will find, after the third radical with dagesh; and so with ל of the plural, as ו is when he takes pathah under מ on account of נ. Sometimes ל is changed to ל, as in חנהו (Pr. 24. 28), for חנהו. The future drops one double letter and takes two quiescents, kamets before, and tseri after, the first radical, as in בָּא. לֹא (1 Sam. 6. 5), לֶא (Jud. 10. 18), לֵא (1 Chron. 3. 3), לָהו (Ez. 9. 6) for לָהו etc., like לָהו (Jer. 11. 19): so when a letter is added to ל (לֹא) and the like, as in לָהו etc., לָהו (Jud. 20. 31): when בָּא (לֶא), and the like are joined to pronominal suffixes, the missing letter is supplied by dagesh, the two quiescents disappear, and the first radical always takes birtak: as in בָּא הבין (Ez. 47. 2), בָּא עָשָׂה (2 Sam. 22. 43), בָּא עָשָׂה (1 Sam. 5. 6), בָּא עָשָׂה (Job. 18. 18). The masculine imperative has one of the double letters and two quiescents, as בָּא: with ל of the plural or ל of the feminine the missing letter is supplied by dagesh and the quiescents remain, as בָּא הבין (Cant. 6. 5): with the pronominal suffixes, dagesh supplies the lost letter, the two quiescents are dropped, and the first radical takes birtak, [inasmuch as the imperative in all conjugations imitates the future: בָּא הבין, בָּא הבין. פָּלָו (Gen. 37. 14), the only difference being that the former take dagesh in their third radical, the latter not.] The participle also has one of the double letters and two quiescents, as בָּא הבין (Jer. 21. 4), הבין (25. 29): the plural supplies the missing letter by dagesh, and drops the quiescents; as בָּא הבין, הבין הבין, הבין etc.; but the absence of dagesh in the latter points to the quiescent second radical written as ל, its presence in the former marks the loss of the first double letter absorbed in the second. The Hophal also takes one double letter and two quiescents, as בָּא הבין, הבין (Is. 28. 28): with ל of the plural, or ל or ל of the feminine, it takes dagesh, as הבין etc. לוהו (Ez. 21. 14): the participle is הבין, הבין, the missing letter being supplied by dagesh; the proper forms would be הבין etc.

On Niphal.

Observing that such forms as יִשָּׁב (Nah. 1. 12), יִשָּׁב (Is. 34. 4), יָשָׁב (64. 2), had dagesh in their final syllable, I recognised them as Niphals of verbs with double letters from singulars יְשָׁב etc., the latent quiescent after כ being added for the reasons above stated; כ is the first radical, כ added for prolongation, כ stands for the double letter; so also יָשָׁב, יִשָּׁב: when כ of the plural is added, the lost letter is compensated by dagesh, the two quiescents remain, as יִשָּׁב etc. In forming יִשָּׁב, יָשָׁב etc., the two quiescents disappear; כ preceded by holem is appended to the third radical with dagesh to attach the terminations, the first radical receives sharek, as יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב etc. In יִשָּׁב the like, kamets under the second radical the sign of the participle, and pathah the sign of the preterite disappear, on account of the second radical being lost. The future is יִשָּׁב etc. with dagesh in the first radical on account of the absorption of כ: like them may be יִשָּׁב (Lev. 10. 3), יִשָּׁב (Gen. 47. 18), when a termination is added, the last letter also receives dagesh to represent the lost radical that now returns, as in יִשָּׁב etc.; יִשָּׁב (Jer. 48. 2) is another example, but יִשָּׁב (Lam. 2. 10) does not. The imperative is הבין, הבין, הבין, הבין etc.: these resemble the imperatives of verbs quiescing in the second radical, but the former have dagesh to mark the lost double letter, the latter omit it to mark the quiescent second radical. I have also found a more usual form of Niphal, itself defective in a letter: the sign distinguishing the preterite and participle remains in this form, except that it stands with the first radical instead of the second, the word being
defective; the participle is בָּשִׁים (Ps. 18. 27), in this it marks the Niphal, the kamets with the latent quiescent is employed in the manner before mentioned. ב is the first radical, the kamets beneath it marks the participle, ה stands for the two in נָשִׁים, the proper form would be בּשִׁים כַּמְּשִׁים; instead of under ב instead of כ. The preterite however, like בָּשִׁים (Num. 34. 4), כַּמְּשִׁים (2 Kgs. 3. 18), takes passhah, [although the sense is made future by the prefixed; just as בְּשׁוּם (Gen. 42. 28) is preterite, בְּשׁוּם (Ex. 36. 1) future; so בָּשִׁים (Gen. 1. 1) and בָּשִׁים (Is. 4. 5):] the proper form would be בָּשִׁים כַּמְּשִׁים. a similar example is בָּשִׁים (Ex. 16. 21), though with kamets on account of soph pasuk. Sometimes both the preterite and participle are pointed with כַּמְּשִׁים under the first radical, and then they can only be distinguished by the sense: as בָּשִׁים (Is. 49. 6) the participle, בָּשִׁים (1 Kgs. 16 31) the preterite: so בָּשִׁים (Nah. 2. 11) the participle, בָּשִׁים (Ex. 21. 12) the preterite, [though with a future sense on account of כ.]. In the plural, the participle בָּשִׁים recovers its lost letter by means of daghesh, drops the two quiescents and takes passhah invariably beneath the first radical, as in בָּשִׁים etc., בָּשְׁמֵס (Ez. 33. 10), בָּשָׁמֶס, with kamets, as ב does not generally take passhah, for בָּשְׁמֵס etc., [as בָּשָׁמֶס (Jer. 2. 13), בָּשָׁמֶס (Job. 28. 4).] In the feminine singular or plural, it becomes בָּשְׁמֵס (Jer. 6. 14), קִנְבֶשֶׁים (Ez. 36. 34), שֵׁשָׂמֶש (id. 35), שֶׁפֶשַׁמֶּשׁ, but שֶׁפֶשַׁמֶּשׁ, שֶׁפֶשַׁמֶּשׁ, שֶׁפֶשַׁמֶּשׁ without daghesh in the ב. In adding the plural, or ב of the feminine, to the preterite בָּשִׁים, the letter will return and be absorbed in the second one, the first radical takes passhah, the two quiescents remain, as in בָּשִׁים (Gen. 19. 4) for בָּשִׁים; so בָּשִׁים (Jer. 25. 37), בָּשִׁים (Is. 34. 4), בָּשִׁים (Is. 34. 4), בָּשִׁים (Is. 34. 11).] the rule is invariable. Sometimes however it is used defectively, as בָּשִׁים (Ez. 41. 7), בָּשִׁים (Gen. 11. 7); they should have taken daghesh, or been written בָּשִׁים, שֶׁפֶשַׁמֶּשׁ, as coming from בָּשִׁים (1 Sam. 7. 16), בָּשִׁים (Gen. 11. 9); they may be from another root beginning with ב, and be of the form בָּשִׁים. In forming שֶׁפֶשַׁמֶּשׁ, שֶׁפֶשַׁמֶּשׁ, שֶׁפֶשַׁמֶּשׁ, the rest, the second double letter takes daghesh, as having absorbed the first, quiescent ב follows, and the first radical takes pathah invariably, the two quiescents disappear; as in בָּשִׁים etc., בָּשִׁים (Ez. 24. 23), בָּשִׁים (2 Sam. 6. 22); so with בָּשִׁים and the like, with the masculine בָּשִׁים, בָּשִׁים, the feminine בָּשִׁים, בָּשִׁים, [and the participle בָּשִׁים (Ez. 30. 7).] It is true that בָּשִׁים and the like, in which ב belongs to the Niphal, and is not a radical, resemble בָּשִׁים and בָּשִׁים in which it is, but in forming the plural, participles etc., the difference will be noticed. The future absorbs נ of Niphal in the first radical which takes passhah, one double letter being dropped; as in בָּשִׁים for בָּשִׁים; so בָּשִׁים (2 Sam. 17. 10), בָּשִׁים (Zeck. 14. 12), כַּמְּשִׁים (id. 14. 12), כַּמְּשִׁים (Is. 17. 4), בָּשִׁים: when כ of the plural is added; the first and last radical have daghesh, one on account of the absorption of כ, the other on account of the absorption of the second radical: as בָּשִׁים (Ez. 1. 9), בָּשִׁים (Jer. 49. 26), בָּשִׁים (Lev. 26. 39), בָּשִׁים (Jud. 15. 14), for בָּשִׁים etc., like בָּשִׁים etc.: so when the feminine termination כ is added, as בָּשִׁים etc. Know also that בָּשִׁים, בָּשִׁים, from the Niphal of these verbs, correspond to the Niphal of verbs ending in soft ב, as ב (Num. 23. 4), ב (Is. 47. 3), but when an addition is made to them you will observe the difference: for בָּשִׁים (Zeck. 14. 12), take daghesh and have all their radicals, the former have it not and are defective: moreover the latter always have pathah except with athnah and sof pasuk, the former always kamets. The imperative is בָּשִׁים etc., for בָּשִׁים: when כ for the plural or כ for the singular is added, the last letter takes daghesh as before explained; thus בָּשִׁים, בָּשִׁים, with two daghesh's, but בָּשִׁים (Is. 52. 11) does not take it on account of כ, as כ before explained; so בָּשִׁים etc.: the proper forms are בָּשִׁים etc., like בָּשִׁים (Gen. 49. 2), בָּשִׁים (Jer. 17. 21), בָּשִׁים (Jud. 13. 4), בָּשִׁים (Zeck. 2. 11). — After these preliminary statements and explanations I will gather together one by one all the verbs with double letters, mentioning the peculiarities of each, thus completing the design by which I hope, with God's help, to be of service to the student.

