⁴, parallel with אִין; generally with לֹא before a substantival predicate, e. g. Ex 4¹⁰ לֹא אִישׁ דְּבָרִים אֲנֹכִי I am not a man of words; Am 5¹⁸.—Noun-clauses with a substantival subject, Gn 29⁷, Nu 23¹⁹, Is 22², 44¹⁹, Hag 1², ψ 22³, Jb 9³², 18¹⁷, 21⁹, 22¹⁶, 36²⁶ (with ׀ of the apodosis); 41²; in Jb 9³³ even לֹא יִשׁ non est is used instead of אִין.—In Pr 18⁵ לֹא is used before an adjectival predicate; in 1 S 20²⁶ (where a preceding noun-clause is negated by בְּלִתִּי) read לֹא טָהוֹר with the LXX, for אִין לֹא. On אִין for לֹא in circumstantial clauses to express attributive ideas, see *u* below.

3. As a rule לֹא stands immediately before the verb, but sometimes is *e* separated from it (frequently to bring into special prominence another word which follows it); thus Jb 22⁷, Ec 10¹⁰ before the object and verb; Nu 16²⁹ before the subject and verb; Dt 8⁹, 2 S 3³⁴, ψ 49¹⁸, 103¹⁰, Jb 13¹⁶, 34²³ before a complementary adjunct. In Dt 32⁵ לֹא according to the accentuation even stands at the end of the clause (*they offend him not*); but undoubtedly לֹא בָנָיו are to be taken together.—On the position of לֹא with the infinitive absolute, see § 113 *v*.

(b) לֹא- is used like *μή* and *ne* to express a *subjective* and *conditional* negation, *f* and hence especially in connexion with the jussive (§ 109 *c* and *e*) to introduce prohibitions, warnings, negative desires, and requests. On לֹא- with the imperfect, see § 107 *p*; with the cohortative, see § 108 *c*; on 2 K 6²⁷, see § 109 *h*.

Rem. 1. לֹא- (like לֹא, see note on *a* above) may be used to form a compound *g* word, as in Pr 12²⁸ לֹא-מָוֶת not-death (immortality); though all the early versions read מָוֶת-לֹא. The instances in which לֹא appears to stand absolutely, equivalent to *no, certainly not* (like *μή* for *μή γένηται*), e. g. Ru 1¹³ אֵל בָּנֹתַי nay, my daughters, and Gn 19¹⁸, 33¹⁰ (אֵל-נָא), are also due (see under *c*) to extreme shortening of a full clause (in 2 S 13²⁵ such a clause is repeated immediately

afterwards); thus in 2 S 1²¹, Is 62², ψ 83² יהי is evidently to be supplied, and in Jo 2¹³, Am 5¹⁴, Pr 8¹⁰ the corresponding jussive from the preceding imperatives, in Pr 17¹² from the preceding infinitive absolute.

ל 2. לֹא, like אֵל, regularly stands immediately before the verb, but in Is 64⁸, Jer 10²⁴, 15¹⁵, ψ 6², 38² before another strongly emphasized member of the sentence.¹

ז (c) אֵין construct state (unless it be sometimes merely a contracted connective form, cf. שְׁנַיִם for שְׁנַיִם § 97 d) of אֵין non-existence (as also the absolute state, see below) is the negative of שׁי existence; cf. e.g. Gn 31²⁹ with Neh 5⁵. As שׁי (he, she, it is, was, &c.) includes the idea of being in all tenses, so אֵין, אֵין includes the idea of not being in all tenses. Hence—

כ (1) The absolute state אֵין, with an evident transition to the meaning of a verbal predicate, *there does not exist*, always follows the word negatived, e.g. Is 37³ (2 K 19³) וְכַח אֵין לְלַדָּה and strength does not exist to bring forth; Gn 2⁵ אֵין was not present; Ex 17⁷ אֵין-אִם or is he not? after הֲיִשׁ is he . . . ? (cf. Nu 13²⁰); Lv 26³⁷, Nu 20⁵, Ju 4²⁰ (אֵין no). In 1 S 9⁴ and 10¹⁴ אֵין is used in reference to a plural; 1 K 18¹⁰, Is 41¹⁷, 45²¹, 59¹¹, Mi 7², Pr 13⁴, 25¹⁴, Jb 3⁹ וְאֵין and let there be none, let none come! Ec 3¹⁹.—Cf. finally אֵין-אִם if it be not so, Gn 30¹, Ex 32³², Ju 9¹⁵, 2 K 2¹⁰.—Quite anomalous is אֵין Jb 35¹⁵ before a perfect as an emphatic negation; the text, however, can hardly be correct.

ל (2) The construct state אֵין stands in its natural position immediately before the substantive whose non-existence it predicates, or before the subject of the sentence which is to be negatived. To the former class belong also the very numerous instances in which אֵין is joined to a participle, e.g. 1 S 26¹² וְאֵין רָאָה וְאֵין יוֹדַע וְאֵין מִקִּין and there was not one seeing, &c., i. e. and no man saw it, nor knew it, neither did any awake; so especially וְאֵין with a participle in subordinate circumstantial or descriptive clauses, such as Is 5²⁹ וְאֵין מְצִיל and he shall carry it away, while there is none delivering, i. e. without any one's delivering it; ψ 7³, &c.; Lv 26⁶ &c., וְאֵין מַחְרִיד without any one's making you afraid; cf. § 141 e. אֵין is used as the negation of an entire noun-clause, e.g. in Gn 39²³, Nu 14⁴² אֵין יְהוָה בְּקִרְבְּכֶם the Lord is not among you; Gn 37²⁹ אֵין-יוֹסֵף Joseph was not in the pit.

מ (3) When the subject which is to be negatived is a personal pronoun, it is joined as a suffix to אֵין, according to § 100 o, e.g. אֵיןִי I am not, was not, shall not be; אֵיןִיךְ, fem. אֵיןִיךְ, thou art not, &c.; אֵיןִיָּהּ, fem. אֵיןִיָּהּ, he, she is not, &c.; also absolutely, Gn 42¹³ he is (5²⁴ he was) no longer alive; אֵיןֵם they are not, &c. When the accompanying predicate is a verb, it follows again (see l) in the form of a participle, since אֵין always introduces a noun-clause, e.g. Ex 5¹⁰ אֵיןִי נָתַן I will not give; 8¹⁷, Dt 1³².

נ Rem. In Neh 4¹⁷ אֵיןִי אֵיןִי אֵיןִי for אֵיןִיִּי is due to its being co-ordinate with three other (substantival) subjects; these are again expressly summed up in אֵיןִי-אֵיןִי-אֵיןִי.—In Hag 2¹⁷ אֵין אֵיןִי אֵיןִי the pronominal complement of אֵין appears

¹ In Jer 51³ the pointing לֹא־לְ occurs twice instead of לֹא־לְ, and is thus, in the opinion of the Masoretes, equivalent to *against him that bendeth*; but undoubtedly we should read לֹא־לְ.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

לֹבְלָתִי as the regular negative with the infinitive construct, see § 114 s; on לֹבְלָתִי as a conjunction, see *x* below.

On אֵן as a negative particle in oaths (*verily not*), see § 149 c above.

u Rem. on לֹא, אֵין, בְּלִי. To the category of negative sentences belongs also the expression of negative attributes by means of לֹא, בְּלִי *not* (both so used almost exclusively in poetic language) or אֵין with a following substantive, mostly in the simplest form of circumstantial clause; e.g. 2 S 23⁴ בֶּקֶר לֹא בָּקֶר עֲבוֹת *a morning when there are not clouds, i. e. a cloudless morning*; cf. Jb 12²⁴, 26^{2b}, 38²⁶ (לֹא-אִישׁ *where no man is, i. e. uninhabited*); 1 Ch 2^{30.32} לֹא בָנִים *childless*; so also בְּלִי e.g. Jb 24¹⁰ and אֵין e.g. ψ 88⁵ *I am as a man אֵין-אֵיל there is not help, i. e. like a helpless man*; Is 9⁶ אֵין-קֵץ *endless*; 47¹, Ho 7¹¹; אֵין-מִסְפָּר *countless*, Ct 6⁸, &c., but usually (ψ 104²⁵, &c.) like a proper circumstantial clause (cf. § 141 e) connected by *Wāw*, וְאֵין-מִסְפָּר.—Less frequently such periphrases take the form of relative clauses (cf. § 155 e), e.g. Jb 30¹³ לֹא עֹזֵר לָמוֹ *they for whom there is no helper, i. e. the helpless* (but probably עֹזֵר is only an intrusion from 29¹², and we should read עֲצֵר *without any one's restraining them*; in 29¹² translate *the fatherless and him that had none to help him*; in ψ 72¹² וְאֵין-עֵץ is used in the same sense); Hb 1¹⁴; with אֵין Is 45⁹ *thy work is that of a man who hath no hands*; Zc 9¹¹ *out of the waterless pit*.¹

u How far such compounds finally came to be regarded by the language simply as negative adjectives, may be seen partly from the fact that they (as also relative clauses analogous to the above) are frequently co-ordinated with real adjectives, Jo 1⁶, ψ 72¹², Jb 29¹²; cf. also Is 59¹⁰, where אֵין-עֵינָיִם is parallel with בְּעֹרֵים; partly from their being introduced by the sign of the dative לְ, e.g. Is 40²⁹ (= *and to the powerless*); Jb 26^{2 a.3}, Neh 8¹⁰.

w (i) אֵין *lest, that not*, at the beginning of a clause expressing a fear or precaution, hence especially after such ideas as *fearing*, Gn 32¹², &c. (cf. *δεῖδω μή, vereor ne*), *taking heed*, frequently after הִשָּׁמֵר, הִשָּׁמְרוּ Gn 24⁶, 31²⁴, &c., *taking care*, 2 K 10²³, &c. Not infrequently the idea on which אֵין depends, is only virtually contained in the main clause, e.g. Gn 19¹⁹ *I cannot escape to the mountain* (because I am afraid), אֵין-תִּרְבַּקְנִי הַרְעָה *lest some evil overtake me*; Gn 26⁹, 38¹¹; also in Gn 44³⁴ from the rhetorical question *how shall I . . . ?* we must understand *I cannot*, governing אֵין. This is especially the case after an appeal to do or not to do an action by which something may be prevented (in which case אֵין is simply equivalent to the final *ne*); cf. e.g. Gn 11⁴, 19¹⁵, Nu 20¹⁸ (where אֵין *lest* is separated from the verb by a strongly emphasized substantive); Ju 15¹² after *swear unto me*; Pr 24¹⁸.—In Gn 3²² *and now, lest he put forth his hand*, &c., אֵין is to be regarded as virtually dependent on a cohortative, which immediately afterwards (verse 23) is changed into an historic tense; cf. also Gn 26⁷, 31³¹, 42⁴ Ex 13¹⁷, 1 S 13¹⁹, 27¹¹, ψ 38¹⁷, in every case after כִּי אֶמְרָתִי, כִּי אֶמַר, &c. = *I thought, &c., I must beware lest, &c.*

Rem. According to § 107 q, אֵין is naturally followed by the imperfect; for the exceptions, 2 S 20⁶, 2 K 2¹⁶, see § 107 q, note 3; cf. moreover, 2 K 10²³ אֵין-יֵשׁ-פֹּה *look lest there be here, &c.*

¹ In Pr 9¹³ (perhaps also 14⁷; but see Delitzsch on the passage) a verbal-clause is used co-ordinately in this way as a periphrasis for an adjective.

(k) לְבַלְתִּי *that . . . not*, with the imperfect, Ex 20²⁰, 2 S 14¹⁴ (in Jer 23¹⁴ *x* read the infinitive שׁוּב for יָשָׁב, in 27⁸ יָבֵאוּ for בָּאוּ). In Ez 13³ בְּלִתֵּי רָאוּ is a relative clause governed by לְ = *according to things which they have not seen*.

2. Two negatives in the same sentence do not neutralize each other *y* (as in *nonnulli, non nemo*), but make the negation the more emphatic (like οὐκ οὐδεὶς, οὐκ οὐδαμῶς, *nulli—non, nemo non*); e. g. Zp 2² (if the text is correct) בְּטָרָם לֹא-יָבוֹא *before there shall (not) come*.¹ This especially applies to the compounds formed by the union of אֵין or בְּלִי with מִן *without* (§ 119 *y*), e. g. Is 5⁹ (6¹¹) מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב (for which in Jer 2¹⁵ מִבְּלִי יוֹשֵׁב), *prop. without no inhabitant, i. e. so that no inhabitant is left there*. On the other hand, in Is 50² מֵאֵין מַיִם the מִן is causative, *because there is no water*; as also in Ex 14¹¹ הֲמִבְּלִי אֵין-יֵין *is it because there were no . . . ?* 2 K 1^{3.6.16}. In Ec 3¹¹ מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא *except that (yet so that man cannot, &c.)*.

3. The negative sometimes extends its influence from the first to *z* a second negative sentence parallel with it (which may or may not have *Wāw*); e. g. 1 S 2³ *talk not so much arrogancy; let (not) boasting come out of your mouth*; Ex 28⁴³, Lv 19¹², 22^{9.15} ^f, Nu 16¹⁴, 23¹⁹, Dt 7²⁵, Is 23⁴, 28²⁷, 38¹⁸, 47¹⁴, Ez 16⁴⁷, ψ 9¹⁹, 13⁵, 35¹⁹, 38², 44¹⁹, 75⁶, Jb 28¹⁷ (so לָמָּה לֹא *why . . . not ?* in Jb 3¹¹ also affects the parallel clause).

§ 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses.

The particles אֵין, רַק *only*, serve to introduce restrictive clauses, and אֲדַ, אֲדַ *also, besides, even*, intensive clauses. It is to be observed that the force of these particles does not necessarily affect the word which immediately follows (as is the case with אֵין Gn 7²³, 34¹⁵; רַק Gn 6⁵, Am 3²; even אֵין הֲרִק *hath he indeed only ?* Nu 12²; אֲדַ Gn 27³⁴, Jb 7¹¹; אֲדַ Dt 15¹⁷), but very frequently extends to the whole of the following sentence. Thus with אֵין, e. g. Nu 14⁹, 1 K 17¹³, Pr 17¹¹, Jb 13¹⁵, 14²², 16⁷, 23⁶; רַק Gn 20¹¹, 24⁸, ψ 32⁶, Pr 13¹⁰; אֲדַ Gn 27³³, 32²¹ (אֲדַ הֲיִנָּה), 44¹⁰; 1 S 22⁷, 28²⁰, Zc 9¹¹, Pr 17²⁶, 20¹¹; אֲדַ Jb 14³, 15⁴.—In Mal 1¹⁰ and Jb 2¹⁰ אֲדַ is placed before two co-ordinate sentences, although, strictly speaking, it applies only to the second. Cf. the analogous examples in § 150 *m*.

¹ In 1 K 10²¹ אֵין-פְּסָף goes with what precedes and must be emended, with the LXX and Lucian, to פִּי הַפְּסָף.

§ 154. Sentences connected by Wāw.

α *Wāw copulativum*¹ (ו) serves to connect two or more sentences, or single words (on its various vocalization, cf. § 104 d-g). Its use, however, is by no means restricted merely to joining sentences which

¹ For further particulars of the use of *wāw copulativum*, see Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, i. 393 ff. On its use in the co-ordination of similar tenses and moods (e.g. five imperfects consecutive in Gn 25³⁴, five perfects with וַיְהִי) as well as of dissimilar tenses and moods, the remarks made in the treatment of the tenses will suffice. With regard to the connexion of single nouns by ו (which strictly speaking is always really a contraction of so many clauses into a single sentence) the following observations may be made:—

(a) Contrary to English usage, which in lengthy enumerations uses the *and* to connect only the last member of the series, in Hebrew *polysyndeton* is customary, as in Gn 12¹⁶ *wāw copulativum* six times, 24³⁵ seven times, 15^{19ff.} nine times, and in Jos 7²⁴ ten times. Sometimes, however, only the last two words are joined (so in a series of three members, Gn 5³², 10¹, 11²⁶, 13², 14¹, 30³⁹, &c.; the last three out of a series of four, Jer 2²⁶); less frequently only the first two, ψ 45⁹; cf. § 132 d. The formula הַיּוֹם שֶׁלִּשְׁמַיְתָא *yesterday (and) the day before yesterday*, Ex 5⁸, &c., is always without the copula. On the other hand, the *constructio asyndetos* in a series of verbs is used as a rhetorical expedient to produce a hurried and so an impassioned description; e.g. Ju 5²⁷ *at her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay*; Ex 15⁹, Dt 32¹⁵, 1 S 15⁶, Jer 4⁷, Am 5²¹, ψ 10¹⁰, 14¹, 45⁵, Jb 20¹⁹, 28⁴, 29⁸, Ct 2¹¹, 5⁶, &c.

(b) Frequently *wāw copulativum* is also *explanatory* (like *isque, et—quidem*, and the German *und zwar*, English *to wit*), and is then called *wāw explicativum*, e.g. Gn 4⁴ *and (i.e. namely) of the fat thereof* (unless it is simply copulative); Ex 24¹², 25¹² (*to wit two*); 27¹⁴, 28²³, Ju 17³ (in וַיִּמְסַכֶּה; here as often elsewhere, to introduce an explanatory gloss, cf. Is 17⁸, Ez 3¹⁵, and especially P. Haupt, *SBOT. Isaiah*, p. 90, l. 21 ff.), 1 S 17³⁴ *and that too with the bear*; 2 S 13²⁰, Is 57¹¹, Jer 17¹⁰, Am 3¹¹, 4¹⁰, Ze 9⁹, Pr 3¹², Neh 8¹³, 2 Ch 23¹⁰ (but in 1 S 28³ the ו before בְּעִירָא is to be omitted with the LXX); cf. also such combinations as מִן—וְעַד *from . . . and even to . . .*, Gn 13³, 14²³, 19^{4,11}, &c.—In 1 S 6¹¹ (see Driver on the passage), 2 S 1²³, &c., ו is equivalent to *yea, and*; in Is 32⁷ *even*.

ו is used to express emphasis (= *and especially*), e.g. in Gn 3¹⁶ וַיְהִי־נָה; Is 2¹, ψ 18¹, perhaps also in Jb 10¹⁷ *yea, a whole host*; 2 Ch 16¹⁴.—An undoubted example of what is called *wāw concomitantiae* occurs in Jb 41¹² *a seething pot with burning rushes*; cf. Ex 10¹⁰ (*with your little ones*), 12⁸, Lv 1¹², Is 42⁵. In Arabic this *wāw concom.* is followed by the accusative.

ו—ו is used in the sense of *both—and* in ψ 76⁷, Dn 1³, 8¹³. On ו—ו as meaning *sive—sive*, cf. § 162 b.

(c) See the Lexicon on adverbs used in a copulative sense, such as אֲנִי also, moreover, summing up a number, e.g. אֲנִי—אֲנִי both together, Gn 27⁴⁵, Pr 17¹⁵; אֲנִי—אֲנִי all together; as an intensive *and*, e.g. Gn 30⁸, 37⁷, 1 S 30⁸; cf. also such examples as 1 S 24¹² *see, yea see!* אֲנִי—אֲנִי or אֲנִי—אֲנִי Gn 24⁴⁴ = *both—and*; אֲנִי occurs three times in Gn 24²⁵ and 32²⁰; also אֲנִי, which is generally still more intensive, in the sense of *also, in addition to this, even*, and belongs rather to poetry, and to the later language; frequently also equivalent to a mere *and*, but sometimes adversative *but now*, ψ 44¹⁰, &c.; and אֲנִי—אֲנִי (also three times), equivalent to *both—and*; cf. אֲנִי אֲנִי *and even*, Lv 26⁴⁴; אֲנִי—אֲנִי prop. *add to this also that*, equivalent to *not to mention*, according to the context either *quanto magis* or *quanto minus*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

in poetic style, the attributive relation is expressed by simple co-ordination.¹

c The governing substantive or pronoun is frequently (in certain cases *always*) resumed by a pronominal suffix or an adverb. The resumption may, however, be omitted, just as in relative clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר, &c.; see § 138 f.

d In Arabic a distinction is made between relative clauses used for the nearer definition of a *determinate* substantive (*ṣila*), and those which are attached to an *indeterminate* substantive (*ṣifa*). The former must be introduced by the demonstrative pronoun *alladī*, the latter are always simply co-ordinated. The same distinction was no doubt originally observed in Hebrew, since simply co-ordinated relative clauses are most commonly found after *indeterminate* substantives (see the examples below), and in cases like Dt 28⁴⁹ (אֲשֶׁר לֹא-תִשְׁמַע לְשׁוֹנוֹ) *a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand*; cf. Is 66¹³, and especially 1 S 3¹¹), the addition of אֲשֶׁר is explained from the special stress laid on the indeterminate substantive,² *a nation of such a kind, thou understandest not their tongue*. On the other hand, in poetic style at least, אֲשֶׁר is somewhat frequently omitted even after a determinate noun, but only rarely in prose (except by the Chronicler; cf. 1 Ch 9²², 12²³, 29¹ (read prob. אֲשֶׁר for אֲחֵר), 2 Ch 15¹¹; after כִּי 1 Ch 29³, 2 Ch 18²³, 30¹⁷, 31¹⁹, Ezr 1⁶, but also Gn 39⁴; for further instances, see Driver, *Introd.*⁸, p. 537, no. 30); so Ex 18²⁰, Ju 8¹, 20¹⁵, 1 K 13¹² (= which way), so 2 K 3⁸, 2 Ch 18²³; Neh 13²³; after a pronominal subject, 1 S 6⁹. In Jer 52¹² for עַמֶּר read עִמֶּר with the LXX.

e 2. If the nearer definition of a substantive or pronoun is effected by simple co-ordination of the relative clause, it may take the form—

(a) Of a noun-clause, e.g. 2 S 20²¹ *a man of the hill country of Ephraim* שֵׁבַע שְׁמוֹ *whose name was Sheba*; Zc 6¹², Jb 1¹, 3¹⁵ *with princes* לָהֶם זָהָב *that had gold*; ψ 11⁴, Pr 22¹¹; when referring to a noun-suffix, e.g. ψ 49¹⁴ לָמוֹ לְמֹלֵךְ *this is the way of them who have (self-)confidence*.—On periphrases of this kind to express negative attributes, as in Jb 38²⁶ עַל-אֶרֶץ לֹא-אִישׁ *on a land where no man is*, see § 152 u, and cf. for this very short form of the relative clause, Gn 15¹³ לֹא לָהֶם בְּאֶרֶץ *in a land that belongs not to them*; Dt 32¹⁷ (לְשָׂרִים לֹא אֱלֹהִים); Hb 1⁶, Pr 26¹⁷ (לֹא-לוֹ).

f (b) Of a verbal clause.

Here we must distinguish the cases in which the retrospective pronoun—

(1) Is the subject of the relative clause, and is contained in the

¹ The old view that all these cases arise from the *omission* of אֲשֶׁר is incorrect. These co-ordinated attributive clauses are rather a mere subdivision of the various kinds of circumstantial clauses (see § 156) which may be attached to a *nomen regens*. Cf. in English *this is the letter (which) he wrote to me*.

² So Baumann, *op. cit.*, p. 14 f., following Böttcher, *Lehrbuch*, ii. 80.

verb; so after a determinate substantive, ψ 34⁹ *happy is the man* יְחַסְדוֹ-בּוֹ *that trusteth in him*; Jb 3^{3b} הַלַּיְלָה אָמַר *the night which said*; after כֹּל- ψ 71¹⁸; referring to a vocative, which is determinate in itself even without the article, Is 54¹, or to a noun-suffix (see under *e*), ψ 16⁴; after an indeterminate substantive, e. g. Jb 31¹² *it is a fire* (that) *devoureth unto Abaddon*; Dt 32^{17b}, 1 S 6⁹, Is 55¹³, 56², ψ 68³¹, 78⁶, Pr 30¹⁷, La 1¹⁰, 2 Ch 28⁹; referring to the suffix in הִנְנִי Is 28¹⁶, prop. *behold me, who have laid*, &c., but perhaps the participle יֹסֵר is to be read; 29¹⁴, 38⁵ (but probably again the participle יֹסֵר should be read instead of the imperfect); Ez 25⁷. The relative clause is used in this way especially to supply the place of an adjective, e. g. Gn 49²⁷ זֶבֶד־אֶרְוֹ *a wolf that ravineth, i. e. a raving wolf*; Is 51¹²; to express a negative quality, e. g. Is 40²⁰, Ho 4¹⁴ עַם לֹא-יָבִין *an undiscerning people*.

Rem. Very frequently such relative sentences are attached to substantives *g* which have the particle of comparison כִּי, e. g. Jb 7² כִּי-עֹבֵד יִשְׁאַף-צֶלַע *as a servant that earnestly desireth the shadow*, &c.; Dt 32¹¹, Is 62¹, Jer 23²⁹, Ho 6³, ψ 42², 83¹⁵, Jb 9²⁶, 11¹⁶; so also after כִּי-כִמוֹ ψ 58⁵; after a determinate substantive, e. g. Is 53⁷ (but the better reading is כִּי-שָׁה without the article), 61^{10f.}, Hb 2¹⁴, ψ 49^{13.21}, 125¹; see also the examples under *h*. Sometimes it seems simpler in such cases, to take the verb directly as predicate to the preceding substantive, and to explain כִּי (for כִּי-אֲשֶׁר; see *Comparative Clauses*, § 161 b) as a conjunction—a view which even Hupfeld was ready to accept, at least as regards ψ 90⁵, 125¹, Is 53⁷, 61¹¹, but it can hardly be right.

(2) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun represents an *h* accusative of the object, or would do so if not suppressed, as it usually is in such cases in relative clauses with אֲשֶׁר, cf. § 138 b. Examples with the retrospective pronoun are, Dt 32¹⁷ אֱלֹהִים לֹא יָדְעוּם *gods whom they knew not* (see also the end of the verse); after a substantive with כִּי (see above, *g*), Jer 23⁹, Jb 13²⁸. Without a retrospective pronoun, after a determinate substantive, Ju 8¹, ψ 33¹² (preceded by a relative clause with אֲשֶׁר); Jb 28¹. Other examples of this kind, though the article is omitted according to poetic usage, are Is 15⁷ (יִתְּרָה עֲשָׂה), for which Jer 48³⁶ יִתְּרַת עֲשָׂה with the substantive in the construct state governing the relative clause, see § 130 d), ψ 7¹⁶, 51¹⁰, La 1²¹.—Without the retrospective pronoun, after an indeterminate substantive, e. g. Is 6⁶ רֶצְפָה בְּמִלְקָחַיִם לָקַח מֵעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ *a live coal which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar*; Ex 15¹⁷, Is 42¹⁶ (48¹⁷, ψ 25¹², all after בְּיָדָהּ; but ψ 32⁸ בְּיָדָהּ-וּוּ תִלְוָהּ); Is 64²; Ec 10⁵ (in 6¹ the same clause with אֲשֶׁר); moreover, in Jer 14¹⁸ read with the LXX אֶל-אֶרֶץ לֹא יָדְעוּ *into a land (that) they know not*.

(3) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun is dependent on *i* a preposition, or its place is taken by the adverb שָׁם, as in Jer 2⁶ end.

Thus after a determinate substantive, ψ 18³ אֲחֶסְהָבוּ צוּרִי *my rock in which I take refuge*; Ex 18²⁰, Is 42¹; in Jb 3^{3a} also, the omission of the article with יום is only a poetic licence. After an indeterminate substantive, Jer 2⁶, last clause but one; ψ 32².

k In this case also the retrospective word is not infrequently suppressed, giving rise to extremely short, bold expressions, such as Is 51¹ *look unto the rock הַצְּבָתָם (whence) ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit גְּבֻרָתָם (whence) ye were digged*; Jb 21²⁷ *the devices (where-with) ye act violently against me*.—A retrospective adverb is suppressed in Jb 38¹⁹ *where is the way (to the place where) the light dwelleth?* cf. 38²⁴.

l Rem. 1. The omission of the retrospective word occurs most frequently in relative clauses which are governed by the construct state of a preceding substantive (especially an expression of time) and hence are virtually in the genitive. In addition to the instances already given in § 130 *d*, cf. the following: after בְּיוֹם Lv 7³⁵, ψ 56¹⁰; after מִיּוֹם Jer 36²; after simple יוֹם ψ 56⁴ (אִירָא יוֹם אִירָא *on the day when I am afraid*); after בְּעֵת הַחֵל הָעוֹלָה 2 Ch 29²⁷ (*at the time when the burnt offering began*); 20²², 24¹¹, Jb 6¹⁷; after לְעֵת Dt 32³⁵; after עַרְעָתָּ Mi 5²; after מִמְּעַתָּ ψ 4⁸ *thou hast put gladness in my heart more than (their gladness) at the time (when) their corn and their wine are increased*.

m 2. The agreement (§ 138 *d*) of the retrospective pronoun with a pronominal regens in the 1st or 2nd person also takes place in a simple co-ordinated relative clause in 1 S 26¹⁴ *who art thou (that) criest?* Cf., however, Is 63¹⁹ *we are become as they over whom (בָּם not בָּנֵינוּ) thou no longer bearest rule*.

n 3. Occasionally—chiefly in poetic or otherwise elevated style—even *independent* relative clauses are simply co-ordinated with a regens, whereas we should expect them always to be preceded by a demonstrative pronoun, on the analogy of the examples in § 138 *e*. The suppressed pronoun would stand—

(a) As subject, Is 41²⁴ *an abomination (is he) that chooseth you* (but read perhaps לְבַחֵר); Jb 30¹³, cf. § 152 *u*.

(b) As object, Is 41², with a retrospective pronoun; Mal 2¹⁶ וְכִסָּהּ *and him that covereth* (or read וְכִסָּהּ ?); Jb 29¹² *I delivered . . . the fatherless also, and him that had none to help him*.

(c) In the genitive governed by a substantive (cf. § 130 *d*), Ex 4¹³ שְׁלַח־נָא בְּיַד־הַשֵּׁלֵּחַ *send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send*, i. e. by the hand of some one else; ψ 65⁵ and Pr 8³², verbal-clauses after אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׂרִי *O the happiness of the man, &c.*; ψ 81⁶, 141⁹, Jb 29¹⁶, La 1¹⁴; after כִּלְ- Gn 39⁴, but we must certainly read here, with the Samaritan and LXX, כִּלְ-אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂלוּ as in verses 5 and 8; Ex 9⁴; verbal-clauses after כִּלְ- 1 Ch 29³, 2 Ch 30¹⁹, 31¹⁹, Ezr 1⁵.

(d) Governed by a preposition; so verbal-clauses after אֲחֶרֶי Jer 2⁸; after לְ- (= *to the place where*), 1 Ch 15¹², but Ex 23²⁰ before the same



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

&c.;¹ so also *to cast oneself down*, אַרְצָה אִפְּיִם *the face being turned to the earth*, Gn 19¹, &c. (for אַרְצָה we find אָרֶץ in 1 K 1³¹, Is 49²³).²—Cf. finally the formula אִם עַל-בְּנִים *mother with children*, Gn 32¹²; cf. Ho 10¹⁴ and § 119 *aa* note 2.

Rem. On circumlocutions of this kind to express negative attributes by means of short noun-clauses (complete or incomplete), cf. § 152 *u*.

d 3. As circumstantial *verbal*-clauses,³ we find (1) sometimes affirmative clauses (see below), but far more frequently (2) negative clauses (see *f*), and among these (3) a certain number of expressions which may be regarded simply as equivalent to negative adverbial ideas (see *g*).

Examples of (1) Is 5^{11b} woe unto them, that tarry late in the evening, יֵין יִדְלִיקֵם *while wine inflames them*; Is 1⁵, 10²⁴, 30³¹, Jer 7²⁶, 20¹⁵, ψ 4³, 5¹², 21¹³, 62⁵. The circumstantial verbal-clause is used to particularize an action which has before been expressed generally, in Gn 44¹², 48¹⁴ = *crossing his hands*; Dt 2²⁷, Ju 6¹⁹; antithetically, 1 K 13¹⁸ לוֹ כִּחַשׁ *wherewith however he lied unto him*. The verbal-clause seems to assign a reason in ψ 7⁷ מִשְׁפָּט צִוִּיתָ *since thou hast commanded judgement*; a consequence in ψ 103⁵.⁴

e Rem. On the cases in which an imperfect in the sense of a final clause is subordinated to a verb of motion (generally קָיַם), see § 120 *c*.

f Of (2), subordinate verbal-clauses with לֹא (in English usually rendered by *without* and the gerund, if the subject be the same as in the principal clause), e.g. Lv 1¹⁷ לֹא יִבְדֵּיל *without dividing it asunder*; Jb 31³⁴; לֹא with the perfect is so used in Gn 44⁴, Ex 34²⁸, 1 S 30², Jb 20²⁶ (*without its being blown upon it*). With a different subject, equivalent to a consecutive clause in English, Is 27⁹ לֹא-יִקְמוּ *so that they shall rise up no more*.—Moreover, verbal-clauses in the same sense (*without doing, &c.*) are frequently connected by וְלֹא; cf. 1 S 20², Jb 24²², 42³; in a concessive sense, Is 33¹, ψ 44¹⁸.

g Of (3), cf. לֹא יָדַע (prop. *he knows it not*) *unawares*, ψ 35⁶, Pr 5⁶ לֹא יִחַמַּל *unsparingly*, Is 30¹⁴ (after an infinitive absolute); Hb 1¹⁷, Jb 6¹⁰ (but וְלֹא יִחַמַּל Jb 16¹³, 27²²; see *f* at the end); לֹא כִּחְרוּ (prop. *they hide not*) *openly*, Is 3⁹ (but

¹ The expression הִתְרָאָה פְּנִים *to look one another in the face* (i. e. to contend in combat) 2 K 14^{8.11}, 2 Ch 25^{17.21}, is probably only a shortened form for הִתְרָאָה פְּנִים אֶל-פְּנִים.

² That אַרְצָה (אָרֶץ) is really to be regarded as a virtual predicate to אִפְּיִם, and not אִפְּיִם as a *casus instrumenti*, is seen from Is 49²³, where אִפְּיִם אָרֶץ precedes the verb.

³ Some examples of these have been already discussed in another connexion above, § 120 *a-c*.

⁴ In Gn 21¹⁴ the circumstantial verbal-clause שָׁם עַל-שִׁכְמָה is only due to a harmonizing transposition; read שָׁ ע' ש' וְאֶת-הַיֶּלֶד ש' ע' ש'. According to the source used in cap. 21 Ishmael was still a young child; according to 17²⁵ he was about 16 or 17 years old.

Jb 15¹⁸ בְּלֹא כִּחְרוֹ (וְלֹא כִּחְרוֹ); בְּלִי חֲשָׁךְ (prop. *he restrains not*) *unceasingly*, Is 14⁶; בְּלִי-יָמוּט; Jb 41¹⁵ (ψ 93¹ בְּלִי-תַמוּט) and לֹא יָמוּט Is 40²⁰ (*without tottering*) *immovably*; cf. also לֹא אֶמְעַד *without wavering*, ψ 26¹.

§ 157. Object-Clauses (*Oratio Obliqua*).

Clauses which depend on a transitive verb, especially on what are called *verba cordis*, i. e. verbs denoting any mental act, such as *to see, to hear, to know, to perceive, to believe, to remember, to forget, to say, to think, &c.*, may be subordinated to the governing verb without the help of a conjunction by simple juxtaposition (§ 120 a), or they may be co-ordinated with it either with or without *wāw copulative* (§ 120 d-h). As a rule, however, the objective clause is introduced by the conjunction כִּי *that*, less frequently by אֲשֶׁר *that*.¹

Examples:—

(a) Object-clauses without a conjunction. Besides the passages mentioned in § 120 (especially under e) there are a number of examples, in which a clause depending on a *verbum dicendi* or *sentiendi* (the *oratio obliqua* of the Latin and English Grammar) is added in the form of an independent noun-clause or verbal-clause; e. g. Gn 12¹³ אָמַרְתִּי אֵלַי אַחֲתִי אַתְּ *say, I pray thee, thou art my sister*; ψ 10¹³, Jb 25^{8a.14}, Neh 6⁶; Zc 8²³ (after שָׁמַע); ψ 9²¹ (after יָדַע); verbal-clauses, e. g. ψ 50²¹ *thou thoughtest* כְּמוֹךָ הָיִיתִי-אֵלַי *I was surely like thyself* [but read הָיוּ for הָיִיתִי]; Gn 41¹⁵, Ju 9⁴⁸ *what ye have seen me do*; Is 48⁸, Ho 7².

(b) Object-clauses introduced by כִּי, e. g. Gn 6⁵ וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה כִּי רַבָּה רָעַת הָאָדָם *and the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great, &c.*—Direct narration also is very frequently introduced by כִּי (analogous to the *ōri recitativum*; frequently, indeed, with the secondary idea of a particle of asseveration, as in Gn 26⁹, 27²⁰), e. g. Gn 21³⁰, 22^{16 f.}, 26²², 29³², 37³⁶, Jos 2²⁴, &c., even when the direct narration is not expressly indicated, Gn 4²⁶, 3²³, 41^{51 f.}, Ex 18⁴.—On the expression of a second object by means of a clause introduced by כִּי, see § 117 h.²

(c) Object-clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר, e. g. Est 3⁴ בְּיַהֲגִיד לָהֶם אֲשֶׁר-הוּא *for he had told them that he was a Jew*; 1 S 18¹⁵, Ez 20²⁶, Ec 8¹²,³ even before direct narration, 1 S 15²⁰, 2 S 1⁴. Somewhat frequently אֲשֶׁר is preceded by

¹ On these clauses with כִּי and אֲשֶׁר and generally on clauses which we should render as subordinate, cf. P. Dörwald 'Zur hebr. Syntax' in *Neue Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädag.* 1890, p. 115 ff.

² Instead of a complete objective clause we sometimes find a kind of accusative and infinitive construction, especially after נָתַן (prop. *to give up*) in the sense of *to allow*, e. g. Nu 21²³ וְלֹא-נָתַן סִיחֹן אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל עֲבַר בְּגַבְלוֹ *and Sihon did not suffer Israel to pass through his border*; 20²¹; followed by an infinitive with לֵ, e. g. Gn 20⁶, 31⁷, Ex 3¹⁹.—Cf. also the analogous examples in Dt 28⁵⁶ (after נָסָה *to venture*; see § 113 d); Ju 11²⁰ (after הֵאֱמִין *to trust*); 1 K 19⁴ (after שָׁאַל *to request*).

³ In Jer 28⁹ a subject-clause is thus introduced by אֲשֶׁר instead of the usual כִּי.

the *nota accusativi* ׀ִתָּ (equivalent to *the circumstance, the fact, that*), e. g. Jos 2¹⁰, 1 S 24^{11.19}, 2 S 11²⁰, Is 38³, but in Gn 30²⁹, Dt 29¹⁵ equivalent to *the way in which*.

§ 158. Causal Clauses.

a A complete clause, assigning the reason for statements, demands, threats, &c., sometimes follows with the simple *wāw* copulative, e. g. ψ 60¹³ *give us help against the adversary, and (for) vain is the help of man*; Gn 6¹⁷ (׀ִתָּ), 22¹², Ex 23⁹, Jb 22¹², perhaps also ψ 7¹⁰; or even without *Wāw*, e. g. Gn 17¹⁴. As a rule, however, special conjunctions in various combinations are used to introduce causal clauses.

b The most common causal conjunctions are ׀ִעַן כִּי Is 3¹⁶, &c., and ׀ִעַן אֲשֶׁר *because, prop. on account of the fact that*; both, however, may also be shortened to the simple ׀ִעַן Nu 20¹², &c., or to כִּי *because*, Gn 3^{14.17}, &c., or to אֲשֶׁר Gn 30¹⁸, 31⁴⁹, 34^{13.27}, 1 S 15¹⁵, 20⁴², 26^{16.23}, 1 K 3¹⁹, 8³³, Ho 14⁴, Zc 1¹⁵; also בְּאֲשֶׁר Gn 39^{9.23}. On the other hand, the simple ׀ִעַן is sometimes repeated for emphasis, ׀ִעַן וּבְיָעַן (something like the German *sintemal und alldieweil*) Lv 26⁴³, Ez 13¹⁰ (without ׀ִ 36³); also עַל-אֲשֶׁר 2 S 3³⁰, and עַל-כִּי Dt 31¹⁷, Ju 3¹², Mal 2¹⁴ *on the ground that*; עַל-דִּבְרֵי אֲשֶׁר *because of the circumstance that*, Dt 23⁵; עַל-כֵּן אֲשֶׁר *for this very cause that*, Jer 3⁸. But just as the simple ׀ִעַן is used for אֲשֶׁר, so also the simple עַל with the perfect stands for אֲשֶׁר ψ 119¹³⁶, Ezr 3¹¹; cf. עַל-בְּלִי Gn 31²⁰ and מִבְּלִי Dt 28⁵⁵ both with the perfect, equivalent to *because . . . not*.—Cf. further עָקַב אֲשֶׁר Gn 22¹⁸, 26⁵, 2 S 12⁶, all with the perfect, and עָקַב כִּי (2 S 12¹⁰ with the perfect; Am 4¹² with the imperfect) *prop. in return for the fact that*; similarly again the simple עָקַב Nu 14²⁴ with the perfect, and Dt 7¹², 8²⁰ with the imperfect; finally, מִמֵּן אֲשֶׁר Is 43⁴ *arising from the fact that, = because*; מִתַּחַת אֲשֶׁר 1 S 26²¹, &c., and מִתַּחַת כִּי Dt 4³⁷, Pr 1²⁹ *for the reason that*.

c Rem. 1. The preposition עַל (*because of, on account of*) with the infinitive (§ 114 *e*) is frequently used as the equivalent of a full causal clause; cf. e. g. Am 1^{3.6.13}, 2^{1.6}. Such a construction with the infinitive may, however, according to § 114 *r*, be continued by means of a finite verb, in which case עַל governs the verb as a conjunction; e. g. Am 1⁹ וְלֹא זָכְרוּ . . . עַל-הַסִּגְיָרָם *because they delivered up . . . and remembered not, &c.*; 1¹¹, 2⁴; without *Wāw*, Is 30¹⁴.

d 2. The choice of tense is regulated by the general principles stated in § 106 ff., viz. the perfect (cf. especially § 106 *f*) refers to causes already brought fully into effect, the imperfect to those which may contingently arise; cf. e. g. Dt 7¹², 8²⁰, 1 K 8³³, where the imperfect leaves the possibility still open that the persons addressed will perhaps escape the threatened punishments by avoiding disobedience.—Cf. further, § 111 *k* on the imperfect consecutive, and § 112 *nn* on the perfect consecutive in the apodosis to causal clauses.

