Verbs like רָאָס etc. when prefixing the letters תְּרִיטָא in the future, make ר quiescent and no longer pronounce it, as בָּשׁ etc.: the quiescent latent ת corresponds to the ב of בָּשׁ; so רָאָס, רָּוָה etc.; the prefixed letters are sustained by ga'ya to mark the quiescent, any one therefore who reads them without a pause is an idiot, as he thereby omits the first radical. I have moreover seen many persons from whom was hidden the difference between רָאָס and רָּוָה, although it is plain enough: so much so, that some declared it to be a profound mystery, not to be explained by any of the Captivity: others, that there was no difference between them. All this came from their not being able to see ת in the text, and not noticing that it was still pronounced. Therefore 1 say that the ת of רָאָס pointed with kafets is the first radical, like the ב in בָּשׁ, the ש in רָּוָה (Gen. 18. 19) and the ת in רָּוָה (Jer. 31. 12): it is from the preterite רָּוָה, רָאָס, which, when preceded by ת with šav'a below, becomes future in signification, as רָוָא רָאָס (Is. 66. 24), רָוָה (60. 10), רָאָס.
On Niphal.

Understand that the first radical of every Niphal quiesces and is pointed with šēva, like שֶׁבֶשׁ etc., unless it be נ, ק, או י, then it takes a vowel. In the future, if it be none of these, it absorbs the נ of Niphal, taking daghesh and kamets beneath, as שֶׁבֶשׁ etc. In the preterite of verbs beginning with נ, this quiesces and is changed to נ, the preceding letter taking holem in general, as הוהו etc. In the preterite, נ is absorbed in נ, which accordingly receives daghesh; as from השבע comes שבע, שֶׁבֶשׁ etc. (Jer. 23. 6) etc.; from נקָּה (Ex. 25. 22), עָדוֹ (30. 6); so שֶׁבֶשׁ etc. (Is. 8. 13), נַכַּה (Dent. 7. 25); נֶשֶׁר (Job. 23. 7) takes kamets, as being the participle and not the preterite, as I before explained. So in נֶשֶׁר (Is. 1. 18), * נ marks the first person plural, the נ has absorbed נ of Niphal and therefore has daghesh; but נֶשֶׁר (Ex. 23. 48) is peculiar, as נ belongs to the Niphal; it should have been pointed like שֶׁשֶׁר (Is. 8. 15), נֶשֶׁר (Ps. 2. 2); or it may be נֶשֶׁר, in which נ has absorbed נ and so takes daghesh; so נֶשֶׁר (Deut. 31. 8), נֶשֶׁר, there being a Nithpael in the language, as נֶשֶׁר (Pr. 27. 15). The imperative masculine is נֶשֶׁר etc., plural נֶשֶׁר etc. (Is. 45. 22); the feminine נֶשֶׁר (Jer. 6. 8): נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Deut. 4. 23), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Jud. 13. 4), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Jer. 47. 6), which last ought to have received daghesh in נ, had this not been one of the five נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר.] The source (indefinitive) or verbal noun, — so called because all the tenses, past and future, come from it, and the participles also — that of נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר is נֶשֶׁר (1 Kgs. 20. 39): for how could you have נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר without נֶשֶׁר, or נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר and נֶשֶׁר without נֶשֶׁר? — that of נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר is נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Ps. 31. 14).

Another chapter.

In forming Hiphil, נ generally becomes quiescent נ preceded by holem, as נֶשֶׁר etc.: in the future, נ is dropped for convenience, as in נֶשֶׁר etc.; it should remain, as, except in this conjugation, all the letters of the preterite are to be found in the future; sometimes it is kept, as in נֶשֶׁר (1 Sam. 17. 47), (Ps. 116. 6); נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (28. 7), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (45. 18), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Is. 52. 5), from the preterites נֶשֶׁר etc. In adding the termination נ to the preterite, the נ after the second radical is dropped, as in נֶשֶׁר etc. The imperative masculine line of נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר is נֶשֶׁר (Jer. 31. 7): so נֶשֶׁר (Ex. 16. 2), with נֶשֶׁר on account of נ (Gen. 47. 6), נֶשֶׁר (Ex. 33. 5). נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Jud. 6. 30): the quiescent נ is the first radical, originally נ sometimes this נ appears, as in נֶשֶׁר (Ps. 5. 9), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Gen. 8. 17). The Hophal changes נ to נ preceded by shā'ēr, as is the case with every passive: [or by kamets hatuph, or holem, as in נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Ex. 32. 32), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Jer. 48. 15), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Jo. 1. 9), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Nah. 3. 7), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Ex. 12. 39), נֶשֶׁר נֶשֶׁר (Ex. 2. 62); no agent is mentioned in all these. In this manner will be formed נ נ (Gen. 39. 1), no agent is mentioned here, so נ נ (Is. 14. 15), נ נ (Gen. 38. 25), נ נ (Ex. 14. 22), נ נ (Is. 12. 5), נ נ (Ps. 45. 3). I will now with God's help collect all the verbs found in Scripture beginning with
Verbs whose first radical is י.

Hiphil ילתו (Hos. 5. 11), ילחם (Gen. 18. 27), יחרז (Jos. 7. 7): י is here the first radical, as in ינור and ינור (Gen. 43. 22) from יינור. The masculine imperative is ינהי (Jud. 19. 6): the Niphal, with another meaning, is ינהсан (Num. 12. 11), ינהס (Is. 19. 13): י is that of Niphal, י is the first radical; the future ינהא, ינהא, like ינהא, ינהא, ינהא, ינהא (Deut. 7. 25), the imperative masculine ינהא, ינהא, and like it the infinitive.

Ecc. 2. 20 (Ecc. 2. 20) is the infinitive and verbal noun of the Piel: the preterite ינהא, ינהא, ינהא, the future ינהא, ינהא, the passive ינהא, ינהא, ינהא, and, but for the gutural י, it would have received dagesh like it. The Niphal changes י to י preceded by holem, as ינהא (1 Sam. 27. 1): י of the future absorbs י and so has dagesh, ינהא, ינהא.

Ps. 60. 11, ינהא (Ps. 60. 11), ינהא (Is. 18. 7), ינהא (Ps. 76. 12).

Jo. 1. 20 (Gen. 8. 14), ינהא (1 Kgs. 17. 7). The Hiphil changes י to quiescent י, ינהא (Jos. 4. 23), ינהא (Ez. 17. 24); with another meaning, ינהא (2 Sam. 19. 6), ינהא (Jer. 8. 9), ינהא (Is. 30. 5): the Piel is ינהא etc., ינהא (Pr. 17. 22), ינהא (Nah. 1. 4). — Some fancy that this last has lost the first radical, wherefore I explain that such is not the case. When י of the third person is prefixed to the future, then two י's come together, this י, and the first radical, these being hard to pronounce with י conversive, the second absorbs the first and receives dagesh. Analogous to this is ינהא (2 Chr. 32. 30): both י's are written, but only one pronounced, that with dagesh, as you will with God's help understand.

