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PREFACE.

The appearance of the works of R. Jehuda Hayyug, or; as he is termed in Arabic, Abu Zakariyya Yahya ben Dafid, at the end of the tenth century of the Christian era, formed a remarkable epoch in the history of Jewish grammar, although he was not by any means the first who devoted himself to the subject. Others before him had directed their attention to it, and with not unimportant results. The study of it had in all probability become general in Jewish schools about the third century of the Hegira, when Arabic literature was beginning to be widely known, and its language to take the place of Aramaean among Jewish communities. The Karaites also, a sect which arose about 750 A. D., had paid considerable attention to grammar, it being necessary for them in support of their doctrines to submit Biblical texts to a close analysis and thus escape from the traditional interpretations of their antagonists the Talmudists. Their voluminous commentaries, of which a certain portion has descended to us, contained many grammatical notes; those of the tenth century make reference to earlier writers whom they expressly term "grammarians". The assertion therefore of Aben Ezra, that the Ghon Saadia al-Fayumi, who died A. D. 942, was the first Jewish grammarian, cannot be considered as borne out by facts.

To a still earlier period, the beginning of the sixth century, may be assigned a work of great importance and closely connected with the subject of grammar; it was at this time in all
probability that the שֶׁכֵּס, or proper pronunciation of the Old Testament Scriptures, was ascertained and definitely fixed by the invention of the system of vowel-points. But this, though of the greatest value and interest for scholars, can perhaps hardly be considered as the result of a scientific study of grammar on the part of its authors; it is more probable that their only guide was the traditional pronunciation employed in the public readings of the synagogue.

The names of the earliest grammarians which have come down to us are contained in Aben Ezra's preface to his Moznaim. Mention is here made by him of five writers, besides Saadia, anterior to Hayug, viz. a certain anonymous author of Jerusalem, Adonim ben Tamim, Jehuda ben Koreish, Menahem ben Seruk and Dunash ben Labrat; and to them we may add Sahel ben Mattali, Jeshua ben Jehuda, Jephesh ben 'Ali and David ben Abraham. Their labours were not entirely fruitless. A certain amount of progress was made by them in the interpretation of sundry words and formations, but they could give no exact account of the nature of roots nor of very many essential forms of verbs and nouns, for the reason that they were entirely ignorant of the rules by which the permutation, suppression, and assimilation of the feeble consonants בָּלָה are governed. The result was that they confounded totally different roots, and in some instances made them to consist of two or even one letter only. This fact is the more remarkable as the knowledge of Arabic was then becoming widely diffused, and was not without its influence in suggesting sounder views of Hebrew grammar. Still, many of the Jewish doctors considered the study of Arabic grammar as a mere waste of the time which might more profitably be spent in religious studies; their only idea was, to take the Masoretic punctuation as their basis, and devote all their skill and labour to an explanation of the text of the Old Testament Scriptures by a comparison of one part with another. Of all the writers mentioned above, ben Labrat alone seems to have had any definite theory on the subject of consonantal changes. The explanations of David ben Abraham shew scarcely any advance on the results attained by his predecessors. According to him, the true radical will always be seen in spite of all modifications that a word may undergo; such letters as appear at one time, and disappear at another are additions, and do not belong to the true root; the genuine servile also is always employed, whenever the same modification of a word is intended.

From these remarks it may be seen what an important influence upon a right understanding of the principles of Hebrew grammar must have been exerted by the works of Hayug, based as they were upon the now generally accepted theory that all Hebrew verbs are derived from triliteral roots. Hence he is justly termed by Aben Ezra the "first of grammarians". Of his life but few particulars are known; he is stated to have been born at Fez, and to have resided for some time at Cordova, where he became teacher to the eminent grammarian Samuel ha-Naghid, and also acquired repute in the practice of medicine. His works at one time eclipsed the efforts of all former grammatical writers, and first afforded a sound basis on which the edifice of Hebrew grammar and lexicography was reared by later hands. Still further progress was made by his somewhat younger contemporary and rival in eminence, himself also a physician of Cordova, R. Jona, or, as he is termed in Arabic, Abuwalid Merwan. Born about 900 A. D. he early devoted himself to grammatical studies, criticised 1 and amended the new doctrines of Hayug, enlarged and completed the details of his subject, and, collecting all the results attained by previous en-

1 Quoted in Ewald and Dukes' Beiträge zur Geschichte der ältesten Auslegung des A. T., Stuttgart, 1844; vol. II. p. 2. To this work I should express my obligations for much valuable information, also to the article on Abu'l Walid Merwan by M. Munk in the Journal Asiatique for 1850, and to that by M. Neubauer on Hebrew lexicography in the same periodical for 1851. 2

2 This was done by David ben Abraham.

1 M. Degenbourg of Paris promises us an edition of his al-Mustalikh and three other tracts in the course of a few months.
quirers, succeeded in producing works of such merit that in many respects they have not been since superseded by all the efforts of modern investigation.

The first two grammatical treatises published in this volume have been twice translated into Hebrew, first by Moses Gikatilla of Cordova, at the close of the eleventh century, and a little later by Aben Ezra. The Arabic originals exist only in MSS.; a transcript of the Bodleian copy has been for some years in the hands of Prof. Magnus of Breslau, but has not yet made its appearance in print. The translation by Aben Ezra was published in 1844 by M. Dukes 1 from the defective Munich MS., that of Gikatilla, rendered more interesting by the additions 2 of the translator, has remained till now unedited. Its appearance at the present time is due to the resolution arrived at by the Curators of the Clarendon Press to publish the lexicon of R. Jonas from the unique and very valuable Arabic original preserved in the Bodleian under the superintendence of M. Neubauer. As frequent references occur in the latter to the two treatises in question, it became necessary either to publish them separately, or by quotations from them encumber the pages of the lexicon; accordingly I undertook to publish Jâyug's work from a MS. in the Bodleian 3. While engaged in the task I was fortunate enough to meet with another 4 MS., which, though not so full

1 In his Beiträge mentioned above. 2 To point out no further defects, there is a lacuna between ą22 and ą23 filled by 32 verbs in the present edition.

These are enclosed in square brackets in the text and translation.

3 Hunt, 198, in general a carefully written MS. on parchment, in Byzantine character, with double columns, dated early in the 14th century. It also contains Aben Ezra's Ta'aloth and Mozmain. It is quoted in the notes as "L."

