

A fragment from a *Commentary on the Andalusí Books of Hebrew Verbs* (T-S Ar 31.7)\*

José Martínez Delgado  
University of Granada

*Resumen*

Edición, traducción y estudio de dos fragmentos de un tratado anónimo sobre verbos hebreos custodiados en Cambridge (T-S Ar 31.7) muy relacionado con los Libros de verbos hebreos andalusíes. Estos fragmentos (de la sección dedicada a los verbos de segunda radical defectiva) se presentan como un complemento a los tratados de Ḥayyūğ y una antología de otros libros de verbos, a manera de monografía resumida. Es posterior en el tiempo al *Kitāb al-uṣūl* de Ibn Ġanāḥ, comenta la obra de Ḥayyūğ y añade pasajes del *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* y el *Kitāb al-uṣūl*.

*Palabras clave*

Hebreo bíblico, Judeo-Árabe, Ḥayyūğ, Ibn Ġanāḥ.

*Abstract*

Edition, translation and study of two fragments of an anonymous book of verbs found in Cambridge (T-S Ar 31.7) closely related to all of the Andalusí Books of Hebrew verbs. These fragments (from the section on weak second radical verbs) complement the work by Ḥayyūğ and compile the contents from other books of verbs, like a monographic summary. It postdates Ibn Janāḥ's *Kitāb al-uṣūl*, comments on Ḥayyūğ and adds passages from the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* and *Kitāb al-uṣūl*.

*Key words*

Biblical Hebrew, Judeo-Arabic, Ḥayyūğ, Ibn Janāḥ.

*The Andalusí books of Hebrew verbs*

The title *Ars grammaticae* encompasses linguistic works of a very wide-ranging nature. In the study of medieval Hebrew, this concept incorporates grammars

---

\* This work was written under the auspices of the research project *Recovering the Judeo-Arabic Linguistic Legacy of al-Andalus: A Study* (FFI2014-51818-P). A shorter version of the work in Hebrew was presented at the Sixteenth International Conference of the Society for Judaeo-Arabic Studies held at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, July 22-25, 2013. Once I finished this paper I realised that there was an annotated but non-dated transcription and Hebrew translation of this manuscript in the Friedberg Genizah Project site signed by Aharon Maman, Head of FGP Linguistics team. Therefore, both are the result of an exhaustive but independent research.

and dictionaries without establishing a clear difference between the two types of works. The origin of this confusion may lie in the very nature of the first philological works written in Judeo-Arabic in al-Andalus beginning in the mid-tenth century: books of Hebrew verbs (*kutub al-afāl al-ibrāniya*). Inspired by Islamic books of verbs, these works use morphology and analogy to establish the root of each word found in the Bible, which quite possibly produced the confusion between grammar and lexicography. However, viewed in isolation, these texts could be seen as their own genre thanks to the fragments held in the Cairo Genizah. In fact, these books of Hebrew verbs inaugurated Judeo-Arabic literature in al-Andalus and opened up a new line of linguistic thinking among Arabic-speaking Jews. The first examples of this genre, which date back to the mid-tenth century in Cordoba, are two books of verbs, one dedicated to weak verbs and the other to geminative verbs, both written by Ḥayyūj.<sup>1</sup> Although these works have been traditionally considered grammars and their author the father of Modern Hebrew grammar, when seen as a compact work, they comprise four dictionaries with introductions on verbal morphology, much like the books of Arabic verbs. The first question that arises concerns why Ḥayyūj chose this format. According to Andalusi tradition, he took his inspiration from Arabic works, at least as argued by Ibn Parḥon:<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Judeo-Arabic text was originally published in Arab script by Morris Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs in Hebrew by Abū Zakariyyā Yahyā ibn Dāwūd of Fez, Known as Ḥayyūj*, Leide: Brill, 1897; a new edition was recently published in Hebrew script by Daniel Sivan and Ali Wated, *Three treatises on Hebrew grammar by R. Judah Ḥayyuj*. A new critical edition of the Arabic text with a Modern Hebrew translation, Beer Sheva 2012, although in this paper, I will draw on Jastrow's classic edition. By the Middle Ages, the text had already been translated into Hebrew on two occasions, the first in the eleventh century by Moše b. Ḡiqaṭela (see the edition by John William Nutt, *Two treatises on Verbs containing Feeble and Double Letters by R. Yehuda Hayug of Fez. Translated into Hebrew from the original Arabic by R. Moseh Gikatilia of Cordova; to which is added the Treatise on Punctuation by the same Author translated by Aben Ezra*, London-Berlin 1870), and the second in the twelfth century by Abraham b. 'Ezra (see the edition by Leopold Dukes, *Grammatische Werke des R. Jehuda Chajjug. Sifre Diquq me-roš ha-mēdaqdēqim R. Yēhudah Ḥayyūj*, Stuttgart 1844). At this time, the original text has been translated into Israeli Hebrew by Akiva Holander, *Sefer Otiyyot nahot wē-ha-pē'alim ha-kēfulim. Turgam me-ḥadaš*, Tel Aviv 1957, and into Spanish by José Martínez Delgado, *Yaḥyā Ibn Dāwūd: El Libro de Ḥayyūj (Versión original árabe siglo X)*. Introducción y Traducción, Colección Textos: Lengua Hebrea 3 (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> In the original: עד שעמד חיוג ז"ל ומצא ערוך שעשאו חכמי לשון ישמעאל ללשונם וקרא אותו ולמד דרכיו ועשה כן ללשון הקדש וחיבר את ספרו והראה אור לעולם אעפ"כ השיבו עליו תלמידיו ותפסוהו הוא עיקר חכמתם וכמו שראו חכמי בבל ספרו אמרו לא ראינו מצד מערב דבר טוב חוץ מזה הספר שהוא יותר טוב מכל טוב שבועולם. Edited by Salomo Gottlieb Stern, *Maḥberet he-'aruk kolel kēlale lašon 'ibrit bi-šene ḥalaqim* (Pressburg: Typis Antonii Nobilis de Schmid, 1884), p. 54d.

Until Ḥayyūj, blessed be his memory, appeared and found a dictionary written by the Ishmaelites for their tongue. He read it and learned its methodology and did the same for the Hebrew language and wrote his book. The world was enlightened. Even though additions were made and his disciples criticized it, this is the source of their knowledge. When the learned men of Babylonia saw his book they said “we have not seen anything good from the West except for this book, which surpasses all that there is in the world”.

Without downplaying this assertion, which is correct, there is no need to look outside Andalusī Judaism for the answer, as it can be found there. Ḥayyūj used this format to compensate for the deficiencies in Mēnaḥem b. Saruq’s *Maḥberet*, the first large lexicographical work written in Cordoba around the year 950,<sup>3</sup> in which no criteria for recognizing these types of verbs, i.e. weak and geminative verbs, have been found.

Ḥayyūj’s work was written in the second half of the tenth century, surely between the caliphate of al-Ḥakam II (961-976) and the al-Manṣūr regency (976-1009). It is known that Mēnaḥem b. Saruq’s *Maḥberet* and the criticism drafted against it by Dunaš b. Labraṭ, the *Tēšubot*, were written before 958 during the caliphate of ‘Abd-ar-Raḥmān III (929-961).<sup>4</sup> Given that the relationship between Ḥayyūj and Mēnaḥem b. Saruq has been shown to have been quite close<sup>5</sup> and that –again according to Ibn Parḥon<sup>6</sup>– Ḥayyūj was Samuel b. Nagrela’s (b. Cordoba 993) teacher, the books of verbs by Ḥayyūj must have been written during the greatest moment of splendour of the Cordoba caliphate and right before the disturbances that brought an end to the Umayyad dynasty (1009-1031).

As soon as it appeared, Ḥayyūj’s book was memorized and transmitted to the letter (*taqlīd*), quickly becoming a model and standard for every book of Hebrew verbs written during the Middle Ages in Judeo-Arabic. Therefore, it is

---

<sup>3</sup> Mēnaḥem b. Saruq. *Maḥberet Menaḥem*. Edición crítica, introducción y notas por Ángel Sáenz-Badillos (Granada: Universidad de Granada 1986).

<sup>4</sup> These can be dated from the information provided by Dunaš b. Labraṭ in his panegyric to Ḥasday b. Šapruṭ, in which he describes the arrival of a Christian mission to Cordoba in 958: גביר גבור מלך הביאנו כהלך ומחזיק בפלך לעם הם לו צרים / ומשך השופה זקנתו טופה אשך היתה: *musammaṭ murabba*, *mustaṭīl* metre, modified in almost the entire poem with *qaṭ*’ or *tašīl* i.e. cutting a syllable of the feet) ‘a strong lord, a king, dressed as a vagrant, leaning on his walking stick, went to an enemy town / and took the savage, his grandmother Toda, who was covered regally like a lord / with the force of his wisdom and the power of his prudence and his great arts and the sweetness of his words’. *Tēšubot de Dunaš ben Labraṭ*, Edición crítica y traducción de Ángel Sáenz-Badillos (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1980), p. 2\*.

<sup>5</sup> José Martínez Delgado, ‘El uso del *Maḥberet* entre los primeros filólogos hebreos de Alandalús’, *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos (Sección de Hebreo)* 59 (2010), pp. 135 - 165.

<sup>6</sup> *Maḥberet ha-‘aruḳ*, edited by Stern, 1884: XXII.

no exaggeration to assert that out of it arose a specific Judeo-Arabic literary genre: books of Hebrew verbs devised to complete and comment on the catalogue of roots begun by Ḥayyūj.<sup>7</sup>

The genre in and of itself took shape after the appearance of the first sequel to Ḥayyūj's book, the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* or *Book of Supplement* by Ibn Janāḥ,<sup>8</sup> written in Zaragoza sometime after the end of the Siege of Cordoba by Berber troops led by the Umayyad Sulaymān al-Mustaʿīn bi-llah in 1013, which resulted in the massive exodus of the entire population. In his book, Ibn Janāḥ formally follows the outline in Ḥayyūj's work. The contents of this 'supplement' to Ḥayyūj's book sparked a controversy, though only the position defended by Ibn Janāḥ in writing is extant at this time.

Another characteristic of this genre is its wealth of typologies; indeed, it is necessary to differentiate between books of verbs properly speaking and commentaries on books of verbs when discussing these works. The best criterion for recognizing the two types is whether or not the author decided to organize them by roots. According to David Téné, this literary genre developed over the course of thirty years and can be divided into two types: books that clarify, complete and comment on Ḥayyūj's work and those looking to stir up controversy. The former group includes the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* and *Kitāb al-taqrīb wa-l-tashīl*, while the latter contains everything written after the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* between 1020 and 1040. This group of books is so important that Ibn Janāḥ's great dictionary, the *Kitāb al-uṣūl*, is incomplete without them.<sup>9</sup>

In reality, the list of the works identified to date bear testament to the fact that this is a specific genre dedicated to identifying and cataloguing Hebrew weak and geminated roots, their forms and meanings. The works written in al-Andalus between the mid-tenth and mid-eleventh centuries prior to the

---

<sup>7</sup> In the second half of the eleventh century, Yēhudah ben Bil'am wrote his dictionary entitled the *Kitāb al-af'āl al-muštaqqā min al-asmā'* or the Book of Deverbalized Verbs, which has nothing to do with the *Kutubal-af'āl* genre (edited by Shraga Abramson, *Šēlošah Sēfarim šel RaḅYēhudahb. Bal'am. Maqor wē-tirgum lē-'ībrit, mēbo'ot wē-he'arot*. Jerusalem: Qiryat Sefer 1975).

<sup>8</sup> The original text was published in Arabic script with a French translation by Joseph and Hartwig Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasā'il li-Abī al-Walīd Marwān Ibn Janāḥ al-Qurṭūbī = Opuscules et traités d'Abou'l-Walīd Merwan ibn Djanah de Cordoue: texte arabe, publié avec une traduction française*, (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1880: 1-246); for the medieval Hebrew translation, see David Téné, *Sefer ha-Hassagah, hu' Kitāb al-Mustalḥaq lē-Rabī Yonah Ibn Čanāḥ bē-tirgumo ha-ībri šel 'Obadyah ha-Sefardī (Sefer ha-Hassagah which is Kitāb al-Mustalḥaq of Rabbi Jonah Ibn Janāḥ in the Hebrew Translation of Obadiah ha-Sefardi)*, posthumous work edited by Aharon Maman, (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and The Bialik Institute, 2006).

<sup>9</sup> Téné, *Sefer ha-Hassagah*, pp. XXVIII-XXX.

appearance of the great Hebrew dictionaries –the *Kitāb al-uṣūl* by Ibn Janāḥ<sup>10</sup> and *Kitāb al-istignāʾ* by Ibn Nagrela<sup>11</sup>– are:

#### *Books of verbs*

1. The *Kitāb al-afʿāl dawāt ḥurūf al-līn wa-l-madd* or *Book of Weak Verbs* and the *Kitāb al-afʿāl dawāt al-miṭlayn* or *Book of Geminative Verbs* by Abū Zakariyāʾ Yaḥyā b. Dāwūd, Ḥayyūj, written in Cordoba in the second half of the tenth century. These can be understood as a whole divided into four main blocks: 1. Weak first radical verbs, with one section for verbs beginning with *alef* and another for verbs beginning with *yod*; 2. Weak second radical verbs; 3. Weak third radical verbs; and 4. Verbs with geminated radicals. These works provide the first catalogue of up to 454 roots of weak and geminative verbs unknown until then.<sup>12</sup>

2. The *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq fī al-afʿāl dawāt ḥurūf al-līn wa-dawāt al-miṭlayn* or *Supplement to the Book of Weak and Geminative Verbs* by Abū l-Walīd Marwān (Yonah) b. Janāḥ, written in Zaragoza sometime after 1013.<sup>13</sup> Presented as an appendix, the book adopts the structure of Ḥayyūj's works, proposes the identification of up to 63 new roots and adds forms or poses questions about another 128 already identified by his predecessor. It also identifies a new genus, ambiguous verbs (*al-afʿāl al-mušmila*), identifying 12 reduplicated roots (*piḥpel*), without being able to assert that they derive from a concave root.

