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PREFACE.

The distinction between the material and formal parts of a language is nowhere better illustrated than in the case of one which is being gradually recovered from its native records. A dictionary, in the true sense of the word, is impossible: we can have only a vocabulary which is being continually enlarged and corrected. But although the power of speech in producing new words is unlimited, the number of forms under which these words find expression is practically closely defined. A comparatively small number of written works will afford sufficient material for the outlines of a grammar: more extensive means of comparison serve merely for correction and greater detail. Until, however, we know all the actual forms possessed by a language at the various periods of its literary career, we cannot be said to have more than a general acquaintance even with its formative part; we can deal only with its coarser features, and these would be probably much modified by a more intimate knowledge of the niceties and finer texture of the grammar. And while this is of the highest importance for an accurate
interpretation of the language itself, it is of still higher importance for the purposes of comparative philology. Assyrian, it is now recognized, is of the greatest value for Semitic philology. And the time has come when it is possible to give a grammar of the language which may bear some comparison with those of Hebrew or Ethiopic. Of course our acquaintance with the new study is constantly growing; but it is growing rather upon the side of the lexicon than of the grammar. In spite of the prejudice which naturally existed in the minds of Semitic scholars against an upstart science which threatened to dwarf the old objects of study, and the results of which were at once startling and revolutionary, while the decipherers were not always distinguished by scholarship or caution, the method of interpretation has at last won its way to general acknowledgment, so that even Ewald and Renan venture to use the statements of professed Assyriologists. Indeed, rational scepticism is no longer possible for any one who will take the trouble seriously to investigate the subject. The history of the decipherment need not be told over again. No scholar now questions the decipherment of the Persian inscriptions; and when this had once been accomplished, the translation of the Assyrian transcripts with their numerous proper names, and with the aid of the immense stores of comparison which the discoveries at Nineveh and elsewhere afforded, could only be a matter of time. The language dis-
closed was found to be Semitic in grammar and vocabulary, and the sporadic phenomena which at first offended Semitic scholars have turned out either to be errors on the part of the decipherers, or to admit of sufficient explanation. The contents of the inscriptions, again, have thoroughly verified the method of interpretation. Not only are they consistent, but the names and facts are such as are required by historical criticism. The greatest stumbling-block in the way of the sceptics has proved to be one of the most striking verifications of the method. It was urged that the existence of polyphones—that is, characters with more than one value—was sufficient to condemn the whole theory. Polyphones, however, actually exist in Japanese for the same reason that they existed in Assyrian;¹ and we find that the Assyrians, in their use of polyphones, observed certain general laws, so that the transliteration of a word (unless it be a native proper name) is very rarely doubtful. Still these polyphones were felt by the Assyrians themselves to be the weak point in their system of writing, and Assur-bani-pal accordingly caused syllabaries to be drawn up in which the several

¹ See Léon de Rosny, "Archives Paléographiques," 2ème Livraison, pp. 90–100. This is referred to by Mahaffy, "Prolegomena to Ancient History," p. 207, whose Fourth Essay on the History of Cuneiform Decipherment is very good, and suited to the popular understanding. The want of acquaintance with Assyrian on the part of the author, however, has led to a few mistakes, most of which I have pointed out in the Academy, December 15th, 1871, p. 564.
/signs have their different phonetic values attached. Now the various powers which the decipherers assigned to the same character are found assigned to it in the native syllabaries. Thus the character which by itself denotes a lion is variously used as ur, lig, tas; and a syllabary gives us the same sign explained u-ri, li+iq, and ta-as. The syllabaries also explain the origin of these polyphones. The cuneiform characters were primarily hieroglyphics (like the Chinese), and were invented by a Turanian population of Babylonia. These in their several dialects\(^1\) assigned various names to the object denoted by the same hieroglyphic, and when the latter came to be used as a phonetic character, the various names became so many phonetic sounds. Every character, however, continued to be employed as an ideograph as well as phonetically; consequently when the Semitic Assyrians adopted the written system of their Turanian predecessors, they translated the Accadian word into their own language, and in some cases employed this (stripped of its grammatical inflexion) as a new phonetic value.

The tablets also give other evidence in favour of our system of interpretation. Some of them contain lists of Assyrian synonymes, and each synonyme is often a well-known Semitic word. Thus bi-is-ru (גַּלְעָב) is equated with se-ru (גְּלעָב), and al-pu (גָּלע) with su-u-ru (גַּלע).

\(^1\) Berosus ap. Syncelli Chron. p. 28:\—ἐν δὲ τῇ Βαβυλώνι πολὺ πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων γενέσθαι ἄλλοις ἁπατών τῇ Χαλδαίᾳ.
A last and conclusive corroboration of the method is afforded by bilingual inscriptions in Phœnician and Assyrian, on private contract-tablets and duck-weights. The maneh of the Phœnician is ma-na in Assyrian; the proper names in the two legends agree, as well as the chief facts of a "sale," and of the chattels sold, which are stated in both.¹

The following pages will show to how great an extent I am indebted to Dr. Oppert’s Grammar (second edition). He possesses the great merit of having first made Assyrian available to other Semitic students by formulating the general grammatical principles of the language. And this merit will outweigh all the disadvantages of arbitrary conclusions upon insufficient evidence, which have resulted not only in minor errors, but in three radical misconceptions—of an emphatic state, of the want of a Perfect (or Permansive) and

¹ Thus ṭadāmî Arb-il-khirat, "the giving up of A." appears in the Phœnician legend as ʿārābālā; pan Mānnucı-Arb-il, "in the presence of M.," as لامننعرئل. Harkavy (Revue Israélite, 1870, p. 20) says:— "A présent, grâce au zèle indefatigable et à la persévérance du petit corps d'assyriologues, cette défiance et cette réserve diminuent et disparaissent peu à peu. Le vote solennel de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, qui a décerné à notre célèbre corréligionnaire M. Oppert le prix de la plus grande découverte dans le domaine de la philologie,— l'explication des légendes bilingues, araméennes et assyriennes, au Musée britannique, par Sir H. Rawlinson,—la trouve à Suez, d’une inscription quadrilingue, malheureusement endommagée, se sont succédé coup sur coup, et on contribué à attirer aux études cunéiformes la confiance de tous, sauf naturellement de ceux qui ferment les yeux à la lumière."
Passives, and in a confusion between the Present Kal and the Pael—which make his book a dangerous one for beginners. I have entered into the arena of controversy wherever I have thought it needful; but this, I hope, does not prevent me from bearing testimony to Dr. Oppert's scholarship, research, and acuteness. His grammar lacks completeness, it is true, as well as accuracy; but this is due to the progressive nature of Assyriology; and the same plea is needed for my own pages. The most defective portion of his work is the chapter on syntax, and this might have been remedied.

To Dr. Hincks my obligations are even greater. It will be seen that in most of the points of dispute between him and Dr. Oppert, independent investigation has made me follow the Irish scholar. The student of Assyrian may well deplore his loss.

I have also made considerable use of Mr. Norris's "Assyrian Dictionary" (the third volume of which is about to appear), and of Mr. G. Smith's "Annals of Assur-bani-pal." Such books are greatly wanted to lighten the labour and facilitate the research of other students. I can only regret that Mr. Norris has not yet got beyond his second volume, and that Mr. Smith's promised "Annals of Sennacherib and Essarhaddon," upon the same plan as his former work, are still un-

1 The volume has been published since the above was written. It brings the list of nouns as far as the end of N. The next volume will begin the verbs.
published. It is with the same regret that I am obliged to finish my labours without having had the advantage of consulting the two Papers by Dr. Schrader upon the Assyrian language, which are expected by readers of the "Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft."

Before concluding, I would express my thanks to Mr. G. Smith, for his courtesy and kindness in enabling me to consult the original texts.

The cuneiform has been throughout transliterated into Roman characters, partly because the original type would be at once expensive and cumbrous, and partly to facilitate the comparative studies of Semitic scholars who are disinclined to commit to memory the complicated Assyrian syllabary. I have avoided confusing my text with references, so far as was possible; and have only broken the rule in points where dispute might arise.

A. H. Sayce.

Queen's College, Oxford,
May 11th, 1872.
ABBREVIATIONS USED.

W. A. I. = Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, Vols. I., II., III. (the fourth volume containing translations of Accadian hymns, is expected to be published before the end of the year).

S. H. A. = Smith’s History of Assur-bani-pal, 1871.

[In the transcription of Æthiopic words, shewa is denoted by ę and y.]
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AN ASSYRIAN GRAMMAR.

INTRODUCTORY.

The Assyrian language was spoken in the countries watered by the Tigris and Euphrates. It was bounded on the north by the Aryan populations of Armenia and Media, and on the east by the Turanian dialects of Elam. With the exception of one or two doubtful words preserved in classical writers, such as παιδοῦρα (Pollux, iv. 60), Armalchar (Plin. H. vi. 30), all that remains of it is to be found in the cuneiform inscriptions. These, though fragmentary, are copious, and are met with in Assyria (1), in Babylonia, and in Persia. The Semitic character of the language is unmistakable (2); indeed, the fulness, antiquity, and syllabic character of its vocabulary and grammar would claim for it the same position among the Semitic tongues that is held by Sanskrit in the Aryan family of speech (3). It has borrowed its syllabary from the primitive Turanian inhabitants of Chaldæa; and this, though not without grave inconveniences, has yet had the fortunate result of preserving the vocalic pronunciation of the Assyrians. Every character is syllabic, as in Æthiopic.

The Semitic dialects to which the Assyrian shows most affinity are the Hebrew and Phœnician. It agrees with these in its preservation of the sibilants (4), which are not changed as in
Aramaic, in its fuller expression of the vowels (5), in its want of an Emphatic State, in its construct plural, in the forms of the personal pronouns, in the possession of a Niphal, and in the general character of its vocabulary (6). Next to Hebrew, it has most affinities with Arabic. Like the latter, it retains the primitive case-endings of the nouns, though these in the later inscriptions have begun to lose their strict value (7), and agrees with it in the variously modified forms of the imperfect (8), in the use of the participle (9), in the conjugations (10), in the possession of a dual by the verb, in the mimmission which replaces (as in Himyaritic) the Arabic nunation, in the simplicity of the vocalic system, and in the formation of the precative (11). It does not possess, however, any broken plurals (12). Its points of resemblance to the Æthiopic are not so great as might have been expected from the similar position of the two languages—outposts, as it were, of the Semitic family, in constant contact with non-Semitic populations, whom they had dispossessed of their former country, and using a syllabic mode of writing which ran from left to right. Like the Æthiopic, the Assyrian has split up its imperfect into two tenses (13), has chosen the guttural form of the first personal pronoun in the Persansive tense (14), has no article, has borrowed many foreign roots (15), and has adopted several peculiar prepositions (16).

Of all the branches of the Semitic family, the Aramaic is furthest removed from the Assyrian. In the one the vowel-system is very meagre, in the other it is correspondingly simple and full (17). They stand in much the same relation to one another that the Sanskrit does to the Latin. The only points of likeness are the existence of a shaphel and an aphabet (18),
the use of *ana* with the accusative as מ in Aramaic (compare 2 Chron. xvii. 5; Ezr. viii. 16), and the formation of the prepositive. Peculiar to the Assyrian is the change of a sibilant into a liquid before a dental (19), as well as the form of the third personal pronoun,—which is, however, met with in South Arabic (20); the extended use of the secondary conjugations with an inserted dental (21), the division of the imperfect into an aorist, present, and future (22), and the adverbial ending (23).

The Assyrians seem to have dispossessed the Turanian population of their cities and country in the sixteenth century B.C. (24), and the oldest inscriptions which we have written in the language are two or three centuries later. The original home of the Semitic people was apparently Arabia (25), whence the northern branch moved into Palestine, and then into Mesopotamia and Assyria. About B.C. 1270 (26), under the name of קֶנֶדִים (**Assyrian** casidi, "conquerors") (27), the Assyrian Semites took possession of Babylonia, subduing the Sumiri (? רָעֵל) or Cassi (Cush), and the Accadi or "highlanders," the inventors of the cuneiform system of writing, who claimed kindred with the Turanian Elamites. A peaceful Semitic population had already been settled in Chaldeæ for some centuries, in subordination to the dominant Turanian race. One of the first Babylonian Semitic inscriptions of which we know belongs to Khammurabi (? Semiramis) (28), and records the construction of the Nahr-Malka, the great canal of Babylon, whose two towers were called after the names of the king's father and mother. The Assyrian and Babylonian dialects differed in several respects. Thus the Assyrian *p* becomes *b* in the Southern dialect (*e.g.*
Sardanapalus and Merodach-Baladan, u-se-pi-sa Assyrian, and u-se-bi-s Babylonian, episu Assyrian, and ebiu Babylonian); s becomes șh (compare בִּלְעַנּוּ, like the sharper pronunciation of the northern Ephraimites, Judg. xii. 6); k is changed into c and g (as in katu “hand” Assyrian, gatu Babylonian, šanaku “chain” Assyrian, šanagu Babylonian); ˁy sometimes replaces ˁḫ, e.g. ri-e-su for ri-i-su “head,” or-ni-tiv for ir-ti-tiv “earth,” which is also an instance of the interchange of ˁy and ˁi; ˁi represents the third person singular and plural aorist Kal of verbs ˁy/: in Babylonian, while in Assyrian the first and third persons are identical (beginning with ˁu); lu is used before substantives as in vulgar Assyrian; and generally the Babylonian presents us with a much greater fulness of vowel-sounds, and has a preference for the mimmation.

The Assyrian itself varies slightly in the oldest and the latest inscriptions (29). Thus Nabuw became Nabdau, and Assur-bani-pal’s inscriptions present us with such grammatical irregularities as sal-la-ti (“spoil”) for sal-la-at, and ic-su-du for the dual ic-su-da. The doubling of letters is frequently omitted (30). Masculine verbs are even found with feminine nouns, e.g. Istaru yu-sap-ri “Istar disclosed.” The language also in the mouths of the common people was to some extent corrupted, and these corruptions may occasionally be detected in private tablets, and even in the royal inscriptions. Dr. Oppert instances kham-sa by the side of khan-sa “five”; and we may add e-rab-bi for i-rab-bi or i-rab-bi-u, ippaleita for ippaleita, i-ta-tsu for it-ti-si, sa used without any antecedent, as in ina sa Gar-ga-mis for ina mana sa, “according to the standard of Carchemish,” umma, “thus” “that,” inserted
as in Greek before quotations, and on Michaux's stone and elsewhere ʾirin, 'he gave,' for ʾidin (ʾiddin). In Assur-bani-pal's inscriptions umma is generally preceded by ciham. The contract tablets also offer us examples of the change of u to i, as ʾiddini for ʾiddinu (31). In the Persian period the Assyrian experienced considerable changes. New words were introduced, such as birid 'among,' uku ('people,' Accadian originally), hagā, hagāta, haganet 'this,' 'these' (which, prefixed to the personal pronouns, and the demonstrative, passes into an article—compare too aganet mati 'these lands'); ʿil is used with nouns and pronouns instead of la; and an Aryan order of words even is followed, as in Kam-bu-ṣi-ya mi-tu-tu ra-ma-ni-su mi-i-ti, 'Cambyses by the death of himself dead.' The same cause seems to have produced such ungrammatical sentences as ʾistin in iteḥme maḍuʿutu, or even ʾistin iteḥme maḍuṭu and maḍuṭu in itaḥime (!), 'one among many law-givers' (32).

1. Assur was originally the name of the primitive capital of the country, now called Kileh-Shergat. It was of Turanian origin, and the name is explained in the bilingual tablets as compounded of a (=mie, מתי) and wiṣar (= ṣiḏaṣ, שדר). Two or three brick-legends belonging to its early Turanian princes, called pates'is, are in our possession. They are placed in the nineteenth century B.C., by a chronological reference in the inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I.

2. Had scholars not been prejudiced, this might have been concluded from the few Assyrian words preserved in the Bible or classical writers, viz., Rab-shakeh, Rab-saris, ʾabī Ṣabar, Belus, Zab (= λύκος), Zabate (= ʾaṣprea'), and Pliny's Narraga or (N)ar-malaka (= 'flumen regium') mentioned above. And see Is. xxxiii. 19.

3. The Assyrian would take this rank as furnishing us with some of the earliest examples of Semitic literature. The simplicity of its vowel-system evidences its antiquity, as well as its so-called case-terminations, which are identical with those of the aorist. The Semitic languages have marked their decay by modifications of the three primitive vowels, which alone
appear in Assyrian and classical Arabic. The large number of conjugations
preserved in Assyrian, as well as the form of the third personal pronoun
and the first person singular of the Permsive, are archaic. So also is the
mimination and the use of shaphel. Lastly, the vocabulary is extremely
large, and it is unfortunate that we have to explain Assyrian from Hebrew
and not Hebrew from Assyrian. Obscure points in Hebrew lexicography
have already been cleared up (e.g. דוע ה being explained by
Dr. Oppert as Assyrian uesto, “one,” masculine). Even in the Persian
period we get ה-ת-מ-ה or ה-ט-מ-ה, “lawgiver,” from וֹתֹלּוּ, formed by
the prefix u or i, traces of which are to be found in such Hebrew proper
names as יִלְּטַכָּו, or the Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSYRIAN</th>
<th>HEBREW</th>
<th>ARAMAIC</th>
<th>ETHIOPIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ת</td>
<td>ש, ש</td>
<td>ג, ג</td>
<td>ג, ג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ש</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צ</td>
<td>פ, צ</td>
<td>נ, נ</td>
<td>נ, נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ז</td>
<td>ז</td>
<td>ז</td>
<td>ז</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus Assyrian סל-סא = סל, Arabic قلت, Aramaic מלת, Ethiopian סָלָטָא; Assyrian וֹרֹט = וֹרֹט, Aramaic וֹרֹט, Assyrian צָלַל = צָלַל, Arabic נָלָל, Aramaic נָלָל, Ethiopian צָלָל = צָלָל, Arabic נָלָל, Aramaic נָלָל, Ethiopian נָלָל.

The Assyrian s, however, frequently replaces s both in Hebrew and
in Assyrian itself, especially where Hebrew has ה; e.g. סִבּוּ and סִבּוּ, “seven,” סִבּוּ = סִבּוּ, סִבּוּ = סִבּוּ.

5. E.g. כָּתִים = כָּתִים, Aramaic כָּתִים.

6. Thus we have nadinu (נָדִינֶו) instead of Aramaic y'hab, bâu (בּוּ) instead of 'atah, radu (רָדַע) for n'khat, etc. So כָּתִים, as in Hebrew, =
“to establish;” it has not passed, as in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Phœ-
nician, into the general idea of “existence.” The inserted כ is absent, as
in Hebrew; e.g. כָּתִים = כָּתִים, in Phœnician כָּתִים, Aramaic כָּתִים, Syriac כָּתִים, Arabic כָּתִים.

Assyrian differs from Hebrew chiefly in its rare use of the perfect and
vav conversivum, its want of an article (except perhaps in the Acha-
menian period), its plural, its extended use of the secondary conjugations,
its substitution of paei for paei, and its want of the inseparable preposi-
tions, and (except in the later inscriptions) of the accusative prefix. The
feminine always ends in t (like classical Arabic, Ṣethiopic, and Phœnician)
both in noun and verb. With Hebrew must be classed Phœnician and
Moabite (as found in the inscriptions of Mesha). Phœnician agrees with
Assyrian in the scanty use of an article and of waw conversum, in the
use of the participle for tenses, in the substitution of the relative מ for
אש (as in the northern dialect of Judges and Canticles), and in the older
form of the feminine suffix י for י. In most cases, however, where
Phœnician and Hebrew differ, Assyrian agrees with the latter; e.g., ṭa‘lu
“foot,” not דִּבּ, ḏebu “good,” not דִּבּ, sani “years,” not דִּוָּל, nadimu,
not י. In many instances the Assyrian employs words common in Phœnician,
but poetical in Hebrew, e.g., pilu = הָיָלָ (Hebrew usually קְלֹ),
apu = הֲלֹא (Hebrew usually הֵרֵ), arku = הֵרֵ (Hebrew usually הֵרֵ).

It often happens that the Assyrian agrees only with the poetical (archaic)
words and forms of the Hebrew, e.g., דִּוָּל (Assyrian ḏasu), the plural in
י', the sparing use of the article and the accusative prefix יָ, and the
lengthened form of the pronoun-suffixes יָ, etc., which preserve the final
-ו of the Assyrian (םו).

7. The syllabaries carefully give the typical form in ו or ו, but we find
in the inscriptions numberless instances of a wrong use, more especially of
the oblique cases. Thus, Assur-bani-pal has pu-lukh-tu for pu-lukh-ti,
di-ē-ni for di-ē-mu, libba for libbu; while in Babylonian inscriptions we
even meet with such instances as ana da-ai-nu tsi-i-ri, “to the supreme
judge,” for ana da-ai-na tsi-i-ra; and the astrological tablets have ḏobi
senu, “recent lacuna.”

8. These also are liable to be interchanged in the later inscriptions: e.g.
in Assur-bani-pal we have indifferently as-lu-lu and as-lu-la, “I carried
away;” is-ta-nap-pa-ra and is-ta-nap-pa-ru, “I wished to be sent forth;”
though perhaps a stands here for ו- (wa), as in asiula, “They carried
away.”

9. More properly, verbal adjectives, as in Arabic, one denoting the agent
(e.g., madīcu, “ruling;” asibut, “habitantes?” ṭuṣu, “slaying;” limattu,
for limantu, “she who injures;” limatuu, for limantu, “she who is in-
jured;” ṭuṣu, “slain”). The participles of the conjugations (Kal excepted)
are formed by the prefix מו.

10. The Assyrian possessed a passive for every conjugation (except
Kal, which used Niphal instead), formed as in Arabic; e.g., in the Pael,
su-ra-ap, “to burn,” su-ru-up, “to be burnt.”

Every conjugation, again, had a secondary one (intensive), formed by
the insertion of ֵו, as in the Arabic eighth conjugation. So also the nasal Assyrian conjugation (e.g. istanappar) may be compared with the Arabic fourteenth and fifteenth. In Mosibite we find an ʼiftaʼala (for Niphal) ʼifthala, infinitive ʼiftale, imperfect ʼifta, imperative ʼifta.

11. The precative formed by the prefix ֵו is compared by Dr. Oppert with the Arabic precative prefix 도, the 도 of the Talmud, and with the Aramaic forms ֵו, ֵו. But it is better to regard these last as equivalent to the usual preformative of the imperfect ֵו, with the intensive particle ֵו prefixed. This has been united with the verb, causing the elision of the person-determinative, and in Syriac has been corrupted into ֵו.

12. Broken plurals are a later formation in the Semitic languages, and were originally merely singular nouns of multitude. In Himyaritic the Arabic plural ʼestab occurs by the side of the ordinary plural (e.g., ʼeshb, “tribe;” plural ʼashbō). Broken plurals, common in ʼEthiopic, have become the rule in Arabic. As in Hebrew and Aramaic, there are no certain traces of them in Assyrian. Dr. Hincks believed he had detected two or three: ʼbalu, plural of ablu, “son” (but this word means “power”), ʼrid, plural of ardu, “servant” (but ʼrid is singular referring to Assur-izir-pal, explained as equivalent to miil-ʼu (ʼu) and admu (ʼu), 30.3.; like ʼli-du by the side of ʼa-li-tuv, ʼi. 36.2.), ʼri-ʼmu, plural of ar-mi, “bull” (but this explanation of ar-mi is doubtful), and ni-ʼsi from anis (but the latter word is not found). Assyrian differs from the Arabic chiefly in its consonantal system (besides agreeing with Hebrew in the sibilants, it does not possess the modern Arabic modifications ʼ, ʼ, ʼ); in its want of an article (ʼmam is ʼaš ʼKus or ʼKis, “the town of ʼIs” in Babylonia); in its want of auxiliary tenses; and in its vocabulary (e.g., ʼmā in Arabic, as in Syriac, is negative, in Assyrian only interrogative).

13. This will be proved further on. The Assyrian present ʼigabir or ʼigabir answers exactly to what Ludolf calls the present in ʼEthiopic ʼyegabēr, and the aorist ʼigbur (or ʼigbar) to his subjunctive ʼyēgbar.

14. Assyrian ʼagbacu or ʼagbar stands side by side with the ʼEthiopic ʼagbarcu. So in Mahri (ʼegidēk, “I strike”) and Amharic (zagaţhu). In the second person, however, the Assyrian has the ֵו of the other dialects (ʼagbirra, ʼagbirite), herein departing from the ʼEthiopic and Mahri, as well as the Samaritan. The ֵו seems more original than ֵו when we compare the substantive suffixes throughout the Semitic dialects, and the absolute form of the first personal pronoun (Assyrian ʼanacu, where ʼana is explained by the root ʼan), For the change of ֵו and ֵו, conf. ֵו and
ASSYRIAN GRAMMAR.

It appears to belong to the oldest period of the languages. The inhabitants of Raímá near Zebid still say kunk for kunt.\(^1\) Assyrian agrees also with Ethiopic and Himyaritic in one of the forms for the plural—dnu (dn); as well as in forming many adverbs by means of the accusative affix a (as also Arabic), e.g., baza, “as rubbish,” be'-ka, “much.” So, too, we find such forms as manszcu, “fixed,” like Ethiopic maf'rey, “fruitful,” where Arabic has u, and Hebrew and Aramaic shewa. Himyaritic, again, possesses the mimmation, as in the genitive Marthadim; and Amharic and Hararic have a nunated accusative, čn, in. The Ethiopic shêmâlem is an old mimmated accusative.

15. Few, if any, are derived from an Aryan source. This is the more strange, as Aryan nations (Medes, Armenians, Tibareni, Comagenians) surrounded them on the north, the people of Van even adopting their mode of writing. Perhaps wrdhu, given in a tablet as a synonyme of šilla, “high,” is the Zend creadhoa, etc., but I have never met with the word in inscriptions. Alcami-wood, again, one of the trees introduced into Assyria by Tigrath-Pileser I., is possibly तिरातिति, Sanskrit Valgu (ka), “sandal.” On the other hand, a large number of Accadian vocables were borrowed by the Assyrians, after being Semitized. Thus mug becomes mug-ku, gal or gula gal-iu, naga nanguu. Though words of more than one syllable have been thus taken, the roots are more commonly monosyllabic; and the proximity of the remote ancestors of the Semitic family to the Turanian of Chaldea seems to make it probable that a considerable proportion of the monosyllabic Radicals common to the Semitic tongues were originally foreign. A curious example of this may be found in khirat, khitu, “woman,” a Semitic feminine formation from the Accadian kharra, “man” (? ܢܗܪ, Syriac khira). Some roots, lost in the other dialects, are found in Ethiopic and Assyrian alone: e.g. basu, “to exist,” has been well compared by Dr. Oppert with Ethiopic bisi, “man.” There are no traces of Egyptian influence unless it be pirkhu given as a synonyme of “king,” on a tablet (II. 30., 3). More probably, however, this merely means “a young man” (נַען). Ammat (ܢܡܐ), “cubits,” is Semitic. Mana is of Accadian origin, as is shown by the famous law-tablet.

16. Ana, ina, assu, are not less Semitic than dibu and edba. The other Assyrian prepositions are common to the surrounding dialects. Ana and ina are merely accusative cases used adverbially: ana I would derive from אָני, “to be suitable,” and assu from the common root asaru,

\(^1\) V. Maltzan (Zeitschrift d. D. M. G. 1871, p. 197).
ample, "establish." The inseparable prepositions of Hebrew and Arabic are merely contracted forms of roots which bore much the same meaning, ב (just as we have ב for כ and ב for בר). In Assyrian also cima is contracted into ci (e.g., ci pi, "according to the tongue"), and limetu (למכ) is also found as li (ל). So, too, before a consonant we sometimes have an for ana, and it for itti. Another point of resemblance between Assyrian and Æthiopic is the violent change of sounds usual in both. Thus in Assyrian a sibilant before a dental regularly changes into tı. So again Æthiopic, Himyaritic, and Mahri, like Assyrian, have no article. Sunu, "illii," may be compared with Himyaritic and Arabic humi, Æthiopic wecome, n becoming n, as in the plural of nouns. Su, sa, si, must be ranged with the Mahri ści, "ahe," with plural sēn, and Himyaritic s.

17. As already remarked, the consonantal character of Assyrian agrees with Hebrew, not with Aramaic; compare יי and sanē. Mandaite, perhaps, most exhibits the degenerating tendency of Aramaic. In this dialect the three quiescent letters are vowels; and the gutturals are all pronounced as נ, as is sometimes the case in Galilee, in the Talmud, in Nabatean, and on the Jewish bowls found at Babylon by Layard. These, it is important to notice, present a complete contrast to the Assyrian, which goes so far as to permit the doubling of נ as well as of י. Assyrian נ, however, was frequently dropped in writing, and the language resolves the final י into א, as Aramaic does into ס. The guttural sound of י, again, was not known, it being always a vowel (thus, יְדֵי is written ḫasitu). Ḫimru, however, is not דע, but Phoenician דע ("lamb"). The numerous contractions and agglutinations of Mandaite are altogether alien to Assyrian. Assyrian, so far as I know, has but one example of the substitution of n for the reduplication of a letter, usual in Aramaic and Mandaite. This is the word pulunge, "regions," once used by Sargon; which is, moreover, an Aramaic use of the usual palgu, "a canal" (but found also in Phoenician).

This unlikeness of Assyrian to the peculiarities of Aramaic marks it off from the dialects of Yemen (which have an emphatic termination o, the Aramaic prefixed vowel, and such words as bar, "son"), or the Siniatic inscriptions (which have bar and di for the relative pronoun).

The vocabulary, again, is strikingly non-Aramaic (note 6). Thus we find ול instead of לְבָנִכְב, and נֶלֶט instead of נָלַת, ab-lu (לְבָנִכְב) and binu instead of אָלָנַט. So admu, "man," is found only in Hebrew, Phoenician, and Himyaritic.

Other points of contrast between Assyrian and Aramaic will be the want
of the emphatic termination (the prefixed article), the formation of the passive by vowel-mutation, the want of compound tenses (in which Arabic agrees with Aramaic), the use of isu (ʾšn) instead of ʾn, and the rarity of substantives expressing abstract ideas by the help of final terminations.

18. Traces of shaphel are to be found in Hebrew (e.g., בְּשָׁפֶל). But the conjugation is presupposed by Arabic istaata and Ἑθιοπικόν ἑταγάββαρα. Istaphel is possessed by the Mahri. Apher from shaphel (hiphil), Arabic and Ἑθιοπικόν ἑταλα, is found in Assyrian only in verbs ʾy.

Other points of resemblance will be the want of the article, the usual loss of emphatic ʾš in the status constructus like the loss of the case-endings in Assyrian, and the circumscription of the genitive by the relative pronoun (as in Ἑθιοπικόν ʾs), which is, however, ʾs (not Aramaic י or Hymaritic ʾ). So, in both languages, the superlative is formed by the insertion of the relative between the positive and the genitive plural.

Before the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions, philology had shown that the so-called Chaldee was really the language of Northern Syria, and did not encroach upon Palestine and Chaldea until after the overthrow of the Babylonian empire. Isaiah xxxvi. 11 merely shows, what we know to be the case from private contract tablets extending from the reigne of Tiglath-Pileser II. to that of Sennacherib, that after the fall of Tyre Aramaic, together with its alphabet, had become the language of commerce and diplomacy (like French in modern Europe). It was not yet understood by the lower orders, but was regarded as the language of politics. Ezra iv. 7 bears out this fact: with the Persian supremacy, the native dialects of east and west began to pass away before the influence of the Aramaic. Daniel ii. 4 only exhibits the unhistorical character and late date of the book, which cannot be brought into harmony with the inscriptions. Laban (Genesis xxxi. 47) was a Syrian of Mesopotamia (xxxviii. 5). Sahadutha,1 neither in form nor root, is found in Assyrian. Igaru (ʾš), however, is common, answering to the Accadian ʾši or ʾs.

19. This is the regular change (e.g., mikhil-tu for mikhita-tu, ʾlanappar for ʾlanappar, ʾuisi for ʾuisi), but it is often disregarded, especially in the later inscriptions. The comparison of ʾখ Kobe with ʾখ is ʾখ has been brought forward as an instance of this phonetic change; but though a sibilant becomes a labial, the converse never takes place; and the ʾখ are first met with in inscriptions of the eighth century, as a small Elamite tribe on the lower Euphrates. They gradually advanced north-

---

1 With the suffixed article of the Aramaic emphatic state, the Assyrian would be Sahaduthi. Contrast אֲחַדּוֹת = Rab(u)-sakku.
ward; and under Merodach-Baladan, son of Yagina, got possession of Babylon. The sibilant must have been changed into r before it could have become t.

20. This alone would claim for Assyrian a standard place among the Semitic tongues, as retaining archaic forms. The \( \text{r} \) of the other dialects has long ago been shown to have been originally \( \text{w} \), just as Hiphil presupposes Shaphel. It is curious that in the sub-Semitic dialects the third personal pronoun has a sibilant. Thus Harar zo or so, "he,"\( \text{singyo} \), "they;" Barber (suffixed) \( \text{ez} \), \( \text{as} \) (singular), and \( \text{son} \) or \( \text{asen} \) (plural masculine), \( \text{sent} \), \( \text{asent} \) (plural feminine). Hausa \( \text{si} \), "he," \( \text{su} \), "they," \( \text{sa} \), "him." Mahri again gives us \( \text{se} \), "illa," \( \text{stem} \), "illa," and the suffixes \( \text{-ce} \), \( \text{-senn} \).

21. The dental was originally inserted at the beginning, as in Assyrian verbs \( \text{y} \) (e.g. \( \text{it-bu-ni} \), "they went,") or \( \text{y} \text{b} \) (\( \text{it-ebus} \), "he made"). In the eighth and tenth conjugations of the Arabic the dental has been inserted into the form. So too in the \( \text{A} \text{thiopic} \text{estagabba} \), Mahri \( \text{shakkber} \) (for \( \text{stakkber} \)), and Aramaic \( \text{eshtaphai} \). Compare also Hebrew forms like \( \text{הפי} \).

The uniformity of the Assyrian in using this conjugation with \( t \) by the side of every other conjugation, seems rather to be the result of a secondary striving after uniformity than the relic of original usage, when it is considered that the dental primitively stood before the root and had a reflexive meaning.

22. I cannot help believing that this was influenced by the neighbourhood of their Turanian neighbours. The Accadian had an aorist and a present, and with the machinery already possessed by the Assyrian verb, it was not difficult to set apart one form for the aorist signification, and another for the present. The same phenomenon re-appears in \( \text{A} \text{thiopic} \), which was similarly situated in close neighbourhood to a non-Semitic population. A grammatical form was not borrowed by the Assyrian (comparative philology would protest against such an assumption); but the existing forms were specialized to suit the requirements of a bilingual people. The elaboration of a future was easy: it is merely the older and fuller form of the present, just as future time is an extension of present time by dwelling longer upon it. The fuller form of the aorist had a tendency to express a similarly extended action: it is used rather where the Aryan languages would employ a perfect or a pluperfect, just as, conversely, in Arabic and Hebrew, the apocopated form denotes energetic, immediate action. The Assyrian inscriptions, however, will not allow us to draw the same distinction of meaning between the shorter and longer forms of the past tense that must be drawn between the shorter and longer forms of the present.
The difference was only felt in an indistinct way; the language never
definitely and consciously expressed it.

23. The adverbial ending in -is has been admirably explained by Dr.
Oppert as a contraction of the third personal suffix-pronoun attached to
the oblique case of the noun. Thus sallatis, "as a spoil," will be for
sallati-su. The pronoun is often found in a contracted form; e.g. yusati-
limus, "he conferred on him," balus, "his power."

24. The names of the chief cities of Assyria are Accadian, and are
generally written ideographically with the Accadian st ('land') affixed.
Shalmaneser seems to mention Bilu-sumili-sapi as the founder of the
Semitic monarchy. Sennacherib brought back from Babylon (in B.C. 700)
a seal which belonged to a former Assyrian king, Sallimmanu-ussuru (whose
name and legend are Semitic), 600 years previously. Before that event
alliances had been made with (non-Semitic) kings of Babylonia by Assy-
rian kings who bear Semitic names (Assur-yupallat, Buzur-Assur). The
two patēris of Assur, however, who founded the great temple there, and
who are stated by Tiglath-Pileser I. (1120) to have built the temple 701
years before his time, have Turanian names and inscriptions. The first
known inscription of the Semitic Assyrians is the seal above referred to;
Shalmaneser's predecessors are only known through a tablet which gives
a synchronous history of Assyria and Chaldea.

25. The Semitic traditions all point to Arabia as the original home of
the race. It is the only part of the world which has remained exclusively
Semitic. The racial characteristics—intensity of faith, ferocity, exclusiv-
eness, imagination—can best be explained by a desert origin. Palestine
would seem to have been originally occupied by non-Semitic tribes, the
Zamzummim, etc., the giants of old days. The Phoenicians were said to
have come from the Persian Gulf (Strab. i. 2, 35, xvi. 3, 4; 4, 27; Justin,
xviii. 3, 2; Plin. N. H. iv. 36; Hdt. i. 1, vii. 89; Schol. to Hom. Od.
iv. 84). The myth of Kepheus and the Æthiopians at Joppa might point in
the same direction. Egypt would seem to have been colonized by a
ruling Semitic caste at an early period; in this way we can best explain
the Semitic colouring of the grammar, and the strange mixture of an ele-
vated Semitic religion with Nigrarian beast-worship; and the Semites could
only have crossed from Arabia. Apparently, also, Palestine was not Semi-

1 In this way, perhaps, we may account for Accadian kings with Semitic
names and inscriptions (Naram-Sin, the destroyer of Carrak, for instance)
in the sixteenth century B.C. In the case of Naram-Sin, however, it must
be borne in mind that there seems to have been another contemporary
monarch in Babylonia, Rim-Sin (unless the two names are identical).
tized in the fourth millennium B.C. No affinity can be shown to exist between the Semitic and Aryan families of the speech. They are radically different in genius and in grammar. One is based upon monosyllabic roots: the other presupposes triliterals. All attempts to compare single roots in the two families are unscientific; we have no Grimm's law, neither do we know the original meaning and form in many cases: and coincidences often happen in the most diverse languages (e.g. Mandschu sngui and Latin sanguis). Words like lādī compared with kīpas are borrowed; and onomatopoeia has played a great part in the origin of all languages, producing similar sounds for the same idea.

26. This date comes from Berosus: here begins his Assyrian (Semitic) dynasty, headed by Semiramis, for 526 years (cf. Hdt. i. 95). The date is confirmed by the scanty hints of the inscriptions: all the older Chaldaean kings have Turanian names and legends; Semitic begins with Merodach-iddin-akhi, the contemporary of Tiglat-Pileser I. (B.C. 1110). The mutilated records of the cylinder of Nabonidus point in the same direction.

27. Casadus is a common Assyrian word ("to possess"); casidu will be the nomen agentis. If "Ur of the Casdim" is to be identified with the Chaldaean Huru,1 it will be the Semitic name attached to the old Accadian "moon-city" (however pronounced). The Semites changed the names of the Babylonian cities in many cases: thus Ca-dimirra, "the gate of God," became Bab-ilu. Chesed was brother of Huz and Buz and uncle of Aram (Gen. xxii. 21), and Arphaxad was son of Shem.

28. This Khammurabi was the leader of a dynasty which was not Accadian, but Elamite, though speaking a language allied to Accadian. It would seem to be the Arabian dynasty of Berosus. Probably ‘Atpdβɔw is a corruption of the final part of Khammurabi (or for ‘Avpdβɔw). The Nahr-Malk was ascribed to Semiramis. Sennaqrarat was the name of an Assyrian queen, whose name, I think, was confounded by Greek writers with Khammurabi.

29. The plural of yumu, "day," is made feminine (W.A.I. iii. 44), yumāti instead of yumī, and the curious phrase ana yumati, "for ever," used. So, again, we must notice the use of in (נ, e.g. in matima, "if any one"). Assur-bani-pal's inscriptions give us the first examples of

1 Huru or 'uru simply meant "the city," and I have found the name used for the whole of Babylonia. 'Uru, I believe, was borrowed by the nomad Semites under the form of ṡarn. Cities were a product of Accadian civilization; and the Assyrians retained in their usual term for "a city" alu (=ልオリ) a remembrance of their original tent-life.
"תנ with the accusative pronouns; e.g., *attu-a* and *attu-cunu* (S. H. A., 190, 23). We also get *anacu* used with a preposition (*asnu*) in *asnu anacu*, "of myself" (S. H. A., 190, 24). Assur-bani-pal, again (S.H.A. 187 k), has the strange form *ikhallici* for *ikhallic* after *pani*, where the final vowel seems to have a conditional force. So the astrological tablets have *ikkhkar*, *ikkhiram*, with initial *m* suppressed from *makharu*.

30. Not only is this common in the verbs (which always admitted the omission more or less), but we even find *yu-tag-gil-a-ni* for *yu-tag-gil-an-ni*, "he confided to me;" as well as the converse (e.g. *i-sac-kan-nu* for *isaccanu*, "they place").

31. So, again, *ma-na-e*, as plural of *mana*, and *ta-a-din* (or *ta-din*) for *taddin*. Similarly we find the ungrammatical form *abbattiv-va* (S.H.A. 189, 13), instead of *abbattiv*.

32. Besides the use of a quasi-article, *תנ with the accusative became common, especially in the case of the first personal pronoun, e.g., *at-tu-a*, "me" (*תנ). The change of *י* into *י*, which is already effected in Hebrew (except in a few archaisms like *יִהָיֶה*, Gen. xiv.), has also begun in Achaemenian Assyrian (e.g. *itahma* by the side of *utahma*).

In spite of its preservation of many archaic forms, Assyrian has entered upon a stage of corruption and degeneracy. The attempt at system displayed in its secondary conjugations is perhaps an instance. The dual has for the most part perished; it is only found in a few nouns (as in Hebrew) which express duality; and it is rarely met with in the verb. The apocopated aorist has become the most usual form. Niphal has acquired a passive signification. The cases of the noun which are accurately distinguished in the earliest inscriptions tend to be more and more improperly used until in the Persian period even -*u* has ceased to be the mark of the nominative. The same

1 So it has disappeared from the verb in modern Arabic, and was wanting in *בֵּיתֵי*.

2 Traces of the case-terminations are to be found in Hebrew (י Genesis i. 24, Numbers xxiv. 3, 15, Psalms cxiv. 8; י in construct, e.g. Genesis xlix. 11, Isaiah i. 21; י local). So, too, in proper names, *Metu-seelah*, *Metu-sha-el* (where the Assyrian sign of the genitive appears), *Peni-el*, *Khamuel* (1 Chronicles iv. 26), etc. In the Sinaitic inscriptions the
has been the fate of Arabic; in most dialects of modern Arabic they have even disappeared altogether. The Assyrian third plural of the verb-tenses has lost its final terminations *na* and *nu*, which Hebrew has in some rare cases retained: probably this was in great measure caused by the addition of *ni*, the characteristic of the subjunctive. Both *nu* and *na* have been weakened to *ni* in the perfect and future. The plural of nouns has degenerated into *an*, and even *i* or *o* for masculine, and *at* or *et* for feminine. Hence, in many instances, the plural and the second case of the singular have exactly the same form. Verbs יי undergo contraction, as in the allied dialects (though the nomen agentis takes the same form as in Arabic and Aramaic, e.g. *da-i-is* or *da-is*, “trampling on,” instead of יב or יב). Verbs יי are regular, except that a preceding *u* assimilates *e*.

Dr. Hincks believed that in an early stage the Assyrian made no distinction between the genders of the personal pronouns. A bilingual tablet of Accadian laws reads *atta* for *atti*, and *su* for *sa*, besides *isir* for *tazir* and *igtabi* for *tagtabi*;

nominative in proper names and titles only ends in *u*, and the genitive takes *i* if the nomen regens and the nomen rectum are connected so as to form a compound. *Gashmu* in Nehemiah (vi. 6), elsewhere *Geshem* (ii. 19), is another instance. In the old Egyptian monuments names of places in Palestine, which end in a consonant in the Old Testament, have *u* final; thus יב = *Negeb*, יב = *Baal*. So in Phcenician *Hasdrubal*, etc., while Samaritan shows -*u* and -*i* in certain words before suffixes (especially י); similarly Aramaic. The Abd-Zohar coins (Levy, Z. D. M. G. xv.) have י (e.g. in יִלּוֹד) before י, and the proper names, as in the inscriptions of Palmyra, the Hauran, and the Nabatean kings, terminate in י. In ᾳEthiopic the sign of the accusative a has been preserved (also the termination of the *status constructus*). According to Palgrave, the three terminations are still to be heard in central Arabia; further south and east *a* stands for *i*, and nearer the coast all three have entirely disappeared. Nödeke disputes, to a certain extent, the existence of the case-endings in Hebrew, and affirms that they are peculiar to Arabic. Assyrian, however, opposes this conclusion.
and he compared the (supposed) archaic use of לֵעָן and אֱלֹהִים as of common gender in the Pentateuch. But the tablet states that it was written in the reign of Assur-bani-pal, and it is a mere assumption that it is a transcript of an older translation. We do not find any disregard of gender in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser I. Moreover, it is very possible that the translator was an Accadian, and but imperfectly acquainted with Assyrian. This is rendered almost certain by the ungrammatical use of the verbs, which follow the genderless Turanian idiom. The same looseness of grammar characterizes a letter to Assur-bani-pal from the Elamite king Umman-aldâsi (S. H. A., p. 252); and in one place we even have ūs for the feminine (mahâbû for mahad-ûs, S. H. A., 291, m).

The introduction of attu to form the accusative shows that already in the time of Assur-bani-pal the case-endings had begun to lose their meaning, and we are not surprised, therefore, to find the different terminations confounded one with the other.

LITERATURE OF THE ASSYRIAN LANGUAGE.

The first conscious attempts at the formation of a grammar —older probably than the earliest of the Hindu grammarians —seem to have been made by the Semitic Assyrians. It was found necessary to explain the Accadian language, the original possessor of the cuneiform system of writing, in which were contained, stored up in the libraries of Huru and Senkerêh, which Sargins had founded in the sixteenth century B.C., all the treasures of borrowed Assyrian science and religion. By the command, therefore, of Eßar-haddon and
Assur-bani-pal, syllabaries, grammars, dictionaries, and translations were drawn up. The last king states that Nebo and Tasmitu had inspired him to attempt the re-editing of the "royal tablets," which no previous king had attempted, and at the same time to explain and chronicle all the difficulties, "as many as existed," "for the inspection of his people." This implies that there was a considerable amount of culture in the country at the time. The nouns are always given in the nominative, generally with the immimation added, which was therefore considered the typical form of the word. The third persons singular and plural of the aorist and present are the only parts of the verb which we find; it would seem that they took the place of the nominative of the nouns; from them the other persons could at once be derived. The most important fact which we have to notice is the full recognition of triliteralism. No radix consists of less than three letters, and the rule is accurately observed in the defective verbs: thus we have da-‘a-ou (דַּג), ba-‘a-бу (בע), ei-‘i-mu, pu-‘u-ru, ma-lu-‘u (מלע), ka-bu-‘u (קבע) Just as Sanskrit grammar begins with the recognition of monosyllabic roots, Semitic grammar begins with the recognition of a triliteral basis. Assyrian passed away before the encroaching influence of Aramæan, but as late as the reign of Antiochus we have the cuneiform characters (and apparently the language also) still used. Since the decipherment of the inscriptions the following works upon the subject have appeared:—


PHONOLOGY.