4 Now numbered Opp. Add. Ms. Quo. 90; the transcript of a MS. in the possession of M. de la Torre, professor in the rabbinical school at Padua; it formerly belonged to the late professor S. D. Luzzatto of the same city; it is written on paper in ordinary rabbinical hand, and is quoted in the notes as "L."

as the former, yet was of great service in correcting its errors, and in one case supplied a whole chapter which had been omitted by a mistake of the copyist. M. Neubauer also kindly placed at my disposal his collation of the Paris MS. of Gikatilla, which he had made some years previously with a view to its publication 4. The two Oxford MSS. I have compared throughout and noticed any important variations at the foot of the page; but, where the sense was clear and not affected by the various reading, I have not always thought it necessary, (engaged as I was in the publication of a translation, of which the original was at hand to fix the author's meaning), to encumber my work with a crowd of unimportant collations, which would have increased neither its interest nor utility to students.

The quotations of Jâyug from the Old Testament are not always made with care; he evidently trusted to his memory and consequently often cites incorrectly; sometimes the exact expression he employs does not occur, sometimes he confounds two separate passages together: in all such cases that I have observed I have either restored the original, or called attention to the mistake in a note.

My translation does not profess to be literal. At the outset I had intended to make it so, but soon found that it would be impossible to produce one of such a kind, which would at the same time be acceptable or of value to English readers. The reason of this is, that the style of the original is often exceedingly prolix and involved; for instance, a rule is given at full length, with an abundance of words, then some examples alleged, and finally the rule stated over again with elaborate and wearisome minuteness; it was therefore, as I found, absolutely necessary for the sake of clearness to abbreviate considerably.
My endeavour however throughout has been to omit no new statement, but only to avoid repetition; the translation will therefore, as I hope, though it does not render word for word, be found on examination to express faithfully the sense of the author.

There is another Ms. 1 in the Bodleian, which contains a great part of the work of Hayyug in a translation by R. Isaac ha-Levi ben Eleazar entitled רש ייער השכינה. After a dedication of the work to his pupil Aaron ben Abraham, the author announces his intention of combining the two treatises of Hayyug with the criticisms thereupon of R. Jonas contained in his מהדורה, that is, "annotations" or "objections". He then proceeds, to divide verbs into eight conjugations (בנית), the last of which, as an unusual one, he does not specify by name. Of the other seven, three are original forms (אבות), viz. the Kal, Hiphil and Piel; four are derived (ת qualità), the Niphal, Hophal, Paul and Hithpael; he employs the same expressions for these as Kishni. After further illustrations of them, and of the method in which the preterite and other parts of the verb are formed, he proceeds to explain the modifications which the feeble letters ת and י undergo by quiescence (noon), prolongation (בשם), or of a vowel as well (ת שם), daghesh; and omission (ת שם). I append the latter part of the preface as a specimen of his style:

אלה הם ה排行yen תוספיות שכתובות על שמה של ה排行yen.WARD, לא. הזנקים

היוו הרוחות והתרוממות והנשאים של החכמה. זה היה השם: והא פתים אשתות

אלה הם ה排行yen תוספיות שכתובות על שמה של ה排行yen.WARD, לא. הזנקים

היוו הרוחות והתרוממות והנשאים של החכמה. זה היה השם: והא פתים אשתות

As the Bodleian also possesses a 3 Ms. of the translation made by Aben Ezra of Hayyug's treatise on Punctuation (נִלְפָּה), with the additions of Gilatilla, I have added this to his other two tracts, printing with it the original Arabic text. To the kindness of M. Rabbinovicius of Munich, I am indebted for a collation of the Ms., 3 belonging to the royal library there: as however this had been already published, 3 I thought it desirable to follow the

1 Hunt. 477, a well-written Ms., on paper, in Syrnic rabbinical character, apparently of about the 14th century. The work is mentioned by M. Dukes in his notices of the עיון by the same author in the Literaturblatt des Orients, VII. 705, he had however never met with a copy; attention was first called to this Ms. by M. Neubauer in the Journal Asiat. vol. 20, (1862) p. 250. As it is specially connected with my subject, I have thought it worthy of a longer notice.

2 Mich. 279, a somewhat carelessly written Ms. on paper, in an Italian rabbinic hand, apparently of the sixteenth century. It is quoted as "O."

3 Quoted as "M."

4 By M. Dukes in his Beiträge.
Oxford text except in passages where it had manifestly been corrupted by the carelessness of the copyist. My translation ceases with the work of Hayyug, at the bottom of page 126; the remaining six pages I did not think it worth while to render into English, as they form a fragment which does not properly belong to the treatise; thus, a third part of page 127 is copied word for word from Ben Balaam, the chapter on the quiescence and motion of letters at page 131 is to be found at page 4 of Hayyug's first treatise. It was difficult also to identify some of the names borne by the accents; and the examples quoted did not bear out the rules, as the author appears to have followed a text accentuated differently from that at present in use.

I had hoped to have brought out a work of greater interest than this, viz. Gikatilla's own translation of the Ḥocma, which, from the description given in De Rossi's catalogue, I supposed was to be found in the royal library at Parma. This however on enquiry proved to be a mistake. The treatise in question, three copies of which are preserved in the library, is not that of Hayyug, but of an anonymous author of the 13th or 14th century, who, like Isaac ha-Levi before described, combines for his purpose the information afforded by several previous writers; he mentions by name Hayyug, Ibn Gânaḥ, Aben Ezra, Samuel Naqdân, Rashi, and Moses Rofé. Thanks to the courtesy of the Abbé Perreau, librarian at Parma, who with great kindness himself copied and collated the MSS. for me, I am enabled to give the following specimen of his style.

The treatise commences thus:

[Translation of passage in Hebrew]

The rest of the treatise is devoted to an explanation of the eight heads into which he has thus divided it. It is a work of some interest, but not so closely connected with my subject as to render it worth while to print it at length in this volume.

I must not conclude without expressing my thanks to M. Neubauer for the interest he has taken in this my first attempt in the field of Oriental literature, and for the advice he has always been ready to give me in difficulties. To him also I am indebted for the brackets which distinguish the original from the additions made by the translator, and for the transcription of the Arabic text of the Ḥocma.
This is a book composed by a man of intelligence and learning, acquainted with Jewish grammar and understanding Hebrew logic; hereafter shall his name and that of his father be famous, and at the end of all things shall he be celebrated as the head of philosophers and of those who understand the properties of the Hebrew language. Yet forasmuch as a strange people bears rule over us, and we are swallowed up among nations of a deep speech and of a hard language, and lions have scattered the dispersed sheep of Israel till the day when the judgment shall be set and the books opened; and forasmuch as the language of the sanctuary is lost among the languages of the world, and they who speak them are numerous as the sand, while we are left but few out of many, and the wisdom of our wise men has perished and the prudence of our prudent ones is hidden; and forasmuch as no one is left from whom we may learn the properties of the language, and none remaining from whom we may acquire all its meanings, but only what we may understand from the materials afforded in the holy Scriptures, and learn from the prophetic books; — though that is but a small portion of the whole, inasmuch as the prophets did not come to employ the language in its full extent, but only so far as they required for their prophecy and vision. For these reasons therefore Jewish grammarians were obliged to compose their works in Arabic, this being current in the mouth of a
The son of R. Samuel ha-Kohen (Paradise be his rest!), the city of Cordova, to translate for him this book into Hebrew, and this accordingly have I done.

