

A GRAMMAR
OF THE
SAMARITAN LANGUAGE,

WITH
EXTRACTS AND VOCABULARY.

BY
G. F. NICHOLLS,

READER IN ORIENTAL LITERATURE, AND MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS;
LATE EXHIBITIONER OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.



LONDON:
SAMUEL BAGSTER AND SONS;
WAREHOUSE FOR BIBLES, NEW TESTAMENTS, PRAYER BOOKS, CHURCH SERVICES,
LEXICONS, GRAMMARS, CONCORDANCES, PSALTERS, AND BIBLICAL WORKS,
IN ANCIENT AND MODERN LANGUAGES;
15, PATERNOSTER ROW.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

<http://www.archive.org/details/grammarofsamarit00nichrich>

P R E F A C E.

IN offering to the public a work of so *novel* a character as the present, the author has seized the opportunity of stating the grounds on which it was undertaken.

The importance of the study of the Biblical languages has never been questioned, excepting by those men who are ignorant of them, and are disposed to condemn *in toto* the utility of that which they have not the means or opportunity to acquire. On the other hand, those illustrious scholars, whose definition of the utilitarian *cui bono* is directly opposed to the former, have not only inculcated the momentous importance of linguistic study by *precept*, but have led the van thereof conspicuously by *example*.

To recount the imperishable names of those who, from the earliest ages of Christianity, have patronised or pursued this study, is unnecessary in this place; their opinions of its importance may be summed up in the words of the learned Dr. Jahn: "occurrit et illud, quod est totius theologiæ fundamentum, neque tamen *sine subtili et intimâ linguarum Biblicarum cognitione* satis firmari potest, *γνησιότης*, inquam,

sacrorum librorum, *quâ labefactatâ*, ruit authoritas horum documentorum, et theologiæ ædificium evertitur." And again, "librorum *γνησιώτητα* et verum sensum, *absque subtili et intimâ linguarum scientiâ*, comprobare nemo potest."

The phrase "Biblical Languages," although capable of extension to all those versions of the Sacred Scriptures which have been made during the last century into almost every important language and dialect, is usually confined to the following: viz. Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Samaritan, Ethiopic, Amharic, and Coptic; to which, of course, the Greek and Latin may be added.

- The first four of the languages just enumerated have received especial attention at the hands of scholars; while the four latter have been wholly neglected or forgotten. In fact, during the last few years, so little attention and study have they attracted, that, at the present time, it is impossible to acquire even the rudiments of them, except through the medium of the Latin tongue. Why they have been allowed to fall into such disrepute, it is not worth while to inquire, but we have only to do with the fact that such is the case, and, if possible, to remedy it.

The present work is a Grammar of the Samaritan Language; it is strictly *Rudimentary*, and is intended as a precursor to a more critical and philological view of the tongue. The main object of the author has been to deal with the ordinary facts of Etymology and Syntax, and to produce such a work (to use an illustrious scholar's words), "non ut in ipso hæreat juvenus, sed ut per eum transeat,

per cum excolatur, et ad altiora præparetur." How far he has succeeded in his endeavours will be for the discerning public to determine; to whose favour he would commend his present attempt.

The author has consulted nearly the whole of the extant writers on the subject,—as Cellarius, Morinus, Castellus, Leusdenius, and others. To the first he is *especially* indebted in the Etymological part of the work; whose facts, notwithstanding they are undigested, and expressed in questionable Latinity, are undoubtedly invaluable.

The Syntax is, however, wholly original; and the author has especially aimed at giving the ordinary rules, to the exclusion of all which might seem hypercritical to the young scholar.

The Work is preceded by a brief dissertation upon the Samaritans, their language and literature, which the author hopes will not be unacceptable to the reader, and is concluded by an extract, from Walton's Polyglot, of three chapters of the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, with exegetical remarks upon the text, together with a short Lexicon, carefully compiled by actual reading and observation. The student will do well, after he has mastered the Grammar, to construe, by the aid of the Lexicon, and parse the whole of the extracts, in doing which he will find his labours considerably diminished by observing the analogy which the Samaritan bears to the Syriac and Chaldee.

Before concluding, it is scarcely necessary to dwell upon

the extent to which the Samaritan text as edited in the books is vitiated; and no doubt many of the anomalies, which have come to be considered *grammatical* peculiarities, are to be referred to this cause. The fact is simply mentioned here, to show that the reader must bear with some things, which in the *present* state of the text are unavoidable.

The author hopes to have an opportunity of editing a critical and philological Grammar, which, with a Lexicon and a revised text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, would form a somewhat complete library of Samaritan literature.

LONDON:
1853.

INTRODUCTION.

BEFORE entering upon the Grammar, a brief account of the Samaritans, their language and literature, may not be unacceptable to the generality of our readers.

It appears that the ten tribes of Israel who had revolted from Solomon's son, elected Jeroboam as their king, who fixed his capital at Shechem, in mount Ephraim.

The Israelitish king, in order to prevent his people from going to Jerusalem, set up two golden calves, one in Dan, and the other in Bethel, to which they might offer the usual sacrifices.

We pass over the remaining acts of Jeroboam and his successors, until we come to Omri, the sixth king of Israel, who began his reign, A.M. 3079. He it was who purchased the hill of Samaria from Shemer, and built on it a city called by the same name, from which the gentile noun, *Samaritans*, is derived.

The city Samaria was besieged during Ahab's reign, by the Syrian king, Ben-hadad, but without success: in the reign of Hoshea, however, Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, attacked it, and after three years' siege succeeded in taking it, and carrying away the Israelites captive into Assyria.

The territories of the banished Jews were occupied by a mixed people, brought from different parts of the Assyrian empire,—from Babylon, Cuthah, Ava, Hamath, and Se-

pharvaim. It is to these colonists that the name *Samaritans* is specially, though not exclusively, applicable. According to Josephus, they were called כּוּתָאִי *Cuthæi*, as the following extract will show (B. ix. c. 14):—οἱ δὲ μετοικισθέντες εἰς τὴν Σαμάρειαν Χυθαῖοι—ταύτη γὰρ ἔχρωντο μέχρι δεῦρο τῇ προσηγορίᾳ, διὰ τὸ ἐκ τῆς Χυθᾶς καλουμένης χώρας μεταχθῆναι, αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Περσίδι καὶ ποταμὸς τοῦτ' ἔχων ὄνομα, etc.

It appears, moreover, that these colonists were infested with lions, on account of their idolatry; and believing the cause of this visitation to be their ignorance of the worship due to the "God of the land," they resolved to request Shalmaneser to send them a priest or priests of the captive people, who might teach them "the manner of the God of the land." This request was complied with,—a priest was sent. But it does not appear that the instruction he imparted had the effect of totally eradicating idolatry from among them; for we read, that "they feared the Lord, but served their graven images." How long this semi-idolatry continued it is impossible to say: it would appear, however, that on the return from the Babylonish captivity it had ceased; for they not only made an application to Judah and Benjamin to be allowed to participate in rebuilding the temple, for which the latter had obtained a decree, but added, as if reprobating their former wickedness, "we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esar-haddon, king of Assur, which brought us up here." This proposal was refused by Ezra and Nehemiah, and the other Jews; who were not only empowered by the decree of Cyrus to rebuild their temple, but also to fortify their city. This refusal on the part of the Jews, gave rise to that im-

placable and deadly hatred which ever after existed between themselves and the Samaritans.

The latter, by their calumnies and intrigues at the court of Persia, at length forced the Jews to desist from their work. We are told that they "hired counsellors against them;" and to judge from the proceedings recorded in Ezra, c. iv., there can be no doubt that the Samaritans were actuated by the most fiendish spleen. They are even said to have gone so far as to attempt to hinder the rebuilding by force, but without success, for the temple was completed.

The Jews never forgave the Samaritans: and as an instance of the contempt and abhorrence in which they held the latter, we may mention the saying, "he who eateth bread of a Cuthæan shall be as one who eateth pork." The Jews even refused to write a copy of the law on a Samaritan parchment.

What their feelings were, therefore, when it was resolved to build a rival temple to their own, may be more easily imagined than described.

Manasses, brother of the high-priest, and son-in-law of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, was ordered, in common with the other Jews, to give up his "strange wife." He refused, and was consequently compelled to fly for protection to his father-in-law.

On the representation of Sanballat, that the building of a temple in opposition to that of the Jews would tend to weaken the latter,—whom he represented as a nation ever disaffected, and always ready for revolution,—a temple was built by the Samaritans on mount Gerizim, of which Manasses was made high priest.

Shortly after the building of this temple, the Samaritans

revolted from Alexander, who expelled them, and put Macedonians in their place, and gave the province to the Jews. After Alexander's death, Ptolemy Lagus subdued both Judæa and Samaria, and carried away numbers of Jews and Samaritans to Egypt. Samaria afterwards fell into the hands of John Hyrcanus the Jewish chief priest; and soon after him into the hands of the Romans, during whose rule Herod Antipater rebuilt the temple and city with great magnificence, to which he gave the name Sebaste, or Augusta. At the present time, few of this once powerful people exist. Scaliger, who was desirous of being informed of their customs, wrote two letters, one to the Samaritans of Egypt, and the other to the chief priest, who resides at Neapolis, in Syria. Their answers are now in existence, and are well worthy of perusal.

We shall close the preceding brief sketch of the Samaritans, with a short account of their language and Pentateuch; and especially of what is called the Samaritan Version. But as our remarks have been, and must be brief, we may refer those who wish for complete information on the subject, to the Proleg. of Walton's Polyglot, Gesenius "de origine et indole Samaritani Pentateuchi," Cellarius, Schwarzzius, Scaliger, Hottinger, and others.

The Samaritan is chiefly a compound of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac. Among the words derived from these sources, are to be recognised a great number of Cuthæan words, imported, doubtlessly, by the new colonists.

Some of the words borrowed from the former languages have undergone various transformations, as will be seen hereafter, while others have remained entire and unchanged.

The *sympathies* of the language are decidedly Syro-

Chaldaic, as the reader will observe in the sequel. This is probably to be attributed to the fact, that while the Samaritans sought to fashion their own tongue after the manner of that of the Syrians, who were situated in Decapolis, north of Samaria; they scrupulously eschewed every thing which savoured of their southern neighbours, against whom they appear to have entertained the most implacable hatred.

There does not appear to be any substantial ground for the affirmation of Cellarius, that the Samaritan dialect was ruder and less polished than those of its neighbours. Generally speaking, it is far more simple in its syntax than the Hebrew, and free from those technical constructions with particles, which are especially found in the latter. It does not, however, appear to convey ideas more imperfectly than the Hebrew; on the contrary, there are cases in which its simple diction seems paramount to that of the latter; and to judge of a tongue by the utilitarian principle, that it was made for man, so far the Samaritan successfully attains the end for which language was in part designed. There is one peculiarity in the Samaritan, which especially arrests our attention; and that is, the promiscuous interchange of the so called *guttural* letters: but whether this is an argument against the ἀκρίβεια of the language, it is not our intention to determine.

It has been previously stated, that besides a large number of words borrowed from the three principal dialects of the Shemitic family, the Samaritan language is found to contain words foreign to all three of them. The historical fact, that the Cuthæi held possession of the Samaritan territories after the Babylonish captivity, or else that the Jews, on their return from Assyria, imported a number of exotic words previously unknown to their own and the cognate dialects,

is not only sufficient to account for the presence of such words, but also gives a clue to fixing the date when the Samaritan dialect was formed. This appears to have been about the seventh century before Christ. Previous to the captivity, there is every reason to believe that the Alphabet now called the Samaritan, was also employed by the Jews in transcribing those copies of the law which were disseminated throughout the tribes of Israel. The Pentateuch, known as the Hebræo-Samaritan, appears to support this supposition; for although written in Samaritan characters, the difference between it and the authorised Hebrew Pentateuch is so small, that there can be no difficulty in pronouncing the former to be a copy of the latter, or rather the latter a copy of the former; for, notwithstanding the ingenuity of Kopp, it is highly probable that on their return the Jews adopted, instead of their ancient characters, the Chaldee, now called the Hebrew, in which the Sacred text, as restored by Ezra, was written. In fact, the coincidence between the Hebrew and Hebræo-Samaritan text is so remarkable, that it induced Morinus to say of the latter, "purum putum Mosis Pentateuchum." The whole question, however, of the priority which ought to be given to one of these two copies of the Law, apparently turns upon the point as to whether the Assyrian characters were known among the Jews previous to the Babylonish captivity,—a question which it is not our purpose to discuss here. The Samaritan Version, which is written in the Samaritan dialect, and of which the following work is a Grammar, claims especial notice in this place.

We have previously spoken of the language in which it was written, whose genius is well set forth in the following

extract from the Atlas Ethnographique of the learned Adrien Balbi:—"Le Samaritain tient de l'Hébreu, du Chaldéen, et du Syriaque; mais diffère cependant d'une manière assez notable de ces idiomes, soit par ses formes grammaticales, soit par des racines qui lui sont propres, soit par des acceptions particulières de celles qui lui sont communes avec les autres dialectes sémitiques."

A few remarks upon the time, and author of this Version, will not be out of place here.

Upon the question of *time*, many illustrious scholars are at issue. Gesenius, in his learned discourse on the origin and character of the Samaritan Pentateuch, is disposed to place its execution some centuries after Christ. Hottinger and Walton, on the other hand, considered it of the highest antiquity. The illustrious orientalist Gesenius has not favoured us with the grounds upon which he came to the preceding conclusion, whereas the opinion of the two latter scholars appears to be supported by as reasonable hypotheses as the case admits.

In the first place, the internal evidence of the Version is sufficient to show that it is not older than the Babylonish captivity, in fact, that it must have been made after the building of the temple, under the auspices of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria; because the words rendered in our Version (Deut. xxvii. 4) by *Mount Ebal*, were changed by them into *זמרגמרגמרג* in *Mount Gerizim*. This could not have been done till after the building of their temple. The reader who will take the trouble to consult Schwarzzius, will find also another reason, which, however hypercritical it may seem, is certainly no less conclusive than the preceding.

Moreover, the analogy which the corresponding Hebrew version bears to the Samaritan will probably enable us to fix more precisely the time when the latter was written.

During the long captivity of the Jews in Babylon, few, if any of them, could have retained their own language free from the contamination of that of their conquerors. Besides, on the termination of that captivity, all the old Jews who had been removed from their country must have been dead: and if we suppose the Assyrian king carried away their infant children, we cannot doubt that few at the restoration, judging from the ordinary length of human life, remained alive to return; and those who did must certainly have spoken the language of their conquerors. Most of the Jews who returned to their country must have been men who had been born in Assyria; so that the Law in the original Hebrew must have been to them pretty much the same as a book written in the standard English of the present day would be to a real Lancashire provincialist. The consequence was, that a paraphrase was made called Targumin, and by this means the Jews were enabled to understand that which, from their ignorance of their vernacular language, must have otherwise remained almost a dead letter.

Judging, therefore, from analogy, it seems reasonable to suppose that the Samaritan version was made for a similar purpose, and about the same time.

That it was made for a public purpose is highly probable from the fact that such works were usually undertaken with that view; and there is no reason to believe that a private individual would undertake and complete such a work for his own amusement, much less that such an attempt would have escaped the ravages of time as the Samaritan has, and have

been handed down to our own age. This supposition, together with the fact that the independence of the Samaritans appears to have had no existence after the time of Alexander, would at least be presumptive evidence that it is coeval with the Targumin; because, generally speaking, works for national use are not undertaken when a nation's nationality is destroyed, or its independence lost.

As regards the author of this version, nothing is known; his name has not transpired, like those of Onkelos, Jonathan, and Saad. The way, however, in which he has performed his work, with few solitary exceptions, (and those probably due to the inaccuracy of the *librarii*, who have here, as in other cases, disfigured the original text by innovations, either the result of design or negligence,) will justify the words of Schwarzzius: "Cæterum nostro, quisquis demum ille fuerit, interpreti variæ et ingenii et doctrinæ laudes meritò deferuntur."

SAMARITAN GRAMMAR.

CHAPTER I.

1. THE Samaritan letters are the same in number as the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac; they have the same power, and the same names. The following Table contains the Alphabets of the four languages:—

Names.	Samaritan.			Hebrew or Chaldee.	Syriac.	Powers.
Aleph	Ⲁ	ⲁ	Ⲃ	א	ܐ	vowel <i>a</i> .
Beth	Ⲅ	ⲅ	Ⲇ	ב	ܒ	our <i>b</i> or <i>v</i> .
Gimel	Ⲉ	ⲉ	Ⲋ	ג	ܓ	<i>g</i> .
Daleth	Ⲍ	ⲍ	Ⲏ	ד	ܕ	<i>d</i> .
He	Ⲑ	ⲑ	Ⲓ	ה	ܗ	vowel <i>e</i> .
Vau	Ⲕ	ⲕ	Ⲍ	ו	ܘ	vowel <i>u</i> or consonant <i>v</i> .
Zain	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ז	ܙ	<i>z</i> .
Cheth	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ח	ܚ	guttural <i>k</i> .
Teth	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ט	ܛ	<i>t</i> .
Yod	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	י	ܝ	vowel <i>i</i> or consonant <i>j</i> .
Kaph	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	כ	ܟ	a hard <i>c</i> .
Lamed	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ל	ܠ	<i>l</i> .
Mem	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	מ	ܡ	<i>m</i> .
Nun	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	נ	ܢ	<i>n</i> .
Samech	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ס	ܣ	<i>s</i> .
Ayin	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ע	ܥ	vowel <i>o</i> .
Pe	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	פ	ܦ	<i>p</i> or <i>f</i> .
Tsade	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	צ	ܥ	<i>z</i> .
Coph	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ק	ܩ	a very hard <i>k</i> .
Resch	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ר	ܪ	<i>r</i> .
Schin	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ש	ܫ	<i>sch</i> .
Tau	Ⲙ	ⲙ	Ⲏ	ת	ܚ	<i>th</i> .

The Samaritan Alphabet may be written in various ways. The first of the three columns of letters given above contains the Alphabet as edited by Brian Walton in his Polyglot Bible, and Edmund Castel in his Heptaglot Lexicon, and is the mode of writing adopted in this Grammar. The second column contains the Alphabet as adopted by Scaliger, and Leusdenius in his Syriac Grammar. The third column contains the letters which Castel affirms are especially used in MSS.

The Samaritans have no means of distinguishing between the Hebrew letters ש and שׁ, both of which may be represented by ש. There are only a few purely Hebrew words involving ש, in which that letter is represented by ש; as, שׁשׁשׁ for שׁשׁשׁ; שׁשׁשׁשׁ for שׁשׁשׁשׁ, etc.; for in most other words, where analogy requires *Sin*, they imitate the Syrians, and use שׁ; as, שׁשׁשׁ for שׁשׁשׁ, שׁשׁשׁ for שׁשׁשׁ, etc.

The Samaritans have no *final* or *dilatable* forms, like the Hebrews, for any of the letters, but use the same form under all circumstances.

DIVISION OF LETTERS.

2. The letters of the Alphabet are divided into five classes, according to the *organs of speech* chiefly employed in articulating them; viz., Gutturals שׁשׁשׁשׁ; Labials שׁשׁשׁשׁ; Palatals שׁשׁשׁשׁ; Linguals שׁשׁשׁשׁ; and Dentals שׁשׁשׁשׁ. The preceding is the division of Castel. It will be seen hereafter, that the five letters שׁשׁשׁשׁ may be advantageously considered as vowels, or *matres lectionis*.

There is another division of letters into *Radicals* and *Serviles*. The *Radical* letters are those which constitute a *root* or *primitive* form. The *Serviles* such as are added to

the *Radicals* in derivation, conjugation, declension, and composition.

All the Serviles may be Radicals, but the Radicals are never Serviles. Those letters which are *essentially* Radical are, א ב פ מ נ ו ז ח ט י. The Serviles, which may also be Radicals are, כ ד ש ז ט מ נ ז ח ט י.

VOWELS.

3. The Samaritans have no points to mark the vowels, like the Hebrews. To remedy this defect, various means have been proposed. Some scholars are of opinion that the Hebræo-Chaldaic method of punctuation ought to be adopted; others the Syriac, among which the learned author of the Heptaglot may be mentioned: he says, “Lingua Syriaca optima est ac certissima regula punctandi tam Chaldaica, quàm Samaritana.”

Cellarius has taken the mean between these extremes, and, arguing from the fact that the Samaritan is for the most part a compound of Chaldee, Syriac, and Hebrew, he says, “Liberiorem esse Samariticam prononciationem, et quæ in linguâ illâ sunt purè Ebræa, Ebræo forsitan more efferrî posse; quæ Syro-Chaldaica ad Syrorum indolem enunciari debere.”

The remark of Hottinger, *Anti. Mor.* p. 34, that Jac. Golius had been informed by an individual acquainted with the Samaritans at Damascus, that the pronunciation of the latter was rough and inartificial, would, perhaps, justify the belief that such was the case in ancient times. This supposition receives confirmation from the fact that the Syrians and Arabs, who bordered as closely on the Hebrews as the

Samaritans, have never admitted into their languages all those subtle rules of punctuation adopted by the Jews.

The chief vowel or *mater lectionis* made use of by the Samaritans is א, as is manifest from the frequent occurrence of this letter or its substitutes in Samaritan words. This fact must be carefully borne in mind, because in combinations of letters which cannot be properly pronounced without a vowel, we may suppose this vowel inserted.

The reader who is an advocate of the Masoretic punctuation cannot do better than follow the advice given by Cellarius. There is, however, no necessity for his doing so; for it is not only easy to read the Samaritan without points, but the whole of the Shemitic languages in which they are omitted. The questionable authenticity of those points ought to be a great objection to their use, especially in the Samaritan, where no regular system of punctuation has been adopted.

We may suppose, therefore, the letters א, א, מ, נ, ז, which are chiefly called *quiescents*, to be the vowels or *matres lectionis* which are to be employed in reading the Samaritan language. These letters are equivalent to our five vowels *a, e, i, o, u* respectively.

There cannot possibly be any objection to extend to the individual letters of the Samaritan exactly the same usage as is observed in our own language; thus, when any letter or consonant, as *b, d, g*, etc., is pronounced, we are compelled to add a short vowel to it, though that vowel is not expressed; thus, we pronounce the preceding letters *be, de, ge*, etc., adding the short vowel *e* to each. In the Sanscrit language the short *a* or अ is usually omitted. Thus कर where there are two consonants without a vowel, is pro-

nounced *karā*; कतर *katara*, etc. Moreover, in our own language, words with short vowels are usually pronounced so rapidly, that if the consonants were written without the vowels we should have no difficulty in recognising them; as, for instance, who does not immediately recognise the words *bkr*, *mckrl*, *mrnr*, *sllr*, etc., as *baker*, *mackerel*, *mariner*, *seller*, etc.? The same might be observed in other languages, where, on the omission of the *short* vowels, the consonants are sufficient to indicate the word. Vide Coptic Gram.

Judging, therefore, from analogy, it is reasonable to suppose that the short vowels were omitted in Samaritan words, while the long ones were usually expressed by the letters א, א, מ, נ, ר. And in every case where a vowel is required after a letter, we may suppose the *mater lectionis* to be the short *a* of the Sanscrit, and supply it accordingly.

We shall subjoin a specimen from Gen. i. 1, 2, of the manner in which the language may be read; presuming, of course, the student is aware that, in common with all the Shemitic languages (with the exception of the Abyssinian branch), the Samaritan is read from right to left.

<i>Samaritan.</i>	אמאאא	·	אמ	·	אאאא	·	אאאא	·	אאאאאאאא
<i>Pronunciation.</i>	shumië		ith		Aleë		tlämäš		B'kämäuthe
<i>Samaritan.</i>	אאאאא	·	אאאאאא	·	אאאא	·	אאא	·	אאאאא
<i>Pronunciation.</i>	v'käshäce		v'rikni		shame		ëüth		V'aroë

The short vowels are marked; the others may be pronounced long and distinctly. The student will find no difficulty in reading, by adopting this course: we would, however, remind him of the pithy remark of Cellarius, "Linguas hasce addiscimus non tam colloquendi causâ, quàm intelligendi scripta monumenta Orientalium Populorum."

4. The Samaritans distinguish each word by means of a thick point placed after the word; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph \cdot \aleph\aleph\aleph$. At the end of a period they generally use the sign $;$; sometimes the simple *distinctive* \cdot , at others $-:$. When the sense is suspended and imperfect, instead of our colon they substitute the sign $\cdot\cdot$ placed above the word and after it. Sometimes the single point is used instead of it, and *vice versâ*.

They have various signs to supply the place of our full stop; as, $=-:$, $<:$, $=<$, $-<$, or $-:$. The first is that which is more frequently used.

Sometimes between two verses or lines we find stops compounded of some of the preceding; as, $<-:-==-:-<$.

It must be observed, however, that these signs apparently depend on the caprice of the writer, and are found differently written in all the copies of the Pentateuch.

The small horizontal line $-$ which is sometimes placed over letters, has various meanings. In the first place, it signifies that an ambiguous word is not to be taken in its usual acceptation; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ a name, but $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *Shem*, the son of Noah; $\aleph\aleph$ *God*, but $\aleph\aleph$ the preposition *to* or *at*. In the second place, it is a sign of *apocope*; as, $\aleph\aleph$ for $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *thou*. Or else it is a sign of *cacography*; as, Gen. xxix. 32, 34, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ which ought to have been $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *his name*.

The Samaritans do not divide their words at the end of a line; but, if a word be too long, they reserve it for the next line; and, in the mean time, write the last word in such a manner that the two last letters may fall at the end of the line, divided from the rest of the word *without any mark*; as, $\aleph\aleph \quad \aleph\aleph\aleph \cdot \aleph\aleph\aleph \cdot \aleph\aleph$ *with Moses, saying*.

5. Before proceeding further, it is necessary to remark, that there are three parts of speech recognised in the

Grammar, viz. the Noun, Verb, and Particle; in which order they will be considered.

CHAPTER II.

THE NOUN.

1. THE Samaritan nouns, like the Hebrew, may be considered as having their roots in the verb. They are formed in various ways: some consist of radical letters alone; as, *𐤏𐤍* a man, *𐤏𐤊* God: others by the insertion of some quiescent letter; as, *𐤏𐤍𐤏* a goat, *𐤏𐤍𐤏* a judge, etc.; or by the addition of a letter or letters to the beginning or end of the root; as, *𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤏* a word, *𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤏* a judgment.

Some are derived from *imperfect* verbs; as, *𐤏𐤍𐤏* a stranger, *𐤏𐤍𐤏* history, etc.

The quadriliteral nouns are such as are composed of four radical letters. They are usually read with some quiescent; as, *𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤏* a treaty.

The adjectives are found to vary in their formation, like nouns substantive; as, *𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤏* holy, *𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤏* pitiful, *𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤏* naked, etc.

In a rudimentary Grammar like the present, a critical discussion of the various senses of the nouns, according to the *species* of the verb from which they are derived, would be out of place. The Lexicon will supply their senses, which will be sufficient for all practical purposes.

In the Samaritan, as well as in the other Shemitic or Syro-Arabian languages, there are only two genders, Masculine and Feminine.

The Feminine supplies the place of a Neuter gender.

Nouns of the Masculine gender are usually known by their *termination* or *signification*. By the former, when they end in a *radical* letter, or *servile* other than א or ל*; as, אִישׁ a man, מִלְּכֵי אֲשֵׁרָא an Hebrew; by the latter, when the subject of the noun is masculine; as, אֱלֹהִים God.

Nouns of the Feminine gender are also known by their *termination* or *signification*. By the former, when they end in א and ל*; as, אֲמָלִיכָא a maid servant; by the latter, when the subject of the noun is *essentially* feminine; as, רַחֵל Rachel, Gen. xxxiii. 7; אִמָּא a mother, Exod. xx. 12.

The nouns expressing districts and cities are generally feminine. Sometimes under one termination both genders are included. This is especially the case with the names of animals, as in the Hebrew.

Some nouns, though terminating in an essential masculine characteristic, are, however, feminine; as, Lev. v. 1, אֲדָמָה · אִשׁ · אֲשֵׁרָא and when a soul sins. So אֶרֶץ the earth, אֲנָשׁ breath, אֵינָא an eye. As no fixed rules can be given for determining the genders, they can only be acquired by reading and observation.

