

Redundant Pronominal Suffixes Denoting Intrinsic Possession

JOSHUA BLAU
Hebrew University

In the first part of his paper "The Idea of 'Possession' in Linguistic Expression,¹ A Significant Use of the Possessive Pronoun," the late M. M. Bravmann dealt with the "pregnant" use of possessive pronouns in cases like *w'dāḇaq b'īstō* "and he cleaves unto his wife" Gen. 2:24, instead of the expected . . . *b'īššā* ". . . unto a woman." Compare also Iraqi Arabic *yāx'd marta* "he takes a wife" (literally ". . . his wife") and Qur'ān 2:232 *yankihna 'azwājahunna* "they marry 'their' husbands." He further adduced expressions of the type of Arabic *marbūṭun birummatiḥi* "tied with 'his' neck-rope"; *wuḍi'a 'alā sarriḥi* "he was laid upon 'his' bed"; *kuffina fi 'aṭwābiḥi* "he was shrouded in 'his' garments"; *falyatabawwa' maq'adahū* "he shall take up 'his' seat";² *rumiya biḥajariḥi* "he was thrown with 'his' stone"; Bagdadi Judeo-Arabic *qay'bni ḥōšū* "he built 'his' house"; as well as some Ethiopic examples. In the second part of his paper, entitled "Various Semantic Characteristics of the Concept 'to have'," Bravmann compared this usage with the use of the possessive pronoun for the expression of the concept 'to possess' in cases like 'ndī b'ntī (Bagdadi Judeo-Arabic) "I have 'my' daughter," *akū jīrān'm* "they have a neighbor," literally 'there is their neighbor'.

I would like to consider this extraordinarily interesting collection of examples from an additional vantage point. All the nouns adduced by Bravmann exhibiting a *prima facie* redundant possessive pronoun are substantives—generally or at least in the special context in which they occur presupposed—so that, being implied, they do not need to be introduced to those who share in the discourse. Men have wives, women husbands, people have homes, neighbors, and daughters, dead men are laid on beds, shrouded in garments, prisoners are tied with neck-ropes, persons in certain situations take up seats, and every person meets an adequate adversary, denoted by the metaphor of being thrown with stones. In the wake of Levy-Bruhl,³ these nouns are often dubbed inalienable. This term has the great advantage of being suggestive and perfectly fits the parts of body, nouns like husband, wife, daughter, and so forth. On the other hand, its clear overt references make its use somewhat difficult for nouns

1 This paper appeared in its final form in Bravmann's *Studies in Semitic Philology* (Leiden, 1977), 357–73; but its first part was already published in *Le Muséon* 85 (1972), 269–74.

2 A parallel passage is Ibn Saad, *Biographien Muhammads, seiner Gefährten und der späteren Träger des Islams*, (Leiden, 1904f.), 12:10, ll. 3–4 *man ḥalaḥa 'ala minbari kāḍiban . . . falyatabawwa' maq'adahū mina -lnāri* "he who swears falsely on my pulpit . . . , shall take up 'his' seat of fire." Similarly p. 12:20.

3 See H. (B.) Rosén, *Lingua* 8 (1959), 267, n. 6.

like bed, garment, neck-rope, seat, which cannot easily be described as something “the ownership of which is not transferable.” E. H. Bendix⁴, speaks, in the main, of inherent nouns as against accidental ones, yet he also mentions the opposition objective: subjective, and, further, intrinsic: extrinsic. R. Hetzron⁵ speaks of “intimate possessions”. In the following, I shall use the term “intrinsic possession,” because it suggests not only parts of the body, parts of a whole and relatives, but everything that naturally belongs to a given context.