The syllabary, as we have seen, was of non-Semitic origin, and primitively hieroglyphic. Its inventors spoke a variety of Turanian idioms, and inhabited the lowlands of Chaldaæ. Every character was an ideograph, denoting some object or notion, sometimes more than one, as in Egyptian and Chinese. Different sounds, consequently, were attached to the same character, either because the object or idea admitted of different names, or because the various tribes of Chaldaæ did not always agree in their vocabulary. When these characters came to be used phonetically, polyphony was the necessary result. The Assyrians adopted the system of writing, along with the science and mythology, of their predecessors. When space was an object, the characters were used ideographically, and this was generally pointed out by the addition of the (Semitic) grammatical termination. Thus ideographs came to take the place of the Hebrew literæ dilatabiles. Ordinarily, however, the words were spelled out phonetically: in this case, the sounds attached to the characters by the Accadians, which had ceased
to have any meaning for people who spoke another language, were employed as phonetic values. As these sounds (words once, but now replaced by Semitic roots if the characters were used ideographically) were manifold, almost every character had at least more than one power attached to it. This would seem to introduce an element of confusion into the orthography; but such is not the case. The different powers were used in accordance with rule—the Assyrian writing was to be read, not puzzled out—and it is but seldom that the transliteration is doubtful. Homophones are rare. Owing to the hieroglyphic origin of the writing, the number of characters is very large, almost every possible combination of two or three letters (one being a vowel) being found. Many are of rare occurrence, some are only to be met with in the syllabaries. Were these perfect, this part of the subject would be complete. A syllabary, generally, sets the character to be explained in the second of three parallel columns; the first column representing the Accadian word (a mere phonetic sound in Assyrian), and the third the Assyrian root, which translated the Accadian of the first column and was the pronunciation when the character was employed as an ideograph. Thus we have a character, whose usual value is is, explained i-si in the first column, sa-du-'u ("mountain") in the third: then in the next line the same character with i-sa-khar in the first column, ip-ru ("dust") in the third. Again, a character, whose ordinary power is mi, is given thrice following as mi-s in the first column, successively translated ku-lu ("assembly"), ka-'a-lu ("assemble") and tam-teu ("weight") in the third;

1 Mr. G. Smith gives 389 in his "Syllabary," about 200 being compounds, but he has not given all the characters that are found.
then the same sign with i-si-ip in the first column and ra-am-ou ("herd") in the third. It will be seen that when a closed syllable of two consonants is not used, two characters which respectively end and begin with the same vowel take its place, the two vowels coalescing in a long syllable. For the syllabary the reader is referred to Ménant's "Grammaire Assyrienne," pp. 11—36, or his "Syllabaire Assyrienne," 1 or to Norris's "Assyrian Dictionary," vol. i. (beginning), with supplement in vol. ii.

My transcription of the Hebrew alphabet is as follows:—

$\aleph = \alpha$, ב = b, ג = g, ד = d, ה = h, י = y, ק = k, נ = n, ק = kh, ד = dh, ט = t, י = c, ל = l, מ = m, נ = n, ס = s, פ = p, צ = ts, ק = k, ר = r, ש = s, ת = t.

The Assyrian syllabary made no difference between b and p final; similarly between f, c and k final, or s, s and ts final, or t, d and dh final. Unless, therefore, the syllabary is doubled, and the initial letter of the next character determines the value of the last preceding, we have to be guided by comparison alone in fixing upon the root. Between initial p and b, again, when followed by n, and between initial s and ts

1 This will contain all that is needed by the student of Assyrian grammar. At the same time the syllabary is very incomplete (e.g. the character under lak has further values of gal and issep, that under du of gub, sū, rā, and dun, that under kap, which does not require a query, is the Assyrian sumitu, "left"), and a considerable number of rarer characters are not given at all. Rām is Assyrian ("high"), not Accadian, which is aca. The character marked 15 in p. 34 of the Grammaire was phonetically gā, No. 16 is ur Accadian, not connected with Semitic ʾān; 14 was uca (sivan); 13 was uru; 12 was (Accadian) urud, Assyrian uru ("metal"), and so on. The characters in p. 86 are similarly deficient. The first meant "south"; 8 is "a goat" (Assyrian saramu); 9 meant "limb" or "body" (Assyrian bi-i-ru); 10 was in Accadian cē, just as 2 was nejudit.

Since the above was written, Mr. G. Smith has published his "Syllabary," which leaves but little to be desired in this part of the subject.
when followed by a, as well as between initial ḫ when followed by a or i, there was the same confusion. The Assyrians did not improve upon the syllabary which they borrowed, and which in some respects was not well adapted to express a Semitic speech.

ח is expressed by the same letter, whether it denotes a syllable or merely a long vowel (1). Thus ta-‘a-ru (תאער, “to return, become”) and khar-sa-a-nu, kharšānu, “forests,” have both the same character. The same holds good of i and u. ArrayType, as the weaker letter, is lost after or before u, e.g. usāliq for a-usāliq, u-ylla for u-alla. It is very commonly weakened to i, as in the cognate dialects. In this case the Babylonian dialect generally had o in place of the guttural; e.g. rēsu, “head,” Assyrian rīsu (like recitu for רֵלָו). ArrayType with ḫ following coalesces into a long syllable, as dīu = מְלַע or nāru by the side of nahru. In correct orthography ḥ is written when a syllable is denoted; thus we have indiscriminately na-h-ru and na-‘a-ru, “a river.” ArrayType is sometimes used to represent the diphthong ai: thus “house” is either bi-yā-he, ba-h-tu, bi-‘i-tu, or more commonly even bi-tu.¹ ArrayType also stands for י, e.g. ri-h-u-tu and ri-o-u-tu, “rule” (from יִלְעָר), rah(i)mu and remu, bu-h-i, “seeking” (from לֵב). It sometimes expresses the breathing before verbs which have a vowel as first radical, e.g. ah-a-bid, “I perish,” u-h-a-bid, from רֵבָב, u-sa-h-bid, ah-al-du from הָבָב (2).

¹ This is an instance of the tendency of the Assyrians to corrupt their language by breaking down the syllables. In this respect they are the Latins of ancient Semitism. Another instance of this tendency is shown in the fact that י is always a vowel simply. The confusion of syllables is carried so far that we get מ dropped altogether; e.g. for u-tu-h-ut (וְתָעַ), the later inscriptions give us וְתָעָה.
\ as a consonant is not distinguished from \textit{m}. This is a
fault of the original system of writing, but it has had great
influence upon the Assyrian. In this way the mimination
has hardened into a long vowel (\textit{tum}, \textit{twu}, \textit{ta}). The con-
junction after a verb which ends in a vowel is represented
by a character which usually stands for \textit{ma}, but here is \textit{va}.
Hence, after the mimination, it is impossible to say whether
\textit{ma} or \textit{va} is to be read; probably the former (see below).
“The suppression of \textit{m} or \textit{v},” Dr. Oppert says, “is more
frequent than in the other Semitic languages.” Conversely,
we find \textit{accom}, “I burned” (\textit{בלמר}), Hebrew \textit{amaru},
“seeing,” Hebrew \textit{יָרִים} (but also \textit{uwr}). So in \textit{Ethiopic}
\textit{m} and \textit{v} interchange, e.g. \textit{masaca} and \textit{vasaka} (3).

As a vowel, \textit{u} is expressed by three different characters,
properly \textit{hu}, \textit{u}, and \textit{va}, though this distinction is not always
observed. The cuneiform could not express either \textit{yu} or
\textit{uy}; consequently these sounds had to be expressed by \textit{u}.
Hence the first and third persons of pael, iphtaal, etc., are
written in precisely the same way, though pronounced \textit{u-}
and \textit{yu}. So, again, we have \textit{abu’a}, \textit{katu’a} for \textit{abu-ya}, \textit{katu-ya}.
This want of inventiveness and adaptation on the part of the
Assyrians argues against the Semitic origin of the Aramaic
alphabet. \textit{U} hardened easily into \textit{va}, as in all Semitic
tongues: thus, \textit{yunakkaru-va}, “he shall destroy, and”; \textit{kharri-
va bamäti}, “the valleys and heights”; \textit{issukh-va}, “it was
removed and.” In both the latter instances we should
usually have had \textit{u}, since, as in Hebrew, the conjunction
inclines to a vowel-sound before a labial. This \textit{va} some-
times becomes simple \textit{a}, the \textit{u} being lost altogether, as
in \textit{sukalul} for \textit{sukalul-va}, or \textit{dhäbu} for \textit{dhävåbu}. \textit{U} passes
readily into the weaker i, e.g. sumu by the side of sina, urape-inni for urapeu-inni (comp. optimum, optimus).

B before v is generally assimilated, e.g. eruv-vā, "he descended and," for erub-vā. Conversely, vā becomes ma after a preceding immutation, as abnum-mā, "I built and," where the second m merely expresses the length of the preceding syllable, which has been lengthened by the enclitic, and the loss of w (or v).

Z as in Hebrew never changes to a dental. Z in Babylonian may take the place of ts, as in orsitiv for orsitiv. In Babylonian, also, we find Bar-si-pa taking the place of the Assyrian Bar-si-ip, or Bar-sa-ip (where we have again to notice the confusion between ai and i). Rarely s and ts, when followed by i, are confused; e.g. we find both takhāṣi and takhāṣi, "battle," (תַּקהָשָׁה) and arzik by the side of artsip, "I built," (ארְצִךְ). Compare בֵּית and בֵּית, בֵּין, בֵּין, etc., in Hebrew. The Assyrian tendency to soften the pronunciation is exemplified in their use of û (though their preference for ψ in many cases, and their preservation of the sibilants show that this tendency had not gone far). Once we find the extraordinary assimilation of ṣẖ into ss, and ṣẖ in ṣassaru, "small," for ṣaabkaru, and ṣisārū for ṣisẖhiru.

Kh like r can be invariably doubled, as in Arabic (likeProv. xiv. 10; צֵרִין Ezek. xvi. 4). It is occasionally used to express the guttural sound of the Hebrew ψ, as in Khasitu-(Target). Conversely, we have לֶחֶר for İddiklat. This, however, was Accadian, not Assyrian; and the Assyrian ẓmiru is not צֵנֶר, but Phœnician and Aramaic צֵנֶר. The Assyrian tendency towards a soft pronunciation showed itself
in sometimes omitting the medial or final ו of a root, its
place being supplied by the simple aspirate: e.g. פָּתַח is
always פַּתָּח, and קָטֶע, "hand," is perhaps from קָטֵע, the
Assyrian form of which is sikū, "he took." Rukutu, again,
"distant," is the Assyrian form of רָקָע. In Babylonian
it is ri-e-ku-tu or ri-s-ou-tu, where י replaces ַ. So also
אָפָּט is instead of the ordinary אָפָּט from אַפָּט.

Dh is found for t after a guttural: e.g. akdhirid, "I
approached," the iphtea of כַּכַּב. So d replaces t after m
or n; e.g. indanakharu.

I is regularly found in the place of the Hebrew ש, when-
ever this last varies with י, either in Hebrew itself or in the
cognate dialects: e.g. ris=רַמְּש (רַמְּש), Targ. zibu=
נֵיבִּי. In Assyrian itself, a, first weakened to ֵ, was
absorbed by an י: e.g. yutir, "he restored," from ta'aru (for
yuta'ir), bitu for bi-ya-tu or ba-hi-tu (בָּהִי), etc. So in the
third person ispur, ispuru for yaspur, yaspuru. Hebrew,
Aramaic, Æthiopic, and Himyaritic, show a similar weaken-
ing. I interchanges also with ִ: e.g. oi-i-nu (Assyrian), and
oi-e-nu (Babylonian), tsu-‘i-ri, tsu-ya-ri, and tsu-e-ri, and the
oblique cases and plurals of masculine nouns.

I, like ִ and ֵ, is never doubled.

C rarely takes the place of ֵ and (more frequently) כ in
the cognate dialects: e.g. kakkaru=כָּכָר (comp. כָּר), cirbu=
כַּרּו, ca'ari, carie=כַּרְיָה, כַּרְי, cutesbam, "beautifully"=
כַּרּב.

C and ts are frequently combined in roots, where Hebrew,
etc., prefer the softer consonants: thus aotsur (from catesiru)
כַּרְו, cutesalu=כַּרְו, cinisatu=כַּרְו.
In Assyrian itself an interchange of 发音 c with k and g sometimes occurs; e.g. cabru and gubru; kinnātu (“female slave”) is on Michaux’s stone cinātu. The latter was apparently the vulgar pronunciation common in Babylonian. In fact, in the Babylonian, g commonly takes the place of k, e.g. gatu for katu, sangute for šankute, “chains.” This pronunciation began to prevail in Assyria in the later days of the empire. Dr. Oppert remarks that c seems to have had a softened sound, which assimilated it to the Hebrew ל; thus Tukulti- nuru, S’arru-cinu = צור, Sacamu = סכר. Tiglath, however, answers to the Assyrian tiglat or tigulti; Sargon is not the Assyrian S’arru-cinu, but the Accadian original Sargina; and Sacamu, by which, I suppose, either Sacnu or Saccanacu is meant, was non-Semitic. On the other hand, c and ל answer to one another in Nebuchadnezzar, Calah, and Accad.

L is the pronunciation generally, though by no means necessarily, assumed by a sibilant before a dental: e.g. khamistu and kmiltu (“five”), ītu and ultu (“from”) asdhur and aldhr (“I wrote”), astanc an altanān (“I fought”), lubistu and lubultu (“clothing”), mikhistu and mikhiltu (“strong”). L, however, never becomes a sibilant. This change of consonant, peculiar to Assyrian, must have been effected through r into which the sibilant first passed. Compare the mutations of final s in Sanskrit. Before a second hard sibilant, s may also become l; as in ulzis for uszis. In common pronunciation l seems to have been somewhat mouillé; thus verbs ending in l generally have s attached even in cases which would hardly permit the conditional suffix, e.g. astula; while on the other hand the case-terminations are sometimes improperly dropped before a following l, as in ana gurunit lā agrun, “to a heap I heaped.”
M usually, but not always, becomes n before a sibilant, a
dental, or a guttural: thus we have dhen-su from א outras, khansa
and khamsa (“five”), khandhu (מהד), teindu and teindu (“a
yoked-chariot”), muntakhitsu for muntakhitsu (“fighting”),
dumku and dunku (“lucky”). In this way is explained the
change of the plural-ending into n, like the change of mimma-
tion into nusination. So in Ethiopic, m before dentals and
labials passes into n. A double b or p may be replaced by mb,
mp (e.g. inambu for inabbu), and a double dental by nd, nt,
(e.g. inandin for inadain) just as in Ethiopic. M first
changed to n can be assimilated to a following consonant, as
in _TRUNC from makhiru, takhatsi (for takhhatsi) from חור.

N, as in Hebrew, is assimilated generally to the following
radical. This is the rule with verbs י, though we meet
with inandin for inaddin (“it is given”). Contrary, however,
to Hebrew, n is assimilated (regularly) before t and s; e.g.
limitu for limuntu (“injured”), libittu for libintu (“brick-
work”), madattu or madattu (“tribute”) for mandantu
(mandantu is found); cissu (“much,” “collected”) from חס
(Targum. חס). So in Hebrew חס for חס for

S rarely represents a Hebrew ש as in khuransis from
ש,  ši’amu = ש,  šiba, “seven” (W.A.I. ii., 19, 66).
Where the Hebrew has ש and ש, Assyrian also has ס and ס;
e.g. sarru and zaru (“king”), cabis and cabis, “trampling.”
S seems to have been preferred by the Assyrians, ס by the
Babylonians (see sup). Just as the example of סוֹר =
Sarru-cinu shows that the Assyrian pronunciation of ס was
hard, so the fact that t-s is frequently expressed by ס points
to a similarly hard pronunciation of the latter. Thus
sarrut-su ("his kingdom") is also spelt sarrubu, kat-su ("his land") becomes kabbu for ka-šu. The difference between š and ts in Assyrian was probably that between t-s and t-s. Hence a final dental followed by the sibilant of the third personal pronoun is very commonly represented by š; e.g. dannubu for dannut-su, illasu for illad-su. Conversely, s followed by the dental of the secondary conjugation is often written š (like st pronounced sh in the tenth conjugation of the Mahri), as asacan for astacan, abicin for asticin, asarak for astarap. Probably, however, the sibilant in vulgar pronunciation changed the place of the dental, just as, conversely, in Hebrew the dental of Hithpael followed the sibilant. In the inscription of Khammurabi š takes the place of š in tsirrasina = tsirrusina (tsirrat-sina). This hard pronunciation of š would once have been universal among the Semites, as is implied by the Greek pronunciation of samech (Σ). The interchange of š and s in Assyrian (mostly in the later inscriptions) would show that a softened pronunciation was becoming usual. Similarly in Babylonian we find usalbis-šu, "I covered it" (for šu).

E is always a vowel. Occasionally, however, it answers to a Hebrew נ; e.g. ecilu ("place") = Aramaic נכרל, or recutu in Babylonian = נכרל. There must, therefore, have been a time when the guttural pronunciation of ن was known to the Assyrians. E sometimes replaces ن (as in orinu = עירון); conversely we have ra-a-du ("thunder") = ערך, aggullu ("wheel") = עגל. Hebrew sız is also sometimes represented by ș or š, e.g. usalhu ("gazelle") = עזל. Its pronunciation differed but slightly from that of š, as is shown by the interchange of the two
vowels (see supra), and the fact that many characters have indifferently ə and ı as their vowel-sound. At the same time the presence of radical ə was always observed; verbs with ə radical are full. E with u fell away; thus from לארשי we have ul-la-'a in Assyrian, and u-ul-la-'a in Babylonian. Babylonian sounded it more clearly than Assyrian (so ci-e-nu for ci-i-nu). So from שדרש, Assyrian has επίστ, Babylonian ἐ-ἰδ-σίτ. On the other hand, generally in Babylonian and Achaemenian ə was assimilated to i, while in Assyrian the converse took place; thus Assyrian ēbusu = Babylonian ēbusu. In both the weaker sound a was lost before e; e.g. ēbus, "I made" (for a-ēbus); but a following assimilated even a radical ə; e.g. isma’a for isma’a from יֵשׁור. Occasionally ə is interchanged with a in roots, owing to the guttural aspirate common to both, like יֶלֶל and יֶלֶל, יָנֵס and יָנֵס in Hebrew. Thus agu’u, “crown,” is given also as e-gu’u in a syllabary, from the Accadian ega (compare יֵלֶל), and eliyah and aliya are used indifferently; so eratid for irsitiwu in Babylonian, which often replaces by ə an Assyrian i, where this has been weakened from an original ‘a. In the Babylonian recitu (Assyrian ruktu) u has been lost before ə, which here replaces kh.

P prevails in Assyrian where ə appears in Babylonian, and (often) in the cognate dialects (e.g. Assyrian επίσ = Babylonian ebs, pursu = בִּקְו). Conversely we have bišu = בֵּלק. The two sounds interchange in Assyrian itself; thus we find šikhupar, “he overthrew,” šikhubartu, “overthrow,” paldhuti, “surviving,” šaladhu, “house” (שָׁלֶד). In one instance ə seems to replace ə; ettsuru, “a bird,” = Arabic عصفور, Hebrew עִשֵּׁף.
R, though, like l, sometimes used to form quadrilateral roots (e.g. *parsidu, palcitu, iskhupar*), is much more scantily employed than in the cognate dialects. Thus we have *ussbu‘u*, not רבר, "hare", not לבר. S was never aspirated, as in ancient Hebrew and Phœnician *Samsu*—سف. Dr. Oppert gives a long list of words where Hebrew has ס and ש, but Assyrian simply s in both cases: *sumilu*—ستمر, *siptu*—שטר, *sarru*—שֶׁר, *pasku*—שֶׁר, *dussitu*—שֶׁר, *distu*—שֶׁר. Already in the seventh century B.C. the Hebrew pronunciation seems to have inclined towards an aspirated s; this would explain the transcription of Sargon, etc., by ס. In Assyrian itself we have a word like *bis-su, bis-sate*, and in Assur-bani-pal’s inscriptions *tasbusu* is a variant of *tasbusu*. In Arabic (and Æthiopic for the most part) s (ṣ) = Northsemitic š, and šḥ = Northsemitic s (ṣ). Before a dental, ts might become s, as in *marustu* (and *marultu*) for *marutstu*. So *bilu*—Hebrew בָּלֶו, *isid*—יוּדֶו.

T servile, in the secondary conjugations, is assimilated to a preceding י, י, and ס (e.g. *istabbat* becomes *istabat*, “he takes,” *istocir* becomes *issacir*, *astacan* becomes *asacan*. After a guttural, t servile may change to ḍ or ḏ, e.g. *igdamir* for *igtamir, ikdirib* for *iktarib, ikdhabi* for *iktabi*. We find even *amdakhits* for *amtakhits* (“I fought”), according to Dr. Oppert through the influence of the following י, though after m or n t more usually becomes ḍ. Б in Assyrian, again, was regularly changed into pt; e.g. *captu, “heavy* (בּוּר), *aptati, “ruins” (בּוּר). There is one instance of ḍ in Assyrian and Babylonian replacing a מ of the other dialects: מ is always nadin. T replaces dḥ in Babylonian in *tub = dhub* (so in Æthiopic *cadana = כמע, damana=...
The syllabary had no special character for *dha*. In *isitil*, *t* replaces Hebrew א, as in **Ethiopic.**

The Assyrian avoided the use of diphthongs: *au* is very rare; perhaps the foreign name *Khawan* is the only certain example of it. *Ai* and *ya* are much more common. The Gentile termination is *ai*, e.g. *Madai*, "the Medes." *Ai* has a tendency to become *ya* or *yā*;¹ thus *ayāsi* (םי) is more usually *yāsi*; *aibut*, "enemies," also appears as *yābut*; *yanu* or *yānu* = יָנָע. More frequently *ay* or *ya* passed either into *ah* (בָּהַט = biyatu) or *i*; while in proper names an initial Hebrew יָא was always *ya* (e.g. *Yahuah*, *Yahukhazi*), in roots it was more generally *i* (e.g. *inmu* = יָנָמ, *irad* = יָרָד, *isibu* = יָסִיב, *isara* = יָסַר). Even when answering to ה, *ai* became *i*; e.g. *inu* = יָנָע. To prevent a compound vowel, *hemsa* was largely employed, as in *abu’a* for *abu-ya*, "my father." As in modern Arabic, *hemsa* tended more and more to be lost: in the Babylonian period it is very generally replaced by a long vowel: so even *utut* for *utuḫu*.  

1. As in all ancient Semitic alphabets, ‘*a* was a consonant, a soft breathing, namely, followed by the vowel *a*. This will explain how it is that *ai* is represented by ‘*a*’ *a*. The second breathing here passed into *y*, so that we have ‘*ayaa*; and hence *ai*.  

2. *H* is another instance of the ambiguity arising from the employment of a foreign alphabet. It stood for *h*, *ah*, and *hi*. More usually the value is *ah*.  

3. In the Babylonian inscriptions the *m* final very often appears as a separate character, implying that the mimimation was more strongly pronounced in Babylonia than in Assyria. The interchange of א and א in the cognate languages argues the weaker and later pronunciation of א as *e*. Assyrian does not exhibit any interchange of *b* and *m*. *B* reduplicated, however, may be changed into *mb*, e.g. *innambu*, "he is proclaimed," for *innabbu*, just as we find *ambda* for דב, ‘*epepšđa* for *yepšđ*, *s* *mbk*  

¹ This is properly יָנָע; e.g. *yarru* = יָנָע.
for נָבִי; and conversely נֵבְיָרִים from הסנַרָתָה. The change is an Aramaising one, and therefore exceptional in Assyrian: more frequently in (mercantile) contract tablets of late date.

There is no trace of aspiration in Assyrian in the letters δ, γ, d, c, p, t. In Hebrew also the dagesh lene would be of late introduction, caused by Aramaic influence, as the alphabet, like the cuneiform syllabary, uses but one character for both sounds. So, too, in Arabic and Æthiopic. Equally unknown to Assyrian are the sounds elaborated by Arabic ذ, خ, ﾂ, ﺖ, and 🌙 (as in modern Aramaic) the й of Arabic and Æthiopic. The soft pronunciation of gimel, again, is not found.

The accent, as in Arabic, is thrown back as much as possible. Without doubt, this was also the usage of ancient Hebrew (as is shown by the segholates) before the necessities of a rhythmic intonation of the Old Testament changed the accent. The accent is upon the antepenult, unless the penult has a long vowel or is a closed syllable. The accent is often indicated by the incorrect insertion of a long vowel or a double letter. Besides accent, Assyrian observed the laws of quantity. A long vowel was according to rule expressed, though in many cases omitted (as in the case of the double letters). In the nomina verbi a short vowel in the second syllable was generally dropped before the case-endings. The accent and the quantity seem to have coincided, as in Arabic, whenever a word possessed a long syllable not further back than the antepenult or not in the last syllable. There was a tendency to shorten vowels and words in the later period; thus the Babylonian inscriptions give us labû, for which the Assyrian is always labirû ("old"). When a
word consisted of three short syllables, the second vowel was
generally dropped, making the first a closed syllable long by
position; thus māliak becomes malak. The enclitic threw
back the accent upon the preceding syllable, even though this
had a long syllable before it; e.g. ʾillicūniv-vā (for ʾillicūnē-vā),
ʾikhduʾuninni (for ʾikhduʾunīn-mē).

The doubling of a consonant was frequently disregarded
even in pālī—sometimes it was replaced by a long vowel,
more often by the accent merely, as in ʾu-mē for ʾi-n-mū in
contract tablets.

THE PRONOUNS.

The personal pronouns in the Semitic languages, as in the
Aryan, are formative elements of the verb, and therefore
must be considered first.

SINGULAR.

I, me = anacu; yāti, yati, yātima.
Thou, thee (masculine) = atta; (feminine) attē; ʾōt(a) (ʾōtē).
He, him (masculine) = suʾu, suʾ; (feminine) ʾīʾē, ʾī.

PLURAL.

We, us = [anakhni].
You (masculine) = aṭṭunu; (feminine) [aṭṭina].
They, them (masculine) = ʾunu, ʾun, ʾunu tu; (feminine) ʾīna, ʾin, ʾinatu.

Attina has not been found, but analogy would lead us to
this form. Anakhnu or anakhni, Dr. Oppert’s conjecture, is
probably right. The word is met with only in a mutilated
part of the Behistun inscription (l. 3), where Sir H. Rawlin-
son’s cast reads doubtfully a-ga-nī. As the suffix of the noun
is -nī, the form anakhni is to be preferred, u being weakened
to ʾ through a false analogy of the plural termination.

¹ So in Hebrew, Ἁθθιωίη, etc.
Anacu is Hebrew ינאק, Phœnician ינאק, for which in the other dialects we have only ana, ani, or eno. Traces are found in the Æthiopic tense-ending -cu, Mahri -k (Arabic and Hebrew tu and ti). The plural in all the dialects is manifestly formed from it, ə becoming kh. In Coptic (and Old Egyptian) anok (and nuk) = "I," anen = "we"; so in Berber nekki = "I," nekni = "we." The relation of these sub-Semitic dialects to the Semitic family is very questionable. Vulgar Assyrian used anacu, in the place of the suffix pronoun, after a preposition, e.g. assu anacu, "as regards myself" (S.H.A. 190).

The Arabic and Æthiopic ana, Hebrew ant, point to another form of the pronoun in ya. This has lost the final vowel in Hebrew and the initial vowel in the other two languages. It is the form that appears as the suffixed pronoun in Assyrian ya, later i and a, in Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramaic i, in Æthiopic ya. The Assyrian alone uses this without the verbal root an preceding, substituting for the latter the abstract termination tu, ti, as in sunuti by the side of sunu, or ristu, "chief," from ris, "head" (compare Æthiopic we'tu, "he," and ye'ti, "she"). Yāti is often shortened to yatī, just as in Arabic 'anā is used by the poets as a word of two short syllables. Yatima, "me here" (e.g. cima yatima, "like me here"), has the demonstrative ma added (as in suma), for which see below. Yāti is for the most part used only at the beginning of a sentence, but we find also ikbi yatī, "he told me." I have not found it, except in Babylonian inscriptions, and those of the later Assyrian empire (after Sennacherib). Yāti is not to be confounded with yāsī or aīsī, "myself." This is yasu (עָסָי), "man," (used for "self,"
compare 1 Kings xx. 20, etc.), with the pronoun-suffix of the first person added (yār-i). Yā'ā (S.H.A., 37, 9) is irregularly lengthened from yā, like ma'ā for ma. The survival of the old word for the first personal pronoun in Assyrian is parallel to the existence of * as third personal pronoun in the Phœnician—a form pre-supposed by the third person of the verb.

In the second person, again, Assyrian agrees with Hebrew in assimilating the nasal to the dental, while the other dialects have anta and ant. The Coptic ntok and Berber prefixed pronoun enont have been compared. The interchange of guttural and dental already noticed appears in the Æthiopic tense-ending ca, ci (Mahri -k, -sh). Hebrew has in most instances shortened the feminine to att’, just as Aramaic has contracted the masculine. In the plural, antumu has become in Assyrian attunu, like Aramaic antūn and the feminine plural in all the dialects. Assyrian and Æthiopic alone preserve the case-ending of the masculine, though it is found also in Arabic poetry. Like sunuti and yāt, attunu is used in vulgar Assyrian as an accusative after the verb in place of the suffixed pronoun (e.g. allapra attunu, “I sent to you,” where the preposition is ungrammatically omitted). Cātā (in the accusative) is employed for the sake of emphasis after a preceding verbal-suffix ca, which is changed into a separate pronoun by the abstract termination tu, ta (e.g. S.H.A., 180, usamkhar-ca cātā, “I cause thee, even thee, to be present,” as tributary).

The verbal root with which the pronouns of the first and second persons are compounded is regarded by Dr. Hincks as ḫN, “adesse,” whence the preposition ana. I should prefer
Dillmann regards it as the pronominal element *n* or *na*, "there," whence נָא, נַא́, etc., with a prefixed. The demonstrative *annu* is referable to the same source. The third personal pronoun is peculiar, but apparently exhibits a more primitive form than is the case in the cognate dialects. See page 12.

'U in *su'u*, and 'i in *si'i*, answer to Arabic *wa* and *ya* in *huwa* and *hiya* (1). They are more often found in their contracted forms (as in Hebrew and Aramaic). The full form of the plural was *sunut* (*sunutu*), frequently shortened to *sunut*; and still more frequently to *sunu*. This, again, especially before consonants, might be still further shortened to *sun*, just as we find in the singular *s* for *su*, e.g. *usadlimu*-*s*, "they conferred on him." It is in these pronouns, the words most in use, that we find the first tendency to drop the case-endings: besides the third personal pronoun, in the first person of the permansive tense we have *pitlukhao* ("I worship") for *pitlukhau* (2).

1. *i* is a weaker vowel than *a* or *u*, and therefore more fitted to express the feminine. So in the Aryan languages we have *ayam*, "this," masculine, *iyam* feminine.²

2. To compare these pronouns *acu*, *ta*, and *su'u* with the Aryan personal pronouns is unscientific. We have no standard of comparison: it is impossible to say in what form an Aryan guttural or dental would appear in

---

1 *Sunut*, *sunut*, are specially separate forms; *sunu* generally, and *sun* always, being used as suffix-pronouns. The second case-ending -*i*, the weakened -*a*, is used rather than -*a* because the ideas of motion towards a place and rest are not so prominently brought forward as in the case of the ordinary substantive. *Sunutu*, however, is sometimes found, and even *sunutu*.

Semitic. Moreover, the original Aryan first personal pronoun was *ma*; the
nominative was of later formation. *Ac* and *ta* are primitive sounds, and
we do not know what form they originally had. Phonetic decay would
tell primarily upon the pronouns, and *su*/*u* has preserved its disyllabic
origin owing to its want of a supporting prefix. At an early stage in the
language the guttural and dental seem to have been interchangeable: just
as in the verbs the first person appears in Hebrew and Arabic as *ti* or *tu*,
so in Ethiopia (and Mehri) the second person is *ca*, *ci*, *cyamu*, *cyu*, (*com*,
canned). And the guttural is always found in the suffixed pronouns. (Comp.
ילא and ילאו.) The evidence of the sub-Semitic languages may also
perhaps be adduced. Coptic gives both dental and guttural combined for
the second person *stek*, and in Berber we have *kocchi* (masculine), *kommi*
(feminine), and in the plural *kumwi* (masculine), *kumwit* (feminine).
This may lead us back to a stage of language when, as in Japanese and
other Allophonic tongues, there were no words set apart specially for the
different pronouns, but some root of general meaning (“servant,” “one,”
etc.) was employed sometimes for one person, sometimes for another,
according to the context. Comparison would lead us to infer that the
original root used for the first two persons was *eteg*, *eceq*, or *eeet* (the
initial being retained in *aco*), and this reminds us of יָד, “one.” 1 For
the change of י and י compare בִּלַּנָא and בִּלַּנָא. For *su*/*u* we may have
יָד, “like,” “companion,” which in Assyrian takes exactly the same
form as the pronoun *su*/*u*.

The suffixed pronouns will be treated of under the verbs
and the substantives (see below).

The Demonstrative Pronouns.—The Assyrian was rich in
these. The usual demonstratives “this,” “that,” were declined
as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>su</em>/<em>ati</em></td>
<td><em>su</em>/<em>ati</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>su</em>/<em>ata</em></td>
<td><em>su</em>/<em>atun</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sa</em>/<em>atu</em>, <em>sia</em></td>
<td><em>sa</em>/<em>atim</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sa</em>/<em>ata</em></td>
<td><em>sa</em>/<em>atina</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Two objections must be set against the assumption of this root: יָד
seems to be of Turanian origin (see below), and י is not י. Perhaps the
original root may better be sought in Arabic *acca*, “amavit,” or Ethiopia
*acata*, “to honour,” “thank.”
Another form of the pronoun, which seems to be employed indifferently with it, is *sasu*:

**SINGULAR.**

Masculine—sāsu (*sa'su*).
Feminine—sa'asi, sa'asa.

**PLURAL.**

Masculine—sāsunu, sāsun.
Feminine—sa'asina, sa'asin.

Both forms immediately follow their substantive. *Sasu* may be used alone in place of the separate personal pronouns. *Su'atu* is merely a secondary form of the third personal pronoun, in which the radical *a* (as in *ššař*) is preserved by the termination *t-u*. The feminine is formed similarly from *ā*, the form taken by the third pronoun when suffixed. *A* has been weakened to *i* in *si'ī* on account of the following *i* in *sa'atu*, however, it is preserved by *ā* following, though we also find *siatu*. *Sasu* is a compound of the relative and the third personal pronoun; so that *bitu-sasu* would be literally "house which (is) it," i.e. "that house."

In the Achaemenian period we find a new demonstrative in common use, 'agā or *agah*:

**SINGULAR.**

Common gender—agā, agah.
Feminine—agata, agāta.

**PLURAL.**

Common gender—agā.

This is compounded with the demonstrative *annu* and the personal pronouns so as to strengthen the determinative idea; thus:

**SINGULAR.**

Nominative—*agannu.*
Accusative—*aganna.*

**PLURAL.**

Masculine—*agannutu.*
Feminine—*agannitu, aganēt.*

*aga-su'nu*, "he namely;" *aga-sumu*, "they namely."

The word is often employed like a mere article, as *ḫur* in
Hebrew, في in Arabic: thus while it usually follows its noun, we meet with agannitw mati, “these countries,” and both aganet mati and mati aganet. So, too, aga-su’u by the side of su’u aga, which also occurs at the beginning of a sentence. The origin of the word is obscure: it can hardly be the Accadian demonstrative gan. In Himyaritic agi has been doubtfully read as the relative pronoun. According to Dillmann ca is the Semitic demonstrative root for indicating the further object, as in ناکت (؟), ṭḥ, ᾱthiopic sycu (“that”). As the word, however, does not make its appearance until the Achaemenian period, perhaps it is best to regard it as of foreign origin.  

In classical Assyrian three demonstratives are used to express determinative distance, amnu or ma (“hic”), annu (“iste”), ullah (“ille”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[amnu]</td>
<td>[ammutu], mā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ammi]</td>
<td>[ammuti].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[amme], or ma, mā.</td>
<td>[ammutu].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Feminine—[ammeš].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ammāti]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ammāte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ma, the shortened form of amma, is appended as an enclitic to nouns and pronouns: e.g. sar Assur-ma, “king of this same Assyria” (i.e. “also”), racibu-sin dicu-ma, “their charioteers were killed here,” yatima, “I here” (“for myself”), ina asarišuti-ya-ma, “in this my pre-eminence,” ullah usmani annite-ma, “from that camp here,” ina lime anni-ma, “in the eponym of this person here” (i.e. “myself”). Annima is frequently contracted into anma, and once we have

---

1 Prof. Schrader regards it as an Aramaism, referring it to ṭḥ, ṭḥ.
annimma. *Su-ma,* "that," is also used absolutely for "him." We even find *ina sanati-ma siti,* "in this very year." The explanation of this word is due to Mr. Norris. *Ma* is irregularly lengthened to *mā* or *ma‘a,* and is then often used as a conjunctive particle (like *sa*) with the meaning "since," "that being so." We have one instance of *mā* employed absolutely with a plural verb (S.H.A. 156, 50), *mā* *sa* *isbudu,* "one of them who laboured." *Suma* in its demonstrative sense follows the noun (like $^n\text{f}¥^n$) and is interchanged with *su,* as in *ina yumi suva* or *su,* "on that day." We may compare the Phœnician third person singular pronoun suffix $^3$, as also the Hebrew $^3$.

**Singular.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>annu</td>
<td>annitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anni, anni‘i</td>
<td>anniti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anna, anna‘a</td>
<td>[annitu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>annātu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annāte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Another form of this pronoun, more nearly representing the Hebrew $^n\text{f}¥^n$, is *‘a’anati* (S.H.A. 103), and *‘a‘anni* (W. A. I. II. 60, 11).**

From *annu* we get the prepositions *anna*, *inna* (to be distinguished from *’ana*, *’ina*); like *ulli* ("among") from *ullu.*

**Singular.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ulla</td>
<td>ullatu, ullātu, ulluṣi (Achæmenian).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulla‘i, ulla‘i‘i</td>
<td>ulluṣi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ullā</td>
<td>ulluṣa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feminine** ulla‘tu. ulla‘te.

**Ullu** is also used absolutely in the common phrase *ullu ulla,* "from that (old) time." In an Achæmenian inscription *ulla* is joined with *ma, ullamma,* "that thing." *Ulluṣi* is a
product of the Persian period, and Xerxes even gives us the monstrous compound akhulluai ullah, "those shores," for akhi ullahu.

Ullu is Hebrew Delimiter, Deli, Aramaic ullah, Aramaic ullah, Arabic al, ulla, ulai, ulai, Ethiopian yll, yllu, yllante, ylluntu: annu connects itself with the Ethiopian yntyq and yarn; and amnu is one of the archaic forms preserved in Assyrian which make this language so valuable to the philologist. Traces of it are found in ullah (Assyrian in), Arabic in, Ethiopian uma: annu pre-supposes amnu, just as the plural affix has changed from amnu into anu, or Arabic am into im.

The Relative Pronoun.—This is za, identical with the Phœnician 盅 and northern and later Hebrew 盅 (in Canticles, Judges, and Ecclesiastes), which appears again in Rabbinic 盅. Here, again, Assyrian and Hebrew agree. In the other dialects we have a different root employed: Ethiopian za, Aramaic zi, Syriac ci, Hymaritic ci, Sinaitic di (Hebrew ב, ב), Arabic allasi (=allas) and zu. Za is often used pleonastically to introduce a sentence (like que in French patois), "as regards which." The genitive, when the relation is not expressed by the construct state, is formed by the relative pronoun (e.g. sarru za Assur), as in Ethiopian, Hymaritic, Sinaitic, Aramaic, etc. We have traces of this in Hebrew, e.g. Methu-sa-el. The Phœnician uses 盅 in this sense exactly as in Assyrian (e.g. בותך שמש "the builders of stone"). We find also za uma used rarely to express the genitive, like מ" and Rabbinic מ" (compare Canticles i. 6, iii. 7). In relative sentences za may be omitted, as in Hebrew and Arabic. "That which is not," is za-la. Za must not be
connected with יָשָׁן (בּ=רְשָׁן, asaru, like so, “place,” “which,” in Chinese), while the Phœnician יָשָׁן (ysh) is probably ישן. Sa was originally the demonstrative, and stood by the side of su, sa, si. Hymaritic and Æthiopic show traces of a pronoun s. Like יָשָׁן, sa is indeclinable. In vulgar Assyrian it was often used without an antecedent (e.g. ina sa Gargamis, “after (the maneh) of Carchemish”).

The Interrogative Pronoun.—This is mannu, mānu, or man, “who?” contracted by the vulgar pronunciation into mā. Ma appears in the adverb matima, “at any time” (Hebrew לֵא, “when”), where the demonstrative ma is attached to the interrogative with ti affixed. In the later inscriptions matima is used as an interrogative, e.g. sa matima, “of what place.” Mō or mi, weakened (because either a neuter or an enclitic) from mā, is found attached to mannu, which is thus reduplicated; e.g. mannu-mē attā akhū, “who (art) thou brother?” Mānu is Æthiopic manu, mi, ment; Arabic man, mā; Aramaic man, mā; Hebrew mi, mah. Mi was also used by the Assyrians, as is proved by the indefinite mimma and the existence of mō. The interrogative enters into the composition of

The Indefinite Pronouns.—These are mammun, mammā, manumma, or manamma in Assyrian, manama in Babylonian, manma in Achaemenian, “aliquis.” In manama or manamma and manumma (where the double letter merely expresses the accent), the interrogative precedes the demonstrative;¹ in mammun (where the accent again occasions the double letter) the converse is the case. Dr. Oppert compares ὅτις. Just as in Arabic, etc., the interrogative becomes conjunctive: thus at Behistun we have manu atta sarru, “whatever king you

¹ So in samumma and samamma, “another,” from sanu, “second,” and ma.
may be” (so in אֲמָה, אֲמַה, Arabic ʾamā, ʾamā, Assyrian ʾimā). “Whatever” was ʾimāma, from the neuter mi. Followed by lā before the verb, manama = “nobody”: in the Achæmenian period the negative might be dropped, manma having acquired a negative sense like personne, etc., in French; e.g. manma isallimma, “no one accomplishes.” Just as manu has become מָלֵא in Hebrew, so in Assyrian we find mamma (for manama, manma) like mē used as an enclitic: lū aba lū khallū manma, “whether an officer or any common man whatever.”

Another indefinite pronoun is the indeclinable mala, mal, “as many as,” whose meaning was first pointed out by Dr. Hincks. Mala would be compounded of the conjunctive manu, ma, and the demonstrative lā, which we have repeated in ʾÆthiopic lala, “he himself,” and which may possibly be related to ʾulū, ʾulū, ʾÆthiopic al; just as the two negatives אָנָּא and אָנָּא, Assyrian ul, and lā or la stand over against one another.

“Some”—“others,” is expressed by anute—anute and akhadat—akhadat or akhadi—akhadi. As an adjective “other” is akharitu. Sanumma is “another.” We also find estin ana estin, “one to another.”

The Reflexive Pronoun.—This is ramanu, ramani, ramana, raman, so excellently explained by Dr. Oppert. He first pointed out its true meaning and derivation. The first syllable is long, for rahmanu, from rahamu, the Assyrian form of רָמַע which we get in rihma, “mercy,” and raʾim misari, “lover of justice” (whence לָגָרָם according to Harkavy, Rev. Israel., March, 1870). Ramanu, therefore, is primarily “bowels,” then “self,” עַלְבּ. It is combined with the
personal pronoun suffixes, so that we have *ramaniya*, “my-
self,” *ramanići* “thyself,” *ramanisi* “himself,” “herself,”
[ *ramanin*, “ourselves,” ] [ *ramanisćin* “yourselves,” ]
*ramaninisćun* “themselves.” The second syllable was ac-
cented: ¹ hence the nasal is often doubled (*ramannuca*). So-
some, however, the accent was kept on the (long) first
syllable; this necessitated the excision of the second (*ram-
nisu*). Another word for expressing the same idea is *gadu,*
“an individual” (“a piece cut off”), which is sometimes
combined with *sasu* (as *sasu gadu*). *Sasu* may also be used
alone in the same sense; and *anni-ma* or *anma* is common for
“Myself” (like ὅ̀δε in Greek). So “myself” is also ex-
pressed by *yās-i* or *aš-i* (see *suprd*).
Su or *sunu* placed before the noun gives it emphasis, e.g.
*su Elamu,* “the Elamite himself.”

**THE VERB.**

The Assyrian verbs are for the most part triliteral. There
are very few quadrilaterals. This assimilates Assyrian rather
to Hebrew, than to Arabic and *Äthiopic*. Verbal roots will
be discussed further on.

The verbs are either complete or defective. The latter
will be arranged as in the Hebrew grammar: verbs יְּב; 
verbs יְּב, יְּב (נְּב), יְּב; verbs יְּל, יְּל; verbs יְּל (נְּל),

¹ This is occasioned by the shortness of the last syllable, which obliges
the accent to be on the preceding syllable. Properly the vowel of the
servile abstract termination in מ was short (ע) (lengthened in *Äthiopic,
Hebrew, [and Arabic], though words like *Äthiopic yrgynā,* “age,” bear
witness to an originally short vowel), thus distinguishing it from the long
vowel of the plural termination in *ānu.*
and verbs doubly defective. Verbs ḳ'}) are not irregular in Assyrian. Instead of verbs ṭ'y, ṭ'y, the language preferred verbs ḳ'y, which therefore exist in an unusual number. Verbs ṭ'y or ṭ'y are regular. Verbs ḳ'y are conjugated in great measure like verbs ṭ'y. Indeed ṭ radical in any place produces certain peculiarities. Verbs containing ṭ, however, do not deviate from the ordinary type.

There are six conjugations in ordinary use, each admitting a secondary conjugation. Others are occasionally met with, anomalously, as in Hebrew.

The secondary conjugations are formed by the insertion of ṭ (sometimes changed to ḫ or ṣ, p. 29) between the first and second radicals. In concave verbs the dental precedes the first radical. The six principal conjugations with their secondary forms are as follows:

1. Kal, as catim; aorist ictum.
2. Niphal, as nanzux; aorist issacin.
3. Pael, as hallac, aorist yunaccoir.
4. Iphtaal, as aorist yuqtadhāhir.
5. Shaphel, as aorist yusalbis.
6. Istaphal, as aorist yultisib (for yustisib).

