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1. By Biblical Aramaic we understand the language of Gen. 31, 47 (two words); Jer. 10, 11; Dan. 2, 46–7, 28; and Ezra 4, 8–6, 18; 7, 12–26.

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

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

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

*The Aramaic document used by the compiler of Ezra probably formed part of a narrative of the rebuilding of the Temple. It seems to have been trustworthy, although its extent is a matter of conjecture; its scope may have been more or less comprehensive. At the points where the document was inserted into the compilation, the Aramaic verses establishing the connection belong to the Chronicler; possibly they were found by him in a compilation previously made. Cf. Driver,
Intr. 549; Bertholet’s Commentary, 1902, xiv f. Doubt has been cast on the authenticity of the edicts (notably by Kosters, 1895; Wellhausen, 1895), though perhaps without sufficient foundation (see E. Meyer, Entstehung des Judenthums, 1896); it is probable, however, that the present form was given to the edicts by the Chronicler or some previous compiler. (See, for a review of the question, J. Fischer, Die chronologischen Fragen in den Büchern Esra-Nehemia, 1903, 4 ff.)

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

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

It is maintained (Riessler, § 1; Jahn, V) that the LXX translator had before him a Hebrew text of the Aramaic section. The examples enumerated by Jahn (ibid., footnote 1) in support of his thesis, however, are not conclusive. With the exception of two passages (7, 8; 2, 44), the argument is based upon so-called Greek “Hebraisms.” In 7, 8 (spómos) stands for (spómos); cf. Zech. 10, 2, where (s. b) have the correct reading (spómos) for (spómos), which the other codices offer, and Sir. 10, 17, where again SAC, several cursive s, and the Ethiopic and Sahidic versions read (Heb. הָנַע, read הָנַע) instead of the (pavan) of B and the Latin (see Nestle, Marginalien, 50); cf. also in Jer. 28 (51), 36, (pavó) AB for (pavó). In 2, 44 LXX reads
The opinion that the Aramaic section goes back to a Hebrew original is rejected by Marti, p. x.

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

2. The Aramaic portions of the Old Testament have come down to us in the same square characters, and are furnished with the same vowel and accent symbols, as the Hebrew portions of the Bible. The problem at once arises: How far was the Masoretic system, developed for the Hebrew of the Old Testament, applied also to the Aramaic portions? Hebrew influence of this character would, if found, be placed to the credit of the schools of the readers and masters of the late synagogue. Quite different is the following question: To what extent was BA, as the living speech of the post-exilic Jewish community in Palestine, influenced by the Hebrew which still continued to be used in school and synagogue even after it had been supplanted in the daily life of the people? Here the case is much analogous to the problem of Hebraisms in Biblical Greek, except for the following facts: first, that Hebrew and Aramaic are cognate languages, and therefore more liable to influence each other; secondly, that the Greek texts of the Bible are mainly translations, while the Aramaic texts are originals.
The so-called square characters in which our MSS. of the Hebrew Bible are written are not Hebrew in origin, but Aramaic. They represent the forms which the old Hebrew alphabet (= Phoenician, Western Semitic in general) assumed, through gradual transformation in the course of centuries, in the Aramaic (Egyptian and Palmyrene). The question still remains whether this transformation from old to square was gradual in the case of the Biblical text, as it was in ordinary documents, or whether the change was deliberate and was made by an authoritative body long after the new characters had established themselves in common use. Tradition (Jewish, in the Talmud, verified by references in the church fathers) ascribes the change to Ezra. Jewish coins down to the time of Bar Kokhba bear the old characters. The notice found in the church fathers that in Greek versions the Tetragrammaton was written in Hebrew and in the old characters, is now verified by the Cairene fragment of Aquila (ed. Burkitt, 1897; see the discussion on p. 15 f. [the spelling with v in place of ו for ט is on a line with תבָּנָה, תבָּנָס, according to Margolis]). Cf., on the whole subject, Driver, *Hebrew Text of Samuel*, 1890, VII–XXV; Lidzbarski, 189 ff.; and art. Alphabet in *JE.*, I, 442 f., especially p. 445, col. 2, and Plates I–III.


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

On the Hebraisms of Biblical Greek see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien* (1895); *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897); *Die sprachliche Erforschung d. griech. Bibel* (1898); his article in *PRE.*, VII (1899), 62 ff.; Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, 1901, 12 ff.;
cf. also Grenfell-Hunt-Smyly, _Tebtunis Papyri_, I (1902), 86 (n. 14). Many of the supposed Hebraisms have been found to be part of the common Hellenistic language.

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

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

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

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

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

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

*G. B. Winer, _Grammatik des biblischen und targum. Chaldaismus_, 1824, 5 f., rejects the opinion that BA was from the beginning a corrupt and mixed jargon, and maintains that it bears the character of a real Aramaic dialect. He considers the few agreements with
Hebrew as against Syriac, which are confined almost entirely to orthography and vocalization, as dialectal differences rather than mutations introduced from the Hebrew by the schools of the Jewish punctators, since the identical pronunciation of Aramaic is attested by the Greek transcription of Aramaic words in the N. T.

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

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

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


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

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

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

4. Aramaic is one of the North Semitic languages, and, in the course of its history, was spoken throughout Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine. Upon the decay of Babylonian culture
and influence, Aramaic became the international language of commerce and diplomacy (II Kings 18, 26). The oldest specimens of Aramaic are the inscriptions from Zenjirli, Nineveh and Babylon, which belong to the eighth and seventh centuries almost all the others being from Persian times or later (cf. Lidzbarski, 121). The distribution of the inscriptions according to place and time appears as follows:

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

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

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

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

*a* The inscriptions from Zenjirli, a small village in northwest Syria, afford the earliest specimens extant of Aramaic. They were discovered in 1890 and 1891. Although undoubtedly Aramaic, the dialect has features which ally it to Hebrew. It is just with reference to this affinity of the Zenjirli inscriptions with Hebrew that Sachau (quoted by Behrmann, p. viii, footnote) remarks that the older the Aramaic is, the more it is like Hebrew. On these inscriptions see Lidzbarski, 440 f.; Cooke, 185; Halévy, *J.A.*, XIX (1892), VIII; Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XLVIII (1893), 96 f.; D. H. Müller, *WZKM.*, VII (1893), 113 ff.; X (1896), 193 ff.; Hoffmann, *ZA.*, XI (1897).
5. Among the remnants of Aramaic* BA belongs chronologically between Egyptian Aramaic and the language of the Nabatean inscriptions. They all belong to the Western group of dialects, the Eastern b being represented by the Syriac,c or dialect of Edessa, the Mandaic, and the language of the Babylonian Talmud. The Mohammedan conquest replaced Aramaic as the vernacular with Arabic, the former surviving in Syria and Persia only in certain isolated and more or less corrupt dialects.4

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

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

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


6. BA differs from Syriac and agrees with Hebrew orthographically in the use of ַא where Syriac has ִא (l). Similarly,
certain words are written with מ, where Syriac has ך (ך), the letter מ not being found in Syriac.

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

a) The ending of the emphatic state of nouns.

b) The ending of the absolute state of feminine nouns.

c) The ending of infinitives.

d) Pronouns.

e) Pronominal suffixes.

f) Verbs נג נ (ךךך).
Masculine nouns in the emphatic state occur with נ as follows:

* נַּתְנָה Ez. 5, 12; 6, 15; * נַתְנֵה Ez. 5, 14; 6, 5; 7, 18; * נַתְנִי Ez. 7, 26; נַתְנֵה Ez. 6, 2; * נַתְנִּי 5, 20; נַמָּה (k) 5, 30; Ez. 5, 12; נַמְנָה 5, 7, 15; נַמְנִּה (k) 6, 1; נַמֵּלֶמֶּר 2, 11; נַמְנָה (k) Ez. 5, 1; 6, 14; * נַמְנִּי Ez. 5, 3+12 times in Ezra; נַמָּה (k) 3, 26, 32; 5, 18.

21; נַמִּמִּי Ez. 5, 12; נַמָּה (k) 6, 29; נַמְנָה 2, 7; 5, 12; נַמָּה (k) 2, 40; 3, 25; 7, 7, 23; נַמְנָה 2, 38; נַמָּה 3, 24+5 times. Note that נ is the rule when, as in the marginal forms (k) noted, it is preceded by נ. The נ in these cases is to be regarded as purely orthographic, and presupposes spellings like נַּמָּה, which latter, in accordance with general Semitic usage, is for נַּמְנָה (cf. below, § 38).

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

Feminine nouns in the emphatic state singular with נ are as follows: נַּמָּה Ez. 4, 11; 5, 6; נַּמָּתָה Ez. 4, 12; נַּמָּה Ez. 6, 2; נַּמָּת ה 2, 20, 23; נַּמָּת ה 2, 25; 5, 13; 6, 14; Ez. 6, 16; נַּמָּת ה 4, 12+5 times (in 4, 11 Ginsb. gives a var. נַּמָּת ה); נַּמָּת ה 2, 20. 21. 23; נַּמָּת ה 2, 10; נַּמָּת ה 3, 6+7 times; נַּמָּת ה Ez. 5, 8; 6, 2; נַּמָּת ה 2, 37+18 times (in 7, 24 Ginsb. gives a var. נַּמָּת ה); נַּמָּת ה 5, 10; נַּמָּת ה 2, 8+11 times; נַּמָּת ה Ez. 4, 12; נַּמָּת ה 3, 5, 7, 10, 15; נַּמָּת ה 5, 5; נַּמָּת ה Ez. 6, 4, 8; נַּמָּת ה 2, 41; נַּמָּת ה 2, 49; Ez. 5, 8; נַּמָּת ה 7, 4; נַּמָּת ה Ez. 4, 12+5 times; נַּמָּת ה 7, 19, 23; נַּמָּת ה 5, 18, 19, 7, 27; נַּמָּת ה 4, 27; נַּמָּת ה Gen. 31, 47; נַּמָּת ה 4, 14; נַּמָּת ה 3, 6, 15; 4, 30 (in 3, 6 Ginsb. gives a var. נַּמָּת ה).

Feminine nouns in the emphatic state singular are found with נ only in the following: נַּמָּת ה 2, 44 (here Ginsb. gives a var. נַּמָּת ה); נַּמָּת ה 2, 5; נַּמָּת ה 5, 5 (here Ginsb. gives a var. נַּמָּת ה).
Feminine nouns in the emphatic plural are found with נ as follows: נְהַרְנָה 2, 41; נְהַרְנָה 6, 8, 13, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25 (twice), 28; נְהַרְנָה 7, 12, 19; נְהַרְנָה 3, 2, 3; נְהַרְנָה 2, 44; 7, 23; נְהַרְנָה 2, 22; נְהַרְנָה 3, 2, 3, 27; 6, 8; נְהַרְנָה 7, 8.

b) Feminine nouns in the absolute singular are found with נ as follows: נְהַרְנָה Ez. 4, 24; נְהַרְנָה (k) Ez. 6, 17; נְהַרְנָה 4, 13 (Strack gives a var. נְהַרְנָה); נְהַרְנָה 3, 19; נְהַרְנָה 5, 24; נְהַרְנָה 3, 24; 6, 13; 7, 16 (in the last place used adverbially, so also in 3, 24, although נְהַרְנָה may be understood); נְהַרְנָה (k) 6, 19; גֵּלֶב 7, 12, 19; נְהַרְנָה (k) 2, 40; 3, 25; 7, 7, 23; נְהַרְנָה 3, 5, 7. 10, 15; נְהַרְנָה 7, 5, 19; נְהַרְנָה (k) 2, 39; נְהַרְנָה 7, 7.

Feminine nouns occur with נ as follows: נְהַרְנָה Ez. 4, 8 (Ginsb. gives a var. נְהַרְנָה); נְהַרְנָה 7, 7, 19; נְהַרְנָה 3, 23; 7, 6, 17; נְהַרְנָה 4, 24 (Ginsb. gives a var. נְהַרְנָה); 7, 12; נְהַרְנָה 2, 21; נְהַרְנָה 4, 34; נְהַרְנָה 7, 19; נְהַרְנָה 7, 5; נְהַרְנָה 7, 8; נְהַרְנָה 6, 23 (Ginsb. gives a var. נְהַרְנָה); נְהַרְנָה 2, 9 + 8 times (in Ez. 4, 8 Ginsb. and in Dan. 2, 35 Strack gives as a var. נְהַרְנָה); נְהַרְנָה Ez. 6, 16; נְהַרְנָה (k) Ez. 6, 17; נְהַרְנָה 7, 5, 7; נְהַרְנָה 2, 30; 5, 11, 14; נְהַרְנָה 7, 21; נְהַרְנָה 2, 11; נְהַרְנָה 3, 22 + 5 times (used adverbially in 7, 7, 19; Baer has נְהַרְנָה everywhere except in 6, 4, where he gives נְהַרְנָה; Strack cites certain MSS. which always have נְהַרְנָה); נְהַרְנָה 2, 9; נְהַרְנָה 5, 5 (Ginsb. gives a var. נְהַרְנָה); נְהַרְנָה 6, 2; Ez. 6, 17; 7, 22; נְהַרְנָה Ez. 6, 2; נְהַרְנָה 7, 19; נְהַרְנָה 2, 15; נְהַרְנָה 3, 22; נְהַרְנָה 2, 9, 10; נְהַרְנָה Ez. 4, 13, 20; 7, 21; נְהַרְנָה 2, 46; נְהַרְנָה Ez. 4, 19; נְהַרְנָה 2, 6; נְהַרְנָה 3, 5, 15; נְהַרְנָה (k) 3, 10 (Ginsb. gives a var. נְהַרְנָה); נְהַרְנָה 7, 21; נְהַרְנָה 6, 5 (twice). 6; נְהַרְנָה Ez. 5, 14; נְהַרְנָה 2, 41; נְהַרְנָה 4, 24; נְהַרְנָה 4, 23 (Ginsb. gives נְהַרְנָה only as a variant for נְהַרְנָה; Baer and Strack give נְהַרְנָה in the text and נְהַרְנָה as a variant); נְהַרְנָה Ez. 4, 10; נְהַרְנָה 7, 7, 19; נְהַרְנָה 3, 19 + 4 times; נְהַרְנָה 2, 9; 6, 5 (twice); נְהַרְנָה 7, 7 (Ginsb. gives a var. נְהַרְנָה); נְהַרְנָה 4, 16; נְהַרְנָה 2, 42; נְהַרְנָה 7, 5; נְהַרְנָה 2, 40, 42 (in 2, 42 Ginsb. gives a var. נְהַרְנָה).

c) Infinitives with נ are found in נְהַרְנָה (Strack gives נְהַרְנָה) 2, 12, 24; נְהַרְנָה Ez. 4, 21 (Ginsb. gives a var. נְהַרְנָה); 6, 8; נְהַרְנָה 7, 19.

