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Abstract

In the introduction to his dictionary, considered to be the first scientific Hebrew dictionary based on the principle of the triconsonantal root, medieval grammarian Judah Ḥayyūj enumerates the conventional verbal patterns presently accepted, and in addition *pô‛ēl* (פּוֹעֵל). However, Ḥayyūj's identification of this latter pattern was not accepted by all medieval grammarians. Ibn Ezra in particular disputed the existence of this pattern among the strong verbs.

This article suggests that the difference between Ḥayyūj's and Ibn Ezra's views is a result of their different historical contexts. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, the science of Hebrew linguistics, and especially grammar, followed the Arabic model. Accordingly, Ḥayyūj created the pattern *pô‛ēl* as the parallel to *fā‛ala*, one of the four basic forms of the Arabic verb. By the twelfth century, however, Ibn Ezra revaluated the issue using the data of Hebrew itself, and found no evidence for this form.

# Introduction[[1]](#footnote-2)

 Judah Ḥayyūj formulated the structure of the Hebrew verbal system in the Middle Ages. In his dictionary dealing with weak and geminative verbs, Ḥayyūj presented all the Hebrew patterns (*binyānîm*), distinguishing, in accordance with the Arabic grammarians, between heavy and light patterns. This dictionary is the first scientific Hebrew dictionary based on the principle of the triconsonantal root.[[2]](#footnote-3)

In the introduction to the dictionary, Ḥayyūj, for the first time in the history of Hebrew grammatical thought, enumerates the conventional verbal patterns presently accepted, with the addition of *pô‛ēl* (פּוֹעֵל).[[3]](#footnote-4) These verbal patterns are divided into heavy and light patterns*.* His student Jonah ibn Janah followed in his footsteps in his *Kitāb al-Luma‛* (*Sēp̱er Hā-Riqmâ*), chapter 13.[[4]](#footnote-5) From their own discussion, it is evident that they did not see this pattern as an innovation and found it natural that the classification of patterns in Hebrew would include *pô‛ēl*.

Several questions arise: Was Ḥayyūj’s view accepted among all medieval grammarians? What evidence does he rely on in establishing the *pô‛ēl* pattern? Does the verbal system as it appears in the Bible support the existence of this pattern?

It emerges that Ḥayyūj’s view was not universally accepted by medieval grammarians. Ibn Ezra held a contrasting view on the *pô‛ēl* pattern, disputing the existence of this pattern among the strong verbs. While his opinion has been examined by several scholars,[[5]](#footnote-6) as I will demonstrate in this article, this examination has yet to encompass the entirety of ibn Ezra’s views on the matter. Similarly, a satisfactory explanation has yet to be provided for the dispute between Ḥayyūj and ibn Ezra.

These issues, which are fundamental to understanding Semitic grammar in the Middle Ages, have received little attention. To the best of my knowledge, not a single study has systematically examined the views of various medieval grammarians on the *pô‛ēl* pattern.[[6]](#footnote-7)

The goal of this paper is to correct this lacuna. The paper identifies two different understandings of *pô‛ēl* among medieval grammarians and explains the divergent views. It also shows that grammarians relied on Arabic grammar in formulating Hebrew grammar, and that the *pô‛ēl* pattern was conceived by Ḥayyūj out of a desire to align the grammar of the two languages.[[7]](#footnote-8) In the second half of the twelfth century, after the consolidation of Hebrew grammar, ibn Ezra, the most original and critical grammarian of this period,[[8]](#footnote-9) began to view the verbal system through a Hebrew lens. Accordingly, he posited that the *pô‛ēl* pattern does not exist among the strong verbs. In his opinion, the supposed occurrences of this pattern in the Bible do not in fact prove its existence, contrary to the views of Ḥayyūj and ibn Janah.[[9]](#footnote-10)­

Before discussing the *pô‛ēl* pattern itself, we will compare the Hebrew verbal system as viewed by Ḥayyūj and his student ibn Janah to the Arabic verbal system as viewed by Sibawayh and his students. This comparison will illuminate why Ḥayyūj felt it necessary to include the *pô‛ēl* pattern in his verbal system.