Job. 9. 28 (Job. 9. 28), ינהא (Job. 22. 25).

Ez. 30. 32 (Ez. 30. 32), ינהא (Jer. 31. 19): the Hiphil is ינהא (11. 18), ינהא (Ex. 33. 12), ינהא (Ps. 105. 1), ינהא (Ez. 16. 2); sometimes י is used for י, as ינהא (1 Sam. 21. 3) for ינהא: a better explanation however is, that י is the first radical, and that it is a Pual, like ינהא whence comes ינהא (Job. 9. 15), [for had this been from the Kal it would have been ינהא.] There is another signification, ינהא, ינהא (Jud. 8. 16).

Ps. 55. 23), ינהא (Ps. 55. 23), a preterite like ינהא: the imperative masculine is ינהא (Dan. 5. 17), like ינהא: ינהא may be a noun and not a verb.

Ez. 44. 18: the infinitive, which is also the verbal noun, is used without י, ינהא (Gen. 3. 19), like ינהא from ינהא, ינהא from ינהא.

Ps. 51. 7) like ינהא and ינהא (Jud. 5. 28): י, had it not been a guttural, should have received dagesh, as in ינהא (Ps. 119. 139).

The infinitive and verbal noun is ינהא (Gen. 31. 10), like ינהא, ינהא (Ez. 39. 12), ינהא, ינהא (Gen. 30. 41) like ינהא. There is a Kal, ינהא (id. 39) like ינהא, ינהא (id. 38) like ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc., ינהא etc.
pathah, nor is prolonged with kamets: הַהֲרָפָא הַנְּאִירָא (Is. 57. 5) is like הַהֲרָפָא הַנְּאִירָא הַנְּאִירָא, the quiescent between the ו and the ה is the first radical.

1 In H. and L. שָׁנָא and שָׁנָא are thus transposed; as is the case with several more.

Sometimes this ו, which is not a radical, but inserted for prolongation, is for convenience omitted, and the proceeding letter takes kamets hatoph, as מִתְּרָפָא (Ex. 18. 28). יָנָא (Ps. 13. 5), just as it is dropped in יָנָא (Ex. 2. 3). יָנָא (Num. 9. 6); this however is only when words are closely united, in pause or returns, as יָנָא (Ex. 8. 14). The future changes to quiescent with shurek in the preceding letter, [this being preferred to holém.] in order to distinguish between this word and the future of יָנָא, יָנָא יָנָא (Dent. 21. 16); יָנָא יָנָא (16. 5). יָנָא יָנָא (Num. 11. 14), יָנָא יָנָא (Jud. 16. 5). יָנָא יָנָא יָנָא (Gen. 44. 1), יָנָא יָנָא יָנָא (Is. 47. 11). the verbal noun is יָנָא (Num. 14. 16).

28. 60, יָנָא (Gen. 32. 11).
וכן (Ex. 5. 13), ונמצא (Lev. 25. 45), נמצל (Is. 66. 9); the imperative masculine is יָדְלוּ (Ex. 1. 15); the imperative feminine is יָדַּלְתּ (Gen. 38. 28), יָדַּלְתּ (Ex. 1. 15); the imperative masculine is יָדִּלְתּ (Ex. 1. 15); the imperative masculine is יָדִּלְתּ (Gen. 11. 30) like יָדַּלְתּ (Ex. 1. 22) like יָדַּלְתּ etc.; but יָדִּלְתּ (Pr. 23. 22) is a preterite Kal which, before the addition of יָדַּלְתּ, was יָדִּלְתּ, with the second person added as object, יָדִּלְת; in pause, as with аתָּנָּה, ephah, yavasak, and sometimes zakeph, יָדַּלְתּ (Deut. 32. 6) with zakeph, instead of being like יָדַּלְת (id.). The Niphal is יָדִּלְתּ (Gen. 48. 5), יָדִּלְתּ (Job. 3. 3); the יָדִּלְתּ (1 Chr. 20. 8); יָדִּלְתּ (Ps. 104. 5) is a preterite, יָדִּלְתּ (Num. 5. 15); a noun signifying place, יָדִּלְתּ (Ex. 29. 12); the verbal noun and participle are יָדִּלְתּ, יָדִּלְתּ, with quiescent יָדִּלְתּ, the first without dagesh; the second is the passive participle, יָדִּלְתּ receiving dagesh on account of the absorption of יָדִּלְתּ: it might have been without it also: it is derived from the Hophal, יָדִּלְתּ (Ezr. 3. 11), future יָדִּלְתּ and participle יָדִּלְתּ. There is a RV, יָדִּלְתּ, יָדִּלְתּ (Ps. 8. 3), יָדִּלְתּ (Zech. 4. 9), יָדִּלְתּ (Job. 6. 26); Niphal יָדִּלְתּ, יָדִּלְתּ (Ps. 31. 14) with a different but similar meaning.

This is יָדִל (Gen. 13. 9), in this יָדִּל is the first radical: in יָדִּל (1 Chr. 12. 2) it is clearly pronounced; it also becomes יָדִּל in יָדִּל (Is. 30. 21): the imperative singular is וֻיָדִּל with יָדִּל clearly pronounced, [and וֻיָדִּל with it latent, the preceding יָדִּל taking tseri:] the feminine is וֻיָדִּל (EZ. 21. 21); anything on your right you name וֻיָדִּל, וְיָדִּל to distinguish it from the patronymic of the tribe of Benjamin. Know also that וֻיָדִּל is composed of two words וֻיָדִּל and יָדִּל, sometimes it is written as two, as וֻיָדִּל (1 Sam. 9. 1), though pronounced as one; sometimes 곧 is dropped, as וֻיָדִּיל (2 Sam. 20. 1), sometimes both are employed, as וֻיָדִּיל (1 Chr. 27. 12).

This pointing is that of Ben Naphtali.

ישוע (Ps. 104. 2) does not come from this root [but from אָשַׁע כֹּל עַל יָדִּל and אָשַׁע כֹּל עַל יָדִּל].
be ב, ע, or ש, it always precedes כ, as in播报 (Ecc. 12. 15), מיכל (Mic. 6. 16), תכשיטים (Gen. 44. 16); here כ stands for כ to bring out the pronunciation of כ, [with כ it would have sounded like כ: so also תכשיטים (Jos. 9. 4) from ככ (id. 12) from ככ.] In one word כ precedes כ, תכשיטים (Jer. 49. 3), it being difficult to pronounce this תכשיטים without confusing the sound of כ and ג, the two being similar. If the first radical be not one of these three, כ always precedes it, as播报 (Dent. 9. 18). In מַגְּלַשׁ, the first radical comes before כ, as, on account of daghesh in כ, it must have been pronounced clearly, had it come after.