1 text p. 13, transl. p. 15.
A list of all the verbs with double letters which are found in Scripture.

Aramaic, בְּשַׁמִּים (Ps. 40. 13), בְּשַׁמִּים (Jon. 2. 6): this verb is regular in keeping both the second and third radical.

םָמָש, בְּשַׁמִּים (Is. 16. 7): hence also comes בְּשַׁמִּים (46. 8); with another meaning, בְּשַׁמִּים (Hos. 3. 1), בְּשַׁמִּים (Cant. 2. 5).

אכר, אכר is the regular form, אכר the usual one: in אכר (Mal. 2. 2), [should have dagesh, as מָמְיק (Job. 40. 4): so מָמְיק (Ez. 20. 38), derived from מָמְיק (Job. 33. 3), מָמְיק (Dan. 12. 10).] The future is אכר (Gen. 12. 3), for אכר (Jud. 5. 23), (id.), should have had dagesh in אכר as מָמְיק (Ps. 48. 13), מָמְיק (1 Sam. 14. 9); however (Mal. 3. 9) is not from this root, but from מָמְיק (Lam. 2. 7), had it not been for מָמְיק, the second radical would have had dagesh as having absorbed the first, [like מָמְיק etc., for מָמְיק belongs to Niphal:] the proper form would be מָמְיק. The Piel אכר should also have dagesh, for מָמְיק (Gen. 5. 29); מָמְיק (Num. 5. 27); הַיַּרְשָׁם (23. 7) is the imperative aid and should have two יָמְשָׁם.

בד, בְּדֵי (Lev. 13. 46), בְּדֵי (Zech. 12. 13). like this is בְּדֵי (Ps. 102. 8), (Hos. 8. 9), (Is. 14. 31).

כָּמֶש, כִּמֶּש (Dent. 3. 7); כִּמֶּש, כִּמֶּש are also used; כִּמֶּש (Zeph. 2. 9); כִּמֶּש (1 Sam. 14. 36) should have dagesh in כִּמֶּש; but it is omitted for lightness; כִּמֶּש (Esth. 9. 16), כִּמֶּש (Num. 31. 32); plural כִּמֶּש, with dagesh in כִּמֶּש.

כְּמֶש, כְּמֶש (Gen. 11. 9): כְּמֶש may be two words, כְּמֶש כְּמֶש, united in writing; as ר כְּמֶש (30. 11) is written כְּמֶש; the former however is written and read as one word, the latter written as one and read as two: in this way will כְּמֶש be derived from כְּמֶש. There is another meaning כְּמֶש (Ps. 92. 11), כְּמֶש (Lev. 14. 21), כְּמֶש (2. 5); כְּמֶש also (21. 20) is said to be from this root; a third sense is כְּמֶש or כְּמֶש.

(1) Hebr. om. (2) The Poel is זִכְרָא שְׁנֵי עַשָּׁה (Jer. 51. 2)."
(Ps. 142. 7), or regularly יִשָּׂרֵאָל: יִשָּׂרֵאָל (Is. 19. 6), יִשָּׁר (Ps. 79. 8), יִשָּׁר (Job 28. 4); the Niphal יִשָּׂרֵאָל (Is. 17. 4) for יִשָּׂרֵאָל, [like יִשָּׂרֵאָל, plural יִשָּׂרֵאָל] with dagesh in יִשָּׂרֵאָל: a second sense is יִשָּׂרֵאָל (38. 14).

ירחַף, or regularly יִרְחַף: יִרְחַף (1 Sam. 14. 9), יִרְחַף (1 Kgs. 19. 12), יִרְחַף (Hab. 2. 19); יִרְחַף (Job. 29. 21) may be the Niphal, with dagesh in יִרְחַף as having absorbed יִנְדַי, יִנְדַי also should have it as having absorbed the second יִנְדַי. Another meaning, also a Niphal, is יִרְחַף (Jer. 8. 14), יִרְחַף (25. 37), יִרְחַף (49. 26), יִרְחַף (51. 6); the יִרְחַף too in יִרְחַף יִרְחַף, as in the others, should have dagesh, as having absorbed the first יִרְחַף. The Niphal in this sense is יִרְחַף, יִרְחַף or יִרְחַף יִרְחַף (Jer. 8. 14), for יִרְחַף יִרְחַף etc. יִרְחַף: יִרְחַף (Jud. 13. 23), יִרְחַף יִרְחַף, יִרְחַף יִרְחַף etc.