There are two Numbers,—the Singular and Plural. It is scarcely necessary to recognise a Dual number, since, in consequence of the absence of diacritical points in the Samaritan, there are no means of distinguishing it from the plural.

Cellarius apparently inclines to the opinion, that the dual number, if it occur at all, is not supported by sufficiently conclusive examples to justify us in attempting to establish it as one of the essential numbers of the Samaritan language.

* Nouns in א and מ, apocopated for אִשׁ and אִמָּא (§ 5, 9) are however feminine.

Morinus, however, is of opinion, that \aleph inserted before the termination is probably characteristic of the dual; thus, $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ Gen. xxvii. 36. Many exceptions may be taken to the use of this letter as an essential mark of the dual number, and none stronger than that of $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ in Exod. xvi. 29, where it is absolutely necessary that the Hebrew dual $\aleph\aleph$ should be emphatically marked, so as to prevent the possibility of confounding it with the plural,—such, however, is not the case. The terminal \aleph , which is supported by Castel, does not depend upon sufficiently conclusive examples to justify its adoption as a mark of this number. All the *pertinent* examples produced of it by the learned author of the Heptaglot are accompanied by numerals, which, in the absence of a *characteristic* termination of the noun, supply the place of the dual number. The termination \aleph is evidently plural. The same remarks apply to the form $\aleph\aleph$ in Gen. xxxiii. 1, which is accompanied by the numeral; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph \cdot \aleph\aleph\aleph$ *two handmaids*.

The existence of a dual in the Hebrew language, essentially different from the plural, is entirely due to the Masoretic points. In such cases as the one given above from Exod. xvi. 29, where there is an apparent necessity for distinguishing the numbers, it is doubtful whether this distinction is not as clearly pointed out by the *context*, independent of the diacritical distinction, as it would be by the addition of a numeral which removes all ambiguity. And in the case just mentioned this numeral is actually expressed in the Syriac; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$.

STATES OF NOUNS.

2. The Samaritans, like the Syro-Chaldees, have three

states or forms of nouns, viz., the absolute, emphatic, and constructive. In each of these states we have to consider the formation of gender and number.

ABSOLUTE STATE.

3. *Singular Masculine.*—Every noun which is used *simply* or *absolutely*, or which does not govern another usually expressed by our genitive, is said to be in the *absolute* state; as, 𐤀𐤆𐤏 *a king*, 𐤀𐤓𐤏 *a master*, etc.

4. *Plural Masculine.*—The affinity which the Samaritan bears to the Chaldæo-Syriac, might lead us to expect that the plural termination 𐤌 of the latter would be far more used than the Hebrew 𐤌. Such, however, is not the case, as the more usual form is 𐤌; thus, 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤌 *days*, 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤌𐤏 *judges*, etc. Cellarius rightly affirms that the vast majority of nouns are thus formed.

The Syro-Chaldaic form will also be found, though, comparatively speaking, rarely; as, 𐤏𐤌𐤏 *sons*, 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤏 *eyes*, etc.

Nouns ending in 𐤌 omit one of the consecutive *yods*, which concur in affixing the plural terminal; as, Exod. xxxiv. 24, 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤏 · 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤏𐤏 *many nations*, for · 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤏𐤏.

Some masculine nouns form their plural like those of the feminine gender; as, 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 *fathers*, 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 *names*.

The two nouns, 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤏 *life*, 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤏 *a countenance*, have no singular number: this is also the case with some others.

The Hebrew ecthlipsis of 𐤌 in the formation of the plural number is also to be remarked; thus, 𐤏𐤌𐤏𐤏 *houses*, from 𐤏𐤌𐤏 in the singular number, the Hebrew plural being 𐤏𐤌𐤏.

5. *Feminine Singular.*—The feminine singular of this state

is formed by adding the *suffix* א; as, אַזְרָאָה *a maid servant*, אַנְיָא *a beast*, from זְרָאָה, אַנְיָ respectively.

As regards the termination א, Cellarius doubts whether it is *legitimately* employed here in expressing the feminine; he refers all nouns in אָ and אַ to the *constructive* rather than to the *absolute* state.

Characteristic of this gender also are י and מ; as, Exod. xx. 16, יְהוּדָה *testimony*; Deut. x. 18, מַגְלֵי אֶרֶץ *a garment*.

The adjectives in this state have no other mark for the feminine than א; as, אַחַיִּים *living*, masc., אַחַיִּים, fem.; מִצְרַיִם *Egyptian*, masc., מִצְרַיִם, fem. This is the case also with all names of people and races.

6. *Feminine Plural*.—The feminine plural is formed by the *suffix* ים, the Chaldee י; as, כְּלֵי זָבֻחַ *complete*, בְּרָכָה *blessings*, גְּדוּלָה *great*, etc.: ים may also be preceded by א; as, אֲרָצוֹת *cities*, אֲרָבָה *kine*, from אֶרֶץ, אָרַב respectively.

The feminine nouns שָׁנִים *years*, מִסְפָּרִים *words*, אֲבָנִים *stones*, etc., follow the masculine gender in the plural number. So with נָשִׁים *women*, which has no singular number.

EMPHATIC STATE.

7. *Masculine Singular*.—When a noun is to be expressed *emphatically*, this is done by *affixing* א to the noun, which is then said to be in the *emphatic state*; as, אֱלֹהֵי *God*, אֲדָמָה *the man*, אֲמֹר *the people*, etc. Sometimes the Hebrew *prefix* ה is employed, especially with pronouns and participles, as will be seen in the Chapter on the Particles. Such cases are, however, rare, and foreign to the genius of a language, which from its Syro-Chaldaic sympathies, denoted the emphatic state by a *suffix*, not a *prefix*.

Nouns ending in *מֵא* on assuming the suffix *א* drop the penult. *מ*; as, *אֵלֵינוּ* the Hebrew, for *אֵלֵינוּא*. Similarly, *שְׁלֹשָׁה* third, *אַרְבָּעָה* fourth, from *שְׁלֹשָׁהא* and *אַרְבָּעָהא* respectively, etc.

8. *Masculine Plural*.—Like the Chaldee, the absolute terminal *מ* becomes *אֵמ*; as, *בָּתַי* houses, for *בָּתַימ*, etc.

Nouns in *מ* of the absolute sing., instead of *אֵמ* in the plural emphat., adopt *אֵמֵא*; as, *בָּנָי* boys, from *בָּנָימ*, etc.

The names of races and patronymics end in *מֵא*, as in absolute sing.; thus, *לֵוִיִּם* Levites, *כְּנַעֲנִים* Canaanites, etc.

Nouns only found in the plural are regularly inflected; as, *חַיִּים* life, from *חַיִּימ*; *שָׁמַיִם* the heavens, from *שָׁמַיִמ*, etc.

Similarly *אִמֹּתַי* women (fem.), is derived from the absolute *אִמֹּתַימ* or *אִמֹּתַיִמ*.

9. *Feminine Singular*.—The feminine singular of this state is formed by changing the absolute terminal *א* into *אֵא*; as, *אֶרֶץ* the earth, from *אֶרֶצַא*; *קָדְשָׁא* holy, from *קָדְשַׁא*, etc.

Nouns ending in *ת* and *מ* add *אֵא*; as, *בָּתַיִת* from *בָּתַיִתַא*; *בָּתַיִת* from *בָּתַיִתַא*, etc. Cellarius considers the emphatic forms of such words as having been once the absolute, whence by *apocope* those in *ת* and *מ* arose.

Some nouns are feminine in gender, but masculine in the termination of their absolute state; as, *נְפֹשׁ* the soul, *יָד* a hand, etc. Such words form their emphatic state like nouns masculine; as, *נְפֹשָׁא*, *יָדַא*; similarly *אֶרֶץ* the land. The use of the letter *א* in *אֶרֶצַא* thy land, Deut. xxi. 23, presupposes an absolute form *אֶרֶצַא*. Vide Chap. IV. § 11.

10. *Feminine Plural*.—This is more frequently used than the absolute, from which it is formed by changing *א* into

אֵל, if א be preceded by א or א, but if not, into אֵלֵאל; as, אֵלֵאלִמֶלֶךְ from אֵלִמֶלֶךְ, אֵלֵאלֵצַדִּיק from אֵלֵצַדִּיק; אֵלֵאִמְרָתִי *wonders*, אֵלֵאֲשֵׁרִים *beasts*, or with א for א as in Gen. i. 26, Deut. xxxiv. 11. Similarly from אִמְרָתֵנוּ *Egyptians* (fem.), we have, dropping מ, אֵלֵאֲרָמִי; from אִמְרָתֵנוּ *Hebrews*, comes אֵלֵמִצְרַיִם; also without מ, Exod. i. 19.

The following masculine nouns are similarly formed, viz., אֵלֵאֲבֹתַי *fathers*, אֵלֵאֲשֵׁמַי *names*, אֵלֵמִדְּנָנִים *fishes*, Num. xi. 5, from אֲבֹתַי or מִדְּנָנִים from Chald. אֲבֹתַי.

CONSTRUCTIVE STATE.

11. *Masculine Singular.*—This is the same as the *absolute* masculine singular. The nouns אֲבֹתַי *father*, אֲחֵי *brother*, assume מ in the constructive state like the Hebrew; as, Gen. x. 21, אֲבִימֶלֶךְ · אֲבֹתֵי · אֲבֹתֵי · אֲבֹתֵי · אֲבֹתֵי · אֲבֹתֵי · אֲבֹתֵי *He was the father of all the sons of Eber, brother of Japheth.*

The noun אֲחֵי, though often used by the Hebrews, is usually replaced among the Samaritans by אֲבֹתֵי Gen. xiv. 12; אֲבִימֶלֶךְ xxii. 23.

12. *Masculine Plural.*—The terminal letters of the *absolute* and *emphatic* masculine plural, viz. א, א, א are omitted in the formation of the *constructive* state; thus, אֲבֹתֵי אֲבֹתֵי *angels* in the absolute state, becomes אֲבֹתֵי אֲבֹתֵי in the constructive; as, אֲבֹתֵי אֲבֹתֵי *angels of God*; · אֲבֹתֵי אֲבֹתֵי *face of the water*, etc.

13. *Feminine Singular.*—This is formed from the *emphatic* state of the same number and gender, by omitting the final letter א and retaining the penult. א; as, · אֲבֹתֵי אֲבֹתֵי *the wickedness of man*; which is אֲבֹתֵי אֲבֹתֵי in the *emphatic* state; אֲבֹתֵי · אֲבֹתֵי *the word of God*; · אֲבֹתֵי אֲבֹתֵי *beast of the earth*, from אֲבֹתֵי, or אֲבֹתֵי.

14. *Feminine Plural*.—The *constructive* feminine plural ends in *א*, the Chaldee *ת*. The *mater lectionis* *א* sometimes precedes this termination; as, Gen. xlix. 26, *בִּרְכַּתְּךָ אֲבִי וְבִרְכַּת אִמִּי שָׁרְיָהּ* *the blessings of thy father and thy mother have prevailed*; Gen. vi. 2, *בָּנוּ אֶת־בְּנוֹתֵי הָאָדָם* *the daughters of the man*.

The following masculine nouns follow this form; viz. *אָבִי* *father*, *שְׂמֵי* *names*, *דְּשֵׁי* *fishes*. Examples are, Num. xxxi. 26, *רִשְׁתֵּי הָאָבִימֹת וְרִשְׁתֵּי הַקְּהִלָּה* *the heads of the fathers of the congregation*; Gen. xxxvi. 40, *שְׂמֵי הַדּוּכָאִים* *the names of the dukes of Esau*; Gen. i. 26, *דְּשֵׁי הַיָּם* *fishes of the sea*.

These observations will be sufficient to show the modes employed in forming the different states of nouns.

CASES.

15. The genitive case is the only one marked by inflection; the others are formed by *prefixing* prepositions to the nouns, sometimes *separable*, sometimes *inseparable*.

The genitive case is not only formed *constructively*, after the manner explained in § 11–14, but also with the Syriac prefix *א*; as, Gen. xxii. 18, *אֵת כָּל־עַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ* *all the people of the earth*; Exod. xx. 16, *אֵת הַשֹּׁדֵד הַזֶּה* *false witness*; Num. xxi. 9, *אֵת הַנָּחֹשׁ* *brazen serpent*. This case-mark is far more frequently used by the Syrians than the Samaritans.

The dative and ablative cases are formed by *inseparable* prefixes; as, *בְּנֵי* *to thy sons*, *בְּשֵׁמִי* *in my name*, etc.; also by *separables*, as, *מֵבַיִת* *from the house*, *בְּתוֹכָם* *between the people*, etc.

The accusative or objective case is formed by prefixing

the *separable* word ܐܪܘܪ (the Chaldee ܪܝ) to the noun; as, $\text{ܐܪܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ ܐܪܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ}$ *the heavens and the earth*. Sometimes by *prefixing* ܘܥܘܪ , which is properly a preposition signifying *with* like the Hebrew עִם ; as, Exod. iv. 25, ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ *she cut off the foreskin*; Exod. xx. 24, ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ *I have recorded my name*. In all these cases it is probable that the preposition ܘܥܘܪ has, as far as we are aware, lost its original force and become redundant; though, from the similar instances found in other languages, this construction would seem to have originally arisen from phrases in which the force of the preposition was emphatically marked. The same remarks apply to ܘܥܘܪܐ in Exod. xxxii. 35, where we find ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ *he plagued the people*.

As in other languages, in the absence of a particle, the active verb is a sign of the accusative case.

The vocative case is the same as the nominative.

COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES.

16. There are three degrees of comparison: the positive, comparative, and superlative; each of which is defined as in other languages.

Of the *positive* degree nothing need be said.

The *comparative* is formed by ܘܥܘܪܐ , a preposition conveying an idea of superiority; as, ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ *more than the people of the land*, Exod. v. 5; ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ *more righteous than I*, Gen. xxxviii. 26.

The *superlative* is formed by an adverb; as, Gen. i. 31, ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ *very good*: or by doubling the positive; as, ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ ܘܥܘܪܐ *very greatly*, Gen. xvii. 2.

NUMERALS.

17. The numeral nouns are divided into two classes, Cardinal and Ordinal; as their construction is sufficiently explained in the Syntax on Adjectives, it will be sufficient in this place to give tables of both classes.

The following is a Table of the Cardinals:—

	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>
One	ጳጵጵ	ጳሉጵ
Two	ሠጠጻሉ	ጎጠሉጻሉ
Three	ሉጊሉ	ጳሉጊሉ
Four	ጎጎጻሉ	ጳጎጎጻሉ
Five	ሠሠጵ	ጳሠሠጵ
Six	ሉሠ	ጳሉሠ and ሉሉሠ
Seven	ጎጎሠ	ጳጎጎሠ
Eight	ጎሠሉ	ጳጎሠሉ
Nine	ጎሠሉ	ጳጎሠሉ
Ten	ጻጻጎ	ጳጻጻጎ
Twenty		ሠጠጻጻጎ
Thirty		ሠጠሉጊሉ
Forty		ሠጠጎጎጻሉ
Fifty		ሠጠሠጵ
Sixty		ጎጠሠሠ
Seventy		ሠጠጎጎሠ
Eighty		ሠጠጎሠሉ
Ninety		ሠጠጎሠሉ
Hundred		ጎሉጎሠ
Thousand		ጎጊሉ

In the formation of the numerals between ten and a hundred, the *less* is commonly put before the *greater*; as,

᠑ᠫ᠈ ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠢᠨ *eleven*, ᠰᠢᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ ᠠᠨᠠᠨ *eighty-three*, etc. This rule is, however, relaxed in the case of numbers exceeding a hundred; as, ᠸᠠᠭᠠᠰ ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ ᠠᠨᠠᠨ ᠠᠨᠠᠨ ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *but Moses was a son of one hundred and twenty years*, Deut. xxxiv. 7.

In the Samaritan language, as in the other oriental tongues, the *ordinal* numbers do not exceed ten: beyond that, their place is supplied by the cardinal; as, Num. xxxiii. 38, ᠰᠢᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *in the fortieth year*.

The Ordinals are:—

First	ᠲᠤᠸᠠᠭ or ᠲᠤᠸᠠ	Sixth	ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ
Second	ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠ	Seventh	ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ
Third	ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ	Eighth	ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ
Fourth	ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ	Ninth	ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ
Fifth	ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ	Tenth	ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ

The forms ᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ and ᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ are also read for ᠲᠤᠸᠠᠭ.

These numerals are sometimes found to end in ᠸᠠ instead of ᠸ, a termination which may be compared with the Chaldee 𐤏.

The *distributive* numerals are expressed by repeating the cardinals; as, ᠸᠠᠨᠠᠨ ᠠᠨᠠᠨ *two by two*, etc.

For further information upon this subject, the student is referred to the Syntax.

CHAPTER III.

THE VERB.

1. THE second part of speech is the verb, which we now proceed to consider; and, in so doing, two things claim especial attention:—First, the *species* of the verb, by which are meant its various forms and conjugations:—Secondly, the mode of inflecting each *species* or *form* through its moods, tenses, and persons.

2. The *primitive species* consists of radical letters alone (generally three in number), as in the Hebrew.

3. The *derivative species* are formed from the *primitive* by the addition of servile letters, which mark the peculiar characteristics of each.

4. Edmund Castel, in his Heptaglot Lexicon, recognises in the Samaritan as many different *species* of the verb, or as many *forms* as are found among the Syrians and Chaldees; that is, six,—three active and three passive: the active are respectively called Pehal, Pahel, and Aphel; and the corresponding passives, Ethpehel, Ethpahal, and Ettaphal. The *primitive species* is Pehal; all the rest are *derivative*. Morinus, however, is of opinion that, in consequence of the absence of diacritical points in the Samaritan dialect, there are only three distinct conjugations, viz. Pehal, Aphel, and Ethpehel or Ethpahal.

The difference of opinion which exists between Castel and Morinus, as to the number of conjugations may be reconciled by regarding the two conjugations Pehal and Pahel of the

former, which appear to differ but slightly in form, as one and the same *species*; and the three passive *forms*, whose individuality cannot be easily discerned, as in reality but one form; we have then only three conjugations.

Castel's division is, however, not only supported by Syro-Chaldæan usage, but in the Samaritan language itself there is, doubtlessly, evidence to show that *Pehal* and *Pahel* are not only distinct in signification but also frequently in form. This is especially the case in the infinitives and participles, as may be inferred from the few examples which Cellarius has given in his Grammar: he quotes 𐤒𐤓𐤁 of the conjugation *Pehal* from Exod. xx. 5, which is used in the sense of *visiting*, whereas 𐤒𐤓𐤁𐤌 of the conjugation *Pahel* is found in Deut. iv. 2, in the sense of *commanding*. Compare also 𐤑𐤒𐤍 Gen. xii. 3; 𐤒𐤓𐤁𐤌 Num. xxiii. 10, etc., "quæ frustra ad *Pehal* reduceris, partim *formatione*, partim *significatione* repugnante."

The individuality of the passive *forms* cannot be so defended: generally speaking, there is apparently no reason why they should not be considered one and the same, though used in different senses. There can scarcely be any doubt, however, that the Samaritans and the other tribes of the Shemitic family were able to distinguish accurately in pronunciation the different senses of a word consisting of the same combination of letters; or, at least, that the sense could easily be conjectured "ex serie orationis," supposing the pronunciation the same; under these circumstances we shall adopt the division of Castel, and in the first place give the signification of each of these *species*, upon which their classification must depend in the absence of distinct forms.

5. The first conjugation, or *Pehal*, the Chaldee *Pehal*,

and Hebrew *Kal*, has simply an active transitive or intransitive signification; as, $\text{כִּנְּוּ} he sold, \text{בָּרַח} he ceased.$

The second conjugation, or *Ethpehel*, is the passive of *Pehal*; and, like the Chaldee *Ethpehel* and Hebrew *Niphal*, has, generally speaking, a passive signification; as, $\text{בָּרַח} \cdot \text{בָּרַח} \cdot \text{בָּרַח} because there he was revealed unto him, Gen. xxxv. 7; \text{לֹא} \cdot \text{לֹא} \cdot \text{לֹא} \cdot \text{לֹא} \cdot \text{לֹא} ye shall not make yourselves unclean with them, that ye be defiled thereby, Lev. xi. 43.$

The third conjugation, or *Pahel*, the *Piel* of the Hebrews, has various senses. First, when the signification of *Pehal* is intransitive, this conjugation renders it transitive; thus, $\text{שָׁבַע} thou shalt return, Gen. iii. 19,$ of the conjugation *Pehal* is intransitive, but in *Pahel* it is transitive; as, $\text{בָּרַח} \cdot \text{בָּרַח} \cdot \text{בָּרַח} must I certainly bring back thy son, Gen. xxiv. 5. It is causative, Gen. xv. 11, \text{בָּרַח} \cdot \text{בָּרַח} Abraham caused them to go away. Sometimes also it is intensitive$

The fourth conjugation, or *Ethpahal*, is the passive of the preceding, and as *Pahel* is frequently causative in an active sense, this is causative in a passive one; as, $\text{כִּנְּוּ} were finished, Gen. ii. 1,$ in the sense of having been caused to be made or finished.

The fifth conjugation, or *Aphel*, the *Hiphil* of the Hebrew, is usually the causative of *Pehal*; as, $\text{בָּרַח} \cdot \text{בָּרַח} and caused it to be led about, Exod. xiii. 18. It may have the sense of permitting, declaring, exhibiting what is indicated by *Pehal*: as also a passive sense; thus, $\text{בָּרַח} he shall be slain, Num. xviii. 7; \text{בָּרַח} they were anointed, Num. iii. 3, etc.$$

The sixth conjugation, like the Hebrew *Hithpael*, is generally reflexive; as, $\text{בָּרַח} he shall cleanse himself,$

ሉኅላሉሉ he shall purify himself. It is sometimes found actively; as, ገኛላሉሉ they desired, Num. xi. 4.

We have previously stated, § 1, that each species is inflected through moods, tenses, numbers, persons, and genders.

There are three modes, the indicative, imperative, and infinitive. There is no difference between the subjunctive or potential mood and the indicative in *form*; they can only be distinguished by the sense or context.

The indicative is susceptible of a definition similar to that given to it in other languages.

The imperative mood is only used in commanding, exhorting, or imprecating; its place is supplied by the future in forbidding, dissuading, and deprecating.

The infinitive mood expresses an action or passion; sometimes an intransitive notion *indefinitely*, that is, without restriction to time, person, number, and gender, all of which are regarded in the *finite* verb. This mood exactly resembles the noun in its use, inasmuch as it is capable of receiving *nominal* constructions, especially when used with the prefixes ሠ, ጊ, ሥ, ዓ. Moreover, the sense resulting from combination with these prefixes is such as is usually conveyed, or may be usually conveyed, by verbal nouns, and hence it is that De Sacy, in his Arabic Grammar, prefers to consider *infinitives* as *verbal nouns*. For instance, the word ጠላገገገገ, which is *when I sent*, may also be rendered by a verbal noun *on my sending*. This is also the case in the Hebrew, which, as well as the Samaritan, approximates to the terse mode of construction followed by the Greeks, who use the article with the infinitive, as, ἐν τῷ πέμπειν. This idiom is further exemplified in the Syntax.

The participle is nothing more than a noun adjective,

carrying with it a notion of action or passion; it is scarcely necessary to remark that the laws for the formation of gender, number, etc., are the same as those for nouns adjective.

There are two *tenses* in the indicative *alone*, the perfect and future. To express our present tense, the same method is adopted as among the Hebrews. Vide Syntax.

The *numbers* are two, singular and plural.

The *persons* in each number of the perfect and future of the indicative are three; but in the imperative mood there is only one person in each number, viz. the second; the place of the third is supplied by the future tense.

There are two *genders*, masculine and feminine. It will be observed that the first persons in each number are common.

Subjoined is a Paradigm of a regular verb through its different conjugations.

I. PEHAL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M. ጥዖጋ	ኝጥዖጋ
	{ F. ሉጥዖጋ	ጠጥዖጋ
2.	{ M. ሉጥዖጋ	ኃኃሉጥዖጋ
	{ F. ጠሉጥዖጋ	ኃጠሉጥዖጋ
1.	ጠሉጥዖጋ and ሉጥዖጋ	ኃኃጥዖጋ and ኃጥዖጋ

Future Tense.

<i>Person.</i>		<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M.	ጥጥጠ	ኅጥጥጠ
	{ F.	ጥጥሉ	ኅጥጥጠ
2.	{ M.	ጥጥሉ	ኅጥጥጥሉ
	{ F.	ጠጥጥሉ	ኅጥጥሉ
1.		ጥጥሉ	ጥጥኅ

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

<i>Person.</i>		<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
2.	{ M.	ጥጥ	ኅጥጥ
	{ F.	ጠጥጥ	ኅጥጥ and ኅጥጥጥ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ጥጥ ጥጥጥ ኅጥጥ ኅጥጥጥ

Also [according to Cellarius],

ጥጥኅ ጥጥጥኅ ኅጥጥኅ*

PARTICIPLES.

<i>Present.</i>		<i>Past.</i>	
M.	F.	M.	F.
ጥጥ	ኅጥጥ	ጥጠጥ	ኅጥጠጥ

* These forms belong rather to the third conjugation. Vide § 10.

II. ETHPEHEL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

<i>Person.</i>		<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M.	ጥየጋሉኛ	ንጥየጋሉኛ
	{ F.	ሉጥየጋሉኛ	ጠጥየጋሉኛ
2.	{ M.	ሉጥየጋሉኛ	ኃንሉጥየጋሉኛ
	{ F.	ሉጥየጋሉኛ	ኃሉጥየጋሉኛ
1.		ሉጥየጋሉኛ	ኃኃጥየጋሉኛ

Future Tense.

<i>Person.</i>		<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M.	ጥየጋሉጠ	ኃንጥየጋሉጠ
	{ F.	ጥየጋሉሉ	ኃጥየጋሉሉ
2.	{ M.	ጥየጋሉሉ	ኃንጥየጋሉሉ
	{ F.	ጠጥየጋሉሉ	ኃጥየጋሉሉ
1.		ጥየጋሉኛ	ጥየጋሉኃ

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

<i>Person.</i>		<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
2.	{ M.	ጥየጋሉኛ	ንጥየጋሉኛ
	{ F.	ጠጥየጋሉኛ	ኃኃጥየጋሉኛ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ጥየጋሉኛ ሉጥየጋሉኛ ሉንጥየጋሉኛ

PARTICIPLE.

ጥየጋሉኃ

III. PAHEL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

Same as the Perfect of the First Conjugation.

Future Tense.

Same as that of Pehal.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

Person.	Singular.	Plural.
2.	M. ᠰᠦᠯᠤ	ᠰᠦᠯᠤᠰ
	F. ᠮᠠᠰᠦᠯᠤ	ᠰᠢᠨᠰᠦᠯᠤ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ᠰᠦᠯᠤᠰ

PARTICIPLE.

ᠰᠦᠯᠤᠰ

IV. ETHPAHAL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

Same as the Perfect of Ethpehel.

Future Tense.

Same as that of Ethpehel.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

Same as that of the Third Conjugation.

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ሉኖረገሉኛ ሉንኖረገሉኛ

PARTICIPLE.

ኖረገሉኛ

V. APHEL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

<i>Person.</i>		<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M.	ኖረገሉኛ	ንኖረገሉኛ
	{ F.	ሉኖረገሉኛ	ጠኖረገሉኛ
2.	{ M.	ሉኖረገሉኛ	ኃንሉኖረገሉኛ
	{ F.	ጠሉኖረገሉኛ	ኃጠሉኖረገሉኛ
1.		ሉኖረገሉኛ	ኃኃኖረገሉኛ

Future Tense.

Same as that of Pehal.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

<i>Person.</i>		<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
2.	{ M.	ኖረገሉኛ	ንኖረገሉኛ
	{ F.	ጠኖረገሉኛ	ኃንኖረገሉኛ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ጻፋጥፃጋ

PARTICIPLE.

ጥጠፃጋ and ጥፃጋ

VI. ETTAPHAL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

Same as the Perfect of Ethpehel.

Future Tense.