I will begin my work by saying, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting to everlasting: He is the living God and eternal King; immortal, while all living beside Him shall die; wise, without folly, whereas all wise except Him are fools; strong, without weakness, while all strong beside Him are weak; He giveth wisdom unto the wise and knowledge to them that know understanding; He revealeth the deep and secret things, He knoweth what is in the darkness and the light dwelleth with Him. But where shall wisdom be found, seeing it is hid from the eyes of all living? Though a man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it. Yet for all this should he not refuse to learn and to instruct, or cease to enlighten himself and others according to his ability, the extent of his strength, and the reach of his hand. For from the Lord is the answer of the tongue: the Lord giveth wisdom, out of His mouth cometh knowledge and understanding." And in His great Name will I, Moses ha-Kohen, begin the translation of this book. Thus commences our author in praising the Lord his lord and giving glory to God that owned him:

"Praise be to God: to Him praise is due. He was without beginning and shall be without end, Creator and Ruler of the world: He decrees a thing and it is established unto Him. He made man by His power, noble in form, excellent in understanding, with good qualities did He endow him, and with mercy require him: I will exalt Him, for highly is He exalted, and His name more holy than all that is holy: I will offer Him praise that shall gain His approval, and so shall an increase of His goodness be returned to me: I will ask that I may be enlightened and enlighten others, that I may understand and teach."

Thus says Jehuda son of David; my wish in this book is to gain knowledge and understanding with regard to the latent and lengthening letters of the Hebrew language, and to explain their ways, for their secrets are hidden from

---

1 France. 2 The Christians. 3 Ez. 23, 6. 4 حرط الإبي. 5 إبراهيم. 6 إبراهيم.
many of the sons of men: manifold is their origin, wide their meaning, deep their mysteries, so that men know not the properties of the verbs which contain them. Many persons accordingly employ such in their sayings and verses in an improper way. Thus one man says in a certain part, 'Behold man was found, was known before he was created, and sanctified before he was formed.' He thought that was derived from עשה, and knew not that it should come from יעש, according to like היעש fromעש. Again he says, 'what occasion have the sons of Pirahah to adorn themselves with bracelets and earrings?' He fancied that פרש came from תרש (Ez. 23. 40), and did not understand that, this last corresponding to פרש, the infinitive should be פירש like תרש, and not פירש like תרש. Another states that in the word פרש (1 Sam. 28. 24) there is no radical but ה, not remarking the כ before it, which stands for the כ of כרש. Another, that the radicals in כרש are ה and כ only, not knowing that the כ heard in כרש (Ez. 37. 11) and כרש (Gen. 8. 14) becomes silent כ in כרש. Or again, that the only radicals in כרש are כ and כ, or in כרש only כ, or in כרש only כ. But if in all these there are but two radicals, and in כרש only כ, then you may from כרש form כרש without כ, if this does not stand in the place of כ. Or again from כרש form כרש, like כרש, כרש, or כרש, like כרש. And if כ, כ like כ, consists of two letters only, you may say כ, כ, like כ, כ, or כ, כ, like כ, כ, or כ, כ like כ, כ. Or again from כרש either כ, כ, or כ, כ, ח or כ, כ, ח, or כ, כ like כ, כ, ח. Then would the structure of the language be destroyed, its walls thrown down, and all its boundaries rooted up. For a verb with a weak letter for its first radical would exchange it for one in the second or third place; one having such for its second radical will take it in the first or third place, or in the first or second instead of the third. Then, when I saw this confusion occurring in these letters, I with the help of the Lord,

1 Menahem ben Sorak, Dalke. composed this book, in which I have explained all their secrets, and mentioned the occasions when they fall out, are changed, or hardened by dagesh; after stating why they are called latent and lengthening letters and also every thing else bearing on the subject. In all this my purpose is to argue from what is contained in Scripture to what is not contained therein. Thus, when I find only part of a conjugation and not the rest of it, I am guided by what is found to that which is not, if only my statements are convincing; and it is not possible to confront me with plain proofs and credible testimony. I have moreover collected together from the whole of Scripture all the verbs containing these letters as radicals, arranging them in their proper order, like with like, to carry out my scheme of explanation; in so doing I trust with God's help to make myself useful. I have had no wish in all this to use choice language foreign to my subject; my only desire has been to make my purpose clear, to express my thoughts in suitable words which should bring out the full meaning of the author. The reader will per chance judge me gently and kindly in this and also in any error or mistake he may himself find, or that may be revealed to him by the will of heaven. It is moreover the duty of us who desire to write in the holy tongue and to know its ways, to acquire it from the works of the early Hebrews, who were born in it, grew up in its ways, and established its boundaries; especially should we imitate the language of vision and prophecy. By so doing our language will be built upon its foundation, stand upon its base, and grow out of its roots; we shall learn what we were ignorant of; and receive profit in that with which we were acquainted.

I have divided my work into three parts; the first contains the preliminary statements and explanations I have been compelled or have thought fit to make on latent and lengthening letters before describing the various conjugations and uses of verbs; it treats also of verbs whose first radical, corresponding to the כ of כרש, is a latent letter, either כ or כ.
On the motion and rest of letters.