Since nouns intrinsically possessed, in contradistinction to ordinary, extrinsic nouns, need not be introduced to those who take part in conversation, they often behave in a haphazard manner. Being implied in the situation, they need not be referred to exactly.⁶ Therefore, sometimes the singular is used instead of the exact number, as Ps. 115:5–6 *pē lāhem*. . . *ʾap lāhem* “they have ‘mouth’. . . they have ‘nose’”. Similarly, in Classical Arabic the plural, and sometimes the singular, replaces the dual of such nouns denoting single members of the body, preceding a pronominal suffix in the dual, as *qulūbuhumā* (sometimes *qalbuhumā*) “the hearts of them both.” Often intrinsic nouns, which according to context are expected to be accompanied by a possessive pronoun, instead exhibit the definite article, as Qur ʾān 4:23, where between names of relatives that govern possessive pronominal suffixes two nouns defined by the definite article (or, more accurately, defined by a genitive determined by the definite article) are inserted: *ḥurrimat ʿalaykum ʾummahātukum wabanātukum waʾaxawātukum waʾammātukum waxālātukum wabanātu -Paxi wabanātu -Puxti waʾummahātukum -llatī ʾarḍaʿnakum waʾaxawātukum minā -lraḍāʿatī waʾummahātu nisāʾikum*. . . “forbidden to you are your mothers and daughters, your sisters, your aunts paternal and maternal, ‘the’ brother’s daughters, ‘the’ sister’s daughters, your mothers who have given suck to you, your suckling sisters, your wives’ mothers. . . .” Moreover, even indefinite nouns may replace expected definite nouns with a possessive pronominal suffix, as Mal. 1:6 *ben yʿkabbeḏ ʾab* “a son honors [his] father.”

Here, however, we are interested in the inverse phenomenon, namely, the use of possessive pronouns even in contexts in which one would not have expected them. Since intrinsic nouns are firmly anchored in context, they are so regularly accompanied by references to this context that in some languages they regularly govern possessive pronouns.⁷ An additional reason for the use of possessive pronouns with intrinsic nouns, related with the connection of intrinsic nouns with their context—but by no means identical with it—is the tendency toward concreteness: intrinsic nouns, especially parts of the body (but not only they), are conceived by the speaker only in connection with their owners, rather than as such.⁸ In some cases, as in those of proleptic pronominal suffixes in Akkadian and Aramaic (type *aḥātīšu ša S*. ‘S.’s

4 Bendix, *Componential Analysis of General Vocabulary, the Semantic Structure of a Set of Verbs in English, Hindi, and Japanese* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1966). I am indebted to E. Rubinstein for calling my attention to this work.

5 *The Gunnān-Gurage Languages*, Studi di Semitistica e del Vicino Oriente Antico, Richerche 12 (Istituto Orientale di Napoli: Napoli, 1977), 119.

6 I hope to deal *in extenso* with the following features in a monograph treating intrinsic possession in Arabic and Hebrew, to be published in the *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*. Here I content myself with citing the main types of the special behavior of intrinsic nouns, my aim being to deal with redundant pronominal suffixes attached to intrinsic nouns.

7 V. W. Havers, *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1931), 111–12, §92, where further literature is quoted.

8 Loc. cit.

sister'; *abūhī dī A.* 'A.'s father'),⁹ the prevalence of this feature with intrinsic nouns is it seems due to the tendency toward concreteness only, since the possessor to which the proleptic pronoun refers has not yet been mentioned.

In other cases, however, multiple causation for the use of (a special form of) possessive pronouns¹⁰ with intrinsic nouns obtains. Thus in Modern Hebrew two sets of possessive pronouns are used: synthetic pronominal suffixes, relatively often attached to intrinsic nouns, and analytic *šel* forms. H. Rosén¹¹ was the first who called attention to the same substantives being used in intrinsic sense with pronominal suffixes (type *b'nōtay* 'my daughters'), in extrinsic usage with *šel* (type *bānōt šellī* 'my girls'), interpreting the difference in usage as primarily marking the opposition intrinsic: extrinsic. U. Ornan,¹² however, has demonstrated that *šel* forms occur with substantives used in a less common meaning, in our case, *bānōt* in the sense of 'girls'. Consider, for example, *ʔōšār*. In its usual sense 'treasure' it takes pronominal suffixes: *ʔōšārēnū* 'our treasure'. But in its exceptional usage 'treasury' it employs the *šel* form: *hāʔōšār šellānū* 'our treasury', *ʔōšār* being in both senses an extrinsic noun.