# The Hebrew and Arabic verbal systems in the Middle Ages

## The patterns *fa‛‛ala*, *fā‛ala*, and *af‛ala* as viewed by Sibawayh

The relationships between the various Arabic patterns and their different roles was a central topic for Arabic grammarians in the medieval period. This section briefly surveys the views of Sibawayh, the greatest of the medieval Arabic grammarians, on patterns 2, 3, and 4. It seems that Sibawayh was the first to see these three patterns as representing one morphological group. In his opinion, these three patterns are similar to quadriconsonantal roots, as he writes: ‘and these three [*fa‛‛ala, fā‛ala, af‛ala*] are similar to the quadriconsonantal roots which do not have additions, like *daḥraja*, since their number is like their number, and they are alike in passivity and movement’.[[10]](#footnote-11)

As Yavrumyan explains: ‘in the classes of the extended three-radical verbal stems there are two models of different morphemic patterns, but with a uniform syllable structure’.[[11]](#footnote-12)

We can put this more simply as:

Past: *daḥraja: fa‛lala = fa‛‛ala = fā‛ala = ’af‛ala.*

Future: *yudaḥrij: yufa‛lil = yufa‛‛il = yufā‛il = yu’af‛il*.[[12]](#footnote-13)

After Sibawayh lists the patterns and distinguishes the different types of the first four patterns, he discusses the other long patterns. As we will see, Hebrew grammarians do the same.

## The Hebrew verbal system in Judah Ḥayyūj and Jonah ibn Janah

In the introduction to the section of his book dealing with ‘verbs with weak letters’ *(ḥurūf al-līn)* Ḥayyūj enumerates four patterns in the Hebrew verbal system, *pā‛al, pi‛ēl, pô‛ēl, hip‛îl*:

And I have divided the verbs into light and heavy, and I have called by the name ‘light’ those which come through the pattern *pā‛altî*, for it is the lightest of the patterns; and by the name ‘heavy’ those which come from outside the pattern *pā‛altî*, like *hip‛altî*, or *pi‛altî*, or *po‛altî*¸ or other patterns.[[13]](#footnote-14)

It may seem strange that Ḥayyūj mentions only these four – *pā‛al* as a light pattern, *hip‛îl, pi‛ēl,* and *pô‛ēl* as heavy patterns – explicitly, and the others only by implication. Regarding the passive patterns *hup‛al* and *pu‛al*, Ḥayyūj’s fundamental principle is that they are included in the active patterns *hip‛îl* and *pi‛ēl*; he does not consider it correct to enumerate them separately.[[14]](#footnote-15) However, a question remains concerning *nip‛al* and *hitpa‛ēl.* Furthermore, a thorough examination of his works shows that Ḥayyūj considers neither *nip‛al* nor *hitpa‛ēl* a ‘heavy’ pattern.[[15]](#footnote-16) These four patterns alone, in Ḥayyūj’s scheme, are described as ‘light’ patterns or ‘heavy’ patterns.

In Jonah ibn Janah’s *Kitāb al-Luma‛* we find a more explicit discussion of this issue. In the thirteenth chapter, dedicated entirely to the Hebrew verbal system, ibn Janah devotes the first and main part to an examination of the four patterns – *qal, hip‛îl, pô‛ēl,* and *pi‛ēl* –which in turn are classified in two divisions.