3. The *Kitāb al-istifāʾ/al-istiḥfāʾ* or *Book of Exhaustive Treatment/Concealment*.<sup>14</sup> An anonymous team-written book, this text targets the contents of the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq*. The work is only known thanks to Ibn Janāḥ, who never saw it and only heard of it from an expert on the topic. It is quite difficult to form an exact idea of the contents of the *Kitāb al-istifāʾ* and its nature because Ibn Janāḥ himself said that it had reached him 'by word of mouth'. In any case, the *Kitāb al-istifāʾ* was clearly a book of Hebrew verbs that followed the model devised by Ḥayyūj and adopted by Ibn Janāḥ. Like the others, it was divided into four major blocks. The innovation that differentiated this work from its

---

<sup>10</sup> Abū al-Walid Marwān (Yona) b. Janāḥ. *The book of Hebrew roots*. New first ed. by Adolf Neubauer with an appendix, containing extracts from other Hebrew-Arabic dictionaries (Oxford, 1873-1875).

<sup>11</sup> The known fragments were published by Pavel Konstantine Kokóvtsov, *Novye materialy dlia kharakteristiki ĭekhudy Khaĭudzha, Samuila Nagida i niekotorykh drugikh predstavitelei evreĭskoĭ filologičeskoĭ nauki v X, XI i XII viekie* (S. Petersburg: Tip. Imp. akademii nauk, 1916).

<sup>12</sup> For the editions and versions, v. note 1.

<sup>13</sup> For the edition and the Hebrew version, v. note 8.

<sup>14</sup> There are no known remains of the *Kitāb al-istifāʾ*; for a reconstruction of its contents, see José Martínez Delgado, 'Risālat al-tanbīh by Ibn Ġanāḥ: an edition, translation and study', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 43 (2016), pp. 317-361.

predecessors was that it included all the verb roots and nominal forms with the letters *alef*, *waw*, *yod* and *he'* or had geminated radicals. The authors did not care if *alef*, *waw* and *yod* functioned as weak lengthened letters (*al-līn wa-l-madd*) or whether or not the roots were affected by the phenomenon known as *i'tilāl* (permutation and labiality of the three weak letters). Following the trend at the time, they limited themselves to inventorying all the verb roots and nominal forms of these four genres. In the face of the criticism the book received, its authors withdrew it from circulation, which led people to scornfully call it the *Kitāb al-iḥtifā'* (*Book of Concealment*).

4. The *Rasā'il al-rifaq* or *Epistles of the Companions*. Another anonymous book written by a team directly linked by tradition to Abū Ibrāhīm Šemu'el b. Nagrela. The only two extant fragments of this work show that it is comprised chapters or epistles concerning assertions made by Ibn Janāḥ and that it does not seem to follow the order established by Ḥayyūj.<sup>15</sup>

5. The *Kitāb al-tašwīr* or *Book of Unmasking* by Abū l-Walīd Marwān (Yonah) b. Janāḥ. This work defends the attacks on his opinions in the *Epistles of the Companions*. Only two short fragments of this work are extant.<sup>16</sup>

6. The *Anonymous Book of Verbs* lists the *binyanim* used by the geminative verbs recorded by Ḥayyūj and adds a chapter on nominal patterns with weak letters. This work literally follows the order established in Ḥayyūj's works. Conspicuously, this book and the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* ignore each other. The work was originally published by N. Allony as *al-Kitāb al-kāmil* by Ya'qob b. El'azar.<sup>17</sup> Two new fragments have been identified that make it possible to reconstruct the entire chapter on geminative verbs.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> The fragments identified to date are contained in Firk manuscripts Ebr.-Arab. II 1239 and I 2573; the first was published in Arabic script by Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasā'il*, pp. LIX-LXVI.

<sup>16</sup> One was published in Arabic script by Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasā'il*, pp. XLIX-LIII and another in Hebrew script by Maaravi Perez, 'Qeṭa' ḥadaš mittoḵ *Kitāb al-tašwīr* lē-R. Jonah b. Janāḥ', *Kiryat Sefer* 64.4 (1993), pp. 1367-1387.

<sup>17</sup> Nehemyah Allony, *Ya'qob ben El'azar Kitāb al-Kāmil*, (Jerusalem: Hoša'at ha-Aqademyah ha-Ameriqanit le-mada'e ha-Yahadut, 1977). This edition was revised by Joshua Blau, "He'arot la-ṭeqṣṭ wē-la-targum šel *Kitāb al-Kāmil* lē-Ya'qob ben El'azar (Mahadurat N. Allony)", *Tarbiz* 48.1-2 (1979), pp. 164-166. For new fragments from *al-Kitāb al-kāmil*, see José Martínez Delgado, 'Nuevas alusiones al *Kitāb al-Kāmil* de Ya'qob ben El'azar (Edición, traducción y estudio)', *Sefarad* 69.2 (2009), pp. 315-360 and 'A fragment of Jacob ben Eleazar's *al-Kitāb al-Kāmil* (lexicographical section)', in Amir Ashur (ed.), *Judaeo-Arabic Culture in al-Andalus* (Córdoba: Oriens Academics CNERU-CSIC 2013), pp. 121-152.

<sup>18</sup> José Martínez Delgado, 'An Anonymous Book on Hebrew Verbs in Judeo-Arabic', *Revue des Études Juives* 173.3-4 (2014), pp. 359-393.

*Commentaries on the books of verbs*

1. The *Risālat al-tanbīh* or *Epistle of Admonition* by Abū l-Walīd Marwān (Yonah) b. Janāḥ.<sup>19</sup> Written in Zaragoza, it prefaced a signed copy of the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* requested by a friend of the author. The epistle reports on the existence of the *Kitāb al-istifāʾ*. In the text, Ibn Janāḥ first defends himself generally before later addressing specific cases. With his pride wounded, he defends himself and focuses on what he sees as explicit attacks on his arguments and contributions to the study of the Hebrew Bible. Ibn Janāḥ wrote this letter to defend his arguments and warn beginners about the low academic quality of the group that he insults throughout the epistle.

2. The *Risālat al-taqrīb wa-l-tashīl* or *Book of Approach and Facilitation* by Abū l-Walīd Marwān (Yonah) b. Janāḥ. Proposed as a complementary introduction to the verbs listed by Ḥayyūj, this work follows its format, focusing on the points that the author considers obscure without configuring a book of verbs properly speaking.<sup>20</sup>

3. The *Kitāb al-taswīʾa* or *Book of Reprobation* by Abū l-Walīd Marwān (Yonah) b. Janāḥ.<sup>21</sup> This work belongs more to the genre of philological dispute. It describes a literary gathering in the house of a common friend of Ibn Janāḥ and his adversary who, as described in the book, is more of an aficionado who has picked up some grammar than a linguist, and is stubborn and incapable of mastering improvised verbal conjugation. This elicits open ridicule from the author who is said to suffer a fainting spell similar to epileptic spells when exposed to the linguistic ramblings of the apprentice of his real adversary, who remains anonymous (*al-qawm*) at all times.

4. The *Kitāb al-ḥuǧǧa* or *Book of the Proof* by Abū Ibrāhīm Šǧmuʾel b. Nagrela. As the only information about the existence of this book comes from allusions

---

<sup>19</sup> The original text was published in Arabic script with a French translation by Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasāʾil*, pp. 247-267; for a new edition in Hebrew script based on all the extant manuscripts, see Martínez Delgado, *Risālat al-tanbīh*.

<sup>20</sup> The original text was published in Arabic script with a French translation by Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasāʾil*, pp. 268-342; for a new edition in Hebrew script, see Ahmad Alahmad Alkhalaf, *Risālat al-taqrīb wa-l-tashīl de Abū l-Walīd Marwān ibn Ġanāḥ de Córdoba, edición diplomática y traducción* (Madrid: Sindéresis 2018).

<sup>21</sup> The original text was published in Arabic script with a French translation by Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasāʾil*, pp. 343-379; for a new edition in Hebrew script, see María Ángeles Gallego, *El judeo-árabe medieval; Edición, traducción y estudio lingüístico del Kitāb al-taswīʾa de Yonah ibn Ġanāḥ* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006); one fragment of this Hebrew version, which was published by José Manuel Camacho Padilla, “Rabí Yonā ben Gannach: La segunda mitad del «Sefer Hahaxua», versión hebraica de su «Kitab at-tasuiya», por Salomón bar Yosef ben Ayyub”, *Boletín de la Real Academia de Ciencias, Bellas Letras y Nobles Artes de Córdoba* 25 (1929), pp. 23-74, is extant.

made by the author himself, it is impossible to determine whether this was a book of verbs or a commentary.<sup>22</sup>

\* \* \*

The fragment of an anonymous book of verbs that I found in Cambridge (T-S Ar 31.7) is closely related to all of these works. Only two fragments from the section on weak second radical verbs have been preserved; they complement the work by Ḥayyūj and compile the contents from other books of verbs, like a monographic summary. It postdates Ibn Janāḥ's *Kitāb al-uṣūl*, comments on Ḥayyūj and adds passages from the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* and *Kitāb al-uṣūl*, suggesting that everything not taken from Ibn Janāḥ comes from Ibn Nagrela. However, while these fragments cite Ḥayyūj and Ibn Janāḥ, they never cite Ibn Nagrela.

*The anonymous commentary on the books of Hebrew verbs (T-S Ar 31.7)*

The text preserved in fragment T-S Ar 31.7 comprises six folios of 15 lines each.<sup>23</sup> Although damaged, it is easy to reconstruct thanks to its anthological nature. The text is really two fragments with three folios each. It has a total of sixteen lemmas. In the first fragment, seven are complete (גוד, גול, גול, גול, גול, גול, גול) and two incomplete (גור, גור); in the second fragment, six are complete (דוג, דוח, דוך, דום, דון, דון), one incomplete (דאב) and one other (דור) introduced at the end of the fragment.

The work is a *Tafsīr* or commentary on the books of Hebrew verbs by Ḥayyūj. Like all books of verbs, it requires that the user first memorize the work by Ḥayyūj. In fact, many of its articles begin with the refrain *ilā akhrihu tafsīr* or 'at the end, commentary', i.e. new information is being added to the original article by Ḥayyūj. This occurs systematically with the roots גול, גוד, גור, דון, דוח and דוך.

The sources used in the commentary are the work by Ḥayyūj and Ibn Janāḥ's *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* and *Kitāb al-uṣūl*. There is also an anonymous opinion that usually opposes Ibn Janāḥ, which suggests that these could be from works by Ibn Nagrela. It is also impossible to determine if the new standardization applied to the articles written by Ḥayyūj is a contribution of

---

<sup>22</sup> Kokóvtsov, *Nouie Materiali*, p. 210.

<sup>23</sup> For a formal description, see the catalogue by C.F. Baker and M. Polliack, *Arabic and Judaeo-Arabic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections: Arabic Old Series (T-S Ar.1a-54)*; specialist advisor H. Ben-Shammai (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press 2001), [2913].



the author himself or is taken from the *Kitāb al-istignā'* by Ibn Nagrela, which, again, is never cited. As a matter of fact, in the articles the author:

1. Reproduces the words of Ḥayyūj, but adding information that was implicit in the original:

Ḥayyūj.<sup>24</sup> בָּס קָמִינוּ (Ps 44:6), וְעַל-הָרֵי אַבְוִסָנוּ (Isa 14:25), תְּבוּס נֹפֶת, בִּסְתִי בָס (Prov 27:7), בּוֹסְתִי, בּוֹסְתִי מוּבָס, כְּפָגַר מוּבָס (Isa 14:19). In the root there is a heavy form, בּוֹסְתִי, בּוֹסְתִי, מְבוֹסְתִי, אַבּוֹסְתִי (Ezra 16:6). מְתוּבּוֹסְתִי בְדַמְיָךְ (Isa 63:18), מְבוֹסְתִי, בּוֹסְתִי מְקַדְשֶׁךְ (Isa 63:18), [בוֹס... The heavy form is] מְבוֹסְתִי, בּוֹסְתִי מְקַדְשֶׁךְ (Isa 63:18), מְבוֹסְתִי, [אַבּוֹסְתִי]. The *hitpa'el* is מְתוּבּוֹסְתִי בְדַמְיָךְ (Ezra 16:6).

Ḥayyūj.<sup>26</sup> וַיִּגַּר אַבְרָהָם (Isa 16:4), יִגְרוּ בְךָ נְדָחֵי מוֹאָב (Gen 32:5), עִם-לְבָן גְּרָתִי, גְּרָתִי, גָּר (Gen 21:34), בְּאַרְץ פְּלִשְׁתִּים (Gen 26:3), גָּר בְּאַרְץ הַזֹּאת (1 Kgs 17:20).

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>27</sup> At the end of the article. Commentary: גָּר (Gen 32:5), עִם-לְבָן גְּרָתִי, גְּרָתִי (Gen 21:34), גָּר בְּאַרְץ הַזֹּאת (Judg 17:7), וְהוּא גָּר-שָׁם: (Exod 12:48), וְכִי-יִגְרוּ אֶתְךָ (1 Kgs 17:20). All are from “inhabit”. The *hitpa'el* is הִתְגַּוְּרָה, יִתְגַּוְּרָה, מִתְגַּוְּרָה (1 Kgs 17:20).