¹ Also כִּי-עַל-כֵּן *prop. for therefore*, Gn 18⁵, 19⁸, 33¹⁰, 38²⁶, Nu 10³¹, 14⁴³, 2 S 18²⁰ *ôré*, and אֲשֶׁר-עַל-כֵּן Jb 34²⁷, always mean *forasmuch as*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

what the imperfect in the protasis had represented as still conceivable; cf. Ho 8¹²); with the perfect consecutive, Gn 47²⁵, Ex 33⁵; with the protasis suppressed, Jb 5⁸ (see § 107 x).

d (b) *Jussive* in protasis (cf. § 109 h, i) and apodosis, ψ 104¹⁰ תַּשְׁתְּחֹשֶׁךְ; לֵילָה וְיִהְיֶה לֵילָה (if) thou makest darkness, it is night; imperfect in the apodosis, ψ 104^{29b}; cohortative Pr 1²³. Also in Ex 7⁹ יְהִי לְחַנּוּן it shall become a serpent, is the apodosis to a suppressed protasis if thou cast it down; so in 2 K 5¹⁰ וְיִשָּׁב is the apodosis to a protasis if thou wash, contained in what precedes.

e (c) *Cohortative* (see § 108 e) in the protasis; perfect in the apodosis, ψ 40⁶; imperfect consecutive, Jb 19¹⁸ אֶקוּמָה וַיְדַבְּרוּ בִי (if) I arise, they speak against me; on the cohortative in the apodosis, cf. § 108 f.

f (d) *Imperfect consecutive* in the protasis (§ 111 x), ψ 139¹¹ וְאָמַר if I say, &c. (with a noun-clause as the apodosis); with a frequentative perfect consecutive in the apodosis, 1 S 2¹⁶.

g (e) *Perfect consecutive* in the protasis and apodosis (see the examples, § 112 kk and ll), Gn 44²² וְעָוַב אָבִיו וּמָתָהּ and should he leave his father, his father would die; 9¹⁵, 44²⁹, Ex 4¹⁴, 12¹³, 1 S 16², 19³, 2 S 13²⁸, 1 K 8³⁰; with frequentative perfects, Ex 16²¹ (referring to the past, Jer 20⁹); with imperfect in the apodosis (being separated from the *Wāw* by לֵ), Nu 23²⁰, Jb 5²⁴; introduced by an infinitive absolute, 1 K 2³⁷; an interrogative clause in the apodosis, Lv 10¹⁹; a noun-clause, ψ 37¹⁰, Jb 7²¹.

h (f) *A simple perfect* (to represent actions which are to be regarded as completed) in the protasis and apodosis, Pr 18²² מָצָא אִשָּׁה טוֹבָה has one found a wife, he has found a good thing; an imperfect in the apodosis, Jb 19⁴, 23¹⁰; an imperfect consecutive, Ex 20²⁵, Pr 11², Jb 3²⁵, 23^{13b}, 29¹¹; an interrogative clause, Nu 12¹⁴, Jb 7²⁰ if I have sinned (prop., well, now I have sinned!) what can I do unto thee? 21³¹, 35⁶, Am 3⁸; a noun-clause, Jb 27¹⁹.

i (g) *A participle as casus pendens* (cf. § 143 d, and the sections of the Grammar there cited, esp. § 116 w) or a complete noun-clause in the protasis; the apodosis mostly introduced by *wāw* apodosis, e.g. Pr 23²⁴ Keth. יוֹלֵד חָכָם וְיִשְׂמַח בּוֹ if one begetteth a wise child, he shall have joy of him; with perfect frequentative in the apodosis, 1 S 2¹³, &c.; but also with a simple imperfect, e.g. Ex 21¹² (cf. § 112 n); with an interrogative imperfect, 2 K 7^{2.19}; with an interrogative perfect, Ju 6¹³.

k (h) *Infinitive with preposition* (also as the equivalent of a conditional clause) in the protasis, and a perfect consecutive in the apodosis (cf. § 112 mm), e.g. 2 S 7¹⁴ אִם יַעֲשֶׂה חַטָּאת וְהִכַּחֲתִיו וְגו' if he commit iniquity, I will correct him; Ex 34³⁴ (with imperfect, followed by perfects frequentative in the apodosis).

Rem. On the expression of condition and consequence by means of two co-ordinate imperatives, see § 110 f.

l 3. Particles used to introduce conditional sentences are אִם (for which in the later and latest Books sometimes הִן, see below, under w) and לֵ (1 S 14³⁰, Is 63¹⁹ לֵא; Ec 6⁶, Est 7⁴ אִלֵּי, from לֵ אִם) if, negative אִם לֵ and לֵ אִם (לֵאִלֵּי) unless; כִּי supposing that (Lat. ut), in case that, sometimes used almost in the same sense as אִם. With regard to the difference between אִם (אִם לֵ) and לֵ (לֵאִלֵּי), the fundamental rule is that אִם is used if the condition be regarded either as already fulfilled, or if it, together with its consequence, be thought of as possibly (or

¹ On לֵ cf. Kohler in Geiger's *Zeitschr. für Wiss. und Leben*, vi (1868), p. 21 ff.

probably) occurring in the present or future. In the former case, אִם is followed by the perfect, in the latter (corresponding to the Greek $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ with the present subjunctive) by the imperfect or its equivalent (frequently in the apodosis also). On the other hand, לִי (לִי־אִם) is used when the condition is to be represented as *not fulfilled* in the past, or as *not capable of fulfilment* in the present or future, and the consequence accordingly as not having occurred or never occurring. In the former case, לִי and אִם־לִי are necessarily followed by the perfect (mostly also in the apodosis) corresponding to the Greek $\epsilon\iota$ with the indicative of an historic tense, and the Latin imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive. In the latter case (which is extremely rare) the perfect, or the participle, or even the imperfect, may be used.

Rem. Since it again frequently depends on the subjective judgement of the speaker (see under *a*), whether a condition is to be regarded as possible or impossible, we cannot wonder that the distinction between אִם and לִי is not always consistently observed. Although naturally לִי and אִם־לִי cannot take the place of אִם and אִם־לִי (on the strange use of לִי in Gn 50¹⁵ see below), yet conversely אִם is sometimes used where לִי would certainly be expected; cf. e.g. ψ 50¹², 137⁵, 139⁸, Ho 9¹² (cf. verse 11). These examples, indeed (אִם with the imperfect), may without difficulty be explained from the fact that the connexion of לִי with the imperfect was evidently avoided, because the imperfect by its nature indicates a still unfinished action, and consequently (as opposed to לִי) a still open possibility. But אִם is also used for לִי in connexion with the perfect, especially when an imprecation is attached by the apodosis to the condition introduced by אִם , e.g. ψ 7⁴ $\text{אִם־עָשִׂיתִי זֹאת . . . יִרְדְּךָ וְג'}$ if I have done this . . . let the enemy pursue my soul, &c., cf. Jb 31⁹. The speaker assumes for a moment as possible and even actual, that which he really rejects as inconceivable, in order to invoke the most severe punishment on himself, if it should prove to be the case.

On the frequent addition of an infinitive absolute to the verb in clauses with אִם see § 113 o above.

Examples:—

A. אִם I. with *perfect* in the protasis to express conditions, &c., which have נ been completely fulfilled in the past or which will be completely fulfilled in the future (the perfect is here equivalent to the *futurum exactum*, § 106 o). The apodosis¹ takes—

(a) A *perfect* also, e.g. Pr 9¹² $\text{אִם־חֲכָמָה תִּבְמָת לָךְ אִם־חֲכָמָה תִּבְמָת לָךְ}$ if thou art wise, thou art wise for thyself; ψ 73¹⁵ (see below on לִי).

(b) *Imperfect*, e.g. Dt 32⁴¹ $\text{אִם־שִׁנֹּתִי אֶשִׂיב}$ if I whet my glittering sword . . . אֶשִׂיב I will render vengeance, &c.; Jb 9^{15f.30} (in both cases we should expect לִי rather than אִם ; so also in ψ 44^{21f.}, with an interrogative imperfect in the apodosis); Jb 11¹³ (the apodosis is in verse 15).

(c) *Jussive* (or *optative*), e.g. Jb 31⁹ (see *m* above); Gn 18³.

¹ We are not here concerned with the fact that the logical apodosis (the consequence of the condition) is sometimes mentioned before the condition; as in Gn 18^{28.30}, Ju 11¹⁰, ψ 63^{6f.}, 137⁶, and according to Dillmann Is 4⁴.

O (d) *Perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112 gg), e. g. Gn 43⁹ אִם-לֹא הֵבִיאֲתוּ וְגַ' if I bring him not . . . then I shall have sinned, &c. ; Ju 16¹⁷, 2 S 15³³, 2 K 7⁴. On the other hand, e. g. Gn 47⁶, Mi 5⁷, Jb 7⁴ refer to actions already completed ; in Gn 38⁹ and Nu 21⁹ the perfect with וְ is a perfect frequentative and refers to past time.

(e) *Imperfect consecutive* (see § 111 q), e. g. Jb 8⁴ if thy children have sinned (חָטְאוּ) . . . , וַיִּשְׁלַחֵם he has delivered them, &c.

(f) *Imperative*, e. g. Gn 50⁴ אִם-נָא מָצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֵיכֶם דַּבְּרֵרְנָא וְגַ' if now I have found grace in your eyes, speak, I pray you, &c. ; the imperative precedes in Gn 47¹⁶ and Jb 38^{4.18}.

P (g) A (complete or incomplete) noun-clause, e. g. Jer 14¹⁸ (a vivid realization of the future) if I have gone forth into the field (= if I go, &c.), then, behold, the slain with the sword ! &c. ; Pr 24¹⁴ (apodosis with *wāw apodosis*).

Q 2. אִם with *imperfect* in the protasis, to express what is possible in the present or future, as well as (according to § 107 b) what has continued or been repeated in the past. The apodosis takes—

(a) The *perfect*, e. g. Nu 32²³ וְאִם-לֹא תַעֲשׂוּן בֵּן הַיְּהוָה חָטְאתֶם but if ye will not do so, behold, ye have sinned ; here the apodosis represents the time when the consequence has already taken place ; so also Jb 20¹²⁻¹⁴. On the other hand, Nu 16²⁹ (as also 1 S 6⁹ and 1 K 22²⁸) is a case of a pregnant construction, if these men die as all men die, then (it will follow from this) the Lord hath not sent me.

R (b) The *imperfect*, e. g. 2 K 7⁴ אִם-יַחְיֶינוּ נַחֲיָה if they save us alive, we shall live, &c. ; Gn 13¹⁶, 18^{28.30}, 28^{20 ff.}, Ex 20²⁵ (the second imperfect is equivalent to a jussive) ; Is 1¹⁸, 10²², Am 9²⁻⁴, ψ 50¹² (where אִם ironically represents an impossibility as possible) ; Jb 8^{5 f.} (with the insertion of a second condition in the form of a noun-clause) ; 9^{3.20}, 14⁷ ; a frequentative imperfect referring to the past, Gn 31⁸ אִם-כִּיָּהוּ יֹאמֶר if (ever) he said thus . . . , וַיִּלְרֹד then they bare . . . ; Ex 40³⁷. In Gn 42³⁷ the consequence (on תָּמִית cf. § 107 s) precedes the condition.

(c) The *jussive* (or *optative*), e. g. ψ 137⁵ ; cf. § 109 h.

(d) The *cohortative*, e. g. Gn 13⁹, Jb 31⁷ ; cf. § 108 f.

S (e) The *perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112 ff and gg), e. g. 1 S 20⁸ אִם-פָּקַד יִפְקְדֵנִי אָבִיךָ וְאָמַרְתָּ if thy father miss me at all, then shalt thou say, &c. ; Gn 24⁴¹, Ju 4²⁰ ; with a frequentative perfect consecutive, Gn 31⁸ if he said (as often happened) . . . , then, &c.

(f) The *imperfect consecutive* ; so perhaps ψ 59¹⁶, if וַיִּלְיֵנוּ is to be explained according to § 111 t.

(g) The *imperative*, e. g. Gn 31⁵⁰, 1 S 20²¹ (with *wāw apodosis*, but in verse 22 simply לֵךְ), 21¹⁰, Jb 33⁵.

T (h) A noun-clause, e. g. Gn 4⁷, ψ 139⁸, Jb 8⁶, 31^{26 f.}

3. אִם with *cohortative*, e. g. Gn 30³¹ ; cf. the passages in § 108 e.

U 4. אִם with *infinitive*, Jb 9²⁷ אִם-אָמַרְי prop. if my saying is (but probably we should read אִם-אָמַרְתִּי).

V 5. אִם with a noun-clause, e. g. Dt 5²² (in the apodosis a perfect with *wāw apodosis*), Gn 27⁴⁶, Ju 9¹⁵ (imperative in the apodosis) ; 11⁹ (imperfect in the apodosis) ; 2 S 12⁸ (cohortative in the apodosis) ; Ho 12¹² ; especially if the subject of the conditional clause be a personal pronoun. In an affirmative sentence this pronoun is often joined to שִׁי, in a negative sentence to אִין (cf. on both, § 100 o), while the predicate (cf. § 116 q) is represented by a participle, usually expressing the future, e. g. Ju 6^{36 f.} אִם-יִשְׁךָ מוֹשִׁיעַ



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

its origin is obscure. Cf. the exhaustive discussion of Delitzsch and Wetzstein on Jb 34³⁶, where this וְנִי appears to be used as a desiderative particle.—Sometimes when one case has been already discussed, another of the same character is added by means of וְנִי or, e.g. Ex 21³⁶ וְנִי נִדְרָע וְנִי or (another possible case) *it is known that, &c., i. e. but if it be known, &c.*, LXX ἐὰν δέ, Vulg. *sin autem*; cf. Lv 4^{23.28}, 5¹, 25⁴⁹, 2 S 18¹³; with a following imperfect, Ez 14^{17f.}—On the hypothetical use of וְנִי (which is interchangeable with וְנִי in other senses also) Lv 4²² (in verses 3 and 27 וְנִי), Dt 11²⁷ (verse 28 וְנִי), Jos 4²¹, see the Lexicon.

dd 2. The conditional sentence is frequently found in an abridged form, where the suppressed clauses can be easily supplied from the context; cf. Gn 13⁹, 24⁴⁹, 1 S 2¹⁶ וְנִי-וְנִי *and if not, i. e. and if thou wilt not give it to me, then I take it* (perfect according to § 106 *n*) *by force*; cf. 1 S 6⁹. The use of וְנִי alone in Ju 6¹³ is peculiar, as also וְנִי in 2 K 10¹⁵ (where read with the LXX וְנִי וְנִי) in the sense of *if it be so*.—In 2 S 13²⁶, 2 K 5¹⁷ וְנִי alone appears to be used in the sense of *if really . . . not*, in each case with a following jussive equivalent to *may there at least, &c.* (cf. § 143 *d*); but perhaps with Matthes, *ZAW.* 1903, p. 122 ff., following Kuipers, we should read וְנִי *would that!*—In 1 S 13¹³, Jb 3¹³ the condition must be supplied from the preceding clause to complete the sentence introduced by וְנִי, in Jb 31²⁸ by וְנִי, in 2 K 13¹⁹ by וְנִי.—The apodosis also appears sometimes in an abridged form (e.g. Gn 4²⁴, Is 43²) or is entirely suppressed, e.g. Gn 30²⁷, 38¹⁷, 50¹⁵ (see *y* above), Ex 32³², ψ 27¹⁹, Jb 38⁵, where properly וְנִי must be supplied with וְנִי as in verses 4 and 18; cf. § 167 *a*.—In ψ 8⁴, instead of the apodosis *I exclaim* which we should expect, the exclamation itself follows.

ee 3. The absolute certainty with which a result is to be expected is frequently emphasized by the insertion of וְנִי Is 7⁹; וְנִי 2 S 2²⁷, 19⁷, Jb 11¹⁵; or וְנִי *now verily*, Nu 22²⁹, 1 S 14³⁰ after וְנִי, Gn 31⁴², 43¹⁰ after וְנִי, Jb 8⁶ after וְנִי. On this corroborative וְנִי cf. such passages as Gn 18²⁰, &c., and § 148 *d*. On וְנִי after an oath cf. 163 *d*.

ff 4. Sometimes the force of a hypothetical particle extends beyond the apodosis to a second conditional clause, as in the case of וְנִי Pr 9¹², Jb 10¹⁵, 16⁶, 22²³, and וְנִי Is 43².

gg 5. In Ex 33²⁰ a negative statement takes the place of a condition with a negative consequence, *for a man doth not see me and live*, instead of *for if a man sees me, he does not live*; cf. the similar passages, Dt 22^{1.4} *thou shalt not see . . . and hide thyself*, instead of *if thou seest . . . thou shalt not hide thyself*.

§ 160. Concessive Clauses.

a Besides the use of the imperative in the sense of a concession, meant either seriously (§ 110 *a*) or mockingly (§ 110 *f*), and of concessive circumstantial clauses (§ 141 *e*, § 142 *d*, and § 156 *f*), concessive clauses may be introduced—

(*a*) By a simple וְנִי *if*: thus Jb 9¹⁵ with perfect, *if (= though) I had been in the right*; Is 1¹⁸ and 10²² with imperfect in reference to a contingent event.

b (*b*) By וְנִי וְנִי *yea though*, Is 1¹⁵ with imperfect; for which we find simply וְנִי in Is 49¹⁵ with imperfect, *yea, though these may forget, yet . . .*; on the other hand, with perfect, Jer 36²⁵, ψ 95⁹, Neh 6¹; finally וְנִי וְנִי *even if, though*, Ec 4¹⁴.

(c) By the preposition עַל governing a complete noun-clause, as Jb 16¹⁷ $\text{עַל לֹא־הָמָס בְּכַפְּי}$ notwithstanding that no violence is in mine hands, or a verbal-clause, Is 53⁹. On עַל with the infinitive in a similar sense (equivalent to *in addition to the fact that* = *notwithstanding that*), cf. § 119 aa, note 2.

§ 161. Comparative Clauses.

1. A comparison between two facts is sometimes established by *a* simply uniting them with *wāw* copulative, especially in gnomic poetry, when facts of a moral nature are compared with those of the physical world, e. g. Jb 5⁷ *man is born unto trouble, and the sons of flame fly upward*, i. e. as the sparks by nature fly upward, so man, &c.; Jb 12¹¹ (in an interrogative form; in 34³ the same comparison as a statement); 14^{11f.}, Pr 17³, 25³, 26^{3.9.14}, 27²¹, &c.¹ Even without the connecting ו Jb 24¹⁹ *drought and heat consume the snow waters*, שֶׁאוֹל הִטָּאוּ so doth Sheol those who have sinned (cf. § 155 n); cf. Jer 17¹¹.

2. The conjunction כַּאֲשֶׁר (cf. § 155 g; the simple אֲשֶׁר occurs in the *b* same sense in Ex 10⁶, 14¹³, 34¹⁸) *as, quemadmodum*, is used as a comparative conjunction (Ob 15), frequently with כֵּן so, corresponding to it in the apodosis, Is 31⁴, 52^{14f.}. Sometimes, however, כֵּן (*so also*) occurs even after independent statements, Is 55⁹, Jer 3²⁰.—Exact coincidence of two facts is expressed in Ec 5¹⁵ by כָּל־עֲמֹתָיִךְ ² *in all points as*.

Rem. On the use of כֵּן *as*, with single nouns or pronouns to introduce *c* comparisons, cf. 118 s; on the alleged use of כֵּן as a conjunction (equivalent to כַּאֲשֶׁר), cf. § 155 g.—It is to be further remarked that כֵּן—כֵּן when used in correspondence with one another, *as—so* (e. g. Lv 7⁷, Ju 8¹⁸, Is 24², Ho 4⁹; also *so—as*, Gn 18²⁵, 44¹⁸, Dt 1¹⁷, 1 K 22⁴; in Jos 14¹¹, 1 S 30²⁴ כֵּן—וְכֵן ; כֵּן—כֵּן ψ 127⁴ and often, כֵּן—כֵּן , cf. Jo 2⁴), are not to be regarded as conjunctions, but as virtual substantives with a following genitive; $\text{כַּמֶּנּוּ כַּזָּרָבִיבִי}$ Nu 15¹⁵ properly means *the like of you shall be the like of the stranger*, i. e. *your duty shall be (also) the stranger's duty*; cf. Lv 24²².

¹ On this *wāw adaequationis*, and in general on these proverbial comparisons, see Delitzsch, *Das Salomonische Spruchbuch*, p. 9 f. Moreover, instead of entire clauses, the nouns alone (without predicates) are frequently grouped together, e. g. Pr 25²⁵, 26²¹, 27²¹ (called by Delitzsch, the 'emblematic Mashal'). The expressions עִם נִחְשָׁב עִם prop. *to be counted with some one*, ψ 88⁵, and עִם נִמְשָׁל עִם *to be likened with some one*, ψ 28¹, 143⁷, also arise from the idea of comparison implied in grouping things together. On this use of עִם cf. Jb 9²⁶, where *with* is equivalent to *like*.

² In spite of its form this particle has originally nothing to do with כָּל , כַּל , כָּל־כָּל . The expression is compounded of כֵּן and לְעֵמֹתָיִךְ , like the Aramaic כָּל־קָבֵל for כָּל־קָבֵל ; cf. M. Lambert, *REJ.* xxx. 47.

§ 162. *Disjunctive Sentences.*

- a* The introduction of another possible case, excluding that which preceded, is effected by *וְ* or, e. g. Ex 21³⁶, equivalent to the Latin *vel*; but also equivalent to *aut* with an exclusive antithesis, 2 K 2¹⁶; so Is 27⁵ *וְ* = *it would then happen that*, for which elsewhere *וְ* *וְ*.
- b* In the sense of *sive—sive* we find *וְ—וְ*, or *וְ—וְ*, or *וְ—וְ* (see the examples in the Lexicon), also *וְ—וְ* Lv 5³, Nu 9¹⁴, Dt 24⁷, Is 2¹³^π, Jer 32²⁰, ψ 76⁷, Jb 34²⁹, perhaps also Ex 21¹⁶ (but not Pr 29⁹; cf. Delitzsch on the passage), and *וְ—וְ* (see § 143 *e*); cf. also *וְ—וְ* (in Gn 24⁴⁴ *וְ—וְ*) *both—and*; but *וְ—וְ* (in Gn 21²⁶ *וְ—וְ*) *neither—nor*. On disjunctive questions, see § 150 *g*.

§ 163. *Adversative and Exceptive Clauses.*

- a* 1. After negative sentences (especially after prohibitions) the antithesis (*but*) is introduced by *וְ*, e. g. 1 S 8¹⁹ *and they said, Nay, but we will have a king over us*; ψ 1², &c.; frequently also by *וְ* alone, e. g. Gn 18¹⁵, 19², or even simply connected with *וְ*, Gn 17⁵, *וְ* as perfect consecutive; 42¹⁰; cf. Ex 5¹⁸.
- b* Rem. Sometimes the negation is only virtually contained in the preceding sentence, e. g. in the form of a rhetorical question (Mi 6³^f.) or of conditions which are to be regarded as not having been fulfilled (Jb 31¹⁸); *וְ* or *וְ* in such cases becomes equivalent to *nay, rather*.
- c* 2. *Exceptive* clauses, depending on another sentence, are introduced by *וְ* *וְ* *except that*, and (again after negative sentences, see *a* above) *וְ* *וְ*¹ *unless*; especially *וְ* *וְ* with the perfect (equivalent to *unless previously*) after imperfects which contain a declaration, e. g. Gn 32²⁷ *I will not let thee go, except thou hast previously blessed me*; Lv 22⁶, Is 55¹⁰, 65⁶, Am 3⁷, Ru 3¹⁸. Finally, *וְ* *וְ* *unless*, Am 3⁴ (with perfect after a rhetorical question), or simply *וְ* *וְ* Gn 43³ with a noun-clause, *except your brother be with you*; Is 10⁴ after a rhetorical question, with a verbal-clause.

¹ Very probably this use of *וְ* *וְ* arises from the original meaning *for if, surely if* (*וְ* in an affirmative sense); so evidently in Ex 22²² as a forcible resumption of the preceding *וְ*. Thus, e. g. Ju 15⁷ is simply *surely when I have been avenged of you, after that I will cease*, equivalent to, *I will not cease, until I have, &c.* When the exception follows, an ellipse must be assumed, e. g. Ru 3¹⁸ *surely (or for) when he has finished it (then the man will rest)*. It is far less natural to assume such an ellipse with *וְ* *וְ* *but* (before entire clauses as before single nouns); see *a* above.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

and when thou dost overtake them (as soon as thou shalt have overtaken), thou shalt say unto them. Naturally, examples of this kind are very closely related to conditional sentences; see, therefore, the examples in § 112 *kk* and § 159 *g*. On the connexion of an imperfect consecutive or a perfect with detached expressions of time (as equivalent to complete clauses), cf. § 111 *b*; on the imperfect consecutive after וַיְהִי and a statement of time, cf. § 111 *g*; on the perfect consecutive following a detached statement of time, as in Ex 16⁶, cf. § 112 *oo*.—In 1 S 29¹⁰ an imperative with ו follows the perfect consecutive.

C (5) The fact that one action or event has not yet taken place on the occurrence of another, is expressed by בָּרָם (an adverb, not a conjunction) with the imperfect (according to § 107 *c*). The apodosis, which may consist of a subject and perfect or even of a noun-clause (Gn 24¹⁵),¹ is then connected by ו (or וְהִנֵּה) as in the examples above, under no. 3, e.g. Gn 19⁴ (cf. Jos 2⁸) וְשָׁפְכוּ וְאֲנָשֵׁי הָעִיר . . . נִסְבּוּ וְגו' they had not yet lain down, and (= when) the men of the city . . . compassed, &c.; Gn 24²⁵.

d 2. Conjunctions used to introduce temporal clauses are כִּי (with perfect, e.g. Gn 6¹, Ju 1²⁸, 16¹⁶, 1 S 1¹²; with imperfect, Gn 4¹², 12¹², 24⁴¹, Ex 3²¹, Lv 21⁹, Dt 31²¹, Is 1¹², 8¹⁹) and כִּי־אֲשֶׁר² when (כִּי with the imperfect also = *as often as*, ψ 8⁴; with perfect Jb 1⁵); less frequently אֲשֶׁר³ (joined with a perfect), e.g. Gn 38⁹, Nu 21⁹, Ju 6³, ψ 41⁷, 94¹⁸, cf. also Is 24¹³ = *quotiescunque*; also in the same sense with an imperfect, Nu 36⁴; with a perfect, equivalent to the *futurum exactum*, Is 4⁴. Other conjunctions of time are the compounds כִּי־כֵן when, Gn 19¹⁵; כִּי־אֲשֶׁר when, after that; עַד־אֲשֶׁר, עַד־כִּי until (also the simple עַד, e.g. Gn 38¹¹, Jos 2²², 1 S 1²² [with the imperfect = *only when*, as in 2 S 10⁵]); 2⁵, &c.; especially in the formula עַד־בְּלֹתִי הַשְּׂאִיר לוֹ until there was none left remaining to him (where indeed it would be very natural to read הַשְּׂאִיר the infin. constr., as elsewhere after בְּלֹתִי, § 114 *s*) Nu 21³⁵, Dt 3³, Jos 8²², 11⁸ (but 1 S 14¹⁹ while, as long as); עַד־אֲשֶׁר לֹא before that, Ec 12^{1.2.6} with an imperfect, as in Pr 8²⁶ עַד with a perfect; עַד־אֲמַם, עַד־אֲשֶׁר until the time when; אַחֲרֵי־אֲשֶׁר (for which in Ez 40¹ אַחֲרֵי־אֲשֶׁר; Lv 25⁴⁸, 1 S 5⁹ simply אַחֲרֵי; Lv 14⁴³, Jer 41¹⁶, Jb 42⁷ simply אַחֲר) after that; מֵאָז (prop. since that time; the dependent clause is attached to it in the same way as the attributive clause to the demonstrative אֲשֶׁר § 138 *e*) since, Gn 39⁶; בְּתָרָם (and simply תָּרָם § 107 *c*) before; קִדְמַת (for קִדְמַת אֲשֶׁר) before, ψ 129⁶.

e Rem. 1. With regard to the tenses used with the above conjunctions, the rules are practically the same as those given in § 158 *d* for causal clauses. The perfect indicates actions completed in the past or future (in the former case corresponding to the Latin pluperfect, § 106 *f*, and in the latter to the

¹ On the perfect in the protasis, which is critically doubtful, cf. § 107 *c*.

² On כִּי־אֲשֶׁר as an original demonstrative, cf. § 138 *a*; hence עַד־אֲשֶׁר נָשׁוּב is properly up to that (moment)—we shall return.

³ Cf. the frequent use of *wenn* [prop. if] for *wann* [= when] in German.

Latin *futurum exactum*, § 106 o), the imperfect denotes actions occurring contingently in the future. On בְּתָרָם, תָּרָם, and עַד with the imperfect as a *tempus historicum*, cf. 107 c.

2. Clauses introduced by עַד, עַד-כִּי, or עַד-אֲשֶׁר, sometimes express a limit *f* which is not absolute (terminating the preceding action), but only relative, beyond which the action or state described in the principal clause still continues; thus, עַד with the imperfect, ψ 110¹; עַד-כִּי with the perfect, Gn 26¹³, with i.npf. 49¹⁰; עַד-אֲשֶׁר with the perfect, Gn 28¹⁵; with the imperfect, ψ 112⁸.—Like the Arab. حَتَّى, עַד may even introduce a main clause; e.g. Ex 15¹⁶ עַד-יַעֲבֹר prop. no doubt = thus it came to this—they passed through, i.e. so they passed through.

3. The infinitive construct governed by a preposition (§ 114 d, e) is very *g* frequently used as the equivalent of a temporal clause; the infinitive with כִּי may usually be rendered by *when, as, or whilst*; the infinitive with כִּי by *when, as soon as* (in Pr 10²⁵ followed by a noun-clause introduced by *wāw apodosis*), or, when referring to the future, by *if*; the infinitive after מִן by *since*. According to § 111 g such statements of time are generally preceded by וַיְהִי and the apodosis follows in the imperfect consecutive; hence in 1 S 17⁵⁵ (cf. Driver on the passage) וַיִּכְרְאוּת with a simple perfect following, is unusual. On the continuation of these infinitival constructions by means of the perfect consecutive, cf. § 112 v, and in general, § 114 r.—With the participle, כִּי appears to be used as the equivalent of a conjunction in כִּי-שָׁב as he drew back, Gn 38²⁹ (unless we should read כִּי-שָׁב [or כִּי-שָׁב, cf. Gn 19¹⁵]), and in כִּי-פָרַחַת when it budded, 40¹⁰.

§ 165. Final Clauses.¹

1. Like most of the dependent clauses hitherto treated, the final *a* clause may also be joined by a simple *wāw copulative* to the main clause, unless the final clause is directly subordinated to the governing verb. ??

Examples of the connexion: (α) of a final imperfect (or jussive?) with a perfect by means of וַ, La 1¹⁹, see § 107 q; with an interrogative sentence, 2 S 9^{1,3}, Jb 38²⁴; with an optative, ψ 51⁹; with an imperative, 1 K 11²¹; (β) of a cohortative with an imperative by וַ, Gn 29²¹, 1 S 15¹⁶, or a jussive, Neh 2⁵ (§ 108 d); (γ) of a jussive with an imperative by וַ, Ex 9¹, 2 S 16¹¹, 1 K 5²⁰, ψ 59¹⁴, 86¹⁷; with a jussive, Jb 21¹⁹, or cohortative, § 109 f, g (cf. also 2 S 24²¹ the infinitive with לְ, Jon 1¹¹ מָה with the 1st plur. imperf., and 2 Ch 29¹⁰ עִם-לְבָבִי, which are equivalent to cohortatives); (δ) of an imperative with a jussive, cohortative, or interrogative sentence by וַ, § 110 i; (ε) of a perfect consecutive after another perfect consecutive, Lv 14³⁶; after an imperfect, § 112 m and p; similarly after a jussive, § 112 q; after an imperative, § 112 r.—On negative final clauses joined by וְלֹא to the imperfect (so Ex 28⁴³, 30²⁰; and 2 S 13²⁵ after אֶל-נָא with a jussive in the main clause) see the Rem. on § 109 g. In Ex 28³², 39²³ the negative final clause is simply connected by וְלֹא.—On the use of an historical statement after verbs of command-

¹ Cf. H. G. T. Mitchell, *Final Constructions of Biblical Hebrew*, Leipzig, 1879.

ing, where we should expect a final clause (e.g. Neh 13⁹ *then I commanded, and they cleansed*, equivalent to *that they should cleanse, and they cleansed*; in Jb 9⁷ a negative final clause is connected in this way by וְלֹא), cf. § 120 f.

For examples of the direct subordination of the final imperfect (without וְ) see § 120 c.

b 2. Final conjunctions are לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר *to the end that*; also simply לְמַעַן Gn 12¹³, 27²⁵, Ex 4⁵, ψ 51⁶, &c.; אֲשֶׁר בְּעֵבֶר prop. *for the purpose that*, Gn 27¹⁰, and simply בְּעֵבֶר Gn 27⁴, Ex 9¹⁴, 20²⁰; also the simple אֲשֶׁר¹ Dt 4^{10,40}, 6³, 32⁴⁶, Jos 3⁷, Neh 8^{14f.}; negatively, לֹא אֲשֶׁר Gn 11⁷, 24³, 1 K 22¹⁶; or וְ Ec 3¹⁴; also negatively, עַל-דְּבַר שְׁלֹא *for the matter (purpose) that . . . not*, Ec 7¹⁴; לְבַלְתִּי with imperfect, Ex 20²⁰, 2 S 14¹⁴ *that . . . not*.—Quite exceptional is the use of מִן (if the text be right) in Dt 33¹¹ מִן-יְקוּמוֹן, with the imperfect, equivalent to *that . . . not* [in prose, מִקּוּמִים].

c Rem. All the conjunctions here mentioned are naturally always used with the imperfect, see § 107 g (on the apparent exception in Jos 4²⁴, see § 74 g).—On the negative conjunctions לֹא and פֶּן *that not, lest*, see § 152 f and w. On the infinitive with לְ² (also לְמַעַן Gn 18¹⁹, 37²², &c.) as the equivalent of a final clause (Gn 11⁵, 28⁴, &c.), see § 114 f, h, p. On the continuation of such infinitival constructions by means of the finite verb, see § 114 r. On the negation of the final infinitive by לְבַלְתִּי, § 114 s. On the preposition מִן with a substantive or infinitive as the equivalent of a negative final clause (Gn 31²⁹, 1 S 15²³, &c.), see § 119 x and y.

§ 166. Consecutive Clauses.

a 1. Consecutive clauses are added by means of simple *wāw copulative* with the jussive,³ especially after negative and interrogative sentences, e.g. Nu 23¹⁹ לֹא אִישׁ אֵל וְיִכְזֹב וּבֶן-אָדָם וַיִּתְנַחֵם *God is not a man, that he should lie, and (i. e. neither) the son of man, that he should repent*; Is 53² וַיִּנְחַמְדָּהוּ; Ho 14¹⁰ מִי חָכָם וַיִּבֶן אֵלֶּה נְבוֹן וַיִּרְדְּעֵם *who is wise, that he may understand these things? prudent, that he may know them?* Jb 5¹² וְלֹא=*so that . . . not*; in Pr 30³ וְ is separated from the predicate by the object. In Gn 16¹⁰ a negative consecutive clause comes after a cohortative, and in Ex 10⁵ after a perfect consecutive.—On the other hand, in Jb 9^{32,33} the jussive in the sense of a consecutive clause is attached without *Wāw* to the preceding negative sentence (in

¹ In Ez 36²⁷ a final clause is introduced by אֲשֶׁר אֵת, thus at the same time taking the form of an object-clause.

² On לְ as a supposed conjunction (equivalent to the Arabic *li*) 1 K 6¹⁹, see § 66 i.

³ That such examples as וְיִכְזֹב are to be regarded as jussive is probable from the analogy of Ho 14¹⁰ and Jb 9³³.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

pressed; but the text can hardly be correct); perhaps also Is 66¹⁸ (cf., however, Delitzsch on the passage, which is certainly corrupt).¹ On Gn 23¹³ (אֲלֵךְ with the imperative), see § 110 e.

c 3. We may mention as instructive examples of *involved series* of sentences Gn 24¹⁴ and 42 ff., and Gn 28^{6ff.}

¹ On the other hand, from the Semitic point of view the various kinds of compound sentences are *not* to be regarded as instances of anacoluthon, e.g. Gn 17^{14,17}, nor even Gn 31⁴⁰ (cf. § 143).

THE PARADIGMS.

IN the paradigms of the verbs, those forms which are to be especially noticed by the beginner are marked throughout by an asterisk as model forms. Thus e.g. in the strong verb the 3rd *sing. fem.* קָטְלָה is the model for קָטְלִי , which likewise has only a vocalic affirmative, and קָטְלֵךְ is the model for קָטְלֵךְ , קָטְלֵי and קָטְלֵנִי , which in the same way have a toneless affirmative beginning with a consonant. On the other hand, the forms קָטְלֵתֶם and קָטְלֵתֶן , where the affix beginning with a consonant has the tone, stand by themselves.—In the table of the pronouns the asterisk has a different meaning; see the footnote there.—The bracketed forms (from Paradigm G onwards) are merely analogous formations not occurring in the Old Testament.

The newly added paradigm (Q) consists of forms actually found, belonging to various verbs.

A. The Personal

Nominative of the Pronoun,
or *Pronomen separatum*.

Accusative of the Pronoun,

A.

Simple form.

Sing. I. comm. אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי; אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי I.

אֲנִי; אֲנִי; אֲנִי me.

2. { m. אַתָּה (אַתָּה), in pause
אַתָּה } thou.
f. אַתְּ (אַתְּ)

אַתָּה; אַתָּה, in pause אַתָּה,
אַתָּה } thee.
אַתְּ; אַתְּ; אַתְּ, אַתְּ

3. { m. הוּא he.
f. הִיא she.

הוּא, ו; הוּא (הוּ), ו; הוּא him.

הִיא; הִיא; הִיא her (eam).

Plur. I. comm. אֲנַחְנוּ (נַחְנוּ), in
pause אֲנַחְנוּ (נַחְנוּ) we.

אֲנַחְנוּ; אֲנַחְנוּ; אֲנַחְנוּ us.

2. { m. אַתֶּם
f. אַתֶּן, אַתֶּן } you.

אַתֶּם; אַתֶּם } you.
[אַתֶּן; אַתֶּן]

3. { m. הֵם, הֵמָּה } they.
f. הֵנָּה

(הֵם), ם; ם, ם, מוּ* ; ם,
(ם), מוּ* them (eos).

[הֵן], ו; ו, (ם); [ם] them (eas).



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

B. Strong

		Qal.			Niph'al.	Pi'el.	
<i>Perf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	קָטַל*	כָּבַד*	קָטַן*	נִקְטַל*	קָטַל, קָטַל*	
	3. f.	קָטְלָה*	כָּבְדָה*	קָטְנָה*	נִקְטְלָה*	קָטְלָה*	
	2. m.	קָטַלְתָּ*	כָּבַדְתָּ*	קָטַנְתָּ*	נִקְטַלְתָּ*	קָטַלְתָּ*	
	2. f.	קָטַלְתְּ*	כָּבַדְתְּ*	קָטַנְתְּ*	נִקְטַלְתְּ*	קָטַלְתְּ*	
	1. c.	קָטַלְתִּי	כָּבַדְתִּי	קָטַנְתִּי	נִקְטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתִּי	
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	קָטְלוּ	כָּבְדוּ	קָטְנוּ	נִקְטְלוּ	קָטְלוּ
		2. m.	קָטַלְתֶּם*	כָּבַדְתֶּם*	קָטַנְתֶּם*	נִקְטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם
		2. f.	קָטַלְתֶּן	כָּבַדְתֶּן	קָטַנְתֶּן	נִקְטַלְתֶּן	קָטַלְתֶּן
1. c.		קָטְלוּנִי	כָּבְדוּנִי	קָטְנוּנִי	נִקְטְלוּנִי	קָטְלוּנִי	
<i>Inf.</i>	שָׁכַב, קָטַל*			הִקְטִיל*	קָטַל*		
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	קָטוּל*			הִקְטִיל, נִקְטַל	קָטַל, קָטַל*		
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	2. m.	קָטַל*	כָּבַד*	הִקְטִיל*	קָטַל*		
	2. f.	קָטְלִי*	כָּבְדִי*	הִקְטְלִי*	קָטְלִי*		
	<i>Plur.</i>	2. m.	קָטְלוּ	כָּבְדוּ	הִקְטְלוּ	קָטְלוּ	
		2. f.	קָטְלֶנָה*	כָּבְדֶנָה*	הִקְטְלֶנָה*	קָטְלֶנָה*	
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יִקְטַל*	יִכְבֵּד*	יִקְטַן*	יִקְטַל*	יִקְטַל*	
	3. f.	תִּקְטַל	תִּכְבֵּד		תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטַל	
	2. m.	תִּקְטַל	תִּכְבֵּד		תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטַל	
	2. f.	תִּקְטְלִי*	תִּכְבְּדִי*		תִּקְטְלִי*	תִּקְטְלִי*	
	1. c.	אֶקְטַל	אֶכְבֵּד		אֶקְטַל	אֶקְטַל	
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יִקְטְלוּ	יִכְבְּדוּ		יִקְטְלוּ	יִקְטְלוּ
		3. f.	תִּקְטְלֶנָה*	תִּכְבְּדֶנָה*		תִּקְטְלֶנָה*	תִּקְטְלֶנָה*
		2. m.	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּכְבְּדוּ		תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּקְטְלוּ
		2. f.	תִּקְטְלֶנָה	תִּכְבְּדֶנָה		תִּקְטְלֶנָה	תִּקְטְלֶנָה
		1. c.	נִקְטַל	נִכְבֵּד		נִקְטַל	נִקְטַל
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>							
<i>Part. act.</i>	קָטַל*	כָּבַד	קָטַן	נִקְטַל*	מִקְטַל*		
<i>pass.</i>	קָטוּל*						

Verb.

