

The Participial Formations of the Geminate Verbs.

By B. Halper, M. A., in London.

Before proceeding to explain the participial formations of the geminate verbs it is necessary to give a brief outline of the principles underlying the participles of the ordinary strong verb. The interesting studies of BARTH, LAGARDE and others in this field of research have largely contributed to a better understanding of the development of verbal and nominal forms of Semitic languages, and facilitated the task of special inquiries. My indebtedness to these scholars will be evident everywhere, especially in the sections dealing with the regular verb.

I.

The participles and adjectives commonly used in Semitic languages are three in number:—

- 1) **فَعْلٌ**, as: **تَبِعٌ** *following*; **حَسَنٌ** *beautiful*; **نَصَفٌ** *middle-aged*. **חָכֵם** *wise*; **יָשָׁר** *right, straight*; **קִבְלָה** *foolish*; **לָבָן** *white*.
- 2) **فَعْلٌ**, as: **הִמְסֵם** *tearing*; **וָجַעַ** *suffering*; **וָרַחַ** *irrigated*; **חָרַן** *sad*. **שָׁפַל** *low*; **חָפֵץ** *desiring, delighting*; **שָׁכַח** *forgetting*.
- 3) **فَعْلٌ**, as: **יָקָץ** *awake*; **תָּכַף** *witty*; **חָרַץ** *impatient*. **יָרַר** *fearing*¹; **עָמַק** *deep*; **עָקָם** *crooked*; **עָגַל** *round*.

Out of these simple forms arose the following classes of participles and adjectives which, especially in the case of **فَعْلٌ** and **فَعْلٌ**, have almost completely supplanted the original unlengthened forms:—

- 1) **فَعَالٌ** out of **فَعْلٌ** by lengthening the second vowel, as: **صَنَاعٌ** *diligent*; **جَرَانٌ** *irascible*; **جَبَانٌ** *cowardly, timid*. **טְהוֹר** *clean*; **גְּדוֹל** *great*; **בַּחוּן** *one who tests*; **בְּגוֹד** *treacherous*; **פְּרוֹף** *a purifier*. The feminine of all these when it occurs naturally retains the ¹ unchanged. It must be noticed here that LAGARDE² classifies some of these examples among the

¹ יָרַר may, as far as the form is concerned, be classified as a **فَعَالٌ**, but as its perfect is also יָרַר I prefer to take it as a **فَعْلٌ**.

² *Bildung der Nomina*, p. 30.

unlengthened فَعَلٌ forms. This view, as shown by BARTH throughout his *Nominalbildung* and ZDMG XLIV, p. 683, is quite untenable, since the feminine forms of this class are entirely different from those of فَعَلٌ .

2) فَعِيلٌ out of فَعِلٌ by lengthening the second vowel, as: قَتِيلٌ slain; كَرِيمٌ noble; عَرِيفٌ knowing; قَضِيبٌ cutting; كَبِيرٌ mighty; قَرِيبٌ near; عَزِيزٌ strong; عَظِيمٌ powerful. מְשִׁיחַ anointed; בְּתוּרָה beaten; קְצִיר a reaper¹; אֶסִּיר imprisoned, a prisoner; זָעִיר small, young; נְעִים pleasant, sweet.

In Syriac this form appears either with the first vowel omitted, as: חֲדַי holding; מְלֵיכָא slain; חַיֵּימָא empty; סַחֲמָא lame; or with the first syllable sharpened, as ܩܬܝܠܐ terrible; ܩܬܝܒܐ rebelling, resisting; ܩܬܝܒܐ terrifying; ܦܪܝܡܐ far, removed; ܩܘܕܝܫܐ holy; ܩܘܕܝܫܐ wise.

3) فَعُولٌ out of فَعُلٌ by lengthening the second vowel, as: شَكُورٌ thankful; قَبُولٌ received; ضَعُوفٌ feeble; كُفُورٌ ungrateful. لَعَاوِم strong, mighty; אִנְדוּשׁ incurable, dangerous, sore; בְּתוּבָה written; זְכוֹר remembering, mindful. In Syriac we have again two forms of this class: a) with the first vowel omitted, as: ܩܬܝܠܐ sad; ܩܬܝܠܐ a friend, beloved; b) with the first vowel lengthened into \bar{a} as ܩܘܕܝܠܐ a guide; ܩܘܕܝܠܐ a creator; ܩܘܕܝܠܐ a commander; ܩܘܕܝܠܐ a dweller, an inhabitant; ܩܘܕܝܠܐ a hearer.

4) فَاعِلٌ out of فَعِلٌ by lengthening the first vowel, as: قَاتِلٌ a killer, killing; عَامِرٌ inhabited, cultivated; عَالِمٌ knowing; سَالِمٌ sound, unimpaired. בּוֹתֵב a writer, writing; בּוֹחֵר choosing; אִלְלֵי worthless, mean. יִשְׁמַח loving; יִשְׁחַח hungry; יִשְׁחַח fearing. At this stage it must be stated that the derivation of this form, which is perhaps the most frequent in all Semitic languages, is the subject of a great deal of controversy. BARTH² on the one hand maintains that the origin of this form is فَعِلٌ corresponding to the imperfect stem, in which the vowels \ddot{u} and \ddot{z} are characteristic of the transitive verb. While most of the other scholars, as, for instance, WRIGHT³ and LAGARDE⁴ have explained this participle as arising out of فَعَلٌ , the first vowel being lengthened to \bar{a} and the second attenuated to \ddot{z} , like בּוֹחֵר out of בּוֹחַר . WRIGHT, however, admits the possibility of this form being an intensive of the intransitive kätil , the use of which has been gradually extended so as to embrace all classes of verbs. This view approximates very closely that of BARTH, although the explanation is entirely different. But BARTH's view is by far the most preferable.

