

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE II.

SEMITIC COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.

BY DR. L. TAFEL AND PROF. R. L. TAFEL, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, MO.

THE labors of the comparative school of philology have thus far been limited to the Indo-European family of languages. Besides the work of J. E. Renan (*Histoire et Système comparé des langues Sémitique*), of which the first volume, treating of the history and genius of the Semitic languages, appeared several years ago, no systematic application of this new discipline has been made to these languages. And yet a comparison of the various Semitic idioms sheds as much light upon their respective grammars, as a comparison of the Indo-European or Arian languages elucidates theirs. In the present Article we propose to make a first contribution to Semitic comparative philology, discussing *the Semitic Verb and Noun*, as developed in the Hebrew grammar of Gesenius and the more recent school-grammar of Ewald, the Chaldee grammars of Fürst and Winer, the Syriac of Uhlemann, the Arabic of Caspari, and the Ethiopic of Dillmann. The form in which we treat our subject will be a review of the above-mentioned Hebrew grammars of Gesenius and Ewald, in the light of Semitic comparative philology.

Gesenius and Ewald have been considered, for a long time, as the leading oriental scholars of Europe, and their Hebrew grammars are more extensively used than any other. The former scholar has long been familiar to our orientalist by the translations of his Hebrew grammar and dictionary; and of his life and other works, Prof. Robinson has given a detailed account in an early number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. Prof. Ewald is not so well known; and for this reason, before entering upon a discussion of his grammar, we propose to draw a short comparison between the gram-

mars of Gesenius and Ewald, and give our opinion of the latter, both as a man and a scholar.

In the preface to his Hebrew grammar for beginners, which he published upon his return to Göttingen, after a protracted stay in Tübingen in southern Germany, on pages v and vi he exclaims: "How much labor and toil, perfectly useless, has been expended during the last three hundred years, by thousands of students, in either acquiring no knowledge of Hebrew at all, or a mere smattering for the sake of showing off! Is it not time that in this respect, likewise, we in Germany should begin to think about true use?" From this extract we are to infer that before the time of Ewald there were no able text-books for the study of the Hebrew language in Germany; while yet the grammar of Gesenius, which since his death, by the care of the learned Rödiger is kept on a level with the science, fulfils all just claims to a good grammar, and by means of other grammars, too, able Hebrew scholars have been educated. In this wholesale denunciation of a lack of knowledge of the Hebrew among his countrymen, and more especially among the Swabians in southern Germany (because in their schools they had preferred Gesenius's to his own grammar), Ewald does them manifest injustice. For the last three hundred years the Hebrew has been very thoroughly studied in all parts of Germany, and especially in Württemberg, where great care has been bestowed upon the instruction in Hebrew, both in the theological seminaries or colleges and in the university proper. The reason why the professors in these institutions preferred Gesenius's to Ewald's grammar is, because the former is very simple and intelligible, and arranged in a convenient form; while the school-grammar of Prof. Ewald lacks even the convenience of an index, without which no grammar, and especially no school grammar, ought ever to be published.

By his low estimation of the works of others, Prof. Ewald injured his usefulness very much in the university of Tübingen in Württemberg, to which he received a call after his exile from Göttingen; and by his supercilious manner he

prevented his real merits from being duly acknowledged and appreciated. Ewald, as regards the Hebrew, we are told, is an *αὐτοδιδάκτος*; since he, independent of all *ὀδηγία* of other Hebrew scholars, has made his own thorough studies of the holy scriptures; and has occasionally compared the Hebrew with the other Semitic idioms and also the Indo-European languages which he calls Mediterranean. But by the impetuous flight of his genius, he has sometimes been carried into the realm of arbitrary hypotheses, while the cautious Gesenius has remained more on "terra firma."

Yet the school-grammar of Ewald is by no means void of merit. On page iv of his Preface, he very justly opposes the common method of commencing the study of a language with committing the rules of grammar to memory, of which the students have not the slightest conception. For by this means, he says, the eyes and ears of beginners, since time immemorial, have been frightened off, their ideas confused, and their interest in learning killed." He continues: "the various wants and mental gifts of the scholars must be taken into consideration by a wise teacher; and, according to circumstances, he may either enter into details and institute comparisons with other languages known to the student, or else confine himself to the general matters (*die grossen Hauptsachen*) on the surface. Nor is it necessary," he adds, "for the professor to confine himself strictly to the order followed in the text-book, but he may as well commence the study of the details of the language by committing the paradigms to memory." This mode of proceeding reminds us of the course pursued by a German professor of eminence, who, whenever his boys, upon entering his room, brought their new grammars with them, took his penknife and cut out all except the declensions and conjugations, declaring that the rest, viz. the rules of syntax, the boys would have to make up for themselves. And he was not altogether wrong. In olden times, when the boys were not yet furnished with grammars in which the minutest rules of syntax were laid down, and when they had to deduce these rules themselves, there were more thorough masters of

classical literature, than at the present day, when a student, with his memory inflated with rules deduced by others, exhibits the learning of others and not his own. Prof. Ewald, however, does not go quite as far; he simply opposes the committing to memory of the rules of syntax, and recommends that the students learn how to use their grammars as books of reference, under the guidance of an experienced teacher. After this preliminary talk, we enter upon the subject of the grammar itself.

Prof. Ewald, at the beginning of his work, before entering into the details of grammar, gives a synopsis of the masculine and feminine nouns in the states construct and absolute of the singular, dual, and plural numbers, with their pronominal suffixes, and divides the nouns into such of the first, second, and third formation; in the place of the nine masculine and four feminine declensions of Gesenius, which the latter gives partly in §§ 53, 55, and partly in the appendix. Afterwards Ewald introduces the verbs according to their different conjugations, and concludes with examples of the verb with pronominal suffixes.

Upon comparing the two grammars in respect to the doctrine of the noun and the declensions, that of Ewald has a decided advantage over that of Gesenius. *First*, Ewald justly includes the masculine and feminine nouns in the same declensions; for the suffix of the gender is subject to the same law as the suffix of the number and of the pronouns. *Secondly*, Gesenius, in establishing nine masculine and four feminine declensions, takes into consideration mere accidental and external analogies, without paying any attention to internal similarities; while at least the first two of Ewald's three declensions represent certain stages in the formation of the nouns. The only point where we differ from Prof. Ewald is the priority of these several stages. This point we will develop more fully hereafter, and simply state now, that in the Semitic languages the nominal and verbal roots were originally, to a great extent, the same, not only as regards the consonants, but also the vowels; and that an analogy may be traced between the declensions of

the noun and the different forms of the verb. We now turn to an investigation of the primitive condition of the Semitic tongues.

Inasmuch as all things in nature, as well as among men, proceed from simple beginnings, and afterwards become developed and perfected more and more, we may assume that the grammatical forms of the first men were very simple, corresponding to their bodily and mental wants.¹ This also we find corroborated by the history of the several languages, as far as we can trace them towards their beginnings; and, with regard to the Semitic languages, it will appear in the following pages. We are not prepared, with Prof. Fürst (§ 1. chaldäische Formenlehre), to admit that the *Aramean* idiom is the oldest of all Semitic dialects; but we believe that the original Semitic people, starting from their seats in the north, spread themselves in an easterly and southerly direction, and that the common ancestral language, in different latitudes, was developed differently; and that in the original, rougher home, more vestiges of the primitive language were preserved, than in other places and idioms; for there, owing to the peculiar nature of the land, they were frequently subjugated by the neighboring people, who did not speak a Semitic tongue, and, impeded by this foreign language, the original Semitic language of the subjugated people could not be developed as readily as among the Hebrews, Phoenicians, Arabs, and Ethiopians; hence more archaic forms occur in the former than in the latter idioms.