Infinitives with נ are found as follows: נְהַרְנָה 7, 26; נְהַרְנָה 3, 13; 5, 2; נְהַרְנָה 2, 25; 3, 24; 6, 20; נְהַרְנָה Ez. 7, 15; נְהַרְנָה 5,
20; הָלִּים Ez. 6, 12; הָלִּים 2, 10, 16, 27; 3, 32; 5, 15 (in 2, 10 Ginsb. gives a var. נְלִים); הָלִּים Ez. 7, 15; הָלִּים 5, 8; הָלִּים Ez. 5, 3, 9; הָלִּים 3, 20; הָלִּים 2, 46; הָלִּים 6, 24; הָלִּים 3, 29; הָלִּים 5, 7; הָלִּים 4, 3; הָלִּים 2, 14; הָלִּים 2, 13; הָלִּים 6, 8; הָלִּים 6, 5 (twice); הָלִּים 7, 26; הָלִּים 6, 9, 16; 7, 25; Ez. 6, 12 (in the last passage Ginsb. gives a var. נְלִים); הָלִּים 4, 34; הָלִּים 6, 8.

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

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

f) Verbs נְלִים (נְלִים) are found ending in נ as follows: Perfect—
* נְלִים Ez. 5, 16; נְלִים 2, 49; * נְלִים 5, 19+5 times (in 6, 4 Ginsb. and Strack give a var. נְלִים); * נְלִים 4, 25; נְלִים 2, 35 (in נְלִים Ez. 6, 15 the נ is otiose). Imperfect— נְלִים Ez. 5, 15; 6, 3; נְלִים Ez. 4, 13. 16. 21 (in Ez. 4, 16 Ginsb. gives a var. נְלִים); נְלִים 6, 8, 13; נְלִים 7, 16; * נְלִים 2, 28+15 times; * נְלִים 2, 40+3 times; נְלִים 2, 24 (Baer has נְלִים; Strack and Ginsb. give variants נְלִים and נְלִים); נְלִים 2, 4 (so Strack; Baer and Ginsb. have נְלִים; נְלִים 4, 32; נְלִים Ez. 6, 11; נְלִים 4, 8. 17; נְלִים 6, 9. 13 (in both cases Ginsb. gives a var. נְלִים), while Baer has נְלִים in the text); נְלִים 4, 14. 22. 29; נְלִים Ez. 7, 17; נְלִים 5, 17 (Strack gives a var. נְלִים); נְלִים 3, 6. 11; 6, 8. 13; נְלִים 3, 31; 6, 26; Ez. 4, 22; נְלִים 7, 24; נְלִים 6, 8; 7, 23; נְלִים 2, 9; נְלִים Ez. 6, 11. Imperative— נְלִים Ez. 5, 15. Participle— נְלִים 6, 14; נְלִים 2, 22. 28. 29; נְלִים 5, 19; נְלִים 2, 23; נְלִים 6, 11; נְלִים 5, 25 (twice). 26; נְלִים 5, 19; נְלִים 6, 11; נְלִים 3, 4; 4, 11; 5, 7; נְלִים 2, 21; נְלִים 2, 22; נְלִים 5, 12. Infinitive— נְלִים 3, 19; נְלִים 3, 2; נְלִים Ez. 5, 2. 17; 6, 8; נְלִים Ez. 5, 3. 13; נְלִים 2, 18; נְלִים 2, 47; נְלִים Ez. 4, 14; נְלִים 5, 8. 16; נְלִים 3, 20; נְלִים 5, 16.

Verbs נְלִים (נְלִים) are found with final נ as follows: Perfect—
* נְלִים 7, 22; Ez. 5, 3; נְלִים 2, 16 (Baer נְלִים); נְלִים 4, 26+6 times; נְלִים 4, 20; 7, 1 (in 4, 20 Ginsb. gives a var. נְלִים); נְלִים 7, 13. 22; נְלִים 5, 26; נְלִים 4, 8. 17. 30. Imperfect— נְלִים 4, 22; נְלִים 2,
7. A similar fluctuation appears in the early Aramaic inscriptions, so much so that Lidzbarski remarks (p. 20): "In verbs third ܐ (ܢ) and in the st. abs. fem. sing. as well as the st. emph. the use of ܐ and ܢ fluctuates down to the latest times, but the oldest texts show a preference for ܐ." Examples are as follows (as noted above, references, unless otherwise specified, are to the CIS; for abbreviations see Lidzbarski, pp. 4, 507):

a) In the masc. sing. emph. st., ܐ occurs for ܢ only in ܢ ܢ (ܢ) (BA ܢ) and in the following forms, which, however, are not entirely certain:

proper name 122, 1. 2; ܢ ܢ 53, 1 (also ܢ, e.g., 113, 18; Syr. ܐ); ܢ ܢ Si., Eut. 99, 2 (Syr. ܐ); ܢ ܢ name of a deity (cf. Baethgen, Beiträge z. semit. Religionsgeschichte, 1888, 108) Na., 197, 5; 198, 4 (also ܢ Na., 209, 9); ܢ (grain?) Pan. 6, 9. In the fem. emph. st. ܐ appears only in the doubtful form ܢ (which could be taken as with suff. 3 sing.; BA ܢ ܢ ܢ; Syr. ܢ) 146 A, 1. In Christian Palestinian final ܐ is represented by ܢ instead of ܢ only in a few evidently uncertain cases, viz. ܢ ܢ, eternal life, John 5, 24 (elsewhere always ܢ ܢ), and ܢ ܢ, the rulers of the people, Luke 24, 20; cf. Nöldke, ZDMG., 22 (1868), 448 (the forms may, of course, be taken as with suffix 3 sing., after the type ܢ ܢ, Nöldke, § 205, C).

b) In the feminine ending of nouns ܢ appears as follows:

Na. proper name 204, 2; 271, 3 (Eut. 18, 11); ܢ, Had. 28; Na., 218, 4; 221, 6 (also ܢ ܢ Pa., T II b, 10; BA ܢ ܢ, Syr. ܐ); ܢ ܢ Pan., 6. 9 (also ܢ ܢ Pa., T II b, 9 = Arab. ܢ ܢ — by analogy — corresponds); ܢ ܢ Na., 209, 6; 219, 5 (= Arabic ܢ ܢ); ܢ ܢ Na., 205, 9; Si., Eut. 457, 1 (BA ܢ ܢ, Syr. ܐ); cf. ܢ ܢ ܢ Na., 200, 9; ܢ ܢ 145 A, 5 (BA ܢ ܢ, Syr. ܐ); ܢ ܢ 113, 20 (Syr. ܐ); ܢ ܢ and ܢ ܢ Pa. 6. 9 (cf. Cooke, p. 176); also in the following participles, ܢ ܢ ܢ 141, 3; ܢ ܢ 141, 1. 3; Si., Eut. 393; 394, 1.
c) No instance occurs with נ in the ending of infinitives.
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8. Thus it will be seen that, while in Syriac feminine nouns as well as masculine nouns in the emphatic state regularly end in נ (Nöldeke, § 70; Brockelmann, §§ 98, 99), in BA, on the other hand, feminine nouns in a majority of cases end in נ, while the emphatic state usually has נ. ד

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

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

9. In BA, as in Hebrew, נ is used in the prefix of the perfect, imperfect, and infinitive of the causative stem (add the
examples of the imperfect and participle with ס not syncopated, given below, §26, and the participle of the Hoph'al, given in §48), as well as in the prefix of the perfect and infinitive of the passive (reflexive) stems, ס appearing only occasionally. This is regarded by Kautzsch as an Hebraism (GBA., §23, 1, rem. 1).

The examples with ס are as follows: Haph'el perfect: 3d sing. masc. סי 6, 24; סי 5, 13; סי Ez. 4, 10; 5, 12; סי Ez. 5, 14; 6, 5; סי 2, 15, 17, 28, 45; סי 2, 29; סי Ez. 4, 10; סי 5, 2; Ez. 5, 14 (twice); 6, 5; סי 2, 25; 6, 19; סי 3, 30; 6, 29; סי 3, 2. 3. 5; סי 6, 2; סי 5, 11; סי 2, 48; סי 2, 38; סי 5, 26; סי 2, 14; 3d fem. sing. סי 2, 34, 45; סי 7, 5; 2d masc. sing. סי 2, 23; סי 3, 23; סי 3, 12, 18; סי 5, 22; 1st sing. סי 3, 14; סי 2, 25; 3d plural, סי 5, 3, 23; 6, 17, 25; סי 6, 25; סי 7, 22; סי 5, 29; סי 5, 29; סי 5, 3; סי 3, 22; סי 5, 20; 7, 12; סי Ez. 6, 18; סי Ez. 6, 17; סי 7, 13; סי Ez. 5, 12; סי 6, 7, 12, 16; סי 6, 12; Ez. 4, 19; סי Ez. 5, 11; 1st plural, סי Ez. 4, 14; סי 6, 6; imperative סי 2, 24; סי Ez. 7, 19; סי 2, 6. Hithpe'el perfect: 3d masc. sing. ס 2, 35; 6, 24; Ez. 6, 2; ס Ez. 3, 19; 3d fem. sing. ס 2, 34; ס 5, 11, 12, 14; 6, 5, 23; 2d masc. sing. ס 5, 27; 3d plural, ס 3, 28. Hithp'alel perfect, 3d masc. sing. ס 3, 27; ס Ez. 5, 1; 3d plural, ס Ez. 7, 15; 2d plural, ס (§k) 2, 9. Hithpo'ol perfect, 2d masc. sing. ס 5, 23. To the infinitives given above (§6) add the following: ס Ez. 5, 10; ס 2, 26; 4, 15; 5, 15, 16; ס Ez. 4, 22; ס 6, 15; ס 6, 4; ס 3, 16; ס Ez. 7, 16.

Following are the examples with ס: Haph'el perfect, ס 3, 1; imperative, ס Ez. 5, 15; ס 4, 11; infinitive, ס 5, 12. Hithpe'el, ס 2, 45; ס 7, 15; ס (k), ס (k), 7, 8. Hithpa'al, ס 3, 19; ס 6, 8. Ethpo'ol, ס 4, 16.

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

With ס: Haph'el, 3d masc. sing. ס Ner. 2, 3; ס Pan. 4; ס Pan. 18; ס Pan. 18; ס Na., 161, 1, 1; ס 75, 4;
11. While in Arabic the usual preformative of the IV is ٍ, there are certain rare forms with ١, as نَذَرُ, أَرَجُ, أَرَجْحُ (Heb. "gayyâm, a noun singular masculine (Arabic ٍ), Aramaic "gaymann, "kinnâs) (Heb. "gayymim, "kinnâmim), Wright, Arab. Gram., I, § 45, rem. d. With reference to the last example it must be said that it is a loan-word ultimately from the Hebrew; cf. Syriac ܡܸܫܬ (Nöldeke, Mand., § 163). In the Sabæan dialect ܐ and regularly occurs as the preformative, whereas in the corresponding Mineæan dialect ܘ is employed, etc. (Hommel, Süd-arab. Chrestomathie, 1893, § 23). In Mandaic also ܐ is found occasionally, e. g., ܒܢܘܕܐ (Syr. ܒܢܘܕܐ, Heb. "bûdâl), ܓܢܘܕܐ ܓܢܘܕܐ (also ܓܢܘܕܐ), as a loan-word (see above) ܓܢܘܕܐ; cf. also the inf. ܓܢܘܕܐ (by the side of the nomen actionis ܓܢܘܕܐ); cf. Arabic ܓܢܘܕܐ (Nöldeke, Mand., § 163).

Thus, although BA and Hebrew agree in the use of ܐ in the preformative of the Haph'el (Hiph'Il), in view of the fact that ܐ is found in the inscriptions and in Sabæan, and sporadically in Arabic and Mandaic, we need not assume Hebrew influence to account for its use in BA.
12. The following words are written in BA with ש:

> הָלִית (Syr. הלת) 7, 5; מְלַקֵת 2, 11; 4, 9; נְשֶׂת 2, 35; נְתֶת Ez. 5, 15; נַיְשֶׂת Ez. 4, 19; מְלַקֵת (Syr. מלת) 4, 12; מְלַקֵת 3, 22, 29, 30; 5, 21; מְלַקֵת (Syr. מלת) 4, 26; 7, 7, 20, 24; Ez. 6, 17; מְלַקֵת 7, 24; מְלַקֵת Ez. 6, 2; מְלַקֵת (Syr. מלת) Ez. 5, 5; 6, 7, 8, 14; מְלַקֵת Ez. 5, 9; מְלַקֵת (root מְלַק) 3, 31; 6, 26; Ez. 4, 22; מְלַק 2, 6 + 10 times; מְלַק Ez. 2, 48; Ez. 5, 11; מְלַק (Syr. מלת) Gen. 31, 47; מְלַק (root מְלַק, Syr. מלת) 3, 10; מְלַק Ez. 6, 12; מְלַק Ez. 5, 3 + 7 times; מְלַק Ez. 5, 14; מְלַק Ez. 4, 21; מְלַק 3, 29 + 6 times; מְלַק Ez. 6, 18; מְלַק Ez. 4, 21; מְלַק Ez. 5, 8; מְלַק (Syr. מלת) 7, 5; מְלַק 5, 11. 12. 14; מְלַק 7, 8; מְלַק (Syr. מלת) 4, 16; מְלַק (Syr. מלת) 3, 27; 7, 9; מְלַק 4, 30; also מְלַק (Greek σαμβέκη) 3, 5, 7, 10. 15 (in 3, 5 Ginsb. gives a var. מְלַק); and the following proper names: מְלַק Ez. 4, 7 (twice). 8. 11. 23; 7, 15; cf. מְלַק Ez. 7, 12, 21; מְלַק (Syr. מלת) Matt. 2, 6) Ez. 6, 14 + 5 times; מְלַק Ez. 2, 10; מְלַק (k) 2, 5; 4, 4; 5, 7, 30; מְלַק 3, 8.