Traces of other conjugations are also found. The most common of these are an iphtaneal (1b), an iphtanael (3b), an ittanaphal (2b), and an istanaphal (4b); e.g. istanahālu (“they asked one another”) ictanarrāb (“he approaches
near”), ikhtanabbata (“he wasted much”), istanappar (“he sends forth often”), istandakhu, ittanallaca (“he goes repeatedly”). These forms with the inserted nasal may be compared with the fourteenth and fifteenth Arabic conjugations. It is possible that this strengthened form of the secondary conjugations in Assyrian was influenced by the Accadian causative, which inserted tan between the pronoun and the verbal root. It retains the original meaning of reciprocity more persistently than the form with a simple dental. Another conjugation rarely found is an istataphal; e.g. yustetesser or yustetesir from @store, yuûtetatsir, “he marshalled” (Iphtatael). A Pilel and a Pael, also, like Arabic conjugations ia. and xi., are occasionally met with (mostly in concave verbs), as acsuttu (“I acquired,” for acsüddu), ipparsüddu, “they fled”; yutarru (“they bring”), compared with yutaru Pael present, and yutirru (“he returned”) compared with Pael aorist; irtenin, “he made”; ıddanan, “he gives.” Examples of a Poel and Hithpoel, Arabic conjugations iii. and vi., are ilubusu, “he had put on”; etupusa, “I made.” A Tiphel with passive signification seems to occur in the permansive tebusu, “he has been made” (W.A.S., 17, 1, 1). Compare the participle etpisu, “constituted.” Illiliq, “he went,” is an instance of a form with the second radical doubled.

Concave verbs have a peculiar conjugation, in which the aorist and present agree with the Pael of regular verbs; the permansive, however, takes the form niba (“told”), dicu

1 So in Æthiopic a short tonic vowel may strengthen itself by an inserted nasal, e.g. syntu for sytu.
2 This cannot be passive of Pael, as the meaning is against it, and we ought to have yulubbisu.
ASSEMBLY GRAMMAR.

(“smitten”), nikha (“rested”), with a passive or neuter meaning. So in Arabic we have kila, perfect passive i. of kulu: hence we may conclude that the Assyrian niba stands for nivuba (like limunu, see below).

As in Arabic, every conjugation, except Niphal and Ittaphal, possesses a passive formed by means of the obscure vowel u. Kal also has no passive, Niphal being used for it. As the signification of Niphal was originally reflexive, not passive, Kal in Assyrian nevertheless wanting a passive, it would seem that the passive was a late addition to the Semitic verb. This is confirmed by its being found only in Arabic and Assyrian. The passives of the other conjugations of the Assyrian verb are as follows:

(3.) Pa'al makes nuluku (“they climbed up”), surruh (“he is burned”), gubbu (“he is proclaimed”). The Aorist yunumnu, “it is seen.”

(4.) Shaphel makes sukuru (“they were made to be called”), suiluku (“they were made to go”). When the permansive had a vowel attached, the vowel of the second syllable could be irregularly changed to a. Thus we find subaru (“he drives away”), and sukalula by the side of sukulula (“he caused to reach”). The aorist would be yususlu (“he caused to be finished”), as we find yusulti.

(5.) Aphel seems to make yuahbu (“they were made good”). This is rather the aorist than the permansive, which ought to be udhubu.

(4a.) Istaphal makes sutesuru (“they were kept right”), sutabulu from 32.

I have found no examples of a passive in the remaining conjugations.

In (1a) Iphthal, however, we have latbusa (“they were covered”), with which we may compare the form of the nomen mutati of Kal, as in darummu (“a habitation”).

1 In sipru suatu ippasu, “this message has been accomplished,” ippasu is not passive, but a late irregular form (as in Babylonian) of edusu (Kal), “one has accomplished.”
Special details will be found under the head of each conjugation.

Quadriliterals are rare in Assyrian. Unlike the Arabic, they have the same conjugations as triliteral verbs, with the exception of a Pael, viz. (1) Kal, or Pael, e.g. Aorist iskhupar ("he overwhelmed"), present îpaloit ("he comes over"); (1a.) Iphtalel, e.g. yuptaloit; (2) Saphalel, e.g. yuspaloit; (2a.) Istaphalel, e.g. yustapaloit; (3) Niphalel, e.g. îppaloi, present îppalcat; (3a) Ittaphalel, e.g. îltapaloit, present îltapalcat; (4) Iphalalla or Nipherella, e.g. îppsiddû ("they fled"), and îporsiddû. These four voices are strikingly analogous to the four Arabic conjugations, saphalel taking the place of taphalala and niphalel of iphanlala. An instance of the tertiary conjugation (t-n) in a quadrilateral is ittanaprassidu, "he has fled to" (ittanaphalel). Quadriliterals are mostly found in the Niphalel, and generally the Niphal of triliterals is to be compared with them. With Ittaphalel the Hebrew Nitpael is to be compared, so common in the Rabbinic literature. I have found no instance of the Permansive tense.

The Assyrian verb is rich in tenses. It possesses a Permansive, or Perfect as it is generally called in Semitic grammars, of comparatively rare occurrence in the historic inscriptions, but sufficiently common in the tablets; besides four more other tenses. These have been formed out of the Imperfect or Future of ordinary Semitic grammars. This tense was first divided into two forms, the longer expressing present time, and the shorter having an aoristic sense. Exactly the same phenomenon appears in Æthiopic, and would seem in both languages to have been due to non-Semitic influence.
At all events, Accadian possessed an aorist and a present. The two tenses thus gained by the Assyrians were still further modified by attaching a different shade of meaning to the form which ended with the original short vowel and to the apocopated form. Thus, *isallim* is a present, *isallimu* has a future signification. In the case of the aorist this difference of meaning was not so uniformly observed. Generally *isāhuru* has a perfect or pluperfect signification, while *isāhur* is aorist; sometimes, however, the longer form cannot be distinguished in sense from the aorist. We thus have the following tenses:—(1) Permansive, e.g. *sacīn* ("he places"); (2) Aorist, *iscon* ("he made"); (3) Perfect or Pluperfect, *isconu* ("he has made"); (4) Present, *isaccin* ("he makes"); (5) Future, *isaccinu* ("he will make"). The Kal present is only distinguished from the Pael aorist by the person-prefix which is amalgamated with *u* in the Pael; thus, *isaccin* is Kal present, *yusaccin* is Pael aorist. As in Pael, the double letter of the Kal present is frequently dropped; a fault common to all Semitic writing.¹

In the remaining conjugations Niphal, Pael, and Shaphel, the Present is distinguished from the Aorist by containing *a* instead of *i* in the last syllable: thus, *issacan, issacin; yusaccan, yusaccin; yuqā' an, yucin (†); yusascan, yusascin.*²

The name Permansive is due to Dr. Hincks, who thus marks it off from what he calls the Mutative tenses.

¹ Very rarely, and only in ungrammatical inscriptions, such as the Law-tablet, the present takes the form *iraggum*, through the influence of an unfrequent form of the Pael aorist.

² *I* is a weakened *a*, and consequently *a* more fitly marks a continuing period of time upon which the mind dwells.
Besides the termination in \( u \), the Assyrian aorist resembles the Arabic in possessing two other forms at least. Adopting the Arabic division, we have:

(1.) The Apocopated Aorist, expressing urgency and command, and therefore usually employed in the inscriptions.

(2.) The Telic Aorist, terminating in \( u \), denoting the continuance of past time.

(3.) The Aorist of Motion, or Conditional Aorist, terminating in \( a \).

(4.) The Paragogic Aorist, expressing energy, terminating in \( m \) or \( mma \).

Besides these, I have detected traces of a termination in \( i \) — e.g. \( yubahi \), “it had sought,” \( amdakhtisi \) as a variant of \( amdakhtis \) (“I fought”), \( uraci \) (“I reached”), \( usarrikhi \) (“I consecrated”) in Babylonian. The same termination is pre-supposed by \( imma \), which is found (though rarely) by the side of \( umma \) and \( amma \). This termination would seem properly to have been used when the idea expressed in the sentence was subordinate to what went before.

These flexions are identical with those of the noun.\(^1\)

The Apocopated Aorist, from its aptitude to denote vigour, like the Jussive in Arabic and Hebrew, has become the common form in Assyrian, as in Phœnician, Hebrew, Aramaic, and \( \delta \)Ethiopic. Not but that all the forms given above, with the exception of that in \( -i \) (which has been altogether lost in Arabic), are frequently found.

The principal form in \( -u \), answering to the nominative of the noun, so conspicuous in Arabic, has acquired in Assyrian

---

\(^1\) As in the noun, \( i \) is weakened from both \( a \) and \( u \), which would, therefore, be the primary terminations.
for the most part a telic sense, i.e. it generally denotes a perfect or pluperfect action. In those persons which end in a vowel, the original termination in $n$, otherwise lost in Assyrian, is preserved, the vowel being attached. This is in a few rare cases $a$, though $i$ generally takes its place, $a$ not being met with. The prevalence of $i$ is to be explained partly by the fact that the additional vowel is mostly found in relative and subordinate sentences, partly by the influence of $ni$, the conditional enclitic. The final syllable of the person-ending was long; hence we often find $yusalidi\'uni$ written for $yusalid\'ani$. When followed by the enclitic conjunction, the accent was thrown upon the final $i$, which, accordingly, generally has the consonant after it doubled: thus, $ikh\'ahun\'iv-va$ for $ikh\'ahun\'i-va$.

The aorist of motion answers to the accusative of nouns, and hence signifies motion towards a place. Both have in Assyrian the vowel $a$, which corresponds to the termination of the Hebrew Cohortative in the verb and the local case in the noun, long recognized as a relic of the old Semitic accusative.

The long $i^\text{r}$ originates in the primitive mimmation ($\text{amma, am, Arabic, anna, an}$), just as in Arabic $\text{yacetul\'ama or yacetul\'an}$ becomes $\text{yacetul\'a}$ in pause. Assyrian, when it drops the mimmation, preserves the original short quantity of the vowel. While in Assyrian the aorist in $-a$ very frequently signifies motion (e.g. $\text{aslula, \"I carried off\"}$), in many instances it denotes a purely quiescent state (e.g. $\text{ebusa, \"he made\"}$); but in this case it either stands in a conditional sentence or has its object following it, so that the action of the verb is moved forward to the noun. I have not found it
used as a cohortative, a sense which arises from the idea of motion in urging oneself or another forward to do a thing, and implies a continuance of the action desired by putting it into effect. When it stands in a relative sentence it exactly corresponds to the Arabic subjunctive, a use of the form originating in the conception of limitation implied in the termination (as in the accusative of the noun)—the action having proceeded to a certain point and no further,—from which also arises the idea of motion. The accusative is the object to which the mind travels. Hence it is expressed by the broad vowel \( a \).\(^1\)

The Paragogic or Energetic aorist is merely that in which the attached vowels retain the primitive mimination, once possessed by all noun-cases, and which has become a nunmination in Arabic. The final \( ma \) is generally the enclitic conjunction \( \ddagger \), in which \( v \) has been changed into \( m \) on account of the preceding \( m \) (see p. 28).\(^2\) Thus we have \( abnu\) or \( abnum \) ("I built"), \( iddin\u0101num \) ("they have given"), \( isrucunimma \) ("they have presented and"), \( usetsamma \) ("I brought forth and"), \( usolamma \) ("I brought up and").

The Moods, excluding the Indicative, are four in number: (1) Preceptive, (2) Subjunctive, (3) Imperative, and (4) Infinitive, though the latter would better be described as a verbal noun.

(1) The Preceptive is formed from the aorist, as in Arabic

\(^1\) We have to distinguish the enclitic \( a \) for \( va \), "and," from this tense-ending. Final \( u \) coalesces with the \( a \); thus \( aslu\u0101\) for \( aslu\u0101\)-\( a \) (\( aslu\u0101\u0161a\) ) "they carried off." The augment of motion is found also with the Present (especially when used cohortatively), as well as with the Imperative and Preceptive (see below). So, too, the mimination.

\(^2\) In classical Assyrian this final \( ma \) is always the enclitic conjunction.
and Aramaean, by means of the prefix *li* or *lu*. So, too, 
Æthiopic often prefixes *la* to the shorter form of the Im-
perfect in the same sense. In Assyrian, when the first letter
of the verb is a vowel, *lu* is used; *a, u,* or *yu* are absorbed by
the *u* of the prefix which is lengthened: if, however, the first
letter be *i,* *lu-* is contracted into *li,* which becomes *al*
before *e.* This *lu* must be distinguished from the particle
*lu,* denoting
past time (like *kād* in Arabic, or *sma* in Sanskrit), which
never amalgamates with the verb. Dr. Oppert points out its
connexion with the *ל* of the Talmud and the Aramaic (as in
the forms in Daniel נוֹל and כְּנֵל). The Precautive is
confined to the first and third persons, the Imperative being
used for the second; but it is chiefly found in the third.
Examples are *hulád* (joined with *anaot,* *lucud* (“may I
obtain”), *lusba-* *a* (with the augment of motion added) and
*lusbim* (“may I be satisfied with”), *lurabis* (“may he
enlarge”), *lutir* (“may he restore”), *lirur* (“may he curse”),
*líbí-tu* (“may they rule over”), *lisumnu,* (“may they place”).
Irregularly it was even used in later times with the second
person: thus Nebuchadnezzar has *lutippis* (“mayest thou
make”). The same form is used for the masculine and
feminine of the third person. The subjunctive enclitic -*ni*
may be attached to the Precautive; e.g. *lissu-ni,* “may they
carry away” (in a quotation).

(2) The Subjunctive is hardly to be called a distinct mood.
It is formed by the subjunctive enclitic *ni* added either to the
Perfect or to the Permansive, e.g. *utabacum.* In some cases the
enclitic cannot be distinguished in form from the fuller plural

---

1 This *ל* however, may represent the *y* of the Aramaic third person
of the verb.
termination of the aorist: generally, however, an accusative pronoun is inserted between the verb and the enclitic, e.g. abilu-sina-ni ("I have possessed them"), ikabu-su-ni ("he calls it"). The enclitic is used after the relative or such particles as ɔi. A common idiom is to use this enclitic without ɔi, followed by ɔa ("and") and an aorist (not unlike the use of waw consecutivum); e.g. istsatuniv-ɔavamu, "when they had taken, they saw" (where the first ɔ does not represent the mimination, but points out that ɔ has the accent thrown back by ɔa). ɔn must be compared with the Æthiopic enclitic ɔn added to ɔova, "until," shortened probably from ɔn̪a, which is attached to the accusative of motion. Both probably go back to ɔn̪ (as in nāhu, nāwā), Arabic anna, Hebrew נָה. Compare Assyrian eninna, "again" (?).

(3) The Imperative is confined to the second person, the second person singular feminine ending in -i, the second person plural masculine in -u long, feminine -a. The subjunctive augment of motion is sometimes attached to the second person singular masculine, e.g. sullimā (pael), "complete." It would be more true to say that the final ɔ was the primitive form which was afterwards contracted, the object-vowel (ɔ) being used rather than the subject-vowel (a), as in Arabic, because the action passed on from the speaker to the object. The length of the final vowels in the plural is sometimes denoted by otiose characters, as in Arabic: thus, salkhu'usu for salkhū-su, "do ye extend it." In Shaphel, the imperative is always formed as if from Aphel: e.g. suscin for sususcin, as in Hebrew hactēl for hehactēl.

The Energetic Augment may be used (especially in Baby-
lonian), with both the imperative and the preative, e.g. surihimam, "cause to be exalted;" lusbi, "may he be sated with," besides lusbi, which combines (like surihimam) the Conditional and Energetic Augments.

(4) The Infinitive is a verbal substantive, and as such may take the feminine termination. It would be better called, as in Arabic, a nomen verbi; and as such will be considered further on.

The participle prefixes mu in all conjugations except Kal, and the Pael of concave verbs, as in the other Semitic tongues. This mu is the pronoun ma, mi, manu, etc., as Ewald has pointed out. Assyrian here agrees with Arabic, as well as really with Hebrew and Aramaic, in which shaqo is equivalent to the short a of the other more conservative languages: እግሄት is the original a.

THE PERSONS.

As in the other Semitic languages, a distinction is made in the attachment of the person-suffixes in the Permansive and the Aorist. The Permansive is conjugated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 m. and f. tsabactu, tsabacta,</td>
<td>3 f. tsabta.</td>
<td>1 m. and f. [tsabitni]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tsabtaq</td>
<td>3 m. [tsabta]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>[tsabtita]</td>
<td>2 f. [tsabittina]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>[tsabiti]</td>
<td>3 m. tsabtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>tsabit</td>
<td>3 f. tsabta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f.</td>
<td>tsabtat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have taken the greater part of the above from Dr. Hincks. The form of the second singular is restored from the forms of the pronoun in Assyrian, atta and atti.
The Aorist is conjugated thus:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 m. and f. asdhrur</td>
<td>2 m. and f. [tasdhrūrā]</td>
<td>1 m. and f. nisdhur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>tasdhrur</td>
<td>2 m. tasdhuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>tasdhrurā</td>
<td>2 f. tasdhura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>isdhrur</td>
<td>3 m. isdhuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f.</td>
<td>isdhrurā</td>
<td>3 f. isdhurā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Present will be:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 m. and f. asaccin, asaccan, asacin</td>
<td>2 m. and f. [tasaccinā, tasaccnā]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>tasaccin, tasaccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>tasaccini, tasaccani, tasacni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>isaccin, isaccan, isacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f.</td>
<td>tasaccin, tasaccan, tasacin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 m. and f. nisaccin, etc.</th>
<th>3 m. isaccinu, isacnu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>3 f. isaccinā, isacnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>tasaccina, tasacna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Perfect and Future we have to add u to such persons as terminate in a consonant, and ni or nu to those that terminate in a vowel.

The dual is very rare: as in modern Arabic, it has almost disappeared from the verb. We find, however, basaʻū usnā-su, “his ears always exist,” icosūdā katā-su, “his hands possessed” (with a variant icosudu).

The first person of the Permansive is identical in form with the Æthiopic, and refers us to the original form of the first personal pronoun. As in the case of the affixed pronoun su, the final u may be dropped: this seems almost always to happen in the Babylonian and Achaemenian inscriptions. The form in a corresponds with the aorist subjunctive, being used in relative sentences, e.g. sa anacu tsibāca, “what I wish.”
In the third plural (and dual) the short ı has been dropped, as will be seen is often the case.

In the Aorist, u following or preceding causes the distinctive a to disappear: the first person singular of the Paal is *usaddhir*.

The person-endings in the Permansive are attached to the root as in the Aryan languages; *tsabaou* exactly corresponds to *ad-mi*. In order to distinguish the two tenses, as the Semites did not possess the Aryan machinery of augments, the pronouns were divided in the aorist, the characteristic letter being prefixed, and the rest of the word affixed. *At* (in *atta* and *attin*) was shortened into *t*, -ı and -in being affixed. The a of the first person is either the last relic of the ancient guttural *ao* (?from *dödî*) or the pronoun which appears in *yati*. The third person in the aorist seems to have employed a different pronoun from that in common use among the Semitic nations. In the Permansive it is merely the abstract participle, with the feminine termination attached to the feminine (*a* in the plural standing for *an(u)*; see below). In the Aorist the pronoun seems to be that preserved in the Æthiopic *wêtu*, *yiîti*, which cannot be derived from *hînc*, *hiya*, by dropping the first syllable, as this is the all-important one, and the Semitic languages in abbreviations dropped the final, never the initial, syllable.

In the preceding it will be seen that I have followed the views of Dr. Hincks in the main, rather than those of Dr. Oppert. The researches of the latter into the Assyrian verb have been vitiated by a refusal to perceive minor differences, and by a pre-conceived theory deduced from the general usage of the historical inscriptions. Dr. Oppert, in the second
edition of his Grammar, still denies the existence of a Per-
mansive, a Present (which he confuses with Pael), and of a
Future or Perfect (which he considers to be interchanged
indiscriminately with the shorter forms); while he ignores
several facts of importance, such as the existence of a dual,
the use of the aorist subjunctive, and the passives. As he
has brought forward arguments against the existence of a
Permansive tense in Assyrian (now admitted by Mr. Norris
and Mr. G. Smith), it will be necessary to show that such
really does exist in the inscriptions.

Dr. Oppert seems to admit that cullu, "they are holding,"
and nasu'u, "they are carrying," in the Achæmenian in-
scriptions—to which he might have added bitluqku, "he has
been worshipping," saladhac, "I am ruling," tesbau and
tsummukhu—are true perfects; but he objects that the texts
in which they are formed belong to a corrupt period of the
Assyrian language, and that the forms, therefore, are to be
classed with other (Aramaising) peculiarities of the Persian
period. The cases, however, are not quite parallel. One, the
Permansive, is part of the original stock of the Semitic family
of speech; the others are words which could easily have been
borrowed from neighbours. How could a people which did
not possess the Semitic Perfect ever feel the want of such a
tense? Even Semitic scholars find it hard to grasp its
fundamental idea. Moreover, forms identical with those just
cited, and necessarily construed as finite verbs, are to be
found in the older texts. Against the sentence quoted by
Dr. Hincks, eipir sepi-sunu ... pān samie rapsutī catīm, "the
dust of their feet ... the face of the whole heaven is con-
cealing," Dr. Oppert urges that the sentence is not completed
here, *illumu-a* being added. But *illumu* is a preposition, “before”; and the case governed by *catim* is *pan*. So that Dr. Hincks’s argument still holds good; were *catim* a participle (in that case, by the way, it ought to be *catimu*), it “would stand before what it governs, and would require a verb to complete the sentence.” But another instance may be brought forward in which the permissive is absolutely the last word in the sentence. This is *bašti uššu pulukhi melamme sarruti itati-su šakhrā-va*, “the strong power of reverence, the fear of royalty, surround its walls; and.” This sentence is complete in itself, and, according to Dr. Oppert, the verb ought to be in the aorist. Another instance quoted by Dr. Hincks from Sennacherib is *tobuni gibou(t)-šun urukh Accadi itebatuni-va ana Babila tobuni*, “their forces took the road to Accad and came on to Babylon;” the verb is מָלַךְ. Dr. Oppert tries to invalidate this by saying that *te* is a mistake of the engraver for *it*. But the time has not yet come for us to amend our texts: until we know a good deal more of Assyrian than what can be gathered from the uniform phraseology of royal historical inscriptions, we must be content to take what lies before us, and to believe that the Assyrian scribes knew a good deal more about their language than we do.

Moreover, to close all doubt upon the matter, the same word is found in another passage—*sa pan matti mitkharis ana epis tukmati tobuni*, “who to the countries in person to make opposition came on,” and Assur-bani-pal’s texts have *tebaou*, “I am coming” (S.H.F., 124). The same remarks apply to Dr. Oppert’s statement that *tsabtu* (which can only be a verb) is a mistake for *itesabtu*, “which is often found in the same
phrase.” But we can match the permansive *tsabtu* with numberless instances. Thus we have *sa ina lanni-sunu ina carbi-su kamu‘u*, “(the youths) who in their dwellings within it were associated”; *arakh il li‘ni nabu‘u sum-su*, “the month of the god of bricks they call its name” (Sivan); *sa ilu ana sarrutiv eri curu zicir-sun*, “whose fame the god hath called to the sovereignty of the city”; *sa la citnusu ana niri*, “who were not submissive to my yoke”; *teir sukti Nipur . . . subat-sun sitounat-va*, “upon the covers of Nipur . . . their abode was situated, and”; *cima solut . . . ana same zikipta saqnu*, “like rocks . . . to the sky pointed they stood”; *cirkhu-su cima uba‘an sade sacin*, “its head like the top of a mountain was standing”; *cima zikip samdhu*, “like a stake they pierced”; *cima zikip . . . nadi*, “they a stake . . . they were situated”; *tsalui . . . sakis nanzsus*, “images . . . on high were fixed”; *racibu-sin diou*, “their charioteers were slain”; *sa cima khirate tsabruni*, “which like women (men) collect”; *nummuru bukhar-sun*, “their excellency was seen”; *sa latbusa*, “which were covered”; *mala basu‘u*, “as many as exist”; *sa nubalu-su . . . subaru*, “who drives away his enemies”; *sa . . . sursudu*, “which was erected”; *sa sutabulu ciri‘-sa*, “which had been carried within it”; *sa . . . sukuru*, “which were appointed by proclamation”; *sa . . . suluca-va . . . nisi . . . la ida‘a*, “which were made to go and . . . men . . . did not know of”; *tulu-sa ul ipsi sabat-sa tsukhkharat*, “its mound was not, its site was small”; *eli sade-sunu martsuti daglu*, “to their rugged mountains they trusted”; *Turbu . . . inacidu-va attu-ni asaba-ni minu*, “Tirhakah will be unfortunate and (men) measure out our habitation to us.” In most of these cases the perman-
sive is joined with an aorist and follows its case, so that it can no more be a participle (as Dr. Oppert would have us believe) than any perfect in the Bible. Besides, were the permansives above-given participles, we should require *tsalui nansuzi* instead of *nansuzu*, or *sa la citnusi* instead of *citnusu*. *Teukkurat* and *sulua*, again, would have the prefix *mu*. But, says Dr. Oppert, “the other Permansive forms of Hincks are either participles like *musarbu* or infinitives *sitkunat*, *suḫurat*, etc.” Dr. Hincks however, in the first place, never called *musarbu* a Permansive; and, in the second place, the examples given above are sufficient to show that the words instanced are not infinitives. This will be made still plainer by the following sentence from Sennacherib’s cylinder: *ruubi adi kurra-sina sa ina kitrub takhasi danni racibu-sin dio-ama va sina mursa-re va ramanu-seun ittanallaca*, “the chariots with their horses whose charioteers in the meeting of mighty battle were killed there; then they (feminine) were abandoned and the men themselves went away.” Here *mussu* and *ittanallaca* are on exactly the same footing; if one is an infinitive, the other must be so likewise. So, again, in a relative sentence like *abnu ... sa ... nusiblu*, “the stone ... which ... climbed up,” an infinitive is out of the question; and the same will apply to the phrases quoted above. The astronomical reports prove the same thing: in which the only verbs that occur are, according to this strange theory of Dr. Oppert, in the infinitive mood! Thus we have *yumu VI. arakhī Nisanni yumu va musi sitkulu*, “the sixth day of Nisan, day and night are balancing one another.”

The last argument of Dr. Oppert is directed against the
first person singular of the Permansive: and this is a form which it is difficult to explain away. Accordingly, he asserts that *sarracu*, “I am king”; *zicaracu*, “I am a male,” etc., are substantives, with *cu* for *anacu* affixed (!), while *utsbacu(ni)*, *saldhag*, and *tsibaca* are to be read *yutsbacuni*, *saldha opus*, and *tsiba ioris*. Now the first explanation either means that *sarracu*, etc., are first persons of a Permansive tense, or else introduces an altogether non-Semitic grammatical form. In the latter case we must prefer an explanation which accords with Semitic grammar to one which contravenes its principles. A permansive first person of the form *sarracu* is in accordance with the rules of Semitic grammar; a substantive with a Separate Pronoun-affix cannot be paralleled among the cognate languages. Moreover, the bilingual tablets translate Accadian *verbe*, not substantives, by this form; e.g. *mun-lu* is rendered *tsabtaou*, “I am taking,” *mu-s-tugdu* by *khasaou*, “I am honouring.” If, however, Dr. Oppert does not wish to introduce a non-Semitic conception, then he is merely using an inaccurate expression to denote the Permansive. No one will deny that in the ṢEthiopic *gabarou* the pronoun-affix appears: but equally no one will deny that *gabarou* is the first singular of the Preterite. The Assyrian, like all other Semitic tongues, employs a different pronoun-affix for substantives, and attaches to the compound an altogether different sense from that which *tsabtaou* bears. If Assyrian be Semitic, it must be interpreted in accordance with the genius of Semitic speech. *Tsabtaou* could by no possibility be a substantive. That would require *tsabituqa* or *tsabtyua*, and would have to be translated “my capturer.” Next as regards the explanation of the three last words
instanced by Dr. Oppert. Two obvious rules for every decipherer are—(1) not to assume ideographs in the text unnecessarily, and (2) to explain in the same way similar forms with similar significations. This will dispose of the monstrosities saldha bus (for saldhaq, "I am ruling," Persian patiakhshiya) and tsiba tiris for tsiba'aca, together with many like words, e.g. pitlukhaq, "I am worshipping"; bitugaq, "I am working at"; cainaq, "I am stedfast"; badhlaq, "I am failing"; for which I suppose Dr. Oppert would adopt the same desperate explanation. Dr. Oppert seems to imagine that these first person Permansive forms are exceptional. Even in the historical inscriptions, however, this is not the case; and certain tablets, such as those containing prayers, regularly present them; e.g. puputa rabacu acala dabsaq, "crops I increase, corn I mature" (where neither form nor syntax allow rabacu to be called a substantive); cinacu cī makhalī, "I am strong as a fortress"; tsammiracu cī atani, "I rejoice like a wild ass (?)"; sarraku, "I am king," where the change of guttural implies that the form had become so well established as to obliterate the recollection of its origin. The examples just given are found side by side with ridā isu, "I have a servant," and anacu napāsa, anacu nubasa. However possible it may be to imagine a substantive in such intransitive verbs as sarracu, xiciracu, this is altogether out of the question with rabacu and dabsaq. These two words alone would be sufficient to establish a Permansive tense in Assyrian. As for utsbaqani ("I am stopping," with the subjunctive enolitic after cī; in other instances, where cī is wanting, utsbaqou alone occurs), Dr. Hincks has already set aside Dr. Oppert's utsbaqumi.
It is an impossible form, which cannot be matched in Assyrian. "Išbakuni would be legitimate; and so would išabkuni, or with št or šš in the place of š; yušabkuni might pass also for conjugation III. [Pael]; but the substitution of yu for i before šb—such a form as yuṣgaluni—is unparalleled." And lastly, if the above arguments were not sufficient, the bilingual tablets conclusively settle the whole matter. Here, for example, we have a sentence which runs in Assyrian dalētu va šicuru ommnu, "the door and the porch are founded," where ommnu (third plural Pael) answers to the Accadian ib-tan-gubbu-s, "they caused to be fixed" (third plural aorist causative). Another passage, in an inscription of Nebuchadnezzar (W. A. L., 54, 3, 19), affords an example of the Permansive used with the pronoun-suffix of the verb, and the infinitive and preposition: ana ebisu Bit-Ili nasa-nni libb-i, "to the building of Bit-Ili my heart urges me." Here the participle must have had ya (nasu-a or nas-ya), not -ni. These two instances by themselves are sufficient to disprove the opinion of Dr. Oppert, who seems to have forgotten that in its origin the Perfect (or Permansive) of the Semitic languages was nothing more than the participle, and that the arguments brought against its form in Assyrian apply equally well to Hebrew or Æthiopic.

As regards the confusion made by Dr. Oppert between Pael and the present of Kal,—a tense whose existence he denies,—no arguments have been brought forward against Dr. Hincks. An appeal can only be made to the inscriptions, where a distinction between the two parts of the verb is always maintained. Isaccin invariably has a present meaning. Dr. Oppert does indeed say that the present of Pael
ought to have the second radical quadrupled. We have to do, however, with matters of fact, not of a priori fitness: and the Assyrians conceived that a sufficient distinction was made by a change of vowel. The whole question is set at rest by the bilingual tablets. On the one hand, a careful distinction is made between the aorist and the present Kal, the Accadian aorist being translated by the form ʾiscun, the Accadian present by the form ʾisaccin (e.g. in-laš “he weighed”) = ʾiscul, in-laš-ê (“he weighs”) = ʾisaccal: on the other hand, the Pael (with prefixed ū) is generally set apart for the Accadian intensives, while the present and aorist in Pael itself are accurately noted down (e.g. in-gin (“he placed”) = yucin, in-gin-ê (“he places”) = yucaʾan). With respect to the nuances of meaning in the lengthened forms of the aorist and future, I do not mean to say that the form ʾisaccinu contains as clear an idea of future time as the Latin constituere. It was set apart to express that conception with a kind of unconscious instinct; so that in the inscriptions wherever we should speak of future time the form ʾisaccinu is almost invariably used. In the case of the perfect the instinct was not so clearly marked: we can only say that in the majority of instances the lengthened form of the aorist represents the perfect or the plural perfect.

Traces of the use of waw consecutivum are to be found in Assyrian, though the comparative rarity of the Permansive greatly restricts the use. Thus we have Šina messura-va ramanušum ittanallaca.

Contracted forms.—The Assyrian verb frequently drops a short vowel. Just as in Pael (or other grammatical forms in which one of the radicals is doubled) where the reduplication
of the letter leads to the lengthening of the preceding vowel, like the Arabic third conjugation, an ʿ or ʾ is frequently elided. Verbs with ʿ as second radical, often omit it; e.g. *sibi* by the side of *si-ʿobi*. The same happens when ʿ is third radical before ʿ and a; thus, *ismu*, “they heard,” by the side of *ismaʿu* and *ismaʿa*. In verbs ʿʿʿʿ, a falls away before ʾ with *homma*, e.g. *ucin*, *ubiʿ*. So in verbs which begin with ʿ, the Assyrian drops this radical after ʾ, while the Babylonian transposes the vowels, e.g. *ipṣit* and *eʾipṣit* (ʾʾʾ); with ʿ as preformative, ʿ becomes ʿ also, and in Assyrian the two letters coalesce (thus *ullat*a, “I ascend” (ʾʾʾʾ), Babylonian *uʿullaʿa*; so *uṭetsib* for *uʿuṭetsib*). The same holds good of ʾʾʾʾ, e.g. *uṭetsi* for *uʿuṭetsi*, pael of ʾʾʾʾ. Verbs ʾʾʾʾ compensate for the loss of ʾ by doubling the second radical. In Iphiteal the short vowel after the second consonant may be suppressed, when an open syllable, e.g. *tastalmi* for *tastalami*, *listalmu* for *listalamu*, *taptikdi* for *taptikidi*. So, too, in Pael, where the loss of the vowel is accompanied by the loss of the double consonant (thus *tasalmu* for *tasallimu*, *muparca* for *muparrica*). In Iphtaal and Niphal the contractions are frequent; e.g. *ittalu* for *ittellicu*, *istamu* for *istuncanu*; *ippakku* for *ippattiku*, *innabtaav* for *innabtaav*, *lissaca* for *lissacina*. In Shaphel they are rare, chiefly occurring when the first radical is a sibilant, as *ussis* or *ulzis* for *usazis*, “he caused to fix”; but we also find *yusdhibbu* for *yu-*saddhibbu.¹

Shaphel is chiefly distinguished by ellipse of the characteristic consonant. Just as this has become ʾ in Hebrew (as

¹ This, however, may be Shaphael, as the Assyrians possessed a root דבכ by the side of דבכ.
in the case of the third personal pronoun), and a in Arabic, Aramaic, and Æthiopic, so in Assyrian has us become first
wh and then u in the concave verbs. Another assimilation
of consonants takes place in Iphtenal (and Iphtaal). When the
first radical is d, ts, z, or s, the characteristic t is assimilated
to these letters; thus we have isteabat for isttabat, issaor
for istacar. Sometimes even e changes the t into t; e.g.
issacan for istacan, aßarap and even asbarap for astarap.1 So
in Arabic t is assimilated with d, ð, z, s, ts, dh, ðh, as first
radical. In Niphal and verbs ינ n is regularly assimilated
to the following letter (as in Hebrew, etc.), e.g. iddin,
ippakid, lissacín, tabbanu, tadani for taddani. The assimila-
tion, however, is not always observed. If the first radical
cannot be doubled, the characteristic letter is elided; in the
Achæmenian period, however, the second radical was doubled,
as ibbus (quoted by Dr. Oppert from Nakhsh-i-Rustam; see
below).

After gutturals and nasals t may be changed into ב or י,
as ikkhairb, ikkhabi, igdamar, nimdagar, amsakkhs by the side
of amtrakhts (probably read antakhir)

THE STRONG VERB.

Kal.—I shall give the forms of the Permansive (where this
is possible), the Present, and the Apocopated Aorist. The
longer forms can be supplied from these in accordance with
the rules already given.

1 In these cases the t has been transposed (as in Hebrew, Arabic, etc.,
or in Assyrian defective verbs), and ts regularly becomes f (see p. 32).
The assimilation is common in Æthiopic (e.g. yéssabar for yéssabar). Compare Arabic yatsassar'auna for yataissar'una. For the Hebrew see
Is. i. 16; Eccl. vii. 16, etc.
Verbs in Kal are either transitive or intransitive. The majority of those found in the inscriptions are transitive. As in Arabic (also in Hebrew and Aramaic), the second radical takes either one of the three primary vowels in the aorist. By far the largest majority of verbs have usercontent (which has been confined to intransitives in Arabic).

Among those which take usercontent are found bi'selu, gadaru, dagalu, khalku, casaru, casapu, cataru, nacabu, lacar, lânaku, eribu, eribu, okhiru, ocimu, enisu, etiku, padharu, pakadu, basam, pataku, tsanaku, rakhatsu, rasapu, sabalu, sam'elu.

Verbs in usercontent, like those in usercontent, are either transitive or intransitive (so with usercontent in Arabic). Among verbs in usercontent are canadu, lamadu, makhatu, makkaru ("to receive"), palakhu, pasakhu, ttebatu, racabu, rasabu, tab'elu: mostly transitives (a denoting the passing-on of the action).

Many verbs admit both forms; e.g. isibut and itsbat, opus and epis.

The first person singular of the aorist is often formed in Babylonian by usercontent, especially when the vowel of the second radical is usercontent; e.g. csnik, csuir. The same was the case in vulgar Assyrian.

Verbs urchases in Assyrian might undergo the same change: thus we find both acul and ecul, "I ate." Comp. okdiohol, ekkatél in Hebrew, and see p. 33.

The first person plural is always ni-, except where the singular has usercontent, when nu is used (e.g. nubahi, "we sought," in the Apfel).

The typical form of the infinitive is regarded in the tablets as casadu. Verbs UAGE substituted usercontent after the second radical, and dropped the usercontent of the first. The nomina verbi, however,
will be considered hereafter, as well as the participles. In verbs יֵּכְד, the a of the first radical in the present Participle is dropped; thus, באש by the side of כָּשִׁד.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. sacnacu</td>
<td>asaccin</td>
<td>ascun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. sacinta</td>
<td>tasaccin</td>
<td>tascun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. sacinti</td>
<td>tasaccini</td>
<td>tascuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. sacin</td>
<td>isaccin</td>
<td>iscun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. sacnat</td>
<td>tasaccin</td>
<td>tascun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. sacinni</td>
<td>nisaccin</td>
<td>niscun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. sacintunu</td>
<td>tasaccinu</td>
<td>tascunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. sacintina</td>
<td>tasaccina</td>
<td>tascuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. sacnu</td>
<td>isaccinu</td>
<td>iscunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. sacna</td>
<td>isaccina</td>
<td>iscuna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. sacnā</td>
<td>isaccinā</td>
<td>iscunā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same verb sometimes takes indifferently more than one vowel after the second radical in the aorist, as acsuud and acsid. Occasionally the difference of vowels distinguishes two separate verbs; e.g. amkhar, “I received,” and amkhur, “I increased.”

In the later inscriptions a feminine nominative is now and then used improperly with a masculine verb. Thus, Assur-bani-pal has iktbi‘ and yusapri‘ (for takbi‘ and tusapri‘) with Istar. So in the law-tablet the Assyrian translator has used isir and iktbi‘ with assatu, “woman” (as well as su for sa, like נָעָר and נְבָע in the Pentateuch). The same is the case in the Assyrian text of the legend of Sargon (W.A.I. iii. 4, 7). In the earliest inscriptions even the
feminine of the third person of the Precative is lost. So
in Amharic the feminine second and third plural have been
lost.

Imperative.

Singular.
2 m. sucuń; rikhlts; tsabat
2 f. sucini, sućni; rikhltisi, rikhlti; tsabti

Plural.
2 m. sucino, sućnu; rikhltu, rikhltu; tsabtu
2 f. sucina, sućna; rikhltsa, rikhltsa; tsabta

Precative.

Singular.
1. luscun; lurkhlt; lutsbat
2 m. lutsacun; lutarkhltis; lutsatbsat
3 m. and f. liscun; lirkhlt; litsbat

Plural.
3 m. liscunu; lirkhltu; litsbatu
3 f. liscuna; lirkhltsa; litsbata

The first person singular of the Precative stands for ī lenses. The second feminine singular would be, according to
analogy, lutacsun, lutarchhltis, lutsatbsat; the second plural
would be lutsacunu (masculine), lutsacuna (feminine), etc.

Both the Imperative and the Precative may take the aug-
ment of motion (a). In this case sućun, rikhltis, and tsabat
are generally contracted into sućna, rikhltsa, and tsabta.

Iphtead.—This conjugation is formed from Kal by the
insertion of t after the first radical (as in the Arabic eighth con-
jugation), except in concave verbs, where it precedes the first
radical; e.g. ītbuni, ībācu (as in Hebrew, Aramaic, Ėthio-
pic, and the fifth and sixth conjugations in Arabic).¹ The

¹ So, too, in the Aramaising form, itlican, "they went," at Behistun,
for the regular ītalicu, contracted īticu, in the conditional īticāni, with
the subjunctive enclitic added.
secondary conjugations formed by the insertion of ʲ have an intensive force, and are for the most part intransitive. This arises out of the originally reflexive sense imparted by ʲ. Its origin is to be sought in the pronominal root, pronounced with the dental, which has given rise to the characteristic of the feminine in the verb and the noun, as well as to the second personal pronoun. For the changes of letters see above, p. 71.

The Present and Aorist are distinguished, as in the Kal of concave verbs, by a difference of vowel in the last syllable: the aorist is intakhits or izzazus (for izzazus), the present istaccan or istaacan. The latter is distinguished from Iphtaal only by wanting the preformative 𝑢.

Verbs which have ʲ in the aorist of Kal generally assimilate the vowel of ʲ to that of the last syllable in the aorist; e.g. iptikid for iptakid. In verbs with ʸ for first radical ʲ is followed by ə; e.g. ətebir, "he crossed." Te is sometimes wrongly expressed by ti and even ta. Another peculiarity of these verbs is that the second radical is sometimes doubled in the aorist, Iphtéal being confused with Iphtaal through the presence of the ə: e.g. present ətappas, aorist ətibbus and ətebus, əettika (elsewhere ətatik). Two verbs, episu and əribu, always have ə in the aorist, ətebus and əterub or ətarub. If the last radical is increased by any addition, the vowel of the second radical is usually dropped, even in the present, where the double letter is thus lost; e.g. ətarba for ətarrraba, "I am going down," ətisəbətu for ətisəbu, ətasəcnu for ətasaccanu, əlistəma for əlistalama.

The tendency to nasalization which appears in the minimation (rarely, in later inscriptions, changed to a nunnation,
as in Assur-bani-pal, where for in cirib Ninâ illikam-ma yusanna’a we have a variant illikan-ma), or in the plural ending in an, has given rise to a lengthened form of the inserted t, viz. tan. Hence we get the present attanakkhar, ittanakhar or imdanakhar, “he receives,” tattanakkhar, ittanallac, itanarrar, ıstanakkhar (for istanakkhar), ıstanamma (for istanamma), ıktanarrab, ıltanappar and istanappar, ikhtanabbata (with the subjunctive augment), in the aorist imtanallic, tattanigir, ittanassi, ikabanabbi. Where Iphiteal has te (tı), Iphiteanal has ten, e.g. (in Babylonian) ertienddi. The form in tan seems to have been a vulgarism, and is chiefly met with in and after the time of Sargon.

The common verb atnimmus, “I departed,” is well explained by Dr. Oppert (who wrongly reads it atnummuss) as an Iphiteanal, standing for atnimmus. Another verb of the same signification is attrusir, an Ittaphal, with u for a, according to the rules of verbs ı’ı.

For letter-changes see p. 71.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. kitnusac (kitnusacu)</td>
<td>astacan, astacan, altacan</td>
<td>astacin, altacin; aptikid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. [kitnusta]</td>
<td>tastacan, etc.</td>
<td>tastacin;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. [kitnusti]</td>
<td>tastacani</td>
<td>tastacini;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. kitnus</td>
<td>itstacan</td>
<td>istacin;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. kitnusat</td>
<td>tastacan</td>
<td>tastacin;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. [kitnusni]</td>
<td>nistacan</td>
<td>nistacin;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. [kitnustunu]</td>
<td>tastacanu</td>
<td>tastaciu;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. [kitnustina]</td>
<td>tastaccina</td>
<td>tastacina;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. kitnusu</td>
<td>istaccinu</td>
<td>istacinu;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. kitnusa</td>
<td>istaccina</td>
<td>istacina;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSYRIAN GRAMMAR.

**Imperative.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR.</th>
<th>PRECATIVE.</th>
<th>PARTICIPLE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 m. sitcin</td>
<td>1. lustacan; [luptikid]</td>
<td>mustacanu, multacanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. sitcini</td>
<td>3. listacan; liptikid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plural.**

| 2 m. sitcinu | 3 m. listacanu; liptikidu | muptikudu |
| 2 f. sitcina | 3 f. listacana; liptikida | |

_Niphal._—The Assyrian Niphal agrees exactly with Hebrew, both in form and use. Arabic and Æthiopic have prefixed 'a. Aramaic employs _eth_ instead. Originally reflexive, as in _innabid_, “he fled,” both in Hebrew and Assyrian Niphal has become the passive of _Kal_. The characteristic is probably the pronominal root which we find in the Aramaic _nektul_, _nektylon_, and which refers us to the demonstrative _annu_, etc. As in Hebrew, _a_ regularly assimilates with the first radical. Exceptions, however, occur, chiefly in later times, _e.g._ Achaemenian _indin_ for _iddin_.

Verbs ṣṣ double the second radical, _a_ not admitting reduplication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANSIVE.</th>
<th>PRESENT.</th>
<th>AORIST.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. [nanzuzacu]</td>
<td>assacan</td>
<td>assacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. [nanzuzta]</td>
<td>tassacan</td>
<td>tassacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. [nanzuzti]</td>
<td>tassacani</td>
<td>tassacini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. nanzuz</td>
<td>issacan</td>
<td>issacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. [nanzuzat]</td>
<td>tassacan</td>
<td>tassacin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PLURAL. | |
| 1. [nanzuzni] | nissacan | nassacin |
| 2 m. [nanzuztunu] | tassacanu | tassacini |
| 2 f. [nanzuztina] | tassacana | |
| 3 m. nanzuzu | issacanu | issacini |
| 3 f. [nanzuza] | issacana | issacina |

The forms _nagarrur_ and _nasallul_ instanced by Dr. Oppert,
do not belong to Niphal, but to Niphael. Another form of the aorist is *issanun*.

**Imperative.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>1. lussacin</th>
<th>3. lissacin</th>
<th>mussacinu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>nascin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>nascini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preservative.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Preservative</th>
<th>Lissacinu</th>
<th>Lissacnu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>nascinu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>nascina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participle.**

Ittaphal.—This voice is but little used, and chiefly with quadrilaterals.

According to Dr. Hincks the Permansive would be *nastecun*.

The Present is *attapalcoet*; the Aorist *attapalcit*, for which we once find *ittapaloutu*, and in vulgar Assyrian even *itta-palacita*.

The Preterite is *littasgar*; the Participle *muttascanu*. Dr. Oppert believes the Imperative to have been *nitasgien*.

Pael.—Pael is distinguished from the Present of Kal by the preformative *u*, answering to Æthiopic *a*, Arabic *‘i* (in conjugations 7, 8, 9, 10, etc.).

Pael expresses intensity, and therefore doubles the second radical, giving emphasis to the idea which is longer dwelt upon. The same machinery produces the present with its idea of extension of time. The Assyrian form corresponds with Hebrew Piel, Aramaic Pael, Arabic *kattala*, Æthiopic *gabbara*.

From its intensive meaning comes the idea of causation. When Kal is intransitive, Pael becomes transitive.