ךַד (Deut. 9. 21) is the preterite, for קַד, and so has pathah: קַד (Is. 29. 5) is the adjectival and so has kamets: the feminine is קַד (1 Kgs. 19. 12), קַד (Gen. 41. 7): the Hiphil פָּצְדָי (2 Kgs. 23. 15) for פָּצְדָי: פָּצְדָי (Mic. 4. 13), פָּצְדָי (2 Sam. 22. 43), פָּצְדָי (Ex. 30. 36); the Hophal פָּצַד (Is. 28. 28), פָּצַד (and dagesh with dagesh in פָּצַד, and a latent quiescent between it and פָּצַד for compensation:) פָּצַד, פָּצַד, פָּצַד, פָּצַד etc.; feminine קַדְמָי, plural פָּצְדָי, פָּצָדִים etc., both with dagesh in פָּצָד, פָּצָד: the latent quiescent in these disappears.

בולַן (Ps. 119. 164), בּוֹלַן (150. 6): בּוֹלַן and בּוֹלַן have dropped dagesh for lighteness: בּוֹלַן, בּוֹלַן (145. 21): a second sense is בּוֹלַן, or בּוֹלַן regularly: future בּוֹלַן (75. 5): a third sense is בּוֹלַן, [for בּוֹלַן, like בּוֹלַן (2 Kgs. 4. 27); בּוֹלַן (Job. 31. 26), בּוֹלַן (41. 10), בּוֹלַן (Is. 13. 10), בּוֹלַן, בּוֹלַן: from this sense comes בּוֹלַן (14. 12).

הָצִיד (Ex. 23. 27), מָצִיד (2 Chr. 15. 6), מָצִיד (Is. 28. 28) [is like מָצִיד and therefore] with pathah under the first מָצִיד: the future is מָצִיד, plural מָצִיד; מָצִיד (Jos. 10. 10), with dagesh on account of the absorption of the first מָצִיד: מָצִיד (Jer. 17. 3), מָצִיד (Ps. 36. 7), מָצִיד (Dent. 8. 9), מָצִיד would have dagesh but for מָצִיד.

בּוֹלַן (Ps. 62. 4) will be from בּוֹלַן, of the form בּוֹלַן, like יִרְחַף from יִרְחַף, or of the form יִרְחַף from יִרְחַף, like יִרְחַף from יִרְחַף and יִרְחַף: no other explanations are possible, [which is preferable cannot be decided, the word not occurring elsewhere.

בּוֹל (Lam. 4. 7), (Job. 25. 5), יִנְדַי (8. 6), plural יִנְדַי, יִנְדַי with dagesh: יִנְדַי also (28. 17) is said to be of this meaning: the Hiphil is יִנְדַי, יִנְדַי (9. 30), יִנְדַי, יִנְדַי etc.

דָּרְכָּה (Lam. 1. 11), דָּרְכָּה (Dent. 21. 20): there is a second meaning, from the Niphal, דָּרְקָה, דָּרְקָה (Is. 64. 2), דָּרְקָה etc.

דָּרְקָה (Ps. 17. 3), Daniel (Zeck. 8. 15) regularly, מָדַק (Jer. 51. 12), מָדַק (Ps. 140. 9), מָדַק (Job. 17. 11), מָדַק (Pr. 2. 11): with another meaning מָדַק (Ez. 22. 9).

דָּרְקָה (Job. 36. 27), (28. 1): the Piel, מָדַק (Mal. 3. 3), מָדַק (Ps. 12. 7).

דָּרְקָה, or דָּרְקָה regularly: דָּרְקָה (Dent. 33. 3), دָּרְקָה (Job. 31. 33), דָּרְקָה (Ez. 18. 7) may be from this meaning.

דָּרְקָה (Ex. 12. 14), מָדַק (Ps. 42. 5), מָדַק (Ez. 46. 11), מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק (Nah. 2. 1): another or similar meaning is מָדַק (Ps. 107. 27): מָדַק (Is. 19. 17), with מָדַק for soft מָדַק, as is done with these letters.

דָּרְקָה (Hab. 1. 8), דָּרְקָה (Job. 41. 22) is said to come from this root.

דָּרְקָה (Deut. 32. 40), מָדַק (4. 4), מָדַק (Gen. 42. 16), מָדַק (Pr. 18. 21), מָדַק (Gen. 1. 20), [for מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק, מָדַק] but that quiescent מָדַק is changed to מָדַק, as takes
place in the letters רהו, and the second radical is absorbed in the third radical which receives daghesh.

There is a second meaning, in the Hiphil ביהם (1 Sam. 22: 15), הביח (Num. 17: 11), הבית (Dent. 2: 25), הביל (Jud. 20: 49), הביל (Pr. 9: 10); a third meaning is ביהם (Ps. 37: 7), הביל (Job. 29: 21); a fourth, התם (Is. 2: 19); a fifth, התם (1 Kgs. 1: 40), התם (Is. 5: 12).

The root (Is. 44: 16), הדמ (id), הדמ (Ecc. 4: 11), הדמ (Ex. 16: 21), הדמ (Ps. 39: 4), הדמ (Jos. 9: 12), הדמ (Job. 37: 17), הדמ (Gen. 8: 22), הדמ (Jer. 51: 39), הדמ (Gen. 17), הדמ (31: 20), the Piel, הדמ, הדמ, הדמ, הדמ (39: 14), the Niphal, הדמ, הדמ, הדמ; הדמ (Ecc. 4: 11), הדמ (Hos. 7: 7), for הדמ, הדמ, [like כבש] (Am. 9: 1), הדמ (Is. 18: 6): from this meaning comes התם (Cant. 6: 10), הדמ (Ps. 19: 7): הדמ (Is. 47: 14) also, it is said.

In the consonants, הדמ (Gen. 33: 11), הדמ (Gen. 33: 19), הדמ (Job. 33: 24), הדמ (Gen. 33: 21), הדמ (Ps. 41: 5), הדמ, הדמ, הדמ, הדמ, הדמ, הדמ (Lam. 2: 19), or הדמ (Zech. 2: 14): The two ב both appear, regularly, in ב (Gen. 33: 5), ב (Am. 5: 15): but but הדמ (Is. 30: 19) should have had kamets hatuph under בת, as having borrowed the first ב however is quiescent and its vowel thrown upon the preceding ב (Pr. 18: 23); from this meaning comes בת (Ecc. 2: 17), בת (Gen. 39: 21); the Piel, בת (Pr. 26: 25); בת (Ps. 9: 14) should have had daghesh in the first בת, [like הביל (140: 2): so perhaps (Gen. 43: 21) should have had it. [Like הביל (Num. 16: 19):] the Piel בת (Pr. 14: 21): the Piel בת (Is. 26: 10), for בת, plural בת, with daghesh in בת as having absorbed the first בת.

The root (Dent. 33: 12): הדמ (Gen. 49: 13) may come from this, [plural הדמ, הדמ, like הדמ, הדמ.]