Nevertheless, the use of intrinsic nouns with pronominal suffixes is not without connection to their intrinsicity. In spoken Modern Hebrew a tendency toward the use of *šel* forms, at the expense of pronominal suffixes, obtains. In Biblical Hebrew, on the other hand, pronominal suffixes are always used. Accordingly, since one of the most important factors influencing Modern Hebrew is Biblical Hebrew, nouns occurring in the Bible with pronominal suffixes¹³ tend to be used in literary Modern Hebrew with pronominal suffixes as well, whereas other

9 The connection of this feature with intrinsic nouns was—correctly in my opinion—stated by Havers, *Wörter und Sachen* 12 (1929), 170f. (also quoted in his *Handbuch*. . . , pp. 112, 239). It is a pity that his observation has not been heeded by Semitists. At any rate, the analysis of the examples cited by M. Z. Kaddari, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies* (Jerusalem, 1969), 109-10; T. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*² (Leipzig, 1898), 155-56, 158, M. Schlesinger, *Satzlehre der aramäischen Sprache des babylonischen Talmuds* (Leipzig, 1928), p. 66, §39; H. Bauer - P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (Halle, 1927), 314j; W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (Roma, 1952), p. 193, §138j, demonstrates the prevalence of intrinsic possession in this construction, making the historical connection between this construction and intrinsic nouns quite likely. For this feature in the Arabic dialect of Djidjelli see below.

10 According to J. H. Greenberg, in C. N. Li, ed., *Word Order and Word Order Change* (Austin, 1975), 41-42, Austronesian and Amerindian languages have for intrinsic nouns (Greenberg uses "inalienables"), typically body parts and kinship terms, possessive affixes (type: head-my), whereas extrinsic possession is expressed by a superordinate possessed noun in apposition to the noun designating the actual possessed object (type: dog my-animal; one cannot say "my dog" directly). Historically, Greenberg adds, it is the intrinsic nouns that retain the earlier construction. In my opinion, the reason for the survival of the earlier construction with intrinsic nouns is that, because of their firm connection with the context and tendency towards concreteness, they have been so often used in (the earlier) possessive construction that the new possessive construction did not supersede it in them. Cf. however, note 15 below.

Greenberg also mentions Egyptian Arabic *ʔabi* 'my father' as against *bēt b'tā'i* 'my house'; it seems, however, that the situation in Egyptian Arabic is more complicated (see W. Spitta, *Grammatik des arabischen Vulgärdialectes von Ägypten* [Leipzig, 1880], 262f.), though intrinsicity is one of the important factors determining the use of pronominal suffix. Cf. the use of pronominal suffix in Djidjelli, below.

11 *ʔvrit ʔova*¹ (Jerusalem, 1957), 137f.; *ʔvrit ʔova*² (Jerusalem, 1967), 149f.; cf. also *BSL* 53 (1957-58), 321111f.

12 In: *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Papers*, (Jerusalem 1968), Hebrew lectures, 2:117-22.

13 I am simplifying the issue. As a matter of fact, the development was more intricate since the use of pronominal suffixes in later layers of Hebrew influenced Modern Hebrew as well.

nouns are more exposed to the influence of the spoken language and exhibit *šel* forms. This is the reason—besides the important principle of differentiation, rightly stressed by Ornan—that nouns in their usual meaning, influenced by Biblical Hebrew, govern pronominal suffixes, whereas in their exceptional meaning, occurring only rarely or not at all in the Bible, they are followed by *šel* forms. Since intrinsic nouns *because of their intrinsicity* are very often used in the Bible with pronominal suffixes, they are used so in literary and even spoken Modern Hebrew as well, in contradistinction to their usage in exceptional, extrinsic meanings. Thus intrinsicity does bear, though indirectly, upon the use of pronominal suffixes with intrinsic nouns.

As we have seen, one of the characteristics of intrinsic nouns is their tendency—because of their firm connection with the context and tendency toward concreteness—to govern possessive pronouns even in contexts in which they are redundant. This is, no doubt, at least one of the main factors that caused the nouns cited by Bravmann to be used with pronominal suffixes. Wives cannot be imagined without their husbands,¹⁴ men without their wives, daughters without parents, neighbors without their neighbors, homes without their inhabitants. Similarly, other nouns must in certain situations be connected with their possessors, as neck-ropes with the person tied, beds with the person lying on them, shrouds with the dead, seats with the persons sitting on them, and stones with the persons who are pelted with them. It is because of this tight connection with the possessor that these nouns may exhibit pronominal suffixes even when according to strict logic these pronouns are redundant.

In the following I shall cite additional cases of such “redundant” pronouns with intrinsic nouns, dividing them into three groups. First, I shall adduce cases in which the use of the possessive pronoun may be due both to the intrinsic nouns being firmly anchored in the context and to the tendency toward concreteness. Then I shall treat cases which, it seems, reflect concreteness only. Finally, I shall deal with ramifications of the concept “to possess,” which were also treated separately by Bravmann.