As regards Prof. Rödiger's denial (§ 1. of Gesenius's grammar) of the originality of the monosyllabic roots which exist in the Aramean, viz. the Chaldee and Syriac, and to some extent yet in the Hebrew, and also with regard to his assertion that these roots, in the course of time, were reduced and compressed into monosyllables, this is a sheer arbitrary assumption; for Prof. Rödiger does not offer a single proof, showing that these verbal and nominal roots

¹ See our Review of Bopp's Comparative Grammar, Oct. 1861, p. 775.

were ever dissyllables or trisyllables, such as are the roots in the Hebrew, Arabic, or Ethiopic. His statement that the old Hebrew, in its construction, agrees more with the modern than the old Arabic, proves nothing; this will be sufficiently proved hereafter. It is an incontrovertible fact that all languages, after reaching their adult age, i. e. after arriving at the culminating stage of their sensual or merely external development, come to a stand-still, and, in proportion as the popular mind increases in strength, begin to cast aside various forms as needless props. This process is called, by the modern linguists, one of deterioration, marking the downfall of the language; but we are more inclined to look upon it as a process of spiritualizing. Suppose we grant (which, however, we are not willing to do) that the old Hebrew originally had the same number of declensions and conjugations as the old Arabic, and subsequently, many centuries before the Arabic itself, cast them aside again; this would be but a similar process to what we notice in the Indo-European idioms, e. g. in the English we find *we, ye, they speak, spake, spoke*, compared with the German *wir sprechen, sprachen* (instead of *sprechem, sprachem*, old German *sprahumes*), *ihr sprecht, sprachet, sie sprechen, sprachen* (instead of *sie sprechent, sprachent*), and the Greek *λέγ-ομεν, λέγ-ομεν, λέγ-ετε, λέγ-οντι, λέγ-ουσι*; and in the Anglo-Saxon, already, the distinction of the three persons in the plural has been given up, *we hab-bon, ge hab-bon, hi hab-bon*, while in the French, three different forms have been retained for the three persons, *nous parl-ons, vous parl-ez, ils parl-ent*, of which the third person has given up the mark of the plural number, at least for the ear.

We are, however, by no means justified in assuming that all the members of the Semitic stock attained the same development of forms as the Arabic. In nature, even, we find that not all individuals of the same species of plants or animals, though favored by apparently the same circumstances, reach a like state of perfection; and upon viewing man, we are impressed with the fact, that frequently children of the same parents not only differ with regard to their

bodily constitutions, but also their mental gifts, their dispositions, and characters; and among the same people we find that different tribes have developed differently as regards their mode of thinking, and the expression of their thoughts by language. So in Great Britain there are the Devonshire and Yorkshire men, and the Low Scotch, descended from the same parentage; among the Germans the Swabians, Franconians, Saxons, etc., all differing in disposition, character, and language; and in antiquity there were the Athenians, Ionians, Dorians, etc., members of the same Hellenic stock. Many pertinent points we have to omit here, but we will recur to them afterwards.

That deterioration of form ("Formenverkümmerng," as it is called by Prof. Rödiger and others) in the Semitic languages, touches the inflection of words only, and not their roots, and Prof. Rödiger has attempted to fasten it upon the language against all law and reason; and, inasmuch as he has not furnished us a single proof, showing that dissyllables and trisyllables have ever dwindled down into monosyllables, we naturally abandon his hypothesis, and admit the existence of monosyllabic nominal roots which coincide with the corresponding verbal roots, and which are nothing else but verbal roots, expressing the realization of an activity, applied as nouns. The monosyllabic form of these nouns is קטל (קטל, קטל), which is usually found in the eastern and western Aramean, and even in the Hebrew, in the state absolute, in a number of words, as גבר man (גברת mistress), דני sickness (דח to be sick), דבש honey, שכם shoulder, ארי for ארי lion (ארי to pull to pieces), לחי for לחי cheek, צבי for צבי splendor, etc., and in the state construct, which we regard as the original form of the noun, in a still greater number. The sheva of the first radical, the embryo of a future vowel, in the state absolute, was subsequently generally filled up, in Hebrew, into a kamets, rarely into a tseré; and the pattah of the second radical, also, was lengthened into a kamets, and, by a second subsequent formation, into a tsere; but this was done in such a manner that the accent still remained upon the last syllable; e. g. דני;

word into דָּבָר; גֵּזֶב grape, into גֵּזֶב; אִישׁ o'd man, into אִישׁ; in the singular of the state absolute a tsere was afterwards employed, to mark the intransitives, as is done even in the verb. The plural, however, is still regularly formed of the original form קָטַל, the patah in this case, according to a special Hebrew law, being lengthened into a kamets, on account of its now closing the syllable, as דָּבָר, דְּבָרִים; אָרִי for אַרְיִים; צָבִי for אַצְבִּי; צְבָרִים for אַצְבָּרִים beauties, אֲצָבוֹת for אַצְבוֹת (by assimilating the sound of the yod to that of the preceding vowel, which is also frequently done in the Aramean). The plural retained the original monosyllabic form, even in those cases in which afterwards the so-called segol-form had been preferred, as in מֶלֶךְ (מְלִיכָה) king, מְלָכִים, מְלָכָה; שָׂמְרָה (שְׂמִירָה) maid-servant, שְׂמִירָה; from which it appears that the Hebrew plural partakes even of more originality than does the Aramean, as will probably be admitted even by Prof. Fürst himself. The original form of the root, also, has been occasionally preserved in the dual, the early form of which has been excluded from the language at a later period, e. g. קָרְנִים for קָרְנָיִם; לְחָיִים for לְחָיִים both cheeks; דְּרָה, דְּרָה way, דְּרָה, דְּרָה two ways or a double way.

Prof. Ewald says, § 117, p. 109: "The termination of the plural, in the common noun, is יָיִם; very seldom the Aramean form יָיִן.¹ This form was originally rather *am*, conf. יָם people, multitude, from which it was probably borrowed; hence, also, *om, um, un*." We think it strange that Prof. Ewald should not mention this explanation of the suffix of the plural in his "Ausführliche Grammatik" (larger grammar), which he was publishing at the same time, and that he should have reserved for his "Schulgrammatik" this addition, which, with the exception of Dr. Donaldson in England, has not been, and probably will not be, adopted by any other Hebrew scholar; for, such a combination of two nouns, except in proper nouns, was an unheard of and unprecedented occurrence in those primitive times; all similar suffixes in nouns, as well as in verbs, having been formed

¹ How will the Professor explain the Aramean יָיִן (Nun)?

of pronouns only. Moreover, the Semitic forms הַיּוֹנִין , הַיְּמִינִי , הַיְּמִינִי , הַיְּמִינִי , הַיְּמִינִי (conf. Fürst's Chaldäische Formenlehre, p. 238), which originally served for both genders, furnish all the elements necessary for the explanation of the plural of all the Semitic idioms.

Prof. Ewald seems to us equally unfortunate in what he says about a pretended original neuter gender among the Semites. He says, p. 19: "Many things which must have originally existed in the youthful age of the language, e. g. a distinct neuter gender, have been lost again; compound words, also, which in the Sanskrit languages describe a peculiar, still higher degree of development, with the exception of a few beginnings, have become entirely foreign to the Semitic languages." If a thing could become foreign to a language, a time must necessarily have existed when it was less foreign to it. Now we should like to know whence Prof. Ewald derived this information. As he does not give us any additional information, in his "Schulgrammatik," about the primitive neuter in the Semitic languages, we have to turn to his "Ausführliche Grammatik," published in the same year. Here he says, § 172, a: "It is satisfactorily established, by all vestiges, that the Semitic, in the primitive times, before its peculiar genius had been developed, distinguished the impersonal or so-called neuter gender. This is a matter beyond any doubt; because, before language can regard inanimate things as masculine, it must first have been in the habit of treating some inanimate things as persons, and others as impersonal things. This is clearly shown by the interrogative pronoun מִי , τὴς , who? מַה , τὶ , what? which, no doubt, dates from that time, and the latter form of which clearly corresponds to our neuter. This interrogative pronoun, also, distinguished in this manner, is found in all Semitic languages. We are also taught by the fuller, and no doubt older, pronunciation of this word *ment* (*mant*), instead of מַה , which still occurs in the Ethiopic, that the neuter in the Semitic, as well as in the Mediterranean [i. e. the Indo-European], was formed by the letter *t* (conf. Sanskrit *tat*), which afterwards passed over into *n* or *m*.