1 So L, but Aben Ezra and H. ym.
Piel ְתקפפ, or regularly ְתקפפ (1 Kgs. 21. 19); the Piel, ְתקפפ, ְתקפפ, ְתקפפ (Jud. 7. 6); the first p should have had dagesh, [it is omitted as in ְתקפפ etc.]

I. ְתקפפ (Is. 65. 7), ְתקפפ (Num. 35. 5), ְתקפפ (Ez. 47. 3); the Piel ְתקפפ (2 Sam. 8. 2); ְתקפפ (id.); ְתקפפ (Hab. 3. 6); similar to this in meaning is ְתקפפ (1 Kgs. 17. 21), ְתקפפ (Is. 45. 14). From this may come ְתקפפ (7. 4), a precative; another sense is ְתקפפ (Ex. 16. 18), ְתקפפ (Is. 40. 12), ְתקפפ (Job. 28. 29).

I have found ְתקפפ (Ps. 17. 5) with dagesh in some copies, and without it in others; if the former is right, it comes from this root, if the latter, from a verb quiescing in its second radical, as ְתקפפ (Ps. 19. 29), ְתקפפ (Nah. 3. 18), as I explained in the treatise on latent letters.

I. ְתקפפ (Gen. 21. 7), the Piel: ְתקפפ (Ps. 106. 2), ְתקפפ (Job. 33. 9), ְתקפפ (Job. 35. 4).

I. ְתקפפ (Ps. 52. 7); the Hiphil ְתקפפ (Deut. 1. 28), ְתקפפ, ְתקפפ etc.: the Niphal ְתקפפ (Ex. 16. 21), ְתקפפ (Is. 34. 3), ְתקפפ (Jos. 7. 5), ְתקפפ (2 Sam. 17. 10) for ְתקפפ, ְתקפפ, ְתקפפ (Num. 14. 45). There are, like ְתקפפ, פָּקַפ (Jud. 15. 14); the imperative is ְתקפפ, ְתקפפ, with dagesh in ה, and a latent quiescent after ה: from this may come ְתקפפ (Jud. 6. 14).

I. ְתקפפ or ְתקפפ (Is. 66. 11).

II. ְתקפפ, ְתקפפ (Zech. 14. 12), [and also the imperative, plural נָקֵפ, feminine נָקָפ: the Hophal,] הָקְפַּפ, הָקְפַּפ, נָקְפַּפ, etc.; the Niphal, (Is. 34. 4); ְתקפפ (Ex. 24. 23); ְתקפפ (33. 10), ְתקפפ (Lev. 26. 39), ְתקפפ (Zech. 14. 12), in the last one p stands for two; so ְתקפפ (id.); the

1 Gik. has combined Ez. 47. 3 and 42. 16. 2 Vid. text p. 39, transl. p. 45.
proper forms would be יְדַאֶה, יְדַאֶה, like ֑ יְדַאֶה, יְדַאֶה. [From this root and meaning comes גּוּ, (Is. 3. 24), plural גּוּ, with daghesh in ג.]

דָּאָה (1 Sam. 22. 2), גּוּ (Ex. 15. 25), פֻּשָּׁה (Pr. 5. 4).

deh (1 Sam. 1. 10); all these would have had daghesh but for ג, which does not ordinarily take it. הָדָּאָה (Gen. 26. 35), is the noun, this also should have daghesh and kamets haqaf, daghesh being omitted the vowel is lengthened to loqem; פֻּשָּׁה (Pr. 14. 10) has the proper points; גּוּ (Num. 9. 11), פֻּשָּׁה (Ex. 21. 11), פֻּשָּׁה (Dent. 32. 24); the second ה in this last is the ה of affinity, [as in מָהוּ, מָהוּ, connecting it with מָהוּ, מָהוּ, כָּפָרָה, כָּפָרָה, כָּפָרָה].

From this root and meaning may come גּוּ (Pr. 17. 25) for פֻּשָּׁה, as 1 explained in the case of גּוּ for פֻּשָּׁה the Hiphil is פֻּשָּׁה (Ezra. 1. 20), גּוּ (Job. 27. 2), פֻּשָּׁה (Job. 14. 3), פֻּשָּׁה (Is. 14. 14); the Piel, פֻּשָּׁה (Ex. 1. 14); these also should have daghesh.

בּוּשָּׁה (Gen. 27. 12); פֻּשָּׁה, גּוּ (Dent. 28. 29).

תָּאָה (Job. 11. 12), (Ex. 27. 8).

רָדָּה (Hos. 7. 13), רָדָּה (Nah. 3. 7), רָדָּה (Ps. 68. 13);

deh (Job. 20. 8) is regular, with both its double letters, ג is absorbed in ג with daghesh. The Hiphil is רָדָּה, רָדָּה; in רָדָּה (18, 18) ג has hirik, to show it is from this root: had it been from רָדָּה, רָדָּה (Is. 66. 5), then it would have had pathah like רָדָּה (Ps. 78. 36), from רָדָּה, רָדָּה. There is another meaning, or one allied to the first, רָדָּה (Esth. 6. 1); רָדָּה (Gen. 31. 40), absorbs ג in ג (Job. 7. 4); but רָדָּה (Is. 38. 15) is not from this root.

1 text. p. 114, transl. p. 128.

כְּנֶפֶשׂ (Is. 5. 26), (Ps. 60. 6), כְּנֶפֶשׂ (id.); similar in meaning is כְּנֶפֶשׂ (Zeck. 9. 16); another sense is כְּנֶפֶשׂ (Is. 10. 18).

כְּנֶפֶשׂ (Ex. 1. 7).

כְּנֶפֶשׂ (Is. 7. 19).

כְּנֶפֶשׂ, כְּנֶפֶשׂ (Gen. 41. 51), like גּוּ (33. 11); pathah under the ג and daghesh in ג show that the word is from this root; for had it been from כְּנֶפֶשׂ, כְּנֶפֶשׂ (Lam. 3. 17), one might have pointed כְּנֶפֶשׂ, like כְּנֶפֶשׂ from כְּנֶפֶשׂ, and כְּנֶפֶשׂ would have been derived from it like כְּנֶפֶשׂ however is not from כְּנֶפֶשׂ although the meaning is the same.