Same as that of the Second Conjugation.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

Same as that of Ethpehel.

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ጻፋጥፃጋሉ

PARTICIPLE.

Very rarely occurs, perhaps not at all.

7. Upon the first conjugation, the following observations will be found useful.

The preterite of the indicative of this conjugation is formed like the Syriac, and differs both from the Hebrew and Chaldee. The difference between the Hebrew and Samaritan in the *singular* is apparent in the third person feminine; the former ending in ם, and the latter in ם. In the *plural* number, the Samaritan and Hebrew differ widely, especially in the first and third person; the difference is not so great between the Samaritan and Chaldee, though remarkable in the first and third person feminine, both of which end in ם. Sometimes, however, the *servile* letter ם is adopted, as in the Arabic كَتَبُوا, after the masculine termination ى, as will be seen from the examples אָרְזַם־בְּעַלְמֵי־בְּרִיתֵינוּ Gen. xlix. 23, and אָרְזַם־בְּעַלְמֵי־בְּרִיתֵינוּ Num. xxxii. 39. It must not be forgotten, however, that in most cases of this kind the pronominal suffix א is found; so that ם would seem to have been added for the purpose of distinguishing more emphatically between the verbal termination and the suffix.

It will, perhaps, be as well to observe, that the suffix ם of the first person singular may be considered as attached to the verbal root by the vowel ם; for, as Morinus has observed, ם is sometimes expressed, as in Exod. xxxiv. 18, אָרְזַם־בְּעַלְמֵי־בְּרִיתֵינוּ *I have commanded thee*. This expression of ם may be accounted for on the ground that, as all the characteristic terminations of the persons are derivable from the pronouns expressing those persons respectively, we may suppose the whole of the pronoun of the first person, viz. אָנֹכִי *,

* The inserted letter ם, if we suppose it changed into ם, will give the suffix for forming the first person singular, as אָנֹכִי־אָנֹכִי.

added to the root of the verb, without omitting the *ℵ*. This will lead us also to determine the vowels by which the other suffixes may be supposed attached to the root, as the second person singular, masculine and feminine, and the whole of the plural, whose initial letters being *ℵ*, we may suppose this to be the *mater lectionis* by which they are connected with the verbal root.

The first person plural is usually expressed by double *ⲛ*; still it is to be found with a single *ⲛ* in the Pentateuch, as the instance produced by Cellarius, from Num. xxi. 7, will prove, where *ⲛⲚⲚⲛ* *we have spoken*, is read.

8. The future tense of this conjugation is decidedly Chaldaic in its formation; it agrees as closely with the Chaldee as the perfect does with the Syriac, because, though the second person feminine singular is found usually without the paragogic *ⲛ*, it is frequently employed. The last radical of the verb in the future tense is sometimes preceded by *ⲥ*, the Syriac *ⲟ̇*, and Hebrew *י*; as, *Ⲛⲥⲣⲙⲕ* Gen. vi. 7, for *Ⲛⲣⲙⲕ*. The termination *ⲛⲥ* of the second and third person plural is sometimes read *ⲥ* with the omission of the *ⲛ*; thus, *ⲥⲛⲕⲕ* Num. xxxv. 6, *ⲥⲚⲃⲡⲙ* Gen. viii. 22. This ecthipsis of Nun no doubt induced Castel and Morinus to consider it as paragogic; the frequent occurrence, however, of this letter, as well as the coincidence of the future generally with the Chaldee, would seem to be a great objection to the opinion entertained by those two scholars.

9. In the imperative mood, the Syriac *ⲟ̇* is very rarely found before the last syllable. It must also be observed, that, in the imperative mood, examples of the plural feminine are very rare. Cellarius gives the following instances: *ⲛⲙⲕⲙⲙⲕ* Gen. iv. 23, *ⲛⲣⲛⲕ* Exod. ii. 20.

10. In the paradigm we have given various forms of the infinitive of *Pehal*, which is sometimes accompanied by the Syriac 𐤃, but is more frequently without it; the form with 𐤃 being chiefly confined to *Pahal*; in fact, there appears to be no reason why this form should not be *exclusively* confined to *Pahal* (except in the case of the infinitive of *Aphel*, which is generally known by the termination 𐤆𐤏), especially when we consider that *Pehal* and *Pahal* have frequently the same force, like *Kal* and *Piel* in the Hebrew. It must be observed that the *form* with 𐤃 is seldom used when the infinitive is construed with its verb; as, 𐤆𐤇𐤀𐤌 𐤆𐤇𐤀𐤌𐤏, the governing preposition 𐤄 being omitted. The *form* frequently made use of among the Hebrews in this construction is the infinitive of *Kal*, which being usually rendered in the Samaritan version by the infinitive without 𐤃, is, to say the least of it, a circumstance which favours the supposition previously made, that the *form* without the prefix 𐤃 is exclusively confined to *Pehal*, while that with 𐤃 belongs to some of the other conjugations.

In some instances we find 𐤆 placed before the last radical; as, Num. xxiii. 11, 𐤆𐤇𐤀𐤌 𐤏𐤆𐤇𐤀𐤌 *thou hast certainly blessed*; 𐤍𐤅𐤅𐤏𐤏 *in gathering together*, etc. This is frequently the case in the construction followed in the first example; thus, 𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 *just gone out*, Gen. xxvii. 30; 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 Gen. xxxi. 30. The paragogic 𐤆 of the infinitive is changed to 𐤏 before suffixes; as, Num. x. 36, 𐤆𐤏𐤆𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 *when it rested*, where the paragogic 𐤆 has been changed to 𐤏 before the suffix 𐤆. The same may be said of the *metabole* of 𐤆 into 𐤏𐤆 before suffixes, and when the infinitive is in construction; as, 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 *to purify them*, Num. viii. 7, 21; 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 *from loving you*, Deut. vii. 8.

11. The first conjugation has two participles, called Benoni and Pehil, corresponding to the Chaldee participles of the same name; the former answers in sense to the Latin participle in *ens*; the latter generally to the perfect participle in *tus*; thus, ܕܡܦܘܠܐ *they who ascend*, ܕܝܘܒܐܠܘܢܘܬܝܘܬܝܘܢ *oi ávabálovntes*; ܕܡܘܒܪܟܝܘܬܝܘܢ *blessed*, ὁ εὐλογημένος .

Cellarius has given numerous instances in which he considers the active participle as having ܘ before the last radical; thus, ܕܘܕܡܐܘܠܐ *he that sheddeth*, Gen. ix. 6; ܕܘܕܘܒܘܫܐ *he that possesseseth*, Gen. xiv. 19; ܕܘܕܢܘܠܘܬܝܘܢ *he that revengeth*, Num. xxxv. 21. I strongly suspect, however, that these instances, and others which are met with, are nouns substantive, formed by means of the servile letter ܘ . Compare ܘܕܡܘܕܝܘܢ *a judge*, ܕܘܕܘܩܝܠܘܕܝܘܢ *a murderer*, ܘܕܡܘܕܝܘܢ , and a multitude of others, all of which are nouns. Cellarius states that Pehil has sometimes an active signification; and gives, as an instance of this, ܕܡܘܩܕܝܘܢܝܘܢ , Gen. xxiv. 13, which he renders “egredientes;” it is manifest, however, from the passage, that it preserves its usual passive sense; the action denoted by it being one which is manifestly more *perfect* than *inchoative*.

Pehil is found, in Deut. xxi. 23, with ܘ instead of ܡ ; as, ܘܕܘܕܡܐܘܠܐ *he that is hanged*. There are cases also in which this participle seems to have the force of the aorist in Greek; as, for instance, ܕܡܘܩܝܠܘܕܝܘܢ ὁ κτανὼν .

Both participles are sometimes found, like nouns adjective, with ܐ emphatic.

12. Remarks on the second conjugation:—The rules observed in the Hebrew for transposing the *sibilants*, on account of the passive character ܠ , are also found in the three passive conjugations of the Samaritan; as, ܕܘܕܡܐܘܠܐ *shall be shed*, Gen. ix. 6; ܕܘܕܡܐܘܠܐ *was beheld*, Exod. ii. 12.

Moreover, after this transposition, if the first radical be א, the Tau is changed into ט; if it be מ, into פ; as, פֿוֹטֿאֵם *he shall be called*, Gen. xvii. 5, for פֿוֹטֿאֵם, from פֿוֹטֿאֵ. Also, אֵצֿרֿוֹפֿוֹמֿוֹ *ye shall be afflicted*, Gen. xlv. 5, for אֵצֿרֿוֹמֿוֹ, from צֿרֿוֹ. The prefix לוֹ is sometimes found written לוֹ, though rarely. The first person of this conjugation sometimes ends in מִלֵּ; as, Deut. xxxiv. 4, מִלֵּוֹ *I swear*. The second person plural feminine sometimes also ends in מִלֵּ instead of לוֹ.

13. In the imperative mood, instead of לוֹ we find לוֹ, though, as far as I have observed, this is not very frequently the case; as, Gen. xlii. 16, לוֹלוֹ.

14. The usual form of the infinitive of this conjugation is that first given in the paradigm: the other forms are to be explained in the same manner as in § 10. The two instances, viz. לוֹלוֹ, Gen. v. 2, and לוֹלוֹ, Gen. xvii. 13, given by Cellarius, are undoubtedly of the fifth conjugation, which has sometimes a passive sense, as we have shewn in § 5.

15. Remarks on the third conjugation:—The difference between this conjugation and the first has been previously pointed out. It is important to observe that the quadriliteral verbs, as לוֹלוֹ *he formed*, לוֹלוֹ *he consoled*, לוֹלוֹ *he poured forth*, belong to this conjugation, as they do in the Syriac.

Castel marks this conjugation by the insertion of מ (to express the vowel *Tsere*) between the last two radicals; as, לוֹמֵלֵ. It is found in Deut. ix. 12, under the form לוֹלוֹ *have become corrupted*, with which *mater lectionis* the last syllable of the root may be usually pronounced.

The imperative of this conjugation is formed like the Syro-Chaldaic. The infinitive, like that of Pehal, is capable

of receiving the terminations \mathcal{A} , $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{Z}$, under the circumstances mentioned in § 10.

The participles of this conjugation, as well as the imperative, are formed like the Syro-Chaldaic.

16. Remarks on the fourth conjugation:—What has been said of the second conjugation will also apply here; the usual forms of the infinitive are $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}$.

17. Remarks on the fifth conjugation:—It has been previously stated (§ 5) that Aphel has sometimes a passive sense. The prefix \mathcal{A} is often changed to \mathfrak{A} ; as, Gen. xxxv. 2, $\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{Z}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}$ $\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{A}\mathfrak{A}$ *purify yourselves, and be clean*; so $\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}$ for $\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}$. The feminine plural imperative of this conjugation may end in $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}$; as, Gen. iv. 23, $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}\mathcal{A}\mathfrak{M}\mathcal{A}\mathfrak{M}\mathcal{A}$ *hearken*; it is, however, very rarely used.

The usual form of the infinitive is that given in the paradigm: other forms are met; as, Gen. xxix. 7, $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}$ *to be collected*. Also $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}$ *to be circumcised*, Gen. xvii. 13.

The participial forms in use are $\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{A}\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}\mathcal{A}\mathfrak{A}$.

18. Remarks on the sixth conjugation:—This conjugation is thought by Castel to arise from the *absorption* of the second \mathcal{A} of the Syriac Ettaphal; thus, $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{A}$ is read for $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}$; $\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{A}$ for the Syriac $\overset{\cdot}{\mathfrak{A}}\overset{\cdot}{\mathfrak{A}}\overset{\cdot}{\mathfrak{A}}\overset{\cdot}{\mathfrak{A}}$, in the formation of which one of the Syriac \mathcal{A} 's is omitted.

These remarks will be sufficient for the *perfect* verbs. We now proceed to the consideration of the *imperfect* verbs.

IMPERFECT VERBS.

19. Those verbs which, on account of certain peculiarities in their roots, vary in their inflection from the paradigm previously given of a *perfect* verb, are called *imperfect* verbs. They are divided into three classes; Defective, Quiescent,

and Anomalous verbs; in which order they will be considered.

DEFECTIVE VERBS.

20. Of these verbs there are two classes,—those which lose their *first* radical, and those which lose their *second*.

The verbs of the first class are, as in Hebrew and Chaldee, such as have *Nun* for their first radical; those of the second class, such as have their second and third radicals the same.

DEFECTIVES OF FIRST CLASS.

21. Verbs of this class follow, for the most part, the same rules as in the Hebrew and Syriac. The future of the indicative, the imperative, and infinitive of *Pehal*, also the whole of the conjugation *Aphel*, omit, *generally* speaking, the *נ*. These verbs are, for the most part, regular in the other conjugations, except *Ettaphal*.

(a) Examples of the future of *Pehal* are, נָפַח for נִפְחֵם ; פָּאָן for פִּאָנָן *we will go up*; נִפְחֵם for נִפְחֵם , etc.

(β) Examples of the imperative are, פָּא for פִּאָן ; נָפַח for נִפְחֵם ; נָפַח for נִפְחֵם , etc. Sometimes *נ* is inserted in the future and imperative between the remaining radicals; as, פָּנָח *he shall go*; פָּנָח *go out*. On this account *נ* may be made the *mater lectionis* in every case.

(γ) Examples of the infinitive are, נָפַח for נִפְחֵם ; נָפַח for נִפְחֵם ; פָּאָן for פִּאָנָן , etc.

(δ) Examples of *Aphel* are, פָּנָח and פָּנָח , Gen. xiv. 18; פָּנָח *causing to go up*, Lev. xi. 45.

(ε) Examples of *Ettaphal* are, נָפַח Exod. xix. 11, for נִפְחֵם ; נָפַח , Num. x. 17.

Cellarius gives two instances in which *נ* is omitted from the perfect; as, Gen. xiv. 10, נָפַח ; also, xxiv. 63, נָפַח *he went*

out. This is, however, very rarely the case, and such deviations are remarkable rather as anomalies. Many of these verbs are regular; as, אָשׁוּ *he slew*, אָפַל *he fell*, etc.

The sense of the different conjugations is, of course, the same as in the perfect verb.

DEFECTIVES OF SECOND CLASS.

22. Verbs of this class are mostly regular; the chief irregularities are observable in the whole of *Pehal* (the participle excepted), and in the whole of the fifth conjugation, where the third radical is usually omitted.

(a) Examples of the preterite of *Pehal*; Gen. xxxviii. 11, בָּרָח *he entered*, for בָּרַח , which is found in full, Gen. xiv. 5. So Gen. xxxviii. 9, with אֶ interpolated, בָּרַח־אֶ . The feminine of the third singular is found in full אֶבָּרַח , but without the last radical, אֶבַח , Gen. xlii. 21. Similarly בָּרַח־אֶ and בָּרַח־אֶ are read for בָּרַח־אֶ , etc.

For the future, בָּרַח־אֶ Gen. xxxii. 11, בָּרַח־אֶ , בָּרַח־אֶ , like בָּרַח־אֶ of *Castel*.

(β) Examples of the imperative mood are; בָּרַח , Gen. xxx. 3, also read fully בָּרַח־אֶ . The feminine singular is found in full, Num. xxi. 27, בָּרַח־אֶ . The plural בָּרַח־אֶ for בָּרַח־אֶ is found, Deut. i. 7.

(γ) Examples of the infinitive are, בָּרַח־אֶ for בָּרַח־אֶ , or in *Pahel* for בָּרַח־אֶ , Exod. xvii. 12. So בָּרַח־אֶ in *Pahel*, etc.

(δ) Examples of the fifth conjugation: *perfect*, בָּרַח־אֶ and בָּרַח־אֶ for בָּרַח־אֶ , etc.; *future*, בָּרַח־אֶ , Gen. xxvii. 10. *Imperative mood*, בָּרַח־אֶ Exod. vi. 11, or with a *mater lectionis*, בָּרַח־אֶ . The form בָּרַח־אֶ , found in Exod. x. 1, seems to be contracted from בָּרַח־אֶ . *Infinitive mood*, בָּרַח־אֶ for בָּרַח־אֶ , Deut. ix. 28.

(e) The instances given in the preceding paragraphs, in which the forms are uncontracted, seem to belong to the conjugation *Pahel*; in fact, the only means of distinguishing the first and third conjugation in form appears to be by considering the *apocopated* forms to belong to *Pehal*, and the *perfect* forms to *Pahel*; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, Gen. xix. 10; $\aleph\aleph$, etc.

(f) The passive of *Pehal* is not apocopated; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, etc.; while *Ettaphal* loses its middle radical; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, etc.

The observations made in this and the preceding section will be found sufficient without a paradigm.

QUIESCENT VERBS.

23. Verbs are called *quiescent* whenever, among the letters constituting the root, any one of the quiescents \aleph , \aleph , \aleph , \aleph , as they are improperly called, is found.

These verbs may be divided into three classes; first, such as are *quiescent* in the first radical; second, those which are *quiescent* in the second; third, those *quiescent* in the third radical.

The Samaritan mode of inflecting these verbs is very like the Syro-Chaldaic.

QUIESCENTS OF FIRST CLASS.

In Aleph, or Pe-Aleph.

24. The class of verbs, whose first radical is \aleph , is inflected more like the *perfect* verb than any other class of *quiescents*. The following observations will supply the place of a paradigm. In the first and fifth conjugations, the initial \aleph is changed into \aleph whenever it is preceded by a

servile formative. For example, in Pehal, from אָמַר comes אָמַרְתִּי *I will say*; so, for אָמַרְתָּ we find אָמַרְתָּם , etc.

The same law is also observable in the passive forms; as, Gen. xvii. 1, לָקַחְתָּ *walk*; לָקַחְתָּם , also לָקַחְתָּם , etc.

The Aleph is sometimes omitted; as, Deut. vii. 10, אָמַרְתָּ *to destroy it*; in Exod. iii. 2, we find the passive לָקַחְתָּ ; but in Gen. vi. 21, the apocopated form לָקַחְתָּ is given, unless it be read לָקַחְתָּ , Aphel used in a passive sense.

Cellarius adduces an instance in which the *quiescent* is changed to אָ ; as, לָקַחְתָּ , Gen. xi. 31. This is very rare, and I cannot call to mind another instance of it.

In such forms as לָקַחְתָּ , לָקַחְתָּם , etc., the אָ is manifestly changed to אָ ; this sometimes takes place in Aphel, as well as in the passive forms. There does not seem to me, however, to be any reason for exclusively confining this *metabole* to those conjugations. The example adduced by Cellarius, viz. לָקַחְתָּ , in the conjugation Aphel, may also be referred to the first or third conjugation.

In Yod, or Pe-Yod.

25. The *quiescents* whose first radical is מ are formed much in the same way as Hebrew verbs of the same kind.

The Yod is usually omitted in the future and imperative of Pehal, but in Aphel is changed to אָ .

(a) Examples of the future: אָמַרְתָּ for אָמַרְתָּ ; אָמַרְתָּ for אָמַרְתָּ ; though it may be written regularly as אָמַרְתָּ , Gen. xxi. 10, not אָמַרְתָּ .

(β) Examples of the imperative mood are, אָמַר for אָמַרְתָּ *sit thou*; so from אָמַרְתָּ we have אָמַרְתָּ , אָמַרְתָּ , etc.

(γ) Examples of the fifth conjugation: אָמַרְתָּ *I will add*, Gen. viii. 21; אָמַרְתָּ for אָמַרְתָּ . The infinitive אָמַרְתָּ ,

Gen. xlv. 5, etc. There are cases, however, in which the *m* is not changed; as, Gen. iv. 7, *ḥḥm*, instead of *ḥḥm*. Again, *ḥm* for *ḥm*, Exod. xiv. 21.

(δ) The *m* sometimes undergoes the same change for the passive conjugations as in Aphel; thus, *ḥm*; *m* from a radix *ḥm*, etc.

(ε) Those cases in which the *m* is omitted in the perfect tense, as in Gen. ix. 23, where *ḥm* is found for *ḥm*, are to be marked as anomalies. The same may be said of the presence of Yod where it should be absent; as *ḥm*, Deut. xxxi. 19.

26. Verbs in Aleph and Yod are usually regular, except in the cases mentioned in the preceding sections.

QUIESCENTS OF SECOND CLASS.

In Vau, or Ayin-Vau.

27. The only class of verbs worthy of note under this head are those whose middle radical is Vau. The following paradigm with *ḥp* or *ḥp* will give the student an idea of the peculiarities of verbs of this class:—

I. PEHAL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	M. <i>ḥp</i> or <i>ḥp</i>	<i>ḥp</i>
	F. <i>ḥp</i> or <i>ḥp</i>	<i>mḥp</i>
2.	M. <i>ḥp</i>	<i>ḥp</i>
	F. <i>ḥp</i>	<i>mḥp</i>
1.	<i>ḥp</i>	<i>ḥp</i>

Future Tense.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M. ሠንዮጠ F. ሠንዮሉ	ኳንሠንዮጠ ኳሠንዮጠ
2.	{ M. ሠንዮሉ F. ኳጠሠንዮሉ	ኳንሠንዮሉ ኳሠንዮሉ
1.	ሠንዮሉ	ሠንዮኳ

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
2.	{ M. ሠንዮ F. ጠሠንዮ	ንሠንዮ ጻኳሠንዮ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ሠንዮ ሠንዮሠ ሠንዮሠ ጻሠንዮሠ

PARTICIPLES.

Present ሠሉዮ

Past ሠጠዮ

28. Remarks on the first conjugation:—The *preterite* of this conjugation strongly resembles the Syriac. In the paradigm of Pehal, we have given two forms of the third person singular, one with and the other without the *mater lectionis*. The third person plural may be similarly written; as, ܐܘܘܪܐ, Gen. xxxvii. 35; in fact, the *mater lectionis* is sometimes absent in the other persons.

The *future* tense is generally read with ܐ; it is, however, found without it; as, Deut. xiii. 8, ܐܘܘܪܐ *it shall spare*; ܐܘܘܪܐ *they will go*, for ܐܘܘܪܐܐ, Exod. xxxii. 1; ܐܘܘܪܐ for ܐܘܘܪܐܐ, Deut. xxviii. 52.

The imperative mood is like the Chaldee and Hebrew. When the ultimate or penultimate is a guttural or Resh, the Vau is frequently omitted; as, ܐܘܘܪܐ *inhabit*, Gen. xxxv. 1, for ܐܘܘܪܐ; also, ܐܘܘܪܐ, etc.

In this case the ܐ, though omitted in the imperative, is sometimes found in the future; as, ܐܘܘܪܐ, Gen. xxiv. 55; the rule, however, for omission in the future is, generally speaking, the same as that for the imperative.

Of the infinitive mood, we have given various forms; those which are preceded by ܐ belong rather to the third conjugation; thus, ܐܘܘܪܐܐ, Gen. xxxi. 7, is *transitive*, whereas the signification of Pehal is *intransitive*, as will be seen by consulting Gen. xxxviii. 10, where ܐܘܘܪܐ intransitively is *to be evil*. Compare also ܐܘܘܪܐ, Gen. xxiv. 3, and xiii. 6.

The *mater lectionis* of the participle of the present is sometimes changed to ܐ; thus, instead of ܐܘܘܪܐ, we find ܐܘܘܪܐ, Exod. iii. 5; sometimes ܐ is changed to ܐ, as in the anomalous verb ܐܘܘܪܐ; sometimes for Aleph, ܐܘܘܪܐ or ܐܘܘܪܐ is written; as, ܐܘܘܪܐ, Num. xiii. 20; ܐܘܘܪܐ, Gen. xv. 14, etc. Such forms seem to carry considerable emphasis.

		IMPERATIVE.	INFIN.	PARTIC.
ure Tense.				Benoni Pehil
E T H P E H E L .				
as that of Pahel.		<p>ሠጠሮሉኦ ጠሠጠሮሉኦ</p> <p>ኘሠጠሮሉኦ ፋኘሠጠሮሉኦ</p> <p>ሉኘሠጠሮሉኦ</p>	<p>ሠጠሮሉኦ ጠሠጠሮሉኦ</p> <p>ኘሠጠሮሉኦ ፋኘሠጠሮሉኦ</p> <p>ሉኘሠጠሮሉኦ</p>	<p>ሠጠሮሠ ሠሮሠ</p>
1.	ሠጠሮሉኦ	ሠጠሮሉኦ	ሠጠሮሉኦ	ሠጠሮሉኦ
3.	M. ኘሠጠሮሉጠ	ኘሠጠሮሉጠ	ኘሠጠሮሉጠ	ኘሠጠሮሉጠ
	F. ኘሠጠሮሉጠ	ኘሠጠሮሉጠ	ኘሠጠሮሉጠ	ኘሠጠሮሉጠ
2.	M. ኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ኘሠጠሮሉኦ
	F. ኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ኘሠጠሮሉኦ
1.	ሠጠሮሉኘ	ሠጠሮሉኘ	ሠጠሮሉኘ	ሠጠሮሉኘ
2.	M. ሠጠሮሉኦ	ሠጠሮሉኦ	ሠጠሮሉኦ	ሠጠሮሉኦ
	F. ጠሠጠሮሉኦ	ጠሠጠሮሉኦ	ጠሠጠሮሉኦ	ጠሠጠሮሉኦ
2.	M. ኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ኘሠጠሮሉኦ
	F. ፋኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ፋኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ፋኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ፋኘሠጠሮሉኦ
	ሉኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ሉኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ሉኘሠጠሮሉኦ	ሉኘሠጠሮሠ
	ሠጠሮሉኘ	ሠጠሮሠ <i>idem</i>	ሠጠሮሠ <i>idem</i>	ሠጠሮሠ <i>idem</i>
	Plural.	Sing.	Plur.	Sing.

PARADIGM OF VERBS IN AYIN-VAU.

29. Remarks on the second conjugation:—This conjugation is like the Syriac in its formation; thus, ܘܡܢܘܠܐܘܐ *was pleased*, Gen. iv. 5; ܓܡܘܠܐܘܠܐ, Exod. xxxii. 30, etc. The student who is acquainted with the paradigm of the Syriac verb in Ayin-Vau will find no difficulty in recognising the tenses, etc., of the conjugation Ethpehel.

30. Remarks on the third conjugation:—This conjugation may be generally known by the characteristic ܡ, as in the Syriac. It is, however, rarely used. Compare the Chaldee Pahal.

31. Remarks on the fourth conjugation:—This conjugation is sometimes read with the characteristic ܡ; as, ܡܡܦܠܐܘܐ. The difficulty of distinguishing between it and Ethpehel may have led to the adoption of ܘ instead of ܡ, and the duplication of the last radical; as, ܘܘܘܘܠܐܘܐ, Gen. xvi. 2; ܡܡܘܘܠܐܘܐ, xxviii. 13.

32. Remarks on the fifth conjugation:—Aphel is generally accompanied by the *mater lectionis* ܡ; as, ܓܡܘܠܐܘܠܐ; though the ܡ may be omitted before the syllabic suffixes; as, ܠܡܦܠܐ, Gen. xxi. 29; ܘܠܘܘܠܐ, xlv. 4. There are some few instances in which ܠ is put for ܡ; as, ܦܠܘܘܡ *shall distress*, Deut. xxviii. 53, 55. The characteristic *pre-formant* ܠ is very frequently changed to ܘ, as in the perfect verbs.

33. The sixth conjugation is scarcely distinguishable from the second, except as regards the sense.

QUIESCENTS OF THIRD CLASS.

34. The *quiescent* verbs of this class have ܠ, ܘ, ܡ, ܘ for their third radical. The two latter terminations are rarely found; thus, ܡܘܘܠܐ, Num. xxiii. 21, which is

usually quoted as *Pehal*, seems to be *Pahel*, from the root 𐤀𐤋𐤄 . The two other instances given by Cellarius, viz. 𐤍𐤕𐤔 , from Gen. xxxvii. 35, and 𐤕𐤄𐤔 , Exod. vii. 20, may be obsolete forms, at least the latter; for the former may be considered as *Pahel*, the first conjugation *Pehal* not being in use.

The usual termination of *quiescents* of this class is 𐤀 . The following is a paradigm of verbs of this kind with 𐤀𐤔𐤈 *he wept*.