<i>Pu'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Hithpa'el.</i>
קָטַל*	הִקְטִיל*	הִקְטַל*	הִתְקַטַּל*
קָטַלְהָ*	הִקְטִילְהָ*	הִקְטַלְהָ*	הִתְקַטַּלְהָ*
קָטַלְתָּ*	הִקְטַלְתָּ*	הִקְטַלְתָּ*	הִתְקַטַּלְתָּ*
קָטַלְתִּי	הִקְטַלְתִּי	הִקְטַלְתִּי	הִתְקַטַּלְתִּי
קָטַלְוּ	הִקְטִילוּ	הִקְטַלוּ	הִתְקַטַּלוּ
קָטַלְתֶּם	הִקְטַלְתֶּם	הִקְטַלְתֶּם	הִתְקַטַּלְתֶּם
קָטַלְתֶּן	הִקְטַלְתֶּן	הִקְטַלְתֶּן	הִתְקַטַּלְתֶּן
קָטַלְנוּ	הִקְטַלְנוּ	הִקְטַלְנוּ	הִתְקַטַּלְנוּ
wanting. קָטַל*	הִקְטִיל* הִקְטַל*	wanting. הִקְטַל*	הִתְקַטַּל* הִתְקַטַּל*
wanting.	הִקְטַל* הִקְטִילי* הִקְטִילוּ הִקְטַלְנָה*	wanting.	הִתְקַטַּל* הִתְקַטַּלְי* הִתְקַטַּלוּ הִתְקַטַּלְנָה*
יִקְטַל*	יִקְטִיל*	יִקְטַל*	יִתְקַטַּל*
תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטִיל	תִּקְטַל	תִּתְקַטַּל
תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטִיל	תִּקְטַל	תִּתְקַטַּל
תִּקְטַלְי*	תִּקְטַלְי*	תִּקְטַלְי*	תִּתְקַטַּלְי*
אִקְטַל	אִקְטִיל	אִקְטַל	אִתְקַטַּל
יִקְטַלוּ	יִקְטִילוּ	יִקְטַלוּ	יִתְקַטַּלוּ
תִּקְטַלְנָה*	תִּקְטַלְנָה*	תִּקְטַלְנָה*	תִּתְקַטַּלְנָה*
תִּקְטַלוּ	תִּקְטִילוּ	תִּקְטַלוּ	תִּתְקַטַּלוּ
תִּקְטַלְנָה	תִּקְטַלְנָה	תִּקְטַלְנָה	תִּתְקַטַּלְנָה
נִקְטַל	נִקְטִיל	נִקְטַל	נִתְקַטַּל
	יִקְטַל*		
	מִקְטִיל*		מִתְקַטַּל*
מִקְטַל*		מִקְטַל*	

C. Strong Verb

		Suffixes	1 Sing.	2 Sing. m.	2 Sing. f.	3 Sing. m.	
<i>Perf. Qal</i>	3. m.		{ קָטַלְנִי שָׁבַחְנִי }	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלְךָ	{ קָטַלְהוּ קָטַלוּ }	
	3. f.		קָטַלְתִּנִּי	קָטַלְתְּךָ	קָטַלְתְּךָ	{ קָטַלְתְּהוּ קָטַלְתְּהוּ }	
	2. m.		קָטַלְתִּנִּי	—	—	{ קָטַלְתְּהוּ קָטַלְתְּהוּ }	
	2. f.		קָטַלְתִּינִי	—	—	קָטַלְתְּיָהוּ	
	1. c.		—	קָטַלְתִּיךָ	קָטַלְתִּיךָ	{ קָטַלְתִּיו קָטַלְתִּיהוּ }	
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.		קָטַלְנִי	{ קָטַלְוּךָ שָׁבַחְוּךָ }	קָטַלְוּךָ	קָטַלְוּהוּ
		2. m.		קָטַלְתִּוְנִי	—	—	קָטַלְתְּוּהוּ
		1. c.		—	קָטַלְנִוּךָ	קָטַלְנִוּךָ	קָטַלְנִוּהוּ
	<i>Inf. Qal</i>		{ קָטַלְי קָטַלְנִי }	{ פְּתַבְךָ קָטַלְךָ }	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלוּ	
	<i>Imp. Qal</i>	2.		קָטַלְנִי	—	—	קָטַלְהוּ
			(from an Imperf. in a שָׁבַחְנִי, שָׁמַעְנִי)				
<i>Impf. Qal</i>	3. m.		{ יִקְטַלְנִי יִלְבַּשְׁנִי }	{ יִקְטַלְךָ יִלְבַּשְׁךָ }	{ יִקְטַלְךָ יִלְבַּשְׁךָ }	{ יִקְטַלְהוּ יִלְבַּשְׁהוּ }	
	3. m. with <i>Nûn energ.</i>		יִקְטַלְנִי	יִקְטַלְךָ	—	יִקְטַלְנֻהוּ	
	<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.		יִקְטַלְנִי	יִקְטַלְוּךָ	יִקְטַלְוּךָ	{ יִקְטַלְוּהוּ יִגְאָלְוּהוּ }	
<i>Perf. Pī'el</i>	3. m.		קָטַלְנִי	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלוּ	



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

D. Verbs primae gutturalis

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'il.	Hoph'al.	
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	עָמַד	נִעְמַד*	הֵעִמִּיד*	הֵעֲמִיד*	
3. f.	עָמְדָה	נִעְמְדָה*	הֵעִמְדָה	הֵעֲמְדָה*	
2. m.	עָמַדְתָּ	נִעְמַדְתָּ	הֵעִמַּדְתָּ	הֵעֲמַדְתָּ	
2. f.	עָמַדְתְּ	נִעְמַדְתְּ	הֵעִמַּדְתְּ	הֵעֲמַדְתְּ	
1. c.	עָמַדְתִּי	נִעְמַדְתִּי	הֵעִמַּדְתִּי	הֵעֲמַדְתִּי	
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.	עָמְדוּ	נִעְמְדוּ	הֵעִמְדוּ	הֵעֲמְדוּ	
2. m.	עָמַדְתֶּם*	נִעְמַדְתֶּם	הֵעִמַּדְתֶּם	הֵעֲמַדְתֶּם	
2. f.	עָמַדְתֶּן*	נִעְמַדְתֶּן	הֵעִמַּדְתֶּן	הֵעֲמַדְתֶּן	
1. c.	עָמַדְנוּ	נִעְמַדְנוּ	הֵעִמַּדְנוּ	הֵעֲמַדְנוּ	
<i>Inf.</i>	עָמַד*	הֵעִמַּד*	הֵעִמִּיד*		
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	עָמוּד	נִעְמֹד, הָאָסֶף	הֵעִמַּד*	הֵעֲמִיד*	
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> m.	עָמַד*	חֹק*	הֵעִמַּד*	הֵעִמִּיד	wanting.
f.	עָמְדִי	חֹקִי	הֵעִמְדִי	הֵעֲמִידִי	
<i>Plur. m.</i>	עָמְדוּ	חֹקוּ	הֵעִמְדוּ	הֵעֲמִידוּ	
f.	עָמְדֵנָה*	חֹקֵנָה*	הֵעִמְדֵנָה	הֵעֲמִידֵנָה	
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	יַעֲמֵד*	יִחְזַק*	יַעֲמֵד*	יַעֲמִיד*	יַעֲמֵד*
3. f.	תַּעֲמֵד	תִּחְזַק	תַּעֲמֵד	תַּעֲמִיד	תַּעֲמֵד
2. m.	תַּעֲמֵד	תִּחְזַק	תַּעֲמֵד	תַּעֲמִיד	תַּעֲמֵד
2. f.	תַּעֲמְדִי*	תִּחְזְקִי*	תַּעֲמְדִי	תַּעֲמִידִי	תַּעֲמְדִי*
1. c.	אֶעֱמֵד*	אֶחְזַק	אֶעֱמֵד	אֶעֱמִיד	אֶעֱמֵד
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יַעֲמְדוּ*	יִחְזְקוּ*	יַעֲמְדוּ	יַעֲמִידוּ	יַעֲמְדוּ
3. f.	תַּעֲמְדֵנָה	תִּחְזְקֵנָה	תַּעֲמְדֵנָה	תַּעֲמִידֵנָה	תַּעֲמְדֵנָה
2. m.	תַּעֲמְדוּ	תִּחְזְקוּ	תַּעֲמְדוּ	תַּעֲמִידוּ	תַּעֲמְדוּ
2. f.	תַּעֲמְדֵנָה	תִּחְזְקֵנָה	תַּעֲמְדֵנָה	תַּעֲמִידֵנָה	תַּעֲמְדֵנָה
1. c.	נִעְמַד	נִחְזַק	נִעְמַד	נִעְמִיד	נִעְמַד
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			יַעֲמֵד		
<i>Part. act.</i>	עֹמֵד	נִעְמָד*	מֵעִמִּיד*		
<i>pass.</i>	עָמוּד			מֵעֲמִיד	

E. Verbs mediae gutturalis.

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Pi'el.	Pu'al.	Hithpa'el.
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	שָׁחַט	נִשְׁחַט	בָּרַךְ*	בָּרַךְ*	הִתְבָּרַךְ*
3. f.	שָׁחַטָה*	נִשְׁחַטָה*	בָּרְכָה	[בָּרְכָה]	הִתְבָּרְכָה
2. m.	שָׁחַטְתָּ	נִשְׁחַטְתָּ	בָּרַכְתָּ	בָּרַכְתָּ	הִתְבָּרַכְתָּ
2. f.	שָׁחַטְתְּ	נִשְׁחַטְתְּ	בָּרַכְתְּ	בָּרַכְתְּ	הִתְבָּרַכְתְּ
1. c.	שָׁחַטְתִּי	נִשְׁחַטְתִּי	בָּרַכְתִּי	בָּרַכְתִּי	הִתְבָּרַכְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.	שָׁחַטוּ*	נִשְׁחַטוּ*	בָּרְכוּ	בָּרְכוּ	הִתְבָּרְכוּ
2. m.	שָׁחַטְתֶּם	נִשְׁחַטְתֶּם	בָּרַכְתֶּם	בָּרַכְתֶּם	הִתְבָּרַכְתֶּם
2. f.	שָׁחַטְתֶּן	נִשְׁחַטְתֶּן	[בָּרַכְתֶּן]	בָּרַכְתֶּן	הִתְבָּרַכְתֶּן
1. c.	שָׁחַטְנוּ	נִשְׁחַטְנוּ	בָּרַכְנוּ	בָּרַכְנוּ	הִתְבָּרַכְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	שָׁחַט	הִשְׁחַט	בָּרַךְ*	wanting.	הִתְבָּרַךְ*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	שָׁחוּט	נִשְׁחוּט	בָּרַךְ*		
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> m.	שָׁחַט*	הִשְׁחַט	בָּרַךְ*		הִתְבָּרַךְ*
f.	שָׁחַטִי*	הִשְׁחַטִי*	בָּרְכִי*	wanting.	[הִתְבָּרְכִי]
<i>Plur.</i> m.	שָׁחַטוּ	הִשְׁחַטוּ	בָּרְכוּ		[הִתְבָּרְכוּ]
f.	שָׁחַטְנָה	הִשְׁחַטְנָה	בָּרַכְנָה*		הִתְבָּרַכְנָה
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	יִשְׁחַט*	יִשְׁחַט	יְבָרַךְ*	יְבָרַךְ*	יִתְבָּרַךְ*
3. f.	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תְּבָרַךְ	תְּבָרַךְ	תִּתְבָּרַךְ
2. m.	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תְּבָרַךְ	תְּבָרַךְ	תִּתְבָּרַךְ
אֲשֶׁר. f.	תִּשְׁחַטִי*	תִּשְׁחַטִי*	תְּבָרְכִי	[תְּבָרְכִי]	[תִּתְבָּרְכִי]
יִשְׁלַח. c.	אֲשַׁחַט	אֲשַׁחַט	אֲבָרַךְ	אֲבָרַךְ	אֲתְבָרַךְ
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יִשְׁחַטוּ	יִשְׁחַטוּ	יְבָרְכוּ	יְבָרְכוּ	יִתְבָּרְכוּ
3. f.	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תְּבָרַכְנָה	תְּבָרַכְנָה	תִּתְבָּרַכְנָה
2. m.	תִּשְׁחַטוּ	תִּשְׁחַטוּ	תְּבָרְכוּ	תְּבָרְכוּ	תִּתְבָּרְכוּ
2. f.	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תְּבָרַכְנָה	תְּבָרַכְנָה	תִּתְבָּרַכְנָה
1. c.	נִשְׁחַט	נִשְׁחַט	נְבָרַךְ	נְבָרַךְ	נִתְבָּרַךְ
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִשְׁחַטְהוּ				
<i>Part. act.</i>	שֹׁחֵט	נֹשְׁחָט	מְבָרַךְ*		מִתְבָּרַךְ*
<i>pass.</i>	שָׁחוּט			מְבָרָךְ*	

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Pi'el.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	שָׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	שִׁלַּח*
3. <i>f.</i>	שָׁלְחָה	נִשְׁלְחָה	שִׁלְחָה
2. <i>m.</i>	שָׁלַחְתָּ	נִשְׁלַחְתָּ	שִׁלַּחְתָּ
2. <i>f.</i>	שָׁלַחְתְּ*	נִשְׁלַחְתְּ*	שִׁלַּחְתְּ*
1. <i>c.</i>	שָׁלַחְתִּי	נִשְׁלַחְתִּי	שִׁלַּחְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>c.</i>	שָׁלְחוּ	נִשְׁלְחוּ	שִׁלְחוּ
2. <i>m.</i>	שָׁלַחְתֶּם	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּם	שִׁלַּחְתֶּם
2. <i>f.</i>	שָׁלַחְתֶּן	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּן	שִׁלַּחְתֶּן
1. <i>c.</i>	שָׁלַחְנוּ	נִשְׁלַחְנוּ	שִׁלַּחְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	שִׁלַּח*	הִשְׁלַח*	שִׁלַּח*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	שֹׁלַח	נִשְׁלֹחַ	שִׁלַּח
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> <i>m.</i>	שִׁלַּח*	הִשְׁלַח*	שִׁלַּח*
<i>f.</i>	שִׁלְחִי	הִשְׁלְחִי	שִׁלְחִי*
<i>Plur. m.</i>	שִׁלְחוּ	הִשְׁלְחוּ	שִׁלְחוּ
<i>f.</i>	שִׁלְחֵנָה*	הִשְׁלְחֵנָה	שִׁלְחֵנָה*
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִשְׁלַח*	יִנְשַׁלַּח*	יִשְׁלַח*
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּנְשַׁלַּח	תִּשְׁלַח*
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּנְשַׁלַּח	תִּשְׁלַח
2. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלְחִי	תִּנְשַׁלְחִי	תִּשְׁלְחִי
1. <i>c.</i>	אִשְׁלַח	אִנְשַׁלַּח	אִשְׁלַח
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִשְׁלְחוּ	יִנְשַׁלְּחוּ	יִשְׁלְחוּ
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*	תִּנְשַׁלְּחֵנָה*	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁלְחוּ	תִּנְשַׁלְּחוּ	תִּשְׁלְחוּ
2. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּנְשַׁלְּחֵנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה
1. <i>c.</i>	נִשְׁלַח	נִנְשַׁלַּח	נִשְׁלַח
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִשְׁלַחֲנִי		
<i>Part. act.</i>	שֹׁלַח*	נִשְׁלָח	מִשְׁלִיחַ*
<i>pass.</i>	שֹׁלְחָ*		



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

G. Verbs mediae geminatae

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	סָבַב, הִסַּב	נִסְבַּב, נִסְבַּס
3. <i>f.</i>	סָבְבָה, תִּסְבְּחָה	נִסְבְּבָה
2. <i>m.</i>	סָבַבְתָּ*	נִסְבַּבְתָּ*
2. <i>f.</i>	סָבַבְתְּ	נִסְבַּבְתְּ
1. <i>c.</i>	סָבַבְתִּי	נִסְבַּבְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>c.</i>	סָבְבוּ, תִּסְבְּחוּ	נִסְבְּבוּ
2. <i>m.</i>	סָבַבְתֶּם	נִסְבַּבְתֶּם
2. <i>f.</i>	סָבַבְתֶּן	נִסְבַּבְתֶּן
1. <i>c.</i>	סָבַבְנוּ	נִסְבַּבְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	סָבֵב*	הִסְבֵּב
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	סָבֹב	הִסְבֹּב, הִסְבֹּב
<i>Imp. Sing. m.</i>	סָבֵב*	הִסְבֵּב
<i>f.</i>	סָבְבִי*	הִסְבְּבִי*
<i>Plur. m.</i>	סָבְבוּ	הִסְבְּבוּ
<i>f.</i>	[סָבְבִינָה]	[הִסְבְּבִינָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִסְבֵּב (p 67 § יקל) * יִסְבֵּב	יִסְבֵּב*
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּסְבֵּב	תִּסְבֵּב
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּסְבֵּב	תִּסְבֵּב
2. <i>f.</i>	תִּסְבְּבִי*	תִּסְבְּבִי*
1. <i>c.</i>	אִסְבֵּב	אִסְבֵּב
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִסְבְּבוּ	יִסְבְּבוּ
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּסְבְּבִינָה*	[תִּסְבְּבִינָה]
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּסְבְּבוּ	תִּסְבְּבוּ
2. <i>f.</i>	[תִּסְבְּבִינָה]	[תִּסְבְּבִינָה]
1. <i>c.</i>	נִסְבֵּב	נִסְבֵּב
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>	וַיִּסְבֵּב* (pause וַיִּסְבֵּב)	
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִסְבְּבִי*	
<i>Part. act.</i>	סָבֵב	נִסְבֵּב
<i>pass.</i>	סָבֹב	(נִסְבְּבָה fem.)

or double v.

<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Po'el.</i>	<i>Po'al.</i>
הִסֵּב, הִסֵּב*	הוֹסֵב*	סוֹבֵב*	סוֹבֵב*
הִסְבָּה*	הוֹסְבָה	סוֹבְבָה	[סוֹבְבָה]
הִסְבֹּת*	[הוֹסְבֹת]	סוֹבְבֹת	סוֹבְבֹת
הִסְבֹּת	הוֹסְבֹת	סוֹבְבֹת	סוֹבְבֹת
הִסְבֹּתִי	[הוֹסְבֹתִי]	סוֹבְבֹתִי	סוֹבְבֹתִי
הִסְבֵּב, הִחֲלוֹ	הוֹסְבֵב	סוֹבְבֵב	סוֹבְבֵב
הִסְבֹּתֶם	[הוֹסְבֹתֶם]	סוֹבְבֹתֶם	סוֹבְבֹתֶם
הִסְבֹּתֶן	הוֹסְבֹתֶן	סוֹבְבֹתֶן	סוֹבְבֹתֶן
הִסְבִּינִי	[הוֹסְבִינִי]	סוֹבְבִינִי	[סוֹבְבִינִי]
הִסֵּב*		סוֹבֵב	
הִסֵּב	הִשְׁמָה	סוֹבֵב	[סוֹבֵב]
הִסֵּב*		סוֹבֵב	
הִסְבִּי	wanting.	[סוֹבְבִי]	wanting.
הִסְבֵּב		סוֹבְבֵב	
[הִסְבִּינָה]		[סוֹבְבִינָה]	
יִסֵּב, יִסֵּב*	יֹוֹסֵב, יֹוֹסֵב*	יִסוֹבֵב	[יִסוֹבֵב]
תִּסֵּב	[תוֹסֵב]	תִּסוֹבֵב	תִּסוֹבֵב
תִּסֵּב	תוֹסֵב	תִּסוֹבֵב	תִּסוֹבֵב
[תִּסְבִּי]	*תוֹסְבִי	[תִּסוֹבְבִי]	תִּסוֹבְבִי
אִסֵּב	[אוֹסֵב]	[אִסוֹבֵב]	אִסוֹבֵב
יִסְבֵּב, יִסְבֵּב	יֹוֹסְבֵב	יִסוֹבְבֵב	יִסוֹבְבֵב
*תִּסְבִּינָה	*[תוֹסְבִינָה]	[תִּסוֹבְבִינָה]	תִּסוֹבְבִינָה
תִּסְבֵּב	תוֹסְבֵב	תִּסוֹבְבֵב	תִּסוֹבְבֵב
תִּסְבִּינָה	תוֹסְבִינָה	[תִּסוֹבְבִינָה]	תִּסוֹבְבִינָה
נִסֵּב	[נוֹסֵב]	נִסוֹבֵב	[נִסוֹבֵב]
וַיִּסֵּב			
יִסְבִּי* (יִסְבְּכֶם)		יִסוֹבְבִי	
מִיִּסֵּב*		מִסוֹבֵב	
	מוֹסֵב		מִסוֹבֵב

H. Verbs 1st.

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'ël.	Hoph'al.
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	[נָגַשׁ] נָפַל	נָגַשׁ*	הִגִּישׁ*	הִגִּישׁ*
3. f.		נָגַשָּׁה	הִגִּיֶּשֶׁה	הִגִּיֶּשֶׁה
2. m.		נָגַשְׁתָּ	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתָּ	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתָּ
2. f.		נָגַשְׁתְּ	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתְּ	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתְּ
1. c.	regular.	נָגַשְׁתִּי	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתִּי	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתִּי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.		נָגַשׁוּ	הִגִּיֶּשׁוּ	הִגִּיֶּשׁוּ
2. m.		נָגַשְׁתֶּם	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתֶּם	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתֶּם
2. f.		נָגַשְׁתֶּן	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתֶּן	הִגִּיֶּשְׁתֶּן
1. c.		נָגַשְׁנוּ	הִגִּיֶּשְׁנוּ	הִגִּיֶּשְׁנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	נָגַשׁ*	נָפַל*	הִגִּישׁ	הִגִּישׁ*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	נָגוּשׁ	נָגוּף, הִגִּישׁ	הִגִּישׁ*	הִגִּישׁ*
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> m.	נָשׁ*	נָפַל*	הִגִּישׁ	הִגִּישׁ*
f.	נָשִׁי	נָפְלִי	הִגִּיֶּשִׁי	wanting.
<i>Plur. m.</i>	נָשׁוּ	נָפְלוּ	הִגִּיֶּשׁוּ	הִגִּיֶּשׁוּ
f.	נָשְׁנָה	נָפְלָנָה	הִגִּיֶּשְׁנָה	הִגִּיֶּשְׁנָה
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	יִגִּישׁ*	יִפֹּל*	[יִגִּישׁ]	יִגִּישׁ*
3. f.	תִּגִּישׁ	תִּפֹּל		תִּגִּישׁ
2. m.	תִּגִּישׁ	תִּפֹּל		תִּגִּישׁ
2. f.	תִּגִּיֶּשִׁי	תִּפְלִי		תִּגִּיֶּשִׁי
1. c.	אִגִּישׁ	אִפֹּל		אִגִּישׁ
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יִגִּישׁוּ	יִפְלוּ	regular.	יִגִּישׁוּ
3. f.	תִּגִּיֶּשְׁנָה	תִּפְלִנָּה		תִּגִּיֶּשְׁנָה
2. m.	תִּגִּישׁוּ	תִּפְלוּ		תִּגִּישׁוּ
2. f.	[תִּגִּיֶּשְׁנָה]	[תִּפְלִנָּה]		[תִּגִּיֶּשְׁנָה]
1. c.	נָגַשׁ	נָפַל		נָגַשׁ
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			יִגִּישׁ*	
<i>Part. act.</i>	לֹגֵשׁ		נֹגֵשׁ*	מֹגִישׁ*
<i>pass.</i>	נֹגֵשׁ			מֹגֵשׁ



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

		Qal.	Niph'al.	
<i>Perf. Sing</i>	3. m.	יָשַׁב	נִישַׁב*	
	3. f.		נִישְׁבָּה*	
	2. m.		נִישְׁבַּת	
	2. f.		נִישְׁבַּת	
	1. c.	regular.	נִישְׁבַּתִּי	
	<i>Plur.</i>		3. c.	נִישְׁבוּ
			2. m.	נִישְׁבַּתֶּם
			2. f.	נִישְׁבַּתְנָן
1. c.		נִישְׁבְּנוּ		
<i>Inf.</i>	יֹסֵד, רָשַׁת, *נִשְׁבַּת	*הִישַׁב		
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	יָשׁוּב	wanting.		
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	m.	*יֹשֵׁב, דַּע	*הִישַׁב	
	f.	שְׁבִי	הִישְׁבִי	
	<i>Plur.</i>	m.	שְׁבוּ	הִישְׁבוּ
		f.	שְׁבֹנָה	[הִישְׁבֹּנָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	*יֹשֵׁב	*יֹשֵׁב	
	3. f.	תִּישַׁב	תִּישְׁבִי	
	2. m.	תִּישַׁב	תִּישַׁב	
	2. f.	תִּישְׁבִי	תִּישְׁבִי	
	1. c.	אִישַׁב	*אִישַׁב	
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יֹשְׁבוּ	יֹשְׁבוּ
		3. f.	תִּישְׁבֹּנָה	[תִּישְׁבֹּנָה]
		2. m.	תִּישְׁבוּ	תִּישְׁבוּ
		2. f.	[תִּישְׁבֹּנָה]	[תִּישְׁבֹּנָה]
		1. c.	נִישַׁב	נִישַׁב
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>				
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>	*וַיֹּשֵׁב			
<i>Part. act.</i>	יֹשֵׁב	*נִישַׁב		
<i>pass.</i>	יָשׁוּב			

פ"י (for פ"ו).

L. Verbs properly פ"י.

<i>Hiph'el.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Hiph'el.</i>
הוֹשִׁיב*	הוֹשִׁיב*	יָטַב	הִיטִיב*
הוֹשִׁיבָה	הוֹשִׁיבָה		הִיטִיבָה
הוֹשִׁיבְתָּ	הוֹשִׁיבְתָּ		הִיטִיבְתָּ
הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי	הוֹשִׁיבְתִּי	regular.	הִיטִיבְתִּי
הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשִׁיבוּ		הִיטִיבוּ
הוֹשִׁיבְתֶּם	הוֹשִׁיבְתֶּם		הִיטִיבְתֶּם
הוֹשִׁיבְתֶּן	הוֹשִׁיבְתֶּן		הִיטִיבְתֶּן
הוֹשִׁיבֶנּוּ	הוֹשִׁיבֶנּוּ		הִיטִיבֶנּוּ
הוֹשִׁיב*	הוֹשִׁיב*	יָטַב	הִיטִיב*
הוֹשִׁיב		יָטוּב	הִיטִיב
הוֹשִׁיב	wanting.		הִיטִיב*
הוֹשִׁיבִי			הִיטִיבִי
הוֹשִׁיבוּ			הִיטִיבוּ
[הוֹשִׁיבְנָה]			[הִיטִיבְנָה]
יוֹשִׁיב	יוֹשִׁיב*	יִיטֵב*	יִיטֵב*
תוֹשִׁיב	תוֹשִׁיב	תִּיטֵב	תִּיטֵב
תוֹשִׁיב	תוֹשִׁיב	תִּיטֵב	תִּיטֵב
תוֹשִׁיבִי	תוֹשִׁיבִי	תִּיטֵבִי	תִּיטֵבִי
אוֹשִׁיב	אוֹשִׁיב	אִיטֵב	אִיטֵב
יוֹשִׁיבוּ	יוֹשִׁיבוּ	יִיטְבוּ	יִיטְבוּ
[תוֹשִׁיבְנָה]	תוֹשִׁיבְנָה	תִּיטְבְּנָה	[תִּיטְבְּנָה]
תוֹשִׁיבוּ	תוֹשִׁיבוּ	תִּיטְבוּ	תִּיטְבוּ
[תוֹשִׁיבְנָה]	[תוֹשִׁיבְנָה]	[תִּיטְבְּנָה]	[תִּיטְבְּנָה]
נוֹשִׁיב	נוֹשִׁיב	נִיטֵב	נִיטֵב
יִוֹשֵׁב			יִיטֵב
וַיִּוֹשֵׁב		וַיִּיטֵב	וַיִּיטֵב
מוֹשִׁיב*	מוֹשֵׁב*	יָטַב	מִיטֵב
		יָטוּב	

		Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'il.	
<i>Perf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	קָם*	מָת*	נָקוּם*	
	3. f.	קָמָה*	מָתָה*	נָקוּמָה*	
	2. m.	קָמַת*	מָתָה*	נָקוּמַת	
	2. f.	קָמַת	[מַת]	[נָקוּמַת]	
	1. c.	קָמַתִּי	מָתִי	נָקוּמַתִּי	
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	קָמוּ	מָתוּ	נָקוּמוּ
		2. m.	קָמַתֶּם	[מַתֶּם]	נָקוּמוּתֶם
		2. f.	[קָמַתְנָן]	[מַתְנָן]	[נָקוּמוּתְנָן]
1. c.		קָמַנּוּ	כָּתְנוּ	[נָקוּמוּנּוּ]	
<i>Inf.</i>		קוּם*	הַקוּם*	הַקִּים*	
<i>Inf. absol.</i>		קוּם*	הַקוּם, נָסוּג	הַקִּם*	
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	m.	קוּם*	הַקוּם*	הַקִּם*	
	f.	קוּמִי*	[הַקוּמִי]	הַקִּימִי*	
	<i>Plur. m.</i>		קוּמוּ	הַקוּמוּ	הַקִּימוּ
		f.	קָמְנָה*		[הַקָּמְנָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יָקוּם, יָבוֹא*	יִקוּם*	יִקִּים*	
	3. f.	תִּקוּם	תִּקוּם	תִּקִּים	
	2. m.	תִּקוּם	תִּקוּם	תִּקִּים	
	2. f.	תִּקְוִי*	[תִּקְוִי]	תִּקְוִי*	
	1. c.	אָקוּם	אָקוּם	אָקִים	
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יִקְוּמוּ	יִקְוּמוּ	יִקְוִמוּ
		3. f.	תִּקְוִינָה, תִּשְׁבְּנָה*		תִּקְוִינָה, תִּקְמִינָה*
		2. m.	תִּקְוּמוּ	תִּקְוּמוּ	תִּקְוִמוּ
		2. f.	תִּקְוִינָח		[תִּקְמִנָה]
1. c.		נָקוּם	נָקוּם	נָקִים	
<i>Shortened Impf.</i>		יִקֶּם*	יִקֶּם*		
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>		וַיִּקֶּם (pause וַיִּקֶּם*)	וַיִּקֶּם*		
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>		יִשׁוּפְנִי*	יִקְוִימֵנִי*		
<i>Part. act.</i>		קָם*	נָקוּם*	מִקִּים*	
	<i>pass.</i>	קוּם*			



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

		<i>Qal.</i>		<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Pi'el.</i>	
<i>Perf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	מָצָא*	מָלֵא	נִמְצָא*	הִכָּא, מִצָּא	
	3. f.	מָצְאָה	מָלְאָה	נִמְצְאָה	[מָצְאָה]	
	2. m.	מָצְאָתָ*	מָלְאָתָ	נִמְצְאָתָ*	מָצְאָתָ*	
	2. f.	מָצְאָת	מָלְאָת	נִמְצְאָת	[מָצְאָת]	
	1. c.	מָצְאָתִי	מָלְאָתִי	נִמְצְאָתִי	מָצְאָתִי	
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	מָצְאוּ	מָלְאוּ	נִמְצְאוּ	מָצְאוּ
		2. m.	מָצְאָתֶם	מָלְאָתֶם	נִמְצְאָתֶם	מָצְאָתֶם
		2. f.	[מָצְאָתֶן]	[מָלְאָתֶן]	[נִמְצְאָתֶן]	[מָצְאָתֶן]
		1. c.	מָצְאָנוּ	מָלְאָנוּ	[נִמְצְאָנוּ]	מָצְאָנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	מִצֵּא		הִמְצֵא	מִצֵּא		
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	מִצּוֹא		נִמְצֵא	מִצֵּא		
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	m.	מִצֵּא*		הִמְצֵא	מִצֵּא	
	f.	מִצְּאִי		[הִמְצְּאִי]	[מִצְּאִי]	
	<i>Plur. m.</i>		מִצְּאוּ		הִמְצְּאוּ	מִצְּאוּ
		f.	מִמְצְּאֵנָה*		[הִמְצְּאֵנָה]	[מִמְצְּאֵנָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יִמְצָא*		יִמְצָא*	יִמְצָא	
	3. f.	תִּמְצָא		תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	
	2. m.	תִּמְצָא		תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	
	2. f.	תִּמְצְּאִי		תִּמְצְּאִי	[תִּמְצְּאִי]	
	1. c.	אִמְצָא		אִמְצָא	אִמְצָא	
	<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יִמְצְּאוּ		יִמְצְּאוּ	יִמְצְּאוּ
		3. f.	תִּמְצְּאֵנָה*		תִּמְצְּאֵנָה*	תִּמְצְּאֵנָה*
		2. m.	תִּמְצְּאוּ		תִּמְצְּאוּ	[תִּמְצְּאוּ]
		2. f.	תִּמְצְּאֵנָה		תִּמְצְּאֵנָה	תִּמְצְּאֵנָה
		1. c.	נִמְצָא		[נִמְצָא]	נִמְצָא
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>						
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>		יִמְצְּאֵנִי, יִמְצְּאֵנִי			יִמְצְּאֵנִי	
<i>Part. act.</i>		מִצֵּא		נִמְצָא	מִמְצָא	
	<i>pass.</i>	מִצּוֹא				

Verbs, ל"א.

<i>Pu'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Hithpa'el.</i>
קרא [מצא]	המציא	[המצא]	[התמצא]
מצאה	המציאה	המצאה	התמצאה
מצאת	המציאת*	[המצאת]*	התמצאת*
מצאת	המצאת	המצאת	[התמצאת]
מצאתי	המציאתי	המציאתי	התמצאתי
מצאו	המציאו	המצאו	התמצאו
מצאתם	המצאתם	המצאתם	[התמצאתם]
מצאתו	[המצאתו]	המצאתו	התמצאתו
[מצאנו]	[המצאנו]	[המצאנו]	[התמצאנו]
wanting.	המציא המצא	wanting.	התמצא wanting.
wanting.	המצא המציאי המציאו [המצאנה]	wanting.	[התמצא] התמצאי התמצאו התמצאנה]
ימצא	ימציא	[ימצא]	יתמצא
[תמצא]	תמציא	תמצא	תתמצא
תמצא	תמציא	תמצא	תתמצא
תמצאי	תמציאי	תמצאי	[תתמצאי]
אמצא	אמציא	אמצא	אתמצא
ימצאו	ימציאו	ימצאו	יתמצאו
*תמצאנה	*תמציאנה	*תמצאנה	[תתמצאנה]
תמצאו	תמציאו	תמצאו	תתמצאו
תמצאנה	תמציאנה	תמצאנה	[תתמצאנה]
[נמצא]	נמציא	נמצא	[נתמצא]
	ימצא		
	ימציאני		
	ממציא		מתמצא
ממצא		ממצא	

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Pi'el.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	גָּלָה*	נִגְלָה*	גָּלָה*
3. f.	גָּלְתָה*	נִגְלְתָה*	גָּלְתָה*
2. m.	גָּלִיתָ*	נִגְלִיתָ, יָתָ	גָּלִיתָ*
2. f.	גָּלִית	נִגְלִית	גָּלִית
1. c.	גָּלִיתִי	נִגְלִיתִי	גָּלִיתִי, גָּלִיתִי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.	גָּלוּ*	נִגְלוּ	גָּלוּ
2. m.	גָּלִיתֶם	[נִגְלִיתֶם]	גָּלִיתֶם
2. f.	גָּלִיתֶן	[נִגְלִיתֶן]	[גָּלִיתֶן]
1. c.	גָּלִינוּ	נִגְלִינוּ	גָּלִינוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	גָּלוֹת*	הַגָּלוֹת*	גָּלוֹת*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	גָּלָה	נִגְלָה, הַנִּגְלָה	גָּלָה, גָּלָה
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> m.	גָּלֵה*	הַגָּלֵה*	גָּלֵה, גָּל
f.	גָּלִי*	הַגָּלִי*	גָּלִי*
<i>Plur.</i> m.	גָּלוּ	הַגָּלוּ	גָּלוּ
f.	גָּלִינָה*	[הַגָּלִינָה]	[גָּלִינָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	יִגְלֶה*	יִגְלֶה*	יִגְלֶה*
3. f.	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה
2. m.	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגְלֶה
2. f.	תִּגְלִי*	[תִּגְלִי]	תִּגְלִי*
1. c.	אִגְלֶה	אִגְלֶה, אִגְלֵי	אִגְלֶה
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יִגְלוּ	יִגְלוּ	יִגְלוּ
3. f.	תִּגְלִינָה*	תִּגְלִינָה*	תִּגְלִינָה*
2. m.	תִּגְלוּ	תִּגְלוּ	תִּגְלוּ
2. f.	תִּגְלִינָה	תִּגְלִינָה	תִּגְלִינָה
1. c.	נִגְלֶה	[נִגְלֶה]	נִגְלֶה
<i>Shortened Impf.</i>	יִגְלֵ*	יִגְלֵ*	יִגְלֵ*
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִגְלֶה, *יִגְלֵנִי		יִגְלֶה, *יִגְלֵנִי
<i>Part. act.</i>	גָּלָה*	נִגְלָה*	גָּלָה*
<i>pass.</i>	גָּלוּי*		



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

	1. Sing.	2. Sing. m.	2. Sing. f.
<i>Perf. Qal. 3. m.</i>	נָחַנִּי	רָאָה, עָשָׂה	
	<i>P.</i> עָשָׂנִי	<i>P.</i> קָנָה, עָנָה	
3. f.	עָשָׂתִנִּי		
2. m.	רָאִיתִנִּי		
	<i>P.</i> עָנִיתִנִּי		
2. f.	<i>Pi.</i> רָפוּתִנִּי		
1. c.		רָאִיתִיךָ	עָנִיתִיךָ
<i>Plur. 3. c.</i>	עָשׂוּנִי	רָאוּךָ	<i>Pi.</i> כָּסוּךָ
1. c.		<i>Pi.</i> קוֹיִנוּךָ	

<i>Imper. 2. m.</i>	נָחֵנִי } עֲנֵנִי }		
2. f.	<i>Hiph.</i> הִרְאֵינִי		
<i>Plur. 2. m.</i>	<i>Pi.</i> כַּפְּסוּנִי		

<i>Impf. 3. m.</i>	יִרְאֵנִי	יִפְדֶּךָ } יִחַתֶּךָ }	
3. f.		תִּשְׁבֶּךָ	
2. m.	תִּרְאֵנִי		
2. f.			
1. c.		אֶרְאֶךָ	אֶעֱרֶךָ
		אֶעֱנֶךָ	
<i>Plur. 3. m.</i>	יִעֲשׂוּנִי	<i>Pi.</i> יִפְתּוּךָ	
2. m.	תִּצַּוּנִי		

with Suffixes.

3. Sing. m.	3. Sing. f.	1. Plur.	3. Plur. m.
עָשָׂהוּ	רָאָהָ	עָשָׂנוּ	עָשׂוּם
<i>Pi.</i> בָּלְתָו	<i>Pi.</i> צִוְתָהּ		<i>Hiph.</i> הֶעֱלֵתָם
<i>Pi.</i> בָּפִיתָו	עָשִׂיתָהּ	<i>Pi.</i> דָּבִיתָנוּ	עָנִיתָם
עָשִׂיתָיָהּ } רָאִיתָיו }	רָאִיתָהּ		רָעִיתָם
עָשָׂהוּ	רָאָהָ		שָׁבוּם
<i>Pi.</i> קוֹיְנָהוּ			
		<i>Hiph.</i> הִרְאֵנוּ	רָעָם
תָּלַהּוּ			<i>Hiph.</i> הִכִּים
יִרְאֶהוּ } יִלְוֶנוּ }	יִרְאֶהָ } יִרְאֶנָּה }	<i>Pi.</i> יִצְוֵנוּ	יִחַצֵּם } יִעֲשִׂם }
<i>Hiph.</i> תִּשְׁקֶהוּ	תִּעֲשֶׂהָ	<i>Hiph.</i> תִּתְעַנֶּנוּ	תִּזְרֵם
תִּעֲשֶׂנוּ			<i>Pi.</i> תִּכְבְּסִים
אֶרְאֶנוּ	אֶעֱשֶׂנָּה		אֶפְדֵם
אֶעֱנֶהוּ			
<i>Pi.</i> יִפְתָּהוּ	יִעֲשֶׂהָ	<i>Pi.</i> יִעֲנֵנוּ	
נִשְׁקֶנוּ	נִעֲשֶׂנָּה		תִּצְוֵם



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

- 1 *c, m*, 2 *q, t*, 24 *e*, 44 *c*, 47 *a N, c N*: Pi'el, 52 *a*: Nûn epentheticum, 58 *i-l*: Aram. forms of verbs, י"י , 67 *g*: of verbs י"י , 72 *ee*: of verbs ה"ל , 75 *hh*: Aram. termination of the feminine, 80 *h*: of the plural, 87 *e*.
- Araq al-Emir, inscription of, 5 *a*.
- Archaisms, 2 *k, q*: supposed, in the Pentateuch, 2 *n*.
- Article, 35: syntax of, 126: with demonstrative force, 126 *a, b*: before names of classes, 126 *l-n*: in comparisons, 126 *o*, cf. *p*: with the attributive, 126 *u-x*: used as a relative, 138 *i, k*: punctuation of, 35, *a-k, o*: rarely retained after prepositions, 35 *n*: original form of, 35 *l*: א elided after it, 35 *d*: omitted with ה, ת, א after a subst. with pronom. suff., 126 *y*: found anomalously with a noun in constr. st., 127 *f-i*.
- Ashdod, language of, 2 *w*.
- Asher, ben, 7 *h N*².
- Aspirates, 6 *n*.
- Asseverations, 149.
- Assimilation, 19 *b-f*, 54 *c, d*, 66 *d-g*: of י and י 71: 'backward-assimilation,' 19 *f N*.
- Assuan papyri, 1 *m*.
- Assyrian language, 1 *d*.
- Asyndeton, cases of, 120 *g, h*, 154 *a N (a)*.
- Athê merahîq, 20 *f, g*.
- Athnâh, chief divider of verse in prose, 15 *f*: secondary divider in poetry, 15 *h*.
- Attraction, cases of, 145 *u N*³, 146 *a*.
- Attribute, *see* Adjective.
- Attributive ideas expressed by ש"א , בן , בעל , followed by a genitive, 128 *s-v*: by the genitive, 128 *o, p*, 135 *m*: by a substantive in apposition, 131 *c-e*: by a subst. as predicate, 141 *c, d*: negative expressed by a noun-clause, 152 *u, v*. *See also* Adjectival idea.
- Babylonian language, 1 *a, d, e, i*.
- Babylonian punctuation, 42 *N*³.
- B°gadh°phath letters, 3 *d*, 6 *n*, 12 *a, c*: aspiration of, 21.
- Ben Asher's recension of the text, 7 *h N*².
- Ben Naphthali's recension of the text, 7 *h N*².
- Beth essentiae, 119 *i*: pretii, 119 *p*.
- Bodily and mental defects denoted by adjectives of the form קטיל , 84^b *d*.
- Boustrophedon, 1 *k N*², 5 *d N*³.
- Canaanite branch of the Semitic languages, 1 *b (ii)*.
- Canaanite glosses in the cuneiform tablets of Tell el-Amarna, 2 *f N*¹.
- Cardinal numbers, 97.
- Case-endings, remains of early, 90: ן as locative, 90 *c, e*, of time, 90 *h*, in place-names and as a poetical form without meaning, 90 *f, g* with *N*: punctuation and tone, 90 *i*: י , 90 *k-m, o*: י - and י -, 90 *k, n, o*.
- Cases, absolute, 143 *c N*: instrumental, 144 *m N*.
- Casus pendens, various uses of, 111 *h*, 112 *n, t, mm, oo*, 116 *u*, 143, 159 *i*.
- Causal clauses, 106 *f*, 112 *nn*: syntax of, 158.
- Chaldee, incorrect use of the term, 1 *c N*.
- Changes of consonants, 19.
- Chiasmus in the arrangement of words in parallel members of a verse, 114 *r N*, 142 *f N*.
- Circumstantial clauses, 156: expressing negative qualities, 152 *u*: noun-clauses, 156 *c*: verbal, 156 *d*.
- Citation, formulae of, 150 *e*.
- Cognate accusative, 117 *p-r*.
- Cohortative, 48 *b*: form of, 48 *c, d*: meaning, 48 *e*: syntax of, 108: very rare in verbs ה"ל , 75 *l*.
- Coins, Hebrew, 2 *d (4)*.
- Collective nouns, 123 *a, b*: in fem. sing., 122 *s*: names of classes used collectively, 126 *l-p*: with the plural of the adj. or ptcp., 132 *g*: with the predicate in the plur. masc., 145 *b-e*, in 3rd pl. fem., 145 *c (י"א)*, in masc. sing., 145 *f*, in sing. followed by plur., 145 *g*, in fem. sing., 145 *k (cf. 135 p)*.
- Common gender, 122 *b, d*.
- Comparatio decurtata, 118 *r N*, 133 *e N*.
- Comparative, expression of, 133 *a-f*.
- Comparative clauses, 161.
- Comparison, use of article in, 126 *o, p*.
- Compensatory lengthening, 25 *a, 27 c, e-h*.
- Composition of words, 30 *p, (b), r, 81 d*, 152 *a N*: of particles, 99 *e*.
- Compound ideas, how thrown into the plural, 124 *p-r*: with the article, 127 *e*: with suffixes, 135 *n*.
- Compounds formed by א with a substantive or adjective, 152 *a N*.