ןָוָּס (Lev. 2. 1), שִׁמְךָ (Num. 5. 15); שִׁמְךָ (2 Kgs. 4. 40), is sustained by גַּ'אָנָא to mark the first radical ג, it is of the form מַגְּלַשׁ: but מַגְּלַשׁ (1 Kgs. 18. 34) is different, ג is the first radical and is sustained by גַּ'אָנָא, not in the usual way, but like שִׁמְךָ (Ex. 11. 21). The future absorbs ג in ג, as in (Is. 44. 3): the imperative with ג is ככ (Ex. 24. 3), and without it, ככ (2 Kgs. 4. 41): מַגְּלַשׁ (1 Kgs. 7. 24); in מַגְּלַשׁ (Ps. 45. 3), כ, is changed to quiescent ככ, the preceding letter taking shureq to mark it: it is from the heavy conjugation מַגְּלַשׁ, מַגְּלַשׁ (2 Kgs. 4. 5).

גַּ'אָנָא (Gen. 2. 8), שִׁמְךָ (Is. 43. 21), שִׁמְךָ (Gen. 2. 7); with ג absorbed in ג, ג (Jer. 1. 5), רָאָה (Is. 44. 12) of the form מַגְּלַשׁ, מַגְּלַשׁ (Job. 17. 7): the Hiphil is מַגְּלַשׁ (Is. 43. 10), מַגְּלַשׁ.

ןָו (Dent. 32. 22), שִׁמְךָ (Is. 10. 16), of the form מַגְּלַשׁ, מַגְּלַשׁ (Ps. 102. 4), מַגְּלַשׁ (Lev. 6. 2), with כ changed to ככ: only a Hiphil is found, with כ changed to ככ: only a Hiphil is found, מַגְּלַשׁ (2 Sam. 21. 6), מַגְּלַשׁ (id. 9), מַגְּלַשׁ (Num. 25. 4).

ןָו גַּ'אָנָא (Gen. 28. 16), (9. 24); in מַגְּלַשׁ (Hab. 2. 7) כ is sustained by גַּ'אָנָא to show that the following one is the first radical: ככ (2 Kgs. 4. 31), מַגְּלַשׁ (Ps. 35.
23), רָכַב (Jer. 31. 26), are not from this, but belong to verbs whose second radical is qeses 1 or 3.

דָּקַב (Ps. 36. 8), דָּקַב (Is. 43. 4), דָּקַב (Ps. 139. 17), דָּקַב (2 Kgs. 1. 13), דָּקַב (Ps. 72. 14), דָּקַב (49. 9), [with tseri, דָּקַב (1 Sam. 18. 30) with hirik, both to mark the qeses 1 that follows: the form is דָּקַב.] The adjectival is דָּקַב, like the preterite, except that ה in the former has kamets, in the latter pathah: דָּקַב (Ecc. 10. 1) like דָּקַב, דָּקַב: in regimen ה takes sh’sh, ה pathah, as דָּקַב (Pr. 17. 27), like דָּקַב (Job. 9. 4), but that the guttural ה takes šh’sh and pathah. The substantive is דָּקַב with šh’sh under ה, דָּקַב (Zech. 11. 13): in regimen, the kamets of ה takes pathah (Esh. 1. 4). There is also a heavy transitive conjugation, דָּקַב, דָּקַב, דָּקַב (Is. 13. 12): here ה is the object, and ה the subject.

סָקַב (Jer. 50. 24), like סָקַב, סָקַב, סָקַב (Ecc. 9. 12), with the form of בּוּלוּוּוּל, and the signification of בּוּלוּוּל (Jer. 5. 26) like בּוּלוּוּל: Niphal, נָקַב (Pr. 6. 2), נָקַב (Is. 29. 13), נָקַב (Deut. 7. 25): imperative בּוּלוּוּל, as also the infinitive and verbal noun: in id. 16 ב stands for ה, as in ב in בּוּלוּוּל and ה in בּוּלוּוּל.

זָרַע (Deut. 25. 18), זָרַע (Ex. 1. 21), זָרַע (Gen. 18. 15), זָרַע (Hos. 10. 3): future זָרַע (Ps. 112. 8), זָרַע (Gen. 28. 17), זָרַע (3. 10), זָרַע (Ex. 34. 30), זָרַע (Jer. 51. 46), זָרַע (Ps. 33. 8), like זָרַע, זָרַע, זָרַע: the prefixed letters are sustained, to mark the latent qeses standing in the place of the first radical: זָרַע (Ex. 1. 17) like זָרַע, however on account of א, 1 it takes segol instead of pathah: זָרַע (1 Sam. 18. 20) like זָרַע, זָרַע, [tseri marking א, the first radical:] the noun is רָכַב: the imperative רָכַב (Pr. 3. 7): in רָכַב (Ps. 34. 10) ר, though not pronounced, is still written according to the root; it should have been רָכַב [with א pronounced from the throat, taking hirik and ה sh’sh, like רָכַב, רָכַב:] this may have been done to distinguish it from רָכַב (22. 18), (Pr. 23. 33), the future of רָכַב. The verbal noun is רָכַב (Gen. 9. 2), רָכַב (Ps. 75. 12), רָכַב (Is. 8. 12), with ה for ה. The Niphal is רָכַב (Jo. 2. 11), רָכַב (Ps. 65. 6), רָכַב (130. 4): the Piel רָכַב like רָכַב: ה should have had daghesh as רָכַב: רָכַב (2 Sam. 14. 15), like רָכַב (1 Sam. 26. 19): the future רָכַב, רָכַב, the participle רָכַב, plural רָכַב (Neb. 6. 9): the imperative רָכַב, which is also the infinitive and verbal noun, רָכַב (2 Chr. 32. 18).

זָרַע (Num. 11. 17), זָרַע (Gen. 43. 20), זָרַע (46. 4), זָרַע, רָכַב, etc.: the prefixed letters are sustained with ga’ay to mark the qeses first radical which follows: ה is omitted in the imperative רָכַב, רָכַב (Is. 47. 1), רָכַב (Job. 8. 2): the noun רָכַב (Job. 7. 5), (10. 11), with ה for ה, the Hiphil is רָכַב (Gen. 45. 13), רָכַב (43. 22), רָכַב (Num. 1. 51), רָכַב (Ps. 78. 16).

זָרַע (Is. 15. 4), זָרַע, זָרַע (Is. 15. 4), זָרַע, זָרַע (Num. 12. 14), זָרַע (Deut. 25. 9): but זָרַע, זָרַע (Lev. 15. 8), זָרַע (Is. 50. 6), זָרַע (Job. 7. 19), זָרַע (30. 10) are from רָכַב, like רָכַב from רָכַב.

זָרַע (Jer. 49. 2), זָרַע (Num. 13. 30), זָרַע (Deut. 17. 14), זָרַע (Gen. 21. 10), זָרַע (Jud. 11. 24), זָרַע (Num. 21. 35): the imperative is רָכַב, and, with the addition of ה, the participle רָכַב (Deut. 33. 23), like רָכַב, רָכַב (Is. 7. 11): without ה, רָכַב (Deut. 1. 21): [it takes kamets in pause (2. 24): plural רָכַב (1. 8):] the noun is רָכַב (Ob. 1. 17), רָכַב (Is. 14. 23): the Hiphil is רָכַב, רָכַב; רָכַב (Jud. 11. 24), רָכַב (Job. 13. 26). There is also another meaning רָכַב (Dent. 18. 12); רָכַב (4. 38), רָכַב (Num. 33. 55): the Piel in the same sense is רָכַב (Deut. 28. 42), like רָכַב, רָכַב: this also should have had daghesh in ה. The Niphal is רָכַב, like רָכַב, future רָכַב, רָכַב (Gen. 45. 11), רָכַב (Pr. 30. 9).