2. Summarizes *Kitāb al-uṣūl* by Ibn Janāḥ:

Ibn Janāḥ *uṣūl*.<sup>28</sup> וְלִפְנֵי תְדוּן דְאַבְהָה (Job 41:14). This has already been included in the *Kitāb ḥurūf al-līn*. The meaning of וְדִיצָה is very well known in the sayings of the ancient rabbis and it is “joy, elation”. The *targum* of פְּצָחִי רִגְה וְצָהֲלִי (Isa 54:1) is בּוֹעֵי תִשְׁבַּחְתָּא וְדוּצִי and the *targum* of שְׂיִשׁוּ אֶתְהָ מְשׁוּשׁ (Isa 66:10) is דּוּצוּ עִמָּה דְוִן.

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>29</sup> וְלִפְנֵי תְדוּן דְאַבְהָה (Job 41:14). The meaning of וְדִיצָה is very well known in the sayings of the ancient rabbis and it is “joy, elation”. The *targum* of פְּצָחִי רִגְה וְצָהֲלִי (Isa 54:1) is בּוֹעֵי תִשְׁבַּחְתָּא וְדוּצִי and the *targum* of שְׂיִשׁוּ אֶתְהָ מְשׁוּשׁ (Isa 66:10) is דּוּצוּ עִמָּה דְוִן.

<sup>24</sup> Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 92.

<sup>25</sup> 1r:1-2.

<sup>26</sup> Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 93-94.

<sup>27</sup> 3v:12-15.

<sup>28</sup> Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 156.

<sup>29</sup> 6v:12-15.

However, the author can also present a case from the *Kitāb al-uṣūl* and later add Ḥayyūj's opinion, which would be discarded if the *Kitāb al-uṣūl* were being followed. This occurs with דוּם, which is interesting because it omits a controversial commentary by Ibn Janāḥ against the Christian version of the Bible:

גַּם־מִדְּמֶן תִּדְמִי (Ezra 27:32) כְּדָמָה בְּתוֹךְ הַיָּם: (Ps 94:17) שִׁכְנָה דוּמָה נִפְשִׁי:<sup>30</sup> Ḥayyūj (Jer 48:2) may belong to this and its original form is תַּתְּדוּמָמִי, that is, תַּתְּפַּעֲלִי.

Ibn Janāḥ *uṣūl*.<sup>31</sup> שִׁכְנָה דוּמָה נִפְשִׁי: (Ps 94:17), כְּדָמָה בְּתוֹךְ הַיָּם: (Ezra 27:32). This was already included in the *Kitāb ḥurūf al-līn* with גַּם־מִדְּמֶן תִּדְמִי (Jer 48:2). Its interpretation is “lost”. It seems to me that it is most likely analogous to מִשְׁא דוּמָה (Isa 21:11) and is translated “oracle of the lost nation”, referring to מַלְכוּת אֱדוֹם הַרְשָׁעָה (the perverse kingdom of Edom). When the translator of the Christians became aware of this secret that affected them, he left דוּמָה, according to his criterion, without translating it or rather refusing to give it this meaning. The translation of the verse with this meaning would be as follows: “this is the oracle of the lost nation, I have heard a cry that clamours for *rūm*, Oh, guardian! What it left of the night?”, referring to the duration of his reign. But in this case the author of the *targum* (*ṣāḥib al-targum*) omitted this option and left דוּמָה without translating it. For this reason, I refer to leaving דוּמָה without translating it, it is possible to ascribe this oracle to a nation called דוּמָה, which is a descendent of Ishmael (Gen 25:14), but then I do not know the meaning of the word מִשְׁעִיר according to the interpretation that the author of this *targum* gives it, and it does not seem acceptable to me. I have interpreted מִשְׁעִיר as “about יַשְׁעִיר” as if it said לַשְׁעִיר, as in וְאָמַר פֶּרְעֹה לְבָנָי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Exod 14:3: for the Pharaoh will say of the Israelites) since I have found that *min* can appear where *lamed* corresponds, for example, מִכְּלִצְרָי הֵייתִי חֶרֶפָּה (Ps 31:12), which has the meaning of לְכִלְצְרָי, just as מִאֵד וּפָחַד לְמִיָּדַעִי has been said (Ps 31:12). From this root and with this meaning: שְׁבִי דוּמָם וּבְאֵי בְּחֹשֶׁךְ (Isa 47:5), it means “the darkness of the tomb”, *mem* in דוּמָם indicates a state; that is, I am in this state. The translation of the phrase is “I am lost”, that is, “lost” just as is said in שִׁכְנָה דוּמָה (Ps 94:17), that is, “it is lost”. Regarding כָּל־יִרְדֵי

<sup>30</sup> Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 95.

<sup>31</sup> Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 155.

:דומה (Ps 115:17) it is perdition properly speaking and it is a noun, not a qualifier.

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>32</sup> שְׁכָנָה דוּמָה נִפְשֵׁי: (Ps 94:17), “dejected, lost”. כְּדָמָה בְּתוֹךְ הַיָּם: (Ezra 27:32), “lost”, מִשָּׂא דוּמָה (Isa 21:11) and it is “the lost nation”, referring to the perverse kingdom of Edom. From this root and with this meaning: שְׁבִידוּמָם וּבָאֵי בְּהִשָּׁדָה (Isa 47:5), *mem* in דוּמָם indicates a state; that is, I am in this state. The translation of the phrase is “I am lost”, that is, “lost”. Regarding כָּל-יְרֵדֵי דוּמָה: (Ps 115:17) it is perdition properly speaking and it is a noun, not a qualifier. Abū Zakariyā’ said: It may be from this root גַּם-מְדַמֵּן תִּדְמֵי (Jer 48:2), meaning that they would be verbs that reduplicate the third radical according to the form תִּתְדוּמְמֵי, but assimilate the *taw* of *hitpa’el* in the first radical and the third assimilates in *mem* added because of the reduplication, giving תִּדְמֵי. This directive would be weakened for whoever follows Abū l-Walīd’s version in this chapter.

3. Comments on Ḥayyūj, adding information from the *Kitāb al-uṣūl*:

Ḥayyūj.<sup>33</sup> אָגוּל, יָגוּל, וְגִלְתִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם, גִּלְתִּי, גָּל (Isa 65:19), הַגִּילוֹתִי, וַיִּגַּל כְּבוֹדִי (Ps 16:9). It is written גִּיל יָגוּל and גִּיל יָגוּל (Prov 23:24) with quiescent *waw* because both forms are used at the same time in the root.

Ibn Janāḥ *uṣūl*.<sup>34</sup> וַיִּגַּל כְּבוֹדִי (Ps 16:9). This meaning was already included in the *Kitāb ḥurūf al-līn* and it is “emotion”. The emotion can be joyful or sad, as in: וַיִּגַּל כְּבוֹדִי (Ps 2:11), וַיִּגַּל כְּבוֹדִי (Hos 10:5). Emotion is a feeling that affects the joyful and the sad. From this root, according to the rules we established in the introduction to the *Kitāb al-uṣūl*, it is אֶת-שִׁתֵּי גִלוֹת הַכְּתָרוֹת, אֶחָד מִיָּמִין הַגִּלְתָּה (Zech 4:3), אֶת-שִׁתֵּי גִלוֹת הַכְּתָרוֹת (2 Chr 4:12 and 13). It is interpreted “bowl and platters” because the bowl shape is on top of the pillar, leaving כְּתָרוֹת (a capital) over the bowl. *Lamed* is reduplicated, having assimilated the *waw* that is the second radical, just like *ṣade* is reduplicated in וּפְטוּרֵי צִצִּים (1 Kgs 6:18), having assimilated inside *yod* which is the second radical in צִיץ.

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>35</sup> At the end. Commentary: In this root there are two types: The first is a light verb: אָגוּל, יָגוּל, וְגִלְתִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם, גִּלְתִּי, גָּל (Isa 65:19). The second is

<sup>32</sup> 5v:1-13.

<sup>33</sup> Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 93.

<sup>34</sup> Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 128.

<sup>35</sup> 3r:12-3v:12.

*hifil*: הַגִּיל, הַגִּיל, הַגִּיל, הַגִּיל (Ps 16:9), וַיִּגַּל כְּבוֹדִי, יִגִּיל, הַגִּיל (Prov 23:24), וַנִּפְשֵׁי תִגִּיל בִּי (Ps 35:9), וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Ps 2:11), וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Job 3:22), הַשְּׂמֵחִים אֶל־יִגִּיל, וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Hos 10:5). Abū l-Walīd said: it means “emotion” and the emotion can be joyful or sad, as in: וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Ps 2:11), וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Hos 10:5), אֶל־יִגִּיל (Job 3:22). Emotion is a feeling that affects the joyful and the sad. From this root comes אָחַד מִיָּמִין אָחַד מִיָּמִין (Zech 4:3) הַגִּלָּה (2 Chr 4:12 and 13). It is interpreted “bowl and platters” because the bowl shape is on top of the pillar, with כְּתֹרֶת over the bowl. *Lamed* is reduplicated, having assimilated the *waw* which is the second radical, just like *šade* is reduplicated in וּפְטוּרֵי צָצִים (1 Kgs 6:18), having assimilated *yod* which is the second radical in צִיץ, or how the *waw* of תְּלוּנָה is assimilated in תְּלוּנוֹת (Num 14:27 and 17:20) or the *waw* of וּבְלוּלִים יַעֲלוּ in לֹל (1 Kgs 6:8).

הַנְּיָ. <sup>36</sup> Hayyūj. יָדוּג, דְּוּג, דְּוּג, דְּוּג, דְּוּג. The adjective is דְּוּג and דְּוּג, with *waw* reduplicated. הַנְּיָ שֶׁלַח לְדִיגִים רַבִּים (Jer 16:16), יַעֲמֵדוּ עָלָיו דְּוּגִים (Ezra 47:10). The heavy form is הַנְּיָ שֶׁלַח לְדִיגִים רַבִּים נֶאֱמַרְי וְדִיגוֹם, מְדִיג, יְדִיג, דְּוּג, although its original form is וְדִיגוֹם with *yod* reduplicated, but it is reduced to facilitate pronunciation, in the same way that *qof* in תִּבְקְשׁוּ (Lev 19:31) is quiescent to facilitate pronunciation, but the original is reduplicated, since it is from יִבְקֵשׁ, בִּקֵּשׁ, בִּקֵּשׁ. In the same way, *sin* in יִסְעוּ (Exod 12:37) to facilitate pronunciation, but the original is reduplicated as it is from יִסְעוּ, יִסְעוּ, יִסְעוּ. The same occurs with *qof* in וַיִּקְחוּ, וַיִּקְחוּ which is quiescent to facilitate pronunciation, and the original is reduplicated as it is from לִקַּח, וַיִּקַּח and from וּמְקַח־שֶׁחַד: (2 Chr 19:7). The reduplication of *mem* is also quiescent in הַמְשַׁרְתִּים (Esther 1:10) and in וְהַמְהַלְלִים (2 Chr 23:12) and in the other cases to facilitate pronunciation, but the original is reduplicated.

Ibn Janāh <sup>37</sup> uṣūl. וְהִיא יַעֲמֵדוּ עָלָיו דְּוּגִים (Ezra 47:10). וְדִיגוֹם (Jer 16:16), its original form is וְדִיגוֹם with *waw* reduplicated although they could reduce this *waw* as they did with *qof* in וְלֹא בִקֵּשׁוּ (Hos 7:19), and because when what preceded it was vocalized *kasra* /i/, it was transformed into a weak *yod*. They also replaced it with *yod* in לְדִיגִים רַבִּים (Jer 16:16). This has already been included in the *Kitāb ḥurūf al-līn*. It has the meaning of דְּוּג, דְּוּגִים, דְּוּג וְהַדְּגָה, דְּוּגִים, דְּוּג (Exod 7:18). From this meaning: בְּסִירוֹת דְּוּגָה: (Amos 4:2). Regarding

<sup>36</sup> Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 94.

<sup>37</sup> Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, pp. 153-154.

לְמִינָהּ תִּהְיֶה דְגָתָם (Ezra 47:10) it may not be from this root, although it has this meaning because if it were from this, it would be analogous to עֲקַת רָשָׁע (Ps 55:4), הֲלֵא רָעַתְךָ רַבָּה (Job 22:5), בְּנִפְתַּ שְׂוֵא (Isa 30:28), which are derived from the defective second radical, although for me it is from וַיִּדְגּוּ לְרַב (Gen 48:16), which is derived from the defective third radical according to the form מְנַת־חֲלָקִי וְכוּסִי (Ps 16:5), מְנַת שְׁעָלִים (Ps 63:11), בְּשִׁנְתַּ הַיּוֹבֵל (Lev 25:13). That is what I think about דָּגַי הַיָּם (Gen 9:2), I mean that it is from the root in וַיִּדְגּוּ לְרַב (Gen 48:16).