- Concessive clauses, 160.
- Concord of subject and object in gender and number, 145 *a-t*: cases of false concord, 145 *u*.
- Conditional sentences, perfect in, 106 *p*: imperf. in, 107 *x*: cohortative in, 108 *e, f*: jussive in, 109 *h*: imperat. in, 110 *f*: ptep. in, 159 *v*: ptep. without DN , 116 *w*, 159 *i*: perf. consec. in apodosis, 112 *ff-mm*: different types of, 159: without conditional particle, 112 *kk, ll*, 159 *b-k*.
- Conjugations, or verba derivata, 38 *b*, 39 *c, d*: number and arrangement of, 39 *e-f*: Niph'al, 51: Pi'el and Pu'al, 52: Hiph'il and Hoph'al, 53: Hithpa'el, 54: the less common conjugations, 39 *g*, 55: conjugation of aim or attack (Pô'el), 55 *c*.
- Conjunctions, 104.
- Conjunctive accents, 15 *g, i*.
- Consecutio temporum, perf. and imperf. with wāw consec., 49: perf. with wāw consec., 112.
- Consecutive clauses, 107 *u*: syntax of, 166.
- Consonants, 5: changes of, 19: pronunciation and division of, 6: transcription of their names, 5 *fN*: weak consonants, 7 *a-g*: softening of, 19 *o*.
- Constructio ad sensum, 132 *g*, 145 *a-l*: asyndetos, 120 *g, h*, 154 *a N(a)*: praegnans, 119 *x, y, ff, gg*.
- Continuous action expressed by infin. abs., 113 *s-u*.
- Continuous progress expressed by duplication of a word, 133 *k*.
- Contraction of vowels, 7 *a*.
- Co-ordination of verbal ideas instead of subordination, 120.
- Copula, *see* Wāw copulativum: verbal, how expressed, 141 *f-h*.
- Cuneiform inscriptions, 1 *d, m N¹*, 5 *g(b)*, 6 *b*.
- Dageš forte, 12: in place of a letter assimilated, 19 *b-f*: orthophonikum, 20 *g*, 13 *c*: necessarium, compensativum, characteristicum, 20 *a*: euphonicum, 20 *c*: conjunctivum, 20 *c-f*: dirimens, 20 *h*: affectuosum, 20 *i*: firmativum, 20 *k*: implicitum, 20 *m*, 22 *c*: omission of, 20 *l, m*: in gutturals, 22 *b, s*: occasionally in \daleth , 22 *q(a)*, *s*: four times in \aleph (acc. to others Mappiq), 14 *d*: omitted sometimes in 2nd radical of verbs $\aleph''\aleph$, 67 *g, dd*. *See also* Strengthening.
- Dageš lene, 13, 21: after יהוה (i.e. יהוה), 21 *c*: omitted anomalously after consonantal \aleph and \aleph' , 21 *c*: exceptional cases of (\aleph , \aleph' , \aleph'' , \aleph'''), 21 *d*.
- Dative, 119 *s*.
- Dativus ethicus, 119 *s*, 135 *i*: dative expressed by a suffix, 117 *x*.
- Decalogue, double accentuation of, 15 *p*.
- Dehiq, 20 *c*.
- Denominative nouns, *see* Nouns: verbs, *see* Verb.
- Desiderative sentences, 151.
- Determination of nouns, 125: omission of it, 117 *q*, 126 *p*: determination of proper names, 125 *c-f*: determination by the article, 126: by a following determinate genitive, 127: determination of numerals, 134 *k*.
- Diacritical points, *see* Puncta extraordinaria.
- Dialects in the O. T., 2 *w*.
- Diminutives, 86 *g* and *n*.
- Diphthongs, 7 *a*, 8 *m*, 24 *f*.
- Disjunctive accents, 15 *f, h*.
- Disjunctive questions, 150 *f-i*.
- Dissimilation of vowels, 27 *x*.
- Distributive numerals, 134 *q*.
- Doubling of consonants, *see* Strengthening.
- Dual, 88: with the plural of the adjective, 132 *f*: with predicate in the plur., 145 *n*: in numerals, 97 *g, h*, 134 *r*: place-names doubtfully so explained, 88 *c*.
- E-sounds, 7 *a, b, e*, 8 *b*, 9 *i-m*.
- Each, every, how expressed, 139 *b, c*.
- East Semitic, 1 *d*.
- Elatives, 85 *b*, 133 *a N*.
- Elegy, rhythm of, in Hebrew, 2 *r*.
- Elision, *see* Syncope and elision.
- Ellipse of the pronominal object, 117 *f*: other cases of ellipse (real or apparent), 116 *s*, 118 *s N* (in comparisons), 134 *n* (of names of measures, weights, &c.), 144 *o* (due to corruption).
- 'Emblematic Mashal,' 161 *a N*.
- Emphasis expressed by infin. abs., 114 *l-r, v-x*: by cognate accus., 113 *w* (end): by cognate accus. with defining adjective, 117 *q*: by duplication of a word, 123 *e*, 133 *k, l*: by combination of different derivatives from the same root, 133 *l*: by

- the article or a genitive (the superlative degree), 133 *g-i*: by a personal pronoun added to the subject, 135 *a, c*: by the pronoun annexed in the nominative to the suffix or to a noun, 135 *d-h*: by ל with the suffix, 135 *k*: by position, 142 *f, g, 152 e* (after ל), 152 *w* (after ל).
- Emphasis on indeterminate nouns, 117 *g, 125 c*.
- Enallage of gender, 135 *o, 144 a*.
- Epicene nouns, 122 *b, e-g*.
- Epithets, poetical, used as substantives, 132 *a n*.
- Era, Jewish, 5 *l*.
- Ethical dative, 119 *s, 135 i*.
- Ethiopic, 1 *b (i), 30 p n*.
- Exceptive clauses, 163 *c*.
- Exclamations, 146 *b* ($\text{הִנֵּה} = \text{hark}$): with הִנֵּה , 147 *b*: without הִנֵּה , 147 *c*: with other interjections, 147 *d*: expressing a wish, 148 *a-d*: in form of a question expressing irony or indignation, 148 *a, b*; expressed by וַיִּזְעַק , 148 *d, 151*.
- Extension of influence of a preposition over a parallel clause, 119 *hh*: of a negative, 152 *z*: of an interrogative, 150 *m*: of a conjunction, 150 *m n*.
- Extension, plurals of, 124 *a-g*.
- Feminine, forms of, 80, 94: ending in ָ , 80 *f, 127, 80 *g, 127, 80 *l*: in the constr. state, 89 *e*: in the plural, 87 *i-l*: paradigms, 95: of a land or people, 122 *h, i*: of abstract ideas, 122 *g*: of holders of offices¹, 122 *r*: of collectives, 122 *s*: in verb or pronoun to express *it*, 135 *p*: in impersonal verbs (*it rains*), 144 *b, c*: in the predicate of collective plurals, 145 *k* (cf. fem. of pronoun referring to collectives, 135 *p*): dislike of the fem. form, 132 *d, 145 p, t*: fem. forms of the infinitive, 45 *d, 66 b, g, h, 69 b (C), c*: fem. nouns with plur. in ָ , 87 *g*: fem. denoting artificial (as opposed to natural) objects, 122 *u*, in plur. (as opp. to dual), 87 *o*.**
- Feminine pronoun = English *it*, 135 *p, 144 b, c*.
- Figura etymologica, see Schema etymologicum.
- Final clauses, 107 *q* (imperf.), 109 *f, g* (jussive): syntax of, 165.
- Final letters, 5 *c*.
- Formae mixtae, 78 *d*.
- Formative letters, or serviles, 30 *c*: in formation of nouns, 81 *b, 85*.
- Frequentative force of imperf., 107 *b-g*: of perf. with wāw consec., 112 *e-o*, cf. *kk, ll*.
- Fulcra, 8 *h n*.
- Future tense, 47 *a n*: futurum exactum, 106 *o, 107 l*: futurum instans, 116 *p*.
- Ga'ya, 16 *c, g, h*.
- Ge'ez, 1 *b (i)*.
- Gemara, 1 *c, 3 a*.
- Gender of nouns, 122: in the construction of subject and predicate, 145: irregularities in use of, 110 *k, 135 o, 144 a, 145 p, t, u*.
- Genitive, expression of, 89, 127 *a, 128*: epexegetical or explicative, 128 *k-q, x, y*: subjective, 128 *g, 135 m*: objective, 128 *h, 135 m*: partitive, 128 *i, r*: expressing the genus, *l*, the species, *m*: expressed periphrastically by לְ , 129 *a-f*: by לְ אֲשֶׁר , 129 *a, h*.
- Gentilic names, in ָ , 86 *h*: determination of, 125 *e*: of compounds (as בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), 127 *d*.
- Geographical names with a following genitive, 125 *h*: with the article (appellatives), 125 *e*.
- Germanic languages, 1 *e*.
- Gerund, 45 *f, g*.
- Grammarians, early, p. 20 *n*¹.
- Gutturals, pronunciation of, 6 *c-f, o, r*: peculiarities of, 22: in verbal stems, 62-65.
- Hadad inscription, 1 *m*.
- Ḥateph-Pathah, 10 *f, g*: shorter than Ḥateph-Seghol, 27 *r, 63 f*.
- Ḥateph-Qames, 10 *f, h*.
- Ḥateph-Seghol, 10 *f*.
- He interrogative, pointing of, 100 *k-n*.
- He locale, 90 *c-i*.
- Hebrew language, 1 *a, b (ii)*: history of, 2: remains of the literature, 2 *d, l, o*: dialects of, 2 *w*: grammatical treatment of, 3: system of writing, 2 *i, 5*.
- Hebrews, 2 *b*.
- Helping vowels, 9 *h, m, 28 e* (to keep a syllable open), 84^a *a, 93 c* (in segholates).

¹ Cf. Driver, *Introd.*⁸, p. 466: Segal, *Mišn. Hebr.*, p. 63.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Kaph veritatis, 118 x.
K^othibh, 17 a-c.

Lamed auctoris, 129 c.

Lamentation metre, 2 r.

Letters, forms and names of, 5 a, b, e, f: final, 5 c: order of, 5 h, i: numerical value, 5 k.

Litterae dilatabiles, 5 d: maiusculae, minusculae, suspensae, 5 n: spirantes, 6 n: quiescibiles, 8 h n, 23: incompatibiles, 30 m n: serviles, 30 g, 81 b: compaginis, 90 k-o.

Loan-words in Hebrew and Greek, 1 i.

Locative, 90 a, c-i.

Mandaeans, 1 c.

Mappiq, 8 m n¹, 14 a-d: omitted in 3rd fem. sing. suffix of verb, 58 g: of noun, 91 e: in מֶּיִךְ, 103 g (end): found four times in נ, 14 d.

Maqqēph, 9 u (c, d), 16 a, b.

Masculine as prior gender, 122 g, 146 d: masc. nouns with plur. in מִן-, 87 m-p.

Masora and Masoretic text, 3 b, c: masora marginalis (magna and parva) and finalis, 17 d, e.

Masoretic terms explained, 17 e.

Material expressed by the genitive, 128 o, 135 n.

Matres lectionis, 8 h n.

Meša' inscription, 1 b (ii), k, 2 d, final vowels in, 7 b-d n¹: מֶּיִךְ = מֶּיִכִּי, p. 105 n: מֶּיִךְ = מֶּיִיךְ, 32 k n: wāw consecutive, 49 a n: the forms הַלְתַּחַם, &c., 54 l: לְסַפַּת, 69 h n: מֶּיִכִּי, 75 b n: fem. sing. abs. in מִן-, 80 f n: plur. masc. in מִן-, 87 e n: suffixes, 91 k n: the imperfect, 107 b n¹: impf. consec. III h n: article omitted with מִן though the noun has it, 126 y: use of the separate pronoun, 135 a n: casus pendens, 143 b n.

Metathesis, see Transposition.

Metheg, distinguishing ā from ō, 9 u, v: marks secondary tone, 15 c, 29 b, 20 f: various kinds of, 16 c-i: with short vowel in open syllable, 26 i-l (but cf. o n): with sere in closed ultima, 29 f: in perf. consec. 49 i.

Metre in Hebrew, 2 r.

Mil'el and Milra', 15 c, 20 f.

Mishna, 3 a.

Mixed forms, 78 d.

Moods, expression of, 40 a, 106 p, 107 m-x: modus rei repetitae (imperf. as frequentative), 107 e.

Multiplicatives (once, twice, &c.), how expressed, 134 r.

Nabataean inscriptions, 1 c.

Naphthali, ben, 7 h n.

Names of countries, peoples, and towns, fem., 122 i: of places and peoples with the article, 125 d n, e: with a following genitive, 125 h.

Nasog ahor, 29 e.

Negative sentences, 152.

Negatives, 152: two negatives intensify negation, 152 y: influence extending over a following clause, 152 z.

Neuter, wanting in Hebrew, 80 a: expressed by feminine, 122 q with n, 135 p: by plur. of adjectives, 122 q: by suffix of 3rd plur., 135 p: in pronoun, 136 b, in verb, 144 b, c.

Niph'al, 51: tolerativum, 51 c: reflexive and reciprocal senses of, 51 c-e: infin. with מִן elided after a preposition, 51 l.

Nithqattēl, 55 k (9).

Nomen regens and rectum, 89 a.

Nomen unitatis, 122 t.

Nominativus pendens resumed by a pronoun, 143.

North Semitic, 1 c.

Nota accusativi, 57: when used, 117 a-e.

Nothing, no one, how expressed, 139 d.

Noun-clauses, ptc. in, 116 m-r: defined, 140 a: syntax of, 141: shortened unusually (rare), 147 e: negatived by מִן and מִן, 152 a, d, i-m: relative, 155 e.

Noun-forms with verbal force (nomina verbi), 45 e (with prefixed מ), 115 d.

Nouns, derivation and various kinds of, 81: primitive, 30 f, 79 a, 82: on nouns in general, 83: forms derived from the simple stem, 84^a, from intensive stems, 84^b: nouns formed with preformatives (מ, מִן, מִן, &c.), 85 b-r, with affirmatives, 85 s-v: quadriliterals and quinqueliterals, 85 w: denominatives, 86: with pronominal suffixes, 91: paradigms of, 93: forms with peculiar flexion (מִן, מִן, &c.), 96: distinctions of gender in, 122: collectives, 123 a, b: with the article, 126: appellatives, 125 e-g: nomina unitatis, 122 s, t, 123 b: abstracts, see Abstract. See also Names.

Number in the construction of subject and predicate, 145.

Number of words in the O. T., 2 *w n*.
 Numeral adverbs, 124 *r*.
 Numerals, 97 : syntax of, 134 : order of compound numerals in different books, 134 *c n, h, i*.
 Numeration, ascending (rhetorical figure), cases of, 134 *s*.
 Numerical signs, 5 *k*.
 Nûn paragogicum, in imperf., 47 *m* : in perf. (?), 44 *l* : assimilation of Nûn, 19 *b, c*, 66 *d* : Nûn energicum (demonstrativum, epentheticum), 58 *i-l* : inversum, 5 *n*.
 O-sounds, 8 *c, d*, 9 *p-s*.
 Oaths, formulae of, 149.
 Object, in the accusative, 117 : introduced by ל , 143 *e* : introduced by ב instrumenti, 119 *q* : absolute or internal (cognate accusative), 117 *p, q* : dative expressed by accus. suffixes, 117 *x*.
 Object of verb anticipated by pronom. suffix, as in Aram., 131 *m, o*.
 Object-clauses, 157.
 Occupations denoted by nouns of the form לִמְעַלְמֵי , 84^b *b*.
 Old Hebrew, 1 *k*, 2 *a*.
 'Ôlè w^eyôrêdh, principal divider of verse in poetry, 15 *b*.
 One, indefinite, how expressed, 144 *d-k*.
 Onomatopoeica, 1 *h*, 30 *h*.
 Optative, 109 *b, c*.
 Oratio obliqua, how expressed, 157.
 Order of the alphabet, 5 *h, i*.
 Order of words, 114 *r n* (chiasmus) : in noun-clauses, 141 *l-n* : varieties of, in verbal clauses, 142 *a, f, g* : with the infinitive constr., 115 *e-k*.
 Ordinal numbers, 98, 134 *o, p*.
 Oriental and Occidental texts, 7 *h n*.
 Orthography of Hebrew in the masoretic text and previously, 7.
 Pa'lâl, 55 *d* : in three פָּלַל verbs, 75 *kk*.
 Panammu inscription, 1 *m*.
 Papyri of Assuan, 1 *m*.
 Parallel texts, 3 *g*.
 Parallelism of members, 2 *q*, 150 *h*.
 Participle, forms of, in Qal, 50 : Niph'al, 51 *a* : Pi'el and Pu'al, 52 *a-c* : with aphaeresis of ב , 52 *s* : Hiph'il and Hoph'al, 53 *a, b* : anomalous forms in Hiph., 53 *o* : with suffix, 61 *h* : fem. in בָּרַחְתִּי 84^a *s*, 94 *d* : plur. in בָּרַחְתֶּם 93 *qq* ; force of, 107 *d* : syntax of, 116 : construed as verb or noun, 116 *f-i* : passive ptcp. construed with accus.

or genitive, 116 *k, l* : of imminent future, 116 *p* : subject with הִיָּהוּ (of continuous action), 116 *r* : subject omitted, 116 *s, t* : participle absolute, 116 *w* : continued by finite verb, 116 *x*.
 Particles, 99.
 Partitive sense of בְּ , 119 *m* : of בְּ , 119 *w n*.
 Paseq, p. 59 *n*².
 Passive, 39 *e*, 51 *f* (Niph'al) : probable passives of Qal, 52 *e*, 53 *u* : construction of passives, 121 : expressed by the 3rd plur. active, 144 *f, g*, by the active participle, 144 *i* : impersonal passive, 121 *a* : passive verbs construed with בְּ , 121 *a, b* : agent after passive expressed by בְּ , בְּ , and (rarely) בְּ , 121 *f*.
 Patbah, 8 *a*, 9 *e* : preferred with gutturals, 22 *d* : furtive, 8 *f*, 22 *f, g*, 65 *a-e* : as a helping vowel, 27 *r*, 28 *c, e n*², 65 *g*, 84^a *a* : in the imperfect of verbs פָּלַל , 75 *bb* : in pause for Sere, 29 *q*, 51 *m* : before a guttural (esp. ק) with Qames changed to S^eghôl, 27 *q*, 29 *v* : in perf. Pi'el for Sere, 52 *a, l*.
 Patronymics, 86 *h*.
 Pause, 29 *i-v* : pausal forms with lesser distinctive accents, 29 *i*.
 Pe'al'al, 55 *e*.
 Pentateuch, linguistic character of, 2 *m, n*.
 Perfect, 40 : flexion of, 44 : 3rd fem. sing. in בָּרַחְתִּי , 44 *f*, 72 *o* : 2nd fem. sing. in בָּרַחְתִּי , 44 *h* : 1st sing. in בָּרַחְתִּי , 44 *i* : 3rd plur. in בָּרַחְתֶּם (?), 44 *l* : did Hebrew possess a 3rd pl. fem. in בָּרַחְתִּי ? 44 *m* : contraction of last radical with affirmative of perfect, 44 *o* : meaning of, 47 *a n* : with suffixes, 59 : syntax of, 106 : not precativè, 106 *n n*² : perfectum confidentiae, 106 *n* : propheticum, 106 *n* : with בְּ consec., 49 *a*, change of tone, בְּ - בְּ , syntax, 112 : with בְּ consec. as a frequentative, 112 *e-o*, *dd, ee* : carrying on the protasis, 112 *p*, introducing the apodosis, 112 *f-ii* : with simple בְּ of a single act, in narrative, 112 *pp-uu*.
 Periphrastic expression of qualities by means of בְּ , בְּ , בְּ , 128 *s-v*.
 Periphrastic future, 114 *p n*.
 Permutation, 131 *k*.

- Permutative, 131 *k-o*
- Person, abrupt changes of, in poetry, 144 *p*.
- Personification of countries or peoples, 122 *i*.
- Phoenician and Punic language, 1 *a, b* (ii), 2 *f*, 10 *e N¹*, p. 106 *N*, § 34 *N⁴*, 36 *N*, 49 *a N*, 80 *f*, 87 *d*: writing, 1 *l*, 7 *d N*.
- Phonetic system of Hebrew, 6 *o, p*.
- Phonetics, 6 *a, b*.
- Pi'ēl, 52: privativum, 52 *h*: intensive sense of, 52 *f, k*: rare in verbs י"ץ, 72 *m*.
- Pi'lēl, 55 *d*: in verbs י"ץ, 72 *m*.
- Pilpēl, 55 *f*: in verbs י"ץ, 67 *l*: in verbs י"ץ, 72 *m*.
- Pleonastic use of the pronoun, 135 *a, b*: of the negative, 152 *y*.
- Pluperfect, 106 *f*, 111 *q*: pluperf. subjunctive, 106 *p*.
- Plural, terminations of, 87: in יַ, 87 *e*: יַ, יַ, יַ not plural endings, 87 *f-h*: double plural ending in constr. st. of certain words, 87 *s*: double plur. of subst. and following genitive, 124 *q*: uses and senses of, 124: unusual constructions of, 145 *h-m*: plur. forms of prepositions, 103 *n, o*: plur. suffix referring to collective singular, 135 *p*: plur. predicate of a collective singular, 145 *b-g*.
- Pluralia tantum, 124 *f N*.
- Pluralis excellentiae or majestatis, 124 *g-i* and *N*: its construction, 132 *h*: pl. of extension, 124 *a-c*: intensive pl., 124 *a, d, e*: of the result or product, 124 *m*: amplifying plur., 124 *b, d-f*: expressing abstract ideas, 124 *d, f*: pl. of pronoun to denote a group of actions (= *it*), 135 *p*.
- Plurals of compound ideas, 124 *p-r*: of names of animals or things construed with a fem. sing., 145 *k*.
- Pō'ēl, 55 *b, c*: in verbs י"ץ, 67 *l*.
- Poetic style, 2 *q-s*.
- Point used to divide words, 3 *g N*.
- Polpal, 55 *f*.
- Polysyndeton, 154 *a N*.
- Potential sense of the imperfect, 107 *r-w*.
- Precative, 109 *b, c*.
- Predicate, without the article, 126 *i, k*: agreeing (or not) with the subject, 145: with compound subj., 146: attracted to the principal idea of a compound subject, 146 *a*: subst. as predicate where we should use an adjective, 141 *c, d*.
- Prefixes, *see* Prepositions.
- Preformatives of the imperfect, 47: of the noun, 85.
- Pregnant construction with prepositions, 119 *ee*: with מן, 119 *x, y, ff*: with אחר־י, אל, לקראת, ב, ל, 119 *gg*.
- Prepositions, 101: prefixed, 102: with suffixes, 103: under the government of the verb, 119: compound prepositions, 119 *b-e*: chief meanings of, אל, ב, ל, מן, על, 119 *g-dd*: pregnant uses of, 119 *ee-gg*: force of, extending over parallel clause, 119 *hh*: with adverbs (rare), 119 *ii*: prep. (esp. ב) not used after ב, 118 *s-w*, found exceptionally, 118 *s N*.
- Present expressed by the Perfect, 106 *g, h*.
- Preterite, *see* Perfect.
- Pretonic vowels, 26 *e*: with ב, כ, ל, 102 *f-k*: with ׀ before suffix, 103 *c*: with ל, 104 *g*.
- Printed texts, earliest Hebrew, 3 *e N*.
- Prohibitions, expressed by אל or אל with jussive or imperfect, 107 *o*, 109 *c, d*, 152 *f*.
- Pronominal ideas expressed by substantives, 139.
- Pronominal suffix anticipating noun, attached to verb, 131 *m, o*; to subst. or prep., 131 *n*.
- Pronouns, 32: syntax of, 135-8: personal, 32, 135: oblique cases of, 135 *i-k*: suffixes, 33, with the verb, 58, with the noun, 91, with adverbs, 100 *o, p*, with prepositions, 103: suffix of 3rd fem. sing. referring to entire sentences, 135 *p*: demonstrative, 34, 136, used relatively, 138 *g, h*: relative, 36, 138: indefinite, 37 *g*, 137 *c*: interrogative, 37 *a-f*, 137 *a-c*: suffix reflexive, 135 *i, k*: suffix possessive, 33, 135 *m-o*: suffix as genitive, subjective or objective, 135 *m*: separate pronoun in nominative emphasizing a suffix, 135 *d-h*: reciprocal, 139 *c* with *n, e*.
- Pronunciation of Hebrew, 6 *a, b*, 48 *f*.
- Prosthetic Aleph, 19 *m*.
- Pu'al, 52 *b-d, h* (end), *q-s*: as passive of Qal, 52 *e*.
- Pu'lal, 55 *d*.
- Puncta extraordinaria, 6 *n*.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

- South Semitic, 1 *b* (i).
 Spirants, 6 *n*, 13, 21.
 Square character, 5 *a*.
 Status absolutus of the noun, 89 *a*.
 Status constructus, its form, 89:
 vowel-changes marking it in many
 nouns, 91-6: its use, 128: before
 an adjective treated as a subst.,
 128 *w*, 133 *h* (end), 134 *p* (end):
 wider use of it, 130: before preposi-
 tions, 130 *a*: before relative clauses,
 130 *c*, *d*: in apposition with another
 constr. st., 130 *e*, *f*: before numerals,
 134 *o*, *p*: anomalously with the arti-
 cle, 127 *f-i*: before ׀, used as a
 relative, 138 *g* (*a*).
 Stem-consonants, or radicals, 30 *c*.
 Stems, distinguished from roots, 30 *a*,
d, *g-k*.
 Strengthening (doubling or sharpen-
 ing) of consonants, 12, 20: in
 gutturals, 22 *b*: virtual, 22 *c*: to
 intensify the idea of the stem,
 52 *a*, *d*: of 3rd radical in fem. and
 plur. of nouns of the forms ׀׀׀,
 ׀׀׀, 84^a *h*, 93 *s*, *ee*, *kk*, 94 *c*, 95 *g*, cf.
 93 *pp*: virtual sharpening of ׀,
 64 *e*: sharpening sometimes omitted
 in 2nd radical of verbs ׀׀׀, 67 *g*, *dd*.
 Subject, omitted in participial clauses,
 116 *s*, *t*: impersonal, 144 *b*, *c*: inde-
 finite, 144 *d-k*: two subjects in a
 verbal clause, 144 *l*, *m*: construc-
 tion of compound subjects, 146.
 Substantive, its construction with the
 adjective, 132: as predicate of a
 noun-clause, 141 *b*: used as pre-
 dicate where we should use an
 adjective, 141 *c-d*.
 Suffixes, (pronominal) attached to
 verbs, 58: rare, irregular, or poetic,
 with verb, 58 *g*, *i*, *k* (cf. 59 *e-h*,
 60 *d-h*, 61 *b-e*, *g*, *h*): with noun in
 sing., 91 *e*, *f*: in plur. 91 *l*: the
 sing. form after ׀-, 91 *n*: with
 prepositions, 103: 3rd sing. masc.
 in ׀-, 7 *c*, 58 *g*, 91 *e*: 3rd sing. fem.
 without Mappiq, 58 *g*, 91 *e*, 103 *g*:
 omission of ׀ in fem. nouns
 before suffix, 91 *e* (end): 3rd plur.
 in ׀, 58 *g*, 91 *f*, *l*, 103 *f* ׀³: omis-
 sion of ׀ in plur. nouns before suffix,
 91 *k*: original ׀ of sing. nouns from
 ׀׀ stems retained before suffix,
 93 *ss*: denoting the remoter object,
 117 *x*: use of 3rd fem. sing. and
 3rd plur. to express 'it', 135 *p*:
 anticipating the object (as in
 Aram.), 131 *m*, *o*: apparent verbal
 forms attached to nouns used as
 adverbs, 100 *o*, *p*: anticipating the
 genitive, 131 *n*: syntax of, 135 *m-r*:
 heavy (or grave) and light, 59 *e*,
 91 *o*, 93 *b*: masculine suffixes re-
 ferring to feminines, 135 *o*: fem.
 suff. with collective force, 135 *p*:
 suffixes which have lost their
 meaning (׀׀, ׀׀), 135 *q*, *r*:
 omitted sometimes with infinitive,
 115 *e* *N*.
 Superlative, expression of, 132 *c*,
 133 *g-l*.
 Šureq, 8 *c*, 9 *n*.
 'Surface'-plurals, 124 *b*, *c*.
 Suspended genitive, 130 *e*, *f*.
 Syllables, theory of, 26.
 Syncope and elision, 19 *k*, 35 *d*: of the
 article, 35 *n*: of ׀ in Hiph'il and
 Hoph'al, 53 *a*, *b*, in infin. Niph.,
 51 *l*, in infin. Hiph., 53 *q*, in infin.
 Hoph., 67 *y* (end).
 Syriac language, 1 *c*.
 Syriasm in pronunciation, 24 *e*: cf.
 Aramaisms.
 Talmud, 3 *a*.
 'Tam'-character, 5 *a* (end).
 Targums, 1 *c*, 3 *a*.
 Tell-el-Amarna tablets, 2 *f*.
 Temporal clauses, 106 *f*, 111 *d*, 112 *oo*,
 164: expressed by infin. constr.
 with a preposition, 164 *g*.
 Tenses, 40: their use, 106-9, 111, 112:
 tempus historicum, 106 *d*.
 Text of the O. T. probably derived
 from a single archetype, 3 *c*.
 Textual criticism, 3 *g*: intentional
 and unintentional changes in the
 text, 3 *g*.
 Tiph'el, 55 *h*.
 Titles indicated by the feminine
 form, 122 *r*.
 Tone of Hebrew words, 29: marks of,
 15 *b*, *c*, *k*, *l*: thrown forward, 29 *e*:
 retrocession of, 29 *d-g*: incomplete
 retrocession, 29 *f*: tone in pause,
 29 *i-r*: concurrence of two tone-
 syllables avoided, 29 *e*, *f*, *h*. Tone
 in perfect thrown forward after
 wāw consec., 49 *h-l*: in imperf.
 often thrown back in jussive and
 after wāw consec., 48 *f*, 49 *d*, 67 *x*,
 68 *d*, *e*, 69 *p*, 71, 72 *t*, *aa*, 73 *e*.
 Transitions in poetry from one per-
 son to another, 144 *p*, cf. 135 *r*.
 Translations of the O. T., 3 *a*.
 Transposition (metathesis) of con-
 sonants, 19 *n*, 54 *b*.
 U-sounds, 8 *c*, 9 *n*, *o*.

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS AND FORMS

The numbers refer to the sections: the 'superior' figures after the letters refer to the notes. Doubtful forms are marked ? Corrupt forms with †

א as consonant and guttural 6 c, 22; quiescent 23 a-i; prosthetic 19 m

- אב 96
- אבד 68 b
- אבד 50 e, 93 qq
- אבדה 85 v
- אבה 68 b, 76 d
- אבוא ? 23 i
- אבותיהם 91 n
- אבחר 10 g³
- אבי 74 k, 76 h
- אבי for לו 159 cc
- אבדה 68 i
- אביר 84^b f
- אבל 93 hh
- אנאלתי ? 53 p
- אנרות 95 q
- אנדה 55 g
- אנדיש ? 113 w³
- אדם without article, 125 f, 126 e¹
- אדני 87 g, as Qerê for יהוה 102 m, force of suffix lost 135 q and note²
- אדני כם 21 c
- אדנים 124 i, 145 h
- אדעך 69 b¹

- אדרש ? 51 k
- אהב 68 e
- אהבו 64 a
- אהבו הבו † 55 e
- אהה 105 a
- אהיה 75 hh
- אהל 22 h
- אהלה 91 e
- אהלים 23 h, 93 r
- אהמיה 75 l
- אהרנה 63 f
- או 104 c, in disjunctive questions 150 g. in indirect questions 150 i, in conditional sentences 159 cc, in disjunctive sentences 162
- אוביל 50 e
- אוי 105 a
- אויה 105 a
- אוויל 84^a o
- אוביל 68 i
- אולם 92 g
- אולת 84^b c
- אוניות 93 r
- אופן 84^a r
- אור 72 c², n
- אות 95 n
- אותהם 103 b

- אותהן 103 b
- אותכם 103 b
- או 100 i, with perf. and imperf. 107 108 g¹
- אזור 23 h
- אזין 68 i
- אזכרה 85 b
- אזלת 44 f
- אזרה 75 hh
- אזרוע 84^a n
- אח 96, 105 a
- אחד 96
- אחד not in const. st. 130 g
- אחדלה 63 f
- אחו 1 i
- אחוד 75 bb
- אחומי 90 k
- אחות p. 283
- אחוז 64 c
- אחוי 64 c
- אחפנה 23 f, 75 oo
- אחיותך 91 n
- אחל 67 y
- אחלי, אחלי in wishes 151
- אחרי, אחרי 103 o
- אחר 64 d
- אחרו 64 h



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

אֶצֶק 71
 אֶקטל 47 *b*
 אֶקרא 10 *g*³
 אֶרה-לי 9 *v*, 67 *o*
 אֶרחם 52 *n*
 אֶרחתיו 93 *r*
 אֶרי 93 *x*
 אֶריוֹף 72 *gg*, 75 *dd*
 אֶרפה 75 *pp*
 אֶרץ 67 *p*
 אֶרצה 90 *f*
 אֶש = יֶש 47 *b*¹, 114 *l*⁶
 אֶשה 96
 אֶשבים 53 *k*
 אֶשכם 93 *bb*
 אֶשעה 75 *l*
 אֶשקה 20 *m*
 אֶשקטה 10 *h*, 48 *c*
 אֶשר as relative
 pron. 36, its syntax 138,
 in relative clauses 155,
 introducing obj.-clause
 157 *c*, after יֶעו, עֶל, &c.
 158 *a*, hypothetical (rare)
 159 *cc*, introd. temporal
 clauses 164 *d*, final 165 *b*,
 consecutive 166 *b*, with
 prepositions forming con-
 junctions 104 *b*; אֶשר לְ for
 the genitive 129 *h*
 אֶשרו 84 *b* *g*
 אֶשריך 93 *l*
 אֶת, אֶת 103 *b*, syntax
 of 117 *a-m*; before an un-
 determined noun 117 *d*; not
 denoting accus. 117 *i-m*
 אֶת 20 *l*, 32 *h*; as
 masc. 32 *g*
 אֶת = אֶתה 32 *g*
 אֶתא 75 *rr*

אֶתה 76 *d*
 אֶתהם 103 *b*
 אֶתהוֹן 103 *b*
 אֶתחבר 54 *a*²
 אֶתי, אֶתי 32 *h*
 אֶתי 29 *t*, cf. 75 *u*
 אֶתי מרחיק 20 *f*
 אֶתוֹן 32 *i*
 אֶתנו 75 *rr*

בְּ preposition
 102; punctuation of 102
d, k, m; with suffixes
 103 *g*; senses of 119 *h-q*;
 בְּ essentialia 119 *i*; בְּ par-
 titive 119 *m*; בְּ pretii,
 119 *p*; בְּ instrumenti with
 the object 119 *q*

בְּאוֹ ? 72 *o*, 76 *g*,
 152 *x*
 בְּאֵלים 20 *g*
 בְּאֵני 9 *v*
 בְּבגדוֹ 61 *b*
 בְּגֵדי 93 *k*
 בְּגֵדְתָה 44 *g*
 בְּדָאם 74 *i*
 בְּדִיל 84 *a* *o*
 בְּהֵלוֹ 67 *p*
 בְּהוֹן 22 *h*
 בְּהֵנוֹת 93 *r*
 בְּהֵרג 51 *l*
 בְּהֵשָׁמָה 67 *y*
 בְּהֵשָׁתְחוּיָתִי ? 75 *kk*
 בּוֹא 76 *g*
 בּוֹדָאם 23 *c*
 בּוֹטָה 75 *qq*
 בּוֹסִים 72 *p*
 בּוֹשָׁסְכֶם ? 61 *e*
 בּוֹ 72 *dd*
 בּוֹה לְךָ 72 *l*

בּוֹרוֹעַ 20 *g*
 בּוֹחֵי 27 *n*
 בּוֹחַ 64 *d*
 בּוֹחֵקוֹ 67 *r*
 בּוֹחֵר־אֶף 9 *v*
 בּוֹטָנִים 93 *r*
 בּוֹטָרִם 107 *c*
 בּוֹי for בְּעֵי
 as interjection 105
 בּוֹיְהוֹה 102 *m*
 בּוֹי 73 *a*
 בּוֹי 103 *o*
 בּוֹיְנוֹתָנִי 103 *p*
 בּוֹיְנִי ? 103 *o*
 בּוֹיְנִיךָ ? 103 *o*
 בּוֹי תְבִין 73 *d*
 בּוֹיְנִתִי 73 *a*
 בּוֹיְתִי 96
 בּוֹיְתָה 103 *g*
 בּוֹיְתָה ? 91 *e*
 בּוֹיְתָה אֶנְשִׁים 127 *c*²
 בּוֹיְשָׁלוֹ 51 *l*
 בּוֹיְתָה ? 93 *hh*
 בּוֹי 152 *t*
 בּוֹי ? 19 *k*²
 בּוֹיְאֵי 93 *x*
 בּוֹי 8 *k*
 בּוֹי 152 *t*
 בּוֹיְעֵל 81 *d*
 בּוֹיְעֵרִי 99 *e*
 בּוֹיְתִי with
 constr. 114 *s*, with
 jective 152 *t*; לְתִי
 . . . not, with infin
 with impf. 152 *x*; (
except, 163 *c*
 בּוֹי 23 *k*
 בּוֹי 103 *k*

tuation 35, syntax 126:
see Article in Index I

הָ interrog. 100,

origin and pointing 100

i-n, uses of 150; הָ... (ו)אם 150 *h*

150 *h*

הָ (with the tone),

ending of fem. nouns 80 *c*

הָ (toneless), end-

ing of the Cohortative and

Imperative 48 *c, d, i*; an old

case-ending 90 *a-i*

הָ— 3rd masc. sing.

pronominal suffix 91 *e*

הָ (without Map-

pîq) anomalous 3rd fem.

sing. pronom. suff. 91 *e*

הָ 105 *b*

הַאֲזֹכָה (Mi 6¹¹) 47 *b*¹

הַאֲזִיחוּ 53 *g*

הַאֲזִקִים 35 *d*

הָאֵח 105 *a*

הָאִישׁ *one*, 144 *d*¹

הָאֵל בֵּית-אֵל 127 *f*¹

הָאֵנַח 65 *e*

הָאֵרוֹן 35 *o*

הַבָּאֵת 74 *g*

הַבָּאֵתָה 74 *d*

הַבָּאֵתָה 72 *w*

הָבָה 105 *b*

הָבִיא 72 *y*, 74 *l*

הַבִּישׁוֹתָה 78 *b*

הַבִּישׁ 72 *x*, 78 *b*

הַבַּמַּת זֹאת (Moab.) 80 *f*¹

הַבְּרוּ 67 *t*

הַבְּרָכָה 10 *g* (end)

הַבְּרָכָה 16 *g*

הַבְּרָכָה *Qerê* for הַבְּרָכָה

118 *e*²

הַגָּח 69 *w*

הָגוּ 75 *n, aa*

הַגְּרָנוֹת 93 *r*

הַדֹּשׁ 72 *v*

הַדְּרֹךְ חֲתָלוֹן 127 *f*¹

הַדְּשָׁנָה 54 *h*

הַהִימִיר? 72 *e*

הַהִלְכָתִי 90 *n*

הַהִלָּלָה 52 *s*

הָיָא, הָיָא, הָיָא 32 *k*; הָיָא with

Qerê הָיָא 17 *c*, הָיָא as fem.,

not an archaism 32 *l*

הָיָא (הָיָא, הָיָא) =

ipse or *idem* 135 *a*¹, demon-

strative 136, for the copula

141 *h*, resuming the sub-

ject 145 *u*³, in questions

136 *e* (end), 150 *l*

הָיָא 75 *hh*

הַוָּבִישׁ 72 *x*

הַוָּדַע 69 *w*

הָוִי 105 *a*

הַוָּכַח 65 *f*

הַוָּלְדָת 71

הַוָּלְלוֹת 86 *l*

הַוָּלַם פָּעַם 29 *f*

הַוָּנַח? 72 *ee*¹

הַוָּפִיעַ? 69 *v*

הַוָּצִיא 74 *l*

הַוָּרְדָתָנוּ 59 *h*

הַוָּשַׁע 65 *f*

הַוָּוְרָה? 80 *i*

הַוָּלְלוּהָ 67 *y*, 72 *ee*

הַוָּכַח 54 *d*

הַוָּפְרָכָם 53 *l*

הַחֲבָאֵתָה 75 *oo*

הַחֲבָה 75 *pp*

הַחֲדָלְתִי 63 *k*

הַחֲתִי, הַחֲתִי 35 *f*, 27 *q*

הַחֲלִל 67 *t*

הַחֲלִי 74 *k*, 75 *ii*

הַחֲפָנִים 35 *f*

הַחֲרִיטִים 35 *f*

הַחֲרָסָה 90 *f*

הַחֲחָתָה 67 *w*

הַחֲהָרוּ 27 *q*

הָיָא 32 *k*

הָיָה 16 *f*, 6

with participle 116

ל before infin. 114

copula 141 *g-i*. C

הָיָה 75 *n*

הַיּוֹם = *one*

126 *s*

הַיּוֹם שְׁלֹשָׁה 134 *o*¹

הַיֵּטֵב 113 *k*

הַיֵּבֵל 9 *i*, 85

הַיֵּלִיכִי? 69 *x*,

הַיֵּפָה? 90 *f*

הַיֵּצָא 69 *v*

הַיֵּקִיץ 70 *e*

הַיֵּשֶׁר 24 *f*²,

הַיֵּת 75 *m*¹

הַיֵּבוֹת (inf. a

הַיֵּבִי 150 *d*

הַיֵּבִין 72 *z*

הַיֵּבִינִי 75 *m*

הַיֵּבִלְמִנּוּ 53 *p*

הַיֵּבֵנּוּ 72 *w*

הַיֵּלֵא *expre*

assurance 150 *e*

הַיֵּלְדָת 69 *w*,

הַיֵּלֵז 34 *f*

הַיֵּלֵזָה 34 *f*

הַיֵּלֵזָה 34 *f*

הַיֵּלֵזָה 34 *f*

הַיֵּלֵזָה *inflex*

69 *x*, use of, to exp

tinuance 113 *u*

הַיֵּלֵזָה 69 *m*

הַיֵּלְכוּבָא? 23 *i*



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

הַתְּמַהְמָהוּ ? 55 *g*
 הַתְּמַדְ 67 *v*
 הַתְּנַבּוֹת 75 *qq*
 הַתְּנַבִּית 75 *qq*
 הַתְּפַקְדוֹ 54 *l*
 הַתְּפַקְדוֹ 54 *l*
 הַתְּרָאָה פָּנִים 156 *c*¹
 הַתְּרַחֲצֵתִי 64 *d*

ו as a vowel-letter 5 *b*¹, 7 *b-g*, 8 *h-m*, 9 *n-s*, its changes 24, initial 26 *a*; a firm consonant in verbs ו"ע 72 *gg*, in verbs orig. ו"ל 75 *a, b, kk*, cf. in nouns 93 *x*

וְ pointing of 104 *d-g*, connecting sentences 154, = *and that*, or *and especially* 114 *p*, 154 *a*¹ (*b*), introducing predicate 143 *d*; וְ introducing predicate 111 *h*, or apodosis (rare) 111 *q*, 159 *o (e), s (f)*. 143 *d*; וְ with perf. introducing predicate or apodosis 112 *ff-oo*, 143 *d*, 159 *o, s*. See also Wāw in Index I.