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

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

Thus: "Λαρόμε" Pa. proper name, Vog. 4, 2 (Cooke, 113, 2) transcribed Λάρωμα; cf. מִאְרָוּס Pa. proper name, Müller, 46, 2
(Cooke, 143, 2), and ḫÎš, Scheil, 2, 1; 3, 1; ḫîṣ, CIS., II, 10, explained in the Assyrian section as meaning "a half mina;" cf. Pa. 6; cf. also Dan. 5, 25 (cf. Bevan, p. 106). ǧnds "great," Pa., Vog., 15, 5 (Cooke, 121, 5); cf. in the same line and Pa., T. I, 6; Bag. I 17; Sam'al name of a country, perhaps = Hebrew "the left," i.e., "the north;" cf. Ba., "thy left hand," Nöldeke, ZA., 14 (1894), 264–267; .sax proper name transcribed σοράχων (= Arab. ُسَرايْل) Vog. 11, 1; 12, 1; Afr. 1, 2; also probably 13, 2; cf. ُصَرَح Vog. 26, 4; 101, 3. Lidzbarski (p. 372) mentions also ُعَبَر "to satisfy" and refers to Cl. Ganneau's Pa. I, 7, also proper name 115.

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

Assyrian $s = \check{s}$, in ṣârîm, ṣârî-bêšî, ṣârî, ṣârî.

" $s = \check{s}$, in ūrâniy, šârîy, šârîy, šârîy.

" $s = \check{s}$, in šârây, šârây, šârây.

" $s$ elsewhere = $\check{s}$

Babylonian $s = \check{s}$, in šârâmâr.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>$ס$</td>
<td>ס</td>
<td>[ס]</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$š₁$</td>
<td>$ש$</td>
<td>ש</td>
<td>ש</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>ע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$š₂$</td>
<td>$ש$</td>
<td>ש</td>
<td>ש</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>ע</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

$דָּהָנְץ$ $דָּהָנְץ$ ed. Frensdorff, 1864, No. 191, contains a list of eighteen words with $ש$ in the place of $ס$. On the other hand, we sometimes find $ס$ for $ש$ = Arabic $ש$; e. g., $ך$ Cant. 2, 11 = Arabic $שֹׂמֶךְ$ (Hommel, Aufsätze und Abhandlungen, I [1892], 105).


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

* Haupt, loc. cit., 762: “$ס$ appears in all Semitic languages as $ס$, and therefore may be supposed to have existed as $ס$ in primitive Semitic; $ך$, on the other hand, appears in Ass., Heb., and Aram. as $š$, in Eth. and Arabic, however, as $s$. I believe that here the Eth. and Arabic approach the phonetic conditions of primitive Semitic most closely. In primitive Semitic $ך$ represented an $s$ which originally was distinct from the $s$ which appears in Hebrew as $ס$; in Eth. and Arabic, however, they became identified, while in Ass., Heb., and Aram. the first $s$-sound came to be pronounced $š$. As for $ש$, it appears in Ass., Eth., and Arabic as $š$—which probably was also its original pronunciation—while in Hebrew it is found as $ש$ and in Aram. as $ס$. In Ass. and Eth. likewise this $š$ in course of time became $s$.” D. H. Müller, loc. cit., 246: “The original Semitic possessed three sibilants, the exact pronunciation of which cannot now
be determined. We will represent them by $\delta$, $s$, and $\delta$ (i.e., $\mathfrak{w}$, $\mathfrak{s}$, $\mathfrak{z}$). Of these three consonants $\delta$ and $s$ stand closer to each other than either does to $\delta$. Cf. also Zimmern, 11; 14 f.; Lindberg, 73 f.

'Cf. Delitzsch, Assyrian Grammar, §46.

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

*Cf. Nöldeke (he is treating of the Palmyrene inscriptions), ZDMG., XXIV (1870), 95: “As far as the sibilants are concerned, we find $\mathfrak{w}$ several times where we should expect to find $\mathfrak{s}$; thus in $\text{יָאָבָד}$, $\text{אָבָד}$ and $\text{לָאָבָד}$. In all these cases Hebrew has $\mathfrak{w}$ and we must read $\mathfrak{s}$. However, I regard this manner of writing only as a reminiscence of an older form of language, because the fact that the specific consonant $\mathfrak{w}$ (differing as well from $\mathfrak{z}$ as from $\mathfrak{s}$) does not occur elsewhere, but, as usual in Aramaic, had become $\mathfrak{s}$, is proved by the use of $\text{נֶאָבָד} in close proximity to $\text{נֶאָבָד}$ and by $\text{הָוָס} ‘to witness,’ which etymologically should also have $\mathfrak{w}$.”

16. The doubling of a consonant in BA, as in Hebrew, is organic in the Pa‘el (Pi‘el); e. g., $\text{נָבָד}$ 2, 6, etc.; and the Hithpa‘al (Hithpa‘el); e. g., $\text{לָבָד}$ 2, 44, etc. This, of course, is a part of general Semitic grammar. The intensified meaning is expressed by an increase of volume within the stem
(Stade, § 154 a; König, II, 379). In Syriac, with regard to doubling in general, it must be remarked that only the Eastern Syrians continued to pay attention to it, while the Western Syrians gave it up at a very early date. The vocalization, however, unmistakably points to the general prevalence of doubling in the earlier stages of Aramaic; in other words, BA is proved to be more primitive than Syriac in this respect.

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

18. Assimilation of vowelless $^3$ takes place in BA as in Hebrew (*GK*, § 19, 2 a):

a) With $^3$ בָּלָל: 4, 22, 30; 5, 21; בָּלָל Ez. 6, 14; בָּלָל Ez. 6, 8. In all other cases the $^3$ is retained, not only before laryngeals, as $^3$ (cf. Heb. יָּבָל) Ez. 5, 16; יָּבָל 5, 2; Ez. 6, 5; יָּבָל 7, 20; יָּבָל (cf. Heb. יָּבָל) 2, 20; but also before other consonants, as בָּלָל (Heb. יָּבָל) Ez. 6, 5, etc.; בָּלָל 6, 24, etc.; בָּלָל Ez. 6, 14; בָּלָל (Heb. יָּבָל) 7, 7, etc.; בָּלָל (cf. Heb. יָּבָל) 2, 16, etc.; בָּלָל 2, 41; בָּלָל 7, 16; בָּלָל 5, 19; בָּלָל (cf. Heb. יָּבָל) 4, 20, etc.; בָּלָל (cf. Heb. יָּבָל) Jer. 10, 11. It will thus be seen that the assimilation of the $^3$ of בָּלָל is rather rare in BA as compared with Hebrew, where the rule is that while the $^3$ remains in the majority of cases before the article (i.e., before the laryngeal יָּבָל) it is otherwise usually assimilated.

b) In verbs $^3$ סָּל (Syr. סָּל) Ez. 5, 15; סָּל Ez. 6, 5; סָּל Ez. 6, 1; $^3$ בָּלָל (Syr. $^3$ בָּלָל) 3, 6, 10, 11; בָּלָל 3, 15; בָּלָל 3, 29; בָּלָל 6, 15; בָּלָל 6, 28; בָּלָל 2, 6, 48; בָּלָל 5, 17; בָּלָל (Syr. סָּל) 4, 11.

19. $^3$ remains unassimilated in BA:

a) As in Hebrew before laryngeals, יָּבָל (cf. Heb. יָּבָל) Joel 4, 11) 5, 20; יָּבָל Heb. יָּבָל 2, 46; יָּבָל 7, 12.
b) In verbs יִשָּׂא Ez. 4, 22; יִנֶּבֶר Ez. 4, 13; יִנֶּבֶר (Sy. יִנַּבְּר) Ez. 4, 5, 2; Ez. 5, 14 (twice); 6, 5; יִנֶּבֶר 5, 3; יִנֶּבֶר (cf. Syr. יִנֶּבֶר) Ez. 4, 13; יִנֶּבֶר Ez. 7, 20.

(c) In roots יִסָּג, יִסַּג (Syr. יִסָּג, Heb. יִסָּג) 2, 46; 3, 19; always in the pronoun יִסָּגו (k, i.e., יִנָּגֶו. Syr. יִנָּג); יִסָּג (Syr. יִסָּג or יִסָּג contracted from יִסָּג) Ez. 7, 20 and יִסָּגו Ez. 5, 17; 6, 1; יִסָּ違反 (Syr. יִסָּ違反, Heb. יִסָּ違反) Ez. 6, 9; 7, 22; יִסָּ違反 (cf. Syr. יִסָּ違反, Heb. יִסָּ違反) Ez. 5, 4, 9 + 5 times.

d) In the following examples: יִסָּ違反 Ez. 5, 4; יִסָּ違反 Ez. 6, 17; יִסָּ違反 (Syr. יִסָּ違反) Ez. 7, 5; יִסָּ違反 (Syr. יִסָּ違反) Ez. 2, 7; יִסָּ違反 Ez. 4, 9. In יִסָּ違反 3, 10, יִסָּ違反 3, 5, 15 and יִסָּ違反 (Syr. יִסָּ違反) Ez. 5, 8; 6, 2, the כ under י represents a Greek or Semitic vowel lost in Aramaic. In יִסָּ違反 3, 5, 10, 15 and יִסָּ違反 3, 7, the כ stands for l as shown by the Greek ψαλτήριον. (On the interchange of n and l cf. Haupt, SBOT., Isaiah, p. 121, l. 48.)

e) As in Hebrew, after the non-formative (separable, representing an originally separate word in proclisis) prefixes ב and ג, in יִסָּ違反 Ez. 6, 14 and יִסָּ違反 7, 6.

20. On the whole, the same principles obtain in Syriac. As first radical, כ is almost always assimilated after a prefix; cf. יִנָּג for יִנָּג, יִנָּג for יִנָּג, etc. As second radical, כ is assimilated in certain nouns, as כ (for כ* cf. Heb. כ Cant. 4, 9 [Lagarde, Übersicht, 175: כ—form fi‘al—to כ—as כ to כ, כ to BA כ, כ to כ, כ to כ, כ to כ]; cf. Margolis, AJSL, XII (1896), 215), כ, etc., as compared with כ, etc. (it is immaterial, as far as Syriac is concerned, whether the syllable was originally closed in early Aramaic, or became closed in Syriac). The כ which is dropped in pronunciation is sometimes retained in writing, e.g., in כ (cf. כ), כ, כ, etc. Similarly, before כ, כ frequently loses its sound, at times even when retained in writing; e.g., כ (cf. Heb. כ), כ (cf. Heb. כ), כ (cf. Heb. כ), כ (cf. Heb. כ);
and אָסָ֣דְו (cf. אָסָ֣דְו), אִּיםְּדֵ֣ה (cf. Heb. אִּיםְּדֵ֣ה), אִּיםְּדֵ֣ה (cf. אִּיםְּדֵ֣ה, Targum, אִּיםְּדֵ֣ה Mesha stone, 2, 8, and elsewhere; see below, § 17).

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

Following are the examples collected from Lidzbarski's glossary:

אָסָ֣דְו (root אָסָ֣דְו; observe that the אָסָ֣דְו is assimilated before אָסָ֣דְו as in Syriac and BA, 145 B, 6; אָסָ֣דְו (root אָסָ֣דְו) Ner. 1, 9; אָסָ֣דְו 113, 14; אָסָ֣דְו, with assimilation always in the Palmyrene Tarif, as אָסָ֣דְו II b, 43; אָסָ֣דְו II a, 31; b, 31 ff.; אָסָ֣דְו II b, 47; אָסָ֣דְו II c, 12; אָסָ֣דְו II b, 16; אָסָ֣דְו II a, 11 ff.; אָסָ֣דְו II c, 44; without assimilation, אָסָ֣דְו 113, 21; אָסָ֣דְו Na. 197, 2, 198, 5, 9; 206, 5; 207, 3; אָסָ֣דְו (root אָסָ֣דְו) Pa., Müller, C, 1; inf. אָסָ֣דְו Had., 10 (twice); אָסָ֣דְו always without assimilation, אָסָ֣דְו Ner. 1, 13; אָסָ֣דְו Ner. 1, 12 (in Hebrew this word is always אָסָ֣דְו in non-pausal forms, cf. Prov. 20, 28, but אָסָ֣דְו when in pause, cf. Deut. 33, 9; GK, § 66, 2 Rem. 1. On אָסָ֣דְו Prov. 2, 8 cf. Haupt, SBOT., p. 35, l. 30: "For the non-assimilation of the אָסָ֣דְו in אָסָ֣דְו cf. the Ass. ẞalf el ušansir [Del., HW., 477 b; Assyr. Gr., § 49b].