I. PEHAL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M. 𐤀𐤔𐤈	𐤕𐤔𐤈
	{ F. 𐤀𐤔𐤈	𐤍𐤔𐤈
2.	{ M. 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈	𐤕𐤕𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈
	{ F. 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈	𐤕𐤕𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈
1.	𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈	𐤕𐤕𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈

Future Tense.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M. 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤍	𐤕𐤕𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤍
	{ F. 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤀	𐤕𐤕𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤀
2.	{ M. 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤀	𐤕𐤕𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤀
	{ F. 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤀	𐤕𐤕𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤀
1.	𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤀	𐤕𐤕𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤈𐤀

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
2.	{ M. 𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆 F. 𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆	𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤆 (𐤏𐤎𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆)

INFINITIVE MOOD.

 𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆

PARTICIPLES.

Present.		Past.	
M.	F.	M.	F.
𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆	𐤏𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆	𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆	𐤏𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆

35. Remarks on the first conjugation:—The feminine plural of the third person of the preterite occurs Exod. ii. 16; as, 𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤆𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤆 *they came and drew, and filled*; it will be observed that the *quiescent* 𐤏 is not omitted in 𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆 before 𐤎 . This is also the case in 𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤆 , Gen. xxxii. 30. Compare remarks in § 7.

The quiescent letter may remain unchanged in the future; as, 𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤆 , Gen. xi. 4. The Chaldee corresponds exactly with the Samaritan, if we suppose the terminal 𐤏 changed to 𐤏 .

An instance of the feminine singular imperative is 𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆 , Gen. xxiv. 60. The form given in the paradigm for the feminine plural of the imperative is like the Syriac in ܦܢܝܢ . Castel has 𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤆 , the Syriac ܦܢܝܢ . The Chaldee termination 𐤏 may also be added to the root; thus, 𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤆 . As far as I am aware, I do not think that any example exists, at least in the Pentateuch, to settle the matter definitely.

The infinitive is generally accompanied by the prefix 𐤏 ;

as, ጠጋሠሠ *to number*, Gen. xv. 5; ጠላላሠሠ *to see*, Exod. iii. 4.

The plural feminine of the participle is found in Gen. xli. 54, ኃሉጠላሠሠ. It will be observed that Benoni and Pehil do not differ in form.

36. Remarks on the second conjugation:—The following are examples of the preterite: Gen. xvii. 1, ጠላላላሠሠ; ጠጋላሠሠ, Exod. xiv. 21; ሉጠጠጋላሠሠ, Gen. xxxii. 30, etc. An instance of the future will be found in Gen. ix. 14.

37. Remarks on the third conjugation:—This conjugation is usually terminated in the third preterite by ጠ; as, ጠላላላ, Exod. xv. 25; ጠጋላላ, Gen. xxix. 13.

The other instances given by Cellarius, viz. ጻጋላ and ጻላጋጠ, are of the conjugation Pehal.

38. The passive of the third conjugation cannot be distinguished from that of the first, except by the sense; they have the same forms.

39. The fifth conjugation is supported by the following examples:—For the *preterite*—Gen. xix. 24, ጠጋጋጋ; ሉጻላላላ, viii. 9; ጻጋላላ, viii. 13; ጻጋላላ, xxxi. 20. For the *future*—ጠጋላላ *I will increase*, Gen. xii. 2; ጠጋላላ, xv. 1; though in both cases they may be *preterites* for the future. (*See the Syntax.*) For the *imperative mood*—ጠጋላላ, Gen. xxiv. 14. For the *infinitive mood*—ጻላላላላላ, Gen. xxiv. 19; ጻላላላላ, xxxvii. 22. For the *participle*—ጠጋላላ, Gen. vi. 17. In the infinitive and participle, the examples produced are exceedingly pertinent.

40. Cellarius has given the form ጠጋጋላላላ, from Castel, as belonging to the sixth conjugation; it occurs but very seldom. The following paradigm contains the remaining conjugations.

PARADIGM OF QUIESCENTS IN THE THIRD RADICAL.

		INDICATIVE MOOD.				
		Perfect Tense.			Future	
No.	Person.	ETHPEHEL.	PAHEL.	ETHPAHAL.	APHEL.	ETTAPHAL.
Singular.	3. { M. F.	ጠደግሉሉኛ ሉጠደግሉሉኛ	ጠደግ ሉጠደግ		ጠደግኛ ሉጠደግኛ	ጠደግሉሉጠ ሉጠደግሉሉሉ
	2. { M. F.	ሉጠደግሉሉኛ ሉጠደግሉሉኛ	ሉጠደግ ጠሉጠደግ		ሉጠደግኛ ጠሉጠደግኛ	ሉጠደግሉሉሉ ሉጠደግሉሉሉሉ
	1.	ጠሉጠደግሉሉኛ	ሉጠደግ		ሉጠደግኛ	ጠሉጠደግሉሉሉኛ
Plural.	3. { M. F.	ኝደግሉሉኛ ጠደግሉሉኛ	ኝደግ ጠደግ		ኝደግኛ ጠደግኛ	ኝደግሉሉኛ ጠደግሉሉኛ
	2. { M. F.	ኃኝሉጠደግሉሉኛ ኃሉጠደግሉሉኛ	ኃኝሉጠደግ ኃሉጠደግ		ኃኝሉጠደግኛ ኃሉጠደግኛ	ኃኝሉጠደግሉሉኛ ኃሉጠደግሉሉኛ
	1.	ኃኝጠደግሉሉኛ	ኃኝሉጠደግ		ኃኝጠደግኛ	ኃኝጠደግሉሉኛ
Singular.	3. { M. F.	ጠደግሉጠ ጠደግሉሉ	ጠደግጠ ጠደግሉ	S A M E A S	Same	ጠደግሉሉጠ ጠደግሉሉሉ
	2. { M. F.	ጠደግሉሉ ኃኝጠደግሉሉኛ	ጠደግሉ ኃኝጠደግሉ			ጠደግሉሉ ኃኝጠደግሉሉኛ

		IMPERATIVE.	INFIN.	PARTIC.
Tense.				Benoni Pehil
<p> 1. מִצַּוְּתָא 3. { M. מִצַּוְּתָא F. מִצַּוְּתָא 2. { M. מִצַּוְּתָא F. מִצַּוְּתָא 1. מִצַּוְּתָא </p>		<p> מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא </p>	<p> מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא </p>	<p> מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא </p>
as that of Pehil.		<p> מִצַּוְּתָא <i>idem</i> מִצַּוְּתָא (מִצַּוְּתָא) </p>	<p> מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא </p>	<p> מִצַּוְּתָא <i>idem</i> </p>
E T H P E H E L.				
<p> 1. מִצַּוְּתָא 3. { M. מִצַּוְּתָא F. מִצַּוְּתָא 2. { M. מִצַּוְּתָא F. מִצַּוְּתָא 1. מִצַּוְּתָא </p>		<p> מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא </p>	<p> מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא </p>	<p> מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא מִצַּוְּתָא </p>
Plural.				
Sing.				
Plur.				
Sing.				

PARADIGM OF QUIESCENTS IN THE THIRD RADICAL.

ANOMALOUS VERBS.

41. This class of verbs must be distinguished from the *Defectives* and *Quiescents*, inasmuch as the latter are *regular*, though varying from the paradigm of a *perfect* verb, while the former apparently follow no regular rule, but, in consequence of peculiar combinations of letters, undergo certain changes which sometimes cannot be accounted for by referring them to any class of verbs previously considered. There are ten of these verbs which, from their frequent occurrence, may be advantageously explained in this place.

I. THE SUBSTANTIVE VERB ᐃᓃᐃ *he was*.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M. ᐃᓃᐃ	ᓃᓃᐃ
	{ F. ᐱᓃᐃ	(ᓃ)ᓃᓃᐃ
2.	{ M. ᐱᓃᓃᐃ	ᓃᓃᐱᓃᐃ
	{ F. ᓃᓃᐱᓃᐃ	ᓃᓃᓃᐃ
1.	ᐱᓃᓃᐃ	ᓃᓃᓃᐃ

Future Tense.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M. ᐃᓃᓃᓃ or ᓃᓃᓃᓃ	ᓃᓃᓃᓃ
	{ F. ᓃᓃᓃᓃ or ᓃᓃᓃᓃ	ᓃᓃᓃᓃ
2.	{ M. ᓃᓃᓃᓃ or ᓃᓃᓃᓃ	ᓃᓃᓃᓃ
	{ F. ᓃᓃᓃᓃ or ᓃᓃᓃᓃ	ᓃᓃᓃᓃ
1.	ᐃᓃᓃᓃ or ᓃᓃᓃᓃ	ᓃᓃᓃᓃ

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
2.	{ M. ṢṢṢ	ṢṢṢ
	{ F. ṢṢṢ	(ṢṢṢṢṢ)

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ṢṢṢ, or ṢṢṢ Gen. xviii. 18.

There are no participles. The third masculine future is sometimes further apocopated; as, ṢṢṢ, Gen. xxviii. 14. The first person masculine is also read ṢṢṢ, Gen. xvii. 8. This verb is, for the most part, regular in the *perfect tense* of the indicative, and in the imperative mood, both of which follow *quiescents* of the third class.

II. THE VERB ṢṢṢ *there is.*

This verb is the same as the Syriac ṢṢ and Hebrew שׁ; it is frequently found in the Syriac New Testament. Examples of the Samaritan are, Exod. xvii. 7, ṢṢṢṢ · ṢṢṢṢṢ *Is God among us?* The medial letter Ṣ is sometimes omitted; as, ṢṢṢ · ṢṢṢṢṢṢ · ṢṢṢṢṢ · ṢṢ · ṢṢṢṢ *truly God is in this place*, Gen. xxviii. 16.

The *initial* letter is often omitted, especially when *suffixes* are used; as, ṢṢṢṢ · ṢṢ *if thou art*, Gen. xxiv. 42; ṢṢṢṢṢṢṢ, *whether ye are*, Deut. xiii. 3. The negative adverb ṢṢṢ is compound of this verb and ṢṢ. Compare the Syriac ṢṢṢ which is derived from ṢṢ and ṢṢ by crasis and ecthlipsis. (See Schaaf's Syriac Lexicon.)

III. THE VERB 𐤆𐤍𐤃 *he lived.*

PEHAL.

This conjugation, which has an *intransitive* sense, is rarely used; as, 𐤍𐤃𐤌 *she shall live*, Gen. xii. 13; xxvii. 40; 𐤍𐤃, Gen. iii. 22, which should be read 𐤍𐤃𐤍, vide Deut. v. 26; 𐤆𐤃𐤌 *ye shall live*, Exod. i. 22.

PAHEL.

This conjugation, which is *transitive*, is often found; as, 𐤆𐤍𐤃𐤍 𐤆𐤍𐤌𐤍 *they will save thee alive*, Gen. xii. 12; 𐤆𐤍𐤃𐤌 *I will make alive*, Deut. xxxii. 39. It is also found written 𐤆𐤌𐤃; as, 𐤆𐤌𐤃 *keep alive*, Num. xxxi. 18. Compare 𐤆𐤌𐤃𐤆, Gen. i. 20, which is rather of the fifth conjugation.

APHEL.

This conjugation is formed from a root which may be supposed to arise from the *metathesis* of the initial radicals, viz. 𐤆𐤍𐤃; as, 𐤍𐤃𐤆𐤌 *he lived*, passim; 𐤆𐤃𐤌𐤍𐤃𐤆 *saved alive*, Num. xxxi. 15; 𐤆𐤍𐤃𐤆 𐤆𐤌𐤃𐤆 *to save the people alive*, Gen. i. 20, xlv. 5.

ETTAPHAL.

This conjugation is used *intransitively*; as, 𐤍𐤃𐤆𐤌, *he lived*, Gen. xxv. 7; 𐤆𐤃𐤌, *live*, Gen. xlii. 18.

The other conjugations are rarely met with.

IV. THE VERB 𐤌𐤆𐤆 *he descended.*

This verb, which is the same as the Syriac ܐܘܪܘܘܢ and Chaldee ܐܘܪܘܢ, is written for 𐤌𐤃𐤆, whence it is formed by changing 𐤃 into 𐤆.

PEHAL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

This is, for the most part, *regular*. Sometimes the primitive form is read; as, ሉሉጻኝ *she let down*, Gen. xxiv. 16, 45.

Future Tense.

<i>Person.</i>		<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{	M. ሉገጠጠ	ኃኃሉገጠጠ
		F. ሉገጠሉ	ኃሉገጠጠ
2.	{	M. ሉገጠሉ	ኃኃሉገሉ
		F. ኃጠሉገጠሉ	ኃሉገሉ
1.		ሉገጠሉ	ሉገጠኝ

N.B. It must not be inferred that all these forms are in use; some few are given by analogy. ኃኃሉገሉ occurs in Gen. xlii. 38, xlii. 29, but, from its transitive sense, may be referred to Pahel or Aphel.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

<i>Person.</i>		<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
2.	{	M. ሉኝ or ሉገኝ	ጻሉገኝ
		F. ጠሉገኝ	ጻኝሉገኝ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ሉገጠኝ

The participles are formed in the usual manner; as, Deut. ix. 21, Gen. xxviii. 12.

APHEL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

The two persons of this tense mostly used are, the third singular; as, ḤṬḤ Exod. xix. 20; ḤḤḤ Gen. xxiv. 18; and third plural, ṢḤṬ Gen. xlv. 11.

Future Tense.

The third plural, ṢṢḤṬ, Num. i. 51. Second plural, ṢṢḤṬ, Gen. xlv. 29. The other persons are sometimes met with.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
2.	{ M. ḤṬḤ	ṢḤṬ
	{ F. ḤḤḤ	ṢṢḤṬ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ḤṬḤ Gen. xxxvii. 25.

The *passive* form of this verb also occurs; as, ḤṬḤḤ, Gen. xxxix. 1; ḤḤḤḤ, Num. x. 17, etc.

V. THE VERB ḤḤḤ *he gave*.

PEHAL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

This is formed *regularly*. The instance ḤḤḤ, from Lev. x. 17, given by Cellarius, must be referred to Pahal. Compare Lev. xix. 20.

Future Tense.

This is regular, like verbs in Pe-Yod. It is, however, sometimes formed from בָּאֵר , Hebrew בָּרַךְ .

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
2.	M. בָּרַךְ ; also, בָּרַךְ Gen. xxx. 26;	בָּרְכוּ
	בָּרַךְ Gen. xlii. 37.	
	F. בָּרְכִי Gen. xxx. 14.	בָּרְכוּ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

בָּרֵךְ בָּרְכֵם

PARTICIPLES.

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Past.</i>
בָּרַךְ ; also, בָּרְכָה Gen. xlix. 21.	בָּרַכְתָּ

The latter participle appears to be used in Gen. xxxviii. 14, בָּרַכְתָּ *she was given*. This is probably the case with the instances mentioned under the *perfect tense*. In Lev. xix. 20, our version has "liberty given her," though it should rather be *he has not given her liberty*; a change of nominative which has been adopted in Lev. x. 17, correctly.

The passive forms also occur; as, בָּרַכְתָּ , Lev. x. 14; בָּרַכְתָּ , Lev. xxvi. 25; בָּרַכְתָּ , Lev. xxiv. 20. Also the participle בָּרַכְתָּ , Exod. v. 16, 18.

VI. THE VERB בָּרַךְ *he died*.

This is the same as the Syriac ܒܪܚ , Chaldee בָּרַךְ .

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

The middle letter of the whole of this tense is π ; as, 𐤀𐤍𐤏 *he died*; 𐤀𐤀𐤍𐤏 *she died*, Gen. xxiii. 2; 𐤏𐤀𐤍𐤏 *they died*, Exod. iv. 19, etc.

Future Tense.

This is exactly like verbs in Ayin-Vau; as, 𐤀𐤏𐤏𐤀 , 𐤀𐤏𐤏𐤀 , etc.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

Singular.

𐤀𐤏𐤏 Deut. xxxii. 50.

Plural.

𐤏𐤀𐤏𐤏

INFINITIVE MOOD.

𐤀𐤏𐤏

𐤀𐤏𐤏𐤏

𐤀𐤍𐤏𐤏𐤏

PARTICIPLES.

Present.

M.

𐤀𐤏𐤏

F.

𐤏𐤀𐤀𐤏 Gen. xxx. 1.

Past.

M.

𐤀𐤍𐤏𐤏

F.

𐤏𐤀𐤍𐤏𐤏

VII. THE VERB 𐤏𐤏𐤀 *he went*.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

This follows the form of verbs in Ayin-Vau; as, 𐤏𐤏𐤀 *he went*, Gen. xxii. 13.

Future Tense.

In this tense ʔ is omitted, on account of the guttural ܣ.
(Vide § 28 of this Chapter.)

The INFINITIVE MOOD is ܣܳܘܳܫ; as, ܳܣܳܘܳܫܳܘܳܘ to go, Deut.
xxix. 18.

VIII. THE VERB ܘܳܠܳܗܳܐ he went.

PEHAL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

In this mood the verb is formed *regularly*.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

Singular.

ܘܳܠܳܗܳܐ or ܘܳܠܳܗܳܐ

Plural.

ܘܳܠܳܗܳܐ or ܘܳܠܳܗܳܐ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ܘܳܠܳܗܳܐܳܘܳܫ Gen. xi. 31.

The corresponding conjugation Ethpehel is also found;
as, ܘܳܠܳܗܳܐܳܘܳܫܳܘܳܘ walk, Gen. xvii. 1; ܘܳܠܳܗܳܐܳܘܳܫܳܘܳܘ walking, Gen.
iii. 8.

IX. THE VERB ܳܘܳܠܳܗܳܐ he came.

Compare the Syriac ܘܳܠܳܗܳܐ.

PEHAL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Perfect Tense.

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3.	{ M. ጸሎሎ also ሎሎሎ Gen. xlvi. 1. F. ሎጠሎሎ	ጸሎሎ ጠሎሎ
2.	{ M. ሎጠሎሎ F. ጠሎጠሎሎ	ኃጸሎጠሎሎ ኃሎጠሎሎ
1.	ሎጠሎሎ and ሎጠሎሎ	ኃኃጠሎሎ

Future Tense.

This is formed *regularly* according to verbs in Pe-Aleph, and *quiescents* of the third class.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

ጸሎሎ Gen. xxxvii. 13, and ጠሎሎ ጸሎሎ

INFINITIVE MOOD.

ሎሎሎ ጠሎጠሎ ሎሎጠሎ
Gen. xxxvii. 10. Gen. xlii. 15. Num. x. 21.

PARTICIPLES.

	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
Present.	{ M. ጠሎሎ	ኃጠሎሎ also ኃጠሎጠሎሎ Gen. xxx. 38.
	{ F. ጸጠሎሎ	ኃሎጠሎሎ Gen. xli. 29.

APHEL.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

The perfect and future tenses are formed as usual; thus, *ḥāḥāḥ* *he brought*, Gen. xxxvii. 2; *ḥāḥāḥā* *he shall bring*, etc.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

*Singular.**Plural.**ḥāḥāḥ**ḥāḥāḥā*

PARTICIPLES.

ḥāḥāḥ Exod. x. 4.*ḥāḥāḥā* Deut. viii. 16.

This verb is very frequently used in Pehal.

X. THE VERB *ḥāḥā* *he was able*.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

The *perfect* tense of this verb is *regularly* inflected.

The *future* follows the law of verbs in Pe-Yod; as, *ḥāḥā* *I shall be able*, Deut. xxxi. 2; *ḥāḥā*, *thou shalt be able*, Exod. xviii. 23, etc. There are cases, however, in which the Hebrew anomaly is adopted; as, *ḥāḥā* *I shall be able*, Num. xxii. 11.

The infinitive, *ḥāḥā*, occurs Num. xiii. 31.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PARTICLES.

1. The Particles, which form the third part of speech, are generally understood to comprehend the Pronoun, Adverb, Preposition, Conjunction, and Interjection; or, in other words, all those parts of speech recognized in Greek and Latin, and in the modern European languages, with the exception of the Verb and Noun.

PRONOUN.

2. The Pronoun, as being the most prominent and important of the grammatical divisions included in the term Particle, will be considered in the first place. The Samaritan pronouns may be divided into two classes, as in the other Shemitic languages, viz. *Separables* and *Inseparables*; the latter (except the relative) are sometimes called *Suffixes*, the propriety of which term will appear hereafter.

Under the head of *Separables* are included, Personal Pronouns in the nominative and vocative cases, Demonstratives, sometimes the Relative (which is, however, generally expressed by a *prefix*), and the Interrogative Pronouns.

Under the head of *Inseparables* are classed, Personal Pronouns in the oblique cases or preceded by a preposition, Relative, Reflexive, and Possessive Pronouns.

SEPARABLE PRONOUNS.

PERSONAL.

3. The personal pronouns are, as in other languages, of the first, second, and third persons, in both numbers.

There is only one form for both genders of the first person in each number; in the other persons there is a distinct form for each gender, as the subjoined table will shew:—

TABLE OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

<i>Pers.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>		<i>Plural.</i>														
1. COM.	ܐܢܐ, ܡܢܐ, ܡܢܝܢܐ	<i>I.</i>	ܐܢܝܢܐ, ܐܢܐ <i>we.</i>														
2.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>M. ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ</td> <td rowspan="2">} <i>thou.</i></td> <td rowspan="2"> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܐܢܐ</td> <td rowspan="2">} <i>ye.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܡܢܐ</td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>F. ܡܢܐ</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	{	M. ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ	} <i>thou.</i>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܐܢܐ</td> <td rowspan="2">} <i>ye.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܡܢܐ</td> </tr> </table>	{	ܐܢܐ	} <i>ye.</i>	{	ܡܢܐ	{	F. ܡܢܐ					
{	M. ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ	} <i>thou.</i>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܐܢܐ</td> <td rowspan="2">} <i>ye.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܡܢܐ</td> </tr> </table>			{	ܐܢܐ		} <i>ye.</i>	{	ܡܢܐ						
{	ܐܢܐ			} <i>ye.</i>													
{	ܡܢܐ																
{	F. ܡܢܐ																
3.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>M. ܐܘܘܐ, ܐܘܘܐ</td> <td rowspan="2">} <i>they.</i></td> <td rowspan="2"> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܐܘܘܐ</td> <td rowspan="2">} <i>they.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܡܢܐ</td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>F. ܐܡܡܐ, ܡܡܐ</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	{	M. ܐܘܘܐ, ܐܘܘܐ	} <i>they.</i>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܐܘܘܐ</td> <td rowspan="2">} <i>they.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܡܢܐ</td> </tr> </table>	{	ܐܘܘܐ	} <i>they.</i>	{	ܡܢܐ	{	F. ܐܡܡܐ, ܡܡܐ			<i>he.</i>	<i>she.</i>	
{	M. ܐܘܘܐ, ܐܘܘܐ	} <i>they.</i>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܐܘܘܐ</td> <td rowspan="2">} <i>they.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>{</td> <td>ܡܢܐ</td> </tr> </table>			{	ܐܘܘܐ		} <i>they.</i>	{	ܡܢܐ						
{	ܐܘܘܐ			} <i>they.</i>													
{	ܡܢܐ																
{	F. ܐܡܡܐ, ܡܡܐ																

There is another form of the first person singular, viz. ܐܢܐ, which sometimes occurs; this form and that first given in the table correspond exactly to the Chaldee ܐܢܐ and ܡܢܐ; while the second and third forms are the Hebrew ܐܢܐ and ܡܢܐ. The two forms of the second person masculine are the same as ܐܢܐ and ܡܢܐ.

The second person feminine is found in Gen. xxiv. 23, *without* a line over it; it corresponds to the Hebrew ܡܢܐ, which is usually written ܡܢܐ.

The first form of the third person masculine is the same as ܐܘܘܐ, while the second is the Syriac ܐܘܘܐ.

With the first form of the third feminine, compare the Chaldee and Hebrew ܡܡܐ.

The second form of the first person plural is manifestly the Chaldee ܐܢܝܢܐ.

With the forms of the second plural, compare the Chaldee ܐܢܝܢܐ, ܡܢܝܢܐ.

With the two forms of the third plural, compare ܐܘܘܐ masc. and ܡܡܐ fem.; for, by interchanging the quiescents ܐ and ܡ

'of the same organ,' the Chaldee forms are easily transformed to the Samaritan.

DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS.

4. These are included in the following table:—

<i>Singular.</i>			<i>Plural.</i>
M.	ܘܢ, ܘܢܘܢܘܢ, ܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢ	<i>this.</i>	
F.	ܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢ	<i>this.</i>	C. ܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢ <i>these, those.</i>
C.	ܘܢ, ܘܢܘܢ	<i>this, that.</i>	

Compare the first form of the masculine singular with the Chaldee ܘܢ, and the second and third with the Hebrew ܘܢ.

With the feminine forms, compare the Chaldaean ܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢ.

The first forms of the masculine and feminine, as will be observed, are repeated as of common gender; this arises from their indiscriminate use, somewhat similar to that of ܘܢܘܢ and ܘܢܘܢܘܢ among the Hebrews.

With the common form of the plural, compare ܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢ.

It must be observed, that many of the Personal and Demonstrative Pronouns receive ܘܢ emphatic as a *prefix*; thus, ܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢ *that very place*. Again, ܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢ *these very stones*.

RELATIVE PRONOUNS.

5. Like the Hebrews, the Samaritans have a *separable* relative pronoun, viz. ܘܢܘܢܘܢ; its use, however, is generally superseded by the *prefix* ܘܢ, like the Chaldee ܘܢ from ܘܢ. It is common in number and gender; thus, ܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢ *thy stranger, who is in thy cities*, Exod. xx. 10; ܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢܘܢ *thy gods, which brought thee up*, Exod. xxxii. 4.

· INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS.

6. There are two forms of this pronoun; the first ܐܘܢ, Chald. ܐܘܢ, which is used of persons, and equivalent to our *who?*—the second ܐܘܝܢ, Chald. ܐܘܝܢ, used of things, and like our *what?* Thus, ܡܢܢܢܢ ܐܘܢܢܢܢ *whose daughter are you?* and, ܐܘܝܢܢܢ ܐܘܢܢܢܢ *what is his name?* The neuter form ܐܘܝܢ, as it may be called, sometimes appears to lose its sense when used with prefixes; thus, ܐܘܝܢܢܢ *like as*. There is also another interrogative form ܐܘܢܢ, found in Gen. xxxii. 29; .as, ܡܢܢܢܢܢ ܐܘܢܢܢܢ *why seek for my name?*

Before proceeding to the Inseparable Pronouns, it must be observed that, to express the words 'self,' 'the same,' 'the very one,' the Samaritans follow the Hebrews in substituting ܐܘܢܢܢ for its equivalent ܐܘܢܢܢ, as in Gen. vii. 13, ܐܘܢܢܢ ܐܘܢܢܢܢ ܐܘܢܢܢܢ *in this very day*. Compare the Syriac ܐܘܢܢܢܢ which is used in a similar manner; as, Rom. ix. 3, ܐܘܢܢܢܢܢܢܢܢ *I myself*. So 1 Cor. vi. 7, ܐܘܢܢܢܢܢܢܢܢܢ *you yourselves*.

It is probable that ܐܘܢܢܢܢ, synonymous with ܐܘܢܢܢ, as well as ܐܘܢܢܢ *the soul*, are used as reciprocals, in the sense of the Latin 'seipsum.' This inference is justified by the numerous examples found in the New Testament, in which it is so employed by the Syrians.

The Samaritans apparently use ܐܘܢܢܢܢ *the heart*, reciprocally; as in Gen. xviii. 12, where we find ܐܘܢܢܢܢܢܢܢܢܢܢܢܢ *and Sarah laughed within her heart*, i. e. herself.

INSEPARABLE PRONOUNS.

7. These Pronouns, which may also be called *suffixes*, from the peculiarity of their being joined to the end of

words with which they coalesce, include the Personal Pronouns with a preposition, Reflexives, and Possessives.

They are contained in the following table:—

<i>Person.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1. COM.	מ, מו	נ, ננ
2.	{ M. מ, מו F. מו, מו, מ	נננ, ננננ, ננננ מומ, מו, נננ, ננננ
3.	{ M. מ, מ, מו F. מ, מו	ננמ, נמ, ננמ מומ, מו, (ננ)

These inseparables are not joined to nouns, verbs, and particles *indiscriminately*; it will be proper therefore to make a few remarks on their use.