¹ Isa. 175. ² *Nominalbildung*, p. 200. ³ *Lectures on Comparative Grammar*, p. 196.

⁴ *Bildung der Nomina*, p. 83, l. 17.

There is no necessity to assume that the second vowel was attenuated from \tilde{a} to \tilde{z} , since all Semitic languages in their earliest stages known to us have \tilde{z} in this form and not \tilde{a} . And for WRIGHT's alternative explanation it is hardly possible that out of the intransitive $k\tilde{a}t\tilde{l}$ the ordinary active participle of the regular transitive verb should be developed. All the objections urged against BARTH have been ably refuted by him in ZDMG XLIV, p. 695 ff., and in a note on page 200 of the second edition of his *Nominalbildung*.

As may be noticed from the examples which I have quoted above, one and the same form may be transitive in one case and intransitive in another. Moreover the transitive forms are sometimes active and sometimes passive. Thus in נָעִיר *small, young* and נְעִים *sweet, pleasant* we have instances of intransitive adjectives, whereas בְּתוּיַת *beaten* and מְשִׁיחַ *anointed* are transitive and passive, and פְּקִיד *a commander* and קַצִּיר *a reaper* are transitive active. עֲצוּם *strong, mighty* and נִגְוָשׁ *incurable, sore* are intransitive adjectives, whilst חֲרוּת *engraved* and עָוָב *forsaken* are transitive passive participles, and הַשְׂרוּדָה *the oppressor, despoiler* (ψ 137 8) is transitive active. גְּדוֹל *great* and קָרוֹב *near* are intransitive adjectives, while בְּחוֹן *one who tests*, צִרּוּף *a purifier*, עֹשֶׂק *an oppressor* (Jer 22 3, parallel to עֹשֶׂק , Jer 21 12) are transitive active.

BARTH in his *Nominalbildung*, as is well known, accounts for this phenomenon in a very ingenious way. He divides nouns and adjectives into two classes: 1) those which are derived from the perfect stem, and 2) those which are derived from the imperfect stem. And since in the perfect stem \tilde{a} in the second syllable is the characteristic vowel of the transitive verb and \tilde{u} and \tilde{z} of the intransitive verb, we get forms like חָכֵם *wise, (discriminating)* from the transitive \tilde{a} perfect חָכַם , בְּחוֹן *one who tests* from בָּחַן , צִרּוּף *a purifier* from צָרַף . נְעִים *pleasant* is from intransitive \tilde{z} perfect נָעַם ²; נִגְוָשׁ *sore* is from intransitive \tilde{u} perfect נָגַשׁ which does not occur in Hebrew, but Arabic أَنْتَ *was soft* makes it clear that נִגְוָשׁ underlies this adjective. On the other hand in the im-

¹ BARTH classifies חָכֵם *wise* and יָשָׁר *right* among the nouns and adjectives belonging to the transitive \tilde{a} perfect. יָשָׁר cannot obviously belong to this class, as it is intransitive, and its imperfect is יִישַׁר from which it must be derived. In *Nachträge und Verbesserungen*, p. 468 of the second edition BARTH corrects this oversight, and classifies both חָכֵם and יָשָׁר among the intransitive \tilde{a} imperfect forms. חָכֵם , however, may really be taken to belong to the transitive \tilde{a} perfect, as the original meaning seems to be *he distinguished, discriminated*; hence in Arabic حَكَمَ = *a judge*. The imperfect יִחְכַּם , which is used almost exclusively in the *Hokhma literature*, has a technical meaning, and is probably a denominative.

² Cf. נְעָמָה Gen 49 15.

perfect \dot{z} and \ddot{z} in the second syllable are the characteristic vowels of the transitive verb and \check{z} of the intransitive one. Thus we get transitive (active and passive) participles and adjectives like קָתוּב *written*; שְׁמוֹר *observed* from \ddot{z} imperfect; פְּקִיד *a commander*, אֶסִיר *a prisoner* from \dot{z} imperfect; and also intransitive adjectives like לָבָן *white*, שְׁחוֹר *black*, קָרוֹב *near* (plural קְרוֹבִים) from \check{z} imperfect.

However much we may differ in details from Prof. BARTH, it must be admitted that this theory is the only one which fully accounts for the derivation and meaning of most of the nouns and adjectives. No unbiased investigator of the facts can deny the possibility of nouns being derived from the imperfect stem as well as from the perfect. As to the difference of meaning which one might expect between nouns or adjectives derived from the perfect stem and those derived from the imperfect, that scholar does not say anything explicitly. But in many places of his book it is assumed that two nouns or adjectives, one derived from the perfect and the other from the imperfect, may be identical in signification. Thus קָרוֹב *near* derived from \check{z} imperfect is identical with قَرِيبٌ and قَرِيبٌ from \dot{z} perfect; רָחוֹק *far* from \check{z} imperfect has exactly the same signification as بَعِيدٌ from \dot{z} perfect.

The same scholar also attempts to explain why one and the same form may be active and passive. According to his opinion participles and adjectives were originally infinitives, that is to say, abstract nouns. And since in an abstract noun there is no reference to the agent or to the one on whom the action passes over, it may be applied to either of them. Thus طَرِيقٌ رُكُوبٌ originally meant *a way, a riding*, hence *a way on which people ride*; رَجُلٌ رُكُوبٌ originally signified *a man, a riding*, and hence *a man who rides*. In support of this suggestion BARTH reminds us of the fact that in Arabic most of the forms فَعُولٌ remain unaltered in the feminine and plural. This remarkable fact, according to this scholar, indicates that originally these forms were abstract nouns, and that is the reason why they do not admit of any reference of gender or number. In Hebrew also we find וְאֵתִי שְׂרִיד (Jer 4.30) in a verse which contain the archaic form וְאֵתִי .