ץָרַע (Gen. 13. 12), יָרַע (45. 10): in the future qeses and is omitted in writing, as יָרַע (Ps. 61. 8), 3
It is said also that in the latent qieqew, which in the prefix comes before and stands for the first radical, is in the root put after as second radical. The imperative is suffix (Num. 22. 19), in pause as suffix (Jer. 13. 18); it is also changed to latent qieqew (Is. 12. 40). The Niphal is from (Jer. 22. 6), neuter (Ex. 16. 15); the future suffix, the Hophal also has suffix (Is. 5. 8) from suffix (Job. 36. 7), Masoretic (Ps. 145. 10); the Piel is suffix, suffix (Ex. 25. 4) etc.

The adjective is of the form suffix and suffix, or suffix and suffix, as suffix (Ecc. 12. 12) and suffix (Pr. 12. 20); the noun is suffix (Gen. 49. 3), suffix (Ecc. 1. 3); there is another form of suffix (Jer. 3. 19): suffix (Gen. 49. 4) is, as I suppose, a Hophal, even although it has hokm for shak, as I have already explained that in some formations they are identical: it may also be a Hiphil like suffix (Job. 40. 32). There is another meaning, suffix, suffix, suffix, suffix (Jer. 31. 7); suffix (Is. 63. 8); so the Niphal, suffix (Deut. 33. 28), with pathah under, because it is the preterite, suffix (Ps. 33. 16) with kamets, as being the participle; suffix (Jer. 30. 7) suffix (Is. 45. 28).

The adjective is suffix (1 Kgs. 9. 12), suffix (Num. 23. 27), suffix (Jer. 27. 5), with pathah under, is the preterite, suffix (Jud. 14. 7), suffix (Jer. 33. 3); the adjective is suffix with kamets (23. 7), suffix (Pr. 14. 13); when in regimen, it takes suffix (29. 27): suffix (Is. 40. 4); like suffix, suffix of the form suffix like suffix, suffix of the form suffix: the Piel is suffix, suffix (Ps. 119. 128), suffix (2 Chr. 32. 30), suffix (Is. 45. 2), suffix (40. 3), suffix (Pr. 9. 15), suffix (1 Kgs. 6. 35), suffix (Is. 12. 12); there may be two reasons why this last receives dagesh in suffix, either that it is a Kal and the first radical is absorbed in suffix, which therefore takes dagesh as suffix (Is. 44. 3). suffix (Jer. 1. 5), the word will then answer to suffix, suffix, corresponding to suffix, with suffix under the prefixed letter, which is absorbed in the letter with dagesh that is written, viz. the first radical. The first explanation is preferable, as the first radical of every conjugation that has hokh in the preterite takes pathah in the future, as suffix, suffix, suffix: so the suffix of suffix should have pathah like suffix: [there being no form like suffix found in all the Bible.] There is moreover a Hiphil, with clearly pronounced, suffix, suffix, suffix, suffix (Pr. 4. 25): imperative suffix (Ps. 5. 9), like suffix (Job. 13. 21).

Ends the first chapter of the book on latent and lengthening letters composed by R. Jehuda, son of R. David, surnamed Hayag (Paradise be his rest), translated into the holy language by R. Moses ha-Kohen, son of R. Samuel ha-Kohen (Paradise be his rest?), of Cordova.
Chapter the second:

containing all the verbs whose second radical is a quiescent latent.

Thus says Jehuda: the description of verbs with a quiescent latent for their first radical is now finished: in this chapter I will mention the verbs which have such for their second radical. [For every verb is composed of three letters, answering to the מ, ו, and י of יִשְׂרָאֵל, this being the parent of all the verbs and that from which all are named, whether transitive or intransitive, without exception.] Before making a list of them, I will with God’s help offer some explanations which will set them right and clear up their difficulties.

On verbs whose second radical is latent and quiescent.

When the Hebrews wish to employ the past tense of the Kal, or its participle, in these verbs, they make the second radical quiescent, pronouncing it like latent ע, but not writing it, except in a few words. For instance, the latent quiescent in אֶלָּכַי (Ps. 86. 14) is the second radical; the proper form should be אֶלָּכַי as in Esth. 9. 32, אֶלָּכְּנַי (Ez. 13. 6); it is written in אֵלָכַי (Hos. 10. 14). Other examples are אֶלְּכָה (Lam. 4. 18), אֶלְּכָה (1 Sam. 17. 48) אֶלְּכָה (Ps. 86. 14); אֶלָּכַי (Lam. 3. 52) for אֶלָּכַי, מְדִינֵה, מְדִינֵה, these being derived from מְדִינֵה (Is. 18. 6) from מְדִינֵה (Gen. 8. 22); אֶלָּכַי (1 Chr. 21. 20) from אֶלָּכַי (Ps. 26. 5); אֶלָּכַי from אֶלָּכַי (1 Sam. 24. 16), אֶלָּכַי (Num. 11. 8) from אֶלָּכַי (Is. 33. 21); so also אֶלָּכַי (Ps. 7. 11) אֶלָּכַי (Lev. 15. 3), אֶלָּכַי (Ps. 34. 11), וֹ (Gen. 4. 25), אֶלָּכַי (2 Kgs. 4. 38) with many others. Know also that אֶלָּכַי (2 Sam. 12. 18) is another instance, this being derived from אֶלָּכַי (Pr. 18. 21), אֶלָּכַי (Ps. 116. 15); this explanation accordingly upsets the theory of those who hold that there are but two radicals in these verbs. This latent quiescent is neither written nor pronounced in the form corresponding to אֶלָּכַי in the sense of the future, as אֶלָּכַי (Gen. 28. 21), אֶלָּכַי, מְדִינֵה, מְדִינֵה, אֶלָּכַי (Is. 65. 19), וֹ (Zech. 3. 9), וֹ (Am. 7. 9); so with the form אֶלָּכַי (Num. 32. 14), אֶלָּכַי (Dent. 11. 28), אֶלָּכַי (2 Kgs. 1. 5), and so with all. Know also that most of the participles derived from these verbs take the same form in pronunciation as their pretetrites; thus אֶלָּכַי plural אָלָכְּנָי (Ps. 3. 2) is the participle; אֶלָּכַי (1 Sam. 17. 48) the preterite; so אֶלָּכַי (Gen. 27. 33) and אֶלָּכַי (Lam. 3. 52); [for the final כ is the plural termination, כ the pronoun of the first person; these being removed only כ remains. In the same way אֶלָּכַי (Zech. 12. 2) must be the participle, as you cannot say אֵלָּכַי את אֵלָּכַי, or אֵלָּכַי את אֵלָּכַי, את אֵלָּכַי. For אֶלָּכַי, like אֶלָּכַי, this word describing the action or condition of the agent; but with אֶלָּכַי (Dent. 4. 44) is the preterite; so אֵלָּכַי (1 Sam. 17. 15) is the participle, and (Is. 9. 12) the preterite; again אֵלָּכַי (2 Sam. 12. 1), and אֵלָּכַי (Ps. 34. 11), וֹ (Ps. 34. 11), אֵלָּכַי and the participle and the preterite (Jos. 1. 2); all these and the like should have a vowel under their second radical like אֵלָּכַי or אֵלָּכַי; as partitciple or preterite should be אֵלָּכַי with tseri under the כ, like אֵלָּכַי, אֵלָּכַי. But אֵלָּכַי (Ps. 5. 5) is the former, the latter in Gen. 34. 19: so אֵלָּכַי (Is. 56. 3) and (40. 7):] however becoming quiescent, אֵלָּכַי loses its kamets and receives the tseri of כ should its origin: it is the same with אֵלָּכַי, אֵלָּכַי, אֵלָּכַי, אֵלָּכַי.