In Assyrian antedental אָסָ֣דְו is, as a rule, not assimilated in cases where the assimilation would produce ambiguity; e. g., enzu "goat" in distinction from ֶזֶזו "strong;" enzu "weak" in distinction from ֶזֶזו (ezzu, hadó) "new," etc.); אָסָ֣דְו (root אָסָ֣דְו) Had., 23; 149 BC, 12; Pa., T., II a, 5; b, 20; אָסָ֣דְו Had., 4; and the doubtful case אָסָ֣דְו(א) 138 B, 2; cf. also אָסָ֣דְו 145 D, 1; Na. 197, 3, 6; 198, 5.

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

*See above, § 16.
23. Doubling results in BA, as in Hebrew, from the suppression of נ or יп after a vowelless consonant. Hebrew forms like סנפ Ps. 42, 6, cf. יָהוּדִי Ps. 72, 15, are due to this process. The Hithpe'el of verbs יָע is an example in BA; e. g., יָע 4, 9 is to be explained as being really a Hit'aph'al form, of which no example is extant in roots other than יָע (cf. Noldeke, § 36; contrast Haupt, SBO'T., Ezra, p. 62). The Syriac form יָז (ירא), however, proves that we are dealing with a phonetic principle which existed in Aramaic independently of Hebrew. Talmudic יָבָא, i. e., יָבָא for יָבָא, is another illustration of the same principle; cf. Syriac יָז (ירא). In Arabic יָבָא and similar forms (Wright, I, § 139) the doubling of the consonant compensates for the suppression of a preceding י.

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

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

The examples in BA are יָבָא 3, 2, etc. (=Heb.); יָבָא 2, 10, etc. (Heb. יָבָא); יָבָא 3, 4, etc. (cf. Syr. יָבָא); יָבָא Ez. 6, 18 (cf. Heb. יָבָא); יָבָא 5, 6. The words יָבָא and יָבָא, however, may represent lexical Hebrewms, technical words from the temple liturgy and service; cf. also above, § 20, for another view.

From this older period date the imperfect forms יָבָא 3, 29 and יָבָא 7, 26; cf. in Hebrew regularly the forms of the imperfect of יָבָא.
verbs, the second radical of which is a sibilant; e. g., יָאָבַד (rt. יָאִבַּד); Gk., § 93, 2, Rem. 1 and § 71). Elsewhere (the noun יָאָבַד, which is perhaps an Aramaism [Kautzsch, Aramaismen, 51], excepted) in Hebrew, instead of the doubling of the second radical, the vowel of the prefix is modified in accordance with the usual rules applying to open unaccented syllables immediately preceding the accented syllable, and is treated as permanent even though the accent shifts; hence יָאָבַד, יָאָבַד, יָאָבַד, יָאָבַד. Jer. 17, 9.

Margolits (AJSL., XIX [1903], 168) regards "יָאָבַד and יָאָבַד as parallel forms exactly as are יָאָבַד and יָאָבַד; the permanency of the vowel of the prefix and the 'doubling' of the first radical serve, each in its way, to increase the volume of the biconsonantal basis of the imperfect stem." So also Brokelmann: "Das Streben, diese Formen den dreikonsonantigen anzugleichen, bewirkte in Syr. bei וּוּמַי und וּוּמַי Verdoppelung des 2 Radikals: וּוּמַי, וּוּמַי." (Syr. Gram., § 192). In Syriac the doubling is found in these two verbs only, the other first * verbs following the analogy of first 1 verbs (Nöldeke, § 175). The principle thus belongs clearly to Aramaic in general (cf. also the Christian-Palestinian example referred to by Kautzsch, Aramaismen, 51; the rebuke which Kautzsch administers to Jacob in this work shows that he has here arrived at a clearer conception of the term "Hebraism" so freely used by him in his grammar of BA).

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

25. In BA as in Hebrew the plural of יהָבַד takes dagesh in the י; e. g., יָאָבַד 2, 5; cf. יָאָבַד Ex. 1, 21; יָאָבַד Gen. 42, 19, etc. Kautzsch at first regarded this as a pure Hebraism (GBA., 12 c). His later opinion, however, is that, in view of the fact that Syriac also has יָאָבַד after the vowel (Nöldeke, § 146;
Mand., § 148), the *dagesh* is due to the character of the form. This is the opinion also of Behrmann (commentary, p. 8).

Whatever may be the true explanation of the *dagesh*, the Syriac and Mandaic prove that the form in BA is not a Hebraism. Wright (Comp. Gram., 88) regards the *dagesh* in the מ as d. *lene,* and reads מִבָּטִים; so also does Brockelmann (Syr. Gram., § 123, Anm. 1); the analogy of the singular to which he refers, however, falls to the ground, since the explosive after a diphthong is peculiar to Syriac (late Aramaic) and is not shared by BA; cf. אָדַר Ez. 5, 3. Nöldeke (Merx’s Archiv, I, 456 ff.; Mand., § 148), on the other hand, regards the point as d. *forte* and reads *bātim.* Cf. also König, Lehrgeb., II, 56; Philippi, ZDMG., XLIX (1895), 206.

26. Transposition of consonants takes place in BA as in Hebrew, in the reflexive (BA passive) stems when the מ of the preformative immediately precedes a sibilant.

The examples are: יִֽבְּסָתִים 2, 44; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 5, 9; רֶֽבֶּסָתִים Ez. 4, 15, 19; אֶֽבְּסָתִים 3, 29; אֶֽבְּסָתִים 6, 24; Ez. 6, 2; אֶֽבְּסָתִים 2, 35; 5, 11, 12, 14, 27; 6, 5, 23; יִֽבְּסָתִים 4, 16; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 7, 27; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 3, 19; אֶֽבְּסָתִים 2, 9; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 5, 10; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 7, 28; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 5, 6; and in the ḫı̂ ֶֽבְּסָתִים Ez. 4, 13, 16; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 7, 8. In the *kerē* יֶֽבְּסָתִים 2, 9, and in יֶֽבְּסָתִים 5, 21, there is not only transposition, but the מ is changed to מ and מ respectively in “partial assimilation” to the first radical. (See for the Hebrew, GK., § 54, 2; cf. also Sievers, Phonetics, 1901, § 751.)

27. This, however, is in accordance with regular Semitic usage. Cf. the Syriac, יֶֽבְּסָתִים, יֶֽבְּסָתִים, etc. (Nöldeke, § 26; Brockelmann, § 89). Wright regards יֶֽבְּסָתִים, the Arabic VIII form as a development from this transposition, “which began with the verbs which commenced with a sibilant, and was gradually extended to all alike” (Comp. Gr., 208).

28. In BA syncope of מ sometimes takes place in the Haph’el after the preformative of the imperfect and participle.

Following are the examples: יֶֽבְּסָתִים 7, 2; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 2, 40, 44; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 7, 23; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 7, 7, 19; יֶֽבְּסָתִים 3, 25, 34 (the reading יֶֽבְּסָתִים is preferred by Strack, Kamphausen, Marti); יֶֽבְּסָתִים Ez. 4, 12 (the form is somewhat doubtful; cf. Kautzsch, § 16, 5 Anm.; Fraenkel, ZAW,
XIX (1889), 180; Batten, SBOT, Ezra, p. 62); נְהָזֵב 5, 19; הָשֵׁה 7, 18; יָשֶׂה וּמָעַל 3, 22; לָשֶׂה 4, 9; אַשּׁה 6, 11; אַותָה Ez. 6, 5; בָּשֵׁה 6, 28; בָּשֶׂה 2, 44; לָשֶׂה 5, 8; הָשֶׂה יָשֶׂה 6, 14; לָשֶׂה 2, 44; 4, 14; לָשֶׂה 6, 9; לָשֶׂה 5, 19; לָשֶׂה 5, 5.

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

Haph'el, imperfect: 3d masc. sing., הָשֶׂה 5, 12; הָשֶׂה 2, 25; הָשֶׂה 7, 16; הָשֶׂה 5, 21; 6, 16; הָשֶׂה Ez. 6, 11; הָשֶׂה Ez. 4, 13; 2d masc. sing., הָשֶׂה 2, 24; הָשֶׂה Ez. 4, 15; 7, 16; 1st sing. הָשֶׂה 5, 17; 3d pl. masc., הָשֶׂה 2, 18; הָשֶׂה 2, 30; הָשֶׂה Ez. 6, 5; 2d masc. pl., הָשֶׂה 2, 6; הָשֶׂה 2, 9; הָשֶׂה Ez. 7, 25; הָשֶׂה 2, 5; 9th pl. הָשֶׂה 2, 1; הָשֶׂה 6, 6. Haph'el participle: masc. הָשֶׂה 2, 45; 6, 5; הָשֶׂה 2, 40; הָשֶׂה 2, 15; הָשֶׂה Ez. 4, 15; pl. הָשֶׂה 2, 21; הָשֶׂה 2, 21; הָשֶׂה 2, 21; הָשֶׂה 2, 21; הָשֶׂה Ez. 4, 16; 7, 24; הָשֶׂה Ez. 6, 1; הָשֶׂה Ez. 6, 10.

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

*With syncope of הָשֶׂה, הָשֶׂה Na., 220, 4; 224, 9; הָשֶׂה Na., 197, 6; 199, 6; 206, 4; 214, 5; 217, 6; הָשֶׂה Na., 212, 3; הָשֶׂה Na., 206, 3; הָשֶׂה Pa., Vog. 79, 2; 80, 2; and frequently fem. הָשֶׂה Pa., Vog. 83 a, 2; 6 b, 2; pl. הָשֶׂה Pa., Vog. 93, 1; impf. with suff. הָשֶׂה Pa., T., II, b, 23; הָשֶׂה Na., 197, 2; 198, 5, 9; 206, 5; 207, 3; part. act. הָשֶׂה Pa., T., II, a, 31; 6 b, 31 ff.; part. act. pl. הָשֶׂה ibid., II, b, 47; part. act. הָשֶׂה ibid., II, b, 30; part. pl. st. c. הָשֶׂה ibid., II, a, 1; part. act. fem. s. הָשֶׂה Pa., Noldeke, 6; הָשֶׂה Had., 28; הָשֶׂה Na. 206, 4.

*With הָשֶׂה or הָשֶׂה retained: הָשֶׂה Nerab 1, 11; הָשֶׂה Nerab 2, 9; part. pass. הָשֶׂה Pa., T., II, c, 12; הָשֶׂה Nerab 113, 21.

31. In Hebrew the הָשֶׂה is regularly syncopated in the imperfect and participle. Occasionally, however, the הָשֶׂה is retained in the imperfect, as הָשֶׂה הָשֶׂה for הָשֶׂה, I Sam. 17, 47 (GK, § 53 q). In Syriac, likewise, the הָשֶׂה of the prefix disappears after prefixes in the imperfect, participle, and infinitive (Noldeke, § 164). Similarly, הָשֶׂה disappears in forms of the verb הָשֶׂה (Noldeke, § 183). In Arabic, when הָשֶׂה is used as the preformative of the IV perfect, it is syncopated in the imperfect.
and participle, but, when  ס is used, it is retained and the verb is treated as a quadriliteral. Thus מְרַחֲס, etc. (cf. Wright, I, §118, Rem. b; Comp. Gram., 205; Zimmer, 20; also above, §11).

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

a E.g., מְרַחֲס, Ez. 4, 12 (for מְדַחֲס); מְדַחֲס, 4, 34 (for מְדַחֲס). מְדַחֲס, 4, 16 (for מְדַחֲס); מְדַחֲס, 2, 35 (for מְדַחֲס).

b E.g., מְדַחֲס, Gen. 11, 23 (for מְדַחֲס*); מְדַחֲס, Gen. 31, 39 (for מְדַחֲס), etc. (Stade, §111.)

c E.g., מְדַחֲס, לְיַחֲס for לְיִחֲס; לְיִחֲס for לְיַחֲס; with the  ה omitted in writing: מְדַחֲס, מְדַחֲס, cf. Heb. מְדַחֲס, Job 35, 11 (Nöldeke, §33). Note, however, the practice of the Eastern Syrians (ibid.).

d E.g., מְדַחֲס in מְדַחֲס is certainly more original than מְדַחֲס. On מְדַחֲס, etc., cf. below, §58.

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

a Cf. below, §46, 15.

b So-called virtual doubling, the frequency of which decreases, while the frequency of vowel modification increases, in the order נ, ג, ד, ס, נ. Thus we have virtual doubling with נ always; with נ in eight out of nine cases (contrast נְדַנַּה נְדַנַּה 5, 9 with לְדַנַּה 4, 16, etc.); with ד in seven out of nine cases; with נ in only one (גְּנַּא נְדַנַּה Ez. 4, 14) out of twenty-two cases. No examples with ס are available.

For the Hebrew see GK., §22 c. The tendency in Hebrew is for נ to reject the doubling altogether. On נ cf. GK., §22 g, and particularly ס; add לְדַנַּה, Gen. 14, 10 (for נְדַנַּה*). In Syriac it is questionable how far ס and ג undergo a true
doubling. The vocalization, however, is as though such took place (e. g., יָמַשׁ). The Eastern Syrians very early ceased to double ָי, and in consequence frequently modified a preceding a to ָי (Nöldeke, § 21 A).