In fact, however, this is not a solution of the problem. It merely transfers the problem from the participle to the infinitive. It should not be forgotten that we even find passive infinitives like גָּנַב (Gen 40 15) which tend to prove that even in the infinitive the active and passive ideas were more or less distinguished. For after all no one can say with

certainty that formations like בָּנָה belong to a later stage of development. There is no decisive reason why they should not be regarded as archaic forms preserved in Hebrew. Without referring the participles back to the infinitives, we may say that فَاعِلٌ and فَعُولٌ denote *persons or things who do a certain action, or to whom a certain action is done*, that is to say, persons or things connected with the action expressed by the verb.

The facts to be borne in mind about the participles in use may be summarised as follows:—

Arabic فَاعِلٌ , Hebrew קִטְלָל , Syriac ܦܘܠܐ are active. In Hebrew it is seldom found of stative verbs which have ז or ז in their perfect, whereas Arabic and Syriac form this participle from all classes of verbs without distinction. WRIGHT¹, however, observes that فَاعِلٌ when formed from فَعَلَ and the transitive فَعَّلَ (as رَهَبٌ “to fear”, رَكَبٌ “to ride”, عَلِمٌ “to know”, مَسَّ “to touch”) these nomina agentis are not only real participles, indicating temporary, transitory or accidental action or state of being, but serve as adjectives or substantives, expressing a continuous action, a habitual state of being, or a permanent quality, e. g. كَاتِبٌ “writing”, “a scribe”, خَادِمٌ “serving”, “a servant”, حَاكِمٌ “judging”, “a judge”, عَالِمٌ “a scholar”, رَاهِبٌ “an ascetic”. But if from an intransitive فَعَلَ and فَعَّلَ , they have only the participial sense, the adjectival being expressed by one or other of the nominal forms enumerated in § 231. Thus فَارِحٌ or جَادِلٌ “being glad”, “rejoicing”, جَائِسٌ “being cowardly”, جَائِدٌ “being liberal”, ضَائِقٌ “being narrow”, “confined”, are participles, the adjectives which indicate the corresponding permanent qualities or characteristics are فَرِحٌ and جَدِلٌ or جَدْلَانٌ “gladsome”, “cheery”, جَبَانٌ “cowardly”, جَوَادٌ “bountiful”, “generous” and ضَيِّقٌ “narrow”. In another place² he says that فَاعِلٌ is rarely used as a verbal adjective from فَعَلَ (intransitive) or فَعَّلَ ; e. g. أَمِينٌ “safe”, “secure” = أَمِينٌ or أَمِنٌ from أَمِنَ “safe”, “sound” = سَلِيمٌ from سَلِمَ ; عَاقِرٌ “barren” from عَقَرْتُ ; حَامِضٌ “sour”, “acid” from حَمَضَ or حَمِضَ . LAGARDE³ on the other hand regards the فَاعِلٌ forms of stative verbs as late.

فَعُولٌ is used in Arabic indifferently, both with active and passive significations, without any special tendency to one or the other. It is true that mostly this form has an active signification, but this is merely accidental, since regularly for the participles proper Arabic employs

¹ *Arabic Grammar* § 230 Rem. a.

² O. c. § 232 Rem. b.

³ See *Bildung der Nomina*, p. 83.

فَاعِلٌ for the active and مَفْعُولٌ for the passive. In Syriac it has become the usual form to denote the agent, especially when its first syllable is lengthened, as *ܦܫܬܐܘܠܐ* a commander. But there also exist forms with a passive meaning. LAGARDE¹ quotes the following forms *ܟܠܐܘܠ* = *ܟܠܘܠ* *παρθενος* (Cor a 7 34). Fem. *ܟܠܐܘܠܐ* *ܩܬܘܠܐ* *ܒܩܘܠܐ* *ܟܠܐܘܠܐ* *ܟܠܐܘܠܐ* a concubine, *ܟܠܐܘܠܐ* food, *ܟܠܐܘܠܐ* a garment = *ܟܠܐܘܠܐ*. One cannot understand why Hebrew *לְבוּשׁ* cannot belong to this class, as LAGARDE states emphatically. He maintains that *לְבוּשׁ* is corrupted form *לְבַשׁ* = *לְבַשׁ*. The omission of the first vowel *ā* is not at all surprising as we find *קָפַר* = *קָפַר* and *נָצַיַב* = *נָצַיַב*.² BARTH considers *לְבוּשׁ*, and presumably also *לְבַשׁ*, as an infinitive *فَعُولٌ*³ which has become concrete. To this class, according to BARTH, belong also *גְּבוּל* a border and *רֶכֶב* a chariot. This latter, by the way, occurs only with a suffix, and it is possible that the absolute state is *רֶכֶב*. This view is, however, untenable. For if we assume that all infinitives may become concrete, there would be no necessity to divide forms into participles and infinitives. We could regard all of them as infinitives, some of which remained abstract nouns, while others became concrete. It is much more logical to take concrete nouns as original participles, provided the form allows us to regard them as such. It is therefore preferable to take *רֶכֶב* and *לְבוּשׁ* as passive participles. It should be remembered that in Hebrew one says *לְבַשׁ אֶת-בְּגָדָיו* (Lev 16 24) where *בְּגָד* is the direct object of *לְבַשׁ*, hence *לְבוּשׁ* = *something that is put on*. BARTH cites as passive *فَعُولٌ* the well known *יְשׁוּעָה* beloved, a friend, as well as *טְמוּרַי* *דְּלֵבָא* the hidden things of the heart.