The reduplication is neglected especially in the more ancient inscriptions. This is particularly the case, Dr. Oppert
points out, with hh, c, r, and s. The reduplication in labials and dentals is sometimes replaced by a nasalization (as in Aramaic), e.g. in the Kal Presents tanambu for tanabbu, imandad for imaddad, inandin for inaddin.

There is no reduplication of e, h, and 'a, though it always takes place in hh and r.

The Present and Aorist are distinguished by a and i after the second radical, as is stated in a grammatical tablet, where we have yunaccar and yunaccir, yusanna and yusanni.

Irregularly (as with Kal Present) u takes the place of i in the Aorist, as in yuracum (like iragum). As in Ipihtal, verbs with i in the Kal Aorist may take i after the second radical, thus, yunicim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANSIVE.</th>
<th>PRESENT.</th>
<th>AORIST.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SINGULAR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>karradcu</td>
<td>usaccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>[karradta (karratta)]</td>
<td>tusaccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>[karradti]</td>
<td>tusaccani, tusacni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>karrad</td>
<td>yusaccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f.</td>
<td>karradat</td>
<td>tusaccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLURAL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>[karradni]</td>
<td>nusaccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>[karradtunu]</td>
<td>tusaccanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>[karradtina]</td>
<td>tusaccana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>karradu</td>
<td>yusaccanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f.</td>
<td>karrada</td>
<td>yusaccana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPERATIVE.</th>
<th>PRECATIV.</th>
<th>PARTICLE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SINGULAR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>succin (sucin), sullima</td>
<td>1. lusaccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>succini</td>
<td>3. tusaccanu, tusacni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLURAL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>succinu</td>
<td>3 m. tusaccanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>succina</td>
<td>3 f. tusaccana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ipihtal.—Ipihtal is formed from Pael by the insertion of t
after the first radical. Dr. Oppert calls it the middle voice of Pael, strengthening the latter conjugation: thus in Kal halaču, "to go," Pael hallacu, "to make go," Iphtalal attallacu, "to be driven to go," "ambulare."

An instance of Iphtaneal is the aorist ultiāpiru (for ultiānāpiru), as distinguished from the present ultiānapparu.

As in Iphtale, verbs with ʾ in Kal aorist may substitute to (tī) for a after the dental, e.g. yuptekid. The same takes place with verbs yūḏ; thus, lutebus, lutebbus.

Neither the Permansive nor the Imperative have been found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Precautive</th>
<th>Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ustaccan</td>
<td>ustaccin</td>
<td>1. lustaccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>tustaccan</td>
<td>tustaccin</td>
<td>3. lustaccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>tustaccani</td>
<td>tustaccini, tustacni</td>
<td>[Imperative. suctcin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>yustaccan</td>
<td>yustaccin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f.</td>
<td>tustaccan</td>
<td>tustaccin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Precautive</th>
<th>Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>nustaccan</td>
<td>nustaccin</td>
<td>3 m. lustaccanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>tustaccanu</td>
<td>tustaccinu</td>
<td>3 f. lustaccana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>tustaccana</td>
<td>tustaccina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>yustaccanu</td>
<td>yustaccinu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f.</td>
<td>yustaccana</td>
<td>yustaccina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaphel.—This is one of the most commonly-used conjugations in Assyrian, and is formed by a prothetic s. Like the Aramaic Shaphel, presupposed in Arabic istaktala (conjugation 10) and Ṣethiopic ystagabbala, Hebrew and Phœnician Hiphil, Arabic and Ṣethiopic aktala, Aramaic and Assyrian Aphel, the conjugation has a factitive meaning. I would refer it to the root which appears in the Arabic shāḥā, "wish," attached to the verb, like sa in Arabic (from sauфа,
“in the end”), which is prefixed to the Imperfect to express futurity. As s has become š in Hebrew, etc., it must have been initial, so that the peculiarly Hebrew root יָשָׁל is excluded. A large number of roots in the various Semitic tongues, even in those which, like the Hebrew, have lost nearly every trace of Shaphel, are really Shaphel forms, e.g. פָּשַׁל from וָשַׁל, פָּשַׁל from פָּשַׁל.

In verbs יָשָׁל, a after the characteristic s becomes e; e.g. wesebš, weselš. In the later inscriptions this change of consonant is sometimes transferred to the regular verbs, as in usescin, tusescin, musescin; just as a in Babylonian tends to become e (see p. 26); and as we get upškš, etc., in Iphtaal and Iphtea1.

The vowel of the characteristic may be dropped; e.g. ussis and even ulšš for uesiss.

For the Imperative see p. 58.

The Permansive has not been found. Dr. Hincks restores it as satcan.

**Present.**  **Aorist.**  **Imperative.**  **Percaotive.**  **Participle.**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ušascan</td>
<td>usascin</td>
<td>1. lusascin</td>
<td>musascinu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. tusascan</td>
<td>tusascin</td>
<td>2 m. suscin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. tusascani</td>
<td>tusascini</td>
<td>2 f. suscini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. yusascan</td>
<td>yusascin</td>
<td>3. lusascan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. tusascan</td>
<td>tusascin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Istaphal.**—This conjugation corresponds to Aramaic Ista
phal, Arabic Tenth conjugation, Æthiopic *ystagabbaru*, Hebrew Hithpael, and has a desiderative signification.

Verbs כד have *o* after the dental instead of *a*, e.g. *ultebis*. This is imitated by other verbs in the Babylonian period; e.g. *ultesib* and *ustonis*ēdu.

The Permansive Dr. Hincks believes would be *satsecan*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ustascan, ultascan etc.</td>
<td>ustascin, ultascin etc.</td>
<td>mustascinu, multascinu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td><strong>Precautive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. sutiscin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. lustascan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. sutiscini</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. lustascan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. sutiscinu</td>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td>3 m. lustascanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. sutiscina</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 f. lustascana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the example of Iphteaš, another form of Istaphal, without the preformative *u*, seems to have come into use in the later period of the language. Thus we find in the Achæmenian inscriptions *altabus* (a corrupt form) by the side of *ultebis*, and *istandhakku* may be another instance from Shalmaneser; but this is rather an Iphtaaš from পুষ.

*Apheš.*—This conjugation is confined, so far as I know, to the concave verbs, and will be treated of under them.

*Itaphal.*—Dr. Oppert quotes from the syllabaries *itatspur* as an example of this conjugation. The form ought to be *yutatspir*; *itatspur* will stand by the side of *altabus* above; but I should prefer to regard it as standing for the Ittaphal *ittatspur*.

*Shaphaš.*—The same grammatical regularity that distin-
guishes Assyrian among the Semitic languages like Sanskrit among the Aryan languages, producing the secondary conjugations with every voice, has also displayed itself in the Causative conjugation. Kal and Pael, answering to the aorist and present tenses, were regarded as the primary voices; to each of these was attached a causative in (u)sa. Each of the four forms thus obtained had a Passive assigned to it, the Reflexive Niphal being set apart for the Passive of Kal, as otherwise standing outside the regular verbal scheme—and finally all were provided with a secondary conjugation in t and tan. Shaphael is rarely found in the strong verb, as e.g. in yusnammir; but it frequently takes the place of Shaphel in verbs יִּלָּח: thus usḥibbu‘, usmallu‘, usrabbi‘. The Permansive may have had the form sasaccan; but it has not been found.

The Present is usnammar, the Aorist usnammir.

The vowel after s is regularly dropped on account of the weight of the following syllable.

The Imperative was probably susuccin. The Participle is musnammiru.

Istaphael.—Here we find yusteni‘edi for Aorist, ustamalta‘ for Present. The other tenses have not been detected.

The Passives.—I have already given my reasons for not considering forms like ilubusu as Passives of Kal, but as examples of a Poel.

As examples of the Passive of Pael, we have for the Permansive nubsuku third plural masculine, nummuru, nummukhu, etc. In the Present we find yubullat, in the Aorist yubullit. Judging from Arabic analogy, there was no Imperative. I can add nothing to
what I have already said about the Passives of the remaining conjugations. The Passive of Shaphael ought to be *sunummar* or *sunammar* Perfonsive, *yusnummar* Present, and *yusnummir* Aorist. The Passive is never formed, as in Aramaic, by the dental. A solitary Aramaising form is *itpisu* for *etpisu*, "constituted," and here the dental is inserted after the first radical, while the word is only a nomen verbi. Traces of other conjugations, or rather nomina verbi, such as *papel*, *pola䶪*, etc., will be found (see further on) under the head of the nomina verbi.

THE DEFECTIVE VERBS.

Verbs ܟܕ. These verbs follow the example of Niphal, assimilating the nasal when followed by any consonant except ख or ञ, and the consonant is doubled. Before ञ and the vowels the first radical remains unchanged. *Nn* is never written ञ; thus we never find *inamar* for *innamar*, "it is seen."

The Aorist of Kal takes .userService, ائية, and ܐ after the second radical.

Among those that have userService are *na'amu*, *nabalu*, *nagagu*, *namaru*, *nasakhu*, *nasacu*, *napakhu*, *napaku*, *natsaru*, *nakabu*, *nakaru*.

Among those that have ܐ: *na'aru*, *naharu*, *nasalu*, *nasaru*, *nakhu*, *nadhalu*, *napalu*, *natsabu*, *natsatu*, *nakamu*.

The nasal is sometimes irregularly retained, more especially in the Achemenian period. Thus we have *indin* for *iddin*, *mandattu* and *mandantu* for *maddattu*. It is possible, however, that the ञ was frequently not pronounced, though
written, as in Arabic. Some few verbs always retain the ә, e.g. *indhur*, as in Hebrew.

Before ә or ә, ә, instead of being elided, may be changed into ә; thus we find *ambi* and *abbi* ("I called"), *munambu* and *munabbu*. This has had a reflex action; *nabu‘u* can replace the reduplication of the second radical by әә; e.g. *tanambu*, *nunambu*.

The Imperative Kal rejects the first radical, as in Hebrew, but replaces it by ә, ә, ә, according to the vowel of the Aorist; thus *ugug*, *idin*, *ecil*, *apal*.

The principal forms are as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Kal.</em></td>
<td>namir</td>
<td>inammir</td>
<td>immur</td>
<td>umur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ipaal.</em></td>
<td>nūtmur</td>
<td>ittam̄ar</td>
<td>ittam̄ir</td>
<td>nītmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nipal.</em></td>
<td>nāmmur</td>
<td>innam̄ar</td>
<td>innam̄ir</td>
<td>nāmmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ittaphal.</em></td>
<td>nātumur</td>
<td>ittam̄ar</td>
<td>ittam̄ir</td>
<td>nītam̄ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pael.</em></td>
<td>nām̄mar</td>
<td>ynum̄mar</td>
<td>ynum̄mir</td>
<td>nūmmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ipaal.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>yuttam̄ar</td>
<td>yuttam̄ir</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Shaphel.</em></td>
<td>sam̄mar</td>
<td>yusam̄mar</td>
<td>yusam̄mir</td>
<td>sum̄mir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I斯塔sh.</em></td>
<td>sān̄mar</td>
<td>yustam̄mar</td>
<td>yustam̄ir</td>
<td>suttam̄ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Shaphel.</em></td>
<td>san̄am̄mar</td>
<td>yunam̄mar</td>
<td>yunam̄mir</td>
<td>sum̄num̄mir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I斯塔sh.</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yusten̄am̄mar</td>
<td>yusten̄am̄mir</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbs ә‘ә, ә‘ә, ә‘ә, ә‘ә.—These verbs have some forms in common. Others are shared in by the last two. In other

1 A false analogy with Niphal Present has produced forms like *inacoar*. 
forms they all differ from one another. They constitute the most difficult part of Assyrian grammar; and it is here that Dr. Oppert and Dr. Hineks are in the most direct opposition. The following are the results obtainable from the inscriptions.

(1.) Verbs סָד and תָד are identical, save in the third masculine. Regularly, however, the second radical of verbs תָד is doubled, e.g. alliq, illiq, for ahliq and ihliq; but this doubling is often omitted in writing; thus we find alig, iliq, ipug. (2.) Verbs סָד and יָד are used interchangeably; so in Hebrew בָּאִל and בְּלִיל, etc., the syllabaries equate namaru with amaru: hence umar (Pael present) comes, not from mamaru, but from amaru. (3.) Verbs סָד and concave verbs have certain forms in common; the Pael of verbs סָד is often identical with the Aphel of concave verbs, and the Kal of the latter has the same form as the Kal of the former when written defectively (without reduplication). (4.) Verbs סָד and יָד are confounded, especially in the Babylonian period: thus we have indifferently acul and cowl, elih and alih (see p. 33), so וָסָסֵכַב. (5.) Verbs סָד and יָד are liable to be confounded; the syllabaries, for instance, give both aladu and uladu. (6.) Verbs יָד have the same forms in Kal as the (irregular) Pael of verbs סָד and the Aphel of concave verbs. (7.) The Pael of verbs תָד and יָד is the same; e.g. u'ullaa'a and u'llaa'a from תָלָל, and u'llii and u'llii from תָלִיל. (8.) As in Hebrew, verbs יָד tend to become יָד; hence ilittu (iillituv) by the side of ulidu.

It will be seen from this that Dr. Hineks is not right in asserting that verbs סָד have no forms in common with verbs יָד, which are not also common to verbs יָד. Neither is Dr Oppert justified in the belief that Hebrew verbs יָד
become in Assyrian נד if they correspond to Arabic verbs in א; while if Arabic has א, Assyrian has the same. This is generally the case; but it has many exceptions. Dr. Oppert has not sufficiently distinguished between verbs נד and verbs נד; the first have יא in the third person Aorist and Present, e.g. יאתא, "he creates;" the latter have א or א with the second radical doubled. The Aorist Kal in א, again (as עד), comes from a verb יד, not נד. The learned Doctor, moreover, has confounded verbs יד and נד; as well as all these classes of verbs with concave verbs.

The participles מרידע, מלימע, etc., which Dr. Oppert believes to belong to Kal, are really Paal participles, with the reduplication omitted, as in מיכינע for מיכינע.

Our chief difficulty as regards these verbs lies in the uncertainty of the first radical. Sometimes this was א, sometimes פ (Babylonian), sometimes ע: thus two roots were indifferently employed by the Assyrians, עסוע and עסוע. From the first we have ע特斯י (Ittaphal), from the second ע特斯י. But א and פ are always carefully distinguished. In Shaphel, however, the first radical becomes פ, whether originally א, פ, or פ.

It was only at a comparatively late period that the Semites came to distinguish between the various forms which a biliteral root might take. The servile letters were for the most part absolutely interchangeable. The sharp divisions of the Hebrew grammarians are the results of later reflection. Assyrian has hardly entered upon this discriminating stage: hence the same biliteral root appears under different forms which a grammar has to assign to different triliteral stems. From ב, for instance, we have forms which presuppose
VerbsKal:

### Aorist.

**PRESENT.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE AND PRECATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>asib, esib (acul)</td>
<td>asab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasib</td>
<td>tasab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasibi</td>
<td>tasabib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yasib</td>
<td>yasab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasib etc.</td>
<td>tasab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE AND PRECATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nasib</td>
<td>nasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasibu</td>
<td>tasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasiba</td>
<td>tasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yasibu</td>
<td>yasab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yasiba</td>
<td>yasaba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Participles

**SINGULAR.**

| allic             | allac                    |
| 2 m. tallic       | tallac                   |
| 2 f. tallici      | tallaci                  |
| 3 m. illic        | illac                    |
| 3 f. tallic       | tallac                   |

**PLURAL.**

| nallac            |                              |
| 2 m. tallicu      | tallacu                   |
| 2 f. tallica      | tallaca                   |
| 3 m. illicu       | illacu                    |
| 3 f. illica       | illaca                    |

---

1. These Precative forms, *lusib*, etc., though ordinarily used, do not come from בֵּּל, but from בֵּל. So the Paal *gussib* for *yu'assib* (cf. p. 67).

2. Besides this usual form for verbs בֵּּל, we also find instances in which
ASSYRIAN GRAMMAR.

Verbs ʾāš Kal:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperative and Precative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ulid</td>
<td>ulad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. tulid</td>
<td>tulad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. tulidi</td>
<td>tuladi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. yulid</td>
<td>yulad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. tulid</td>
<td>tulad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLURAL.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. nulid</td>
<td>nulad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. tulida</td>
<td>tuladu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. tulida</td>
<td>tulada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. yulida</td>
<td>yuladu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. yulida</td>
<td>yulada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTICIPLE—inulidu.**

Verbs ʾāš Kal:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperative and Precative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. inik</td>
<td>inak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. tinik</td>
<td>tinak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. tiniki</td>
<td>tinaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. inik</td>
<td>inak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. tinik</td>
<td>tinak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLURAL.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ninik</td>
<td>ninak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. tiniku</td>
<td>tinaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. tinika</td>
<td>tinaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. iniku</td>
<td>inaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. inika</td>
<td>inaka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTICIPLE—ininiku.**

the initial letter is regarded as a strong radical, and the verb is accordingly conjugated regularly; e.g. ābbid, "I destroyed," abapta for ābbida, ībbid, ʾābbid, for āhabbīd, etc.

1 Besides ʾoḥa, we meet with ʾoḥa conjugated both regularly and like ʾalaqū; e.g. nēšēddid, ʾiḥāridu (=išišdu).
The other conjugations of verbs ܢ ܡ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perf.</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iptearl.</td>
<td>tesub</td>
<td>itasab</td>
<td>itasib</td>
<td>itaib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niphal.</td>
<td>[nâsub]</td>
<td>inasab</td>
<td>inasib</td>
<td>nasib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ittaphal.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ittesab</td>
<td>ittesib</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pael.</td>
<td>[assab]</td>
<td>yu'assab</td>
<td>yu'assib</td>
<td>uasib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipteaal.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yutassab</td>
<td>yutassib</td>
<td>itasab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaphal.</td>
<td>sâsab</td>
<td>(yusasab)</td>
<td>(yusasib)</td>
<td>susib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istaphal.</td>
<td>[satesab]</td>
<td>yustesab</td>
<td>yustesib</td>
<td>sutesib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istaphal.</td>
<td>[satesesab]</td>
<td>yustetesab</td>
<td>yustetesib</td>
<td>sutesesib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itaphal.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yutesab</td>
<td>yutesib</td>
<td>[utesib]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass. Pael</td>
<td>ussub</td>
<td>yu'ussab</td>
<td>yu'ussib</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass. Istaphal.</td>
<td>[sutesub]</td>
<td>[yustusab]</td>
<td>[yustusib]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbs ܢ ܒ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perf.</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iptearl.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>itallac</td>
<td>itallic</td>
<td>itlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niphal.</td>
<td>[nalluc]</td>
<td>inallac</td>
<td>inallic</td>
<td>nallic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ittaphal.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ittlac</td>
<td>ittallic</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pael.</td>
<td>allac</td>
<td>yu'allac</td>
<td>yu'allic</td>
<td>hullic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipteaal.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yutallac</td>
<td>yutallic</td>
<td>itallic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaphel.</td>
<td>[sallac]</td>
<td>yusallac</td>
<td>yusallic</td>
<td>sulic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istaphal.</td>
<td>[sallac]</td>
<td>yustallac</td>
<td>yustallic</td>
<td>sullic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass. Pael.</td>
<td>[ulluc]</td>
<td>[yu'ullac]</td>
<td>[yu'ullid]</td>
<td>ullid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass. Istaphal.</td>
<td>[ulluc]</td>
<td>[yu'ullac]</td>
<td>[yu'ullid]</td>
<td>ullid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all the above cases the reduplication may be dropped, and often is dropped in the inscriptions. On the other hand, these verbs ܢ ܒ may be conjugated like the strong verb.

Verbs ܢ ܓ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perf.</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iptearl.</td>
<td>telud</td>
<td>itulad</td>
<td>itulid</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niphal.</td>
<td>nulud</td>
<td>[inelad]</td>
<td>[inelid]</td>
<td>nulid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ittaphal.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ittulad</td>
<td>ittulud</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pael.</td>
<td>[ullad]</td>
<td>{yu'ullad}</td>
<td>{yu'u'llid}</td>
<td>ullid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipteaal.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yuttulad</td>
<td>yuttulid</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaphel.</td>
<td>[sulad]</td>
<td>yuselad</td>
<td>yuselid</td>
<td>sulid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istaphal.</td>
<td>[sulad]</td>
<td>yustelad</td>
<td>yustelid</td>
<td>sulid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verbs יָדः:

PERSANSIVE. PRESENT. AORIST. IMPERATIVE. PARTICIPLE.

Iphtael. | tenuk | itinak | itinik | itnik | mutiniku
Niphal. | [nenuk] | ininak | ininik | ninik | muniniku
Ittaphal. — | ittinak | ittinik | nitinik | muteniku
Pael. | [ennak] | (i'ennak) | (i'ennik) | unnik | mu'enniku
Iphtaal. — | yuttenak | yuttenik | ittinnik | muttenniku
Shaphel. | [senak] | yusenak | yusenik | sunik | museniku
Istaphal. | [satinak] | yustenak | yustenik | sutenik | musteniku
Istataphal. | [satetinak] | yustetenak | yustetenik | sutetenik | musteteniku

It must never be forgotten that all this class of verbs (with the exception of יד) are greatly confounded with one another, and had a tendency to adopt the same form borrowed from verbs יָד. The Assyrians pronounced י as a vowel, and this served as a common meeting-point for the obscured sounds of the three primary vowels.\(^1\) The same verb is sometimes conjugated as a יד, sometimes as a יד, sometimes as a יד; just as in Hebrew we have בול and בול, etc.

Concave Verbs.—These are not so numerous in Assyrian as in the cognate languages. They are generally replaced by verbs יד, יד, יד, or more especially by pael. So in Hebrew the concave verbs substitute paseb for piel.

In Kal the first radical can be doubled, as in Hebrew.\(^2\) So, too, with verbs יָד, as innar for inhar.

In Pael, the Persansive generally has a Passive or neuter meaning, and changes ayya into i. The other tenses are formed as though from יד.

\(^1\) Even י sometimes represents י; thus, bua (from bua'tu) = יולב.
\(^2\) The reduplicated forms really come from verbs יד.
Niphal is formed as though from Pael.
Besides the participle active, Kal also possesses a participle passive, like Hebrew, though у has become і, as in Aramaic, e.g. дію, “slain.” This takes the same form as some parts of the Permansive Pael. Babylonian substitutes е for і in the first syllable, e.g. нёбі for нібі.

Verbs ܢܘJacob, ܢܘJonah, and ܢܘDavid are all conjugated in the same manner, except in Kal Aorist and Imperative. Pael and Iphtalel regularly appear in these verbs.

Intensive and Iterative forms, Pапel and Pапel, are also formed from them; e.g. babdaru, lallaru, gargaru, rakeru, khalkhallu.

The Assyrians seem to have regarded in most cases the typical form as belonging to verbs ܢܘDavid; thus, the infinitive given in the syllabaries is та’aru, not туру or та’ару.1

Kal:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permansive</th>
<th>Аорист</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR.</strong></td>
<td><strong>AORIST.</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRESENT.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. camacu</td>
<td>ca’инacu</td>
<td>atur, attur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. camta</td>
<td>ca’inta</td>
<td>tatur, tattur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. camti</td>
<td>ca’inti</td>
<td>taturi, tatturi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. ca’am</td>
<td>ca’ин</td>
<td>itur, ittur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. camat</td>
<td>ca’инat</td>
<td>tatur, tattur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PLURAL.** | | |
| 1. camunu | ca’инну | nattur, natur | nacis’ | nатар |
| 2 m. camtunu | ca’ıntunu | taturu, etc. | тасіс’у | татару |
| 2 f. camtina | ca’ıntina | tatura | тасіс’а | татара |
| 3 m. camu | ca’инu | ituru | iciса | itару |
| 3 f. cama | ca’ина | itura | iciса | итара |

1 Strictly speaking, however, та’ару stands for та’ару, like ܒܡ for ܒܡ and ܒܡ (see p. 27).
**ASSYRIAN GRAMMAR.**

**Imperative and Precautive.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. luttur, lutur</td>
<td>2 m. duku, cinu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. duk, cin, tirra</td>
<td>2 f. duca, cine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. duki, diki, cin</td>
<td>3 m. littur, litura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. littur, litur.</td>
<td>3 f. littura, litura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participle Active—ta’iru, ca’imin.**

**Participle Passive—tiru, cinu.**

In the other conjugations:—

**Permsive. Present. Aorist. Imperative. Participle.**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iphteal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[citnacu]</td>
<td>[ictan]</td>
<td>(ictin)</td>
<td>(citun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘tebāc‘u,</td>
<td></td>
<td>(itbu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I come”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niphalel.</th>
<th>[nacnun]</th>
<th>iccanan</th>
<th>(iccanin)</th>
<th>nacnin</th>
<th>muceaninu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nactenun]</td>
<td>ittacnan</td>
<td>ittaclin</td>
<td>nitaclin</td>
<td>muttacnanu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ittaphalel.</th>
<th>[saecan]</th>
<th>yusacan</th>
<th>(yusacen)</th>
<th>sucun</th>
<th>muncinu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[yaecan]</td>
<td>yustacan</td>
<td>yustacin</td>
<td>suteun</td>
<td>mustacinu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pael.</th>
<th>[nikha]</th>
<th>yuccan</th>
<th>(yuuccin)</th>
<th>[uucin]</th>
<th>muccinu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[yuccan]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iphtaal.</th>
<th></th>
<th>yuctan</th>
<th>—</th>
<th></th>
<th>—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yucnin</td>
<td>ucnin</td>
<td>mcninu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pal. | cunnu, 3rd plural | yucnan | yucnin | ucnin | mcninu |
|      |                  |        |        |       |        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iphtalel.</th>
<th></th>
<th>ictenan</th>
<th>[ictenin]</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shaphel.</th>
<th>[saeean]</th>
<th>yusacan</th>
<th>(yusacen)</th>
<th>sucun</th>
<th>muncinu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[yaecan]</td>
<td>yustacan</td>
<td>yustacin</td>
<td>suteun</td>
<td>mustacinu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Istaphal.</th>
<th>[satecan]</th>
<th>yustacan</th>
<th>yustacin</th>
<th>suteun</th>
<th>mustacinu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yuccan</td>
<td>yuccin</td>
<td>(cin)</td>
<td>muncinu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(cun)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aphel.</th>
<th>[yuccan]</th>
<th>yucean</th>
<th>yucin</th>
<th>(cin)</th>
<th>muncinu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(cun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Itapael.</th>
<th>[satecan]</th>
<th>yustacan</th>
<th>[yustacoin]</th>
<th>[sutecoin]</th>
<th>mustacinu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pass. Shaphel. | sucun | yusucan | yusucin | — | —      |
|                |       |         |         |   |        |

The regular forms of the Iphteal and Iphtaal have been first given above. These are occasionally met with—e.g. *étud* from דָּל, *astil* from לָל, *ultil* from לָל, *uotin* from לָל.

---

1 So in Aramaic דָּל, Arabic كَلْمًٰن.

2 The length of this syllable is sometimes denoted by doubling the final letter before the conditional suffix; e.g. *uotana-en*, “I establish it.”
but the usual forms are those in which the dental precedes the first radical: thus, *itbu*, "he went," *itcun*, "he established;" where the vowel of the last syllable is *a* in the Aorist, and *a* in the Present.

Verbs אָלְ, אָלוּ, אָלִים, אָלְ, אָלִים. These verbs, like the classes already spoken of, are confounded in Assyrian.

The final vowel of the Aorist in verbs אָלְ, אָלִים, is *i*; verbs אָלְ have *e*, e.g. *isme*e, often improperly written with *i*. When *u* is added, the two vowels often coalesce into *u*; e.g. *itbi'u* and *ikbu*, *ismi'u* and *isma*. The last radical almost always coalesces with *a* following. The pronominal suffixes generally require *a* in the last syllable.

Hebrew verbs אָלְ are for the most part אָלְ in Assyrian. These have *u* final in the Aorist. Such Hebrew verbs אָלְ as are אָלִ in Assyrian follow verbs אָלְ in having *i* in the Aorist, unless *u* is added, when *u* generally reappears: thus, *ikbi', ikbu'u*. So, too, *a* is found when followed by the subjunctive augment *a*, or in the Present of the derived conjugations.

In the Imperative second singular verbs אָלְ lose the last radical; e.g. *nas* (from אָלְ); but verbs אָלְ אָלְ (אָלְ) and אָלְ have *i*, as *siti*, "drink" (from אָלְ). These verbs possess a Niphael as well as a Shaphaেl; thus, by the side of *illaki* we find *illaki*, "it was taken."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. nasacu</td>
<td>abnu* akbi*</td>
<td>agabbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. nasata</td>
<td>tabnu* takbi*</td>
<td>tagabbi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. nasati</td>
<td>tabni* takbi*</td>
<td>tagabbi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. nasu</td>
<td>ibnu* ikbi*</td>
<td>igabbi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. nasat</td>
<td>tabnu* takbi*</td>
<td>tagabbi*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSYRIAN GRAMMAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANSIVE</th>
<th>AORIST</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLURAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRESENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. nasanu</td>
<td>nabnu'</td>
<td>nabnu'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. nasatunu</td>
<td>tabnu'</td>
<td>takbu'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. nasatina</td>
<td>tabna'</td>
<td>takba'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. nas'u</td>
<td>ibnu'</td>
<td>ikb(u)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. nasā</td>
<td>ibna'</td>
<td>ikbā'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPERATIVE AND PRECATIVE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
<th>PARTICIPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iph.</td>
<td>lubnu'</td>
<td>2 m. banu'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>lukbi'</td>
<td>2 f. 'bana'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iph.</td>
<td>2 m. ban, bani, khidhi'</td>
<td>2 f. ban, bani, khidhi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niph.</td>
<td>khidhi'</td>
<td>3 m. libna'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itt.</td>
<td>libnu'</td>
<td>3 f. libna'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERMANSIVE. PRESENT.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AORIST. IMPERATIVE. PARTICIPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istpa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass. Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass. Shph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbs containing ﬂ—Most of the peculiarities of these have been already alluded to.

In verbs ﬂ, the first person singular, as well as the third person singular and plural in Kal, were represented in Assyrian by ə; in Babylonian and Achæmenian ə stands in the third person; the Babylonian, also, often used əi. When preceded by u, e became u; the two us were then contracted into u in Assyrian, though not in Babylonian, e.g. ulla Assyrian, u'lla Babylonian.
The second radical may also be irregularly doubled in Niphal. This is only found in the Achæmenian period: the older inscriptions omit the characteristic altogether.

Verbs יִיָּי have been already considered under concave verbs, from which they do not differ. The Babylonian inscriptions insert in the Imperative, as surebi.

Verbs יִיָּי do not differ from verbs יִיָּי.

Verbs יִיָּי are declined in the following manner:—

Kal:—

**PRESENT.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE AND PRECATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. [epsacu]</td>
<td>ebus, emid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m. epista</td>
<td>tebus, temid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f. episti</td>
<td>tebusi, temidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. epis</td>
<td>ebus, emid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. epsat</td>
<td>tebus, temid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTICIPLE—ebisu.**

**PERMANSIVE. PRESENT. AORIST. IMPERATIVE. PARTICIPLE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>etbus</td>
<td>i(b)bas</td>
<td>i(b)bis</td>
<td>ettebas</td>
<td>yubbas</td>
<td>yutebbas</td>
<td>yusebas</td>
<td>yustebas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etappas</td>
<td>ettebas</td>
<td>ettebas</td>
<td>ettebas</td>
<td>yubbis</td>
<td>yutebbas</td>
<td>yusebas</td>
<td>yustebas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ebus</td>
<td>ni(b)bis</td>
<td>ni(b)bis</td>
<td>nitebis</td>
<td>ubbis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>subis</td>
<td>suttebis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emid</td>
<td></td>
<td>mutepisi</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emad</td>
<td></td>
<td>mutepisi</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>epas</td>
<td></td>
<td>mutepisi</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>epas</td>
<td></td>
<td>mutepisi</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>epas</td>
<td></td>
<td>mutepisi</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>epas</td>
<td></td>
<td>mutepisi</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
<td>mubeis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbs doubly defective.—These may be divided into four classes:—

(1.) יָנָי and יִי; as nasu, nādu, nābu, nāgu, naku, nādu, naru, nāsu.
(2.) אֲבָעַ and אֹלַ; as abu, aду, akhu, alu, anu, apu, atsu, aru, atu, yasu, yaru, yano.

(3.) וְהָ and וְהָ; as aibu, ‘umu, ‘uду, ‘unu, uru.

(4.) וְהָ and וְהָ; as bavu (бу), davu, cavu, lavu, navu.

In (4) the second radical generally becomes a consonant:¹ in the other cases the verbs are conjugated according to the rules already laid down; thus, īsi, “I had,” from אֲבָמ; tsā, tsī, tsu ‘u, tsā’ a, Imperative of atsu, from which a syllabary gives us the following nomina verbi: atsu, atsī, tsav, satsu ’u (Shaphel), sutu ’u (Passive Shaphel), tetītu (Ipteatl), sū- tetsu ’u (Istaphal). So ībbī, “he called,” from nabu.

Quadriliterals.—These are comparatively few in number in Assyrian. Dr. Oppert gives the following instances: parsidu, palcitu, parzakhu, palśakhu, paśkaru, khamsatu, to which may be added kharpsu, naśkaru, šakhparu. In the Aorist verbs with u (mostly transitives) have iskhupir, Present iskhupar; verbs with a (and ī) (mostly intransitives) give ipalcit, for which the vulgar language had ipalacitu and iplacit.

For further details see p. 52. The conjugations will be:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kal (Pael).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphtalel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saphalel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istaphalel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niphalel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Not always, however. Thus bavu, “to go,” is always conjugated as if it were bu; e.g. ibu, “they went,” yustēba or yustēba’a, “he caused to go.”
THE PRONOMINAL SUFFIXES OF THE VERB.

These are identical with those of the cognate languages, the third person beginning with the original sibilant, as already explained (p. 12). They are as follows:

SINGULAR.
1st pers. -anni, -inni, -nni, -ni.
2nd m. -accu, -icca, -ca, -ca, -c.
2nd f. -acci, -icci, -cci, -ci.
3rd m. -assu, -issu, -su, -s.
3rd f. -assi, -assá, -ssu, -ssi, -sa, -si.

PLURAL.
1st pers. -annini, -annu, -nini, -nu.
2nd m. -accunu, -accun, -cunu, -cun.
2nd f. -accina, -accin, -cina, -cin.
3rd m. -assunu(u), -assunu, -assun, -sunu(u), -sunu, -sun.
3rd f. -assinat(u), -assiná, -ssin, -ssinat(u), -sinu, -sin.

In the first person, the longer form -anni was used when the form of the verb ended in a consonant, and the double letter merely showed that the accent rested upon the penultimate. If the form terminated with a vowel, ni was properly used alone; e.g. isruu-u-ni, "they have given to me;" ikbā-ni, "they ordered me"; yumahrā-ni, "he urged me." The penultimate was long, and in order to show this a kind of Furtive Pathakh was introduced, producing isruu-‘inni, a form that is frequently met with; e.g. usāsīsā-‘inni, "they made me strong." Innī was sometimes used even after a, though here the correct form again was ratsibā-nni, "pierce me," where the double letter only marks the accent. In later inscriptions the language approached more nearly to the Hebrew pronunciation by substituting Pathakh for i (in -inni), and expressing in the writing the hemsā: thus, in the Achæmenian period we find lītsuru-h-anni, "may they protect
me,” *itticru-hanni*, “they were estranged from me.” After *u*, *-nni* was never used, as *u* was known to be long of itself: if, therefore, particular stress had to be laid upon the enclitic, hemza was employed as shown above. Very rarely *u* was dropped after first becoming *w*; e.g. *yuraps'-inni*, “they enlarged for me.” *U-a* became *wa*; accordingly, when the union-vowel *a* was used for the sake of emphasis, and hemza did not intervene to produce *u-h-inni* or *u-h-anni*, *u* was dropped altogether, so that we get *yusatlimanni*, “they conferred on me,” for *usatlimwanni*. The union-vowel *a*, as in Hebrew and Æthiopic, is found with all the pronouns. It is the same vowel that we have in the accusative of the noun and the subjunctive aorist, and it well expresses the action of the verb passing on to the governed pronoun. Compare the union-vowel *ā* in Æthiopic, which expresses the construct state both in the singular and the plural. Like the Æthiopic, the Assyrian has no separate form to express the dative of the pronoun.

With the second person feminine, *a* after *i* is dropped, so that we get *tucassipinni*, “thou didst reveal to me,” *tucabinni*, “thou didst cover me,” *tuv'alinii*, “thou didst exalt me.” This contraction of *ya* into *i* has met us before, as in *bitu* for *biyatu* (see p. 35).

Instead of the suffix *ani*, *yati* or *yasi* could be used as a substantive; e.g. *ikbu yati* (see p. 38).

In the second person the same rules hold good, except that the contracted forms of the pronouns (*ca*, *ci*, etc.) may be attached to consonants. The last vowel of the second person singular masculine, and masculine and feminine plural is sometimes omitted, as in *attapsac* for *attappisdac*, and the
accent is thrown back upon the preceding syllable. In the vulgar language, instead of the suffix, the substantival attunu (attina) could be used in the accusative, e.g. altapra attunu, “I sent to you,” where -a carried on the action of the verb to the pronoun.

In the third person singular and plural, again, the final case-vowel is frequently dropped (as in the status constructus, and in Hebrew, Aramaic and modern Arabic generally). Thus we find usatlimus for usatlimusu. This is especially the case, if the verb ends one sentence, and the next word begins with a vowel. In Babylonian, verbs ʃu might assimilate this final letter to s following; e.g. indanas-su-nu-ti for indanan-sunuti (Palel), tumašissunuti for tumaššin-sunuti, “thou knowest them.”

The longer forms, sunutu, etc., are as often employed as the shorter ones. They are increased by the same suffix as that of the Æthiopic pronouns wetu, yeti, which forms abstract substantives in Assyrian (see below).¹ The nominative would be -tu, but, of course, when governed by the verb, we only find the oblique and accusative cases -ti, -ta, more generally the former. This is accounted for by the fact that the idea contained in the verb does not pass on to any new idea: the pronoun refers back to some preceding notion. Just as the genitive has -i, marking its priority to the noun in the status constructus, so is the priority contained in the personal pronoun suffix expressed by the same case-termination. These

¹ As the same suffix builds the plural, a double plural is the result. According to Philippi (Wesen u. Ursprung d. Status Constr., p. 26), this suffix is the demonstrative that we have in the third person feminine of the Imperfect, the Arabic demonstrative ʃu.
longer forms, it must be observed, are used as accusative substantives, not as suffixes like -sunu, etc.

The final vowels might be dropped in sunut, etc., as in -s for su or -ca.

In the third person feminine singular, si is nearly as common as sa, a being weakened to i (like šin and risu, etc.), -assı, -assa stand for -āsi, -āsa, as in pitassı, "open for her," where the double letter only expresses the length of the final vowel (=pitā-si).¹

With the enclitic conjunction va, mimination generally takes place to denote the accent: e.g. icsudu-assu-va, "they obtained him, and," icsudu-sunutav-va, "they obtained them, and."

With the pronoun-suffixes contractions in the verbs are frequent, i and a being as often elided as retained; e.g. isalmūs for isallimu-su.

THE NOUNS.

As in the cognate languages, nouns substantive and adjective have in Assyrian the same form, and but two genders, masculine and feminine. There is no separate form for the comparative and superlative. Like Æthiopic and Aramaic, Assyrian possesses no article, which in Hebrew and Arabic is merely the demonstrative pronoun. In the Achæmenian period, however, an article was being introduced (see p. 5).

Assyrian has three numbers, Singular, Plural, and Dual; but the last is very little used. It preserves (like classical

¹ The strange form cumu-si in Assur-bani-pal's proclamation (S.H.A., 189)—ludhab cunnus, "may it be well with you,"—must be a badly-engraved ti, as in at-si-mus for the usual atimmus (see p. 76), unless the character has a value tim.
Arabic) the case-terminations of the primitive Semitic speech, 
-\textit{u} (nominative), -\textit{i} (genitive), -\textit{a} (accusative). These have been lost in modern Arabic (though still used in Central Arabia), in Aramaic, and in Hebrew (which has but a few traces of them); while Ėthiopic only preserves the accusative in -\textit{a}. In Assyrian itself the suffixed pronouns are often found without the final vowel; and the Construct State is marked by the absence of the case-ending in the governing noun if in the singular; thus, \textit{sarru}, "king," but \textit{sar nisî}, "king of men." Besides the case-endings, as in the verbs, a final \textit{m} might be added to the vowel, giving \textit{nism}, \textit{nism}, \textit{nism}. This is regarded in the syllabaries as the correct form, though in the inscriptions this \textit{minimation}, as it has been happily termed by Dr. Oppert, is frequently omitted. Dr. Oppert compares the Arabic \textit{nunnation}, and refers to the minimation traceable in Hebrew in the adverbial accusatives \textit{yom}, \textit{rib}, \textit{palm}, \textit{zib}, \textit{bima}, \textit{bina}, \textit{bina}, \textit{bina}, \textit{bina}, etc., where an obsolete plural can hardly be represented.\footnote{So \textit{yom} in Phoenician (Cit. 38) and Aramaic \textit{yemâm}, \textit{témâm}. Nöldeke (Gött. gel. Ann. June 7, 1871) objects that these words are as little accusative as \textit{labî} (Assyrian \textit{ilatu}) or the Syriac \textit{as} in \textit{lailai témâm}, "day and night." Himyaritic, like Assyrian, possessed the minimation.} The origin of the minimation is probably, as with accusatives and neuters in the Aryan languages, an attempt to give firmness to the final vowel, which produces an obscure closing of the syllable.

Before going further, it will be necessary to controvert Dr. Oppert's extremely misleading ascription of an "emphatic state" to the Assyrian noun. Olshausen has already objected that "the value of the nasalisation of the case-vowel in
Arabic, and of the *status emphaticus* in Aramaic, is not only altogether different, but totally opposed: the Arab nasalises the termination of the indeterminate word, the *status emphaticus* marks the determined word. The nasalisation is really part of the case-ending; the *status emphaticus* is first made possible through the loss of the latter. While it is conceivable that in Aramaic the termination *ā* arose from the termination *a*, it is in the highest degree improbable, nay impossible, that *ā* could also arise from *ā* and *ī*.” The last sentence refers to Oppert’s transliteration of all the case-endings by  Notify; a procedure which throws Semitic philology into the greatest confusion, assumes the original identity of the case-terminations, which is philologically impossible, and in spite of Arabic derives them from the post-fixed article of the Aramaic. Oppert replies that as the Assyrian has no article, it cannot be compared with Arabic: its case-endings correspond to the Arabic noun without *tanwīn* preceded by the article, and to the Aramaic emphatic state. But the emphatic state in Aramaic is most probably a post-fixed article, consequently it can be compared with the Assyrian even less than Arabic. Moreover, under any circumstances, the Aramaic emphatic state has a different philological origin from the Assyrian case-endings, which can be compared only with the similar terminations in Arabic. Besides, the case-endings are used in Assyrian in cases where the article, as a general rule, would not be allowed (as with predicates). Dr. Oppert seems to separate the mimmation and the case-vowels: this cannot be done: the mimmation is but the older and more correct form belonging equally to verbs and nouns, which a later stage of language began to drop, though it was generally
retained before the conjunction va. Dr. Oppert's view reduces itself to this: either the "emphatic state" in Assyrian means a post-fixed article, which is untrue, or it means that special emphasis was to be laid upon the words which have the case-endings—always added unless the noun is in the construct state—which is equally untrue.\(^1\) The error is a serious one; it not only calls up misleading ideas, but it actually gives rise to mistakes, such as placing 'ihu (with the case-vowel) by the side of bucur (in the status constructus) and the feminine ilt (also in the status constructus), the statement that "the emphatic state is sometimes reduced to the syllable -an" (again the status constructus), and the strange assertions that "the plural of feminines is always formed from the simple form of the singular. Thus the plural rasat does not come from rasauti [it ought to be rasautu], but from rasat," and that "the plural of masculines is generally formed from the emphatic state, e.g. gimri from gimir, status emphaticus gimru." It is like saying that dominis comes from domino.

*Derivation of Nouns.*—As in the other Semitic languages, a distinction may be made between primitive nouns, such as 'abu, "father," 'ummu, "mother," and derivative nouns. Properly, however, derivative nouns ought to be those which are formed by the addition of a new letter, m, t, etc.; the so-called verbal nouns arising simultaneously with the verb itself from the radical idea. The different forms of the verbs, modified by pronouns and formative letters, are more strictly derivative than many of the so-called derivative participial or infinitival nouns. We may assume a time in the history

\(^1\) As in the case of the predicates mentioned above, or of substantives used as prepositions, e.g. orti sarri, "against the king."
of Semitic speech when the same combination of consonants might be used either as noun or verb:¹ gradually differences of meaning were introduced, firstly by means of nuances of vowel-sounds, or by reduplication of the radicals, and afterwards by additional elements. However, it will be convenient to adhere to the usual custom of Semitic grammars, and to treat of "verbal nouns" as derivatives.

With three radicals we have:—

From Kal—

1. *sacan*, nomen permanentis, to be distinguished from infinitive *sacdn*;
e.g. *sacaru* "monument," *cassadu* "acquisition," *saharu* "writing," *alayu* "ox," *tealamu* "image," *naharu* "river"; as adjectives *karadu* "warlike," *gasaru* "bold."

2. *sacin*, nomen permanentis, to be distinguished from the nomen agentis *sadin*; e.g. *zaciyu* "cross," *amili* "man"; adjectives *namiru* "bright," *malicu* "king," *cabidu* "heavy," *labiru* or *laboru* "old."

3. *sacun*, nomen permanentis, to be distinguished from *sacdn*, the nomen mutati; e.g. *batiu* "young man"; adjectives *marratu* "difficult," *rakuku* for *rahuku* "distant," *casumu* "servant."

4. *sicin*, a segholate; e.g. *sidhiru* "a writing," *sipinu* "a heap,"
   *epiynu* "a work," *gimiru* "the whole," *eisid-tu* "spoils"; adjective *zikhiru* "small."

5. *sicun*, nomen permanentis; e.g. *cisaedu* "presence"; adjective *sicaru*
   "manly."

6. *sicun*, nomen mutati; e.g. *sicuru* "memorial," *cisadu* "a captive";
   adjective *emuku* "deep."

7. *sucun*, nomen permanentis; e.g. *suluku* "citadel," *cupuru* "bitumen,"
   *cududu* "gem."

8. *sucan*, nomen permanentis; *suparu* "measure," *khuratu* "gold";
   adjective *pumalu* "strong."

9. *sucin*, nomen permanentis;² e.g. *buridu* "a pie" (bird).

¹ Comparative grammar, however, shows that in Semitic the verb presupposes the noun; just as in Aryan the noun presupposes the verb.
² These three last forms are identical with the Hebrew לְשׁוֹנָם, לְשׁוֹנָה, לְשׁוֹנָה, formed after the infinitive, and therefore dissimilar from the forma-
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(10.) saodn, nomen mutationis; e.g. tsab‘atu “to take,” rakhātu “to inundate,” uraccu for parācu “to rule,” canāsu “submission.”

(11.) sicin, nomen mutationis; e.g. niōtā “to cut off,” episu “to make.”

(12.) suūn, nomen mutationis; e.g. sumūru “to keep.”