וְאָבְרָךְ 23 *d*, 68 *k*
 וְאָבְרַכְם׃ 60 *d*
 וְאָגִישׁ 49 *c*
 וְאֲדַנִּי 23 *d*, 26 *g*,
 102 *m*, 104 *d*
 וְאוֹצְרָה 53 *n, g*, 68 *i*
 וְאִחוֹ 68 *e*
 וְאַחֲלֶלְךָ 111 *w*¹
 וְאַחַר 64 *h*, 68 *e*
 וְאַחֲרַי שְׂתָה 113 *e*³
 וְאַחֲשֹׁבָה ? 49 *e*
 וְאַיְחָלָה ? 49 *e*

וְאָכַל 68 *e*
 וְאָכְלָה 49 *e*
 וְאָכַסְךָ 49 *c*
 וְאַל- = *rather than*
 133 *b*²
 וְאַלְהֵי 69 *p*
 וְאַלֵּהִים 102 *d*, 104 *d*
 וְאַסְחָבָה (Moab.) 7 *c*
 וְאַעֲיֶדָה ? 49 *e*
 וְאַקוּם 49 *e*, 72 *t*
 וְאַקְרָאָה ? 48 *d*
 וְאַרְבַּ 75 *gg*
 וְאַרְצֵי 29 *i*¹
 וְבָטֹן 104 *g*
 וְדִיגִים 73 *b*
 וְדַהּאֲוִיחֵי 53 *g*
 וְדַבֵּי־אֲתִי 76 *h*
 וְדַגְלָה 75 *ee*
 וְדוֹשְׁבוֹתַי ? 72 *x*
 וְדַחַתְתִּי 67 *dd*
 וְדַחַלְתִּי 72 *k, w*
 וְדַהּיָה in prophetic
 style 112 *y, z*
 וְדַהּיָה 28 *b*
 וְדַהּיָי 28 *b*
 וְדַהּיִטְבַּחְתִּי 70 *e*
 וְדַהּיִיחַם 63 *q*, 104 *f*
 וְדַהּמְטַרְתִּי (Am 4⁷) 112 *h*³
 וְדַהּמְתִּי 72 *w*
 וְדַהּמְתִּיהָ 72 *w*
 וְדַהּמְתִּין 72 *w*
 וְדַהּנִיחָה ? 72 *ee*
 וְדַהּנִפְתָּ 72 *w*
 וְדַהּצִּיתָהָ 71
 וְדַהּצִּירְתִּי 67 *ee*
 וְדַהּקִאֲתוֹ 76 *h*
 וְדַהּקִדְשֵׁנוּ 29 *l*
 וְדַהּקִמְנוּ 72 *i*
 וְדַהּרִאִיתִי 53 *p*, 75 *ee*

וַיִּז 75 r, 76 b	וַיֵּרָד 75 cc	וְלָנִי 73 d
וַיִּזְבַּח 65 e	וַיִּפֹּר 67 x	וַיִּז- in' perfect
וַיַּחְזֹק 29 g	וַיִּפְתָּ 75 q	(rare) 44 l; in imperfect
וַיַּחְטֹא 74 l	וַיִּצְלַח 65 f	47 m, n; less frequent with
וַיַּחֲיוּ 16 g	וַיִּצַק 71	wāw consec. 49 d ¹ . Cf.
וַיַּחְלֵא 75 rr	וַיִּצַק 71	וַיִּזְ-
וַיַּחְלֹו (Ho 8 ¹⁰)? IIIIw ¹	וַיִּקְרַד 67 g	וַיִּזְנֶה 64 i
וַיַּחְלֹו 24 e	וַיִּקְרַד 67 g	וַיִּזְנֶה? 69 r, 76 f
וַיַּחְלִיפוּ (Moab.) 7 c	וַיִּקְרַח? 71	וַיִּזְעַל III 2 tt ¹
וַיַּחְלֹק? 63 n	וַיִּרְא 75 q	וַיִּזְעַמִּיד 49 e ²
וַיַּחְמוּ 69 f	וַיִּרְאוּ המוראים 75 rr	וַיִּזְעַשֶׂה 75 hh
וַיַּחְמְנוּ 69 f	וַיִּרְבּוּ 68 i	וַיִּזְשׁוּב 49 e ²
וַיַּחֲזוּ 75 r	וַיִּרְדּוּ 75 q	וַיִּזְשׁוּמִים 67 y
וַיַּחֲרֹו 75 r	וַיִּרְיבון 49 d ¹	וַיִּזְשַׁכַּחַת 44 f
וַיַּיֵּט 75 r	וַיִּרְם 27 o, 67 o;	וַיִּזְשַׁקָה? 19 k ²
וַיַּיְטְמוּ 47 i	with accus. 121 d ²	וַיִּזְשַׁתְּעָה 75 l
וַיַּיְחַל 69 t	וַיִּרְפוּ 75 qq	וַיַּעֲצֹר 28 b, 104 d
וַיַּיִף 76 f	וַיִּרְפוּ 23 f, 75 qq	וַיַּעֲתֹר 104 g
וַיַּיְצֵר 71	וַיִּרְשׁוּד 69 s	וַיַּפְשִׁטֶם 44 d
וַיַּיְשִׁם 53 u, 73 f	וַיִּרְשׁוּהָ 69 s	וַיַּצְמַח 75 qq
וַיַּיְכּוּ 60 d	וַיִּרְשַׁתָּה 44 d	וַיַּקְדְּמָה 104 g
וַיַּיְכֹּם-שָׂב 58 g	וַיִּרְשַׁתֶּם 44 d	וַיַּקְוִי 8 k
וַיַּיְכַנְנוּ 72 cc	וַיִּשְׁבּוּ 26 p ² , 75 q	וַיַּקְצַתָּה 67 ee
וַיַּיְכַתּוּ 67 g, y	וַיִּשְׁבַּתֶּם 69 k	וַיִּרְאִינָה 75 n
וַיַּיְלֶדֶת? 80 d, 94 f	וַיִּשְׁנוּ 60 d, 75 bb,	וַיִּרְצַאתִי 75 rr
וַיַּלְלַת 24 e	131 m ³	וַיִּשְׁבַּת 44 f, 72 o
וַיַּלְלִן 72 ee	וַיִּשְׁעֶכֶם? 65 f	וַיִּשְׁבַּתִּי (ψ 23 ⁶)? 69 m ¹
וַיַּמְלִאוּם 60 h	וַיִּשְׁרַם 69 u	וַיִּשְׁבַּת- nouns ending
וַיַּנַּח 72 ee	וַיִּשְׁרַנָּה 71	in 86 k, 95 t, plur. of 95 u
וַיַּסֵּב 67 y	וַיִּשְׁתָּ 75 q	וַיִּתְאַרְנָה 72 k
וַיַּסְבּוּ 67 g	וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ 75 kk	וַיִּתְבַּאת 76 h
וַיַּסְדּוּ 67 p, 73 f	וַיִּתְא 68 h	וַיִּתְבַּאתִי 48 d
וַיַּסְרְנִי 59 h	וַיִּתּוּ 75 bb	וַיִּתְגַּבְּהִינָה 47 l
וַיַּעַט 72 ff	וַיִּתְמַהֲמַה 55 g	וַיִּתְהַם 72 h
וַיַּעֲנוּ (Moab.) 75 b ²	וַיִּתְמוּ 67 g	וַיִּתְקַל 69 r
וַיַּעַף 72 t	וַיִּתְחַשׁ בּוּ 29 g	וַיִּתְוַיֵּשֶׁם 75 ii
וַיַּעֲקֹבְנִי 63 m	וַיִּלָּא 104 g	וַיִּתְוַיֵּרְנִי for "וַיִּתְאוּ" 23 f,
וַיַּעֲקֹשְׁנִי? 53 n	וַיִּלְנָה 73 d	68 k
		וַיִּתְחַבֵּא 74 l
		וַיִּתְחַו 23 f

וַתְּחַלְקֶם 63 <i>m</i>	ח with dageš f.	חֵלֶב 93 <i>dd</i>
וַתִּחַשׁ 72 <i>ff</i>	implicitum 22 <i>c</i>	חֵלְוֵי 87 <i>g</i>
וַתִּיפֵי 76 <i>f</i>	חָבִי 75 <i>qq</i>	חֵלְוֵי הָיָא 67 <i>r</i>
וַתְּלוֹשׁ 72 <i>t</i>	חֲבִלָּהּ 63 <i>l</i>	חֵלְיָהּ 105 <i>b</i>
וַתְּמוּגְגֶנּוּ 72 <i>cc</i>	חֲבִלְתֶּךָ 59 <i>g</i> ¹	חֵלֶל 67 <i>cc</i>
וַתְּנַיֶּקְהוּ 70 <i>e</i>	חֲבַרְתּוֹ 84 ^b <i>g</i>	חֵלְכָאִים 93 <i>x</i>
וַתַּעֲגִב 63 <i>m</i>	חָנָא 95 <i>d</i>	חָם 96
וַתַּעֲט 72 <i>ff</i>	חָנוּי 93 <i>x</i>	חָמָה 23 <i>f</i>
וַתַּעֲצֵר 65 <i>e</i>	חָפִי 67 <i>ff</i>	חָמוּטָל 90 <i>k</i>
וַתַּצְפֵּנוּ 60 <i>d</i>	חָד (אָחָד) 96	חָמוּתֵי 67 <i>ee</i>
וַתַּקְרְבוּ 60 <i>a</i> ¹	חָדְלָהּ 20 <i>i</i>	חָמְלָהּ, חָמְלָהּ 45 <i>b</i>
וַתֵּרָא 75 <i>p</i>	חָתוּחִים 93 <i>w</i>	חָמְשֵׁי 98 <i>a</i>
וַתֵּרֶץ 27 <i>o</i> , 67 <i>p</i>	חָוָא 75 <i>oo</i>	חָמֶשֶׁת 94 <i>f</i>
וַתִּשְׁיִמוּן 58 <i>g</i>	חָוֶל תְּחִיל 73 <i>d</i>	חָמֶשֶׁת עֶשֶׂר 97 <i>e</i>
וַתִּתְחַצֵּב 71	חֹמְתַיִם 95 <i>o</i>	חָמֶשֶׁתֵּי 91 <i>l</i>
ז (Moab.) for זָה 7 <i>d</i> ¹	חֹנִי 27 <i>n</i>	חָנוּת 67 <i>r</i>
זָאת 34, use of 136	חֹרִי 86 <i>i</i> , 87 <i>g</i>	חָנָהּ 91 <i>e</i>
זָה 34, use of 136;	חֹתָם 84 ^a <i>r</i>	חָנָם 118 <i>q</i>
enclitic 136 <i>c</i> , <i>d</i> ; = <i>here</i>	חֹזָל 23 <i>k</i> ¹	חָנְנִי 67 <i>a</i>
or <i>now</i> 136 <i>d</i> ; as a rela-	חֹזָה (2S24 ¹¹)? 93 <i>rr</i>	חָנְנִי 20 <i>b</i> ,
tive 138 <i>g</i>	חֹזִיר 84 ^a <i>o</i>	67 <i>cc</i>
זָהּ 82	חֹזִיר 84 ^a <i>o</i>	חָסְרִי 93 <i>m</i>
זֶה, זֹה 34 <i>b</i>	חֹזְקָה 45 <i>d</i>	חָסִידָהּ 82
זֶה demonstr. pron.	חֹזְקִי 93 <i>ee</i>	חָצוּ 91 <i>k</i>
34 <i>d</i> ; relat. pron. 138 <i>g</i>	חָסָאִים 23 <i>c</i> , 74 <i>i</i> ,	חָצוּצֵר 55 <i>e</i>
זוּלָת 90 <i>l</i> , 101 <i>a</i>	75 <i>oo</i>	חָצוּצְרָהּ 55 <i>e</i> ,
זָרָה 73 <i>d</i>	חָטוּ 75 <i>qq</i>	חָצְצִיךְ 93 <i>bb</i>
זָיקוֹת 20 <i>n</i>	חַי יְהוָה, חַי נַפְשֶׁךָ 93 <i>aa</i> ¹ ,	חָקֶךָ 93 <i>bb</i>
זָבֹוּ 67 <i>ee</i>	149 <i>a</i> ¹ , <i>c</i>	חָקְכֶם 93 <i>bb</i>
זָמְמֵי 67 <i>aa</i>	חַי אֲנִי 32 <i>c</i>	חָקְקִי 10 <i>g</i> ,
זָמְרָה 52 <i>p</i>	חָיָהּ what forms	חָרְבוּ 46 <i>d</i>
זָמְרָת? 80 <i>g</i>	take Metheg 16 <i>f</i> , pointing	חָרְבִי 63 <i>l</i>
זָנְבוֹת 93 <i>ee</i>	of 63 <i>q</i> , shortened forms of	חָרְדִית 95 <i>g</i>
זָעִיר 86 <i>g</i> ¹	in imperfect 75 <i>s</i> , perfect	חָרָו 67 <i>ee</i>
זָעֵמָה 63 <i>p</i> , 64 <i>c</i>	forms as if from חָיָי 76 <i>i</i>	חָרַשׁ 84 ^b <i>b</i>
זָעַת 95 <i>e</i>	חִיצוֹן 27 <i>w</i>	חָשׁוּפִי 87 <i>g</i>
זָרָו 67 <i>m</i>	חִית? 80 <i>f</i>	חָשְׁפִי 46 <i>d</i> ,
זָרְמוּ 55 <i>b</i>	חִיתוֹ 90 <i>o</i>	חָשִׁים 72 <i>p</i>
	חִבִּי 23 <i>l</i> , 75 <i>aa</i> , <i>hh</i>	חָשְׁמֶל 85 <i>s</i>
	חֲכָמוֹת 86 <i>l</i>	



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

יִדַע 69 <i>b</i> ¹ , <i>p</i>	יָנַטַר 66 <i>e</i>	יִקְדָּעַם 21 <i>e</i> ¹
יִיטִיב 70 <i>d</i>	יָנִי 74 <i>k</i> , 76 <i>h</i>	יִקּוּם 72 <i>r</i>
יִיטִיב 70 <i>e</i>	יָנִיחַ 72 <i>ee</i>	יִקּוּם 72 <i>t</i>
יִילִיל 70 <i>d</i>	יִנְצָרוּ 66 <i>f</i>	יִקּוּם 72 <i>h</i>
יִיֶסֶף? 73 <i>f</i>	יִנְקָה 75 <i>hh</i>	יִקַח 53 <i>u</i>
יִיקַר 69 <i>b</i> ¹	יִנְשׂוּא? 23 <i>i</i> , 47 <i>n</i> , 75 <i>oo</i>	יִקַחוּ 20 <i>m</i>
יִיֶשְׂרוּ 70 <i>b</i>	יִסַּב (Addit.) 67 <i>g</i>	יִקְטַלְנָה 47 <i>k</i>
יִבְלָה 75 <i>qq</i>	יִסַּג 72 <i>dd</i>	יִסַּב-קָו 29 <i>g</i>
יִבְלָתִיו 44 <i>e</i>	יִסַּיג 72 <i>ee</i>	יִקַּם (juss.)
יִבְסִימוּ 75 <i>mm</i>	יִסִּית 72 <i>ee</i>	יִקַּם 53 <i>u</i>
יִבְסִימוּ 75 <i>dd</i>	יִסְפָּחוּ 67 <i>o</i>	יִקַּץ forms
יִבַח 53 <i>u</i> , 67 <i>g</i> , <i>y</i>	יִסַּף 69 <i>h</i> ¹ , 78 <i>c</i>	יִדְיָקַר 93 <i>ww</i>
יִלְבַּב 67 <i>cc</i>	יִסַּף 68 <i>b</i>	יִקַּר 84 ^a <i>n</i>
יִלְדָתֶיךָ 27 <i>s</i> , 44 <i>d</i>	יִסְרָה 52 <i>p</i>	יִקְרָא 75 <i>rr</i>
יִלְוֹד 27 <i>w</i> , 84 ^b <i>e</i>	יִסְרָךְ 61 <i>d</i>	יִקְרָאָהוּ 60 <i>c</i>
יִלְוֹנוּ 72 <i>ee</i>	יִסְרָפִי 59 <i>f</i>	יִקְרָאוּ 60 <i>c</i> , 7
יִלְיוּד 72 <i>ee</i>	יִעֲבֹרוּ 53 <i>n</i>	יִקְרָה 75 <i>rr</i>
יִלְיִן 72 <i>ee</i>	יִעֲוֹרְנוּ 72 <i>cc</i>	יִקְשֹׁן 72 <i>r</i>
יִלְיִן 72 <i>ee</i>	יִדְעֵלְעוּ 55 <i>f</i>	יִקְתַּל 21 <i>e</i> ¹
יִלְיִנוּ 72 <i>ee</i>	יִעַן, יִעַן אֲשֶׁר 107 <i>q</i> ¹	יִרָא 76 <i>e</i>
יִלְךָ 69 <i>p</i>	יִעַן וּבִיעַן 158 <i>b</i>	יִרָא 75 <i>hh</i>
יִלְכָדְנוּ? 60 <i>e</i>	יִיעֲעֹרוּ? 72 <i>cc</i>	יִרָא 75 <i>p</i> ,
יִלְקַטּוּן 27 <i>l</i>	יִעֲקֹב (verb) 63 <i>c</i>	יִרָא 75 <i>oo</i>
יִם? (Siloam inscr.)	יִעֲרַם 63 <i>m</i>	יִרְאִי 93 <i>ii</i>
7 <i>f</i>	יִעֲשֶׂה 75 <i>hh</i>	יִדְרֹאָתָם 74 <i>g</i>
יִמָּה (Moab.) 7 <i>c</i>	יִפְגֹּשֶׁךָ 10 <i>g</i> , 60 <i>b</i>	יִרְד 69 <i>g</i> ,
יִמַח 75 <i>y</i>	יִפָּה forms of 76 <i>f</i>	יִרְדֶּךָ? 63 <i>n</i>
יִמִּים 132 <i>h</i> ²	יִפָּה־פִּיה 23 <i>k</i> ¹ , 84 ^b <i>n</i>	יִרְדְּפוּ 60 <i>d</i>
יִפְּךָ 67 <i>g</i>	יִפַּח 72 <i>dd</i>	יִרְדְּפֶךָ 10 <i>h</i>
יִפֹּל 67 <i>g</i>	יִדְפִּיפִית 55 <i>e</i>	יִרָה forms
יִמְלָה 23 <i>e</i> , 75 <i>pp</i>	יִפְרַח 65 <i>e</i>	יִרְוּמוּ 72 <i>dd</i>
יִפְצֶה 75 <i>hh</i>	יִפְרִיא 75 <i>rr</i>	יִרְזַן 67 <i>p</i>
יִמַר 72 <i>dd</i>	יִצָּא 76 <i>e</i>	יִרְזַע 67 <i>t</i>
יִמְרוֹךְ 68 <i>h</i>	יִצָּא 75 <i>qq</i>	יִרְזִץ 67 <i>p</i>
יִ— in 2nd sing.	יִצָּא (אל-) 9 <i>l</i> , 69 <i>p</i>	יִרְזָשְׁלִים 88 <i>c</i>
fem. imperf. 47 <i>o</i> ; Aram.	יִצַּב 71	יִרְחַף 52 <i>n</i>
plur. for יִם— 87 <i>e</i> .	יִצַּחַק 64 <i>h</i>	יִרְכָּתִי 95 <i>i</i>
יִגְאֹץ 73 <i>g</i>	יִצַּר 71	יִרְמִיָה 23 <i>k</i>
יִגְהַל 64 <i>d</i>	יִצָּתִי 23 <i>f</i>	יִרַע 67 <i>n</i>
	יִקְבֹּךְ 93 <i>k</i>	יִרַע 67 <i>n</i>

יָרְעוּ 67 *dd*
 יִשְׂאֵא 75 *rr*
 יִשְׂטָם 75 *q*
 יִשְׂיִק 66 *e*
 יִשְׂשׂוּם 47 *n*
 יִשְׂשָׁבֵר 47 *b*¹
 יִשְׂ meaning 152 *i*;
 suffixes 100 *o*; *p*;
 hypothetical sentences
q (with ptcp.), יִשְׂ
 oth. 159 *dd*; in ques-
 s 141 *k* (with ptcp.)
 יִשְׂא 74 *l*
 יִשְׂבֵּב 47 *b*¹
 יִשְׂרָדִם 20 *b*, 67 *cc*
 יִשְׂרָד 67 *p*
 יִשְׂוִי 47 *b*¹
 יִשְׂוַע 27 *w*
 יִשְׂוִים 67 *y*
 יִשְׂרָד 67 *g*
 יִשְׂלָם 53 *n*
 יִשְׂם 67 *g* (Addit.)
 יִשְׂמַעְיָאל 23 *c*
 יִשְׂנָא 75 *rr*
 יִשְׂנָא 75 *rr*
 יִשְׂנֹו its suffix 67 *o*¹;
 doubtful form 100 *o*²
 יִשְׂפֹוֹטוּ 47 *g*
 יִשְׂרֹוֹן 86 *g*
 יִשְׂרָחֹוֹנָה 60 *e*
 יִתְ nouns ending
 86 *l*, 94 *f*, 95 *t*
 יִתְאֹו 75 *bb*
 יִתְאָרְהוּ 64 *i*
 יִתְם 67 *g*
 יִתְם 67 *g*
 יִתְמוּ 67 *g*
 יִתְן 53 *u*, 66 *k*
 יִתְנַחֵם 27 *q*, 29 *v*
 יִתְשַׁקֵּד 54 *l*

יִתְיִן 53 *u*
 יִתְרַח 80 *g*
 כ for כִּי (Moab.)
 7 *d*¹
 כִּי its meaning
 102 *c*; with suff. 103 *h*;
 construction of 118 *s-x*,
 prepositions often omitted
 after 118 *s-w*; exception-
 ally with prep. 118 *s*²; כ
 veritatis 118 *x*; omitted in
 comparisons 141 *d*; not
 = כִּי־אִשְׁרָ 155 *g*
 יִתְכָּאֵר 19 *k*²
 יִתְכָּאִשְׁרָ 161 *b*, *c*
 יִתְכַּחֲצִי 118 *s*²
 יִתְכָּם 52 *l*
 יִתְכַּרְאֲשָׁנָה 118 *s*²
 יִתְכַּחֲלָה 118 *s*²
 יִתְכָּרַד 21 *d*
 יִתְכָּהִים 35 *n*
 יִתְכַּהֲדָה? 51 *k*, 66 *f*
 יִתְכָּבֵּב 19 *o*, 84^b *o*
 כִּי for כִּי־ 24 *b*.
 cf. 93 *y*
 כִּי omitted in
 obj.-clause 157 *a*, intro-
 ducing obj.-clause 157 *b*,
 introducing direct narra-
 tion 157 *b*, causal 158 *b*,
 in conditional clauses
 159 *aa*, *bb*, asseverative
 159 *ee*, adversative and
 exceptive 163, temporal
 164 *d*, consecutive 107 *u*,
 166 *b*
 כִּי־אִם 163 *a-d*
 כִּי־לִי 86 *i*
 כִּי־עַל־כֵּן 158 *b*¹
 כִּי־עֲנִים 35 *b*

כִּי־תֵרֹוֹן 24 *e*
 כִּכָּה 100 *i*
 כִּכְרִים 88 *b*, 131 *d*²
 כָּל (verb ע"י) 73 *b*
 כָּל used abso-
 lutely 117 *c*, with a fol-
 lowing genitive 117 *c*,
 127 *b*, *c*; construction of
 its predicate, 146 *c*; with
 a participle absol. 116 *w*;
 with a negative 152 *b*
 כָּל־אֲתִי 75 *oo*
 כָּל־הָ 91 *e*
 כָּל־הַמְּקַלְלוֹנִי 61 *h*
 כָּלוּ (= כָּל־אוּ) 75 *qq*
 כָּלִי 96
 כָּל־כָּל 72 *m*
 כָּל־נֹו 91 *f*
 כָּמוֹ 103 *k*
 כָּמוֹנִי 103 *h*⁵, *k*
 כָּמִפְנֵי 118 *s*²
 כָּמִרִירִים? 84^b *m*
 כֵּן 100 *i*
 כֵּן־הִיא 20 *g*
 כֵּן־לוֹת 20 *h*, 53 *q*
 כֵּן־ם 85 *t*, 87 *h*
 כֵּן־פֹּת 93 *ee*
 כֵּסִיל 84² *o*
 כֵּעָבֵד 35 *g*
 כֵּעֹוֹפֶרֶת 35 *g*
 כֵּעַל 118 *s*²
 כֵּעָפָר 35 *n*
 כֵּפִימוֹ 103 *f*³
 כִּפְכָה 91 *e*
 כִּפְלִים 134 *r*²
 כִּרְמֵל 85 *s*
 כִּרְתַּת 22 *s*, 64 *e*
 כִּרְתָה 64 *e*
 כִּרְתִי 44 *o*

כְּשִׁית 20 g
 כָּשַׁל forms of 78 c
 כְּתָב 25 c², a qitâl form 84^a n, the *â* unchangeable 93 ww
 כְּתוּבִים 91 e
 כְּתַב-הַדָּת 9 u
 כְּהֵנֶה 95 r
 כְּתָר 65 e

לְ preposition

45 f, g; pointed לְ 102 f-i, 103 e, f; uses of 119 r-u; reflexive use 119 s; introducing the object 117 n; denoting the genitive 129; with a passive and with passive ideas 121 f; לְ inscriptionis 119 u; distributive 123 d; with the infinitive 114 f-s, "ול" with infin. 114 p; = *in respect to* 143 e; perhaps = Arab. *lā*, *surely* 143 e.

לֹא origin 100 a; in prohibitions 107 o; with the Jussive 109 d; as negative answer 150 n, uses of 152 a-d, u; negating a single idea 152 a¹; exceptional positions of for emphasis 152 e; וְלֹא = *in order that . . . not* 165 a; וְלֹא forming hypothetical sentence 159 dd

לֹא written for לוֹ

103 g

לְאָדִיב 53 q

לְאֹר 51 l, 72 v

לְאֹט 72 p

לְאָמַר 23 d
 לְאָסַר 28 b
 לְבַד 119 c
 לְבוֹז 67 n
 לְבוֹר 67 r
 לְבִיא 53 q, 72 z
 לְבִיָּא ? 80 h
 לְבִלְתִּי with infin.

114 s; with impf. 152 x

לְבָד 93 dd

לְבַעַר קִיּוֹ 29 f

לְבָרָם 67 p

לְדָה 69 c

לְדַרְיוֹשׁ 45 g

לָהּ 23 k, 103 g

לְהוֹשִׁיבִי 90 n

לְהִיּוֹת 28 b

לְהַכִּיל 68 i

לְהַנָּפֵחַ 72 z

לְהַנְתִּיךָ 66 f

לְהַפִּיר 67 w

לְהַפְרֹכֶם 67 dd

לְהַרְאוֹת 75 c

לְהַשׁוֹת 75 qq

לְהַשְׁמָעוֹת 53 l

לוֹ written for לֹא

103 g

לוֹ in wishes, its construction 151 e; in conditional clauses 159 l, m, x-z

לוֹא 23 i

לוֹט 72 p

לוֹיִנוּ 91 k

לוֹיָתוֹן 86 f

לוֹיָא, לוֹיָי formation

27 w, in conditional 159 l, m, x-z

לְחָה 91 e

לְחָטִיא 53 q

לְחָיִים 88 b

לְחָלֵק 53 q

לְחָם 22 h

לְחָמָם 28 b, 6

לְחֻנְנָה 67 cc

לְחֻפֵּר פְּרוּחַ 84^b n

לְטַעַת 66 b

לְיֵהוּהָ 102 m

לְיֵלָה 90 f

לְיֹסֵד 69 n,

לְיִרְוֹא 75 rr

לְיִרְשָׁנוּ 69 m

לְךָ imper

for לְכָה 48 i; as a jectio 105 b

לְכָה prono

לוֹךְ 1

לְכוּ 105 b

לְלֹאוֹת 93 x

לְלִבּוֹ 53 q

לְלָה (Moa

לְיֵלָה

לְלָת 19 d,

לְמָה, לְמָה, לְמָה

punctuation 49 f, in requests or w often nearly = *lest*

לְמוֹ 103 f

לְמוֹ 103 k

לְמַחֹת 53 q

לְמִינֵהֶם 91 k

לְמוֹ 119 c



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

מִימִין לְ 130 a ³	133 a, b; = too much or too little for 133 c; pregnant use in comparisons 119 ff, 133 e	מָקוֹם 85 g
מִימִן ? (Siloam inscr.) 7 f	מִן-הַיָּא 103 m	מָקַח (infin.)
מִירְדִי 69 m	מִי 37 b	מָקַח 75 qq
מִכְּלָת 23 f	מִי מִנְאֵץ ? 55 b	מָקַחְךָ 93 ss
מִכְּרָם 48 i, 61 b	מִיָּגֵד 119 c ²	מִקְנֵנִתִי 90 n
מִכְּתָהּ 91 k	מִיָּהוּ 103 m	מִקְרָא (infin.)
מִכְּתָךְ 91 n	מִי plur. apoc. ? 87 f; poet. for מִן 90 m, 102 b, for מִיָּנִי 103 i (in pause מִיָּנִי)	מִרְאָה 75 rr
מִלָּא 75 oo	מִי twice poet. for מִן 102 b	מִרְאֵיהֶם 93 ss
מִלָּאוּ 74 g	מִסֵּב 85 h, k	מִרְאֵיוֹ 93 ss
מִלָּאוֹת 74 h	מִסֹּרָה 3 b	מִרְבֵּעַ 65 d
מִלָּאכָה 23 c, 85 g	מִסִּיף ? 67 v	מִרְגֵּז 22 s
מִלָּאכְכָה 91 e, l	מִסְלָאִים 75 rr	מִרְדָּה 69 m
מִלָּאֵת 75 qq	מִסַּע (infin.) 45 e	מִרְדָּף 22 s
מִלְבָּד 119 c ²	מִסְרַת 23 f	מִרְדָּף 102 b
מִלֹּ 75 qq	מִעוֹז 85 k	מִרְחֵק 85 h
מִלֹּכָה 46 e	מִעוֹנִיָּה ? 20 o	מִרְךָ 85 k
מִלוֹשְׁנֵי 55 b, 90 m	מִעוֹרִים 53 o	מִרְכָּבָה 85 h
מִלִּין 72 ee	מִעִינוֹ 90 o	מִרְפָּא 75 rr
מִלְכִי 46 d	מִעַל-לְ 119 c ²	מִרְתָּ 22 s
מִלְמַעְלָה 99 e, 119 c ²	מִעֲלָה (infin.) 45 d	מִשְׁאוֹת (infin.) 74 h
מִלְךָ 68 k	מִעֲלוֹ 93 ss	מִשְׁאוֹן 85 u
מִלְפָּנַי 119 c	מִעַת 133 e ⁴	מִשְׁחַח ? 80 b ²
מִלְשָׁנִי 64 i	מִפְּנֵי 119 c	מִשְׁכּוֹ 46 d
מִלְתִּי 23 f	מִצָּאֵן, 74 h	מִשְׁלֹחַ (Inf.)
מִמּוֹל 119 c ²	מִצָּב 92 g	מִשָּׁם 119 c
מִמְחִים 75 dd, 93 ss	מִצּוֹתָךְ 91 n	מִשְׁמִים 67 cc
מִמְּנֹנֹ 103 m, 135 o ³	מִצֵּל 67 v	מִשֵּׁק 85 h
מִמְעַל 119 c ²	מִצְפּוֹן לְ 130 a ³	מִשְׁקֵל 92 g
מִמְרָ 85 g	מִצְרִים 88 c	מִשְׁרַת 80 d,
מִמְתְּקִים 85 g ¹	מִצְתִּי 23 f	מִשְׁרַתִּי אֹתִי 116 g
מִן preposition	מִקְרָשִׁיהֶם 93 oo ¹	מִשְׁרַתְּחֹתֶם 75 kk
101 a; its punctuation	מִקְהָלִים 93 qq	מִשְׁתִּי, מִשְׁתִּים 97 b ¹
102 b; with suffixes		מִשְׁתִּיהֶם 93 ss
103 i, m; its meanings		מִת 72 c ² ,
119 v-z; partitive 119 w ² ;		מִתּוֹשָׁאֵל 90 k
negative force of 119 w-y;		מִתּוֹשָׁלַח 90 k
with the comparative		מִתַּחַת 119 c
		מִתְיַחֲשִׁים ? 64 i

נָהָה 66 c	נִכְבְּרוּת 121 d ¹
נִהְלֵתָּ 64 d	נָכָה forms of 76 c
נִהְרִים 88 c, 93 ee	נִכְחוּ 27 w
נִוְיִי 69 t	נִבְרַר 93 gg
נִוְהֵם 93 ss	נִבְרַר שׁוּעַ 29 g
נִוַח (inf. constr.)	נִלְוֹ (imper.) 51 o
72 q	נִמְבְּזָה 75 y
נִוְטִיָּהִם 93 ss	נִמוּג 72 v
נִוְלְדוּ 69 t	נִמּוּל 72 ee
נִוַע (inf. constr.)	נִמְלָתָם 67 dd
72 q	נִמְצָאִים 93 oo
נָזָה forms of 76 c	נִמָּר 72 dd
נִזְלוּ 67 dd	נִסְבָּה 67 dd
נִחְבְּאִים 93 oo	נִסָּה 76 b
נִחְבְּאָתָּ 63 c	נִסּוּג 72 r, v
נִחְבְּבָה 75 pp	נִסּוּג אַחֲזוֹר 29 e
נִחָה forms of 78 c	נִטְבְּהֵם 91 k
נִחָה 66 c	נִעְבְּדֵם 60 b
נִחָה 91 e	נִעוֹר 72 ee, v
נִחַל 67 u	נִעְתּוֹר 63 c
נִחְלָה (from חֲלָה)	נִעְתְּרוּת 63 c
63 c	נִפְלְאָת 74 g
נִחְלָה 90 f	נִפְלְאָתָה 75 oo
נִחְלָתָּ? 80 g	נִפְלוּ 61 b
נִחַם 66 f	נִפְלַל 55 d
נִחְמִים 67 u, dd	נִפֵּץ 67 dd, 78 b
נִחְנוּ 32 d	נִפְצָה 67 dd
נִחְנִיתָּ 23 f ¹	נִפְשׁ שְׁנַיִם 132 g, 134 e ¹
נִחַר 67 u	נִצַּב forms of 78 b
נִחְרוּ 75 x	נִצָּה 91 e
נִחַת 95 k	נִצָּנִים 85 u ¹
נִחַת 67 u	נִצְרָה 48 i
נִחְתּוֹם 63 c	נִקְבְּצוּ (imper.) 51 o
נִחָה forms of 76 c	נִקּוּם 72 h
נִחָה 66 c	נִקְטָה 72 dd
נִטוּת 75 v	נִקְטוּ 72 dd
נִטְיוּ 75 x	נִקִּיא 23 i
נִטְמָאִים 93 oo	נִקִּיתָּ 75 x
נִטַע 65 d	נִקְרָא 75 rr
נִינָם 76 f	