Except in this small vestige, the Semitic has given up entirely the distinction of the neuter gender; and the reason of this is, evidently, that the distinction of the feminine from the masculine gender, which could only have been fully carried out in a second stage of the language, has prevailed in it to such an extent as to crowd out completely the other distinction, which is the older." Prof. Ewald also observes, among other things, § 182, a: "If we examine the origin of these interrogative pronouns, we find that they are already compounded, without any doubt, of the mere interrogative word *ma* and the demonstrative *na*. *Mān* or *mān*, in the sense of *who?* is found in all other Semitic tongues, and seems to have been shortened, in the Hebrew only, into *mī*; this word was originally attended by *ment*, which, from the primitive times, expressed the neuter, i. e. the impersonal gender. From *ment* first arose מן, which is found Ex. xvi. 15. at the occasion of the explanation of a word; because, most probably, it was still understood in some [?] of the dialects, even as it has been preserved at all times in the Aramean [and, we may add, in the Arabic and Ethiopic]; from this form, finally, was shortened the Arabic *man* and the Hebrew מן. At first, § 172, Prof. Ewald speaks of a number of vestiges which prove the former existence of the neuter gender, but immediately afterwards he confines them to the "small vestige" of the interrogative word. We are afraid that this small vestige, too, will disappear when viewed in the true light; suppose, even, the existence of the neuter gender to be laid into those "primitive times, in which the Semitic had not yet developed its peculiar genius." We contest the very first point of Ewald's argumentation, viz. that it is established beyond any doubt, that before language (i. e. man who speaks it) can regard inanimate things as masculines, it must first have been in the habit of treating some inanimate things as persons, and others as impersonal things. If here, in the place of man in general, we put a child, we may find, at any time, that he treats inanimate things as living, and thus personifies them; such, we hold, was the case with the first man through whom

language was formed. In his eyes everything was alive; he only saw concrete actions of men, and took the phenomenon of an action for the actor himself; thus מַּהֲבַחֵל (מָה or מַּ what, מַּבַּחֵל has killed) means that which has killed, and which, on this account, may kill again, = the one killing. The process of deriving the abstract from the concrete, and of expressing what is inanimate and void of gender by a particular form, did not precede but follow the process of reflection, provided the Semitic languages ever reached this state of development; which, it is well known, they never did. We doubt, very much, whether Prof. Ewald will ever make many proselytes to his theory besides his pupil Prof. Dillmann, who has probably composed his Ethiopic grammar under the influence of the master, and who has actually created this Ethiopic form a *neutrum in partibus infidelium* (Ethiopic grammar, p. 265). The Ethiopic form ጠንቅ (ment) in question, is nothing else but the Ethiopic feminine agreeing with the Arabic feminine مَنَتْ (*manath*, shortened into *manth*, *menth*), and neither of these forms is more primitive than מַּחַ, מַּחָ, as is supposed by Prof. Ewald, nor have they been formed, at a later period, from the masculine מַּחַ or מַּחָ. If we are not willing to regard מַּחַ and מַּחָ, as primitive forms, we may imagine them shortened of מַּחַ; even as מַּוּת and מַּוּחַ mouth, are formed from מַּוּחַ; (מַּוּחַ from מַּוּחַ); מַּאֲבִי and מַּאֲחִי instead of מַּאֲבִי and מַּאֲחִי (conf. מַּאֲבִי) from מַּאֲבִי, מַּאֲחִי; in which case the diphthongal form would be reduced into מַּחַ and מַּחָ, מַּחַ, and the former would be employed afterwards for persons, and the latter for personified things, and be mistaken for a feminine form מַּחַ, מַּחָ.¹ The Semitic interrogative word מַּחַ (מַּחַ), which Prof. Ewald supposes to be compounded of *ma* and *na*, we would rather explain as being composed of מַּחַ shortened into מַּחַ, and the pronoun מַּחַ (מַּחַ) or מַּחַ (מַּחַ), which still survives in the Aramean, and as a suffix occurs both in the Semitic and

¹ The Ethiopic really furnishes an old form ጠንቅ (מַּחַ, meo), which according to our opinion is shortened from the diphthongal form *mai*, מַּחַ, and, with the meaning of *what?* is used of things (cf. Dillmann, *Aethiopische Grammatik*, p. 265.)

Indo-European languages, and as a prefix shortened into η , α , is found in the Hebrew Niphal and the Arabic انْقَلَب (*inkätälä*), in the capacity of a demonstrative adverb η and perhaps as an article in the Hebrew. At all events, as regards the article, it is much more natural, and lies much nearer to assume the assimilation and consequent dropping of η in η (since we have a precedent of this process in η , η , η , etc.), than to admit the assimilation and consequent dropping of η in η , by which prefix the Hebrew article is usually explained; for the only instance where η is found thus assimilated and dropped is η for η , which form may also be explained some other way. But to return to η : the *a* sound of η , η , was, afterwards, more and more regarded as a feminine ending, and as such it was, at the same time, adopted to represent what is called the neuter gender; especially since it is also written η . The suffix η in *menth* or *manth*, as in the Semitic languages generally, denotes the feminine. When occurring as a prefix, it may be masculine as well as feminine, and in this case it corresponds to the Greek τ in *τήμερον*, etc., and also to the demonstrative $\tau\omicron$, $\tau\alpha$, which was afterwards employed as an article; e. g. η for η , *the one taking possession of [you]*; η , *the one or the thing melting away, for a melting*; η , *the one or the thing afflicting, i. e. the fasting*; η , *the one rising up against*; η , *a rising or standing up against, the power of resisting*.

But to return from this digression to Prof. Ewald's classification of the noun. Before discussing this subject any further, we must repeat a former statement, which will be examined in detail hereafter, in treating of the verb, viz. that the nominal and verbal roots are originally the same, not only as regards their consonants, but also their vowels, and that the only difference between them consists in a different mode of affixing pronouns; that consequently there are formations of the verbs corresponding to those of the nouns.

If, in the arrangement of the Hebrew declensions, with Prof. Ewald, we start from genetic principles, those nouns evidently constitute the *first declension*, which agree with the verb

in its original monosyllabic form, with the accent upon the last syllable, and the sheva of the first radical, e. g. אָבֵר man, דְּבַשׁ honey, etc.; or in which the sheva of the first radical is filled up into kamets, e. g. אָבֵר word, זָכָר a male. This class is made the second declension by Prof. Ewald. As regards his first declension (Gesenius's sixth), we would not even make it the second, but the third declension.

Those appear to us as nouns of the *second declension* which coincide with the intransitive verbs. In these the pattah of the second radical is either varied into a tsere, chirek, cholem, or shurek, and the sheva of the first radical is almost invariably filled up into a kamets, e. g. אָבֵל, אָבֵל, אָבֵל, אָבֵל into אָבֵל, אָבֵל, אָבֵל; אָבֵל into אָבֵל, אָבֵל, אָבֵל; אָבֵל, אָבֵל, אָבֵל — those nouns which are formed with chirek and shurek frequently assuming a passive meaning. In order to obtain an insight into the formation of the nouns composing this class, we must analyze the formation of the intransitive verbs with which they coincide. In the transitive verbs which belong to the first formation, the original pattah after the second radical has been retained, while this in the intransitive verbs is usually changed into a tsere in the Aramean, Hebrew, and Ethiopic; into a cholem in the Chaldee; in a few verbs in the Hebrew into shurek of the first, chirek of the second, radical; in the Arabic into a chirek; finally, it is found changed in the Chaldee and Arabic. This chirek no longer occurs in any Hebrew verb, but it is found in some of its nouns; and from the fact that we still meet with it in Chaldee and Arabic verbs and nouns, we conclude that it was of ordinary occurrence in the original Semitic tongue, before this branched out into its dialects; and that from this general language it has survived in Hebrew nouns. We now direct the attention of the reader to the difference between the transitive and intransitive verbs, viz. that the former is followed by a complemental accusative case, but the latter is used without it. A similar relation as between the transitive and intransitive verbs, we hold exists between the noun in the state construct and the state absolute. In the former

state the noun is attended by a complemental genitive case, and in the latter it is used without it. The effect, in either case, upon the patah of the second radical is the same. As in the transitive verb this patah is retained, but in the intransitive verb is varied into a chirek, cholem, or tsere; so also in some of the nouns of the second declension in the state construct, the original patah is retained, while in the state absolute it is varied into a tsere. When the vowel after the second radical is a tsere, this is usually changed into a patah in the state construct, e. g. state absol. זָקַן, 'state constr. זָקַן; יָחַד, יָחַד; עָרַל, עָרַל; קָבַר, קָבַר; שָׁבַן, שָׁבַן; שָׁבַע, שָׁבַע; in some of these nouns, however, the tsere of the state absolute is retained in the state construct, e. g. יָגַע, יָגַע; שָׁמַח, שָׁמַח. When the second radical is followed by a chirek, cholem, or shurek, these vowels are also retained in the state construct, and in the forms with suffixes.