With respect to the *first* person, it must be observed, that the form מ of the singular is joined to nouns of both numbers; thus, from מו comes מומו *my lord*; from מומו *sons*, we have מומומו *my sons*, which is contracted into מומו, as in the Hebrew.

There are some instances in which מ is joined to verbs; as, מומו *he sent me*, Gen. xlv. 5, Exod. iii. 14. This is frequently the case when the letter immediately preceding the *suffix* is essentially radical.

The second form, however, is that usually found with verbs; as, מומומו *thou hast blessed me*; מומומומו *he shall see me*, etc.

Both forms of the *first* person plural are used with nouns and verbs; instances of the first are, מומומו *our God*; מומומומו *our sepulchres*; מומומומו *our fathers*. Again, מומומומו *he made us go up*, Exod. xxxii. 1; מומומומו *thou*

hast led us out, Num. xxi. 5. Instances of the second form are, ኃሉሕጠጊሉ *our sister*, Gen. xxiv. 60; ኃሉጠጓ *he delivered us*, Exod. ii. 19.

8. Upon the suffix ዳ of the *second* person, the following remarks may be made.

It is found with nouns of both numbers for the masculine gender; and, for the feminine gender, with nouns plural; as, ዳጓጊሉ *your God*; ዳሉዓጓኝ · ዳዓጓ *your son and your daughter*; ዳሉጓጓሉ *your fathers*; ዳጠጎጠጎ *your eyes*, etc. In Gen. xix. 12, ጠ is inserted before the terminal ዳ; for, in speaking of Lot's daughters, we find ዳጠሉጎጓ *your daughters*. This insertion of ጠ must not be confounded with the feminine form ዳጠ, which is used with singular nouns; as, Gen. iii. 16, ዳጠዓጓገ *your husband*; ዳጠጎዓላጓ *your seed*, Gen. xvi. 10.

The form ዳ is also found with verbs; as, ዳሕዳላ *he loved thee*; ዳሉሕጠዋሉ *have I established thee*, Exod. ix. 16; ዳጂጊሕሉ *I will send thee*, Gen. xxxii. 26. The terminal ዳ with the *epenthetic* ኃ is usually found with the future tense; as, ዳኃጎጎጎሉ *I will make thee*, Gen. xii. 2; ዳኃዓላጎሉ *I will restore thee*, Gen. xxviii. 15, etc.

The ጠ of the feminine form ዳጠ is usually omitted when joined with a particle; as, ዳጊ *to thee*, Gen. xx. 16; ዳኃሕ from thee, Gen. xxx. 2; ዳጠጊ is found in Exod. ii. 7.

The first form ኃኃ of the *second* person *plural* masculine is found with nouns and verbs; but with the latter it is generally not suffixed immediately, but with the interposition of the characteristic of the accusative case; as, ኃኃዳጊሉ *your God*; ኃኃዳሉጓጓሉ *your fathers*; ኃኃዳሉጠ · ዓላጎጠኝ *and will lead you*, Gen. xlviii. 21. It is also found with particles; as, ኃኃሕ *to you*, ኃኃሕሕጎ *with you*, etc., though

in this case the second form בְּנֵי is usually employed; as, בְּנֵיכֶם *from you*, Deut. ii. 4, etc.

The latter form is not only found with the particles, but also with nouns; as, $\text{בְּנֵיכֶם} \cdot \text{לְבַבְךָ} \cdot \text{בְּנֵיכֶם} \cdot \text{לְבַבְךָ}$ *in your heart and in your soul*, Deut. xi. 18.

The last form in both genders, viz. בְּנֵי , is a verbal suffix, and is formed by means of the *epenthetic* ב , from בְּנֵי , like בְּנֵי from בְּנֵי .

The first two forms of the feminine plural are joined to nouns; as, בְּנֵיכֶם *your soul*; sometimes by the insertion of א , as in the case of the masculine suffixes; thus, $\text{בְּנֵיכֶם} \cdot \text{אָבִי}$ *your father*, Gen. xxxi. 5. The other forms of the feminine are found with verbs.

9. The form אָ of the *third person singular* is found with nouns of both numbers, also with verbs; as, אָבִי *his head*; אָבִי *her seed*; אָבִי *he set him*, Gen. xlvii. 7; אָבִי *I drew him forth*, Exod. ii. 10. In the masculine gender, אָ is sometimes *suffixed* by the interposition of א ; as, אָבִי *his father-in-law*, Exod. iii. 1; אָבִי *he shewed him*, Exod. xv. 25. The א was probably added to mark distinctly the difference between the word and its suffix. Compare remarks on verbs, § 7.

The second form אָ of the masculine gender, is used with plural nouns, as, אָבִי *his eyes*; אָבִי *his sons*, Gen. ix. 1; Chald. אָבִי , Syriac אָבִי , etc.

This terminal is found also with singular nouns and particles, in which case אָ is inserted before the suffix; as, אָבִי *his father*, Gen. xlvi. 1, xlvii. 11; אָבִי *his brother*, Exod. xvi. 15; אָבִי *upon him*, etc.

The suffix אָ of common gender, formed by the *epenthetic* Nun from אָ , is used with verbs; as, אָבִי *I will*

destroy him, Exod. xxxii. 33; *אֲנִי אֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ shall hate her*. Deut. xxii. 13. It must be observed that it is mostly employed with the *future* tense, and, comparatively speaking, is very seldom found with the preterite; as, *אֲנִי הִצַּדְתִּי אֹתוֹ he placed him*, Deut. xxxii. 10.

The first two forms of the *plural* number *masculine* are joined with nouns of the singular number, the second being that which is usually employed; as, *יָדָם their hand*, Gen. xxxvii. 22; *יָדָם אֲחֵרָהּ on their left hand*, Exod. xiv. 22. Also with nouns of the plural number; as, *אֲבוֹתָם their fathers*, Exod. xii. 40; *אֲנִי אֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ*, Gen. xii. 5.

The third form, *אֲנִי*, is masculine, and is only employed with verbs; as, *אֲנִי אֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ I will bless them*, Num. vi. 27; *אֲנִי אֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ אֲנִי אֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ they struck them and bruised them*, Num. xiv. 45. This suffix is not, however, used exclusively, since the simple form *אֲנִי* occurs; as, *אֲנִי אֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ he slew them*, Gen. xiv. 16; *אֲנִי אֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ*, Num. xvi. 39. Vide Deut. ix. 17.

The *feminine* forms of this person, viz. *אֲנִי* and *אֲנִי*, are used with nouns of both numbers; as, *אֲנִי אֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ their judgment*, Num. xxvii. 5; *אֲנִי אֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ their father*, Num. xxvii. 7, etc.

The last form, *אֲנִי* of the feminine gender, may be joined to verbs, but very seldom occurs. The student must be careful to distinguish it from the same form, which is used for the first person plural.

These pronouns, it will be observed, serve for the Personal Pronouns in the oblique cases, for the Possessives, and Reciprocals.

10. The relative pronoun is usually expressed by the *prefix* *אֲנִי*, which is employed like the Chaldee *ܐܢܝ*.

ON THE MODE OF SUFFIXING.

11. In adding the inseparables to nouns of the absolute state, the \aleph characteristic of the feminine is changed into \aleph ; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *a handmaid*, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *my handmaid*, Gen. xvi. 2. If the noun be plural, the terminal \aleph or \aleph of the plural *formative* is omitted, and the suffix added to the remaining part; as, from $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *sons*, comes $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *his sons*, etc.

But if the noun be in the emphatic state, the \aleph is wholly omitted, and the suffix takes its place; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *the soul*, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *my soul*; $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *the wife*, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *thy wife*; $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *fathers*, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *our fathers*.

12. There are three nouns which deserve especial consideration; these are, \aleph *a father*; \aleph *a brother*; $\aleph\aleph$ *a father-in-law*. These nouns are connected with their suffixes by inserting \aleph , like the Chaldee and Syriac; or \aleph , like the Hebrew.

The following are examples of this peculiarity:—

Examples of \aleph ; as, $\aleph\aleph$, $\aleph\aleph$, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, etc., with \aleph ; $\aleph\aleph$, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, with \aleph .

Examples of \aleph ; as, $\aleph\aleph$, $\aleph\aleph$, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, etc., with \aleph ; and $\aleph\aleph$, $\aleph\aleph$, etc., with \aleph .

Examples of $\aleph\aleph$ are rare; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, Exod. xviii. 1; $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, Gen. xxxviii. 13. Also with \aleph in Gen. xxxviii. 25; as, $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *her father-in-law*.

This is not, however, the case with the suffix of the first person; for in Gen. xx. 12, we find $\aleph\aleph$ *daughter of my father*; and in Gen. iv. 9, $\aleph\aleph$ *am I my brother's keeper?* In both these instances, however, the nouns are in 'regimen,' which may probably account for the deviation from the general rule.

13. The suffixes are usually added to verbs without changing any letter; as, *מֵלֵךְ* *he led me*, Gen. xxiv. 27; *שָׂרָפָה* *they made thee go up*, Exod. xxxii. 4, etc.

Quiescents of the third radical in *ל* or *ש* sometimes vary from this rule. These letters may be changed into *ל*; as, *בָּרָאֵם* *he numbered them*, Num. i. 19; *בָּרָאֵם* *he delivered us*, Exod. ii. 19; *בָּרָאֵם* *he overlaid them*, Exod. xxxvi. 36. They are also sometimes omitted; as, *מֵלֵךְ* *he shall see me*, Exod. xxxiii. 20.

14. The *epenthetic* *ב* between the verb and its suffix is so often used by the Samaritans, that, by coalescing with the *suffixes* themselves, an entirely new series would seem to have arisen. See the table, p. 72.

15. The *interposition* of *ל* which sometimes occurs may be accounted for by supposing it to be a contraction of the case-mark *ל*; thus, *בָּרָאֵם*, Deut. iii. 3, is the same as *בָּרָאֵם לְ*; similarly, *בָּרָאֵם* for *בָּרָאֵם לְ* *they saw them*. In fact, the pronominal suffixes, especially *ש* and *ל*, are frequently found separated from the verb by *ל*; as, *בָּרָאֵם לְ* *he will bless you*, Deut. i. 11; *בָּרָאֵם לְ* *he blessed them*, Exod. xxxix. 43.

16. There are cases in which the methods employed by the Hebrews in suffixing the particles have also been adopted by the Samaritans; thus, *בָּרָאֵם*, Gen. xix. 16, 30; instead of which *בָּרָאֵם*, Gen. xxxvi. 6, and *בָּרָאֵם* Num. xxxvi. 2, are more usually employed. Such instances of Hebrew usage are perhaps due to the carelessness of the copyists, who from their acquaintance with that language, may have foisted in forms which are undoubtedly opposed to Samaritan usage.

ADVERB.

17. The adverbs, as well as the prepositions and conjunctions, may perhaps be considered as having been originally substantives in the constructive state. Some of them consist of *radical* letters alone; as, $\beth\daleth$ *suddenly*; $\beth\aleph$ *against*; $\aleph\aleph$ *before*. Others are formed with *serviles*; as, $\aleph\daleth\aleph\aleph$ *little*, or *too little*; $\beth\aleph\daleth\aleph$ *in order that*, etc. It is scarcely worth while, in a rudimentary work like the present, to discuss the senses of the substantives from which these particles are derived. The syntax of the adverb will be found in the Chapter on that subject.

A list of adverbs is subjoined, slightly differing from that given by Cellarius, which will be found exceedingly useful for reference.

$\beth\aleph$ where	$\aleph\daleth\aleph$ nay
$\aleph\daleth\aleph$ } hitherto (<i>a</i>)	$\beth\aleph$ behold, lo!
$\aleph\daleth\aleph$ } }	$\aleph\aleph\daleth$ moreover
$\aleph\aleph$ } so, also	$\aleph\daleth\daleth$ then; <i>also</i> $\aleph\daleth\daleth$
$\beth\aleph\aleph$ } }	$\daleth\aleph$ when, since
$\beth\aleph$ verily	$\daleth\daleth\aleph$ already
$\beth\aleph$ not; <i>prohibitive</i>	$\aleph\daleth\aleph$ like as, Lev. xix. 34.
$\beth\aleph$ if, since, where;	$\aleph\aleph\aleph$ like as
Heb. $\beth\aleph$	$\beth\aleph$ so, also
$\aleph\daleth\aleph\aleph$ before that	$\aleph\daleth$ not
$\beth\aleph\daleth$ so, just as	$\daleth\aleph$ oh that, perchance
$\daleth\aleph$ why, because	$\daleth\daleth\aleph$ } only
$\aleph\aleph$ for $\aleph\aleph$ behold	$\daleth\aleph\daleth\aleph$ } }
$\aleph\aleph\aleph$ here, hither	$\aleph\aleph\daleth$ not, nothing
$\aleph\aleph\daleth\aleph$ however	$\aleph\aleph\daleth$ wherefore (<i>\beta</i>)

𐤅𐤍 in vain, gratis	𐤅𐤆𐤆 hitherto, moreover
𐤅 since	𐤍𐤅𐤆 hitherto, more
𐤅 how	𐤆𐤆 suddenly
𐤅𐤆 above	𐤍𐤆𐤍𐤆 little, too little
𐤅𐤆𐤅 whence (β)	𐤅 much, exceedingly
𐤍 } now	𐤍𐤅 and 𐤍𐤆 now (γ)
𐤍 } now	𐤅𐤍 same as 𐤅
𐤅𐤆 } as far as	𐤅𐤍 there
𐤅 } as far as	

The adverb marked (α) is generally used of the *continuation* of time. The final 𐤅 is omitted with a suffix; as, 𐤅𐤆𐤍, Exod. ix. 17.

Those marked (β) are interrogative adverbs. The former is from 𐤅 and 𐤅; Greek *δίότι*. The latter is a compound of 𐤅 and 𐤅𐤆, that is *from where*; Latin *unde*; Greek, *πόθεν*.

The adverb marked (γ) is the Hebrew 𐤍; it is properly an imperative mood; its plural, 𐤅𐤍, is found in Gen. xlv. 4, but the singular form, 𐤍𐤅, may be used in a plural sense; as in Exod. xii. 3.

The student is recommended to get this table of adverbs by heart; inasmuch as frequent recurrence to the Lexicon, in the present state of Samaritan lexicography, is not only tedious, but requires more than ordinary skill and perseverance to render it practically useful.

PREPOSITION.

18. The Prepositions may be divided into two classes, like the Pronouns, viz. Separables and Inseparables or Prefixes. As regards the former class, it is sufficient to

observe that they are generally employed as in the other Shemitic languages.

The following Table of them, formed from that of Cellarius, will be read advantageously, inasmuch as it contains those which are mostly in use:

2 ^h at, to	h ^h 2 } at, to
2 ^h m ^h at, to, near	ḡm2 } at, to
22ḡḡ on account of	22ḡḡ same as 22ḡḡ
ḡmḡ between	ḡḡ2 below, beneath
h ^h 2ḡ beside, except	ḡḡ2 without, from (γ)
ḡhḡ after, behind	h ^h m ^h m ^h within
m ^h ḡḡ on account of (a)	ḡḡ from, before
m ^h ḡḡḡ behind, after	ḡḡḡ as far as
h ^h 2m ^h 2ḡ for, in the place of	2ḡ upon (δ)
ḡḡḡ over against; also with prefix 2.	ḡḡ with, together with
m ^h h ^h under, below; with prefix ḡ	2ḡḡ against, afar; with prefix 2, accord- ing to, nigh to
h ^h ḡ2 } within	ḡḡḡ } before, in the
ḡḡ2 also ḡḡ2 } within	ḡḡ } presence of;
2ḡ2 beyond, afar (β)	also with the prefixes 2, ḡ

The preposition marked (a) is accompanied by 2ḡ, Gen. xx. 3; it is like the Hebrew עַל.

That marked (β) is read, in some cases, with ḡ prefixed. The preposition (γ) is formed by means of a double prefix. (δ) also is formed in a similar manner to (γ); thus, 2ḡ2ḡ is a *pleonasm*, with the same force as 2ḡ.

The pronominal suffixes are added to these prepositions in the same way they are added to nouns; thus, m^hḡḡ with me; ḡḡ from thee; ḡḡḡ after them, etc.

19. Some of these prepositions, as in the Hebrew, insert *m* between themselves and the suffix; as, *ṣmʔ* upon him; *ʔmʔ* upon us; *ʔmʔ* in thy presence; *ʔmʔ* before them, etc.

The two prepositions *ʔmʔ* and *ʔmʔ*, which latter is used for the Hebrew *לָּ*, are found with and without the *m* inserted; as *ʔmʔ* between thee; *ʔmʔ* between you; *ʔmʔ* to you; *ʔmʔ* to them, etc.

Generally speaking, the others adopt the common rule, though there are many exceptions.

20. The preposition *ʔ* not only assumes *m*, but, in addition to it, *ʔ*; as, Gen. xxxviii. 13, xlv. 1, *ʔmʔ*; in the latter place, however, the *ʔ* is marked by a small horizontal stroke, signifying that the letter was inadvertently inserted.

For further information respecting the construction of the Prepositions, see the Syntax.

INSEPARABLE PREPOSITIONS.

21. These consist of single letters, and are joined to nouns, to verbs in the infinitive, and to particles, by *prefixing* them: from which circumstance the name sometimes given to them is derived.

These prepositions are *ʔ*, *ʔ*, *ʔ*, *ʔ*, corresponding exactly to the same *prefixes* in Hebrew. It will be observed that the complete forms *ʔ* and *ʔ* are generally used with the *suffixes*.

The following examples will shew how these prepositions are connected with the *suffixes*: *ʔ* in you; *ʔ* in them; *ʔ* to him; *ʔ* to us, etc.; *ʔ* from thee, Gen.

xxx. 2; מִלִּשְׁתֵּי like as *thee*, Deut. xviii. 18. For further information, see the Syntax.

CONJUNCTIONS.

22. The following list is from that given by Cellarius:

מִלִּשְׁתֵּי or, either	}lest (α)
לִּשְׁתֵּי but	
וְלֹא unless	לִּשְׁתֵּי same as לִּשְׁתֵּי
לֹא־וְלֹא if not, unless	לִּשְׁתֵּי because, for (β)
מִלִּשְׁתֵּי if	וְלֹא because, if, that
וְגַם also, moreover	וְלֹא because
לְמַעַן in order that; also	מִלִּשְׁתֵּי because; also with the
מִלִּשְׁתֵּי but [with prefix ל	prefix ו
וְלֹא but, only; lest	מִלִּשְׁתֵּי same as מִלִּשְׁתֵּי
(Gen. iii. 3.)	

The conjunction marked (α) is read with וְלֹא ; as, וְלֹא־וְלֹא so as *not*. That marked (β) is found with לִּשְׁתֵּי in the sense of *that not*; and with מִלִּשְׁתֵּי in the sense of *but that*.

The prefix ו *and*, is also a conjunction; it is not *conversive*, as in Hebrew.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE PARTICLES.

23. We must not omit to mention here the *prefix* ו , which is rarely used in the Samaritan with the force of the Greek article, like the corresponding Hebrew *prefix* ו , except in some nouns purely Hebrew; as, וְאֱלֹהִים the *God*; וְאָדָם the *man*. It is also employed with the pronouns; as, וְהוּא *he*; וְהִיא *she*; וְהֵם and וְהֵנָּה for הֵם and הֵנָּה respectively; וְאֵלֶּהּ *these*, וְאֵלֵיהֶם *they*, etc.

The following are instances of its use with the participles;

מלכאָ םֵ םֵֹרְחֹמֵנוֹס, Exod. xiv. 19; פֵֹאָפֵֹאָ םֵ םֵֹנֵאָגֵאָגֵאָוֹנֹ, Levit. xi. 45; אָנֵֹאָ םֵ םֵֹכֵאָוֵאָוֹנֹ, Deut. i. 44.

24. The use of אָ, as explained in the previous article, must be carefully distinguished from that in which it is interrogative; as, אָנֵֹאָ · מֵֹאָלֵֹאָ · אָנֵֹאָאָ םֵֹ *am I my brother's keeper?* Gen. iv. 9; so in Gen. xlv. 3, אָמֵֹנֵֹאָ · מֵֹאָלֵֹאָ · אָנֵֹאָ םֵֹ *is my father yet alive?* etc. In Deut. xxxii. 6, לֵֹ is put for אָ; as, אָמֵֹאָלֵֹאָ · לֵֹאָנֵֹאָ · לֵֹמֵֹלֵֹאָ *is not he thy father?*

25. The Samaritans do not appear to employ אָ as a *suffix* like ן of the Hebrews, expressive of *motion* or *rest*. For though אָנֵֹאָלֵֹ is sometimes found without the preposition לֵֹ, אָ can scarcely be held to supply its place; because instances occur of נֵֹאָלֵֹ without אָ, as in Gen. xii. 5, where ellipses of the preposition לֵֹ are manifest.

ON THE PERMUTATION OF LETTERS.

26. No letters in the Samaritan language undergo such various permutations as those which are usually, though improperly, called gutturals; viz. נֵֹ, אָ, אָ, לֵֹ. The letter נֵֹ is very frequently written for אָ; as, אָנֵֹאָלֵֹ for אָאָלֵֹאָ; אָאָנֵֹ for אָאָנֵֹ; לֵֹאָנֵֹ for לֵֹאָאָ, etc.

This letter is also found written for לֵֹ; as, אָנֵֹ *if*, for אָלֵֹ; אָמֵֹאָמֵֹאָנֵֹ for אָמֵֹאָמֵֹאָלֵֹ. So אָאָנֵֹ for אָאָלֵֹ *a mother*; לֵֹאָאָ for לֵֹאָאָ, etc. On the other hand, לֵֹ is found for נֵֹ; as, פֵֹאָלֵֹ for פֵֹאָנֵֹ, etc. The guttural אָ is found for נֵֹ; as, אָאָלֵֹ for נֵֹאָלֵֹ. Also for לֵֹ; as, אָלֵֹאָאָ for אָלֵֹאָלֵֹ.

The guttural אָ is found for נֵֹ; as, אָאָלֵֹ for נֵֹאָלֵֹ. Also for לֵֹ; as, מֵֹאָאָאָ for מֵֹאָאָלֵֹ.

The above are only a few examples of such permutations; numerous others could be produced, but may be safely left

to the student's own observations. Such variations are not easily to be accounted for, except on the principle that "letters of the same organ may be interchanged promiscuously."

27. Other letters are found interchanged, besides the gutturals; as, א for א in אגא , instead of the Hebrew הגה *he shewed*; ג for א , etc. Also פ for צ ; as, מפזא for מצזא , Gen. xxv. 32.

Similarly, א is found for א , and א for פ . Various others are given by Morinus. These are sufficient, however, for our purpose.

28. Besides interchanging letters, the Samaritan, like most other languages, is affected by those changes known as *metathesis* and *aphæresis*. Thus, מאנ for מנא ; אממפ for אממפ . So אא for אא ; אננ for נאנ , etc. Instances of *aphæresis* are מנפ for the complete form מנפא ; מא for מאמ ; אא for אאא , etc.

29. Before concluding, we shall give a few examples of *crasis*; thus, $\text{אנא} \cdot \text{אא}$ *behold I*, becomes, Gen. xxii. 11, אנאא ; similarly, אנאאא *behold ye*, Deut. i. 10. This change especially takes place with the particle אא and verbs; as, אנאאא , Deut. iii. 26; אנאאאאא , Gen. xxxvii. 22, etc. I confess, however, I have some doubt as to the legitimacy of the *crasis* in the latter case.

S Y N T A X .

CHAPTER V.

ON THE NOUNS.

1. One substantive depending on another is frequently used by the Samaritans instead of an adjective; thus, *ḥāšān · ḥāšān · šāšān · šāšān · ḥāšān* and his mother took for him an ark of bulrushes, Exod. ii. 3; *šāšān · šāšān · šāšān · šāšān · ḥāšān* and the clothes of service and the garments of holiness, Exod. xxxi. 10; *šāšān · šāšān · šāšān* sacrifices of righteousness, Deut. xxxiii. 19.

2. A substantive is frequently used, as in the first section, instead of an adjective, to denote the materials of which anything is composed; as, Exod. xxviii. 17, *šāšān · ḥāšān · šāšān* rows of stone. In this place we may notice the phrase *šāšān · šāšān · šāšān*, Gen. xli. 1, signifying *two years of days*, or *two full years*, as it is rendered in our version; it must be observed that the governing noun is in the absolute state, and not in the constructive, as is generally the case; the nouns *governing* and *governed* must therefore be considered in *apposition*, the former expressing the whole, the latter parts thereof.

3. The cardinal numerals from three to ten inclusive interchange their genders, as in the Hebrew, inasmuch as feminine forms are joined with masculine nouns, and *vice versâ*; thus,

ሦስት ስድስት *two years*, Gen. xlv. 6; ጳጳሽ ጳጳረዎን *one day*, Gen. i. 5, etc., are *concordant*; but ስጦና ጳጳረሉ *three sons*, Gen. vi. 10; ጳጳረሉ ስጦና ሦስት *four kings*, Gen. xiv. 9; ሦስት ስድስት *five years*, Gen. xlv. 11; ስድስት ስድስት *seven kine*, Gen. xli. 18; ጳጳሽ ስድስት *nine bullocks*, Num. xxix. 26; ስድስት ጳጳሽ *ten she-asses*, Gen. xlv. 23, are all *discordant* in gender, and in number also; the singular numeral being added to a plural noun.

It will appear by the subjoined examples that the cardinals are used in the constructive as well as in the absolute state; as, ስድስት ስድስት *two of his wives*, Gen. xxxii. 22; ጳጳረሉ ስድስት *eight of oxen*, Num. vii. 8; ጳጳረሉ ስድስት *ten of sayings or commandments*, Deut. iv. 13, etc.

4. The cardinal numerals *usually* precede their nouns, as our examples will shew; this is, however, by no means always the case, as they sometimes follow; in which situation ጳጳሽ *one* is always found.

5. Those numerals which are multiples of ten are joined to singular and plural nouns; ስድስት ስድስት *thirty camels*, Gen. xxxii. 15; ስድስት ስድስት *twenty silver pieces*, Gen. xxxvii. 28; ጳጳሽ ስድስት *thirty years*, Num. iv. 3.

6. The *composite* numerals from ten to one hundred are usually so arranged that the less precedes the greater; as, Gen. xxxii. 22, ስድስት ጳጳሽ *eleven*; ስድስት ጳጳሽ *fourteen*, Num. xxix. 20, etc. The *composite* numerals beyond one hundred are free from this restriction, and can either follow or precede; ስድስት ስድስት ስድስት ጳጳሽ *three hundred and eighteen*, Gen. xiv. 14; ስድስት ስድስት ጳጳሽ *one hundred and twenty*, Deut. xxxiv. 7.

7. The ordinal numerals do not exceed ten in number;

for beyond that number, their place is supplied by the cardinals; as, ሠጠጋጋላላጻ ሉኃሥጋ *in the fortieth year*, Num. xxxiii. 38.

8. The noun substantive is frequently doubled, so as to convey the idea of a whole, comprehending a series of individuals of the same kind; thus, in Lev. xxiv. 15, $\text{ሥኃሉ ጻጻጊሉ ጊጊዋጠ ህሉ ሥኃሉ}$ *whosoever curseth his God*; that is, *every man*, without exception.

This repetition of the substantive frequently implies *multitude*; as, in Gen. xiv. 10, ህሉጋጠጋ ህላጠጋ ህላጠጋ *many slime-pits*; or, as it is rendered in our authorised version, “full of slime-pits.”

The repetition in Gen. xxxii. 16, has a *distributive* sense; $\text{ላጥጋ ላጥጋ ገጠጥጋጋ ጥሉጋ ጋጻጠገ}$ *and he delivered them into the hand of his servants, drove by drove.*

This repetition expresses duality and diversity in Deut. xxv. 13, ህጋሉገ ህጋሉ *two different stones*, or two stones of different weight.

9. It has been previously said that one noun dependent on another is frequently used instead of an adjective; there are cases in which the governing noun has the force of an adjective; as, $\text{ገገገ ሠጠጋ ጻህዋገጋ ጻሉሉሉጠጊሉ ጋገጋጋ}$ *and as for the flower of his captains he hath drowned it in the Red sea*, Exod. xv. 4, rendered “chosen captains” in our version.