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

The examples are found in the perf. of פָעַל verbs (e. g., יָמַשׁ 3, 24, יָמֵשׁ 6, 15 [Arabic ٣٩٣٣ 3, 32]; in the part.-act. Pe’al (e. g., יָמַשׁ 2, 8; cf. Heb. יָמֵשׁ Ps. 94, 9; the corresponding Hebrew form here as in all nouns is to be looked for in the cstr. state with which the cstr. and absol. states in BA coincide, while in the absol. state Hebrew goes its own way in producing pausal forms which BA does not recognize); and in the (perf., imperf., imper., and—differing from the Hebrew—participle active of the) Pa’el, Haph’el (for the corresponding Hebrew forms use the jussive), and Hithpe’el (e. g., יָמַשׁ 4, 11; יָמַשׁ Ez. 4, 15; יָמַשׁ 5, 4; יָמַשׁ 5, 12; יָמַשׁ 3, 30; יָמַשׁ 2, 23; יָמַשׁ Ez. 5, 8; יָמַשׁ 2, 35). The Hithpa’al forms are purposely ignored, as Hithpa’al forms are an anomaly peculiar to Hebrew only (cf. Arabic يَفْتَقَلُ, يَفْتَقِلُ, and Hebrew pausal forms, GK, § 54). In the prefix of the impf. Pe’al (e. g., יָמַשׁ Ez. 6, 8, cf. Heb. יָמַשׁ, Dt. 12, 30) the original vowel is apparently preserved (cf. Arabic يَفْتَقَلُ). Equally to be ignored is the a in the imperf. Pe’al of פָעַל verbs with a laryngeal as third radical (cf. יָמַשׁ 2, 30 [Heb. יָמַשׁ]; יָמֵשׁ Ez. 5, 17 [Heb. יָמֵשׁ]), which as a possibility comes from common Semitic times (cf. Syr. ܢ嗪, Arabic يَفْتَقَلُ, يَفْتَقِلُ, etc.; cf. Vernier, I, § 146, 20; Wright, I, § 91, Rem. a).

In 3. 10 the ָי is, of course, original and not the result of the influence of the laryngeal ָי; cf. Arabic يَفْتَقَلُ (cf. Wright, I, § 92).

35. The same phonetic changes occur in Syriac; cf. perf. of the type פָעַל, מָעַל, etc.; part. יָמַשׁ, יָמַשׁ, מָמַשׁ, יָמַשׁ, corresponding to יָמַשׁ, יָמַשׁ, יָמַשׁ, יָמַשׁ, etc.;APH’el יָמַשׁ, יָמַשׁ, etc., corresponding to יָמַשׁ, etc.
Ethpe'el אַיָּה. There are no traces of the vowel a in the prefix of the impf. Pe'al in Syriac (Brockelmann, § 182'). With regard to the imperf. of מָלַך verbs with a laryngeal as third radical, Syriac agrees with Arabic, rather than with Hebrew and BA, in allowing the vowel u to remain quite frequently (Brockelmann, § 186).

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

a E.g., יָמָה (Heb. יָמָה) 7, 1; מָלַךְ Ez. 5, 15. מָלַךְ is probably only a secondary form מָלַךְ = מָלַךְ; cf. Lagarde, Über-sicht, 184. We eliminate proper names like מָלַךְ 5, 1, etc., which are borrowed from Assyrian.

b E.g., יָמָה 4, 14; מָלַךְ 5, 27 (Heb. יָמָה Is. 40, 15); מָלַךְ 2, 9, hence also with the נ lost in writing מָלַךְ Ez. 5, 11; cf. also מָלַךְ 3, 19 and מָלַךְ 3, 2; מָלַךְ Jer. 10, 11 (Heb. מָלַךְ Jud. 5, 31); מָלַךְ 4, 30 (Heb. מָלַךְ Gen. 49, 27); מָלַךְ 2, 7 (Heb. מָלַךְ Gen. 31, 8). For Hebrew examples in the Niph'al and Hiph'il cf. GK., § 68 i. BA מָלַךְ 2, 14, however, as may be seen from Syriac, מָלַךְ, etc., is to be explained as an analogical formation induced by the נ class.

c E.g., מָלַךְ 2, 14; מָלַךְ 6, 24; מָלַךְ 5, 23; מָלַךְ Ez. 6, 12 (for Hebrew examples cf. GK., §§ 102 d, 104 d). On the other hand, cf. מָלַךְ 4, 12; מָלַךְ 7, 4; מָלַךְ 2, 19; מָלַךְ Ez. 5, 7 for מָלַךְ, מָלַךְ and מָלַךְ. It is incorrect to derive forms like מָלַךְ and the like (as does Kautzsch, § 11, 3 b) from מָלַךְ, etc. The truth is that we are dealing with two sets of forms, those with quiescent נ and those with נ retaining its consonantal force. When once the נ quiesced, the syllable which it closed became opened, and its vowel was treated accordingly (cf. below, § 46). Where נ retained its consonantal force, it is self-evident that forms like מָלַךְ preceded those like מָלַךְ. To say that מָלַךְ comes from מָלַךְ is to say that the נ retains its consonantal force and at the same time quiesces.
37. In the Aramaic inscriptions it is difficult to tell whether the א which is written is also meant to be sounded. Since, however, we find (just in one example) the א omitted (after the prefix א), the inference is legitimate that elsewhere the א is meant to be pronounced.

The examples are: נוֹר. Ner. 2, 10; יִשְׂרָאֵל Hadad 15, 20, 25; יִשְׂרָאֵל (first per. sing.) ibid. 3; יִשְׂרָאֵל Hadad 21; יִשְׂרָאֵל 137 B, 3; inf. יִשְׂרָאֵל Hadad 23; יִשְׂרָאֵל ibid., 34; יִשְׂרָאֵל ibid., 17. 21. 29 (twice); יִשְׂרָאֵל 45 D, 8; יִשְׂרָאֵל Na., 217, 2 (219, 4).

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

Examples: הבנה (Heb. הבנה, Arabic הבנה; הבנה = בִּיִּרְבָּא (on Heb. הבנה, etc., cf. below, § 58); הבנה (observe the phonetic spelling; next step הבנה, etc.); הבנה; הבנה (Brockelmann, §§ 68, 191 b); הבנה (Nöldeke, § 33, who unnecessarily confounds it with הבנה and similar cases).

39. In Arabic likewise the hamzah is subject to quiescence; e. g., for א and for א. Quiescence necessarily takes place after the prefix א as or אמש (i.e., the quiescent א is lost also in writing), etc. The Arab grammarians refer to the loss of the consonantal force of א as "lightening of the hamzah" (קְפֵּס הַהַמַּזָּה: Wright, I, 18 D; cf. Mufassal, 198 ff.). In the dialect of Hijaz in the time of Mohammed the takflf was quite general even when other consonants than א preceded the hamzah (cf. footnote in Wright, I, 72 D; also Nöldeke, Geschichte des Qorans, 1860, 345 ff.).

40. It is thus clear that the loss of the consonantal force of א began in the common Semitic period. Excepting in the dialect of Hijaz, it is rather rare in Arabic; Hebrew comes next with its examples of the quiescent א; then BA; and last of all Syriac, in which, when reference is had to the examples of syncope (cf. above, § 32), the loss of א in sound is the rule. With Syriac go the modern dialects of Arabic (Spitta, § 5; Vollers-Burkitt, §§ 91 ff.).
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41. ṭ and * ̣, when closing a syllable, represent in BA as well as in Hebrew consonantal ụ and ṭ (corresponding to the sonants ụ and ṭ; for the term “consonantal” and “sonant” cf. Brugmann, I, 35; Philippi, “Die Aussprache der semit. Konsonanten ṭ und *,” ZDMG., XL [1886], 639 ff.; Haupt, “Über die beiden Halbvocale ụ and ṭ,” BSS., I [1889], 255–293 ff.; Philippi, “Nochmals die Aussprache d. semit. Konsonanten ṭ und *,” ZDMG., LI [1897], 66 ff.), and coalesce with a homogeneous vowel into the corresponding sonants ŭ and ṭ,* while with a heterogeneous vowel they form a diphthong. The diphthong thus formed may remain uncontracted or be contracted into a monophthong.5

5Eg., ṭāḇrān 2, 20 (Heb. ḇāḇrān Gen. 31, 16; cf. below, § 65); 5̣āḇrān 4, 33 (cf. Heb. ḇāḇrān Gen. 30, 1), etc. No examples for ṭ (cf. Heb. ḇāḇrān Gen. 21, 10, etc.) are found in BA, 5̣āḇrān, ẹ ṭ 2, 6; ṭāḇrān 4, 33; ṭāḇrān 3, 38; ṭāḇrān 2, 34, etc., originating in ṭāḇrān + 1, etc., i. e., initial ṭ was pronounced ṭ.

*We meet with a diphthong always after a (Semitic) long vowel, e. g., ṭāḇrān 3, 28 (cf. Heb. ṭāḇrān I Kings 6, 1), or a long vowel which is the resultant of a Semitic diphthong, e. g., ṭāḇrān 7, 6; and after ọ originating in Semitic i, e. g., ṭāḇrān 4, 24 (cf. Heb. ṭāḇrān Job 16, 12); also after a parasitic ẹ, e. g., ṭāḇrān 5, 17. The vowel a combines into a diphthong with ṭ as well as with * ̣. In Hebrew aū and ai may and may not be contracted when followed by no vowelless consonant, hence ṭāḇrān Job 26, 30 by the side of ṭāḇrān Job 5, 16; ṭāḇrān I Chron. 12, 2 by the side of ṭāḇrān Ezek. 21, 21. The contraction, however, is uniformly avoided in Hebrew (as in BA and Syriac, and also in modern Arabic) when the ụ or ṭ is doubled, e. g., ṭāḇrān Gen. 2, 7 (hence also in ṭāḇrān for ṭāḇrān; Sievers, I, 296, footnote), etc. While ụ is the correct form for the absolute state, ṭāḇrān Gen. 3, 22 is a (semi-) pausal and ṭāḇrān Lev. 25, 36 is a construct state (not in the sense of G.K., § 76 ṭ, but in that given to the term by Margolis, AJSL., XIX [1902], 169). ṭāḇrān II Sam. 22, 21 = 2 ṭāḇrān (Wright, I, § 317) is prevented from becoming ṭāḇrān* by the impetus of the original doubling, or, as it may be said in the usual parlance of our grammars, the * is virtually doubled; contrast ṭāḇrān Gen. 24, 30 = ṭāḇrān. Cf. BA ṭāḇrān 4, 15, contrast ƙāḇ (with otiose ƙ) ẹstr. state 3, 25; ƙāḇ Nöldeke, § 102; cf. Spitta, § 17 b). When fol-
lowed by a vowelless consonant, hence when in a doubly closed syllable (GK., § 26 d), contraction is the rule if the loss of the (Semitic) vowel following the closing consonant occurs in the middle of a word (the construct state properly not counting as a separate word), as in

Is. 58, 3, 3
Num. 18, 31, 31 (estr. state) Gen. 25, 11, 11 (estr. state) ibid., 12, 15. If, on the other hand, the loss of the vowel occurs in pause (Vernier, I, § 126)—hence in the absolute state (cf. Margolis, AJS, XII [1896], 208)—the proper Hebrew method requires an uncontracted diphthong, which is made possible by the insertion of a parasitic vowel; hence ḫn. Deut. 19, 6, Ez. 12, 30, 30
Is. 28, 3 = maýt, baít, raglaím, = maýt-a (accus.), baít-a (accus.), ragl-aí-mi (or -ma, cf. the dialectal form -aí-na, Wright, I, 235 n.). Contracted forms in the absolute state, e.g., לָבָז II Sam. 12, 6, do not violate the principle just stated, as in such cases the construct state has been made to do service for the absolute (as is the case in Aramaic always—an “Aramaism” in Hebrew). In BA no example is available of uncontracted ay. When not followed by a vowelless consonant the diphthong ay appears uncontracted more frequently in BA than in Hebrew, e.g., כְּכִב 3, 29; כֶּכִב 2, 41, כְּכִב 5, 13, etc.; but cf. כְּכִב 2, 23: כְּכִב 3, 24; כְּכִב 7, 8, כְּכִב Ez. 5, 14, etc. When followed by a vowelless consonant not in pause, contraction is the rule as in Hebrew, e.g., כְּכִב 5, 30; כְּכִב (estr. state) 4, 8; כְּכִב (estr. state) 4, 27; כְּכִב 4, 1, etc. In pause, we find on the one hand, as in Hebrew. כְּכִב 3, 20 כְּכִב 2, 35; כְּכִב 7, 4, כְּכִב 7, 7 (cf., however, כְּכִב Ez. 4, 12 [plural of the participle = *bínaí-in]; Kautzsch, § 47 g, e rightly compares the Heb. plurals כְּכִב and כְּכִב, to which add the traditional כְּכִב, in the texts כְּכִב); on the other, כְּכִב (absol. st.) Ez. 6, 9, that is, the constr. state replaces the proper absolute state form. Philippi, ZDMG., LI (1897), 83, n. 3, neglects to account for כְּכִב, כְּכִב, etc. The – in the examples just referred to is correctly explained by Brockelmann, ZDMG., 58 (1904), 523, against Foote, J. H. U. Circulars, No. 163, June, 1903, 70 ff., who looks upon the point as an equivalent to כְּכִב. The forms of the Kethibh כְּכִב (k כְּכִב) 2, 4, etc., are to be read accordingly כְּכִב, etc. The contraction is analogous to Heb. כְּכִב Gen. 37, 17 by the side of כְּכִב ibid. The loss of the final vowel in כְּכִב occurred, however, in late Aramaic.

42. In Syriac we meet with the same phenomenon.

E.g., כְּכִב for כְּכִב, כְּכִב, written also כְּכִב, hence כְּכִב. With
regard to ay and ai, Syriac presents the contraction in doubly closed syllables, no account being taken of pause (i.e., the estr. state (sing.) is used also for the absolute), e.g., ــد، ــد، ــد، ــد، ــد، etc. In the middle of a word, when followed by no vowelless consonant, the diphthong remains uncontracted, e.g., ــد، ــد، etc., although here likewise the contraction occurs in Eastern Syriac and in Mandaic, not, however, to the exclusion of the uncontracted diphthongs (cf. Nöldeke, § 49 A; Mand., 21 f., 258, 246 f.; note the fluctuating orthography ــ and ــ and cf. for the principle of orthography, p. 7).

is correctly interpreted by Nöldeke (§ 49 A) as a late form in Syriac; Likewise were probably late; However, however, is on a line with BA ــ k. In ــ, however, Syriac goes its own way. The form is due probably to analogy with ــ, etc. (so correctly Philippi, loc. cit.).