The nouns of the *third declension* or *formation* (Ewald's first) evidently belong to a period in which the Hebrew was already detached from its sister-languages; inasmuch as no other Semitic tongue possesses the segol-forms. As regards Prof. Ewald's assertion that the reason of the removal of the accent [and, we add, the vowel] from the ultimate to the penult in the noun, is to distinguish it from the verb (Ausführl. Lebrb. d. Hebr. Spr. p. 325), we cannot agree with him, inasmuch as this removal of the accent is also found in many *verbs*, but does not occur in more than three fourths of the nouns. He may be right so far that the length of the vowel of the final syllable of the root, in the state absolute of the nouns, expresses a certain completeness and independence on the part of the noun; while the patah of the second radical of the verb indicates a leaning of the verb towards the object which limits its action. So also the vowel of the final syllable is found short in the state construct of the nouns, by which a more intimate conjunction of the noun with the qualifying or modifying attribute seems to be expressed. In the intransitive verbs, again, the action of which is not limited by an object, we find the longer tsere and cholem, and in some dialects the chirek and

shurek, as has been stated above. From all this it follows that this removal of the accent from the second to the first radical, is not for the sake of distinguishing the noun from the verb, but probably rises in a cause common both to the noun and the verb.

In order to place this statement on a firmer basis, we must be allowed to dilate on the subject before us, and to show that it has a historical foundation. As the Indo-European languages, in their ante-historical youth, when they were still united under some common idiom, lacked the article, and as in the Greek, at a time when it already belonged to history, i. e. after Homer, a definite article was created, we are led to suppose that the Semitic idioms, also, were originally destitute of it ; inasmuch as the Ethiopic, during the entire duration of its existence, seems to have done without it ; and in Hebrew poetry, likewise, the noun is used without the article, because the poets are fond of archaic forms and constructions. It seems, however, that while the Semitic languages were yet united, a beginning was made towards the creation of an article. For in the Aramean, the Arabic, and to some extent in the Hebrew, we meet with the ending *ā, ō, an, on, un*, which evidently contains the same vowels *ā* or *ō* (*ū*), that still exist in the Aramean in a sort of rudimental capacity in the article emphatic, and are likewise found in the Latin *domin-a, domin-o*, and the Greek *ἴππ-ο, ἴππ-α, ἴππ-η* ; in which languages these vowels gradually lost their power of an article, and became fortified by the addition of a new pronoun *s, n*, e. g. *hom-o-n, av-o-s, avus, δαίμ-ω-ν*.

We thus have in the Indo-European, as well as in the Semitic tongues, two suffixed articles : *first, a* and *o*, and *secondly, n* or *s*, so that in the Indo-European languages we obtain the endings *o-n, o-s*, and in the Semitic *a-n* and *o-n*. The ending *an* is contracted of *a-han*, and *on* of *o-hon*, *han* being a demonstrative pronoun in the Chaldee, and *hon* in the Syriac. The consciousness of the suffixes *an* and *on* being articles, became soon lost in the Hebrew and Arabic tongues, where they dwindled down into mere endings ; but

in the Aramean the ending *a*, even without the addition of *n*, continued as an article. To compensate for this loss of the article, in Hebrew ן or נ began to be prefixed, and in the Arabic ن . In the Arabic we, moreover, find this peculiarity, that when the article *al* is prefixed, the letter *n* of the suffix is dropped, as *malkan* king, *almalka* the king. A parallel case of this prefixing of the article, after the meaning of the suffixed article became lost, we find in the Greek $\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\nu}\pi\pi\text{-}\sigma\text{-}\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\ \delta\alpha\iota\mu\text{-}\omega\text{-}\nu$, while in the Latin the suffixed article sufficed, as *fili-u-s*, the son.

The prefix ן , on account of its causing the vowel of the following consonant to be accented, exercised the same effect upon the noun, as did the stereotype ל upon the verb, viz. by dropping the final syllable *a*, it caused the root to become again monosyllabic,¹ as happened with several other prefixes, e. g. מָצַר sorrow, for מָצַר from מָצַרַר , מָצַר from מָצַרַרַר ; מָצַר from מָצַלַל ; מָצַר from מָצַרַרַר . Yet we are far from maintaining that the prefixing of the article, or any other prefix, was the only cause by which the ultimate syllable was cut off; for in the Ethiopic we meet with a wearing off of this syllable without the prefixing of any syllable whatever.

By assuming the pre-existence of the suffixed article *a* or *ha*, we also have the key for an understanding of the formation of the dual, which originally seems to have been but another form of the plural, and afterwards was confined to a duality of things or persons, as in Heb. יוֹם , Chald. יוֹמָא , Samar. יוֹמָה , יוֹמָיִם for יוֹמִים the days; afterwards, the two days (properly it signifies *the day-they*; יוֹם being instead of יוֹמִים or יוֹמָיִם , which is the plural of יוֹם). The diphthong יוֹ was either contracted into יִ , as in שְׁנַיִם two; or into kamets, as in בָּזָם for בְּזַיִם flies, gnats, סָלָם steps, for סָלָיִם , which arose from סָלָיִם or סָלָיִיִם ; or, finally, it was contracted into יוֹ , which is the ordinary mark of the plural in later times. The original diphthongal form, however, may have been in use

¹ As a relic of this final *a* in Hebrew we may regard לְיָמָיִם , where, moreover, the original ן , instead of the later Aramean נ , is preserved; as is also the case in the Samaritan, which in this respect appears more primitive; for the ancient form of the suffixed article was not *a* but *ha*.

in which it appears in the Old Testament, the cases are no longer distinguished by their endings." In a foot-note he continues : " As the meaning of the cases is entirely lost in the endings ־ and ־ , it is not quite right to call them endings of cases ; yet it is probable that, at some time, they had a specific meaning in the language, just as ־ : even as the corresponding endings [*u* for the nominative, *i* for the genitive, and *a* for the accusative case] are found in the old Arabic, and became subsequently lost, as in the Hebrew." Prof. Rödiger, in his statement, starts with the same supposition which, we think, has been sufficiently disproved above, viz. that all Semitic idioms, because they are the offspring of the same mother-language, have been developed together, and reached the same degree of grammatical perfection, although the nations who spoke these languages were scattered through different climates and different tracts of country, and although, intellectually and morally, they differed very much from each other. Moreover, in the Aramean, there is not a single trace found of a local accusative, and, in the Hebrew, the local accusative is never used for the accusative generally ; although it is misemployed so as to denote, sometimes, a rest or a stay in a place, and is partly additionally supported by prepositions ; most frequently, however, it either disappears entirely, or else it is replaced by prepositions. We are therefore justified in asserting that in the original Semitic tongue, as it still survives in the Aramean, and to some extent in the Hebrew, there was wanting a proper form for the accusative case, limiting the verb, unless we take the sign ־ or ־ for it in the Hebrew and the Aramean. Prof. Ewald, on the other hand, observes, p. 131 of his " Schulgrammatik " : " The only insignificant beginning of the formation of a case is made by the appending of a demonstrative ־ (rarely ־), in order to express a tendency, direction, and motion towards a place — the direction towards a person is never expressed by this ending. The idea of the accusative case, which is the case of relation and motion, might be easily connected with it, but this application of the ending has never been

developed." It has only been thus applied in the southern Semitic tongues, the Arabic and the Ethiopic.

