

of the letter,  
 Adresse in order  
 rs.  
 y of the East  
 i Iran, since at  
 ular leaders of

ANDRZEJ ZABORSKI

(Cracow)

### Qātala and Qattala in Semitic and Hamitosemitic\*

The so-called third class of derived verbs with long *-ā-* in the first syllable of the stem has been object of the monumental monograph study by the eminent Arabist and Semitist Père Henri Fleisch (1944; cf. reviews by M. Cohen 1946 and F. Rosenthal 1947). Since then it is usually taken for granted that *qātala* is limited only to Semitic being a Semitic (or even South Semitic) innovation, its main functions being, according to Moscati et al. (1964, 124): 1. reciprocal "i.e. to indicate an action accomplished together with another person", e.g. Arabic *katab* 'he wrote' versus *kātaba* 'he corresponded', 2. conative (cf. Sh. Morag in "The Annual of the Schocken Institute for Jewish Studies" 2, 1969–1974, pp. 120–125) since it "indicates an action directed towards an object as well as an attempt to accomplish something", e.g. Arabic *qatala* 'he killed', versus *qātala* 'he fought'. In the standard Introduction by Moscati et al. (1964) there is no mention at all of the fact amply illustrated by Fleisch (1944 and 1979) that:

1. *Qātala* has also an intensive function like *qattala* in many verbs — this was emphasised already by Christian in 1936. E.g. Arabic (cf. also Fleisch 1979, pp. 299–300) *ḥaṣara* 'to surround, encompass' versus *ḥāṣara* 'to surround for a long time, to besiege', *waliya* 'to be close, next, adjacent' versus *wālā* 'to do constantly, to continue without interruption, to follow immediately', *ṭarada* 'to chase away' versus *ṭārada* 'to chase after, to run after, to pursue'. In Tigre where *qātala* forms are frequently used they often have intensive meaning including action directed at several objects (cf. Akkadiom), e.g. *salas wa faras qātala* 'il en tua trois

---

\* The original version of this paper was presented at the open seminar organized by the working group on "The Living Semitic Languages and Comparative Semitics" of the Institute for Advanced Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem in September 1991. It was written during my stay as a fellow of the Institute in Jerusalem in 1990/1991.

et le cheval', *kafla* 'to divide' versus *kāfala* 'to divide into several portions'. The situation in Tigrinya is similar, cf. Fleisch 1944, 264. In some instances *qātala* is used also for expression of repeated, habitual action (cf. Leemhuis 1977, pp. 74-89) which is connected with the intensive/iterative function of *qattala* (cf. Fleisch 1979, 298). It should be emphasised that the original meaning of *kātaba* 'to correspond' (see above) was rather 'to write a lot, to write many letters', the 'reciprocal' function being secondary and due to the semantics of the particular verb.

2. *Qātala* has also a causative or transitive-factitive function (Wright 1896, 1896, rem. c; Brockelmann 1908, 512; MacDonald 1963, 83 and 107; Fleisch 1979, pp. 300-301; Jastrow 1971, 257-258) like *qattala* in some instances, e.g. *ḡāwaza* = *ḡawwaza* 'to make pass'; *sāqata* 'to make fall', *tāba'a* = *tabba'a* 'to make to be followed, to make consecutive'; *ṭāraqa* = *ṭarraqa* 'to put together, to sew together', *zāhara* = *zahhara* 'to put together, to put one over the other', *ḡā'afa* = *ḡa'afa* 'to put together, to double' (cf. also Nöldke 1963, pp. 26-27). This causative function is combined with the reciprocal function.

3. Both the third and the second class (also four radical verbs but this is another problem) are used for derivation of denominal verbs.

4. Both are used when loanwords are incorporated.

Finally the Introduction by Moscati et al. (1964) makes a false impression that *qātala* is limited to Arabic and Ethiopic while 'traces of this stem in Northwest Semitic are rather dubious' though there is *pq'el* in Hebrew.

While the monograph study by Fleisch makes it clear that *qātala* goes back to Proto-Semitic, its Proto-Hamitosemitic status has been ignored so far. Fleisch has been looking for cognates in other Hamitosemitic languages but somehow he has missed the point. Fleisch looked into the Cushitic Beja but unfortunately he knew only the grammar of the Bishari dialect by Almkvist (1881) ignoring two other basic grammars by Reinisch (1893) and by Roper (1928). Almkvist (1881, pp. 161-162) provides only four examples of the form in question but first of all Fleisch has rejected the hypothesis about a relation between Semitic *qātala* and Beja derived forms with long *-ā-* because he was unaware of their use with a reciprocal function. Strangely, he considered the frequentative function of forms with *-ā-* mentioned by Almkvist as an argument against a relation with Semitic *qātala* although in his book he provides a lot of examples of an intensive function of *qātala* in several Semitic languages.