נָרָא (Is 41 ²³ Keth.)	כָּפּוּ 69 <i>h</i> ¹	uses of 119 <i>aa-dd</i> ; c
48 <i>g</i> ¹	כָּפוֹת (from יָסַף) ?	with perfect 158 <i>b</i> ,
נָרַךְ 26 <i>r</i>	69 <i>h</i> ¹	infin. 158 <i>c</i> ; conc
נָרְפָאֵי 75 <i>oo</i>	כְּפָרִים <i>a letter</i> 124 <i>b</i> ¹	160 <i>c</i>
נָרְפָתָה 75 <i>qq</i>	כָּרִים 84 ^{<i>b</i>} <i>f</i>	עָלִיוֹן 133 <i>g</i> ¹
נָשָׂא 66 <i>c</i> , 76 <i>b</i>	כָּרַר 67 <i>cc</i>	עָלִיזָה Is 23 ⁷ <i>w</i>
נָשָׂא forms of 76 <i>b</i>	כְּתוּמוֹם 60 <i>h</i>	article 126
נִשְׂאָת 76 <i>b</i>	ע pronunciation	עָלִימוֹ 103 <i>f</i> ³
נִשְׂאָת 74 <i>i</i> , 94 <i>f</i>	6 <i>e</i> ; with dageš <i>f. implicitum</i> 22 <i>a-c</i>	עַם its 101 <i>a</i> ; pointing, wi
נִשְׂוָא 23 <i>i</i> , 75 <i>oo</i>	עָבְרִי 2 <i>b</i> , 9 <i>b</i>	103 <i>c</i>
נִשְׂוִי 75 <i>qq</i>	עָגַב 84 ^{<i>a</i>} <i>t</i>	עָמְדָךְ 61 <i>d</i>
נִשְׂקָה 66 <i>e</i>	עָגוּל 93 <i>kk</i>	עָמוּקָה ? 93 <i>kk</i>
נִשָּׂא 75 <i>oo</i>	עָרְהֵם 32 <i>n</i>	עַמִּי plur.
נִשְׂאָר 48 <i>g</i> ¹	עַר, poetic עָרִי 103 <i>o</i> ; with	87 <i>f</i>
נִשְׂרָנוּ 67 <i>u</i>	imperf. of past time 107 <i>c</i>	עַמְמִים 93 <i>aa</i>
נִשְׂנִי 52 <i>m</i>	עָדוֹתִי ? 91 <i>n</i>	עַנְבִּי 20 <i>h</i>
נִשְׂתָּוָה ? 75 <i>x</i>	עָדִים 29 <i>e</i> ¹	עָנָה 63 <i>l</i>
נִשְׂתַּעָה 75 <i>l</i>	עָדִיכֶם 103 <i>o</i>	עָנָה 63 <i>l</i>
נַח forms of 78 <i>c</i>	עָוֵד 72 <i>m</i>	עָנֹת 75 <i>aa</i>
נָתַן 66 <i>h, i</i> ; with	עָוָה 67 <i>ff</i>	עָפְאִים 93 <i>z</i>
accus. and infin. = <i>allow to</i>	עָוִן 55 <i>c</i>	עָץ 9 <i>l</i> , 26
157 <i>b</i> ²	עָוֶל 93 <i>u</i>	עָצְבוֹן 93 <i>uu</i>
נָתַן 66 <i>i</i> , 69 <i>m</i> ²	עָוְנָךְ 61 <i>h</i> , 91 <i>d</i>	עָצְבִּי 61 <i>a</i>
נָתַן 66 <i>h</i>	עָוְנָנִי 91 <i>k</i>	עָקַב 93 <i>hh</i>
נָתַנּוּ 44 <i>o</i>	עָוְרִי 72 <i>s</i>	עָקַרְב 19 <i>m</i>
נָתַתְּ 19 <i>c</i> , 20 <i>l</i>	עָזָאֵל 30 <i>n</i>	עָרְבִיאִים 93 <i>x</i>
נָתַתָּה 44 <i>g</i> , 66 <i>h</i>	עָזְבוֹנֶיךָ 93 <i>uu</i>	עָרְבִים 88 <i>c</i>
סָאָפָה ? 55 <i>f</i>	עָזְרַת 80 <i>g</i>	עָרוֹ 75 <i>cc</i>
סָבוֹת 67 <i>d</i> ¹	עָטִיה 75 <i>v</i>	עָרוֹם 118 <i>n</i> ,
סָבִיב 103 <i>o</i>	עִי 24 <i>b</i> , 93 <i>y</i>	עָרוּפִים 93 <i>pp</i>
סָבִיב 50 <i>e</i>	עִוֹן 82	עָרוֹת (Hb 3
סָבְלוּ 10 <i>h</i> , 93 <i>q</i>	עִוְנוֹת 93 <i>v</i>	עָרְכָה 48 <i>i</i>
סָג 72 <i>p</i>	עִיר 96	עָרְכוּ 48 <i>i</i>
סִוְפָתָה 90 <i>f</i>	עִירָה 91 <i>e</i>	עָרְלָה 95 <i>d</i>
סִוְרָה 72 <i>p</i>	עִירוֹ 93 <i>v</i>	עָרְמָם 91 <i>e</i>
סִוְתָה 91 <i>e</i>	עִירוֹם 27 <i>w</i>	עָשְׁבוֹת 20 <i>h</i> ,
סִינִי 24 <i>g</i> ¹	עַל 2 <i>f</i> ¹	עָשָׂה 69 <i>m</i> ²
סִכָּה 91 <i>e</i>	עַל its origin	עָשָׂהֶל 23 <i>k</i> ¹
סָכַר 6 <i>k</i>	101 <i>a</i> ; poetic עָלִי 103 <i>o</i> ;	עָשָׂהוּ 75 <i>n</i>
סָלַם 85 <i>t</i> , 87 <i>h</i>		



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

קִּשְׁטִים 85 <i>u</i> ¹	רַבְעִים 93 <i>qq</i>	
קִמָּה 44 <i>h</i> ¹	רַבָּת 73 <i>a</i>	
קִנְיָן 20 <i>g</i>	רַבְתִּי עִם 90 <i>l</i>	
קִנְמוֹן 93 <i>uu</i>	רַנֵּעַ 65 <i>d</i>	
קִסְמִי 46 <i>d</i>	רַנְעִי 93 <i>ii</i>	
קִפּוֹד 27 <i>w</i>	רַד 19 <i>i</i> , 69 <i>g</i>	
קִץ (Is 18 ⁶) 73 <i>b</i>	רַדָּה 69 <i>m</i> ²	cle I
קִצָּה 91 <i>e</i>	רַדְפִי 61 <i>c</i>	
קִצּוֹי 93 <i>x</i>	רוֹם 72 <i>q</i>	
קִצְרָבִים 61 <i>d</i>	רַחֵם 22 <i>h</i>	
קִרְאִים 75 <i>oo</i>	רַחֲמָה 80 <i>k</i>	
קִרְאֵן 46 <i>f</i>	רַחֲמִים 93 <i>l</i> , 145 <i>h</i>	
קִרְאֵן 74 <i>h</i>	רִי 24 <i>b</i> , cf. 93 <i>y</i>	
קִרְאֵת 74 <i>g</i>	רִיבּוֹת 73 <i>a</i>	
קִרְב 52 <i>n</i> , 64 <i>h</i>	רִיב יָרִיב 73 <i>d</i>	in J
קִרְב 84 <i>n</i>	רִים 23 <i>e</i>	
קִרְבָּה 48 <i>i</i>	רִבּוֹ 67 <i>ee</i>	tive
קִרְחָא 80 <i>h</i>	רִכְסִי 93 <i>r</i>	שׁ,
קִרְן 82	רִפוֹ 67 <i>m</i>	36 ;
קִרְנִים 88 <i>b</i> , 93 <i>n</i>	רִפוֹ 20 <i>i</i>	
קִשָּׁט 26 <i>r</i> , 93 <i>p</i>	רִפּוֹנִי 87 <i>f</i>	
ר 6 <i>g</i> , <i>o</i>	רִפּוֹי 67 <i>ff</i>	
ר 22 <i>q</i> , <i>s</i>	רַעְבוֹן 85 <i>u</i>	
רָאָה 105 <i>b</i>	רַעָה 64 <i>d</i>	
רָאוּ (א with Map- píq) 14 <i>d</i> , 64 <i>e</i>	רַעָה 84 ^a <i>i</i> , 93 <i>ll</i>	
רָאוּה 75 <i>n</i>	רַעָה 67 <i>o</i> , <i>s</i>	
רָאוֹת 75 <i>v</i>	רַעָהוּ 91 <i>k</i>	
רָאוּתָה ? 72 <i>p</i>	רַעֲתֶכֶם 91 <i>k</i>	
רָאוֹנִי 61 <i>h</i> , 75 <i>v</i>	רַפָּאָה 74 <i>h</i>	
רָאשׁ 23 <i>g</i> , 72 <i>p</i>	רַפָּאֲתִי 75 <i>oo</i>	
רָאשׁ 96	רַבָּה 75 <i>pp</i>	
רָאשׁוֹן 27 <i>w</i>	רַצּוֹא 113 <i>s</i> ²	
רַבָּה adverbial ? 132 <i>h</i> ²	רַק 153	
רַבָּה 48 <i>l</i> , 75 <i>cc</i>	רַשָּׁה (Moab.) 7 <i>c</i>	
רַבּוֹ 67 <i>ee</i>	שׁ pronunciation 6 <i>i</i> , <i>k</i>	
רַבּוֹ 67 <i>m</i>	שָׂאֲת 76 <i>b</i> , 93 <i>t</i>	
רַבּוֹא 23 <i>i</i>	שָׂדֵי, שָׂדֵה 84 ^a <i>f</i> , 93 <i>ll</i>	

for *יָשׁוּב* 19 *i*, 69 *g*; in-
constr. (once) of *שׁוּב* 72 *q*
שׁוּבִי (imper.) 72 *s*
שׁוּבִי + 72 *b*
שׁוֹשְׁבֵי 75 *z*
שׁוֹחֲרוֹ 22 *p*, 64 *a*
שׁוֹחֵף 67 *ee*
שׁוֹחֲחֵף 67 *cc*
שׁוֹחֲטָה ? 64 *a*
שׁוֹחֲת 95 *k*
שׁוֹלְנִי 85 *v*
שׁוֹתוֹ 93 *v*
שׁוֹכֵב 45 *c*
שׁוֹכְבָה 61 *c*, 93 *s*
שׁוֹכַחַת 65 *g*
שׁוֹכֵן 44 *c*
שׁוֹכְנֵתִי 90 *n*
שׁוֹלְהֶבֶת 55 *i*, 85 *o*
שׁוֹלְוֵ בָהּ 21 *c*
שׁוֹלֵחַ with accus.
121 *d*¹
שׁוֹלֵם subst. and
adj. 141 *c*²
שׁוֹלַח 65 *a*
שׁוֹלְחוֹ 52 *o*
שׁוֹלְחָךְ 61 *h*, 65 *d*
שׁוֹלְחַת 21 *f*, 28 *e*³
שׁוֹלֵי 129 *h*¹
שׁוֹלִיו 84^a *g*
שׁוֹלֵם 52 *o*
שׁוֹלְשִׁים 93 *qq*
שׁוֹלְשֵׁמָה 129 *h*¹
שׁוֹלְחָךְ 23 *f*
שׁוֹם 26 *o*¹, 96
שׁוֹמוֹאֵל 90 *k*
שׁוֹמוֹת (inf.) 67 *r*
שׁוֹמֵם 88 *d*, 96
שׁוֹמְמִים see Additions

שׁוֹמֵנַת עֶשֶׂר 97 *e*
שׁוֹמְעוֹן 46 *f*
שׁוֹמְעוֹת 80 *g*
שׁוֹמְרָה 48 *i*², 61 *f*¹
שׁוֹמְרוֹן 88 *c*
שׁוֹמְרֵנִי 48 *i*², 61 *f*¹
שׁוֹנָא 23 *l*
שׁוֹנָא 75 *rr*
שׁוֹנָב (Phoen.) 7 *d*¹
שׁוֹנוֹת 95 *c*¹
שׁוֹנִים 97 *d*
שׁוֹנַת 80 *g*
שׁוֹסַע 65 *d*
שׁוֹעַר ? 135 *p*¹
שׁוֹפֵט אֶת- 29 *i*¹
שׁוֹפִיפּוֹן 86 *g*
שׁוֹפְמוֹת 10 *g*
שׁוֹפְעַת 80 *f*
שׁוֹפְרוֹר 84^b *m*
שׁוֹקְמִים 93 *o*
שׁוֹקְקוֹת 95 *f*
שׁוֹרְאֵשִׁי 22 *s*
שׁוֹרִית 23 *f*
שׁוֹרֵךְ 22 *s*
שׁוֹרְשִׁים 9 *v*, 93 *r*
שׁוֹשָׂא 55 *f*
שׁוֹת-לִי 9 *u*, 26 *o*¹
שׁוֹתָה (only Qal) 78 *b*
שׁוֹתָה 73 *d*
שׁוֹתֵף 67 *ee*
שׁוֹתוֹת (inf. abs.) 75 *n*
שׁוֹתֵי 73 *d*
שׁוֹתִים 97 *b*¹
שׁוֹתִים 97 *d*

ת as preforma-
tive of nouns 85 *p-r*

ת־, ת־ original femi-
nine ending 80 *f, g*, 89 *e*

ת־הֶבֶר 63 *m*, 93 *t*¹

ת־אֲחֵר 65 *e*
ת־אֲכָל 68 *c*
ת־אֲכָלְהוּ ? 68 *f*
ת־אֲמָנָה 51 *m*
ת־אֲסַפֵּן 68 *h*
ת־אֲרוֹ 93 *q*
ת־אֲתָה 68 *f*
ת־אֲל־תֵּבֵא 75 *hh*
ת־בֵּאנָה 72 *k*
ת־בֹּאוּ אֲתָה 48 *d*
ת־בֹּאוּ אֲתָךְ ? 48 *d*
ת־בַּחַר 10 *g*³
ת־בָּטַחְוּ as 3rd pl. fem
47 *k*
ת־בָּל 85 *p*
ת־בָּנָה 75 *hh*
ת־בָּיִד 53 *n*
ת־בָּלָה 75 *hh*
ת־בָּקִין 27 *l*
ת־בָּרַחְוּ 52 *n*
ת־בִּרְאוּנֵי 75 *oo*
ת־בִּרְמִי 67 *t*
ת־בִּרְמִין 75 *dd*
ת־בִּשָׂא 53 *n*
ת־הוֹם 85 *r*
ת־אֲל־תֵּהִיָּה 75 *hh*
ת־הִימָנָה 72 *k*
ת־הִכְרוּ 53 *n*
ת־הִלָּךְ 69 *x*
ת־הִלָּת ? 80 *g*
ת־הִתְלֹו 53 *q*
ת־וּגִיזוּן 75 *gg*
ת־וֹלַעַ 84^a *r*
ת־וֹמִיף ? 50 *e*
ת־וֹמִים 23 *f*
ת־וֹסַף 26 *r*, 69 *v*
ת־זָכַר ? 51 *g*
ת־זָרְעָנִי 47 *k*
ת־חֹם 72 *r*

תְּחִנּוֹתַי	91 n	תִּפְקָנָה	67 dd
תַּחַת	103 o	תַּלְתַּיִם	67 y
תַּחַת	66 f	תְּנַדֵּף ?	66 f
תַּחֲתָנָה	103 d	תְּנַשֵּׂא	19 d
תַּחֲתָנִי	103 d	תַּתְּנֶתְנוּ אֶת-	121 b ¹
תַּטְעִי (Is 17 ¹⁰) ?	20 m ³	תַּסְפִּינָה	67 d ¹
תִּיטִבִי	70 e	תַּעֲבֹדֶם	60 b
תִּיכוּן	27 w	תַּעֲבֹרִי	47 g
תַּתְּעַשֶׂה	63 h	תַּעֲנָנָה	51 m
תִּירָאוּ (Jb 6 ²¹ +)	75 t	תַּעֲנָנָה	58 k
תִּישְׂמְנָה (Ez 6 ⁶) ?	67 p ² , dd	תַּעֲלֹ ?	75 y
תַּתְּכַבְּדֶךָ	60 f	תַּעֲנָנָה (Ju 5 ²⁹)	75 w
תַּבוּנָה	19 d	תַּעֲפָה	48 d
תַּבִּיִּים	1 i	תַּעֲשֶׂה אֶל-	75 hh
תַּכְלָה	77 rr	תַּעֲשֶׂרְנָה	60 g
תַּל-	20 g	תַּפּוּצוֹתֵיכֶם ?	91 l
תַּלְאוּם	75 rr	תַּצְלִינָה	67 p
תַּלְאִים	75 rr	תַּצְלִנָה	67 g
תַּלְבַּשׁוֹן	47 l	תַּצְרִי	67 dd
תַּלְלוֹנִי	72 ee	תַּקְבְּנוּ	67 g
תַּלְלוּ	29 q, 73 e	תַּתְּקוּן מִיָּד	72 cc
תַּלְעַג	10 g ³	תַּקְטֹל	47 k
תַּמוּתָנָה	72 k	תַּקִּימָה ?	72 k
תַּלְתַּחֲתִי ?	75 ii	תַּקְרָאנָה	47 k, 75 rr
תַּתְּחַץ	10 g ³	תִּרְא	75 p
תַּתְּמוּנִי	67 e, dd	תִּרְאָה	75 hh
תַּתְּמוּנִי (Lam 3 ²²) ?	20 o	תִּרְאִינָה	75 w
תַּתְּמוּן	85 p		



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

Genesis

8 4 1240
 5 129*f*, 134*p*
 7 70*a* N., 113*s*,
 126*r*, 126*t*
 8 150*i*
 9 135*i*
 12 69*t*
 13 . 15*l*, 72*t*, 72*aa*
 14 129*f*
 17 . 69*v*, 70*b*, 119*i*
 18 15*g*, 146*f*
 21 72*aa*
 22 104*g*, 146*d*
 9 2 135*m*
 3 117*c*, 138*b*
 4 119*n*, 131*k*
 5 139*c*
 6 116*w*, 121*f*, 143*b*
 9 143*a*
 10 116*h*, 119*i*, 143*e*
 11 121*f*, 152*b*
 14 52*d*, 112*y*, 117*r*
 15 159*g*
 16 131*t*
 19 67*dd*, 134*k*
 20 120*b*
 21 75*bb*, 91*e*
 22 117*f*
 23 117*f*, 141*e*, 146*f*
 24 70*a*, 133*g*
 25 133*i*
 26 116*r* N.
 27 75*gg*
 10 5 139*b*
 9 107*g*
 11 118*f*
 17 35*g*
 19 91*d*, 144*h*
 21 135*h*
 26 35*m*
 11 1 141*d*
 3 69*o*, 117*r*
 4 107*q*, 152*w*
 5 114*g*
 6 67*w*, 67*dd*, 133*d*,
 147*b*
 7 67*dd*, 107*q*, 124*g*
 N., 165*b*
 8 63*f*
 9 144*d*
 10 118*i*
 28 125*h*
 29 146*f*
 30 152*o*
 31 20*f*
 12 1 119*s*, 121*c*
 2 63*q*, 110*i*, 141*d*
 3 116*g*
 4 134*h*
 7 116*o*

Genesis

12 8 91*e*, 156*c*
 9 113*u*
 11 111*g*, 114*m*
 12 112*c*, 112*y*, 112*hh*,
 164*d*
 13 110*d*, 112*p*, 141*l*,
 157*a*, 165*b*
 14 111*g*, 117*h*, 118*u*
 15 118*f*
 16 145*o*
 17 117*q*
 19 111*m*, 117*f*, 147*b*
 13 2 126*m*
 3 138*c*, 154*a* N.
 5 145*o*
 8 131*b*
 9 . 51*n*, 56, 159*dd*
 10 144*h*
 11 139*e*
 12 142*c*
 13 140*a*
 14 104*g*
 15 142*g*, 143*c*
 16 166*b*
 17 120*g*
 14 4 118*i*, 134*o*
 5 134*o*
 6 93*aa*, 131*f*
 9 134*k*
 10 27*q*, 90*c*, 90*i*,
 93*aa*, 123*e*, 130*e*
 13 . 2*b*, 126*r*, 128*u*
 17 115*a*
 18 129*c*
 19 121*f*, 128*a*
 22 106*i*
 23 102*b*, 109*g*, 135*a*,
 149*c*, 154*a* N.
 24 135*c*
 15 1 126*r*, 131*q*
 2 116*n*, 118*n*, 128*v*,
 141*e*
 5 150*i*
 6 112*ss*, 122*q*, 135*p*
 7 . 29*f*, 66*i*, 138*d*
 10 139*b*, 139*c*
 11 126*r*
 12 114*i*
 13 113*o*, 135*p*, 155*e*
 14 119*n*
 15 135*a*
 16 118*q*
 17 111*g*
 18 106*m*, 136*b*
 16 1 142*b*, 156*b*
 2 . 51*g*, 51*p*, 119*x*
 3 102*f*
 4 67*p*
 5 5*n*, 103*o*, 135*a*,
 135*m*

Genesis

16 7 60*d*, 127*e*
 8 10*k*, 76*g*, 107*h*,
 116*n*
 10 166*a*
 11 . 80*d*, 94*f*, 116*n*
 12 127*c*, 128*l*, 156*b*
 16 115*f*
 17 1 110*f*
 4 143*a*
 5 117*ii*, 121*b*, 163*a*
 8 128*p*
 9 142*f* N.
 10 113*gg*
 11 67*dd*, 112*aa*, 121*d*,
 144*b*
 14 29*q*, 67*v*, 112*mm*,
 158*a*, 167*b* N.
 15 143*b*
 17 96, 100*l*, 107*t*,
 134*d*, 150*g*
 19 49*l*
 20 106*m*, 112*s*
 21 154*a*
 26 72*ee*
 18 1 116*o*, 118*g*, 141*e*
 5 158*b* N.
 6 . 90*c*, 90*i*, 131*d*
 7 117*f*, 126*r*
 9 147*b*
 10 118*u*
 11 116*d*, 146*d*
 12 106*n*, 139*f*, 141*e*,
 150*a*, 150*b*
 13 106*g*, 136*c*
 14 133*c*, 139*d*, 141*m*
 15 106*b*, 163*a*
 17 100*l*
 18 75*n*, 142*d*
 19 114*o*, 165*c*
 20 128*h*, 148*d*, 159*ee*
 21 100*l*, 108*b*, 135*m*,
 138*k*
 24 117*g*, 122*l*
 25 112*v*, 115*b*, 161*c*
 26 112*ff*
 27 141*e*
 28 47*m*, 117*aa*,
 119*p*, 134*l*, 159*n*
 N., 159*r*
 29 134*k*
 19 1 116*o*, 141*e*, 141*f*,
 156*c*
 2 17*e*, 20*d*, 20*g*,
 100*o*, 135*q*, 142*g*,
 150*n*, 152*c*
 4 15*l*, 107*c*, 152*r*,
 154*a* N., 164*c*
 5 29*f*
 6 93*i*
 8 34*b*, 103*b*, 139*d*

Genesis

19 9 66 c, 113 r
 11 126 n
 12 150 b
 14 20 g, 116 d
 15 152 w
 16 15 f, 45 d, 55 g,
 115 f
 17 107 p
 18 152 g
 19 60 d, 72 n, 107 f,
 152 w, 154 a
 20 109 f
 21 61 a
 22 120 g
 23 164 b
 28 126 o
 29 115 a, 124 o
 30 126 r
 31 133 f, 152 o
 32 69 x, 117 cc
 33 5 n, 47 l, 61 c, 93 s,
 126 y
 34 126 b
 20 1 90 c
 5 32 l
 6 66 b, 75 qq, 114 m,
 157 b N.
 7 63 q, 110 i
 9 107 w
 10 107 v, 166 b
 11 112 x, 153
 12 152 d
 13 119 u, 124 h N.,
 127 e, 141 f, 145 i,
 167 b
 16 116 s, 134 n
 17 145 u
 18 106 f, 113 n
 21 3 138 k
 5 121 b, 128 v
 6 10 g, 64 h, 114 c
 7 106 p, 124 o, 142 f,
 151 a
 8 51 m
 9 52 n
 11 67 p
 13 143 c
 14 95 l, 128 q, 156 d
 N⁴
 16 75 kk, 108 b, 113 h,
 119 k, 119 s
 17 138 e
 19 117 cc
 20 131 b
 23 20 f, 51 o
 24 51 p, 135 a
 25 112 rr
 26 162 b
 28 91 c, 127 e
 29 91 f, 126 x

Genesis

21 30 117 d, 157 b
 32 138 f, 146 h
 22 1 111 g
 3 135 i
 4 111 b
 5 119 s
 7 147 b
 12 116 g, 158 a
 14 130 d N²
 17 75 ff
 23 134 k
 24 111 h, 147 e
 23 1 134 d, 134 h
 3 122 f
 4 52 f, 128 m
 5 110 e
 6 75 qq, 119 x, 128 r,
 142 f N², 152 b
 8 61 g
 9 119 p
 10 116 h, 141 b, 143 e
 11 106 m, 152 c
 13 110 e
 20 111 k
 24 3 128 a, 165 b
 5 100 n, 113 q
 6 51 n, 152 w
 7 138 a
 8 75 x, 109 d, 126 y
 9 16 h
 14 112 bb, 135 p,
 167 c
 15 106 f, 107 c, 152 r
 18 120 d
 19 106 o, 164 b
 20 75 bb
 21 130 a, 150 i
 22 134 n, 156 b
 23 37 a, 118 g
 26 67 g
 27 75 ll, 135 e, 143 b
 29 156 b
 30 115 e N., 116 s
 31 116 l
 33 73 f
 35 154 a N.
 37 149 c
 41 95 n, 117 f, 164 d
 42 159 v, 167 c
 43 112 t
 44 154 a N., 162 b
 45 135 a
 48 75 t
 49 159 v
 51 109 f, 117 f
 55 139 h, 146 f
 56 142 d
 58 150 n
 60 63 q, 97 g, 134 g
 61 146 g, 146 h

Genesis

24 63 114 f N.
 65 34 f
 67 127 f
 25 1 120 d
 5 16 a
 16 136 d
 21 51 n, 121 f
 23 119 ff
 24 23 f
 26 115 a, 115 c, 115 e
 N.
 31 35 n, 48 i
 34 75 o
 26 7 144 p N., 147 a N.
 9 148 b, 152 w, 157 b
 10 49 l, 106 p
 13 113 u, 164 f
 15 60 h, 135 o
 16 133 c
 18 60 h, 111 q, 120 d
 23 118 f
 25 76 c
 28 75 n, 103 p N.
 29 65 h, 75 hh
 27 1 111 q, 114 d, 119 y
 3 118 f, 122 t
 4 20 b, 106 g, 108 d
 7 58 g
 9 117 ii
 12 49 l, 112 p
 13 10 g, 141 f
 19 60 d
 20 114 n N., 136 c,
 148 b
 21 67 r, 136 d
 24 150 a
 26 10 g
 28 20 m
 29 145 l
 30 113 n, 164 b N.
 31 72 t
 33 107 c, 116 d, 117 q,
 150 l, 153
 34 111 h N., 113 m,
 117 q, 135 e, 153
 36 63 m, 136 d, 150 e
 37 103 g, 117 ff, 117 ii,
 142 g, 150 l
 38 10 g, 16 g, 100 l
 39 20 m, 119 c
 41 63 f
 42 61 a, 121 a
 43 112 r, 119 s
 45 114 d, 114 r,
 117 aa, 118 i,
 150 e, 154 a N.
 28 2 16 h, 90 i
 3 75 ll
 4 95 g, 114 g
 6 167 c

Genesis

28	8	III d
	9	119 aa N.
	11	126 r
	15	106 o, 147 b
	16	106 g
	18	71
29	2	111 e, 144 f
	6	150 n
	7	126 i, 152 d
	9	116 u, 129 h
	10	. 67 p, 75 gg, 106 f	
	14	131 d
	15	112 cc, 150 e
	17	145 n
	19	133 a
	21	69 o, 165 a
	25	142 g
	26	107 g
	27	121 b
	30	133 b
	32	60 d
30	3	51 g
	6	26 g, 59 f
	8	85 n, 117 q, 154 a	N.
	13	106 n
	15	114 a
	16	126 y
	18	17 c, 135 m
	19	96
	20	117 bb, 117 ff
	23	135 m
	27	111 h N., 120 f,	159 dd
	29	157 c
	31	120 g, 120 h
	32	112 mm
	34	109 b, 151 e
	37	117 r, 123 b
	38	10 g, 47 k, 76 g,	95 f, 138 c, 145 c
	39	69 f, 145 p
	40	. 119 aa N., 142 f	
	41	91 f, 112 ee
	43	132 g
31	6	32 i
	7	67 w, 112 h
	8	145 u, 159 r, 159 s	
	9	135 o
	13	127 f
	14	146 g, 146 h
	15	113 r
	19	67 cc
	23	118 h
	27	63 c, 111 m, 114 n	N.
	28	75 n
	29	152 i
	30	51 i, 113 p
	32	138 f

Genesis

31	32	59 g, 138 f
	34	111 q, 124 h N.,	132 h N.
	35	106 l
	36	20 d, 37 d
	39	23 f, 74 k, 75 oo,	75 qq, 90 l, 107 e
	40	67 cc, 76 a, 104 g,	143 a N., 167 b N.
	41	136 d
	42	106 p
	44	69 x
	45	117 ii
	47	1 c
	52	149 c, 167 b
	53	145 i
32	1	103 b, 122 g
	3	136 b
	5	64 h, 68 f
	6	49 e, 104 g, 123 b	
	7	116 s
	8	67 p, 144 b
	9	112 p, 145 u
	10	116 o
	11	106 g, 119 n, 133 c	
	12	119 aa N., 152 w,	156 c
	13	107 w
	15	134 c
	16	28 b, 122 d, 132 e,	135 o
	17	123 d
	18	9 v, 10 g, 60 b, 64 f,	137 b
	19	124 i
	20	. 52 n, 61 d, 74 h	
	25	51 n
	27	. 60 f, 65 h, 163 c	
	30	20 f, 107 h
	31	90 k, 111 e, 156 c,	157 b
33	2	146 e N.
	3	66 b
	4	5 n
	5	37 a, 67 a, 117 ff,	137 a
	7	146 h
	8	147 a N.
	10	. 112 gg, 158 b N.	
	11	74 g
	13	60 h, 104 g, 122 d,	126 i, 135 o
	18	118 n
	19	134 g
34	5	112 ss
	7	45 c, 45 g
	8	140 d
	9	117 w
	15	72 h, 119 p
	16	44 o, 49 k

Genesis

34	19	64 d
	22	72 ee
	23	143 a
	24	145 d
	25	118 q, 131 q
	27	144 g
	30	128 n, 141 d
	31	107 t, 118 v
35	1	65 a
	3	116 d
	7	124 h N., 145 i	
	8	126 d, 144 d
	11	145 f
	13	142 g
	14	138 c
	22	15 p, 45 g
	26	121 b
36	7	133 c
37	2	126 z
	3	112 h, 133 b
	4	115 c
	7	47 l, 116 o
	8	113 q, 150 h
	15	107 f, 116 s
	16	142 f N.
	17	117 f
	18	117 w
	19	128 u
	21	117 ll
	23	117 cc
	29	152 l
	30	116 p, 143 a
	32	150 i
	33	60 d, 113 w
	35	118 n
38	5	112 uu
	9	13 c, 66 i, 112 gg	
	11	118 g, 152 w
	17	159 dd
	21	126 y
	24	20 m, 97 c, 116 s,	119 y N.
	25	32 l, 74 i, 116 v,	142 e
	26	133 b N.
	28	144 d
	29	164 g
39	1	142 b
	4	130 d, 155 d, 155 n	
	5	145 q
	6	128 x
	8	137 c
	9	107 t, 112 p
	10	123 c
	11	35 n, 126 s
	14	. 2 b, 29 g, 64 g	
	16	72 ee
	18	114 r
	20	130 c
	22	116 s



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Exodus

3	13	112 t
	15	133 l
	18	49 l
	19	69 x, 157 b N.
	20	63 m
	21	164 d
	22	95 k, 139 b
4	1	107 i
	2	37 c
	4	29 g, 64 c
	10	61 e, 128 t, 152 d
	12	75 ee
	13	130 d, 155 n
	14	159 g
	21	112 mm, 143 d
5	2	107 u
	5	112 cc
	7	68 h
	10	152 m
	11	138 e
	16	74 g, 116 t, 152 o
	18	163 a
	19	57 N., 135 k
	20	126 r
	21	66 i, 102 f
	23	113 v
6	3	119 i, 144 l N.
	6	112 x
	10	20 c N.
	14	124 r
	28	52 o, 130 d
7	9	109 h, 159 d
	11	131 l
	20	119 q
	27	52 s
8	1	20 m, 75 gg
	4	63 o
	10	123 e
	17	117 z
	20	107 b
	22	150 a, 159 w
9	4	130 d, 155 n
	9	117 z
	15	106 p
	16	115 e N.
	18	91 e, 127 f
	23	63 n, 69 x
	27	126 k
	30	107 c
	31	141 d
10	1	126 g
	3	51 l, 106 h
	4	65 e
	6	161 b
	7	107 c, 152 r
	8	137 a
	9	91 k, 127 e
	10	154 a N.
	11	135 p
	22	133 i

Exodus

10	28	69 v
11	6	135 o
	8	9 v
12	4	133 c, 139 c
	5	128 v
	6	88 c
	8	154 a N.
	12	124 g
	13	159 g
	14	67 n
	15	20 g, 112 mm, 116 w, 126 w
	16	146 c, 152 b
	18	134 o
	21	46 d
	23	126 l N.
	27	61 a
	31	20 g
	34	107 c
	39	117 ii
	43	119 m
	48	113 gg
	49	145 u
13	2	52 n
	3	113 bb
	7	118 k, 121 b
	8	138 h
	18	67 y
	21	53 q
14	2	93 q
	11	61 c, 152 y
	20	139 e N.
15	1	20 e, 107 c, 146 f
	2	58 k, 80 g, 117 b
	4	128 r
	5	58 g, 75 dd, 91 l
	6	90 l
	7	116 i
	8	15 c
	9	117 z, 120 g N., 154 a N.
	10	35 g
	11	20 e, 20 g
	12	107 d
	13	20 e, 64 d, 138 g
	14	47 m
	15	107 c
	16	20 e, 67 g, 90 g, 132 c, 138 g, 164 f
	17	20 h, 155 h
	20	47 l, 146 c
	21	20 e
	24	20 c
	26	113 o
16	2	72 ee
	6	112 oo
	7	32 d, 72 ee, 141 l N.
	8	72 ee
	12	88 c
	14	55 k

Exodus

16	16	118 h
	20	27 o, 67 n, 121 d N., 139 h N.
	21	123 c, 159 g
	22	134 e
	23	63 i, 76 d
	29	9 l, 69 p, 139 d
	32	117 cc
	33	125 b
17	1	115 f
	2	47 m
	3	72 ee, 117 e
	4	112 x
	6	49 k
	7	152 k
	12	141 d, 145 n
	14	126 s
18	4	119 j
	5	118 g
	9	75 r
	14	102 b
	18	75 n, 133 c
	20	155 d, 155 i
	21	97 h
	22	127 b
	23	49 i
	26	47 g, 112 g
	27	119 s
19	1	102 f
	3	53 n
	5	113 o
	8	135 r
	13	69 t
	15	134 o N.
	18	93 dd
	19	113 u
	23	72 w, 72 x
20	2	15 p, 138 d
	3	107 o, 132 h
	5	60 b, 129 e
	8	113 bb
	9	118 k
	15	107 o
	18	116 o
	20	135 m, 152 x
	24	127 e
	25	72 k, 117 kk
21	2	159 bb
	4	145 h, 146 e
	5	113 o
	8	61 b, 75 ee, 103 g
	12	104 g, 112 n, 116 w
	13	112 ii
	18	47 m
	20	126 r
	28	117 d, 121 b
	29	124 i
	31	29 i N.
	35	135 m
	36	159 cc

Exodus

21 37 . . . 47 *f*, 123 *a*
 22 1 . . . 124 *n*
 3 . . . 51 *k*, 113 *o*
 4 . . . 53 *n*
 5 . . . 117 *q*
 8 . . . 138 *e*
 11 . . . 113 *o*
 17 . . . 94 *d*
 22 . 113 *m*, 163 *c N.*
 25 . . . 135 *o*
 29 . . . 60 *d*
 30 . . . 131 *k*
 23 4 . . . 21 *h*
 8 . . . 107 *g*
 9 . . . 158 *a*
 16 . . . 61 *a*
 21 . . . 51 *n*, 67 *y*
 22 . . . 113 *o*
 24 . . . 60 *b*
 26 . . . 94 *d*
 27 . . . 117 *i N.*
 28 . . . 126 *t*
 30 . . . 123 *e*, 133 *k*
 31 . . . 58 *g*
 24 3 . . . 118 *q*
 4 . . . 134 *f*
 10 . . . 139 *g*
 12 . . . 154 *a N.*
 25 5 . . . 52 *q*
 11 . . . 49 *l*
 15 . . . 135 *o N.*
 18 . . . 117 *hh*
 28 . . . 117 *hh*
 29 . . . 20 *f*, 117 *hh*
 31 . . . 63 *h*
 33 . . . 123 *d*
 35 . . . 123 *d*
 40 . . . 121 *c*
 26 2 . . . 134 *n*
 3 . . . 123 *d*, 139 *e*
 19 . . . 123 *d*
 33 . 49 *h*, 53 *r*, 133 *i*
 27 11 . . . 134 *n*
 28 9 . . . 117 *d*
 10 . . . 134 *c N.*
 17 . . . 131 *d*
 20 . . . 117 *y*
 21 . . . 139 *c*
 32 . . . 165 *a*
 43 . . . 165 *a*
 29 1 . . . 66 *g*
 2 . . . 126 *m*
 12 . . . 119 *w N.*
 31 . . . 128 *p*
 35 . . . 103 *b*
 30 4 . . . 103 *g*
 20 . . . 117 *y N.*
 32 . . . 73 *f*
 31 4 . . . 63 *i*
 13 . . . 60 *f*

Exodus

31 17 . . . 51 *m*
 18 . . . 124 *g*
 32 1 . . . 126 *aa*, 137 *c*
 3 . . . 54 *f*, 117 *w*
 4 . . . 72 *t*, 145 *i*
 6 . . . 52 *n*, 113 *e*
 12 . . . 150 *e*
 25 . 5 *n*, 58 *g*, 116 *i*
 26 . . . 137 *c*
 29 . . . 114 *p*
 30 . . . 108 *h*
 32 . . . 159 *dd*, 167 *a*
 33 . . . 137 *c*
 34 . . . 112 *oo*
 33 3 . . . 27 *q*
 6 . . . 54 *f*, 117 *w*
 7 107 *e*, 112 *e*, 113 *h*
 10 . . . 112 *kk*
 11 . . . 156 *c*
 12 . . . 75 *gg*
 13 . . . 69 *b N.*, 91 *k*
 14 . . . 150 *a*
 19 . . . 67 *ee*
 20 . . . 60 *d*, 159 *gg*
 23 . . . 124 *b*
 34 1 . . . 124 *q*
 10 . . . 122 *q*
 13 . . . 47 *m*
 19 . . . 51 *g*
 24 . . . 51 *l*
 34 . . . 159 *k*
 36 1 . . . 103 *g*
 29 . . . 112 *ss*
 38 3 . . . 117 *hh*
 5 . . . 95 *n*
 39 17 . . . 131 *d*
 18 . . . 60 *h*
 23 . . . 165 *a*

Leviticus

1 1 . . . 49 *b N.*
 2 . . . 139 *d*
 2 1 . . . 139 *d*, 145 *t*
 2 . . . 85 *b*
 8 . . . 144 *p N.*
 4 2 . 119 *w N.*, 139 *d*
 23 . . . 69 *w*
 5 9 . . . 75 *hh*
 11 . . . 131 *d*
 13 . . . 119 *w N.*
 15 . . . 128 *d*
 6 2 . . . 91 *e*
 3 . . . 128 *d*
 7 . . . 113 *gg*
 8 . 118 *g*, 135 *o N.*
 9 . . . 118 *q*
 13 . . . 131 *c*
 7 8 . . . 117 *d*
 35 . . . 53 *l*, 155 *l*

Leviticus

8 11 . . . 76 *c*
 16 . . . 91 *c*
 9 6 . . . 107 *q*, 120 *c*
 10 6 . . . 109 *g*
 10 . . . 114 *p*
 19 75 *rr*, 100 *k*, 159 *g*
 11 7 . . . 67 *g*
 23 . . . 88 *f*
 35 . . . 53 *u*
 42 . . . 5 *n*
 43 . . . 74 *k*
 44 . . . 54 *k*
 13 4 . . . 91 *e*
 19 . . . 131 *i*
 34 . . . 127 *e*
 55 . . . 54 *h*
 14 34 . . . 101 *a*
 43 . . . 53 *l*
 46 . . . 53 *l*
 55 . . . 54 *h*
 15 29 . . . 53 *r*
 16 8 . . . 30 *n*
 17 14 . . . 145 *l*
 18 7 . . . 75 *hh*
 21 . . . 95 *q N.*
 25 . . . 76 *h*
 27 . . . 34 *b N.*
 28 . . . 116 *s*
 19 9 . . . 61 *d*, 142 *f N.*
 16 . . . 118 *q*
 20 . . . 113 *w*
 28 . . . 102 *i*
 20 7 . . . 54 *k*
 10 . . . 117 *d*
 14 . . . 117 *d*
 19 . . . 75 *hh*
 21 4 . . . 67 *t*
 9 . . . 67 *t*, 164 *d*
 21 . . . 142 *f N.*
 23 17 . . . 14 *d*
 22 . . . 61 *d*
 39 . . . 61 *a*
 42 . . . 126 *r*
 24 5 . . . 49 *l*, 117 *ii*
 22 . . . 134 *d*
 25 5 . . . 20 *h*
 10 . . . 134 *o N.*
 20 . . . 159 *w*
 21 . . . 49 *l*, 75 *m*
 33 . . . 145 *u N.*
 36 . . . 76 *i*
 48 . . . 130 *d*
 26 15 . . . 67 *dd*
 18 . . . 52 *p*
 25 . . . 49 *l*
 33 . . . 52 *n*
 34 . . . 67 *y*, 75 *m*
 37 . . . 118 *s N.*
 42 . . . 128 *d*, 131 *r*
 43 . . . 67 *y*

Leviticus

27 2 128 *d*
 23 127 *i*

Numbers

1 1 49 *b N.*
 2 124 *r*
 47 54 *l*
 2 33 54 *l*
 3 1 52 *o*, 130 *d*
 9 123 *e*
 26 117 *l*
 46 117 *m*, 134 *k*
 49 85 *t*
 4 2 113 *bb*
 23 45 *g*
 27 128 *v*
 5 2 102 *i*
 3 119 *e*
 10 117 *m*, 139 *c*
 17 128 *p*
 19 110 *i*
 20 167 *a*
 22 53 *q*, 66 *f*
 23 126 *s*
 27 112 *g*
 6 7 74 *b*, 96
 9 133 *k N.*, 144 *e*
 26 109 *b*
 7 2 5 *n*
 11 123 *d*
 8 7 27 *q*, 64 *d*
 24 45 *g*
 9 20 131 *e*
 10 3 145 *c*
 4 134 *r N.*
 29 138 *b*
 35 5 *n*
 36 118 *f*
 11 4 35 *d*, 151 *a N.*
 5 106 *g*
 7 93 *h*
 10 117 *h*
 11 74 *k*
 12 69 *s*, 122 *f N.*
 15 32 *g*
 16 48 *i*
 17 119 *m*
 20 80 *h*
 25 23 *d*, 68 *f*, 72 *q*,
 120 *d N.*, 126 *x*
 27 126 *r*
 29 154 *b*
 12 1 146 *g*
 2 133 *k N.*
 4 97 *i*
 6 128 *d*
 13 105 *b N.*
 14 154 *b*
 13 21 102 *f*

Numbers

13 27 118 *f*
 32 72 *l*
 14 2 106 *p*, 151 *e*
 16 69 *n*, 114 *s*
 17 5 *n*
 21 167 *b*
 24 119 *gg*
 27 72 *ee*
 31 76 *h*
 33 91 *l*
 34 123 *d*
 35 67 *g*
 40 58 *k*
 41 135 *p*
 15 15 161 *c*
 24 119 *w*
 29 143 *c*
 31 51 *k*
 35 113 *gg*
 16 13 54 *e*
 15 117 *d*
 22 100 *m*, 150 *m*
 29 121 *b*, 159 *c N.*,
 159 *q*
 17 6 72 *w*
 10 67 *t*, 72 *dd*
 17 139 *c*
 20 72 *ee*
 25 128 *v*
 27 106 *n*
 28 67 *e*, 67 *dd*, 150 *g*
 N.
 18 8 143 *e*
 26 72 *i*
 19 12 74 *b*
 20 3 65 *a*, 154 *b*
 5 59 *a*, 152 *a N.*
 18 152 *w*
 21 66 *i*
 21 1 75 *q*
 5 59 *a*
 9 117 *d*
 14 127 *f*
 15 112 *pp*
 17 63 *l*
 20 112 *ss*
 23 157 *b N.*
 24 112 *pp*
 27 54 *c*, 75 *hh*
 30 67 *g*, 69 *r*, 76 *f*
 35 164 *d*
 22 1 125 *h*
 6 20 *c*, 53 *u*, 67 *o*,
 120 *c*, 138 *e*
 12 103 *c*
 13 69 *x*, 115 *c*
 17 67 *o*
 19 109 *d*, *i*
 29 151 *e N.*
 33 103 *b*, 117 *e*