In Hebrew *קָטוּל* is the regular passive participle. There are sporadic instances of this form being used with an active signification. BARTH on p. 175 gives an almost exhaustive list of these instances to which I should like to add *עָשׂוּק* and *רְצוּן* (Hos 5 11). LXX renders that verse *κατεδυσάστευσεν Ἑβραῖμ τὸν ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ κατεπάτησε τὸ κρίμα*, evidently taking them both as active participles. It must, however, be admitted that almost all the instances can be taken to be passive participles. Even *בַּת-בְּבִל* *הַשְׂדוּדָה* (ψ 137 8) has been explained to mean *O daughter of Babylon, thou doomed one*. CHEYNE⁴ says: "Thou doomed one". *Literally* 'that art (= hast been) stormed (or destroyed)'. *The Semite, Jew or Arab, prophet or common man, anticipates the future and describes it as present or past (as completed or incompleted action). Hence*

¹ *Bildung der Nomina*, p. 64.

² See *Nominalbildung*, p. 184.

³ See o. c. p. 85.

⁴ *Book of Psalms*, p. 347 (1888).

he says, "I am killing him" = "I will kill him"; "this man is killed" = "he is to be killed." But since, as is known from all the other Semitic languages, this participle could be active as well as passive, there is no necessity to force the sense when the active signification seems to be more satisfactory. At all events there unmistakably exists a distinct tendency to employ קָטוּל as the ordinary passive participle, and this form has almost completely supplanted the old קָטַל which seems to have been used as a passive participle, as הַיְיָלֵךְ (Jud 13 8) for instance¹.

فَعِيلٌ in Arabic is used almost exactly in the same way as فَعُولٌ, both with active and passive significations. Grammarians usually regard this form as a passive adjective. So WRIGHT², for instance, says: فَعِيلٌ when derived from a transitive verb has usually a passive sense; as قَتِيلٌ "slain" = مَقْتُولٌ. There probably is a preponderant majority of instances of this adjective with a passive signification. Yet in spite of this there is no trace of any tendency. The circumstances that a larger number of instances of this adjective which have been handed down to us are passive do not prove anything, since one is not allowed to form a فَعِيلٌ himself and give it a passive signification.

In Hebrew the facts are pretty much the same as in Arabic. פָּקִיד a commander; נְבִיא a prophet; קַצִּיר a reaper are active. נָשִׂיא a prince (literally, raised above); מְשֻׁחַח anointed (Cf. also II Sam 1 21); בְּתִיחַ beaten are passive.

In Syriac this form is the ordinary passive participle like קָטוּל in Hebrew. There still, however, exists a good number of instances which are active. חֲזִי holding; نَحِي desiring; إِتْم regarding, holding (also passive closed). NÖLDEKE³ quotes several examples. He, however, offers a quite different explanation.

It is needless to mention the well-known fact that an adjective or a participle is frequently used instead of a concrete noun. In English we also say *the blacks, the whites, etc.* Jewish grammarians call such forms תַּאֲרַב בְּחֶסְרוֹן הַמְּתָאֲרַב, an adjective with the omission of the noun which is qualified, or, as we should say, the noun is understood.

LUMSDEN mentions a few rare forms which are used as passive participles. كَعْفُ a fallen-off leaf, ذَبِحٌ sacrificed, إِمَامٌ a prelate, someone placed in front. In Hebrew also we have such forms both active and

¹ See BARTH, *Das passive Qal und seine Participien*.

² *Arabic Grammar*, § 232 Rem. a.

³ *Syriac Grammar*, § 380.

passive. וְלֵד *a child* (Gen 11 30) = וְלֵד (Gen 17 12) = וְלֵד and וְלֵד, respectively. הָלַל *slain, pierced* (cf. Arabic حَلَّ *he pierced*), וְלֵד *a cloud, something that intervenes* (cf. Arabic عَنَّ). The passive נִפְשָׁה נָזַח (Isa 49 7) and the active וְנִרְאָה נִרְאָה (II Rg 9 25) should be regarded, I think, as فَعَالٌ forms. BARTH¹ classifies them among the فَعَالٌ forms which are exceedingly rare as adjectives. To the passive فَعَالٌ I should like to add פְּרוּתֵי (Eze 13 19) *crumbs*.

II.

Thus far for the regular verbs. In the geminate verbs فَاعِلٌ is usually unaugmented in Arabic and Syriac. We have كَالٌ *guiding*, feminine كَالَّةٌ. In Syriac the singular masculine is كَال on the analogy of the *mediae waw*. The feminine is كَالَة, plural masculine كَالِب. For in these two languages a letter may be doubled even after a long *ā*. The fact that the *ī* of the second syllable disappears is no argument against BARTH's view that the origin of this participle is فَعِلٌ and not فَعَلٌ. For as soon as the first vowel becomes lengthened, the second loses its importance as a characteristic vowel and becomes subordinate, and is thus liable to be dropped.