On the future.

Know that the future of these verbs is formed by changing the second radical to latent quiescent כ, the previous letter receiving shurek in general, occasionally holam, as אֵלָּכַי, אֵלָּכַי etc: there must also, it is universally agreed, be a quiescent added after the four letters ע, י, ג, ֖ which are prefixed to signify the future, in order to compensate for the quiescence of the second radical. For, the vowel of this being lost, if you make ש for, the word is incomplete, and not equivalent to אֵלָּכַי; if however you employ kamets, and thus introduce a quiescent between כ and ש, you supply the deficiency. I further explain that the proper form of אֵלָּכַי is אֵלָּכַי, as אֵלָּכַי, אֵלָּכַי, and that for convenience, the second radical quiesces, that also being in this condition.
though pointed with šh'va,[ there are four quiescent letters in one word, viz. the two just mentioned, the ı of prolongation which appears in קַלַּע, קַלַּע, also, and lastly the כ; it being impossible to pronounce all these, the third is omitted and כ receives the vowel of the second radical ֵי; then having ceased to be quiescent, and the second radical having become so, its vowel being thrown upon כ, a confusion ensues, consequently the latent quiescent is introduced after the prefixed letters as an equivalent. This however is never done but in words which have lost some vowels, as יָדָע, יָדָע, יָדָע, יָדָע; or some letters, as לְלָע (Job. 33. 21), לְלָע (Gen. 31. 49), לְלָע (33. 19); for יָדָע יָדָע, יָדָע יָדָע, as I shall further explain. Also let no one be foolish enough to suppose that the ı of לְלָע, etc. is added for the sake of prolongation as that of לְלָע, etc. for the former stands when ı of the plural is added either in pause or not, as in לְלָע etc.; the latter disappears when ı of the plural is added, if it be not in pause; as for instance in לְלָע etc., šh'va being substituted for it. When however the pronominal suffixes are added to these verbs, the quiescent which follows the prefixed letters, as it does not belong to the root, falls away, as in הָע (Ps. 140. 11) from הָע (Lev. 17. 13), הָע taking its place, so in הָע (Deut. 2. 19), הָע (Ps. 2. 9), הָע (Gen. 3. 15), הָע (Num. 24. 17), הָע (Job. 31. 15), הָע (Is. 64. 6), and the same happens when ı is added to ı of the plural, as in הָע etc. Further, הָע etc. may be pointed with šhreq or holam, these sometimes being equivalent; and when they receive a conversive with הָע, they lose the ı representing their second radical, when they are not in pause, the syllable receiving kamets hatuph to mark the loss; as in אָּנָּה (Gen. 25. 8), אָּנָּה (23. 17), אָּנָּה (Jud. 14. 8), אָּנָּה (Gen. 20. 1), אָּנָּה (39. 13), אָּנָּה (Is. 6. 6), אָּנָּה (Gen. 45. 26), אָּנָּה (2 Sam. 12. 16), אָּנָּה (18. 26), אָּנָּה (Jos. 5. 3), and so always, unless the first radical be י or ה, or the third י or ה, then, as being easier, הָע takes the place of kamets hatuph; as אָּנָּה (2 Sam. 21. 15), אָּנָּה (Job. 31. 5), אָּנָּה (Gen. 8. 4), אָּנָּה (Is. 7. 2), אָּנָּה (2 Kgs. 17. 5), אָּנָּה (Jud. 4. 18), אָּנָּה (6. 38); but it is a mistake to read with הָע any but these and the like: however in a pause the second radical ı is again pronounced, as before the addition of the first ı, as in אָּנָּה (Hos. 13. 1), אָּנָּה (2 Sam. 3. 16), אָּנָּה (2 Kgs. 9. 10), and the rest: with the plural and other terminations it remains, as in אָּנָּה, יָּנָּה, יָּנָּה, יָּנָּה.

On the imperative.

Know that the masculine imperative is formed by making the second radical quiescent and pointing the preceding letter with šhreq or holam, as in the future, for instance, בָּע, בָּע, etc. And should any one ask why I say that in these verbs is the second radical, while I do not say the same of the similar latent quiescents in בָּע, בָּע, etc., but assert that these are from בָּע, בָּע, that, I reply that the latent quiescent in these last does not belong to the root, but is due to the prolongation caused by the accent, and, when this goes, disappears with it, as in בָּע (Gen. 12. 1), בָּע (35. 1); here there is neither accent nor latent quiescent, but in בָּע and the like the quiescent remains whether there be an accent or no. Another proof of my statement is, that, when ı of the plural is added to בָּע and the like, šh'va takes the place of the quiescent, as in בָּע (Num. 22. 19), בָּע (Gen. 42. 2), בָּע (1 Kgs. 12. 5); this is not so with בָּע, בָּע, either in pause or otherwise, and this settles the matter. A few past participles also are found, which will serve for samples of the rest, which, like the imperative, have a quiescent ı preceded by šhreq, as נֶאֶה (Cant. 7. 3), in another sense, נֶאֶה (Pr. 14. 14), נֶאֶה (Jos. 5. 5), נְעָה (Job. 31. 34), נְעָה (2 Sam. 13. 32), נְעָה (1 Sam. 21. 10), נְעָה (Is. 25. 7), the second word here must be a past participle, as is shown by בְּנֶאֶה which follows; נְעָה, נְעָה (Pr. 25. 19) like נְעָה: some persons add to this list נְעָה (Zeph. 3. 10). All these should have been pointed with a vowel after the ı, and kamets after the first radical, like נְעָה, but these for ease of pronunciation have been dropped, as also the ı of prolongation, as this could not be pronounced after the second radical had become quiescent. Some are formed like this, though not with a passive signification, [but
as expressing manner or condition.] as בָּשָׂה (Jer. 48. 39), בָּשָׂה (Ez. 32. 30), כְּכָסְלָה, כְּכָסְלָה etc. So מַכְשָׂה (Ps. 145. 9), מַכְשָׂה (Num. 13. 19), מַכְשָׂה (Jer. 17. 13), מַכְשָׂה (2 Kgs. 21. 20), מַכְשָׂה (Ez. 27. 32); though the latter have shurek and the former hdlm, the meaning is the same: the infinitive, which serves for a noun as well, likewise takes both vowels indifferently, for instance בָּשָׂה (Job. 15. 22), בָּשָׂה (Ps. 18. 39), בָּשָׂה (Num. 23. 10), בָּשָׂה (Job. 3. 1), בָּשָׂה (Gen. 44. 29) with hdlm and בָּשָׂה etc. (Num. 31. 15), בָּשָׂה (Jer. 2. 11). [sometimes it takes seghol when the guttural has kamats, as בָּשָׂה (Num. 11. 12), בָּשָׂה (Jo. 1. 2); all these should be pointed like בָּשָׂה (Gen. 29. 6), בָּשָׂה (Jud. 22. 22), בָּשָׂה (Num. 13. 19), בָּשָׂה etc. When בָּשָׂה and the like receive pro-
nominal suffixes, then the quiescent after the prefixed letters disappears, as in בָּשָׂה etc. and so with מַכְשָׂה etc.; this is because it does not belong to the root and is therefore dropped for the sake of convenience [when anything is added to the end of the word: but in בָּשָׂה (Jud. 19. 22) it is part of the root, and therefore מַכְשָׂה is written; as being the first radical, and standing in the place of the מַכְשָׂה of מַכְשָׂה and the מַכְשָׂה of מַכְשָׂה.