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>38</sup>At the end. Commentary: יָדוּג, דְּגָתִי, דָּג. The adjective is דְּיָגִים, דְּיָגִים (Jer 16:16), the yod in לְדְיָגִים appears as a replacement for the waw in יַעֲמְדוּ עָלָיו דְּיָגִים (Ezra 47:10). The root has a heavy verb with the reduplicated *pi'el* form, וְהִיָּה עֲמָדוֹ עָלָיו דְּיָגִים רַבִּים נְאֻם־יְיָ וַיִּדְגּוּם (Cf. Ezra 47:10 and Jer 16:16) and with waw reduplicated although they could reduce it as they did with *qof* in וְלֵא בְקֶשְׁהוּ (Hos 7:19), and because when what preceded it was vocalized *kasra* /i/, it was transformed into a weak yod because of its weakness. It has the meaning of דָּג, דְּגָתִי, דְּגָתִי אֲשֶׁר־בִּיאָר (Exod 7:18). From this meaning: בְּסִירֹתַי דְּיָגָה (Amos 4:2). Abū l-Walīd said: Regarding לְמִינָהּ תִּהְיֶה דְגָתָם (Ezra 47:10) it may not be from this root, although it has this meaning because if it were from this, it would be analogous to עֲקַת רָשָׁע (Ps 55:4), הֲלֵא רָעַתְךָ רַבָּה (Job 22:5), בְּנִפְתַּ שְׂוֵא (Isa 30:28), which are derived from the defective second radical, although for me it is from וַיִּדְגּוּ לְרַב (Gen 48:16), which is derived from the defective third radical according to the form מְנַת־חֲלָקִי וְכוּסִי (Ps 16:5): בְּשִׁנְתַּ הַיּוֹבֵל (Lev 25:13). This is what I think about דָּגַי הַיָּם (Gen 9:2), I mean that it is from the root in וַיִּדְגּוּ לְרַב (Gen 48:16).

In the same way, the author draws on the contents of the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* and *Kitāb al-uṣūl*. In these cases it is impossible to determine the origin of the standardization of the entries and the meanings that do not come from Ibn Janāh.

הַדִּיחַ.<sup>39</sup>דָּחַ, דוּחָתִי, דָּחַ: וְלֹא־יִכְלוּ קוּם: (Ps 36:13), יָדוּחַ. The heavy form is הַדִּיחַ, שָׁם יָדִיחוּ, וְאֶת־דָּמִי יְרוּשְׁלָם יָדִיחַ מִקְרָבָה (Isa 4:4), הַדִּיחֹתִי, שָׁם יָדִיחוּ (Jer 51:34), אֶת־הָעֵלֶה: (Ezra 40:38).

<sup>38</sup> 4r:13-4v:14.

<sup>39</sup> Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 95.

Ibn Janāḥ *mustalḥaq*.<sup>40</sup> This article includes: דָּחָו וְלֹא־יִכָּלּוּ קוּם: (Ps 36:13) and the third section denies that it is from דחה. This is the proof that he read it מְלֵעַל (grave), meaning that in his opinion, it was a perfect verb with the form of מֵה־טָבוּ אֶהְלִיךָ (Num 24:5), אָרוּ עֵינַי (1 Sam 14:29). We have seen it in Levantine scrolls מְלֵרַע (acute) and as such, it is a passive of דחה, in the same way that וְשָׁפוּ עֵצְמֹתָיו לֹא רָאוּ: (Job 33:22) is the passive of ראה. If it were not for the presence of *het* in דָּחָו the reduplication would be explicit. The *holem* in דָּחָו is identical to *šureq* in the other (passive forms). If it has shifted from the path of its analogues, it is because *holem* in this case is easier (to pronounce) than *šureq*.

Ibn Janāḥ *uṣūl*.<sup>41</sup> In this article Abū Zakariyā' included: דָּחָו וְלֹא־יִכָּלּוּ קוּם: (Ps 36:13), הִדְיַחְנִי: (Jer 51:34), יְדִיחַ מִקְרָבָה (Isa 4:4), יְדִיחוּ אֶת־הָעֵלָה: (Ezra 40:38) and I responded in *al-mustalḥaq* to the case of: דָּחָו וְלֹא־יִכָּלּוּ קוּם: (Ps 36:13). If דָּחָו were a defective second radical as he believed, why would it have the meaning of: יְדִיחוּ אֶת־הָעֵלָה: (Ezra 40:38) and יְדִיחַ מִקְרָבָה (Isa 4:4) which is “they wash, they clean” and this is the meaning of יְדִיחַ מִקְרָבָה (Isa 4:4). In the sayings of the ancients מְדִיחַ וּמוֹלֵחַ וּמְדִיחַ (Hull 113<sup>a</sup>: it clears, it muddies, it clears). But דָּחָו is not like this because its meaning is from דָּחָה דְּחִיתָנִי (Ps 118:13). This is also the meaning of דְּחִיתָנִי (Ps 118:13) although it is a permutation of דחה, but Abū Zakariyā' mixed it, as was his custom, making it necessary to discuss it.

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>42</sup> At the end: Commentary: Under this root there are two groups. The first is a light verb: דָּחָו וְלֹא־יִכָּלּוּ קוּם: דָּחָה, דָּחָה: דָּחָו (Ps 36:13) according to the form אָרוּ עֵינַי (1 Sam 14:29) and its analogues. [Abū l-Walīd] read it with the accent מְלֵרַע (acute) and thus, according to him, it was a passive form of a weak third radical verb analogous to: וְשָׁפוּ עֵצְמֹתָיו לֹא רָאוּ: (Job 33:21) and if it were not for the position of *het* in דָּחָו it would reflect its reduplication and this is the opinion of Abū l-Walīd and we have only seen this and become aware of it in his book. The second group is *hif'il*: הִדְיַחְנִי, יְדִיחַ, הִדְיַחְנִי: (Jer 51:34). Its meaning is identical to that of דָּחָה דְּחִיתָנִי (Ps 118:13) and for that reason it has been said that דְּחִיתָנִי (Ps 118:13) is its permutation. There

<sup>40</sup> Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasā'il*, p. 71.

<sup>41</sup> Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, pp. 154-155.

<sup>42</sup> 4v:14-5r:12.

is a second meaning in the root: הִדִּיחַ מִקְרָבָהּ, הִדִּיחַ (Isa 4:4), יְדִיחוּ אֶת־הָעֵלָה: (Ezra 40:38). It means “to wash, to clean”.

4. Establishes what Ḥayyūj’s opinion would be and contrasts it with those defended in the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* and *Kitāb al-uṣūl*:

Ibn Janāḥ *mustalḥaq*.<sup>43</sup> He (Ḥayyūj) does not mention it. If יְגַד עֲקָב (Gen 49:19) are defectives, their form is like that of יְצַדְנוּ (Ps 140:12) and יְצַד (Lev 17:13). Although they may be from those that have geminated letters, then it would be expected that *dalet* in יְגַדְנוּ would reduplicate according to the form יְסַבְנוּ (Jer 52:21), יְדַקְנוּ (Isa 28:28), but it would have been omitted to facilitate pronunciation. It could also be that the second radical was a weak letter replacing a geminated letter. They often used a weak letter to replace one of the geminated letters in defective second radical verbs and also in those with a defective third, as seen in passages in this treatise. However, the weak letter in defective second radicals replaces the first geminated letter, while in weak third radicals, it replaces the second geminated letter. In all of these cases, they were trying to facilitate pronunciation.

Ibn Janāḥ *uṣūl*.<sup>44</sup> יְגַדְנוּ וְהוּא יְגַד (Gen 49:19). I have already included both words in the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq* and I believe that there are two explanations: it may be that יְגַדְנוּ has the meaning of גָּדַד and the weak quiescent between *gimel* and *dalet*, which is the second radical of the verb, has been replaced, in my opinion, by one of the geminated letters and indicates this change; just as the weak quiescent in יְחִיתָן which is the second radical, I refer to the verse וְשָׂד בְּהִמּוֹת יְחִיתָן (Hab 2:17), replaces one of the geminated letters in חָתַת and therefore, it seems to me, that it derives from this, as I explained to you in *al-mustalḥaq* and its original form is יְחִיתָן reduplicating *taw*, like פָּן־אֲחַתָּהּ לַפְּנִיָּהֶם (Jer 1:17). Its analogue is לַעֲלוֹת לַעֵם יְגַדְנוּ: (Hab 3:16). Regarding יְגַד עֲקָב: it may be most likely in this case that it is akin to the Aramaic, that is, גָּדוּ אֵילָנָא (Dan 4:11) which means “pruning, cut”, that is, that he will cut the heels of those who have enlisted and it is akin to the Hebrew וַיִּתְגַּדְדוּ כַּמְשַׁפְּטִים (1 Kgs 18:28), because a scratch is a cut in the flesh. It also may have the meaning of גָּדַד, that is, that in the end victory is achieved.

---

<sup>43</sup> Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasā'il*, pp. 67-68.

<sup>44</sup> Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 91.

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>45</sup> גָּד גְּדוּד יְגוּדְנוּ וְהוּא יִגְד עֲקָב: (Gen 49:19); these could well be derived from a weak second radical and the forms would be יְצוּדְנוּ (Ps 140:12) and יָצוּד (Lev 17:13) and this is the method of Abū Zakariyā'. In this case Abū l-Walīd said that this is from the (roots) that he neglected to mention in the *Book of Weak Verbs* and here I add וַיִּתְגַּדְדוּ כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם (1 Kgs 18:28), לֹא תִתְגַּדְדוּ (Deut 14:1). It is possible that יְגוּדְנוּ reduplicates and is identical to יִסְבְּנוּ (Jer 52:21), יִדְקְנוּ: (Isa 28:28), but he eliminates it to facilitate pronunciation. It is possible that the weak letter that they have is replacing one of the geminated letters. Abū l-Walīd said: I believe that there are two explanations: either יְגוּדְנוּ has the meaning of גְּדוּד and is analogous to לְעֹלוֹת (Hab 3:16) or it means יִגְד עֲקָב. It may be most likely in this case that it is akin to the Aramaic, that is, גְּדוּ אֵילָנָא (Dan 4:11), which means “pruning, cut”, that is, he will cut the heels of those who have enlisted and it is akin to the Hebrew וַיִּתְגַּדְדוּ כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם (1 Kgs 18:28), because a scratch is a cut in the flesh. It also may have the meaning of גְּדוּד, that is, that in the end victory is achieved.

5. Confronts an anonymous opinion with the contents of the *Kitāb al-uṣūl*; it is not known whether it comes from the author or another anonymous source:

Ibn Janāḥ *uṣūl*.<sup>46</sup> בּוֹקָה וּמְבוֹקָה (Nahum 2:11). Abū Zakariyā' does not mention it.

It may be from this וַיִּבְקְקוּ אֶת־אֲרָצָה (Jer 51:2). הַבּוֹק | תְּבוֹק הָאָרֶץ (Isa 24:3).

Regarding בְּקָקוּם בְּקָקִים (Nahum 2:3), it is a geminated letter and Abū Zakariyā' already included it. All have the meaning of “misfortune”, it is said that “misfortune followed them”, that is, it happened to them. Misfortune is calamities, ill luck.

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>47</sup> בּוֹקָה וּמְבוֹקָה (Nahum 2:11). It is said that בּוֹקָה is a feminine singular passive participle identical to אוֹרְהָ וְשִׁמְחָהּ וְשִׂשׂוֹן (Esther 8:16). Abū l-Walīd said: it may be from this וַיִּבְקְקוּ אֶת־אֲרָצָה (Jer 51:2). It has already been put forward that Abū l-Walīd tended to catalogue תְּבוֹק הָאָרֶץ | הַבּוֹק (Isa 24:3) as a geminative verb more than from this root although it would be advisable for you to know now that if בּוֹקָה is a singular passive participle as we have said, this opinion is overridden. All have the meaning of “misfortune”, it is said that “misfortune followed them”, that is, it happened to them. Misfortune is calamities, ill luck.

<sup>45</sup> 2v:2-3r:3.

<sup>46</sup> Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 87.

<sup>47</sup> 1r:3-11.



6. Presents materials of unknown origin:

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>48</sup> אִזְ דָּכּוּ בַּמְדָּכָה, יְדוּךְ, דָּךְ (Num 11:8), דָּךְ נִכְלָם (Ps 74:21) with *pataḥ* when the prescriptive was *qameṣ*. It may be from דכה, as discussed under the article דכה.

Ḥayyūj.<sup>49</sup> דָּן, דְּנָתִי, אָדוֹן, בְּאֶדָם (Gen 6:3), יִגְרָה מְדוֹן (Prov 29:22), vocalized *waw*, and in the noun it transforms into *yod*, מְדִינִים יִשְׁלַח: (Prov 6:14) with the form of מְשַׁפְּטִים. The imperative could be דוּן or דִּין. The *nifal* is גְּדוּן יְבוּז, גְּדוּן, יְבוּז, גְּדוּן, אָדוֹן, אָדוֹן, יְדוּן, גְּדוּנוֹתָ, וַיְהִי כְּלִי-הַעֵם גְּדוּן, גְּדוּן (2 Sam 19:10), and גְּדוּן. In the root there is a second meaning, דָּן לֹא-דָנוּ, דְּנָתִי, דָּן, דְּנִי (Jer 5:28), דְּנִי (Gen 30:6), but its original form is דוּן, יְדוּן, אָדוֹן. דְּנִי (Gen 15:14) and we also have וַיְהִי יְדִי לְדָוָן, לְדָוָן (1 Sam 24:15) and from this comes לִמְעַן תִּדְעוּן שְׂדוּן: (Job 19:29). It is most likely that דוּן follows the form of בּוּז, מוּל, חוּם, שׁוּב, שׁוּמָה, לוּטָה. The heavy form is יִדְוּן בְּגוּיָם, הִדְוּן (Ps 110:6), כִּי-יִדְוּן יְיָ עִמּוֹ, דָּן לֹא-דָנוּ (Jer 5:28), יְיָ יִדְוּן אַפְסֵי-אַרְצָךְ (De 32:36), וְלֹא-יִוָּכַל לְדָוּן, (Qo 6:10). The imperative would be דִּין or דָּן.