(13.) sācin, nomen agentis; e.g. mālicu “ruling,” kā‘isu “snaring,” dāciku “governing,” ālicu “going,” māgiru “loving.”

(14.) sačin, nomen mutati; e.g. dalīkhu “troubled.”

(15.) sačan, nomen mutati; e.g. darūnu “a dwelling.”

From Pael (expressing intensiveness)—

(1.) saocan, nomen permanentis; e.g. gammalu “camel;” adjective karvadu “warlike.”

(2.) sīcan, sicin, nomen mutantis; e.g. limmanu (limanu) “injuring,” sīcaru (for sīcaru) “remembering.”

(3.) sīcan, sicin, nomen mutati; e.g. limmanu (limunu) “injured.”

(4.) sīcan, nomen permanentis; e.g. cīstātī “royal.”

From Pael Passive—

(1.) sacanan, nomen permanentis; e.g. adanu “mighty.”

(2.) sacunum, nomen mutati; e.g. agurru “cement.”

(3.) sicinin, nomen mutationis; e.g. cidīnunu “ordinance,” cītirru “cornice.”

(4.) suvunum, nomen mutationis; e.g. cudurru “landmark”; šumummu “alliance.”

(5.) sacin, nomen permanentis; e.g. namriuru “bright.”

From Iphtea, Iphtaal—

(1.) sitoun, nomen permanentis; e.g. hitrubu “a meeting,” etrubu “witness”; adjective pitkudu “good”; also infinitives, as sitlumu “to perfect.”

tion of sacan, sacin, and sacun from sacancu. They express a permanent state after change, and therefore may perhaps be better termed nomina mutati.
(2.) *situm* (Iptseal), nomen mutati; e.g. *eitumdu* "stored."
(3.) *satu*um, nomen mutati; e.g. *latumdu* "covered," *latu* "made king."
(4.) *siti*um, nomen mutati; e.g. *eiti*um "made."
(5.) *sita*um, nomen permanentis; e.g. *eitumas(tu)* "a gathering;" adjec-
tive, *gitmaitu* "benefactor."

From Shaphel—

(1.) *sascan*, nomen permanentis; e.g. *sapsaku* "opening," *satu* "ex-
pulsion."

From Shaphel Passive—

(1.) *sasau*um, nomen mutationis; e.g. *sumoutu* "a slaughter," *surbu* "greatness," and the usual infinitives *suldu*um "preservation," *sundu*um "protection," *sumuru* "guard," etc.

From Niphal—

(1.) *nasecan*, nomen permanentis; e.g. *nabkharu* "collected," *naramu* "chosen," *namrutu* "difficult."
(2.) *nascal*, nomen mutationis; e.g. *napdharu* "to defend."
(3.) *nasocin*, nomen permanentis; e.g. *nabniitu* "offspring."
(4.) *nisocin*, nomen mutati; e.g. *nomiku* "deep," "learned."
(5.) *nisocan*, nomen mutati; e.g. *niciatu* "a completion."
(6.) *nusocan*, nomen mutati; e.g. *numkharu* "the receipt."
(7.) *nasaucan*, nomen permanentis; e.g. *nadanumu* "strengthened," *naparocu* "diminished."

From *papal* and *pilpel* we have *gigums* "defences" (גִּגּוֹמָה), *gigur* "copulative" (גִּגוּר), *dandumu*, "very powerful," *dur-
daru", "great age." Verbs נ*ם* and י*ם* have curious derived forms which repeat the second radical; e.g. *lilic* "a going," *lildu* (pael) "a birth," *dadmi* "men" (דָּדָם), *babilat* "bringing" (of water, בָּל), *papakhu* "shrine" (פַּאֲבַקּוּ). From defective verbs we get similar formations. In con-
cave verbs, except in the participle active Kal, the vowel of the first radical was assimilated to that of the second; e.g. *ra*uku for *ra*uku (רָאָעַק, רָאָק), *miru* "offspring" for *ma*iru. In
Pael we have a nomen mutati *saccin*; e.g. *mi’iru* “offspring” for *ma’iru*. Verbs with $e$ for second radical often take $h$ instead; thus we have *bahtatu* by the side of *behtu*. Verbs $\gamma$ $\ddot{y}$, as in Hebrew, drop the first syllable in *sacin*; e.g. *sahu’u* “summit” (from נ褛). So *sascan* appears as *sascu* “spoil” (נאש). In verbs $\gamma$ $\ddot{y}$ the initial radical was dropped in *sacan*, *sicin*, and *sicin*, *suowm*, *sacin* (but not *sactn*), and *siccun*; e.g. *radu* “servant” (דוע), *ridu*, *rittu* for *rid(a)tu* “foot,” *rudo* “chariot,” *littu* (for *lidtu*) “offspring,” and *lidtu*, *lidu* (but *ilittu*), *li’udu* or *li’itu*. In other cases the initial vowel is always $a$; e.g. *ardatu* “service,” *atsu* “a going.” The same verbs give us also such forms as *lidaćatu* (from the infinitive), *littutu* (palsel). In Niphal the forms are *nullatu* “height” (*nuscan*) and *nebikeru* “passage” (*niscin*). The Pael Passive is *ubbiru* “ford,” with the second radical doubled according to rule. In verbs $\gamma$ $\ddot{y}$ the second radical is doubled before a case-ending: otherwise only the first two radicals are expressed; e.g. *sar* but *sarru*, *lib* but *libbu*, ‘um but ‘ummu. *Pilpel* generally becomes *papel* in Assyrian, as *kakkadu=כקר* $\rightarrow$ כקרב ($\gamma$ קדרב; *caccabu=ככבר*). Verbs $\gamma$ $\ddot{y}$ assimilate their last vowel to the case-ending; thus *pu’u*, *pi’i*, *pa’a*.

Besides these inner and more primitive formations, we have also, as in the cognate languages, external formations created by the broken-down roots *m*, *t*, *n*, and an initial vowel.

The prefix *m* (see p. 59) denotes the instrument, action, or place; e.g. *manzasu* “a bulwark” (“anything fixed”), *marsištu* “a heritage,” *mandattu* “tribute” (“what is given”), *msecunu* “dwelling,” *midduku* “slaughter” (יִּדָּק).
where $a$ has been weakened to $i$, as is often the case in Hebrew. Its use in forming the present participles of the verb has already been considered.

$N$ is used both as prefix and as suffix. As a prefix it is to be referred to Niphal (see p. 77). As an affix it must be carefully distinguished from the plural, with which it may easily be confounded. The usual form is $ānu$, like Arabic $ānūn$ for adjectives, or $ān$ and $ān$ in Hebrew. Originally it would seem to have been $āmu$ (comp. יָזְרֹעַ and יָזְרֹע). In this case its origin would have been the same as that of the mimnation.\(^1\) Besides $ānu$, we have also $i$nu (and even $i$nu for $i$nu), more especially in adjectives. It builds abstracts and adjectives used as substantives: e.g. $lisānu$ "tongue," $kibirānu$ "an offering," $bunānu$ "image," $almanatu$ "widow," $ristānu$ "first-born," $ṣildhānu$ "king," $elinitu$ "high," $ter-
\textit{din'u}$ "a descending." -$Unu$, as in Hebrew, is rare: we find $diλu$nu by the side of $diλutu$, and $agunu$ "crown," by the side of $agu$.

$T$ inserted has already been noticed. Of a different origin is $t$ affixed to build abstracts, which must be referred to the same source as the feminine termination. This is always $utu$, as in $malcutu$ "kingdom," $sarrutu$ "royalty," $belutu$ "lordship," $ristanutu$ "headship." These feminine abstracts must be distinguished from the masculine plurals in $utu$; and they never admit the plural. There is also another rare feminine

\(^1\) Possibly, however, considering the long $ā$, it is a plural form, used to express an abstract singular, like neuter plurals in Aryan languages. This is borne out by forms like $sanīyānu$, "for the second time." In Hebrew $ān$ has been changed into $ān$ (Ewald, Gramm., § 341, who refers it to the demonstrative $ānu$); so $'anochi$ for $anacu$, etc. Compare the feminine abstracts in -$utu$ by the side of the plurals in -$utu$. The plural -$ānu$, it must be remembered, was indifferently masculine or feminine.
abstract formation in -ti from -ṭi; e.g. amarti “a body,”
tukultu (tuklat) “help.” It is difficult to say whether this
irregular formation is the oblique case of the ordinary
feminine in -tu, or whether it is a plural, the masculine
termination in -i being affixed to the feminine termination, as
in the plurals in -tan, to be considered later.

T prefixed is common, and is derived from the secondary
conjugations, like לְעַבֵּר in Hebrew, or the Arabic takat-
tulun, takattulun. It refers us to a period when strong verbs,
as well as concave verbs, might prefix the dental. The
forms with t prefixed are tasmatu “hearing,” tamkhatu
and takhatsu “battle,” talucu (talucu) “a going,” talidtu
“birth,” tamirtu (tammirtu) “sight,” takhlupu “a coping.”

With e (i, u) initial, ta becomes te; e.g. tenisetu “man-
kind,” terdinnu “descent.” As in Hebrew, the forms thus
produced are abstracts. Tu even is found, e.g. tupukatu
“race” (iphtaal), compared with pitoku and pitku, tukumatu
or tukmatu “opposition,” from לְפַל.

Roots increased by prefixed vowels are rare; though, not
as in Hebrew, preserved only in such old words as הַיְנִי, etc. The original vowel seems to have been a; this
was weakened to i and e, and even to u. Thus we find
alaqat and ilaqaat “stories,” aplusu “weight,” aškuppu
“doorpost,” acałatu by the side of calatu; ipdhiru “ransom”
(כָּרָה); edakhu by the side of dakhu “king”; ebillu by the
side of belu; utuhut “desire” (עָנָה), urinni “ostrich-hens”
(עִפְּאִה), uta’amma and ita’imu “lawgiver.” The length of
the first syllable is shown by the fact that it may be doubled
before a defective root, as in immiru “youngling,” by the
side of miru and smartu. As in Hebrew and Arabic, intense
active qualities are thus denoted. The origin of the prefixed vowel is obscure. It may be compared with Aphel (Hiphil, etc.), and so may be set by the side of ascan and suscan: on the other hand, as initial s passes into h, it may be referred to the third person pronoun, in which case u will be the original vowel. Perhaps this may throw light on the origin of the third person of the imperfect, where i- will stand for u- (=su) (see p. 61).¹

Gentile nouns are formed like the Arabic relatives in iyyún by ai (aya), e.g. Accadai “the Accadians,” Aramai “the Arameans.” So -i in Hebrew, -ai in Aramaic, -i in የ(IntPtric for derived adjectives, and -āwī and -āy for gentilic nouns.

A few rare forms, pilpal (e.g. mulmulu “heavy-armed,” lalkaku “stock,” girgirru “roaring water”) and peawel (Arabic Twelfth conjugation) (e.g. adudillu), are also met with (see p. 107).

Quadriliterals are occasionally found, as well as a few quinqueliterals. Generally the former are produced by the insertion of r or l, and more rarely n, into the root; e.g. sikhuparu “overthrow,” kharpasu “vehemence,” asariyu “eldest,” paleitu “trespass.” Sometimes a dental has this function, as in ipparsu by the side of ipparsidu or ipparsudu. One of the superfluous letters, especially an r, is often assimilated by the Assyrian, as in annabu (Hebrew and Arabic אַנָבָע) “hare,” ʾitseuru “bird” (Hebrew יִשְׁרֵע, Arabic شرير, ʿatšür). Another way of forming these words is by repeating at the end one of the radicals, more usually the

¹ The length of the syllable precludes us from ranking it with the merely euphonic ā in the numerals (see further on).
first, as in khamîlukkhi “stores,” gablu “roof” by the side of gablu. The initial is also repeated, as in gungulipu “hump,” with n inserted as a fulcrum-letter. So in seseru “hero,” by the side of sērru, and in sâskhartu “small,” by the side of sîkharu’u and teikhirutu: in kassaru an assimilation has taken place. Many of these increased roots double the last letter before the case-ending, as in verbs y’y; e.g. barzillu “iron,” khabatsillatu “lily.”

Primitive roots must be left to the lexicographer. In these the Assyrian approaches most nearly to the Hebrew. Its vocabulary was very large, and the syllabaries enable us to compare together certain roots and forms which throw light upon the phonology of the primitive Semitic language as well as of the Assyrian. Thus l and r are interchanged in ayalu and ayaru “man,” “hero” (אָילא); and abru (=âbrû), namaru, amaru, acaru and adaru are all given as synonymous. With this correspondence of c and d compare the synonyms acasu and atasu. So, again, we have nadu’u, adu’u, and aru’u (“clear”) (compare irûn=îdûn); and askhu joined with aoru “place.” G and c are interchanged, as in aou “crown,” by the side of agu and etsû, or in daragu, durgu “road” (דרג), or in dugaku “king,” by the side of dâciku and dâkhu. The interchange of a and e is frequent; and t and d are interchanged in atamu, atmû, “man,” by the side of adamû, admu (the converse takes place in nadamu=âdû). Kalu’u and kamû’u or camu’u, “burn,” may be compared; and p and q are interchanged in the root aslug and aslûp, “I pulled out.”

The noun may have its meaning rendered more specific by the reduplication of the first radical, or the prefixing of the pronoun a (see p. 110), as in adamu and admu, “man”
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(דאם), from *damu* "blood," "relation," "child." The tablets also afford us a number of synonymous forms from the same root: thus, *mar* "youngling," is equivalent to *mir*, *maʿaru*, *immiru*, *miʿiru*, *muʿuru*; *beltu* ("lordship") to *baki-lat[u], beʿlitu, ebiltu, and bilatu*; *tsikkhirutu* ("small") to *sazzar[u], ik/hrut[u, baṣkhart[u, šiṣer[u, tsikkhirut[u, šukhar[u* (where the interchange of š and ts is to be noticed); *asatu* to *issu* ("woman"); *maluc[u* and *maluv* are identical in meaning; and *beltu* or *bilatu*, and *tsikkhirut[u* or *tsikkhirt[u*, may be indifferently used.

The most interesting point connected with this part of the subject is the Turanian origin of many Semitic words, more especially of the so-called biliteral roots (see p. 9). Besides the many instances given in the syllabaries in which Accadian words in the one column are Semitised in the other column,—e.g. *muq*—*muoc[u*, *nanga* ("town")—*naguʿ[u, kakkul = *kakkull[u, gurus* ("hero")—*gurus[u, lamma* ("monster")—*lamašu* (? Talmud. דועה), šaʿ—*baʿamu* ("blue"), diʿ—*denu* ("judge"), šilim = *šulmu, ab* =* abtu, zik = *zikku, surru* = *surruʿu* ("beginning"), *ingar* = *iccaru* ("foundation"), *sab* = *sabbu, al = *allu, ge = *cit[u* ("abyss"), *šangu* = *šanguʿ[u, pišan* ("branch") = *pišann[u, cir = *ciʿiru, mitsi = *manš[u, sok = *sakummat[u* ("height"), *zab* = *zaʿabu, mar = *marru, cur* ("land") = *cuʿuru, mat* ("country") = *maʿatu, gur* ("return") = *guru*,—we find the prototypes of many words hitherto known as Semitic in the Accadian language.

Instances may be found in the above list, *baʿamu* (דועה). *denu*, *ge* (גא), *surru* (*אתיופית sărara*), *ingar* (_cover), *gur* (גא), to which we may add *id* "hand" (יד), *bar*
"king," apparently pa "speech" (ם 나오), 1  "sick" (רל), gun "inclosure" (נ), uru "city" (ר י), as in Jerusalem; the Assyrian is ālu, ל), cin "work" and gin "make" (ר בע), whence gina is translated cinu "constituted," bat "open" (perhaps Assyrian pitu'u, ב), zabar "bronze" (Assyrian ṣiparru, Arabic ثن, ثن, ثن, ثن), and many others. In some cases the loan-word has been further modified in accordance with the rules of Semitic grammar. Thus, the Accadian kharra "man," gives rise to the Assyrian khairu, whence we get the usual word for "wife," khiratu, 脔, with the feminine termination attached. The Assyrian especially has been indebted to the Accadian vocabulary, and one of the chief difficulties of decipherment arises from our ignorance of the meaning of the numerous words so derived, which are not to be found in any of the other Semitic tongues. Thus one of the commonest Assyrian adjectives is dannu "strong," from Accadian dan; and matu "country," has a similar Turanian origin (ma or mada). A converse interchange of words seems also to have taken place in those prehistoric times when Turanian and Semite bordered one upon the other; thus, surru, in the list given above, may really have been Semitic; gabiri, one of the many Accadian words for "mountain," appears clearly to be Arabic jebelūn, and the ungrammatical title of the Proto-Chaldean kings ciprat irba was borrowed from the Semitic cipratu irbai or irbittu, "the four races" (of Syria).

Number and Gender.—The Assyrian, like the cognate languages, possessed three numbers, Singular, Dual, and Plural.

1 So, just as oc-oc "mouth-mouth," meant "face," pānu or pātu, פנ, etc., has the same signification in Semitic.
The Dual is rarely used, and is restricted, as in Hebrew, to pairs like usnā "ears." 1 Similarly, in modern Arabic the dual has been lost almost entirely in verbs, pronouns, and adjectives; and only three words in Syriac possess it. In Æthiopic it does not exist at all. It is, however, older than the plural: the primitive savage, with his narrow wants and small stock of language, had neither need nor capacity of speaking of more than two persons. Gradually as isolated life gave way to nomad life, and the power of counting numbers was developed, the plural—which originally expressed merely the indefinite number that all beyond two seemed to the feeble mind of the savage to be—came more and more into use, until civilization finally dropped the dual altogether. The dual is usually denoted in the inscriptions by the addition of the symbol of "two": it was sounded as ā. This corresponds to Arabic -āni, Hebrew -aim, Aramaic -ain, the final consonant being dropped, as generally in the plural. Examples of the dual are: usna'a (and in Babylonian usūna'a) "the ears," katā "the hands," birkā "the knees," ina'a "the eyes," sepā "the feet." There is no distinction of gender.

The Plural is formed in several ways. The oldest is that which terminates in -ānu, -āni, -ān, which is found in a comparatively small number of substantives, some of which also form their plural in other ways: e.g. pa'ānu and pa'ātu,

---

1 The adjective in agreement is always found in the plural, consequently a case like sa katā-su atsmā, "whose hands are strong," shows that we are dealing with a Permansive. The participle of the derived conjugations may, however, take the dual: thus, ukukh Dunahu Šamah-gunu munirridū and a variant munirridā, "I carried off D. (and) S.' the opposers."
matānu, matātu and mātti. It is noticeable that this termination is not confined to the masculine. We find it in the feminine omukānu ("deep powers"), risānu ("heads"), khaltsānu ("strongholds"), just as in Hebrew some feminines like נִדָּמֶל make their plural in לָמָּו, or in Aramaic the absolute form of the feminine plural is in -īn. Often the oblique case -āni stands for -ānu, from analogy with the common plural-ending -i; thus we find duppa‘ani "tablets," khaltsa‘ani "fortresses," khara‘ani "woods," used as nominatives. The contracted form -ān is occasionally used even when not in regimine. As in the cognate languages, -ān in Babylonian could be weakened to -īn. Thus in Khammurabi’s inscription we find cilalin instead of the usual cillātan "omnia."

An was irregularly added to the feminine singular to express a collection of anything (Arabic nomina abundantia). Thus from the feminine ḥtánu "a crossing," we have the plural ḫtátni ("where crossings are made," "a ford"), nīlatān "all," pārdhūtān "the preceding," akhratān (instead of the ordinary akhrat and akharitu) "the remainder," "the future." Adjectives which have this form are used absolutely as substantives, or rather adverbially, generally following the verb, and omitting the preposition ana (like he local in Hebrew). Compare the plural of the numerals from 2 to 10 in Samaritan in לָא.

An old and very rare form of the plural is that which reduplicates the root. Thus by the side of āgi or āgo "crowns," we have āgāgi. It is probable that this plural is of Turanian origin; I have found no true Semitic radix in which it occurs.

Another old form is that which is preserved to us in satānu,
sunu, etc., which seems to have been partly suggested by false analogy with the case-endings of the singular, partly due to the original long ṣ of the third person pronoun. Instances of this Arabicising plural in nouns are to be found in dilunu by the side of dilutu “door-posts,” and datunu, which seems of Accadian origin.

Another masculine plural is in -utu, -uti, -ut, like the Hebrew masculines in יִשְׂרָאֵל, which should be distinguished from the feminine plural. It is employed especially by words derived from verbs יָשָר, or which otherwise end with a vowel. It is used by all adjectives, and by the nomina mutantis of all the conjugations. Examples are ziurutu “males,” naoluti “complete,” hunut takhani “materials of war.”

The most common masculine plural, however, was formed by -σ or -ι, like the construct masculine plural in Hebrew. It is an instance of the omission of the final nasal similar to that which allowed the mimmation to be dropped. In monosyllabic nouns this plural did not differ in form from the second case of the singular, though an attempt to distinguish it was often made by writing σ instead of ι, especially in Babylonian. Indeed the length of the syllable in the case quoted from the Hebrew, and the fact that the plural had been weakened from ἄμ (άν), would tend to show that there was properly a real difference in pronunciation between the plural-ending and the short vowel of the case-termination. In dissyllables, however, where the accent is on the first syllable, and the second syllable is not long, the two forms were distinguished by dropping the vowel of the second radical in the singular, and laying the accent on the first
syllable, while the plural retained the vowel of the second radical, and placed the accent upon it, which is frequently marked by doubling the third radical; e.g. nakirî “enemy,” nakiri “enemies”; naklî “valley,” nakhalî “valleys.” Examples of this kind of plural in monosyllables are su’uri maruti “young oxen,” nisî labiruti “ancient men,” bucci nacluti “complete houses,” yume mahduti “many days.” Many masculine substantives took both the earlier and the later plural ending: thus we have sarrānu and sarri, khaltu and khaltse.

The termination of the feminine plural was twofold. Usually we find -ātu, -āti or -āte, āt; e.g. elātum “high,” ummanātu “armies,” khirātu “wives” (so distinguished from the singular khirātu or khirtu), ḏanātī “strong,” tsirāte “supreme,” khutarāte “rods,” idāt “forces.” This -ātu answers to the Ethiopic -āt (ātā), Aramaic -āth (in construct), Arabic āṭān, Hebrew ūṭh. Besides this termination of the feminine plural, we also meet with another in -etu or -etu, -ete or -ite. Some nouns take both terminations; many, however, are confined to the rarer form, as esereti “sacred places,” rukseti “distant parts,” khidheti “sinners,” anneti “these.” Dr. Hincks conjectures that the latter form was used only in the case of adjectives used as substantives. It is an instance of a being weakened to ā or ē, which we find in -an and elsewhere. It is mostly to be found in Babylonian inscriptions, and may perhaps be ascribed to an Aramaic influence.

Many words, as in the other Semitic dialects, admitted of both plurals, being of common gender. Thus we have pa’anu and pa’atu, babi and babātu (“gates”).
It is often uncertain what plural an Assyrian noun took, owing to the employment in the inscriptions of the monogram for multitude in place of the final syllable, which all readers were supposed to be capable of supplying. Sometimes, however, the proper plural was added to this symbol, and sometimes the symbol was not expressed at all.

The Assyrian, like the cognate tongues, possessed but two genders, the masculine and the feminine. The neuter is a refinement upon primitive language, which endowed nature with the life and gender of the subject. The feminine was weaker than the masculine: hence abstracts, in which the notion of life was necessarily harder to conceive than in the case of material objects, were considered as feminines. In this way is to be explained the substitution of a feminine singular with a collective signification for a plural; e.g. lišnatur “bricks.” Many feminine substantives have no distinctive termination, and their gender can only be known from their meaning, from their plurals, or from their being joined with feminine adjectives. Such are ummu “mother,” ummanu “army,” katu “hand,” usnu “ear,” khalitu “fortress,” lisunu “tongue.”

Those that have a distinctive suffix are of three kinds. Firstly, there are the feminine abstracts in -ātu, as sarrātu “kingdom,” which are carefully to be distinguished from the masculine plurals in -ātu, and which do not admit the plural. Secondly, there is the general feminine termination -ātu, -ātī, -āta, which may be shortened into -tu, -ti, -ta, where possible. Thus besides khirātu we may have khirtu, besides belātu, beltu. Triliterals, in which the second syllable is not long, can drop either this or the vowel of the feminine-
ending: thus, "life" may be either napsatu or napistu, "fear" may be pulkhatu or pulukhtu. Surd roots do not allow this omission of the -ä, as the final radical must be doubled: thus from šar "king," we may only have šarrātu "queen." A third mode of forming the feminine singular is by -ittu, weakened from -ātu; e.g. elinitu "high." According to Dr. Hincks, this form is never used in the case of nomina agentis or with surd roots. The same rules that apply to the omission of the vowel of -ātu apply also here, except that surds always have -ātu. Thus we have binitu and bintu "daughter," saplitu and sapiltu "low," makhritu and makhirtu "former," teikhritu and teikhirtu "small." Words yý admit only this form, as elitu "high"; just as from dannu we can only have dannatu. Otherwise both forms are indiscriminately used, e.g. ilitu and ilātu "goddess," belitu and belātu "lady." ¹

The addition of the feminine-terminations often causes a change in the last radical. N, ä, ā, are regularly assimilated, as in limuttu "injuring" for limuntu, libittu "brick-work" for libintu, oabittu "heavy" for oabidtu. So s, z, š, and tš were generally changed to l. Thus we have mikhiltu "fortified," besides mikhistu and mikhatsatu,-marustu and marultu "difficult" (where tš has become š, as in risti for risti), lubustu and lubultu "clothing."

In one or two instances the feminine termination seems to have been contracted to a', as in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. Thus Dr. Hincks quotes the variant sukalula for sukalulat from Assur-nazir-pal.

¹ This indiscriminate use of a and i in the feminine noun is analogous to the indifferent employment of sa and si for the feminine relative pronoun.
The origin of the feminine termination would take us back to the personal pronoun. The Assyrian, like Ἄθiopic, classical Arabic, Phœnician, and Sinaitic, preserves the archaic ḍī(u), which also appears in the Hebrew ḫī and the construct state, and in the Aramaic construct and emphatic states. In Berber the third personal pronoun is netta “he,” nettěth “she,” plural nutḥi (masculine), nutḥnet (feminine), and the accusative verbal suffix of the third person is -īth, -it, plural -ithon. So the demonstratives are wayyi “this” (masculine), thayyi (feminine), winna “that” (masculine), and thinna, thīdhak or ḏīhak (feminine). In Coptic nētho广泛关注 = “he,” nēthos = “she,” nēthōḏa = “they.” The Assyrian enclitic -tu, -ti, which belongs to the pronouns (sunutu, yati, etc.), and is met with again in the Ἄθiopic wētu, yēti, ēmuntu, and, with the plural-ending affixed, wētomu, wētōn, cannot be separated from the feminine abstract suffix -utu, or the ordinary feminine termination -atū, -itu. These forms, accordingly, will be like iste, an emphatic reduplication of the demonstrative. We have already seen that the primitive Semitic recognized but one root for all three persons (see p. 41).

The original plural-ending seems to have been -dū, as found in old Arabic ḥumā, antumā, katal tumā; Ἄθiopic Ḫōmā, Ḫētōmā, antōmā, nagarōmmā; Aramaic himmo, himmōn; Hebrew ḫūnā, ḫīn, etc. Arabic has shortened the final vowel, according to its general rule (e.g. and “I,” ḫunnā, katalītā, katalī by the side of Ἄθiopic gabara, etc.). So has Assyrian, as in sunā by the side of sunutu, khaltsānā by the side of khaltsănām. Am has been changed to an in Assyrian, Ἄθiopic, Himyaritic, and Berber (just as the
mummation becomes nunnation). So, too, in the Syriac
anakhan, hynan, “we.” This change takes place in As-
syrian even between two vowels, as in kaltsaunu, sunu. Am,
an, are weakened to im, in, in Hebrew and Aramaic; though
the original form seems to be preserved in Hebrew נִנָּא
“gnats.” The Arabic -ānā would display the same weaken-
ing; and appears to be the result of a false parallelism with
the singular case-endings, as though the nunnation were the
same as the plural sign, and cannot be compared with the
verbal -anā (with which compare Syriac nakhārihānā-chnū,
nekāhīrihānā(hi), etc.). The dropping of the consonant in the
Assyrian plurals bućci, etc., or in the Hebrew construct, is
parallel with the loss of the mummation, or with the Assyrian
verb-forms sa氰u, sa氰u, is氰u, is氰u, for s氰u, sa氰u,
is氰u, is氰u. The Assyrian dual in a, compared with
the plural in -i, seems to have lost a final m,\(^1\) which is retained
in Hebrew -ām, Aramaic -ān, Arabic -āni and -āni, Syriac
en. The original dual was probably -a‘amu, expressing by
its long-continued reduplication of the pure primary vowel
the reduplication of the object. So the Botocudos of Brazil
extend ouatou “stream,” into ouatou-ou-ou-ou “ocean,” with
the Chavantes rom-o-wodi=“I go a long way;” but rom-o-o-
o-o-wodi=“I go an exceedingly long way,” in Madagascar
ratchi=“bad,” ra-r-atchi “very bad,” and still more analog-
gously among the Aponegicrans 6=itawuna, 7=itawu-ā-una
(Tylor, “Primitive Culture,” vol. i. pp. 196, 197). Simi-
larly, according to Schott, “six” in the Ural-Altaic
languages is expressed by a modification of “three.” Now
a±a=either d or the gunated ai (p. 35). In Hebrew we

\(^1\) In Arabic m falls away in the dual before the pronoun-suffixes.
find *Dothain* becoming *Dothan*. The plural would have been formed upon the dual, with a contraction of the vowel-sound, as the idea to be expressed by the plural was less definite than that expressed by the dual. The *m* final, inclosing and strengthening the vowel, is to be compared with the mimmati- tion, or with the accusative and neuter in Aryan nouns. We cannot follow the analogy of these, however, in holding that the plural -*m* was attached to the case-endings of the singular, or ever had a separate existence pronominal or otherwise. Here, as elsewhere, Semitic and Aryan procedure was contradictory. A double set of case-endings would have been unmeaning. The form in -*un* must be explained differently, as above. The plural imperfect follows in its vowel-endings, not the cases, but the contrasted pronouns *sunu* and *sina* (*sana*). The feminine plural -*atu* or -*at*, Hebrew -*eth* (for -*awath* = -*amath*), is formed from the plural -*am*, which indifferently denoted both genders, by the addition of the feminine termination, exactly as in the singular. *At* stands for -*amat* or -*awat*, *m* and *v* being interchangeable in Assyrian. (So *amaru* = נ, *ma* = 1, etc.)

The forms *ebirtan*, etc., are of later growth, in which the plural termination has been attached to the feminine, instead of the converse. The same irregular formation appears in the *Æ*thiopic *wētāmī*, *wētan*. This is another point in which Assyrian and *Æ*thiopic grammar curiously agree. The *Æ*thiopic forms are even more exactly paralleled by the Assyrian demonstrative plural *satu*, *sata*. For a Samaritan comparison see p. 116.

*The Cases.*—These are like the Arabic: -*t* nominative, -*i* genitive, -*d* accusative. Very frequently a final *m* is
added, lengthening the preceding vowel, similar to the numna-
tion in Arabic. The immation, as Dr. Oppert has happily
termed it, becomes rarer in the later Assyrian inscriptions.
The case-terminations are attached both to the singular and to
the plural, to the masculine and to the feminine. They cause
certain alterations in the vowels of many forms; and these
are as follows. Whenever a long vowel precedes the last
letter, or when the word is a monosyllable (provided it be
not derived from a surd root), or when the last vowel, though
short, is preceded by more than one consonant (as in *sitcum,
*masacin, *nisin), no change takes place. Thus we have
‘ummanātu (construct ‘ummanāt), mutu “man” (construct
mut), kitrubu “midst” (construct kitrub). When, however,
a root ends in a weak letter, the latter is assimilated to the
case-vowel. Thus, from atsi “going-out” (feminine atsišu),
we have atsu‘u. From agu “crown,” Accadian ega, we get
agu‘u, agi‘i or age‘e, aga‘a. So, again, we find pu‘u, pi‘i,
pu‘a.

In surd roots the construct form is a monosyllable. The
case-ending, however, doubles the last consonant; e.g. šar,
barru; liš, liššu; ‘um, ‘ummu. This is really a Palel form
of a biliteral; like the Palel triliterals agammu “lake”
(agam), cidinnu “ordinaance” (cidin), etc.

The vowel of the second radical is always omitted before
the case-ending in sacan (but not in saodān), sioin, suoun,¹
sirum, and in augmented forms like mustacin, where the
second radical stands between two vowels, the latter of which

¹ In Babylonian, however, instead of ‘umāš, the usual dual form, we
have ‘umšumāšu (W.A.S., I. 51, 1, 1, 4). As it occurs at the end of the
line, the retention of û seems due to the pause and the naturally long
syllable ā.
is short. Thus we have kardu (karad), gimru (gimir), pulkhu (pulukh), limnu (limun), muntakhtiu (muntakhits). It is
generally omitted also (especially in Babylonian) in saoin, as
well as in saoin, sican, and siccan: e.g. namru (namir), labru
(Babylonian, but labiru, and more archaically laburu in
Assyrian), martsu (marute), zicru and zicaru (zicar), gisru
(gissar). Dr. Hincks believed that a liquid as third radical
preserved a preceding ă; hence he would explain pumalu
"powerful," and badhalu by the side of baghiiti (from badhil)
"interrupted."

The Construct State.—This is formed, as in Hebrew, by
shortening the first word, and so bringing the two words so
closely into connexion one with the other, that they may be
pronounced in the same breath. The first word is subordi-
nated to the second, which is the source from which the
determined idea of the first word is derived. Just as in
Arabic tenuin is dropped, or in Hebrew the vowels con-
tracted, so in Assyrian the case-ending of the first word falls
away. Thus, instead of barru barri, we have bar barri, "king
of kings," susub napsati, "the preservation of life." The
determining word has the case-ending -i, as in Arabic, as
expressing a weakened conception of the direction towards
which the mind of the speaker is looking (in this case the
direction is that of derivation, origination). The status con-
structus may be replaced, as it often is, by the relative sa,
when the first word—except in some rare instances from
analogy with the status constructus¹—retains its case-ending;
e.g. barric sa Assuri, "king of Assyria": the second word

¹ In this case the first word is in the status constructus before the
whole sentence following. According to Philippi, sa, in such instances,
retains its original demonstrative meaning, and is not a relative.
has either -u or -i. So in Phœnician, is sometimes substituted for the status constructus, and in Hebrew we may compare the proper name Methu-sa-el "man of God." D is used in the same way in Himyaritic, de in Syriac, di in Aramaic, za in Ethiopic. The union-vowel (ḥ, in pronouns š) in the so-called status constructus of the Ethiopic cannot be identified with the ya in Amharic, which was originally the demonstrative z̄ēya.¹

The case-endings have been already compared with those of the other Semitic languages (p. 15, note). They form one of the most striking likenesses between Assyrian and Arabic. The name is unfortunate, as their use does not correspond to that of the cases in the Aryan tongues. The subject-termination was always -u or -um, which, accordingly, invariably appears in the syllabaries as the typical form of the word. The case-terminations, though short in Arabic and Assyrian, were originally long. This is shown in Assyrian by the mimmation, and by such forms as iṣu’u by the side of iṣu ("a door") in the syllabaries. So in Arabic, we find the pausal -ū; and both languages have a tendency to shorten a final vowel (see p. 121). On the other hand, Hebrew has long vowels ֶא, ֶא, ֶא, and this language does not lengthen final short vowels. So, again, the Ethiopic -ḥ of the accusative occasionally appears as -ḥā. In this way, too, must be explained the long vowel of the Assyrian feminine abstracts in -ū-ṭu. The origin of this -ū must be assigned to the same instinct that set apart ʾu in the pronouns to denote the stronger masculine. The subject, being absolute, was

¹ Forms like Penuel, etc., in Hebrew (p. 15, note) go back to the Arabic, which herein separates itself from Assyrian.
naturally regarded as stronger than a determined case. The accusative ought rather to be called the augment of motion. It expresses the direction to something, or the object to which the idea has travelled. This is best exemplified in the Hebrew use of *he local*. The idea of motion was suggested, it would seem, to the primitive Semite by dwelling upon the pure deep sound of -ā or -āhā, by which the word was lengthened and extended, as it were, beyond itself. This accusative case, needed as soon as a verb appears to distinguish verbal from nominal government, is the oldest Semitic case, and naturally, therefore, the "nearest" vowel.

A, as always in Semitic—in the Assyrian *sa* and *si*, *risu* and יסנה ex. gr.—is weakened into *i*; hence the so-called genitive -i, intermediate between the subject and the direct object, and expressing a weakened kind of motion or direction. This is well exemplified in such Assyrian phrases as answer to the Hebrew *he local*, in which the preposition is omitted, and where, instead of -a, we have the weakened -i; e.g. *takhās* "to battle," instead of *ana takhās*. From the substantive these terminations (primarily strengthened by the mimmaton) were transferred to the verbs, without losing their meaning.

**The Pronominal Suffixes.**—These are as follows:

---

**SINGULAR.**

1st pers. -ya, -a, -i
2nd pers. -ca, -c (masc.), -ci (fem.)
3rd pers. -su, -s (masc.), *sa, si* (fem.)

**PLURAL.**

1st pers. -ni
2nd pers. -cunu, -cun (masc.), [-cina, cin (fem.)]
3rd pers. -sunu, -sun (masc.), -sina, sin (fem.)

The second person feminine plural has not been found.
The second and third persons masculine singular, after an unaccented \( u \), are shortened to \( c \) and \( s \): e.g. ausu-Patu "his life." After an accented \( u \), a second \( u \) is generally inserted, as usi-Patu-a "upon me," yannu-Patu-a "I (am) not," or else the consonant of the pronoun is doubled, as yenumu "thou (art) not," yannusu "he (is not)," usisusun "upon them," katusu "his hand," kisumu "(it is) thy will," Pamoci "before thee," kirbusa "within it." This reduplication does not take place after the feminine formative \( t \), except in a monosyllable.

The suffixes can be attached either to the case-endings of the noun, or to the construct state. In the first instance they are purely adjectival, in the second the third personal pronoun is regarded as a substantive. The apparent construct state with the pronoun suffixes of the first and second persons is really euphonic. The suffixes of the third person are more usually attached to the construct; the converse holds good of the suffixes of the first and second persons. Euphony comes into play here: four short syllables cannot stand together, so that we may have either kirtbo or kirtbo, just as we may have *tukmatu* or *tukumtu*.

The suffix of the first person singular is -a, or more generally -ya, when the root terminates in a vowel, or has the case-endings, especially after i; e.g. abu-a "my father," galli-ya "my servants." I-a (-ya) might become ai in Assyrian (see p. 35); hence we find gabrai "my rivals." After a consonant -i is used; e.g. ab-i "my father," ısmanci "my army," bint-i "my daughter," katt-i "my hand," rama-i "myself," assat-i "my wife." Surd roots doubled their final letter, as ımm-i "my mother." Sometimes, in
the Babylonian inscriptions, -a takes the place of -î, as in ab-a “my father,” be’el-a “my lord.” With the dual î is employed: e.g. katî-i “my hands.”

When the noun ends in d, dh, t, s, z, ts, the third person suffix becomes šu, ša, etc., e.g. khirît-šu “its ditch” (for khirît-su), bit-šu “his house.” Still more frequently, the last letter of the noun is assimilated to the š of the suffix; e.g. khirîš-šu, biš-šu, rupus-su “its breadth” (from rupus), libnas-šu (from libnat). As elsewhere, the reduplication may be dropped, so that we get khirišu, bišu, rupusu, rakhasu (by the side of rakheti-su) “his flood,” etc.

The plural of masculine nouns attaches the suffix to the plural-ending -i; e.g. kharri-su “its hollows.” Following this analogy, the plural in -ānu annexed the pronoun to the oblique case; e.g. sarrâni-su “his king’s,” instead of sarrânu-su. Compare in Arabic the insertion of ʾ after a word ending in jesma, in the case of watela (when the next word begins with an elif conjunction). Sometimes the pronoun was affixed to the construct -ān: in this case the nasal was according to rule assimilated to the next letter; thus gabrâ-su (for gabrâs-su) “his rivals,” risâ-su (for risâs-su) “his heads.”

In the later period of the language attu, answering to the Hebrew עָלָה, Aramaic āth, Arabic ‘iyyâ, and used in the same way, makes its appearance, with the personal suffixes attached superfluously. The inscriptions mostly afford examples of the first person only: e.g. attuʾu-a abû-a “to me (was) my father,” zir-ya attû-a “my own race” (“my race (which is) mine,” “mon père a moi”), in Hebrew עָלָה.¹

¹ Assur-bani-pal uses attû exactly as in Hebrew to mark the accusative; thus, sa la iptailakhu abî-ya va attû-a, “who revere not my fathers and me.”
We find also attū-ni, attū-ownu; and the other persons might be restored, attū-ca, attū-ci, attū-su, etc. See p. 15.

THE NUMERALS.

These have two forms, masculine and feminine, as in the other Semitic tongues, and show the same peculiarity of using the masculine of the numerals from 3 to 10 with feminine nouns and the feminine of the numerals with masculine nouns. Originally the numerals seem to have been abstract substantives, like τετάρας, and could take either a masculine or a feminine form. The feminine was most commonly employed, and so became associated with nouns of the predominant masculine gender. In Ṣthiopic (and vulgar Arabic) the feminine is almost exclusively used.

The forms of the Semitic numerals early became fossilised, and hence are almost identical in the various dialects. Notwithstanding this, the Assyrian cardinal-numbers are more closely connected with the Hebrew than with those of the cognate languages. Estin “one” is found in the Hebrew אוח; there are no traces of the Ṣthiopic cal’a “two”; and the numeral for “six,” like Hebrew, omits the dental, which appears in Arabic and Ṣthiopic, while the Aramaic consonantal changes in פ״ד, etc., find no place in Assyrian.

The cardinals are as follows.—

**Masculine.**

1. akhadu, khad-u or khidu, edu, estin
2. sane’e, san’u, sin’u
3. salsutu, salsatu

**Feminine.**

1. ikhit, ikhtu (for ikhidtu)
2. sanetu
3. salsu

**Hebrew.**

אוח, אוחא
פ״ד, פ״ת
ש״ד, ש״ת
MASCULINE.  
4. irbittu, riba'atu  
5. khamistu, khamiltu  
6. sisatu  
7. sibittu, sibitu  
8. [samnatu]  
9. [tisittu]  
10. esirtu, esrit, eserit  
15. khamisserit (for khamis esrit)  

FEMININE.  
4. arba'i, irba'i  
5. khamesa, khansa  
6. sisu, sis  
7. sib'u, siba  
8. samna  
9. [tis'u]  
10. esir, esru  

HEBREW.  
4. עברה, עברה  
5. שלמה, שלמה  
6. מָשָׁה, מָשָׁה  
7. שָׁם, שָׁם  
8. סמנאה  

The words in brackets have not yet been found in the inscriptions. Generally the cardinals are denoted by symbols; “one” is an upright wedge, “two” two wedges, and so on. “Ten” is expressed by <; 11 by <1; 20 by <<, and so on.

The masculine numeral estin is important as throwing light upon the Hebrew יָנָה in 11, which does not appear in the cognate languages. Besides akhdu, a theme khad seems to exist, which shows itself in the adverb edis “only,” edis-su “by himself.” We also have instances in which the Accadian id “one” is used, apparently with the value of khad or ed, as both masculine and feminine, singular and plural. Now kh and e are interchangeable (see pp. 28, 29) in Assyrian, especially in the case of foreign words, and the Semite often tried to represent the rough Turanian vocalisation at the beginning of an Accadian vocable by the guttural

1 Ṣḥ in Ṣthiopic.
kh (as in Idiklat, (cp) ). 1 I'd and kat in Accadian meant "hand" primarily, so that we are taken back to the time when the savage signified "one" by holding up his hand. As in Hebrew and Arabic, irba' interchanges with reba'. The form khamisserit shows that the Assyrian could contract its numerals like vulgar Arabic, or New-Syriac. 2

The origin of the Semitic cardinal numbers is a matter of some difficulty. Ewald and others, struck by the superficial resemblance of one or two, shēsh, sheba', etc., to the corresponding Aryan numerals, have imagined common roots. But this proceeds upon the assumption of the common parentage of the two families of speech; and even were this granted, we should have no Grimm's Law upon which to base our comparisons. Moreover, there are several numerals which are confessedly unlike in the two classes of languages; and the resemblances in the case of those which are most like are not greater than between shēsh and the Basque sei, or irba and the Mongol durban. Nothing, again, is more usual among savage tribes than to adopt different roots at different times to express the same numerals. Thus in English we have "first," "second," "ace," "tray"; 3 and among the Semitic languages themselves, the only trace which ᾳthiopic presents of the ordinary numeral for "two" is in the words sanuy and sānet, while it has taken another root, cal'a "to divide," to express the idea of duality. The same holds good of estin and 'ashtē. The whole theory, however, has been disposed of by an analysis of the Aryan numerals, which

demonstrates that the original forms of the numbers were widely different from those required to bring them into relationship with the Semitic. Thus "six" (which a similar analysis applied to the Semitic languages shows was primarily shadash in them) had originally a guttural at the beginning of the word, now preserved only in the Zend kshvās. Professor Goldstücker, taking this word as the starting-point of his investigations, has obtained the following results from an analysis of the numerals. "One" is the demonstrative pronoun "he"; 2 is "diversity" (ḥšdš, ḍṣ̌ḍ-, šsr-); 3="that which goes beyond" (root ṭḥr, whence ṭrans, through, etc.); 4="and three," i.e. "1+3" (ḥd-tšr); 5="coming after" (p̣n-č̣n, q̣ṇṣ̌q̣ṣ̌); 6="four," i.e. "(2) and 4" (kṣ̌ṣ̌ṿṣ̌ for ḳḥẉṛ); 7="following" (šp̣ṭ̣ṣ̌n, ġp̣ẉ, etc.); 8="two fours" (dual ašṭ̣ṇu, ḍṣ̣̌ṭ̣ņ̣ẉ, with prothetic ā, o); 9="that which comes after" (same root as ṇṿnṣ, ṇṿnṣ); 10="2+8" (ḍ̣ṣ̌ṣ̣̌ṇ, ḍ̣ṣ̌ṣ̣̌ṃ).

These results are in full accordance with the facts presented by the Turanian and Allophylian languages generally, and, in short, by all those modern savage dialects which still bear on their surface, unobscured by decay, the primitive machinery of language and calculation. Analogy would lead us to infer that the Semitic tongues formed no exception to this mode of forming numbers, which, so far as it can be analysed, is found to be universal. Calculation is an art slowly acquired; many modern savages cannot count beyond "two" or "three," and we find that this was the case with the ancestors of the highly-gifted Aryan race itself. Once acquired, however, calculation is continually needed: no words are more used than those which denote the numerals;
and consequently no words are more liable to be contracted, changed, and, in short, to undergo all the phenomena of phonetic decay. If we apply this test to the Semitic tongues, we shall find that they fully submit to it. Not to speak of instances like *khamisserit*, or vulgar Arabic *sette* "six," a more pertinent example would be *shesh* for *shadash*. The Aramaic *tērin* shows how an often-repeated word could change its primitive form, and the *Æ*thiopic *cal'a* and Assyrian *estin* remind us of the possibility of co-existing roots. Then another element has to be taken into consideration. We have seen how many words, not to speak of an alphabet, the Semites could borrow from their Turanian neighbours, more especially words like *sabar* "copper" which signified objects communicated by the civilized Accadian to the rude Bedouin tribes. Now the Accadians had attained a high degree of knowledge of arithmetic and astrology; the great libraries of Huru and Senkereh, formed in the sixteenth century B.C., contained tablets of square and cube roots, a developed sexagesimal system, observations of eclipses, and a symbolic numeration. We may therefore expect to find among Semitic loan-words Turanian numerals. Comparative instances among other nations warrant, I think, the following analysis of the Semitic numerals.