Ibn Janah then dedicates several pages to the patterns *nip‛al*, *hitpa‛ēl*, *hup‛al*, and *pu‛al.* These are given the title: ‘and the patterns *added to the verb, for adding meaning*,[[16]](#footnote-17) are: *nip‛al, hitpa‛ēl,* and that of which its agent has not been mentioned [that is, *hup‛al* and *pu‛al*]’ (*wa-mimmā yalḥaq al-fiʿl min al-abniya li'l-maʿnā fa-hiya al-infiʿāl wa'l-iftiʿāl wa-mā lam yusamma fāʿiluhu*’).[[17]](#footnote-18) In other words, the basic verbal patterns are the first four, while the rest are extrapolated from them.[[18]](#footnote-19) Ibn Janah goes on to clarify that the *nip‛al* pattern is a variant of the light pattern,[[19]](#footnote-20) although he is not certain whether *hitpa‛ēl* belongs to the light pattern or to *pi‛ēl*.[[20]](#footnote-21)

Judah Ḥayyūj and his disciple ibn Janah consider the four abovementioned patterns as the fundamental patterns of the Hebrew language. As discussed, these are the light pattern *pā‛al* and the heavy patterns *hip‛îl, pi‛ēl,* and *pô‛ēl*.

We can now return to the central question of this article: On what does Ḥayyūj rely when attempting to establish the fourth pattern, *pô‛ēl*, among the strong verbs?

There are only a tiny number of occurrences of this pattern in the strong verbs in Scripture. Only two verbs that are clearly part of *pô‛ēl* appear in the works of medieval grammarians:

1. אֲשֶׁר אִם־צָדַקְתִּי, לֹא אֶעֱנֶה; **לִמְשֹׁפְטִי** אֶתְחַנָּן (Job 9:15)
2. וְאֶת-הַנְּעָרִים **יוֹדַעְתִּי** אֶל-מְקוֹם פְּלֹנִי אַלְמוֹנִי (1 Sam. 21:3)[[21]](#footnote-22)

As Joseph Kimhi writes in *Sēp̱er Ha-Zikkaron* on the form *limšōp̱ᵉṭî* and its grammatical explanation:

And there are found from this form, in the strong verbs, a few words, like *limšōp̱ᵉṭî ’etḥannān*, we cannot judge it to be in any other pattern; for were it in *qal*, it would be *lᵉšōp̱ṭî*, and if it were from *pi‛ēl,* it would be *limšappᵉṭî*, like *limgaddᵉlî*, and if from *hip‛îl*, it would be *lᵉmašpîṭî*, like *lᵉmagdîlî*, thus it was said that *mᵉšōp̱ᵉṭî* is of the model of *mᵉkônᵉnî*, *‘mᵉrômᵉmî mišša‛ărê māwet’* (Ps. 9:14).

Kimhi, as we see, explains the form *mᵉšōp̱ᵉṭî* as representing the form *pô‛ēl*, and hence the form that deviates from the other patterns is explained. The verb *yôda‛tî* is similarly explained as a first person past tense verb in the *pô‛ēl* pattern.[[22]](#footnote-23) Kimhi emphasizes that ‘few words are found from this form’; in other words, we have little evidence attesting to its existence.

Here the central question returns: Are a handful of occurrences adequate to establish the existence of such a significant pattern in the Hebrew verbal system? Moreover, as we shall see below, ibn Ezra, two centuries after Ḥayyūj, correctly argues that there is no clear evidence from the Bible to support the claim for the verbal pattern *pô*‛*el*.

As adumbrated above, I believe that the comparison with Arabic was the primary factor that influenced Ḥayyūj in conceiving of this form. To clarify the point, there is no question concerning the existence of *pā‛al, pi‛ēl,* and *hip‛îl* in Hebrew, and the parallel with Arabic is obvious: *pā‛al* is the light pattern like *fa‛ala/fa‛ila*/*fa‛ula*; *pi‛ēl* with gemination is like *fa‛‛ala*; *hip‛îl* is like *af‛ala*.[[23]](#footnote-24) But is it possible to find a parallel to the Arabic *fā‛ala*? Ḥayyūj was not unique in his desire to identify a parallel: both he and ibn Janah failed to construct a Hebrew verbal system perfectly mirroring that of Arabic, as the number of patterns in Arabic is greater than in Hebrew. Nevertheless, they wished to maintain the parallelism at least for the first four patterns in the Arabic verbal system: the light pattern and the unitary system of the three first heavy patterns, according to Sibawayh’s view. The need to include a parallel for *fā‛ala* motivated the creation of the *pô‛ēl* pattern;[[24]](#footnote-25) to do so, Ḥayyūj applied the same ā > ô pattern as in the other parallel patterns.[[25]](#footnote-26)