Before giving an account of the latent and lengthening letters I will explain what is meant by being in motion and at rest. I define therefore a letter in motion to be one employed with one of the seven vowels called kings, viz., kamets, pathal, tseri, seghol, birik, holom, shurek; a letter at rest is one which is not set in motion (pronounced) with one of these. Did I not fear to be tedious, and that it would not be in accordance with the design of my book, I should have clearly explained the general use of these vowels and the position of kamets and pathal. So much however I say, that the Hebrews never begin their words with a vowel-less letter, nor end them with one having a vowel, and that a vowel-less letter is never found except after one having a vowel. For every sh'va beginning a word is pronounced, although in various ways. Some are pronounced like the vowel of the following letter, if this be s, m or y: should one of these follow with pathal, then sh'va will be like pathal; if with shurek, like shurek; with birik, like birik. For instance in רמא (Pr. 29. 3), appears to have pathal because s has it; in רמא, t has tseri because s has it; so in ירש (Jos. 3. 12), p has shurek; in ירש (Is. 47. 2), birik; the same with יריעה (Pr. 24. 14), in מית (Lam. 3. 45), v. This rule however does not apply to sh'va before kamets, [for no one will read the v of ירש with it but with pathal], for instance in אקיע, etc. sh'va is pronounced like pathal as being easier. Again, some sh'vas are pronounced like birik, this is when w follows with any one of the seven kings for its vowel, as for instance in יריעא יבכש (Ex. 9. 35), יריעא (11. 8), יריעא (14. 4), etc. (1 Sam. 17. 46), מונא היי (2 Chr. 8. 13). Sh'va not followed by יאול or אול always takes pathal, like יאול, יאול etc.; except in the plurals of those words whose singulars begin with holom, this is changed to kamets хатуш, as אֶתָו from אֶתָו, אֶתָו from אֶתָו, אֶתָו from אֶתָו (Pr. 30. 19) etc. (1 Kgs. 10. 11) for יאול, אֶתָו (Gen. 16. 13) for יאול accented on the penultimate: the same with יאול (Deut. 29. 23), יאול (Ps. 83. 2), both of which should have holom like יא (Job. 30. 27). Sh'va at the beginning of words under s, m, n, or y is not pronounced like the vowel of the following letter; if this last be not one of these four, but in various ways: sometimes with хатуш pathal, as אֶתָו, אֶתָו; sometimes with хатуш seghol, as אֶתָו, אֶתָו; sometimes with хатуш kamets as רמא; the гаъa standing with sh'va at the beginning of the word will remind you of all I have said. I say moreover that the Hebrews do not join together two quiescent sh'vas in the middle of a word, but only at its end, when the sentence is finished: when therefore two sh'vas meet in the middle or end of a word the first is quiescent and the second pronounced, according to the rule I have given for sh'va at the beginning of a word; thus in יושב, יושב, א, יושב א has no vowel, א. You will however pronounce the s of יושב with pathal, and that of א with shurek on account of the y following. So also in יושב, יושב, א and א have no vowel, א and א birik on account of א. Again in יושב (Gen. 45. 15), יושב (Pr. 30. 6), יושב (Gen. 9. 27), יושב (Job. 31. 27),
On latent and lengthening letters.

These are three in number, א, י, ו, and are divided into two classes, according as they are more or less clearly pronounced. In the first, there is a distinct and marked vocalisation, and a distinct and marked quiescence, as in all the other letters; in the second, the quiescence is not marked: these letters therefore differ from all others in being quiescent in two ways. Instances of the first kind are, the א in קָנֶה (Ps. 89. 16), בּרָאָרֶשֶׁ (Ex. 14. 6), which takes quiescent sh'va and not one of the seven kings; it is pronounced deep in the throat; again the י in רֹאשׁ (Job. 3. 20), רְאֶמֶשׁ (Jer. 15. 10), pronounced by closing the lips; again the ו in רָבָד, רָבָד, coming from the gullet; instances of the latter kind which is not pronounced at all are, the א in קָנֶה (Hos. 10. 14), אָרֶשֶׁ (Num. 12. 13), the י in קָשָׁר, כָּשָׁר, or the ו of רֹאשׁ, רֹאשׁ, רֹאשׁ, וֹאָשׁ. From this second class the name of "latent" letters is derived: they belong to and are thrown upon the preceding letter with its vowel. They are called "lengthening" letters because they are added to the roots of words to prolong the vowels and do not belong to the original form, as the י of בּוֹשַׁה and בּוֹשַׁה, [the radicals in these being ב, ב, י, and י, י, appearing in רֹאשׁ (Is. 29. 9) and רֹאשׁ (2 Sam. 11. 23),] the י is dropped as not being part of the root: so with the י of רֹאשׁ, רֹאשׁ, רֹאשׁ, and their quiescent latents in past tenses as רֹאשׁ, רֹאשׁ, רֹאשׁ, and their corresponding nouns: for between the first and second letters of רֹאשׁ and רֹאשׁ there are quiescent latents, which, though not written, are pronounced by lengthening kāmet: they and their derivatives should be written with א, as רֹאשׁ is all through the Bible or רֹאשׁ (2 Sam. 11. 2). A general rule by which to know whether one of these letters is a radical or added for prolongation or any other cause is this: should you find a word possessed of three letters for radicals, then consider this to have been added; if there be not three besides, then let this supply the deficiency: thus in רֹאשׁ (Deut. 12. 28), י is not a radical, there being already three, but in רֹאשׁ (Num. 23. 18) it is the second radical, corresponding to the י of רֹאשׁ, and appears as י in יִפְשַׁר (Esth. 9. 32). Know also that י too is a quiescent latent, but only at the end of words and when in the place of א, this latter being quiescent at the end of very many words; it is never so in the middle of words, as are א, י, ו. Should any one object that the י of יָשָׁר in its different forms is latent and quiescent, for instance between the א and י in יָשָׁר (Jud. 4. 9), which might have been יָשָׁר, or between the י and י of יָשָׁר (Jer. 37. 9): we shall reply that יָשָׁר, יָשָׁר, יָשָׁר may be two roots, י being that of יָשָׁר, יָשָׁר, as י is of יָשָׁר, יָשָׁר, and that the Hebrews use them indiscriminately, their meaning and pronunciation being identical. Know also that for convenience the Hebrews allow quiescent to be omitted in writing, trusting that they will be audibly pronounced in reading: thus יָשָׁר etc. are written with and without י, יָשָׁר with and without י, to shew that each is correct, so with the י of יְשׁוּר, יְשׁוּר, יְשׁוּר, and the י of יְשׁוּר, יְשׁוּר, יְשׁוּר. In conclusion, when we find a word containing one of these letters written sometimes full and sometimes defectively, we shall understand that this is in accordance with custom. Understand moreover that words like יָשָׁר, יָשָׁר, יָשָׁר, יָשָׁר, ending in א or י with kāmet should
have נī following, and there are some examples of it: the same also with those ending in ג or ד with kamets, as דמר, גמר etc.; all ending in ה with kamets as הים etc. should take נ or ה after it: one word indeed is found with נ following ה, viz. אֶנֶּה (Ex. 41. 15.), but this is unusual.

On the absorption of a latent quiescent in the following letter.