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>50</sup> At the end. Commentary: With this root Abū Zakariyā’ has already made it clear that there is a light verb: דָּן, דְּנָתִי, יְדוּן, לֹא-יְדוּן (Gen 6:3), [6] מְדוּן (Prov 29:22) with a vocalized *waw* that transforms into *yod* in the noun, מְדִינִים (Prov 6:14), with the form of מְשַׁפְּטִים. The *nifal* is גְּדוּן, גְּדוּנוֹתָ, יְדוּן, אָדוֹן, אָדוֹן, יְדוּן, הִדְוּן is the imperative and the infinitive. וַיְהִי כְּלִי-הַעֵם גְּדוּן (2 Sam 19:10). It means “dispute, feud”. Regarding לֹא-יְדוּן רׁוּחֵי (Gen 6:3) there are three possible interpretations. The first is from the sayings of the rabbis, may peace be upon them, in *Genesis Rabba*: “said the blessed, when I return the spirit to its recipient, I do not return the spirits to their bodies” and thus the exegete (Sa’adya Gaon) made use of this and said “my spirit will not be sheathed in flesh”. (The ancient rabbis), may peace be upon them, included another provision with this case: “I said that my spirit will judge them although they have not asked for it [...]” and we will discuss it. This

<sup>48</sup> 5r:12-15.

<sup>49</sup> Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 95.

<sup>50</sup> 5v:14-6v:11.

means “I will not grant them an extension, but I will impose a duration of 120 years and if they refuse that, they will do penance and disappear”. The third possibility is that *דון* derives from *מדינים* (Prov 6:14) [...] because he is going to dispute with them [...] this being the choice of Abū Zakariyā’. It has another meaning: *דון* (Gen 30:6) *דגני אלהים*, *דון לא דנו* (Jer 5:28), *דנתי*, *דן* is the imperative and infinitive. The adjective is *דן אנכי* (Gen 15:14) and also *למען תדעון שדון*: (Job 19:29). According to him, this would be a singular passive participle with the form of *שומה*, *לוטה* and according to him [...] feminine active participle [...] in this case [...]. The heavy form with this meaning is *י ידן אפסי-ארגן* (1 Sam 2:10), *י עמו*, *פידון י עמו* (Deut 32:36), *ולא-יובל לדון*, *וגם-אתה תדון את-ביתי* (Zech 3:7), *ולא-יובל לדון* (Qo 6:10). The imperative is *דן*.

Finally, the following cases help to explain the evolution of the genre itself from its origins to the mid-tenth century, making it possible to identify Hayyūj’s primary source, Měnaḥem b. Saruq’s *Maḥberet*.

Měnaḥem b. Saruq.<sup>51</sup> The second: *ביגז חיש ונעפה*: (Ps 90:10); *וכן נגוזו ועבר* (Nahum 1:12); *ממעני אמי אתה גוזי* (Ps 71:6); *ויגזו שלמים* (Num 11:31). They mean “step”.

Hayyūj.<sup>52</sup> *גז*, *גזתי*, *גז* (Ps 90:10), *ביגז חיש ונעפה*: *גז*, *גזתי*, *גז* (Num 11:31). It may belong to this meaning *גוזי אתה גוזי* (Ps 71:6). The *nifal* is *נגזו*, *נגוזותי*, *נגזו*, *הגזו*, *תגזו*.

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>53</sup> *גז*, *גזתי*, *גז* (Num 11:31), *ביגז חיש*, (Ps 90:10). Abū Zakariyā’ said: it may belong to this *גוזי אתה גוזי* (Ps 71:6).

Měnaḥem b. Saruq.<sup>54</sup> The first: *ביאתה גתי מבטן* (Ps 22:10); *יבטח | כייגיה ירדן* (Judg 20:33); *וארב ישראל מגיח ממקמו*; *אל-פיהו*: (Job 40:23). They mean “exit”.

Hayyūj.<sup>55</sup> *גתי*, *גתי*, *גתי* (Job 40:23), *גתי*, *גתי*, *גתי* (Ezra 32:2); *גתי*, *גתי*, *גתי* (Judg 20:33). It may belong to this root *גתי* *מבטן* (Ps 22:10).

<sup>51</sup> Sáenz-Badillos, *Maḥberet*, p. 102\*:20-21.

<sup>52</sup> Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 93.

<sup>53</sup> 3r:3-4.

<sup>54</sup> Sáenz-Badillos, *Maḥberet*, p. 102\*:103\*:14-15.

<sup>55</sup> Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, pp. 127-128.

Ibn Janāh *uṣūl*.<sup>56</sup> מִבְּטֹן גָּחַי כִּי־אֲתָהּ (Ps 22:10), transitive qualifier and it is a masculine singular active participle, that is, “my exiting”. The heavy form is אֶל־פִּיהוּ: יֵרְדֶן כִּי־יֵגִיחַ (Job 40:23), מִגִּיחַ מִמְקָמוֹ (Judg 20:33) and it is intransitive. Abū Zakariyā’ already included this meaning in the *Kitāb ḥurūf al-līn* and he added וַתִּגַּח בְּגִהְרוֹתֶיךָ (Ezra 32:2), which appears to me to have another meaning and is interpreted as “and you became agitated”, identical to הוֹלִי וְגָחִי (Mic 4:10), which is interpreted as “my suffering and my agitation” and not “my exit, my appearance” as stated by another who is not us, since a woman in labour is not in the condition to appear or exit during childbirth, but to be agitated because of her pain and writhe because of her torment; however it is true that both meanings are shared during this process. If וַתִּגַּח בְּגִהְרוֹתֶיךָ (Ezra 32:2) had the meaning of הוֹלִי וְגָחִי (Mic 4:10) then it would be light, identical to וַתִּגַּח הַתְּבָהּ (Gen 8:4), וַיֵּנַע לְבָבוֹ (Isa 7:2) and there is no need to list the heavy forms as Abū Zakariyā’ did according to his theory, but using an argument.

T-S Ar 31.7.<sup>57</sup> מִבְּטֹן גָּחַי כִּי־אֲתָהּ (Ps 22:10), qualifier, it is its masculine singular active participle, that is, “my exiting”. The heavy form is יֵגִיחַ, הֵגִיחַ, כִּי־יֵגִיחַ יֵרְדֶן (Job 40:23), מִגִּיחַ מִמְקָמוֹ (Judg 20:33). Both are intransitive verbs. Abū l-Walīd said: this root has another meaning וַתִּגַּח בְּגִהְרוֹתֶיךָ (Ezra 32:2) and is interpreted “and you became disturbed”, identical to הוֹלִי וְגָחִי (Mic 4:10) which is interpreted as “my suffering and my concern”. According to this rule, וַתִּגַּח is light and according to Abū Zakariyā’ it is from מִגִּיחַ (Judg 20:33) and it has its meaning, that is, “you came back, you appeared”.

In conclusion, given the anthological nature of the text, it is very difficult to precisely date and locate the author. It may be the author himself wrote the copy, as suggested by the first-person NOTE inserted between folios 1v-2r: ‘it was right for us to write this root here and we add it now because it had escaped us’. In any case, it does not appear that the author’s intention was to stir up controversy with regard to the classic authors or to defend misunderstood positions like the works written by Andalusī authors in exile such as Abraham b. ‘Ezra in his defence of Sa’adia Gaon against the critiques of Adonim,<sup>58</sup> and the defence of Ben Saruq’s *Maḥberet* by Yosef b. Qimḥī,<sup>59</sup> and,

<sup>56</sup> Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 87.

<sup>57</sup> 3r:4-11.

<sup>58</sup> This work, known as *Šēfat yeter*, was written in Lucca, ed. by Gabreil H. Lippman (Frankfurt am Main, 1843). For the authorship of these critiques, see Raaya Hazon, ‘*Sefer Tiqqun Shegagot: Its author and Other Issues*’ (in Hebrew) in M. Bar-Asher and C.E. Cohen (eds.), *Mas’at Aharon*. Linguistic Studies presented to Aron Dotan (Jerusalem: The Bialik Insitute 2009), pp. 289-304.

therefore, does not seem to fit in with these twelfth-century works. Rather, it is reminiscent of the thirteenth-century *kutub al-taysir* or books of facilitation, a well-known anthological genre in Arabic literature, specifically in the field of medicine and most notably the summaries or ‘facilitations’ of works by Avenzoar and Avicenna. These anthologies were a consequence of what has come to be called the ‘age of cultural decay’ (*‘aṣr al-inḥitāt*),<sup>60</sup> one of many attempts –at times brilliant ones, as in this case– to provide the general public with access to the great works written in the centuries of the greatest splendour of Islam. In the case of Judeo-Arabic lexicography, the *Kitāb at-Taysir* written between the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries by the Karaite Šelomoh ben Mobarak ben Ṣa’ir in ancient Cairo is particularly noteworthy.<sup>61</sup>

Edition of T-S Ar. 31.7

First fragment

[ואלתקיל?]	בוסס בוססו מקדשיך [מ]בוסס	[א1]
	[אבוסס. וא]לאפתעאל מתבוססת בדמיך	
	[בוקבוקה [ ומבוקה. קיל פי בוקה אנהא מפעו }לה]	
	[מתל אור]ה [וש]מ'וש. קאל אב אלוליד וימכן אן	
5	[יכון מ]נה ויבוקקו את ארצה. וקד תקדם לך	
	[אן] כאן אב אלוליד ירגח בין הבוק הארץ {תבוק}	
	[מן] פעל די מתלין ען כונה מן הדא אלאצל לכן	
	[ינ]בגי אן תעלם האהנא אנה אן כאן בוקה	
	מפעולא כמה חכינא בטל תרגיחה ואלגמע	
10	מן מעני אלבאיקה יקאל באקתהם אלבואיק אי	
	נזלה עליהם ואלבואיק הי אלגואיל ואלשר. בוש	
	פי הדא אלאצל ג אקסאם אחדהא פעל כפיף	
	והו מן צא' אצחאב אור. כך בטחו ולא בשו.	
	כי בשתי לשאול מן המלך ובושו מתבואותי {כס}	
15	בחתיתם מגבורתם בושים. הפנה עורף מואב	
	בוש קיל אנה מפרש בושים. [ובוש פעל?]	[ב1]

<sup>59</sup> His *Sefer ha-galuy* (ed. Henry M. Mathews, Berlin 1887) and see Ángel Sáenz Badillos - Judit Targarona, ‘Aspectos del Sefer ha-galuy de Yosef Qimhi’, *Homenaje al Prof. Fernando Díaz Esteban. Sefarad* 52 (1992), pp. 217-226.

<sup>60</sup> Some authors argue that this period began in the mid-eleventh century when the Seljuqs entered Baghdad (Mahmud Sobh, *Historia de la literatura árabe clásica* (Madrid: Cátedra, 2002), pp 675-735), while others hold that it started in the mid-thirteenth century with the Mongol invasion (Juan Vernet, *Literatura árabe* (Barcelona: El Acantilado, 2002), pp. 191-216), but all agree that it extended to the Ottoman conquest in the early sixteenth century.

<sup>61</sup> For the edition of the work, see José Martínez Delgado, *Šelomo ben Mubarak ben Ṣa’ir, Kitāb at-Taysir Libro de Facilitación (Diccionario judeoárabe de hebreo bíblico)* II Volúmenes; introducción, edición, traducción e índices, prólogo de Federico Corriente (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2010) and also José Martínez Delgado, ‘Fragments of Shelomo ben Mobarak’s *Kitāb al-Taysir* in the Taylor-Schechter Collection’, *Ginzei qedem* 11 (2015), pp. 9\*-37\*.