The construction just explained is that always followed by ጊህ, the signification of which, since it is properly a substantive, is ‘the whole’; as, ገጠጋጋ ጊህህ *more than all his children*, Gen. xxxvii. 3, properly, *the whole of his children*; ጠህጋ ህኅጊህ *we all are sons*, Gen. xlii. 11; ጠጋገጋ ጊህ *all of my goodness*, Exod. xxxiii. 19; ህሉጥጠጋ ጊህ *all thy work*, Deut. v. 13. In the two last examples the *con-*

struction may be inferred from the former ones, where a discrepancy of number exists between 𐤆𐤃 and the governed noun.

10. By joining a noun with itself in the plural number, a superlative sense is frequently conveyed; as, 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *holy of holies*, Exod. xxvi. 33; 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *servant of servants*, Gen. ix. 25; 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *God of gods*, Deut. x. 17.

11. The governed noun of two nouns in *regimen* may have either a *subjective* or *objective* sense; thus, · 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 may be either *the injury* inflicted on Sodom, or, *the injury* inflicted by Sodom on others. In Gen. xviii. 20, 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *the cry about Sodom*, the relation is objective. In Gen. i. 26, 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *the fishes of the sea*, the relation is subjective. 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤍𐤏𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *my wrong be upon thee*, Gen. xvi. 5; here the suffixed pronoun is objective. 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤍𐤏𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *the days of his mourning*, Gen. l. 4; here it may be subjective or objective,—in the former case referring to Joseph, and in the latter to Israel. The reader who has an acquaintance with Latin and Greek, will immediately see that the Samaritan usage here precisely accords with that of the genitive, objective, and subjective in those languages.

12. When one noun depending on another is used for an adjective, the suffixed pronoun, if there be any, is sometimes added to the governing, at other times to the governed noun; thus, in Lev. xx. 3, 𐤍𐤏𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *the name of my holiness*, instead of 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤍𐤏𐤏𐤍 *my name of holiness*, or, *my holy name*, as it is usually rendered; 𐤍𐤏𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *the mountain of my holiness*, instead of 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 · 𐤍𐤏𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *my mountain of holiness*, or, *my holy mountain*, etc.

13. The adjective, when qualifying a substantive, is

usually put after it; as, $\text{אֲנֹכִי וְאֵלֹהִים גְּדֹלִים}$ *two great luminaries*, Gen. i. 16. When, however, the adjective is used predicatively, it precedes the substantive; as, $\text{גָּדוֹל הַעֲוֹנוֹתַי}$ *great is my punishment*, Gen. iv. 13, $\text{אֲשֶׁר לֹא טוֹב הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה}$ *the thing is not good*, Exod. xviii. 17.

14. The Hebrews and Samaritans sometimes use a substantive accompanied by a preposition with the same force as an adjective; thus, Exod. i. 14, $\text{עֲבַד בְּשָׂדֵי הָאָרֶץ}$ *work in the field*, i. e. 'field-work.'

15. The subject of a simple proposition in the plural number is sometimes accompanied by a predicate in the singular, the effect of which is to add a *distributive* force; as, $\text{אָרְצְךָ אֲרֻרָה וְבֵרַכְךָ אֵלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר בְּרֵכְךָ}$ *curseth thee, and blessed be each one that blesseth thee*, Gen. xxvii. 29; $\text{אֵלֶּיךָ יָבִיאוּ מִן הַצֹּאן אֶתְּךָ}$ *a pastor of sheep is each of thy servants*, Gen. xlvi. 3. Similar constructions are observed in the classic authors; as, Catull. c. 107, 'insperanti nobis;' Tibull. lib. 3, in last elegy, 'nobis merenti,' etc.

With אֶתְּךָ , which is supposed to be of the singular number, compare אֶתְּךָ , Zech. xi. 17.

16. The peculiar construction of the noun אֱלֹהִים with a plural verb, among the Hebrews, does not appear to have been adopted by the Samaritans in the corresponding word אֱלֹהִים ; for, in Gen. xx. 13, where the Hebrew plural אֱלֹהִים is used, the corresponding Samaritan is אֱלֹהִים אֶתְּךָ *God caused me to wander*; $\text{אֱלֹהִים אֶתְּךָ אֶתְּךָ}$ *because there God appeared unto him*, Gen. xxxv. 7.

17. Nouns collective, though in the singular number, are capable of being construed with a plural verb; as, בָּרַח הַכּוֹל *the whole of the earth came*, Gen. xli. 57;

and all the days were, Gen. v. 23, 31, Gen. ix. 29. In both these examples, the agreement of the predicate with the governed noun must be observed; this does not, however, appear to be the case in Exod. xii. 16, 'ሉጊ ጳጳሙግግ ጊሥ ኃገግ ግግግሎሙ *all work shall not be done in them.*

22. When a predicate is added to subjects of different gender or number, it generally agrees with the more worthy; as, ጳጳረ ሙጳሎ ጳሙግግግግግ ጳሎሎሎ *the wife and children shall be her master's*, Exod. xxi. 4; ጳጳሥን ሥጳጻጻሎ ሥሙሎሎ ሥሙጻጻጳ *Abraham and Sarah were becoming old*, Gen. xviii. 11. The predicate appears to agree with the nearest subject in Gen. viii. 18, ሙሥኃን ጳሎሎሎን ገሙጻጻን ጳጳ ገጋን ገሙጻጻ *and Noah went out, and his sons, and his wife, and the wives of his sons.* See Num. xii. 1. This is generally the case when the verb precedes; but when the verb follows, the agreement of the predicate may be inferred from the following examples: ገገገጳን ገሙግግግግ ጳሎጊጊሎ ሎሥግግግ ገገገጳን ጊጳጻን ጊጳገሙ ሥግግ ጳሎግግ *and Leah approached also, and her sons, and bowed themselves; and then Joseph approached, and Rachel, and bowed themselves*, Gen. xxxiii. 7; ገሎጻግን ጻሥሙሥን ሥጊሥሙጻሎ ሥግግግ *and Abimelech rose up, and Memar, and returned*, Gen. xxi. 32.

23. The Samaritans, like the Hebrews, sometimes use a nominative case *absolute*, which may be connected with the rest of the sentence in English, by supplying such a phrase as 'as to,' or 'as regards'; ጻጻ ጊሥ *as to all the gold*, Exod. xxxviii. 24; ሙጳ ጊሎ ሎግግግ ጳሎኃጊግሥን *and as to his concubine, she herself also bare*, Gen. xxii. 24.

24. Here also may be noticed the peculiar *hypallage*, or inversion of words, which is remarkable in the Shemitic languages; as, ጳሎገግ ሥግግግ *in the blood of purification*,

Levit. xii. 4, instead of 'in the purification of blood;' $\nabla\lambda\text{ג} \cdot \text{א}^{\text{ג}}\text{ז}\text{ז}$ *the copulation of seed*, Levit. xxii. 4, instead of 'seed of copulation;' $\text{ז}\text{מ}\text{ז}\text{פ}\text{א}\text{ז} \cdot \text{ז}\text{א}\text{ז}$ *silver of shekels*, Lev. v. 15, for 'shekels of silver.'

25. In all languages more or less *pleonasms* are found to abound. This is especially the case with certain nouns in the Samaritan; as—

(a) With $\text{מ}\text{ז}\text{א}$ *face*; $\text{ז}\text{מ}\text{ז} \cdot \text{מ}\text{ז}\text{א} \cdot \text{ז}\nabla$ *on the face of the waters*, Gen. i. 2; $\text{ז}\text{א}\text{מ}\text{ז} \cdot \text{מ}\text{ז}\text{א} \cdot \text{ז}\nabla \cdot \text{ז}\text{ז}$ *from before the face of his dead*, Gen. xxiii. 3, instead of 'from the dead body.'

(β) With $\text{א}\text{ז}$ *hand*; $\text{מ}\text{ז}\text{ז} \cdot \text{ז}\text{ז} \cdot \text{א}\text{ז} \cdot \text{ז}\text{ז}$ *from the hand of every living being*, Gen. ix. 5; $\text{ז}\text{ז}\text{ז} \cdot \text{א}\text{ז}\text{ג}$ *by the hand of Moses*, Exod. ix. 35, i. e. 'by Moses.'

(γ) With $\text{א}\text{ז}\text{מ}\text{ז}$ *a word, tenour*; $\text{ז}\text{א}\text{ג}\text{ג} \cdot \text{א}\text{ז}\text{מ}\text{ז} \cdot \text{ז}\nabla$ *according to the purport of the lot*, Num. xxvi. 56, i. e. 'according to the lot;' $\text{ז}\text{מ}\text{ז}\text{ז} \cdot \text{א}\text{ז}\text{מ}\text{ז} \cdot \text{ז}\nabla$ *according to the tenour of his speech*, Gen. xliii. 7, i. e. 'according to his speech.'

The student will observe others, too numerous to mention here.

ON THE VERB.

1. The Samaritan language, like the Hebrew, has only two absolute tenses, *the perfect* and *future*. To supply the place of the imperfect and pluperfect in other languages, the Samaritan perfect is sometimes used, so that we can only be guided by the *context* as to the force which must be given to it. Vide the remarks on the moods, § 6, Chap. III.

The usual force of the perfect is that conveyed in the following example; $\text{ז}\text{א}\text{מ}\text{ז} \cdot \text{ז}\text{א}\text{ג}\text{ז} \cdot \text{ג}\text{פ}\text{ז}\text{מ}\text{ז} \cdot \text{פ}\text{ז}\text{מ}\text{מ}\text{ז} \cdot \text{פ}\text{ז}\text{א}\text{ז}$

ᐱᑭᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ *and Isaac called Jacob and blessed him, and charged him, and said to him*, Gen. xxviii. 1.

2. The perfect is also found in the *imperfect* sense of 'was,' 'did;' as, ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ *why did Sarah laugh?* Gen. xviii. 13; in the sense of 'used to,' ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ *and Israel loved Joseph*, Gen. xxxvii. 3; in the sense also of 'began to,' ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ *and the people began to murmur against Moses*, Exod. xv. 24.

3. The perfect is also found in a pluperfect sense in Gen. ii. 5; thus, ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ *for the Lord God had not caused it to rain*. Another and more usual method of expressing the pluperfect will be found in the Syntax of the Infinitive.

4. Some verbs include, under the perfect form, both a *perfect* and *present* sense; such as, ᐱᑭᐱᑦ *he hates* and *he hated*, conveying both the senses of 'odit' and 'odio habuit.' Also, ᐱᑭᐱᑦ *he knows* and *he knew*. Compare the Greek *oîde* and the Latin 'novit,' *perfect* forms with *present* senses.

5. We sometimes find a future circumstance related in the perfect tense, as something which has actually taken place. The design of the writer in this case was to mark the future occurrence as something already *irrevocably* decreed and decided upon, and therefore, as it were, accomplished; thus, in Gen. xv. 18, ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ ᐱᑭᐱᑦ *to thy sons have I given the land*.

6. The peculiar use of ᐱᑭᐱᑦ, called *Vau conversive* among the Hebrews, is unknown to the Samaritans, Chaldees, and Syrians; so that the numerous rules founded on this idiom in Hebrew are not applicable to those dialects.

7. The future tense, besides the force of our future, has

various other senses among the Samaritans, examples of which are appended.

(a) In some cases the future seems to have the force of a present; as, Gen. xxxvii. 15, *מפגלך מה תבקש* *what seekest thou?* again, Exod. v. 15, *למה אתה עושה כן* *why do you so?*

(β) It is sometimes used to imply *possibility, propriety, or necessity*, like the perfect in Lev. iv. 2, *למה לא תעשה כן* *which ought not to be done.*

(γ) In the first sense, denoting *possibility*, it is found in Deut. i. 12, *אני לבד איך אעמוד* *how can I alone bear you?*

(δ) In the second sense, Gen. xx. 9, *אני לבד איך אעמוד* *deeds which ought not to be done.*

(ε) In the third sense, Gen. xxiv. 5, *אני אעמוד* *must I needs restore thy son?*

8. The future is also used *indefinitely* to denote that which takes place frequently; thus, in Num. ix. 16, *אני אעמוד* *so it was always, a cloud covered it;* again, in Gen. ii. 6, *אני אעמוד* *and a mist ascended from the earth.*

9. Sometimes it implies permission to do anything; as, *אני אעמוד* *let one fetch, I pray you, a little water*, Gen. xviii. 4.

10. It is used, as was before observed, in forbidding, dissuading, and deprecating, for the imperative; as, *אני לא תהרג* *thou shalt not kill*, Exod. xx. 14; it may also be used in commanding, exhorting, and imploring; thus, *אני תירא* *thou shalt fear thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name*, Deut. vi. 13; *אני ימות* *he shall surely die*, Ex. xxi. 15.

11. The future is employed also in a general proposition, which always holds good; the following examples will

render this clear; $\text{אָרְנָם} \cdot \text{אִמִּי} \cdot \text{אֶל־הַיְּסוּסִים} \cdot \text{לְרָדְמִים} \cdot \text{אֲשֶׁר}$
as a foster-mother beareth the suckling, Num. xi. 12;
 $\text{אָדָם} \cdot \text{אִמִּי} \cdot \text{אֲדַגִּי} \cdot \text{לְרָדְמִים} \cdot \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ *as a man doth bear his son*,
 Deut. i. 31.

12. The moods known to us as the Indicative and Subjunctive do not differ among the Samaritans as regards their inflection; they can only be distinguished, therefore, by the *context*. The two absolute tenses, generally speaking, answer to our Indicative tenses of the same name in *direct* narration; but in *indirect* narration, and in conditional clauses, depending upon something previously mentioned, they answer to the Subjunctive.

13. The Subjunctive is chiefly designated by the use of certain conditional particles; such as, אִם , אֲנִי , אִם *if*; אֲלֵאנִי , אֲלֵאנִי *unless*; אֲלֵאנִי , אֲלֵאנִי *lest*; אֲלֵאנִי *that*, etc. Thus, $\text{אֲבִיָּאֵם} \cdot \text{אֲלֵאנִי} \cdot \text{אִם}$ *if I should bring him not*, Gen. xliii. 9; $\text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲלֵאנִי}$ *if thou shouldst lift up*, etc., Exod. xx. 25; $\text{אֲבִיָּאֵם} \cdot \text{אֲנִי}$ *if I should find*, Gen. xviii. 26. The particle is also omitted; as, $\text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲשֶׁר} \cdot \text{אֲבִיָּאֵם} \cdot \text{אֲנִי}$ *and should I overdrive them one day*, Gen. xxxiii. 13.

14. The condition also on which the subjunctive clause depends is sometimes omitted, and must be supplied from the context; as, $\text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי}$ *within a little there had lien one of the people with thy wife*, Gen. xxvi. 10.

15. The copulative particle ו joining one verb with another, is used like the Latin 'ut,' expressing a *purpose* or a *consequence*; thus, $\text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי}$ *and hast not told me, that I might send thee away with mirth*, Gen. xxxi. 27; $\text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי} \cdot \text{אֲנִי}$ *God is not a man, that he should lie*, Num. xxiii. 19.

16. The Subjunctive mood may also be used when a relative pronoun is accompanied by a verb expressing something indefinite, or depending on a condition not expressed; thus, $\text{זל} \cdot \text{צמנע} \cdot \text{אצפ} \cdot \text{לצמאז}$, *and thou shalt eat of the flesh which he may give thee*, Deut. xii. 15.

17. To express the Optative mood, the Samaritans adopt the following methods:—They make use of the particle זל , the Hebrew לו *would that*, joined to either the perfect or future tense; $\text{צמאזמז} \cdot \text{נאזפ} \cdot \text{ננאזמז} \cdot \text{זל}$ *would that we had died in the land of Egypt!* Num. xiv. 2; $\cdot \text{מז} \cdot \text{זל}$ צמלצמז *would it may be according to thy words!* Gen. xxx. 34.

18. The Optative mood is also expressed by the formula $\text{צמאזמז} \cdot \text{מז}$, the Hebrew מיהי ; as, $\text{ננאזמז} \cdot \text{צמאזמז} \cdot \text{מז}$ *would God we had died*, Exod. xvi. 3, Hebrew מיהי מיהי . It will be observed that צמאזמז is passive in form, but active in signification.

19. The Imperative mood is sometimes used in an Optative sense; thus, $\text{צאזלזל} \cdot \text{מללזל} \cdot \text{מזז}$ *mayest thou be a mother to thousands of millions*, Gen. xxiv. 60.

20. The Imperative mood, when enjoining the performance of something, is often joined with another imperative expressive of the result or consequence of the action enjoined; as, $\text{זללצזז} \cdot \text{זצז}$ *purify yourselves, and be clean*, Gen. xxxv. 2.

21. The Infinitive mood, though usually restricted to no time, is, however, capable of being referred to some definite time on combination with particles; as, $\cdot \text{לזלז} \cdot \text{מאזלזלז}$ מלז *on my going out, I will spread forth my hands*, Ex. ix. 29; $\text{זצזפ} \cdot \text{צננאזמז} \cdot \text{למנפזל}$ *for the purpose of delivering him into thy hand*, Deut. ii. 30.

22. The Infinitive mood is placed *absolutely* without the

intervention of particles; as, in Gen. v. 2, *בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִבְרָא* *in the day they were created*. This instance and that given by Cellarius, from the first verse of the same chapter, scarcely belong to the rule; for *יִבְרָא* in both cases may be the preterite third person singular, accompanied by the suffix *יָר*.

23. The Infinitive mood is, perhaps, used for the Imperative in some cases. The identity of form, however, which exists between the infinitive and the second person masculine singular of the imperative, in consequence of the absence of vowel points in the Samaritan, exceedingly diminishes the number of such irregularities.

24. The participles being verbal adjectives, and having no means of distinguishing by inflexion between any of the tenses except the present and past, may also refer to future time, and serve as gerundives, etc.

(*a*) They frequently have a present sense, like those in *ens* in Latin, and in fact are generally used to express the present definite as well as the imperfect, with or without the substantive verb *עָשָׂה*; thus, *עוֹשֶׂה* *doing*; and also, *עוֹשֶׂה אֲנִי* *I am doing*; *עוֹשֶׂה הָיָה* *he was doing*, etc. Vide next section.

(*β*) The participle seems to have a future sense in Gen. xix. 14; *בָּנֵי חָתָן* *sons-in-law* who were about to marry his daughters, i. e. his future sons-in-law.

(*γ*) The participle is used as a gerundive in Lev. xi. 47; *בְּחַיֵּי הַחַיָּה* *between the animal that ought to be eaten*, and *בְּחַיֵּי הַחַיָּה אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִאָּכַל* *between the animal that shall not be eaten*.

25. The *periphrastic* use of the participles and verb substantive for the finite verb is very frequent; thus, for the

imperfect, *ጻጥጠጊ ጎንሥጠጥጻ ጎጠሥጠጥ* *ye were rebelling against the Lord*, Deut. xxxi. 27; *ጻጻሥጥ ጻሥጥ ጻጥጻጥ ጻጥጥጥ* *and he was sitting in the door of his tent*, Gen. xviii. 1; *ጻጻጻጥ ጎጥ ጻጥጥ ጻጻጥ* *and, behold, he was standing on the river*, Gen. xli. 1. In Gen. i. 6, it is found for the third person singular imperative; *ጻጻጥ ጻጥጻጥ* *and let it divide*.

26. The participles have also frequently a future sense, like those in *rus* in Latin; thus, *ጻጥጻሥጥ ጎንሥጎጥጥጥ ጻጥጻጥ* *and, behold, I am about to destroy them from the earth*, Gen. vi. 13; *ጎንሥሥጥ ጎንሥጻጥ ጎንሥጻጥ ጻጥጠጥ* *which the Lord your God giveth, or, is about to give, you*.

27. We have previously observed, that the participles have sometimes the force of the Latin gerundive or verbal in *bilis*; to the instance given above may be added, *ጻጥ ጎጥጻ ጻጥሥ ጠሥሥጥጥ* *what a dreadful (horribilis) place is this*, Gen. xxviii. 17; the instance from Gen. ii. 9, *ጎጥ ጻጥ ጻጥጥ ጻጥጥጥ* *every tree pleasant to the sight*, is an infinitive, and *ጻጥጥጥ* has the force of a supine in *u*, which is commonly used after adjectives; as, ‘*arbor delectabilis visu.*’

28. Though generally the nominative case agrees with the verb in gender and number, there are instances in which this concord is neglected in both cases. We proceed to give examples of such irregularities.

(a) A masculine verb is found with a feminine noun; as, *ጎጥ ጻጥጥጥ* *sin lieth*, Gen. iv. 7; *ጻጥ ጻጥጥጥ* *and there was darkness*, Gen. xv. 17. Other instances may be easily found, as in Deut. xxii. 23. *ጻጥጥጥ ጻጥጥጥ* *work shall be done*, Exod. xxxi. 15, Lev. xi. 32; *ጎጥጥጥ ጠጥ ጻጥ* *what will become of his dreams*, Gen. xxxvii. 20.

(β) The following are instances of discord in number:—

ሕዝባህን ሕዝባሌህ ሕጊ ጳጳሳህ ለኔ *thou shalt not have other gods*, Exod. xx. 3; ከሕዝባህ ጳጳሳህ *let there be lights*, Gen. i. 14; ሕዝባዎ ሕዝባዎህን ጥጠረህ ሕዝባህን *cursed be each one that curseth thee, and blessed be each one that blesseth thee*, Gen. xxvii. 29. The use of the singular participle gives a distributive sense, as in the Hebrew.

(γ) Nouns used only in the plural may have a singular verb agreeing with them; as, ጳጳሳህ ጠጥህ ጠጥህ ለኔ *there shall be no more water*, Gen. ix. 15; ለኔ ጳጳህ ጠጥህ ለኔ ጳጳህ ጠጥህ ጠጥህ *because the water of separation was not sprinkled on him*, Num. xix. 13, 20.

(δ) In the following instance, gender and number are both neglected; as, ሕዝባህን ጳጳሳህ ጳጳሳህ *the congregation, the whole of them, are sanctified*, Num. xvi. 3.

29. The nominative of a verb is frequently omitted when it can easily be supplied from the context. There is also a frequent ellipsis of the words ሕዝባህ *a thing*, and ሕዝባህ *a man*.

30. Verbs in the third person singular, both intransitives and passives, are susceptible of a *neuter* use; especially such as contain implicitly in their signification the nominative to which they refer; as, ጠጥህ ጠጥህ ጠጥህ ጠጥህ *let not there be anger in the eyes of my lord*, Gen. xxxi. 35; ሕዝባህ ጠጥህ ጠጥህ *let it not be grievous in thy sight*, Gen. xxi. 12. So for the passive; as, ጠጥህ ጠጥህ ጠጥህ ጠጥህ *then it was begun to be called on*, Gen. iv. 26. I have altered the text given by Walton in the first and last of these examples; in the latter, I have read *Aphel* in a passive sense, instead of ጠጥህ; or we may render with Walton's text, *then one began to invoke*, etc.; to this, however, the passive infinitive is an objection, unless it be employed in an active sense; Chap. III. § 5. Compare the Latin idiom so often used by Tacitus.

31. When a circumstance is related without reference to the agent, the third person singular is employed in an *indefinite* sense; as, $\text{טָרַדְתָּ} \cdot \text{וּפָמָה} \cdot \text{לֹא}$ one *hath not found a help*, Gen. ii. 20; $\text{לָמָוּת} \cdot \text{לֹא-יָמוּת} \cdot \text{וְאִם}$ *and if one in dying should die*, Num. vi. 7; $\text{כִּי-יִפֹּל} \cdot \text{יִפֹּל} \cdot \text{לֹא-יָשׁוּב}$ *when one in falling shall fall*, Deut. xxii. 8. Compare the English 'one' and French 'on'. A similar construction is adopted in the Coptic to express the passive voice.

32. There are numerous cases in which the second person is used instead of the third; as, Lev. ii. 4, $\text{וְכִי-תִשָּׂא} \cdot \text{תִּשָּׂא} \cdot \text{לֶחֶם}$ *and when you shall offer an offering*, i. e. when any one shall offer; $\text{וְכִי-תֵלֵךְ} \cdot \text{לְצֹר}$ *as you go to Zoar*, Gen. xiii. 10, i. e. as one goes to Zoar; see Exod. xx. passim. Compare Horace, Carm. ii. 3, " Nil interest, an pauper et infimâ de gente sub divo moreris." Also, ii. 18, " Tu secunda marmora locas, etc." Such instances are profusely found in all languages.

33. The idiomatic usage of the verbs וַיִּשָּׂא and וַיִּקַּח among the Hebrews is also followed by the Samaritans in the verbs וַיִּשָּׂא and וַיִּקַּח ; as, $\text{וַיִּשָּׂא} \cdot \text{וַיִּקַּח} \cdot \text{אֶת-הַיְהוָה}$ *and Abraham added and took a wife*, i. e. again took a wife, Gen. xxv. 1; $\text{וַיִּשָּׂא} \cdot \text{וַיִּקַּח} \cdot \text{אֶת-הַיְהוָה}$ *Isaac went and digged the wells of water*, i. e. digged again, Gen. xxvi. 18. Numerous other instances may be easily found.

34. There is another peculiar use of the finite verb with an infinitive, in which the former may be rendered adverbially; as, $\text{וַיֵּלֶךְ} \cdot \text{וַיִּשְׂרָף} \cdot \text{אֶת-הַיְהוָה}$ *and the angel of the Lord went further*, Num. xxii. 26; $\text{מָה-זֶּה} \cdot \text{וְעַתָּה} \cdot \text{מָה-זֶּה} \cdot \text{וְעַתָּה}$ *what is this thou hast quickly found?* Gen. xxvii. 20.

35. The substantive verb, being the copula of a proposition, generally agrees with the *subject* of that proposition,

though it is found agreeing also with the *predicate*; as, in Gen. xxxi. 8, *ሥገሉ ጠጃ ሕጠጥሕሕ the speckled shall be thy wages.*

36. The substantive verb used as a copula is usually expressed in the perfect and future, but omitted in the present and imperfect; as we have previously observed. See § 24.

37. The accusative case, expressing an object, is used with verbs passive and intransitive, with the omission of a preposition signifying *as to*, in which case it resembles the Greek construction with the ellipsis of *κατὰ*, and the Latin with the ellipsis of *secundum*; thus, ሉጠ ስጠጃጊጠ ሉጠጊጥ ጃሉጊጥ ጻጃጋ *he who shall not be circumcised as to the flesh of his foreskin*, Gen. xvii. 14. Perhaps we ought to consider ስጠጃጊጠ as *Pahel*, and render, *he who shall not circumcise the flesh, etc.* ንጊ ሉሕሕጃሉሉ ሉጊ ጃጊጠ ጠሕሕጊ *but as to my name Jehovah, was I not known to them*, Exod. vi. 3; ስጃሕ ጊሕጊ ሕጠጃ ግጥጊ ጊሕጊ ሕሕሕ ስጃሕ ጊሕጊ ሕጊጊ ጊሕጊ ጊሕጊ ጊሕጊ ሕጠጠጥ *and be purified as to all the raiment, and as to every instrument of skin, etc.*, Num. xxxi. 20.

38. Sometimes a transitive verb has two accusatives, one of which may be preceded in English by the phrase 'as to'; thus, in Deut. xxii. 26, ሕጊ ጃጊጥጊ *and hath slain him as to his life.* There are various other forms of accusatives, easily explicable by supposing an ellipsis of a preposition; thus, ጃጊሕሕ ጃሉ ሕጥጥጊ *and stood at the door of the tabernacle*, Exod. xxxiii. 9, where there is an ellipsis of the preposition ጥጠጊ before ጃሉ.

39. It must be observed, that verbs of *naming* take an accusative case of the name, and a dative formed by the preposition ጊ, of the thing to which the name is given;

thus, *ṣṁlmlʾ pʾvly ʾsʾmʾlʾn ʾsʾmʾlʾ ʾʾʾʾnʾ ʾʾʾʾʾ pʾvly*
God called (to) the light day, and (to) the darkness, etc. Gen. i. 5.