On the future of Hiphil.
Know that the Hebrews use בָּשָׂה with hirik and בָּשָׂה with tseri with the same meaning, so בָּשָׂה etc.; this בָּשָׂה, as I have before stated, belongs to the root, and so does the latent quiescent after the בָּשָׂה corresponding to it; this is dropped for ease of pronunciation with בָּשָׂה, except in rare instances, and the first radical receives seghol to indicate the loss of בָּשָׂה, as in בָּשָׂה, בָּשָׂה (Jud. 2. 16), בָּשָׂה, בָּשָׂה (Gen. 14. 16) etc.; all take seghol, unless the third radical be ב or ב or ב, then pathlah is substituted, as in בָּשָׂה (1 Kgs. 14. 9), בָּשָׂה (Ez. 32. 2), בָּשָׂה (Jos. 21. 42), בָּשָׂה (Gen. 8. 21), בָּשָׂה (Ps. 31. 14); one word takes hirik, בָּשָׂה (Jud. 9. 53), this was originally בָּשָׂה, and on the addition of ב to the ב for convenience of pronunciation, but kept ב as before. With pronominal suffixes, בָּשָׂה and the like recover the quiescent representing the second radical, as בָּשָׂה etc.]

On the imperative of Hiphil.
The imperative masculine from בָּשָׂה and the like has kamats under the ב, followed by a latent quiescent, בָּשָׂה, בָּשָׂה, with hirik or tseri, but the former only with the plural
termination of the feminine, as לְךָ, לֹּכָּה, לְכַּה (Is. 14. 21), לְכָים (Gen. 35. 2), לְכַה (Jer. 5. 10). Sometimes it has no ה, as לְכָּה (Josh. 8. 2), לְכַּה (Judg. 19. 9). It is more common (Ps. 94. 8). Sometimes it has no ה (Is. 65. 18), לְכַּה (Jer. 4. 3), לְכָּה (Ex. 15. 21), לְכַּה (Ps. 48. 14), לְכָּה (Jer. 21. 12). The infinitive, which also serves as a noun, is sometimes like the first form of the imperative, as לְכָּה (Is. 56. 11), לְכַּה (Gen. 30. 32), sometimes like the second, as לְכַּה (Pr. 23. 1), לְכָּה (Jr. 50. 34). The verbal noun is formed sometimes like לְכַּה, לְכַּה etc., the of these being part of the root, the ה a prefixed, ה marking the feminine: לְכַּה is derived from לְכָּה, [and stands in the place of two words לְךָּה, לְכָּה, 'hearing a cry'] but לְכַּה is from לְכָּה, [and it may be said that לְכַּה is formed from the of לְכָּה]. Other nouns are formed thus, לְכַּה, לְכַּה, לְכָּה etc.: these לְכַּהs also belong to the root, [the word being formed like לְכַּה, לְכַּה, but have suffered quiescence.] Some are found without ה at their end, as לְכִּי (Ecc. 9. 11), with לְכַּה under ה on account of the ה, instead of taking kamets like לְכַּה, לְכַּה etc.

On Hophal. 1

This is formed by changing the quiescent inserted after the ה of Hiphil, and after the prefixes לְכָּה in the future, to quiescent ה, with sharek preceding, this vowel being always used in the Hophal of verbs whose first radical is not one of the four לְכָּה, לְכַּה, לְכַּה, לְכָּה; the second radical of the preterite and future disappears when they are not in pause; as for instance לְכָּה, לְכַּה, לְכַּה etc., and so with all. Let no one suppose that ה in these corresponds to that in לְכָּה (Job. 33. 19), לְכַּה (Gen. 33. 1), לְכָּה (Is. 12. 5), the latter being the first radical, the former added in the way I explained in לְכָּה etc. The proper form of לְכָּה, לְכַּה, לְכָּה, לְכָּה would be מְכָּה, מְכַּה, מְכַּה, מְכָּה etc.

1 II. om. from after ה to the same words at the beginning of the next chapter.

On Niphal.