43. In modern Arabic the contraction of the diphthongs ay and ai into อ and อ is the rule in some regions, e.g., ــ, ــ, ــ, ــ, etc., although examples occur with the diphthongs kept uncontracted (Spitta, § 17).

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

**גֵּרָה** (k) 4, 13, 14 (גֵּרָה k), cf. Heb. ــ Is. 8, 1; ــ 4, 2 (contrast Syriac ــ mirage PS, col. 1047; Baer, 1868, 573, incorrectly introduces the Aramaic ــ for Heb. ــ); ــ 4, 22, 29, ــ 5, 21 (contrast ــ 2, 11); ــ Ez. 6, 2, cf. Heb. ــ Josh. 4, 7, and contrast ــ Ez. 4, 15; ــ 4, 9, 18, cf. Heb. ــ Gen. 45, 23; II Chron. 11, 23 (Dillmann, II, 409 regards ץ in Genesis as a gloss and the word as an Aramaic loan-word; it is frequent in Mishnaic Hebrew; cf. also below, § 45, n. 12); ــ 7, 18, etc., cf. Heb. ــ Gen. 14, 18; ــ 2, 30; ــ 7, 28; ــ 2, 29; ــ 5, 10; ــ 4, 16; 5, 6; cf. Heb. ــ Ecc. 1, 17 (an Aramaic loan-word; Kautzsch, Aramaismen, 82 f., contrasts ــ); ــ 3, 2, etc., cf. Heb. ــ Ecc. 8, 4 (Aramaic loan-word, Kautzsch, loc. cit., 88 ff.; contrast ــ 7, 27); ــ 5, 27 cf. Heb. ــ Is. 40, 15 (from original ma'zin cf. above, § 36, a). Doubtful cases have been omitted.
45. There is no reason, however, to speak of this as a Hebraism. According to Lagarde (Mittheil., I, § 80; Übersicht, 84, footnote **, 199, 200), Syriac *ת_dual-\(\text{Heb. } yᮥ\text{); persuasion, Isa. 8, 1* (Heb. *ת_dual-\(\text{II Sam. 7, 17*; *ת_dual-\(\text{Sir. 13, 11 c}^*\) are loan-words from the Hebrew, recognized by the Hebrew \(\text{Hebrew}_{\text{Hebrew}}\) and \(\text{Hebrew}_{\text{Hebrew}}\), which are said to be Aramaic loan-words, were Hebraized in pronunciation after the Aramaic word had been introduced into the Hebrew. The fact, however, that we meet with \(\text{Hebrew}_{\text{Hebrew}}\) Na., 163 A; 169, 1; 338; \(\text{Hebrew}_{\text{Hebrew}}\) Na., 196, 5, and other examples in Christian Palestinian (ZDMG., XXII [1868], 474), Samaritan (Barth, § 194 c), Syriac, and Mandaic in words which are not loan-words (Nöldeke, Mand., § 21) indicates that in a definite area shared both by Hebrew and certain Aramaic dialects Semitic \(\text{Hebrew}^{\text{Hebrew}}\) was sounded as \(\text{Hebrew}^{\text{Hebrew}}\) (so Barth, loc. cit.).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARABIC VOWEL</th>
<th>CLOSED</th>
<th>OPEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaccented</td>
<td>Accented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through Doubling</td>
<td>By Simple Consonant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>u/o</em></td>
<td>(\vphantom{\text{Hebrew}}_{\text{Hebrew}}) (\text{Hebrew}^{\text{Hebrew}})</td>
<td>(\text{Hebrew}^{\text{Hebrew}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>i/e</em></td>
<td>(\text{Hebrew}^{\text{Hebrew}})</td>
<td>(\text{Hebrew}^{\text{Hebrew}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>a</em></td>
<td>(\text{Hebrew}^{\text{Hebrew}})</td>
<td>(\text{Hebrew}^{\text{Hebrew}})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The table, enlarged so as to include Aramaic, follows the table prepared for Hebrew by Margolis and printed AJSL., XIX (1908), 191; consult the footnotes (on the
The doubling may be organic, or artificial to preserve an exceptional vowel.

E. g., התי 6, 17; מִּתֵּן Ez. 4, 12; הָיְתָה 3, 29; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 3, 4; הָיְתָה 3, 31; מִּתֵּן 6, 24. Cf., however, מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 2, 38 and מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 7, 19. Cf. Hebrew מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Deut. 4, 5; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Gen. 37, 7; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Jud. 6, 28; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Ruth 2, 11; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Lev. 13, 34. On the other hand, מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Zeph. 2, 9; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Is. 19, 17; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Ex. 15, 2; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Ps. 21, 2; (by the side of מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Ps. 66, 3); מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Ps. 67, 2 (by the side of מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Is. 27, 11); מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Prov. 14, 10; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Na. 3, 7 (by the side of מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Jer. 4, 20); מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Ps. 72, 20 (cf. מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Gen. 2, 1); מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Ezek. 16, 4. Cf. in Syriac such examples as מִּתְּפֶּשׁ (Nöldeke, § 104), מִּתְּפֶּשׁ (§ 121), מִּתְּפֶּשׁ (§ 104).

E. g., מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 5, 20; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 4, 33; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 6, 20; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 4, 12; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 2, 37; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 5, 23; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 5, 11; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 5, 11; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 2, 20; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 2, 10. Cf., however, מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Ez. 5, 8; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 3, 8; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ 3, 12 (in the last two cases the כ is due to the following labial). Cf. Hebrew מִּתְּפֶּשׁ I Sam. 20, 2; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Jud. 9, 10; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Lev. 5, 23; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Lev. 6, 15; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Lev. 6, 15; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Gen. 4, 8. On the other hand, מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Lev. 2, 2; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Lev. 19, 9; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ II Sam. 20, 21; מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Gen. 18, 13 (by the side of מִּתְּפֶּשׁ Ruth 3, 12). Cf. such Syriac forms as מִּתְּפֶּשׁ, מִּתְּפֶּשׁ, מִּתְּפֶּשׁ, etc. (Nöldeke, § 103); מִּתְּפֶּשׁ (§ 104) but also מִּתְּפֶּשׁ = kol (§ 48).

E. g., בִּלְפַל 6, 8; בִּלְפַל 6, 8; בִּלְפַל 7, 5; בִּלְפַל 4, 34; בִּלְפַל 2, 10; בִּלְפַל 2, 40 shows that it matters not whether the syllable be closed with a simple or double consonant. Cf. Hebrew בִּלְפַל Gen. 2, 5; בִּלְפַל Gen. 32, 11; בִּלְפַל Lev. 10, 6; בִּלְפַל Is. 10, 2. Cf. Syriac בִּלְפַל (§ 104); בִּלְפַל (§ 103); בִּלְפַל (§ 160). Cf., however, בִּלְפַל 3, 6; בִּלְפַל 6, 9; בִּלְפַל 4, 24; בִּלְפַל 4, 30; בִּלְפַל 7, 23; בִּלְפַל 3, 29 and contrast Syriac בִּלְפַל (Nöldeke, § 48, is uncertain as to the value of the כ; cf. also Brockelmann, § 46).

E. g., התי 2, 25; התי 2, 9; התי 3, 6; התי 4, 14; התי 2, 34; התי Ez. 5, 11; התי Ez. 5, 4; התי 2, 11; התי 4, 9; התי 2, 5; התי 3, 7. Cf., however, התי 7, 11. Cf. Hebrew התי Gen.
Powell.—Hebraisms in Biblical Aramaic.

20, 12; Gen. 43, 14; Ps. 91, 4; I Sam. 16, 15; Gen. 18, 28; Jud. 16, 26; Jos. 4, 14. But cf. Gen. 12, 19; Is. 1, 24 but Gen. 19, 20; Ezek. 14, 3, etc. In Syriac is invariably used before doubling.

There is in BA, as little as in Hebrew, a fixed rule as to when to use and to represent an Arabic in an unaccented closed syllable. Thus in BA 3, 22 (Völ.), cf. Heb. הָבוּ, i. e., Si. 16, 11, the form inferred from Zech. 12, 4, cf. AJSIL., XII (1896), 215) הָבוּ 2, 11 (Völ.), cf. Heb. 24; הָבוּ 2, 10 (= ka-din-a); 3, 6; הָבוּ 4, 2; 2, 18; Ez. 6, 4; 5, 14; 3, 6; 2, 39; 2, 16; 3, 15; but 2, 9; (Heb.) is a by-form of יָאוֹס [from which יָאֵוָס], of which is [from which Gen. 1, 9] is an intensive [nominal] form; just as Ex. 22, 1 is the intensive of Ex. 21, 16; another by-form of is Na. 1, 10; 5, 5; Ez. 5, 8; 2, 13; Ez. 7, 21; Ez. 4, 19; Ez. 7, 20. , however, seems to be the rule, and the exception.

Before and after the gutturals, , , , , is more common, but there are examples with , the fluctuation being greatest in the case of : 4, 23; 2, 21; Ez. 4, 15; 7, 16; 5, 17; 4, 16; but 4, 18; 2, 9; 6, 8; 7, 15; 7, 8; 3, 19— Ez. 6, 2, 13; 3, 19; Ez. 6, 2, 35; Ez. 6, 9; Ez. 6, 18; Ez. 4, 22; Ez. 7, 14; Ez. 5, 20; but 4, 30; 7, 5. The same obtains in Hebrew, i. e., with ordinary consonants is the rule, although will be found occasionally, as (the forms marked with are isolated examples standing for themselves only, while the others represent types) Ex. 3, 15; Deut. 5, 25; Ps. 110, 4 (cf. below, § 59); I Ki. 13, 1; Gen. 24, 59; II Ki. 18, 22; Deut. 17, 14; Prov. 2, 1; Deut. 13, 18; Job 34, 15; Mal. 3, 22; Is. 1, 17; Ex. 31, 13; Ezek.
28, 23; "םלמאו" Eze. 11, 44; but "םל" Is. 48, 17; "םי" Gen. 9, 2; "םלמאו" Ex. 3, 22; "םל" Deut. 32, 10; "םל" Gen. 4, 1; "םלמאו" Ps. 63, 6; "םל" Ps. 38, 11; "םל" Gen. 21, 23; I Kings 2, 8. Before and after א, ה, ט, י are more common, although there are examples with י, which in certain types is the rule: יִבָּא יִבָּא Gen. 14, 10; יִבָּא I Sam. 17, 30; יִבָּא Lev. 19, 34; יִבָּא Ps. 75, 3; יִבָּא Is. 18, 4; יִבָּא Prov. 30, 9; יִבָּא Ps. 50, 13; יִבָּא II Chron. 20, 35; but יִבָּא Job 20, 29; יִבָּא Is. 3, 10; יִבָּא Prov. 10, 3; יִבָּא Ex. 23, 3; יִבָּא Lev. 19, 19; יִבָּא and יִבָּא and their like; יִבָּא Num. 25, 5; so always in the prefix יִבָּא. Ps. 68, 31; יִבָּא Num. 18, 27; יִבָּא Ex. 16, 18; יִבָּא Hab. 1, 16; but יִבָּא Prov. 1, 11; יִבָּא Gen. 24, 13; יִבָּא Is. 2, 22; יִבָּא Ecc. 5, 8; יִבָּא Ex. 16, 18; יִבָּא Ex. 18, 4; but יִבָּא Ex. 5, 18; יִבָּא Gen. 31, 31. Note יִבָּא Deut. 4, 36, but יִבָּא Amos 7, 1. In Syriac nothing but יִבָּא is found.

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

In Hebrew יִבָּא is not found in an open accented syllable and very rarely in a closed accented syllable in pause (the absolute state of nouns being regarded as a semi-pausal form).

E. g., יִבָּא 7, 10; יִבָּא 6, 1; יִבָּא 4, 26; יִבָּא 5, 2; יִבָּא Ez. 7, 19; יִבָּא 4, 13, etc.; יִבָּא 6, 3; יִבָּא 2, 47. In Hebrew יִבָּא is the rule in pausal verbal forms and in the absolute state of nouns in
the singular. \( \frac{v}{v} \) in the place of \( \frac{v}{v} \) is found occasionally both in BA and Hebrew, especially before \( \frac{v}{v} \), e.g., \( \text{יִכְּרָא} 2, 33, \) Heb. \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \). Deut. 33, 25. \( \frac{v}{v} \) is retained in BA in the accented closed syllable in forms like \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 6, 21 \); \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 6, 22 \); \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 7, 25 \), etc. No example is available in Hebrew. According to Nöldeke (§47) a short \( e \) may have been lengthened by the tone in Syriac in final syllables, so perhaps in \( \text{סְמַקָּה} \), in which words the Eastern Syrians represent the second vowel by \( \frac{v}{v} \). The lengthening is nevertheless uncertain, nor do we know whether it was general. Cf. also Wright, Comp. Gr., 84; Zimmerm, §21.

9 E. g., \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 6, 1 \); \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Ez. 7, 13, etc. Cf. Hebrew \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Micah 6, 5, etc. \( \text{אִיִּבְּרֶש} \) (Nöldeke, §102), etc.

10 E. g., \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Ez. 5, 15, etc. Cf. Hebrew \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) I Ki. 2, 38., etc. Cf. Syriac \( \text{אִיִּבְּרֶש} \) (Nöldeke, §94).

11 Here BA and Hebrew separate. In BA \( \frac{v}{v} \) remains (\( \frac{v}{v} \) occurs occasionally in pause, as \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Ez. 4, 18; \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Ez. 4, 23; \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Ez. 4, 17), e. g., \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 4, 28 \); \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 2, 17 \), etc., while in Hebrew \( \frac{v}{v} \) is the rule in pausal forms and in the absolute singular of nouns, e. g., \( \text{אֲבָרְיָא} \) Ps. 78, 23; \( \text{אָרָי} \) Gen. 6, 12, etc.