40. The cause or agent is sometimes expressed, after a passive verb, by the sign of the dative case; thus, *ʾsʾmʾlʾ ʾʾʾʾnʾ ʾʾʾʾlʾ ʾsʾmʾlʾ ʾʾʾʾnʾ ʾsʾmʾlʾ ʾʾʾʾnʾ*
blessed be Abram by reason of his mighty power, Gen. xiv. 19; *ʾnʾsʾnʾlʾ ʾʾʾʾʾmʾ*
shall be done by you, Ex. xii. 16.

41. To express the verb 'habere' the Samaritans and Hebrews adopt the circumlocution known in Latin as 'est pro habeo'; thus, *mʾsʾmʾlʾ ʾʾʾʾmʾ ʾʾʾʾʾmʾʾsʾnʾʾlʾ*
and all that he hath he has given into my hand, Gen. xxxix. 8; *ʾnʾmʾmʾ ʾnʾʾʾʾmʾʾmʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾlʾ,*
if a man have two wives, Deut. xxi. 15.

42. The substantive verb has sometimes the sense of 'to become', followed by the preposition ʾ; as, in Exod. iv. 9, *ʾsʾmʾlʾ ʾʾʾʾnʾ ʾnʾʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾ*
and the water which thou takest out of the river shall become blood. Other verbs with a similar notion may follow the same construction.

43. The Samaritans, like the Hebrews, studious of brevity, sometimes express, by a single verb, an idea usually conveyed with us by two; as, in Exod. xxxiv. 15 *ʾnʾʾʾʾmʾ*
ʾnʾmʾʾʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾ *they go to fornicate after their gods;*
ʾʾʾʾmʾ ʾʾʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾ *because he hath completed to follow after the Lord,* i. e. hath wholly followed, Deut. i. 36.

44. An infinitive clause may stand either as a nominative or accusative to a verb; as, *ʾʾʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾʾ ʾmʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾ*
it is not good, the man to be alone, Gen. ii. 18, etc.

45. The noun denoting the agent or sufferer, which in finite verbs is put in the nominative, with infinitives is in *regimen*, or in the accusative; as, *ʾʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾ*
until the coming of the morning, Gen. xxxii. 24; *ʾʾʾʾ ʾʾʾʾʾʾʾ*
ʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾʾ *on bearing to him Isaac his son,* Gen.

xxi. 5; ንጠጋጠኛን ፡ ንጠኛንጥጋ ፡ ዓፍሠ *in not keeping his commandments, and his judgments*; like the Greek ἐν τῷ μὴ τηρεῖν.

46. When the inseparable particles ሠ, 2, ያ, ዓ, are prefixed to the infinitive, the resulting combination answers to the Latin gerund, or the Greek construction of the article with the infinitive. Instances are subjoined of these prepositions with this force.

(a) With ዓ; as, ጠጋፍጥሠዓ *when I killed*, Exod. xii. 13; ጠጻንጊሥዓ *when I sent*; ንኝዝጠጋጠንጎላ ፡ ሎጠ ፡ ጻፍሠሠሠዓ *because he heareth your murmurings*, Exod. xvi. 7.

(β) With ያ; as, ጻሠሠሠሠ ፡ ጊንገሠሠ *at the going down of the sun*, Deut. xvi. 6; ንሠፍ ፡ ገሠሠሠ *on the hearing of Esau*, Gen. xxvii. 34.

(γ) With 2; as, ጻሎሠኔሠ ፡ የገላሠጊ ፡ ያጊ ፡ ንኝጻጠን *and they shall be to thee for calling the assembly*, Num. x. 2; ፡ ንሠየሠዓኝሠጊ *they rose to console*, Gen. xxxvii. 35; ፡ ሎገገሎሠሎኛ ንኝጊ ፡ ንሎሠጊ *which I swear to give them*, Deut. x. 11; ንኝጠየኝጊሠጊ *after they were come out*, Num. i. 1; so, in the same place, ዓሠጠሠጊ *by saying*; ንኝሎጻጊሠሠጊ ፡ ጠጻጎሎሎ ፡ ሎጊን *and he would not let them go*, Exod. x. 27. In the last sense, the 2 is frequently omitted; as, in Exod. x. 28, ፡ ጋላጎሎ ፡ ጊሎ ጠጋሎ ፡ ሎንላጎ ጻ *no more go to see my face*; while, in Deut. xxviii. 68, we find ጻንጠላጎ ጻሠጊ ፡ ንኝጋላጎሎ ፡ ሎጊ with 2.

(δ) The *periphrastic* use of the substantive verb, with the infinitive accompanied by 2 for the future, is worthy of notice; as, ጻሠሠሠሠሠጊ ፡ ንኝጻጠን *that they may be about to execute*, Num. viii. 11. Also, in Gen. xv. 12, ፡ ጻሠሠሠሠ ፡ ሎንጻን ጊጊገጊ *and the sun was about to set*.

(ε) With ሠ; as, ጻሎንጊፍጥሠ *from slaughtering*, Gen. xiv. 17; ሎገጠሠሠ ፡ ጊጻኛሎ ፡ ሎጊ *fear not to go*, Gen. xlvi. 3,

Syr. ܠܚܘܨܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ, whence I have corrected it; ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ. *and his eyes were so dim as not to see*, Gen. xxvii. 1. In this case, the whole preposition ܘܢܐ is read, although the Hebrew is ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ. ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ *far be it from me to do this*, Gen. xlv. 17, etc.

(§) This preposition is used to express a *cause* or the ground upon which an action is performed; as, ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ *not because ye were more in number than all people, but because the Lord loved you, and because he kept the oath*, Deut. vii. 7, 8.

47. The construction of the finite verb with its infinitive has been frequently alluded to in the previous part of the Grammar, and examples have been given of it; so that it will suffice to say, that in those cases in which this construction obtains, the student must bear in mind that the infinitive is not *redundant*, but, with the finite verb, forms a strong asseveration, and increases the force of the latter *intensely*; as, ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ *he shall most certainly be put to death*, Gen. xxvi. 11; ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ *we shall certainly prevail against him*.

48. In the construction mentioned in § 47, the *species* of the infinitive is generally the same as that of the finite verb with which it is connected, as in the first example given in the preceding section; and, even in the second example, a *transitive* notion is conveyed in the finite verb, for the action implied in *prevailing* passes on, which, perhaps, may account for the use of ܘܢܐ in Pahcl. There are cases, however, in which a difference of *species* seems evident; as, ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ *we certainly have gone down*, Gen. xlv. 26; but here we may suppose the *finite* verb to have an intensive

force, which is still further increased by the *infinitive*. Vide § 5, Chap. III.

49. Participles may follow the construction of the finite verb, so as to govern the following noun *immediately*, or by the interposition of a preposition; as, *·ʾnm · ʾyḏāʾ · ḥzḥz ḥyḥ · ʾz* and it was encompassing the whole land, Gen. ii. 11; *ḥzḥz · ḥzḥz* bearing seed, Gen. i. 29; *· ʾyḏāʾ ḥyḥ · ʾnmḥz · ḥyḥz · ʾnmḥz* dividing light and darkness.

50. They may have the construction of nouns *in regimine*; as, *· ʾnmḥz · ḥyḥ · ʾnmḥz* knowing good and evil, Gen. iii. 5, *· ʾnmḥz · ʾnmḥz* keeping sheep; though, in both cases, it seems preferable to consider *ʾnmḥz* and *ʾnmḥz* as nouns, which have much the same force as the Greek construction of the article with the participle; thus, in the above cases, the former is the same as *οἱ γινώσκοντες*, and the latter as *οἱ φυλασσόντες*. The latter example may also be explained as in § 15 of the Noun.

51. Many participles of intransitive verbs, as well as passive ones, turn the noun, with which they ought to be connected by a preposition, into the genitive case; as, *· ʾnmḥz · ʾnmḥz* having gone out of the ark, Gen. ix. 10; *· ʾnmḥz · ʾnmḥz* as captives of the sword, Gen. xxxi. 26; *· ʾnmḥz · ʾnmḥz · ʾnmḥz · ʾnmḥz* to all entering the gate of his city, Gen. xxiii. 10; though, in all these cases, and numerous others, the governing participles may be considered as nouns substantive, an assumption which is supported by their peculiar forms. Compare the forms *ʾnmḥz* and *ʾnmḥz* with the substantives *ʾnmḥz* a judge, *ʾnmḥz* a homicide, etc.

THE PARTICLES.

PRONOUN.

1. The personal pronouns of the second and third persons, especially the *suffixes*, are found in the plural masculine referring to nouns in the feminine gender; as, ንገገሉፍ *their flocks*; ንገገገግግግፍ *drove them away*, Exod. ii. 17; ንገገ *to them*, Exod. i. 21, referring to the midwives.

2. A pronominal *suffix* singular is sometimes referred, in a collective sense, to a plural noun, comprehending a body of individuals; as, ጻገጻጠ፡ ጻገገሉጠገ፡ ሕጠግፍፍ፡ ጊፍ *against thy enemies, and the Lord has delivered him, etc.*

3. A personal pronoun, when added to the noun to which it refers, is not redundant, but emphatic; as, ሉጠጻ, Gen. iii. 12; ጻገሕ፡ ጊሕጠሉ፡ ሉጊ፡ ፍፍ፡ ሕሕጻሕፍ፡ ንገጠፍ፡ ንሕገ፡ *and of the tree of the knowledge of good, etc., thou shalt not eat of it*, Gen. ii. 17.

4. An inseparable pronoun is sometimes added to a separable one of the same person, to mark with force and emphasis the person to whom it refers; as, Num. xiv. 32, ንገሉሉ፡ ንገሕጠግገገገ፡ *and your dead bodies, you, I say, etc.*

5. The personal pronoun is used to denote an ellipsis of the verb substantive, especially in the present and imperfect tenses; as, ንገገገገሉ፡ ጻግጻ፡ ግፍገ፡ ጠገፍ፡ ንገገገገ፡ *all of us, the sons of one man are we*, Gen. xlii. 11; ሉገገ፡ ጠገሉ፡ *I am he*, Deut. xxxii. 39. See Castel's Gram. Harmon.

6. The demonstrative pronoun, when repeated, has a distributive sense; as, ንገገ፡ ንገ፡ ገፍፍ፡ ሉገገ፡ *and they came not near one to the other*, Exod. xiv. 20; ንገገ፡ ንገ፡ ገፍፍ፡ ሉገገ፡ *and they said one to the other.*

7. The demonstrative **ኃኖ** is sometimes coupled with the interrogative **የኃኒ**, in which case the former is apparently redundant; as, **የዓሙ ለዳህሉ ኃኖ የኃኒ** *wherefore hath Sarah laughed?* Gen. xviii. 13; **ጠንላዳረሙ ኃኖ የኃኒ** *why hast thou sent me?* Exod. v. 22.

8. The relative pronoun very frequently includes the noun or antecedent pronoun to which it refers; as, **ጊኃሉኖ** that *which thou shalt say*, Exod. iv. 12; **ኖኖኖ** that *which he did*, etc.

9. The relative pronoun is not put in the genitive case; but if this case be required by the construction, it is expressed by a subsequent pronominal *suffix*; as, **ጎኃሙ ለሉረኖ ጠንገ የኃሙ** *the nation which thou shalt not understand as to the language thereof*, Deut. xxviii. 49. It can, of course, stand in the accusative; as, **ጠጊ ለዳኃሉኖ የሉሉሉ** *the woman which thou hast brought me*, Gen. iii. 12; **ኃንሉጠ ኖኖጠኖ የሙኃሉ** *which the man shall do (them)*, Lev. xviii. 5, where **ኃንሉጠ** is redundant.

10. The relative, when it includes the antecedent noun or pronoun, may take a preposition; as, **ጊኖ የኃኖ ሉጠ ኖገ ኃጊ ለጊኃኖ** *lead the people to the place which I spake to thee of*, Exod. xxxii. 34; **ኃንጎሞሉኛ ኖኃ ኃኖ ናኃ** *get straw from the place which ye can find*, Exod. v. 11; **ኃንኖሉጊ ኖኃ ኖኖ** *of that which was our father's*, Gen. xxxi. 1; **ኃዳሉጊ ኖኃ ኖኖ** *of that which is Aaron's*, etc.

11. When the relative pronoun is preceded by the noun with a preposition to which it refers, this preposition is omitted before the relative; as, **ኃንላዳረሙኖ የጎሉጊ ኃንጊኖ** *we came to the land to which thou sentest us*, Num. xiii. 27; **የንጎጠ ዳኖኖ ጠሉኃኖ ጊኃኖ** *from all the nations whence the Lord has scattered thee*, Deut. xxx. 3.

12. The adverb **ከሆኑ** *there*, with the relative preceding it, has the force of a relative adverb; as, **የዓየኑ ከሆኑ** *where there is gold*, Gen. ii. 11; **ሕዘቅጊላዳ ከሆኑ** *where God was*; **ከሆኑ ከሆኑ** *where ye are*, Exod. xii. 13; **ከሆኑ ስላዳኑ** *where he is*, Gen. xxi. 17; **ከሆኑሆኑ ከዓከላኑ** *whence he was taken*, Gen. iii. 23. Vide also, Gen. x. 14, etc.

13. The relative pronoun is frequently omitted; as, **የዓየሙ ገዳዮች ሕዘቅጊላዳ** *like as the tents which the Lord hath fixed*, Num. xxiv. 6; **የዓየሙ ጊዜ ሕዘቅጊላዳ** *on the day in which the Lord spake*, Deut. iv. 15; **ሆኑ ሕዘቅጊላዳ የዓየሙ የዓየሙ ሕዘቅጊላዳ** *and how shall I afflict whom the Lord hath not afflicted (him)*, Num. xxiii. 8.

14. The relative **ከሆኑ** usually refers to *persons*; it is, however, sometimes used of things which involve the idea of a person; as, **ከሆኑ የሆኑ ሕዘቅጊላዳ ሕዘቅጊላዳ ከሆኑ** *what to thee is all this drove?* Gen. xxxiii. 8. This interrogative is sometimes found in *oblique*, as well as in *direct* narration; as, **የዓየሙ ከሆኑ** *who slew him*, Deut. xxi. 1.

15. It is also used in an *indefinite* sense, and answers to our *whoever, whatever*; as, **ሕዘቅጊላዳ ከሆኑ ሕዘቅጊላዳ ከሆኑ** *whoever is having business*, Exod. xxiv. 14. Similarly with the Hebrew **מי** in **יִשְׁבֵּן מִי־יָרָא וְהָרָר**, Judg. vii. 3.

Also with the addition of the prefix **ከ**; as, **ከሆኑ ሕዘቅጊላዳ ከሆኑ** *whoever hath sinned against me*, Exod. xxxii. 33. Compare also the corresponding Hebrew **מִי אֲשֶׁר חָטָא לִי**, and Syriac **ܡܝܢ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ**.

ADVERBS.

1. Adverbs are, for the most part, construed with verbs. They are sometimes placed *absolutely*, at other times governed by a preposition; as, **ሕዘቅጊላዳ** *myself alone*, Num. xi. 14;

but, ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢ *besides himself alone*, Deut. iv. 35; ᠠᠮᠠᠭᠤ *very*, Gen. iv. 5; ᠠᠮᠠᠭᠤᠰᠤᠩ *exceedingly*, Gen. xvii. 2; ᠵᠢᠰᠠ *there*, Gen. ii. 12; ᠵᠢᠰᠠᠰ *thence*, Gen. xi. 8.

2. Nouns are also used adverbially, either *absolutely* or when governed by a preposition; as, ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ *to-day*, Gen. iv. 14; ᠵᠢᠰᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ *this day*, Gen. xxv. 31; ᠮᠤᠯᠮᠤᠵᠢᠨ ᠰᠢᠰᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ *day and night*, Lev. viii. 35; ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ *first*, Gen. xxxviii. 28; ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ , Num. x. 13.

3. Certain adverbs are also joined to nouns, or separable pronouns, in the same way as to verbs; as, ᠠᠮᠠᠭᠤ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ *very good*, Gen. i. 31; $\text{ᠵᠢᠰᠢ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$ *how dreadful is this place!* Gen. xxviii. 17; $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$ *how good!* Num. xxiv. 5; in the two latter cases ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ is properly the relative. See Syntax of the Verb, § 27.

4. The particle ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ is sometimes joined to nouns substantive and adjective, as will appear from the following examples: $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$ *and not wise*, Deut. xxxii. 6; $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$ *at no period of her separation*, Lev. xv. 25, Hebrew $\text{עַתְּנִיחַ לְבָרָה}$; $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$ *by no God*, Deut. xxxii. 21. Similarly $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$. Compare the Greek construction, $\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\ \pi\epsilon\text{ριτείχισις}$, $\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\delta\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma$, in Thucydides and Lucian.

5. The particle ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ is similarly used to the Latin 'nihil', 'parum', etc.; thus, $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$ *nihil ad servandum*, Deut. xxii. 27; $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$ *parum panis et parum aquæ*, Num. xxi. 5; Gen. xlvi. 13, etc.

(a) It is also found like *ne* in 'nemo', and 'nie' in the German 'nie-mand'; as, $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$ *no man*; $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ ᠰᠢᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠳᠠ}$ *nothing*, or it might be rendered, in conformity with the preceding, *nihil rei*, Gen. xxxi. 50, Exod. v. 11.

(β) It is used to deny a quality predicated by an adjective, and has a *suffix* referring to the subject of the predicate:

as, ጳሎሞድኅ ጳሎሞጊኅ *which (it) is not clean*, Gen. vii. 8; ጋጊፍሠ ጊሎሞጊ ጳጋጊፍጊ *but the hoof (it) is not dividing*, Lev. xi. 4; ጊሞዓሉ ጊዋዓ ፍሠሠ ጊሎሞጊ *he that hearkeneth not unto the voice of his father*, Deut. xxi. 18; ጊሠሉሉሠ ጊሎሞጊ ጳሞጊጋ *the bush (it) was not burning*, Exod. iii. 2.

6. The particle ጳጊዓ or ጳጊዓ is used, like ሉጊ, with a substantive; as, Deut. iv. 42, ሠሠጸ ጳጊዓዓ *with no knowledge*; but in Deut. xix. 4, without a mark, i. e. not knowingly.

7. Some adverbs, besides a preposition, take also a pronominal suffix; as, ሞኖጊ ጳጊሉ *I myself alone*; where ኖጊ is for ኖጸጊ, Syriac ܐܢܝ, from ጊ and ኖጸ *one, alone*; ጳኖጊ *it alone*, Num. xxiii. 9; ሞኖጊ ጊሠሉ ሉጊ *I myself am not able alone*, Deut. i. 9. Also without prepositions, ሠሉ ጸጊሠሠ ሠሎሞጊ *if thou thyself art not sending*, Exod. viii. 21.

8. Two particles of negation are sometimes joined, as in Greek, to strengthen the negation; thus, ሉሞጊ ጊጊዓሠጳ ሠሞዓዎ *truly were there no, no sepulchres?* Exod. xiv. 11; Hebrew יֵשׁ לֹא לֹא.

9. A negative particle is also construed with the word ጊሠ *all*, so that the negation is not merely confined to this word, but extends also to the verb; as, ጊፍዎሠ ጳጊኖጊ ጳጸዎሠ ጊሠ ጳሎሞ *lest finding him every one might be killing him*, Gen. iv. 15. The negation is, however, sometimes *special*; as, Num. xxiii. 13, ሞላጸሉ ሉጊ ጳጊሠጊ *but all of it thou shalt not see*, i. e. you shall see a part.

10. The repetition of the adverb, besides giving the usual intensive force, sometimes denotes a *progressive* action; as, ጳጊዓፍሉ ሉፍጠጠ ሉፍጠጠ *I will expel him little by little*, Exod. xxiii. 30; ጊፍጊ ጊፍጊ ሠሞጊፍ ፍጋሞ *he shall mount above thee higher and higher*, Deut. xxviii. 43.

11. Comparative particles are sometimes redundant; as,

ኃዳገጠኝ ጠጊ ጎዓሉላኝ *sware to me to-day*, Gen. xxv. 33, where ኃ is redundant; ኃጠጊጎዓላኝ ጳዳጎ ጳጳጎ *and the people were complaining*, Num. xi. 1, which is rendered by the LXX., *καὶ ἦν ὁ λαὸς γογγύζων*. Compare Exod. i. 12.

12. The particle ኃይጊ is principally used to point out an event as the consequence of one previously stated; thus, ኃይጊሉጎሉሉኒ ኃይጊ *therefore ye shall not lead*, Num. xx. 12; ጊሉዓላጠ ጠዓፃጊ ጳዳሉ ኃይጊ *therefore say to the children of Israel*, Exod. vi. 6; ኃጠዎ ጊጎዎ ጊዳ ኃይጊ *therefore who-soever slayeth Cain*, Gen. iv. 15.

13. The compound particle ኃዳ ጊጠዓፃ *therefore*, differs somewhat from the preceding one, for while the latter marks the relation of two events as that of direct cause and effect, the former generally indicates an event resulting indirectly from a preceding one; thus, ጳፍገ ጎዋላጠ ጎዳ ጊጠዓፃ *on this account shall a man leave*, Gen. ii. 24; ጎጎላኃ ጎዳ ጊጠዓፃ ኃላ *therefore he called the name*, Gen. xix. 22; instead of this, we find ኃዳ ጊጎ, Gen. xx. 6; ጊጠዓፃጊ, Gen. x. 9; and the simple ጊጠዓፃ, Gen. xvi. 14.

14. Many particles which are included in the *conjunctions* by some, are referred to the *adverbs* by others. On this account, the student will probably find, under conjunctions, particles which, from their force and use, he has led to consider as adverbs, and *vice versâ*.

PREPOSITION.

1. The separable prepositions are properly nouns in the *constructive* state, governing the word before which they are placed in the genitive case; as, ጳጎዓሉ ጊጎ *upon the earth*; ጠሉሉሉ ኃጎ *with my wife*; ጎጎጎጠጊ *unto them*; ጎጠጎጠፃ ጎጎጠፃ *between me and between thee*, etc.

2. The separable prepositions are also preceded by other separables and inseparables, so as to form words whose signification is compounded of both; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠭᠠᠨ and ᠠᠨᠠᠭᠠᠨᠵᠢ, from ᠠᠨᠠᠭ; ᠠᠨᠵᠢ from ᠠᠨ, with a double prefix; ᠮᠠᠨᠤᠨᠵᠢ, etc.

3. Many prepositions are not immediately connected with the noun they govern, but are followed by other particles, especially the inseparables ᠵ and ᠰ; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠭᠠᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠭᠠᠨᠵᠢ *within the veil*, Heb. לְפָנֵי הַכַּתָּוֶת, Lev. xvi. 15; ᠠᠨᠵᠢ ᠵᠠᠨᠠᠭᠠᠨ *beside the family*, Exod. xii. 37.

4. The preposition ᠠᠨᠠᠨ *between*, is construed in the two following ways: the preposition is repeated with both the objects which form the limit of the space implied in ᠠᠨᠠᠨ; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *between the light and darkness*. In the place of the second ᠠᠨᠠᠨ, the suffix ᠵ is read; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *between the water and water*, Gen. i. 6; ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠵᠢᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *and between contact and contact*, Deut. xvii. 8.

5. This section contains an account of the principal senses of the *separable* prepositions ᠠ, ᠰ, ᠵ, ᠶ.

The preposition ᠠ,—

(a) Denotes *place*; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *in the house*, Gen. xxxix. 5, and is sometimes employed with substantives, so as to form with them adverbs; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *deceitfully*, Gen. xxxiv. 13.

(β) Expresses *motion towards*; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *towards heaven*, Gen. xi. 4.

(γ) In the sense of *against*; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *against all*, Gen. xvi. 12; ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *against Egypt*, Exod. xiv. 25.

(δ) It expresses also the *material*; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *of gold, and of silver, and of brass*, Exod. xxxv. 32; also the *subject of an action*; as, ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨ *he shall*

eat thereof, Exod. xii. 43, 44; also the *manner of an action*; as, ሕፃፊ ጋሕፍ *with all thy heart*, Deut. vi. 5, etc.

(ε) In the sense of *for, on account of*; as, ገንዘብ *for money*, Deut. ii. 6; ገብረ ገብረ *for his theft*, Exod. xxii. 3; ስምዖን *on account of five*, Gen. xviii. 28.

(ζ) With the force of *by, through*; as, ማሳኘት *by Moses*, Num. xii. 2; also in the sense of *with*, denoting the instrument; as, ጠቅላይ *with my sword*, Gen. xlvi. 22; also *with*, in the sense of *together with*; as, ጠቅላይ *with my rod*, Gen. xxxii. 10.

(η) It has frequently the senses of *when, after that, etc.*, especially with the infinitive mood. Moreover, this preposition is frequently wanting, and sometimes redundant.

6. The preposition ለ,—

(α) Primarily signifies *like as, as if*; thus, ለጠቅላይ *according to our likeness*, Gen. i. 26. When it is doubled, the former is *so*, the latter *as*; thus, ገብረ ገብረ ለገብረ *so the righteous as the wicked*, Gen. xviii. 25; ገብረ ገብረ ለገብረ *so thou as Pharaoh*, Gen. xlv. 18.

(β) In the sense of *about, nearly*; of number, ለጠቅላይ *about six hundred*, Exod. xii. 37; of time, ለጠቅላይ *about the time of life*, Gen. xviii. 10.

(γ) Like ሁ, it is used in the sense of *when, after that*; as, ገብረ ገብረ *and when Esau heard*, Gen. xxvii. 34; ለጠቅላይ *after he had made an end*, Deut. xx. 9.

(δ) It is deficient in Gen. xlix. 9, ገብረ ገብረ ለገብረ *as a lion's whelp*. Sometimes it is redundant, like ሁ.

7. The preposition ለ,—

(α) Is used in the sense of *at, to, or in*, expressing motion; as, ገብረ ገብረ ለገብረ *all which there is to him*, Gen. xxxix. 8; ገብረ ገብረ *to go*, Deut. xxix. 18.

(β) It expresses the *essence, condition, or state* of a thing; as, $\text{אֱשׁוּמֵנִי וְאִישׁ בְּנֵי אָדָם}$ and *man was in the state of a living soul*, Gen. ii. 7; $\text{אֵלַי וְאֵלַי וְאֵלַי}$ and *she was to me for a wife*, Gen. xx. 12.

(γ) It denotes the instrument, and is used for בְּ ; as, בְּחֶרֶב *by the sword*, Lev. xxvi. 7.

(δ) In the senses of *according to*; as, בְּמִינֵיהֶם *according to their species*:—*concerning*; as, בְּמִנִּי *say concerning me*, Gen. xx. 13:—*on account of*; as, בְּשִׁבְעָה *on account of their noise*, Num. xvi. 34.

(ε) Expressing advantage, in the sense of *for*; as, בְּעֵינֵיהֶם *for them*, Exod. xiv. 25; בְּעִמִּי *had been with me*, Gen. xxxi. 42: also in the sense of *exchange*; as, בְּבָרֶכֶת *brick for stone*, Gen. xi. 3.

(ζ) The construction of בְּ with the infinitive has been previously explained. It is sometimes redundant and deficient.

8. The preposition מִן ,—

(a) The original force of this preposition, like that of the full form מִן , is *from*; it denotes the *cause*; as, מִן־אֵלֹהִים *from the God of thy father*, Gen. xlix. 24; here I have read מִן־אֵלֹהִים for Walton's מִן־אֵלֹהִים , according to Castel's emendation in the Heptag. under בְּיָמָיו . Hence arises its negative force; as, מִן־אֵלֹהִים *not to say unto Jacob*, Gen. xxxi. 29, instead of which the complete form מִן־אֵלֹהִים is found.

(β) With the sense of *on account of, because*; as, מִן־אֱהָבָה *because God loved you*, Deut. vii. 8.

(γ) In the sense of *after*; as, מִן־יָמֵינוּ *after some days*, Gen. iv. 3.

(δ) This preposition has other senses, which are, however,

of rare occurrence. Like the rest, it is sometimes deficient and redundant.

CONJUNCTIONS.