The Hebrews are accustomed to absorb a latent quiescent in the following letter which accordingly receives dagesh: in the middle of words this does not often occur in the Bible: an example is דאֶנֶּה (Is. 44. 3), with dagesh in ח as having absorbed נ, this word being from the same root as יָשַׁה (Lev. 2. 6): sq. יָשַׁה (Ps. 74. 17), יָשַׁה (Jer. 5. 20), from יָשַׁה (Ex. 34. 5); יָשַׁה (Jer. 49. 20) from יָשַׁה (Ex. 6. 6); יָשַׁה (Jer. 1. 5) from יָשַׁה. Numerous examples however are found of latent quiescents being absorbed at the end of words, when the beginning of the next word is closely united to them, so that two words in writing become one in sound: for instance אֶנֶּה (Gen. 19. 14), with dagesh in ח as having absorbed נ, so that אֶנֶּה (Jos. 17. 14), אֶנֶּה (Deut. 11. 11), אֶנֶּה (Ex. 25. 29), אֶנֶּה (Gen. 43. 15), אֶנֶּה (Deut. 16. 1), אֶנֶּה (Pr. 31. 2), אֶנֶּה (Gen. 44. 18), אֶנֶּה (2 Kgs. 1. 5), אֶנֶּה (2 Kgs. 5. 1), אֶנֶּה (Ex. 4. 2), אֶנֶּה (Is. 3. 15), without נ as being absorbed in נ and ג; the two words are made one both in reading and writing: the latent quiescent is thus treated as if it had been in the middle of a word, for in such a case it often is not written.

On נָהֲלוּ followed by latent נָהֲלוּ.

Understand that the letters נ and נָהֲלוּ are employed in Hebrew in two ways, with or without dagesh: in the first case they are called „heavy“ and in the second „light“: the former being found both heavy and light, but the latter always light: instances of the very heavy with unmistakeable dagesh are דָּרָשׁ (Deut. 28. 66), דָּרָשׁ (Ex. 21. 19), דָּרָשׁ (Gen. 15. 10), דָּרָשׁ (Ex. 6. 18), דָּרָשׁ (45. 14), דָּרָשׁ (Pr. 31. 2), דָּרָשׁ (1 Sam. 20. 4), דָּרָשׁ (Gen. 43. 15). The following, at the beginning of syllables, are light though belonging to the class of heavy ones, דָּרָשׁ (Gen. 1. 1), דָּרָשׁ (Pr. 19. 19), דָּרָשׁ (Ex. 10. 6), דָּרָשׁ (Is. 10. 9), דָּרָשׁ (Ex. 17. 10), דָּרָשׁ (Ex. 14. 18), דָּרָשׁ (Jos. 15. 18). The second class is always found light, and it is as compared with them that the examples just given are called heavy, not as being so in every respect; and I say that the class, which is lighter than the very heavy, and heavier than the very light, cannot follow a quiescent latent in the middle of a word, except in כּוֹנֶה alone. For this נ is not soft, like that in כּוֹנֶה (Jud. 16. 2), כּוֹנֶה, כּוֹנֶה (1 Chr. 2. 58), and the rest of כּוֹנֶה when joined to quiescent latents, as in כּוֹנֶה (Ex. 15. 11), כּוֹנֶה (id.): so אָנָּה (id. 1), אָנָּה (Jer. 20. 9), אָנָּה, אָנָּה (Ex. 14. 17).

Of נָהֲלוּ in speaking.

It is the custom of the Hebrews to interexchange נ and נ: thus we have אָנָּה (2 Chr. 20. 35) for אָנָּה, אָנָּה (Is. 63. 3) for אָנָּה; אָנָּה (Ps. 78. 6) for אָנָּה; אָנָּה (Jer. 52. 15) for אָנָּה; אָנָּה (Lev. 24. 7) for אָנָּה; אָנָּה (Jer. 52. 15) for אָנָּה; אָנָּה (Is. 56. 12), from the same root as אָנָּה (Ps. 68. 32), אָנָּה (Ex. 43. 15) like אָנָּה (id. 16), אָנָּה (Dan. 10. 17) for אָנָּה, אָנָּה (Ex. 7. 11) for אָנָּה, אָנָּה (Ex. 7. 11) for אָנָּה, אָנָּה (2 Sam. 19. 5): indeed they make the נ in this last word quiescent and drop it in writing, as אָנָּה (Ex. 7. 22): so אָנָּה (2 Chr. 10. 18) and אָנָּה (1 Kgs. 12. 18), אָנָּה and אָנָּה with the same meaning; this latent נ is like latent נ preceded by kamets: as אָנָּה and אָנָּה (Ex. 36. 6), with the same significiation; אָנָּה (Am. 1. 11) might have received
mappik. So again with נָשָׁה (Hos. 11. 7) with נָשָׁה (Jer. 38. 12) and נָשָׁה (id. 11). נָשָׁה (1 Chr. 2. 13) and נָשָׁה (id. 12). נָשָׁה (25. 2) and נָשָׁה (id. 14). נָשָׁה (id. 4) and נָשָׁה (id. 27). נָשָׁה (Neh. 12. 44) and נָשָׁה (id. 47). And indeed נָשָׁה (1 Chr. 5. 10), נָשָׁה (2 Chr. 17. 11) are used, with נ for the נ of affinitive which occurs in נָשָׁה, נָשָׁה, etc., and serves for a sign of affinity between a man and his ancestors, or family, or country, as in נָשָׁה etc.; in the plural this may be absorbed in the following letter which accordingly receives dagesh; you may therefore write it with one or two נ's. Some words may be used with נ נ (1 Chr. 7. 1) and נ (Gen. 46. 13); or with נ and נ, as נָשָׁה (Num. 33. 42) and נ (Gen. 36. 41); נָשָׁה (id. 23) and נָשָׁה (1 Chr. 1. 40); נָשָׁה (Gen. 10. 28) and נָשָׁה (1 Chr. 1. 22); נ (Gen. 36. 23) and נָשָׁה (1 Chr. 1. 40). נָשָׁה and שָׁה (Gen. 4. 18), in this last there are two נ's, the firsts stands in the place of נ in נָשָׁה and is absorbed in the second which accordingly receives dagesh: נָשָׁה (Ps. 36. 27) and נ (1 Chr. 1. 42), נָשָׁה (Ps. 37. 9) and נ (Is. 49. 23): indeed נָשָׁה (1 Sam. 21. 3) is used for נָשָׁה: all these may be different words, some employed by one and some by another; however an instance of similar change, about which there can be no dispute, is that of the נ of נָשָׁה to נ in נָשָׁה, for it is pronounced as נ, though written נ: so נָשָׁה, נָשָׁה, נָשָׁה, נָשָׁה. כְּ in like manner the כ נ becomes נ in נָשָׁה, נָשָׁה, and is equivalent to the כ of נָשָׁה: so the quiescent in the præterites נָשָׁה, נָשָׁה is in place of the second radical, and appears as נ in גְּנָשׁ נָשָׁה: again, the soft נ in נָשָׁה, נָשָׁה becomes נ in נָשָׁה, נָשָׁה as I shall hereafter explain. Thus also נ in נָשָׁה becomes quiescent נ in נָשָׁה, as is shewn by this taking נָשָׁה, and נָשָׁה is a corresponding word, for its נ is pronounced as נ, and in נָשָׁה becomes quiescent נ, though this is written and that of נָשָׁה is not: the two plurals accordingly correspond to each other. The conjunction נ pointed with shurek is read alike, whether it preceede the letters נָשָׁה with one of seven kings or

Of נ נ in writing.