*Akhadu*, found in Assyrian in *akhadi*—*akhadi* "the one—the other," has already in historic times undergone contraction in the feminine *ikhitu*, *akhat* for *ikhidtu*. The stronger masculine *a* has been weakened into the feminine *-i*, and this has affected both vowels, according to the vowel-harmony of all savage people. Now by the side of *akhad* we have Aramaic and Targumic *khad*, and Assyrian *çd(ê)* and
khad, represented by the Accadian ‘id (and kat) "one" or "hand." It is difficult not to see here a Semitic modification of the Turanian numeral, with the prosthetic demonstrative vowel prefixed in some cases. The other synonyme of "one" which is found in Assyrian and Hebrew is more difficult to resolve. Estin (or with the case-ending estinu) compared with ashtē, has n servile, like tordinnu, etc. Hence we get estu as the original word, curiously like the preposition estu. Now this we shall see is from the Accadian es "house," 1 whence Assyrian esu’u, esu, "house," "door," ussu, estu, "foundation." 2 Can it be also the origin of estin, as the "foundation" or root of all numbers? In sh’nai we are again met by an easily-recognized contraction in the feminine. This numeral also presents us with an undoubted instance of the prosthetic vowel in the Arabic ʻithnain; 3 while Aramaic has extended the change of š into t to a change of n into r, and has irregularly formed the plural of the feminine (tar-tain) by adding the plural-ending to the feminine-termination (like Assyrian forms in -tān). Sh’naim is clearly "the two

1 The Accadian es is itself resolvable into e "house" (literally "the hollow") and is or is "heap," like mes "many," from me "multitude," and is "heap."

2 The same borrowed root has produced the Hebrew לשב and Arabic āšīwā (P). An Accadian synonyme of Anu is Susrū, which is translated ussuru "the founder," ru and ṭa being formatives in Accadian, as in rumu and ẓanosu "high," zīu, sīqū, and ṣīgaru "heaven," ṣa and ṣara, "king," ḍudḥatu and ḍadhrū "the deviser" (a title of the Babylonian Sargon).

3 This prosthetic vowel meets us in most of the numerals, and is not to be confounded with the nominal vowel-prefix (p. 110). It is the demonstrative breathing prefixed in vulgar pronunciation to facilitate the pronunciation of common words. So, according to Wetzelein, the Bedouin pronounces k-balatim ordinarily as k-balait, when in the Annexion as kalkab; and compare Greek forms like ὄκλαθα, ἀμφρω, Ὀλυμπως, Ὁλυμπως (root ἄπο) or the Romance estar, etc. (Curtius, Grundzüge d. Griech. Etymol., pp. 650-5).
folds,” from  יָנָל “to bend” or “fold.” Shalosh has become sōs-t in Amharic, and Coptic gives us somn(t), which reminds us of  שִׁמְנָה “eight.” The root has been supposed to be סַלֵע: compare sulu “a heap,” “multitude.” Arba‘ or reba‘ may have the prosthetic a: in this case the root may be לְבָר “to grow” or “increase.” As, however, the Coptic ‘fstu “four” is plainly 5—1, from tu “five” and wa “one,” so may arba‘ be the remains of some kind of similar composition. Khamis has lost its initial guttural in the Amharic aumis-t, and has changed it into s in the Berber summus. Assyrian shows the varying forms khamiltu and khasa. Here the final sibilant would be original, as well as a medial m; the initial was probably a strong guttural, successively weakened to kh, s, and ar. This conducts us to יָנָא “the fist,” “five” being expressed in most languages by some word meaning “hand” (with its five fingers). The next two or three numbers after 5 would be, according to the analogy of other languages, compounded out of two preceding numerals; and accordingly we find the names of 6, 7, and 8 all beginning with s. This raises the presumption that we may here find either sh‘nai or shalosh. Most of the Allo- phylian tongues, however, form 6 not by means of 2, but of 1 or more generally 3; and the fact that the Semitic dialects give three successive numerals with an initial s, excludes the employment of sh‘nai. Moreover, the most natural way of forming “six” was by saying “three-three.” We have already seen that the more primitive form of šēš was shادash, as in Arabic and Ḥethiopic, or Berber sedis, Amharic.

1 So the Malay lima “hand” = 5; the Zulus call 6 esesanta “finish hand;” with the Tamanacs of the Orinoco amgnaitone “whole hand” is 5.
Sedis-t. Coptic has reduced the original word to sou. If shalshal were the primary form of shalosh, repeated to express number, like the plurals of Allophylian languages, the only part of the word used in composition would be shal. D and l were interchangeable in old Semitic (as in סָה and שָלֹשׁ, דָל and לָל); hence sad-sad, contracted into sadas "six." To distinguish it from 3, the dental was retained in 6, the labial in 3.\(^1\) If our theory be right, we ought to detect "four" in the termination of the name of 7. And this we do in sheba "seven," where the final ba unmistakably refers us to arba. R throughout the Semitic tongues has a tendency to interchange with e on the one side, and a long vowel on the other. Both of these may be shortened, as in Assyrian t for e, and Dimasku by the side of מנדב (see p. 111). The l of sal(as) had already been assimilated to r and its representatives. In Coptic, 7 is shasf for shasft, in which ‘fu “four” is recognizable by the side of shas (shalas) “three.” This is better than to make shasf=6+1, especially as 6 is sou. Sh’moneh again discovers sal(as): it ought to be compounded with khamis. Now the consonants of sh’moneh, besides the fluctuations of the initial between s and t, shown also by the other numerals, are not quite fixed, even in the historic period. In Markhes van “the 8th month” (in Assyrian arakh samna), the word has been shortened to מָשַו; and in Berber (tem) the final nasal has been lost altogether, the sibilant becoming t as in thanat “two.” Khamis, we saw above, has lost the guttural in Amharic, and kh is very frequently dropped in Assyrian, or replaced by a vocalic e

\(^1\) So in Accadian essha=3, as=6; and, according to Professor Schott, 6 in the Ural-Altaic languages is expressed by a modification of 3.
(see p. 29). The final ū of the masculine shows that the word was originally generally pronounced with a final t; hence we may expect some change in the s. S became l (through r) in Assyrian, and a comparison of tēlēn or pēbant'rin and the Ṣ Ethiopic dēnt (for dēlt) would seem to show that l and r once, before a dental, regularly became n. That this was the case with the numerals is made likely by the Coptic somnt “three,” which would stand for solst (ol passing into -om, or rather ou, before n); and just as somnt = solst, so would shmon(t) = shmes(t), m being preserved by the intervening vowel. Shal, as we saw before, would have already become sho. Following still the analogy of other languages, 9 ought to be 10—1. In tésha‘ we have, I believe, khad (ed') or est(u), more probably est(u). Esā‘ points to a long initial syllable, such as e. This gives us the first two radicals of eser “ten.” R, especially when final, has an intimate relation to e in the Semitic languages; Arabic grammarians explain e by r combined with a guttural. Hence esā‘ may well stand for eser. The last word is from ṚN (whence the Assyrian god Ussuru) “to bind together,” referring to the combination of the two hands. Mēkah is obscure: it has been derived from māim “water,” or from the Arabic ma‘i “to be wide.” Its origin, however, is best explained by the Accadian mih, which is interpreted “assembly” (kālu), “mass” (tamsu), and “herd” (ram-outu). Eloph is “a head of cattle.”

The only ordinals hitherto found in the inscriptions are ristānu “first” (Hebrew rishōn) and salsa “third,” formed like the ordinals in Hebrew (shēnî, etc.). Dr. Oppert restores the other Assyrian ordinals, sahu, riba‘u, khansa, etc.
A formation in yānu similar to ristānu was used to express relations of time: thus saniyānu “the second time,” salseyānu “the third time.”

Fractions were formed as in Hebrew (khomesh, etc.) and Arabic by the form sucum or suunu. Thus we find sunnu “one half,” sulsu “a third,” sumunu “an eighth,” susu “a sixth.” Susu is also used for “a sixtieth,” whence the sóssos of Berosus, which we may translate “a minute.” Dr. Oppert restores the other fractions rub’u “a fourth,” khunu “a fifth,” sub’u “a seventh,” tus’u “a ninth,” uru “a tenth.” The Babylonians expressed their fractions with a denominator of 60. Thus 20, 40\(\frac{1}{6}\)=20\(\frac{1}{6}\). This discovery is due to Dr. Oppert. Besides sulsu, the Assyrians also used sussānu for “a third,” from the Accadian sussana. Sinibu was \(\frac{2}{3}\), from the Accadian sanabi (“forty”), and parapu was \(\frac{1}{3}\), apparently also Accadian, though kigisili seems to have been the usual term for the fraction in that language. Susu, meaning 60, was also Accadian. Baru or māsu was \(\frac{1}{6}\). According to Abydenus a sarus=3600 years, a nerus=600, and a sossus=60. In the inscriptions a ner is denoted by a wedge (\(\text{-}60\)) followed by the symbol of 10. All this notation, together with the symbols which expressed it, was derived from the Accadians.

Among the indefinite numerals may be reckoned mahdutu “much” (לך), calu, oulat, “all” (לך), gabbu “all,” gimru “the whole” (לך), cabittu “much” (לך). “Repetition” is expressed by sanutu (sanitu in Achemenian, e.g. saniti salsa “the third time”) and rubbu. “Anew” is generally ana essuti.

The measures of length were \(\frac{1}{3}\) inch=\(\frac{1}{6}\) of an ‘ammu, 6
‘ammi ("cubits") = 1 canu (חַנֻ), 2 cani = 1 sa or riğu, 60 sa = 1 sus, 30 susi = 1 kasbu or "day's journey." Time was divided into 6 kasbd(mi) of the day and 6 of the night, a kasbu being = 2 hours. The year contained 12 months of 30 days each, together with an intercalary Ve-Adar. At the end of certain cycles there were also a second Nisan and a second Elul. According to the lunar division, the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th were days of "rest" (sulum), on which certain works were forbidden; and the two lunations were divided each into three periods of 5 days, the 19th ending the first period of the 2nd lunation.

The tonnage of ships was reckoned by the gurrü; thus we have ships of 15 and 60 gurru.

According to Dr. Hincks, the iku was = 4/5 grains, 30 iki = 1 cib (129 grs.), 60 cibi = 1 maneh (mano), 60 manehs = 1 heavy talent (bīlātu) (950,040 grs.). Half a talent, or a light talent (of 30 manehs), was the biru or tsiptu (479,520 grs.). The talent was according to the standard either of Assyria ("the royal talent" or "the talent of the country") or of Carchemish. Money was weighed, and there was a different talent for gold and for silver.

For measures of capacity the Assyrians possessed the lagit or log of 3 standards, which contained respectively 10, 9, and 8 subdivisions called ka. Land and grain were equally measured by this lagit (tuv), whose fractional parts are given as the baru (or "half"), the aru, and the arrat. The arrat was also a measure divided into the "baru of wood," and the "baru of stone," and the latter into ka.
THE PREPOSITIONS.

These are generally shortened roots; and, not being part of the stock of the primitive Semitic speech, naturally differ in the different dialects, which have set apart various substantives more or less stereotyped to express the relations of the several parts of a sentence.

In Assyrian the simple prepositions are: — ana “to,” “for”; ina “in,” “by,“ “with” (instrumental); inna, “in”; innannu, “from”; itti “along with;” ultu or istu “from”; adi “up to”; ela “over”; eli “upon”; elan or illan “beyond”; asu “in,” “by,” “on account of”; cuv “instead of”; ullanu “before”; ullanumma “upon”; illamu “before”; tiq “behind,” “from,” “of”; pan “before”; sa “of”; baliv, balu, “without”; ema “around,” “over”; elat “except”; dikhi “opposite”; nir “below,” “near,” “against”; orti “against”; sep “below”; ‘ulli “among”; mikhrit “among”; ci-la “without”; saytu, cibit, “by the help of”; šikharti “throughout”; nemidu “towards”; arci “after”; tsir “against,” “upon”; illu “upon”; birid and cirib, kirib, “within”; akhar “behind”; makhri “before”; ci and ci pi “according to (the mouth)” ; cima, tuma, “like”; limet, li, “near”; sar (im) “from”; ana sar “to.” Most of these are still used as mere substantives, as sep “foot,” nir “foot,” mikhrit “presence,” tik “rear,” some being adjectives, as tsiru “supreme,” “above,” and one, sa, the relative. Itti, ci, adi, and eli agree with the Hebrew; but Ewald’s explanation of the final -i from the final ן of the root will not hold, as the Assyrian in that case would be -u. It can hardly be the plural, again, but, as in arci, will be a case-ending, like li and
bi in Arabic. 'Adi stands for edî, like agu and egu. Cum is
cumu “heap.” 'Assu is rare, and is apparently of Accadian
origin. 'Ina and 'ana, with their lengthened forms inna and
anna (?), are objective cases of the old nouns 'inu and 'anu,
inna being identical with the Hebrew יִנְעָל from הבּלָל. 2 In
ultu or istu the case-ending is abnormally retained (so assu).
Ultu is formed from the Pael, istu from the Kal, of עָלָף,
עה, perhaps=ה, tu being the feminine suffix. 3 Ullu, ullah
are rather from the Pael of יִלָע, than from the
pronoun 'ullu; so also 'illamu (for elamu) and elat. Noru
is properly “yoke,” sopu “foot,” saptu “lip.” As in the
cognate languages, ci is generally used instead of cima; we
also find sometimes li, an, el, and it (see p. 10). Before a
vowel the final vowel of the preposition is rarely elided, as in
ult-ulla (“from that”) = “from old time,” ad-usse “to the
foundations.”

Attu, the Hebrew עָלָף, with the accusative of the pronoun,
is found only in the later period, and bears witness to the
Aramaizing of the language.

The compound prepositions are numerous. Thus we meet
with ina cirib “in the midst of”; ina libbi “in the midst
of”; ana itti “to be with”; ultu panu “from before”; ultu
criib, ultu libbi, “from the midst of”; ina pan “from be-
fore”; ina kuki “in front of”; ina bibil, ina biblat, bibil,
biblot, “in the midst of”; ina khatstsi “in the time, presence of”; ina nirib, nirib, “near”; ina eli “above”; ina la “for want of”; ana la “not to be”; ina tsat “after”; ana orti “to the presence of”; ana sar “to”; lapan, lapani, “from,” “before”; ina anni “at this (time)”; ina adi dhemi “by command of.”

Lapani is hardly identical with the Hebrew קָלָל, as the preposition is li, not la; and we cannot assume a change of vowel, such as we have in Hebrew lo (= la-hu; so Ἐθιοπικ la). Li, however, is contracted from limet, limu (לח). From the same root comes lamu “a clay-tablet,” and in this way I would explain lam or lav in an inscription of Assur-izir-pal, where we read lav samsi napakhi “close upon sunrise.” From this lav we get la in lapan.

THE INTERJECTIONS.

Of these I have only noticed ‘a “O,” and ninu “behold,” ninu-su “behold him.” We may add also adu “now,” “thus.”

THE ADVERBS.

These, like the prepositions, are fossilised noun-cases. Generally the accusative is the case used, as in Ἐθιοπικ and Arabic. Thus we have béla “copiously,” bassa “as rubbish,” pala “amply,” and most adverbs of place and time. The (original) mimmination is also found (as in Hebrew and Arabic). Dr. Oppert quotes cusvan “in a covert manner,” rub’am “greatly,” cainam “strongly.” Rarely the second case is employed instead of the third; e.g. batstsi “in ruin,”
makhri “before,” arcī “afterwards.” The mimmination is also found here; e.g. labirim(ma) “of old (and),” “through decay (and),” by the side of labaris.

The most common mode of forming the adverb in Assyrian is by the termination is. Dr. Oppert has happily explained this by the contracted third personal pronoun attached to the second case, which is here used as though a preposition had preceded. This actually appears in some rare cases, e.g. ana daris (see further on). Analogous are the Æthiopic adverbs formed by the third pronoun suffix, like kadim-ū “first,” cantū “in vain.” Dr. Oppert refers also to the Hebrew יְלַי. Everywhere the inscriptions offer us words like rabis “greatly,” essis “strongly,” namris “brightly,” abubis “like a whirlwind,” naulis “completely,” elis “above,” saplis “below,” cacabis “like a star.” Sometimes the adverbial termination is attached to the plural in -an; thus tilanis “in heaps,” khursanis “completely,” sadanis “like mountains.” In the last case, as often elsewhere, the adverbs preserve old forms which have been lost in the noun.

The most common adverbs of place and time are as follows:—Umma “thus,” “that”; as-umma, ya-umma, and umma . . . la, “never”; umma assu “because”; allu, alla, alla-sa, “then,” “afterwards”; sa, ci-sa, “when”; eninna “again”; arcī “afterwards”; adi “till”; sis “as of old”; teatis “in future”; ina yumi suma “at that time”; makhri, panama “formerly”; matema “in times past”; lu-mahdu, lu-maḏ, “much”; sanumma, sanamma, “in a foreign land,” “elsewhere”; ciḥam “thus”; calama “of all kinds”; enuwa “at that time,” “when”; ulti ulla and ullana “from that time,” “from of old”; udina “at the same time.”
Alla and alla-sa are only found in the Achaemenian period. So also is 'aganna (from 'aga) "here."

Lumadu (so sanumma) is like the Arabic adverbs which end with -u.

THE CONJUNCTIONS.

U and vâ "and" ("et"), vâ "and" ("que"); 'à "or"; mā "for," "and"; ai "not" (with the imperative or pre-
cative); lû "whether," "thus" (verbal prefix of past time);
ô, ô, "when," "while," "if"; sâ "when," "because,
"that"; lâ "not"; ul "not" (only with verbs, except in the
Achaemenian period); inu "behold," "now"; mî "also";
mî "that" (for umma); ina matima "in any case"; sî matima
"of what place?"; im "if"; im matima "if at all"; adi-sa,
adî-si-sa, "in so far as"; assu "when"; summa "thus,
"when"; ôî "as"; libbu-sa "just as."

Adi-si-sa and libbu-sa belong to the Achaemenian inscrip-
tions.

After verbs û is sometimes found instead of vâ, especially
if the vowel u has gone before (see p. 27).

1 The two negatives are derived from the demonstrative 'ullu, 'ulla.
The first half of the word, being the more emphatic and full of meaning,
was appropriated to the verbs, and (as in Hebrew) had a prohibitive
force; the second part of the word was conjoined with the noun, where
the negative was less clearly brought out.
THE SYNTAX.

Speaking generally, the syntax of the Assyrian language agrees with that of the other Semitic dialects.

OF THE NOUN.

In the oldest inscriptions, and in a large proportion of those belonging to the later Assyrian period, the case-endings are for the most part carefully observed, -u as nominative, -i as genitive, and -a as accusative. Even in later Assyrian, however, -u is sometimes used for the accusative, and even -a for the nominative; e.g. Assur-bani-pal has libba-sunu nominative. So in Egyptian Arabic -ix is found in the accusative, and -aix in the nominative, and -i for all cases in the status constructus. Similarly the Bedouins use -ix and -a to prevent the concourse of consonants, and use -a for all the cases before plural-suffixes. 

Tanwin occurs in poetry when it cannot be used in prose. Compare Italian loro from illorum, and the Persian animate plural -añ originally a genitive.

The mimmation, especially frequent in Babylonian, was purely euphonic, and descended from a period in which none of the cases ended in an open vowel.

In the Babylonian the cases are all confused more or less with one another, and have ceased to express fully their flexional meaning. We even find bit sarru "house of the king," dumku in the accusative, libba in the nominative.

The accusative follows a verb. The genitive is used after a governing noun or a preposition, which is merely an old worn substantive.
The *status constructus* is carefully observed. Before a governed noun the case-ending is dropped. Cases like *rabbi bitu* are plural. Only expressions which have come to be used as compound prepositions are excepted; e.g. *ina tukulti* for *ina tuklat* (like *eli, adi*).\(^1\) But even this exception does not occur in the oldest period. Anomalies, like *bcurti Anuv* "eldest daughter of Anu," are exceedingly rare. Conversely, when several short syllables come together, the *status constructus* is found after a preposition without a genitive; thus, *ana gurunti* by the side of *ana gurunte* (but see p. 30). The short final *i* was peculiarly liable to be lost in pronunciation as its case-meaning became weakened. A word is sometimes defectively written when the next word begins with the same vowel, the two really coalescing, as is probably the case in *bcurti Anuv* above.

The old plural-termination *-an* very frequently retained the case-ending *-i* in the *status constructus*, partly from a confusion with the contracted, but more usual, plural in *-i*, and partly because *-i* is a weakening of *-a*, the original mark of the object. It must be remembered that the case-endings are older than the *status constructus*, hence we may find them sometimes anomalously retained when the *status constructus* had come to imply the loss of them in the first noun, as in Hebrew *yod compaginis*, or the Ethiopic accusative-ending *-a*. Compare too the pronoun-suffixes.

The first noun may be used without the case-endings before an adjective, when the latter is employed as a substantive:

\(^1\) This short *i* had so far lost its original flexional signification as to be regarded as simply euphonic (see p. 153). It must also be remembered that in many cases the *i* is a mark of the plural, and that the euphonic *i* is only found after (*ài)tu.
e.g. *ipparu asar la-hāri* "they fled to (a place of the unfruitful＝) the desert," *dhudat la-hāri paskātī* "crooked desert morasses."

The *nomen agentis* is used like any other substantive when in *regimine*.

The adjective always follows the substantive, both having the case-terminations; e.g. *sarru rabbu* "the great king."

When the substantive has a pronoun suffixed, the adjective still retains the case-ending; e.g. *kat-su dannatu* "his strong hand."

Abstracts are rare; hence a substantive expressing the possessor or subject is followed by another substantive expressing the attribute; e.g. *bel-khiddi* ("the lord of the rebellion"＝) "a rebel"; *bel ade* ("lord of homage"＝) "a subject"; *nis rucubi* ("the man of chariots"＝) "the charioteers"; or *sarruti-su sa Arrame* "his royal city of Arramū."

These compounds have often become so closely united, that when the plural is required, it is sufficient to attach the plural-termination to the second part of the compound only. They may be still further compounded by prefixing the negative particle, as *Surri la-bel-caššu* "Surri, a usurper."

The adjective agrees with the gender of its substantive. Sometimes, however, the substantive is of two genders; e.g. *babātu rabbatu* and *babī rabbī* "the great gates." Where the substantive has not the feminine-ending in the singular, the gender can only be determined by the accompanying adjective, which must always have the appropriate termination.

The adjective in certain rare cases may precede its noun: in this case the case-endings are dropped; thus *halicet idi*
gamarri "marching bands of troops." Really, however, it is here a substantive in the status constructus. If the noun is dual, the adjective is plural: e.g. halicut ida-su "his marching bands."

To supply the want of abstract adjectives a substantive in the genitive is often found; as hunut simi mahdi ("furniture of great price") = "costly furniture."

There are no special forms for the comparative or superlative. They are expressed by the positive with istu and ina: e.g. rabu ina ili Uramazda "Ormuzd is the greatest of the gods" ("great among the gods is Ormuzd"). The superlative may also be represented by a repetition of the adjective; e.g. bilat mahda-mahda "tribute very abundant," asar dandanti "a very strong place" (see p. 107).

Two substantives may be placed in apposition (the substantive verb being omitted) so as to qualify one another. In this case both have the case-endings: e.g. bilutu Assur "the lordship of Assyria" ("Assyria as a lordship"); pulkhu adiru melam Assur "exceeding fear of the attack of Assur;" abni khipisti sad Khamani pil-su usatriša "stones dug from Mount Amanus, the choice of it, I arranged."

A few nouns are collective in signification, (1) those which denote an individual out of a class, as ruрубu for ruçubi "chariots"; (2) feminine abstracts as lībittu (lībintu) "bricks"; and (3) measures and other arithmetical terms, as seri mana "20 maneha."

Nisu ("man") in the sense of "every one" is often used in this collective way; e.g. nis sa mat Sukhi ana mat Assuri la ilicuni," none of the Sukhi had gone to Assyria."

The plural is used as in Hebrew to express extension of
space or time and their parts, e.g. *mē* "water," *pānī* "face," *cīrī* "the interior" (as a permanent state).

The genitive often expresses the object as well as the subject; e.g. *ṣīrīr sumī-su* "the memory of his name," *sallat ērī* "the spoil from the cities."

Geographical names replace apposition by the genitive; e.g. *mat Dimaski* "the land of Damascus." When the *status constructus* is replaced by *sā* ("of"), the first noun retains the case-endings: thus *kharīta sa ēr-ya* "the ditch of my city." Rarely a feminine plural after a preposition may have the case-ending -i before the following noun (as though it had become a compound preposition); e.g. *ana taprātī cissat nīsī* "for the delight of multitudes of men." Compare *yōd compagnis* in Hebrew.

As in *ippiarsu asār* "they fled to a place," an accusative of motion may follow the verb without a preposition; this is regularly the accusative, but the second case is sometimes found instead (as in the *status constructus*); e.g. *takhāzi ītsā* "he went forth to battle."

The later Aramaising stage of the language is marked by an increasing use of prepositions; thus *ana* becomes, like Aramaic י, a mark of the accusative; e.g. at Behistun *aducu ana Gumātāv* "I had killed Gomates."

Just as the prepositions are old accusative cases, standing for the most part in the *status constructus*, so substantives may be used absolutely as accusatives of limitation: e.g. *illiciu resut* "they went ahead," by the side of *sa ana resuti sulucu."

**OF THE NUMERALS.**

As in the other Semitic languages, the cardinals from 3 to
10 use the masculine with feminine nouns, and the feminine terminations with masculine nouns; e.g. *ciprātu irbaʿi* "the four regions," *elip khamis gurri* "a ship of 5 tons." This rule is rarely transgressed, as in *tupukatu irbittu* "the 4 races."

The cardinal (in the plural) may be placed before a following noun in the genitive in the place of the ordinal; the second noun being in the singular; e.g. *ina salei garri-ya* "in my third campaign."

The plural masculine follows all the numerals (except in the case of arithmetical terms, measures, etc., when the singular is used) (so 2 Kings ii. 16); e.g. *esritu alpi* "20 oxen"; but *esri mana* "20 manehs."

The measures are often preceded by the preposition *ina*, followed by the sign of unity: e.g. CC *in I. ammi* "200 cubits," which Dr. Oppert has well explained as meaning 200 × 1 ("by 1").

In dates, first comes the day, then the month, then the year, each followed by the numeral, and preceded in many cases by *ina*.

"About" with a numeral is expressed by *istu*; thus *ina elippi sa ina khuli istu XX. i(ḏi)ḥulā-ni ina er Kharidi nahra Purat lu etsibir," "in ships, which on the sand about 20 in number were drawn up in Kharid, the Euphrates I crossed."

**OF THE PRONOUNS.**

The personal pronouns are used by themselves to express the substantive verb; e.g. *anacu sarru* "I (am) the king," *summa ina mati-ya sunu* "when they (were) in my country."

Occasionally the personal pronouns are found attached to
a noun in the sense of the demonstratives, though really in
apposition; e.g. ina cito babi sinati “in the niches of these
gates” (literally “gates even them”), khuspa-sū olim sa ina
yumi pani usarbi “that masonry above what (it was) in
former days I enlarged.” So usamkhar-ca cēta “I capture
thee, even thee.”

The third personal pronouns singular and plural may
stand at the beginning of a sentence absolutely, to call
attention to the subject of the clause: as sū ci pi’i
annimma istanappara unma “he, according to my dictation,
sent word that;” sū asardu cabtu “he, the glorious chief;”
sū Khasaki’ahu pulkhi melamme belutti-yä iskhupu-su “him
Hezekiah, the fears of the approach of my lordship over-
whelmed him;” sū Elamû ala . . . sanamma ebus-su “he,
the Elamite another city built.” So also yāti.

The possessive pronouns with the substantive verb are
replaced by the personal pronouns with sli preceded by ana
and ina.

When it is required to give emphasis to the third personal
pronoun plural, a substantive form sunuti or sunut (sinati,
sinat) is used, which is not attached as a suffix to the verb,
and accordingly sometimes stands before it; e.g. usalic sunuti
“I made them go,” sinati birid sallat-xazati ultil “them
within the image-gallery I placed,” paldhit sunuti icsud “he
took them alive,” tsadi sunuti . . . uratti “the soldiers, even
them (=those soldiers), I threw down,” where the emphasis
is laid upon the object. Sāsnu sometimes takes the place of
sunuti; e.g. sāsnu adi nisi-sunu . . . ashlu “them and their
men I carried off.” So sāsu and sāsa in the singular.

The verbal suffixes may be either in the dative or the
accusative: e.g. usušidu-ni "they caused to be brought to me," ana šebis Bit-Saggadhu nasa-nni liúb-i "my heart is raising me to build Bit-Saggadhu."

The pronominal suffixes may be regarded as independent nouns requiring the status constructus, or as simple adjectives. ¹ Euphony has much to do in determining this question, and the suffixes of the first and second persons are generally used with the case-endings (the accusative excepted). Speaking generally, the second case-ending is very rarely dropped. The masculine plural in -ut is employed without the case-endings of the nominative and accusative, monosyllabic roots excepted. The singular ut drops the case-endings of the nominative and accusative, and if the second syllable is long (as in ciḏinnu), of the genitive also. The feminine plural (ātu) always retains all three case-endings, unless the first two syllables are short, or the last radical is doubled, when the accusative case-ending may be omitted. Itu, etu, also retain all the case-endings. So does the feminine singular (ātu), except in the case of monosyllables and roots derived from verbs iyiyi, which always drop -u, generally -a, and very often -i. The plural in ān always drops the terminations; monosyllables excepted, which retain -i. Ordinary triliterals retain -i, generally drop -u (which, if retained, is lengthened), and always drop -a, unless the noun is used as a preposition, when a is lengthened in Assyrian (e.g. cišitassu,

¹ Rather, perhaps, in apposition. It is not quite correct to say that the pronoun suffixes of the first and second persons are independent nouns, and the apparent status constructus, whenever used with them, is due to the euphonic law which forbids three short syllables to come together, or else is the result of contraction, as in ab-ā = abū-a or aba-a. As in other languages, u and a have generally been weakened to the so-called connecting vowel -i.
but Babylonian *cerba-su*). The participle, however, retains the terminations. If the word is a quadriliteral, the case-ending may be kept, as *asur-sin* and *asurru-sin*. Mono-syllabic roots more usually retain the case-endings, which may be lengthened; and roots *y*-*y* almost invariably do so.

When two nouns are so closely united as to form but one idea, the personal suffix is attached to the second noun; e.g. *kharudā sarruti-ya* “the sceptre of my kingdom” (= “my royal sceptre”). This takes place even when the nouns are in apposition, as *papakha beluti-ya* “the shrine of my lordship.”

The pronominal suffix is frequently added pleonastically to the verb at the end of the sentence; and sometimes the singular (expressing “the whole of it”) refers to subjects which are in the plural; thus *salāt-su va camut-su ana er-ya Asur ubla-su* “his spoils and his treasures to my city Asur I brought it (= them),” *hunut takhazi-sunu ecim-su* “their materials of war I took them (it).”

The demonstrative pronouns always follow their substantive, which generally retains the case-endings.

The relative ordinarily requires the noun following as well as the verb to have a pronominal suffix attached: e.g. *Yahudi sa asar-su ru'ku* “Judah, whose situation (is) remote” (lit. “of which its situation (is) remote”).

In this way the oblique cases of the relative are formed, as *sa ina abli-su* “upon whose son.”

The relative pronoun may be omitted, as in Hebrew or English; e.g. *sarru ... tanambu sicir-su* “the king (whose) memory thou proclaimest;” *miri eri nirmaq va namkhar siparri ... bilata va madatta issa'a amkhar* “works of iron,
a tray (?) and an offering of copper . . . the tribute and gifts (which) he brought I receive;" itti kari ab-i iexuru "with the castle (which) my father had made;" assu khultuv ebusu "on account of the wickedness (which) he had done."

The relative is frequently used absolutely at the beginning of a sentence, as sa ana natsir citte va misari-su . . . inambu-inni ili rabi "as regards which (city) for the protection of its treaties and laws . . . the great gods proclaim me." Hence its adverbial use, as sa . . . ina cuSsi sarriti rabis usibu "when on my royal throne pompously I had sat."

The other pronouns may be used in the same absolute way; e.g. annute cappi-sunu ritti-sunu udattiq "as regards some their hands (and) their feet I chopped off."

The relative generally follows its antecedent, thus interpolating a parenthesis between the latter and the verb which goes with it; e.g. Sa-duri dananu epeetu sa ili rabbi isimu-inni isme'e "Sa-duril the mighty works, which the great gods established for me, heard of."

In the Achæmenian period we find the relative when used as a sign of the genitive standing before its governing noun; thus, sa Cambuzya aga-su akhu-su "the brother of this Cambyses" (lit. "as regards which Cambyses, him, his brother," where the addition of the demonstrative shows what a purely genitival mark sa had become). This use is traceable to the absolute employment of the relative at the beginning of a sentence; e.g. in Sargon's inscription sa Ambarissi malic-sunu damikte Sarru-cinu imeu "as regards whom Ambaris their king has the prosperity of Sargon despised." So in Æthiopic and rarely in Arabic and later Hebrew.

The personal and demonstrative pronouns are often included
in the relative; in the vulgar dialect this may even take place when *sa* is used for the genitive: e.g. 4. mana caṣpi
ina sa Gargamis "4 manehs of silver according to (the
maneh) of Carchemish."

The indeterminate relative is sometimes omitted in the
subordinate clause, even when it is placed first; e.g. ışıkkhira
abdhu amattu sa piṭi-su ustenna "(whoever) evades (his)
pledge, the truth of his mouth changes."

When there is no definite antecedent, the third personal
pronoun is very often used in the singular in the sense of
"people"; e.g. usalio-su with variant usalio-sunut, usalmi-s
"I caused the people to approach," edis pani-su îpparṣiḍ
"alone before them he fled." So also ści; e.g. ana bit oili
la isarrac-si "to the store-house he does not (=shall not)
deliver them" (i.e. columns and other palace-decorations).

In the Achaemenian period the loose use of the genitive
with *sa* allowed a personal pronoun to be placed before its
antecedent pleonastically; e.g. la Barṣiya anacu abil-su sa
Curas "I (am) not Barden, the son of Cyrus."

The later inscriptions occasionally use the third personal
pronoun masculine for the feminine; e.g. dicta mahād-su
adduc, sirtare-sa "her many soldiers I slew, her pavilions,"
etc. So in the Law-tablet inaddu-su "they place her." Con-
versely *sa* is used incorrectly for *su* before a following; e.g.
damkatu opuruṣ-sa aspuru ittakhta-su insi (for имвi) "the
benefits (which) I had done him (and) had sent to his aid he
despised."

Occasionally the pronoun is omitted after the verb; e.g.
yusannā' yāti "he repeated (it) to me."
OF THE VERBS.

The third person masculine is sometimes used for the feminine (but not until the later days of the Assyrian Empire); e.g. Istar . . . ana ummani-ya sutta yusapri-va ci'dm icle-sunut “Istar . . . to my soldiers a dream disclosed and thus said to them.” So on the Law-tablet iotabi is used with assatu (“woman”), but as su is also found for sa or si, the translation from the Accadian was probably made by a person who was but imperfectly acquainted with the Assyrian language. Dr. Oppert well compares the want of a third person feminine in the preceptive; e.g. si limut u anacu lubudh “let her die and may I live.”

On the other hand, in the second person plural there is a tendency to substitute the feminine for the masculine form: thus, Tiglath-Pileser I. says of “the great gods” (ili rabi) aga’a tsira tuppira-su “the supreme crown ye have entrusted to him.” This is especially the case in the Imperative; e.g. halca “go ye,” khula “rejoice,” and even duca’ah “smite,” all with masculine subjects. The last instance, however, would suggest another explanation of this anomaly, that the final a is the subjunctive-augment, like מ Cohortative in Hebrew. In this case the preceding u will have coalesced with a into d or ah, as in issa’a=issa-va (issa-ua) or aba= abu-a (abua).¹ This actually happens in sima’a by the side of sime “hear thou.” In this way we may explain the ungrammatical use of the second person imperative with the relative at Behistun, in mannu atta sarru sa bela’a aroi-ya

¹ Cf. yuraps-inni for yurapsu-inni (=yurappisu-inni). See p. 27.
"whoever thou (art), O king, who rulest (goes on ruling) after me."

If the first nominative be feminine, the second masculine, the verb, though in the plural, is generally feminine; e.g. *si va ili abi-sa tabbu’u sum-i* "she and the gods her fathers proclaimed my name."

When a singular noun has a collective signification, it may be followed by a plural verb; thus *lillicu-s suppu-ca* "may thy speech come to him."

The Imperfect of the other dialects has been split up into four tenses (as in ᾳEthiopic into two): the Aorist, which is the one most commonly found in the historical inscriptions; the Pluperfect (often used, however, for perfect and aorist); the Present; and the Future. The Perfect, originally a present participle, has a permansive signification (see pp. 52, 62). Thus *bilata ascun* "tribute I established"; *sa Asur ... kati yusatmikhu* "which Asur had caused my hand to hold"; *an sunne usun-su isacanu-vu libba-su imalicu* "to his two ears shall he put (it) and his heart shall rule"; *ina uppitarppits* "in the dust dost thou lie down."

The subjunctive is used (1) when the accusative follows the verb, (2) is found in conditional sentences, and (3) is often attached to roots which contain ̀l or ̀r; e.g. *yutsalla-à beluti-ya* "he submitted to my lordship"; *icnusa ana nerí-ya* "he submitted to my yoke"; *sa epusa* "which I had made"; *aslula* "I carried off"; *aspura* "I sent."

In many cases, however, the final ̀a is the conjunction, for *va*. See p. 27.

After a conditional particle a Pluperfect generally follows; e.g. *sa amkhuru-sí* "when I had invoked her."
The Hortative sense of the Subjunctive augment is confined to the Precautive and Imperative; e.g. *lillicu* "may he go," *sullima* "accomplish."

The Conditional Suffix is generally attached to the Perfect, and follows the relative and such particles as *ci* ("when") expressed or understood; e.g. *sa Asuru va Ussuru . . . ikisu-ni* "which Asur and Ussuru had entraped" (at any time); more rarely it is attached to the Precautive, as *ana yāsi va zirriti-ya ciribta dhabita licrubu-ni* "to myself and my seed may they give good fealty." Here the prayer depends upon the unknown conditions of future time. Occasionally the suffix is found with the Permansive, as in *ci utebacu-ni* "while I was stopping." When *sa* is expressed, the pronominal suffix of the verb is inserted before the subjunctive-enclitic; e.g. *sa nisini . . . Pitru ikabu-su-ni* "which the men . . . call Pethor," *sa abilu-sina-ni* "which (countries) I have conquered."

When the future occurs by itself in a conditional sentence and after a relative, it expresses the certainty of the event which is looked forward to; e.g. *ci bitu-rabu ilabiru-va innakhu* "when this palace shall grow old and decay" (as it certainly will), *ci takabbu'u umma* "if thou shalt say at all" (= "whenever thou shalt say").

The Present is often, as in other languages, used for the Future and Imperative: e.g. *umpici la tasaddiri impuci la takabbi* "umpici (rubies) thou dost not write, impuci dost not say" (i.e. do not write and say), *tanadhala ana epis sassi asar panu-ci sacnu tebacu anacu* "thou shalt carry off to make spoil, (to) the place (which) before thee is set I will come," where the subjunctive augment after the Present in the
sense of the Future or Imperative and the emphatic position of the pronoun are to be noticed.

The Imperative may also be used for the Future; e.g. bukhkhir umman-ca dioc’ a caras-ca Bab-il “select thy army, strike thy camp, O Babel” (for “thou shalt select,” etc.).

In comparisons the aorist is used as an iterative present (as in Greek), what happens at any time being conceived to have already taken place on some definite occasion; e.g. cima Ramanu igum “as the Air-god pours.”

The substantive verb is usually omitted: e.g. in the Law-tablet ul asati atta (for atti) “thou art not my wife.” When existence has to be expressed, in place of yahu, basu is generally used (e.g. mal basu or mala basu “as many as exist”), which Dr. Oppert has acutely compared with the Æthiopic bisi “men.” Isu (’) is also used in the same sense: e.g. sanin su la isu “a rival to him there was not”; but more commonly this verb includes the idea of possession, as isi “may I have” (ai isi naciri mugalliti “may I not have enemies multiplied”).

The Infinitive, as a verbal noun, may have either the verbal or the nominal side brought most prominently forward. More usually the former is the case, the infinitive governing an accusative like the verb, and therefore retaining the case-endings; e.g. ana sadada madata “to bring tribute,” ana episu Bit-Saggadha “to the building of Bit-Saggadh,” ana pakadav cal dadmi “to preside over all men.” To the same use must be referred the absolute employment of the infinitive in negative sentences; e.g. ina la bana “in the doing of nothing” (i.e. while I had leisure), adi la basi’s “until there were no more” (“up to the not being”), ana la
tsabato "not to be taken," where it answers to the gerundive; ana la tsabat-su "that he might not take it," ana la casad-i ina mati-su "in order that I might not get to my country" (where the construct Infinitive is used). Often, however, the Infinitive is employed like any other noun in the status constructus without the case-endings, as ana epis ramani-su "to the working of himself," epis buhri "the making of snares."

Much of the same nature is the employment of the abstracts in t servile with a relative and a verb; e.g. ina ta'asiarti sa alic "(it was) at (my) return that I went."

Not unlike the use of navo consecutive (see p. 69) is the use of va to join a Pluperfect and an Aorist, in the place of a conditional clause; e.g. itsußi-ti va emuru "when they had taken they saw." The Permansive may take the place of the aorist, va becoming a true navo consecutive; e.g. itsußi-ti va . . . tebuni "when they had taken they are continually coming."

As in the other Semitic languages, the idea of intensity or continuation is expressed by attaching to the verb, as object, a verbal noun formed from the same root, like the Infinitive Absolute in Hebrew; e.g. dicta-sun aduc "their slayables I slew," khirit-su akhri "its ditch I dug," sipic . . . aspuc "a heap I heaped up," amsukh misikhtu "I measured its dimension," ikhtanabbata khubut nisi sa Assur "he is ever wasting the wasting of the men of Assyria," ilbinu libitta "they made bricks." Sometimes the noun is accompanied by ana ("for"); e.g. batuli-sun va batulste-sun ana sagaltu asgul "their boys and maidens I dishonoured "; sometimes by cima ("as"); e.g. Bit-Amucâni cima dai'asti ades bukhar nisi-su "Bit-Amucani, like a threshing-floor, I threshed the glory of its men."
The position of the verbal noun is generally before its verb: when continuance is implied, however, it stands after the verb (as in Hebrew), and the verb sometimes has the subjunctive augment. Herein the Assyrian marks itself off from Arabic, which regularly places the Infinitive when it expresses intensity after the verb, and attaches itself to Hebrew and Syriac. The ḳEthiopic usage agrees throughout with the Assyrian.

A verbal noun in m-, without the case-endings, may be used to express an adverb; thus marab urabbi “greatly I enlarged.” It may also be used to express a participial clause; e.g. utsabbita mutetsa-sun “I captured the exit of them (—them as they were going out).”

A compound verb is often formed by יָנַש with a substantive attached; e.g. takhaza asoun “I made battle” — “I fought,” hapiota-sunu lu asoun “I effected their overthrow” — “I overthrew them.”

Two verbs in the same tense may be joined together without a conjunction to express a compound idea; e.g. irdu‘u illicu kakkar tsuumi “they descended, they went (to) dry ground,” for “they came down to;” illic enakh “it went on decaying.” So ‘alacu is used with labaris to form a compound idea: labaris illic “it became old.”

The Participle present active is generally used as a noun, in the status constructus; e.g. da‘is matani naciri “the trampler upon hostile lands,” somat ikribi “hearer of prayers,” alic pani-ya “going before me.”

It may, however, preserve its full verbal character, and in this case it retains the case-endings; e.g. la palikhu zicri beli “not worshipping the memories of the lords.”
Occasionally it is used as a finite verb, as in the proper names *Musallim-Ussur* “Ussur (is) a completer,” *Mutaggil-Nabiu* “Nebo (is) an auxiliary,” *cullat aidi mupariru* “all enemies he (is) crushing.”

Often it bears a relative signification; e.g. *munaccar sidhriya* ... *Asumer ... naoris lizis-su* “the defacer of my writing (=if any one defaces) may Asur in a hostile manner constrain.”

The passive participle sometimes has the meaning of “able to be —,” “ought to be—”; especially the Pael participles of concave verbs; e.g. *diou* “what can be slain,” *la niba* “what cannot be counted,” *pu’u ussuru* “a mouth that should be bound.”

The participle may be used in the singular as a collective noun, and so take a plural verb; e.g. *itti dagil pan Asuri* “with those who trusted in Asur” (literally “him trusting in Asur”), *racibu-sin diou* “their charioteers were being slain,” *nisi asib garbi-su* ... *illisou* “the people dwelling within it went,” *lama’bi ‘alepi sa abni ... natsiru kitbi musallimu tallacti* “colossi and bulls of stone guarding the treasures (and) completing the corridors.”

The indeterminate third person is expressed by the third person plural, as *sa ina lisian Akharri Bit-Khilani isas-su* “which in the tongue of the West Bit-Khilani they name,” *ana mat Nizir sa mat Lullu-Cinipa ikabu-su-ni akdhirib* “to Nizir, which they call Lullu-Cinipa, I drew near.” In a conditional clause the particle may be omitted, as *lu ana ziga yusetstou’u* “or (if any one) expose to harm.”

This third person plural is also used impersonally (like יושב in Hebrew); e.g. *kharsanu sakatu epis buhi-sunu ikbi’uni-su*
"it had been ordered him to make snares in the thick woods"
(literally "the thick woods (for) the making of their snares
they had appointed unto him"), where the double accusative
must be noticed. The singular may be employed in the
same way; e.g. allaou khandhu . . . illicav-va "by a long
journey (one) came and," yusapri "(one) revealed."

All transitive verbs in Shaphel and Shaphael take two
accusatives; e.g. dura dalin palri Samsi-utsani Babili usākhīr
"a high wall round the fords of the Rising Sun of Babylon
I built." Many intransitive verbs may take an accusative
of cognate meaning; e.g. illicu urukh mu'uti "he went the
path of death."

Verbs of motion may take an accusative of direction with-
out a preposition; e.g. illicu rīsūt-su "they went (to) his
help," sacut Ninua . . . utir asru-sea "the laws of Nineveh
I restored its (=their) place," cissitum sad cašpi . . . alic "(to)
the acquisition of the silver mountain I went."