1. Redundant possessive pronouns due, besides other possible reasons, to the firm connection of intrinsic nouns with the context and a tendency toward concreteness (as are the examples cited by Bravmann in the first part of his paper): In the Arabic dialect of Djidjelli in Algeria, and in the Berber substratum, too, some nouns denoting relationship are always used with pronominal suffixes, even in cases like *būh qahwāzi ʔubnu ʕeiyād* “the (literally: his) father is coffee-house keeper and the (literally: his) son is fisherman.”¹⁵ In Biblical Hebrew redundant pronominal suffixes occur in adverbials of limitation, governed by an adjective/participle either in the absolute or in construct. The absolute is attested in 2 Sam. 15:32 *qārū^{ac} kuttontō* ‘with his coat rent’; Neh. 4:12 *w^habbōnīm ʔiš ʕarbō ʕsūrīm ʕal motnāw ūbōnīm* “and the builders every one had his sword girded by his side and built.” For

14 The husband is also mentioned as possessor in Gen. 29:28 *wayyitten lō ʔet rāḥel bittō lō l^ʔiššā* “he gave him Rachel his daughter to be his wife,” *lō l^ʔiššā* constituting a separate syntagmeme, “a wife for him.” Cf. also Gen. 29:29 *wayyitten lāḥān l^erāḥel bittō ʔet bilhā šiphātō lāh l^ešiphā* “and Laban gave Rachel his daughter Bilhah his maid to be her maid,” *lāh l^ešiphā* denoting “a maid for her”; similarly, 29:24 *wayyitten lāḥān lāh ʔet zilpā šiphātō l^el^eʔā bittō šiphā*, literally “and Laban gave her Zilpah his maid to be Leah his daughter’s maid” (which seems more convincing than to regard *l^el^eʔā bittō* as apposition to *lāh*).

15 For additional examples, see P. Marçais, *Le parler arabe de Djidjelli* (Paris, n.d.), 406. Intrinsic nouns denoting body parts tend to use the earlier constructions in Djidjelli (cf. note 10 above), viz., pronominal suffixes and the construct. Yet surprisingly enough the construct is especially frequent with nouns denoting body parts used in figurative sense; for particulars see *ibid.*, 415–16.

the construct see Prov. 14:2 *nēlōz d'rākāw* "one who is perverse in his ways." In other cases the adjective/participle may be analyzed as either absolute or construct: 2 Sam. 9:13; Isa. 1:30; 30:27; Amos 2:16; Prov. 19:1. In all these cases one would have rather expected the adverbial to be indeterminate, such as *nēlōz d'rākīm*, literally "one who is perverse as to ways," rather than "as to his ways."¹⁶ Observe that the (secondary) pronominal suffix of *d'rākāw* does not determinate the construct *nēlōz*, which according to the context and the parallel *hōlēk b'yošrō* has to be analyzed as indeterminate.¹⁷ Compare perhaps also Gen. 41:14, 2 Sam. 12:20 *wayhallep šimlōtāw* "he changed 'his' apparel."¹⁸

2. In the following cases the use of redundant pronouns with intrinsic nouns is due to tendency toward concreteness, rather than to the context: In Djidjelli with certain kinship terms proleptic pronouns are used (see above for such pronouns in Akkadian and Aramaic), as *lūsetha ddi-zīn'b* "the sister-in-law of Z."¹⁹ The pronominal suffix seems redundant with certain nouns denoting time as well, as Hebrew *kebeš* (*ʿeḥād*) *ben š'nātō* (see the concordance) "one lamb of the first year." Note again that the (secondary) possessive pronoun does not determinate *ben*, which serves as an apposition to the indefinite *kebeš*. Compare Classical Arabic *sārā laylatahumā wayawmahumā* "they went day and night"; *ʾanna -llāha qad faraḡa ʿalayhim xamsa ṣalawātīn fī yawmihiḡ walaylatihim* "that God has prescribed them five prayers every day and night"²⁰; and Akkadian *ina ḡarpišu* 'in summer'.²¹