Let us reconsider the intensive form of strong i.e. prefix conjugated verbs in Beja which is, unfortunately, still ignored by many Semiticists in spite of the fact that it is one of the most archaic Hamitosemitic languages and thus extremely important for Semitic. The intensive forms are made in Beja (Roper 1928, pp. 68-70), Reinisch 1893, § 201-202; Hudson 1976, pp. 117-118 in three different but related ways:

1. Reciprocal  
*bābab'as*  
versus *ba*  
*laliḡ/lāla*  
places'. F  
radical' q  
this is ra  
collect a

2. Locative  
cession, t  
*birir* 'to  
divorce f

3. Abstract  
*dār* 'to k  
at, drag,  
once' ver

There  
another  
(a)m(o)-  
function  
mean 'to  
only), e.  
'throw a  
'to kill e  
other!' (

There  
*dedār* m  
e.g. *ama*  
used onl  
and of t  
that her  
both *-ā-*

There  
of you t  
let him  
reciprocal  
a plural  
object (i  
a *patient*  
between

The  
*qātala* :

1. Reduplication (complete or partial) e.g. *b'as* 'turnover' versus *bab'as* and *bābab'as* (note long *-ā-* in the first syllable!) 'turn over repeatedly'; *bis* 'bury' versus *babis* and *bābabis* (again *-ā-*!) 'to bury in several places'; *lig* 'stab' versus *lalig/lālalig* 'to prog repeatedly'; *kitim* 'arrive' versus *kātatim* 'arrive at many places'. Hudson (1976, 118) mentions also 'repetition of one consonant in the radical' quoting as example *ē-ddabīl-na/ē-dbabīl-na* 'they collected carefully' but this is rather a case of partial reduplication; cf. *dibil* 'collect' versus *dābabil* 'to collect a large number of different things'.

2. Long *-ā-* in the first syllable, e.g. *kātīm* 'to arrive at several places in succession, to arrive repeatedly at the same place', *dābil* 'to collect several times'; *birir* 'to spread' versus *bārir* (intensive); *fedig* 'to loose, let free' versus *fādig* 'to divorce for ever'.

3. Ablaut *-i/-ā*, *-i/-o*, *-i/-ē* in biconsonantal roots, e.g. *dir* 'to kill' versus *dār* 'to kill several people', *bis* 'bury' versus *bos* (intensive); *bir* 'to snatch, pluck at, drag, tug' versus *bor* 'to tear to pieces by repeatedly plucking'; *delib* 'to buy once' versus *dālīb* 'to buy consonantly, to be a merchant'.

There is in Beja (Reinisch 1893, § 217-219; Roper 1928, pp. 73-74) also another verbal class with long *-ā-* in which it occurs together with the prefix (a)m(o)- corresponding to Semitic *n-* (cf. Liebermann 1986) and an overall function of this derived class is reciprocal. In the singular such derived forms mean 'to assist another in doing'; in plural it is 'to do each other' (of two persons only), e.g. *gid* 'to throw' and *āneb amógāda* 'help me throw!', *tāktak amógādna* 'throw at each other (you two)!'; *dir* 'to kill' versus *mōdār* 'to help to kill', *m-dedār* 'to kill each other', cf. *baró amódār-heb* 'help me to kill him!', *amódārna* 'kill each other!' (Roper 1928, 73).

There is also another reciprocal form made by partial reduplication (cf. *m-dedār* mentioned above) of the root and prefixing *amo-* (cf. Roper 1928, § 225), e.g. *amógagādna* 'throw at one another!' This form with partial reduplication is used only in plural. Obviously this is a combination of reflexive/passive with *amo-* and of the intensive form (cf. Zaboriski 1996). What is especially important is that here we have a long *-ā-* again which shows the original intensive function of both *-ā-* and gemination/reduplication.

There is another interesting example: *á-kām amó-āma* (note long *-ā!*) 'one of you two rides the camel while the other walks, then, when the walker is tired, let him ride and so alternatively'. That there is a combination of reflexive with reciprocal and intensive which actually is used in Beja when a transitive verb has a plural object is rather natural since in such a situation we have subject and object (or *patiens*) which alternate their functions i.e. subject is at the same time a *patiens* and *patiens* is also a subject (cf. French 'ils se battent'). The connection between intensive and reciprocal in Beja is quite clear.