This is formed by changing the second radical to latent quiescent ה preceded by holem, the ה marking Niphal taking kamets, and thus a latent quiescent is made to follow it as I before explained: for instance לְכִּי (Gen. 41. 39); here the ה is that of Niphal, the following latent quiescent is added, ה is the first radical, ה is the second, ה is the third; it should be pointed like לְכָּה, לְכַּה etc., but for convenience the ה is made quiescent: so again לְכִּי (Hos. 6. 3), לְכִּי (Pr. 19. 29), לְכִּי (Ps. 17. 5), לְכִּי (2 Sam. 19. 10), לְכִּי (Pr. 3. 32), לְכִּי (Ecc. 12. 6), לְכִּי (Is. 1. 4), לְכִּי (Ps. 76. 5), לְכִּי (Is. 29. 10), לְכִּי (Nah. 3. 18), לְכִּי (Jo. 1. 18), לְכִּי (Esth. 3. 15), לְכִּי (Ps. 44. 19), לְכִּי (Nah. 2. 7), לְכִּי (Jos. 2. 24), לְכִּי (Zech. 2. 17), [with tseri under ה on account of the ה which follows]. Know also that in the participle, which should be pointed with kamets, and the preterite, which should have pathah, the second radical is lost in ה and the like, inasmuch as the pronunciation of ה cannot be distinguished, and it has none of the kings for its vowel; and when we form the plural, the quiescent after the ה disappears, as in לְכִּי (Deut. 1. 13), לְכִּי (Ex. 19. 15), לְכִּי (Ps. 2. 15), לְכִּי (Ps. 46. 5), לְכִּי (Ps. 75. 4). The same happens when ה in the preterite is declined, the first radical receiving shuruk to mark the second, the third holem, a latent quiescent is thus formed, as in לְכִּי (Is. 10. 13), לְכִּי (Ps. 38. 9), לְכִּי (Ps. 20. 48), לְכִּי (id. 34). With לְכִּי, the prefixes of the future, the ה of Niphal is absorbed in the following letter, which accordingly receives dagesh, as is always the case in Niphal, unless the letter be one of the five לְכִּי, לְכִּי, לְכִּי, לְכִּי, לְכִּי and therefore refuse it, the ה is quiescent as before: the dagesh is important as distinguishing Niphal, for instance in לְכִּי (Pr. 12. 3): this should have been pointed like לְכִּי, לְכִּי. So לְכִּי (16. 3), לְכִּי (Is. 10. 4), לְכִּי (Ps. 13. 3), לְכִּי (Ps. 140. 10), לְכִּי (Nah. 3. 19), לְכִּי (Ps. 35. 4).
The Hebrews sometimes double the third radical in these verbs, leaving the second a quiescent ้, as before, this is owing to a change of meaning: thus from דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (Ec. 12. 6), דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (2 Sam. 2. 32) from דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (Ps. 76. 5), all these would have received dagesh had they been capable of it: so also with other verbs whose first radical is one of דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה, as דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה etc. The masculine imperative is דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (Am. 4. 12), of the form דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה, like דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה, and therefore with dagesh in דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה, it should have been pointed like it and like דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (2 Kgs. 14. 10), so לְבָרָה יְדֹמֵה (Jer. 4. 4). The infinitive, which also serves for a verbal noun, is of the same form; as לְבָרָה יְדֹמֵה (Gen. 34. 17), לְבָרָה יְדֹמֵה (Lev. 14. 43), like לְבָרָה יְדֹמֵה [עָלָה (1 Sam. 27. 1), and הסָךְ (1 Kgs. 20. 39);] so לָבֶּרֶד (Is. 25. 10), although this has shureq and the others halem, these being often equivalent; consequently ר receives dagesh; מָכָּה and מָכָּה (Is. 24. 3) should also be of this class.

Another chapter.

The Hebrews sometimes double the third radical in these verbs, leaving the second a quiescent ้, as before, this is owing to a change of meaning: thus from דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (Ec. 12. 6), דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (2 Sam. 2. 32) from דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (Ps. 76. 5), all these would have received dagesh had they been capable of it: so also with other verbs whose first radical is one of דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה, as דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה etc. The masculine imperative is דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (Am. 4. 12), of the form דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה, like דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה, and therefore with dagesh in דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה, it should have been pointed like it and like דִּבָּרָה יְדֹמֵה (2 Kgs. 14. 10), so לְבָרָה יְדֹמֵה (Jer. 4. 4). The infinitive, which also serves for a verbal noun, is of the same form; as לְבָרָה יְדֹמֵה (Gen. 34. 17), לְבָרָה יְדֹמֵה (Lev. 14. 43), like לְבָרָה יְדֹמֵה [עָלָה (1 Sam. 27. 1), and הסָךְ (1 Kgs. 20. 39);] so לָבֶּרֶד (Is. 25. 10), although this has shureq and the others halem, these being often equivalent; consequently ר receives dagesh; מָכָּה and מָכָּה (Is. 24. 3) should also be of this class.
Verbs with a latent quiescent for their middle radical, either ı̂ or ı.

The Hebrews employ this participle with the ı̂ clearly pronounced by the palate, יִשְׁרֵי (2 Sam. 4, 8), with hirik, like יִשְׂרֵאֶל, and in such a form the second radical always has a vowel, though it varies. With all this, however, the second radical does not escape being made quiescent and latent, as in יִשְׂרֵאֶל (Gen. 3, 15).

YISHAREL (Ps. 88, 5), YISHAREL (22, 20); with the same meaning and derivation, YAREL (Gen. 31, 29), (Mic. 2, 1); the latent quiescent between ı̂ and ı̂ is the ı̂ appearing in יִשְׁרֵאֶל and יִשְׁרֵי, sometimes this is written, as in יְשָׁרֵאֶל (Ex. 32, 21). [This last has the sense of an adjective, the former is a noun.]

And now, having completed my explanations on the verbs whose second radical is a quiescent latent, I have thought fit to collect the verbs themselves together, and will mention with regard to each anything peculiar I may find in its ways or meaning. It is not my purpose to state when their middle radical is ı̂ and when ı̂, that being generally uncertain: my intention however is, and I have sufficient knowledge to carry it out, to explain the position of the quiescent which stands for the second radical, whether it be ı̂ or ı̂. As, for instance, יִשְׂרֵי corresponds to יִשְׂרֵאֶל, and the quiescent between the ı̂ and ı̂ is for the ı̂; you may say it is ı̂, if you derive it from יָשָׁר (Ex. 13, 6), or ı̂, if you observe the quiescent in יָשָׁר, and so with יָשָׁר, whose ı̂ is manifest in the pronunciation of יָשָׁר (Pr. 18, 21). So now with God’s help I proceed to collect them together.

1 H. W. F. S. transl., twice. L. om. from רָאָשׁ to רָשׁוֹת.
that the middle radical has been placed first: that is, that the
ז or ב which is the second radical of ולש, ולש, is changed
to the first in וְלָשׁ: the same is said of מְשִׁית (Jer. 6. 15),
that the latent quiescent standing in the place of the first
radical after the written ז the sign of the future is another
ד and that for this reason ד does not take kafem as in מְשִׁית.
It may be so, and it may be that they are two roots of
like signification, as וְלָשׁ, וְלָשׁ, and of similar sound. There
is another signification, מְשִׁית (Jud. 3. 25), and of like sense
a heavy conjugation with the third radical doubled, מְשִׁית
(Ex. 32. 1), (Jud. 5. 28), מְשִׁית, מְשִׁית, יִשָּׁמַע, in pause pointed
like מְשִׁית (Neh. 2. 5).

one, like וְלָשׁ etc. So יָשָׁמַע and יָשָׁמַע, in the same
verse (Ez. 16. 55), יָשָׁמַע וְלָשׁ for יָשָׁמַע יָשָׁמַע and the
like. The Hiphil is יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, like
the imperative, infinitive, and verbal noun: וְלָשׁ and וְלָשׁ are both
used, the former being the proper form; like יָשָׁמַע
and יָשָׁמַע, so יָשָׁמַע יָשָׁמַע etc. For the noun, two forms are used, יָשָׁמַע
and יָשָׁמַע etc.; we may say that יָשָׁמַע was made to match יָשָׁמַע, without any
notice being taken of the derivation, for the latter is of
the form יָשָׁמַע from יָשָׁמַע; the י corresponding to the י of יָשָׁמַע
and the י of יָשָׁמַע, whereas there is no preterite יָשָׁמַע, but יָשָׁמַע,
like יָשָׁמַע: it should therefore be like יָשָׁמַע (Ex. 46. 19),
*םָשֵׁמַע* like יָשָׁמַע etc. There is another noun like יָשָׁמַע
(8. 5), as יָשָׁמַע etc.