כְּנֶפֶשׂ (Ecc. 7. 25), or regularly כְּנֶפֶשׂ (1 Sam. 7. 16), (Ps. 88. 18), קָנָה (Ecc. 11. 18), קָנָה (1 Kgs. 7. 23), קָנָה (Deut. 2. 1), קָנָה (Job. 16. 13), קָנָה (Gen. 49. 22), קָנָה (Ps. 49. 6), קָנָה (Gen. 37. 7), קָנָה (Cant. 2. 17), קָנָה (Ps. 48. 13), קָנָה (Is. 23. 16), קָנָה (Deut. 2. 3) קָנָה (Ecc. 1. 6), קָנָה (2 Chr. 4. 3), קָנָה (Job. 41. 6), קָנָה (Ecc. 1. 6), קָנָה (1 Kgs. 12. 15), קָנָה (Ps. 6. 29), קָנָה (Cant. 1. 12), קָנָה (Pss. 140. 9), קָנָה (Job. 37. 12); the Hiphil is קָנָה (Ex. 6. 22), קָנָה (1 Kgs. 18. 37), קָנָה (1 Sam. 5. 9), קָנָה (Ez. 47. 2), קָנָה (Ps. 26. 2) קָנָה (Jer. 21. 4); plural is קָנֵי, קָנֵי with daghesh and hirik in קָנֵי: daghesh also is inserted in קָנֵי (Ex. 13. 18) to compensate for the missing double letter, just as a latent quiescent is inserted in other similar cases for the same reason: so in the plural קָנֵי (1 Sam. 5. 8) there are two daghesh’s, in קָנֵי as before the addition of the plural termination קָנֵי, in קָנֵי having absorbed the first one: it would have done equally well to insert a latent quiescent after קָנֵי: daghesh after קָנֵי and omit daghesh in קָנֵי. The Hophal is קָנֵי etc., participle קָנֵי etc.: in this also קָנֵי takes daghesh for compensation, as in קָנֵי (Ps. 28. 27), קָנֵי (24. 12); they might have had a latent quiescent instead, as קָנֵי (28. 28). There is a Piel קָנֵי, קָנֵי; קָנֵי (2 Sam. 14. 20); a Piel קָנֵי, קָנֵי, קָנֵי, קָנֵי (Ps. 55. 11), קָנֵי (Dent. 32. 10); the Niphal קָנֵי, קָנֵי, קָנֵי, קָנֵי (Num. 34. 5), קָנֵי, קָנֵי.
(1 Kgs. 12. 11), יִשְׂרָאֵל also (Job. 16. 15) is said to be hence derived.

כְּסִ↗וּל (Ex. 33. 22), מִטְוִים (Lam. 3. 44), יָרֵעַ (1 Kgs. 8. 7), נְפַחְּשׁי (Job. 40. 23), מִשְׁלִים (Ps. 27. 5), מַמְלָכָה (Is. 4. 6), בֵּית (Lev. 25. 43); from this root may come יִשְׂרָאֵל (Job. 38. 8), (3. 28); but יִשְׂרָאֵל (1. 10) is not from this root, [it being of the form תּוֹךְ] מַמְלָכָה. (Jud. 5. 20), מִטְוִים (Is. 33. 8), יָרֵעַ (Jer. 18. 15), יִשְׂרָאֵל (50. 26), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Job. 30. 12).

כְּסִ↗וּל (Ex. 40. 6), מִטְוִים (43. 8), מַמְלָכָה (Am. 3. 1) מַשְׁמֶר (Ps. 84. 11).

כְּסִ↗וּל (Hos. 4. 16), כְּסִ↗וּל (Deut. 21. 18), כְּסִ↗וּל; יִשְׂרָאֵל (Hos. 7. 14) may also be from this, י omitting daghesh as usual.

כְּסִ↗וּל (Jud. 3. 10), כְּסִ↗וּל (Ecc. 7. 19), כְּסִ↗וּל (Jud. 6. 2), כְּסִ↗וּל (Num. 13. 28), כְּסִ↗וּל (Ps. 59. 4), כְּסִ↗וּל (Pr. 21. 14), כְּסִ↗וּל (Ps. 28. 7), כְּסִ↗וּל (24. 8), כְּסִ↗וּל (78. 4), כְּסִ↗וּל (Pr. 8. 28).

כְּסִ↗וּל (Lam. 4. 4), כְּסִ↗וּל (Ps. 8. 3); from this may also come הבִּזְזָמָה (Is. 3. 12); another meaning is יִשְׂרָאֵל (Jer. 6. 9), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Jud. 20. 45), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Is. 17. 6); a third sense is יִשְׂרָאֵל (Deut. 22. 14) יִשְׂרָאֵל (Ps. 66. 5), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Lam. 1. 22), יִשְׂרָאֵל (id.) יִשְׂרָאֵל (Ex. 10. 2), יִשְׂרָאֵל (1 Sam. 25. 3): a fourth is יִשְׂרָאֵל (Num. 19. 2), יִשְׂרָאֵל (Is. 10. 27), יִשְׂרָאֵל.

1 Gkt. om. "כְּסִ↗וּל, יִשְׂרָאֵל would have been equally correct."
6. 29); from this meaning comes שלב (Zech. 14. 20), another sense is לְַל (Ex. 15. 10); לְַל (Neh. 13. 19) is said to be from this: [and also, as it is said, from the first meaning, לְַל (Gen. 19. 8), for the sun had gone down at even.]

נהר (Num. 25. 17), רַעֵץ (id. 18), קָרָץ (Is. 11. 13), רַעֵץ (2 Sam. 20. 3); like this meaning and root are רַע (Dent. 28. 52), פֶּרֶץ (Zeph. 1. 17), רַע (Neh. 9. 27); they should have dagesh "like לְַל (2 Kgs. 23. 15), רַע (Lev. 26. 32), רַע (Hos. 8. 10), but for ר, which generally refuses it. Another meaning is "רַע (Lev. 18. 18), רַע (1 Sam. 1. 6); the ר of this last also should have dagesh.

נהר (Num. 23. 27), for רַע (1 Kgs. 2. 31), רַע (Num. 23. 8), רַע (id.) for רַע, רַע; dagesh in רַע is for compensation: ר has segol as in רַע: it might also have taken kamesh: ר (id. 11), רַע (22. 17) with one ר lost, it should have had dagesh and kamesh לְַל; or it may be the Piel like רַע, for רַע, with dagesh omitted: but רַע (23. 13) is not from this root, but from רַע.

Thus says Moses ha-Kohen the translator: In this statement are two errors: others indeed occur in the treatise, but as these may mislead careful students I think it right to notice them. One is, that רַע may be from the Piel רַע; for if such be the case, then this יַּכְּנַה stands for three, viz. the two represented by the first one with dagesh, and the one following; this however is impossible. — The other, that יַּכְּנַה is from יַּכְּנַה, as this root never occurs in Scripture, only רַע; besides, the imperative is not so formed, we have רַע, רַע, not רַע רַע רַע, יַּכְּנַה; therefore will be part of a suffix just as it is with ר. For רַע רַע רַע רַע are employed, like רַע רַע רַע רַע, and in the same way יַּכְּנַה; but when ר loses its dagesh for lightness, as the in רַע (Pr. 7. 13) and ר in יַּכְּנַה (Job. 19. 23), it receives shva, and יַּכְּנַה in our editions without dagesh.

instead of shurek: א losing its dagesh, א does the same, as dagesh never follows shva. But בּ (Lev. 24. 11), בּ (id. 16), are from בּ, like בּ, ה, ה, from דּ.