In Hebrew, however, where no *dagesh forte* can follow a long vowel, it was impossible to retain the long vowel and at the same time leave the form unaugmented. Hence, as in most of the other parts of this class of verbs, we find augmented forms with a long vowel in the first syllable, like the regular verbs, existing side by side with unaugmented forms which retain the original short *ā*. Of course the psychological reason — no longer known to us now — which compelled the Semite to lengthen, in the regular verbs, the first vowel and thereby making the usually characteristic second vowel subordinate to it, must have influenced him to adopt the *ā* and not the *ī* as the important vowel. Hence the form became פֶּב and not פִּב. The augmented פֶּבֶב is by far more frequent, because in the living language there was a marked tendency to make the verb appear trilateral. חַי *living, alive*, has frequently a participial force, and, in absence of any other participle of this root, it must be regarded as an unaugmented فَاعِلٌ, although it is sometimes an ordinary adjective. Mediaeval Jewish grammarians give both פֶּב and פֶּבֶב. In our modern grammars פִּב has been omitted entirely, without justification, I think. The reason why this form is ignored is because the

¹ *Nominalbildung*, p. 164.
Zeitschrift f. d. alttest. Wiss. Jahrg. 30. 1910.

majority of the unaugmented forms are adjectives or nouns, like רְבִים *archers* (Jer 50 29, Job 16 13) חָם *warm*, קָל *light*, and as such they can be classified as simple فَعْلُ forms. But in view of the testimony from the cognate languages and of one or two examples in Hebrew itself, this simple unaugmented form should not be lost sight of.

It must be noted here that LAGARDE¹ and BARTH² consider such forms as לוּ, דָּל, צַח, צַר, קָל, רָךְ, קָר, חָם as فَعْلُ, because we find that in Arabic they correspond to كَرِيهُنَّ, كَرِيْبٌ, etc., and in Syriac to ܟܪܝܘܢܐ, ܟܪܝܒܐ, etc. But this view is quite inconsistent with the theory which these two scholars are never tired of emphasising, namely, that the second vowel alone is the characteristic one. We should have expected, accordingly, the forms to be לוּ, דָּל, etc. The reason why the perfect has *ā* is quite different. In the perfect the second vowel was never emphasised as much as in the adjective or noun. It must be remembered that it is the lengthening that makes any particular vowel characteristic, and in the perfect where all vowels are short they must be regarded as of equal importance. לוּ can no more be etymologically identical in form with كَرِيْبٌ and ܟܪܝܒܐ than חָם with חָכִים and ܡܚܡܐ. The fact that one language or dialect adopts one form does not prove anything for another. BARTH himself quotes such examples as קָרוּב *near* = Arabic قَرِيْبٌ = Syriac ܩܪܝܒܐ, and רָחוֹק *far* = Syriac ܪܚܘܩܐ. And these latter forms are moreover identical in their significations, which cannot always be said of the examples דָּל and ܕܠܐ, etc. Moreover ܩܪܝܒܐ and ܩܪܝܒܐ correspond to חָכִים and not to חָם, as is evident from the meaning of these words. It is true that BARTH³ thinks that it is possible, as far as the external appearance is concerned, to classify these forms among the unaugmented or contracted فَعْلُ. But he rejects this hypothesis because the last-named forms are rarely found as adjectives, especially in Hebrew, whereas adjectives like קָל, דָּל are very numerous. One cannot help recognising the weight of this objection. All possibilities, however, have not been exhausted, and it is difficult to see why these adjectives cannot be classified as intransitive فَعْلُ forms belonging to the *ā* imperfect. This class, as a matter of fact, comprises a good number of adjectives, usually intransitive, especially in Hebrew, as for instance לָבָן *white*, קָטָן *small*, סָבָל *foolish*, יָשָׁר *right* and many others. This supposition is in fact made more probable by the circumstances that יָקָל has imperfect יִקַּר and מָר has imperfect יִמַּר.

¹ *Bildung der Nomina*, p. 43.

² *Nominalbildung*, p. 18.

³ *Nominalbildung*, p. 171.

III.

Quite a different fate was shared by the forms *فَعُولٌ* and *فَعِيْلٌ*, transitive and intransitive, belonging to the geminate verbs. Hitherto only augmented forms have been generally recognised. Thus BARTH in treating of these forms always remarks that *ע"ע sind überall aufgelöst*. This is already surprising enough in itself, for most of the modern scholars have adopted the view that the unaugmented forms are more ancient, and that the augmented forms arose out of the tendency to make every root appear trilateral¹. We should therefore expect to find at least some traces of the original forms. In almost all other parts of the verb we find the augmented and the unaugmented forms existing side by side, *לְכַבֵּב* and *לְכַבֵּב*, etc. KAUTZSCH in the latest editions of *Gesenius' Grammar*² asserts that *the augmentation of the stem must always take place whenever the ordinary strong form has an unchangeable vowel in the second syllable* (e. g. *כָּבַב*, *כִּבְּבַב*), or *where the strengthening of the second radical is required by the character of the form*, e. g. *שָׁדַד*, *הִלְלֵל*. The language of this statement is very accurate. We are not told any more that *contraction cannot take place, etc.*, but that *the augmentation must take place, etc.*, for on page 190 of that grammar it is stated that the old view that *כָּב* is contracted from *כִּבְּב* is abandoned. But are these two statements consistent? Are we not to expect to find that ע"ע verbs have developed *فَعُولٌ* and *فَعِيْلٌ* forms according to their own style before the augmentation took place, that is to say, before the trilateral tendency made itself universally felt? Apart from these conjectural speculations, let us examine the facts as they are. As to the infinitive absolute which, according to the commonly-accepted view, must always be augmented, it has been observed already by J. OLSHAUSEN³ that *in an irregular manner* the infinitive absolute is contracted in *לֹא תִקְבְּנוּ* (Num 24 15), *שֶׁל תִּשְׁלוּ* (Rt 9 2), *רֵעָה תִּתְרוּעָעָה* (Isa 24 15). Has KAUTZSCH then quite forgotten that the participle Hiphil has in the ordinary strong verb a long and an unchangeable *i* in the second syllable, *מִקְטִילָה*, *מִקְטִיל*, and yet in the geminate verb it has the unaugmented *מִסְבָּה*, *מִסְבֵּב*. I am aware that to this objection a ready answer may be given, namely, that the *i* of the second syllable in the Hiphil was not originally long, since in Arabic and Syriac it is short, as *مُتَقَبِّلٌ*, *مُتَعَبِّلٌ*. This is, however, no refutation at all, for the *u* and *i* of *فَعُولٌ* and *فَعِيْلٌ* were also originally

¹ See STADE, *Hebräische Grammatik* § 143 a, and many others.

