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I Sam. ii. 24. The Massoretic text reads: יִּלְחָם מַלְכָּה יִּשְׁפַּעַתְּא שָּׁר עָנָי שׁמֶעָתִים גַּם הָדוֹחַ. A. V. and R. V. accept this text and translate, "Ye make the Lord's people to transgress." This is simply impossible. Wellhausen accepts the text and Ewald's explanation, in Umlauf setzen, verbreiten. Budde accepts the text and, presumably, this rendering. Driver also accepts the rendering, but has a caveat that "the integrity of the text is reasonably open to suspicion." The LXX. render τὸν μὴ δουλεύων λαὸν θεο; they had apparently the same text and could make nothing of it.

Driver notes that יִּלְחָם in this sense is always accompanied by an "indication of the locality in or through which the proclamation is made to pass." I would add to that another consideration which makes the text impossible for me. If we adopt this rendering, עָנָי יִוָה, to use the language of Arab grammarians, is maf'ul bi'hi to שְׁמֶלע, and מַעְרִים is a ḫal, i.e. "I hear the people of Yahweh in the state of persons spreading." But the ḫal must come last, and therefore the order would be מַעְרִים עָנָי יִוָה. The point is that מַעְרִים is not a clause consisting of subject and predicate in which the predicate could be made to precede. Even though that were the case, the construction would still be difficult, as the predicate is only made to precede for a definite reason, and there is none here. Further, the juxtaposition of the two participles is exceedingly harsh and awkward. I would suggest, then, to read, מַעְרִים שָׁמְעָתִים יִוָה. The ḫal in מַעְרִים is got from the preceding שְׁמֶלע and in some forms of the archaic alphabet is hardly distinguishable from .

II. I Sam. iv. 15, קֶרֶם מֵאֱלֹהָי יְאֻצוּן מֵאֱלֹהָי. This phrase seems to indicate some form of blindness, but its occurrence in Arabic has not, apparently, been noticed. Lane (Suppl., p. 2996, c) quotes from Abû Zayd in the Lisan (s. السد An eye [blind, or white and blind, but still whole: or] that has become white and blind but not burst: and from the Mughrîb of al-Muţarrîzî and the Mibdâh of al-Fayûmî:—sightless, but with the black still remaining.
III. Num. xl. 4. נבר is generally explained as נבר from נבר with the נ dropped out of pronunciation as in נבר and נבר. This is not quite satisfactory, as the נ which drops out in נבר does not belong to the root, but is formal; nor is the sense derived by connection with נבר very good. Lane (p. 1368, c) suggests the Arabic ספָּסֵא, "anything that is bad, paltry, mean," used of poetry, disposition, affair, action, saying, etc. To the examples quoted by Lane, I would add Fihrist, p. 91, 1. 28, where it is opposed to גָּבִיל and used of poetry.

IV. Prov. xii. 3 b. נבר is commonly rendered "but the root of the righteous shall never be moved." This takes נכָּר in its first sense of root, and the figure is somewhat confused. It is intelligible to speak of the "root of the righteous," but how a root can נכָּר, 'sway, stagger, slip,' is not clear. In Job xiii. 27 we read נכָּר and נכָּר is taken generally as meaning "my feet" or "the soles of my feet." Did נכָּר, נכָּר come to have itself the meaning foot, feet, and are we to translate the passage in Proverbs, "but the foot of the righteous shall not slip?" Compare מִתְּיָה xxxviii. 17; xciv. 18, etc.

V. נכָּר. In the new English Gesenius, now appearing in parts, נכָּר is referred to a root נכָּר and with that root is given the following etymology:

"Meaning dub. √ whence Arabic פָּאָת [a misprint for פָּאָת] calamity, and also wonder, portent; according to Thes. Arabic √ = אָיָף suffer evil."

Here there are several points to which exception can be taken. First, Gesenius (Thes., p. 143) does not refer אָיָף to a root פָּאָת but to a root פָּאָת (a mistake which he probably got from the Calcutta Qāmūs), and secondly, it is wrong to speak of a root אָיָף, since אָיָף is simply the perfect passive (like אָיָף of a root פָּּיִף). See the root in Lane; and notice that it does not mean to suffer evil generally, but is used mostly of crops, and means to be smitten with a blight, blast, taint, canker, or the like.
Last, it is true that on p. 143 of the *Thesaurus* Gesenius gives מְלַמְלָה to the root מָלִים, but on p. 612 he takes it all back, and refers the word to the root מָלַל (Barth appears to do the same, *Nominalbildung*, § 172, c) through a form מְלַלְלָה, and to this withdrawal he again directs attention on p. 72 of the *Corrigenda*.