12 The column "near" exists really only for the Hebrew, since it is a peculiarity of Aramaic that it treats "near" syllables as "distant," so much so that similar treatment in Hebrew is spoken of as an Aramaism (cf. below, §60). Nevertheless, there are certain types of forms in BA which retain the vowel in an open unaccented syllable immediately before the accent, e. g., \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) forms, which Barth (§92) regards as developed from the \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) infinitive in accordance with his law of compensation, as \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 2, 14 \). The \( \frac{v}{v} \) becomes then stationary even in "distant" syllables; hence \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 4, 14 \); \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 7, 11 \); \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 5, 23 \); \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 5, 2 \); (\( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 4, 14 \); \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 4, 24 \) in an unaccented closed syllable with metheg). In Hebrew these forms often retain the \( \frac{v}{v} \), though the accent be shifted, as \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Deut. 22, 3; \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) II Sam. 2, 13; \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Is. 26, 19. No examples are available in Syriac. Other cases are also to be accounted for; firstly, \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} 4, 9 \) (cf. Heb. \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) cf. above, §45). Similar forms are found in O. T. Hebrew mostly from verbs \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \), e. g., \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) I Ki. 10, 17 (from \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \)); cstr. st. \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Is. 22, 8 (from \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \)); \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Dan. 11, 38 (from \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \)); while \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) cf. Arabic \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \) Sura 12, 33, really comes from \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \), the Masora seems to derive it from \( \text{יֵכְּרָא} \). See GK., §85). In Syriac we have
(cf. Heb. הָבָלָּה; מַחֲלָא) regarded by Noldeke (§ 126 G) as borrowed from the Assyrian (מַחֲלָא, e. g., ma-ḥa-ze rabûti, Shalm. Obel. 81); Hebrew ַּֽאֱ֒יִּ֔רְּס is likewise a loan-word, and the Syriac word is probably borrowed from the Hebrew and only indirectly from the Assyrian. Although not in O. T. Hebrew, is found in Sirach 31, 8. Noldeke, ZAW., XXII (1902), 84, doubts the genuineness of the word; LXX has χρωσίαν; it is very frequent in Mishnaic Hebrew, e. g., Sanhedrin 1, 1). The word occurs also in the N. T. (Mt. 6; 24; 16, 9. 11. 13); while the uncial MSS. all have μαμων, the other spelling (with one μ) is attested by versions and patristic citations. מַחֲלָא would be parallel to מַחֲלָא, just as Syr. ְָאָא (part. of Aph'el) is parallel to Hebrew ַּֽאֱ֒יִּ֔רְּס (see Nestle, EB., col. 2914, § 3; cf. also Lagarde, Übersicht, 185). Noldeke (Mand. 130, n. 4) is inclined to regard ma- as a very ancient form of the prefix; but his grounds are insufficient. מַחֲלָא and its like are rather Hebrew loan-words in Aramaic, and the Hebrew מַחֲלָא is retained as stationary (cf., on the other hand, מַחֲלָא 4, 22). The other cases are the Hap'el forms מְהָלִּי 5, 21; 6, 16 (contrast מְהָלִּי 2, 44); מְהָלִּי 2, 21; מְהָלִּי 5, 9; and מְהָלִי 2, 44. Baer (Dan., p. xxxvi) derives מְהָלִּי from the root הָלִּי; Kautzsch, though deriving it correctly from הָלִּי, is doubtful as to the certainty of the derivation. It may be questioned, however, whether these are examples of the so-called "lengthening" of a vowel before the tone as in Hebrew, or whether the "lengthening" is not an attempt to increase the volume of the biconsonantal (so-called מַחֲלָא) stem, just as doubling increases the volume of the biconsonantal (so-called מַחֲלָא) stem in מְחָלִּי and מְחָלִּי. These forms would then be parallel, as מְחָלִּי and מְחָלִּי are parallel. In the treatment of verbs מַחֲלָא the Syriac is not always uniform; in some verbs the first radical is doubled after the preformative, e. g., מַחֲלָא, מַחֲלָא, etc., while in others the syllable remains open, e. g., מַחֲלָא, מַחֲלָא, etc. The general principle in Syriac is that short vowels in open syllables are reduced, but before a consonant originally doubled the short vowel remains even when the doubling is lost and the syllable becomes opened. Occasionally the lost doubling is compensated for in pronunciation by lengthening the vowel. The Eastern Syrians also lengthen short vowels when they remain by way of exception in open syllables, e. g., מַחֲלָא for מַחֲלָא (see Noldeke, §§ 117 D, and 42).

13 E. g., מְחָלִּי 7, 4 (cf. Arab. מְַחָלִּי); מְחָלִּי 2, 18 (cf. Arab. מְחָלִּי); מְחָלִּי 5, 11 (cf. Hebrew מְחָלִּי 27; Jer. 31, 26 (25); מְחָלִּי 5, 1 cf. Heb. מְחָלִּי Job 39, 5). In Hebrew: מְחָלִּי Job 14, 5; מְחָלִּי 7, 4 (cf. Arab. מְַחָלִּי); מְחָלִּי 2, 18 (cf. Arab. מְחָלִּי); מְחָלִּי 5, 11 (cf. Hebrew מְחָלִּי 27; Jer. 31, 26 (25); מְחָלִּי 5, 1 cf. Heb. מְחָלִּי Job 39, 5).
Gen. 1, 1; I Ki. 5, 4 (sing. א"ל); Deut. 8, 9. In Syriac we meet with א"ל, א"ד, א"מ, א"נ (Nöldeke, § 34); the vowels very probably correspond to the א"נ in BA and Hebrew.

E. g., ב"ל Ez. 7, 22 (Arabic ב"ל); Ez. 4, 17 (Arabic ס"ל). In Hebrew: ס"ל Gen. 37, 14, etc. Syriac: ס"ל, etc.

E. g., מ"ל 4, 2; מ"ל 2, 10; מ"ל 7, 5; מ"ל 2, 29; מ"ל Ez. 4, 8; מ"ל 5, 13; מ"ל 4, 24; מ"ל Ez. 6, 5; מ"ל Ez. 7, 18; מ"ל 2, 19. In Hebrew: מ"ל Jer. 2, 3; מ"ל Prov. 30, 12; מ"ל Gen. 31, 14; מ"ל Ezek. 25, 3; מ"ל Ex. 10, 17; מ"ל Deut. 8, 12; מ"ל Gen. 29, 2; מ"ל Ezek. 39, 7. In Syriac ס"ל, ס"ל, ס"ל, ס"ל, ס"ל, ס"ל, etc., prove earlier ס"ל, ס"ל, ס"ל, etc.

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

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

*See Driver, Tenses, 7 ff.

48. Since the Syriac does not show the development of internal passives, at least not to the same extent as Hebrew, but uses regularly instead the reflexives with the prefixed ס"ל, it has been claimed that the Hoph'āl forms occurring in BA are due to Hebrew influence (Luzzatto, § 43; Kautzsch, § 34, and contrast § 45, 1, e; Blake, JAOS., XXII [1901], 46; Duval, REJ., VIII [1884], 58; on the other side are found Noldeke, GGA, 1867, No. 45, p. 1784; 1884, No. 26, p. 1015; Bevan, 37, note; Behrmann, p. vii).
By the term Hoph'al we mean the internal passive of the Haph'el, corresponding to the Arabic IV. and to the Hebrew Hiph'il. The forms found in BA are as follows: ֹמ ֹה 5, 20; ֹף 3, 4, 33; ֹב 7, 11; ֹמ ֹתי 4, 33; ֹמ ֹתי 7, 4; ֹי 5, 18; ֹי 5, 15; ֹף 6, 24; ֹי 3, 13, and the participle ֹמ ֹה 2 A, 45; 6, 5.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th><em>Early Aramaic</em></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>Syriac</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perf.</td>
<td>נָתָל</td>
<td>נָתָל</td>
<td>נָתָל</td>
<td>נָתָל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impf.</td>
<td>יָכְלָל</td>
<td>יָכְלָל</td>
<td>יָכְלָל</td>
<td>יָכְלָל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV or Hap'el Stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th><em>Early Aramaic</em></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>Syriac</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perf.</td>
<td>אֵכָל</td>
<td>אֵכָל</td>
<td>אֵכָל</td>
<td>אֵכָל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impf.</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**for** יָכָל

### IV Passive or Hoph'al

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th><em>Early Aramaic</em></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>Syriac</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perf.</td>
<td>אֶזַּל</td>
<td>אֶזַּל</td>
<td>אֶזַּל</td>
<td>אֶזַּל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impf.</td>
<td>יַכָּל</td>
<td>יַכָּל</td>
<td>יַכָּל</td>
<td>יַכָּל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part.</td>
<td>מַכֶּל</td>
<td>מַכֶּל</td>
<td>מַכֶּל</td>
<td>מַכֶּל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

(2) Sachau, *loc. cit.* although probably right in considering the Palmyrene forms adduced there as passives, errs in their vocalization. He is misled by Arabic يָכְלָל, מַכֶּל, and Hebrew יָכָל, מַכֶּל. In these forms, however, the א represent the vowel of the prefix which remained, while the vowel following the syncopated י (cf. above, § 28) was dropped. That vowel was א, as may be proved from the analogy of the passive of the II (Aram. Pa’el). Thus we have יָכְלָל, מַכֶּל, cf. Syr. מַכֶּל (Nöldeke, § 165). Hence, the impf. passive of the Pa’el had the form מַכֶּל (active יָכָל). Its perf. was originally מַכֶּל and later (through the influence of the impf.) it became מַכֶּל.
In the same manner, from the part. caus. pass. we are able to reconstruct the imperf., from בָּדָאִים ("Nöld., loc. cit.")—בָּדָאִים. On the subject of internal passives in the Semitic languages and their gradual disappearance, cf. Noldeke, Mand., § 162; Wright, Comp. Gr., 226, 253; König, Lehrgeb., II, 384 f.; Vollers-Burkitt, § 42.

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

Wright explains בָּדָאֵים on the analogy of the Arabic III. בָּדָאֵים; א being ָ. This form “is in general use in Arabic only, but examples occur in Ethiopic, too . . . . The inflexion runs entirely parallel to that of the intensive form . . . .” (Comp. Gr., pp. 202 f.).

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

In these forms, as in בָּדָאֵים, the א represents an original או, and not א, as Wright has it. The true character of the forms was recognized, as far back as 1876, by Noldeke who says (ZDMG., XXIX
51. Verbal forms in BA which agree with Hebrew are 

4, 34, and הָעַיִּים 5, 23. Kautzsch (§ 45, 6) regards these as Hebraized forms, and Bevan (p. 97) says that the forms "are, of course, borrowed from the Hebrew; the verb וִיהוּדִי 'to exalt' occurs again in the Targums and in Christian Palestinian, which shows that it had really passed into common use." Kautzsch, however, classifies the forms correctly, calling them "Pa'lel and Hithpa'lel" (Hithpa'lal?) respectively. Stade (Heb. Gram., § 155, c) likewise correctly explains such forms in Hebrew by placing נָרַי forms by the side of בָּעַי י and רָעַי; but he then claims that the 5 represents א (similarly GK., § 72, 7), thus being guilty of a contradiction, for יָנִיא, יָנַי; i. e., יָנֵי * , יָנָא * are clearly פָּרְעֲל forms, while קַמְיָמ(a) , i. e., K'am-am(a) would have to be designated as a יָמָל form—which, of course, is an impossibility. In a footnote, Stade says that the Syrian ָא in these forms is probably a resolution of א. Syrian ָא is rather the original, which in BA and Hebrew in accordance with rule becomes contracted into א.

Similar forms appear in Syriac, as אֶּאָמ "to chew the cud, to meditate," אֶּאָמ "to be amazed," אֶּאָמ "to break in pieces," אֶּאָמ "to be crumbled in pieces," אֶּאָמ with similar meanings, and אֶּאָמ "to be amazed" (from אָמ; Nöldeke, § 180). In Arabic there is a form מָלְו in verbs middle and in which the second radical always becomes מ. Thus מָלְו from מָלְו כֶּנִּיתֶא . דּוֹמְמָּה מָלְו א. Wright says that "the rare substantive forms מָלְו from מָלְו 'to be chief or ruler,' and מָלְו from מָלְּוָא 'to desire the male of a camel;'" certain cognate forms; "and the analogy of the Aramaic verbal
form אֶ-יָסָמִים (as אֶ-יָסָמִים, אֶ-יָסָמִים, etc.) and the Hebrew אֶ-יָסָמִים (as אֶ-יָסָמִים, אֶ-יָסָמִים, etc.) all combine to prove that אֶ-יָסָמִים comes directly from a quadriliteral אֶ-יָסָמִים (Arab. Gram., I, 120 D; Comp. Gram., 203 f.).

These forms are all analogous:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Syriac</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אֶ-יָסָמִים</td>
<td>אֶ-יָסָמִים</td>
<td>אֶ-יָסָמִים</td>
<td>אֶ-יָסָמִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶ-יָסָמִים</td>
<td>אֶ-יָסָמִים</td>
<td>אֶ-יָסָמִים</td>
<td>אֶ-יָסָמִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

אֶ-יָסָמִים 2, 34; 6. 18; Ez. 5, 8; 6, 4; אֶ-יָסָמִים 7, 10; אֶ-יָסָמִים 3, 4. 20; אֶ-יָסָמִים 7, 1; אֶ-יָסָמִים Ez. 6, 14; אֶ-יָסָמִים 2. 10. 37; 4, 34; 7, 1; Ez. 5, 11. 12; 6, 12. 14; 7, 11. 12; אֶ-יָסָמִים 6, 11; אֶ-יָסָמִים 3, 5. 7. 10. 12. 14. 18; אֶ-יָסָמִים 2, 35; אֶ-יָסָמִים 7. 8. Cf. also the following, אֶ-יָסָמִים 2, 45; אֶ-יָסָמִים 2, 34; אֶ-יָסָמִים Ez. 4, 10. 11; 7, 12 parallel to אֶ-יָסָמִים Ez. 4, 17; אֶ-יָסָמִים Ez. 4, 11. 23, 5, 6; 7, 11; אֶ-יָסָמִים 2, 25; אֶ-יָסָמִים 5, 27; (cf. also perf. 3 f. s. אֶ-יָסָמִים 5, 11. 12. 14; 6. 5. 23).