² English translation, p. 181.

³ *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache*, § 245i.

short, as was explained above, and in Hebrew the *i* of מִקְטִיל is not more changeable than that of אָסִיר.

Our next step must be to enquire what shape the *فَعُولٌ* and *فَعِيلٌ* formations would assume in the geminate verb when not augmented. Naturally the *u* or *i* could not be lengthened before a doubled consonant. But it was sufficient to emphasise the importance of the *a* or *i* in the second syllable as a characteristic vowel by retaining it and dropping the *ā* of the first syllable. Thus the unaugmented *فَعُولٌ* בָּב, feminine בָּבָה, etc.; *فَعِيلٌ* becomes בָּב feminine בָּבָה etc. This assumption is borne out by analogy of the other parts of the verb. Whenever the regular verb has a long *i* in the second syllable, as in Hiphil, the geminate verb when unaugmented has — instead of it, as מִסָּב, instead of מִסְבִּיב. There is, in the regular verb, no other *ā* by which we could prove that *ā* becomes — in the geminate verb. But an irrefutable proof is furnished by *mediae waw* verbs. It is well known that the last-named class of verbs is very much akin in its forms to the geminate verb, and whenever there is a long vowel in the former there is a short one with a *dagesh forte* after it in the latter. That short vowel, being liable to be lengthened when it has the accent, and the *dagesh forte* being naturally dropped at the end of the word. Thus the imperfect of קוּם is יְקוּם and that of סָבַב is יִסָּב; the perfect of קוּם is קָם, that of סָבַב is סָב; the perfect Hiphil of קוּם is הִקִּים, that of סָבַב is הִסָּב, feminine הִסָּבָה; participle Hiphil of קוּם is מְקִים, that of סָבַב is מְסָב, feminine מְסָבָה. Now the participial forms *فَعُولٌ* and *فَعِيلٌ* of the *mediae waw* verbs are קוּם and קִים, respectively, as for instance סִיגָה *fenced about* (Cnt 7 3), לוּטָה *wrapped up* (I Sam 21 10), וְשִׁים בְּפִלַעַ קִנְדָה *and thy nest is put in a rock* (Num 24 21). Hence in the geminate verbs they would be סָב and בָּב.

In the literatures we find a good number of forms which could only be properly explained by assuming this principle. Of course formerly all the forms of the type of סָב and בָּב were taken to be *kütl* and *kittl*, respectively. But we shall presently see that many difficulties arose out of this latter assumption. Naturally enough the monosyllabic forms *kütl* and *kittl*, in which the vowels *ü* and *ī*, respectively, are characteristic, would actually have the same appearance as *فَعُولٌ* and *فَعِيلٌ*. But the meaning would at once give us the clue to determine which form was meant in every particular case. Thus we frequently find that one and the same form is *فَعُلٌ* and *فَعِيلٌ* at the same time. حَبٌّ, for instance, signifies *love, friendship* as well as *beloved, a friend*. It is evident that

حَبٌّ in the first instance is a فَعْلٌ form, and in the second it is a فَعِيلٌ, equalling حَبِيْبٌ which is actually in use and is identical with it in signification.

Further on the reader will find a good deal of examples which are fully discussed and explained. For the present it will suffice to mention a few instances which illustrate and, to my mind, conclusively prove the validity of the theory set forth above. In Hebrew חַ (feminine חַיִּי) = *fleece*, that is to say *something shorn off*, from חָטַח *he cut, sheared*. The usual explanation that חַ is a *kīl* form, that is to say, an abstract noun, and that it originally means *a shearing*, hence *fleece*, is rather assuming too much and is quite unnatural. The transition from *a shearing* to *fleece* is hardly conceivable. Whereas if we take חַ to be an augmented فَعِيلٌ with a passive signification all the difficulties disappear. It is true that in the ordinary strong roots we sometimes find forms which only admit of an explanation similar to that of חַ. But in cases where a more natural interpretation is possible we should have no hesitation in adopting it. Moreover *kīl* forms as *nomina agentis* are exceedingly rare. In Hebrew we only have חַיִּי *a wayfarer* (I Sam 12 4). And yet in the geminate verbs forms like חָטַח *a mutterer*² (Isā 19 3) are proportionally of very frequent occurrence. This fact tends to prove that some of the supposed *kīl* and *kīl* forms are really فَعُولٌ and فَعِيلٌ.