The occurrence of intensive *-ā-* in Beja is already enough to prove that Semitic *qātala* goes back to Proto-Hamitosemitic (and not simply to a theoretically pos-

sible though rather improbable \*Proto-Cushitic-Semitic) but there is also an evidence of Berber supporting this thesis. Tuareg (which is, generally speaking, the most conservative dialect of Berber) has reflexive/passive *mV/nV* - prefix and in some instances the passive function is combined with intensive providing meanings like 'to be done completely, entirely' (more exactly, following Prasse 1973, 62 "être fait quant à son tout totalement, dans son essence même"), e.g. *mālkāz* (< *alkāz*) 'to be completely crushed, grindled', *māndu* (< *əndu*) 'to be entirely finished', *nāgri* (< *əgru*) 'to discern, to perceive clearly, to be wise'. Tuareg has also derived forms with the reflexive/passive *m/n*- doubled which have a reciprocal function (Prasse 1973, pp. 64-65) where the doubling is connected with the iterative/intensive function. Like in Beja (and in Semitic!) 'Le réciproque signifie donc que deux ou plusieurs sujets exécutent ou subissent simultanément ou alternativement l'action verbale, chacun dans son intérêt (réflecti indirect)' (Prasse 1973, 64). E.g. *nəmānkəs/nəmānkas/mānkās* meaning 'to suck together (the same she-camel)', *nəmādānky* 'to push against each other strongly'. There are also examples of forms which mean that a function is executed by subjects (plural subject) alternatively or successively, e.g. *nəmky* (< *aky*) 'to keep watch successively', *mālkaw* 'to be distributed around successively', *māhwār* 'to transport one after another'. Cf. also pure reciprocal forms like *nāktāb* 'to write to each other, to correspond' (that *k-t-b* is a loan is without any importance here). It is also interesting that *nəmālkāz* means 'to crush each other' while *mālkāz* (see above) means 'to be completely crushed, grindled' but this is already another problem. What is most important here is that forms with the doubled *nm*- prefix originally had \*-ā- (Prasse 1973, pp. 64, 59 and 163!) which is preserved e.g. in the intensive imperfect of *itīmhiwāl* (the meaning is 'to be said by both parties', *itīmšiwār* and *itīmšawār*, *itīnmāšiwār* 'to consult each other' (Prasse 1973, pp. 175-176). Thus the Proto-Hamito-Semitic origin of originally intensive -ā- verbal class is quite clear.

Originally the long -ā- and gemination were variants (probably conditioned phonetically) of the same morpheme with the basic function of intensive/frequentative/continuous (cf. Rosenthal 1947, Garbini 1960, 134 and Ryder 1974, pp. 46-47 on earlier attempts to find a historical relation between the two classes). Actually Brockelmann at first suggested that *qātala* was only a variant ("Nebenform") of the intensive *qattala* (1908, pp. 511-512) but apparently later (1916, 124) he abandoned this idea. Other functions like conative and reciprocal were variants of this basic function which were conditioned by the semantics of the particular verbs and/or by syntactic-semantic factors. Obviously originally intensive *qattala/qātala* has a secondary conative (meaning 'to attempt, to make effort to') function since the basic function of intensive implies repetition of efforts so that '\* to kill repeatedly > to repeat attempts to kill > to fight with someone' and the semantics of the particular verb implies both attempt (one can kill someone only once so that repetition implies attempt or effort, Latin *conatio*)

and at least vi  
-ō<\*ā. Mehri  
forms could ex  
*taqātala* (Ara  
secondary *qā  
qatala*. That  
grammar of A  
sive meaning  
synchronic ap  
der to escape  
approach whi  
comparative

- Almkvist H.,  
Brockelmann  
t. 1, Berlin  
Brockelmann  
Christian V.,  
Orientalia  
Cohen M., 19  
Fleisch H., 19  
Fleisch H., 19  
Goshen-Got  
guages, in  
Jerusalem  
Götze A., 194  
Oriental S  
Hudson R. A  
Carbonda  
Jastrow O.,  
Dialekten  
Jenni E., 196  
Kuryłowicz  
Leemhuis F.  
Liebermann  
Origins o  
Orientalis  
MacDonald  
"The Isla  
Moscati S. et  
Wiesbade  
Nöldeke Th.  
Porges N., 18  
der Kais

and at least virtual reciprocity. E.g. in Mehri there is intensive conative class with  $-ō < *ā$ . Mehri Imperfect goes back to this intensive. In some cases doubly derived forms could exert a secondary influence on the original derived forms, so that e.g. *taqātala* (Arabic sixth class) could influence primary *qātala* and sometimes even secondary *qātala* forms could be derived from *taqātala* and not from the basic *qatala*. That *qātala* has been established as a separate class in the descriptive grammar of Arabic in spite of the fact that so many *qātala* forms have just intensive meaning like *qattala* is due to Arab grammarians who made, in their purely synchronic approach, an arbitrary cut taking a secondary function as basic in order to escape the interpretation of *qātala* and *qattala* as variants. This synchronic approach which is otherwise justified has to be supplemented by a diachronic and comparative perspective.