Numbers

22 38 114 *m*
 23 3 130 *d*, 137 *c*
 6 64 *c*, 67 *o*, 93 *aa*
 8 58 *g*
 10 151 *a*
 13 20 *o*, 48 *i*, 67 *o N.*,
 69 *x*, 100 *o N.*,
 152 *b*
 14 118 *f*
 15 51 *p*
 18 90 *o*, 96
 19 27 *q*, 64 *d*, 109 *i*,
 166 *a*
 20 159 *g*
 24 124 *n*
 25 10 *h*, 67 *g*
 24 1 123 *c*
 3 90 *o*, 96
 4 116 *k*
 5 148 *b*
 6 75 *x*
 7 54 *c*, 93 *z*
 10 113 *r*
 17 55 *f*
 22 29 *f*
 23 115 *k*
 24 93 *y*
 25 12 5 *n*, 128 *d*, 131 *r N.*
 26 62 54 *l*
 27 7 135 *o*
 29 39 93 *m*
 30 5, 8 91 *k*
 31 28 134 *d*
 32 6 150 *m*
 14 69 *h*
 17 72 *p*
 20 159 *c N.*, 167 *b*
 23 47 *m*, 159 *q*
 30 68 *i*
 32 32 *d*
 42 103 *g*
 34 2 131 *f*
 7 75 *bb N.*
 14 23 *c*
 38 6 135 *o*

Deuteronomy

1 1 101 *a*
 2 118 *g*, 134 *f*
 3 134 *o*
 5 120 *g*, 120 *h*
 7 119 *s*
 13 119 *s*
 16 75 *t*, 112 *u*
 17 47 *m*, 53 *r*, 133 *c*,
 161 *c*
 18 117 *gg*
 19 118 *h*, 126 *v*
 21 69 *f*
 23 134 *f*



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

Deuteronomy

33	3	116 s
	4	131 s
	9	19 c, 117 b N.
11			116 i, 117 ll, 165 b
12			44 c
16			48 d, 90 l, 90 m
19			130 f, 133 h
21			68 h, 76 d
23			48 i, 69 f
24			119 w, 126 m
26			91 l
27			131 s
34	8	67 g
	9	116 f

Joshua

1	1	49 b N.
	2	131 n
	5	106 c
	7	107 p, 135 o N.
	8	91 k
12			125 d N.
2	2	63 i
	4	60 a, 135 p
	5	114 k
	6	59 g
10			117 c, 157 c
13			63 q, 96
15			126 r
16			63 c, 72 q, 74 k
17			34 a N., 59 h
18			59 h
20			126 y
3	5	54 k
	7	115 c
	9	66 c
	11	128 c
	12	134 q
	14	127 g
	16	120 g
4	3	72 z
	4	134 k
	6	47 m
	7	9 v
	14	52 l
	24	74 g
5	2	120 g, 124 q
	8	63 q
6	8	134 l
	9	113 u
	13	112 i, 113 t
	17	75 oo
	22	134 l
7	7	63 p, 113 x, 120 e, 154 b
	9	75 hh
	15	121 b
	21	127 i, 134 g
	24	154 a N. (a)
	25	117 ee
8	3	60 c

Joshua

8	11	127 g
	25	146 c
	28	20 g, 117 ii
	33	127 f, 127 i
9	2	118 q
	8	137 a
12			54 f, 72 m, 112 ss, 126 aa
20			113 z
24			75 hh
10	2	107 c
	13	107 c, 135 p, 150 e
	17	93 oo
	24	23 i, 138 i
	36	90 e
11	2	10 g
	8	126 y
	14	53 l
12	9	2 r (end)
13	5	127 f
	7	125 d N.
	14	145 u N.
14	1	64 d
	7	72 aa, 115 i
	8	75 ii
	11	115 k, 161 c
15	3	112 ss
	5	90 d
	12	90 f
	14	134 l
	18	16 f
	19	117 x, 117 ff, 126 y
	21	90 e
	38	56 21 e N.
16	2	112 ss
	3, 5	126 y
17	11	97 c, 117 l
18	12	90 i, 112 ss
	13	126 y
	20	47 f
19	11	112 ss
	13	90 i
21	11	91 k
22	3	112 ss
	9	68 i
	17	117 aa
	20	150 m
	25	69 n
23	5	60 a
	15	103 b
24	7	145 m
	10	113 r
	14	75 oo
	19	124 h, 145 i
			Judges
1	1	49 b N.
	2	106 m
	3	49 h
	6	93 r

Judges

1	7	116 k, 121 d, 141 i, 156 b
	12	112 ii
	15	59 h, 126 y
	19	114 l
	22	145 c
	28	113 n, 164 d
2	1	107 b
	18	112 hh
	19	112 e, 112 ee
3	23	112 tt
	24	67 v, 164 b
	25	116 d
	28	129 e
4	4	131 b
	6	150 e
	8	49 m
	18	72 s, 72 t, 126 r
	19	74 k
	20	58 g, 64 f, 110 k, 147 c, 150 n, 152 k
	21	72 p, 72 t
	24	113 h N., 113 u
5	1	2 r, 73 e, 117 b, 146 g
	4	117 z
	5	67 dd, 136 d N.
	7	20 i, 36, 44 h N.
	8	107 b, 149 e
	10	87 e, 130 a
	12	10 g, 72 s
	13	69 g
	14	93 aa
	15	10 g, 87 g, 93 bb
	17	117 bb
	21	118 q
	22	20 h, 123 e
	24	119 w
	26	47 k
	27	154 a N.
	28	64 h
	29	75 w, 128 i, 133 h
6	9	49 c, 49 e
	10	49 e
	11	127 d
	13	159 dd
	14	126 y
	16	49 l
	17	36
	18	114 q, 135 a
	19	53 n, 156 d
	20	34 f
	25	126 w, 128 c
	28	63 p
	31	73 e, 100 m
	36	116 q, 159 v
	39	109 a N.
7	3	137 c
	4	136 b
	6	93 n

Judges

7	8	131 s
	12	36
	13	112 qq
	19	113 z
	20	147 c
	23	102 b
	25	124 r
8	1	74 h, 155 d, 155 h	
	2	20 m
	4	118 n
	10	97 e
	11	130 a N.
	18	126 o, 161 c
	19	63 q, 159 x
	32	125 h, 128 c
9	8	113 o
	9	63 k, 100 n, 106 n	
	10	46 d, 46 e
	15	159 v
	16	167 a
	17	119 bb
	28	137 a
	29	48 l, 76 e, 154 b	151 b,
	39	69 p
	41	35 d
	45	117 ee
	48	157 a
	53	27 o, 67 p, 125 b	
	55	145 d
10	4	96
	11	167 b
	18	137 c
11	5	21 b
	10	159 n N.
	18	47 m
	20	157 b N.
	25	51 i, 133 a N.
	29	118 f
	33	134 e
	34	135 o, 135 o N.
	35	119 i
	36	124 e
	39	144 b
12	5	100 m, 112 ee
	6	2 w
	7	124 o
13	2	125 b
	5	80 d
	6	44 d, 64 f, 127 e
	8	52 s
	12	135 m
	16	119 m
	21	75 y
	23	90 h N.
	25	61 c
14	2	90 e
	3	135 a
	4	122 q, 135 p
	6	152 p

Judges

14	15	9 v, 69 n, 150 g
		N.
	17	134 m
	18	37 d, 90 f, 93 x,
		133 a
15	1	119 n
	7	163 c, 163 d N.
	12	152 w
	13	113 p
	14	164 b
16	5	66 h
	9	126 o
	10	67 dd
	11	113 o
	13	28 c N.
	14	127 g
	15	141 e
	16	10 g, 52 d, 60 d,
		164 d
	18	112 tt
	20	123 c
	25	52 n
	26	67 v
	27	126 x
	28	34 a N., 88 f, 97 b
		N.
	30	72 r
17	2	32 h, 121 f
	3	154 N.
18	3	142 e
	19	20 g, 150 g
	23	67 g, 67 y
	29	52 q
	30	5 n
19	1	131 b
	2	75 t
	5	9 u, 64 c N.,
		117 ff
	6	110 h, 120 d
	8	64
	9	91 k
	11	19 i
	13	69 x, 73 d
	18	118 e N.
	20	29 q, 73 e
	22	54 c, 130 e
	30	112 ee, oo, 116 w
20	2	29 f
	15	54 l, 155 d
	16	90 i N.
	31	66 f
	32	20 h
	38	75 gg
	39	118 u
	43	22 s
	44	117 m
21	7	131 n
	9	54 l
	16	123 b
	21	145 p

1 Samuel

1	1	49 b N., 125 b,
		125 h, 156 b
	2	134 l, 145 o
	3	112 dd, 123 c
	4	112 g, 126 s
	6	20 h, 22 s, 59 g,	
		117 p
	7	107 e, 123 c
	8	37 e, 102 l
	9	91 e, 113 e N.,
		141 e
	10	128 y
	11	113 o
	12	112 uu, 114 n N.,
		164 d
	13	20 g
	14	47 o
	16	128 v
	17	23 f, 95 h
	20	44 d, 64 f
	22	112 oo
	24	135 i
	27	95 h
	28	64 f
2	1	2 r, 106 g
	3	103 g, 120 g, 124 e,
		133 k, 152 z
	4	146 a
	6	111 u, 116 x
	8	107 g, 116 x, 135 p
	9	67 g
	13	112 oo, 116 w,
		131 c, 159 i, 164 a
	14	131 h, 132 g
	15	112 oo
	16	103 g, 106 m,
		112 ll, 113 w, 159 f,
		159 dd
	18	116 k, 118 q, 121 d
	19	112 e
	20	145 u
	22	112 k
	23	126 g
	24	116 s
	25	117 x
	26	113 u
	27	113 q, 114 e, 150 e
	28	49 e, 113 z, 119 w
	29	133 b
	30	113 p, 116 g, 149 a
	31	112 x, 116 d
	33	53 q, 118 q, 145 e
3	2	107 b, 120 b
	3	107 c, 152 r
	5	46 c, 120 g, 120 h
	7	107 c
	10	54 k, 118 u, 123 c
	11	67 g, 67 p, 116 w,
		155 d
	12	113 h

1 Samuel

3	13	112 qq, 130 c N., 119 p
	14 149 c
	17 149 d
	21 75 y
4	1 131 c, 145 c
	3 127 g
	5 72 h, 145 c
	6 37 f
	7 125 e
	8	132 h, 136 d, 147 d
	10 124 b, 145 o
	12 127 e
	15	44 m, 145 k, 145 n
	16 126 k
	19 69 m, 112 tt
	21 152 q
5	3 116 d
	7 112 rr
	9 67 v, 130 d, 164 d
	10 115 c, 145 m
	11 117 e
6	4 118 h, 135 r
	7 72 i N., 135 o
	9	155 d, 155 f, 159 q
	10 60 h, 75 qq
	11 154 a N.
	12	. 47 k, 71, 75 n, 113 s
	14 127 d
	18 126 x
	19 119 k
7	9 131 k
	10 116 u
	11 119 c
	12 111 d
	14 72 k
	16 112 f
	17 29 i N.
8	11 72 l
	12 114 p
	19 20 g, 163 a
9	2 133 a
	3	. 96, 117 d, 130 g
	4 104 g, 152 k
	7 159 w N.
	9	. 107 e, 144 d N ¹
	10 120 g
	11 116 u
	13 35 n, 47 m
	17 138 b
	20	73 e, 134 m, 143 c
	21 133 g
	24 138 i, 138 k
10	3 97 c
	4 134 n
	5	29 g, 101 a, 109 k, 112 z
	6 75 qq

1 Samuel

10	8 112 v
	9 112 uu
	11	20 h, 111 g, 116 s, 116 w, 136 c
	12 154 b
	13 75 qq
	14 152 k
	16 113 o
	18 135 a
	23 133 b
	24 22 s, 100 l
	25 126 s
	27 136 b
11	1 125 h
	2 135 p
	5 107 v
	11 111 g, 116 w
	12 150 a
12	3 137 b
	7 51 p
	13 44 d, 64 f
	14 167 a
	17 114 o
	19 107 p
	20 135 a
	23 126 x, 135 g
	24 75 oo
	25 29 o, 113 o
13	3 2 b
	6 93 w
	7 119 gg
	8 69 t
	11 67 dd
	12 54 k
	13 159 dd
	15 93 oo, 132 g
	17	118 q, 126 m, 126 z, 134 l
	19 152 w
	20 118 f
	21	. 35 n, 96, 112 dd
	22 112 ee
	23 92 g
14	1 126 s
	13 72 m
	14 118 s N.
	15 95 g
	16 129 b
	19	111 h, 113 u, 164 d
	21 2 b
	22 53 n
	24 76 d, 112 w
	27 72 k
	28 72 t
	29 126 x
	30	106 p, 113 o, 159 x
	33	. 23 c, 74 i, 75 oo
	34 96 (p. 286)
	36	48 g N., 67 dd, 109 d
	38 66 c

1 Samuel

14	39 100 o N., 149 c
	43 113 p
	44 149 d
	45 119 w N.
	49 47 b N.
	52 112 ll
15	1 9 v
	2 106 g
	4 93 x
	5 68 i
	6	20 g, 22 s, 60 f, 68 h, 154 a N.
	9	67 t, 75 y, 132 d, 135 c N.
	13 121 f
	14 37 f, 154 b
	16 165 a
	19 72 ff
	20 157 c
	23	29 q, 53 l, 111 h, 119 x
	32 118 q
	33 119 w
16	1 65 h, 127 d
	2 114 g, 159 g
	3 138 e
	4	141 n, 144 d, 145 u, 150 a
	7 35 g, 132 c
	8 125 i
	11 133 g
	12 128 x
	14 112 h
	16	. 120 b N., 124 i
	18 128 t, 129 c
	20 128 q
	23	112 ee, 112 oo, 126 x
17	5 121 d, 131 q
	12 126 x
	14 133 g, 134 l
	15 113 u, 118 g
	16 113 k
	17 126 x, 134 n
	20 112 rr
	21 122 i
	24 111 h
	25	22 s, 53 n, 60 g, 100 l, 114 g, 116 s
	26 34 f, 132 h
	28 136 c
	32 112 p
	34	. 112 kk, 126 r, 154 a N.
	38 112 tt
	40 132 c
	41 113 u
	43 124 o
	46 145 e
	47 53 q, 145 c
	48 112 uu



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

2 Samuel

6	2	125 c
	3	126 z
	6	117 g
	16	112 uu
	20	75 y, 148 b
7	5	112 r, 150 d
	14	112 mm
	29	120 d
8	2	126 m
	3	17 b
	4	69 v
	8	131 e
9	1	165 a
	3	128 g, 152 s
10	7	131 o
	9	145 k, 146 a
	12	54 k
11	1	23 g
	4	141 e
	11	149 a N.
	19	142 f N ²
	20	157 c
	24	69 r, 75 rr
	25	117 l
	27	60 d
12	1	72 p
	2	126 d, 126 x	146 f
	3	152 p
	6	97 h
	9	144 n
	10	114 g
	14	52 o
	15	51 m
	16	112 f, 117 q
	17	75 rr
	28	61 f, 135 a, 150 m	N.
	30	127 e
13	4	p. 457 N ¹
	5	75 cc
	8	72 t
	12	75 hh, 107 g
	14	117 u
	15	117 q
	17	64 c
	18	47 l, 112 tt N., 156 b	
	19	113 t
	20	. 84 a s, 118 p,	154 a N
	23	131 d
	25	152 g, 165 a
	26	159 dd
	28	72 w, 159 g
	31	116 k
	32	73 f
	39	131 g, 144 o
14	2	75 m, 136 d
	3	76 g
	4	126 e
	6	60 d

2 Samuel

14	7	73 b
	10	116 w
	11	. 75 ff, 119 w N.	
	13	92 b, 115 i
	19	47 b N., 70 c
	21	106 m
	26	118 h, 134 g
	30	71
	31	102 l
15	2	. 111 g, 127 b N.	
	4	112 p, 151 a
	5	10 g N ^s
	7	10 g
	12	113 u
	16	117 d
	20	150 a
	21	93 aa N., 130 c,	163 d
	23	117 t
	25	117 e
	27	72 s
	32	116 k, 121 d
	33	49 l, 75 w
	34	67 dd, 143 d
	37	93 ll
16	1	134 n
	5	112 tt, 113 t
	7	128 t
	13	93 gg, 112 f
17	5	135 f
	8	117 h
	9	144 e
	10	67 t
	11	106 i
	12	109 d, 122 l
	13	106 o
	15	135 a
	16	121 a
	17	112 k, 126 r
	22	96, 130 g
	23	51 m
	26	118 g
18	3	63 i, 97 g
	11	114 l, 119 aa, 154 b,	159 w N.
	12	137 c, 154 b
	13	159 cc
	14	108 c, 156 c
	16	22 s
	18	117 d
	19	119 ff
	22	74 i
	23	110 b
	29	114 f, 150 a
	33	133 l N.
19	1	135 f, 151 b
	6	70 c, 128 a
	13	112 i
	14	68 h
	18	97 e, 112 tt

2 Samuel

19	19	53 q
	20	115 g
	25	52 l, 127 f
	27	122 f
	30	106 i
	43	76 b
	44	67 w
20	1	147 c
	5	68 i
	8	142 e
	9	68 h, 141 c
	11	137 c
	12	112 oo, 116 e
	13	69 w
	14	125 h
	18	113 w
	19	130 f N.
	20	149 a, 149 e
	21	53 s, 155 e
	23	16 b, 127 f
21	2	74 h
	3	110 i
	4	120 c
	9	118 i
	11	121 a
	12	75 rr
	15	72 t
	20	35 n
	22	121 b
22	1	. 2 s, 53 l, 130 d	
	24	49 e
	27	67 l
	33	35 d, 131 r
	37	103 d
	38	108 e
	40	68 k
	41	19 i, 116 w
	44	87 f
23	1	2 s, 29 g
	3	116 w
	4	152 u
	5	. 135 m, 150 a N.	
	6	91 f, 143 a
	7	113 w
	8	47 b, 87 f
	11	127 e
	13	134 k
	17	167 a
	19	150 d
24	3	145 n, 154 b
	6	90 i
	11	93 rr
	13	145 h
	16	142 f
	21	165 a
	22	93 pp
	23	106 m
	24	75 n, 113 p

1 Kings

1	1	. . .	49 b, 67 g
	2	. . .	131 b, 144 f
	5	. . .	116 o
	6	. . .	119 w N.
	12	. . .	117 p
	14	. . .	116 u
	15	. . .	80 d, 90 c
	20	. . .	135 g
	21	. . .	146 d
	24	. . .	150 a, 150 b
	26	. . .	135 g
	27	. . .	150 f
	31	. . .	156 c
	40	. . .	117 q, 145 c
	41	. . .	146 a
	47	. . .	70 e
	52	. . .	119 w N.
2	2	. . .	116 p
	3	. . .	95 u, 114 o
	6	. . .	109 d
	7	. . .	116 h
	17	. . .	131 g
	18	. . .	135 a
	21	. . .	121 b
	22	. . .	110 a, 154 b
	23	. . .	149 d
	26	. . .	75 z, 93 ss, 118 f, 128 t
	30	. . .	75 ll
	31	. . .	128 w
	36	. . .	80 i, 90 i
	40	. . .	90 i
	42	. . .	72 aa
	43	. . .	128 h
3	4	. . .	107 b
	7	. . .	114 c
	8	. . .	166 b
	11	. . .	112 tt
	12	. . .	166 b
	15	. . .	71
	16	. . .	107 c
	18	. . .	128 f, 135 r
	26	. . .	46 e
4	5	. . .	93 ll
	7	. . .	112 l
	12	. . .	90 i
	13	. . .	128 c
	14	. . .	90 d
5	1	. . .	144 i
	3	. . .	131 c
	7	. . .	112 dd
	9	. . .	131 e
	12	. . .	134 g
	17	. . .	117 h
	20	. . .	68 c
	25	. . .	23 f, 107 e
	29	. . .	131 b
6	1	. . .	134 h, 134 o
	6	. . .	63 i
	7	. . .	131 c

1 Kings

6	16	. . .	117 d
	19	. . .	66 i
7	6	. . .	92 g
	7	. . .	118 p, 126 w
	8	. . .	118 g
	14	. . .	41 o, 131 b
	15	. . .	117 hh
	27	. . .	134 l
	28	. . .	20 m
	37	. . .	91 f
8	1	. . .	107 c, 109 k
	5	. . .	119 z, 145 c
	12	. . .	138 e
	13	. . .	118 k
	29	. . .	91 k
	30	. . .	119 g, 159 g
	31	. . .	145 o
	32	. . .	118 g
	33	. . .	158 d
	44	. . .	75 w
	46	. . .	49 m
	48	. . .	44 i
	64	. . .	133 c
9	3	. . .	75 w
	8	. . .	67 g
	11	. . .	75 oo
	17	. . .	126 y
	25	. . .	112 dd, 113 z
	26	. . .	122 t
10	9	. . .	115 d
	11	. . .	35 m
	12	. . .	117 ii
	21	. . .	152 y N.
	22	. . .	74 i
	23	. . .	119 u
	24	. . .	164 b N.
	27	. . .	126 p
	29	. . .	75 t
11	1	. . .	10 h
	3	. . .	145 o, 145 p
	5	. . .	122 f
	8	. . .	131 h N.
	9	. . .	138 k
	12	. . .	135 p
	15	. . .	52 f
	16	. . .	53 l
	19	. . .	54 k
	21	. . .	165 a
	25	. . .	117 m N.
	30	. . .	117 ii
	31	. . .	134 l
	33	. . .	87 e
	34	. . .	117 ii
	39	. . .	23 d
	41	. . .	150 e
12	2	. . .	138 d
	6	. . .	64 b, 117 gg
	8	. . .	116 q, 118 q
	10	. . .	93 q
	12	. . .	74 k

1 Kings

12	15	. . .	115 a
	28	. . .	133 c
	31	. . .	117 d
	32	. . .	21 d, 65 e, 112 pp
13	3	. . .	112 tt
	7	. . .	10 h
	11	. . .	125 b
	12	. . .	155 d
	14	. . .	126 r
	18	. . .	156 d
	30	. . .	147 d
	33	. . .	109 f, 109 g
14	2	. . .	32 h
	3	. . .	65 g
	5	. . .	94 d, 112 z
	6	. . .	118 p, 121 d N ¹
	10	. . .	64 d
	12	. . .	72 r N,
	13	. . .	129 g
	14	. . .	136 d N.
	15	. . .	91 n
	16	. . .	23 c
	17	. . .	116 u
	19	. . .	129 d, 150 e
	21	. . .	10 g
	24	. . .	127 g
15	13	. . .	119 x
	23	. . .	118 q
	25	. . .	134 p
16	2	. . .	74 l
	10	. . .	134 o
	24	. . .	29 f, 88 b
	25	. . .	67 x
	31	. . .	150 d
17	1	. . .	93 pp
	3	. . .	119 s
	9	. . .	90 i
	11	. . .	66 g
	13	. . .	75 m
	14	. . .	66 i, 75 rr
	15	. . .	32 l
	16	. . .	146 a
18	5	. . .	119 w N.
	10	. . .	107 e
	27	. . .	53 q, 67 y
	32	. . .	117 ii, 117 kk
	43	. . .	152 p
	44	. . .	58 g
19	4	. . .	157 b N ²
	9	. . .	126 r
	11	. . .	132 d
	15	. . .	26 h, 90 c, 90 i
	19	. . .	134 o
	20	. . .	20 m
	21	. . .	131 m
20	14	. . .	137 b
	20	. . .	145 c
	21	. . .	112 tt
	22	. . .	54 k
	25	. . .	103 b

1 Kings

20	27	54 l
	33	53 n
	35	75 mm, 128 v
	39	51 k
	40	116 g N.
21	2	34 c
	8	124 b N.
	10	104 g
	11	116 q, 118 q
	12	112 qq
	13	119 c
	15	69 f
	19	74 k, 135 f
	21	74 k, 74 l
	25	72 w
22	3	150 e
	4	161 c
	7	108 b
	10	121 d
	12	110 f
	15	150 c
	16	102 k, 134 r
	23	126 y
	25	75 pp
	27	131 c
	28	135 r, 144 p, 159 q
	30	104 g, 113 dd N.
	35	71
	49	44 m

2 Kings

1	1	49 b
	2	126 g
	3	152 y
	7	37 f
	9	97 i
	10	154 b
	11	120 d
2	1	10 h, 114 q
	9	107 c
	10	52 s, 114 n N.
	16	93 u, 107 q N ^s
	20	72 aa
	21	75 oo
	22	75 qq
	24	122 e
3	3	135 p
	4	2 d, 112 h, 131 k
	8	155 d
	15	112 uu
	16	113 bb, 123 e
	23	113 w
	24	75 ff
	25	112 e
	27	107 k
4	1	125 b
	3	91 l, 133 c N.
	8	126 s
	13	114 k, 117 r

2 Kings

4	14	154 b
	16	32 h, 116 p
	23	90 n
	24	66 c
	25	34 f
	27	63 e
	31	29 k
	41	69 f
	43	113 ee
5	2	118 q
	3	151 e
	9	129 d
	10	110 i, 113 bb, 159 d
	11	112 p
	12	107 t
	13	110 f, 142 f, 159 cc
	17	104 g, 159 dd
	18	75 kk
	20	112 gg, 163 d
	22	136 d
	23	72 t, 88 b, 131 d
	26	150 a N ¹
6	5	117 m N.
	8	91 n
	9	51 n
	10	134 r
	11	36
	19	34 b N ^s , 52 n
	22	p. 457 N ¹
	27	109 h, 150 g
	29	74 l
	32	22 s, 100 l
7	1	131 d
	4	112 ff
	8	47 i
	10	135 p N ¹
	13	127 f
	18	10 h
8	1	32 h
	6	53 m, 72 y, 91 e
	8	126 g
	16	52 l
	17	134 e
	21	50 e
9	2	72 w, 76 h
	4	127 g
	17	80 f
	18	32 n, 103 o, 119 b
	19	150 a N ¹
	27	147 c
	31	144 p
	33	76 c
	35	119 m
	37	75 m
10	1	124 b N., 127 f
	6	131 h N.
	15	159 cc
	21	102 h
	23	152 w
	29	93 o

2 Kings

11	1	112 pp
	2	116 e
	4	75 gg, 75 q, 97 g
	5	116 h
	12	74 l
	13	87 e
	15	113 cc, 119 e
12	9	72 h, 66 g, 93 h
	12	112 pp N ^s
13	6	74 k
	17	69 r, 76 f
	19	114 k, 159 dd
	21	111 g
14	7	21 e, 112 tt
	8	156 o
	14	93 oo, 112 pp, 112 tt, 124 q
15	16	76 c, 127 i
	29	80 k
16	4	65 e
	7	72 p
	14	127 h
	17	127 h
	18	80 k
17	4	118 u
	6	134 p
	11	53 p
	15	103 l
	29	124 r
18	1	134 p
	4	112 tt
	17	128 w N.
	20	44 i
	26	2 a
	28	2 a
	29	74 l
	30	121 b N.
	36	112 tt
19	2	131 h N.
	4	132 h
	14	124 b N.
	21	72 l
	25	23 f, 75 qq
20	1	49 a
	19	126 x, 141 n
21	11	74 l
	12	67 g
	13	113 h N.
	15	112 tt
	26	144 d N.
22	1	134 e
	13	138 b
	20	61 h, 124 c
23	3	127 c
	4	75 v, 112 pp, 112 pp N.
	8	112 pp N.
	10	112 pp, 114 s
	12	112 rr, 127 f
	14	112 pp N.



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

Isaiah

10 16 69f
 17 93v
 18 67cc
 22 117z
 24 . 58i, 119o, 156d
 30 . . 132b, 144m
 32 . . 114k, 119o
 33 23c
 34 119o
 11 2 128a
 7 122e
 8 142f
 9 106u, 114c, 115d,
 116fN., 117n, 126z
 10 119gg
 12 20m
 14 93hh
 12 1 109k
 2 80g
 5 116e
 6 122s
 13 3 135n
 4 . . 146b, 147c
 6 118x
 8 . . 47m, 119gg
 18 52n
 19 115d
 20 68k
 22 145o
 14 2 54f, 57N^a, 117w
 3 22s, 102b, 115g,
 121b, 121f
 4 . 49k, 49m, 148b
 6 . . 117q, 130a
 9 145t
 11 . . . 93ss, 145o
 14 87s
 17 . . 116x, 117o
 19 . 29f, 126p, 130a
 23 . . . 55f, 113e
 24 . . 144b, 149b
 27 . . 116q, 126k
 30 . . . 72w, 133h
 31 . . . 72v, 113bb
 15 2 70d, 96
 5 72cc
 7 155h
 8 119hh
 16 2 126p
 4 145d
 6 122v
 7 70d
 8 . . 75m, 145u
 9 75dd
 10 72bb, 121a, b, 144e
 17 1 . . 119x, 121b
 4 128r
 5 122n
 6 118u, 131n N¹,
 134s

Isaiah

17 8 . 35f, 154a N. (b)
 10 . . 20m N., 47k
 11 72n
 12 . . . 47m, 75u
 18 1 124e
 2 . . . 52s, 103m
 3 66b
 4 10h
 5 29q, 67v, 72dd,
 142f, 145q
 6 73b
 19 1 72l
 3 67dd
 4 . . 124i, 132h
 6 . 53g, 53p, 124e
 9 86i
 10 128y
 11 133h
 12 109f
 13 142f
 17 . 80h, 95d, 143b
 18 2a
 22 113s
 20 1 115k
 2 . . . 113i, 118n
 4 . . . 87g, 118o
 21 1 114o
 2 . 44o, 72s, 121b
 7 . . 93dd, 117q
 8 118r
 9 136d
 11 . 90f, 93w, 116t
 12 29t, 75u, 75rr,
 76d
 14 76d
 17 127a, 128a,
 146a
 22 1 . . . 91e, 150l
 2 75v, 91e, 117z,
 126e, 128x, 152d
 3 119w
 5 . . . 128a, 133l
 7 128r
 10 20m
 11 . . . 95v, 124k
 13 75n, 113d, 113f,
 113dd
 14 107c, 112ss, 149b,
 149e
 16 . . . 90m, 144p
 17 113r
 18 118r
 19 144p
 24 . . 128w, 133h
 23 1 . . 110k, 119y
 4 152z
 5 . . 118u, 128h
 7 126z N.
 8 93pp
 11 . . . 20o, 53q

Isaiah

23 12 . 35b, 46e, 118f,
 130e, 132b
 13 136d N.
 15 . 44f, 116p, 118t
 17 . . . 72l, 91e
 24 2 . 35g, 116s, 127i
 3 67t
 10 119x
 12 121d
 16 117q
 19 . . . 67o, 113w
 22 117q
 25 6 . . 75dd, 93ss
 7 72p
 10 72v
 26 4 119i N.
 9 144m
 10 159c
 11 47m
 16 . . . 44l, 72o
 18 124e
 19 . . . 95h, 122s
 20 75qq
 27 3 65a
 4 10h, 65b, 71,
 117x, 151b
 5 162a
 8 55f
 9 156f
 11 . . 70a N., 124e
 18 152x
 28 1 . . . 124e, 128c
 2 125c
 3 47k
 4 91e, 128w, 135n,
 144e
 6 . . . 90i, 119hh
 7 . . . 72l, 118g
 8 127c
 9 130a
 10 . . 102h, 147c
 11 116b
 12 . . 23i, 114m N.
 16 71, 119i, 130f
 N., 155f
 17 . . . 29u, 142f
 18 145o
 20 133c
 21 . . . 118t, 132b
 24 144e
 26 112rr
 27 152z
 28 112m, 113w N.
 150a
 29 1 19c, 66f, 69h N.,
 130d
 4 120g
 5 . 126p, 133k N.
 6 . . 84^as, 144b
 7 . 75qq, 116i, 118t

Isaiah	Isaiah	Isaiah
29 8 116 s	34 6 54 h	41 3 118 q
9 55 g, 72 l	10 102 i	4 135 a N.
13 115 d, 127 a, 142 d	11 21 c, 80 g	5 75 u
14 . 50 e, 113 w, 155 f	13 117 z	7 29 f
15 53 q, 112 n	17 59 g	8 138 d
16 147 c, 150 f	35 1 47 n	10 75 bb
19 128 l, 132 c, 133 h	2 117 q, 130 b	12 135 n
23 131 o	4 65 f	15 96
30 1 69 h N.	7 135 p	17 20 i
2 63 i, 72 q	9 84 ^b f, 132 c	23 48 g N., 75 l, 75 v,
5 78 b	36 2 128 w N.	109 d
6 135 p	8 127 f	24 155 n
8 61 f, 135 p	9 119 s, 119 u	25 23 d, 76 d
11 102 b	11 2 a	28 . 109 h, cf. 159 d
12 61 d, 111 v, 114 d,	14 74 l	42 4 67 q
114 r	16 110 f, 127 f	5 . 65 d, 93 ss, 124 k
13 116 d	17 114 r	6 . 107 b N., 109 k
14 . 63 i, 113 i, 156 g	37 3 69 m, 152 k	13 126 p
18 67 cc, 130 a	11 150 a	18 35 g, 126 e, 126 f
19 . 58 g, 67 n, 75 ll	14 124 b N.	20 75 n, 144 p
20 131 c, 145 n	17 10 g	21 120 c
21 56	19 113 f, 113 z	22 29 q, 72 g, 119 hh,
22 135 n, 145 m	22 130 e	124 q
23 93 ss	24 128 r	24 113 d, 114 m N.,
24 52 s	25 124 e	138 g
25 74 i	26 75 qq, 114 k, 117 ii	25 131 k
26 114 r, 134 r	28 114 c	43 1 . 61 h, 74 e, 91 d
28 72 z	29 112 nn	2 159 dd, 159 ff
31 156 d	30 113 z, 113 ee, 126 b	6 122 v
33 32 l	38 3 16 f N., 157 c	8 . 53 m, 69 v, 74 l
31 2 141 f	5 50 e, 113 bb, 155 f	9 . 51 o, 106 n N ²
3 75 u	9 114 r	10 135 a N.
5 67 p, 113 t	10 108 g, 121 d	25 141 h
6 . 138 f N., 144 p	14 . 48 i N., 61 f N.	44 3 71
8 125 c, 152 a	15 55 g	9 5 n
32 1 143 e	16 75 mm, 103 g, 135 p	13 64 i
7 154 a N.	17 119 ff	15 . . 66 e, 103 f N.
9 44 o	18 116 h, 152 z	16 67 ee
11 . 48 i, 67 o, 110 k	20 86 i, 114 i	19 150 a
12 116 s, 144 i	39 1 124 b N.	21 20 f, 57 N., 117 x
13 128 c	2 15 e N., 126 x	24 65 d
17 113 c	40 1 107 f	28 53 n, 114 p
18 124 e	3 146 b	45 1 67 p
33 1 20 h, 53 q, 53 u,	4 93 v	2 70 b
67 v, 120 b, 156 f	6 112 qq, 127 c	4 . 111 b N., 131 g
3 67 dd	9 119 s	9 152 u
4 85 h	10 119 i	10 47 o
5 116 s	11 93 x	14 10 g
6 130 b	14 124 e	46 5 75 dd
7 75 u	18 15 c, 75 dd	47 1 120 c
9 29 q, 145 t	19 119 hh	2 46 d, 63 l
10 54 c, 133 l	20 155 f, 156 g	5 . 100 g N ² , 118 o
12 20 i	22 126 b	7 94 g
14 . . . 84 ^a s, 117 bb	25 150 m	8 90 l, 144 p
15 117 r N., 119 z,	26 124 e	10 59 g, 61 h, 75 v,
124 e	29 152 v	116 f
16 124 b	30 69 q	12 138 f
20 152 t	31 8 k	14 28 b, 67 cc
34 4 67 t, 126 o	41 1 119 gg	48 8 52 k, 157 a
5 52 k	2 35 n N., 75 gg, 155 n	9 119 hh

Isaiah

48	11	67 t
	14	119 hh
	17	61 h, 93 qq
	18	111 x, 151 e
49	6	67 t, 115 a, 142 f	N ²
	7	111 q
	11	145 u
	13	126 o
	15	160 b
	18	32 c
	19	67 dd
	21	72 p
	23	122 f N., 156 c
	26	135 l
50	2	133 c, 150 m, 152 y	
	8	15 c, 20 f
	9	136 c
	10	137 c
	11	20 n
51	1	155 k
	2	107 b N.
	3	146 e
	9	72 s, 118 u, 124 q	
	10	93 pp, 138 k
	12	61 h, 111 m
	13	52 k
	15	65 d
	17	128 q
	19	47 b, 122 q
	21	50 f, 130 b
52	1	120 c
	5	55 b
	7	75 x, 106 g
	8	117 a N ² , 146 b
	11	67 t
	12	61 h
	14	93 q
53	1	151 a
	2	166 a
	3	96, 128 q
	4	116 l, 117 ii
	5	121 a, 128 q
	8	103 f N.
	9	160 c
	10	74 k, 75 ii
	11	117 n, 120 h, 132 b
54	1	67 ff, 144 p, 155 f	
	4	91 l
	5	124 k, 124 k N.
	6	58 g
	10	103 b
	11	152 a N.
	12	21 d
	14	54 c, 110 c
	15	137 c, 159 w
55	2	152 a N.
	3	93 m
	9	161 b
56	3	138 k

Isaiah

56	4	138 f
	5	112 mm
	8	20 m
	9	29 t
	12	29 t
57	4	93 m
	5	67 u
	6	20 h
	8	47 k
	17	113 h
	20	113 d
58	3	19 c, 20 h, 150 m	
	9	115 b
	13	119 hh
59	3	51 h
	5	73 d, 80 i
	9	93 r
	10	152 v
	12	67 k
	13	52 e, 75 n, 113 d	
	14	72 cc
	21	143 a
60	3	107 b N.
	4	51 m, 122 v
	7	60 e
	9	58 g
	14	118 q, 125 h
61	1	84 ^b n
	7	119 hh
62	2	16 f
	9	20 m, 52 p
	12	152 a N.
63	3	53 p, 76 c
	11	128 c
	16	60 d
	19	151 e, 155 m
64	3	75 hh
	6	72 cc
65	1	51 c, 155 n
	2	126 z
	5	117 x
	11	35 g
	14	70 d
	17	29 i N., 51 m
	18	110 c
	20	75 oo
	24	107 c
66	13	155 d
	15	119 i
	18	167 b
Jeremiah			
1	10	45 g
	13	90 e
2	2	49 k
	8	155 n
	11	72 e, 155 n
	12	46 d
	15	44 m

Jeremiah

2	16	117 u
	17	116 g N.
	19	60 a
	20	44 h N.
	21	126 z
	24	60 c, 122 d
	27	59 h, 69 s
	31	85 h
	33	44 h
	35	114 d
	36	68 h
3	1	113 ee, 159 w
	5	47 k, 66 f, 69 r
	6	75 ii, 132 b
	7	84 ^a k
	8	91 l
	9	112 ss
	15	113 h
	22	75 pp, 75 rr
4	1	143 d
	2	10 g
	5	120 h
	7	20 h, 93 t
	11	67 v
	13	67 ee
	18	75 n
	19	44 h, 108 g, 133 l	N.
	30	145 t
5	6	20 b, 67 cc
	7	65 b
	13	52 o, 138 i
	22	58 i, 58 k, 60 e
	26	67 p
6	4	10 g
	8	51 c, 152 a N.
	10	108 g
	17	112 dd
	20	126 x
	28	133 i
	29	67 u
7	4	133 l N.
	9	112 o, 113 cc
	19	57 N ⁴ , 135 k
8	4	150 m
	5	128 c
	11	75 qq, 133 l
	13	72 aa, 113 w
	14	67 dd
	19	100 m, 102 m
9	1	108 f, 151 b
	2	53 n, 119 u
	3	63 c
	4	53 q, 113 d
	11	109 i
	12	114 r
	17	74 k
	23	113 d, 113 g, 144 e
10	3	145 u N ³
	4	109 g



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books'
Full Membership
provides unlimited
access to more than
28,000 volumes of
Christian literature for
\$8.99/month