3. Ramifications of the concept "to possess": El-Amarna 20: 8–9 *ana aššatīšu ana bēlti Mišri ana leqē* "in order to take for him a wife to become the lady of Egypt", the underlying structure being "to make him: he has a wife". Similarly 27: 17–18 *undu aššatīša ʿerīšu aḡūiā inandunmāme* "as soon as my brother gives a wife for me whom I want", the underlying structure being "makes me: I have a wife". In other cases the *ša*-phrase precedes *aššatu* with a pronominal suffix referring back to it:²² 20: 16 *ša aḡīia aššassu ša māi Mišri bēlassu anandin*, literally "the wife of my brother, the lady of Egypt I shall give", that is, "I shall send a wife for my brother to become the lady of Egypt," the underlying structure being "I shall make: my brother has a wife, Egypt a lady". Similarly

16 In classical Arabic, as a rule, accusative adverbials of limitation are indeterminate. Yet, after adjectives/participles in construct, adverbials of limitation are introduced by the definite article, whereas in the so-called *naʿt sababī* construction, in which the adverbial of limitation in the surface structure has the function of the subject of the adjective/participle, it invariably governs a pronominal suffix.

17 One could, of course, read *nālōz* in the absolute and thus account for its being indeterminate. Yet not only is a similar phenomenon attested with *ben š'nātō* (see below), but this phenomenon is well attested with the improper construct in classical Arabic—which, as mentioned in note 16, exhibits a genitive with definite article, rather than with pronominal suffix. It is even possible that the fact that the genitive in improper construct does not make the *nomen regens* definite arose through the perhaps secondary determination of the genitive.

18 This phrase, however, may also be interpreted as expressing possession: "made change: he has an apparel". In Gen. 19: 12 an indeterminate kinship term alternates with two determinate ones: *ḡatān uḡānēkā uḡnōtēkā* "son in law, 'your' sons and 'your' daughters." Interesting is 2 Sam. 15:30 *w'rōš lō ḡāpūy* "and he had his head covered," rather than *w'rōšō ḡāpūy*.

19 For further examples, see Marçais, *Djidjelli*, 421.

20 See H. Reckendorf, *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen* (Leiden, 1895-98), 391.

21 For this and other examples in Akkadian, see B. Landsberger, *JNES* 8 (1949), 288. Landsberger, however, considers them determinate by situation because—in contradistinction to Hebrew and especially Arabic—the pronominal suffix does not refer to the subject.

22 Cf. von Soden, *Grundriss*, p. 193, j-l.

29: 28 *ša aḥīia ša arammūš aššassu mārī attannaššu* “to my brother whom I love I have given my daughter as wife,” the underlying structure being “I have made: my brother has my daughter as wife”; and so also 21: 13–14. In the examples adduced from El-Amarna ‘wife’ exhibits a redundant pronominal suffix, as in *w^edābaq b^eištō*, cited by Bravmann, and in *UT Krt 12–13 att.šdqh.lypq mtrht.yšrh* “he could not find ‘his’ rightful wife, ‘his’ proper spouse,” being the surface structure of “he could not get: he has a lawful wife. . .” So also Jud. 21:21 *waḥ^aṭaptem lākem ʾiś ʾištō* “and catch every man ‘his’ wife”; 21:22 *lō lāqaḥnū ʾiś ʾištō* “we have not taken each man ‘his’ wife”, the underlying structure being “to make (by catching, taking): you/we have wives.”

One would also like to mention here the Hebrew phrase *bānā*, etc. *bētō* “he built (etc.) ‘his’ house” (for example 1 Kgs. 3:1; 7:1; 9:15; Jer. 22:13; Prov. 9:1; 14:1), although *bētō*, etc., may also be analyzed as an object of result; the underlying structure would then be “he made through building: he had a house.”²³ Even less certain is whether *nāṭā/tāqa^c*, etc., *ʾoh^olō* “he pitched ‘his’ tent” has to be interpreted as being the surface structure of “he made (etc.) by pitching: he had a tent”, since “his tent” may be analyzed as an ordinary object (not necessarily as an object of result): he has a tent, which he pitches wherever he camps. On the other hand, indefinite *ʾohel* does occur in such phrases: Jer. 6:3 *ʾēlēhā yābōʾū rōʿīm w^eedrēhem tāq^cū ʾālēhā ʾohālīm sābīb* “shepherds with their flocks will come unto her, they will pitch tents against her round about.” Compare further Ps. 104:21 *ūl^hbaqqeš mēʾēl ʾoklām* “to ask “their’ food from God” (= “to ask: they have food”); 104:27 *lātēl ʾoklām b^cittō* “to give food in due time,”²⁴ and perhaps also 105:11 = 1 Chr. 16:18 *l^hkā ʾetten (ʾet) ʾereš kⁿnaʿan hebel naḥ^olatkēm* “unto you shall I give the land of Canaan, ‘your’ lot of inheritance.”