### References

- Almkvist H., 1881. *Die Bischari-Sprache*, Upsala.
- Brockelmann C., 1908. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, t. 1, Berlin.
- Brockelmann C., 1916. *Semitische Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin.
- Christian V., 1935. *Die kausative Bedeutung des semitischen Steigerungsstammes*, "Analecta Orientalia" 12. pp. 41-45.
- Cohen M., 1946. Rev. H. Fleisch 1944, "Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris" 42.
- Fleisch H., 1944. *Les verbes à allongement vocalique en sémitique*, Paris.
- Fleisch H., 1979. *Traité de philologie arabe*, vol. 2, Beyrouth.
- Goshen-Gottstein M. H., 1969. *The System of Verbal Stems in the Classical Semitic Languages*, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies*, pp. 70-91, Jerusalem.
- Götze A., 1942. *The So-Called Intensive of the Semitic Languages*. "Journal of the American Oriental Society", 62, pp. 1-8.
- Hudson R. A., 1976. *Beja*. In: ed. M.L. Bender, *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*, Carbondale.
- Jastrow O., 1971. *Der III. Stamm des dreiradikaligen Verbums in den arabischen qeltu-Dialekten*, ZDMG 123, pp. 252-261.
- Jenni E., 1968. *Das hebräische Pi'el*, Zürich.
- Kuryłowicz J., 1951-1952. *Le degré long en sémitique*, RO 17, pp. 138-145.
- Leemhuis F., 1977. *The D and H Stems in Koranic Arabic*, Leiden.
- Liebermann S.J., 1986. *The Afro-Asiatic Background of the Semitic N-Stem: Towards the Origins of the Stem-Affirmatives of the Semitic and Afro-Asiatic Verb*, "Bibliotheca Orientalis" 43, pp. 578-628.
- MacDonald J., 1963. *The Arabic Derived Verb Themes — a Study in Form and Meaning*, "The Islamic Quarterly" 7, pp. 96-116.
- Moscatti S. et al., 1964. *Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Wiesbaden.
- Nöldeke Th., 1963. *Zur Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch*, Darmstadt.
- Porges N., 1875. *Über die Verbalstambildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, "Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Wien), Phil.-hist. Klasse" 79.

- Reinisch L., 1893. *Die Bedauye-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika*, Wien.
- Roper E.M. 1928. *Tu Bedawie — an Elementary Handbook*, Hertford.
- Rundgren F., 1959. *Intensiv- und Aspektkorrelation*, Uppsala.
- Rundgren F., 1964. *Das Verbalpräfix yu- im Semitischen und die Entstehung der faktivkausativen Bedeutung des D-Stammes*, "Orientalia Suecana" 12, pp. 99-114.
- Rundgren F., 1980. Rev. of F. Leemhuis, 1977, "Die Welt des Islams" 20, fasc. 3-4, pp. 219-226.
- Rosenthal F. 1947. Rev. H. Fleisch, 1944. "Orientalia" 16.
- Ryder S.A., 1974. *The D-Stem in Western Semitic*, The Hague-Paris.
- Wright W., 1896. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, Cambridge.
- Zaborski A., 1996. *Intensive Verbs and the Present in Cushitic*. In: ed. C. Griefenow-Mewis, *Cushitic and Omotic Languages*, pp. 133-142, Köln.

Oskar Tyciński,  
 Albertyna Demb  
 Krystyna Łyczko  
 John MacGinn  
 Stefan Zawadzki  
 Izabela Jaruzelska  
 Boubker Intissar  
*as-Şan'ānī*  
 Krystyna Skarż  
*arabe en Tun*  
 Edward Tryjarski  
 Olga Molchanova  
*to Place-nam*  
 Irena Kalużyńska

Janusz Danecki  
 and Bo Uta  
 Janusz Danecki  
*Birthday of*  
 Janusz Danecki  
*schra. Eine*  
 Janusz Danecki  
 Jolanta Sierak  
*land in Tran*  
 Danuta Stasik  
*Devotional*  
 Stefan Zawadzki  
 Corrigenda