Verbs of filling, giving, finding, etc., take two accusatives;
e.g. Assur . . . malout Lasanan yumallu'u katassu "Assur
has filled his hand with the kingdom of the world," sa
Maruduc bel-a yumallu'u gatū-a "with whom Merodach my
lord has filled my hand," dahtu imkhar sunuti "the gifts he
received them," XXII. er-khalti . . . iddin-su "22 fortresses
he gave him," sa itsturu mubar-su la ibah "which (mount-
tain) a bird (for) its crossing finds not," Bir-Saggadhu VA
Bit-Zida sannan ustesser oset-i "Bit-Saggadhu and Bit-Zida
(to) restore I directed my direction" (literally "I caused
Bit-Saggadhu and Bit-Zida to direct my course to restore,
where sannan for sannana is the accusative of direction).
The last instance will show how general the use of two
accusatives is when one of them expresses an idea cognate to that of the verb: e.g. sa manaq Ilu‘u-biahdi khammahi iturupu “who had burned the skin of Ilu‘u-biahdi with heat,” sa limniw va aibi itsannu imat māti “which repel the injurious and wicked (by) the fear of death.”

As in all languages, the Assyrian affords instances of constructio praemans, especially with ܢܘܼܪܼܐ (“to seize”) used as a verb of motion, as dur-su itebat “he fled to his fortress,” ana casad-i ana mat Madai “for my getting to Media.”

The derived conjugations sometimes change the meaning of Kal; thus Dr. Oppert instances from ܫܠܫܼܐ the Istaphal participle mustismâ‘u “he who governs” (= “causes to hear himself”), and from ܢܫܼܼܐ ("to possess") the Pael cassadu “make to approach.” So in Niphal ܦܠܼܼܐ “to weigh,” but ܢܼܪܼܼܐ “to be favourable”; ܢܼܼܪܼܼܐ “to serve,” but ܢܼܼܐ “to trust.”

With compound nouns, when the governing-word is in the singular, and the genitive in the plural, the verb follows the number of the latter; e.g. zabil-cudurri isounu-su “the magistrates (dwellers of boundaries) appointed it.”

This is universally the case with cala, cala, cullat, and gimir, when followed by plural genitives (or, in the case of cala, nominatives); e.g. sa cala simi u etsi harmonu “where all plants and trees were cultivated.”

OF THE PARTICLES.

Originally the case-endings, the meaning of the verb, and the position of the noun, expressed those modifications of space, time, and relation which a later period of language
more closely denoted by prepositions. Thus we find in the inscriptions the second case used occasionally without a preposition to express motion to a place (see p. 150).

The idea of "change," "result," "object," is expressed by anā with the accusative; e.g. anā tulle u simmi itur "it became (crossed over to) heaps and ruins," or su anā essešī abnī "that city anew (for a change) I built," anā susūb napāšī-sūn ipparsīdu "to save their lives they fled."

For the Achemenian (Aramaizing) use of anā to denote the accusative, see p. 3.

The following idiom with anā is noticeable: me va tekūta baladh napīšīt-sūn anā pī'ī yusāciit "water and sea-water (to) preserve their lives their mouths drank" (literally "water and sea-water, the preservation of their lives, to their mouths it drank," where yusācīit is used impersonally).

Ina frequently denotes the instrument, like the Hebrew ב; e.g. ina katti ramāni-su "by his own hands"; ina espi iricatamū "with dust shall cover."

It also bears the signification "into" with certain verbs; e.g. ina nēribi-sūn...erūb "into their lowlands I descended."

The use of ina and anā with לשת "to take," "occupy," is noticeable. Thus we have anā la casad-i ina mati-su "that I might not find myself in his country" (by the side of anā casad ina matati satina), and anā casad-i anā mat Madai, "on my getting to Media."

In one passage of Sennacherib (Grotefend's Cyl., l. 50) the preposition is actually placed after its noun: abnī sādi danni ītti nahra šbbā aṣī "with strong mountain-stones the clear stream I concealed." Probably it shows the influence of the Accadian. We may compare such sub-Semitic dialects as
that of Harar, in which the substantive regularly takes a
postposition, and in which the determining word is actually
placed before the determined.

_Ultu_ is used to express "(exacting punishment) from"; e.g. _ultu Assuri tirra dūtē abi_ "from Assyria bring back the
slaughter of (thy) father," _i.e._ revenge thy father's death
upon Assyria.

_Ultu_ is sometimes used adverbially for "after that" "from
the time when" (with _yumi sa_ "the day whereon" under-
stood); e.g. _ultu bit-rabu . . . ana ribat sarruti-ya usaelišu_
"after that I had caused the palace to be finished for the
greatness of my sovereignty," _isti ḫna-nni Maruduc anā
sarrūtī_ "from the time when Merodach created me for
sovereignty."

_Adī_ "up to," comes to have a conjunctive signification
as denoting how far the objects pointed out extended; e.g.
_nisi adī maruti-sunu_ "men and children" (= "up to their
children"), _sarrani matat Nairi adī sa niraruti-sunu illicunī_
"the kings of the countries of Nairi, including (those) who
(to) their aid had gone."

_Itti_ may be used in the sense of "(revolting) from" (= "breaking with") or "against"; e.g. _(S'ute) itti-ya
yuspalcit_ "(the Suti) from me he alienated," _icciru itti-ya_
"they revolted against me," _iḍinu ēnī itti Urtaci_ "they
gave judgment against Urtaci."

As in Hebrew, a preposition which has been employed in
the first member of a clause may be dropped in the second; e.g. _er suatu ana la tsabate va dur-su la ratsapi_ "this city not
to be occupied and for its wall not to be built."

The following idiomatic use of _sa_ and _assu_ with the infini-
tive, which has been well explained by Mr. Norris, is noticeable, “sa limnu la bane paniv “that the evil-doers may not make head” (literally “on account of the evil-doer the not making head”), and asēnu aībi la bane paniv, where our idiom “to make head” curiously coincides with the Assyrian.

The adverbs in -is may pleonastically be preceded by ana, thus confirming Dr. Oppert’s conjecture as to their origin; e.g. ana daris likkura “to futurity be it proclaimed,” ana daris yucinnu “for ever they established,” isallu’u an nahrīs “they rolled as in a river.”

The negative la is put before a noun (substantive or adjective) to form a negative compound, as la-mami “the want of water,” la-magiri “disobedient,” la-khaddu “unerring.”

Ul is put only before verbs, but it does not possess the prohibitive force of ל in Hebrew. In the Achaemenian period ul has come to be used like la with all words; thus ul anacu, ul sir-ya.

The negative particle of prohibition or deprecation is ai, which in Ṣethiopic (‘i) is the common negative, from Ṣ (Ṣethiopic yn). It is rare in Hebrew, and found only in a few compounds. Instances in Assyrian are ai ipparcu’u ida-sa “may its defences not be broken,” ai ippaciri “may I not have enemies.” Compounded with the indefinite umma at the beginning of a sentence, with ul or nin following immediately before the verb, it signifies “no one whatever” (as aumma ina bibbi-sunu asar-su ul yumassiti-va susub-su ul idi “no one among them touched its site, and undertook its settlement”). Hence, the force of the negation lying in the second negative, aumma has come to have a purely indefinite
sense when used alone; e.g. *lu aklu . . lu aiumma* “whether a chief or any one whatever.”

The substantive verb with the negative may be expressed by the substantive *yânû* “not-being” (†Soph), the different persons being denoted by pronominal suffixes; e.g. *manma yânû* “any one there (was) not,” *yanu-a* “I (am) not.”

The conjunction after a verb takes the form of the enclitic -vā (like the Latin *que*); e.g. *sa bitrabi sātu tūtū-sa ul iber-va tsukkhurat subat-sa* “of that palace its mound was not, and its site was small,” *urukh Aoccadi itsbatuniv-va ana Babila tebuni* “the path of Accad they had taken, and to Babylon had come.” The short enclitic throws the accent back upon the last syllable of the verb, which is therefore lengthened, and accordingly has often a second *v*. A preceding *b* may become *v*, as in *eruv-va* for *erub-va*.

The enclitic is sometimes contracted into *a* simply (for *wa*), just as *abu-a* may become *ab-a*; e.g. *alpi tsini bilata va mačata issa-a amkhar* “oxen, sheep, tribute, and offering he brought, and I received.” This contraction may take place even after a consonant, especially a liquid, and may readily be mistaken for the subjunctive suffix (see p. 56, note): e.g. *remi pulhote yutsabib-ā ana er-su Asur yubl-ā* “the wild bulls alive he took, and to his city Asur brought, and,” *asar-sa usarda-ā* “its place I deepened, and.”

With substantives and clauses *ā* is used, also *vā* (only after vowels).

The conjunction is sometimes omitted both with nouns and verbs; e.g. *ili istari sâtunu* “those gods (and) goddesses,” *same irtsît “heaven and earth,” appal agger in isatî asrup* “I overthrew, demolished (and) burned with fire”; *ina
akhi 'apli imri-a “amongst the brethren (or) sons of my family,” sù cisu-su ... yuptatekhu akhai “he (and) his sword-bearer cut open one another.”

When a verb is followed by a substantive so that they form but one idea, od may irregularly be placed after the latter; thus attisi ina giri-ya-va asukhra Asi’il “I turned aside in my course and outflanked Aziel.”

The same happens even if the first clause has only a substantive verb understood, but not expressed; e.g. sa cima-sasuv-va iroiru “who was like him and had revolted.”

In the Achaemenian period od is ungrammatically found between two nouns; thus mati saniti-va lisamnu sanituv “other lands and another tongue.”

-va may sometimes take the place of yusanni “he repeated,” as in isasi-va umma “he told thus,” where some verb like ikbi “he said” is understood after the enclitic.

Lú is prefixed to verbs to denote past time (like kad in Arabic); e.g. lú allíc “I went.” If the first syllable of the verb is u or yu, the two vowels coalesce into one; e.g. lusádi.

In Babylonian and Achaemenian it is joined with nouns; e.g. anacu lú sarru “I (am) the king.”

Lú also signifies “whether” or “either”—“or,” and as such is found before nouns and clauses; e.g. lú nuturda lú itú lú aiumma ... lú ana ila yusasracu lú ana ziga yusetesu” “whether nuturda or itu or any one ... either to a god shall give or to harm shall expose.”

Lú (Aramaic יָלע, Arabic lau) is like limeti, li (Aramaic יָלע “at”) from יָלע “to adhere,” hence “immediately,” “union,” “if.”

The indefinite umma (as in aiumma, manumma, etc.)
(Arabic anna) in later inscriptions introduces a quotation with the meaning “thus,” “that”; e.g. (Istar) ikti-sumut umma “Istar told them that.”

In “if” is frequently followed by matima (“in any case”) with the indefinite pronoun (“any one”) sometimes understood before the verb. Occasionally we find im omitted, and only matima used. In the Law-tablet we have ana matima in imitation of the Accadian original; ana matima mut lubbi-su ikhššu “in every case a man has full power over his child.”

The conditional particle (ci or im) is not unfrequently understood, though the enclitic -ni is generally added; e.g. yutsu-ni nor-ya štabut “(when) he came out, he took my yoke.” Even the conditional augment (ni) may be omitted; e.g. sa lā agru-su igranni “who (when) I did not make war with him made war with me.”

In one passage ci seems to mean simply “then,” “accordingly;”—Umma-khaldasu emuci-su ci yupakhkhir, “Umma-khaldasu then gathered his forces.”

Summa “thus” occasionally takes the place of im; e.g. summa assatu mut-su ... iktabi “if a wife (to) her husband say” (literally “thus,” with “if” omitted).

Yumu “day” may be used absolutely, without a preposition, with “when” (sa) following omitted; as yumu annitu emuru “the day he had seen that dream.”

The preposition which denotes the instrument may also be omitted; as katā ā sepā bīratav barsilli iddi “(his) hands and feet (in) fetters of iron he laid.”
PROSODY.

The order of the sentence is most commonly subject, object, and verb at the end (as in Aramaic). But the object very frequently follows the verb, especially when it has a suffix, and sometimes even the subject. Often a noun with a preposition comes after the verb, but its usual place is after the object or subject. The genitive circumlocution with sa is in some few instances placed at the beginning of the sentence with the subject following. Conditional and relative words always begin the sentence. Relative sentences are usually intercalated between the subject or object and the verb. The pronoun sunuti or sunut regularly ends the clause.

A dislocated word like ismo-va in ismo-va cisitti eri-su Cudur-Nakhundu nis Elamî imkut-šu khattuv “Kudur-Nakhundu the Elamite heard of the capture of his cities, and fear overwhelmed him,” is due to the blunder of the illiterate engraver, who inserted the word in the wrong place.

The Assyrians, like other nations, had their poetry; but little of this has been preserved to us, the religious hymns which we possess being literal translations of Accadian originals.* From the following purely Assyrian specimen of psalmody, however, it will be seen that Assyrian poetry corresponds to Hebrew; it was characterized by the same parallelism, and affected the same play upon words.

FIRST STANZA.

(1) *Ilu Ussur bel ‘a-ba-ri | sa su-par-su dan-nu-šu
(2) ana Sarru-cinu sarra gašra | sar Assuri
(3) ner-ebid Babili | sar Sumiri u Accadi
(4) ba-nu-u cu-me-ca | si-du-ut padh-si-šu
(5) liš-ba-a bu-ha-ri.

O Ussur, lord of the wise, to whom (is) beauty (and) power [of whom (is) his beauty (and) his power],
For Sargon mighty king, king of Assyria,
High-Priest (yoke-servant) of Babylon, king of Sumiri and Accad,
Build thy store-house, the dwelling of his treasure,
May he be sated with (its) beauties!

SECOND STANZA.

(1) ina ci-rīb Bit Bīs-Sallīmī | u Bit S‘er-ra
(2) cin pāl-su | cin-nī irṣītī sū-te-sī-ra
(3) sul-li-ma āsīn-dī-su | su-ūt-līm-su e-mu-kān la-sa-na-an
(4) dun-nu zīc-ru-ti | gālī-su sū-udh-bī-va
(5) li-nā-ar ga-rī-su.

In the midst of the Temple of the Head of Peace and Bit-S‘erra
(i.e. in peace and good fortune)
Establish his course of life: the stability of the land direct;
Make perfect his harnessed horses; confer on him the powers of
the world,
Even greatness (and) renown; his servants make good, and
May he curse his foes!

Here the double parallelism is very exact. Notice, too,
the lively change of subject, and the semi-rhyme at the end
of each stanza. The play upon cin and cinnī plainly refers to
the name of Sarru-cinnū.

Before concluding, it will be well to select one or two
inscriptions for analytical translation.* The first that I shall
take is an Invocation to Beltis (W.A.I., II. pl. 66, No. 2):—

I. (1) A-na(ēl) Beltīs bel-lat ma-
tātī 1 a-si-baṭ 2 Bīt-Mas-maṣ D.P.
(ēl) Assur-ba-nī-‘āblā sar mat Assurī
rubū pa-lukh-sa (2) ner-ṣebdu 5 bi-
nu-ūt 4 kālā-sa 6 sa ina ci-be-ti-sa
rabitāv 5 ina kit-ru-ūb 7 takh-kha-si 8

I. (1) Ad Beltim dominam terrarum, habitantem Bit-Merodach, Assurbani-pal rex terrae Assyris princeps adorans-eam (2) pontifex creatura manuum ejus, qui secundum jussa-ejus magna in vicinitate praelii

* The figures in parentheses refer to the lines in the inscriptions; the superior figures refer to the analyses on pp. 175, 176, 177.
I next select a short private contract of the year 676 B.C.
(W.A.I., III. 47, 5):—

II. (1) {bilat} con saki² (2) sa ana 'ilati Istari sa er 'Arb-'il³ sa D.P. Man-nu-ci-'arb'-i³ (4) ina pan D.P. Maruduc-akhe-sallim (5) ina arkhi Ab id-dan-an⁶ sum-ma-la-a id-di-ni³ (7) a-na III. ribatu-nu⁶ i-rab-bi-su (8) ina arkhi Sivan yumi XI. (9) lim-mu D.P. Bam-ba-a (10) pan D.P. Istar-bab-cam-es (11) pan D.P. Ku-u-a D.P. Sarru-ikki⁴ (12) pan D.P. Dumku-pan-sarri (13) pan D.P. Naibur-rub-abii.

* The story of my conquest of them has become famous everywhere.

II. (1) Talenta ferri optimi, (2) quae (sunt) danda des Astarti urbis Arbelae, (3) quae Mannu-ci-Arbela (4) in presentia Merodach-akhe-sallim (5) in mense Ab (Julio) tradit, (6) si non reddiderunt (es) (7) quadrantibus usu ris auspere-faciunt. (8) In mense Maio die XI. (9) eponymo Bambâ (10) teste (ante) Istar-bab-cames (11) teste Kûa (et) Sarru-ikbi (12) teste Dumku-pan-sarri (13) teste Neborub-bal.
My next selection is Sennacherib’s private will (W.A.I., III., 16, 3):

III. (1) D.P. S’in-akhi-er-ba sar cie-sa-ti¹ (2) sar mat As-suri esiri khuratsi tu-lat kurni (3) (gil) khuratsi a-gi esiri itti sa-a-ti (4) du-ma-ki² an-nu-te sa tu-lat-su-nu (5) abna ibba ina abna (likh-khal) abna za-dhu³ | (6) I. (bar)⁴ ma-na II. (bar) cibi⁵ (dhu) ci sakal-su-nu⁶ (7) ana D.P. Assur-akhi-idāin abia-ya sa ara-У (8) D.P. Assur-ebil-mucin-‘aba sum-su (9) na-bu-u ci-i ru-hi-a (10) a-din cie-ta⁷ Bit D.P. Amuk (11) [D.P. . . . ]-iirq-erba ca-nu-wa-t⁸-ni⁸ D.P. Nabi.


ANALYSES.

I. ¹ bella matāti; status constructus, feminine plural in genitive (dependent) case: I doubled after e as in the verbs yמי. Matu (＝mađtu for mađātu) is of Accadian origin, ma-da “country” or “people.”

² asībat; feminine status constructus, nomen agentis, from בני.

³ ner-ebā; literally “yoke-servant,” an Accadian compound (nīnī or saconacu), in which the first character was probably non-phonetic.

⁴ binūt from בִּנּוּ, abstract feminine singular, status constructus.

⁵ kātā, dual from katu, probably from בקל. Kat or kattakh, however, signified “hand” in Accadian, as well as ḫa, which has lost the initial guttural. Comp. Talmud. נֵחַפ “handle” (like בקל ד).

⁶ rabībat, feminine of rabu, with mimmination.

⁷ kitrub, form situm, nomen permanentis of Iphtea from בִּרְבּ.

⁸ takkhahi, also written takkasi, for tamkhaqi, nomen permanentis of Tiphel from תִּמְלֹא, Heb. יִמְלֹא.

⁹ iċċisu, third person singular Perfect of יָכַב. Here the Pluperfect sense is almost lost.

¹⁰ kakkadu, Hebrew יָכַב. Assyrian assimilates the second radical to the first in Palpel, giving us instead Pappel or Papel: so aċcābū “star.”
11 *Num* in Accadian meant "high" (Elamite *khabar*), translated by the Semitic *elamu* from אָמ ("to be strong").

12 *ebus* or *epon*, third singular Pluperfect after the relative. Schrader compares עֲבַס ("to be strong").

13 *sarrut* or *barrut*, abstract singular, status constructus, from מִר or מָר.

14 *kat-i* "my hand."

15 *is-sa* (Accadian) is explained *pidnu*. Literally the Accadian would be "wood-work."

16 *sstadu* in Accadian is *bu* or *bu-dā* "long." Mr. Smith translates "war-chariot." Compare Arabic *sada*.

17 *rudu* from רְוי. *Sarruti-ya* is in apposition.

18 *siron* form *siom*.

19 *pelu* from פָּלִי, passive participle, like *nibu* or *nebu* (of concave verbs) "worked" so "choice."

20 *esā* is of uncertain meaning. It ought to be a quadriliteral אֶשֶנ, but is more probably a Babylonian form (้อ for או, like Hebrew Niphal Imperative) from נְשָא.

21 *sictta*, accusative for *sicinta* from שִּׁנָּה, literally "that which is made."

22 *uqā* singular aorist of עַקְב, "strike down," in the sense of "found" (so שִׁגָּה).

23 *palakh* (and *palukh* above), nomen permanentis in status constructus, from the same root as *pulukhitu* "fear."

24 *baladh*, or in Assyrian generally *paladh*, אֶל. It often happens that a root which in early Assyrian has initial *p*, but in Babylonian (and frequently in later Assyrian also) *b*, answers to a Hebrew radical with ב; so *bakharu* or *pakharu* is בָּקַח.

II. 1 *ticon* was apparently the Accadian word, for which Assyrian substituted *bītu*, *bīlat*, from בּית.

2 *saku* was a Turanian loan-word, *sak* in Accadian being "head," "high." Hence also *sakummu* "highlands."


4 *iddanan*, third singular Present Pael of *nādanu*.

5 *iddīnu*, for *iddīnu*, is an instance of the vulgar pronunciation. It shows the same tendency as that which changed -ūnūv tā-ūnīv.
The Latin translations given above are intended to answer to the Assyrian word for word. I subjoin an English version:—

(I.) To Beltis, queen of the world, dwelling in Bit-Merodach, Assur-bani-pal, king of Assyria, the prince who worships her, the high-priest, the creation of her hands, who, according to her high bidding in the meeting of battle, has cut off the head of Teumman, King of Elam; and Umman-igas, Tammaritu, Pake, and Umman-aldas, who after Teumman received the kingdom of Elam, by her powerful help I conquered, and in the mighty yoke of my royal chariot I captured; and my conquest of them has become...
famous in all lands, for they had no equals. At that time,
I carved the sculptured work of the altar of the temple of
Istar with choice carvings. I made it great for the pleasure
of Beltis. This altar I dedicated before her. As for me,
Assur-bani-pal, the worshipper of thy mighty divinity, a life
of long days, goodness of heart and stability are coming upon
me. May Bit-Merodach last long under me.

(II.) Talents of the best iron, for Istar of Arbela, which
Mannu-ci-Arbela in the presence of Merodach-akhe-sallim, in
the month Ab, hands over, shall be lent at three per cent.,
unless they are given back. The 11th day of the month
Sivan, during the eponymy of Bamba, in the presence of
Istar-bab-cames, Kua, Surru-ikbi, Dumku-pan-sarri, and
Nebo-rub-bal.

(III.) I, Sennacherib, king of multitudes, king of Assyria,
have given chains of gold, heaps of ivory, a cup of gold,
crowns and chains with them, all the riches, of which there
are heaps, crystal and another precious stone, and bird’s
stone: one and a half manehs, two and a half cibi according
to their weight: to Essar-haddon my son, who was after-
wards named Assur-ebil-mucin-pal, according to my wish:
the treasure of the temple of Amuk and ... iriq-erba, the
harpists of Nebo.
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Page 3, line 19. According to Abul-Faraj (p. 18, ed. Po-cocke), Shinar "is Sāmarrah," and Sāmīrūs, king of Chaldaea in the time of Serug, invented weights and measures, weaving and dyeing. The change of m into ng is paralleled by the Accadian dimir "god," which is also found under the form dingir. Otherwise a nearer explanation would be sana-uru "the four cities." The Cassi, I now find, were not identical with the Sumiri or people "of the dog's language," who lived in Babylonia from immemorial times, but were an Elamite tribe, who conquered Babylonia under Khammurabi in the sixteenth (?) century B.C.

P. 4, l. 5. Later Assyrian itself shows the same interchange of k and g, as in gadistu in the Law-tablet by the side of kadistu ("sanctuary").

P. 4. Older Babylonian, especially in the vulgar dialect, presents many peculiar forms. Thus š is preferred to s, as in yušannu "he changed"; m becomes n, as in sun-sumu for sum-sumu "their name"; the possessive pronoun ni "our" appears as na, as in Šamšu-ilu-na; ina mukkkhi is regularly used for the preposition ina eli; and we even find such corrupt forms as bašurri (W.A.I. iii., 43, 16) "flesh" for bišru, and the ungrammatical liseli and lisetsbit (iii. 43, 20, 31) instead of luseli and lusatsbit or lusatsbat.

P. 5, l. 7. Birid was not a new word, but goes back to the oldest period of the language. My mistake was caused by a
hasty recollection of Norris's Dict., p. 102. In place of it, read *zilluv* (*ix-mi*) "grace," "favour." In the Persian period, we also find a final -ה added to the third person plural of the verb, like quiescent liga in Arabic (though this is sometimes met with in the vulgar Assyrian of the cuneiform tablets). Ittur has assumed the general sense of "became," and the plural *itturunu* is an instance of the old final vowel of the third person plural, which was generally weakened to י.

P. 8, note 10. Change *kamets* before י to *pathakh*.


P. 10, note 17. M. Neubauer informs me that in Babylonian Hebrew י is doubled just as in Assyrian.

After "Assyrian has but one example of the substitution of ן for the reduplication of a letter," add, "except in verbal forms." Here we not unfrequently meet with instances like יינינד for יינינד, Niphal of יינינד; see p. 31.

P. 13, note 23. Dr. Haug ("Old Pahlavi-Pazand Glossary," p. 53) connects the Assyrian adverbial ending with the Aramaic -דית, Syriac -(ד)ית, which forms adverbs from substantives, adjectives, and past participles, as well as with the Hebrew ידית. But phonology alone would exclude this explanation.

P. 14, note 26. It is not quite accurate to say that "all the older kings have Turanian names." This is not the case with Naram-Sin, or Samšu-iluna, a contemporary of Khammurabi (unless he is to be identified with the latter king), but their names admit of a sufficient explanation (p. 13). See a good paper by Mr. G. Smith on the "Early History of Babylonia," in the *Transactions* of the Society of Biblical Archæology, vol. i., part 1.
P. 15, note 29. We may add the tendency of a to become i in forms through the medium of e, as in innindu for innandu, and the intermixture of the Perfect-termination with the Augment of Motion, e.g. yubta'uni.

P. 15, note 31. Other peculiarities will be the uncertainty of gender, as in the plural makarut ("a measure") by the side of makarrāt (for makdrāt), or casaptu instead of caspu ("silver").

P. 17. The same disregard of gender in the verb occurs in the Assyrian translation of a legendary account of the famous Accadian king Sargina (W.A.I. iii., 4, 7), which must be ascribed to the age of Assur-bani-pal. So upon the principle that grammatical forms get shortened, not lengthened, with the wearing of time, 𒈗𒈣 must be later than the longer form.

P. 20. Add letters by Rawlinson, Hincks, and others in the Athenaum: Aug. 23, 1851 (Rawl.); Sept. 6, 1851, Sept. 20, 1851, Oct. 25, 1851, Dec. 27, 1851, Jan. 3, 1852 (Hincks); Aug. 18, 1860 (Rawl.); March 8, 1862 (Rawl.); May 31, 1862 (Rawl., first announcement of the discovery of the Assyrian Canon); July 19, 1862 (Rawl. on the Canon); July 5, 1862 (Hincks); Sept. 20, 1862 (Ménant, on Kham-murabi's Inscrip.); Jan 24, 1863 (Fox Talbot); Feb. 14, 1863 (Rawl. on Taylor's Discoveries); Aug. 22, 1863 (Rawl., Early Hist., etc.); Oct. 24, 1863 (Hincks); March 18, 1867 (Rawl., Verification of Canon by eclipse); Sept. 7, 1867 (Rawl., Assyrian Calculation of Time); Oct. 18, 1868 (G. Smith, Protochaldæan Chronology); Nov. 7, 1868 (Smith); Nov. 14, 1868 (Sayce, Assyrian Poetry), Nov. 21, 1868 (Sayce), May 29, 1869 (Sayce, the Law-tablet); June 12, 1869 (Smith), June 19, 1869 (Smith), July 17, 1869 (Smith). Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, 1851, xiv. part 1 (Rawl. "Analysis of Babylonian Text at Behistun"); 1854, xvi. 1

P. 25, note. Owing to ill-health, Mr. Smith was unable to make his Syllabary so complete as he wished. The following values may be added: 1. kharra=samu; 3. essu; 4. oitamma; 6. idin, belu; 8b. dudu; 10. cuda, se, gudibir=Marudo; 12. gita; 15. nurma, cušu, khalacu; 30b. duddhu; 30k. šiši, šidi; 43. laluruv; 44. turi; 45. gu, ni, raru, illu; 48. ša; 50. humis; 53. essit; 70. dara; 73. tiskašu=rancuti; 76. la, nindanu; 88. masadu; 92. mahu; 93. mas; 99. rabdu; 102. ilba; 108. ginu, ĝūnū=padanu, khasas; 112. dhūc, nita, mutstēa; 118. sana; 135. dū; 136. khibu, ginu=...
ASSYRIAN GRAMMAR.

muniru; 143. ul, nakbu; 146. summa; 147. siriz; 152. calu,
narasu; 155. urugal, mitu; 158o. alal=alallu; 159. khut, un=
napistu; 159c. luga; 164. sun, lukh; 166. alittu, natsabu sa
etsi; 169. gut, khar, dapa; 179. pil, napakhu; 180. gi;
182. guk; 182b. garru, mandinu; 187. nadalu, etsibu, sanin,
rada, takh; 188. istatt; 191. garru; 192. uguši; 200.
galam, galum; 201. sem, sänu; 203. khur, sarakhu, calu, atsu
sa etsi u kani; 208. gä; 209. tsalam; 212. lugur, cü; 215.
vak, tam; 217. udessu; 224. a=dilto; 226. idgal; 229.
biseba, alala, alam=tsalamu; 232. balag=balangu; 237. pakh,
rar, lib; 238. sana, niga=maru; 239. šus, našakhu, sepus=
napakhu, Damcina; 240. esu; 241. mus; 242. tsir; 246. suplu,
mikhiltu; 247. igä; 253. naku; 254b. šagalum; 255. cislukh
=mašcanu; 255h. canlāb; 262. arik, nē; 266. enu, garru,
samu; 270. cacabu; 272. dim, idinnu; 273. sita; 280. ugun
=akhsētu; 282. pusur=samun; 293. šarru, napistu sa tammi;
303. kha, id, sar, ešet same; 305. kham; 307. ur; 307e.
uru=tirtu; 309. lammubi; 311. šukh; 318. ga, naku; 318f.
ara; 318h. ir=calu naccal; 324. garru, sēmu; 338d. pusu;
339. girim, git, mēk; 348. gur; 352. illammi; 354. ligittu,
ดารู=šukh, ə, issik iorê; 355. garru, acalu; 355b. kharšu;
356. amaru; 359. halacu; 360. rak; 362. ni; 367. šikhapu;
371. khisu; 373. cîstu; 377. isi, šulea; 368. sutul. Several
characters have been omitted altogether, whose powers are
for the most part known. It would have added to the value
of the Syllabary had the meanings been attached wherever
possible.

P. 26, l. 5. Add:—The division of words sometimes takes
place without being marked by the writing, when the second
word begins with a vowel; especially if the first word is in
the status constructus, or is a shortened preposition, as in
adussi for adūssē “to the foundations”; matturru for matürru
"land of light" or "morning" (W. A. I., ii. 39, 13); *igidibbu* for *igid-ibbu* “it joins phrases” (according to Norris). Assyrian very seldom divides a word at the end of a line; now and then, however, we find a vocable not ending with the line (e.g. Layard 70, 3, 13).

P. 29. A good example at once of the loss of *kh* in Assyrian, and of the confusion between *m* and *v*, is *lamu* “a tablet,” the Hebrew לִימָן.

P. 29. This derivation of *katu* is due to Dr. Hincks. Many reasons, however, would rather point to an Accadian origin. Talmudic Hebrew uses קטר in the sense of “handle” (e.g. קתרה דהתרב, like kater). From *katu* comes the feminine adjective *katitu*, as in *daltu la katitu* “a door without handles,” by which *arzabinu* is explained.

P. 30. *Kinnatu* “a female slave” is probably from קינבע “to buy,” like Talmudic זיר “slave” from ייר “to sell,” according to conjecture. (Neubauer, “La Géographie du Talmud,” p. 306.)

P. 31. Other similarities between Assyrian and Babylonian (Talmudic) Hebrew (as might be expected) may be pointed out. Thus like *nadinu* instead of נדניא נדוע we have נדניא נדוע “gift,” quoted by Harkavy, who also notices that in the Targum (Ex. v. 7, 12, etc.) נבב—“to unite,” like the Assyrian *gabbu* “all” (so in the Talmud המלומב “he who amasses”). The Assyrian *lamatsu*, again, derived from the Accadian *lamma* or *lamsi* “colossus,” seems to reappear in Rabbinic לוסמ, and the Rabbinic אסמס “gullet” finds its analogue in the Assyrian *assadhu* (W. A. I., ii. 17, 20).

P. 34. The sharper pronunciation of *s* may have been due to Turanian influence. The earliest specimens of Babylonian Semitic write *S'amdu*.
P. 34, 1. 4. Read נַדַּה.
P. 50, 1. 22. For S read I.

P. 50. Add:—The conjugation Niphael, which stands by
the side of Shaphael, is an evidence of the artificial regularity
introduced by the Assyrians into their verbal system. Niphael
is mostly found in verbs whose last radical is a vowel (p. 94).
But Dr. Oppert quotes also nagarrur and nasallul in the
strong verb (see p. 78).

P. 51. A good instance of the aorist of the Shaphel Passive
occurs in W.A.I., iii., 38, 56, where we have yussupulu for
yusaasupulu "(which) had been caused to be overthrown."

P. 53. The Future often takes the form ıqattamu or ıqatamu
"he shall cover," from the analogy of the derived conjugations.
Vulgar Babylonian actually presents us with the form
inassakhu "he shall take away" (W.A.I., iii. 41, 11).
P. 61. 1. 22. After "never the initial syllable," add:
"when this expressed the force of the root."
P. 63, 1. 28. For F read A.

P. 67, 1. 18. Atani is not "wild-ass," but a river-bird,
also called cunu'u like the appunnu (W.A.I., ii. 37, 55). The
Accadian name seems to mean "blue rump." Appunnu may
be compared with the Biblical יָלָד, which the Targum of
Jerusalem renders דָּנִיָּה.

P. 69. Yucin, yucan' might be Aphel; but as the other
Assyrian forms are Pael, yucin must be for yuccin, the ordi-
nary Pael form. The late Dr. Hincks denied the existence of
an Aphel in Assyrian altogether; but without good reason.
P. 80, 1. 5. For Iphaneal read Iphentaal.
P. 94. Similarly the Hebrew יֶלֶל appears as יֵלֶל on the
Moabite Stone.
P. 98. The forms -annini, -nini, for the First Personal
Pronoun Suffix are given upon the authority of Dr. Oppert. I do not recollect having found them in the inscriptions.

P. 108. Add the instance of a Shaphel Passive from verbs נָּשַׁמַּת, which we find in susuptu "a royal throne," given as a synonyme of napalsukhti.

P. 109. Quadrilaterals admit of an inserted dental after the second radical: thus tsimtaru or teivtaru "a spirit of the neck" (צִמָּךְ).

P. 110. Since גלפמ is a Piel Infinitive, it would be more nearly represented by the Arabic forms taktil, taktit, etc. We may compare the ᾙEthiopic ta'agâli "robber," tasâlaki "abuser," and the Hebrew בָּלָּא or Aramaic בלע, from which Ewald would deduce the original personal use of the formation with ְנ.

P. 111. A few strange forms terminating in a from weak roots are found. Thus we have mali'â "fullness" as nominative in the syllabaries, and imri'â "family" (but sometimes "my family") in the contract-inscriptions. The form is generally used in the status constructus. It may be Aramaising, or it may be due to the influence of Accadian, where the participle was distinguished by final a. Daru "name" —a word originally borrowed from the Accadian—appears as dâri'â in the Accadian (W.A.I., ii., 33, 71).

P. 112. I have forgotten to speak of Compounds in Assyrian. These are rare, as in the other Semitic languages; but we meet with bin-binu and lib-libbu "grandson." These examples will show that the first part of the Compound took the form of the Construct; the second part, however, had the nominative, not the genitive, ending. See pp. 148, 165.

P. 113. Another instructive instance is the root יָרְנֵס "green," "yellow" in W.A.I. ii., 26, 50, where we have arku, rakaku, 'urriku, urik, and urcitu, besides the Accadian ara.
P. 140. M. Neubauer has pointed out to me that a second Nisan and a second Elul are mentioned in the Talmud.

P. 140. Another measure of capacity was the makaru, with a double plural makarut (masculine) and makarrat (feminine). We find 100 makarrat of barley in a contract-tablet. Comp. Hebrew סֵפֶר or פִּקָּר "to dig out," like בִּר and בְּקָר.

The Accadian name of the lagitu or ligittu was īb.

According to Dr. Oppert, the ka was a determinative prefix of measure.

According to M. Lenormant, the kakkar or "Equator" (but see W.A.I. iii., 51, 18) was divided into 12 kasbi, each containing 60 degrees (daragi or dargatu), again subdivided into 60 sussi or "minutes."

P. 143. I would now connect lamu with Hebrew לַעֲדָה not with לַעֲדַה; see above.

P. 144. Add akkennā "on the other side," akhamis "with one another."

P. 157. Traces of a feminine in the Third Person of the Precreative are, however, found in the Vulgar Babylonian: e.g. liparrett "may she (Papsucul) break" (W.A.I. iii., 43, 27), where the vowel of the first syllable is to be noticed (see p. 179).

P. 160. In a paper read before the Society of Biblical Archaeology, April 2nd, 1872, Mr. Cull sought to connect basu, kabu, and iṣu, respectively with the Hebrew בָּאשׁו, קָבֻ, and יִשָּׁה.

P. 166. The myth of the Babylonian Sargon contains a good example of the use of ana to express the object, where we read Acci nis-abal ana maruti yurabba-nni Acci nis-abal ana pakid-ciri iscun-anni, "Acci the abal reared me to youth; Acci the abal made me the woods-superintendent."
Since the foregoing was sent to the press, I have been permitted, through the great kindness of Dr. Haigh, to see the MS. notes made by the late Dr. Hincks in a copy of Dr. Oppert’s Grammar (1st edit.). Dr. Hincks draws attention to the fact that ḫh in Assyrian was sometimes so strong as to approach c in sound, iptakhid being sometimes written iptacid. We may compare the Hebrew ברושי by the side of the Arabic شكر, or the interchange of ḫh and ḥh with c in Ᾱthiopic, as in vacaya and wakhaya “to shine,” zëcyr and zëkhyr “memorial.” Dr. Hincks gives the following list of Assyrian Ordinal Numbers: makhru “first,” sannu (fem. sanutu) “second” (nn for nw or ny), salu (fem. salistu “third,” rib’u (fem. rib’atu) “fourth,” khansu (fem. khamistu) “fifth,” šib’u (fem. šib’utu) “seventh,” and by analogy šidu, šiditu “sixth,” šimunu, šimattu “eighth,” ēru, ērritu “tenth.” He makes sunnu, rub’u, etc., collectives, “a pair,” etc.; and this is certainly one of the uses of sunnu, pl. sunne. He adds another conjugation, “of which the 1st Aorist is ‘upokil,” e.g. usepic from בקיע, uneic from גבעה. Considering, however, the interchange of c with i on the one hand, and a on the other, this seems a needless refinement (see p. 79). The following list of concave verbs in which t in Iphtea precedes the root is also given: דאול “to kill,” בזע “to go,” זיב “to be an enemy,” נעז “to judge,” עופ “to be sure,” מזר “to die,” זאול “to be,” and Moore dekor “to be good.”

THE END.
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Calcutta Review.—**The Calcutta Review.** Published Quarterly. Price 8s. 6d.

Callaway.—**IzinganeKwane, Nensumansumane, Nezindaba, Zabantu** (Nursery Tales, Traditions, and Histories of the Zulus). In their own words, with a translation into English, and Notes. By the Rev. Henry Callaway, M.D. Volume I., 8vo. pp. xiv. and 378, cloth. Natal, 1866 and 1867. 16s.

Callaway.—**The Religious System of the Amazulu.**

Part I.—Unkulunkulu; or, the Tradition of Creation as existing among the Amazulu and other Tribes of South Africa, in their own words, with a translation into English, and Notes. By the Rev. Canon Callaway, M.D. 8vo. pp. 128, sewed. 1868. 4s.

Part II.—Amatongo; or, Ancestor Worship, as existing among the Amazulu, in their own words, with a translation into English, and Notes. By the Rev. Canon Callaway, M.D. 1869. 8vo. pp. 127, sewed. 1869. 4s.

Part III.—Izinyanga Zokubula; or, Divination, as existing among the Amazulu, in their own words. With a Translation into English, and Notes. By the Rev. Canon Callaway, M.D. 8vo. pp. 150, sewed. 1870. 4s.

Part IV.—On Medical Magic and Witchcraft. [In preparation.]

Calligaris.—**Le Compagnon de Tous, ou Dictionnaire Polyglotte.** Par le Colonel Louis Calligaris, Grand Officier, etc. (French—Latin—Italian—Spanish—Portuguese—German—English—Modern Greek—Arabic—Turkish.) 2 vols. 4to., pp. 1157 and 746. Turin. £4 4s.
Canones Lexicographici; or, Rules to be observed in Editing the New English Dictionary of the Philological Society, prepared by a Committee of the Society. 8vo., pp. 12, sewed. 6d.

Carpenter.—The Last Days in England of the Rajah Ram Mohun Roy. By Mary Carpenter, of Bristol. With Five Illustrations. 8vo. pp. 272, cloth. 7s. 6d.


Chalmers.—The Origin of the Chinese; an Attempt to Trace the connection of the Chinese with Western Nations in their Religion, Superstitions, Arts, Language, and Traditions. By John Chalmers, A.M. Foolscap 8vo. cloth, pp. 78. 2s. 6d.

Chalmers.—An English and Cantonese Pocket-Dictionary, for the use of those who wish to learn the spoken language of Canton Province. By John Chalmers, M.A. Third edition. Crown 8vo., pp. iv. and 146. Hong Kong, 1871. 15s.

Chalmers.—Ludus Patronymicus; or, the Etymology of Curious Surnames. By Richard Stephen Charnock, Ph.D., F.S.A., F.R.G.S. Crown 8vo., pp. 182, cloth. 7s. 6d.

Charnock.—Verba Nominalia; or Words derived from Proper Names. By Richard Stephen Charnock, Ph. Dr. F.S.A., etc. 8vo. pp. 326, cloth. 14s.


Chaucer Society's Publications. Subscription, two guineas per annum. 1868. First Series.

Canterbury Tales. Part I.

I. The Prologue and Knight’s Tale, in 6 parallel Texts (from the 6 MSS. named below), together with Tables, showing the Groups of the Tales, and their varying order in 38 MSS. of the Tales, and in the old printed editions, and also Specimens from several MSS. of the “Moveable Prologues” of the Canterbury Tales,—The Shipman’s Prologue, and Franklin’s Prologue,—when moved from their right places, and of the substitutes for them.

III. " " " " " " Hengwrt " 154.
IV. " " " " " " Cambridge " Gg. 4. 27.
V. " " " " " " Corpus " Oxford.
VI. " " " " " " Petworth "
VII. " " " " " " Lansdowne " 851.

Nos. II. to VII. are separate Texts of the 6-Text edition of the Canterbury Tales, Part I.
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1868. Second Series.

On Early English Pronunciation, with especial reference to Shakspere and Chaucer, containing an investigation of the Correspondence of Writing with Speech in England, from the Anglo-Saxon period to the present day, preceded by a systematic notation of all spoken sounds, by means of the ordinary printing types. Including a re-arrangement of Prof. F. J. Child's Memoirs on the Language of Chaucer and Gower, and Reprints of the Rare Tracts by Salisbury on English, 1547, and Welsh, 1567, and by Barclay on French, 1521. By ALEXANDER J. ELLIS, F.R.S., etc., etc. Part I. On the Pronunciation of the XIVth, XVth, XVIth, and XVIIth centuries.


1869. First Series.

VIII. The Miller's, Reeve's, Cook's, and Gamelyn's Tales: Ellesmere MS.
IX. " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Hengwrt
X. " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Cambridge
XI. " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Corpus
XII. " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Petworth
XIII. " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Lansdowne
These are separate issues of the 6-Text Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, Part II.

1869. Second Series.

English Pronunciation, with especial reference to Shakspere and Chaucer. By ALEXANDER J. ELLIS, F.R.S. Part II.

1870. First Series.

XIV. The Miller's, Reeve's, and Cook's Tales, with an Appendix of the Spurious Tale of Gamelyn, in Six parallel Texts.


Childers.—A Páli-English Dictionary, with Sanskrit Equivalents, and with numerous Quotations, Extracts, and References. Compiled by R. C. Childers, late of the Ceylon Civil Service. [In preparation.

Chronique de ABOU-DJAFAR-MOHAMMED-BEN-DJARIR-BEN-YEZID TABARI. Traduite par Monsieur HERMANN ZO TENBERG. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 608. Vol. II, 8vo. pp. ii. and 252, sewed. 7s. 6d. each. (To be completed in Four Volumes.)

Clarke.—Ten Great Religions: an Essay in Comparative Theology. By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. 8vo. cloth, pp. x. and 528. 1871. 1s.

Colenso.—First Steps in Zulu-Kafir: An Abridgement of the Elementary Grammar of the Zulu-Kafir Language. By the Right Rev. JOHN W. COLENSO, Bishop of Natal. 8vo. pp. 86, cloth. Ekukanyeni, 1859. 4s. 6d.


Second Zulu-Kafir Reading Book. By the same. 16mo. 108, sewed. Natal. 3s.
Colenso.—Fourth Zulu-Kafir Reading Book. By the same. 8vo. pp. 160, cloth. Natal, 1859. 7s.

Colenso.—Three Native Accounts of the Visits of the Bishop of Natal in September and October, 1859, to Umande, King of the Zulus; with Explanatory Notes and a Literal Translation, and a Glossary of all the Zulu Words employed in the same: designed for the use of Students of the Zulu Language. By the Right Rev. John W. Colenso, Bishop of Natal. 16mo. pp. 160, stiff cover. Natal, Maritzburg, 1860. 4s. 6d.

Coleridge.—A Glossarial Index to the Printed English Literature of the Thirteenth Century. By Herbert Colbridge, Esq. 8vo. pp. 104, cloth. 2s. 6d.

Collecaio de Vocabulos e Frases usados na Provincia de S. Pedro, do Rio Grande do Sul, no Brasil. 12mo. pp. 32, sewed. 1s.

Contopoulos.—A Lexicon of Modern Greek-English and English Modern Greek. By N. Contopoulos.
Part I. Modern Greek-English. 8vo. cloth, pp. 460. 12s.
Part II. English-Modern Greek. 8vo. cloth, pp. 582. 15s.

Cunningham.—The Ancient Geography of India. I. The Buddhist Period, including the Campaigns of Alexander, and the Travels of Hwen-THsang. By Alexander Cunningham, Major-General, Royal Engineers (Bengal Retired). With thirteen Maps. 8vo. pp. xx. 590, cloth. 1870. 28s.

Cunningham.—An Essay on the Arian Order of Architecture, as exhibited in the Temples of Kashmire. By Captain (now Major-General) Alexander Cunningham. 8vo. pp. 86, cloth. With seventeen large folding Plates. 18s.