Know that latent quiescent נ נ are in Hebrew pronounced alike when at the end of word they are preceded by קָמָא. Accordingly נ is written for נ in נָשָׁה (2 Kgs. 25. 29), which is from the same root as נָשָׁה (Job. 14. 29), and נ (Mal. 3. 6): so נ (Ps. 127. 2), מֶּר (Ex. 31. 5), נָשָׁה (Jer. 50. 11), נָשָׁה (Ruth. 1. 20); this נ being the feminine נ of נָשָׁה etc. in nouns, and נ נ in verbs. Thus נ (Is. 21. 12) and נ (Dent. 33. 2), נ (Pr. 1. 10), נָשָׁה (Dent. 13. 9), נ (Gen. 27. 29) and נ (Job. 37. 6), נָשָׁה (Ps. 8. 8), נָשָׁה (Gen. 30. 16) corresponding to נ נ, נ נ, נ נ, has the same: נָשָׁה (Ex. 43. 27), and נ (Jer. 51. 9) have נ for נ, as corresponding to נ (Ps. 48. 10): in this way we interpret the נ נ in נָשָׁה (Lev. 11. 21, 25, 30), and all other passages in which נ is written for נ, just as they put נ in נָשָׁה (Gen. 12. 8): so also if we find נ נ signifying "not" written with נ, it being a word, which, although the h cement points to a latent נ, is always written with נ to distinguish it from the other one signifying \"to him\", except in a few places such as 1 Sam. 20. 2: sometimes it appears with נ, as in נ נ (Dent. 3. 11). Also נ, written after קָמְא where נ should stand, as in נ נ, נ נ etc.: there is however a reason for it, as this is the נ of the dual or plural which occurs in נ נ etc.; in appending the affix of the third person masculine, the נ is left to show its origin, though in sound it is quiescent נ. Understand also that the נ of נ נ is the נ of נ נ, נ נ etc.
Beginning of the verbs with latent letters.

I will begin with God's help to explain these verbs and first those beginning with נ. But previously I will remark that no verb is composed of less than three letters. Should one have fallen out or been cut off, it may be clearly proved by comparison with others that such is the case: this I say because the Hebrews omit, cut off and insert for compensation, or not, in the very same word, as I shall explain. I have divided verbs into two divisions, the "light" and "heavy" conjugations, the first corresponding to יִלְעָה as being lighter than all others, the second containing all besides, as for instance וַיִּלְעָה and וַיִּלְעֶה. I say that יִלְעָה is lighter than all the rest because the latent נ between the ס pointed with kamets and י is in the future dropped and kamets becomes quiescent shin, as in לִלְעָה etc.; in the active and passive participles moreover you will not prefix י as in the heavy conjugations, for instance when you form לִלְעָה and לִלְעֶה, and לִלְעָה and לִלְעֶה; but the active is לִלְעָה, like לִלְעָה (Ps. 121. 4), and the passive לִלְעָה, like לִלְעָה (1 Sam. 9. 24). So I call Hiphil heavy on account of the נ prefixed to it, and because it takes י in its participles as before mentioned; Piel also, like Piel, and Пiel, as before (1 Sam. 21. 3), with all others not resembling לִלְעָה, because the latent quiescent between their first and second radicals in the preterite remains in the future, or the second radical in them and the tenses derived from them takes daghesh, and also because their participles are always formed by prefixing י. Know also that Piel and Пiel like לִלְעָה and לִלְעָה (Ex. 9. 29) never lose daghesh of the preterite throughout their tenses, but always take it unless one of the five נ, נ, נ, נ, נ be the second radical, as in לִלְעָה (Num. 22. 13), לִלְעָה (Lev. 13. 6), לִלְעָה (2 Kgs. 23. 24), לִלְעָה (Is. 49. 13), לִלְעָה (Num. 8. 26): to these, as being different in their ways from all others, I shall devote a separate chapter. One exception only I remember, but nothing can be based upon it, which has none of the five and yet takes daghesh: viz. יָדָה (Gen. 31. 7); לָאָה, לָאָה
Verbs whose first radical is נ, subject to queiscence and change.

(Job. 11. 20), יָדִּ֖יוּ (Num. 21. 29), this נ is in pronunciation changed to queiscent ת, as in יָדִּ֖יוּ (Job. 3. 3), יָדִּ֖יוּ (Jon. 1. 14), יָדִּ֖יוּ (Num. 16. 33); the ת of יָדִּ֖יוּ and ת of יָדִּ֖יוּ are held back to mark the first radical which follows them. There is a heavy transitive conjugation in this signification: [by transitive I mean that the action passes from the agent to the object; sometimes the verb is a Kal, as יִּדֵּ֖ה, but the action of eating and possessing passes from the person eating and possessing to that which is eaten and possessed: but not from the person perishing; he does this by himself, and should you wish the action to pass on, you must say יִּדֵּ֖ה, as יָדִּ֖יוּ (Num. 24. 19). (Dent. 8. 20); this נ is also changed to quiescent ת, as יָדִּ֖יוּ (Jer. 46. 8); here נ marks the first person and the following ת is changed from the נ of יָדִּ֖יוּ, it being hard to unite two נ’s: the proper form would be יָדִּ֖יוּ. There is a second heavy conjugation, [its] also transitive, יָדִּ֖יוּ (Lam. 2. 9), יָדִּ֖יוּ (Pr. 29. 3), יָדִּ֖יוּ (Ez. 28. 16); the latent quiescent thrown upon the ת with נֶּ֖שֶׁר stands for נ of the first person, this has been made quiescent and omitted in writing on the understanding that it would still be pronounced, [the נ that is written being the first radical:] the proper form would be יָדִּ֖יוּ [with two נ’s, the first pointed with נֶּ֖שֶׁר and נֶּ֖שֶׁר, as יָדִּ֖יוּ (Job. 33. 33)]; יָדִּ֖יוּ (Jer. 23. 1).

This נ is also to the ear changed to ת, and is sometimes, as being still pronounced, dropped in writing, as in יָדִּ֖יוּ (Pr. 1. 10); here the latent quiescent between נ and ת stands for נ of יָדִּ֖יוּ, the final נ is for נ, as is often the case.