The similarity which Prof. Rödiger notices between the two other endings $\dot{\iota}$ and $\dot{\iota}$, and the Arabic nominative and genitive, as we shall presently see, is merely apparent and accidental. It is well known that some of his examples, with these endings, dating from remotest antiquity — we mean the compound proper nouns — are composed of the roots of $\dot{\iota}$ and $\dot{\iota}$, from which the forms ending in $\dot{\iota}$ differ either in respect to age or dialect ($\dot{\iota}$, according to 1 Sam. i. 20, stands for $\dot{\iota}$, just as $\dot{\iota}$, and consequently does not belong here). Among these words are found $\dot{\iota}$, $\dot{\iota}$; $\dot{\iota}$; $\dot{\iota}$; $\dot{\iota}$ (?), among which the more archaic $\dot{\iota}$ has gradually yielded to the softer $\dot{\iota}$, as in $\dot{\iota}$ ($\dot{\iota}$), which is a later form for $\dot{\iota}$. Still, not even in such instances, where the suffix $\dot{\iota}$ or $\dot{\iota}$ is appended to trilateral roots, can we recognize marks of cases, corresponding to the Arabic. Wherever these words occur, they are either followed by genitives, or, as is frequently the case with nouns in the state construct, by words which have prepositions prefixed to them, and which are just as intimately connected with the nouns, qualified, or, at least modified, by them. If, now, we take the words ending in $\dot{\iota}$, which Rödiger describes as genitives, we find that they differ from the Arabic in this remarkable particular, that in the Hebrew not the qualifying word, as in the Arabic, but that which is qualified by the genitive, would thus bear the mark of the genitive — which is simply absurd. For this reason we are led to prefer Prof. Ewald's explanation, who, in opposition to Prof. Rödiger (we do not recollect Gesenius himself having advanced this proposition in a former edition of his work), says, § 211, that at the end of the qualified word there was originally a copulative vowel, towards which the entire word rushed vehemently, in order to attract the better from this position the new member. Of this final vowel, however, he says mere scattered remains are left. We do not, however, quite agree with Prof. Ewald in what follows; he says: "This final vowel, at the time of its fulness, probably

sounded *yá*, which was a word of reference, and it now usually occurs in the form of *i*, as in the proper noun **יְקִיָּצְרָק**, properly king of right; and more rarely in that of *ó*, as in **בִּי**, or of *a* in *fate*, as in **מִי** from **מִיָּי** (Isa. xxx. 11); but as a general thing, the copulative vowel has become very scarce, and, except in a few proper nouns and some prepositions, as **בְּלֵי** *without*, **יְלֵי** *besides*, we only meet with it in poetry. Yet even where this final vowel is no longer visible, it has left some traces behind: 1. the ending of the feminine singular always sounds hard = *t*, as before a new vowel; 2. the ending of the feminine plural *óth* has appropriated as a copulative vowel the vowel *ay* in *way* of the masculine plural in the state construct of the words **בְּגָמֵי** [the] heights of, **בְּרֵאשֵׁי**, at [the] heads of; also most of the suffixes have acquired it; 3. several roots of nouns in the state construct again exhibit a vowel as a part of the original root, which had been entirely given up in the state absolute, e. g. in the words expressing relations, **אָבִי** father of, **אֵמִי**, **אָמִי** (?) ; also, **רֵעִי** or **רֵעִי** friend, together with **רֵעִי** in the state absolute."

Thus far we have quoted from Prof. Ewald. The last word, **רֵעִי**, we intend to keep in sight, in order to trace it again in other words. As regards Prof. Ewald's theory about *yá* (*já*), it lacks all proof, and is contrary to all probability. It seems to us that all feminines originally ended in *i*, and not only when followed by a genitive. Besides the endings **ִי** and **ִי**, we need also to explain **ִי**, **ִי**, and **ִי**, and as we found ourselves compelled to oppose Prof. Rödiger's explanation of the former endings, viz. **ִי** and **ִי**, so we have now to raise some objections to Prof. Ewald's definition of the [primitive] meaning of these latter endings.

In the Aramean, and also in some non-Semitic idioms, we meet with some awkward modes of expressing the genitive case, e. g. in the Swabian (German) dialect, we hear: *meinem Vater sein Bruder* (literally: to my father his brother) instead of *meines Vaters Bruder* (my father's brother); *meiner Schwester ihr Kind* (to my sister her child), instead of *meiner Schwester Kind* (my sister's child); the very

same thing is of an ordinary occurrence in the Aramean. In this language the suffix, which agrees in number and gender with the attribute by which the noun is modified or qualified, is first appended to the noun, and then follows the attribute in the genitive case. This is even done in cases where, instead of the qualified noun a preposition is used which formerly figured as a noun, though the original noun in some cases can no longer be recognized. A few examples may illustrate this: אֱלֹהֵי (his name) ה' (of) אֱלֹהִים (the God) — his name of the God, instead of "the name of God, or God's name." The same thing occurs in the Syriac. The suffix of the third person singular, afterwards because it occurs most frequently, appears to us to have become stereotyped or petrified, as it were, in the Hebrew, after its meaning had become lost in the popular understanding. Now this third person occurs in the Aramean, in several different forms, all of which may be traced again in the Hebrew, הַ for הֵ (rarely הֶ), הֵ and instead of this הֵ, which may have been, itself, originally הֵ for הַ; unless we assume this to be shortened of הֵ or הֵ. As the Hebrew was only provided with vowel-marks in the seventh century after Christ, and the letter yod had also represented the sound of *a* in *fale*, the original pronunciation of this letter, two thousand years ago, can no longer be determined with any certainty. As regards the suffix ה, this would have to be taken for the Hebrew suffix ה from הַ, or for a dilapidated form of הֵ.¹ The original pronominal suffix would thus, as it seems, have been gradually reduced in the Hebrew into a mere copula or connective vowel, and a considerable number of words, the endings of which thus far appeared abnormal, would thereby receive an easy and natural explanation. If we, according to what appears above, regard the final ה in הַתְּנֵן *ten*, as identical with the final yod,

¹ The ה we partially find in the Syriac and Chaldee, as well as in the Ethiopic, before suffixes. The Hebrew ה seems to us to have originated in הֵ = *au* (*ā - oo*), and this is the demonstrative suffix *a* (*a* in *far*) which we spoke of above, and the suffix הַ, he or it. This *ā* we recognize also in the state construct of the Ethiopic, at variance with Prof. Dillmann, who identifies it with the sign of the accusative.

it agrees with the Chaldee yod in *ten*; and in *ten*, also, in which, on account of its being a primitive root, we cannot expect to find four radicals, the final syllable does not belong to the root [as little as do the syllables *ten* and *ten* in the state construct *ten* and *ten* of *ten*], as is wrongly maintained by Prof. Ewald, but it is a mere copulative form for *ten* or *ten*. In the Chaldee forms *ten*, also, the final syllables are no more marks of the feminine gender [as is imagined by Prof. Fürst, p. 242 of his Chaldee grammar] than is *ten* in the Hebrew *ten*, or *ten* in *ten*, and *ten*, the mark of the Chaldee feminine. But in the Hebrew (*ten*), *ten* is the proper root, and in the Chald. *ten* (Heb. *ten*), as is even admitted by Prof. Fürst in *ten*. By this mode of interpreting, these two numerals are found in agreement with the archaic form *ten*, which by Ewald, Fürst, and Rödiger is declared to be an obscure form, the etymology of which they have by no means cleared up. Mr. Rödiger says, p. 190: "R. Jona explains this word by *ten* till twelve, or, as it were, near twelve, which is an expression like *undeviginti*, but which in the present instance would be a little out of the way. Moreover, this explanation would only fit the feminine, while in the masculine we also say *ten*, instead of *ten* for *ten*, which was to be expected; unless we admit an incorrectness of the language. Others say that it means something which is added, in thought, to *ten*, from *ten* to think; which is Prof. Fürst's explanation. This gentleman, however, adds that it may also be derived from *ten* (= *ten*), to incline, to bend, to incline towards; so that *ten* means [inclinings or] an inclining towards, or an attaching, and *ten*, an attaching to *ten*." In this case, however, we add, *ten* would have to be written without a dagesh, which yet is written everywhere. Prof. Ewald comes much nearer the truth; for he says, "Ausführliches Lehrbuch, etc.," p. 572, and "Schulgrammatik," p. 166: "In the place of the first numeral in *ten* masc., *ten* fem., *eleven*, there is also found *ten*, which occurs only in this connection. This word only occurs in the Hebrew, and its derivation is obscure; especially

since it serves for both genders; yet it seems merely a dialectic variation of אָחַר." In a foot-note he adds: "Even as in the Samaritan עַר עָשָׂרִי is said, instead of חַר, and as this very number *eleven*, being the next one to the short words for the numbers from one to ten is singularly developed in many languages."