But it may be worth while to inquire further whether there is any such word in Arabic as מְלַלְלָ and what we know generally about the root מְלַל. It is unlucky that this root did not fall within Lane's definition of "classical words and significations commonly known to the learned among the Arabs," and was therefore excluded from his First Book and, in the end, from his Lexicon. We are thus forced back on the Arabic lexicographers, and I shall give in translation all that I have collected from such of them as are accessible to me. I may say that the only Arab lexicon which has been printed and is not accessible to me is the *Nihāya fi Gharaḥ al-Hadīth* by Ibn al-Athlr [d. A. H. 606], which appeared at Cairo a year or two ago. The root מְלַל is lacking completely in the *Ṣabāḥ* of al-Jawharī [d. A. H. 393], the *Aṣd* of az-Zamakhsharī [d. A. H. 538], and the *Miṣbāh* of al-Fayyūmī, who finished his work in A. H. 734. Nor can I find any trace of מְלַל in the *Fiqh al-Lughā* of ath-Tha'ilibī [d. A. H. 429], or the *Kitāb al-Faṣḥ* of Tha'lab [d. A. H. 291], or the *Mu'arrab* of al-Jawharī [d. A. H. 465], or the *Kitāb al-Aḍḍād* of Ibn al-Anbārī [d. A. H. 328], or Dozy's *Supplément* with Fleischer's *Studien* and von Kremer's *Beiträge*, the only European contributions of which account can be taken in such a matter as this.

In the *Lisān al-'Arab* of al-Mukarram [d. A. H. 711] the root מְלַל occurs and runs as follows:

*אֲמַלְלָה* from such and such, like *אֲמַלְלָה*, *אֲמַלְלָה*, i. e. he turned him; and *אֲמַלְלָה* is the highly bred of camels and its feminine is the same. Abū 'Amr said *אֲמַלְלָה* is the highly bred; and Tha'lab said *אֲמַלְלָה*, with *חַלְב* is the swift she-camel, and it is she who overcomes camels in journeying, and he recited from Ibn 'Aḥmar:

*กาָאָמְלֵה לָמָא אַלֶל עָמָא אִמְלָה נִרְגֶּרֶת עָבָא אָלְמָא*.

As though I had not said, 'Ājin [a chiding cry] to a swift she-camel who alternated after her Hizza [a sharp pace] the Raslm [another sharp pace].
And in a MS. is َالْأَلْفَتُ with Kasr—so the Tuhdiḥ.

And there is the saying of al-'Ajījāj:


daa’ib an-nahy rahibī al-alfat َقاطرتنَّ أنثى عَلَى هُوَلِهِ بَالْأَلْفَتِ

Whenever the daughters of the Arḥabīte, the swift she-camel, [draw near to the extremity of its extent through advance in journeying.]

Ibn al-Arabī said:—He means by َالْأَلْفَتُ the she-camel with which is such patience and endurance as is not with other than her, as Ibn Aḥmar said. And Abū ‘Amr said, َالْأَلْفَتُ is the highly bred; he said that it stood so in a MS. that was recited [or read] to Shamir—

Ibn al-Arabī said:—I do not know whether this is dialectal or a mistake.

It will be noticed here that the root َأَلْفَتُ is simply a by-form to َأَلفُ and that besides that by-form there only exists, according to this lexicon, a noun َالْأَلْفَتُ or َالْأَلْفَتُ, meaning a swift, highly bred camel or she-camel. It should be noticed, too, how elaborate is the care with which these meanings are established by means of old authorities, Ibn al-Arabī, Tha'lab, Abū ‘Amr, Ibn Aḥmar. This is the method of Arabic lexicography. A word or a meaning is regarded as of no value if it is not based on a quotation from the works of some one who was born at least not after the establishment of al-Islām in Arabia, or on the authority of some early lexicographer of repute.

Next in chronological order comes the Qāmūs of al-Fīruzābādī [d. A. H. 816], and there we shall find something, if not exactly what we are looking for.