It can hardly be considered to be accidental that חַיִּי *thorns* has precisely the same signification as the augmented חַיִּי. In Arabic such instances are exceedingly numerous. Almost every geminate verb has both the augmented and unaugmented forms with an identical signification, as for instance حَبٌّ and حَبِيْبٌ quoted above. This proves indisputably that the two forms existed side by side, the unaugmented form being the older one, but gradually giving way in the living language to the trilateral forms, especially when the participle had something of the verbal character in it, for the verbal forms are more subject to change than the names of substantives. It must at the same time be admitted that in Arabic we find many فَعْلٌ forms having the same meaning as فَعِيلٌ. Thus كَفٌّ *a hand* = *something bent* from كَفَّ *be bent*; كُدٌّ *a heap*, corresponding to Hebrew כָּדָה *a mound*, corresponding to Hebrew כָּדָה. But this is to be attributed to the fact that فَعْلٌ forms of the ordinary verb sometimes also possess a passive sense. Etymologically, however, they have nothing to do with فَعِيلٌ.

² See below under חָטַח.

As real adjectives or participles forms like כב and כב occur now and then in the Old Testament. שן רעה (Prv 25 19) is a very clear instance. The meaning of רעה is very plain. It must necessarily be a *broken tooth*. But what about the form? Several suggestions have been made. Some read רעה bad with LXX¹. Others either emend רעה to רעעה, or consider it to be contracted from that form. This is, however, impossible. For there is no parallel case for such a contraction. Nor is the sense of the active participle suitable here. For this root רעע with the meaning *he broke* is always transitive whenever it occurs in the Old Testament, as for instance ברוזל ברעם בשבט ברזל (ψ 2 9) *Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron*² and ירע בפירים (Job 34 24) *he breaks mighty ones*. The only instance which apparently points to an intransitive sense is ורעי דליותיו (Jer 11 16). But even in this passage ורעי may be transitive and is to be taken as impersonal, *someone will break its branches*. Other scholars think that ורעי belongs to the root רעע *was bad*. רעי וחתו (Isa 8 9) is uncertain. Then on the other hand to render רעה שן a *breaking tooth* with a transitive sense would be against the parallel מוערת רגל a *tottering foot*. The suggestion to take רעה as an active participle of רעה *he tended, fed* hardly deserves consideration.

In face of all these unsurmountable difficulties the most natural and only possible explanation is to take רעה to be an unaugmented ^ופְּעוּל, that is to say, the ordinary passive participle in Hebrew, and it would then = רעועה. This explanation renders unnecessary the suggestion of FRANKENBERG, followed by TOY³, to read נרעה, נ having fallen out after ן. It should be observed that RASHI without offering any explanation as to the form remarks that רעה = רעועה, apparently guessing from the context.

This unaugmented form of the participle is even found to possess something of the verbal character, in at least one passage of the Old Testament. In IRg 12 15 we read the following:—ולא שמע המלך אל העם כי היתה סבה מעם יהוה למען הקים את דברו אשר דבר יהוה ביד אהיה השלוני אליהם בנגבם. The word סבה in this simple verse has caused some difficulty to commentators. That סבב = *he occasioned, brought about* is beyond doubt. Arabic سَبَّب (second conjugation of سَبَّ = *he occasioned, brought about*). So also in Rabbinical Hebrew. In Biblical

¹ ὁδός κακοῦ is obviously corrupted from ὁδός κακός.

² The parallel clause ככלי יצר תפצם like the potter's vessel wilt thou shatter them proves that this reading is to be preferred to that of the Versions which read תרעם thou wilt tend them.

³ נרעה in Toy's *Proverbs* is certainly a misprint.

Hebrew we also find this meaning. אֲנִיכִי סַבְתִּי בְּכָל-נַפְשׁ בֵּית אָבִיךָ (I Sam 22 22) literally, *I have been the cause, or, occasioned, in all the souls of the house of thy father*, i. e. *I have brought about their death*. That the reading of MT is correct is made sufficiently certain by LXX which reads ἐγὼ εἶμι αἴτιος τῶν ψυχῶν οὐκου τοῦ πατρὸς σοῦ. Peshitta's reading اللّاحه is clearly a paraphrase. In Hebrew this use of נָפֶשׁ is purely idiomatic, as בְּנַפְשׁוֹ דָּבַר אֲדֹנָיָהוּ אֶת-הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה (I Rg 2 23) *Adonijah spoke this word at the risk of his life*, literally, *at his soul*, בְּ being ב pretii (See BURNEY *ad locum*). But in Syriac a literal translation of סַבְתִּי בְּנַפְשׁ would not convey the right idea to the reader, and it was therefore necessary to paraphrase the expression slightly. Hence there is no justification for the suggestion put forth by THENIUS, followed by many scholars including DRIVER, to read חָבִיתִי *I am guilty*.

Now as to the form of סָבָה it has usually been taken to be a فَعَّلَ = סָבָה, that is to say, an abstract noun. DRIVER, in his *Notes* to I Sam 22 22, renders it *there was a bringing about from Fahrweh*. BURNEY assigns to it the meaning of *Providence* which can scarcely be derived from סָבָה. The *Oxford Gesenius Lexicon* translates it by *a turn of affairs*. None of these explanations, however, even if we should consider some of them admissible as far as the word itself goes, relieves the above passage from its awkwardness. Hebrew syntax would require the definite article to be affixed to סָבָה. For let us substitute such a word as דָּבַר for סָבָה, and the cogency of this augment would become apparent. The difficulty is still more enhanced by the parallel passage in 2 Chr 10 15, where we find נִסְבָּה instead of סָבָה. Now נִסְבָּה is evidently Niph'al participle, and one is hardly justified in taking it as a substantive.