Delgado claims that ibn Barun was the first to compare *fā‛ala* with *pô‛ēl*. I do not dispute this; ibn Barun clearly and openly compares the two, and Ḥayyūj does not explicitly do so. Rather, what I am suggesting is that the desire to create a parallel order stems from Arabic. In other words, in the specific case of *pô‛ēl,* as well as in many other instances in his work on Hebrew grammar, Ḥayyūj had Arabic on his mind.[[26]](#footnote-27)

# The *pô‛ēl* pattern

## Ḥayyūj and ibn Janah

Judah Ḥayyūj appears to have been the first of the medieval grammarians to mention *pô‛ēl* as a pattern in its own right.[[27]](#footnote-28) Ḥayyūj’s central statement on this matter is the one cited above:

And I have divided the verbs into light and heavy, and I have called by the name ‘light’ those which come through the pattern *pā‛altî*, for it is the lightest of the patterns; and by the name ‘heavy’ those which come from outside the pattern *pā‛altî*, like *hip‛altî*, or *pi‛altî*, or *po‛altî*¸ or other patterns.

In his chapter on verbs (*Kitāb al-Luma‛*, chapter 13), ibn Janah similarly distinguishes between the heavy and light verbs:

But the extended triconsonantal verb is that whose pattern is not the like the light pattern, for instance: *hip‛îl*, *pô‛ēl, and pi‛ēl* … and each of these species is called ‘heavy’, as R. Judah explained in *Kitāb Ḥurūf al-Līn* (*al-Luma‛*, p. 139).

Elsewhere he defines the pattern *pô‛ēl* as an ‘extended’ (*mazīd*) verb because of the added *wāw*.[[28]](#footnote-29)

Ḥayyūj’s words present a clear division between the strong verbs and the geminate verbs, on the one hand, and the hollow verbs, on the other. In his opinion, the pattern *pô‛ēl* exists both in the strong verbs and the geminate verbs, but not in the hollow verbs; the occurrences that seem to place it in the hollow verbs are interpreted by him instead as quadriconsonantal instances of the model *pi‛lēl*. As he writes in his introduction to the hollow verbs:

There are those with a duplicated *lāmed* of these weak *‛ayin* verbs, and the *‛ayin* *hapoal* in them is a quiescent *wāw*. Sometimes this is to differentiate in meaning. Such was said in *qām, hēqîm* – *lᵉ’ôyēb yᵉqômēm* (Mic. 2:8) … as for *yᵉsōbᵉbūhā ‛al ḥômōtêhā* (Ps. 55:11), it is not of one those since it is *yᵉpô‛ēl* from *wᵉsābab bêt ’ēl* (1 Sam. 7:16) and not *yᵉpa‛lēl,* the first bet is the *‛ayin* of the verb … and such as *mᵉšômēm* and *’eštômēm* – *mᵉpô‛ēl* and *etpô‛ēl,* for they are from *šᵉmāmâ…*[[29]](#footnote-30)

In other words, the geminate verbs are like the strong verbs. *Sôbēb* represents the pattern *pô‛ēl*, where the *wāw* is part of the pattern, while in the hollow verbs the *wāw* is part of the root. For example, *yᵉqômēm* is modeled by *yᵉpa‛lēl*, where the *lāmed* is doubled;[[30]](#footnote-31) the model *pi‛lēl* is the quadriconsonantal double, similar to *pilpēl*, where the first and the third radicals of the verb are reduplicated, like the verb *ṭilṭēl*. In these two cases, Hebrew makes this duplication for the sake of semantic diversity:

And it may occur that the *‛ayin* of the verb is duplicated differently, I believe that this duplication is to separate the meanings. As I shall explain: *wayyāṭilû ’et hakkēlîm* (Jonah 1:5) – *hinnēh H’ mᵉṭalṭelkā ṭalṭēlâ* (Isa. 22:17); *’im mippānay lō’ tāḥîlû* (Jer. 5:22), *wattitḥalḥal hammalkâ mᵉ’ōd* (Esth. 4:4)…[[31]](#footnote-32)

## Ibn Ezra

Ibn Ezra has an entirely different method regarding *pô‛ēl*, which coincides with his understanding of the hollow verbs, as we will see below. In *Ṣaḥot* (p. 123–4) he explicitly disputes the existence of *pô‛ēl* in the strong verbs:[[32]](#footnote-33)

And I do not admit, at all, that there is a heavy pattern and it is *pô‛ēl.* And the future *’ăpô‛ēl, yᵉpô‛ēl, nᵉpô‛ēl, tᵉpô‛ēl.* For the proof that all the grammarians have brought is not complete, and it is that they found ‘*limšōp̱ᵉṭî ’etḥannān*’, ‘*wᵉ’et hannᵉ’ārîm yôda‛tî’*, and how could it be for there to be a pattern in the language and they will not find thousands of its ilk … and for *yôda‛tî* which is a loan word … we will make an entire pattern? And the word *limšōp̱ṭî* is also not a proof, for the matter shall not be established by one witness!

In other words, a pattern should not be added simply to account for rare occurrences. In order to establish a categorical class, such as a form in the verbal patterns, we should find thousands like it. Ibn Ezra proffers alternative explanations for these unique forms.[[33]](#footnote-34) As suggested above, the primary source for Ḥayyūj and his disciple was not the occurrences in the Bible, but rather the Arabic verbal system, which served as their lodestar. It is unclear whether ibn Ezra was aware of the comparison that Ḥayyūj and ibn Janah made to the Arabic verbal system, leading to the creation of the *pô‛ēl* pattern, but it is evident he did not accept it. In order to fully understand his view on this pattern*,* we must examine his approach to hollow verbs as a whole, which he dubs the *šᵉniyyîm*, that is, biconsonantal roots (literally, ‘seconds, those of two’).

As is known, ibn Ezra accepts the principle of the triconsonantal root. His statement on Ḥayyūj’s great innovation is often quoted:

Know, that the early ones would say, the root *yāṣar* is *ṢR* alone, and the root of *šāb* *ŠB* alone, and we will find like that in most of the early *piyyû*‏*ṭim* … this was the opinion of R. Judah ben Quraysh and R. Menaḥem Saruq, and only R. Adonim Halevi awakened slightly from this mistaken slumber, for a deep sleep from the Lord has fallen upon the aforementioned, and the Lord opened the eyes of R. Judah b. R. David, called Ḥayyūj, to recognize the passive letters, and how they are added and missing and replaced (*Sāpâ Bᵉrûrâ* 25:2).[[34]](#footnote-35)

But, as Goldenberg and Eldar have written, establishing that there are no roots with fewer than three consonants was not Ḥayyūj’s greatest innovation; rather, it was the establishment of the latent quiescent (*al-sākin al-layyin*)*,* a termwhich is not found in Arabic, but was invented by Ḥayyūj and applied to Hebrew. The latent quiescent denotes a phonological entity that extends the vowel it follows.[[35]](#footnote-36)

Ibn Ezra theoretically agrees with this term. By way of example, the verb *’eṣṣāq* –as in *’eṣṣāq mayim* (Isa. 44:3) – contains three consonants, and the missing radical is swallowed up by the doubling of the *ṣ*. However, when a long vowel precedes the expected position of the consonant (that is, where an ’*ālep*, *yôd*, or *wāw* is added), ibn Ezra disagrees with Ḥayyūj and claims that we should not see a consonant.[[36]](#footnote-37) Accordingly, ibn Ezra does not see a triconsonantal root in *qām* and similar forms: ‘And R. Šmuel Hanagid of blessed memory said that the truth of *qām* and its ilk are two visible letters and one latent quiescent, this is primary, and my opinion is very close to his.’ (*Ṣaḥot,* p. 120)