1. The separable conjunctions agree in construction, for the most part, with the adverbs, except that they are always put before sentences, for the purpose of *connecting* them. Some, like nouns and adverbs, are preceded by prepositions; as, $\text{אֲזַל} \cdot \text{עַד}$ *so as not*, Deut. iii. 3.

2. The relative prefix כִּי is sometimes used with the perfect tense, expressing the reason for a thing done; as, $\text{כִּי} \cdot \text{בָּנִינוּ} \cdot \text{בְּאֶרֶץ} \cdot \text{מִצְרָיִם} \cdot \text{בְּעַלְמֵי} \cdot \text{כִּי} \cdot \text{שָׁפַט} \cdot \text{אֱלֹהִים}$ *we went to the land because thou sentest us*, Num. xiii. 28; $\text{כִּי} \cdot \text{יְהוָה} \cdot \text{שָׁמָּה}$ *because God was there*, Exod. xx. 21. It is also found with the future, expressing the purpose or consequence of any thing; as, $\text{כִּי} \cdot \text{יִשְׁלַח} \cdot \text{יְהוָה} \cdot \text{בְּרָכָה}$ *that it may be well with thee*, Deut. iv. 40. The relative is similarly used with prepositions.

3. A conjunction is sometimes found where, in Hebrew, there is an ellipsis of כִּי after a preposition; as, $\text{כִּי} \cdot \text{יְבָרֵךְ} \cdot \text{יְהוָה} \cdot \text{בְּרָכָה}$ *that my soul may bless thee*, Gen. xxvii. 4; $\text{כִּי} \cdot \text{יִשְׁכַּח} \cdot \text{יְהוָה} \cdot \text{בְּרָכָה}$ *that you may live*, Deut. iv. 1.

4. Sometimes a sentence upon which another depends seems to be wholly omitted; to complete the sense, therefore, and construction, it must be supplied; as, $\text{כִּי} \cdot \text{יִשְׁכַּח} \cdot \text{יְהוָה} \cdot \text{בְּרָכָה}$ *because I said*, I will take care, *lest thou take thy daughters*, Gen. xxxi. 31, where there is an ellipsis of the Latin 'cavebo'.

5. The inseparable conjunction וְ is variously used in connecting the members of a sentence; it usually has the sense of 'and' or 'also'.

(a) It is found in Gen. xii. 12, in the sense of 'but'; as,

ገጠዳሙ ያሙሉሙን ጠገን ጊግዮሞን *and they will kill me, but thee will they save alive.*

(β) In the sense of 'however', 'since'; as, 'ጳሠሠ ጠሉሙ ንገሉሙኅ ንገሉሉን ጠግሞጊ ንገሉሙሉሉ *wherefore have you come to me, since ye hate me*, Gen. xxvi. 27; ጊግዮ ሉኅዳኃሠ ሉጠጻን *because she is the possession of a master*, Gen. xx. 3.

(γ) It is also found in the sense of 'either', 'therefore'.

(δ) In the sense of 'so that', 'in order that'; as, 'ሉጊ ዳጊጊሉ ሠሙ ሉጠ ጊጊዳሉን ጻዮሠጊ ጠሠሠግ ንገግዮሉሉ *ye shall not swear by my name falsely, that ye profane not the name of your God*, Lev. xix. 2; ሉሉሠን *that he may die*, Exod. xxi. 12.

(ε) In the sense of 'when' or 'while'; as, 'ጊጊግ ግንጊገ ጻግጠጊ *when Lot entered Zoar*, Gen. xix. 23.

(ζ) The particle ገ is used in a sentence to which it gives a *retributive* sense, arising from the expression of a condition or cause in a preceding one; as, 'ጳሉሉ ጠሠጠጊሉ ሉንዳጻ ገገሠ ጠገሠሠሉን *whether because thou art my brother, therefore wilt thou serve me freely*, Gen. xxix. 15; 'ጻንጻጠ ጻግጠን ጻሠሉጠዮ ሉጠ ዳጊ *therefore the Lord will keep for thee the covenant*, Deut. vii. 12. Similarly, 'ጻገሠ ንገዳጊጊጠሠሠሠን ጠጊገሉሉን *in the day of your eating of it, then shall your eyes be opened*, Gen. iii. 5.

(η) The conjunction ገ is sometimes apparently redundant; as, ሉጠጻጻ ጻሠገገ ጻዮሉሉን ጠሠዳ ጊዳሉ ጊዳ *every one who eateth bread leavened, that soul shall be cut off*, Exod. xii. 15, 19.

There are various other senses, too numerous to mention here.

6. When the conjunction ሠሉ is repeated, the former

significs 'either', the latter 'or'; as, $\text{מִדְּבַר שֶׁאֵין אֶלֶף שֶׁאֵין אֶלֶף}$ *whether ox or sheep*, Deut. xviii. 3. This is similar to the Greek usage of $\epsilon\iota$ and $\epsilon\iota$.

7. The particle כֵּן , when repeated, is used in the sense of 'so'——'as'; thus, $\text{כֵּן אֵין אֶלֶף כֵּן אֵין אֶלֶף כֵּן}$ *so we, as our fathers*, Gen. xlvii. 3.

8. Conjunctions expressing *doubt* are not always found with this force, but are sometimes used to denote the difficulty of accomplishing the object in question, or to bring forward prominently other similar circumstances connected with it; as, $\text{אֲשַׁר אֶעֱלֶה אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף}$ *I will ascend unto God, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sins*, Exod. xxxii. 30; Heb. יְהִי . It is rendered by the LXX., $\text{\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\xi\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\iota}$. In this case, the peculiar force of the conjunction is well marked by the English "peradventure". $\text{וְאֵין אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף}$ *and ye shall not touch of it, lest ye be destroyed*, Gen. iii. 3, rendered by the LXX., $\text{\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha \mu\grave{\eta} \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\tau\epsilon}$, where the stress lies upon the necessary consequence of their so doing, and conveys no doubt; $\text{אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף}$ *let her receive it to herself, lest we may be for contempt*, i. e. may be mocked, Gen. xxxviii. 23, which is expressed by the LXX., $\text{\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \mu\grave{\eta} \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu}$. In all these cases, though adverbs of *doubt* are used, they appear to carry but little of their usual force, but prominently introduce certain points arising from the previous sentence.

INTERJECTIONS.

1. The interjections, properly speaking, are placed *absolutely* in a sentence; that is, do not depend in construction upon any word or words therein.

2. As in Latin and Greek, some verbs are used as interjections; thus, $\text{ΑΥΠΙΣ} \cdot \text{ΜΗΛΕ} \text{ ἄγε, καταβαίνωμεν}$; or, *age, descendamus*. So, $\text{מלמד} \cdot \text{בשאל} \cdot \text{מנחם} \cdot \text{בא} \text{ si iter mihi ineundum; quæso, ex sententiâ facere liceat}$, Gen. xxiv. 42; $\text{וואלד} \cdot \text{זעצד} \cdot \text{לך} \text{ Behold! here is seed for you}$, Gen. xlvii. 23; $\text{באנו} \cdot \text{דבר} \cdot \text{ללך} \text{ Come! let us make a treaty}$, Gen. xxxi. 44.

3. Some nouns have the force of interjections when, on account of a vehement affection of the mind, they are *abruptly* expressed, and are entirely independent of the rest of the sentence; as, $\text{מרחצנד} \cdot \text{לדך} \text{ profanum servis tuis!}$ i. e. *absit à servis tuis*, Gen. xlv. 7.

4. Few remarks are required on the Syntax of the Interjection for practical purposes, inasmuch as that part of speech is independent of the rest of the sentence. The force of the Interjections, which may be derived from the Lexicon, is all that is required.

On the Syntax generally it may be observed, that, for the most part, it agrees with the Hebrew and the other Shemitic languages.

EXTRACTS.

THE following remarks upon the text and construction of some passages in the Extracts will be read with advantage by the student.*

GENESIS, I.

Ver. 2.— מְרִמָּה should probably be read מְרִמָּה or מְרִמָּה ; compare the rendering מְרִמָּה in the Targum with the latter. Cellarius explains the form in the text as, “factum κατ’ ἀποκοπήν ex [מְרִמָּה] ; *inanitas*,” to this conjecture the use of the preceding מְרִמָּה as an *adjective* is somewhat opposed.

Ver. 9.—There is an apparent ellipsis of 2 before מְרִמָּה .

Ver. 11.— מְרִמָּה is for מְרִמָּה , from מְרִמָּה . The succeeding מְרִמָּה in the text, may be taken as an *emphatic* infinitive; so we may render, *let the earth (fem.) abundantly bring forth herbage sowing* (i. e. the earth) *seed*, † inasmuch as מְרִמָּה is *Pahel* or *Aphel* participle fem., as may be inferred from v. 12, 29.

* The author would remind such of his readers as are disposed to be *Sebaldi Ravii*, that his conjectures are not made in the spirit or on the principles of *Houbigant*.

† That is, by the agency of wind and water, as in the case of the seeds of the *Anastatica Hierochuntica*, or *Rose of Jericho*.

Ver. 14.— אֲשַׁרְמִי would lead us to expect אֲמַלְמַל for מַלְמַל ; so in vers. 16, 18.

As regards רָצַמ in this verse, and רָצַצַמ in the succeeding, both are evidently misread for רָצַמַּר , as Cellarius would seem to insinuate in a note upon this place; “ רָצַמַּר eliso א pro רָצַצַמַּר quod per paragogen est pro רָצַמַּר .”

Ver. 16.—I doubt whether מַרְצַלַּם should form part of the text; and this doubt is confirmed by the succeeding *parallel* passage, $\text{אֲרָצַלַּם \cdot אֲמַרְצַלַּם}$, where no such circumlocution occurs, although it appears perfectly *antithetical*.

Ver. 17.— אֲפֶלֶל may be Aphel for אֲפֶלֶלַּם , from אֲפֶלֶל ; or, by *metathesis*, for אֲפֶלֶלַּם , regularly אֲפֶלֶלַּם , Pahel. The latter supposition receives confirmation from אֲפֶלֶלַּם in the succeeding verse.

Ver. 20.— אֲפֶלֶל may be an *emphatic* infinitive after אֲפֶלֶלַּם , as well as a substantive. The former supposition is perhaps preferable.

Ver. 25.—As regards the expression $\text{אֲפֶלֶלַּם \cdot אֲפֶלֶלַּם \cdot אֲפֶלֶלַּם}$, there can be little doubt of its inaccuracy as it now stands; it is incompatible with the Hebrew, Targum, and Syriac version. It might be read with a slight alteration, $\text{אֲפֶלֶלַּם \cdot אֲפֶלֶלַּם \cdot אֲפֶלֶלַּם}$, which is tolerable. On the other hand, it may be corrupted from a gloss, $\text{אֲפֶלֶלַּם \cdot אֲפֶלֶלַּם}$, in explanation of the term אֲפֶלֶלַּם in the succeeding verse, and carelessly transferred into the text. In the latter case, the phrase $\text{אֲפֶלֶלַּם \cdot אֲפֶלֶלַּם}$ should be omitted from Walton's text. It is difficult to explain it as it now stands.

Ver. 26.— אֲפֶלֶלַּם is somewhat anomalous; probably imitated from the Hebrew participle שֶׁרֶץ or שֶׁרֶץ , the *Tsere*

being represented by מ . Should it be read אֶלְמַחְזָר Pehil? Vide also ver. 30.

Ver. 28.—All the versions tend to render the reading אֶלְמַחְזָר suspicious. Should it be אֶלְמַחְזָר , as in ver. 24, 25, etc.? The compound אֶלְמַחְזָרָא immediately succeeding answers to the Hebrew תִּשְׁמְרֶנָּה , whence it is probably derived. Here again, I apprehend, the true reading may be obtained by expelling ז , when we may render, *which hath crept*, Pahal; at least, such an elision would produce a form consistent with the general principles of the language.

EXODUS, XX.

Ver. 5.— $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא} \cdot \text{זָרָא} \cdot \text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא} \cdot \text{זָרָא}$ is literally rendered from the Hebrew. Of course there is an ellipsis of a substantive, and in all probability this substantive is $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$ in the extended sense of *descendants*; hence we may render, *visiting the sin of fathers upon the immediate descendants* (i. e. children and grand-children), *and upon the third and fourth descendants* (generations). In the Targum we have, $\text{עַל-דְּרִבְרֵי יִתִּי וְעַל-דְּרִבְרֵי בְּנֵי}$.

Ver. 10.—Upon the hiatus after $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$ Cellarius remarks, “hiatus arguit vocem $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$ *jumentum tuum*, quam codex Ebræo-Sam. habet; in versione autem non apparet.”

Ver. 11.—The reading $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$ for $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$ is to be remarked.

Ver. 16.— $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$ is apocopated for the full form $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$ Pahal, from $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$.

Ver. 17.—The latter part of this verse is interpolated from Deut. xxvii. 2, etc.; xi. 30. The apocopate $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$ for $\text{אֲנִי וְנִסְתָּרָא}$ should also be noted.

I have retained $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ in the text, in deference to the opinion of Castel, who says, " $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ *idem quod* תורה," although I am convinced we ought to read $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ instead.

Ver. 19.—This verse is chiefly derived from Deut. v. 24—27. In it $\aleph\aleph$ for $\aleph\aleph$ must be observed; as also $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ Aphel imperative, formed regularly like the Chaldee from $\aleph\aleph$, the vowel *Tsere* being represented by the *mater lectionis* \aleph .

Ver. 20.—In the phrase $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph \cdot \aleph\aleph\aleph$, the infinitive is governed by the ellipsis of \aleph , or by the \aleph in the adverb.

Ver. 22.—This verse is interpolated from Deut. v. 28, xviii. 18, and succeeding verses. Perhaps $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ should be read $\aleph\aleph\aleph$.

As regards the expression $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$, something is clearly wrong. It perhaps should be either $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, as in Gen. xxx. 34, or $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$; the latter is preferable. The reading in the text is evidently a compound of the two conjectures just given; for, $\aleph\aleph$ is for $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ or $\aleph\aleph\aleph$. The latter conjecture may even be an incorporated gloss on the former, or *vice versâ*.

Some little difficulty attaches to the word $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ in the latter part of the verse. I propose to derive it from $\aleph\aleph$ to bear, to attend, the compound $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ being found in Gen. xlii. 23, in the sense of *interpreter*. If this be the case, we ought to read $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ as a participle, and render, *I will tell all that pertaineth to the decrees and judgments*, etc. I have simply rendered it by "precepts" in the Lexicon.

Ver. 25.— $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ is perhaps *Pehil* with a suffix; so that we may render, *thou shalt not build them* (fem.), *having hewn them* (masc.); i. e. thou shalt not build them of hewn,

etc. The word may also be an infinitive, with the omission of the prefix א ; in this case, render, *after hewing them*. The discrepancy in gender between אֲמַר and אָרַב should be noted.

DEUTERONOMY, XXXIV.

Ver. 1.—The student will see that the greater part of the first and the two succeeding verses of the Hebrew, probably containing a complete account of the extent of the panorama exhibited by God to Moses, are rendered in the version by a vague expression of the limits of Moses' observation, without specifying the individual occupants between those limits.

The proper reading of אֲמַרְאֲמַר should be אָרַבְאֲמַר , as in Num. xxii. 1, xxvi. 3, 63, etc.

Ver. 6.—After אָרַב , the suffix אָרַב is manifestly omitted.

Ver. 8.—Upon the somewhat confused phrase אָרַבְאֲמַרְאֲמַר , Cellarius remarks, “forte quod dedecus, neminem à morte eximi; vel fletus *nimius*, quod indecorum dolori indulgere.” I have doubts about the genuineness of this passage, which it would be superfluous to give here.

• ለጠጥን ጳጳስንገጊ ጳጳሳቶ ለታላላቅ ለጠጥ ጳጳሳቶ ጥገገገገ 25
 • ጳጳሳቶ ለጠጥ ጳጳስንገጊ ጳጳሳቶ
 : ገገገ ለጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 • ከሌሎች ሌሎች ከሌሎች ሌሎች ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ 26
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 : ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ 27
 • ከሌሎች ከሌሎች ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ 28
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 : ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ 29
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 • ከሌሎች ከሌሎች ከሌሎች ከሌሎች ከሌሎች ከሌሎች ከሌሎች
 : ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ 30
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 < : ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ 31
 — < : ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ

EXODUS, XX.

: ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ 1
 • ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ 2
 ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ ጳጳሳቶ

• ከሆነው ስለዚህ ስላለው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው 25
 • ከዚህ ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው 26
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 —<: ስለሆነው

DEUTERONOMY, XXXIV.

• ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው 1
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው 4
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 —<: ስለሆነው
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው 5
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው 6
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው 7
 —<: ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው 8
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው 9
 • ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው
 —<: ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው ስለሆነው

- ልሙቱ ጳሙዳህ ጊሉ ልሙደግ ሉደግ ጠግ ጸጋ ሕገገጠ ሉጊጊ 10
 • ሕጠጊሉጊ ሕጠጊሉ ጳጥጠ ጳጋግጠ
- ግግጋሕጊ ጳጥጠ ጳጋግጠ ልሙቱ ጳሙደግ ጊሉ ጠግ ጸጋ ሕገገጠ ጊሕጊ 11
 • ጳጋግሉ ጊሕጊ ጠግ ግግጋ ጊሕጊ ጳጋግጠ ሕጠጊ ጋግሉግ
- ግግጋ ልሙቱ ጳጋግ ጳጋግ ጳጋግ ጊሕጊ ጳሉ ጋጠጋሉ ግጠጳ ጊሕጊ 12
 — < ጊሉ ልሙደግ ጊሕ ጠጋ ሕገገጠ ጳሙዳህ

LEXICON.

. The Student will remember, that the words which have been previously discussed in the Grammar, are not contained in the Lexicon.

<p> አ ዓአ a father ጎዓአ a stone ሠዓዓዓአ Abraham ኅአ a hand ሠኅአ a man ዳሠኅአ earth, land ዓንአ to shine; <i>as a subs.</i>, light ፕዓንአ way, path ዓዖንአ to honour; <i>Aphel</i>, Chald. ܩܪܝ ጊላኅአ to go away, depart ሄአ a brother ሠጠአ how? Chald. ܩܝܢ ጎጊጠአ a tree ሠሠጠአ day; Syr. ܠܡܨܒܐ ዓፍጠጠአ same as ዓፍጠ ጊሣአ to eat, devour ዳጊአ God ሠጠዳጊአ same as preceding </p>	<p> ሠአ a mother ዳሠአ a female domestic ዓሠአ to say, speak ሄኅአ to rest, cease from; <i>Aphel of</i> ܩܪܝ ዳዖኅአ female; <i>also</i> ዳዖኅ ሠኅአ a man ሠጠኅአ face; Heb. ܩܝܢ ዳሉዳዳዓአ a law; <i>also</i> ዳሉዳዳዓአ ሠዓአ to prolong ፕዓአ earth, land ዳሠአ fire ዓሠአ who, which ዳሉአ a wife ዓሉአ a place <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> ዳሠዳዓ a beast of burden, cattle ሉጠዓ a house </p>
--	--

𐤆𐤑𐤃 to weep, lament
 𐤇𐤑𐤃 grief, lamentation
 𐤆𐤃 a son, child
 𐤆𐤑𐤃 to build
 𐤆𐤑𐤃 flesh
 𐤆𐤑𐤃 to seek, enquire after
 𐤆𐤑𐤃 a lord, master
 𐤑𐤑𐤃 } a plain, valley
 𐤆𐤑𐤃 }
 𐤆𐤃 son; *fem.* 𐤆𐤑𐤃
 𐤆𐤑𐤃 to create
 𐤆𐤑𐤃 iron
 𐤆𐤑𐤃 to bless

𐤇

𐤇𐤃 a body; *from* 𐤆𐤃𐤇
 𐤇𐤃𐤇 to lift over, pass
 over
 𐤇𐤃𐤇 to commit adultery
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 to hew, cut, circum-
 cise
 𐤇𐤃𐤇 a decree, command
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 a valley, recess
 𐤇𐤃𐤇 a stranger
 𐤇𐤃𐤇 Galgal
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 to discover
 𐤇𐤃𐤇 generation, age; *for*
 𐤆𐤃𐤇
 𐤇𐤃𐤇 to steal
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 baseness, disgrace
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 *same as* 𐤆𐤃𐤇

𐤆𐤃𐤇 kind, genus; *for*
 𐤆𐤃𐤇. Comp.
 Greek γένος

𐤇𐤃𐤇 winged
 𐤆𐤃𐤇𐤇𐤃𐤇 Gerizim

𐤆

𐤆𐤃𐤇 to sacrifice
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 gold
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 to fear; *also* 𐤆𐤃𐤇
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 dread, fear
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 to remember, to
 make mention of;
 as a subs., a male
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 a likeness

𐤆

𐤆𐤃 a mountain
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 this, that
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 to be
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 to add; *vide*
 Syntax

𐤆

𐤆𐤃𐤇 less
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 presumption
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 to hold innocent
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 to call, name
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 to plant, sow;
 as a subs., seed
 𐤆𐤃𐤇 seed

𐎧

- 𐎧𐎢𐎥 neighbour
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 to rejoice
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 distant, last
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 a vision, sight
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 to see, behold
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 to sin
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 to live
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 life
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 to know
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 knowledge, wisdom
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 to pollute
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 heaven
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 to desire
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 an ass; *for* 𐎧𐎢𐎥
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 mercy
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 an axe, a sword
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 a tree, shrub
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 to be dark
 𐎧𐎢𐎥 darkness

𐎨

- 𐎨𐎢 good, well
 𐎨𐎢 a mountain
 𐎨𐎢𐎢 to move away, to
 pervert
 𐎨𐎢𐎢 to create, make

𐎩

- 𐎩𐎢 to flower, bring
 forth; *as a subs.*,
 a herb

- 𐎩𐎢𐎢 dry earth
 𐎩𐎢 a hand
 𐎩𐎢 to know, discern
 𐎩𐎢 to give
 𐎩𐎢 the Lord
 𐎩𐎢𐎢 Joshua
 𐎩𐎢 a day
 𐎩𐎢 to-day
 𐎩𐎢 to be well
 𐎩𐎢 sea; Chald. 𐎩𐎢
 𐎩𐎢 Jacob
 𐎩𐎢 Isaac
 𐎩𐎢𐎢 glory, greatness
 𐎩𐎢 Jordan
 𐎩𐎢 Jericho
 𐎩𐎢 to occupy, inhabi
 𐎩𐎢 Israel
 𐎩𐎢 to remain, occupy

𐎪

- 𐎪𐎢 a star
 𐎪𐎢 to dispose, pre-
 pare; *also* 𐎪𐎢
 𐎪𐎢 all, any
 𐎪𐎢 all, the whole
 𐎪𐎢 to darken, to be-
 come dim

- 𐎪𐎢𐎢 Canaanite
 𐎪𐎢 to collect
 𐎪𐎢 silver
 𐎪𐎢 to write

Z

- 9Z the heart
 9AZ to be in a flame;
 as a subs., a flame
 מZמZ darkness, night
 9מZ a lamp, torch
 9ZZ a bud, germ
 9ZZ to bud, flourish
 ZZ to teach
 9ZPZ a reptile
 9PZ to cast forth
- ש [מאה]
- 99ש a hundred; Heb.
 99ש a luminary
 99ש gratis, in vain
 99ש an altar
 99ש Moab
 99ש to fear, dread
 ש water [מים]
 99ש the middle; Chald.
 99ש a plane, valley
 99ש a collection
 99ש to fill up
 99ש fullness
 ZZ to speak, say
 99ש a word; *also* 99ש;
 Plural, שש
 99ש precepts
 99ש Egypt
 99ש Moses

99ש tabernacle, tent

ב

- 99ב Nebo
 99ב a prophet; Chald.
 ב; *also* 99ב
 99ב a luminary
 99ב to be light; *as a*
 subs., light; also
 a river
 99ב a fish; *prop. name,*
 Nun
 99ב to raise, lift up;
 as a subs., seed
 99ב to keep
 99ב to sacrifice
 99ב to explore, try
 99ב to fly
 99ב an animal
 99ב to breathe
 99ב to give, bestow

ב

- 99ב to take, *or* receive
 99ב to create, multiply
 99ב to adore
 99ב to bear witness
 99ב a sign
 99ב an eye
 99ב pot-herb
 99ב to mount, ascend

𐤁𐤏𐤍𐤔𐤏 a hill, beacon; *for*
 𐤁𐤏𐤍𐤔𐤏
 𐤔𐤏𐤏 to place, support
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to hate
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 testimony

▽

 𐤏𐤏𐤏 *same as* 𐤏𐤏𐤏 *or* 𐤏𐤏
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to make; *as a*
 subs., a servant
 𐤁𐤏𐤍𐤔𐤏 work
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to pass over
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to see, behold
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 time
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 a sin
 𐤔𐤏𐤏𐤏 *same as* 𐤔𐤏𐤏
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 another, strange
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to return
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 a tree; *also* 𐤏𐤏𐤏
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 an eye
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 burnt offering
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to enter; *also* 𐤏𐤏
 𐤁𐤏𐤏 *for* 𐤁𐤏𐤏
 𐤔𐤏𐤏 age, eternity
 𐤔𐤏𐤏𐤏 holocaust
 𐤁𐤏𐤏 a people
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to occupy, inhabit
 𐤏𐤏 a flock of sheep;
 also 𐤏𐤏𐤏
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to flourish; *adj.*,
 grassy

𐤁𐤏𐤍𐤔𐤏 an animal
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 land
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 darkness
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to depart; *also* 𐤏𐤏𐤏
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to acquire, seek

𐤏 [also 𐤏𐤏𐤏]

 𐤏𐤏𐤏 a command, precept;
 𐤔𐤏𐤏 to multiply, increase
 𐤍𐤏 a word
 𐤔𐤏𐤏 a sphere, an arch
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 the firmament
 𐤁𐤏𐤏 prodigy, wonder
 𐤔𐤏 a mouth
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 a graven image
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 Phogor
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 to visit, command
 𐤁𐤏𐤏 precept
 𐤍𐤏 fruit; fruitful
 𐤁𐤏𐤏 Pharaoh
 𐤔𐤏𐤏 to separate, divide;
 also 𐤏𐤏𐤏 & 𐤏𐤏𐤏
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 Euphrates
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 judgment

𐤍

 𐤁𐤏𐤏 form, image
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 side, coast
 𐤏𐤏𐤏 morning; *opposed to*
 𐤔𐤏𐤏

P

- 29P a district, region
 99P to bury
 399P a sepulchre
 59P to approach, touch
 as a subs., a face
 79P to justify, sanctify
 999P a state, city; *also*
 39P and 399P
 39999P seed
 29P to kill
 2P a voice
 5992P thunder (*tonitrua*)
 39999P a beginning
 999P a bird, fowl
 999P to envy, be jealous
 of
 59999P firmament
 99P to approach, touch

9

- 799P head, top; *also*
 999P
 99P great, mighty
 9999P greatness
 9999P *same as* 99P
 9999P *same as* 999P
 99999P remote, distant
 9999P to love
 99999P strength, vigour
 9999P breath, smell

- 9999P void; *fem.*,
 99999P,
 Chald. 99999P
 9999P to creep; *as a subs.*,
 a creeping thing
 99P a neighbour
 9999P evening

99

- 9999P desolate, mis-shapen
 9999P a sabbath
 9999P to swear
 9999P to send
 99999P the firmament
 9999P to cover over, to
 plaster
 9999P to place, put
 99999P the heavens
 9999P trumpet
 9999P plaster
 9999P Sicheu
 9999P to rule
 9999P to finish, fill up; *as*
 an adj., complete
 99999P a finishing
 999999P peace offerings
 9999P a name
 9999P to hear
 9999P to serve, obey
 99999P the sun
 9999P a year

ԳՐԱՍ a step; <i>as a verb,</i>	ԳՅԻ an ox
to mock, prevaricate	ԿՈՒՅՔԸԼԻ a crocodile
ՅԻԱՍ <i>same as</i> ՅՆԱՍ	ՃՈՐԻԻ brave, apt,
Ի	strong
ԽՆՅԻԻ an abyss	ՅԻՈՐԳԱՍԻ likeness