לְַל (Job. 40. 4) הֹלֵכָה, הֹלֵכָה, הֹלֵכָה, הֹלֵכָה: the Niphal לְַל (2 Kgs. 3. 18), הֹלֵכָה (2 Sam. 6. 22), הֹלֵכָה, הֹלֵכָה (Jer. 6. 14); the future לְַל (Gen. 16. 4), לְַל (id. 5); these ל should have dagesh as having absorbed א. Another meaning is לְַל (Lam. 4. 19): the Niphal, לְַל (Is. 30. 16), with dagesh, regularly; a third sense is לְַל (Dent. 11. 26), לְַל (Ex. 21. 17); a fourth, לְַל (Ex. 1. 7): לְַל (Ex. 10. 10) is also said to be hence derived.

לְַל (Ps. 104. 17), לְַל (Is. 34. 15), the Piel; לְַל (Ps. 84. 4), יַּכְּנַה (Gen. 6. 14), יַּכְּנַה (Job. 29. 18).

לְַל (Dent. 25. 12), יַּכְּנַה, יַּכְּנַה, יַּכְּנַה, יַּכְּנַה: the Piel יַּכְּנַה (Ps. 129. 4), יַּכְּנַה (Ex. 29. 3), יַּכְּנַה (Jud. 1. 7).

לְַל (Zeph. 2. 1): a second sense, יַּכְּנַה (Ex. 5. 13), יַּכְּנַה (Num. 15. 32), יַּכְּנַה (1 Kgs. 17. 10), יַּכְּנַה, plural יַּכְּנַה, with dagesh in שָׁל.

לְַל (Ps. 63. 5), לְַל (Ex. 23. 29), לְַל (Jud. 7. 4) לְַל (Pr. 19. 8), לְַל (Ps. 110. 6), לְַל (Gen. 6. 1), לְַל (Hos. 8. 12); לְַל is also said to come from this; a second meaning is לְַל (Job. 16. 13), לְַל (Jer. 50. 29): the Piel is לְַל, הֹלֵכָה, הֹלֵכָה; the first double letter is dropped, and the other accordingly receives dagesh, in לְַל, הֹלֵכָה, הֹלֵכָה, הֹלֵכָה, for הֹלֵכָה, the imperative; and so לְַל and לְַל for the imperative; that of the Kal will also be לְַל, הֹלֵכָה, as לְַל (Ps. 48. 13) for הֹלֵכָה: this ל of prolongation is omitted, but in the other conjunction it is retained both in the imperative and preterite.

לְַל (Ps. 144. 2).

לְַל (Ps. 55. 22), יַּכְּנַה, יַּכְּנַה (2 Kgs. 22. 19) is the preterite, יַּכְּנַה (Gen. 18. 7) the adjective, plural יַּכְּנַה (33. 13), יַּכְּנַה (Is. 47. 1), יַּכְּנַה (Gen. 29. 17), יַּכְּנַה (Is. 1. 6): the Niphal is יַּכְּנַה (Job. 23. 16), יַּכְּנַה, יַּכְּנַה, יַּכְּנַה, יַּכְּנַה, יַּכְּנַה, יַּכְּנַה: for יַּכְּנַה etc.: the Niphal is יַּכְּנַה (Jer. 51. 46), יַּכְּנַה should have

1 Gik. om. "like these may be יַּכְּנַה (Ps. 119. 149), יַּכְּנַ (Esth. 7. 4), יַּכְּנַ (Lam. 1. 7), יַּכְּנַ (2 Kgs. 19. 3), יַּכְּנַ (Ps. 71. 20), all should have dagesh."
Thus says Moses the translator; this is also a great error in two ways; first, because in all the Scripture there are only found (Job. 23. 16), (2 Chr. 13. 7), etc., all from (2 Kgs. 22. 19), etc. will therefore be from the same; is prefixed, as in (Ex. 12. 4), and the latent quiescent in each supplies the place of the missing letter of the geshen. One however has holem, the other seghol; one should be, with kaphem, like with kaphem, and this is prolonged to holem: the other should be, like, its hiriq is prolonged to seghol; in each case the prolongation is intended to compensate for the loss of a letter. Secondly, in my opinion it is a matter for wonder that he should derive (Ps. 11. 9), and not from (Job. 22. 13), for if he states that in it is a radical, and that the word is unique, being of the form הָיֶּלֶת and its friends may reply that it is a radical in its geshen also, and that it is unique, and of the form הָיֶּלֶת and (Ps. 25. 19), more.

The plural of (Job. 21. 26), and also (Ex. 16. 20) is said to be hence derived; in the plural the word has geshesh, another sense is מְדֻּבָּד (Job. 22. 12) like (Ps. 25. 19).

The plural of (Ps. 35. 6), (Job. 20. 5), (Ps. 100. 2), (Job. 39. 18), and (Is. 14. 7), (Job. 38. 7), (Ps. 32. 7), (78. 65); the Hiphil is complete, (Job. 29. 13), (Ps. 81. 2); the Piel is (Job. 31. 12), (Ps. 132. 16).

The plural of (Ex. 46. 14), (Cant. 5. 2).

The plural of (1 Sam. 12. 3), (id. 4), (Ecc. 12. 6), (id.) may also be hence derived; with of the plural of receives geshesh, unlike like (Is. 34. 4); the Piel is only (Job. 20. 19): the Piel is only (Jud. 10. 8).

Rabbah. (Gen. 41. 20), (Ex. 29. 2); (Gen. 41. 27) is not from this root, [for the latent quiescent between and is the second radical which appears as in (Is. 65. 23), (Ex. 23. 15);]

Shezai (Mal. 1. 4); from this may come (Pr. 13. 7), (Jer. 5. 17).

Shebok (Hos. 8. 6); hence also may be derived (Ex. 39. 2), (Mic. 2. 4); a second meaning is (Job. 18. 5).

Sheneng (Lev. 5. 18), (Ecc. 5. 5).

Shevah, or regularly (Ps. 17. 9), (Ps. 11. 3), (Is. 33. 1), (Ps. 32. 4), (Is. 59. 7); the Piel (Ps. 19. 26); the Piel (Is. 10. 2); the Niphal is (Ps. 22. 26), (Is. 35. 1) for (1 Kgs. 19. 21) for (Ps. 113); so the of (Ps. 113) would not take holem but shureq on account of of the plural which follows; according to this it should be, not (Hos. 10. 11).

Shedai (Is. 28. 24), (Hos. 10. 11).

Shevah (Job. 9. 13), (Ps. 38. 7), (Ps. 38. 40); they should have geshesh like (Ps. 10. 10), (Job. 22. 20); the Niphal, (Is. 2. 9), (Ecc. 12. 4), for (Ecc. 12. 4); like (2 Sam. 4. 4), (Num. 16. 3).

Shevuah (Gen. 8. 1), (Ecc. 2. 1), (7. 10); the Hiphil (Num. 17. 20), (Num. 17. 20), (Num. 17. 20).
From this root may come `םש (Is. 18. 5), [like פַּש (2. Kgs. 23. 15), in plural פָּשִׁים with daghesh, like פָּשִׁים (1 Sam. 5. 10).]

From this root may come `םש (Ps. 55. 12), [like פַּש (72. 14), in plural פָּשִׁים (Pr. 29. 13).]

From this root may come `םש (Dent. 13. 17), [like פַּש (Jos. 11. 13), פָּש (Ez. 17. 22); from this root and meaning may come פָּשִׁים (Ps. 137. 3), according to one interpretation.