In the examples here adduced the pronominal suffix may be interpreted as “dative”: “to take/give (etc.) him a wife”, “to build himself a house,” “to pitch himself a tent,” “to give him food, inheritance,” “to ask food for himself.” It stands to reason that if in Biblical Hebrew datival pronominal suffixes in fact exist, they arose, partly at least, through the decisive influence of intrinsic nouns with pronominal suffixes in ramifications of the concept “to possess.” At any rate, all the examples adduced by C. Brockelmann,²⁵ exhibit, as Brockelmann realized, the concept “to possess,” the possessed being, as I would like to add, an intrinsic noun:²⁶ Num. 12:6 *ʾim yihyē n^hi^akem* “if you have a prophet”; Jud. 4:9 *lō tihyē tip^artēkā ʿal hadderek* “you will not attain honor on your way”; Job 6:10 *ūt^hī ʿōd neḥāmāti* “I shall yet have comfort.” Brockelmann adds as a ramification of this construction Exod. 2:9 *ʾetten ʾet š^ekārēk* “I shall give you reward” (= “I shall make: you have reward”). The same applies to two Ugaritic passages, cited by S. E. Loewenstamm,²⁷ *UT 67:I:20–21 šb^c ydty.bš^c* “I have seven portions in the bowl”; 2Aqht:I:26–27 *wykn.bnh bbt.šrš.bqrb hklh* “and he will

23 Cf. Bagdadi Judeo-Arabic *qay^ebni ḥōšū* “he built ‘his’ house” (cited above from Bravmann), which, pace Bravmann, must therefore be analyzed as expressing possession rather than exhibiting the “pregnant” use of possessive pronouns.

24 Cf. Sefire I B 38 (Old Aramaic) *hn lthb lhmy* “if you do not give ‘my’ provisions.”

25 *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Berlin, 1908–13), 2:263, § 182b.

26 Yet Exod. 3:21, cited by Brockelmann, *ḥen ḥāʿām* “favor with the people” is a *genitivus obiectivus*, *ḥnn* being a transitive verb.

27 *L^ešōnēnū* 38 (1973–74), 149–50.

have a son in (his) house, a scion in the midst of his palace.” Loewenstamm rightly remarks that Ps. 115:7 *y^edēhem . . . raḡlēhem* “they have hands . . . they have feet,” cited by Brockelmann²⁸ as one-term clauses, should not be separated from what Loewenstamm terms “datival usage” and what we prefer to call “expressing the concept of possession with intrinsic nouns”, treated by Brockelmann in the passage cited.²⁹ I am inclined to interpret similarly the Classical Arabic phrase *wa’axaḡati -Parḡu zīnatahā*,³⁰ literally “and the soil took its ornament,” that is, “and the soil adorned itself”, its deep structure being “and the soil made: it had ornament.”

I have endeavored to cite additional examples besides those adduced by Bravmann for redundant pronominal suffixes, both in what he terms “pregnant” usage and in those usages expressing the concept “to possess.” We have seen that in all examples, in those quoted by Bravmann and in those added, the nouns governing the possessive pronoun were intrinsic substantives, which being firmly anchored in the context and/or tending toward concreteness, very often govern pronominal suffixes, even when the latter seem redundant. I had hoped that I would have been given the opportunity to discuss this additional view with Dr. Bravmann personally. It happened, however, that these lines are published in the volume dedicated to his memory.

y^ehē zikrō bārūk!

28 *Grundriss*, 2:40, §21g. The other two examples, Eccl. 5:14 and Gen. 22:24, adduced by Brockelmann as denoting possession, exhibit intrinsic nouns as well. It is, however, very dubious whether they can in fact be interpreted as denoting possession (Brockelmann himself contents himself by adding them as “perhaps” pertinent).

29 Loc. cit.

30 A. Ṣāliḡānī, ed., *Rannat ’almaṡālīṡ walmaṡānī fī riwāyūt ’aṡaḡānī* (Beirut, 1932), 1:18, 5f.b. (= 19, 8f. b.).