All this, however, is not saying much. It is not very extraordinary that in the Samaritan we should find עַר in the place of the Aramean חַר; for it is well known that the Samaritans frequently place ע in the stead of other gutturals. But this does not assist the etymology of this word any; because the Aramean form is a later abbreviation. In the Hebrew we find of the numeral אָחַר the secondary form אַחַר, and in the Arabic رَحَر, both as nouns and as verbs, and in addition to these we have, in our present case, the archaic guttural form עַחַר. Which of these forms was the original one, can now no longer be decided with any certainty. To judge by analogy, the stronger ע must be prior to א; and instances of such a transition occur in other words; e. g. עוֹר, אֹר; אָנֹכּ, אֹנֹכּ; אָנֹכּ, אֹנֹכּ; אָנֹכּ, אֹנֹכּ; אָנֹכּ, אֹנֹכּ; אָנֹכּ, אֹנֹכּ. The fact that gutturals may pass over into sibilants, is noticed in the Indo-European, as well as in the Semitic idioms: Engl. *frog*, Germ. *Frosch* (speak frosh); Germ. *Brücke*, Engl. *bridge*; Engl. *to break*, Germ. *brechen*, Fr. *brèche*, and Engl. *breach*; Gr. *παχίω*, *πάσσω*; *ἐλαχίς*, *ἐλάσσω*; פֶּלֶק, חֶלֶק, חֶלֶק; אָרֶג, אָרֶג, to plait, etc. But more particularly we notice the change of ח into ט, חַרְחַר into טַרְטַר; חֶבֶט into טַבֶּט; אָרֶג, Aram. חֶר. The form אַחַרִּי would, therefore, be instead of אָחַרִּי, from the feminine אַחַרִּי אַחַרִּי or אַחַרִּי, which, with its copula, would be united to the masculine אַחַרִּי אַחַרִּי, according to rule; this form, moreover, would be on the same stage of formation with אַחַרִּי אַחַרִּי for אַחַרִּי אַחַרִּי, the Chaldee חֶרְחַרִּי or חֶרְחַרִּי, and the Chaldee feminines אַחַרִּי אַחַרִּי, אַחַרִּי אַחַרִּי, etc., in which not the ending חַרִּי, but the letter ח is the mark of the feminine gender.

Ewald, Rüdiger, and Gesenius, as well as their predecessors, are mistaken in supposing אַחַרִּי to be a feminine form. For, *first*, in order to prove their assertion, they cannot

furnish one single other word in which ת־ is a feminine ending; and, *secondly*, among the compound numbers this would be the only instance where two feminine forms would be found together; and so long as another explanation is possible, it is wrong to admit this exception. A satisfactory explanation, however, is almost forced upon us, when we compare the number *ten* in the three more archaic Semitic idioms. In the *Hebrew* we find the following forms for the number *ten*: 1. עָשָׂר, 2. עֶשֶׂר, 3. עֶשְׂרֵה, 4. עֶשְׂרֹה, 5. עֶשְׂרָה; in the *Chaldee*, 1. עֶסֶר (2. עֶשֶׂר, 3. סַר), 4. עֶסְרִי (סְרִי), 5. עֶסְרָא, 6. עֶשְׂרָה (7. עֶסְרָה), 8. עֶסְרַת, 9. עֶשְׂרֵתַי; in the *Syriac*, 1. ܥܫܪܐ (עֶסֶר), 2. ܥܫܪܐ (ܥֶסְרָא for עֶסְרָא), 3. ܥܫܪܐ (ܥֶסְרָא), 4. ܥܫܪܐܐ, עֶסְרָה, *esrath'*; when compounded with units. We thus have, in the Hebrew, Syriac, and Chaldee, three forms for the feminine: in the state absolute, Heb. עֶשְׂרָה, Syr. עֶסְרָא, Chald. עֶסְרָא, in the state construct, Heb. עֶשְׂרֹה, Syr. עֶסְרַת, Chald. עֶסְרַת, עֶסְרֵי; for the masculine, state absolute, Heb. עָשָׂר (עֶשֶׂר), Syr. and Chald. עֶסֶר. After deducting these forms, there remains in all these languages one single form, which must have sounded alike in all of them, viz. עֶסְרָה, עֶסְרָא, עֶסְרִי (סְרִי). Now, in none of these languages is there a single instance found of a feminine form ending in ת־, א־, or י־, and it is perfectly inconceivable to us, how Profs. Winer and Fürst, in the face of the feminine form עֶסְרֵתַי, given in their Chaldee grammars, can still insist that עֶסְרִי is a feminine form. By doing so, Mr. Fürst even contradicts himself; for, on p. 201 of his "Chaldäische Formenlehre," he absolutely denies that substantives ending in ת־ can ever be feminines. Inasmuch as the three forms mentioned above are evidently identical, and as the final yod, moreover, in a large number of words, appears as a copulative form, we are led to assume that the Chaldee form in this particular instance is the older one, common to all, and that the letter ה of the Hebrew and the א of the Syriac were weakened from or exchanged for an original yod. As regards the fact of the meaning of an original suffixed word being lost from the popular understanding, and of its dwindling down into a mere gram-

matical form, such instances are found in all languages. We need but direct the attention of our readers to the adverbial ending *ment* in the Romance tongues, which was originally the ablative case *-mente* of the noun *mens*, and which, as may be still traced in the Spanish, at first was used only in a limited sense and with appropriate adjectives, but afterwards was employed as a general adverbial ending. *Sapienti sat!*

As regards the construction of the numerals with the numbered nouns, or with other numerals, the two grammars before us gave us satisfaction in this one respect, that their authors are no longer willing to make white appear black, and black white, i. e. to call the masculines feminines, and the feminines masculines, as is still done by their colleagues in the other Semitic idioms, viz. by *Winer* and *Fürst* in the Chaldee, *Uhlemann* in the Syriac, *Dillmann* in the Ethiopic, and *Caspari* in the Arabic. But we are not at all satisfied that these gentlemen simply mention this singular construction, without any satisfactory account of it. Prof. Ewald supposes that the numerals were originally substantives of quantity, and that, as such, they are found in the state construct of the feminine ending : שְׁלִישָׁה בָּנִים he regards as a trine of sons, *trias filiorum*; and afterwards, when these substantives gradually assumed the character of mere adjectives, and could be placed before, or even after the nouns, without entering into a very close conjunction with them, the distinction of gender, also, among them remained settled in this manner, i. e. the form of the feminine remained for the nearer gender, viz. the masculine [we would ask the professor whether the feminine gender is not just as near as the masculine], and they were thus enabled to cast this ending entirely aside for the feminine gender. How does Prof. Ewald know that these forms ever had the feminine ending? for, in order to cast it aside, they must have had it originally. These are arbitrary assertions.

Prof. Rödiger explains this peculiarity by saying that they were originally *substantiva abstracta*, such as *decas*, *trias*, and that, as such, they could have both a masculine and a

feminine form. The feminine form, according to him, was the principal form, and for this reason it was combined with words of the prevailing masculine gender; and the other form, without the feminine ending, was employed for words of the feminine gender. This distinction, however, according to him, could only have been established by usage. It was certainly established by usage, and indeed before the separation of the Semitic tribes; but no language ever goes to work arbitrarily; on the contrary, it always operates according to some fixed laws; and first among these laws are those of euphony and of symmetry. Gesenius and Rödiger look upon the feminine as the chief form; but we hope they do not regard it as the older form, from which the masculine is shortened. Unless therefore we choose to admit, with Ewald, that the forms of both genders were born as twins, there must have been a time in which the shorter form of the numerals was common to both genders, and when, after they commenced "to count above five," the masculine pronoun of the third person plural (in the Hebrew $\text{הֵם} = \text{הֵי}$), which, at that time was likewise common to both genders, was suffixed to the units. When, subsequently, it was deemed proper to distinguish the feminine from the masculine gender by a particular ending (נִי), and, in contradistinction to the concrete masculine, to prefer a graphic representation of the abstract the form of the feminine gender because it represents the less active and more receiving or passive element; when, finally, in the plural of this heavier form, by a lengthening of the short vowel into a long \bar{a} or \bar{o} , the endings נִי or נִי were produced, in this case, we ask, was it not very natural that, for the sake of euphony, the ill-sounding, tautophonic endings in נִי should be avoided? We ask further, whether it was not right to do justice to the law of symmetry, by wedding the shorter, now masculine form of the numeral, to the longer feminine form of the numeral or noun, and, with the same regard for symmetry, to combine the singular form of the numeral with the longer form of the plural of both endings of the noun, and, also, the singular of the nouns of both genders, not lengthened by

the plural ending, with the form of the tens, ending in — , which by the appending of the pronominal suffix to the originally monosyllabic units, had become dissyllabic. Among the numerals, therefore, not so much attention is paid to the genders, as to the proportional distribution of the various forms; by which is also explained the apparent irregularity in the use of the different forms of number two, where the forms of both genders, שְׁנַיִם masc. and שְׁנַיִם fem., are of the same length and ending, and where the construction שְׁנַיִם נָשִׁים no longer requires any particular explanation.