Following R. Šmuel Hanagid, ibn Ezra sees the roots this class as composed of only two consonants and a latent quiescent, which is an integral part of the root but is not itself a consonant. Thus for ibn Ezra, forms such as *qômēm and kônēn* do not belong to the pattern of *pô‛ēl*:

[In the matter of the forms] *qômēm, sôbēb, kônēn lammišpāṭ kis’ô*,and a great grammarian said that they are by the model *pô‛ēl* and it is another heavy pattern, and he did not say anything … since if there is a word *qām* from three letters, then *qômēm* is in the model *pa‛lēl*, for the quiescent *wāw* is replacing the *‛ayin* of the verb according to the opinion of all the grammarians that were before me and after ben Saruq, and foremost R. Judah of blessed memory; and if according to my opinion that they are two we cannot put them in the *pô‛ēl* model*,* which is one of the triconsonantal verbs. (*Ṣaḥot,* p. 123)

Ibn Ezra attacks from all possible angles the ‘great grammarian’ who said that the forms *qômēm, kônēn,* and their ilk represent a *pô‛ēl* pattern. If the hollow verbs are triconsonantal and the *‛ayin* of the verb is indeed a *wāw* – which is, is he says, ‘the opinion of all the grammarians that were before me and after ben Saruq, and foremost R. Judah’ – the form *kônēn* must be *pa‛lēl* because the *wāw* belongs to the root and is not an addition. Conversely, if there are no hollow verbs and the root is biconsonantal *QM*, as ibn Ezra indeed believes, it would be absurd to place the form *kônēn* in the triconsonantal *pô‛ēl* pattern. In other words, ibn Ezra disagrees with Ḥayyūj, and rejects the idea that hollow verbs belong to the *pô‛ēl* pattern. Ibn Ezra has another solution for the forms of *kônēn.*

And you should know that regarding these biconsonantals [the hollow verbs according to ibn Ezra – MK] it would be inconceivable that they will be found by way of the heavy patterns with a *dagesh*, for they have no middle letter that would receive a *dagesh*, in my opinion; and according to the grammarians, it is gone and will never receive a *dagesh*, and therefore, the Hebrews have placed in its stead a duplication of the last letter, like *qômēm, sôbēb, kônēn lammišpāṭ kis’ô.* (*Ṣaḥot*, p. 122–3)[[37]](#footnote-38)

Here, Ibn Ezra offers a possible rebuttal, based on both his and Ḥayyūj’s views of the hollow verbs. In his eyes, this class belongs to the biconsonantal roots. In the *qāl* pattern, two consonants are present, but in *pî‛ēl* there is no possibility to place a *dagesh* in the *‛ayin* of the verb since it does not exist. Therefore, the last letter is duplicated. Even according to Ḥayyūj’s view, which holds that this class of verbs is triconsonantal, the hollow verbs, these letters cannot receive a *dagesh* when they appear in *pî‛ēl* (the heavy form with *dagesh*). The duplication of the *lāmed* of the verb is the morphological and phonetic alternative to the missing gemination of the *‛ayin*.

Like his predecessors, ibn Ezra also differentiates between the verbal classes as far as pattern is concerned. The duplication of the *lāmed* of the verb is a morphological solution intended for the biconsonantal class (the hollow verbs).[[38]](#footnote-39) In theory, the geminate verbs, which have three consonants, do not require this solution, and should perform like the strong verbs, eliding the *‛ayin* of the verb in some cases.[[39]](#footnote-40) However, geminate verbs can also mix with biconsonantals and behave like them: ‘And this pattern, which is the biconsonantal verbs alone, will mix with the geminate verbs, *yᵉsōbᵉbû* is said instead of *yāsōbbû,* and this is like *yᵉkônᵉnû.*’ (*Ṣaḥot*, p. 165)