Sometimes this נ quiesses when preceded by נ of the first person, it being awkward to bring two together; thus in יָדִּ֖יוּ (Pr. 8. 17), נ is not the first radical; the word should be יָדִּ֖יוּ: sometimes נ becomes latent ת [marked by holom in the preceding נ, as in יָדִּ֖יוּ (Mal. 1. 2), for יָדִּ֖יוּ (Pr. 1. 22) should have had two seghols, under נ and ת, and sh’va under ת, like יָדִּ֖יוּ (Jud. 9. 34), יָדִּ֖יוּ (Hos. 11. 11), but this is awkward; the pronunciation of נ resembling that of ת, consequently the seghol of נ is changed to sh’va, pathaḥ added to the sh’va of ת, and the seghol of נ lengthened to tseri. There is another heavy conjugation יָדִּ֖יוּ, יָדִּ֖יוּ, יָדִּ֖יוּ, יָדִּ֖יוּ.
The Niphal is יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Gen. 22, 13), יֵשְׁתַּקְשָׁק (47, 27), this שַׁקְשָׁק having absorbed the ı̂ of יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק should have received daghesh, as יִשְׁתַּקְשָׁק (Ex. 8, 16), יֵשְׁתַּקְשָׁק (Gen. 8, 2), but that יֵשְׁתַּקְשָׁק cannot do so.] In this conjugation also שַׁקְשָׁק sometimes quiesces and is not written, though still pronounced, as in יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Is. 13, 20), for יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק, like יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק (Job. 15, 31).

ימֹּקַם (1 Sam. 9, 7), יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Job. 14, 11), יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Jer. 2, 36): the quiescent between these three answers to the יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק of יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק, and, to mark this, יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק is held back by גָּיָּה and pointed with רְטִי.

In a Hiphil יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Deut. 1, 45), with future יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Is. 42, 23): this שַׁקְשָׁק quiesces and is no longer written, but is marked by the preceding kamets, as in יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Job. 32, 11), [for יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק, like יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (9, 16), יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (6, 11), and so] יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק for יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק. Another heavy conjugation is יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Ecc. 12, 9), יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק, like יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק, יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק. This שַׁקְשָׁק cannot quiesce on account of the יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק: daghesh follows, as if the word would be difficult to pronounce, and the only object of making a letter quiescent is to facilitate pronunciation, which is accomplished by making the שַׁקְשָׁק of יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק and יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק quiescent, and changing that in יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק, יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק, to ı̂ quiescent, as the following letter has not daghesh.

דֶּשֶּׁק (1 Sam. 2, 4), דֶּשֶּׁק (Jer. 1, 17): from the heavy conjugation יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Ps. 30, 12): this שַׁקְשָׁק is omitted, both in reading and writing alike, and its vowel thrown upon the preceding יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק, the יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק loses its daghesh, and the word is read יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק (2, Sam. 22, 40). But a better account is, that this comes from the same root as יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק (Ps. 193, 3), and is interpreted according to the context, although they come from different heavy conjugations, the former from יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק, the latter from יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק.

דֶּשֶּׁק (Ex. 33, 24), דֶּשֶּׁק (21, 21): שַׁקְשָׁק changed to יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק in דֶּשֶּׁק (Job. 21, 26, 22). דֶּשֶּׁק (Ps. 22, 21). דֶּשֶּׁק (Jud. 11. 34). דֶּשֶּׁק (Zech. 12, 10): this שַׁקְשָׁק in דֶּשֶּׁק (Gen. 49, 6), in these two words it represents the שַׁקְשָׁק of יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק, but יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁק and שַׁקְשָׁק may be two different roots.

יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Ps. 77, 5): this שַׁקְשָׁק also becomes quiescent ı̂, as יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Jud. 20, 6), יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (2, Sam. 20, 9), יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Job. 18, 9). [H. and L. יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק, a combination of 2 Chr. 9, 18, and 1 Kgs. 10, 19.]

This שַׁקְשָׁק also in the future is pronouned like quiescent ı̂, though still written as שַׁקְשָׁק, the preceding letter taking holem, as יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק etc.; sometimes it is written, as it is pronounced, with ı̂, as in יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Ex. 42, 5), sometimes it is left out as יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Job. 31, 17), יִשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (Gen. 27, 25), (Ex. 3, 3):
the Paual is יִשָּׁר, plural יִשָּׁרִים (Nah. 1. 10), יִשָּׁרָה (Is. 1. 20). I used to think that יִשָּׁר (Ex. 3. 2) also was a Paual preterite, and that its kamets was due to soph pasuk, just as many other words with athnāḥ and soph pasuk receive kamets for path, still I remarked יִשָּׁר (2 Kgs. 2. 10) with kamets, though it had neither athnāḥ nor soph pasuk: then I understood that the two words should have been יִשָּׁר וְיִשָּׁר, kamets of the form יִשָּׁר, as having that meaning; for, had it here been the Paual preterite, it would have had path, as יִשָּׁר (Is. 52. 5), (Jer. 29. 22), יִשָּׁר (Zeph. 1. 17) with many others. Moreover, but for the kamets, יִשָּׁר (2 Kgs. 2. 10) might have been a preterite with its object יִשָּׁר placed before it, as הִשָּׁר אֶל חָוָה (Deut. 4. 14): at other times the object follows, as יִשָּׁר אֶל חָוָה (1 Kgs. 13. 9), יִשָּׁר אֶל חָוָה (Jos. 2. 4), this last may be a singular with יִשָּׁר for its object, this word being employed to represent singular, dual, and plural: יִשָּׁר may also refer to the two men as being a pair: had the plural form been used, it would have been יְשָׁרִים. There are two examples analogous to יִשָּׁר and יִשָּׁר, יִשָּׁר (Pr. 25. 19), of form יִשָּׁר from יִשָּׁר (Ps. 18. 37): and יִשָּׁר (Ecc. 9. 12), with the meaning of יִשָּׁר (Jer. 5. 26) but the form of יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר. I remember no other example besides these four in all the Bible.