If, now, from the nominal roots we pass over to the verbal, which we, in conformity with Fürst, hold to have been originally monosyllabic, we differ from him in not finding the most archaic form of the verb in the third person of the Aramean perfect, but in the third person of the feminine sing. of the Hebrew verb, when it precedes a suffix, and next to the Hebrew in the Arabic and Ethiopic, viz. Heb., originally קָטַל , now קָטַל masc., קָטְלָה fem.; Arab. and Ethiop. קַטַּל . The Hebrew form קָטְלָה evidently dates from a time when the masculine still sounded קָטַל ,¹ and when the sheva of the first radical, according to a specific Hebrew usage, was not yet expanded into a foretone kamets. For this reason we hold that the Hebrew form of the plural which still survives before suffixes, is the older; because, if the form קָטַלִּים had already existed at that time, nothing could have prevented their saying קָטַלְיָהוּ , etc. Again, the Hebrew form קָטְלָהּ (for קָטְלָהּ and קָטְלָהּ for $\text{קָטְלָהּ} = \text{קָטְלָהּ}$) for the representation of both genders, appears to us more primitive; and the process of distinguishing the genders seems to belong to a time when the form קָטְלָה , which originally was common to both genders, was already employed in designating the feminine, in contradistinction to קָטַלָה ; as may be seen from the Arabic *kāthālnā*. This latter Arabian form, however, again appears older than the Aramean *ketālā* and the Ethiopic *kāthālā*, because they both seem shortened from this Arabic

¹ Since we have no notice of the primitive centuries, we do not know, from the not vocalized text, when the Hebrew verb ceased to be a monosyllable.

form; unless we assume that these latter forms, viz. *ketālā* and *kāthālā*, have lost a final nasal sound.

On returning to the third person singular feminine, Gesenius is evidently right in assuming, both in the case of the verb and of the noun, that the ending תְ is original, and that the ending תֵּ is blunted from it, and we can see no reason whatever why Ewald should say, § 248: "Whenever these suffixes meet with the verbal pronouns, the ending תֵּ of the third person singular feminine of the perfect is constantly hardened into *at*, § 173," and why he should identify this verbal ending with the feminine ending, which he evidently does by referring to it. In this passage quoted he says: 'Wherever the feminine is distinguished externally, it has, as an original mark, the syllable *-at* appended to it; yet this *t* is very much (*sic!*) softened into a mere breathing, after the vowel *āh*, which is written תְ , and very seldom תֵּ .'

Ewald removed the Niphal from its former place, immediately after the Kal, into the last place; we do not see a sufficient reason for such a removal, and we rather, with Prof. Rödiger retain the order introduced by Gesenius and his predecessors. In case this order was to be remodelled, we would propose that the Hiphil and Hophal should be placed immediately after the Niphal, in order to have together all the forms derived from the simple root. We approve, however, of Prof. Ewald's making a synopsis of the perfect tenses of all verbal forms, in order to obtain a general view of them; because they likewise represent the indicative mood. Ewald, also, is perfectly right in vindicating to the Hebrew ת , the characteristic letter of the Hiphil, the priority over the ס of the other Semitic idioms; he also says that the vowel *ā* or patah of the Piel or Hiphil first "tapered off," in the Hebrew, into a chirec, as he expresses himself. The same, also, we hold to be the case with the chirec of the second syllable of the Hiphil; inasmuch as this only appears as an exception in the Aramean, and is not at all found in the Arabic and Ethiopic. In the Hebrew, too, it is replaced in the first and second persons, by a tsere, or else a patah stands in its place. How old the chirec of the first syllable is,

in the Hebrew, and that of the second syllable, also, partly in the Chaldee, can now no longer be determined, because the yod of the ultimate in the texts represented both the tseré and the chirec, and the vowels were added only in the seventh century after Christ.

As regards the origin and formation of the imperative mood, Ewald and Rödiger differ from each other. Rödiger says: "Along [with the third person of the perfect tense] is placed a second radical or fundamental form, which sounds the same as the infinitive mood בִּשְׁׁרָ , also בִּשְׁרָ , after which come the imperative mood, and the imperfect tense." He continues, on p. 94: "The principal form of the imperative mood בִּשְׁרָ (בִּשְׁרָ) is the same which also underlies the formation of the imperfect tense, and which, in another direction, in the form of the infinitive mood, verges towards the noun." In a foot-note he observes: "It seems preferable to regard the imperative mood as an abbreviation of the second person of the imperfect tense, בִּשְׁרָ from בִּשְׁרָ ; but it is more probable that each of these three forms is an independent grammatical formation, and that they did not arise one from another, but that all three originated together on the foundation of the abstract verbal form. The inflection of the imperative mood, on the other hand, may have arisen from the imperfect tense." Ewald (and also Fürst, in his "Chaldäische Formenlehre"), however, does not hesitate in the least to assert that the imperative mood was generated from the imperfect tense; for he says, p. 137, 2: "The proper distinction of the imperative mood first arose by the dropping of the initial mark of the person, while the number and gender still remain indicated with sufficient accuracy." The three above-named gentlemen deserve some credit for refusing to admit any longer the absurd hypothesis of the former grammarians, that the imperative mood and the imperfect tense were generated from the abstract nominal form of the infinitive mood. But we are not quite sure what to do with Rödiger's form בִּשְׁרָ or בִּשְׁרָ , inasmuch as it is neither the imperative nor the infinitive mood. What part of speech is this unknown x?

We are aware that our linguists, in their investigations, are in the habit of starting with such nameless and shapeless skeletons of word-roots; but we are convinced that such linguistical phantoms could never have existed in *rerum natura*. All words have a certain office to perform in the sentence or worded thought, and they are, therefore, parts of a sentence, and belong to some one of the well-known parts of speech. Let these gentlemen, then, declare themselves! What parts of speech are those skeletons? There is no difficulty at all in supposing that the same word may have originally served both in the capacity of a noun and of a verb; but, in this case, it would not only have preserved the same consonants, but also the same vowels. The skeleton has never existed without flesh and blood. Ewald is certainly right in objecting to the simultaneous birth of the several forms of the imperfect tense, but he is most undoubtedly wrong in making (p. 226) the mother to be the daughter, by supposing the imperative mood to be shortened form the future tense.

It is a matter of surprise to us, that our scholars "cannot see the forest, although there are so many trees;" and we wonder why they do not follow the example of *Winer*, who (like *Uhlemann* in his *Syrian Grammar*, page 37), in his "*Chaldäische Grammatik*," p. 33, very justly derived the compound form of the future, in the Chaldee,¹ from the simple form of the imperative mode. In the Semitic languages, at least, the aorist or perfect tense is the original expression of a realized activity, which first strikes the observer; this form, afterwards, is either provided with the agent or author of this activity in the form of a succeeding pronoun (which is generally suffixed), or of a noun; or else the activity itself becomes personified, or "nounified" as it

¹ In the Chaldee, Syriac, and Samaritan it is seen most clearly that the imperative mood and the future tense did not arise from the nominal infinitive, because, in this language, the infinitive mood is a nominal form, made of the aorist or perfect, by prefixing the relative letter א , e. g. הַשָּׁחַט , he, it, has killed, הַשָּׁחַטְךָ for הַשָּׁחַט (who or) what has killed and does kill, i. e. the killing.

were, and, without changing the sound of the word any, the same word is originally used as a noun, and as a verb. The form required next in order to express our thoughts — as has been shown in a previous Article — is that by which we cause, order, or beseech, a repetition of the same activity. As this command or request is usually made for a concrete case, and is directed to an individual present, it was originally effected by a repetition of the same sound which had been employed for the expression of an activity, perceived or noticed, as is still done to some extent in the Aramean and Hebrew, Ethiopic (and Arabic) רָרַרְה, אָבַרְר, אָשַׁבְב, אָשַׁטַט, or else this sound is used in such a manner that the patah was reduced into the shorter *o*, *u*, or *e*, as is done, for instance, in the German, where, from *sprach* (spake) has been formed *sprich* (speak), and of *stach*, *stich*.¹ This form was afterwards completed, and applied to the other persons, but in such a manner, that the person addressed who existed before the action was to take place again, was very logically placed before, and not after, the verb; i. e. it was prefixed and not suffixed. But if this be so, the so-called jussive or commanding form of the future is the first which was formed of the imperative mood. The Semites, therefore, in forming their future or imperfect tense, did not start with the idea of *growing* or *coming into being* (Germ. *werden*), but with that of *forcing* or *ordering into being* (Germ. *sollen* or *müssen*). It is true, that thus the imperative mood and the formations of the imperfect tense, derived from it, did not express the distinct opposition of what was not yet realized, to what has been realized (which distinction was raised by Ewald). But this was not indispensably necessary; for the primitive people, in building up their language, did not care about hunting after opposites, but they simply endeavored to express their thoughts in a plain manner; they did not start with beautiful, philosophical theorems, but cared for their immediate wants. But, suppose the commanding form to have been next the perfect