Cunningham.—The Bhilsa Topes; or, Buddhist Monuments of Central India: comprising a brief Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Decline of Buddhism; with an Account of the Opening and Examination of the various Groups of Topes around Bhilsa. By Breve-Major Alexander Cunningham, Bengal Engineers. Illustrated with thirty-three Plates. 8vo. pp. xxxvi. 370, cloth. 1854. 21s.


Delepiere.—Essai Historique et Bibliographique sur les Rébus. Par Octave Delcpiere. 8vo. pp. 24, sewed. With 15 pages of Woodcuts. 1870. 3s. 6d.


Early English Text Society's Publications. Subscription, one guinea per annum.

1. **Early English Alliterative Poems.** In the West-Midland Dialect of the Fourteenth Century. Edited by R. Morris, Esq., from an unique Cottonian MS. 1s.

2. **Arthur (about 1440 A.D.).** Edited by F. J. Furnivall, Esq., from the Marquis of Bath's unique MS. 4s.

3. **Anne Compendious and Breue Tractate concerning ye Office and Dewtie of Kyngis, etc.** By William Lauder. (1556 A.D.) Edited by F. Hall, Esq., D.C.L. 4s.

4. **Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight (about 1320-30 A.D.).** Edited by R. Morris, Esq., from an unique Cottonian MS. 10s.

5. **Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britaine Tongue;** a treatie, noe shorter than necessarie, for the Schooles, by Alexander Hume. Edited for the first time from the unique MS. in the British Museum (about 1617 A.D.), by Henry B. Wheatley, Esq. 4s.

6. **Lancelot of the Laik.** Edited from the unique MS. in the Cambridge University Library (ab. 1500), by the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, M.A. 8s.

7. **The Story of Genesis and Exodus, an Early English Song,** of about 1250 A.D. Edited for the first time from the unique MS. in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by R. Morris, Esq. 8s.

8. **Morte Arthure; the Alliterative Version.** Edited from Robert Thornton's unique MS. (about 1440 A.D.) at Lincoln, by the Rev. George Perry, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln. 7s.

9. **Animadversions upon the Annotationes and Corrections of some Imperfections of Chaucer's Workes,** reprinted in 1598; by Francis Thynne. Edited from the unique MS. in the Bridgewater Library. By G. H. Kingsley, Esq., M.D. 4s.

10. **Merlin, or the Early History of King Arthur.** Edited for the first time from the unique MS. in the Cambridge University Library (about 1450 A.D.), by Henry B. Wheatley, Esq. Part I. 2s. 6d.


12. **The Wright's Chaste Wife, a Merry Tale,** by Adam of Cobsam (about 1462 A.D.), from the unique Lambeth MS. 306. Edited for the first time by F. J. Furnivall, Esq., M.A. 1s.

13. **Seinte Marherete, be Meiden ant Martyr.** Three Texts of ab. 1200, 1310, 1330 A.D. First edited in 1862, by the Rev. Oswald Cockayne, M.A., and now re-issued. 2s.

14. **Kyng Horn,** with fragments of Floriz and Blauncheflur, and the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.Edited from the MSS. in the Library of the University of Cambridge and the British Museum, by the Rev. J. Rawson Lumby. 3s. 6d.

15. **Political, Religious, and Love Poems,** from the Lambeth MS. No. 306, and other sources. Edited by F. J. Furnivall, Esq., M.A. 7s. 6d.


**LI Meidenhead,** about 1200 A.D. Edited for the first time from e MS. (with a translation) by the Rev. Oswald Cockayne, M.A. 1s.
Early English Text Society's Publications—continued.

19. The Monarche, and other Poems of Sir David Lyndesay. Part II., the Complaynt of the King's Papingo, and other minor Poems. Edited from the First Edition by F. Hall, Esq., D.C.L. 3s. 6d.


23. Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwytt, or Remorse of Conscience, in the Kentish dialect, 1340 A.D. Edited from the unique MS. in the British Museum, by Richard Morris, Esq. 10s. 6d.


25. The Stacions of Rome, and the Pilgrim's Sea-Voyage and Seasickness, with Clene Maydenhod. Edited from the Vernon and Porkington MSS., etc., by F. J. Furnivall, Esq., M.A. 1s.


30. Piers, the Ploogham's Crede (about 1394). Edited from the MSS. by the Rev. W. W. Skelat, M.A. 2s.

31. Instructions for Parish Priests. By John Myec. Edited from Cotton MS. Claudius A. II., by Edward Peacock, Esq., F.S.A., etc., etc. 4s.


33. The Book of the Knight de la Tour Landry, 1372. A Father's Book for his Daughters, Edited from the Harleian MS. 1764, by Thomas Wright, Esq., M.A., and Mr. William Rossiter. 8s.

34. Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises. (Sawles Warde, and the Wohunge of Ure Lauerd: Ureisuns of Ure Louerd and of Ure Lefdi, etc.) of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries. Edited from MSS. in the British Museum, Lambeth, and Bodleian Libraries; with Introduction, Translation, and Notes, by Richard Morris. First Series. Part 2. 8s.


40. ENGLISH GILDS. The Original Ordinances of more than One Hundred Early English Gilds: Together with the olde usages of the cite of Wynchestre; The Ordinances of Worcester; The Office of the Mayor of Bristol; and the Customary of the Manor of Tettenhall-Regis. From Original MSS. of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Edited with Notes by the late Toulmin Smith, Esq., F.R.S. of Northern Antiquaries (Copenhagen). With an Introduction and Glossary, etc., by his daughter, Lucy Toulmin Smith. And a Preliminary Essay, in Five Parts, ON THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF GILDS, by Lujo Brentano, Doctor Juris Utriusque et Philosophiae. 21s.


42. BERNARDUS DE CURA BEI FAMILIARIS, with some Early Scotch Prophecies, etc. From a MS., KK 1. 5, in the Cambridge University Library. Edited by J. Rawson Lumbby, M.A., late Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge. 2s.

43. RATTY RAVING, and other Moral and Religious Pieces, in Prose and Verse. Edited from the Cambridge University Library MS. KK 1. 5, by J. Rawson Lumbby, M.A., late Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge. 3s.

Early English Text Society’s Publications—continued.

45. King Alfred’s West-Saxon Version of Gregory’s Pastoral Care.
   With an English translation, the Latin Text, Notes, and an Introduction

Extra Series. Subscriptions—Small paper, one guinea; large paper,
two guineas, per annum.

1. The Romance of William of Paleme (otherwise known as the
   Romance of William and the Werwolf). Translated from the French at the
   command of Sir Humphrey de Bohun, about A.D. 1350, to which is added a
   fragment of the Alliterative Romance of Alisaundre, translated from the
   Latin by the same author, about A.D. 1340; the former re-edited from the
   unique MS. in the Library of King’s College, Cambridge, the latter now
   first edited from the unique MS. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. By the

2. On Early English Pronunciation, with especial reference to
   Shakspere and Chaucer; containing an investigation of the Correspondence
   of Writing with Speech in England, from the Anglo-Saxon period to the
   present day, preceded by a systematic Notation of all Spoken Sounds by
   means of the ordinary Printing Types; including a re-arrangement of Prof.
   F. J. Child’s Memoirs on the Language of Chaucer and Gower, and reprints
   of the rare Tracts by Salesbury on English, 1547, and Welsh, 1567, and by
   Barclay on French, 1521. By Alexander J. Ellis, F.R.S. Part I. On
   the Pronunciation of the xivth, xvith, xviith, and xviiiith centuries. 8vo.
   sewed, pp. viii. and 416. 10s.

3. Caxton’s Book of Curtesye, printed at Westminster about 1477–8,  
   A.D., and now reprinted, with two MS. copies of the same treatise, from the  
   Oriel MS. 79, and the Balliol MS. 354. Edited by Frederick J. Furnival,
   M.A. 8vo. sewed, pp. xii. and 58. 5s.

4. The Lay of Havloch the Dane; composed in the reign of
   Edward I., about A.D. 1280. Formerly edited by Sir F. Madden for the
   Roxburgh Club, and now re-edited from the unique MS. Land Misc. 108, in
   sewed, pp. lv. and 160. 10s.

5. Chaucer’s Translation of Boethius’s “De Consolatione
   Philosophiae.” Edited from the Additional MS. 10.340 in the British
   Richard Morris. 8vo. 12s.

6. The Romance of the Chevelere Aisgnée. Re-edited from the
   unique manuscript in the British Museum, with a Preface, Notes, and
   Glossarial Index, by Henry H. Gibbs, Esq., M.A. 8vo. sewed, pp.  
   xviii. and 38. 3s.

7. On Early English Pronunciation, with especial reference to
   Shakspere and Chaucer. By Alexander J. Ellis, F.R.S., etc., etc.
   Part II. On the Pronunciation of the xiiiith and previous centuries, of
   Anglo-Saxon, Icelandic, Old Norse and Gothic, with Chronological Tables of
   the Value of Letters and Expression of Sounds in English Writing. 10s.

   A Booke of Precedence, The Ordering of a Funearall, etc. Varying Versions
   of the Good Wife, The Wise Man, etc., Maxims, Lydgate’s Order of Fools,  
   A Poem on Heraldry, Occieve on Lords’ Men, etc., Edited by F. J.
   Furnival, M.A., Trin. Hall, Camb. With Essays on Early Italian and
   German Books of Courtesy, by W. M. Rossetti, Esq., and E. Oswald
   Esq. 8vo. 13s.


(Part I., Starkey's Life and Letters, is in preparation.


Edda Saemundar Hinns Froda—The Edda of Saemund the Learned. From the Old Norse or Icelandic. Part I. with a Mythological Index. 12mo. pp. 152, cloth, 3s. 6d. Part II. with Index of Persons and Places. By Benjamin Thorpe. 12mo. pp. viii. and 172, cloth. 1866. 4s.; or in 1 Vol. complete, 7s. 6d.

Edkins.—China's Place in Philology. An attempt to show that the Languages of Europe and Asia have a common origin. By the Rev. Joseph Edkins. Crown 8vo., pp. xxiii.—403, cloth.

Edkins.—A Vocabulary of the Shanghai Dialect. By J. Edkins. 8vo. half-calf, pp. vi. and 151. Shanghai, 1869. 21s.


Loe and Grime; an Early English Romance. Edited from Bishop's Folio Manuscript, about 1650 A.D. By John W. Hales, M.A., now and late Assistant Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Frederick Furnivall, M.A., of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. 1 vol. 4to. (only 100 copies bound), bound in the Roxburghe style. pp. 64. Price 10s. 6d.

Eitel.—THREE LECTURES ON BUDDHISM. By the Rev. E. J. Eitel. (In the Press.)


Elliot.—MEMOIRS ON THE HISTORY, FOLK-LORE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE RACES OF THE NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES OF INDIA; being an amplified Edition of the original Supplementary Glossary of Indian Terms. By the late Sir Henry M. Elliot, K.C.B., of the Hon. East India Company's Bengal Civil Service. Edited, revised, and re-arranged, by John Beames, M.R.A.S., Bengal Civil Service; Member of the German Oriental Society, of the Asiatic Societies of Paris and Bengal, and of the Philological Society of London. In 2 vols. demy 8vo., pp. xx., 370, and 396, cloth. With two Lithographic Plates, one full-page coloured Map, and three large coloured folding Maps. 36s.


Ellis.—ENGLISH AND WELSH LANGUAGES. THE INFLUENCE OF THE ENGLISH AND WELSH LANGUAGES upon each other, exhibited in the Vocabularies of the two Tongues. Intended to suggest the importance to Philologers, Antiquaries, Ethnographers, and others, of giving due attention to the Celtic Branch of the Indo-Germanic Family of Languages. Square, pp. 30, sewed. 1869. 1s.


Ethnological Society of London (The Journal of the). Edited by Professor Huxley, F.R.S., President of the Society; George Buse, Esq., F.R.S.; Sir John Lubbock, Bart., F.R.S.; Colonel A. Lane Fox, Hon. Sec.; Thomas Wright, Esq., Hon. Sec.; Hyde Clarke, Esq.; Sub-Editor; and Assistant Secretary, J. H. Lamprey, Esq. Published Quarterly.

Vol. I., No. 1. April, 1869. 8vo. pp. 38, sewed. 3s.


Common-Leg Meeting, March 9, 1869 (held at the Museum of Practical Geology), Professor Huxley, F.R.S., President, in the Chair. Opening Address of the President.—On the Characteristics of the population of Central and South India (Illustrated). By Sir Walter Elliot.—On the Races of India as traced in existing Tribes and Castes (With a Map). By G. Campbell, Esq.—Remarks by Mr. James Ferguson.—Remarks by Mr. Walter Dendy.—Ordinary Meeting, January 23rd, 1869. Professor Huxley, F.R.S., President, in the Chair. On the Lechpas. By Dr. A. Campbell, late Superintendent of Darjeeling.—On Pre-historic Archaeology of India (Illustrated). By Colonel Meadows Taylor, C.S.I., M.R.A.S., M.R.I.A., etc.—Appendix I. Extract from description of the Pando Coolies in Malabar. By J. Babington, Esq. (Read before the Literary Society of Bombay, December 20th, 1820. Published in Volume IV. of the Society's Transactions).—Appendix II. Extracts from an old letter from Capt. now Colonel, A. Doria, dated Camp Katastrich, April 12th, 1832.—On some of the Mou tribes of the North Western frontier of India. By Major Foxbery, V.C.—On Peramet
**Facsimiles of Two Papyri found in a Tomb at Thebes.** With a Translation by **SAMUEL BIRCH, LL.D., F.S.A., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, Academies of Berlin, Herculaneum, etc., and an Account of their Discovery.** By **A. HENRY RHIND, Esq., F.S.A., etc.** In large folio, pp. 30 of text, and 16 plates coloured, bound in cloth. **21s.**

**Educatio in Early England.** Some Notes used as rewords to a Collection of Treatises on "Manners and Meals in the Olden Time," for the Early English Text Society. By **FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL, A., Trinity Hall, Cambridge, Member of Council of the Philological and English Text Societies.** 8vo. sewed. pp. 74. **1s.**


God.—The Name of God in 405 Languages. Ἄγνωστος Θεός. 32mo. pp 64, sewed. 2d.


Goldstücker.—Panini: His Place in Sanskrit Literature. An Investigation of some Literary and Chronological Questions which may be settled by a study of his Work. A separate impression of the Preface to the Facsimile of MS. No. 17 in the Library of Her Majesty’s Home Government for India, which contains a portion of the Manava-Kalpa-Sutra, with the Commentary of Kumaṇila-Swamin. By Theodor Goldstücker. Imperial 8vo. pp. 268, cloth. 12s.

Grammatography.—A Manual of Reference to the Alphabets of Ancient and Modern Languages. Based on the German Compilation of F. Ballhorn. Royal 8vo. pp. 80, cloth. 7s. 6d.

The “Grammatography” is offered to the public as a compendious introduction to the reading of the most important ancient and modern languages. Simple in its design, it will be consulted with advantage by the philological student, the amateur linguist, the bookseller, the corrector of the press, and the diligent composer.

Alphabetical Index.

Afghan (or Pushto). Czeckian (or Bohemian). Hebrew (current hand). Polish.
Amharic. Danish. Hebrew (Judæo-German). Pushto (or Afghan).
Arabic Ligatures. Ethiopic. Irish.
Aramaic. Etruscan. Italian (Old).
Canarees (or Carnâtese). Gujerat (or Guzeratte). Greek.
Coptic. Hieroglyphics. Old Slavonic (or Cyrillic).
Croatio-Glagolitic. Hieroglyphics. Old Slavonic (or Cyrillic).
Cyrillic (or Old Slavonic). Hebrew (Rabbinical). Persian.


Vol. II. Part 1. Australia. 8vo. pp. 44. 1s. 6d.
Vol. II. Part 2. Papuan Languages of the Loyalty Islands and New Hebrides, comprising those of the Islands of Nengone, Lifu, Aneitum, Tana, and others. 8vo. p. 12. 6d.

Vol. II. Part 4.—New Zealand, the Chatham Islands, and Auckland Islands. 8vo. pp. 76. 3s. 6d.

Vol. II. Part 4 (continued).—Polynesia and Borneo. 8vo. pp. 77-154. 3s. 6d.

Vol. III. Part 1.—Manuscripts and Incunabula. 8vo. pp. viii. and 24. 2s.


Grey.—Maori Mementos: being a Series of Addresses presented by the Native People to His Excellency Sir George Grey, K.C.B., F.R.S. With Introductory Remarks and Explanatory Notes; to which is added a small Collection of Laments, etc. By Ch. Oliver B. Davis. 8vo. pp. iv. and 228, cloth. 12s.

Green.—Shakespeare and the Emblem-Writers: an Exposition of their Similarities of Thought and Expression. Preceded by a View of the Emblem-Book Literature down to A.D. 1616. By Henry Green, M.A. In one volume, pp. xvi. 572, profusely illustrated with Woodcuts and Photolith. Plates, elegantly bound in cloth gilt, large medium 8vo. £1 11s. 6d.; large imperial 8vo. £2 12s. 6d. 1870.


Vol. II., containing Book II., with additional Notes and Index of Names. 8vo. cloth, pp. 504. 18s.

Grout.—The Isizulu: a Grammar of the Zulu Language; accompanied with an Historical Introduction, also with an Appendix. By Rev. Lewis Grout. 8vo. pp. lli. and 432, cloth. 21s.


Haug.—A Lecture on an Original Speech of Zoroaster (Yasna 45), with remarks on his age. By Martin Haug, Ph.D. 8vo. pp. 28, sewed. Bombay, 1865. 2s.

Haug.—Outline of a Grammar of the Zend Language. By Martin Haug, Dr. Phil. 8vo. pp. 82, sewed. 14s.


Haug.—Essay on the Pahlavi Language. By Martin Haug, Ph. D., Professor of Sanscrit and Comparative Philology at the University of Munich, Member of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, etc. (From the Pahlavi-Pazand Glossary, edited by Destur Hoshangji and M. Haug.) 8vo. pp. 152, sewed. 1870. 3s. 6d.

Haug.—The Religion of the Zoroastrians, as contained in their Sacred Writings. With a History of the Zend and Pehlevi Literature, and a Grammar of the Zend and Pehlevi Languages. By Martin Haug, Ph.D., late Superintendent of Sanscrit Studies in the Poona College. 2 vols. 8vo. [In preparation.

Heaviside.—American Antiquities; or, the New World the Old, and the Old World the New. By John T. C. Heaviside. 8vo. pp. 46, sewed. 1s. 6d.

Hepburn.—A Japanese and English Dictionary. With an English and Japanese Index. By J. C. Hepburn, A.M., M.D. Imperial 8vo. cloth, pp. xii., 560 and 132. 5l. 5s.


The Chinese characters contained in this work are from the collections of Chinese groups, engraved on steel, and cast into moveable types, by Mr. Marcellin Legrand, engraver of the Imperial Printing Office at Paris. They are used by most of the missions to China.


History of the Sect of Maharajahs; or, Vallabhacharyas in Western India. With a Steel Plate. 8vo. pp. 384, cloth. 12s.


Hoffmann.—A Japanese Grammar. By J. J. Hoffmann, Ph. Doc., Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences, etc., etc. Published by command of His Majesty's Minister for Colonial Affairs. Imp. 8vo. pp. viii. 352, sewed. 12s. 6d.

Historia y fundacion de la Ciudad de Tlaxcala, y sus cuatro cayev-ceras. Sacada por Francisco de Loaiza de lengua Castellana á esta Mexicana. Año de 1718. Con una Traduccio Castellana, publicado por S. Leon Reinsch. In one volume folio, with 25 Photographic Plates. [In preparation.

Hsowse.—A Grammar of the Cree Language. With which is combined an analysis of the Chippeway Dialect. By Joseph Hsowse, Esq., F.R.G.S. 8vo. pp. xx. and 324, cloth. 7s. 6d.


Ikhwán-u Safá.—Ikhwán-u Safá; or, Brothers of Purity. Describing the Contention between Men and Beasts as to the Superiority of the Human Race. Translated from the Hindustani by Professor J. Dowson, Staff College, Sandhurst. Crown 8vo. pp. viii. and 156, cloth. 7s.

Inman.—Ancient Faiths Embodied in Ancient Times; or, an attempt to trace the Religious Belief, Sacred Rites, and Holy Emblems of certain Nations, by an interpretation of the names given to children by Priestly authority, or assumed by prophets, kings and hierarchies. By Thomas Inman, M.D., Liverpool. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 1. and 1028, cloth, illustrated with numerous plates and woodcuts. £3.

Inman.—Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism Exposed and Explained. By Thomas Inman, M.D. (London), Physician to the Royal Infirmary, Liverpool. 8vo. pp. xvi. 68, stiff covers, with numerous illustrations. 1870. 6s.
Jaeschke.—A SHORT PRACTICAL GRAMMAR OF THE TIBETAN LANGUAGE, with special Reference to the Spoken Dialects. By H. A. Jaschke, Moravian Missionary. 8vo sewed, pp. ii. and 56. 2s. 6d.

Jaeschke.—ROMANIZED TIBETAN AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY, each word being re-produced in the Tibetan as well as in the Roman character. By H. A. Jaeschke, Moravian Missionary. 8vo. pp. ii. and 158, sewed. 6s.

Julien.—SYNTAXE NOUVELLE DE LA LANGUE CHINOISE.
Vol. I.—Fondée sur la position des mots, suivie de deux traités sur les particules et les principaux termes de grammaire, d'une table des idiomes, de fables, de légendes et d'apologies traduits mot à mot. 8vo. sewed. 1869. 20s.


Kafir Essays, and other Pieces; with an English Translation. Edited by the Right Rev. the Bishop of Grahamstown. 32mo. pp. 84, sewed. 2s 6d.

Kalidasa.—RAGHUVANSA. By Kalidasa. No. 1. (Cantos 1-3.) With Notes and Grammatical Explanations, by Rev. K. M. Banerjea, Second Professor of Bishop's College, Calcutta; Member of the Board of Examiners, Fort-William; Honorary Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, London. 8vo. sewed, pp. 70. 4s. 6d.

Kern.—THE BRIHAT-SANCHIT; or, Complete System of Natural Astrology of Varaha-Mihira. Translated from Sanskrit into English by Dr. H. Kern, Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Leyden. 8vo. pp. 50, stitched, Part I. 2s.

[Will be completed in Nine Parts.]


Kielhorn.—A GRAMMAR OF THE SANSCRIT LANGUAGE. By F. Kielhorn, Ph.D., Superintendent of Sanskrit Studies in Deccan College. Registered under Act xxv. of 1867. Demy 8vo. pp. xvi. 260. cloth. 1870. 10s. 6d.

Kistner.—BUDDHA AND HIS DOCTRINES. A Biographical Essay. By Otto Kistner. Imperial 8vo., pp. iv. and 32, sewed. 2s. 6d.

Koran (The). Arabic text, lithographed in Oudh, A.H. 1284 (1867). 16mo. pp. 942, bound in red goatskin, Oriental style, silver tooling. 7s. 6d.

The printing, as well as the outer appearance of the book, is extremely tasteful, and the characters, although small, read very easily. As a cheap edition for reference this is preferable to any other, and its price puts it within the reach of every Oriental scholar. It is now first imported from India.


Leigh.—The Religion of the World. By H. Stone Leigh. 12mo. pp. xii. 66, cloth. 1869. 2s. 6d.

Leitner.—The Races and Languages of Dardistan. By G. W. Leitner, M.A., Ph.D., Honorary Fellow of King’s College London, etc.; late on Special Duty in Kashmir. 4 vols. 4to. [In the Press.]


Leland.—Hans Breitmann as an Uhlman. Six New Ballads, with a Glossary. Square, sewed, pp. 72. 1s.


Leasley.—Man’s Origin and Destiny, Sketched from the Platform of the Sciences, in a Course of Lectures delivered before the Lowell Institute, in Boston, in the Winter of 1865–6. By J. P. Lesley, Member of the National Academy of the United States, Secretary of the American Philosophical Society. Numerous Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. pp. 392, cloth. 10s. 6d.

Liherien hag Avielen; or, the Catholic Epistles and Gospels for the Day up to Ascension. Translated for the first time into the Brehoneg of Brittany. Also in three other parallel columns a New Version of the same into Breizounec (commonly called Breton and Armorican); a Version into Welsh, mostly new, and closely resembling the Breton; and a Version Garlic of Manx or Cernaweg; with Illustrative Articles by Christoll Terriken and Charles Waring Saxton, D.D. Ch. Ch., Oxford. The Penitential Psalms are also added. Oblong 4to. pp. 156, sewed. 5s.

Lobscheid.—**CHINESE AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY, Arranged according to the Radicals.** By the Rev. W. Lobscheid, Knight of Francis Joseph, C.M.I.R.G.S.A., N.Z.B.S.V., &c. 1 vol. imp. 8vo. double columns, pp. 600, bound. £2 8s.

Ludewig (Hermann E.)—**The LITERATURE OF AMERICAN ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES.** With Additions and Corrections by Professor WM. W. Turner. Edited by Nicolas Trübner. 8vo. fly and general Title, 2 leaves; Dr. Ludewig’s Preface, pp. v.—viii.; Editor’s Preface, pp. iv.—xii.; Biographical Memoir of Dr. Ludewig, pp. xiii.—xiv.; and Introductory Biographical Notices, pp. xiv.—xxii., followed by List of Contents. Then follow Dr. Ludewig’s Bibliotheca Glottica, alphabetically arranged, with Additions by the Editor, pp. 1—209; Professor Turner’s Additions, with those of the Editor to the same, also alphabetically arranged, pp. 210—246; Index, pp. 247—256; and List of Errata, pp. 257, 258. Handsomely bound in cloth. 10s. 6d.


Manava-Kalpa-Sutra; being a portion of this ancient Work on Vaidik Rites, together with the Commentary of KUMARILA-SWAMIN. A Facsimile of the MS. No. 17, in the Library of Her Majesty’s Home Government for India. With a Preface by Theodor Goldstücker. Oblong folio, pp. 268 of letterpress and 121 leaves of facsimiles. Cloth. £4 4s.

Manipur Vocabulorum; A Rhyming Dictionary of the English Language. By Peter Levins (1570) Edited, with an Alphabetical Index, by Henry B. Wheatley. 8vo. pp. xvi. and 370, cloth. 14s.

Manning.—**AN INQUIRY INTO THE CHARACTER AND ORIGIN OF THE POSSESSIVE AUGMENT IN ENGLISH AND IN COGNATE DIALECTS.** By the late James Manning, Q.A.S., Recorder of Oxford. 8vo. pp. iv. and 90. 2s.

Markham.—**QUICHUA GRAMMAR AND DICTIONARY.** Contributions towards a Grammar and Dictionary of Quichua, the Language of the Yncas of Peru; collected by Clements R. Markham, F.S.A., Corr. Mem. of the University of Chile. Author of “Cuzco and Lima,” and “Travels in Peru and India.” In one vol. crown 8vo., pp. 223, cloth. £1 1s.

Markham.—**OLLANTA: A DRAMA IN THE QUICHUA LANGUAGE.** Text, Translation, and Introduction, by Clements R. Markham, F.R.G.S. Crown 8vo., pp. 128, cloth. 7s. 6d.

Marsden.—**NUMISMATA ORIENTALIA ILLUSTRATA.** The Plates of the Oriental Coins, Ancient and Modern, of the Collection of the late William Marsden, F.R.S., etc., etc., engraved from drawings made under his direction. 4to. pp. iv. (explanatory advertisement). cloth. £1 11s. 6d.


Mason.—**THE PALL TEXT OF KACHCHAYANO’S GRAMMAR, WITH ENGLISH ANNOTATIONS.** By Francis Mason, D.D. I. The Text Aphorisms, 1 to 673. II. The English Annotations, including the various Readings of six independent Burmese Manuscripts, the Singalese Text on Verbs, and the Cambodian Text on Syntax. To which is added a Concordance of the Aphorisms. In Two Parts. 8vo. sewed, pp. 208, 75, and 28. Toogoo, 1871. £1 12s.
Mathuráprasáda Misra.—A TRILINGUAL DICTIONARY, being a comprehensive Lexicon in English, Urdu, and Hindi, exhibiting the Syllabication, Pronunciation, and Etymology of English Words, with their Explanation in English, and in Urdu and Hindi in the Roman Character. By Mathuráprasáda Misra, Second Master, Queen’s College, Benares. 8vo. pp. xv. and 1330, cloth. Benares, 1865. £2 2s.

Mayer.—ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE LAMAIST SYSTEM IN TIBET, drawn from Chinese Sources. By William Frederick Mayer, Esq., of Her Britannic Majesty’s Consular Service, China. 8vo. pp. 24, sewed. 1869. 1s. 6d.


Megha-Duta (The). (Cloud-Messenger.) By Kálidásá. Translated from the Sanskrit into English verse, with Notes and Illustrations. By the late H. H. Wilson, M.A., F.R.S., Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford, etc., etc. The Vocabulary by Francis Johnson, sometime Professor of Oriental Languages at the College of the Honourable the East India Company, Haileybury. New Edition. 4to. cloth, pp. xi. and 180. 10s. 6d.

Memoirs read before the Anthropological Society of London, 1863-1864. 8vo., pp. 542, cloth. 21s.


Particula II. Royal 8vo. pp. 137-388, sewed. 10s. 6d.

Moffatt.—THE STANDARD ALPHABET PROBLEM; or the Preliminary Subject of a General Phonic System, considered on the basis of some important facts in the Sechwan Language of South Africa, and in reference to the views of Professors Lepsius, Max Müller, and others. A contribution to Phonetic Philology. By Robert Moffatt, jun., Surveyor, Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society. 8vo. pp. xxviii. and 174, cloth. 7s. 6d.


The test based on the Manuscripts of the Berlin, Leipsic, Gotha and Leyden Libraries, has been carefully revised by the learned editor, and printed with the utmost exactness.
Muir.—ORIGINAL Sanskrit Texts, on the Origin and History of the People of India, their Religion and Institutions. Collected, Translated, and Illustrated by John Muir, Esq., D.C.L., LL.D., Ph.D.

Vol. II. A New Edition is in preparation.

Vol. III. The Vedas: Opinions of their Authors, and of later Indian Writers, on their Origin, Inspiration, and Authority. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo. pp. xxxii. 312, cloth. 1868. 16s.

Vol. IV. Comparison of the Vedic with the later representation of the principal Indian Deities. 8vo. pp. xii. 440, cloth. 1863. 15s.

Vol. V. Contributions to a Knowledge of the Cosmogony, Mythology, Religious Ideas, Life and Manners of the Indians in the Vedic Age. 8vo. pp. xvi. 492, cloth, 1870. 21s.

Müller (Max).—THE SACRED HYMNS OF THE BRAHMINS, as preserved to us in the oldest collection of religious poetry, the Rig-Veda-Sanhitâ, translated and explained. By F. Max Müller, M.A., Fellow of All Souls' College; Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford; Foreign Member of the Institute of France, etc., etc. In 8 vols. Volume I. 8vo. pp. cliii. and 264. 12s. 6d.

Müller (Max).—A NEW EDITION OF THE HYMNS OF THE RIG-VEDA IN THE SANHITÂ TEXT, without the Commentary of the Sâyana. Based upon the Editio princeps of Max Müller. Large 8vo. of about 800 pages. [In preparation.

"The above New Edition of the Sanhitâ Text of the Rig-Veda, without the Commentary of Sâyana, will contain foot-notes of the names of the Authors, Deities, and Metres. It will be comprised in about fifty large 8vo. sheets, and will be carefully corrected and revised by Prof. F. Max Müller. The price to subscribers before publication will be 24s. per copy. After publication the price will be 36s. per copy.

Müller (Max).—LECTURE ON BUDDHIST NIHILISM. By F. Max Müller, M.A., Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford; Member of the French Institute, etc. Delivered before the General Meeting of the Association of German Philologists, at Kiel, 28th September, 1869. (Translated from the German.) Sewed. 1869. 1s.

Naphegyi.—THE ALBUM OF LANGUAGE, illustrated by the Lord's Prayer in one hundred languages, with historical descriptions of the principal languages, interlinear translation and pronunciation of each prayer, a dissertation on the languages of the world, and tables exhibiting all known languages, dead and living. By Gyula Nephegyi, M.D., A.M., Member of the "Societá Geográfica y Estadística" of Mexico, and "Mejoras Materiales" of Texasco, of the Numismatic and Antiquarian Society of Philadelphia, etc. In one splendid folio volume of 322 pages, illuminated frontispiece and title-page, elegantly bound in cloth, gilt top. £2 10s.

Contents.—Preface (pp. 2).—Introduction.—Observations on the Origin of Language (pp. 12).—Authors of Collections of the Lord's Prayer (pp. 8).—Families of Language (pp. 13).—Alphabets (pp. 25). The Lord's Prayer in the following languages (each accompanied by a transliteration into Roman characters, a translation into English, and a Monograph of the language), printed in the original characters.


1Suk. 23. Cashmere.

Nayler.—Commonsense Observations on the Existence of Rules (not yet reduced to System in any work extant) regarding the English Language; on the pernicious effects of yielding blind obedience to so-called authorities, whether Dictionary-Compilers, Grammar-Makers, or Spelling-Book Manufacturers, instead of examining and judging for ourselves on all questions that are open to investigation; followed by a Treatise, entitled Pronunciation Made Easy; also an Essay on the Pronunciation of Proper Names. By B. S. Nayler, accredited Elocutionist to the most celebrated Literary Societies in London. 8vo. pp. iv., 148, boards. 1869. 5s.


Newman.—The Text of the Iguvine Inscriptions, with interlinear Latin Translation and Notes. By Francis W. Newman, late Professor of Latin at University College, London. 8vo. pp. xvi. and 54, sewed. 2s.

Newman.—Orthoëpy: or, a simple mode of Accenting English, for the advantage of Foreigners and of all Learners. By Francis W. Newman, Emeritus Professor of University College, London. 8vo. pp. 28, sewed. 1869. 1s.


Oriental Text Society.—(The Publications of the Oriental Text Society.)

1. Theophania; or, Divine Manifestations of our Lord and Saviour. By Eusebius, Bishop of Cesarea. Syriac. Edited by Prof. S. Lee. 8vo. 1842. 15s.


4. Umdat Akidat Ahl al Sunnat wa al Tamaat; Pillar of the Creed of the Sunnites. Edited in Arabic by the Rev. W. Cureton. 8vo. 1843. 5s.

5. History of the Almohades. Edited in Arabic by Dr. R. P. A. Dozy. 8vo. 1847. 10s. 6d.


7. Dasa Kumara Charita. Edited in Sanskrit by Professor H. H. Wilson. 8vo. 1846. £1 4s.

8. Maha Vira Charita, or a History of Rama. A Sanskrit Play. Edited by F. H. Trithern. 8vo. 1848. 15s.


10. Salaman-u-Ubsal; A Romance of Jami (Dshami). Edited in Persian by F. Falconer. 4to. 1843. 10s.


Osburn.—THE MONUMENTAL HISTORY of EGYPT, as recorded on the
Ruins of her Temples, Palaces, and Tombs. By WILLIAM OSBURN. Illustrated
with Maps, Plates, etc. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. xii. and 461; vii. and 643, cloth. £2 2s.
Vol. I.—From the Colonization of the Valley to the Visit of the Patriarch Abram.
Vol. II. — From the Visit of Abram to the Exodus.

Palmer.—EGYPTIAN CHRONICLES, with a harmony of Sacred and
Egyptian Chronology, and an Appendix on Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities.
By WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., and late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.
2 vols., 8vo. cloth, pp. lxxiv. and 428, and viii. and 636. 1861. 12s.

Pand-Nâmah.—THE PAND-NÂMAH; or, Books of Counsels. By
ADÂRÂBÂD MÂRÂSPAND. Translated from Pehlevi into Gujerathi, by Harbad
Sheriarjee Dadabhoy. And from Gujerathi into English by the Rev. Shapurji
Edalji. Fcap. 8vo. sewed. 1870. 6d.

Pandit.—A PANDIT'S REMARKS on PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER'S TRANSLA-
TION of the "Rig-Veda." Sanskrit and English. Fcap. 8vo. sewed. 1870. 6d.

Paspati.—ÉTUDES SUR LES Tchinghianés (GYPSIES) ou BOHÉMIENS de
L'EMPIRE OTTOMAN. Par ALEXANDRE G. PASPATI, M.D. Large 8vo. sewed,
pp. xii. and 652. Constantinople, 1871. 28s.

Patell.—COWASJEE PATELL'S CHRONOLOGY, containing correspon-
ding Dates of the different Eras used by Christians, Jews, Greeks, Hindús,
Mohamedans, Parsees, Chinese, Japanese, etc. By COWASJEE SORABJEE
PATELL. 4to. pp. viii. and 184, cloth. 50s.

Pauthier.—LE LIVRE de MARCO POLO, Citoyen de Vénise, Conseiller
Privé et Commissaire Impérial de Khoubilai-Khaán. Rédigé en français sous
sa dictée en 1298 par Rusticen de Pise; Publié pour la première fois d'après
trois manuscrits inédits de la Bibliothèque Impériale de Paris, présentant la
réduction primitive du Livre, revue par Marco Polo lui-même et donnée par lui,
en 1307, à Thébault de Cépy, accompagnée des Variantes, de l'Explication
des mots hors d'usage, et de commentaires géographiques et historiques, tirés
des écrivains orientaux, principalement Chinois, avec une Carte générale de l'Asie
par M. G. PAUTHIER. Two vols. roy. 8vo. pp. clvii. 832. With Map and View
of Marco Polo's House at Venice. £1 8s.

Pazand.—THE BOOK of the MAJNIYO-I-KHARD. The Pazand and
Sanskrit Texts (in Roman characters) as arranged by Nerosengh Dhalva, in
the fifteenth century. With an English translation, a Glossary of the Pazand
texts, containing the Sanskrit, Rosian, and Pahlevi equivalents, a sketch of
484. 1871. 16s.

Percy.—BISHOP PERCY's FOLIO MANUSCRIPTS—BALLADS and ROMANCES.
Edited by John W. Hales, M.A., Fellow and late Assistant Tutor of Christ's
College, Cambridge; and Frederick J. Furnivall, M.A., of Trinity Hall, Cam-
bride; assisted by Professor Child, of Harvard University, Cambridge, U.S.A.,
Vol. 3, pp. 640. Demy 8vo. half-bound, £4 4s. Extra demi 8vo. half-bound,
on Whatman's best ribbed paper, £6 6s. Extra royal 8vo., paper covers, on What-
man's best ribbed paper; £10 10s. Large 4to., paper covers, on Whatman's
best ribbed paper, £12.

Perny.—DICTIONNAIRE FRANÇAIS-LATIN-CHINOIS de la LANGUE MANDA-
RINE PARLÉE. Par Paul PERNY, M.A., de la Congrégation des Missions
Etrangères. 4to. pp. viii. 459, sewed. £2 2s.

Perny.—GRAMMAIRE PRATIQUE de la LANGUE MANDARINE PARLÉE.
Par Paul PERNY, M.A., de la Congrégation des Missions Etrangères.

[In the Press.

—PROVERBES CHINOIS, RECUEILLIS et MÉS EN ORDRE. Par Paul

**Philological Society.**—**Proposals for the Publication of a New English Dictionary.** 8vo. pp. 32, sewed. 6d.

Pierce the Ploughman's Crede (about 1394 Anno Domini). Transcribed and Edited from the MS. of Trinity College, Cambridge, R. 3, 15. Collated with the MS. Bibl. Reg. 18. B. xvii. in the British Museum, and with the old Printed Text of 1558, to which is appended “God sped the Plough” (about 1500 Anno Domini), from the Lansdowne MS. 762. By the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, M.A., late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. pp. xx. and 75, cloth. 1867. 2s. 6d.

**Prakrita-Prakasa; or, The Prakrit Grammar of Vararuchi, with the Commentary (Manorama) of Bhamaha.** The first complete edition of the Original Text with Various Readings from a Collation of Six Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and the Libraries of the Royal Asiatic Society and the East India House; with copious Notes, an English Translation, and Index of Prakrit words, to which is prefixed an easy Introduction to Prakrit Grammar. By **Edward Byles Cowell,** of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, Professor of Sanskrit at Cambridge. Second issue, with new Preface, and corrections. 8vo. pp. xxxii. and 204. 14s.

Priaux.—**Questioes Mosaeae; or, the first part of the Book of Genesis compared with the remains of ancient religions.** By Osmond de Beauvoir Priaux. 8vo. pp. viii. and 548, cloth. 12s.


**Ram Raz.**—**Essay on the Architecture of the Hindus.** By Ram Raz, Native Judge and Magistrate of Bangalore, Corresponding Member of the R.A.S. of Great Britain and Ireland. With 48 plates. 4to. pp. xiv. and 64, sewed. London, 1834. Original selling price, £1 11s. 6d., reduced (for a short time) to 12s.

**Rask.**—**A Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Tongue.** From the Danish of Erasmus Rask, Professor of Literary History in, and Librarian to, the University of Copenhagen, etc. By **Benjamin Thorpe,** Member of the Munich Royal Academy of Sciences, and of the Society of Netherlandish Literature, Leyden. Second edition, corrected and improved. 18mo. pp. 200, cloth. 5s. 6d.

**Rawlinson.**—**A Commentary on the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Babylon and Assyria, including Readings of the Inscription on the Nimrud Obelisk, and Brief Notice of the Ancient Kings of Nineveh and Babylon, Read before the Royal Asiatic Society, by Major H. C. Rawlinson.** 8vo., pp. 84, sewed. London, 1850. 2s. 6d.


**Renan.**—**An Essay on the Age and Antiquity of the Book of Nabatean Agriculture.** To which is added an Inaugural Lecture on the Position of the Semitic Nations in the History of Civilization. By M. Ernest Renan, Membre de l'Institut. Crown 8vo., pp. xvi. and 148, cloth. 3s. 6d.

**Revue Celtique.**—**The Revue Celtique, a Quarterly Magazine for Celtic Philology, Literature, and History.** Edited with the assistance of the Chief Celtic Scholars of the British Islands and of the Continent, and Conducted by H. Gaidoz. 8vo. Subscription, £1 per annum.

**Ridley.**—**Kamilaroi, Dipple, and Turrubul.** Languages Spoken by Australian Aborigines. By Rev. Wm. Ridley, M.A., of the University of Sydney; Minister of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales. Print by authority. Small 4to. cloth, pp. vi. and 90. 30s.
Rig-Veda.—A NEW EDITION OF THE HYMNS OF THE RIG-VEDA IN THE SANHITÁ TEXT, without the Commentary of the Sāyana. Based upon the Editio princeps of MAX MÜLLER. Large 8vo. of about 800 pages. See also under MAX MÜLLER. [In preparation.]

Rig-Veda-Sanhita (The). The Sacred Hymns of the Brahmins, as preserved to us in the oldest collection of Religious Poetry, the Rig-Veda-Sanhita, translated and explained. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A., Fellow of All Soul’s College; Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford; Foreign Member of the Institute of France, etc. In 8 vols. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. cliii. and 264. 12s. 6d.

Rig-Veda-Sanhita (The): THE SACRED HYMNS OF THE BRAHMANS. Translated and explained by F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of All Soul’s College, Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford, Foreign Member of the Institute of France, etc., etc. Vol. I. HYMNS TO THE MARUTS, OR THE STORM-GODS. 8vo. pp. cliii. and 264. cloth. 1869. 12s. 6d.

Rig-Veda Sanhita.—A COLLECTION OF ANCIENT HINDU HYMNS. Constituting the First Ashtaka, or Book of the Rig-veda; the oldest authority for the religious and social institutions of the Hindus. Translated from the Original Sanscrit. By the late H. H. WILSON, M.A., F.R.S., etc. etc. etc. Second Edition, with a Postscript by DR. FITZEDWARD HALL. Vol. I. 8vo. cloth, pp. lii. and 348, price 21s.

Rig-veda Sanhita.—A Collection of Ancient Hindu Hymns, constituting the Fifth to Eighth Ashtakas, or books of the Rig-veda, the fullest Authority for the Religious and Social Institutions of the Hindus. Translated from the Original Sanskrit by the late HORACE HAYMAN WILSON, M.A., F.R.S., etc. Edited by E. B. COWELL, M.A., Principal of the Calcutta Sanskrit College. Vol. IV., 8vo., pp. 214, cloth. 14s. A few copies of Vols. II. and III. still left. [Vols. V. and VI. in the Press.

Sáma-Vidhâna-Brahmana (The). With the Commentary of Sāyana. Edited, with Notes, Translation, and Index, by A. C. BURNELL, M.R.A.S., Madras Civil Service. In 1 vol. 8vo. [In preparation.

Schele de Vere.—STUDIES IN ENGLISH; or, Glimpses of the Inner Life of our Language. By M. SCHELE DE VERE, LL.D., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Virginia. 8vo. cloth, pp. vi. and 365. 10s. 6d.

Scheimei.—EL MUSTAKER; or, First Born. (In Arabic, printed at Beyrout). Containing Five Comedies, called Comedies of Fiction, on Hopes and Judgments, in Twenty-six Poems of 1092 Verses, showing the Seven Stages of Life, from man’s conception unto his death and burial. By EMIN IBRAHIM SCHEMEL. In one volume, 4to. pp. 166, sewed. 1870. 5s.


Schloßmann.—THE MONUMENT OF A VICTORY OF MESA, King of the Moabites. A Contribution to Hebrew Archaeology by DR. KONSTANTIN SCHLOßMANN, Professor of Theology at the University of Halle. Translated from the German. [In the Press.

Shápurjí Edaljí.—A GRAMMAR OF THE GUJARÁTI LANGUAGE. By SHÁPURJÍ EDALJÍ. Cloth, pp. 127. 10s. 6d.

Sherring—The Sacred City of the Hindus. An Account of
Benares in Ancient and Modern Times. By the Rev. M. A. Sherring, M.A.,
LL.D.; and Prefaced with an Introduction by FitzEdward Hall, Esq., D.C.L.
8vo. cloth, pp. xxxvi. and 388, with numerous full-page illustrations. 21s.

Smith.—A Vocabulary of Proper Names in Chinese and English.
of Places, Persons, Tribes, and Sects, in China, Japan, Corea, Assam, Siam,
Burma, The Straits, and adjacent Countries. By F. Porter Smith, M.B.,
China. 4to. half-bound, pp. vi., 72, and x. 1870. 10s. 6d.

Smith.—Contributions towards the Materia Medica and Natural
History of China. For the use of Medical Missionaries and Native Medical
Students. By F. Porter Smith, M.B. London, Medical Missionary in
Central China. Imp. 4to. cloth, pp. viii. and 240. 1870. £1 1s.

Sophocles.—A Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek. By E. A.
Sophocles. 4to., pp. iv. and 624, cloth. £2 2s.

Sophocles.—Romaic or Modern Greek Grammar. By E. A. Sophocles.
8vo. pp. xxviii. and 196. 7s. 6d.

Sophocles.—Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods
(from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100). By E. A. Sophocles. Imp. 8vo. pp. xvi. 1188,
cloth. 1870. £2 5s.

Steele.—An Eastern Love Story. Kusa Jatikaya: a Buddhistic
Legendary Poem, with other Stories. By Thomas Steele, Ceylon Civil
Service. Crown 8vo. cloth, pp. xii. and 260. 1871. 6s.

Stratmann.—A Dictionary of the English Language. Compiled
from the writings of the xixth, xivth, and xvth centuries. By Francis
Henry Stratmann. Second Edition. 8vo. Part I, price 10s. 6d.
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