َالْأَلْفَتُ with َفَلْحُ is the she-camel with which is such patience and endurance as is not with other than her, and the swift camel which overcomes the camels in journeying and the highly bred of camels; and sometimes it has Kasr. And َالْ إِلْفَتُ and َالْإِلْفَتُ. And an encampment of the tribe of Hudhayl. And with Kasr it is [the same as] َالْأَلْفَتُ َعَدَّة. And َالْأَلْفَتُ is, ‘he turned him.’
It will be noticed that the greater part of what stands here is exactly as in the *Lišān*, with the omission of all authorities. This is the method of al-Fūrūzābādī throughout, and his dictionary is simply an enormous vocabulary, and, in consequence, is not regarded as of any authority in itself. What he adds to the *Lišān* is the point of interest for us. It is that, or, apparently, 

\( \text{العجَب–} \)

its common meaning is certainly calamity; and [See, too, the *Fiqh*, p. 322, l. 7 of Bayrūt ed.] and are given in Lane as having that meaning; but there is another possibility. According to Lane, (p. 927, b) you can say *دَعَيْتُ*, *I was turned, or kept from a thing, or an affair, by deceit or guile*. This to be turned from is exactly the force which we have already found assigned to أَنْتُ as a by-form of أَنكَ, then, would mean *one who so turns another*, and 

\( \text{المَوْثَكَة} \)

the stratagem, deceit that turns anyone; and this last may be the meaning that al-Fūrūzābādī, or his authority, intended to assign to أَنْتُ. The case of العجَب is more difficult, but it is certain, at least, that it does not mean portent, nor, in the first instance, a wonder. العجَب is more immediately the act or state of wondering; and if a wonder had been meant we should have expected العجَب 

معْرَكَةٌ, the stratagem, deceit that turns anyone. But it is hard to bring wondering into any connection with the root, and there is a possible connection for a wonderful occurrence. According to Lane (p. 70, a) المَوْثَكَة and occur in the *Qur'ān* of the cities overthrown by God upon the people of Lot. You can, then, say also *عَشَّفَتْ البَلْدَة*, the land, or district, was, or became, overturned, or subverted, and *عَشَّفَتْ أَنْتُ or *عَشَّفَتْ أَنْتُ* means a punishment sent by God whereby the dwellings of a people are overturned. All these are evidently allusions to the story of the overthrow of the people of Lot and go back to the root-meaning of أَنْتُ to turn away, or back. It might then be possible to say أَنْكَ, or its by-form أَنْتُ, of a wonderful occurrence, but only as an allusion to the passage in the *Qur'ān*. Thus the possibility of العجَب going back to this أَنْتُ seems to be effectually blocked.
In order to give absolutely all the evidence, I shall now translate the corresponding article in the Tāj al-ʿArūs, the commentary on the Qāmūs by Sayyid Murtadā [d. A. H. 1205].

The mention of Fath is unnecessary, our Shaykh [i. e. al-Firuz ābād] said it is the she-camel with which is such patience and endurance as is not with other than her (Ibn al-Aʿrābī and Ibn ʿĀlīmar said it); and (al-ʿilf is) the swift camel which overcomes the camels in journeying (from Thaʿlab, and the feminine is the same, and he quoted from Ibn ʿĀlīmar:—

And (al-ʿilf is) the highly bred (Abū ʿAmr said it and it was so in a MS. which was recited [or read] to Shamir, and the overtaker of other than it) of camels; (and the feminine is the same) and sometimes it has Kasr, (it stood so in a MS. of the Taḥdīb and he quoted from al-ʿAjjāj).

And (al-ʿilf with Fath is) a calamity, and a wonderful occurrence, and an encampment of the tribe of Hudhayl; and (al-ʿilf) with Kasr is (a dialectal form for) ʿalīf, and (they say) ʿalīf ʿammat ʿalīf (like ʿammat whenever it) is, he turned him.

Here all is practically as in the Lisān, with the addition of what the Qāmūs has alone, and with everything arranged so as to form a running commentary on the Qāmūs. But it will be noticed that for what is in the Qāmūs alone the Tāj names no additional authorities, neither Ibn al-Aʿrābī, nor Abū ʿAmr, nor any of the others are quoted in support of these usages. This is exactly what we should expect if ʿalīf is a by-form to faʾl in the sense of mā dhāhib, used, as we have found, in allusion to the Qurʾānic story of how God overturned the city of the people of Lot.

Since working this out, I notice that in the last edition of the German Gesenius (edited by Buhl) the existence of ʿalīf in the required sense is said not to be gut bezeuget. We certainly might have better evidence for it, for example, if it were in the Lisān, but the real point is that it is post-Qurʾānic.