 än (Num. 19. 9). לאֹ (Ex. 3. 16), לאֹ (Mio. 2. 12), לאֹ (Lev. 25. 20): the n is sometimes changed to quiescent: pres. 4. 6): the n is added, as in לאֹ, לאֹ, the proper form is לאֹ, sometimes however it is hard to pronounce two n's together, although we do say לאֹ, as being easier. The imperative is לאֹ (Num. 21. 16); לאֹ (11. 16) is peculiar, as this verb always takes the form לאֹ, and then n is appended, with kamets hatuph below the first radical, like לאֹ etc.: when, without it, the form should have been לאֹ, then with it it becomes לאֹ, like לאֹ, לאֹ, etc.; one however differs from these, like לאֹ from the previous examples: לאֹ (Deut. 5. 27) becomes לאֹ (Ps. 69. 19), [this should have had bārīk, and לאֹ kamets hatuph]. The Niphal is לאֹ (Gen. 49. 29), (Num. 27. 13), the former example with kamets as being the participle, the latter with path, as being the preterite. Know moreover that לאֹ is either the preterite or the participle: as the preterite, with conjunctive accents, it will take path, this being its proper form; with pause accents, [such as athnāḥ, soph pasuk and sometimes zakaph.] kamets; as the participle, it always has kamets except in regimen, when it takes path; [for instance לאֹ (Num. 12. 7), (Is. 22. 23) with kamets, but לאֹ (Pr. 11. 13) with path]. When then we use the Niphal preterite of לאֹ, we put path under n in conjunction with other words, kamets with pause accents: when n for the feminine is added, we say לאֹ, if it is in connection with other words, with shōva under n: if it is in pause, with kamets under the same letter, as it would have without the n. 1 If we have to employ the participle, it will always take kamets under n, unless it be in regimen: if n for the feminine be added, it always has kamets as before. But the scribes who settled the accents have made this difference between לאֹ the preterite in pause, and לאֹ the participle, that they place the accent of the former on the second radical, as in לאֹ (Ps. 34. 21), that of the latter on the thee third radical, as in לאֹ (51. 19).

1 The words in the text which are enclosed in round brackets are omitted in the translation as unnecessary.
the Pual is בָּשָׁה, plural בָּשָׁתָה (Nah. 1. 10), בָּשָׁתָה (Is. 1. 20). I used to think that בָּשָׁה (Ex. 3. 2) also was a Pual preterite, and that its kamets was due to sopher pasuk, just as many other words with athnakh and sopher pasuk receive kamets for pathah, till I remarked שָׁבֶּה (2 Kgs. 2. 10) with kamets, though it had neither athnakh nor sopher pasuk; then I understood that the two words should have been בָּשָׁה, שָׁבֶּה of the form עֲשֵׂה, as having that meaning; for, had שָׁבֶּה here been the Pual preterite, it would have had pathah, as שָׁבֶּה (Is. 52. 5), (Jer. 29. 22), שָׁבֶּה (Zeph. 1. 17) with many others. Moreover, but for the kamets, שָׁבֶּה (2 Kgs. 2. 10) might have been a preterite with its object יְהֹוָה placed before it, as נִשְׁתִּים (Deut. 4. 14); at other times the object follows, as יִשְׁתִּים יִשְׁתֵּין (1 Kgs. 13. 9), יִשְׁתִּים יִשְׁתֵּין (Jos. 2. 4), this last may be a singular with יִשְׁתַּק for its object, this word being employed to represent singular, dual, and plural; יִשְׁתַּק may also refer to the two men as being a pair: had the plural form been used, it would have been יִשְׁתִּיק יִשְׁתִּיק. There are two examples analogous to יָשָׁה and יָשָׁה (Pr. 25. 19), of form יִשְׁתִּים from יִשְׁתַּק (Ps. 18. 37); and יִשְׁתַּק, יִשְׁתַּק (Ecc. 3. 12), with the meaning of יִשְׁתַּק (Jer. 5. 26) but the form of יִשְׁתַּק. I remember no other example besides these four in all the Bible.

 xảyה. This verb frequently occurs: נִשְׁתִּים of the future quiescent and is read like נ, though still written נ like the root, as in יִשָּׁה etc.: sometimes it is also written מ, as נִשְׁתִּים (Ps. 50. 12); sometimes dropped, as נִשָּׂה (Job. 10. 2), נִשָּׂה (Ex. 3. 17), נִשָּׂה (2 Sam. 19. 14); הָיַֽוָּה נִשָּׂה (Ecc. 1. 2) is according to the sense but against the grammar, הָיָֽוָּה being a feminine like יָשָׂה, יָשָׂה, הָיַֽוָּה is also used (7. 27), with the grammatical but against the sense: הָיַֽוָּה signifying a man and being a name of Solomon, though feminine in form; it was done with the belief that the matter would be understood. There is also a Hiphil with different meaning: מַיָּה (Deut. 26. 18).רָיָּה (id. 17).

נסָה (Num. 19. 9). נִשָּׂה (Ex. 3. 16). נִשָּׂה (Mish. 9. 16). נִשָּׂה (Mic. 2. 12). נִשָּׂה (Lev. 25. 20): the נ is sometimes changed to quiescent נ preceded by holem, as נִשָּׂה (Mic. 4. 6): the נ is added, as in נִשָּׂה, נִשָּׂה; the proper form is נִשָּׂה, sometimes however, it is hard to pronounce two נ's together, although we do say נִשָּׂה, as being easier. The imperative is נִשָּׂה (Num. 21. 16); נִשָּׂה (11. 16) is peculiar, as this verb always takes the form נִשָּׂה, and then נ is appended, with kamets ָתָּה below the first radical, like נִשָּׂה ָתָּה etc.; when, without נ, the form should have been נִשָּׂה, then with נ it becomes נִשָּׂה, נִשָּׂה etc.; one however differs from these, like נִשָּׂה from the previous examples; מַיָּה (Deut. 5. 27) becomes מַיָּה מַיָּה (Ps. 69. 19), [this should have had hirik, and נִשָּׂה kamets ָתָּה]. The Niphal is נָשָׂה (Gen. 49. 29), (Num. 27. 13), the former example with kamets as being the participle, the latter with pathah, as being the preterite. Know moreover that נָשָׂה is either the preterite or the participle; as the preterite, with conjunctive accents, it will take pathah, this being its proper form; with pause accents, [such as atnakh, sopher pasuk and sometimes zakeph] kamets: as the participle, it always has kamets except in regimen, when it takes pathah; [for instance נָשָׂה (Num. 12. 7), (Is. 22. 23) with kamets, but נִשָּׂה (Pr. 11. 13) with pathah]. When then we use the Niphal preterite of נָשָׂה, we put pathah under נ in conjunction with other words, kamets with pause accents; when נ for the feminine is added, we say נִשָּׂה, if it is in connection with other words, with shva under נ; if it is in pause, with kamets under the same letter, as it would have without the נ. 1 If we have to employ the participle, it will always take kamets under נ, unless it be in regimen: if נ for the feminine be added, it always has kamets as before. But the scribes who settled the accents have made this difference between נָשָׂה the preterite in pause, and נָשָׂה the participle, that they place the accent of the former on the second radical, as in נָשָׂה (Ps. 34. 21), that of the latter on the the third radical, as in נָשָׂה (51. 19).

1 The words in the text which are enclosed in round brackets are omitted in the translation as unnecessary.