From this root may come `םש, פָּשִׁים (Dent. 2. 16), פָּש (Gen. 47. 18), (Lam. 4. 22), פָּש (Gen. 47. 18), פָּש (Ez. 24. 11), with daghesh for compensation, [as in יָש (1 Sam. 5. 8), יָש (Deut. 9. 21), it takes the place, as I said, 3 of the latent quiescent in יָש (Jud. 11. 18), פָּש (7. 5); יָש (Jos. 8. 24), יָש (Num. 32. 13), יָש (Is. 18. 5); יָש with קָנָת is the adjective, plural פָּשִׁים, [with daghesh in יָש as having absorbed the first one]; יָש (Lam. 25. 30), of the form יָש: יָש (Num. 17. 28) is peculiar, it should be יָש, or, regularly, יָש; the Hiphil is יָש (Ez. 22. 15), יָש (Dan. 8. 23); יָש יָש (Is. 33. 1), יָש omits daghesh for lightness: יָש; יָש; it also takes it in יָש in place of a latent quiescent [in the way before mentioned, for instance in יָש (Gen. 47. 15); the Niphal is יָש יָש (Num. 14. 35), (Ps. 104. 35); it is possible that יָש (Gen. 47. 15), יָש יָש (id. 18), יָש יָש (Ez. 24. 11) may be according to the other form of Niphal which I mentioned at the beginning of the book, so יָש יָש (Nah. 1. 12); with יָש of the plural it becomes יָש יָש, with יָש of the feminine יָש יָש, as יָש יָש (Jer. 48. 2); יָש יָש יָש (Dent. 34. 8) omits daghesh in יָש irregularly, [as also does יָש יָש (Job. 29. 21); its proper form should be יָש יָש יָש (Lev. 10. 3), יָש יָש יָש (Jer. 48. 2); or יָש יָש יָש (Ps. 104. 35), יָש יָש Y (Jer. 50. 80); the daghesh in יָש has been omitted and also the latent quiescent which precedes, under the idea that daghesh in יָש and the יָש would mark the absorption of the יָש of Niphal. A second meaning is יָש (Ps. 25. 21), יָש יָש (Cant. 5. 2), plural פָּש, פָּש with daghesh: but Y (Lev. 1. 3), פָּש יָש יָש (Ps. 19. 8), are of the form פָּש יָש יָש, the first

The book of punctuation composed by R. Jehuda, son of R. David Hayug, of blessed memory.

Know, and may God lead you in the right way, that kamets and tseri are never found but with a quiescent, whether it be written or not, and with no others than נ and ר, as in נבר; here נ takes kamets on account of the quiescent between it and the ר which does not appear in writing; ר also takes it on account of the quiescent which appears, viz. נ; other instances are נכ etc. in כרה the ר takes tseri, as in כע etc. The quiescents in Hebrew are four, כעץ, but ר is never so except at the end of a noun or verb. Pathah and seghol are generally found before a vowel-less

deletter which is clearly pronounced, as in רמא; here נ takes kamets, as I remarked, but ר pathah before ר, and so in רמא etc.; in like manner the first נ of רמא has seghol as preceding a clearly pronounced vowel-less ר; similarly the נ of רמא takes it, on account of the vowel-less letter absorbed by ר which accordingly receives dagesh, as this represents two letters; other instances are רמא etc. The truth of the above rules will be proved by the fact that each person of a regular verb like רמא takes pathah after נ of the pretterite, each one of a verb ending in a quiescent like רמא, kamets. The same is the case with a feminine noun ending in ר, as רמא, here ר has kamets as preceding a quiescent latent; in the construct state רמא (Jud. 14. 8) it takes pathah, as coming before a clearly pronounced vowel-less letter; the same happens with רמא etc., and all nouns of three, four, five or more letters with the feminine termination ר. Should any one object that in רמא and the like there is a quiescent between the נ and ר, and yet the former takes pathah, the reply will be that this is apparently, not really, the case, but is due to the stress made by the accent, and that when this is removed by the verb being closely connected with other words, as in רמא (2 Kgs. 5. 1), רמא (Ps. 63. 2), רמא (Is. 38. 15), (Ez. 16. 6) the latent quiescent also disappears; in pause, made with athnah and soph pames, at the middle or end of a verse, as in רמא (Gen. 21. 1), רמא (Ps. 1. 1), and many others, the quiescent appears and therefore receives kamets. However, in a conjunction of accents or words, kamets, as pathah, will not lose its ground; thus the ר of רמא takes it on account of the quiescent between itself and נ, so with רמא and the rest, all of which are nouns, not verbs, and so have two quiescents; as the pretteries of verbs they will lose the second of these when connected with other words; as in רמא (Ex. 19. 18), רמא (Ez. 29. 19), רמא (id.); the first רמא (Lev. 5. 19) takes kamets, as being a noun, the second pathah, as being a preterite; so רמא (Is. 32. 19) to distinguish it from רמא (Ex. 9. 18); רמא (Ps. 109. 22), and רמא (Deut. 21. 1); רמא (Jer. 27. 5), and רמא (Deut. 32. 4); רמא (Pr. 23. 15) and רמא (10. 1). Know also that רמא and the like change

1 here רמא seems to be an adjective qualifying רמא, in the opening of the first book to be a cognomen.
their form in the construct state, and losing the latent quiescent between their second and third radicals take pathah in its place; as in ḥōth (Jos. 8. 20), ḫēb (1 Chr. 26. 32), ḇeth (29. 4), shīm (Gen. 2. 12), ḫōth (Num. 19. 16), ḫēb (Nah. 1. 3), ḥōth (1 Kgs. 20. 10), ḫēb (Num. 7. 88), ḇeth (Ex. 31. 6), ḥōth (Pr. 29. 27) with many others; though the reader might think they contain a quiescent on account of the accent, yet it is not so, as I before explained.

Another chapter.

Know that in some few instances pathah and seghol are found with a quiescent latent, viz. in verbs and verbal and other nouns containing one of the four quiescents, as ḥōth, which is milēl, that is, loses its second quiescent and retains its first; this may not appear in writing, as in ḥēth, or appear, as ḥēb in ḥēb. The meaning of milēl is that a verbal or other noun of three letters retains both its quiescents, between the first and second, and the second and third radicals, as with kamets in ḥōth and the like; whereas every verbal or other noun with one of the four quiescents for its middle letter is milēl and takes pathah under its first radical; however six or seven exceptions are found, as ḥēth, ḥēb, ḥādāth, ḥīfṭē, ḫēb thōth, ḫim, the first five take kamets like ḥōth, the last three resemble neither ḥōth nor ḥēth, as taking pathah and yet being milēl. Know also that ḥôth and the like do not change their form in the construct state as ḥēth; as for instance ḥōth (Gen. 34. 24), ḥēth (2 Sam. 9. 9), ḫēb (Jud. 13. 20), ḫēb (Jos. 15. 4), not ḥēth etc.

Another chapter.