- מאין עלי זנה הבקר אור. וחדף מ[נה אלעין]  
 ויגזו אן יכון מצדרא מתל גם בן[ש לא יבושו].  
 אלאסם ואל כל פנים בושה. [ובושים?]
- 5  
 ..תה. ואלאפ{ת} עאל ולא יבו יתבושו ומ[ע']  
 אלכגל. ואלקסם אלב הפעיל. הביש. הבי[שותה כי]  
 אל' מאסם. יביש. בן מביש ומחפיר. ומן הדא  
 אלמעני והחזיקה במבושיו. אי בעורתה. ואלמר {אד}  
 בה אלאנתיין. ומנה קיל ללותן. בשנה אפרים  
 יקח. וידת אלנון עלי אלאצל תגיירא ללאסם  
 ותהגינא ללמסמי בה. ואלאצל פיה בושה כמק  
 והבשת אכלה את יגיע אבתינו. ופי אלאצל  
 מעני ב ויחילו עד בוש. ואלקסם אלג הו הד[א]  
 אלמעני פועלל. כי בושש משה. מדוע בושש.
- 15  
 יבושש גמיעה מן אלאבטא האשיה כאן { אלואגב }  
 [אלואגב הנ]א אן נכתב הדא אלאצל ונצעה  
 [לאננא] גפלנא ען דלך. ב'ין אלי אכרה אלת'ס  
 [פי הדא אלא]צל ג' אקסאם אאד אהדהא פעל  
 כ[פיף ב]ן בנתה לרעי מרחוק. יבון בון. ואלאנפעאל  
 נבון. כי נבונותי. יבון תבון. אין נבון וחכם כמוך  
 5  
 מנפעל. וגמעה ונגד פניהם נבונים. תבונה  
 ואלקסם אלב הפעיל הבין. הבינותי. יבין תבין. ולבבו  
 יבין. וקד תעדי הדא אלפעל ומה שגיתי הבינו  
 לי. ואלאפתעאל התבונן עדותיך אתבונן גמעה  
 מן אלפיהם ואלאפהאם. ופי אלאצל מעני אכר  
 10  
 תבין. אבינה בבנים. ואבינא בעם. התבונן. התבו{ננו}  
 וקדמוניוה אל תתבוננו. עמדתי ותתבונן בי  
 ומה אתבונן ע' ב. ואתבונן אל ב. גמיעה מן  
 אלנטר ואלאלתפאת ומן הדא אלאצל ביני ובי ובי.  
 אל בינות לגלגל. ביניכם וביניו. ומן הדא אלמעני  
 איש הבינים אי אלמבארז בין אלצפ[ין אלמתוסט]  
 בין אלגמעין. ג'וד גד גדוד יג'ו {דנו} [והוא יגוד עקב]  
 אן יכונא מן אלמעלתה אלעין וזונה [מא יצודנו]  
 יצוד. והדא מדהב אב זכ קאל פ[יה אב אלוליד אן]  
 הדא מא פאתנא דכרה פי כתאב חרוף [אל]לין  
 ואצאף אליה הנאך ויתגודדו כמשפטם לא  
 תתגודדו. וגאיז אן יכון יגודנו אלתשדיד מ[תל]  
 מתאל יסובנו ידקנו. פתחך פתחך אסתכפאפא.  
 ורבמא כאן חרף אללין פיהמא בדל מן אחד  
 אלמתלין. ק אב אלוליד. והמא ענדי פי מעניין  
 אמא יגודנו. פמן מעני גדוד. ומתלה לעלות  
 לעם יגודנו ואמא יגוד עקב. פלאחסן פיה  
 אן יכון מגאנסא ללסריאני. אי גדו אילנא.  
 אלדי מענאה אלגד ואלקטע אי אנה יגד אעקאב  
 אלמתגנדין. ויגאנסה מן אלעבראני. ויתגודדו {כמש}  
 [כמשפטם פ]אן אלתכדיש קטע פי אללהם. ויצלח  
 15  
 פיה [איצא] אן יכון מן מעני גדוד אי אן אלפלג

- [י] כו[ן] לה אכ[רא]. גוז. ויגז שלוים. כי גז חיש.  
 [ק] אב זכ וימכנ[ן] אן יכון מנה אתה גוזי. גוז כי אתה  
 5 גוחי צפה פאעלה. אי מכרגי. ואלתקיל הגיח  
 יגיח כי יגיח ירדן אל פיהו. מגיח ממקומו. והדין  
 פעלין לאזמין. קאל אב אלוליד ופי הדא אלאצל  
 מעני אכר וְתַגַּח בְּנֶהְרֵי תֵיבָה. תפסירה ואצטר {בת}  
 מתל חולי וְגַחֵי. אלדי תפסירה אתגעי וצטר {בי}.  
 10 וְיַתְגַּח עלי הדא אלתוגיה כפיף והו ענד אז מן  
 מְגַחַח ומן מענאה אי תצררת וברזת. גול  
 אלי אכרה. אלתפסיר פי הדא אלאצל קסמין  
 אחדהמא פעל כפיף גל. וגלתי בירושל  
 יגול אגול. ואלקסם אלב הפעיל הגיל. יגיל. ויגל  
 15 כְּבָדִי. גיל יגיל. ונפשי תגיל ביי. וגילו בר[עד]ה  
 השמחים אלי גיל. וְכִמְרִיו עָלְיוּ יגילו [קאל אב]  
 [ב3] אלוליד מענאה אלטרב. ואלטרב פ[י] אלפר[ח] ו[אלחזן]  
 כק וגילו ברעדה. עליו יגילו. אלי גיל. [מ]עני  
 אלטרב חרכה תציב אלמסרור ואל[מחזון איצ]א  
 5 ומן הדא אלאצל אחד מימין הגלה את שתי  
 גלות הכתרות ותפס {י}רה צחפה וצחאף לאן  
 היה אלצחפה כאנת עלי ראס כל עמוד וכאנת  
 וכאנת אלכותרות עלי אלצחפה ושדה אללאם  
 לאנדגאם אלואו אלדי הו אלע פיה כאשתדאד  
 10 צאד ופטורי צצים. לאנדגאם אליא אלדי הו ע  
 ציץ פיה. וכאנדגאם ואו תלונה פי תְלֻזֹת וואו  
 לול פי ובללים יעלו. גוז אלי אכר אלבאב  
 אלתפסיר גר עם לְ גַרְתִּי. וכי יגור אַתְּ  
 והוא גַר שָׁם גור בארץ הזאת גמיעה מן  
 15 אלסכני. ואלאפתעאל הַתְּגֹרֵר. יתְגֹרֵר אַא {תְּתְגֹרֵר}

Second fragment

- [א4] [אן מן הדא] אלאצל לאדיב את נפשך עלי אן  
 תכו[ן] אלאלף ז[אידה פיה כזיאדתהא פי אדוש ידושנו  
 וה[ו] אעני ו[לאדיב את נפשך מצדר הדיב וכאן  
 אל]אצל פיה ו[להדיב עלי זינה ולהשיב כספיהם].  
 5 פח[דף אלהא] ונקלת חרכתה אלי אללאם פצאר  
 ולדיב עלי זינה לביא אותו בבלה. תם זאדו  
 אלאלף כמא זאדוהא פי אדוש ידושנו. עלי מא  
 קלת אלא אן אלקמץ אלדי כאן יגב אן יכון פי  
 לאם ולדיב מתלה פי לאם לְבִיא לביא דהב  
 10 לוקועה עלי חרף צלד והו אלאלף. ורבמא כאן  
 ולאדיב מקלובא מן עיני דאבה אעני אן אלאלף  
 אלתי הי עין פי דאבה צארת פא פי לאדיב  
 אלא אן דאבה כפיף ולאדיב תקיל. דוג אלי אכרה  
 אלתפסיר דג דגתי ידוג. ואלצפה דיג לדיגים  
 15 רבים אליא פי לדיגים מבדלה מן ואו יעמדו עלי

- [ב4] דוגים ופי אלאצל פעל תקיל עליז[ינה פעל אל]  
 משדד והיה עמדו עליו דוגים ור[בים נאום יי]  
 ודיגום. באלואו אלשדידה. פלמא כפ[פוחא]  
 5 כמא כפפוא קאף ולא בקשוה[ו וכאן מא קבלהא]  
 מכסורא אנקלבת יא לינה ללינה[א והו מן מ]עני  
 דג ודגים והדגה אשר ביאור ומן הדא אלמעני בסי {רות}  
 דוגה ק אב אלוליד ואמא למינה תהיה דג[תם]  
 פימפאן פימכן אן יכון מן גיר הדא אלאצל ואן  
 כאן מן הדא אלמעני לאנה לו כאן מנה לכאן עלי  
 10 מתאל עקת רשע. הלא רעתך רבה. בנפת שוא  
 אלתי הי מעתלה אלע {י} נאת לכנה ענדי מן וידגו  
 לרוב אלדי הו מעתל אללאם אללאם והו עלי  
 זינה [מנת חלקי וכו]סי. בשנת היב היובל. והו קולי  
 פי דגי הים אעני אנה מן אצל וידגו לרוב. דוה  
 15 אלי אכרה. אלתפסיר פי הדא אלאצל קסמין {אחדהמא}  
 [אחדהמא]פעל כפיף. דוח דוחתי. דוחו וליק  
 [א5] [ולא יכלו ק]ום עלי זנה אורו עיני. ואצחאב  
 [ואב אלוליד? כאן י]קראה מלרע ולדלך הו ענדה  
 [מא למ יסם פ]אעלה. מן פעל מעתל אללאם  
 5 [עלי מ]תאל [ש]פו עצמותיו לא ראו. ולולא מכאן  
 אלחא מן דוחן דחו. לטהר פיה אלתשדיד והדה  
 [רי]אה אב אלוליד למ נסמעהא ולא ראינאהא  
 אלא פי כתאבה. ואלקסם אלב הפעיל הדיח. ידיח.  
 הדיחני. מעני הדא מתל מעני [דחה דחי]תני  
 10 ולדלך קיל אן הדיחני מקלוב [מנה. ופי אלאצ]ל  
 מעני תאני הדיח. ידיח מקרבה [ידיחו את]  
 העולה. מענאה אלגסל ואלתפט. [דוך דך]  
 ידון. או דכו במדוכה. דך נכל[ם והו פתח]  
 וכאן חקה אלקמץ ויג[ו] אן יכון מן דכה]  
 15 הדא כמא צ נדכרה פי ב[א]ב [דכ]ה דום  
 שכנה דומה נפשי. מכתה האלכה [כדומה בתוך]  
 [ב5] ים. האלכה משא דומה והי אלאמה [אלהאלכה יע]  
 מלכות אדום הרשעה. ומן הדא [אלאצל ומן הדא]  
 אלמעני שבי דומם ובאי בחשך [ואלמים פי דומם]  
 5 ללחאל אי צירי פי הדה אלחאל ו[תרגמ]ה [אללפט]  
 אמכתי הלאכא אי האלכה. ואמא כל יורדי ד[ומה]  
 פהו אלהלאך נפסה והו אסם לא צפה. ק אב זכר  
 וימכן אן יכון מן הדא אלאצל גם מדמן תדומי.  
 יעני אן יכון אפעאלא מצאעף אללאם עלי  
 10 מתל [תתדון]ממי פאדגם תא אלאפתעאל פי פא  
 אל[פעל ואדג]ם לאם אלפעל פי אלמ אלזאידה  
 [ללמצא]ף פצאר תדומי. ויצעף הדא אלתיגיה  
 ל[מן מנ]קולה ען באב אלוליד פי הדא אלבאב.  
 דון [..]ת [אלי אכרה א]לתפסיר פי הדא אלאצל  
 15 קד [בי]ן א פעל [כפ]ף. דן ידנתי. ידון לא ידון  
 [מדון וקד חר]כת אלואו וקלבת יא פי אלסם [א6]

	[מדינים וזנ]ה משפטים. ואלאנפעאל נדון. [נדונות ידון אדו]ן. הדון אמר ומצדר יהי כל [העם נדון ומענ]אה אלכצאם ואלמכאצמה. ואמא 5 [לא ידון רוחי פ]סר פיה ג' מעאני אהדהא מא [קול]ה אלאולון ע'פ' ע'א אלס'ה פי בראש רבה א' אמ' הבה בש[ע]ה שאני מחזיר את הרוח לנדה. איני מחזיר את רוחן לנדה. ומן הדא א[פאד] אלמפסר פקאל לא ינגמד רוחי פי אלב[שר] 10 ודכרוא פיה ע'אס' מר[ת]בא אכר ק[ו]י א[מרת]י שתהא רוחי דנא בהן [והן לא בקשו ...] אלדי נדכרה'. ואלמעני לא אחכא[ם עליהם] בחכם אלמהלה אנהא אצרב ל[הם מדה] מאיה וכ סנה פאן תאבוא דאת[הם ענה] 15 ה ותובו הלכוא. ואלמדהב אלג' אן [יכוו] [ידוון] משתק מן מדינים ישל[ח] ... .. [ב6] [ ... לאנה עא]רצהם עלי[הם] ... .. והד[א] הו מדהב אב' זכ' [ופיה מעני אכר] דן דנתי דין לא דנו דנ[ני] אלהים דון 5 אמר ומצדר ואלצפה דן [אנכי ואיצא והיה] יי לדיין למען תדעון שדון הדא ענד[ה] מפעול [עלי זיב]ה שומה [לו]טה והו ענד[ה] [... .. ל... ..] פאעל[ה] ..ל. [פיה] ... [... .. ופעל] תקיל הדא אלמ[עני] יי ידון 10 [אספי] ארץ כי ידין יי עמו וגם אתה תדין א' [את ביתו ולא יכלו ל]דין. ואלאמר דין דוץ [תדוץ דא]בה מענא [אלדי]צה [משהור פי כ]לאם [אלאואיל] והו אלפרח ואלסרור. ותרג' פ[צחי] [רנה וצה]לי בועי תשבחתא ודוצי. ותרגום 15 [שישון] אתה משוש דוצו עמה דוץ. דוץ
--	--

Translation of T-S Ar 31.7

First fragment

[1r] [בוס... The heavy form is] בוסס (Isa 63:18) בוססו מקדשך, בוסס [אבוסס], [אבוסס]. The hitpa'el is מְתַבּוֹסֵסֶת בְּדַמְיָךְ (Ezra 16:6).<sup>62</sup>

[בוק]

בוקה (Nahum 2:11) וּמְבוּקָה. It is said that בוקה is a feminine singular passive participle [identical to וּשְׂמָחָה וּשְׂשׂוֹן (Esther 8:16). אורה]. Abū l-Walīd said: it may be from this וּיְבַקְּוּ אֶת־אֲרָצָה (Jer 51:2). It has already been put forward that Abū l-Walīd tended to catalogue תְּבוּק הָאָרֶץ | תְּבוּק (Isa 24:3) as a geminative

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 92. Here I only include a translation of the passages that were not translated before in the introductory study.



verb more than from this root although it would be advisable for you to know now that if בוקה is a singular passive participle as we have said, this opinion is overridden. All have the meaning of “misfortune”, it is said that “misfortune followed them”, that is, it happened to them. Misfortune is calamities, ill luck.<sup>63</sup>

בוש

Under this root there are three groups:

The first is the light verb and it is analogous to אור ולא-בושו: אור (Ps 22:6), בָּדָד בָּטְחוּ וְלֹא-בֹשׁוּ (Ps 22:6), בְּשִׁטְי לְשֹׂאֵל מִן-הַמְּלֹךְ, כִּי בָשָׁתִי לְשֹׂאֵל מִן-הַמְּלֹךְ (Esdr 8:22), וּבִשׁוּ מִתְּבוּאֹתֶיכֶם, כִּי בָשָׁתִי לְשֹׂאֵל מִן-הַמְּלֹךְ (Jer 12:13), בַּחֲתִיתָם מִגְּבוּרָתָם (Ezra 32:30), בּוֹשִׁים (Ezra 32:30), הַפְּנֵה-עַרְףְּ מוֹאֵב בּוֹשׁ (Jer 48:39), it has been said that it is “knocked down to be slaughtered”, בּוֹשִׁים (Ezra 32:30), [בוש a verb] [1v] that is perfect with the form of אור הבקר אור (Gen 44:3) and [the second radical] has been suppressed<sup>64</sup> or it could be an infinitive, like גַּם-בּוֹשׁ לֹא-יִבּוֹשׁוּ (Jer 6:15). The noun is וְאֵל כָּל-פְּנִים בּוֹשָׁה (Ezra 7:18) [...] The *hitpa'el* is וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׁשׁוּ (Gen 2:25). It means “to become embarrassed”.<sup>65</sup>

The second is *hifil*: הִבִּישׁ, יָבִישׁ, הִבְשִׁיתָה (Ps 53:6), הִבִּישׁ, הִבִּישׁ (Ps 53:6), וּמַחְפִּיר (Prov 19:26).<sup>66</sup> From this meaning וְהִחֲזִיקָה בְּמַבְשָׁיו (Deut 25:11), that is, “by his private parts” and what it means is the testicles. From this it was said for the idol בְּשִׁנָּה אֶפְרַיִם יִקָּח (Hos 10:6) and a *nun* is added to the root to transform it into a noun and with a pejorative nuance for what it denominates; its original form is בּוֹשָׁה just as in וְהַבְּשִׁתָּ אֶת-יָגִיעַ אֲבוֹתֵינוּ (Jer 3:24).<sup>67</sup>

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 87.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Ibn Bil'am's *Commentary on Jeremiah*. אֵיד הַפְּנֵה-עַרְףְּ מוֹאֵב בּוֹשׁ (Jer 48:39) is a perfect verb identical to אור הבקר אור (Gen 44:3) and its pattern is פעול but the lengthened *waw* is dropped, weakening the second radical and moving its vowel to the first (edition by Ma'aravi Perez, (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2002), p. 137).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, pp. 92-93. בָּדָד בָּטְחוּ וְלֹא-בֹשׁוּ (Ps 22:6), בְּשִׁטְי לְשֹׂאֵל מִן-הַמְּלֹךְ, כִּי בָשָׁתִי לְשֹׂאֵל מִן-הַמְּלֹךְ (Esdr 8:22), וּבִשׁוּ מִתְּבוּאֹתֶיכֶם, כִּי בָשָׁתִי לְשֹׂאֵל מִן-הַמְּלֹךְ (Jer 12:13), וְאֵל כָּל-פְּנִים בּוֹשָׁה (Ezra 7:18), הַפְּנֵה-עַרְףְּ מוֹאֵב בּוֹשׁ (Jer 48:39), בּוֹשִׁים (Ezra 32:30), בַּחֲתִיתָם מִגְּבוּרָתָם (Ezra 32:30), וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׁשׁוּ (Gen 2:25).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 92. The heavy form is הִבִּישׁ, יָבִישׁ, הִבְשִׁיתָה (Ps 53:6), הִבִּישׁ, הִבִּישׁ (Ps 53:6), וּמַחְפִּיר (Prov 19:26).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 87. בָּדָד בָּטְחוּ וְלֹא-בֹשׁוּ (Ps 22,6), וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׁשׁוּ (Gen 2:25). וּמַחְפִּיר (Prov 19:26). This has already been included in the *Kitāb ḥurūf al-līn*. From this meaning וְהִחֲזִיקָה בְּמַבְשָׁיו (Deut 25:11), that is, “by his private parts” and it means the testicles. From this it was said for the idol בְּשִׁנָּה אֶפְרַיִם יִקָּח (Hos 10:6) and a *nun* is added to

This root has a second meaning: וַיְחִילוּ עַד-בֹּשֶׁשׁ (Judg 3:25) and the third group has this meaning and is כִּי-בִשְׁשׁ מִשָּׁה (Exod 32:1), מְדוּעַ בִּשְׁשׁ (Judg 5:28), יְבוּשֶׁשׁ. All are “delay”.<sup>68</sup>

NOTE: it was [2r] right for us to write this root here and we add it now because it had escaped us.

בין

At the end. Commentary:

[This] root has three types.

The first is a light verb: בּוֹן, יְבוֹן, בְּנִתָּה לְרַעִי מִרְחֹק: בּוֹן (Ps 139:2), בּוֹן, יְבוֹן. The *nifal* is בּוֹן (Isa 10:13), בּוֹן, יְבוֹן. תְּבוֹן, יְבוֹן: תְּבוֹן וְחָכְמָה כְּמוֹד: אִין-נְבוֹן וְחָכְמָה כְּמוֹד: תְּבוֹן, יְבוֹן (Gen 41:39) is the masculine singular participle. Its plural is: וַיִּגְדּוּ פְּנֵיהֶם נְבוֹנִים (Isa 5:21). תְּבוֹנָה.

The second type is *hifil*: הִבִּין, הִבִּינוּ, הִבִּינֵנוּ, הִבִּינֵנוּ (Prov 23:1), בִּין תְּבִין, הִבִּינוּ, הִבִּינֵנוּ, הִבִּינֵנוּ (Isa 6:10). This verb can be transitive: וּמַה-שָּׂגִיתִי הִבִּינוּ לִי: (Job 6:24).

The *hitpa'el* is הִתְבוֹנֵן, הִתְבוֹנְנוּ (Ps 119:95).

All are from “understanding, comprehension”.<sup>69</sup>

The root has another meaning: אֶבְיָה בְּבָנִים, תְּבִין (Prov 7:7), וְאַבְיָה בְּעַם, אֶבְיָה בְּבָנִים (Esd 8:15). וְתַתְּבִין בֵּי: וְקִדְמֵנוּיֹת אֶל-תְּתַבְּנֵנוּ: (Isa 43:18), הִתְבוֹנְנוּ: הִתְבוֹנֵן (Isa 52:15), הִתְבוֹנֵן (Job 30:20), וְיָמָה אֶתְבוֹנֵן עַל-בְּתוּלָה: (Job 31:1), וְיָמָה אֶתְבוֹנֵן (1 Kgs 3:21). All are from “attention, consideration”. From this meaning [2v] אִישׁ-הַבָּנִים (1 Sam 17:4), that is, he who fights between the (two) ranks and is placed between (both) bands.<sup>70</sup>

---

the root to transform it into a noun and with a pejorative nuance for what it denominates; its original form is בּוֹשֶׁשׁ just as in וְהַבִּשְׁתָּ אֶכְלָה (Jer 3:24). He includes here וַיְחִילוּ עַד-בֹּשֶׁשׁ (Judg 3:25). כִּי-בִשְׁשׁ מִשָּׁה (Exod 32:1).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 93. There is another meaning in this root, מְדוּעַ בִּשְׁשׁ (Judg 5:28). The heavy form of this meaning is כִּי-בִשְׁשׁ מִשָּׁה (Exod 32:1), מְדוּעַ בִּשְׁשׁ (Judg 5:28), יְבוּשֶׁשׁ. In context יְבוּשֶׁשׁ and paused יְבוּשֶׁשׁ.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 92. בִּין תְּבִין, הִבִּינוּ, הִבִּינֵנוּ, הִבִּינֵנוּ (Prov 23:1). The *nifal* is בּוֹן (Isa 10:13), בּוֹן, יְבוֹן. וְיָבִינֵנוּ, וְיָבִינֵנוּ (Isa 10:13), בּוֹן, יְבוֹן. תְּבוֹן, יְבוֹן: תְּבוֹן וְחָכְמָה כְּמוֹד: אִין-נְבוֹן וְחָכְמָה כְּמוֹד: תְּבוֹן, יְבוֹן (Gen 41:39) is the imperative and the infinitive. Another heavy form is בּוֹנֵן (Deut 32:10), יְסַבְּבֵנָהּ יְבוֹנְנָהּ, בּוֹנֵנִי, בּוֹנֵן (Deut 32:10), בּוֹנֵן is the imperative and the infinitive.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 91. בִּין תְּבִין, הִבִּינוּ, הִבִּינֵנוּ, הִבִּינֵנוּ (Prov 23:1). This meaning was already included in the *Kitāb ḥurūf al-līn*, although there is no mention there of the light verb which is בְּנִתָּה לְרַעִי (Ps 139:2) nor do we append it to the *Kitāb al-mustalḥaq*. Neither is there any allusion nor do we append the transitive heavy verb that follows the *hifil* form, I refer to: וּמַה-שָּׂגִיתִי הִבִּינוּ לִי: (Job 6:24). The root has another

גוד

:גִּדְדוּ יְגֹדְנוּ וְהוּא יִגְדֵּךְ עֵקֶב: (Gen 49:19); these could well be derived from a weak second radical and the forms would be יְצוֹדְנוּ (Ps 140:12) and יָצוּד (Lev 17:13) and this is the method of Abū Zakariyā'. In this case Abū l-Walīd said that this is from the (roots) that he neglected to mention in the *Book of Weak Letters* and here I add וַיִּתְגַּדְדוּ כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם (1 Kgs 18:28), לֹא תִתְגַּדְדוּ (Deut 14:1). It is possible that וַיִּתְגַּדְדוּ reduplicates and is identical to יִסְבְּנוּ (Jer 52:21), יִדְקְנוּ: (Isa 28:28) but he eliminates it to facilitate pronunciation. It is possible that the weak letter that they have is replacing one of the geminated letters.<sup>71</sup> Abū l-Walīd said: I believe that there are two explanations: either יְגֹדְנוּ has the meaning of גִּדְדוּ and is analogous to לְעֹלֹת לְעַם יְגֹדְנוּ: (Hab 3:16) or it means: יִגְדֵּךְ עֵקֶב. It may be most likely in this case is that it is akin to the Aramaic, that is, גְּדוּ אֵילָנָא (Dan 4:11), which means “pruning, cut”, that is, that he will cut the heels of those who have enlisted and it is akin to the Hebrew כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם [3] וַיִּתְגַּדְדוּ (1 Kgs 18:28), because a scratch is a cut in the flesh. It may also have the meaning of גִּדְדוּ, that is, that in the end victory is achieved.<sup>72</sup>

גוז

וַיִּגְזוּ שְׁלוֹיִם, יְגֹזוּ, גֹז (Num 11:31), כִּי-יִגְזוּ חַיִּישׁ, (Ps 90:10). Abū Zakariyā' said: it may belong to this אֶתְהַ גֹזִי (Ps 71:6).<sup>73</sup>

meaning that Abū Zakariyā' does not include nor do we append it and that is וַיִּקְדַּמְנוּת (Is 43:18), it is “you will not consider them”. וַאֲתַבּוֹנֵן אֵלַי (1 Kgs 3:21) “when I paid attention to him in the morning, when I woke him up”; identical to these is וַאֲשֶׁר לֹא-שָׁמְעוּ (Isa 52:15), “they looked, they saw with their own eyes, they were witnesses”. וַתִּתְבַּנְּנוּ בֵּי: (Job 30:20), וַיִּמָּה אֶתְבּוֹנֵן עַל-בַּתּוּלָה: (Job 31:1). From this meaning אֶתְבַּנְּנִים בְּבָנִים (Prov 7:7) and also וַאֲבִינָה בְעַם (Ezra 8:15). Also it is from this root וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל בֵּינִי וּבֵין בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Exod 31:17); בָּא אֶל-בֵּינֹת לְגַלְגַּל (Josh 22:27); כִּי עָד הוּא בֵּינִינוּ וּבֵינֵיכֶם; (2 Sam 21:7); עַל-שִׁבְעַת יְיָ אֲשֶׁר בֵּינֵתָם; (Ezra 10:2); בָּא אֶל-בֵּינֹת לְגַלְגַּל (Josh 22:27); הַגֵּל הַזֶּה עַד בֵּינִי וּבֵינֶךָ; (Gen 30:36); בֵּינוּ וּבֵין עֵקֶב; (Josh 3:4); בֵּינֵיכֶם וּבֵינֵינוּ; (1 Sam 17:4), that is, he who fights between the (two) ranks and is placed between (both) bands. The Masorete is referring to this meaning when he says “two and defectives”.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasā'il*, pp. 67-68.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 91.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 93 and Sáenz-Badillos, *Maḥberet*, p. 102\*:20-21.

גוח

גְּחִי (Ps 22:10), qualifier, it is its masculine singular active participle, that is, “my exiting”. The heavy form is הִגִּיחַ, הִגִּיחַ, יִגִּיחַ אֶל־פִּיהוּ: (Job 40:23). Both are intransitive verbs.<sup>74</sup>

Abū l-Walīd said: this root has another meaning וַתִּגַּח בְּנִהְרוֹתֶיךָ (Ezra 32:2) and is interpreted “and you became disturbed”, identical to חוּלִי וְגַחִי (Mic 4:10) which is interpreted as “my suffering and my concern”. According to this rule, וַתִּגַּח is light and according to Abū Zakariyā’ it is from מָגִיחַ (Judg 20:33) and it has its meaning, that is, “you came back,<sup>75</sup> you appeared”.<sup>76</sup>

גול

At the end. Commentary:

In this root there are two types:

The first is a light verb: אָגוּל, יָגוּל, וְגִלְתִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם, גִּלְתִּי, גָּל (Isa 65:19).