All these difficulties would be removed if we were to take סָבָה to be a passive participle, that is to say, an unaugmented فَعِيلٌ = סָבָה. The translation of the verse would then be *And the king did not listen to the people for it was occasioned, or, brought about by Fahrweh, in order, etc.* By the author of the Books of Kings, who lived in the classical period of the Hebrew language, such a form as סָבָה as passive participle was considered quite legitimate and intelligible. But not so by the compiler of the Books of Chronicles, whose style is already decadent and who belongs to a much later period, when the augmented فَعُولٌ as a passive participle has entirely stamped out the older and more original forms. This compiler had therefore to alter סָבָה to the Niph'al participle, for at that period that conjugation has usurped the place of the passive

of Qal. This explanation of קָבַהּ is somewhat supported by Targum which renders it by פְּלוּגְתָא *decided, decreed*, literally, *divided*, which is also the old Aramaic passive participle.

The construction of הִיָּתָה קָבַהּ מֵעַם (II Sam 13 32) *By the command of Ab-salom it was fixed*. There can be no doubt that שִׁמָּה or שׁוּמָה is a passive participle of שׁוּם or שִׁים. The words עַל־פִּי² exclude, I think, the conjecture of EWALD to take שִׁמָּה to mean a *scowl*, comparing it with Arabic شَمَّ *he was unlucky, unfortunate*.

IV.

It appears also probable that even the Rabbins were more or less conscious of the possibility of such unaugmented passive participles. In *Baba Kamma (Babli)* 10^b (last line) the following *Baraitha* is quoted: אִם טָרַף וְטָרַף וְיָבִיאוּהוּ עֵדִים יָבִיאוּ עֵדִים שֶׁנִּטְרַפָּה בְּאוֹנָם וּפְטוּר אָבָא שְׂאוּל אוֹמֵר יָבִיאוּ עֵדוּתָא לְבֵית־דִּין The anonymous opinion about Ex 22 12 is that it means *he should bring witnesses that the animal was torn accidentally and should not be required to pay*, whereas Aba Saul thinks it means *he should bring the torn animal to the Court of Justice*. It must be stated that there are various readings of this *Baraitha*. The one quoted here is that of RASHI. *Tosephoth* reads אֲרוּרָה *the cursed one*, and explains that the torn animal is called *cursed* because *it perished without a benediction*, for according to the Jewish rite a benediction is to be pronounced before slaughtering an animal. This fanciful reading, of course, hardly deserves any consideration. Other readings are עֲדוּרָה *the one which is missing*, quoted by *Tosephoth*; אֲדוּרָה *its skin*, supposed to be connected with Greek δορά, is given by 'Aruch; עֲרָה עוּרָה (two separate words) *till*, or *to its skin* is a modern conjecture. An unbiased reader of this *Baraitha*, however, will have no difficulty in concluding that the Rabbins aimed at explaining the word עֲרָה, and therefore the reading of RASHI is the correct one, for all the other words cannot possibly be connected with עֲרָה. Thus the opponents of Aba Saul take עֲרָה here to be the usual word for *witness*. Aba Saul, however, probably felt the difficulty of the suffix יָבִיאוּהוּ if we take עֲרָה to be *a witness*. For although we find a suffix anticipating the object as וַתִּרְאוּהוּ אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד (Ex 2 6), literally, *and she saw him, the child*, this construction occurs only in the case when the object has the definite article or is otherwise determined. He therefore suggests

¹ Kthib. שִׁמָּה, Qrē שׁוּמָה.

² Cf. Gen 45 21. Num 3 39, etc.

³ Ex 22 12.

to take עָר to equal עֲרֹדָה, that is to say, it should be taken to be an unaugmented فَعِيلٌ with a passive signification. Here again, as is the case of סָבָה, it was necessary to translate עָר to עֲרֹדָה in order that it might be understood. According to this interpretation the suffix וּיִאָּחֶזֶק refers to the animal which is also the subject of יִטְרַף.

Whether the root עָרָר *he tore, devoured*, is to be recognised in Hebrew or not, is a matter open to discussion. RASHI in support of his reading עֲרֹדָה remarks in the name of his teacher that עָר is to be connected with עָר יִאָּכַל עָר בְּבֹקֶר (Gen 49 27) *in the morning he devours prey*, where עָר is parallel to שָׁלַל. Of course עָר with the meaning of *booty, prey* occurs several times in the Old Testament. Modern lexicographers, however, derive עָר from a root עָרָה, and connect it with Arabic عَدَا *he passed by, ran, rushed in*. Cf. also عَدُوٌّ *an enemy*. But the omission of ה in itself, though probable, is sufficient to excite suspicion. Nor can one easily follow the derivation of a word which signifies *booty, prey* from a root which denotes *he passed by*. It is therefore preferable to assume the existence of a root עָרָר *he tore*, and connect it with Arabic عَدَّى *be diminished, impaired, or made him lose*. The fact that Hebrew ט usually corresponds to Arabic ط is no weighty objection to this view, for we find that sometimes ט = ט, as for instance قَنَّعْدُ = קָפוּד; הָלַל *was poor, weak, brought low* = Arabic دَلَّ. The suggestion to connect הָלַל with Arabic دَلَّ *he guided, directed*, which suggestion is adopted by *Oxford Gesenius Lexicon*, is on the face of it quite improbable.

For a fuller discussion of Ex 22 12 and of the other meanings of עָרָר see below under this root.

Starting from this point of view, we may find it interesting to examine in detail all forms like סָבָה, סָבָה, סָבָה, and see what light can be thrown on the meaning of some passages or words in the Old Testament, by classifying them, according to their signification, among *kītl* and *kūtīl* or *kätīl* and *kätül* forms. I have excluded forms like סָבָה, since these have already been recognised as participles by mediaeval grammarians, and as adjectives by modern ones.

I have arranged the roots alphabetically on account of the convenience of such an arrangement, in spite of its monotony.

¹ קָפוּד also occurs.

[To be continued.]