Should there be a preterite of the same form as one of these verbal or other nouns containing ḥēth, ḫēth, or ḥēth, then its first radical will take kamets and its second pathah, just as one like ḥōth would: thus in Jos. 22. 20 the first ḥōth has kamets and pathah, as being a preterite, the second two pathahs, as being a verbal noun; so ḥēth riṣaph (Is. 60. 5), to distinguish them from ḥēth (24. 17) and ḫēb (Ps. 87. 4); ḥōth (Pr. 23. 7) and ḥēth (Gen. 34. 24); ḥēth (Is. 30. 26) and ḇēth (Job. 26. 12); ḫēth (Zech. 2. 16) and ḇēth (Jos. 15. 4); ḇēth (1 Sam. 14. 24) and ḫēth (Job. 6. 6); ḫēth (Mal. 1. 4) and ḇēth (Ps. 78. 49); ḫēth (2 Sam. 13. 18) and ḇēth (Deut. 25. 10); ḫēth (Job. 30. 30) and ḫēth (Gen. 19. 15), and so with all.

On milēl nouns like ḫēth.

Verbal and other nouns like this always take seghol under their first and second radicals; thus ḥēth has it under ḥēth as this precedes a clearly pronounced vowel-less letter, under ḥēth as being followed by a latent quiescent; such is the case also with ḥēth, ḥōth and the like, ḥōth (Jos. 2. 1). ḫēth (Lev. 20. 12). Some few are found like ḥēth which are according to the rule milēl but with tseri under the first radical; the same happens with ḥēth, ḥōth and a few more.

Another chapter.

Know that the pointing of words in connection with each other will be different from that of such as are in pause, which is marked by athnāh, and soh pasuk, sometimes, though rarely, by zakēph koton. As a general rule, seghol in connection will other words becomes kamets in pause, but this only happens in the case of the first radical, the second remains as before. Thus the third ḥēth in Jer. 22. 29 is sustained by athnāh, and accordingly receives kamets in place of seghol; so ḥēth (2 Sam. 3. 12), ḥēth (Is. 57. 14), ḫēth (Job. 6. 16); ḥēth (16. 14) in the first instance has seghol, in the second kamets; so ḥēth (Hab. 3. 5); in examples like these athnāh and soh pasuk always, with some few exceptions, take kamets.

Another chapter on the same.

Know that ḥēth and the like do not change their form in regimen; thus ḥēth (Gen. 41. 33), ḫēth (Jer. 18. 14), ḥēth (Ex. 31. 11), ḥēth (Is. 25. 4) etc.: there is one exception, ḫēth (Ecc. 1. 2): note this, as there is nothing resembling it (but
On mil'el nouns like שֵׁם.

Every verbal or other noun of three letters like this, which drops its second quiescent and retains its first, is mil'el, and takes seghol rightly under the second radical, there being no latent quiescent between it and the third, as is seen in שֵׁם; it retains its first latent quiescent ש, but this sometimes is not written: other instances are שֵׁד, שֵׁר etc. Should any have ש, ש, or ש for a second or third letter, then pathah takes the place of seghol and the word still remains mil'el; examples are שֵׁמָא, שֵׁד, שֵׁר etc.: only two such take seghol, שֶׁמֶה and שֵׁמֶא, the others are without doubt regular.

Another chapter on the same.

Understand that שֵׁמָא and the like are mil'el as שֵׁם: but if a noun be formed like שֶׁמֶה, without one of the four שֵׁד, שֵׁד, שֵׁר for its second or third radical, it may not be of another shape, but yet be different, as being mil'el and having kəmets in the second place; in the construct state also and in union with other words it will be otherwise: examples are שֶׁמֶא, שֶׁמֶה etc.; between their second and third radicals they have a latent quiescent not expressed in writing. Three examples are found, with a guttural for their third radical, not pointed like שֵׁמָא but with kəmets, viz. שֶׁמְכֵּן and שֶׁמְכֵּן.

Another on the same.

In the construct state שֵׁמָא, שֵׁמִים and the like are unchanged as שֵׁם (Gen. 29. 14), שֵׁמִים (Is. 11. 10), שֵׁד (Lev. 19. 8), שֵׁר (2 Kgs. 6. 25), שֵׁר (Num. 19. 4) with many others; but with suffixes the quiescent which makes them mil'el, that is the י, departs, and a short vowel replaces it, kəmets hataphe; thus never precedes a latent quiescent as do kəmets and tseri. Thus in שֵׁמִים the latent quiescent י is dropped, י receives a short vowel, י none; other examples are שֵׁמָא, שֵׁמֶה etc.

1 M. مرا. דוקו مرا.
Another chapter on the same.

Know that רַשָׁ is unchanged in the construct state; with suffixes, the first radical takes kamets, ָ is dropped, and the second radical receives a short vowel, it is not quiescent as in בּ and the like; this is seen in רַשָׁ, רַשָׁ etc.; רַשָׁ has the cognate vowel seghol instead of pathah; you will say רַשָׁ etc., not רַשָׁ with the second radical quiescent, for it is a guttural, and such always receive a vowel when they should be quiescent. Should however it be followed by one of the six רַשָׁבּ with dagesh, then the latent quiescent ָ will not be dropped, for in that case you would not be able to give the guttural a vowel, but it receives a short one, that the verbal noun may not be like the verb with a suffix. Should any one object that רַשָׁ is like רַשָׁ [and yet has not ָ], the reply will be that רַשָׁ [only] can be quiescent when followed by רַשָׁ with dagesh.

Corrections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>page</th>
<th>line</th>
<th>Transal.</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 for, sometimes it is ּ</td>
<td>6 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>of the</td>
<td>7 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>גּ answers</td>
<td>12 23 for רַשָׁ read רַשָׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>רֶסֵתָא, רֶסֵתָא, רֶסֵתָא</td>
<td>15 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>רַשָׁנְא</td>
<td>20 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 10</td>
<td>רַשָׁנְא</td>
<td>23 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 38</td>
<td>רַשָׁנְא</td>
<td>24 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 29</td>
<td>סּוּנָמ</td>
<td>66 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 19</td>
<td>סּוּנָמ</td>
<td>71 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 9</td>
<td>insert stop before רַשָׁ</td>
<td>71 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 32</td>
<td>for רַשָׁ read רַשָׁ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 27</td>
<td>רַשָׁנְא</td>
<td>75 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 25</td>
<td>insert stop before, not after רַשָׁ</td>
<td>83 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 15</td>
<td>for רַשָׁ read רַשָׁ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 11</td>
<td>remove stop after רַשָׁ</td>
<td>99 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arab. | 5 for רַשָׁ read רַשָׁ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII 15</td>
<td>(רַשָּא)</td>
<td>הָעָן</td>
<td>VII 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX 17</td>
<td>לֹא שֶׁלֹּסְעָא (sic. ms.)</td>
<td>לֹא שֶׁלֹּסְעָא</td>
<td>IX 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI 30</td>
<td>לֹא שֶׁלֹּסְעָא (sic. ms.)</td>
<td>לֹא שֶׁלֹּסְעָא</td>
<td>XI 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>