The second is *hifil*: וּנְפָשִׁי, גָּל יָגֵל (Prov 23:24), וַיִּגַּל כְּבוֹדִי, יָגֵל, הִגִּיל (Ps 16:9) and וּבְכַמְרֵיו עָלְיוּ, הַשְׂמֵחִים אֶל־יָגֵל [3v] (Job 3:22), וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Ps 35:9), וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Ps 2:11), וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Hos 10:5).<sup>77</sup> Abū l-Walīd said: it means “emotion” and the emotion can be joyful or sad, as in וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Ps 2:11), וַיִּגִּלוּ בְרַעְדָּה: (Hos 10:5), אֶל־יָגֵל (Job 3:22). Emotion is a feeling that affects the joyful and the sad. From this root comes אָחַד מִיָּמִין הַגִּלָּה (Zech 4:3), אֶת־שְׂתֵי גִלּוֹת הַכְּתָרוֹת, אֶת־שְׂתֵי גִלּוֹת הַכְּתָרוֹת (2 Chr 4:12 and 13). It is interpreted “bowl and platters” because the bowl shape is on top of the pillar, with כְּתָרוֹת over the bowl. *Lamed* is reduplicated, having assimilated the *waw* which is the second radical, just as *šade* is reduplicated in וּפְטוּרֵי צִצִּים (1 Kgs 6:18), having assimilated *yod* which is the second radical in צִיץ,<sup>78</sup> or how the *waw* of תְּלוּנָה is assimilated in תְּלוּנוֹת (Num 14:27 and 17:20) or the *waw* of לוּל in וּבְלוּלִים יִעָלוּ (1 Kgs 6:8).

גור

At the end of the article. Commentary:

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 93 and Sáenz-Badillos, *Maḥberet*, p. 103\*:14-15.

<sup>75</sup> صیر, صار < תצרת in the original, where כָּרַת is expected.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, pp. 127-128.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 93.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 128.

וְהוּא גִר־שָׁם: (Judg 17:7), וְכִי־יִגֹּר אֶתְךָ (Exod 12:48), עַם־לָבָן גִּרְתִּי, גֹּר (Gen 32:5), גֹּר בְּאַרְצָן הַזֹּאת (Gen 26:3). All are from “inhabit”. The *hitpa’el* is הִתְגֹּרַר, הִתְגֹּרַר (1 Kgs 17:20).<sup>79</sup> [...]

#### Second fragment

[4r] which is from this root וְלֹאֲדִיב אֶת־נַפְשִׁי (1 Sam 2:33) although the *alef* would have been added, just as it is added in אָדוּשׁ יְדוּשְׁנוּ (Isa 28:28) and it would be, I refer to וְלֹאֲדִיב אֶת־נַפְשִׁי (1 Sam 2:33) the infinitive of הָדִיב and its original form would be וְלֹהֲדִיב, according to the form וְלֹהֲשִׁיב כְּסַפִּיהֶם (Gen 42:25). But *he’* is suppressed and its vowel is moved to *lamed*, giving לְדִיב, according to the form לָבִיא אֲתוּ בְבִלָּה: (Jer 39:7) and then they added *alef* to it like they added it in אָדוּשׁ יְדוּשְׁנוּ (Isa 28:28) according to what I have said, only that the *qames* that corresponded in the *lamed* of לְדִיב, analogous to that of the *lamed* in לָבִיא, disappears since it is located in a hard consonant which is *alef*. וְלֹאֲדִיב (1 Sam 2:33) may be a permutation of עֵינֵי דָאֲבָה (Ps 88:10), I mean that the *alef* which is the second radical in דָאֲבָה has become the first radical in לֹאֲדִיב, although דָאֲבָה is light and לֹאֲדִיב heavy.<sup>80</sup>

דוג

At the end. Commentary:

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, pp. 93-94.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasā’il*, pp. 69-70. I believe that this root (דאב) belongs to וְלֹאֲדִיב אֶת־נַפְשִׁי (1 Sam 2:33), although *alef* has been added, just as occurs in אָדוּשׁ יְדוּשְׁנוּ (Isa 28:28) and in וְהֶאֱזִיחוּ נְהִירוֹת (Isa 19:6). This case, I refer to וְלֹאֲדִיב אֶת־נַפְשִׁי (1 Sam 2:33), is an imperfect of הָדִיב, according to the form הִשִּׁיב, הִבִּיא. Its original form would be וְלֹהֲדִיב, according to the form וְלֹהֲשִׁיב כְּסַפִּיהֶם (Gen 42:25), וְלֹהֲבִיא צֶדֶק עֲלֵמִים (Da 9:24), *he’* is suppressed and its vowel moves to *lamed*, giving וְלִדִּיב, according to the form לָבִיא אֲתוּ (Jer 39:7). Then they added *alef*, just as they added it in אָדוּשׁ יְדוּשְׁנוּ (Isa 28:28), in וְהֶאֱזִיחוּ נְהִירוֹת (Isa 19:6), just as I said, and in אֶסְף אֶסִּיפֶם (Jer 8:13), according to the way that it was understood that אֶסְף was a word from אֶסִּיפֶם, only that the preceptive *qames* in the *lamed* in וְלִדִּיב is identical to that of the *lamed* in לָבִיא אֲתוּ בְבִלָּה: (Jer 39:7), it disappeared because it preceded a hard consonant, which is *alef*. It may be a metathesis of עֵינֵי דָאֲבָה (Ps 88:10), I refer to the fact that *alef* which is the second radical of דָאֲבָה has transformed into the first in לֹאֲדִיב, however, דָאֲבָה is light and לֹאֲדִיב is heavy. Regarding וּמְדִיבַת נַפֶּשׁ (Lev 26:16), it is a defective second radical, according to the form מְאִירוֹת אוֹתָהּ (Isa 27:11). Cf. Neubauer, 1875: 21, ‘*db* root, where it changes position with respect to the identification of the root; it is impossible to know whether the author of this commentary is aware of this change.

דָּג, דָּגְתִי, יָדוּג, דָּגְתִי, דָּג. The adjective is דָּגְתִי (Jer 16:16), the yod in דָּגְתִי appears as a replacement for the waw in יַעֲמְדוּ עָלָיו דָּגְתִי [4v] (Ezra 47:10).

The root has a heavy verb with the reduplicated *pi'el* form, וְהָיָה עֲמָדוֹ עָלָיו (Cf. Ezra 47:10 and Jer 16:16)<sup>81</sup> and with waw reduplicated although they could reduce it as they did with *qof* in וְלֹא בִקְשָׁהּ (Hos 7:19), and because when what preceded it was vocalized *kasra* /i/, it was transformed into a weak yod because of its weakness. It has the meaning of דָּג, דָּגְתִי, וְהָיָה אֲשֶׁר-בִּיָּאֵר, דָּגְתִי (Exod 7:18). From this meaning בְּסִירוֹת דָּוָה: (Amos 4:2). Abū l-Walīd said: Regarding לְמִינָהּ תִּהְיֶה דָּגְתִי (Ezra 47:10) it may not be from this root, although it has this meaning because if it were from this, it would be analogous to עֲקַת רָשָׁע (Ps 55:4), הָלֵא רַעְתֶּךָ רַבָּה, (Job 22:5), בְּנִפְתַּ שָׁוֵא (Isa 30:28), which are derived from the defective second radical, although for me it is from וַיִּדְגּוּ לָרֶב (Gen 48:16), which is derived from the defective third radical according to the form מְנַתְחֶלְקִי וְכוּסִי (Ps 16:5), בְּשִׁנַּת הַיּוֹבֵל, (Lev 25:13). This is what I think about דָּגְתִי הַיָּם (Gen 9:2), I mean that it is from the root in וַיִּדְגּוּ לָרֶב (Gen 48:16).<sup>82</sup>

#### דוּח

At the end. Commentary: Under this root there are two groups. [5]

The first is a light verb: דָּחַ וְלֹא-יִכְלֹו קוֹם: דָּחַ, דָּחַתִּי, דָּח (Ps 36:13) according to the form אָרוּ עֵינַי (1 Sam 14:29) and its analogues. [Abū l-Walīd] read it with the accent מְלָרַע (acute) and thus, according to him, it was a passive form of a weak third radical verb analogous to וְשָׁפוּ עֲצַמֹתָיו לֹא רָאוּ: (Job 33:21) and if it were not for the position of *het* in דָּחַ it would reflect its reduplication and this is the opinion of Abū l-Walīd and we have only seen this and become aware of it in his book.<sup>83</sup>

The second group is *hifil*: הִדִּיחַ, הִדִּיחַתִּי, יָדִיחַ, יָדִיחַתִּי (Jer 51:34). Its meaning is identical to that of דָּחַתִּי דָּחַתִּי (Ps 118:13) and for that reason it has been said that דָּחַתִּי דָּחַתִּי (Ps 118:13) is its permutation.<sup>84</sup>

There is a second meaning in the root: יָדִיחַ מִקְרָבָהּ, הִדִּיחַ (Isa 4:4), יָדִיחוּ: אֶת-הַעֲלֵהּ: (Ezra 40:38). It means “to wash, to clean”.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 94.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, pp. 153-154.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. Derenbourg, *Kutub wa-rasā'il*, p. 71.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, pp. 154-155.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 95.

דוד

דָּוָד (Ps 74:21) with *pataḥ* when the prescriptive was *qameṣ*. It may [be from דכּה], as discussed under the article ה[דכ].

דום

[5v] דָּוָם (Ezra 27:32), “dejected, lost”. שָׁכְנָה דוּמָה נִפְשִׁי: (Ps 94:17), “lost”, מִשָּׂא דוּמָה (Isa 21:11) and it is “the lost nation”, referring to the perverse kingdom of Edom. From this root and with this meaning: שָׁבִי דוּמָם (Isa 47:5), *mem* in דוּמָם indicates a state; that is, I am in this state. The translation of the phrase is “I am lost”, that is, “lost”. Regarding כָּל־יָרְדִי (Ps 115:17) it is perdition properly speaking and it is a noun, not a qualifier.<sup>86</sup> Abū Zakariyā’ said: It may be from this root תִּדְמִי (Jer 48:2), meaning that they would be verbs that reduplicate the third radical according to the form תִּתְדוּמְמִי, but assimilate the *taw* of *hitpa’el* in the first radical and the third assimilates in *mem* added because of the reduplication, giving תִּדְמִי.<sup>87</sup> This directive would be weakened for whoever follows Abū l-Walīd’s version in this chapter.

דון

[...] At the end. Commentary: With this root Abū Zakariyā’ has already made it clear that there is a light verb: לֹא־יָדוֹן, יָדוֹן, יִדְוֶנִּי (Gen 6:3), [6] מְדוֹן (Prov 29:22) with a vocalized *waw* that transforms into *yod* in the noun, מְדוּנִים (Prov 6:14), with the form of מְשַׁפְּטִים. The *nifal* is יָדוֹן, גְּדוּנוֹתָ, גְּדוֹן. אֲדוֹן. הַדּוֹן is the imperative and the infinitive. וַיְהִי כָל־הָעָם גְּדוֹן (2 Sam 19:10). It means “dispute, feud”.<sup>88</sup>

Regarding לֹא־יָדוֹן רִוְחִי (Gen 6:3), there are three possible interpretations. The first is from the sayings of the rabbis, may peace be upon them, in *Genesis Rabba*: “said the blessed, when I return the spirit to its recipient, I do not return their spirits to their bodies” and thus the exegete made use of this and said “my spirit will not be sheathed in flesh”.<sup>89</sup> (The ancient rabbis), may

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 155.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 95.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 95.

<sup>89</sup> He is referring to Sa’adya Gaon; see Joseph Derenbourg, *Version Arabe du Pentateuque de R. Saadia ben Iosef al-Fayyūmī* (Paris: Ernest Leroux 1893), p. 12.

peace be upon them, included another provision with this case: “I said that my spirit will judge them although they have not asked for it [...] and we will discuss it”. This means “I will not grant them an extension, but I will impose a duration of 120 years and if they refuse that, they will do penance and disappear”. The third possibility is that דון derives from מדינים (Prov 6:14) [...] because he is going to dispute with them [...] this being the choice of Abū Zakariyā’.

It has another meaning: דן, דנתי, דן (Jer 5:28), דן לא־דנו, דנתי, דן (Gen 30:6), דון is the imperative and infinitive. The adjective is דן אנכי (Gen 15:14) and also דן (1 Sam 24:15). דן (Job 19:29). According to him, this would be a singular passive participle with the form of שומה, לויטה and according to him [...] feminine active participle [...] in this case [...]. The heavy form with this meaning is דן אפסי־ארץ (1 Sam 2:10), דן (Deut 32:36), דן (Zech 3:7), דן (Qo 6:10). The imperative is דן.<sup>90</sup>

#### דון

דון (Job 41:14). The meaning of דון is very well known in the sayings of the ancient rabbis and it is “joy, elation”. The *targum* of דון (Isa 54:1) is פצחי רנה וצהללי and the *targum* of דון (Isa 66:10) is דון עמה.<sup>91</sup>

#### דור

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Jastrow, *The weak and the geminative verbs*, p. 95.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Neubauer, *The book of Hebrew roots*, p. 156.