¹ English aorist, drank, imperative, drink; and in most addresses, as *fili* for *filius*; *dōmīnē*, *dominus*; *waī*, *waīs*, etc.

or aorist, the first and oldest, it must also have been the shortest, because it applied to concrete cases; and such, also, is actually the case, and in this short form it is called the *Jussive* mood. If, however, the jussive mood is the oldest form, it cannot have been shortened from the other forms, as is wrongly supposed by Ewald and Rödiger; but on the contrary, these other forms are derived and lengthened from the jussive mood. The fact that this mood was the oldest, can also be proved *a posteriori* from this consideration, that it was common to all idioms before their final separation; for the tsere of the Hebrew imperative, e. g. in עֲשֵׂה is older than the chirec.¹ From the *vav conversivum*, however, about which we will now say a few words, it may be seen that this jussive mood of the Hebrew passed over into all the different modifications of the imperfect tense.

We have mentioned above the syllabic *vav conversivum*, i. e. the *vav*, prefixed with a *pattah* or *kamets*, and not with a *sheva*; and we have there spoken of its capacity of drawing back the accent, if possible, from the last syllable to the penult, of dropping entirely the final syllable הַ, and, in order to make up for these changes, of furnishing the first vowelless radical with a short *segol* or *pattah*. This monosyllabic prefix ׀ has been identified with the non-syllabic ׀, and, in the hands of our modern grammarians, has become a regular wizzard, changing its color like a chameleon; at one time it removes the accent, as far as it can, from the final syllable, and, when it does not meet with any obstruction, it even amputates this syllable completely, and changes the whole constitution of the words. At another time, when put with the *sheva*, it does exactly the opposite; it forces the accent upon the final syllable, neglecting, apparently, the preceding syllables. It, moreover, converts, on the one hand, perfects into futures, and, on the other, futures into perfects; it is, also, placed at the head

¹ Even the Chaldee chirec of the second feminine and the plural masculine, as well as in Hebrew, is of a later vocalization, and also of later formation. As for the plural masculine, think of the English 'come! see!' spoken both to one and to several persons.

of entire books, and thus commences them with the conjunction *and*, even as a certain peasant commenced his letter with the conjunctions *but, however*. We confess that we do not appreciate this modern identifying of the prefixes ך and ך; into which position even Gesenius allowed himself to be driven in the eighth edition of his grammar, by the cross-fire opened upon him by the partisans of Ewald. Not everything that is new is good. As Ewald does not give us any satisfactory information in his school-grammar about the transformation of ך into ך, we must have recourse to his "Ausführliche Grammatik," where, p. 512, § 259, he makes the following statement:

"As the preposition with its subordinate (?) noun, so also the conjunction with its subordinate verb, may form one inseparable, close combination, in which not one member modifies the other, but where both members together express a meaning which they only have in this connection. For this purpose, however, only particular conjunctions are available; inasmuch as a common conjunction, without any such power, is connected much more loosely with a sentence. Such a conjunction, with a superior power, is particularly the copula ך, when it does not express the simple *and*, but like our *because* (Germ. *da*) and *thus* (Germ. *so*), indicates forcibly the consequence of an action, time or intention, in which case, no doubt, more stress was laid upon it in pronunciation. Wherever this or any other similar conjunction forms a composition with a tense or mood, certain progressing, connecting, and, consequently, relative tenses and moods are formed, and the tenses themselves, for this purpose, are developed more firmly in a novel and peculiar manner. Hence results, *first*, the relative progressing imperfect tense. The imperfect is preceded by the little time-particle *a*, which has reference to the past, and doubles the following consonant (perhaps it is originally *ad*, אד). This particle is of a pronominal origin, and corresponds to the augment: it means as much as our word '*da*' (= *because, there or then*), and has coalesced with the conjunction ך *and* (which thereby becomes more forcible)

into *va*, doubling the consonant which follows. The more forcible *and*, which removes an action into the past, is produced by the coalescing of these two little words." Ewald adds further that the imperfect tense becomes subordinate to this prefix in the voluntative mood, which mood, by itself, puts an action into motion, and, consequently, renders it dependent, attaching it to some point; in this manner, he says, a certain combination is formed by which the action is removed into the past, attaching it there to some point, already given, within its own series; so that the development of the action may be traced from that point. This, he says, is the *imperfectum perfecti*, which progresses from a certain given point or thought, and is never placed independently, but always in reference to some preceding point. How is it, we ask, when the syllable \imath commences entire books? According to his statement at the outset of his explanation, we expected Ewald to give us a number of conjunctions, which become thus inseparably connected with verbs; but, with the exception of \imath , he does not mention a single other instance, and he admits, himself, that the conjunctions, generally, are more loosely connected with the sentence. And this must necessarily be so, because a conjunction, though it sometimes arises from a relative particle, yet differs from it; for the office of a conjunction does not only consist in connecting parts of the following clause, but also in attaching an entire clause to its leading clause. As regards the whole theory of Ewald in respect to \imath , it may be said it is *scitior quam verior*. If we choose to proceed in his fashion, anything whatever may be proved, and, compared with him, a certain scholar of antiquity who derived *Neptunus* from *nando*, proceeded less arbitrarily. We are at a loss to comprehend why Gesenius's mode of explaining the *vav conversivum* was ever abandoned by the learned; for it is certainly more natural and less artificial. While the vowel *a*, in the sense of *then (tum)*, which has been conjured up by Ewald, does not at all exist in the language, and while there is not a single instance on record in which \imath coalesces into one syllable with a following \varkappa , in

the other explanation everything follows naturally; moreover it has tradition in its favor, which ought not to be neglected, when it can be rationally confirmed, and when it can show analogies in another Semitic idiom.¹ Instead of acknowledging with Rödiger that the theory of former grammarians is wrong, who hold that *וַיִּקְטַל* arose by a process of shortening and by a contraction from *וַיְהִי וַיִּקְטַל*, or *וַיְהִי וַיִּקְטַל*, for which denial he does not offer any reason whatever, we rather agree with the old grammarians — if it is at all proper for us to give an opinion concerning the genesis of this archaic form — and we hold that this form arose from the old verb *וַיְהִי* for *וַיְהִי* (*וַיְהִי*) which is only found in seven places, but still survives in the name *וַיְהִי* (not *וַיְהִי* as Ewald reads, prompted by a desire of innovation). This verb, like *וַיְהִי*, *וַיְהִי*, coalesced with the following word, as in *וַיְהִי לָכֵן* for *וַיְהִי לָכֵן*, and the first syllable *וַיְהִי* was dropped, as in the Syriac. When, subsequently, the verb *וַיְהִי* passed over into *וַיְהִי*, *וַיְהִי*, and the people were no longer conscious of the old form, the construction itself, indeed, remained, but the prefix was wrongly taken for the conjunction *וַיְהִי*. The fact that the particular form of construction of commencing with the perfect tense, and following with the future or imperfect tense, did not arise on Hebrew ground, but is founded on the primitive Semitic mode of viewing and representing things, is proved by this consideration, that in the Arabic, also, we meet with a similar form of construction, and, indeed, the verb *cana*, which in this language is in the place of the Hebrew *וַיְהִי* *كَانَ يُحِبُّ* (*כָּן יוֹהֵבִי*) *amabat*, he used to love, *וַיְהִי* *كَانَ يَرْكَبُ* (*כָּן יִרְכָבִי*), literally: it was or came to pass [that] he will (would) ride, i. e. he used to ride.

¹ Even in the Ethiopic one single instance, like a solitary relic from older times, perhaps may survive, *väyēbē*, and he said, for it happened that he would or did say.