The future conjugation of the root SBB in *qal*, in its original form, entails the doubling of the *bêt*, *yāsōbbû*, and appears as such fifteen times in the Bible. The verb *yᵉsôbᵉbû* (two occurrences: Ps. 59:7, 15) is a mixture of the biconsonantal and the geminate verbs (*yᵉsôbᵉbû* [*SBB*] = *yᵉkônᵉnû* [*KNN*]). But there is not complete overlap. The similarity between the classes, according to ibn Ezra, exists only in the past and future tenses, while in the present progressive the difference is maintained: ‘And the difference between them is in the present, for from SBB it will be said *sôbēb,* and from the biconsonantal roots *mᵉkônēn* with the addition of a *mem*.’ (ibid., p. 165)

According to ibn Ezra, the model *mᵉpô‛ēl* occurs only in the biconsonantal roots, that is, those linguists consider to be the hollow verbs. In the geminate roots, the present is of the model *pô‛ēl,* similar to the occurrences in Scripture.

To summarize, we see that ibn Ezra based his theory of the verbal system, especially *pô‛ēl,* on the occurrences in the Bible. Accordingly, he sees no foundation for the existence of the pattern *pô‛ēl* among the strong verbs. The few cases found in strong verbs in the Bible can be easily interpreted otherwise.

# Conclusion

This article discusses the fundamental difference between Ḥayyūj, the father of scientific Hebrew grammar, and R. Abraham ibn Ezra. The former constructed a Hebrew verbal system similar to that in Arabic, introducing forms corresponding to the first four Arabic patterns. The latter constructed the verbal system internally, based on the evidence and occurrences in Scripture, without resorting to Arabic parallels.

It is interesting to note that in *Sāpâ Bᵉrûrâh* (p. 40), after disputing Ḥayyūj’s view of *pô‛ēl*, ibn Ezra criticizes his predecessors for their comparison between the quadriconsonantal verbs, like *kirsēm,* and the model *pa‛lēl*:

And they erred in everything when they weighed the quadriconsonantal roots on the model of *P‛L* [that is, triconsonantal roots], they said that *kirsēm* is on the model *pi‛lēl*, and how can it be that a quadriconsonantal word has the model of a triconsonantal word?

As we have seen in the article, the comparison between the model *pa‛lēl* and the quadriconsonantal roots lies at the very foundation of Sibawayh’s Arabic grammar, which categorizes the second, third, and fourth roots as one morphological division, syllabically identical and similar to the model *pa‛lēl*. Ḥayyūj and ibn Janah adopted this view from Sibawayh, and, as noted, compared Hebrew to the Arabic verbal system.

The dispute we have described here is also reflected in modern linguistics, which is also divided regarding the existence of the pattern *pô‛ēl* among the strong verbs in Hebrew. Scholars who deny its existence employ claims remarkably similar to those offered by ibn Ezra.

## Afterword

In this article, we see an example of a recurrent process in the history of cultures. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, the science of Hebrew linguistics, and especially grammar, followed the Arabic model. This served, and rightfully so, as the lodestar for the new and innovative science of linguistics. At this stage, the objective was to make the copy as similar to the original as possible. This is why Ḥayyūj and his disciple after him conceived of the pattern *pô‛ēl* as the parallel to *fā‛ala*, one of the four basic forms in Arabic. Several generations later, in the twelfth century, when Hebrew grammar had already established itself, ibn Ezra revaluated the issue using the data provided by Hebrew alone and found no evidence proving the existence of this form.[[40]](#footnote-41) We might liken Ḥayyūj and ibn Janah to someone restoring an ancient sculpture, only partially finished (Hebrew grammar), on the basis of another, more complete statue (Arabic grammar). Even if the original foundation stones (the Bible) are missing, the sculpture can be restored. Ibn Ezra, by contrast, is a sculptor building a new sculpture (Hebrew morphology) using the materials he found (the Bible) for its construction. The old sculpture (Arabic morphology) may serve as an example, illustrating general lines and ideas, but there is certainly no restoration here.[[41]](#footnote-42)
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