It is necessary for us to know something of the origin of “segolate” forms in order to decide whether they are common to several of the Semitic languages, and also whether they are to be classified on statistic grounds or on grounds of internal grammatical growth. (The term “segolate” is usually restricted to nouns, but it may be applied likewise to verbal formations.) A “segolate” noun may be defined as a noun with a vowel between the first and second radicals of the basic forms, and none between the second and third; i. e., it is of
the form cvcc—. When we speak of “segolates,” we refer to Semitic nouns, and not to Hebrew or Aramaic formations, because the absence of a vowel between the second and third radicals in Aramaic is no guarantee of its absence in Semitic times. (Thus ܪܝܦܐ ܕܢܐ 4, 24 could not be determined to be a non-“segolate” without the aid of Hebrew ܪܝܦܐ.) Hence, if we had only Aramaic, we should not know in any given case whether we had “segolate” formations or not. We determine Aramaic “segolates,” therefore, by the aid of Hebrew or Arabic.

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

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

The form יִנֵה in Hebrew is the construct state of “segolates.” It presupposes יִנֵה, which is not found in Hebrew, but is a legitimate form in Syriac, produced by reading with
see Nöldeke, §§ 17, 34, 52 C; Brockelmann, § 12). Hence for their existence in BA no Hebrew influence whatever need be assumed.

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

The following table of forms will illustrate the development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marheṭana</th>
<th>Mehaggiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>◌תלמשי</td>
<td>◌תלמשי</td>
<td>◌תלמשי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◌תלמשי</td>
<td>◌תלמשי</td>
<td>◌תלמשי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◌תלמשי</td>
<td>◌תלמשי</td>
<td>◌תלמשי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* So in Jewish Aramaic ◌תלמשי.

*b* Jewish Aramaic.

In the light of these forms it is not astonishing to find that so-called “segolate” formations are found in Christian Palestinian; e.g., ◌תלמשי (pronounced ◌תלמשי or ◌תלמשי). So also in the Peshiṭta ◌תלמשי (from primitive ◌תלמשי). See Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XXII (1868), p. 475. On the ground of these forms Bevan (*Commentary*, p. 71) and Behrmann (*Commentary*, p. viii) consider it doubtful whether ◌תלמשי forms in BA are to be regarded as Hebraisms. Behrmann, however, while admitting that the noun forms may be original, regards the “segolate” verb formations as Hebraisms of the Masora. The same pronunciation, however, which produced the segolate noun-formation would also operate in verb-forms; e.g., ◌תלמשי or ◌תלמשי (cf. ◌תלמשי Dan. 4, 27) ◌תלמשי, ◌תלמשי, similarly ◌תלמשי.

It need not be supposed that the forms are made anew in each case. When once the type is introduced, other forms are made by analogy. (On the general subject of segolates cf. GK., 84, a; König, *Lehrgeb.*, II; Lambert, *RÉJ.*, 1896, pp. 18 ff.; Lagarde, *Übersicht*, pp. 72 f. and 80 f.; *Mittheil.*, I, p. 150; Philippi, *Beiträge z. Assyrv.*, II, pp. 359–389; Ungnad, Z.A., XVII [1903], pp. 333 f.)

53. In BA the dual appears in certain forms, ◌תלמשי (in ◌תלמשי) 2, 34; ◌תלמשי Ez. 6, 17; ◌תלמשי 7, 7; ◌תלמשי 7, 4; ◌תלמשי 7, 7.
Marti (GBA., p. 73) cites also the following: וָנַי, וָנַי 7, 8; וָנַי 7, 25, and וָנַי 5, 25. In the use of the dual, BA represents an older stage of language than does the Syriac. In the latter, while a few traces of the dual still exist (in two or three words, viz.: וָנַי, f. וָנַי [cf. BA וָנַי above]; וָנַי [cf. BA וָנַי]; and וָנַי), yet it had disappeared as a component part of the language (cf. Nöldeke, § 70, n.). Indeed, the tendency in all the Semitic languages seems to be to discard the dual. Traces of it are found also in Ethiopic and Assyrian; and it survives to a limited extent in Modern Arabic (cf. Volland and Burkitt, p. 106; Wright, Comp. Gr., 149 f.; Zimmern, 173; König, Heb. und Sem., 49).

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

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

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

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

55. The BA doubles the first radical in forms from וָנַי roots after a formative prefix; when there is no prefix, the second radical receives the doubling; occasionally the latter method is also used in the former case. The first method is so peculiarly Aramaic that, wherever it occurs in Hebrew, we speak of it there as an Aramaism (GK., § 67 g; Margolis, AJSL., XII [1896], 213). The examples are:
a) Pe' al, imperf. דֶּלֶת 2, 40 with rejection of d. *forte* from ד; inf. דֶּל (Syr. מ"ה) 4, 24; Haph'el, perf. 3 m. s. דַּל (Syr. מ"א) 2, 25; 6, 19, with resolution of doubling by insertion of Nun; 3 f. s. דַּל (Syr. מ"א) 2, 34. 45; 3 m. pl. דַּלְנ (Syr. מ"א) 6, 25; imperfect. 3 f. s. דַּל (Syr. מ"א) 2, 40. 44; 2 f. s. with suff. דַּלְנ (Syr. מ"א) 7, 23; imperative 2 m. s. with suff. דַּלְנ (for an explanation of the form cf. Margolis, *AJSL*, XIX [1902], 45-48) 2, 24; inf. דַּלְנ 5, 7 and with resolution of doubling by insertion of Nun דַּלְנ 4, 3; part. m. דַּלְנ (Syr. מ"א) 2, 40; f. דַּלְנ 7, 19; Hoph' al, דַּל 5, 13; דַּל 5, 15 (with virtual doubling of the ל the d. *forte* in ל is similar to that in דומ in Jud. 5, 7; דומ Job 29, 21, etc. In Hebrew, however, all these examples are in pause; but the regular Aramaic forms in the 3. plural correspond to the pausal forms in Hebrew; cf. GK., §20, 2, c.). Example of a noun: יָדִין 6, 15. Kautzsch, §60, 3, b, followed by others, fails to understand the form; יָדִין however, = יָדִין = יָדִין; the variant יָדִין, on the other hand, = Syr. יָדִין (cf. Behrmann *ad locum*).

b) Pe' al perfect, 3 m. s. דַּל (Syr. מ"א) 2, 16. 24; 4, 5; 6, 11; 3 f. s. דַּל (Syr. מ"א) 5, 10 k (לַל k); דַּל 6, 19; but contrast 3 m. pl. דַּל (Syr. מ"א) 2, 35; probably for דַּל after ד"ו analogy; impv. pl. m. דַּל 4, 11. 20; part. pl. דַּל (k) דַּל (k) (Syr. מ"א or מ"א, see Nöeldeke, §178, B) 4, 4; 5, 8. We miss, however, a metheg: יָדִין cf. יָדִין above, §25. Example of a noun: יָדִין Ez. 6, 2; cf. Syr. יָדִין, יָדִין (Nöeldeke, §126 B).

56. Aphæresis, or loss of an initial consonant, takes place in BA in the case of ס in the words ס 3, 19; ס Ez. 5, 13. In Hebrew the only regular instance appears to be ס for ס (cf. *ZDMG.*, 1876, 707); ס, Ezek. 33, 30 (see, however, Cornill, 398), may be regarded as an Aramaism. In Syriac ס loses its consonantal value in many words, and although written in the text it has the "linea occultans" and is not pronounced; e. g., ס, or ס. In certain words, however, ס is always omitted in writing, e. g., ס, exactly as in BA (Nöldeke, §32). The examples which Kautzsch cites (§11, 3, a) of the first radical in the imperative of verbs ס, e. g., ס 5, 17; ס 6, 16, and of verbs ס, e. g., ס Ez. 5, 15; ס 3, 26 are not really examples of aphæresis, if thereby is meant "a
psycho-physiological process, not merely the absence of a letter in front. The imperative being the prefixless ‘apocopatus,’ the forms mentioned are direct descendants of הָעֵבָר, הָעֵבָר, נָשֹׁי, הָעֵבָר” (Margolis, *AJSL*, XIX [1902], 162). This is true of verbs יָזָא in Syriac and in Arabic, and of verbs יָזָא in Syriac, as well as in Hebrew (cf. Wright, I, §144; Nöldeke, §§173, 175; GK., §§ 66 a, c, 69 b, h).

57. The regular plural ending of masculine nouns in BA is רֶפֶת. This is also the regular plural in Syriac (cf. Nöldeke, §70). The Hebrew form רֶפֶתוּ Prov. 31, 3, etc., is called an Aramaism. It illustrates the care necessary in using the term “Hebraism,” “Aramaism,” etc., which should indicate a form or word or grammatical peculiarity borrowed from one language by the other, but is usually applied in the grammars to a development and use in a less frequent manner of phenomena that are the rule in related languages. Thus, in this case, Kautzsch believes that the use of the plural ending רֶפֶת in Hebrew is not to be regarded as a pure Aramaism, but as a late weakening (“Abschwächung”) of the original רֶפֶת, and cites as proof the form רֶפֶת מָעֶשֶׁ ה “fifty” in 1. 28 of the Mesha inscription.

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

58. BA רֶפֶת רֶפֶת 2, 14; רֶפֶת 2, 38, etc. (cf. Syriac רֶפֶת) have their parallels in Hebrew רֶפֶת inferred from רֶפֶת Gen. 1, 1, which one is tempted to regard as an Aramaism by the side
of the genuine Hebrew גָּנַה (cf. Arabic امس), Gen. 31, 8, etc., provided the ק is explained with Haupt, "The Assyrian E-Vowel," American Journal of Philology, October, 1887, pp. 265–291, as imālah. Ethiopic re'(e)s (ra's would have yielded ro's; Praetorius, Athiop. Gram., § 16, 1), as well as Arabic ٌ and the like, corresponding to Hebrew רָנַה; Gen. 21, 30; הָנַה Gen. 49, 27; הָנַה Num. 23, 22, etc., which Haupt regards as resolutions from רָנַה, etc., seem to indicate that ra's and ri's, etc., represent from the beginning parallel Semitic forms (cf. also Nöldeke, Mand., 16; Margolis, AJSL., XII [1896], 225; XIV [1903], 162 f.; Sievers, I, 280, n. 2; Haupt, SBOT., Proverbs, p. 34; ibid., Isaiah, p. 88; Jager, BSS., I, 472).

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

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

60. On what Margolis terms the Aramaic method in Hebrew nominal inflection, cf. AJSL., XII (1896), 213 ff., where the implication is, not that this method was applied to the Hebrew of the Old Testament by the Masoretes who spoke as their vernacular an Aramaic dialect, and were therefore more or less influenced by it in their reading of the Hebrew, but that the Aramaic method is merely the one which is uniformly used in Aramaic, being ultimately based, however, on a phonetic development which had its beginning in Semitic times and
entered Hebrew at a late period, when it crossed with another phonetic development likewise originating in Semitic times (cf. above, § 57).

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

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

62. In Hebrew there is no distinction in form between the masc. and fem. of the perf. 3d pl. Similarly, in BA the kethibh makes no distinction, but the kere everywhere requires הַלְעֵנָה for הַלְעֵנָה; e. g., הָפַכְּה, הָפַכְּה 5, 5; הָפְלַעַמ, הָפְלַעַמ 7, 8; and הָפְלָעַמ, הָפְלָעַמ 7, 20.

The question here is as to which represents the original. Kautzsch (p. 46) suggests that the original did actually distinguish between the genders in the perf. 3d pl., but that this distinction was lost through an Hebraizing textual revision, in which case the kere is a restitution of the original. He inclines to the supposition that the non-distinction of gender (due to Hebrew influence) is the original, and that the Masora was the first to introduce the distinction into its system of vocalization, as that distinction was familiar to it from the Targums. Bevan (p. 99 f.) also regards the kethibh as the original, but, unlike Kautzsch, he holds that the use of the same form for both genders is not necessarily a Hebraism, but may be due to grammatical laxity, for the same phenomenon appears in Nabatean and Modern Arabic. (Cf. Vollers and Burkitt, 30; CIS., II, 205, 1; Cooke, 221; Wright, Comp. Gram., 169.)

In Ruth 1, 13 הַנְּרוֹן may stand for הַנְּרוֹן and is an instance of the same textual laxity, although most commentators take הַנְּרוֹן here to mean "therefore" as in BA.
63. In the use of d. lene the Masoretes treated BA precisely like Hebrew. The spirants take d. lene at the beginning of a syllable unless preceded by a vowel; e. g., בְּדָלָה אֶפְתִּים 2, 18. Even this, however, may not be due to Hebrew influence, for Syriac has similar phenomena (cf. Nöldeke, Syr. Gram., § 24). The so-called daghesh lene orthophonicum is another instance which is simply a mechanical device to secure orthoepy. It was used no doubt to indicate the accurate pronunciation of a word, but was no part of the spoken language. It occurs in אֶפְתִּים 2, 10, and אֵלֶּה 6, 3 (cf. Kautzsch, § 9, Rem. 3; Gk., § 13, 2 n.).

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

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

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

The few instances of כ for כ in pause may be part of the Hebraization of the text which we must assume began in late Masoretic times and has crept into certain MSS. and the ordinary editions of our OT. text. Most of these late corruptions
have been removed through the efforts of Baer, Ginsburg, and Strack. A few, however, have undoubtedly remained, and are not to be placed to the credit of the early Masora, much less to the living speech in Palestine.

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