בּ (Pr. 6. 30), (Cant. 8. 1), נ (Pr. 13. 13),
נ (Is. 37. 22), נ marking the feminine, from נ; but
 Assyria (Nun. 15. 31), נ (1 Sam. 2. 30); מ (2 Sam. 12. 9),
מ (id. 10), are from another root.

v. ר, נ*, נ, יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע: the Niphal לָשׁ, לָשׁ, לָשׁ, לָשׁ is the
imperative, infinitive, and verbal noun. There is
another heavy conjugation, with the third radical doubled:
*לָשֵׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע* (Deut. 32. 10): יָשָׁמַע is the imperative and
verbal noun.

אִם (Pr. 27. 7), אָשָׁמַע, אָשָׁמַע, אָשָׁמַע, אָשָׁמַע (Ps. 60. 14): the Hophal participle מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ, מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ, מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ: another heavy conjugation has the third radical doubled,
*מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ, מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ, מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ* (Ex. 16. 6).

בּ (Ps. 22. 6), מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (Jer. 51. 51), מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (Ez. 8. 22);
מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (Jer. 12. 13), [is the second person imperative,
like the third person of the preterite: the noun,] מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (Ez. 7. 18),
[and מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (Zeph. 3. 5); the participle] מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (Jer. 48. 39),
*מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ:* (Gen. 2. 25); the Hiphil מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ, מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ,
*מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ* (Ps. 53. 6), מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (Pr. 10. 26); מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (2 Sam.
19. 6), מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (Jer. 8. 9), מָשַׁמֵּשָׁהוּ (Is. 93. 5) are not from this
root, but from one beginning with כ. Some however suppose

*בּ* (Ps. 90. 10), יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע (Nun. 11. 31); יָשָׁמַע (Ps.
71. 6) may be from this root: [this before receiving the
suffix would be like יָשָׁמַע, the singular from יָשָׁמַע (2 Kgs. 16. 7).]

ז* (Job. 40. 28); יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע (Ps. 22.
10) may be from this root, in the way I explained
in reference to יָשָׁמַע.

אִם (Is. 65. 19), יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע ( Hos. 10. 5), יָשָׁמַע
(Pr. 23. 24), also written יָשָׁמַע יָשָׁמַע: as both conjugations
are found: [like יָשָׁמַע יָשָׁמַע, the former like יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע.]

ז* (Gen. 32. 5), יָשָׁמַע (Is. 16. 4), יָשָׁמַע (2 Kgs. 8. 2),
יָשָׁמַע (Gen. 26. 3), יָשָׁמַע (1 Kgs. 17. 29). With an-
other meaning, יָשָׁמַע (Dent. 1. 17), יָשָׁמַע (Num. 22. 3), יָשָׁמַע (Job.
19. 29); יָשָׁמַע (Is. 63. 4), יָשָׁמַע (Pr. 10. 24); but יָשָׁמַע
(Jer. 22. 25), יָשָׁמַע (Dent. 9. 19) are from a root beginning with כ,
as I explained in the chapter thereon.

*בּ* (Neh. 7. 3): the imperative masculi-
line is יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, like יָשָׁמַע יָשָׁמַע.

בּ יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע: a fisherman is called יָשָׁמַע or יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע
(Jer. 16. 16), יָשָׁמַע (Ez. 47. 10): the Piel יָשָׁמַע, יָשָׁמַע,
should have had daghesh, but it has been omitted for ease of pronunciation, as in יָשָׁמַע יָשָׁמַע, the י, which is absorbed.
second radical does, except with athnah, soph pasuk, and zaleph in some places: קָשְׂרָה (2 Sam. 22. 15); הבּ (Jud. 4. 15); [these last may be from both קָשְׂרָה and סָפָע (Is. 28. 28), as רַעַק and סָפָע. Ps. 49. 6] The Hiphil is with הַדָּשֶׁם, with pathah under it, as I explained in the case of יָדַע (M. 33), יָדַע (Jer. 44. 25), יָדַע (Ruth. 1. 19); as יָדַע (2 Sam. 2. 23).

ןְיָדַע, אָרוּם (Dent. 1. 41), מְחַלֶּה, מָחַל (Lev. 15. 25), בּוֹז (Lev. 20. 20), בּוֹז (Lev. 20. 24), בּוֹז (Lev. 15. 33).

ץָהַבּ, בּוֹז (Jer. 49. 4), בּוֹז (Ps. 78. 20), בּוֹז (Lev. 20. 24), בּוֹז (Lev. 15. 33).

ץָהַבּ, בּוֹז (Jer. 49. 3), בּוֹז (Ps. 18. 11), בּוֹז (Jer. 50. 20), בּוֹז (Ps. 21. 24), בּוֹז (Ps. 124. 5) like יַעַנְנַם, יַעַנְנַם, יַעַנְנַם; with פָּשֹׁנַם, פָּשֹׁנַם, פָּשֹׁנַם; between the יִגְלָה and יִגְלָה rightly and according to the root. The Hiphil is יִגְלָה, יִגְלָה (Neh. 9. 10), יִגְלָה (Ex. 21. 14).

ץָהַבּ, בּוֹז (Is. 46. 6), פָּשֹׁנַם, פָּשֹׁנַם (Gen. 45. 23).

ץָהַבּ, בּוֹז (Ps. 144. 13), בּוֹז (Gen. 45. 23).

ץָהַבּ, בּוֹז (Esth. 5. 9), בּוֹז (Ecc. 12. 3), יִגְלָה the masculine imperative, as also the infinitive and verbal noun. In the noun יֵעַל indeed (Is. 28. 19), the יֵעַל receives a vowel; some suppose that יֵעַל is changed from it, with the second and third radicals transposed.

ץָהַבּ, בּוֹז (Job. 39. 15), בּוֹז (Jud. 6. 38); the past participle יֵעַל (Is. 59. 5), the final יֵעַל marking the feminine as in יֵעַל (Zech. 5. 4). Another meaning is יֵעַל, יֵעַל (Ps. 78. 30), יֵעַל (Job. 19. 17), יֵעַל (Lev. 22. 12), יֵעַל (Jo. 4. 17). In the preterite another form יֵעַל is used, יֵעַל (Ps. 58. 4); the Niphal: יֵעַל (Is. 1. 4), יֵעַל, יֵעַל, יֵעַל the masculine imperative and verbal noun.

ץָהַבּ, בּוֹז (Ex. 18. 7); there is also a Piel in which quiescent יֵעַל becomes יֵעַל, with daghesh, דָּגַג, דָּגַג, דָּגַג (Dan. 1. 10), פָּשֹׁנַם, פָּשֹׁנַם.