**HOLY
BIBLE**

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Ezekiel	Ezekiel	Ezekiel
1 6 87 t, 88 f	16 50 47 l	26 2 67 t
11 91 l	51 96	10 130 b
14 113 s N.	52 52 p, 91 n, 95 p, 96	14 47 k
20 123 d N ²	53 91 e, 91 f	15 51 l
2 3 126 x	54 103 b	17 52 s, 138 k
10 19 h	55 72 k	21 10 g
3 3 49 e	57 72 p	27 3 90 m
15 67 cc, 154 a N. (b)	59 44 i	7 121 b
4 9 87 e	17 5 19 i, 66 g	19 20 i
12 58 k, 95 e	7 52 d	31 80 h
5 11 72 r, 109 d	9 45 e, 93 m, 150 a	32 23 k
12 52 n, 75 hh	N ¹	34 116 g N.
13 54 c	15 29 i, 93 rr	35 117 q
16 109 d	19 67 v	28 4 32 g
6 3 93 v	21 117 m	16 23 d, 68 k, 75 qq,
6 67 p N., 67 dd	18 6 131 c	III w N.
8 91 l	7 131 r	17 75 n
9 72 dd	10 119 w N., 139 d	23 55 d
10 119 ii	14 103 l	24 72 p
11 128 c	28 75 t	29 3 117 x, 124 e
12 91 e	29 145 u	7 127 c
14 133 l	32 139 d	30 9 93 y
7 7 127 g	19 1 124 e	12 124 e
14 72 z, 113 z N.	2 80 h	16 73 d
24 93 oo	12 53 u	31 3 67 v
8 2 90 f	20 9 67 t	5 44 f
3 75 qq	16 117 m	7 76 f
16 75 kk	22 112 tt	16 128 a N ¹
9 2 116 k	37 23 f	32 12 51 n
3 116 k, 121 d N ¹	38 145 u	19 46 a N ²
7 112 tt	41 110 i	30 20 m, 72 n
8 64 i	21 12 67 t	32 53 s
11 116 k	15 75 n	33 17 143 a N ³
10 3 131 n, 131 n N ²	18 64 d	26 44 k
15 72 dd	21 73 a	34 2 57 N ⁴
17 72 q, 72 dd	22 124 o	8 57 N ⁴
11 3 150 a N ¹	29 53 l	10 57 N ⁴ , 149 c, 167 b
13 150 a N ¹	31 113 bb N ³	21 103 b
24 90 c	32 133 l	31 32 i
13 2 93 oo	33 45 c, 68 i	35 6 10 h
3 152 x, 155 n	35 72 y	9 72 k
11 35 m	22 4 47 k	10 117 m
18 87 f, 103 f N ²	20 66 f	12 84 ^b e
19 72 k, 93 r	23 5 63 m	36 3 67 r, 75 y, 113 g
20 32 i, 91 l	20 48 d	5 91 e
14 3 51 k, 51 p	28 91 e, 138 e	11 70 e
14 112 ll	32 47 k	12 69 s
22 117 l, 126 w	42 21 c	25 34 f
16 4 22 s, 52 q, 53 s,	44 96	32 152 d
64 e, 71	45 103 b	37 2 112 pp
5 71	47 103 b	7 60 a N.
6 123 d N ²	48 55 k, 91 f	8 9 u, 29 i
10 49 c	49 74 k, 76 b, 144 a	11 116 t, 119 s
27 131 r	24 11 67 q	16 66 g, 119 u
31 91 l	19 75 m	17 52 n, 64 h
32 117 d	26 53 e, 54 k	19 117 m N.
33 20 l, 64 c	25 3 67 u	38 21 49 l
34 121 a	4 91 e	23 54 k
45 96	6 23 c, 74 e	39 2 55 f
47 103 m	15 117 q	9 66 e

Ezekiel	
39	26 75 <i>qq</i>
40	3 74 <i>l</i>
	4 74 <i>d</i>
	5 134 <i>n</i>
	16 91 <i>l</i>
	17 121 <i>d</i>
	19 80 <i>k</i>
	27 134 <i>g</i>
	28 126 <i>w</i>
	31 93 <i>ss</i>
	43 20 <i>m</i>
	45 136 <i>d N.</i>
	48 92 <i>g</i>
41	7 67 <i>dd</i>
	15 91 <i>l</i>
	18 121 <i>d</i>
	20 5 <i>n</i>
	22 141 <i>b</i>
	25 131 <i>n N</i> ¹
42	5 68 <i>h</i> , 131 <i>n</i>
43	7 117 <i>m</i>
	17 103 <i>o</i>
	27 75 <i>rr</i>
44	3 117 <i>m</i>
	8 58 <i>g</i>
	9 93 <i>hh</i> , 143 <i>e</i>
	12 112 <i>e N.</i>
45	2 65 <i>d</i>
	12 97 <i>e</i>
	16 127 <i>g</i>
46	6 132 <i>g N.</i>
	9 93 <i>q</i>
	17 72 <i>o</i>
	19 127 <i>f</i>
	22 53 <i>q</i> , 53 <i>s</i>
	23 121 <i>d</i>
	24 124 <i>r</i>
47	3 128 <i>n</i>
	4 131 <i>e</i>
	7 91 <i>e</i>
	8 75 <i>oo</i>
	15 127 <i>f</i> and <i>N.</i>
	17 117 <i>m</i>
48	14 72 <i>dd</i>
Hosea	
1	2 52 <i>o</i> , 130 <i>d</i>
	6 120 <i>c</i> , 152 <i>a N.</i>
	7 119 <i>o</i>
2	1 130 <i>c</i>
	3 96
	5 72 <i>w</i>
	6 52 <i>n</i>
	11 120 <i>e</i>
	14 91 <i>e</i>
	21 133 <i>l</i>
	25 152 <i>a N.</i>
3	1 125 <i>c</i>
	2 20 <i>h</i>

Hosea	
3	5 2 <i>v N.</i>
4	2 113 <i>f</i>
	3 119 <i>i</i>
	8 145 <i>m</i>
	14 155 <i>f</i>
	15 145 <i>m</i>
	16 150 <i>a</i>
	18 55 <i>e</i>
5	2 64 <i>a</i>
	3 135 <i>a</i>
	8 147 <i>c</i>
	15 60 <i>e</i>
8	1 109 <i>k</i>
	2 119 <i>y N.</i> , 134 <i>s</i>
	3 155 <i>g</i>
	4 120 <i>g</i>
	6 119 <i>w</i> , 133 <i>b</i>
	9 23 <i>l</i> , 75 <i>aa</i> , 93 <i>s</i>
	10 114 <i>l</i>
7	2 157 <i>a</i>
	4 80 <i>k</i>
	5 93 <i>ss</i>
	6 91 <i>c</i>
	12 24 <i>f</i> , 70 <i>b</i>
	14 70 <i>d</i>
	16 34 <i>b N.</i>
8	3 60 <i>d</i>
	4 67 <i>v</i>
	7 90 <i>f</i>
	9 119 <i>s</i>
	10 20 <i>g</i> , 111 <i>w N.</i>
9	6 130 <i>a</i>
	9 120 <i>g</i>
	11 69 <i>m</i>
	12 159 <i>m</i>
10	4 75 <i>n</i>
	6 121 <i>b</i>
	10 60 <i>a</i> , 71
	11 90 <i>l</i>
	14 9 <i>b</i> , 23 <i>g</i> , 53 <i>u</i> , 72 <i>p</i> , 156 <i>c</i>
	15 133 <i>i</i>
11	1 68 <i>f</i>
	3 19 <i>i</i> , 55 <i>h</i> , 66 <i>g</i>
	4 68 <i>c</i>
	7 75 <i>rr</i>
12	1 124 <i>h</i>
	5 58 <i>k</i>
	11 112 <i>dd</i>
	14 118 <i>q</i>
13	2 91 <i>e</i> , 128 <i>l</i>
	3 120 <i>g</i>
	8 122 <i>e</i>
	10 150 <i>l</i>
	14 93 <i>q</i>
	15 75 <i>rr</i>
14	1 84 ^a <i>a</i> , 145 <i>u</i>
	3 128 <i>e</i>
	4 68 <i>f</i>

Hosea	
14	5 118 <i>q</i>
	10 69 <i>b</i> , 166 <i>a N.</i>
Joel	
1	2 100 <i>n</i> , 126 <i>e</i> , 150 <i>g</i>
	5 126 <i>e</i>
	6 152 <i>v</i>
	7 113 <i>n</i>
	8 63 <i>l</i> , 116 <i>k</i>
	12 102 <i>b</i>
	15 147 <i>d</i>
	17 20 <i>h</i>
	18 148 <i>a</i>
	20 145 <i>k</i>
2	2 109 <i>d</i>
	4 72 <i>u</i> , 126 <i>p</i>
	6 23 <i>d</i>
	13 152 <i>g</i>
	17 150 <i>e</i>
	21 46 <i>e</i>
	22 144 <i>a</i>
	24 93 <i>r</i>
	26 114 <i>o</i>
4	1 125 <i>k</i>
	3 69 <i>u</i>
	11 51 <i>o</i> , 64 <i>h</i>
	14 123 <i>e</i> , 147 <i>c</i>
	18 117 <i>z</i>
	21 49 <i>k</i> , 75 <i>z</i>
Amos	
1	3 134 <i>s</i> , 158 <i>c</i>
	4 49 <i>m</i>
	5 145 <i>c</i>
	8 145 <i>e</i>
	9 114 <i>r</i> , 158 <i>c</i>
	11 58 <i>g</i> , 112 <i>i</i> , 114 <i>r</i>
2	6 61 <i>b</i>
	7 126 <i>b</i>
	9 53 <i>n</i>
	10 69 <i>x</i>
	12 51 <i>n</i>
	16 118 <i>n</i> , 128 <i>y</i>
3	4 163 <i>c</i>
	5 113 <i>q</i>
	7 163 <i>c</i>
	8 159 <i>h</i>
	9 124 <i>e</i>
	11 67 <i>t</i> , 154 <i>a N.</i>
	12 88 <i>f</i> , 126 <i>r</i>
	13 125 <i>h</i>
4	1 135 <i>o</i> , 144 <i>a</i>
	2 75 <i>oo</i> , 112 <i>x</i>
	3 44 <i>k</i>
	4 113 <i>z</i>
	7 112 <i>h N.</i> , 144 <i>c</i>

Amos

4	8	134 s
	9	126 n
	10	154 a N.
	11	115 d
	13	29 e N., 116 g N.	
5	2	128 k
	3	117 z, 129 g
	4	110 f
	5	122 h
	7	126 b
	8	111 u, 117 ii
	11	61 e
	14	109 k, 152 g
	15	67 cc
	18	152 d
	19	112 m, 126 r
	21	20 h, 106 g, 154 a N.	
	26	112 x, 112 rr
6	1	112 n
	2	125 h, 126 y
	6	63 e, 93 k, 119 m N.	
	10	114 l; 145 m, 152 s	
	12	123 a N., 144 d
	13	152 a N.
	14	125 c
7	1	86 i, 147 b
	2	112 uu
	4	112 tt
	7	156 b
	14	128 v
	15	119 b
8	4	53 q
	8	125 e
	9	49 l
	10	128 h, 135 p
	13	54 k, 146 g
9	1	61 g, 144 e
	3	112 p
	7	150 e
	8	53 h, 113 n, 113 v	
	11	116 d, 118 u
	13	54 k

Obadiah

3	90 l, 93 x
10	128 h
11	. 9 v, 61 f N., 69 u	
13	47 k

Jonah

1	3	116 d, 122 t, 135 p	
	5	51 m
	6	120 b
	7	150 k
	9	2 b
	10	117 q
	11	113 u, 165 a

Jonah

1	14	16 f
	15	61 c
2	2	122 s
	4	117 r
3	5	133 g
4	1	117 q
	2	. 16 f, 114 n N.	
	6	117 q
	9	113 k
	10	96, 128 v
	11	20 m, 97 b, 150 a	

Micah

1	2	109 k, 135 r, 144 p	
	5	23 c, 137 a
	7	. 52 l, 67 g, 117 ii	
	8	. 69 b N., 118 n	
	10	113 v
	11	122 s, 131 c, 145 m	
	13	110 k
	15	74 k
2	3	118 q
	4	67 u, 144 d, 148 b	
	6	72 dd, 145 o
	7	100 n, 118 n
	8	72 p, 116 h
	12	72 k, 127 i
3	1	114 l, 150 e
	4	109 k
	6	119 w, 144 c
	12	87 e, 121 d
4	3	91 n, 145 c
	6	68 h, 84 ^a s, 122 s	
	8	68 f
	9	117 q
	10	. 10 k, 76 g, 145 n	
	11	119 dd
	12	90 i
	13	. 44 h, 72 q, 117 ii	
	14	119 o
5	1	135 g, 142 g
	2	106 o, 155 l
	4	. 72 i, 128 l, 134 s	
6	1	138 e
	3	. 53 p, 75 ee, 163 b	
	5	117 gg
	8	163 d
	9	146 b
	10	. . 47 b N., 118 g	
	11	47 b
	13	115 c
7	1	93 p
	2	117 ff, 119 i, 152 k	
	3	135 f
	4	133 e, 133 g
	8	122 s
	10	75 p, 75 w, 75 hh	
		145 n	

Micah

7	11	126 x
	12	126 aa
	14	90 m
	17	116 h
	18	148 c
	19	129 g

Nahum

1	2	5 h, 128 u
	3	75 hh, 143 a
	4	69 u
	5	126 k
	12	67 t
2	4	52 q
	5	55 g, 93 ss
	8	63 p, 91 c
	9	130 d N.
	11	67 t, 133 l
	14	91 l
3	5	53 p
	7	52 q, 67 cc
	8	70 e, 133 b
	9	91 e
	10	69 u
	11	145 p
	15	110 a, 110 k
	17	20 h

Habakkuk

1	5	116 s
	6	13 c, 155 e
	8	67 ee
	11	138 h
	14	152 u
	15	63 p
	16	103 g
	17	114 k, 156 g
2	1	37 b
	3	72 dd
	6	147 c
	10	116 s, 118 p
	12	112 n
	14	116 f N., 155 g
	15	90 m, 113 z
	17	. 20 n, 60 d, 67 v	
	19	. 100 g N., 152 p	
3	2	75 mm
	6	67 k, 67 ee
	8	131 r
	9	117 q
	10	91 l
	13	22 s, 75 aa, 75 n, 113 h	
	15	144 m
	17	95 f, 145 u
	19	86 i



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

Psalms

12	3	. . .	117 t, 123 f
	4	. . .	122 q
	7	. . .	10 g, 97 h
	8	. . .	126 g
	9	. . .	54 k
13	4	. . .	117 r N.
	5	. . .	44 e, 59 i, 152 z
14	1	. . .	154 a N.
	3	. . .	152 o
	5	. . .	117 p
	7	. . .	151 b
15	2	. . .	118 n
16	1	. . .	48 i N ² , 61 f N.
	2	. . .	44 i, 152 t
	3	. . .	130 d, 143 e
	4	. . .	93 m, 145 p, 155 f
	5	. . .	50 e
	6	. . .	80 g, 122 q
	8	. . .	116 s
	9	. . .	111 r
	10	. . .	114 m
	11	. . .	122 q, 124 e
17	3	. . .	59 h
	4	. . .	143 e
	5	. . .	113 gg
	9	. . .	138 g
	10	. . .	91 f
	12	. . .	126 p
	13	. . .	144 m
18	1	. . .	2 r, 53 l, 130 d, 154 a N.
	3	. . .	93 pp, 155 i
	4	. . .	116 e, 132 b
	7	. . .	10 g N ⁸ , 107 b
	10	. . .	69 p
	12	. . .	109 k
	17	. . .	117 g
	18	. . .	126 z
	22	. . .	119 ff
	26	. . .	93 h, 93 s
	28	. . .	132 f
	30	. . .	67 g, 119 o
	31	. . .	126 c, 140 d, 143 a
	33	. . .	116 f, 116 x, 117 cc
	35	. . .	145 k
	38	. . .	107 b N ²
	40	. . .	116 i
	41	. . .	117 ii N.
	49	. . .	116 i
19	3	. . .	20 f
	4	. . .	152 t
	5	. . .	135 p
	6	. . .	122 o
	8	. . .	116 g
	10	. . .	126 b, 141 e
	11	. . .	116 e
	14	. . .	49 k, 67 p
20	3	. . .	135 m
	4	. . .	48 d
21	2	. . .	109 k, 126 h, 148 b

Psalms

21	4	. . .	117 ff
	7	. . .	117 ii, 124 e
	13	. . .	117 ii N., 156 d
22	2	. . .	59 h
	3	. . .	152 d
	4	. . .	117 bb
	6	. . .	112 h
	7	. . .	116 l
	8	. . .	119 q
	9	. . .	144 p
	14	. . .	118 r
	15	. . .	67 t
	16	. . .	121 c, 122 n
	18	. . .	107 s
	22	. . .	23 f, 119 ff
	29	. . .	116 s
	32	. . .	116 e
23	2	. . .	124 e, 128 p
	4	. . .	107 x, 159 bb
	5	. . .	126 n, 141 c, 141 d
	6	. . .	69 m N.
24	1	. . .	129 c, 130 a
	2	. . .	107 b, 124 e
	4	. . .	128 y
	10	. . .	136 c
25	1	. . .	5 h
	10	. . .	141 c
	11	. . .	112 nn
	14	. . .	114 i
26	2	. . .	48 i
	3	. . .	112 rr
	4	. . .	128 t
	7	. . .	53 q
	10	. . .	20 f
	12	. . .	93 qq
27	7	. . .	144 m
	13	. . .	5 n, 159 dd, 167 a
28	1	. . .	119 ff
	7	. . .	53 q
	9	. . .	10 g
29	1	. . .	124 g, 128 v
	4	. . .	141 c N ²
	10	. . .	111 r
30	2	. . .	60 f
	4	. . .	69 m
	8	. . .	90 n, 93 aa
31	2	. . .	108 c
	21	. . .	93 r
32	1	. . .	75 qq, 116 k
	2	. . .	155 i
	6	. . .	143 e, 153
	8	. . .	107 q, 138 g, 156 c
	9	. . .	114 a, 114 k, 114 s
33	5	. . .	116 s
	7	. . .	118 w
	8	. . .	145 e
	10	. . .	67 v
	12	. . .	155 h
	15	. . .	126 b
34	1	. . .	5 h

Psalms

34	2	. . .	21 d
	6	. . .	109 e
	9	. . .	155 f
	12	. . .	60 f, 126 o
35	1	. . .	73 d
	8	. . .	156 g
	10	. . .	9 u
	14	. . .	93 hh
	16	. . .	113 h
	19	. . .	131 q N.
36	6	. . .	35 n
	8	. . .	75 u
	9	. . .	75 u
	13	. . .	64 d
37	1	. . .	5 h, 35 b, 75 bb
	5	. . .	67 n
	9	. . .	20 f
	14	. . .	45 g
	15	. . .	20 h
	16	. . .	129 b
	20	. . .	29 o, 75 m
	23	. . .	121 f
	24	. . .	159 bb
	31	. . .	145 k
38	11	. . .	55 e
	13	. . .	124 e
	21	. . .	61 c
39	13	. . .	10 h
	14	. . .	75 gg
40	2	. . .	75 aa
	5	. . .	93 oo
	6	. . .	108 f
	15	. . .	29 o N.
	18	. . .	29 q
41	3	. . .	109 e
	5	. . .	74 h
	8	. . .	54 f
42	2	. . .	122 f, 155 g
	4	. . .	115 e N.
	5	. . .	117 x
	6	. . .	111 t
	10	. . .	68 g, 102 l
43	1	. . .	72 s
	2	. . .	102 l
	3	. . .	124 b
44	3	. . .	144 m
	6	. . .	119 o
	18	. . .	156 f
	20	. . .	119 q
	23	. . .	128 q
	26	. . .	67 k
	27	. . .	72 s
45	1	. . .	124 e
	3	. . .	55 e
	5	. . .	131 c, 154 a N.
	6	. . .	15 o, 29 o N.
	7	. . .	128 d
	8	. . .	117 ee
	9	. . .	87 f, 141 d
	10	. . .	20 h N ²

Psalms

45 12 75 *bb*, 109 *h*, 124 *i*
 16 76 *g*
 18 53 *q*, 123 *c*
 46 3 115 *g*
 4 132 *h* N.
 5 124 *b*, 132 *c*
 7 119 *q*
 48 6 164 *b* N.
 11 93 *g*, 93 *x*
 15 126 *aa*
 49 6 102 *l*
 7 126 *b*
 8 113 *v*
 14 155 *e*
 15 10 *g*, 67 *ee*, 114 *k*
 N.
 50 3 109 *e*, 144 *c*
 4 115 *b*
 10 90 *n*
 12 159 *m*, 159 *r*
 17 142 *d*
 21 112 *cc*, 113 *x*, 157 *a*
 22 116 *b*
 23 58 *i*
 51 4 75 *gg*, 120 *g*
 5 142 *f*
 7 64 *h*
 9 165 *a*
 10 155 *h*
 14 117 *ff*
 18 108 *f*
 19 128 *h*
 52 5 119 *w*
 15 58 *i*
 53 6 91 *e*, 116 *i*
 54 6 119 *i*
 55 3 108 *g*
 10 52 *n*
 16 74 *k*
 18 108 *g*
 19 119 *gg*
 22 10 *g*
 23 117 *x*
 56 4 155 *l*
 57 2 75 *u*
 5 117 *bb*, 144 *m*
 58 2 52 *n*
 5 63 *n*
 9 69 *x*, 96, 118 *r*
 59 6 125 *h*, 128 *x*, 131 *s*
 8 151 *a*
 16 159 *s*
 60 4 75 *pp*
 5 131 *c*
 13 80 *g*, 158 *a*
 61 1 80 *f*
 8 75 *cc*
 62 4 52 *q*
 5 145 *m*
 8 13 *c*

Psalms

63 2 132 *d*
 4 60 *e*
 6 117 *t*
 64 5 69 *r*
 7 67 *e*
 8 117 *ff*
 9 130 *a*
 65 6 92 *g*
 10 53 *n*, 60 *g*
 11 117 *y*
 66 6 108 *g*
 13 119 *n*
 17 144 *m*
 68 3 19 *c*, 51 *k*, 67 *t*
 5 119 *i* N³, 122 *t*
 7 117 *bb*, 124 *e*
 9 136 *d* N.
 17 131 *c*
 18 21 *c*, 97 *h*
 19 20 *f*, 117 *bb*
 22 128 *c*
 23 75 *u*
 24 10 *g*, 103 *m*
 34 119 *q*
 69 4 118 *p*
 5 131 *q* N.
 9 48 *i*
 10 95 *b* N.
 11 144 *l* N³
 24 64 *h*
 33 69 *s*
 71 1 108 *c*
 7 131 *r*
 23 44 *o*
 72 2 107 *n*
 13 72 *r*
 14 69 *f*
 17 10 *g*
 20 52 *q*
 73 2 75 *u*
 7 145 *o*
 9 63 *n*, 69 *x*
 14 123 *c*
 16 49 *e*, 108 *e*
 17 108 *h*
 20 53 *q*, 119 *y* N.
 27 119 *ff*
 28 73 *d*
 74 7 119 *gg*
 8 76 *f*
 10 64 *e*
 19 80 *f*
 75 4 116 *w*, 146 *g*
 76 6 54 *a* N²
 11 124 *e*
 77 2 63 *o*
 4 75 *l*, 75 *u*
 10 67 *r*
 11 67 *r*
 16 20 *g*, 125 *c*

Psalms

77 18 55 *b*, 93 *bb*
 20 20 *h*
 78 6 107 *k*
 15 132 *h* N.
 16 74 *l*
 21 66 *e*
 44 75 *u*, 124 *e*
 54 138 *g*
 80 8 131 *s*
 11 52 *q*, 121 *d*
 14 5 *n*, 56
 15 125 *h*
 19 72 *t*
 81 9 109 *b*
 11 116 *f*
 83 12 131 *o*
 19 144 *l* N³
 84 9 125 *h*
 86 2 9 *v*, 48 *i* N., 61 *f* N.
 9 117 *n*
 87 3 121 *d* N¹, 145 *u*
 5 123 *c*
 88 5 152 *u*
 6 116 *h*
 17 55 *d*
 89 7 124 *q*, 128 *v*
 10 76 *b*
 40 64 *e*
 48 135 *f*
 51 132 *b*
 52 20 *h*
 90 2 107 *c*, 152 *r*
 3 109 *k*, 111 *t*
 4 118 *r*
 5 155 *g*
 6 112 *m*
 8 73 *d*
 10 49 *e*
 13 147 *c*
 15 87 *n*, 130 *d*
 91 4 67 *p*, 109 *k*
 6 67 *q*, 118 *i*
 9 117 *ii*
 11 20 *c*
 12 60 *e*
 92 12 132 *b*
 93 5 75 *x*
 94 1 53 *m*, 69 *v*
 9 93 *qq*
 12 20 *g*
 20 60 *b*, 63 *m*
 99 6 74 *i*, 75 *oo*, 119 *i*
 100 3 103 *g*
 101 5 55 *b*, 64 *i*, 90 *m*
 102 4 67 *u*
 9 116 *i*
 14 67 *cc*
 19 106 *e*
 28 67 *g*, 135 *a* N¹
 103 1 10 *g*

Psalms

103	3	91 e, 91 l
	4	58 g
	5	145 k, 156 d
	9	117 g
104	1	106 g
	3	20 m N ² , 126 b	35 b,
	8	138 g
	11	90 n
	1293 z
	18	20 m, 126 x
	20	109 h, 159 d
	21	114 p
	25	136 d
	26	138 g
	28	47 m, 159 c
105	12	118 x
	28	53 n
	4378 l
107	23	5 n, 17 e
	43	93 m
108	7	144 m
109	2	117 t
	3	57 N ²
	10	64 e
	13	75 y
110	1	164 f
	2	110 c
	3	141 c
	490 l
111	15 h
112	15 h
	8	164 f
	9	120 g
113	5	90 m
	7	90 m
	8	90 n
	9	90 n
114	1	128 a N ²
	8	90 m, 90 n
115	7	143 d, 147 e
116	1	90 n
	416 f
	6	53 q
	7	72 s, 91 l
	1291 l
	1590 f
118	5	20 g, 59 f, 119 gg	
	7	119 i
	10	60 d
	1167 cc
	13	113 p
	14	80 g
	18	20 g, 59 f
	23	74 g
	25	53 m
	26	59 e
119	1	5 n, 75 oo
	18	75 cc
	28	91 n

Psalms

119	11775 l
	128	130 f N.
	136	155 n
	137	145 r
120	1	90 g, 127 e
	5	117 bb
	6	119 s
	7	141 c N ³
121	1	127 e
	3	107 p, 109 e
	5	124 k
122	6	75 u
123	1	90 m
	4	119 s, 127 g
124	490 f
125	1	155 g
126	6	113 p, 113 u
127	1	118 i
	2	23 l, 80 h, 114 n	
128	3	75 v, 96
	5	110 i
131	172 l
132	1	52 r
	3	128 m
	4	80 g
	12	34 b, 91 n, 138 g	
133	2	126 x
135	7	53 o
136	12 r
	3	102 m
	6	65 d
137	1	124 e
	3	117 gg
	5	159 m
	6	58 g
	7	75 cc, 116 d
138	2	16 f
	6	69 b N., 69 p
139	1	59 h
	2	73 a N.
	591 e
	8	66 e, 159 m
	11	103 d, 111 x, 159 f	
	12	133 b N ²
	14	75 qq, 118 p
	18	159 c N.
	20	23 i, 68 h, 75 oo
	21	72 cc
	22	117 q, 128 r
140	491 l
	1075 mm
	1344 i
141	3	20 h, 48 i
	496
	5	74 k
	8	75 bb
	10	145 m
142	5	113 bb
143	6	106 g
144	2	87 f

Psalms

144	14	122 e
145	15 h
	7	132 b
	13	123 c
147	1	52 p
	2	20 m
149	2	124 k
Proverbs			
1	991 n
	1068 h, 75 hh
	16	145 u
	19	29 f
	20	47 k, 48 d, 86 l
	2175 v
	22	63 m, 93 t N.
	23	159 d
	2860 e
2	8	114 i N.
	10	145 u
	1158 i
	14	128 w
	19116 i
	22	144 g
3	3	110 f
	822 s
	1216 b
	25	109 e
	26119 i
4	475 n
	8	60 f, 67 l
	1320 h
	2172 ee
	2570 b
5	2	145 u
	496
	672 l
	1375 ee
	16	150 a
	17	152 o
	22	60 e, 131 m N.
6	24	114 i N., 128 w
7	275 n
	5	114 i N.
	7	108 h
	891 e
	1194 d
	13	67 dd, 68 e
	26116 l
8	347 k
	496
	12	117 bb
	13	122 v
	1768 f
	2259 f
	25	107 c, 152 r
	26124 l
	2767 r
	2893 v
	30122 f



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

HOLY BIBLE

Continue

*Fair use policy applies

Job		Job		Job	
5	10	9	29	15	6
	12		31		7
	13		32	10	10
	14		116 s, 152 d, 166 a		11
	16		33		13
	18		109 i, 152 d		15
	19	10	34		16
	22		60 d		17
	24		1	15	75 bb, 138 h, 143 d
	27		72 dd		20
6	2		7		21
	5		119 aa N.		22
	7		8		23
	66 b, 106 g		III e		26
	8		159 ff	16	3
	95 h, 151 d		159 g		4
	9		109 h, 120 g		103 l, 108 f, 119 q
	10		154 a N.		5
	12		107 n		63 f, 108 e, 159 ff
	141 d, 150 f		17 n		7
	13		107 c		53 p, 75 ee, 144 p
	150 g N.		22		8
	16	11	90 g, 152 a N.		118 q, 119 q
	126 b		2		10
	17		128 t		54 k, 119 q
	130 d, 155 l		3		12
	19		111 t		13
	119 s		151 b		95 h
	20		110 i, 134 r N.		14
	135 p, 145 u		9		126 p
	21		91 e		16
	75 t, 152 a		11		44 m, 55 e
	22		128 t		17
	22 p, 64 a, 69 o		51 g, 131 c N.		152 a N., 160 a
	25		119 w, 159 ee		19
	154 a		48 d, 108 e, 133 e		124 b
	26		144 c		22
	65 f, 69 v		20	17	69 x, 75 u, 145 u
	28	12	103 m		1
	120 g		152 d		124 c
7	2		3		2
	155 g		4		20 h, 73 e, 75 ff
	3		111 u		4
	121 c, 144 g		29 t, 75 u, 124 e		72 cc
	4		7		75 w
	124 f		145 k		75 p
	6		11		10 h
	133 b		135 i, 161 a		10
	13		141 d		120 e, 135 r
	112 hh, 119 m		159 w		13
	14		15 c		124 b
	58 i, 60 d		17		16
	15		116 s, 116 x, 118 o		47 k
	133 b		23	18	2
	18		117 n		3
	123 c		24		75 qq
	20		128 a, 152 u		4
	102 l, 119 aa, 159 h		3		51 n, 139 f
	21	13	53 k, 113 d		7
	37 f		7		67 dd, 135 n
8	5		150 h		8
	159 r		9		54 k
	7		67 g		12
	145 u		119 ff, 137 c		109 k
	9		15		18
	141 d		153		144 g
	10		16		21
	125 c		152 e	19	2
	11		17		21 d, 60 e, 75 gg,
	75 rr, 150 h, 152 a		113 r		75 oo
	N.		29 q, 60 d, 64 h		3
	14		25		53 n, 120 c
	72 r, 93 oo		117 c		7
	18		124 e		63 h N., 159 w
	29 g, 64 g		27		10
	19		54 f, 93 r		69 p, x
	145 d		28		15
	21		144 p, 155 h		60 a
	23 e, 75 pp	14	1		67 ee
9	6		116 l		159 e
	54 k		2		138 h
	7		111 s		23
	109 g, 165 a		150 b, 153		53 u, 67 y, 126 s,
	8		151 b		151 d
	87 s		109 f, 156 g		24
	11		65 e, 112 m		51 m
	117 n, 159 w		10		118 n
	15		111 t		26
	55 b, 159 n, 160 a		161 a		119 w, 144 g
	16		145 k		28
	111 x		153		117 n
	18		113 h, 119 hh		
	20 h, 114 m				
	19				
	147 b				
	20				
	53 n, 107 x				
	22				
	106 i				
	24				
	150 l N.				
	26				
	155 g, 161 a N.				
	27				
	159 u				

Job
 20 4 150 e
 9 122 l
 10 72 k
 12 159 q
 17 . . . 109 e, 130 e
 19 154 a N.
 22 74 h, 118 e
 23 103 f N.
 24 159 c
 26 . 68 f, 145 u, 156 f
 29 . . . 131 c, 135 m
 21 4 100 n, 135 f, 143 a,
 150 g
 5 67 v
 7 117 z
 9 . 119 w, 141 c N^s
 11 52 n
 13 20 i, 66 f
 16 . . . 20 f, 106 n N²
 17 150 h
 21 . . . 37 d, 146 a
 22 142 d
 23 139 g
 25 119 m
 27 155 k
 29 44 d, 64 f
 32 124 c
 22 2 103 f N^s
 3 67 y
 7 152 e
 9 121 b
 12 20 i, 117 h, 141 c,
 158 a
 16 . . . 121 d, 149 a
 18 106 n N.
 20 91 f, 149 e
 21 48 d, 110 f, 135 p
 23 159 ff
 29 23 f
 30 152 q
 23 2 119 aa
 3 120 e
 6 100 l
 9 109 k
 11 76 c
 12 143 d
 13 119 i
 16 67 v
 24 1 75 m, 121 f
 5 118 r, 145 m
 7 118 o
 10 118 o, 152 u
 14 109 k, 118 x, 120 c
 19 161 a
 21 70 d
 22 87 e, 156 f
 23 91 l
 24 . 51 m 67 m, 67 y
 25 . 150 l N., 152 a
 25 2 116 z

Job
 25 3 91 d
 5 67 ee
 26 2 152 a N., 152 u,
 152 v
 4 117 gg
 5 119 c
 7 116 s
 9 56
 14 119 m
 27 3 128 e
 5 149 a
 6 119 w N.
 7 118 x
 12 117 q
 1 . . . 68 h, 120 d N.
 2 103 f N.
 28 2 155 h
 3 121 d, 127 ii
 4 126 b
 5 118 w
 6 124 l
 11 119 x
 12 119 ff
 17 152 z
 25 114 r
 27 60 d
 29 2 118 u, 130 d, 151 b
 3 67 p, 118 h, 131 o
 6 23 f
 8 120 g N.
 10 44 c, 146 a
 12 152 u, 155 n
 15 141 d
 16 130 d, 155 n
 21 . . . 20 i, 24 e, 67 g
 23 118 w
 25 10 g, 126 p
 30 3 126 b, 133 l
 6 114 k, 133 h
 10 106 g
 13 152 u, 155 n
 14 75 u
 15 121 b
 19 59 f, 75 ll
 20 72 bb
 26 49 e, 108 e
 28 118 n, 120 c
 31 1 148 a
 5 72 ff
 7 23 c, 108 f
 9 159 m
 10 87 e
 11 32 l, 131 s
 12 155 f
 15 58 k, 72 cc
 18 117 x, 126 p, 163 b
 22 91 e
 26 67 p, 111 q, 118 n,
 118 q
 27 75 q

Job
 31 28 159 dd
 29 112 e
 31 151 b
 34 156 f
 35 151 b
 32 6 68 e, 69 m
 7 146 a
 11 68 i
 12 103 o
 17 63 f
 18 23 f, 74 k
 22 120 c
 33 4 16 h, 75 mm
 5 48 i, 54 k
 21 14 d, 64 e
 25 56
 30 51 l, 72 v
 32 61 d
 34 13 90 f
 18 113 ee N.
 22 115 g
 36 159 cc
 35 10 124 k
 11 68 k
 15 152 k
 36 2 65 e
 7 111 b N.
 18 145 u
 32 122 o
 36 143 d
 37 5 118 p
 6 75 hh
 12 90 f
 14 117 w
 16 124 e
 18 150 b
 24 59 i
 38 2 136 c
 3 126 p
 5 159 dd
 6 137 b
 7 67 n, 128 v
 12 119 w N.
 13 5 n, 114 r
 14 118 w, 134 r
 16 150 h
 18 122 q, 150 b
 19 155 k
 21 107 c, 146 a
 24 165 a
 26 152 u, 155 e
 27 133 l
 28 150 g
 30 118 w
 32 145 m
 39 1 64 d
 2 91 f, 150 b
 3 135 o
 9 22 s
 13 150 f

Job

39	15	135 p
	17	119 m
	24	75 oo
	26	53 n
	30	55 f
40	2	113 ee, 113 gg
	5	134 r, 134 s
	8	150 g
	19	116 g N., 127 l
	22	67 n
	23	159 w
	24	66 f
	25	150 a N ¹
	30	150 b
	32	69 v
41	1	93 ss, 150 a N ¹
	2	72 cc
	4	103 g, 124 e
	7	118 r
	12	154 a N.
	15	156 g
	17	76 b
	20	128 v
	22	133 h
	25	24 b, 75 v, 126 b
	26	16 f, 117 a N ⁴
42	2	44 i
	3	133 d, 156 f
	5	75 mm
	7	164 d
	8	163 d
	10	91 k
	13	97 c
	15	135 o, 145 o
	16	75 t

Canticle

1	1	133 i
	6	60 u, 75 x
	7	36, 75 v
	8	20 h
	10	75 x, 141 c
	15	141 d
2	7	144 a
	12	85 u N.
	13	141 d
	14	69 v, 93 ss
	17	119 s
3	7	131 n
	8	50 f
	11	75 n
5	5	135 b
	8	137 b N.
	9	59 h
	16	85 g N., 141 c
6	8	32 n
	11	67 dd
7	1	137 b N.
	2	93 x

Canticle

7	10	126 x, 133 h
8	2	87 f, 131 c N.
	4	137 b N.
	5	59 g N.
	6	93 m
	10	74 i
	14	119 s

Ruth

1	1	49 b N.
	8	135 o, 144 a
	9	46 f, 74 h, 74 k, 110 i
	12	106 p, 107 x
	13	51 m, 103 f N., 152 g
	14	76 b
	16	138 e
	19	91 f
	20	46 f, 80 h
	21	118 n
	22	32 n, 138 k
2	2	10 h, 64 i
	3	129 d
	6	138 k
	8	47 g, 47 o
	9	75 qq, 112 kk
	14	53 n, 66 c, 69 v, 103 g
	15	35 k
	16	67 o
	20	121 f
	21	47 o, 122 g
3	2	91 f, 141 c
	3	44 h, 104 g
	4	47 o, 109 k, 112 z
	6	59 g
	12	163 d
	14	107 c
	15	64 c, 69 o, 134 n
	18	163 c and N.
4	1	69 p, 72 t
	3	129 h, 138 k
	4	29 i N., 152 o
	7	112 h
	15	59 g

Lamentations

1	1	5 h, 90 l
	4	69 t, 87 e
	8	67 y, 72 ee, 117 p
	9	124 f
	10	120 c, 155 f
	14	130 d, 155 n
	16	75 v, 117 z
	19	107 q, 165 a
2	7	64 e
	11	51 l
	16	15 c

Lamentations

2	18	80 f
3	1	144 p
	5	53 n
	12	80 h
	14	87 f
	22	20 o
	26	100 g N., 107 q
	33	69 u
	48	29 q, 69 p, 117 z
	50	109 k
	53	69 u
4	1	54 k, 75 rr
	2	75 rr
	5	117 n
	14	51 h, 120 g
	17	100 o
	21	90 n
5	5	72 ee N., 121 a
	10	145 u

Ecclesiastes

1	1	122 r
	2	133 i
	4	116 l
	6	113 u
	9	137 c
	13	112 pp N.
	16	135 b
	17	86 l
2	1	135 b
	5	112 pp N.
	7	145 u
	8	122 v
	13	24 e, 133 b
	15	93 rr, 135 e
	19	150 g
	20	64 e
	21	131 m
	22	36
	26	75 oo
3	2	2 s
	4	114 b
	11	152 y
	14	165 b
	15	114 i
	18	36, 67 p
	19	93 rr
	21	100 m, 150 i N.
	22	102 k
4	2	113 gg
	3	117 l
	10	124 o, 131 n
	14	35 d
	17	133 e
5	5	53 q
	6	143 d
	7	124 h
	8	32 l



THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS
Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page



Never be without a book!

Forgotten Books Full Membership gives universal access to 797,885 books from our apps and website, across all your devices: tablet, phone, e-reader, laptop and desktop computer

A library in your pocket for \$8.99/month

Continue

*Fair usage policy applies

1 Chronicles

15	12	155 <i>n</i>
	19	131 <i>d</i>
	24	53 <i>o</i> , 55 <i>e</i>
	26	63 <i>i</i>
	27	56, 127 <i>g</i>
16	8	2 <i>s</i>
19	8	131 <i>b</i>
20	8	69 <i>t</i>
21	1	125 <i>f</i>
	17	141 <i>h</i> N.
22	7	143 <i>a</i> N.
23	6	63 <i>n</i>
	26	114 <i>k</i>
24	3	63 <i>n</i>
26	28	138 <i>i</i>
27	12	127 <i>d</i>
28	2	143 <i>a</i> N.
	11	96
	15, 18	131 <i>d</i>
29	1	155 <i>d</i>
	3	155 <i>n</i>
	8	138 <i>i</i>
	33	65 <i>f</i>

2 Chronicles

1	4	138 <i>i</i> , 155 <i>n</i>
2	12	117 <i>n</i>

2 Chronicles

3	17	126 <i>k</i>
4	3	123 <i>a</i> N.
	13	131 <i>d</i>
5	11	114 <i>k</i>
8	18	93 <i>r</i>
11	22	114 <i>k</i> , 147 <i>a</i>
15	3	147 <i>a</i>
	8	127 <i>f</i>
16	4	125 <i>h</i>
	9	155 <i>n</i>
	10	147 <i>a</i>
	12	75 <i>rr</i> , 147 <i>a</i>
	14	124 <i>c</i>
17	11	93 <i>x</i>
18	3	147 <i>a</i>
	23	155 <i>d</i>
	26	131 <i>c</i>
19	2	114 <i>k</i>
	6	147 <i>a</i>
20	1	102 <i>b</i>
	19	128 <i>v</i>
	22	155 <i>l</i>
	34	63 <i>p</i>
	35	54 <i>a</i> N.
21	4	119 <i>w</i> N.
	17	133 <i>g</i>
22	5	35 <i>d</i>
23	1	117 <i>n</i>
25	17	156 <i>c</i> N.

2 Chronicles

26	5	114 <i>c</i>
	10	22 <i>s</i>
	15 75 <i>rr</i> , 114 <i>n</i> , 126 <i>z</i>	
	18	114 <i>l</i>
28	10	142 <i>f</i> N.
	21	147 <i>a</i>
	23	53 <i>o</i>
29	6	67 <i>y</i>
	10	165 <i>a</i>
	17	134 <i>p</i>
	18	117 <i>n</i>
	27	155 <i>l</i>
30	9	114 <i>p</i> , 147 <i>a</i>
	17	155 <i>d</i>
	18	130 <i>d</i> N ²
	19	155 <i>n</i>
31	7 69 <i>n</i> , 71, 142 <i>f</i> N ²	
	10	121 <i>d</i> N ¹
	17	117 <i>m</i>
32	9	101 <i>a</i>
	13	8 <i>k</i>
	30	69 <i>u</i>
34	10	45 <i>g</i>
	11	16 <i>f</i>
	12	10 <i>h</i>
35	4	93 <i>ww</i>
	21 109 <i>g</i> , 135 <i>g</i> , 147 <i>a</i>	
	23	69 <i>r</i>
36	23	137 <i>c</i>

7
260